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Abstract
The goal of this paper is to describe the gradual emergence of an innovative future construction in the extant Late Egyptian and Demotic textual material and to discuss the grammaticalization of this construction down to Coptic, where it became a regular future form known as the “First Future” or “Future I”. We propose that, during the grammaticalization process, the selectional restrictions of the construction are relaxed due to the spread of speaker-oriented inferences. As a consequence, new types of subject and predicates can appear and innovative grammatical meanings associated with future time reference, e.g., prediction, become increasinly entrenched. In a final section, we briefly comment on the future cycles in Ancient Egyptian and propose that the comparative notion of allative future is not only useful for comparing specific patterns across languages, but also within a single language with a lengthy attested history.

0 Introduction
This paper explores the ways in which types of context and inferential mechanisms interact in the course of grammaticalization. Specifically, we focus on the ways in which contexts that allow multiple interpretations of a single utterance interact with the changes in selectional restrictions on constructions undergoing grammaticalization. We examine these questions on the basis of a single case study, which deals with the grammaticalization of future tense constructions in the later phases of the Ancient Egyptian language, i.e, Late Egyptian, Demotic, and Coptic.¹

The lengthy diachronic attestation of the Ancient Egyptian language — documented continuously for around four thousand years — allows us to observe extremely long-term changes. Among these long-term changes are a number of linguistic cycles, involving nearly every functional domain, including negation, modality, tense and aspect, valency and transitivity, possession, and more. A particularly striking

* We are grateful to our friends and colleagues Lieselotte Brems, Joachim Friedrich Quack and Jean Winand for insightful comments on earlier drafts of this paper.

¹ Ancient Egyptian is traditionally divided into five diachronic macro-stages: Old Egyptian (3000-2000 BCE), Middle Egyptian (2000-1300 BCE), Late Egyptian (1300-700 BCE), Demotic (700 BCE-450 CE) and Coptic (400-1400 CE), see Loprieno (1995: 5-8).
linguistic cycle involves the domain of future reference: over the course of Ancient Egyptian’s linguistic history, numerous future tenses are grammaticalized, undergo further changes, and are eventually refunctionalized, replaced, or lost. Even more interesting for the study of language change is the fact that in some cases, similar grammaticalization pathways recur several times. One such cycle involves the repeated emergence and grammaticalization of allative futures, constructions involving allative expressions that come to express future reference.² In a previous paper (Grossman & Polis 2014), we traced the development of an allative future in Early Egyptian, first attested around 2400 BCE. In the present paper, we turn to a second allative future, whose origins are found in Late Egyptian towards the end of the Ramesside period, around 1050 BCE.³

The structure of the paper is as follows. In §1, we briefly sketch the system of future reference in Late Egyptian. We then discuss in §2 the first examples of the source construction that would later grammaticalize into the Later Egyptian Allative Future. In §3 and §4, we trace the evolution of the new future construction in Demotic and Coptic.⁴ In these descriptive sections, we focus on the contexts in which the Allative Future occurs, both in terms of syntagmatic and paradigmatic constructional properties and in terms of broader discourse context. Of special interest are changes in the selectional restrictions — essentially, the compatibility of the construction with lexical items with various semantic properties — and the ways in which they change over time. In §5, we explore the consequences of this study for theories of grammaticalization, especially those that invoke inferential mechanisms as part of their explanatory accounts.

² The label ‘allative future’ (Grossman & Polis 2014) is defined as any future tense that is grammaticalized from an allative source construction, and in which the element that marks the future also synchronically marks at least some typical allative meanings, especially spatial destination or purpose. This comparative concept covers both venitive (“to come to”) and andative (“to go to”) constructions, and includes allative futures that contain an allative expression without a verb a motion. See Reintges (2011: 67-69, 79-83) for a recent description of andative and venitive futures in Ancient Egyptian.

³ These constructions are, somewhat confusingly, referred to respectively as the ‘Third Future’ (or ‘Future III’) and the ‘First Future’ (or ‘Future I’) even though the former is attested millennia earlier than the latter. Rather than the traditional terms, we will call them, respectively, the Earlier Egyptian Allative Future (EEAF) and the Later Egyptian Allative Future (LEAF). However, we occasionally use the traditional terminology when we refer to earlier literature.

⁴ The Egyptian examples are transliterated and glossed in accordance with the Leipzig Glossing Rules (http://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resources/glossing-rules.php) and with most of the suggestions proposed in Di Biase, Kammerzell & Werning (2009), an abridged form of which is found on http://wikis.hu-berlin.de/interlinear_glossing/Ancient_Egyptian:Glossing_recommendations. The main thing that may be unfamiliar to readers is the presence of two lines of Egyptian text preceding the glosses. This is because traditional Egyptological transliteration uses punctuation that creates conflicts with punctuation used in morphosyntactic glosses. For example, an equal sign (=) is used in the transliteration of Egyptian for some bound elements, while in the Leipzig Glossing Rules it marks a boundary between a clitic and its host. The second line of text is that which is glossed. As for the Coptic text, it is transliterated in accordance with the Leipzig-Jerusalem proposal (Grossman & Haspelmath 2014+) and glossed according to the Leipzig Glossing Rules. A list of abbreviations used is found at the end of the paper.
1 The Two Allative Futures of Later Egyptian

1.1 The Earlier Egyptian Allative Future

In Late Egyptian (1300-700 BCE), the main future tense is the Earlier Egyptian Allative Future, which is usually called the ‘Future III’ in Egyptological linguistics.5

Ex. 1 iwꜰ r spr rsk
iw-i r spr r-k
FUT₁-1SG FUT₂ arrive:INF ALL-2SGM
“I will come to you (…)”. (P. Berlin 10463, r⁰ 1-2 = Caminos 1963: pl. VIA)

This construction comprises four elements:

1. the subject auxiliary iw,
2. a subject expression (either a bound person index or a full noun phrase),
3. the allative preposition r,6
4. the verbal predicate, usually realized as an infinitive.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Late Egyptian</th>
<th>iw</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>sdm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FUT₁</td>
<td>3SGM</td>
<td>FUT₂</td>
<td>listen:INF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coptic</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>sōtm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Constructional scheme of the Earlier Egyptian Allative Future (‘Future III’):
source construction and Coptic

The auxiliary iw and the allative preposition r are grammaticalized as two parts of a single future construction (glossed here FUT₁ ... FUT₂), although the allative preposition is not always written.

The future auxiliary iw has an allomorph irl, which occurs when the subject is a full noun phrase rather than a person index.8

Ex. 2 bn iri pꜰsyi sn di.t mdwꜰtw m-di.i
bn iri py-i sn di-t mdw-tw m-di-i
NEG FUT POSS-1SG brother CAUS-INF talk:SBJV-one with-1SG
“My brother will not let someone dispute me!”
(P. BM EA 10052, r° 6,10 = KR VI, 782,12)

This construction appears for the first time in Old Egyptian (c. 2400 BCE), but develops the function of expressing predictions, and thereby grammaticalizing as a future tense, only in Middle Egyptian (Grossman & Polis 2014). In Late Egyptian (Ex. 1-2) and Demotic (Ex. 3), it is the main future tense:

Ex. 3 iwꜰ r ḫy-tet r wꜰ-mꜰꜰ
iw-f r ḫy-t-t r wꜰ-mꜰꜰ
FUT₁-3SGM FUT₂ take:-INF-2SGF ALL ART:INDEF-place
“He will take you to a place.” (Setne I, 5/8 = Goldbrunner 2006: 21)

---

7 For Statives and other types of predicates occurring in this construction, see Winand (1996).
8 See Kruchten (2010) regarding the origin of this allomorph in the future construction.
This construction begins to show signs of acquiring optative modal meanings, i.e., the expression of a speaker’s wish, in Late Egyptian: 

Ex. 4  
\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
  \text{iri} & \text{Pth} & \text{in.t\text{n}} & \text{mtw\text{n}} & \text{ptr\text{\text{-}}} \\
  \text{FUT} & \text{Pth} & \text{bring\_back\-INF\_1PL} & \text{CONJ\_1PL} & \text{see\:INF\_2SGF} \\
  \text{“May Ptah bring us back so that we may see you!”} \\
\end{array}
\]

(P. Leiden I 362, v\text{\text{o}} 1 = KRI 11, 927,5)

In most Coptic dialects, its main function is the expression of future time reference (Ex. 5 from the Mesokemic dialect). In Sahidic, optative modality is also a prominent function (Ex. 6, Layton 2011: 263-267).

Ex. 5  
\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
  \text{ere\text{-}p\text{-}rome} & \text{kô} & \text{m\text{-}pef\text{-}iot} & \text{nso\text{-}f} \\
  \text{FUT\_ART\_DEF\_MSG\_man} & \text{place} & \text{ACC\_POSS\_MSG\_3SGM\_father} & \text{after\_3SGM} \\
  \text{“A man will leave his father.”} & (\text{Matthew 19:5, Mesokemic = Schenke 1981: 98}) \\
\end{array}
\]

Ex. 6  
\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
  \text{t\text{-}e\text{i\text{\text{-}r\text{\text{-}}}n\text{\text{-}}}e} & \text{e\text{-}s\text{-}e} & \text{sâpe} & \text{na\text{-}k} \\
  \text{ART\_DEF\_FSG\_peace} & \text{FUT\text{\text{-}1\_3SGF\_FUT\text{\text{-}2}} & \text{become} & \text{for\_2SGM} \\
  \text{“May peace be unto thee.”} & (\text{Judges 6:23 = Thompson 1911: 170}) \\
\end{array}
\]

Only from Late Egyptian onwards does this construction have a symmetric standard negation, which precedes the auxiliary. A symmetric standard negation is one in which ‘the structure of the negative is identical to the structure of the affirmative, except for the presence of the negative marker(s)’ (Miestamo 2013). An asymmetric negation, on the other hand, is one in which ‘the structure of the negative differs from the structure of the affirmative in various other ways too, i.e. there is asymmetry between affirmation and negation’ (Miestamo 2013). The following examples illustrate the symmetric negation of this construction, respectively from Late Egyptian (Ex. 7), Demotic (Ex. 8) and Coptic (Ex. 9):

Ex. 7  
\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
  \text{y\text{\text{-}}} & \text{bn} & \text{iw\text{-}s\text{n}} & \text{r} & \text{r\text{\text{-}}} & \text{f\text{\text{-}y\text{\text{-}f}}} \\
  \text{indeed} & \text{NEG} & \text{FUT\text{\text{-}1\_3PL\_FUT\text{\text{-}2}} & \text{know\_INF} & \text{bring\_INF\_3SGM\_M} \\
  \text{“Indeed, they will not be in the position to contest it.”} & (\text{P. Anastasi V, r\text{\text{o}} 27,3 = LEM 71,14}) \\
\end{array}
\]

Ex. 8  
\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
  \text{bn} & \text{iw\text{-}i} & \text{ḥtbsk} \\
  \text{NEG} & \text{FUT\text{\text{-}1\_3SG\_kill\_INF\_2SGM}} \\
  \text{“I am not going to kill you.”} & (\text{Mythus 15/30 = de Cenival 1988: 46}) \\
\end{array}
\]

Ex. 9  
\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
  \text{mne\text{-}u\text{-}ka\_ou\_one} & \text{kičn\_ou\_one} & \text{m\text{-}pe\text{\text{-}me}} \\
  \text{FUT\_NEG\_3PL\_place\_ART\_INDEF\_stone} & \text{on\_ART\_INDEF\_stone} & \text{in\_DEM\_MSG\_place} \\
  \text{“Stone will not be left on stone in this place.”} & (\text{Mesokemic, Matthew 24:2 = Schenke 1981: 110}) \\
\end{array}
\]

---


10 Detailed discussions of this construction can be found for some of the Coptic dialects (Wilson 1970; Reintges 2011 for Sahidic; Shisha-Halevy 2002, for the documentary texts of Kellis; Shisha-Halevy 2007, for Bohairic; Shisha-Halevy 2003, for Mesokemic).
1.2 The Later Egyptian Allative Future

In the Coptic dialects, one finds a second fully grammaticalized future tense, which is usually called the ‘Future I’ in Egyptological linguistics. This morphosyntactic construction comprises three elements: (1) a subject expression, either a bound person index or a full noun phrase, (2) the future auxiliary na-, and (3) a verbal lexeme, usually realized as an infinitive (Layton 2011 and below Fig. 2).

Ex. 10  
\[ t-na-bôk ~ e-cep-tbt \]  
1SG-FUT-go to-fish-fish  
“I am going to go fishing.”  
(Sahidic, John 21:3 = Quecke 1984: 217)

Ex. 11  
\[ auô pe-šlel ~ mn-t-pistis ~ na-touče-pet-šône \]  
and ART.DEF.MSG-prayer with-ART.DEF.FSG-faith FUT-save-NMLZ-sick  
\[ auô p-čoëis ~ na-tounos-f \]  
and ART.DEF.MSG-Lord FUT-raise-3SGM  
“And prayer with faith is going to save the sick, and the Lord is going to raise him up.”  
(Sahidic, James 5:15 = Horner 1924: 234)

Gardiner (1906) suggested that this construction developed from a Late Egyptian source construction involving the lexical verb n\textsuperscript{e}y ‘to travel (by boat)’. The source construction comprises five elements:

1. a subject expression (either a bound person index or a full noun phrase),
2. the locative preposition \( m \) (‘in’),
3. the infinitive form of the verb \( n\textsuperscript{e}y \) (‘to travel’),
4. the allative preposition \( r \) (‘to’),
5. the lexical verb, realized as an infinitive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Late Egyptian</th>
<th>sw</th>
<th>m</th>
<th>n\textsuperscript{e}y</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>sgm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3SGM</td>
<td>PROG</td>
<td>travel/go:INF</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>listen:INF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coptic</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>na</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>sôm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3SGM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>listen:INF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Constructional scheme of the Later Egyptian Allative Future: source construction and Sahidic Coptic

The predicate of this construction, i.e., the movement verb \( n\textsuperscript{e}y \), occurs with a purpose clause comprising an infinitive phrase headed by the allative preposition \( r \).

It should be noted that in Late Egyptian the construction \([\text{SUBJECT} + m + \text{VERB}]\) is the typical means of encoding progressive aspect for intransitive verbs of motion, as well as some other intransitive verbs, while the unmarked imperfective aspect is expressed by the preposition \( hr \), ‘(up)on’.\(^{11}\)

\(^{11}\) Except for the verb \( s\text{m} \) ‘to go’, which generally occurs with \( hr \) + infinitive, due to the Aktionsart of this lexeme (see already Satzinger 1976: 135-139, 143-145), but cf. Ex. 49 below. Regarding the opposition progressive (\( m \)) vs unmarked imperfective (\( hr \)) in Late Egyptian and its origin, see Vernus (1990: 143-162, with previous literature) and Winand (1992: 419-423 §649-656; 2006: 303-313).
2 The emergence of a second Allative Future in Late Egyptian

Towards the end of the Late Egyptian stage of the language (c. 1050 BC), one finds the earliest examples of the source construction identified by Gardiner:12

Ex. 12  twk ṭp.tw pšy mšr nty twi m nry r irsf
      twk ṭp-tw pšy mšr nty twi m nry r ir-f

2SGM know-STAT DEM.MSG expedition REL 1SG in go:INF ALL do:INF-3SGM
“You know the kind of expedition which I am going to make!”
(P. BN 197 V, v1 2-3 = LRL 35,15)

This sentence occurs in a short letter from Piankh, a general of Pharaoh, to a scribe, Dhuutmose. Piankh asks Dhuutmose to send some old clothes in the form of strips. “They shall be made into bandages with which to wrap up men,”13 he says, and adds, “You know the kind of expedition which I am travelling-going to make,” alluding to battles going on in the south of Egypt (Wente 1967: 8).

Cited out of context, this example could be open to two readings. According to the first reading, the verb nry (ฤฤฤฤฤฤฤฤฤ) could have a literal meaning “to travel”: the general Piankh, while travelling South for an expedition [MOTION WITH PURPOSE], sends a letter in order to have bandages sent to him. A second reading — which is favored by scholars due to the obvious link between the subject mentioned in this letter and in others, as well as the postulated temporal relationship between these letters14 — is to consider that the general had not yet started his trip, but is still near Thebes and is trying to get the material that he needs, the bandages, for the expedition that he is about to make [IMMINENT FUTURE]. What matters in the framework of this study is that we are dealing with a bridging context (Evans & Wilkins 1998: 5; Heine 2002: 84). According to Heine, bridging contexts have the following properties:

(a) They trigger an inferential mechanism to the effect that, rather than the source meaning, there is another meaning, the target meaning, that offers a more plausible interpretation of the utterance concerned.

(b) While the target meaning is the one most likely to be inferred, it is still cancellable (see Grice 1967), that is, an interpretation in terms of the source meaning cannot be ruled out.

(c) A given linguistic form may be associated with a number of different bridging contexts.

(d) Bridging contexts may, but need not, give rise to conventional grammatical meanings.

In the present case, both the [MOTION WITH PURPOSE] and the [IMMINENT FUTURE] readings are potentially available, but the latter is the one most likely to be inferred, given the context. However, it is not a coded meaning, since it is cancellable. For example, if the writer were to say ‘You know the kind of expedition I am travelling (in order) to make,’ and continue with ‘In fact, it is very hot on the road,’ indicating that the subject is in the process of moving in order to do something.

---

14 See e.g. Wente (1967: 16 & 53 n. d) and the discussion of Ex. 17 below.
Interestingly enough, this example of *m nʔy r INFinitive* (‘going to V’) with a likely [IMMINEr\(\text{FUTURE}^{*}\)] reading appears in the written documentation at the same time as the first example of the construction with a [MOTION WITH PURPOSE] reading (see Ex. 16): the construction seems to first occur in the corpus at the end of the Ramesside period with both the [MOTION WITH PURPOSE] and the [IMMINEr\(\text{FUTURE}^{*}\)] interpretations available. Accordingly, we have no evidence here that would support a grammaticalization pathway [MOTION WITH PURPOSE] \(\rightarrow\) [IMMINEr\(\text{FUTURE}^{*}\)]. Of course, written documentation is unlikely to capture the actual moment of innovation, and as such, it is not to be ruled out that the traditional assumption of directionality (e.g., Bybee et al. 1994) might hold.

Before proceeding with additional later examples of the construction, this first occurrence of the construction points to the need of defining more precisely the semantics of *nʔy* in Late Egyptian, when it became a *prospective* or *mellic* auxiliary.\(^{15}\)

2.1 The semantics of the verb *nʔy* in Late Egyptian

The verb *nʔy* (*Wb.* II, 206,7-21) is already well-attested in the *Pyramid Texts* and probably refers originally to motion over water (cf. the use of the boat classifier \(\text{w}_n\)), a meaning which is still well-established in the Late Egyptian corpus:

Ex. 13  *hr wnm pū lmw nʔy*

\(\text{hr} \ \text{w}n\ \text{m} \ \text{p} \ \text{lm} \ \text{n} \ \text{ʔ} \ \text{y}\)

and *when* FUT ART.DEF.MSG boat go:INF

\(\text{i}w\text{s}i \ \text{hr} \ \text{in} \ \text{n} \ \text{s}k \ [n]\text{ly} \text{s}k \ \text{b} \text{s}k \text{w} \ \text{lm} \ \text{w}\)

\(\text{i}w\text{-i} \ \text{h} \ \text{r} \ \text{in} \ \text{n-} \ \text{k} \ \text{n} \ \text{y-} \ \text{k} \ \text{bs} \ \text{k-} \ \text{w} \ \text{l} \ \text{m} \ \text{w}\)

SEQ-1SG on bring:INF for-2SGM POSS.PL-2SGM product-PL crafts

“Now when the boat will set sail, I will bring you your manufactured products.”

(P. Chester Beatty III, *N5* 5,5 = KRI I, 88,1)

In Earlier Egyptian, this verb was also used for referring to other kinds of movement with a vague or unspecified manner component, not necessarily by boat, e.g., *from* some location (*m* NP), *on* some surface (*hr* NP), *in the direction of* some place (*r* NP). Furthermore, it clearly appears from the corpus that the semantics of this lexeme is not defined in terms of deictic center with respect to the subject (like “to go,” away from the deictic center, or “to come”, in the direction of the deictic center), but rather depends on the types of arguments involved, as illustrated by the following Late Egyptian examples:

Ex. 14  *nʔ-t pw Ir.n lmf m-hd*

\(\text{n} \ \text{ʔ-} \ \text{p} \ \text{w} \ \text{I} \ \text{r} \ \text{n} \ \text{l} \ \text{m} \ \text{f} \ \text{m} \ \text{h} \ \text{d}\)

go:INF COP do-REL.PST Majesty-3SGM northwards

“He Majesty travelled north (his infantry and chariery being with him).”

(Battle of Qadesh, §28 [L.2] = KRI II, 12,3)

\(^{15}\) See already Reintges (2011: 68) who stresses that in Late Egyptian, “the andative construction (…) functions not so much as an immediate future, but rather as a periphrastic expression of prospective aspect. Prospective aspect relates the present state of the subject to some subsequent situation. It thus comprises the future-oriented dimension of current relevance.”
Ex. 15 hr ir se m n²y hr n³ $snw.w
hr ir se m n²y hr n³ $snw-w
and TOPZ 3SGF in walk:INF under ART.DEF.PL trees-PL

“And, while she was walking under the trees, (she gazed around and saw the
Emnead busy eating in the presence of the Universal Lord in his pavilion).”
(P. Chester Beatty I, r² 6,2 = LES 44,5-6)

Ex. 16 hr wnn twi n²y m niw:t <r> in n³ rmf
hr wnn twi n²y m niw-t r in n³ rmf
and while 1SG go:INF in city-F to bring:INF ART.DEF.PL men
nty hms.w Im
nty hms-w im
REL si$STAT-3PL there

“And while I was walking in the city to bring the men who were staying there, (I
met A and B, and they told me).”
(P. BM 10375, r° 14-15 = LRL 45,7-8)

Besides its usual use for referring to non-oriented motion, usually over water in a boat,
n²y enters in Late Egyptian into a paradigmatic relationship with two other roots in the
less formal registers for expressing more specifically an oriented “go-motion”. In the
Present I predicative pattern, two patterns participate in an aspectual opposition:

sw m n²y 3SGM in go progressive aspect ‘he is going’
sw hr sm 3SGM on go unmarked imperfective ‘he goes’

The number of examples of this construction remains however very small: less than
10 occurrences in the Late Egyptian corpus.

Finally, we would like to point out a fact that has apparently gone largely unno-
ticed in the grammatical description of the Present I construction [SUBJECT + m + n²y]
in Late Egyptian: in some examples, the progressive construction is obviously used
for referring to an event that is about to happen, which means that it rather encodes
mellic aspect in this case. A clear example is found in one of the Late Ramesside
Letters (same text as Ex. 16):

---

16 This interpretation of n²y m (Wente 1990: 194) is perhaps to be preferred to Winand’s translation
(1992: 421 n. 40, §653) “et comme je m’en allais vers la ville”, for which one would rather expect
n²y r.
17 As shown by Peust (2007: 67) who stresses: “n²i existiert in älterer Zeit tatsächlich als
eigenständiges Verb „(zu schiff) fahren“ und fließt erst im Neuägyptischen mit sm und hr in ein
Paradigma zusammen”.
18 See n. 5, and Erman (1933: 249-250 §500); Wente (1959: 136-139); Groll (1969: 186); Satzinger
19 In Late Egyptian, the verb n²y is constructionally much more limited than in Earlier Egyptian
(Peust 2007: 72). Outside the progressive construction discussed here, it occurs mainly in the
oracular expressions ['hr:n p r nj (hr)] n²y m-hr.f “to move forward” and m-hi.f “to move
backwards” referring to the approval or denial of the god statue in procession, see Parker (1962),
Černý (1942: 23) and Kruchten (1986: 252). During the Ramesside Period, see e.g. O. Genève
MAH 12550, r² 8-9 (= KRI v, 453,6-7), O. Caire CG 25555 + O. DeM 999, r² 7 (= KRI v, 456,13-
14); O. Petrie 21, r² 6-7 (= KRI v, 518,13), St. for Herihor, l. 4 (KRI vi, 709,9).
20 To the best of our knowledge, the only exception is Wente (1959: 108-109) who states that “also in
Late Egyptian this construction is used to express motion in process and by extension of this notion
action about to take place in the future.” He quotes possible candidates with the verbs lw “to come”, hw “to sail north” and kd “to sleep”. 

Ex. 17 (and she said to the scribe Tjary:)

(1)n bn twk m n'y irm-w nḥ hbs.w  
(1)n NEG 2SGM in go:INF with-3PL ART.DEF.PL clothes-PL

"Are you not travelling with them, the pieces of cloth? (for you are the one who shall deliver them to your lord.)"  
(P. BM EA 10375, r² 2,6-7 = LRL 46,9-11)

In this text, which is related to, and in fact chronologically follows, the letter discussed in relation to Ex. 12, mention is made of a reminder by the general Piankh to the crew of Deir el-Medineh regarding a request that he previously made: he wants to have some clothes sent to him. In this remainder, he adds that they should be sent on to him, in case he has already left. The letter then makes it clear that the general had set sail south before the bandages had been delivered and Tjary, the scribe in charge, is given the order to catch up with the general. Apparently in an attempt to avoid this burden, they deliver the clothes to his wife, but she reacts directly with Ex. 17: “Are you not travelling with them, the pieces of cloth? For you are the one who shall deliver them to your lord.” In this interrogative sentence, the progressive construction is clearly to be understood with a [SCHEDULED/IMMINENT FUTURE], since Tjary is obviously not yet on his way.

Bearing this example in mind, other occurrences of the construction are likely to be interpreted in the same way. A case in point is the following example:

Ex. 18  

ir ink twi nᵗ tp m p ly c=tbw r mry.t  
in ink twi nᵗ tp m p ly c-tbw r mry-t

TOPZ 1SG 1SG go:INF load:STAT with DEM.MSG pair-boxes ALL riverbank-F

“As for me, I was about to move (lit. I was leaving) in the direction of the riverbank loaded with these two tbw-boxes, (when PN arrived and took delivery.).”  
(O. DeM 569, r² 1-2 = KRI Ṗ, 568,13-14)

This example has generally been translated with a past tense in the scholarly literature: “I went to the riverbank.” This translation means that nᵗ has been understood as a Stative, i.e., a construction in which intransitive verbs of motion encode anterior/past meaning. It would therefore be a counter-example to Wente’s argument (1959: 113) that in Late Egyptian, n’y is construed only as an infinitive headed by the locative preposition m in the First Present pattern. This itself is not problematic, but calls for closer attention. At the graphemic level, we find a bare nᵗ (\[\[\]\] ), without the suffixes k(wl) or tw, typical of the first person singular during the 20th dynasty:

Ex. 19  

twi ḥmsi.kwi šw.kwi r-ṣ[t³] pʾ hrw  
twi ḥmsi-kwi šw-kwi r₃ pꜣ hrw

1SG sI STAT-1SG be.empty\STAT-1SG until ART.DEF.MSG day

“I am still lacking (it) today.”  
(O. Gardiner 54, v[n] 7 = HO, pl. XLIXa,3)

21 The hypothetical reading of the rhematized circumstantial form in l.iIrtn dl.t lw m-sḥl lwI wḫ.kwi “In case I have already left, you will send them after me” (LRL 463-4) is probably to be preferred to the traditional “[o]nly when I have set out, you are to send them after me” (Sweeney 2001: 66; similarly see Wente 1990: 194) if one takes into account the reaction of Dhutmose as described afterwards, namely that he almost died when he learned that Piankh had already left Thebes and that he had to go south himself with the bandages.

Other cases of Statives without these suffixes are known of course, e.g., in the following example:

Ex. 21  

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{iw} & \text{hmsi.k(}} \text{wi} \text{) } & \text{iw} & \text{w}^e \\
\text{SBRD-1SG} & \text{sit\-STAT} & \text{be.alone\-STAT} \\
\end{array}
\]

“(…) while I am sitting alone.”  
(O. UC 39619, r° 4-5 = HO, pl. LXX,1)

However, such examples are rare. More decisive here is the context. The sentence in Ex. 18 appears at the very beginning of a text, which reads directly afterwards:

Ex. 22  

(As for me, I was leaving in the direction of the riverbank loaded with these two tbw-boxes, when PN arrived and took delivery)

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{iw} & \text{šm} & \text{irmf} & \text{iw(}} \text{si} \text{) } & \text{hr} \text{-} w \\
\text{SBRD-1SG} & \text{go}\-\text{INF} & \text{with-3SGM} & \text{SBRD-1SG} & \text{under-3PL} \\
\end{array}
\]

“‘And I set out together with him, with these (boxes), (and I handed them over to PN).”  
(O. DeM 569, r° 2-3 = KRI v, 568,14-15)

It is therefore clear that the two protagonists move together (šm irm) at this point of the text, when the content of the boxes has been registered. It would be contextually awkward to read the first sentence in examples (18) and (22) as a past construction: in this case, the writer would have moved before the registration process took place. As such, a [SCHEDULED/IMMINENT FUTURE] reading is most plausible, suit the graphemic, morphological, constructional and contextual features of the text.

In both cases, one sees that the progressive construction is used in order to present scheduled future actions as already actual. The same holds for a third example:

Ex. 23  

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{ptr} & \text{twk} & \text{m} & \text{n}^y \text{y} \text{m-hd} \\
\text{ATT} & 2SGM & \text{in} & \text{go}\-\text{INF} \\
\end{array}
\]

“Look, you’re travelling north (i.e. you’re about to travel north).”  
(O. IFAO 1409, 2 [unpubl.] = Černý & Groll 1984: 339-340)

The mellic aspectual value of the progressive is typologically well-represented (Bybee et al. 1994: 275-278) and accounts for Černý & Groll’s (1984: 340) translation of the preceding unpublished ostracon as “You are going to go north”.

---

24 As in r° 5 of the same text, see KRI v, 569.3.
25 Discussing the opposition between SUBJECT + m + INFINITIVE and SUBJECT + hr + INFINITIVE in Earlier Egyptian, Vernus already noted (1990: 152) that “[t]he meaning of the two constructions may sometimes overlap (…) since the speaker/writer is likely to anticipate, indicating that he is performing the action whereas he is only about to perform it: For instance, a child may say ‘I am going to school’ while still in the house, preparing his schoolbag.”
26 These mellic uses of the progressive construction in Late Egyptian are linguistically conservative. Indeed, in Earlier Egyptian, the SUBJECT + m + INFINITIVE pattern had precisely this mellic value as the only available meaning for verbs of all Ak tionsart classes (Vernus 1990: 143-162). As shown by the above-mentioned examples, this value is apparently sometimes preserved in Late Egyptian, even for durative events. The examples discussed here potentially enlarge the uses of SUBJECT + m + INFINITIVE in Late Egyptian that are presented in Winand (2006: 310).
2.2 Two additional post-Ramesside examples of the future construction

Besides the above-mentioned Ex. 12, the source construction of the Future I is probably attested twice in a fragmentary letter of the 21st Dynasty coming from the so-called “el-Hibeh” archive. Unfortunately, the lacunary contexts in which these two examples appear do not allow us to delve too deeply into the semantics of the construction in this document:

Ex. 24 [...] st n\(^{\text{r}}\)y r m\(^{\text{s}}\)e [...] st n\(^{\text{r}}\)y r m\(^{\text{s}}\)e [...] they go:INF ALL march:INF [...] “[...] they are going to march [...]”

(P. Strassburg 24 IV+V\(^{29}\), \(r^{o} 2 = \text{Spiegelberg 1917a: 19}\))

Ex. 25 y\(^{3}\) wnsf n\(^{r}\)y smi [...] y\(^{3}\) wn-f n\(^{y}\) smi [...] actually PST-3SGM go:INF report:INF [...] “Actually, he was going to report [...]”

(P. Strassburg 24 IV+V, \(r^{o} 5 = \text{Spiegelberg 1917a: 18}\))

However, both examples display interesting features at the constructional level. First, it should be noted that the preposition \(m\) is missing in examples (24) and (25), as sometimes happens (Černý & Groll 1984: 339) in the Late Egyptian corpus when the infinitive that follows the preposition \(m\) in the Present I pattern has a nasal initial consonant. This is part of a broader tendency in Late Egyptian not to write clusters of two nasals. A further example of such omission with the verb \(n^{y}\) is found in the tale of Wenamun:

Ex. 26 ptr st iw-w n\(^{r}\)y r khh.w

ptr st iw-w n\(^{r}\)y r khh-w

ATT 3PL SBRD-3PL go:INF ALL swamp-PL “Look at them (i.e. the birds) going to the swamps.”

(P. Moscow 120, \(r^{o} 2,66 = \text{LES 73,16}\))

The absence of \(m\) in the construction will be discussed further below in the context of Demotic (see §3.4), but it should be noted that it is already lacking in some of the earliest examples.

A second noticeable feature is the absence of \(r\) before the infinitival phrase after \(n^{y}\) in example Ex. 25, as opposed to Ex. 12 and 24. Indeed, the loss of the \(r\) before

---

27 See Müller (2009: 251-264) who convincingly shows that this archive is likely to come from el-Ahaiwah, some 170 kilometers north of Thebes.


29 The join between these two fragments is due to D. Lefèvre and M. Müller (see Lefèvre 2008: II,44). We are very grateful to D. Lefèvre for giving us access to his unpublished PhD thesis.

30 Winand (1992: 421-422 §654-655) notes that, in the Present I predicative pattern, “la préposition \(m\) est très rarement omise (3 cas sur 25). (…) Quand la préposition est absente, le verbe a toujours une consonne nasale à l’initiale” and he points to the fact that “[l’]absence de la préposition \(m\) (…) possède un caractère accidentel, dû à des raisons phonétiques”; as Wente (1959: 95) puts it: “assimilation of the first consonants can be regarded as responsible for the omission.” Given the absence of graphemes that would favor an analysis of \(n^{y}\) as a stative in these cases, we prefer this explanation to the one suggested by Reintges (2011: 68) who analyses Ex. 24-26 as statives already in Late Egyptian (see the discussion in §3.4; furthermore, the progressive reading attributed to the stative of verbs of motion in Late Egyptian — his Ex. 79 — appears to us disputable).
the infinitive in the [SUBJECT (m) n\textordmasculine} y r sqm] construction between Late Egyptian and Demotic has generally been considered to be problematic (e.g. Winand 1992: 423 §656). For example, while discussing the source construction of the Future I in Coptic, Polotsky (1960: 403) noted that “[t]here is no satisfactory explanation for the absence of the expected preposition e- after na-” in Coptic. But he refers immediately afterwards to Spiegelberg (1893), which discusses Der infinitiv des Zweckes nach den Verben der Bewegung (1893: 39-41). Elaborating on a remark by Erman (1880: 197-200 §303-307) in the first edition of his Neuägyptische Grammatik, Spiegelberg suggests that, besides the usual purpose construction comprising the allative preposition r + infinitive for expressing the goal after movement verbs, there is a less frequent construction\(^{31}\) with the same meaning in which the bare infinitive is used after verbs of motion (i.e., with no preposition introducing the goal expression). Compare for instance the following two expressions of goal-oriented motion after the verb iwi “to come”:

\begin{verbatim}
Ex. 27 hr ir $p_i$ nty iwek r irsf nsi
but TOPZ ART.DEF.MSG REL FUT\(^1\)-2SGM FUT\(^2\) do:INF-3SGM for-1SG
phyšk iy.t r nwy.tsi
psy-k iy-t r nwy-t-i
POSS.MSG-2SGM come-INF ALL take.care-INF-1SG
“But what you will do for me, is to come to take care of me (if you learn that something happened to me).”
(P. d’Orbiney 8,3 = LES 17,11-12)
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
Ex. 28 wn.in ti 7 hw.t-hr.t hr iy.t ptrs
wn_in ti 7 hwt_hrt hr iy-t ptr-s
SEQ ART.DEF.FSG 7 Hathors on come-INF see:INF-3SGF
“And the seven Hathors came to see her.”
(P. d’Orbiney 9,8 = LES 19,10)
\end{verbatim}

As is often the case, one might imagine that the preposition r ‘to’ is simply omitted in the second case, i.e., we are dealing with a kind of scribal mistake that does not represent an actual linguistic construction. However, a quick survey of the available Late Egyptian material\(^{32}\) shows that the second construction with the bare infinitive after the motion verb is found more than 30 times in the corpus and is not limited to particular lexemes, but is rather possible with any verb of motion.\(^{33}\) Here, we will limit ourselves to quoting a handful of examples involving different verbs of motion (“\(n\) “to turn”, \(hn\) and \(sm\) “to go”, \(h\dot{s}l\) “to go down”, \(shsh\) “to run in a hurry”)\(^{34}\) in order to ascertain the plausibility of two different constructions for the expression of the goal after movement verbs:\(^{35}\)

\(^{31}\) The earliest quoted occurrence is P. Westcar, 12,2; he also mentions Coptic examples.
\(^{32}\) In the Ramses corpus, see Polis, Honnay & Winand (2013).
\(^{33}\) As noted by J.Fr. Quack (p.c.), one could alternatively postulate that the preposition r was left unwritten in Late Egyptian hieratic because of its purely vocalic realisation. Although this possibility can definitively not be ruled out, we think that the relatively rare absence of the allative preposition r for introducing purpose clauses after other types of verbs makes the proposal put forward here likely.
\(^{34}\) One should probably also include here examples of the related construction rwi “to go away (from)” + INFINITIVE, which are common in epistolary formulas. See, e.g., P. Turin 1974+1945, r\(^9\) 6 (= LRL 39,11).
\(^{35}\) Compare e.g. French je viens manger vs. je viens pour manger.
Before proceeding, we briefly summarize the feature that was rather the short pattern construction with future reference. As such, the absence of infinitive were possible.

As shown by Ex. 31, the allative preposition ḥn is probably not to be taken as an index of an advanced stage of grammaticalization: it was rather the short pattern, also available for other verbs of motion, that had been preferred in this case for the new construction with future reference.

2.3 Features of the Future I in Late Egyptian

Before proceeding, we briefly summarize the features of the Allative Future in Late Egyptian. First, it should be noted again that this exploratory construction is fairly rare: three examples occur in the published material (Ex. 12, 24-25), all of which come from the south of Egypt.

---

Ex. 29 (And all the warriors who escaped me,)

\[iw\text{-}sn \; \text{ḥr} \; \text{ḥn} \; m\text{ḥf} \; ir\text{-}n\text{ḥf}\]

SEQ-3PL stand:INF on turn:INF see:INF do-PST.REL-1SG

“They stood up, turning (themselves) to see what I did.”

(P. Raïfè-Sallier 3, = KRI II, 64,15)\(^{36}\)

Ex. 30 \[mtw\text{-}k \; di\text{-}t \; ḥn\text{ḥf} \; wḥ\text{ḥf} \; t\text{ḥ} \; ih\text{ḥf}\]

Conj-2SGM CAUS-INF go:SBJV-3SGM search:INF ART:DEF:FSG cow-F

“(…) And you will have him go look for the cow.”

(O. Leipzig 16, r\(^{5}\) 8-v\(^{2}\) 2 = HO, pl. 33A,2)\(^{37}\)

Ex. 31 \[\ldots\; pt \; nty \; h\text{ḥy} \;  ErrorResponse \; n\text{ḥk}\]

\[\ldots\; p\text{s} \; nty \; h\text{ḥy} \;  ErrorResponse \; n\text{ḥk}\]

\[\ldots\; ART:DEF:MSG \; REL \; go\text{-}down:INF \; call:INF \; for-2SGM\]

“(…) The one who goes down to call you.”

(O. Michaelides 102, r\(^{5}\) 5 = Goedicke & Wente 1962: pl. 92)

Ex. 32 \[iw\text{ḥf} \; sm \; n\text{-}w\text{ḥb}\text{-}t \; n \; p\text{-}y\text{ḥf} \; it\]

SEQ-3SGM go:INF avenge-INF for POSS.MSG-3SGM father

“(…) And so he went to seek justice for his father.”

(P. Chester Beatty 2, r\(^{1}\) 6,7-7,1 = LES 33,13-14)

Ex. 33 \[m \; sḥs\text{ḥ} \; ph \; ps \; ph \; tw\]

VET hurry:INF attack:INF ART:DEF:MSG attack:PTCP:PST = 2SGM

“Do not hasten to attack the one who attacked you (leave him to the god)”

(P. Boulaq IV & P. DeM I, 21,14/8,2 = Quack 1994: 320)

If one accepts examples of this kind as an argument in favor of the existence of an alternate construction of the infinitive when encoding goals after verbs of motion, it appears that both the infinitive introduced by the allative preposition ḥn and the bare infinitive were possible purpose clause constructions.

As shown by Ex. 25, as early as the 21\(^{st}\) dynasty, the shorter, syntactically more bound expression may have been preferred for the Subject (m) n\(^{5}\) (r) infinitive construction with future reference. As such, the absence of the allative preposition ḥn is probably not to be taken as an index of an advanced stage of grammaticalization: it was rather the short pattern, also available for other verbs of motion, that had been preferred in this case for the new construction with future reference.

---

36 In the hieroglyphic version of the Battle of Qadesh, the construction is different since mḥf (‘see’) is introduced by the locative preposition ḥn (KRI II, 64,12-14). Another possible interpretation of this example would therefore be to consider that ḥn is omitted under relevance before mḥf.

37 For a similar construction of ḥn (‘go’), see P. BM 10375, v\(^{6}\) 3-4 = LRL 47,3-4. In O. Leipzig 16, see also v\(^{6}\) 4 for a construction sm (‘go’) + infinitive.
Furthermore, the construction is attested in a relative clause, as in Ex. 12, and can follow the backshifter wn, as in Ex. 25. In general linguistic studies, these are usually features considered to be characteristic of an advanced stage of grammaticalization of future constructions. The Ancient Egyptian data, however, show that this is not necessarily the case, even if one has to keep in mind that this observation is based on very few examples and could be modified by new evidence.

Additionally, we suggested an explanation for the absence of both m and r at the graphemic level already in Late Egyptian. This means that the formal reduction observed in grammaticalization studies had actually taken place very early. It cannot be described as a long process of erosion, but is rather accounted for based on phonetic constraints, i.e., a constraint on clusters of nasals in m n'y, and constructional constraints, i.e., the existence of an alternate construction for the infinitive of goal after verbs of motion in Late Egyptian.

Finally, there is no symmetrical negation attested for the innovative Allative Future. At this stage, the older negative construction, the symmetrical negation of the Earlier Egyptian Allative Future (bn lwf r sd’n “he will not hear”) is the only means for negating future time reference, as in, e.g., Ex. 2 and 7.

The description above might lead one to think that the Later Egyptian Allative Future can already be described as a fully grammaticalized future tense in Late Egyptian, even if it is used solely for referring to near future events — the only restriction being that no symmetrical negation is attested. Based on the three examples at our disposal, this is however not the case, since the construction imposes strict selectional restrictions on the type of participants that are licensed: not all types of subject and predicate can appear in this construction. In other words, whatever the available readings, all inferences are limited to those that are permitted by the inherent semantics of the event participants, e.g., the subject, and by the inherent semantics of the event itself, i.e., the predicate.

Considering the three examples at hand, one sees that the subject always has a human [+ANIMATE] referent (pronouns of the 1st singular, 3rd singular and 3rd plural), who is presented as exercising control [+CONTROL] over the predicate: “the expedition which I am going to make”, “they are going to march”, “he was going to report”. In all cases, the speaker reports about the action (“to make”, “to march”, “to report”) that the grammatical subject intends to perform. Furthermore, all of the predicates are compatible with intentional subject referents. In other words, these clauses report on the subject’s intentions.

What consequences does this observation have for the analysis of the semantics of a future ‘tense’ like the emerging Allative Future in Late Egyptian? The most plausible reading or inference that is available to addressees in these contexts is a subject-oriented one: in these contexts, the addressee would plausibly infer that the writer is making a statement about the intentions of the grammatical subject to carry out an action.

---

38 See Bybee et al. (1991: 32); Bybee et al. (1994: 244). See also the comments on this point about the Earlier Egyptian Allative Future in Grossman & Polis (2014).
As will become clear, this point is crucial for the argument that follows regarding the grammaticalization of the construction. We have argued elsewhere\textsuperscript{39} that, given the same perceptual input, addressees can make different types of inferences. A prominent type is participant-oriented inferences, e.g., subject-oriented inferences, as described above. The other type is speaker-oriented inferences. In this case, the reader infers that the writer is talking about his or her own state of mind, perspective, or view of that which is said. The difference between these two types of inference can be more or less salient, depending on the particular context and cotext, types of subject and types of predicate. For example, take the following utterance:

Ex. 34  Sebastian is going to move to Berlin.

The reader can infer that the speaker is reporting on the subject’s intention (= subject-oriented inference), or that the speaker is making a prediction about an event (speaker-oriented inference). The point we would like to emphasize here is that speaker-oriented inferred meanings (e.g., prediction in this case) are those that impose fewer selectional restrictions on the construction than does the semantics of the earlier source construction: a speaker can use the innovative form-function pairing with previously unlicensed participants, i.e., new types of subjects and predicates. If a listener interprets the above utterance as being a statement about Sebastian and his movement in space or his intentions, this would tend to reinforce the existing selectional restrictions, which are essentially presuppositions about the way the world works; if, on the other hand, the listener interprets the utterance as being a prediction about an event that will come to pass, this would lead to the relaxation of selectional restrictions, since predictions can be made about nearly anything. When a relaxation of selectional restriction takes place, new types of subjects and predicates can occur in the construction.

Examples like the ones attested in the Late Egyptian corpus are potentially open to such speaker-oriented inferences; and if the meaning of a construction is interpreted, on the basis of a given utterance, as encoding the prediction of the speaker rather than the intention of the subject, then the construction can be replicated with the same constructional meaning, with the resulting relaxation of the selectional restrictions bearing on the INTENTIONAL/SCHEDULED future construction.

2.4 Other emergent future constructions in Late Egyptian?

Before turning to the Demotic evidence, we would like to point out that these first occurrences of a construction that was to become the Allative Future in Coptic appear alongside another incipient construction involving a movement verb, namely Šm “to go (away)”.

This verb can express motion with purpose. Three different constructions are attested with the meaning “go (in order) to do something”. The most frequent is when Šm governs a prepositional phrase introduced by the allative preposition r: Šm r + INFINITIVE “to go to + INFINITIVE,” as in Ex. 35-36. As we have seen above (§2.2), another possibility after verbs of motion like Šm is a bare infinitive in order to express the purpose of the movement, as in Ex. 37:

\textsuperscript{39} See Grossman and Polis (2014).
The third construction is syntactically limited to occurrences where šm, as governing verb, is introduced by hr “(upon)”. In such cases, the purpose meaning can be expressed by a phrase also introduced by hr: hr šm hr + INFINITIVE. The second predicate introduced by hr is syntactically coordinated, even if semantically subordinated. The main patterns relevant here are the Present I, as in Ex. 38 and sequential narrative constructions, see Ex. 39-40.

Ex. 38 (and as for any member of the army about whom one will hear that)

sw hr šm.t hr nhm dh-r.w grw š3 m p3 hrw
ds hr šm.t hr nhm dh-r.w grw š3 m p3 hrw

3SGM on go-INF on seize:INF skin-PL still since from ART.DEF.MSG day

“He is still going and seizing skins from now on, (one will apply him the law as follows).”

(Horemhab Decree, l. 27 = Kruchten 1981: 80)

Ex. 39 (wef hr šm.t hr swr m p3 dmi

iw-f hr šm-t hr swr m p3 dmi

SEQ-3SGM on go-INF on drink:INF in ART.DEF.MSG village

“He went and drank in the village (and when the crew went up to work, he remained on leave in the village).”

(O. IFAO 1357, r° 5 = KRI IV, 1626-7)

---

40 We quote this example here because, interestingly enough, it is the only example mentioned by Černý & Groll (1984: 340 §23.4) in a section devoted to one peculiarity of the verb šm (‘go’) where they stress that it is able, much like (m) n(y) (r) šḏm, to convey the “near future”. It should be noted however that the “near future” reading of this example (“the crew is not going to go work”) is only a possible inference based on the coded progressive meaning “the crew is not going (i.e. actually moving) to work”. One can hypothesize that, in the present case, Černý & Groll might have been influenced by the polysem of the construction in English. Indeed, nothing in the context indicates that a “near future” interpretation is required.
Ex. 40 (And he encountered the Ennead)

\[
\text{Ex. 41} \quad \begin{array}{l}
\text{hy-r}^e \quad \text{iwn} \quad r \quad \text{šm}^t \quad r \quad m\text{s}^f \\
\text{hy-r}^e \quad \text{iwn} \quad r \quad \text{šm}^t \quad r \quad m\text{s}^f \quad \text{FUT}^2 \quad \text{ALL} \quad \text{march:INF} \\
\text{Indeed, we will set sail (lit. go and travel, namely by boat).}^42
\end{array}
\]

(P. Anastasi VIII, 2,6-7 = KRI III, 501,13)

This use of \(\text{šm}\) can be easily accounted for if one keeps in mind the punctual Aktionsart of this lexeme (which can be represented as \(<+>\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots>\): the beginning (<+>) of this event is selected by the future pattern in the present case.

The second auxiliary use of \(\text{šm}\) can be approached by first considering a formulaic expression often used in letters: \(^44\)

\[
\text{Ex. 42} \quad m\text{-ir} \quad \text{šm} \quad [r \quad \text{ir}^l \quad b]\text{t}^3 \quad r\text{sw} \\
\text{m\_ir} \quad \text{šm} \quad r \quad \text{ir}^l \quad \text{bt}^3 \quad \text{r\_w} \\
\text{VET} \quad \text{go:INF} \quad \text{ALL} \quad \text{do:INF} \quad \text{crime} \quad \text{against:3PL} \\
\text{“Don’t proceed to do wrong to them, (or I will hold it against you as a great offense).}.” \quad (P. BN 199,5-9+196,v+198,IV, r^o 14-v^o 1 = LRL 6,3-4)\(^45\)
\]

\[
\text{Ex. 43} \quad \text{lw} \quad m\text{-ir} \quad \text{šm} \quad r \quad \text{w\_h} \quad \text{w}^e \quad \text{w}^e\text{ty} \quad \text{im} \quad \text{im\_w} \\
\text{iw} \quad \text{m\_ir} \quad \text{šm} \quad r \quad \text{w\_h} \quad \text{w}^e \quad \text{w\_ty} \quad \text{im} \quad \text{im\_w} \\
\text{SBRD} \quad \text{VET} \quad \text{go:INF} \quad \text{ALL} \quad \text{leave:INF} \quad \text{one} \quad \text{single} \quad \text{there} \quad \text{of:3PL} \\
\text{“And don’t proceed to leave a single one of them (i.e. the chariot poles) there.”} \quad (P. BM EA 10100, r^o 10 = LRL 50,12)
\]

\(^41\) And can be added to the ones mentioned in Winand (2006: 325-337).

\(^42\) KRITA III, 355 interestingly translates “seeing that we are going to depart”. This example should be directly compared to Ex. 1: \(n^f y \quad r \quad m\text{s}^f\) is used for the mellic whereas \(\text{šm} \quad r \quad m\text{s}^f\) is used for the inchoative.


\(^44\) See already Wente (1967: 23), who noted about Ex. 27: “\(\text{šm}\) would appear to have auxiliary force here”, and mentioned six possible additional occurrences of this use.

\(^45\) An additional example of this construction could be P. DeM 8, r^o 7 (= KRI VI, 671,12); \text{m\_ir} \quad \text{šm} \quad \text{[LAC]} “do not proceed […]”. P. Sallier I, 5,5-6 (= LEM 82,6-7) reads \text{m\_dy} \; \text{ḥštyk} \; \text{šm} \; \text{hw\_sw} \; \text{mi} \; ḡb\:w \; \text{r-h\_t} \; \text{tsw} “do not let your heart go and flutter about like the leaves in front of the wind” (on the use of the Stative inflexion after the causative \(\text{rdi}, see Kammerzell 1983 and Peust 2006). Note that P. BN 199,4, \(v^o 3\) (= LRL 71,7-8) is probably not a case of an auxiliary use of \(\text{šm}\), but rather an occurrence of the pair \(\text{šm} \quad iy\) “to go back and forth (lit. ‘to go (and) to come’)” (on such pairs, see Winand 2006: 276 and here, n. 48).
In these examples, the verb šm occurs in a vetitive construction where the actual movement reading is not possible. Rather, šm refers here to cognitive movement towards an event, i.e., the intention to start a process expressed by (r) + INFINITIVE. As such, šm can be described here as a mellic auxiliary, with a use restricted to fully agentive and intentional subjects who are able to initiate an event. Regarding the translation of Ex. 42-45, we opted above for a literal rendering “proceed to do something”, but the intended meaning is clearly a modally marked “do not voluntarily do something”, i.e. “do not dare do something”.

Bearing these examples in mind, one can quote additional examples where the meaning is much the same, even if the verbs involved (ḥmsi “to sit”, ḥṣ “to stand” and ʿk “to enter”) are compatible with a movement interpretation:

Ex. 46 (Do not be slothful, do not be idle.)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ex. 46} & \quad \text{iw} & m-ir & šm & r & hms & m & pływšk & pr \\
& \text{SBRD VET} & \text{go:INF} & \text{ALL} & \text{sit:INF} & \text{in} & \text{POSS.MSG-2SGM} & \text{house} \\
& \text{“And do not dare to stay in your house, (without caring for you superior, so that the harvest of Pharaoh which is under you responsibility perish).”} \\
& \text{(P. Chester Beatty V, v$^o$ 1,6-7 = Gardiner 1935: pl. 26)}
\end{align*}
\]

Ex. 47 (Then, see, you should come to see who is going to go and perform the corvée labor for and who is not going to go.)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ex. 47} & \quad m-ir & iry\langle\text{r}\rangle & n & šm.t & r & ḥṣ \\
& \text{m-ir} & \text{iry-tn} & šm-t & r & ḥṣ \\
& \text{VET AUX:SBJV-2PL} & \text{go:INF} & \text{ALL} & \text{stand:INF} \\
& \text{“And not[46], don’t dare stay inactive (when this retainer of mine reaches you […]).”} \\
& \text{(P. Mallet, IV,3-4 = KRI VI, 66,13)}
\end{align*}
\]

Ex. 48 (May you not go and enter the tribunal!)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ex. 48} & \quad \text{imywšk} & šm & ʿk & r & knb.t \\
& \text{imy-k} & šm & ʿk & r & knb-t \\
& \text{VET-2SGM go:INF} & \text{enter:INF} & \text{ALL} & \text{tribunal-F} \\
& \text{“May you not go and enter the tribunal!”} \\
& \text{(P. Boulaq 4, 16,17 = Quack 1994: 289)}
\end{align*}
\]

Now, the question is whether šm can be used as mellic auxiliary in other syntactic environments, namely, outside the modally-colored mellic use in the vetitive pattern. Two examples seem to point in this direction, with a possible use of šm in a construc-

---

46 For this absolute use of the vetitive construction m-ir, see Vermus (2010b: 315-316; 324-325).
47 Similarly, see P. Mallet, III,8 = KRI VI, 66,8.
48 The traditional interpretation “do not go in and out the tribunal” (e.g. Quack 1994: 95; Vermus 2010a: 318) is perhaps not the most likely, since one would then expect the pair ʿk/pr: both šm “to go” and ʿk “to enter” seems to imply a movement away from the deictic center.
tion with future time reference. Unfortunately, both are problematic from a philological perspective.

The example occurs in a letter that definitely contains some mistakes, which makes the interpretation of the whole communication somewhat complicated. It seems clear, however, that the addressee is being criticized for not having been able to supply the birds that the writer previously asked for. We suggest understanding the passage as follows:

Ex. 49  (Don’t you have numerous scribes? And you have very many attendants! Can’t you ask to provide this ?attendant? with an amount of birds)

\[
\text{twk hr } \text{ṣm t ir.t } \text{ḥḫ } <r> \text{ pšy rmṭ} \\
\text{twk ġṛ } \text{ṣm-t ir-t } \text{ḥḫ } \text{ṛ } \text{psṭ rmṭ} \\
\]

2SGM on go-INF do-INF what about DEM.MSG man

“Are you going to do with this man?: (Can’t you tell him that there is none [i.e. no bird], so that he go [namely, to find some]; fare you well!)”

(P. Anastasi V, 1 11.6 = LEM 61.14)

The second example comes from the first two lines of a “love song” written on an ostracon. The reading of the subject of the main clause (ḥwtw)\(^49\) as well are the traces at the beginning of line 2 ([… l]wśl) are problematic, but the reading of the whole sentence is likely to be:

Ex. 50  p3 grḥ, (l)n ?twwt? m ṣm isk […] l[wśl] ḥnūs

p3 grḥ in twwt m ṣm isk […] tw-ḥ ḥnū-s

VOC night Q one in go:INF delay:INF […]PRS-1SG with-3SGF

“O night, is one going to delay [the moment when] I will be with her?”\(^50\)

(O. Nash 12, 1.1-2 = Mathieu 1996: pl. 26)

In both examples, the verb ṣm occurs in the Present I pattern. It is introduced by the preposition hr in Ex. 49 and m in Ex. 50,\(^51\) where the progressive aspect is overtly marked (see above, §1). It should be noted that, in both examples, the infinitive governed by ṣm is not introduced by r (see also Ex. 37 & 48), which could be taken — very cautiously — as an argument in favor of an auxiliary, viz., more bound, status of the verb ṣm in these contexts.

Most important in the context of this study, however, is that, if these examples are to be taken as positive evidence in favor of the existence of a construction involving ṣm with future time reference, then it means that more than one exploratory construction entered the written repertoire during the New Kingdom for expressing imminent/scheduled future reference, even if only one of them eventually came to be grammaticalized as a full-fledged future tense.

We now turn to the analysis of the Demotic examples of the Later Egyptian Allative Future in order to describe the evolution of the selectional restrictions of the nfy sḏm


\(^{50}\) For the use of ỉw for introducing complement clauses after verbs of manipulation, see Polis (2009, with the previous literature). Mathieu (1996: 115), who translates “est-ce que l’on marche pour m’empêcher d’être avec elle”, understands the construction in a similar way, but suggests a disputable translation for the governing verb isk “to linger, to delay”.

\(^{51}\) This example contradicts Wente’s (1959: 114) observation that ṣm is not found after the preposition m in the Present I pattern in Late Egyptian, as opposed to Middle Egyptian.
construction and to see how the functional and formal features of the construction change during this period (7th c. BCE-5th c. CE).

3 The Later Egyptian Allative Future (‘Future I’) in Demotic

In the extant Demotic corpus, the examples of ṣay (typically written ṣr, but see below) used as future auxiliary are much more numerous than in Late Egyptian. However, the most frequent form used for future reference is still the Earlier Egyptian Allative Future (‘Future III,’ see above §1.1).

Furthermore, as will be seen below, there is a significant time gap between the emergence of the construction in the Late Egyptian corpus at the end of the 20th dynasty and its first occurrences in Demotic: the first certain examples of the Later Egyptian Allative Future in Demotic can be dated to the 1st century CE,52 i.e., some 1000 years after the first occurrences of the construction in Late Egyptian.

In this section, we first present a short overview of the verb ṣay in Demotic when used as a lexical verb of motion; we then turn to the future constructions based on this verb and their syntactic environments; the final part of this section will be devoted to the study of the selectional restrictions still in place on the use of the Later Egyptian Allative Future in Demotic.

3.1 The verb ṣay in Demotic

In Demotic lexicographical tools, the verb ṣay is said to have the meaning “to go”,53 which indicates that it has become a regular verb of oriented motion, the earlier [SAILING] semantic component being completely lost.

As shown by Ex. 51-53, this verb is used throughout the entire Demotic documentation. Indeed, these three examples belong to different genres, e.g., literary texts (Ex. 51 & 53), on the one hand, and, e.g., legal documents, on the other (Ex. 52). Moreover, they range from Early Demotic (P. Rylands IX) to Roman Demotic (P. Harkness):

Ex. 51   in l.irsk nṢy r tšyw-dy
in iir-k  nṢy r tš_y_w_dy
Q PRS-2SGM go:INF ALL Teudjoi
“Are you going to Teudjoi?”

Ex. 52   i.irs k nṢ r tš s.t n pš-rw
iir-k nṢ r tš s-ṭ n pš_rw
SBRD-2SGM go:INF ALL the place-F of Paru
“(…) when you are going to the place of Paru.”
(P. Marseille 299, n8 8 – Thebes – 3rd c. BCE = Vittmann 1980: 129)

---

52 Ex. 87 is dated by its editor from the 2nd century BCE, but this dating, as well as the reading of the text itself, is problematic.

53 See Erichsen (1954: 207-208) and CDD, N, p. 22-24. It occurs 64 times in the Thesaurus Linguae Aegyptiae (as of January 2014), which does not cover the whole Demotic documentation.

54 All the dates of the Demotic examples are taken from www.trismegistos.org, unless mentioned otherwise.
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Ex. 53 ḥd iw-y nṛ i.ir wsir ḥnh-wdj-snb
D ḥd iy nṛ iir wsir ḥnh wdj snb
QUOT FUT-1SG go:INF ALL Osiris life prosperity health
“(…) saying: I’m going to go to Osiris, life, prosperity, and health.”
(P. Harkness 2/5 – Per-nebet-oudji55 – 1st c. CE = Smith 2005: 55)

In terms of transitivity and valency, the verb nṛ in Demotic is intransitive and occurs only with oblique arguments. These can be introduced by various prepositions, such as r (frequent, see above) or n/n-im-six. In some instances, the verb can be modified by adverbs like r-hr (‘down’) and r-hr (‘up’),57 which are in turn followed by an oblique argument.

3.2 The future construction with nṛ in Demotic

The corpus shows clear evidence that there are two constructions that involve the verb nṛ followed by an infinitive in Demotic. In the first construction, the infinitive after nṛ is introduced by the allative preposition r [SUBJECT nṛ r INFINITIVE], while in the second, the bare infinitive is used after nṛ [SUBJECT nṛ INFINITIVE].

3.2.1 The construction SUBJECT nṛ r + INFINITIVE

There are 17 examples of this construction in the Demotic corpus of the Thesaurus Linguae Aegyptiae.58 These examples occur in 6 different texts belonging to a variety of genres (literary, administrative and magical texts) and dating from the 3rd century BCE to the 3rd century CE. The spelling of nṛ in this construction varies quite a bit in the corpus:59

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texts</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P. Mag. LL</td>
<td>n-nṛ / n-n(&gt;().k</td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. MH 154; Setne I; Inaros</td>
<td>nṛ.k</td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Magical LL; O. MH 4038</td>
<td>in-nṛ / in-n(&gt;().k</td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inaros; P. Mag. LL; Setne II</td>
<td>in-nṛ.k</td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 3. Writing of the auxiliary verb in the nṛ r + INFINITIVE construction

The main difficulty with this construction in Demotic is to decide whether the examples are to be understood as having future reference or as denoting a progressive motion with purpose. As illustrated by the following example, it is often not easy to

---

55 In the 10th nome of Upper-Egypt, north of Antaipolis/Qaw el-Kebir.
56 See for instance Mythus 16/29 or P. Vienna D 12006 4/11.
57 Setne I, 3/12 and Setne II, 6/1 respectively, as well as P. Mag. LL 6/30.
58 To the examples listed by the TLA (as of January 2014), one can add O. MH 4038 A/4, iwš hpr iwš in-nṛ r ir ney km “If you are going to be a gardener for me”.
59 We will come back to this issue later (see under §3.4) when discussing the probable reanalysis of the auxiliary verb constructed as m + infinitive as a Stative.
know whether the subject is actually moving, the interpretation relying heavily on difficult contexts:

Ex. 54  (It is he who placed the sky and the air under Horus,)

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{iw} & \text{f} & n^\circ \text{k}^60 & \text{r} & \text{khh} & \text{n} \\
\text{SBRD-3SGM} & \text{go:AUX} & \text{ALL} & \text{make} & \text{inf} & \text{f} \\
\text{for} & \text{father} & \text{3SGM} & \text{Osiris} & \text{for} & \text{father} \text{Osiris} \\
\text{“When he goes to make libation for his father Osiris”} & \text{(P. Spiegelberg, 1/7-8)} \\
\end{array}
\]

Is Horus actually travelling to make libation for Osiris or are we to understand this sentence as involving future reference alone? The context favors the first interpretation, i.e., that motion is actually taking place.

Other examples are certainly best understood as involving future reference, even if the [MOTION WITH PURPOSE] cannot be completely ruled out:

Ex. 55  (The balm that you should apply to your eye,)

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{i} & \text{ir} & \text{k} & \text{in} & \text{n}^\circ \text{k} & \text{r} \\
\text{SBRD-2SGM} & \text{go:AUX} & \text{ALL} & \text{interrogate} & \text{inf} & \text{ACC} \\
\text{the} & \text{lamp} & \text{“When you are going to perform a lamp divination.”} \\
\end{array}
\]

In the context of Ex. 55, a [MOTION WITH PURPOSE] reading is difficult: why would the balm have to be applied to the eye specifically before or during the walk to the lamp? It probably makes more sense to simply understand this sentence as a future tense.

Finally there are examples of the construction \( n^\circ r + \text{INF} \) with a future meaning as the only possible reading (see also n. 50):

Ex. 56  A ship that is going to sink because of the names of Dioskoros.

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{dy} & \text{iw} & \text{f} & \text{n}^\circ & \text{r} & \text{byk} \\
\text{dy} & \text{iw} & \text{f} & \text{n}^\circ & \text{r} & \text{byk} \\
\text{ship} & \text{SBRD-3SGM} & \text{go:AUX} & \text{ALL} & \text{sink} & \text{inf} \\
\text{iw} & \text{db} & \text{n} & \text{rn} & \text{w} & \text{n} & \text{Dioskoros} \\
\text{iw} & \text{db} & \text{n} & \text{rn} & \text{w} & \text{n} & \text{Dioskoros} \\
\text{because} & \text{ART.DEF.PL} & \text{name-PL} & \text{of} & \text{Dioskoros} & \text{“A ship that is going to sink because of the names of Dioskoros.”} \\
\end{array}
\]

It would make little sense to understand that the ship is actually purposefully sailing in order to sink. The sentence has to be understood as an example of the construction \( n^\circ r + \text{INF} \) used to express future reference. Much in the same vein are examples where the infinitive phrase is built with a verb of goal-oriented motion, which shows that the \( n^\circ \) is a future auxiliary and cannot be understood as a verb of motion: \(^{61}\)

---

\(^{60}\) Concerning the presence of a final \( k \), see below §3.4.

\(^{61}\) On this example, see already the comments by Reintges (2011: 79-80).
Ex. 57  (He made Pharaoh, as well as the people from Egypt who were standing in the
court, see him as an evil bird.)

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{rwf} & \text{n's.k} & \text{r} & \text{šm} \text{ nsf} \\
\text{iw-f} & \text{n'sk} & \text{r} & \text{šm} \text{ n-f} \\
\end{array}
\]

\text{SBRD-3SGM go:AUX ALL go:INF DAT-3SGM}

“That was going to go.”  
(\text{Setne II, 6:23 = Griffith 1900: 198-200})^{62}

One could argue at length about the examples where both readings are possible, but
what should be stressed is that, while some instances are actually open to two
readings, the only one to be sometimes excluded is the motion reading, the future
reading being always available, at least as an inference.

3.2.2 The construction SUBJECT n's + INFINITIVE

In addition to the examples discussed in the previous section, the Demotic corpus
contains occurrences of an alternative construction without the allative preposition \( r \)
governing the infinitive after the verb of motion \( n's \).\(^{63}\) As we have seen (cf. §2.2), this
construction is already attested in the Late Egyptian material and is the exact parallel
of the Allative Future \( 'l-na-sōm \) in Coptic.

This construction is not yet very common in Demotic, but 45 examples from 24
different texts have been found in the whole Demotic corpus.\(^{64}\) As noted by Quack
(2006: 193), all of them appear rather late in Demotic: they are to be dated to the
Roman period or to the very end of the Ptolemaic period, except for maybe one
example (see below, Ex. 87).

When compared to the construction with the allative preposition \( r \), this second
construction involving \( n's \) displays two interesting features. First, at the semantic level,
the FUTURE reading is the only one available — unlike with the \( n's \ r \) INFINITIVE
construction where the [MOTION WITH PURPOSE] meaning is possible, if not always
plausible. Second, at the graphemic level, except for the examples from one
document,\(^{65}\) all texts exhibit a non-etymological writing of the verb \( n's \), in sharp
contrast with the first construction (compare Fig. 3 and Fig. 4, below).

\(^{62}\) Based on the photographs at our disposal, the presence of the allative preposition \( r \) after \( n's \ k \) is not
entirely certain.

\(^{63}\) For the Later Egyptian Allative Future (‘Future I’) in Demotic grammatical descriptions, see
\text{e.g.} Spiegelberg (1925: 69, §139; 77, §162); Lexa (1947-1951: §575, §630, §691); Johnson (1976:

\(^{64}\) We have collected 45 examples, and there are more. In addition to the examples quoted in this
study, see O. MH 4038, B/17-21; O. MH 4038, D5-6; O. MH 4038, D8-11; P. Mag. LL 3/34; P.
Mag. LL 17/14-15; P. Mag. LL 18/31-32; P. Mag. LL 20/19-20; P. Mag. LL 20/21; P. Mag. LL \( \nu^a \)
28/1; P. Wien 6920-6922 x+2/6; P. Wien 6920-6922 x+2/7; Ph. 218/4-5; Ph. 285/4; Ph. 289/8; Ph.
417/10; Ph. 422/6; Ph. 445/1; Kal. 14/6-7; Kal. 15/3; Dak. 61/4; OMM 100/7-8; OMM 777/6-11.
In terms of diatopic variation, the 24 texts in which the examples are found come from the
Fayyum, Abydos, Thebes, El-Hesa (near Aswan) and the Dodecaschaenus, which means that the
construction occurs in documents ranging from all over Egypt. This wide array of provenances, as
well as the chronological proximity of the examples, make it hard to know if the use of the \( n's \)
INFINITIVE construction was originally limited to a particular region.

\(^{65}\) O. MH 4038, which has 6 occurrences of the Later Egyptian Allative Future. It should be noted
that, in this document (the so-called “Gardening Agreement”), besides the usual spelling \( n's \) of
the future auxiliary, one finds an instance of \( in-n's \) (see the example quoted in n. 58), when the
infinitive of the construction is introduced by the preposition \( r \) (cf. 3.2.1). Wente (1959: 37) sug-
We think that this “phonetic” spelling of the auxiliary might be considered as a graphemic symptom of a higher degree of grammaticalization: the idea is that the etymological link between the lexeme “to move” and its use as future auxiliary was no longer perceived by writers.

3.2.3 Replacement of the Future III in the “curse/blessing’ formula

Approximately a fourth of the examples of the new future construction comes from the Graffiti of the Dodecaschenaenus, a region South of modern Aswan. Of these 15 attestations, all but two appear in a very specific context, i.e., at the end of the graffito, in a formula aimed at the potential reader or eraser of the said graffito. It typically reads as follows:

Ex. 58 nte n³w fte t<y> wyšte
A R T . D E F . M S G  R E L  g o : A U X  e r a s e : I N F  D E M . F S G  a d o r a t i o n
rnsf gbe
rn-f gbe
name-3SGM cut_off:STAT
“He who will erase this adoration, his name is cut off.”
(Ph. 97/1-2 – Philae – 30 BC–499 CE = Griffith 1937: 63)

These examples are precious since they allow us to observe the replacement of the older Earlier Egyptian Allative Future construction (the ‘Future III’) in a stable syntactic environment and to have a grasp on the semantic value of the Later Egyptian Allative Future (‘Future I’) without having to make use of the later Coptic corpus.
This closing formula has a long history, which makes it possible to compare the graffiti from the Dodecaschenus and earlier examples from the Third Intermediate Period (10th–7th c. BC). Here we cite some examples from the temple of Khonsu in Karnak that are characteristic of earlier uses:

Ex. 59  
\[
\begin{align*}
ir & pꜣ nty iwꜣ ft pꜣ dgs \\
ir & pꜣ nty iw-f ft pꜣ dgs \\
\end{align*}
\]

TOPZ ART.DEF.MSG REL FUT-3SGM erase:INF ART.DEF.MSG footprint

\[
\begin{align*}
iwꜣ & ft rnꜣ \\
iw-i & ft rn-f \\
\end{align*}
\]

FUT-1SG erase:INF name-3SGM

“As for the one who will erase the footprint, I [i.e. Khonsu] will erase his name.”


Ex. 60  
\[
\begin{align*}
iwꜣ & fdk rn pꜣ nty \\
iw-i & fdk rn pꜣ nty \\
\end{align*}
\]

FUT-1SG destroy:INF name ART.DEF.MSG REL

\[
\begin{align*}
iwꜣ & ft pꜣ dgs \\
iw-f & ft pꜣ dgs \\
\end{align*}
\]

FUT-3SGM erase:INF ART.DEF.MSG footprint

“I will destroy the name (of) the one who will erase the footprint.”


Ex. 61  
\[
\begin{align*}
pꜣ & nty iwꜣ ft pꜣ dgs n D. \\
pꜣ & nty iw-f ft pꜣ dgs n D. \\
\end{align*}
\]

ART.DEF.MSG REL FUT-3SGM erase:INF ART.DEF.MSG footprint of D.

\[
\begin{align*}
pꜣ & bik-i iw-i fttn gf n bbn n \\
pꜣ & bik-i iw-i fttn gf n bbn \\
\end{align*}
\]

ART.DEF.MSG servant-1SG FUT-1SG erase:INF name-3SGM from benben

“The one who will erase the footprint of D., my servant, I will erase his name from the benben.”


As can be seen, the future construction in the relative clause is always the Earlier Egyptian Allative Future in Ex. 59-61. While this construction is still found in numerous examples of the Demotic graffiti of the Dodecaschenus, the following examples show that the new future construction is also found in this environment:

Ex. 62  
\[
\begin{align*}
pꜣ & nt nꜣw fte t<3>y wꜣste.t \\
pꜣ & nt nꜣw fte ty wꜣste-t \\
\end{align*}
\]

ART.DEF.MSG REL go:AUX erase:INF DEM.FSG adoration-F

\[
\begin{align*}
- ꜣ & gb m-biḥ pꜣy Šy ṯꜣ ṯꜣ \\
- ꜣ & gb m-biḥ py Šy ṯꜣ ṯꜣ \\
\end{align*}
\]

name-3SGM cut_off:STAT before DEM.MSG divinity great

“He who will erase this adoration, his name is erased in front of this great divinity.”

(Kal. 2/4-5 – Kalabsha – 30 BC-284 CE = Griffith 1937: 36)

---

69 These are taken from Jacquet-Gordon (2003).
As shown by this last example, the Future I can also be found in a slightly different syntactic environment, i.e., a cleft-sentence, but the semantic value of the construction remains identical: the subject is conceived as intentional, and as such exerts full control over the event.

---

70 This applies of course only to the corpus of 13 examples featuring the ‘Future I.’ The graffiti of the Dodecaschenus also exhibit a number of curse formulas in which no ‘Future I’ is found, but only the ‘Future III’ is used. Ex. Dak. 4, Dak. 10, Ph. 270.
In summary, the occurrences of the Future I in this syntactic pattern are symptomatic of this construction still being associated most strongly with subject-oriented inferences, rather than with speaker-oriented ones. As in Late Egyptian (§2.3), the subject exercises full control over the predicate and is presented as intending to perform the action.

One isolated example is worth mentioning. In one graffito (Ex. 67), the scribe apparently combined the older future construction (Future III) with the auxiliary use of nt. If our interpretation of the semantic value of the new allative future construction is correct, it could mean that he somehow used this means for combining the future value of the older construction and the strongly intentional meaning of the new future construction (i.e., subject-oriented inferences):

Ex. 67  pꜣ tnt iwꜣf nꜣ ḫṭ ꜣy wꜣš.t
ART.MSG REL FUT-3SGM go:AUX erase:INF DEM.FSG adoration-F
rnsꜣ gb m-bꜣh […]
name-3SGM cut:STAT in_front_of […]
“He who will erase this adoration, his name is cut in front of […]”
(Ph. 422/6 – Philae – 26th December 232 CE = Griffith 1937: 122)

3.2.4 The syntactic environments of the Future I

While the Late Egyptian examples were not numerous enough for us to analyze the syntactic distribution of the Future I, such a description appears within reach for Demotic. We will illustrate below the various syntactic construction in which the Future I occurs.

First, it can be used autonomously in independent main clauses (13 examples), both declarative (see below Ex. 68) and interrogative ones (Ex. 69):

Ex. 68  tḥw nꜣ w tꜣ l ḫ nꜣ pꜣ t [hw r ḫ ḫ ḫ]
PRS-1SG go:AUX CAUS:INF do:INF sky fall:INF ALL ART.MSG earth
“I will make (the) sky fall to the earth.” (P. Vienna 6920-6922, x+2/6-7

Ex. 69  (While he makes them eat and makes them drink, you tell Anubis:)
(3PL 3SG go:AUX interrogate:INF DAT-1SG today
“Will they interrogate me today? (If he says ‘Yes’ again...)”
(P. Mag. LL 18/31 – Thebes – 3rd c. CE = Griffith & Thompson 1904: 122)

As discussed above (§3.2.3), it is also well attested in relative clauses (23 examples), where the grammatical subject has full control over the predicate (see §3.3):

---

71 It should be stressed that the reading of this text is not certain; Griffith (1937: 122) tentatively reads pꜣ tnt iwꜣf mwšnt(?).
72 Another occurrence of this construction might be found in P. Cairo 30605, r² 16 (see Lexa 1947-1951: §691), but the reading of nꜣ is problematic (see de Cenival 1972: 76 & pl. VI).
73 This example could also be interpreted as a conjunctive, see Ex. 82.
Ex. 70 (Write these ostraca that are after them together with these 50 papyri and (the) note.)

IRM n l nt iw.ir=k n³w sš
IRM n³ nt iw_ir-k n³w sš
with ART.DEF.PL REL PRS-2SGM GO:AUX write:INF
“Together with those which you will write (…)”

(OMM 100/7–8 – Narmouthis – 150–225 AD = Giannotti 2007: 130-131)

Ex. 71 iw bn-šw pš nt n³w ešy
iw bnšw pš nt n³w ešy
SBRD NEG.EXIST ART.DEF.MSG REL GO:AUX stand:INF
pšy(šy) lḥry(?)
pš-y lḥry(?)
POSS.MSG-1SG healing(?)
“(…) there being no one who would help my healing(?)”

(ODN 136/5-6 – Narmouthis – 198-206 CE = Menchetti 2005: 76)

Ex. 72 (and you will make him stand on a new brick)

n pš nw nt-iw.ir-e pš-r e n³e hš n-imš
n pš nw nt_iw_ir-e pš-r e n³e hš n-im-f
in ART.DEF.MSG moment REL PRĀ GO:AUX raise:INF IN-3SGM
“When PRĀ will raise up (and ascend full…)”

(P. Mag. LL 29/2-3 – Thebes – 3rd c. CE = Griffith & Thompson 1904: 164)

It is also found after the circumstantial (Ex. 73) and second tense converters (Ex. 74):

Ex. 73 (My heart hangs upon you in Egypt, in Meroe and in the deserts.)
pšy sn wšf nt mtw-y iw-y n³w hšš
pšy sn wšf nt mtw-y iw-y n³w hšš
DEM.MSG brother one REL with-1SG SBRD-1SG GO:AUX leave:INF-3SGM
“This only brother of mine, I will leave him (and I say to you: ‘Keep him safe
until I come back to Egypt’.”

(Ph. 416/21 – Philae – 10th April 253 CE = Griffith 1937: 115)

Ex. 74 (... the son of a master of song for 202 generations,)
r:šr pr-šs rsr n³w ti wš n-imš nšn(?) i.r/hršš(?)
ršr pr-šs rsr n³w ti wš n-imš nšn(?) i.r/hršš(?)
THMZ Pharaoh Osiris GO:AUX give:INF one IN-3PL TO-1PL before-3SGF
“It is before her that king Osiris will give one of them to us.”

(Ph. 319/6-7 – Philae – 81 BC–499 CE = Griffith 1937: 94)

Finally, one notices the frequent occurrence of this construction in conditional
constructions, both in the protasis (e.g. Ex. 75, with second person subjects; see §3.3)
and in the apodosis (e.g. Ex. 76, with first person subjects; see also §3.3):

Ex. 75 hpr.i-ršš n³w in pšyš bšš r-bnr
hpr.i-ršš n³w in pšyš bšš r-bnr
COND=2SGM GO:AUX bring:INF POSS.MSG-2SGM garbage outside
“If you intend to bring your garbage outside, (you carry your earth for the pot-
task).”

(OMM 785/7-5 – Narmouthis – end of 2nd c. CE = Menchetti 2006: 146)

Ex. 76 twy wš ti st n-wšš šwšš(?)
twy wš ti st n_wšš šwšš(?)
PRS=1SGM GO:AUX give:INF =3PL without substitution

write (…).”

(Ex. 76/3/21 = Griffith 1937: 94)

write (…).”

(Ex. 76/3/21 = Griffith 1937: 94)

write (…).”

(Ex. 76/3/21 = Griffith 1937: 94)

write (…).”

(Ex. 76/3/21 = Griffith 1937: 94)

write (…).”

(Ex. 76/3/21 = Griffith 1937: 94)

write (…).”

(Ex. 76/3/21 = Griffith 1937: 94)
This variety of syntactic contexts is usually seen as evidence of an advanced stage of grammaticalization (see n. 36). However, as mentioned above regarding the Late Egyptian example (see §2.3), this might not necessarily be the case. Indeed, some of the oldest examples in Late Egyptian are already found after the relative marker nty and the backshifter wn.

3.2.5 Negation of the Future I in Demotic

Up until recently, no example of a symmetric negation was attested for the Future I in Demotic, the negation of future reference always being expressed by the older symmetric negation of the Earlier Egyptian Allative Future (Future III), even in the latest Demotic texts (as mentioned by Quack 2006: 193):

Ex. 77 iw f ḫpr iw tš mn tš md t n c ḫpr (…)
COND-3SGM happen:INF SBRD anything go:AUX happen:INF (…)

“(…)?”

The publication of new Demotic ostraca from Narmouthis, a town in the Fayyum in which were found several hundreds of late Demotic ostraca (late 2nd c. CE–early 3rd c. CE), whose chief characteristic is their use of Greek words written with the Greek alphabet, has changed this situation. Indeed, we now have at least two occurrences of the symmetric negation of this construction in Demotic.74

Ex. 78 r bn-iw tawy {tawy} nsw ir παραγράφω n-imf
COND-3SGM NEG PRS-1SG go:AUX do:AUX register ACC-3SGM

“(…)?”

(O. MH 4038, B/17–21 – Thebes – 3rd c. CE = Parker 1940: 87)
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Ex. 79 (Give me food)

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
    r & bn\text{-}lw & tw\text{w} & n\text{sw} & ir & \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\gamma\rho\alpha\nu & n\text{-}im\text{-}tn & ?n'?
    \hline
    r & \text{bn}_\text{iw} & tw\text{-}y & n\text{w} & ir & \text{paragrap}^{\text{in}} & n\text{\_im\_tn} & ?n?
\end{array}
\]

“For I am not going to register you (because it is your duty to report him).”


At a semantic level, it is significant that these two Demotic examples of a symmetric negation for the Later Egyptian Allative Future appear in discourses with first person singular subjects, i.e., subject that refer to the speaker as a strictly intentional source of assertion.

3.3 Selectional restrictions on the construction

As shown in §3.2, there is ample evidence that the construction tw\text{w} n\text{sw} q\text{dm} is already well on its way to becoming a future tense in Demotic: the loss of the preposition r before the infinitive in most of the examples, the non-etymological writing of n\text{sw}, the variety of syntactic environments in which the construction can occur and the emergence of a symmetrical negation of the Future I all attest to this. All in all, at the formal level, the Future I construction in Late Demotic is very similar to its Coptic descendant.

In terms of semantics, however, the selectional restrictions of the construction (see §2.3) indicate that subject-oriented inferences (intentional reading) are still very prominently associated with this future construction, compared with speaker-oriented inferences, i.e., the ones that lead to the predictive meanings in context.

Fig. 5 below shows the types of subjects attested for this future construction in Demotic:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANIMATE</th>
<th>Nominal</th>
<th>INANIMATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pronominal</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nominal</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1SG\textsuperscript{78}</td>
<td>s\textsubscript{y} (11 occ.)</td>
<td>p\textsuperscript{3-\text{r}} “Prā”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG.M\textsuperscript{79}</td>
<td>s\textsubscript{k} (5 occ.)</td>
<td>wsir “Osiris”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG.F\textsuperscript{80}</td>
<td>s\textsubscript{t} (3 occ.)</td>
<td>rm\textsuperscript{t} nb “anyone”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG.M\textsuperscript{81}</td>
<td>s\textsubscript{f} (1 occ.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG.F\textsuperscript{82}</td>
<td>s\textsubscript{s} (1 occ.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL\textsuperscript{83}</td>
<td>s\textsubscript{t} (1 occ.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1SG\textsuperscript{78}</td>
<td></td>
<td>t\textsuperscript{i} mn t\textsuperscript{i} md.t\textsuperscript{84} “anything”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\textsuperscript{76} See the comment in n. 74.
\textsuperscript{77} P. Mag. LL 29/2-3; Ph. 319/6-7; St. Aswan 1057.
\textsuperscript{78} O. MH 4038, B/17-21; O. MH 4038, B/31-36; P. Mag. LL 20/19; P. Mag. LL 20/19-20; P. Mag. LL 20/21; P. Wien 6920-6922 x+2/6; P. Wien 6920-6922 x+2/6-7; P. Wien 6920-6922 x+2/7; Ph. 416/21; ODN 156/2-9+ODN Narmouthis 2006/1-8; ODN Narmouthis 2006/8-12.
\textsuperscript{79} P. Mag. LL v\textsuperscript{o} 28/1; P. Mag. LL v\textsuperscript{o} 33/3; OMM 100/7-8; OMM 777/6-11; OMM 785/5-7.
\textsuperscript{80} O. MH 4038, C22-24; O. MH 4038, D5-6; O. MH 4038, D6-8.
\textsuperscript{81} Ph. 422/6 (see the discussion above of Ex. 67).
\textsuperscript{82} P. Mag. LL 18/31.
\textsuperscript{83} P. Mag. LL v\textsuperscript{o} 8/13-14.
\textsuperscript{84} P. Mag. LL v\textsuperscript{o} 8/13-14.
One can first observe the significant proportion of first person subjects in assertive speech acts, i.e., in sentences where the subject/speaker is stating his personal intentions for the future:

Ex. 80  (If you want gold, gold being what you want.)
\[
\text{twy n}^e \text{ ti } \text{t}w \text{ tk r p} \text{ lgtw}^\text{n} \\
\text{taw n}^e \text{ tl-w } \text{tk r p} \text{ lgtw}^\text{n}
\]
PRS-1SG go:AUX CAUS:INF ascend:SBJV-3PL 2SGM ALL ART.DEF.MSG lgtw^\text{n}
“I will have you brought to the lgtw^\text{n} (three times a month, since there is no agreement by me to give you gold).”

(O. MH 4038, B/31-36 – Thebes – 3\text{rd} c. CE = Parker 1940: 87)

Ex. 81  (... saying ‘You are praised.’)
\[
\text{twy } n^e \text{ hys}tk p \text{ nhh} \\
\text{tw-y n}^e \text{ hys-t-k p} \text{ nhh}
\]
PRS-1SG go:AUX praise-INF-2SGM ART.DEF.MSG oil
“I will praise you, Oil, (…)’”

(P. Mag. LL 20/19–Thebes – 3\text{rd} c. CE = Griffith & Thompson 1904: 130)

Second and third person subjects are not exceptional, but they always occur in non-asserted contexts, i.e., in contexts where the speaker does not make a prediction about the behavior of an animate subject (e.g. “he will go to the city tomorrow”) but rather leaves the possible future fulfillment of the event entirely up to the grammatical subject.\(^{85}\) Such non-asserted contexts where the intentions of the grammatical subjects are typically interrogative clauses (Ex. 82), protatic clauses (Ex. 83) and relative clauses (Ex. 84):

Ex. 82  (They said ‘Horus, come, are you eating? Horus, come.)
\[(i)n \text{ iw} \text{.ir}^\text{k} n^e \text{ wnm} \\
\text{in iw} \text{.ir}-k n^e \text{ wnm} \]
Q PRS-2SGM go:AUX eat:INF
“Will you eat?” (He said ‘Get off me!’)\(^{86}\)

(P. Mag. LL v\text{o} 33/3 – Thebes – 3\text{rd} c. CE = Griffith & Thompson 1904: 202)

Ex. 83  iw$f \text{ hpr} \text{ iw} \text{.ir}^\text{at} n^e \text{ ir n}^3y \text{ hr-n}^3y \\
\text{iw-f hpr} \text{ iw} \text{.ir}-t n^e \text{ ir n} \text{y hr-n}y
\]
COND-3SGM happen:INF SBRD-2SGF go:AUX do:INF DEM.PL thus
“If you do this in this way, (without me having had to call after you again...)”

(O. MH 4038, C22-24 – Thebes – 3\text{rd} c. CE = Parker 1940: 88)

Ex. 84  [p \text{]} \text{ nt n}^\text{sw} \text{ t}^\text{s} \text{ t<3>y w} \text{ste} \text{t} \\
\text{p\text{=} nt n}^\text{sw} \text{ t}^\text{s} \text{ t} \text{w} \text{tет} \text{r}
\]
ART.DEF.MSG REL go:AUX read:INF DEM.FSG adoration
“[He] who will read this adoration, may he give this adoration.”

(Kal. 3/4-5 – Kalabsha – 30 BC-284 CE = Griffith 1937: 37)

On the other hand, it is quite remarkable that there is only one example in our corpus with an inanimate, unintentional subject — that is consequently unable to exercise any

\(^{85}\) See already the remarks in Polis (2006: 242).

\(^{86}\) This example is analyzed by Quack (2006: 194-195) as a conjunctive.
kind of control over the predicate. This sentence is part of a magical formula to be recited by the officiant:

Ex. 85  (I am Ramshou Shou Ramshou, the son of Pashou, of his mother Tapashou,)

\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{iw}f & \text{hpr} & t\text{i} & mn & t\text{i} & md.t & n3e & \text{hpr} \\
\text{iw-f} & \text{hpr} & t\text{e}_\text{m} & n_{e} & t\text{mdt} & n3e & \text{hpr} \\
\end{array}
\]

COND-3SGM  happen:INF  anything  go:AUX  happen:INF

“If anything happens, (do not come to me in your face of Pekhe).”

(P. Mag. LL 8/13-14 – Thebes – 3rd c. CE = Griffith & Thompson 1904: 64)

Correlatively, this is the only example with a predicate (hpr “to happen”) that presupposes a non-agentic subject. Such an example shows that, in Late Demotic, the selectional restrictions of the construction are increasingly relaxed, leading progressively to a fully fledged future tense, able to express prediction.

This predictive meaning is indeed attested in the Demotic corpus, even if admittedly rarely, for a second person subject (Ex. 86) as well as for a generic third person subject (Ex. 87):

Ex. 86  (The small cattle which escaped from the herders,)

\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
tw\text{t} & n & gm & t\text{f} & hr & t\text{i}y\text{w} & nb\text{i} & t \text{e}_t \\
tw-t & n & gm & t-f & hr & t\text{y-w} & nb-t & t \text{e}_t \\
\end{array}
\]

PRS-2SGF  go:AUX  find-INF-3SGM  on  their  nb\text{i-F}  big

“You will find it on their great nb\text{i}.t”

(O. MH 4038, D6-8 – Thebes – 3rd c. CE = Parker 1940: 89)

Ex. 87  (The small cattle which escaped from the herders,)

\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
r\text{m} & nb & n & gm & md & t \\
r\text{m} & nb & n & gm & md & t \\
\end{array}
\]

REL  FUT-3PL  come:INF  ALL  enrich:INF(?)  ART.DEF.PL  festival-PL

\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
n & l\text{w} & w & ly & r & smne(?) & n & h\text{b}.w \\
n & l\text{w-w} & iy & r & smne(?) & n & h\text{b-w} \\
\end{array}
\]

ART.DEF.PL  acts_of_praise-PL  CAUS:PTCP  PST  Isis  be_great:SBJV-3PL

“This is Isis, one of the most divine. Every man will find wealth(?), who shall come to enrich(?) the festivals and the acts of praise which Isis has made great.”

(St. Aswan 1057 – El-Hesa – 150-100 BCE = Ray 1987: 173)

See Winnicki (1996: 128) for a reading iw\text{w} iy r t\text{i} [nfr?] n3 h\text{b}.w.

One could of course claim that the Demotic corpus is limited and that the data at hand are quite fragmentary, but the fact remains that, out of more than 40 occurrences, only a few of them have the predictive meaning as the most plausible inference.

3.4 Morphological reanalysis:

From a prepositional phrase to a Stative and a future morpheme?

Throughout §3.2-3, the auxiliary n\text{f}/n3 has been glossed “AUX”, thereby avoiding taking any position regarding the morphological status of this core element of the Late Egyptian Allative Future in Demotic. We now turn to this question. In a nutshell, the Late Egyptian and Demotic material seems to show that a morphological

---

87 On this problematic example, see n. 52. The reading suggested by the editor is syntactically difficult. Quack (p.c.) suggests reading rm\text{t} nb (n) t\text{i} gm-md.t.
The grammaticalization of the Later Egyptian Allative Future

reanalysis from a prepositional phrase \((m + \text{INFINITIVE})\) to a Stative took place quite early.

As suggested by Wente (1959: 25-46), it is likely that the Statices of certain verbs of motion in Coptic — which convey a state of motion (be going, etc.) and not a completed motion event (be gone, etc.) — are not etymologically morphological Stative forms (i.e., the so-called “Old Perfective”), but derive rather from an earlier construction involving the locative preposition \(m + \text{INFINITIVE}\), which clearly expresses a progressive aspect with verbs of motion in earlier stages of the language. The relevant Coptic verbs, cited here in the Sahidic dialect, are primarily the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infinitive</th>
<th>Stative</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bôk</td>
<td>bêk</td>
<td>“to go, be going”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ei</td>
<td>nêu</td>
<td>“to come, be coming”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pôt</td>
<td>pêt</td>
<td>“to run, be running”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he</td>
<td>hêl</td>
<td>“to fall, be falling”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hôl</td>
<td>hêl</td>
<td>“to fly, be flying”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 6. Coptic verbs with Statices of ongoing motion

Even though it seems clear that these forms are grammatically Stative forms in Coptic, both at a syntactic and morphologic level, to the extent that they conform to phonological patterns for formation of other Statices, Wente’s explanation accounts for the difference in meaning of these Statices as well as for otherwise unexplained phonological features.

Crucially, in the framework of the present study, Wente’s proposal also applies to the verb \(n^r/n^\text{z}\): one most probably observes a reanalysis of an original construction \(m + \text{INFINITIVE}\) as a Stative.

The Demotic spellings of the auxiliary \(n^r\) in the construction SUBJECT \(n^r r + \text{INFINITIVE}\) studied above (§3.2.1) definitely supports such a scenario. Indeed, the grapheme \(in^\text{-}\) in spellings such as \(in-n^r\) or \(in-n^r.k\) (see Fig. 3) indeed seem to indicate that this form is not a Stative in origin, but derives from earlier \(m + \text{infinitive}\) used as durative predicate. The grapheme \(k\) that can occur at the end of the form, on the other hand, is probably to be understood as graphemically reflecting the fact that the form is considered by the scribes to be morphologically a Stative, without necessarily having any phonological substance.

---

88 Some of these reanalyzed forms might have come from an infinitive headed by a different locative preposition \((hr)\). See the remarks in Wente (1959: 43-44). This opinion is endorsed by Johnson (1969: 19, 63).
89 See above §1.2 (with n. 10) and §2.1.
90 See Layton (2011: 130, §168; 237, §309); Wente (1959: 27).
91 He actually generalizes an observation made by Griffith (1900: 153-154) regarding the origin of the stative \(nêu\) “be coming” of the verb \(ei\) “to come”, which he suggested to link to the predicative \(m \text{“in” + } iw \text{“to come”}\).
93 See e.g. Spiegelberg (1925: 53, §98); Wente (1959: 28 with n. 3); Johnson (1976: 22 & 26). Even if some Coptic lexemes probably preserve traces of the first person \(-k\) ending for the Stative (like \(nkotk\ ‘to sleep’, see Reintges 2011: 57), we think it is risky to generalize such rare cases backwards by analogy to the Demotic spellings that display a final \(-k\) for the Stative.
Finally, the fact that the vast majority of non-etymological/phonetic spellings for the verb nfirebase in the (more grammaticalized) construction SUBJECT nfirebase + INFINITIVE (§3.2.2) is indicative of the fact that the verb form is considered by the scribes to be a future auxiliary in this construction, the etymological link with the lexeme nfirebase “to move” no longer being obvious to the writers. At this stage, the presence of the allative preposition r for introducing the lexical predicate simply becomes irrelevant, since the link with the original goal-oriented verb form is lost; this accounts for the systematic absence of this preposition in the Coptic corpus.\(^94\)

The evolution of the grammatical status of the verb nfirebase could therefore be summarized as follows:\(^95\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>m + INFINITIVE</th>
<th>(\rightarrow)</th>
<th>STATIVE (\rightarrow)</th>
<th>FUTURE AUXILIARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m nfirebasej</td>
<td>(\rightarrow)</td>
<td>(in-)nfirebase(k)</td>
<td>nfirebase(n)3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 7. The reanalysis of nfirebase as a future auxiliary (1)

To sum up, the two — apparently — contradictory opinions that have been expressed regarding the origin and nature of the future auxiliary nfirebase\(n\)3 are actually compatible,\(^96\) it simply depends on the point of view one wishes to adopt. From a diachronic point of view, Gardiner’s suggestion (1906: 98) that the early Late Egyptian example\(^97\) SUBJECT + (m) nfirebase(r) sdmr is “clearly an early instance of the Coptic tense tinasōtm” — which was to be almost unanimously adopted by Egyptologists — still holds.\(^98\)

From a synchronic point of view, on the other hand, the analysis of nfirebase\(n\)3 in Roman Demotic\(^99\) and of na- in Coptic\(^100\) as a Stative is legitimate. To sum up, as Polotsky

---

94 See Polotsky (1960: 403, obs. 2).
95 Reintges (2011: 81-82) argues against the ‘traditional’ view that the future auxiliary developed from a Stative form of the verb nfirebase. He postulates that nfirebase is cyclically derived, created by a process of ‘participle formation’ (we assume that ‘particle’ was intended by the author), followed by a number of phonological rules. For Reintges, there are three main arguments against the analysis of the auxiliary as a Stative form. The problems raised in his first two arguments, which are morphosyntactic in nature, are addressed in this paper (sections §2.2 and §3.4, respectively). The third argument, phonological in nature, which deals with “the replacement of the voiced pharyngeal fricative /ʕ/ by a glottal stop /ʔ/,” (2011: 81) could be explained as typical reductive morphophonological changes characteristic of grammaticalization processes, i.e., loss of phonetic substance.
97 Namely LRL 35,15 about which Spiegelberg (1895: 60) already observed that it was a periphrasis for a future tense similar to English “I am going to do” and the French “je vais faire”.
98 Recently, see Quack (2006: 193) who stated that “[é]tymologiquement, le futur I tire son origine de la construction lw=f m naj r sârm ‘Il est en train d’écouter’ [sic], attesté en néo-égyptien mais sans grammaticalisation. (…) En démotique, il n’est pas utilisé avant la période romaine.”
99 Johnson (1976: 63): “[t]his construction (…) was rare in Demotic, where it first appeared in the Roman period. (…) It consists of the present tense with the qualitative of the verb nfirebase “to go” written nfirebase.”
100 Starting with Jernstedt (1927); see also Westendorf (1965/1977: 116, with n. 8). Schenke (1978: 55) was of the opinion that the syntactic distribution of ne- in Middle Egyptian (namely the possibility of its occurrence in the tripartite conjugation pattern) could indicate that na-ne- was originally an infinitive. However, it seems risky to infer anything regarding the origin of the Coptic future auxiliary based on this highly grammaticalized complex morpheme. For the Coptic infinitive now “to go” as a back-formation from na-, see already Polotsky (1960: 403) “(…) as soon as a ‘Future’ is formed.
(1959: 458) — independently of Wente — already noted:¹⁰¹ “[z]wischen Gardiner’s Nachweis daß na- auf m n'y r zurückgeht […] und Jernstedt’s Beweis daß na-(Funktionell) ein Qual. ist […] besteht jedenfalls keine Antinomie.”

When the reanalysis of m n'y as a Stative in the Present I construction for expressing ongoing motion took place is yet another issue. Based on Wente’s data regarding the spellings of n'y/n' in Demotic,¹⁰² it seems safe to assume that this reanalysis had already taken place in Ptolemaic Demotic. However, this reanalysis is probably even older, if we are to trust the hieratic spellings of the verb n'y in the following examples coming from the tale of the Papyrus Vandier (c. 600 BCE):

Ex. 88  (How could Pharaoh L.P.H. possibly be with me again?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ptr-sw</th>
<th>i.ʃr(s)</th>
<th>n'y k</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p³</th>
<th>mwt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ptr_sw</td>
<td>i_ir-i</td>
<td>n'-k</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>p_i</td>
<td>mwt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ATT  THMZ-1SG  go/STAT-1SG  ALL  ART.DEF.MSG  death

“Look, it’s to death that I am going.”¹⁰³

(P. Vandier, r² 3,9 [similarly in r⁰ 3,10-11] = Posener 1985: 61)

Ex. 89  (You will live, you will not die!)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>iwsf</th>
<th>hpr iw</th>
<th>mntk</th>
<th>p³</th>
<th>nty</th>
<th>n'y</th>
<th>tw</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iw_f_hpr_iw</td>
<td>mntk</td>
<td>p_i</td>
<td>nty</td>
<td>n'i-tw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COND  2SGM  ART.DEF.MSG  REL  go-STAT

r  [di].t  "nb[i]"

r  di-t  "nb-i"

ALL  CAUS-INF  live:SBJV-1SG

“[If you are the one who] was going to make [me] live, (are you the one who will not live?)”¹⁰⁵

(P. Vandier, r² 2,3-4 = Posener 1985: 50)

In these two examples, we do not take the graphemes .k and .lw at the end of the verb form n'y as being necessarily indices of the phonetic level at that time, since the characteristic endings of the Stative are usually not written then.¹⁰⁶ Rather it might be a graphemic index of the way scribes categorized this verb form.¹⁰⁷

One should stress here the interest of Ex. 89 both at the formal and semantic level. At the formal level, the full etymological construction (SUBJECT n'r 1NFINITIVE) here occurs in hieratic script, but with the verb form clearly reanalyzed as a stative, much

from a conjugation of the Tripartite Pattern, na- is replaced by its non-durative (Infinitive) alternative

nou (Bohairic nou) e- […] it may very well be a late back-formation from na-.”

¹⁰¹ See also Polotsky (1990: 214).
¹⁰² See the table in Wente (1959: 34).
¹⁰³ Note that Shisha-Halevy (1989: 429) considers the ptr sw introducing the sentence to be an instance of ptr/pty sw “what is it” rather than the presentative ptr sw “behold”. On the use of the Stative after a Second Tense converter (basically a predicate-backgrounding construction), see Johnson (1976: 60) and Shisha-Halevy (1989: 428).
¹⁰⁴ See also Johnson (1976: 5); and Posener (1985: 50) notes that “[i]ci n'y a un sens prospectif bien attesté en démotique et qui donnera les futurs I et II coptes”.
¹⁰⁵ See also Winand (1992: 138-140, §246-249).
¹⁰⁶ The reanalysis of the m + Infinitive phrase (for expressing ongoing-motion) as a Stative — and the consequent alignment of the paradigm of the verbs of motion with the formal system of opposition for other verbs, i.e., (hr) + Infinitive vs Stative —, might even have taken place earlier, namely in later Late Egyptian (c. 1000 BCE), at least for the verb iw “to come” (see the spelling of the verb iw in P. BM EA 10416, r² 2 = LRLC pl. 15; curiously, Janssen (1991: 30, n. 5) considers the spelling n-iw to be equivalent to n'y); P. Moscow 120, r² 2,63 = LES 73,10-11).
like in the Demotic corpus (construction §3.2.1). At the semantic level, on the other hand, one observes a strong intentional reading coming from the subject-oriented inferences that are available for third person subjects in relative clauses (see §3.3); these subject-oriented inferences lead to [SCHEDULED FUTURE] meaning in a past context. As such, this example appears to be some kind of “missing link” between the Late Egyptian and Demotic material, i.e. the etymological construction SUBJECT n\text{a}r + INFINITIVE encoding a strongly subject-oriented modal meaning, but with the verb n\text{a}r already re-analysed as a Stative form.

Taking into account the first occurrences of the non-etymological writing of the future auxiliary in Demotic (§3.2.2), we can now emend Fig. 7 chronologically and observe that around 450 years took place between the first occurrences of each stage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th>Stage 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c. 1050 BCE</td>
<td>c. 600 BCE</td>
<td>c. 100 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m + INFINITIVE</td>
<td>\rightarrow STATIVE</td>
<td>\rightarrow FUTURE AUXILIARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m n\text{a}r</td>
<td>\rightarrow (in-)n\text{a}(.k)</td>
<td>\rightarrow n\text{a}^\text{f}/n\text{a}^3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 8. The reanalysis of n\text{a}r as a future auxiliary (2)

4 The Later Egyptian Allative Future (‘Future I’) in Coptic

In this section, we examine only those aspects of the construction that are relevant to our main argument. A full study of future tenses in the Coptic dialects is well beyond the scope of the present paper. In the majority of Coptic dialects (ca. 4th century CE), the Later Egyptian Allative Future has been fully grammaticalized.\textsuperscript{108} We find indications of its advanced stage of grammaticalization both at the syntactic and at the semantic level.

At the syntactic level, not only does the construction freely occur in all sorts of subordinate clauses (as was already the case in Demotic, see §3.2.4), but the Later Egyptian Allative Future has also developed a productive symmetrical negation in Coptic (§4.1).

At the semantic level, we have argued above that selectional restrictions on constructions are a useful diagnostic for identifying the type of semantic change typical of grammaticalization. In this section, we provide evidence that the selectional restrictions on the construction have been totally relaxed: it can now freely occur with all types of subjects (§4.2) and predicates (§4.3), which is characteristic of fully fledged future tenses, crucially able to express prediction in all persons. In at least one dialect, Sahidic, its grammaticalization goes further, acquiring optative modality as part of its polysemy network (§4.4).

4.1 Symmetrical negation

In Coptic, the Later Egyptian Allative Future has a symmetrical negation, the same \((n)\) ... \(an\) that negates most non-verbal clauses and the so-called First Present, also known as the Bipartite Pattern or Durative Pattern ‘durative sentence pattern,’\(^{109}\)

**Sahidic**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ex. 90</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>t-pe</strong></td>
<td><strong>mn-p-kah</strong></td>
<td><strong>na-parage</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART.DEF.FSG-heaven</td>
<td>and-ART.DEF.MSG-earth</td>
<td>FUT-pass.away</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na-(\dot{s})=e=de</td>
<td>na-parage=an</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS.PL:1SG-word=but</td>
<td>FUT-pass.away=NEG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Heaven and earth are going to pass away but my words are not going to pass away.” (Matthew 24:35 = Perez 1984: 251)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bohairic**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ex. 92</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p(^{k})ara(^{\dot{o}}) na-s(\dot{\iota})tem nsa-t(\dot{\iota})=enou=an</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharaoh FUT-listen after-2PL=NEG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Pharaoh will not listen to you.” (Exodus 11:9 = Lagarde 1867: 151)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ex. 93</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p(\dot{\iota})e-e(\dot{\iota})=na(\dot{\iota})t</td>
<td>ero-f</td>
<td>n-se-na-krine</td>
<td>mmo-f=an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM.MSG-REL-believe ALL-3SGM NEG(^{1})-3PL-FUT-judge ACC-3SGM=NEG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“He who believes in him will not be judged.” (John 3:18 = Horner 1898: 356)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lycopolitan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ex. 94</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p-et-r-pisteue</td>
<td>ara-f</td>
<td>se-na-r-krine</td>
<td>mma-f=en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART.DEF.MSG-REL-believe ALL-3SGM 3PL-FUT-judge ACC-3SGM=NEG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“He who believes in him will not be judged.” (John 3:18 = Thompson 1924: 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fayyumic**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ex. 95</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pe</td>
<td>et-ne-elpisteuin</td>
<td>ela-f</td>
<td>n-se-ne-ti-hep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM.MSG REL-FUT-believe ALL-3SGM NEG(^{1})-3PL-FUT-judge ACC-3SGM=NEG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ela=f=en</td>
<td>ALL-3SGM=NEG(^{2})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“He who believes in him will not be judged.” (John 3:18 = Till 1931: 10*-11*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mesokemic**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ex. 96</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\varepsilon)o(\dot{\iota})=(\dot{\iota})e</td>
<td>a-tetn-tm-k(\dot{\iota})</td>
<td>ebal</td>
<td>n-n-rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COND=but</td>
<td>COND-2PL-NEG-put out</td>
<td>ACC-ART.DEF.PL-man</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m-petn=iot</td>
<td>ne-k(\dot{\iota})=n(\dot{\iota})n</td>
<td>ebal=en</td>
<td>n-netn-parapt(\dot{\iota})m(\dot{\iota})a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG(^{1})-POSS.MSG:2PL-father FUT-put=DAT:2PL out=NEG(^{2}) ACC-POSS.PL:2PL-sin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“But if you do not forgive people, your father will not forgive your sins.” (Matthew 6:15 = Quecke 1981: 64)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interestingly, in some corpora, the negated Later Egyptian Allative Future exists but is relatively rare, the older Allative Future being more frequent in negative contexts. For example, Shisha-Halevy (2003: 272) notes that in the Mesokemic dialect, the negated Allative Future is rare.\(^{110}\) In the Scheide Codex manuscript of the Gospel of John, we

---

110 See also Shisha-Halevy (2002: 300) who stresses that, in the hitherto published documents from Kellis, ‘practically the only negative future occurring is the negative energetic future \(mno\).’
find 10 examples of the negated Allative Future, compared with 51 examples of the negated older construction.

We interpret this as meaning that in such corpora the newer construction has not yet become the unmarked means of expressing future reference in negative contexts, despite the newer construction’s compatibility with negation. This situation is paralleled in other languages, e.g., some varieties of Canadian French, in which the newer future construction is the most frequent in affirmative contexts, but the older future construction is retained in negative contexts, leading to a virtual ‘polarity split’ or statistical asymmetry between the two future constructions (Poplack and Turpin 1999).

4.2 The selectional restriction of the Later Egyptian Allative Future in Coptic

We now describe the semantic evolution of the construction in Coptic based on its selectional restrictions, i.e., the types of subjects and predicates that are attested in the textual material.

4.2.1 Types of subject

The construction occurs with inanimate subjects, which do not allow the event to be interpreted as involving an agentive subject referent. As such, readings involving a subject’s intention are excluded, the only meaning available in these examples being a prediction made by the speaker about a forthcoming, scheduled, event. This means that they are instances of switch context (Heine 2002), contexts in which the meaning of the source construction is incompatible with the meaning of the utterance in context.

Ex. 97 kan esôpe a-f-r-hen-ke-nobe se-na-kaa-u na-f ebol
even if PST-3SGM-do-some-other-sin 3PL-FUT-put-3PL DAT-3SGM out
“Even if he has committed sins, they are going to be forgiven him.”

(James 5:15 = Horner 1924: 234)

Ex. 98 šen nim ete-n-f-na-ṭ′karpos=an e-nanou-f
tree each REL-NEG1-3SGM-FUT-give-fruit=NEG2 SBBD-good-3SGM (...)
se-na-koore-f n-se-noč-f e-p-kōht
3PL-FUT-cut.down-3SGM SEQ-3PL-throw-3SGM ALL-the-fire
“All the tree that is not going to give good fruit (...) is going to be cut down and cast into the fire.”


Ex. 99 mn-ou-fō=gar nouót na-he ebol hn-t-ape
NEG.EXIST-ART.INDEF-hair=for single FUT-fall out in-ART.DEF.FSG-head
n-laau mmōtn
of-any of:2PL
“For there is not one hair about to fall out of the head of any of you.”

(Acts 27:34 = Thompson 1932: 81)

Ex. 100 e-n-r-nobe=gar ntencom mnnsa-tre-n-či
COND-1PL-do-sin=for deliberately after-CAUS-1PL-receive
m-p-sooun n-t-me mn-č′usia ce
ACC-ART.DEF.MSG-knowledge of-the-truth NEG.EXIST-sacrifice PTCL
The grammaticalization of the Later Egyptian Allative Future

4.2.2 Types of predicate

The construction is compatible with predicates denoting goal-oriented motion (see Ex. 10). This indicates that the auxiliary is a future marker, and cannot be a lexical verb of motion, as in English, he is going to go or French il va aller.

Conversely, it occurs with predicates that exclude any motion reading. This also provides evidence that the future auxiliary na- does not have spatial motion as part of its semantics:

Ex. 106 l-na-hupomeine e-p-čoëis
1SG-FUT-wait ALL-the-Lord
“I am going to wait for the Lord.” (Psalms 26:14 = Budge 1898: 28)
Ex. 107 eishēête ʾt-na-ahera-t hirm-p-ro auô ti-na-tōhm
ATT 1SG-FUT-stand-1SG at-ART.DEF.MSG-door and 1SG-FUT-knock
“Behold, I am going to stand at the door and knock.” (Apoc. 3:20 = Horner 1924: 300-302)

Ex. 108 ʾt-na-cô sânt-k-i
1SG-FUT-tarry LIMIT-2SGM-come
“I am going to tarry until you come.” (Judges 6:18 = Thompson 1911: 169)

Ex. 109 ḫn-ou ʾt-na-imê e-pai
in-what 1SG-FUT-know ALL-this
“How am I going to know this?” (Luke 1:18 = Quecke 1977: 97)

Crucially, this construction occurs with verbs that exclude an intentional reading. As such, the only possible reading is prediction, since the intentional subject-oriented inferences are not available with such predicates. These are also instances of switch context (see above).

Ex. 110 ṽṣah ṽṣah ṭn-na-tako
master master 1PL-FUT-perish
“Master, master, we are going to perish!” (Luke 8:24 = Quecke 1977: 157)

Ex. 111 ḫn-ou-mou ṭn-na-mou ḫbol ēte a-n-nau e- pnoute
in-a-death 1PL-FUT-die because PST-1PL-see ALL-God
“We will surely die because we have seen the Lord.” (Judges 13:22 = Thompson 1911: 212-213)

4.2.3 Modal meaning

Similarly to the Earlier Egyptian Allative Future (see §1.1 with n. 9), the Later Egyptian Allative Future develops deontic modal meanings. For example, in Bohairic, one finds cases of the second person Allative Future with a clearly directive function.

**Bohairic**

Ex. 112 pa-son kʰ-na-i nte-n-ōli m-p-sōma
POSS.MSG:1SG-brother 2SGM-FUT-come SEQ-1PL-take ACC-ART.DEF.MSG-body
m-pai-marturos ntot-ou n-nai-matoi
of-DEM.MSG-martyr from-3PL MOD-DEM.PL-soldier
“My brother, come and let’s take the body of this martyr from these soldiers.” (Nitrian Bohairic = Hyvernat 1886: 136)

In Sahidic, a form of the Allative Future — traditionally considered to be the Second Future[111] — comes to encode optative meanings (Shisha-Halevy 1986, Layton 2011, Richter 2008). This is apparently a case of insubordination (Evans 2007), but the actual pathway of change in Coptic has yet to be studied. What can be said at this point is that it appears to have developed only in those Coptic dialects in which Second Tenses can encode predicate-centered focus, (Güldemann et al. 2010, Grossman 2014). Interestingly, in some varieties of late Coptic, e.g., the language of the documentary texts from Thebes (Richter 2008), it almost completely replaces the Earlier Egyptian Allative Future as the main optative construction in affirmative contexts.

---

111 The 'Second Future' is the descriptive label used for a form which originally was associated with predicate-backgrounding, and by Coptic comes to have greatly extended functions.
Sahidic

Ex. 113  exbol=de  hn-t-bô  n-knte  e-tet(n)-ne-eime
        out=but  in-ART.DEF.FSG-tree  of-fig  THMZ-2PL-FUT-know
        e-t-parabolê
        ALL-ART.DEF.FSG-parable
        “From the fig tree you shall learn the parable.”
        (Gk. imperative mathete tén parabolên)  (Sahidic, Mark 13:28 = Quecke 1972: 155)

Ex. 114  mntsnoous  n-sap  te-rompe  ere-p-hlo
        twelve  MOD-time  ART.DEF.FSG-year  THMZ-ART.DEF.MSG-old
        na-bôk  ehour  e-n-êei  têr-ou  n-t-sunanôgê
        FUT-go  in  to-ART.DEF.MSG-house  ALL-3PL  of-ART.DEF.FSG-congregation
        “Twelve times a year, the Senior Monk shall enter all the houses of the congregation.”
        (Sahidic, Shenoute, Leipoldt IV: 58,1-2)

Ex. 115  e-k-na-tôôbe  an  n-n-et tôôbe
        THMZ-2SGM-FUT-retaliate  NEG  ACC-ART.DEF.PL-REL-retaliate
        na-k  n-hen-peôôou
        DAT-2SGM ADVZ-ART.INDEF.PL-bad
        “Don’t retaliate against those who retaliate against you with badness.”
        (Sahidic, Shenoute, Leipoldt III: 104,27-28)

Ex. 116  ere-p-sahou  n-ne-grapôê  na-ei  eôô-f
        THMZ-ART.DEF.MSG-curse  of-ART.DEF.PL-scripture  FUT-come  upon-3SGM
        “May the curse of the Scriptures come upon him.”
        (P. KRU 106, 194-195 = Crum & Steindorff 1912: 333)

Ex. 117  prof[on]=men  nne-f-opûlisìai  n-laau
        first=CONTR  OPT.NEG-3SGM-need  ACC-thing
        deuteron=de  e-f-na-sôk  ehrâi
        second=CONTR  THMZ-3SGM-FUT-draw  down
        ha-p-krima  m-pnoute
        under-ART.DEF.MSG-judgment  of-God
        “First, may he need nothing. But second, may he submit to the judgment of God.”
        (P. KRU 83, 12-13 = Crum & Steindorff 1912: 270)

Ex. 118  t-kêlêpre  ntehê  etbe  pe-froou  n-termêesêion
        1SG-order  so  about  ART.DEF.MSG-four  of-trimesion
        ere-pa-hai  na-bit-ou
        THMZ-POSS.MSG:1SG-husband  FUT-take-3PL
        ne-f-taa-u  n-prospôora  haro-i
        CONJ-3SGM-give-3PL  as-offering  for-1SG
        “I order the following about the four trimesion: may my husband take them and
give them as offering for me.”
        (P. KRU 69, 29-31 = Crum & Steindorff 1912: 222)

Ex. 119  hôb  nim  nt-a-u-ei  eôô-i  ha-na-eiote  (...)
        thing  every  REL-PST-3PL-come  upon-1SG  from-POSS.PL:1SG-parents  (...)
        e-u-na-ôôpe=na-k  têr-ou  mn-nek-sêre
        THMZ-3PL-FUT-be=DAT-2SGM  all-3PL  and-POSS.PL:2SGM-child
        “Everything that came to me from my parents (...) may they be yours and those
of your children.”
        (P. KRU 67, 97-99 = Crum & Steindorff 1912: 213)
5 Conclusions

In this paper, we have sketched the grammaticalization of the Later Egyptian Allative Future, from its first documentation in later Late Egyptian, through Demotic, and up to late Coptic. In this section, we summarize our descriptive findings, and afterwards turn to their theoretical implications. In terms of functional change, we take the selectional restrictions of the construction to be a good diagnostic of the semantics of the construction at each particular stage, and as such, of semantic change. We trace the development of the source construction that codes an animate subject’s intentional motion through space, with intention as a prominent inference (Late Egyptian), to a construction that codes future tense, and as such imposes no restrictions on the type of subject or predicate (Coptic). In Coptic, we even find non-referential subjects and clear examples of first person futures that express predictions bare of any speaker intention. In Demotic, we find an interim stage, in which the selectional restrictions on the construction are somewhat relaxed, as subjects overwhelmingly tend to be high on the animacy scale, which means that they are compatible with intention readings, with prediction as the most plausible meaning in some contexts. Similarly, it is in Demotic that predicates that preclude motion readings begin to occur in the construction, as do the first examples of subjects that preclude intentional readings.

From a formal point of view, we argue that the original source construction, involving a locative preposition-cum-aspectual marker (m), followed by an infinitive, is reanalyzed in Demotic, or perhaps even earlier, as a Stative. This is corroborated by the prevalence of non-etymological writings of the incipient future auxiliary. Additionally, we show that the assumption that the allative preposition (r) heading a purpose clause was ‘lost’ over the course of grammaticalization is unwarranted, at least in any simple sense. Rather, alongside the more explicit construction with the allative preposition existed a construction with a bare infinitive after verbs of motion, both encoding purpose clauses. A more nuanced view of the grammaticalization of the Later Egyptian Allative Future indicates that it was the latter construction that ‘won’ the competition.

Furthermore, we show that this construction is limited to affirmative contexts for most of its history, with symmetric negation developing only in the very late Demotic of Narmouthis, which is in many respects close to Coptic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AFFIRMATIVE</th>
<th>NEGATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Late Egyptian</td>
<td>twêl m nêy r/ø sdm</td>
<td>bn jwêl r sdm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demotic</td>
<td>twêl nê sdm</td>
<td>bn jwêl r sdm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coptic</td>
<td>ti-na-sôtm</td>
<td>n-ti-na-sôtm an</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 9. The development of a symmetric negation in late Demotic (Narmouthis) and Coptic

This study also provides an interesting counter-example to assumptions about the grammaticalization of future tenses, i.e., that their occurrence in conditionals and in subordinate clauses in general occurs at a rather late stage of development. The Egyptian data show that the source construction of the Later Egyptian Allative Future occurred in subordinate clauses from its very first documentation.
From a theoretical point of view, we argue that the documented history of the Later Egyptian Allative Future corroborates assumptions about the ways in which contexts and inferential mechanisms interact in semantic change. Crucial here is the notion of *bridging context*, a context in which multiple readings of a given utterance are possible, with an innovative meaning being more plausible — but still cancellable.

We add to this the conceptual distinction between *subject-oriented* vs. *speaker-oriented* inferences, claiming that speaker-oriented inferences lead to the relaxation of selectional restrictions on constructions. Subject-oriented inferences strengthen existing selectional restrictions, because they involve understanding an utterance as being a statement about an entity and an event. Entities and events impose particular semantic restrictions on the type of statements that can be made. In the present case, we argue that directed motion events presuppose intentional subjects that are capable of movement with purpose. Speaker-oriented inferences, on the other hand, do not impose the same restrictions. For example, if a listener interprets a given utterance as involving a speaker’s prediction — rather than a statement about a given subject’s intention to act — the listener can replicate the construction, in his or her turn as speaker, in ways that are not limited by the selectional restrictions of the source construction.

This study is intended as a part of a broader project to understand the future cycles of Ancient Egyptian. Looking at the domain of allative futures in Egyptian, we find the first Old Egyptian occurrences of the source construction that would later grammaticalize into an allative future *lwef r sDm* — in Middle Egyptian. This construction, which develops both modal meanings and a productive symmetric negation — *bn lwef r sDm* — only in Late Egyptian is the main future tense up until latest Demotic. It survives nearly until the end of Coptic, where its attestation as an optative — at least in some varieties and in affirmative contexts — is much reduced, in favor of the innovative optative *efnasôtm*.

The Later Egyptian Allative Future, in some respects, replicates the grammaticalization pathway of its earlier antecedent (Grossman & Polis 2014), both functionally and formally. For example, the relative lateness of modal meanings and productive symmetric negation is observed in both developmental pathways; bridging contexts are clearly implicated in the changes in selectional restrictions observed; the selectional restrictions of the construction are gradually relaxed, with intentional animate subjects at the first stage, and only afterwards inanimate, non-referential, or otherwise unintentional subjects.

The picture sketched here has dealt only with allative futures, and still has to take into account the other constructions that participate in the long-term future cycle in Ancient Egyptian, in which innovative future tenses are continually grammaticalized from a variety of source constructions. A more complete understanding of the history of the future also has to take into account exploratory future constructions, which can be built with allative verb forms, e.g., the incipient grammaticalization of *Sm* as a future auxiliary in Late Egyptian (§2.4). We also find a Coptic modal construction in

---

112 See e.g. in late Coptic documentary texts, the grammaticalization of *ouafsôtm* as yet another future tense (Müller 2007).
which *bôk* (“to go”) is not plausibly understood with its lexical meaning (see Crum 1939: 29a-b). In Ex. 120, *bôk* highlights the agent’s control over a future event.

Ex. 120 *ešče mp-k-rpistos hn-nai et-k-na-bôk e-kaa-u*

COND PST.NEG-2SGM-be_faithful in-DEM.PL REL-2SGM-FUT-go ALL-leave-3PL

“If you were not faithful in those you are going to leave, (how will you fare in those who will remain)?”

(ShA 2 146 = Amélineau 1911: 146)

These constructions, as well as many others in the domain of future time reference, still await systematic study.
Glossing abbreviations

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1st person</td>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>future</td>
<td>PTCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2nd person</td>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>imperative</td>
<td>PST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3rd person</td>
<td>INDEF</td>
<td>indefinite</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>accusative marker</td>
<td>INF</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
<td>QUOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVZ</td>
<td>adverbalizer</td>
<td>JUSS</td>
<td>jussive</td>
<td>REL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>allative</td>
<td>LIMIT</td>
<td>limitative</td>
<td>relative form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>article</td>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>locative</td>
<td>SBJV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT</td>
<td>attention marker</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>masculine</td>
<td>SBRD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUX</td>
<td>auxiliary</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>modifier</td>
<td>particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUS</td>
<td>causative</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negation</td>
<td>SEQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COND</td>
<td>conditional marker</td>
<td>NMLZ</td>
<td>nominalizer</td>
<td>SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONJ</td>
<td>conjunctive</td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>nominative marker</td>
<td>STAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTR</td>
<td>contrast marker</td>
<td>OPT</td>
<td>optative</td>
<td>THMZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORD</td>
<td>coordinating particle</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
<td>predicate-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>dative</td>
<td>PN</td>
<td>proper name</td>
<td>backgrounding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>demonstrative</td>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>possessive</td>
<td>marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXIST</td>
<td>existential</td>
<td>PRS</td>
<td>present</td>
<td>TOPZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>feminine</td>
<td>PTCP</td>
<td>participle</td>
<td>VET</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bibliography

Amélineau, Émile. 1911. Œuvres de Schenoudi, tome deuxième, Paris.
CDD = Chicago Demotic Dictionary (http://oi.uchicago.edu/research/pubs/catalog/cdd/).


Evans, Nicholas & David Wilkins. 1998. The knowing ear: An Australian test of universal claims about the semantic structure of sensory verbs and their extension into the domain of cognition, Arbeitspapier Nr. 32 (Neue Folge), Köln: Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft, Institut für Linguistik, Universität zu Köln.


O. MH 4038 = Ostracon Medinet Habou 4038. See Parker 1940.
P. KRU = See Crum & Steindorff 1912.
P. Vienna 6920-6922. See Hoffmann 1996.


Setne I. See Griffith 1900.


———. 1924. The Gospel of John according to the earliest Coptic manuscript, London: British School of Archeology in Egypt.
TLA = Thesaurus Lingae Aegyptiae (http://aaew.bbaw.de/tla/index.html)

Wente, Edward F. 1959. The Syntax of Verbs of Motion in Egyptian, Chicago.
———. 1990. Letters from ancient Egypt, Writings from the Ancient World 1, Atlanta: Scholars Press.