

**Identification negated:
Semantic properties of the double particle constructions
and their functional spreading in the history of Egyptian**

Barbara Egedi
Research Institute for Linguistics
Hungarian Academy of Sciences

1 Introduction

Double particle constructions (DPC)

→ standard negative particle + an additional particle, forming a pair of linked negatives (Payne 1985: 224)

→ 119 languages out of 1157 make use of some kind of double negation, i.e. negative constructions that involve two simultaneous morphemes (Dryer 2013 = WALS Ch112:)

→ usually described in term of the so called Jespersen's cycle (so named first by Dahl 1979; for a good presentation of the cycle, see van der Auwera 2010)

This talk aims to fulfill three interrelated tasks:

- (i) to provide a descriptive and diachronic overview of negative patterns that involve a double particle strategy in Egyptian;
- (ii) to explain why some apparently different constructions use the same form of negation;
- (iii) to account for the spreading of the construction into syntactic environments in which it was not used earlier.

Typologically, the Egyptian DPC is:

- a non-standard negation (Payne 1985),
- a symmetric one (in terms of Miestamo 2005)

2 The classical *nj...js* construction

2.1 Description and use

→ combines the particle *nj* which is a standard negator, and the subordinating particle *js*

→ the two forms a discontinuous morpheme, since the enclitic particle cannot be eliminated (Satzinger 1970:30 n92), or replaced by other particles (contra Satzinger 1970, Gunn 1924); the particle *js* is an integral part of the construction (Gilula 1972: 58)

Gilula (1970: 208): a specific negation of non-verbal sentences without *iw*

Gilula (1972: 56-57): the negation of the non-verbal predicative nexus

➤ *overgeneralization*

Loprieno (1991a: 216; 1991b: 217-222 and 1995: 128)

- "the negative counterpart to all patterns involving focality"
- "focal negation indicating contrariety".

➤ *overspecification*

Table 1. Syntactic contexts in which *nj...js* systematically appears:

The negation of nominal sentences		
- nominal sentence proper - adjectival sentence* - predication of possession (*note the negation of AdjPred by <i>nn</i>)	AB, A pw, A pw B Adj sw > A pw <i>nj</i> -A B	<i>identification, specification, classification, qualification, attribution</i>
The negation of focus constructions		
- cleft-sentence / participial statement - pseudo-cleft? (= A pw B) - sentences with emphatic verb forms		- <i>subject in focus</i> - <i>object in focus</i> - <i>adverbial arg/adjunct in focus</i>

For a uniform treatment of these constructions, see also Ritter (1994) and the cited works of Loprieno. For *A pw B* pattern functioning as pseudo-clefts, cf. Ritter (1994: 246-248); Loprieno (1995: 106)

The *nn...js* construction

nj...js > *nn...js* (cf Loprieno 1991a: 228-229; 1995: 129, 171 with an explanation of the general tendency *nj* > *nn*)

Allen (2000: 125): only occasionally, in later Middle Egyptian texts, after Dynasty 12

Gilula (1972: 208 n2): it is only an alternative writing of negative *n*.

2.2 Examples

- (1) *m-k nj rnpt js n3 n.t b3gj jn zj hr nb=f* AB
'Look, this is not a year for a man to be lax about his master'
[Heqanakht Letter I,14] Translation after Allen (2002: 15)
- (2) *n ntk js zj* AB
'You are not a man' [Leb. 31] after Allen (2010: 125)
- (3) *nj z3=j js nj msj.t(w)=f js n=j* A(pw)
'It is not my son, he was not born to me' + EmphS
[Berlin 1157,20] after Loprieno (1991a: 218)
- (4) *nj wsh js pw* AdjPred
'It was not a broad one' [Peas. R 7,4] after Allen (2010: 125)
- (5) *n jnk js q3 s3* AdjPred
'I am not one high of back (arrogant)' [Sin B 230]
- (6) *n nj wj js sp3t* PossPred
'I am not of the district' [CT III 390e]
- (7) *n jnk is dd n=k nw jn Gb dd n=k nw hn^c Wsjr* Cleft
'It is not I who says this to you, it is Geb who says this to you and Osiris'
[CT I. 302e-f, T9C, Sq3C]
- (8) *n NN tn is dbh.t m3=s tn m kd=t pw wn=t im=f* Cleft
'It is not NN who is asking to see you in your present shape'
[CT VI. 353l-n] cited after Ritter (1994: 245)

- (9) *m-k nn jnk js jnn n=k sj* Cleft
 'Look, it is not I who bring it to you' [Westcar 9:6]
- (10) *nn s3=k js nn ms.n.tw.f js n=k* A(pw)
 'It is not your son, he was not born to you' [Ptahhotep 213-214 L2] + EmphS
- (11) *tm.t hn hr-m* [Westcar 6,5] after Gardiner, 1957: §346 *tm*
 'Why don't you row?'

2.3 The semantics of the constructions

emphatic forms / second tenses → two types of negative morphemes

- DPC negates the nexus between the second tense form and the adverbial predicate in focus (e.g. Groll 1978: §27.2, Johnson 1976: 83)
- Loprieno (1995: 213): the scope of negation is limited to the adverbial focus
- Allen (2000: §25.14): two different forms of negation in emphatic sentences, "depending on whether the predicate or the rheme is being negated"

Loprieno (1991a: 216; 1991b: 217-222 and 1995: 128)

nj...js : "represents focal negation indicating contrariety".

→ The scope of the *nj...js* negation is the focus, while the presupposition remains unaffected by the negation. The scope of the negation is not the nexus between the subject and the predicate, but it is only the predicate (or rather a part of the predicate) that constitutes the *internal* scope of the negative operator *nj...js*.

Focus construction = identificational/specificational predication (É. Kiss 2006, *forthcoming*)
focus = predicate *background* = its argument

The focussed constituent represents the only member of a relevant set of alternatives for which the rest of the sentence, the lower embedded predicate, is true.

The specificational nominal sentence type, introduced by Higgins (1973)

→ the subject of the predication determines a set, which the predicate identifies referentially by listing its members. The subject describes a variable, and the predicate identifies its value.

The background of the focus is always associated with an existential presupposition.

Excursus about *js*

- Gilula (1972: 59): *js* in affirmative sentences has a syntactic function, it is the predecessor of *ntt* ('that') and appears in non-verbal embedded noun-clauses, if they are nominal, possessive or emphatic sentences
- Allen (2000: §12.13.1): originally a noun clause marker, but used in other non-verbal clauses as well in Middle Egyptian. Only with nominal and adjectival predicate.
- Loprieno (1995: §6.3.1): it transforms a categorial statement into athetic one (⇒ the S presents an all-new information!); it signals "pragmatic prominence rather than backgrounding", it is rather "a contrastive focus"
- Loprieno (1995:154-155): a marker of dependency in nominal, adverbial, pseudo-verbal, and verbal sentences (i.e. not only in noun-clauses)

Excursus about *nj-js*

Gilula (1972: 56): "to dissociate emphatically the words that follow it from what precedes this by interposing a purely adverbial negation"

→ serves to negate an adverb; often translated as "except, and not, but not"

Loprieno (1995: 170): The scope of the negation is limited to a *phrase*

(12) *jw=k sb3.t(j) jw=k hmw.t(j) jw=k t(w)t(.tj) n-js n ʿwn*
 'You are educated, you are skilled, you are accomplished, but not for the purpose of robbing' [Peas B1,291-292] after Loprieno (1995: 170 Ex. 112)

(13) *n-js n rmt.w*
 Then His Majesty said: 'Is the rumor true that you can join a severed head?' And Djedi answered: 'Yes, I can, O sovereign my lord.' Then His Majesty said: 'Have a prisoner brought to me from the prison, that he may be executed!' And Djedi answered: 'Not to people, O sovereign my lord.' [Westcar 8,12-17] after Loprieno (1995: 170 Ex. 113)

Proposal: elliptical sentences

(12') *jw=k sb3.t(j) jw=k hmw.t(j) jw=k t(w)t(.tj) n (*wwn=k sb3.t(j) wnn=k hmw.t(j) wnn=k t(w)t(.tj)) js n ʿwn*

(13') *n (*jir=j st) js n rmt.w*

NB. Loprieno (1991a: 219) the presupposition is "canceled in the surface structure, mostly due to immediate anaphoric reference"

3 The Late Egyptian *bn...jwn3* construction

3.1 Description and use

Generally: Černý–Groll 1978: §13.5; "negative identity sentence" (Groll 1967: 98)

See also Polotsky (1944 88-89); Loprieno (1995: §5.11);

Winand (1997) with a list of contexts and a considerable amount of examples!

- ◆ The negation of the nominal sentence (Groll 1967: 94-102; Junge 1996: 180; Černý–Groll 1978: §58)
- ◆ The negation of adjectival predicates (Groll 1967: 109-114; Černý–Groll 1978: §60; Junge 1996: 182)
- ◆ The negation of cleft sentences (Groll 1967: 102-108; Černý–Groll 1978: §58.3; Satzinger 1981: 489-491; Ritter 1994: 253 and 260; Junge (1996: 190 and 193))
- ◆ The negation of sentences consisting of a second tense form + an adverbial focus (cf. Černý–Groll 1978: §27; Groll 1970: 150-156; Winand (1992: 285-286); Junge (1996: 138); Neveu (1996: 116-117))
- ◆ The negation of Present I / AdvS; *occasionally* by *bn...jwn3* (cf. Neveu (1996: 72), but without explanation; it seems to occur when the predicate part is really adverbial, or PP (Černý–Groll 1978: §20.6; Junge 1996: 119, §3.1.1(4))

bn...jwn3 is commonly assumed to be the functional successor of the ME pattern.

BUT: *jwn3* can be absent in all types, even in NomS (cf. Černý–Groll 1978: §58);

Winand (1997) counterexamples for each context + uses prospective and FutIII

Where does this jwn3 come from?

Gardiner (1904: 130): the earliest meaning might be ‘indeed’, ‘certainly’ and this suggestion has
See Winand (1997: 233-234) for an exhaustive list of references about its etymologies

Asymmetry in clefts: [bn A jwn3 p3 ntj... -type] vs. [bn m A/ jnk j.sdm-type]

- Observed by many: Groll (1967: 102-104); Davis (1971); Neveu (1994: 193 and 197), Junge (1996: 190 and 193); the most clearly described in Ritter 1994)
- Satzinger (1981: 491) the difference is in the placement of **jwn3**
- Winand (1997: 231): weakened emphasis/contrast in the cases of true cleft sentences

The DPC not yet grammaticalized?

Winand (1997: 231-232): The use of *jwn3* is quite free, and never obligatory.

→ reinforcing function: "un indicateur focal, non obligatoire" (p. 229)

→ *but*: DPC is the (almost) exclusive strategy by which nominal sentences are negated.

Besides nominal sentences, it is primarily attested in emphatic sentences. (Winand 1992: §765)

Table 2. The proportional growing of *jwn3* (Davis 1973: 129)

	Colloquial examples	Formal examples
Dyn 19	5 with <i>jwn3</i>	7 with <i>jwn3</i>
	38 without <i>jwn3</i>	118 without <i>jwn3</i>
Dyn 20	29 with <i>jwn3</i>	5 with <i>jwn3</i>
	105 without <i>jwn3</i>	45 without <i>jwn3</i>

3.2 Examples

- (14) *hr bn t3y.i hmt twn3* [O, DM 439,1 5,16] A(pw)
‘It is not my wife’ cited after after Neveu (1996: 225)
- (15) *jr t3j wpwt j.jr.tn m p3 hrw bn wpwt jwn3* [Abbott 5,16] A(pw)
‘With regard to this demonstration that you have made today,
it is not a demonstration’
- (16) *bn ntk rmt twn3* [O.Berlin 10627,6 = KRI VI 155,12-14;] AB
‘You are not a man’ cited after Groll (1967:100),
Neveu (1996: 212), Junge (1996: 180)
- (17) *bn m3^c jwn3 n3* AdjPred
‘This is not true’ [P.BM 10052 11,21]
- (18) *bn ink iwty h3ty iwn3* [O. Gardiner 273, 6 = KRI VII 355, 6-7] AdjPred
‘I am not heartless’ cited after Neveu (1996: 212)
- (19) *iw bn ink sw twn3* PossPred
‘although it is not mine’ [C654 of Davis = HO 52, 2, 8-10]
- (20) *iw bn ink i.h3b [se]* [O. Gardiner 90, 7 (=KRI V, 571,1)] Cleft I
‘while it is not I who sent it’ after Neveu (1994: 198) $\emptyset jwn3$

- (21) *bn mš^c swg³ jwn³ n³ ntj tw=j jm=w* [Wen 2,23] Cleft II
 ‘It is not foolish journeys that I am involved’
- (22) *hr bn i.ir.i βi.w dy jwn³* [P. DM VII vs6] 2ndTense
 ‘I did not brought them *here*’ after Neveu (1994: 116)
- (23) *bn i.ir.f in p³y h^d iw.f m p³y.i pr twn³* [TR 34, 15,6-7] 2ndTense
 ‘He did not bring this silver *when he was in my house*’
 after Winand (1992: 286)
- (24) *i.ir.k tm di.t wd^c.tw.tn hr jh* *tm*
 ‘Why did you prevent judging you?’ [HorSeth 15,12 (=LES 59,6)]
 after Junge (1996: 138) and Neveu (1996: 116)
- (25) *bn tw=j m p³y=j shr jwn³* [P.Leiden I 369 vs.4 (=LRL2,8-9)] AdvS
 ‘I am not in my (normal) condition’
- (26) *bn sw m šs twn³ p³-pš i.iri.k n=i* [pMayer B 1] AdvS
 ‘The share you have left me is not fair’
 cited after Černý–Groll 1978: §20.6.1

Absence of *jwn³* in positions where it is expected to appear:

- (27) *bn ntk sš n dhwtj p³y=f gstj p³ ntj m d^rt=k* [Turin A vs. 4,1] NomS
 ‘Are you not a scribe of Thoth? For it is his palette that is in your hand.’
- (28) *nn bn jmw n kmt hr jst n kmt n³ nty hn hr nj-sw-b³-nb-dd* [Wen 1,x+22-23] Cleft
 ‘Is it not an Egyptian ship? Behold, it is an Egyptian crew that sail under N.’
 ‘Is it not an Egyptian ship and an Egyptian crew that sail under N.?’
- (29) *in bn i.iri.n b³k n.k m ib h³ty.n* [LRL 46,16] 2ndTense
 ‘Don’t we work for you with all our heart?’
 cited after Černý–Groll 1978: 389, §27.2

bn questions the truth-value of the sentence rather than the identificational predication.
 Cf. the observation by Groll (1967: 101): usual in negative interrogative sentences

4 The Demotic *bn...jn* construction

4.1 Description and use

- ◆ The negation of the nominal sentence (cf. Johnson 1981: 416)
- ◆ The negation of adjectival predicates: i) nominal pattern, ii) adjectival verbs (after Johnson 1976: 86)
- ◆ The negation of cleft sentences (cf. Johnson 1981: 420)
- ◆ The negation of the second tenses [= the nexus of the focalizing conversion]
- ◆ The negation of Present I (and AdvS)
 NB. only with definite noun phrase subjects! With indefinites → negative existential negation

“The negative of the second tense was formed the same way as the negative of the present tense, of which it was syntactically a subset”; “The construction *bn...in* negated the nexus between the second tense clause serving as subject and the adverbial predicate, just as (it) always negated the nexus in present tense sentences.” (Johnson 1976: 81)

4.2 Examples

- (30) *bn iw 3hy in p3y p3 rmt* A pw B
 ‘The man is not a read’ [Krall 23/11] after Johnson 1981: 416]
- (31) *p3 hl rn.f bn iw p3y.y šr in p3y* A B pw
 ‘The above-named youth is not my son’ [Krugtexte A/11]
 after Johnson 1981: 417]
- (32) *iw bn n3-sbq.k n msy in* AdjPred
 ‘you no longer being young’ [P.Rylands IX. 6,9]
 after Johnson 1976: 86]
- (33) *bn iw ink p3 nty sš n-im.w in* Cleft
 ‘I am not the one who insults them’ [Petubastis 11/18]
 after Johnson 1981: 420]
- (34) *bn iir(.y) ir.w n n3y.tn iṯw in iir(.y) ir.w n imn* 2ndTense
 ‘It was not for you fathers that I did them; it was for Amun I did them’
 [P.Rylands IX. 13,11-12] after Johnson 1976: 82]
- (35) *bn iw i-ir-w iy r bw(?) -n3y r-db3 t3 dni.t ḥm-ntr n imn [i]n* 2ndTense
 ‘It is not on account of the share of the prophet of Amun that they come here’
 [P. Spieg. (=Petubastis) 8:9] after Williams 1948: 226]
- (36) *bn tw.y sby n-im.k in* [Setne 3/11] Present I.
 ‘I am not laughing at you’ after Johnson 1976:55]

5. The Coptic (ⲛ̅) ... ⲁⲛ construction

5.1 Description and use

The obligatory element is the enclitic ⲁⲛ and the sentence-initial ⲛ̅ can be omitted.
 Polotsky 1960: §31; Layton 2000: §250f; Reintges 2004: 344-346; Till 1986: §§403-405

- ◆ The negation of the nominal sentence
- ◆ The negation of adjectival predicates: i) nominal pattern, ii) the ⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩⲓⲥ-type [= the suffixally conjugated verboids formed in initial ⲛⲁ.], iii) plus Ⲓⲛⲉ- ('it is pleasing to') and similar some impersonal predicates, cf. Layton 2000: §§379, 487, see also Polotsky 1960: §37)
- ◆ The negation of cleft sentences
- ◆ The negation of the second tenses [= the nexus of the focalizing conversion]
- ◆ The negation of the Bipartite Conjugation (AdvS, Present I, Futurum I), [= durative sentence patterns] NB. only with definite subjects!

Polotsky (1960: §31): (\bar{n})... λn negates the nexus between subject and a non-verbal predicate
 (\bar{n})... λn negates a non-verbal part of the sentence having predicate force

5.2 Examples

- | | |
|---|---------|
| (37) $\bar{n}\lambda n\sigma k \lambda n \pi e \pi e\bar{x}\bar{c}$
‘I am not the Christ’ [John 3:28] | ApwB |
| (38) $\bar{n}n\lambda n\sigma y\pi e\tau\bar{n}\omega\sigma y\omega\sigma y \lambda n$
‘Your boasting is not good’ [1Cor 5:6] after Layton (2000: §373) | AdjPred |
| (39) $\bar{n}\sigma a\rho\bar{z} \lambda n \zeta i\sigma n\sigma\bar{q} \pi e\tau a\delta e\lambda\pi\pi a i n\lambda k$
‘It’s not flesh and blood that has revealed this to you’
[Matt 16:17] after Layton (2000: §464) | CleftS |
| (40) $\pi e\tau\pi i\sigma\tau e\gamma e \epsilon\rho o i n e\bar{q}\pi i\sigma\tau e\gamma e \epsilon\rho o i \lambda n \alpha\lambda\lambda a \epsilon\pi e\tau a\bar{q}\tau a\sigma\gamma o\epsilon i$
‘He who believes in me, believe not in me, but in him who sent me’
[John 12:44] after Layton (2000: §448) | PresII |
| (41) $\bar{n}\tau a\pi e i\bar{z}\omega b \omega\omega\pi e \lambda n \bar{z}\bar{n} \pi\bar{z}\omega\pi$
‘This matter didn’t happen secretly’
[Acts 26:26] after Loprieno (1995: 233) | PerfII |
| (42) $\bar{n}\bar{q}\bar{n}\pi e i\mu a \lambda n$
‘He is not here’ [Luke 24:6] after Layton (2000: §250f) | AdvS |
| (43) $\pi n\sigma y\tau e n\bar{t}\bar{p}\bar{z}\sigma\tau e \bar{z}h\bar{t}\bar{q} \lambda n$
‘I do not fear God’ [Luke 18:4] after Layton (2000: §313) | PresI |
| (44) $\bar{n}\bar{q}n\lambda m\sigma y \lambda n$
‘He will not die’ [Luke 17:21] | FutI |

Note the difference:

Negation + circumstantial Present $\epsilon n\bar{q}... \lambda n$
 Negation + Present II $n e\bar{q}... \lambda n$
 (Polotsky 1960. 406, §28 obs; Till 1986: §303.).

6 The functional spreading of DPC

Allen (2013: 91): "The development of non-verbal negations from Late Egyptian through Coptic shows an increase in the range of the particle *jwnʒ*, from the negation of nominal and adjectival predicates in Late Egyptian to adverbial predicates in Demotic and Coptic. This suggests an initial reanalysis of adjectival predicates as nominal and a subsequent appreciation of *bn. . . jwnʒ* as the norm for nonverbal sentences."

Proposal: The crucial role of focus constructions in this process!

Table 3. Syntactic contexts in which DPC systematically appears

	ME	LE	Demotic	Coptic
NomS	+	+	+	+
Cleft	+	+	+	+
2ndTense	+	+	+	+
AdvS	–	+/-	+	+
pseudo-verbal > PresI	–	–	+	+
pseudo-verbal > FutIII	–	–	–	–

Note the restricted use of old CleftS with a definable set of lexical items (Junge 1996: §4.3.2)

DPC in first present in Late Egyptian:

The Late Egyptian *bn...jwn3* was much more common with true adverbial predicates, whereas simple *bn* was more frequent with infinitival and qualitative predicates (Groll 1970: Ch3, cited after Johnson 1976: 62).

Table 4. A syntactic analogy?

2ndTense	<i>j.jr.f sdm</i>	AdvP / PP / adverbial clause
PresentI	<i>sw</i>	AdvP
PresentI	<i>sw</i>	(<i>hr</i>) infinitive

Proposal:

- ❖ *jwn3* emerged as a reinforcing element, in accordance with what Winand (1997) proposed
- ❖ *bn...jwn3* grammaticalized in the contexts where identification is negated – in a similar way it happened in earlier Egyptian ⇒ spreading in all types of identificational / specificational predication (including all focus constructions).
- ❖ While focus structures in which one of the arguments (S/O) is negated have a nominal syntax, emphatic sentences have an adverbial syntax. Thus second tense forms with an adverbial focus could provide a pattern for analogical syntactic change and DPC spread into every sentence type that displayed an adverbial predicate.
- ❖ Reanalysis: DPC has become the general negation of non-verbal predication patterns by the time of Demotic and Coptic.

References

- Allen, James P. 2000. *Middle Egyptian. An Introduction to the Language and Culture of Hieroglyphs*. Cambridge University Press (2nd.ed. 2010)
- Allen, James P. 2002. *The Heqanakht Papyri*. Metropolitan Museum of Art. New York
- Allen, James P. 2013. *The Ancient Egyptian Language, an Historical Study*. Cambridge University Press
- Černý, Jaroslav – Groll, Sarah I. 1978. *A Late Egyptian Grammar*. 2nd ed. Roma: Biblical Institute Press
- Dahl, Östen 1979. 'Typology of sentence negation.' *Linguistics* 17. 79-106.
- Dahl, Östen 2010. 'Typology of negation.' In: Horn, L. R. (ed.): *The expression of negation*. The expression of cognitive categories 4. Berlin: de Gruyter
- Davis, V. L. 1973. *Syntax of the Negative Particles bw and bn in Late Egyptian*. MÄS 29. München
- Dryer, Matthew S. 2013. Negative Morphemes. In: Dryer, Matthew S. & Haspelmath, Martin (eds.) *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. (Available online at <http://wals.info/chapter/112>, Accessed on 2014-11-29.)
- Edel, Elmar 1955-64. *Altägyptische Grammatik*. Analecta Orientalia 34-39. Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum
- É. Kiss Katalin 2006. 'Focussing as predication.' In: Valéria Molnár - Susanne Winkler (eds.): *The Architecture of Focus*. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 169-194.
- É. Kiss Katalin (forthcoming) 'Discourse functions: The case of Hungarian.' In: Caroline Féry és Shinichiro Ishihara (eds.): *Handbook of Information Structure*. to appear, Oxford University Press.
- Gardiner, Alan 1904. 'The word iwn3.' ZÄS 41: 130–135.
- Gardiner, Alan H. 1957. *Egyptian Grammar Being an Introduction to the Study of Hieroglyphs*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Griffith Institute, Ashmolean Museum
- Gilula, Mordechai 1970. Review of Die negativen Konstruktionen im Alt- und Mittägyptischen by H. Satzinger. *JEA* 56: 205-214.
- Gilula, Mordechai 1972. 'Enclitic particles in Middle Egyptian.' *GM* 2: 53-59.
- Groll, Sarah I. 1967. *Non-Verbal Sentence Patterns in Late Egyptian*. London, Oxford University Press.
- Groll, Sarah I. 1970. *The Negative Verbal System of Late Egyptian*. London.
- Gunn, Battiscomb 1924. *Studies in aysEgyptian Syntax*. Paris.
- Higgins, Roger F. 1973. *The Pseudo-cleft Construction in English*. PhD dissertation. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT
- Johnson, Janet H. 1976. *The Demotic Verbal System*, SAOC 38, Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago
- Johnson, Janet H. 1981. 'Demotic nominal sentences.' In: Young, Dwight W. (ed.): *Studies presented to Hans Jacob Polotsky*. East gloucester, 414-430.
- Junge, Friedrich 1996. *Einführung in die Grammatik des Neuägyptischen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz
- Layton, Bentley 2000. *A Coptic Grammar with Chrestomathy and Glossary. Sahidic Dialect*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag. (2nd ed.: 2004)
- Loprieno, Antonio 1988. 'On the typological order of constituents in Egyptian', *Journal of Afroasiatic Languages* 1: 26–57.
- Loprieno, Antonio 1991a. 'Topics in Egyptian negation.' In: Mendel, Daniela & Ulrike Claudi (eds.): *Ägypten im afro-orientalischen Kontext. Aufsätze zur Archäologie, Geschichte und Sprache eines unbegrenzten Raumes. Gedenkschrift Peter Behrens*. (Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere, Sondernummer) Köln, 213-235.

- Loprieno, Antonio 1991b. 'Focus, mood, and negative forms: Middle Egyptian syntactic paradigms and diachrony' *LingAeg* 1: 201–226.
- Loprieno, Antonio 1995. *Ancient Egyptian: A linguistic introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Miestamo, Matti 2005. *Standard negation. The negation of declarative verbal main clauses in a typological perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter
- Neveu, François 1994. 'Vraie et pseudo-cleft sentence en néo-égyptien.' *LingAeg* 4: 191-212.
- Neveu, François 1996. *La langue des Ramsès. Grammaire de néo-égyptien*. Paris: Khéops
- Payne, J. R. 1985. 'Negation.' In: T. Shopen (ed.): *Language typology and syntactic description. Vol. I, Clause structure*. Cambridge, 197-242.
- Polotsky, Hans J. 1944. *Études de syntaxe copte*. Publications de la Société d'Archéologie Copte, Le Caire
- Polotsky, Hans J. 1960. 'Coptic conjugation system'. *Orientalia* 29. 392-422.
- Reintges, Chris H. 2004. *Coptic Egyptian (Sahidic Dialect.) A Learner's Grammar*. Afrikawissenschaftliche Lehrbücher 15. Köln: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag
- Satzinger, Helmut 1970. *Die negativen Konstruktionen im Alt- und Mittelägyptischen*. MÄS 12. Berlin
- Satzinger, Helmut 1981. 'Nominalsatz und Cleft-Sentence im Neuägyptischen.' In: Young, Dwight W. (ed.): *Studies presented to Hans Jacob Polotsky*. East gloucester, 480-505.
- Shisha-Halevy, Ariel 1986. *Coptic Grammatical Categories. Structural Studies in the Syntax of Shenoutean Sahidic*. Analecta Orientalia 53. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum.
- Spiegelberg, Wilhelm 1925. *Demotische Grammatik*, Heidelberg: Carl Winters
- van der Auwera, Johan 2010. 'On the diachrony of negation.' In: Horn, Laurence L. (ed.) *The expression of negation*. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 73-109.
- Williams, Ronald J. 1948 'On certain verbal forms in Demotic' *JNES* 7: 225-228.
- Winand, Jean 1992. *Études de néo-égyptien I. La morphologie verbale*. Liège
- Winand, Jean 1997. 'La négation *bn...* *iwn3* en Néo-Égyptien' *LingAeg* 5: 223–236.