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Some Reflections on the Egyptian Conjugative

Ariel Shisha-Halevy (Jerusalem)

The conjugative is still the most mystifying clause-form in Egyptian, from LE through Demotic to Coptic. For several reasons, including its shadowy origins and puzzling morphology, but especially because of its elusive semantics and syntactic properties, and indeed, its syntactic essentials, it is still not clearly understood and probably often misinterpreted. Most of the diachronic or diachronically conscious treatments of this uneasy form share a pronounced pre-Coptic Egyptian bias, while its very name, originating in early Coptic grammar (Peyron's "subjunctivus" in 1841, Steinthal-Schwarze's "conjunctiv", 1850; Stern's "conjunctiv", 1880) and progressively projected back into the study of pre-Coptic Egyptian, has inevitably, as specially "tyrannical" terms will inevitably do, been exerting a prejudicial influence on grammatical opinions. Its alien-looking morphology has been central to its study; "translation linguistics" statements have been often taken for adequate systemic-functional ones.

In this paper I propose to share with the reader some reflections (often disjoined and sometimes lacononic) on focal points in the overall Problematic of this fascinating form, not diachronically in the proper methodological sense, yet touching upon various synchronic stages of Egyptian.

The conjugative is primarily conceived of as a "continuing" form, a morphologically formalized type of coordination. The consensus of grammatical description classifies the occurrences of the conjugative by the "form continued". And yet, the conjugative was never a "tense" and therefore calls for analysis more cotextual and ultra-clausal than is usual for other conjugation forms. It is agreed that, diachronically, the compatibilities and roles of the conjugative were progressively extended from its emergence as a distinct "conjugation-carrying syntagm" somewhere in Middle Egyptian (with its roots in earlier phases) to its extinction with Coptic. However, the precise diachronic picture is still blurred, and most functions (beside, "coordination") remain fuzzy even synchronically.

1 Textemic compatibilities: temporality and atemporal, narrativity and "Past Tense Colctex"

(a) Many discussions centering on this issue suffer from a lack of sophistication regarding the conception of "narrativity" and "narrative texture", and of a text-grammatical perspective, i.e. the resolution of a functional value by precise syntagmatic and paradigmatic configuration.

The conjugative syntagm is atemporal or generic, both in its own reference and in its compatibilities. It is "ahistoric"; in Sahidic Coptic, its compatibility is strictly limited to verbal elements that are either atemporal, extratemporal or have no fixed temporal anchoring-point; when it apparently occurs in narrative, this turns out to be "gnomic, generic or "paradigmatic"4 - that is to say, ahistoric once again. For the present-tense compatibility of the conjugative, we find atemporal, non-actual (esp. substantival relative "present") to be especially typical.5 This property of the conjugative, which I believe is central to its semantic indication value, may perhaps be traceable to the "verbal abstract", infinitival atemporal predication of the original ḫnʾ nṯf sgm. This constitutes yet another contrasting feature of the conjugative with the circumstantial, which features a full range of temporal and other verbal categories:6 it applies to 18th-19th Dynasty systems of Egyptian,7 to Late Egyptian,8 to Demotic9 as well as to Coptic.10

(b) The grammatical consensus regarding the LE Conjunctive focuses essentially on its dialogic nature (although it is certainly oversimplifying things to claim that the con-
and patterns – narrative forms and functions constitute twin systèmes de valeurs. Macrosyntactically, narrative texture is (paradigmatically) layered – or (syntagmatically) complex – constituted by textemes, i.e. textual subunits distinct in their systems of grammar.

(c) Probably the most familiar and perplexing instances of the „non-dialogic“ occurrence of the Conjuuctive in LE are two passages, in the introductory part and in a later episode part of the Tale of the Two Brothers. Almost all other „historical past“ instances of the conjunctive occur in non-literary locutive (i.e., „perfect“ 1st-person-sphere) reporting sequences. The conventional interpretation (by Hintze, Lichtheim, Frandsen and others) considers these passages as foreground or „mainline“ plot narrative, with the conjunctive yet another concatenating tense leaning back onto a specific narrative past tense form. Wente (1962) takes them as instances of the conjunctive conveying „the nuance of past custom“ or „past habitual action“ (and the conjunctive thus an aspectual/aktionsart form?). Naturally, from a structuralist point of view, this raises the questions of what the specific role of the form could be as yet another member of the „narrative tenses“ paradigm, and, more basically, of what the essentially dialogic form might be doing in this alien textual environment.

Now I would suggest that the way to understand the D’Orbiny conjunctives is through viewing the form as atemporal rather than historical, as schematically expanding rather than coordinating (European-style) or concatenating, as well as through applying a more careful and refined conception of narrative grammar – a conception blending narratological functional analysis with a structuralist système de valeur resolution of formal/functional categories.

Translating the passages in question (I find it unnecessary to quote the Egyptian yet again. Bridged lacunae are bracketed. The English Present Simple is used to render the conjunctive, as the English atemporal generic „arist“; an arrow, „⇒“ indicates the recommencement of the narrative segment that follow the conjunctive one):

(1.4ff.) ... many days passed, his younger brother herding his cattle as was his daily habit; he returns home in the evening loaded with all herbs of the field, with milk, wood and all good produce of the field; he lays all these before his elder brother sitting with his wife, he drinks, eats; he goes to lie in the cattle shed amongst his cattle. The morning after, [he prepares cooked food], puts it beside his elder brother, gives him loaves for the field, drives his cattle to pasture them in the field, herding his cattle. [They tell him: „The grass in this or that place is good“], he listens to all they said and takes them to that place where the grass is good, as they wish. ⇒ And the cattle which he herded became outstanding; they doubled and tripled their youngs. And when plowing time came, his elder brother said to him ...“

The conjunctives here construct a narrative plane that is outside narrative „history“, namely, one of the background planes, part of the „initial (or given) situation“ narrative-continue the present, pace DEPUYDT 1993: 14ff., P. Salt 124 to 21.1ff etc.). Nearly all of Frandsen’s exx. in 1974: §80 are instances of report.

11 So FRANSDEN 1974: 112.
12 JOHNSON 1974: 291, DEPUYDT 1993: 26ff. Harald Weinrich’s Tempus (WEINRICHT 1977), the theoretical authority for the „narrative world“ vs. „spoken/discussed world“ dichotomy, greatly oversimplifies either extemic category (and moreover distorts the facts in some of the languages discussed, notably Italian and English). Incidentally, DEPUYDT’s Coptic exx. from the NH (I: 33.35ff.) and Shenoute (ed. Chassinat 195.8ff.) are irrelevant, the former conjunctive being final, the latter referable to the infinitive.
13 FRANSDEN 1974: 126.
14 FRANSDEN 1974: §80. Outside report (in which „past“ typically implies the „perfectum praenens“), the conjunctive is very rarely, if at all, compatible with a past form throughout the history of Egyptian. In Mag. 11/21 (JOHNSON 1974: 285 EX 503), the conjunctive follows the circumstantial neg. perfect which is temporal („before“ in Coptic it is similarly found after deo and e-1-re, „unless“, see SHISHA-HALEVY 1986: 202.).
15 While the texteme-regulated comparability of the LE „narrative“ with the dialogic/reporting perfective sgmn is fairly well established, I would hesitate to draw parallels between the sequential and the conjunctive (BORGHOUTS 1979), since the structures and textures of narrative and dialogue are so asymmetrical, and the conjunctive not a sequential concatenating but a thematic annexation form (see below); similarly, between the zero-coordinated aqurw hiatus in Coptic and the conjunctive (DEPUYDT 1993: 99 with reff.), since its real counterpart is the zero-conjunction (or rather zero-adverb: SHISHA-HALEVY 1986: 189, + n.25) conjunctive.
16 The „historical“ content of report may be brief or so extensive as to constitute a complex „reported narrative“ (which would still be basically different from a 1st-person-presented „narrator’s narrative“). So for instance in the Tomb Robberies texts (e.g. BM 10054 to 2.1ff, where the conjunctive does not continue the present, pace DEPUYDT 1993: 14ff., P. Salt 124 to 21.1ff etc.). Nearly all of Frandsen’s exx. in 1974: §80 are instances of report.
17 So for instance (Dem.) P. Rylands 9 3/4ff., P. Rylands 18/8 (LE) RAD 14.9ff., Weil 1.18ff. Note that a conjunctive occurring in past context may be final, resultative-apodotic or consecutive, so e.g. (LE) Mayer B 1ff.
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in very neat and economic structure with his two main fellow-characters: his brother (first his antagonist, then his helper, later, in correlation with the various metamorphoses undergone by the characters, virtually the deuteragonist who finally merges with the protagonist), and his brother’s wife.

A striking and, I believe, corroborating parallel to the generic “attributes texteme” is found in the ME Tale of the Shipwrecked Sailor, with morphysologically distinct irredundating sequelling sdm.f forms expressing attribute-signifying acts (27ff., sim. 95ff.):

Sm.kwi r Bliw-n-nty, h.kwi r Wgw Wr m dpn nt mì 120 m lw.s, mì 40 m sww.s, skd 120 ins.m sww n Kmt, mì.sn pt mì.sn t' mkl lb.s m lw.sr sr sn d'n ly.t(l) n sn.n hpr.f.t⇒ D' pr(w)...

The ship’s crew is characterized as expert, vigilant and fearless by verb-forms which cannot belong to any of the basic categories; another instance of what is probably the same form occurs later on in the story (70ff.), apodotically (see below, 2 (b) 1.): ir wdl.k mk d'n i in tw r lw pn, rd.l ij.k tw lw.k m ss.

2. The functional core: “Sequelling Rhetoricality” : Superordination

The conjointive is in essence a modifier syntagm, both etymologically and by synchronic nucleus/satellite taxonomy. Its common functional characterization as “continuing” or “coordinating” tends to obscure this basic fact, which is why I have avoided using this term here.

(a) Several years ago, in a study of the Shenoutean idiom meant as a structural scan of the main grammatical categories of Sahidic Coptic, I attempted to show that the Coptic conjointive, very like the circumstantial conversion, is rhetorical and “adnexal”: that is, annexing one nexus (i.e. a verbal theme-rheme interdependence) to another, or to a clause, or to a textual stretch, or even to a noun — not unlike a “finitized” Greek partitive in predicative status. I then argued from morphology,23 morphosyntax and syntagmatics, also from text semantics. In this sense, the accepted and somewhat mechanistic coordinative reading of the conjointive at any phase of the language is more of a “translation” statement than a true analytic interpretation (it might certainly prove both easier and more exact and sensitive to render it into, say, Turkish or Mongolian, or Amharic).

The two following functional definitions seem basic:

(1) Macrosyntactically, the conjointive is a sequelling finite verb,24 adjoining ensuing/follow-up nexus in a semantic spectrum ranging from apodosis, “aftermath”, “upshot” or consequence to issue and even eventuality. Much more nuanced than simple coordinate “continuation”, in the sense of a catalogue of events or temporal succession,25 sequelling is a feature of the relative progressivity rhetoricity of the conjointive (as a

23 Esp. the coincidence of the conjointive base in Coptic with the alloforms of the nota relations (in and htw,).24 For the term see H.J. Polotsky, Notes on Garuge Grammar, Jerusalem 1951, p. 41ff. (= Collected Papers [Jerusalem 1971] 556ff.)

25 Cf. P. Salt 124 21.14-17 (apud Erman 1933: 278), which is a cataloging listing (in what Erman calls “Geschäftsfall” rather than a linear eventual sequence.

The conjointive, being rheumatic, conveys the younger brother’s “heroic” attributes as distinctive and definitive. This constitutes a special subnarrative texteme that is in fact expository, not narrative.20 The surrounding narrative conveys, truly linear-evolving, eventive and temporally actualized (by past verb forms, by wn-in and hr-fr-m-ht delimitations and iw.Hr sdm concatenations), is thus in opposition to the “initial situation” texteme, which is in fact an instance of narrative relief.21 Typically and significantly, the conjointive adjoins the circumstantial, which is no more narrative-advancing. It delineates — yet does not tell — a recurring essential characterizing “story”, therein consisting on the attributes and sketching the coordinates within which the reader (or listener) will have to decode the sequelling narrative information regarding the protagonist hero in relation and function constituent, which, in our story, follows the preliminary subconstituent that introduces the dramatis-personae relationship, 1.1-1.3). This is descriptive and static in relation to the narrative plot, although it does have its own inner sequence and development, as an embryonic “micro-narrative”. It is wondrously economic: there isn’t a single redundant component in the passage. The thriving and talking cows, crucially reappearance later in the story, characterize the “younger brother” as a hero protagonist, of moral and mythical qualities: industry, self-effacement, humility, with faculties of superhuman communication and empathy with animal nature. He also has the significant (preliminary) task-fulfillment” attribute.19 The conjointive here is thus not a “habitat” Aktionsart past tense, but a descriptive, evaluative, attribute-characterizing atemporal one. In the second passage, the conjunctives carry but a partial reassertion of these attributes:

(4.3f.) He reached his elder brother, and they finished their work. Later, in the evening, his elder brother returned home; his younger brother, herding his cattle, loads himself with all produce of the field, drives his cattle to put them to sleep in their shed in the village. ⇒ Meanwhile, his elder brother’s wife was afraid because of the request she had made …

The conjointive, being rheumatic, conveys the younger brother’s „heroic“ attributes as distinctive and definitive. This constitutes a special subnarrative texteme that is in fact expository, not narrative.20 The surrounding narrative conveys, truly linear-evolving, eventive and temporally actualized (by past verb forms, by wn-in and hr-fr-m-ht delimitations and iw.Hr sdm concatenations), is thus in opposition to the „initial situation“ texteme, which is in fact an instance of narrative relief.21 Typically and significantly, the conjointive adjoins the circumstantial, which is no more narrative-advancing. It delineates — yet does not tell — a recurring essential characterizing „story“, therein consisting on the attributes and sketching the coordinates within which the reader (or listener) will have to decode the sequelling narrative information regarding the protagonist hero in relation and
higher-Communicative Dynamism form), a rhetoric always based on and presupposing the preceding textual segments, which constitute its "thematic layer". Thus, the conjunctive may be seen as a non-autonomous superordinated clause form.26 Prominent among the components of this semantic-functional range is apodoticity (see below, 2 (b) 1). The alleged predominance of the coordinative function throughout the history of the language (with all other functions demanding special clarification), is in my opinion but an ethnocentric, European-sensibility "squinting" view of the less prominent instances of the same semantic field.

As said, the conjunctive syntagma is adnexal (i.e. nexus-adjoining) and adverbial" (in the sense suggested in my Coptic Grammatical Categories),28 with adverbial, ad-clausal or adnominal compatibilities. Its grammatical characteristic (or "base"), whether ḫn, m-tw-l hūt or hūt, carries the modifier and adjoining functional charge, and as it were bracket the nexus itself.29 In a comparative-typological perspective, I find the conjunctive immediately comparable to the Ethiopian (e.g. Amharic) finite gerund = a nomen actionis or verb-noun in an "adverbial case" with an originally possessive suffix pronoun, used to express gradation of the act, sequencing and sequencing, European-style coordination (in a series of gerunds preceding a single "main" verb-form, according to the "inverse" Amharic basic syntagmatic order).30

(2) Microsyntactically, the conjunctive is a verbal-nexus form, atemporal-generic in its "time-reference" (cf. the rhatmatic infinitive in the late Middle Egyptian etymon construction).

(b) The high-level rhetoricism of the Conjunctive is the functional key factor, fundamental and general, whether its translation rendering be coordinative, consecutive or resultative; indeed, it is the functional core of our form even in such diachronically familiar and well-known syntagmas as "imperative + conjunctive" or "infinite + conjunctive". Being a clause or nexus pattern, the conjunctive itself comprises a theme and a rhyme; by characterizing the entire form as rhatmatic I mean macroscopic rhetoric, a relative

new-information-contributing communicative function which the conjunctive carries out in the ultra-clause extent of a clause complex.

(1) Apodoticity is probably the clearest case of relative text-grammatical rhetoric, for, in the protasis-apodosis complex, both constituents are nuxally interconnected (and interdependent) at high-level topic-theme and rhyme. Though well-established as a role of the conjunctive (well attested in Late Egyptian,31 Demotic32 and some variety of Copritic,33 the signification of the apodotic role is nevertheless underestimated,34 for it is by no means restricted to the "conditional apodosis" slot (which includes of course the topicalized "protatic topicalization" of a substantival relative),35 but may be found in most other types of foregoing context, and indeed is a useful and instructive paraphrase form for ultra-clausal rhetoricism in general:

(LB) P. Mayer B 8f.: ḫw[d.j] pi-ms (-ḥr) ... m-tw.t ḫm-dn n r-bł (Dem.) Ankhsh.19/15: m-ir ḫm ḫt-nw k mr m-tw.t ḫhp-ml-ntw (Copt.) Shenoute Paris 130v 83 rπ. άπω ΧΛΗΣΟΡ ΚΊΟΛ ΠΗΝΚΑΡΙΑΚΙ ΧΑΣΟΧΟΧ ΧΕ ΜΑΚΕΝΠΟΡΟ ΤΟΥΟΚΑ 36

Böh. Jason I:16: άπω ΧΛΗΣΟΡ ΚΊΟΛ ΠΗΝΚΑΡΙΑΚΙ ΧΑΣΟΧΟΧ ΧΕ ΜΑΚΕΝΠΟΡΟ ΤΟΥΟΚΑ 36

Ibid. 1:7: άπω ΧΛΗΣΟΡ ΚΊΟΛ ΠΗΝΚΑΡΙΑΚΙ ΧΑΣΟΧΟΧ ΧΕ ΜΑΚΕΝΠΟΡΟ ΤΟΥΟΚΑ 36...

(2) It is certainly not "of extreme rarity" (FRANSDEN 1974: 125). LICHTHEIM 1964: 3 doubts the apodotic role altogether.

E.g. (Dem.) P. Rylands 17/4f, again in a contractual obligation clause.

31 Cf. exx. in FRANSDEN 1974: 148ff; BORGHOSTS 1979: 23; see O. Nasb 1 (Pto. XLVI 2 r0).
32 Cf. Botli, Deir El-Medineh, 6103 20 ro f. (contractual obligation clause); Nur el Din, Ostr. 280, 281, 284, 286 etc. (apodotic to "if he take the oath ... "); Kaplony-Heckel, Templeide 1/1, sm.4/a,b, 5/11f etc. See SPIEGELBERG 1925: 152-3.
33 Nitrian Boharic (De Via, Homilies II 168; post-classical Sabdhic (Leipoldt, Opera Sinaii II 130,17f. (Vita Monachorum) 76, not by Shenoute), translatable as jussive, yet in fact also apodotic-rhetoric (see below). See STERN 1880 646f; Crum & W. Monastery of Epiphaniaus I 250f., II 373.
34 It is certainly not "of extreme rarity" (FRANSDEN 1974: 125). LICHTHEIM 1964: 3 doubts the apodotic role altogether.
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Setne 4/18: tl-wntw mtw. Fr 't šnt.i ... (an alternative interpretation: the conjunctive sequencing the protasis - so Griffith).
Ins. 27/10: wpr ntb mtw.k šnt sy m-im.w.
(Copt.) Epiphanius ed. Crum 244: τιμοῦν πειράζουσαν ἡμᾶς ἐνθαματίζουσα ἡμᾶς ὑμῖν θυρίφ - Crum's rendering: "that it rest ...";
cf. the Anastasi I LE example above.
Job 10:21: ... ἡμᾶς ὑπάθη τοῦτο (δεδειχθής ἀναστρέψετε - note the future tense of the original)
Leipoldt Sin. Vita 12:22: ... ὡς τοὺς ἄνθρωπος τοῦτο γνωρίζουν (b) A special member of the abnodinal paradigm, one that is especially close to the conjunctive, is the "that"-form xe- as a generic-rhetematic ("such ... as ..."") abnodinal negative clause-form (abnodinal to a zero-determinated noun, which is as a rule an existant of hñ- ("there isn't ...") or in a rhetorical paraphrase of non-existence: see footnote 40);
(Bohaicic) Mt. 10:26: ἰηνον πέπωθες γὰρ ἕνην ἱνήκατε ἐφολ άν (sim. Luc. 8:17)
(Shenoute Sah.) BM Cat. (Crum) No.196 p.81: ἡν-επεφώνε τε-επεφώνε άν ἁν ἀνθρώποι άν 
Amélineau, Œuvres ... I 234.8f: ού γὰρ πέπωθημάτι τοῦ πέπωον ἃν ἐν

4. Autonomy and Initiality, Protatic conjunctive? The "Oath Protasis"

The autonomy of cases of hñ+ infinitive, and later the conjunctive, which seem initial and/or independent of preceding forms, has rightly been questioned. Indeed, the rare instances conventionally adduced for the initial-autonomous conjunctive all turn out, upon careful examination, to be more or less normal cases of superordinating retrodependence, either to specific preceding clause-forms or to the entire "bracketed" foregoing text as theme.44

(a) On a point of terminology. Considering the applicability of Černý-Groll's syntactic concept, "non-initial main sentence" to the conjunctive.45 Unlike Depuydt, I conclude

---

37 I find it interesting that in the Coptic Pap. Médical (ed. Chassían) the "guaranteed result" clause is expressed by ἱμαλο- (ἐπαγαγος, ἱμαρτων) etc. or the in-future (ἐπιξερον, ἱμαρτων"; in the ME medical papyri, the resultative stative (?), prospective suf.m.f and ἱμαρτων serve to express similar phrases). The conjunctive occurs following instructing imperatives; only very rarely (23) do we find it immediately following the initial list of components.

38 LRL 35.3ff., 60.10f., 69.1f.

39 Here belong some of the LE LRL instances usually taken for "simple coordination cases": 21.8ff., 46.1. 58.1f. (pace Černý-Groll 1975: 448f).

40 SHISHA-HALEVY 1986: 190 n.31. The circuituarii contracted clause-form is abnodinal-adnexal to no such as well as non-specific nominal nouns; following non-specific nominal nouns, the circuituarii is practically the only abnodinal expansion-form, neutralizing the opposition of attributive and adnominal.

41 Cf. the so-called "consecutive", eventual, generic relative in Latin, marked by the conjunctive- mood ("semilemum nullast qui seque diligent", Plautus Am. 509; see Ernout-Thomas, Syntaxe latine, Paris 1953, pp.338ff).

42 Many exx. in Spiegelberg 1925: §151 ("relativischer Gebrauch"); JOHNSON 1974: 294f. considers these as a "variant spelling" for the relative, but her own statements rule this out (e.g. mtw.-following an indefinite noun or negated by im).

43 KROEBER 1970:156ff.

44 FRANDESEN 1974: § 83 reports on LICHTHEIM 1964 and implicitly accepts her findings. Yet LRL 19.13f. and 51.15f. (the conj. following a jussive or injunctive), and 28.7f. (following the optative mrr mnhk) are none of them unambiguous, conclusive instances of initiality. Moreover, m-mrt introducing the conjunctive is not a mark of initiality (pace Litchfield and Frajnden pp.147-8): on the contrary, it indicates connectedness, like m-rx pw (cf. Anast. VIII 3.5) and br before the conjunctive, comparably to the adverbials ἄνοιξα, ἅν (as on and the like before the Coptic conjunctive (SHISHA-HALEVY 1986: 189). For Demotic, cf. CRUM 1974: 292ff. Mag.15/24f. is clearly a jussive apodosis; other instances of the conjunctive immediately following the spell captive have the conjunctive sequencing an infinitive in the caption, and in Mag.5/3 (EX 5532a) the conjunctive may well be a sequencing "that" form (see below) in a "Wechselsatz" Nominal Sentence nexus with the caption noun. The case of LRL 14.14f., the conjunctive following in.β is "you said" different: it is a quoted episopal item, with its original environment unknown.

45 Cf. ČERNÝ-GROLL 1975: 438: the statement (on rd- conjunctive) of ἀν belongs, not to the conjunctive, but to a missing sentence pattern is arbitrary and question-begging. Similarly, "Since mtw.
that, while "main sentence" is rather infelicitous to describe its syntactic essence, the conjunctive being inherently co-predicative, adnexal, a non-autonomous "converb" (cf. the "clause conjunction" status in Coptic of the Coptic apodotic εἰκάζων conjunction form, probably ← 1w. f. fr. σύμ), and since non-initiality is indeed a significant characteristic of the form, and is far from a trivial "circumstance", even if it is not exceptionless (see (b) below, on the "οάθον protasis").

(b) The protasis-marking role of the conjunctive – an alleged initial-position role par excellence, as distinct from the non-initial in protasis role, which is well-established47 (Incidentally, the conjunctive in protasis often illustrates clearly the progressive rhetoric of the form, which is as a rule rhapsodic with reference to the predications preceding it48) must also be carefully reexamined. Frankly, I can find no conclusive examples for the conjunctival protasis.49 The conjunctive as a formal (the first) constituent of the jurative formula,50 which is commonly taken to be protatic and provides almost all exx. for this alleged role, must, I believe, be differently interpreted. For the conjunctive actually expresses the gist of the oath (so explicitly ERMANN 1933: 280), while the second constituent, expressing the agreed penalty for non-fulfillment of the pledged action, is almost invariably circumstantial in form (1w. f. + adverbial, 1w. f. + static, 1w. f. + present, 1w. f. + passive perf. sfm.), and cannot therefore be apodotic. As I see it, the only logical analysis consistent with these facts is one identifying and equating, in an interdependence of implication, the circumstance of (say), "being obliged to pay ..." (with "not", "having given you ..." ← inversely paraphrasable as, "the (very) fact that I arrive at the circumstance of having to pay ...", "necessarily and simultaneously implies" "my not having given you ...". Here, then, it is (once again) the conjunctive that is apodotic and rhapsodic to the circumstance "protasis" expressed by the 1w. f. clause. It is true, however, that in this complex the conjunctive is initial – the only case of initiality that is really incontestable – but this is functional placement: the initiality is relative, expressing the contingency of the "events" in the two clauses by this very relative-order opposition, viz. the apodotic-enabling clause preceding the "protatic" one.

5. Main-clause Modality?

A terminological "trap" in this context consists in the fact that the very (and only) name of the formal category in point bears and implies associations with an Indo-European type of "mood" (a fully privileged morphological, morphosyntactical, syntactical and semantic category). One must here obviously distinguish between the conjunctive allegedly occurring initially (in its own clause or in a larger grammatical unit) and, always in a relative manner of speaking, autonomously, and the conjunctive retrodependent upon other clause forms or constructions. In the former case, a jussive/injunctive role has been suggested; in the latter, faculty or consecutivity. In the former case, seemingly "independent" allocutive (second-person) instructions expressed by the conjunctive are still sequelling textual themes. We isolate in ME, L, Decim and Coptic clear cases of what may be termed "injunctive apodosis" (or, more generally, "jussive sequelling"), where the allocutive (and, more rarely, delocutive) reference triggers a western injunctive-jussive rendering. In the latter, we see a final or consecutive dependence is arguably only a semantic nuance, the sensitivity to which is probably due to European "translation exigencies" rather than to a distinct and formally correlatable Egyptian function, and in any case one of no syntactical relevance (see below, 6.)


(a) As Kroeker puts it (1970: 140f.), the conjunctive is said to express "simple coordination", but also "modalities, foremost finality" ("modale Brechung" is his general term). Yet he goes on, in unambiguous words (and virtually alone among scholars discussing Egyptian grammatical functions), to make the crucial distinction – amounting to a methodological caveat – between the structural description of the Egyptian form and its

---

45 ME. P. Med.Berlin 11.9 (KROEBER 1970:145 n.7) ἢν ἀνεβάζει δίδωσι is comparable with Coptic ἢττε ὑποταμίευσιν, followed by medical recipes (Chassain, Pop. Mèdicaux), – LE : LRL 47.12ff. ἐνάντια ἤ τούτῳ which, like Kroeker, I do not consider a case of "independent conjunctive expressing a wish, command or injunction" (LIEHTHEIM 1964: 4f.), yet not an eclipse of a verb and a "stylistic variation". – LE/early Dem.: exx. in VERNON 1990: 177-182; – Dem.: Mag. 12/24f. (Lit. k – protasis). Canopus 19.68 (SPIEGELBERG 1925: §152) the conjunctive, apodotic to an i.k. "eventual" temporal protasis, significantly corresponds to an apodotic-jussive Greek infinitive. – Coptic: Εἰς τὸ ὄνομα μισθὸν ἢ ἐμαρτύρατο τὸ ἐπίσκοπον (Till Ostr.62, 56), the conjunctive is equally retrodendent (iso that ...). De Vis, Homildies I 83 πάντως ἢ ἐπίσκοπον εὐθανάστη χρόους II 130 (?). In the preceptive genres – in the specific practical instruction, not in rhetorical or general-principle passages – post-classical Coptic employs also the prospective "that-form εὑρίσκεται as apodotic jussive/hortative (rarely, not apodotic) Leip. Sinuhh. Op. IV 132.17ff., 22ff. εὐπροφυτεύων δι νεκροῦς δι εὐφυοσύνης εὑρίσκεται ἢ ὁποῖος ὁ πάντως ὁτι ... , 133.17ff., 136.27ff., 136.13f., 137.21ff. ἢ 147.2ff. (not Shenoute) εὑρίσκεται δι εὐφυοσύνης, εὑρίσκεται, ποταῖος δι θεραπείας καθάρ. Other "that-forms are used similarly (notably in Shenoute and elsewhere). The Second Future. Unique to my knowledge is Epiphanius ed. Crum 295, where εἰς τὸ ἐπίσκοπον ἢ εὐθανάστη χρόους εἶπεται constitutes a text; cf. Crum's note (p.232): "The subjunctive either indicates an eclipse (p. "pray thee") or gives the force of a verb to the intersection occ. I have not noted a similar usage elsewhere". May this be a prospective "that"-form role of the conjunctive (see below) as "presentative", governed by the presentant εἰς...
all of its roles and constructions (e.g. as object of ḫḏ, governed by prepositions, negated by ḫmr and by ḫmr.).

We isolate this syntactic status of the conjunctive in the following cases: (1) as content-object to a specific inventory of verbs: ʿqwr, qwvr, ṣrḥ, ṣrḥ, etc. (2) as a post-conjunctival and post-adverbial "coupling" clause form: ṣrḥ + conj., ʿqwr + ḫmr + conj., ṣrḥ + conj. (following e.g. the rhetorical ʾmmk-hmn ʾmmk in Late Sahidic and Bohairic), ṣrḥ + ḫmr + conj. (Epiphanius ed. Crum 387), disjunctive in Kān nḥmr Kān nḥmr (Epiphanius ed. Crum 338); (3) as an appositive theme in a delocutive Nominal Sentence: ṣrḥ, ṣrḥ, ṣrḥ, ṣrḥ + conj., ṣrḥ, ṣrḥ + conj.; (4) ʿqwr + ḫmr + conjunctive, ubiquitous in Bohairic but attested also in post-classical Sahidic; ṣrḥ, ṣrḥ, ṣrḥ + conj.; also generally as postposed theme to a "neuter" cataphoric pronoun in the present (Boh. ʾḥmr, ṣrḥ, ṣrḥ, ṣrḥ, ʾḥmr, ṣrḥ, ṣrḥ, ʾḥmr, ṣrḥ); (5) in a final-conjunctive role (again, typical of Bohairic). The expressive "that" status of the conjunctive is attested earlier, already in Demotic, as object of ṣḏmr, ṣḏmr; perhaps also following the conjunction gmr, gmr and in a "Nominal Sentence" nexus.94

(d) ṣḏmr - like the conjunctive, essentially a modifier96 - is in post-classical Sahidic, Theban and Nitrian Bohairic Copitic another striking sequelling or conjunctive "that"-form, truly concursing with the conjunctive, with which its associations are more than merely morphological and the fact that both (like many other Clause Conjunction and converted verb forms) are retroderivative.1 It too typically occurs as object of such verbs as ṣḏmr, ṣḏmr (Rylands ed. Crum 159, 196, 332, 409, Apophth. ed. Chaline 148, 176, Acta Mart. ed. Hyvernat II 49); in an absolute opening of a letter (_ISO).

61 SHISHA-HALEVY 1986: 207f.
62 See DEPUYDT 1993: 23 n.28 (Burns, Four Martyrdoms, 26) - not focussed by the Second Tense, which is here autofocusal, but focussed ṣḏmr in a rhetorical question; also Epiphanius ed. Crum 85, 93, 386-7 etc.
63 Cf. De Vis, Homitdes I 13, 33, 35, 70, 117; it sometimes commutes with ṣḏmr; for final/conjunctive ṣḏmr, ṣḏmr: ṣḏmr with the conjunctive, see STERN 1880: §§ 448, 511; SHISHA-HALEVY 1986: 207.
65 See STERN 1880: §442; A. Levy, Syntax d.Apost'hognes patrum, Berlin 1909, 1914. In fact, the conjunctive in an instance such as (Shenoute ed. Chassai 93.22f.): ṣḏmr ṣḏmr must also be considered apodic.
66 E.g. De Vis, Homitdes II 171, 276; STERN 1880 611f.
67 Exx. for ṣḏmr from Mag. and BM 10591 in JOHNSON 1974: 293f., who considers them instances of the "independent conjunctive" (cf. Copite ṣḏmr + ṣḏmr, see below); P.Ox. Griffith T40 (ed. Bresciani).
68 Perhaps in Mythus 710 ( ḫmr + conj. final construction?); in 5/6 ṣḏmr. is the Sec. Perfect; cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 1986: 207 n.66.
70 SHISHA-HALEVY 1986: 115 n.46. Classical or "orthodox" ṣḏmr, studied by Polotsky in 1944 as the first of his two "Etudes de syntaxe copite", is apodic - again, macroanalytically "rhetoric" - in its "implicative + ṣḏmr" complex. It is not a "promissory future" (pace DEPUYDT 1993: 75f.), though conveniently (if very roughly and exaggeratedly) translatable by a promise. Its true semantic distinction consists of its unique fusion of allocutive and locutive features, and its syntactic distinction is in its textual rhetoricacy. It is not a future tense: like the conjunctive, it is stemporal.
71 Pace DEPUYDT 1993: 80f.; 87. For some instructive exx., see ṣḏmr - neatly opposed to the sequelling conjunctive, see Acta Mart. (ed. Hyvernat) I 182, II 36, 113.

53 Fransen too begins his own discussion of this issue (1974: 143ff.) with a similar observation, yet makes his subsequent statements (attempts to separate conjunctive and functional semantics for the conjunctive on the basis of contextual considerations and plausibility) from an admitted translator's-eye view.
54 Not only of a Western observer but already evident in the Greek-Demotic bilinguals: cf. Canopus 12.43.
55 FRANSDEN 1974: 146.
56 Cf. (LE, Tomb Robberies) BM 10052 6.18ff., Mayer A 6.10f., Mayer B 8f., (Dem.) Sene 3/n5, Myth 18/4, often in the didactic gem; e.g. Ins. 2/7, 3/14, 7/13; cf. SPIEGELBERG 1925: §§149, 519.
57 Cf. Borghouts's "coextension" as the distinctive feature of the conjunctive in narrative (1979: 24); elsewhere (22/22), he characterizes the conjunctive as "hifernal", which comes close to our "rhetoric".
58 To judge e.g. by Copitic, which uses numerous constructions - in later sahidian or Nitrian Bohairic, no less than eight, all told - for this semantic range or spectrum. As I see it, the distinctions are not carried by "conjunctival" means (cf. FRANSDEN 1974:143ff.)
59 A role which would well agree with Mathay's etymology of the conjunctive as "la ḫmr ṣḏmr ṣḏmr (BIPAQ 45: 43-55 [1947]), however, this thesis seems unacceptable (KROEBER 1970: 146f.)
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