A Note on Converbs in Egyptian and Coptic

Ariel Shisha-Halevy, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem

(1) *The term and its diffusion.* The converb, in its vaguest and least critical, also least specific resolution - cf. the notorious conceptual muddle involving *-ing* forms and constructions in English - is used as meaning "adverbial verb form", or "verbal adverb"; see the subtitle of Haspelmath and König (eds.) 1995.; mostly and for long it has been known as "gerund"[1]. Definitions reveal the underlying blurredness: Haspelmath (1995:3ff.): "Non-finite verb-form whole main function is to mark adverbial subordination"[2]; Nedjalkov's (in Nedialkov 1995) is more sophisticated: "a verb-form which depends syntactically on another verb-form but is not its syntactic actant, that is does not realize its semantic valences": this is surely unsatisfactory, for the converb is arguably actantial in cases like "start walking". Probably the worst is the definition in Himmelmann and Schultze-Berndt (eds.), 2005:60 "we use the term converb for 'participles' which are used primarily as adjuncts". As Grønbech 1979:35 says of Turkic postpositions and gerundial forms, the converbs are "fluid and hard to hold on to", which, for a "cross-linguistically valid category" (the title of Haspelmath and König (eds.) 1995, in which see Haspelmath's and König's own contributions), is not an ideal condition.

And indeed, one detects symptoms of terminological or descriptive insecurity or malaise in

---

[1] Historically a misnomer, for some reason especially widespread in English writing, more or less corresponding to the French "gérondif" (English "gerundive" must be a gallicism). See Goldenberg 1977:489-499, 2002:28-30. Lewis 1967:174 explains his preference of "gerund" over "converb" by the "merit of brevity"; see his Chapter XI on "deverbal adverbs".

[2] "Embedded/incorporated to the superordinate clause" (HASPELMATH 1995:8) is no less question-begging.

the distinction between "canonical" and "non-canonical" converbs; or between "general" and "adverbial" converbs (Haspelmath (ed.) 2004:232ff.), or "contextual" as against "specialized" Converbs; symptomatic are also quotes, or the use of prefixes such as "pseudo-" or "old-" or "half-" ("Old Perfective", "Parfait ancien", "Pseudopartizip", all for the Egyptian Stative, probably the most striking converb throughout the history of Egyptian; "half-gerunds", or "half-participles" in Baltic grammatical terminology), along with certain red herrings which I find no less than pseudo-queries, e.g. of the polysemy *vs.* vagueness of converbs.[3] The issue of English *ing-forms* - gerund, "adverbial" and non-adverbial participle, verbal noun and infinitive is a fine illustration of this simplistic superimposing of a "prefabricated" primitive, essentially morphological model on a complicated reality of syntactic dynamicity and sophistication.[4]

A term coined, so far as I know, without definition, by the Finnish Altaicist G. Ramstedt as "Converbum" or "Converbium", in his 1902 monographic description of Khalkha, the most famous of Mongolian dialects[5], is the basis of today's standard Mongolian; the term is still widely used in Altaic and Turkic linguistics, where the rich morphological and functional variety of Converbs is truly staggering;[6] it is considered by its users to be apt, referring to a notion "not existing in Indo-European". Following Ramstedt, the term was used by Poppe 1951-2, A. von Gabain, Menges (converbs and participles constitute the "nomina verbalia temporum", used alongside "Gerundium" and "gerundial forms", also "Verbal Adverbs"[7]; also Aalto 1987:186). In German writing, a by-form is Konverb plural Konverba or Konverbia. In 1951, the term was applied by Hans-Jakob Polotsky to Ethiopian languages, notably Gurage and Amharic[8], as a *syntactical category*, "Converb" specialized and co-existing with, and contrasted to, the morphological "gerund"[9]. In 1995, the converb was celebrated as a typologically important "Cross-Linguistically Valid Category" by Martin Haspelmath and Ekkehard König, editing an anthology of studies that point to the importance of converbal forms in Finnish, Slavonic, Japanese,

---

[3] König 1995: 59ff.

[4] Cf. Kortmann in Haspelmath and König (eds.) 1995.

[5] Ramstedt 1902: 55 "Da sie (i.e. the converbs) aber im Khalkhassischen eine wichtige Rolle spielen, habe ich die nichtssagenden und in viel engerer Bedeutung angewandten Namen *Supinum* und *Gerundium* durch die hoffentlich deutlichere, geeignetere Benennung "Converbum" ersetzt." See also pp. 44ff. 61ff. 104ff. etc. Ramstedt, always historically and morphologically associating the Mongolian Converbs with verbal nouns, still uses here "Gerundium" (e.g. 76f.), in spite of his explicit rejection of this term as "meaningless". In the poshumous Russian version of Ramstedt's Introduction to Altai Linguistics (Moscow 1957), the term used is "gerundivno-pričastnaya forma" (e.g. 111): *deepričastiya* is, of course, the Russian correspondent of "gerund".

[6] Among Ramstedt's converbs, enumerated and described in 1902, we find the C. Conditionale; C. Perfecti/Imperfecti; Converba Modalia - C. Terminale, C. Finale; C. Succesivum, C. Contemporale, C. Abtemporale, C. Momentanei and more.

[7] Gerundium is used also e.g. by Menges in the *Handbuch d. Orientalistik* 1963, Rahmati 1928, Grønbech 1979.

[8] Polotsky 1951:41f., Goldenbech 1977:489-494. See, however, Myhill and Hibiya 1988:355ff., on the converb as a narrative form in the Gurage language Soddo.

[9] Polotsky 1951:45; Goldenberg 1977:491.

Asian and European languages of different genetic affiliations, For some reason, Ethiopian is not represented beyond a single footnote;[10] neither is Celtic in Europe, or Egyptian in Africa. However, it seems the converb is ubiquitous – converb-less languages seem to be the exception, not the rule, and may be of interest on that account.

(2) *Formal and functional perspectives on the converb. Problematik. Methodological and Theoretical Prolegomena.*

Following a cluster of terminological-conceptual theoretical reflections, I wish to no more than hint here at a systematic consideration of Egyptian-Coptic adverbial-slot and adverbial-commutation features, on this occasion merely isolating them and appreciating their inventory, prior to evaluating their systemic standing and their structural profile. The benefits of terminological-conceptual deliberation, whether comparative-contrastive or internal-typological, are obvious. There is, I believe, an exercise no more salubrious than judging the degree of comparability of linguistic phenomena, putting in sharper focus and forcing us to contemplate critically notions we take for granted and use automatically, almost thoughtlessly, and one that provides some unexpected insights, from the basic question: "is this X"? In fact, I mean to investigate here the descriptive usefulness and aptness of an "hyper-category", which would comprehend several so far disjoined features of Egyptian.

(a) First, one must contemplate the descriptive meaning of "adverbiality", and refine one's conception of this most difficult, and perhaps most dubious of word-classes. Where and what is the adverb? Can the "adjunctal" role represent this category at all? And is this quality, thus conceived, of any importance for understanding the Converb, when we consider such an overruling parameter as *syntactical slotting*? Adverbiality, if we are to stay rigorously analytical ("word-class" distinct, in distinct commutation, in distinct syntagmatic slotting), may be too fragmented to be useful as an overall umbrella:

adnominal[11]
adlexemic (valential or non-valential)
ad-(verbal)-nexus
ad-clausal
rhematic ("predicative")
rhematic ("predicative") complement
focal
interclausal

---

[10] P. 342 n.52: "Thus, Amharic, which is not genetically related to Turkic, and has had no close contacts with it, exhibits a very similar constituent order and corresponding patterns of converb subordination".
[11] Especially instructive, for often (e.g. in Egyptian-Coptic) opposed as *adnexal* to the *attributive* relative.

topicalized-presetting

and more.

Moreover, there exist (in Egyptian as in other languages) formal statuses in which adverbiality cannot recognized and resolved as such, and not merely superficially; for instance, differentiated from nominality (e.g. in topic or rheme status). The immediate or conventional adjunctal association of adverbiality (Nedialkov 1995:98: "an adverbial in a simple sentence") does not connect *ohne weiteres* with the other two alleged converbal roles (*ibid.*) , namely "secondary or coordinate predicate" and "predicate of a subordinate clause".

(b) Questions regarding the converb's formal characteristics (I):

• Is the converb essentially and typically a non-finite (adnexal: see below) and/or a finite (nexal/adnexal) verb form? Is this essentially morphological distinction at all important (especially since the infinitive, and indeed the converb, may be finitized by numerous constructional devices)? Moreover, the infinitive or participle constituents of a Nominal-Sentence-type nexal pattern, are "finite" in construction and interdependence with their theme (or subject). In fact, the typology of actor-expression characterization of converbs as compared with infinitives in very instructive.[12]

• An essentially junctural set of parameters concerns the converb as a unit, continuous or discontinuous. Analyticity and syntheticity are observable as diachronic and synchronic qualities of converbal forms. A curiosity in this context is the question of *unity*, which is largely psychological, namely a bias against viewing the [prefixed preposition+noun] syntagm - so in Egyptian, Celtic - as a single converbal unity, although clearly a grammaticalized "morphologized" pattern; apparently, there's no such difficulty with case endings and postpositions. Another formal question is one of *external* juncture: Converbs, especially non-finite ones, are often "induceable" for verb categories such as tense, person or negation. The scale and scope of such induction are a significant factor of linkage and delimitation.

(c) Formal characteristics (II):

• The initiality or finality of converb / non-converbal verb forms: this is a pertinent and sometimes crucial issue in Ethiopian and Egyptian; elsewhere, this formal "syntaxic" opposition correlates with a functional one.

• Juncture: the nature and grading of linkage of the converb with, or its delimitation from,

---

[12] Cf., for Modern Welsh and Modern Irish, Shisha-Halevy 1998:56f. (ans 264, s.v. "*i-* cum infinitivo"); *o-* finitizes narrative infinitives in Welsh, especially Middle Welsh; *do-* narrative converbs in Irish.

its verbal environment. This (very complex) junctural profile may have important functional implications.

• "Ordination" – a question recurring in general and specific accounts of Altai and Turkic converbs: What is the "main" and what "subordinate" verb, or action , or predication, in cases like "he fell slipping", and especially "he started crying", "he goes on crying" – descriptive or auxiliary or modal verbs, very typical of Altai and Turkic languages but prevalent elsewhere. The semantic query may perhaps be dismissed as subjective and non-illuminating, and it often certainly appears to be trivial, leading to such problematic distinctions such as "logical" as against "grammatical" main-ness. Ramstedt himself, trying to make sense of the elusive "Haupthandlung" and "Nebenhandlung" (not *Hauptsatz* and *Nebensatz*) hierarchy, has recourse to the not really helpful "psychologisches (as against "grammatical" or "syntactical") Hauptwort", for the converb itself. But the difficult question of the nuclear *vs.* satellital status in cases of nexal combination, and the formal nature of their association, must still be satisfied, as well as the junctural issue of linkage between them. In cases like Turkish *a*-CONVERB *gelmek* "do… often", or *a*-CONVERB *yazmak* "almost do…", or *i*-CONVERB *vermek* "do…very quicky", the final verb, non-converbal, supplies *Aktionsart* characterization of the converb-expressed action, and is, by token of its drastically smaller commutability (smaller still in cases of copular "be" or "exist" or "become") definable as grammemic, auxiliary and nuclear, with the cohesion or linkage between the two nexuses closer than in cases of two more fully lexemic constituents.

• Negation modality of finite and non-finite converbs. In some phases or dialects of Egyptian-Coptic, there are special forms of negation of adverbials in various statuses, and converbs are by this token revealed as constituental or of an adverbial word-class.

(d) Formal characteristics (III):

• Grammaticalization/fusion and analyzability of syntagms are correlated scalar properties, both a matter of gradience, and a interface function of diachrony/synchrony[13] - the later occurring, the more sharply analyzable the syntagm. Moreover, as noted above, cases of

---

[13] Grammaticalization is a diachronic as well as synchronic-paradigmatic-junctural phenomenon (see SHISHA-HALEVY 2003a, 2004, 2007 Index, s.v.).

preposition governing infinitives, preeminent candidates for converb-hood are, I suggest, not, or only in part, analyzable as prepositional phrases but grammaticalized as converbs.

• Syntactic versatility and environmental sensitivity of the converb: privilege of occurrence as adjunctal expansion ("She turned to me dancing"), adnominal expansion ("the girl dancing was too lovely for words"), adnexal expansion ("I found her dancing"), rheme ("She was dancing when I first saw her"), focalizability ("It was dancing that I first saw her"), topic-preset ("dancing, the girl looked at me"), and others, e.g. exclamative status (important in Egyptian): "Dancing!")

(e) The converb's structural identity: commutation, compatibilities; relationships synchronic or diachronic, and affinities with verbal nouns (notably infinitives), not merely morphologically (the Altai converbs are synchronic or diachronic case-forms of verbal nouns) , but systemically, in the sense of the implicative significance of their respective "Leistung" and their mutual trade-off, homonymy (where applicable) and/or complementary distribution.[14]

(f) Syntagmatic relationship of converbs. Once again, we face the theoretical conundrum of the epistemology and phenomenology of "ordination", or "inordination" (Hamp 1973), cf. German *Einordnung*: the macrosyntactic pattern and syntactic relationship of *one predicative nexus adjoining another*, that is neither subordination, nor coordination: attributive and/or adnexal expansion of one nexus by another[15]. "Subordination", a basic component of prevailing converb description, is, I believe, a faulted and dubious concept in syntactic analysis, and at the very least is question-begging, not merely in esoteric languages (including Egyptian or Celtic).

 (g) Textemic significance: narrative concatenation by Converb sequencing, often discussed in Haspelmath and König (eds.) 1995.

(h) Categorization of converbs, especially in linkage to/delimitation from their verbal environment. Most prominent are tensing and negation,[16] which may be environmentally induced in the converb (as link) or (re)asserted (as delimitation).

(i) Function (I): "Adverbiality" yet again: what does this actually mean, in an analytical view of language that rejects the Part-of-Speech model as aprioristic and logic-based. As a structurally conceived word-class, the adverb is not a category at all, but a synthetic and synthesizing cluster of paradigms. See above.

---

[14] See Haspelmath 1995:28; also, "a kind of infinitive" (Kortmann 1995 n.16). In Old, Middle and Late Egyptian, the so-called "absolute" and narrative infinitives may at least in part be converbal. Both in Celtic and in Egyptian, some converbs are morphologically homonymous with infinitives.

[15] Cf. Shisha-Halevy 1986, Chapter Seven; 2006a; Hamp 1973.

[16] Both exquisitely illustrated in the Egyptian "Conjunctive" converb, attested from the 19th Dynasty on, but really

(j) Function (II), quintessential and definitive: the converb as adnexal. As brilliantly suggested by Johannes Lohmann,[17] the converb has affinities with the original and historically correct conception of the Participle – μετοχή - not adjectival "partaking of the nature of verb and noun" or sim., but abstract-substantival "predication-sharing" or "predicative union" (other formulations by Lohmann and others: "durchkonstruierter Satz", "adsentenziale Subordination"; "copredicative", see Haspelmath 1995:17ff., of participles, comes quite close). The elusive, intriguing status and slot that has been variously called "halb-prädikativ" (Behaghel; cf. "half-participle" in Baltic grammatical terminology), "degradiertes Prädikat" (Hermann Paul), "Prädikative Apposition" (Sommer), and, least felicitous, "second" or "secondary" predicate"[18] - which I prefer to see, following Otto Jespersen, as "adnexal":[19] it is the relationship of *converbiality* with *rhematicity*, as a special sector of clause-linkage spectrum, that is here at issue.[20] On a yet higher general plane, I would pose the question of the *affinity of adverbiality to predicativity or rhematicity,* an affinity sometimes manifested by formal similarities: consider the Arabic accusative, Welsh lenition, Coptic N-marking.

(k) Function (III): narrative structure/texture roles. Converb concatenation, and converb combination with narrative carriers, are prominent wherever converbs occur. Discussions abound.[21]

(3) *On a general, meta-meta-linguistic terminological-epistemological level,* several queries arise, beyond the obvious ones of the scope and extent of the term/concept (and not necessarily its definition). Is a term a denotative Proper Name, an indifferent label or code-name, or is it an item of a sub-lexical system, with a connotativity charge? Is "naming" of linguistic features in general, and in particular by imports from other systems, an act of description? To what degree do terms condition, and go on guiding, the description of a linguistic feature? What are the dangers we run here, the potential harm, the usefulness or benefit of a specific act of terminological naming? The basic queries, "What is X?" and "Is this the Y I already know and understand as Z (in another system)" or "Is X an instance of Y as known in another system of language?" must,

---

flowering in later Egyptian: for Sahidic Coptic, see Shisha-Halevy 1986, Chapter Seven.

[17] Lohmann 1965:295.

[18] Himmelmann and Schulze-Berndt (eds.) 2005.

[19] Shisha-Halevy 1986, 2007.

[20] The current concept of "participant orientation" (Himmelmann and Schulze-Berndt (eds.), 2005) is germane here. This is essentially a complicated junctural feature, the two predications inter-merging in looser linkage with common actants.

[21] See Haspelmath and König (eds.) 1995, also Myhill and Hibiya 1988. In Egyptian, converbs provide narrative background, narrative focus and marked narrative-pacing and narrative-rate forms. Note the Stative, in Old and Middle Egyptian; *sḏm.n.f.* in Middle Egyptian; ⲉⲁϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ in Sahidic Coptic; the Temporal in various dialects of Coptic.

of course, be addressed.

(4) The following very brief sketches of converbs in the successive stages of Egyptian are not only sketchy: they are no more than tentative suggestions, and impressionistic reports. One observes in Egyptian diachrony two peaks of systemic importance for the converb – Middle Egyptian and Coptic (probably with some dialects more striking than others). There are (to us) blurred periods, immediately preceding those peaks: Old Egyptian and Demotic, with the systemic resolution of the converbs as yet very inadequate. In fact, Egyptian diachrony is for us still more a matter of wishful thinking, a *vorrei ma non posso* than a confident reality, due to what I call the Continuity Fallacy, using the written-language succession as representing a real linguistic evolution, but also to our total ignorance of diasystems and varieties, and to the fact that all linguistic periods of Egyptian, centuries to one millennium long, have their own "micro-diachrony" and comprise several sub-periods. In general, we find in Egyptian the earlier synthetic finite converbs gradually replaced by analytic ones, while non-finite grammaticalized "prepositional" converbs hold their ground, with lessened analyzability, as do the progressively grammaticalized finite "prepositional" converbs (from the OE #preposition+ "that"-form# syntagms to the Coptic Clause Conjugation).

Throughout Egyptian diachrony, it is the ***focalizability of converbs*** that is most significant for defining and recognizing them,[22] and this is arguably the quintessential symptom of converb-hood; for in Egyptian, and especially Old to Middle Egyptian, we find a special Cleft focalization pattern (the substantival, so-called "Emphatic" verb form) for focalizing adverbials. By this token, the Conjunctive, not yet converbal in LE, is a real (albeit incipient) converb in Coptic.

On the whole, despite the remarkable stability of the Egyptian verbal system over four millennia,[23] the evidence in Egyptian diachrony of a periodical rise in converb performance seems unmistakable.

• Old Egyptian:

Somewhat like Demotic in its relationship to Coptic, OE gives the impression of "incipient ME". We have all the forms, but their systemic standing is for us still hesitant or blurred, and functional as well as formal proportions are different. With clear internal differences (also ones of genre!) between the Pyramid Texts and Old Kingdom autobiographical inscriptions, we find, for instance, the non-converbal *sḏm.f*, not *sḏm.n.f* a basic narrative carrier; the circumstantial converter *jw* is not yet attested; the "Pseudo-Verbal Construction" is as yet not fully operative. The Stative, the show-piece of Egyptian grammar, is here already almost fully converbal, posing here more than anywhere else that million-dollar question: how does an originally non-adverbial form acquire adverbial status? The

---

[22] See Shisha-Halevy 1990:116.
[23] Cf. Shisha-Halevy 2000.

OE converbs are present-tense or extratemporal, and as a rule negated. only as adverbials. OE features the "second" or "adverbial infinitive"[24] *mswt, rmyt* etc., in focal and topical status, which occurs in religious genres of ME as well, but all but disappears in later phases of Egyptian, to reemerge in Coptic with the "Tautological Infinitive" (see below).

• Middle Egyptian:

This is a peak of converb systemic importance and performance (*Leistung*). practically all rhematic constituents of the periphrastic verbal system are converbs, the rhematic building-blocks of almost all non-focalizing verbal-nexus patterns, and rhematic-focal constituents of important focalization ones (Polotsky, Egyptian Tenses [1965]).[25] The "Bipartite", Adverbial-Predicate nexus pattern is pivotal in Middle Egyptian, informing the entire verbal system. In this pattern, converbs are typically rhematic, substantival forms often thematic. Converbs are negated as adverbs, by means of the negative prefiz *n-js-*.

Finite Converbs, adverbial clause conjugation forms:

• Rhematic, adjunctal, adnominal (to non-specific nuclei), focal: *sḏm.f* ("Circumstantial");

• Rhematic, adjunctal, adnominal (to non-specific nuclei), focal, narrative-concatenating: *sḏm.n.f* ("Circumstantial");

• Rhematic, adjunctal, adnominal (to non-specific nuclei), focal, narrative-resultative, narrative-situational, exclamative-modal (esp. allocutive and delocutive): Stative: *jj.kwj,* "I (being) gone, come", *ꜥḥꜥ.kwj*, "I standing", *snwḫ.ti* "it (f.) (having been) boiled";

• Temporal finite converbs, constructed of prepositions combined with "that"-forms, in incipient grammaticalization, are adjunctal or focal/topical.

Non-Finite Converbs:

• Rhematic, adjunctal: *ḥr-*"upon"+ INFINITIVE, *m-*"in"+ INFINITIVE, *r-*"to"+ INFINITIVE (Gardiner's "Pseudo-Verbal Construction");

• Focal/topical: "Adverbial Infinitive" (e.g. *msyt/mswt* of *msj*, "give birth"), prevalent in Old Egyptian.

The circumstantial converter *jw*, fully systemic in LE, appears here in some formal sectors: this, in this phase preceding only the Present Tense, will eventually be the marker of the analytic converb, fully operative in Coptic.

• Late Egyptian:

---

[24] Also known as "Komplementsinfiniktiv", perhaps corresponding morphologically to the Semitic "adverbial case" *–wt*. What is here striking is the overrule of morphology by syntactic status – here adverbial - , which is the only real indication of the nature of this form. See Shisha-Halevy 1990:114ff.

[25] Polotsky's postulation of adverbial-privilege finite verb-forms in Middle Egyptian aroused in the nineteen-nineties a furore of revisionism among certain linguistic Egyptologists, for whom the converb category must have been unfathomable or unthinkable: see Satzinger and Shisha-Halevy 1996. It is crucial to realize that by "adverbial commutation" Polotsky meant the "coordinate signal" of commutabilities (i.e. paradigmatics) and compatibilities (i.e. syntagmatics), not the former alone. This coordinative location is after all the only conceivable structural identity of an element, to which may be added its diachronic dimension.

This is a non-converbal or low-performance converb phase of Egyptian. Although it is difficult to quantify the respective performance (*Leistung*) of substantival ("that"-forms) or nominal *vs.* adverbial forms – as observable in periphrastic constructions where the form in question is combined with auxiliaries - one may impressionistically say that in LE and to an extent Early Demotic, the former prevail, compared with Roman Demotic, Coptic and Middle Egyptian. Almost all of the old converbs are not operative on their own in LE, but occupy a rhematic slot in an *jw*-converted matrix, or are converted on their own; for in LE we have the first period of a real systemic distribution of the analytic circumstantial (*jw-* Circumstantial converter, before any nexus, even the imperative), and a narrative form - *jw.f ḥr sḏm* – which is entirely "poker-faced" as to its essential nature. In LE, nuclear auxiliaries combine with nominal forms or with the analytic circumstantial, which, I suggest, is not (yet) converbal. The Stative does occur unconverted outside its matrix, but usually in focal status.

• Temporal finite converbs, all constructed of prepositions combined with "that"-forms, substantival relative forms or infinitives in varying degree of grammaticalization/fusion, [26] occur as topics, adjuncts or foci;

• The Conjunctive[27] is in LE only incipiently converbal, by most formal tests of adverbiality: it is serial-adjunctal only.[28]

• Demotic:

In a millennium of Demotic, considerable differences between sub-periods are to be expected and indeed emerge, let alone the varieties correlated with dialects and genres. We do not as yet have a sharp picture of respective systems and subsystems, but the overall impression, at least for the late Roman Demotic, the phase more pampered by grammarians, is of a remarkable similarity to Coptic.

• Coptic (Shenoutean Sahidic)[29]:

Undoubtedly the highest peak of converbal importance in Egyptian diachrony, with a rich system of synthetic and analytic converbs.

Finite converbs:

• The so-called "Clause Conjugation": topical, focal, adjunctal or actantial: ⲉϥϣⲁⲛⲥⲱⲧⲙ, ⲛⲧⲉⲣⲉϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ, ϣⲁⲛⲧⲉϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ. Partly belonging here is

• ⲛϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ ("Conjunctive"); serial-adjunctal: (micro-)coordinative,   generic-narrative carrier; (rarely) focalized.

---

[26] See Frandsen 1974 §116.

[27] See Shisha-Halevy 1986, Chapter Seven; 1995.

[28] The protatic (Frandsen 1974:127-140), final-consecutive (ibid. 140-146) and modal (ibid.146-148) roles of the LE Conjunctive all seem to be "that"-form functions, in different slots. This function is also strikingly present in the Bohairic Coptic Conjunctive (Shisha-Halevy 2007, see Index),

[29] Polotsky 1960, Shisha-Halevy 1986; for Bohairic, in which the converb system is very different, see 2007 (see Index).

• Eventives (topical, focal or adjunctal): ϨⲘⲠⲦⲢⲈϤⲤⲰⲦⲘ, ⲘⲚⲚⲤⲀⲦⲢⲈϤⲤⲰⲦⲘ, ⲚⲦⲈⲢⲈϤⲤⲰⲦⲘ

• Analytic converbs: Circumstantial Conversion (usually ⲉ-) + Nexus - ***adnexal expansion-form***

- adjunctal (adverbal, ad-clausal, adnominal), focal, topical, narrative-subconcatenating (ⲈⲀϤⲤⲰⲦⲘ)

ⲠⲀⲒ ⲈⲚⲦⲀⲠⲈϤⲖⲀⲤ ϢⲀϤⲈ ***ⲈϤⲘⲈϨ-ⲢⲰϤ*** ⲀϤⲘⲞⲨ "he whose tongue swelled *filling his mouth*, (and) he died"

ⲈϤⲦⲘⲔⲀⲢⲰϤ ⲆⲈ ***ⲈϤϢⲒⲚⲈ*** ϢⲀⲨϨⲞⲦⲂϤ ("But unless he hold his mouth *asking*, they kill him")

ⲀⲠϢⲀⲬⲈ ϢⲰⲠⲈ ***ⲈϤϨⲞⲢϢ*** ⲚⲀϤ "The words were *(being) hard* for him"

ⲀϤⲞⲨⲰ ***ⲈϤⲘⲞⲨ*** "He was-done *dying*" = "He has already died"

Non-Finite converbs:

• Rhematic, focal status only: Stative, in the Present (**†-ⲤⲞⲦⲠ** "I am-in-a state-of-having-been-chosen";

ⲈⲔⲖⲞⲂⲈ "It is *become-crazy* you are")

• Rhematic, focal status only: Dynamic Converb, in the Present ("durative infinitive": **†-ⲤⲰⲦⲠ** "I am-in-the-process-of-choosing", ⲈⲤⲚⲔⲞⲦⲔ "It is *being-asleep* she is")

• Topicalized: "Tautological Infinitive" ϨⲚ-ⲞⲨ-ϢⲖⲎⲖ ⲀϤϢⲖⲎⲖ "pray he did"[30]

Bibliographical References

AALTO, P., 1987, *Studies in Altaic and Comparative Philology*, Helsinki:Societas Orientalis Fennica.

FRANDSEN, P.J., 1974, *An Outline of the Late Egyptian Verbal System*, Copenhagen:Akademisk Forlag.

GOLDENBERG, G., 1971, "Tautological Infinitive", *Israel Oriental Studies* 1:35-85.

GOLDENBERG, G., 1977, "The Semitic languages of Ethiopia and their classification" *BSOAS* XL 461-507.

GOLDENBERG, G., 2002, "Semitic Linguistics and the General Study of Language", *Israel Oriental Studies* XX 21-41 .

GRØNBECH, K., 1979, *The Structure of the Turkic Laguages* (translated by T.R. Krueger) Bloomington:Research Institute for Inner Asian Studies.

HAIMAN, J., and THOMSON, S. (ed.), 1988, *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse,* Amsterdam:J. Benjamins.

HAMP, E., 1973, "Inordinate Clauses in Celtic", in: C. Corum *et al.* (eds.), *You Take the High Node and I'll Take the Low Node:Papers from the Comparative Syntax Festival*, Chicago:Chicago Linguistic Society, 229-251.

HASPELMATH, M., 1995, "The Converb as a Cross-Linguistically Valid Category", in: HASPELMATH, M.,

---

[30] Goldenberg 1971; Shisha-Halevy 1990.

and KÖNIG, E., (ed.) 1995 1-55.

HASPELMATH, M., and KÖNIG, E., (ed.) 1995, *Converbs in Cross-Linguistic Perspective: Structure and Meaning of Adverbial Verb-Forms – Adverbial Participles, Gerunds* Berlin/NY:Mouton-de Gruyter.

HASPELMATH, M., (ed.) 2004, *Coordinating Constructions* Amsterdam etc.:John Benjamins.

HIMMELMANN, N.P. and SCHULTZE-BERNDT, E. (eds.), 2005,*Secondary Predication and Adverbial Modification: the Typology of Depictives*, Oxford:OUP..

KAZENIN, K.I. and TESTELETS, J.C.2004, "Where Coordination Meets Subordination: Converb Construction in Tsakhur", in: Haspelmath (ed) 2004: 227-240.

KÖNIG, E., 1995, "The Meaning of Converb Constructions" in: HASPELMATH and KÖNIG (eds.) 1995:57-95.

KORTMANN, B., 1995, "Adverbial Participial Clauses in English", in: HASPELMATH and KÖNIG (eds.) 1995:189-237.

LEWIS, G. L.,1967, *Turkish Grammar*, Oxford:OUP.

LOHMANN, J., 1965, *Philosophie und Sprachwissenschaft,* Berlin:Duncker und Humblot.

MYHILL, J. and HIBIYA, J., 1988, "The Discourse Function of Clause Chaining", in: HAIMAN and THOMPSON, (eds.) 1988:361-398

NEDJALKOV, V.P., 1995, "Some Typological Parameters of Converbs", in: HASPELMATH and KÖNIG (eds.), 1995, 97-136.

POLOTSKY, H.J., 1951, "Notes on Gurage Grammar", *Notes and Studies Published by the Israel Oriental Society*, Jerusalem.

POLOTSKY, H.J., 1960, "The Coptic Conjugation System", *Or.* 29:392-422

POLOTSKY, H.J., 1965, *Egyptian Tenses* (=Proceedings of The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1965, Vol. II, No.5), Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities.

RAHMATI, G.R., 1928, *Die Hilfsverben und Verbaladverbien im Altaischen*, Berlin-Leipzig:De Gruyter

RAMSTEDT, G. J., 1902, *Über die Konjugation des Khalkha-Mongolischen,* Helsingfors:Finnische Literaturgesellschaft.

SATZINGER, H., AND SHISHA-HALEVY, A., 1996 "The Snark is Dead", *Lingua Aegyptia* 6:167-176.

SHISHA-HALEVY, A., 1986, Coptic Grammatical Categories: Structural Studies in the Syntax of Shenoutean Coptic, Rome: The Pontifical Institute (=Analecta Orientalia, 53)

SHISHA-HALEVY, A., 1990, "The Tautological Infinitive in Coptic" *Journal of Coptic Studies* 1(*Journal of Coptic Studies* 1 = *Elanskaja Festschrift*) 99-127.

SHISHA-HALEVY, A., 1995, "Some Reflections on the Egyptian Conjunctive" in: *Divitiae Aegyptii (Krause Festschrift)* Wiesbaden:Reichert, 300-314

SHISHA-HALEVY, A., 1998 *Structural Studies in Modern Welsh Syntax: Aspects of the Grammar of Kate Roberts*, Münster:Nodus (=Studien und Texte zur Keltologie, 2).

SHISHA-HALEVY, A., 2000, "Stability in Clausal/Phrasal Pattern Constituent Sequencing: 4000 Years of Egyptian (With Some Theoretical Reflections, also on Celtic)" in: *Word Order - Stability and Change over Time*, ed. R. Sornicola, E. Poppe, A. Shisha-Halevy, Amsterdam/Philadelphia:J. Benjamins, 71-100.

SHISHA-HALEVY, A., 2003, "Celtic Syntax, Egyptian-Coptic Syntax", in: *Das Alte Ägypten und seine Nachbarn: Festschrift Helmut Satzinger*, Krems:Österreichisches Literaturforum, 245-302.

SHISHA-HALEVY, A., 2003a, "Juncture Features in Literary Modern Welsh: Cohesion and Delimitation - Problematik, Typology of Exponents and Features" *Zeitschrift f. Celtische Philologie* 53:230-258

SHISHA-HALEVY, A., 2004 "Juncture Features in Shenoutean Coptic: Linkage and Delimitation", *Coptic Studies on the Threshold of a New Milennium: Proceedings of the Seventh International Congress of Coptic Studies*, ed. M. Immerzeel and J. Van Der Vliet, Peeters:Leuven-Paris-Dudley.

SHISHA-HALEVY, A., 2007, *Topics in Coptic Syntax: Structural Studies in the Bohairic Dialect,* Leuven:Peeters, IN PRESS.