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 used. 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 considered 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 nAP which was used in negation in Middle Egyptian; it passed some stages till reached to this familiar form, nAP turns into bw and pAP turns into pwy in Late Egyptian, then it became bwpwy. It has a fixed role in negation especially past tenses; it is classified as follow:

- Perfective
- Perfective Passive
- Circumstantial first present (iw bwpwy.tw)
- After relative pronoun (nty + bwpwy.f)
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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 $n\ p^3$ which was used in negation in Middle Egyptian; it passed some stages till reached to this familiar form, $n$ turns into $bw$ and $p^3$ turns into $pwy$ in Late Egyptian, then it became $bwpwy$. It has a fixed role in negation especially past tenses; it is classified as follow

- 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 introduce the predication sentence in past with the Infinitive. With suffix pronoun read *bwpwy*, it had been written  also  and rare  without Determinative, with Det.  ,  (1).

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;

(2) J. Winand, Etudes de néo-égyprien, 1 le morphologie verbale, AEgyptiaca leodiensia; 2, Liège, 1992, p. 208.
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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 sdm.f, it has many forms such as; iw sdm.f, iw sdm.n.f, sdm.f & sdm.n.f from Old Egyptian, iw p3.f sdm from ME(4), and finaly iri.f sdm 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

(2)Ibed, p. 59.
(3)P. J. Frandsen, An Outline of the Late Egyptian Verbal System, Copenhagen, 1974, p 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;

\textbf{a prwme swtM}

*The man heard*

\textbf{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 \(sdm.f\), this tense was negated by using negative auxiliary verb \(bwpwy\) \(^{(6)}\) (compare in Coptic \(Mpe\)), as we will see in these examples;

\textbf{Ex. 3.1(1)}:

\(\text{iri}.i\ rh r.T\)

*What have I done against you?*

\textbf{Ex. 3.1(2)}:

\(\text{iri}.i\ rh r.T\)

---

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

\(^{(2)}\) A. Gardiner, The origin of Coptic negative \(Mpe\), ZÄS 45, 1908, p.73.


\(^{(4)}\) Ume-Karsten Plisch, op.cit, p. 61.


\(^{(7)}\) KRI VII, 384, 3-4.
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iri.i smtr.f gm.i s 3 mnḥ 1(1)
I looked (him) and I found three men and a helper

Ex. 3.1(3):

bwpwy n3 itβw rḥ 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;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Middle Egyptian</th>
<th>Late Egyptian</th>
<th>Coptic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>sdm.n.f / iw sdm.n.f / p3.f sdm</td>
<td>i.iri.f sdm</td>
<td>afswtM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>np3.f sdm</td>
<td>bwpwy.f sdm</td>
<td>MpFswwtM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After what has been mentioned, now going to explain the using of bwpwy (1)KRI IV, 81, 1-2. (2)KRI VI, 470, 15-16. (3)LRL, 15, 7. 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;
"Černy" mentioned that this form is opposite in Coptic "MpefswtM"\(^{(1)}\), the origin source of this Aux. verb is \(\text{M}n\) \(\text{p}\;\text{A}\) \(\text{n}\;\text{sDm}\) \(\text{mitt}\) \(\overset{(2)}{\text{which was used in negation in Middle Egyptian, } n\text{ turns into } bw\text{ and } p\;\text{A}\text{ turns into } p\;\text{w}\text{y in LE}}\) \(\overset{(3)}{\text{negation of } p\;\text{A}-\text{sentence, can be identified through following example;}}\)

**Ex. 3.1(5):**

\[\text{iw } p\;\text{A}\;\text{n } s\text{Dm mitt} \overset{(4)}{\text{}}\]

*We have heard the like*

The default negation of this sentence will be as follows:

**Ex. 3.1(6):**

\[\text{n } p\;\text{A}\;\text{n } s\text{Dm mitt}\]

*We have not heard the like*

\(p\;\text{A}\) has a great role from beginning of Old Egyptian with negative particle \(n, n\;\text{sp}\)\(^{(1)}\). This verb makes with the infinitive which followed it verbal form


\(^{(2)}\)p\;\text{A}\): or \(p\;\text{A}\;\text{w}\?)\), (have done in the past), Auxiliary verb with Infinitive, it had been written \(\overset{(5)}{\text{by}}\), \(\overset{(6)}{\text{by}}\), \(\overset{(7)}{\text{by}}\), for more, R. Faulkner, A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian, Oxford, 1976, p. 87. A.H. Gardiner, Egyptian Grammar, Oxford, 1957, p. 565.

\(^{(3)}\)P. J. Frandsen, op.cit, p. 9.

\(^{(4)}\)Sinai, 90, 11.
On the Late Egyptian negative *bwpwy* 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. This third-waek auxiliary verb *p³(w)* or *p³(i)* has been used by the Middle Egyptian scribes following by infinitive.

Ex. 3.1(7):

\[ n \, sp \, p³\, y \, mi.\, tw.\, i \, sdm \, sšt \, n \, ipt-\, nsw \, dr-\, b³\, h(4) \]

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. 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):

\[ n \, sp \, p³i.\, t(w) \, iri.\, t \, st(7) \]

Never has it been done

Ex. 3.1(10):

---

(4) *URK, ɪ, 101, 4.*
(7) Ibid., P.71.
What that means that you took my Sandels? And took the ...of me? And you will not bring the ...?.

Verb $p^3$ also is the etymological of the verbal construction $pej$ in Coptic, some translated it "Said" another translated it "What he said was", as it Consists of two parts, $pe$ from Hieroglyphic $p^3$ and $je$ from Hieroglyphic $idd$.

\[
\begin{align*}
&dd.f \\
&\rightarrow \\
&\rightarrow \\
&\rightarrow peje
\end{align*}
\]

Ex. 3.1(11):

\[
ouox \ peje \ pquois \ 9abram \ je \ amou \ ebo5 \ 4en \ pekkaxi
\]

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

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, as in;

Ex. 3.1(12):

\[
\begin{align*}
&n\ w\sb.f\ n\ nn\ srw
\end{align*}
\]

He did not replay to these officials.

In Middle Egyptian the perfect is often used after negation $\sim n$ (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

---

(3)The Bible, Genesis, Chapter 12, Verse 1.
(5)Peasant, B1/50-1.
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...tenses(1). n sdm.f "He did not hear", this construction corresponds to the affirmative iw sdm.nf(2).

The following table explains that:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Past active (perfective)</th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iw sdm.n.f</td>
<td>n sdm.f</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following example describes the above;

**Ex. 3.1(13):**

```plaintext
n ir.(i) ht n šrr nb ir.n(i) ht n ḫty-έ
```

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);

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middle Egyptian</th>
<th>Late Egyptian</th>
<th>Coptic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>npA.f sdm</td>
<td>bwpwy.f sdm</td>
<td>MpeFswtM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Kruchten" supposed that the bwpwy.f sdm formation, with its highly recognizable - pwy- unit, derived from a verb pA "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 ɪɪⅱ to Amonhotep ɪv);

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middle Egyptian</th>
<th>Beginning of LE</th>
<th>Late Egyptian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>npA.f sdm</td>
<td>bwpwy.f sdm</td>
<td>bwpwy.f sdm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples;

(1)J. P. Allen, op.cit, p.239.
(2)J. E. Hoch, Middle Egyptian Grammar, Mississauga, 1997, p.120.
(3)F. Neveu, op.cit, p. 62.
Ex. 3.1(14):

\[
\text{bwpwy.}f \; 3k \; (1)
\]

He did not perish

Ex. 3.1(15):

\[
(\text{i})n \; \text{in.k} \; \text{sw} \; n \; \text{bwpwy}.k \; \text{in} \; (2)
\]

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

The main sentence here, Perfective \( sdm.f \) 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):

\[
dd.tw \; n.f \; \text{wn.k} \; \text{hms.tw} \; \text{irm} \; 3, \; \text{hr} \; \text{wn.k} \; \text{irm}.f, \; dd.f \; "d3 \; \text{bwpwy}.i \; \text{ptr}.f \; \text{bwpwy}.i \; \text{šm} \; \text{irm}.f \; (4)
\]

One said to him: "you were sitting with A and you were with him". He said: "It is wrong. I did not see him. I did not go to him".

(1)LRL, 15, 7.
(2)Ibid, 37, 7.
(3)A. M. Elsayd, op.cit, p. 62.
(4)Mayer A 5, 17-19.
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Ex. 3.1(17):

```
ir pʒy.k dd …. r-dd 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 *sDm.f*, the nature or indefinite pronoun *tw* and also sometimes Ø (zero) were used with *bwpwy*(7). Then *bwpwy* was used to negate Perfective passive in its normal form either *bwpwy.tw sDm* or *bwpwy. Ø sDm*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominal subject</th>
<th>Pronominal subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>bwpwy. Ø sDm</em></td>
<td><em>bwpwy.tw sDm</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples;

-Nominal subject;

(1)LRL 32, 13-15.
(2)Neveu, op.cit, p. 63.
(3)J. Winand, op.cit., p.303.
(5)Neveu, op.cit, p. 63.
(6)P. J. Frandsen, op.cit, p. 30.
Ex. 3.2(1):  
\[ bwpwy. \overline{Ø} msy n.f s3 \ t3ty^{(1)} \]
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  
\(^{(2)}\)KRI VI, 475, 4-5.  
\(^{(3)}\)P. J. Frandsen, op.cit, p. 76.  
\(^{(4)}\)Neveu, op.cit, p. 70.  
\(^{(5)}\)P. J. Frandsen, op.cit, p. 200.  
\(^{(6)}\)M. Korostovtsev, op.cit, p. 183.  
\(^{(7)}\)\(iw\); \(\Delta\) or \(\epsilon\) as auxiliary verb in Late Egyptian, it has special construction with \(sdm.f\) 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.
When \( bwpwy.f \ sdm.f \) 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 \ p\tilde{y} \ 3 \ bbd \ n \ hrw \ iir(.i) \ dit \ wsht \ tw \ bwpwy.k \ dit \ in.tw \ n.i \ w^e \ 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.
Ex. 3.3(2):

hr tw. n di hms. ti m ti-Hwt iw. k rh. tw p?y. n sh? hms nty twt. n im.f (1)

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;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Circumstantial first Present</th>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Passive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>iw.f (hr) sdm</td>
<td>iw.f sdm.Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>iw bn sub. (hr) sdm</td>
<td>iw bwpwy.tw sdm.f (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
Ex. 3.3(2):

*iw A šm .... r w'r .... 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 iḥ tw.i dit in.tw n.tn pǔy ḫmn n št i ṭ iw bwpw.tn dit in.tw w.rf* (2)

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

Ex. 3.3(4):

*gmy nṯ rmṯ iw b wpw.w ṭ ṭ nb* (3)

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

(1)Abbott 5, 2-3.
(2)LRL 1, 9-10.
(3)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:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative Relative Adjective</th>
<th>Negative Relative Adjective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nty Sing. M.</td>
<td>lwty Sing. M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ntt Sing. F.</td>
<td>lwtt Sing. F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nti Plu. M.</td>
<td>lwtil Plu. M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nti Plu. F.</td>
<td>lwtywt Plu. F.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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)?*

---

\(^1\)J. Allen, op. cit, p. 134.
\(^2\)A.H. Gardiner, op. cit, p. 147.
\(^4\)F. Neveu, op. cit, p.150-156.
\(^6\)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):**

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

*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**

*\(\text{Pseudo-participle/ old perfective from intransitive verbs} \)*

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\(^{(5)}\).

\(^{(2)}\)EvPhil p. 55.27f.  
\(^{(3)}\)KRI VI, 238, 2.  
\(^{(4)}\)LRL, 17, 16.  
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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>tw.i šm.kwi</em> (Active)</td>
<td><em>bwpwy.i šm</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tw.i sdm.kwi</em> (Passive)</td>
<td><em>bwpwy.tw sdm.l</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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):**

![Hieroglyphs]

*dd.f*³bd³ *bwpwy.i ptr.f bwpwy.i šm irm.f* (2)

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

This example shows the using of *bwpwy* to negate perfective *sdm.f* and first present with predicate of pseudo-participle (old perfective), the affirmative form of this sentence is (*dd.f* m³ *tw ptr.f tw.i šm.kwi irm.f*) *He said; "I saw him, and I went with him"* (3).

**Ex. 3.4(2):**

![Hieroglyphs]

*bwpwy.tw gm.f iw rḥ.f st nb im wpw (ḥr) t3 st 2* (4)

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

---


(2)KRI VI, 814, 12-13.

(3)Neveu, op.cit, p. 81.

(4)Abbot, 5, 5-6.
On the Late Egyptian negative \textit{bwpwy}\footnote{\textit{bwpwy}}\footnote{\textit{bwpwy}}

\section*{4-Conclusion}

Study concludes importance of \textit{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 \textit{bwpwy} comes after converter \textit{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 \textit{n p3} which was used in negation in Middle Egyptian; then it passed some stages till reached to this familiar form, \textit{n} turn into \textit{bw} and \textit{p3} turn into \textit{pwy} in Late Egyptian, than it became \textit{bwpwy}. \footnote{\textit{n sdm,n.f} \rightarrow \textit{n p3,f sdm} \rightarrow \textit{bw p3y,f sdm} \rightarrow \textit{bwpwy,f sdm}. (See point 3-1)}

- The Main use of \textit{bwpwy} is to negate Perfective \textit{sdm,f} (Active/Passive) in Late Egyptian (\textit{bwpwy,f sdm}), which became in Coptic \textit{Mpa.fcwtM} 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 (\textit{iw bwpwy,f sdm}), after converter \textit{iw} in non-initial sentences. (See point 3-3)

- It using after relative pronoun \textit{nty} (\textit{nty + bwpwy,f sdm}), referring to negation of relative First perfect tense not participle as some thought. (See point 3-4)

- \textit{bwpwy} also used to negate a type of first present when the predicate is pseudo-participle (old perfective) and indicating for past time. (See point 3-5)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Tenses</th>
<th>Late Egyptian</th>
<th>Coptic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Active Perfective sdm.f</td>
<td>i.iri.f sdm</td>
<td>afswtm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passive Perfective sdm.f</td>
<td>i.iri tw sdm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Circum. First Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After relative nty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Active Perfective sdm.f</td>
<td>bwpwy.f sdm</td>
<td>Mpefswtm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passive Perfective sdm.f</td>
<td>bwpwy.tw sdm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Circum. First Present</td>
<td>iw bwpwy.f sdm(Active)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iw bwpwy.f sdm(Passive)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After relative nty</td>
<td>nty bwpwy.f sdm</td>
<td>eteMpefswtm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Schedule show role of *bwpwy* in negation)

(Late Egyptian and Coptic)
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