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ABSTRACT

This paper tackles one of the significant Late Egyptian (LE) verbal system constructions, which was an innovation of the Amarna Period. It also shows the evolution of the verbal system in the late stage. The author explores this subject for the importance of the Amarna Period in the transitional stage from Classic Egyptian (CE) to the LE. The language used in the Amarna Period has extraordinary characteristics. The most important one is the attestation of the patterns of the colloquial language, which was used as an official language.

الملخص

يناقش هذا البحث أحد التراكيب الفعلية بالعصر المتاخر للغة المصرية القديمة، والذي يعد نجلاً في عصر العمارنة. وهذا كان أحد أسباب اختيار هذا الموضوع يكمَن في أهمية عصر العمارنة في المرحلة الانتقالية ما بين العصر الكلاسيكي إلى العصر المتاخر والذي شهد تطوراً واضحًا في التراكيب الفعلية النابع للعصر المتاخر. هذا وقد كانت اللغة المستخدمة في عصر العمارنة لها عدة صفات مميزة، وأحدة من أهم هذه الصفات هي استخدام اللغة العامة كلغة رسمية.
INTRODUCTION

The analytic or periphrastic system was more dominant within LE verbal system construction. Most of the constructions in this system consist of auxiliary verb *ir*, subject and the main verb is in the form of infinitive\(^1\). The clause order in LE is SVO\(^2\) (e.g., Auxiliary verb *ir* + Subject + Infinitive), but it was VSO in CE\(^3\).

The conjunctive *mtw.f sDm* construction, is a sequential clause following the analytic system of the LE, which is attested in texts of the Amarna Period 14\(^{th}\) times.

THE CONSTRUCTION

The conjunctive *mtw.f sDm* is a sequential clause, which was used as the Non-Initial Main Sentence (NIMS), was based on the Initial Main Sentence (IMS)\(^4\), even though was not attested as subordinate\(^5\). It has the value of independent use. It can be translated into independent future. It also could express a wish, command or injunction\(^6\). The conjunctive *mtw.f sDm* follows the

---


The Conjunctive Construction mtw. main clause\textsuperscript{7}. Additionally, this construction gives rarely the meaning of past tense in narrative cases\textsuperscript{8}. It fulfills the meaning of purpose\textsuperscript{9} and is considered as a subjective construction\textsuperscript{10}. This form was derived from Hna sDm ntf, which was attested from Middle Egyptian (ME) till the middle of the 19\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty\textsuperscript{11} and then Hna ntf sDm form was rare and ephemeral construction used from the 18\textsuperscript{th} dynasty till the 19\textsuperscript{th} dynasty\textsuperscript{12}. The mtw.f sDm construction follows the analytic system. It consists of: mtw + suffix pronoun (actor) .f + infinitive sDm\textsuperscript{13}. It continued to survive in Coptic taswtm or Ntefswtm\textsuperscript{8} or nFswtm\textsuperscript{5,A2} or FswtM\textsuperscript{A14}. Gardiner\textsuperscript{15} assumed that the first attestation of mtw.f sDm is in the 19\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty onward. This investigation proves that

\textsuperscript{7}Egberts, Concise Introduction to Late-Egyptian, 17.


\textsuperscript{9}Frandsen, Outline of the Late Egyptian Verbal System, §82.

\textsuperscript{10}Egberts, Concise Introduction to Late-Egyptian, 17; Junge, Late Egyptian Grammar, §2.3.3, 104, §5.4.3 (1), 232.

\textsuperscript{11}Kröber, Neuägyptizismen vor der Amarnazeit, §34.32.12; Junge, Late Egyptian Grammar, §2.3.3, 103-4.

\textsuperscript{12}Gardiner, “Origin of the Coptic Conjunctive Tense”, 86; Volten, “The Late Egyptian Conjunctive”, 54; Kröber, Neuägyptizismen vor der Amarnazeit, §34.2; Junge, Late Egyptian Grammar, §2.3.3, 103-4; Neveu, The Language of Ramesses, §25.3. Winand supposed it from exist from Seti I to Ramses II. Winand, Études de neo-égyptien, §725.

\textsuperscript{13}Černy, “Origin of the Egyptian Conjunctive”, 25; Kröber, Neuägyptizismen vor der Amarnazeit, §34.2, §34.33; Frandsen, Outline of the Late Egyptian Verbal System, §64; Winand, Études de neo-égyptien, §731; Loprieno, A Linguistic Introduction, 95-6; Egberts, Concise Introduction to Late-Egyptian, 16; Junge, Late Egyptian Grammar, §2.3.3, 103-4; Neveu, The Language of Ramesses, §25.3.

\textsuperscript{14}Černy, “Origin of the Egyptian Conjunctive”, 25; Kröber, Neuägyptizismen vor der Amarnazeit, §34.2, §34.33; Frandsen, Outline of the Late Egyptian Verbal System, §64; Winand, Études de neo-égyptien, §731; Loprieno, A Linguistic Introduction, 95-6; Egberts, Concise Introduction to Late-Egyptian, 16; Junge, Late Egyptian Grammar, §2.3.3, 103-4; Neveu, The Language of Ramesses, §25.3.

\textsuperscript{15}Gardiner, “Origin of the Coptic Conjunctive Tense”, 91.
this construction was an innovation of the Amarna Period and it continued up to the demotic phase. The outline of the development of the conjunctive mtw.f sDm, from ME to Coptic:

Hna sDm ntf → Hna ntf sDm → mtw.f sDm → taswtm or NtefswtmB or nFswtmS.F.A2 or FswtM A

Gardiner suggests that mtw- did not develop from any preceding stage, as the independent pronoun ntf continued as mn tf in LE and as Ntof in Coptic. Mattha and Černy rejected Gardiner’s point of view and confirms that independent pronoun nt- + suffix gives a uniform mtw- + suffix from the Amarna Period onwards. Hammam suggest, “Im Laufe der Entwicklung fällt die Präposition Hna aus, was an einem Beispiel bereits aus der Zeit Ramses’ III. (Elephantine-Dekret, Zeile 7) festzustellen ist … und ntf wird zu mtw.f, obwohl das unabhängige Pronomen im Neuägyptischen als mtwf auftritt. D. h. der Zusammenhang mit dem unabhängigen Personalpronomen geht verloren. Ein Brückenbeleg stammt aus dem P. Kairo CG 58053:Recto 7–9, Verso 1, wo anstelle des erwarteten unabhängigen Pronomens ein Suffixpronomen auftaucht.”

Moreover, Lexa reject the derivation of mtw.f from the independent pronoun and proposes that mtw- is identical with the LE proposition, which become nte- at Coptic and the personal suffix acts as the semantic subject. Likewise, Hammam suggest that the conjugation bases mtw and m-dj are very striking, and there is no difference between their occurrences. Volten theory is that “in order to try to put a new
hypothesis concerning the origin of the Late Egyptian conjunctive it will be necessary to turn to the verb prefix sante^{S,B,A}/sate^{B,A}. It was formerly generally admitted that this prefix contained the conjunctive mtw> Nte preceded by SAA" and it writing as SAatw.f sDm and Samtw.f sDm at Demotic\(^{24}\) according to the different dialect.

THE INSTANCES

Ex.1. The inscription from the Boundary Stelae K, X reads\(^{25}\):

```
xr bn Dd n.i tA Hmt-nswt wrt mk wn st nfrt n Axt-Itn m kt st
mtw.i sDm n.s
```

```
xr bn Dd n.i sr nb xr.i m srw n xnty m srw n-bnr m imy-xnty
m rmT nb nty m tA r-Dr.f mk wn st nfrt n Axt-Itn m kt st mtw.i
sDm n.sn
```

“Then, the great royal wife will not say to me: “behold, there is a beautiful place for Akhetaten in another place” and I shall listen to her. Not even one of the officials will say (this) to me. Neither, the favourite officials, nor the officials outside, nor chamberlain,
nor any human, who is on the whole land: “behold, there is a beautiful place for Akhetaten in another place” and I shall listen to them.”

**Ex.2.** The inscription from the Boundary Stelae K reads\(^{26}\):

```plaintext
/// mtw.i sDm pA ///
```

“/// And I should listen ///”.

**Ex.3.** A hieratic text on the pMond I reads\(^{27}\):

```plaintext
r Dd.k n tAw [pA]y.i mtw.k ///.st imi iwt tA-rmT
```

“You say that; ‘[m]y lands’ and you will // them. Allow (to) the woman coming.”

**Ex.4.** A hieratic text on the pMond I reads\(^{28}\):

```plaintext
[tw].k sDm n.i pA nty tri r.i mtw.i smi n[.k] n srw
```

“While you listening to me this time, than I will report to [you] and the officials.”

**Ex.5.** A hieratic text on the pMond I reads\(^{29}\):

---

\(^{26}\) Murnane, *Boundary Stelae of Akhenaten*, 27 (K23).

\(^{27}\) Peet, “Two letters from Akhetaten”, Pl. XXIII (L.7-8); Silverman, “Texts from the Amarna Period”, 311 (L.7-8).

\(^{28}\) Peet, “Two letters from Akhetaten”, Pl. XXIII (L.9-10); Silverman, “Texts from the Amarna Period”, 311 (L.9-10).

\(^{29}\) Peet, “Two letters from Akhetaten”, Pl. XXIII (L.13); Silverman, “Texts from the Amarna Period”, 311 (L.13).
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xr ir sDm.s n.k r iy i.TAy st mtw.k hA ///

“Now, if she listens to you to come, take her and then go down ///.”

Ex.6. A hieratic text on the pMond I reads:

bAk n Itn i.wxA.f mtw.k in tw.f mtw.k dit hA.f

“Servant of Aten, whom he sought and you shall bring him and you shall allow him to come.”

Ex.7. A hieratic text on the pMond II reads:

r.i m-TA(wt) mtw.t gm n.i wa n rmT mtw.t hAb .n .f n.i

“Against me furtively, and you will find one of the people for me and then you will send him to me.”

Ex.8. A hieratic text on the pMond II reads:

30 Peet, “Two letters from Akhetaten”, Pl. XXV (2, L.18-9); Silverman, “Texts from the Amarna Period”, 311 (L.18-9).
31 Peet, “Two letters from Akhetaten”, Pl. XXVII (L.11-2); Silverman, “Texts from the Amarna Period”, 312 (L.11-2).
32 Erman and Grapow, Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache.V, 350 [6-8].
33 The suffix pronoun .t is the singular second person, female. Erman and Grapow, Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache.V, 337 (4).
34 Sic. Peet, “Two letters from Akhetaten”, Pl. XXVII (L.12).
35 Peet, “Two letters from Akhetaten”, Pl. XXVII (L.15); Silverman, “Texts from the Amarna Period”, 312 (L.15).
ky-Dd xft spr tAy.i Sat r.t mtw.t pt[r]

“Another says; when my message arrives for you then you will see.”

**Ex.9.** A hieratic text on the pMond II reads:\(^{36}\):

\[
\text{bw ir.n.i mtw (.t) hAb n.i Hr pAnty nb iw.i r Dd}
\]

“I cannot act and (you) will send to me about all what I shall say."\(^{37}\)

**Ex.10.** A hieratic text on the pMond II reads:\(^{38}\):

\[
iw.k r smi.f /// nA srw mtw.i in.tw m in.tw.i nb ///
\]

“You will report him /// about the officials, and then I shall bring one and I shall bring all ///.”\(^{39}\)

**Ex.11.** A hieratic text on the oAmarna reads:\(^{39}\):

---

\(^{36}\) Peet, “Two letters from Akhetaten”, Pl. XXIX (2, L. 19-20); Silverman, “Texts from the Amarna Period”, 312 (19-20).

\(^{37}\) Osman, “Negative Aorist forms from Amarna”, 141.

\(^{38}\) Peet, “Two letters from Akhetaten”, Pl. XXIX (2, L. 20-1); Silverman, “Texts from the Amarna Period”, 312 (20-1).

\(^{39}\) Pendlebury, *City of Akhenaten*, Pl. LXXXIV (1); Silverman, “Texts from the Amarna Period”, 313 (1).
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ix di.k dbn 10 n PyAy mtw.k dit 50

“Then, you will give 10 depan to Piay, and you will give 50 […]”

DISCUSSION

All the instances above of the conjunctive mtw.f sDm express future tenses. It was used as consequence for the main verb in the preceding clause. The conjunctive mtw.f sDm construction also exists in direct speech in all the instances above and gives the conjunctive meaning.

The conjunctive mtw.f sDm expresses future after negative prospective (Ex.1). On the other hand, the Exs. 4 and 8 show the conjunctive mtw.f sDm expressing future after present tense. Mattha mentioned that “mtw.f sDm is directly related to the preceding verb with which it is co-ordinate, in the sense that it is either directly dependent on it as resultant from it, or that both verbs are closely connected by their common relation to a third member of the sentence”.

The conjunctive mtw.f sDm expresses future after imperative which has been shown in the above (Ex.5). This construction can express future after relative clause and it is proved in the above (Ex.6). Morover, the above (Ex.10) represents the conjunctive

40 Callender, “Grammatical Models in Egyptology”, 70.
41 Frandsen, Outline of the Late Egyptian Verbal System, §64; Egberts, Concise Introduction to Late-Egyptian, 17.
42 Loprieno, “The sequential forms”, 144-5.
43 Mattha, “Egyptian conjunctive”, 50.
44 Callender, “Grammatical Models in Egyptology”, 71; Frandsen, Outline of the Late Egyptian Verbal System, §83; Borghouts, “A New Approach to the Late Egyptian Conjunctive”, 20; Egberts, Concise Introduction to Late-Egyptian, 17; Junge, Late Egyptian Grammar, §5.4.3 (1), 232.
mtw.f sDm expressing future after a third Future as Neveu\textsuperscript{46} suggested.

Mattha\textsuperscript{47} explained, the used of mtw.f dit/rdit in demotic is to express future actions in an emphatic instead of using 3\textsuperscript{rd} future iw.f (r) sDm, which is declared in the above (Ex.11).

The Amarna texts used the conjunctive mtw.f sDm in stelae and letters on papyri to express the future tense. The only attestation appears for the use of mtw.f sDm is on an ostracon\textsuperscript{48} to express future actions in an emphatic position instead of using 3\textsuperscript{rd} future iw.f (r) sDm\textsuperscript{49}.

On the other hand, scholars argue about the attestation of preposition Hr in the conjunctive mtw.f sDm construction;

1. Erman and Grapow\textsuperscript{50} recorded that mtw- was usually needed for Hr +infinitive.

2. Gardiner\textsuperscript{51} assumed that the conjunctive mtw.f sDm construction is the original construction, but later at the beginning of 19\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty preposition Hr occurred in the spoken language and occasionally in the written language.

3. Mattha\textsuperscript{52} supposed that “mtw.f sDm is directly related to the preceding verb with which it is co-ordinate, in the sense that it is either directly dependent on it as resultant from it, or that both verbs are closely connected by their common relation to a third member of the sentence”. However, mtw.f Hr sDm represents action referring to a future tense after imperative, injunctions and relative clauses.

4. Černy\textsuperscript{53} suggests that the conjunctive mtw.f sDm and mtw.f Hr sDm construction has no difference.

\textsuperscript{46}Neveu, \textit{The Language of Ramesses}, 78.
\textsuperscript{47}Mattha, “Egyptian conjunctive”, 54-5.
\textsuperscript{48}Pendlebury, \textit{City of Akhenaten}, Pl. LXXXIV (1); Silverman, “Texts from the Amarna Period”, 313 (1).
\textsuperscript{50}Erman and Grapow, \textit{Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache}. II, 165.
\textsuperscript{52}Mattha, “Egyptian conjunctive”, 47, 50-1.
\textsuperscript{53}Černy, “Origin of the Egyptian Conjunctive”, 27.
5. Volten\textsuperscript{54} assumed that “there can not doubt that all the wrong Hr belong to the actual spoken language of their time.” To sum up this point, the examples that are attested on the stelae, papyri and an ostracon of the Amarna Period, which is shown above, confirm that the preposition Hr does not exist in the construction of mtw.f sDm.

At the same time, the conjunctive mtw.f Hr sDm construction was used in the spoken language or oral communication more than in the written language in communications\textsuperscript{55}. This expresses continuity and succession\textsuperscript{56}. It also has no tense\textsuperscript{57} and is used more frequently in the imperative, optative and 3rd future\textsuperscript{58}.

CONCLUSION

The following table shows the number of attestations of instances in the mtw.f sDm construction in the texts of the Amarna Period:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Boundary Stelae</th>
<th>Papyri</th>
<th>OAmarna</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conjunctive mtw.f sDm</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mtw.f sDm construction expresses the future tense in action. It was also used as NIMS in emphatic sentences and come frequently in a direct speech position. The conjunctive mtw.f sDm used in the boundary stelae, papyri and on an ostracon. The conjunctive mtw.f Hr sDm was not observed in texts of the

\textsuperscript{54} Volten, “The Late Egyptian Conjunctive”, 72.


\textsuperscript{56} Callender, “Grammatical Models in Egyptology”, 71; Černy and Groll, Late Egyptian Grammar, §42, 440; Neveu, The Language of Ramesses, §25.1.

\textsuperscript{57} Frandsen, Outline of the Late Egyptian Verbal System, §82 (1-2, 4); Callender, “Grammatical Models in Egyptology”, 71-2; Neveu, The Language of Ramesses, §25.3.

\textsuperscript{58} Callender, “Grammatical Models in Egyptology”, 71; Frandsen, Outline of the Late Egyptian Verbal System, §83; Borghouts, “A New Approach to the Late Egyptian Conjunctive”, 20; Egberts, Concise Introduction to Late-Egyptian, 17; Junge, Late Egyptian Grammar, §5.4.3 (1), 232.
Amarna Period, so it was attested later at the beginning of the 19th Dynasty.
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