

Tests on verbal Aktionsart applied to Ancient Egyptian: Instruments to determine verbal semantics in an ancient language¹

Carlos Gracia Zamacona, Cambridge, MA

Summary

A cluster of 37 tests largely employed to determine verbal Aktionsart is described, in order to provide a corpus-based approach with instruments of analysis. These tests are illustrated with 56 examples of several Ancient Egyptian verbs, different in Aktionsart, which occur in an extensive textual corpus, the Coffin Texts, dating back to circa 2000-1500 BCE. A systematic application of these tests upon the verb *prj* ‘go out, go up’, one of the most frequent in that corpus, is also proposed in order to display the relevant results of this analysis (22 examples are adduced for this verb). Finally, equivalence between the Egyptological transliteration and the IPA encoding, as well as a collection of the main literature relevant to these tests, are given in two appendices.

Zusammenfassung

Es wird eine Gruppe von 37 Tests zur Bestimmung der Aktionsart von Verben beschrieben, um einen korpusbasierten Ansatz mit Instrumenten zur Analyse zu bieten. Diese Tests werden anhand von 56 Beispielen verschiedener altägyptischer Verben illustriert, die sich in der Aktionsart unterscheiden und aus einem umfangreichen Textkorpus – den Sargtexten (ca. 2000 – 1500 v. Chr.) – stammen. Diese Tests werden darüber hinaus systematisch mittels des Verbums *prj* ‚herausgehen, hinaufsteigen‘ – einem der Häufigsten innerhalb dieses Korpus – angewendet, um die relevanten Ergebnisse dieser Analyse zu veranschaulichen (22 Beispiele werden für dieses Verbum angeführt). Schließlich werden in zwei Anhängen eine Gegenüberstellung der ägyptologischen Transliteration mit dem IPA-System, sowie eine Zusammenstellung der wesentlichen Literatur bezüglich dieser Tests gegeben.

¹ I warmly thank Rune Nyord, María Dolores Sánchez-Jáuregui, and the journal reviewers for their time and useful remarks. I have reduced footnotes to a minimum (some to contextualize examples, others to include divergent remarks on the tests’ general interpretation).

1. Introduction

"Il n'y a guère en linguistique de question plus actuelle que celle de l'aspect. Chaque linguiste s'en préoccupe du point de vue de ses études propres et l'introduit dans des recherches sur les langues plus variées. Mais il n'y en a guère aussi de plus difficile, parce qu'il n'y en a pas de plus controversée et sur laquelle les opinions divergent davantage." (Vendryes 1946: 84)

<1>

These words were written in 1946, and although great achievements have since been made, they could have been written yesterday (compare Sasse 2002). The aim of this paper is to combine several tests frequently employed in analyzing verbal Aktionsart that might permit us to address aspect-related issues from a corpus-based approach. The purpose is thus simply practical, since one does not usually find this cluster of instruments together, mainly due to these two reasons: first, although some tests are very 'famous' and used for different languages, many of them have been recognized only for one specific language (this is especially true in the case of ancient languages); and second, some of them are recognized or employed by some linguistic schools and disregarded by others, not to mention those scholars who repudiate their linguistic value altogether. In this paper, both problems have been left aside, respectively, by a thorough 'search of tests' independently of language and discipline, and by an overtly maximalist criterion. This does not mean that *all* possible tests imaginable to the human mind (at least linguists', language philosophers', and psycholinguists' minds) are discussed here, but this paper is expected to be a tool for the researcher interested in verbal Aktionsart.

<2>

The theoretical frame adopted here to analyze verbal semantics (Aktionsart, but also valency) in Ancient Egyptian has been proposed and developed during the last twenty years by Jean Winand (Winand 1994, 1998, 2006; Malaise & Winand 1999: §§ 342, 354, 359-360, 365, 397-404, 719, 782-785). Winand has investigated the temporality of Egyptian by constructing a theory that clearly distinguishes the concepts of tense, aspect, and Aktionsart. This is the major contribution of Winand's theory, as the information provided by these three concepts is usually hard to distinguish (Binnick 1991: 139-149, 371-434).² Winand starts from Reichenbach's classical ideas on time and tense (Reichenbach 1947: § 51)³ and those of Vendler's on Aktionsart (Vendler 1957), and he develops them in depth to reach a powerful descriptive model. As for the verbal Aktionsart, Winand distinguishes verbal Aktionsart (the inherent temporal structure of a verb) from extended Aktionsart (the temporal structure of a verb and its arguments) and actionality (the temporal structure of a verb, its arguments, and its eventual adverbials) (Winand 2006: 36-37, 42-43, with fn. 19).⁴ This model is in some respects similar to that proposed by Mourelatos, who specifies six features which permit the classification of a *verb predication*: 1) the verb's inherent meaning, 2) the nature of the verb's arguments, 3) adverbials, 4) aspect, 5) tense as phase (for instance, the perfect) and 6) tense as time reference to past, present, or future (Mourelatos 1981: 199).

² For a current state of the art in tense and aspect, see Binnick 2012.

³ And the main subsequent literature: Comrie 1976; Comrie 1985; Klein 1994.

⁴ See, in the same vein, Dowty 1979: 51: "In this section I will introduce a classification of verbs (or rather, of verb phrases) that developed in the philosophical literature as a result of a distinction made originally by Aristotle".

<3>

As far as Aktionsart is concerned, the Vendlerian classification has been the most productive, both in adoption, even with formal or content modifications, and rejection.⁵ As a matter of fact, it is a reference point for any study on Aktionsart. Further articulated and adapted for Egyptian by Winand (2006: 91-149), this model will be discussed in this paper and considered for the determination of the tests which allow the analysis of verbal Aktionsart. According to this model the features which determine verbal Aktionsart are as follows:

Table 1: Features of verbal Aktionsart

	Types of verbal Aktionsart					
	State	Activity		Accomplishment		Achievement
		Durative	Semelfactive	Non-gradable	Gradable	
Dynamicity	-	+	+	+	+	+
Duration	+	+	-	+	+	-
Telicity	-	-	-	+	+	+
Prephase ⁶	0	0	0	-	-	- / +
Postphase	0	0	0	+	+	+
Gradability	0	0	0	-	+	0
Explicit telicity ⁷	0	0	0	0	+ / -	0

<4>

Here follow some major contributions of Winand's model.

First, this model accounts for the difference between durative and non-durative activities, the latter usually called *semelfactives*. Following this distinction, it should be possible to interpret all or many *iteratives* as a secondary meaning of punctual verbs (achievements and semelfactives) in specific aspectual conditions, typically when the verb is used in progressive forms (Winand 2006: 104-105).

Second, interconnections between Aktionsart and valency may also be explained within this model: for example, gradable accomplishments of explicit telicity are always transitive (ibid: 119). This approach defines different verbal classes by using linguistic concepts such as 'telicity' or 'transitivity', which represent a great advantage over other more intuitive or reality-based approaches.

Third, the use of concepts *prephase* and *postphase* permits the following distinctions to be made:

- activities, which have no prephase or postphase (ibid: 68, 104), from telic types, all of which have postphase (either static, in the case of accomplishments, or mostly static, in the case of achievements) (ibid: 67-68);

⁵ See Dowty 1979: 55f; Freed 1979: 40f; Mourelatos, Pustejovsky, Tenny and Verkuyl among others. For a discussion on the different approaches, see Hinrichs 1985: 10-33; and Binnick 1991: chap.6. Also in Egyptology, see for instance Loprieno 1984 and 2003: 76-77.

⁶ For the concepts prephase and postphase, see mainly Kearns 1991: 276-279; Moeschler 1998a: 160; Moeschler 1998b: 294; Winand 2006: 39-41, 67-68, 109-112, 118 gives a thorough presentation with previous bibliography.

⁷ Winand 2006: 64-67 and 114-121.

- accomplishments, which have no prephase, from achievements, which may have a prephase (ibid: 67);
- achievements among themselves, as some have a dynamic prephase while others have no prephase at all; also because some achievements have a static postphase while others have a dynamic postphase; and finally, because other achievements can have both a dynamic prephase and a static postphase (ibid: 112).

<5>

To conclude, the possible types of verbal Aktionsart proposed here are as follows (for the graphics, slightly modified here, see ibid: 121-122):

1. Atelic & static:
 - States: <————> (example: ‘cost’)
2. Atelic & dynamic:
 - Activities: <·····> (example: ‘flow’)
 - Semelfactives: <·> (example: ‘hit’); and iteratives: <· · · > (example: ‘patter’)
3. Telic & durative (accomplishments):
 - Non-gradable accomplishments: <·····+>———— (example: ‘come’)
 - Gradable accomplishments with implicit telicity: <+ + +>_i———— (example: ‘grow’)
 - Gradable accomplishments with explicit telicity: <+ + +>_e———— (example: ‘build’)
4. Telic & non-durative (achievements):
 - Achievements without prephase and with static postphase: <+>———— (example: ‘find’)
 - Achievements without prephase and with dynamic postphase: <+>····· (example: ‘leave’)
 - Achievements with prephase and postphase: ·····<+>———— (example: ‘die’)

The features shown in Table 1 construct verbal Aktionsart, and cause semantic changes (Loprieno 1995: 76) through their interaction with valency, aspect, and tense, which may restrict the use of verbal forms. It is thus necessary to determine by a series of tests which information is pertinent to Aktionsart and which is not.

<6>

Since this theoretical frame and the study of the subsequent tests are applied to Ancient Egyptian, it is recommended that the reader look at Appendix 1 for the correspondences between the IPA signs, used here, and the conventional Egyptological transliteration symbols. As for glosses, the Leipzig Glossing Rules will be followed.⁸

⁸ See <http://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resources/glossing-rules.php>. There is a specific adaptation of these glosses to the Egyptian language (http://wwwuser.gwdg.de/~dwernin/published/DiBiase_Kammerzell_Werning-2009-Glossing_Ancient_Egyptian.pdf), but of no use for the general aim of this article.

2. Tests on Aktionsart

<7>

The tests which help to determine verbal Aktionsart features are mainly based on morpho-syntactic criteria: morphological changes, tense and aspect, temporal adverbials, and others. Three preliminary conditions of the validity of these tests should be taken into account:⁹

- the higher the number of tests pointing to a given Aktionsart feature, the more probable the Aktionsart feature;
- depending on the co(n)text, some tests may either point to a given Aktionsart feature, or to the opposite: thus, a test for telicity that is positive for a telic verb can also be positive for an atelic verb in a telicized utterance;
- some tests have been recognized for specific languages, and their generalization may be unwarranted.

<8>

The following tests are grouped according to the Aktionsart features they are thought to indicate. Some of them may point to more than one Aktionsart feature: i.e. there are some mixed groups of tests. There are thus seven groups of tests which indicate respectively:

- telicity (tests n. 1-9),
- duration (tests n. 10-12)
- telicity and duration (tests n. 13-20)
- dynamicity (tests n. 21-27)
- dynamicity and duration (tests n. 28-31)
- transformativity (tests n. 32-33)
- gradability (tests n. 34-37).

<9>

In this section, every test is illustrated with at least one glossed example in Ancient Egyptian, from a textual corpus called *Coffin Texts* (abbreviated *CT*) dating back to circa 2000 BCE. It is the largest corpus written in Middle Egyptian (Gracia Zamacona 2013). Although most of the tests are employed here as general hypotheses, the reader may go to the references quoted for each of them to learn about the specific language(s) for which the test was proposed. The Egyptian verbal forms are analyzed according to the grammar by Malaise & Winand (1999).

<10>

This general display of the tests is applied in the next section to an analysis of the verb *prj*, and it is supported in Appendix 2 by a historiographical compilation of the linguistic literature relevant to each test. This compilation does not claim completeness, but may help the reader to understand the thread in general linguistics and specific languages for the tests discussed here.

2.1. Tests for telicity

<11>

TEST n. 1. The so-called *implicative inference*: it is generally admitted that if a state-of-affairs is given in the present, and implies its truth in the past, that state-of-affairs is atelic (Kenny 1963: 172-173; Comrie 1976: 44; Dowty 1979: 54; Mourelatos 1981: 198-199; Pustejovsky 1988: 35; Verkuyl 1989: 53; Binnick 1991: 176; Winand 2006: 52, 103).

⁹ Compare the remarks in Winand 2006: 51-52, 86.

and that this is not the case with imperfective verbal forms like the progressive:

(4)

jsc wj ʔ? m t? pn hr Jb? ns-t=k
 DECL me here in land this on.PROG dress throne-F=2SGM
 Now, here I am, in this land, **dressing** your throne

(CT I 163 b – c)

<14>

TEST n. 4. Egyptian verbal prefixes such as s-, n-, ḥ-, sn-, ḥn- may modify the Aktionsart of the derived verb relative to the simple one (Loprieno 1986: 130-131; Winand 2006: 47-51, 76, who considers that causatives with s- indicate the subject's agentivity). More specifically, if one admits that a tendential relation exists between the presence of a patient and telicity¹³ (see test 2), then prefix s-, which transitivizes intransitive verbs, might imply telicity for the derived verb (also tendentially):

(5)

wJ~J-t pw mn mj rʔ J-t
 command~PASS-F this.COP last like Ra forever-F
 What is commanded is **to last** like Ra, forever

(CT VI 125 h)

(6)

smn cw r=k m s-t=k tn χnt-t s-wt
 establish 2SG to=2SGM in seat-F=2SGM this front-F seat-PLF
Establish yourself then in this seat of yours that is in front of the seats!

(CT VII 237 c)

<15>

TEST n. 5. The adverbs 'already' and 'still' with affirmative and negative predications respectively are only compatible with telic verbs and / or telicized utterances (Klein 1994: 146-147). The Egyptian equivalent for this adverb could be the verbal form sJm-t=f¹⁴ ('he has already heard', negative 'he has not heard yet').

(7)

zi pn nw n jw ncr pn
 what this time of come god this
 What is this hour for a god to come,
 n wpr-t jw-wt n jrj-t sχr-w ncr-w
 NEG separate-LIMITATIVE shade-PLF NEG make-LIMITATIVE plan-PL god-PL
 when the shades are **not separated yet**, **nor** the gods' plans **done**?

(CT IV 101 g – h)

¹³ For this relation, see the *transitivity parameters* proposed by Hopper & Thompson 1980: 252-253. Also in general and for the Egyptian, see Winand 2006: 87, 106-107.

¹⁴ Egyptologists refer to some Egyptian verbal forms in this way: verbal lexeme (sJm), grammatical infix (if any) (t), and subject suffix (f), here separated by hyphen and equality sign following the conventions adopted for the glosses. (In fact, Egyptologists use their own transliteration fonts, for which see Appendix 1, and usually separate the elements by dots.) For the sJm-t=f form, see Malaise & Winand 1999: 361-365.

<16>

TEST n. 6. Transitivity of spatial complements¹⁵ (i.e. treating spatial complements as objects, with no preposition) may only be possible with telic verbs (Hopper and Thompson 1980: 261-262, ex. 31 and 32; Gracia Zamacona 2010a: 243-244). Notwithstanding this, in Egyptian this depends on the kind of spatial complement transitivized, and on the verbal Aktionsart: achievements are more prone to transitivize the spatial complements DESTINATION and PROVENANCE; but with atelic states-of-affairs (durative or not), it is the spatial complement COURSE¹⁶ which is more likely to be transitivized (Tenny 1988: 9; Dowty 1991: 569):

(8)

N	tn	pꜥr	ʃ=f	m	sJ-t	nb	sʃp
Name	this.F	circulate	lake = 3SGM	as	flame-F	master	light

It is this N who **circulates** through **his**¹⁷ **lake** as a flame, the Lord of the light
(CT VII 294 a)

Finally, with accomplishments, spatial complements of DESTINATION are preferentially transitivized, though spatial complements of COURSE may also be transitivized:

(9)

j-n=j	ww	ww
come-PFV.EMPHATIC=1SG	district	district

It is (into)¹⁸ **the two districts** that **I have come**
(CT V 152 b)

In other languages, transitivity affects aspect more than the Aktionsart: compare German *er las das Buch* (perfective) vs. *er las im Buch* (imperfective) (Comrie 1976: 8). Consider also the Finnish opposition ‘partitive + imperfective’ vs. ‘object + perfective’, as remarked by Comrie (1976: 8, fn. 2).

<17>

TEST n. 7. Greek perfect expresses the resulting state (imperfective present meaning) of telic verbs with static postphase (for example ἀποθνήσκω ‘die’; compare Egyptian verbs like ʃḥʃ

¹⁵ For the concept, see Gracia Zamacona 2010a. For the terminology adopted here (complement instead of adjunct), see Herbst 2004: xxiv.

¹⁶ Although the term PATH, as opposed to SOURCE and GOAL, is usually employed in general linguistics since Talmy 1975, I will use in this paper the term COURSE, as I did in previous publications (Gracia Zamacona 2010a, 2010b). I prefer COURSE to PATH for two reasons: first, it expresses better the notion of ‘orientation’, which I consider crucial to explaining the asymmetry of ‘towards’ against a contradictory, but theoretically possible, *‘fromwards’; second, the term COURSE easily permits me to create neologisms, such as ‘cursive’, ‘endo-cursive’ and ‘exo-cursive’, to distinguish different types of COURSE spatial complements (general, interior and exterior), which are relevant to the analysis of Middle Egyptian data, and which would be difficult to shape out of the term PATH. Besides what has been said above, the term COURSE is not totally new in this sense, as can be seen in Eschenbach et al. 2000: 130 (“Directional prepositions differ regarding the spatial specification of the paths. Goal prepositions specify the end of the path, source prepositions give the start of the path, and course prepositions characterize the intermediate course of the path”). I also use in this paper the term PROVENANCE instead of the usual SOURCE, and DESTINATION instead of the usual GOAL because I consider them intuitively closer to the idea of ‘motion’.

¹⁷ ‘His’ refers to a masculine noun (an ʔχ-‘spirit’) previously alluded in the text.

¹⁸ Five documents (G1T, G2T, M2NY, M5C and M4C) out of six have this version. The sixth one (A1C) has the preposition m ‘into’ and reads: ‘into them, the two districts’. See Faulkner 1977: 35, n. 65 (p. 40).

çr-t p-t m bjk ʕ? pw spd ?-t ?w ʃw-t
 lower-F sky-F as hawk big this pointed heel-F long feather-F
 the lower part of the sky like this large hawk with pointed heels and long feathers (...) (CT IV 58 h – m)²²

2.2. Tests for duration²³

<20>

TEST n. 10. The Egyptian construction **m** + infinitive tends to fit durative verbs,

(13)
 jw ʃms-w m-çn-w wj? (m)sk-t~t m rʃ
 DECL retinue-M in-interior-M sun.bark night.bark-F~F in.PROG rejoice
 The retinue of the inside of the sun bark, i.e. the night bark, **is rejoicing**
 (CT I 229 b)

while **hr** + infinitive²⁴ tends to accommodate non-durative verbs (before the grammaticalization of the latter for all kind of verbs; see Gracia Zamacona 2010b: 15):

(14)
 sc = sn hr rdj-t n = f j?
 DECL=3PL on.PROG give-INF for=3SGM homage
 Now, they **are paying homage** to him
 (CT VI 172 o)

Notwithstanding this, the construction **m** + infinitive is also compatible with achievements because it can select the prephase; if the latter does not exist, the construction can have a mellic meaning (Winand 2006: 56):

(15)
 jw jr-t(i) n-t(i) N pn m zʃ n dn-w
 DECL eye-F.DU of-F.DU Name this in.PROG open because plant-PL
 The eyes of this N **are about to open** because of the dn-plants
 (CT V 296 a)

<21>

TEST n. 11. Temporals of situation (for example ‘at X hours’; Egyptian **m** / **r** **nw** / **?t** ‘at the exact moment of / when’) with a perfective verbal form imply punctual Aktionsart (Bertinetto 1997: 139; Mourelatos 1981: 192; Winand 2006: 54), as temporals expressing lack of extension in time do (for example ‘suddenly’; Egyptian **m-sχ?χ**) (Winand 2006: 55):

²² The fact that this is the beginning of CT [305] spell, along with the absence of utterance-focused marks (such as **jw**, **mk**, **sc**, etc.) and the logical sequence of the actions stated about a bird (growing, hatching out, flying off and fluttering) suggests that this statement better fits a narrative than a descriptive context. A desiderative interpretation also seems less probable, as the sentences that immediately follow (CT IV 59 a – d) this passage are undoubtedly perfective (**sʃm-n=f** ‘he has heard’ forms) and emphasize the rheme, which mainly refers to the places where the bird-god goes after coming out of the nest.

²³ Tests of this section are, roughly speaking, useful in determining an achievement’s prephase. See Winand 2006: 67.

²⁴ These two constructions are composed by a spatial preposition (**m** ‘in’, **hr** ‘on’) and the infinitive as their landmark (see Langacker 1987: § 6.3), and then grammaticalized for the progressive (see Malaise & Winand 1999: 454-479).

(16)

jnk ftʔ-ḥr m-çn-w ʔḥ
I\ hide-face in-interior-M castle

I am Hidden-Face in the castle,

ḥr-i çm n ncr-w r nw pḥ-(w)-n = j²⁵ jm = f
on-ADJ chapel of god-PL to moment reach-REL-PFV=1SG in=3SGM
the one who is in charge of the gods' chapel the very instant **I got** there

(CT VII 315 c – 316 a)

Conversely, manner adverbials implying an extension in time (for instance ‘slowly’) are mainly used with durative states-of-affairs (Winand 2006: 52, 55).

<22>

TEST n. 12. The English expression ‘It took / takes me X hours to + infinitive’ is compatible with durative verbs and achievements with the active prephase (Vendler 1957: 147; Kenny 1963: 176; Mourelatos 1981: 193-194; Verkuyl 1989: 56; Klein 1994: 186). Nevertheless, Fillmore (1975: 35) opposes ‘It takes me + X hours + to + infinitive’ (for telic verbs) to ‘I spend + X hours + present participle’ (for atelic verbs). According to Winand (2006: 60), an Egyptian equivalent might be the very rare expression with the verb *jcj* ‘take’ followed by the subject and the temporal expression, as in the example that he uses:

(17)

jw jci-n = (j) rnp-t 6 jm ḥr çrp kʔ-t
DECL take-PFV.RES=1SG year-F 6 there on.PROG direct work-F

I spent six years there directing works

(Urk. I 215, 13)

2.3. Tests for telicity and duration

<23>

TEST n. 13. English temporals of precise moment and closed period (such as ‘in an hour’) imply telicity and duration (Pustejovsky 1988: 35; Verkuyl 1989: 49-52; Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1992: 261-262; Bertinetto 1997: 37, 62-63; Binnick 1991: 175; Winand 2006: 53, 59-60, 108), while open period temporals (for instance ‘for an hour’) imply atelicity and duration (Pustejovsky 1988: 35; Verkuyl 1989: 49-52; Klein 1994: 32; Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1992: 261-262; Binnick 1991: 175; Bertinetto 1997: 37-38, 87, 139; Klein 1994: 185, 209; Winand 2006: 53, 59-60, 62, 103):²⁶

(18)

jrj-t²⁷ r-gs z ʔḥʔ-w r hrw 7 m jrj-t nn rʔ nb
do-INF to-side man stand-M to day 7 in.PROG do-INF this.PL day every

Acting beside the standing man **for (lit. up to) 7 days**, doing this²⁸ every day

(CT VI 329 o)

²⁵ The interpretation of this form as a perfective relative form is based on the sentence meaning as well as on the explicit spelling with the infix -w-, and the same verb (*pḥ*), in the parallel sentence in CT VII 316 c (B4L). See also Faulkner 1978a: 140-141 (fn. 5).

²⁶ According to Winand (2006: 62), this test implies also the reproducibility of a state-of-affairs.

²⁷ It is also possible to interpret a *mrr-tw = f* (‘the fact that he is loved’) form instead of the infinitive, but this does not alter the temporal interpretation of the sentence. See Faulkner 1977: 260-261 (fn. 15).

²⁸ Plural demonstrative to express the neuter: the referent meant is a magic spell.

In addition to this, Klein (1994: 193-196) suggests that open period temporals can also modify “achievements with postphase” (according to the present description, simply achievements) such as ‘leave’ and ‘find’ (in Egyptian these verbs accept the pseudoparticiple and, if they have a dynamic prephase, also accept the construction m + infinitive), but they cannot modify “achievements with no postphase” (according to the present description, semelfactives, such as ‘explode’); in Egyptian, these verbs would not accept the pseudoparticiple, but they are particularly difficult to individualize. A possible example would be the following:

(19)
ns? *ʃw* *rʃ=j*
 burst light Ra=1SG
 The light of my Ra (= the sun god) **bursts**
 (CT VII 93 I)

Furthermore, the Egyptian conjunction *Jr* means ‘since’ (open period) with activities, but ‘after’ (closed period) with telic states-of-affairs (Winand 2006: 108):

(20)
jr~I=j *rn* *rstʔw* **Jr** **χr-w=j** *jm=f*
 do~FUT.EMPHATIC=1SG name Rosetau after fall-FUT=1SG in=3SG
 It is **after falling** there (= Rosetau, a place), that I will create the name ‘Rosetau’
 (CT VII 358 c)

<24>

TEST n. 14. In English, compatibility with adverbials of temporal extension and success (scalar adverbials like ‘almost’²⁹ and ‘completely’; see in Egyptian *m ʔtp*, *m ʃsr*)³⁰ implies that the state-of-affairs is an accomplishment (Ryle 1949: 151; Vendler 1957: 147; Pustejovsky 1988: 33, 36):

(21)
rʃ *ʔr* (...) *n* *wsjr* (...) *j~I* **m ʔtp** *r* *jmn-t* (...)
 rejoice Horus (...) for Osiris (...) come~PTCP.PFV in peace to west-F (...)
 May Horus (...) rejoice at Osiris (...), **who has come at last** (lit. in peace) to the West (...)!
 (CT I 224 c – e)

Compare the very frequent Egyptian construction *n sʃm-t=f* ‘he has not heard yet’,

(22)
rʃ *pw* **χnp-n=f** *sw* *jm-I-jns=f* **n** **χn-t=f** *ʃ=f* *r=f*
 Ra this. capture- him in-ADJ- NEG lift- arm= against
 COP PFV.RES=3SGM linen=3SGM LIMITATIVE=3SG 3SG =3SG
 This means that Re has captured The-One-in-his-Red-Linen, when **he had not lifted yet** his
 arm against him
 (CT II 280 d – 281 e)

²⁹ According to Winand 2006: 109, with an achievement with no prephase, ‘almost’ just implies the intent to accomplish the state-of-affairs; but, with an achievement with prephase, it implies that the state-of-affairs is started though is not accomplished yet.

³⁰ According to Winand 2006: 52, 60, for all telic states-of-affairs.

but also the rare semi-auxiliary verb **tm** ‘become accomplished’:

(23)

tm~i sw? b? = j m g(r)-w hr = sn
 accomplish~FUT pass b? = 1SG in silence-M on = 3PL
 My b?³¹ **shall accomplish** the passing in silence by them
 (CT I 398 c – 399 a)³²

<25>

TEST n. 15. Achievements display a strong tendency for perfective verbal forms (Comrie 1976: 17-18, 42; Bertinetto 1997: 51, 60; Binnick 1991: 379, 412; Delidaki 2007: 222-224).³³ With progressive verbal forms, as well as with temporals like ‘every day’ (Bertinetto 1997: 33; Anderson 1982: 108), in Egyptian rʕ nb ‘every day’, they show an iterative meaning (Comrie 1976: 43; Klein 1994: 96), which is also shared by semelfactives (Winand 2006: 104-105, 107):

(24)

χʕ~ʕ rʕ rʕ nb r sʕm mdw N pn
 appear~ IPFV.EMPATHIC Ra day every to listen word Name this
 It is to listen to the words of this N, that Re **appears** every day
 (CT IV 59 l)

In contrast, progressive verbal forms of activities take a habitual meaning, and not an iterative one (Comrie 1976: 27):

(25)

sʕm-t(w) ?w-wt m jwnw hr χʕw-wt rʕ rʕ nb
 lead-offering- in Heliopolis on altar-PLF Ra day every
 PASS.IPFV PLF
May the offerings **be led** into Heliopolis onto the altars of Ra, every day!
 (CT III 10 a)

Also in contrast to achievements, activities do display a clear tendency for imperfective verbal forms (Binnick 1991: 379, 412; Bertinetto 1997: 60; Delidaki 2007: 222-224). In Egyptian, atelic states-of-affairs (for instance of the group of motion verbs) do not accept a typically perfective form as the (active) pseudoparticiple, because activities have no postphase; but telic states-of-affairs, which have a postphase, do accept it (Malaise and Winand 1999: § 719; Winand 2006: 107):

(26)

mk cw j-t(j) ?χ-t(j) ʕpr-t(j)
 DECL you-M come- PRF.2SG be.ʕχ- PRF.2SG equip- PRF.2SG
 Here **you have arrived**, **you are an ?χ-spirit**, and **you are equipped**
 (CT II 140 c)

³¹ The b? is a psychic entity of the deceased person.

³² In four documents (B1Bo, B1C, B2L & B1P) out of eight. The other four documents (S1C, S2C, T3C & M23C) simply read ‘My b? shall pass in silence by them’.

³³ As for Egyptian gmj ‘find’, see Schenkel 1965: 57-58 & Schenkel 1967: 130 (few occurrences of active perfective participle, but very frequent the perfective sʕm-n = f ‘he has heard’ verbal form). For the verb pʕj ‘fly off > happen in the past’, see Westendorf 1962: 237 & 317. In a similar way (telicity – perfective – perfect – relative past), see the Chinese morpheme *-le* (in Melchert 1980: 651 and Iljič 1989: 266-267) or the Japanese *-ta* (in Kubo & Suwa 2008).

<26>

TEST n. 16. Morphological reduplication is frequently employed to express intensity and iteration in different languages (Feichtner 1932: 209; Diakonoff 1965: 36-37; Loprieno 1986: 21 (fn. 20), 51-52; Anderson 1982: 92-95; Givón 1982:153).³⁴ An iterative meaning for a reduplicated verb implies that the simple verb is an achievement,³⁵ because “iteration presupposes a return to the previous state” (Klein 1994: 96). The reduplicated verb is durative:³⁶

(27)

wnwn=j p-t mj ʃḥwti
wind=1SG sky-F like Thoth

May I wind (through) the sky like Thoth (= a Moon god)!

(CT III 193 a)

<27>

TEST n. 17. In Egyptian, perfective verbal forms of accomplishments take a present (*perfectum*) meaning.³⁷

(28)

jw rχ-n=f cz-wi j~pw-(wi) ʃd-w(i)-n ḥ? n jm-i-j?-w
DECL know-PFV.RES sentence PROTHETIC- say-REL- Ha to in-ADJ-
=3SGM -DU VOWEL~this-DU PFV ram.head-M

He knows (lit. he has learned) the two sentences that Ha (= a god) said to The-one-with-ram-head³⁸

(CT I 139 c – 140 a)

<28>

TEST n. 18. The imperfective present, such as the German present or English progressive, of accomplishments, which all have static postphase, takes a future meaning in those languages, due precisely to the postphase (Klein 1994: 127-128). Compare this particular case in Egyptian:

(29)

jnpw ncr ḥr wʃb=j
Anubis god on.PROG purify=1SG

Anubis is the god who **is purifying me** (= is going to purify me)³⁹

(CT IV 344 b)

³⁴ See also Bertinetto 1997: 166 for the Italian periphrasis *andare* + active present participle of a verb with frequentative suffix, which expresses iteration.

³⁵ Winand 2006: 104-105, 107 considers these verbs semelfactives (punctual activities).

³⁶ See the remarks by Winand 2006: 48-49.

³⁷ For the Egyptian verbs *mrj* ‘love’ and *msʃj* ‘hate’, see Griffith & Thompson 1904:82 (fn. on line 11: Demotic relative verbal form); Malaise & Winand 1999: § 555.

³⁸ Doubtful: this word is an hapax (Van der Molen 2000: 12, who follows Faulkner 1973: 25-26, fn. 12).

³⁹ This example deserves a specific comment. The futurate interpretation in this particular case is due to the immediately previous context (CT IV 343 i – 344 a), a dialog between some gods reticent to admit the newcomer, the deceased, into their realm. The gods say: ‘He (= the deceased) is like a man who has not finished yet his body-liquid-emission (= of the embalming process)’. The deceased responds: ‘It is once I have finished my body-liquid-emission that I have come to you!’ And the deceased reinforces his argumentation with the next action that Anubis is going to perform on his dead body, the example here discussed: ‘And Anubis (in person!) is the god who will be purifying me!’

<29>

TEST n. 19. Temporals of begin-end (such as ‘from X hours to X hours’) imply that the state-of-affairs involved is durative and atelic (i.e. an activity) (Comrie 1985: 30; Bertinetto 1997: 34, 122, 139). Although no example of this is attested in the Coffin Texts, a case of the atelic expression **ʃm jw** ‘go (and) come’ (Winand 2006: 276) with a temporal expression for each verb might partially overlap this test:

(30)

ʃm-t **mjn** **jw-t** **bk?**
go-INF today come-INF tomorrow
Going today and **coming back** tomorrow (CT VI 86 i)

<30>

TEST n. 20. Achievements display a tendency for spatial complements PROVENANCE and DESTINATION, as well as for the ADESSIVE:⁴⁰

(31)

prj **n = k⁴¹** **m** **pr = k** **m** **s-t = k** **m** **bw** **nb** **ntk** **jm**
go.out for=2SGM in house=2SGM in place-F=2SGM in spot every you there
Off you **go from** your house, **from** your place, **from** every spot in which you are!
(CT I 41 b)

Conversely, atelic states-of-affairs prefer the spatial complements of COURSE and the INESSIVE (Wunderlich 1991: 602):⁴²

(32)

pꜥr-n = f **ḥnḥ** **ʃw** **ḥr** **pꜥr-t** **n-t** **ḥw** **sj?**
proceed.round- together.with Shu on circuit-F of-F Hu Sia
PFV.EMPATHIC=3SGM
It is together with Shu **that he has proceeded along the circuit** of Hu and Sia⁴³
(CT IV 147 i)

2.4. Tests for dynamicity

<31>

TEST n. 21. Compatibility with expressions that make explicit the control of the agent over the state-of-affairs (such as ‘can’, ‘consciously’, ‘purposely’; Egyptian **r mrr = f** ‘at his own will’, and other similar expressions) (Vendler 1957: 148-149; Dowty 1979: 55; Verkuyl 1989: 47; Bertinetto 1997: 84; Pustejovsky 1988: 34; Binnick 1991: 174),⁴⁴

⁴⁰ For these and other similar terms, concerning the spatial complement of verbs of space (motion and position verbs), see Gracia Zamacona 2010a.

⁴¹ Most documents (7 out of 10) have a preceding vocative, which makes the imperative plus *dativus ethicus* interpretation the most plausible. The other three documents have another version with no vocative, and in the third person with nominal subject (**prj-n N**), which clearly points to an emphatic **sʃm-n = f** (‘it is + adverbial + that he has heard’) form.

⁴² Compare Matsumoto 1996: 192 (with fn. 8), 194 (with fn. 12), who relates telicity to the spatial complements of DESTINATION, and atelicity to the spatial complements of COURSE. Similarly, Boons 1985: 227, who remarks the preference of atelic states-of-affairs for spatial complements of COURSE.

⁴³ Shu, Hu and Sia are gods.

⁴⁴ Winand (2006: 58, 72) considers this test essentially for the agentivity of a state-of-affairs.

(33)

jnk	jrj-(w)	wj	qd-n = (j)	wj	r	mr~r=j	χft	jb=j
l\	create-	me	fashion-	me	to	love~IPFV.NMLZ	as	heart=1SGM
	PTCP.PFV		PFV.EMPHATIC=1SG			=1SGM		

It is me the one who created me: it is **as I wish, according to my heart**, that **I fashioned** myself
(CT VI 344 c – d)

as well as with subordination to volitive verbs,⁴⁵

(34)

j~mr=j	m?ϣ-χrw=k	m	jrj-t-n=k
PROTHETICVOWEL~love=1SG	true-voice=2SGM	in	do-F-PFV=2SGM

I would **want you to be vindicated** with what you have done!

(CT VI 186 a)

and with the impersonal passive of intransitive verbs⁴⁶ implies that the involved state-of-affairs is dynamic, because a state typically takes a non-agentive subject.

<32>

TEST n. 22. Perfective verbal forms of states are restricted to the inceptive or terminative meanings (Comrie 1976: 19-20, 50-51; Binnick 1991: 165),⁴⁷ because states are tendentially prone to imperfective verbal forms (there are no punctual states) (Comrie 1976: 50), while dynamic states-of-affairs prefer perfective verbal forms (Comrie 1976: 122). These meanings do not occur in the Coffin Texts,⁴⁸ though we can adduce a case with the semi-auxiliary verb χpr ‘happen’ to express the inceptive of a state (see test n. 30):

(35)

mḥ-n	n=f	m-w	rd-n	n=f	sm-w	χpr-n	ϣnχ	rmc
flood-	for=	water	grow-	for=	grass-	happen-	live	people
PFV.EMPHATIC	3SGM	-PL	PFV.EMPHATIC	3SGM	PL	PFV.EMPHATIC		

It is for him **that** the waters have flooded, the grass has grown and people **have begun to live**
(CT VI 306 d – e)⁴⁹

<33>

TEST n. 23. Egyptian verbs of quality (Heckel 1956, 1957; Vernus 1984a; Vernus 1984b: 171-184; Winand 2006: 120) are prone to ‘stative’ constructions like the pseudoparticipial and the adjectival construction (non-agreed adjective + noun / dependent pronoun) (Vernus 1984b: 173), which may indicate that they have a static postphase:

⁴⁵ Winand (2006: 76-78) considers this test essentially for the agentivity of a state-of-affairs.

⁴⁶ Winand (2006: 85) considers this test essentially for the agentivity of a state-of-affairs. For the hypothesis of the existence of ‘unergative’ and ‘unaccusative’ intransitive verbs, compare the remarks by Dowty (1991: 605-613).

⁴⁷ See also Cohen 1989: 38: in Russian, the perfective of intellect verbs has usually an inceptive meaning (compare the Egyptian sJm.n.f ‘he has heard’ verbal form of rχ ‘know’); Winand 2006: 207-208.

⁴⁸ As Winand 2006: 208 puts it: “En moyen égyptien, il n’y a guère d’exemple d’un verbe d’état à la sJm.n.f ponctuelle”.

⁴⁹ That this passage constitutes a full syntactic and semantic unit is displayed by the presence of two different and independent sentences: a preceding nominal sentence (CT VI 306 c: ‘N is the Only One, Osiris in this land’), and a following verbal sentence starting by a new, and thematized subject (CT VI 306 f: ‘The rebellion, it happened after Horus’).

(36)

nh ʃrr zp-t t (...)
 reduce small rest-F bread (...)
 The remainder of bread is **reduced** and **small** (...)
 (CT IV 45 j)

Similarly, the alternation of pseudoparticiple and adverbial constructions with motion verbs might prove the existence of a static postphase:

(37)

a.⁵⁰ m = cn wj j-k(w)j χr = cn
 DECL=2PL me come-PRF.1SG nearby=2PL
 You, behold! **I have come to you**

b.⁵¹ m = cn N pn χr = cn
 DECL=2PL Name this nearby=2PL
 You, behold! This N **is next to you**
 (CT III 382 c)

<34>

TEST n. 24. English progressive is incompatible with states (Vendler 1957: 144; Kenny 1963: 172; Comrie 1976: 35; Dowty 1979: 54-55; Mourelatos 1981: 192; Pustejovsky 1988: 34; Verkuyl 1989: 44, 47; Binnick 1991: 173; Klein 1994: 42; Bertinetto 1997: 75; Winand 2006: 52, 57, 72, 81).⁵² But states are not indicated by the same or even similar verbs in different languages: in Egyptian, verbs of quality are dynamic (Winand 2006: 120). Generally speaking, the progressive would only be possible with dynamic and durative states-of-affairs (activities and accomplishments), but in fact it can occur with achievements with prephase (and the progressive affects precisely that prephase),

(38)

jw sʃm-n = f χrw bʔ = j
 DECL hear-PFV.RES= 3SGM voice bʔ=1SG
 He [= Sia] has heard the voice of my bʔ

ħr nħm = f ʃs = f m ʃ j~bc-tiw
 on.PROG free= 3SGM self= 3SGM from arm PROTHETICVOWEL~trap-F.ADJ.PL
trying to free itself from the trappers (CT VI 75 k – l)

achievements with no prephase (progressive with mellic meaning),

(39)

jr N pn wsir m bc-t ʃwʃ j~gr
 TOP Name this Osiris in.PROG forsake-INF ʃwʃ-bird PROTHETICVOWEL
 ~ silence

As for this N, Osiris **is about to let go** the ʃwʃ-bird of the Silent One

(CT VI 293 d)⁵³

⁵⁰ Documents S1Ca, S1Cb, S2Ca, S2Cb and S3C.

⁵¹ Document B1Bo.

⁵² For Winand (2006: 81), the progressive implies the subject's agentivity.

⁵³ For this passage, see Leitz 2002: II, 80 & VI, 316. This author seems to interpret it as a vetitive with the deceased as first participant. Nevertheless, the deceased is just mentioned as the topic of the utterance, the first participant being Osiris, then followed by the construction m + infinitive (lit. 'in doing'), a pro-

and semelfactives (iterative meaning) (Winand 2006:52, 56):

(40)
 (...) wn-χr=f ḥr sjn ḥḥ=f jm (...)
 (...) be-FUT=3SGM on.PROG rub limb=3SGM with (...)
 (...) and then he shall be **rubbing** his limbs with it⁵⁴ (...)
 (CT V 209 i)

<35>

TEST n. 25. The imperative implies that the affected state-of-affairs is dynamic (Lakoff 1970: 121; Dowty 1979: 55; Pustejovsky 1988: 34; Binnick 1991: 174); or rather that its subject is agentive, especially with implicative and beneficiary coreferential with the subject (Winand 2006: 58, 78-79, 84).

(41)
 N pn cz cw ḥr jḥb=k
 Name this raise you.M on left=2SGM
 ‘Oh this N, **raise yourself** on your left side!’
 (CT I 6 b – 7 b)

<36>

TEST n. 26. English pseudo-cleft constructions (such as ‘What John did was run’) imply that the affected state-of-affairs is dynamic (Dowty 1979: 55; Binnick 1991: 174). The equivalent Egyptian construction infinitive + pw (‘this’) + perfective relative verbal form of the verb jrj (‘infinitive is what he did’) (Winand 2006: 80-81)⁵⁵, is a typical marked construction in narrations which does not occur in the Coffin Texts:

(42)
 ḥq pw jrj-(w)-n zḥ-nsw ḥr-dj dj=f r smj-t
 enter this.COP do-REL-PFV son-king Hardedef to report-INF
What the Prince Hardedef **did was enter** to repor
 n ḥm n nsw-bj-ti χfw
 for majesty of Upper.Egypt.king-Lower.Egypt-F.ADJ Khufu
 to the Majesty of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Khufu
 (Westc. 8,6-7 = Blackman 1988: 10, l. 5-6)

A similar Egyptian construction (jrj + subject + infinitive / verbal noun of a motion verb) can imply that the verb is telic or the utterance telicized, and this is related to the notion of ‘cause’.⁵⁶

gressive structure for which see Gracia Zamacona 2010b, with bibliography. For the verb, see also Gracia Zamacona 2010b: 16 (fn. 16). As for the contextual motivation for a mellic meaning, the section of the spell CT [666] to which this passage belongs is uttered by the deceased’s opponents in the sky: they recognize the deceased as an ḥχ-spirit, and then allowed to join them. The ḥwḥ-bird’s ‘letting go’ (lit. ‘abandon’) could be a sign of this (see Guglielmi 1991: 155).

⁵⁴ Referring to some barley mentioned in CT V 209 f.

⁵⁵ Who considers this test to be for agentivity.

⁵⁶ For the Egyptian causative and factitive verbs, compare Winand 2006: 73-76.

(43)

dj=j n=k rd-wy=k jrj=k ʃm-t
give=1SG for=2SGM foot-DU=2SGM make=2SGM go-INF

I give you your feet, **may you make your going (= go your way)**

(CT I 266 b)

<37>

TEST n. 27. Adverbials of frequency (for example ‘twice’) are only compatible with dynamic states-of-affairs (Klein 1994: 199; Bertinetto 1997: 85):

(44)

jw-t=f ʃʃʔ
come-SBJV=3SGM much

May he (= the Nile’s flood) come many times⁵⁷ (...)!

(CT IV 145 d)

2.5. Tests for dynamicity and duration

<38>

TEST n. 28.⁵⁸ English expressions such as ‘stop (doing)’, ‘cease (doing / to do)’ are incompatible with achievements (Vendler 1957: 154; Pustejovsky 1988: 35; Binnick 1991: 174),⁵⁹ but also with states. Beside this, these expressions detelicize accomplishments. They are typical for activities (Winand 2006: 52, 60-61, 103, 339). Compare the Egyptian expressions rwj ‘abandon’, ʔbj ‘stop’, fχ ‘cease (lit. loose)’, hʃ ‘cease (lit. break)’, χʔʃ ‘leave’, and also tm ‘cease’ (Winand 2006: 107-108, 339, 341-345):

(45)

zʔ pw n rʃ-tm m jw-(w) mʔ=k (w)j
son this of Ra-Atum NEG.IMP come-NEG see=2SGM me

Oh, this son of Ra-Atum! Do not come to see me!

tm-jn=k mʔ=k (w)j m pr nbw
cease-PST.SEQUENTIAL=2SGM see=2SGM me in house gold

—And **you ceased seeing** me in the house of gold

(CT VII 97 k – l)⁶⁰

In a similar way, negative forms of the general imperfective take a cessation nuance with activities, which is not the case with telic states-of-affairs (Winand 2006: 107).

<39>

TEST n. 29.⁶¹ English expressions such as ‘finish (doing)’, ‘end up (doing)’ are compatible only with accomplishments (Vendler 1957: 145; Pustejovsky 1988: 35-36; Binnick 1991: 174,

⁵⁷ The speaker’s main point is to express their wish that the Nile’s flood may always come and provide Egypt with life. For the meaning of ʃʃʔ as an adverb, ‘frequently’, see *Wb.*:I 228 (V).

⁵⁸ For this test applied to English, see Freed 1979: chap. VI.

⁵⁹ For the Egyptian, Winand (2006: 346-347) considers that in this case achievements are serialized.

⁶⁰ This interpretation (mʔ=k wj ‘you see me’) is better than considering a first person pseudoparticiple (mʔ=kwj ‘I am seen’), which does not make much sense, as the deceased tries to escape a terrible enemy (a snake), even if the first person object pronoun (wj) is written without w, possibly due to the contact with the preceding suffix subject pronoun (see a possibly similar phenomenon in Faulkner 1978b). As for tm ‘cease’, it is also translated in this way by Carrier 2004: 1910-1911, although his analysis is different: tm (imperative) + jn=k (subjunctive): ‘stop saying that...’. My interpretation of this passage is that the interdiction to the enemy (a magical action: ‘Do not come to see me!’) is followed by a positive result (‘And you ceased seeing me...’).

⁶¹ For this test applied to English, see Freed 1979: chap. VII.

176-177; Bertinetto 1997: 104).⁶² Compare the Egyptian expressions with *qn* ‘finish’, *grḥ* ‘end’, *ṛrq* ‘complete’, *ph* ‘attain’ (Winand 2006: 107, 339-341), and *km* ‘complete’, as well as some termination adverbials like *mi qd=f*, ‘completely’ (lit. ‘like his shape’) or *r Jr=f*, ‘totally’ (lit. ‘until his boundary’).

(46)

jw=f **rdj-(w)** *n=j* **km-t**⁶³ *çr=j*
 DECL=3SGM place-PRF.3SGM for=1SG complete-F below=1SG
He [= an enemy] **is placed** for me **completely** below me

(CT II 249 c)

<40>

TEST n. 30.⁶⁴ Expressions like ‘begin (doing / to do)’ (compare Egyptian *χpr* lit. ‘happen’)⁶⁵, ‘start (doing / to do)’ (compare Egyptian *ṣṣ* ‘start’)⁶⁶ imply that the affected state-of-affairs is dynamic and durative (Vendler 1957: 154 ; Binnick 1991: 174, 177):

(47)

wbn=f *pw* *m* *jʔb-t* *p-t* *k-i* *Jd*
 rise.NMLZ=3SGM this.COP in east-F sky-F other-M say
 This means that he rises in the east of the sky; in other words:

ṣṣ *rṣ* *pw* *m* **χṣ-t** *ḥr* *tʔ*
 start.NMLZ Ra this.COP in.PROG appear-INF on earth
 this means **that Ra starts appearing** on earth

(CT IV 187 d – f: BH1Br)

<41>

TEST n. 31. As in English (Vendler 1957: 147; Austin 1962: 46-47; Pustejovsky 1988: 34-35; Verkuyl 1989: 55; Binnick 1991: 173), Egyptian general imperfective (present) has an habitual present meaning with accomplishments and activities,

(48)

jw=j **çn=j** *jw=j* *rχ-kwj* *jth*
 DECL=1SG row=1SG DECL=1SG know-PRF.1SG tow
I row. I can (lit. ‘know’) tow.

jw *ns-t=j* *m* *wjʔ*
 DECL throne-F=1SG in sun.bark
 My throne is in the sun-bark

(CT VI 381 f – g)

⁶² See also Winand 2006: 60-61, 339 (they are compatible with *all* telic states-of-affairs), 346 (they also telicize activities).

⁶³ Taking this as an adverb with ‘feminine’ ending -t, not only occurring as ‘etymologische Figur’. For this, see Edel 1955-1964: 362-363, 381; Vernus 2000: 186; Mathieu 2013: [445-447 & Appendix].

⁶⁴ For this test applied to English, see Freed 1979: chap. IV.

⁶⁵ Winand 2006: 324-325 (compulsory to express inceptive with telic states-of-affairs and facultative with states), 327 (punctual states-of-affairs are serialized).

⁶⁶ Winand 2006: 61, 333 (with atelic states-of-affairs or detelicized utterances; punctual states-of-affairs are serialized). Compare François 1990: 14 (‘commencer’ [begin] + activity).

but a present meaning with achievements and states:

(49)

dj=j sw? =j m ḥtp wꜥꜥ rꜥ
cause.SBJV=1SG pass=1SG in peace leave Ra
May I let myself pass at last when Ra **leaves!**

(CT VII 509 d – e)

2.6. Tests for transformativity

<42>

TEST n. 32. Transformative verbs prefer the passive voice (Loprieno 1995: 76):

(50)

(...) **whn-k2-t(w)** ḥw-wt çr-(w)t mj-qd (...)
(...) demolish-FUT.SEQUENTIAL-PASS mansion-PLF under-PLF like-shape (...)
(...) then the lower mansions **shall be** completely **demolished** (...)

(CT VI 173 n)

<43>

TEST n. 33. Semi-auxiliary verbs, prefixes (such as re-) and adverbials of repetition (for example, ‘again’)⁶⁷ are only compatible with non-transformative states-of-affairs, excepting cultural restrictions (as with the Egyptian verb *mwt* ‘die’)⁶⁸. Compare the Egyptian expressions *wḥm-w* ‘again (lit. repeatedly)’, *mꜣw* ‘anew’, and *k-i zp*, *zp-f* ‘another time’:

(51)

tm mwt-w **wḥm-w**
NEG die-NEG repeat-PRF.M
Not to die **again**

(CT V 175 a)

2.7. Tests for gradability

<44>

TEST n. 34. The English progressive is only compatible with some states (for example, ‘understand’) that can be displayed as developing gradable states-of-affairs, i.e. as being recategorized as gradable accomplishments. Other states (for example, ‘know’) do not have this possibility and therefore they do not express the progressive in normal contexts (Comrie 1976: 36-39; Pustejovsky 1988: 36-37 with fn. 1 accepts an emotive use for the progressive too; for the Egyptian, Winand 2006: 57-58):

(52)

n-ntt jnk js ꜥ-t m wr = cn (...)
for-COMPL I\ EMPHATIC limb-F of.PARTITIVE great=2PL (...)
Because I am indeed a limb of your Great One (...),

⁶⁷ Winand 2006: 62 (for whom this test implies that the state-of-affairs is reproducible).

⁶⁸ At least as far as the Coffin Texts are concerned, for they are *mortuary* texts.

ʕ~ʕ tp-w ncr-w hr rx⁶⁹ rn=f (...)
 cut~IPFV head-PL god-PL on.PROG know name=3SG (...)
 the one who cuts the gods' heads who **are getting to know** his name (...)

(CT VII 14 p – r)

<45>

TEST n. 35. Adverbials of gradability (for instance, 'gradually') show that the affected state-of-affairs is a gradable accomplishment (Bertinetto 1997: 43 and fn. 11; Winand 2006: 64). I have found no evidence of this kind of adverbial in the Coffin Texts, but a quantification of the accomplishment's postphase, which is expressed by a pseudoparticiple, may convey a similar sense of 'gradability':

(53)

hr-twnj jr=j wr-t
 be.far-PRF.2PL to=1SG much.F
You stay very far from me! (= Stay away from me!)

(CT IV 66 l)

<46>

TEST n. 36. In English, the *locative alternation*, verb + object (place) + instrumental (matter) / verb + object (matter) + locative (place), is only compatible with gradable states-of-affairs, as Tenny (1988: 6-9) exemplifies it: *Spray the wall with paint / Spray paint on the wall*. Here is a similar case with the Egyptian verb ʕpr 'provide, furnish':

(54)

(...) ⁷⁰ ʕpr-n=f tʔ pn m rx-t-n=f (...)
 (...) provide-RES=3SGM land this with know-REL.F-PFV=3SGM (...)
 (...) after **he has provided this land with everything that he knows** (...)

(CT I 150 a)

(55)

r n wbʔ jmn-t ʕpr ʕf-tt⁷¹ n-t jmn-tt m ʕr-t-ncr
 spell of pierce west-F provide handbook-F of-F west-F in necropolis
 Spell of piercing the West and **furnishing the mortuary handbook of the west in the necropolis**

(CT III 329 a – b)

<47>

TEST n. 37. Adverbials like 'very', 'much', 'a few', 'too', etc. with the resulting state of a state-of-affairs show that such a state-of-affairs is a gradable accomplishment with implicit telicity (Winand 2006: 65, 117-118), for instance, 'redden'. These adverbials are thus

⁶⁹ This analysis (a progressive hr + infinitive construction as a virtual adverbial clause employed in adjectival function when specifying an indefinite antecedent, see Malaise & Winand 1999: 579-580) is possible because the whole passage (CT VII 14 o – r) is about the fault that some gods did in knowing Ra-Atum's name, for which they paid with their heads: these generic and indefinite gods are the ones who are specified by the virtual clause. The translations by both Faulkner 1978a: 7, and Carrier 2004: 1781 imply this analysis as well.

⁷⁰ I analyze the ʕpr-n=f 'he has provided' clause as a virtual clause of anteriority, whose co-referential subject is ʔpd 'bird'. This noun occurs in the immediately preceding adverbial phrase (mj ʔpd 'like a bird'), which modifies the previous verb in CT I 149 d (sdʔ-n=k 'you have trembled'). I consider that this adverbial phrase (mj ʔpd) is paralleled by mj hʔ-w-n=k n=sn 'like those for whom you have gone down' in CT I 150 b, which similarly modifies ʕpr-n=f 'he has provided'.

⁷¹ Otto 1977: 12; Van der Molen 2000: 71.

incompatible with non-gradable telic states-of-affairs like ‘come’ (accomplishment) or ‘die’ (achievement).

(56)

jw=j hr mh-t wrJ-k(w)j wr-t
DECL=1SG on flood-F be.tired-PRF.1SG big-F

I am on the flood and **I am very tired**

(CT II 34 h)

3. The tests at work: analysis of prj ‘go up, go out’

<48>

The verb chosen to display the results of these tests is **prj** ‘go out, go up’, one of the more frequent verbs in the Coffin Texts, and the second most frequent motion verb in this corpus, just after **jj** / **jw** ‘come’. Its basic meaning is ‘sprout’, whence its double semantic extension, describing a motion upwards and also to the outside, as a seed when sprouting goes up and out of the earth. Among many others, these examples have been chosen because they are easily understandable.

<49>

TEST n. 1. The present of this verb does not convey the truth of **prj** in the past; hence it must be a telic state-of-affairs:

(57)

nss n wsjr N pn pr=f m ?χ-t
flame of Osiris Name this go.out=3SGM in horizon-F

The flame of this Osiris N, **it goes up** out of the horizon

(CT IV 33 f: document Sq6C)

<50>

TEST n. 2. The compatibility with the imperfective (infinitive) and the temporal of distributive frequency, with the loss of the second participant, points to an atelic state-of-affairs or, more probably, to a detelicized utterance of a telic state-of-affairs:

(58)

sχm=k m rd-wI=k r tr nb
master =2SGM in leg-DU=2SGM to season any

May you master your legs at every season

mr~r=k pr(j)-t jm m wnw-t nb-t
want~REL.IPFV=2SGM go.out-INF.F there in hour-F any-F

you want to **go out**, at any hour

(CT I 68 a)

<51>

TEST n. 3. The perfective implies the terminus of the state-of-affairs: it should be a telic state-of-affairs.

(59)

prj r=f⁷² ncr pn r p-t
go.out to=3SGM god this to sky-F
This god **did ascend** to the sky (...)

(CT VII 32 c)

<52>

TEST n. 5. Limitative verbal form sĴm-t=f ('he has not heard yet'): compatible with a telic state-of-affairs or a telicized utterance.

(60)

j jrj-I rn=f m ç-t n-t mw-t=f
oh create-PTCP name=3SGM in belly-F of-F mother-F=3SGM
Oh, the one whose name was created in his mother's belly

n pr(j)-t=f hr t?
NEG go.out-LIMITATIVE=3SG on earth
when **he was not born yet**

(CT VII 32 c)

<53>

TEST n. 6. Spatial complements of PROVENANCE (7)⁷³ and DESTINATION (3)⁷⁴ are mostly transitivized with **prj**, but also spatial complements of COURSE (2)⁷⁵. This state-of-affairs could thus be an achievement (which typically transitivizes DESTINATION and also PROVENANCE) or an accomplishment (which usually transitivizes DESTINATION, but also COURSE).

(61)

n pr-n=c řr-wt jnb-w
NEG go.up-PFV.RES=2SGF door-PLF wall-PL

You cannot go up (to) the gates of the walls
(CT I 60 d)⁷⁶

<54>

TEST n. 7. Pseudoparticiple expressing the resulting state: **prj** should be a telic state-of-affairs with static postphase.

⁷² The narrativity, and then perfectivity, of the verbal form is reinforced by the implicative expression (r=f 'as for him', see Vernus 1997: 76, ex. 96), and by an explanatory sentence that follows: 'It has been done for him by Atum the same that he (= the god) made for him (= Atum) down there' (CT VII 32 g). The version of this passage occurring in the Pyramid Texts (*Pyr.* § 476 b) has the sĴm-t=f 'he has already heard' form, also perfective (see Faulkner 1978a: 21, fn. 3, who also considers **pr** r=f the best reading). Besides this, the initiality of this sentence is supported by the fact that the preceding sentence is an interpolated clause (CT VII 32 b: j-t jn řs-t '—said by Isis'), which follows the exclamatory sentence ('How beautiful to see! How satisfying to hear!') at the beginning of the spell CT [832].

⁷³ CT II 36 d, II 256 e, III 257 a, III 318 t, VI 37 h (two provenance spatial complements) & VI 348 t.

⁷⁴ CT I 60 d, VI 120 o & VI 339 d.

⁷⁵ CT V 31 a & VI 250 t.

⁷⁶ Document MC105. The preposition is also absent in T9C. Documents B1P, B6C, T1L & BH5C have preposition r (allative), and document B3Bo has preposition m (illative).

(62)
 rχ-n=j cn rχ-n=j rn-w=cn **pr(j)-k(w)j** r=j wꜣb-k(w)j
 know- you.PL know- name-PL= go.out- to= be.pure-
 PFV.RES=1SG PFV.RES=1SG 2PL PRF.1SG 1SG PRF.1SG
 I know you and I know your names: **I am out** and purified
(CT VI 136 n – o)

<55>

TEST n. 8. Perfective sꜣm=f verbal form with terminative meaning⁷⁷: **prj** should be a telic state-of-affairs with static postphase.

(63)
prj nm r=k ꜣm-n=f cw
 go.out knife against=2SGM devour-PFV.RES=3SGM you
 The knife **has come out** against you and has devoured you
(CT VII 95 q – r)⁷⁸

<56>

TEST n. 9. Narrative meaning of the perfective sꜣm=f (‘he heard’) verbal form in a chain of perfective verbal forms⁷⁹: **prj** is telic.

(64)
pr(j) sc=f dr-(w) nr-w=f m p-t
 go.out smell=3SGM reject-PASS terror-M=3SGM in sky-F
 His smell **went up**, his terror was rejected from the sky,
 hꜣ(j) snꜣ m ꜣχ-t (...)
 go.down fear in horizon-F (...)
 and fear went down into the horizon (...)
(CT IV 31 k – 32 a)⁸⁰

<57>

TEST n. 10. The existence of the pseudoverbal construction m + infinitive with the verb **prj** would seem to point to a durative state-of-affairs, but it indicates rather an achievement without prephase, as that construction seems to have a mellic meaning in

(65)
 wsjr N pn m **pr(j)-t**
 Osiris Name this in.PROG go.out-INF
 This Osiris N **is about to go out**
 m ꜣtp-w=f j~pn r=k ꜣb-(w)
 with offering-PL=3SGM PROTHETICVOWEL~this mouth=2SGM close-PRF.3SGM
 with these offerings of his, and your mouth is closed!
(CT VII 52 b – c)

⁷⁷ CT I 82 a – 83 b, I 178 m, *passim*.

⁷⁸ The Pyramid Texts parallel (*Pyr.* § 431 a), quoted by de Buck (CT VII 92, fn. 22) is also to be considered a perfective: see the translation in Allen 2005: 54: ‘Recitation. (...) the knife all dappled black **has emerged** and swallowed for itself (...)’.

⁷⁹ CT IV 31 k, IV 164 f, *passim*.

⁸⁰ The preceding sentence has an impersonal utterance verb, ‘They say (about this Osiris N)’, the sentence under study being then a quotation, an initial utterance. The passive form ꜣr-w ‘was rejected’, which is commonly admitted as perfective, seems to indicate that the preceding (**prj**) and the following (**hꜣj**) verbal forms are also perfective forms within a narrative chain, although a prospective interpretation would also be possible. Nevertheless, the main sentences in this spell, CT [282], seem to be perfective sꜣm-n=f (‘he has heard’) verbal forms (CT IV 31 h – i and 32 g).

<58>

TEST n. 11. Compatibility with a temporal of situation such as **m nw pn** ‘at this moment (lit. in this time), now’⁸¹, yet modifying an infinitive and not a perfective verbal form, could point to a punctual state-of-affairs.

(66)

jr-I=j **prj- < t >**⁸² **m nw pn** **nz?**⁸³ **ʃw** **rʃ=j** (...)
make-FUT=1SG go.out-INF.FEM in time this dawn light Ra=1SG (...)
I will do the **coming up** now, when the light of my Ra dawns (...)

(CT VII 93 k – l)

<59>

TEST n. 13. Open period temporals implying serialization, together with the absence of spatial complements, suggests a detelicized utterance in *CT III 259 b*, rather than an atelic state-of-affairs, because of the compatibility of **prj** with the pseudoparticiple (see test n. 7) and with the mellic construction **m** + infinitive (see test n. 10): **prj** should thus be an achievement with prephase or an accomplishment.

(67)

pr(j) = k **m** **hrw** **m** **grḥ**
go.out=2SGM in day in night
May you go out day or night!

(CT III 259 b)

<60>

TEST n. 14. Compatibility with **m ḥtp** ‘completely’ and **n sʃm-t=f** ‘he has not heard yet’ form would indicate an accomplishment.

(68)

m? = cn **sw** **pr(j)-(w)** **m ḥtp**
see=2PL him go.out-PRF.3SG in peace
May you see him gone out in peace [= completely, at last]!

(CT I 37 a)

(69)

jw **Jd-n** **n=(j)** **ḥ?-tj-w=cn** **ncr-w** **n** **pr(j)-t=Ø**⁸⁴ **m** **r=cn**
DECL say- to=1SG front-ADJ- god-PL NEG go.out-LIMITATIVE in mouth= 2PL
 PFV.RES PL= 2PL =ZERO.SBJ

Your hearts (lit. ‘those-of-the-front’) have spoken to me, oh gods, **before anything has come out** from your mouths!

(CT I 382 d – 384 a)

<61>

TEST n. 15. The progressive of **prj** is non-habitual (see ex. 65), and it takes an iterative meaning with **rʃ nb** ‘every day’. This, along with the compatibility of **prj** with the pseudoparticiple (see ex. 62) should indicate an achievement, notwithstanding the fact that perfective verbal forms of this verb are not the most frequent in this corpus (432 out of 883

⁸¹ Compare the similar expressions **m t? ?-t**, and **m t? wnw-t**, rendered with ‘*jetzt*’ in *Wb.*: VI, 83.

⁸² For the verb **jrj** ‘do’ as auxiliary of the infinitive of a motion verb, see Malaise & Winand 1999: 509.

⁸³ For a possible **nz?** ‘break’, see Hannig & Vomberg 1999: 385, to which compare **z?w** ‘break’ (*Wb.*: III, 419).

⁸⁴ For ‘zeros’ in Egyptology, see Winand 2009 and Vernus 2014b. In general, see Lemaréchal 1997.

cases), which must be due to the textual main characteristics of the corpus (most of it non-narrative).

(70)

pr~r χ nm-t jm=s n wsjr r $\bar{\text{f}}$ nb
 go.out~IMPFV.EMPHATIC cake-F in=3SGF for Osiris day every

It is every day that a χ nm-t-cake comes out from her [= the Lady of Offerings] for Osiris
 (CT VII 302 b)

<62>

TEST n. 17. The verb **prj** is not an accomplishment, because its perfective verbal forms do not have a present meaning.

(71)

dj-i n=k sJ-t m bw **pr(j)-(w)-n=k** jm
 put-IMP for=2SGM flame-F in place go.out-REL-PFV=2SGM there

You, put the flame in the place **you have come out** of!

(CT VI 294 e)

<63>

TEST n. 20. 341 spatial complements of PROVENANCE and 242 of DESTINATION, out of 656 in all, seem to indicate that **prj** is an achievement.

(72)

nss n wsjr N pn **pr=f** m ? χ -t
 flame of Osiris Name this go.out=3SGM in horizon-F

The flame of this Osiris N, **it goes up out of** (lit. in) the horizon

(CT IV 33 f: document Sq6C)

<64>

TEST n. 21. The verb **prj** must be dynamic and / or its subject agentive, because of its compatibility with expressions that make explicit the control of the agent over the state-of-affairs (such as the semi-auxiliary verb $r\chi$ ‘can’ in CT IV 342 e, *passim*), or **r mrr=f** ‘at his will’ in the example below), and also because of its subordination to volitive verbs (such as **mrj** ‘want’ in CT V 199 a).

(73)

(...) **pr(j)=j** r mr~r=j m ? χ -t jmn-tt (...)
 (...) go.out=1SG to want~IPFV.NMLZ=1SG in horizon-F west-F (...)

(...) **I go out** at my will from the western horizon (...)

(CT VI 334 o)⁸⁵

<65>

TEST n. 24. Compatibility with the progressive, which has a mellic meaning (see test n. 10): **prj** is dynamic, and an achievement with no prephase.

<66>

TEST n. 25. Compatible with the imperative: this verb is dynamic and / or its subject agentive

⁸⁵ The deceased identifies himself as ‘Lord of transformations’ in the preceding sentence (CT VI 334 n). The sentence under study heads a list of actions (CT VI 334 o – q) proper to this status of ‘Lord of transformations’.

(74)

prj nk=k m bʔ=k jn=sn ncr-w nb-w
 go.out copulate=2SGM with bʔ=2SG say=3PL god-PL all-PL
Go out! May you copulate thanks to (lit. with) your bʔ! —say all the gods

(CT II 78 d – 79 a)

<67>

TEST n. 26. Occurs once in the construction **prj** ‘make’ + abstract noun, whence **prj** must be telic, or this utterance telicized:

(75)

jr~I=j **pr(j)-w** r ʔχ-t
 make~FUT.EMPHATIC=1SG go.up-PL to horizon-F

It is to the horizon **that I will make ascents**

(CT VII 199 b)

<68>

TEST n. 28. Negative general imperfective without cessation nuance: **prj** must be telic.

(76)

n prj-n = Ø m r = f
 NEG go.out-PFV.RES=ZERO.SBJ from mouth=3SGM

Nothing can come out from his mouth (= He cannot speak)⁸⁶

(CT II 104 c)⁸⁷

<69>

TEST n. 31. Non-habitual general imperfective (CT I 205 e, II 121 c, *passim*): **prj** should be an achievement.

(77)

jw = f prj = f m χpr-w nb-w mr-I = f m sχ-t jʔr-w
 DECL= go.up= in form-PL all-PL wish-REL.FUT in field-F rush-PL
 3SGM 3SGM =3SGM

He goes up into the Field of Rushes in any form he will wish

(CT V 200 c)

<70>

TEST n. 33. Compatibility with mʔw ‘anew’: **prj** could be non-transformational.

(78)

pr~r mʔ(w) rʃ nb
 go.out~PTCP.IPFV anew day every

The one who goes out anew every day

(CT VII 15 o)

<71>

The results of each test for **prj** are gathered in the following Table 1. The signs employed mean that the concepts on the top of the table are asserted by a test (Yes), denied by a test (No), test-attested but interpretation-unsure (X), and no-relevant (-). According to them, the more probable conclusion is that of **prj** being an achievement with a static postphase and no prephase.

⁸⁶ Remark that **n mdw-n = f** ‘He cannot speak’ is the variant in documents B2L, B1C, B2P & B1Y.

⁸⁷ In documents S1C, G2T & S2C. I consider this to be a main sentence, although it would also be possible to consider it a virtual adverbial clause. Either way, the issue under discussion remains unaffected.

Table 2: Tests on the Aktionsart of prj

TEST n.	Telic	Telicized utterance	Detelicized utterance	Prephase	Static post-phase	Achievement	Accomplishment	Durative	Dynamic / Agentive subject	Transformational
1	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	X	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	X	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	-	-	-	-	-	X	X	-	-	-
7	Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-
8	Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-
9	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	-	-	-	No	-	X	-	-	-	-
11	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No	-	-
13	-	-	-	Yes	-	X	X	-	-	-
14	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-
15	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	-
17	-	-	-	-	-	-	No	-	-	-
20	-	-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-
21	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	-
24	-	-	-	No	-	X	-	-	X	-
25	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	-
26	Yes	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
28	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
31	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	-
33	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X

4. Conclusion

<72>

In the preceding paragraphs, the semantic interplay between the Aktionsart and verbal forms (tense and aspect), adverbials of time, and other constructions related to temporality has become clear. This has been possible thanks to the use of a large number of linguistic tests, most of them syntactic, which help determine verbal Aktionsart. In section 1, examples are given to illustrate these tests and to show how they can be applied.

<73>

This kind of analysis can only be significant under two conditions: first, when applied to large groups of verbs (ideally all verbs) occurring in an extensive and appropriate textual corpus; second, when such an analysis includes the highest number possible of tests relevant to every linguistic unit, and the majority of them point to the same result. The study in section 2 meets both conditions by displaying the relevant results for a given verb (prj ‘go out, go up’) to find its Aktionsart.

<74>

The analysis of semantic issues based on extensive corpus and by means of linguistic tests will no doubt be further developed in the future, as new tests will be added, older ones reconsidered, and new analyses will encourage review of the theoretical scheme, as a whole or in a part.

5. Appendices

5.1. Conventional transliteration of Ancient Egyptian

<75>

Because Egyptian is an ancient language, its phonology is not established with certainty, and on this topic no general agreement has been reached, as can be seen, among many others, in Vernus 1988, Loprieno 1995, Peust 1999, and Allen 2013. The following is a table of the more usually accepted correspondences between the Egyptological transliteration and the IPA signs.

IPA	Egyptological transliteration
ʔ	ʕ
j	<i>i (or j)</i>
ɪ	<i>y (or jj)</i>
ʕ	<i>ʕ</i>
w	<i>w</i>
b	<i>b</i>
p	<i>p</i>
f	<i>f</i>
m	<i>m</i>
n	<i>n</i>
r	<i>r</i>
h	<i>h</i>
ḥ	<i>ḥ</i>

χ	<i>b</i>
ς	<i>h</i>
z	<i>z (or s)</i>
s	<i>s (or ś)</i>
∫	<i>š</i>
k	<i>k</i>
q	<i>q (or k)</i>
g	<i>g</i>
t	<i>t</i>
c	<i>ṭ</i>
d	<i>d</i>
ʃ	<i>ḍ</i>

5.2. Historiographical compilation arranged by test

<76>

In the following list, repetitions due to tests' overlapping have been reduced to a minimum. The aim of this list is to offer to the readers an illustrative picture of the successive stages in the development of each test, so they can judge the changes as well as the continuities from one author to the next: this does not imply that the authors mentioned first are the creators of an idea, nor that those mentioned at the end are actually the more recent in treating a specific issue. This list is not intended to be exhaustive, merely representative of research over time.

TEST n. 1

Where 'A is ϕ ing' implies 'A has not ϕ d' but rather 'A has ϕ d' I shall call the verb a 'performance-verb' and say that it stands for a performance; where 'A is ϕ ing' implies rather 'A has ϕ d' I shall call the verb an 'activity-verb' and say that it stands for an activity. (Kenny 1963: 172-173)

The telic nature of a situation can often be tested in the following way: if a sentence referring to this situation in a form with imperfective meaning (such as the English Progressive) implies the sentence referring to the same situation in a form with perfect meaning (such as the English Perfect), then the situation is atelic; otherwise it is telic. (Comrie 1976: 44)

1. Perfective aspect throughout: If it is true now that he has this very moment walked to the Rose and Crown, it will be true in the future that he did walk, or had walked, to the Rose and Crown. 2. Imperfective aspect throughout: If it is true now that he is walking, or has been walking, to the Rose and Crown, it will be true in the future that he was walking, or had been walking, to the Rose and Crown. (Mourelatos 1981: 198-199)

(...) if *x is ϕ ing* entails *x has ϕ ed*, then the verb is a[n] activity verb, or the verb phrase is an activity predicate. (Pustejovsky 1988: 35)

If V is an activity verb, then *x is (now) V-ing* entails that *x has V-ed*. If V is an accomplishment verb, then *x is (now) V-ing* entails that *x has not (yet) V-ed*. (Verkuyl 1989: 53)

For activity verbs, *x is (now) VERBing* (or *x VERBs*, this latter too with statives) entails that *x has VERBed*. For accomplishment verbs, *x is (now) VERBing* entails that *x has not (yet) VERBed*. (Binnick 1991: 176)

(...) l'inférence implicative: si un procès duratif garde ses conditions de vérité une fois mis au passé, il s'agit d'un procès atélique; dans l'autre cas, d'un procès télique. (Winand 2006: 52)

Une proposition d'activité mise au progressif implique nécessairement la vérité de la même proposition au passé, à l'inverse des propositions téliques ('il est en train de courir' vs. 'il est en train d'écrire une lettre'). (Winand 2006: 103).

TEST N. 2

(...) situations are not described by verbs alone, but rather by the verb together with its arguments (subject and objects). Thus although *John is singing* describes an atelic situation, the sentence *John is singing a song* describes a telic situation, since the situation has a well-defined terminal point, namely when John comes to the end of the song in question. *John is singing songs* is again atelic, whereas *John is singing five songs* is again telic. (Comrie 1976: 45)

On way for Transitivity to be signaled in O[bject] is by distinction between an ACCUSATIVE and a PARTITIVE case. (...) the accusative —the case of the totally affected O[bject]— gives the clause a perfective or telic value, while the partitive gives it an imperfective or atelic one (...). (Hopper & Thompson 1980: 262)

(...) *run* forms an activity predication in some contexts, a performance predication in others. (...) the distinction hinges on the presence of a verb object in the one case and its absence or suppression in the other. (Mourelatos 1981: 197)

(...) it is the object that delimits the event. (Tenny 1988: 5)

(...) the direct object can at least affect some sort of basic temporal meaning of a verb (...). (Verkuyl 1989: 40)

(...) both the verb and the NPs are taken as aspectual carriers. (...). (...) the verb takes (...) the direct object to yield a terminative VP-feature (...). (Verkuyl 1989: 79-80)

(...) a bare plural or mass term (...) can make an otherwise telic sentence behave like an atelic (or durative) sentence. (Dowty 1991: 589)

(...) *run* (...): this verb is an activity verb when it occurs without a goal phrase, but an accomplishment verb when it takes a goal phrase. (Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1992: 258)

(...) there is a connection between the presence of the meaning component direction and telicity. (...) the argument of an intransitive directed motion verb (...) 'measures out the event' (...) and thus qualifies as a direct object (...). (Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1992: 261)

La suppression du second argument d'un verbe télique bivalent entraîne généralement la détélicisation du procès. Par contre, la suppression du second argument d'un verbe atélique bivalent reste sans effet sur l'actionnalité du procès. (...). L'augmentation de valence entraîne généralement l'effet de sense inverse de la suppression d'un argument. La présence d'un nouvel argument précise la portée de l'action, ce qui revient aussi le plus souvent à la délimiter. On est donc en présence d'un phénomène de télicisation. (Winand 2006: 127-130)

TEST N. 3

(...) a perfective form referring to a telic situation implies attainment of the terminal point of that situation. (Comrie 1976: 46).

(...) [*John drew a circle*] counts as an accomplishment (where a change of state is encountered that results in a circle being drawn), whereas there is no such entailment in [*John was drawing a circle*], since John might have stopped drawing before he finished the circle. (Pustejovsky 1988: 36)

Telic predicates fulfill their inherent character only in perfective situations. (Bertinetto 1997: 30)

TEST N. 4

Die Aktionsart ändert sich nicht von Form zu Form innerhalb derselben Wurzel —wie etwa der Aspekt, dessen Oppositionen durch morphologisch unterschiedliche Strukturen gekennzeichnet

werden—, sondern bleibt eine *dem einzelnen Lexem inhärente* semantische Eigenschaft. Eine andere Aktionsart wird erst dadurch zum Ausdruck gebracht, daß entweder ein anderes Lexem gewählt oder dieselbe Wurzel durch entsprechende Modifizierungen (Prä- bzw. Suffixe, u.s.w.) zu einem anderen Lexem wird. (...) Das gilt auch für die verhältnismäßig wenigen *s*-Kausativa oder *n*-Reflexiva, deren Präfixe im Ägyptischen nicht mehr paradigmatisch frei bildbar sind, sondern als lexikalisierte Bestandteile der Verbalwurzel aufzufassen sind. (Loprieno 1986: 130-131.)

Si la dérivation offre un regard privilégié sur les phénomènes d’Aktionsart, les deux points de vue ne coïncident pas exactement. (...) les formes dérivées ne donnent pas d’indication tranchée sur l’actionnalité des formes simples. (Winand 2006: 49)

(...) les causatifs en *s*- constituent un critère fiable d’agentivité (...). (Winand 2006: 76)

La notion de Patient semble impliquer la présence du trait de télicité. (Winand 2006: 87)

En égyptien, les activités ne se reconnaissent pas à une formation lexicale particulière. On note bien une quasi-absence de verbes causatifs à préformante *s*- (...), ce qui n’est pas fait pour surprendre dans la mesure où les causatifs comportent généralement le trait de télicité. (Winand 2006: 106-107)

TEST N. 5

(...) *The quagga was still extinct* is not false, but does not make sense: once extinct, forever extinct. (Klein 1994: 85)

In 0-state contents [= atemporal propositions], neither *still* nor *already* is possible (...). For one-sided 1-state contents, like someone’s being dead, *already* is possible, but not *still*. It is exactly the other way around for someone’s not being dead (...). Both are always possible for usual 1-state contents [= atelic propositions]. (Klein 1994: 146-147)

TEST N. 6

The difference between English *he read the book* and *he was reading the book* can to some extent be captured in German by the difference between *er las das Buch* (...) and *er las im Buch* (...). In Finnish (...): in the first sentence the direct object will be in the accusative (...), while in the second it will be in the partitive (...). (Comrie 1976: 8)

18 a. *walk the bridge* b. *walk across the bridge* c. *walk to the bridge*. In 18a *the bridge* is a path argument which measures out the event by virtue of being the verb’s direct argument. Although both 18b and 18c are acceptable expressions, only 18b may be a paraphrase of 18a. (Tenny 1988: 9)

(...) what is partially but not totally affected in this case [= John drives from New York to Chicago, but the trip is interrupted before it finishes], in a way parallels to the Themes in 20 [= build a house, write a letter], is the PATH John traverses in driving from NY to Chicago (...). (...) an Incremental Path Theme can be syntactically realized as a Direct Object in semantically parallel telic examples (...). (Dowty 1991: 569)

La notion de Patient semble impliquer la présence du trait de télicité. (Winand 2006: 87)

TEST N. 7

(...) das Perfekt mit *to be* neben *to have* gebildet werden kann, so handelt es sich bei den *to be*-Formen um das Resultativum; also *he is fallen* ist resultativ, während *he has fallen* nur einfaches Tempus (Perfect) ist. (Deutschbein 1920: 84)

El valor del tema de perfecto es expresar el contenido verbal después de su término. (...) En el tipo ‘normal’ [= with telic states-of-affairs with stative postphase] (...) este valor se realiza con el sentido de estado resultante de la acción transformativa después del término (final) de ésta (...). (...) En el tipo ‘anómalo’ [= with atelic states-of-affairs] (...) la noción de contenido verbal después de su término (inicial) se realiza como noción del contenido verbal mismo, pero con la particularidad de considerar también el término inicial. (Sánchez Ruipérez 1954:62; also quoted in Binnick 1991: 163)

The perfect/nonperfect opposition is different from the perfective/imperfective opposition. There does still, however, remain the generalisation that there are some languages (...) where the perfect is restricted to perfective aspect, while there are apparently none where the perfect is restricted to imperfective aspect, i.e. there is a more natural relationship between perfect and perfective than between perfect and imperfective. (Comrie 1976: 63)

(...) in Indo-Iranian the Past Passive Participle can also be formed from intransitive verbs, and has active meaning. (...) in order to express Perfect Aspect in this way, one must in the one case use an active construction (with intransitive verbs), in the other a passive construction (with transitive verbs). (...) The perfect relates a past action to a present state, i.e. can express a present state as being the result of some past action. The older forms of the passive in many languages are likewise stative. (...). With transitive verbs (...) the most usual state resulting from an action will be the changed state of the semantic object of the action (...). The perfect passive is precisely that form which predicates a change of state to the object of an action. With intransitive verbs, the change of state is apparent in the agent, so the active voice is appropriate (...). (Comrie 1976: 85-86)

The *semantic* value of the ‘perfect’/‘lingering’-*anterior* forms in Bemba is substantially the same as that of the Creole *anterior*. For active verbs, the ‘lingering’ aspect implies an action performed during whatever time-division the tense-marking indicates, but whose *consequences* are relevant to the *time-of-speech*, in other words, they linger. For active verbs, thus, what ‘lingers’ to the time-of-speech is some ‘consequence’ of the act. In other word, in terms of the discourse topic, that information is *relevant* at the time-axis (...). For stative verbs (...) what ‘lingers’ is the state itself. (...) a ‘lingering’ past tense is normally used to render those states *in the present* (...). (Givón 1982: 137)

Das <w> ≈ /a/-Morphem kennzeichnet also im Ägyptischen eine Form mrj-w = f (meistens defektiv geschrieben), deren zwei entweder als einzelne oder kombiniert auftretende Merkmale [+ PROSP.] und [+ PASS.] unter dem gemeinsamen Nenner der Perfektivität zusammengeführt werden können. Dabei muß hervorgehoben werden, daß sowohl aus allgemein sprachwissenschaftlichen Gründen (linguistische Ökonomie) als auch aufgrund der innerägyptischen Sprachbetrachtung lediglich eine w-Form anzusetzen ist: am Anfang der diachronischen Entwicklung des Ägyptischen sind ‘Prospektivität’ und ‘Passivität’ zwei semantische Unterordnungen des perfektiven Aspekts, und erst im Laufe der späteren sprachgeschichtlichen Stufen (etwa in der klassischen Sprache) verselbständigen sie sich morphologisch und syntaktisch, wobei voneinander klar getrennte prospektive und passive Strukturen in das Sprachsystem eingeordnet werden. (Loprieno 1986: 43)

Leech points out that the English present perfect may represent a result of a past action which is still operative at the present time, observing that “this meaning is clearest with transitional event verbs denoting the switch from one state to another [arrive, give, recover (from illness), break]. (Binnick 1991: 384, quoting Leech 1971: 34)

(...) the correlation between finiteness, passive voice and non-imperfective aspect (...) would require an in-depth investigation (...). (Reintges 1998: 466)

Comme on le sait, le parfait ancien exprime fondamentalement une situation conçue comme le résultat d’un procès antérieur, à l’exception notable des verbes d’état. (Winand 2006: 89)

(...) le parfait ancien postule d’ordinaire un procès télique. (Winand 2006: 149)

TEST N. 8

(...) en un semantema verbal transformativo provisto de duración el aoristo puntual se realiza como finitivo. (...) en un semantema verbal no-transformativo provisto de duración el aoristo puntual se realiza como initivo. (Sánchez Ruipérez 1954: 80-81; also quoted in Binnick 1991: 165)

TEST N. 9

Telic predicates have an unquestionable affinity for foregrounded clauses, and this is easily understood. Foregrounded clauses typically recount sequences of events which mimic the chronological

order of those events, as they are supposed to have occurred. Each event in foregrounding is thus viewed in its entirety; from the viewpoint of the discourse, it is bounded at its beginning by the termination of the preceding event, and at its end by the initiation of the next event. (...). In backgrounding, however, events and situations are not bounded by the discourse: they are presented as on-going, or repeated, or simultaneous with foregrounded events. (Hopper & Thompson 1980: 285-286)

He enjoyed and admired the sonnets of Petrarch (simultaneous). *He addressed and sealed the envelope* (sequential). (...). The first example above cannot be understood sequentially nor the second simultaneously, because the verbs in the first are stative and so non-telic, whereas in the second are performances and therefore telic. (Binnick 1991: 373)

States (...) and activities (...) do not advance narrative time, do not transfer the R[eference] point, but accomplishments and achievements do. (Binnick 1991: 400)

The perfective (...) views a situation as a whole and hence makes reference to its boundary points. (Binnick 1991: 411)

(...) les procès atéliques, et plus encore les procès dynamiques, entretiennent des relations étroites avec la sphère de l'imperfectif (ou du statif) et donc avec les constructions d'arrière-plan. (Winand 2006: 420)

TEST N. 10

Un procès ponctuel ne se combine pas naturellement avec le progressif, sauf si le procès possède une pré-phase susceptible d'être sélectionnée (...); si le procès ne possède pas de pré-phase, la combinaison est bloquée ou prend, chez certains locuteurs, un sens mellique 'être sur le point de' (...). (Winand 2006: 56)

A punctual state-of-affairs could be conceived as having no interior temporal space (i.e. duration), while a non-punctual state-of-affairs would appear to have interior space. So, it would be the semantic extension of a spatial concept into the temporal domain (more precisely, into the verbal Aktionsart). Consequently, non-punctual dynamic verbs would naturally accept the *m* + infinitive construction to express the progressive, while with achievements without a prephase, this construction would take an imminent sense ('to be about to do something'). As for the *hr* + infinitive construction, it would naturally be accepted by punctual states-of-affairs to express the progressive. Nevertheless, this construction seems to be grammaticalized for the progressive of all states-of-affairs since it appears in the texts known at the present time. (Gracia Zamacona 2010b: 15)

TEST N. 11

ACHIEVEMENTS (...) can be dated, or they can be indefinitely placed within a temporal stretch, but they cannot in themselves occur OVER or THROUGHOUT a temporal stretch (...). In contrast, ACCOMPLISHMENTS have duration intrinsically. So in the case of accomplishments we can properly say '*X V-ed*' with reference to the whole of that time segment, not just with reference to a single moment (...). (Mourelatos 1981: 192)

Si pensi ad un tipico verbo non-durativo quale *partire* (che è, più specificamente, un trasformativo (...)) [= punctual & telic: achievement]. Esso risulta, prevedibilmente, compatibile con avverbiali puntuali (...) ed è invece incompatibile, di nuovo secondo le attese, con avverbiali durativi quali i culminativi [e.g. *fino a*] ed i delimitativi [e.g. *da ... a*] (...). (Bertinetto 1997: 139)

Avec des procès ponctuels, ces adverbes [i.e. *huit jours, trois jours, etc.*] sont d'ordinaire exclus (...). Les procès ponctuels admettent en revanche sans difficulté les adverbes de temps de position (...). (Winand 2006: 54)

On ajoutera ici la compatibilité avec des adverbes de manière dénotat une extension dans le temps (...): a *Il construisit sa maison lentement* (procès duratif) b *Il trouva soudain la réponse* (procès ponctuel). (Winand 2006: 55)

TEST N. 12

States may *last for* a time, and activities *go on for* a time; only performances *take* time. (Kenny 1963: 176)

When I say that it took me an hour to write a letter (which is an accomplishment), I imply that the writing of the letter went on during that hour. This is not the case with achievements. Even if one says that it took him three hours to reach the summit, one does not mean that the *reaching* of the summit went on during those hours. Obviously it took three hours of climbing to reach the top. (Vendler 1957: 147; also quoted in Verkuyl 1989: 56)

(...) both accomplishments and achievements ‘take’ time, indeed definite time - that is, they are both admissible into contexts of the form ‘It took him *N Ts* to *V*’, where *N* is a count expression and *T* is a unit of time. (Mourelatos 1981: 193-194)

Some event types are characterized as having fixed terminations, others are characterized in terms of the activity itself. We can call these *bounded* and *unbounded*, and refer to the verbs as *completive* and *durative*, respectively. Time-indicating verbs of the type I have been discussing which distinguish between these two notions are the verbs ‘take’ and ‘spend’. (Fillmore 1975: 35)

Semantically related to the *for-an-hour* [atelic] and *in-an-hour* [telic] sentence (...) are: *John spent an hour painting a picture. It took John an hour to paint a picture.* (Binnick 1991: 175)

(...) it is possible to measure the duration of events and specify this duration, for example, by expressions like *lasts x hours* or *took x days*. But this is not the function of a TADV-D [Temporal Adverbial of Duration]: they specify the duration of STATES rather than of events [= telic verbs]. (Klein 1994: 186)

(...) l’expression ‘cela prit (x) temps pour/à’ révèle-t-elle un procès télique. (Winand 2006: 60)

TEST N. 13

(...) durative adverbials such as *for an hour* seem acceptable only with statives and activities. (...) phrases such as *in an hour* or the so-called frame adverbials go only with achievements and accomplishments. (Pustejovsky 1988: 35)

(...) the duration expressed by the adverbial [for x time] is incompatible with the concept of a unique definite event that is discernible by its bounds. (Verkuyl 1989: 50)

Whereas accomplishment verbs take adverbial preposition phrases with *in* but only very marginally with *for*, activity verbs allow only the phrases with *for*. (Binnick 1991: 175)

Such verbs [arrive, come] are also inherently telic (...) and as such are incompatible with durational time adverbials. (...) these verbs [run, cry, work] take the durational temporal adverbials typical of activity verbs (...). (Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1992: 261-262)

(...) language may conceive of processes as having no duration, hence being punctual, and this is the case for VPs like *to arrive in Spain* or *to find a solution*. (...) they do not combine with durational adverbials, such as *for two seconds* or *for several hours*. (Klein 1994: 32)

(...) phrases like *for two hours* (...) are confined to 1-state lexical contents [= atelic]. (Klein 1994: 185)

If a TADV-D [temporal adverbial of duration] is applied to a 2-state expression [= achievements], either it is meaningless, or it is interpreted in such a way that only one of the two states is affected. This, it appears, is normally the target state (...): *John found a room for three days* (...). But it is not possible to say: **The bomb exploded for three days*. The target state of the exploding of a bomb cannot be confined: the bomb is in pieces, and is so forever. (Klein 1994: 195-196)

(...) ‘*in X Time*’ (...) This demands telic verbs, and is associated with the terminative Aspect only (...). (...) ‘*for X Time*’ (...) is clearly a detelicizing adverbial. (Bertinetto 1997: 37-38)

(...) ‘*in X time*’ (...) is only compatible with telic verbs on actional grounds, and with perfectivity on the aspectual one (...). (Bertinetto 1997: 62)

La durativité est compatible avec des adverbes de durée comme ‘en (x) temps’ (...), ‘pendant (x) temps’ (...). (Winand 2006: 53)

La présence d’un TEM-Di [adverbe de temps de durée instrumentale] (‘en (x) temps’) est l’indice d’un procès télique; en revanche, les procès atéliques sélectionnent des TEM-D [adverbe de temps de durée] (‘pendant (x)temps’). (Winand 2006: 59-60)

Les activités admettent des TEM-D, du type ‘pendant (x) temps’ (*il a couru pendant une heure*). La présence d’un TEM-Di, du type ‘en (x) temps’, implique nécessairement une recatégorisation de l’activité dans la classe des procès téliques pour être acceptable (*il a couru en deux heures*, avec objet sous-entendu). (Winand 2006: 103)

À l’inverse des procès téliques, les activités ne sont pas attestées avec des TEM-Di (‘en x temps’). On notera également que la conjonction (m)-Jr prend un sens différent suivant qu’elle introduit une proposition d’activité ou une proposition télique. Dans le premier cas, elle signifie ‘dès que’, dans le second ‘après que’; en d’autres termes, on retrouve le même type d’instruction que pour l’accompli ponctuel: inchoatif pour les propositions atéliques, terminatif pour les propositions téliques. (Winand 2006: 108)

TEST N. 14

(...) we can significantly say that someone has aimed in vain or successfully, but not that he has hit the target in vain or successfully; that he has treated his patient assiduously or unassiduously; but not that he has cured him assiduously or unassiduously; that he scanned the hedgerow slowly or rapidly, systematically or haphazardly, but not that he saw the nest slowly or rapidly, systematically or haphazardly (...). (Ryle 1949: 151)

a John almost died b Bill almost arrived c Mary almost won the race. The only reading available for these sentences is one where something has occurred without the terminus event being achieved. (Pustejovsky 1988: 33)

a John almost swam b John almost painted a picture c John almost arrived d John almost left. In sentence (10a), we are saying that John almost performed an activity of swimming, but did not even begin it. Sentence (10b) (...) allows for two interpretations. (Pustejovsky 1988: 36)

Les adverbes de manière soulignant le succès d’un procès comme ‘avec fruit’, ‘avec succès’, ‘totalemt’ (cf. m ḥtp, m jsr en égyptien), ne se combinent guère qu’avec des propositions téliques. (Winand 2006: 60)

La différence entre achèvements avec et sans pré-phase se trahit aussi en français par le comportement de ‘presque’: *a Il est presque sorti de chez lui b Il a presque atteint le sommet.* En (a), le procès n’a pas de pré-phase; l’implication logique est que le procès a failli avoir lieu (...). En (b), en revanche, le procès comporte une pré-phase; l’implication logique est que le procès a été entamé, et a failli aboutir. (Winand 2006: 109-110)

TEST N. 15

p?(j) ‘auffliegen’ = ‘etwas getan haben’. (Westendorf 1962: 237)

p?(j) ‘fliegen’ (nur als Verbum der Vergangenheit belegt). (Westendorf 1962: 317)

gmj beinhaltet allein unter diesen und anderen geläufigen Verben [rJj ‘give, put’, jrj ‘do, make’] ausschließlich resultative Aktionsart. (...). ‘Finden’ und sicher auch das ägyptische gmj beinhaltet also immer gleichzeitig ein Geschehen, das gegenüber dem Vorausgehenden etwas wesentlich Neues bringt, das aber andererseits immer engstens als Folge mit dem Vorausgehenden verbunden ist. (Schenkel 1965: 57)

Trotzdem wird man gerade bei gmj Vorsicht walten lassen müssen, da die Aktionsart auch sonst von Belang ist; so kommt von diesem Verb kaum einmal das sog. imperfektische Partizip vor, normalerweise steht vielmehr das sog. perfektische. (Schenkel 1967: 130)

In some discussions of habituality, it is assumed that habituality is essentially the same as iterativity, i.e. repetition of a situation, the successive occurrence of several instances of the given situation. (Comrie 1976: 27)

(...) a punctual situation, by definition, has no internal structure, and in a language with separate imperfective forms to indicate reference to the internal structure of a situation, then clearly punctuality and imperfectivity will be incompatible. (Comrie 1976: 42)

Imperfective forms of *reach the summit* would then only have iterative meaning, as in *the soldiers are already reaching the summit* (i.e. some have already reached it, some have not yet reached it, there being several individual acts of reaching the summit). (Comrie 1976: 43)

Because foregrounded clauses denote the discrete, measured events of the narrative, it is usually the case that verbs are punctual rather than durative or iterative. This correlation can be stated as a correlation between the lexical, intrinsic AKTIONSART of the verb and the discourse-conditioned ASPECT. One finds, in other words, a tendency for punctual verbs to have perfective aspect (i.e., to occur in foregrounded sentences) and conversely for verbs of the durative/stative/iterative types to occur in imperfective, i.e. backgrounded, clauses. (Hopper 1979: 215; also quoted in Binnick 1991: 379)

Taxis, or relative tense, is indicated by markers which precede the main verb in the underlying structure: *yǒu* for ‘anteriority’ and *zai* for ‘simultaneity’. Manner of action is expressed by verbal suffixes: *-guo* for ‘experience’ and *-zhe* for ‘duration’. The only function even comparable to aspect in European languages is carried by sentence-final particles: *-le₂* marks ‘entry into a state’, *-ne* ‘continuation of a state’. However, the ‘aspectual’ functions of these particles are only one facet of their more general meanings: *-le₂* expresses a change or new circumstance, while *-ne* marks identity. (...). In the presence of another suffix, the *yǒu* is deleted; otherwise it appears as *-le₁*. (Melchert 1980: 651)

It remains to point out that ASL [American Sign Language] is a language which expresses plurality of objects or subjects in the verb in addition to iterative aspect, by displacing the verb across space as it is repeated. (Anderson 1982: 108)

It is further claimed that, universally or nearly so, perfective and imperfective aspect are associated with foreground and background respectively, particularly in narratives. Thus the perfective gives the plot line, the major or central sequential events; it is associated with punctual, dynamic, or kinetic verbs. The imperfective gives supportive or subsidiary background information, such as description, characterization, and commentary; it thus is often associated with stative or durative verbs. (Waugh & Monville-Burston 1986: 847; also quoted in Binnick 1991: 379)

Le suffixe d’accompli *-le* marque la fermeture d’un processus et indique l’antériorité para rapport à un point de référence donné (...). *-le* renvoie à un état résultant (...). (Iljič 1989: 266)

In the case of the perfective, the Aristotelian classes matter because achievements and accomplishments presuppose boundaries, while states and activities do not. What then of the past tenses of various languages with nonperformances? In fact, such uses are understood to make reference to boundaries. They may be inchoative or terminative or merely complexive. (Binnick 1991: 412)

(...) achievement verbs (...) are obviously incompatible with durative adverbials, unless they are contextually reclassified as denoting an iterative (...). (Bertinetto 1991: 33)

If an adverbial has a strong telic inclination, it also necessarily has a terminative one. (Bertinetto 1997: 51)

(...) bounded verbs are normally associated with terminative Tenses, unbounded verbs with non-terminative ones. This is presumably the path along which Russian and languages of the same sort reached their present state, in which the aspectual oppositions have been lost entirely. Indeed, the

research carried out by Petrukhin [1996]⁸⁸ on the chronicle *Piskariovskij* (written over a long period, extending from the XI to the XVII cent.), provides a striking confirmation of this. Especially in the first part of the text (XI-XIII cent.), where the so-called *l*-forms of the Past are still rarely used to the advantage of the Aorist and the Imperfect, one observes with prefixed verbs a very strong correlation between boundedness and the Aorist; more precisely, the Imperfect is rarely attested in general, and is virtually absent with the bounded predicates. By contrast, with non-prefixed verbs both bounded and unbounded predicates appear in a more or less balanced proportion; however, the Imperfect is used only with the latter type of predicates. (Bertinetto 1997: 60)

(...) verbs such as *to blink, to jump, to cough, to drip*. It has been noted that they show a particular behaviour with respect to the progressive form; they assume an iterative reading in the progressive form. (...) iteration presupposes a return to the previous state. (Klein 1994: 96)

(...) les verbes téliques et les verbes atéliques. Seuls les premiers acceptent le parfait ancien parce qu'ils incorporent une post-phase dans la représentation mentale du procès. (Malaise & Winand 1999: 445)

Le sémelfactif *stricto sensu* ne se combine pas aisément avec un aspect ou un circonstant de temps duratif; si c'est le cas, on observe des effets de sens dérivés, par exemple l'itératif. (Winand 2006: 104)

À l'accompli ponctuel, les verbes d'activité sélectionnent le début du procès, c'est-à-dire qu'ils prennent une valeur inchoative (...). Les activités n'acceptent pas facilement le parfait résultatif. La présence de ce dernier est toujours l'indice d'une recatégorisation (...). (Winand 2006: 107)

TEST N. 16

(...) das ägyptische Verbum nach durchaus primitiver, in Afrika allgemein verbreiteter Art irgendwelche Intensivierung, sei sie iterativer, wie bei den Verben den Bewegung, oder durativer, wie bei den Verben, die von Eigenschaften aussagen, oder gradueller Natur wie bei rʃrʃ usw., oder Emphase wie bei mrr usw., durch Reduplikation des Grundstammes ausdrückt. (Feichtner 1932: 209)

(...) it seems probable that the Semito-Hamitic verbal root might have originally consisted of two consonants only and a vowel. The problem of the third radical consonant is a very difficult one. In some cases it is doubtlessly a lexicalized grammatical element (e.g. in the case of the first radical *n*-); in other cases the third radical is a relic of root-reduplication (cf. the numerous class of the so-called *verba secundae geminatae* (...)). (Diakonoff 1965: 36-37)

Spoken languages use a variety of reduplicative forms in word-formation and inflectional categories. (...). There is a division into two basic types, one expressing meanings in the area of verb aspects, the other expressing 'intensive' meanings or forming derived verbs. (...). There are further divisions between different kinds of aspectual meanings. (...) the Perseverative [durative] categories of English and ASL [American Sign Language] are alike in function and in form (rhythm, possibility of three repetitions) [for instance *to look at it again, and again, and again*]. In Micronesian reduplications, the Continuous form had open syllables (CV-) while the Iterative and Perseverative had closed syllables (CVC-). This may have an analog in ASL, in that the Continuous has no clear division between one stroke and the next, while the Iterative and Perseverative Punctuals clearly complete the motion and stop before returning to repeat. (Anderson 1982: 92-95)

(...) observing post-Creole processes in Krio is of some interest. Initially, the marker *dɛ* (when unstressed) functioned as non-punctual marker for both 'continuous' and 'habitual' (with 'iterative' being indicated by verb-reduplication). (Givón 1982: 153)

⁸⁸ P. Petrukhin, "Narrativnaja strategija i upotreblenie glagol'n'yx vremen v russkoj letopisi XVII reka", *Voprosy Jazykoznanija* (1996), 62-84.

Es ist interessant zu beobachten, daß das morphologische Verfahren der ‘Dehnung’ irgendeiner Form immer mit der Anwesenheit eines semantischen Merkmals [+ INTENSITÄT] bzw. [+ KONTINUITÄT] verbunden ist. (Loprieno 1986: 21, fn. 20)

Es ist interessant zu bemerken, daß auch der semitische Zweig diese morphologische Struktur [die Reduplikation des letzten ‘starken’ Radikals] kennt, aber mit einer anderen semantischen Nuance, nämlich der sog. ‘iterativen’ Aktionsart. (Loprieno 1986: 51-52)

(...) alcuni verbi continuativi che chiamerò verbi ‘inerentemente intensificati’ sono direttamente ammessi con la PC [Perifrasi Continua, i.e. *andare / venire* + Gerundio] per via del loro intrinseco contenuto semantico, anche senza bisogno del sostegno di specifici intensificatori (o incrementalizzatori). Si pensi a predicati con suffisso alterativo come *saltellare, canterellare, scribacchiare* etc., ma anche a verbi come *meditare, scrutare, ripensare*. (Bertinetto 1997: 166)

Certains procédés, par iconisme, peuvent être liés à un sens précis, comme par exemple la reduplication partielle ou totale du lexème, qui est le plus souvent un signe d’itérativité ou d’intensité. (...) les formes dérivées ne donnent pas d’indication tranchée sur l’actionnalité des formes simples [in Egyptian]. (Winand 2006: 48-49)

(...) le progressif [of a semelfactive] implique d’ordinaire une répétition plutôt qu’une très longue action (...). Les procès itératifs sont généralement constitués à la base d’un procès semelfactif qui se répète (...). Les verbes itératifs sont le plus souvent des verbes redupliqués (...). (Winand 2006: 104-105, 107)

TEST N. 17

Note the present sense of the sJm=f in a relative clause, apparently confined in demotic to the verbs mr(j) ‘love’ and msJ(j) ‘hate’ (...). (Griffith & Thompson 1904: 82)

Avec ces deux verbes [mrj and msJj], l’accompli se rend par un présent en raison de leur Aktionsart. Ainsi, le verbe mrj, qui signifie fondamentalement ‘se prendre d’affection pour’ (la valeur inchoative de ce verbe est bien marquée à l’inaccompli progressif) prend la signification d’‘aimer’ à l’accompli. Un effet de sens analogue est obtenu avec msJj, dont le sens premier est ‘se prendre d’aversion pour’. (Malaise & Winand 1999: 347)

TEST N. 18

(...) the ‘future reading’ of the *Präsens* also crucially depends on the inherent lexical features of the verb (...): (4) a *Hans kommt* [achievement] b *Hans schläft* [activity] c *Hans ist krank* [state]. Whereas (4a) is regularly interpreted as ‘Hans will come’, both (4b) and (4c) are regularly interpreted as ‘Hans is sleeping’ and ‘Hans is ill’, respectively. (...) it is not the entire coming which is in the future, but only the target state of his coming — his being here. This explains the different behaviour of 1-state contents [atelic] and 2-state contents [telic]. (Klein 1994: 127-128)

TEST N. 19

(...) in English it is sometimes possible to collocate punctual time adverbials [at X (hour)] with durative situations in order to give the time point of the beginning of the durative situation. But note that the rest of the sentence does not refer to the beginning of the durative situation [for example, *the prime minister will make a speech at six o’clock*] (...). (Comrie 1985: 30)

(...) the durative adverbial type ‘until t_x’ [being t_x a given instant of time, different to t_y] (...) is aspectually terminative and actionally atelic. In fact, it is clearly incompatible with telic verbs. (Bertinetto 1997: 34)

(...) a number of verbs exhibiting ambiguous actional properties, such as *connect, switch off, disappear*, etc. These are all achievement verbs: but unlike the others, admit also delimitative and culminative adverbials. Consider: (17) a *John mysteriously disappeared from 4 to 6 / until 6 o’clock* c **John came back from 4 to 6 / until 6 o’clock*. Clearly, these predicates have the idiosyncratic property of combining, in the appropriate context, the behaviour of achievements and activities. Hence, they might be called ‘achievement-activity’ verbs. (Bertinetto 1997: 122)

Si pensi ad un tipico verbo non-durativo quale *partire* (...). Esso risulta, prevedibilmente, compatibile con avverbiali puntuali (cf. 1) ed è invece incompatibile, di nuovo secondo le attese, con avverbiali durativi quali i culminativi ed i delimitativi (cf. 2-3): 1 *Giorgio è partito alle 5 in punto* 2 **Giorgio è partito fino alle 5* 3 **Giorgio è partito dalle 3 alle 5*. (Bertinetto 1997: 139)

TEST N. 20

(...) *errer* (...) [:] ce verbe, comme *promener* ou *gambader* (...) n'a pas de résultat à proprement parler. (Boons 1985: 227)

Such a verb ['put'] does not inherit a path in its full sense but only a two-phase location; first some object is located at some place (...), and then it is located at some other place. What is expressed is always the goal location. (Wunderlich 1991: 602)

(...) all motion verbs (both manner-of-motion verbs and path-conflating motion verbs) except *iku* 'go', *kuru* 'come', *tsuku* 'arrive', and *itaru* 'reach' can occur as the participial verb in complex motion predicates. (fn. 8: These exceptions are probably related to the fact that these verbs entail the completion of the motion event. *Iku* and *kuru* can in fact be used as participial verbs in complex motion predicates, but with a meaning different from the one under discussion here [recategorization]. *Itte kuru* (the participial form of *iku* 'go' plus *kuru* 'come'), for example, means 'come back after going' or 'go and return'. In this case, the participial verb does not represent an activity that accompanies the motion expressed by the main verb, but an activity that precedes that of motion ((...) 'perfective' reading)). (Matsumoto 1996: 192, with fn. 8)

(...) *hashiru* ['run'] (...). The impossibility with such verbs of expressing a goal (...) may be related to the fact that these verbs focus on the activity of the running motion, and not on the change of location that results from the activity (...). (fn. 12: (...) these verbs are inherently atelic. (...) their *-te iru* aspectual form. (...). When the verb represents a durative action, *-te iru* marks progressive aspect; when the verb represents a process resulting in a change of state of the subject NP, it marks the resultative. The *-te iru* form of *hashiru* marks the progressive, showing that the focus is not on the change of location of the runner, but instead on the activity itself. Of more interest in this regard is the verb *noboru* 'climb', which can take either a *ni*-marked goal argument or an *o*-marked route argument. When *noboru* takes a goal argument, the *-te iru* form marks the resultative, and when it takes a route argument, it marks the progressive. This contrast shows that a verb's ability to take a goal argument is related to its aspectual nature). (Matsumoto 1996: 194, with fn. 12)

TEST N. 21

(...) it is enough to mention that while to be able to run is never the same thing as to run or to be able to write a letter is by no means the same as to write it, it seems to be the case that, in some sense, to be able to know is to know, to be able to love is to love, and to be able to see is to see. One might point out that some achievements also share this feature. (...). Thus here the consideration of the time element is not sufficient; we have to look for another criterion. If we consider that one can start or stop running deliberately or carefully and also that one can be accused of, or held responsible for, having started or stopped running but not of having spotted or recognized something, then we realize that the above-mentioned curious behavior with respect to 'can' is proper to verbs denoting achievements that cannot be regarded as voluntary (or involuntary) actions. (Vendler 1957: 148-149)

Neither do they [= states] occur as complements to *force*-type verbs. (3) a **John forced Bill to resemble Harry*. (Pustejovsky 1988: 34)

(...) there is a criterion which I shall call AgMod, as it boils down to Agentive modification by adverbials [deliberately, attentively, studiously, carefully]. (...) AgMod has to do with voluntary agency rather than with continuous tense. (Verkuyl 1989: 47)

Only non-statives co-occur with the adverbs deliberately, carefully (...). (Binnick 1991: 174)

(...) the intransitive predicates argued to be unaccusative on syntactic grounds usually turned out to entail relatively patient-like meanings for their arguments (e.g. *arrive*, *die*, *fall*), while those argued

to be syntactically unergative were usually agentive in meaning (*smile, walk, talk*). (Dowty 1991: 605)

(...) the most important for the unergative/unaccusative contrast seems to be volition (or ‘protagonist control’ in the unaccusativity literature, i.e. a presupposition that volition is possible for this type of action). (Dowty 1991: 607)

(...) habitual sentences may be modified by adverbs, or adjuncts, relating to the agentive control of the event, whereas stative sentences cannot be so modified (...). (Bertinetto 1997: 84)

(...) la compatibilité avec des adverbes de volonté (manière et instrument) et la possibilité pour le procès de dépendre de verbes volitifs. Ces tests sont en fait destinés à éprouver l’agentivité du sujet. (Winand 2006: 58)

Pour évaluer l’agentivité du sujet, on recourt souvent à des tests de compatibilité, p. ex., tester l’acceptabilité d’une proposition avec des adverbes impliquant la volonté ou le contrôle comme ‘délibérément’, ‘volontairement’, etc. (Winand 2006: 72)

Les verbes dépendant d’un verbe jussif ou désidératif impliquent normalement la présence d’un sujet agentif et causateur. (Winand 2006: 76)

Le passif impersonnel des verbes intransitifs n’est autorisé que si le procès est conçu comme agentif, c’est-à-dire pour les verbes qu’on désigne parfois, à la suite de Perlmutter (1978)⁸⁹, comme des ‘unergatives’ (...). (Winand 2006: 85)

TEST N. 22

In many languages that have a distinction between perfective and imperfective forms, the perfective forms of some verbs, in particular of some stative verbs, can in fact be used to indicate the beginning of a situation (ingressive meaning). (...) states are less likely to be described by perfective forms than are events (including entries into states), then there is some functional value in utilising the perfective forms of stative verbs to denote the event of entry into the appropriate state, since otherwise there would be little use for the perfective forms of these verbs, but such an explanation is at present speculative. (Comrie 1976: 19-20)

Since punctual situations automatically involve a change of state, they are automatically dynamic: there can be no such thing as a punctual state. (Comrie 1976: 50)

In many languages stative verbs do not have forms with perfective meaning, while in many other languages this applies to a large number of stative verbs. Thus the combination of perfectivity and stativity can only have a rather restricted semantic range —reference to a state with its inception and termination— (...). (Comrie 1976: 50-51)

(...) correlation between imperfective and stative, and between perfective and nonstative. (Comrie 1976: 122)

(...) [in Russian] les valeurs caractéristiques de certains modes d’action, liées à des préverbes spécifiques, coïncident avec celles que, du fait de leurs significations lexicales ou en raison de contextes particuliers, l’aspect perfectif confère normalement à certains verbes. Ainsi un grand nombre de verbes dénotant des activités intellectuelles, des attitudes, des états psychologiques ont une valeur inchoative au perfectif (...). (Cohen 1989: 38)

(...) “the aorist of verbs which denote a *state* or *condition* generally expresses the entrance into that state or condition”. (Binnick 1991: 165, quoting W.W. Goodwin, *Syntax of the moods and tenses of the Greek verb*, Macmillan, London, 1889)

TEST N. 23

(...) l’*Aktionsart* intrinsèque des verbes de qualité les prédispose à des constructions aspectuelles affines, donc statives (pseudoparticipe, nfr.Ø sw [adjectival sentence: non-agreed adjective +

⁸⁹ D.M. Perlmutter, “Impersonal passives and the unaccusative hypothesis”, *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 8 (1978), 71-51.

dependent pronoun or noun]), inversement, le recours à des constructions non affines, comme les constructions processives (sujet + *hr* + infinitif [= progressive], sujet + *sJm=f* [= general imperfective], *sJm=f* indicatif narratif [= punctual perfective]) modifie leur *Aktionsart* originelle. Réciproquement, les verbes à *Aktionsart* processive ont une prédilection pour les constructions processives, mais n'excluent pas les constructions statives, quitte à subir un infléchissement sémantique. (Vernus 1984b: 173)

TEST N. 24

I start with the well-known difference between verbs that possess continuous tenses and verbs that do not. The question 'What are you doing?' might be answered by 'I am running (...)', but not by 'I am knowing (...)'. (Vendler 1957: 144)

Let us first distinguish between those verbs which have, and those which have not, continuous tenses. (...). I shall call verbs of the [second] class 'static' verbs and say that they stand for states. (Kenny 1963: 172)

(...) verbs tend to divide into two disjoint (nonoverlapping) classes, those that can appear in the progressive forms, and those that cannot. Moreover, this distinction corresponds to that between stative and nonstative verbs. Thus we can give the general definition of progressiveness as the combination of progressive meaning and nonstative meaning. Naturally, then, stative verbs do not have progressive forms. (Comrie 1976: 35)

Verbs expressing states do not have progressive forms (...). (Mourelatos 1981: 192)

(...) only non-statives can appear in the progressive (...). (Pustejovsky 1988: 34)

Accomplishment verbs and Activity verbs can have a Progressive Form, whereas State verbs and Achievement verbs cannot have it. (Verkuyl 1989: 44)

Only non-statives (expressions other than those of states) occur in the progressive (...). (Binnick 1991: 173)

Aspectual differentiation as expressed by continuous form vs. simple form requires this possibility of a TT [Topic Time]-contrast, and no such contrast is possible for non-temporary properties. (Klein 1994: 42)

Usually —indeed, with very few exceptions— statives refer to 'dense' situations, i.e. situations that cannot be interrupted without causing the cessation of the state referred to. Progressives, on the other hand, admit very easily of interruptions. (Bertinetto 1997: 75)

[A frequently used linguistic test, among others is] la compatibilité avec les temps grammaticaux aspectuellement marqués. Par exemple, les linguistes se sont particulièrement préoccupés en ce domaine des conditions régissant l'emploi du progressif. (Winand 2006: 52)

Un procès ponctuel ne se combine pas naturellement avec le progressif, sauf si le procès possède une pré-phase susceptible d'être sélectionnée (...); si le procès ne possède pas de pré-phase, la combinaison est bloquée ou prend, chez certains locuteurs, un sens mellique 'être sur le point de' (...). Un cas particulier est constitué par les procès exprimant une activité atélique ponctuelle (sémelfactif). Le progressif donne alors à la proposition une valeur itérative (...). (Winand 2006: 56)

Un test couramment appliqué pour détecter la dynamique d'un procès consiste à voir si l'énoncé est acceptable au progressif (...). Les activités et les accomplissements se laissent conjuguer sans difficulté, mais il n'en va pas de même des états (...). Les (...) achèvements (...) forment une catégorie à part. Le progressif n'est pas inconcevable à condition que le procès soit pourvu d'une pré-phase. De même, les procès sémelfactifs (atéliques et sans pré-phase) prennent un sens itératif au progressif. Le test n'est donc pas infaillible pour révéler la dynamique. (Winand 2006: 57)

(...) le test du progressif ne donne pas les mêmes résultats en anglais qu'en français; la tournure 'progressive' du français implique une agentivité renforcée du sujet (...). (Winand 2006: 72)

(...) constructions progressives (...) Elles semblent toujours forcer une interprétation agentive du sujet. (Winand 2006: 81)

Sous l'appellation (...) d'accomplissements gradables à télicité implicite (...) j'ai rangé ce qu'on regroupe habituellement sous l'étiquette de verbes de qualité. (Winand 2006: 120)

TEST N. 25

Both adjectives and verbs can be subcategorized with respect to the feature STATIVE (or NONACTIVITY) and as a result, both can undergo, or fail to undergo, rules conditioned by that feature. a. Imperative: Look at the picture. *Know that Bill went there. Don't be noisy. *Don't be tall. (Lakoff 1970: 121)

(...) only non-statives can occur as imperatives. (Pustejovsky 1988: 34)

Only non-statives occur as imperatives. (Binnick 1991: 174)

Parmi les tests permettant de déceler la dynamicité d'un procès, il faut encore citer (...) l'emploi de l'impératif (...). (Winand 2006: 58)

Un verbe à l'impératif suppose d'ordinaire un sujet agentif. Les langues admettent, avec des latitudes variables, des phénomènes de recatégorisation. (Winand 2006: 78-79)

Avec les verbes transitifs, l'emploi d'un Bénéficiaire coréférencé au sujet est un autre moyen de faire ressortir l'agentivité du sujet, et sans doute le contrôle que celui-ci exerce sur le procès. Le procédé n'est pas sans rappeler des tournures analogues servant de renforcement à l'impératif ($n/r = k$) [implicative]. Une tournure similaire semble attestée avec les verbes intransitifs; le Bénéficiaire peut prendre un sens atténué, soulignant l'intérêt que le sujet prend à l'action, voire la soudaineté de l'action elle-même (...). (Winand 2006: 84)

TEST N. 26

The components of cause (...) are fundamentally of verbal rather than adverbial nature (...). [They] contrast with those of aspect in that they connect to a whole combination constituted by the moving body and its motion rather than directly to the motion (...). (Ikegami 1969: 186)

Only non-statives appear in Pseudo-cleft constructions. (Dowty 1979: 55; also Binnick 1991: 174)

La construction $sJm\ pw\ jrj-w-n=f$ [infinitive + copula mark + perfective relative verbal form] '(litt). c'est écouter ce qu'il a fait' est d'abord une tournure marquée de la narration. Mais elle met aussi en exergue le procès lui-même en désignant explicitement le sujet comme agent. (Winand 2006: 80)

TEST N. 27

For obvious reasons, 0-state contents [states] allow no TADV-Q [temporal adverbials of frequency]: a book, once in Russian, is forever in Russian (...). (Klein 1994: 199)

(...) adverbial of numerical specification are compatible with habitual but not with permanent statives. (Bertinetto 1997: 85)

TEST N. 28

(...) the fact that 'to start (or stop) knowing' does not make sense demonstrates that 'knowing' is not the beginning of an activity but the beginning of a state. (Vendler 1957: 154)

(...) only achievements are not possible as a complement to the verb *stop* (Pustejovsky 1988: 35)

Statives do not normally occur with aspectual auxiliary verbs such as *start*, *stop*, *finish*, though they do so occur in a habitual or frequentative sense (but only in the complement in *-ing*) (...). (Binnick 1991: 174)

(...) les expressions lexicales permettant de distinguer le début ou la fin d'un procès sous contrôle d'un agent comme 'se mettre à', 's'arrêter de' excluent normalement les situations (...). (Winand 2006: 52)

(...) un procès télique peut se combiner avec des auxiliaires du type ‘finir’, un procès atélique avec des auxiliaires du type ‘cesser’ (...). Un phénomène de recatégorisation est toujours possible (...). (Winand 2006: 60-61)

Les activités se combinent de manière prototypique avec des auxiliaires comme ‘arrêter’ (...). (Winand 2006: 103)

La négation de l’inaccompli général (...) exprime la non-occurrence d’un procès ou l’impossibilité pour celui-ci de se produire. Ces deux sens sont bien attestés dans les propositions téliques. Dans les activités, peut s’ajouter, en contexte, une nuance supplémentaire: la cessation d’une activité qui avait cours précédemment. Une nuance similaire s’applique aux constructions contenant le verbe négatif tm ‘cesser’. (Winand 2006: 107)

L’égyptien connaît deux séries d’auxiliaires aspectuels pour marquer la fin d’un procès (...): les auxiliaires terminatifs pour les propositions téliques (type qn ‘achever’, grḥ ‘finir’), les auxiliaires égressifs pour les propositions atéliques (type rwj ‘arrêter’). (Winand 2006: 107-108)

Les propositions téliques ne se combinent pas facilement avec les auxiliaires du cessatif. C’est le cas des achèvements (...), sauf si l’on souhaite donner au procès un sens habituel (sérialisation) (...). (Winand 2006: 346)

TEST N. 29

Running a mile and drawing a circle have to be finished, while it does not make sense to talk of finishing running or pushing a cart. (Vendler 1957: 145)

The verb *finish* allows as complements no event-type except accomplishments. (...). Apparently, you can only finish something that has a logical culmination at the end of the event. (Pustejovsky 1988: 35-36)

Only accomplishment verbs can normally occur as the complement of the verb *finish* (...). (Binnick 1991: 176)

(11) *The wounded man was brought moribund to the hospital: a he died half an hour later b *he finished dying in half an hour.* (12) *The novelist left to her holidays place with the first draft of her book in the suitcase: a *she wrote it two weeks later b she finished writing it in two weeks.* The achievement in (11) and the accomplishment in (12) show a symmetrical behaviour in contexts (a-b). As it happens, the event of dying includes a preparatory phase, but the culminating phase instantiates something completely new, occurring at the end of the preparatory phase and leading to a ‘resulting state’. By contrast, the event of writing a book is truly durative: every moment comprised in this interval of time is a phase of writing. (Bertinetto 1997: 104)

En égyptien, les principaux auxiliaires du terminatif sont qn et grḥ, plus rarement ṡrq et ph, ceux du cessatif rwj, plus rarement ḥbj, fχ, ḥḤ ou χʔṡ. (Winand 2006: 339; see quotations for test n. 28)

TEST N. 30

(...) the fact that ‘to start (or stop) knowing’ does not make sense demonstrates that ‘knowing’ is not the beginning of an activity but the beginning of a state. In general, it is important to distinguish achievements that start activities from achievements that initiate a state. (Vendler 1957: 154)

La prédication non bornée [atelic] est convertie en un SV [syntagme verbal] borné en combinaison par ex. avec l’auxiliaire de phrase *commencer à* (...). (François 1990: 14)

Stop occurs with achievements only in a habitual sense (...). The same is true of *start* (...). (Binnick 1991: 174, 177; see quotation for test n. 28)

Avec ‘commencer à’, on peut s’attendre à trouver majoritairement des propositions d’activités et non des propositions téliques. (Winand 2006:61; see quotations for test n. 28)

Les formes de l’accompli ponctuel donnent un sens inchoatif aux propositions atéliques, mais véhiculent le complétif avec les propositions téliques (...). Pour exprimer l’inchoatif avec ces

dernières, la seule possibilité est de recourir à un auxiliaire approprié (p.ex. χ_{pr} [‘happen’]). Ce qui ne serait qu’un renforcement optionnel de l’expression avec une classe d’actionnalité devient ainsi obligatoire avec une autre. (...). Pour exprimer un état (ou une situation) nouvellement acquis, l’égyptien recourt normalement à un auxiliaire aspectuel (...). (Winand 2006: 324-325)

(...) l’auxiliaire χ_{pr} ne connaît pas de restriction d’emploi en fonction de l’actionnalité des procès. Cela posé, la majorité des emplois concernent des propositions atéliques ou des propositions détélicisées. Quand une proposition est ponctuelle (achèvement ou sémelfactif), il y a factorisation du procès, c’est-à-dire que l’auxiliaire marque le début d’une série. (Winand 2006: 327)

Comme auxiliaire de l’inchoatif, $\int\Omega$ ne semble attesté qu’avec des propositions atéliques (ou, à tout le moins, détélicisées). Quand il est suivi d’une proposition ponctuelle (achèvement ou sémelfactif), il marque le début d’une série d’actions (...). (Winand 2006: 333)

TEST N. 31

(...) in cases of pure achievement terms the present state is almost exclusively used as historic present or as indicating immediate future. (Vendler 1957: 147; also quoted in Verkuyl 1989: 55)

(...) what is the relation between the utterance, ‘I apologize’, and the fact that I am apologizing? It is important to see that this is different from the relation between ‘I am running’ and the fact that I am running (or in case that is not a genuine ‘mere’ report between ‘he is running’ and the fact that he is running).

This difference is marked in English by the use of the non-continuous present in performative formulas: it is not, however, necessarily marked in all languages—which may lack a continuous present—or even always in English.

We might say: in ordinary cases, for example running, it is the fact that he is running which makes the statement that he is running true; or again, that the truth of the constative utterance ‘he is running’ depends on his being running. Whereas in our case it is the happiness of the performative ‘I apologize’ which makes it the fact that I am apologizing: and my success in apologizing depends on the happiness of the performative utterance ‘I apologize’. This is one way in which we might justify the ‘performative-constative’ distinction—as a distinction between doing and saying. (Austin 1962: 46-47)

(...) statives do not have a habitual interpretation in the present, whereas other types do. For example, the sentence in (4a) has no sense of habitual activity to it while (4b) and (4c) are acceptable as recurring actions. (4) a *John knows Bill* b *Bill runs* c *John builds houses*. (Pustejovsky 1988: 34-35)

When an activity or accomplishment occurs in the simple present tense (or any non-progressive tense), it has a frequentative (or habitual) interpretation in normal contexts (while in null context a stative is a true present) (...). (Binnick 1991: 173)

TEST N. 32

(...) transformative verbs will be more likely than non-transformative verbs to be found in passive constructions (...). (Loprieno 1995: 76)

TEST N. 33

On peut d’abord distinguer les procès réversibles, ou plus correctement reproductibles, des non réversibles, c’est-à-dire les procès qui peuvent recommencer de ceux qui ne le peuvent pas. Par exemple, ‘mourir’ ne peut, prototypiquement, arriver qu’une fois (...), mais ‘tomber’ est susceptible de se reproduire (...). Le contraste se marque notamment dans le sens que prennent certains adverbes, voire dans le blocage de certaines combinaisons: (22) a *Il est encore tombé* b ?? *Il est encore mort*. (Winand 2006: 62)

TEST N. 34

(...) there are many verbs that are treated sometimes as stative, sometimes as nonstative, depending on the particular meaning they have in the given sentence. (...) the non-Progressive refers to a more

or less permanent state of affairs, whereas the Progressive refers to a more temporary state. (...) although many stative verbs can be used in the Progressive to indicate a contingent state, it is by no means the case that all stative verbs can be used in this way. For instance, the verb *know* does not allow formation of a Progressive, even with reference to a contingent state (...), even with reference to a surprising state (...), even with reference to a counterfactual state (...), even with reference to a changing degree of knowledge (...). (Comrie 1976: 36-39)

Un autre exemple de la polysémie du progressif est encore fourni par certains emplois en anglais dans des propositions d'état (...). Selon les cas, le progressif donne au procès un caractère dynamique (a), ou souligne le caractère contingent d'un procès (b), par opposition à un procès permanent (c): (16) a *He is knowing her more and more* b *The statue is standing in the park* c *The statue stands in the park*. (Winand 2006: 57-58)

TEST N. 35

(...) adverbials of 'graduality' (*gradually*, *little by little* and the like) (...) admit both major aspectual values, but are restricted to telic predicates (fn. 11: More properly, they are restricted to accomplishment verbs for (...) achievements are normally incompatible with durative adverbials). (Bertinetto 1997: 43, fn. 11)

Cette qualité [gradual telicity] s'apprécie notamment par le test de la cooccurrence d'adverbes comme 'graduellement', 'petit à petit', etc. la différence se marque nettement dans les phrases suivantes: (25) a *La maison se construit petit à petit* b *?Il court petit à petit* c **Le livre est progressivement sur la table*. (Winand 2006: 64)

TEST N. 36

(...) the locative alternation (...). For example: (10) a *Spray paint on the wall* b *Spray the wall with paint*. (...). These verbs describe exactly those events in which the goal may be construed as measuring out the event. (...). (...) only the material can be a direct argument (...). This is because a material is consumed a little at a time until it is gone, thus measuring out the event (...). (Tenny 1988: 6-8)

TEST N. 37

Cette notion de limite inférieure ou supérieure peut se tester en français par la compatibilité du procès avec les adverbes 'pas assez' ou 'trop'. Cette télicité implicite paraît suffisante pour ranger ce type d'activités parmi les procès téliques, dont ils constituent dès lors une sous-classe. (Winand 2006: 65)

(...) un test qui permet de séparer les accomplissements à télicité explicite des accomplissements à télicité implicite: il s'agit du test mettant en oeuvre des adverbes de quantité comme 'beaucoup, peu, abondamment', et, plus précisément dans cette catégorie, des adverbes qui mettent en évidence la notion de limite comme 'trop' ou 'pas assez'. Alors que la présence de ces adverbes ne pose aucun problème d'interprétation avec les accomplissements à télicité implicite, elle devient difficilement acceptable avec les accomplissements à télicité explicite: Accomplissements à télicité implicite: (77) a *Il a trop rempli la piscine* b *Il n'a pas assez rempli la piscine* c *Il a abondamment rempli la piscine*. Accomplissements à télicité explicite: (78) a **Il a trop construit la maison* b **Il n'a pas assez construit la maison* c **Il a abondamment construit la maison*. (Winand 2006: 117-118)

Bibliography

Allen, James P. 2005

The Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts (Writings from the Ancient World, XXIII). Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature

Allen, James P. 2013

The Ancient Egyptian language: an historical study. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

- Anderson, Lloyd B. 1982
 ‘Universals of aspect and parts of speech: parallels between signed and spoken languages.’ In: Hopper, Paul J. (ed.) *Tense-aspect: between semantics and pragmatics. Containing the contributions to a symposium on tense and aspect, held at UCLA, May 1979* (Typological Studies in Language 1). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 91-114
- Austin, John L. 1962
How to do things with words. Oxford: University Press
- Bertinetto, Pier Marco 1997
Il dominio tempo-aspettuale: demarcazioni, sezioni, contrasti. Turin: Rosenberg & Sellier
- Binnick, Robert I. 1991
Time and the verb: a guide to tense and aspect. Oxford: University
- Binnick, Robert I. (ed.). 2012
The Oxford handbook of tense and aspect. Oxford: University
- Blackman, Aylward M. 1988
The story of king Kheops and the magicians. Reading: J.V. Books (edited by W. Vivian Davies)
- Boons, Jean-Paul 1985
 ‘Préliminaires à la classification des verbes locatifs: les compléments de lieu, leurs critères, leurs valeurs aspectuelles.’ In: *Linguisticae investigationes*, IX, II, pp.195-267
- Carrier, Claude 2004
Textes des sarcophages du Moyen Empire égyptien I-III. Paris: du Rocher
- Cohen, David 1989
L’aspect verbal. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France
- Comrie, Bernard 1976
Aspect: an introduction to the study of the verbal aspect and related problems. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Comrie, Bernard 1985
Tense. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- CT = de Buck, Adriaan 1935-1961
The Egyptian Coffin Texts I-VII (Oriental Institute Publications XXIV, XLIX, LXIV, LXVII, LXXIII, LXXXI and LXXXVII). Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Delidaki, Sophia 2007
 The acquisition of aspect in child Greek: a production experiment. In: De Saussure, Louis, Jacques Moeschler and Genoveva Puskas (eds.), *Tense, mood and aspect: theoretical and descriptive issues*. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi
- Deutschbein, Max 1920
 ‘Die Einteilung der Aktionsarten.’ In: *Englische Studien*, LIV, pp.80-86
- Diakonoff, Igor M. 1965
Semito-Hamitic languages: an essay of classification. Moscow: Nauka
- Dowty, David R. 1979
Word meaning and Montague grammar. Dordrecht: Reidel
- Dowty, David R. 1991
 ‘Thematic proto-roles and argument selection.’ In: *Language*, LXVII, III, pp.547-620
- Edel, Elmar 1955-1964
Altägyptische Grammatik I-II (Analecta Orientalia, XXXIV & XXXIX). Rome: Pontificum Institutum Biblicum

- Eschenbach, Carola et al. 2000
 ‘Lexical specification of paths.’ In: Freksa, Christian et al. (eds.), *Spatial Cognition II*. Berlin: Springer
- Faulkner, Raymond O. 1973
The Ancient Egyptian Coffin Texts I. Warminster: Aris & Phillips
- Faulkner, Raymond O. 1977
The Ancient Egyptian Coffin Texts II. Warminster: Aris & Phillips
- Faulkner, Raymond O. 1978a
The Ancient Egyptian Coffin Texts III. Warminster: Aris & Phillips
- Faulkner, Raymond O. 1978b
 ‘Liaison n between -n and wj.’ In: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, LXIV, p.129
- Feichtner, Max K. 1932
 ‘Die erweiterten Verbalstämme im Ägyptischen.’ In: *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, XXXVIII, pp.195-228
- Fillmore, Charles J. 1975
Santa Cruz lectures on deixis, 1971. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club
- François, Jacques 1990
 ‘Classement sémantique des prédications et méthode psycholinguistique d’analyse propositionnelle.’ In: François, Jacques and Guy Denhière (eds.), *Cognition et langage: les types de prédications en sémantique linguistique et psychologique (Langages, C)*. Paris
- Freed, Alice F. 1979
The semantics of English aspectual complementation. Dordrecht: Reidel
- Givón, Talmy 1982
 ‘Tense-aspect-modality: the Creole prototype and beyond.’ In: Paul J. Hopper (ed.), *Tense-aspect: between semantics and pragmatics. Containing the contributions to a symposium on tense and aspect, held at UCLA, May 1979* (Typological Studies in Language, I). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins
- Gracia Zamacona, Carlos 2010a
 ‘The Spatial Adjunct in Middle Egyptian: Data from the Coffin Texts.’ In: *MOSAIKjournal*
- Gracia Zamacona, Carlos 2010b
 ‘Space, time and abstract relations in the Coffin Texts.’ In: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde*, CXXXVII, pp.13-26
- Gracia Zamacona, Carlos 2013
 ‘A database for the Coffin Texts.’ In: Polis, Stéphane and Jean Winand (eds.), *Texts, languages and information technology in Egyptology* (Aegyptiaca Leodiensia, IX). Liège: Presses Universitaires de Liège
- Griffith, Francis Ll. and Herbert Thompson 1904
The Leyden papyrus. New York: Dover (reprint: 1974)
- Guglielmi, Waltraud 1991
Die Göttin mr . t: Entstehung und Verehrung einer Personification (Probleme der Ägyptologie, VII). Leiden: Brill
- Hannig, Rainer and Petra Vomberg 1999
Wortschatz der Pharaonen in Sachgruppen. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern
- Heckel, Ursula 1956
 ‘Studien zum Eigenschaftsverbund und zum prädikativen Adjektivum im Altägyptischen.’ In: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde*, LXXXI, pp.76-82

- Heckel, Ursula 1957
 ‘Studien zum Eigenschaftsverbund und zum prädikativen Adjektivum im Altägyptischen (Fortsetzung).’ In: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde*, LXXXII, pp.19-47
- Herbst, Thomas et al. 2004
Valency dictionary of English (Topics in English Linguistics, XL). Berlin: De Gruyter
- Hinrichs, Erhard W. 1985
 A compositional semantics for Aktionsarten and NP reference in English. Unpublished Ph. D. Diss. Columbus: Ohio State University
- Hopper, Paul J. 1979
 ‘Aspect and foregrounding in discourse.’ In: Givón, Talmy (ed.), *Discourse and syntax* (Syntax and Semantics, XII). New York: Academic
- Hopper, Paul J. and Sandra A. Thompson. 1980
 ‘Transitivity in grammar and discourse.’ In: *Language*, LVI, II, pp.251-299
- Ikegami, Yoshihiko 1969
The semiological structure of the English verbs of motion. Tokio: Sanseido
- Iljič, Robert 1989
 ‘Aspectualité et modalité en chinois contemporain: le cas du pékinois laizhe.’ In: *Bulletin de la Société Linguistique de Paris*, LXXXIV, pp.259-279
- Kearns, Katherine S. 1991
 The semantics of the English progressive. Unpublished Ph. D. Diss. Cambridge, Mass.: Massachusetts Institute of Technology
- Kenny, Anthony 1963
Action, emotion and will. London: Routledge
- Klein, Wolfgang 1994
Time in language. London/New York: Routledge
- Kubo, Kazumi and Michiko Suwa 2008
 ‘[Early use of the past marker -ta in L1 speakers of Japanese.](#)’ In: [Selected papers from the 2007 Conference of the Australian Linguistic Society](#)
- Lakoff, Georges 1970
Irregularity in syntax. Saint Louis: Holt, Rinehart & Winston
- Langacker, Ronald W. 1987
Foundations of cognitive grammar I. Stanford: Stanford University Press
- Leech, Geoffrey N. 1971
Meaning and the English verb. London: Longmans
- Leitz, Christian 2002
Das Lexikon der ägyptischen Götter und Götterbezeichnungen I-VII. (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta, CX-CXVI). Leuven: Peeters
- Lemaréchal, Alain 1997
Zéro(s). Paris: Presses Universitaires de France
- Levin, Beth and Malka Rappaport Hovav 1992
 ‘The lexical semantics of verbs of motion: the perspective from unaccusativity.’ In: Roca, Iggy M. (ed.), *Thematic structure: its role in grammar*. Berlin: Foris
- Loprieno, Antonio 1984
 ‘Aspekt und Diathese im Ägyptischen.’ In: Junge, Friedrich (ed.), *Studien zu Sprache und Religion Ägyptens zu Ehren von Wolfhart Westendorf überreicht von seinen Freunden und Schülern I*. Göttingen: Hubert

- Loprieno, Antonio 1986
Das Verbalsystem im Ägyptischen und im Semitischen: zur Grundlegung einer Aspekttheorie (Göttinger Orientforschungen IV, XVII). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz
- Loprieno, Antonio 1995
Ancient Egyptian: a linguistic introduction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Loprieno, Antonio 2003
 ‘Egyptian linguistics in the year 2000.’ In: Hawass, Zahi (ed.), *Egyptology at the dawn of the twenty-first century. Proceedings of the eighth International Congress of Egyptologists III*. Cairo: American University in Cairo
- Malaise, Michel and Jean Winand 1999
Grammaire raisonnée de l'égyptien classique (Aegyptiaca Leodinsia, VI). Liège: CIPL
- Mathieu, Bernard 2013
 ‘Grammaire et politique: réflexions sur quelques empreintes idéologiques dans la terminologie linguistique des grammaires de l'égyptien ancien.’ In: Bickel, Susanne et al. (eds.), *Ägyptologen und Ägyptologien zwischen Kaiserreich und Gründung der beiden deutschen Staaten: Reflexionen zur Geschichte und Episteme eines altertumswissenschaftlichen Fachs im 150. Jahr der Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* (Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde – Beiheft, 1). Berlin: De Gruyter
- Matsumoto, Yo 1996
 ‘Subjective motion in English and Japanese verbs.’ In: *Cognitive Linguistics*, VII, II, pp.183-226
- Melchert, H. Craig 1980
 ‘Some aspects of *aspect* in Mandarin Chinese.’ In: *Linguistics*, XVIII, pp.635-654
- Moeschler, Jacques 1998a
 ‘Pragmatique de la référence temporelle.’ In: Moeschler, Jacques (ed.), *Le temps des événements: pragmatique de la référence temporelle*. Paris: Kimé
- Moeschler, Jacques 1998b
 ‘Les relations entre événements et l'interprétation des énoncés.’ In: Moeschler, Jacques (ed.), *Le temps des événements: pragmatique de la référence temporelle*. Paris: Kimé
- Van der Molen, Rami 2000
A hieroglyphic dictionary of Egyptian Coffin Texts (Probleme der Ägyptologie, XV). Leiden: Brill
- Mourelatos, Alexander P.D. 1981
 ‘Events, processes and states.’ In: Tedeschi, Philip J. and Annie Zaenen (eds.), *Tense and aspect* (Syntax and Semantics, XIV). New York/London/Toronto/Sydney/San Francisco: Academic
- Otto, Eberhard 1977
 ‘Zur Komposition von Coffin Texts Spells 1130.’ In: Assmann, Jan et al. (éds.), *Fragen an die altägyptische Literatur: Studien zum Gedenken an Eberhard Otto*. Wiesbaden: Reichert
- Peust, Carsten 1999
Egyptian phonology: an introduction to the phonology of a dead language. Göttingen: Peust & Gutschmidt
- Pustejovsky, James 1988
 ‘The geometry of events.’ In: Tenny, Carol (ed.), *Studies in generative approaches to aspect* (Lexicon Project Working Papers, XXIV). Cambridge, Mass.: Center for Cognitive Science (MIT)
- Reichenbach, Hans 1947
Elements of symbolic logic. London: Collier-MacMillan (reprint in 1966. New York: The Free Press)

- Reintges, Chris H. 1998
 ‘Ancient Egyptian in 3D: synchrony, diachrony and typology of a dead language.’ In:
Orientalia, LXVII, pp.447-476
- Ryle, Gilbert 1949
The concept of mind. London: Barnes & Noble
- Sánchez Ruipérez, Martín 1954
Estructura del sistema de aspectos y tiempos del verbo griego antiguo. Salamanca: Colegio
 Trilingüe de la Universidad
- Sasse, Hans-Jürgen 2002
 ‘Recent activity in the theory of aspect: Accomplishments, achievements, or just non-
 progressive state?’ In: *Linguistic Typology*, VI, II, pp.199-271
- Schenkel, Wolfgang 1965
 ‘Beiträge zur mittelägyptischen Syntax, III-IV.’ In: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und
 Altertumskunde*, XCII, pp.47-72
- Schenkel, Wolfgang 1967
 ‘Beiträge zur mittelägyptischen Syntax, III A: ‘Emphatische’ Formen im ‘Tempus’ system des
 Berichts über die Vergangenheit (Revision der Deutung frühmittelägyptischer Belege in
 Syntaxbeitrag III).’ In: *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde*, XCIV, pp.130-
 131
- Talmy, Leonard 1975
 ‘Semantics and Syntax of Motion.’ In: Kimball, John P. (ed.), *Syntax and Semantics IV*. New
 York: Academic Press
- Tenny, Carol 1988
 ‘The aspectual interface hypothesis: the connection between syntax and lexical semantics.’ In:
 Tenny, Carol (ed.), *Studies in generative approaches to aspect* (Lexicon Project Working
 Papers, XXIV). Cambridge, Mass.: Center for Cognitive Science, MIT
- Urk. I = Sethe, Kurt 1932-1933
Urkunden des Ägyptischen Altertums I: Urkunden des alten Reiches. 2. ed. Leipzig: Hinrichs
- Vendler, Zeno 1957
 ‘Verbs and times.’ In: *Philosophical review*, LXVI, pp.143-160
- Vendryes, Joseph 1946
 ‘Compte rendu de Jens Holt, *Études d’aspect*.’ In: *Bulletin de la Société Linguistique de Paris*,
 XLII, II, pp.84-88
- Verkuyl, Henk J. 1989
 ‘Aspectual classes and aspectual composition.’ In: *Linguistics and philosophy*, XII, pp.39-94
- Vernus, Pascal 1984a
 ‘Sujet + sJm = f et sujet + pseudoparticipe avec les verbes de qualité: dialectique de l’aspect et
 de l’Aktionsart.’ In: Junge, Friedrich (ed.), *Studien zu Sprache und Religion Ägyptens zu Ehren
 von Wolfhart Westendorf überreicht von seinen Freunden und Schülern I*. Göttingen: Hubert
- Vernus, Pascal 1984b
 ‘Etudes de philologie et de linguistique III.’ In: *Revue d’Égyptologie*, XXXV, pp.159-188
- Vernus, Pascal 1988
 ‘L’égypcio-copte.’ In: Perrot, Jean (ed.), *Les langues dans le monde ancien et moderne, 3^{ème}
 partie: Les langues chamito-sémitiques. Textes réunis par David Cohen*. Paris: Centre National
 de la Recherche Scientifique
- Vernus, Pascal 1997
Les parties du discours en moyen égyptien: autopsie d’une théorie (Cahiers de la Société
 d’Égyptologie, 5). Geneva: Société d’Égyptologie de Genève

- Vernus, Pascal 2000
 ‘Situation de l’Égyptien dans les langues du monde.’ In: Fauvella-Aymar, François-Xavier, Jean-Pierre Chrétien and Claude-Hélène Perrot (eds.), *Afrocentrismes: l’histoire africaine entre Égypte et Amérique*. Paris: Karthala
- Vernus, Pascal 2014a
 ‘Élaboration littéraire et affectation archaïsante: Comment Sinouhé sait se mettre en avant en se mettant à l’écart.’ In: Hays, Harold M., Frank Feder and Ludwig D. Morenz (eds.), *Interpretations of Sinuhe. Inspired by two passages. Proceedings of a workshop held at Leiden University, 27-29 november 2009* (Egyptologische Uitgaven, XXVII). Leiden/Leuven: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten/Peeters
- Vernus, Pascal 2014b
 ‘La non représentation segmentale du (premier) participant direct (“sujet”) et la notion de ø.’ In: Grossman, Eitan et al. (eds.), *On forms and functions: studies in Ancient Egyptian grammar* (Lingua Aegyptia – Studia Monographica, XV). Hamburg: Widmaier
- Waugh, Linda R. and Monique Monville-Burston 1986
 ‘Aspect and discourse function: the French simple past in newspaper usage.’ In: *Language*, LXII, pp.846-877
- Wb. = Erman, Adolf and Hermann Grapow 1926-1963
Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache I-VII. Leipzig: Hinrichs
- Westendorf, Wolfhart 1962
Grammatik der medizinischen Texte (Grundriß der Medizin der alten Ägypter, VIII). Berlin: Akademie
- Winand, Jean 1994
 ‘Entre sémantique et syntaxe: pour une classification des lexèmes verbaux en néo-Égyptien.’ In: Junge, Friedrich, Frank Kammerzell and Antonio Loprieno (eds.), *Proceedings of the International Conference on Egyptian grammar (Crossroads III). Yale, April 4-9, 1994* (Lingua Aegyptia 4). Göttingen: Seminar für Ägyptologie und Koptologie, 349-367
- Winand, Jean 1998
 ‘Prolegomènes à une théorie unifiée de la temporalité en Égyptien.’ In: Eyre, Christopher (ed.), *Proceedings of the Seventh International Congress of Egyptologists. Cambridge, 3-9 September 1995* (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta, 82). Leuven: Peeters
- Winand, Jean 2006
Temps et aspect en Égyptien: une approche sémantique (Probleme der Ägyptologie, 25). Leiden: Brill
- Winand, Jean 2009
 ‘Zeros in Egyptian: can nothing mean something?’ In: *Lingua Aegyptia*, XVII, pp.319-339
- Wunderlich, Dieter 1991
 ‘How do prepositional phrases fit into compositional syntax and semantics?’ In: *Linguistics*, XXIX, pp.591-621