Prohibitive strategies and prohibitive cycles in Ancient Egyptian

Eitan Grossman & Stéphane Polis (Jerusalem – Liège)

The aim of this paper is twofold.

(1) SYNCHRONIC POINT OF VIEW: to present the main prohibitive/negative jussive strategies attested for each state of the language in Ancient Egyptian.
(2) DIACHRONIC POINT OF VIEW: to describe the grammaticalization pathways of two prohibitive constructions, from Old Egyptian down to Coptic.

In the introduction (§1), a brief review of current typological studies of prohibitives will be given as background information. Then, we start with a description of the two main types of prohibitive constructions that one finds in Coptic, taking into dialectal variety[1] (§2), namely *mpr*+V(ERB) and *mn*-V(ERB) "do not V". Afterwards, we describe the grammaticalization pathway along which the first of these two constructions developed, from Old Egyptian down to Coptic (§3). Additionally, we provide a description of the main prohibitive (as well as negative jussive) strategies that are attested for Earlier (§4) and Later Egyptian (§5), in order to situate more precisely the grammaticalization process of the first strategy within the successive 'synchronic' systems of oppositions in the semantic field of prohibition. In a final section (§6), we discuss more in depth the second, more marginal, prohibitive construction of Coptic (*mn*-V) — investigating Coptic dialectal diversity — and we suggest a diachronic scenario that could account for the appearance and development of this second strategy.

The first (and better-known) construction is the result of the univerbation of a prohibitive marker and a lexical verb (*mpr*-V). The second construction, which is usually mentioned only in descriptions of Coptic dialects and has not yet been integrated into studies of Egyptian diachrony.[2] It appears to involve the grammaticalization pathway NEGATIVE EXISTENTIAL > PROHIBITIVE.[3] Such a pathway does not figure prominently in typological discussions on prohibitives.[4]

This study turns up a point of more general interest: while treatments of the grammaticalization of prohibitive markers usually focus on second person constructions, a broader perspective may be necessary in order to understand the pathways

1 For an excellent overview of linguistic and sociolinguistic situation of the Coptic dialects, see Funk (1988).
2 For example, Loprieno (1995).
3 As we will see the actual development of this construction is more complex.
4 These two grammaticalization pathways account for the majority of prohibitive systems found across the Coptic dialects, although numerous marginal or 'exploratory' constructions also occur.

along which prohibitive markers develop. The grammaticalization of prohibitive markers and constructions can involve other processes of language change, such as analogical extension on the basis of distinct but related negative modal constructions, such as *jussives*. This accounts for the fact that we provide a description of the *prohibitive* and *jussive* systems for the different periods discussed here.

1 Prohibitive constructions in typological perspective

Prohibitives are constructions whose main function is to express a prohibition, e.g., English 'Don't touch that!'. Prohibitive markers are linguistic items that are 'more or less dedicated to the prohibitive construction' (van der Auwera 2010a). While all prohibitive markers occur in prohibitive constructions, not all prohibitive constructions involve dedicated prohibitive markers, since prohibitive constructions often comprise general, non-dedicated negators.

A number of studies have been devoted to the typology of prohibitives, e.g., Birjulin & Xrakovskij (2001), van der Auwera (2010a; 2010b), van der Auwera & Lejeune (2005), and Aikhenvald (2010). The parameter most frequently dealt with in these studies involves the morphosyntactic makeup of prohibitive constructions, e.g., the form of the negation and of the verb. Birjulin & Xrakovskij propose six possibilities:

(1) The verb form is identical to that of the imperative, and the negative marker used for both prohibitive and declarative negation;
(2) The verb form is identical to that of the imperative, but the negative marker occurs only in prohibitives;
(3) The verb form is identical to that of the imperative and has two negative markers, one that occurs in declarative negation as well and one that occurs only in prohibitives;
(4) The verb form is not identical to that of the imperative, and the negative marker is used for prohibitive and declarative negation;
(5) The verb form is not identical to that of the imperative, and the negative marker occurs only in prohibitive;
(6) A specialized verb + a marker of negative prescription.

This typology has been reduced by van der Auwera & Lejeune (2005) to a four-way classification based on two parameters:

(1) the verbal construction of the second singular imperative and a sentential negative strategy found in (indicative) declaratives.
(2) the verbal construction of the second singular imperative and a sentential negative strategy not found in (indicative) declaratives.
(3) a verbal construction other than the second singular imperative and a sentential negative strategy found in (indicative) declaratives.
(4) a verbal construction other than the second singular imperative and a sentential negative strategy not found in (indicative) declaratives.

This reduction seems justified, since it is not clear how Birjulin & Xrakovskij's type (6) is really distinct from type (5), and their type (3) can be considered a sub-type of (2).[5]

This typology has generated significant questions and insights. For one thing, it clearly demonstrates that dedicated prohibitive markers are common in all areas of the world, except for Western Europe.[6] This raises the question as to why dedicated prohibitive markers are so common. It appears that formally-oriented morphosyntactic explanations (e.g., the position of the negative relative to the verb, whether the negative is a clitic, and whether there is a dedicated imperative) are inadequate, according to van der Auwera (2010a), who proposes a functional, frequency-based explanation.

2 The prohibitive system in Coptic

The most common prohibitive construction found in most of the Coptic dialects comprises two elements: one, a dedicated prohibitive marker *mpr-*,[7] and two, a lexical verb, realized as an infinitive. Unlike most verbal constructions in Coptic, prohibitives do not morphologically distinguish number or gender, viz., the same construction applies to all second persons.[8]

Ex. 1) Sahidic
mpr-r-hote
PROH-do/INF-fear
"Don't fear!"

In dialects with this strategy,[9] this construction is required for all verbs, regardless of the form of the affirmative imperative. This means that the morphological distinction

5 Aikhenvald (2010) mentions many structural possibilities. However, they can probably all be categorized as one of van der Auwera and Lejeune's four types, with some reduction of data.

6 König & Siemund (2007) appear to reach the opposite conclusion: 'Although true prohibitive markers appear to be a comparatively infrequent phenomenon …. the previous discussion has shown that it is relatively common for languages to treat negative imperatives differently from positive imperatives in a way or another' (2007: 311). The difference between their statement and van der Auwera's lies in the degree of restrictiveness of the definition of a 'true' prohibitive marker. König & Siemund consider dedicated prohibitive markers to be 'affixes expressing negative directive speech acts without the relevant sentences being overtly negative' (2007: 308), while van der Auwera works with the notion of *construction*, thereby evading the problem of distinguishing between morphological and syntactic encoding, so long as it is 'conventionally used to express a prohibition' (2010a: 1). This is justified, since there is no good way to distinguish morphology and syntax based on cross-linguistically valid criteria. As such, we can refer to a single domain of morphosyntax (Haspelmath 2011), using the more general term 'construction' to talk about conventionalized form-function pairings.

7 This marker bears some similarity to other negators in Coptic, such as *mp-*, the past-tense negation, but the two are diachronically unrelated. Furthermore, there are at least seven distinct negations in Coptic; depending on analysis, there are potentially many more than seven. In any event, it is hard to say that Coptic has a 'standard' negation (Payne 1985; Miestamo 2007), since there is not a 'basic means … for negating declarative main clauses.'

8 For most lexemes, positive imperatives do not distinguish number or gender either.

9 In the other dialects, there are slight intradialectal and interdialectal variations in the orthography (and probably phonological form) of the prohibitive marker, e.g. Bohairic *mper-*, Fayyumic *mpel-*, while in less standardized varieties, e.g., documentary and epigraphical texts, one finds a wide range of variants, including *nper*, *per-*, *mr-*/*mer-*.

between dedicated and non-dedicated imperatives[10] is neutralized in the Prohibitive. In terms of the typology proposed by van der Auwera et al. (§1), it means that Coptic has a mixed system:

(1) For verbs with a dedicated Imperative, viz., one that differs from the Infinitive, Coptic is of Type 4.
(2) For verbs without a dedicated positive imperative, Coptic is of Type 2.

The difference between the two types can be made clear by the following examples:

Infinitive	Imperative	Prohibitive	Type
ei 'come'	*amou* 'come!'	*mpr-ei* 'don't come!'	4
hareh 'guard'	*hareh* 'guard!'	*mpr-hareh* 'don't guard'	2

Fig. 1: Prohibitive types in Coptic

The difference between the two types is the result of the differential progress of a diachronic process, i.e., the replacement of dedicated imperative forms by infinitive forms for the encoding of directive speech acts.[11] This differential process might be explained by usage: high frequency verbs were affected less by this development than lower-frequency verbs.[12] It is not that the Type 2 situation is per se more innovative than Type 4, but rather that the relationship between the prohibitive and the imperative shifted due to independent changes in the morphosyntax of the affirmative imperative. This situation shows how a language can acquire a new 'type' of prohibitive construction as the byproduct of grammaticalization processes that target other, related construction types within the same broad functional domain.[13]

The Negative Jussive[14] in Coptic (see Ex. 2), on the other hand, is a construction comprising the same auxiliary *mpr-* and the so-called Causative Infinitive *tre-f-sôtm*, the etymological structure of which is as follows:

t	*re*	*f*	*sôtm*
cause/INF	do/SBJV	3SGM	hear/INF

"to cause him to hear."

Fig. 2: The causative infinitive *trefsôtm*

10 The Coptic Imperative is a single *syntactic* paradigm, but is morphologically heterogeneous, with dedicated and non-dedicated forms. The dedicated forms are more conservative, and occur principally for the most common verb lexemes. The non-dedicated forms are the result of replacement of dedicated forms by non-dedicated forms, specifically, those of the infinitive. This pathway of change is an ongoing process within Coptic, reflected differentially in the various dialects.

11 The diachrony of the Ancient Egyptian Imperative has never been studied in any detail. However, it seems to involve the conventionalization of a 'directive infinitive' strategy. See van Olmen (2010) on for a usage-based explanation for this construction type, based on Dutch.

12 This process is ongoing within Coptic. For example, in some dialects, the older dedicated Imperative *ma-* 'give' varies with an innovative form *t*^{i}, which is identical to the Infinitive.

13 For the development of futures and subjunctives as the *byproduct* of grammaticalization processes targeting other constructions, see Haspelmath (1998).

14 The Jussive is a modal form in complementary distribution with the Imperative: the Imperative is restricted to the second person, while the Jussive occurs with the first and third persons. Such constructions are sometimes called 'non-canonical imperatives' (e.g., Aikhenvald 2010).

Ex. 2) Sahidic
mpr-tre-f-sôtm
PROH-CAUS.INF-3SGM-hear/INF
"Don't let him hear/let him not hear!"

This results in a homogeneous system for the Prohibitive and the Negative Jussive, in which both constructions are marked by the same auxiliary *mpr-*:

	SG	PL	
1	*mpr-tr-a-sôtm*	*mpr-tre-n-sôtm*	NEGATIVE JUSSIVE
2	*mpr-sôtm*	*mpr-sôtm*	PROHIBITIVE
3M	*mpr-tre-f-sôtm*	*mpr-tre-u-sôtm*	NEGATIVE JUSSIVE
3F	*mpr-tre-s-sôtm*		

Fig. 3: Symmetrical marking of the Prohibitive-Jussive system

In such an analysis, the simple infinitive would be selected for second persons, while the causative infinitive would be selected for first and third persons.

However, there is some evidence that this construction has been further grammaticalized, and as such, the Prohibitive and Jussive do not have an entirely symmetrical marking. First of all, the meaning is no longer entirely compositional, as the negative jussive does not always encode directly causative meaning but rather a weaker kind of addressee involvement, at times even approaching an 'optative meaning' with no discernible speaker involvement, as in the affirmative Jussive.[15] Another point to be made is that at the level of the signifier, some dialects show a distinction between the prohibitive marker and the Negative Jussive:

	Sahidic	Early Bohairic	Later Bohairic
PROHIBITIVE	*mpr-*	*mper-*	*mper-*
NEGATIVE JUSSIVE	*mpr-*	*mpe-*	*mpen-*

Fig. 4: Formal differences between Prohibitive and Negative Jussive markers

As such, the marker of the Negative Jussive can be analyzed as a distinct — albeit diachronically related — element *mprtre-*, and the common denominator of the Prohibitive and the Negative Jussive would be the simple Infinitive as the realization of the verbal lexeme. In this analysis, the two constructions would be asymmetrical in terms of finiteness.

	SG	PL	
1	*mprtr-a-sôtm*	*mprtre-n-sôtm*	NEGATIVE JUSSIVE
2	*mpr-sôtm*	*mpr-sôtm*	PROHIBITIVE
3M	*mprtre-f-sôtm*	*mprtre-u-sôtm*	NEGATIVE JUSSIVE
3F	*mprtre-s-sôtm*		

Fig. 5: Dedicated Prohibitive and Negative Jussive markers

This is the analysis implicitly adopted by Layton (2004: 295) and others.

This simplified presentation of the prohibitive system in Coptic now needs to be complicated by taking into account dialectal variation. Indeed, in the southernmost dialects, the prohibitive marker is *mn-*, not *mpr-*. It is found mainly in dialects A

15 Reintges (2004: 321).

(Akhmimic), P ('Proto-Theban'), and in L* (the dialect of Kellis).[16] The equivalence of the two can be seen from the following examples, in which (a) has the prohibitive marker described above, and (b) has the *mn-* variant:

Ex. 3) Sahidic
mpr-mere-p-kosmos
PROH-love-the-world
Akhmimic
mn-mrre-p-kosmos
PROH-love-the-world
"Don't love the world."

Ex. 4) Sahidic
mpr-plana
PROH-go_astray
Akhmimic
mn-rplana
PROH-go.astray
"Don't go astray "

Ex. 5) Sahidic
mprtre-u-plana ce mmô-tn
NEG.JUSS-3PL-lead.astray therefore ACC-2PL
Akhmimic
mnt-u-rplana ce mmô-tne
NEG.JUSS-3PL-lead.astray therefore ACC-2PL
"Therefore, don't let them lead you astray!"

Ex. 6) Sahidic
mprtre-laau-čoo-s
NEG.JUSS-INDF-say-3SGF
Akhmimic
mnte-laaue-čoo-s
NEG.JUSS- INDF-say-3SGF
"Don't let anyone say it/let no one say it!"

Some additional examples of the second prohibitive construction in additional dialects:

Ex. 7) Lycopolitan
mn-sôt ce a-rime
PROH-start.anew therefore to-cry
"Therefore, don't start crying again!"

Ex. 8) Lycopolitan
mn-rhnohe
PROH-fear
"Don't be afraid!"

Ex. 9) Dialect I
mn-čioue […] *mn-rnaeik*
PROH-steal […] PROH-fornicate
"Don't steal [...] Don't commit adultery!"

16 For the names and sigla of the dialects discussed here, see Funk (1988).

Ex. 10) Dialect P
mn-čise mmo-k ačn-tk-sop^{h}ia
PROH-exalt ACC-2SGM upon-your-wisdom
"Don't exalt yourself on your own wisdom!"

Ex. 11) Dialect P
mn-çôpe n-rmnhêt na-k ouaat-k
PROH-be ACC-wise DAT-2SGM alone-2SGM
"Don't be wise for yourself alone! (Don't be wise in your own eyes alone!)"

Ex. 12) Dialect P
pa-šêre mnte-hn-rmeurnobe-rplana mmo-k
my-son NEG.JUSS-INDF.PL-sinners-lead.astray ACC-2MSG
"My son, do not let sinners lead you astray!"

Ex. 13) Dialect P
mnt-ou-kôrk aro-k xn-ns-bal
NEG.JUSS-3PL-waylay to-2SGM in-her.PL-eye
"Don't be waylaid by her eyes!"
oude mnt-s-torp-k xn-ns-bahoue
nor NEG.JUSS-3SGF-seize in-her.PL-eyelid
"And don't let her seize you with her eyelids!"

The grammaticalization pathways along which these two constructions developed is discussed in the following section. In section 3, we discuss the evolution of the commonest construction (*mpr*-V) and then provide a general description of the other prohibitive strategies in Earlier (§4) and Later Egyptian respectively (§5). In section 6, we discuss in more detail the development of the *mn*-V construction — apparently a case of the rare NEGATIVE EXISTENTIAL > PROHIBITIVE, but which turns out to actually be more complex.

3 The grammaticalization of the prohibitive marker *mpr*-: The larger picture

A wide range of diachronic pathways by which prohibitive markers develop are attested. Van der Auwera (2010a) has classified these pathways into four types:[17]

(1) the grammaticalization of predicative constructions;
(2) the result of changes undergone by general negation strategies (as in, e.g., Jespersen cycles);
(3) the grammaticalization of a negation + affirmative imperative;
(4) language contact.

The *mpr*-V construction reflects the relatively common pathway of univerbation of a dedicated prohibitive marker and a lexical verb meaning 'to do, to make', thereby attesting a long-term typological change from Type 4 to Type 2 (see §1).

3.1 The prohibitive

The ultimate origin of the Coptic prohibitive *mpr*-V is found in an Earlier Egyptian construction comprising a dedicated negation *m*, the imperative form of the 'negative

17 These types, especially the first, are rather broad, and may involve quite diverse pathways and mechanisms of language change.

verb' *jm*,[18] followed by a dedicated verb form known in Egyptian grammar as the 'negatival complement'[19] (glossed NC in this paper). In other words, in Earlier Egyptian, the prohibitive is a Type 4 construction. The so-called Negatival Complement is morphologically and syntactically distinct from both the positive Imperative and the Infinitive.

While the morphological distinction is not always reflected by Egyptian orthography (Ex. 14; the ending *-w* being limited to certain classes of verbs, see Schenkel 2000), the syntactic difference is clear, at least for transitive verbs with pronominal objects, since Infinitives and the Negatival Complement take different object clitics (for details, see e.g. Gardiner 1957: 261 and §4.2 with Ex. 76-77 below):

Ex. 14) *m snḏ sḫtj*
PROH fear:NC peasant
"Don't fear, peasant!" (*Peasant*, B2,123)

Ex. 15) *m ir sw r tkn im=k*
PROH do:NC 3SGM ALL draw_near:PTCP from=2SGM
"Don't make him into an intimate (lit. 'one who draws near to you)!"
(*Ptahh.* 486 Pr. 15,2)

In early Later Egyptian (18th dyn., Thutmose 3), an innovative periphrastic construction began to supersede the earlier, non-periphrastic construction.

Ex. 16) *fꜣ(j) tw m ir wꜣḥ*
carry:IMP 2SGM PROH do:NC stop:INF
"Do carry, don't stop!" (TT100, *Rekhmira* pl. 15)

In the periphrastic construction, the verb *irỉ* ('make,' 'do') occurs in the Negatival Complement form *ir*, and governs an Infinitive form of the lexical verb. The difference can be seen clearly in examples where the lexical verb is itself a form of the verb *irỉ*. Such examples show that *m-ir* has been grammaticalized as an innovative prohibitive marker.

Ex. 17) *m-ir ir-t pꜣy sḫrw*
PROH do-INF DEM.SGM plan
"Don't carry out this plan!" (O. Glasgow D.1925.84, v° 3 = K*RI* VII, 125)

The two constructions co-existed for a time,[20] until the earlier one became obsolete. Here are two examples from the time of Amenhotep II (Vernus 2010: 317):

Ex. 18) *m sḏm n md-wt n tꜣ ḥm.t snw.ty*
PROH hear:INF to word-F.PL of this wife second
"Don't listen to the words of this second wife!"
(Münich ÄS 4313, v° 4 = Burchberger 1991: 54)

---

18 See e.g. Gardiner (1957: 260, 262-263, 264 and 296, §340, §342-343 & §345); Loprieno (1995: 90); Malaise & Winand (1999: 513-514, §840); Allen (2000: 187, 403); Grandet & Mathieu (2003: 280-282, §25.2); Borghouts (2010: 146 & 160, §38(ii) & §42.b.1).

19 Term coined by Gardiner (1957: §341). This section is especially indebted to Kroeber (1970: 171-175, §3.5; 185-187, §41.2) and Vernus (2010), a penetrating study of the grammaticalization of the prohibitive in the early New Kingdom.

20 It has not been established whether a functional opposition between the two obtained at any point, although it is *a priori* possible.

Ex. 19) *m-ir sḏm n md-wt=sn m ḏ^{ꜥ} (r) wp-wt=sn*
PROH hear:INF to word-F.PL=3PL in investigate:INF ALL task-F.PL=3PL
"Don't listen to their words while investigating their tasks!"
(Boston MFA 25.632 = *Urk.* IV, 1344,19-20)

At this stage of development, the prohibitive construction involves a dedicated prohibitive marker. The lexical verb is no longer realized by a dedicated form (i.e., Negatival Complement) but rather by the Infinitive, the form in which lexical verbs occur in nearly every periphrastic construction in Later Egyptian. Nor is the Infinitive identical to the positive Imperative; the two are assumed to be morphologically and syntactically distinct. In a sense, this situation persists until Coptic. Indeed, it is this auxiliary (*m-ir*) that continued into Coptic (*mpr-* with an epenthetic *-p-*).[21]

Taking the Sahidic dialect as representative, the grammaticalized prohibitive marker occurs with the Infinitive, while the positive Imperative is a dedicated morphological form, with distinctive direct object syntax. However, this is the case only for a small list of highly frequent verb lexemes, which preserve a dedicated Imperative form. For all other lexemes, the dedicated Imperative form has been replaced by the Infinitive. In other words, for the majority of verbal lexemes, the Sahidic dialect is characterized by a Type 4 construction, which involves a dedicated prohibitive marker and a verb form identical to that of the affirmative imperative.

Based on this account, we see that the shift from Type 4 to Type 2 is not only the direct result of the grammaticalization of an innovative prohibitive strategy. Rather, it also depends on independent changes in the morphosyntax of the positive Imperative.

1	*m* + NC	
2	*m* + NC	*m-ir* + INF
3		*m-ir* + INF/*mpr-* + INF.

Fig. 6: Stages of grammaticalization of the Prohibitive

3.2 The Negative Jussive

The development of the Negative Jussive is in some ways parallel to that of the Prohibitive, although the latter emerged and was conventionalized a bit earlier than the former. The original construction was *m dy* (variant *m rdi*)[22] 'don't cause,' followed by the Subjunctive (*sḏm=f*).

Ex. 20) *m rdi ḥ3b=i n=k ḥr=s ky zp*
PROH CAUS:NC write:SBJV=1SG to=you about=3SGF another case
"Do not make me write to you about it another time!"
(*Heqa.* II, ro 34-35 = Allen 2002: pl. 30)

21 This probably resulted from a phonological reality along the lines of /mr/, cf. Latin *camera* > French *chambre*. This epenthesis would only have occurred if the auxiliary were proclitic or affixal, and therefore unstressed. Otherwise, /m/ and /r/ would not be in contact, as they would be separated by a vowel. On 'emergent consonants' or consonant epenthesis in general, see Ohala (1997), and Blevins (2008). On consonant epenthesis in Coptic, see Peust (1999).

22 For the spellings of *rdi* after the prohibitive marker *m* in Late Egyptian, see Winand (1992: 82-84, §153-155)

This construction persisted well into Late Egyptian. Somewhat later than the Prohibitive, a periphrastic construction *m-ir di*(*.t*) + Subjunctive, arose. In some cases, the conservative and innovative constructions occur in one and the same text:[23]

Ex. 21) *m rdi ꜣsḳ wʿ m nꜣn mḏꜣ-wt*
PROH CAUS:NC drag_out:SBJV one among ART.PL papyrus_roll-F.PL
rdi.n=i m-ḏr.t=k (…)
give-ANT=1SG in-hand=2SGM (…)
ḫr m-ir rdi.t th=tw r nꜣ-n Nby
and proh CAUS-INF attack:SBJV-one ALL ART.PL people_of_Neby
"Do not let any of the written documents which I gave you drag out, (…) and do not let anyone attack the people of Neby!"
(P. Caire 58054, r^{o} 13 & v^{o} 4 = K*RI* I, 323,13 & 324,3-4)

Probably by the end of Late Egyptian, and certainly by Demotic, the auxiliary *m-ir* was generalized for the Negative Jussive, and the older construction was lost. Alongside the older construction arose yet another periphrastic pattern, *m-ir di*(*.*)*t ir-f sḏm*, which involves a periphrastic variant of the Subjunctive.

Ex. 22) Late Egyptian
m-ir di-t ir-y=i gꜣ(*i-t*)
PROH CAUS-INF do-SBJV=1SG lie:INF
"Don't make me lie!" (P. BM 10052, v^{o} 12,20-21 = K*RI* VI 794,12)

Ex. 23) Demotic
m-ir di-t ir-y=f nw m-sꜣ ge mꜣʿ
PROH CAUS-INF do-SBJV=3SGM look:INF after another place
"Don't let him look at another place (except the lamp alone)!"
(P. Mag LL, XVII,16 [cf. Johnson 1976: 223])

The construction *di*(*.t*) *ir-f sḏm* is the antecedent of the Causative Infinitive discussed above (Coptic *tre-f-sôtm*).

On general principles, the distribution between the innovative periphrastic and the older non-periphrastic construction is not unexpected. The older construction had undergone further semantic change, typical of grammaticalization, from causative to jussive, and an innovative causative construction emerged and eventually superseded the earlier non-periphrastic construction. The semantic 'bleaching' is of a type found in other grammaticalization processes, involving the gradual loss of subject control over the process.[24] In a causative construction, it is implied that the 'causee' has the ability to act to bring about the predicated state of affairs, while in jussives, such an implication is not necessarily present. When jussives develop into optatives, subject control, as a coded meaning, is almost entirely lost.

As a final observation, the later date of the emergence of the periphrastic Negative Jussive is probably significant, indicative of the fact that the construction with *m-ir*

23 See Vernus (2010: 322-324). For a possible functional opposition between the two constructions, see below, §5.

24 For a similar semantic development in the grammaticalization of the perfect in Coptic, see Grossman (2009), and more recently, for futures in Earlier and Later Egyptian, Grossman & Polis (2014a, 2014b).

di(.*t*) + Subjunctive (as opposed to the simple *m dy* + Subjunctive) initially arose through analogical extension from the Prohibitive.

Before proceeding to the next section, it should be mentioned that at the end of the linguistic history of Egyptian, we observe the same process occurring again. In late Bohairic, we find an innovative periphrastic construction encoding a negative causative:[25]

Ex. 24) Bohairic
mper-k^{h}a-t nt-ou-ol-t
PROH-put-1SG CONJ-3PL-take-1SG
"Don't let me be taken!"

On the basis of this construction, a new Negative Jussive pattern arose, involving a neuter pronominal object and a conjunctive ('Don't-let-it that-it-happen').

Ex. 25) Bohairic
mper-k^{h}a-s nte-n-t^{i} n-ou-enkot n-nen-bal
PROH-put-it CONJ-1PL-give ACC-a-sleep to-our.PL-eye
"Let us not give sleep to our eyes!"

These later periphrastic constructions have never been studied in a detailed way. However, the broad picture is clear: a linguistic cycle involving multiple stages of emergence of innovative causative constructions, in contrast to negative jussives, and the subsequent semantic development of the former into new jussives, which in turn developed new polysemies of their own.

		Periphrasis (1)	Periphrasis (2)	Periphrasis (3)
1	*m dy sḏm-f*			
2	*m dy sḏm-f*	*m-ir di.t sḏm-f*		
3		*m-ir di.t sḏm-f*	*m-ir di.t ir-f sḏm*	
4			*m-ir di.t ir-f sḏm*/ *mprtre-f-sôtm* (S) *mpent^{h}re-f-sôtm* (B)	*mperk^{h}as nte-f-sôtm* (B)

Fig. 7: Stages of grammaticalization of the Negative Jussive

4 Prohibitive markers and prohibitive strategies in Earlier Egyptian

In Earlier Egyptian (ca. 3000-1400 BCE), both the prohibitive (Ex. 26-31) and the negative jussive (Ex. 32-33) described in §3 both remain at Stage 1 of their evolution, which means that the periphrasis of the Negatival Complement is not attested:

Ex. 26) *m h3-w ḥr 3ḥ.t n-t rmṯ nb*
PROH go_down-NC on field of-F people any
"Do not farm (lit. 'go down on') the field of everyone (i.e. the field that everyone else takes care of)!" (*Heqa.* I, r^{o} 8 = Allen 2002: pl. 26)
Similar expression in *Heqa.* I, vo 10

Ex. 27) *m mḥ ib=k ḥr-ntt ṯw m rḫ*
PROH fill:NC heart=2SGM because 2SGM as know:PTCP.IMPV
"Do not be over-confident because you are someone knowledgeable!"
(*Ptahh.* 53 = L2, 1,13)

25 This construction developed from a permissive construction based on the verb *k^{h}ô* 'put.'

Ex. 28) *m iʿ(i) ib n nty ḫft=k*
PROH wash:NC heart DAT REL facing=2SGM
"Do not relieve (lit. wash the heart of) the one who is facing you!"
(*Ptahh.* 79 = Pr. 6,2)

Ex. 29) *m mdw n=f r i3š-t=f*
PROH talk:NC to=3SGM until summon-TERM=3SGM
"Do not talk to him before he aks" (*Ptahh.* 99 = Pr. 7,1)

Ex. 30) *m s:ḥḏn-w ib n nty 3tp-w ʿ*
PROH CAUS-be_angry-NC heart DAT REL load-STAT.3SGM arm
"Do not vex the heart of someone who is burdened!" (*Ptahh.* 389 = Pr. 12,6-7)

Ex. 31) *m k3hs-w ḫft wsr=k*
PROH be_harsh-NC according_to be_powerful=2SGM
tm spr bw-ḏw r=k
NEG:SBJV reach:NC something_evil ALL=2SGM
"Do not be harsh because you are powerful, so that nothing evil may reach you." (*Peas.* B1, 244-245)

Ex. 32) *m rḏ i-ḫm ṯw* NN *sk sw i-rḫ ṯw*
PROH CAUS:NC SBJV-ignore 2SGM NN for 3SGM PTCP-know 2SGM
"(Don't ignore King NN, god, for he knows you,
Don't cause King NN to ignore you, for he knows you!" (*PT* 262, §327,a-b [T])

Ex. 33) *m rḏi ʿm ib=k n grg ḥr […]=f*
NEG CAUS:NC be_neglectful:SBJV heart=2SGM of Gereg about […]=3SGM
"Do not let Gereg be neglectful about his […]!"
(*Heqa.* IV, r^{o} 4 = Allen 2002: pl. 38)

When the verb *iri* is used, it is always with its full lexical meaning "to do, to make, to act" (depending on its argument structure), not as an auxiliary verb:

Ex. 34) *m ir bd.ty im*
PROH do:NC emmer there
"(Now, you should do that basin-land in full barley,
Do not do emmer there!" (*Heqa.* I, v^{o} 11 = Allen 2002: pl. 28)

Ex. 35) *m ir r=k zp-2 gr*
PROH do:NC ALL=2SGM twice also
"Do not act against yourself anymore!" (*Sinuhe* B 258)

Ex. 36) *m ir iḳr ḫnms*
PROH do:NC excellent friend
"Do not act as a clever one, my friend!" (*Sh.S* 183-184)

As for the verb *rdi*, besides its use as causative (Ex. 32-33), it is of course also well attested with its full lexical meaning "to give" as well as in idioms:

Ex. 37) *m rdi ib=tn m-s3=i*
PROH give:NC hear=2PL behind=1SG
"Do not worry about me!" (*Heqa.* II, ro 2 = Allen 2002: pl. 30)
See also Heqa. IV, r^{o} 2 = Allen 2002: pl. 38.

The dedicated prohibitive construction *m sḏm*(*-w*) can be nuanced and/or reinforced by the use of particles, as well as by the intensification phrase *zp-sn*, lit. "twice":

Ex. 38) *m snḏ(-w) m zp-sn nḏs*
VET fear-NC PTCL twice humble_man
"Have absolutely no fear, humble man!" (*Sh.S.* 111-112)
The enclitic *m* "points to a polite request, as if an invitation is meant" (Borghouts 2010: 174, §46.e.2)

In terms of syntax, the prohibitive is often coordinated asyndetically to an Imperative (Ex. 39) or to another prohibitive (Ex. 40):

Ex. 39) *nḏr m3ʿ.t m sn st*
preserve:IMP truth PROH pass_by:NC 3SGF
"Keep to the truth, do not pass by it!" (*Ptahh.* 151-152 = Pr. 7,4)

Ex. 40) *m w3 <n> nt-t n ỉy-t=ø*
PROH brood:NC to REL-F NEG come-TERM-ø
m ḥʿ n nt.t n ḫpr-t=ø
PROH rejoice:NC for REL-F NEG happen-TERM-ø
"Do not brood from what has not yet come,
do not rejoice over what has not yet happened" (*Peas.* B2,27-28)

We will now turn to the vexing question of the origin (§4.1) and later replacement (§4.2) of the Negatival Complement by the Infinitive. This will lead us to investigate more broadly the *negative jussive* strategies of Earlier Egyptian, of which we provide a general picture in §4.3-5.

4.1 The origin of the Negatival Complement and the diversity of of prohibitive construction with *jmi* in Old Egyptian

The origin of the form known as the Negatival Complement has been a matter of controversy among scholars. We present here the main lines of the arguments, in order to introduce and discuss other types of prohibitive constructions that are encountered in the Earlier Egyptian corpora. This form is characterized by an ending *-w* (rarely *-y* in older texts), but which is mostly left unwritten.[26]

1) Sethe (1899: II,1017) suggested recognizing a kind of participle.
2) Gardiner (1957: 262, §341) was of the opinion that one could hypothesize "a survival of the 3d pers. m. of the active old perfective" that became "stereotyped and invariable for all persons and numbers in this particular use.
3) For Edel, who reviewed and criticized (1) and (2), it is likely to be a noun-like verb form and may be originally identical to the gerund[27] (see e.g. Edel 1955, 373 who refers to the "Abstraktbildung auf *-w*"). This could explain the fact that the negatival complement is (1) immutable, (2) indifferent to diathesis (see e.g. Edel 1955: 372-374, §743; exx. after *tm* in Edel 1964: 584, 586, 587, §1121, §1125, §1129), and (3) can take an accusative-like object (i.e., dependent pronoun).

More recently, based on the observation that the classes of verbs that occur with the ending *-w* are the same when used as Negatival Complement and when used as prospective/subjunctive in the *Pyramid Texts* and *Coffin Texts*, Allen (1984: 479, §686) and Schenkel (2000) suggested that the Negatival Complement might originally

26 On the morphology of the Negatival Complement in Old Egyptian and Middle Egyptian, see Edel (1955: 372-373, §742); Allen (1984: 476-482, §680-688) and Schenkel (2002), respectively.

27 Borghouts (2010: 161, §42.c.1) however notes that, at the graphemic level, the plural strokes characteristic of the gerund do rarely occur with the Negatival Complement.

be a prospective/subjunctive form with zero subject. The emergence of the Negatival Complement would, in this scenario, be linked to the non-expression of a coreferential subject: *m sdm-w=k* > *m sḏm-w=ø* > *m sḏm-w*. Compare in the *Pyramid Texts* what would then be the original and later constructions, in different versions of the same spell:

Ex. 41) *m s:fḫḫ-w=k im*[*=f*]
PROH CAUS-loose-SBJV=2SGM from=3SGM
"Don't you let loose of him!" (*PT* 23, §16c [N])

Ex. 42) *m s:fḫḫ-w im=f*
PROH CAUS-loose-NC from=3SGM
"Don't you let loose of him!" (*PT* 23, §16c [Nt 67 / *Ibj* Frag. E])

This scenario accounts for the existence of two prohibitive constructions for the second person in the *Pyramid Texts*, with no discernable semantic difference:

1) *m sdm*(*-w*)*=k* "don't hear", the putative older construction, with person marking on the dependent verb form.
2) *m sḏm-w* "don't hear", the putative newer construction, without expression of the coreferential subject on the dependent verb form.

The prohibitive of Type (1) is actually quite frequent in the *Pyramid Texts*; compare below Type (1) in Ex. 43-44 with Type (2) in Ex. 45:

Ex. 43) *m wn=k ꜥ-w*(*j*)*=k n=f*
PROH open=2SGM arm-DU-2SGM for=3SGM
"Don't you open your arms for him!" (*PT* §1267b [P])

Ex. 44) *m ḫ3tb=k*
PROH take_pity=2SGM
"(O Thot,) don't you take pity!" (*PT* §1336a [P])

Ex. 45) *s:ꜥḥꜥ.n tw ḥr m nwtwt-w*
CAUS-stand_up-ANT 2SGM Horus PROH totter-NC
"Horus has made you stand up, do not totter!"
(*PT* 364, §617c [T]; note that M has 𓈖 instead of 𓀀𓈖)
Edel (1964: 581, §1112) translates "ohne das es ein Schwangen gibt".

So far, so good. However, the negative verb *jmi* is not only used as an *imperative* verb form for second person addressees (examples above), it's also attested as a *subjunctive* form in a series of related *negative jussive* constructions for first, second and third person subjects.[28] One can distinguish here the following patterns in the *Pyramid text* (and some *Coffin texts*):

1) If the subject is a pronoun, one finds two constructions: (1) *jmi=f sḏm*(*-w*), with person marking on the negative verb *jmi* (Ex. 46-48) and (2) *jmi sḏm*(*-w*)*=f*, with person marking on the dependent *sḏm=f* form (Ex. 49-52)[29]:

28 For classical Middle Egyptian, see Gardiner (1957: 263, §343); Allen (2000: 256); Malaise & Winand (1999: 406-407, §649); Grandet & Mathieu (2003: 278-279, §25.1).

29 See *CT* VI, 207o-p, with Allen (1984: 481) for a first person subject.

Ex. 46) *jmi=i sip-w ṯw n mw.t=k*
PROH=1SG assign-NC 2SGM DAT mother=2SGM
"May I not assign you to your mother! [said to a demon]" (*CT* V, 50.d/B2Bo)
See also *Book of the Dead* 67 for another possible instance of *im=i sḏm* (with Gilula 1970: 212).

Ex. 47) *imi=k ḏi wḥm=s*
PROH=2SGM CAUS:NC repeat:SBJV=3SGF
"Please do not let it happen again!" (*PT* 1622b)

Ex. 48) *imi=k ḏd sw*
PROH=2SG say:NC 3SGM
"Please do not say it!" (*PT* 1161b [P])

Ex. 49) *imi iw-w wsir m iw-t=f tw ḏw-t*
PROH come-NC/SBJV Osiris in coming=3SGM DEM bad-F
m wn=k ꜥ-w(y)=k n=f
PROH open=2SGM arm-DU-2SGM for-3SGM
"May Osiris not come in that bad coming of his, do not open your arms to him"
(*PT* 534, §1267a [P]; similarly in §1268a and §1269a)

Ex. 50) *im wꜣ=f mꜥ=k*
PROH move_away=3SGM from=2SGM
"May he not move away from you!" (*PT*, *Nt* 319)

Ex. 51) *im pr=f mꜥ=k*
PROH go_out=3SGM from=2SGM
"May he not escape from you!" (*PT* 1018, P IV,90)

Ex. 52) *im nhp=f mꜥ=k*
PROH move_away=3SGM from=2SGM
"(He made you seize him with your hand,) may he not move away from you!"
(*PT* 356, §582b)

2) If the subject is a noun phrase, the expected construction is *jmi sḏm* NP (Ex. 49 & 53 [parallel to Ex. 36, which has a pronominal subject on *imj*][30]), even if some rare occurrences of *jmi* NP *sḏm* (Ex. 44) have been noticed in the literature:

Ex. 53) *imi sip-w ṯw* N *pn n mw.t=k*
PROH assign-NC 2SGM N DEM DAT mother=2SGM
"May this N not assign you to your mother! [said to a demon]"
(*CT* V, 50.d/B6C)

Ex. 54) *imi nw n(i)ni-w m ꜥ=n*
PROH DEM turn_away-NC from arm=1PL
"May this one (i.e., our brother) not turn away from us!" (*CT* I, 307.b)

One therefore ends up with four constructions, the frequency of which varies depending on the nature of the subject:

30 See Borghouts (2010: 160-161, §42.b.1).

	jm sḏm(*-w*) SUBJECT	*jm* SUBJECT *sḏm*(*-w*)
PRONOMINAL SUBJECT	*jm sḏm*(*-w*)*=f*	*jm=k sḏm*(*-w*)
NOMINAL SUBJECT	*jm sḏm*(*-w*) NP	*jm* NP *sḏm*(*-w*)

Fig. 8: The four prohibitive strategies with the subjunctive of *jmi*

As regards the syntax of these constructions, it has been (etymologically) analyzed as follows:

1) [*jm sḏm*(*-w*) SUBJECT]: originally the subjunctive of *jmi* followed by a Subjunctive form, functioning as subject (Satzinger 1968: 52, §82; Allen 1984: 479-481). So [*imj*]$_{\text{PREDICATE}}$ [*sḏm*(*.w*)*=f*]$_{\text{SUBJECT}}$ "May it not be that he hears!"
This hypothesis is supported by examples such as Ex. 55 and 56, where the verb *jmi* has its full lexical meaning "not to be"[31] and the subject is a future participle (the so-called *sḏm.tj.ff*):

Ex. 55) (*i*)*m* *ḥmw-t=f* *im=tn*
PROH:SBJV drive_back-PART.FUT=3SGM among=2PL
"Let there be none of you who will turn back (as you carry Osiris N)"
(*PT* 544, §1338b-c; sim. 1823b)

Ex. 56) *rḏ-n* *ḥr* *nḏr=k* *ḫft.jw=k*
CAUS-ANT Horus seize:SBJV=2SGM opponent-PL=2SGM
im *psḏ-t*(*j*/*w*)*=f*(*j*) *im=sn* *ḫft=k*
PROH:SBJV turn_the_back-PART.FUT=3SGM among=3PL in_front_of=2SGM
"Horus did make you seize your opponents
so that there shall be none of them who will turn the back to you."
(*PT* 356, §579b)
Compare with *PT* 600, §1656a: *imi psḏ-t=f im=tn r tm* "Let there be none of you who will turn his back to Atum). See below in §4.1 for the dependent uses of *jmi*.

2) Based on this analysis, Allen (1984: 480-482, §687) has suggested that the construction [*jmi* SUBJECT *sḏm*(*-w*)], is a case of transposition of the pronominal subject to the negative verb. So *jmi sḏm*(*-w*)*=f* > *jmi=f sḏm*(*-w*). In this scenario, the construction *jmi=f sḏm*(*-w*) is more recent than the construction *jmi sḏm*(*-w*)*=f*. The fact that this construction is attested only later (and very rarely) with nominal subject (see Ex. 54) would seem to point in this direction.

A possible problem with the hypothesis presented so far is to apply this explanation to the prohibitive *stricto sensu* with the imperative of *imy*: how does one account for the occurrence of a Prospective/Subjunctive *sḏm-w=f* after the imperative. This point led Schenkel to suggest that all the constructions involving the verb *jm* + *sḏm*(*-w*) imply etymologically the use of a *sḏm-w=f* with a consecutive, adverbial function, lit. "May it not be such that one hears". This does not affect the hypothesis of Satzinger and Allen that much, except that the *sḏm*(*-w*)*=f* is not interpreted as being the subject of the negative verb *jm*, but rather a dependent verb form with final function. To conclude, one should say that this hypothesis might find some confirmation in very rare examples such as:

31 For examples of *tm sḏm=f* in the *CT*, possibly with the full lexical meaning of tm 'to cease', see Schenkel (2000: 5-6).

Ex. 57) *imi ir-t=k i3rr=s*
PROH eye-F-2SGM be_dim:SBJV=3SGF
"May your eye not be dim!" (*PT* 1161b [P])
See Edel (1955, 574, §1102, anm.) for a different analysis.

Literally, this example indeed reads: "May your eye not be such that it be dim". The actual etymological explanation for these constructions actually does not matter as much as the remarkable variety of constructions that are possible for the negative verb *jmi* in the old corpus of religious texts:

		jmi as SBJV			*jmi* as IMP
		jm sḏm(-*w*) SUBJECT		*jm* SUBJECT *sḏm*(-*w*)	
PRONOMINAL SUBJECT	1	*jm sḏm*(-*w*)=*i*	?→	*jm*=*i sḏm*(-*w*)	
	2	*jm sḏm*(-*w*)=*k*	?→	*jm*=*k sḏm*(-*w*)	*m sḏm*(-*w*=*k*)
	3	*jm sḏm*(-*w*)=*f*	?→	*jm*=*f sḏm*(-*w*)	
NOMINAL SUBJECT		*jm sḏm*(-*w*) NP	[?→	*jm* NP *sḏm*(-*w*)]	

Fig. 9: The variety of constructions of *jmi* in the Old Egyptian religious corpus

It should immediately be noted with Satzinger (1968: 63, §85) that such a variety of constructions is virtually limited to the *Pyramid Texts* (with rare examples in the *Coffin Texts*), and no clear semantic difference have been identified, as shown by the following examples (second person) of the same sentence in parallel texts with different constructions (and compare also to Ex. 41-42) :

Ex. 58) *m s-fḫḫ=k im=f*
PROH CAUS-loose=2SGM from=3SGM
s3w im=k s-fḫḫ-w im=f
stay_away:IMP PROH=2SGM CAUS-loose-NC from=3SGM
"Don't you let loose of him
pay attention not to let loose of him" (*PT* 23, §16c [W]; sim. *PT* 698C, §*2177b)
For the final use of *imj*, see below and compare with *CT* I, 71d (quoted by Edel 1964: 584, §1120): *s3w tm=k prj-w* "pay attention not to go out!".

Ex. 59) *im=k s-fḫḫ im=f*
PROH=2SG CAUS-loose:NC from=3SGM
"Don't you let loose of him!" (*PT* 68, §47c-d [Nt])

In other corpora of the Old Kingdom, as well as in classical Middle Egyptian,[32] the system is more rigid and is actually limited to the cells highlighted in gray in Fig. 9: if the subject is pronominal, it comes directly after the negative verb *jmi* (Ex. 60-64), while if the subject is a full lexical noun phrase, it is placed after the Negatival Complement (Ex. 65):

Ex. 60) *im=k rḏi <3>ḥm.t nb*(-*t*) *n rmṯ nb*
PROH=2SG give:NC field-F any-F to people any
"You should not give any field to anyone!" (*Urk.* I, 213,1)

32 Note that according to Brose (2014: 285, §256.4), the prohibitive construction *imi*=*k sḏm* is not attested in the documentary texts of the Middle Kingdom.

Ex. 61) [*im*]=*k* *sn* *tȝ* *sn* *n*=*k* *rd*(=*i*)
PROH=2SG kiss:NC earth kiss:IMP for=2SGM leg=1SG
"You should not kiss the ground, kiss my leg!" (*Urk.* I, 41,15)

Ex. 62) *im*=*k* *wḥm* *mdw*
PROH=2SG repeat:NC word
"Please do not repeat the word!" (*CT* II,115h/G2T)

Ex. 63) *im*=*tn* *bdš* *ḥr*-*w*=*ṯn* *ḥr*=*s*
PROH=2PL be_weak:NC face-PL-2PL on-3SGF
"May you not droop your faces because of it!" (Sinai 90, W. 4 = pl. 25A)

Ex. 64) *im*=*k* *ir* *ḥr* *m* *rmṯ*
PROH=2SGM do:NC fear in men
"May you not disseminate fear among men" (*Ptahh.* 99 = Pr. 6,8)

Ex. 65) *im* *ꜥšȝ* *ḫrw*=*k*
PROH be_numerous:NC voice=2SGM
"May you not be talkative" (*Tomb of Ti* = Steindorff 1913: pl. 115)

In example such as Ex. 65, the original 'subject' of a *sḏm*-*w*=*f* form (if one follows Allen and Schenkel's hypothesis) is likely to have been reinterpreted as type of so-called *nfr ḥr* "beautiful of face" construction (i.e., a *bahuvrihi* construction), as it occurs mostly with verbs expressing qualities:[33]

Ex. 66) *m* *ꜥȝ* *ib*=*k* *ḥr* *rḫ*=*k*
PROH be_great:NC heart=2SGM on know=2SGM
"Do not be pretentious because of what you know! (lit. Do not be great as regards you heart)" (*Ptahh.* 52 = Pr. 5,8)

To be compared in the same text with:

Ex. 67) *im*=*k* *ꜥȝ* *ib*=*k* *r*=*f*
PROH be_great:NC heart=2SGM ALL=3SGM
"Do not be pretentious against him!" (*Ptahh.* 178 = Pr. 7,8-9)

Ex. 68) *m* *ꜥwn* *ib*=*k* *ḥr* *psš.t*
PROH be_greedy heart=2SGM on share
"Don't be greedy when sharing!" (*Ptahh.* 316 = Pr. 10,5)

Ex. 69) *m* *ȝṯ.w* *ḥr*=*k*
PROH become_white-NC face=2SGM
"Do not turn white in your face! (lit. Do not become white as regards your face!)" (*ShS.* 112)

Ex. 70) *m* *ȝd*(*.w*) *ib*=*k* *r*=*f* *ḫft* *ḫss*=*f*
PROH be_aggressive-NC heart=2SGM to=3SGM according_to be_weak=3SGM
"(If you find a disputant in action — a miserable one, not your equal —,)
"Do not be aggressive in your heart against him because he is weak!"
(*Ptahh.* 74-76 = Pr. 6,1)

33 Cf. Gardiner (1957: 263, §343 obs.); Allen (2000: 188); Grandet & Mathieu (2003: 281); Borghouts (2010: 173, §46.d.2).

Ex. 71) *m ḳ3(.w) ib=k tm=f dḥi(.w)*
PROH be_high-NC heart=2SGM NEG.SBJV=3SGM be_humiliated-NC
"Do not be haughty, in order to not be humiliated (lit. 'Do not be high as regards you heart, in order for it not to be humiliated')" (*Ptahh.* 374 = Pr. 12,1)

The smaller number of constructions in Middle Egyptian is paralleled by a diminution of the syntactic functions of the *jmi* headed constructions. As stressed by Allen (1984: 224-226, §344-347), the construction *im=f sḏm* can fulfill three main syntactic functions in the *Pyramid Texts*:

1) Initial/independent prohibitive construction (numerous examples above)
2) Noun clause, functioning as the object of a governing verb (such as *s3w*; see Ex. 58 above)
3) Asyndetic final clause (elsewhere in Old Egyptian and in Middle Egyptian, usually *tm=f sḏm*)[34]

Ex. 72) *im=k ḥmm* N *im=k smt* N
PROH=2SGM oppose? N PROH=2SGM interrogate N
im=k nḏ ḥḳ3 mˁ N
PROH=2SGM request magic from N
im N *ḥsb ˁr=k gmgm=f wḏˁt=k*
PROH N break reed=2SGM smash=3SGM ink_shell=2SGM
[Address to the doorkeeper] "(O Away-turner, Interrogator) may you not oppose N, may you not interrogate N, may you not request magic from N (may you not demand the magic of N from N – you have your magic, he has his magic –) lest N break you pen and lest he smash your ink-shell." (*PT* 678, §2029a-2030c)

In Middle Egyptian, only the first of these three functions (independent prohibitive construction) is fully productive, while the second disappeared and third is preserved only in the linguistically conservative religious corpus,[35] as illustrated by:

Ex. 73) *im=k ḏd sw n ḫry.w ḥry-ib.w iw-nsrsr*
PROH=2SGM say 3SGM to being_below-PL being_in_the_midst-PL IslandOfFire
im iw N *pn r=k*
PROH come N DEM ALL=2SGM
"Please do not say it to those who are below, in the midst of the Island of Fire, lest this N will come against you!"
(*CT* VI, 295e-g; similar construction in P. Ebers 108,1)

As stressed by Vernus (1990: 118), halfway between the independent and dependent use are the cases in which *im=f sḏm* follows an imperative form.

Ex. 74) *mj r=k r=i imy=f sḳr-w w(j)*
come:IMP ALL=2SGM ALL=1SG NEG=3SGM beat-NC 1SG
"Come, you, to me, so that he will not beat me!"
(*Tomb of Ti* = Steindorff 1913: pl. 110)

34 Loprieno (1991: 217-218) describes the shift in the respective use of *tm* and *im* between the *Pyramid Texts* and other corpora as a shift from a semantic opposition (*tm* in assertive and conditional clauses while *im* is used in purpose clause) to a strictly syntactic one: *tm* in any dependent clause while *im* appears in independent jussive sentences.

35 See Vernus (1990: 117-118).

4.2 The replacement of the negatival complement by the infinitive

If no periphrasis of the prohibitive construction *m sḏm*(*-w*) appears to be attested in Earlier Egyptian, several indices nevertheless point to a change undergone by the construction at the formal level, namely the replacement of the Negatival Complement by the Infinitive after the prohibitive marker *m*. As observed by Kroeber (1970: 171-175; §3.5), this phenomenon occurs already during the Middle Kingdom.

At the morphological level (as partly reflected by the spellings of the verbs), the characteristic ending *-w* with certain classes of verbs disappears, and one observes, on the other hand, the occasional appearance of the feminine ending *-t* on the verbs with a final weak radical (*ult.-infirmae*), an ending that is characteristic of the Infinitive form. The earliest examples quoted by Kroeber (1970: 172) go back as far as to the early 11th dynasty (in an inscription of the temple of Min at Coptos, after the negative verb *tm*), but are strikingly absent from the texts of the Middle Kingdom.[36] The first certain occurrence of an Infinitive in the construction *m sḏm* "do not hear" actually belongs to the 18th dynasty, during the reign of Amenhotep II:[37]

Ex. 75) *m n$^{\text{ʿ}}$-t n nḥsj m-kft*
PROH be_mild-INF for Nubian at_all
"Don't have pity for the Nubian in any case"
(Letter of A. II to the governor of Kush = *Urk.* IV, 1344,11)

This replacement can also be observed when the lexical verb form of the prohibitive occurs with a direct pronominal object. The Negatival Complement is constructed with the dependent pronoun (*m sḏm sw*, see Ex. 76), while the infinitive requires a suffix pronoun (*m sḏm=f*, see Ex. 77):

Ex. 76) *m ỉr st bw.t ms pw*
PROH do:NC 3SGF abomination surely COP
"Don't do it! This is indeed an abomination" (*Ptahh.* 294 = L2 5,11)

Ex. 77) *m ng$^{\text{ɜ}}$=s m sšr zp-2*
PROH be_lacking=3SGF from good_order twice
"Don't keep it from being in proper order"
(P. Berlin 10463, r$^{\text{o}}$ 3 = Caminos 1963: pl.)

As a matter of fact, even if the replacement of the Negatival Complement by the Infinitive had probably occurred earlier in some spoken registers, we have no positive evidence before quite late in the 18th dynasty (Amenhotep II) for the occurrence of the Infinitive in this construction in the written documentation.

4.3 The prohibitive construction with *s$^{\text{ɜ}}$w* "to guard (against), to stay away (from)"

The verb *s$^{\text{ɜ}}$w* (*Wb.* III, 416,12-417,21) can be used as a prohibitive auxiliary[38] in different constructions, but always with a *second person* addressee. It is already

36 Kroeber (1970: 173) alludes to a possible (but elusive) diatopic/diaphasic reason for this. There are however many occurrences in the literature (e.g. *Ipwer*) and inscriptions of the early 18th dynasty after the negative verb *tm*.

37 Starting with the reign of Amenhotep III, the cases are more numerous. See e.g. P. Cairo 58055, 5-6.

38 See Gardiner (1957: 259-260, §338); Malaise & Winand (1999: 449 & 514, §726 & §840).

attested in the *Pyramid Texts* in independent main clauses. In the earliest occurrences, the verb *s3w* is an imperative governing a subjunctive *sḏm=f*, usually of the negative verb *jmi* (see already Ex. 58) with the meaning "pay attention not to do something":

Ex. 78) *s3w jm=k ḥm.w m-ḫt* NN
stay_away:IMP NEG:SBJV=2SGM turn_back-NC after NN
"Beware not to turn back behind NN!" (*PT* 698C, §2177b [N])

Later occurrences of the construction *s3w sḏm=f* seem to indicate that the verb *s3w* alone has taken over the meaning "pay attention *not* to", since no negation occurs after *s3w* (such as *im=k* or *tm=k*), whereas the advice to the addressee is clearly that something should *not* happen:

Ex. 79) *m gr(.w) s3w ḫn=k*
PROH be_silent-NC stay_away:IMP intrude:SBJV=2SG
"Do not be silent, but avoid intruding!" (*Ptahh.* 375 = Pr. 12,1)

Ex. 80) (…) *mi p3 ḥr s3w ḏd nb ꜥ.w.s*
PROH according_to ART.M.SG directive keep_away:IMP say:SBJV lord L.P.H.
iw=f gr ḥr ḏd-t-n=i n=f
BASE:3SGM silent:STAT about say-F-REL.ANT=1SG to=3SGM
"(…) in accordance with the (following) directive: 'pay attention that the lord l.p.h.. does not say that he is unresponsive concerning what I said to him' "
(P. UC 32198, r[o] 15-17 = Collier & Quirke 2002: 92)

Ex. 81) [… *s*]*3w mḥ ib=k m ḫ-t nb-t*
keep_away:IMP fill heart=2SGM with thing-F any-F
"Beware of filling your heart (= boasting) with anything!"
(P. UC 32126, r[o] 2,2 = Collier & Quirke 2002: 62)

The verb *s3w* has the same prohibitive meaning in another independent construction: *s3w tw*/*ti ḥr* + infinitive, lit. "stay away concerning something". There are conflicting arguments as to whether *s3w* in this pattern is best analyzed as an Imperative reinforced by the dependent pronoun of the second person ("keep yourself away from") or as a Stative form with prohibitive function ("be kept away from"; see Jenni 2007); the spellings make the latter analysis more likely.

Ex. 82) *s3w ti ḥr ḫsf m-nf*
stay away:IMP 2SGM on punish:INF wrongfully
m sḳri(.w) nn st 3ḫ n=k
PROH smite-NC NEG 3SGF useful for=2SGM
"Keep yourself away from punishing wrongfully!
Do not smite!, this is not useful for you" (*Merik.*/P48 + M. 4,2)

As shown by Ex. 83-84, the construction is attested with a noun phrase after the preposition *ḥr*:

Ex. 83) *s3w ti ḥr zp n mh.t-ib*
stay_away:IMP 2SGM on case of negligence
"Stay away from any occasion of negligence! (*Ptahh.* 154 = L2, 3,3)

Ex. 84) *ꜥḥ3 t(w) ḥr zp n ꜥwn-ib* [PR]
fight:IMP 2SGM on case of avidity

s3w tj ḥr zp n ʿwn-ib [L2]
stay_away:IMP 2SGM on case of avidity
"Keep away from any occasion of avidity" (*Ptahh.* 300 = Pr. 10,1 & L2 4,15)

The two versions of the last example from *Ptahhotep* show that the verb *ʿḥ3* "to fight" has been used in Papyrus Prisse much like *s3w*, with a meaning close to "Pay attention (not) to (do) something". It is not clear, however, whether *ʿḥ3* ever governs a phrase with an infinitive introduced by the preposition *m* (interpretation A) or if *ʿḥ3 tw* is coordinated to a regular prohibitive construction *m sḏm*(*-w*) (interpretation B):

Ex. 85) *ʿḥ3 t*(*w*) *m sḏw m mdt* [INTERPRETATION A]
fight:IMP 2SGM from slander:NC in speech
ʿḥ3 t(*w*) *m sḏ-w m mdt* [INTERPRETATION B]
fight:IMP 2SGM PROH slander-NC in speech
"Stay away from slandering in a speech! OR
Pay attention! Do not slander in a speech!" (*Ptahh.* 149 = Pr. 7,4)

Compare P. Prisse with L2:

Ex. 86) *ʿḥ3 t*(*w*) *m tkn m ḥm-wt* [PR]
fight:IMP 2SGM PROH/from approach:NC/:INF in woman-F.PL
s3w t[*j m*] *tkn m ḥm-wt* [L2]
stay_away:IMP 2SG VET/from approach:NC/:INF in woman-F.PL
"Pay attention! Do not approach women! OR
Stay away from approaching women!"
"Stay away from approaching a woman!" (*Ptahh.* 281 = Pr. 9,9 & L2 5,7)

Besides these two (three?) independent prohibitive uses of this verb, the lexeme *s3w* is also attested in dependent uses[39] (much like *jmi*; cf. §4.1). One first step in this direction occurs in contexts where *s3w* follows an initial imperative form like *ʿḥ3 ṯw* "Pay attention, beware":

Ex. 87) *ʿḥ3 ṯw zp-sn s3w s:i3ṯ=k it-mḥ ḫ3r im*
fight:IMP 2SGM twice keep_away:IMP cheat=2SG full_barley khar there
m ir m it-mḥ n=f-imy
as do:PTCP with full_barley belonging_to=3SGM
"Pay attention! Stay away from shortening a khar of full barley therein, as someone dealing with full barley belonging to himself"
(*Heqa.* I, r° 10-11 = Allen 2002: pl. 26)

Ex. 88) *ʿḥ3 ṯw zp-sn s3w sḫm-ib=k*
fight:IMP 2SGM twice keep_away:IMP take_liberties=2SG
"Pay attention! And do not take liberties (with a single oipe of full barley therein)" (*Heqa.* I, r° 13-14 = Allen 2002: pl. 26)

Clear cases of dependent uses of the verb *s3w* are its occurrences with a negative final value (compare with the dependent use of *jmi* in §4.1) in examples such as:

39 Allen (2002: 23) states that *s3w* is used in the Heqanakht's letters "with the sense of a conjunction 'lest, that not,' followed by a *sḏm=f* form" and Brose (2014: 332, §307) observes that it can have "die Funktion einer Negativpartikel mit final-prospektivischem Wert" in the documentary texts of the Middle Kingdom.

Ex. 89) *m sw3 ḫpr šnʿ-t(w)=k* [PR]
PROH be_great:NC happen:SBJV turn_back-PASS=2SGM
m š3š st s3w šnʿ(.tw)=k [L2]
PROH avoid-NC 3SGF stay_away:SBJV turn_back=2SGM
"Do not go beyond (your duties), or it will happen that one will turn away from you!"
"Do not avoid it, lest one will turn away from you"
(*Ptahh.* 223 = Pr. 8,3 & L2 4,3)

Ex. 90) *mk rdi-n(=i) rḫ=k nn n ḫ-wt*
ATT CAUS-ANT=1SG know:SBJV=2SGM DEM of thing-F.PL
rdi-n=i n nn n wʿb-w m-ỉsw nn n ḫ-(w)t
give-ANT.REL=1SG to DEM of priest-PL in_exchange_of DEM of thing-F.PL
rdi-n=sn n=i s3w ḫtḫt ḫ-wt ỉm=sn
give-ANT.REL=3PL to=1SG keep_away:SBJV drive_away-ø things from=3PL
"Look, if I did let you know these things which I gave to these priests in exchange of the things which they gave me, this is in order that none of them be taken away!" (Hapidjefa = *Leses.* 92,14-16; see Brose 2014: 422, §386)

Between final uses and uses as a negative complement clause, broadly speaking, are the two following examples:

Ex. 91) *ỉw=tw r rdi-t ʿrḳ=sn ḥr=s m ʿnḫ n nb ʿ.w.s*
PROSP=ONE ALL CAUS-INF swear=3PL about-3SGF with oath to lord l.p.h.
s3w ʿnn=sn ḥr[*=s*] *r nḥḥ*
keep_away:IMP come_back=3PL on=3SGF for eternity
"One was going to make them swear an oath by the lord l.p.h., never to come back (to discuss) about it" (Karnak Juridical Stela, l. 21 = *KÄT* 6, 68,13-14)

In a damaged context:

Ex. 92) […] *r rdi-t ʿrḳ=sn*
PROH ALL CAUS-INF swear=3PL
s3w ḏd=sn [direct speech]
keep_away:IMP say=3PL
"[…] in order to have them swear; may they refrain from saying (or: to have them swear not to say)" (P. Berlin 10470, 2,15 = *KÄT* 6, 53,10-11)

Finally, one can note a rather strange, but deliberated construction (as observed by Allen 2002):

Ex. 93) *ỉr s3w ḳnḏ=tn ḥr n3*
TOP stay_away be_angry=2pl about DEM
"And do not be angry about that: (look, the whole household as well as the children, everything is mine to allocate."
(*Heqa.* II, r° 24-25 = Allen 2002: pl. 30, with comment on p. 41)

As can be observed, the auxiliary *s3w* is attested in a variety of constructions for expressing meanings directly linked to the semantic domain of prohibition with second person subject. Like *jm*, it is also used as a negation in dependent clauses.

4.4 Other negative jussive strategies in Earlier Egyptian

In order to complete the picture of the negative jussive domain, some additional constructions must be taken into account.[40] Besides the negative jussive *jm=k sḏm(-w)* / *jm sḏm(-w)* NP, one can mention two negations of the subjunctive *sḏm=f*:

1) The negative optative *nn sḏm=f* "May he not hear," which can be used for negative wishes, commands or exhorations with all types of grammatical subjects (e.g. Gardiner 1957: 377-378, §457; Vernus 1990: 124-130; Malaise & Winand 1999: 402, §642; Allen 2000: 255)

Ex. 94) *nn d-t(w)=k m ỉnm n sr*
NEG give-SBJV.PASS-2SGM in skin of sheep
"You should not be placed in the skin of a sheep!" (*Sinuhe* B197-198)

Ex. 95) *nn šsp nṯr=f ḥḏ=f*
NEG receive:SBJV god=3SGM white_bread=3SGM
"His god should not accept his white bread!" (*Heqaib* IX, l. 24)

2) The enclitic negation *=w* that is typical of the religious registers and combines with the with the active subjunctive *sḏm=f*/*iri-w=f* as well as the passive *sḏmm=f*/ *iri-w=f* (see e.g. Sethe 1924: 63-64; Gardiner 1957: 267, §352A; Satzinger 1968: 65-66, §104-106; Gilula 1970: 213-214; Meltzer 1983: 109; Allen 1984: 222-223, §339; Vernus 1990: 119-120; Kammerzell 1993)

Ex. 96) *ʿḳ=tn=w r ỉz pn zbi-t*[*iwn*]
enter:SBJV=2PL=NEG to tomb DEM be_irreverent-STAT.2PL
"(If you want this and this)
You should not enter this tomb with irreverence!" (*Urk.* I, 218,8-10)

Ex. 97) *ḏd=w s w ỉt pw*
say:SBJV=NEG man property father cop
"May a man not say: 'this is a familial property!" (*Ptahh.* 98 = Pr. 6,7)

It is not fully clear whether the negation *ȝ* is to be distinguished from the enclitic negation *=w* (Vernus 1990) or not (Gilula 1970). It does occur as a variant of the enclitic negation *=w* in the *Pyramid Texts* (see Edel 1964: 411-412, §820), but is apparently also used in a single case as a negation of the imperative (Grandet & Mathieu 2003: 279, 282):

Ex. 98) *snḏ=ȝ n ḫsf*
fear:IMP=NEG for punishment
"Don't fear the punishment!" (*Sinuhe* 260)

To sum up the description of §4, in Earlier Egyptian, the main constructions in the domain of prohibition are:

40 Gilula (1970: 212, n. 5) already noted that the negations of the Jussive (prospective *sḏm=f*) are *nn*, *ỉm* and *w*.

PROHIBITIVE 2nd pers. subject	NEGATIVE JUSSIVE Any subjects
m sḏm(-w) / *m sḏm(-w)=k*	*jm=f sḏm* / *jm sḏm* NP
sꜣw sḏm=f *sꜣw-tw ḥr sḏm*	*nn sḏm=f*
?*sḏm ꜣ*?	*sḏm=f w* / *sḏm w* NP

Fig. 10: The constructions in the domain of prohibition in Earlier Egyptian

5. Prohibitive strategies in Late Egyptian and Demotic

From the 18th dynasty onwards, one observes a formal evolution of the prohibitive construction *m sḏm(-w)*, with the emergence and spread of a periphrastic form *m-ir sḏm* (§5.1). The same evolution affects the Negative Jussive a bit later on (§5.2), with a shift from *m dy* + Subjunctive to the periphrastic *m-ir di.t* + Subjunctive. By the end of the Ramesside period, a last periphrasis occurs, namely, of the dependent subjunctive after *rdi*, which lead to the negative construction *m-ir di.t ir=f sḏm*, which is preserved until Coptic *mpertrefsôtem*. Here we provide an overview of other prohibitive constructions attested in Late Egyptian (and Demotic) (§5.3) and we discuss issues linked to the stressed prohibitive marker in Coptic (§5.4).

5.1 The periphrastic prohibitive

As a matter of fact, the first occurrences of the periphrastic prohibitive (Vernus 2010) are a bit older (Thutmose III) than the first positive evidence for the replacement of the Negatival Complement by the Infinitive after *m* (Amenhotep II, see §4.2). As rightly pointed out by Kroeber (1970: 185-187, §41.2), however, given the fact that the construction is *m ir sḏm* (with the Negatival Complement) and not **m ir.t sḏm* (with the Infinitive), and knowing that the replacement of the Negatival Complement by the Infinitive was certainly well on its way during the Middle Kingdom, one can postulate that the periphrasis occurred quite early,[41] but that it made its way into the written repertoire only during the early Thutmoside era in the so-called 'Arbeiter-rede':

Ex. 99) *m-ir snḏ ḥr tꜣ ꜣḫ-t*
PROH fear on ART.FSG field-F
"Don't fear about the fields!" (*Paheri* pl. V 3rd register [T. III])
See also pl. XII, 2nd reg (*m-ir nḏb*).

Ex. 100) *m ir ḫꜣʿ ḥꜣ=k (r) nꜣn kꜣ-w n imn pꜣy=n nb*
PROH do:NC leave:INF back=2SGM ALL ART.PL bull-PL of Amun our lord
"Don't turn your back to the bulls of Amun our Lord!" (Urk. IV, 1624,1 [T IV])

During the second half of the 18th dynasty and the 19th dynasty, the use of the periphrastic prohibitive spread through all written registers, which means that non-

41 Gardiner (1957: 261-262, §341); Malaise & Winand (1999: 439, §711) state: "dès avant la 18e dynastie, cette forme spéciale est de plus en plus souvent remplacée par l'infinitif, au point qu'en néo-égyptien, elle a disparu, en dehors de deux cas où elle s'est lexicalisée (*m ir* et *m dj*, et jamais *m ir.t* ou *m di.t*)"; Borghouts (2010: 146).

periphrastic occurrences of the prohibitive after the reign of Ramesses II are exceptional, even in the literary realms where *m-ir* has become the norm (Ex. 102). The periphrasis is also well attested for the verb *iri* "to do" itself[42] from the reign of Ramesses II onwards (Ex. 101), which means that by this time *m-ir* can be considered as being fully grammaticalized as a prohibitive marker (cf. Eng. *gonna go*):

Ex. 101) *m-ir ir-t rmṯ bin*
PROH do-INF people bad
"Don't play the bad guy!" (O. Staring v° 2-3 = *KRI* III, 542,1-2)

Ex. 102) *m-ir ir=f*
PROH do=3SG.M
"Don't do it!" (*Ani* = O. DeM 1063, 3)

To the best of our knowledge, the last non-periphrastic form of the prohibitive in a firmly dated document occurs in a letter from the Vizier Thutmose and the Overseer of the Treasury Amenhotep (O. Louvre E 11178a = K*RI* VII, 377,5-6) dating from year 4 of Ramesses IX (end of the 20th dynasty). The text is, however, far from being clear. Another instance dating from the reign of Ramesses IX might be:

Ex. 103) *m f3y b3kw=w*
PROH take_away:NC work=3PL
"Don't take the product of their work away!"
(P. Turin 167,etc., r° 2 = K*RI* VI, 639,15)

In Demotic, the periphrastic construction is the norm in all texts (e.g. Spiegelberg 1925: 100, §219):

Ex. 104) *m-ir md irm ḥ3tj=k*
PROH speak:INF with heart=2SGM
"Don't speak with your hear!" (P. Ryl. IX, 4/5)

Ex. 105) *m-ir iy n3=i*
PROH come:INF to=1SG
"Don't come to me!" (P. Mag. LL 8/14)

5.2 The periphrastic Negative Jussive: a functional opposition?

In the Late Egyptian corpus, the commonest Negative Jussive construction[43] is *m dy sḏm=f* (i.e., a non-periphrastic construction[44]), with about a hundred occurrences that are quite evenly distributed between the second half of the 18th dynasty and the 21st dynasty (e.g., Ex. 107-109). The Negatival Complement *dy* can, of course, still be used with its full lexical meaning "to give" or the like (Ex. 106):

Ex. 106) *m dy ḥ3ty=k ms3=f*
PROH give:NC heart=2SGM after=3SGM
"Don't worry about him!" (P. Geneva D 191, v° 7-8 = *LRL* 59,3)

42 See also Vernus (2010: 316 & 328, n. 13).
43 See e.g. Černý & Groll (1983: 356-365); Neveu (1996: 106-107).
44 On the spellings of the negative complement *dy* in the Late Egyptian corpus, see Winand (1992: 82, §153).

Ex. 107) *iw m di in-tw bin*
and PROH CAUS:NC bring-PASS bad
"And, don't let bad one (i.e. bad material for writing) be brought!"
(P. Northumberland I, v° 7)

Ex. 108) *m dyt ʿḥʿ=f m pȝy=f spr r={t}n*
PROH CAUS:NC stay:SBJV=3SGM in POSS=3SGM reach:INF ALL=1PL
"Don't let him dawdle on his way to us!" (O. DeM 613, r° 3)

Ex. 109) *m dyt gm=i n=k btȝ*
PROH CAUS:NC find:SBJV=1SG to=2SGM fault
"Don't let me find fault with you!" (P. BN 197 III, v° 2 = *LRL* 34,13-14)

The first occurrence of the periphrastic construction of the Negative Jussive (*m-ir di-t sḏm=f*) appears quite early in the documentation, actually not long after the first occurrence of the periphrastic construction of the prohibitive, since it dates from the reign of Amenhotep III (Ex. 21). However, unlike in §5.1, one does not observe a significant rise in frequency in the extant documentation: there are a bit more than 30 occurrences of this construction in the Late Egyptian corpus, which are evenly distributed, chronologically speaking.

One might wonder whether, over more than two hundred years of shared attestation, some functional opposition may be detected between the non-periphrastic (*m dy*) and the new periphrastic (*m-ir di-t*) constructions? Groll (1970: 20) observed that the pattern *m-ir di-t sḏm=f* is mostly used with first person subjects — in the limited corpus that she investigated at the time (according to our data, 7 out of 32 occurrences) — and she suggested that the construction is used for expressing permission (or the like, 'don't let me hear') rather than causation ('don't make me hear'). More recently, Vernus (2010: 323) made an alternate proposal and cautiously suggested that, one step further in the grammaticalization process, the new periphrastic construction could express a negative causative of the *third person* ('May he not hear'), without any reference to the second person. The prohibitive marker *m-ir* "serait perçu comme un simple morphème d'impératif négatif, sa référence originelle à la deuxième personne s'étant estompée, selon un processus très fréquent dans les langues du monde."

The principle mentioned by Vernus (2010) is indeed attested, but much later in the history of the construction (see below §6); as for the one put forward by Groll (1970), it is in the right direction, but must be rephrased the other way around: an examination of all the examples show that we face here a typical marked vs. unmarked opposition, with the new periphrastic construction being used only when the addressee exerts full control over the causative verb, so "don't make/let something happen", with the implication that (s)he is fully responsible of the causation of the event:

Ex. 110) *m-ir rdi-t ʿḥʿ nkt im*
PROH CAUS-INF stay:SBJV something thereof
"Make that nothing thereof is missing!" (O. Berlin P 11238, ro 4-5)

Ex. 111) *m-ir di-t iw-t=tw r ʿḥȝ mdi=k*
PROH CAUS-INF come-SBJV=IMPS ALL fight:INF with=2SGM
"Don't make one come to punish you!"
(P. Bologna 1094, r° 4,9 = *LEM* 4,13-14)

Ex. 112) *m-ir di.t ꜥḥꜥ=i dy*
PROH CAUS-INF stay-SBJV=1SG here
"Don't make me stay here (i.e. too long)!" (O. DeM 115, v° 3-4)

The older, non-periphrastic construction, on the other hand, is unmarked with respect to the control that is exerted on the causative event. Hence, it paves the way for cases where the addressee is virtually irrelevant for the causation and, therefore, jussive uses of the construction:

Ex. 113) *m dy ꜣd=w*
PROH CAUS:NC be_in_need:SBJV=3PL
"Don't let them be in need! →
Let them not be in need" (P. Turin 1972, r° 11-12 = *LRL* 8,4)

As for the periphrasis of the subjunctive form after *rdi*, the only occurrence in Late Egyptian is from the very end of the Ramesside period:

Ex. 114) *m-ir di-t ir-y=i gꜣ*
PROH CAUS-INF do-SBJV=1SG lie:INF
"Don't make me lie!" (P. BM EA 10052, 12,20-21 = K*RI* VI, 794,12)

Compare with the alternate construction:

Ex. 115) *m-ir gꜣ=i*
PROH lie:INF=1SG
"Don't make me lie!" (P. BM EA 10052, 14,17 = K*RI* VI, 794,2)

In Demotic, the non-periphrastic construction of the negative jussive is not attested anymore (**m dy sḏm=f*), but the periphrasis of the dependent subjunctive is not yet systematic (Spiegelberg 1925: 100, §219) and can vary in a single text (compare Ex. 118 and Ex. 119):

Ex. 116) *m-ir di-t šm=f*
PROH CAUS-INF go:SBJV=3SGM
"Don't make him go!" (P. Ryl. IX, 3,5)

Ex. 117) *m-ir di-t šn=s r rmṯ mtw=i*
PROH CAUS-INF come_close:SBJV=3SGF ALL man of=1SG
"Don't let it come near one of my men!" (P. BM 73785, l. 9 = Hughes 1968: pl. 28)

Ex. 118) *m-ir di šm Nꜣ-Nfr-Kꜣ-Ptḥ r Mn-nfr*
PROH CAUS:INF do:SBJV Naneferkaptah ALL Memphis
"Don't let Naneferkaptah go to Memphis!" (*Setne* 4/8)

Ex. 119) *m-ir di ir=n ḥrr*
PROH CAUS-INF do:SBJV=1PL delay:INF
"Don't let us delay!" (*Setne* 4/12)
See Johnson (1976: 143) who comments this unique periphrasis of *ḥrr* in Setne.

According to Johnson (1976: 142), the negative jussive in Demotic mostly "retained the literal imperative meaning of the vetitive" ("Don't let…"), i.e., without a semantic evolution leading to a negative optative expression ("May it not…"), as is mostly the case in Coptic. However, one finds several examples amenable to this reading, even in hieroglyphic inscriptions:

Ex. 120) *m-ir di-t ir-y=i p(ꜣ) nty msḏ=k*
PROH CAUS-INF do-SBJV=1SG lie:INF
"May I not do what you hate!" (Inscription of Taharqa, l. 11 = Vernus 1975)

Ex. 121) *m-ir di-t di=w ꜣḳ=n*
PROH CAUS-INF CAUS-SBJV=3PL perish:SBJV=1PL
"Do not let them (/ May they not) cause us to perish!"
(P. Meermanno-Westreeniamun 44, l. 7 = Vleeming 1984: pl. 36)

Unlike in Coptic (§6), however, second person subjects do not seem to be attested in the negative jussive construction.

5.3 Other prohibitive strategies in Late Egyptian

We now turn to a brief description of the other prohibitive strategies that are attested in Late Egyptian:[45]

1) The negation of the subjunctive (*nn*/*bn sḏm=f*) is still used with a negative jussive meaning (Ex. 122), but it usually endorses a stronger modal meaning of interdiction (Ex. 123) or impossibility in Late Egyptian:

Ex. 122) *nn swḏ=f iꜣw-t=f n ḫrd-w=f*
NEG pass_on:SBJV=3SGM function-F=3SGM to child-PL=3SGM
"Don't enter the house of someone else (when he did not yet agree to your marks of respect)!" (*Ani* = P. Boulaq 4, 16,10)

Ex. 123) *nn ḥtr-tw=f bꜣk m sš w*
NEG tax-PASS=3SGM work:PTCP in writings
"He may not be taxed, the one working in writings!"
(P. Anastasi V, r° 17,2-3 = *LEM* 65,5-6)

2) The negative construction *jm=k sḏm* (cf. §4.1 for Earlier Egyptian) suffers clear restrictions in terms of genre. It occurs in non-literary texts only during the 18th dynasty (Ex. 124):

Ex. 124) *jm=k bꜣg r-ntt twi rḫ-kwi r-ḏd ntk wi(ꜣ)wi(ꜣ)*
PROH=2SGM be_neglectful:INF for 1SG know-STAT that 2SGM disenchanted
"Don't be neglectful, because I know that you are disenchanted!"
(P. Berlin P 10463, vo 2-3 = Caminos 1963: pl. 10)
See later this formula in P. Koller, r° 5,6 (*LEM* 120,13).

All the other occurrences of the construction come from literary compositions (mostly wisdom literature, Ex. 125; especially the so-called *Prohibitions*, see Ex. 126 with Hagen 2005) and from the so-called *Miscellanies* (mostly in frozen formulas, Ex. 127):

Ex. 125) *jm=k ꜣḳ r pr ky*
PROH=2SGM enter:INF ALL house other
"Don't enter the house of someone else (when he did not yet agree to your marks of respect)!" (*Ani* = P. Boulaq 4, 16,10)

Ex. 126) *jm=k s:sꜣꜣ wʿ-ty*
PROH=2SGM CAUS-be_satiate:INF be_alone-STAT.2SG
"You should not satiate yourself alone (while your mother is a have-not)!"
(*Prohibitions* A11, O. DeM 1632 I(c), 11 = Hagen 2005: 130)

45 For the detail, see Polis (2009: 206-227). Unfortunately, a large-scale investigation of this topic in the Demotic corpus is still missing. We plan to conduct it for the publication.

Ex. 127) *jm=k wsf*
PROH=2SGM be_idle:INF
"Don't be idle!" (P. Anastasi V, 23,1-2 = *LEM* 69,4)

Most importantly from a grammatical point of view, *only second person subjects* are attested, with a limited number (2 occurrences) of the 2nd person plural (and only in monumental contexts):

Ex. 128) *jm=ṯn ḥꜥm=f*
PROH=2PL come_close:INF=3SGM
"Don't approach him!" (*Qadesh* §286 [K1] = K*RI* II, 87,6)

As such, the construction with nominal subject *jm sḏm* NP has disappeared in Late Egyptian. The same holds true for the dependent uses (negative consecutive) of this prohibitive marker: unlike in Earlier Egyptian, none seems to be attested in the Late Egyptian corpus. The construction *im=k sḏm* is, to the best of our knowledge, not attested in Demotic anymore.

3) In the Late Egyptian corpus, *sꜣw* "stay away (from)" (see §4.3) — when used as a prohibitive marker — is usually constructed as an imperative (always accompanied by the reflexive pronoun *tw*/*ti*) governing a prepositional phrase introduced by the preposition *r* (a construction which is not regular in Earlier Egyptian). This preposition can be followed by a substantive (Ex. 129) or by an infinitive (Ex. 300):

Ex. 129) *sꜣw tw r=i*
stay_away:IMP 2SG ALL=1SG
"Pay attention to me!" [threat] (P. Cairo CG 58054 = Allam 1987: pl. 3)

Ex. 130) *sꜣw tw r ḫwrꜥ iꜣd r nꜥš sꜣw-ꜥ*
stay_away:IMP 2SG ALL steal:INF destitute ALL aggress:INF weak
"Don't steal the destitute or aggress the weak!"
(*Amenemope*, P. BM EA 10474, r° 4,4-5 = Laisney 2007: 329)

In the older texts of the corpus (Ex. 129), as well as in some literary registers (Ex. 130), one still find the ancient construction *sꜣw* + subjunctive *sḏm=f* (note the causative meaning of the whole construction: "Don't let X happen"):

Ex. 131) *sꜣw ir=f md-t ḫnꜥ=i iw=i iy.kwi*
PROH do:SBJV=3SGM word-F with=1SG SBRD=1SG come-STAT.1SG
"Don't let him discuss (this) with me when I'll be there!"
(P. BM EA 10102, v° 6-7 = Glanville 1928: pl. 35)

Ex. 132) *sꜣw tw tkn ḏbꜥ-w-k m mdw-nṯr*
PROH 2SG approach:SBJV finger-PL-2SGM in hieroglyphs
"Don't let your finger approach the hieroglyphs!"
(P. Anastasi I, r° 11,6-7 = Fischer-Elfert 1983: 99)

Finally, one should note rare instances of *sꜣw* still being used as a dependent negative morpheme, as use that went unnoticed in grammatical descriptions:

Ex. 133) *im=k sꜥḫꜥ btꜣ šri sꜣw ꜥꜣ=f*
PROH=2SGM raise:INF fault small NEG be_great:SBJV=3SGM
"You should not raise up a minor fault, lest it becomes major!"
(*Prohibitions* C4, O. Petrie 11, v° 4 = Hagen 2005: 136)
See also O. Petrie 11, 6, with a similar use of *sꜣw*.

To the best of our knowledge, no prohibitive construction with *sꜣw* is attested in Demotic.

To sum up the description of §5 so far, in Late Egyptian, the main expressive means in the domain of prohibition are:

PROHIBITIVE 2nd pers. subject	NEGATIVE JUSSIVE 1st and 3rd pers. subjects
m-ỉr sḏm / *m-ỉr dỉ.t sḏm=f*	*bn sḏm=f*
sʒw tw r sḏm (*sʒw sḏm=f*)	(*m dy sḏm=f*)
ỉm=k sḏm	

Fig. 11: The constructions in the domain of prohibition in Late Egyptian

5.4 Stressed prohibitive markers in Coptic: a case of degrammaticalization?

In the southern dialects, mainly Lycopolitan and some southern varieties of Sahidic, one finds the construction *mpôr*-V alongside *mpr*-V.

Ex. 134) *mpôr-ee-f*
PROH-do-3SGM
"Don't do it!" or "*Dón't* do it"

The existence of a full vowel in the prohibitive marker is indicative of stress.[46] This construction is best analyzed as a Coptic-internal innovation rather than a conservative construction, since if it were original, there would have been no opportunity for epenthetic *p* to have emerged: there simply would have been no contact between /m/ and /r/, as a full vowel would have come between them.

Further evidence for the innovative nature of the debonding of the prohibitive marker is found in constructions involving *mpôr* and an infinitive marked by the allative preposition *e-* ('to'). This construction is well attested in the same dialects as *mpôr*-V. It occurs with both the Infinitive and the Causative Infinitive. With the former, it is an alternative to the more frequent ('unmarked') Prohibitive; with the latter, it is an alternative to the more frequent ('unmarked') Negative Jussive.

Ex. 135) Sahidic
mpôr ce pa-son e-sorme-k mauaa-k
PROH therefore my-brother to-lead_astray-2SGM alone-2SGM
"Do not on any account, therefore, my brother, lead yourself astray by your own agency!"

Ex. 136) Sahidic
mpôr e-tr-a-mou hm-pei-sêu tenou
PROH to-CAUS.INF-1SG-die in-this-moment now
"*Don't* let me die at this time!"

Ex. 137) Sahidic
mpôr e-tre-p-oua p-oua mmo-n hroše e-p-et-hitouô-f
PROH to-CAUS.INF-the-one the-one of-1PL burden to-DET-REL-beside-3SGM
"Let's not burden each other!"

46 However, Loprieno (1995: 260) states: "[t]he only indication of the original vocalization of the negatival complement is provided by the Coptic negative imperative *mpôr* < *m jrj.w* "do not do," in which *-ôr* < *jrj.w* */ja:rvw/."

The structure and function of this construction still await detailed treatment, but it has generally been interpreted as 'emotive' or 'emphatic,' to judge from translations in text editions, which usually render it as 'Do not on any account' or 'Do not … by any means.' It is striking — and perhaps significant — that it is much more frequent in the Negative Jussive than in the Prohibitive. It is also worth noticing that *mpôr* is not bound to a verb, i.e., there is an open juncture between *mpôr* and the second constituent, the allative preposition *e-* and the infinitive. In this construction, there can be no doubt that *mpôr* is completely debonded, as it is separated by enclitic particles (e.g., *ce*) and full noun phrases, e.g., *pa-son* 'my brother'.

Its development can be best understood if we take into account other historical developments in Coptic. The allative preposition *e-* 'to,' when in construction with infinitives, was undergoing a gradual process of grammaticalization as an infinitive marker. Infinitives marked by *e-* were gradually replacing bare infinitives in a number of syntactic environments, including as subjects of nominal predications. In the following example, both the bare infinitive and the allative-marked infinitive occur in the same sentence:

Ex. 138) Sahidic
te-p^{h}usis n-n-esoou pe ouahou nsa-p-šôs name
the-nature of-the-sheep SBJ.MSG follow:INF after-the-shepherd really
pe-k^{h}(risto)s auô teu-p^{h}usis an te e-ouahou nsa-p-ouônš p-satanas
the-Christ and their-nature NEG SBJ.FSG to-follow after-the-wolf the-Satan
"It is the nature of the sheep to follow the true shepherd Christ, and
it is not their nature to follow the wolf."

In the context of the present discussion, it is unsurprising that an innovative constructions in Coptic would comprise *e-* marked infinitives, which were gaining ground on bare infinitives in many constructions.

The next question to be asked is whether the debonded construction developed directly from the apparently stressed but bound *mpôr-* of *mpôr*-V and *mpôr-trefsôtm*, variants of the Prohibitive and the Negative Jussive, respectively. It is difficult to know with any certainty, but several additional constructions provide some indication that the pathway was less direct. The first is the 'auxiliary-copying' construction *mpôr mpr*-V, which is attested in early documentation, especially in Sahidic.

Ex. 139) Sahidic
mpôr p-coeis mpr-kaa-f nsô-k
PROH the-lord PROH-put-3SGM after-2SGM
"Don't, Lord, don't abandon him!"

Ex. 140) Sahidic
mpôr ce mprtre-n-eia-toot-n
PROH so NEG.JUSS-1PL-wash-hand-1PL
"So let us not despair!"

The phenomenon of negation-copying is well known in cross-linguistic studies of the diachrony of negation, where it is often implicated in Jespersen cycles (van der Auwera 2009, 2010c).

Evidence from the Bohairic dialect indicates that this construction developed first in the Prohibitive, and spread by analogy to the Negative Jussive, since the form for both the prohibitive and the negative jussive is *mp^{h}ôr*, even though the auxiliary of the negative jussive is *mpet^{h}re-* in Early Bohairic or *mpent^{h}re-* in later Bohairic.

A related construction is attested in the dialect of Kellis:

Ex. 141) Kellis
tinou mpr-ramelei a-tnnau-se nclam mpôr
now PROH-neglect to-send-them quickly PROH
"Now don't neglect to send them quickly, don't!"

Here we find what appears to be clause-final negation-copying.[47]

In order to discuss whether these constructions constitute a case of degrammaticalization, and if so, of what type, it is necessary to mention several other constructions whose origin is in the debonded auxiliary *mpôr*. The first is the interjection *mpôr*, translated in Crum (1939: 178b) as 'do (it) not! , by no means!, nay!' Its range of meanings is not limited to prohibition, however, and it often signals an emphatic denial, sometimes translating Greek *mêdamôs* 'no way.'

Due to its tendency to appear in explicit denials, it has been called a 'responsive,' comparable to those found in Welsh.[48] Moreover, like the *mpôr* found in the debonded construction discussed above, it is non-clitic. It is not the only member of this category of non-clitic — debonded — responsives. A number of affirmative and negative responsives that correspond to specific verbal tenses and moods are found in Coptic, e.g.,

	POSITIVE			NEGATIVE	
	AUXILIARY	RESPONSIVE		AUXILIARY	RESPONSIVE
AORIST	*ʃa-*	*ʃo*	OPTATIVE	*nne-*	*nno*
			PAST	*mpe-*	*mpe* (B *mp^{h}ê*)

Fig. 12: Some Coptic responsives (Sahidic, B = Bohairic)

These responsives are, to the best of my knowledge, attested for the first time in Roman Demotic.[49] The responsives are an important piece of evidence in the question of degrammaticalization, since they do not involve just debonding. Rather, they show a shift from obligatorily inflected elements to elements incompatible with inflection. The most significant reason to think that they constitute degrammaticalization, however, is that they gain in semantic substance, acquiring new functions. For example, *mmon*, the debonded responsive of the negative existential '(it) doesn't exist,' is used to respond as a refusal to imperatives, as well as to answer present tense, future

47 I have no additional examples of this construction, and it seems to have remained but an exploratory innovation with little success in the written language, even in private letters, which tend to reflect less standardized varieties.

48 For the most detailed study of Coptic responsives, see Shisha-Halevy (2007: 64-177).

49 Shisha-Halevy (2007: 166-167).

tense, and nominal-predicate clauses.[50] Additional evidence for the degrammaticalization of *mpôr* comes from its occurrence after disjunctive *cn-* 'or else.' In this construction, *mpôr* longer directly appeals to the addressee at all.

Interestingly enough, debonding and negation copying does not occur only Coptic: we have some earlier cases — much certainly independent from the Coptic internal development of *mpôr* — of the negation *m-ir* used in such a way (Vernus 2010: 324). In the two examples below (both from the 18th dynasty), *m-ir* is debounded and used in front of independent main clauses as a lexical item with the meaning "no!", "definitely not!":

Ex. 142) *m-ir n3n khs-w n sf gr m p3 hrw*
no! ART.PL boaster-PL of yesterday be_silent:STAT in ART.MSG day
"(– Give me a hand so that we finish (this) in the evening!)
– No! The boasters of yesterday are silent today…" (*Paheri.* Pl. 3)

Ex. 143) *m-ir imy pr-ꜥ3 ꜥ.w.s m ḥ3ty=k r-pw iw=k r mwt*
No way! give:IMP Pharaoh L.P.H in heart=2SG or FUT=2SGM FUT die:INF
"No way! Put Pharaoh in your heart, or you are going to die!"
(Stela of Kurkur, l. 4-5 = Darnell, *SAK* 31, 82)

In another interesting passage (Vernus 2010: 325), *m-ir* is used three times with different values. In its first occurrence, *ir* is the Negatival Complement with its full lexical meaning after the prohibitive marker *m*; the second occurrence shows a case of *negation-copying* with a clear emotive effect, while the last *m-ir* is the periphrastic negation followed by the infinitive that is expected in Late Egyptian (see above under §5):

Ex. 144) *m ir r=i ḥnw-t*
PROH do-NC ALL=1SG mistress-F
m-ir m-ir ḫ3ꜥ=i m isḳ
PROH PROH leave:INF=1SG in wait
"Do not play against me, mistress!
Do not, don't leave me waiting!" (O. DeM 1078, r° 2 = Mathieu 1996, pl. 12)

Finally one should notice an isolated — but very interesting (Vernus 2010: 325) — instance of *debonding* with the prohibitive marker *im=k* (see above §3.1 & §4.4):

Ex. 145) *imy=k p3 3pdw iw=k ḥr ḏyḏy=i*
PROH:SBJV=2SG ART.MSG bird SBRD=2SG on tease:INF=1SG
"Please don't, O bird, tease me!"
(P. BM EA 10060, r° 5,6 = Mathieu 1996, pl. 12)

In this example, *imy=k* is not followed by the infinitive, as expected in Late Egyptian (*imy=k sḏm*). Rather, the fact that the vocative *p3 3pd.w* "O bird" occurs between the prohibitive marker (*imy*) and the lexical verb (*ḏyḏy*) apparently led to an interpretation of *imy* as a negative manipulative verb "May you not do that" followed a completive circumstantial clause, as expected after weak manipulative verbs in Late Egyptian (Polis 2009).

50 Shisha-Halevy (2007: 165-177).

6 The negative existential strategy in Coptic and beyond

It has been noted above that one of the prohibitive markers in Coptic was apparently grammaticalized from a negative existential source construction. The following examples are taken from the Akhmimic dialect:[51]

Ex. 146) *mn-mrre-p-kosmos*
PROH-love-the-world
"Don't love the world!"

Ex. 147) *mn-com* *mmo-k*
NEG.EXIST-power to-2SGM
"You are powerless." / "you cannot."

This pathway is not an isolated instance, cross-linguistically. As such, the identification of this pathway contributes to the study of diachronic typology, the typology of language change itself.[52] However, as we shall see, the route from negative existential marker to prohibitive marker is a somewhat winding one.

This proposal is based on three types of evidence: diachronic, dialectal, and typological. Ancient Egyptian is abundantly attested for over 4000 years, in a wide range of textual genres. This richness of attestation allows us to trace actual pathways of diachronic development, without having to rely exclusively on internal reconstruction or comparative-genetic evidence. In the present context, diachronic data indicates that the construction discussed here is indeed innovative, emerging as a fully grammaticalized construction only in Coptic. The majority of Coptic dialects preserve the older prohibitive construction, which was grammaticalized more than a thousand years earlier.

The next section (§6.1) will 'dynamicize' the dialectal distribution of prohibitive constructions in Coptic, allowing us to make reasonable hypotheses about the pathway of development.[53] The dynamicized dialectal distribution indicates that the innovative construction emerged first in a third-person modal form, the Jussive, and only afterwards was extended to the second person Prohibitive. This is important, since most typological studies of prohibitives have focused on second person constructions; this focus has obscured the possible role played by non-second person modal constructions in the development of prohibitive markers.

Afterwards (§6.2), I will draw on comparative evidence from another language, Gəʿəz, an Ethiopian Semitic language. This case allows us to make reasonable hypotheses about the actual mechanism of semantic change involved in the development of prohibitive meanings out of negative existential constructions.

---

51 See *KHWb.* 93 & Roquet (1978: 531 with n. 1 for the literature on this prohibitive morpheme in Akhmimic). Note that it is also the normal prohibitive gram in P. Bodmer VI (see Kasser 1964: 64 & 66).

52 Greenberg (1969, 1979, 1989), Croft (1991).

53 For the dynamicization of the dialectal distribution of a grammaticalizing anterior construction, see Grossman (2009).

6.1 Broadening the perspective: prohibitives within 'prohibitive paradigms'

Typological studies of imperatives have raised the issue of imperative and prohibitive paradigms, in which full person paradigms are examined in terms of their formal homogeneity (Birjulin and Xrakovskij 2001, van der Auwera & Lejeune 2005). However, it is uncertain to what extent we are really dealing with a single category, since the meanings of the various constructions in such paradigms are often quite distinct. Nonetheless, evidence from language change might shed some light on the paradigmatic relationship between second person imperatives or prohibitives and other constructions.

There is a strong tendency for the Coptic dialects to have symmetrical marking for the Prohibitive and the Negative Jussive: most dialects have either *mpr-* or *mn-* for both. However, this is a tendency, and not an absolute. The following table shows the Prohibitive and the Negative Jussive markers in a number of the Coptic dialects, as well as intradialectal variation. It shows only the main strategies and not variants within a single strategy. The first column gives the most frequent strategy, the second the less frequent strategy:

DIALECT	PROHIBITIVE		NEGATIVE JUSSIVE	
S	*mpr-*		*mprtre-*	
B	*mper-*		*mpenthre-*	
B4	*mper-*		*mpethre*	
V	*mper-*		*mperte-*	
W	*mpr-*		-	
M	*mper-*		*mperte-*	
F5	*mpel-*		*mpeltre-*	
L4	*mpôr-*		*mpôrte-*	
L5	*mpr-*		*mpr-*	
L6	*mpr-*	*mn-*	*mprtre-*	*mntre-*
L* (Kellis)	*mpr-*	*mn-*	*mpôrte-*	*mntre-*
A	*mn-*	*mpr-*	*mnte-*	*mpr-*
P	*mn-*		*mnte-*	

Fig. 13: The dialectal distribution of Prohibitive and Negative Jussive markers

We can draw several conclusions from the dialectal distribution of the two constructions types. First of all, most Coptic dialects have only the *mpr-* construction type, for both the Prohibitive and the Negative Jussive, while only one dialect (P) has *mn-* for both. A group of dialects from southern Egypt (A, L6, and L*) have both construction types. In L6 and L*, *mpr-* is the more frequent construction type, *mn-* being marginal. In A, on the other hand, this situation is reversed: *mn-* is the main construction type, *mpr-* being marginal.

In order to identify the value of this dialectal distribution for tracing language change, we will take a look at a single early variety in which there is synchronic variation.

6.1.1 The prohibitive system of Kellis (L*)

At first glance, the prohibitive system of the Kellis dialect appears clear-cut: prohibitives are headed by *mpr-* (Ex. 148-151), while negative jussives are headed by *mn-* (Ex. 152).

Ex. 148) *mpr-r-the hô-k m-pe-ke-oue*
PROH-make-like too-2SGM of-the-other-one
"Don't you too be like the other one..."

Ex. 149) *tinou mpr-šbti ou-proairesis*
now PROH-change a-fixed.purpose
"Now, don't change a fixed purpose!"

Ex. 150) *et[b]e-o mpe-ø-tnnau-f*
because-what PST.NEG-2SGF-send-3SGM
tinou ce mpr-ramelê e-[t]nnau ne-n
now so PROH-neglect to-send to-1PL
"Why didn't you send it?
Now don't neglect to send it to us!"

Ex. 151) *mpr-cô ošn-tnnau ne-n hitot-ou*
PROH-tarry without-send/INF to-1PL by.mean.of-3PL
"Don't tarry in sending it to us by means of them!"

Ex. 152) *mntr-ou-rphthoni arô-tn*
NEG.JUSS-3PL-envy against-2PL
"Don't make them envy you!"

However, this presentation obscures an important fact: in the Kellis dialect, there are second person negative jussives:[54]

Ex. 153) *mntre-ten-ka-s hatn-têne ø-s-heie a-tot-f a-rôme*
NEG.JUSS-2PL-keep-3SGF with-2PL CONJ-3SGF-fall to-hand-3SGM of-person
"Don't keep it with you, lest it fall into someone's hands!"

The importance of these examples is considerable, since it means that there is no *complementary distribution* between the Prohibitive and the Negative Jussive. Rather, there is a full personal paradigm of the Negative Jussive. As such, the second person forms are in *opposition* with the Prohibitive. The former are less frequent and are possibly functionally distinct.

The Kellis system allows us to propose a plausible scenario for the diachronic development of the two main prohibitive strategies as they are actually found in the Coptic dialects.

Stage 1: The original unmarked prohibitive strategy is *mpr-*. It is the auxiliary of both the Prohibitive and the Negative Jussive.
Stage 2: The *mn-* construction arises as an alternative to the earlier Negative Jussive. At this point, it is opposed to *mpr-*. Both co-exist in the same dialect for second person subjects.

54 Other examples come from unpublished texts. In this material, there are two more examples with a second person plural subject (*mntre-ten-*, *mntra-ten-*) and two examples with a second person masculine singular subject (*mntre-k-*).

Stage 3: The opposition between *mn-* and *mpr-*in the Negative Jussive is neutralized in favor of *mn-*. This results in *mpr-* for the Prohibitive, and *mn-* for the Negative Jussive. In other words, there is a mixed system in which both strategies co-exist.

Stage 4: *mn-* is extended by analogy to the Prohibitive. The entire prohibitive system is marked by *mn-*.

Stage 1 is attested by most Coptic dialects, and is even attested in a single Akhmimic corpus.[55] Stage 2 — tending towards Stage 3 — is what one finds in the Kellis dialect. Stage 4 occurs in Akhmimic as well as in Dialects P and I.

	PROHIBITIVE	NEG. JUSSIVE	DIALECT
STAGE 1	*mpr-*	*mpr-*	S, L, B, M
STAGE 2	*mpr-*	*mpr-*/*mn-*	Kellis (1)
STAGE 3	*mpr-*	*mn-*	Kellis (2)
STAGE 4	*mn-*	*mn-*	A, I, P

Fig 14. Stages of development of Prohibitive-Neg.Jussive systems

If the pathway of development proposed here is correct, we are not dealing with a simple or straightforward grammaticalization pathway (NEGATIVE EXISTENTIAL > PROHIBITIVE), involving a single construction that undergoes functional and subsequent formal change. Rather, the negative existential prohibitive strategy emerged first in another modal form, the Jussive, via grammaticalization, and was only later extended, via analogy, to second person prohibitives.

6.1.2 Earlier occurrences of the construction?

However, it is possible that multiple, mutually-reinforcing processes were at work here. For example, we cannot rule out the possibility of another process, such as the grammaticalization of a negative 'directive infinitive' strategy, similar to that discussed by van Olmen (2010) for Dutch. For one thing, a similar process was at work in the domain of the affirmative imperative (see above). Furthermore, it is supported, to an extent, by two early but very rare attestations of pre-Coptic precursors of the construction.

The first one occurs in Late Egyptian (within the so-called *Tomb Robberies* corpus)[56] and is not philologically unproblematic, but is likely to read as follows:

Ex. 154) *iw=f th pȝy=i ḥry iw mn th im=f*
CORD.PST=3SGM ATTACK:INF POSS=1SG chief SBRD NEG.EXIST attack:INF in=3SGM
"(…) and he attacked my chief, whereas one should not attack him (lit. 'the fact of attacking him does not exist)!" (P. BM EA 10383, r° 2,5 = K*RI* VI, 835,9-10)

Here, the construction is formally similar to the one that occurs in Coptic: the negative existential marker *mn* is followed by the Infinitive. However it does not occur in an interlocutive context, but rather in the subordinate clause of a narrative with a strong impersonal deontic value.

55 However, the latter is open to alternative explanations, and may not reflect an earlier or conservative norm. (Wolf-Peter Funk, p.c.).

56 An additional example might be P. Boulaq 6, r° VII,7, but this occurrence is open to several interpretation.

Things are different with the second case, since the construction is attested in an interlocutive context in Demotic, with prohibitive (rather than deontic) value.[57] Compare the parallel texts:

Ex. 155) *m-ir ḫn […]*
NEG.EXIST draw_near:INF
"Do not draw near [to the chamber]!"
(*Book of Thot* C07.1,18 [sim. F01.2, F14.2])

Ex. 156) *bn-iw ḫn*
NEG.EXIST enter:INF
"Do not draw near [to the chamber]!" (*Book of Thot* B07,21 [sim. L02,1/3])

The marker *bn-iw* is an alternative writing of the negative existential marker *mn-*. In this text, see e.g.:

Ex. 157) *in bn-iw mtw-w t-myt*
Q NEG.EXIST with-3PL guidance
"Do they not have guidance?" (*Book of Thot* B01,1/7)

Add late examples from P. Mag. London-Leiden:

Ex. 158) *pȝ nti i.ir=k r lkh=f i.ir=k ꜥm=f*
ART.MSG REL FUT=2SGM FUT ?lick?:INF=3SGM FUT=2SGM swallow:INF=3SGM
bn pȝj n-im=f r pȝ tȝ
NEG(.EXIST) spit:INF OBJ=3SGM ALL ART.M ground
"What you will lick, you will swallow it
Don't spit it on the ground!" (P. Mag. LL 20/12)

Ex. 159) *iw=s ḏd n pȝ rꜥ ḏd bn pr*
SBRD=3SGF say:INF TO ART.MSG Râ QUOT NEG.EXIST go_out:INF
n pȝ iꜥḥ ḏd bn wbn
to ART.MSG moon QUOT NEG.EXIST rise_up:INF
"While she was saying to the (god) Râ: 'Don't go out!',
to the Moon: 'Don't rise up!', etc." (P. Mag. LL 21/22-23)

However, it is unlikely that the grammaticalization of such a strategy could by itself explain the observed changes. For one thing, such a pathway would not necessarily predict that the negation that became grammaticalized, out of the numerous negations, would be the negative existential marker. In fact, one finds another pre-Coptic Egyptian 'directive infinitive' construction that is arguably closer to what one finds in some European languages. In this construction, the prohibitive marker is the infinitive form of the 'negative verb' *tm*, typical of lexemic negation, followed by a lexical verb, realized as an Infinitive.[58]

57 This was already noted in the text edition in which this example is found: 'Curiously, *mn* as a vetitive prefix is attested for the Akhmimic dialect,' Jasnow & Zauzich (2005: 103). See also Spiegelberg (1925: 100, §219, Anm.).

58 This construction is interesting, since it is the only case of which I know where the shift from dedicated imperative forms to infinitive forms occurs in the negative system.

A possible very early example of this use of *tm* is found in the P. Ramesseum XVIII (13th dyn., c. 17th cent. BCE):[59]

Ex. 160) *sꜣḳ tw rs tp tm ꜥm ib*
pull_together:IMP 2sgm watch:IMP head NEG be_neglectful heart
"Pull yourself together, be vigilant, don't be neglectful!"
(P. Ramesseum XVIII, 1,x+5 = Gardiner 1955: pl. LXII)
Gardiner (1955: 17, n. 2) notes "The use here of the negative verb *tm* is obscure. Can it be an imperative?".

One can compare this passage with the usual formula in letters, using the common prohibitive marker *m*:

Ex. 161) *m ꜥm(-w) ib=k ḥr=s*
NEG be_neglectful-NC heart=2SGM about=3SGF
"Do not be neglectful about it!" (*Heqa.* I, v° 13 = Allen 2002: pl. 28)
Usual formula, see e.g. *Heqa.* I, v° 9 & II, r° 32-33. Also in causative constructions, see e.g. above Ex. 29.

In Late Egyptian, two apparently isolated examples occur in the corpus of the *Late Ramesside letters* (Polis 2009: 218-222), in syntactic positions where it would be difficult to assume the omission of the conjunctive *mtw=k* (Wente 1967: 19, n. p):

Ex. 162) *ḫr bn twi m pꜣy=i sḫr iwnꜣ*
and NEG PRS.1SG in POSS=1SG plan at_all
tm dì.t ḥꜥty.tn m ?ḥ.t?
PROH put-INF heart-2PL in thing
"And I not at all in my habits,
Do not worry about ?something else?!" (P. Leiden I 369, v° 4 = *LRL* 2,8-9)

Ex. 163) *wnn tꜣy=i šꜥ.t spr r=k*
when POSS=1SG letter reach ALL=2SG
tm pr r mꜣꜣ ḫḫ
PROH go_out ALL see:INF scuffle
"When my letter will reach you,
do not go out to see the scuffle!" (P. Philipps, r° 10-11 = *LRL* 29,10-12)
One could hypothesize that the *tm* headed clause might be a proverbial quote, given the unexpected use of the old verb *mꜣꜣ* "to see" instead of *ptr*.

In Demotic, this negation is not infrequently used in later period wisdom texts (especially P. Insiger, c. 70 BCE):[60]

Ex. 164) *tm dì-t ḥpr*
PROH cause-INF happen:INF
"Don't let it happen!" (P. Insinger XVIII,23)

Ex. 165) *tm ḥn ty r slꜣ*
PROH command:INF fight:INF ALL prophet
"Do not command fighting against a prophet!"
(*Book of Thot* L01, 4/5 [sim. B02.6, 11])

59 Brose (2014: 285) notes "Gebrauch des Negationsverbs *tm* im imperative anstatt *m*" and refers to the phenomenon in P. Insiger (Demotic; see Lexa, 1926 (2), III, nr. 577; IV, p. 14). He suggests that one could alternatively think of a mistake for the 'Conjunctive' *ḥnꜥ tm ꜥm-ib*[=*k*] *sic*.

60 See e.g. *DG* 631. Note that in the *Book of Thot* (Jasnow & Zauzich 2005: 546), *m-ir* alternates with *tm* as prohibitive

The point to be made here is that the 'directive infinitive' strategy may have played a supporting role in the grammaticalization of the negative existential as a prohibitive marker, but it was probably not the sole or even main process of change. Nonetheless, the above constructions (Ex. 156, 158-159) establishes that the negative existential prohibitive strategy was already attested in Demotic, although there is little evidence that it was already conventionalized at this stage.

Similar pathways of development are known from other languages, including such as Gəʿəz. However, it is important to emphasize that *similarity* does not mean *identity*: the relevant grammaticalization pathways depend not only on universal patterns of semantic change but also on the particular structure of the constructions involved.

6.2 Gəʿəz

In terms of van der Auwera et al.'s typology, the main prohibitive in Gəʿəz is a Type 1 construction: the negation (*'i*) is also found in declarative clauses, but the verb form — the Subjunctive — is distinct from the positive Imperative.

An innovative prohibitive marker develops out of a negative existential construction. In Gəʿəz, the negative existential marker is *ʾalbo,* which was grammaticalized from an older negation *ʾal-* and the affirmative existential marker *bo,* which was in turn grammaticalized from a locative construction *b-o* ('in-3SGM').

Ex. 166) *bo/'albo māy(a)*
EXIST/NEG.EXIST water
"There is(n't) water"

Like other nominals, relative clauses (headed by *zä-*) can occur with the negative existential marker.

Ex. 167) *wä-ʾalbo säbʾ zä-yətḳāw(w)äm ḳədmekəmu*
and-NEG.EXIST person REL-defy:3SG:IMPF against:you
bä-kʷəllu mäwāʿälä ḥəywät-əkä
in-all periods life-2SGM
"There is no one who can stand against you
all the days of your life" (Joshua 1:5)

Ex. 168) *wä-ʾalbo säbʾ zä-yərʾay=ki ʾəskä yäḫalləḳ*
and-NEG.EXIST person REL-see:3SGM:SBJV=2SGF until finish:3SGM
bäliʿa wä-sätyä
eating:CVB and-drinking:CVB
(a) "And there is no one who should see you until he has finished eating and drinking"
(b) "Let no one see you until he has finished eating and drinking." (Ruth 3:3)

Ex. 167 above encodes the non-existence of an argument-oriented (viz., agent- or patient-oriented) predication, 'There is no one who can stand against you.' Ex. 168 is superficially similar, but differs in terms of its constructional meaning, and as such, its syntactic analysis. It does not state that there is no one who should see Ruth, but rather that Ruth should prevent the state of affairs from coming to pass (viz., a jussive construction). This would imply a reanalysis from an argument-oriented to an event-

oriented construction. In fact, this is a better interpretation of the above examples, which should be interpreted as involving an appeal to the addressee.

The likeliest mechanism for this process is pragmatic inferencing. To put it plainly, if there is no one that should perform a given act, then listeners may infer that the event should not come to pass. Nevertheless, on the basis of such examples alone, it is difficult to prove that the new meaning is coded rather than inferential.

However, examples like the following demonstrate that the construction has been reanalyzed as a prohibitive construction:

Ex. 169) *ʾalbo* *za-təṭgāʾazu* *ba-fənot*
NEG.EXIST that-argue/JUSSIVE:2PL on-way
"Don't quarrel on the way!" (Gen 45,24)

In this example, *zä-* *cannot* represent one of the participants. It is clear that the construction has the expression of a prohibition as a coded meaning. Moreover, since an existential reading is excluded, the construction as a whole has been reanalyzed as a monoclausal construction. As a result, *ʔalbo zä-* has been reanalyzed as a synchronic prohibitive marker.

It is important to stress that the third person construction is a crucial step in this process. The emergence of a second person emphatic prohibitive in Gəʿəz is probably to be considered a case of analogical extension from the third person. I am unaware of any examples of a first person negative jussive *ʔalbo zä-* construction. The extension of permissible subjects — in this case, from third person to second person — is a typical development in grammaticalization, where restrictions on the type of subject are relaxed.[61]

7 Conclusions about negative cycles

Due to the frequent innovation of prohibitive and related modal constructions in Egyptian — as opposed to the relative stability of the affirmative imperative system — it is tempting to see the Egyptian data in light of negation cycles, such as Jespersen cycles.[62] However, for the most part, Egyptian prohibitive constructions do not undergo typical Jespersen cycles, at least if the latter are defined as a complex change in which:

> 'For the purposes of expressivity, a negative marker may be accompanied by another word, which then becomes part of the negative marker and may further either replace the old marker or merge with it' (van der Auwera 2010c).

Most of the Egyptian prohibitive constructions discussed above do not involve changes in which a negator is strengthened by a minimizer or another negator. Yet there are also points of similarity, at a more abstract level:

61 See Grossman & Polis (2014a, 2014b) for a proposal regarding the pragmatic mechanisms that lead to the relaxation of selection restrictions on constructions.

62 Or Croft's cycle, which is attested in Earlier Egyptian.

(1) Alongside a pre-existing prohibitive construction, a new construction emerges.
(2) The two constructions are functionally opposed, but through smaller, local changes, the innovative construction comes to dominate the functional domain (of prohibition, in the present case). The older construction can become restricted to certain lexical or grammatical environments, or specialized for a more circumscribed function. It is also possible that the two constructions vary more or less freely.
(3) In the end, the old construction can disappear from use over time. The process may recur again.

As such, many of the changes described above resemble a Jespersen cycle. However, this isn't very informative or restrictive, since the above characterization would apply to most types of language change.

Nonetheless, the case of Egyptian is relevant for the typological study of cyclical change. For one thing, philologists have often suggested that innovative constructions were somehow 'emphatic' (see above). This would strengthen the link between the Egyptian data and Jespersen cycles, but further textual research is necessary to corroborate or disprove such proposals.

However, other kinds of functional oppositions can be relevant for cyclical change in the domain of prohibitive constructions. In Late Egyptian, for example, the innovative periphrastic Negative Jussive construction did not encode 'emphatic' prohibition, but rather a marked causative meaning, in opposition to the older construction, which had already lost its causative meaning for the most part, having become a simple jussive. This indicates that negative cycles can be set in motion, or otherwise catalyzed, as the result of processes that have little or nothing to do with negation per se.[63] Yet the basic principle is the same: the occurrence of two formally and functionally distinct constructions within the same functional domain can be enough to set a negation cycle in motion. In order to appreciate how long a single stage of this process can endure, it is instructive to note that the beginnings of a new cycle of this sort emerge in Bohairic Coptic more than two thousand years after the last time such a cycle began.

Furthermore, innovative prohibitive markers and constructions can spread through analogy from other negative modal constructions. In general, in Egyptian, prohibitive and other modal constructions do not undergo the same innovations at the same time, with a 'lag-and-leveling' effect. However, the frequency of analogy between the Prohibitive and other negative modal constructions indicates that for speakers, a paradigmatic relationship was perceived.

Nonetheless, some of the cases described in this paper do seem to involve an opposition between an emphatic and a non-emphatic construction. It is striking that the most innovative constructions discussed above are found almost exclusively in the southern dialects. In the northern dialects, especially Bohairic, none of these innovative constructions occur, although Bohairic has its own emphatic prohibitive construction. This involves a totally different kind of strategy, itself the result of a more classical Jespersen cycle.

63 See van der Auwera 2010c.

In earlier Egyptian, an emphasizing element *ỉwnꜣ* began to accompany negative constructions.[64]

Ex. 170) *bn di=i ꜥḳ=f*
NEG cause:SBJV=1SG enter=3SGM
"I won't let him enter."

Ex. 171) *bn dbḥ=i nkt mdỉ=k ỉwnꜣ*
NEG ask:SBJV=1SG something from=2SGM EMPH
"I won't ask anything of you at all."

At the early phases, i.e., throughout Late Egyptian, negative constructions with *ỉwnꜣ* were clearly emphatic (Winand 1997), but over time these doubling constructions became the unmarked negation for a number of clause types, mainly those with substantival, adjectival or adverbial predicates, as well as related biclausal constructions, such as cleft sentences) In the various Coptic dialects, the Jespersen cycle played out in different ways. In Sahidic, for example, *an*, the descendant of *ỉwnꜣ*, is in certain cases the sole marker of negation in independent clauses.

Ex. 172) *i(êsou)s mmau an*
Jesus there NEG
"Jesus in not there." (John 6:24)

This process went even further in Akhmimic, where it spread to subordinate clauses, with significant morphosyntactic consequences.[65]

Stage 1	*bn*			
Stage 2	*bn*	*bn … ỉwnꜣ*		
Stage 3		*n ... an*	*(n) ... an*	
Stage 4				*... an*

Fig. 10: A sketch of a Jespersen cycle in Later Egyptian

Nevertheless, throughout the Coptic dialects, one finds cases of negation without *an*, (viz., Stage 1) which seem to reflect especially conservative constructions.[66]

In some dialects, most prominently Bohairic, this *an* became a generalized marker of emphatic negation, occurring with constructions such as statements of non-existence and prohibitives.

Ex. 173) *mmon-hli n-hôb na-hôp ero-k an*
NEG.EXIST-trifle of-thing FUT-hide to-2SGM NEG
"Nothing at all will be hidden from you."

This is reminiscent of Late Egyptian, where the precursor of *an* served to mark emphasis, but differs in that it is precisely those Late Egyptian constructions that were incompatible with *ỉwnꜣ* that occur with *an* in Bohairic. As such, these constructions

64 Winand (1997) established that *ỉwnꜣ* was a synchronic intensifier in Late Egyptian, and only later did it become part of an obligatory discontinuous negation.
65 Funk (1985).
66 Shisha-Halevy (1981), Wolf-Peter Funk (p.c.).

should probably be interpreted as innovative, the result of analogical extension to new grammatical environments.

8 Final remarks

This paper above has focused on the pathways along which prohibitive markers and constructions developed in Egyptian. However, much remains to be done, especially with regard to functional oppositions between competing prohibitive constructions. A number of suggestions have been made regarding the motivations for the emergence of innovative prohibitive constructions. For example, Van Olmen proposes that the emergence of new prohibitives may be attributed to politeness, based on the idea that "prohibitive speech acts are less polite than positive imperative ones" (2010). This would result in languages having multiple prohibitive strategies, since innovative strategies would develop as face-saving alternatives to the less polite conventional prohibitive construction. It also predicts that "prohibitive forms are likely to be replaced at a faster rate than positive imperative ones," and that "in a group of genealogically related languages, the variety of prohibitive structures might be expected to be greater than the variety of positive imperative structures. Egyptian prohibitives corroborate all three generalizations, at least if we take the Coptic dialects as "genealogically related languages." One might also propose, based on the Egyptian evidence, that there will be more exploratory prohibitive than positive imperative constructions that are 'tried out' but are not conventionalized and do not replace pre-existing constructions.

However, as Van Olmen notes, politeness is probably not the sole explanation. As we have seen over the course of the paper, semantic change undergone by prohibitives — as well as other constructions within the broad functional domain of deontic modality — can matter for the grammaticalization of prohibitive constructions. Related constructions, such as jussives, can be the basis for the analogical extension of prohibitive markers, and functional oppositions of 'emphatic' vs. 'plain' prohibition can bring prohibitives into Jespersen cycles, just to name two instances in which politeness may not be the sole or immediate motivation.

In our attempt to better understand the role of language change in explaining synchronic language structures and the limits to cross-linguistic variation, rare pathways – such as the one discussed in the present paper – are of significant interest. For one thing, once described for one language, they may be more easily identified in other languages. However, they are interesting for yet another reason: their very rarity asks for explanation. Given the paucity of clear examples of a NEGATIVE EXISTENTIAL > PROHIBITIVE pathway in other languages, it is difficult to make a plausible hypothesis. Nonetheless, it may be that dedicated negative existential markers are rare, compared to other strategies. It may also be the case that dedicated negative existential markers tend to grammaticalize into negations associated with clause types other than those encoding prohibition, as Croft (1991) seems to indicate. Finally, it may that there is simply no *direct* semantic link between negative existentials and prohibition, although deontic interdiction constructions like Modern Hebrew *ʔen* +

infinitive show that there is a probably direct link between negative existential + verb constructions and some kinds of deontic modality.

Ex. 174) *ʔen* *lehašlix psolet me-ha-xalon*
NEG.EXIST toss/INF trash from-the-window
"No throwing trash out the window" (sign commonly found on buses).

The Coptic and Gəʿəz evidence presented here indicate that there *is* a pathway between negative existential and prohibitive constructions, but in both cases, it is an indirect one, the result of the relatively straightforward grammaticalization of 'non-canonical' prohibitives followed by analogical extension.

Abbreviations

The abbreviations used here are those found in the Leipzig Glossing Rules (http://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resources/glossing-rules.php), except for the following: EXIST – existential marker, CONJ – conjunctive (a sequential verb form), JUSS – jussive, PRES – presentative marker.