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ADVERTISEMENTS

*LingAeg Studia Monographica: New Publication*
Relative Clauses in Later Egyptian

Matthias Müller, Basel

Abstract

Almost all grammatical descriptions of any of the diachronic stages of Later Egyptian argue for a definiteness effect in the use of relative clauses: definite antecedents may only have a relative clause with nty-/ete-, participles or relative forms, whereas with indefinite antecedents a ‘virtual’ relative clause, i.e., a circumstantial clause, must be used. The present paper discusses the evidence for this with a special view on the counterexamples and concludes that an occasionally ventured explanation as a restriction-dichotomy explains the evidence in a much better way. Thus, nty-headed clauses (as well as their diachronic successors), participles, and relative forms mark the relative clause as restrictive, while dependent clauses mark it as non-restrictive. In addition, a description of the coordination of relative expressions is presented.

1 Preliminaries

One of the few features that seem to have met principle agreement among Egyptological linguists is that Later Egyptian relative clauses are subject to a definiteness effect. If the antecedent is marked for definiteness the relative clause is either formed with the particle LLeg. nty- > Dem. nty(īw)- > Copt. ete-, or appears as a participle or a relative form. If not, i.e., with an indefinite antecedent, then the relative clause must not be formed with the mentioned particle, but a dependent (‘circumstantial’) clause has to be used marked with the initial particle LLeg. ēw- > Dem. ēw- > Copt. e-. Descriptively, this resembles the situation in Arabic (for which, however, see below) and has thus the advantage of being a pattern typologically attested in the language area, even if much later only.

---

1 I am grateful to Heike Behlmer/ Göttingen, Jennifer Cromwell/ Copenhagen, Eugenio Garosi/ Basel, Eitan Grossman/ Jerusalem, Andrea Hasznos/ Berlin, Sergey Kim/ Basel, Julianna Kitty Paksi/ Basel & Paris, Stéphane Polis/ Liège, Maryan Raghab/ Cairo, Clémentine Reymond/ Basel, Nathalie Sojic/ Liège, Sami Uljas/ Uppsala, Noémi Villars/ Basel, and Ghislaine Widmer/ Lille as well as the two anonymous peer-reviewers for their respective help and suggestions to improve the present paper.

Almost all Late Egyptian and all Demotic examples resulted from searches with the TLA-database (aaew.bbaw.de/tla/) and the Ramsès-database (ramses.ulg.ac.be). Since I added a few Late Egyptian instances from texts not yet included in these databases, I have decided to provide references to the respectives editions for every Late Egyptian example. The Demotic texts are given without these, due to the reason that readings found in the old editions are often obsolete now. The texts can be found easily in the Demotic part of the mentioned TLA-database. The Coptic texts all have a reference to an edition, except for citations from the Scripture.
The statements in the respective grammars are almost univocal\(^2\) and until recently also the present author generally subscribed to this common wisdom. However, counterexamples do exist (a diachronic survey of some of these has been given already by Griffith 1968), as will be shown later. Usually such ‘violations’ of the mentioned rule are hidden under descriptive adverbs such as ‘fast immer’ (Erman 1933: §836) or have to be explained (away one would almost have to say) as slips or the incompetence of the ancient authors (e.g., in Černý & Groll 1993: 498, see also 499). When preparing the first volume of the Basel Diachronic Grammar (Loprieno, Müller & Uljas 2016) we noticed a certain mismatch in the description of the use of the relative clauses between Earlier Egyptian by Sami Uljas and Later Egyptian by me. Initially convinced about the definiteness effect at work, I had to admit though that when scrutinising the data again the definiteness frame lost some of its appeal. Therefore we now argue that not only Earlier Egyptian relative clauses\(^3\) but also their Later Egyptian descendants are used according to the feature [±restriction]. Since the prospected volume I of the Diachronic grammar had reached a considerable length already, the basic arguments for describing Later Egyptian relative clauses within the framework of the mentioned dichotomy has been outsourced here.\(^4\)

Among the prevalent explanations based on definiteness as the decisive criterion, some noteworthy exceptions must be stated: Du Bourget (1971: 46–54) was probably the first to deny the definiteness effect and distinguished between “relatives descriptives (ou contingentes)” and “relatives déterminatives (ou nécessaires à la compréhension de l’antécédent)” (Du Bourget 1971: 46). The description of the Demotic relative clauses in his Demotic grammar (1976: §§76–115) is based on the same model. Approximately around the same time, Korostovtsev (1973: 446) gives an account on the difference between “les relatives subordonnées” (i.e., \(iw\)-headed dependent clauses) and “les relatives auxiliaires” (i.e., \(nty\)-headed relative clauses) based on Tesnière’s Syntaxe (1976: 557) as between “… essentielles: elles sont indispensables pour le sens de régissante” and “accessoires.”\(^5\) Similarly, among the Demotic grammars only Simpson’s (1996: 54–57) deviates from the general definiteness-pattern and explains the difference (apparently expanding on a proposal of Ariel Shisha-Halevy [1989: 49 §6d]) as one between restrictive and non-restrictive clauses. Finally, the definiteness hypothesis is the prevalent pattern in Coptic grammars, except for Reintges (2006), who in addition to the definiteness-split describes restrictive vs. non-restrictive relative clauses as well. Ariel Shisha-Halevy (2007: 350; 2015: 711, 730–731) seems to be the only grammarian of Coptic who speaks explicitly against the usual definiteness-dichotomy and argues for relative clauses as specifying

---

\(^2\) They will be listed below in the respective sections on the diachronic stages.

\(^3\) Following the example of Du Bourget (1971: 46–54) and Malaise & Winand (1999: §§1002, 1021–1027). However, already in Loprieno (1995: 158–161), the difference between the use of the two relative patterns is explained on the basis of the feature [±specificity] of the antecedent.

\(^4\) We are grateful to the editors of LingAeg for granting us the space in their journal to do so.

\(^5\) Additionally, one could name Borghouts (1981: 104), who explains definiteness as the result and not the prerequisite of relativization.
and circumstantial clauses as non-specifying relative clauses. Otherwise, it seems that the restriction pattern mainly has been mentioned in passing for Later Egyptian.\textsuperscript{6}

Restriction as a function of relatives is attested in many languages (Lehmann 1984: 261–280).\textsuperscript{7} In a restrictive relative clause, the latter limits the possible references of the antecedent to a single one and must therefore not be omitted. In addition, it may only refer to a non-clausal antecedent. In a non-restrictive relative clause, the latter adds some further information about the antecedent, which is of lower relevance for the entire sentence and can thus be omitted without changing the meaning. Opposite to restrictive relative clauses, the antecedent of non-restrictive clauses may also be a whole clause (as in, e.g., *The university is short on money, which you know very well, and therefore budget cuts are inevitable.\textsuperscript{7}*)

To exemplify this, let us assume the following situation. Two persons enter a room. In situation A, these are two women. Referring to one of them in the continuation of the discourse will make it necessary to add some information for the recipients, such as the colour of her hair or clothes she wears, body features or something else, such as who entered first, etc. Thus we might refer to one of the women as: *the woman whom I saw first* to distinguish her from the other who appeared second in the narrator’s sight. In this situation of the narrative, the relative clause restricts the reference to one of the ladies and it cannot be left out without crashing the semantics of the whole sentence (as in *the woman whom I saw first is drinking coffee while the woman I noticed later sips tea.\textsuperscript{7}*)

If we now assume situation B, in which the two persons entering are a woman and a man. In this case, *the woman, whom I saw first* does not necessarily distinguish her from the man (assuming a reference system in which we have enough knowledge to tell the difference between these two entities). Thus, the relative clause does not restrict the reference of ‘the woman’, but parenthetically adds some information that was assumed to be of interest for the audience. In contrast to the above-given restrictive relative clause, it can be dispensed with without losing any information from the whole sentence (as in *The woman, whom I saw first, is drinking coffee while the man, whom I noticed later, sips tea.\textsuperscript{7}*)

Note, in addition, that in this function English cannot dispense with the relative pronoun.

In most of the discursive threads, restrictions appear as above with definite entities, which explains the propensity of definite antecedents for relative constructions of that kind. Similarly, most texts introduce an entity as indefinite with further attributions and hence the preponderance of non-restrictive relative clauses with these. However, we could easily imagine a narrative in which the situation above is developed in the following way. People enter the room and the narrator continues: *A woman whom I saw first is drinking coffee while a woman whom I noticed later sips tea.\textsuperscript{7} Even though the antecedent is now marked as indefinite the relative clause still restricts the reference. Similarly in the other

\textsuperscript{6} E.g., Borghouts (1981: 99–100); Friedrich Junge’s description of the determination of the antecedent (Junge 2008: 212–213) for instance could be seen in this light. However, it stands in contrast with his description for the motivation of the ‘virtual’ relative clause elsewhere in his book (Junge 2008: 207).

\textsuperscript{7} Note that the following is not intended to serve as a typological overview, but rather tries to explain the matter with examples from more or less common Egyptian languages.
case: *A woman, whom I saw first, is drinking coffee while a man, whom I noticed later, sips tea.* Here, the relative clause adds some information, but does not necessarily distinguish between the two. Thus, neither of the two relative clause patterns is subjected to the definiteness of the antecedent.

Names, but also designations that are connected with a single entity such as ‘the Pope,’ ‘the President’ (of the whichever state) or ‘the Devil’, as well as noun phrases in generic use such as ‘the archaeologist’ or ‘the refugee’, usually allow only semantically non-restrictive relatives, since there is no pragmatic need to single them out as the class contains only a single member. The same applies to personal pronouns (Lehmann 1984: 264). If a restrictive relative clause is used with such noun phrases, it is always in contrast to other possible members, as in, e.g., *Only the President who ... is a good President.*

In coordinating several relative clauses, it is semantically impossible to posit a non-restrictive relative clause first and then restrict it. The opposite, however, i.e., a non-restrictive clause following a restrictive relative clause, is unproblematic (Lehmann 1984: 263–264).

Finally, nouns with a universal quantifier (every X) compel in most cases the language users to use restrictive relative clauses (Lehmann 1984: 264–265).

English differentiates the two functions via punctuation in written and via pausing in spoken discourse. Restrictive relative clauses follow immediately (as in *the woman whom I saw first*), whereas a comma separates non-restrictive ones from their antecedent (as in *the woman, whom I saw first*). German, instead, does not mark the difference in written (restrictive: *die Frau, die ich zuerst sah* vs. non-restrictive: *die Frau, [pause] die ich zuerst sah*), but in spoken discourse by moving the stress (marked in bold above). Other languages such as Danish (Lundskær-Nielsen & Holmes 2010: 226) have an intermediate position in the graphemic level, since the use of the comma is optional in restrictive but compulsory in non-restrictive relative clauses (restrictive: *kvinden(,) som jeg så først* vs. non-restrictive: *kvinden, som jeg så først*).

Hungarian for instance does not mark the difference in the relative clause. Instead, it uses a specific referential morpheme with the antecedent to signal the restrictive function. Thus, the Hungarian version for a restrictive relative clause in the above cited situation A would be:

```
Two women enter a room and the narrator refers to one of them:

az a nő, aki-t először lát-t-am meg
restr def woman who-acc first see-pst-1s pf.vp
```

“the woman whom I saw first”

The non-restrictive relative clause in situation B would look formally identical in Hungarian and would also be separated by a comma from its antecedent. Yet, the antecedent would lack the restrictive morph *az*:

---

8 Similarly in other languages such as French: *la femme que j’ai vue en premier* vs. *la femme, que j’ai vue en premier*.

9 I owe these examples to the kindness of A. Hasznos/Berlin, and I am grateful to her, as well as Julianna Kitty Paksi’s patience in the matter.
A woman and a man enter a room and the narrator refers to the woman:

*a nő, aki-t először lát-t-am meg*

DEF woman who-ACC first see-PST-1S PF.VP

“the woman, whom I saw first”

As mentioned above, Arabic shows a definiteness split. If the antecedent is definite the relative pronoun *allaḏī m/ allatī f/ allāḏīna mp/ allātī/allawātī/allā’ī fp* (in Standard Arabic, *allī* in Egyptian Arabic) introduces the relative clause, if the antecedent is indefinite, no relative pronoun appears. However, Arabic is capable of marking the difference between restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses as well. The made up sentence of situation A above would in Standard and Egyptian Arabic be:10

Two women enter a room and the narrator refers to one of them:

*as-sayida allatī raʾ-ša-hā awlā* Standard Arabic

DEF-woman REL.f see.PST-1S-3Fs first

*as-sitt allī šuf-ta-hā al-awwel* Egyptian Arabic

DEF-woman REL see.PST-1S-3Fs DEF-first.m

“the woman whom I saw first”

For the non-restrictive function, both varieties use the same pattern, but embrace the relative clause with the *faṣla*, the graphemic equivalent of a comma, whereas in spoken Arabic a pause is set.

A woman and a man enter a room and the narrator refers to the woman:

*as-sayida , allatī raʾ-ša-hā awlā ,* Standard Arabic

DEF-woman PAUSE REL.f see.PST-1S-3Fs first PAUSE

*as-sitt allī šuf-ta-hā al-awwel* Egyptian Arabic

DEF-woman PAUSE REL see.PST-1S-3Fs DEF-first.m PAUSE

“the woman whom I saw first”

Finally, languages such as Russian have no means to distinguish restrictive from non-restrictive relative clauses (Timberlake 2004: 209). Hence, the chosen example of a restrictive relative clause would appear as:11

Two women enter a room and the narrator refers to one of them:

*девушка, которую я увидел сначала*

devuška, kotor-uju ja uvid-el snatšala

woman who-ACC 1S see.PF-PST first

“the woman whom I saw first”

The non-restrictive relative clause would look identical:

10 I am grateful to M. Raghab/Cairo for her kind help in the matter.
11 I am grateful to S. Kim/Basel for confirming this and supplying me with the above given data.
A woman and a man enter a room and the narrator refers to the woman:

девушка, которую я увидел сначала
devuška, kotor-uju ja uvid-el snatšala
woman who-ACC 1s see.PF-pst first

“the woman, whom I saw first”

However, Murelli (2011: 401) shows that, while Russian relative clauses with relative element are prevalingly used to encode restrictive relations, zero-marked post-nominal embedded relative clauses show a propensity for marking non-restrictive relations, similarly to the situation in Earlier Egyptian.

2 Late Egyptian

Basically, and this is probably the reason for the preponderant description, an estimated 90% of the Late Egyptian data follow the definiteness distribution, with nty-relative clauses and relative forms after definite antecedents and virtual relative clauses after indefinite antecedents, as in the two examples given below, while participles seem to have an intermediary position:

(1) In a list, an object is mentioned and a remark appended:

sw m-ti-gʃ nty-ḥr-hd
3MS in-DEF,F-chest REL-under-silver

“It is in the chest that contains the silver.” (pBM EA 10053 rto 5, 14 ed. KRI VI 512, 4)

(2) The accused robbers report that they took care of:

pŠ-nbw i-gm-n m-piŠ-s’h šps n-piŠ-ntr
DEF,M-gold RF-find,PST-1P in-DEM,M-mummy noble of-DEM,M-god

“… the gold that we found in this august mummy of this god.”
(pLeopold-Amherst 2, 15–16 ed. KRI VI 485, 1–2)

(3) One day, the prince stands on the roof-top of his desert abode and beholds:

wŠ-n-gm Ŧw-f m-si-wŠ-n-zi $ʃ$
IDEF,S-of-dog DEP-3MS in-back-IDEF,S-of-man great

“…a dog, which followed an adult/great man.” (Doomed Prince ed. LES 2, 2–3)

Probably the most explicit description is the one in Černý & Groll (1993: 497): “Only such clauses as refer to defined antecedents are introduced by nty,” followed by an extensional list of antecedents considered as defined (Černý & Groll 1993: 497–498) including:

---

12 See Behnk (1930: §102a); Erman (1933: §830 & 836); Frandsen (1974: §100 sub B); Satzinger (1976: 227); Bakir (1977: 121–129); Borghouts (1981: 101; 104); Černý & Groll (1993: 463–511); Neveu (1996: 145–161 & 168–169); Junge (2008: 207, 212–213 & 215). The diachrony of the descriptive approaches is blurred somewhat by the fact that the latest accessible edition has been quoted.

13 See also Bakir (1977: 121): “It is to be stressed that of fundamental importance in Egyptian is whether the antecedent of a qualifying clause is defined or not.”
1) proper names,
2) personal pronouns,
3) the definite article (i.e., the article in headless relative clauses in absolute use),
4) nouns marked as definite with the definite article, the demonstrative, the possessive article, or pronominal possessive marker, as well as
5) nouns with the universal quantifier $=nb$.

Hence, as the list shows, the antecedent either has to be marked for simple definiteness or has to be over-specified for definiteness.

The sole exception is the above-cited grammar of Mikhail Korostotsev (1973), who explains, even though using a slightly different terminology, relative clauses headed by $nty$- as restrictive and dependent clauses with $hw$ as non-restrictive (“explicative”).

As mentioned above, the definiteness effect seems to explain almost all examples. However, there remains a certain amount of examples which apparently violate this rule of distribution. In the following, I will first examine examples in which an $hw$-introduced ‘virtual’ relative clause follows a definite antecedent (2.1) and then $nty$-headed clauses, participles, and relative forms – for convenience sake here subsumed under relatives – after an indefinite antecedent (2.2). In addition, I shall deal with coordinated relative clauses (2.3).

2.1 Late Egyptian ‘virtual’ relative clauses after definite antecedents

As mentioned in the introduction to this sub-chapter, most Late Egyptian $hw$-headed clauses follow an indefinite antecedent as exemplified in example 3 above. However, the corpus also provides examples after a noun with a demonstrative (4–5), a noun with the definite article (6–7), or a noun with a possessive (8):

(4) As his father told him his sad story, the young son develops a revenge plan. He acquires an ox and bribes the herdsman of his father’s opponent to take care of the animal for a little extra. A couple of days after, said opponent, called ‘Lie,’ pays a visit to his pasture and his cattle:

\[
\text{wn-in-f} \quad hr-\text{ptr} \quad p\text{ly-i h} \quad n-p\text{ly-s}d
\]

\[
\text{aux-seq-3ms} \quad \text{prp-see-INF} \quad \text{dem.m-ox} \quad \text{of-dem.m-youth}
\]

\[
\text{iw-f-nfr} \quad zp-2 \quad r-<i>qr \quad m\text{-iwn}
\]

\[
\text{dep-3ms-be_fair.sta} \quad \text{times-2} \quad \text{to-very} \quad \text{in-colour}
\]

“Then he beheld that ox of that boy, which was utterly beautiful in its appearance.”

(Blinding of Truth 8, 1–2 ed. LES 34, 7–8)

14 See also $p\text{Neskhons}$ 77 ed. IdS I 137, 4–5 $p\text{i-rmt} \text{hw-f m-ply-shr}$ “...the man, who is in this state ...”

= Board of Neskhons 22 ed. IdS I 126, 5–6 showing $p\text{i-rmt} \text{hw-f m-p\text{'}(nty)-shr}$. 
The wife of someone involved in the robberies in the royal necropolis is interrogated:

\[ \text{ib hrt Pswry pty-hy pwt i-in pty-hd} \]

what say-2fs N  DEM.M-poss.2fs PPA-bring  DEM.M-silver

\[ \text{iw-f-m pty-t-pr} \]

DEP-3MS-in-poss.m-2fs-house

“What can you tell about Pauro, this husband of yours, who brought that silver, which is in your house?”

(pBM EA 10052 v°13, 15–16 ed. KRI VI 796, 10–11)

In a letter of complaint the writer addresses several issues in which he feels he has been mistreated. Among them is that someone started to conscribe a group of weavers under his name:

\[ \text{iw-hy-f btmri iw-s mpty-f-dmi} \]

DEP-take.PST-3MS DEF.F-weaver DEP-3FS in-poss.m-3MS-town

“..., after he took away the group of weavers, which is in his town.”

(pAnastasi VI 14 ed. LEM 73, 11)

The sender of a letter urges the addressee to send his envoy back to him, but without delay, unlike with the one he had sent before. With the arrival of the present letter, the addressee is ordered to send everything the writer asks for:

\[ \text{iw-di-k in-t-n-i ptr-nbw iwnfr} \]

DEP-give.OPT-2MS bring.SBJ-PASS=to-1S  DEF.M-collar-gold  DEP-good-Ø

\[ \text{mtkrd in-t-n-i tbw n-hd} \]

CNJ-2MS-\{to\}-give.INF bring.SBJ-PASS=to-1S vessel of-silver

\[ \text{iw-lw-irs wr im-f} \]

DEP-FUT-1S-FUT-drink.INF in-3MS

\[ \text{mtkrd in-t-n-i nhrbsw smwy iwnfr} \]

CNJ-2MS-\{to\}-give.INF bring.SBJ-PASS=to-1S DEF.P-garment-P fine-P DEP-good-Ø

“... while you will have me brought the gold-collar, which is beautiful, you should bring me a silver vessel, from which I shall drink, and you should bring me the fine garments, which are beautiful.”

(pBM EA 75019+10302 r° 8–10 ed. Demarée 2006: 47)

After his sister-in-law had poisoned the older brother’s mind by raising false accusations against the younger brother, the former hides behind the door waiting with a spear in his hand for his younger brother to return home in the evening.

\[ \text{iwfhrptr rwd pty-[f-sn]} \]

PTK-3MS-PRP-see.INF foot-DU of-poss.m-3MS-brother great

\[ \text{iwfc hy nhrpsb iwpwy-f-n[iwy mdr-t-f} \]

DEP-3MS-stand.STA in-behind-DEF.M-door DEP-poss.m-3MS-spear in-hand-F-3MS

---

15 Even though the repeated writing of rd| for the infinitive in this letter seems odd (see Winand 1992: 77–78), to assume a cleft sentence here (\[ mkt rd in-t-n-i tbw n-hd iw-lw-r swr im-f \]) “It is you who sent me a silver cup, from which I shall drink,” would result in a long chain of past reference clefts (almost the whole of the letter). For the adjectival sentence with zeroed subject, see Loprieno, Müller & Uljas 2016: chapter III.1.2.1.
“Then he saw his brother’s feet, who was standing behind the door, and had a spear in his hand.”

(Two Brothers 6, 2 ed. LES 15, 7–8)

In example (4), one might attempt to argue that the dependent clause could be an object clause of a verb of perception, but that would stand against the semantics asked for here, as the point is apparently less that the beholder notices the fairness of that animal, which he sees for the first time in his life. The $iw$-headed clause in (5) might be analysed as referring grammatically to Pauro, the husband, who then would live no longer in the mentioned home at the time of the interrogation. In that case, however, one wonders why the clause was not marked as preterit (i.e., $iw$ wn-$f$ m-$p$y-$t$-$pr$ “when he was at your house”). In example (6), the mentioned group of weavers is the only one of its kind. No other workforce of this profession appears in the letter. Again, in example (7), the sender asks for a specific gold-collar and specific garments of fine linen, apparently not for the nice one in opposition to another of lesser aesthetic qualities, but the ‘virtual’ relative clause is apparently a general statement of admiration of these items’ craftsmanship. Example (8) provides a case of coordinated dependent clauses. Again, the situation is not that the second brother is standing behind the door and holding a spear (a detail not even the hero of an Egyptian story might have been able to infer from sighting the feet of a man behind the door), but that the first brother is holding the spear after discovering him.

Such virtual relative clauses can be attested after numbered entities, whether with ordinals (9) or cardinals (10):

(9) Returning from his conversation with the prince of Byblos, Wenamun goes to the harbour of the town:

$iw$-$l$-$nw$ r-$II$ $n$-$br$

$ptk$-$ls$-$sec$,INF $obj$-$II$ of-boat

$iw$-$w$-$niw$ $n$-$p$-$ym$ $iw$-$ns$-$st$ $ni$-$tkr$-$w$

“And I saw eleven ships, that were coming over the sea and belonged to the Tjeker.”

(Wenamun 2, 62–63 ed. LES 73, 10–11)

(10) The header of a magical spell informs:

$r'$ $tpy$ $n$-$sh$-$i$ $m$-$mw$=$nb$ $iw$-$dd$ $hrytp$-$w$ $r$-$f$

spell first of-song of-water=$QU$ dep-say,PRS magician-p to-3p

“First incantation of all the water conjurations, about which the sorcerers say: ...”

(pMag. Harris 501 r° 6, 10 ed. Leitz 1999: pl. 17)

Although the little armada is quantified, the use of a virtual relative clause marks the identification of their owners as additional information. Hence, we can infer that there were probably more ships to be seen than just these eleven vessels. In example 10, the ‘virtual’ relative clause refers to the ‘first incantation,’ to which it adds the information that the sorcerers pronounce the prohibition to reveal it to others.

Semantically more ambiguous are cases with $iw$-headed clauses after personal names, whether of humans (11–13) or deities (14–15):
(11) In a legal document, a couple relates the circumstances that led to manumission of some slaves:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ini} & \quad \text{hm} & \quad \text{Dinihtiry} & \quad r-\text{swn} & \quad \text{iw}-\text{s-ms} & \quad p\text{i}y-3 & \quad \text{hrd}-w \\
\text{bring} & \quad \text{p.st.} & \quad \text{slave} & \quad \text{to-price} & \quad \text{dep-3fs-bear} & \quad \text{inf} & \quad \text{dem.m} - 3 & \quad \text{child-p} \\
\text{w} & \quad \text{s-t-hm-t} & \quad \text{2-t} & \quad \text{dmg} & \quad 3 \\
\text{idf.s-male} & \quad \text{woman-f-female-f} & \quad \text{2-f} & \quad \text{total.3} \\
\end{align*}
\]

“We purchased the slave Dinihtiry, who gave birth to these three children; a male one and two female, together three.” (pAdoption 16–17 ed. Gardiner 1940: pl. VI)

(12) Among the various administrative jottings on the Turin Strike Papyrus, the scribe Amennakhte notes down the accusations of one member of the gang of necropolis workmen against another of these. Besides accusations of theft, they contain allegations of sexual misdemeanour:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{hr} & \quad \text{nk} & \quad 3 & \quad \text{hm-w-t} & \quad p\text{i}y & \quad \text{nh-n-n'-t} & \quad \text{Mnt} & \quad \text{iw-s-mdl-Qnn} & \\
\text{copulate.pst} & \quad \text{3} & \quad \text{woman-p-f} & \quad \text{husband lady} & \quad \text{N} & \quad \text{dep-3fs-with-N} \\
\text{nh-n-n'-t} & \quad \text{Tiwns} & \quad \text{iw-s-mdl-Nhtimn} & \quad \text{nh-n-n'-t} & \quad \text{Twrhtpti} & \quad \text{iw-s-mdl-Pnt/ wrt} & \\
\text{lady} & \quad \text{N} & \quad \text{dep-3fs-with-N} & \quad \text{lady} & \quad \text{N} & \quad \text{dep-3fs-with-N} \\
\end{align*}
\]

“And he copulated with three married women: the lady Menat, who is with Qenna; the lady Tynes, who is with Nakhtamun; the lady Twurehatipti, who is with Petwure.” (Turin Strike Papyrus r° 4, 8–10 ed. RAD 57, 14–16)

(13) A list of similar accusations of sexual misdemeanour, all directed against the foreman Paneb, uttered by the latter’s son under oath:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{nk} & \quad \text{P}n\text{b} & \quad \text{nh(n-n'-t)} & \quad \text{py} & \quad \text{iw-s-mdl-hm-t} & \quad \text{n-rmt-\text{i}s-t} & \quad \text{qmn} & \\
\text{copulate.pst} & \quad \text{N} & \quad \text{lady} & \quad \text{N} & \quad \text{dep-3fs-as-wife-f} & \quad \text{of-man-gang-f} & \quad \text{N} \\
\text{nk-f} & \quad \text{nh(n-n'-t)} & \quad \text{hl} & \quad \text{iw-s-mdl-Pndw} & \\
\text{copulate.pst-3ms} & \quad \text{lady} & \quad \text{N} & \quad \text{dep-3fs-with-N} \\
\text{nk-f} & \quad \text{nh(n-n'-t)} & \quad \text{hl} & \quad \text{iw-s-mdl-Hyswnbf} & \\
\text{copulate.pst-3ms} & \quad \text{lady} & \quad \text{N} & \quad \text{dep-3fs-with-N} \\
\end{align*}
\]

“Paneb copulated with the lady Ty, who is the wife of the workman Qenna, he copulated with the lady Hal, who is with Pendua, and he copulated with the lady Hel, who is with Hesineubef.” (pSalt 124 r° 2, 2–3 ed. Černý 1929: pl. XLIII)

(14) The ennead plans to hold counsel and dine on an island. The Sun god decided to give an order to the divine ferryman Nemty not to ferry any woman over to the island lest the goddess Isis disturbs them:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{wn-in-Js-t} & \quad \text{iy} & \quad \text{iw-st-spr} & \quad \text{r-Nmt} & \quad \text{pji-\text{mhn(t)i}} & \\
\text{aux-seq-N-f} & \quad \text{come.sta} & \quad \text{ptc-3fs-reach.inf} & \quad \text{to-N} & \quad \text{def.m-ferryman} \\
\text{iw-f-hmsi} & \quad \text{spr} & \quad \text{r-pji-f-imw} & \quad \text{dep-3ms-aux.sta} & \quad \text{reach.inf} & \quad \text{to-poss.m-3ms-boat} \\
\end{align*}
\]

“Then Isis came and reached Nemty, the ferryman, who was about to reach his boat.” (Horus & Seth 5, 6–7 ed. LES 43, 6–7)
Relative Clauses in Later Egyptian

(15) The god Osiris has written a letter to the god Reharakhte:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ch-n} & \quad \text{pi-\text{whj}} & \quad \text{n-Wsir} & \quad \text{spr} & \quad \text{r-\text{nty}-\text{pi}-\text{R-\text{hr-\text{hjti}}} & \quad \text{im} \\
\text{PTC-PST} & \quad \text{DEF.M-REL} & \quad \text{DEF.M-N} & \quad \text{there} & \quad \text{iw-\text{f-hms}} & \quad \text{hn-ti-psd-t} & \quad m-ti-id & \quad \text{hd-t} & \quad m-pi-\text{hsw}w \\
\text{DEP-3MS-sit.STA} & \quad \text{with-DEF.F-ennead-F} & \quad \text{in-DEF.F-mound} & \quad \text{white-F} & \quad \text{in-DEF.M-N} \\
\end{align*}
\]

"Then Osiris’ letter reached the abode of Reharakhti, who sat with the ennead on the white mound in Xois." (Horus & Seth 14, 12–15, 1 ed. LES 57, 8–10)

Although usually considered to express the circumstances of those ladies’ temporal relationships (see Černý 1929: 245; McDowell 1999: 47; Toivari-Viitala 2001: 79–80 ‘when she was with …’) and thus influencing Egyptological perceptions of Egyptian marriage (McDowell 1999: 47; Toivari-Viitala 2001: 80), the \text{iw}-headed clauses in 12 and 13 might be analysed as ‘virtual’ relative clauses as well. The \text{iw}-headed clause of 14 has been analysed as a circumstantial clause denoting the state of affairs in which the goddess found the ferryman. Similarly, in example 15, the common reading is ‘while he sat …’.

In almost all of the above cases, the antecedent is the subject of the ‘virtual’ relative clause. Below is an example in which the antecedent is the object of the relative clause:

(16) The father reacts angrily to his son’s reply, in which the latter attempted to refuse his father’s teachings, arguing that the character of a person cannot be changed. The father now exemplifies how even animals can be domesticated against their nature. Among other animals, he refers to:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ti-\text{kiyry}} & \quad (\text{hr-fi}) & \quad \text{pi-\text{mqr}} & \quad \text{iw-\text{bw-\text{fil}=sw}} & \quad \text{mw-t-s} \\
\text{DEF.F-monkey} & \quad \text{PRP-carry.INF} & \quad \text{DEF.M-situla} & \quad \text{DEP-NEG-carry.PST=3FS} & \quad \text{mother-F-3FS} \\
\end{align*}
\]

“The monkey carries the situla, which her mother did not carry.” (Teachings of Ani B 23, 4 ed. Quack 1994: 334–335)

In principle, even the by-form of the ubiquitous epistolary formula “I am praying to the sun-god…” followed by \text{iw}-clauses, which are usually understood as circumstantial, might be seen as containing ‘virtual’ relative clauses: “sun-god, who rises and sets.”

Rather underrepresented are cases of \text{iw}-headed clauses after nouns with the universal quantifier \text{=nb} with the indefinite meaning “any X”:

(17) In a magical spell, the poison in the patient’s body is adjured to leave:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{mi} & \quad \text{m-hr} & \quad \text{n-\text{ibd}=nb} & \quad \text{iw-\text{q-t}} & \quad \text{im-w} \\
\text{come.IMP} & \quad \text{as-face of-bird=QU} & \quad \text{DEP-enter.PST-2FS} & \quad \text{in-3P} \\
\end{align*}
\]

“Come with/as face of any bird, which you entered.” (pmagVatican 19a spell 1 x+3, 2 ed. Suys 1934)

2.2 Late Egyptian relatives after indefinite antecedents

We will now examine cases in which a \text{nty}-headed relative clause, a participle, or a relative form is found after an indefinite antecedent marked as such, either by the singular (\text{w-} in examples 18) or the plural indefinite article (\text{nty-} in examples 19–21).
(18) After protesting against the conscription of some workmen for corvée-labour, the sender of the letter insults the addressee, saying that he does not consider him a scribe of the god Thoth but only as someone who carries the god’s writing palette in his hand. He then returns to the issue of hierarchy:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ir} & \quad \text{w$^{-}$gri} & \quad n-hm-f & \quad \text{c.w.s.} & \quad \text{mrpw} \\
\text{as} & \quad \text{idf.s-shieldbearer of-majesty-3MS} & \quad \text{l.h.p.} & \quad \text{or} \\
\text{w$^{-}$hri$^{-}$lh} & \quad \text{w$^{-}$sms} & \quad n-Pr\text{cij} & \quad \text{c.w.s.} \\
\text{idf.s-master-stable} & \quad \text{idf.s-follower of-Pharaoh l.h.p.} \\
\text{nty} & \quad \text{i-iri-f} & \quad \text{thm} & \quad \text{pi$^{-}$h$^c$} & \quad \text{n$^{-}$r$^{-}$bik} & \quad \text{nty m-Mnnfr} \\
\text{REL} & \quad \text{FOC-do.PST-3MS} & \quad \text{drive,INF} & \quad \text{DEF.M-quantity} & \quad \text{DEF.P-NOM-work REL in-N} \\
\text{bn-mntk} & \quad \text{i-iri-k-hn=n-sn} & \quad \langle m\rangle \quad \text{pr-d$h$witi} & \quad \text{piy-k-ntr} \\
\text{NEG-2MS} & \quad \text{RF-AUX.PST-2MS-order,INF=for-3P} & \quad \text{in-house-N} & \quad \text{POSS.M-2MS-god} \\
\end{align*}
\]

“As for one of his majesty’s, l.h.p., shield-bearers or a stable master, (or) a retainer of Pharaoh, l.h.p., who assigns the amount of work that is in Memphis – it is not you who gives orders to them in the temple of Djehuti, your god.”

(PTurin A v° 4, 1–3 ed. CLEM 508, 10–14)\(^{16}\)

(19) Pharaoh Horemheb addresses his officers, reminding them of the duties he imposed upon them to safeguard foreign territories. Then, in a broken context, he probably quotes a report:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{dd} & \quad m-nhy & \quad n-hjr$^{-}$t-w & \quad \text{hm} & \quad \text{bn-t$^{-}$sn} & \quad \text{iw} & \quad \text{hr-[…]} \\
\text{CMP} & \quad \text{PTC-IDF.P of-foreign_land=F-NIS.P ignorant,PPA live,SBJ-3P come,PPA on-[…]} \\
\text{“[…] that foreigners who do not know how to survive came because […]”} \\
\text{(Memph. Tomb of Horemheb text 76, 13 ed. Martin 1989: pl. 115)\(^{17}\)}
\]

(20) In a letter, the mayor of the town of Elephantine protests against unjustified tax-demands concerning a plot of land near the town of Kom Ombo. The tax has been demanded of him, although he has not cultivated the land, as he swears under a holy oath. Instead, he says:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{w$^{-}$h$^{-}$t} & \quad n-hjr$^{-}$nmh$^{-}$y & \quad fj & \quad nbw & \quad r-pr-wi-hd \\
\text{idf.s-field-f of-IDF.P-free_mann-P carry,PPA gold to-house-DU-silver} \\
\text{n-Pr\text{cij}} & \quad \text{c.w.s.} & \quad \text{pi-ski} & \quad \text{ni-nmh$^{-}$y} \\
\text{of-Pharaoh l.h.p.} & \quad \text{COP.M-cultivate,PPA DEF.P-free_mann} \\
\text{“It is a field of freemen who carried gold to the treasury of Pharaoh, l.h.p., which the free men cultivated.”} & \quad \text{(pValençay I v° 2–3 ed. RAD 73, 1–2 = Gardiner 1951: 131)}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{16}\) According to Caminos’ translation, he seems to divide the text into two sentences. However, cleft sentences with the initial topic marker \text{ir} seem problematic, hence the above proposed analysis as topicalized NP followed by a negated cleft sentence.

\(^{17}\) See also Gardiner (1953: 7), whom Martin apparently followed.
(21) The administrators of the royal Theban necropolis write to the General Piankh, reporting their achievements in matters concerning which he had instructed them. They quote him to have said:

\[ \text{im} \quad \text{in-I} \quad \text{nhy} \quad n-hbs-w \quad \text{gm} \]

\[ \text{make.IMP} \quad \text{bring.SBJ-one} \quad \text{IDF.P} \quad \text{of-garment-P} \quad \text{find.PPP} \]

“Have some garments sent that have been found!”

\[ (LRL \ 46, \ 3) \]

As with the examples cited in 2.1, these aberrant uses of relatives after indefinite antecedents also cannot be explained within the definiteness approach. Understanding them as restrictive clause remedies this. Thus, in example 18, it is not just any retainer of Pharaoh, but only one who assigns the amount of work.\(^{18}\) Similarly in example 19, in which specifically “foreigners who do not know how to survive” are meant instead of saying generally that foreigners would be unaware how to make a living outside the Nile valley, or, in example 20, in which the use of the participle narrows down the group of freemen to those who carried gold for the treasury. Finally in example 21, the garments must refer to some textiles the discovery of which the general was aware of when he left these orders.

In addition, relatives are attested after indefinite pronouns such as \(w^c\) ‘someone’ or \(ky\) ‘another’:\(^{19}\)

(22) A standard-bearer gives orders to a man responsible for a prison to mobilize the prison only after respective orders reached him:

\[ m-rdi-t \quad \text{sn-I} \quad w^c \quad nty \quad m-dr-t-k \]

\[ \text{PROH-give-INF} \quad \text{ask.SBJ-one} \quad \text{one} \quad \text{REL} \quad \text{in-hand-F-2MS} \]

“Don’t cause that someone who is in your charge has to be asked for!”

\[ (\text{PCairo CG} \ 58055 \ \text{ed. KRI I} \ 325, \ 1) \]

(23) A man reports in a missive that eight stone masons stopped their work and continues:

\[ n^#-n-h^#b=n-I \quad \text{hr-kv} \quad nty \quad m-ib-tn \]

\[ \text{DEF.P}-\text{of-send.PST.PASS=} \quad \text{for-1S} \quad \text{on-other} \quad \text{REL} \quad \text{in-heart-2P} \]

\[ \text{dl-I} \quad \text{ini-T}=n-k \]

\[ \text{let.OPT=1S} \quad \text{bring.SBJ-PASS=3MS=} \quad \text{to-2MS} \]

“Those (things) which were sent to me because of another whom you want; I will have him brought to you.”

\[ (\text{oBerlin P.} \ 10614, \ r^9 \ 3–6 \ \text{ed. HPB III pl. 30}) \]

In example 22, the restrictive reading would mark especially the addressee’s responsibility. In example 23, however, one might attempt to explain it in the usual, i.e., definiteness-split, way, in that \(ky\) relates to a specific person here and hence is definite (i.e., ‘the other’).

A relative form is attested after the attributively used \(kthw\) ‘other’:

\[ \]

---

\(^{18}\) Even if one intends to assume the resumptive singular pronoun to pertain to each of the disjuncted preceding NPs, it would simply pertain to each of these.

\(^{19}\) Possibly also in Ani B 18, 7–8 \(hmms \ w^c \ mti \ m^c\) “Befriend yourself with someone correct and just”, which were analysed as adjectives by the editor (Quack 1994: 99 with note 48).
(24) The recipient of a model letter is castigated for unlawful assumption of authority, as well as neglectful conduct of administration. Thus he is asked:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{is-} \text{bn} \text{ dy-t-} \text{k} \text{ r-} \text{ti-} \text{s-} \text{t} \text{ n-} \text{kth-} \text{w-} \text{mr-} \text{w-} \text{pr-} \text{h} \text{d} \\
&\text{IRP-} \text{NEG} \text{ give.} \text{PST-} \text{PASS-3MS} \text{ to-} \text{DEF.} \text{F-} \text{place-} \text{F} \text{ of-} \text{other-} \text{p-} \text{overseer-} \text{p-} \text{house-} \text{silver} \\
&\text{wn-} \text{w} \text{ hr-} \text{sn} \text{ hr-} \text{tk} \text{t} \text{n} \text{ n-} \text{wh} \text{3-t} \\
&\text{be.} \text{RF.} \text{PST-3P} \text{ PRP-} \text{PASS.} \text{INF} \text{ on-} \text{N} \text{ of-} \text{oasis-} \text{F} \\
&\text{“Have you not been put in the position of other overseers of the treasury that meddled with Tjukten of the Oasis …”} \text{ (pAnastasi IV r° 11, 3–4 ed. LEM 46, 13–15)}
\end{align*}
\]

Similarly, participles (and probably also relative forms, which are unattested though) or \text{nty}-relative clauses can be found after antecedents that do not meet the usual definition of being definite, inasmuch as they bear no morphological marking at all:

(25) An account of the robberies sums up the results:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{dm} \text{d} \text{ i} \text{t} \text{j-} \text{w} \text{ wn-} \text{m-} \text{p} \text{-} \text{mhr} \text{ n-} \text{p} \text{i} \text{w-} \text{ntr} \\
&\text{total} \text{ thief-} \text{p} \text{ be.} \text{PPA-} \text{in-} \text{DEF.} \text{M-} \text{pyramid} \text{ of-} \text{DEM.} \text{M-} \text{god} \\
&\text{sw} \text{d} \text{ n-} \text{p} \text{i} \text{w-} \text{hm-} \text{ntr} \text{ tp} \text{i} \text{ n-} \text{Jmn} \text{ m-} \text{hr} \text{w=} \text{pn} \text{ zi} \text{ 3} \\
&\text{assign.} \text{PPP} \text{ to-} \text{DEM.} \text{M-} \text{servant-} \text{god} \text{ first} \text{ of-} \text{N} \text{ in-} \text{day=} \text{DEM.} \text{M} \text{ man} \text{ 3} \\
&\text{i} \text{t} \text{j} \text{i} \text{ n-} \text{n} \text{i-} \text{m} \text{r} \text{h-} \text{y} \text{ zi} \text{ 1} \text{ dm} \text{d} \text{ 4} \\
&\text{thief} \text{ of-} \text{DEF.} \text{P-} \text{tomb} \text{ man} \text{ 1} \text{ total} \text{ 4} \\
&\text{“Total: Thieves that were in the pyramid of the said god and were handed over to the first prophet of Amun on that day; 3 men. Thief of the tombs; 1 man; total: 4.”} \text{ (pLeopold II-Amherst 4, 9 ed. KRI VI 489, 1–3)}
\end{align*}
\]

(26) The god Amunrasonther grants the lady Neskhons the ability to do everything possible for her that she will benefit from. He assures that as long as the sky is fixed and the sun shall go up:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{i} \text{w-} \text{bn-} \text{iri-} \text{md-} \text{t} \text{ bin-} \text{t} \text{ ph-} \text{s} \text{ n-md-} \text{t}= \text{nb} \text{ bin-} \text{t} \text{ nty} \text{ ph} \text{ r-} \text{rm} \text{t} \\
&\text{DEP-} \text{NEG-} \text{FUT-} \text{thing-} \text{F} \text{ bad-} \text{F} \text{ reach.} \text{INF-} \text{3FS} \text{ of-} \text{thing-} \text{F=} \text{QU} \text{ bad-} \text{F} \text{ REL} \text{ reach.} \text{INF} \text{ to-man} \\
&\text{nty} \text{ m-} \text{p} \text{i} \text{y-} \text{q} \text{y} \text{ nty} \text{ Nh} \text{nsw} \text{ im-f} \\
&\text{REL} \text{ in-} \text{DEM.} \text{M-} \text{state} \text{ REL} \text{ N} \text{ in-} \text{3MS} \\
&\text{“… while nothing evil shall befall her of evil things that befall a man who is in this condition that Neskhons is in.”} \text{ (Board of Neskhons 31–32 ed. IdS I 127, 19–128, 2} \text{ = pNeskhons 94–95 ed. IdS I 138, 18–19)}
\end{align*}
\]

(27) Pharaoh’s new wife has demanded to have felled the two persea trees and make furniture out of their timber. So shortly thereafter:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{wn-} \text{in} \text{ hm-} \text{f} \text{ } \text{c.w.s.} \text{ hr-} \text{rdi-} \text{t} \text{ } \text{šm} \text{ hm-} \text{w} \text{ rh-} \text{y} \\
&\text{AUX-SEQ} \text{ majesty-} \text{3MS} \text{ l.h.p.} \text{ PRP-} \text{make-} \text{INF} \text{ go.} \text{SBJ} \text{ craftsman-} \text{p} \text{ know-PPA} \\
&\text{šw} \text{t} \text{ hr-} \text{š} \text{d} \text{ } \text{n-} \text{ṣ-} \text{šw} \text{ } \text{n-} \text{Pṛṛ} \text{š} \text{c.w.s.} \\
&\text{PTC-ONE} \text{ PRP-} \text{cut.} \text{INF} \text{ DEF.} \text{P-} \text{of-} \text{persea_tree of-Pharaoh} \text{ l.h.p.} \\
&\text{“His Majesty, l.h.p., had then skilled craftsmen come and the trees of Pharaoh, l.h.p., were cut down.”} \text{ (Two Brothers 18, 2–3 ed. LES 28, 3–4)}
\end{align*}
\]

In example 25, the bare noun has been explained as denoting a group of people (Černý & Groll 1993: 470–471), which does not side very well with the morpho-syntactic conditions
given for the appearance of participles, relative forms, or $nty$-relative clauses in the other cases. Assuming it to be a restrictive relative clause would explain the appearance of the form here, since it would then limit the reference to a specific group of thieves. The Neskhons instance (example 26) has been quoted by Erman (1933: §836 note 1) as the sole certain instance of a $nty$-headed relative clause after an indefinite noun, but it was doubted by him in light of similar phrases in the text showing $rmT \ iw-f-m-pjy-shr$. Finally, the craftsmen in the Story of the Two Brothers are singled out as skilled ones from the rest of the potential artisans of Egypt.

Their appearance is common after NP’s containing the universal quantifier $=nb$ “every”, which can also attain the indefinite meaning “any” (Griffiths 1968: 64):

(28) The sender of a letter quotes from an oracle that said:

\[
\text{rw}i \quad \text{rmT}=nb \quad nty-n-pi-h\text{ity} \quad nty \quad m-\text{lnw-pjy-pr} \quad n-swpjy\text{nh} \\
\text{remove.IMP \ man=QU REL-of-DEF.M-captain \ REL \ in-inside-DEM.M-house \ of-N} \\
\text{“Remove all the men who belong to the captain and who are in the house!”} \\
\text{(pStrasbourg 31, 8–9 ed. ZÄS 53, 6)}
\]

(29) In the initial setting of the story we learn that King Apophis made the god Seth his god:

\[
\text{iw-f-\text{(hr)-tm-bik} \quad n-nTr=nb \quad nty \quad m-pi-ti} \quad r\text{Dr-f} \quad wpw-swth \\
\text{PTK-3MS-PRP-NEG-work.INF \ for-god=QU REL \ in-DEF.M-land \ to-end-3MS \ except-N} \\
\text{“… and he did not serve any god that is in the whole land except Seth.”} \\
\text{(Apophis & Seqenenre r° 1, 3 ed. LES 85, 9–19)}
\]

(30) The workman Panutem is interrogated again on the matter of a certain slave and he is quoted with the followings words he reportedly said to a woman:

\[
\text{m-}\text{ir-\text{hn} \quad md-t=nb \quad nty \quad iw-t-(\text{r})-nd\text{ngl-w} \quad mdi-t} \quad m-pi-w\text{r-sp} \\
\text{PROH-AUX-agree \ thing=QU REL \ FUT-one-FUT-ask.INF-3p \ with-2FS \ in-DEF.M-one-time} \\
\text{“Do not agree to anything you will be asked about for once!”} \\
\text{(pBM EA 10052 v° 14, 20 ed. KRI VI 799, 6–7)}
\]

(31) The sender of a letter reports what he did in accord with the following sentence in an earlier letter of the addressee who wrote:

\[
\text{m-}\text{ir-nni} \quad m-md-t=nb=\text{ink} \quad s\text{hn}=nb \quad rnty \quad m-s\text{h-t} \quad n\text{-it} \\
\text{PROH-AUX-neglect.INF \ in-thing=F=QU=1S.POSS \ task=QU REL \ in-field=F \ DEF.P-grain} \\
\text{r-ski} \quad r\{-dg\} \quad n\text{-}\text{\textit{wid}-w}-t \quad m\text{-mit-t} \\
\text{to-plough.INF \ to-plant.INF \ DEF.P-vegetable-P-F \ in-likeness-F} \\
\text{“Don’t be neglectful with any of my business, any task which is in the field, the grain, to plough and to plant as well as the vegetables!”} \\
\text{(LRL 14, 11–12)}
\]

(32) The scribe Djehutimose reminds the addressees not to neglect their tasks and take care of all the people in their care. In addition, he points out:

\[
\text{m-}\text{ir-nni} \quad m-md-t=nb=\text{ink} \quad s\text{hn}=nb \quad rnty \quad m-s\text{h-t} \quad n\text{-it} \\
\text{PROH-AUX-neglect.INF \ in-thing=F=QU=1S.POSS \ task=QU REL \ in-field=F \ DEF.P-grain} \\
\text{r-ski} \quad r\{-dg\} \quad n\text{-}\text{\textit{wid}-w}-t \quad m\text{-mit-t} \\
\text{to-plough.INF \ to-plant.INF \ DEF.P-vegetable-P-F \ in-likeness-F} \\
\text{“Don’t be neglectful with any of my business, any task which is in the field, the grain, to plough and to plant as well as the vegetables!”} \\
\text{(LRL 14, 11–12)}
\]

---

20 E.g., *Board of Neskhons* 33 ed. *IdS* I 128, 8 = *pNeskhons* 98 ed. *IdS* I 139, 6–7. In *Board of Neskhons* 35 ed. *IdS* I 128, 15–16 = *pNeskhons* 102 ed. *IdS* I 139, 14 one finds the instance with the participle to which Erman refers (*md-t nfr-t nty hpr mdi-rmnt i-hpr r-pjy-qii “anything good which befalls a man who happened to be in that state”).
typically, the relative expression restricts the universal reference of the quantifier to these members of the group who underlie the specific details given in the relative clause. thus, in example 28, the use of a ‘virtual’ relative clause would under the here proposed semantics signal that the addressee is to remove all men. in addition, he is informed that these belong to the captain and are inside the house of a certain gentleman. the restrictive relative clause specifies exactly which persons are to be detained. the relative clause in the last example (34) has been assumed to refer to the indefinite antecedent _swr_ (thus Helck 1991: 234), but in light of the pluralic resumption it seem preferable to analyse the whole NP _hrw=nb n-sw_r_ “every day of drinking” as the antecedent. except for example 16 quoted above, relatives are the preponderant choice after noun phrases with the universal quantifier _nb_.

relatives are also encountered after numbered entities:

(35) The sender of a letter writes that he prays to the Theban deities. Among them:

\[ \text{pBologna 1094 11, 2 ed. LEM 10, 8–9} \]
2.3 Coordination of relatives

All grammars of Late Egyptian are suspiciously silent on the matter of how relative clauses are coordinated. In example (28) we have seen coordinated patterns by simple juxtaposition of relative clauses. In addition, one might refer to the following:

(36) After he gave an account of his participation in the extraction and processing of the precious metals from stolen temple objects, the authorities ask the man for more details. Besides an enumeration of all the gold, they ask for:

\[ \text{rmT}=\text{nb} \quad i-\text{wn} \quad \text{irm}-k \quad i-\text{q}m \quad r-qq \quad p-\text{nbw} \quad (n)-n-\text{ht}-w \]

\[ \text{man}=QU \quad \text{PPA.be} \quad \text{with-2MS} \quad \text{PPA-go} \quad \text{to-peel-INF} \quad \text{DEF.M-gold} \quad \text{of-DEF.F-door jamb-P} \]

\[ n-p-\text{pr} \quad n-\text{nbw} \quad n-nzw \quad W\text{sr}-s\text{tr}^{s}p\text{tnr}^{c} \quad \zeta\text{.w.s.} \quad p-\text{ntr} \quad \zeta \]

“…everyone who has been with you and who went to peel the gold of the door jambs of the house of gold of king Wasmuariusapiptani, l.h.p., the great god.”

(pBM EA 10053 v°2, 10–11 ed. KRI VI 757, 4–6)

(37) A header in a collective memorandum of examinations of various thefts in the temple of Ramesses II at Western Thebes:

\[ \text{s}\text{h}^{j} \quad r-t-i-s-t \quad w-r-t \quad n-qdti \]

\[ \text{memorandum} \quad \text{to-DEF.F-seat-F} \quad \text{great-F} \quad \text{of-a_kind_of_tree} \]

\[ i-\text{wn} \quad wih-t \quad m-t-3-t-s-t-snt \]

\[ \text{PPA-be} \quad \text{place-STA.3FS} \quad \text{in-DEF.F-place-F-foundation} \]

\[ i-t-ty \quad p-3-\text{hmw}-w \quad n-pr=pn \quad nby \quad ty \]

\[ \text{RF}=\text{take.PST} \quad \text{DEF.M-3-artisan-P} \quad \text{of-house}=\text{DEF.M} \quad \text{goldsmith N} \]

“Memorandum concerning the great throne of qdjt-wood that had been stored in the basement (?) and that the three craftsmen of that temple and the goldsmith Ty had taken.”

(pBM 10053 v°4, 23 ed. KRI VI 763, 9–10)21

(38) The final entries of a robbery papyrus resume the results of the examination and present lists of various concerns. Among them:

\[ i-tj \quad n-p-\text{qy}=\text{m(h)r} \quad n-p-\text{w-ntr} \quad nty-m-t\]

\[ \text{thief}=\text{DEF.M-pyramid} \quad \text{of-DEF.M-god} \quad \text{REL-in-burgle.PPP} \]

\[ dy \quad m-\text{hr} \quad n-p-\text{w-hm-ntr} \quad tpy \quad n-Jmn \]

\[ \text{give.PPP} \quad \text{in-face} \quad \text{of-DEF.M-servant-god first} \quad \text{of-N} \]

“Thief of that pyramid of that god which was burgled and who was presented to that high priest of Amun”

(pLeopold II–pAmherst 4, 10 ed. KRI VI 489, 3–5)

One might here remark only that, even though the two participles in the first of the examples relate both to the same antecedent, i.e., \( \text{rmT}=\text{nb} \) ‘every man,’ they do not refer to the same group of people, for it seems that the second specification would limit the group of suspect persons in an unnecessary way. So either one might regard this as another case of disjunction by juxtaposition (“everyone who was with you or who went …”) or understand it as referring to a second group not identical with the first one (thus: “everyone

---

21 Similarly in pBM EA 10053 v° 4,18–19 ed. KRI VI 762, 16–763, 2.
who was with you as well as everyone who went …”). The second participle would in the latter case refer to people who were in the same business as our man, but not necessarily working together with him.

As the following examples show, the different relative clauses may follow each other in whichever sequence. In example 39, a *nty*-clause follows a participle, a relative form follows a passive participle in example 40 and vice-versa in 41, a passive participle follows an active participle in example 42 (see also example 25 above), and a passive participle follows a passive participle in example 43:

(39) The author is praising the scribal profession to the idle and unwilling pupil:

\[ nDm=sw \ r-mw-t \ ms \ nty \ bw-ft-n \ ib-st \]
\[ sweet=3MS \ to-mother-F \ give_birth.PPA \ REL \ NEG\-turn\_away-PST \ heart-3FS \]
\[ iW-st-(hr)-rd \ m-mm\z \ si-st \]
\[ DEP\-3FS\-PRP\-be\_firm \ in-nurse \ son-3FS \]

“It is sweeter than a mother who gave birth and whose/while her heart does not grow tired constantly weaning her son.” (pLansing r° 3, 2 ed. *LEM* 101, 9–11)

(40) A missive starts right away with the order, once the letter arrives:

\[ iW-k-(hr)-ptr \ ti\-i\-h-t \ n-ty \ hr-<pr \ n>-\Mt{\ hr\-Mwt} \]
\[ PTK\-2MS\-PRP\-look \ DEP.F\-field-F \ of-N \ on-house \ of-N \ \{on-N\} \]
\[ i-dd \ r-pr-dw\z \ c.w.s. \ n-\Jmn \ i-dd \ rvq \ Mrir\z \]
\[ PPP\-give \ to-house\-adoratrice \ I.h.p. \ of-N \ RF\-say.PST \ title \ N \]
\[ (n)-pr-dw\z \]
\[ of-house\-adoratrice \]

“… you shall look after the field of Teye on the estate of Mut which was added to the estate of the Adoratrice, I.p.h., of Amun and of which the controller of the estate of the Adoratrice Merire said: …” (pBM EA 10373 r° 1–4 ed. Janssen 1991: pl. 27–28)

(41) In the header of another document of the robbery examinations, one reads after the date and the designation of the text:

\[ n\-\Hmt\-w \ n\-n\-\Ity\-w \ i\-gmy \ iW\-\Ity\-w \ ti\-s-t \ nfr-t \]
\[ DEF.P\-copper-P \ of-DEF.P\-thief-P \ PPP\-find \ DEP\-take.PST-3P \ DEF.F\-place-F \ nice-F \]
\[ i\-iry \ t\ity \ h\-mw\z \ ... \ p\iy\-w\-smtr \]
\[ RF\-do.PST \ vizier \ N \ ... \ POSS.M\-3P\-inquiry \]
\[ i\-dy \ m\-md\z-t \ r\-\sd-w \ m\-dr-t \ h\iy\z \ p\iwf\z \ ... \]
\[ PPP\-give \ in-document \ to-remove-3P \ in-hand-F \ title \ N \ ... \]

“The copper pieces of the thieves who stand convicted of theft (in) the Valley of the Queens, whom the vizier Khaemwase (… and others …) had interrogated, and which were registered in a document so as to remove them by the mayor Pawro (… and others …).” (pBM EA 10053 r° 1, 4–6 ed. *KRI* VI 506, 7–11)

(42) A list of the precious metals recovered from the thieves contains the entry:

\[ dm\q \ nbw \ h\d \ i\-d\i \ n\-\Ity\-w \ n\-n\-rm\t \ n\-n\-t \ imn\t-t \ n\-t \]
\[ total \ gold \ white \ RF\-give.PST \ DEF.P\-thief-P \ to-DEF.P\-man \ of-town-F \ west-F \ town-F \]
\[ \sd \ in\-\Ity \ p\-hn\-ntr \ tpy \ n\-\Jmn \]
\[ save.PPP \ PBS\-vizier \ DEF.M\-servant-god \ first \ of-N \]
“Total of the white gold which the thieves have given to people in the city and the west of the city (i.e., on the East and West bank of Thebes) and which was recovered by the vizier and the high-priest of Amun: …”

(pBM EA 10068 r° 4, 22 ed. KRI VI 502, 15–16)

(43) A list of the precious metals recovered from the thieves is headed by:

\[
\text{dmD nbw nbw \(h\ddot{d}\) \(h\ddot{d}\) \(h\text{nty} \) \(\text{ssp}\) \(m-hrw=pb\)}
\]

total gold gold white silver copper receive.

\[
\text{ppp in-day}^{=DEM.M} \text{ppp}
\]

di \(hr-h\ddot{t}(m)\) \(n-t\text{nty} \) \(p\dddot{i}-hm-ntr\) tpy \(n-Jmn\)

give.

“Total of the gold, white gold, silver, and copper recovered that day and given on the seal of the vizier and the high-priest of Amun: …”

(pBM EA 10068 r° 3, 16 ed. KRI VI 500, 10–11)

However, the \(hw\)-clause in the Lansing-example above (39) is probably not a continuation of the relative clauses, but the circumstance of the mother’s tirelessness. Also the \(hw\)-clause from the tomb-robbery papyrus in example 41 is better analysed as the object clause of the verb \(gm\) (see Collier 2007 on these).

Such \(nty\)-relative clauses can appear side by side if they relate to different antecedents:

(44) In a letter, the sender advises the recipient to supply various animals to present them to Pharaoh. In addition, he notes the lack of cattle in the byre of the domain of the god Rehakhte:

\[
\text{ilh whj-k 4 k\(\ddot{i}\)-w \(\eta fr-w\) \zp-2 \(cj-y\) \zp-2 m-nty-\(i-h\)-w}
\]

PTC search.

\[
\text{opt-2ms 4 ox-P good-P time-2 great-P time-2 in-poss-P 1s-cattle-P}
\]

\[
\text{nty mdi-k nty-\(iw\)-sn-r-\(t\)-md-t n-pr-R^c-hr-h\ddot{t}t\)}
\]

REL with-2ms REL-FUT-3P-FUT-DEF.F byre-F of-house-N

“Thus, you should search for four especially beautiful and especially big oxen from my cattle, that are with you, which are going to be for the byre of the domain of Rehakhte.”

(pSallier I r°4,4 ed. LEM 80, 10–11)

(45) The author of a letter treats various issues. One of them is introduced with the words:

\[
\text{t-i-ly m-Jwrd \(hr-p\dddot{i}-kr\) 2 n-whc-w nty \(hr-p\dddot{i}-rm\)}
\]

PTC-1S-come.sta in-N under-DEF.M-boat 2 of-fisherman-P REL under-DEF.M-fish

\[
\text{nty-ilw-f-r-t\ddot{i}-br r-p\dddot{i}-nty-mr-ilw hnr\ddot{h}t m-im}
\]

REL-FUT-3MS-FUT-DEF.F-barque to-DEF.M REL-overnseer-cattle N in-there

“I came from Jured with the two fisher-boats which were full of fish that are intended for the barque to the place where the overseer of cattle Harnakhte is.”

(pLeiden I 348 v° 8, 4–6 ed. LEM 135, 6–8)

In example 44, the first \(nty\)-clause clearly relates to the phrase \(m-nty-\(i-h\)-w “from my cattle”, while the second \(nty\)-clause pertains to four oxen. Similarly, in example 45, the first \(nty\)-clause specifies “the two fisher boats” and the second one their cargo, i.e., “the fish.”

22 Similarly, with passive participles in pBM EA 10068 r° 4,1–3 ed. KRI VI 502, 5–7 (\(p\dddot{i}-h\ddot{d} \(\text{shdy}\) \(gmy\) \(\text{shdy}\) ...); r° 4,18 ed. KRI VI 502, 12–13 (\(dmD nbw-h\ddot{d} \(\text{shdy}\) \(gmy\) ...); r° 5,18–19 ed. KRI VI 504, 4–5 (\(dmD nbw-h\ddot{d} \(\text{shdy}\) \(gmy\) ...).
Let us now examine the following case:

(46) The people of the Royal necropolis administration write to the high-priest Piankh, answering certain issues raised by the latter:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>r-p#y-sS</th>
<th>i-wn=dy</th>
<th>(r)-hit-n</th>
<th>i-w-mntf</th>
<th>p#-nty-di</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>as-DEM.M-scribe</td>
<td>ppa-be=here</td>
<td>to-front-1P</td>
<td>DEP-3MS</td>
<td>DEF.M-REL-give</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-w-f-rL</td>
<td>w$^c$-hy</td>
<td>i-w-f</td>
<td>m-rmt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEP-3MS-know-INF</td>
<td>IDF.S-inspector</td>
<td>DEP-3MS</td>
<td>as-man great</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-w-mtry=st</td>
<td>p#y-f-it</td>
<td>sw</td>
<td>irm-k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEP-testify,PST=3CS</td>
<td>POSS.M-3MS-father 3MS</td>
<td>with-2MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“As for this scribe who used to be in charge of us here, whom it is who gives and who knows about a certain inspector, who is an important man, and concerning whom his father had testified – he is with you.” (LRL 47, 7–9)

The first relative in 46 is construed as a participle and hence in the present understanding a restrictive relative clause. The following clauses, until the actual main sentence, are *i-w*-clauses. The last two of these pertain apparently to the *w$^c$-hy* “an inspector” and can thus be disregarded for the moment. The other two have been explained as continuations of the preceding relative phrase with the participle *i-wn* (Junge 2008: 274). However, it has not been explained why they appear as ‘virtual’ relative clauses. The motivation behind this is apparently less one of definiteness, since the above presented examples 36–43 show that definiteness would not be bound to proximity if that would be the underlying pattern. Instead, it is proposed here that only the initial relative clause is marked for restriction, while the others following it are non-restrictive, i.e., additional information that is presented.

Further examples of the same patterning can be found below:

(47) Someone addresses a deity in rising despair, since he is eagerly waiting for an oracular answer concerning a matter of various garments. Apparently, he had addressed the deity earlier already, but seemingly to no avail. He then utters the following statement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>hR-IR</th>
<th>p#-nty</th>
<th>mI-qd-k</th>
<th>i-w-f-m-s-t</th>
<th>sSt</th>
<th>i-w-f-hjP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PTC-AS</td>
<td>DEF.M-REL</td>
<td>like-way-2MS</td>
<td>DEP-3MS-in-place-F</td>
<td>secret</td>
<td>DEP-3MS-hide.STA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sw-dI</td>
<td>prI</td>
<td>hrw-f</td>
<td>bnr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3MS-give.INF</td>
<td>go_out.SBJ</td>
<td>voice-3MS</td>
<td>outside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Yet whoever is one of your kind, who is in the place of mystery and who is hidden – he sends out his pronouncements.” (pNevill v° 2 ed. Barns 1949: 70)

23 Although often analysed as a stative (Frandsen 1974: 188–189 ex. 11 with note 15; Junge 2008: 274), it would be the sole attestation in the form of *di* of that root, see Winand (1992: 149).

24 One might be tempted to motivate this with the rule to avoid a conversion of a nominal sentence into a relative clause found from Earlier Egyptian. However, Late Egyptian attests the first harbinger of this pattern (*LES 39, 13–14*), which is so common in later stages of the language. Hence, this explanation loses some of its explanatory strength.
In a magical spell for protection, the crocodile faced god Maga, son of the God Seth, is said to approach a box and open it:

```
pTR-f    p#-nty-m-hnw-f     i\w-f-m-hr    n-gf    n-\$nw    n-35\$n
```

see.pST-3MS def.m-rel-in-inside-3MS def-3MS-as-face of-guenon as-hair of-baboon

“… and he saw the one who is inside and who has the face of a guenon and the fur of a baboon.”

(pMag. Harris 501 r° 9, 9–10 ed. Leitz 1999: pl. 20)

The author exemplifies the effect of education brought to various animals such as cows or horses, which go out on their duties harnessed:

```
ist-hpr-t    mi-nty    ms-w    i\w-w-3h\$c    m-pTR-i\h
```

3p-happen-STA like-REL give_birth.INF-3p def-p-dep-3p

```
i\w-i-ir-st    r-dr-w    zp-2    zp-2    n-snd    n-qq\$\$n
```

def-FOC-do-3p to-all-3p times-2 times-2 in-fear of-beating

“They (the horses) have become like one who gives birth, who are standing in the stable and who do it all only through fear of beating.”

(pLansing r° 2, 7–8 ed. LEM 101, 9–11)

The header of the protocol of the official examination of alleged robberies in Western Thebes starts after the date:

```
iRP-p\$R-smtr    n-ni\$-hr-w    \$j-y    n-it\$i-w
```

do.INF-def.M-inquiry of.def.P-enemy-P great-P of-thief-P

```
\$p\$-dgs-n\$-s-w-t    \$j-y
```

def.M-enter-def.P-place-P great-P

```
i\w-w-ir-ni-dgs    n-hiw    i\w-w
```

def-3p-do.INF-def.P-enter in-increase in-3p

“…enquiry of the great enemies of thieves which entered the great place and entered many others thereof…”

(pBM 10052 r° 1, 1–2 ed. KRI VI 767, 6–8)

A similar sequencing is also found after other relative expressions, such as participles and relative forms:

```
p\$R-p\$R-rmt    i-gmy    im    i\w-p-hr-mh    i\w-f
```

def.M-man PPP-find there def-one-PRP-fill with-3MS

```
i\w-f-m-3-rmt    n-ti-hw-t    r-gs-ni-s-w-t
```

def-3MS-in-3-man of.def.F-temple to-side-def.P-place-P-F

```
i-ir\$y    m\$R-ni\$-t\$i\$y    nbm\$5\$t\$\$\$n\$\$t    p\$y-f-sm\$t    m-rnp-t-zp    14
```

rf-do.pST title N poss.m-3MS-enquiry in-year-f-count 14

“… the man who has been found there, who had been taken into custody and who was among three men of the temple adjacent to the places, and whose interrogation the vizier Nebmuarenakht had made in regnal year 14.”

(pAbbott r° 4, 14–16 ed. KRI VI 474, 6–8)
A person is asked for details about robberies he presumable committed:

\begin{align*}
\text{ih} & \text{ l-h-k} \\
\text{ti-md-t} & \text{n-nj-s-w-t} \\
\text{i-ph-k} & \text{irm-nj-rmt-w} \\
\text{IRP} & \text{say-2MS} \\
\text{DEF.F-thing-F} & \text{of-DEF.P-place-P-F} \\
\text{RF-reach.PST-2MS} & \text{with-DEF.P-man-P} \\
\text{i-di} & \text{Jwfnimn} \\
\text{wn} & \text{m-hry-pdt-t} \\
\text{ln-w} & \text{RF-give.PST} \\
\text{N} & \text{be.PPA} \\
\text{as-chief-bow-F} & \text{go.SBJ-3P} \\
\text{iw-Jhwmh} & \text{pjy-f-sn} \\
\text{r-hj-t-w} & \text{DEF-N} \\
\text{poss.M-3MS-brother} & \text{to-front-F-3P} \\
\end{align*}

“What can you tell about the issue of the places you reached with the men whom Jufamun who had been chief of the bowmen had sent out, who were headed by his brother Ihumeh?”

(pBM EA 10052 r° 7, 10–11 ed. KRI VI 784, 12–14)

A header in a collective memorandum of examinations of various thefts in the temple of Ramesses II at Western Thebes:

\begin{align*}
\text{sh3} & \text{ r-pj-3-hjt} \\
\text{n-mry} & \text{n-pj-twt} \\
\text{cjt} & \text{n-pj-wb3} \\
\text{c.w.s.} & \text{DEF.M-3-wood} \\
\text{memo} & \text{of-cedar of-DEF.M-statue great of-DEF.M-court l.h.p.} \\
\text{n-ti-hwt} & \text{i-di} \\
\text{s3} & \text{sdj} \\
\text{n-s3-m3c} & \text{RF-give.PST scribe N to-scribe-army N of-domain-N} \\
\text{iw-hmw} & \text{pjsn} \\
\text{i-sfh=sw} & \text{DEF-artisan N PPA-loose=3MS} \\
\end{align*}

“Memorandum concerning the three cedar-wood pieces of the Great Statue of the Forecourt, l.h.p., of the temple which the scribe Sedy gave to the army-scribe Oneru of the domain of Amun, which the craftsman Pasan dismantled.”

(pBM EA 10053 v°4, 20–21 ed. KRI VI 763, 3–5)

In the first tomb robbery example above (example 51), it is stated that this accused thief had been found in a certain place. The ensuing clauses relate additional circumstances of the detention.\footnote{Here, an analysis of \text{ih}-headed clauses as object clauses looks syntactically less plausible, since the typical raising feature that comes along with the latter use is conspicuously missing.} Again the fact that the interrogation of this delinquent had been done already by the vizier seems to be important. In example 52, the point seems less to be the circumstance that the brother of the man who sent out a group of men happened to be with this gang, but that this is additional information relating to the mentioned group. In addition, the example shows that, similar to the \text{nty}-clauses attested in a single sentence, relative forms appearing in the same utterance may also relate to different antecedents. Finally, in example 53, the fact that a certain craftsman dismantled them is apparently less easy to verify in official records than that a scribe named Sedy gave these pieces of wood to the army-scribe Oneru.

However, in light of later developments to be described below, it does not seem possible to infer that juxtapositioned relatives would always mark nested relative clauses (i.e., pertaining to different antecedents). Yet, chained dependent clauses must refer to the same antecedent as the initial relative.
Such a sequence of ‘virtual’ relative clause following others can be found even in cleft sentences, as the following example shows, in which the first *i*w*-clause has been usually understood as the circumstances of the return:

(54) The sender reports that he found two men and repeats what they told him:

\[ t \cdot n \cdot t \cdot y \cdot t \quad m \cdot p \cdot i \cdot y \cdot n \cdot n b \quad r \cdot d i \quad i w \cdot n \quad r \cdot p \cdot i \cdot n t y \]

PTC-1p-come STA PTC-POSS.M-1p-lord PPA-give come.SBJ-1p TO-DEF.M-REL

\[ t \cdot t n \cdot i m \]

PTC-2p-there

\[ i w \cdot d i \cdot f \quad i n \cdot n \quad w \cdot c \cdot s \cdot z \cdot t \]

DEP-give.PST-3MS bring.SBJ-1p IDF.S-letter

“We returned. It was our Lord who made us come where you are, who made us bring a letter.”  \((LRL\ 45, 10–11)\)

(55) After initial epistolary formalities and questions on the conditions of those loved ones at home, the writer asks one of the addressees, his son:

\[ i h \quad m \cdot m d w \cdot w \quad n i \cdot n t y \cdot t \cdot k \quad q d \cdot w \cdot n \cdot i \quad i w \cdot w \quad m \cdot m d w \cdot w \quad w s b \cdot t \]

what COP-PREL-PTC-2MS say-3p=for-1s DEP-3p as-word-p answer-p

\[ [i w] \cdot b p y \cdot k \cdot w h \cdot f \quad i m \cdot w \]

DEP-NEG.PST-2MS-explain in-3p

“We what are the issues that you are talking about to me, that are issues of answering and which you did not explain.”  \((LRL\ 72, 9–10)\)

In addition, a typological observation by Lehmann (1984: 263–264) can be confirmed in Late Egyptian as well, inasmuch as a sequence ‘virtual’ relative clause + relative clause is not attested, since it seems pragmatically problematic to add parenthetic information first and later restrict the reference of the antecedent.  \(^{26}\)

In sum, one can state that these examples cannot be explained within the definiteness split hypothesis, but pose no problem under the restriction assumption.

2.4 Relative clauses in Late Egyptian

As should be clear from the examples provided above, there are too many exceptions to the definiteness rule that is assumed to underlie the choice between participle, relative form, and *nty*-headed relative clause, on the one hand, and the *i*w*-headed ‘virtual’ relative clause on the other. However, the restriction hypothesis is able to account for these apparent deviations from the definiteness-rule. Especially, it explains why nominal phrases marked by a universal quantifier such as *rmT=nb “everyone” would attract one of the former relative constructions: not because they were considered definite, as has been said repeatedly, but to restrict the group of entities to whom some state of affairs pertains. Similarly, it explains why universal concessive conditionals (“whosoever”, “whatsoever”,

26 Note that example 51 shows the sequence restrictive, non-restrictive, non-restrictive, and restrictive clause. Thus, the non-restrictive clauses are interlaced into the restrictive ones and the whole presents no counterexample.
etc.) are formed with *nty*-headed relative clauses (Griffiths 1968: 63–64): their specific semantics are best expressed by the restrictive relative clause.

Thus, the three examples used to illustrate the assumed definiteness-split above can also be explained alongside the restriction hypothesis favoured here: in example 1, it is apparently a specific box that needs to be singled out. The same can be stated for the gold in example 2. It is the gold the thieves robbed from a specific mummy. In opposition, the dog of example 3 is in that scene the only one around and hence there is no need to distinguish it from other dogs, such as ‘the dog that barked on the hill’, etc.

3 Demotic

As with Late Egyptian, the description of the distribution of both major types of relatives is also presented in grammars of Demotic as subjected to the definiteness split: a definite antecedent can only be followed by a *nty*-headed clause (with the suppletive form *ntyhw* when the subject is not deleted in Present I relative clauses)\(^{27}\), while an *hw*-headed clause can only be used with an indefinite antecedent.\(^{28}\) While the grammars of Late Egyptian use scalar adverbs to give room for exception, most Demotic grammars are rather adamant in their claims.\(^{29}\) Thus, the common distribution is exemplified by examples like the following: if the antecedent is a definite noun, the relative clause is built with the operator *ntyhw*, as in example 56, or with a participle or a relative form, as in example 57. If the antecedent is an indefinite noun, the relative clause is formed with the operator *hw*, as in example 58:

\[(56)\] After participating in the procession of the god, the hero of the story, Naneferkaptah, reads the inscriptions on the shrines of the gods when an old priest laughs at him. Asked for the reason, the old man tells him these texts would be pointless. Instead, he says, Naneferkaptah should come with him and he would bring him to:

\[
\begin{align*}
pi\-m^c & \quad ntyiw\-p\-ly\-dm^c & \quad nim\-f \\
def.m\-place & \quad rel-dem.m\-book & \quad in\-3ms
\end{align*}
\]

“…the place where this book is …” (Setne I 3, 12)

\[(57)\] After Naneferkaptah has lost his son and wife by drowning as a revenge of the god Thoth, he returns, his wife narrates in the netherworld, to:

\[
\begin{align*}
pi\-m^c & \quad r\-hi\-n & \quad r\-p\-i\-ir & \quad nim\-f \\
def.m\-place & \quad rf\-fall.pst\-1p & \quad to-def.m\-river & \quad in\-3ms
\end{align*}
\]

“…the place where we fell into the river.” (Setne I 4, 17)

\(^{27}\) Note that this is no discrete suppletive morphological form, but just the graphemic adjustment to a phonetic process motivated by different syllable structures.

\(^{28}\) See Spiegelberg (1925: §§524–555); Ort-Geuthner (1936: §452–453); Lexa (1947–1950: III §462; V §1146); Bresciani (1978: 105–106); Johnson (1976: 46 on relative forms); Johnson (1986: ¶81 on ‘virtual’ relative clauses; ¶83 on relatives, i.e., *nty*-headed clauses, participles, and relative forms).

\(^{29}\) To quote but one example: “Die Konstruktion der Relativsätze ist im Demotic(ischen) ähnlich wie im Neuägypt(ischen) und Kopt(ischen) von der Determiniert oder Nichtdeterminiertheit des Beziehungswortes abhängig.” (Spiegelberg 1925: §524)
(58) Trying to win the lady Tabubu’s favour, Setne has his servant tell her that he would have the power to rescue her, promising to have her brought to:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{w}^\sim\text{m}^\sim & \quad \text{iw-f-hp} & \quad \text{iw-bniw-rt}=\text{nb} & \quad \text{n-pi-t} & \quad \text{gm-t-t} \\
\text{idf.s-place} & \quad \text{dep-3ms-hide} & \quad \text{dep-neg.fut-man}=\text{qu} & \quad \text{of-def.m-land} & \quad \text{find-inf-2fs}
\end{align*}
\]

“…a place, which is hidden and no one can find you.” (Setne I 5, 5)

As in Late Egyptian, counterexamples do exist and will be discussed below in the same manner as above, first with ‘virtual’ relative clauses after definite antecedents (3.1), followed by relatives, i.e., nty-headed clauses, participles, and relative forms, after indefinite antecedents (3.2).

Again, as among the grammars of Late Egyptian, notable exceptions to the prevalent description pattern can be found. The first to be mentioned is Du Bourget’s Demotic grammar (1976: §§76–115), who explicitly rejects the determination hypothesis introduced above (Du Bourget 1976: §76) and held dear by almost all descriptions of (not only) Demotic. Instead, he proposes to analyse the mechanisms underlying the choice of the relatives according to the restrictive function of relatives and the attributive one of circumstantial (or ‘virtual’ relative) clauses.30

The other one is Simpson’s description of the grammar of the sacerdotal decrees (Simpson 1996: 54–57), who states that relatives “normally expand only the definite base and determiner nb (i.e., the universal quantifier, MM) … more rarely … other types of identifiable phrases” (Simpson 1996: 55). In describing their semantics (under Content), he says “most typically, a relative clause restricts the reference of its phrase” (Simpson 1996: 55), while ‘virtual’ relative clauses “resemble non-restrictive relative clauses” (Simpson 1996: 57). However, Simpson’s description does not seem to be built upon Du Bourget’s insightful comments, but rather on those of Ariel Shisha-Halevy in his Work-Notes on Demotic Syntax (Shisha-Halevy 1989: 49 §6.d).

3.1 Demotic ‘virtual’ relative clauses after definite antecedents

Even though ‘virtual’ relative clauses are in the majority of cases attested after indefinite antecedents, Demotic texts display a couple of attestations after a definite antecedent, such as the ones cited below. The majority of these are marked for definiteness (59–61), the last one (63) showing a demonstrative in the noun phrase that is the antecedent of the ‘virtual’ relative clause:

(59) The small dog-ape has tried to soothe the wrathful goddess with chosen words, yet admits:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{pi-gi} & \quad \text{n-ks} & \quad \text{mtw-t-nim-f} & \quad \text{rhr-l} & \quad \text{pi-y} & \quad \text{ir} & \quad \text{pi-stf} & \quad \text{r-pi-si} \\
\text{def.m-way} & \quad \text{of-look.inf} & \quad \text{rel-2fs-in-3ms} & \quad \text{against-1s to-def.m-do} & \quad \text{def.m-butcher to-def.m-ox} \\
\text{riw-f} & \quad \text{sn} & \quad \text{lrhr-f} \\
\text{dep-3ms} & \quad \text{bind.sta before-3ms}
\end{align*}
\]

“The kind of look you have towards me is the one the butcher has towards the ox, that is bound before him.” (Myth of the Sun’s Eye [Leiden I 384] 11, 17–18)

30 Since he demonstrates this only with examples that can be explained also along the definiteness split, the approach might have lacked some of its appeal to the audience and thus might have led to its general ignorance.
(60) Setne and his son have entered the realm of the dead and proceed from hall to hall. When they proceed into the seventh hall:

Setne and his son have entered the realm of the dead and proceed from hall to hall. When they proceed into the seventh hall:

(61) The moral precepts collected in the Great Demotic wisdom text reason about the necessity of patience and the effects of the lack thereof. They go on to dwell on the fool:

The moral precepts collected in the Great Demotic wisdom text reason about the necessity of patience and the effects of the lack thereof. They go on to dwell on the fool:

(62) In a graffito, a man from Nubia states that he came to Egypt after crossing the great desert:

In a graffito, a man from Nubia states that he came to Egypt after crossing the great desert:

---

31 This sequence is followed by another one of iw-headed clauses, which, however, would refer to either the whole group of mentioned divine beings or any of the last pluralic ones. These are then followed by further iw-headed clauses, which must be circumstantial since they do not contain any resumptive element referring back to any antecedent. The common understanding of the whole string of iw-headed clauses seems to see them all as circumstantial clauses; see, e.g., Vittmann (2015: 404). Another possibility would be to analyse them as object clauses of nw with subject to object raising (“Setne saw that the secret image of Osiris was sitting …”).

32 The last word is written above line 20 at the end of line 19.
A butcher will have the look that is evoked in example 59 towards every bull it seems, and not only bound ones. Yet, usually the animal to be slaughtered is readily bound in front of him and hence this addition is made here. Irrespective of whether the ‘virtual’ clause pertains to the antecedent ‘the image’ or ‘Osiris’ in example 60, both are definite entities; the ‘virtual’ relative clause marks its content as additional information. The fool’s patience of example 61 is likened not to a specific flame that flares up and is extinguished, but the flame in general. With the help of the ‘virtual’ relative clause, the speaker thus further elaborates on the behaviour of the flame that is behind his allegory. The goddess Isis, whom the author of the graffito, from which example 62 is quoted, invokes, is here meant as a single goddess and not one of her specific forms, which needs to be distinguished from another form of Isis. Finally, the book mentioned in example 63 is not at a place where there is another book not written by the god of wisdom. Instead, the ‘virtual’ relative clause provides additional information. As can be seen, the restriction-hypothesis again can account for the violations to the definiteness rule.

However, examples involving a verb of perception such as gm ‘to find’ or nw ‘to see’ (as in example 60) are semantically often ambiguous, since the iw-headed clauses can be (and often are) the expression of the object clause. Hence, possible examples of these have been majorly disregarded.

‘Virtual’ relative clauses are attested also after headless relative clauses:

(64) Setne and his son have entered the realm of the dead and proceed from hall to hall. When they proceed into the fifth hall:

Setne saw the venerable spirits, who stood according to their rank and file, and those who had a claim on violence, who stood by the door and lamented.” (Setne II 2,2–3)

Often the antecedent is the subject of the ‘virtual’ relative clause but not always:

(65) The official who sent the letter to a priest at Elephantine is apparently angry about local misconduct; especially since the Elephantine-priesthood lowered their tax-load in grain by a large amount, for which now the sender has to stand surety:
“I was made to sign the oath of Pharaoh for the grain, which contained the 230 measures of wheat.” (pBerlin P 13537, 23–24)

‘Virtual’ relative clauses are attested after names, such as personal names or those of divinities (see also examples 60 and 62 above), as well as designations such as \(Pr\)' ‘Pharaoh’ or place-holders such as \(mn s^i-mn\) ‘X the son of Y’:

(66) The final line of a graffito at the Temple of Medinet Habu reveals its author:

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{sx} & |t-nTr \ P\ddot{\imath}\dot{\iota} \ s\ddot{\imath} \text{-}Nsp^\prime \text{ntr} & \text{rn} & n \text{-}m\text{w-}t \text{f} & \text{Tawi} \\
\text{write-}\
\text{Inf} & \text{title} & \text{N} & \text{son-}N & \text{name of-mother-}3\text{MS} & \text{N} \\
\text{ta} & P\ddot{\imath}vrnsw & s^i-D\ddot{d}hr \\
\text{poss.-}f \text{-}N & \text{son-}N \\
\text{iw} & n\text{-}m\text{y-}f-s\ddot{m}s-w & m\text{-}b\ddot{i}h-n^3-ntr-w & n \text{-}d\ddot{m}a \\
\text{dep-3MS-}do & \text{obj-poss.-}3\text{MS-service-}p & \text{in-presence-}3\text{f} & \text{god-}p & \text{of-}N \\
\text{iw} & r-n \text{-}f & mn & m\text{-}b\ddot{i}h-w & s^\circ \text{-}d-t \\
\text{dep-name-}3\text{MS} & \text{remain-}sta & \text{in-presence-}3\text{f} & \text{until-eternity-}\text{-f} \\
\end{array}
\]

“Written (by) the priest Petemestus, son of Espmetis, whose mother’s name is Taus, daughter of Psenchonsis, son of Teos, who serves in the presence of the gods of Jeme and whose name will remain in their presence for ever.” (grMedinet Habu 43, 11)

(67) A caption to a depiction says:

\[
\begin{array}{l}
w^\circ \text{-fwtw} & n-Inp & iw-f-m\ddot{h}t & n \text{-hmswf} \\
\text{idf.-}s \text{-figure of-}N & \text{dep-3MS-grasp-Inf} & \text{obj-}N \\
\end{array}
\]

“A figure of Anubis, who holds Hamsuphis” (pRhind I 7 above vignette)

(68) A literary text dates its story into the 16th regnal year of:

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{[p]} & P\ddot{r} \text{-}f \text{-}j \text{-}Pr \text{-}j \ N\ddot{h}tt \ n[\text{-}jywhhrh]b & iw-f-n-nzw & mnh & n-p\ddot{i}-t \text{-}i & dr-f \\
\text{def.-}m \text{-}Pharaoh} & \text{N} & \text{dep-3MS-as-king} & \text{beneficent of-} \text{def.-}m \text{-land all-3MS} \\
\text{r-kmi} & s\ddot{\imath}b & n \text{-innfr} \text{=} [nb} & n-p\ddot{i}-f-h[3] \\
\text{dep-N} & \text{unite with-good} \text{-thing=QU} & \text{off-poss.-}m \text{-3MS-time} \\
\end{array}
\]

“…Pharaoh Nektanebos, who was a beneficent king of the whole country while Egypt possessed all good things of its time.” (pCarlsberg 424, 1–2)

(69) A legal manual describes a possible case in which a house is signed over by party A to party C. However, this very property had been signed over as a mortgage to party B, which now sues and states:

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{ir-f-sh} & r-p\ddot{i}-m\ddot{w}i & nty-hry & s^i-mn \\
\text{foc.-3MS-sign-Inf} & \text{to-} \text{dem.-}m \text{-house rel-} \text{-above to-def.-}m \text{-someone} & \text{son-someone} \\
\text{iw-mn-mtw-f} & md & m-dr-p\ddot{i}-m\ddot{w}i & nty-hry \\
\text{dep-} \text{-neg.} & \text{have-with-3MS} & \text{thing-}f & \text{in-Hand-def.-}m \text{-house rel-} \text{-above} \\
\end{array}
\]

“He signed this above-mentioned house over to so-and-so, son of so-and-so, who has nothing to do with the above-mentioned house.” (Codex Hermopolis x+2, 14–15)
Note that the last example is often considered to be an adversative clause, which is possible too.

3.2 Demotic relatives after indefinite antecedents

Similar to the Late Egyptian data, relatives such as nṯr-headed clauses, participles, and relative forms are also attested in Demotic after antecedents marked for indefiniteness via the indefinite singular or plural article:33

(70) The sender of a letter comes straight to the point and starts his message after the address with the words:

\[ \text{\textit{\textbf{wn-ŵ-bik \ r-i-r \ i\textit{irhr-p̂-nMr-\text{\textit{iḥ}}} \ mî \ Šf-s}} {\textit{Ex-IfS-writing \ \textit{rf-do.PST-1S \ \textit{to-DEF.M-chief-field \ make.IMP}} \ \textit{read.SBJ-3MS=3MS}}} \]

“There is a written document that I have made for the overseer of fields; have him read it!”

(pLouvre E 3231b, 1-2)

(71) A letter starts after the address and a short greeting with the following statement:

\[ \text{\textit{tny w\text{-\textit{r-rn}}} \ \textit{\textit{\textit{n̂hsmt\text{-\textit{wi}}} \ \textit{\textit{s\text{-\text{\textit{hrnnfr}}} r-st}} \ 33 \ \textit{iḥ}}} \]

REL to-name N son-N to-Aroura 33 field

“The coachyte Psenesis, son of Herer<\textit{em}>, brought to me a papyrus that was issued in the name of Ankhsemematau, son of Hamufe, concerning 33 arouras of arable land.”

(pLouvre E 3231b, 1-2)

(72) A wisdom text starts with the header:

\[ \text{\textit{twś h-t \ ŵt-sb̟-t \ r-tw=n-w \ sh-pr\text{-\textit{nḥ}}} \ n-ke-śr} \]

PTC copy (of)-IfS-f-teaching-f REL-give=to-3p scribe-house-life for-other-child

\[ \text{\textit{\textit{i\textit{w-f-sbq}}} \ n-mś \ mśś \ sp-2} \]

DEP-3MS-be_young.STA in-birth very time-2

“This is a copy of a teaching which a scribe of the House-of-Life gave to them for another child, that is yet very young.”

(oBM ea 50627, 1–2)

(73) The decree of Canopus stipulates the procedure to celebrate religious feasts that have to be celebrated on the ‘wrong’ calendar day due to the moon calendar, such as:

\[ \text{\textit{hń-hb-w \ nty-śb́n \ (r)-Kmy \ nty\text{-\textit{i-ırhr-śr}} \ w=st \ n-pr-t}} \]

IDF.P-feast-P REL-unite to-N REL-FOC-AUX-AOR-do-3P=3P in-winter-f

“…feast that are celebrated in Egypt and that are usually celebrated in winter …”

(Canopus decree, Kom el-Hisn, CG 22186, 11)

33 Instances of the type ŵt \ n-nj-... nṯr-... seem questionable (such as, e.g., Canopus decree Cairo CG 22187, 59, pRhIn 1, d14 or pBM EA 10524, 4; similarly in pMagLondon-Leiden 9, 34 \textit{r̂nk ŵt n-piy-bk 2 nty rṣi r-ıst irm Wsir} “I am one of these two falcons who are watching over Isis and Osiris”), since, due to the subject deletion within the relative clause, it is not clear whether the relative clause refers to the single member or the whole group.

Cases with pluralic antecedents are underrepresented. Instances like pBM EA 10591 r̂t 3, 18 hin-igi n-md-t n-̂q ntw-s ̇q d \textit{nim-w} “Deceitful accusations (?) is what she says” are better analysed as clefts without copula.
The sender of a letter urges the addressee to make sure that some fields of the former remain untouched. He says that he already reported to the overseer of fields:

\[
\text{hīn-ḥmḥr}-\text{w} \quad \text{nty-} \quad \text{nī-nty}-\ldots
\]

\(\text{IDF.P-servant-P REL-here COP.P-REL-…}\)

“It is servants who are there who ….” (pLoeb 6 30–31 = v° 3–4)\(^{34}\)

Setne wants to know more about the people he saw in the netherworld and asks his son Siosire, who is guiding him through the realm of the dead, to tell him about:

\[
\text{iw-hin-ki}-\text{w} \quad \text{ntyiw-tjy-w-hrj}-\text{t} \quad \text{mw} \quad \text{q} \quad \text{ḥi}
\]

\(\text{DEP-IDF.P-other-P REL-POSS.F-3P-share-F water bread hang.STA} \)

\(\text{n-tjy-w-ri-t hry}-\text{t} \)

\(\text{in-POSS.F-3P-side-F upper-F} \)

“…, whereas there are others whose portion of water and bread hung above them …” (Setne II 2, 16)

After the hearing-bird told a parable, containing the description of a food chain of one animal eaten by another again eaten by another, etc., until finally a griffon devours a lion, the seeing bird asks him:

\[
\text{iḥ} \quad \text{pi-nty-rw-f-r-hpr} \quad \text{hr-pi-hdb} \quad \text{n-pi-mṣi}
\]

\(\text{what COP.M-REL-FUT-3MS-FUT-happen under-DEF.M-killing of-DEF.M-lion} \)

\(\text{r-kʿmi} \quad \text{pi-srrf rr-f} \)

\(\text{RF.-harm.PST DEF.M-griffon to-3MS} \)

“What will happen in matters of the murder of the lion which the griffon harmed.” (Myth of the Sun’s Eye [pLeiden I 384] 14, 32–33)

In example 70, the papyrus brought to the sender of the letter is admittedly the only one mentioned in the letter, but apparently he needs to specify for the addressee the details as to what kind of document that has been. Similarly, in example 71, the document in question is not just a random text, but one that has been issued by the sender. In example 72, the relative form could either refer to the antecedent ‘copy’ or ‘a teaching.’ However, since both are indefinite it would violate the definiteness rule either way. Seen as marking a restriction, it can be understood as narrowing the reference of possible copies or teachings to a very specific one, i.e., one that has been passed on by a scribe of the House-of-Life. The stipulations of example 73 pertain then only to those feasts which are celebrated in Egypt and which are usually celebrated in winter and not to any other feast. Even though the last word in example 74 defies its identification, the relevant part for us is the relative clause pertaining to the noun in first position of that cleft sentence. Hence, the servants are not just any servants but specifically those who are in the village near those fields the sender of the letter wishes not to be touched by anyone. The relative clause in 75 singles out the group in questions from many other unlucky souls in the netherworld. Finally, in example 76, the fate of that specific lion who was eaten by the griffon is enquired about and not that of any member of that species of feline predators.

\(^{34}\) The last word cannot be clearly identified.
The above listed relatives are attested after nouns without any determiner (Lexa 1947–50: III §462)\(^{35}\). The example taken from the paratext to a teaching quoted as example 72 above might belong in this category as well, if one considers the antecedent to be the word ‘copy’ instead of ‘a teaching.’ Example 77 attests a relative form after such a noun:

(77) The Great Demotic wisdom text praises the work of a god by telling the things he created. Among them we find:

\[
\begin{align*}
tw-f-hpr-mw & \quad n\!\!m \quad n\!\!m-s \quad r-w\!\!hj-n\!\!i-ti-w \quad q\!\!r-w \\
give.\text{PST-3MS} & \quad \text{create-water} \quad \text{sweet in-3FS} & \quad \text{RF-search.\text{PST}P-\text{DEF}P-\text{land-P} \quad \text{all-3P}}
\end{align*}
\]

“He created sweet water which all lands seek therein.” (PlInsinger 32, 6)

Relatives such as nty-clauses, relative forms, or participles can be found also after antecedents such as indefinite pronouns like \(w^e\) ‘one’:

(78) A deed contains a list of pieces of land held by various people. Among them is the following entry, which starts with the words:

\[
\begin{align*}
w^e \quad n\!m-w & \quad n\!\!m-ir \quad 8 \quad s\!\!l-t \quad s\!\h
\end{align*}
\]

one in-3P REL-make eight arouras of arable land

“One of them that makes eight arouras of arable land.” (pBM EA 10591 r\(^e\) 7,25)

(79) A missive tells the addressee to spread the word among a specific group to come to a certain place on a certain date:

\[
\begin{align*}
my \quad l\!v-w & \quad r-b\!\!n\!\!i-\!\!jy \quad i\!\!r\!m-n\!\!i-\!\!i\!\!r-\!\!x-\!\!j-w \quad n\!\!t\!\!y-n\!\!h\!\!t-n\!\!t\!\!r
\end{align*}
\]

let.IMP come.\text{SBJ-3P} to-here with-\text{DEF}P-keeper-door-P REL-in-house-F-god

ms\!\!r^e w\!\!c \quad r-h\!\!j\!\!o-f \quad n-p\!\!i-\!d\!\!m\!\!i
except-one RF-let.\text{PST-3MS} in-\text{DEF}M-town

“Let them come here with the doorkeepers who are in the temple, except one whom he let into the town!” (pSaq. H5-DP 458 [2379], 11–16)

Relatives of the above-mentioned kind can be found after nouns with the universal quantifier \(=\text{nb}\), which may also be used with an NP marked by a determiner, as in example 82:

(80) In an obligation not to return to her lawsuit against a priest, a woman asserts to have returned to him a document and that she has no claim against him in matters pertaining to this document:

\[
\begin{align*}
mn-mtw\!\!t & \quad m\!\!d=\text{nb} \quad n\!\!m=\text{nb} \quad n-p\!\!i-ti \quad i\!\!r\!n-k \quad n\!\!rn \quad n-md=\text{nb}
\end{align*}
\]

have.\text{NEG} with-1S thing=\text{QU} REL=\text{QU} of-\text{DEF}M-land to-2MS in-name of-thing=\text{QU}

r-\!\!d\!\!d-w=r\!\!r-k \quad s\!\!r-t\!\!j-q\!\!s-t \quad n\!\!rn-s \quad
\text{RF-say.\text{PST}P-to-2MS} \quad \text{under-\text{DEF}F-burial-F} \quad \text{in-name-3FS}

\[
\begin{align*}
hn^e-s\!\!m\!\!i=\text{nb} \quad r-i\!\!r-l=r\!\!r-k \quad s\!\!r-s
\end{align*}
\]

with-report=QU RF-do.\text{PST}P-to-2MS under-3FS

“I have no matter nor anything in this land against you concerning any issue that has been said against you concerning the mentioned embalming, as well as any lawsuit I have pressed against you concerning it.” (pCarlsberg 37b, 9–10)

---

\(^{35}\) Lexa’s other quoted instance from PlInsinger is rather the construction preposition + infinitive.
The god Thoth turns to the Sun-god Re concerning Naferkaptah’s deeds to obtain the magic book and he is told:

\[ iw-f^\circ ilhr-r \ k \ irm-\text{rmt}=\text{nb} \ nty-\text{mtw}=\text{f} \ dr-w \]

PTC-3MS-to-2MS with-man=QU REL-with-3MS all-3p

“He is in your mercy with anyone/everyone who is with him.” \(\text{(Setne I 4, 7)}\)

The Alexandria decree stipulates how the preparations for the offering have to be made for the great religious feast, as well as official feast days such as the birthdays of king and queen and continues:

\[ mt-w-tS-w \ (n)-w\\#H \ r-wo-rmT=nb \ nty-Sms \ (n)-n\\#-\text{rp} \]

CNJ-3p-distribute-3p in-addition to-IDF.S-man=QU REL-serve (in)-DEF.P-temple

“… and distribute them in addition to any man who is serving in the temples.” \(\text{(Alexandria decree 37)}\)

Relative clauses with \(nty\text{(iw)}\) can be found in explanatory constructions, which will become a common pattern in Coptic (see 4.2 below). These can follow indefinite, as well as definite, antecedents:

An instruction for a charm to make a woman love a man starts with:

\[ ilr-k-in-w^\circ m\text{hrr} \ n-hrd\text{sr} \ ntyiw-p\text{y}-m\text{hrr} \ hm \ p\text{y} \]

FOX-AUX-2MS-bring-IDF.S-scarab of-Mars REL-DEM.M-scarab small SE.M

\[ iw-\text{mtw}=\text{f-tp} \ iw-f-ti|l \ 3 \ n-ikim \ hr-ti-\text{hi-i-t} \ n-di|li-f \]

DEP-NEG.have-3MS-horn DEP-3MS-take 3 of-shield on-DEF.F-front-F of-head-3MS

“You shall take a scarab of Mars which is that little scarab that has no horn and has three shields in front of his head.” \(\text{(pmagLondon-Leiden r° 21, 10–10)}\)

Among the things the deceased is supposed to say or do, we find:

\[ c^S-k \ r-p\text{y}-nfr \ ntyiw \ W\text{sr} \ pi|y \ nty-\text{htp} \ n-ti|y-f-c\text{hi-i-t} \]

call.SBU-2MS to-DEF.M-good_one REL N SE.M REL-REST.STA in-POS.H.F-3MS-tomb-F

\[ tw-f-hpr \ pi|y-k-iy|h \ hr-p\text{y}-f-\text{ist} \]

give.SBU-3MS-happen POS.M-2MS-gost on-POS.M-3MS-ground

“May you call to the beautiful one which is Osiris who rests in his tomb, so that he allows your akh-spirit to be upon your ground.” \(\text{(pRhind d 5, 6–7)}\)

Both uses can be properly aligned with the restrictive function of the relative clause to specify the antecedent further.

3.3 Coordination of relatives

Like Late Egyptian, Demotic allows the juxtaposition of relative clauses irrespective of their construction, i.e., \(nty\)-headed relative clause, participles, or relative forms:

\[ \text{etet-X se ‘i.e., X’ or etet-X cop Y ‘…, i.e., X is Y.’} \]
(85) Somebody reacts to a request to come north and complains that this is impossible for him:

\[ wn-n^i\text{-}rmT\text{-}w \ nty\text{-}dy \ nty\text{-}hr\text{-}p^i\text{-}mS^i \]

be-def.p-man-p rel-here rel-plunder-def.m-multitude

“There are men who are locals and who rob the people.” (pGieben 1, 4–5)

(86) A deity is invoked with its magical name and then addressed as:

\[ p^i\text{-}nTr \ nty\text{-}n\text{-}t^i\text{-}r^c \ hri\text{-}t \ n\text{-}t^i\text{-}p\text{-}t \]

def.m-god rel-in-def.f-part upper-f of-def.f-heaven-f

\[ nty\text{'}iw-p^i\text{-}\text{sbtt} \ nty\text{'}i\text{'}yn\text{'}i\text{-}n^f \ n\text{-}dr\text{-}r\text{-}t \]

rel-def.f-rod rel-adj-be_nice-3ms in-hand-f-3ms

“…the god who is in the upper part of heaven and in whose hand the rod that is beautiful is…” (pMagLondon–Leiden r° 5, 18)

(87) A Demotic hymn scribbled onto a papyrus with Greek documentary texts ends with the words:

\[ l\text{-}t \ p^i\text{-}d^f\text{-}m^c \ r\text{-}gm\text{-}w \ r\text{-}sh\text{-}w \]

copy-f def.m-scroll rf-find.pst-3p rf-write.pst-3p

“Copy of the book that was found and that was copied” (pBerlin P 8279 7, dem. 8)

(88) Words the sorcerer has to say contain self-identifications with certain deities, such as equating himself with a bull:

\[ p^i\text{-}nTr \ cy\text{-}t \ nty\text{-}hnn\text{-}t^i\text{-}wdj^i\text{-}t \]

def.m-god great rel-in-def.f-eye-f

\[ i\text{'}r\text{'}pyr \ r\text{-}bnr \ hnn\text{-}p^i\text{-}4\text{-}hnw \ n\text{-}d\text{-}t \]

ppa-come to-outside in-def.m-four-thing of-eternity-f

“…the great god who is in the udjat-eye and who came forth from the four things/elements of eternity.” (pMagLondon–Leiden r° 9, 13)

(89) In a property division, a house is divided and one party states they have given a storeroom in an upper floor to another party. Yet:

\[ i\text{'}w\text{-}t^i\text{-}s^c \ nty\text{-}m\text{-}hnn\text{-}t^i\text{-}s^c \ i\text{-}dl\text{-}(i)=n\text{-}t \]

defp-def.f-storroom rel-in-inside-def.f-storroom rel-give.pst-1s=for-2fs

\[ i\text{'}w\text{-}n \ s \ 4 \ cy\text{n} \]

between-1p man four again

“… while the storeroom that is inside the storeroom that I gave you is still between the four of us.” (pTurin 2125, 4–5)

The last example is again interesting, insofar as it shows that there seem no means to distinguish between a coordinated (X_1 rel ..., CON rel ..., “X which ... and which ...”) and a nested relative clause reading (X_1 rel ... Y_k rel_k ... “X which ... Y that ...”).

Again, as in the earlier stage of the language, examples of coordination with iwj-headed clauses following relatives are attested also in Demotic texts:
(90) The sender of a letter urges his addressee to approach the overseer of fields, who is soon to come to Elephantine:

\[ \text{iw-k-dd}=n\text{-f} \quad \text{h}=nb \quad \text{ntr-šw-dd-w} \quad \text{iw-nš-n-w} \]

DEP-2MS-SAY.INF=for-3MS say=QU REL-be_worth-say.INF-3P DEP-ADJ-be_nice-3P

“…and you will tell him all the things that are worth telling and are good.”

(pBerlin P. 15617, v° 1–2)

(91) In the description of a piece of real estate that is being sold, the exact position is given. It is stated that in the north there are certain buildings and:

\[ \text{irm-nšy-f-mš-n-w} \quad \text{nty-mš-f} \quad \text{r-pš-hr} \quad \text{iwt-w} \]

CON-POSS.P-3MS-place-P REL-in-behind-3MS DEP-DEF.M-street between-3P

“…and its other places which are behind it and between the street is.”

(pVienna 9479, 6)

(92) The priesthood of Alexandria is quoted as saying that king Ptolemy III has done:

\[ \text{nš-nty-nšy-šf-w} \quad \text{iw-nš-n-w} \quad \text{rm-nš} \]

DEF.P-REL-ADJ-be_plenty-3P DEP-ADJ-be_nice-3P to-be_beneficient.INF

nš-irpy-w (n)-kmy for-DEF.P-temple-P of-N

“…many and beautiful things to be beneficent to the temples of Egypt…”

(Alexandria decree 23–24)

(93) After Pharaoh’s son has been captured, his camp is in dismay. Pharaoh asks a man of his entourage:

\[ \text{ih} \quad \text{pš-ntyiw-f} \quad \text{(r)-hpr} \quad \text{nim-n} \quad \text{hr-nšy-sšm} \]

what COP.M-REL-3MS to-happen OBJ-1P under-DEM.P-shepherd

nty-hr-mr-t pš-w(ii) n-Jmn REL-on-board DEF.M-bark of-N

iw-w-dl-hpr hnín mlh hr-tš-hš-t Jmn (iw)dbi-pš-sšnh DEP-3P-let-happen disturbance strife under-DEF.F-front-F N because-DEF.M-prebend nš-dni-t hm-ntr tpy r-wnwiwr hrš-nhr hr š-nsw of-DEF.F-share servant-god first DEP-be.PPA under-N son-king

“What will befall us from these shepherds who are on board the bark of Amun and cause disturbance and strife before Amun because of the prebend of the share of the High-priest that belonged to Ankhhor?”

(The Fight for the Prebend of Amun [pSpiegelberg] 6, 21–7, 2)

(94) Somebody gives a list of persons who are said to display a repelling criminal attitude. Among them:

\[ \text{Hr sš-Rš} \quad \text{sš-Pawš} \quad \text{[i]-ir-wp} \quad \text{nšy-f-pr} \]

N son-N son-N RF-do.pst-collection POSS.P-3MS-grain

iw-fšy nšm-s r-pš-wdi DEP-3MS-carry.INF OBJ-3FS to-DEF.M-granary

“Horos, son of Rera, son of Paues, who collected his grain and carried it to the granary; …”

(pGieben 1, 10–11)
Thus, again, the pattern serves to disambiguate references of relative clauses that might be less clear in constructions of juxtapositioned relatives.

The following case is remarkable, in which first a relative clause appears that is continued with a *̀w-headed clause. Then, however, further relative clauses follow.

(95) In a document of the distribution of the inheritance, tombs are listed as well, such as:

\[ t\text{-h-}t \quad nty-qd \quad ̀w-s-hbs \]

DEF.F-tomb-F REL-build.STA DEF-3FS-roof.STA

\[ nty-\text{wn-pr}[h\text{d}] \quad 9 \quad (hn)-s \quad nty-hr-p\text{î-m\text{î}} \quad rsl \quad n-t\text{-h\text{î}s-t} \quad n-mnnfr \]

REL-PTC-store_room 9 in-3FS REL-on-DEF.M-place south of-DEF.F-desert-F of-N

“…the tomb which is built and roofed, wherein there are 9 storerooms and which is in the southern part of the necropolis of Memphis”

(pLeiden I 379, 3)

However, this appears in variation to *nty qd hbs “which is built and roofed” in other texts. Therefore, one may assume that there is a close relation between the terms, which is marked in the above quoted example by the use of the circumstantial clause.

Not unexpectedly, the continuation with *̀w-headed clauses is also met within Cleft sentence structures:

(96) The small dog-ape tells another story: a fearless lion who had no previous contact with humans one day finds a panther flayed and skinned and he was half-dead and half-alive. Then the lion asked the panther:

\[ nm \quad p\text{î-[i-r]-}h\text{hé} \quad p\text{îy-k-[tj]} \quad r\text{îw-f-}\text{spe} \quad p\text{îy-k-}\text{îmm} \]

who COP.M-[REL-AUX]-flay POSS.M-2MS-hide DEP-3MS-skin POSS.M-2MS-skin

“Who was it who flayed your pelt and skinned your hide?”

(Myth of the Sun’s Eye [pLeiden I 384] 17, 13–14)

(97) Among the words the sorcerer has to recite equating himself with divine beings is the following sentence:

\[ r\text{nk} \quad p\text{î-nty-}r\text{-}t-f \quad n\text{-îr} \quad n\text{-h\text{m}} \quad ̀w-f-rs \quad r\text{-}W\text{sir} \quad n\text{-grh} \]

1s COP.M-REL-eye-F.DU-3MS as-eye of-falcon DEP-3MS-guard.INF ORI-N in-might

“I am the one whose eyes are a falcon’s eyes and who guards Osiris at night.”

(pmagLondon–Leiden r° 6, 24)

3.4 Relative clauses in Demotic

Summarising the above, we can state that, also for Demotic, the deviating examples cannot be accounted for within the definiteness hypothesis, except as to regard them as mistakes. The restriction hypothesis is again able to explain these as either restrictive (*nty-headed relative clause, participle, and relative form) or attributive (‘virtual’ relative clause).

Similar to the situation in Late Egyptian, the restriction hypothesis fits with the ‘normal’ distribution on which the definiteness assumption was based. Thus, in examples 56 and 57 above, a very specific location is meant (‘where this document is’ and ‘where we fell

---

37 As in, e.g., pPhiladelphia 1 1, 1 or pLouvre E 3440 B2.
into the river’). In opposition, the suggested transport to a safe place in example 58 is less specific, as long as it meets the safety criteria.

Often, however, it is difficult to distinguish between the circumstantial and the relative reading of the īn-headed clause. As Shisha-Halevy (1989: 46 §6a) pointed out, resumption can be a guidance in the matter.

4 Coptic

Coptic grammars (or grammatical descriptions of specific Coptic corpora) explain the distribution of relatives rather uniformly along the definiteness effect.\(^{39}\) If the antecedent is definite, a relative clause with the operator ete(re)- must be used. In cases of an indefinite antecedent, a ‘virtual’ relative clause with e(re)- must be chosen instead. The situation in Coptic is of a somewhat lower complexity compared to the above treated earlier phases of Later Egyptian, as the earlier participles and relative forms have survived only in residual pockets of the language’s grammar and are no longer actively used for relatives. Thus, relative clauses are only those with ete- and its derivatives (such as \(^{s}\)nta-/\(^{b}\)eta-, etc.), while ‘virtual’ relative clause are those with initial e- (and derivatives). However, some patterns have only a single pattern for both, such as the Aorist with \(^{s}\)nta-/\(^{b}\)e-\(^{s}\)a- or the Preterite with e- (for which see the remarks at the end of 4.4)

Similar to the procedure above, the two following examples shall exemplify this:

\[(98)\] Shenute ponders about a certain situation, asking why it is being announced to man that his mother went mad or darkness veiled her eyes (although nobody who sees her notices it since her eyes are open, yet she does not see). However, the man:

\[\begin{array}{llll}
\text{a-f-i} & \text{ehrai} & \text{ecn-t-mau} & \text{ent-a-s-cpo-f} \\
\text{pst-3ms} & \text{come} & \text{upon-def.f-mother} & \text{rel-pst-3fs-beget-3ms} \\
\text{hm-p-ma} & \text{ete-s-nhêt-f} \\
\text{in-def.p-place} & \text{rel-3fs-inside-3ms} \\
\end{array}\]

“He reached the mother who begat him in the place where she is.”

\(^5\)Shenute, Is It Not Written ed. A I 53, 7

\(^{38}\) Even though I do occasionally quote from grammars of other Coptic dialects, I limit myself here to the two major dialects Sahidic and Bohairic to avoid lengthening the discourse further by quoting examples from all of them. I thus tacitly assume a similar situation in the other dialects.

Relative Clauses in Later Egyptian

(99) Shenute castigates idolaters and pagans, but also the servants of mammon, as well as
covetous people who are obviously idolaters as well:

\[
\text{ⲙⲁⲗⲛⲟⲩⲇⲉ} \text{ⲟⲩⲛ̄ⲩⲧⲉ} \text{ⲉϥⲏ} \text{ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲙⲁ} \\
\text{mallon}=\text{de} \text{ un-u-nute} \text{ e-f-kê} \text{ hn-u-ma} \\
\text{more}=\text{yet} \text{ EX-IDF.S-god} \text{ DEP-3MS-set.STA} \text{ in-IDF.M-place} \\
\text{ⲉⲛϥ̄周恩来} \text{ⲉⲃⲟⲗ} \text{ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲛⲁⲁⲙⲉⲗⲉⲓ} \\
\text{e-n-f-uonh}=\text{an} \text{ ebol} \text{ n-n-et-na-amelei} \\
\text{DEP-NEG-3MS-reveal}=\text{NEG} \text{ out} \text{ for-DEF.P-REL-FUT-be_neglectful} \\
\text{ⲓⲟⲰⲧⲧⲏ} \text{ ⲛⲃⲃⲣⲏ} \\
\text{e-i-šace} \text{ e-t-hê} \\
\text{FOC-1S-speak} \text{ OBJ-DEF.F-belly} \\

\text{“In addition, there is a god, who is in a place, which is less obvious for those who are}
inattentive; I am talking about the belly.”}

(Shenute, I Have Heard About Your Wisdom ed. Ch 110, 14–20)

Yet, some grammars, such as the one by Vergote (1983: a §210), supply an extensional
list of grammatical entities that are considered definite in Coptic:

1) a noun with the definite article,
2) a noun with a demonstrative prefix,
3) a noun with a possessive prefix, and
4) a noun with the quantifier nim “every”.

Again, some grammars, such as the one by Vergote (1983: a §210), supply an extensional
list of grammatical entities that are considered definite in Coptic:

Again, some grammars, such as the one by Vergote (1983: a §210), supply an extensional
list of grammatical entities that are considered definite in Coptic:

Yet, in Coptic grammars, the counterexamples to the definiteness rule are acknowledged
again, e.g., by Till (1970: §461): “… gilt folgende allgemeine, wenn auch oft außer acht
gelassene Regel.”40 Steindorff assumed that only non-standard (“in vulgären Texten”)
texts would allow these deviations (see his Anm. to §510 in the second edition, Steindorff
1930).41 Chaîne (1933: §223) admitted that “on trouve parfois le relatif verbal après une
nom déterminée par l’article indéfini, mais alors, en ce cas, ce nom est rappelé devant le
relatif ou moyen du pronom démonstratif qui devient le véritable antécédent grammatical.”

Reintges (2004: 425–429) follows generally the definiteness dichotomy, but explains
the deviations with marking the difference of specification and/or restriction. However,
otherwise the distribution proposed in the present paper, he connects the restrictive function
with ‘virtual’ relative clauses (Reintges 2004: 427–428), albeit not exclusively.

Ariel Shisha-Halevy (2007: 350) speaks explicitly against the usual dichotomy of (in
his terms) specific vs. non-specific nucleus. Instead, he says, the two kinds of relative
clauses are found to be rather in opposition following specific nuclei: “the Circumstantial,
rheticm or adnexal, the Relative attributive. In fact, the attributive clause expansion is
(co-)specifying, while the adnexal one is non-specifying.”

---

40 Similarly, Levy (1909: §216) “die allgemeine Regel, dass an ein unbestimmtes Nomen der Rela-
tivsatz unmittelbar, an ein bestimmtes mit Hilfe von Partikeln angeknüpft wird, erscheint fast aus-
nahmslos innegehalten” and (1909: §229) “die allgemeine Regel vom Relativsatz wird manchmal
durchbrochen.”

41 This probably goes back to Junker’s observations on the grammar of the late Coptic poetic texts
(Junker 1908: 93 sub IV.)
However, the description in Stern’s Coptic grammar (1880: §400–439) stands, at first glance, somewhat outside the above-mentioned pattern. Introducing the distinction between relative and ‘virtual’ relative clauses, he states (Stern 1880: §400):

Der Unterschied zwischen ḫ und ḫⲧ tritt im Gebrauche scharf hervor: ḫ, eigentl.(ich) »seiend«, ist von allgemeiner, unbestimmter, ḫⲧ, eig.(entl) »welcher« von besonderer, bestimmter Bedeutung; ḫ ist das participium indefinitum, ḫⲧ das relativum definitum. ḫⲧ ist im grunde nominal, ḫⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧ涞

He thus did not motivate the choice between the two types of Coptic relative clauses with the definiteness of the antecedent. However, a few paragraphs later (Stern 1880: §405) recants this, stating: “Das part.ici(mium) definitum wird nur als attribut bestimmter nomina gebraucht, … Das participium indefinitum … wird dagegen … durch ḫ gebildet.”

4.1 Coptic ‘virtual’ relative clauses after definite antecedents

As in the earlier stages of Later Egyptian described above, ‘virtual’ relative clauses are attested after definite antecedents:

(100) Shenute quotes non-orthodox claims about the number of the Gospels, saying that some say there are twelve:

εις ους οικοιογια
ε-μν-ιον  nsa-fiou
DEF-NEG-one after-four.M
πικαταμαικος  πικαταμαιρκος
p-kata-maththaios  p-kata-markos
DEF,M-according-N  DEF,M-according-N
εις
n-f-meste-t-mnt-casi-hêt       tai  ere-p-nute   moste  mmo-s
CNJ-3MS-hate-DEF,F-ABST-lift.PIA-heart  DEM,F  DEF,M-god hate OBJ-3FS
“…, although there is none but four: The Gospel according to Matthew, the Gospel according to Mark, the Gospel according to Luke, and the Gospel according to John, these being the ones that illuminate the whole world.”

(Shenute, I Am Amazed §425 ed. Cristea 180, 2–13)

(101) Within the description of the ideal monk, it is stated that such a monk should, among other qualities, excel by doing the following:

καταβαθατανταχαρη
n-f-meste-t-mnt-casi-hêt
tai ere-p-nute moste mmo-s
“…, and hate the vanity, which God hates, …” (AP #269 ed. Chaîne 82, 26–27)
(102) Somebody once asked the venerable Poimen:

\[
\text{aš te i-še et-ëšše ero-i e-šôpe hm-p-ma}
\]

what DEF,F-way REL-befits to-1s to-be in-DEF,M-place

e-i-œêh nhêt-f

DEP,1s-dwell.STA inside-3MS

“How should I behave in the place, wherein I dwell?”

(\(^5\)AP #104 ed. Chaîne 24, 29–30)

(103) An old hermit falls sick one day and feels the urge to eat fresh warm bread. Another, zealous brother hears of it and:

\[
\text{a-f-ci n-te-f-melôtê e-s-meh n-oëik e-f-šûôu}
\]

pst-3ms-take OBJ-poss.f-3Ms-bag DEP-3Fs-fill.STA with-bread DEP-3Ms-be_dry.STA

“He took his satchel, that was filled with dried bread ….”

(\(^5\)AP #163 ed. Chaîne 36, 27)

(104) The humblest Daniel writes in his letter to brother Hellô that he met him on the road and asked about three jars. Hellô is quoted as having said that he would look into the matter. Now, Daniel continues:

\[
\text{is pei-rôme e-pô-i=pe a-i-tnnou-f ša-te-k-mnt-son}
\]

lo DEM,M-man DEP-poss,M-1s=se,M PST-1s-send-3Ms to-poss,f-2Ms-abst-brother

ταρκτήν̄νωούτιξαν̄ναί γιτοοτῆ λαω χρονηρ τε ττήν̄n
tare-k-tnnou-p-côk=na-i hitoot-f auō ce-uêr te t-timê

FIN-2Ms-send-DEF,M-total=for-1s through-3Ms CON CMP-how_much COP,F DEF,F-price

“Here is this man, who is mine, I have sent him to your brotherhood, so that you can send me the total amount through him and what is the price.”

(\(^5\)P.Mon.Epiph. 283, 6–10)

(105) In a collection of sayings of philosophers and wise pagans, as well as fables, the one on the wolf and the sheep is preserved only incompletely. The first sentence starts in the middle with:

\[
\text{m-p-uônś e-f-mout ere-p-ke-esou hn-rô-f e-f-mout}
\]

OBJ-DEF,M-wolf DEP-3Ms-die.STA DEP-DEF,M-other-sheep in-mouth-3Ms DEP-3Ms-die.STA

“… the wolf, who was dead and who even had the sheep, that was dead, in his mouth.”

(\(^5\)Sayings & Fables ed. Crum 1905: 97b, 1–2)

(106) When Jesus heals a woman from a spirit on the Sabbath, the ruler of the synagogue objects that he had transgressed the Sabbath rest. Jesus calls him a hypocrite, asking
whether he or any of those present would not loosen an ox from the manger and lead
him to drink even on the Sabbath:

whether he or any of those present would not loosen an ox from the manger and lead
him to drink even on the Sabbath:

“And this one, she is a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan has bound. Lo it is 18 years,
ought she not be loosened from this bond on the day of the Sabbath?” (Lk 13:16)

(107) On his return from Babylon, St John Colobus meets with Theophilus at Alexandria.
The patriarch entreats the saint to tell him what has happened. After saying that Jesus
guided him, John does the following:

“He took out the book wherein everything is written – that what he saw and that what
the saints told him – and he gave it to me.”

(108) Once Macarius the Great walked from the Scetis to Terenutis, i.e., present day Kom
Abu Billu. He entered a tomb and slept there. Yet, the place was abandoned, but not
empty for:

“There were ancient corpses of the pagans, who had died.”

(109) The venerable Cicoi (Sisoes) narrates an episode he once witnessed when dwelling with
Macarius in Scetis. A group of monks was harvesting in a field and noticed a widow
who would not stop crying. Inquiring about her with the owner of the field, they say:
The point Shenute wants to make in example 100 is that there are only these four gospels. Hence, these do not need to be distinguished from other gospels, since there are none, and the relative clause is therefore attached as a ‘virtual’ relative clause. It is not a specific vanity out of various vanities that a monk should hate, in so far as it is this specific vanity that God hates, because we can be sure that God will condone no vanity at all. Even though the place wherein the brother who addresses Poimen in example 102 dwells is a rather specific place, it is not set in contrast to other places. It seems that the question does not pertain to the dwelling place alone. Example 103 is clearer, for the brother does not choose between various satchels, of which one was filled with bread, but he takes his own satchel and we learn that it was filled with bread. The man sent by Daniel in example 104 is said to be one of his people, but he is not distinguished from others, who do not belong to Daniel. Instead, Daniel presents this as additional information with the help of the ‘virtual’ relative clause. In example 105, both animals are dead, but this does not distinguish them within the discourse from other wolves and sheep that are alive.

The Bohairic data can be explained in a similar way. The quoted instance from the Gospel of Luke (example 106) depends on what to regard as the antecedent. If it is the initial demonstrative, it violates the definiteness rule. If one regards ‘a daughter of Abraham’ as the antecedent, it does not. However, in both cases the information given in the relative clause is additional information, since the addressed audience knows by now who she is and thus it would be pointless to use a restrictive clause. John Colobus obviously did not take his personal library with him on his road trip to Babylon, so specifying the book he takes out in example 107 as the one in which he noted all things done, in opposition to other books, is moot. Apparently, the information that the heathens had all died, in example 108, is something additional that is not utterly necessary when speaking of corpses. It also clearly refers to ‘the heathens’ as the antecedent, since it seems moot to point out that the corpses have died. Even though there could have been more elderly ladies working on the mentioned field of example 109, the widow is the only one introduced into our story and hence the ‘while she is crying’ is an additional piece of information.

‘Virtual’ relative clauses appear also after definite nouns that are used like appellations or names such as p-nute “God”42 or p-satanas “Satan”:43

42 Note instances such as Dionysius the Areopagite ed. von Lemm 274 p. 35 10–13 Pνυτε περα-καν ετεναιροαν ήβαλ η ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηην ηη

43 Some of the following examples I owe to the kindness of Heike Behlmer/ Göttingen.
(110) Shenute relates that he witnessed someone addressing a snake after it had been killed and smashed with the question of why its race would be a tool of the devil from time immemorial. Shenute says that when he finally comprehended that this is humankind, he understood:

\[
\text{tai te se etonyxasa niphxh mih nrahe}
\]

\[
\text{tai te t-he et-u-na-aa-s m-pykh nim n-rome}
\]

DEMF COPF DEF-F-way REL-3P-FUT-do-3FS for-soul QU of-man

\[
\text{eto hma nhourh nisxatnas}
\]

et-o m-ma n-uôh m-p-satanas

REL-be.STA as-place of-dwell for-DEF,M-N

\[
\text{e-f-sorm n-hen-miee n-rome ebol m-p-nute}
\]

DEF-3MS-lead_astray OBJ-DEF,P-multiplet of-man out in-DEF,M-god

\[
\text{gru nentoy ebol igttoy fime fmooy}
\]

hrail nhêt-u é ebol hitoot-u m-mine mmo-u

down inside-3P or out by-3P in-self of-3P

“This is what will be done to every human soul that is a dwelling place of Satan, who leads many men astray from God in them or by them themselves.”

(Shenute, *I myself have seen* ed. L III 208, 13–16)

(111) Having eaten from the forbidden tree Adam and Eve hide themselves:

\[
\text{uoh a-u-sôtem e-t-smê nte-p-c(h)i(s) p(h)-(nu)ti}
\]

amf 3P-hear OBJ-DEF,F-voice of-DEF,M-Lord DEF,M-God

\[
\text{e-f-moi hen-pi-paradisos m-p^b-nau n-ruhi}
\]

DEF-3MS-walk in-DEF,M-garden in-DEF,M-moment of-evening

“And they heard the voice of the Lord God, who walked in the garden at evenfall.”

( Gen 3:8 )

(112) After Jesus heard Matthias telling that the Jews said Jesus’ blood will be spilled like that of the rooster Matthias slaughtered, Jesus likens the rooster to John the Baptist by saying:

\[
\text{p-typos pe n-iôhannês p-baptistês e-f-kyrisse ha-ta-he}
\]

DEF,M-image SE,M of-N DEF,M-baptist DEF-3MS-proclaim under-POSSE,F,1s-front

“He is an image of John the Baptist, who proclaimed before me.”

(Book of Resurrection of Jesus Christ ed. Westerhoff 1999: 50 A 29, 58–62)

(113) When the Passover draws nigh, the chief priest and the scribes discuss how to kill Jesus when suddenly circumstances change to their benefit, since:

\[
\text{apxatnasa=de se efum e-p-hêt n-iudas pê et-u-muti ero-f}
\]

PST-DEF,M-N=yet go into to-DEF,M-heart of-N DEF,M REL-3P-call to-3MS
Obviously there is just one God and hence there is no need to distinguish him from another. The same applies to the designation p-satanas, which usually is given only to a very specific being and no other besides him. Although there were and are many Johns, there is only one John the Baptist and hence he cannot be narrowed down in reference any further. Note in the example from the Gospel of Luke how first a relative clause is used to specify which Judas is meant and then additional information, that he is one of the twelve disciples, is given with a virtual relative clause.

In a similar way, the ‘virtual’ relative clause is met with after definite nouns expressing specific concepts such as:

(114) PsAthanasius addresses his audience:

Psathanasius addresses his audience:


(115) Cyprian the magician narrates what he learned in Egypt about magic and witchcraft and the secrets pertaining to them:

Cyprian the magician narrates what he learned in Egypt about magic and witchcraft and the secrets pertaining to them:

\[\text{“I saw there the spirit of deceit, that has an appearance of many forms and the spirit of fornication, which has three faces, which have the colour of blood, another of the linen, another of the fire.”}\]

\[\text{Spsathanasius, the sins of the Priests & Monks ii.2 ed. Witte 2002: 116 a20–21}\]

\[\text{Ev.Judas 39, 21–22 ed. Kasser & al. 2007: 197: “That one is the god you serve.”, clearly distinguishing this deity from the true gnostic God.}\]
colour of linen, and another, that has perished, is like a fiery flame.”


For PsAthanasius there is only a single orthodox faith, which is, in addition, strong, and not a strong orthodox faith, as opposed to weaker variants thereof. Similarly, the spirit of deceit is presented as a single entity and hence must (and can) not be distinguished from other spirits of deceit.

Finally, ‘virtual’ relative clauses are attested after numbered entities:

(116) In a collection of sayings and fables of Greek philosophers, one of the latter is quoted as having introduced once a parable with the setting words:

\[ \text{αὐξηρωθεὶς ἵνα ἔπονος ὁ βασιλεὺς} \]
\[ \text{a-u-en-snau n-katadikos m-p-rro} \]
\[ \text{PST-3P-bring-two.M of-villain to-DEF.M-king} \]
\[ \text{ἐξερήμων ἑνοῦρος θηγοῦτ μήπενα} \]
\[ \text{exerēmōne hēn-ου-robe n-uōt m-pe-snau} \]
\[ \text{DEP-PST-3P-do-sin in-DEF.S-sin of-single in-DEF.S-two} \]

“Two condemned criminals were brought to the king, who both had sinned in the same sin.”

(‘Sayings & Fables ed. Crum 1905: 98a)

(117) The emperors order to have Theodore crucified on a tree and the torturers position him accordingly in front of one “in the manner of the saint’s lord” as these vile men say:

\[ \text{ἡ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἡρῴου ἔπονος Ἠρῴας ἢ ἔπονος ἢ ἑρῴος} \]
\[ \text{hen-ti-unu=de a-u-ini n-153 n-if} \]
\[ \text{in-DEF.M-2.hour=yet PST-3P-bring OBJ-153 of-nail} \]
\[ \text{ἐφαίωνυσι όθωνος ή μοναπι νηῶς} \]
\[ \text{ere-uon-u-paš-mahi lýen-pi-ui pi-ui ai mmō-u} \]
\[ \text{DEP-PTC-DEF.S-half-cubit in-DEF.M-one DEF.M-ONE2DIST in-3P} \]

“And forthwith they brought 153 nails, which each had a half cubit.”

(‘Mart. Theodore, Leontius & Panigerus ed. AM I 60, 6–8)

Again, the information purveyed in the relative clauses above, whether the commitment of the same sin or the length of the nails, is presented in addition and not as something that would distinguish the villains or the nails within the discourse from others of their kind.

4.2 Coptic relative clauses after indefinite antecedents

Relative clauses appear regularly as explanatory statements or glosses of the type \( X \text{ ete-} Y \)
\( \text{SE, or } X \text{ ete-DEMY COP, Y} \) (Polotsky 1987: 104–105), irrespective of the definiteness of the antecedent:

(118) The Book of Acts start a new narration by saying that in the church of Antioch there were:

\[ \text{ἡ εὐαγγελικὴ ἡ εὐαγγελικὴ ἡ εὐαγγελικὴ} \]
\[ \text{hen-propheřēs mn-hen-sah ete-barnabas=pe} \]
\[ \text{IDF.P-prophet CON-DEF.P-teacher REL=N=SE.M} \]
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When the hegemon is surprised by St Ptolemy’s rosy complexion after another night in prison, the saint tells him that mundane food or earthly pleasures would be nothing compared to the grace of the Christ and exemplifies it by saying:

“… the sinners, i.e., the male and female fornicators, and the effeminates, and those who sleep with men, and the adulterers, and those who have destroyed God’s creation, …”

(Acts 13:1)
and the magicians, and the wizards, and the violators, and the idol-worshippers, and the astrologers, and slanderers, …” (~Ps. Ath., TestPatr: Jacob ed. Guidi 253, 9–15)

In example 118, the antecedent that is explained is marked as an indefinite plural, in example 119 it is an indefinite pronoun, and in example 120 the antecedent is a definite noun.

Besides these, Coptic like its predecessors attests the use of relatives after nouns marked as indefinite:

(121) Jesus reasons that marriage and divorce do not pertain to everyone:

οὐγινέντος τοῖς ἤταξχίπουοις εβολ ἵνα ἣτεταχμένος
un-hen-siur=gar nt-a-u-cpo-u ebol nhét-s n-te-u-mau

Among other things, the idiosyncratic use of relatives after nouns marked as indefinite:

(122) One fine day, the venerable Bane asks the venerable Abraham:

οὐρανὸς ἡταξίρφος ἡδαμον γίγνεται δικαστήριον
u-rôme nt-a-f-r-t-he n-adam hm-p-paradisos

“A man who has become like Adam in the paradise, does he still need counsel?” (~Mt 19:12)

(123) St Pachomius stipulates in his rules for the monastic community:

ἐρημοῦνε ἡπαράφει ἐτικανοὶ ἤταξχίπουοι ετικανοὶ ἤνοος
ere-p-rôme n-n-rôme et-šône na-kó e-pahu mmo-u

“The person in charge of sick people shall remain behind because of a brother who might fall sick.” (~Pachomian Rule 129 ed. Lefort 1956: 33, 25–26)
(124) John Colobus arrives at Alexandria from his journeys to the east and patriarch
Theophilus narrates:

John colobus arrives at alexandria from his journeys to the east and patriarch theophilus narrates:

\[ \text{ⲟⲩⲁⲓⲉ ₪ⲃⲟⲗ ₫ⲧⲛⲡⲓⲣⲟⲥ ₫ⲧⲁϥⲩ ₫ⲣⲟⲥ} \]
\[ \text{ωⲑⲓⲇ ₩ⲟⲩⲗ ₫ⲭⲣⲏⲥⲧⲓⲁ ₫ⲡⲑⲉⲛⲟⲥ ₫ⲧⲁⲥⲉⲧⲙⲟⲛⲁⲭⲏ} \]
\[ \text{ⲡⲕⲃⲗⲕⲔⲯ ₫ⲡⲙⲔⲣⲛⲝ ₫ⲧⲁⲣⲟⲓ ₫ⲧⲉⲧⲛⲡⲟⲥ ₫ⲧⲁϥⲧⲱⲛϥ ₫ⲧⲁⲥⲧⲁⲥⲑⲟⲥ} \]

“One of the clergy who had seen him came and informed me that the venerable John had come.”

(\(^{9}\text{Theophilus of Alexandria, On the three Youths ed. de Vis 1929: 152, 4–5} \)

(125) As St Anatolios is brought into the presence of the emperor, the saint addresses the
latter with some insults. The monarch, however, ignores him as if he had not heard
him and orders his soldiers:

Struck holy for

Be that godless one for he is more of a burden upon me than an usurper that rose
against my rule.”

(\(^{9}\text{M. Anatolios ed. AM I 28, 11–13} \)

The text of the Gospel of Matthew, example 121, presents us with several groups of
eunuchs. To distinguish these, they are marked with \( \text{ete} \)-relative clauses, since there are
some born that way, others that have been castrated, and those who remain celibate on
their own will. In example 122, Bane asks Abraham about a specific kind of man, namely
one that has been living like Adam in paradise, not just any man. St Pachomius’ rule,
extample 123, pertains only to the circumstance that the infirmarian has to take care of a
brother who will fall sick. If this is not the case, the rule does not apply. The member of
the clergy that comes and reports about the arrival of John in example 124 is thus singled out
from the other members of the mentioned group. Finally, the usurper the emperor invokes
in example 125 is marked as a very specific type of nuisance by the relative clause.

Relative clauses appear also after antecedents that show no determining element at all:

(126) Basil urges his audience to abstain from sinful and fleshly desires with which the
Devil might tempt them. Quoting Lk 17:27, he says therefore:

\[ \text{ⲡⲕⲃⲗⲕⲔⲯ ₫ⲡⲙⲔⲣⲛⲝ ₫ⲧⲁϥⲧⲱⲛϥ ₫ⲧⲁⲥⲧⲁⲥⲑⲟⲥ} \]
\[ \text{ⲡⲕⲃⲗⲕⲔⲯ ₫ⲡⲙⲔⲣⲛⲝ ₫ⲧⲁϥⲧⲱⲛϥ ₫ⲧⲁⲥⲧⲁⲥⲑⲟⲥ} \]

Religious\( \text{fed} \)-CAUS-ACT-3FS-vow OBJ-3FS for-DEF-M-Christ

REL-PST-3FS-turn-3FS to-back in-DEF-M-AGT-CAUS-3FS-VOW OBJ-3FS for-DEF-M-Christ
“May no Christian take (as a wife) a virgin who has become a nun and who has returned after she vowed herself to the Christ, for there will be no blessing of the Lord upon the house, while such a person will live inside it.”

("Basil of Cesarea, On Noah’s Ark ed. de Vis 1929: 217, 9–12)

(127) Demetrius calls out to his audience:

be poor be rich be servant be free be male be woman

“No, I do not prevent anyone who will be able from reporting to me anything they observe.”

(130) A man suffering from great pains serves in the topos of Saint Theodore. One day, God answers his prayers and plants the thought into the man’s heart to note down all his sins from his youth until the present day onto a receipt. And he tells himself:

“When he was brought, the hegemon saw that he was fresh like someone who just came from a breakfast and he marvelled.” (BM. Epimad. AM i 131, 1–3)45

(131) In the Catena to the Gospels, John Chrysostom is quoted with an explanation to Mt 18:3–4 (“…unless you turn around and become like little children, you will never enter the kingdom of heaven …”):

“When…, that means any man who has the guilelessness of that child and somebody receives it to him because of God’s name, the Christ it is who receives him.” (Catena ed. Lagarde 1886: 49, 4–7)
In example 128, Shenute specified the indefinite ‘anyone’ as ‘anyone who will be able’ with the help of a relative clause. The hegemon’s expectations to behold a man succumbed to torture are belied, in example 129, when he has to notice that St Epima appears exactly as fresh as someone who just got up from an extended morning meal. As this comparison refers to some rather specific attitude, it is marked so with the relative clause. The place in which the man should hide the note in example 130 must be specifically one that is unbeknownst to any other person as the state of guilelessness in example 131 must be exactly like that of a child.

Again, relative clauses are the preponderant choice after antecedents with a universal quantifier such as ḫⲛⲓⲟⲙ ‘every’:

(132) Shenute urges his audience to ponder about what is for their benefit: to abhor sin and tread on it, since God the almighty will otherwise punish them and he calls God:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ⲓⲙ} & \quad \text{ⲁⲧⲉⲓ} \\
\text{ⲧⲏⲙⲓ} & \quad \text{ⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲩ}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ⲓⲙ} & \quad \text{ⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲩ}
\end{align*}
\]

“…he who will scatter him with the great wrath of His anger from all around every human soul who seeks Him with all his heart, who loves him with all his soul and who prays that he might empower him to ‘love their neighbours’ with all his desire.”

(Shenute, I Have Been Reading the Holy Gospels ed. Coquin 2001: 11, 11, b28–12, a13)

(133) Jesus preaches on the Mount: Ask and you will be given, seek and you shall find, knock and it shall be opened for you:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ⲓⲙ} & \quad \text{ⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲩ}
\end{align*}
\]

(\text{"Mt 7:8\})

(134) When Herod learns that the magi outwitted him, he gets very angry. He sends out:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ⲫⲏⲣⲓⲟⲩ} & \quad \text{ⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲩ}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ⲫⲏⲣⲓⲟⲩ} & \quad \text{ⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲩ}
\end{align*}
\]
Relative Clauses in Later Egyptian

As mentioned above, certain examples show the use of a demonstrative pronoun preceding the relative clause, which Chaïne (1933: §223) used as an explanation for the aberrant appearance after indefinite antecedents:

(136) After he told various parables to the people, the disciples ask Jesus, after the crowd left, to explain some to them. Once he did, he asks them whether they comprehend all he said and they affirm. So Jesus says:

because-DEM.M scribe QU DEF-PST-3MS-take-teaching TO-DEF.F-ABST-king

Therefore every scribe, after he has been instructed about the kingdom of heavens, is like a rich man who casts forth from his treasure old and new things.” (Mt 13:52)

(137) Hard times start for the children of Israel in Egypt, for:

“Another king rose over Egypt who knew Joseph not.” (Ex 1:8)

Although the patterns of use of these demonstratives or definite articles are still elusive for Coptological grammarians, their absence in the other examples of similar kind above will
sufficiently show that they have, in all probability, nothing to do with the feature discussed and appear thus out of a different motivation.

4.3 Coordination of relatives in Coptic

Generally, Coptic shows a tendency to mark the first relative clause only and to coordinate the following ones with the connector ωυυ ωυυ “and”, as if they were main clauses (Till 1970: §483).

(138) Jesus says that hell is:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{p나} & \quad \text{ετεμπευην} & \quad \text{ναμογαν} \\
p-ma & \quad \text{ete-m-pe-u-fnt} & \quad \text{na-mu=an} \\
\text{DEF.M-place} & \quad \text{REL-NEG-POSS.M-3p-worm} & \quad \text{FUT-die=NEG} \\
\text{ωυυ} & \quad \text{τευειατε} & \quad \text{νησαξεααν} \\
\text{auö} & \quad \text{te-u-sate} & \quad \text{n-s-na-cena=an} \\
\text{CON} & \quad \text{POSS.F-3p-fire} & \quad \text{NEG-3FS-FUT-quench=NEG} \\
\text{“… where their worm will not die and their fire will not be quenched.”} & \quad (\text{ŚMk 9:48})
\end{align*}
\]

(139) Stephen accuses the Jews:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{nαι} & \quad \text{ναταζετιχι} & \quad \text{νιπυνοπο} & \quad \text{ερηναδαξταγι} & \quad \text{νεατελος} \\
nai & \quad nt-a-tetn-ci & \quad m-p-nomos & \quad e-hen-diatagê & \quad n-aggelos \\
\text{DEM.P} & \quad \text{REL-PST-2p-receive} & \quad \text{OBJ-DEF.M-law} & \quad \text{to-IDF.P-command of-angel} \\
\text{ωυυ} & \quad \text{Χεπτελεαεο} & \quad \text{εροκ} \\
\text{auö} & \quad \text{mpe-tn-hareh} & \quad \text{ero-f} \\
\text{CON} & \quad \text{NEG.PST-2p-guard} & \quad \text{OBJ-3MS} \\
\text{“You who you received the law as angelic orders and have not kept it.”} & \quad (\text{ŚActs 7:53})
\end{align*}
\]

However, this kind of ‘head’- or group-marking is not generally obeyed and instances with both (or all) relative clauses marked as such can be found as well:

(140) Shenute speaks of the sword that obeys God only, i.e., the word of God:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{εμαυαουαυαυ} & \quad \text{εβολ} & \quad \text{γηντοπος} & \quad \text{ετσκακος} & \quad \text{θητογ} \\
e-ša-s-uôninstead & \quad \text{ebol} & \quad \text{hn-n-topos} & \quad \text{et-s-kons} & \quad \text{nhét-u} \\
\text{FOC-AOR-3FS-reveal} & \quad \text{out} & \quad \text{in-IDF.P-place} & \quad \text{REL-3FS-pierce in-3p} \\
\text{ωυυετετετακο} & \quad \text{μηνου} & \quad \text{εβολαχεπατακε} & \quad \text{ετσαλωδε} & \quad \text{on} \\
auö & \text{et-s-talk}=o & \text{mno-u} & \text{ebolce-(e)-s-patasse} & \text{s-talk}=o=de \text{on} \\
\text{CON} & \text{REL-3Fs-heal OBJ-3p} & \text{because-DEP-3FS-beat 3FS-heal=yet again} \\
\text{“It (the sword) reveals itself in the places which it pierces into and which it heals, because although it strikes, it does heal again!”} & \quad (\text{ŚShenute, If everyone errs ed. L IV 16, 5–7})
\end{align*}
\]

(141) Shenute states that by commandment it is not permitted to return to the refectory to eat after having left it:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ωυυ} & \quad \text{ται} & \quad \text{τε} & \quad \text{οε} & \quad \text{εντχυοβουωγ} & \quad \text{νοιμενειοτε} \\
\text{auö} & \quad \text{taite} & \quad \text{i-he} & \quad \text{ent-a-u-obs-u} & \quad \text{nki-ne-n-iote} \\
\text{CON} & \quad \text{DEM.F} & \quad \text{COP.F} & \quad \text{DEF.F-WAY} & \quad \text{REL-PST-3p-forget-3p} & \quad \text{PVS-POSS.P-1p-fathers.p}
\end{align*}
\]
“And thus our fathers made an exception and permitted us a small amount of bread outside of the refectory at the time we need it …”

(Shenute, You, God the Eternal ed. L IV 57, 14–16 = Layton 2014: 166–167 rule 195)

Some dialects such as Bohairic generally favour the marking of both relative clauses:

(142) Jesus reasons about the law:

οὐνι ἐπὶ πάντα ἐγκαθιστήθη ἐβολον ἀντὶ θηρίων

“Everyone who throws out his wife and takes another one commits adultery.” (Lk 16:18)

(143) The psalmist describes the situation of him being in distress. Plenty of bull calves and large bulls surround him and they open their mouths to him:

“…like a lion that ravens and roars.” (Ps 21[22]:14[13] acc. to NETS)

However, this kind of patterning is not alien to other dialects.

In addition, a second relative clause is occasionally introduced as a dependent clause (Till 1970: §486; Quecke 1970: 379). This pattern appears on occasion as a manuscript variation to one of the above-mentioned patterns:

(144) While Simon of Cyrene carries the cross for Jesus on the way to Golgotha:

“A large crowd of the people followed him and the women, who bewailed and lamented him.”

(Łk 23:27 ed. Quecke var.)
Speaking about the sword that bows to God only, i.e., God’s word, Shenute says:

“The places where it is close or where it is hanging are the Scripture or the laws which have been given so that we, the humans, are healed through them.”

(Shenute, If everyone errs ed. L IV 16, 11–14)

The psalmist praises God’s might:

“… him who divided the Red Sea into divisions – because his mercy is forever – and brought Israel through the midst of it – because his mercy is forever – and cast Pharaoh and his force into the Red Sea – because his mercy is forever – …”

(Ps 135:13–15)

After speaking about the necessity to avoid any swearing of oaths (Mt 5:34), Benjamin wants to exemplify the disturbing results of an oath and starts his little story with the words:
ti-na-cô  erô-ten  n-u-hôb  n-šp̣ēri  et-a-f-šôpi
1st-fut-say  to-2p  OBJ-DEF.S-thing  of-marvel  REL-PST-3MS-happen
et-he-π-anaš  n-nuc  e-a-i-nau  ero-f  n-na-bal
because-DEF.2-M-oath  of- lie  DEP-PST-1S-see  OBJ-3MS  in-poss.p.1S-eye

“I will tell you a marvellous thing that happened because of the false oath and which
I beheld with my own eyes.”

(Benjamin of Alexandria, On the Wedding of Cana ed. Müller 1968: 132)

Again, these examples would be inexplicable within an assumed definiteness framework,
as it would be difficult to understand why the attraction of the shared antecedent’s
definiteness should terminate after the first clause. Within a system based on restriction,
these examples instead pose no problem. Here, they can even be explained as patterns to
mark the reference to the same antecedent, whereas another relative clause could possibly
be understood as referring to a different antecedent (i.e., to mark the difference between
‘the man who bought the car I have seen’ with two relatives and the second one referring
to ‘the car’ and ‘the man who bought the car I have seen’ with relative and ‘virtual’ relative
and the second one referring to the man).

4.4 Relatives in Coptic

As in Late Egyptian and Demotic, the amount of examples violating the “law of
definiteness” is also in Coptic too big to regard them simply as mistakes or slips. Again,
the restriction hypothesis can account for these. The difference can neatly be illustrated
with the following example:

(148) John Colobus relates what he did in the holy city of Jerusalem. He worshipped the
Cross and the tomb of the Saviour, as well as other holy places such as the place of
veneration of St Mary in the Valley of Josaphat and prayed to her:

“i also went to the well Jeremiah had been thrown into and I also went to the Mount
of Olives, where the apostles gathered with Mary the mother of the Lord.”

(Theodosius of Alexandria, On the Three Younglings of Babylon
ed. de Vis 1929: 136, 3–5)
Here, the assumption that the definiteness of the antecedent, irrespective of the semantic or the adjacent syntactic elements\(^{48}\), i.e., whether the relative clause is referring to the antecedent *pi-ma* ‘the place’ or *p-tōu* *n-ni-cōit* ‘the mount of olives’, does not provide any means to explain the apparent difference in the two sentences, between the use of the relative clause in one and the use of a virtual relative clause in the other. However, when the first relative clause (*pi-ma et-a-u-hiui* ...) is understood as restrictive, it becomes clear that it is marked in order to identify the specific well among the many that might be in and around Jerusalem. The Mount of Olives is already in itself specific, since there is only a single hill, at least in this world, with that name. Hence, “where the apostles gathered with Mary” is some additional information and appears as a virtual relative clause.

Similarly to the situation in the earlier stages of the language described above, restriction accounts better for the use of headless relative clauses within universal concessive conditionals (Müller 2009: 174–176 for Sahidic), which have even been occasionally subsumed under indefinite pronouns (at least their initial morph *pet-*), see Chaîne 1933: §473):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(149) Horsiese being asked whether the congregation would accept someone who has wife and children quotes the Gospels (e.g., Mt 19:29) and resumes:} & \\
\text{πετηγγογη μαρον} & \text{μαρισοποι εφον} \text{γιογραωε} & p\text{-et-neu=un} & \text{σαρo-n} & \text{σα-}n\text{-}sop-f & \text{ερο-n} & \text{ιn-u-raše} \\
\text{DEF.M-REL-COME.STA=then} & \text{aor-1p-receive} & \text{to-1p} & \text{in-IDF.S-joy} & \\
\text{“Whoever then comes to us, we will accept with joy.”} & \\
\text{(Hist. Horsiese ed. Crum 1915: 16, 9–10)} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(150) Shenute asks a businessman, whom he had helped to recover his stolen property, for a favour in return. Once he arrives at Alexandria, he should, Shenute asks him, acquire the first thing he sees:} & \\
\text{ογοι φιε ετεκαχτηια} & \text{δροι ηχατηιεκ} & uoh & p\text{-e} & \text{ete-k-na-ti} & \text{f} & \text{haro-f} & \text{ti-na-ti} & \text{f}=na-k & \\
\text{CON DEF.M REL-2MS-FUT-give-3MS} & \text{under-3MS} & \text{1S-FUT-give-3MS}=\text{for-2MS} & \\
\text{κασαντανκοκ} & \text{μαροι} & \text{υγηφουακ} & \text{ηφf} & \\
\text{akshan-tast'ok} & \text{σαρo-i} & \text{ην-}p\text{-}u6s & \text{m-p} & \text{nu} & \text{ti} & \\
\text{CND.2MS-return-2MS} & \text{to-1S} & \text{in-DEF.M-wish} & \text{of-DEF.M-god} & \\
\text{“And whatever you will pay for it, I will give to you, when you return to me God-willing.”} & \\
\text{(Ps.Besa, Life of Shenute §47 ed. L 27, 6–8)} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

So far, we have discussed mainly examples that violate the definiteness rule, while the majority of Coptic relatives obey that very pattern. Since the amount of examples cited above that do not match the rule is sufficiently big so as not to be passed by in blissful ignorance, one might be tempted to try and ‘save’ the common wisdom by proposing a basic definiteness effect, which is accompanied by a sub-level rule, according to which relatives used with indefinite antecedents would mark restriction in opposition to non-restrictive ‘virtual’ relative clauses after definite antecedents. However, the non-restrictive functions of *e*-headed clauses explain also their appearance after indefinite antecedents:

---

48 For Coptic locative adverbial clauses, see Müller fc.
When people press Jesus to hear the word of God on the shores of the Sea of Galilee, he sees two fishing boats without their crew, who is washing the nets:

a-f-ale=de e-ua n-n-coi e-pa-simôn=pe

“He entered one of the ships, which was Simon’s, ...” (\(^*\)Lk 5:3)

While Jesus and the disciple dine, Matthias serves a rooster and tells how the Jews watching him prepare the animal said that Jesus’ blood will be spilled likewise. Jesus likens the rooster to John the Baptist and calls himself the true light wherein there is no darkness. He continues with the words:

ešce a-pei-alektôr   mu e-u-cô mmo-s ero-i ce-ti-na-mu hô

“Since that rooster has died, they tell me that I will die too, whom Mary begot in her womb and who was in her womb with the Cherubim and the Seraphim.”

(\(^*\)Book of Resurrection of Jesus Christ ed. Westerhoff 1999: 50 A 30, 4–16)

The point in the example from Luke is not to say that he entered one of the many boats Simon Peter might have possessed, but rather to supply some additional information that the boat Jesus entered happened to belong to Simon. In Jesus’ speech, the ‘virtual’ relative clauses (circumstantial readings can be excluded here for sure) refer back to him as a 1st person entity and hence there is no need to grammatically restrict the reference any further, as there is no other self to which he could possibly refer.\(^49\)

Similarly, relative clauses fit into the restrictive semantics after definite antecedents:

After calling the son to wisdom the Proverbs’ author bewails those who did otherwise:

\(\text{\(\omega\) ni et-xw h-woyg ni-ni-moit et-sutôn e-\text{\(\omega\)}r-\text{\(\omega\)}-moi} \)

\(\text{\(\theta\) nê et-\text{\(k\)}\text{\(\omega\)} nsô-u n-ni-moit} \)

\(\text{\(\nu\) voc def, p-rel put after-3p obj-def, p-way rel-straight sta to-cause 3p walk} \)

\(\text{\(\eta\) ni-moit nte-p-\text{\(k\)}\text{\(\alpha\)}ki} \)

\(\text{\(\eta\) ni-moit nte-p-\text{\(k\)}\text{\(\alpha\)}ki} \)

\(\text{\(\eta\) ni-moit nte-p-\text{\(k\)}\text{\(\alpha\)}ki} \)

\(\text{in-def, p-way of-def, m-darkness} \)

“Oh, those who abandon the ways that are straight, to walk in the ways of darkness.” (\(^*\)Pro 2:13)

\(^49\) For an example with a first person plural pronominal antecedent, see \(^*\)Book of Resurrection of Jesus Christ ed. Westerhoff 1999: 68 A 44, 32–36 ὑπερτική ἡρών ἐνοτί ἐρογι ἐπευθετεκα ναλίγει ἱν-χετ-κ हरो-न e-n-op ehun e-pe-श्नॅ-टीको n-amnte “...have mercy on us, who we are locked in the prison of Amente.”
Matthias Müller

(154) St Basil narrates that he once went to Jerusalem on the day of the Resurrection:

Admittedly, there are many ways, and thus it is necessary to single out those straight ones from the others, e.g., the crooked paths or the ways of the darkness. Likewise, there are plenty of tombs in Jerusalem, but Basil wishes to pray in a very specific one. Hence, we can argue that the distribution of the respective functions is permanent among the forms and not, e.g., the outcome of a chiastic pattern, as proposed above.

The restriction approach could possibly also account for the cleft sentence patterns with a dependent clause in second position (Layton 2011: §§469–471 for Sahidic; Shisha-Halevy 1976: 137 sub 2; Shisha-Halevy 2007: 297 for Bohairic), but that would require a study of its own.

Occasionally, the semantics are apparently subtle on the first approach:

(155) An endowment deed begins after the introductory header naming the giving person, a certain Raphael:

“… so that I may pray in the tomb into which the body of my lord has been put.”


(156) Stipulations in the Book of Leviticus deal with animals consecrated as gifts to the Lord. In case of an unclean animal, which is not wont to be presented as a gift to the Lord, it must be presented to the priest, who shall assess it:

The editor of the text that example 155 is taken from had to explain this and other examples as a breakdown of the definiteness system that is a peculiarity of late Sahidic texts (Richter 2000: 100). However, in the here proposed framework, the cow is apparently the only one Raphael owns and hence there is no need to distinguish this one from another or any other cow. Probably of the two possibilities in example 156, only one needed to be narrowed down further against the other. Hence, only the first mentioned ‘good one’ is marked thus via the relative clause.

Then again, one finds e-headed clauses after definite antecedents in contexts that would favour a restrictive reading, as in collections of rules or canons, but also within other texts:
(157) Athanasius orders that the readers at Easter celebrations should not eat anything unlawful:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{ⲉⲩⲟⲩⲱⲙⲅⲁⲣ} \text{ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ} \text{ⲛ̄ⲩⲟⲟⲉⲓⲕ} \text{ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲕϩⲥ̄} \text{foc-3p-eat=for said-3ms obj-def.s-bread of-affliction} \\
&\text{ⲉⲧⲉⲡⲖⲓ̈} \text{ⲡⲉ} \text{ⲡⲟⲉⲓⲕ} \text{ϩⲓϩⲙⲟⲩ} \text{ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲧⲉ} \text{ⲏ̂} \text{ⲕⲉⲉⲇⲟⲥ} \text{ⲛ̄ⲉⲛⲧⲏϭ} \text{etepai pe p-oik e-mn-hêdonê nhêt-f} \\
&\text{ⲉⲧⲉⲡⲖⲓ̈} \text{ⲡⲉ} \text{ⲡⲟⲉⲓⲕ} \text{ϩⲓϩⲙⲟⲩ} \text{ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲧⲉ} \text{ⲏ̂} \text{ⲕⲉⲉⲇⲟⲥ} \text{ⲛ̄ⲉⲛⲧⲏϭ} \text{etepai pe p-oik hi-hmu mmate ê ke-idos n-entêk} \\
&\text{ⲉⲧⲉⲡⲖⲓ̈} \text{ⲡⲉ} \text{ⲡⲟⲉⲓⲕ} \text{ϩⲓϩⲙⲟⲩ} \text{ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲧⲉ} \text{ⲏ̂} \text{ⲕⲉⲉⲇⲟⲥ} \text{ⲛ̄ⲉⲛⲧⲏϭ} \text{etepai pe p-oik n-hêdonê nhêt-f} \\
\end{align*}
\]

**"For a bread of affliction," he said, ‘they eat,’ i.e., the bread, that contains no sweetness, i.e., there is only bread and salt or some sort of herb, with no sweetness therein.”**

(§Canons of Athanasius §57 ed. Crum apud Riedel 1904)

(158) An old female hermit tells the story of her youth with a weak and sick father and a mother of outrageous behaviour with a propensity for fornication. After her parents’ death, the old woman tells how she pondered:

\[
\begin{align*}
&aş \text{ pe } p-bios \text{ e-i-na-sotp-f=na-i } \text{ta-ônh nhêt-f} \\
\end{align*}
\]

**“What is the style of life, that I shall choose for me to live in it?”**

(§AP #210 ed. Chaine 55, 25)

In the example taken from the *Canons of Athanasius*, one would expect the bread to be distinguished from other bakery products. Yet, the relative clause appears as ‘virtual’ and hence presents additional information only. However, the use of the ‘virtual’ relative clause does violate also the common definiteness-based explanation. The same pertains to the example from the *Apophthegmata Patrum*, since a ‘virtual’ relative clause should not appear after a definite antecedent. But, again, one would assume that the life style she ponders to choose should be a specific one.

Due to the preponderant use of relative constructions containing a verb in the Preterite with *e*-headed clauses, the difference is less clear in these patterns:

(159) Jesus and the disciples sit on the Mount of Olives when suddenly a power of shining light appears:

\[
\begin{align*}
&e-mn-ši \text{ e-p-uoin et-s-o mmo-f} \\
&\text{dep-neg-ex-measure to-def.m-light rel-3fs-be.sta in-3ms} \\
\end{align*}
\]

**“… of which there was no measure for the light wherein she was.”**

(§Pistis Sophia ch. 2 ed. Schmidt 4, 24–25)
(160) The power of shining light surrounds Jesus completely so that he shines very brightly and:

\[ e-mn-\text{si} \quad e-p-uoin \quad e-ne-f-\text{scoop} \quad mmo-f \]

DEP-NEG. be-measure to-DEF.M-light REL-PRT-3MS-happen.STA in-3MS

“… while there was no measure for the light wherein he was.”

(\textit{Pistis Sophia} ch. 2 ed. Schmidt 4, 24–25)

(161) Expounding on Eccl 1:2, Gregory of Nyssa warns that none should suppose that words are an indictment of creation, as this would also pertain to the creator of all:

\[ ce-a-f-tamio=na-n \quad n-hen-tei-mine \]

for-PST-3MS-create=for-1P OBJ-DEF.P-DEM.f-way

PVS-DEF.M-REL-PST-3MS-create=DEF-M-all-3MS out in-DEF.M-REL-PRT-3MS-exist.STA=NEG

“… for he, who created everything out of that which did not exist, created for us things of this kind…”

(\textit{Gregory of Nyssa, In Ecclesiasten I–VIII} ed. A II 418, 6–7)

(162) After God told him to build an altar at Bethel, Jacob tells the members of his household to remove from their midst all the foreign gods, to purify themselves, and go up to Bethel to build the altar:

\[ uoh \quad a-u-ti \quad n-ni-nuti \quad n-\text{šemmo} \quad n-iakôb \quad nê \quad e-na-u-kê \]

and PST-3P-give OBJ-DEF.2.P-god of-alien to-N DEF.1.P DEP-PRT-3P-AUX

\[ \text{jennoyçex} \quad \text{nemni-leon} \quad \text{enayxhx} \quad \text{jennoyçex} \]

\[ \text{hen-nu-cic} \quad \text{nem-ni-leon} \quad e-na-u-kê \quad \text{hen-nu-maśc} \]

in-POSS.P.3P-hand with-DEF.2.P-earing DEP-PRT-3P-AUX in-POSS.P.3P-car

\[ uoh \quad a-f-kê-op-u \quad nce-iakôb \quad \text{ha-ti-terebinhos} \quad e-kê \quad \text{hen-sikima} \]

and PST-3P-hide-3P PVS-N under-DEF.2.P-terebinth REL-AUX.STA in-N

“… for the gods that were in their hands, and the earrings, that were in their ears, and Jacob hid them under the terebinth that is in Sikima.”

(\textit{Gen} 35:4)

(163) The narrator starts another marvellous episode of the Life of St Simeon Stylites the Elder and relates that once there lived a serpent (drakon) to the east of the mountains in a den:

\[ uoh \quad \text{uotj} \quad niben \quad \text{etebayxo} \quad \text{nibhoj} \quad \text{etemay} \quad \text{etatako} \]

\[ uoh \quad uoti \quad niben \quad \text{et-na-u-cyo} \quad \text{mmô-u} \quad \text{hen-pi-ma} \quad \text{etemau} \quad \text{na-f-tako} \]

CON plant every REL-PRT-3P-plant OBJ-3P in-DEF.2.M-place that PRT-3MS-destroy

\[ \text{nibhoj} \quad \text{pe} \quad \text{eixho} \quad \text{nêli} \quad \text{nibtyon} \quad \text{eprw} \quad \text{pe} \quad \text{eixhîtytæ} \]

\[ \text{mmô-u} \quad \text{pe} \quad \text{e-f-kê} \quad \text{n-hli} \quad \text{nêt-u} \quad \text{e-rôt} \quad \text{pe} \quad \text{e-p-cin-ti-utah} \]

OBJ-3P PTC DEP-3MS-let OBJ-any inside-3P to-grow PTC to-DEF.1.M-AGT-give-fruit
“And whatever plant they planted in that place he destroyed not allowing anything to grow until it would give fruit.”

(“Life & Miracles of St Simeon Stylites” ed. Chaine 1948: 54, 12–16)

The appearance of preterite relative clauses with *ete-* is rather underrepresented, compared to those as virtual relative clauses. Sahidic shows a very low frequency of the former pattern, while Bohairic supplies a number of examples in a slightly higher percentage. This might be a diachronic adjustment of the system.

Finally, the existence of *ete*-relatives must be noted in which a restrictive readings seems difficult:50

(164) Besa castigates the nun Aphthonia accusing her of the intention:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ⲉⲧⲁⲕⲉⲧⲟⲩⲯⲩⲭⲏ} & \quad \text{ⲉⲧⲉⲙ̄ⲡⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ} \\
e-take-tu-psykhê & \quad \text{ete-m-p-kosmos} \\
têr-f & \quad \text{mpša} \\
m̄ⲡϣⲁ & \quad \text{mmo-s} \\
\text{ⲁⲛ} & \quad \text{an}
\end{align*}
\]

“…to destroy your soul of which the whole world is not worthy…”

(6Besa, To Aphthonia ed. Kuhn 1956: 38, 3)

Although Besa does accuse her of many things, to have more than a single soul is probably not part of his rant against her.

5 Conclusion

From the above it will be clear that assuming a dichotomy restriction vs. non-restriction for Later Egyptian provides a better means to explain the appearance of relative clause constructions than the definiteness of its antecedent, since the latter has to assume too many exceptions. That restrictive clauses are preponderantly attested with definite antecedents and non-restrictive or attributive ones with indefinite antecedents is rather based on pragmatics than on morpho-syntactic rules. In most discursive threads introduced entities need to be singled out from others of similar kind, whereas newly introduced entities are often presented with just some additional information. Hence the distribution that lead to the assumption of a definiteness-split based on the situation of Arabic, a language scholars like Ludwig Stern or the influential members of the Berlin School, who introduced and advocated the mentioned rule were well-trained in it seems.

Based on the restrictive vs. non-restrictive dichotomy offered here the diachronic development can be charted thusly:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Late Egyptian</th>
<th>Demotic</th>
<th>Coptic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restrictive</td>
<td><em>nty</em>-Relative clause</td>
<td>Relative form</td>
<td><em>ete</em>-Relative clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-restrictive</td>
<td>Dependent clause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Representation of functional distribution

50 I owe this example to the kindness of E. Grossman/ Jerusalem.
Taxonomically, one might discuss whether it makes descriptively more sense to assume only relatives to be marked for restriction, while dependent clauses do not implicate non-restriction, but are simply void of any specific feature except dependency. Admittedly, some cases must be acknowledged where one would rather expect the opposite pattern. However, it might well be that we witness here the linguistic influence of the new dominant language in Egypt, i.e., Arabic. It might be interesting to study this further.

Abbreviations used in Glossing

The glossing follows a simplified version of that proposed by Di Biase-Dyson, Kammerzell & Werning 2009 or Grossman & Haspelmath 2014. All Late Egyptian and Demotic examples contain a transcription and a glossing line. For the sake of convenience, Demotic transiliteration follows that given in the TLA, but has been reduced in graphemic complexity if the latter does not pertain to grammatical morphemes, but only represents attempts to align the standard written form to what was probably pronounced (e.g., \textit{wni}$\textit{swi}$\textit{lr}$ instead of \textit{wn.n}.\textit{i}.\textit{lr}$).

All Coptic examples are glossed containing a Coptic line, a line with analysed text with morpheme division, a morpheme-by-morpheme glossing line, and a translation. These equal the lines (1), (4), (5), and (6) in the glossing proposal of Grossmann & Haspelmath (2014: 148–149). As I dispensed with the transliteration line, I choose to represent the digraph $\text{o}$\text{i}$ in Coptic words as $\text{u}$ only and not as suggested by Grossmann & Haspelmath (2014: 147) as $\text{ou}$. Finally, following good use of papyrology, I continue using round brackets to dissolve abbreviations, such as $p$-$c^{\text{o}}$\text{o}$ \text{i}$\text{is}$ for $\text{n}$\text{t}$\text{c}$, instead of the suggested pointed parentheses, i.e., $p$-$c$<$\text{o}$\text{i}$>$\text{s}$ (Grossmann & Haspelmath 2014: 148).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\emptyset$</td>
<td>zero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,2,3</td>
<td>number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>absolute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABST</td>
<td>abstract morpheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGT</td>
<td>agentive morpheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOR</td>
<td>aorist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUX</td>
<td>auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^B$</td>
<td>Bohairic dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^C$</td>
<td>communis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUS</td>
<td>causative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMP</td>
<td>complement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMPL</td>
<td>Completive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CND</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNJ</td>
<td>Conjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>connector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>copula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF</td>
<td>definite article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF$_1$</td>
<td>definite, generic (in $^B$ only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF$_2$</td>
<td>definite, phoric (in $^B$ only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF$_3$</td>
<td>definite, used as head in REL-clause only (in $^B$ only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEP</td>
<td>dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX</td>
<td>existential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>Finalis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC</td>
<td>focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDF</td>
<td>indefinite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRP</td>
<td>interrogative particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUSS</td>
<td>Jussive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.h.p.</td>
<td>life, health, prosperity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIM</td>
<td>Limitative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relative Clauses in Later Egyptian

| M     | masculine      | PST     | past     |
| N     | name (personal, toponym, etc.) | PTC     | particle |
| NCPL  | negative completive | PVS     | post-verbal subject |
| NEG   | negation       | QU      | quantifier |
| NIS   | nisbeh         | REL     | relative |
| OBJ   | object         | RESTR   | restrictor |
| OPT   | Optative       | RF      | relative form |
| ORD   | ordinal        | S       | Sahidic dialect |
| P     | plural         | S       | singular |
| PASS  | passive        | SBJ     | Subjunctive |
| POSS  | possessive     | SE      | subject element |
| PIA   | participle imperfective active | SEQ    | Sequential |
| PPA   | participle perfective active | STA    | Stative |
| PPA   | participle perfective passive | TERM   | Terminative |
| PROH  | prohibitive    | TMP     | Temporal |
| PRP   | preposition    | VOC     | vocative |
| PRS   | present        | VP      | verb prefix |
| PRT   | preterite      | XDIST   | distributive |
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