

Language Typology and Egyptian-Coptic Linguistics

**International conference organized by the Egyptological Institute of the
University of Leipzig and the Max-Planck Institute for Evolutionary
Anthropology,**

2 – 5 October 2008

Martin Haspelmath

MPI EVA Leipzig

Tonio Sebastian Richter

University of Leipzig

Invited Speakers

Bernard Comrie (Leipzig)

Orin Gensler (Addis Abeba)

Eitan Grossman (Jerusalem)

Tom Güldemann (Zurich)

Dmitry Idiatov (Antwerpen)

Frank Kammerzell (Berlin)

Antonio Loprieno (Basel)

Elsa Oréal (Paris)

Carsten Peust (Konstanz)

Ariel Shisha-Halevy (Jerusalem)

Andréas Stauder (Basel)

Jean Winand (Liège)

International conference
organized by the Egyptological Institute of the University of Leipzig
and the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology

2 – 5 October 2008

Speakers: Mark Collier, Bernard Comrie, Leo Depuydt, Barbara Egedi, Frank Feder, Orin Gensler, Carlos Gracia Zamacona, Eitan Grossman, Tom Güldemann, Martin Haspelmath, Dmitry Idiatov, Birgit Jordan, Ildar A. Kagirow, Frank Kammerzell, Ruth Kramer, Renata Landgráfová, Elliott Lash, Eliese-Sophia Lincke, Helena López Palma, Antonio Loprieno, Chris Lucas, Matthias Müller, Elsa Oréal, Carsten Peust, Chris H. Reintges, Tonio Sebastian Richter, Wolfgang Schenkel, Ariel Shisha-Halevy, Andréas Stauder, Sami Uljas, Jean Winand, Ewa Zakrzewska

Language Typology and Egyptian-Coptic Linguistics

www.uni-leipzig.de/~egyptol/index.htm

Supported by

UNIVERSITÄT LEIPZIG

Ägyptologisches Institut / Ägyptisches Museum
– Georg Steindorff –



MAX-PLANCK-GESELLSCHAFT

Max-Planck-Institut
für evolutionäre Anthropologie

Fritz Thyssen Stiftung
FÜR WISSENSCHAFTSFÖRDERUNG

Verbundnetz
Gas AG



Mouton
de Gruyter
Berlin · New York

Vereinigung von Förderern und Freunden
der Universität Leipzig e.V.



CALL FOR PAPERS

The Egyptian-Coptic language, attested for more than 4000 years from the early development of the hieroglyphic writing system before 3000 BCE up to its obsolescence and extinction as a spoken language around 1300 CE, is not only one of the earliest attested human languages, it may justly be called the most long-lived language that is available for study by linguists.

Its uniqueness in terms of age and longevity and the evidence for long-lasting processes of language change it provides, including a change in typologically basic traits, such as word order correlation, make the Egyptian-Coptic language a most worthwhile object for general linguistics, regardless of philological and methodological obstacles usually connected to the study of dead corpus languages.

However, while the Coptic language has been an important source of inspiration and information for pioneers of language typology such as Chajim Steintal, encounters between Egyptian and general linguistics have become scarce and sporadic during the last century. Although the Berlin school of Egyptology adopted grammatical categories and terminology of the advanced linguistics of Semitic languages since the 1880s, and although Hans Jakob Polotsky started applying terms and concepts of linguistic structuralism to Egyptian and Coptic by the mid-20th century, and despite even occasional flirtation with generative grammar, Egyptian linguistics hardly contributed to, and was no longer asked for its evidence by general linguistics.

The aim of our conference is to stimulate, or re-intensify, mutual perception of Egyptologists and general linguists. We hope to approach this by addressing an issue of obvious significance and considerable breadth – the behaviour of the Egyptian-Coptic language in its different phases in terms of language typology.

We request papers within this general perspective, dealing with data from any period, branch and part of the Egyptian-Coptic language, including fields and issues such as areal linguistics, phonology, word formation, morphology, syntax, language change and language contact typology. Papers are welcome both by Egyptologists that are interested in a more general typological perspective, and by typologists that have been intrigued by data from Egyptian-Coptic and would like to discuss their broader significance.

Please submit your proposal containing a provisional title of your talk and a 500 words abstract (abstracts in languages other than English are also welcome), by 31 March 2008.

Notification of acceptance is by 15 April 2008.

Martin Haspelmath

Tonio Sebastian Richter

List of Participants

Balthasar Bickel (Leipzig)
Mark Collier (Liverpool)
Bernard Comrie (Leipzig)
Leo Depuydt (Providence)
Camilla Di Biase-Dyson (Sydney)
Peter Dils (Leipzig)
Barbara Egedi (Budapest)
Christopher Eyre (Liverpool)
Frank Feder (Berlin)
Hans-W. Fischer-Elfert (Leipzig)
Orin Gensler (Addis Abeba)
Glenn Godenho (Liverpool)
Stéphanie Gohy (Liège)
Carlos Gracia Zamacona (Paris)
Eitan Grossman (Jerusalem)
Tom Güldemann (Zürich/Leipzig)
Martin Haspelmath (Leipzig)
Anne-Claude Honnay (Liège) Dmitry Idiatov (Antwerpen)
Hanna Jenni (Basel)
Birgit Jordan (Universität Mainz)
Friedrich Junge (Göttingen)
Ildar A. Kagirov (St. Peterburg)
Frank Kammerzell (Berlin)
Friederike Kampp-Seyfried (Leipzig)
Ines Köhler (Mainz)
Ruth Kramer (Santa Cruz)
Renata Landgráfová (Prag)
Elliott Lash (Cambridge)
Eliese-Sophia Lincke (Berlin)
Helena López Palma (A Coruña)
Antonio Loprieno (Basel)
Chris Lucas (Cambridge)
Maike Ludwig (Leipzig)
Ludwig D. Morenz (Berlin/Leipzig)
Matthias Müller (Basel)
Laurence Neven (Liège)
Elsa Oréal (Paris)
Carsten Peust (Konstanz)
Stéphane Polis (Liège)
Tanja Pommerening (Mainz)
Chris H. Reintges (Paris)
Sebastian Richter (Leipzig)
Wolfgang Schenkel (Tübingen)
Ariel Shisha-Halevy (Jerusalem)
Andréas Stauder (Basel)
Katharina Stegbauer (Leipzig)
Michael Streck (Leipzig)
Sami Uljas (Cambridge)
Daniel Werning (Berlin)
Jean Winand (Liège)
Ekkehard Wolff (Leipzig)
Ewa Zakrzewska (Leiden)
Monika Zöllner (Mainz)

Provisional Schedule

THURSDAY 2 OCTOBER

Starting Session, chairperson: Sebastian Richter (University of Leipzig)

2:00 – 2:30 pm	Welcome
2:30 – 3:15 pm	<i>Frank Kammerzell</i> : (to be announced)
3:15 – 4:00 pm	<i>Elsa Oréal</i> : 'Types of predication' and types of alignment in Proto-Egyptian: a typical conflict between description and analysis
4:00 – 4:30 pm	Coffee break
4:30 – 5:05 pm	<i>Sami Uljas</i>: Describing the Earlier Egyptian Verbal System: Topics on Methodology and Research Practices
5:05 – 5:40 pm	<i>Frank Feder</i>: Prospektiv und Subjunktiv – die Entwicklung der „futurischen“ Suffixkonjugation vom Alt- und Mittelägyptischen zum Demotischen
5:40 – 6:15 pm	<i>Leo Depuydt</i>: Types of Relative Clauses and Nominal Sentences in Egyptian and Coptic: Towards final definitions in Boolean and Vennian terms
6:15 – 6:50 pm	<i>Ewa Zakrzewska</i>: Coptic linguistics in the 21st century: synthesis and perspectives
	(Dinner in selected restaurants downtown)

FRIDAY 3 OCTOBER

Morning session, chairperson: Martin Haspelmath (MPI Leipzig)

9:00 – 9:45 am	<i>Jean Winand</i>: The indirect expression of the direct object in Egyptian: from semantics to pragmatics to a fully-fledged grammatical device. An inner Egyptian and a typological approach
9:45 – 10:30 am	<i>Andréas Stauder</i>: From morphological passive to desubjective. Some synchronic and diachronic idiosyncrasies of detransitive constructions in Egyptian
10:30 – 11:00 am	Coffee break
11:00 – 11:35 am	<i>Chris H. Reintges</i>: The diachronic typology of the Egyptian-Coptic stative diathesis
11:35 am – 12:10 pm	<i>Ildar A. Kagirov</i>: Temporal and aspectual features of the two Middle Egyptian verb forms: cDm=f and cDm.n=f

12:10 – 12:45 pm	<u>Wolfgang Schenkel: Aspekt oder Tempus. Ägyptische „tenses“ im Spiegel ägyptologischer Übersetzungen</u>
12:45 – 2:15 pm	Lunch break

Afternoon session, chairperson: Antonio Loprieno (University of Basel)

2:15 – 3:00 pm	<u>Tom Güldemann: How typology can inform philology: quative /j(n)/ in Earlier Egyptian</u>
3:00 – 3:45 pm	<u>Carsten Peust: Der Endreim im Koptischen und anderen Sprachen. Versuch einer Typologie</u>
3:45 – 4:25 pm	Coffee break
4:25 – 5:00 pm	<u>Renata Landgráfová: Topicalisation or processing? NP fronting in Middle Egyptian</u>
5:00 – 5:35 pm	<u>López Palma: The grammar of Egyptian NPs with fractional number expressions</u>
5:35 – 6:10 pm	<u>Birgit Jordan: Grammatik, Semantik und Pragmatik von Zitaten</u>
From 7:00 pm	Reception (Egyptological Institute, Burgst. 21 [near St. Thomas Church], 1st floor)

SATURDAY 4 OCTOBER

Morning session, chairperson: Jean Winand (Université de Liège)

9:00 – 9:45 am	<i>Orin Gensler: (to be announced)</i>
9:45 – 10:30 am	<u>Ariel Shisha-Halevy: Reflections on adnominal, adverbial, adnexal – on the circumstantial and relative in Coptic</u>
10:30 – 11:00 am	Coffee break
11:00 – 11:35 am	<u>Mark Collier: Typology and the meaning of conditionals in Late Egyptian</u>
11:35 am – 12:10 pm	<u>Carlos Gracia Zamacona: Espace, temps et rapports abstraits dans l'égyptien des textes des sarcophages</u>
12:10 – 12:45 pm	<u>Eliese-Sophia Lincke: The expression of spatial relations in Ancient Egyptian</u>

12:45 – 2:15 pm	Lunch break
-----------------	-------------

Afternoon session, chairperson: Ariel Shisha-Halevy (Hebrew University, Jerusalem)

2:15 – 3:00 pm	<i>Dmitry Idiatov: Egyptian non-selective interrogative pronominals: history and typology</i>
3:00 – 3:45 pm	<i>Eitan Grossman: Aspects of Coptic Negation in Typological Perspective perspective</i>
3:45 – 4:30 pm	Coffee break
4:30 – 5:05 pm	<i>Barbara Egedi: Possessive constructions in Egyptian and Coptic</i>
5:05 – 5:40 pm	<i>Martin Haspelmath: The Coptic alienability contrast in typological perspective</i>
5:40 – 6:15 pm	<i>Matthias Müller: Adversative coordination in Coptic</i>
	(Dinner in selected restaurants downtown)

SUNDAY 5 OCTOBER

Morning session, chairperson: Orin Gensler (University of Addis Abeba)

9:30 – 10:05 am	<i>Sebastian Richter: Lexical borrowing into Coptic. A case study in loanword typology</i>
10:05 – 10:40 am	<i>Elliott Lash & Chris Lucas: Bipartite negation in Egyptian-Coptic and beyond</i>
10:40 – 11:00 am	Coffee break
11:00 – 11:45 am	<i>Bernard Comrie: Relative clauses in Middle Egyptian: a typology perspective</i>
11:45am – 12:30 pm	<i>Antonio Loprieno: Typological idiosyncrasy in Egyptian language history</i>
12:30 – 1:00 pm	End of the Conference (possibility to have lunch in selected restaurants downtown)

Mark Collier:

Typology and the Meaning of Conditionals in Late Egyptian

This paper will concentrate in some detail on conditionals in documentary Late Egyptian (principally c. late-thirteenth–eleventh century BC), focusing on the relationship between their typology and their meaning.

In the first part of the paper, the basic threefold division of conditionals in Late Egyptian will be introduced for those not familiar with Ancient Egyptian, as marked by the introductory lexemes *ir (iw)*, *inn*, and *h-n*. These will be discussed in relation to basic typological criteria such as those outlined by Comrie (in Traugott et al. (eds), *On Conditionals* (Cambridge, 1986), 77–99), such as prototypicality, ability to be analysed by material implication (as well as the philosophers' Ramsey Test approach), the relationship between protasis and apodosis (including causal and non-causal relations), tense-marking, as well as the useful distinction between eventive (content), epistemic, and speech-act conditionals and the correlation with the ordering of event-sequence and thesis-sequence. If time allows, conditional meanings of other constructions will be exemplified (such as the paratactic conditional reading of certain examples of imperative followed by conjunctive).

In the second part of the paper, more detailed aspects of Late Egyptian conditionals will be discussed, including: pragmatic strengthening (the tendency towards the exclusive reading of conditional perfection; concessive readings (not marked by separate lexemes but correlated with construction-building elements which lead to inclusive scalar readings), consequent-entailment conditionals (that is, where the realization of the condition is essentially independent of the realization of the apodosis), as well as a more detailed look at epistemic and speech-act conditionals in late Egyptian.

The aim is to show the rich variety of attested conditional meaning even within the partial dataset of documentary Late Egyptian and how that variety of meaning finds formal expression in this phase of the language. As such, it contributes to the cross-linguistic basis of both typology and various aspects of contemporary pragmatics (such as conversational implicature and scalar readings) and adheres to the view that the dataset of Ancient Egyptian can be readily and fruitfully engaged with contemporary research in linguistics (and, in the case of conditionals, formal philosophy) whilst conserving key aspects of traditional philology in Egyptology, such as exhaustive corpus coverage of attested examples situated within their original textual co(n)text.

Mark Collier

School of Archaeology, Classics and Egyptology

University of Liverpool

12–14 Abercromby Square Liverpool UK

m.a.collier@liv.ac.uk

Bernard Comrie:

Relative clauses in Middle Egyptian: a typological perspective

Middle Egyptian relative clauses present a number of properties that are interesting from a general typological perspective, not only in the sense that they can contribute to our cross-linguistic understanding of relative clauses but also in that the typological approach can provide insight into these constructions by situating them in a cross-linguistic perspective. Particular properties that will be investigated include: 1) the distinction between marked and unmarked relative clauses in relation to the definiteness of the head noun; 2) the distinction between direct and indirect relative clauses in relation to typologies based on the position relativized (subject, direct object, etc.); 3) resumptive pronouns in relative clauses in relation to accessibility to relative clause formation.

Bernard Comrie

Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology and

University of California Santa Barbara

comrie@eva.mpg.de

Leo Depuydt:

Types of Relative Clauses and Nominal Sentences in Egyptian and Coptic: Towards Final Definitions in Boolean and Vennian Terms

In the 1980s and early 1990s, there was a flood of studies on the nominal sentence in all stages of Egyptian. It seemed as if no one could respectably deem oneself a grammarian of Egyptian or Coptic without writing an article on the subject. This writer too was swept up in the frenzy and went as far as postulating an “emphatic” nominal sentence. One would think that, as a result of all this activity, the subject was fully exhausted. Yet, in a plenary lecture at of the Fourth International Congress of Coptic Studies read in 1988 and published in 1992, Wolf-Peter Funk states exactly the opposite about Coptic: the discussion of the nominal sentence “on a structural and functional basis” had not been “concluded” but only just “opened.” Funk also rejects the existence of a distinct emphatic nominal sentence. In spite of Funk’s call to action, nominal sentences soon vanished from the radar screen. Their absence from grammatical discussion contrasts sharply with their prior overwhelming presence. How come no one had anything more to say just when Funk advised that nothing had been said yet? The reluctance to say more may have much to do with the nature of the nominal sentence. Grammatical observations require empirical evidence. But how much that is empirically differentiable is there to observe about what seem like infinite variations on the simple theme “A = B”? What more is there to say than that nominal sentences equate one entity with another?

This paper’s design is threefold. The main purpose is to heed Funk’s call by trying to jumpstart the debate through a new method of analysis. The larger context is an effort to digitalize all of language structure. The quest will be for final definitions. “Final” does not imply that criticism is not welcome or that the proposed solutions might not turn out to be in error—even if they are proffered as correct. “Final” makes reference to the undeniable fact that our mental faculties are subject to absolute limitations. There is no thinking beyond them. A definition arriving at those

limits may be deemed final. The search for final definitions will be guided by the assumption that everything in the brain is either on or off. In short, final definitions ought to satisfy electrical engineers. Nothing has been more inspiring to the present investigation than the works of two pioneers of the digital age, George Boole and John Venn. Two secondary purposes of this paper are adducing empirical support for the emphatic nominal sentence and presenting a bibliographical update on the nominal sentence as a follow-up on an earlier such report. A phenomenon that allows digitalization more transparently than the emphatic nominal sentence is the relative clause. It will be adduced for comparison, as a kind of test-case, to raise hopes that all of language can ultimately be digitalized. By the limitations of thought, there can only be three types of relative clauses. Remarkably, Coptic has them all three and they are empirically perfectly distinct.

Barbara Egedi: Possessive Constructions in Egyptian and Coptic

In this talk I investigate the distributional properties of Coptic possessive constructions from a typological point of view, and analyze the question from a historical perspective as well. Coptic has two types of genitive pattern: one involves the possessive marker *n-*, while in the other construction the preposition-like element *nte-/nta=* is used. In descriptive terms (Till 1961: §113; Lambdin 1983: §2.3. §4.2. §15.1. §22.1; Vergote 1983: §190.1), the genitive relationship is expressed by the first pattern except when the possessed noun is indefinite, has a demonstrative article, or is followed by an adjective; in such cases the second alternative is used. In contrast with earlier assumptions (Shisha-Halevy 1986: §1.1.1. C, 1, d; Layton 2000: §§146-148), I propose to explain this distribution by formulating a rule on purely syntactic grounds. I also argue against Reintges's claim (2004: 94) that the linkage marker *n-* is selected when the possessed noun and the possessor agree in definiteness.

In the pattern with *n-*, the possessed noun must be definite; it must have a definite article but cannot have any other determiner or modifier. In other words, this pattern imposes obligatory definiteness on the possessed noun, and requires strict adjacency of the possessum and the possessor. This syntactic configuration partially corresponds to the so called *construct state* constructions that characterize Semitic and Celtic languages. Clearly, the Coptic possessive relationship differs from the real construct state in several respects. I will nevertheless show that a parallel structural analysis can straightforwardly account for the Coptic data.

Through a historical survey, I attempt to answer the question whether a *real* construct state structure can be traced back in earlier Egyptian, and – if so – what can be said about its syntactic behaviour and morphological features. The so-called *direct genitive* in Classical Egyptian requires strict adjacency, but the definiteness requirement cannot be proved easily since this language phase dispensed with the definite article. Unfortunately, there is only indirect evidence for a special morphological *status* of the possessed noun (*inter alia* Gardiner 1957: §78, §85). Moreover, the direct genitive apparently ceased to be productive as early on as in the first documented phases of the language (cf. Callendar 1975: §4.2.7; Edel 1955-64: §§318-319). Consequently, in Late Egyptian, when definiteness can be easily detected by the appearance of the article, *construct state* structures are already restricted to a group of relational nouns (denoting inalienable objects). Nevertheless, I will argue that the combination of the syntactic and

morphological facts points to an early existence of such a construction.

What is really remarkable for the present investigation is that the original functional opposition, which presumably was coded by the direct vs. indirect genitive constructions and soon after disappeared in course of the Egyptian language's history, re-emerged in the two Coptic possessive patterns. Moreover, a further step may be observed in the Bohairic Coptic dialect, where the construction with the possessive marker *n-* is again restricted to inalienable possession.

References:

- Edel, E. 1955-64. Altägyptische Grammatik. Roma, Pontificium Institutum Biblicum*
Callendar, J. B. 1975. Middle Egyptian. Malibu, Udena Publications
Gardiner, A. H. 19573. Egyptian Grammar Being an Introduction to the Study of Hieroglyphs. Oxford, Griffith Institute
Lambdin, Th. O. 1983. Introduction to Sahidic Coptic. Macon, Mercer University Press
Layton, B. 2000. A Coptic Grammar with Chrestomathy and Glossary. Sahidic Dialect. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz
Reintges, Ch. H. 2004. Coptic Egyptian (Sahidic Dialect). A Learner's Grammar. Köln, Rüdiger Köppe Verlag
Shisha-Halevy, A. 1986. Coptic Grammatical Categories. Structural Studies in the Syntax of Shenoutean Sahidic. Roma, Pontificium Institutum Biblicum
Till, W. C. 19612. Koptische Grammatik (Säidischer Dialekt). Leipzig, VEB Enzyklopädie Verlag
Vergote, J. 1983. Grammaire Copte. Ila. Morphologie syntagmatique. Syntaxe. Partie synchronique. Louvain, Peeters

Frank Feder:

Prospektiv und Subjunktiv – die Entwicklung der futurischen Suffixkonjugation vom Alt- und Mittelägyptischen zum Demotischen und Koptischen

Nachdem gerade die oftmals problematische Erklärung des Verbalsystems der Suffixkonjugation des Alt- und Mittelägyptischen durch die paradigmatische Substitution (Transposition) von substantivischen, adjektivischen und adverbialen (nichtverbalen) Formen, wie sie die so genannte „Standardtheorie“ vorstellte, mehr und mehr Kritik und Revision erfahren hat, gehen die neueren grammatischen Untersuchungen zunehmend wieder von einem System von „verbalen“ (prädikativen) Verbformen aus, das historische Ansätze (Sethe, Gardiner) wieder aufnimmt und weiterentwickelt.

Allerdings ist man noch zu keinem geschlossenen neuen grammatischen Paradigma für die ägyptische Suffixkonjugation gekommen.

Die meiner Ansicht nach tragfähigste Grundlage für eine solche Neuordnung bietet die von James P. Allen in seinem Buch *Middle Egyptian – An Introduction to the Language and Culture of Hieroglyphs* (Cambridge 2000) vorgeschlagene Einteilung des Verbalsystems der Suffixkonjugation.

Auch Wolfgang Schenkel, der über Jahrzehnte in den verschiedenen Auflagen seiner *Tübinger Einführung in die klassisch-ägyptische Sprache und Schrift* ganz der „Standardtheorie“ gefolgt war, geht in der jüngsten Auflage (2005) wieder von einem System „verbaler“ (prädikativer)

Verbalformen aus. Wenn auch Schenkels Terminologie weit differenzierter und dadurch komplizierter erscheint als bei Allen, so ist der gemeinsame Ansatz doch unverkennbar. Offensichtlich unterscheidet sich jedoch die Auffassung der beiden Autoren zum Ansatz der „futurischen“ Formen der Suffixkonjugation. Während der „Subjunktiv“ bei beiden Autoren im Wesentlichen als rein modale Verbalform angesehen wird, setzt Schenkel ein „prädikatives Futur“ und ein „abstarkt-relativisches Futur“ (jew. für Aktiv und Passiv) an. Den prädikativen Verbformen bei Schenkel entsprechen bei Allen zwar „Prospective“ und „Prospective Passive“, jedoch gibt es für Allen kein zusätzliches „abstrakt-relativisches Futur“.

Wie unschwer zu erkennen ist, hält Schenkel hier noch am Verteilungsschema der Substitutionsklassen der „Standardtheorie“ fest, die für jedes „Tempus“ (Präsens, Perfekt, Futur) der Suffixkonjugation (neben der adjektivischen und adverbialen) eine substantivische Transposition, auch als „emphatische Form“ bezeichnet, festlegte. Wie bei der „Standardtheorie“ fällt allerdings das perfektive sDm=f aus dem Verteilungsschema heraus (die „Standardtheorie“ hatte ja sogar die Existenz des perfektiven sDm=f für das Mittelägyptische gänzlich in Frage gestellt), so dass nur das sDm.n=f-Perfekt von Schenkel einen „abstrakt-relativischen“ Partner erhält.

Allen folgt einem anderen und, wie ich meine, besseren Ansatz, der für das sDm=f „Perfective, Imperfective, Subjunctive, Prospective, Prospective Passive“ und „Passive“ sowie (das sDm.n=f) Perfekt umfasst. Eine „nonattributive Relative Form“ (Schenkels „abstrakt-relativische“ Form) können nach Allen nur Perfective, Imperfective und Perfect bilden. Denn die „nonattributive Relative Forms“ sind nur die formreduzierten (maskulin singular) attributiven Relativformen, die in bestimmten syntaktischen Konstellationen eine bestimmte Funktion (auch als Substantiv) übernehmen können; u.a. als thematische Verbalform zur Fokussierung eines anderen, als Rhema fungierenden Satzgliedes (sog. „emphatische Konstruktion“). Nach diesem Ansatz kann keine „nonattributive Relative Form“ für das Futur gebildet werden.

Dies zur Illustration der gegenwärtigen inner-ägyptologischen Diskussion.

Allerdings soll der Beitrag keine paradigmatische Darstellung der ägyptologischen Diskussion bieten, sondern einen möglichst auch terminologischen Neuansatz aus sprachtypologischer Sicht versuchen, um zu einer konsistenten diachronen Darstellung der Entwicklung der futurischen Verbalformen der ägyptischen Suffixkonjugation zu kommen. Perspektivisch werden die futurischen Verbalformen der Suffixkonjugation im jüngeren Ägyptisch (Neuägyptisch - Koptisch) vollständig durch analytische Bildungen (Konjugationsbasis/0 + Agens + Infinitiv/Stativ) ersetzt. Allein die als „Subjunktiv“ bezeichnete, zumeist modal übersetzbare Verbalform der Suffixkonjugation bleibt bis zum Demotischen in Gebrauch.

Interessant wird hierbei sein, zu sehen, wie Tempus, Aspekt und Modus futurisch übersetzbarer Verbalformen des Ägyptischen aus sprachtypologischer Perspektive analysiert werden können.

Frank Feder

Berlin

Carlos Gracia Zamacona:

Espace, temps et rapports abstraits dans l'égyptien des textes des sarcophages

Voici une étude sur l'utilisation des expressions spatiales pour exprimer le temps et les rapports abstraits dans l'égyptien des Textes de Sarcophages. Ceci se produit en quatre échelons logiques (métaphoriques).

Tout d'abord, l'espace fait l'objet d'une double voie d'expression : la situation et le mouvement.

1) La situation est exprimée par la structure syntactique appelée Proposition à Prédicat Adverbial, qui est atemporelle. Dans la situation, les cas sont: l'abessif (le p1 est dehors du p2 sans l'envisager), l'essif (le p1 est dans la zone du p2), l'inessif (le p1 est dedans du p2) et l'adessif (le p1 est dehors du p2 en l'envisageant).

2) Le mouvement (déplacement ou position) est exprimé par des verbes de mouvement qui fonctionnent dans les cadres syntactiques de la Proposition à Prédicat Verbal et de la Proposition Pseudo-verbale. Voici les cas du mouvement : l'élatif, l'ablatif, l'originaire (provenance) ; l'endoparcoursif, l'exo-parcoursif et le parcoursif (parcours) ; l'illatif, l'allatif et le terminal (destination) ; l'inessif, l'adessif et l'essif (locatif).

3) A continuation, les moyens d'expression spatiale analysés utilisés pour des **expressions temporelles** sont présentées : il s'agit des constructions pseudoverbales à infinitif et des propositions circonstancielle temporelles. Les constructions pseudo-verbales à infinitif ont la structure sujet + préposition + infinitif. L'auteur étudie justement les prépositions : Hr et m + infinitif seraient des constructions qui expriment le progressif, tandis que r + infinitif exprime un futur inaccompli. Le choix entre les prépositions Hr et m pour le progressif aurait été déterminée en origine par l'Aktionsart des verbes (les duratifs utiliseraient m et les ponctuels Hr). Quant aux propositions circonstancielle temporelles, il y en a d'antériorité et de postériorité (avec Dr) et aussi de concomitance (avec m).

4) En dernier lieu, les moyens d'expression mentionnés peuvent être employés pour exprimer des **rapports abstraits** (autre que le temps) qui sont classés en trois, *sensu lato* : la cause, la caractérisation et le but. Du côté de la cause stricto sensu (avec Dr, n, Hr et m), l'auteur a rangé des concepts proches comme l'agent oblique (avec in et xr) et la *cleft* sentence (avec in). La caractérisation est représentée par : l'attribution de fonctions (avec m et r) ; l'identité (m) et l'intention (r) ; la matière, partition et instrument (avec m) ; l'opposition (r et m) ; la comparaison et le modèle (r) ; et l'affaire en question (Hr et tp).

Dans le groupe appelé but on rencontre : l'intérêt et l'implicatif (avec r et n), les propositions circonstancielle finale (avec r surtout), le rapport (r), l'opposition (r) et la condition (ir), le destinataire / bénéficiaire et l'appartenance (avec n).

Pour en finir, l'auteur propose un cadre de signifiés basiques par les prépositions simples de l'égyptien des Textes des Sarcophages, qui permettent les usages métaphoriques de ces prépositions, à savoir: Hr 'généralité' (absence de marque), m 'unité' (absence de limite et d'orientation), r 'visée' (orientation et limite), n (visée et animation), xr (visée et divinité) et Dr 'limite' (limite sans orientation).

Tom Güldemann:

How typology can inform philology: quotative /j(n)/ in Earlier Egyptian

A crosslinguistic study of quotative indexes (Güldemann forth.), based in particular on a sample of 40 African languages, has challenged a number of widely-held assumptions on the history of these expressions. Notably, quotative indexes frequently are not predicative expressions based on speech verbs (like, e.g., /Peter said/). Consequently further grammaticalization in this domain often does not start out from such an assumed default construction. There exist a number of other typical patterns in quotative indexes which have a different structure and which turn out to be subject to change more frequently than predicative 'say'-structures. These findings also throw

new light on the history of quotative /j(n)/ in Earlier Egyptian. One can make a promising case for the hypothesis that quotative indexes based on /j(n)/ originate, at least partly, in a non-verbal copulative construction which later assumed more predicate-like properties.

Güldemann, Tom. forthcoming. /Quotative indexes in African languages: a synchronic and diachronic survey/. *Empirical Approaches to Language Typology* 34. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. (Habilitation thesis 2001)

Tom Güldemann
Universität Zürich and
MPI-EVA Leipzig

Dmitry Idiatov:

Egyptian non-selective interrogative pronominals: history and typology

Non-selective interrogative pronominals (NIPs) are forms equivalent to English *who?* and *what?*. From a typological perspective NIPs are best defined through their functions in terms of prototypical combinations of values (Idiatov 2007). Thus, ‘who?’ is an NIP that prototypically asks for the identification of a person and that expects a proper name as a typical answer. The interrogative ‘what?’ is an NIP prototypically asking for the classification of a thing and expecting a common noun as an answer. Some languages do not oblige their speakers to distinguish formally between ‘who?’ and ‘what?’, but most languages do. Languages differ considerably in how they accommodate non-prototypical combinations of values.

In my talk I will address the following questions. (i) How do Egyptian NIPs behave with respect to the typology outlined above throughout the recorded history of the Egyptian language? (ii) How can we account for the attested shifts in the patterns of use of different NIPs and the development of new NIPs in the course of the history of the Egyptian language? (iii) How do Egyptian data relate to the data from the other branches of the Afro-Asiatic phylum?

Idiatov, Dmitry. 2007. A typology of non-selective interrogative pronominals. Antwerp: University of Antwerp PhD.

Birgit Jordan:

Grammatik, Semantik und Pragmatik von Zitaten

An der Mainzer Universität beschäftigt sich eine aus Sprachphilosophen, Germanisten, Linguisten und Logikern zusammengesetzte Forschungsgruppe mit dem Thema „Zitat und Bedeutung“ (vgl. dazu den Sammelband *Linguistische Berichte Sonderheft 15*, hrsg. von Elke Brendel, Jörg Meibauer und Markus Steinbach). Zitate sind sprachliche Metarepräsentationen, die sich möglicherweise universell nachweisen lassen. Dabei wird von einem breiten Zitatbegriff, der neben den direkten und indirekten Redewiedergaben auch modalisierende und emphatische („Greengrocer’s Quotes“) Formen berücksichtigt, ausgegangen. Das Ziel ist eine adäquate Zitattheorie. Wünschenswert für die Stützung der theoretischen Überlegungen ist eine empirische Basis, die möglichst heterogenes Material erschließt, wie sich vor allem bei der Arbeit an der Semantik-Pragmatik-Schnittstelle gezeigt hat. Das Erkenntnisinteresse umfaßt

weiter die Eigenschaften und die logische Funktion von Anführungszeichen oder allgemeiner formuliert von Zitatmarkierungen sowie die grammatischen Eigenschaften der verschiedenen Zitatarten. Sprachphilosophisch interessant ist die Unterscheidung von Erwähnen und Verwenden, ferner damit zusammenhängende Paradoxien, außerdem Ansätze wie die Namens- und die Demonstrativtheorien der Zitate.

Die aus der langen Überlieferungsgeschichte der ägyptisch-koptischen Schrift und Sprache gewonnenen Daten können als sicherlich oft Überraschungen bietende Testfälle für die Erklärungsreichweite der gewonnenen Hypothesen dienen. Dabei empfiehlt sich nicht nur die Betrachtung solcher Texte, über deren Einordnung in die „Literatur“ in den letzten Jahrzehnten von literaturwissenschaftlich interessierten Ägyptologen ausführlich diskutiert wurde, sondern vor allem von Dokumenten anderer Textregister wie juristischen Schriftstücken und Briefen. In der Gegenrichtung erwarte ich, daß eine philosophisch aufgeklärte und linguistisch informierte Sichtung des ägyptisch-koptischen Materials der ägyptologischen Forschung Erkenntnisfortschritte verschaffen kann, z. B. bei der Identifikation und Unterscheidung von Phrasen, Allusionen und Zitaten. Ich werde mich in meiner ägyptologisch-philosophischen Magisterarbeit mit Zitaten auseinandersetzen und mir dabei die Möglichkeiten, die sich aus dem kurz skizzierten interdisziplinären Ansatz ergeben, zunutze machen.

Ildar A. Kagirow:

Temporal and aspectual features of the two Middle Egyptian verb forms: cDm=f and cDm.n=f

The present report deals with the problem of temporal and aspectual features of the two Middle Egyptian verb-forms: cDm=f and cDm.n=f.

This question has been a subject of heated discussion for a number of decades yet, but it is absolutely clear, that nowadays there is no common ground between Egyptologists to come to an agreement. In fact, every new monograph proposes a new linguistic model, and different Egyptologists apparently hold opposite opinions on the matter. However, all the proposed models seem to me inadequate, or unsatisfactory, or not explicit . partly for lack of general linguistic background in many of them.

Through my investigation, I have followed concepts of time and aspect worked out in terms of the general linguistics, for example, these by E. Koschmieder, J.S. Maslov, B. Comrie, O. Dahl, L. Johanson and others.

Only literary text dated to the epoch of the XI-XIII Dyn. were chosen as the material for my investigation. Obviously, there is little sense in taking into account texts and inscriptions of later Dynasties because of changes that took place in the structure of Egyptian.

In the course of the investigation, it was found out that both cDm=f and cDm.n=f are atemporal from the grammatical point of view. That means, that there is no sense in characterizing them as having "past", "present", "future" or even relative time reference in any context.

As for aspectual features, cDm=f-form is no unity: it can be subdivided into two zones: *imperfective*, i.e. unlimited (marked with gemination of the 2nd root consonant) and all the others aspectual meanings (with no gemination), such as *factitive*, *factitive resultative*, *actual prolonged* and many variations of *iterative*. The interpretation of particular verb-form without the consonant gemination entirely depends on the context. In this case the verbal semantics covers a vast range of different aspectual zones, which appear to be incompatible, and therefore I

can state that cDm=f-form with no gemination is indifferent to aspect.

For cDm.n=f-form *terminus ad quem* (when the action is performed) is of high relevance, i.e. this is *perfective* - an aspectual meaning, which implies both absence of inner constituency and the end of an action (limit). This is the cause of the traditional treatment of cDm.n=f-form as Past: an action with marked *terminus ad quem* always has "Future"→ "Past" time reference, as it was shown by E. Koschmieder.

Thus the verb-forms in issue: cDm=f with no germination (for example, irj=f), cDm=f with germination (for example, irr=f) and cDm.n=f (for example, irj.n=f) form two privative oppositions: irr=f vs. irj=f and irj.n=f vs. irj=f.

<i>Form</i>	<i>Limit</i>	<i>Name</i>
irr=f	-	Imperfective
irj=f	∅	Unmarked
irj.n=f	+	Perfective

The conclusion about absence of such morphological categories as Tense and Aspect for irj=f-type is of high importance in itself: it actually blurs bounds between Nouns and Verbs. This phenomenon is not unique though, being attested in some ancient languages such as Old Chinese and Archaic Greek. So owing to typological parallelisms, the situation is quite plausible from linguistic point of view.

Renata Landgráfová:

Topicalisation or Processing? NP Fronting in Middle Egyptian

The paper discusses the motivation for NP fronting (both with and without the particle jr) in Middle Egyptian, focussing above all on the problems of topicalisation and processing. It has been suggested that VSO languages, to which Middle Egyptian belongs, have a tendency to topic-first constructions and consequently tend to front NPs and develop Subject (default Topic)-first constructions (Croft 1991; Landgráfová 2001, 2002). While the tendency to place the Topic early in the sentence has been corroborated, besides linguistic research, also by psychological experiments (the so-called “lay the foundations first” principle, Caron 1995) and by the Structure Building Principle of cognitive science, this theory has been challenged by several linguists. Among the theories challenging the tendency to place Topics early in the sentence, the Performance theory of J. A. Hawkins (1994), according to which long NPs are fronted in order to facilitate processing, appears highly promising and applicable to Middle Egyptian. The paper will show that in Middle Egyptian, both topicalisation and processing play an important role in NP fronting, and outline the interrelatedness of both these phenomena.

References

Caron, Jean 1995: “Cognitive psychology”, in: Verschuieren, J., Ístman, J.-O. & Blommaert, J. (eds.) *Handbook of Pragmatics. A Manual, Amsterdam (John Benjamins)*, 116–23.

Croft, William 1991: *Typology and Universals [Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics]*, Cambridge (Cambridge University Press).

Hawkins, John A. 1994: *A Performance Theory of Order and Constituency*. Cambridge

(Cambridge University Press).

Landgráfová, Renata 2001: "Focusing on the topic. Some perspectives in the functionalgenerative description of Middle Egyptian", in: Popielska-Grzybowska, J., *Proceedings of the first Central European Conference of Young Egyptologists, Warsaw: Institute of Archaeology, Warsaw University*, 69–80.

id., 2002: "Resumptive pronouns in Middle Egyptian - A means of avoiding non-projective constructions?" *LingAeg* 10, 269–282.

Renata Landgráfová
Czech Institute of Egyptology,
Charles University,
Prague

Eliese-Sophia Lincke:

The expression of spatial relations in Ancient Egyptian

Space has been a steady topic in Linguistics in the past decades. The progress of Cognitive Science and Cognitive Linguistics has given new insights into the mental conceptualisation of *space*. At present, there are two theoretically well-founded ways to approach this concept: cognitive experiments and language typology. The department of *Language and Cognition* of the MPI for Psycholinguistics (Nijmegen) has collected data on how *space* is verbalized in languages around the world (Levinson & Wilkins 2006). The recently established Cluster of Excellence *TOPOI – The Formation and Transformation of Space and Knowledge in Ancient Civilisations* (Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin and Freie Universität Berlin in cooperation with other institutions) includes a research group *Language and Text* working on *space* in languages of the Ancient World. These languages have not been subjected to an analysis regarding this topic yet. One of them is Ancient Egyptian. Ancient Egyptian uses – like most other languages – adpositions, spatial nouns (as complex prepositions), adverbs and verbs (but not cases) to express spatial relations. Levinson & Wilkins (2006: 5) observed for the languages having been subject to their research that "the spatial relation between figure and ground may be encoded in locative verbs and case, but is especially to be found in adpositions and spatial nominals." Whereas the dominance of adpositions (in terms of prepositions) for static spatial relations can also be presumed for Ancient Egyptian, no detailed study has been carried out yet. Another part of the concept space is change of position, i.e. *movement*. Talmy (1985) distinguished languages that express *manner* (the manner of the motion in question) by the semantics of a verb and *path* (i.e. the direction of the movement) by other elements of a phrase and those languages in which the verb semantics reveals *path* but *manner* has to be verbalised by other elements.

The paper will put up for discussion some thoughts about static and kinetic spatial expressions in Ancient Egyptian. The main focus is on Old and Middle Egyptian. An overlook over the diversity of possibilities of Ancient Egyptian to translate spatial concepts (position and movement) into language will be given. This shall be a first approach to locate Ancient Egyptian in the typology of linguistic realisations of spatial concepts.

Quoted literature and other resources:

Levinson, Stephen C. & David P. Wilkins. 2006. *Grammars of space. Explorations in cognitive*

diversity, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Talmy, Leonhard 1985. Lexicalization patterns: semantic structure in lexical forms, in: T. Shopen (ed.), Language typology and syntactic description, Vol. III, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 55-149. www.topoi-berlin.de

Eliese-Sophia Lincke
Seminar für Archäologie und Kulturgeschichte Nordostafrikas
Institut für Kultur- und Kunstwissenschaften
Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin
Unter den Linden 6, 10099 Berlin eliese.lincke@nexgo.de

López Palma:

The grammar of Egyptian NPs with fractional number expressions

We study the syntax of NPs containing fractional numerals in Middle, Late and Coptic Egyptian, and we compare them with those of Classical Greek and Berber. The main source for the Egyptian fractional numerals data is mathematical texts, mostly papyri, written in hieratic script. Egyptian fractional number expressions were used to denote the concept of a unit fraction, understood as the last fractional part of a unit divided into a number n of equal parts. Egyptians expressed ordinary proper fractions, with a numerator ≥ 2 , as the sum of two or more unit fractions, the only exception being $2/3$, which was very frequent in calculations, and to a lesser extent $3/4$. The general way to express unit fractions in Egyptian was by combining the noun r "part" with a numeral to convey the denominator. The numeral was written after the "part" denoting noun. That order probably reflected the information structure, and in ordinary language, the numeral appeared before the noun. It has been proposed that the numeral in the unit fraction expression had an ordinal interpretation, and a fractional numeral such as r -mdw ("partten", $1/10$) had the meaning "the tenth part" (Gardiner 1979, par. 265). We suggest that the noun r in expressions such as r -10 could have a predicative interpretation with the meaning "a partition in ten fragments" or "a ten-partitioned unit". No article affix was used in Middle Egyptian with the name r . In Coptic Egyptian, the definite article was prefixed to the masculine noun p -ra-wtooy ("the-part-four"). In Middle Egyptian the unit fractions one-half and one-quarter were represented by separate names: gc , "side" ($1/2$) and hsb "fraction" ($1/4$), later replaced by r -jfdw (r -4, $1/4$). In the Egyptian language gc and hsb are natural fractions (Neugebauer 1951) that express basic concepts from which other fractions were derived. They conveyed the notions of halving and doubling, which had a fundamental role in Egyptian arithmetic operations. The unit fractions r -Hmtw (part-3), hsb ($1/4$) were complemented by the fractions rwy ($2/3$) and xmt rw ($3/4$). Rwy , symbolized in hieratic with a double line above the numeral $//2$, had the meaning 'the 2 parts (that remain after subtracting the third part)' (Gardiner 1979, par. 265). The complementary fraction rwy ($//2$) (the reciprocal of $1\ 1/2$) seemed to have been a frequently used one, and it was probably better known by the scribes than r -Hmtw ($1/3$), which was often expressed as gs n rwy ("1/2 of 2/3"). To link the fractional nominal expression with the noun denoting the unit being partitioned, Coptic Egyptian used the indirect genitive (nisbe n) construction (t -paéente-yéh "the-half of-the-night"). The direct genitive was still used in Coptic with nouns that formed a compound nominal with the fractional numeral (oy -phis àoooy "1-half day"). Berber also uses indirect genitive ($azin$ n $irgazn$ "half of men").

The Greeks had a tendency to express ordinary proper fractions in the Egyptian way as the sum of unit fractions. However, ordinary proper fractions were also expressed by a single fractional number expression (Archimedes, Diophantus), which could be notated in a variety of ways. Coptic adopted the Greek alphabetic notation for unit fractions (d' (1/4)). The neuter noun *μέρος*, the feminine *μοιρα* "part" or *λεπτά* ('fraction', 'fractional part') were used to express fractional numerals: *γ' μέρος* (1/3), *τὰ τρίτον μέρος* ('the third part'). Complementary fractions were also composed with the neuter *μέρος* (*τὰ δύο μέρη* "the two parts", 2/3). To express ordinary proper fractions, the noun that denotes the denominator appears in the genitive case (*Τῶν πέντε τὰς δύο μοίρᾱς* ,2/5).

Elliott Lash & Chris Lucas: Bipartite negation in Egyptian-Coptic and beyond

This study addresses the development of bipartite negation in the history of Egyptian-Coptic and argues that the presence of bipartite negation as a North African areal feature has its origins in the Coptic *n...an* construction.

Bipartite negation in Egyptian is generally said to start with the Early Egyptian focal-negator *nj...js* (later *nn...js*). In fact it is not clear that *js* is genuinely a negative element. Rather, it is a focalising particle in dependent clauses which also frequently co-occurs with the true negator *nj* (and *nn*), but never itself becomes restricted to negative contexts. Where it occurs with a negative element the two surround the first prosodic unit of the sentence (Loprieno 1995: 128). However, the scope of negative focus is on the element following *js*. *js* appeared after both pronominal forms (1) and particles (2):

- 1) *nj* *ntk* *js* *zj*
 NEG you FOC real.man
 'You aren't a *real man*'
 nj *jn* *js* N pn dd nn

- 2) NEG PTC FOC N this says this
 'It's not *this N* who says this.'

Later, in the Middle Egyptian period, we find a second focalising negative construction *bn...jwn3* which, however, has a quite different syntax (3) to *nj...js* despite effectively replacing it in this function.

- 3) *bn* *ju=j* *hr* *sdm* *jwn3*
 NEG PTC=1s. on hearing FOC/NEG
 'I do not hear.'

Here the element in focus is that which precedes *jwn3*. The etymology of this item is elusive: we

first find it in the Late Egyptian period where it is already a strong negative polarity item, hence it differs both syntactically and functionally from its supposed counterpart *js*. We follow Meltzer (1990) in seeing *jwn3* as a borrowing from a non-standard dialect in which it had already developed this function, presumably from an earlier weak negative polarity item. It appears that the *bn...jwn3* construction started off restricted to non-verbal sentences, but later expanded its range to include various verbal forms, thanks, we argue, to the reanalysis of marked verbal nouns as full-fledged tense-marking verbs.

Finally, *bn...jwn3* appears in Coptic as *n...an*, in which *an* no longer has any particular focalising properties, indeed *an* becomes sufficient to mark negation on its own, in an instance of Jespersen's Cycle, familiar from European languages. We present the results of a corpus study of late Coptic texts which suggest, however, that even by the 9th century the bipartite construction *n...an* still dominates, while the majority of examples of negation with *an* alone can be attributed to the omission of *n* for purely phonological reasons. This finding is crucial to an explanation of bipartite negation as a North African areal phenomenon (found in both Arabic and Berber; Lucas 2007) as it makes possible the hypothesis we develop that negation with *ma...-š* in Arabic has its origin in the imposition of bipartite negation by native speakers of Coptic on their L2 Arabic after the Arab conquest of Egypt in the seventh century.

Matthias Müller:

Adversative Coordination in Coptic

Adversative coordination belongs to the group of Coptic grammatical characteristics that have attracted relative little interest among researchers. A glance through recent descriptions of Coptic reveals that often no information thereof is given at all (e.g. Reintges 2004; Eberle 2004) or that this is limited to simple listing of lexical items used (Layton 2004: §§145; 256; 235). In older works there is often slightly more data (Till 1970: § 364; Steindorff 1951: §211) but a more detailed description is found only in Ludwig Stern's grammar (1880: §596-599). Yet, even his discussion is restricted mainly to a list of examples. In addition, Stern's description focuses on clausal coordination only. Although he gives examples of phrasal coordination, he does not, for instance, comment upon the absence of adversative coordinate attributes. In Ancient Egyptian the topic of adversative coordination has been almost wholly neglected, presumably due to absence of an adversative lexeme or morpheme in Egyptian of this stage.

The present paper examines the question of adversative coordination first in Coptic. Among the various adversative conjunctions listed the majority are of Greek origin. Those of a Coptic descent can be traced back to complex personal pronouns. The various conjunctions are contrasted on basis of their syntactic and pragmatic functions in order to see whether there exist patterns similar as those found in unmarked coordination (Ernst 1994). Finally, the paper discusses the situation in Ancient Egyptian, where none of the Coptic lexical items appear to have had etymological forerunners with a similar pragmatic function. Consequently, there arises the question whether the language actually possessed a feature [\pm adversative] or whether the modern focus on discrete lexical items obscures patterns that might be analysed thus.

Bibliography

Eberle, Andrea 2004. *Koptisch — Ein Leitfaden durch das Săidische, unter Mitarbeit von Regine Schulz, Languages of the World, Materials 7, Mŭnchen.*

Ernst, Ralf 1994. „NP-Koordination im Koptischen & Neuägyptischen“, *LingAeg* 4: 89-115.
Layton, Bentley 2004. *A Coptic Grammar, with Chrestomathy & Glossary, Sahidic Dialect, Porta Linguarum Orientalium* 20, 2. Auflage, Wiesbaden.
Reintges, Christoph H. 2004. *Coptic Egyptian (Sahidic Dialect): A Learner's Grammar, Afrikawissenschaftliche Lehrbücher* 15, Köln.
Steindorff, Georg 1951. *Lehrbuch der Koptischen Grammatik*, Chicago.
Stern, Ludwig 1880. *Koptische Grammatik*, Leipzig.
Till, Walter Curt 1970. *Koptische Grammatik (Säidischer Dialekt) mit Bibliographie, Lesestücken & Wörterverzeichnissen, Lehrbücher für das Studium der Orientalischen Sprachen* 1, 4. Auflage, Leipzig.

Carsten Peust:

Endreim im Koptischen und in anderen Sprachen

End rhyme, as characteristics of poetic language in general, belongs to the least explored fields within linguistics, or is not even seen as falling within the discipline of linguistics. It is attempted here to initiate a typological approach in the study of end rhyme.

Among several possible subtypes of rhyme (= identity of segments within text strings), end rhyme (= identity of segments at the end of text strings) is the most wide-spread type today. Some languages also make use of end rhyme as a grammatical means outside poetry ("echo compounds"). It is argued that despite its present near-global distribution, end-rhyme is a language contact phenomenon which spread from a still unidentified source only comparatively recently.

Among the possible typological parameters of end rhyme belong at least: (1) "rhyme phonology": the division of the sound space implied in the notion of "identity" in rhymes, which does not always coincide with "common phonology", and (2) the size of the segment that is required to be identical. Sketches of settings of rhyme parameters in some languages are provided. It is suggested that one way of according rhyme phonology with common phonology could be to assume a hierarchy of phonological features to distinguish between phonemes, with rhyme having the possibility of ignoring features whose rank is lower than a certain threshold. Finally, end rhyme in Coptic is discussed, where this mechanism was introduced when the language was already on the verge of language death. Being a tradition relatively independent from the better known European rhymes, Coptic rhyme provides some features which seem "exotic" to us.

It is finally hinted at the possibility of deducing information on the pronunciation of Coptic based on rhyme usage.

Chris H. Reintges:

The diachronic typology of the Egyptian-Coptic stative diathesis

1. THE ISSUE. The relationship between changes in the morphology and the consequences thereof insyntax has been a topic of recurrent debate in historical linguistics. Much recent work connects structural shifts in grammar to prior morphological change, which is generally equated with the simplification of morphological properties (e.g. Joseph 1990; Harris & Campbell 1995;

Roberts & Roussou 2003). However, as Lightfoot (2006: 101) points out, the opposite scenario of INCREASING morphological complexity should be equally possible. The life-cycle of the Egyptian-Coptic stative provides a case in point, where the transformation of an inflectional paradigm into a lexical-derivational process of stem formation gives rise to an extremely rich and largely unpredictable morphology. The growth of morphological complexity contrasts of the stative diathesis with a stable resultative-stative meaning and relatively modest changes in argument structure (valence).

2. STATIVE DIATHESIS. Ancient Egyptian represents the typologically marked case of a language in which a stative-resultative verb form is not derived from non-stative base form, but where the members of the opposition, stative and eventive, are encoded by different types of inflectional paradigms (cf. Nedjalkov & Jaxontov 1988: 29). The stative conjugation is an integral part of the grammatical voice system. On the one hand, it imposes a stative-resultative interpretation on the finite verb form. On the other hand, it encodes alternations in the participant status of the subject referent vis-à-vis the situation that is described. More specifically, the subject of Stative-inflected verbs is semantically interpreted as the AFFECTED, i.e. the entity upon which the principal effects of the action at hand devolves (Klaiman 1991: 69ff.). As an AFFECTIVE conjugation pattern, the Egyptian Stative is semantically contrastive with the eventive conjugation, which shows an alternation between active and three distinct morphological passives.

3. TWO INFLECTIONAL PARADIGMS. Finite verb forms occur in two exclusively suffixal conjugation patterns to morphologically distinguish event- and state-denoting verbs that are derived from the same root. While there is an exponent of every person, gender and number combination in the synthetic forms of the Eventive paradigm, two or more paradigmatic cells share one exponent in the corresponding Stative.

Eventive-inflected verbs appear in two distinct forms: a *s y n t h e t i c* form containing a person, number and gender marking personal suffix and a *b a r e , a n a l y t i c* form which lacks such a suffix. The selection of synthetic and analytic forms in the Eventive paradigm is dependent on the pro/nominal status of subject: synthetic forms can only appear in the absence of a nominal subject. Unlike the Eventive conjugation, the Stative paradigm only has synthetic forms, which do not differentiate between nominal and pronominal subjects. These facts can be accommodated by analyzing the personal endings of Stative verb forms as subject agreement, whereas the Eventive conjugation lacks agreement proper: the suffixes on the synthetic forms of Eventive verb forms represent incorporated pronouns that occupy the designated postverbal subject position. In the Stative paradigm, the presence of agreement in excludes independent tense, aspect, mood as well as passive morphology, while the absence of agreement in the Eventive paradigm makes it compatible with the entire range of tense, aspect, mood, and passive voice morphology (Reintges 2005).

4. PARADIGM EROSION. The inflectional paradigm of the Stative conjugation patterns in Middle Egyptian, Late Egyptian, and Demotic is represented in table 1. The reconstruction of the second person plural *-tn* of the Late Egyptian Stative is not entirely certain (Erman 1933, 159 §334).

The historical development of the Stative shows a general tendency towards paradigm erosion, which manifests itself in the reduction of paradigmatic cells (i.e. the disappearance of the dual) as well as the reanalysis of the exponents of certain person, number and gender distinctions as morphological markers of grammatical voice. Accordingly, the erstwhile inflections become indifferent towards the referential specification of the preverbal subject, which results in 'apparent' agreement mismatches, as seen in examples (1)-(2).

Demotic has a greater variety of alternating stative stems, which originates from the reanalysis of the agreement inflection as grammatical voice marker (Johnson 1974, 16f.). Such specialised prefixes seem to represent a morphological innovation of Demotic Egyptian, which did not survive in Coptic. Yet, such innovations may be at the heart of the unusually rich and complex system of Coptic stative formation.

5. STATIVE STEM PATTERN IN COPTIC. The formation of statives in Coptic Egyptian reflects an essentially lexical process during which intransitive-unaccusative verbs are derived from transitive and intransitive-unergative ones. At the root of this morphological complexity lie a large number of apophonic ('Ablaut') patterns, which combine with remnant agreement in some morphological classes. Thus, consider the following pairs of eventive (absolute state) and stative forms from different morphological classes of verbs:

6. CONCOMITANT SYNTACTIC CHANGES. With its extremely rich and largely unpredictable morphology and its irregular lexical distribution, Coptic stative formation seems markedly derivational in character. However, in terms of syntactic behavior and stable semantics, it behaves more like an inflectional category of the verb. The 'Aktionsart' semantics of the Stative remains constant, describing states that result from prior events (e.g.; Layton 2000, 151ff. §§186-193; Reintges 2004a, 204ff. §6.1.2). The main patterns of syntactic change concern the loss of transitive-active statives. In other words, the stative develops into a detransitivizing voice that eliminates the AGENT argument of a transitive-active verb and promotes the PATIENT argument to subject. The erosion of the Middle Egyptian Stative paradigm in Late Egyptian and Demotic made room for the reanalysis of stativized motional and positional verbs as aspectual auxiliaries. However, this diachronic process was never fully accomplished in so far as such grammaticalized statives never replaced their lexical counterparts. Furthermore, the effects of grammaticalization could be reversed in certain lexical classes of verbs.

REFERENCES

- ERMAN, A. 1933. *Neuaegyptische Grammatik*. Leipzig: Engelmann Verlag.
- HARRIS, A.C. and L. CAMPBELL. 1995. *Historical Syntax in Cross-linguistic Perspective*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 74. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- JOHNSON, J.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, B. 1990. *Morphology and Universals in Syntactic Change: Evidence from Medieval and Modern Greek*. New York: Garland.
- KLAIMAN, M.H. 1991. *Grammatical Voice*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 59. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- LAYTON, B. 2000. *A Coptic Grammar, With Chrestomathy and Glossary*. Porta Linguarum

- Orientalium N.S. 20. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.*
- LIGHTFOOT, D. 2006. *How New Languages Emerge. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.*
- LOPRIENO, A. 1995. *Ancient Egyptian - A Linguistic Introduction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.*
- NEDJALKOV, V.P. and S.J. JAXONTOV 1988. *The Typology of Resultative Constructions. In Typology of Resultative Constructions. Edited by V.P. Nedjalkov. Typological Studies in Language 12. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 3-62.*
- REINTGES, C.H. 2004a. *Coptic Egyptian (Sahidic Dialect): A Learner's Grammar. Afrikawissenschaftliche Lehrbücher 15. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.*
- 2005a. *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 K. É.Kiss. Studies in Generative Grammar 83. Berlin: Mouton, 31-103.*
- ROBERTS, I.G. and A. ROUSSOU. 2003. *Syntactic change: A Minimalist Approach to Grammaticalization. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 100. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.*

Tonio Sebastian Richter : **Lexical Borrowing into Coptic. A Case Study in Loanword Typolog**

Although not based on a sound and broad lexicographical base until today, lexical borrowing from Greek into Coptic has always attracted scholars as a most obvious feature of Coptic written texts. While in the 19th and 20th centuries single items and selected groups of Greek loanwords have largely been studied from a merely philological perspective, with the foremost aim of clarifying morphological and semantic properties of borrowed words, recently the focus has been expanding and shifting to issues closer to general linguistics, such as syntactic strategies of inserting lexical items of various grammatical categories into Coptic structures and the effects caused thereby, borrowability of various grammatical and semantic types of loanwords, and the sociolinguistic processes underlying the linguistic evidence of Coptic.

The approach chosen in the present paper takes its starting point from Martin Haspelmath's strategy paper "Loanword typology: Steps toward a systematic cross-linguistic study of lexical borrowability". Based on three coherent corpuses of Coptic non-literary texts (far from representative in terms of sheer quantity), lexical borrowing from the two donor languages Greek and Arabic will be dealt with alongside such issues as borrowability scales, parts of speech, token frequency, semantic fields, etc., in order to gain some comparable data from Coptic bearing upon a general idea about factors for differential borrowability of word meanings.

Lit.:

- FEWSTER, Penelope 2002: *"Bilingualism in Roman Egypt". In: J.N. ADAMS, M. JANSE & S. SWAIN: Bilingualism in Ancient Society. Language Contact and the Written Text. Oxford, 220-245.*
- HASPELMATH, Martin 2008. *"Loanword typology: Steps toward a systematic cross-linguistic study of lexical borrowability". In: STOLZ, Thomas; BAKKER, Dik; PALOMO, Rosa (eds.): Aspects of Language Contact: New Theoretical, Methodological and Empirical findings with special focus on Romanisation Processes. Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 35. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 43-62.*

KASSER, Rodolphe 1991. "Vocabulary, Copto-Greek". In: *The Coptic Encyclopedia* vol. 8: Appendix: Linguistics, 215-222.

ORÉAL, Elsa 1999. "Contact linguistique. Le cas du rapport entre le grec et le copte". *Lalies* 19, 289-306.

RICHTER, Tonio Sebastian 2006. "Coptic[, Arabic loanwords in]". In: *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*, vol. 1. Leiden, 595-601.

**Wolfgang Schenkel:
Aspekt oder Tempus. Ägyptische „tenses“ im Spiegel ägyptologischer
Übersetzungen**

Das Ägyptisch-Koptische wandelt sich im Laufe der Zeit von einer Aspekt- zu einer Tempus-Sprache. Kontrovers beurteilt wurde und wird, inwieweit (wenn nicht gleich: ob) man es im klassischen Ägyptisch noch mit Aspekten oder schon mit Tempora zu tun hat. Ich schlage vor, die Frage einmal ganz pragmatisch anzugehen: Wie werden ägyptische „tenses“ intuitiv in moderne Tempus-Sprachen übersetzt? Liegen im Ägyptischen Aspekte vor, müssten diese bei der Übersetzung partiell anders umgesetzt werden, als wenn es sich um Tempora handelte. Das Experiment kann man unabhängig voneinander an den finiten Verbalformen der Suffixkonjugation, den finiten Relativformen und den infiniten Partizipien durchführen. Was die Partizipien und Relativformen angeht, möchte ich Überlegungen weiterführen, die ich bei Gelegenheit der Bad Honnefer Tagung zum Gedenken an Hans Jacob Polotsky unabgeschlossen zurückgelassen habe (s. *LingAeg* 14 (2006), S. 79f.).

**Ariel Shisha-Halevy:
Reflections on Adnominal, Adverbal, Adnexal – On Clauses in Satellital Status in
Coptic**

Thirty-five years following a doctoral dissertation on the circumstantial conversion and sentence in Shenoutean Sahidic Coptic, and on the basis of an extensive corpusbased study of the circumstantial and relative conversions in several dialects of Coptic, a brief analytical and typological rethinking is offered of the following issues:

- the structural meaning of adnominality and nuclearity, expansion, satellitehood and periphery as a syntactic/syntactic status in Coptic;
- the compatibility of adnominality and rhematicity;
- the asymmetry between an adnexal and an attributive clausal expansion;
- the environmental “specificity aura” or sphere of a noun phrase, as consequential for its nexus or a nexal expansion.

Terminological and conceptual issues will be discussed, as time permits.

Andréas Stauder:

From morphological passive to desubjective. Some synchronic and diachronic idiosyncrasies of detransitive constructions in Egyptian

In order to provide a general background to passives in Earlier Egyptian, I will start by summarily alluding to two remarkable typological peculiarities. Earlier Egyptian has multiple morphological passives (according to some up to four), whose complex functional distribution is due to diverse aspectual and pragmatic restrictions, which in turn reflect different diachronic sources. As to the morpheme introducing the demoted agent, it cannot be synchronically analyzed as a preposition and may follow passives only, always introducing a nominal A or S, never an instrumental or the like, nor a pronoun.

The second part will be devoted to describing the rather unusual evolution of the tw-marked detransitive construction, from a morphological passive to a desubjective. Examples from Dynasty XII (ca. 1950 BC) onwards show its ongoing functional extension to non-dynamic and non-agentive state of affairs, later even to non-verbal clauses. At the same time, the morpheme undergoes categorial reanalysis, as evidenced by its increasing use in preverbal NP slot, instances of doubling, acquisition of control properties, and its later integration as part of a paradigm of newly developed independent pronouns.

As an epilogue to part 2, I will briefly evoke some further evolutions directly or indirectly triggered by the said reanalysis : the loss of the other main type of morphological passive, the semantic reconstruction of a former resultative/stative to a pure stative, the development of a large class of O/S ambitransitives, the replacement of the tw-desubjective by a more classical construction built with a non-anaphorical 3pl., and its eventual reanalysis as an agentive passive in later Demotic and Coptic.

The third part will strive at an explanation to the peculiar evolution witnessed by the tw-marked detransitive construction. A general context, favorable to later reanalysis, is provided by the strong pragmatic functionalization of Earlier Egyptian detransitive constructions, the tw-passive in particular. In a typological perspective, especially as compared with the Semitic counterparts of the tw-passive, this appears as a consequence of the rigid word order patterns of Earlier Egyptian, not allowing for WO-inverse-like constructions.

The causal element itself however would lie with the particular ways by which the diachronic extension of the SVO order took place. Initially associated with progressive, stative/resultative and prospective semantics only, it later invades less strongly marked domains, perfective, general imperfective, future. In the latter domains, some formal strategy has to be developed in order to allow for the expression of detransitive state of affairs.

Lastly, the typological audience will be asked how far the process of reanalysis that has been described and interpreted in this presentation would qualify as an instance of partial antigrammaticalization, beyond mere reanalysis.

Sami Uljas:

Describing the Earlier Egyptian Verbal System: Topics on Methodology and Research Practises

The present paper offers a reassessment of the methods used in Egyptological linguistics for defining and isolating verb forms in Earlier (Old and Middle) Egyptian language.

Traditionally, there have been two principal alternative approaches to this problem: one devised by A. Erman and developed by H.J. Polotsky, and another due to K. Sethe. Yet, as discussed, of these only the former is nowadays widely used in the field. By contrast, the Sethean method has, with only minor exceptions, lapsed into oblivion in more recent Egyptological research.

Unlike its less popular counterpart, the currently favoured method assumes verb forms to be isolable in fixed syntactic positions such as adjunct clauses, and views them as largely equivalent to paradigms of writings of the various types of roots of the Earlier Egyptian verb. However, when subjected to a closer scrutiny, it is found to suffer from various practical and theoretical difficulties. These are illustrated with a number of case studies involving the sDm=f-formation in various syntactic positions as well as by comparing the method and the model of the Earlier Egyptian verbal system it proposes with material from other languages and with general linguistic theory. It is argued that in all instances the equation of syntactic position with form is not the sole available analysis of the data. Furthermore, this seems to break various widely recognised principles pertaining to isomorphism of form and function, and to confuse syntax and morphology.

As a response to these difficulties, the alternative method of isolating verb forms in Earlier Egyptian – which stresses the primacy of morphological observations over syntax – is re-examined and found to be free from the problems marring its more popular rival. Yet, its systematic application reveals that it too is ultimately open to various cross-linguistic and other objections. Most importantly, and again using the sDm=f-formation as an illustration, it is shown that the Sethean method forces the assumption of extreme poly-functionality of many forms, which is most unlikely to be correct when set against data from other languages.

In sum, it is argued that all the currently available methods of defining and identifying verb forms in Earlier Egyptian have innate defects. It seems that no final word can as yet be said on which – if any – of them should be adopted as the foundation of grammatical analyses.

Nevertheless, it is tentatively suggested that the second, hitherto less applied method might have various advantages over the current orthodoxy both in terms of internal consistency and the overall likelihood of correctness of the results. A significantly developed form of the Sethean method appears to provide a better description of how mapping of functions onto forms may take place involving only a very limited set of morphologically distinct patterns. This not only seems to be more in keeping with comparable mechanisms observable in languages generally. In addition, the resulting model of Earlier Egyptian verbal system can be updated in conjunct with developments in linguistic research outside the field of Egyptology.

c. telic transitive verbs + Ø + m SN : activity in a place

3: iw.i (Hr) xpr m pAy sxr n TA.t
iw(seq.).1msg (Hr become(inf.) in this manner of steal(inf.)
seq.)

Ø m nA maHa.wt n nA sr.w
Ø in the(pl.) tombs of the(pl.) nobles
« and I got in this manner of stealing in the tombs of the nobles »

(P. Léopold II-Amherst, III,5)

d. telic transitive verbs + m SN [+ PATIENT] : progressive meaning

4: sw ir m pAy.f sHn
3msg do(inf.) in his duty
« he is doing his duty » (*LRL* 32,13)

All these constructions cannot obviously be derived from a single prototype. There are many differences at the semantic (nature and thematic roles of the actants) and at the syntactic level (reaction to some derived constructions like passivization). Up to a certain point, it is clear that diachrony matters for understanding how this complex process evolved.

It is strongly suggested here that the emphatic function of the m-phrase (pattern b) should be completely disconnected from the other uses. It is proposed to analyse this pattern as V + Ø + m + SN, that is with a zero-object followed by the so-called m of equivalence : irr.f Ø m X « he does (it), namely X », that is « it is X that he does ». Only this construction can be passivized :

6: mntw nA ptr.i aqA
3pl the(pl.) see(relative).1sg exactly
« it is precisely them that I saw » (P. Mayer
A, 2,14)

The pattern c is best explained as a detelicized construction by the suppression of the object (Winand 2004) and by adding a prepositional phrase to situate the locus actionis : iw.f Hr ir.t Ø m X « he is acting in the place X ». It is thus closely related to the class of intransitives :

7: iw.f Hr ktk t m nHb.t.f
iw(seq.).3msg Hr(seq.) quiver in neck.3msg
« and he began to quiver around his neck » (*LES*)

26,10-11)

In some cases, these intransitives can undergo a process of transitivization: the following example shows an interesting intermediary case with something close to a dummy object:

8: nA nty iw.w ktk nkt im.w n-dwA-Hr-
sA dwA
the(pl.) pr.rel iw(futur).3pl remove something in.3pl. from-now-
on
« those who will remove something from them from now on »

(Maâtkarê, l. 6 = Winand 2003)

In our corpus, the examples of partitive uses with verbs of consumption or of taking (pattern a) are clearly the oldest ones. So I'll reserve for this pattern the appellation « oblique expression of the object » in a narrow sense. This construction may be viewed as a means for :

- . detransitivizing the verb
- . detelicising the process, which may lead to activities

As was only to be expected, the head nouns of the syntagm are most often mass nouns or indefinite and plural. This probably paved the way for the use of this pattern in expressing progressive aspect (the semantic links between progressive and partitivity are well known). The earliest examples thereof cannot be traced back before Ramesside Late Egyptian. By that time, the oblique object was not at all mandatory (only two undisputable examples known). It must rather be seen as part of a complex strategy to mark the progressive aspect as there was no specific morphological device anymore since the disappearance of the classic opposition within the imperfective between iw.f sDm.f (inaccompli general) and iw.f Hr sDm (inaccompli progressif) (see Winand 2006).

In this paper, examples will mainly be case studies, focussing on a small set of verbs that show a maximal diversity of syntactic patterns.

3. SOME SIGNIFICANT CORRELATIONS

The choice of an oblique object (instead of a direct object) can be triggered by some features.

The most prominent ones seem to be :

- . the definition (definite vs. non definite), number (singular vs. plural) and semantics of the object (count vs. mass)
- . TAM features
- . negative polarity

4. TYPOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

What can be observed in Egyptian is not typologically isolated. Here will be (summarily) reviewed parallel or near parallel systems that can be grouped according to their morphosyntactic manifestations :

- . Case systems

- . Prepositional systems
- . Split systems

BIBLIOGRAPHY : A SHORT SELECTION (SO FAR)

- Depuydt 1993 : L. Depuydt, For the Sake of ouwꜥ Koptisch, 'love': an Exception to the Stern-Jernstedt Rule and its History, in JEA 79 (1993), p. 282-286.*
- Depuydt 1994 : L. Depuydt, On a Late Egyptian and Demotic Idiom, in RdE 45 (1994), p. 49-73.*
- Engsheden 2006 : A. Engsheden, Über die Markierung des direkten Objekts im Koptischen, in Lingua Aegyptia 14, 2006, p. 199-222.*
- Layton 2000 : B. Layton, A Coptic Grammar, Wiesbaden : Otto Harrassowitz, 2000.*
- Lazard 1994 : G. Lazard, L'actance, Paris : PUF, 1994.*
- Lazard 2001 : G. Lazard, Le marquage différentiel de l'objet, in M. Haspelmath, E. König, W. Oesterreicher, ... [et al.], Language typology and language universals : an international handbook, Berlin, New York : Walter de Gruyter, 2001.*
- Lemarechal 1997 : A. Lemarechal, Zero(s), Paris : PUF, 1997 (= Linguistique nouvelle).*
- Lemarechal 1998 : A. Lemarechal, Etudes de morphologie en f(x,...), Louvain : Peeters, 1998 (= Bibliothèque de l'Information Grammaticale, 39).*
- Neveu (1994) : Fr. Neveu, Vraie et pseudo-cleft sentence en neo-egyptien, in Lingua Aegyptia, 4, 1994, p. 191-212.*
- Polotsky 1990 : H.J. Polotsky, Grundlagen des koptischen Satzbaus, II, Atlanta : Scholars Press, 1990 (= American Studies in Papyrology, 29/2).*
- Silverman 1980 : D. Silverman, An Emphasized Direct Object of a Nominal Verb in Middle Egyptian, in Orientalia, 49 (1980), p. 199-203.*
- Winand 2003 : J. Winand, Les décrets oraculaires pris en l'honneur d'Henouttaouy et de Maatkare (Xe et VIIe pylones), in Cahiers de Karnak, 11 (2003), p. 603-710.*
- Winand 2004 : J. Winand, La non-expression de l'objet direct en égyptien ancien : études valentiennes, I, in Lingua Aegyptia, 12, 2004, p. 205-234.*
- Winand 2006 : J. Winand, Temps et aspect en ancien égyptien. Une approche sémantique, Boston-Leyde : Brill, 2006 (= Probleme der Ägyptologie, 25).*

Ewa D. Zakrzewska:

Coptic linguistics in the 21st century: synthesis and perspectives

This paper is a revised version of my main paper ('Hauptreferat') on Coptic linguistics, to be read at the Ninth International Congress of Coptic Studies in Cairo (September 2008). It is both descriptive and desiderative, as I would like to advocate more interaction between Coptic language studies and the broader world of linguistics. I am deeply convinced that such interaction will be beneficial for both linguists and Coptologists.

The postulated interaction implies a mutual exchange of insights. Coptologists could do a great job by making the Coptic language facts available to non-Coptologists. Obviously, Coptic is of interest in its own right, but it also represents the last stage of the roughly 4000 years of recorded development of the Egyptian language, and a language variety (or varieties) which developed in a bilingual society under the strong influence of Greek while at the same time displaying areal correspondences with some African languages.

A presentation of Coptic language facts in a 'linguist-readable' manner requires, among others,

the application of an analytical apparatus developed in other fields of linguistics, which sometimes can lead to a re-analysis of the Coptic facts. It is certainly not my intention to plead for a particular linguistic theory. I would rather welcome the acknowledgement of the fact that e.g. certain grammatical categories of Coptic are also to be found in other languages. This is where language typology enters. Coptic is not so exceptional as some Coptologists would like to think.

In the remaining part of my paper I will illustrate my point with examples from various subdisciplines of Coptic linguistics:

-phonology and dialect classification

-morphology and syntax

-language contact and multilingualism

-language change (both internal and contact induced) and grammaticalization

-lexicology and lexicography; corpus linguistics

-discourse analysis and pragmatics I will also pay attention to practical questions, such as the teaching of Coptic and the ever changing academic environment in which the research on Coptic has to take place.