FOLIA ORIENTALIA
VOL. 48 2011

Articles

Chris H. Reintges

Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris

THE EVOLUTION OF THE ANCIENT EGYPTIAN STATIVE: DIACHRONIC STABILITY DESPITE INFLECTIONAL CHANGE

Abstract

Ancient Egyptian represents the typologically marked case of a language in which the dynamic-stative contrast among verbs correlates with two finite verb paradigms. Building on earlier work (Reintges 2005, 2006), the present study examines the morphosyntax of the Stative inflectional paradigm by combining synchronic, diachronic and typological viewpoints. The Stative is a showcase for the diachronic stability of an inflectional category, remaining an integral part of the Egyptian verbal system throughout its entire history. In spite of this diachronic stability, it undergoes inflectional changes. The morphological simplification and paradigm erosion that we see with the Stative in later stages represents a hitherto unnoticed case of *endogenous* morphological change, which proceeds largely independently of concomitant syntactic and semantic changes.

Keywords

Stative · Situation Aspect · Affected Subject Voice · *Pro*-drop · Paradigm Erosion · Grammaticalization

1. Introduction

Ancient Egyptian (not to be confused with Egyptian Arabic), the indigenous language of Pharaonic Egypt, has the longest written tradition of any language, with the earliest records dating back to the fourth millennium BCE. Its closest relative is Coptic Egyptian, the vernacular of Late Antique and Medieval Egypt (from about the third to the fourteenth century CE). According to the main working hypothesis in Afroasiatic linguistics, the family tree divides into six branches: Berber, Semitic, Chadic, Cushitic, Omotic, and Egyptian-Coptic. The latter is the only autonomous branch of the Afroasiatic phylum that is presented by the successive diachronic stages of a single language. Egyptian language history has traditionally been subdivided into two macro-stages, each with distinct typological characteristics. On the one hand, there is Earlier Egyptian, which includes Old Egyptian (2650–2135 BCE) and Middle Egyptian (1990–1300 BCE). On the other hand, there is Later Egyptian, which consists of (1300–700 BCE), Demotic (700 BCE–400 CE), and Coptic Egyptian (see Loprieno 1995 for a concise presentation).[1] Due to the time depth and the *wealth*

[1] The two-stage model of Ancient Egyptian history just outlined faces several problems. To begin with, it is too coarse-grained to make finer distinctions within Earlier Egyptian language history. The monumental corpus of the Coffin Texts (from around 2150–1990 BCE) has a complex history, with one strand of tradition going back to the Pyramid Texts (Mathieu 2004), while another strand shows a tendency towards dialectal differentiation and linguistic innovation (Vernus 1996). In a sense, then, the linguistic idiom of the Coffin Texts represents a halfway house between Old and Middle Egyptian. For the want of a better name, it will be referred to as *Early Middle Egyptian* in the present study. Furthermore, the traditional model of Ancient Egyptian history does not accommodate very well the diversity of the Egyptian speech community in the first millennium BCE. On the one hand, there is the formal register of the so-called *égyptien de tradition*, which maintains the linguistic norms and standards of Classic Middle Egyptian literature. On the other hand, there are the more colloquial registers, which are arguably much closer to the spoken vernacular. Diglossia and 'registers-in-contact' create a linguistically instable environment, which provides the locus of diachronic change. Despite striking typological differences with its Late Egyptian and Demotic predecessors, Coptic is widely believed to be an integral part of the Later Egyptian macro-stage. In more recent work (Reintges 2001, 2004b) I propose, however, to trace the language's non-Egyptian features to contact-induced language change. From this perspective, Coptic emerged from widespread bilingualism within a speech community, with Greek as the politically and culturally predominant language. Greek superstratum influence manifests itself not only in the relexification of the native word stock, but also in the restructuring of Egyptian syntax according to a Greek model. Coptic can therefore be classified a bilingual language variety with two parent languages, Ancient Egyptian and Greek. As a new language forms, it is only partially integrated in the family tree of Egyptian language stages. The reader is referred to Thomason & Kaufman (1988) for further discussion on the relation between genetic linguistics and language contact and change.

of its linguistic resources, Ancient Egyptian provides an ideal domain for the study of diachronic syntax, making it possible to closely follow the development of a particular morphosyntactic *pattern and/or construction type* over a long period of time.

The concern here is with the evolution of the Egyptian Stative, with particular attention being paid to the connection between inflectional change and the redistribution of forms through grammaticalization.[2] The Stative is of particular interest for comparative syntax and morphological theory alike. It embodies one of the functionally most versatile verbal patterns of the language and sheds new light on the intersecting categories of agreement, aspect and grammatical voice. More generally, it provides a window onto the complex ways in which the inflectional morphology interacts with systematic alternations in verbal meaning on the one hand, and with word order and clausal structure on the other hand. In lasting until the Coptic period, the Stative shows a remarkable diachronic productivity. This underscores the central role it continued to play in the Egyptian verbal system throughout its entire history. To do justice to its morphological and semantic complexity, the Stative will be approached from different angles by combining synchronic, diachronic and comparative perspectives.

The Stative is an inflectional category of the verb, whose status is thus comparable to that of other verbal inflectional categories such as tense, aspect, and grammatical voice. Yet, in contrast to all tense/aspect and basic voice categories, it is realized morphologically as a finite verb paradigm. In line with current theories of word structure including inflectional morphology (inter alia: Anderson 1992: 79–80, 83–84; Stump 2001: 43–44; Joseph 2009: 46), an inflectional paradigm represents a central unit of morphological

[2] A note on the terminology is in order here. The Stative has been labeled *Pseudoparticiple* ('Pseudopartizip') or *Old Perfective* ('ältere Flexion') in in the German Egyptological tradition. The term *Pseudoparticiple* goes back to Erman's (1889) original discovery that a group of verb forms ending in a suffix *-tj* are not participles at all, but rather constitute a separate finite verb paradigm (see, in particular, his discussion on pp. 66–78). This term is not at all felicitous, since a finite verb form with person–number–gender inflections is characterized as not being a participle. To highlight its resemblance with the Semitic suffix conjugation in general, and the Akkadian Permansive in particular, Gardiner (1957: 234–236 §309 OBS. 1) labels the Egyptian Stative as *Old Perfective*. I consider the term *Old Perfective* equally infelicitous, since it leads to confusion with both the perfective/neutral aspect, whose inflectional exponence is the basic verb stem, and the Perfect tense/aspect which is expressed by the stem-external suffix *-n*. Moreover, there is no convincing evidence that the Stative paradigm belongs to an older stratum of the language than the corresponding Eventive paradigm (traditionally referred to as the *śḏm=f* conjugation). I therefore consider *Stative* the most appropriate and comprehensive label for this inflectional category. It is also the lable that is most widely used in typological studies (Mchombo 2004: 95). An opposing view has been taken by Schenkel (1990: 108); Jansen-Winkeln (1993: 5–6, footnotes 6–7); and, more recently, by Oréal (2007: 376 footnote 17).

organization. It can be characterized as the set of all inflectionally related forms belonging to an individual lexical item. The members of a given paradigm are correlated with a particular morphosyntactic property or combination of properties called morphosyntactic features. Person, number and gender represent the most typical morphosyntactic features, which are involved in agreement relations. As many linguists have pointed out, the notion of agreement and the phenomena covered by it are notoriously difficult to define. Anderson (1992: 103), for example, writes that "just as in the case of inflection itself, this is a quite intuitive notion which is nonetheless surprisingly difficult to delimit with precision". Yet, a maximally inclusive approach would probably be to define agreement in terms of the covariance in morphosyntactic features between two or more items in a given structure. Crucially, the sharing of morphosyntactic features between structurally related items must be systematic. This can be seen by the fact that when one item varies so will the other (see Kuroda 1988: 10; Wechsler and Zlatić 2003: 8–9; Corbett 2006: 4–5, 114–116 and others for the feature sharing view on agreement).

As an inflectional paradigm of person-number-gender markers, the Stative expresses grammatical agreement as one of its most basic functions. This point is illustrated by the initial example in (1). The two correlated clauses contained in it are introduced by adverbial subordinator *sk* 'while', followed by an enclitic subject pronoun and a Stative-inflected form of the verb of knowledge and acquisition of knowledge *rx* 'to learn'. The two embedded clauses differ minimally with respect to the employed subject pronoun and the morphological shape of the verb. In the first clause, the Stative *rx-t(j)* 'you know' agrees in person and number, but not in gender with the second person singular masculine subject pronoun *tʃw* 'you'. The covariance in person and number is morphologically manifest in the stem-final suffix *-t(j)*. In the second clause, the Stative *rx*(*-w*) 'knows' agrees in person and gender, but not in number with the third person singular masculine clitic pronoun *sw* 'he'. The shared person and gender features have their morphological representation in the stem-final suffix *-w* (i.e. /u/), which, due to its vocalic nature, has not been rendered orthographically in hieroglyphic writing (as indicated by parenthesis). It is clear then that the feature sharing relation involved in subject–verb agreement is both asymmetric and local, with the pro/nominal subject acting as the controller for the finite verb form. In other words, the inflectionally related forms of the Stative paradigm redundantly express the person, number and gender features of the preverbal subject constituent (see Corbett 2006: 9 for further discussion on locality).

(1) The agreement component of the Stative paradigm: 2SG *rx-t(j)* vs. 3M *rx(-w)*

m	*xm(-w)*	*Wnjs*	*nt-ḥr*
NEG.IMP	ignore(-GER. M.SG)	Unas.M.SG	god.M.SG
sk	*t-ḥw*	***rx-t(j)***	*sw*
COMP	CL.2M.SG	learn-STAT.2SG	CL.3M.SG
sk	*sw*	***rx(-w)***	*t-ḥw*
COMP	CL.3M.SG	learn-STAT.3M	CL.2M.SG

'Do not ignore (King) Unas, god! Since he knows you and you know him.' (Pyramid Texts 327a–b/W)

Apart from subject–verb agreement, the Stative has two equally essential meanings and functions. One such core function is situation aspect, traditionally known under the German term *Aktionsart* 'kind of action'. Situation aspect is a non-deictic temporal category, which is routinely grammaticalized in languages alongside with viewpoint aspect (i.e. the distinction between perfective and imperfective aspect). Situation aspect concerns the typology of verbal predicates and specifies inherent aspectual properties of various classes of lexical items (Smith 1991: 3–6). The most fundamental distinction among the types of verbal predicates, as identified by Vendler (1967: 97–121), is the contrast between states and events, where the latter include actions, accomplishments and achievements. A characteristic trait of states is that they lack a clearly defined endpoint. Accordingly, all phases of a state are essentially the same.

States can be further subdivided into two separate categories, to wit, resultative and qualitative (see Mchombo 2004: 95–96 for a very similar distinction in the Chichewa Stative). The two kinds of states are subject to different temporal restrictions: resultant states emerge from the culmination of an event and are in principle irreversible, meaning that the attained state has to hold forever after. For a result state to change there must be another event whose corresponding state effectively replaces the previous result state. Quality states, by contrast, denote independently identifiable states or conditions that the subject has entered. This type of state is in principle reversible and can therefore be temporally restricted and transitory (see Comrie 1976: 104; Parsons 1990: 234–235; Kratzer 2000: 385–390; Embick 2004: 356–360).

The semantic contrast between result and quality states is illustrated in examples (2a) and (2b), respectively. The first person singular Stative *snj-kjw* 'I am released' in (2a) has a resultative interpretation; it implies a contextually salient causing event that brings about the current 'released' state of the speaking person. The juxtaposed second person singular Statives *w?d³-tj* 'you are green' and *wr-tj* 'you are great' in (2b) have a qualitative meaning. Here the Stative asserts that the subject referent has entered a particular condition or state, but such that there is no implication of agency responsible for that condition or state. Rather, in contrast to result states, the locus or origin of quality states is not

further specified. Moreover, the attained state of being refreshed and elevated has evolved from a previous state, which is diametrically opposite. After all, the utterance arises from the ritual dialogue between the funerary priest and the deceased pharaoh.

(2) The aspectual component of the Stative paradigm: result states vs. quality states

a. ***snj-kjw*** *m-ʕ* *xt* *nb-t* *dʒw-t*
release-STAT.1SG from-arm.M.SG thing.F.SG every-F.SG evil-PTCP.ACT.F.SG
'I am released from all evil.' (Pyramid Texts 1100: c-d/P")

b. ***wʔdʒ-t(j)*** ***wr-t(j)*** *m* *rn=k* *n(j)*
be.green-STAT.2SG be.great-STAT.2SG in name.M.SG=POSS.2M.SG LINK.M.SG
WʔdʒWr
Green-Great.M.SG
'You are fresh (lit. green) and great in your name of the Great Green one (i.e. the Mediterranean Sea).' (Pyramid Texts 628c/M)

In addition to the aspectual component of its semantics, the Stative also constitutes a voice category in its own right. As such, it encodes alternations in the subject's participant status *vis-à-vis* the situation described in the clause. More precisely, the Stative presents the subject as 'the locus of the denoted situations' principal effects' and consequently assumes a non-agentive interpretation (cf. Klaiman 1991: 69). In this study I will adopt the cover term 'affected subject' for the semantic role of Stative subjects (see Jaggar 1988 for the original terminology and an insightful analysis of very similar facts concerning Hausa Grade 7 verbs). Example (2a) above is instructive for the dual function of the Stative as an aspectual and as an affected subject voice category. Here the speaker is presented as being positively affected by the action named by the transitive verb *snj* 'to release'. The first person singular Stative *snj-kjw* 'I am released' thus effectively renders an adjectival passive in English (Wasow 1977; Levin & Rappaport 1986).

The Stative is a showcase for the diachronic stability of an inflectional category. It survives into Coptic Egyptian the original paradigm has long disappeared. The erstwhile person–number–gender markers of the inflectional paradigm have been reanalyzed as stem-specific markers, which distinguish alternating Stative and Eventive stems in various morphological classes of verbs. A case in point for the semantic erosion of the bound agreement marking is the third person feminine ending *-t*, which is no longer recognizable as such in the Stative verb stems *hkaeit* 'to be hungry' and *showoret* 'to be cursed'. Inflectional change contrasts with a relatively stable semantics and only moderate changes in the syntax. The continuation of the resultative–qualitative contrast is exemplified in examples (3a) and (3b), respectively.

(3) The diachronic continuity of the aspect/voice semantics

a. *se-**showoret*** *awɔ:* *se-**showoret*** *an*
(PRES)3PL-curse.STAT and (PRES)3PL-curse.STAT not
'They are cursed and they are not cursed.' (Shenoute III 154:3)

b. *te-**hkaeit*** *te-**ofe*** *əm-pə-oeik* *mən pə-mou*
(PRS)2F.SG-hunger.STAT (PRS)2F.SG-thirst.STAT for-DEF.M.SG-bread and DEF.M.SG-water
'You are hungry and thirsty for bread and water.' (Shenoute III 204:4)

The erosion of the inflectional paradigm that we see with the Late Egyptian and Demotic Stative and its transformation into an essentially lexical process of stem formation represents a hitherto unnoticed case of endogenous morphological change. It is an endogenous type of change because the observed changes in the inflectional morphology proceed largely independently of concomitant syntactic and semantic changes. Endogenous morphological change has broader theoretical implications for the diachronic study of language. One general issue it raises relates to the role of the paradigm in morphosyntactic change. The Stative remains an integral part of the language's aspect/voice system even though the original paradigm of person–number–gender forms has undergone morphological simplification and is ultimately lost. This generally suggests that the inflectional category is independent of the paradigm that realizes it (see Joseph 2009 for a case study on paradigm restructuring in the history of post-classical and Medieval Greek). Another issue concerns the connection between syntactic change and morphological change, which must be much more indirect than previously assumed (e.g.; by Lightfoot 2006 and Roberts & Roussou 2003).

The organization of this chapter is as follows. The next two sections (§§2–3) address the opposition between the Stative and the Eventive paradigm of Old and Early Middle Egyptian. The two finite verb paradigms serve to distinguish stative from eventive predicates on a morphological basis. The Eventive paradigm involves anaphoric agreement in the sense of Bresnan and Mchombo (1987): the person–number–gender markers represent enclitic subject pronouns, which are attached by the phonology to the tense- and aspect-inflected verb stem. This contrasts with the Stative paradigm, whose inflectionally related forms redundantly express the person, number and gender features of the preverbal subject and must therefore instaniate grammatical agreement. The focus of section 2 is on the morphosyntactic properties of the Old and Early Middle Egyptian Stative. Section 3 discusses the meaning and function of the Stative, with a view to seeing how inflectional morphology interacts with situation aspect and the construals of eventualities.This section also addresses the similarities and differences between detransitivized Statives and morphological passives. In section 4 we turn to the diachronic typology of the Stative conjugation by first examining the largely identical morphosyntax of the Classic Middle Egyptian Stative. This leads to section 5, which is devoted to the restructuring of the Stative paradigm in Late

Egyptian and Demotic. Paradigm erosion is manifested in the neutralization of person, number, and gender distinctions. Here the use of originally first-person singular Statives as default person forms in Demotic deserves special mention. Section 6 follows the grammaticalization path of cardinal posture and movement verbs. Section 7 summarizes the main findings of this study.

2. The morphosyntax of the Old and Early Middle Egyptian Stative

2.1. Overview: Two finite verb paradigms

Old and Middle Egyptian represents the typologically marked case of a language in which a stative–resultative verb form is not derived by a special overt marker from a non-resultative base form. Rather, the members of the aspectual opposition, stative-resultative and non-resultative, have different finite verb paradigms (Nedjalkov & Jaxontov 1988: 20, §2.3.2.1). The complete person-number-gender paradigms of the Eventive and the Stative are presented in Table 1 (see Edel 1955/1964: 271–276, §§572–576; Allen 1984: 384–387, §564). In line with the philological tradition, the three-consonantal verb *sḏ³m* 'to hear' has been chosen to illustrate a typical paradigm.

Table 1: The person–number–gender paradigms in Old and Early Middle Egyptian

		EVENTIVE PARADIGM	STATIVE PARADIGM
SG	1	sḏ³m(=j), sḏ³m=j	sḏ³m-k(j), sḏ³m-kj, sḏ³m-kw, sḏ³m-kjw, sḏ³m-kwj
	2M	sḏ³m=k	sḏ³m-t(j), sḏ³m-tj
	2S	sḏ³m =tꜣ, sḏ³m= tꜣn	
	3M	sḏ³m=f	sḏ³m-w, sḏ³m-jj, sḏ³m(-w)
	3F	sḏ³m=s	sḏ³m-t(j), sḏ³m-tj
DU	2	sḏ³m= tꜣnj	sḏ³m-tjwn, sḏ³m-tjwnj, sḏ³m-tjwny
	3M	sḏ³m=snj	sḏ³m-wjj, sḏ³m-wj
	3F		sḏ³m-tjj
PL	1	sḏ³m=n	sḏ³m-wn, sḏ³m-wjn, sḏ³m-nw
	2	sḏ³m= tꜣn	sḏ³m-tjwn, sḏ³m-tjwnj, sḏ³m-tjwny
	3M	sḏ³m=sn	sḏ³m-w, sḏ³m-jj, sḏ³m(-w)
	3F		sḏ³m-t(j), sḏ³m-tj
NP	M	sḏ³m	sḏ³m-w, sḏ³m-jj, sḏ³m(-w)
	F		sḏ³m-t(j), sḏ³m-tj

The Eventive and the Stative paradigms display a surprising asymmetry with respect to their internal organization. While there is an exponent of every person, gender and number combination in the Eventive, two or more paradigmatic cells share a single exponent in the corresponding Stative. The distinction between masculine and feminine gender is neutralized in second person singular Statives, while there is no morphological differentiation between singular and plural forms in the third person. The most conspicuous feature of the Stative paradigm is the homophony of the second person singular and the third person feminine forms. The employed suffix *-tj* can, however, be disambiguated for person and gender reference by means of person pronouns or full noun phrases, as we will see later on in this section.

On the face of it, the paradigmatic split of the inflectional system looks like another instance of the asymmetry between rich and poor agreement in Modern Standard Arabic (e.g.; Fassi Fehri 1988; Aoun et al. 2010). In what follows I will argue that we are dealing with an agreement asymmetry of a rather different kind. The person, number, gender inflection of the Stative paradigm manifests grammatical agreement proper, while the pronominal suffixes of the Eventive paradigm are actually enclitic subject clitics that correspond to an argument position. As pointed out by Siewierska (2004: 121–127) and Corbett (2006: 100–112), it is often difficult to find the relevant evidence to tease apart grammatical agreement from anaphoric agreement. This is so because bound pronouns and inflectional subject agreement are realizations of the same morphosyntactic features. As a result, the two kinds of agreement cannot be distinguished in terms of morphological category, but rather in terms of their different roles in the syntax.

2.2. Evidence for the loss of person markers and number neutralization

The Old and Early Middle Stative does not constitute a monolithic inflectional paradigm, but exhibits considerable amount of allomorphic variation in various person, number and gender distinctions. This variation is indicative of dialect mixing and ongoing language change. Already in the monumental corpus of the Pyramid Texts one finds clear indications for the loss of person markers and the neutralization of number distinctions. The single attestation of the first person plural ending *-nw* and the loss of the dual–plural distinction in the second person are two cases in point.

2.2.1. The first person plural endings *-nw* and *-wn*

There is only a single attestation of the Stative first person plural ending *-nw* in the Pyramid Texts, which is shown in example (4a). The variant *-wn*, on the other hand, can be found somewhat more regularly in contemporary autobiographical inscriptions, as seen in examples (4b–c).

(4) The first person plural endings *-nw* and *-wn* of the Old Egyptian Stative paradigm

a. *dʒw=f* *n* *ʃm=n* ***jꜣb-nw*** *n=f*
summon.PFV=3M.SG CL.1PL depart.PFV=1PL unite-STAT.1PL with=3M.SG
'He (the deceased king) is calling us. Let's go to be united with him.' (Pyramid Texts 1646b/N)

b. *jw=n* ***sḏ-wn***
AUX=1PL satisfy-STAT.1PL
'We (group of workmen) are satisfied.' (Stele of Mehu-Akhti B:2)

c. ***s-dʱḏ-wn***
CAUS-provide-STAT.1PL
'We are provided with food.' (Bissing, Gem-ni-kai I 18)

Significantly, neither the first person plural ending *-nw* nor the more common allomorph *-wn* contains the dual marker *-j* and its lengthened variants *-jj* and *-y*. Since we are dealing with a *hapax legomenon*, it is difficult to say whether the two allomorphs were originally differentiated in terms of an inclusive–exclusive opposition with interpretations that include or exclude reference to the addressee in addition to the speaker. At any event, there is no contextual evidence to corroborate such a distinction (see Siewierska 2004: 82–88 and the reference cited therein). Furthermore, it cannot be concluded with certainty, as many Egyptologists have proposed (Edel 1955/1964: 273 §574aa N.B; Allen 1984: 386 §564 D; Schenkel 1990: 105; Jansen-Winkeln 1993: 21), that the variant *-nw* is more archaic than the more productive form *-wn*. We may very well be dealing with an innovative form that simply failed to be integrated in the person paradigm of the Old Egyptian Stative. In view of the fact that the two allomorphs *-nw* and *-wn* are morphologically related by metathesis, it is tempting to decompose the first person plural ending into two distinct person/number markers. While the *-n* component can be identified as a plural morpheme with relative certitude, the identity of the second formative *-w* is less clear. It is, however, tempting to analyse it as first person marker, which has a corresponding dependent form in the first person singular clitic pronoun *wj* 'me'.

2.2.2. The neutralization of the dual–plural distinction in the second person

Another case in point for the simplification of the Stative paradigm in the earliest stages of Ancient Egyptian is the neutralization of the dual–plural distinction in the second person. The dual number involves a set of exactly two participants. Consequently, the interpretation of plural number involves a set of at least three participants. Contrary to what is stated in Edel (1955/1964: 274 §575), Allen (1984: 386 §564 G), and Schenkel (1990: 105), there is no conclusive evidence for

a number opposition between second person dual and plural Statives. Rather, the Stative ending *-tjwn* is used indiscriminately with dual and plural antecedents. This is illustrated in examples (5a) and (5b), respectively.

(5) Number syncretism between in the nonsingular second person

a. *ʃʔs=tˤn̲j ħrt **jʂb-tjwn** m snkw*
wander.PFV=2DU sky.F.SG unite-STAT.2DU/PL in darkness.M.SG
'You two (the deceased king and the god Atum) wander throughout the sky united in darkness.' (Pyramid Texts 152c/W)

b. ***ħr-tjwn** r bʔ=j pn*
be.far-STAT.2DU/PL from soul.M.SG=POSS.1SG DEM.M.SG
'You (group of divine personages) should be remote from this soul of mine.' (Coffin Texts VI 76c/B3L)

The innovative forms *-tjwnj* and *-tjwny* are attested for the first time in the monumental corpus of the Early Middle Egyptian Coffin Texts, where they occur in free variation with the standard form *-tjwn*. As already observed by Kammerzell (1991b: 189–190, 196), the innovative forms *-tjwnj* and *-tjwny* are modeled after the second person dual pronoun *tˤnj* and *tˤny* of the Eventive paradigm. However, despite the presence of the dual suffix *-y*, the newly created form *-tjwny* can be used interchangeably with second person dual and plural pronouns, as shown by the contrast between examples (6a) and (6b).

(6) The insensitivity of the *-tjwnj* and *-tjwny* endings with respect to dual/plural number

a. *m-xt tn̲y **gm-tjwny***
after CL.2.DU find-STAT.2DU/PL
'After you two (the two hands of Horus) have been found' (Coffin Text II 350a/B1L)

b. *jn jw=tˤn̲ **rx-tjwny** rdʒjjt Pʔ*
FOC AUX=2PL learn-STAT.2DU/PL foundation.F.SG Pe.M.SG
'Do you (groups of divine personages) know the foundation of Pe (Buto) (toponym)?' (Coffin Text II 331d/B1L)

The reshaping of the nonsingular second person marker *-tjwn* can be seen as a cross-paradigm development, which involves the same person–number cell but then in different paradigms—in our case the paradigm of enclitic personal pronouns (see Joseph 2009: 46–51 with particular reference to the Greek medio-passive). However, note that the introduction of morphological dual number lacks semantic support and therefore fails to introduce a split between plural and dual number in the second person. Accordingly, the innovative forms *-tjwnj* and *-tjwny* have exactly the same nonsingular number specification as the standard form *-tjwn*, with which they alternate in free variation.

There are only few languages in which the person paradigm manifests a dual in the third but not in the first and second person, as in the case of the Old Egyptian Stative. In her crosslinguistic survey of person-number paradigms, Siewierska (2004: 95–96) mentions two parallel cases, viz. the independent person paradigm of Tlappanec, a language of Mexico, and the possessive prefix paradigm of the Nishel dialect of Kham, a Central Himalayan language. This typologically unusual situation is diachronically unstable, for, as we will see in the section 4, the third person dual seems to have already been lost in the Classic Middle Egyptian period.

2.3. Grammatical agreement versus pronoun incorporation

This section addresses what has been called the 'Affix Identification Problem' in Semitic linguistics (Fassi Fehri 1988)—the morphological classification of the person-number-gender forms of the Stative paradigm. Traditionally, these bound, dependent affixes have been conceived of as incorporated pronouns (see, among various others, Allen 1984: 6, §11, 384, §564; Vernus 1986: 382; Schenkel 1997: 199, §7.3.2). More recently, Oréal (2009) has put forward a dual function analysis, according to which these inflectional markers are categorially ambiguous: they have a referential use as suffixed subject pronouns and a non-referential use as subject agreement markers. Both accounts face empirical and theoretical problems. I will review the issues involved and introduce some new considerations in support of a unifying analysis of the Stative as an agreement paradigm, as opposed to the personal pronoun paradigm of the Eventive. Of particular relevance is the person asymmetry with respect to the permissibility of covert pronominal subjects: an overt subject pronoun is optional in the first and in the second personof the Stative but is generally required in the third person.

2.3.1. The absence of the complementarity effects

The Eventive paradigm comprises for the most part synthetic forms with enclitic person-number-gender forms (which I propose to analyze as personal pronouns), while there is only a single cell that corresponds to an uninflected, analytic form. Even though the analytic form has no exponent of person, number and gender features, it can still be inflected for tense, aspect, mood, and passive voice. Examples (7a–b) are meant to illustrate the 'Complementarity Principle', so called because synthetic forms can only be selected in the absence of nominal subjects.

(7) The complementary distribution between synthetic Eventive forms and NP subjects

a. ***jj-n*** *mꜣꜥ* *pn* *m ḥtp*
come-PERF army.M.SG DEM.M.SG in peace.M.SG
'This army (here) has returned in peace.'

b. ***bꜣ-n=f*** *tꜣ* *ḥr(-y)-w* *ꜥꜣ-w*
destroy-PERF=3M.SG land.M.SG upon-NOMINAL-M.PL sand-M.PL
'It has destroyed the land of the Bedouins (lit. those upon the sand).' (*Urkunden* I 103:7–8)

The same distributional pattern can be reproduced for other parts of speech categories such as basic prepositions (e.g. *ḥr=f* [on=3M.SG] 'on him' vs. *ḥr mw* [on water.M.PL] 'on water') and possessed nouns in the construct state (e.g. *pr=f* [house.M.SG=POSS.3M.SG] 'his house' vs. *pr Wnjs* [house.M.SG Unas.M.SG] 'house of (King) Unas'). The cross-categorial applicability of the Complementarity Principle receives a straightforward explanation under the 'Pronominal Argument Hypothesis' (Baker & Hale 1990), according to which person, number and possibly gender marking suffixes on finite verb forms in verb-initial languages are enclitic pronouns. As such they compete with a related nominal expression for the same structural slot in phrases and clauses (see also Anderson 1982 and Doron 1988 for comparable evidence from Breton). No such complementarity can be observed for the Stative paradigm, in which each cell is occupied by a synthetic form. Accordingly, the same third person form is selected with personal pronouns and full NP subjects. In the Stative sentences in (8a–b), the syncretic *2SG/3F* form *-tj* is construed with the enclitic third person feminine singular pronoun *s(j)* 'she' (which is attached to the subordinating complementizer *wnt* 'that') as well as the feminine singular NP *Nwt* '(the goddess) Nut'.

(8) No complementarity effects: co-occurrence of 3rd person agreement and NP subject

a. *wnt* *s(j)* ***sr-t(j)*** *n=k* *r=s*
COMP CL.3F.SG foretell-STAT.3F to=2M.SG about=3F.SG
'(To let you know) that she foretold it to you.' (Coffin Text I 140g/B3Bo)

b. *Nwt* ***j-ḥꜥꜥ-t(j)*** *m* *xsf* *Nfr-kꜣ-Rꜥ* *pn*
Nut.F.SG AUG-cheer.PLUR-STAT.3F about meet.INF Nefer-ka-Re.M.SG DEM.M.SG
'(The goddess) Nut is very excited about meeting this (King) Nefer-ka-Re (here).' (Pyramid Text 1426a/N)

Based on the absence of the complementarity effects, one can safely assume that the person, number and gender marking inflections of the Stative do not represent incorporated subject pronouns, as maintained in the traditional Egyptological analysis. Rather, these endings represent grammatical subject–verb agreement.

2.3.2. The first/second vs. third person asymmetry in subject omissibility

For the agreement analysis of the Stative to go through, it must also be shown that the individual person-number-gender markers never acquire pronominal status themselves, even when there is no independent subject in the sentence. This is in essence Oréal's (2009) proposal. Consider in this regard the following sentence pair, which contain the first person singular Stative *jw-k(j)* 'I have come' and denote the present location of the speaking person. Yet, the preverbal subject position is occupied by the first person singular clitic pronoun *w(j)* in the a-example, which is introduced by the presentative particle *m* 'look'. There is no such first person singular pronoun in the corresponding b-example, which is a pragmatically neutral declarative clause without focus or emphasis on the first person singular subject.

(9) First person singular Stative with and without a corresponding clitic pronoun

a. *m=k* *w(j)* ***bs-k(j)*** ***jw-k(j)***
INTERJ=2M.SG CL.1SG instal-STAT.1SG come-STAT.1SG
'Look, I am installed. I have come.' (Pyramid Text *Nt* 831)

b. ***jw-k(j)*** *ỿr* *ħnkt* [...] *jm*
come-STAT.1SG under offering.F.SG there
'I have come [...] with an offering.' (Pyramid Text 1069c/N [P/A/E 20= 224])

In principle two types of analysis may be envisaged for the subject omission pattern that we see with first person singular Statives. In a Lexical-Functional Grammar analysis, in which non-overt material is not posited, the person marker itself is identified with an incorporated pronoun, while the same marker expresses grammatical agreement when the sentence contains an overt nominal or pronominal subject (see Bresnan & Mchombo 1987 for subject omissibility in Chichewa and Toivanen 2000 for a related analysis for possessive pronoun dropping in Finnish.) However, as Toivanen (2000: 580) herself points out, a lexical split account along these lines may be regarded as costly insofar as the same person marker corresponds to two lexical entries. The two entries are completely identical in phonological shape and spell out the person, number and gender features, but differ only in one respect—their referential or non-referential role as an incorporated pronoun or as an agreement marker, respectively. No such problem arises under an alternative generative analysis which posits covert pronominal categories. These covert pronouns are equivalent to overt pronouns as far as the syntax is concerned, the only difference being that they are left unpronounced. Accordingly, the person marker is consistently used as an agreement morpheme that corresponds to a single lexical entry.

No such problem arises under an alternative generative analysis which posits covert pronominal categories. These covert pronouns are equivalent to overt pronouns as far as the syntax is concerned, the only difference being that

they are left unpronounced. Accordingly, the person marker is consistently used as an agreement morpheme that corresponds to a single lexical entry. In Rizzi's (1982: 142, 1986: 518–523) seminal work, the possibility of omitting unstressed subject pronouns in languages like Italian and Spanish as opposed to English and German has been related to a morphological property, to wit, the relative degree to which person and number features are discretely represented in the language's verbal paradigms. In other words, subject–verb agreement must be specified beyond a certain threshold to recover the referential content of the phonologically null subject pronoun.

The inclusion of a broader range of languages into the comparative research furthermore revealed that the presence of highly structural paradigms in a language cannot be a morphological prerequisite for the licensing of *pro*-drop. Otherwise, it would be difficult to explain why null subject pronouns are licensed in a language like Mandarin Chinese, which lacks agreement inflection altogether (see Huang 1984). The morphological uniformity condition of Jaeggli & Safir (1989: 29–30) is intended to handle the availability of null subjects in languages with and without rich agreement. However, partial null subject languages such as Brazilian Portuguese, Finish, Marathi and Modern Hebrew pose an obvious problem for such an approach. In these languages, null subjects are permissible but under more restricted conditions than they are in consistent null subject languages, while the employed inflectional paradigms are otherwise morphologically uniform and distinguish most or all person-number combinations (e..g.; Vainikka & Levy 1999; Holmberg *et al.* 2009).

Shifting the attention back to Old and Early Middle Egyptian, the first thing to observe here is that pronoun omission is not a licit option with Eventive verb forms. This can be directly related to the pronominal agreement paradigm of the Eventive, which consists of agreementless verb forms and enclitic personal pronouns. Furthermore, and perhaps more importantly, there is no alternative recovery mechanisms available, which would allow null subjects to be identified by a discourse antecedent. The situation is different with Stative sentences, in which overt subject pronouns are omissible in the first and the second person while they cannot be so omitted in the third person. This can be seen by comparing examples (10a–d) with examples (10e–g). (Covert pronominal subjects are indicated as *pro*.)

(10) The first/second vs. third person asymmetry of the Stative agreement paradigm

a. 1SG *pro* ***pr-kj*** *r=j* ***wꜣb-kj***
come.forth-STAT.1SG PCL=1SG purify-STAT.1SG
'I have come forth purified.' (Coffin Text VI 136o/M22C)

b. 1PL *pro* ***s-dꜣ3-wn***
CAUS-provide-STAT.1PL
'We are provided with food.' (Bissing, *Gem-ni-kai* I 18)

c. 2SG *pro* ***rd³-t(j)*** *n mwt=k* *Nwt*
give-STAT.2SG to mother.F.SG=POSS.2M.SG Nut.F.SG
'You are given to your mother Nut' (Pyramid Texts 616d/T)

d. 2PL *pro* ***j-gr-tjwn***
AUG-be.silent-STAT2DU/PL
'You are to be silent!' (Tomb of Ankhmahor, pl. 42)

e. 3M.SG *sk* *sw* ***ʿnx(-w)***
COMP CL.3M.SG live-STAT.3M
'while he was (still) alive' (*Urkunden* I 21: 4)

f. 3F.SG *mwt=f* *njswt* *sk* *s(j)* ***xp-t(j)***
mother.F.SG=POSS.3M.SG king.M.SG COMP CL.3F.SG depart-STAT.3F
'while she has departed (ie. died)' (Mastaba of Kahif, West wall, false door, 1st line)

g. 3.PL *sk* *sn* ***rx-jj*** *s(j)*
COMP CL.3PL learn-STAT.3M CL.F.SG
'while they know it' (Coffin Text VII 111j/SQ10C)

A very similar contrast between first/second and third person agreement has been observed for the future and past tense paradigms of Modern Hebrew (inter alia: Doron 1988; Ritter 1995; Vainikka & Levi 1999; Shlonsky 1997, 2009). Here I propose to derive the person asymmetry of the Old and Middle Egyptian Stative paradigm from a recoverability condition on the controller of agreement. The key idea is that controller of agreement—the subject pronoun in question—can be left unpronounced if (part of) its person, number and gender features are morphologically realized on the target of agreement—the inflected verb form. This is no longer an option when the target of agreement is morphologically ambiguous. Morphologically ambiguous forms arise as a consequence of person and number syncretisms in a verbal paradigm, whereby one member of the paradigm realizes more than one person-number-gender cell (see Baerman *et al.* 2005: 2; Baerman & Brown 2005: 122; Corbett 2006: 86). In such a context, the target of agreement no longer satisfies the recoverability condition. Consequently, an overt pronoun must be introduced into the structure to avoid referential ambiguity.

In the case at hand, the selected member of the Stative paradigm must have an explicit morphological representation of person and number features. This is obviously the case with the first person singular and plural forms *-kj* and *-wn* and the nonsingular second person form *-tjwn*. Third person agreement is less richly specified insofar as it encodes gender but not number features. An analysis along these lines in which null subjects need to be licensed and identified by a non-ambiguous subject marker raises a question about the syncretic 2SG/3F marker *-tj*. Elsewhere (Reintges 2005: 49) I have argued that the null subject constructions provide the relevant syntactic context to distinguish the second person singular

from the third person feminine reference. In other words, null subjects are the default option for first and second person contexts. The interpretative rule can thus be stated as follows.

(11) Construal rule for the syncretic 2SG/3F inflection *-tj*
The syncretic 2SG/3F subject agreement marker *-tj* has a default second person singular interpretation in null subject sentences.

2.3.3. The presence of first and second person pronouns in non-neutral Stative sentences

The subject omission pattern is further complicated by the fact that other factors come into play, motivating the presence of an overt pronoun in first and second person contexts. One such factor is the information status of the subject referent: first and second person pronouns cannot be left unpronounced when they fulfill a topic or focus role. Examples (12a–b) illustrate the contrastive role of free-standing pronouns such as the second person singular masculine *tˀwt* 'you' in null subject contexts. I assume, following Frascarelli (2007), that such pronouns have a discourse-related function (focus or contrastive topic). Accordingly, they are not located in the preverbal position as grammatical subjects, but rather belong to the left periphery of the clause.

(12) Second person singular Statives with free pronoun 2nd person sing. masc. *tˀwt*

a. *tˀwt* *ỉḥ ḫ-tj* *ḥr-t(j)* *r=f*
you.M.SG stand-STAT.2SG be.far-STAT.2SG from=3M.SG
'You are standing far away from him.' (Pyramid Text 251c/W)

b. *tˀwt* ***wrr-tj*** *m* *tʔ-wr*
you.M.SG be.great.PLUR-STAT.2SG in land.M.SG-great.M.SG
'You are very great in 'Great-Land' (the district of Thinis).' (Pyramid Text 877b/P)

Another complicating factor is the presence of other structural elements in the Stative sentence such as embedding complementizers and auxiliary verb. In general, these elements require the following subject constituent to be an overt pronoun or a corresponding full NP in the normal course of events. Accordingly, an overt first and second pronoun must be inserted into the structure. The data in (13a–d) illustrate the strong statistical preference for first and second person clitic pronouns to surface in temporal adverb clauses introduced by the temporal subordinators *sk* 'while' and *m-xt* 'after' (see Zakrzewska 1990: 137–139 for the distributional behavior of Statives in various kinds of subordinate contexts). Yet, example (13c) indicates that the *pro*-drop option is still available in second person singular context. It therefore looks as if first and second person clitic pronouns convey a contrastive topic or focus interpretation.

(13) The presence of first/second person clitic pronouns in temporal adverb clauses

a. 1SG *sk w(j) ʃpss-k(j) xr Izzj*
COMP CL.1.SG esteem-STAT.1SG under Izezi.M.SG
r mjtj(=j) nb
(more) than equal.M.SG=POSS.1SG each.M.SG
'while I was more esteemed under (King) Izezi than anyone of my rank' (*Urkunden* I 59:13)

b. 2SG *sk tʃw xʕt(j) m jʔbt pt*
COMP CL.2M.SG appear-STAT.2SG in eastern.F.SG heaven.F.SG
'while you appear in the eastern (side) of heaven' (Pyramid Text 1496b/P)

c. 2SG *sk ḥm pro rx-t(j) mrr(=j) tʃw*
COMP PCL learn-STAT.2SG love.IMPERF=1.SG CL.M.SG
'while you, indeed, know (that) I love you' (*Urkunden* I 61:14)

d. 2PL *m-xt tny gm-tjwny*
COMP CL.2.DU find-STAT.2DU/PL
'after you two (i.e. hands) have been found' (Coffin Text II 350a/B1L)

Matters are somewhat different with auxiliary verb constructions, which consist of two finite verbs in series (see Reintges 1997: 76–83, 304–308, 2005a: 71–72 for further discussion on the temporal and aspectual semantics of the auxiliary verbs). In the context of auxiliary verbs, null subjects are no longer licensed in first and second person contexts. Consider in this regard the uninflected auxiliary *jw*.

(14) The presence of first/second person pronouns in auxiliary verb constructions

a. 1SG *jw=j rx-k(j) psdʒt J(w)nw*
AUX=1SG learn-STAT.1SG ennead.F.SG Heliopolis.M.SG
'I know the ennead of Heliopolis.' (Coffin Text II 272a/S2P)

b. 1PL *jw=n sʔ-wn*
AUX=1PL satisfy-STAT.1PL
'We (group of workmen) are satisfied.' (Stele of Mehu-Akhti B:2)

c. 2SG *j(w)=k ʕnx-tj*
AUX=2.M.SG live-STAT.2SG
'You are alive.' (Pyramid Text 1700/M)

d. 2PL *jw=tʃn rx-tjwn wj*
AUX=2PL satisfy-STAT.1PL CL.1SG
'You know me.' (Coffin Text II 24b/B1C)

The unavailability of *pro*-drop in this context is to be sought in the inflectional properties of auxiliary verbs. Auxiliary verbs such as the deictic movement verb *jw* 'to come' belong to the Eventive paradigm, which has been identified with an enclitic pronoun paradigm. The enclitic first and second

person pronoun cannot be omitted from the Eventive clausal pattern without also loosing the relevant speaker- or addressee-oriented centered of the subject. It should furthermore be observed that the overt first or second person pronoun does not induce a contrastive focus or topic shift interpretation, but rather signals topic continuity or familiar topichood. Such unstressed subject pronouns thus form a natural class with covert pronouns in terms of their information-structural properties (see Frascarelli 2007: 695, 712–713 for comparable facts in Italian).

To recapitulate: the different person-number-gender forms of the Stative paradigm never acquire pronominal status themselves even when there is no overt pronominal subject in the sentence. The possibility of having null subjects in first and second person contexts has been accounted for in terms of a morphologically conditioned recoverability condition. However, the pattern of subject omissibility turns out to be quite complex once a broader range of constructions is taken into consideration. The complexity in the distribution of overt and covert pronouns constitutes a weak spot in the verbal system of the language, which is the target of language change.

2.4. Related morphological and syntactic properties

The agreement inflection that distinguishes Stative from Eventive verb forms has broader consequences for the morpho-syntax. Eventive and Stative categories display an asymmetric behavior with respect to their modifiability by temporal, aspectual and modal categories. Eventive verb forms can be inflected for the whole range of tense/aspect/mood and passive voice markers, while the corresponding Statives are subject to very strict selectional restrictions. At first sight, it looks as if the presence of agreement marking excludes independent tense and aspect morphology. A case in point is the unavailability and of Statives formed from Imperfective verb stems (**prr-tj* 'you have been coming forth'). This section also addresses a syntactic consequence of grammatical agreement, which is the rigid subject–verb–object (SVO) order of Stative sentences.

2.4.1. The complementarity between agreement and tense/aspect morphology

Old and Middle Egyptian can be classified as an aspect–oriented language, in which aspectual notions imply temporal interpretations (i.e. the location of an event in time) (cf. Cohen 1989: Ch. 3). The imperfective–perfective opposition is encoded by pairs of simplex and geminated stems, for instance, *ḥz-j* (perfective) 'to praise' vs. *ḥzz* (imperfective) 'to be praising'. The formation of Imperfectives is lexically restricted to weak verbs, so called because members of this class display a stem-final glide *-j*. Bendjaballah & Reintges (2009: 141–143) analyse the final glide of weak verbs as a vocalic classifier suffix, which distinguishes morphological classes of verbs. The verbal classifier disappears in the Imperfective stem alternant, indicating that it occupied the same structural slot in the template

as the geminated root consonant of the Imperfective. Imperfective verbal stems can be formed from different kinds of transitive and intransitive verbs, as shown by examples like the following:

(15) The distribution of imperfective verbs across different verb classes

a. ***wnn*** *ʕ7* ***ḥzz*** *wj* *ḥm=f*
be.IMPERF great.PTCP.M.SG praise.IMPERF CL.1SG majesty.M.SG=POSS.3M.SG
'It was enormous (how) His Majesty praised me.' (*Urkunden* I 221:4)

b. ***ḥ77=sn*** *r* *t7* *m* *ḥfʔw-w*
descend.IMPERF=3PL to earth.M.SG as serpent-M.PL
'They (the gods) are descending to earth as male serpents.' (Coffin Texts III 24a/B2Bo)

As first observed by Edel (1959), Imperfective verb stems are excluded from the agreement paradigm of the Stative. This selectional restriction can however not be derived from the reduplicative expression type, since Statives may be formed with pluractional verbs that indicate multiple, iterative or intensified action. Pluractionals are morphologically derived by full or partial reduplication of the verbal base, where the latter look superficially like imperfectives (see Bendjaballah & Reintges 2009: 139–143 for ways to distinguish the two non-concatenative patterns).Yet, fully or partially reduplicated pluractionals do occur in the Stative, which thus display a different distributional behavior than Imperfectives.

(16) Statives formed from geminated and reduplicated pluractional verbs

a. *tʲwt* ***wrr-tj*** *m* *tʔ-wr*
you.M.SG be.great.PLUR-STAT.2SG in land.M.SG-great.M.SG
'You are very great in 'Great-Land' (the district of Thinis).' (Pyramid Text 877b/P)

b. *ḥtm* *ḥr=k* *jm=s* ***pd³-pd³(-w)***
provide.IMP face. M.SG=POSS.2M.SG with=3F.SG spread.out-PLUR-STAT.3M
'Provide your face with it (the eye of Horus) (such that) it (the scent) is spread out!' (Pyramid Text 29b/W)

The complementary distribution between Imperfectives and Statives is the result of conflicting aspectual specifications. The Imperfective is used to describe dynamic situations, which involve change over time. Even though the Imperfective presents an event as having not yet reached its natural endpoint, they generally have a clearly defined starting point (at least under an episodic interpretation). Furthermore, Imperfectives denote dynamic situations (events, activities), which can only be maintained if they are subject to 'a continuing input of energy' (Comrie 1976: 49). Statives, on the other hand, are used to describe non-dynamic situations without clearly defined starting and endpoints.

Furthermore, it requires no special effort to remain in a particular state. Naturally, Imperfective stems are excluded from the Stative paradigm as the resulting form would specify a given actionality as dynamic and non-dynamic, agentive and non-agentive (see Reintges 2005a: 50–52 for further discussion and explication).

2.4.2. The correlation between word order, agreement, and situation aspect

On the surface, Old and Early Middle Egyptian meet the syntactic profile of Greenberg's (1963: 79) Sixth Universal, according to which "all languages with dominant VSO order have SVO as an alternative or as the only alternative basic word order". However, these are not simply alternatives, since verb-initial and subject-initial clauses differ systematically in meaning. When the verb of knowledge and acquisition of knowledge *rx* 'to learn' appears in the Eventive paradigm, the resulting sentence verb–subject–object (VSO) has an event-related interpretation. When used eventively, *rx* comes close in meaning to a perception verb 'to recognize'.

(17) Dominant VSO order with Eventive verb form and perception interpretation
j-rx *Pjpj* *pn* *mwt=f*
AUG-learn.PFV Pepi.M.SG DEM.M.SG mother.F.SG=POSS.3M.SG
'This (King) Pepi (here) will recognize his mother.' (Pyramid Text 910a/P)

By contrast, the alternative subject–verb–object (SVO) word order is used for the description of resultant states and/or mental and physical conditions. When used statively, the verb of knowledge and acquisition of knowledge *rx* assumes a possessive sense 'to know (through learning)'.

(18) Alternative SVO order with Stative verb and resultant state interpretation
Dʒḥwt(j)-nxt *pn* ***rx(-w)*** *rn* *n(j)* *wḥʿ-w*
Thoth-nakht M.SG DEM.M.SG learn-STAT.3M name.M.SG LINK.M.SG fowler-M.PL
'This Thoth-nakht (the deceased male) (here) knows (through learning) the name of the fowlers.' (Coffin Text VI 22o/B1Bo)

The SVO alternative differs from the dominant VSO clausal pattern morphologically in that the clause-medial verb must be inflected for the Stative and semantically in that the resulting sentence has a resultative and/or Stative interpretation—an issue to which we will return in a moment (§3). Regardless of the details of syntactic analysis (see Reintges 2009: 50–57 for a recent proposal, cf. also Kramer 2009 for an alternative analysis), what is relevant here is that the VSO–SVO alternation is correlated with variation in other grammatical domains, viz. the presence or absence of agreement inflection and situation aspect.

3. Argument realization and aspectual semantics across different verb classes

Having discussed the morphosyntax of the Old and Early Middle Egyptian Stative, we turn to consider in more detail its basic meaning and function, with a view to seeing how inflectional morphology interacts with situation aspect and the construal of eventualities. The aspectual meaning of the Stative paradigm will be analyzed in terms of its similarities to and differences from the corresponding active and passive forms of the Eventive paradigm. The main idea is that the denotation of finite verbs can be compositionally derived from the lexical meaning of the underlying root and the inherent aspectual meaning inherent to the verbal-inflectional paradigm. This view diverges substantially from previous analyses (Loprieno 1995: 76; Kramer 2009: 40–41), according to which the notional categories of motion versus stasis, events and states, are part of the lexical information of the underlying root.

The following description is based on a simple taxonomy of verb classes, in which valence information is considered apart from argument meanings. In lines with Grimshaw (1990: 4–5), I assume that argument structure itself does not encode thematic roles like agent, patient or theme, but rather pertains to relations of prominence between arguments and their canonical structural realizations. Broadly speaking, the most prominent argument in the argument structure of a verb will be realized as the subject, while the less prominent argument, if present, will be realized as the direct or indirect object.

The selection of either the Eventive or Stative paradigm determines not only the situation aspect of the clause, but also defines the thematic role of the most prominent argument that is realized as the surface subject. In general, Stative subjects have a non-agentive interpretation, covering a broad range of participant functions such as patient, experiencer or possessor. The different thematic roles of Stative subject can be subsumed under the cover term 'affected subject'. Another goal is to find ways to distinguish in semantic terms morphological passives from detransitivized Statives. Morphological passives and passively used Statives show some affinity with respect to the patient/theme role of their subjects.

3.1. Statives formed from transitive verbs

As an affected subject voice, the Stative does not necessarily affect the argument structure of the verb that it combined with. In what follows I will, in fact, challenge traditional claims that the transitive-active Stative in Old and Early Middle Egyptian represents an obsolete constructional pattern.

3.1.1. Some problems with the traditional analysis

Erman (1928: 148, §328) conjectures that the Stative (which he calls '*Pseudoparticip*'; see above, footnote 2 on the traditional Egyptological terminology), originally existed in two forms, an active-like ('*activische*') form and a passive-like one ('*passivische*'). With transitive verbs, the active-like form is used to describe an action (e.g. *rdj.kwj* 'I gave'). The passive-like forms are said to have two meanings and functions. When combined with intransitive verbs, it asserts the continuation of a condition or state (e.g. *ʿnḫ.kwj* 'I live'), but it may also function as a passive with transitive verbs (*śḏm.kwj* 'I am heard') (Erman's examples and transcriptions [CHR]). I suspect that the label '*passivisch*' should be taken in a broad sense, indicating the non-agentivity of the Stative subject.

In his Egyptian grammar, Gardiner (1957: 237, §311) takes a similar stance: "There can be no doubt but that, in an early lost stage of the Egyptian language, the old perfective was a freely used narrative tense with both active and passive meanings. In historic times, however, and particularly in Middle Egyptian, this tense has become much restricted and specialized in its use". *From a synchronic perspective*, Edel (1955/1964: 269–270, §570) suggests that the transitive-active use of the Pseudoparticiple was already in decline in Old Egyptian. All three scholars furthermore stress the exceptional character of the Stative of the verb of knowledge and acquisition of knowledge *rx* 'to know' as it can only be used transitively (Erman 1928: 148, §328; Gardiner 1957: 237, §311; Edel 1955/1964: 284, §588). Gardiner (1957: 238, §312) and Edel (1955/1964: 284, §590) also comment on the narrative use of first person singular Statives in the autobiographical inscriptions of the late Fifth and the Sixth Dynasties (2300–2155 BCE). This use is, however, considered to be an archaic feature of the autobiographical genre.

Without any supporting statistical evidence, it is generally difficult to evaluate traditional claims about the morphological productivity of transitive Statives. As is well known, *there are attested examples* of such Statives in the Pyramid Texts and then in all three grammatical persons. Representative examples are shown in (19a–c).

(19) The transitive-active use of the Stative in the Pyramid Texts

a. 1SG *jnk Nwt msnt/t* ***njs-kj*** *rn Wsjr Pjpj*
I Nut.F.SG granary.F.SG call-STAT.1SG name.M.SG Osiris.M.SG Pepi.M.SG
'I (am) Nut, the Granary. I have called the name of Osiris Pepi.' (Pyramid Text 786a/P)

b. 2SG *hʔ Nfr-kʔ-Rʕ pw* ***wnx-tj*** *dȝ=k*
VOC Nefer-ka-Re.M.SG DEM.M.SG cover-STAT.2M.SG body.M.SG =POSS.2M.SG
'Oh Nefer-ka-Re (here), you are to cover up yourself!' (Pyramid Text 2119/N)

c. 3F.SG *jwt mwt=k* ***ms-tj*** *tˁw m rmtˁw*
NEG mother.F.SG=POSS.2M.SG give.birth-STAT.3F CL.2M.SG among man-M.PL
'There is no mother of yours who delivered you among men.' (Pyramid Text 659d/T)

There is reason to believe that Pyramid Text discourse has an oral-compositional form that manifests traditional language use (Reintges 2011). This does not carry over to the contemporaneous autobiographical inscriptions, which represents to large extent a new literary genre. Indeed, a typical feature of autobiographical discourse is the narrative use of first person singular Statives—a point to which we will return later on in this section. It is unlikely that such a stylistic innovation is based on a virtually obsolete constructional pattern. It can therefore be concluded that transitive-active Statives represent for all intents and purposes a fully grammatical option of the Old Egyptian language.

3.1.2. No decrease of valency

As an affected subject voice category, the Stative does not necessarily involve a valency-changing operation and can be derived from various types of intransitive verbs and, though less frequently, from transitive verbs. The 'active' or 'passive' syntax of transitive-based Statives is exemplified in (20a) and (20b), respectively. The presence of the subject and the direct object argument gives rise to a transitive-active clause (*wdʒ-tj* 'you order'), whereas the supression of the subject argument and the promotion of the direct object to subject function produces an intransitive construction that comes close in meaning to an adjectival passive (*wdʒ-kw* 'I have been ordered').

(20) Transitive-active vs. detransitivized Statives
a. ***wdʒ-tj*** *mdw* *ntˁr-w*
order-STAT.2SG word.M.SG god-M.PL
'You order the word of the gods.' (Pyramid Text 2110d/N)
b. ***wdʒ-kw*** *ʔ ħw ʔ wj* *jm*
order-STAT.1SG PCL PCL PCL CL.1SG there
'I have, indeed, been ordered! Oh I could be there!' (Coffin Text IV 48d/B1C)

Transitive-active Statives may select different types of complements. Examples with direct object nouns and pronouns are given in (21a–b).

(21) Transitive-active Statives with nominal and pronominal objects
a. ***nħm-kw*** *R̲ˁ* *m-ˁ* *ˁʔpp* *rˁ* *nb*
save-STAT.1SG Re.M.SG from-arm.M.SG Apophis.M.SG day.M.SG each.M.SG
'I have (the sun god) Re saved from (the god) Apophis every day.'(Coffin Text VII 403b/B12C)

b. ***rx-k(j)*** *t͗n*
learn-STAT.1SG CL.2PL
'I know you.' (Coffin Text 152h/B2Bo)

Subordinated finite clauses with or without embedding complementizers may equally well be used as complements. (Brackets demarcate the embedded clause.)

(22) Transitive-active Statives with embedded finite clauses
a. *j(w)=k* ***rx-t(j)*** [*ntt* *dʒd-n* *Jdw* *r* *sʔ=f* (...)]
AUX=2M.SG learn-STAT.2SG COMP say-PERF Idu.M.SG about son.M.SG=POSS.3M.SG
'You know that Idu said about his son (...).' (Letters to the Dead, Haskell Museum 13945:1)
b. ***j-mr-k(j)*** [*ndʒ=k* *jrt=k* *m-ʕ*
AUG-love-STAT.1SG save.PFV=3M.SG eye.F.SG=POSS.2M.SG from-arm.2M.SG
jr *n=k*]
do.PFV.PTCP.M.SG for=2M.SG
'I have come to the wish to save your eye from him who acted for you.' (Coffin Text VI 220j/L2Li)

It is also possible, though not very common, for transitive-active Statives to have an unspecified object argument, which is interpreted as inanimate. The content of the missing object can be inferred from the extra-linguistic situation or is anaphorically supplied by the preceding discourse. Thus, the understood object in example (23a) refers to things that are imported from the Wadi Hudi such as minerals and precious stones. In example (23b), the elided object pronoun refers to past accomplishments of the speaker.

(23) Transitive-active Statives with missing direct objects
a. ***jn-k(j)*** *jm* *r-ʕʔ-t* *wr-t*
bring-STAT.1SG there PREP-great-F.SG great-F.SG
'I imported much from there (i.e. Wadi Hudi).' (Wadi Hudi Inscription 14:10)
b. ***jr-k(j)*** *mj-qd* *r* *ḫz-t* *w(j)* *ḥm=f* *ḥr=s*
do-STAT.1SG altogether to praise-INF CL.1SG majesty=POSS.3M.SG for=3F.SG
'I used to act in every respect such that His Majesty would praise me for it.' (*Urkunden* I 106:11)

Mittwoch (2005: 243–249) observes that missing objects are much commoner in habitual sentences than in episodic ones, as in the case at hand.

3.1.3. The Eventive–Stative opposition in different classes of transitive verbs

The Eventive–Stative opposition is attested in different lexical classes of transitive verbs, although the semantic difference between the Eventive and the

Stative form is hard to pin-point exactly. As a first approximation, transitive-active Statives convey an object-oriented possessive resultative meaning: the resultant state attained by the direct object has a positive or negative impact on the subject. As Nedjalkov & Jaxontov (1988: 25 §3.3) put it, "in the secondary possessive resultative the state expressed by the form of the objective or, even, subject resultative (...) happens to be important for a person who is in some way involved in the resulting state. This person can be loosely called *possessor* (emphasis in the text [CHR])".

Consider in this regard verbs of creation such as *jwr* 'to conceive, become pregnant' and *ms-j* 'to give birth, deliver'. Broadly speaking, members of this class describe the coming into existence of a new entity as the result of the very act of creation. Creation verbs in English are conventionally analyzed as having a complex event structure, comprising a process through which an entity comes to exist and a resultant state which asserts the existence of the newly created entity at some place (see Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1995: 247–248 for further discussion and exemplification). In example (24a), the coordinated Eventive forms *jwr=s* 'she conceived' and *msj=s* 'she delivered' describe a past birth-giving event. The resultant state of that event—the existence of the re-born king in the hereafter—is semantically implied but not explicitly mentioned. The corresponding Stative in example (24b) works in the opposite direction and highlights the resultant state without further specifying the causing event. It is clear then that the selection of either form involves the up- or downgrading of one component in the complex event structure of Egyptian creation verbs.

(24) The Eventive–Stative opposition in verbs of creation

a. ***jwr=s*** *sw* ***ms-j=s*** *sw*
conceive.PFV=3FSG CL.3M.SG give.birth.PFV=3F.SG CL.3M.SG
'She conceived and delivered him (the deceased king).' (Pyramid Text 1370a/P)

b. ***j(w)r-kw*** *ʃd-w* ***ms-kw*** *pd³-w*
conceive-STAT.1SG lower.sky-M.SG deliver-STAT.1SG upper.sky-M.SG
'I have become prenant with the lower sky and given birth to the upper sky.'
(Coffin Text IV 51e-f/B3L)

It may very well be the case the affected subject is viewed more abstractly as the possessor and the direct object referent as the possessed item, as in Nedjalkov & Jaxontov's (1988: 25 §3.3) analysis. The possessive sense of transitive-active Statives is, however, much more pronounced in the verb of knowledge and acquisition of knowledge *rx* 'to learn'. The first person singular Perfect *rx-n=j* 'I have learnt' in (25a) makes reference to the acquisition of secret knowledge, while the Stative counterpart *rx-k(j)* 'I know' in (25b) denotes the possession of this type of knowledge.

(25) The Eventive–Stative opposition in the acquisition of knowledge verb *rx*

a. *jw* ***rx-n(=j)*** *ħkꜣ* *nb* *ftꜣ* *n(j)* *ɣnw*
AUX learn-PERF=1SG magic.M.SG each M.SG secret.M.SG LINK.M.SG residence.M.SG
'I learned about every secret magic of the residence.' (*Urkunden* I 143:2)

b. *jw* ***rx-k(j)*** *ħkꜣ* *nb* *ꜣx* *n=f*
AUX learn-STAT.1SG secret.M.SG every.M.SG be.glorious.PTCP.M.SG for=3M.SG
m *ɣrt-ntʃr*
in necropole.F.SG
'I know (through learning) every magic through which one becomes glorious in the necropolis.' (*Urkunden* I 263:14)

Consider now the more complex Eventive-Stative pair in (26a–b) with the transitive spatial configuration verb *qrs* 'to bury' (i.e. to put a dead body in the ground). The first person singular Perfect *qrs-n=j* 'I buried (my father)' and its Stative counterpart *qrs-k(j)* 'I had (this man) buried' describe what is objectively the same situation. Yet, the Perfect and the Stative variants differ with respect to the participant role of their subjects. In the Perfect, the completion of the event named by the finite verb principally affects the direct object, while the subject is presented as agent or imitator of that event. Even though Stative subjects are non-agentive, their referents may be involved in the coming about of the state attained by the direct object. The lasting effects on the speaker by his own actions are explicitly stated in the following sentence, which gives a description of the impressive rewards allotted to him by the royal court.

(26) The Eventive–Stative opposition in verbs of putting into a spatial configuration

a. *jw* ***qrs-n(=j)*** *jt(=j)* *pn* *m* *jz=f*
AUX bury-PERF=1SG father.M.SG=POSS.1SG DEM.M.SG in tomb.M.SG=POSS.3M.SG
n(j) *ɣrt-ntʃr*
LINK.M.SG necropole.F.SG
'I buried this father of mine in his tomb of the necropolis.' (*Urkunden* I 139:1)

b. ***qrs-k(j)*** *z* *pn* *m* *jz=f*
bury-STAT.1SG man.M.SG DEM.M.SG in tomb.M.SG=POSS.3M.SG
mħj *Nxb*
north.M.SG Nekheb.M.SG
rdʒ-t(j) *n(=j)* *ꜥħt* *stʃꜥt* 45 *m* *tꜣ-mħj* *ʃmʕw* (...)
give-PASS$_2$ to=1SG field.F.SG aroura.F.SG 45 in Lower.Egyp Upper.Egypt
r *ħz-t* *bꜣk* *jm*
to praise-INF servant.M.SG there
'I had this man buried in his tomb north of Nekheb (modern El-Kab). A field of forty-five arouras (of land) was given to me each in Lower and Upper Egypt (...) to reward this servant.' (*Urkunden* I 140:8–11)

To conclude with a comparative note, the possibility of forming transitive-active Statives in Old and Middle Egyptian is unexpected under current analyses of stative aspect as a morpho-lexical operation that eliminates the agent and associates the patient with the subject role. Dubinsky & Simango (1996) and Mchombo (2004: 98–102) propose an analysis along these lines for the Chichewa stative. As will become clear while we proceed, there are other problems with such a detransitivizing analysis for the Egyptian Stative.

3.1.4. On the narrative use of first person singular Statives in Old Kingdom autobiographical discourse

In this section I will outline a semantic explanation for the narrative use of first person singular Statives in late Old Kingdom autobiographies. Schenkel (1971: 304) proposes that the Stative places emphasis on the initiative of the speaker. I suggest a modification of this view, according to which this use of first person singular Statives represents a metaphorical extension of its core affectedness meaning. As an affected subject voice, the Stative lends itself for the description of the life-time achievements of the deceased speaker. Example (27) describes the speaker's holding of a high office of state, where the first person Stative is formed with the informationally light verb *jrj* 'to do' (*jr-k(j) mr ʃmʕ* 'I fulfilled (lit. 'I did') (the office of) Overseer of Upper Egyptian'). Importantly, this statement is embedded in the concluding paragraph of a narrative sequence. It is therefore not part of the chain of events that constitutes the main plot, but rather belongs to the backgrounded portions of the historical narrative.

(27) Occurrence of first person singular Stative in backgrounded portion of the narrative

jr-k(j)	*n=f*	*mr*	*ʃmʕ*	*r*	*hr-t*
do-STAT.1SG	for=3M.SG	overseer.M.SG	Upper.Egypt	according	satisfy-GER.F.SG

'I fulfilled (lit. 'I did') for him (the King) (the office of) Overseer of Upper Egyptian satisfactorily (lit. 'according to satisfaction').' (*Urkunden* I 106:11)

The first person singular Stative *qrs-k(j) z pn* 'I had this man buried' in example (26b) above looks like a less straightforward case. However, if my understanding of this passage is correct, it falls within the semantic spectrum of affected subject voice. As already observed by Schenkel (1971: 303–304) and Osing (1977: 166–168), the autobiographical genre of this period shows a tendency to resort to the Stative for first person singular narration, while the Perfect and, to a lesser extent, the simple past are used for the description of past events performed by other interlocutors. Accordingly, first person singular Statives are used to narrate historical events that belong to the foregrounded portions of the autobiographical discourse.

(28) Occurrence of first person singular Stative in foregrounded portion of the narrative

a. ***s-ḥ3ḳ-k(j)*** *n=f* *ḥtp* *pn* *n hrw-w* 17
CAUS-descend-STAT.1SG for=3M.SG offering.table.M.SG DEM.M.SG in day-M.PL 17
'I transported for him (the King) this offering table in 17 days.' (*Urkunden* I 108:1)

b. ***d3ḳ-k(j)*** *m* *nmj-w* *ḥnꜥ* *t/z-wt* *ptn*
cross.over-STAT.1SG in ship-M.PL with troop-F.PL DEM.F.PL
'I crossed over in transport ships together with these troops.' (*Urkunden* I 104:14–15)

Narratively used first person singular Statives are a clear case of metaphorical extension from a central sense. The affectedness meaning inherent to the Stative viewpoint is generalized and develops into a stylistic device—a subjective mode of representing the major events in the life of the deceased speaker as showing lasting effects. Despite appearances, the narrative use of the first person singular form does therefore not provide conclusive evidence for a dynamic value of transitive Statives. Even though I do not share Oréal's (2009: 192) skepticism about a discourse-based approach to analyzing this phenomenon, I would readily admit that it is very difficult to effectively render the affectedness connotation of first person singular Statives in this context.

3.2. Statives formed from intransitive verbs

Having addressed to controversial issue of transitive Statives, I will next consider the contrastive semantic behaviour between Eventive and Statives in intransitive verbs. Intransitive verbs seem to constitute a fairly homogeneous class of verbs with a single argument in subject position. The 'Unaccusative Hypothesis', as originally formulated by Perlmutter (1978), claims that intransitive verbs fall into two classes of so-called unergative and unaccusative verbs, each with distinct syntactic and semantic properties. In terms of argument structure, a unergative verb such as *laugh* and *dance* selects an agent argument that corresponds in grammatical behaviour to the subject of a transitive verb. By contrast, an unaccusative verb such as *die* and *fall* takes a non-agentive patient, experiencer or theme argument. The classification of intransitive verbs as either unergative or unaccusative is complicated by the fact that some verb classes show a variable behaviour. In any event, the unergative–unaccusative distinction should be established on language-internal grounds. In earlier work (Reintges 1997) the possibility of forming impersonal passives is used as a diagnostic for unergativity, in line with the predictions of the Unaccusativity Hypothesis.

3.2.1. The Eventive–Stative opposition in unergative verbs

The focus of this section is on two classes of unergative verbs, which both lexicalize motion and location in space—notions that are considered as central

for the construal of events (but cf. Levin & Rappaport Hovav 2005: 79–87 for a critique of the localist approach). The first class comprises verbs of spatial configuration and the second class verbs of directed motion. Levin & Rappaport Hovav (1995: 126–133, 142–144, 163–164) discuss the complex behaviour verbs of spatial configuration in English and Dutch. Their detailed study reveals two basic senses of the non-causativized forms. The first sense is the *assume position* sense, which describes an animate subject obtaining a particular position under his control. With assume position verbs, the subject is typically a human, volitional agent. The second sense is the *simple position* sense, which is non-agentive and describes the position of the subject with respect to a particular location.

In Old and Middle Egyptian, the agentive and non-agentive meanings available to the cardinal spatial configuration verbs *ḥ*ʃ 'to stand (up)' and *ḥms* 'to sit (down)' are distinguished on a morphological basis. When appearing in the Eventive paradigm, these verbs exhibit an agentive assume position sense, as seen in examples (29a) and (30a). The corresponding Statives are used as simple position verbs and describe simultaneously the at-rest position of the subject and its location with respect to some deictic reference point (viz. the rising sun (29b), the divine throne (30b)).

(29) The Eventive–Stative opposition in verbs of spatial configuration

a. ***ḥ*ʃ=*k*** *r=k* *m* *jtr-tj* *ʔxt* *ḥr* *ʃw*
stand.up.PFV=2M.SG PCL=2M.SG in chapel-F.DU horizon.F.SG on void.M.SG
n(j) *nwt*
LINK.M.SG sky.F.DG
'You stand up in the two chapels of the horizon on the void of the sky.' (Pyramid Text 1992a/N)

b. ***ḥ*ʃ-*tj*** *xft* *R*ʃ *pr=f* *m* *jʔbt*
stand-STAT.2SG before Re.M.SG come.PFV=3M.SG from east.F.SG
'You are standing before (the sun-god) Re (when) he comes from the East.' (Pyramid Text 743b/T)

(30) a. ***ḥms*** *Nfr-kʔ-R*ʃ *jr* *rmn=k* *Ḥr*
sit.PFV Nefer-ka-Re.M.SG at shoulder.M.SG=POSS.2M.SG Horus.M.SG
'(King) Nefer-ka-Re takes a seat besides you, Horus.' (Pyramid Text 2056a/N)

b. ***j-ḥms-t(j)*** *ḥr* *nst* *jt=k* *Gbb*
AUG-sit-STAT.2SG on throne.F.SG father.M.SG=POSS.2M.SG Geb.M.SG
m-xnt *jtrt* *ḥr* *xnd* *pw* *n(j)* *bjʔ*
in-front chapel.F.SG on chair.M.SG DEM.M.SG LINK.M.SG iron.M.SG
'You are sitting on the throne of your father (the god) Geb before the two chapels on this iron chair.' (Pyramid Text 1992b/N)

Having discussed cardinal posture verbs, I now turn to the Eventive–Stative alternation in various types of movement verbs. Levin & Rappaport Hovav (2010: 27–30) characterize verbs of directed motion as conflating *motion* and *path*. For example, the directed motion verb *descend* specifies a downward direction of motion, without further specifying the manner in which the motion is effected. Old and Middle Egyptian verbs of directed motion may undergo impersonal passivization and can therefore be classified as unergatives (Reintges 1997: 211–230). The first person singular Perfect *hꜣ-n(=j)* 'I descended' in example (31a) asserts that the speaking subject travelled along a trajectory and arrived at its endpoint. The displacement and the downward motion sense are backgrounded in the corresponding Stative *hꜣ-k(j)* 'I have come down' in example (31b). When used statively, directed motion verbs have a locative sense and describe the presence of the subject at the endpoint of the motion path along which he or she has travelled.

(31) The Eventive–Stative opposition in verbs of directed motion

a. ***hꜣ-n(=j)*** *m* *spꜣt(=j)*
descend-PERF=1SG from district.F.SG=POSS.1SG
'I descended from my district.' (*Urkunden* I 121:12)

b. *jw* ***hꜣ-k(j)*** *r* *ꜣbdˢw* *ỉr* *Rs*
AUX descend-STAT.1SG to Abydos.M.SG under Res.M.SG
'I descended to Abydos with Res.' (Stele Metropolitan Museum NY 65.107:4)

The directed motion verbs *jj* and *jw* 'to come' incorporate into their lexical meaning a particular deictic orientation. Generally speaking, the motion is directed towards the deictic center, which can be identified with the location of the speaker. When inflected for the Stative, *jj* and *jw* no longer function as motion verbs stricto senso, but rather show a more grammaticalized use as a locative auxiliary. The only extra contribution that they make is to add a presentative sense of appearing on stage. As noted by Levin & Rappaport Hovav (1995: 242) for the very similar case of English *come*, such as presentative sense is not part of the meaning of other existential auxiliaries.

(32) The Eventive–Stative opposition in deitic motion verbs

a. ***jj-n*** *Wnjs* *m* *jw* *nsjsj*
come-PERF Unas in island.M.SG fire.M.SG
'(King) Unas has come into the island of fire.' (Pyramid Text 265b/W)

b. *m* *Wnjs* ***jj(-w)*** *m* *Wnjs* ***jj(-w)***
INTERJ Unas come-STAT.3M INTERJ Unas come-STAT.3M
m *Wnjs* ***pr(-w)***
INTERJ Unas come.forth-STAT.3M
'Look, (King) Unas has arrived! Look, (King) Unas has arrived! Look, (King) Unas has arrived!' (Pyramid Text 333a/W)

When appearing in the Stative paradigm, verbs of spatial configuration and verbs of directed motion display unaccusative behaviour: their subject is interpreted as the theme argument (i.e. the located entity), while the verb comes close in meaning to a positional or locative auxiliary. One might therefore be tempted to analyze the Stative as the unaccusative variant of a unergative verb. Such a conclusion is unwarranted, however, for two reasons. First, mono- and ditransitive verbs can be inflected for the Stative without being reduced in their basic valency. Second, Statives can be formed from bona fide unaccusative verbs. This issue will be taken up in the next section.

3.2.1. The Eventive–Stative opposition in unaccuative verbs

The Eventive–Stative alternation is fully productive in unaccusative verbs of quality, size, and color. The Eventive variant expresses inchoative aspect and describes a change of state. The corresponding Stative denotes the physical condition or property of the subject after the change of state has taken place (see Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1995: 159–162 for further discussion on the inchoative–stative alternation).

(33) The inchoative–Stative alternation in verbs of quality, size, and color

a. ***ʔx-n=f*** *m* *ʔxt* ***d³d-n=f*** *m* *D³dwt*
be.glorious-PERF=3M.SG in horizon.F.SG endure-PERF=3M.SG in Djedut.F.SG
'He became glorious in the horizon and enduring in Djedut (toponym).' (Pyramid Text 350c/T)

b. ***ʔx-t(j)*** *m* *ʔxt* ***d³d-t(j)*** *m* *D³dwt*
be.glorious-STAT.2SG in horizon.F.SG endure-STAT.2SG in Djedut.F.SG
'You are glorious in the horizon, you are enduring in Djedut.' (Pyramid Text 1261b/N)

Even the most typical member of the unaccusative class, the verb *mwt* 'to die' behaves like a verb of entity-specific change of state. The Eventive variant of *mwt* refers to the process of dying, through which an entity comes not to exist, while the Stative denotes the resultant dead state.

(34) The inchoative–Stative alternation with the unaccusative change of state verb *mwt*

a. *n* ***mwt*** *Nt* *n* *njswt* *n* ***mwt*** *Nt* *n* *rmtʃ*
NEG die.PFV Neith.F.SG for king.M.SG NEG die.PFV Neith.F.SG for man.M.SG
'(Queen) Neith will not die on account of a king. Neith will not die on account of a man.' (Pyramid Text *Nt* 694)

b. *jʔm* *Nḫb-kʔw* *m* *mtwt* *Hjw* ***mwt-tj***
burn.PFV Nekheb-kau.M.SG PREP semen.F.SG *Hiu*-serpent.M.SG die-STAT.3F
'(The god) Nekheb-kau burns dead the semen of the *Hiu*-serpent.' (Pyramid Text *Nt* 717)

The availability of unaccusative Statives shows fairly clearly that stativity and unaccusativity are two separate categories of verbal semantics.

3.3. The passive use of transitive-based Statives

Old Egyptian and, to a lesser degree Early Middle Egyptian, is a language with multiple passives, all of which belong to the Eventive paradigm. As far as one can tell, there are no passive Statives in the morphological sense, whereby active and passives uses are indicated by morphological changes. The passive meaning of transitive-based Statives has long been acknowledged in traditional Egyptology. However, as of yet, little or no attention has been paid to the contrastive behaviour between morphological passives and detransitivized Statives.

3.3.1. Differences between morphological passives and detransitivized Statives

Even though the Stative does not necessarily involve a valence-reducing operation, transitive-based Statives commonly appear in intransitive clauses whose subject is associated with the semantic role of patient/theme. Such detransitivized Statives run parallel to morphological passives, which align the NP bearing the patient/theme role with the subject function. In spite of these overlapping functions, the two grammatical voices differ in important respects. One such difference concerns the dynamic–stative contrast. Morphological passives are eventive and depict dynamic situations from the viewpoint of the patient, which is partially or totally affected by the verbal action. Detransitivized Statives have, as a rule, a resultative meaning and denote states resulting from prior events. The passive–stative contrast in transitive verbs can conveniently be illustrated with the following example.

(35) Morphological passive co-occurring with a detransitivized Stative

ms-jj=j	*m*	*grḥ*	*m-jj*	***ms-kj***
bear-PASS$_1$=1SG	at	night	come-IMP.PL	bear-STAT.1SG

'I was born at night. Come! I am (in a) new-born (state).' (Pyramid Text 714a/P")

Morphological passives such as *ms-jj=j* 'I was born' imply the presence of an agent even when it is not syntactically expressed. The identity of the implicit agent is either contextually given or inferable from pragmatic world knowledge. In the above example, the childbirth presupposes the involvement of a delivering female. The corresponding Stative *ms-kj* 'I am (in a) new-born (state)' describes the speaker's having entered a particular condition or state but such that there is no implication of agency responsible for this condition.

Elsewhere (Reintges 1997:191) I have shown that passive constructions in which the agent is not expressed syntactically represent the language's passive

prototype. Yet, all morphological passives allow the overt expression of the agent to form a canonical passive construction in the traditional grammarian sense. As pointed out by Siewierska (1984: 35–36) and, more recently, Ward *et al.* (2002: 1444–1445 §10.2), canonical passives in English are only felicitous under certain pragmatic conditions. In particular, the passive subject must not represent information that is newer in the discourse than the demoted agent. The informational status of the agent expression has a morphological correlate in the Egyptian passive. Canonical passives belong to a family of information-packaging constructions in which the presence of different semantic types of focus is registered by the proclitic particle *jn* (Reintges 1998).[3]

(36) Canonical morphological passive with *jn*-marked focus constituent
jwr(-w)=s *jn* *Sxmt*
conceive-PASS$_1$=3F.SG FOC Sakhmet.F.SG
ms(-w) *Nt* *tn* *jn* *ʃzmtt*
deliver-PASS$_1$ Neith.F.SG DEM.F.SG FOC Shezmetet.F.SG
'She was conceived by (the goddess) Sakhmet. This (Queen) Neith (here) was born by (the goddess) Shezmetet.' (Pyramid Text *Nt* 7–8)

Passively Statives, too, can be expanded by an *jn*-marked focus. The construction thus formed bears a close resemblance to canonical passives (inter alia: Westendorf 1953: 49–51; Edel 1955/1964: 283 §587aa; Schenkel 1971: 301; Allen 1991: 21–23; Loprieno 1995: 84–85). The situation with Egyptian Stative is therefore different from Chichewa, where an agentive prepositional phrase cannot be added to a stative sentence construction (Dubinsky & Simango 1996: 751; Mchombo 2004: 95–96).

(37) Detransitivized Stative with *jn*-marked focus constituent
a. *jw=j* ***j(w)r-kw*** ***ms-kw*** *jn* *ʃzmtt*
AUX=1SG conceive-STAT.1SG deliver-STAT.1SG FOC Shezmetet.F.SG
'I was conceived (and) delivered through Shezmetet.' (Coffin Text VI 63d–e/B2L)
b. ***ħz-k(j)*** *ħr=s* *jn* *nb(=j)*
praise-STAT.1SG for=3F.SG FOC lord.M.SG=POSS.1SG
'I was praised (lit. in a praised state) for it by My Lord.' (*Urkunden* I 255:5)

Taken by face value, the presence of an *jn*-marked focus constituent in (37a–b) above seems problematic for an analysis of detransitivized Statives as a non-agentive voice. However, note that the *jn* + NP constituent derives historically from a truncated cleft sentence and hence represents a separate clause

[3] The focus marking of the demoted agent represents an unusual feature of the Egyptian passive, as most of the world's languages resort to instrumental and locative prepositions to encode passive agents (see Keenan & Dryer 2007: 343–344).

that is added to an intransitive passive or Stative sentence. More importantly, however, the focused NP may be an agent or a cause, thereby involving two distinct types of agency (see Doron 2003 for further discussion and explication). Consider in this regard example (38), in which the Stative *qꜣ(-w)* 'is elevated' describes an externally caused change of state.

(38) Stativized verb of quality, size and color with *jn*-marked focus constituent
tꜣ ***qꜣ(-w)*** *ỉr* *Nwt*
ground.M.SG be.high-STAT.3M under Nut.F.SG
jn *ḥ-w(j)=tj* *Tfnwt*
FOC arm-M.DU=POSS.2F.SG Tefnut.F.SG
'The ground under (the goddess) Nut is elevated through your arms, (goddess) Tefnut.' (Pyramid Text 1405a/P)

With detransitivized Statives, the *jn*-phrase denotes the external causer or cause of a condition, which arises from some prior event that is not further specified (Reintges 1997: 366).

3.3.2. The morphological non-distinctness of active and passive Statives

Kammerzell (1991) proposes a morphological distinction between active and passive Statives. The voice alternation is marked by the presence or absence of an augment *j*-. The claim is that the *j*-augment is used as an active voice marker. In this function, it is incompatible with passively used Statives (Kammerzell 1991a: 177, 183). The analysis just outlined is unlikely from a typological point of view. When voice alternations are expressed by changes in the verbal morphology, it is the passive rather than the active voice which involves additional coding material (Siewierska 1984; Haspelmath 1990; Keenan & Dryer 2007). There are also empirical concerns. To begin with, the presence of the purported active voice marker is not obligatory in transitive- and intransitive-active Statives, which may be left unmarked. More importantly, however, there exist a considerable number of counterexamples in the Pyramid Texts, in which passively interpreted Statives contain an *j*-augment—contrary to the predictions of Kammerzell's proposal.

(39) Passively interpreted Statives with *j*-augment
a. *jzz-n=sn* *sw* ***j-bḥn(-w)***
punish-PERF=3PL CL.3M.SG AUG-cut.up-STAT.3M
'They have punished him (so that) he is cut up (in pieces).' (Pyramid Text 643c/T)
b. *dꜣr* *mꜥꜥ=sn* *Tjtj* ***j-rnp-jj***
since see.PFV=3PL Teti.M.SG AUG-rejuvenate-STAT.3M
'Since they (the gods) see (King) Teti rejuvenated.' (Pyramid Text 715c/T)

As a verb category that expressed affectedness, the Stative enters into a paradigmatic opposition with transitive-active constructions as well as morphological passives. The active or passive interpretation of transitive-based Statives depends entirely on the syntactic realization of the verb's arguments. If the two core arguments of a transitive verb are encoded as respectively the subject and the direct object, the Stative sentence will have an active interpretation. On the other hand, if the agent is removed from the argument structure of the verb, the detransitivized Stative will have a resultative-passive interpretation.

4. Diachronic continuity in the Classic Middle Egyptian Stative

4.1. Minor readjustments in the inflectional paradigm

Despite the partial temporal overlap with Early Middle Egyptian, Classic Middle Egyptian shows some innovative features in its grammar, with the proliferation of auxiliary verb constructions and the rise of infinitival tenses deserving special mention. At the same time, unproductive pattern such as the reduplicative passive disappear almost entirely from the language documentation. The Stative, on the other hand, appears to be largely unaffected by these diachronic changes. It has an inflectional paradigm that is largely identical to that of the Old and Early Middle Egyptian Stative. The person-number-gender paradigms of the Early and the Classic Middle Egyptian (ME) Stative are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: The paradigms of the Early and the Classic Middle Egyptian (ME) Stative

		EARLY ME STATIVE	CLASSIC ME STATIVE
SG	1	sd^{3}m-k(j), sd^{3}m-kj, sd^{3}m-kw, sd^{3}m-kwj	sd^{3}m-kw, sd^{3}m-kwj
	2	sd^{3}m-t(j), sd^{3}m-tj	sd^{3}m-t(j), sd^{3}m-tj
	3M	sd^{3}m-w, sd^{3}m-jj, sd^{3}m(-w)	sd^{3}m-w, sd^{3}m-jj, sd^{3}m(-w)
	3F	sd^{3}m-tj, sd^{3}m-t^{ʃ}j, sd^{3}m-t(j)	sd^{3}m-t(j), sd^{3}m-tj
DU	2	sd^{3}m-tjwn, sd^{3}m-tjwnj, sd^{3}m-tjwnj	
	3M	sd^{3}m-wjj, sd^{3}m-wj	
	3F	sd^{3}m-tjj	
PL	1	sd^{3}m-wn, sd^{3}m-wjn, sd^{3}m-nw	sd^{3}m-wn, sd^{3}m-wyn
	2	sd^{3}m-tjwn, sd^{3}m-tjwnj, sd^{3}m-tjwny	sd^{3}m-tjwn
	3M	sd^{3}m-w, sd^{3}m-jj, sd^{3}m(-w)	sd^{3}m-w, sd^{3}m-jj, sd^{3}m(-w)
	3F	sd^{3}m-t(j), sd^{3}m-tj	sd^{3}m-t(j), sd^{3}m-tj

(i) The standardization of the more innovative first person singular form *-kw* represents a minor morphological readjustment. The two allomorphs *-kw* and *-kj* reflect different vocalization patterns of the underlying representation *-k*V, viz. /ku/ and /k:/, respectively (but see Kammerzell 1991b: 200 for a claim to the contrary).

(ii) A more significant inflectional change concerns the gradual loss of the dual number in the third person (e.g.; Gardiner 1957: 234 §309; Lefebvre 1955: 169 §336 footnote 3). As a result, singular and non-singular third person forms are no longer distinguished on a morphological basis. This inflectional change is in line with the cross-linguistic tendency to neutralize number distinctions in the third person (Siewierska 2004: 7).

(iii) As with Old and Early Middle Egyptian, null pronominal subjects are licensed in the first and second person, in which the inflectional ending is unambiguously specified for person and number. For the syncretic 2SG/3F ending *-t(j)* pronoun omissibility provides the relevant cue for disambiguating pronominal reference.

(40) The first/second vs. third person asymmetry of the Classic Middle Egyptian Stative

a. 1SG *pro* ***wn-k(j)*** *r=f* *m* *jw=f* *ʕ?=f*
be-STAT.1SG PCL=3M.SG as come.PFV=3M.SG be.great.PFV=3M.SG
'I really was someone (such that) he comes and becomes bigger.'(stele British Museum 146:4)

b. 1PL *pro* ***ḥtp-wn*** *ḥr=s* *m* *ʕnx* *ḥtp*
be.content-STAT.1PL for=3F.SG in life.M.SG peace.M.SG
'We are content about her (Queen Hatshepsut) in life and peace.' (*Urkunden* IV 244:4)

c. 2SG *pro* ***jj-tj*** *n=j* *pro* ***ḥʕ-tj*** *m??* *nfr-w=j*
come-STAT.2.SG to=1SG rejoice-STAT.2SG see.INF
nfr-w=j
beauty-M.PL=POSS.1SG
'Welcome to me (lit. you come to me) and rejoice whilst seeing my beauty!' (*Urkunden* IV 620:5–6)

d. 2PL *pro* ***ḥr-tjwny*** *r* *wnm* *ʕ?d-w*
be.far-STAT.2PL from eat.INF *ʿādu*-fish-M.SG
'Beware from eating the *ʿādu*-fish!' (Mother & Child 8:6)

The resulting situation with the Classic Middle Egyptian Stative is one of greater symmetry in the inflectional paradigm, whereby gender distinctions are realized in third person, while the singular/nonsingular contrast is only expressed in the first and the second person. In other words, the morphological realization of number and gender features are in complementary distribution with one another. The perpetuation of the first/second vs. third person asymmetry shows fairly clearly that apart from the obsolete third person dual endings, the Stative person-number-gender paradigm underwent virtually no inflectional changes in Middle Egyptian.

4.2. The productivity of transitive-active Statives

On the semantic side, there is virtually no change in the argument structural properties and in the aspectual semantics of the Middle Egyptian Stative. Nonetheless, one often finds claims to the contrary in the traditional descriptive literature (inter alia: Gardiner 1957: 237–238 §311; Lefebvre 1955: 173 §341; Schenkel 1971: 302–303). Thus, in historical narratives the past actions of the deceased speaker are presented from the Stative point of view, which is particularly well-suited to underscore the lasting results of his life-time achievements.

(41) The narrative use of first person singular Statives in Middle Egyptian

a. ***rd³-kj*** *jwt* *d³ʔm-w* *n(j)* *ḥwn-w* *nfr-w*
give-STAT.1SG come.SUBJ troop-M.PL LINK.M.SG recruit-M.PL beautiful-PTCP.M.PL
r *jr-t* *n=f* *wʔt*
to make-INF for=3M.SG path.F.SG
'I let the troops of the recruits come to pave for it (i.e. the statue) a way.' (Bersheh I 14:2–3)

b. ***wd-k(j)*** *rn=j* *r* *bw* *ɣr(-y)* *ntʲr*
put-STAT.1SG name.M.SG=POSS.1SG to place.M.SG under-NOMINAL.M.SG god.M.SG
'I set my name at the place which is under the god.' (Stele British Museum 574:13)

The above examples are instances of transitive-active Statives. One also encounters examples of the object deletion construction, in which the direct object pronoun is omitted from the surface structure of the clause. When this happens, transitive Statives assume a habitual interpretation.

(42) Omission of direct object pronominal in transitive–active Statives
jr-kw *m* *ʕq* *nn* *d³d(-w)=f*
do-STAT.1SG as enter.PTCP.ACT.M.SG NEG say-PASS$_1$=3M.SG
'I acted as one who enters without being announced.' (stele Munich 3:16)

There is some evidence to suggest that the Stative has been extended to a new semantic domain—that of quotative evidentiality. Schenkel (1971: 302–303) propose to analyze the first person singular Stative *d³d-kw* 'I said' in example (43) as an instance of middle voice.

(43) First person singular Stative formed with quotative verb *d³d* 'to say'
d³d-kw *r=j* *n=f* *wʃb=j* *n=f*
say-STAT.1SG PCL=1SG to=3M.SG answer.PFV=1SG to=3M.SG
'Indeed, I said to him answering him ...' (Sinuhe, pap. Berlin 3022:45)

The evidence for the purported middle voice interpretation is far from being conclusive. Rather, what we are dealing with is an elaborate quotative construction, in which the first person Stative *d³d-kw* is expanded by another verb of speaking *wʃb=j* 'I answer'. It therefore looks as if the entire construction has evidential overtones, emphasizing the verbatim character of the speaker's verbal report (see Aikhenvald 2004: 132–142 for further discussion on reported speech as an evidentiality strategy).

As illustrated by examples (44a–c), verbs of knowledge and acquisition of knowledge such as *rx* 'to learn' and *jbj* 'to think' require for their semantic completeness a nominal or clausal complement.

(44) Transitive-active Statives formed with verbs of knowledge

a. *jw=j* *grt* ***rx-kwj*** *nb* *n(y)* *spꜣt* *tn*
AUX=1SG PCL learn-STAT.1SG lord.M.SG LINK.M.SG district.F.SG DEM.F.SG
'Now I have come to know the lord of this district.' (Eloquent Peasant B1:46–47)

b. *m=k* *tw* ***rx-t(j)*** [*ntt* *sy* *mn-t(j)*
INTERJ=2M.SG CL.2M.SG learn-STAT.2M.SG COMP CL.3F.SG remain-STAT.3F
ḥr *wp(w)t* *n(y)-t* *Gs-Jꜣby*]
on list.F.SG LINK-F.SG Ges-jabi
'Look, you know that she should remain on the list of Ges-jabi.' (Illahun, pap. University College London 32126, 2:3)

c. ***jb-kw*** [*wꜣw* *pw* *n(y)* *Wd³-Wr*]
think-STAT.1SG wave.M.SG COP.M.SG LINK.M.SG Green-Great.M.SG
'I thought it was a wave of the Great Green (i.e. the Mediterranean Sea).' (Shipwrecked Sailor 57–58)

With infinitival complements, Stative *rx* acquires modal overtones and denotes the capacity of the subject to perform the action named by the infinitival verb. Consider in this regard examples (45a–b).

(45) Stative-inflected *rx* with infinitival complement

a. *jw=f* ***rx*** *tꜣz* *tp* *ḥsq(-w)*
AUX=3M.SG learn.STAT.3M tie.INF head.M.SG cut.off-PASS$_1$(PCTP.M.SG)
'He can (lit. knows how to) fix a cut-off head.' (pap. Westcar 7:4)

b. *m=k* *n* ***rx-wyn*** *s-msj*
INTERJ=2M.SG CL.1PL learn.STAT.3M CAUS-deliver.INF
'Look, we can (lit. know how to) deliver (a baby).' (pap. Westcar 10:5)

The modalized use of Stative *rx conforms to the cross-linguistic* tendency verbs of knowledge and acquisition of knowledge to form a particularly prominent lexical source for modal verbs that express ability and possibility. Bybee *et al.* (1994: 192) argue convincingly that "the transition from mental ability to general

ability is easy enough to understand", since "most activities that require mental ability also require some physical activity".

4.3. Virtually no semantic change in Stative-inflected intransitive verbs

4.3.1. Unergative verbs of spatial configuration and verbs of directed motion

The Eventive–Stative alternation is fully productive in verbs of spatial configuration and verbs of directed motion. When appearing in the Stative paradigm, the cardinal posture verbs *ʕḥʕ* 'to stand' and *ḥms-j* 'to sit' are used to simultaneously describe the at-rest position of the subject and its location with respect to some contextually given reference point. This is illustrated in examples (46a) and (46b), respectively.

(46) Statives formed with unergative verbs of spatial configuration

a. *wnn ms nty jm* ***ʕḥʕ*** *m wjʔ*
be.IMPERF PCL COMP.REL.M.SG there stand.STAT.3M in barque.M.SG
'He over there (i.e. in the Netherworld) is standing in the (solar) barque.' (Lebensmüder 143–144)

b. *gm-n=f Rwdʒ-dʒdt* ***ḥms-tj***
find-PERF=3M.SG Rudj-djedet.F.SG sit-STAT.3F
tp=s ḥr mʔst=s
head.M.SG=POSS.3F.SG on knee.F.SG=POSS.3F.SG
'He found Rudj-djedet sitting with her head on her knee.' (pap. Westcar 12:20)

It may be recalled from §3.2.1 that in the Stative the displacement and the downward motion sense of verbs of directed motion such as *hʔ-j* 'to descend' are downgraded. The deictic motion verb *jj* 'to come', on its turn, is informationally light and describes the appearance of the subject onto the scene identified with the deictic centre.

(47) Stative formed with unergative verbs of directed motion

a. *jnk pw* ***hʔ-kw*** *r bjʔ m wpwt*
I COP.M.SG descend-STAT.1SG to mining.region.M.SG with mission.F.SG
jtjj
sovereign.M.SG
'I went down to the mining region with a mission of the sovereign.'(Shipwrecked Sailor 89–90)

b. *jswt=n* ***jj-t(j)*** *ʕdʒ-t(j)*
crew.F.SG=POSS.1PL come-STAT.3F be.safe-STAT.3F
'Our crew has arrived safe.' (Shipwrecked Sailor 7)

c. *dpt nb-t* ***ʃm-t(j)***
taste.F.SG each-F.SG go.away-STAT.3F
'Every taste has gone away.' (Maxims of Ptahhotep, pap. Prisse 5:1 [§ D19])

It generally appears, then, that there has been no semantic change in verbs of spatial configuration and verbs of directed motion. In particular, there is no evidence for a grammaticalization of members of the two verb classes into different kinds of auxiliary verbs. As will be discussed in §6, such grammaticalization processes can be observed no sooner than Late Egyptian and then only for a short period of time.

4.3.2. Some observations about Stative-inflected unaccusative verbs

With unaccusative verbs of quality, size, and color, the Stative may convey a potential interpretation. In this usage, it depicts a target state that is not actualized at speech time, but is attainable by the subject in the nearby future (see Reintges 2006: 126–127 and the references cited therein).

(48) Statives formed with unaccusative verbs of quality, size, and color

snb-t(j)	*sp-snw*	*nd³s*	*r*	*pr=k*
be.safe-STAT.2SG	time-two.M.SG	little.one.M.SG	at	house.M.SG=POSS.2M.SG

'You will be safe (two times), little fellow, at your place.' (Shipwrecked Sailor 158)

Westendorf (1953: 45–46) and Lefebvre (1955: 332 §667) contend that the Stative in Classic Middle Egyptian may adopt an event-related interpretation in very specific contexts. One such context involves the posture verb construction *ʕḥʕ-n plus finite verb form*. In this construction, the initial verb *ʕḥʕ-n* (literally 'has stood up') is devoid of any postural semantics, but rather serves as a clause-chaining device (Gardiner 391–394 §§476–482; Collier 1994: 84; Winand 2006: 376–377; see also Newman & Rice 2004: 352–353, 377 for typological parallels). When coordinated with *ʕḥʕ-n*, the following Stative is said to convey an eventive sense. This holds even when the Stative is formed with an unaccusative verb such as *mwt* 'to die'. Example (49) is an often cited passage for the purported dynamic use of the Classic Middle Egyptian Stative.

(49) The alleged dynamic use of Stative *mw(t)-t(j)* in aspectual posture construction

ʕḥʕ-n	*dpt*	***mw(t)-t(j)***			
stand.up-PERF	ship.F.SG	die-STAT.F			
ntj-w	*jm=s*	*n*	*spj*	*wʕ*	*jm*
COMP.REL-M.PL	in=3.F.SG	NEG	remain.PFV	one.M.SG	from

'The ship was (suddenly) dead (lit. the ship stood up dead). (As for) those who were in it, no one of them was left over.' (Shipwrecked Sailor 37–39)

It is, however, not entirely clear or obvious whether the third person feminine Stative *mw(t)-t(j)* 'is dead' in the above example functions as the primary predicate of the clause. It seems more feasible to reanalyze the Stative

mw(t)-t(j) as a secondary predicate, which modifies the aspectual posture verb *ʕḥʕ-n*. On this view, one need not postulate a radical shift in the semantics of stativized unaccusative verbs, while the co-occurrence with dynamically interpreted aspectual verbs is still accounted for.

4.4. Detransitivized Statives and the notion of external causation

Detransitivized Statives that describe an externally caused state are rather common in Middle Egyptian. As shown by examples (50a–b), the identity of the remote causer can be inferred from pragmatic world knowledge or is contextually implied.

(50) Detransitivized Statives with resultative-passive interpretation

a. ***ḥz-kw*** *ḥr=s* *m* *pr* *njswt*
praise-STAT.1SG for=3F.SG in house.M.SG king.M.SG
'I was praised (lit. in a praised state) for it in the palace.' (Beni Hasan I 8:13)

b. ***s-sbq-kw*** *xnt* *ʃnwt=f*
CAUS-be.splendid-STAT.1SG in.frontentourage.F.SG= POSS.3M.SG
'I was honored in front of his (the king's) entourage.'(Inscription Hammamat M 113:10)

It is possible although not very common for detransitivized Statives to take an agentive *jn*-phrase, thereby specifying the exact identity of the remote causer, which may be inanimate.

(51) Detransitivized Stative with agentive *jn*-phrase
ʕḥʕ-n =j ***rd³-kw*** *r* *jw* *jn* *wꜣw* *n(y)* *Wd³-Wr*
stand.up-PERF give-STAT.1SG to island.M.SG FOC wave.M.SG LINK.M.SG Green Great
'Thereupon, I was thrown to the island by a wave of the Great Green (i.e. the Mediterranean Sea).' (Shipwrecked Sailor 40–41)

The overall impression that one gets from the previous discussion is one of diachronic continuity in the paradigm structure and valency patterns of the Middle Egyptian Stative. More importantly, however, there are no indications for decreasing productivity in various lexical classes of transitive and intransitive verbs. All things considered, the Middle Egyptian Stative is used under the same semantic parameters as in the preceding Old and Early Middle Egyptian stage.

5. Morphological simplification of the Later Egyptian Stative paradigm

5.1. General tendencies in morphological change

The development of the Stative conjugation in Later Egyptian shows a general tendency towards morphological simplification and paradigm erosion with an overall reduction of person, number, and gender distinctions. The inflectional paradigms of the Late Egyptian and Demotic Stative are presented in Table 3. See Erman (1933: 155–160 §§327–336); Černý & Groll (1993: 194–197§§12.3); Winand (1992: 123 §220 and 144–149 tables I–III); Junge (2001: 81–82 §2.2.3 (2)) for the Late Egyptian Stative and Spiegelberg (1924: 52–53 §§96–97); Johnson (1976: 16–17); Simpson (1996: 146–149 §9.5.2 and 204–208 table VIII) and Vittmann (1998: 235 §3) for its Demotic successor.

Table 3: The person paradigms of Late Egyptian and Demotic Stative

		LATE EGYPTIAN STATIVE		DEMOTIC STATIVE	
		traditional paradigm	*reduced paradigm*	*traditional paradigm*	*reduced paradigm*
SG	1	sd³m-kw, sd³m-k	sd³m, sd³m-w, sd³m-tj, sd³m-tw	sd³m-k	sd³m-k, sd³m-ṯ, sd³m, sd³m-w
	2	sd³m-tj, sd³m-tw		sd³m-t̂	
	3M	sd³m, sd³m-w, sd³m-jj		sd³m, sd³m-w,	
	3F	sd³m-tj, sd³m-tw		sd³m-t̂	
PL	1	sd³m-n		sd³m-n	
	2	sd³m-tj, sd³m-tw		not attested	
	3M	sd³m, sd³m-w, sd³m-jj		sd³m-w	
	3F	sd³m-tj, sd³m-tw		sd³m-t̂	

A hallmark of Late Egyptian is the high degree of linguistic diversification, with morphological and syntactic innovations spreading in some registers, while others maintain a more traditional language use. The widespread diglossia leads to a linguistically unstable environment, which paves the way for diachronic change. A case in point for competing grammars is the Late Egyptian Stative, which exhibits a bewildering variety of allomorphs (Winand 1992: 103 §193).

(i) In the more conservative register of the *égyptien de tradition*, the inflectional paradigm of the Classic Middle Egyptian Stative remains largely intact, albeit with two major exceptions. There is another cross-paradigm development, where the first person plural ending *-wn* is replaced by the enclitic first person plural pronoun *=n*.

(ii) There are no examples of the second person plural ending *-tjwn* of the Middle Egyptian Stative in the person paradigm of the Late Egyptian Stative (Erman 1933: 158 §334; Winand 1992: 119–120 §216). Rather, the second person singular forms *-tj* and *-tw* are selected. I interpret this to mean that these forms are number-neutral.

(iii) In the more innovative registers, the inflectional paradigm is radically simplified and comprises only the original third person forms. Due to the neutralization of person and gender distinctions, the originally third person masculine and feminine forms can be now used interchangeably in first, second and third person contexts.

(iv) The alternation between a traditionally inflected and a simplified third person Stative paradigm carries over to the earlier stages of Demotic Egyptian. A crucial difference between the Late Egyptian and Demotic Stative paradigms concerns the loss of person and number features in first person singular Statives. As with featurally underspecified third person forms, the neutralized ***-k*** form can be used in first, second, and third person contexts. In other words, the erosion of the traditionally inflected paradigm leads to a greater variety of forms in the reduced paradigm. As a result, the two paradigms become virtually identical.

The erosion of the Middle Egyptian Stative paradigm and its transformation into an essentially lexical process of stem formation represents a case of endogenous morphological change. As such it proceeds largely independently from syntactic and semantic changes that occur in parallel. In what follows I present a three-stage model for the observed morphological changes, in which the different developmental stages are causually related to each other, with one inflectional change initiating the following one. The individual stages overlap to large extent with the historical stages Late Egyptian, Demotic, and Coptic.

5.2. Stage I: Two competing inflectional paradigms of the Late Egyptian Stative

The initial stage in the evolution of the Later Egyptian Stative is marked by the competition between two person paradigms: the traditionally inflected paradigm of the *égyptien de tradition* and the simplified third person paradigm of the more innovative registers. The latter paradigm is exemplified in (52a–i). Further observe the co-occurrence of the full and the reduced first person singular forms *-kw* and *-k* in the same sentence (52b).[45]

(52) The traditionally inflected Stative paradigm of Late Egyptian

a. 1SG *ptr tw=j* **ꜥnx-kwj** *m-r-ꜥ*
INTERJ PRES=1SG live-STAT.1SG still
'Look, I am still alive.' (Two Brothers 15:8)

b. *jw=j* **ꜥq-kw** *m-bꜣḥ nb* [*mꜣꜥt*]
AUX=1SG enter-STAT.1SG before lord.M.SG truth.F.SG
pr-k [*m*] *mꜣꜥ* *xrw*
come.forth-STAT.1SG as be.true.PTCP.ACT.M.SG voice.M.SG
'I entered in front of the lord (of truth) and I came out as a justified one (lit. true of voice).' (pap. Sallier I 8:4)[4]

c. 1PL *ptr n=k* {*tw*}*tw=n* **ḥꜥ-wn**
INTERJ for=2M.SG PRES=1PL stand-STAT.1SG
ḥr=n *n=k*
face.M.SG =POSS.1PL for=2M.SG
'Look, we are standing (here) (with) our face in your direction.' (*Deir el Medine online*, Ostracon Qurna 691//17/82, verso 3)[5]

d. *mj=t* *jr-jj=n* *wnwt* ***sdʒr-n***
come.IMP=2.F.SG make-PROS=1PL hour.F.SG sleep-STAT.1PL
'Come! Let us spend an hour sleeping (together).' (Two Brothers 5:1)

e. 2SG *jw=k* **ꜥq-tj** *m-bꜣḥ psdʒt*
AUX=2M.SG enter.STAT.2SG in-front ennead.F.SG
pr-tj *m mꜣꜥ* *xrw*
come.forth-STAT.2SG as be.true.PTCP.ACT.M.SG voice.M.SG
'You entered in front of the Ennead and come out as a justified one (lit. true of voice).' (pap. Anastasi V 15:5)

f. 2PL *js bn tw=tn* **rx-tj** *pꜣ-sxr*
Q-PCL NEG PRES=2PL learn-STAT.2M.SG DEF.M.SG-affair.M.SG
n(y) pꜣ-dmj ?
LINK DEF.M.SG-district.M.SG
'Don't you know the affairs of the district?' (*Deir el Medine online*, Ostracon Qurna 633:1)

g. 3M.SG *jw=f* ***wdʒꜣ-jj***
AUX=3M.SG be.healthy-STAT.3M
'He was in good health.' (Two Brothers 19:7)

---

[4] For the emendation of this passage see Gardiner (1937: 86a notes 3a–b).

[5] The combination of the interjection *ptr* 'look' with the ethical dative *n=k* 'for you' for emphatic purposes has not been mentioned in standard grammars of Late Egyptian (see Černý & Groll 1993: 148–149 §9.6). I interpret the repetition of *tw* in the sequence *twtw* as a dittography.

h. 3F.SG *jw=f ḥr gm tʾjj=f-ḥmt*
AUX=3M.SG at find.INF DEF.F.SG=POSS.3.MS.G-wife.F.SG
sdꜣ-tj mr-tj n ʿdʒʾ
lie-STAT.3F.SG be.sick-STAT.3F.SG in falsehood.M.SG
'He found his wife lying down, pretending to be ill.' (Two Brothers 4:8)

i. 3.PL 4 *j-swʾ-wt jm=sn jw=w* ***qʾ*** *zp-snw*
4 AUG-beam-F.PL from=3PL AUX=3PL be.high.STAT.3M very
'Four the beams from of them, which are very high'. (pap. Anastasi IV 8:5)

The availability of null pronominal subjects is restricted to the first and second person singular forms of the traditionally inflected paradigm (Erman 1933: 162–163 §349). The low frequency of examples of the kind in (53a–b) indicates the almost obsolete status of pronoun dropping in this language stage.

(53) The obsolete *pro*-drop pattern in traditionally inflected Statives

a. *pro* ***wrʃ-k*** *ḥr mtr=k*
spend.time-STAT.1SG at counsel.INF=POSS.2M.SG
'(Even though) I spend time counseling you.' (pap. Lansing 8:3)

b. *pro* ***jʾwt-tw*** *pʾ-nb n(y) pʾ-pr*
praise-STAT.2SG DEF.M.SG-lord.M.SG LINK.M.SG DEF.M.SG-mansion.M.SG
'Greetings (lit. you are praised), lord of the mansion.' (pap. Anastasi IV 5:11)

The simplified paradigm shows a neutralization of masculine and feminine gender. Consequently, gender neutrality provides the relevant cue for distinguishing members of the simplified paradigm from the homophonous third person masculine and feminine forms of the traditionally inflected paradigm. This is illsutrated by examples (54a–d).

(54) Neutralization of gender distinctions in the reduced third person paradigm

a. *m=k jb=j* ***pr-tw*** *m tʃʾ-wt*
INTERJ=2M.SG heart.M.SG =POSS.1SG come.forth-STAT.3F in furtive-GER.F.PL
'Look my heart has gone out in a furtive manner.' (pap. Anastasi IV 4:11)

b. *jw d̲ʒ̲rt̲=f* ***wʾḥ*** *ḥr dʒʾdʒʾ=f*
AUX hand.F.SG=POSS.3M.SG place.STAT.3M on head.M.SG=POSS.3M.SG
'His hand was placed on his head.' (Two Brothers 8:7)

c. *jw=st* ***nfr*** *m ḥʿ-wt=st*
AUX=3F.SG be.beautiful.STAT.3M in limb-F.PL=POSS.3F.SG
'She was physically attractive.' (Two Brothers 9:7)

d. *gm=k sw* ***wʾḥ*** ***grg-tw***
find.PFV=2M.SG CL.M.SG lie.STAT.3M establish-STAT.3F
'You find it (MASC. SING.) lying ready' (Late Ramesside Letters 47:14–15)

The neutralization of person and number distinctions in the simplified paradigm is exemplified in (55a–e).

(55) Neutralization of person and number distinctions in the reduced third person paradigm

a. 1SG *jw=j dy* ***xꜣ-tw***
AUX=1SG PCL abandon-STAT.3F
'I am abandoned here.' (Wenamun 2:66)

b. 1PL *xr tw=n* ***mni-tw*** *r ꜣbw*
PCL PRES=1PL land-STAT.3F at Elephantine
'We landed in Elephantine.' (Late Ramesside Letters 7:15)

c. 2SG *jw=k* ***ʿq*** *m-bꜣḥ psd³t* ***pr-jj***
AUX=2M.SG enter.STAT.3M in-front ennead.F.SG come.forth-STAT.3M
[m] mꜣʿ *xrw*
as be.true.PTCP.ACT.M.SG voice.M.SG
'You have entered in front of the Ennead and come out as a justified one (lit. true of voice).' (pap. Anastasi IV 4:1)

d. 2PL *[t]w=tn* ***ḥms*** ***qd***
PRES=1SG sit.STAT.3M be.cool.STAT.3M
'You are sitting comfortably (lit. in a cool state).'(*Deir el Medine online*, Ostracon Qurna 633:1)

In series of Stative predicates, traditionally inflected Statives occur side by side with person- and number-neutral third person forms without any detectable differences in meaning. There are no positional restrictions insofar as the two sets of forms can be used interchangeably as primary and secondary predicates, as argued in detail by Winand (1992: 127–132 §§226–232). Such hybrid formations can be seen as intra-sentential code-switches between two different registers of the same language.

(56) Series of first person singular Statives with traditional and reduced endings
xr xpr=j ***ḥms-k*** ***ḥqr-tw*** *ỉn nꜣ-nh-wt*
PCL AUX=1SG sit-STAT.1SG be.hungry-STAT under DEF.PL-sycamore-F.PL
'And I was sitting hungry under the sycamore trees.' (pap. British Museum 10403, 3:5–6)

There are no attested examples in which traditionally inflected first person singular and plural and second person singular forms are construed with third person subjects. This generally shows that person, number and gender oppositions are still productive in the inherited Middle Egyptian paradigm of the *égyptien de tradition*.

5.3. Stage II: The erosion of the traditionall Stative paradigm in Demotic

The next logical step in the evolution of the Stative involves the neutralization of person and number distinctions in the traditionally inflected paradigm. The productivity of the traditional paradigm in Early Demotic (i.e. the idiom of papyrus Ryland IX and related texts) is exemplified in (57a–g). Crucially, the first person singular ending *-k*, the second person singular and plural ending *-ṯ*, the third person masculine ending *-w*, and the first person plural ending *-n* all agree in person, number, and gender with the preverbal subject (see Johnson 1976: 16 note 53; Simpson 1996: 146 §9.5.2; *Vittmann 1998: 235* §3).

(57) The traditionally inflected Stative paradigm of Early Demotic

a. 1SG *dj(=j)* **ʕy-k** *n(y) ms*
PRES=1SG be.great-STAT.1SG LINK birth.M.SG
'I have become very old (lit. great of birth).' (pap. Rylands IX 5:20)

b. 1PL *tj=n* **hj-n**
PRES=1PL fall-STAT.1PL
'We have fallen.' (pap. British Museum 10845:25)

c. 2SG *jw=k* **ḥms-ṯ** *n=k dy n* *Tʃʔ=w-Dʒj*
AUX=1SG sit-STAT.2SG for=2M.SG PCL in Teuzoi
'And you reside here in Teuzoi' (pap. Ryland IX 9:11–12)

d. 2PL *i* *nʔ-ntʃr-w* **ḥtp-ṯ**
VOC DEF.PL-god-M.PL be.content-STAT.2SG
'Oh gods, may you be content!' (*Demotic book of breathing*, pap. Turin N 766, recto A:27)

e. 3M.SG *jw=f* *r* *xpr* *dy* **gb-w**
AUX=3M.SG PREP exist.INF PCL be.weak-STAT.3M
r$_{sic}$*-ḥr=tn*
PREP-face=POSS.1PL
'He will exist being weaker than you.' (pap. Rylands IX 13:14)

f. 3F.SG *tʔj=w-mdt* *ʔq-ṯ* *dy*
DEF.F.SG=POSS.3PL-wordt.F.SG destroy-STAT.3F PCL
'Their case is lost here.' (pap. Rylands IX 3:12)

g. 3.PL *nʔ-w ʃb-w* **jw-w** *r* *ḥt-ntʃr*
DEF.PL-priest-M.PL come-STAT.3M to house.F.SG-god.M.SG
r pʃ *nʔ-bdt* *r* *nʔ-sʔ-w*
to divide.INF DEF.PL-barley.F.SG according DEF.PL-phyle-M.PL
'(When it dawned) the priests came to distribute the barley according to the (individual) phyla.' (pap. Rylands IX 11:6)

According to Hughes (1969: 53), the traditionally inflected first person plural form *hj-n* 'we have fallen' in (57b) above is a *hapax legomenon*. Yet, it

is not entirely unexpected under the analysis pursued here, according to which early Demotic still has a traditionally inflected Stative paradigm. In religious texts with an archaizing language use, the *pro*-drop option is still available with second person singular Statives. Salutation formulae such as (58) are a case in point.

(58) Omission of the second person singular pronoun in formulaic expressions

pro ***jj-ṯ*** *m ḥtp* *pro* ***ʔwj-ṯ*** *m ḥtp*
come-STAT.2SG in peace.M.SG praise-STAT.2SG in peace.M.SG
bj=k *m ʃnx* *pro* ***ʃnx-ṯ*** *r nḥḥ* *dʒt*
soul.M.SG=POSS.2M.SG in life.M.SG live-STAT.2SG to eternity.M.SG eternity.F.SG
'May you come in peace! You are praised in peace. Your soul is alive. You will live forever.' (*Livre des transformations*, pap. Louvre E 3452, 2:16–17)

The simplified third person paradigm of Late Egyptian gradually replaces the traditionally inflected paradigm in Demotic. Consequently, it appears even in those corpora in which the traditional paradigm is still in use, as in the case of the papyrus Ryland IX (see Hughes 1968: 179 for the use of the reduced form *sdʒm-ṯ* in a first person singular context).

(59) Neutralization of person and number distinctions in the reduced third person paradigm

a. 1SG *dj=j* ***mtr-w*** *r-jr=tn*
PRES=1SG agree-STAT.3M AUG-to=2PL
[n] pʔ-nty *jw=tn* *jr=f* *nb*
PREP DEF.M.SG-COMP.REL AUX=2PL do.INF=POSS.3M.SG each.M.SG
'I agree with you on what you are going to do.' (pap. Berlin P 13562:24–25)

b. *tw=y* ***ʃʔyw-ṯ*** *n(y) ms*
PRES=1SG be.old-STAT.3F LINK birth.M.SG
r nʔ-stbe(-w) *nty* *jw(=y)* *n-im=w*
for DEF.PL-misfortune-M.PL COMP.REL AUX=1SG in-PRON=3PL
'I am too old for the misfortunes that I am (stuck) in.' (pap. British Museum 73785:3–4)

c. 1PL *dj=n* ***ʃʔ*** *(n) qns*
PRES=1PL size.STAT.3M in injustice.M.SG
'We have been taken unrightfully.' (pap. British Museum 10845:25–26)

d. *jw=n* ***ʃnx-ṯ*** *m-dʒrt* *pʔj=n-ḥrj*
AUX=1PL live-STAT.3F from-hand.F.SG DEF.M.SG=1PL-superior.M.SG
'We live through our superior.' (pap. Ryland IX 13:19)

e. 2SG *jn* *jw=k* ***rx*** *nxt.ṯ={t}n* ?
FOC AUX=2M.SG learn.STAT.3M protect.INF.PRON=POSS.1PL
'Are you able to protect us?' (pap. Rylands IX 17:3)

f. 2PL *jn tw=tn* *ḥr* *n p*ꜣ*-qdj*
FOC PRES=2PL stand.STAT3M in DEF.M.SG-vincinity.M.SG
n(y) Jmn
LINK Amun M.SG
'Are you standing around Amun?' (pap. Spiegelberg 4:8)

In coordinated clauses, traditionally inflected and simplified Statives can be used as free variants. Such hybrid formations are, however, less common than in Late Egyptian.

(60) Series of first and second person singular Statives with traditional and reduced endings

a. *tw=i* ***jww-k*** *jw=i* ***mnx***
PRES=1SG come-STAT.1SG AUX=1SG be.excellent.STAT.3M
'I arrived being excellent.'(pap. British Museum 10507, 2:18)

b. *jw=k* ***jj-ṯy*** *jw=k* ***jj-ṯy***
AUX=2M.SG come-STAT.2SG AUX=2M.SG come-STAT.2SG
jw=k ***ḥr-w***
AUX=2M.SG come-STAT.3M
'May you come, may you come content!' (Book of the Dead, pap. Bib. nat. 149 2:35)

The most eye-catching feature of the Demotic Stative is the neutralization of person and number features in traditionally inflected first person singular Statives. The neutralized form *sd*^{3}*m-k* is extended to second and third person contexts (including full NPs) as well as first person plural contexts. To illustrate the semantic bleaching of the originally first person singular form, more examples are presented than customary.

(61) Neutralization of person and number features in first person singular Statives

a. 1PL *tw=n* ***wj-k*** *r-ḫr=t*
PRES=1PL remove-STAT.1SG from-face.M.SG=2.F.SG
r *tꜣj=t-dnjt* ¼
from DEF.F.SG=POSS2.F.SG-part ¼
'We are far from you (woman) with respect to your one quarter part.'(pap. Vienna 9479:15)

b. 2SG *tw=t* ***wj-k*** [*r*] [*sḫmt*] [*Nbt-tꜣi*] [...]
PRES=2F.SG remove-STAT.1SG from woman.F.SG Nebtichis
'You (woman) are far from the lady Nebtichis' (pap. Vienna 9479:13–14)

c. 2PL *jw=tn* ***nḫ-k*** *j-jr* *pꜣ-ntr*
AUX=1PL come-STAT.1SG AUG-to DEF.M.SG-god.M.SG
jw$_{sic}$ *ḥꜣtj=tn* *mtr*
AUX heart.M.SG =POSS.2PL be.content.STAT.3M
'(It is good that) you come to the god with content hearts' (pap. Berlin P 13544:18–19)

d. 3M.SG *jw=f* ***nḫ-k*** *r-ḥrj* *m-sꜣ* *nꜣ-ntr-w*
AUX=3.M.SG go-STAT.1SG PREP-PCL in-back DEF.PL-god-M.PL
'When he (Thoth) went down behind the gods.' (Setne I, 3:12)

e. 3F.SG *jw=s* ***ḥms-k*** *ḥr* *wḫ-glgl*
AUX=3.F.SG sit-STAT.1SG on INDEF.M.SG-bed.M.SG
'while she (the deceased) rests on a bed' (pap. Louvre N 2420c:3)

f. 3.PL *jw=w* ***wj-k*** *r-ḥr=t*
AUX=3PL remove-STAT.1SG from-face.M.SG=2.F.SG
r *tꜣj=t-dnjt* ¼
from DEF.F.SG=POSS2.F.SG-part ¼
'They are far from you (woman) with respect to your one quarter part.' (pap. Vienna 9479:14)

The status of the person/number neutrality of the desemanticized first person singular ending *-k* has been controversially discussed in the Egyptological literature. Spiegelberg (1924: 53 §98) and Johnson (1976: 16, 19) contend that the *-k* ending has a purely graphemic reality, facilitating the distinction of Statives and infinitives in the written language. Winand (1992: 139–140 §249) rejects this explanation as '*un peu désespérée*' ('somewhat desperate') and suggests instead that the diachronic source of the *-k* ending is to be sought in an orthographical misinterpretation of a determinative. In my view, such grapho-phonological explanations are intrinsically problematic. Given that a single neutralized first person singular Stative survived in the Coptic lexical item *ənkotək* 'to sleep', first person singular ending *-k* must have been pronounced and serves a morphological function as the exponent of stative-resultative aspect.

Apart from the desemanticized traditional endings, Stative-inflected verb forms may be distinguished from corresponding infinitives by means of lexical prefixes. Johnson (1976: 18) maintains that Stative *rx* 'to know' is always modified by the prefix *jr-*. However, closer inspection of the data reveals that the prefixed form *jr-rx* may vary with the bare form *rx* in the same environment.

(62) *jr*-prefixed and analytic Statives of transitive-active *rx*

a. *tw=j* ***jr-rx*** *pꜣ-rn* *n(y)* *nꜣ-ntr-w*
PRES=1SG AUG-learn.STAT.3M DEF.M.SG-name.M.SG LINK DEF.PL-god-M.PL
'I know the name of the gods.' (Book of the Dead, pap. Bibliothèque nationale 149, 2:2)

b. *jw=f* ***rx*** *pꜣj=k-dȝr*
AUX=3M.SG learn.STAT.3M DEF.M.SG=POSS.2M.SG-diligence
'When he gets to know your diligence' (pap. Ryland IX 19:3)

The lexical prefix *jn-* has a much broader lexical distribution, but occurs most frequently with verbs of directed motion such as *jw* 'to come' and *nꜥ-j* 'to go', which describe movement directed towards or away from the deictic centre. The semantic distribution of the *jn*-prefixed and prefixless Statives is a moot point. Comparing the a- and the b-examples of (63)–(64), it looks as if the *jn*-prefixed forms *jn-jw* and *jn-nꜥ-k* vary with the simplex forms *jw* and *nꜥ-k* without any transparent differences in meaning. (We shall *have occasion to return to this point in §6.2.4.)*

(63) *jn*-prefixed and prefixless Statives of the movement verb *jw*

a. *jx* *pꜣ-nty-r-jw=k* ***jn-jw*** *r jr=f* *n ỉmꜣḫ* ?
what DEF.M.SG-COMP.REL-AUG-AUX=2M.SG AUG-go-STAT.3M to make.INF in end.M.SG
'What (is it) that you come to do in the end?' (Myth of the Sun's Eye 18:17–18)

b. *j-jr=w* ***jw*** *r* *jr* *jbyt* *n* *sỉḫ* (...)
AUG-AUX=3PL come.3M.SG to make.INF honey.F.SG in writing.M.SG
'If they come to write (lit. make in writing) honey.' (Myth of the Sun's Eye 7:17)

(64) *jn*-prefixed and prefixless Statives of the movement verb *nꜥ-j*

a. *jw=f* ***jn-nꜥ-k*** *r* *qbḥ*
AUX=3M.SG AUG-go-STAT.1SG to libate.INF
n$_{sic}$ *jt.ṯ=f* *Wsjr*
for father.M.SG.PRON=POSS.3M.SG Osiris. M.SG
'He (Horus) is going to make a libation for his father Osiris.' (pap. Spiegelberg 1:10–11)

b. *jw=f* ***jn-nꜥ-k*** *r* *qbḥ*
AUX=3M.SG AUG-go-STAT.1SG to libate.INF
n *jt.ṯ[=f]* *Wsjr*
for father.M.SG.PRON=POSS.3M.SG Osiris. M.SG
'He (Horus) is going to make a libation for his father Osiris.'(pap. Spiegelberg 1:8)

The Stative forms of *mwt* 'to be dead' are occasionally modified by the lexical prefix *jn-*, which seems to be an analogical formation with Stative-inflected movement verbs (cf. Hughes 1968:180).

(65) *jn*-prefixed and prefixless Statives of unaccusative *mwt*

a. *st* ***mwt-ṯ***
CL.3PL die-STAT.3F
'They are dead.' (pap. Rylands IX 2:13)

b. *nꜣ-nty* ***jn-mwt***
DEF.PL-COMP.REL AUG-die.STAT.3M
'Those who are dead' (pap. British Museum 73785:3–4)

The diachronic relationship between the Late Egyptian and the Demotic Stative can now be reconstructed along the following lines. Person and number distinctions are still fully recoverable in the traditionally inflected paradigm of the Late Egyptian Stative. In the transitional period from Late Egyptian to Demotic, distinct first and second person plural forms are subsequently being lost. Finally, the first person singular ending *-k* is deprived of its person and number features. This leads to a situation in which the traditional inflected and the reduced third person paradigm of Late Egyptian are fused into a new paradigm, whose members *sdꜣm-w*, *sdꜣm*, *sdꜣm-ṯ*, and *sdꜣm-k* can be used as free variants in all person, number and gender contexts. The largely unpredictable distribution and largely unintelligible semantics of the prefixes *jr-* and *jn-* indicates that these prefixes are part of the idiosyncratic information stored in the Demotic verbal lexicon.

5.4. Stage III: The lexical-derivational nature of Coptic Stative stem formation

The endpoint of the series of internal morphological changes in the Later Egyptian Stative is marked by essentially lexical character of Stative stem formation in Coptic. The verbal system is organized around relatively abstract lexical representations (roots) and fully specified surface forms (stems), which are associated with a particular morpho-semantic pattern (see Reintges 1994 for a more detailed discussion of Egyptian root–and–pattern morphology). Depending on grammatical and semantic appropriateness, consonantal roots occur in four and at most five mutually exclusive stem patterns. These are formally distinguished by means of vowel change (apophony) and phonotactic structure (syllabification, accent). Table 4 shows the four stem allomorphs of the biliteral root √KT 'to build, together with their valency pattern and aspectual semantics.

Table 4: The four distinct stem patterns of transitive verbs in Coptic (√KT 'to build')

VERB GRADE	STEM FORM	SEMANTICS	SYNTACTIC CONTEXT
Absolute state	*kɔt*	Eventive	Transitive verb plus prepositional object
Nominal state	*ket*	Eventive	Transitive verb plus direct object NP
Pronominal state	*kot*	Eventive	Transitive verb plus enclitic object pronoun
Stative	*kɛt*	Stative	Intransitive verb with affected subject

The formation of Stative stems is characterized by a morphology that is unusually rich and largely unpredictable. The present survey is restricted to the most common patterns. The Stative stem (STAT) of a given root will be contrasted with the corresponding Absolute state form (ABS). The reader is referred to Reintges (2004a: Chap. 6 for a detailed description of the Coptic system of stem formation.

(i) *Apophony.* At the root of the morphological complexity of the Coptic Stative lies a variety of apophonic patterns, i.e. changes in the vowel melody of the lexical verb stem. The most basic pattern is to be found in biliteral C_1VC_2 verbs, in which the lexically specified vowel /ɔ/ of the absolute state stem is replaced by the inflectional vowel /ɛ / in the corresponding Stative, e.g. *kɔt* (ABS) 'to build' vs. *kɛt* (STAT) 'to be built'; *muh* (ABS) 'to fill' vs. *mɛh, meh* (STAT) 'to be filled, full'. In triliteral $C_1VC_2əC_3$ verbs, apophony is restricted to the stressed vowel in the first syllable and the apophony involves an /ɔ ~ a / or /u ~ a/ alternation, e.g. *rɔ:hət* (ABS) 'to strike' vs. *ra:hət* (STAT) 'to be struck'; *nu:həm* (ABS) 'to save' vs. *na:həm* (STAT) 'to be saved'.[6]

(ii) *Reduplication and gemination.* Inchoative–Stative verbs are characterized by the same vowel alternation as biliteral verbs, but the inchoative stem is also differentiated from the corresponding Stative by gemination of the second root consonant, e.g. *hmom, ʃmom* (ABS) 'to become hot' vs. *hɛm* (STAT) 'to be hot'; *kmom* (ABS) 'to blacken' vs. *kɛm* (STAT) 'to be black'. Most Coptic pluractionals are frozen reduplicative formations, which terminate in a reduplicative CVC suffix. The alternation between the absolute state form and the Stative is marked by apophony as well as by the relocation of stress, e.g. (reduplicated biliterals) *ʃórʃər* (ABS) 'to destroy' vs. *ʃərʃór* (STAT) 'to be destroyed'; (reduplicated triliterals) *kʲlómləm* (ABS) 'to embrace' vs. *kʲləmlóm* (STAT) 'to be twisted' (Bendjaballah & Reintges 2009: 149–152).

(iii) *Remnant agreement inflection.* A remnant third person masculine or feminine ending *-w* and *-t* surfaces in the Stative stems of several verb classes (Erman 1933: 155§328; Winand 1992: 142–143 §253; Spiegelberg 1924: 53 §98), e.g. *tʃi* (ABS) 'to take' vs. *tʃɛw* (STAT) 'to be taken'; *ɔ:ɔ:* (ABS) 'to conceive' vs. *eet* (STAT) 'to be pregnant'; *kto* (ABS) 'to turn' vs. *ktɛw* and *ktoit* (STAT) 'to be turned'. The two residual endings can also be fused together, e.g. *sβo* (ABS) 'to learn' vs. *saβɛwt* (STAT) 'to be learned, educated'.

(iv) *Homophony, suppletion, and loss of Stative variants.* Pairs of phonologically identical Absolute state and Stative stem forms can be found in several Coptic dialects, e.g. (Sahidic) *hmoos* (ABS) 'to sit down' vs. *hmoos* (STAT) 'to sit'; (Bohairic) *srɔft* (ABS) 'to have leisure for' vs. *srɔft* (STAT) 'to be at leisure' (Funk 1977: 27–29). The Stative stem has been lost in a considerable number of transitive and unergative verbs, e.g. *eine* (ABS) 'to bring'; *wɔm* (ABS) 'to eat'; *moste* (ABS) 'to hate'; *me* (ABS) 'to love'; *mooʃe* (ABS) 'to go away'; *kim* 'to move' (ABS). Copto-Greek verbs are excluded from Stative formation. This is so because Greek verbs are as borrowed as nominal stems, while the Stative represents a purely verbal category (Reintges 2004b: 76–79). The Absolute state form of *ei* 'to come' *has a* suppletive Stative form *neu* (< *nu:* 'to go') (cf. Jernstedt 1927: 34).
[6]

6. Clines of grammaticalization

The restructuring of the Stative conjugation in Late Egyptian and Demotic manifests a relatively independent series of morphological changes. The main targets of parallel syntactic and semantic changes are Stative posture verbs on the one hand, and verbs of directed motion on the other hand. The incipient grammaticalization of cardinal posture verbs into aspectual auxiliaries indicating continuative, progressive and inchoative aspect represents a syntactic innovation of Late Egyptian, which enhances the language's expressive power. It looks as if this diachronic process is subsequently reversed in Demotic Egyptian. The path of grammaticalization marked out by stativized GO- and COME-constructions is even more complex, since the two patterns show overlapping aspectual functions.

6.1. Lexical and grammaticalized uses of Statives in Late Egyptian

6.1.1. Valence change in transitive–based Statives

Transitive Statives display a decreasing frequency in Late Egyptian. This is a good indication for a change in the valency pattern of the Stative, with transitive–active uses becoming more restricted and even obsolete. Černy & Groll (1993: 197 §12.3) put forward the much stronger claim that certain types of transitive verbs are not stativizable. A case in point is perception verbs. For

[6] In her optimality-theoretic analysis of Coptic root and pattern morphology, Kramer (2006) entertains two conflicting hypotheses about the Stative. The first hypothesis is that the infinitive forms the derivational base for the Stative, which is based on the semantically less marked character of the infinitive *vis-à-vis* the Stative (Kramer 2006: 402). However, the absolute state and the nominal state (which are lumped together as 'infinitives') convey eventive semantics and could not possibly serve as the derivational base for a Stative stem form. It would therefore be more accurate to say that the eventive and the Stative stem allomorphs are independently derived from the underlying consonantal root. The second hypothesis is that "the base for the Stative is a consonantal root, and not an infinitive" (Kramer 2006: 403). It is difficult to see how this would account for the morphological complexity of Coptic Stative formation, which retains diverse non-root material in various verb classes.

the historical linguist, it is often difficult to decide whether the non-attestation of a particular form is due to a lexical restriction or is simply an accidental gap in the language's documentation. In the case at hands, there is some evidence suggesting that Stative-inflected perception verbs like *sdʒm* 'to hear' are permissible in the context of analytic causatives formed with the ditransitive verb *dj* 'to give'.

(66) Transitive–active Stative of perception verb *sdʒm*

jm jb=k ***sdʒm*** *j-dʒd-w-t=j*

give.IMP heart.M.SG =POSS.2M.SG hear.STAT.3M AUG-say-PASS$_1$-PTCP.F.SG=POSS.1SG

'Let your heart listen to what I said!' (pap. Anastasi III 4:1)

Epistemic present tense sentences are the most common pattern for transitive-active Statives.

(67) Lexical uses of Stative *rx*

a. *tw=j* ***rx-k*** *ʃnx-t* *njwt* *Tʔ-kʔrt*

PRES=1SG learn-STAT.1SG live-PTCP.F.SG city.F.SG Ta-Kāret.F.SG

'I know the citizen Ta-Kāret.' (pap. Anastasi V 14:1)

b. *tw=j* ***rx-kwj*** *[dʒd ntk* *wj(ʔ)-wj(ʔ)*]

PRES=1SG learn-STAT.1SG COMP YOU.M.SG be.sluggish-PLUR.PTCP.ACT.M.SG

'I know that you are sluggish.' (pap. Berlin 10463, verso 2–3)

In much the same way as English CAN (Palmer 1988: 16, 75–76; Bybee *et al.* 1994: 192–194), the construction Stative *rx* plus infinitival complement assumes modal overtones and expresses sensations (68a) as well as the subject's ability (68b) or disposition (68c).

(68) The grammaticalized use of Stative *rx* as a modal auxiliary

a. ***rx-tw*** *nw* *r* *jtn*

learn-STAT.2SG see.INF (more)than sun-disk.M.SG

'You can see better than the sun-disk.' (pap. Anastasi IV 5:11)

b. *jw=f* ***rx*** *sʃ* *r-jqr* *zp-snw*

AUX=3M.SG learn.STAT.3M write.INF PREP-perfect time-second.M.SG

'He could write completely flawlessly.' (Blinding of Truth 5:1)

c. *jnn nʔjj=k-sḫn-w* *ʕʃʔ* *r=k*

if DEF.PL=POSS.2M.SG-commission-M.PL be.numerous.STAT.3M for=2M.SG

bn jw=k ***rx*** *ʃm* *m* *pʔy-sḫn*

NEG AUX=2M.SG learn.STAT.3M go.INF from DEM.M.SG-commission.M.SG

n(y) *Pr-ʕʔ*

LINK Pharaoh.M.SG

'(Even) if your commissions are (far too) numerous for you, you cannot walk (away) from this commission of Pharaoh.' (Late Ramesside Letters 69:15)

The use of the Stative as a detransitivizing voice has become the predominant pattern for mono-transitive and ditransitive verbs. Detransitivized Statives assume a resultative-passive interpretation, where a potential or actually occurring state is presented as being externally caused.

(69) Detransitivized Statives with resultative–passive interpretation

a. *tw=j* ***ṯ͗ʾjj-tw*** *n* *tʾjj=k-mr(t)*
PRES=1SG rob-STAT.3F in DEF.F.SG=POSS.2M.SG-harbour.F.SG
'I have been robbed in your harbour.' (Wenamun 1:13)

b. *sw* ***ḥw-tw*** *ḥr* *sʾtw* ***ḥw*** *m* 100
CL.3.M.SG beat-STAT.3F on ground.M.SG beat.STAT.3M with 100
n(y) *sxt*
LINK.M.SG stroke.F.SG
'He is to be beaten on the ground, beaten up with 100 strokes.' (pap. Anastasi III 6:10)

c. *sw* ***smtr*** *m* *qnqnt* *dʒrj*
CL.3.M.SG examine.STAT.3M with beating.F.SG severly
'He was examined with very sever beatings.' (pap. Mayer A 8:22)

d. *j-jr=j* *gm-t=st* ***wn-tw*** *ʿn*
AUG-do.PFV=1SG find-INF=POSS.3F.SG open-STAT.3F already
'I found it (the tomb) already opened.' (pap. British Museum 10052, 1:16–17)

Detransitivized Statives may be expanded by an agentive *jn*-phrase to explicitly state the identity of the remote causer, but this construction has become virtually obsolete.

(70) Detransitivized Statives with agentive *jn*-phrase
sw ***gm-jj*** ***wdʒʾ*** *jn* *nʾ-rwd-w*
CL.3.M.SG find-STAT.3M be.intact.STAT.3M FOC DEF.PL-inspector-M.PL
'It (the tomb) was found intact by the inspectors.' (pap. Abbot 2:7)

6.1.2. Emerging auxiliary uses of posture verb

The Stative meanings 'to be in a sitting position', 'to be in a standing position' and 'to be in a lying position' of bodily posture verbs provide a rich source for figurative and grammaticalized extensions (Newman 2002: 1–3). Crosslinguistically, these verbs are likely to develop into various kinds of auxiliary verbs, in particular, copular/locative verbs and/or continuative, durative, and progressive auxiliary verbs. The semantic distinctions between aspectually used posture verbs may be subtle and concern the relative degree of temporal extension. One may therefore think of the three cardinal posture verbs as forming a kind of 'STAND' > 'SIT' > 'LIE' continuum (see, among various others, Comrie 1976: 102–103; Kuteva 1999; Newman 2002; Newman & Rice 2004; Lichtenberk 2002; Lemmens 2005).

In Late Egyptian, as in many other languages, pseudo-coordinative structures in which bodily posture verbs are coordinated with one or more lexical verbs facilitate their grammaticalization as aspectual auxiliaries. The employed cardinal posture verbs *ḥms* 'to sit' and *ʕḥʕ* 'to stand' may themselves occur as non-finite infinitival verbs or as Statives (Junge 2001: 84–85 §2.2.3; Winand 2006: 329–333). Generally, it seems that grammaticalized extensions co-exist in varying degrees with the original postural meaning (see Kuteva 1999: 206–210 for the comparable case of Bulgarian). This is exemplified in (65a–b), where the postural meaning of the third person feminine Stative *ḥms-tw* 'to be sitting' is maintained along with the metaphorical extension to continuative aspectual meaning.

(71) The posture and extended duration sense of Stative *ḥms-tw*

a. *jw=j* *xpr* ***ḥms-tw*** ***rm***
AUX=1SG become.STAT.3M sit-STAT.3F weep.INF
'I sat down weeping.' (Wenamun 2:64)

b. *jw=j* *dy* ***ḥms-tw*** ***w ʕ-k***
AUX=1SG PCL sit-STAT.3F be.alone-STAT.1SG
'I am sitting here (all) alone.' (Late Ramesside Letters 23:13)

Posture verbs may develop temporal and aspectual meanings without any trace of the original postural semantics. The Stative form *ḥms-tw* in (72) is extended to express durative or continuative aspect. A striking feature of this example is a nuance of prolonged inactivity, which is stressed by the temporal adverb *m-r-ʕ* 'still'.

(72) The continuative/durative aspectual extension of Stative *ḥms-tw*
tw=tn *dy* ***ḥms-tj*** ***ḥr*** ***jr-t*** *jx* *m-r-ʕ* ?
PRES=1SG PCL sit-STAT.2SG at do-INF what still
'And what are you still doing here (lit what are you sitting here still doing)?'(Horus and Seth 8:3)

When coordinated with another Stative, the third person masculine form *ʕḥʕ* has an inchoative and designates the coming about of a state without mentioning the agent. The development of a stativized verb 'STAND' into an inchoative aspect marker is a cross-linguistically well-attested grammaticalization pattern (see Newman 2002: 15–16; Newman & Rice 2004: 355–356 and the references cited therein). The type of state that is expressed by the lexical verb is characteristically one that is temporary or contingent rather than temporally unrestricted or absolute (Comrie 1976: 104; Smith 1991: 70). For the issue at hand, example (73b) is of particular interest insofar as it displays two distinct grammaticalized uses of the cardinal posture verb *ʕḥʕ*—one as consecutive clause marker (*ʕḥʕ-n=f* 'thereupon') and another one as an inchoative auxiliary (*ʕḥʕ* 's/he became').

(73) The inchoative extension of Stative ꜥḥꜥ

a. *jw=st* **ꜥḥꜥ** ***jwr-tj*** *pꜣy-grḥ*
AUX=3F.SG stand.STAT.3M conceive-STAT.3F DEM.M.SG-night.M.SG
m *wꜥ-ꜥd³d* *ꜥrj*
with INDEF.M.SG-child.M.SG small.PTCP.M.SG
'And that night she got pregnant with a child.' (Blinding of Truth 4:5)

b. *ꜥḥꜥ-n=f* **ꜥḥꜥ** ***jwr*** *m* *tꜣ-mtwt*
stand-PERF=3M.SG stand.STAT.3M conceive.STAT.3M with DEF.F.SG-sperm.F.SG
n(y) *Ḥr*
LINK.M.SG Horus.M.SG
'Then he (Seth) got pregnant with the sperm of Horus.' (Horus and Seth 11:12)

Things become more complicated when the aspectually used posture verb ꜥḥꜥ is coordinated with an infinitival construction. In this specific context, Stative ꜥḥꜥ comes close in interpretation to habitual form and describes a pattern of events that is characteristic for an extended period of time. Since the temporal schema for habitual sentences holds for an interval of time, they have the semantic properties of states (see Comrie 1976: 27–28; Smith 1991: 33–34).

(74) The habitual extension of the grammaticalized Stative form ꜥḥꜥ
pꜣ-skꜣ *nꜣ-nmḥjj-w* *jw=w* **ꜥḥꜥ** ***s-wꜣd³***
DEF.M.SG-plough.INF DEF.PL-free.man-M.PL AUX=3PL stand.STAT.3M CAUS-order.INF
pꜣjj=f-nbw *r* *pr-ḥd³* *n(y)* *Pr-ꜥꜣ*
DEF.M.SG=POSS.3M.SG-gold.M.SG to house.M.SG-silver LINK Pharaoh.M.SG
'(As for) the ploughing, the free men (customarily) hand over its gold (i.e. the profit) to the treasury of Pharaoh.' (pap. Valençay I, verso 3–4)[7]

Consider now the somewhat more complex example of a conditional sentence construction, in which an inchoative as well as a habitual interpretation of the first person singular Stative ꜥḥꜥ*-kwj* are excluded on the grounds that the initial protasis/IF–clause reports about a single event in the recent past. It rather looks as if the aspectual posture verb construction *tw=j* ꜥḥꜥ*-kwj gm* 'I was finally finding' has a progressive achievement sense. Progressive achievement sentences can have slow-motion or film-strip readings. When this happens, a normally instantaneous event is described as being stretched out over time (see Rothstein 2004: 37, 56–58 for further discussion and explication). A very similar

[7] The rendering of the causative biliteral *s-wd³* 'to bequeath, hand over' by the causative *mediae-aleph* verb *s-wꜣd³* 'to make green, flourish' is amply attested, e.g., *s-wꜣd³-n=f xt=f n ms-w=f* 'he handed over (*s-wꜣd³-n=f*) his property (*xt=f*) to his offspring' (*n ms-w=f*) (Teaching of Dua-Kheti §16.1); *s-wꜣd³-tw n=j xt nb-t* 'everything (*xt nb-t*) was handed over (*s-wꜣd³-tw*) to me (*n=j*)' (*Urkunden* IV 55:1).

temporal-extension function of aspectual posture verbs has also been observed for Oceanic languages (Lichtenberk 2002: 283–287).

(75) The progressive achievement sense of the first person singular Stative *ʕḥʕ-kwj*

xr jr [t]w=j ***ʕḥʕ-kwj*** ***gm*** *Ḥrj* (...)
PCL PCL PRES=1SG stand-STAT.1SG find.INF Hori.M.SG
jw=f d³d n=j tw=j mz n=k
AUX=3M.SG say.INF to=1SG PRES=1SG enter.STAT.3M for=2M.SG
jw=j ḥ2ʔb=f n=k
AUX=1SG send.INF=POSS.3M.SG for=2M.SG
'Now when I was finally spotting (lit. finding) (the scribe) Hori and he said to me « I can enter (the sanctuary) for you », I send him to you.' (pap. Nevill recto 3–4)[8]

In Kuteva's (1999) analysis, the possibility of having aspectual posture verb constructions in a language is contingent on the lexical use of posture verbs to express the location of inanimate objects entities in space. It is therefore predicted that "the languages that employ a 'sit'/'stand'/'lie' aspectual structure also have the verbs 'sit'/'stand'/'lie' as unmarked/ canonical encodings of physical objects" (Kuteva 1999: 197). This prediction is, however, not entirely borne out by the Late Egyptian evidence. Despite the diversity of aspectualized collocational patterns, the cardinal posture verbs *ḥms* and *ʕḥʕ* are generally restricted to human subjects in their lexical and grammaticalized uses. In other words, these verbs have never developed into unmarked encodings for the present location of inanimate subjects. (76a–d) further illustrate this point.

(76) The lexical use of Stative–inflected posture verbs

a. *ʕrztrt jw=s* ***ḥms-tj*** *ḥr zmyt n(y) pʔ-ywmʕ*
Astarte.F.SG AUX=3.F.SG sit-STAT.3F on dune.F.SG LINK DEF.M.SG-sea.M.SG
'(The goddess) Astarte who was sitting on a dune of the sea' (Astarte 2: x+18)

b. *jw=st* ***ḥms*** *m pʔjj=f-pr*
AUX=3F.SG sit.STAT.3M in DEF.M.SG=POSS.3M.SG-house.M.SG
'She was residing in his house.' (Two Brothers 9:9)

c. *m=k {w} pʔjj=k-sn ʕʔ* ***ʕḥʕ***
INTERJ DEF.M.SG=POSS.2M.SG-brother.M.SG big.M.SG stand.STAT.3M.SG
r ḥʔ-t=k ɣry pʔjj=f-njwy r ɣd{w}bw=k
at front.PRON=POSS.2M.SG with DEF.M.SG=POSS.3M.SG-spear.M.SG to kill.INF=POSS.2M.SG

[8] In this admittedly difficult passage, it may very well be the case that the progressive achievement reading goes together with greater vividness in the narration of events. The speaking person requests the attention of an unnamed deity for an oracle and describes the efforts that he has already been engaged in to contact him (see Barns 1949: 69).

'Look, your older brother is standing in front of you with his spear to kill you.' (Two Brothers 5:8–9)

d. *ntf p3-wn* 𓊪𓂝𓋴 *jrm n3-jtj3-w*
he DEF.M.SG-be.PTCP.ACT.M.SG stand.STAT.3M with DEF.PL-thief-M.PL
'It was him who was standing with the thieves.' (pap. Mayer A 1:4)

Stative-inflected posture verbs express a broad spectrum of aspectual and temporal connotations, ranging from continuativity and extended duration to inchoativity, progressive achievement and habituality. Yet, the auxiliation of posture verbs that we see in Late Egyptian does not show the rapid increase in frequency that is typical of grammaticalization processes. It is therefore not entirely unexpected that aspectually used posture verbs fall out of usage in the subsequent historical stage—a point to which we will return in §6.2.3.

6.1.3. The origins of the andative construction

As the terminology suggests, venitive and andative constructions are grammaticalized constructional patterns formed with the equivalent of English *come* and *go*. Cross-linguistically, movement verbs figure more prominently than desiderative and possessive verbs as lexical sources for future tenses (see Bybee *et al.* 1994: 266–268 tables 7.8 and 7.9). However, as pointed out by Bybee *et al.* (1994: 208), verbs of directed motion do not evolve into future tenses without there being an allative 'MOVEMENT–TOWARDS' component, where the movement is directed towards a particular goal. In general, the allative component is represented by a syntactically reduced clause—be it an infinitival or a subjunctive clause. The evolution of venitive COME- and andative GO-constructions is a well-attested phenomenon in the history of French, Spanish, Portugese and English (see, among various others, Fleischman 1983: 189–193; Hopper & Traugott 1993: 1–3, 82–86; Danchev & Kytö 1994; Nesselhauf 2010).

As is well known, the so-called first future in Coptic *f=na sɔ:təm* 'he will hear' descends from an andative construction formed with movement verb *nꜥ-j* 'to go' and an infinitival purpose clause (Gardiner 1906; Černy & Groll 1993: 339 §23.1; Junge 2001:127 §3.2.3). The infinitival purpose clause represents the allative or GOAL-component that the movement of the subject referent is directed to. As of yet, the details of the diachronic pathway of the GO-future has received little in Egyptological research. Right at the outset a question arises concerning the relation between the andative verb and a homophonous verb of manner of motion *nꜥ-j* 'to travel (by boat)': could it be that the former has been derived from the latter? (Parker (1961: 186) and Simpson (1996: 148 §9.5.2) make suggestions in this direction.) If so, then the erstwhile manner of motion verb has undergone a substantial lexical–semantic change, which blurred its manner component (travelling by boat) beyond recognition.

The andative construction is attested for the first time in Late Egyptian. An important part of its meaning is that the subject referent is already on the path and the movement is in progress. The overt aspect of the andative construction is the present progressive, which is marked by the locative preposition *m* 'in' in the case of movement verbs. As shown by the contrast between (77a) and (77b), the Late Egyptian andative construction is still very close to the literal meaning of change in physical location, where the subject moves away from a location close by or identified with the speaker (for the disappearance sense of English *go*, see Bybee *et al.* 1994: 269; Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1995: 241–242, 302–303 footnote 8).

(77) The lexical and the emergant prospective use of the infinitival andative construction

a. *xr jr sw* ***m*** ***n*** *ỉjj* *ỉr* *nʔ-ỉn-w*
PCL PCL CL.3M.SG in go.INF under DEF.PL-tree-M.PL
'Then he was going under the trees.' (Horus and Seth 6:2)

b. *pʔỉjj-mỉ* *nty* *tw=j* ***m*** ***n*** *ỉjj* *r* *jr=f*
DEM.M.SG-journey COMP.REL PRES=1SG in go.INF to make.INF=POSS.3M.SG
'The journey that I am about to make' (Late Ramesside Letters 35:15)

Despite the strong intentional reading with first person singular subjects, the andative construction in (77b) above functions not so much as an immediate future, but rather as a periphrastic expression of prospective aspect. Prospective aspect relates the present state of the subject to some subsequent situation. It thus comprises the future-oriented dimension of current relevance (see Comrie 1976: 64–65; Fleischman 1983: 191–192). The same semantic contrast between the lexical sense of change in physical location and a periphrastic prospective aspect expression can also be observed for a syntactic variant of the Late Egyptian andative construction, in which the andative verb appears in its Stative–inflected form *n-jj*.

(78) The lexical and the emerging prospective uses of the stativized andative construction

a. *ptr st jw=w* ***n-jj*** *r qbḥ*
INTERJ CL.3PL AUX=3PL go-STAT.3M to watery.region.M.SG
'Look, they (the geese) are departing for the watery region.' (Wenamun 2:66)

b. *st* ***n-jj*** *r mỉ*
CL.3PL go-STAT.3M to travel.INF
'They are about to travel.' (pap. Strasburg 24 V, verso x+2)

c. *jʔ wn=f* ***n-jj*** [*r*] *smj* [...]
PCL AUX=3M.SG go-STAT.3M to report.INF
'Indeed, he is at the point of making a report.' (pap. Strasburg 24 V, recto x+5)

Despite its diachronic productivity, the Stative variant of the andative construction has not been acknowledged in Egyptological studies. The commonly received wisdom is that this construction type is derived by the deletion of the locative preposition *m* 'in' (see Černy & Groll 1993: 339 §23.1; Winand 1992: 422–423 §656). This stipulation is, however, not very well motivated empirically, since Stative–inflected movement verbs are commonly used to indicate motion-in-progress. The progressive reading can be reinforced when the movement path is made explicit by a prepositional phrase or by a predicative adjunct like *wꜣww-tj* 'from a distance' in example (79).

(79) The progressive sense of Stative–inflected verb of directed motion

jw=st	*dy*	***jꜣj-tj***	*wꜣww-tj*
AUX=3F.SG	PCL	come-STAT.3F	be.distant-STAT.3F

'She was coming from a distance (lit. to be far away).' (Horus and Seth 6:4)

In contrast to cardinal posture verbs, which have started to develop into continuative, progressive and inchoative aspect markers, the fluctuating results of lexical-semantic change are less transparent in Stative-inflected movement verbs. These verbs are at the verge of grammaticalizing into periphrastic prospective forms only in the very local context of the andative construction.

6.2. Lexical and grammaticalized uses of Statives in Demotic Egyptian

The Demotic Stative is a showcase for the language's transitional grammar in morphological, syntactic, and semantic respects. Morphologically in the sense that traditionally inflected Statives co-exist with reduced third person forms and are ultimately fused into a single, featurally impoverished paradigm. Syntactically in the sense that some of the structural changes that we have observed for the Late Egyptian Stative are completed in Demotic, while other changes are put on hold and still others are advancing. The obligatory intransitive character of the Demotic Stative can be seen as a stabilized pattern. A case in point for an uninterrupted or failed syntactic change is the predominantly lexical use of cardinal posture verbs, while the diversified aspectual collocational patterns of these verbs have fallen out of use. Although Stative-inflected verbs of directed motion generally move up the grammaticalization cline, the situation is complicated by the fact that stativized venitive and andative construction enter into competition with each other.

6.2.1. The obligatorily intransitive character of the Demotic Stative

The Demotic Stative functions as an obligatorily detransitivizing voice, where the affected subject corresponds semantically to the patient of mono- and ditransitive verbs, as seen in examples (80a–b). The productivity of this

constructional pattern also appears from the possibility of deriving detransitivized Statives directly from nominal roots. In examples (80c), the Stative *sḫn* 'to be crowned' (< *sḫn* 'crown, diadem) has no corresponding Eventive form (see Simpson 1994: 148 §9.5.2 (4)).

(80) Detransitivized Statives in Demotic

a. *tws jw wn-nʔ-w jw(=j)* ***hb-k*** (...)
INTERJ AUX IMPERF AUX=1SG send-STAT.1SG
'Look, when I was sent out ...' (pap. Ryland IX 13:5)

b. *nʔy=k-xl-w st* ***dj-t*** *r-bnr*
DEF.PL=POSS.2M.SG-tooth-M.PL CL.3PL give-STAT.3F PREP-PCL
'(As for) your teeth, they are placed (lit. given) outside' (Mythos of the Sun's Eye 17:28)

c. *jw=w* ***sḫn*** *(n) nʔ-sḫn-w n(y) nʔ-nʧr-w* (...)
AUX=3PL crown.STAT.3M with DEF.PL-crown-M.PL LINK DEF.PL-god-M.PL
'They are crowned with the crown of the gods ...' (Canopus Degree H 19)

It is possible though not at all common to expand a detransitivized Stative construction by means of an oblique phrase, which designates the remote causer. Yet, in contrast to Late Egyptian, the proclitic focus particle *jn* is no longer attested in this function. It is replaced by the compound preposition *m-dʒrt* 'through the hand (of)', where the inalienable possessed noun *dʒrt* 'hand' represents the demoted agent or causer in a pars pro toto fashion. As shown by the contrast between examples (81a) and (81b–c), the oblique *m-dʒrt* phrase can be combined with both detransitivized and intransitive–unergative Statives.

(81) Detransitivized and intransitive Statives with oblique *m-dʒrt*

a. *tws jw(=j)* ***grʕ-k*** *m-dʒrt.ṯ=<t>n* (...)
INTERJ AUX=1SG reject-STAT.1SG through-hand.F.SG.PRON=POSS.2PL
'Look, when I was rejected by you' (pap. Ryland IX 13:13)

b. *jw=n* ***ʃnx-ṯ*** *m-dʒrt pʔ-j=n-ḥrj*
AUX=1PL live-STAT.3F through-hand.F.SG DEF.M.SG=1PL-superior.M.SG
'We live through our superior.' (pap. Ryland IX 13:19)

c. *mdt* ***ʃʃʔ-w*** ***ʃm*** *n=w m-dʒrt=f*
thing.F.SG many-M.PL go.STAT.3M for=3PL in-hand.F.SG=POSS3.M.SG
'Many things are stolen (lit. have departed) by him.' (Demotic Letter to Thoth, pap. Oriental Institute Chicago 19422: 7–8)

The sole exception to the intransitivity restriction of transitive-based Statives are epistemic sentence constructions formed with the allomorphs *rx* and *jr-rx*. Their original lexical sense 'to know (through learning)' surfaces in the context of nominal and pronominal objects and complement clauses, as seen in (82a–b) and (83a–b).

(82) Lexical uses of Stative *rx*

a. *jw=f* **rx** *pꜣj=k-dʒr*
AUX=3M.SG learn.STAT.3M DEF.M.SG=POSS.2M.SG-diligence
'When he gets to know your diligence' (pap. Ryland IX 19:3)

b. *twys* *tw=y* ***jr-rx*** *tn*
INTERJ PRES=1SG AUG-learn-STAT.3M CL.2PL
'I know you (plural).' (Book of the Dead, pap. Bib. nat. 149, 1:28)

There is some degree of syntactic variation in the complement structure of epistemic sentences. One possibility is to extrapose of the embedded clause to the right periphery of the main clause. When this happens, an impersonal third person singular feminine clitic pronoun *s(y)* 'it' appears in postverbal position. Alternatively, the clause is subordinated to the NP *pꜣ-xpr* 'the fact' (see also Parker 1961: 184).

(83) Syntactic variation in the complement structure of epistemic sentences

a. *nꜣj=k-xjr* **rx** *s(y)*
DEF.PL=POSS.2M.SG-enemy.M.SG learn.STAT.3M CL.F.SG
dʒd *nꜣ-wꜣḥ-w* *mw* [...] *tꜣj* [...]
COMP DEF.PL-place.PTCP.ACT.M.PL water.M.SG COP.F.SG
'You (lit. your enemies) know that it were the choachytes' (pap. Louvre E 7854, recto 3)

b. *dj=k* **rx** *pꜣ-xpr* *jw* *tꜣ-dnjt*
PRES=2M.SG learn.STAT.3M DEF.M.SG-fact.M.SG AUX DEF.F.SG-share.F.SG
ḥm-ntr *Jmn* *Tꜣj=w-Dʒj* *ḥnꜥ* *psdʒt=f*
servant.M.SG-god.M.SG Amun.M.SG Teuzoi with ennead.F.SG=POSS.3M.Sg
jnk *s(y)*
I CL.F.SG
'You know the fact (that) (as for) the share of the prophet of Amun of Teuzoi and his ennead, it (is) mine.' (pap. Ryland IX 8:1–2)

With infinitival complements, Stative *rx* continues to be used as a modal verb that expresses ability, possibility and permission. (84a–c) are typical examples.

(84) The grammaticalized use of Stative *rx* as a modal auxiliary

a. *jn* *jw=k* **rx** *nxt.ṯ{t}=n* ?
FOC AUX=2M.SG learn.STAT.3M protect.INF.PRON=POSS.1PL
'Are you able to protect us?' (pap. Rylands IX 17:2–3)

b. *jw=f* **rx** *tqn* *n rn=s*
AUX=3M.SG learn.STAT.3M gleam.INF in name=POSS.3F.SG
'And he can gleam on account of it (lit. in her name).' (pap. Ryland IX 6:3)

c. *jn-nʔ pʔy=n-ḥrj d^{3}d n=j jm ʃʃ Nwt*
FOC-PCL DEF.M.SG=1PL-superior.M.SG say.INF to=1SG come.IMP to city.F.SG
*jn jw(=j) **rx** tm jj*ʔ
FOC AUX=1SG learn.STAT.3M NEG.AUX come.INF
'If our superior says to me «Come to the City (i.e. Thebes)!», how could I not come?' (pap. Ryland IX 12:13)

The Demotic situation is basically identical to the one in Late Egyptian, with the detransitivized uses of the Stative becoming the norm. There is some degree of syntactic variation in the factive use of the Stative *rx*, while there is no such variation in its more grammaticalized use as a modal auxiliary.

6.2.2. The complementarity between adjectival *nʔ*-verbs and Stative formation

Demotic has a class of derived adjectival verbs, which are distinguished from other morphological classes by means of the prefix *nʔ-* (see Spiegelberg 1924: 60–61 §117; Johnson 1976: 21–22, 83–86; Simpson 1996: 127–128 §8.1; Vittmann 1998: 236 §6). A characteristic feature of *nʔ*-derived verbs is that they are not stativisable, whereas the adjectival base verb fully participates in the inchoative–Stative alternation. (85a–c) involves the adjectival base verb *ʕʃʔ* 'to be numerous'

(85) Derived *nʔ-* verbs vs. inchoative- and Stative-inflected adjectival verbs

a. *nʔ-ʕʃʔ nʔ-bʔk-w Pr-ʕʔ*
AUG-be.numerous.PFV DEF.PL-servant-M.PL Pharaoh.M.SG
'Numerous are the servants of Pharaoh.' (pap. Ryland IX 10:14)

b. *bn jw **ʕʃʔ=s***
NEG AUX be.numerous.PFV=3F.SG
'It won't be much.' ('Onchsheshonqy 16:24)

c. *ḥtp ntʃr jw=f **ʕʃʔ-w***
offering.M.SG god.M.SG AUX=3M.SG be.numerous-STAT.3M
pʔ j-wn-nʔw ʃsp r Jmn Tʃʔʃʔʃʔʃʔʃʔʃʔ=w-D^{3}j
DEF.SG.M AUG-AUX. PTCP.M.SG -IMPERF receive.STAT.3M to Amun M.SG Teuzoi
'It (was) was a plentiful god's offering dedicated to (the god) Amun of Teuzoi.' (pap. Ryland IX 6:14–15)

Simpson (1996: 128 §8.1) contends that the meaning of the Stative of adjectival verbs "does not differ appreciably from that of a n*ꜣ*-form". Here I propose an alternative analysis, which explains the complementary distribution between derived adjectival verbs and Stative formation in semantic terms. Generally speaking, *nʔ*-adjectival verbs and their Stative counterparts correspond to the distinction between individual-level and stage-level predicates (Kratzer 1995). Simplifying matters somewhat, individual-level predicates ascribe a permanent

or characteristic property to the subject, while stage-level predicates designate more transitory properties that change over time. As individual-level predicates, *nʔ*-adjectival verbs are semantically incompatible with the Stative, which has a stage-level interpretation.[9]

6.2.3. The increasing non-grammaticalized uses of cardinal posture verbs

The cardinal posture verbs *ʕḥʕ* 'to stand' and *ḥms* 'to sit' are generally used as main verbs and describe the at-rest position of the subject and its location relative to some deictic reference point.

(86) The lexical locative sense of Stative-inflected *ʕḥʕ*

a. *jn tw=tn* ***ʕḥʕ*** *n pʔ-qdj* *n(y) Jmn*
FOC PRES=2PL stand.STAT in DEF.M.SG- DEF.M.SG-vincinity.M.SG LINK Amun M.SG
'Are you standing around Amun?' (pap. Spiegelberg 4:8)

b. *wʕ-xl* *jw=f* ***ʕḥʕ.j-k***
INDEF.M.SG-boy.M.SG AUX=3M.SG stand-STAT.1SG
'A boy who was standing (there)' (Setne I, 5:34)

The positional sense of Stative *ḥms* can be extended to include a slightly more grammaticalized use as a locative–existential copular verb 'to dwell, reside, remain'. As a predicative adjunct, Stative *ḥms* comes close in meaning to a manner adverbial 'at ease, calmly'.

(87) The lexical at-rest sense of Stative-inflected *ḥms* and its extensional uses

a. *wʕ-t-gwʔt* *jw Wsjr* ***ḥms-k***
INDEF-F.SG-chapel.F.SG AUX Osiris.M.SG sit-STAT.1SG
(n) pʔjj=f-bḥd *ỉn=s*
in DEF.M.SG=POSS.3M.SG-throne.M.SG in=3F.SG
'A chapel where Osiris sits on his throne' (Book of the Dead, pap. Bib. nat. 149, 1:22–23)

---

[9] The *nʔ*-formation includes *mr* 'to fall sick' (Johnson 1976: 22). As a change of state verb, *mr* can be classified as an individual-level predicate and is therefore stativisable. Notice, however, that the derived adjectival verb *nʔ-mr* has a somewhat different meaning, functioning as an individual-level predicate of the subject NP *ʃnj nb* 'every sickness'. I propose to render its meaning as 'to be bitter'.

(i) The semantic distinctions between the derived adjectival verb *nʔ-mr* and its Stative counterpart *mr*

a. ***nʔ-mr*** *ʃnj* *nb*
AUG-be.sick.PFV sickness.M.SG each.M.SG
'Every sickness is bitter.' ('Onchsheshonqy 26:9)

b. *m-ir* *ʕrq* *ʕdʒ* *jw=k* ***mr***
NEG.IMP-do.GER.M.SG oath.M.SG false.M.SG AUX=2M.SG be.sick.STAT
'Do not make a false oath, if you are in trouble (lit. sick).' ('Onchsheshonqy 16: 13)

b. *jw=k* ***ħms-ṯ*** *n=k* *dy* *n* *Tʃʔj=w-Dʒj*
AUX=2.M.SG sit-STAT.2SG for=2M.SG PCL in Teuzoi
'And you reside (lit. are sitting) here in Teuzoi' (pap. Ryland IX 9:11–12)

c. *jw=f* *jr* *ʃʔ=f* *n* *xpr*
AUX=3M.SG make.INF surplus.M.SG=POSS.3M.SG as become.PTCP.ACT.M.SG
jw=f ***ħms***
AUX=3M.SG sit.STAT.M.SG
'He will send the rest (of his life) (lit. his surplus) as someone who is being at rest (lit. while he is sitting).' (pap. Ryland IX 10:18)

Intriguingly, the diversified aspectual uses of Late Egyptian posture verbs are no longer attested, whereas the non-grammaticalized uses prevail. In Demotic, these verbs mainly function to express the spatial relation of (human) subjects. The evolution of posture verbs is therefore not a case of degrammaticalization or 'degrammation', during which a modal or aspectual auxiliary verb shifts to a lexical verb (see Norde 2009: 136–143 for case studies and discussion). Since the grammaticalized and the lexical uses of these verbs had always coexisted, we are dealing with the kind of change that Haspelmath (2004: 33–35, 38–39 note 11) has termed 'retraction'. Retraction is a diachronic process, where the more grammaticalized usages become marginalized or even obsolete, while the lexical and non-grammaticalized usages increase in frequency (see also Norde 2009: 121–122, 136–142). Since there is no evidence that new lexical verbs developed out of aspectual auxiliaries, the retraction process that cardinal posture verbs have undergone in Demotic Egyptian does not pose a challenge for the unidirectionality of grammaticalization processes.

6.2.4. Future and non-future uses of Stative venitive and andative constructions

Bybee *et al.* (1994: 269) scrutinize the differences in temporal deixis that exist between andative GO- and venitive COME-construction. With andative constructions, the speaker's vantage point is identified with the moment of speech, while the event in question is situated in the future. In a sense, then, the subject is moving away from the speaker's vantage point towards the event. With venitive constructions, on the other hand, the speaker's vantage point is projected into the future, "very close to the time at which the event is anticipated to occur".

Due to their inherent tense-deictic orientation, venitive constructions often have immediate future reference as their basic meaning, which none of the andative futures has (see Bybee *et al.*'s 1994: 268 table 7.11, 27.2 table 7.12). Bybee *et al.* (1994: 269) offer a cognitive explanation for this typological generalization: since COME-futures entail that the speaker's viewpoint is directed towards the future rather than the present, it follows that "this dislocation of perspective

would not usually involve a projection into the distant future but would more often be a point in time near at hand, yielding an immediate future".

Shifting the attention to Demotic movement verb constructions, a number of complicating factors come into play even if the larger picture is in line with Bybee *et al.*'s (1994: 266–273) findings. One such factor is the convergence between venitive and andative constructions, which are difficult to tear apart in terms of their exact temporal reference. Another factor is the continuing resultative and presentational usages of Stative COME. Consequently, Stative COME-constructions cover a broad spectrum of both future and non-future meanings.Finally, the corresponding GO-construction reaches a peak in grammaticalisation with the sudden emergence of the uninflected tense/aspect particle *nʔ*.

6.2.4.1. The aspectual differentiation of jn*-prefixed and prefixless Statives*

I begin by examining Stative COME-constructions. Johnson (1976: 19, footnote 80) advances an aspectual distinction between *jn*-prefixed and prefixless Statives: the former are said to convey a present progressive meaning, while the latter show the familiar resultant state interpretation. The aspectual and temporal distinctions that can be observed with the first person singular Statives *(j)n-jj-k* and *jj-k* in (88a–b) lend initial support to such claims.[10]

(88) The progressive vs. the resultative meaning of the Stative forms *(j)n-jj-k* and *jj-k*

a. *dj(=j)* ***n-jj-k*** *r rsj* *jrm=k*
PRES=1SG AUG-come-STAT.1SG to south.M.SG with=2.M.SG
'I am coming south with you.' (pap. Rylands IX 5:4)

b. *dj(=j)* ***jj-k*** *r* *Tʃʔj=w-Dʒj*
PRES=1SG come-STAT.1SG to Teuzoi
'I came (back) to Teuzoi.' (pap. Rylands IX 2:5)

As already hinted at in *§5.3,* there are empirical problems with the proposed aspectual differentiation. As Johnson herself (1976: 19, footnote 80) admits, this distinction cannot be replicated for other movement verbs, most prominently, the GO-verb *nʕ-j*. The minimal sentence pair in (89a–b) clearly shows that the two Stative forms *jn- nʕ-k* and *nʕ-k* are free variants of each other.

[10] Johnson (1976: 19, 63) argues that the prefixed forms *n-jj-k* and *jn-nʕ-k* are derived from a present progressive construction, which is formed with the locative preposition *m* 'in' and the infinitival form of the movement verb in question. The Demotic prefix *jn* thus corresponds to an earlier form *m*. An analysis along these lines is, however, untenable from the perspective of grammaticalization theory and formal syntax alike, since it presupposes some kind of rebracketing mechanism across a phrasal or clausal boundary: [subject] + [*m*] + [infinitive] → [subject] + [*m* + infinitive]).

(89) *jn*-prefixed and prefixless Statives of the movement verb *nʿj*

a. *jw=f* ***jn-nʿ-k*** *r* *qbḥ*
AUX=3M.SG AUG-go-STAT.1SG to libate.INF
n_{sic} *jt.t=f* *Wsjr*
for father.M.SG.PRON=POSS.3M.SG Osiris. M.SG
'He (Horus) is going to make a libation for his father Osiris.' (pap. Spiegelberg 1:10–11)

b. *jw=f* ***jn-nʿ-k*** *r* *qbḥ*
AUX=3M.SG AUG-go-STAT.1SG to libate.INF
n *jt.t[=f]* *Wsjr*
for father.M.SG.PRON=POSS.3M.SG Osiris. M.SG
'He (Horus) is going to make a libation for his father Osiris.'(pap. Spiegelberg 1:8)

There is evidence to suggest that *jn*-prefixed and prefixless Statives of the venitive verb *jy* are less rigidly distinguished in terms of their aspectual and temporal semantics than is envisaged in Johnson's proposal. As shown by the contrast between (90a) and (90b), the prefixless form *jw-w* may assume a present progressive interpretation, while the prefixed variant *jn-jw-w* is by no means excluded from past tense contexts.

(90) Marked temporal interpretations of the Stative variants *jw-w* and *jn-jw-w*

a. *jw=f* ***jw-w*** *r rsj* *mj* *ḫn=w* *s(y)*
AUX=3M.SG come-STAT.3M to south.M.SG give.IMP order.SUBJ=3PL CL.F.SG
r *dj-t* *nw=w* *(r-)dʒbʔ.t=f*
to give-INF see.SUBJ=3PL PREP-account.PRON=3.M.SG
'When he is comes southwards, let it be ordered (lit. *give* that they order) to have him being looked after.' (pap. Berlin P 13579: x+15–16)

b. *jw=w* ***jn-jw-w*** *r-bnr* *ḥʔt=f* *jrm* *nʔ-gʔ-w(t)*
AUX=3PL AUG-come-STAT.3M PREP-PCL front=POSS.3M.SG with DEF.PL-shrine-F.PL
n(y) *nʔ-ntr-w*
LINK DEF.PL-god-M.PL
'And they (i.e. the town folk) came out in front of him (Ptolemaios IV) with the shrines of the gods' (Raphia Decree M 16)

Even though the Statives *n-jw-k* and *jn-jw-w* considered so far cannot straightforwardly be identified with a present progressive form per se, there is a clear statistical preference for the *jn*-prefixed allomorphs to appear in this particular context. To make sense of this frequency pattern, I propose an analysis in terms of an isolated lexical–semantic change, which affects only one or two paradigmatic forms of a single verbal item. Due to its limited scope, the change does not carry over to semantically closely related lexical items.

6.2.4.2. The presentative and the narrative past tense use of prefixless Statives

The prefixless Statives *jw-ṯ*, *jw-w* and *jw* are commonly used to describe the appearance of the subject referent on stage. In this meaning, these forms are informationally light and behave like copular verbs. As discussed in §3.2.2, the presentative function of Stative–inflected COME-verbs can be traced back all the way down to Old Egyptian and thus demonstrates a remarkable continuity of contextual meaning and function.

(91) The presentative use of the Statives *jw-w* and *jw-ṯ*

a. *tw=y* ***jw-w*** *n=k*
PRES=1SG come-STAT.3Mto=2M.SG
'I have come unto you.' (Setne II, 6:12)

b. *tw=y* ***jw-ṯ*** *j-jr.n=k* *pꜣ=y-nb*
PRES=1SG come-STAT.2M.SG AUG-to.PRON=2M.SG DEF.M.SG=POSS.1SG-lord.M.SG
'I have come unto you, my lord.' (Book of the Dead, pap. Bib. nat. 149, 1:26)

A collocational pattern for stativived COME-verbs is their narrative use as a historical present perfect. To the best of my knowledge, Johnson (1976: 45) was the first to observe the mismatch between the present tense morphology and syntax of the entire construction and the past tense interpretation of the prefixless Statives *jw-w* and *jw-ṯ*.

(92) The narrative past tense use of the Statives *jw-w* and *jw-ṯ*

a. *Jꜣḥ-ms* *sꜣ* *Pꜣ-dj-Ḥr-n-P* ***jw-w***
Jahmes.M.SG son.M.SG Pa-di-Hor-en-Pe.M.SG come-STAT.3M
n *pꜣ-tꜣ* *rsy* r_{sic} *Tꜣj=w-Dʒj*
from DEF.M.SG-land.M.SG southern.M.SG to Teuzoi
'Jahmes, son of Pa-di-Hor-en-Pe, came from the Southern Land to Teuzoi.' (pap. Rylands IX 1:1–2)

b. *dj=n* ***jj-ṯ*** r_{sic} *Tꜣj=w-Dʒj* *ỉn* *tgs* 2
PRES=1PL come-STAT-3F to Teuzoi in ship.M.SG 2
'We came to Teuzoi in two ships.' (pap. Ryland IX 19:20)

This mismatch can be explained as originating in the resultant state interpretation of these forms, to wit, the implicature that the movement event in question has reached its culmination by the moment of speech.[11]

[11] This particular function of Stative COME-verbs can be seen as a revival of the narrative uses of the Old and Middle Egyptian Stative (see above §§3.1.3 and 4.2), albeit with two important differences. First and foremost, there is no restriction to first person singular narration. Secondly, the narrative use of the Demotic Stative seems to be largely restricted to movement verbs.

6.2.4.3. The immediate future tense orientation of the venitive construction.

The prefixed Statives *jn-jj-ṯ* and *jn-jw* are typically associated with prospective aspect. As illustrated in (93a–b), the most natural contextualization is one of imminent actualization, perhaps coupled with modal overtones of immediate future certainty and prediction.

(93) The present prospective interpretation of the Statives *(j)n-jj-ṯ* and *jn-jw*

a. *jw=f* ***jn-jw-ṯ*** *r* *Nwt*
AUX=3M.SG AUG-come-STAT.3F to city.F.SG
'He is coming to the City (i.e. Thebes).' (pap. Spiegelberg 3:6)

b. *pꜣ-ꜣḥ* *nty* *xpr* *n* *pꜣ-tʃ* (...)
DEF.M.SG-battle.M.SG COMP.REL happen.STAT.M.SG in DEF.M.SG-district.M.SG
jw=f ***jn-jw*** *n* *mhwꜥt*
AUX=3M.SG AUG-come.STAT.3M as family.F.SG
{n} wbꜣ *tꜣ=s-jrjt*
against DEF.F.SG=POSS.3F.SG-comrade.F.SG
'The battle that happens in the district (...), it will come as one family being opposed to another one.' (pap. Krall 9:10–11)

With human subjects, the current relevant of a forthcoming situation ties in with the notion of intention, arrangement and scheduledness (see Huddleston 2002: 171 §8.3, 210–212 §10.2; Nesselhauf 2010: 165–166 for the English *be going to* plus infinitive and the progressive futurate construction).

(94) The present prospective venitive construction

a. *pꜣ-hrw* *rsṯj* *st* ***jn-jw***
DEF.M.SG-day.M.SG tomorrow.M.SG CL.3PL AUG-come.STAT.3M
r *ɣdb.ṯ=f*
to kill.INF.PRON=POSS.3M.SG
'Today or tomorrow, they are going to kill him.' (Qasr Ibrim, pap. Cairo JE 95206, 9–10)

b. *jw=j* *jr-rx* *n* *nꜣ-[ntj]* ***jn-jw-w***
AUX=1SG AUG-learn.STAT.3M PREP DEF.PL-COMP.REL AUG-come-STAT.3M
r *xpr* *n.im=f*
to happen.INF to.PRON=3M.SG
'I know the (things) which are going to happen to him.' (Setne II, 2:15)

The present prospective differs in tense from an otherwise similar variant formed with the prefixless Statives *jw-w* and *jw*. Consequently, the time of the anticipated event is situated in the past.

(95) The past prospective venitive construction

a. *Pꜣ-dj-Jtm* ***jw*** *r mwt*
Pa-di-Atum.M.SG come.STAT.3M to die.INF
'Pa-di-Atum was about to die (lit. came to die).' (Family Archive from Siut, pap. British Museum 10591 recto, 2:17)

b. *Stne* ***jw-w*** *r dwn=f*
Setne.M.SG come.STAT.3M to rise.INF=POSS.3M.SG
'Setne was about to rise himself (lit. came to rise himself)' (Setne I, 5:31–32)

The semantics of this construction is that of a past prospective, which combines prospective aspect with past tense reference. It roughly corresponds to the past tense forms of the English prospective paraphrases *be about to* plus infinitive and the less common *be at the point of* plus gerund V-*ing* construction, which imply extreme closeness and immediacy (see Comrie 1976: 64; Huddleston 2002: 212 §10.2, footnote 68).

6.2.4.4. The near future and volitional orientation of the andative construction

The venitive construction considered so far shows a wide range of future and non-future uses. This contrasts with the andative construction, which always serves as a future time expression. The futurate orientation is even manifest in those contexts in which the andative verb is used in its literal sense, describing movement away from the speaker's vantage point.

(96) The displacement sense of the Stative–inflected andative verb *jn-nʕ-k / nʕ-k*

a. *j-jr=k* ***jn-nʕ-k*** *r-ḥrj r Kmy*
AUG-AUX=2.M.SG AUG-go-STAT.1SG PREP-PCL to Egypt
r_{sic} *jr ḥq n.im=f* (...)
to make.INF socery.M.SG in.PRON=3M.SG
'If you go to Egypt to do socery therein (...)' (Setne II, 6:1)

b. *jw=f* ***nʕ-k*** *r-ḥrj m-sꜣ nꜣ-ntfr-w*
AUX=3.M.SG go-STAT.1SG PREP-PCL in-back DEF.PL-god-M.PL
'And he (the god Thoth) went up behind the gods.' (Setne I, 3:12)

When compared to the Late Egyptian predecessor, the Demotic *jn-nʕ-k / nʕ-k* plus infinitival purpose clause displays an overall increase in frequency. At the same time, there is a semantic bleaching of the movement sense, which is indicative of an advanced state of grammaticalization. The more grammaticalized use of the Stative-inflected andative verb as a future tense auxiliary becomes particularly transparent when the infinitival purpose clause itself contains a verb of directed motion such as *ʃm* 'to go away'.

(97) Semantic bleaching of the Stative–inflected andative verb *nʕ-k*

jw=f ***nʕ-k*** *r* *ʃm* *n=f*

AUX=3.M.SG go-STAT.1SG to depart.INF for=3M.SG

'It (the evil bird) would depart.' (Setne II, 6:23)

Although no statistical evidence is available at present, the andative construction is outnumbered by the futurate progressive and the present prospective variants of the venitive construction. Due to a considerable degree of semantic overlap, the two periphrastic future tenses are in a competition with each other. There is reason to believe that the temporal spectrum of the venitive construction is that of an immediate future, while the corresponding andative construction locates a forthcoming event at a greater distance from the moment of speech.

(98) The future and intention-based meaning of the andative future

a. *jw=k* ***nʕ-k*** *r* *dj-t* *jn=w*

AUX=2M.SG come-STAT.1SG to give-INF bring.SUBJ=3PL

pʔj=f-ʕ.wj *r* *pʔ-jtn* *r-dʒbʔ.t̂=s*

DEF.M.SG=POSS.3M.SG-house.M.SG to DEF.M.SG-earth.M.SG PREP-account.PRON=3F.SG

'Will you cause his house to be torn down to the ground (lit. cause that *they* give to earth) because of it?' (Setne I, 6:14)

b. *jw=j* ***jn-nʕ-k*** *r* *tʃʔy.t̂=s* *r Jbt*

AUX=1SG AUG-go-STAT.1SG to depart.INF.PRON=POSS.3F.SG to Abydos.M.SG

r *dj-t* *ħtp=s* *n* *ʕlgh ʕh*

to give-INF rest.SUBJ=3F.SG in Algah.M.SG

'I shall take it (i.e. the mummy of Osiris) away to Abydos to let (lit. to give) it rests in Alghah.' (London/Leiden Magical Papyrus 15:30)

Apart from the futurate connotations, the andative construction often conveys a strong sense of volition and intentionality. The Demotic andative future therefore confirms Bybee *et al.*'s (1994: 254) conjecture that "all futures go through a stage of functioning to express the intention, first of the speaker, and later of the agent of the main verb".

6.2.4.5. The rise of the nʔe plus infinitive construction

An entirely novel pattern first appears in Roman Demotic (Spiegelberg 1924: 69 §139, 77 §162, Johnson 1976: 63). Its main components are the andative particle *nʔe* and an infinitival complement. The uninflected particle *nʔe* is in principle morphologically invariant, yet shows a limited degree of allomorphic variation with the less common variants *nʔ* and *nʔw*. Some initial examples are shown in (99a–c).

(99) The *nʔe* plus infinitive construction in Late Demotic

a. *(j)n st **nʔe** ʃn n=y n pʔ-hrw* ?
FOC CL.3PL FUT inquire.INF for=1sg on DEF.M.SG-day.M.SG
'Are they going to inquire for me today?' (London/Leiden Magical Papyrus 18:31)

b. *rmt nb **nʔ** gm mdt (...)*
man.M.SG ech.M.SG FUT find.INF word.F.SG
'Every man will prosper (lit. find things) ...' (stele Aswan 1057:3)

c. *dj=j **nʔw** dj-t jr pt ħw r pʔ-tʔ*
PRES=1SG FUT give-INF make.SUBJ sky.F.SG rain.F.SG to DEF.M.SG-earth.M.SG
'I will cause the sky to make rain on earth.' (pap. Vienna D 6920–22, recto x+2:6–7)

The received wisdom in traditional Egyptology is that the andative particle *nʔe* in Late Demotic and the cognate future tense marker *na* in Coptic still represent a Stative–inflected andative auxiliary verb (see Johnson 1976: 64; Jernstedt 1927: 34–35; Polotsky 1960: 402–403 §25, 1987/1990: 213–214 §12). The traditional view does not hold up under closer scrutiny, however. The main analytical problems it faces are the following ones:

(i) If the particle *nʔe* were, indeed, a Stative variant on a par with *jn-nʕ-k* and *nʕ-k*, one might wonder why the lexical verb must appear in its non-finite form. After all, Stative-inflected posture verbs can be coordinated with Stative-inflected lexical verbs in the aspectual posture verb construction (see §6.1.2 above).

(ii) Furthermore, one would predict — contrary to the facts — that the allative component be left intact. However, as already noted by (Polotsky 1960: 403, Obs. 2), there are no attested examples where the Coptic future particle *na* is construed with an infinitival purpose clause. The same holds true for the Demotic predecessor. I interpret this to mean that the particle *nʔe* is in a structural head–complement relation with the 'bare' infinitive, with the two constituent forming an indivisible prosodic unit.

(iii) The traditional view does not accommodate very well the morphology of the andative particle *nʔe*, in particular, the replacement of the voiced pharyngeal fricative /ʕ/ by a glottal stop /ʔ/ as well as its phonotactic properties—the fact that it leans on the linearly adjacent VP constituent.

Here I propose a tentative alternative analysis for the cyclic derivation of the particle *nʔe*, in which its phonological shape (surface form) and its prosodic properties (proclitic status) are closely related. The initial step in the morphological derivation is a process of participle formation, during which the base verb *nʕ-j* is phonologically reduced. The output of this process is a monosyllabic particle word * *nʕ* (96a), which is prosodically deficient and leans onto the following VP constituent. I furthermore assume that Late Demotic has a prohibition on guttural codas, which triggers the insertion of vowel epenthesis—either *-e* (i.e. /i e ə/) or *-w* /u/ (96b). Prevocalic /ʕ/ shows up as /ʔ/ (96c). Subsequently, the epenthesized

forms *nʔe–* /naʔi/ and *nʔw–* /naʔu/ undergo di*phthongization* to /nai̯/ and /nau̯/ (96d). The short form *nʔ* is in all likelihood already identical to Coptic *na* and hence, the output of the *monophthongization* of the /ai̯/ and /au̯/ (96e).[12]

(100) The cyclic derivation of the andative particle *nʔe*

a.	*nʕi*	→	*nʕ*	(Participle formation)
b.	*nʕ*	→	*nʕe* /naʕi/ var. *nʕw* /naʕu/	(Vowel epenthesis)
c.	*nʕe–*, *nʕw–*	→	*nʔe* /naʔi/ var. *nʔu* /naʔu/	(Lenition ʕ > ʔ)
d.	/naʔi/, /naʔu/	→	/nai̯/, /nau̯/	(Diphthongization)
e.	/nai̯/	→	/na/ [*nʔ*]	(Monophthongization)

The *nʔe*/*nʔw*/*nʔ* plus infinitive construction exhibits the expected low frequency of an emerging grammatical pattern. From the available evidence, it can, however, be concluded that the particle *nʔe* is not restricted to the immediate future, but may equally well express indeterminate and potentially distant future tense reference. Moreover, it may have intention-based as well as prediction-based readings, as seen in (101a–c).

(101) The future and intention-based readings of the particle *nʔe*

a. *j-jr=k* ***nʔe*** *dj* *ʃm* *sjw* *r-ɣrɣ* (...)
AUG-do=2M.SG FUT give.INF go.SUBJ star.M.SG PREP-PCL
'You will cause a star to go down (...)' (London/Leiden Magical Papyrus Verso 28:1)

b. *Ḥr* *jm* *n-j-jr=k* *wnm* ?
Horus.M.SG come.IMP CONJ-AUG-do=2M.SG eat.INF
Ḥr *jm* *(j)n* *j-jr=k* ***nʔe*** *wnm* ?
Horus.M.SG come.IMP FOC AUG-do=2M.SG FUT eat.INF
'Horus, come and eat! Horus, come! Are you going to eat?' (London/Leiden Magical Papyrus verso 33:3)

c. *dj=j* ***nʔw*** *smʔ* *r* *pʔ-tw*
PRES=1SG FUT bless.INF PREP DEF.M.SG-mountain.M.SG
'I am going to bless the mountain.' (pap. Vienna D 6920–22, recto x+2:7)

[12] Once we have a clearer picture of Demotic phonology and the historical sound changes, a less speculative analysis for the post-lexical phonology of the particle *nʔe* becomes feasible. For instance, it may very well be the case that the voiced pharyngeal fricative ʕ and theglottal stop ʔ are merged in /ʔ/ in Roman Demotic. Hayward & Hayward (1989) and McCarthy (1994) general discussion of the laryngeals /h ʔ / and the pharyngeals /ħ ʕ/ as members of a natural class of gutturals. The prohibition on guttural codas is attested in Bedouin Arabic and in Hebrew (see McCarthy 1994: 211–216 and the references cited therein). In Modern Hebrew, ʕ has disappeared but may resurface as ʔ in prevocalic position (e.g.; Idsardi 1997: 387–388).

The redistribution processes that COME-and GO-futures undergo turn out to be highly complex in themselves. The stativized venitive construction shows a surprising functional flexibility, with co-existing future and non-future uses. Nevertheless, it is replaced by the *nʔe*-prototype of the Coptic first future tense. The history of the Late Demotic particle *nʔe* is somewhat hazy, but seems to involve a category change from a semi-lexical category (the andative auxiliary verb) to a free functional morpheme without any detectable trace of the original spatial motion sense. The andative future tense construction *jn-nʕ-k* / *nʕ-k* plus infinitival purpose clause increases in frequency, but does not reach a peak in grammaticalisation. Subsequently, it enters into a suppletive relationship with the venitive construction.

6.3. Outlook: Main syntactic characteristics of the Coptic Stative

Within the Coptic root-and-pattern system, the Stative occupies a special position vis-à-vis other types of stem formation. From the perspective of major syntactic categories, the Stative has been singled out as an indisputably verbal category the Coptic descriptive tradition (inter alia; Stern 1880: 172–173 §348; Mallon 1953: 88 §199; Polotsky 1987/1990: 203 §2). In this respect, it differs categorially from the three eventive stem patterns (the Absolute state, the Nominal state and the Pronominal state), all of which exhibit nominal properties. For this reason, they have traditionally been analyzed as infinitives. Taking this line of thought a bit further, I propose that the Stative continues to exist as a residual finite verb pattern. With a morphology that is unusually rich and extremely complex, it looks like a derivational (lexeme-forming) category (see §5.4 above). At the same time, it behaves like an inflectional category, which shows regular and predictable semantic effects in different lexical classes of transitive and intransitive verbs (see Aronoff 1994: 125–127; Stump 2001: 14–19 for the derivation–inflection divide in morphological theory).

6.3.1. The obligatorily intransitive character of the Coptic Stative

With mono- and ditransitive verbs, Stative formation serves as a detransitivizing voice, which eliminates the agent and aligns the patient with the subject function. As many researchers have observed, detransitivized Statives assume a passive interpretation, where a potential or actually occurring state is presented as being externally caused (inter alia: Polotsky 1987/1990: 204–205 §4; Layton 2000: 129 §168a; Reintges 2004a: 228 §6.3.3).

To illustrate this point, verbs of creation such as *kɔt* 'to build' and *miːse* 'to deliver' are instructive. As discussed in §3.2.1, members of this class have a complex event structure consisting of a process and a result state. The Absolute state forms *kɔt* and *miːse* make direct reference to the process component (the

construction of a building, the delivery of a child), while the corresponding Statives *kɛt* 'to be (well) built' and *moːse* 'to be bred' denote the attained state.

(102) Detransitivized Statives of creational verbs

a. *ere* *nə-tʃatʃ* ***moːse*** *ənhɛt=uː*
REL (PRES) DEF.PL-sparrow delive.STAT in=3PL
'And sparrows are bred therein (in the cedars of Lebanon).' (Psalm 103:17)

b. *tʃe* *ne=f* ***kɛt*** *kalɔs*
COMP PRET=3M.SG build.STAT well
'Since it (the house) is built well' (Luke 6:48)

Polotsky (1987/1990: 207–209 §7) discusses a potential counterexample to the obligatorily intransitive character of the Coptic Stative.[13] The language has a wide array of verb–noun compounds and light-verb constructions. A case in point is the inchoative construction, which is composed of the nominal state form *ər* of the light-verb *eire* 'to make, do' and a determinerless, kind-referring noun or an adjective. Despite the overt transitivity of the verb–noun compound, the light-verb *ər* serves as an inchoative copular verb 'to become'. As shown by the minimal pair in (103a–b), the inchoative verb–noun compound may undergo stativization. In the resulting construction, the Stative stem form *o* functions as a BE-type copular verb, while the nominal complement is governed by the originally locative preposition *ən* 'in'. In this particular context, though, it functions as a comparative preposition 'as, like'.

(103) Inchoative verb–noun compound vs. Stative comparative construction

a. *a=tetən* ***ər*** *həmhal* *ən-tə-dikaiosynɛː*
PERF=2PL become.NOM servant.M.SG LINK-DEF.F.SG-justice.F.SG
'You have become the servants of justice.' (Romans 6:18)

b. *ne=tetən* ***o*** *ən* *həmhal* *pe* *ə ən-tə-dikaiosynɛː*
PRET=2PL be.STAT as servant.M.SG COP.M.SG LINK-DEF.F.SG-justice. F.SG
'You were the servants of justice.' (Romans 6:17)

Although the comparative *ən* plus determinerless noun or adjective is an obligatory constituent, the Stative comparative construction cannot be analyzed as having transitive valence. This is so because the comparative construction is a clausal rather than a phrasal constituent; it represents a small clause with

[13] Epistemic verbs, such as *eime* 'to know, understand' and *sowən* 'to know' do not instantiate transitive–active Statives, since they have no Stative stem allomorph to begin with. Accordingly, it is no longer possible to distinguish between the eventive acquisition of knowledge sense and the Stative possession of knowledge sense on a morphological basis. The Stative forms *rx* and *jr-rx* have been lost in the course of language history, leaving a trace in the uninflected modal auxiliary *əf* 'CAN'.

a prepositional predicate. To express temporal and aspectual distinctions, the Stative allomorph *o* is introduced into the structure via a rule of copula support. Accordingly, the inchoative verb–noun and the Stative comparative construction are only semantically related, but instantiate two different construction types.

6.3.2. The syntax of stativized movement verbs

In present tense constructions (which include the preterite tense/aspect particle *ne*), verb of directed motion must appear in their Stative form, while the use of the corresponding absolute state is excluded. Elsewhere (Reintges 2004: 216–217 §6.2.3) I argued that only the Stative is capable of expressing the motion-in-progress sense, which falls within the semantic spectrum of the present tense.

(104) The progressive interpretation of stativized movement verbs

a. *e=i* ***ϐek*** *e-pə-topos* *ən-Apa Mɛna* *ənta* *ʃlɛl*
REL(PRES)=1SG go.STAT to-DEF.M.SG-shrine.M.SG LINK-Apa Mena CONJ.1SG pray.ABS
'I am going to the shrine of Apa Mena to pray.' (Mena, Miracles 27b:23–25)

b. *awɔ:* ***ne=u:*** ***ϐek*** *tɛr=u:* *pe* *pə-wa*
and PRET-3PL go.STAT all= POSS.3PL COP.M.SG DEF.M.SG-one.M.SG
pə-wa *e-shai=f* *ənsa* *te=f-polis*
DEF.M.SG-one.M.SG to-write.PRON=3M.SG to DEF.F.SG=POSS 3M.SG-town.F.SG
'And they were all going, one after the other, to his town to be registered.' (Luke 2:3)

The progressive meaning of Stative movement verbs practically excludes a resultative interpretation, which carries the implicature that the event in question has reached its culmination point by the moment of speech. Yet, the resultative reading is attested with the venitive construction, although the collocational pattern as such is somewhat marginal and highly idiomaticized. It should be recalled from §5.4 that the venitive verb *ei* 'to come' has no corresponding Stative. Rather, this paradigmatic gap must be filled by suppletion, with the supplied form *nɛu* descending from the paradigm of the andative verb *nu:* 'to go'.

(105) The resultative use of the suppletive Stative stem *nɛu*

a. *awɔ:a=tetən* *pisteue* *t-e* *anok* *e=i* ***nɛu*** *eßol*
and PERF=2PL believe.ABS COMP I REL(PRES)=1SG come.STAT PCL
hitəm *pə-jɔt*
from DEF.M.SG-father.M.SG
'And you believed that I came from the Father.' (John 16:27)

b. *e=k* ***nɛu*** *tɔn* *pa-son*?
REL(PRES)=2M.SG come.STAT where DEF.M.SG.POSS.1SG-brother.M.SG
'Where did you come from, my brother?' (Acts Andrew and Paul 198:64–65)

The prospective venitive construction survives into Coptic virtually without semantic change. Although this future time expression it is still very close to its literal spatial motion sense, it admits a broader range of temporal interpretations. Besides the familiar immediate future, the anticipated event may also be located in an indeterminate and potentially more distant future. In this meaning, the venitive construction *nɛu* plus infinitival purpose clause may assume an intention- or prediction-based interpretation.

(106) The range of future tense interpretations of the prospective venitive construction

a. *kʲɔː nə=tən nau tʲe Hɛɬias* ***nɛu*** *e-nuɬəm əmmo=f*
stay.IMP CONJ=1PL see.ABS COMP Elias come.STAT to-save.ABS PREP=3M.SG
'Stay and see whether Elias will come to save him (Jesus).' (Matthew 27:49)

b. *f=****nɛu*** *e-krine əm-pə-kah*
(PRES)3M.SG=come.STAT to-judge.ABS PREP-DEF.M.SG-earth.M.SG
*f=****na*** *krine əm-t-oikuɯmenɛː hən-u-dikaiosynɛː*
3M.SG=FUT judge.ABS PREP-DEF.F.SG-world.F.SG in-INDEF.SG-justice.F.SG
awɔː nə-laos hən-te=f-me
and DEF.PL-nation in-DEF.F.SG=POSS.3M.SG-truth.F.SG
'He (the Lord) will come to judge the earth. He will judge the world in a rightful manner and the nations in his truth.' (Psalm 95:13)

It is worthwhile pointing out that in comparison with the fully productive future tense particle *na*, the venitive construction has a somewhat marginal status. This suggests that the construction is at the verge of becoming obsolete.

6.3.3. The syntax of stativized adjectival verbs

To complete the picture, I finally discuss Stative stem formation with bona fide unaccusative verbs. With verbs of change of state like *hmom* 'to become hot', the Stative *hɛm* 'to be hot' designates the transitory state whose change typifies the verb. This is then a constant in the applicability of the Stative throughout its entire life-cycle.

(107) The use of the Stative in unaccusative verbs of change of state
uɹe nə=g orəf an uɹe nə=g ***hɛm*** *an*
and.not NEG-2M.SG be.cold.STAT not and.not NEG-2M.SG be.cold.STAT not
'You are neither cold nor hot.' (Apocalypse 3:15)

As with Demotic, *na*-adjectival verbs are individual-level predicates, and hence not stativizable. The adjectival base verb, on the other hand, fully participates in the inchoative–stative alternation.

(108) Derived *na*-adjectival verbs vs. inchoative and Stative adjectival verbs

a. *alla* ***naʃɔ=u:*** *on* *ɔnkⁱ* *n-argos*
but (PRES) be.numerous.NOM PCL FOC DEF.PL-lazy.one
'But, again, lazy people are numerous.' (Shenoute, Leipoldt III 115:1–2)

b. *pɔ-tᶠoeis* *etße* *u* *a=u:* ***aʃai***
DEF.M.SG-lord.M.SG for what PERF=3PL multiply.ABS
ɔnkⁱ *n-et* *thliße* *ɔmmo=i*
FOC DEF.PL-COMP.REL (PRES) distress.ABS PREP=1.SG
'Lord, why have those who distress me become so numerous?' (Psalm 3:2)

c. *etße* *pe=k-ran* *pɔ-tᶠoeis*
for DEF.M.SG=POSS.2M.SG-name.M.SG DEF.M.SG-lord.M.SG
ka *pa-noße* *eßol* *tᶠe* *f=**oʃ*** *gar*
put.ABS.IMP DEF.M.SG.POSS.1SG-sin.M.SG PCL COMP (PRES) 3M.SG=multiply.STAT PCL
'For the sake of your name, Lord, forgive my sin because it is numerous.' (Psalm 24:11)

It generally appears, then, that the situation with the Coptic Stative is basically identical to the Demotic one. The main exception concerns the niche position of the venitive construction, presumably under pressure of the ubiquitous *na*-future. The decline of venitive and andative constructions that we see in Demotic and Coptic Egyptian can be seen as yet another case of retraction: the grammaticalized uses of stativized movement verbs as future auxiliaries become marginalized, whereas the lexical uses are increasingly regularized, as witnessed by the present progressive constraint.

7. Concluding remarks

Ancient Egyptian is a language in which the morphological distinction between events and states is essential part of grammar. Accordingly, the Stative showcases the diachronic stability of a verbal inflectional category. We have seen that the Stative paradigm comprises several layers of meaning of agreement, aspect and affected subject voice. The inflectional paradigm shows a split with respect to grammatical person. Null pronominal subjects are only permissible in first and second person contexts, in which the inflectional ending is unambiguously specified for person and number. In third person contexts, the presence of an overt subject pronoun is obligatory.

Stative inflection has a portmanteau character in expressing a particular constellation between the subject and the finite verb, whilst simultaneously specifying the resultative or Stative aspect of the predicate and the affected status of the subject referent. As a combined aspect–voice category, the Stative does not necessarily imply a valency–reducing operation and displays a broad semantic distribution across various classes of transitive, unergative and unaccusative

verbs. In detransitivized Statives, on the other hand, the agent is entirely removed from its argument structure, while the patient is aligned with the subject function. The observable resultative–passive reading of detransitivized Statives still differs from morphological passives, in which the presence of the agent is semantically implied. The systematic and largely predictable modification of lexical meaning by inflecting the finite verb for the Stative follows entirely from the semantic regularity of paradigmatically organized morphology.

As to the overall historical development, the Stative undergoes a change from an inflectional paradigm of person–number–gender markers to an essentially lexical process of stem formation. The primary target of diachronic change is grammatical agreement. The process of paradigm erosion starts out with the neutralization of the dual–plural distinction in the second person, which is already visible in the earliest language documentation. The dual number survives in third person forms in Middle Egyptian, although it is restricted to archaizing texts. The restructuring of the person paradigm of the Late Egyptian and Demotic Stative proceeds in chains, starting with the neutralization of the masculine–feminine gender distinction and the use of featurally reduced third person Statives in all other contexts. For Late Egyptian and early Demotic, it could be shown that a traditionally inflected paradigm co-exists with the reduced third person paradigm, although the available evidence suggests that the distinct second person plural form was lost in the transition from Middle to Late Egyptian. A typologically unusual feature of the Demotic Statives is the use of an originally first person singular Stative as an elsewhere form in first person plural as well as second and third person contexts. This points in the direction of a merger between the traditionally inflected and the featurally reduced third person paradigm.

The growth of morphological complexity in the evolution of the Later Egyptian Stative is in sharp contrast with a stable Stative–resultative semantics and relatively modest changes in valency. Most conspicuously, transitive–active Statives decrease in text frequency. It therefore looks as if the Later Egyptian Stative develops into a detransitivizing voice, with the affected subject as the sole argument. *The clearest examples for syntactic change concern Stative-inflected bodily posture and movement verbs, which are grammaticalized into aspectual auxiliaries of various kinds. It has been demonstrated that chains of grammaticalization and redistribution of forms in Late Egyptian and Demotic are highly complex in themselves. The picture is also somewhat distorted by retraction processes, during which aspectual posture verb constructions and futurate-prospective venitive and andative constructions become more and more marginalized and finally disappear under pressure of morphological innovations. The flipside of retraction is an unexpected increase in frequency in the lexical uses of these verbs.*

This large-scale investigation of the Ancient Egyptian Stative shed new light on the morphology as an independently changing component of grammar and the pivotal role of the person paradigm in inflectional change. It has also been shown that the big picture of diachronic continuity is some deceptive in view of many failed changes in the domain of auxiliation.

Bibliographical references

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2004. *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Allen, James P. 1984. *The Inflection of the Verb in the Pyramid Texts*. Bibliotheca Aegyptia 2. Malibu: Undena Publications.

Allen, James P. 1991. Form, Function, and Meaning in the Early Egyptian Verb. *Lingua Aegyptia* 1: 1–32.

Anderson, Stephen R. 1982. Where's Morphology? *Linguistic Inquiry* 13: 571–612.

Anderson, Stephen R. 1992. *A-Morphous Morphology*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 62. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Aoun, Joseph E., Elabbas Benmamoun & Lisa Choueiri. *The Syntax of Arabic*. Cambridge Syntax Guides. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Aronoff, Mark. 1994. *Morphology by Itself: Stems and Inflectional Classes*. Linguistic Inquiry Monograph 22. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Baerman, Matthew & Dunstan Brown. 2005. Syncretism in Verbal Person/Number Marking. In *The World Atlas of Language Structures. Edited by* Martin Haspelmath, Matthew S. Dryer, David Gil & Bernard Comrie. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 122–125.

Baerman, Matthew, Dunstan Brown & Grevill G. Corbett. 2005. *The Morphology–Syntax Interface: A Study of Syncretism*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 109. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Baker, Mark C. & Kenneth Hale. 1990. Relativized Minimality and Pronoun Incorporation. *Linguistic Inquiry* 21: 289–297.

Barns, John. 1949. The Nevill Papyrus: A Late Ramesside Letter to an Oracle. *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 35: 69–71.

Bendjaballah, Sabrina & Chris H. Reintges. 2009. Ancient Egyptian Verbal Reduplication: Typology, Diachrony, and the Morphology–Syntax Interface. Special Issue on Reduplication: Diachrony and Productivity. Edited by Bernhard Hurch & Veronika Mattes. *Morphology* 19: 135–157.

Bresnan, Joan & Sam A. Mchombo. 1987. Topic, Pronoun, and Agreement in Chicheŵa. *Language* 63: 741–782.

Bybee, Joan, William Pagliuca & Revere Perkins. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press.

Černý, Jaroslav & Sarah I. Groll. 1993. *A Late Egyptian Grammar*. Studia Pohl (Series Major 4). Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.

Cohen, David. 1989. *L'aspect verbal*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Collier, Mark. 1994. Grounding, Cognition and Metaphor in the Grammar of Middle Egyptian. *Lingua Aegyptia* 4: 57–87.

Comrie, Bernard 1976. *Aspect — An Introduction to the Study of Verbal Aspect and Related Problems*. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Corbett, Greville G. 2006. *Agreement*. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Danchev, Andrei & Merja Kytö. 1994. The Construction *Be Going to + Infinitive* in Early Modern English. In *Studies in Early Modern English*. Edited by Dieter Kastovsky. Topics in English Linguistics 13. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 59–77.

Deir el Medine on line — Nicht-literarische Ostraka aus Deir el Medine. 2002–2004. Edited by Günther Burkard, Maren Goecke-Bauer & Stefan Wimmer. Institute of Egyptology of the Ludwig-Maximilians University, Munich. Available at: http://obelix.arf.fak12.uni-muenchen.de/cgi-bin/mmcgi2mmhob/mho-1/hobmain. (Accessed August 2010).

Doron, Edit (1988). On the Complementarity of Subject and Subject–Verb Agreement. In *Agreement in Natural Language: Approaches, Theories, Descriptions*. Papers Presented at a Conference held at Stanford University in October 1984. Edited by Michael Barlow & C.A. Ferguson. Stanford, California: CSLI Publications, 201–218.

Doron, Edit. 2003. Agency and Voice: The Semantics of the Semitic Template. *Natural Language Semantics* 11: 1–67.

Dubinsky, Stanley & Silvester R. Simango. 1996. Passive and Stative in Chicheŵa: Evidence for Modular Distinctions in Grammar. *Language* 72: 749–781.

Edel, Elmar. 1955/1964. *Altägyptische Grammatik*. Analecta Orientalia 34/39, Rome: Pontificial Biblical Institute.

Edel, Elmar. 1959. Beiträge zur ägyptischen Grammatik. 1. Zum angeblich geminierenden Pseudopartizip der Verben III. infirmae. *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 84: 105–108.

Embick, David. 2004. On the Structure of Resultative Participles in English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35: 355–392.

Erman, Adolf 1889. Eine neue Art der ägyptischen Conjugation. *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 27: 65–84.

Erman, Adolf. 1933. *Neuägyptische Grammatik*. Leipzig: Verlag von Wihlem Engelman.

Fassi Fehri, Abdelkader. 1988. Agreement in Arabic, Binding and Coherence. In *Agreement in Natural Language: Approaches, Theories, Descriptions*. Edited by Michael Barlow & Charles A. Ferguson. Stanford: CSLI Publications, 107–158.

Fleischman, Suzanne. 1983. From Pragmatics to Grammar: Diachronic Reflections on Complex Pasts and Futures in Romance. *Lingua* 60: 183–214.

Fleischman, Suzanne. 1989. Temporal Distance: A Basic Linguistic Metaphor. *Studies in Language* 13: 1–50.

Frascarelli, Mara. 2007. Subjects, Topics and the Interpretation of Referential *Pro*. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 25: 691–734.

Funk, Wolf-Peter. 1977. Zur Syntax des koptischen Qualitativs. *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 104: 25–39.

Gardiner, Alan H. 1906. The Origin of the Tense Futurum I. *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 43: 97–98.

Gardiner, Alan H. 1937. *Late-Egyptian Miscellanies*. Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca 7. Brussels: Édition de la Fondation Égyptologique Reine Élisabeth.

Gardiner, Alan H. 1957. *Egyptian Grammar*. Being an Introduction to the Study of Hieroglyphs. Griffith Institute, Ashmolean Museum. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Greenberg, Joseph H. 1963. Some Universals of Grammar with Particular Reference to the Order of Meaningful Elements. In *Universals of Language*. Edited by Joseph H. Greenberg. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 73–113.

Grimshaw, Jane. 1990. *Argument Structure*. Linguistic Inquiry Monograph 19. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Haspelmath, Martin. 1990. The Grammaticalization of Passive Morphology. *Studies in Language* 14: 25–72.

Haspelmath, Martin. 2004. On Directionality in Language Change with Particular Reference to Grammaticalization. In *Up and Down the Cline—The Nature of Grammaticalization*. Edited by Olga Fischer, Muriel Norde & Harry Perridon. Typological Studies in Language 59. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 17–44.

Hayward, K.M. & R.J. Hayward. 1989. 'Guttural': Arguments for a New Distinctive Feature. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 87: 179–193.

Holmberg, Anders, Aarti Nayudu & Michelle Sheehan. 2009. Three Partial Null Subject Languages: A Comparison of Brazilian Portuguese, Finnish and Marathi. *Studia Linguistica* 63. Special Issue on Partial *Pro*-drop. Edited by Anders Holmberg, 59–97.

Hopper, Paul J. & Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 1993. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Huang, C.-T. James 1984. On the Distribution and Reference of Empty Pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 15: 531–574.

Huddleston, Rodney. 2002. The Verb. In *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Edited by Rodney Huddleston & Geoffrey K. Pullum. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 71–212.

Hughes, George R. 1968. A Demotic Plea to Thoth in the Library of G. Michaelides. *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 54: 176–182.

Hughes, George R. 1969. The Cruel Father: A Demotic Papyrus in the Library of G. Michaelides. In *Studies in Honor of John A. Wilson*. Edited by Gerald E. Kadish. Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 35. 43–54.

Idsardi, William J. 1997. Phonological Derivations and Historical Changes in Hebrew Spirantization. In *Derivations and Constraints in Phonology*. Edited by Iggy Roca. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 367–392.

Jaggar, Philip J. 1988. Affected-Subject ('Grade 7') Verbs in Hausa: What are they and where do they come from? In *Passive and Voice*. Edited by Masayoshi Shibatani. Typological Studies in Language 16. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 387–416.

Jaeggli, Osvaldo A. & Kenneth J. Safir. 1989. The Null Subject Parameter and Parametric Theory. In *The Null Subject Parameter*. Edited by Osvaldo A. Jaeggli & Kenneth J. Safir. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1–44.

Jansen-Winkeln, Karl. 1993. Das ägyptische Pseudopartizip. *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica* 24: 5–28.

Jernstedt, Peter V. 1927. Die grammatische und lexikalische Stellung des koptischen Verbums *na* «gehen». *Comptes Rendus de l'Academie des Sciences de l'Union République Soviétique Socialistes* 2: 33–35.

Johnson, Janet H. 1976. *The Demotic Verbal System*. The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 38. Chicago, Illinois: The Oriental Institute.

Joseph, Brian. 2009. Greek Dialectal Influence for the Role of the Paradigm in Inflectional Change. *Morphology* 19: 45–57.

Junge, Friedrich 2001. *Late Egyptian Grammar — An Introduction*. Translated from German by D. Warburton. Oxford: Griffith Institute.

Kammerzell, Frank. 1991a. Augment, Stamm und Endung. Zur morphologischen Entwicklung der Stativkonjugation. *Lingua Aegyptia* 1: 165-199.

Kammerzell, Frank. 1991b. Personalpronomina und Personalendungen im Altägyptischen. In *Ägypten im afro-asiatischen Kontext. Aufsätze zur Archäologie, Geschichte und Sprache eines unbegrenzten Raumes—Gedenkschrift Peter Behrends*. Edited by Daniela Mendel & Ulrike Claudi. Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere, Special Issue 1991. Cologne: University of Cologne, 177–203.

Keenan, Edward L. & Matthew S. Dryer. 2007. Passive in the World's Languages. *Language Universals and Syntactic Description*. Edited by T. Shopen. Vol. V.1. Second Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 325–361.

Klaiman, Miriam H. 1991. *Grammatical Voice*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 59. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kramer, Ruth. 2006. Root and Pattern Morphology in Coptic: Evidence for the Root. In *Proceedings of the 36th Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society (NELS 36)*. Edited by Christopher Davis, Anne Rose Deal & Yourri Zabbal. Amherst, Massachusetts: GLSA, 399–412.

Kramer, Ruth. 2009. VSO and SVO Order in Middle Egyptian. In *Afroasiatic Studies in Memory of Robert Hetzron: Proceedings of the Proceedings of the 35th Annual North American Conference on Afroasiatic Linguistics* (NACAL 35). Edited by Charles G. Häberl. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. 31–75.

Kratzer, Angelika. 1995. Stage-level and Individual-level Predicates. In *The Generic Book*. Edited by Gregory N. Carlson and Francis Jeffry Pelletier. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 125–175.

Kratzer, Angelika. 2000. Building Statives. In *Proceedings of the 26th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistic Society (BLS 26)*. Edited by Lisa J. Conathan, Jeff Good, Darya Kavitskaya, Alyssa B. Wulf & Alan C. L. Yu. University of California, Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society, 385–399.

Kuroda, Sige-Yuki. 1988. Whether We Agree or not: A Comparative Syntax of English and Japanese. *Linguisticae Investigationes* 12: 1–47.

Kuteva, Tania A. 1999. On 'Sit'/'Stand'/'Lie' Auxiliation. *Linguistics* 37: 191–213.

Layton, Bentley. 2000. *A Coptic Grammar*, With Chrestomathy and Glossary. Porta Linguarum Orientalium N.S. 20. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Lefebvre, Gustave. 1955. *Grammaire de l'égyptien classique*. Bibliothèque d'étude 12. 2nd edition (with collaboration of Serge Sauneron). Cairo: IFAO.

Lemmens, Maarten. 2005. Aspectual Posture Verb Constructions in Dutch. *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 17: 183–217.

Levin, Beth & Malka Rappaport. 1986. The Formation of Adjectival Passives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17: 623–661.

Levin, Beth & Malka Rappaport Hovav. 1995. *Unaccusativity at the Syntax-lexical Semantics Interface*. Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 26. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Levin, Beth & Malka Rappaport Hovav. 2010. Reflections on Manner/Result Complementarity. In *Lexical Semantics, Syntax, and Event Structure*. Edited by Malka Rappaport Hovav, Edit Doron & Ivy Sichel. Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics 27. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 21–38.

Lichtenberk, Frantisek. 2002. Posture Verbs in Oceanic. In *The Linguistics of Sitting, Standing, and Lying*. Edited by John Newman. Typological Studies in Language 51. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 269–314.

Lightfoot, David. 2006. *How New Languages Emerge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Loprieno, Antonio. 1995. *Ancient Egyptian - A Linguistic Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mallon, Alexis. 1953. *Grammaire copte. Bibliographie, chrestomathie et vocabulaire*. 4th ed. (with revisions by Michel Malinine). Beirut: Dar el Machreq.

Mathieu, Bernard. 2004. La distinction entre Textes des Pyramides et Textes des Sacrophages est-elle légitime ? In *D'un monde à l'autre: Textes des Pyramides et Textes des Sacrophages*. Actes de la table ronde internationale «Textes des Pyramides versus Textes des Sacrophages». IFAO (24–26 September 2001). Edited by Susanne Bickel & Bernard Mathieu. Bibliothèque d'étude 139. Cairo: Institute Français d'Archéologie Orientale, 247–261.

McCarthy, John J. 1994. The Phonetic and Phonology of Semitic Pharyngeals. In Phonological Structure and Phonetic Form. *Papers in Laboratory Phonology* 3. Edited by Patricia A. Keating. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 191–233.

Mchombo, Sam A. 2004. *The Syntax of Chichewa*. Cambridge Syntax Guides. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mittwoch, Anita. 2005. Unspecified Arguments in Episodic and Habitual Sentences. In *The Syntax of Aspect: Deriving Thematic and Aspectual Interpretation*. Edited by Nomi Erteschik-Shir & Tova Rapoport. Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics 10. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 236–254.

Nedjalkov, Vladimir P. & Sergej Je. Jaxontov 1988. The Typology of Resultative Constructions. In *Typology of Resultative Constructions*. Edited by Vladimir P. Nedjalkov. Typological Studies in Language 12. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 3–62.

Nesselhauf, Nadja. 2010. The Development of Future Time Expressions in Late Modern English: Redistribution of Forms or Change in Discourse? *English Language and Linguistics* 14: 163–186.

Newman, John. 2002. A Cross-linguistic Overview of the Posture Verb 'Sit', 'Stand', and 'Lie'. In *The Linguistics of Sitting, Standing, and Lying*. Edited by John Newman. Typological Studies in Language 51. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1–24.

Newman, John & Sally Rice. 2004. Patterns of Usage for English SIT, STAND, and LIE: A Cognitively Inspired Exploration in Corpus Linguistics. *Cognitive Linguistics* 13: 351–396.

Norde, Muriel. 2009. *Degrammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Oréal, Elsa. 2007. Fracture d'actance et dynamique morphosyntaxique: Le renouvellement du perfectif en Ancien égyptien. *Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris* 102 : 367–397.

Oréal, Elsa. 2009. Same Source, Different Outcomes: A Reassessment of the Parallel between Ancient Egyptian and Akkadian 'Stative' Conjugations. *Lingua Aegyptia* 17: 183–200.

Osing, Jürgen. 1977. Zur Syntax der Biographie des Wnj. *Orientalia* 46: 165–182.

Palmer, Frank R. 1988. *Mood and Modality*. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Parker, Richard A. 1961. The Durative Tenses in P. Ryland IX. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 20: 180–187.

Parsons, Terence. 1990. *Events in the Semantics of English*: *A Study in Subatomic Semantics*. Current Studies in Linguistics 19. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Perlmutter, David M. 1978. Impersonal Passives and the Unaccusative Hypothesis. In *Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*. Edited by Jeri *J. Jaeger*, Anthony C. Woodbury & Farrel Ackerman. Berkeley Linguistics Society: University of California, Berkeley, 157–189.

Polotsky, Hans Jakob. 1960. The Coptic Conjugation System. *Orientalia* 27: 392–422.

Polotsky, Hans Jakob. 1987/1990. *Grundlagen des koptischen Satzbaus*. American Studies in Papyrology 28/29. Decatur, Georgia: Scholars Press.

Reintges, Chris H. 1994. Egyptian Root–and–Pattern Morphology. *Lingua Aegyptia* 4. 213–244.

Reintges, Chris H. 1997. *Passive Voice in Older Egyptian*. HIL Dissertations 28. The Hague: Holland Academic Graphics.

Reintges, Chris H. 1998. Mapping Information Structure to Syntactic Structure: One Syntax for *Jn. Revue d'Égyptologie* 49: 195–220.

Reintges, Chris H. 2001. Code–mixing Strategies in Coptic Egyptian. *Lingua Aegyptia* 9. 193–237.

Reintges, Chris H. 2004a. *Coptic Egyptian* (*Sahidic Dialect*): *A Learner's Grammar*. Afrikawissenschaftliche Lehrbücher 15. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.

Reintges, Chris H. 2004b. Coptic Egyptian as a Bilingual Language Variety. In *Lenguas en contacto de la Antigüedad a la Edad Media* (Languages in Contact in Antiquity and the Middle Ages). Edited by Pedro Bádenas de la Peña, Sofía Torallas Tovar,

Eugenio R. Luján & María Ángeles Gallego. Manuales y Anejos de «Emerita» XLVI. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 69–86.

Reintges, Chris H. 2005. The Correlation between Word Order Alternations, Grammatical Agreement and Event Semantics in Older Egyptian. In *Universal Grammar in the Reconstruction of Ancient Languages*. Edited by Katalin É.Kiss. Studies in Generative Grammar 83. Berlin: Mouton, 31–103.

Reintges, Chris H. 2006. The Older Egyptian Stative Revisited. *Lingua Aegyptia* 14: 115–134.

Reintges, Chris H. 2009. Spontaneous Syntactic Change. In *Historical Syntax and Linguistic Theory*. Edited by Paola Crisma & Guiseppe Longobardi. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 41–57.

Reintges, Chris H. 2011. The Oral-Compositional Form of Pyramid Text Discourse. In *Narratives of Egypt and the Ancient Near East: Literary and Linguistic Approaches*. Edited by Fredrik N. Hagen, John J. Johnston, W. Monkhouse, Kathryn E. Piquette, John Tait & Martin Worthington. *Orientalia Lovaniensa Analecta* 189. Peeters: Louvain, 3–54.

Ritter, Elisabeth. 1995. On the Syntactic Category of Pronouns and Agreement. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 13: 405–443.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1982. *Issues in Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1986. Null Objects in Italian and the Theory of *Pro*. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17: 501–557.

Roberts, Ian & Anna Roussou. 2003. *Syntactic Change: A Minimalist Approach to Grammaticalization*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 100. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rothstein, Susan 2004. *Structuring Events: A Study in the Semantics of Lexical Aspect*. Explorations in Semantics 2. Blackwell: Oxford.

Schenkel, Wolfgang. 1971. Das altägyptische Pseudopartizip und das indogermanische Medium/Perfekt. *Orientalia* 40: 301–316.

Schenkel, Wolfgang. 1990. *Einführung in die altägyptische Sprachwissenschaft*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Schenkel, Wolfgang. 1994. śčm–Perfekt and śčm–Stative: Die beiden Pseudopartizipien des Ägyptischen nach dem Zeugnis der Sargtexte. In ... *Quaerentes Scientiam. Festgabe für Wolfhart Westendorf zu seinem 70. Geburtstag überreicht von seinen Schülern*. Edited by Heike Behlmer. Göttingen: Seminar für Ägyptologie und Koptologie, 157–182.

Schenkel, Wolfgang. 1997. *Tübinger Einführung in die klassisch-ägyptische Sprache und Schrift*. Tübingen: Pagina GmbH.

Shlonsky, Ur. 1997. *Clause Structure and Word Order in Hebrew and Arabic: An Essay in Comparative Semitic Syntax*. Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax 11. Oxford/ New York: Oxford University Press.

Shlonsky, Ur. 2009. Hebrew as a Partial Null–Subject Language. *Studia Linguistica* 63. Special Issue on Partial *Pro*–drop. Edited by Anders Holmberg, 133–157.

Siewierska, Anna. 1984. *The Passive: A Comparative Linguistic Analysis*. London: Croom Helm.

Siewierska, Anna. 1988. The Passive in Slavic. In *Passive and Voice*. Edited by Masayoshi Shibatani. Typological Studies in Language 16. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 243–289.

Siewierska, Anna. 2004. *Person*. Cambridge Textbook in Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Siewierska, Anna. 2005. Passive Constructions. In *The World Atlas of Language Structures*. Edited Martin Haspelmath, Matthew S. Dryer, David Gil & Bernard Comrie. Chapter 107. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 434–437.

Simpson, R.S. 1996. *Demotic Grammar in the Ptolemaic Sacerdotal Degrees*. Oxford: Griffith Institute.

Smith, Carlota S. 1991. *The Parameter of Aspect*, Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Spiegelberg, Wilhelm. 1924. *Demotische Grammatik*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Verlag.

Stern, Ludwig. 1880 [1971]. *Koptische Grammatik*. 2nd ed. Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag.

Stump, Gregory T. 2001. Inflection. In *The Handbook of Morphology*. Edited by Andrew Spencer & Arnold M. Zwicky. Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics. Oxford: Blackwell, 13–43.

Thesaurus Linguae Aegyptiae. 2010. Arbeitsstelle Altägyptisches Wörterbuch. Edited by Ingelore Hafemann, Stephan Seidlmayer, Anika Strobach & Günter Vittmann. Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Available at http://aaew.bbaw.de/tla/index.html.

Thomason, Sarah G. & Terence Kaufman. 1988. *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Toivonen, Ida. 2000. The Morphosyntax of Finish Possessives. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 18: 579–609.

Vainikka, Anne & Yonata Levy. 1999. Empty Subjects in Finnish and Hebrew. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 17: 613–671.

Vendler, Zeno. 1967. *Linguistics in Philosophy*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

Vernus, Pascal. 1986. Aspect and Morphosyntactic Patterns in Middle Egyptian. In *Crossroad, Chaos or the Beginning of a New Paradigm. Papers from the Conference on Egyptian Grammar, Helsingør (May 1986)*. Edited by Gerti Englund & Paul F. Frandsen. Copenhagen: The Carl Niebuhr Institute, 375–388.

Vernus, Pascal. 1996. La position linguistique des Textes des Sacrophages. In *The World of the Coffin Texts*. Proceedings of the Symposium held on the Occasion of the 100th Birthday of Adriaan de Buck, Leiden (17–19 December 1992). Edited by Harco Willems. Egyptologische uitgaven 9. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 143–196.

Vittmann, Günter. 1998. *Der demotische Papyrus Ryland 9*. 2 vols. Ägypten und Altes Testament 38. Wiesbaden: Harrassowith.

Ward, Gregory, Bety Birner & Rodney Huddleston. 2002. Information Packaging. In *The Cambridge Grammar of the English language*. Edited by Rodney Huddleston & Geoffrey K. Pullum. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1363–1447.

Wasow, Thomas. 1977. Transformations and the Lexicon. In *Formal Syntax*. Edited by Peter Culicover, Thomas Wasow & Joan Bresnan, New York: Academic Press, 327–360.

Wechsler, Stephen & Larisa Zlatić. 2003. *The Many Faces of Agreement*. Stanford Monographs in Linguistics. Stanford, California: CSLI Publications.

Westendorf, Wolfhart. 1953. Dynamischer Gebrauch des passivisch–intransitiven Pseudopartizips. *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung* 1: 38–56.

Winand, Jean. 1992. *Études de neo-égyptien*. vol. I: *La morphologie verbale*. Aegyptiaca Leodiensia 2. Liege: Centre informatique de philosophie et letters.

Winand, Jean. 2006. *Temps et aspect en égyptien*: *une approche sémantique*. Probleme der Ägyptologie 25. Leiden Brill.

Zakrzewska, Ewa. 1990. Syntactic Characteristics of the Old Perfective in the Coffin Texts. *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 47: 123–145.