

Sonderdruck aus

DIVITIAE AEGYPTI

Koptologische und verwandte Studien
zu Ehren von
Martin Krause

herausgegeben von
Căcilia Fluck · Lucia Langener · Siegfried Richter
Sofia Schaten · Gregor Wurst

DR. LUDWIG REICHERT VERLAG
WIESBADEN 1995

Th. K. THOMAS, Niche decorations from the Tombs of Byzantine Egypt (Heracleopolis Magna and Oxyrhynchus, A. D. 300-500): Visions of the afterlife (Phil. Diss. New York University, 1990), Ann Arbor, Michigan 1990.

H.-G. SEVERIN, Zum Dekor der Nischenbekrönungen aus spätantiken Grabbauten Ägyptens, in: Rigisberger Berichte 1 (1993) 63-85.

Abbildungsnachweise

Museumsfoto: Taf. 18; 20a.

Foto Severin: Taf. 15b-17b; 19; 20b-21b.

SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE EGYPTIAN CONJUNCTIVE

Ariel Shisha-Halevy (Jerusalem)

The conjunctive 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 form¹ share a pronounced pre-Coptic Egyptian bias, while its very name, originating in early Coptic grammar (Peyron's „subjunctivus“ in 1841, Steintal-Schwarze's „conjunctiv“, 1850, Stern's „conjunctiv“, 1880) and progressively projected back into the study of pre-Coptic Egyptian,² has inevitably, as specially „tyrannical“ terms will inevitably do, been exerting a prejudicing 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 disjointed and sometimes laconic) on focal points in the overall *Problematik* of this fascinating form, not diachronically in the proper methodological sense, yet touching upon various synchronic stages of Egyptian.

The conjunctive is primarily conceived of as a „continuing“ form,³ a morphologically formalized type of coordination. The consensus of grammatical description classifies the occurrences of the conjunctive by the „form continued“. And yet, the conjunctive 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 conjunctive 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 atemporality, narrativity and „Past Tense cotext“*

(a) The 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 conjunctive 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 formal 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 conjunctive, we find atemporal, non-actual (esp. substantival relative „present“) to be especially typical.⁵ This property of the conjunctive, which I believe is central to its semantic indication value, may perhaps be traceable to the „verbal abstract“, infinitival atemporal predication of the original *hn' ntf sdm*. This constitutes yet another contrasting feature of the conjunctive 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 focusses essentially on its *dialogic* nature (although it is certainly oversimplifying things to claim that the con-

1 Good bibliographic resumé: in KROEBER 1970 (pp. 140-170) and BORGHOOTS 1979: 14ff., both in my opinion the best discussions; see also DEPUYDT 1993: 115f., and of course references in grammars (ČERNÝ-GROLL 1975: 438-51 seems the least satisfactory, with arbitrary, superficial or question-begging statements often based on misguided analyses). The first two sources mentioned are in my opinion the best discussions, the first comprehensive, the second on the LE conjunctive in narrative. The most recent contribution, DEPUYDT 1993, is an important book calling for, and deserving, critical comment: here is not the occasion for an extensive review: its main methodological faults seem to me the failure to separate database corpora (the admixture of Shenoute, Patristic Coptic, the New Testament, the Nag Hammadi Codices cannot but obscure the finer differences between their respective value systems), with the implicit assumption that Coptic = Sahidic for the purpose of „diachronic functional tracing“, and, above all, disregard for text-grammatical and textemic considerations of a form that is only meaningful in an ultra-clausal view.

2 SPIEGELBERG 1925 for Demotic, then ERMAN 1933 for Late Egyptian. Incidentally, the term derives, not from Latin *conungere* but from the traditional „conjunctivus“ as applied in European grammatical tradition primarily to the Latin/Greek (and generally Indo-European) languages (pace DEPUYDT 1993: 11f., n.12).

3 Depuydt's „conjoining“ (DEPUYDT 1993: 9ff.) is not different from in essence from the semantic components of the general „continuing“ or „carrying on“: „It is the task of the conjunctive(s) to hold these components [i.e. tense and mood of all component actions – A. Sh.-H.] together in that unit, that is, to con-join them“ says little beyond the traditional statements, and besides fails to address any pertinent syntactic feature of the form (or for that matter of the concept of „conjunction“).

4 An example from Shenoute (ed. Amélineau, II 363f.): οὐρανὸν πεντάπνοϋτε † ναὶ ν-οὐνιτ-ρηναιο ... αὐτὸν πτετῆπνοϋτε † εὐοχία ναὶ εὐοχίῃ εὐολήητος.

5 See KROEBER 1970: 164f. n.5 „tense-neutral relative“. Note that in LE as well as in Demotic (Lichtheim, *Studies ... Polotsky*, ed. Young, 1981, 463-471), and even Coptic (SHISHA-HALEVY 1983: 315f.) we find the atemporal *i.ir-* in compatibility with the conjunctive (consider Mayer A 4.10). Note also that we are dealing here, not with a verbal category – such as the „habitative“ (custom, iteration or duration) *Aktionsart*, but with a special semantic core of genericity or temporal „zero-specificity“, comparable to the same grading in noun determination.

6 SHISHA-HALEVY 1986: 190f. Incidentally, this may explain the virtual absence of *adverbial* circumstantial conversion of the only truly atemporal conjugation form in Coptic, viz. the affirmative aorist.

7 See KROEBER (1970: 165, P Mag. Leiden I 343 ro 6.4f.) *pi-nty hr piy hn' ntf h'*; O. Gardiner 30 (HO Pl. XV 3 ro).

8 SHISHA-HALEVY 1986: 203 n.57; LRL 15.10f., 66.15f. (the conjunctive here is referable, not to the relative present, but to *twi hr ndnd* (pace ČERNÝ-GROLL 1975: 443 Ex.1206); Neskhons 5,7,19).

9 Canopus 10/36 (natural-phenomena generics), SPIEGELBERG 1925: § 147; JOHNSON 1974: 291 (the conj. with „a present tense clause with gnomic meaning“), 293; again, (wn-) *pi-nty* - [present] + *conj.* is typical to didactic-gnomic and legal genres (Ins. 5/20ff., 9/17/19, 13/22, 32/23, Anksh. 8/14, Leg. Code 2/2.3/2, 3/19, 7/25; etc.). Earlier on, see several exx. in VERNUS 1990 §13.4, 13.6 (other conjunctives occur in *protasi* or follow infinitives).

10 STERN 1880: §447(a); SHISHA-HALEVY 1986: 202f.

junctive is „used only in direct speech“),¹¹ and then takes its coordinative-concatenating (M. Lichtheim's „syndetic“) syntagmatic role, together with its temporal „chameleonic“ categorial emptiness, as key factors. I believe that the simplistic combination of these two fixed viewpoints as the „functional profile“ of the form obscures rather than clarifies its true role in narrative. For while it is essentially true that „the conjunctive is not used in narrative sequences“ or „never continues a narrative form“,¹² yet „is capable of continuing constructions conveying past action“,¹³ such formulations need to be considerably refined, and must first define what precisely is meant by „narrative“. We must distinguish between *narrativity*, a *textemic* quality or feature, and „past context“, which is not textemic. The two are by no means coterminous, matching, equivalent or mutually implying. Thus, when the conjunctive is found to occur in „past cotext“,¹⁴ this hardly bears on the narrative compatibility of the form. Consider, above all, the distinction between *narrative* and *report*, which is significant in LE for the differentiation between the narrative „sequential“ *iw.f hr sdm* and the so-called perfective *sdm.f*,¹⁵ the conjunctive is compatible and widely used in the report texteme,¹⁶ which belongs in the locutive (1st-person-sphere) and present-tense subsystem of dialogue, but may well be incorporated in the narrative texteme proper. A dialogic „scenario“, in a real historical sequence which features the conjunctive, may be included in narrative or report.¹⁷ Moreover, it is a truism nowadays, and has been for more than half a century, that „narrativity“ is an extremely complex notion: narrative texture is the syntagmatics of various interwoven „narrative functions“ in signified/signifier correlation with distinct and specialized linguistic forms

¹¹ So FRANDSEN 1974: 112.

¹² JOHNSON 1974: 291, DEPUYDT 1993: 26ff. Harald Weinrich's *Tempus* (WEINRICH 1977), the theoretical authority for the „narrative world“ vs. „spoken/discussed world“ dichotomy, greatly oversimplifies either textemic category (and moreover distorts the facts in some of the languages discussed, notably Italian and English). Incidentally, Depuydt's Coptic exx. from the NHC (I 33.35ff.) and Shenoute (ed. Chassinat 195.8ff.) are irrelevant, the former conjunctive being final, the latter referable to the infinitive.

¹³ FRANDSEN 1974: 126.

¹⁴ FRANDSEN 1974: §80. Outside *report* (in which „past“ typically implies the „perfectum praesens“), 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 ⲉⲗⲁⲥ and ⲉⲗⲏⲏⲉⲥ „unless“, see SHISHA-HALEVY 1986: 202.)

¹⁵ While the texteme-regulated comparability of the LE narrative „sequential“ with the dialogic/reporting perfective *sdm.f* 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 rhematic annexation form (see below); similarly, between the zero-coordinated ⲁⲓⲓⲱⲧⲏⲩ 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 ro 2.10ff., where the conjunctive does not „continue“ the present, *pace* DEPUYDT 1993: 14ff., P. Salt 124 ro 2.1f etc.). Nearly all of Frandsen's exx. in 1974: §80 are instances of report.

¹⁷ So for instance (Dem.) P. Rylands 9 3/14f., P. Rylands 18/8 (LE) RAD 14.9ff., Wen. 1.18f. Note that a conjunctive occurring in past cotext may be final, resultative-apodictic or consecutive, so e.g. (LE) Mayer B 8f.

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 Conjunctive in LE are two passages, in the introductory part and in a later episodic 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'Orbiney conjunctives is through viewing the form as *atemporal* rather than historical, as rhematically 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 „aorist“; 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 out to lie] in the cattle shed amongst his cattle. The morning after, [he prepares cooked food], puts it before 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,¹⁸ part of the „initial (or given) situation“ narrative-

¹⁸ The conjunctive is thus opposed to the narrative *iw.f hr sdm* sequential tense as the perfect („qatal“) to the *wa- + imperfect* („wa-yiqtol“). I believe it is important to stress that, while this is indeed one spe-

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 reappearing 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 conjunctive here is thus not a „habitative“ *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 conjunctive, being rhematic, 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 proper, truly linear-evolving, eventive and temporally actualized (by past verb forms, by *wn-in* and *hr-ir-m-ht* delimitations and *iw.f 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 conjunctive adjoins the *circumstantial*, which is no more narrative-advancing.²² It delineates – yet does not *tell* – a recurring essential characterizing „story“, therein insisting on the attributes and sketching the coordinates within which the reader (or listener) will have to decode the sequencing narrative information regarding the protagonist hero in relation and

cial kind of „background“, yet it would obscure the finer features of this narrative texteme to confuse it with other kinds of background, such as the more common descriptive or parenthetical preliminary „setting“-information ones, or „author's insight“ ones, which are not necessarily expositive.

19 Cf. V.J. PROPP, *Morfologia Skazki*, Leningrad 1928; I quote G.L. Bravo's philologically revisited and precised Italian version (Torino: Einaudi, 1966): see pp. 30f., 127f., 153f. etc.

20 These passages instance Harald Weinrich's (1977) „besprochene“, „spoken“ or „discussed“ „world“, as against „erzählte Welt“, and stand in sharp contrast to the enveloping and developing „action“ conveyed by the true narrative environment. I find this interpretation agrees well with Borghouts's statements (1979: 24 and *passim*), to the effect that the conjunctive „is used to set forth a *theme*, provided by a preceding construction with which it is, rather loosely, coordinated ... [it] sets forth a theme which is developed autonomously ... it records presumed facts, (a function which) attests a non-committal attitude on the part of the speaker with regard to reality“. (Borghouts somewhat surprisedly notes „the influence of situational categories next to grammatical categories“; this, I believe, is no more and no less than the realization of the deep, true cotext and context-sensitive meaning of a text-grammatical function).

21 In H. Weinrich's terminology (1977, esp. 91ff.). Indeed, I take this as „subordination“ in narrative, in the only meaningful text-grammatical sense of the taxonomical term (see SHISHA-HALEVY 1989: 49f., on the affinity of the Demotic-Coptic *relief* conversion forms, viz. the Second Tense and the so-called „Preterite“).

22 The conjunctive does certainly not carry on or continue the circumstantial in 1.4f. (pace DEPUYDT 1993: 7).

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 morphologically distinct *unreduplicating sequencing sdm.f* forms expressing attribute-signifying acts (27ff., sim. 95ff.):

Šm.kwi r Bi'w-n-Ity, hi.kwi r Wiđ Wr m dpt nt mh 120 m iw.s, mh 40 m shw.s,
skd 120 im.s m stpw n Kmt, m i.sn pt m i.sn t i mk i ib.sn r m iw sr.sn q' n
iy.t.(f) nšny n hpr.t.f ⇒ 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 wdf.k m dd n.i in tw r iw pn, rdi.i rh.k tw iw.k m ss*.

2. The functional core: „Sequencing Rhematicity“. Superordination

The conjunctive 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 conjunctive, very like the circumstantial conversion, is *rhematic* 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 participle in predicative status. I then argued from morphology,²³ morphosyntax and syntagmatics, also from text semantics. In this sense, the accepted and somehow mechanistic coordinative reading of the conjunctive 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 conjunctive is a sequencing finite verb*,²⁴ adjoining ensuing/follow-up nexus in a semantic spectrum ranging from apodosis, „aftermath“, „upshot“ or consecution to issue and even eventuality. Much more nuanced than simple coordinative „continuation“, in the sense of a catalogue of events or temporal succession,²⁵ sequencing is a feature of the *relative progressive rhematicity* of the conjunctive (as a

23 Esp. the coincidence of the conjunctive base in Coptic with the alloforms of the *nota relationis* (n- and nte-).

24 For the term see H.J. Polotsky, *Notes on Gurage Grammar*, Jerusalem 1951, p. 41ff. (= *Collected Papers* [Jerusalem 1971] 556ff.).

25 Cf. P. Salt 124 2,14-17 (apud ERMAN 1933: 278), which is a catalogic listing (in what Erman calls „Geschäftstil“ rather than a linear eventual sequence).

higher-Communicative Dynamism form), a rhematicity always based on and presupposing the preceding textual segments, which constitute its „thematic layer“.²⁶ Thus, the conjunctive may be seen as a non-autonomous *superordinated* clause form.²⁷ 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 syntagm is *adnexal* (i.e. nexus-adjointing) and „adverbial“ (in the sense suggested in my *Coptic Grammatical Categories*),²⁸ with adverbial, ad-clausal or adnominal compatibilities. Its grammemic characteristic (or „base“), whether *hn'*, *mtw-* / *ntg-* or *N-*, 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 sequelling, 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 rhematic infinitive in the late Middle Egyptian etymon construction).

(b) The *high-level rhematicity* 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-worn syntagms as „imperative + conjunctive“ or „infinitive + conjunctive“. Being a clause or nexus pattern, the conjunctive itself comprises a theme and a rheme; by characterizing *the entire form* as rhematic I mean *macrosyntactic* rhematicity, a relative

26 See FIRBAS 1992.

27 Text-rhematic superordination is encountered in many languages, e.g. Semitic (Bibl. Hebr. *wa-* often marking an apodosis, reflected in calque translations into western languages; Arab. *fa-*) and Indo-European, old (Hittite *nu-*, Old French *si-*) and modern (the so-called „paraipotassi“ in Italian).

28 Pace JOHNSON 1974: 292 n.182, whether it be in Demotic „clause conjugation“ or not.

29 With Kroeber, I accept Gardiner's derivation of the conjunctive from *hn' ntf sdm* is fully valid, in its three phases: *hn'* + infinitive (+ *ntf*) up to the 18th Dynasty, then *hn' ntf* (extremely rarely, preminally *nty-N*) + infinitive – not „insertion“ of *ntf* in the construction, but its placement in the theme position, thus effecting the *hn' [ntf-sdm]* bracketing immediate-constituents division that is valid for the conjunctive ever thereafter (the one case of the enclitic *grt* following *hn'* before *ntf-sdm*, Gardiner's No. 36, I take as a prosodically significant symptom of both this IC division and the *adverbiality* of *hn'*, immediately comparable to Bohairic Coptic *ntf* – pace KROEBER 1970: 160 „ein wenig monströs“); then a fully categorized „clause conjugation“ form: cf. KROEBER 1970: 152ff., BORGHOUTS 1979: 15 n.9. The rare instances of *hr-sdm* and stative following *hn' ntf* (*loc. cit.* 145 n.7) are certainly no objection from the bracketed-nexus point of view. Note in this context that *hn' ntf sdm* is almost exclusively *allocutive* and *affirmative*, the latter confirming in fact the analysis as a *clause-adverbial + nexus*.

30 See G. Goldenberg, *The Tense-System of Amharic*, Jerusalem 1966: 42ff. with references, esp. to Armbruster, *Initia Amharica* (Cambridge 1908-1920), 185.

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 rhematicity, for, in the protasis-apodosis complex, both constituents are nexally interconnected (and interdependent) as high-level topic-theme and rheme. Though well-established as a role of the conjunctive (well attested in Late Egyptian,³¹ Demotic³² and some varieties of Coptic,³³ the significance 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 cotext, and indeed is a useful and instructive paraphrase form for ultra-clausal rhematicity in general:

(LE) P. Mayer B 8f.: *hdb(i) pī-ms (- hr) ... mtw.f tm-dī.n r-bl*

(Dem.) Ankhsh. 19/15: *m-ir hn hīty iw.k mr mtw.k tbhpī-mwt*

(Copt.) Shenoute Paris 130⁵ 83 ρα: ἀνοῦ νῦορπ εβολ ζννεκακαθαρσία
τοτε νῆσοοc σε „παρωτηρ“³⁶

Boh. Jonas 1:6: ἀρροῦ ἵτεφτ νὰρην οὐοζ ἵτενῶτεντακο

ibid. 1:7: ἀμῶνι ἵτενῶι ἡζανκαρροc οὐοζ ἵτενῆμι ...: in Boh. it is of-
ten οὐοζ that explicates the apodoticity of the conjunctive.

31 Cf. exx. in FRANDSEN 1974: 148ff; BORGHOUTS 1979: 23; see O. Nash 1 (HO Pl. XLVI 2 ro).

32 Cf. Botti, *Deir El-Medineh*, 6103 20 ro 6f. (contractual obligation clause); Nur el Din, *Ostr.* 280, 281, 284, 286 etc. (apodotic to „if he take the oath ...“); Kaplony-Heckel, *Tempeleide* 1/7, sim. 4/7a-b, 5/11f. etc. See SPIEGELBERG 1925: §152-3.

33 Nitrian Bohairic (De Vis, *Homélies* II 168; post-classical Sahidic (Leipoldt, *Opera Sinuthii* IV 130.17ff. („Vita Monachorum“ 76, not by Shenoute), translatable as jussive, yet in fact also apodotic-rhematic (see below.). See STERN 1880 §446; Crum & White, *Monastery of Epiphanius* I 250f., II 373

34 It is certainly not „of extreme rarity“ (FRANDSEN 1974: 152). LICHTHEIM 1964: 3 doubts the apodotic role altogether.

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

36 Cf. Sauneron apud DEPUYDT 1993: 71ff. (Amenemope 20.8f.: *m-ir 'k r k nbt m-bih sr mtw.k s'g'i mdw.k*, rendered „Do not enter ... and then falsify ...“, but, more cogently, „if you enter ... do not falsify“). But then, even a seemingly bona-fide „coordinative“ case like Shenoute *ed.* Leipoldt IV 39.54ff. *ἡπρτοῦα σωτῆρ ερὸκ σε ... ἡσῆεσε σε ...* should rather be translated „if one hears you saying ... let them not think ...“, with the „effect of the conjunctive“ hardly „minimal“ (so DEPUYDT 1993: 70). Consider also the following Shenoutean *locus* (P. Mich. 158, 19a, *ib.*, *ed.* Young) ... *ἐπλοκίμαζε ἡμοῦ σε-αὐτῶν ἡς ἡετσοπ* (i.e. the better dishes) *αὐτῶν ἡετσαν ἡτῶνοῦοῦ, ἡετσοῦ δὲ εἴρ-αναν ἂν ἡτῆκαλῶ ἐπαροῦ ...* or the conjunctives expressing the „promise to pay or perform“ – *the ultimate rheme of the document* – in the various eventualities, in the Demotic contracts edited by Pierce: ... *mtw.i mh.k, ... mtw.i ir.w, ... mtw.n dyt st n.k, ... mtw.k tly.tw* ... (P. Brooklyn 37.1796 E 16f., 26, 37.1803 E 12f., P. Adler 10, Ryl 8.7f., Cairo 30780 6ff., 30781 5ff.); see Pierce, *The Demotic Papyri* ..., Chs. IX-X („the Paragraph of Credibility“, „The Paragraph of Mulct“). Clearly, this is also the case of D'Orbiney 8.5f.: „When you find (the heart), you shall lay it in a bowl of cold water ...“ – a „jussive apodosis“ case, see below; or, with the protasis-apodosis/theme-rheme sequence even more flattened (8.4f.) „... my cutting out my heart and laying it on top of the blossom of the cedar“. Similarly, Wen. 1.x+8ff. I believe Borghouts's inspired essay (1979) comes closest of all to the present statement: „the element *mtw* is an overt marker for a followup“ (15). And yet he too evidently relates the conjunctive to a „starting point“ (15f.), and thus weakens his argument to a degree, almost reinstating the „continuance“ fog.

This is, in fact, nothing but a condensed restatement of the *retrospective eventuality* value of the form:³⁷ the apodosis is the macrosyntactic rheme of the protasis, and indeed, at least in the case under study, may mark it as protatic; the apodosis is dependent upon the protasis in a retrospective kind of relationship.

(2) Consider in this light the negative conjunctive following in LE rhetorical or generally indignant-affective questions ([i]h),³⁸ which is rhematic, expressing the ultimate point queried or protested.

(3) Cases of sequelling „rhematic aftermath“, not „continuing“ any single preceding clause-form but referable to the whole preceding text, abound in LE, Demotic and Coptic.³⁹

3. Adnominal-Rhematic „Consecutive Relative“ Status

Beside the adverbial, or rather ad-clausal rhematic modifier slot, the adnominal paradigm is a striking environment where the conjunctive „concurr“ with (i.e. is opposed to) the circumstantial: this paradigm features several other forms, each with its own specific function.⁴⁰

(a) I believe this slot, usually overlooked in discussions of the form, is especially instructive: for here, by virtue of a neat paradigm, we are given a clear glimpse into both generic and consecutive semantic components.⁴¹ Observe that in pre-Coptic Egyptian the nominal nuclei are typically generic or indefinite-cataphoric, unmistakably pointing to the „predicative“, i.e. rhematic value of the expanding clause; In Coptic we find grammaticalized time/place substantives, contracting a „conjunctive“ zero-resumption relationship with the verb form, or else prospective-resultative cases:

(LE) Anast.I 17.3: „You torch in the darkness before the army *mtw.f shd n.sn*“, unnecessarily interpreted as elliptical by Erman (1933: 280)

(Dem.)⁴² P. Berlin 3115 col.3 13f.: *p3-rmt nb mtw.f sm p3-bl n3y-hnw, iw.f dyt...*

Ros. 22f.: *w'-twtw mtw.w dd n.f...*

37 I find it of interest that in the Coptic *Pap. Medical* (ed. Chassinat) the „guaranteed result“ clause is expressed by *ⲡⲁⲕⲁ* („ⲡⲁⲩⲁⲗⲟ“, „ⲡⲉⲩⲡⲱⲧ“ etc.) or the *ⲡⲁ*-future („ⲡⲁⲗⲁⲟ“, „ⲡⲉⲡⲁⲣⲱⲧ“; in the ME medical papyri, the resultative stative (?), prospective *sdm.f* and *hr.f sdm.f* 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, 58.15f. (pace Černý-Groll 1975: 448f.)

40 SHISHA-HALEVY 1986: 190 n.31. The circumstantial converted clause-form is adnominal-adnexal to specific as well as non-specific nominal nuclei; following non-specific nominals, the circumstantial is practically the only adnominal expansion-form, neutralizing the opposition of attributive and adnexal.

41 Cf. the so-called „consecutive“, eventual, generic relative in Latin, marked by the conjunctive mood („feminarum nullast qui aeque diligam“, Plautus Am. 509; see Ernout-Thomas, *Syntaxe latine*², 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 *tm*).

Setne 4/18: *ti-wnwt mtw-Pr 3 šnt.i...* (an alternative interpretation: the conjunctive sequelling the protasis – so Griffith).

Ins. 27/10: *wpt nbt mtw.k tm sy m-im.w*.

(Copt.) Epiphanius ed. Crum 244: *ⲧⲏⲛⲟⲩⲩ ⲡⲉⲕⲟⲩⲭⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲏⲁⲛⲟⲩⲩ ⲛⲁⲓⲉⲓⲥ ⲛⲏ-ⲧⲉⲕⲉⲣⲱ ⲛⲉⲭⲱ ⲓⲁⲩⲱⲓ ⲛⲏⲡⲁⲛⲓ ⲧⲏⲣⲓ* – Crum's rendering: „that it rest ...“; cf. the Anastasi I LE example above.

Job 10:21: ... *ⲡⲏⲁ ⲛⲧⲁⲧⲏ ⲙⲟⲧⲧ* (δδεν οὐκ' ἀναστρέψω – note the future tense of the original)

Leipoldt *Sin. Vita* 12.22: ... *ⲡⲁ-ⲣⲟⲩⲧⲓ ⲛⲧⲉⲩⲡⲏ ⲓⲱⲧⲡⲓ*

(b) A special member of the adnominal paradigm, one that is especially close to the conjunctive, is the „that“-form *xe-* as a generic-rhematic („such ... as ...“) adnominal negative clause-form (adnominal to a zero-determined noun, which is as a rule an exis- tant of *mn-* („there isn't ...“) or in a rhetorical paraphrase of non-existence: see footnote 40):

(Bohairic) Mt. 10:26: *ⲛⲏⲟⲛ ⲡⲉⲧⲣⲟⲩⲥ ⲓⲁⲣ ⲭⲉ-ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲩⲱⲣⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲁⲛ* (sim. Luc. 8:17)

(Shenoutean Sah.) BM Cat. (Crum) No.196 p.81: *ⲛⲏ-ⲉⲩⲱⲃ ⲭⲉ-ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲩⲏⲕ ⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲧⲏⲟⲩ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ*

Amélineau, *Oeuvres* ... II 234.8f: *ⲟⲩ ⲓⲁⲣ ⲡⲉⲧⲉⲟⲩⲛⲧⲁⲛⲓ ⲛ ⲡⲉⲧⲱⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲁⲛ ⲭⲉ-ⲛⲟⲩⲩ ⲁⲛ ⲛⲉ*

4. Autonomy and Initiality. Protatic conjunctive? The „Oath Protasis“

The autonomy of cases of *hn'* + infinitive, and later the conjunctive, which seem initial and/or independent of preceding forms, has rightly been questioned.⁴³ 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

43 KROEBER 1970:156ff.

44 FRANDSEN 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 *nfr snb.k*) are none of them unambiguous, conclusive instances of initiality. Moreover, *m-mitt* introducing the conjunctive is not a mark of initiality (pace Lichtheim and Frandsen pp.147-8): on the contrary, it indicates connectedness, like *m-r3 pw* (cf. Anast. VIII 3.5) and *hr* before the conjunctive, comparably to the adverbials *ⲁⲩⲱ*, (*ⲁⲉ*) *ⲟⲛ* and the like before the Coptic conjunctive (SHISHA-HALEVY 1986: 189). For Demotic, cf. JOHNSON 1974: 292f.: Mag. 13/24f. is clearly a jussive apodosis; other instances of the conjunctive immediately following the spell caption have the conjunctive sequelling an infinitive in the caption, and in Mag.5/3 (EX 532a), the conjunctive may well be a sequelling „that“ form (see below) in a „Wechselsatz“ Nominal Sentence nexus with the caption noun. The case of LRL 14.14f., the conjunctive following *i.n.k* „you said:“ is different: it is a quoted epistolary item, with its original environment unknown.

45 Cf. ČERNÝ-GROLL 1975: 438: the statement (on *r-dd* + conjunctive) „*r dd* belongs, not to the conjunctive, but to a missing sentence pattern“ is arbitrary and question-begging. Similarly, „Since *mtw.i*

translation into a modern language.⁵³ There is indeed no contradiction between sequencing „coordination“ observed of a given element in a given environment in Egyptian and „final“ or „consecutive“ semantic resolution in the observer's language. Functional „variants“ may be comparatively and contrastively significant (*ibid.* 141f. + n.2), but must still be kept apart from the internal analysis of functional relationships – the *système des valeurs* (as Roman Jakobson once remarked, the crosslinguistic interface problem arises when one language *must* express a structural feature that is absent or non-pertinent in another.) Thus, the „final-consecutive“ seme(s) in the „sequencing“ overhead range emerge, to a western linguistic sensibility⁵⁴ in given co(n)textual environments; yet this hardly means that there is a systemic modal signifier/signified connection, or an internally valid modal semantic range, or a paradigmatically established modal role of the conjunctive, and certainly not that we may simply claim for our form „not only a continuative function but also, occasionally, a consecutive one“.⁵⁵ The „sequel“ value may (in a resolution motivated by a contrasting external linguistic structure and sensitivity) be paraphrased as „... (and) the [next/final event/consequence/effect] [is/will be/has been] that (... not ...)“.⁵⁶ The „continuing“ coordination reading is a very common, forus „flattened“ instance of sequencing.

(b) Consecutive⁵⁷ vs. final semantics. This distinction is as fuzzy and evidently not pertinent (or at least not formally based) for Egyptian,⁵⁸ as in other (e.g. modern and ancient Indo-European) languages, unless it be by different conjunctive lexemics.

(c) A sequencing prospective „that“-form. This is a role (strikingly comparable to that of later Greek ἵνα, Modern Greek νά) that is almost universally ignored in discussions of the conjunctives,⁵⁹ yet is clearly attested in post-classical Sahidic and in other dialects of Coptic (indeed, the extended use of the conjunctive in this role constitutes one of the striking idiosyncrasies of Bohairic as against Sahidic.) Diachronically, we may have here no less than the survival of two very old morphosyntactical entities – and at least one functional category – of Egyptian, the exact interrelationship of which is still obscure; namely the old prospective „that“-*sdm.w.f*-form isolated by Edel⁶⁰ and the long-surviving so-called prospective *sdm.f* itself, which shows „that“-form characteristics in almost

53 Frandsen too begins his own discussion of this issue (1974: 143ff.) with a similar observation, yet makes his subsequent statements (attempting to separate consecutive and final 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 FRANDSEN 1974:146.

56 Cf. (LE, Tomb Robberies) BM 10052 6.18ff., Mayer A 6.10f., Mayer B 8f., (Dem.) Setne 3/15, Myth 18/4; often in the didactic genre (e.g. Ins. 2/7, 3/14, 7/13); cf. SPIEGELBERG 1925: §§149, 519.

57 Cf. Borghouts's „consecutivization“ as the distinctive feature of the conjunctive in narrative (1979: 24); elsewhere (22), he characterizes the conjunctive as „inferential“, which comes close to our „rhetic“.

58 To judge e.g. by Coptic, which uses numerous constructions – in later sahidic 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 „conjunctive“ means (Cf. FRANDSEN 1974:143ff.)

59 A role which would well agree with Mattha's etymology of the conjunctive as „(hn') ntt iw.f hr sdm“. (BIFAO 45: 43-55 [1947]); however, this thesis seems unacceptable (KROEBER 1970: 146f.)

60 Cf. POLOTSKY 1969: 468ff; NICCACCIO 1980: 210.

all of its roles and constructions (e.g. as object of *rdi*, governed by prepositions, negated by *tm* and by *nn*).

We isolate this syntactic status of the conjunctive in the following cases:⁶¹ (1) as content-object to a special inventory of verbs: *wnw*, *oww*, *parakallei*, etc.;⁶² (2) as a post-conjunctive and post-adverbial „coupling“ clause form: *arhy* + conj., *zwtet*/*nnptet* + conj., *xe* + conj. (following e.g. the rhetorical *anok-nih anok* in Late Sahidic and Bohairic),⁶³ *ewwne nccoon*... (Epiphanius *ed.* Crum 387), disjunctive in *kan ngei kan nrtthnooy* (Epiphanius *ed.* Crum 338); (3) as an appositive theme in a delocutive Nominal Sentence: *palakion/oualakion ne* + conj., *oykoyi ne* + conjunctive;⁶⁴ (4) *oyn-bon* + conjunctive, ubiquitous in Bohairic but attested also in post-classical Sahidic; *newak*, *zamo* + conj.; also generally as postposed theme to a „neutric“ cataphoric pronoun in the present (Boh. *cmoten*, *cmor2*, *cwe* etc. etc.);⁶⁵ (5) in a final-consecutive role (again, typical of Bohairic).⁶⁶ The prospective „that“ status of the conjunctive is attested earlier, already in Demotic, as object of *tbh*, *'s-shn*;⁶⁷ perhaps also following the conjunction *dd*,⁶⁸ and in a „Nominal Sentence“ nexus.⁶⁹

(d) *tapetcwth* – like the conjunctive, essentially a modifier⁷⁰ – is in post-classical Sahidic, Theban and Nitrian Bohairic Coptic another striking sequencing or consecutive „that“-form, truly concurring with the conjunctive, with which its associations are more than merely morphological and the fact that both (like many other Clause Conjugation and converted verb forms) are retrodependent.⁷¹ It too typically occurs as object of such verbs as *tw82*, *aitet* (Rylands *ed.* Crum 159, 196, 332, 409, Apophth. *ed.* Chaîne 148, 176, Acta Mart. *ed.* Hyvernat II 49); in an absolute opening of a letter (*tapetkine* ...

61 SHISHA-HALEVY 1986: 207ff.

62 See DEPUYDT 1993: 23 n.28 (Barns, *Four Martyrdoms*, 26) – not focussed by the Second Tense, which is here autofocal, but focussing *wnw* in a rhetorical question; also Epiphanius *ed.* Crum 85, 93, 386-7 etc.

63 Cf. De Vis, *Homélies* I 13, 33, 35, 70, 117; it sometimes commutes with *wt+*; for final/ consecutive *xe*-/*xexac* with the conjunctive, see STERN 1880: §§ 448, 511; SHISHA-HALEVY 1986: 207.

64 Epiphanius *ed.* Crum 174, Ryl.339, Till Ostr.152; SHISHA-HALEVY 1986: 207f., 210f.

65 See STERN 1880: §442; A. Levy, *Syntax d'Apophthegmata patrum*, Berlin 1909, §194. In fact, the conjunctive in an instance such as (Shenoute *ed.* Chassinat 93.22ff.) *cmawne nrtthnecstw* must also be considered apodotic.

66 E.g. De Vis, *Homélies* II 171, 276; STERN 1880 §611f.

67 Exx. for *tbh* from Mag. and BM 10591 in JOHNSON 1974: 293f., who considers them instances of the „independent conjunctive“ (cf. Coptic *tw82* + *tapetq*, see below); P.Ox. Griffith T4 ro (*ed.* Bresciani).

68 Perhaps in Mythus 7/10 (*dd* + conj. final construction?); in 9/6 *mrw.k* – is the Sec. Perfect.; cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 1986: 207 n.66.

69 Mag.5/3 (JOHNSON 1974: 292f. E532a)

70 SHISHA-HALEVY 1986: 195 + n.46. Classical or „orthodox“ *tapetq*, studied by Polotsky in 1944 as the first of his two „Etudes de syntaxe copte“, is apodotic – again, macrosyntactically *rhetic* – in its „imperative + *tapetq*“ complex. It is not a „promissory future“ (*pace* DEPUYDT 1993: 75ff.), though conveniently (if very roughly and exaggeratingly) 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 *rheticity*. It is not a future tense: like the conjunctive, it is atemporal.

71 *Pace* DEPUYDT 1993: 80ff., 87. For some instructive exx. of *tapetq* – neatly opposed to the sequencing conjunctive, see Acta Mart. (*ed.* Hyvernat) I 182, II 36, 113.

Epiphanius *ed. Crum* 314⁷²), merging „that“-contents, final goal and purpose (*ibid.* 162 ro 4) or clear purpose (*ibid.* 162 vo 26, 168,9; even in Shenoute, ViK 930 *ed. Young*, p.39.⁷³)

Bibliographical References

- BORGHOUTS 1979: Borghouts, J.F., „A New Approach to the Late Egyptian Conjunctive“, *ÄZ* 106: 14-24
- ČERNÝ-GROLL 1975: Černý, J. and Groll, S.I., *A Late Egyptian Grammar* Rome: Biblical Institute Press
- DEPUYDT 1993: Depuydt, L., *Conjunction, Contiguity, Contingency: On Relationship between Events in the Egyptian and Coptic Verbal Systems*, New York: Oxford University Press
- ERMAN 1933: Erman, A. *Neuägyptische Grammatik*, Leipzig
- FIRBAS 1992: Firbas, J., *Functional Sentence Perspective in Written and Spoken Language*, Cambridge, 1992
- FRANDSEN 1974: Frandsen, P.J., *An Outline of the Late Egyptian Verbal System*, Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag
- JOHNSON 1974: Johnson, Janet H., *The Demotic Verbal System*, Chicago: The Oriental Institute
- KROEBER 1970: Kroeber, B., *Die Neuägyptizismen vor der Amarnazeit*, Bamberg
- LICHTHEIM 1964: Lichtheim, M., „Notes on the Late-Egyptian Conjunctive“ in: *Studies in Egyptology and Linguistics in Honour of H.J. Polotsky*, Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society, 1964, 1-8
- NICCACCI 1980: Niccacci, A., „Su una formula dei 'Testi dei Sarcofagi'“, *Liber Anuus* 30: 197-224.
- POLOTSKY 1969: Polotsky, H.J., „Zur altägyptischen Grammatik“, *Or.* 38: 465-481
- SHISHA-HALEVY 1983: Shisha-Halevy, A., „Middle Egyptian Gleanings: Grammatical Notes on the 'Middle Egyptian' Text of Matthew“, *Chronique d'Égypte* 58: 311-329
- 1986 *Coptic Grammatical Categories: Structural Studies in the Syntax of Shenoutean Sahidic*, Rome: The Pontifical Institute
- 1989 „Work-Notes on Demotic Syntax, I“ *Or.* 58: 28-60
- VERNUS 1990: Vernus, P., „Entre néo-égyptien et démotique: la langue utilisée dans la traduction du rituel de reposer l'Agressif“ (= Etude sur la diglossie, I)“, *Revue d'Égyptologie* 41: 153-208
- WEINRICH 1977: Weinrich, H., *Tempus. Besprochene und erzählte Welt* 3, Stuttgart-Berlin-Köln-Mainz: Kohlhammer
- WENTE 1962: Wente, E.F., „The Late Egyptian Conjunctive as a Past Continuative“, *JNES* 21: 304-311

⁷² Cf. the LE list/letter opening *r rdit rh.tw* etc., O. Gardiner 59, 126, O. Colin Campbell 1 etc.

⁷³ It is final *ⲧⲁⲣⲉⲩ* in narrative (Apophth *ed. Chainé* 240, Drescher *Coptic Legends* 24, 41) which marks the true categorial metamorphosis of this form, which in classical Sahidic is exclusively dialogic, allocutive + allocutive rhematic apodosis or sequel to an imperative or rhetorical-deliberative question. Another idiosyncrasy of the post-classical *ⲧⲁⲣⲉⲩ* is the existence of the 1st sgl. *ⲧⲁⲣⲉⲩ*, symptomizing the inoperativity of the locutive component of the form.

Sonderdruck aus

DIVITIAE AEGYPTI

Koptologische und verwandte Studien
zu Ehren von
Martin Krause

herausgegeben von
Cäcilia Fluck · Lucia Langener · Siegfried Richter
Sofia Schaten · Gregor Wurst

DR. LUDWIG REICHERT VERLAG
WIESBADEN 1995