



# BULLETIN DE L'INSTITUT FRANÇAIS D'ARCHÉOLOGIE ORIENTALE

en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne

BIFAO 45 (1947), p. 61-64

Girgis Mattha

The origin of the explanatory particles [en] and [entji] : [endje].

#### Conditions d'utilisation

L'utilisation du contenu de ce site est limitée à un usage personnel et non commercial. Toute autre utilisation du site et de son contenu est soumise à une autorisation préalable de l'éditeur (contact AT ifao.egnet.net). Le copyright est conservé par l'éditeur (Ifao).

#### Conditions of Use

You may use content in this website only for your personal, noncommercial use. Any further use of this website and its content is forbidden, unless you have obtained prior permission from the publisher (contact AT ifao.egnet.net). The copyright is retained by the publisher (Ifao).

#### Dernières publications

9782724711622	<i>BIFAO 126</i>	
9782724711059	<i>Les Inscriptions de visiteurs dans les Tombes thébaines</i>	Chloé Ragazzoli
9782724711455	<i>Les émotions dans l'Égypte Ancienne</i>	Rania Y. Merzeban (éd.), Marie-Lys Arnette (éd.), Dimitri Laboury, Cédric Larcher
9782724711639	<i>AnIsl 60</i>	
9782724711448	<i>Athribis XI</i>	Marcus Müller (éd.)
9782724711615	<i>Le temple de Dendara X. Les chapelles osiriennes</i>	Sylvie Cauville, Oussama Bassiouni, Matjaž Kažničnik, Bernard Lenthéric
9782724711707	????? ?????????? ??????? ???? ?? ???????	Omar Jamal Mohamed Ali, Ali al-Sayyid Abdelatif
???	????? ?? ??????? ??????? ?? ????????? ?????????? ??????????????	
????????????	???????????? ??????? ??????? ?? ??? ??????? ??????;	





where  $\mu\tilde{\eta}\tau\epsilon\sigma\nu\theta\upsilon\varsigma \bar{\eta}\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\kappa\omicron\pi\omicron\varsigma$  “12 bishops” determines the 3rd pers. plur. in  $\bar{\eta}\tau\epsilon\rho\upsilon\gamma\text{-}$ ; and  $\mu\tilde{\eta} \bar{\mu}\pi\epsilon\sigma\nu\lambda\gamma \epsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon\gamma \bar{\mu}\pi\epsilon\sigma\nu\lambda\gamma$ <sup>(1)</sup> “hast thou not seen both?” lit. “hast thou not seen them, namely the two persons?”, where  $\pi\epsilon\sigma\nu\lambda\gamma$  defines the 3rd pers. plur. in  $\epsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon\gamma$ ; and  $\lambda\nu\omicron\kappa \Delta\epsilon \lambda\iota\chi\omega \epsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon\gamma \bar{\eta}\nu\epsilon\tau\lambda\gamma\sigma\omega\lambda\bar{\eta} \bar{\eta}\lambda\bar{\iota} \epsilon\beta\omicron\lambda$ <sup>(2)</sup> “I then described what was revealed to me” lit. “I then spoke concerning them, namely the things which were revealed to me”, where  $\eta\epsilon\tau\lambda\gamma\sigma\omega\lambda\bar{\eta} \bar{\eta}\lambda\bar{\iota} \epsilon\beta\omicron\lambda$  “that which was revealed to me” defines the 3rd pers. pl. in  $\epsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon\gamma$ .

Other examples are like  $\theta\lambda\rho\alpha\tau\varsigma \bar{\eta}\theta\upsilon\gamma\beta\omega$  “under a tree”, lit. “at the foot of it, namely a tree”;  $\rho\omega\omicron\upsilon\gamma \bar{\eta}\nu\eta\lambda\sigma\epsilon\beta\eta\varsigma$  “the mouths of the impious” lit. “the mouth of them, namely the unrighteous”, etc. etc.

The word introduced by  $\bar{\eta}$  could also define a preceding independent pronoun as in the following examples :

$\lambda\eta\lambda\kappa \bar{\eta}\pi\alpha\pi\alpha \epsilon\iota\varsigma\iota\tau\rho\upsilon\gamma, \lambda\eta\lambda\kappa \bar{\eta}\kappa\alpha\sigma\epsilon\mu$  etc. (joint authors) and  $\bar{\eta}\tau\omicron\upsilon\alpha \bar{\eta}\pi\lambda\alpha\omega\mu$ <sup>(3)</sup>.

If the defining word is a pronoun, this latter is the independent pronoun :  $\lambda\eta\mu\omega\iota \bar{\eta}\epsilon\mu\lambda\alpha\upsilon \lambda\eta\mu\omega\iota \bar{\eta}\epsilon\mu \kappa\epsilon\sigma\nu\lambda\gamma$ <sup>(4)</sup> “we walked with him, I and two others”. Independent pronouns are etymologically related to the particle  $\bar{\eta}$  and they were not infrequently used in the language parallel to  $\bar{\eta}$  + noun.

Sometimes this explanatory particle  $\bar{\eta}$  is omitted; e. g.  $\epsilon\gamma\tau\omega\bar{\eta} \rho\omicron\upsilon\gamma\lambda\bar{\iota}$ <sup>(5)</sup> “where is thy husband?” lit. “where is he, thy husband?” Compare the absence of  $\bar{\eta}$  in Late Egyptian, referred to above.

Sometimes this particle  $n$  (variant  $m$ ) is followed in demotic by the enclitic particle  $ge$  (old  $\bar{\sigma} -$ ) as is the case in

$\bar{h}bq\epsilon n'm\text{-}s n\text{-}ge 'y\bar{h} t n ty\text{-}s qt\text{-}t m\text{-}ge rm 'mnt$ <sup>(6)</sup> “waste her away, thou demon; take her sleep, thou man of Amenti”, where the first  $n\text{-}ge$  introduces

<sup>(1)</sup> ZOEGA, 397.

<sup>(2)</sup> ZOEGA, 397.

<sup>(3)</sup> CRUM, *Coptic Dict.*, p. 215 b, sub  $n\text{-}$ , I, d.

<sup>(4)</sup> MALLON, *Grammaire*, § 350, last example.

<sup>(5)</sup> ZOEGA, 346.

<sup>(6)</sup> GRIFFITH-THOMPSON, *Mag. Pap.*, verso 13/2.

'yh "demon" and the second *m-ge* introduces *rm 'mnt* "man of Amenti" as nouns defining the pronoun "thou" implicit in the imperatives *hbqe* "waste away" and *l* "take" respectively. Compare  $\text{ⲗ} \text{---} \text{Ⲙ}$  subject, *Wb* V, p. 178, 10.

The group  $\text{Ⲙ}$  is false for  $\text{Ⲙ}$  ( $\text{Ⲙ}$ ). Palaeographically speaking, it is properly the group for  $\text{Ⲙ}$  *sp-2* "twice", which is not infrequently confused by the scribes with that of  $\text{Ⲙ}$ .

While this example is almost the only one in the extant demotic texts for the use of the explanatory particle *n* followed by *ge*, examples for the use of its Coptic form  $\bar{\text{n}}\text{ⲥ}\text{ⲓ} : \bar{\text{n}}\text{ⲭ}\text{Ⲉ}$  are very common.

Its chief use is to introduce a noun to define a preceding suffix pronoun used as subject e. g.  $\text{ⲗⲘⲐⲐⲐⲐ} \bar{\text{n}}\text{ⲥ}\text{ⲓ} \text{ⲐⲘⲗⲗⲐⲐ}$  "an elder said" lit. "said he, namely an elder".

$\text{ⲡⲈⲬⲗⲘ} \text{ⲗⲈ} \text{ⲛⲗⲘ} \bar{\text{n}}\text{ⲥ}\text{ⲓ} \text{ⲡⲦⲠⲐⲐⲐ}$  "the king said to him" lit. "then said he, namely the king, to him", etc. etc.

We have already seen that simple  $\bar{\text{n}}$  had this same use in such examples as  $\text{ⲗⲘⲧⲱⲐⲐⲐ} \text{ⲗⲈ} \bar{\text{m}}\text{ⲡⲈⲬⲛⲗⲘ}$  and  $\bar{\text{n}}\text{ⲧⲈⲠⲐⲐⲐⲐⲐⲐⲐⲐⲐ} \bar{\text{m}}\text{ⲛⲛⲧⲥⲛⲐⲐⲐⲐⲐⲐⲐ} \bar{\text{n}}\text{ⲈⲡⲓⲬⲐⲬⲐⲐⲐⲐ}$  quoted above.

$\bar{\text{n}}\text{ⲥ}\text{ⲓ} : \bar{\text{n}}\text{ⲭ}\text{Ⲉ}$  could also be used in places where simple  $\bar{\text{n}}$  is normally used e. g. <sup>(1)</sup>.

$\text{ⲧⲥⲱⲧⲓ} \text{ⲈⲠⲐⲐ} \bar{\text{n}}\text{ⲥ}\text{ⲓ} \text{ⲓⲱⲗⲗⲗⲗⲗⲗⲗⲗⲗⲗ}$ , where  $\text{ⲓⲱⲗⲗⲗⲗⲗⲗⲗⲗⲗⲗ}$  defines  $\text{Ⲙ}$  in  $\text{ⲈⲠⲐⲐ}$ ; and  $\text{ⲗⲓⲧⲛⲓⲧⲐⲐⲐ} \bar{\text{n}}\text{ⲭ}\text{Ⲉ} \bar{\text{n}}\text{ⲈⲱⲛⲦⲓ} \text{ⲈⲠⲐⲐⲐ}$ , where  $\bar{\text{n}}\text{ⲈⲱⲛⲦⲓ}$  defines  $\text{ⲐⲘ}$  in  $\text{ⲗⲓⲧⲛⲓⲧⲐⲐⲐ}$ ; and  $\text{ⲛⲗⲓ} \bar{\text{n}}\text{ⲧⲗⲘⲱⲛⲛⲓⲬⲈ} \bar{\text{n}}\text{ⲗⲛⲧⲐⲐⲐ} \dots \bar{\text{n}}\text{ⲥ}\text{ⲓ} \bar{\text{n}}\text{Ⲭⲗⲗ}$ , where  $\bar{\text{n}}\text{Ⲭⲗⲗ}$  defines  $\text{ⲐⲘ}$  in  $\bar{\text{n}}\text{ⲗⲛⲧⲐⲐⲐ}$ .

As to the example  $\text{ⲐⲛⲈⲧⲗⲘⲐⲐⲐⲐ} \text{ⲱⲗⲠⲐⲐ} \bar{\text{n}}\text{ⲭ}\text{Ⲉ} \bar{\text{n}}\text{ⲗⲗⲠⲛⲗ}$ , quoted by *CRUM*, *ibid.*, I cannot give an explanation except, perhaps, that  $\text{ⲈⲧⲗⲘⲐⲐⲐⲐ}$  is written in error for  $\text{ⲈⲧⲗⲘⲐⲐⲐⲐ}$ .

<sup>(1)</sup> *CRUM*, *Coptic Dict.*, p. 252, sub  $\bar{\text{n}}\text{ⲥ}\text{ⲓ}$  *ad fin.*