

Sonderdruck aus

# LINGUA AEGYPTIA

JOURNAL OF EGYPTIAN LANGUAGE STUDIES

23

2015

Widmaier Verlag · Hamburg 2016

# LINGUA AEGYPTIA – Journal of Egyptian Language Studies (LingAeg)

founded by Friedrich Junge, Frank Kammerzell & Antonio Loprieno

---

## EDITORS

Heike Behlmer  
(Göttingen)

Frank Kammerzell  
(Berlin)

Antonio Loprieno  
(Basel)

Gerald Moers  
(Wien)

## MANAGING EDITOR

Kai Widmaier  
(Hamburg)

## REVIEW EDITORS

Eliese-Sophia Lincke  
(Berlin)

Daniel Werning  
(Berlin)

## IN COLLABORATION WITH

Tilman Kunze  
(Berlin)

## ADVISORY BOARD

James P. Allen, Providence  
Joris F. Borghouts, Leiden  
Christopher J. Eyre, Liverpool  
Janet H. Johnson, Chicago  
Richard B. Parkinson, Oxford

Sebastian Richter, Berlin  
Kim Ryholt, Copenhagen  
Helmut Satzinger, Wien  
Wolfgang Schenkel, Tübingen

Thomas Schneider, Vancouver  
Ariel Shisha-Halevy, Jerusalem  
Deborah Sweeney, Tel Aviv  
Pascal Vernus, Paris  
Jean Winand, Liège

---

LINGUA AEGYPTIA (recommended abbreviation: *LingAeg*) publishes articles and book reviews on all aspects of Egyptian and Coptic language and literature in the narrower sense:

(a) *grammar*, including graphemics, phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, pragmatics, lexicography; (b) *Egyptian language history*, including norms, diachrony, dialectology, typology; (c) *comparative linguistics*, including Afroasiatic contacts, loanwords; (d) *theory and history of Egyptian literature and literary discourse*; (e) *history of Egyptological linguistics*. We also welcome contributions on other aspects of Egyptology and neighbouring disciplines, in so far as they relate to the journal's scope.

Short articles on grammar and lexicon will be published in the section "Miscellanies". Authors of articles or reviews will receive electronic off-prints. Periodically, we would also like to put the journal at the colleagues' disposal for a forum in which an important or neglected topic of Egyptian linguistics is treated at some length: in this case, a scholar who is active in this particular area will be invited to write a conceptual paper, and others will be asked to comment on it.

Authors should submit papers electronically to the managing editor ([lingaeg@uni-goettingen.de](mailto:lingaeg@uni-goettingen.de)). Please send contributions in both doc/docx and pdf format. Further information (incl. guidelines and a template) is available from [www.widmaier-verlag.de](http://www.widmaier-verlag.de). The decision whether to publish a manuscript is taken by the editors in agreement with the advisory board. For reviews see page 359.

---

## Addresses

Department Altertumswissenschaften: Ägyptologie, Universität Basel  
Petersgraben 51, 4051 Basel, Switzerland

Institut für Archäologie: Ägyptologie und Archäologie Nordostafrikas, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin  
Unter den Linden 6, 10099 Berlin, Germany

Seminar für Ägyptologie und Koptologie, Georg-August-Universität Göttingen

Kulturwissenschaftliches Zentrum, Heinrich-Düker-Weg 14, 37073 Göttingen, Germany

Institut für Ägyptologie, Universität Wien

Franz-Klein-Gasse 1, 1190 Wien, Austria

The annual subscription rates are 49 € for individual and 59 € for institutional subscribers while single issues are available for 99 € (incl. German VAT, excl. shipping). Orders should be sent to the publisher:

Widmaier Verlag, Kai Widmaier, Witthof 23F, 22305 Hamburg, Germany ([orders@widmaier-verlag.de](mailto:orders@widmaier-verlag.de)).

---

[www.widmaier-verlag.de](http://www.widmaier-verlag.de)

ISSN 0942-5659

# CONTENTS

## ARTICLES

Marc Brose

- Darf es noch ein sdm=f mehr sein?  
Zur aktuellen Diskussion über die Anzahl von schriftsprachlich  
kennzeichenlosen finiten Verbalformen im Älteren Ägyptisch*..... 1–59

Roman Gundacker

- Die (Auto)Biographie des Schepsesptah von Saqqarah.  
Ein neuer Versuch zur Rekonstruktion der Inschrift und ein Beitrag  
zur stilistischen Grundlegung des wiederhergestellten Textes* ..... 61–105

Matthias Müller

- Relative Clauses in Later Egyptian* ..... 107–173

Julianna Kitti Paksi

- Linguistic Inclusiveness in Seti I's Kanais Inscription*..... 175–196

Helena Lopez Palma

- Egyptian Fractional Numerals. The grammar of Egyptian NPs  
and statements with fractional number expressions*..... 197–228

Jean Winand

- Dialects in Pre-Coptic Egyptian,  
with a Special Attention to Late Egyptian* ..... 229–269

## MISCELLANIES

Marc Brose

- Zur Etymologie des Suffixpronomens 3.Sg.m. =f*..... 271–276

Willy Clarysse

- Filiation the Egyptian Way in Greek Documents* ..... 277–282

Sami Uljas

- What Is and What Is Not. A very brief note on relative adjectives  
and negations in Earlier Egyptian* ..... 283–288

## REVIEW ARTICLE

Chris H. Reintges

- Analytical Challenges of the Earlier Egyptian Passive Voice  
and Related Constructions* ..... 289–316

## REVIEWS

- Hartwig Altenmüller, *Zwei Annalenfragmente aus dem frühen Mittleren Reich*  
(Marc Brose) ..... 317–322

- Eitan Grossmann, Stéphane Polis & Jean Winand (eds.), *Lexical Semantics  
in Ancient Egyptian*  
(Ines Köhler) ..... 323–330

- Hans-Werner Fischer-Elfert, *Magika Hieratika in Berlin, Hannover,  
Heidelberg und München*  
(Matthias Müller) ..... 331–338

- Eitan Grossman, Stéphane Polis, Andréas Stauder & Jean Winand (eds.),  
*On Forms and Functions: Studies in Ancient Egyptian Grammar*  
(Carsten Peust) ..... 339–353

- Andrea Hasznos, *Graeco-Coptica: Greek and Coptic Clause Patterns*  
(Ewa D. Zakrzewska) ..... 355–358

- BOOKS RECEIVED ..... 359

- ADDRESSES OF THE AUTHORS ..... 361

## ADVERTISEMENTS

*LingAeg Studia Monographica: New Publication*

# Linguistic Inclusiveness in Seti I's *Kanais Inscription*\*

Julianna Kitti Paksi, Basel

## Abstract

The present paper explores the linguistic complexity of Seti I's *Kanais Inscription* through the perspective of linguistic dissimilation. The analysis focuses on the different grammatical realizations of future relative constructions (*s<sub>dm</sub>.tj=fj*, *ntjj r s<sub>dm</sub>*, *ntjj tw=j/sw r s<sub>dm</sub>*, and *ntjj jw=f r s<sub>dm</sub>*). I argue that the unusually high degree of linguistic dissimilation of future relative constructions can be interpreted as a form of linguistic inclusiveness. In the second half of the paper, further examples of linguistic dissimilation are discussed with regard to the various causal conjunctions (*hr-ntjj*, *p<sup>3</sup>-wn*, *mj*, and *hr*) and the different vetitive constructions (*s<sub>3</sub>w s<sub>dm</sub>=f*, *s<sub>3</sub>w tw=j/sw r s<sub>dm</sub>*, and *m-jr s<sub>dm</sub>*) in the text.

## 1 Introduction

Around 55 km east of Edfu, on the way from the Nile valley to the Red Sea, in the Wadi Abbad, stands a small, partially rock-cut temple of Seti I, the temple of Kanais.<sup>1</sup> The sanctuary, which was built in the face of the cliffs of the Eastern Desert during the ninth regnal year of the king, is best known for its threefold inscription<sup>2</sup> labelled Texts A, B, and C after Siegfried Schott.<sup>3</sup> The three texts relate a visit by the king to the gold mines

---

\* The present research was conducted as part of my ongoing PhD that concerns the study of linguistic heterogeneity in the language of the Ramesside royal inscriptions. I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisors, Susanne Bickel and Andréas Stauder, for their ongoing support, their comments, and for all the fruitful discussions that preceded this paper. I am also grateful to Daniel Bättig, Stephan Meyer, and W. Graham Claytor for proofreading earlier manuscripts of this article.

1 For the description of the temple, Brand (2000: 279–281; monument no.: 3.127) and PM VII 323–324. The name of the temple comes from the Arabic al-kanais (الكنائس) meaning “churches, shrines.”

2 *KRI* I 65, 1 – 70, 4. Earlier text editions include *LD* III 140b–d, Sander-Hansen (1933: 25–29), and Schott (1961: pl. 19). On the translation, compare Sottas (1913: 128–132), Gunn & Gardiner (1917), Gauthier (1920), Schott (1961), *AEL* II 52–57, *RITA* I 56–60, Davies (1997: 205–220), and Hafemann in *TLA* (last accessed 06.09.2015).

3 Schott (1961: 139–159); The actual votive text, Text A, was inscribed in five, relatively wide columns on the eastern side of the doorway between the forecourt and the main hall of the sanctuary. The two longer inscriptions, Text B and Text C, were carved into the northern wall of the main hall, to the right and to the left of the doorway respectively. Text B, written in 14 columns on the eastern side of the northern wall and flanked by the figure of the king facing the inscription, contains a dated record of the king's initiative and undertaking including the completion of the well and the

of the desert, the digging of a well in order to ensure a continuous water supply for future expeditions,<sup>4</sup> and the subsequent founding of a temple as well as a settlement at Kanais.

The temple of Kanais is considered a satellite of Seti I's memorial temple in Abydos.<sup>5</sup> The three texts inscribed on its walls establish a strong economic link between the two sites by assigning the entire gold production of the mines at Kanais to the treasury of the Abydos temple. Although the gold was officially meant for gilding the gods' divine images in Seti I's mortuary temple,<sup>6</sup> it can be assumed that it served the combined interests of temple and government.<sup>7</sup>

In 2006, Arlette David studied parts of the *Kanais Inscription* in detail and compiled a list of lexical and grammatical elements that are suggestive of royal decrees.<sup>8</sup> Nevertheless, the language of the inscription has received only modest scholarly attention to date. Most previous studies touching upon the language of the *Kanais Inscription* provided a rather simplified description of its language by mentioning only linguistically homogeneous larger units in the text. Agreeing with Schott's observation,<sup>9</sup> Karl Jansen-Winkeln noted in 1995 that the inscription was "an sich mittelägyptisch," with some Late Egyptian characteristics cumulating in parts of Text A and Text C.<sup>10</sup> A more nuanced view may be deduced from David's short note on the "Neo-Egyptian registers" in the Ramesside royal decrees in general, even though her summary does not mention the *Kanais Inscription* in particular.<sup>11</sup> The linguistically heterogeneous nature of the text has thus been largely overlooked so far. Most recently, Rachel Mairs referred to the threefold inscription as a "formal piece of writing, in classical Middle Egyptian."<sup>12</sup>

---

building of the temple. Text B ends with the king's address to the gods. Although separated by the doorway, Text C, a 19-column-long address to the king's forefathers, royal successors, and future officials, is therefore a logical continuation of Text B. The final part of the inscription, i.e., the last few columns of Text C, deals with the legal status of the gold washers' transport contingent as well as with that of their chief.

- 4 Finding water in the desert was an indispensable preparatory step for any gold-mining project. The importance of water supply is emphasized by the king's previous failed attempts in Nubia; see, for example, lines 20–21 of the *Kuban Stela* (KRI II 357, 1–3): *jw 3bjj.n nsw nb n hr-h3t wb3 hnm* *hr=s bw hpr rwd=s n jw jr.n nsw Mn-m3t-Rc m-mjtt* "All previous kings wished to drill a well there, without success; so did king Menmaatre."
- 5 Haring (2007: 169, n. 26) with reference to Stadelmann (1984: 914).
- 6 See line 9 of Text C (KRI I 68, 12–13): *jw=f hr st3 b3kw=f r t3 hwt Mn-m3t-Rc r nb 3smw=s n nbw* "while he [i.e., a law-abiding future king] is delivering its taxes to the temple of Menmaatre to gild all their [i.e., the gods'] divine images."
- 7 Haring (2007: 169–170).
- 8 David (2006: 112–132).
- 9 Schott (1961: 160): "Nacheinander werden verschiedene Formen der ägyptischen Sprachentwicklung verwandt. Weihinschrift [i.e., Text A] und Bericht [i.e., Text B] sind 'altägyptisch' abgefaßt, der Rest, die Reden sowohl des Heeres [i.e., the so-called thanksgiving prayer of the expedition staff within Text A] wie des Königs [i.e., entire Text C, starting at the end of Text B] 'neuägyptisch,' in der gesprochenen Sprache des Neuen Reiches."
- 10 Jansen-Winkeln (1995: 95).
- 11 David (2006: 12–14).
- 12 Mairs (2011: 154).

In 2010, Antonio J. Morales explored one particular aspect of the text: Seti I's threats and warnings to his royal successors in Text C as well as the changes these threats may imply in regard to the ideological structure of government and kingship. By relying only on the contents of the inscription, Morales concluded that the king aimed to extend his supremacy beyond his earthly dominion and wished to rule over time.<sup>13</sup> The present study intends to show that a closer look at the language of the inscription not only supports Morales' findings from a linguistic point of view but also reveals the stylistic complexity of the text and the high linguistic expertise of its composers.

## 2 Future Relative Constructions in the *Kanais Inscription*

Pascal Vernus introduced the term “linguistic dissimilation” into Egyptology in 1996. He adapted it from the field of historical linguistics where it describes a phonological change. He did so in order to name a linguistic phenomenon he first observed in the syntax of the Coffin Texts. Vernus found that functionally identical but morphologically different grammatical elements are used on purpose in some parts of the corpus. His analysis of the language of the Coffin Texts shows that linguistic dissimilation can be a versatile linguistic tool. First of all, it is a stylistic device that adds subtle auxiliary meaning to a text and thereby contributes to the enhancement of its stylistic complexity. At the same time, it is a way to display the composers' high language proficiency. Furthermore, linguistic dissimilation has a strong capacity as a means of linguistic inclusiveness, that is, as an instrument whereby the diversity and richness of reality are expressed.<sup>14</sup> The phenomenon is not at all limited to the Coffin Texts: it is already present in the Pyramid Texts and is still traceable in the written production of the Ptolemaic period.<sup>15</sup>

Recently, drawing on a few examples from the *Dedicatory Inscription for Ramesses I*, Vernus has demonstrated that Seti I was an “eager researcher” who consciously made use of linguistic dissimilation in order to enhance the language of his proclamations.<sup>16</sup> The same phenomenon may be equally well observed in the language of the *Kanais Inscription*. Future relative constructions, causal conjunctions as well as vetitives find more than one grammatical realization in the threefold inscription at Kanais. The linguistic dissimilation of future relative constructions is, however, the most unusual among the three. There are four different future relative constructions in the text, and these four variants comprise all forms available in the language at the time of Seti I. First, there are three examples of the most ancient, synthetic *sdm.tj=fj* form in the inscription (two in Text B and one in Text C).<sup>17</sup>

13 Morales (2010: 400).

14 On the phenomenon in general, Vernus (1996: 164–168).

15 For further examples of linguistic dissimilation from different times, Vernus (In press: 210–215; 223–224); for examples from Middle Egyptian texts in particular, Stauder (2013: 36; 41; 114; 262; 268, n. 103; 312–313; 424, n. 287). For examples of linguistic dissimilation of interrogative pronouns in particular, Winand (2014: 219).

16 Vernus (In press: 223–224, n. 159).

17 In columns 4 (*KRI* I 66, 6) and 12 (*KRI* I 67, 7) of Text B, and in column 11 of Text C (*KRI* I 69, 2).

Second, the earliest analytic future relative construction, *ntjj r sdm*,<sup>18</sup> is documented four times in the text (twice in Text C, and once in Text A and Text B respectively).<sup>19</sup> Third, the rare, early Late Egyptian future relative construction, *ntjj tw=j/sw r sdm*<sup>20</sup> is represented once in Text C.<sup>21</sup> Fourth, the full-fledged Late Egyptian relative Third Future, *ntjj jw=f r sdm*<sup>22</sup> appears altogether three times (all in Text C) at Kanais.<sup>23</sup>

## 2.1 The *sdm.tj=fj* Form and the *ntjj r sdm* Construction

The two oldest formulations of the relative future in the *Kanais Inscription*, the *sdm.tj=fj* form and the *ntjj r sdm* construction, seem to have preferentially used particular verbs in the text. The *sdm.tj=fj* form is attested only three times in the inscription but twice, in columns 4 and 12 of Text B (B4 and B12), with the verb *jwi*. The *ntjj r sdm* construction, on the other hand, is used with no other verb but *hpr* (A4, B4, C8, and C11).

An excerpt from Seti I's words in the section about the history of the well (B4) aptly illustrates the linguistic dissimilation of the two constructions:

*dw3=sn ntr hr rn=j n m-ht rnpwt jw.t=sn  
jw.t d3mw ntjj r hpr r sw3 jm=j hr t<sup>2A</sup>=j...*

They will thank the god in my name even after the years that will come,  
(and) the expeditionaries who will exist will come to praise me because of my  
prowess, ... (KRI I 66, 5–6)

*Jw.t=sn* “that will come” and *ntjj r hpr* “who will exist” stand just a few words apart in the above example. Since both *jwi* and *hpr* are relatively frequent verbs in the record, their

18 The construction is first found in the version P of *Ptahhotep 50*, but it does not resurface in the extant record until approximately four centuries later. The second example of the *ntjj r sdm* construction dates to the Second Intermediate Period: it appears in line 8 of Nubkheperre Antef's *Coptos Decree* in the Seventeenth Dynasty (Helck 1983<sup>2</sup>: 74). Compare *GEG* §332, Kroeber (1970: 136, n. 2), and Morschauer (1991: 10–11). Since *Ptahhotep 50* is unstable between versions P and L2, Gundacker (2012: 78, n. 137) argues that what appears to be a *ntjj r sdm* construction in version P is a scribal mistake. Winand (2006: 256–257, ex. 348, n. 43; 353, ex. 653), on the other hand, accounted for the linguistic dissimilation of a *sdm.tj=fj* construction and a *ntjj r sdm* construction in *Ptahhotep 49–50* with the different lexical aspects of the two verbs involved.

19 In column 4 of Text A (KRI I 65, 10), column 4 of Text B (KRI I 66, 6), and in columns 8 (KRI I 68, 11) and 11 (KRI I 69, 2) of Text C.

20 This is the relative variant of the otherwise also rarely attested exploratory construction, the early Late Egyptian Third Future (*tw=j/sw r sdm*), which first appeared in the texts of Kamose and coexisted with the fully developed variant of the Third Future (*jw=f r sdm*) for no longer than one and a half centuries (Kroeber 1970: 93–97; Stauder 2013: 45; 94–95; Stauder 2014: 366).

21 In column 15 of Text C (KRI I 69, 9).

22 Compare Kroeber (1970: 136).

23 In columns 14 (KRI I 69, 7–8), 17 (KRI I 69, 15), and 19 (KRI I 70, 3) of Text C.

24 *Tl* is a Hurrian loan word that is documented in Egyptian texts from the Eighteenth Dynasty onwards. According to Schneider (1999), its first securely dated example comes from the time of Thutmose IV. However, the word is also present in the *Papyrus Astarte*, a manuscript that Collombert & Coulon (2000: 210–216) date to the time of Amenhotep II.



association with the two oldest future relative constructions suggests that *ntjj r hpr* and *jw.t=sn*<sup>25</sup> were potentially – at least to some extent – considered as set expressions at the time of composition.

A further example of *sdm.tj=fj* is found with a verb other than *jwi*, with the word *sšn/shnn* “to destroy.” The form’s dissociation from *jwi* happens in a linguistically rather innovative register, in the king’s address to his royal successors (C11). After having paid tribute to his loyal descendants (C8–11), the king turns to possible future royal transgressors in his speech and warns them about the consequence of their disobedience, should they disrespect the independence of his newly founded institution of gold extraction:

*hr jr nsw nb ntjj r hpr shnn.t=f shrw=j nb hn<sup>c</sup> ntf dd*  
*t3w r-ht=j*  
*jnk sn*  
*mj wn=sn<sup>12</sup>|hr=f*  
*sp qsn hr jb ntrw*  
*mk tw=[t]w r wšbw=f m Jwnw*  
*mntsn<sup>26</sup> d3d3t [... ...]*

However, as for any king who will exist and will destroy all my plans and who will say:

“The lands are under my authority;  
 they are mine  
 as they were<sup>12</sup>his.”

(This is) an evil deed in the opinion of the gods.

Look, he will be prosecuted<sup>27</sup> in Heliopolis,  
 for they are the tribunal<sup>28</sup> [... ...].

(*KRI* I 69, 1–4)

25 The singular form, *jw.t=f* is not attested in the *Kanais Inscription*; B12 (*KRI* I 67, 7) also has *jw.t=sn: jh dd=tn n jw.t=sn* “you shall tell those who will come.” For the latter in broader context, see the excerpt under 3.1.

26 The third-person plural independent pronoun, *mntsn*, is a graphical mix, a hybrid of its Middle and Late Egyptian counterparts, *ntsn* and *mntw* respectively. On the idea that the “intrusive” *m* of Late Egyptian independent pronouns may have been the product of a linguistic analogy between independent pronouns and the particle *jn*, given the fact that independent pronouns were employed as the pronominal counterpart of an *jn* + *noun* construction, Uljas (2005).

27 The translation follows Morschauer’s (1991: 72) suggestion. He argues that the verb *wšb* “to answer” specifically refers to the formal arraignment of a criminal here.

28 On the tribunal of gods in Heliopolis in general and concerning state affairs in particular, Bickel (1997).

The topic, syntactically the object of a seldom documented early Third Future construction<sup>29</sup> (*tw*=[*t*]*w r wšbw=f* “he will be prosecuted”), is introduced here in frontal extraposition and is thus given additional emphasis. The particle *hr* at the head of the first clause functions here as a Late Egyptian stylistic tool<sup>30</sup> and relates the paragraph to its pendant dealing with obedient future kings.<sup>31</sup> It is this noun phrase (*nsw nb* “any king”) in left dislocation that is being further specified with the help of two consecutive future relative clauses: a *sdm.tj=fj* formed with the verb *sšn/shnn*<sup>32</sup> (*shnn.t=f shrw=j nb* “who will destroy all my plans”) and a *ntjj r hpr* phrase. The two future relative expressions are continued by a *hn<sup>c</sup> ntf sdm* construction (*hn<sup>c</sup> ntf dd* “and who will say”), the forerunner of the fully developed Late Egyptian conjunctive, *mtw=f sdm*. Although *hn<sup>c</sup> ntf sdm* is regularly attested between the reigns of Hatshepsut and Seti I, its presence in direct continuation of a future relative and not an imperative or adhortative clause is a result of a contemporaneous development.<sup>33</sup> Hence, the *hn<sup>c</sup> ntf sdm* construction – directly following a *ntjj r hpr* phrase and a *sdm.tj=fj* form – essentially functions as a third future relative clause in the above sequence.

In the paragraph dealing with law-abiding future kings, the same *hn<sup>c</sup> ntf sdm* construction directly follows a *ntjj r hpr* phrase:

29 Although Kroeber (1970: 96) argues that the scarcely attested “frühneuägyptisches Futur” is not at all present in the “non-literary” texts of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Dynasties, the *Kanais Inscription* has it twice: first, here as an impersonal construction (C12; *KRI* I 69, 3); and second, in the penultimate clause of the same threat, with the new third-person subject pronoun in initial position: *st r ssw n hđ shrw=j* “they [i.e., the gods] will punish him who destroys my plans” (C13; *KRI* I 69, 5). For further examples of the construction, Kroeber (1970: 94–96) and Stauder (2013: 45; 94–95; 303; 2014: 366, n. 52).

30 Compare Neveu (2001: 97–125).

31 See also below, starting in C8 as follows: *jr nsw nb ntjj r hpr hn<sup>c</sup> ntf swšh jrwt=j...* “As for every king who will exist and will make my deeds endure...” (*KRI* I 68, 11).

32 *Sšn* “to destroy,” an old, caus. 2-lit. verb (Allen 1984: 591–592 and *DZA* 29.612.970) is documented here with a relatively recent spelling that was probably influenced by a 2ae-gem. verb with similar semantics, *hnn* “to violate.” Note the association of the two verbs despite their different classifiers also in Morschauser (1991: 55). David (2006: 118) argues that the “gemination” in *shnn.t=f* represents an archaism and imitates the language of Old Kingdom decrees. Alternatively, the duplication of the *n* could be merely a graphical phenomenon and is not necessarily morphological. According to *DZA* 29.612.970 and the occurrences in *TLA*, *sšn* is regularly spelled as *shnn* in the Nineteenth and the Twentieth Dynasties. If one considered the *sdm.tj=fj* form’s possible relatedness to the prospective *sdm=f*, a finite verbal form that shows gemination with non-causative and non-infirmative verbs (Schenkel 2000: 102–110; Schenkel 2012<sup>5</sup>: 226–228), gemination with a caus. 2-lit. verb would be remarkable unless – due to the altered spelling and thus by analogy to the 2ae-gem. *hnn* – the verb was newly understood as a caus. 2ae-gem.

33 Kroeber (1970: 152): “Kurz vor dem Verschwinden dieser Form weitete sich ihr Gebrauch auf die Fortsetzung futurischer Relativsätze aus, sicher unter dem Einfluß der schon existenten neuägyptischen Form *mt.f sdm*.” On the conjunctive being “eminently suited to set forth a future-oriented action,” Borghouts (1979: 20), and on the Late Egyptian conjunctive in general, Winand (2001).

*jr nsw nb ntjj r hpr hnc ntf sw3h jrwt=j<sup>9</sup> |r rdit mn [hn qr n j<sup>c</sup>w-nbw<sup>34</sup> m hwt=j]<sup>35</sup>  
 jw=f hr st3 b3kw=f r t3 hwt Mn-m3<sup>c</sup>t-R<sup>c</sup> r nb<sup>36</sup> csmw=sn nbw  
 jr Jmn R<sup>c</sup>-Hr-3htj Pth-<sup>10</sup>|T3-<t>nn Wn[-nfr] [... 5 groups lost ...] [r]wd=sn<sup>37</sup>  
 hq3=sn t3w m ndm-jb...*

As for every king who will exist and will make my deeds endure, <sup>9</sup>so as to maintain [the organization of the transport contingent of gold washers in my temple,] while delivering its taxes to the temple of Menmaatre to gild all their [i.e., the gods'] divine images,

Amun, Re-Harakhti, Ptah-<sup>10</sup>Tatenen, Wennufer [... 5 groups lost ...] will make them thrive.

They will rule the lands in joy,...

(KRI I 68, 11–14)

*Ntjj r hpr* and the early Late Egyptian conjunctive – the latter carrying on the function of the preceding relative clause – modify the same frontally extraposed noun phrase as did the corresponding future relative constructions in the previous example: *nsw nb* “every king.” Despite the relatively large lacuna, it seems certain that the coordinate clauses resuming the topic in the actual syntactic position of the sentence also employ future constructions, not early Late Egyptian Third Future constructions as above but the older prospective *sdm=f*s.

## 2.2 The *ntjj tw=j/sw r sdm* and the *ntjj jw=f r sdm* Constructions

Besides the *sdm.tj=fj* form and the *ntjj r hpr* construction, there are two further future relative constructions in the *Kanais Inscription*: the rare, transitional *ntjj tw=j/sw r sdm* construction and the fully developed Late Egyptian relative future, *ntjj jw=f r sdm*. The

34 *J<sup>c</sup>w-nbw* is a New Kingdom designation for the profession of gold washers (*Wb.* I 39.19). The similarly late, presumably collective *qr* is more problematic in its semantics. The *Wörterbuch* (V 21.9–11) leaves the word untranslated; Lesko (IV 6) suggests “caravaneers” with reference to our text; Gunn & Gardiner (1917: 247) decide for a translation “staff of gold washers” after having considered that it may literally mean “miners” (n. 3); and Schott (1961: 177) notes that the spelling of the word only differs in its determinatives from that of “cargo vessel” (*Wb.* V 21.12–13) and thereby concludes that its meaning must be transport related. *Qr* is also documented in line 10 of the *Kuban Stela* (KRI II 355, 4–5) and in line 40 of the *Nauri Decree* (KRI I 52, 8). The latter has it in a combination that supports Schott’s interpretation: *qr [n]j<sup>c</sup>w-nbw whrw* “transport contingent of the gold washers of the dockyards.” Koenig (1979: 212–215, n. uu) speculates that the word has a double meaning referring to both “transport workers” and “miners.”

35 The passage has been restored after Schott (1961: 152; pl. 19).

36 The verb *nbi* “to gild” is spelled here according to its New Kingdom orthography (*DZA* 24.976.350–360).

37 Note the conceptual shift in number: from third-person singular to third-person plural. From this point, the resumptive pronouns treat the originally singular expression, *nsw nb* “any king” as plural, “every king.” The original singularity of the noun phrase is demonstrated by the conjunctive, *hnc ntf sw3h* “who [sing.] will make endure” as well as by the *jw*-converted First Present, *jw=f hr st3* “while he delivers.”

complementary distribution of these two constructions is best demonstrated in the king's address to future officials in Text C (C14–16).

The fact that Seti I tried to ensure that high state functionaries would support his cause and would remind their lords of the maintenance of his endowment suggests that he was well aware of their potential influence on their kings. To those on whose advice he could count, he promised early veneration and peaceful death:

*hr jr sr nb ntjj jw=f r spr nsw hn<sup>c</sup> ntf dit sh3 nfr r smnt jrwt=j hr rn=j*  
*di ntr jm3hjj=f tp t3*  
*phwj=f htp<sup>15</sup> |.w m zij n k3=f*

Now, as for any official who will approach a king and who will kindly remind him of the maintenance of my arrangements in my name, the god will arrange his veneration upon earth, (and) his end shall be peaceful <sup>15</sup>in going to his *ka*. (KRI I 69, 7–9)

On the other hand, the king tried to discourage those who would be prone not to respect his endowment in their advice to their lords:

*hr jr sr nb ntjj sw r stkn jb pn<sup>38</sup> n nb=f r nhm hsbw r dit=w<sup>39</sup> hr kij sdf<sup>40</sup> m shr n*  
*mtjj bjn<sup>41</sup>*  
*jw=f n nsrt*

Whereas, as for any official who – by way of bad advice<sup>42</sup> – will encourage this heart of his lord to remove the personnel in order to place them on another endowment, he will be doomed to fire. (KRI I 69, 9–10)

The contrasting juxtaposition of the contents is accentuated by the parallel linguistic formulation of the two paragraphs. The paragraph-initial particle *hr* plays a central role in the articulation of the king's speech by ensuring the continuation of the sequence that started with the provisions concerning law-abiding future kings (C8). The “good” as

38 Cataphoric use of the usually anaphoric Earlier Egyptian demonstrative, *pn* (Černý & Groll 1975: 40–41); also noted by David (2006: 123).

39 Instead of the Earlier Egyptian =*sn*, the Late Egyptian third-person plural suffix pronoun, =*w*, is used here as an anaphoric reference to the personnel of Seti I's new endowment. The use of the new suffix pronoun as an object attached to an infinitive is not documented before the Amarna period (Kroeger 1970: 39). Compare Winand (1995: 193–195).

40 *Sdf* “endowment, foundation” is the Ramesside version of the Late Egyptian lexeme, *sdf3* documented as of the Eighteenth Dynasty (Gardiner 1948: 116–118). The word originates in the earlier *s*-causative verb, *sdf3* “to provide, to endow.” Although FCD 259 lists a Middle Kingdom example for *sdf3* as a noun (Newberry & Griffith 1893: pl. 13, 10), the referenced passage contains a participle of the verb and not yet the noun. Hannig (HAW II 2404, lemma no. 31812) and Brovarski (1981: 18) have similarly taken it as a noun.

41 The spelling of the word – with the Lower Egyptian crown for *n* – corresponds to a later practice, documented from the Nineteenth Dynasty onwards (DZA 22.827.250).

42 The translation follows Gardiner's (1948: 116, n. 1) suggestion; literally, “by the plan of a false witness” or “in manner of a false witness.”

well as the “bad” officials are introduced with the help of a relatively simple, frontally extraposed phrase: *sr nb* “any official.”<sup>43</sup> Future relative clauses are used to elaborate on the topicalized expressions and to describe the anticipated behavior of the two groups. To this end, a fully evolved Late Egyptian relative Third Future stands parallel to its precursor, an exploratory Late Egyptian relative future construction. In other words, *sr nb ntjj jw=f r spr nsw* “any official who will approach a king” contrasts with *sr nb ntjj sw r stkn jb pn n nb=f* “any official who will encourage this heart of his lord” not only in contents but in language use as well. The stylistic effect of linguistic dissimilation is further enhanced by the use of an early Late Egyptian conjunctive in continuation of the relative Third Future in the first paragraph: *hn<sup>c</sup> ntf dit sh3 nfr* “and who will kindly remind him.”

There are two other examples of the fully developed Late Egyptian relative future, the *ntjj jw=f r sdm* construction in the *Kanais Inscription*. What sets them apart from their counterpart in column 14 of Text C in particular, and from all other future relative constructions in the text in general, lies in the nature of their antecedent. While all other future relative clauses were used to modify a noun phrase, the scope of reference of these two is not restricted by any preceding nominal expression. The antecedent of the last two examples of *ntjj jw=f r sdm* is merely the morpheme *p3*.<sup>44</sup> Hence, it is not surprising to find them in threats that appear to be directed against all possible future evildoers irrespective of social status – or rather, against all parties below the rank of future royal descendants and future officials, that is, against the rest of the Egyptian population.<sup>45</sup> These maledictions are embedded in the final part of the inscription that deals with the legal status of the transport contingent of gold washers as well as with that of their chief (C16–19).

The first stipulation concerns the immunity of the gold washers' transport contingent, while the king's mortuary temple in Abydos is declared the sole beneficiary of gold extraction at Kanais:<sup>46</sup>

43 In the first case, the frontally extraposed noun phrase is syntactically coreferential with the possessor of the object on the one hand (*di ntr jm3hjj=f* “the god will arrange *his* veneration”) and with the possessor of the subject on the other hand (*phwj=f htp.w* “*his* end shall be peaceful”). In the second case, the topicalized expression is coreferential with the subject of the main clause itself (*jw=f n nsrt* “*he* will be doomed to fire”).

44 The cataphoric use of *p3* as the antecedent of a relative expression is already documented in earlier stages of the language (see, e.g., Kroeber 1970: 19–20 or line 17 of pBerlin 10038 A in Luft 1992), however, until the time of Seti I, never in monumental inscriptions.

45 A line in the king's appeal to the gods (B12) supports this interpretation by dividing the relevant future parties whom the gods shall address into kings, high state functionaries, and commoners: *jh dd=tn n jw.t=sn m nsww srw rhjtt...* “Therefore, you shall tell those who will come, (may they be) kings, high officials, or commoners,...” (KRI I 67, 7–8)

46 Seti I's mortuary complex in Abydos is consequently distinguished from the Kanais temple in the text. The former is referred to as *b hwt Mn-m3<sup>c</sup>t-R<sup>c</sup>* (C9, C17, C18, and C19), while the latter as *hwt-nt<sup>r</sup>* (A1, B10, B11, C2, and C3).

*wpw-ḥr wnn p3 qr* <sup>17</sup>|*n j<sup>c</sup>w-nbw jr.n=j r t3 ḥwt Mn-m3<sup>c</sup>t-R<sup>c</sup> ḥw.w mk.w...*  
*jr p3 ntjj nb jw=f r th* <sup>47</sup> *rmt jm=sn* <sup>18</sup>|*di.w* <sup>48</sup> *r kt st*  
*jr n=f n3 nṯw nṯrjt nbw ḥwt=j r jrjj-n-<sup>c</sup>ḥ3* <sup>49</sup>...

Particularly, the transport contingent <sup>17</sup>of gold washers, which I set up for the temple of Menmaatre, ought to be safeguarded and protected....

As for anyone who will interfere with the people among them, <sup>18</sup>(so that they be) relocated to another place,  
 all the gods and goddesses of my temple will be an adversary to him,...

(KRI I 69, 12–16)

Subsequently, the chief of the transport contingent is given exclusive authority to have the gold delivered to Abydos:

*wpw-ḥr wnn p3 ḥr-pdt* <sup>50</sup> *n p3 qr n j<sup>c</sup>w-nbw n t3 ḥwt* <sup>19</sup>|*Mn-m3<sup>c</sup>t-R<sup>c</sup> ḥr drt=f ḥr ḥrp*  
*b3kw=sn m nbw r t3 ḥwt Mn-m3<sup>c</sup>t-R<sup>c</sup>*  
*jr p3 ntjj nb jw=f r sh ḥr r wdt (t)n* <sup>51</sup>  
*jr Wsjr m-s3=f*  
*jw 3st m-s3 ḥmt=f*  
*jw Hr m-s3 ḥrdw=f*

Furthermore, the troop commander of the transport contingent of gold washers of the temple of <sup>19</sup>Menmaatre shall himself be in charge of delivering their taxes of gold to the temple of Menmaatre.

As for anyone who will neglect<sup>52</sup> this decree,  
 Osiris will be after<sup>53</sup> him,  
 while Isis is after his wife,  
 (and) Horus is after his children.

(KRI I 70, 1–4)

47 The verb *thi* “to transgress, to violate” is most common in the threat formulae of the Third Intermediate Period but is consistently attested in stipulative clauses of threats from the beginning of the Eighteenth Dynasty throughout the Late Period (Morschauser 1991: 55–56; 129).

48 The pseudoparticiples of *rdi* is written with the duplication of the corresponding ideogram (sign D37). On this spelling, also Junge (2008<sup>3</sup>: 86, *Anmerkung*).

49 The word *jrjj-n-<sup>c</sup>ḥ3* “opponent, adversary” (Lesko I 46) is a Ramesside construct that literally means “one involved with fighting.” The use of the term is relatively common in threats where it usually applies to divine parties (Morschauser 1991: 70–71). For an example outside of the context of warnings, see line 13 of Ramesses II’s *Abridged Version of the First Hittite Marriage* (KRI II 257, 9).

50 *Hr-pdt* originally stands for “troop commander” (*Wb.* I 571.1–5) but should most probably be understood here in a more general sense, as “leader.” The word is first documented on the *Stela of Nakht* in the Second Intermediate Period in Abydos (Helck 1983<sup>2</sup>: 75, line 3).

51 Note the haplography of the *t*. On the ambiguous legal nature of the document despite the mention of the word “decree,” David (2006: 112–113).

52 The expression *shi ḥr r* literally means “to have a deaf/earless face to something,” i.e., “to turn a deaf ear to something.” In threats, it usually refers to criminal negligence concerning an upkeep of an institution (Morschauser 1991: 60).

53 The compound preposition, *m-s3* is used to express divine pursuit in threats. Compare line 113 of Seti I’s *Nauri Decree* (KRI I 58, 5–6): *jr Wsjr ḥnt-jmntt p3 nb n n3 rmt p3 nb n n3 ḥwt m-s3=f m-s3*

The structure of the above two paragraphs is almost identical. The warnings, which – similarly to the preceding examples – accommodate the future relative clauses, are in each case introduced by a legal section containing the two major regulations of the inscription. The warnings themselves have an encapsulating quality. They might not be explicitly addressed to any particular party, such as royal descendants or state functionaries, but they do have an implicit audience, namely “the rest” of the population. Both *p3 ntjj jw=f r sdm* constructions appear as frontally extraposed topics and thus carry additional emphasis in their own right: *jr p3 ntjj nb jw=f r th rmt jm=sn* “as for anyone who will interfere with the people among them [i.e., among the gold washers]” as well as *jr p3 ntjj nb jw=f r sh hr r wdt (t)n* “as for anyone who will neglect this decree.” The topics defined in left dislocation are resumed by a prepositional expression (with *n=f* “to him” and *m-s3=f* “after him” respectively) in the two punitive clauses that specify the fate of those who disrespect the king’s arrangements. The use of the typically Ramesside, so-called analogical construction of the Late Egyptian Third Future<sup>54</sup> makes the linguistic formulation of these two main clauses equally innovative as that of the corresponding future relative clauses.

### 2.3 Linguistic Inclusiveness via Linguistic Dissimilation of Future Relative Constructions

The *Kanais Inscription* features a remarkably high degree of linguistic dissimilation with regards to its future relative constructions. This dissimilation is systematically present throughout the whole text (see the first example under 2.1) but the contrasting juxtaposition of loyal and disloyal behavioral patterns of the relevant parties (see under 2.1 and 2.2) makes its presence most conspicuous in the context of royal warnings. In the latter case, the distributional pattern of single future relative constructions indicates a gradual shift from a preference for more ancient linguistic formulations towards a preference for more recent ones. The logic that influenced the placing of a particular construction at a particular point in the text may be sought in the social status of the king’s implied audience. In other words, the degree of linguistic formality of a certain register is to some extent directly proportional to the rank of the corresponding social group addressed.

Accordingly, the section in which future royal descendants are addressed remains closest to the traditional linguistic formulations: two *ntjj r hpr* phrases alternate with two early Late Egyptian conjunctives and a *sdm.tj=fj* form. The main clauses, in which the frontally extraposed topics are taken up in their actual syntactic positions, use either prospective *sdm=f*s (positive example) or an early Late Egyptian Third Future with impersonal subject (negative example) in the passages cited. The following section, in which future state functionaries form the implied audience of the king, takes a transitional

---

*hmt=f m-s3 hrdw=f* “Osiris, the foremost of westerners, the lord of people and the lord of things, will be after him, his wife, and his children.” For more examples, Morschauer (1991: 79–80).

54 The analogical construction of the Third Future uses the verb *jri* as auxiliary in future events with full noun subjects. Although the form is characteristic for the Ramesside period, it is already documented in the Eighteenth Dynasty. Compare Kroeber (1970: 138–139), Winand (1996) and Kruchten (2010).

linguistic position when compared to the preceding and following units. In this section, a fully developed Late Egyptian relative Third Future takes turns with an early Late Egyptian conjunctive and a relative exploratory Third Future. Neither *sdm.tj=fj* forms nor *ntjj r hpr* phrases are to be found anymore. However, the comparably innovative nature of the future relative clauses is somewhat muted by the more traditional syntax of the following main clauses. In this case, a prospective *sdm=f* and a clause with pseudo-participial predicate (positive example) contrasts with an adverbial clause that is not necessarily typical of Late Egyptian (negative example).<sup>55</sup> The last section, which presents the commoners as the king's audience, is linguistically the most innovative as well as the most homogenous unit among the three.<sup>56</sup> Both relevant paragraphs contain a *p3*-introduced, fully evolved Late Egyptian relative Third Future construction, which, in this particular case, is identical with the frontally extraposed topic in each instance. The two corresponding main clauses that resume these topics similarly use a characteristically late linguistic formulation as their predicate: the analogical construction of the Late Egyptian Third Future.

The extraordinarily high degree of linguistic dissimilation of future relative constructions demonstrates that the broad scope of linguistic selections relates to the equally broad scope of the royal address. This means that the language of the *Kanais Inscription* was designed to demonstrate the same level of inclusiveness that was aimed at when specifying the king's addressees. Moreover, the principled placement of each construction shows that each given linguistic selection was intended to match the linguistic register of the relevant section. To put it differently, the linguistic dissimilation of future relative constructions reinforces the complex social realities reflected in royal warnings and underlines the king's desire for full compliance with his orders to protect his endowment across all levels of society.

Nevertheless, the question of whether Seti I achieved his goal and succeeded in making further generations respect his arrangements still remains open. Schott speculated, for example, that the gold supply of the new endowment had already dried up under Seti I and that Ramesses II had to renew it on the occasion of his first visit to Abydos at the beginning of his reign.<sup>57</sup> However, the only historical evidence that can give us a clue about the fate of the endowment is a short hieroglyphic note carved on one of the columns in the main hall reading *jn nbw n hb-sd mh II n Wsr-m3<sup>c</sup>t-R<sup>c</sup> Stp-n-R<sup>c</sup>* "bringing gold for the eleventh *sed* festival of Usermaatre Setepenre."<sup>58</sup> Gunn and Gardiner were the only ones to consider the possibility that the note does not necessarily reveal a worst-case scenario but might as well refer to "voluntary offerings" from the priesthood at Kanais on the occasion of

55 Satzinger calls it the "Adverbialsatz des Futurums" (1976: 198–201). Compare with David (2006: 124), who argues for a performative, atemporal value of the clause *iw=f n nsrt* and translates it as "he belongs to a flame" (123). Although David's interpretation seems very plausible, it disregards the overall structure of Text C that calls for a construction with future reference at this point.

56 Although linguistic constructions have the tendency to cluster according to their relative novelty in the text, there still remains an indisputable overlap among the linguistic registers.

57 Schott (1961: 180–181), taken up by Hikade (2001: 62).

58 *LD IV Text*, 82; cited by Hikade (2001: 218, ex. 151).



Ramesses II's eleventh jubilee.<sup>59</sup> The more pessimistic – and perhaps also more realistic – interpretation is, of course, that Ramesses II modified his father's legal arrangements and used the institution for his own benefit.

### 3 Further Examples of Linguistic Dissimilation in the *Kanais Inscription*

The phenomenon of linguistic dissimilation is not limited to the future relative constructions in the inscription. There are two other linguistic domains in which it is unmistakably present: in the various grammatical realizations of causal subordination and in the different linguistic expressions of prohibition.

#### 3.1 Causal Conjunctions

The *Kanais Inscription* features four different ways to express causal subordination. The Earlier Egyptian causal conjunction *hr-ntt*, which was typically used only in the texts of *égyptien de tradition* from the Nineteenth Dynasty onwards,<sup>60</sup> is documented four times in some of the most innovative registers of the inscription (B4, B12, C4, and C16). However, the conjunction is never spelled as *hr-ntt* in the text: it consequently appears according to its Late Egyptian orthography as *hr-ntjj*.<sup>61</sup> Twice it stands alone: once among the closing words of Seti I's supplication to the gods (B12) and once at the end of the king's speech to future officials (C16). In the remaining two examples, the function of *hr-ntjj* is complemented by two enclitic particles, by *js*<sup>62</sup> (B4) and by *rf*<sup>63</sup> (C4) respectively. The characteristically Late Egyptian causal conjunction *p3-wn*<sup>64</sup> is documented once in the king's appeal to the gods (B13) and once in the last clause of the paragraph that deals with the legal status of the transport contingent of gold washers (C18). Besides the more ancient *hr-ntjj* and the typically late *p3-wn*, the former preposition *mj* is represented in its more recent, Late Egyptian role introducing causal subordinations (A3, A5, B12, and C2).<sup>65</sup>

59 Gunn & Gardiner (1917: 249); also noted by Morales (2010: 408, n. 68).

60 Compare Polis (2008–2009: 444, n. 1091).

61 ENG §117, *Anmerkung*.

62 *Hr-ntt/hr-ntjj js* is a conscious but incorrectly employed archaism that is documented in royal and private monumental inscriptions, in clauses with nominal predicate from the early Eighteenth Dynasty onwards. On *hr-ntt js* with an example from the *Karnak Statue* of Amunhotep Son of Hapu (*Urk.* IV 1824, 11), both Uljas (2007: 283–284, n. 51) and Oréal (2011: 165).

63 *Hr-ntt/hr-ntjj rf* is not securely attested before the Eighteenth Dynasty. For an example in *Khakheperreseneb*, Oréal (2011: 88) and Stauder (2013: 166); for further examples from the time of Hatshepsut and Horemheb, Stauder (2013: 166–167).

64 Although *p3-wn* is already documented in the Eighteenth Dynasty (e.g., Polis 2008–2009: 444, ex. 1075; and line 3 of oBerlin 11247, Hafemann in *TLA*, last accessed 28.09.2015), its attestations strongly concentrate in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Dynasties (Winand 1995: 197, n. 35). Goldwasser (2001: 124) even considers it as a prominent Nineteenth Dynasty feature.

65 On “*mj* zur Einführung bekannter Information” in the New Kingdom, Peust (2006: 511–512) and Erman (ENG, 310–311 in §621). On *mj sdm.n=f*, Uljas (2007: 265–266) with an example (no. 317) from the annals of Thutmose III and another (no. 318) from the *Berlin Leather Roll*. On the dating of the latter, Stauder (2013: 249–257).

Like *mj*, the Earlier Egyptian particle *hr* is also attested once (C3) as a causal conjunction, a function it did not possess until the New Kingdom.<sup>66</sup>

The closing section of Text B, the king's appeal to the gods, presents three of these causal conjunctions parallel to one another:<sup>67</sup>

*j.nd hr=tn ntrw wrw*<sup>68</sup> *grgw pt t3 n jb=sn*<sup>69</sup>  
*hsjjw=tn wj*<sup>12</sup> | *r r3-<sup>c</sup> nhh*  
*sddw*<sup>70</sup> = *tn rn=j dt*  
*mj 3h=j*  
*mj nfr=j n=tn*  
*mj nhs*<sup>71</sup> = *j hr hrwt mr=tn*  
*jh dd=tn n jw.t=sn m nsww srw rhjtt*  
*smn*<sup>13</sup> | = *sn n=j jrwt=j*<sup>72</sup> *hr-st-hr hwt=j m 3bdw*  
*nfr jrr hr r3 n ntr*  
*p3-wnn bw h3.n=sn*<sup>73</sup> *shrw=f*  
*dd ds=tn*  
*jrjj=tw hr r3=tn*  
*hr-ntjj ntn n3 nbw*

Hail to you, great gods, who founded heaven and earth at their wish!

May you favor me<sup>12</sup> until the end of eternity,

(and) may you make my name endure forever,

as I am efficacious,

as I am good to you,

66 Neveu (2001: 157–166). Compare this micro-level connective force of *hr* with its function as a macro-level stylistic tool in C11 (under 2.1), C14, and C15 (under 2.2).

67 The theme finds its visual representation on the wall (Schott 1961: pl. 13). On the left-hand side of the text, close to the doorway, stands the speaking figure of the king with Nekhbet, the vulture goddess above his head. The captions read as follows: <sup>1</sup>*ntr nfr nb t3wj Mn-m3<sup>c</sup>t-R<sup>c</sup> 2* | *s3 R<sup>c</sup> nb h<sup>c</sup>w Stsjj mr n Pth 3* | *di <sup>c</sup>nh dd w3s* [...] “[<sup>1</sup>]The perfect god, lord of the two lands, Menmaat, [<sup>2</sup>]son of Re, lord of diadems, Seti I, beloved of Ptah, [<sup>3</sup>]given life, stability and dominion [...]” and *Nhbt hdt Nhn* “Nekhbet, the white one of Nekhen” (*KRI* I 67, 11).

68 Unusual, presumably associative spelling for *wr* “great,” written with the sign A21.

69 The formulation of this passage is similar to that of *Merikare* E 131, *jr.n=f pt t3 n jb=sn* “for their [i.e., the people’s] sake, he has made heaven and earth.” However, the suffix pronoun in *jb=sn* has a different point of reference in the *Kanais Inscription*: *grgw pt t3 n jb=sn* “who founded heaven and earth at their [i.e., their own, the gods’] wish,” that is, “as they pleased.” Compare with Stauder (2013: 196, n. 521).

70 *Sddi* “to make endure” is first documented in the Eighteenth Dynasty (*Urk.* IV 1523, 6) but is seldom attested in the New Kingdom. Its use becomes clearly more frequent in the Ptolemaic and Roman times (data from *TLA*).

71 The verb *nhsi* “to awaken, to be awake” displays a late orthography according to *DZA* 25.184.400 and *DZA* 25.184.410.

72 The substantivized perfect relative form, *jrwt=j* “what I have done” is transitional in its formulation, because it does not yet feature the prothetic yod of a truly Late Egyptian relative form, neither displays the *n* of the otherwise expected Middle Egyptian relative *sdm.n=f* anymore.

73 Note the cataphoric use of the suffix pronoun.

and as I am aware of the matters that you desire.  
 Therefore, you shall tell those who will come, (may they be) kings, high officials, or  
 commoners,  
 that they shall make (it) last <sup>13</sup>for me what I have done under the control of my  
 temple in Abydos.  
 Good is he who acts on the word of god,  
 for (then) they cannot fail<sup>74</sup> – his plans.  
 Speak yourselves,  
 (and) one will act upon your word,  
 because you are the lords. (KRI I 67, 5–9)

The above constellation of the three different causal conjunctions represents a clear example of linguistic dissimilation.

First, the king gives his arguments in three *mj*-introduced causal clauses when praying for the gods' favor and support: *mj 3h=j mj nfr=j n=tn mj nhs=j hr hrwt mr=tn* "as I am efficacious, as I am good to you, and as I am aware of the matters that you desire."<sup>75</sup> Second, the Late Egyptian causal conjunction, *p3-wn* heads a further, single-clause unit of causal subordination: *p3-wnn bw h3.n=sn shrw=f* "for (then) they cannot fail – his plans." *P3-wn* features an unusual, rare spelling, *p3-wnn*,<sup>76</sup> and precedes a transitional written form, *bw sdm.n=f*,<sup>77</sup> the precursor of the Late Egyptian Negative Aorist, *bw sdm=f*: *bw h3.n=sn* "they cannot fail." Finally, a clause introduced by the conjunction *hr-ntjj* gives the ultimate argument for why all parties would obey a divine word: *hr-ntjj ntt n3 nbw* "because you are the lords," that is to say, the highest authority on earth.

The reasoning follows the outline of the king's expectations concerning the gods' behavior in protecting his new endowment. The notion of reciprocity is the principal idea behind the argument that is meant to encourage the gods to inform all possible future transgressors about the importance of the upkeep of Seti I's institution. The use of *mj* in the first three causal subordinations in which the king's worthiness of divine support is explained is thus not surprising. It is the linguistic reflection of the *do ut des* formula that expresses the reciprocal service relationship between human being and deity.<sup>78</sup> As far as semantics is concerned, in contrast to *p3-wn* and *hr-ntjj*, the meaning of *mj* stays close to "like" when it is used to describe the reciprocity of exchange between the king and the gods.<sup>79</sup>

74 On the altered meaning of *h3i*, originally "to descend," *DZA* 26.312.560: "Belegt seit Pyr. Die Bedeutung 'fallen' ist erst seit Anfang N.R. klar auszusondern."

75 Peust (2006: 511, ex. 167) quotes part of the passage in order to exemplify the altered, New Kingdom use of *mj*.

76 Another example of the long spelling for *p3-wn* appears similarly before the negative particle *bw* in line 8 of a Nineteenth Dynasty ostrakon, oBM EA 5631: *p3-wnn bw rh s(j) w* "because no one knows it" (Birch 1868: pl. 18). On the dating of this ostrakon, Winand (1995: 196–197) and Wimmer (2001: 287–288). Further two examples of *p3-wnn* have been noted by Polis (2008–2009: 444, n. 1090).

77 For further examples of the direct descendant of *n sdm.n=f*, Winand (1992: §§379–378) and Neveu (1998<sup>2</sup>: 87).

78 On the *do ut des* formula in Egyptian religion, Morenz (1977<sup>2</sup>: 101–102).

79 Similarly Peust (2006: 511).

## 3.2 Vetitives

The simultaneous presence of two different negative optative constructions in the *Kanais Inscription*, closely followed by a negative imperative, is further evidence of the composers' high awareness of their use of language. An Earlier Egyptian, synthetic *s3w sdm=f* construction<sup>80</sup> (C3) alternates with its more recent, analytic pair, a *s3w tw=j/sw r sdm* construction<sup>81</sup> (C4) as well as with a Late Egyptian negative imperative, an *m-jr sdm* construction<sup>82</sup> (C4–5) in the first part of Text C, in the king's speech to his forefathers:<sup>83</sup>

*jr nbw ḥꜥw ntrw*  
*bn n sj<sup>84</sup> hrwt=tn*  
*s3w dd=tn ddw.n Rꜥ m-š3ꜥ=f n mdwt*  
*jnm=j m dꜥm wꜥb*  
*ḥr Jmn p3 nb ḥwt-ntr=j<sup>4</sup>|r s[gb]<sup>85</sup> [... 10 groups lost ...]*  
*jrtj=fj ḥr ḥwt=f*  
*bn mr=sn sꜥd3<sup>86</sup> m hrwt=sn*  
*s3w tn r thn<sup>87</sup> rmt=w<sup>88</sup>*  
*ḥr-ntjj rf st<sup>89</sup> mj dpjjw<sup>90</sup>*  
*m-jr 3|rst [... 10 groups lost ...]*  
*jr thh sp n kjj*  
*ḥpr n=f phwj m jr mjtt*  
*ḥd.tw mnw n ḥd*  
*bw mn sp n grgjw*  
*[n]ḥtw<sup>6</sup>|nsw m[3ꜥt]*

80 *GEG* §338.3; for a Middle Egyptian example, *Eloquent Peasant* B1 269.

81 Compare Polis (2008–2009: 212–217).

82 On the new auxiliary of the negative imperative, Vernus (2010).

83 The alternation of a *s3w sdm=f* and a *s3w tw=j/sw r sdm* in Text C has also been noted by Polis (2008–2009: 216, exx. 359–360).

84 The spelling of the ligature corresponds to a New Kingdom practice; compare *DZA* 24.604.130–160.

85 The passage has been restored after Schott (1961: 150, n. b). If Schott's reading is correct, column 4 of Text C contains a relatively recent verb, *sgb* "to shout." Line 21 of Horemheb's *Coronation Inscription* on the back of his double-statue with queen Mutnedjmet (Turin, Museo Egizio, Cat. 1379) has the very first attestation of the verb in the extant record (*Urk.* IV 2119, 5).

86 *Sꜥd3* "misuse, deprivation" is a Late Egyptian lexeme that is first documented in the Amarna period, in the tomb of Tutu (Davies 1908: pl. 19, right pane, column 6).

87 The word is written with a new, altered orthography, with sign Z4 at the end. For a diachronic overview of the spelling, *DZA* 31.143.970.

88 The Late Egyptian third-person plural suffix pronoun, =w, is used here as an anaphoric reference to Amun's property, a cover term for Seti I's new endowment and the gold being produced by it. The use of the new suffix pronoun in a possessive case attached to a noun is not documented before the Amarna period (Kroeber 1970: 39). Compare Winand (1995: 193–195).

89 The subject is expressed by the Late Egyptian dependent pronoun, *st* (*ENG* §95; Junge 2008<sup>3</sup>: 80); "häufig seit D.19" (*DZA* 29.663.850).

90 *Dp/dpjj* "crocodile" is a relatively recent word; it first appears in line 6 on Kamose's *Carnarvon Tablet* (Helck 1983<sup>2</sup>: 86).

As for the gold, the flesh of gods,  
it is not of your belongings.

Beware of saying what Re said at the beginning of his speech:

“My skin is pure electrum,”

for Amun, the lord of my temple <sup>4</sup>is going to shout [... *10 groups lost* ...]

His eyes are on his property,

(and) they will not approve of (any) deprivation of their possession.

Beware of harming their people,

because they [i.e., the eyes] are like crocodiles!

Do not <sup>5</sup>rejoice [... *10 groups lost* ...]

As for anyone who interferes with the deed of another,

in the end, the same will happen to him:

the monuments of a destroyer get destroyed,

the deeds of a liar cannot last.

The strength <sup>6</sup>of the king is justice.<sup>91</sup>

(KRI I 68, 1–7)

The three constructions of interest are embedded in a linguistically innovative register that abounds in grammatically novel negative statements. The cornerstone of the king's argumentation for the inviolability of his arrangements is aptly summarized by the beginning of the section: *jr nbw ḥꜥw ntrw bn n sj ḥrwt=tn* “As for the gold, the flesh of gods,<sup>92</sup> it is not of your belongings.”<sup>93</sup> The adjectival predicate of this sentence, *n(j)*, a prepositional *nisbe*, is negated by a Late Egyptian negative morpheme, *bn*. The same morpheme is used to negate a prospective *sdm=f* further below, in column 4: *bn mr=sn* “they will not approve of...” The second last clause of the above excerpt employs another Late Egyptian negative construction, the Negative Aorist: *bw mn sp n grgjw* “the deeds of a liar cannot last.”

It is remarkable that the linguistic dissimilation of vetitive constructions is set against the background of various other negative clauses. The oldest form, the ancient negative optative *s3w sdm=f* construction opens the sequence of negative commands in column 3: *s3w dd=tn ddw.n Rꜥ* “beware of saying what Re said.” A few clauses apart – in column 4 – follows the later, analytic variant of the same construction: *s3w tn r ḥn rmt=w* “beware of harming their people.” The negative imperative, *m-jr ršt* “do not rejoice,” equally follows a relatively recent linguistic pattern. Although the new negative auxiliary of the

91 The message of this Late Egyptian nominal sentence is reinforced by the wall decoration of the inner hall of the temple. The image of the king is offering *maat* to Amun-Re on the southern end of the eastern wall and similarly to Osiris and Isis on the southern end of the western wall. Noted by Schott (1961: 171, n. 1).

92 On this old metaphor with further references, Meeks & Favard-Meeks (1993: 89; 305, n. 22). Compare, for example, *Heavenly Cow* 5–6: *jst rf ḥm=f nḥ-wd3-snb j3w.w qsw=f m ḥd ḥꜥw=f m nbw* “Now, his majesty [i.e., the old sun god], life–health–prosperity, has become old; his bones were from silver, his flesh was from gold.”

93 For an alternative interpretation of *jr nbw ḥꜥw ntrw*, as an *jr AB* nominal sentence with a topicalized subject and the *pw* omitted after the predicate (“As for the gold, it is the flesh of gods.”), Stauder (2013: 290–291). The passage has also been noted by Groll (1967: 13, ex. 40).

imperative, *m-jr*, is fully grammaticalized by the Eighteenth Dynasty, the present example is possibly only its second occurrence in a monumental context after Horemheb's rock-cut temple at Gebel es-Silsila.<sup>94</sup>

The above excerpt demonstrates a further linguistic twist. The linguistic dissimilation of the *s3w sdm=f* and the *s3w tw=j/sw r sdm* constructions is coupled with the linguistic dissimilation of two causal conjunctions, in the opposite direction, however. In other words, a relatively recent casual conjunction is combined with the older vetitive construction, whereas the more recent vetitive construction is followed by a (seemingly) more ancient causal conjunction. In particular, the Late Egyptian *hr* introduces the argument (*hr Jmn p3 nb hwt-ntj=j r s[gb]* “for Amun, the lord of my temple is going to shout”) after the wish expressed by the synthetic *s3w sdm=f* construction. And, vice versa, the presumably archaizing but incorrectly combined *hr-ntjj rf*<sup>95</sup> stands at the head of a causal subordinate clause (*hr-ntjj rf st mj dpjjw* “because they are like crocodiles”) following a Late Egyptian *s3w tw=j/sw r sdm* construction.

#### 4 Conclusion

A close look at the language of the *Kanais Inscription* reveals a highly complex, heterogeneous linguistic construct, a conscious composition that bears witness to an era of great linguistic expertise. Linguistic dissimilation is only one aspect of the text's linguistic complexity, albeit a very significant and compelling one.

The simultaneous use of functionally identical but morphologically different grammatical elements has been demonstrated in three different linguistic domains of the text: in the use of future relative constructions (2.1–3), causal conjunctions (3.1), and vetitives (3.2). Throughout the text, linguistic dissimilation functions as a primary stylistic tool, and, as such, it significantly contributes to the elevated style of the overall composition. Its presence suggests a high consciousness of the language at the time of composition, one particular result of which is the enhanced stylistic complexity of the text. In the majority of cases, the linguistic dissimilation's capacity to display the linguistic virtuosity of the composers of a text is also evident. To this end, the linguistic dissimilation of vetitives combined with the linguistic dissimilation of causal conjunctions is perhaps one of the most illustrative examples in the *Kanais Inscription* (3.2). The function of linguistic dissimilation as a means of linguistic inclusiveness is, however, most apparent in the case of future relative constructions.

Besides the future relative constructions, a comparably high level of linguistic dissimilation is also demonstrated in two other key syntactic categories in the *Kanais Inscription*. While causal conjunctions are indispensable for reasoning and introducing arguments,

94 *Urk.* IV 2138, 18, noted by Vernus (2010: 321–322, ex. 22).

95 *Hr-ntt rf* seems to have been used consistently without *rf* in the Middle Kingdom. However, *Sinuhe* B 168, an obscure passage usually emended to *<n->ntt <r>f*, might provide the earliest parallel to a *X-ntt* conjunction followed by *rf* (Oréal 2011: 88–89; Stauder 2013: 167). The Ramesside variant of the text, *Sinuhe* AOS 64–65 indeed has *hr-ntt rf*. On the pattern of attestation of *hr-ntjj rf*, see also n. 63 above.

vetitives are essential to express prohibitions and negative wishes. Both of these linguistic functions are crucial in conveying the message of the inscription. However, while the aim to express the diversity and richness of reality is at the very core of linguistic dissimilation, this aspect of the phenomenon is clearly less manifest in the case of the various vetitives and causal conjunctions than it is in the case of future relative constructions.

In regard to the linguistic dissimilation of future relative constructions, the additional variable, namely, the social status of the king's addressees, facilitates the understanding of the placing of each individual construction. The analysis of the king's warnings (2.3) has shown that the distributional pattern of the different grammatical solutions is principled and that the scope of linguistic selections resonates with the scope of the king's address. In other words, the linguistic formulation of royal warnings reveals a conscious effort to cover all possible ways available in the language when addressing the relevant parties who could in the future potentially interfere with Seti I's newly established endowment.

## Bibliography

- AEL* II = Lichtheim. 1976. *Ancient Egyptian Literature. A Book of Readings II: The New Kingdom*, Los Angeles.
- Allen, James P. 1984. *The Inflection of the Verb in the Pyramid Texts*, *Bibliotheca Aegyptia* 2, 1–2, Malibu.
- Bickel, Susanne. 1997. Héliopolis et le tribunal des dieux, in: Catherine Berger & Bernard Mathieu (eds.), *Études sur l'Ancien Empire et la nécropole de Saqqâra dédiées à Jean-Philippe Lauer*, *Orientalia Monspeliensia* 9, Cairo, 113–122.
- Birch, Samuel. 1868. *Inscriptions in the Hieratic and Demotic Character from the Collections of the British Museum*, London.
- Borghouts, Joris F. 1979. A New Approach to the Late Egyptian Conjunctive, in: *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 106, 14–24.
- Brand, Peter J. 2000. *The Monuments of Seti I. Epigraphic, Historical and Art Historical Analysis*, *Probleme der Ägyptologie* 16, Köln.
- Brovarski, Edward. 1981. Ahanakht of Bersheh and the Hare Nome in the First Intermediate Period and Middle Kingdom, in: William K. Simpson & Whitney M. Davis (eds.), *Studies in Ancient Egypt, the Aegean and the Sudan. Essays in Honor of Dows Dunham on the Occasion of His 90<sup>th</sup> Birthday, June 1, 1980*, Boston, 14–30.
- Černý, Jaroslav & Sarah Israelit Groll. 1975. *A Late Egyptian Grammar*, *Studia Pohl*, Series Maior 4, Rome.
- Collombert, Philippe & Laurent Coulon. 2000. Les dieux contre la mer. Le début du « papyrus d'Astarté » (pBN 202), in: *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 100, 193–242.
- David, Arlette. 2006. *Syntactic and Lexico-Semantic Aspects of the Legal Register in Ramesside Royal Decrees*, *Göttinger Orientforschungen IV, Reihe Ägypten* 38, Wiesbaden.
- Davies, Benedict G. 1997. *Egyptian Historical Inscriptions of the Nineteenth Dynasty*, *Documenta Mundi Aegyptiaca* 2, Jonsered.
- Davies, Norman de Garis. 1908. *The Rock Tombs of El Amarna VI: Tombs of Parennefer, Tutu and Ay*, *Archaeological Survey of Egypt* 18, London.
- DZA* = *Das Digitalisierte Zettelarchiv* (<http://aaew.bbaw.de/tla/>).
- Eloquent Peasant* = Richard B. Parkinson. 1991. *The Tale of the Eloquent Peasant*, Oxford.
- ENG* = Adolf Erman. 1933<sup>2</sup>. *Neuägyptische Grammatik*, Leipzig.
- FCD* = Raymond O. Faulkner. 1962. *A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian*, Oxford.
- Gardiner, Alan H. 1948. *The Wilbour Papyrus II. Commentary*, Oxford.

- Gauthier, Henri. 1920. Le temple de l'Ouâdi Mfyah (El Knaïs), in: *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 17, 1–38.
- GEG = Alan H. Gardiner 1957<sup>3</sup>. *Egyptian Grammar. Being an Introduction to the Study of Hieroglyphs*, Oxford.
- Goldwasser, Orly. 2001. Poetic License in Nineteenth Dynasty Non-Literary Late-Egyptian?, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 9, 123–138.
- Groll, Sarah Israelit. 1967. *Non-Verbal Sentence Patterns in Late Egyptian*, London.
- Gundacker, Roman. 2012. Hypomnemata Naufragea. Die grammatische Struktur von *Schiffbrüchiger* lin. 183–186, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 20, 51–97.
- Gunn, Battiscombe & Alan H. Gardiner. 1917. New Renderings of Egyptian Texts, in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 4, 241–251.
- Haring, Ben. 2007. Ramesside Temples and the Economic Interests of the State. Crossroad of the Sacred and the Profane, in: Martin Fitzenreiter (ed.), *Das Heilige und die Ware. Zum Spannungsfeld von Religion und Ökonomie*, Internet-Beiträge zur Ägyptologie und Sudanarchäologie VII, London, 165–170.
- HÄW II = Rainer Hannig. 2006. *Ägyptisches Wörterbuch II. Mittleres Reich und Zweite Zwischenzeit I–II*, Kulturgeschichte der Antiken Welt 112, Mainz am Rhein.
- Heavenly Cow = Hornung, Erik. 1982. *Der ägyptische Mythos von der Himmelskuh. Eine Ätiologie des Unvollkommenen*, Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 46, Fribourg.
- Helck, Wolfgang. 1983<sup>2</sup>. *Historisch-biographische Texte der 2. Zwischenzeit und neue Texte der 18. Dynastie*, Kleine Ägyptische Texte 6.2, Wiesbaden.
- Hikade, Thomas. 2001. *Das Expeditionswesen im ägyptischen Neuen Reich. Ein Beitrag zu Rohstoffversorgung und Außenhandel*, Studien zur Archäologie und Geschichte Altägyptens 21, Heidelberg.
- Jansen-Winkeln, Karl. 1995. Diglossie und Zweisprachigkeit im alten Ägypten, in: *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, 85–115.
- Junge, Friedrich. 2008<sup>3</sup>. *Neuägyptisch. Einführung in die Grammatik*, Wiesbaden.
- Koenig, Yvan. 1979. Livraisons d'or et de galène au trésor du temple d'Amon sous la XX<sup>e</sup> dynastie, in: *Hommages à la mémoire de Serge Sauneron, 1927–1976*, I. *Égypte pharaonique*, Bibliothèque d'Étude 81, Cairo, 185–220.
- KRI I–II = Kenneth A. Kitchen. 1975–1979. *Ramesside Inscriptions. Historical and Biographical I–II*, Oxford.
- Kroeber, Burkhard. 1970. *Die Neuägyptismen vor der Amarnazeit. Studien zur Entwicklung der ägyptischen Sprache vom Mittleren zum Neuen Reich*, Tübingen.
- Kruchten, Jean-Marie. 2010. Les serments des stèles frontalières d'Akhénaton. Origine du Futur III & dynamique de l'apparition et de l'extension de l'auxiliaire *iri*, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 18, 131–167.
- LD III = Richard Lepsius. 1849–1859. *Denkmäler aus Ägypten und Äthiopien I–VI*, Leipzig.
- LD IV Text = Richard Lepsius. 1897–1913. *Denkmäler aus Ägypten und Äthiopien. Text I–V*, Leipzig.
- Lesko I–V = Lesko, Leonard H. 1982–1990. *A Dictionary of Late Egyptian I–V*, Berkeley, California.
- Luft, Ulrich. 1992. *Das Archiv von Illahun. Briefe 1*, Hieratische Papyri aus den Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin, Preussischer Kulturbesitz 1, Berlin.
- Mairs, Rachel. 2011. Egyptian 'Inscriptions' and Greek 'Graffiti' at El Kanais in the Egyptian Eastern Desert, in: Jennifer A. Baird & Claire Taylor (eds.), *Ancient Graffiti in Context*, London, 153–164.
- Meeks, Dimitri & Christine Favard-Meeks. 1993. *La vie quotidienne des dieux égyptiens*, Paris.
- Merikare = Joachim Quack. 1992. *Studien zur Lehre für Merikare*, Göttinger Orientforschungen IV, Reihe Ägypten 23, Wiesbaden.
- Morales, Antonio J. 2010. Threats and Warnings to Future Kings. The Inscription of Seti I at Kanais (Wadi Mia), in: Zahi Hawass & Jennifer H. Wegner (eds.), *Millions of Jubilees. Studies in Honor of David P. Silverman I*, Supplément aux Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte 39, Cairo, 387–411.
- Morenz, Siegfried. 1977<sup>2</sup>. *Ägyptische Religion*, Die Religionen der Menschheit 8, Stuttgart.



- Neveu, François. 1998<sup>2</sup>. *La langue des Ramsès. Grammaire du néo-égyptien*, Paris.
- 2001. *La particule hr en néo-égyptien. Étude synchronique*, Études et Mémoires d'Égyptologie 4, Paris.
- Newberry, Percy E. & Francis Ll. Griffith. 1893. *El Berhseh II*, Archaeological Survey of Egypt 4, London.
- Oréal, Elsa. 2011. *Les particules en égyptien ancien. De l'ancien égyptien à l'égyptien classique*, Bibliothèque d'Étude 152, Cairo.
- Peust, Carsten. 2006. Die Syntax des Vergleichs mit *mj* „wie“ im Älteren Ägyptisch, in: Gerald Moers, Heike Behlmer, Katja Demuß & Kai Widmaier (eds.), *jn.t dr.w–Festschrift für Friedrich Junge*, Göttingen, 485–519.
- PM VII = Bertha Porter & Rosalind L. B. Moss. 1995<sup>2</sup>. *Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglyphic Texts, Statues, Reliefs and Paintings VII, Nubia, the Deserts, and Outside Egypt*, Oxford.
- Polis, Stéphane. 2008–2009. *Étude de la modalité en néo-égyptien I–II*, Liège (unpublished manuscript).
- Ptahhotep = Zbyněk Žába*. 1956. *Les maximes de Ptahhotep. Texte, traduction et commentaire*, Prague.
- RITA I = Kenneth A. Kitchen. 1993. *Ramesside Inscriptions. Translated and Annotated. Translations I: Ramesses I, Sethos I and Contemporaries*, Oxford.
- Sander-Hansen, Constantin E. 1933. *Historische Inschriften der 19. Dynastie I*, Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca 4, Brussels.
- Satzinger, Helmut. 1976. *Neuägyptische Studien. Die Partikel ir. Das Tempussystem*, Beihefte zur Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 6, Wien.
- Schenkel, Wolfgang. 2000. Die Endungen des Prospektivs und des Subjunktivs (*sdm=f*, *sdm.w=f*, *sdm.y=f*) nach Befunden der Sargtexte. Mit einem Anhang zum prospektiven Partizip *sdm.t(j)=f(j)*, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 7, 27–112.
- 2012<sup>3</sup>. *Tübinger Einführung in die klassisch-ägyptische Sprache und Schrift*, Tübingen.
- Schneider, Thomas. 1999. Eine Vokabel der Tapferkeit. Ägyptisch *tl* – hurritisch *adal*, in: *Ugarit-Forschungen* 31, 677–723.
- Schott, Siegfried. 1961. *Der Tempel Sethos I. im Wādi Mia*, Göttingen.
- Sinuhe* = Ronald Koch. 1990. *Die Erzählung des Sinuhe*, Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca 17, Brussels.
- Sottas, Henri. 1913. *La préservation de la propriété funéraire dans l'ancienne Égypte*, Paris.
- Stadelmann, Rainer. 1984. Sethos I., in: Wolfgang Helck & Wolfhart Westendorf (eds.), *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* V, Wiesbaden, 911–917.
- Stauder, Andréas. 2013. *Linguistic Dating of Middle Egyptian Literary Texts*, Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica 12, Hamburg.
- 2014. *The Earlier Egyptian Passive. Voice and Perspective*, Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica 14, Hamburg.
- TLA* = *Thesaurus Linguae Aegyptiae* (<http://aew.bbaw.de/tla/>).
- Uljas, Sami. 2005. The 'Intrusive' *m* of Late Egyptian Independent Pronouns, in: *Göttinger Miszellen* 206, 87–90.
- 2007. *The Modal System of Earlier Egyptian Complement Clauses. A Study in Pragmatics in a Dead Language*, Probleme der Ägyptologie 26, Leiden.
- Urk.* IV = Kurt H. Sethe & Wolfgang Helck. 1906–1958. *Urkunden der 18. Dynastie*, Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums, IV. Abteilung, Leipzig & Berlin.
- Vernus, Pascal. 1996. La position linguistique des Textes des Sarcophages, in: Harco Willems (ed.), *The World of the Coffin Texts. Proceedings of the Symposium Held on the Occasion of the 100<sup>th</sup> Birthday of Adriaan de Buck, Leiden, December 17–19, 1992*, Leiden, 143–196.
- 2010. Du moyen égyptien au néo-égyptien, de *m* à *m-jr*: l'auxiliation de l'impératif à la dix-huitième dynastie, in: Zahi Hawass & Jennifer H. Wegner (eds.), *Millions of Jubilees. Studies in Honor of David P. Silverman II*, Supplément aux Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte 39, Cairo, 315–335.

- In press. Restricted Circulation in Old Egyptian as Mirrored in Later “*Repristination von Tradition*” and Revivals. The Dependent Pronoun *kw*; the *nfr-n* Negation; the *n wnt sdm=f* Negative Construction, in: James P. Allen, Mark A. Collier & Andréas Stauder (eds.), *Coping with Obscurity. The Brown Workshop on Earlier Egyptian Grammar*, Atlanta, 203–225.
- Wb.* = Adolf Erman & Herman Grapow. 1971. *Wörterbuch der Ägyptischen Sprache* I–V, Berlin.
- Wimmer, Stefan. 2001. Palaeography and the Dating of Ramesside Ostraca, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 9, 285–292.
- Winand, Jean. 1992. *Études de néo-égyptien, 1: La morphologie verbale*, Aegyptiaca Leodensia 2, Liège.
- 1995. La grammaire au secours de la datation des textes, in: *Revue d'Égyptologie* 46, 187–202.
- 1996. Les constructions analogiques du Futur III en néo-égyptien, in: *Revue d'Égyptologie* 47, 117–145.
- 2001. À la croisée du temps, de l'aspect et du mode. Le conjonctif en néo-égyptien, in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 9, 293–329.
- 2006. *Temps et aspect en égyptien. Une approche sémantique*, Probleme der Ägyptologie 25, Leiden.
- 2014. The *Tale of Sinuhe*. History of a Literary Text, in: Harold M. Hays, Frank Feder & Ludwig D. Morenz (eds.), *Interpretations of Sinuhe. Inspired by Two Passages. Proceedings of a Workshop Held at Leiden University, 27-29 November 2009*, Leiden, 215–243.