Same Source, Different Outcomes ? A Reassessment of the Parallel between Ancient Egyptian and Akkadian 'Stative' Conjugations

Elsa Oréal

Same source, different outcomes ?*

A reassessment of the parallel between Ancient Egyptian and Akkadian 'Stative' conjugations.

Elsa Oréal, UMR 8135 (Llacan) CNRS-Inalco

Abstract

The uses of the Akkadian 'Stative' and of the Egyptian 'Pseudoparticiple' are compared in order to assess the relevance of their historical relationship to a better understanding of the Egyptian form. The *a priori* assumption that they share a common function is challenged by numerous morphosyntactic, lexical and systemic differences. The importance of Egyptian-internal evolution is emphasized, and superficial similarities are showed to be irrelevant on a structural plane. An explanation of the rise of a Stative Pseudoparticiple in Egyptian, correlative with the change from Verb-Subject predication to Subject-Predicate situational predication, is sketched.

1 Akkadian Stative vs. Egyptian Pseudoparticiple

The Akkadian Stative and its uses have been a constant point of reference in discussions of the Egyptian Pseudoparticiple, and are still taken as an argument in its analysis[1]. Thus, my contribution will take as a point of departure a more precise and up-to-date look at the Akkadian data, in order to assess what we can really make of it while trying to explain Egyptian facts. This may result in a more appropriate description of forms and functions which were partly inherited from a common source, but certainly underwent developments within Ancient Egyptian itself. Moreover, the structure of the Ancient Egyptian Pseudoparticiple is more different from that of the Akkadian Stative than is generally assumed. In particular, I hope to show that some crucial points concerning the aspectual and diathesis functions of the Egyptian Pseudoparticiple/Old Perfective (and *not* Akkadian Stative) are better explained from an Egyptian-internal point of view and as such, do not reflect shared innovations. It thus appears that a more probable historical scenario involves a shared inheritance upon which different systems developed. The emerging picture tends to move Ancient Egyptian Pseudoparticiple away from Akkadian Stative and nearer to

---

[1] For conveniency's sake, I will refer to each form with this more or less traditional name, without prejudice concerning its use and function.

the West Semitic Perfect with respect to this restricted part of the conjugation system[2].

1.1 Morphogenesis and categorization as a part of speech

There has been a long-standing debate concerning the morphogenesis of Akkadian Stative. I will try to summarize briefly the later developments of this question, since they are of crucial interest in assessing the value of the parallel which is so often drawn between the facts of Egyptian and of Akkadian. We have a base *paris*, which is the predicative form of the so-called Verbal Adjective *parsum*. The relationship between the two forms is considered to be analogous to the relationship between an adjective like *damqum* (*good*) and its predicative form, *damiq*. To this base one adds enclitic subject pronouns to get the Stative paradigm :

pars	*-aka*	*parsāku*
	-ata	*parsāta*
	-Ø	*paris*
	-t	*parsat*

With a nominal subject : S/P/A *paris*

This construction thus represents a kind of nominal sentence with a predicative participle. This participle is in itself neutral with respect to diathesis, but is usually S-O oriented, for semantic reasons. This construction has a resultative or stative aspectual value.

While everybody seems to agree on the origin of the form, this is not the case concerning its nature in historical times. Following Buccellati, some see in it a « bound nominal sentence »[3]. Other studies argue in favour of a synchronic finite verb[4]. The main argument for the latter line of thought is that « the way in which the stative functions syntactically is verbal in all respects »[5]. Whatever the exact degree of verbalization in this form, there seems to be more weight in favour of a synchronic analysis as a finite verb. In this respect, the fact that Statives can be build upon nouns, which is a well-known difference between it and the Egyptian Pseudoparticiple, has been shown to be a secondary development which does not demonstrate the nominal nature of the form as such[6]. The Akkadian-internal character of this evolution is one more argument in favour of the fact that the stative function of the form is peculiar to

---

[2] The parallel between the Akkadian and the Egyptian forms has already been criticized by Klingenheben (1956), a point which seems to have remained unconvincing for most comparatists, cf. Hodge (1971 : 45).

[3] See Buccellati (1968 & 1988) ; in the same direction Huehnergard (1987).

[4] For a verbal interpretation see Kraus (1984), whose work has been criticized by exponents of the previous thesis, and more recently Kouwenberg (2000), whose analysis seems to us as accurate as linguistically convincing.

[5] Kouwenberg (2000 : 29-30).

[6] See Kouwenberg (2000 : 33-56).

Akkadian and does not have to belong to a shared *héritage*. We shall now turn to the core of this analysis.

1.2 Akkadian vs. Egyptian adjectival/state predication

With a nominal or a Ø subject, things look the same at first sight. Sentences like « *damiq* » in Akkadian and « *nfr* » in Egyptian both mean « it is good ». But with other persons, Akkadian uses indeed the Stative, while in Ancient Egyptian, if the predicate may be represented by a kind of « verbal adjective », the pronominal subject belongs to a different set of pronouns. Moreover, the word order is different with a full noun subject, for the Akkadian Stative stays at the end of the sentence, a 3SG enclitic pronoun resuming the nominal subject[7], while the adjective verb of Egyptian follows a predicate-subject order :

	Akkadian	Egyptian
SG1	*damqāku*	*nfr wj*
SG2	*damqāta*	*nfr ṯw*
SG3m	*damiq*	*nfr sw*
SG3f	*damqat*	*nfr st*
Full Noun	*Adad damiq*	*nfr Ḥr*

This is the so-called Egyptian *« adjectival »* predication. In a forthcoming article, I study some Old Egyptian examples which show that its value is somewhat different from what has often been said[8]. Even if it has a natural affinity with the role of expressing an « inherent » quality, it does not express necessarily an essential property, but rather a mere state, which may be contingent. Now it is in fact possible in Egyptian to use the Pseudoparticiple with a state predicate. Forms like *nfr.kj*, *nfr.tj*,… are indeed attested. But here we must underscore the need to distinguish between ancient V-S order and the use in the situational predication with S-V order after reanalysis of the Pseudoparticiple endings as agreement marks. Thus, it is true that an utterance like « (particle) *Kmt nfr.tj*, Egypt is fine » may look similar to « *ilat damqat*, the goddess is good ». However, it is only if one neglects the paradigmatics of the two constructions that this superficial similarity is maintained. In Egyptian, this construction alternates with (*mk*) *wj nfr.kj, mk ṯw nfr.tj* etc…, while the Akkadian equivalent in the 1SG and 2SG need not express the pronominal subject before the Stative form (*dannāku*, I am/was/will be strong). On the other hand, there are a few occurrences in Old Egyptian of the Pseudoparticiple as a main predicate in the V-S word order pattern with state verbs. But these can be shown to be eventive or resultative[9]. Therefore, the very existence of « adjectival predication » shows that the use of the Akkadian Stative differs crucially from the Egyptian Pseudoparticiple, and should not be so directly put in parallel with it.

---

[7] Cf. Huehnergard (1997 : 220-221) : « *ilatni ina mātīšunu palḫat*, our goddess is/was feared in their land ».

[8] Oréal (forthcoming).

[9] Cf. Oréal (forthcoming).

1.3 A missing slot in Ancient Egyptian ?

It is well-known that the Egyptian Pseudoparticiple shows a striking morphological similarity to the Akkadian Stative :

	Akkadian	Egyptian
SG1	*parsāku*	*sḏm.kj*
SG2	*parsāta*	*sḏm.tj*
SG3m	*paris*	*sḏm.j>w*[10]
SG3f	*parsat*	*sḏm.tj*
Full Noun	S/A/P *paris*	??

But the parallelism is not perfect. A look at the two paradigms shows that there is *something missing* in Ancient Egyptian. What about 3SG *paris* with a nominal participant ? Belief in the close kinship between the two paradigms' relationship led scholars to consider the Egyptian equivalent to the Akkadian construction to be a 'Full Noun+Pseudoparticiple' predication. But this implicit conception is completely misleading, since in Egyptian, such sentences belong to the category of situational predication, with a crucially different syntactic use of the Pseudoparticiple as an adverbial predicate. Its endings are thus reanalyzed as agreement marks, while pronominal 1SG or 2SG subjects of the predication are present in one form or another before the Pseudoparticiple :

(1) *(mk)*   *wj*   *jy.kj*
    PCL   1SG   come.RES1SG
    I have come.

(2) *(mk)*   *ṯw*   *jy.tj*
    PCL   2SG   come.RES2SG
    You have come.

(3) *(mk)*   *Ḥr*   *jy.w*
    PCL   3SG   come.RES3SG
    Horus has come.

Hence, the 'Full Noun+Pseudoparticiple' does not belong to a paradigm with 1SG or 2SG 'predicate-subject' forms like in Akkadian, but to a different and specific type of predication where all persons may appear. There is thus no equivalence between :

---

[10] One must notice that 3MSG *sḏmw*, showing an ending (*-j>-w*), does not represent the predicative state of the adjective, while *paris* is the bare form of the predicative adjective. This morphological difference hints at a deeper one, involving the place of each form in both systems of predication and in particular its role as a real stative in Akkadian vs. the contrast of Egyptian Pseudoparticiple with adjectival '*nfr sw*' predication.

	Akkadian Stative	Egyptian Situational predication
SG1	*parsāku*	*(mk) wj jy.kj*
SG2	*parsāta*	*(mk) ṯw jy.tj*
SG3m	*paris*	*(mk) sw jy.w*
SG3f	*parsat*	*(mk) st jy.tj*
Full Noun	*š/ᵓ/P paris*	*(mk) Ḥr jy.w*

The shift to S-V order with the Egyptian situational construction concerns all persons, while in Akkadian, the seemingly similar construction involves a Full Noun or SG3 pronominal subject (e.g. *Sw paris*), but not other persons[11].

In fact, as we have tried to show elsewhere[12], this missing slot in the Egyptian original paradigm with V-S order can be filled with a form whose functional similarity to the Pseudoparticiple had indeed been recognized in some contexts : the 'perfective/indicative' *sḏm* :

Old Perfective   *sḏm* A P[13]
                   prj S[14]

To sum up, the main facts which justify the integration of these constructions with the Pseudoparticiple « incomplete » paradigm to form a unique Old Perfective are the following :

-the absence of *sḏm* + suffix pronoun with indisputable perfective/perfect value. In fact, what is really attested is *sḏm* A P with bivalent verb (in Old Kingdom autobiographies) and *prj* S with a monovalent one (in the *Pyramid Texts*).

-the complementary distribution of *sḏm* A P with « narrative » active Pseudoparticiple in some Old Kingdom autobiographies.

-the complementary distribution of Pseudoparticiple and *prj* A in the *Pyramid Texts*.

K. Sethe already said in his commentary that the *prj* S used in the *Pyramid texts* was a Pseudoparticiple (but he did not equate it with the *sḏm* A P). E. Edel dismissed this opinion with two arguments[15] :

---

[11] On the interpretation of constructions involving an independent pronoun followed by a stative, Huehnergard (1987 : 228f) seems more convincing than Kouwenberg (2000 : 30, especially n.12 for a discussion of both points of view).

[12] Cf. Oréal (2007) and (forthcoming).

[13] With A for Agentive subject, P for patientive object and S for subject of one –place verb.

[14] In analyzing *prj* in *prj* S as an ancient predicative participle, I am following a previous suggestion by Schenkel (1978 : 115), even if it was not made from the same perspective.

[15] Edel (1955-1964 : § 471), whose whole analysis of the Pseudoparticiple is highly influenced (1) by the supposed Akkadian parallel, (2) by the opinion that S-V order is characteristic of its syntactic use, no attention being paid to the fact that the situational predication as such is a construction peculiar to Egyptian.

-First, because he assumes that the Pseudoparticiple should always appear *after* the subject,; however, this is not true of its original syntactic use as a construction (predicative participle + subject). It is only the a priori parallel with Akkadian which prevents one to see that full noun + Pseudoparticiple does not have the same syntactic status in Egyptian, where nominal subjects commute with all personal pronouns in the same slot, thus representing a different type of predication known as situational predication (see below).

-Second, because of the lack of agreement in a case like :

(4) *ḫr*   *sḏ.t*   *pr.tj*   *m*   *Nw*
     fall.PFT3SG   flame   come forth. RES3SGF   from   Nu
     fallen (has) the flame that came forth from Nu[16].

This seems to be no good reason either, for in this kind of predication in Ancient Egyptian, the absence of agreement is conceivable, and even probable (since the adjectival predicate shows no agreement with a feminine subject). Here the more or less conscious reference to Akkadian may again drive us in the wrong direction, since in Akkadian, subject and predicate would indeed agree there : « a woman *šā mārī waldat*, who has given birth to children ». But the entire system of predication is quite different in Akkadian from what obtains in Ancient Egyptian, so why should it behave in the same way in this ? Things differ here too since « predicative » *paris* in Akkadian fits in a system which is not fully homologous to the Egyptian one. This fact is coherent with our historical reconstitution, with an Egyptian paradigm with no stative function and following a path of verbalization as a perfect which was not taken by its Akkadian cognate.

We can thus reconstruct a kind of fluid semantic alignment in Protoegyptian, i.e. a moment in the history of the Egyptian language when the grammar showed an opposition between eventive Old Perfective and stative predication :

SG1	*sḏm.kj*	*nfr wj*
SG2	*sḏm.tj*	*nfr ṯw*
SG3m	*sḏm.j>w*	*nfr sw*
SG3f	*sḏm.tj*	*nfr st*
Full Noun	*sḏm* A	*nfr* S
	prj A	

Thus, in this phase of Ancient Egyptian, we had motion verbs like *prj* going with transitive verbs as eventive predicates vs. adjectival predication, which we might call the real Stative.

1.4 The case of motion verbs

---

[16] PT 237aW.

Another crucial difference between Akkadian Stative and Egyptian Pseudoparticiple lies in the fact that in Akkadian, it is most unusual for motion verbs to be attested in the Stative. To cite Buccellati 1988 :

« intransitive fientive roots occur as predicates only in « verbal » (or « fientive » sentences – thus no stative sentence is generally possible with a verb like aläkum, to go »[17].

The Stative can still be used in some infrequent cases with an intransitive verb, and then, it denotes rest after motion, i.e. resulting state : *wašib* means « he is seated », which seems similar to Egyptian *ḥmsw*. But this similarity is very restricted in fact, since in Egyptian, the use of the Pseudoparticiple with all kinds of motion verbs like *jy, to go* is usual. This fact is very striking for an Egyptian-oriented use of the data, although it has remained largely unnoticed. Such a difference with Akkadian fits well in the picture which we are trying to draw, since it may be explained as resulting from the different aspectual function of the form in each system :

-as a perfect specialized for eventive predication in Egyptian, the Pseudoparticiple had to be used currently with verbs of motion, which are dynamic by nature.

-while in Akkadian, the Stative, being initially a predicative form of the Verbal Adjective with a real stative meaning, in opposition to the eventive prefixal conjugation, had to remain rare.

1.5 The optative use of the Pseudoparticiple

This use of both Egyptian Pseudoparticiple and Akkadian Stative has been considered as strengthening the parallel between the two forms[18]. But there are many differences in the way they can express a kind of wish. In Akkadian, the optative use of the Stative implies the presence of a particle like *lū*, and from a syntactic point of view, it can be regarded as a kind of nominal clause[19] :

« *lū balṭāta* ! may you live ! »
« *lū awīlāta* ! be a man ! »
« *lū dari*, may he live ! »
are parallel to
« *anākū lū amtum*, let me be a maidservant ! »
« *abušu lū atta*, be his father ! »
« *'dad lū bēl dīnīka*, may Adad be your adversary ! »

In Ancient Egyptian, no particle is used before the Pseudoparticiple, and there is no parallel with nominal sentences. In fact, there is a need to reassess the Egyptian data here. Gardiner was cautious in calling this use « exclamatory »[20], maybe less so

---

[17] Buccellati (1988 : 181-182).
[18] Edel (1955-1964 : § 591).
[19] Cf. Lipinski (1997 : 525) ; Huehnergard (1997 : 326).
[20] Gardiner (1957 : § 312).

in putting the 2SG and 3SG uses on the same plane[21]. Indeed, it concerns mostly greetings and exhortations with some formulaic character, and it is in any case not constructed freely with all verbs. As suggested by Gardiner, one should recognize here an adverbial phrase with an implicit subject (the addressee) known from the context[22]. From a syntactic point of view, we thus have here a situational predication with omitted 2SG topic under situational relevance/saliency[23]. Accordingly, the discourse act is pragmatically more a blessing or a recommendation than an order, as is the case with other situational predicate with no particle and topic like « *m ḥtp*, in peace ! », or with constructions using the same situational predication with a nominal topic *jb=k wḏȝj* or *ḥr=k ꜥnḫj*). This interpretation agrees with the fact that there is no sure attestation of this « optative » use with active transitive verbs, but only with state verbs (*wḏȝ, wꜥb*) and intransitive active verbs like *jgr, ꜥnḫ, ꜥḥꜥ, rs, ḥms*…[24]. From a semantic point of view, the crucial fact is that this kind of utterance aims at maintaining a state presented as the result of a previous action or event. Thus it oftens makes implicit reference to the reverse state, which by the same token is argumentatively presented as a probability whose actualization the speaker is trying to avoid. This meaning fits in better with a purely resultative interpretation. The following example illustrate this use with a state verb :

(5)   *wḏȝ.tj*
        be safe.RES2SG
        (be/remain) saved ![25]

These are the words that the king says to the unlucky courtier who involuntarily touched him in order to spare him any harmful consequences. In such a circumstance, he does not want to wish him to be in good health in a general way, but rather to express the fact that his blessing will preserve a well-being which was immediately threatened by the accident. The state which is thus aimed at is seen as a result of a performative action, and not as a fact with no internal dynamics. It could be paraphrased « be given health again ! ».

---

[21] The very existence of the latter has been called into doubt, and it is in fact a translation artifact, which renders an adverbial-attributive use (e.g. « given life » translated « may he live ! »).

[22] It is thus unfortunate to have classified this use of Pseudoparticiple as Pseudoparticiple « used independently ».

[23] Cf. Kammerzell (1991 : 165-199, 181) about optative Pseudoparticiple as being in a « Spannungsfeld zwischen oberflächlicher Satzwertigkeit und tiefenstruktureller Abhängigkeit ».

[24] It is indeed necessary to withdraw from the very short list of examples given by Edel to illustrate the optative use of the Pseudoparticiple those which show transitive verbs or intransitive verbs expressing a punctual event and not a resulting state. Cf. Edel (1955-1964 : § 593-594), esp. PT 1268b *j.ḏd.t(j)*, which Faulkner (1969) already rendered with a passive, and could maybe represent an archaïc use of dynamic Pseudoparticiple, cf. *Sinouhé,*114 : *ḏd.kj* ; PT 1234a where the Pseudoparticiple is best understood as a dynamic perfect (*Ḥr, ḫsfj.tj m P*, Horus, you have met with Pepi). With passive meaning, it cannot be frequent either, but there seems to be an attestation of it in « *Ḥs.tj*, be praised ! » which occurs in pWestcar, 9, 3.

[25] *Urk.* I, p. 232, l. 9.

The next example shows an optative Pseudoparticiple with an intransitive verb of action :

(6) *j.gr.tjwnj*
     be silent.RES2PL
     Be silent ![26]

The speaker promises a good catch of fowl to his comrades, if they don't make a noise. The resultative meaning is here bound to the fact that the verb *jgr* has an inherent ingressive *Aktionsart* (*to become silent*)[27].

(7) *ꜥnḫ.tj*   *nḥḥ.tj*
     come to life.RES2SG   endure.RES2SG
     (Be/stay) given life, (be/stay) given duration ![28]

We could paraphrase this 'be *hic-et-nunc* in such state (meaning of the situational predication) as a result from the ritual' vs. imperative *ꜥnḫ, live !* (unmarked point of view). This analysis applies well to examples coming from dialogues in tomb scenes like the following, where the optative Pseudoparticiple express more a warning than a wish :

(8) *ḥr.tj*   *jr*   *tꜣ*
     be far.RES2SG   prep   land
     Stay far from the ground !

(9) *j.rs.tj*   *jr*   *ḥr*
     be far.RES2SG   prep   land
     Watch out for the rope [29]!

since the commended state is presented as a result from action (*to watch, to go far*). In the *Pyramid Texts* like in the latter example, one can observe the use of the imperative as a variant. One can here suggest that it represents the unmarked choice vs. the « optative » Pseudoparticiple as the marked option, which pragmatically implies immediate relevance to the situation of utterance and implicit refusal of the potentially reverse state.

While there is no difficulty to assume that suprasegmentals marked the optative use vs. the assertive one, some supposed examples of the optative use of Egyptian Pseudoparticiple in the *Pyramid Texts* or the *Coffin Texts* could, and some of them

---

[26] Cf. Erman (1918 : 37), who notes that the augment j- as « auffällig ». According to Kammerzell (1991), it marks the form as active, a result which fits in well with our analysis of the form as resultative.

[27] Cf. Oréal (forthcoming).

[28] PT 1477d, where parallel versions have the imperative *ꜥnḫ nḥḥ ḏt.*

[29] Variants have the simple imperative *rs* !.

should, be translated as an eventive conjugation with a perfect meaning. Debatable examples are e.g. the following :

(10)   *Wr.tj*   *rr*   *ꜥꜣ.tj*   *rr*
        be great.RES2SG   PCL   be big.RES2SG   PCL
        You have become great as much as you have become big.
        or, as an « optative » blessing :
        Grown great, grown big are you ![30]

Even if a real optative use, such an utterance still illustrates a resultative meaning in a situational predication with an implicit topic known from the context (here the same as the addressee).

2 Systemic differences and paths of evolution

2.1 The place of the « Stative » in the whole verbal system : Explaining the active Stative in Akkadian and in Ancient Egyptian

We must now turn to what is considered a « common point » between Ancient Egyptian and Akkadian which may actually appear as an interesting difference. It pertains to the way one explains the neutrality of the Stative with respect to diathesis in Akkadian, and the relevance of this explanation for Ancient Egyptian. Recent studies, despite some differences in analysis of the Stative, agree in saying that the Verbal Adjective (*parsum*) was basically neutral with respect to diathesis, but was bound to be more often interpreted as a passive for pragmatic reasons[31]. As a result, the Stative, which represents the predicative form of this Verbal Adjective, had to be initially mainly passive too, while neutral with regard to diathesis[32]. Then, the rise of the active Stative is seen as an Akkadian-internal evolution. A change in derivation made the Stative depend directly on the verbal paradigm, through an analogical process. As Huehnergard (1987 : 228) puts it :

« the fientic= nonfientic contrast between finite forms and predicative verbal adjectives that was felt to exist for all other verbal roots created paradigmatic pressure for the existence of an analogous contrast among transitive roots as well, and accordingly for the generation of a new, nonfientic counterpart of the finite forms. (…) given contrasts such as
    ušib, he sat down (= he became seated) : *wašib*, he is seated,
    innovative contrasts arose :
    imḫur, he received (= he came into receipt of) : *maḫir*, he is in receipt of

---

[30] CT I 280c (T2C).

[31] On this point, see Kouwenberg (2000 : 63-65) : « the frequency with which a VA is used is related to the degree in which the resulting state is relevant to the participants involved (…) the higher the transitivity of the action expressed by a verb, the more frequent its VA tends to be and the more consistently it shows passive meaning ».

[32] Kouwenberg (2000 : 63-65) : « In transitive verbs, it may describe either the subject or the object of the preceding action ».

Thus a Stative form was created as specialized Stative in opposition to the dynamic prefixal conjugation »[33]

Thus, from a diachronic point of view, transitive verbal roots may exhibit two forms *paris*/ *parsāku* :
-the passive verbal adjective in the predicative construction.
-the non-fientic counterpart of the transitive finite forms.

This explanation is bound to the fact that, in Akkadian, the dynamic predication is expressed using the *prefixal* conjugations (*iprus*). Now, as everybody knows, this is crucially different from the facts of Ancient Egyptian. The predicative construction whose grammaticalization gave birth to the Akkadian Stative stays from the beginning in contrast with the dynamic conjugation. As such, it was bound to have a stative-resultative aspectual function. But in Ancient Egyptian, the whole system appears to be different. For Ancient Egyptian, the analysis of the dynamic Pseudoparticiple of transitive verbs is a debated problem. As I have tried to explain elsewhere, I remain very skeptical about a purely pragmatic explanation which says : « there is no dynamic transitive active value of the Old perfect Pseudoparticiple, there is just such a non-paradigmatic use of the form with the 1SG because Old Kingdom autobiographies are ego-centered ». Moreover, this theory neglects some traces of the active use of Pseudoparticiple that do not belong to this textual category[34]. Analyzing this use as a recessive one thus seems an alternative worth trying.

2.2 What is really common to Akkadian and Ancient Egyptian ? possible diachronic scenarios

In fact, maybe the only thing which they share here could be the construction involving a participle as a predicative base followed by pronominal forms as subject. The probably genetical relationship between these pronominal forms does not imply in any way that the grammaticalized verbal form share a common destiny, while embedded in completely different predication systems. Different scenarios may explain this situation. It remains difficult to ascertain what was « inherited » and what could be parallel innovation using some shared inherited material. The complexity of the relationships between members of the Afroasiatic « family », which has nothing to do with the more straightforward situation of Indo-european, is well-known. Whatever the scenario, we do not have simply Akkadian and Ancient Egyptian as branches on a tree[35]. It may seem trivial, but the consequences have to be asserted clearly. In particular, the morphogenesis of the Akkadian Stative as it is now integrated into the system of this language must prevent us from drawing any immediate conclusions regarding the Egyptian data. What we have here are some

---

[33] See also Kouwenberg (2000 : 66-67), with different conclusions with regard to the categorization of the active stative as a verb (Kouwenberg) or a « pseudo-verb » (Huehnergard).

[34] See Oréal (forthcoming).

[35] Some questions related to the stages in this scenario have to be left open for the time being, especially what configuration was more similar to the « common » source, if there was any.

12

common morphological bricks, but the whole building is different[36]. Thus, the Egyptian form does not have to share the functions which its Akkadian morphological cognate acquired in the Akkadian system. In other words, it does not have to be a stative-resultative because the Akkadian *paris-parsāku* form is one. Thus, nothing prevents us from thinking that in Ancient Egyptian the perfect construction had moved even farther towards verbalization than in Akkadian, and that it came to be used to express not only a *result*, but an *event*, even if the form of the predicate was initially a participle.

To make clearer the kind of evolution which is meant here, we may take a typological point of comparison : the perfective in Russian shows how a nominal predication using a participle can end up as an eventive verbal form. In Old Russian, the perfect used the auxiliary to be in the present with the –l participle, which was a stative[37] :

Kolja kupil knigu (Russian)   vs. Kolja e kupil knigu (Old Russian)
Kolya bought the book   vs. Kolya is bought a book

This nominal periphrastic construction became a perfect, then a past, while eliminating the auxiliary. Russian speakers have told me that this paradigm appears synchronically as a purely verbal one and that they have no feeling of it being of nominal origin[38]. Now in Ancient Egyptian, the absence of auxiliary in the original nominal predication makes easier the shift toward a perfect use of the verbalized form. It may also help explaining the different uses attested for the Pseudoparticiple in the older stages of the language.

3. The Egyptian-internal evolution

Let us now turn toward the Egyptian facts, and their relevance for reconstructing the united paradigm of Pseudoparticiple and « perfective/indicative » *sḏm*. If the Proto-Egyptian Pseudoparticiple as a Verb-Subject predication does not have to be initially a stative, because it does not have to follow the Akkadian « parallel », there are two consequences :

-it fits perfectly in the system as a perfect, which allows us to reconstruct a paradigm uniting it with Old Perfective/Indicative *sḏm* as an Older Perfective paradigm in some stage of Proto-Egyptian leaving some traces in attested Old Egyptian.

-it may not have an initial orientation on the S-subject of intransitive predicates and O-patient of transitive ones, and the participial base may be initially A-oriented,

---

[36] It is worth noting that a common source construction (not in a genetical sense, but as a source for a grammaticalized paradigm of forms) here leads both to formal similarity and to functional difference. The title of this paper intentionally plays on both meanings of « source ».

[37] See Comrie (1976 : 107).

[38] Note by the way that the elimination of the auxiliary did not take place in Bulgarian, where the construction remained a perfect, and concerned only 1-2SG in Czech, where it became also a perfective.

or neutral towards diathesis, the form of pronominal subject marking the construction as eventive vs. stative.

In other terms, we may have in Ancient Egyptian a perfect participle as a base, followed by a subject, either Noun or Pronoun. Like in Russian, verbalization implies a change in nature. Despite a « nominal » origin, this kind of construction involving a participle as predicate may be grammaticalized as an eventive/dynamic conjugation, as is by the way well known from many Semitic languages, in particular the West Semitic perfect.

3.1 The rise of the Resultative Pseudoparticiple in the Situational predication

A correlative claim of our analysis is that this rise of the Resultative-Stative Pseudoparticiple, which was to last until Demotic and Coptic, with a S/O-orientation is a secondary development related with a major change in its syntactical function : its use in the Subject-Predicate predication and its attributive-adverbial use. The morphosyntactic path of change may have been as follows : the integration of the Pseudoparticiple in the scheme of the locative predication entails a resultative interpretation for intransitive predicates, while selecting a passive one for transitive verbs because of its inherently situative or stative meaning and thus eliminating other options which may have been previously available. The pivotal moment may be found in predication involving a motion verb like :

mk   wj   jy.kj
PCL   1SG   come.PFT1SG
See me, I have come
    >
mk   wj   jy.kj
PCL   1SG   come.RES1SG
See I have come

Two propositions are reanalyzed as one, this reinterpretation being also driven by the fact that the ending now appears no more as a subject but as a mark of agreement. Let us take an example from the *Pyramid Texts* :

(11)   *Nwt   j.ḥ^{cc}.tj   m   ẖsf   Ppj   pn*
         Nut   rejoice.PFT3SGf   in   meet.INF   Pepi   this
         Nut, she has rejoiced about meeting this Pepi[39].

This reconstruction implies that in the older phase of the language, the Pseudoparticiple with V-S order be not attested with passive meaning. To my knowledge , there seems to be very few possible counter-examples. First of all, one

---

[39] PT 1426a N. Chr. Reintges (2005 : 39) classifies this example as a Stative. This interpretation seems difficult if one looks at the context, for the construction occurs amidst a series of dynamic Perfective forms (*sḏm.n=f*).

14

should be careful to distinguish this case from situational predication with no auxiliary and ellipsis of the subject under pragmatic relevance, like the following :

(12) *sḏf₃.wjn*
      endow.RES1pl
      Well endowed are we !⁴⁰

Fishermen react to a big catch. Aspectually, this is clearly resultative, as are necessarily all passive Pseudoparticiples. It does not represent a case of the main passive use of the form outside situational predication, for this is in fact situational predication. Its content could have been phrased « *mk n sḏf₃.wjn* », while the situational immediacy of the utterance, belonging to a daily life scene allows for the absence of any locational particle and explicit topic, thus giving an exclamative or emotional tone to it⁴¹.

(13) *ḥzj.kj*   *ḥr*   *=s*   *jn*   *ḥm*   *=f*
      praise.RES1SG   about   3SGf   by   majesty   3SGM
      (I have pacified all foreign lands for the residence so that my vigilance about it was beneficial) I having been praised about it by His Majesty⁴².

This form occurs in the mid of a long sequence of topoï characteristical of autobiographical discourse, with no narrative dimension, expressed by the New Perfect *jw sḏm.n=j* or the nominal predication (repetition of *jnk*, I am…). The text does not use *h₃b wj ḥm=f,* but there are some *-t* passives with the 1SG. The fact of being rewarded does not represent one particular merit of the speaker, but belongs closely with the preceding *jw sḏm.n=j* clause, as expressing a resulting state attained by the speaker (cf. also the common *ḥr=s* with the preceding clause). In keeping with the general use of *sḏm.n=f* predication in this text, it is thus highly unlikely that this form should represent a main predicative use of the passive resultative Pseudoparticiple as V-S.

According to our analysis, with a state verb, the use of the Pseudoparticiple as predicate in the situational predication had only resultative meaning in the first stage. Then the meaning characteristic of this construction was bound to favour the emergence of a stative interpretation. With this kind of verb, there is of course little difference between being in a state as a result of a its acquisition and being in the same state state without implying any previous change⁴³. The following example illustrates the fact that in Old Egyptian, the resultative interpretation of the Pseudoparticiple it at least possible, and maybe more convincing :

(14a) *m*   *kw*   *wr.t(j)*   *šnj.t(j)*   *m*   *šn*   *wr*

---

⁴⁰ *Kagemni* I, 18.
⁴¹ Cf. Vernus (1997 : 45-57).
⁴² Urk. I, 255.
⁴³ For a more detailed analysis of this question, cf. Oréal forthcoming.

PCL   2SGM   be great.RES2SG   be round.RES2SG   as   Ring   great

Here you are, having become great und round as the Great Ring

(14b)   *m*   *kw*   *dbn.t(j)*   *šnj.t(j)*   *m*   *dbn*

           PCL   2SGM   be circular.RES2SG   be round.RES2SG   as   circle

           Here you are, having become circular und round as the Circle

(14c)   *m*   *kw*   *šnj.t(j)*   *ꜥꜣ.t(j)*   *m*   *šn ꜥꜣ sk*

           PCL   2SGM   be round.RES2SG   be big.RES2SG   as   Big Ring

           Here you are, having become round and big as the Big Ring (?)[44].

It is of course difficult to prove that the discourse here considers the qualities predicated of the dead king as resulting from an acquisition through the ritual, rather than merely describing him as having them. It is only in view of our other arguments in favour of an original eventive value of the Pseudoparticiple as a perfect that this analysis makes full sense and finds its justification. One can still note that it is perfectly coherent with the actual interpretation of this kind of statement in the funerary corpus that the speaker should consider the state of the addressee as resulting from the ritual performance[45]. The use of the presentative *m* goes in the same direction, since it focusses on the present situation as contrasting with a previous stage in the post mortem fate of the deceased.

In fact, all examples of stative translations in Old Egyptian can be interpreted as resultatives. Of course, this does not represent a proof of our analysis, but at the very least it does show that *onus probandi* lies on both parts. Following examples come from dialogues in tomb scenes showing daily life moments :

(15)   *jw*   *=s*   *snḏm.tj*   *wrt*

         PCL   3SGF   make soft.RES3SGF   greatly

         It has been softened well[46].

This statement is about a skin which has been efficiently tanned. With *snḏm*, it is clear that the meaning is resultative. An example involving *nḏm* can illustrate how the Pseudoparticiple, while being originally a resultative, could develop with state verbs in the situational predication a stative use which was to become prominent in a posterior phase of the language :

(16)   *jb*   *=j*   *nḏmw*   *m*   *swnt*

         heart.   1SG   be soft.RES3SGM   in   price

         My heart is happy (=satisfied) with the price. [47]

---

[44] PT 629a-b-c (Pepi, sp 366).

[45] Cf. Assmann (2001).

[46] Tomb of Ankhmahor (Saqqara, cemetery of Teti), room 2, southwall.

[47] *Nianchchnum,* 24.

This utterance is meant to conclude a commercial deal. The state attained is surely a resultative one but, as the two possible English translations show, the semantic difference between this and a mere stative meaning is very elusive with a state verb. As a consequence, the frequent use of the form in this construction could have easily resulted in the rise of a stative interpretation. Yet the absence of any particle like *jw* or *mk* here should not make one forget that such a construction illustrates the use of the Pseudoparticiple in the situational predication with the subject-predicate order characteristical of this construction, without the form itself being ever a S-V order main predicate. In the following example, there is a time indication which refers to an event having occurred at this precise point in time :

(17) *jw   =s   nfr.tj   m   hȝw   Nb-mȝ'͑t-R'͑*
      PCL   3SGF   be good.RES3SGF   in   time   Nebmaâtre
      It has been completed/accomplished in Nebmaâtre's time. [48]

Without going into details regarding the stages of posterior history of the Pseudoparticiple, one can say that it is only in Middle Egyptian that the stative use of the form in the situational predication became frequent. This evolution may be illustrated with an example like the following :

(18) *jw   nȝ   wr(w)   r   =j*
      PCL   this   great.STAT3SG   than   1SG
      This is too much for me[49].

Here the Pseudoparticiple clearly has no resultative meaning. Its difference from a formulation using the *nfr sw* predication **wr nȝ r=j* lies not in the aspectual point of view, but in the pragmatic one, since the choice of the situational predication introduced by *jw* enhances the emotional present relevance of the utterance.

Many examples of the Pseudoparticiple used with an attributive function in the medical corpus also show an overwhelming resultative meaning, e.g.[50] :

(19) *ḥnḥnt   nt   ryt   m   ẖḫt   nt   s   'ȝ.tj*
      swelling   REL   pus   in   throat   REL   man   be big.RES3SGF
      (If you are examining)
      a swelling with pus in the throat of a man which has grown big[51]

---

[48] pLondon 44. Westendorf (1962 : § 168) translates « es (Rezept) ist (schon) gut gewesen zur Zeit des Königs N », which implies a stative interpretation of the construction, but it is far more usual in such *garanties d'authenticité* to make reference to the time of elaboration of receipts and formulas, not to their previous validity. Cf. Coulon (2004) ; Vernus (1995).

[49] *Dialogue of the Man with his Ba*, 5.

[50] Cf. Westendorf (1962 : *).

[51] pEbers 861.

Of course one could translate the Pseudoparticiple ꜥꜣ.tj with a simple adjective like « big », but the point of the diagnosis here clearly lies in the fact that it has become bigger than in its normal, non-pathological state.

The resultative meaning, which is the only one in older sources, remains far more frequent in Middle Egyptian :

(20a)   *jb=s*   *snḏm(w)*   *mꜣꜣ=s*   *ḫꜥw=k*
         heart.3SGf   rejoice.RES3SGf   see.3SGf   appear.2SGM
         (Isis rejoiced at seeing you)
         her heart was pleased at seeing your appearance,

(20b)   *nfr.tj*   *mꜣ.tj*   *mj*   *Rꜥ*   *ḫꜥ.tj*   *m*   *Ḥr*
         be good.RES2SG   be new.RES2SG   like   Re   appear.RES2SG   as   Horus
         (you) completed, rejuvenated like Re, appeared as Horus[52]

Here again, the state in which the adressee finds himself at the moment of utterance is not viewed as unlimited in time, but on the contrary as the result of ritual performance, which the discourse accompanying it aims precisely at putting in light as an argument to help his awakening to yonder life.

3.2 The morphogenesis of the New Perfect *sḏm.n (Full noun/=f)*

Other arguments may come from the fact that the analysis proposed here allow us to reconstruct a historical path between Old and New Perfect with some morphosyntactic concreteness[53].

Conclusion

To sum up the main points of this contribution, the crucial differences between Akkadian Stative and Egyptian Pseudoparticiple are the following :

• the use of the Akkadian Stative with adjectives vs. Egyptian adjectival predication (*nfr sw*).
• 3SGm slot and constructions with full noun subject.
• range of verbs currently used with the form (motion verbs frequent with the Egyptian Pseudoparticiple, almost absent with the Akkadian Stative).
• the optative use, which involves a nominal predication in Akkadian vs. a situational predication in Egyptian.
• language-internal opposite paths of evolution : the active bivalent form appears to be extending its use in Akkadian while it is already recessive in Old Egyptian.
• systemic differences in the conjugation system : the prefixal eventive form in Akkadian (*iprus*, with no equivalent in Egyptian) stands in opposition to the Stative,

---

[52] CT I, 206f (B10Cb).
[53] See Oréal (2007) ; Oréal (forthcoming).

while the Egyptian Pseudoparticiple as an Old Perfective contrasts with the adjectival predication.

I am aware of the fact that the analysis proposed here, like in my forthcoming ZÄS paper, which goes against some well-established points of view, needs more detailed argumentation and illustration with a large corpus of examples. I hope to give it in a forthcoming study, while the aim of this paper was to expose its main ideas as openly as possible.

Bibliography

Assmann (2001)	Assmann, Jan. 2001. *Tod und Jenseits im Alten Ägypten*, Münich.
Buccellati (1968)	Buccellati, Giorgio. 1968. An interpretation of the Akkadian stative as a nominal sentence, in : *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 27, 1-12.
Buccellati (1988)	Buccellati, Giorgio. 1988. The State of the 'Stative', in : Y. L. Arbeitman (ed), *Gedenkschrift for Albert Ehrman*, Amsterdam, , 253-89
Comrie (1976)	Comrie, Bernard. 1976. *Aspect*. Cambridge.
Coulon (2004)	Coulon, Laurent. 2004. Rhétorique et stratégies du discours dans les formules funéraires : les innovations des Textes des Sarcophages, in : Suzanne Bickel & Bernard Mathieu (eds.), *D'un monde à l'autre. Textes des pyramides & Textes des Sarcophages. Actes de la table ronde internationale «Textes des Pyramides versus Textes des Sarcophages», IFAO, 24-26 septembre 2001*, Bibliothèque d'Etude 139, Cairo, 119-142
CT	Adriaan De Buck. 1935-1961. *The Egyptian Coffin Texts*, 7 volumes, Chicago.
Edel (1955-1964)	Edel, Elmar. 1955-1964. *Altägyptische Grammatik*, Analecta Orientalia 34/39, Rome.
Erman (1918)	Erman, Adolf. 1918. *Reden, Rufe und Lieder auf Gräberbildern des alten Reiches*, ABAW 15, Berlin.
Faulkner (1969)	Faulkner, Raymond O. 1969. *The Ancient Egyptian pyramid Texts*, Oxford.
Gardiner (1957)	Gardiner, Alan. 1957. *Egyptian Grammar being an Introduction to the Study of Hieroglyphics*, 3^e ed. Oxford.
Hodge (1971)	Hodge, Carleton Taylor. 1971. Afroasiatic: an Overview, in : Thomas A. Sebeok & al., Current Trens in Linguistics 6, 305-322.
Huehnergard (1987)	Huehnergard, John. 1987. 'Stative', predicative form, pseudo-verb, in : *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 46/3, 215-232.
Huehnergard (1997)	Huehnergard, John. 1997. *A Grammar of Akkadian*, Atlanta.
Kammerzell (1991)	Kammerzell, Frank. 1991. Augment, Stamm und Endung. Zur morphologischen Entwicklung der Stativkonjugation, in : Antonio Loprieno (ed.), *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Egyptian Grammar. Crossroads 2 Los Angeles, Oct. 17 - 20, 1990, Lingua Aegyptia*

	1, 165-199.
Klingenheben (1956)	Klingenheben, August. 1956. Die Präfix- und die Suffixkonjugationen des Hamito-semitischen, in : *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung* 4, 211-277.
KomPyr	Kurt Sethe. *Übersetzung und Kommentar zu den altägyptischen Pyramidentexten*, Glückstadt, Hamburg, New York.
Kouwenberg (2000)	Kouwenberg, N. J. C. 2000. Nouns as verbs : the verbal nature of the Akkadian stative, in : *Orientalia* 69, 21-71.
Kraus (1984)	Kraus, F. R. 1984. *Nominalsätze in altbabylonischen Briefen und der Stativ*, Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akad. van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde N.R. 47/2, Amsterdam, Oxford, New York.
Lipinski (1997)	Lipinski, Edward. 1997. *Semitic Languages. Outline of a Comparative Grammar*, Orientalia Lovanensia Analecta 80, Louvain.
Nianchchnum	Moussa, Ahmed M. & Hartwig Altenmüller. 1977. *Das Grab des Nianchchnum und Chnumhotep*, Archäologische Veröffentlichungen 21, Mainz.
Oréal (2007)	Oréal, Elsa, 2007. Fracture d'actance et dynamique morphosyntaxique : le renouvellement du perfectif en Ancien égyptien, in : *Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris* 102, 365-395.
Oréal (forthcoming)	Oréal, Elsa. forthcoming. in : *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache.*
PT	Kurt Sethe. 1908-1922. *Die altägyptischen Pyramidentexte*, 4 volumes, Leipzig.
Reintges (2005)	Reintges, Chris. 2005. The correlation between word order alternations, grammatical agreement and event semantics in Older Egyptian, in : K. E. Kiss (ed.), *Universal grammar in the reconstruction of ancient languages*, 31-103.
Rowton (1962)	Rowton, M.. 1962. The Use of the Permansive in Classic Babylonian, in : *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 21, 233-303.
Schenkel (1978)	Schenkel, Wolfgang. 1978. Eine Syntax des klassischen Ägyptisch ohne Verbalsatz, in : *Göttinger Miszellen* 29, 1978.
Urk. I	Kurt Sethe. 1933. *Urkunden des Alten Reiches* I, Leipzig.
Vernus (1997)	Vernus, Pascal. 1997. *Les parties du discours en Moyen Egyptien*, Cahiers de la Société d'Egyptologie de Genève 5, Genève.
Vernus (1995)	Vernus, Pascal. 1995. *Essai sur la conscience de l'histoire dans l'Egypte pharaonique*, Bibliothèque de l'École des hautes études 332, Paris, , 112-114.
Von Soden (1952)	Von Soden, Wolfram. 1952. *Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik*, Analecta Orientalia 33, Rome.
Westendorf (1962)	Westendorf, Wolfram. 1962. *Grammatik der medizinischen Texte*, Grundriß der Medizin der Alten Ägypter VIII, Berlin.