

On the Late Egyptian Negative Bwpwy :العنوان

المصدر: مجلة كلية الآداب

الناشر: جامعة سوهاج - كلية الآداب

المؤلف الرئيسي: Mohamed, Emad Mahmoud Edreis

المجلد/العدد: ع37

محكمة: نعم

التاريخ الميلادي: 2014

الشهر: أكتوبر

الصفحات: 22 - 1

رقم MD: MD

نوع المحتوى: بحوث ومقالات

اللغة: English

قواعد المعلومات: HumanIndex

مواضيع: اللغة المصرية القديمة، اللغة الهيروغليفية، علم المصريات

رابط: http://search.mandumah.com/Record/985664

BULLETIN OF THE FACULTY OF ARTS





Vol. (37), October 2014, pp. 1-22

FACULTY OF ARTS

On the Late Egyptian negative bwpwy

Emad Mahmoud Edreis Mohamed^(*)

Abstract

The paper entitled "On the Late Egyptian negative *bwpwy* deals with literally texts from Late Egyptian, in which *bwpwy* seems to negate some types of tenses in Late Egyptian. In brief, it draws attention to the role of using *bwpwy* in negation and shows how and why this Late Egyptian negative morpheme was using? It is introduced with explanation of the beginning of appearance and forms of it in late Egyptian. Following with many examples show its role, location and form of *bwpwy* in sentences.

Introduction

Late Egyptian have a lot of negative morphemes, bwpwy is consider one of the most common morphemes in Late Egyptian, due to its special form and role of negation for some types of tenses in late Egyptian. Although bwpwy is one of the distinctive forms of late Egyptian, it did not appear suddenly, in fact it has descent from Middle Egyptian from which it has derived. The origin of this Late Egyptian negative morpheme is n p3 which was used in negation in Middle Egyptian; it passed some stages till reached to this familiar form, n turns into bw and p3 turns into pwy in Late Egyptian, then it became bwpwy

- Perfective *sdm.f*
- Perfective Passive *sdm.f*
- Circumstantial first present (*iw bwpwy.tw sdm.f*)
- After relative pronoun (nty +bwpwy.f sdm)

^(*) Demonstrator at Department of Egyptology, Faculty of Arts, Assiut University

- First present indicating past time

1- Preliminary

bwpw in Coptic **Mpe**, negative auxiliary verb introduc the predication sentence in past with the Infinitive. With suffix pronoun read *bwpwy*, it had been written $\operatorname{Q}_{\operatorname{also}} \operatorname{Q}_{\operatorname{also}} \operatorname{Q}_{\operatorname{also}} \operatorname{Q}_{\operatorname{also}} \operatorname{Q}_{\operatorname{also}} \operatorname{Q}_{\operatorname{and}} \operatorname{A}_{\operatorname{and}} \operatorname{A}_{\operatorname{are}} \operatorname{A}_{\operatorname{and}} \operatorname{A}_{\operatorname{and}$

2-Forms of bwpwy through language periods

bwpwy appeared in different forms in late Egyptian from the midst of 18th dynasty till 25th dynasty(²). The most common forms of it can be listed as follow,

Dynasty 18:19:

The most common forms were;

Ramesside period:

The most common forms were;

Dynasty 21:

The most common forms were;

Dynasty 22 to 24:

The most common forms in these dynasties were;

⁽¹⁾ A. Erman, & H. Grapow, Wörterbuch der Ägyptischen Sprache, vol I, Berlin-Leipzig, 1957, p. 45.

^{(&}lt;sup>2</sup>)**J. Winand,** Etudes de néo-égyptien, 1 le morphologie verbale, AEgyptiaca leodiensia; 2, Liège, 1992, p. 208.

Dynasty 25:

The most common forms were;

3- Uses

3-1- Perfective *sdm.f*

This form is limited to transitive verbs, it expresses the past. It is the descendant of the $iw \ sdm.n.f$ form of classical language(1). This tense had been used in the Speech, whether it was narrative or not. It is used mainly in Past narrative to describe objectively and timely events happened in the past(2). The function of the perfect active sdm.f expresses actions and events in the past, and it is used in direct speech only. The perfective sdm.f also deals with preceding particles, conjunction or date and it is used in judicial texts(3).

As for the forms of the perfective $s\underline{d}m.f$, it has many forms such as; $iw s\underline{d}m.f$, $iw s\underline{d}m.n.f$, $s\underline{d}m.f$ & $s\underline{d}m.n.f$ from Old Egyptian, $iw p3.f s\underline{d}m$ from ME(⁴), and finally iri.f $s\underline{d}m$ from LE as we will speak about it soon.

Before going to explain the negation of Perfective *sdm.f* in Late Egyptian by using *bwpwy*, it should discuses some notes about Perfective *sdm.f* in affirmative and negative from Middle Egyptian till Late Egyptian and Coptic to know how it become in this form?

Previously we mentioned that *bwpwy* as a negative auxiliary verb of Perfective *sdm.f* corresponds in Coptic negative auxiliary verb **Mpe**, this auxiliary

⁽¹⁾ **F. Neveu**, La Langue des Ramsès, Grammaire du Néo-égyptian, Paris, 1998, p. 59.

^{(&}lt;sup>2</sup>)Ibed, p. 59.

 $^(^{3})$ **P. J. Frandsen**, An Outline of the Late Egyptian Verbal System, Copenhagen, 1974, p 2.

^{(&}lt;sup>4</sup>)Ibed, p. 1-2.

verb(¹) had been used to negate First Perfect Tense in Coptic, so that the same tense, Perfective *sdm.f*, in affirmative corresponds First Perfect Tense in Coptic(²).

First perfect in Coptic is limited by auxiliary verb **a** which was negated by using negative auxiliary verb **Mpe** (³), as we will see in these examples;

a prwme swtM

The man heard

Mpeprwme swtM

The man did not hear(⁴)

Auxiliary verb a in Coptic had been derived from Late Egyptian Auxiliary verb $iri.i(^5)$ which had been used as auxiliary verb of Perfective $s\underline{d}m.f$, this tense was negated by using negative auxiliary verb bwpwy (6) (compare in Coptic **Mpe**), as we will see in these examples;

Ex. 3.1(1):

 $iri.i rh r.\underline{t}(^{7})$

What have I done against you?

Ex. 3.1(2):

⁽¹)Verbal sentence in late Egyptian & Coptic (in addition to old construction sdm.f) was divided into three parts, 1-Auxiliary verb 2-Subject 3-Infinative. Auxiliary verb was very important because by it we can know if this sentence in past or present or future.

^{(&}lt;sup>2</sup>)**A. Gardiner**, The origin of Coptic negative **Mpe**, ZÄS 45, 1908, p.73.

^{(&}lt;sup>3</sup>)**B. Layton,** Coptic in 20 Lessons, Introduction to Sahidic Coptic with exercises & vocabularies, Paris, 2007, p. 79. **Ume-Karsten Plisch**, Einführung in die Koptische Sprache, Wiesbaden, 1999, p. 61.

⁽⁴⁾ Ume-Karsten Plisch, op.cit, p. 61.

⁽⁵⁾iri.i; \(\) \(\) \(\) \(\) \(\) "make, do, act, acquire", in late Egyptian used as auxiliary verb, it was followed by the infinitive, compare in old English "he doth make". Rear early examples occur already in Middle Egyptian. **A.H. Gardiner**, Op.cit, p. 395.

^{(&}lt;sup>6</sup>)**J. Černy, & S. I. Groll**, A Late Egyptian Grammar, Roma, 1993, p. 184. **F. Neveu,** op.cit, p. 60. **J. Winand, Winand,** op.cit, p. 280.

^{(&}lt;sup>7</sup>)KRI VII, 384, 3-4.



iri.i smtr.f gm.i s 3 mnh $1(^{1})$

I looked (him) and I found three men and a helper

Ex. 3.1(3):

bwpwy n3 it3w rh ph.f $(^2)$

The thieves did not reach to his end

Ex. 3.1(4):

 $bwpwy.f 3k(^3)$

He did not perish

After the completion of the previous analysis, one can know that first perfect tense in Coptic is an extension of the Perfective *sdm.f* in Middle and Late Egyptian in affirmative or negative form, as follow in this table;

State	Middle Egyptian	Late Egyptian	Coptic
Affirmative	sdm.n.f / iw sdm.n.f / p3.f sdm	i.iri.f s <u>d</u> m	afswtM
Negative	np3.f sdm	bwpwy.f s <u>d</u> m	MpFswtM

After what has been mentioned, now going to explain the using of bwpwy in Late Egyptian to negate the Perfective sdm.f Tense. Noted that the construction of Perfective sdm.f in negation in Late Egyptian was as follow;

(1)KRI IV, 81, 1-2.

(2)KRI VI, 470, 15-16.

(³)LRL, 15, 7.

Jeen _ D

bwpwy.f sdm

"He did not hear"

"Černy" mentioned that this form is opposite in Coptic "MpefswtM"(1), the origin source of this Aux. verb is $(^2)$ $(^2)$ $(^2)$ $(^3)$ which was used in negation in Middle Egyptian, $(^3)$ turns into $(^3)$ turns into $(^3)$, negation of $(^3)$ -sentence, can be identified through following example;

Ex. 3.1(5):



iw p3.n sdm mitt (4)

We have heard the like

The default negation of this sentence will be as follows:

Ex. 3.1(6):



n p3.n sdm mitt

We have not heard the like

 p_3 has a great role from beginning of Old Egyptian with negative particle n, n $sp(^1)$. This verb makes with the infinitive which followed it verbal form

(3)**P. J. Frandsen,** op.cit, p. 9.

(4)Sinai, 90, 11.

⁽¹) J. Černy, & S. I. Groll, op.cit, p. 227. A. Erman, Neuägyptische Grammatik, Leipzig, 1933, p. 394. A. M. Elsayd, Past tense in verbal forms in ancient Egyptian Language till Late period, Unpublished Master Thesis, Faculty of Archaeology, Cairo university, 2005, p. 62.

⁽²)p3: or p3(w-?), (have done in the past), Auxiliary verb with Infinitive, it had been written [], [], [], [], [], [], for more, **R. Faulkner**, A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian, Oxford, 1976, p. 87. **A.H. Gardiner**, Egyptian Grammar, Oxford, 1957, p. 565.

refers to Past and it equals of new verbal forms which are refers to past and compares *Avoir* in French, *Have* in English and *Haben* in Germany(2). This third-waek auxiliary verb $p_3(w)$ or $p_3(i)$ has been used by the Middle Egyptian scribes following by infinitive(3).

Ex. 3.1(7):



n sp py mi.tw.i sdm ssty n ipt-nsw dr-by! $h(^4)$

No one was like me heard the secrets of royal women before.

This verb p3i, which can be fully conjugated, has the meaning "to have done in the past". The verb from which it serves as an auxiliary follows as an infinitive(5). This verb forms part of a complex verb from following iw or the negative $n sp(^6)$.

Ex. 3.1(8):



iw p3.n sdm mitt

We have heard the like

Ex. 3.1(9):

n sp p 3i.t(w) iri.t st(7)

Never has it been done

Ex. 3.1(10):

⁽¹⁾ **E. Edel**, Altägyptische Grammatik, 2 vol., Rome, 1955, p. 457.

^{(&}lt;sup>2</sup>)**G. Lefebvre**, Grammaire de l'égyptien classique, 2 ed., *IFAO*, Le Caire, 1990, p.204.

⁽³⁾**D. Selden**, Hieroglyphic Egyptian, London, 2013, p. 301.

⁽⁴⁾URK, 1, 101, 4.

⁽⁵⁾ M. Korostovtsev, Grammair du Neo-Egyptien, Moscou 1973, p.189.

⁽⁶⁾**B. Ockinga**, A concise Grammar of Middle Egyptian, 2 ed, Meinz, 2010, p.71.

^{(&}lt;sup>7</sup>)Ibid., P.71.

ih pw p3y.k itt 2 tbty mtw.k itt p3y.imtw.k tm ini p3 $(^{1})$

What that means that you took my Sandels? And took the ... of me? And you will not bring the ...?.

Verb p3 also is the etymological of the verbal construction **peje** in Coptic, some translated it "Said" another translated it "What he said was", as it Consists of two parts, **pe** from Hieroglyphic p3 and **je** from Hieroglyphic $i\underline{d}d(^2)$.

$$dd.f \longrightarrow p = idd.f \longrightarrow pejef$$

Ex. 3.1(11):

ouox peje pqois 9abram je amou ebo5 4en pekkaxi

What the God said to Abram was; "Go forth from your land.(3)

It originally evolved from the Middle Egyptian formula $n \ sdm.f$ and $n \ sdm.n.f$, which were used in Middle Egyptian to negate verbal forms(⁴), as in;

Ex. 3.1(12):

$$n \text{ with } n \text{ min } srw(5)$$

He did not replay to these officials.

In Middle Egyptian the perfect is often used after negation on (ni). Like the perfect itself, the negated perfect is tenseless. Although it expresses the negation of completed action, however, in this use it is not equivalent to the English perfect or past

⁽¹⁾Sauneron, Ostr. D. M., recto, 562, 2-4.

^{(&}lt;sup>2</sup>)**H. M. Kamal**, Auxiliary verbs in Verbal Forms of ancient Egyptian language, Unpublished PhD Thesis, Cairo University, 1995, p. 148.

^{(&}lt;sup>3</sup>)The Bible, Genesis, Chapter 12, Verse 1.

⁽⁴⁾**B. Gunn**, Studies in Egyptian Syntax, Paris, 1924, p.96.

^{(&}lt;sup>5</sup>)Peasant, B1/50-1.

tenses(1). $n \ sdm.f$ "He did not hear", this construction corresponds to the affirmative $iw \ sdm.nf(^2)$.

The following table explains that;

	Affirmative	Negative
Past active (perfective)	iw sdm.n.f	n sdm.f

The following example describes the above;

Ex. 3.1(13):



n ir(.i) ht n šrr nb ir.n(.i) ht n h3ty-c

I did not do things for any small man. I did things for the prince.

"**Neveu**" explained this transformation from ME to LE to Coptic as follow(³);

Middle Egyptian	Late Egyptian	Coptic
np3.f sdm	bwpwy.f sdm	MpeFswtM

"**Kruchten**" supposed that the *bwpwy.f sdm* formation, with its highly recognizable - *pwy*- unit, derived from a verb p3i "to have done (in the past)" (4), that meaning there was an transform operation to this form before it come in its complete form *bwpwy.f sdm*, may we can named it "Beginning of LE", ("**Kruchten**" limited it from Amenhotep III to Amonhotep IV);

Middle Egyptian	Beginning of LE	Late Egyptian
np3.f sdm	bw p3y.f sdm	bwpwy.f sdm

Examples;

⁽¹⁾ **J. P. Allen,** op.cit, p.239.

⁽²⁾ **J. E. Hoch**, Middle Egyptian Grammar, Mississauga, 1997, p.120.

^{(&}lt;sup>3</sup>)**F. Neveu,** op.cit, p. 62.

^{(&}lt;sup>4</sup>)**J.-M. Kruchten**, From Middle Egyptian to Late Egyptian, *LingAeg* 6, 1999, p. 31-32. **O. A. Nour- eldin**, The verbal Forms in the Historical Texts of the Nineteenth Dynasty, Unpublished PhD Thesis, Sohag University, 2013, P. 84.

Ex. 3.1(14):

Jene _ 100

bwpwy.f 3k (1)

He did not perish

Ex. 3.1(15):

(i)n in.k sw n bwpwy.k in $\binom{2}{3}$

Whether you have brought him or whether you have not brought him?

The main sentence here, Perfective $s\underline{d}m.f$ form, preceded with interrogative pronoun (in) and the negative opposite is showing the same meaning, the same tense and the same construction, then the module formed from three parts(3);

- -Aux. verb bwpwy
- -Suffix pronoun as Subject
- -Infinitive

Ex. 3.1(16):



 $\underline{d}d.tw$ n.f wn.k $\underline{h}ms.tw$ irm 3, $\underline{h}r$ wn.k irm.f, $\underline{d}d,f$ \underline{f} \underline{d} \underline{d} \underline{h} \underline{d} \underline{h} \underline{d} \underline{h} \underline{h} \underline{d} \underline{h} \underline{f} \underline{f} \underline{h} \underline{d} \underline{h} \underline{h}

⁽¹⁾LRL, 15, 7.

^{(&}lt;sup>2</sup>)Ibid, 37, 7.

^{(&}lt;sup>3</sup>)**A. M. Elsayd,** op.cit, p. 62.

⁽⁴⁾Mayer A 5, 17-19.

Ex. 3.1(17):

 $ir p3y.k \underline{d}d \dots r-\underline{d}d bwpwy.k h3b n.i(^1)$

As for your saying: "you have not written to me."

3-2- Perfective Passive sdm.f

It's derived from Middle Egyptian form $iw \ sdm.f$ "passive"(2). This tense is attested in Late Egyptian from the 18th until the end of the 20th dynasty(3). In Late Egyptian it was used with a limited number of verbs (such as; iri, rdi, ini, gmi) and some actions(4). In fact, it was exactly like its predecessor in form and analysis(5). The most important function of Perfective passive sdm.f is expressing a statement(6).

There is no special form to negate Perfective passive $s\underline{d}m.f$, the nature or indefinite pronoun tw and also sometimes \mathcal{O} (zero) were used with $bwpwy(^7)$. Then bwpwy was used to negate Perfective passive in its normal form either $bwpwy.tw s\underline{d}m$ or bwpwy. \mathcal{O} $s\underline{d}m$.

Nominal subject	Pronominal subject
bwpwy. Ø sdm	bwpwy.tw sdm

Examples;

-Nominal subject;

(1)LRL 32, 13-15.

(²)**Neveu**, op.cit, p. 63.

(³)**J. Winand,** op.cit,, p.303.

(4)**J. Černy, & S. I. Groll,**, op.cit, p. 242. **Neveu**, op.cit, p. 63.

(⁵)**Neveu**, op.cit, p. 63.

(6)**P. J. Frandsen,** op.cit, p. 30.

(⁷)**B. Lalanne**, Cours de Néo-égyptien, 2008. p, 97. **Neveu**, op.cit, p.65.

Ex. 3.2(1):

bwpwy. \emptyset msy n.f s3 \underline{t} 3 $ty(^1)$

He did not have a son.

-Pronominal subject;

Ex. 3.2(2):



bwpwy.tw gm.tw.f iw rh.f st nb im(2)

He didn't found him although he knows every tomb there.

3-3-Circumstantial first present (*iw bwpwy.tw sdm.f*)

In fact this is an exceptional use of *bwpwy* to negate a type of present tense in late Egyptian Precisely Circumstantial first present (For more about Circumstantial First Present see point 2-3-4-2), It is well known that *bn* which was Basically used to negate present in Late Egyptian(3), but there were some status *bn* were not used *bwpwy bwpwy* which was used(4) specially with the converter(5) (Auxiliary verb(6)) iw(7) in in form $iw\ bwpwy.f\ sdm(^8)$.

⁽¹⁾LES, 1,1-2

^{(&}lt;sup>2</sup>)KRI VI, 475, 4-5.

^{(&}lt;sup>3</sup>)**P. J. Frandsen,** op.cit, p. 76.

⁽⁴⁾**Neveu**, op.cit, p. 70.

^{(&}lt;sup>5</sup>)**P. J. Frandsen,** op.cit, p. 200.

⁽⁶⁾**M. Korostovtsev**, op.cit, p. 183.

 $^(^{7})iw$; 1 Por 1 e as auxiliary verb in Late Egyptian, it has special construction with $s\underline{d}m.f$ form. It may have Nominal subject or pronominal subject. This verb does not reflect to specific time, it's referring to action in statement. So that it mainly role is purely linguistic.

⁽⁸⁾ **S. I. Groll**, *iw.f* (*hr*) *tm sdm* in Late Egyptian, *JEA* 55, 1969, p. 92.

iw bwpwy.tw sdm.f

"When had not been hear"

When bwpwy.f sdm follows the converter iw, grammatically it has the capability to serving in sentence at many functions(1), as follows;

- 1- Serving as predicate of an Emphatic sdm.f.
- 2- Filling the second or third position when following a Conjugation Pattern composed with *gmi* (to find).
- 3- Serving as virtual relative clause.
- 4- Serving as clause after the conjunction hr.

Ex. 3.3(1):



hr m-di p3y 3 3bd n hrw iir(.i) dit wsht **iw bwpwy.k dit** in.tw n.i w^c dbn nbw(²)

And further, for these three whole months, it is in spite of your not having had one deben of gold brought to me that I have sent a barge.

iw here makes as converter in this construction, we have a formal defined a converter as a variable, its function is not necessary for the main function of the main sentence. In late Egyptian every initial sentence conjugations and non-verbal sentence patterns can be preceded by morpheme *iw*, which is clearly derived from the *iw* of the third future and that which progressing the non-initial sentences. This morpheme converts the sentence patterns into non-initial subordinate clauses(³), as in this example;

(¹)Ibid, p 92:93.

(2)LRL 36, 12-14.

(3) **Neveu**, op.cit, p. 201. **P. J. Frandsen**, op.cit, p. 200. **J.-M. Kruchten**, op.cit, p. 52.

Ex. 3.3(2):

hr tw.n di hms.ti m t3-hms tw.k hms tw.k hms nty twt.n hms nty twt.n hms hms nty twt.n hms hms

We are now living here in the mansion, and you know the way of life we have to put up.

As well as it appear from the material, bwpwy was used to negate present patterns in certain cases, it is believed that the reason for this is the complete absence of negative first present patterns expressing past time, habitual and customary action, it does not seem unreasonable to assume that bn can negate first present patterns only when they convey a synchronous or progressive action, or an action in the near future, and consequently that recourse was had to bwpwy.f sdm in cases of first present patterns denoting past time and habitual action(2).

So there are some statues were negated with *bwpwy*. Summarizing this point appears from following table;

Circumstantial first Present				
Active Passive				
Affirmative	iw.f (ḥr) sdm	iw.f sdm.Ø		
Negative	iw bn sub. (ḥr) sdm	iw bwpwy.tw sdm.f(3)		

This schedule clears all previous explanation of using *bwpwy* to negate a type of present patterns, as it appears in these examples;

(1)LRL, 23, 11-12.

(²)**P. J. Frandsen,** op.cit, p. 76:77.

(³)**Neveu**, op.cit, p. 202.

Ex. 3.3(2):



 $iw A \check{s}m \dots r w^{c} hr \dots iw bwpwy.tw krs im.f(^{1})$

A went to a tomb.... in which a burial had not been made.

iw bwpwy.tw krs im.f: here represent negative circumstantial first present in passive.

iw: converter or auxiliary verb of circumstantial first present as previous explain.

bwpwy.tw: negation form (bwpwy+tw of passive).

krs: infinitive of initial sentence

im.f: Adverbial clause.

Ex. 3.3(3):



ii3 ih tw.i dit in.tw n.tn p3y hmn n š $^{\varsigma}$ t iw bwpw.tn dit in.tw w $^{\varsigma}(^{2})$

What is the point of my sending you so letters, you having sent one?

Ex. 3.3(4):

gmy $n3 rm\underline{t}$ iw bwpw.w $r\underline{h}$ st $nb(^3)$

The men were found, they having no knowledge of any place.

^{(&}lt;sup>1</sup>)Abbott 5, 2-3.

⁽²⁾LRL 1, 9-10.

^{(&}lt;sup>3</sup>)Abbott 7, 13-14.

3-4- After relative pronoun "nty + bwpwy.f sdm"

Particle *nty* was one of Relative clause particles in Middle Egyptian, it Correspond in English relative pronouns *who*, *which*, and *that*(1). Relative clause is the name given to that kind of subordinate clause which is equivalent to an adjective. It can, as an adjective, used as either epithet or noun(2).

When negated Relative clause in Middle Egyptian was negated by using the negative forms of Relative Adjectives(³), as we will see in following table:-

Affirmative Relative Adjective		Negative Relative Adjective			
nty	******	Sing.	iwty	~~ <u>R</u>	Sing.
	△\\	Masc.			Masc.
ntt	******	Sing.	iwtt	she R	Sing.
		Fem.		<i>«</i> "	Fem.
nti	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	Plu.	iwtiw	200	Plu.
w		Masc.			Masc.
nti		Plu.	iwtywt	~~	Plu.
wt		Fem.			Fem.

But in late Egyptian the Negative relative adjective became very rare in used, and to negate relative clause in Late Egyptian they were used particle nty plus the suitable negative auxiliary verb or particle of the tens which used(as bn, bw...etc)(4).

bwpwy also used to negate some of relative clauses. Some scholars consider that this form (nty + bwpwy.f sdm) is represented negation of participle(⁵). This type of formula is used when subject identical with antecedent(⁶).

The question that arises here, Is it possible to consider the combination (nty + bwpwy.f sdm) as participle although the particle nty used as relative adjective for another tenses (such as, First Present and Third Future)?

^{(&}lt;sup>1</sup>)**J. Allen,** op.cit, p. 134.

^{(&}lt;sup>2</sup>)**A.H. Gardiner,** op.cit, p. 147.

^{(&}lt;sup>3</sup>)Ibid, p.150-153. **A. Lobrieno**, Ancient Egyptian, Cambridge, 1995, p.158-159.

⁽⁴⁾**F. Neveu**, op.cit, p.150-156.

^{(&}lt;sup>5</sup>)**B. Lalanne,** op.cit, p. 135. **M. A. El-Tokhy**, Active and Passive Participle in Late Egyptian Grammar, Unpublished Master Thesis, Sohag University, 2012, P. 102-103.

^{(&}lt;sup>6</sup>)**F. Neveu**, op.cit, p. 156.

Since the Coptic language is derived from the ancient Egyptian language, we find that this combination (nty + bwpwy.f sdm) represents the relative clause of negative perfect tense in Coptic(1), as in example;

Ex. 3.4(1):

Maria te tparcenos ete Mpedynamis ja5mes

Mary is the virgin who has no power defiled(²)

So that it is not possible to consider this combination as participle. Whatever the negative auxiliary verb *bwpwy* used in Late Egyptian to negate the relative clauses after particle *nty* as follows;

Ex. 3.4(2):



ir p3 nty bwpwy.f dit n.i bn iw.i dit n.f m 3htw.i(3)

Who does not give me I will not give to him.

Ex. 3.4(3):

ir t3y t3y nty bwpwy.w in.s n.i(4)

As for this, that did not give it to me.

3-5- First Present indicating past time

(Pseudo-participle/ old perfective from intransitive verbs)

First present has several forms (see point 2-3-4-1), one of them negate by using Late Egyptian negative auxiliary verb bwpwy, when the predicate is pseudo-participle or old perfective derived from intransitive verbs(5).

(³)KRI VI, 238, 2.

(4)LRL, 17, 16.

⁽¹⁾ Ume-Karsten Plisch, op.cit, p. 83. B. Layton, op.cit, p. 140.

^{(&}lt;sup>2</sup>)EvPhil p. 55.27f.

⁽⁵⁾**Neveu**, op.cit, p. 81. **J. Černy, & S. I. Groll**, op.cit, p. 310.

When the first present indicating past time, it is negated by bwpwy not by using bn the main negative auxiliary verb of first present in Late Egyptian, bn here is incompatible(1).

Affirmative	Negative	
tw.i šm.kwi (Active)	bwpwy.i šm	
tw.i sdm.kwi (Passive)	bwpwy.tw sdm.i	

As this schedule has shown the method of negation of first present, but one should note that this statue comes only when first present indicating past time and with intransitive verbs. KRI VI, 238, 2.

Ex. 3.4(1):



He said; "I did not see him, and I did not go with him".

This example shows the using of *bwpwy* to negate perfective $s\underline{d}m.f$ and first present with predicate of pseudo-participle (old perfective), the affirmative form of this sentence is $(\underline{d}d.f\ m3^c\ tw\ ptr.f\ tw.i\ \underline{s}m.kwi\ irm.f)$ He said; "I saw him, and I went with $him''(^3)$.

Ex. 3.4(2):



bwpwy.tw gm.f iw rh.f st nb im wpw (hr) t3 st 2(4)

It was not found that he knew of any place there except the two places.

⁽¹⁾ **J. Černy, & S. I. Groll,** op.cit, p. 310.

⁽²⁾KRI VI, 814, 12-13.

^{(&}lt;sup>3</sup>)**Neveu**, op.cit, p. 81.

⁽⁴⁾Abbot, 5, 5-6.

4-Conclusion

Study concludes importance of *bwpwy* as new Late Egyptian negative morpheme as follows;

- This morpheme always refer to past tense, so it is considered as indication to past in sentences which it appears in them. (Note; there is an exception in it *bwpwy* comes after converter *iw*, in this case it follows tense on the sentence. (See point 3-3).
- This Morpheme considers one of the distinctive forms of late Egyptian, but it did not appear suddenly; in fact it has descent from Middle Egyptian from which it had been derived. The origin source of this Late Egyptian negative morpheme is p which was used in negation in Middle Egyptian; then it passed some stages till reached to this familiar form, p turn into p and p turn into p in Late Egyptian, than it became p turn into p in Late Egyptian,

 $n \, s\underline{d}m, n.f \longrightarrow n \, p3.f \, s\underline{d}m \longrightarrow bw \, p3y.f \, s\underline{d}m \longrightarrow bw pwy.f \, s\underline{d}m.$ (See point 3-1)

- The Main use of *bwpwy* is to negate Perfective *sdm.f* (Active/Passive) in Late Egyptian (*bwpwy.f sdm*), which became in Coptic **MpafcwtM** and Coptic philologists called it First Perfect tense. (See point 3-1)
- In some cases it used, as exceptional case, to negate Circumstantial first present (*iw bwpwy.f sdm*), after converter *iw* in non-initial sentences. (See point 3-3)
- It using after relative pronoun nty $(nty + bwpwy.f s\underline{d}m)$, referring to negation of relative First perfect tense not participle as some thought. (See point 3-4)
- -bwpwy also used to negate a type of first present when the predicate is pseudoparticiple (old perfective) and indicating for past time. (See point 3-5)

Bulletin of The Faculty of Arts, Vol. 37, October 2014

Case	Tenses	Late Egyptian	Coptic
Affirmative	Active Perfective sdm.f	i.iri.f s <u>d</u> m	afswtm
	Passive Perfective sdm.f	i.iri tw s <u>d</u> m	
	Circum. First Present		
	After relative nty		
Negative	Active Perfective sdm.f	bwpwy.f s <u>d</u> m	Mpefswtm
	Passive Perfective sdm.f	bwpwy.tw s <u>d</u> m	
	Circum. First Present	iw bwpwy.f sdm	
		(active)	
		iw bwpwy.f sdm	
		(Passive)	
	After relative nty	nty bwpwy.f sdm	eteMpefswtm

(Schedule show role of *bwpwy* in negation)
(Late Egyptian and Coptic)

Bibliography

- A. Erman, Neuägyptische Grammatik, Leipzig, 1933.
- A. Erman, & H. Grapow, Wörterbuch der Ägyptischen Sprache, vol I, Berlin-Leipzig, 1957.
- A. Gardiner, The origin of Coptic negative Mpe, ZÄS 45, 1908.
- -Ashref Mahmoud Elsayd, Past tense in verbal forms in ancient Egyptian Language till Late period, Unpublished Master Thesis, Faculty of Archaeology, Cairo University, 2005.
- A.H. Gardiner, Egyptian Grammar, Oxford, 1957.
- A. Lobrieno, Ancient Egyptian, Cambridge, 1995.
- B. Gunn, Studies in Egyptian Syntax, Paris, 1924.
- B. Lalanne, Cours de Néo-égyptien, 2008.
- B. Layton, Coptic in 20 Lessons, Introduction to Sahidic Coptic with exercises & vocabularies, Paris, 2007.
- B. Ockinga, A concise Grammar of Middle Egyptian, 2 ed, Meinz, 2010.
- D. Selden, Hieroglyphic Egyptian, London, 2013.
- E. Edel, Altägyptische Grammatik, 2 vol., Rome, 1955.
- F. Neveu, La Langue des Ramsès, Grammaire du Néo-égyptian, Paris, 1998.
- G. Lefebvre, Grammaire de l'égyptien classique, 2 ed., IFAO, Le Caire, 1990.
- H. M. Kamal, Auxiliary verbs in Verbal Forms of ancient Egyptian language, Unpublished PhD Thesis, Cairo University, 1995.
- J. Černy, & S. I. Groll, A Late Egyptian Grammar, Roma, 1993.
- J. E. Hoch, Middle Egyptian Grammar, Mississauga, 1997.
- J.-M. Kruchten, From Middle Egyptian to Late Egyptian, LingAeg 6, 1999.
- J. Winand, Etudes de néo-égyptien, 1 le morphologie verbale, *AEgyptiaca leodiensia*; 2, Liège, 1992.
- KRI IV= Kitchen, K., Ramesside Inscriptions: Historical and Biographical, Vol. IV, Oxford, 1982.
- KRI VI= Kitchen, K., Ramesside Inscriptions: Historical and Biographical, Vol. VI, Oxford, 1983.

- KRI VII= Kitchen, K., Ramesside Inscriptions: Historical and Biographical, Vol. VII, Oxford, 1989.
- LES= A.Gardinar, Late Egyptian Stories, Bruxelles, 1932.
- LRL= J. Černy, Late Ramesside Letters, Bruxelles, 1939.
- M. A. El-Tokhy, Active and Passive Participle in Late Egyptian Grammar, Unpublished Master Thesis, Sohag University, 2012.
- M. Korostovtsev, Grammair du Neo-Egyptien, Moscou 1973.
- O. A. Nour- eldin, The verbal Forms in the Historical Texts of the Nineteenth Dynasty, Unpublished PhD Thesis, Sohag University, 2013.
- P. J. Frandsen, An Outline of the Late Egyptian Verbal System, Copenhagen, 1974.
- R. Faulkner, A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian, Oxford, 1976.
- Ume-Karsten Plisch, Einführung in die Koptische Sprache, Wiesbaden, 1999.