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"Das Koptische wird sobald keiner auslernen, und ich muss m ich bescheiden, wenn der Weg, den ich zeige, der richtige ist"
L. Stern, Koptische Grammatik, xv

"Willst du dich am Ganzen erquicken,
So mußt du das Ganze im Kleinsten erblicken"
Goethe, Sprüche

"Die paritätische Verbindung von Mikroskopie und Makroskopie bildet das Ideal der wissenschaftlichen Arbeit; in Wirklichkeit kommt meistens die eine gegen die andere zu kurz"
Schuchardt-Brevier, 410

0.0.1  RATIONALE. SELECTION OF PROBLEMS

This study or series of studies aims primarily at being a methodologically conscious account of several interrelated phenomena in the grammar of an important literary corpus of Coptic; namely, the application of the procedures of structural analysis to the linguistic data in the works of SHENOUTE, the fourth-
fifth century Archimandrite. Secondarily, it is meant as a detailed description of a Coptic grammatical system made with programmatic and consistent regard for procedural tenets — indeed beginning with the principle of strictly corpus-based statements, "corpus" meaning a homogenous set of data, as idio-lectal and synchronic as possible, and reflecting an état de langue as closely as possible. The success of this work will be judged on both counts: its only prima facie merit lies in its being the first of its kind.

This is not a "Grammar of Shenoutean Coptic" in the traditional and still conventional sense. Indeed, I contend that writing a "Grammar" is the only unacceptable way of writing about (i.e. reporting on) grammar, unless it be for the purpose of tuition (that is, applied linguistics), a "textbook". I envisage two radically different conceptions for tackling the syntax of a given text or texts: the first a descending, text-to-word scanning, class-and-member analysis of a linear structure (Hjelmslev's "deling"), the second — which I adopt here as being more profitable at the present stage of Coptic grammatical research — a categorial (still class-and-member) scanning of sub-systems (Hjelmslev's "leddeling"), valid for and verifiable within the said texts: a "pattern grammar". The sub-system or set-of-categories I have chosen for description is that of the modifier. A look at the Tables of Contents — which are also a synopsis of patterns — would show the scope of this hyper-category (§0.3). While it may at first impulse appear that an exaggerated edifice is here erected on what is perhaps the narrowest basis possible, namely the expansion-marker morpheme N', no one with a practical or theoretical acquaintance with the workings of Coptic grammar would deny the keynote standing of modifiers — adnominal, adverbal; verbal, non-verbal; adjunctal, predicative — in the overall picture of Coptic.

0.1 Corpus; Authenticity

The statements made on the following pages will be strictly corpus-grammatical, based only on attested facts, with no extra- or interpolation, the "corpus" thus acquiring the additional sense of a "predictive sample of the language" (HARRIS 1951:§2.33). Whereas all Coptic grammars of general validity are in reality mixing-grammars and must be rejected in principle on the objection that they cannot claim to be descriptive of any single Coptic état de langue, but are, at best, overall, stereoscopic impressions of grammatical phenomena, it is my intention here to present systematically corpus-based facts in verifiable Spezialgrammatik statements. This objective constitutes a third facet of the raison d'être of the present study. Before proceeding to define my corpus, I feel I should defend, be it briefly, the choice of Shenoute's works as most suitable for the present purpose. While perhaps not many today would care to subscribe explicitly to Vergote's statement (BiOr 6:102 1949) that "Sahidic is at its purest in the New Testament" — whatever "pure" may here mean — the fact that this is implicitly accepted, without the least realization of its basic circularity, is reflected everywhere: in teaching policy and practice as well as in grammatical research, where almost all corpus-based monographs concern the Scriptures (e.g. WILSON 1970, KICKASOLA 1975) and yet claim general validity. I believe that this rooted bias is wrong, not merely from the theory-conscious descriptive linguist's point of view — who would of course reject at the outset any aprioristic evaluating preference for a given corpus — but, more fundamentally, since we badly need a formulation of authentic (in the sense of "untranslated") grammatical usage for Coptic before we can even begin to argue contrastively about the native-idiotic vs. Greek components of Scripture Coptic, and the degree and quality of artificiality, of adherence to the Vorlage and of its influence on the system of the translation. Moreover, the monolithic nature of the Scripture corpus cannot be taken for granted, but must be established through independent description of its constituents. Thus, the precedence of the authentic (though later) source over the translated (albeit earlier, and, by dint of historical prestige, "classical") ought to be obvious. For a large, homogenous, untranslated literary corpus there is nothing in Coptic to compete with Shenoute's writings. It is, I am convinced, precisely this kind of source that is advisable as a testo di lingua for a grammatical treatise meant to depict
grammatical usage as a system. One may thus add a fourth element to the *raison d’être* of the present work, namely the need to find a way of representing the grammar of Coptic literary norm as realistically as possible.

As for the source material itself: the self-evident major problem here lies in the obvious necessity of basing the descriptive statements on a corpus the Shenouteanity of which is at least reasonably certain, by direct or indirect attribution: on the strength of internal extra-linguistic information, unambiguous linguistic (grammatical, phraseological, "stylistic") data, or — most difficult to formulate — the accumulation of factors of familiarity, the sense of norm and idiosyncrasy, the philologist’s *Sprachgefühl*. There is here an evident danger of circularity of applying to doubtful texts criteria of authenticity distilled from a collection including these self-same sources, or taking as Shenoutean and admitting as basis for critical statements material eligible solely on the strength of these doubtful texts. On the face of it, this pitfall may seem easy enough to avoid, yet in the actual process of selecting, sifting and describing the texts, with simultaneous isolation of critical characteristics, such slips are ever imminent. On the other hand, the highly selective approach is at odds with the pressing need for more complete documentation. My decision has been not to compromise in this matter, and accordingly texts of doubtful (yet possible) Shenouteanity, although certainly consulted and occasionally quoted, have been left outside the core of critical corpus: such sources are indicated by queries in the Appendix lists. Needless to say, such selection involves making subjective and in all probability provisional decisions, which may be contested on the basis of different judgement or independent contrary evidence (e.g. an explicitly attributed parallel turning up, a passage identified as non-Shenoutean by scholars more competent than myself in patristic lore, and so on). The actual procedure is in fact not circular but spiral: from a bona-fide core one works out, along ever-increasing radii, to a periphery of doubtful sources, always drawing upon the newly familiar territory for criteria. I have used all major, minor and minimal published editions of Shenoute and most of the unpublished manuscripts: it is especially with regard to the latter that the above reservation is made.

0.1.1 Criteria of Shenouteanity are too many and too various — even pending a systematic working-over of the corpus — to be enumerated here. A few have been suggested by the present writer (1975, 1976a); others (like *wet, wante, wone*, the notorious "Disiunctio Sinuthiana" 3, lexical favourites or monopolies — *wooy* "incense", *(wurw)2eit-"eject", waw2 "be withered", wuk2 "be/dig deep", kroh, aorwoc and so on 4) are well known 5; numerous others (like *eixw mpal xe-"by

---

1 An early lone advocate of Shenoute as a basis for a Coptic syntax was Spiegelberg (1909:440). In the Department of Linguistics, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, first acquaintance with Coptic through Shenoute is characteristic of students approaching Coptic with a purely linguistic motivation: they testify to an entirely different impression of the language and, on the whole, get a better grasp of it, although this may be partly due to their training.

2 See Lindroth, "Das Sprachgefühl, ein vernachlässiger Begriff", *IF* 55:1-16 (1937). Kern (1888:139), criticising (wrongly, I believe) H. Paul for using as argument (Paul 1920:§258) the fact that the German *Sprachgefühl* does not distinguish between adverb and adjective in predicative status, says: "Wenn doch die gelehnten Grammatiker nicht so oft auf das Sprachgefühl sich da berufen wollten, wo es lediglich darauf ankommt, sprachliche Erscheinungen zu beurteilen! Gewiss weiss das Sprachgefühl hier von einem Unterschied nicht, weil es überhaupt über wissenschaftliche Dinge unwissend ist: dafür ist es eben Gefühl". What Kern here opposes to the "linguistic intuition" must be pre-analytic, aprioristic so-called "scientific informedness", a kind of praeter-factual intelligence which is the cardinal sin in descriptive misinterpretation, while Paul's *Sprachgefühl* is but a misnomer for "listener's model information".

3 A *plent ouwmh h anouwmh 3p2ai met (P 130° 19 fr): see Shisha-Halevy 1976a:37ff.; cf. Fehling 1969:216-8; this is a kind of "linguistic self-criticism" (Jespersen's term, in a 1935 article of that name), or compulsive "legalistic"-precisionist quirk. Other typical Shenoutean turns of phrase, constructions and figures will be pointed out in the course of the present work, without going into such difficult questions as how a "figure" is to be defined (cf. Fehling 1969:7ff.), the degree of awareness in the use of a given construction, its functional charge and contextual correlation.


5 See Amélineau, *Oeuvres de Schenoudi* 1 (1907) xiii ff. The serious practical problem of distinguishing Shenoute's works
which I mean to say", rhetoric-argumentative figures using ένθέλο-, a "πρύμνη πε κατι ετ" "hyperbatic Nominal Sentence pattern, collocations of the "irreversible binomial" type like παν - σχήμα, τεσπε - οβνχε, χάνων - ΧΙΩΥΕ, ΚΡΟΜΗ - ΓΝΑΦΠΕ, are yet to be properly defined and statistically established in special studies; some have to do with peculiarities of dialectal admixture or "substratal" traces (Shishahaley 1976b, cf. Spiegelberg 1909:441), others with a more or less fragmentated stylistic impression, yet others are definable in terms of subsystems of grammatical usage, such as the one under scrutiny here: this adds yet another motivation to this study, since the conclusions arrived at and the "Shenouteans" resolved here could carry considerable practical-diagnostic weight. We are, of course, in search of the converging of the various symptoms, the cumulative evidence. Despite all this, we shall still have to contend with numerous instances of untypical Shenoute, where one cannot improve upon Zoega's "existimo", "arbitror", "nisi fallor", "conjicio" and the like. A nice methodological issue is that of the sub-corpus of quotations, mainly biblical, interwoven in the text. There is again the technical difficulty of recognizing a quoted segment of the text where it is not signalled as such (by έχει, ηύτε ετρήχει το, άυθον/παλιν ομ/μειςα έκει, and the like; an instance of unsignalled quotation is Ch. 115.23f. = Mt. 3:12). More importantly, these quotations (and, significantly, biblical reminiscences) give us a glimpse into an extraneous system of grammar, where, for example, Ἵταν πρός contrasts with Shenoute's own ά示范τος φύνε (§2.5.0.2), Ταπενοῦτο with Shenoute's paradigm of post-imperativ al forms (§7.2.1.1.5), in application to which many of the statements made below are simply not valid. Shenoute's own awareness of this contrast of norms is evident, since he puts it to rhetorical use, switching now and again to the Scripture diastem, ringing diaphasic changes, achieving archaic, pathos-carrying, authoritative effects. As a rule, I have left quotations and reminiscences out of my account, nevertheless referring to them on occasion in contrastive terms; excerpt-quotations, as well as Shenoute's own conscious archaisms, will be duly noted.

Admittedly, in the exposition I have not always drawn uniformly on all sources: unpublished MSS have been called on mainly for scarcely documented phenomena. For some studies (notably Ch. 7, the conjunctive) I have used a core corpus (Leipoldt + Chassinat) with added peripheral evidence, aiming for a higher degree of homogeneity for some central issues.

0.1.2 Shenoute's style. A measure of Shenoute's literary standing ("the greatest of all writers in the Coptic language", Worrell 1945:22) is the frequency of comments on his style. A brief review of these not always favourable reactions is rewarding, since it illustrates the traditional approach to Coptic idiomatic syntax. Zoega (1805), though not the first to edit fragments of Shenoute's work — this distinction goes to Mingarelli — first noted the extremes which Shenoute's "dicendi modus" can attain, a very important piece of information indeed: on the one hand, he observes (588) "sententiarum emphatica inversio... ferveridae illae declaratione... epistolae illae parabolis et paradigmis referetae... scripta stylo plano atque fluido digesta"; on the other hand (ibid., 483) "stilus pedestris et humilis... lectu facilis, stylus placidior... quam est quo uti solet". The first of the two, Shenoute's idiosyncratic, overwrought and often overstating mood is naturally the one most often pointed out; either admiringly: "the fury, eloquence and beauty of the language" (Hyvernat in the introduction to his manuscript catalogue of

from those of other homiletic writers, and especially of his successor, Besa, cannot be solved on a stylistic basis alone (see §0.1.2) but must wait for a comprehensive statement of Shenoute's linguistic usage, a Grammar, Phraseology and Lexicon of Shenoute. The attribution by stylistic impression alone has occasionally misled editors (notoriously Amélineau, even Crum in a few of his "Sh"s in the Dictionary, also in his catalogues). See on this issue Ladeuze, Étude sur le cinénotismes pakhôtmien (1898) 151f.; Kuhn, Muséon 66:225f. (1953), 71:376ff. (1958), and in the introduction to his edition of Besa (CSCO 157/cop.t.21, 1956) p.xiii f. The so-called "Pseudo-Shenoute" texts (ed. Kuhn, CSCO 206-7/cop.t.29-30, 1960 with an unedited parallel codex, B.L. Or. 12689) have a different standing: they seem to be somehow based on, and to contain, genuine Shenoute material (Shisha-Haley 1975:472f., 477, 1976b:362f.). Regarding Leipoldt's No.76 and non-shenoutean fragments included in Amélineau's edition, see the Appendix.

* Malkiel 1959.
1886-7 to the Woide-Clarendon Press collection, now in the Bodleian Library, Oxford); "L’auteur le plus original, le plus passionné, celui dont la langue est la plus riche et le vocabulaire le plus complet" (Amélineau, Miss. IV (1895) 497) or with more or less discerning criticism: "La phrase de Schenoudi n’est pas la phrase assez simple, assez analytique, des autres auteurs coptes; c’est une phrase compliquée, aussi synthétique qu’elle peut l’être, tourmentée, coupée d’incises et de propositions subordonnées" (Amélineau, Œuvres de Schenoudi I (1907) xiv)⁷. LEIPOLDT, the great editor of Shenoute, also comments somewhat adversely on his stylistic idiosyncrasies (1903:§11,13: his characterization, albeit subjective and psychologic, is at times quite apt): "Ihm fehlt die harmlose Naivetät, fehlt die schlichte Einfalt, fehlt die kindliche Ausdrucksweise...". Leipoldt distinguishes between "depression" and "exultation" in Shenoute’s mood, in his works he distinguishes between, on the one hand, the sermons, which exhibit a style "recht hölzern" and in which "fließen Worte und Sätze ruhig dahin. Die einzelnen Teile werden breit und äusserlich von einander geschieden, die Gedanken oft und fast ungeschickt wiederholt. Selbst den Ermahnungen... fehlt es an Kraft und Wärme ", and, on the other, the epistles, in which more emotion is in evidence: "sprunghaft... überstürzen sich die Sätze ". WORRELL’S comment is more restrained (1945:24): "His style is not polished, but it shows some rhetorical skill. He is original and difficult... he had a great command of the language and shaped it ". Obviously, none of the critics make an attempt to glimpse, through the personal style and rhetoric of our author, the true pageant of native, idiomatic (and often colloquial) Coptic: "style" has obliterated syntax, and the point de repère is yet again the norm of Scripture Coptic.

0.2 STATEMENT OF METHODOLOGICAL ORIENTATION

In this series of studies I shall view grammatical phenomena from a European-structuralist viewpoint. This is not the place and there is hardly the space to embark here on a detailed account of this school, since even the European brand of structuralist linguistics, far from being a monolithic school with an agreed, easily epitomizable code of procedure, is rather an ensemble of individualistic, frequently eclectic approaches, tenets and codifications⁸; what follows is a concise programmatic exposé of the most consequential principles of analytic policy to which I adhere in this work.

0.2.1.1 RELATIONSHIPS, SYNTAGMATIC AND PARADIGMATIC. OPPOSITION AND NEUTRALIZATION. A language element can be described as having a value (role, function, meaning), as grammatically operative, only in terms of its relationship to other elements⁹: syntagmatic (linear, (co)textual) or paradigmatic (commutative, categorical) relationship. The former is interpretable in terms of dependence, rectio (government), conditioning, (in)compatibility, sequence (arrangement, placement); the latter in terms of opposition and of relevance, and its negation, neutralization; of substitution and category.

⁷ Observing nevertheless that Shenoute’s style could at times be quite different: "Il avait ses moments d’accalmie, où sa phrase était limpide... les lions ne rugissent pas toujours, ils badinent quelquefois et jouent avec leurs lioceaux" (ibid.). Note Amélineau’s characteristic eloquence. Without rating too highly his grammatical acumen, it is nevertheless amusing to note that Amélineau writes of Shenoute’s sentences with subordinate clauses in which one is liable to go astray, unless one holds firmly to the rules of grammar, "règles encore peu connues que d’ailleurs l’auteur viole, et avec la plus magnifique désinvolture" (ibid., and see too pp. xxix ff.).

⁸ Some valuable retrospective surveys and guides for further reading: LEPSCHY 1972 (see p. 152f. for further state-of-the-art reports); Mohrmann et al. 1961, esp. pp. 126ff., 196ff., 294ff.; articles by Koerner, Engler, Lepschy, Hymes and Fought in Sebeok, ed. 1975:717-1176; see also Bazell 1954, Coseriu 1969, and numerous works referred to below. I must first deny all intention to convey an impression of a nice-and-tidy code of procedure, and confess my awareness of the inevitable superficialities. The following paragraphs are neither a general linguistics manifesto nor a profession de foi, but jotted highlights of orientation for the grammatical studies to follow.

⁹ In Saussure’s words (GODEL 1954:63): "Il n’y a jamais rien qui puisse résider dans un terme", cf. SAUSSURE 1949:150ff.; Benveniste 1963:16; Siertsema 1965:94ff., Coseriu 1969:58ff.: this is the meaning of "grammatical system": there are no elements outside it.
The simplest oppositions\(^\text{10}\) are binary (including privative, with two poles or terms related to each other as marked : unmarked\(^\text{11}\)). Any one member of an opposition may be zero\(^\text{12}\) or neutral (non-functional). Neutralization (Aufhebung, suppression of opposition) is a syntagmatic-and-paradigmatic event just as significant as opposition\(^\text{13}\): the governed or conditioned representative member in a case of neutralization cannot be said to have any meaning, since meaning depends on and presupposes opposition, the possibility of choice\(^\text{14}\), the existence of a paradigm. (Incidentally, any change in the number of terms in a paradigm entails a reassignment of the meaning of the individual members.) Neutralization, like opposition, is only definable for a specific environment.

0.2.1.2 Pattern and category. A category is expressed, realized and defined by a substitution-list or paradigm (of affixes, syntags or constructions), which is its signifiant\(^\text{15}\). This paradigm is in turn valid (being resolvable) only in a given environment. Accordingly, the category is definable only by its localization, in terms of the sequence/substitution set of coordinates. The category is a constituent part of a pattern: the pattern is defined as an ordered sequence of categories (paradigms); but since commutation is dependent on the extent of environment established as relevant\(^\text{16}\), pattern delimitation is a component of decisive importance in the definition. Pattern boundaries, however, are relative (in the sense that they are gradable on a scale of rank of ever-decreasing extent, from text-entirety downwards\(^\text{17}\)). Consequently, established classes or categories are correspondingly gradable on a scale of varying analytic delicacy\(^\text{18}\).

0.2.1.3 Profile of a grammatical phenomenon; identity; models. As stated above, the identification of a grammatical entity is effected by a positional/commutational localization: the point where the coordinates of compatibility and commutability meet in this identificational matrix is its analytic identity, its name\(^\text{19}\); this, no more, no less, is the analytic information we can give on it. We may add,

---

\(^{10}\) Classified by Trubetzkoy (1939:60ff.); see Coseriu 1969:120ff. Oppositions are formal and functional, in a formal system and a système de valeur, as the two faces of the signifiant - signifié linguistic coin. We accordingly adopt as the basic premise in analytic procedure that a formal difference must mean a functional one.

\(^{11}\) Trubetzkoy 1939:67, 77, 84; Martinet 1965:180ff.; see below Ch.5, footnote 24.

\(^{12}\) On the (by definition) structural concept of a "zero element" (significant absence) see Saussure 1949:123ff., 163ff., Meier 1961. with abundant literature.


\(^{14}\) An example: the circumstantial conversion as an expansion of an indefinite nominal nucleus can only be said to be "adnominal" — no more: whereas each of the two main verbal expansions of a definite noun, viz. the relative and circumstantial, has its "meaning", respectively, attributive and adnalexial modification.

\(^{15}\) "Paradigm" — not in its arbitrarily restricted, traditional, schoolbook sense of "substitution-list in the minimal (morphologic, 'word') environment", but also in the sense of commutability in the larger-than-word extent, including paradigms of constructions. See Siertsema 1965:175ff., 262ff., Seiler 1967:517f. (No.1).

\(^{16}\) An example: the converters: ε'-νε', ε'-σκε', η'-τερε' (relative), κε'- (preterite) constitute a single category (paradigm) only in the extent of the minimal environment, namely the converted conjugation form (or predication in general). Their mutual commutability ceases to be true once we extend the pattern boundaries to include, say, the immediately preceding paradigm: this "morphological" category is still further fragmented if the operative environment is extended even more.

\(^{17}\) Halliday 1961:251, 261. See §0.2.2.

\(^{18}\) Halliday 1961:260ff.

\(^{19}\) Cf. Saussure 1949:150ff. This is the policy adopted here regarding the difficult theoretical dilemma of identity vs. homonymy, which will often arise in the course of the following descriptions. An item will be judged and "named" only by reference to the above criteria, to which one must add allo-forms in order to synthesize a "name". For example: the plural definite article and the "nota relationis" are both represented in Coptic by a nasal phoneme: their distinct identities, however, are established on the basis of (a) their paradigms and syntax, (b) their allomorphs in a specific corpus (e.g. in Chassinat's edition of Shenoute: Ν/-Μ- for the nota relationis, Ν/-Μ-/'Ν/-Μ- for the plural article). Another example: ΝΑ-/'ΝΑ- (aorist affirmative base) vs. ΝΑ-/'ΝΑ- (preposition).
or occasionally prefer, a synthetic statement: the various (conditioned) alloforms of our entity. This gives us a different facet of its identity, which, together with the analytic one, I consider the complete descriptive statement to be made concerning any grammatical element. It follows that we must not, indeed cannot, "import" any external pre-conceived notion into the grammar of a language as a 'category'. This *caveat* is immediately and eminently applicable to the part-of-speech assignment of a given element, to which we shall have the opportunity to return now and again 20.

I must here briefly refer to a meta-meta-linguistic perplexity, one that is usually ignored in general linguistic discussion, namely, the so-called "hocus-pocus" vs. "God's truth" nature of theoretical constructs 21. While we pretend to depict in our descriptions a *modèle de récepteur* situation, it is often obvious that the presented models are really of our own creation. It might be claimed, and with very good reason, that any synthesizing model, departing from, assuming or preceding 22 the unstructured data is inevitably an artificial (and to a varying extent arbitrary) construct, superimposed on the data material. This may also apply in general to what we call "structure" and "system" 23. Nonetheless, I consider these models (a) legitimate, valid and viable, provided they be based on sound observation; (b) desirable, in the sense of "constructive", effectively encoding meta-linguistic information in a conventionally decodable manner 24. Still, it cannot be claimed that they are exclusively or universally true.

0.2.2 Levels, Hierarchies, Directions of Analysis. Among the meta-linguistic models or "fictions" referred to in the preceding paragraph are some which I consider fallacious and which I have tried to avoid in the present exposition. First and foremost among these is the *stratification* of analysis, the "levels". Even without resorting to the special pleading warranted by the singular typological reasons 25 that make Coptic much less subject to the preliminary theoretical distinction between *word* and *sentence*, *morphology* and *syntax* than Indo-European or Semitic languages, the advisibility as well as the validity and legitimacy of this particular model must be (and often has been) questioned 26. The analysis must, I believe, be continuous, text-to-morpheme, class-and-member; the word would be but a stage in this downward analysis, an intermediate pattern-unit, defined (like other patterns) by inner constituency, sequence, prosodic characterization and boundary signalling, a syntagm 27 like others.

20 Cf. *Barri* 1975b:56; *Baum* 1976:139-143. Indeed, I accept without reservation Sapir's dictum (*Language* 125) that "No logical scheme of the parts of speech — their number, nature, or necessary confines — is of the slightest interest to the linguist. Each language has its own scheme. Everything depends on the formal demarcation it recognizes." Written sixty years ago, one cannot, unfortunately, dismiss this warning today as no longer necessary. Similarly, one must sadly concede that Halliday's optimistic belief (*Studies in Linguistic Analysis*, 1957, p. 57) that "transference of grammatical categories is a dead horse no longer to be flogged" cannot have been uttered with Coptic in mind. See also §0.3 and Chapter 1, footnote 1.


22 Cf. Saporta, *Word* 12:12 (1956): "It is clear that linguistic patterns are highly patterned. What is not clear is whether this fact is best considered the result of a linguistic analysis or the basis for this analysis"; *Schuchardt* (Spitzer 1928:411ff.): "Nun gibt es Systeme, die schon fertig in den Dingen liegen und von uns nur entdeckt werden, und Systeme, die wir bilden, um sie in die Dinge hineinzulegen... Systeme dieser Art haben nur zeitweilige und bedingte Geltung"; also *ibid*. 299ff.

23 Consider *Halliday*’s definitions (1961:246ff., 254ff.).

24 Cf. *Hall*’s "fictions" (1965).

25 Cf. *Mistelis*’ typologically oriented review of Stern’s *Grammatik* (1982:484ff., 454 “no words, only groups — larger or smaller, closer or looser”); *Stern* xi ff., *Steinthal—Mistelis* 1893:272ff.; and see the discussion of the Coptic “word” below, §6.0.2.3, with further references.


Coptic morphology could be conceived of naively, as a study, synchronic or diachronic, of purely formal inner regularities of structure, with no functional correlates (e.g. for the nominal and infinitive "classes") 28.

Another synthesizing hierarchy which I reject in synchronic description is that of primary vs. secondary functions 29. This is, I believe, an arbitrary and distorting distinction: there is no hint in the actual, i.e. environment-defined, signalling function of elements, of any scale of precedence or importance. (One encounters terms like "primary" or "main" and "original" — both in the only meaningful, diachronic sense, and in a vague uncommitted sense — often confusedly understood as attributes of "use", "function" and the like.) On the other hand, rule ordering or analytic (descriptive) order 30 is acceptable as a descriptive artifice, a necessary heuristic means of interrelating observables, not a dynamic theory of what actually takes place in the system 31. Another hierarchy which I adopt implicitly is that of analytic delicacy, distinguishing between the resolution of primary and secondary classes 32.

0.2.3 NON-ATTESTATION. An inevitable embarrassment of a structural corpus-based grammar (perhaps more acute with a dead language, where no informant can extend our corpus at need) is having to puzzle out the significance of non-attestation. Even in a corpus as extensive as ours, the non-occurrence of some theoretically possible or expected element or construction must be weighed for possible structural significance, status of case vide, as against fortuitousness: we must see our way to distinguishing between systemic and accidental non-occurrence 33. This perplexity is all the more acute here, since the present study is not an exhaustive inventory-catalogue of all paradigmatic or even syntagmatic possibilities, but an account of grammatical structure: the lists in this work should be seen as open-ended, due to the certainty of the corpus being eventually extended and the ever-present possibility of a descriptive oversight. In my opinion, the only theoretically acceptable way out of this predicament is the one, based on an examination of the distribution-structure, suggested by ROSEN (1968). If a non-attestation of item (entity, phenomenon) \( x \) is dependent upon a specific environment and environmental properties, upon a specific pattern \( P_1 \), and it can be shown that a different pattern, \( P_2 \), in which \( x \) does occur, is in this respect in complementary (suppletive) distribution with \( P_1 \), we may consider the non-occurrence of \( x \) in \( P_1 \) a fact of grammatical absence 34 which we should not expect to find refuted (by a chance attestation) in the corpus under observation. If, however, \( x \) does not feature in any complementary environment, the non-attestation may be interpreted as mere non-occurrence, possibly to be rectified in the near future (unless yet another pattern, \( P_3 \), including \( x \), is eventually found to be in an "allo"-relationship with \( P_1 \)).

---


29 See (for example) KURYLWICZ 1964; criticism by E. Koschmieder in Die Welt der Slawen 7:409-22 (1962).

30 See BLOOMFIELD 1933:212f.; ROSEN 1964:§46, 1970; BARRI 1977:21 (“the order of what the linguist does”). I have a similar view also of that other phenomena-relating metalinguistic construct, the transformation, except as a presentation device (cf. SCHUCHARDT [SPITZER 1928:296]: “Umkehrung ist zwar statisch vorhanden, aber nicht genetisch”).

31 “Structural” as distinct from linear (sequential) order (BLOOMFIELD 1933:210; TESNIERE 1965:16f., 19ff.; ROSEN 1970) has a different standing altogether, reflecting, in my opinion, linguistic reality and not a model of convenience. Another non-dynamic structuring device employed below is that of Immediate-Constituents (IC) analysis.

32 HALLIDAY 1961:272f.

33 For instance, the comparison of “adverb” paradigms in the various positions and functions is meaningless unless one can estimate their limits.

34 Some examples: MITIZE “thus” is absent as predicate in the Bipartite pattern, since it is predicated in the # Predicate - # predicate (§1.2.1.2); *HAPEK-MITAPHEK are absent, since the imperative fills their slots; the # *Second Tense (negative) → focal interrogative modifier # is absent in the # Sec. Tense + interrogative focal modifier # pattern, since a different construction, viz. # interrogative modifier → (negative) First Tense#: supplies the “missing” item.
0.2.4 The saussurean dualities. Corpus-based description makes unnecessary stand-taking on the synchrony: diachrony model, which is probably no less fictive and conveniently idealizing than others. Structural description and the very concept of system are essentially static, just as they are primarily internal, i.e. non-comparative. The situation as regards the langue: parole dichotomy is somewhat more complicated. This distinction has often been criticized as inadequate, and additional stratification has been suggested. Hjelmslev’s conception fluctuates between three and four main strata of language, adding the “norm”, an essentially social and system(langue)-oriented, abstract set of rules, and the “usage”, a parole-oriented, also socially determined set of habits. Coseriu introduces the “norm” as an intermediate level, allowed for in the abstract system of the language and its individual adaptation (the parole is its concrete realization). The norm allows for individual variation, with the selection and fixation of variants. In the context of these two reconcilable views, what we are attempting to discern in the present study would be Shenoute’s usage and the Coptic literary norm behind it. The textual realization is the parole, while the features of the innermost core or deepest layer, the Coptic-Sahidic langue, are abstractable from a series of norm reports. “Usage” approximates “idiolect” (in Bloch’s definition, “an individual’s set of linguistic habits”), and it is Shenoute’s idiolect, or whatever layer of it is reflected in his written works, that we aim at portraying, with no reference to other idiolects, dialects or other subdivisions of the Coptic language, or to any “general” (i.e. not syncorporal) formulation or synthetic-panoramic conception of grammar.

0.2.5 Macro-syntactic analysis

0.2.5.1 Textual structure (syntagmatics). The realization of (a) the circular nature of pattern delimitation (paradigm ← extent of resolution environment), (b) the fact that continuous text-to-morpheme analysis is the only way to break this circularity, and (c) the fact that the “context-free” syntactic unit has as little meaning or relevance in the functioning of a language as the illusory isolated morphological one — all this must lead us to recognize the text as the prime syntactic unit, the prime pattern, the prime analyzable entity, subdivisible again and again. Just as the “word”, definable in ad-hoc junctural terms, exists (i.e. functions) only with reference to its environment (phrase and clause), so these too cannot claim any automatic, intrinsic prominence, or pre-analytic status of self-evident significance, but are referable to phrase/clause-including subtextual stretch units. The macro-syntactic view of grammatical phenomena has been adopted, on occasion, in traditional (“sentence”) grammar, in offhand, opportunistic forays into the “context”. The context has been constantly, more or less consciously, consulted, “employed” as an aid for determining function, but rarely formalized, included in the pattern, except in the consideration of traditional (stylistics- or rhetorics-oriented) cases, like conditional complexes, consecutio temporum, etc. In the present work (esp. Chs. 2 and 7) I attempt a formal description of the grammatically relevant context or cotext, i.e. “cotext patterns”, “cotext-
sensitive rules” (Lyons). An important feature of the textual linear system is the coherence or cohesion of its constituent parts; this will occupy us in several junctions. Another, closely related feature, constituting the basis for the discussion in Ch. 2, is the thematic structure of the text: the concatenation and development of ‘theme + rheme’ patterns, involving the concepts of the information unit and its focus.

0.2.5.2 The second, paradigmatic dimension of the textual system may be conveniently called the “paradigm of validity”, i.e. “the textual category for which a given grammatical-systemic statement is valid”. This is approximately the texteme in the textological structure or texture (cf. the paradigm in the syntagmatic sequence). It is clear, for instance, that the system recoverable in a narrative text (or narrative stretch) is quite different from that resolved, say, in a dialogue, where the grammatical inventory is much richer, perhaps maximal. One text (corpus component) may comprise several textemes or text classes, which should be distinguished and separated, in theory, in the pre-analytic stage. In reality, they are resolved in a circular process, on the strength of analysis results. The value (= function) of an element in one text-class is different, by structural definition, from its value elsewhere 42. The definition of textual categories, text (sub)species or types, by reference to the grammatical system and structural distinctive features is one of the objectives of such text-based investigations as the present one.

0.2.5.2.1 The rhetorical dialogue is our case in point, the grammatically definable textual type most in evidence in Shenoute’s writing. Without a rather involved delving into the particulars and theory of the dialogue 44 and an application of what we know of Shenoute’s (and, in general, Byzantine) rhetorical theory and norms 45, it would be difficult to meet the challenge of a full and precise definition of this textual type. This would in any case require separate treatment, and must remain outside the scope of the present discussion. A few brief notes will perhaps give an idea of some of its features. (a) It is a one-way dialogue, an enhanced and distended allocution (with a captive and mute addressee). (b) “Rhetoricity” is a transcurrent (in a different sense, “suprasyntactic”) category, intersecting others; the “rhetorical dialogue” may include real dialogues, real and rhetorical narratives (“paradeigmata”) 46. (c) The first- and second-person referential system is pivotal, with several subsystems (e.g. WE [= I + you]: THEY, I : YOU [metaphorically THOU], WE : YOU, etc.). (d) Among grammatical peculiarities, we find constructions (incl. the so-called “figures”), word-order idiosyncrasies, “values” of constructions, e.g. the polemic function of the Cleft Sentence, characteristic particles and modifiers, and lexical preferences.

42 Some striking Coptic cases in point: ēnacūtum (Second Future) is jussive in a preceptive context; ṛē- (pret. converter) expresses a durative past outside a narrative stretch, but signals (with ṛē) “Relief” (Weinrich) or tempo- or dimension-varying in a narrative context; ēnacūtum (circ. perfect) is continual in a narrative context; the conjunctive is a typical non-narrative form (partly corresponding to ṛē- (ṚYU) ṛē-), ṛē- ṛē- in narrative). For the Second Tense, a context-bound, macrosyntactic category par excellence, see Ch. 2. Note that both ṛē- and the Second Tense are exponents of specific macrosyntactic status (§2.0.1.1), and can only be described adequately in a “context-sensitive grammar” (Lyons 1968:235ff.).

44 Perhaps the most significant definitional feature of dialogue in this connection is its complexity: it is analyzable into two sub-structures of allocution and response, each with a distinct grammatical system of its own. Although not every dialogue is a “Wechselsrede”, this may be taken as the ideal form.

45 See Müller 1956:54 (n. 3), 61ff.

46 Some constituents of the rich paradigm inventory of the rhetorical dialogue: rhetorical narrative (III 38, 78); real narrative (III 208f., IV 198f.); letters (III 21, 25); invective address (Ch. 19ff.); report of conversation (Ch. 50ff.); praising address (Ch. 84ff.); dialogue within dialogue within narrative (Ch. 93ff., 97); generic dialogue (III 51), dialogue within narrative (III 38ff.). Note that the system recoverable from the rhetorical narrative is much fuller than that of the non-rhetorical historical one, including such features as the Second Tense, conjunctive (§7.2.4.2), conditional constructions, etc.
0.2.5.3 Reference. It would be out of place here to enlarge upon the current text-linguistic schools, trends, individual variations and controversies. Most theoreticians of this doctrine 47 underline its superior capabilities for dealing with problems of sub-textual grammar which the sentence-grammatical approach cannot satisfactorily solve. Some main concerns and preoccupations of text-linguistic study are: analysis of discourse structure 48, textual typology 49, textual system 50, thematic text structure ("Functional Sentence Perspective"), see §2.0.2.3 51, and cohesion in the text 52.

0.3 The modifier: a primary or hyper-category

...ΑΥΤΗ ΝΗΜΑΝ ΝΗΜΙΚΑ ΝΟΥΜΑ ΝΗΤΟΝ... (IV 176.3)
ΕΥΣΕ ΤΕΤΜΗ ΔΕ ΜΜΑΥ ΝΗΜΕ+Χ ΜΜOΥ ΕΙΧΙΝ ΜΜΟΥ ΑΝ ΖΑΡΠΕ ΜΑΥΑΤ (IV 96.12f.)
ΑΑΚ ΝΕΛΑΧΙΣΤΩΝ ΝΗΜΙΣΑΧΕ ΝΤΕΚΤΑΠΟ,
ΝΓΛΑΚ ΝΑΤΝΟΕΙ ΝΣΗΝΗΣΕ ΝΝΣΑΒΕΕΥ (IV 41.9f.)
ΟΥΡΨΗΜ ΝΑΠΙΝΟΤΕ + ΝΑΗ ΝΟΥΜΗΤΕΡΩ ΓΙΧΜΠΑΣ,
ΝΗΜΙΑΝ ΝΗΜΙΚΑ ΝΗ-ΓΟΜ ΝΑΗ ΝΠ-ΝΕΡΝΑΝΟΤΕ ΝΗΤΗΣ...
ΝΤΑΧΟΥΜ ΝΗΤΗΣ ΝΟΥ; (Α 2 364).

The present series of studies is concerned with the definition, resolution, compatibilities and combinations which constitute the taxonomic profile of the Coptic modifier. An impression of the range of its distribution can be obtained by studying the excerpts quoted above. This category, including all adnominal, adverbal 53, adnaxial, and ad-pattern 54 satellites or expansions, would be considered, according to one's point of view, either synthetic, conveniently grouping together and condensing a number of paradigms in a continuous distributional structure 55; or analytic, at a low level of delicacy 56. This is a primary category, subdivisible, at a higher level of resolution (at which level the studies are actually conducted) into secondary classes, and these into yet more fragmented subclasses. Although I cannot see any real incongruity between the two conceptions, I prefer the first ("polyparadigmatic hyper-cat-

48 See, for instance, HARRIS 1952; DANEŠ 1970; GÜLICH-HEGER-RAIBLE 1974; WEINRICH 1977, etc.
50 See the excellent WEINRICH 1977: a solitary work for (Late) Egyptian, HINTZE 1950-2.
51 See, for instance, FIRBA 1966; HALLIDAY 1967; BENES 1968; DANEŠ 1974.
52 PALEK 1968, HALLIDAY-HASAN 1962.
53 "Noun" and "verb" have never been explicitly defined for Coptic. Those acquainted with this issue in pre-Coptic Egyptian will agree this is a far from trivial matter. They are definable, like other parts of speech, only in terms of pattern: "noun" — the paradigm expanding determinator pronouns (§5.1.1.0.1f.), expanding the pre-object allomorph of a verb lexeme, privileged to occupy the actor slot of a verbal predication pattern etc.; "verb" — a conjugation-form (defined by POLOTSKY 1960a:§1). Thus the verb-lexeme (traditionally "infinite") is a nominal sub-class privileged to occupy the third position in the Tripartite pattern, not (with some exceptions) expanding or, i.e. in a different "determination" category from other noun sub-classes and finally alternating (true of some of the members of this sub-class) in regular proclitic pre-object allomorphs. This cumulative definition for Coptic corresponds to the "categorical" one, characterizing a part-of-speech by a cluster of morphological categories (case-gender-number, tense-mode-person) in use in languages of a different type. See SCHUCHARDT, SPITZER 1928:275.
54 Note that "adnominal" and "adverbial" are telescoped ways of saying "modifying the noun/verb syntagm". By "ad-pattern" I mean "modifying a predicative pattern", usually used of a Nominal Sentence. "Adnaxial" ("adpredicative" in SHISHA-HALEVY 1972) means "modifying by attaching or adjoining a (predicative) nexus": see §7.1.3.
55 The traditional and conventional conception of the part-of-speech proves on examination to be synthetic on two counts: first, as a conglomerate of categories rather than a single one; second, in mingling arbitrarily semasiological, syntactic and morphologic considerations of classification. See BRINKER 1972:63ff., and §0.2.1.3 above.
56 See HALLIDAY 1961:272f.
egory") for its "propaganda value," as conveying more cogently the idea of the distributional continuity of the expansion — more specifically, the obliteration of the major traditional categorial differentiation of Adverb vs. Adjective as a deep dichotomy (obviously the result of an imported and pre-conceived "part of speech" metalinguistic model). This is especially striking for the adverb. The Coptic "adverb" is by no means a specialized qualifier of verbs. Nor is the attributive satellite marked by N-characterized in any way as adnominal (N-modifiers constitute a crucial intermediate sub-category of postadjunctive modifiers which may profitably be considered the point d'appui for the primary category). Under the heading of "modifier", all sub-categories, all paradigms, are to be judged in their own light, and no other differentiation is necessary or meaningful. By (as it were) reshuffling and respacing them, we arrive at a position where we can consider the grammatical facts free of pre-analytic compartmentalization.

0.3.1 The term modifier has here an exclusively formal, tagmemic reference: "satellite", "expansion". The semasiological aspect of the category is extremely variegated and is not, probably cannot be, an operational criterion for grammatical classification.

0.3.2 Four representative realizations or manifestations of this category are treated here: (a) the modifier in unmarked, or position-marked, or morphematic cohesion with its nucleus (modificatum): Chs. 1, 3, 4; (b) the modifier (adnominal/adpronominal) in anaphoric cohesion with its nucleus: the augens (Ch. 6); (c) the conjunctive, a verbal adnexal modifier (N-marked, combining the interdependences of nucleus-satellite and [logical] subject-predicate): Ch. 7; (d) the focal modifier (presented in a discussion of focalization patterns in general): Ch. 2. For a fuller impression and more details of these four manifestations, it is suggested the reader consult the Table of Contents opening each chapter.

0.4 Retrospect: Coptic Grammatical Research

In view of the aims of the present work, which are fundamentally reoriented in respect to the traditional approach to Coptic grammar, I keep the critical examination of Coptological grammatical tradition to a minimum. It is of course impossible to treat studies of the pre-Polotsky era alongside a consideration of Polotsky’s momentous contributions 57. Several research-historical or state-of-the-art appreciations 58 have commented in more or less strong terms on the methodologically neglectful research history of Coptic grammar — indeed, the sad fact that general linguistic method and interest have to a considerable extent passed Coptic by as is true today as it was a hundred years ago, perhaps more true 59. Without

57 Most of the issues discussed in this work have not yet been treated in extenso by our Master. Only in one instance (the Second Tenses, Ch. 2) have I presumed to question his findings, but even there our differences are traceable to a basic divergence in methodological Weltanschauung. Prof. Polotsky’s statements are by no means invalidated, and what I suggest is an alternative (in my opinion advantageous) view of the facts, conceivable only after he had blazed a trail to understanding the system.

58 POLOTSKY 1971:55f.; SCHEKEL 1972, esp. 169ff. (on structuralism. Incidentally, Coptic, the language which played so crucial a role in Champollion’s decipherment, is sadly underrepresented in this volume commemorating the 150th anniversary of this event); CALLENDER 1973a:59f. on the rare structuralist approach; 61 ff., on Polotsky (Callender’s implied reservation about Polotsky’s structural method is unwarranted, although it is true that he has never openly broken with traditional [non-structural] 19th-century principles and models. As a matter of fact, Polotsky has never pledged himself to any one school of general linguistic method.) JUNGE 1974a is mainly a meta-meta-linguistic discussion, a critique of Schenkel’s and Callender’s papers. FUNK 1978a; MINK 1978.

59 POLOTSKY 1970:558. The severance of Coptic grammatical scholarship from general linguistics — a subject worthy of special study — is as old as Stern’s Grammatik, published at the very time (1880 — the publication year of H. Paul’s Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte) that next door, so to speak, the Neogrammarian Doctrine emerged full-fledged from the controversies of the eighteen-sixties and seventies. Today one observes, not without envy, the methodologically careful, even pampering description of the minutest, most exotic “native dialect” (Pacific, Amerindian, Papuan . . .), and the smooth incorporation of living and dead Near and Far Eastern languages among those constituting the object of current general linguistic research — while Coptic, a para-
dwelling on individual descriptive flaws — examples can be found all over the place — one can compile a list of "seven deadly sins", the more flagrant lapses in method since Stern's Grammatik. These are all the more blameworthy in dead-language grammar, where methodology ought to be, if anything, more rigorous, since one has no "native speaker" to check and control one's findings by or to extend one's corpus at wish. They are as follows, in a diminuendo order of persistence (not necessarily of consequence): A view of phenomena which is: not corpus-based, i.e. unhomogenous; unstructural, i.e. atomistic and absolutistic; uncotextual (self-restricted to an arbitrarily delimited extent of analysis); neglectful of the interdependence of signifié and signifiant, form and function (also the distinction of alternation and variation). This view has been overtly ethnocentric, in terminology as well as in many "docile" calques of extraneous categories, even in circumstances patently pointing to language-specific phenomena. (As a matter of fact, terminology often precedes and motivates the postulation of categories, as is inevitable when one proceeds unstructurally.) Synchronic treatment is often adulterated with diachronic reflections, the descriptive listener's model with generative, speaker's model formulations.

0.4.1 Perhaps it would not be out of place — if only as a curiosity — to close this section with five typological statements made of Coptic, mostly in the last century. Read today, they convey at worst the overpowering impression of utter detachment from the reality of the language; at best, they capture something — not always the same something, always subjective, always inadequate — of the flavour of Coptic. They have nothing particular to do with details of grammar, but with an accumulated contrastive impression in quest of the mot juste. Note the consensus on the austerity, lack of sophistication and of complexity of the language — an unmistakable sign that Shenoute has been left out of consideration:

Mingarelli (1785:82): "... verum haec lingua, ut libere dicam quod sentio, non modo simplex mihi videtur, sed etiam rudiuscula... insuavis, stridula, compositis vocabulis abundans, inops potius quam copiosa".

Peyron (1841:159, "monitum"): "Finem Grammaticae impono, quin de Syntaxi dicam. Praeterquam quod enim in lingua geometrica, cuiusmodi Copticam esse vidimus, par est Syntaxis, quae ordinem naturalum sequitur, neque inversionem verborum patitur".

Steinhall-Misteli (1893 46:107f.): "Formsprache... anreihend... nicht wortig... befriedigende Gestaltung des ganzen Satzes... (268)... nackte steife Einfachheit. (272)... Mumiengeist... (301)... grammatische Armut und Nüchternheit".

classical, almost "nostatic" language, a treasure-trove of grammatical notabilia, has yet to be discovered. The truth is, Coptic has been falling between all possible stools, especially those of "pagan" Egyptology and the study of Eastern Christianity (with the magnificent exception of the Erman-Sethe-Polotsky lineage). The current fashionable flurry of interest in Gnosticism, proceeding on the whole as if the grammatical description of pre-Nag Hammadi Coptic is a fait accompli, may prove to be yet another milestone in the luckless progress of Coptic linguistics.

46 Stern, more than any of the pre-Polotsky grammarians, may claim some structuralist sympathy. Consider his predilection for a dichotomic presentation of binary (often privative) categories: Relation vs. Annexion; conjugierter vs. conjugationsloser Satz; Dauerzeit vs. Ereigniszeit (§369, 494); Tätigkeit vs. Zustand (p. 172f.); Umstand vs. Handlung (§440); mittelbare vs. unmittelbare Anknüpfung (d. Objekts, §489), with some only negative terms, like unabhängig (§480), präfixloser Satz, nicht nominales Subject (§370), etc.

41 This usually means an Indo-European and/or Semitic predicative "squint" (Jespersen's term) in description; see Polotsky 1959:457 (= CP 236). This attitude is more subtle in the typologist's essentially contrastive treatment: the prevailing spirit is rather that of Steinhall-Misteli's "Wo fände sich desgleichen im Indogermanischen oder Semitischen?" (1893:50).


43 I am leaving out here some diachronic-tribological observations, like Hintze, ZPh 1:96ff. (1947) and the apt criticism by Schenkel, 1966 a; briefly, Mink 1978:97f. in traditional Humboldtidian terminology (analytic, synthetic, "wurzelflektierend")

44 Cf. for Egyptian Daumas (1952:34): "L'Égyptien a eu parfois de la peine à reproduire la souplesse de la syntaxe grecque..."; he (and others) probably have in mind mainly word-order properties.

45 The Coptic and Egyptian information is given esp. on pp. 267-301, but various reflections on Coptic may be found passim.
AMÉLINEAU (1895, apud Schmidt, Pistis Sophia, 1925, xxiii): "Cette langue ignore les longues phrases... c'est une langue éminemment analytique et non point synthétique... les phrases procèdent toujours par petits membres très clairs, presque indépendants les unes des autres... jamais, au grand jamais, nous ne rencontrerons en copie ces périodes à incises compliquées à trois ou quatre membres différents, dont les éléments sont unis les uns aux autres d'une manière synthétique, si bien que l'intelligence de la phrase entière ne peut être obtenue qu'avec le dernier mot".

Compare STERN's on the whole unexceptionable account of Coptic word-order (Grammatik §635): "Die Wortstellung... bewahrt die Regelmäßigkeit und Klarheit... Die längsten Perioden, und die Sprache liebt sie weit auszudehnen, zeigen immer den nämlichen einförmigen Bau, indem die paratactische Gedankenabwicklung nur durch die Participia und Relativa oder durch den Conjunctiv oder durch den Infinitiv unterbrochen wird. Die Klarheit, welche der Sprachgeist vom Gedanken fordert, führt seine genaue Zergliederung herbei, wenn er mehrfach und verwickelt ist. Von allen Redefiguren ist daher keine häufiger im koptischen Satzbau als die Prolepsis. Das Zusammendrängen vieler Begriffe in derselben Construction wird dadurch vermindert und der Rede eine gewisse Ruhe und Anschaulichkeit verliehen".

There can be no doubt of the preeminence of STERN as a grammarian of insight and penetration (see n. 60).

0.5 TECHNICAL NOTATION

0.5.1 PATTERNS. The scheme of treatment for a given pattern consists in general of the following main stages and sections: (a) general observations, (b) paradigm, or category constituency, with token documentation, (c) special observations on selected individual members of the paradigm, (d) (for some patterns) documentation: representative examples followed by references "in bulk".

0.5.2 EXAMPLES quoted are representative and selected, unless a given phenomenon is less than well attested, when most or all of the examples in my files are given. The number of examples varies according to the strength of documentation*. Additional references (not necessarily all) will follow, in a "Zitatennest" (following DENNISTON'S maxim, "the reader should be allowed to bathe in examples"). Examples are translated only when they are in any way problematic, or if this is necessary or useful or has any bearing upon the argument.

0.5.3 SPECIAL SYMBOLS and typographical devices used:

- ' ......... ' symbolizes a non-autonomous pattern
- # .... # an autonomous pattern
- + syntagmatic compatibility (not necessarily sequence [contiguity])
- → syntagmatic compatibility and sequence (contiguity)
- * unattested (hypothetical) form
- (*) rare or unique form
- ~ fluctuation, variation
- { } a morpheme, with its paradigm (unqualified substitutability; e.g. [ne], [n-]).
- ~ open juncture
- [] juncture boundary
- || paradigm (substitution group)

The text is followed by an Appendix of Shenoute sources; Bibliographical Reference List; Indices (Index of Terms and Subjects; Index of Coptic Words, Phrases and Constructions; Index Lociorum).

* Cf. Lagarde's "Zwei Beispiele sind etwas wenig, wenn man oft sagt" (Aus dem deutschen Gelehrtenleben, 1881, 26).
CHAPTER 1

A POLYPARADIGMATIC PATTERNING OF MODIFIERS IN UNMARKED,
POSITION-MARKED OR MORPHEMATIC COHESION

1.0.1 Problems of synthesis: preconceived ideas of the "adverb" as a part of speech; the Coptic "adverb"; N-satellites

1.1 Non-predicative modifier status

1.1.1 ADNOMINAL modifier role: ‘noun syntagm → modifier’

1.1.1.1 Modifiers in noun syntagms, expanding a determinator: ΟΥΒΑΕΝΕΣ, ΝΣΒΒ ΝΚΑΤΑΚΑΠΕ etc.

1.1.2.0.1 Predication-modifying role: ADVERBAL modifier. Valency; postadjuncts vs. premodifiers

1.1.2.1 The postadjunctive adverbal modifier

1.1.2.2 Premodifiers; adclausal (adpattern) modifiers

1.1.2.3 Modifiers in a Nominal Sentence

1.1.2.4.1 Modifiers as nuclei: modifiers modified

1.1.2.4.2 Modifiers coordinated/disjoined

1.2 The predicative modifier

1.2.1.1 ≠ noun syntagm/prefixed personal pronoun → modifier ≠ (Bipartite pattern)

1.2.1.2 ≠ modifier → ΝΕ ≠

1.2.1.3 Miscellaneous: Ο N-; ≠ modifier → Θ ≠; Ρ + modifier

1.2.2 The modifier focalized: ≠ Second Tense → modifier ≠, etc.

1.2.3 The modifier in a predication-presupposing zeugmatic pattern: ‘independent pronoun/noun syntagm → modifier’

1.3 Synthetic information: a selective examination of individual members of the category and their properties

1.3.1.1-3 N-marked modifiers: ΜΜΑΥ, ΜΜΑΤΕ (ΕΜΑΤΕ), ΜΜΗΝΕ, ΝΤΕΙΖΕ, ΝΣΟΥΟ

1.3.2 Zero-marked noun syntagms in modifier status

1.3.3 Iteration-marked noun syntagms in modifier status (‘ΚΤΥΥ ΧΑΛΕ ΧΑΛΕ’ etc.)

1.3.4 ΤΕΝΟΥ

1.3.5.1-2 ΝΑΜΕ, ΖΝΟΥΜΕ

1.3.6 ΕΝΕΖ

1.3.7 ΕΠ-marked modifiers

1.3.8 ΖΙΟΥΚΟΠ

1.3.9 ΤΤΙΟΥΟΥ, ΤΤΙΝΕ

1.3.10 ΑΥΘ “additionally, furthermore”

1.3.11 Greek loan-modifiers

1.3.11.1 -ΩΚ-characterized modifiers

1.3.11.2 -ΩΝ-characterized modifiers

1.3.11.3 ΠΑΛΙΝ

1.3.11.4 ΤΑΧΥ

1.3.11.5 Prepositions of Greek origin

1.3.11.6 Greek loan-modifiers: miscellaneous
1.0.1 Problems of Synthesis: Preconceived Ideas of the "Adverb" as a Part of Speech; The Coptic "Adverb"; N-satellites

1.0.1.1 With no other part of speech is it more pertinent to question its definition and demarcation than with the "adverb": this part of speech refutes the claims for universal validity, conflicts with language-specific realities and is generally arbitrary to the point of being unworkable. This is so unanimously felt today that this statement is almost banal; yet "adverb", even if now and then joined or replaced by more modern nomenclature, features as commonly as ever in the grammatical register. Trying to deal here with this almost embarrassing theme as succinctly and as pertinently to the task in hand as possible, I shall limit myself to a few observations of a general and historical nature.

1.0.1.2 The traditional and still conventional approach to defining parts of speech 1 mingles uncontrollably notional, morphematic and syntactic considerations. This alone would appear objectionable, even were one to accept the by itself questionable premise of a grammar "where everything is either this or that" 2, and even were one prepared to tolerate the ethnocentric and/or universalistic bias in tackling what are, first and last, language-specific issues. Such "pre-fabricated" pre-analytic entities — to be identified in (or, in reality, forcibly accommodated to) the structure of every individual language — must be supplanted by structurally conceived categories or category groupings and role relationships: "form-classes" defined by position and commutation.

1.0.1.3 Judged by the traditional lights and pronouncements, the adverb is seen to be a non-category, a negatively defined, "waste-basket" pigeonhole absorbing such elements as are not eligible for classification as other parts of speech, bordering on and merging into others (notably the conjunction [συνδέομεν] and "particles") 3. Within this amorphous aggregate, the sole consistently operative, definitional constituent is the adverb as verb qualifying or verb-adjunctual, adverbial (subsuming, with greater sophistication of classification, a subclass of "sentence modifiers" — see below, §1.1.2.2) 4. This function, really a mixture of syntagmatic and reference-logical phenomena, has nothing natural or immutable about it, and, far from being self-evident, must be given careful consideration, the more so in cases like that of Coptic, where "verb" and "adverbial" need precise definition, where "adverbial" also applies to the status of a paradigm of verb forms 5. All this apart, it must be stressed that (a) adverbial status, although central in forming the detached conception of the "adverb" part of speech, is by no means coextensive with its entire functional spectrum 6, (b) there looms in the background of this conception the metalinguistic proportion model 7: adverb/adverbial \(\approx\) adjective/adnominal — that is to say, the

---

1 From the almost inexhaustible critical literature on this aspect of traditional grammar, I shall quote only De Saussure 1949:12ff., Ternière 1965:51ff., Paul 1920:244ff., Matthews 1974:43ff. ("Our traditional parts of speech have not been handed to us on tablets of stone"). See also the Preliminary Chapter, note 20.

2 Cf. Hockett 1967:936 (with Sapir's famous "all grammars leak").

3 On the Stoic Greek συνδέομαι, μετάστης and πανδεκτός see Schmidt 1839:37, 45ff., Robins 1966:10ff.; see Pinkster 1972:35ff. for Latin grammatical theory. There are discussions of this approach in Ahlman 1938:19ff., Karcevskij 1936:107ff., Scehehow 1950:65, Theileff 1955, e.g. p. 15 n. 1. It is hard to detect a qualitative difference between the descriptive treatment of "verbs" in modern Coptic grammars and (say) that of Tuki 1778, who variously refers to adverbials as "adverbium", "particula", "littera" (n, e), simply "vex" (ΣΕΚΑΑΛΣ); ΑΥΘ is "adverbium" (203ff., see §1.3.10 below); so is ΕΠΣ; ΣΑΘ is "particula seu praeposito", ΝΟΣ "particula seu adverbium". (I fully concur with Tuki's designation of Ν as a "littera coniunctiva" [96ff.]). Callender 1970:327ff. (App. IV) does ask some of the relevant questions — in fact, his is the only penetrating examination of this subject — but is, I believe, handicapped by his generative frame of reference. Instead of function and distribution, he is interested in derivation models and transformational (i.e. dynamic) relationships; my own approach is diametrically opposed to his.

4 A further source of complications is that "adverbial" in "general" application includes modification of the substantive verb (— what about true Nominal Sentences?) and πέραμ was after all used also for "clause", "phrase" or rather "utterance" (Plato, Cratylus 399b): cf. Steinhals 1890:137ff.

5 Clause Conjunction forms, the circumstantial conversion, conjunctial sentence-forms, various eventive forms (σετίτης, μμντεπεν).—


7 See for instance Scehow 1950:64ff., Regula 1951:75, Kurylowicz 1964:19ff. Among the classical grammarians, see
affinity of two distinct functions, related in a transformational or hierarchic model and by some corresponding formal (morphological) correlation — regular at least cardinally, and at least in the "inflecting" Indo-European and Semitic languages. On the other hand, a different point of view goes even further, subsuming "adverb" and "adjective" under a single cover-term \(^8\), with various subdivisional properties; here the syntagmatic *satellite* essence of the two categories overrules morphological considerations. It is this latter approach which I adopt, as being of advantage in Coptic, where neither hierarchy nor transformation is (in my opinion) called for to locate "adverb"/"adjective" in a *système de valeur* \(^9\), and where there is no clear-cut morphematic dichotomy between adnominals and adverbs, and hence no *a priori* call for a correlation theory, in brief, where no content can be given to the concepts "adverb" and "adjective" other than the syntagmatic + paradigmatic information that amounts to their respective distributional structures.

1.0.2 In Coptic, then, it is the "adjective-adverb" or modifier which is analytically isolable as a prime category. The *n*-satellite marker, a typological show-piece and one of Coptic's most cogent messages for general linguistic experience \(^10\), may be taken as the Coptic modifier (satellite, expansion) exponent *par excellence*. The multi-functional nature of *n*-constructions has been the subject of many discussions. The typological ones are often tainted by preoccupation with the corresponding Indo-European(-Semitic) structure ("Is *N* a case morpheme? If so, which case?"), while the Coptological ones \(^11\) show a predilection for (diachronic) speculation rather than (synchronic) description. In this work, I shall be concerned with *N* in several different pattern-types: as adverbal, generally and specially, in the present chapter; as adverbal and focalized, in Chapter 2; as adverbal object-expansion, in Chapter 3; in adnominal construction, here and in Chapter 4, and so on. Thus, the only exposition feasible at this point is necessarily a generic and loose one.

The Coptic "adverb" is not usually a lexical (morphematic) entity but a syntagm. That is to say, lexical "adverbs", not grammatically analyzable and marked only by grammatical compatibilities \(^12\), are the exception. The largest group by far among adverbally privileged elements consists of *prepositional phrases* \(^13\), preposition-marked modifiers. Prominent among these are modifiers marked by *N*/*MOD*, which invite some fundamental questions about their nature, identity and function. The crux, the hub

---

Scholia Dion. Thrax (Hilgard) 233.25-7; Priscian *Inst. (Hertz) XV I* ("hoc enim perficit adverbium verbis additum, quod adiectiva nominis appellativis nominibus adiuncta"), 116 (of the Stoics) "necon etiam adverbia nominibus vel verbis connumerabant, et quasi adiectiva verborum ea nominabant"; see *Schoemann 1862: Ch. 10 (esp. pp. 136, 157ff.), Pinkster 1972:37.

\(^8\) Compare the *viesaka* in Indian grammatical tradition (Cardona 1973:85 n. 6), possibly also Dion. of Halicarnassus *επηρραμα* in the etymological (preterminological?) meaning. See *Sandmann 1939, esp. 91, Lyons 1966:216ff.*

\(^9\) I differ here with Polotsky's "transpositional" approach to the Egyptian-Coptic verb (e.g. *Polotsky 1976 esp. §§1.1-3; see §2.0.0.1 below*). Polotsky implicitly assumes the validity of a universal distinction of *adverb* vs. *adjective* vs. *substantive*, on which he bases a categorization of (in Coptic, converted) verb forms, even though neither "adjective" nor "adverb" have been defined for Coptic. On the other hand, taking "adverbial" and "adjectival" as coterminous with "adverbial" and "adnominal" is open to objections (see above).

\(^10\) Ever a pet subject of the typologists, these constructions have been intelligently treated by *Steinthal 1847, Misteli 1882:433ff.*, *Steinthal-Misteli 1893:281, Schwarz-Steinthal 1850:460.


\(^12\) Cf. (in a sense) Karcevskis's "determinant à marque zéro" (1936:107f.), although he also has here in mind the negative essence and the frequent non-rectangular nature of adverbial links. Coptic modifiers are lexemic, not modulus categories (Whorf): "function-words" (Fries), not a morphosyntactic category as in many Indo-European languages.

\(^13\) Nucleus-satellite IC-analysis of the prepositional phrase is, I believe, impossible in Coptic (*pace* Nagel 1980:90) — although the preposition does presuppose the noun, and is therefore in a *determination* dependency with it. Unlike Indo-European prepositions, which are often modifiers further expanded, Coptic prepositional phrases are exo-centric complexes, and are, judged by this criterion (see Kuryłowicz 1936:88) "a single word". In dependency-grammatical terms, the preposition (including *N*-) "belongs" to the verb syntagm, not to the noun.
of this perplexity lies in the merging in Coptic of the following extra-Coptic (or "universal") terms of relationship; on the one hand (syntagmatically) adnominal/adverbal; on the other hand (paradigmatically), adverbial/direct-object marking/predicative-constituent marking. Different treatments place the burden of the problem at different nodes of this multiple furation. An all-important (though rarely mentioned) feature of the N Modifier is that, more than any other in the prepositional-phrase class, it is essentially post-adjective; indeed, it is the clearest manifestation in Coptic of the 'nucleus → satellite' Grundrichtung or basic syntagmatic sequence; except for certain fixed combinations (see §1.1.2.2), the major tagmemic polarity feature, viz. the opposition of ante- vs. post-location, is neutralized for N-. N-modification is the Coptic adjunct expansion par excellence, the quintessential satellite. I would therefore agree unreservedly with the old typologists' evaluation of N- as a general relator, satellite signall "nota relationis" the reference of the relationship being resolved by the environment.

1.1 Non-predicative Modifier Status

1.1.1 Adnominal Modifier Role: 'Noun Syntagm → Modifier'

(A) General Observations: (1) The presence here of such members of the adnominal paradigm(s) as are associated (by familiarity) with the adverbal status is often explained in transformationalist terms as the result of a "reduction of a relative construction" or as an overall nominalization of a verbal nucleus and its expansion(s). I consider this aetiology unhelpful and unnecessary, as is also the underlying assumption that there is something derived, secondary or marginal in the adnominal occurrence of an "adverb" any "explanation" of this order must be held irrelevant and extrinsic to the structure, significance of this occurrence.

---

14 It must be stressed that these functional mergers are not exclusive to Coptic. For some basic illuminating statements, see Becker 1841:59ff. ("prädikativier Genitiv", adnominal + predicative), also Schoemann 1862:151ff.; von der Gabelentz 1869:383 (adverbal = object, adverbal = predicative); Froben 1898:30ff., 38f. (adverbal + adnominal + predicative); cf. also Sandmann 1946 on the French parler haut, dire vrai (adverbal = object + predicative).


16 Significantly, we find in (Nitar?) Bohairic a neat distinction of ≠ καωικ - vs. ≠ καωικ #, the former a non-adjunctal, non-satellital, adclausal premodifer, the latter an adverbial adjunctual satellite (cf. also ≠ παιφιτ vs. ≠ παιφιτ #). Whether or not the fact that some Bohairic (also "Middle Egyptian" and Sahidic?) prepositions are preeminently post-adjunctal and need a modifier nucleus in premodifier status (=ndefi nem vs. ≠ n-em) is germane here still has to be established.

17 Steinhall 1847:45 "mera relationis signum", 50 "N relationum", 46 "exponens indefinitae relationis cuusdam", "N cum linea mathematica, qua duo puncta conjungantur aut inter se referantur apte comparari posse mihi videtur". Steinhall-Misteli 1893:281 "allgemeiner grammatischer Weiser".

18 So Steinhall 1969:114ff., Brinker 1972:138ff. This is in fact Schenkel's (1966) analysis of the ME blik jm construction, which he considers an "apokoinou" one of a predicative adverb. Truly adnominal, according to him (57ff.) are only adjective-expanding modifiers. Cf. Rudnitzky 1956:130ff.

19 Steinhall 1969:18ff., Brinker, ibid. Obviously, some (notably rectio-type) constructions could be advantageously analyzed in IC-terms as (article) + (verb lexeme + modifier): ουκτο επιβευ (A 2 76), πυρβ γεράκες (IV 32.8), παρες έπαιδαιον (Ch. 106.20f.) πινην αμπινοβε (Bctrl. 1613 2 71b), as could — most cogently of all — regular nominalizations: τεπιβις εζούν (K 9298), τενει μπινα τονα γεμί αμεγιι μινούτε (Ch. 94.31ff.), Τεπιβις αείσκεν τοκύ (P 130 35 vo), τεπιβις εζούν εγεύν τεπιβις (P 131 19 ro) and so on. The distinction between adnominal and adverbial ("object") N- is in these circumstances unfounded (see below).

20 "Extrinsèque" (Sechehay 1950:66ff.). Consider Karcevskij's cogent observation on the incidental nature of the verb's relationship with the verb (1936:110ff.).
(2) The uniformity of the adnominal modifier paradigm may be broken by several (partly overlapping) transformational or analytic expedients: distinguishing between (a) modifiers predicable in the Bipartite Pattern (§1.2.1.1), differently predicable and unpredicable ones, (b) syntagms interpretable as *(article) + (verb lexeme + modifier)* \(^{21}\) and those analyzable as *(article + noun) + modifier*, the former with a subgroup of *(article) + (nominalization exponent + (verb-lexeme + modifier))*, *(περιπ-2ΨΒ ΕΠΙΣΟΜΛΗ) (Κ 934) ΤΕΚΙΝΩΝ ΕΠΑ - (III 13.12f.*)\(^{22}\), (c) various dependency types, see §1.1.2.1: rectional vs. complementational modification (especially relevant with verb lexemes, but not excluded with noun-lexeme "valency").

(3) The *augens*, a specific ad(pro)nominal modifier is discussed in detail in Chapter 6 \(^{23}\).

(4) Among the important adnominally occurring *verbal* modifiers, we find the attributive relative conversion, the adnaxial circumstantial \(^{24}\) and conjunctive (§7.1.3 below, also §§7.3-4).

(B) **CONSTITUENCY AND PARADIGMS** (an open-ended listing) \(^{25}\):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Augen</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ε</td>
<td>see §1.3.1, spec. obs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ε, ΕΧΙ-</td>
<td>spec. obs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ε-</td>
<td>III 180.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ε-</td>
<td>spec. obs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ε</td>
<td>III 87.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ε</td>
<td>Ch. 17.47ff., 94.31ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ε</td>
<td>Ch. 56-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ε</td>
<td>Ch. 117.34ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ε, ΕΞΙ-</td>
<td>93 102 KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ε</td>
<td>IV 74.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ε</td>
<td>IV 194.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ε</td>
<td>IV 29.26f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ε</td>
<td>III 157.11f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ε</td>
<td>IV 32.8, III 72.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ε</td>
<td>III 206.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ε</td>
<td>III 25.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ε</td>
<td>IV 141.27f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ε</td>
<td>IV 106.15f.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{21}\) *Zepez*, after Frei 1966, with η- the nucleus (§5.1.1).

\(^{22}\) *Eyn* ε- modifying action-nouns: *πιτικ* (III 87.15), *αγάμη* (Ch. 88.53ff., P131 88 ΡΑΣ), *μοιτε* (III 135.25f.), *ηντιτική* (Ep. 66), etc., is specifically adnominal, replacing a simple preposition (mostly η-) in the adverbial status. The actor here is usually expressed pronominally in a possessive article (νεν-, ιερ-, etc.), and the whole can be rendered "which I (you, we...) have for..." following (III 172.18) *ναυτικων* ΕΠΙΣΟΜΛΗ *Eyn* ε- (also III 118-9).

\(^{23}\) Borderline cases like ΜΑ-, ΕΠ-, ΖΑΡΙΖΑ- as well as kindred non-augential modifiers like ΝΟΥΤΕ ΜΑΤΕ are discussed in the present chapter or in chapter 6.

\(^{24}\) A distinction neutralized (in favour of the circumstantial) after a non-n-determined nucleus (Shisha-Haley 1972, esp. 75-128; 1976c:n. 3).

\(^{25}\) Ordered by and large on principles of approximate relative frequency, which are of course subject to change as more or new attestations are taken into consideration. Many slots in the three paradigms may be zero-realized. Properly speaking, the first position in the "nom. nucleus — modifier" syntagm is occupied by the determinator paradigm (§5.1.1.0.1), which is expanded by the noun lexeme; either may be further expanded by the augens (Ch. 6) and the modifier paradigms here displayed.
NΣΟΥΟ (§1.3.1.3), ΤΕΝΟΥ (§1.3.4), ΝΑΜΕ, ΖΝΟΥΜΕ (§1.3.5), ΑΛΛΕΗΣ (§1.3.11.1.2), ΖΟΛΑΣ (§1.3.11.1.1), ΚΑΛΛΕ (§1.3.11.1.3), ΖΟΝΟΝΗΣ (§1.3.11.1.4), ΖΑΠΑΣ (§1.3.11.1.7), ΜΟΝΟΝ (§1.3.11.2.1.1) ΜΑΛΑΝΟΝ, ΜΑΛΙΣΤΑ (§1.3.11.2.1.4), ΑΥΣ (§1.3.10).

(C) Special observations: (1) N-/ΜΝΟΙ- / NTΕ-/ΝΤΑ-: (a) It would seem that any account of these elements and their intricate functional structure must start with a statement of position regarding the identity or homonymy of adnominal N- (with ΝΕΥ- a partly suppletive pronounization 27) and adverbal N-/ΜΝΟΙ-. I believe this approach is methodologically unsound, and that the only alternative to speculation in this case lies in a structural definition (cf. §3.1.2.0.1) 28. Adnominal N- occurs, as a nota relationis, in syntagms with a value which (say) an Indo-European-oriented observer could identify with that of his own attributive or possessive syntagms: still, the significance of this for the Coptic innere Form must not, to say the least, be overstated.

(b) N-modification of a nominal nucleus can occur with (usually before) other modifiers. The sequence of several modifiers may (here as with adverbal modification, §1.1.2.1) be subjected to IC-analysis: (Ηγ 90.2) (ΑΑΑΥ ΝΗΜΗ) ΣΗΒΟΑ / (ιβίδ. 217.23) (ΣΑΣ ΝΤΕΗΕΙΟΝ) ΝΖΗΘΥ / (Ch. 17.47ff.) [(ΠΙΝΟΣ) ΝΚΡΙΜΟ] ΕΠΑ / ΕΧΩΝ 29 and so on.

(c) N-, the adjunct-characteristic ΧΑΙΤΙΕ, is prenominal: instances like (Ch. 98.36ff.) ΟΥΜΝΤΕ ΝΥΑΗΕΙΟΝ or (IV 159.13 codd.) ΝΥΠΗ ΝΚΑΤΑΣΕΠ Ι take to be a case of N- governing a nominalized ("hypostasized") modifier — or rather governing a determinator, expanded by a modifier: see §5.1.1. N- is no less a symptom indicative of the "nominalness" of a syntagm than are the determinators: indeed, N- and the determinators always occur conjointly, in a nuclear syntagm further expanded by a noun lexeme or modifier, see §1.1.1.1.

(d) I fear the present account cannot claim to give the last enlightening word on the (allomorphic?) distribution of N- vs. NTΕ-/NTΑ-. The grammar-books' threadbare and lacunary statement for Sahidic 30, to the effect that (a) NTΕ- expanding an indefinite noun, governs a definite one, and (b) NTΕ- expands an already expanded noun — although correct and workable in a general way for Shenoute 31, would

---

28 See §1.0.1.2 above, Chs. 3 and 4. QUECKE (1981:260) does not consider this N- prepositional: what matters synchronically is its satellital status.

27 Note ΜΠΟΑ (O)ΑΕ- (Ch. 93.44ff.), pronominally ΜΠΟΑ ΒΟΑ (ibid. 100.1), Shenoute follows here Akhmimic usage (Dictionary 33-4).

29 I am of course aware of the diachronic roots and grounds for the distinction made between the "properly adnominal" N (< Eg. n) and "adverbial + predicative + prepositional" N (< Eg. m), and also that "in the midst of synchrony we are in diachrony". Nonetheless, I firmly believe in the feasibility of a synchronically-timed consistent description of the status quo resulting from the historical event of the merging of [m] and [n].

30 In Frei's dependence model (FREI 1966):

---

31 For example, STERN §292ff. (not completely separating the Sahidic and Bohairic systems), Till §111ff. (including an example with a demonstrative-expanding nucleus — Joh. 12:34 — which I would rather analyze as ΝΕΑΥΡΑ ΤΕΗΕΙΟΝ).
conflict especially with instances of ‘Ο - + Ν - (def.)’, e.g. (Α 1 133) ζυγος υπερ μπουειν / (Α 2 453, not Sh.) ... υπος υπερ μπουτε/νυπερ ητορθη, ‘(indef.) + Ντε- (indef.)’ e.g. (Α 2 433, not Sh.) γενοκο- δοικη ητερογυρα υπομι and ‘(def.) + Ντε- (def.)’ e.g. (Α 2 420, not Sh.) νευκατακτης ητερομε / (ibid. 452) ημυτρη ητετετακοε / (Ρ 1338 55 ΤΤ) πουςου ητετετιη ηθοαου / (Ρ 1304 22 ΦΜΘ) ηναποτολοαο ητε- ποιοι / even (Ρ 1304 62 ΟΕ) νευκατακωρα ηταγη. Pending the findings of a special study, I suggest that an original opposition of Ν - vs. Ντε- (essential possession vs. incidental possession or appurtenance), usually neutralized in accordance with the above statements, is maintained in isolated cases, perhaps with a limited inventory of noun lexemes in the nucleus 33 where Ν - is the marked exponent of essential possession, with Ντε- either an unmarked or non-possessive relator. The whole issue is a component of the multi-faceted theme of determinator syntax (cf. §5.1.1). Observe, however, that like Ν - , Ντε- is not exclusively adnominal (υτετετετκωοε οε ται ητετθυν Χη 101.38ff.), although Ν - is a regular direct-object expansion mark (Χ 3), while Ντε- is a non-rectional modifier.

(e) See §6.0.1 for Ν - introducing a lexicalizing apposition following a pronominal nucleus: (ΙΙΙ 96.21) ...ζωης ητετετε (Χ 102.9ff.) ...ειςου ητηετοο ηιεμι, even (Α 2 403) (πογγε) ημυτρη ητετθυν. This construction must be kept apart, if only for the reason that a non-determinator pronominal nucleus (predominant in the augential modification patterns, Chapter 6) does not feature in the nucleus paradigm of adnominal Ν - . (On the affinity between ‘noun → modification’ and ‘pronoun → apposition’, see §4.3.)

(2) Ε- : this is the only common, unmistakably rectional modifier in our paradigms. Instances like (Α 2 396) ουσακε εινοη ηοειο or (ΙIV 152.2) ουσωμ ειαοαη are a case apart: the modification here is dependent on the environment of the noun syntagm as well as on the formal nucleus. (On εινοη Ε - see n. 22.)

(3) ζι- , ΜΝ- : the distinction between the non-coordinating modifier ζι- (e.g. in Χ 208.43f. (Η) 2ο ζιοα) and the coordinating ζι- (ΤΕΒΒΟ ζιοε III 34.17) can be stated in terms of the distributional relationship of the latter, which coordinates zero-determinated nouns, with ΜΝ - , which serves to coordinate {N-}/ {ΟΥ-} -determined noun syntagms: ηενοου ΜΜΟΓΗ (Ρ 1302 37 ro), ουεκο μποουει (ιβιδ.), ηνου β ηετθυν (Χ 116.57ff.), ημου ημματαε (Ρ 1302 59 ο); with Θ - ηεμ (§§3.1.1.2.1(3), 5.1.1.0.1) we find αυω/-ζι-/ΜΝ- (Ρ 1315 28 ro) ηγιν ηιοοο ηιοο ηπακ ηιο ηιοκωκ ηιο, also Χ 21.33ff., 48.54ff., etc. The pronominal state of ΜΝ- is found only in coordinative instances like (ΙΙΙ 22.17) ηνα ηοειε or (ΒΜ 209 38) ειπωη ηοοοι, see §1.1.2.4.1.

(4) ΖΑΘΩΝ- : (a) Consider the following instructive example, in which the adnominal modifier is disjoined from the same prepositional phrase in predicative status and adnominal (relative) form: (ΙΙΙ 159.12ff.) ζιαλο ζαθων- ... θαλο ζαθωνθυ- ... ιαλο οιεθατθυν. This does not mean that the adnominal modifier is a “reduced” form of the relative construction, but only that their significations in the given context are sufficiently close. (b) Note the prevalence of indefinite nuclei (this is also true for ζαηθο). Does this imply a prosodically conditioned adnominal placement of an adverbal (or adclausal) modifier — the indefinite nucleus, as it were — attracting the modifier to its vicinity? Compare ηεμ ειεος (§1.3.6 below).

(D) DOCUMENTATION:

Ν- : exx. passim (esp. in §§1.3. and Ch. 4), and consider (Ρ 1304 16 ro) ζικηνοου ηεμαλαοενοι / (Ρ 1304 140 wo) ουα ιεν ειηανοουτε / (ΙΙΙ 221.9) ουα ιεν ηεμετηηοηκηαου ηελαo... / (ΙIV 73.11) ιααυ ιησα

33 This is, I think, the situation in Bohairic; here, however, we have wheels within wheels, since the determinators themselves are exponents — perhaps the primary ones — of this distinction. In Sahidic too, an instance like (Ρ 1304 21 ro) νευηπηη μμεμπηη- μμεμπηη ιετακη proves that “possession” and “Ντε-appurtenance” are compatible, hence distinct categories.
Modifiers in Noun Syntagms. In the syntagm ‘determinator → modifier’, the modifier expands the nuclear determinator pronoun. This is not a “hypostase” except by virtue of a pattern. The inventory of modifiers is here shorter than in the post-lexeme paradigm (§1.1.1), and includes many Greek loan-modifiers and in general mostly fixed expressions, clichés and calques. The ensuing noun syntagm is often (for some modifiers, usually) the predicate of a bimembral Nominal Sentence.

(1) Nucleus: [n]-: (IV 53.4) ΠΑΛΗ ΜΠΟΥΝ / (A I 302) ΠΟΥΝ ΝΗΣΤΟΥ / (Teza 684) ΠΑΑ ΕΝΕΣ, appositive after ΠΟΥΝΤΕ (§4.3) / ΠΕΒΟΛΑ Ν-, Π(Ε)ΒΟΛΑ Ν- (Ench. 89a, P 130\(^2\) 109 vo, IIII 114.25, IV 126.29, Ch. 47.49f., Wess. 9 131a 13f., K 9294, P 130\(^4\) 122, 130\(^2\) 22, A I 289, etc.) / (Ch. 97.35f.) ΜΠΟΥΝΟΥΕΙΣ. No instance of the feminine determinator τ- is known to me. The possessive determinators: (IIII 20-1) ΜΑΧΕΙΜΠΑΙΡΟΣ / ΝΕΚΚΑΤΑΡΙΣ (IV 122.24 cod., A 2 526 etc.).
Chapter 1. Patterning of Modifiers

§1.1.1.1

(2) Nucleus: [οΥ-]: ΟΥΚΑΤΑΡΨΩΝ (III 116.17, 117.5f.) / ΟΥΝΑΡΑ(ΤΕΥ- / ΤΕΝ- / ΤΕΚ)ΩΥΣΙΣ (Ch. 21.26f., IV 112.24, P 130.24 ῬΠΒ) / ΟΥΒΑΕΝΖ (A 2 236) / (A 2 418, not Sh.) ΟΥΝΟΡΟΥΟΥΕΙ (vs. ΟΥΒΑΕΝΖ on line 12) / ΖΕΝΚΑΤΑΚΑΡΕ / ΖΕΝΚΑΤΑΚΑΡΕ (IV 81.5, 112.7, P 130.111 ρο) / (III 107.17ff.) ΟΥΒΕΒΟΛΑ ΖΙΓΜΩΥΤΕ.

(3) Nucleus: θ-, after the modifier marker n-: — ΝΒΑΕΝΖ (IV 38.15, A 2 465) / (IV 159.13) — ΝΚΑΤΑΚΑΡΕ, v.l. ΚΑΤΑΚΑΡΕ, §1.1.1 / (III 58.29) — ΝΚΑΤΑΕΙΩΣΑΝΗΣ / (A 2 100, IV 162.5) ΝΠΑΡΑΨΗ, parall. ΠΑΡΑΝΨΗ, line 6.

(4) A (unique?) case of real hypostase 34: ΥΑΠΟΥΕΣ “until evening” (IV 84.10, 92.2, v.l. ΥΑΠΟΥΕΣ), which however may be explained by metanalytic analogy with ζιτούε < ζιτούε (the latter being etymologically primary). ΕΝΕΖ (§1.3.6), historically a prepositional phrase, is unanalyzable in Coptic.

1.1.2.0.1 Predication-modifying role. The adverbial modifier. Valency. Postadjuncts vs. premodifiers. The adverbial 35 modifier is found to occur in either of two patterns, viz. ≠ verb syntagm + modifier ≠, where it is postadjunctive, and ≠ modifier + verb syntagm ≠, where it is either focal (one construction in a set of focalization patterns, see §§2.4-6) or adclausal (in the sense of “in relation to the whole pattern or clause as such”), premodifying 36. In the latter case (§1.1.2.2) we cannot speak of an expansion or adjunction: I take the function of the modifier here rather as presetting, orientating in advance, prelocating the clause in a framework of local, temporal, modal relationships 37; the modifier is preparatory, in a sense given and (like conditional or temporal protases) often topical (cf. §2.0.2.1). Thus, although the convenient term “premodifier” will be employed in the following discussion, it stands rather for “presetter”, “predeterminer” or the like. No small difficulty here lies in uncovering the syntactic structure of the pattern 38. Two alternative analyses present themselves: (a) The whole ≠ modifier + clause ≠ complex precludes nucleus-satellite analysis, that is to say, cannot be binarily analyzed in terms of a centre-and-periphery hierarchy, yet can be stated as a “determination” dependence, the premodifier presupposing the clause and not vice versa. (This is not unlike the preposition-noun dependence.) (b) Not in line with the basic Coptic nucleus → satellite syntactic sequence (but in accordance with that of the “mediator” lexeme premodifier construction, §3.4), we analyze the complex as * expansion → nuclear clause * 39.

35 "Adverbial": in adjunctal or at any rate non-lexical relationship with a conjugation form (here "verb syntagm") (VS). It goes without saying that further subcategorization of the verb is still called for—or a precise compatibility determination of certain modifiers with certain conjugation forms.

There is no discussion of this issue for Coptic (but cf. Funk 1978b:96ff., 101ff. esp. §4.1.2. on the "conjugation mediators", which Funk considers to be sentence modifiers of a kind; see §3.4 below on the "lexeme premodifiers").

37 Cf. Weinrich 1977:226ff., 268ff., etc. on the "obstinate signals" which premodifies sentences and larger subtextual units, up to text extent.

38 The correlations and interactions of placement (e.g. initial, post-verbal, final) function (adverbial, adclausal) and syntactic structure are too complex, and involve factors too multifarious (including considerations of prosody, prominence, even style) to be thus summarily dismissed. As in any other issue of word order, a unified theory must be evolved in this case. (Cf. Jacobson 1964 for a painstaking scanning study of English modifier placement.)

39 Note too the functionally difficult, if formally sharp, difference between premodifiers preceding an uncharacterized clause-form (" ΚΑΛΟΥΚ ΑΚΚΟΟC") and a focal (nexus-constituent) modifiers. With the latter, the initial position is a feature of the predicative pattern (" ΚΑΛΟΥΚ ΕΥΚΥ ΜΗΜΟC"). Often, the actual difference in function escapes one. (Formally too, there is the possibility of transition from one construction to the other, with Ε- and ΑΕ- "devalued" to a post-modifier clause form; see below, esp. §1.3.11 passim, and §2.5.0.1.)
1.1.2.1 The Postadjunctive Adverbal Modifier

(A) General Observations: (1) Nucleus - Expansion. The verb syntagm is expanded by the modifier; more precisely, it is the verb lexeme that is expanded. Some modifiers may be further expanded in their turn (§1.1.2.4). The prepositional phrase, however, can be analyzed only as a determination dependence, the preposition being the determinant — presupposing the noun, which is the determinate.

(2) Valency Structuring (see also §3.0.1.2). Status hierarchy is the foremost question raised in this construction, since we usually have more than one modifier expanding one verb syntagm. This is primarily a matter of IC-analysis, of analytic model, of definition in terms of sequence and commutation, and — most crucial — of finding criteria for distinguishing between complementation (which is optional, grammatically unrestricted, non-rectional, hence pertinent and meaningful) and rection (conditioned, i.e. non meaningful) of the verbal nucleus ⁴⁰. In this regard, Crum’s Dictionary is notoriously unhelpful (we are lucky, though, to have such a varied and extensive — if unstructured — inventory of attested combinations). A study of verb valency (actantial properties or potential) in Coptic is an urgent grammatical and lexico-logical desideratum. A specimen structured display of combination possibilities follows:

\((\alpha_1, \beta_1): \# \text{VS + modifier} \#; \text{in matrix terms, positions} ⁴¹(0) \text{ and } (1).\)

\((\alpha_1): (K \ 9294) \text{ CSCWBE NCWOW}\)

\((\beta_1): (K \ 913) \text{ WAWNUT EMAY}\)

\((\alpha_1): \text{reaction, “object” (see §3.0.1) or “case”} ⁴². \text{The modifier here is a co-constituent of the verb lexeme (“V +”), and no other actant is addable: “bivalent verbs”. The modifier, being conditioned, is here a mot vide, devoid of own meaning, commutable only with } \emptyset. ⁴³, \text{if that } ⁴⁴. \text{The reaction being par excellence is that of the mediate direct object marked by } N^-/\text{MMO-}, \text{discussed in detail below (Ch. 3). Some other bivalent lexemes: } \text{CWTII (N-)}, \text{ ZAPEE (E-), WUINE (N-)}, \text{ various reflexive verbs (MTON, WOYYOY).}\)

\((\beta_1): \text{complementation. The modifier in position (1) is optional, freely commutable, hence meaningful, semasiologically contributive, distinctive and indeed defining.}\)

\((\alpha_2, \beta_2): \# \text{VS + modifier}_1 + \text{modifier}_2 \#; \text{matrix: (0)-(1)-(2).}\)

\((\alpha_2): (III \ 130.6) \text{ ...ETXI MMOH N00CN} / (IV \ 54.16) \text{ EYECTABOYO E12AAG} ⁴⁵ / (III \ 204.5f.) \text{ YAEPECTIO MMOY} \text{ MNNMOY “satiate thee (2nd fem.) with ...” / (IV 79.14) ZMIPPEYAI1E MMOY MMOY — the identity of MMO- is here structurally definable (§3.1.2.0.1) / (ibid. 82.28) ...E2OBCK MMOY / (III 166.22) NPI ETOUTHAYI MMOY}\)

⁴⁰ On this famous issue, see Tesnière 1965:127ff. (actants vs. circonstants; his two criteria are patently inadequate. The formal one, very ethnocentric, conflicts with our N-, while the semasiological one cannot be accepted on its own). See also Frei 1964:33ff., Helbig 1971:33ff., Brinker 1972:130ff., 154ff. (“In diesem Bereich ist noch fast alles zu tun ”). This distinction is all too often vague and elusive (witness the “essentiality” vs. “erasability” test). For further references, see §3.0.1.2 below. (In Coptic, cases like ΞΕΠΟ- and ΞΕΝΑ- — see Černý, ZAS 97: 44-6 [1971] — are clearly instances of non-rectional expansion turned rectional.)

⁴¹ “Position” in a structural, not sequential sense, and potentially realizable by zero.


⁴³ This, together with absence of complementation (non-pertinent absence), correspond to Dictionary’s “Intr.”, Chérix’s “absolut”.

⁴⁴ Consider MAY E-/EBOA, where E- cannot be zeroed. (The rection of E- can be zeroed, by replacement by BOA). As a matter of fact, zeroing takes place by definition in this pattern only, not in the complementation construction, where the absence of a modifier does not have a grammatical significance.

⁴⁵ “Let the elder be informed about them”. So too (Α 2 310) TCAVE-NETNDO E200YT. In (IV 198.20) AYTCABO1 EPOU “I was informed about him”, the role of slots (1) (“direct object”) and (2) is reversed; the essential point here is the existence of two governed slots, one of which is E- marked. (See also Polotsky 1933:418 n. 1 [not in CP], on TAMOY E-).
(3) **IC-ANALYTIC DECISIONS** are essential in certain cases: (a) Denominal derived "compound verbs"⁴⁸: ‘P-2AA MMOC’ may be analyzed as bivalent (P-2AA | MMOC) or trivalent (P-2AA MMOC). (b) Occasionally one hesitates between assigning two successive modifiers to a single or two separate slots: EI E2PAI E- (expanded modifier, see §1.1.2.4) or EI E2PAI E-. We do not have any means of resolving this dilemma, except that of semasiological evaluation (which would not help us out anyway in case (a), and is inconclusive and arbitrary even in case (b)). (c) In instances of (β+...), IC-analysis is often enlightening (see exx. above).

(4) The manifold **TEXT-COHESIVE function of modifiers does not directly concern us here, as the segment under examination is ‘VS + modifier’ alone; nevertheless, the compatibility of both grammatical (i.e. conjunctional) and lexical elements of the verb syntagm with their modifiers must be investigated. This is hardly feasible in a study such as the present one, which aims at a syntactic schematization of the modifier system (see below, §§1.3). It must be undertaken as part of a monographic, systematic treatment of verbal syntax and semantics for individual conjunctional environments and semasiological syntagmatics. Other **desiderata** are the investigation of modifier occurrence, collocations and of modifier

⁴⁸ With syntagmatic (sequential) and structural (analytic) orders conflicting. As a general rule (with some well-known exceptions, see POLOTSKY 1961) the further away a modifier is from the verb lexeme, the less grammatically involved it is with it; this does not apply, though, to positions (1)-(2) of the matrix.

⁴⁷ At least one possible description of the adnexus ‘noun + circumstantial’ complex expanding a verb would involve distinguishing between a bivalent lexeme (GIME/2E E- + direct object) and its trivalent homonym GNTN/2E EPOH E-, NAY EPOH E-, ZAPEQ EPOH E-, etc. I have found (SHISHA-HALEVY 1972:77-82) this homonymy also for ΧΙ, Τ, ΤΨΥ, ΧΙΤΟ, ΤΑΡΩ and other verbs.

⁴⁹ A striking case of lexemes both rectally and complementationally expandable is that of (and ΧΙ): + γ | E2YN/ E2PAI/OYBE-/MNCA/-E- | ΧΙ γ | E-/ΕΧΠ... also ΜΙΜ | E2YN/E(EPM)-/MNCA–.

⁵⁰ See §3.1.2.2.2 for a discussion and an extensive listing of these syntagms.
mobility in the utterance (this last is here selectively attempted). Specific pronoun-including modifiers are exponents of a cohesion scheme: the *augens*, discussed in Ch. 6: *(A I 122) EPECOOYN TUN H EPEIME TUN H EINAEIME TUN ANOK.* So (less regularly) are anaphoric elements included in the expansions: *(IV 128.11f.) PNOBE ENANMEVE EYAAATC EBOA MMON ETVNNYC, ETVNNYC resuming P(ONBE), YAAATC resuming PEN(CON) in the preceding context / (P 130' 88 ro) N+COOYN MMOK AN XE-NNTK-NIM / *(ibid. 89 vo) MIPRTNEKSCIMA GE KINNE XEKAAS NNEUTAKOK / (III 130.7f.) PAI ETMMAY AUY NEIKOOG NNOYTE MNNKNE ETVNTHNE MNAI MNNAI ETMMAY.* (In a future general study of Coptic text-grammar, and specifically text cohesion ["texture "], this issue of phoric expansions must take a foremost place [see §§3.1.1.1.0.1, 5.1.1.1 and 6.0.2.2(8) for some special anaphoric features].) Otherwise, the modifier stands in unmarked (or morphematically marked) cohesion with its nucleus 81.

(5) Specifically ADVERBAL VERB-FORMS (though not, except for the conjunctive, Ch. 7, discussed here) must be considered members of the modifier paradigm: the conjunctive and other Clause Conjugation forms, the adverbial circumstantial forms 82, vested 83 (2WE-, 2OTAN-, XIN- etc. + E-) and unvested (E-), conditional forms and constructions, the coevective (2WITNE-), postevective (MNNCATNE-), and precursive (MNEPTE-) 84, the last being post-adjunctively in marked placement; various conjunctival constructions (including XE-). Although certainly modifiers and syntactically akin to the mixed bag of items specified in the inventory below, they form a class apart in respect of word order, not being accommodated by the ‘θ/(1)-(2)’ matrix. They are mostly non-rectional (the circumstantial and conjunctive — Ch. 7 — are adnaxal).

(B) CONSTITUENCY. The following is an open-ended inventory, a checklist rather than a true paradigmatic presentation. It is a paradigm in the sense that these modifiers do occur in adverbial postadjectival status and in the compatibilities and order indicated. A few words are called for concerning the exhaustiveness and validity of claims made here. Since we deal here with lexemes (or rather elements in the no man’s land common to grammar and lexicon), the lists and combination possibilities cannot be taken as closed (especially as the corpus may yet be extended, and "productivity" in a dead language must be a matter of inference rather than assumption). References are representative (I have no statistics on frequency. More references are given for the rarer items).

(1) prepositions

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{E-} (\textbf{EPO})
    \begin{itemize}
      \item "to, for, concerning etc.", \textit{III} 184.13, \textit{Ch.} 127.24, \textit{Mun.} 104.
    \end{itemize}
  \item \textbf{EPAT}\textit{-}
    \begin{itemize}
      \item "to (chez)", \textit{Ch.} 155.46f. (\textit{Dictionary} 303).
    \end{itemize}
  \item \textbf{EPN}- (\textbf{EPN}), \textbf{EPO-}
    \begin{itemize}
      \item "to, on (the mouth of...)"
    \end{itemize}
  \item \textbf{ETN}- (\textbf{EOTO})
    \begin{itemize}
      \item "to (hand of...)" \textit{III} 214.1, \textit{A I} 113, \textit{A} 2 26 (\textit{Dict.} 427b).
    \end{itemize}
  \item \textbf{EESN-}
    \begin{itemize}
      \item "προς ", \textit{Wess.} 18 143a 25ff. \textit{Dict.} 685a (also in Besa; cf. (\textbf{E})\textit{EAN-}, spec. obs. 3).
    \end{itemize}
  \item \textbf{EPH}- (\textbf{EPH})
    \begin{itemize}
      \item "towards (the face of...)", rare, usually with EYOUN A I 465 (\textit{Dict.} 649).
    \end{itemize}
  \item \textbf{EXO-} (\textbf{EXO})
    \begin{itemize}
      \item "on, upon, over, against ", \textit{III} 40.8, \textit{Ch.} 198.34f. (\textit{Dict.} 757-8).
    \end{itemize}
  \item \textbf{AAXN-}, \textbf{AXO-} (\textbf{AXO}), \textbf{EXO-}
    \begin{itemize}
      \item "without ", \textit{III} 42.5, \textit{IV} 113.16, \textit{A} 2 519 (\textit{Dict.} 25-6).
    \end{itemize}
  \item \textbf{ETBC-} (\textbf{ETBNN})
    \begin{itemize}
      \item "about, because of..., for the sake of...", \textit{Miss.} 279, \textit{III} 108.19f.
    \end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

81 Compare the cohesive zeroing of the non-rectional modifier in a ‘KW EBOA → KW ’ context pattern (see §§3.1.1.1.0.1 for exx.);
82 Shisha-Halev 1972, first chapter.
83 Ibid., Introduction, Chapter 3.
84 Ibid. §§1.4.1-3.
§1.1.2.1

(2) prepositions (of Greek origin and/or with no presuffixal allomorph); modifiers

**ANTI**
§1.3.11.5

**ΔΥΨ**
§1.3.10

**ΕΝΕΤ**
§1.3.6

**ΕΤΙ**
§1.3.11.6

**ΕΙΣ**
"for" (temporally), III 89.10, 218-9, IV 172.6, P 1305 79 A: "...ΕΙΣΩΤΕΡΟΝ ΕΞΕΙΝ ΝΠΟΨΙΜΕ ΤΗΝ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΝ (Dict. 85b).

**ΚΑΝ**
§1.3.11.6

**ΧΩΡΙΣ**
§1.3.11.5

**ΚΑΤΑ(ΡΟΕ)ΕΙ**
§1.3.11.5

**ΜΕΧΡΙ**
§1.3.11

**ΝΟΥΣ**
"without ", IV 91.20 (Dict. 502a).

**ΝΑΙ**
§1.3.5.1

**ΝΑΙΝ**
§1.3.11.3

**ΠΑΡΑ(ΡΟΕ)ΕΙ**
§1.3.11.5

**ΠΡΟΣ**
§1.3.11.5

**ΤΑΧΥ**
§1.3.11.4

**ΤΕΝΟΥ**
§1.3.4

**ΤΩΝ**
"where/whence?", see Ch. 2, esp. §2.2 (e.g. A 1 33).
TWINOY, etc. §1.3.9

ΨΑΘΤός- "except", P 130; 1 133 ΤΚΘ (Dict. 593).

ΣΟΤΑΝ §1.3.11.6

(2)ΟΤΙ ΔΕ ΧΕ- A 2 338.

ΣΩΚ §1.3.11.5

ΣΩΚΟΝ, ΕΝΣΩΚΟΝ §1.3.11.6

ΧΕ- conjunctional, explicative, gerundial ("saying") etc., III 81.24ff., Wess. 9 126b 3ff., Ch. 116.18ff., 143.34ff.

ΧΙΝ- "since", III 218.9, IV 39.27f. (Dict. 772-3).

noun + noun §1.3.3

(reiterated noun)

Ø-noun §1.3.2

(3) expandable modifiers (cf. §1.1.2.4)

ΕΒΟΛ "out", IV 98.4 (Dict. 34).

ΕΝΑΣΟΥ "back", A 1 24 (Dict. 284b).

ΕΠΕΣΗΤ "down" Ryl. 70 ΚΝΒ (Dict. 60a).

ΕΘ "to the front, forwards", Mun. 91 (Dict. 641a).

ΕΖΟΥΝ "in(side)", III 115.21 (Dict. 685-7).

ΕΖΠΑΙ1 "up", A 2 113, 234 (ΜΟΥΣ "fill") (Dict. 698-9, spec. obs. 2).

ΕΖΠΑΙ2 "down", IV 59.3, A 1 404 (the setting sun) (Dict. 700, spec. obs. 2).
(C) Special Observations: (1) N- / Mmo- (see §§1.0.1, 1.1.1, 1.3.1 and passim). I consider the question of material identity subordinate to that of structural (i.e. functional) identity, which is determined by the slot occupied in the valency matrix and by commutability. Occasional analytic perplexities may arise (gen. obs. 3): P-πμεεγευε- N- or P-πμεεγευε- N- (adnominal N-; P-πμεεγευε corroborates the second alternative.)

(2) ε2paw in a well-known syncretism; a phonological merger has caused two distinct Egyptian "prepositional adverbs" ἀς ("up", r-hry and "down", r-hry) to merge in Sahidic Coptic into a single
entity "up or down", "inclinably, slopingly". This at least is the
communis opinio. It remains
to be seen whether the "up/down" distinctive feature — the functional burden — is situated in the verbal
nucleus (or perhaps its context), or whether this opposition is neutralized, for any given combination of
lexeme + EΣPAI + preposition", in favour of one or the other sense: ΚΩ ΕΣΠΑΙ meaning "lay down",
ΕΙ ΕΣΠΑΙ εί "descend" only, ΑΑΕ ΕΣΠΑΙ (III 99.1, [ΤΑΑΟ] IV 156.3) "ascend, go up", and so on:
consider (III 107.1, 111.2, Miss. 283) ΕΙ ΕΣΠΑΙ εί "fall down into", (A 2 192) ΕΙ ΕΣΠΑΙ ΕΝ- "sprout up
from", (A 1 97) -ΤΑΑΕ ΕΣΠΑΙ ΕΝΕΟΥΜΥ ΜΠΟΝΗΡΟΝ "deliver (down to)", (IV 24.16) ΕΝ-ΕΣΠΑΙ ΕΝ-
"trample, tread down", (ibid. 13f.) -ΝΟΟΥΕ ΕΣΠΑΙ ΕΝΕΚΩΤ "down to", (Ch. 60) (of the sun) ΕΙ/ΝΗΕ ΕΣ-
ΠΑΙ "rise", ΕΒΙΚ/ΜΑΕ ΕΣΠΑΙ "set", and so on. It may well be that one of the two senses — ΕΣΠΑΙ "down"?
— is unmarked environmentally, while the other is so marked; this must be settled by corpus-based
investigation. May cases of "doubt" (Dictionary 698b) really be cases of indifference? Consider (III
210.18) ΠΕΚΘΝΕ ΕΣΠΑΙ ΖΑΠΙΑΡΟΣ, (IV 64.6) ΜΟΚΕ ΕΣΠΑΙ ΕΝ-, (ibid. 55.20f.) OΥΘΒΕ ΕΣΠΑΙ εί etc., where
the direction is immaterial.

(3) (ΕΣΟΥΝ) ΕΝ- "into", pron. ΕΣΟΥΝ ΕΣΠΑΙ- (Dictionary 684b, POLOTSKY 1939:113 = CP 377, LAY-
TON 1981:244f.): (A 1 202) ΝΕΞΕΙ ΕΣΟΥΝ ΣΜΠΕΝΣΟ/ (P 1311 139 TMS) ΤΑΑΕ ΕΣΟΥΝ ΣΜΠΕΝΣΟ/ΕΣΟΥΝ ΕΣΠΑΙ; also
ΧΙ-ΙΑΤΚ ΕΣΠΑΙ ΕΝ- (Z 247 PIB), ΕΒΙΚ ΕΒΙΚ/ΕΝ- (P 1306 24 ΦΝΕ; of viper's venom: "into body"), ΥΑΥΑΛΗ
ΜΠΑΙΚΑΙΟΝ ΣΜΠΕΝΣΟΝΕ ΑΥΗ ΠΤΒΒΟ ΣΜΠΕΝΣΟ (P 1304 104 ΡΚΡ). ΕΒΙΚ ΕΣΟΥΝ ΝΗΣΗΤ (P 1305 16 ΒΟ) seems
to indicate a complete merging of this compound preposition with ΕΝ-/ΝΗΣΗΤ "in" (Akhm. ΕΝ- vs.
ΟΕΝ-). ΕΝ- (e.g. in Besa ed. Kuhn 79 ΝΕΤΝΗΥ ΕΣΟΥΝΕΥΣΗΤ, also common in "Middle Egyptian" Coptic)
is ε + the same.

1.1.2.2 PREMODIFIERS. ADCLAUSAL (ADPATTERN) MODIFIERS

(A) GENERAL OBSERVATIONS: (1) Above (§1.1.2.0.1) the point was made that the modifier preced-
ing the predicative pattern or opening the clause is not adjunctual, but presents or predetermines the cir-
cumstances or attitude in/under which the predication is to be understood as valid. It thus realizes
an option for a specific staging or structuring of the information given in the clause, related to the option
of topic-comment arrangement. Postadjunctive modification has a broader potential of paradigmatic/
syntagmatic extent (embodied as it does the valency matrix, rection and complementation) than pre-
modification. Particularly significant is the absence in the case of pre- or adclausal modification of the
opposition between rection and complementation, so crucial in postadjunctive modification. Paradigm-
atically speaking, the premodifier (insofar as it is opposed to a corresponding postadjunctive homonym) realizes a marked option in a binary category of placement. Syntagmatically, it is different in that
it is free of matricial structuring. There seems to be a restriction on the number of premodifiers to any
single clause, these being much fewer than the number of possible postadjunctive modifiers, and usually
not exceeding three or four premodifiers to a clause.

(2) Premodifiers relate to the content of the entire clause. The degree of their integration with it
may vary, it also is related to their macro-syntactic standing. It is difficult to estimate this degree (in
all probability, on a gradient scale). Prosodically, premodifiers are more autonomous syntactically

55 See §3.3 for the lexeme/stative modifiers.
56 See §7.3.1 for #modifier + conjunctive# syntagms; §§1.3.11 passim for the premodifier-κε-clause integration type. It
is interesting to note that the variant -Θ of -ΤΕ Greek-origin modifiers is much more prevalent in postadjunctive position, which is
apparently sufficiently characterizing, than in premodifier status. Note too the Nitrian Bohairic distinction of # ΚΑΑΒΗΓ- vs. -ΝΚΑ-
ΑΒΗΓ#. For Ν- with Greek-origin modifiers, see CRUM 1926, 1 251ff. (n. 8), KAHL 1954:104.
than postadjuncts, since they usually constitute independent cola and may be disjoined by enclitics from the body of the clause 68.

3) Criteria for identifying adclausal elements proposed for a modern language 69, such as their eligibility as foci of negation, of interrogation, of information, are only in part applicable to Coptic, a dead language. The focalizability test, for instance, shows that there is a subdivision of unfocalizable premodifiers, but most share a potential focal status with the postadjuncts (see §§2.4-6). Indeed, I find more essential the distinction between the non-focal — in relation to the rest of the clause, topical — proposed modifier on the one hand and the focalized one on the other.

4) Here too, one must consider verb forms sharing in the modifier paradigm: the circumstantial (e.g. Ch. 110.26ff., IV 187.6ff.), coevetive (ṃṇṭpeχ-, e.g. III 58.21ff., IV 128.4ff.), posteventive (mmncātpeχ-, e.g. III 133.24 ff.), prescriptive (nteqeχ-, in unmarked placement; e.g. III 24.7f., IV 206.1ff.) 70, conditional forms and syntags ((zotan/kan) ένωμ, ένωμε, ένομε, ένομε, ένομε). The augential modifiers (Chapter 6) are absent in this paradigm.

B) CONSTITUENCY: Only the most common premodifiers are here presented (premodification being an open option, exhaustivity is precluded in this case, in which more and more members are added as one comes across them). Those premodifiers for which placement opposition is rare or absent are marked with an asterisk.

N-

Nhre §1.3.1.2, NGE N- III 112.16, NsyoN III 55.15, NsyoN MnIV IV 99.16, NsyoN Tēza 683.

 politely

IIII III 73.10ff., 院副院长 (§1.3.5.2).

IV

Wess. 9 141a 25ff., 副院长- A 2 334.

without A 2 245ff., Wess. 18 97b 9ff.

IIII 113.12.

*En2aE §1.3.7, ΕΠΝΗ A- Young passim, Ęp2aE ε- III 88.8, ΕΠΝΗ XHI §1.3.7.3.

XIN-

XINEXYTE P 1304 139 ὅ, XINMEQ §1.3.6.

2P2E 2N-

III 73.9ff., IV 99.16.

ΕB2A 2N-

P 1304 129 ME, IV 36.21.

EIC-

Ch. 173.56ff.

mmnc-

P 1304 111 DME.

nn2p2n-

P 1303 37 ὅ nn2p2hntn ἡθτ...

Name §1.3.5.1

TENY §1.3.4

*AYH §1.3.10

0-noun §1.3.2; esp. Con in 2A2 NCON, Con — Con —, etc.


68 See Ch. 6, esp. §6.0.3. This is also borne out by punctuation (e.g. Ch. 53.13, 56.28, 163.12; 21.2, 36.22, 113.50; 115.38; 120.10; 141.21 etc.). Compare too Shisha-HalevY 1975:483 b.4, c.3.4.


70 For extensive documentation and a discussion, see Shisha-HalevY 1972 §§1.1.1, 1.4.1.1.2, 1.4.1.2.2, 1.4.2.1.
(C) **Special Observations:** (1) ΣΤ: ‘2N-ΟΥ + infinitive’, only in Shenoute’s infrequent (Biblicizing) use of the so-called tautological infinitive, the syntagm used in certain languages to focalize (by topicalizing + focalizing) a verb lexeme; see Goldenberg 1971 (a penetrating and detailed, language-specific as well as typological-comparative study of these constructions). I consider the Coptic construction borrowed; for the authentic, stylistically neutral Coptic means of verb focalization (the autofocal Second Tense) see §2.1. Some exx. for the Shenoutean tautological infinitive: (P 130 42 PH) ΜΗ 2ΝΟΥΡΑΨΕ ΝΟΕ- ΝΑΡΑΨΕ 2ΑΝ / (P 130 110 ΝΝΒ) 2ΝΟΥΡΠΙΟ ΜΑΡΝΠΙΟ ΝΝΕΝΕΡΗ / (A 2 49) ΙΕΝΔΑΚΕ ΝΗΜΝ ΣΣΜΑΡΕΨ ΝΙΜ ΣΣΜΑΡΕΨ ΕΠΕΝΖΗΤ / (Ibid. 380) ε2ΝΟΥΕΙ ΚΝΗΥ. Also III 183.4, 188.6, IV 121.4f. (and cf. — post-adjunctively — A 1 274, Wess. 9 90b 1ff., 156c 7ff.). Outside certain stereotyped expressions, 2ΠΑΙ 2Ν- seems to be the premodifier alternant of 2Ν-

(2) Premodifiers of Greek origin are here statistically more weighty than in the post-adjunctive constituency — many are exclusively premodifiers, with no placement opposition. It would seem that Greek supplies here real conjuncts and disjuncts (in the terminology of Greenbaum 1969), in which the Egyptian stock of Coptic is very meagre. (The similarity to the particle situation is striking, if indeed particles too are not to be taken as premodifiers.)

### 1.1.2.3 MODIFIERS IN A NOMINAL SENTENCE

(A) **General Observation:** Since here too one encounters a placement distinction, the question must be asked whether the same functional differentiation in evidence with verbal predication patterns which have their own specific, relatively rigid prosodic structure (cf. §6.0.3.3; 6 note 36). This structure must be considered a possible factor motivating the placement of modifiers. Initially, we note here three placements:

(a) **post-predicate** (adjectival, adleomic?): 2ΓΕΝΑΤΝΟΥΕ ΦΑΝΕΡΟΝ ΝΕ (A 2 485);
(b) **pattern-final** (adclausal?): ΟΥ ΠΕ ΤΡΗΝΗ ΝΣΕΡΝΨΗΕ ΝΝΑΖΜΨΝΟΥΤΕ (III 75.10);
(c) **prepattern** (adclausal?) — premodifier: ΝΑΜΕ ΝΗΜΙ ΠΕ ΤΕΚΚΑΝΙΑ (A 2 332).

These possibilities, observable for example in the bimembral ≠ predicate-[ΠΕ] ≠ pattern 64, must yet be empirically evaluated by reference to syntactic and prosodic motivating factors (for instance, extensive adleomic modification is usually pattern-final; contrast (Wess. 9 117a 10 ff.) ΟΥ ΕΠΟΝ ΝΕ or (Ench. 87a) 2ΓΕΝΕΒΟΑ ΝΖΗΤΝ ΑΝ ΝΕ with (Leyd. 347) 2ΓΕΝΕΒΟΑ ΝΕ 2ΜΠΕΧΜΑ ΠΕ ΤΟΥΑΑΒ. This leaves us, at least in theory, with the simplified binary opposition of post-predicate + pattern-final vs. prepattern. See also §6.0.3.4 for the polar placement conditioning of certain modifiers; some (ΝΑ-, ΝΑΜΕ, augenlia) occur only as colon-second, i.e. in post-predicate placement. In one pattern, post-predicate and pattern-final placements coalesce: (IV 102.16) ...ΕΑΝΟΝ-ΖΕΝΠΜΣΕ ΕΒΟΑ ΣΝΜΝΤΣΝΩΑΛ ΝΟΥΑΗ / (Leyd. 348) ΑΝΟΝ-ΟΥΡΙΚΙΜΑ ΝΟΥΘ ΣΜΠΕΞ. More precisely, we note six different cases:

1. ≠ predicate + [ΠΕ] (nominal subject) ≠ 64: "non-extensive" modification: (a), (b), (c)
   - "extensive" modification: (b), (c)

64 Callender (1970:98-110) discusses, with ample illustration, the subcategorization and semasiological compatibility of "adverbials" with Nominal-Sentence patterns. He does not enter placement issues (see also ibid. 134-143 and Callender 1973b:196).

63 The modifier following the pronominal subject or the apposite lexical (or demonstrative) one. I do not include here cases of the modification of a verb syntagm in position (a): (IV 21.16f.) ΟΥΙΜΕ ΨΩΜΗ ΕΒΟΑ ΠΕ.

(2) **pronominal subject → nom. predicate** #  

(3) **subject + πε + nom. predicate** # (see spec. obs. below): (a) (pattern-second, here post-subject), (b), (c)  

(4) **Focal modifiers, marked or unmarked as such in their construction**: *(Wess. 9 142d 22ff.) σεν- 

(5) **Basically different is the nominal-focus Cleft Sentence, where a premodifier may precede the verbal 

glose (theme) constituent: *(III 55.15ff.) ΝΤΟΥ ΝΔΟΥΡΗ 

(6) **A distinct Wechselsatz Nominal Sentence pattern** ("balanced construction"), where the two (pro- 

nominal terms — lexically identical or related — are symmetrically reversible and (as regards thematic 
structure) of equal rank, i.e. subject/predicate alternatingly. On this pattern, more syntactic and 

prosodic information is still needed (see Ch. 6, n. 37 below). Consider *(A 2 2) ΝΕΤΜΕΛΟΣ ΝΕ ΜΕΤ- 

ΜΕΛΟΣ ΕΚΜΕΡΟΥΣ / (Ch. 59.31ff.) ΝΤΟΥ ΠΕ ΝΤΟΥ ΜΠΑΣ, cf. (Miss. 281) ΝΕ 

ΜΠΕΝΚΟΤΚ ΕΝΑΛΣΤ ΕΞΜΠΕΖΟ ΕΝΚΛΑ-ΠΑΤ ΕΝ αόω ΜΜΟΣ ΧΕ-ΕΝΑΛΑ ΤΕ ΝΕ 

ΜΠΕΝΚΟΤΚ...  

(B) **CONSTITUENCIES**: the most common or notable modifiers are here included, all of category (1) 

above. An asterisk marks those modifiers for which placement opposition is neutralized or reduced.

**Position (a):**

*ΝΑ-  

(IV 102) ΟΥΤΙΝΕ ΝΑΙ ΝΕ.  

*ΜΜΟ-  

(IV 117.19ff.) ΤΕΙΣΕ ΜΜΟΥ ΤΕ; cf. the difficult common formula in the Bruce Codex 'ΠΕΙΡΑΝ ΜΜΟΥ ΝΕ'.  

*Ν-  

(A 2 21-2) ΝΤΟΥ ΝΔΑΝ ΠΕ ΑΥΣ ΝΤΟΥ ΝΔΟΥΡΗ ΠΕ ΑΥΣ ΝΤΟΥ ΤΟΝ ΜΜΗΝ ΝΕ; compare 

with Ch. 63-4, which finishes with ΝΤΟΥ ΠΕ ΝΟΥΟΙΞ ΝΙΜ, i.e. pos. (b).  

*ΕΡΟ-  

(Wess. 9 117a 10ff., 147d 28ff.) ΟΥ ΕΡΟ- ΠΕ / (A 2 464) ΤΑΝΑΓΚΗ ΕΡΟΙ ΤΕ 

*ΝΝΑΣΡΑ-  

(III 203.8) ΣΕΝΒΟΤΕ ΝΝΑΣΡΕ ΝΕ / (P 130 141 νο) ΟΥΠΟΝΗΡΟΝ ΝΝΑΣΡΑΧ ΝΕ 

(sim. ΣΕΝΠΟΝΗΡΟΝ Α 2 512).  

ΝΖΟΥΟ  

(§1.3.1.3) (III 19.2) ΟΥΡΑΦΟΝ ΝΖΟΥΟ ΝΕ.  

ΝΑΜΕ, ΑΛΗΘΙΣ  

(§1.3.5.1, 1.3.11.1.2) (RE 11 16a 17) ΣΕΝΕΒΙΝΗ ΝΑΜΕ ΝΕ / (Wess. 9 144c 4ff.) 

ΝΤΟΥ ΝΑΜΕ ΝΕ / (A 2 402) ΟΥΖΟΤΕ ΓΑΡ ΑΛΗΘΙΣ ΠΕ / (Ryl. 67 ΤΗΣ) ΟΥΚΑΚΟ- 

ΔΑΙΜΩΝ ΑΛΗΘΙΣ ΠΕ ΠΡΩΜΕ.  

ΦΑΝΕΡΟΝ  

(A 2 485) ΣΕΝΔΑΤΟΥΣΤΕ ΦΑΝΕΡΟΝ ΝΕ.  

ΚΑΤΑ-  

(Ryl. 67 ΤΗΣ) ΟΥΡΨΘΟΕ ΜΕΝ ΚΑΤΑΣΙΚΗΝ ΝΜΠΟΥΤΕ ΠΕ ΠΡΩΜΕ.  

ΤΕΝΟΥ  

(§1.3.4) (IV 20.10) ΟΥ ΤΕΝΟΥ ΤΕ ΤΕΧΡΕΙΑ...  

**Position (b):**

N-  

(Ch. 64.1ff.) ΝΤΟΥ ΠΕ ΝΟΥΟΙΞ ΝΙΜ.  

* N- "for"  

(IV 92.22ff.) ΣΕΝΠΟΝΗΡΟΝ ΝΕ ΝΝΕΤΝΑΛΑΜΕΛΕΙ.  

ΖΝ-  

(III 222.8) ΣΕΝΨΙΜΑΟ ΝΕ ΝΜΠΟΥΤΕ / (P 130 58 ΙΔ) ΣΕΝΑΤΝΟΒΕ ΝΕ ΑΥΣ 

ΣΕΝΨΙΜΑΟ ΤΟΣ ΠΕ ΓΕ ΝΝΕΥΞΘΤΗΣ ΤΗΡΟΥ.  

* ΖΙΧΝ-  

(III 190.18) ΟΥΣΩΝΕΝ ΠΕ ΖΙΧΝΤΑΠΕ ΜΠΡΩΜΕ ΝΑΙΚΑΙΟΣ.
Position (c):

* Άνωθ

*(§1.3.10)

*Πάνω

*(§1.3.11.1.6, e.g. III 40.9f.).

*Πάνωτ

*(§1.3.11.1.5, e.g. Ch. 59.31ff.).

*Βομβίκ

*(§1.2.11.1.4, e.g. Ch. 80.15ff.).

*Βομβίκιμεν

*(§1.3.11.1.4, e.g. A 2 464).

*Μοιχία, Μαλακτ

*(§1.3.11.2.1.4, e.g. A 2 510-511).

*Ακρ

*(§1.3.11.6, e.g. III 89.6).

*Ετέρον

*(§1.3.4, e.g. III 77.4).

*Τηνού Γε-

*(§1.3.5, 1.3.11.2) (A 2 332) ΝΑΜΕ ΠΕΣΗ ΠΕ ΤΕΚΧΑΝΙΑ / (ibid. 371) ΠΕΚ-


NAME, ΑΛΛΗΘ

*(§§1.3.5.1, 1.3.11.2) (A 2 332) ΝΑΜΕ ΠΕΣΗ ΠΕ ΤΕΚΧΑΝΙΑ / (ibid. 371) ΠΕΚ-


NAME, ΑΛΛΗΘ

*(§§1.3.5.1, 1.3.11.2) (A 2 332) ΝΑΜΕ ΠΕΣΗ ΠΕ ΤΕΚΧΑΝΙΑ / (ibid. 371) ΠΕΚ-

(C) Special Observations: (1) Appraising the data by reference to opposition/function/modifier, we arrive at the following statements:

Position (a) neutralizes adnominal and adclausal modification

Position (b) is adclausal. Insofar as it is pertinent, it is relatively rare.

Position (c) is the placement of a premodifier.

(2) The “trimembral” pattern ≠ subject + copula (ΝΕ) + nom. predicate ≠ is prosodically different from the bimembral ≠ predicate + [ΝΕ] + (lex. subject) ≠: Ch. 6 footn. 37. The modifier-placement situation is quite different in this case, and in the post-subject position we find a paradigmatically and syntactically more extensive constituency: (A 2 76) πυμ ΝΕΤΥΟΥΝ ΝΕΔΡΟΗΜΕ ΕΥΑΡΧΕΙ ΜΝΗΜΕΟΥ-

ΑΡΧΕΙ ΜΝΗΜΟΥ ΠΕ ΧΡΟΟ ΧΕ- / (ibid. 364) ΑΡΑ ΠΟΥΝΟΥ ΝΟΥΜΙΡΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΝΓΛΩΝΤΡΜΜΑΙ ΕΝΤΑΠΕΧΕΙΤ ΤΑΑΣ ΝΑΚ ΠΕ ΟΥΜΟΥ / (IV 51.6f.) ΠΑΤ ΝΤΥΟΥΝ ΝΕΤΥΟΥΝ ΕΡ-ΣΩΒ ΕΡΟΥ ΠΕ ΠΑΚΟΥΣ. Rarely, one finds similarly

* On the functional yield of the placement of circumstantial forms adnominal to a predicate in the bimembral pattern (placement that may be prosodically conditioned or neutralized), see Shisha-Halevy 1972:100-105 (§2.1.2.3) and 1976a:34.
“loose” junctural conditions even in the bimembral pattern, in circumstances as yet obscure: (A 2 304) ἕνεργείας ὑπό τοῦ ἐμπληθοῦς-τός τε ἡ ὅμοιος ὑποβάθρου. However, this may be an instance of the distinct “Wechselsatz” pattern, the junctural contour of which is similar to that of the trimembral Nominal Sentence, see (a) (6) above.

(3) The placement of ἑλλαζόντων (also of ζιγκ-, and other prep. phrases?) may also be regulated by prosodic weight: presuppositionally, these occur in pos. (a); prenominally — esp. before a further expanded noun — in pos. (b). We need more exx. to establish this mechanism beyond doubt.

(4) ἔτοι τοίς in position (b) (§1.3.4) may represent the intercolary, conditioned placement of this modifier/particle (ταί-τε-θέ “thus” being taken as a single colon).

1.1.2.4.1 MODIFIERS AS NUCLEI: MODIFIERS MODIFIED. Prominent here are the three cardinal directional-motional modifier syntags (ε)ἐφο, (ε)ζούν, (ε)παί, which are expansible by an impressive list of prepositions (see the inventory and spec. observations in §1.1.2.1), thereby constituting the intricate, subtle system of spatial-relational orientation so typical of Coptic. These systematized complexes apart, I have noted the following modifiers expanding others:

NΣΩΤΩ “rather, even (more)”: (III 222.4) ΚΑΛΛΟΤΟ ΝΣΩΤΩ / premodifying in (III 126.23f.) ΣΝΕΟΥΟΕΙΝ ΝΣΕΓΟΥ, ΝΣΩΤΩ ΔΕ ΣΝΕΟΥΟΕΙΝ ΝΣΑΔ / (A 11) ΝΣΩΤΩ ΝΙΜ, ΝΣΩΤΩ ΔΕ ΣΝΝΑΜΒΑΤΩΝ / (ibid. 39) ΕΒΟΛΑ ΣΙΣΥΦΕ... ΝΣΩΤΩ ΔΕ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΣΙΣΥΦΕ.

ΜΑΤΩ “only”: (IV 24.6f.) ΣΜΠΕΥΑΚΛ ΜΑΤΩ ΑΥΣΛ ΣΜΠΕΥΣΗΤ ΑΝ.
ΕΜΑΤΩ “very”: (P 1304 139 ro) ΚΑΛΛΟΤΟ ΕΜΑΤΩ.
ΜΑΛΑΛΩΝ, ΜΑΛΙΚΤΑ “especially”: (III 77.19) ΣΜΠΕΥΟΥ... ΜΑΛΑΛΟΝ ΔΕ ΣΜΠΕΥΣΗ / (IV 78.7f.) ΝΣΑΔ ΝΙΝ ΜΑΛΙΚΤΑ ΜΠΝΑΓ ΣΙΣΥΦΕ.
ΣΠΑΝΩ “simply”: (A 1 204, IV 196.3, Ch. 162.4f. etc.).

Add also the following cases, in my opinion of modification rather than rection: ΧΩΡΙΚ (+ circumstantial) (IV 108.8), ΚΑΝ (+ conditional/circumstantial) (passim, e.g. III 19.28, 22.9, 40.16, 19ff.), ΕΤΙ (+ circumstantial) (III 210.23, IV 191.12). ΣΜΟΙΤΩ (§1.3.11.1.4) and ΟΥ ΜΟΝΟ (§1.3.11.2.1) are likely candidates for the modifier-premodifier role.

1.1.2.4.2 MODIFIERS COORDINATED/DISJOINED. Coordination and disjunction in Coptic, even for the simpler, more obvious word classes, are far from clear and matter-of-fact constructions. The most acute issue here is the exact status of ΑΥΣ (§1.3.10) and Η and their relation to -Θ- and other elements like ΟΥΑΔ and ΕΙΤΕ. ΑΥΣ (ON) and Η (ΝΤΟΥ) are used to coordinate/disjoin modifiers: (III 181.4) ΣΜΠΕΥΟΕΙΝ ΤΕΝΟΥ ΑΥΣ ΟΝ ΣΜΠΕΥΟΕΙΝ ΝΣΑΔ / (P 1308 59 O) ΕΜΟΥ ΑΥΣ ΕΙΜΙΣ / (Ch. 32.19ff.) ΕΒΟΛΑ ΣΠΕΥΕ ΑΥΣ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΣΜΠΕΥΣΗΤΡΑΙ... / (IF 88 apud Dictionary 236b) ΕΒΟΛΑ ΜΟΟΥ Η ΣΙΕΛΟΥ / (III 130.3f.) ΣΝΟΥΜΙΤΤΡΑΝΝΟΣ Η ΝΤΟΥ ΣΝΟΥΜΙΤΤΡΑΝΝΟΣ / (P 1308 63 ΟΖ) ΣΑΣΘΕΝ Η ΣΑΣΘΕΝΘΥΤΝ. So are ΟΥΛΕ and ΕΙΤΕ -ΕΙΤΕ: (A 2 519) ΕΧΩ ("without me") ΟΥΑΔ ΣΑΡΟΚ ΜΑΥΑΑΚ / (III 116.16f.) ΕΙΤΕ ΣΜΠΕΥΟΕΙΝ ΕΖΟΥΝ ΕΙΤΕ ΣΜΠΕΥΣΗΤΑΙΝ / (P 1308

70 Although in a general sense — with reference to the semantics of the interrelationship between ΕΒΟΛΑ ΣΝ- and ΣΝ-, ΕΖΟΥΝ ε- and ε- (etc.) — the nuclear modifier may be taken as “precising” or even “reinforcing” the preposition (so Dictionary, passim; cf. STERN §516, p. 340) — this being a case of the “semasiological nucleus” (see §4.2), the preposition does not coincide with the grammatical nucleus, the modifier. I have no doubt that the modifier here is nuclear, in a syntactic sense. Some prepositions (e.g. ΟΥΕΤΕ, ἐμπ) are rare in Shenoute and are analytically “renewed”, replaced by expanded modifiers (ΕΒΟΛΑ ΟΥΕΤΕ, ΕΖΟΥΝ ἐμπ). In certain references, too, prepositions are replaced by “modifier—preposition” syntags: ΣΝ- “from” (see n. 96) by ΕΒΟΛΑ ΣΝ-, ΣΝ- “from” by ΣΝΑΙ ΣΝ- ε- “against” by ΕΖΟΥΝ ε-, ΣΝ- “into” by ΕΖΟΥΝ ΣΝ-, ΕΣΘ- “onto” by ΕΣΘ- ΕΣΘ- and so on. Needless to say, this system deserves a thorough structural monographic treatment, isolating semasiological ranges as well as grammatical distribution. For the theoretical background, cf. KARCEVSKIJ 1936:110, TESNIÈRE 1965:127ff., JACOBSON 1964:36, PINKSTER 1972:108ff.
62 0ε) ΕΙΤΕ 2ΝΤΕΣΠΕ ΕΙΤΕ 2ΝΘΒΞ ΕΙΤΕ 2ΜΕΝΤΩΜΕΝΕΝΕ. Modifier coordination by means of ΜΝ— is extremely rare in Shenoutean Sahidic: (IV 120.12f.) ΕΞΟΥΝ ΕΩΝΕΝΚΥΝΑΔΙΨΙΝ... ΜΝ—2ΠΑΙ 2ΜΙΝΤΟΝΟΣ ΜΠΗΝΕΙΔΙΤ is a special case, with ΜΝΑ appositive to the modifiers. Iteration of the same modifier may be interpreted as an expressive case of zero-marked coordination, favoured by Shenoutean style: 2ΟΑΣΩ 2ΟΑΣΩ (III 138.23, IV 75.25), ΕΜΑΤΕ ΕΜΑΤΕ (A 2 87, 301), ΜΜΙΝΗ ΜΜΙΝΗ (often ΑΥΘ ΜΜΙΝΗ ΜΜΙΝΗ, III 77.19f., IV 66.15, 69.1f., 205.18, A 1 285, Ench. 85a): this is an "insistence" emphasizing procedure 71, used only with a small subgroup of modifiers. Another idiomatic and typical construction employs the copulative (ΜΝ—) ΜΜΙΝΗ—, mainly to add another preonominal rectum to a usually ‘prep. + pronoun’ prepositional phrase 72: (Ch. 27.24) ΖΑΡΠΟΚ ΜΜΙΝΗ / (III 184.21f., BM 209 ΑΘ) ΕΡΟΙ ΜΜΗΤΝ / (ibid. 211.11) ΜΜΟΟΥ ΜΜΙΝΗ | / (Leyd. 302) ΟΥΤΕΤΝ ΜΜΙΝΗ / (Wess. 9 112a 4f.) ΕΤΒΝΗΤ ΜΜΗ / (Ch. 147.14f.) ΕΝΑΟΕΟΙΚ ΜΜΗΝΑΚ, but also with an additional nominal rectum to a ‘prep. + pronoun’ phrase: (III 191.31) ΜΜΙΝΗ ΜΜΙΝΟΥΤΕ (ΜΝ— in two different identities) / (Wess. 18 97b 9ff.) ΔΕΙΤΚ ΜΝΗΠΚΚΝΑ / (Wess. 9 146a 1 ff., 10ff.) ΠΕΟΟΥ ΝΑΚ ΜΝΗΠΚΚΥΡΕ.

1.2 The predicative modifier

In the following paragraphs, we consider a set of patterns in which the modifier is not adjunctal, but is in a nезal relationship with a pronoun/noun-syntagm constituent. These patterns do not all form a paradigm 73: the two major ones are selected by the predicative modifier, that is to say, are in complementary distribution, constituting together one "arch-pattern" of modifier predication.

1.2.1.1 The bipartite pattern: noun syntagm/prefixed pers. pronoun → modifier 74

(A) General observation: In this pattern we must distinguish two sub-patterns:

(1) subject (theme): [N—] determiner pronoun (+ noun lexeme)/prefixed pers. pronoun/demonstrative pronoun; predicate (rheme): modifier (of the inventory, below), and

(2) subject (theme): [ΟΥ—] or Ω-determinator pronoun (+ noun lexeme)/indefinite pronoun/indeterminable; predicate (discontinuous): (affirm.) ΩΥΝ — modifier, (neg.) ΜΝ — modifier 75. Basic and converted forms of the pattern are considered.

(B) Constituency:

N—

MΜΟΟΥ (A 1 379), ΝΤΠΕ (A 1 245), ΝΞΠΑΙ ΖΜ— (III 201.18), ΝΞΠΑΙ ΝΖΗΤ— (A 1 119), ΝΞΟΥΝ (III 24.19f.), ΜΜΒΟΑ (Ench. 88b), ΜΜΕΗΝΤΟ ΕΒΟΑ (III 27.10), ΜΜΕΗΜΑ (Ch 162.44), ΜΜΕΗΜΖΤ etc. (IV 120.15f.), ΝΤΜΗΤΕ (Ch. 197.39f.), ΜΜΕ(Κ)ΚΨΤΕ (Ch. 30.12f.), ΝΟΘ (A 1 246) etc. (open-ended list).

72 Stern:559. Compare (Ch. 63.6) ΝΟΥΝ ΜΜΙΝΗΑ "ours and his".
73 Cf. Callender 1973b and 1970, Ch. VI. Certain members of his "paradigm" are not considered in the present discussion, namely, the verbal/predicated Ο (N—), ζούει (N—), ζούον (N—). In addition to their being verbal, their selection is differently motivated than the lexically suppletive or complementary members of the set considered here: Callender's "mixed paradigm" is one of a single type — the basic unmarked predication of a modifier (see however in §1.2.1.3.1 below).
75 Polotsky 1969a:§§19ff., 35; Nagel 1980:77ff. I treat both subpatterns conjointly and do not attribute primacy to either. In superscriptions like (III 26.25, IV 22.1) ΕΝΟΥΥ ΝΗΖΑΚΕ ΝΗΖΑΡΝ— we do not have a Bipartite construction at all (the modifier belongs to the 'noun + modifier' predicate group, while the heralded text itself — a ΜΝ-substitute — is the subject). On the other hand, ΕΙΚ + noun syntagm + modifier ΕΙΚ is a deictic presentative alternant (affirmative only) of both Bipartite subpatterns: (IV 91.11) ΕΙΚ-ΤΕΚΑΗΣΙΑ ΓΑΡ ΜΝΗΣΟΙΚ ΖΜΠΚΑΣ ΜΗΜ / (ibid. 161.2f.) ΕΙΚ-ΚΑΕΝ ΝΙΜ ΖΜΠΚΑΣ ΜΗΜ (see Nagel 1980:80ff.).
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III 211.4.

MEO =
(Ch. 148.37ff., 42f., IV 96.24; see spec. obs.).

MMAY
‘there’ (Ch. 11.9f.).

N-NA-
ΠΕΩΟΥ NA- (IV 197.7, RE 10 160b 20 etc.), ΟΥΟΕΙ ΝΑ- (Wess. 9 129a 1, 8f.) (see spec. obs.).

(MN-)/NMMA- (III 101.6f., IV 160.13, Ch. 53.13, 193.53f.).

ΕΠΟ-
(Ch. 98.51f., 102.19, Rossi 2/3 58, IV 43.28, P 130º 32 AB: ΝΧΕΙΡΟΓΡΑΦΟΝ ΕΤΕΡΟΥ, (see spec. obs.).

ΕΣΠΑΙ EXN-/EXW-
very common: ΠΕΥΡΙΜΑ ΕΣΠΑΙ EXWI (Miss. 280), ΠΕΟΟΥ ΝΝΕΙΡΙΜΑ ΕΣΠΑΙ ΕΧΜΠΑΙ (A I 98), ΠΕΥΡΙΣ ΕΣΠΑΙ EXWΟΥ ΧΙΙΧΟΥ ΥΑΡ (P 130º 113 ΡΗ); also P 130º 69 vo, 131º 80 ro (adaptation of Act. 18:6?).

EXN-
(A 2 304, 346; see spec. obs.).

2A-/2ΑΠΟ-
(IV 74.12, Ch. 15.33f., P 131º 20 ΡΝΖ).

2ΑΡΑΤ-
(III 38.10).

2ΑΡΨ-
(Ch. 119.1, P 131º 81 vo).

2Α(2)ΤH-/2Α(2)ΤΗ-
(III 157 passim, Ch. 106.9f., Cat. 42.39).

2Ι-/2ΙΨ-
(IV 74.7f., Wess. 9 138a 29f., III 156.13), ΠΙΘΟΥΝ, ΠΙΒΟΛΑ (III 31.19, 52.20, A I 15),
ΠΙΘΟΝΑΣ, ΠΙΒΟΥΡΠ (III 14.5f.).

2ΙΧΝ-/2ΙΧΨ-
(Ch. 46.35ff., A I 13, K 924).

2Ν-/2ΜΗ-
(IV 86.2, III 14.4, Ch. 90.42ff., P 130º 49 ro).

(ΟΥΤΕ-/ΟΥΤΨ-
(Miss. 234).

ΟΥΒΕ-/ΟΥΒΗ-
(Ch. 70.12, Mun. 102).

(ΝΑΡΨ-/ΝΑΡΗ-
(Ch. 108.49f.).

CΑ-ΝΕΣΗ-
(Cairo 8007. Berl. Sitz. 430).

ΜΝΝΑ-
(BM 253 ΝΖ).

NCΨ-
(IV 24.8).

2ΠΑΙ 2N-
(A 2 175), 2ΠΑΙ 2ΙΧΝ-/2ΙΧΨ- (A I 99, III 189.15), 2ΠΑΙ ΟΥΤΕ-/ΟΥΤΨ- (Ch. 156.12ff.,
163 apud Dictionary 495a), 2ΠΑΙ EXN- (P 130º 37 ΡΝΖ. A I 799), 2ΠΑΙ Ν- (P 130º 126 ΡΚΣ), cf. Ν2ΠΑΙ 2Ν-/2ΜΗ-
(A I 191 etc.).

(C) Special observations: (1) MEO- is used to predicate so-called “inalienable” possession
(Lévy-Bruhl’s term, see ISAČENKO 1954:141ff.), and is selected by a special sub-paradigm of noun lexemes:
ΕΚΙΒΕ (Ch. 148.37ff.), ΤΝΩ (IV 96.24, P 130º 39 ΡΑ), ΑΝΕ (A I 251), ΚΑ ‘beauty’ (K 9320), ΜΙΧ, ΟΥΡΗΤΕ
(Ch. 87.9f. 27ff.), ΝΑΤ (III 143.28), ΒΑΛ (P 131º 80 ro) and of course ΣΟΜ (IV 51.14f.), and possibly many
more. This is a field which must be further investigated also in other contexts, notably that of the
combinatorics of ‘determinator + noun + possessive expansion (Ν-/ΝΤΕ-)’ 76. We may here have a gradient
parameter on a scale of syntactic features converging on a given lexeme (a striking case — valency being
another — of ‘lexemic syntax’).

(2) Predicative Ν-/ΝΕ-
features in a historically interesting, if synchronically problematic pattern 77.
ΟΥΟΕΙ (Ν-) occurs in most conversions (ΕΤΕΘΟΕΙ Ν- Rossi 2/3 37, P 130º 139 vo; ΝΕΟΟΕΙ Ν- IV 94.24,
Wess. 9 142d 9; ΕΟΟΕΙ Ν- [circ.] IV 4.12f.), yet cannot properly speaking be taken as an (indeterminable)

76 Cf. HAVERS 1931:92; STEINTHAL-MISTELI 1893:292, 299. In Coptic, a “be-language” as regards predication of possess-

ition, the opposition ΟΥΝ (ΝΤΕ- : ΜΕ- ) is one of unmarked vs. inalienable possession. On inalienable possession see also

ROSEN, Lingua 8:264-293 (1959).

nour, but rather as part of a composite predicate. \(\text{πεοού} \, \text{ν}-\) is neither convertible nor negatible (moreover, the \(\text{n}-\) determination is here not really pertinent).

(3) \(\text{εποι} -\): predicative only in the sense "to one's debit, one's duty/responsibility" (cf. Dictionary 51), prenominal \(\text{εποι \ ν} -\), not \(\text{εποι}\).

(4) \(\text{εξαι} -\): in three instances where the absence of \(\text{ούν} -\) with an indefinite noun may be due to special modulation of the utterance (idiomatic exclamation, rhetorical question)\(^78\): \((A \ 2 \ 304)\ \text{ΜΗ} \ \text{ούγυντ} \ \text{ΑΝ} \ \text{ΕΒΟΑ} \ \text{ΣΤΙΜΝΟΥΤΕ} \ \text{ΕΠΑΙ} \ \text{ΕΞΑΙΝΟΥΝ} \ \text{ΝΙΜ} ... / (\text{ibid.} \ 346) \ \text{ΜΟΕΙΣΕ} \ \text{ΕΞΑΙΝΟΜΟΕΙΣΕ}, \ \text{but cf.} \ (\text{Cat.} \ 43.29) \ \text{ΖΕΝ}[\text{ΜΟΕΙΣΕ} \ \text{ΕΞΑΙΝΟΜΟΕΙΣΕ}] \ \text{ΝΕ} / (A \ 1 \ 188) \ \text{ΟΥΞΑΠΗ} \ \text{ΕΞΑΙΝΟΥΠΗΙ}, \ \text{ΟΥΞΑΠΙΣΙΣ} \ \text{ΕΞΑΙΝΟΥΠΗΙΣ} ...\)

### 1.2.1.2 # MODIFIER \(\rightarrow \text{νέ} #\)

(A) **General Observations:** (1) The modifier predicated by this pattern — known as a "Nominal Sentence", after the word class more "typically" constituting its predicate — is not unknown, but has never really been treated separately and in detail\(^79\). This predicate position is in fact only one of the positions in which the modifier vies with the noun syntagm: another is in the satellital slot following the determinators (§1.1.1.1)\(^80\). In fact, the Nominal Sentence predicates a *determinator pronoun* followed by its lexeme\(^81\). In our pattern, however, the modifier is invariably non-determined.

(2) The modifier predicate precedes the pronominal subject \(\text{νέ}\). The pattern may be negated, and is (rarely) converted, only in the relative conversion.

(3) **Suppletivity:** A modifier in this pattern does not occur as predicative in the Bipartite (§1.2.1.1). That is to say, it is complementary with the Bipartite, and no opposition obtains between the two predicative patterns (two "allo-syntags" of a single "syntagmeme" predicing a modifier). See §0.2.3.

(4) It may not be going too far to suggest that in the ever accumulating instances of 'present/perfect circumstantial + \(\text{νέ}\)' (see Quecke 1977b:302, Browne 1978a:7 = 53, 1979b:200, to whose exx. add Judith 14:14, and many [Nitrian] Bohairic examples, e.g. in Hyvernat's 1886 *Actes des Martyrs*), the circumstantial is predicated in the very pattern examined here. It is a predication especially on a higher level of analysis — the macro-syntactic level — signalling a "backgrounding" of the evolving action. '\(\text{νευκύριον} \ \text{νέ}\) might accordingly be taken to contain (beside the actor and verb lexeme) two distinct relational signals: \(\text{νέ}\) for the narrative framework characterization, \(-\text{νέ}\) for the macro-syntactic backgrounding (cf. Callender's "situational" subject, 1970:205ff.; also \(\text{νέ}\) as *apodosis marker*, with fut. \(\text{τις} 158.7^\text{f.}, \ P 130^\text{a} 135 \ \text{τάρτ};\) Polotsky 1939:110 = CP 374).

### (B) Constituency:

\(\text{νέ} - \text{nεισε} \ IV \ 84.14, \ \text{see spec. obs.}\)

\(\text{νέ} \ III \ 75.16^\text{f.}, \ \text{see spec. obs.; \text{νέ} \ μενταχειπε} \ \text{νε} \ \text{μενταχειπε} (IV \ 159.11^\text{f}).\)

---

\(^78\) See Nagel 1970:80.

\(^79\) See among Stern's exx. on pp. 300 (Marc. 13:33), 302 (I Cor. 9:18), 305 (Ps. 8:1); Tull §248: Callender 1970:37ff.114f. Sethe 1916:§109 treats our construction together with \# (det. + adv.) \(\text{νέ} \ #\), apparently considering it a case of "article omitted ".

\(^80\) Yet another is the "glose" — or verbal topic — constituent in the focus-initial focalization constructions (§§2.4-6 below). Indeed, I believe that the sharp noun: "adverb" dichotomy which forms the matrix of Polotsky's conception of Egyptian grammatical structure, is considerably blurred in Coptic (cf. also Shisha-Halevy 1978).

\(^81\) The not infrequent instances of \# bare noun (or zero-determinated noun?\) \(\text{νέ} \ #\) merit a special discussion (this is nowhere treated as a distinct case, and is not included in the constituency lists in Callender 1970). We may have here a pattern with apparently limited predicate and subject constituencies, possibly also special environmental properties. Some Shenoutean exx.: (Ch. 183.23) ...\(\text{εράχε} \ \text{νε} \ \text{ναύ} / (A \ 2 \ 34, \ 114) \ ...\text{εραχε} \ \text{νε} \ \text{ναύ} ... / (A \ 1 \ 210) \ \text{ιμπι} \ \text{πε} \ \text{ειού} / (A \ 2 \ 395) \ \text{ορθ} \ \text{κο} \ \text{νε} \ \text{ζούσ} / (Or. 159.34^\text{f.}) ...\text{ενιμιν} \ \text{νε} \ \text{νε} \ ...\text{εβοτε} \ \text{νε} \ \text{νε} ...
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1.2.1.2

(C) Special observations: (1) the is by far the most common modifier in this construction. We find the following varieties of this pattern:

(a) the (III 103.4, IV 80.21, III 74.17f. codd., Ch. 75.44ff., 194.9ff., 24ff., 65.6f., 156.56ff., A 2 537, A 2 337, Wess. 9 86a 28ff. etc.).

(b) the (sgl./plur.) (IV 163.25, 164.2, 111.4, Ch. 193.25ff., Wess. 9 86b 1ff.).

(b') the (sgl.) (IV 106.2).

(b'') the (s + clause: the (s 192, 248, 267) the (III 48.24f.).

This pattern (like other θ-constructions: the , τα το θες το το (θ)ες...) is expandable by a subnexal constituent: noun + adnexal circumstantial (Shisha-Halevy 1972:82ff. and see footnote 99 below): (III 48.24f.) the (s 192, 248, 267) the (III 163-4, Ch. 193.25-39. Here the subnexal unit forms part of the overall nexus in the pattern. Pattern (2) may be regarded as anachronistic. is clearly an essential (if not indispensable) component of this pattern in its different forms.

(2) in (III 47.19) the - we have properly speaking a different pattern, the copular ≠ subject - copula - predicate ≠ Nominal Sentence predicating the modifier the.

1.2.1.3 Miscellaneous patterns

1.2.1.3.1 The stative of θ, o, supplies a convenientoutil grammatical for predicating the important group of n-modifiers in a durative framework, which relates paradigmatically to the Nominal Sentence as a incidental vs. inherent predication: the (A 1 251). Whereas the "copular" (i.e. incomplete-predication) o is empty of verbal-lexical content, other staves, forming a paradigm with this o (n-) and expandable by n- as well as by other modifiers, supply various Aktionsart characterizations of the basic nexus: the (III 98.19, 134.12f., IV 44.25, 50.23, Ch. 57.45ff., 59.46ff., 50.43ff., Ench. 93a, etc.) the. N-modifiers can occur, of course, as predicative ("adnexal") complements of many other verbs (of which only θ — and the — are in regular trans-
formative relationship with their statives): ΑΥΧΙΤΟΥ ΝΑΙΧΜΑΛΣΤΟΣ (A 2 252), ΨΗΝΑΣΟΥΝ ΝΣΗΜΑ ΜΠΝΕΥ ΜΑΤΙΚΟΝ (ibid. 401), ΑΚΑΑΚ ΝΒΟΤΕ (Wess. 9 118a 24ff.) ⁸⁵.

1.2.1.3.2 The prenominal allomorph of ΕΙΠΕ is used to predicate certain prepositions in the Tripartite Conjugation ⁸⁶: Ρ-ΕΠΌ- (IV 12.21, perf., A 1 162, conj., Wess. 18 127a 30, conj., ΑΡΌ-); Ρ-ΣΙΧΨ- (Wess. 9 171b 25f., perf.); Ρ-ΠΑΡΆ- (IV 3.20, P 130a 105 PΚΕ: ΆΝΑΥ ΕΑΥΡ-ΠΑΡΑΤΕΨΑΙΣΙΣ); Ρ-ΣΙΤΠΕ (A 2 192, fut. III, ibid. 441, not Sh., conj.).

1.2.1.3.3 A marginal yet I believe well established pattern predicates a modifier with a zeroed subject (theme) ⁸⁷: ΕΤΒΕ-, in irrealis protases: (A 2 113-4) ΕΝΕΕΤΒΙΝΙΤΟΥ (i.e. ΝΕΠΑΝΗ) ΠΑΡΑΚΕΥΜΗ ΠΕ ΝΤΕ- ΝΕΤΡ-ΝΑΡΡΕ ΠΕ ΡΩΝ ΑΛΑΤΕ ΝΝΖΕΝΨΙΕ / (A 2 398) ΡΑΜΟΙ ΟΝ ΕΝΕΕΤΒΕΟΥΝΤΑΤΣΟΥΝ Η ΟΥΜΝΤΥΝΡΕ ΥΨΗΜ (i.e. it was done). Negatively ("were it not for...") with ΝΚΑΒΝΑ: (A 2 514) ("people say secretly about me) ΧΕ-ΝΚΑΒΝΑ ΕΤΒΙΝΤΖ ΑΥΧΕΝΝΕΠ ΝΝΚΗΝΟΝ, ΝΝΝΑΓΨΝ ΑΝ ΠΕ / (P 131a 56 ΡΟ) ΚΑΙ ΓΑΡ ΑΛΝΘΨΚ ΝΚΑΒΝΑ ΕΤΒΒΝΟΝΝ ΜΝΜΧΑΝΑ ΕΤΟ ΝΚΟΒ ΕΡΟΝ ΝΕΡΝΑΝΑΙΜΨΝ... ΝΑΤΑΚΟ ΝΤΠΟΛΙΚ ΤΗΡΗΣ, but also with ΕΝΕΕΤΒΕ... ΑΝ: (A 1 158) ΕΝΕΕΤΒΕΝΕΖΨΒ ΑΝ ΝΕΟΝΨΥΓΟΜ ΕΤΡΕΖΕΝΚΟΟΥΕ ΤΑΜΙΟΟΥ, compare (IV 156.26) ΕΝΕΕΤΒΕΤΑΓΑΨΗ ΑΝ ΝΙΚ ΝΕΙΨΚ ΝΝΛΑ...

ΖΝ- also in an unfulfillable protasis: (IV 94.23) ΕΝΕΕΝΨΥΓΝΤΖΑΓ ΝΥΑΧΞΕ, ΝΕΗΝΨΥΓ-ΓΟΜ ΑΝ ΝΑΠΑΤΑ ΝΜΠΕΡΟΙΕ... ΝΝΑΖΨΡΨ: (III 107.6) ΑΛΛΘΨΚ ΝΝΑΖΨΡΨ ΓΩΣ ΕΨΧΕ-ΝΟΨΥΗΣ ΝΚΑΥΟΥΣ / (Ch. 135.50ff.) ΝΝΑΖΨΡΨΚ ΜΕΝ ΓΩΣ ΕΨΧΕ-ΨΜΟΩΚΣ, ΑΛΛΑ ΝΝΑΖΨΡΨΝΝΤΝΟΕΙ ΑΝ / (IV 159.11ff.) ΝΝΑΖΨΡΨΝΨΜΕ ΑΓΑΡ ΓΩΣ ΕΨΧΕ-ΝΟΕ ΜΕΝΝ- ΤΑΨΝΨΡΕ ΠΕ ΤΕ ΝΜΠΕΡΝΨΡΕ — in this case ΓΩΣ (ΕΨΧΕ-) may be the theme.

ΝΤΕΞΕ: see §1.2.1.2, spec. obs. (1), sub-pattern (c).

ΚΑΛΨΚ: (III 222.4) ΚΑΛΨΚ ΝΨΟΥΟ ΝΨΥΑΝΚΑΖΨΝ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΝΝΝΒΟΕ — here the conditional may well be the theme / (IV 109.8) ΚΑΛΨΚ ΜΗ "it is well" / (P 130a 105 ΤΜΓ) ΕΨΧΕ-ΚΑΛΨΚ ΝΨΚΟΥΝ, ΚΑΛΨΚ ΝΨΟΥΟ ΝΤΓΙΝΨΥΑΧΕ... ΚΑΛΨΚ ΝΤΜΝΤΚΑΒΕ... ΚΑΛΨΚ ΝΤΜΝΤΡΨΝΖΗΤ.

ΚΑΚΨΚ: (IV 80.2f.) ΚΑΚΨΚ ΝΖΕΝΛΑΟΣ ΕΥΣΨΚ ΜΜΟΥΥ ΝΧΝΑΖ ⁸⁸.

1.2.2 The Modifier Focalized: # Second Tense → Modifier # and Other Patterns. See Chapter 2.

1.2.3 The Modifier in a Predication-Presupposing Zeugmatic Pattern: 'Pronoun/Noun Synonym → Modifier'

(A) General Observations: (1) This is a well-attested, typical Shenoutean construction which I believe has not had the attention it deserves: a syntagm of noun/independent pronoun + modifier is included in a larger syntagmatic complex, in which it expands a nuclear unit comprising some or most of the following components: subject (pro)noun, object (pro)noun, verb lexeme, adjunctal or predicative modifier, and in one of several cohesion possibilities with the constituents of this unit — often in antithetic configuration:

⁸⁵ [ΟΥ-] is not excluded from the predicative post-n-position (ΠΛΑΣΣΕ ΜΜΟΥ ΝΟΥΨΨΜΕ, Ρ-ΚΑΑ ΝΟΥΨΨΜΕ Cat. 42.16f., 43.6, ΨΨΝΙΕ ΝΖΕΝΨΨΜΕ ΝΤΕΝΙΟΥΣΥ ΕΝ. Ch. 93a, and so on) while [Π] is. This is another syntagmatic factor subdividing the determinator category into Θ-. [ΟΥ-] vs. [Ν-] (another is the alternation of the two Bipartite subpatterns, see §1.2.1.1).


⁸⁷ Cf. §§7.1.3, 7.3... for # (modifier - Θ) + adnexal conjunctive #, a pattern much more common than the minimal # mod. - Θ # one (for which cf. TESNIÈRE 1965: 186ff.). For Egyptian # mod. - Θ # cf. JUNGE 1978:§7.1.2.

⁸⁸ Perhaps also (exclamatory, III 146.20) ΠΑΝΜ ΝΙΟΕΙΚ ΣΗΝΓΕΚΨΨΜ ΑΝ (cf. Ps. 6:2, 37:2).
(Ch. 102.19ff.) ΕΡΕΠΒΑΛ ΜΗΜΑΤ ΕΤΒΕΘΑΙ ΑΥΣΚ ΠΗΛΑΣΕ ΕΤΒΕΘΑΤΜ / (Ch. 46.12ff.) ΤΕΕΤΝΤΡΠ ΜΗΜΟΥ, ΖΩΙΝΕ ΝΧΙΝΑ ΖΕΝΚΟΟΥΕ ΖΑΖΕΝΚΟΟΥΕ ΝΤΙΜΗ / (Ch. 28.18ff.) ΝΕΝΤΑΥΣΙΚ ΕΒΟΛ ΕΝΝΕΕΝΣΙΥΜΙΑ (sic) ΜΗΜΑΚ ΑΥΣΚ ΝΤΟΚ ΝΗΜΑΤ / (III 211.10ff.) ΕΤΕΙΡΕ ΜΗΜΟΥ (i.e. ΜΝΤΑΣΕΒΗΣ) ΝΖΗΤΟΥ ΑΥΣΚ ΝΤΟΟΥ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΙΤΟΟΥΣ.

(2) I consider this "zeugmatic" pattern ⁹⁹ a representation of the nuclear pattern structure, projected into the textual sequence — a representation with a higher degree of cohesion with the nuclear unit than would be effected by its simple repetition. This is an outline construction, a suspended or (to borrow from architectural terminology) a corbel or cantilever "overhanging" construction. In preference to this somewhat over-graphic descriptive nomenclature, one may adopt the negative or detractive incompleteness and omission, with the rhetoric-stylistic "elleipsis" ⁹⁰ or the generative "gapping". "Apokoinou", another traditional term, is more descriptive than the others but also insufficiently specific.

(3) As regards the informational or thematic-functional structure of this construction, I think one can validly regard the 'noun syntagm + modifier' complex as relatively predicative (rheumatic), with its subject (theme) — a cohesive-anaphoric one — zeroed within it. Alternatively, the modifier alone can be considered predicative, and the noun prominently topical (§2.0.2.1) there being a nexal relationship between the two.

(B) Constituency (open-ended list):

N-
(Ch. 47.1ff.) ΣΑΤΕΤΝΑΤΟΥ, ΖΩΙΝΕ ΝΟΥΦΗ ΝΤΟΟΥ... ΖΕΝΚΟΟΥΕ ΝΟΥΧΟΥΘ ΜΗΛΑΣΕ, ΓΕΝΚΟΟΥΕ ΝΟΥΡΤΑΒ / (ibid. 168.3ff.) ΝΤΕΙΖΕ ΟΝ ΠΕ ΟΥΤΟΝ ΝΟΥΚΟΥ ΑΥΣΚ ΟΥΣΚΕ ΝΟΥΣΚΕ / (A 2 153) ΝΑΥΝΕΥΣΙΜΕ ΕΤΚΝ ΝΟΥΟΥ ΝΝΕΙΣΙΟΤΕ ΑΥΣΚ ΝΕΙΣΙΟΤΕ ΝΝΕΥΣΙΜΕ ΑΥΣΚ ΝΕΙΣΙΟΤΕ ΝΝΕΥΣΙΜΕ ΝΝΕΙΣΙΟΤΕ.

Ε-
(A 2 60) ΣΕΕΡΟΥ ΕΛΑΥ, ΠΕΓΜΑΝΝΟΚΤΕ ΕΤΒΒΟΤ, ΠΝΑ ΕΛΑΥ... ΠΝΑΙ ΕΛΑΥ ΕΝΧΙ-ΖΟ, ΝΝΗΣΤΕΙΑ ΕΠΑΡΕΣ ΕΡΟΥ / (Ch. 54.19ff.) ΤΟΥΕΡΗΤΕ ΕΣΟΥΘΝ ΣΜΠΙΝΤΑ ΕΤΒΒΟΟΥΣ, ΝΝΙΚ ΕΝΕΥΖΩΒ, ΝΤΕΙΖΕ ΟΝ ΠΜΟΝΑΧΟΣ ΕΤΕΡΕΚ6ΡΑΖΤ.

ΕΖΟΥΝ Ε-
(P 1314 88 ΡΑΔ) ΕΝΝΑΟΥΝ 2ΟΝ ΟΝ ΝΤΕΚΑΓΑΛΗ ΕΖΟΥΝ ΕΡΟΝ, ΑΥΣΚ ΑΝΟΝ 2ΙΘΝΕ ΕΖΟΥΝ ΕΝΕΝΕΡΨΗ.

ΕΞΗ-
(? A 1 188, 9ξ — in line 6 a lacuna where the nodal verb would have been) ΟΥΛΗΝ ΕΞΝΟΥΛΑΠΠΟΝ, ΟΥΛΑΙΨΕ ΕΞΝΟΥΛΑΠΠΟΝ, ΟΥΛΑΙΝΝΕ ΕΞΝΟΥΛΑΠΠΟΝ.

ΖΝ-/ΝΖΗΤ-
(IV 60.19ff.) (ΕΥΝΑΒΣΙΚ ΕΥΡΙΟΜΟΤ), ΚΝΑΥ 2ΝΕΤΡ-ΚΑΒΒΑΤΟΝ, ΑΥΣΚ ΟΥΛ ΣΝΕΤΨΙΝ ΜΠΡΟΟΥΣ... / (Ch. 118.26ff.) ΑΙΚΑ-ΤΕΓΙΑΞ ΓΙΖΗΝ ΑΥΣΚ ΤΕΕΚΟΜ ΝΖΗΤΗ.

ΖΑ-
(Ch. 89.33ff.) ΝΕΙΝΑΙ ΠΕ ΝΝΑΝΤΙΠΤΡΜΙΜΙΣΕ ΖΑΤΑΜΝΤΥΛΑΤΕ... ΠΚΑΡΠΟΣ ΝΖΗΤ ΖΑΠΙΝΟΒΕ ΝΤΑΨΥΧΗ.

(ΜΝ-) /ΝΜΜΑ-
(A 2 20) ΚΕΠΤΡΨΤ ΝΝΕΥΡΨΡΝ ΖΑΡΟΣ ΝΗΜΑΤ (i.e. the Devil and his followers) ΑΥΣΚ ΝΤΟΟΚ ΝΗΜΑΤ.

ΝΝΑΖΡΝ-
(III 221.4ff.) ΝΤΕΙΖΕ ΟΝ ΟΥΣΕΝΟΝ ΝΑΣΕΒΗΣ ΝΝΑΖΡΜΠΣΕΘΝΟΣ ΝΕΥΣΕΒΗΣ, ΑΥΣΚ ΟΥΡΑΧΝΟΥΝ ΝΝΑΖΡΜΟΥΑΡΧΨΝ, ΟΥΡΜΜΑΝΟ ΝΝΑΖΡΝΟΥΡΜΜΑΝ... ΝΑΖΡΑΙ ΕΟΥΛΝΣΗΣ ΜΠΕΜΜΕΤΑΝΟΙ ΝΑΖΡ- ΡΜΠΕΝΤΑΧΜΕΝΑΙΝΟΙ.

ΚΑΤΑ-
(III 220.20)... ΠΟΥΑ ΠΟΥΑ ΚΑΤΑΚΕΤΑΞΙΣ / (ibid. 110.8ff., P 1314 90 ΡΑΝ) ΠΟΥΑ ΠΟΥΑ ΚΑΤΑ- ΚΕΤΑΧΜΕΝΕ...

ΕΒΟΛ ΖΙΤΟΟΥΣ-
(III 211.10, quoted above).

ΕΤΒΕ-
(Ch. 102.19ff., quoted above; 24ff.) ΕΡΕΠΜΝΤΡΜΜΑΝ ΥΟΟΠ ΕΤΒΕΝΑ, ΑΥΣΚ ΤΕΕΥΣΙΑ ΕΤΒΕΡ- ΖΑΠ / (A 2 473-4) ΜΗΛΑΣΛ ΜΝΑΜΠΕ ΕΝΜΤΤ-ΒΑΥΟΥΡ ΕΤΒΕΥΣΗΣ ΤΗ ΠΛΕΥΝΝ ΕΤΜΕΟΥΕΙΣ.

ΧΕ-
§1.2.3  Chapter 1. Patterning of Modifiers

BAROC ΧE-IC, and so on (7x): the basic unit (a 23ft.) is Sec. Present + ΧE-IC / (III 39. 19ff.) ΤΑΙ ΤΕ ΘΕ ΟΥΑ ΧΕ-, ΚΕΟΥΑ ΕΤΒΕ-, ΚΕΟΥΑ ΕΤΒΕ-.

1.3 SYNTHETIC INFORMATION: A SELECTIVE EXAMINATION OF INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS OF THE CATEGORY AND THEIR PROPERTIES

The following is a generally catalogic study of the marking of certain modifiers for modifier status and their distribution, with consideration of their functioning inside various nucleus + modifier constructions.

Coptic modifiers are either analyzable, i.e. syntagmatic (§§1.3.1-3, 1.3.5, 1.3.7-8) or unanalyzable — morphematic or lexemic (§1.3.4-6, 1.3.9-10). The nature of the modifiers of Greek origin (§1.3.11) is not clear. Even those with a recognizable original morphological factor (~ΨC, -ON) cannot be taken as fully analyzable in Coptic, where there is nothing to prove, for instance, that ~ΨC is a suffixed morpheme (it is evidently not productive, i.e. in a motivation relationship, even in the Greek-origin sub-system of Coptic). Nevertheless, modifiers of this type do have a mark, a recurring formal characteristic — albeit with a degree of uniqueness — and are thus more "grammaticalized" than, say, TAXY or the native TAI and TUNOY.

1.3.1 N-MARKED MODIFIERS. The distribution and external syntagmatics of this, the most characteristic of "adverbial" markers, are treated elsewhere. Here I wish to dwell on some specific, well-defined N-syntagms. N- precedes noun syntagms (including the infinitives) in various environmentally determined adnominal and adverbial functions. There is, however, a mixed bag of recurring N-phrases that are more or less fixed as complements of modality (time/space/manner) for the nuclear verb. This is N- as a "relational" preposition, occurring in regular, lexicalized, predictable collocations, which correspond to modal (often de-adjectival) "adverbs" in inflecting languages.

(a) Localization in space: ΜΠΒΟΛΑ Ν- "outside" (III 71.16, P 1304 99 vo), ΜΠΚΥΤΕ "around" (Ch. 33.17f.), ΝΟΥΜΑ (IV 91.14), ΝΗΙ ΕΗΙ ΑΥΒ ΜΠΗΜΑ ΕΠΑΙ "from" (IX 92.20) house to house and from this place to that.

(b) Localization in time: expressions of occasion, event and duration: ΜΠΙΟΥΕΙ (IV 185.12), ΝΟΥΟΕΙ (IV 1.12), ΝΟΥΟΕΙ "once (upon a time)" (IV 185.1), ΝΟΥΟΟΥ (IV 54.19), ΝΣΜΕ ΝΣΟΥ (Ch. 105.52), ΜΜΟΝ (IV 67.23), ΝΚΕΟΝ (IV 83.20), ΝΤΟΟΥ ΝΝΩ (IV 74.6), ΝΟΥΟΝ (IV 67.10), ΜΜΕΟΝ Χ ΝΝΕΚΣΟΥ (A 2 82), ΜΝΑΙ (IV 67.25), ΝΗΑΙ (IV 175.8f.), ΝΑΡΧΑΙΟ "of old" (III 19.14, see §4.2.2.1), ΝΕΑΜ "yesterday" (A 1 50), ΜΜΗΝ "daily", see below, ΝΥΟΥ "at first" (IV 73.12), ΜΜΟΥ "today" (III 95.22f.) ΜΜΟΟΥ Χ ΝΖΟΥ (III 114.11), ΝΤΕΥΝΟΥ "at once" (III 99.11), ΝΟΥΟΥ ΕΒΟΑ 2 ΝΟΥΟΥ "at any given hour" (III 87.8), ΝΟΥΟΥ ΝΑΡΗΤΕ "for a short instance" (IV 67.19), ΝΥΑΕΝΕΖ "for ever" (IV 6.12, see §1.1.1.1), ΝΤΡΟΜΠΕ "this year" (P 1304 140 ro) and many more.

91 Compare the status of some semi-analyzable imported derivational suffixes in English: -tain, -sist, -ceive... Morphematic "uniqueness" (and analyzability or "transparency") seems to be a gradient property. Almost all research remains to be done with regard to the Shenouteans Graecitas Coptica. We have no way of measuring the difference in grammatical transparency between such variants as ΚΑΑΘΘ and ΚΑΑΘΘ; of some relevance here may be the Bohairic alternation of Ν ΚΑΑΘΘ - and - ΝΚΑΑΘΘ (but also ΝΕΠΑΙΡΠ and - ΝΕΠΑΙΡΠ).

92 ΜΜΟΥ- enters this issue only as a resumptive representative of N-: (A 2 489) ΝΗΙ ΝΤΑΥΟΝΤΕ ΜΜΟΥ / (Ibid. 397) ΝΗΕ ΕΠΕΡΕΠΕΡΕΠΕΙΜΕΝΕ ΕΠΑΑΟΟ ΝΑΝΑ ΕΡΟΝ ΜΜΟΥ / (Ibid. 65) ΝΗΙΝΕ ΑΥΒ ΝΗΙΝΕ ΕΙΒΑΡΕΤΑΞΕ ΜΜΟΥ.

93 Cf. (on the fluctuation Boh. N- ~ ΜΕΝ-) PIEHL 1902, ANDERSSON 1904:11ff.; see ΜΝΑΙ (and n. 96 below) on the syncretism of locative ("in") and ablative ("from") semantics in 2ΤΘΜ etc.
(c) Determination of manner/degree: ΝΩ-ΣΙΩ "face to face" (III 153.12, Ch. 208.43f., P 1304 48 ΡΚΑ), ΝΟΥΚΟΥ "(A I 150), ΝΕΚΕΟΥ (III 99.12), ΝΩΤΟΥ "rather", "even (more)", see below; ΝΒΠΠΕ "anew" (A 2 314), ΝΤΕΙΣΕ "thus", see below; ΝΑΥ ΝΣΕ "how?" (Wess. 9 148a 18ff.), ΝΕΞ Ν-/ΕΤ- "in the manner of / that" (III 51.19, 104.26), ΝΕΚΑΣ "violently" (A I 44), ΝΝΟΥ "falsely" (P 1304 39 vo); with infinitives: ΝΟΥΣΜΙ "again" (A I 74), ΝΙΝΩΝ "in hiding" (A I 465), ΝΙΚΟΥ "by stealth" (A 2 495), etc.

1.3.1.1 Certain Ν-syntags deserve more leisurely attention. First, the cases of "unique" or "near-unique" morphemes, in which the isolation of Ν- (in its allomorph Μ-) leaves us with a non-recurring, or almost non-recurring — hence, morphologically undefinable — morph as the residue of the syntagm.

(a) The deictic "pro-modifier" ΜΜΑΥ is a case in point. ΜΑΥ does recur in ΜΜΑΥ "thither" (IV 62.3), but nowhere else. ΜΜΑΥ is a pro-modifier (a more grammaticalized, anaphoric modifier, representing ΝΝ-/Ν- prepositional phrases) meaning "there" (often predicative, III 211.9, Ch. 116.13) or "thence" (III 99.2, IV 121.6f.).

(b) Another instance is the excluding, focusing adjunct ΜΜΑΤΕ "only", which is again in paradigm with ε-ΜΑΤΕ as a sole companion, on which paradigm its analyzability is to be based. Both are post-adjectival only, and neither is ever predicative. ΕΜΑΤΕ "very" is far removed semasiologically: usually adverbal (ΜΑΥΕ-ΤΙΗΣ ΕΜΑΤΕ: A 2 29, A I 247 written ΜΜΑΤΕ, III 13.22, IV 70.5, etc.), it is often adnominal: (A 2 296) ΖΕΝΚΟΥΙ ΕΜΑΤΕ / (ibid. 499) ΔΙΑΚΑΙΟΚΕ ΕΜΑΤΕ / (ibid. 317) ΝΕΑΣ ΝΩΟΝ ΕΜΑΤΕ, sim. III 21.20, 169.13 / (Ch. 146.15f.) ΟΥΝΟΣ ΕΜΑΤΕ ΝΒΣ ΝΕΑΟΔΑ, etc. ΕΜΑΤΕ is occasionally reiterated (§1.1.2.4.2). ΜΜΑΤΕ, which has a special affinity with the augens ΜΑΥΑΑΑ- (§6.1.4.1) is preeminently adnominal, and occurs most typically, stylistically speaking, in (or in conjunction with) a clause including a local ("Satzglied") negation: "not only... but (also)...". e.g. III 173.12f., 184.17f.; see in more detail, and with more exx., §2.9.1.2.2, also §6.2) — also in syntagm with ΕΙΜΗΤΙ "but for", which precedes (pro)noun ΜΜΑΤΕ (IV 62.20) or, less usually, governs ε-: ΕΙΜΗΤΙ ΕΜΑΤΕ ε- (IV 91.12). ΜΜΑΤΕ may modify another modifier: (IV 24.6f.) ΖΝΠΕΛΣΕ ΜΜΑΤΕ / (III 50.4f.) ΖΝΟΥΠΑΦΙΝ ΝΝΟΥΝ ΝΠΒΠΡΕ ΜΜΑΤΕ. I know of no clear instance of adverbial ΜΜΑΤΕ.

(c) ΜΜΗΝΕ "daily" is another instance of the "unique morpheme". Exclusively postadjectival, it occurs adverbially (III 145.23, IV 69.23, Ch. 201.44ff.), adclausally (A 2 21-2 ΝΤΟΥΛ ΜΜΗΝΕ ΝΕ) and (rarely) adnominally (ΠΝΑΥ ΝΟΥΣΜ ΜΜΗΝΕ IV 153.22).

**Footnotes:**

*84* Ν + infinitive occurs rectationally after certain verbs: ΑΡΧΕΙ (III 44.12), ΑΝ-ΓΟΜ (III 109.19), ΚΟΥΝ (III 105.18), ΕΙ (Ch. 201.45ff.).


*86* The syncretism of "locative" and "ab/delative" is evident with many other modifiers (notably ΤΟΜ "whence", Wess. 9 127 b 8ff., 14ff., 128 a 1ff.) and prepositions, esp. 21- (ΣΙΩΜ ΜΙΟΝ, 89b, and ΣΙΩΜΑ Ι33.15.5), Ν- (rescued in ΕΒΟΑ Ν-, ΕΒΟΑ Νι -) — see the entries in *Dictionary*. Incidentally, this may add an improvement to my interpretation of the Shenoutean ΤΙΕlua - WZKM 69:33-9 (1977) — to be understood as "whence — whither?". This suggestion, communicated to me by W.-P. Funk, is corroborated by an unpublished example (P 130 105 ΡΚΕ) ΤΙΕlua ΖΝΕΟΥ ΣΙΜΗΣ-ΜΕ ΕΙ-60Α, ΖΝΙΜΠΑΙΚΑΙΟΝ ΕΙ-6ΟΓΚ, ΖΗΝΙΤΒΟ ΕΑΣΘΛ, where ΣΗΝ-ε- would agree well with a "whence — whither" frame of reference.

*87* Rare instances of ΜΜΑΤΕ used for ΕΜΑΤΕ, "very" (the reverse does not occur, to my knowledge): A I 53, 247, 244.

*88* Usually ΕΙΜΗΤΙ ε- (pro)noun MAYAA - "(III 90.3, 124.6, 136.20 etc.), or with no modification (III 45-6, IV 91.17f.); ΕΙΜΗΤΙ ο- noun": (III 52.10f., IV 62.5, etc.). In Shenoute, the paradigm following ΕΙΜΗΤΙ includes: ε-(pro)noun ΜΜΑΤΕ/MAYAA-, ΕΤΙΕΠΟΓΟΝ, ΕΚ-perfect/present/Nominal Sentence, conjunctive and modifiers (III 138.11f., incl. the circumstantial, IV 60.25f., 61.2). See §7.3.1.1.
1.3.1.2 *nteize* “thus” occurs: (a) *Postadjectively, adverbally*: (III 222.12) МАРМУМОКЕК ЕПОН *nteize*, typically expanding the verbs άξω and είπε (III 18.3, 28.3, 37.7, 49.16, etc.); *adnominally*: (A I 65) ΝΕΙΣΒΗΝΕ ΝΤΕΙΖΕ.

(b) *Initially*, as an adclausal premodifier, in a verb clause: (III 141.20) ΝΤΕΙΖΕ ΑΧΥΨΗΔΕ ΣΜΠΑΑ ΕΤΜΜΑΓ ΝΕΙ ΜΠΟΥΤΩΡ / (ibid. 148.4ff.) ΝΤΕΙΖΕ ΝΕΙΣΒΗΝΕ ΝΕΙΣΒΗΝΕ ΝΤΕΙΖΕ ΝΕΙΣΒΗΝΕ ΝΣΩΤΗΜ ΕΡΟΥ.

(c) *Initially*, in the constructions: (1) ≠ *nteize* (ΣΩΗ-) on (Ν-) noun syntagm (+ circumstantial) ≠: (III 48.24ff.) ΝΤΕΙΖΕ ΖΩΥΩ ΝΝΣΕΛΛΑΝ... ΕΥΜΕΕ Δ ΝΝΣΕΡΡΑ ΩΕ-ΕΥΘΥΌΝ 3ΜΠΟΥΟΓΙΝ / (IV 104.7ff.) ΝΤΕΙΖΕ ΟΝ ΤΜΑΑΥ ΝΤΜΥΝΑΤΗΥΝ ΕΚΝΑΕΠΕ ΣΩΗΔΕ ΟΝ ΝΤΕΙΖΕ — the circumstantial here is adnominal and adnexual 99.

(2) ≠ *nteize on* + [noun syntagm + modifier] ≠: (III 221.4ff., 11f.) ΝΤΕΙΖΕ ΟΝ ΟΥΣΓΕΟΝΟΣ ΝΑΣΕΒΗΣ ΝΝΑΖ- ΡΝΙΣΕΟΝΟΣ ΝΥΣΕΒΗΣ, ΝΤΕΙΖΕ ΟΝ ΟΥΣΟΝ ΕΥΧΑΣΜ ΝΝΑΖΡΝΟΥΟΝ ΕΟΥΑΑΒ. The modifier appears to be predicative here within its information unit — the bracketed constituent being articulated as topic + comment (or theme + rhyme); *nteize* itself is topical in relation to the whole: topic + (topic + comment).

(3) ≠ *nteize (ON) on* [noun syntagm + clause] ≠: (III 98.11ff.) ΝΤΕΙΖΕ ΟΝ ΤΕΧΖΙΜΕ ΕΤΥΨΙΔΝ ΝΝΕΚΚΑΡΕ ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΣ ΟΥ ΝΕΤΜΝΑΧΟΟΥ / (ibid. 109-110) ΝΤΕΙΖΕ ΓΑΡ ΝΟΥΟΕΙΨ ΝΙΜ ΝΕΤΣΙΙΜ ΚΑΚΨΚ ΥΑΨΗΜ ΕΡΟΥ — the noun is extraposed and later resumed.

(4a) *nteize (ON) on* (NEzteide predicative: §1.2.1.2): (IV 84.14) ΝΤΕΙΖΕ ΟΝ ΠΕ ΟΥΡΨΗΜΕ ΟΝ ΟΥΣΖΙΜΕ ΕΥΣΑΝΨ-ΑΤΖΟΜ 2ΝΟΥΨΗΔΕ.

(4b) *nteize* focalized by a verbal topicalization-form (see Ch. 2, esp. §2.4): (III 76.8) ΝΤΕΙΖΕ ΓΑΡ ΕΝΤΑΨΖΑΟΟC...

1.3.1.3 *nzooy* occurs: (a) *Postadjectively, adverbally* (“rather”, “greatly”, “[even] more”, “on the contrary”): (IV 5.8) ΨΩΤΗΝ ΝΖΟΟΥ / (ibid. 18.12) ΣΕΝΑΣΑΜΟΝ ΑΥΨ ΝΝΑΕΙΜΕ ΝΖΟΟΥ / (Ch. 23.19ff.) Η ΕΚΨ-ΡΩΟΥΝ ΣΟΛΨΡΗΜΕ 2ΝΟΥ... ΕΚΟΥΕΨ-ΜΠΟΥΤΨ ΝΤΟΨ ΝΖΟΟΥ / (III 38.24) ΝΝΑΜΗΣΕ ΟΥΨΗΚ ΝΖΟΟΥ / (A 2 341) (they asked whether) ΝΑΝΟΥ-ΝΕΙΖΩΒ, (I answered:) ΖΩΟΟΥ ΝΖΟΟΥ, also III 115.17ff., 146.16, 163.22, IV 18.12, 82.10ff., Ch. 85.13ff. In a typical figure, *nzooy* combines the sense of “rather, on the contrary” with a Second-Tense autosfocal construction (see §2.1.7), e.g. (III 212.8f.) ΝΣΩΜΕ ΜΜΟΣ ΔΕ-ΑΙΖΟΥΨ- ΕΙ... ΕΝΕΙΨΕ ΝΝΑΙ ΗΤΑΝΨ-ΑΤΖΟΟΥΝ ΜΜΟΣ ΝΖΟΟΥ / (Ch. 171.2f.) (2ΨΑΙ ΓΑΡ ΝΖΩΚΠΟΡΟΣ ΕΤΟΥΜΕΕΕ ΕΕΠΑΙ... ΔΕ- ΟΥΤΨΔΝ ΠΕ...) ΕΨΟ ΝΝΑΗΤ ΝΖΟΟΥ.

(b) Adclusally, in a Nominal-Sentence pattern (§1.1.2.3, “on the contrary”): (III 113.20) ΟΥΑΨ ΕΥΧΑΣΜ ΝΖΟΟΥ ΠΕ ΠΑΛΑΣ ΝΝΑΣΒΗΣ / (ibid. 115.28) ΕΨΖΕ-ΟΥΤΣΑΛΑΙΠΟΡΟΣ (sic) ΛΑΛΗΣ (sic) ΠΕ... ΟΥΜΑΚΑΡΙΟΣ ΟΝ ΑΛΗΨΨΝ ΝΖΟΟΥ ΠΕ... / (IV 3.4) ΠΕΤΕΡΨΝΨΜΕΕ ΔΕΕΟΡ ΞΕ-ΟΥΨΟΟΥΝ ΠΕ ΕΟΥΤΨΖ 2ΨΨΗΜ ΝΖΟΟΥ ΠΕ, also III 19.2, IV 60.23, 108.27 etc.

(c) *Adnominally* (“too much”, “even, especially, in particular”): (III 221.18) ΚΕΖΩΒ ΝΖΟΟΥ / (IV 77.2) ΝΕΨΜΝΤΜΑΙΤΟ ΝΖΟΟΥ / (IV 9.20ff.) ΠΚΕΙΟΥΛΑΣ ΝΖΟΟΥ / (Ch. 30.45ff.) ΝΤΟΚ 2ΨΨΚ ΝΖΟΟΥ. It is, in this status, usually *premodified*, semasiologically close to ΜΑΛΛΟΝ, ΜΑΛΚΤΑ (§1.3.11.2.1.4), in the sense of “especially”, “so much more” — a focusing adjunct: usually *NZO0Y ΔΕ + noun* (prosodically a colon by itself): III 37.17f., 106.12f., 108.19f., 112.13, IV 23.7, Ch. 74.18ff., etc.

(d) *Nzooy* expanding or premodifying another modifier 100: (III 222.4) ΚΑΛΨΖ ΝΖΟΟΥ / (III 181.19f.) ...ΕΤΡΕΤΥ+6ΟΜ ΝΤΟΨ ΝΖΟΟΥ / (Ch. 18.28ff.) ΝΤΕΙΖΕ ΕΕ ΝΖΟΟΥ (A I 11) ΝΖΟΟΥ ΝΙΜ, ΝΖΟΟΥ ΔΕ ΡΝΚΑΒΒΑΤΩΝ.

99 Cf. Shishà-Haley 1972:75ff., 81ff.: consider ΝΟΕΤΑΙ ΤΕ ΝΕ Ν-νουν + circc. (IV 82.1ff.) ΝΟΕ ΝΝΚΕΡΓΟΣ ΝΡΨΗΔΕ ΕΥΨΑΑΤ ΝΣΩΜ / (Wess. 9 91b 6ff.) ΤΑΙ ΤΕ ΝΙΑΤΣΘΕ ΕΤΜΜΑΓ ΕΥΖΗΚ ΕΒΟΑ ΝΤΕΝΙΤΝΙΜΑ ΝΤΕΨΨΧΝ / (A / 162-3) ΤΑΙ ΤΕ ΝΙΑΤΣΘΕ ΠΑΝ ΑΥΨ ΝΙΣΚΗΜΑ ΝΕΝΨΧΑΑΤ ΝΤΝΜΟΟΕ / (A 2 138) ΤΑΙ ΤΕ ΝΕΝΨΧΑΑΤ ΝΝΑΖΡΗΟΣ ΕΤΟ ΝΗΝΑΣΗΚΕ ΕΥΨΨΗΚ ΕΒΟΑ 2ΝΤΙΝΟΜΟΣ ΝΚΑΧΕ. Note in the last example the opposition between the two adnominal expansion forms: ΕΤ- attributive, and Ε- adnexual.

100 ΝΖΟΟΥ itself is expanded, in the sense of “more than...”, by Ε + noun (incl. infinitive: III 77.2, A I 56, III 131.10).
Note here especially ΝΔΟΥΟ + circumstantial, in the sense of “especially when”: (Wess. 9 138c 19f.) ...

(e) Initially, ΝΔΟΥΟ is rare: (III 147.14) ΝΕΙΔΟΥΝΕ ΝΑΙ ΜΑΥΑΤ ΣΕΝΑΙΝΥΝΕ ΟΣ ΝΣΚΑΝΔΑΛΟΝ... ΝΔΟΥΟ ΝΕΙΔΟΥΝΕ ΑΝ ΝΕ ΕΑΥΝΕ ΝΕΝΙΧΝΥ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΜΠΙΚΤΟΣ.

1.3.2 Zero-marked noun syntags in modifier status¹⁰¹ are restricted to certain temporal or spatial localizing expressions and the modal pronominal ΑΛΛΑY “at all”, “anyhow”. Related to this lack of marking is the syntagmatic zero — the absence of resumption of initial nouns: contrast (IV 58.19f.) ΝΕΣΜΕ ΝΔΟΥΟ ΝΝΕΡΠΙΕ ΥΣΚΟΔΟΕΙΚ ΝΤΟΟΥ ΕΠΤΗΜΙ, with (ibid. 54.29) ΝΕΣΜΕ ΝΔΟΥΟ ΥΠΡΗ ΝΝΕΥΕΥΝΙΕ ΝΡΥΗ ΕΠΤΗΜΙ. This cohesive distinction is indicative, since it determines the noun as modifying the subsequent clause, not serving as its topic (§6.0.1).

(1) ΕΝΕΖ: see §1.3.6.
(2) ΤΕΡΜΠΝΕ, ΤΡΡΟΜΠΝΕ “yearly”, “— a year”¹⁰², distributive. Postadjunctive, adnominal (to CON only): ΝΟΥΟΝ ΤΕΡΜΠΝΕ (P 131² 13 ro), ΝΤΟΟΥ ΝΝΟΥΟΝ ΤΡΡΟΜΠΝΕ (IV 74.6f.), also ibid. 58.1, 91.8.
(3) CON: initially, as adclausal premodifier: ΖΑΣ ΝΝΟΥΟ “often” (III 146.28, 147.9, 18, etc.) — contrast with the postadjunctive — ΝΖΑΣ ΝΝΟΥΟ (III 107.14, 139.11). Postadjunctive: ΩΥΟΝ (A 2 397), ΥΟΜΤ ΝΝΟΥΟ (Ch. 106.52ff.). The disjunctive CON — CON, ΟΥ/ΖΕΝΟΝ — ΟΥ/ΖΕΝΟΝ “now... now...”, “at times... at times...” (III 19.20ff., 70 passim, 77-8, 110.9f. etc.) is usually a premodifier.
(4) ΥΟΡΝ ΜΕΝ- “first of all”, “at first” is initial and adclausal: (III 164.5, IV 128.6, Ch. 204.19f., P 130⁴ 54 ντ, 130⁵ 39 νο.
(5) ΣΟΟΥ in ΝΕΣΜΕ ΝΔΟΥΟ (IV 58.19).
(6) ΡΟΥΣΟΥ, ΖΟΟΟΥ “at evening”, “at dawn” (IV 65.26). This is a peculiar case, in which the only synchronic indication of nominal status is the occurrence of these words after prepositions, notably ΖΑ-,... ΤΑ-, Ε-,... ΧΑ-, Η- (IV 60.14, 61.1, 92.13f., Ch. 51.22, 145.26ff., P 130⁴ 139 ΤΗΕ: ΝΡΟΥΣΑ ΑΥΣ ΖΟΟΟΥ). ΡΟΥΣΑ ΠΕ (IV 60.21) is inconclusive, in view of the # modifier - ΠΕ# pattern (§1.2.1.2). There is however some basis for considering ΖΑ- in ΖΟΟΟΥ (and even in ΖΡΟΥΣΑ, IV 92.2 cod. ΖΑΡΟΥΣΑ v.l. ΖΑΡΟΥΣΑ) metonymically fused with the lexeme and somehow connected with the (radical) Ζ in ΖΟΟΟΥ¹⁰³ — I know of no attestation for ΖΑ-ΖΟΟΟΥ (see Dictionary 728a; consider also Miss. 282, IV 104.4f. ΖΡΟΥΣΑ ΑΥΣ ΖΟΟΟΥ). Consequently, these expressions may not properly belong here, but are — at least to some extent — modifiers by lexical right, like ΤΑΧΥ or ΤΩΝΟΥ. (ΖΡΟΥΣΑ also occurs as an adnominal modifier: P 131⁵ 133 ro ΤΖΝΑΖΩΗ ΖΡΟΥΣΑ.)

(7) ΑΛΛΑY “at all”, “anyhow”, “in anything” is postadjunctive only: (III 137.23) ...

¹⁰¹ Cf. Schenkel 1966:58 (“absolute substantives” — they are in fact neither absolute nor “syntactic”, but lack an overt marking of the “adverbial” syntactic function. Junge 1978:73-84, esp. 76, 81ff. arrives, through equating “prepositional phrase” “qua” “adverb”) with “noun” “in “adverbial status” “yet qua” “noun”) at the far-reaching and to me unacceptable — since procedurally exceptional — identification (in Middle Egyptian) of nominal and “adverbial” nexus, at least in “deep structure”. This error is due, I believe, to misapplication (and misjudgement of the significance) of commutability. To judge by the occasional variae lectiones, the characteristic zeroed in Coptic is in all probability the N — ΖΝ — syncretism (see footnote 93).


¹⁰³ Černý 1976:302f. suggests for ΖΟΟΟΥ a hybrid etymology: hd-iz + dwJw: Crum gives in Dictionary 727b-728a ΖΩΟΟΥ and ΖΩΑΑΕ as specifically Shenoutean and Akhmimoid (A, A²) forms, but does not consider the possibility that these are syntags, analyzable to a degree.
1.3.3 Iteration-marked Noun Syntagms in Modifier Status

1.3.3.1 The syntagm ‘θ-noun lexeme → θ-noun lexeme’ is a member of the postadjunctive modifier paradigm and occupies a slot in the valency matrix with no further marking: (a) as a distributive-distensive-particularizing complement in the second slot (following) post-verbal slot: (Ch. 183.52f.) ΑΥΘΑΪΟΥ ΕΒΟΛ ΠΒΟΛ (IV 110.9f.) ΖΩΒ ΝΙΜ ΕΤΟΥΝΑΛΛΑ... ΕΥΝΑΛΛΑ ΠΒΟΛ ΜΠΕΓΥΣΒ ΝΙΓΧ ΝΙΣΑΥΑΛΛ... (v.l. ΜΠΒΟΛ), also IV 33.27, 113.24f., A 1 70. Adnominally: (IV 112.17f.) ΖΩΒ ΝΙΜ ΠΒΟΛ ΜΠΚΑΤΑΔΑΣΚΙΣ (sic).

1.3.3.2 ‘θ-noun → θ-noun’ is bracketed and marked by η- as the predicative complement of forms of ΕΙΠΕ: (Miss. 279f., parall. P 1305 69 ro) ΖΩΘΝ ΕΤΟ ΠΜΑΣΕ ΠΑΓΕ / (A 1 240) ΑΥΓΑΝ ΝΙΑΥ ΓΑΗ / (III 110.17) -ΡΟΥΕΙ ΝΙΣΗΜ ΖΙΟΥ / (IF 85, apud Dictionary 378a) -ΛΑΗ ΠΜΑΣΕ ΠΑΓΕ Α ΑΗΠ ΖΙΟΥ (IV 172.10, Mun. 160, P 1305 99 PM, IF 188 apud Dictionary 422b) ...ΕΥΚΟΥΣ ΕΤΟΤΟΥ.

1.3.3.3 Adnominally, we find ‘θ-noun → θ-noun’ (with restricted constituency) in -ΜΜΙΝΕ ΜΙΝΕ (ΣΙΑΥΑΝ ΑΥΑΝ) (Ch. 183.43f., Wess. 9 127b 8f., A 2 116, P 1304 91 PM) with the sense of “each and every...”.

1.3.3.4 In this sense (“each and every...”), complexive/comprehensive universal plurality the iterated ‘determinator + noun’ syntagm occurs in various syntactic statuses even with a definite determinator: (A 1 395) -ΖΩΜ ΕΙΡΑΙ ΕΞΩΝΑΙΟΚΕΣ ΝΙΑΙΟΚΕΣ / (ibid. 155) -ΝΜΑΙΡΟΣ ΝΚΑΙΡΟΣ / (III 126.16) ΖΙΝΕ... ΜΠΕΓΥΣΒ ΖΩΒ / (ibid. 204.6f.) ΧΑΡΕΤΙΟΟ ΜΠΟΝΟΒΕ ΠΝΟΒΕ / (A 2 21) ΜΠΡ-ΠΡΙΜΕ ΠΡΙΜΕ ΑΥΗ ΠΝΟΝ ΠΝΟΝ ΑΥΗ ΤΕΖΙΜΕ ΤΕΖΙΜΕ... / (III 110.8f.) ΠΟΥΑ ΠΟΥΑ ΚΑΤΑΣΠΑΝΕ / (IV 73.19f.) ΠΡΙΜΕ ΠΡΙΜΕ ΕΤΖΙΜΠΗ... ΑΥΗ ΤΟΥΕΙ ΤΟΥΕΙ... ΕΥΣΗΜ ΕΤΟΤΟΥ...

1.3.3.5 The iterated lexeme is rarely found expanding (and bracketed by) a single determinator, meaning “assorted...” (plural only): (A 1 108) ΖΕΝΖΟΕΙΤΕ Η ΖΕΝΖΟΒΟΟΚ Η ΖΕΝΖΑΝΣ ΑΛΝΕ / (A 2 26) ΖΕΝΟΥΑ

---

104 Also ΗΝΗ ΗΝΗ (A 1 101) ΑΝΘΙΝ ΚΗΝ ΚΗΝ, cf. ΗΝΗΜ ΗΝΗΜ ΗΝΗΜ (A 1 150), coordinated with ΚΑΤΑΖΟΟΥ ΖΩΟΥ.
105 Cf. (for Turkish and Modern Armenian) GODEL 1945:10f.: act act gülüyordu (“adverse”), yumurtta çığ çığ yemek (“pré-
   dicate indirect du sujet ou de l’objet”).
OYA “τινες, aliqui” / (Ch. 156.48f.) NOYNOY OYNOY “those various hours” / (A 1 108) NAGE NAGE NTSTY 
NE “a collection of assorted rags” (NTSTY is the augens, §6.1.3).

1.3.4 TEYN OY (once NTSTY, A 1 262, collated) occurs in several formal/functional manifestations, 
ranging from the fully temporal “now” through the “ynegocentric” hic-et-nunc, through various 
contextual values of actuality to particle-like intercalator role accompanied by prosodic symptoms.

1.3.4.1 TEYN adverbial, postadjunctive, often clause-final: “now”, frequently in collocation with other 
time-indications: (A 2 53) ΕΡΙΟΥΔΛΟΝ ΦΟΟΝ ΤΙΝ ΤΕΝΟΥ / (ibid. 159) ΣΥΓΟΝ ΝΗΜΠΡ ΕΤΜΠΟΥΜΕΡ ΝΝΑ 
ΜΠΗΕ ΤΕΝΟΥ / (III 203.15f.) ΕΣΕΡΝΟΟΥΤΕ ΝΑΛΑΚΕ ΝΝΜΕ ΕΙΝΗΜΙΚΑΣ ΤΕΝΟΥ / (ibid. 219.4) (ΠΕΙΝΑΚΕ) ΑΙΈΜΕ 
ΕΠΟΥ ΤΕΝΟΥ ΤΝΙΤΡΟΜΠΝΕ ΤΑΙ — note the tense / (IV 1.23f.) ΕΝΥΑΝΠ-ΒΟΑ ΕΡΝΙΚΣ ΝΝΕΤΜΠΜΑ ΝΜΠΗΜΑ ΤΕΝΟΥ 
/ (ibid. 98.25f.) ΚΟΟΥΝ ΝΕ-ΕΙΡ-ΟΥ ΕΙΝΗΜΠΡΙ ΑΥΨ ΟΝ ΤΕΝΟΥ / (P 1304 40 PA) ΟΥΝ ΝΙΜ ΕΤΕΝΠΟΥΜΕΝΑΙΟΝ.. 
ΖΜΕΝΑ ΤΕΝΟΥ — again, note the compatibility of the perfect with TEYN; also in (P 1304 126 M) ΝΕΝΑΤ-
ΥΡΝΠΚΟΥ ΤΕΝΟΥ “even now”. Additional exx.: III 182.19, 188.17ff., 206.22, 208.17, 131.5f., 150.7, 
IV 6.17f., 1.24, Ch. 82.12ff., etc. etc.

1.3.4.1.1 Postadjunctively, we often find TEYN in idiomatic collocation (coordinated or disjoined) 
with other temporal modifiers: (A 1 287) ΖΜΕΝΟΥΟΕΙΤΕ ΕΤΜΠΑΥ Ν ΝΤΟΥ ΤΕΝΟΥ / (IV 36.2, 98.26, A 2 107 etc.) 
ΕΙΝΗΜΠΡΙ ΑΥΨ ΟΝ ΤΕΝΟΥ / (IV 197.9) ΤΕΝΟΥ ΑΥΨ ΝΟΥΟΕΙΤΕ ΝΙΜ / (ibid. 206.22) ΤΕΝΟΥ Ν ΝΤΟΥ ΝΟΥΟΕΙΤΕ 
ΕΤΜΠΑΥ — note the inverse order on line 28 / (A 1 293) ΤΕΝΟΥ ΑΥΨ ΥΑΕΝΕΖ / (III 194.19f.) ΕΙΤΕ ΕΙΝΗΜΠΚΑΣ 
ΤΕΝΟΥ ΕΙΤΕ ΖΜΕΝΟΥΟ ΜΗΣΑΠ / (P 1304 118 ΚΡ) ΝΑΡΧΑΙΟΕ ΑΥΨ ΟΝ ΤΕΝΟΥ.

1.3.4.2 TEYN colon-enclitic 106 (— TENOY, — δε/ον TENOY —): “now then”, “in our time and 
place”, “in the case under discussion, in this instance”, “at this point in the argument”, “following/in 
view of what has been said”. Here the shift from clause-segment modification through adclausal reference 
to contextual intercalator linkage 110 is most evident: TEYN approaches here the role of a superordinating 
particle, with a corresponding difference in prosodic status, inferable from the placement: (A 1 57) ΜΗ 
ΝΤΟΥΝ ΤΕΝΟΥ ΝΕΝΜΕ ΝΕΝΤΖΙΤΟΥΜ / (A 2 65) ΝΕ ΤΕΝΟΥ ΕΤΕΡΓΕΠΑΡΒΕΝΟΣ ΖΟΥΟΥΜΕ.. ΥΑΛΑ (vs. the bride 
in Song of Songs) / (ibid. 298) ΝΑΥ ΝΕ ΤΕΝΟΥ ΚΑΤΑΝΙΛΑΧΕ ΝΕΝΑΝΟΙ ΑΛ / (A 1 335) ΕΤΕΒΟΥ ΤΕΝΟΥ ΝΕΥ-
ΥΜΗΕ ΕΤΖΟΥΡΤ ΑΝ / (ibid. 297) ΝΕ ΡΟΟΝ ΟΝ ΤΕΝΟΥ ΕΤΝΡ-ΝΟΒΕ / (III 144.26) ΟΥΚΟΥΝ ΝΑΙ ΤΕΝΟΥ ΕΤΜΜΑΥ 
ΝΕΝΑΧΟΟΕ ΝΕ- / (Ch. 171.30ff.) ΟΥ ΔΕ ΤΕΝΟΥ ΝΕ- / (IV 183.7) ΕΝΜΕΕΕΕ ΕΟΥ ΓΕ ΤΕΝΟΥ. Striking here 
is the frequent occurrence after NΕ- /ΚΑΤΑΒΕ- (also A 2 191, Ench. 85a, 87b, 92-3, III 18.27ff., Wess. 9 148c 
9f. etc.) and, in intercalory placement (§6.0.3), after ΤΑΙ ΤΕ ΘΕ 111 (III 142.16, 167.13,21); also after the ante-
cedent in a relative construction 112 (III 205.22f. ΝΕΠΙΟΒΙΟ ΤΕΝΟΥ ΕΤΕΝΗΤΗΤΥ, also IV 121.26 / III 206.7 ΠΙΤΗ 
ΤΕΝΟΥ ΕΝΤΑΗΤΕ ΕΖΟΥΝ ΕΠΟΥ / IV 111.14 ΤΑΙ ΤΕΝΟΥ ΕΤΤΥΟΟΝ ΜΝΗΜΑ ΜΠΙΟ), after the predicate of a Nominal 
Sentence 113 (A 2 306 ΟΥ ΕΠΟΙ ΤΕΝΟΥ ΝΕ- / IV 20.10 ΟΥ ΤΕΝΟΥ ΤΕ ΤΕΧΡΕΙΑ / III 170.9 ΕΤΕΓΥΝΕ ΟΝ ΤΕΝΟΥ ΝΕ), 
and following the focus in focalization (“Cleft Sentences”, see Ch. 2): (A 2 451, not Sh.) ΝΑΙ 
ΤΕΝΟΥ ΝΕΝΟΥΟΥΝΣ ΝΟΗΟΕ ΕΒΟΑ / (Wess. 9 121b 16ff.) ΝΑΥ ΓΕ ΝΕ ΤΕΝΟΥ ΕΤΕΝΚΙΔΑΙΕ. In all these cases 
it is the prosodic contour of the clause that motivates the placement of TEYN, and a full temporal value 
is not rarely found here.

107 See §6.0.3.
111 Cf. POLOTSKY 1961:§12.
112 POLOTSKY 1961:§§12, 20.
113 POLOTSKY 1961:§§8 (p. 308 = CP 412), 18.
1.3.4.3 TENOY initial, an adclausal premodifier: TENOY δὲ —, ἄλλα TENOY — is temporal, often opposed to another foregoing temporal modifier: Ch. 31.27ff. (vs. ὃ(ν)οὐοὐεὶς), sim. IV 185.2ff., 13f., Ch. 143.13ff. (vs. ἡγοῦθα ΜΠΟΟΥ, so too in 150.37ff., A 2 86, P 130 104 vo), Ch. 204.19ff. (vs. ἦσον ΠΕΝΔΕ-), IV 105.3 (vs. ἡγοῦθα ΠΗΜΑΤΗ-). TENOY δὲ- is relatively rare: “now then”, “at this stage of the argument”: III 77.4 TENOY δὲ οὐ τε ἐπιταχεύσας, also A 2 159, 248. Note ἐτι on TENOY (Ch. 91.20f.) a calque of ἔτι καὶ νῦν?

1.3.4.4 TENOY adnominal to situational nouns: π(ε)ΙΜΑ (Ch. 57.45ff., A 2 240, 314, 461, 462, IV 1.24), π(ε)ΙΧΥ, ΝΙΓΟΟΥ (A 1 463, A 2 87, III 145-6, P 130 126 ΡΜΑ, 130 49 ro), ΠΕΙ-/ΝΕΙΟΥΕΙ (III 106.8ff., 126.17,23, 180.19f.,24f., A 2 427), ΝΕΧΝΗ (Rossi 2/3 16), ΤΕΝΦΥΣΙΕ (IV 113.2).

1.3.4.5 TENOY is occasionally found in noun-syntagm status (cf. §1.1.1.1) — in origin, of course, it goes back to ΤΕ-determined ὩΝΟΥ, when it was a case of the “zero-marked noun as modifier” (§1.3.2): ΞΙΝΤΕΝΟΥ (P 130 40 50 CK), ΨΑΖΟΥΝ ΕΤΕΝΟΥ (P 130 40 50 ΦΩΝZ).

1.3.5.1.1 NAME “truly”, “really” (cf. ΑΛΛΗΟΣ, §1.3.11.2), occurs postadjectively, adverbially: (A 2 501) ΧΕ-ΝΕΧΝΗΠΟΣ ΝΑΜΕ ΕΒΟΑ 2ΜΠΟΟΥΤΕ / (A 1 171) ΑΥΚΟΥΟΣ ΠΑΡ ΝΑΜΕ ΕΧΜΠΟΟΟΙΚ / (A 1 121) ΝΕΤ-ΟΥΟΟΣ ΕΒΟΑ ΝΑΜΕ ΧΕ-ΓΕΝΜΑΡΤΟΡΟΣ ΝΕ / (IV 159.8) ΕΤΡΕΨΑΣΤΗ ΝΑΜΕ ΕΤΕΝΠΟΟΥΤΕ / (Ch. 68.6ff.) ΑΝΩΝ ΤΝΟΟΥΝ ΑΝ ΕΛΑΛΑΥ — ΤΝΟΟΥΝ ΑΝ ΝΑΜΕ / (Ench. 80a and often in “Vita Monachorum” passages) — ΕΤΥΜΗΝ ΝΑΜΕ. More exx.: III 165.20, 170.21, IV 57.17f., 156.24, Ch. 62.11ff., etc.

1.3.5.1.2 As adclausal/adverbal, NAME may occupy the colon-second position (or share it); this may be due to the prosodic contour of the construction: (A 2 371) ΠΕΝΝΟΥΤΕ ΝΑΜΕ ΕΤΕΝΟΥΤΕ ΑΝ ΠΕ / (RE II 16a 17) ΓΕΝΕΒΙΝΗΝ ΝΑΜΕ ΝΕ ΝΕΤΜΜΑΥ cf. RE II 16b 16 ΓΕΝΕΒΙΝΗΝ ΑΛΛΗΟΣ (sic) ΝΕ and §1.1.2.3 / (IV 32.2f.) ΝΑΙ ΝΑΜΕ ΝΤΑΥΨΗΝ (Sec. Perfect) ΝΙΟΥΡ ΕΤΒΕΜΠΤΕΡΟ ΜΠΟΟΥΤΕ / (III 173.26) ΓΑΜΟΙ ΝΑΜΕ ΕΝΕΥΝΑ-ΛΟΓΟΣ ΖΑΡΟΟΥ / (Wess. 9 156c 7 ff.) ΧΕΚΑΣ ΝΑΜΕ ΕΧΕΜΟΥ ΕΡΤΙΝ ΝΜΟΥ ΝΙΜ. More exx.: Ench. 82a, Wess. 9 144c 4f., Ch. 142.49ff., 155.33ff., Or. 157.3, 165.42ff., A 2 27, etc.

1.3.5.1.3 NAME initial, a premodifier: (A 1 72) ΝΑΜΕ +ΜΕΕΥΕ ΧΕ-. Here I include cases of ΑΥΘ NAME —: (A 2 332) ΑΥΘ ΟΝ ΝΑΜΕ ΠΕΧΙΝ ΠΕ ΤΕΚΚΑΝΙΑ / (III 71.17f.) ΑΥΘ NAME ΖΗΜΑΥ ΝΙΜ ΜΠΟΟΥΣΙΤ... / (ibid. 191.22) ΤΕΝΑΥ ΕΡΟΟΥ ΑΥΘ NAME ΤΕΣΟΟΥΝ ΆΗ ΜΜΟΟΥ / (Ch. 77.23ff.) ΑΥΘ NAME ΝΕΝΝΑΙΜΕΝΈ — or ΑΛΛΑ NAME —: (III 127.2f.) ΑΛΛΑ NAME ΚΑΡΑΥΟΥΣΗΝ ΝΙΟΥ ΕΟΥΟΑΒ... / (III 131.15f. Cod. B, parall. A 2 196) ΑΛΛΑ NAME ΠΕ ΝΕΟΥΟΥΣ ΠΕ ΕΤΡΕΨΚΥ ΝΑΥ ΕΒΟΑ, see §6.0.3.3 for the “foreshadowed” ΠΕ; also ΑΡΜΥ NAME — (III 140.30f.), ΚΑΙΓΑΡ NAME — (III 146.23), NAME before a conditional complex (III 70.17f.).

1.3.5.1.4 NAME postadjectively, adnominal — very common, occurring with most determinators: “true”, “real”, “veritable”, “genuine”: ΠΙΣΤΟΣ NAME (III 15.16, 137.14, IV 21.5, A 1 14, etc. etc.) / (A 2 96) ΟΥΜΙΣΕ ΝΑΜΕ / (ibid. 55, Ch. 34.53ff.) ΠΝΜΠΟΟΥΤΕ ΝΑΜΕ / (III 223.16) ΝΕΞΕΒΗΚΗΣ ΝΑΜΕ / (A 2 402, 407, etc.) ΝΕΧΡΕΙΚΤΙΑΝΟΣ ΝΑΜΕ / (A 2 60) ΠΑΨΡΟΝ ΝΑΜΕ / (IV 80.23) ΖΕΝΙΟΣΤΕ ΝΑΜΕ / (Ch. 168.44ff.) ΟΥΜΝΤΣΑΔΕ ΕΠΙΝΟΥΤΕ ΝΑΜΕ — NAME expands here the whole ‘noun + modifier’ group / (IV 129.11) ΠΕΝΕΙΣΤ AΥΘ ΤΕΝΜΑΑΥ ΝΑΜΕ / (Ch. 140.20) ΝΟΓΟΥ ΝΑΜΕ / (III 39.26) ΝΧΨΤΙ ΝΑΜΕ ΜΠΟΟΥΤΕ — note the position

114 Consider (Or. 159-160) AΥΘ ΕΩΓΕΙ NAME ΤΕ “she really is one” (i.e. an adulteress), varying with AΥΘ NAME ΕΩΓΕΙ ΤΕ. Both are clear cases of the modifier AΥΘ, translatable here as “and what is more”, “and moreover” (§1.3.10).
of NAME (Ch. 93.19ff.) NЕМУВЕЕР NAME ЗМЕПЕК — note placement. Examples of ‘noun - NAME - relative’ are often ambiguous, but occasionally adnominal beyond doubt, with the relative adding further characterization: (Ch. 93.60ff.) ТЕМЕ NAME ЕТФ0666X / (ibid. 191.28ff.) ПЕРЧ-НОБЕ NAME ЕТР0УТ, НАСЕВНС NAME НТАЕИЯ-ТООТОЙ НСУЧ (contrast with the ambiguous Or. 160.34ff. НА0ТН NAME ЕТР-6РУЗ МП0ЕК). Very occasionally, the second-position placement in the group is motivated, NAME modifying the whole complex: (IV 115.15) НАИ NAME НТЕИМЕ. Note АЗЕ NAME ‘yes, indeed’ : (A 2 106) ЫУС АЗЕ NAME АРУН НТОУ ‘yes, indeed, perhaps even...’ / (ibid. 308) КАН АЗЕ NAME ЕУЯН-.

1.3.5.2 ΖΝΟΥΜΕ is rather less common 116:

1.3.5.2.1 Postadjunctive, adverbal: (Ryl. 67 Т46) ΟΥΝΨΨΕΗ ΕΡΕΤΕΚΚΕ ΝΖΗΤΟΥ ΖΝΟΥΜΕ / (A 2 109) ΝΕΤΡΟΕΙΣ ΕΡΨΤΝ ΖΝΟΥΜΕ / (IV 3.26) ΣΕ-ΕΟΟΥ ΝΑΥ ΖΝΟΥΜΕ / (Ch. 26.50ff.) ΝΕΣΟΥΨΕ ΕΤΡΜΕ ΜΜΟΟΥ ΝΖΗΤΥ ΖΝΟΥΜΕ / (III 108.13f.) ΕΝΕΣΤΑΝΡ-ΠΕΚΟΥΨΕ ΖΝΟΥΜΕ / (III 28.6) ΥΤΡΑΛΑΤ ΜΚΟΤΟΥ ΖΝΟΥΜΕ. Additional exx.: Ch. 21.6ff., 112.21ff., 113.185.12ff., 114.108.12ff., 114.431.472, etc. More unusually, we find the expression postadjunctively modifying a Nominal Sentence: (III 171.9f.) ΖΕΝΠΙΣΟΤ ΑΝ ΝΕ ΟΥΤΕ ΖΕΝΠΙΣΟΤ- ΕΑΨ ΑΝ ΝΕ ΖΝΟΥΜΕ. In (A 1 250) ΛΥΨΗΚ ΕΒΟΑ ΖΝΟΥΜΕ ΑΧΝΤΨΑΜΕ ζης ΖΝΟΥΜΕ modifying a modifier: ‘truly without’, and its placement secondary (conditioned).

1.3.5.2.2 Initially, as a premodifier, ΖΝΟΥΜΕ is extremely rare, if to be found at all. The one possible instance I have noted (III 120.24f., 27ff.) is a nice case of the focalized modifier, preceding a complex topic made up of its own topic (theme) + comment (rheeme) — see Ch. 2: ΝΕΤΨΨΕ ΜΜΟΟ ΤΕ-ΝΤΑΥΧΟΟΥ ΣΗΡΟΥ ΕΡΨΟ, ΕΒΟΑ ΣΕ-ΖΝΟΥΜΕ ΝΤΑΥΧΟΟΥ ΕΤΒΕΝΕΤΜΑΤ.

1.3.5.2.3 The lower incidence of ΖΝΟΥΜΕ compared with NAME is especially striking in the adnominal status, in which relatively few examples have come to light (almost all from Ch.) (Ch. 53.54f., 70.38f. ΧΡΕΠΤΙΑΝΟΣ (НМ) ΖΝΟΥΜΕ / (ibid. 25.27f.) ΝΑΠΕΚΕ ΖΝΟΥΜΕ / (ibid. 79.40f.) ΝΨΨΕΗ ΜΚΟΤΟΥ ΖΝΟΥΜΕ / (Wess. 9 147c 1 ff.) ΜΣΟΟΤΣ ΔΑΨ ΜΣΠΟΤΣ ΖΝΟΥΜΕ — all in commodatory collocations.

1.3.6 έΝΕΖ “ever” is synchronically 116 unanalyzable, sharing the syntactic privileges of a noun:

1.3.6.1 Adverbially-postadjunctively (compatible with the perfect and future, less usually aorist — “the two faces of eternity”) it rarely occurs marked by Н-: (A 1 295) ΜΗ ΑΓΕΑΛΑΤ ΜΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ ΤΨΟΥΝ ΝΕΕΖ ΣΜΠΗΛ, but usually without any marking for modifier status (§1.3.2.): (Ch. 32.36ff.) ΜΠΑ- ΓΕΡΑΤΚ ΖΜΕ ΕΕΖ, ΜΠΕΤΑΙΟΝ ΟΥΨΕΗ ΝΑΚ ΕΕΖ / (Gol. Jelanskaja 1b) ΜΗ ΥΑΡΕΝΝΟΤΕ ΥΨΕΗ ΜΠΟΝΗΠΟΡΟΣ ΝΨΨΕΗ Ν ΟΥΝΟΜ ΕΕΖ ΝΟΥΨΨΕΗ ΝΟΥΨΤ ΜΠΟΝΗΠΟΡΟΣ ΕΚΙ-ΟΥΝΟΜ ΜΜΗΝΨΗ ΝΟΟΝΣ / (P 1306 17 ΡΣ) ΜΗ ΚΝΑΥ- ΣΟΟΟ ΡΨ ΕΕΖ ΧΕ- / (P 1308 24 ΦΝΑ-Ε) ΑΡΕΣΕΤΕ-ΓΗΒΣ ΔΕ ΟΝ ΕΕΖ... ΑΡΤΣΑΒΕ-ΨΨΗΕ ΔΕ ΟΝ ΕΕΖ ΕΝΟΤ... / (P 1304 105 ΡΚΕ) ΝΤΑΝΙΜ ΜΚΟΟΖ ΖΨ ΝΑΥ ΝΖΟΟΥ ΕΕΖ ΝΟΥΨΗΝ ΕΕΨΑΙ / (Wess. 9 120b 3ff.) ΜΠΕΡΣΩΝΙΑΚΨ ΖΨΚ ΕΨΟΥΝ ΕΨΟΥΝ ΕΕΖ / (III 153.10f.) ΜΠΚΝΑΥ ΕΨΟΥΝ ΕΕΖ / (IV 17.11f.) ΜΣΕΝΑΣ-ΨΗΜΕ ΑΝ ΕΕΖ. As in other languages (notably old and modern Indo-European ones), ΏΝΕΖ, which frequently features in interrogative sentences predicated of НΙΜ “who?”, fluctuates here between the post-verbal and post-pronominal (or adpronominal: НИМ έΝΕΖ “whoever?”) placements. From (A 2 518) ΝΤΑΝΙΜ ΕΙΜΕ ΕΕΖ ΝΝΕΙΡΨΟΤΕ ΥΘΡΟΥ... ΧΕ- / (ibid. 153) ΝΤΑΝΙΜ ΝΨΨΕΗ Ρ-ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣ ΕΕΖ, through (A 2 463) ΝΤΑΝΣΤΨΜΤ ΖΗΤΝΜ ΕΕΖ ΧΕ- / (A 1 77) ΝΤΑΥΧΟΟΟ ΕΙΜΗ ΕΕΖ ΧΕ-, to (A 2 151) ΝΤΑΝΙΜ ΕΕΖ... ΖΑΙ / (A 2 18) ΝΤΑΝΙΜ ΝΨΨΗ ΕΕΖ ΚΑΝΕΕΟΟΥ ΣΜΠΟΖΕ / (RE 10 162a 5) ΝΙΜ έΝΕΖ ΠΕΝΤΑΧΙΕΡΕ ΝΑΚ ΝΨΟΡΝ... / (Young II) ΝΙΜ ΥΨΨΗ ΕΕΖ ΠΕΤΝΑΥΤΡΨΝ-ΑΑΛΥ...

116 Postadjunctive, adverbal ΖΝΟΥΜΗΣ is a near-synonym (III 158.28, Ench. 808).
1.3.6.2 Initially, we find only άνηνεζης, premodifying the negative perfect (A 2 241, 341, III 216) \(^{117}\).

1.3.7 en-marked modifiers are mostly analyzable as ε + def. article + noun, yet with a remarkably high degree of semasiological fusion:

1.3.7.1 ένσαε “finally”, initial (premodifier) only, usually ένσαε δε — (contextually marked): (III 103.20) …ένσαε δε αύμουτοι / (A I 260) (on children’s playful constructions) …ένσαε δε ωάυτα-κοοῦ θηρού / (IV 8.12) ένσαε δε αύζιτουτοι έπρρο μητρή. Also A 2 166, P 131\(^{4}\) 151 m.

1.3.7.2 έπηρμή is the native equivalent (showing also formal similarity) of ζολωσ (§1.3.11.1.1):

1.3.7.2.1 Postadjunctively, adverbially (έπηρμή is only postadjectively): “at all”, “in any way”:(IV 70.23) ηνέκαλης έπηρμή έπευχε ηρίζαλης ηρίζαλης ηνέκαλης / (ibid. 72.15) ηνέκαλης ζηράλης ηπο ηπο ηνέκαλης έπηρμή / (Ch. 187-8) ηνέκαλης ουν-αγης ιεθον έπηρμή / (III 132.3f) …έπηρμή ηπο ιεθον έπηρμή (scil. έπηρμή έπηρμή ηπο ιεθον) / (P 130\(^{4}\) 36 vo) ιεθον έπηρμή έπηρμή. In two instances, we may have έπηρμή for έπηρμή (zeroing ε-?: A 2 310, 311, uncollated).


1.3.7.3.1 έπινεξη “in vain. uselessly. with no effect. for no reason. without provocation” \(^{118}\). Postadjunctive, adverbial: (III 124.12) …άλλα άλλα (sim. ibid. 131.4, 139.15, 27) / (ibid. 123.8) άλλα άλλα άλλα άλλα άλλα (P 131\(^{1}\) 30 pme) άλλα άλλα άλλα (Ch. 96.5f.) έπινεξη / (P 131\(^{1}\) 30 pme) έπινεξη / (Berl. 1611 13 k) έπινεξη / έπινεξη / έπινεξη (Berl. 1611 13 k) έπινεξη. Adnominally, έπινεξη is less usual: (IV 94.15) έπινεξη / (A 2 415) έπινεξη / (A 2 298) έπινεξη. Premodifier: έπινεξη (an) an … A 2 131, Ch. 139.19f., III 55.14f. For predicative έπινεξη see §1.2.1.2.

1.3.7.3.2 έπινεξη “without remuneration, gratis”, (rarely) “for no reason” is mostly opposed to έπινεξη: (Ch. 92.25f.) έπινεξη / (P 2 25) έπινεξη / έπινεξη (Berl. 1611 13 k) έπινεξη / έπινεξη / έπινεξη / έπινεξη. έπινεξη opposed to έπινεξη. Rarely, έπινεξη (neutral? consider Ch. 106.62f.) seems synonymous with έπινεξη (A 4 276) έπινεξη. έπινεξη. Both are apparently disjoined in (Ench. 89b) έπινεξη έπινεξη έπινεξη έπινεξη έπινεξη έπινεξη. For predicative έπινεξη (κον) see §1.2.1.2.

1.3.7.4 έπεζογο is “too much, in excess”, postadjunctive: (P 130\(^{4}\) 131 vo) έπεζογο / (Berl. 1611 13 k) έπεζογο / έπεζογο / έπεζογο / (IV 155.8) έπεζογο / (Berl. 1611 13 k) έπεζογο / (Ench. 89b) έπεζογο / (A 4 276) έπεζογο / (Berl. 1611 13 k) έπεζογο / (A 4 276) έπεζογο / (Ench. 89b) έπεζογο / (A 4 276) έπεζογο / (Berl. 1611 13 k) έπεζογο / (A 4 276) έπεζογο / (Ench. 89b) έπεζογο / (A 4 276) έπεζογο / (Berl. 1611 13 k) έπεζογο / (A 4 276) έπεζογο / (Ench. 89b) έπεζογο. Έπεζογο / (Berl. 1611 13 k) έπεζογο / (A 4 276) έπεζογο / (Ench. 89b) έπεζογο / (A 4 276) έπεζογο / (Berl. 1611 13 k) έπεζογο / (A 4 276) έπεζογο / (Ench. 89b) έπεζογο. Έπεζογο / (Berl. 1611 13 k) έπεζογο / (A 4 276) έπεζογο / (Ench. 89b) έπεζογο / (A 4 276) έπεζογο / (Berl. 1611 13 k) έπεζογο / (A 4 276) έπεζογο / (Ench. 89b) έπεζογο. Έπεζογο / (Berl. 1611 13 k) έπεζογο / (A 4 276) έπεζογο / (Ench. 89b) έπεζογο / (A 4 276) έπεζογο / (Berl. 1611 13 k) έπεζογο / (A 4 276) έπεζογο / (Ench. 89b) έπεζογο. Έπεζογο / (Berl. 1611 13 k) έπεζογο / (A 4 276) έπεζογο / (Ench. 89b) έπεζογο / (A 4 276) έπεζογο / (Berl. 1611 13 k) έπεζογο / (A 4 276) έπεζογο / (Ench. 89b) έπεζογο. Έπεζογο / (Berl. 1611 13 k) έπεζογο / (A 4 276) έπεζογο / (Ench. 89b) έπεζογο / (A 4 276) έπεζογ
9ff.) ...πάνυ ξεκάς μνεικάρων ἐπεζοῦ. Adnominally, we find (III 200.22f.) μιμάναις ἐπεζοῦ and perhaps (130^4 40 μτ) γενεχτικάνοις ἐπιούτοις ἐπεζοῦ — unless the last example is adclausal.

1.3.7.5 For ἐναι, see §7.4.

1.3.7.6 ἐν + infinitive: ἐνθωρα (III 218.5ff.), ἐπευθαναμάρθοντες (Ch. 114.53f.) ἐπεύθεν-τ(σ)γενεσθῇ ἐπειθα (Wess. 9 117a 24ff.). Whether or not this is a free procedure — an open-ended (productive) paradigm — remains to be established by more evidence.\(^{119}\)

1.3.8 ζιοῦς "(all) together" reveals a remarkable distribution:

1.3.8.1 Final, modifying a coordination: 'Χ άυς/μην-᾿ Y ζιοῦς': (IV 108.5f.) ξτούος ἐπώνειμα μὴν νευράθοι ζιοῦς (III 13.13) (τεκεγισχαί) μαλαβειοῦς άυς μενεβίνης ζιοῦς / (ibid. 63.9f.) ζενθυζ μαλαβειοῦς ἐμαίτης μὴν μενπούγει ζιοῦς μενζεκένθες εἶναυ / (P 131^4 157 vo) γενεῖζηες ερενεταυς ξτούος μμούς μηνεττίτευς νὴ μαύζε εξατι εξαιπε νηκαξε ζιοῦς.

1.3.8.2 Ad(prot)onominal (in fact augential — see Ch. 6, esp. §6.1), modifying a (usually plural) pronoun, often with (and following) θὴν-ως: (P 131^4 87 παά) άυς έπων ζιοῦς / (IV 191.7f.) ερευνός θηρούζ ζιοῦς γενεμελέτομε μήνεξ / (A 2 299) ερευνός εὔος ζιοῦς (addressed to the congregation), adverbial? Cf. (ζτούος εὔος) IV 158.16, A 2 298 / (A 2 292) ...,ερευνότε θαοί νας ζιοῦς / (IV 89.2f.) ...,νενούς μὴν ζιοῦς / (P 131^6 23 [06]) άνον θηρούς ζιοῦς μαρκες-νοντές / (P 130^5 37 vo) ούον νημί ζιοῦς / (NT 77.18.8) ζιοῦς θηρούς. Also IV 67.8, A 1 68, Π 131^4 86 πα.

1.3.9 Τώνε (rarely) τώνος "very (much)", "greatly" is always postadjectively adverbal, and expands only the present tense: (A 1 58) θυατάτ Τώνε ητάκον, τεαναι τώνε / (ibid. 68) τεμαίην τώνε / (A 2 319) τρ-θηνής μμούτν τώνε / (III 25.6) τν γιν-ζωτν τώνε / (ibid. 117.17) τεκτοκολήες μμούτν τώνος / (IV 193.9) άκα-δοός μπότος τώνε ζενπεκέσωμα.

1.3.10 άυς "also", "too", "moreover", "and indeed", "furthermore" (cf. adeo) — a focusing additive conjunct. This I believe is its true nature, even as a coordinator, which is misrepresented when we take it "simply" as a coordinating conjunction.\(^{120}\) The modifier status of άυς is made conspicuous by the grammatical asymmetry of its flanking constructions (especially — a typical figure — basic tense + άυς + circumstantial, mostly Nom. Sentence and perfect;\(^{121}\): this is a significant normal phenomenon rather than a violation of coordination restrictions — indeed, this is not conjunctival coordination in its usual accepted sense: (A 1 71) θηναρίες εν νέξε-πούτος άυς εντοπι ΝΕ ΠΕΤΟΥΘΗ / (Ch. 79.51ft.) ΜΑΥ ΝΕΣΕ ΠΕΥΟΥΝ ΑΝ ΠΕ ΠΟΥΜ ΝΝΑΜΙΝ, άυς έπογιους ΝΝΑΜΙΝ ΠΕ ΠΕΥΟΥΝ / (IV 24.2f.) άυς-πεζαβοιάκοι νβάλα, άυς έσούβαλε πνε / (ibid. 75.20ft.) ...,πορμαί ΜΝΑΧΙΟΥΣ ΜΝΙΟΓΑ ΜΝΙΒ ΝΕ- ΖΩΥΟΥ... άυς έναι μεταξείς εὐρούς ετθητούς μεντας-χες (III 125.7f.) ζενβαλε ΝΕ ΕΥΣΟΡΗ... άυς έζεις...

\(^{119}\) Cf. the grammaticalized Bohairic επικιν(τε)- (STERN §§470-2, MALLON-MALININE §§271, 273). In Sahidic, we may have a calque of the Greek εἰς-πρός + infinitive (BASS-DEBRUNNER §402.2.5).


\(^{121}\) Cf. §7.1.2.2 for the conjunctive as another "pseudo-coordinative" verb form. Cf. in Bohairic Acta Martyrum (CSCO) II 205.12, 268.2, and compare the Late Egyptian br (esp. άρ-νω-, with no circumstantial preceding: see Wente, Late Ramesside Letters, 1967, 58 n. b: Chronique d’Égypte 44:272ff.; SATZINGER 1976:231ff.). Compare JACOBSSON 1977:49f., for English and.

1.3.10  The question of GREEK LOAN-MODIFIERS is naturally tied up with that of the status of non-Egyptian words in Coptic generally, and, more specifically, with the nature and degree of their assimilation into the Coptic grammatical system — one aspect of the typological issue of the Greek-induced element on Coptic grammar. This difficult subject is outside the scope of the present study. My view, however, is that we are here against a gradient, not dichotomic (“loan-words” vs. “foreign words”) phenomenon of assimilation. The assimilation scale can be established in terms of productivity, of integration in the Coptic semasiological system, and (sometimes) in terms of phonological structure and properties — all three criteria presupposing in-depth monographic investigation, in addition to the procedure in vogue, viz. the collection of Greek-origin items.

1.3.11.1 -wC-characterized modifiers are but partly analyzable (see above, §1.3.0.1) and their listing is apparently limited (or at best half-open-ended, meaning that more and more members may turn up, yet without a substantiable claim to free productivity in Coptic). Although this phonemic configuration is certainly indicative (or rather co-indicative) of modifier status, their transparency and analyzability are not absolute. The most common instances are discussed in the following paragraphs:

1.3.11.1.1  zoWwC (zoLoC, zwawC) “at all”, “wholly” (similar in function and distribution to eITHpC, §1.3.7.2) occurs

(a) Adverbially, postadjectively — note the significant variation in spelling (exclusive to this position!): Usually we find here a negated or negative-implication verb (“at all”): (A 2 548) mnwpy-nbB 2wawC / (IV 69.19f.) NnhT+2NnAy NAY zoWwC NTEzE / (Ibid. 99.20f.) nThwzAtE AN zoWwC / (Ibid. 93.6) nCnOZKZ AN zoWwC eNOE(IMwOY / (P 130 156 TZE) n+P-zOte AN zoWwC / (A 1 105-6) nwAwzAtE ZoWwC AN... eTrEwzAtE zoWwC 2mpAzAtA / (III 43.5f.). (It is blasphemy to say:) OwNpzwzE moY ZoWwC eXmpT-pAtA CmOwOY. More exx.: III 38.16, 135.25ff., IV 62.25ff., 94.1, 124.9, 200.22, Ch. 44.35ff., A 1 47, 97, etc. Less frequently, we see zoWwC modifying an affirmative verb, with the meaning “completely, wholly, totally, altogether”: (A 1 251) scChZ zoWwC Pw- (Pw zoWwC in P 130 138 Tm, 131 89 Pas) / (IV 124.7f.) netNwCtkZ eYzn eQyn ZoWwC. In this position, zoWwC (in contradistinction to eITHpC) may be intensified by reiteration: §1.1.2.4.3.

(b) zoWwC (zoLoC) Pw- “actually”, “on the whole”, is a (relatively rare) premodifier: (K 928) zoWwC Pw NswznpmwE eTo nAH nANe / (P 131 142 K) zoLoC Pw eYzn-kYaAT nKswzB nhoyAzE ePOY / (III 36.15) zoWwC Pw nhNymATaGE-Pw AN — also A 1 47.

---

132 Shisha-Halevy 1976a:33. §1.3.11.6 below and §7.3.1.
134 See Weiss 1968, and (for statement of the problem, with suggestions towards its solution and relevant literature) Minck 1978:95ff. See now also Vergote in Young (ed.) 1981: 339ff.; Anba Gregorius 1981 is the most recent study in a series unfortunately wanting in theoretical considerations: p. 205ff. on “adverbs”.
(c) Adnominally, ἀλλως, ἀλος modifies postadjectively the indefinites ἀἀαυ, πψωμε, κεουα in the sense of “what(soever)” : (I 14) ἐκαλαὶ πνευματικοὶ ἀλος, sim. IV 87.19f., III 92.9, K 921 / εἰς ἐκαλαὶ πνευματικοὶ ἀλος (IV 44.24, 45.4, 87.8f., 206.18, 81.5, etc.) / (P 1304.15.10) ἀἀαυ πνευματικοὶ ἀλος... ἀἀαυ ἐνοχα εἰπθρι / (IV 107.29) τετείσμην τε τεύματα κε ἐκεινοὶ ἀλος.

1.3.11.1.2 ἀλλως “truly” (cf. ὅμηρος, ἕνομε, §1.3.5) occurs

(a) Postadjectively, adverbially (“truly”, “really”): (A 2 464), parenthetically, καὶ εὐξεθμεγενεῦτε ἐνορεύοντες ἐτεθείαμελεία-τεμέγ γαρ ἀλλως... / (A 2 174, Ryl. 67 τεθυ) ἀνωτέρω ἄνως ἄκογα οἰκιστος, also IV 25.8.

(b) In a Nominal Sentence (§1.1.2.3) it is adnominal/adclausal (status neutralized), with a variation ἀλλως/ἀλθος: (A 2 402) οὐστερεῖ γαρ ἀλλως πνευματικοὶ πε ναυ... / (RE 10 162b 16) θεοβινοι ἀλθος πε / (III 115.26ff.) οὐταλαίπνωρος ἁθος πε... οὐμακαριστος ον ἄλθους πνευματικοὶ πε... Also Ch. 195.3ff., A 2 395, Cat. 43.28.

(c) Initially — always — the premodifier ἀλλως means “indeed”, “really” : (A 2 191) ἄλθους καὶ Μιντικρίκα Μαυλάκ / (ibid. 473) Καὶ γαρ ἄλθους οὐστερεῖ πε ψυκτος / (IV 25.2f.) ἄλθους οὐράνιοι λαοῦ πε / (III 107.6) ἄλθους δάκτυλοι ψυκτος εὐξεθμε... see §1.2.1.3.3 / (P 1304 71 ζελ) ἄλθους σενασκουν γαςβων νεμευοι. Also III 114.21, 161.29ff., 212.17. Wess. 9 145b 29ff. μᾶλλον δὲ ἁλθος δε- (Ch. 129.21ff.) with the varia lectio μᾶλλον δε ἁθος (III 35.2) could also be interpreted as ἁθος expanding μᾶλλον (§1.3.11.2.5).

(d) Adnominally, ἀλλως/ἀλθος is rather rare compared with ὅμηρος: (A 2 18) πνευματικοὶ ἀλθος / (RE 10 164a 4) τενακωμεν ἁθος / (Cat. 42.29) τενακωμεν γιαν ἁθος ἄνεπθομος καινοσ.

1.3.11.1.3 καλως “well”, “rightly”, “beneficially” \(^{185}\) and κακως “badly”, “harmedly, with evil intent”, “ill” occur

(a) Postadjectively — very often clause-finally, thus probably adclausal rather than adverbal: (III 80.17) το γιατι πνεματικοὶ πε καλως, sim. ibid. 111.23ff. / (ibid. 220.23) πενταγωγες ευβοϊ πεταλιακος καλως, sim. (ἐκβολος καλως) IV 4.5 / (P 1304 139 τε) εκαλως εἶναι καλως εματε / (IV 157.2ff.) νοι πνεματικοὶ καλως / (A 2 498) πενταγωγες ευβοϊ καλως, ανοικτος κακως / (ibid. 333) χειμων κακως κα- παξακα εστίς παξακα εστίς / (IV 95.10) πνεματικοὶ ςεκ-τενακωμεν εστεραί κακως, with many more exx., e.g. III 93.2, 110.1, 119.10ff., 153.8, 217.13ff., IV 73.22, 118.27, 162.21, A 1 302 etc.

(b) Less usually, καλως occurs initially as a premodifier (with the perfect): (III 222.3) καλως ἄναγμα σαλβων / (IV 8.4) καλως αὐξουσ / (Ch. 104.37ff.) καλως ακεί-παι / (P 1304 109 τε) καλως ποιαν ἀναγμα μακα ἄπειρα: more often, both καλως and κακως tend to predicative status \(^{186}\): either focalized by a Second Tense/circumstantial topologicalization form (§2.6.1): (A 2 338) εὐθυ-παι καλως εὐκαλως μμος / (P 1304 122 τα) καλως αὐξα δικαλως εὐκαλως... in the # modifier -0 # predication pattern (§1.3.1.3.3) or before a conditional topologicalization form: (III 222.4f.) καλως αὐξανας ςμοικας εὐβοϊ πνεματικοὶ.

(c) Adnominally, we find καλως modifying only a verb-nominalization: (A 2 547) τετείσμην τε τεύματα καλος αἰτιματειος.

---

\(^{185}\) See Abel 1876-7:549ff. for a conceptual study of καλως (cf. Blass-Debrunner §102.3).

\(^{186}\) Cf. Paul 1920:§200.
1.3.11.1.4 ΖΩΜΙΣ “nevertheless”, “at all events”, “however that may be, for all that, even so” (licet, quoadminus)\(^{137}\) and ΖΩΜΟΙΣ (often spelled ΖΩΜ(Α)ΙΟ/ΩΣ) “likewise, similarly”, are to an extent functionally conflated in our corpus, with ΖΩΜΟΙΣ encroaching on the semasiological range of ΖΩΜΙΣ\(^{138}\).

(a) Questionably, postadjunctively-adverbially: ΖΩΜΟΙΣ only (not ΖΩΜΙΣ): (III 99.14) Α[Μ]ΟΥΤΕ ΕΠ[ΟΟΥ] ΖΩΜΟΙΣ / (A 262) ΕΥΝΑΙΕΡΕ ΝΑΙ ΖΩΜΑΙΟΣ ΚΑΤΑΠΕΜΠΟΥΑ / (ibid. 378-9) ...ΕΤΡΕΠΑΝΙΣΤΟΣ Ρ-ΡΜΑΛΟ ΑΥΣ ΝΠΙΣΤΟΣ ΖΩΜΟΙΣ, Η ΧΕΠΕΥΕΒΗΣ ΑΥΣ ΠΑΣΕΒΗΣ ΟΝ ΖΩΜΟΙΣ — in all cases I would prefer an ad-(pro)nominial interpretation (“to him too”, “the believer likewise”...) — compare the adnominal pre-modifier\(^{139}\) in (III 220.21) ΝΥΩΡΠ ΜΕΝ ΝΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΣ, ΖΟΜΟΙΣ ΜΠΡΕΣΒΥΕΡΟΣ.

(b) Initially we find both as additive or concessive conjuncts: ΖΩΜΙΣ “nevertheless”: (A 1 382) ΖΩΜΙΣ ΑΕΝ ΝΑΤΝΑΣΤΕ ΕΠΟΠ ΝΕΙΝΕΛΑΣΝΗ / (III 13.9) ΖΩΜΙΣ ΝΥ-ΓΝΕ-ΕΙΝΑΛΑΚΟΣ ΑΝ ΕΔΟΥ / (Ch. 125.10ff.) ΖΩΜΙΣ ΕΙΝΑΛΕ-ΠΥΛΑΔΕ ΕΒΟΛ / (ibid. 128.33ff.) (even though I do not wish to say it) ΖΩΜΙΣ ΕΤΒΕΤΕΦΕΑΙΑ ΝΝΕΤ-ΝΗΛΑΤΗΝ ΠΥΛΑΣΟΥ, sim. ibid. 57.51 ff., 80.15ff. ... ΖΩΜΟΙΣ “nevertheless”: (IV 195.8ff.) (Even if even the people who are pained to hear that “the Kingdom of God is not eating and drinking”) ΖΩΜΑΙΟΣ ΠΟΥΤΕ ΠΝΤΛΑΤΜ- (sic) ΠΟΥΜ ΝΜΠΛΣ ΑΛΑΛ ΕΥΜΠΙΑΤΣΕΙ ΑΝ,... / (A 2 464) ΚΑΝ ΕΥΛΧΕ-ΤΗΜΕ ΣΕ ΝΥΣΜΕ... ΖΩΜΙΣ ΤΑΝΑΚΑΙ ΕΡΟΙ ΤΕ ΕΤΡΑΣΟΕΟΣ. ΖΟΜΙΣ “likewise”: (III 66.12ff.) ΖΩΜΙΣ ΔΕ ΟΝ ΤΑΙΔΟΝΗΧ ΝΒΡΒΕ ΕΣΤ ΑΝ ΟΥΒΕ ΝΕΨΑΔΕ (v.l. ΖΩΜΑΙΟΣ); also ibid. 31.23ff., 67.2. In titles, superscriptions (with date or theme of the homily; not part of the corpus): III 102.9, IV 11.1f. (ΖΩΜΑΙΟΣ/ΟΜΟΙΣ).

1.3.11.1.5 ΠΑΝΤΒΣ (ΠΑΝΤΟΣ a common spelling), “no doubt”, “necessarily”, “without fail”, “eventually”, “as a matter of course”, “naturally”, “assuredly”, “possibly”, “perhaps”.

(a) Clause-finally, as adclausal postadjunctive modifier, usually with an apodotic future tense (the protases being ΕΨΑΛ-Ν-, ΕΥΛΧΕ- or the protasis-equivalent ΠΕΤ(ΝΑ)-, ΠΕΝΤΑ-): (A 2 535) ΕΡΨΑΝΕΠΣΗΡΕΗΤΕ ΕΨ-ΝΕΚΙΒΕ ΕΠΕΟΥΟ, ΝΕΠΝΟΥ ΝΑΕΙ ΕΒΟΛ ΠΑΝΤΒΣ / (ibid. 360) ΕΥΛΧΕ-ΠΡΙΨΜΕ ΟΥΜΟΥ ΑΓ ΕΚΑΛ ΝΜΨ ΙΝΑΨ, ΧΝΑΚΑΛΕ ΠΑΝΤΒΣ ΕΨΑΛ ΑΝ / (ibid. 165) ΕΥΛΧΕ-ΠΟΨΜΕ ΝΝΑΧΕΣ-ΤΑΒΝ ΑΝ ΕΠΝΟΟΥ ΕΤΒΕΝΟΤΕ ΕΤΕΣΟΥ, ΧΝΑΛΟΕ ΠΑΝΤΟΣ ΝΕΠΝΑΝΟΟΥ / (ibid. 249-250) ΠΕΤΝΑΜΕΡΕ-ΠΝΟΕΙΚ ΑΝ... ΧΝΑΕΙ ΠΑΝΤΣΕ ΕΤΟΤΥΧ ΜΠΕΙΝΟΙ ΜΝΨΝΟΓΗΕ / (III 213.19) ΝΕΤΑΥΝΕΙ ΓΑΡ ΚΑΤΑΝΟΥΤΕ, ΠΟΥΤΕ ΝΑΧΙ-ΤΕΥΑΝΗ ΠΑΝΤΒΣ / (ibid. 214.10f.) ΝΕΤΕΙΡΕ ΝΝΑΙ, ΝΕΝΑΜΟΥΤΕ ΕΡΟΟΥ ΓΣΟΥ ΠΑΝΤΒΣ ΑΝ ΝΕΝΕΓΑ ΝΤΑΙΑΚΟΙΟΥΝ / (Ch. 182.15ff.) ΤΕΤΕΝΟΨΜΕ ΝΑΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΑΝ, ΣΕΝΑΤΑΛΕ ΝΑΕ ΠΑΝΤΒΣ. More exx.: III 24.14, IV 3.17ff., Ch. 134.48ff., 161.28ff., A 2 14, 165 etc. Rarely, adclausal PANTUS occurs outside this configuration (“no doubt”): (IV 6.23ff.) ΑΛΝΣ ΠΑΝΤΒΣ ΕΤΡΕΥΣΙ-ΕΔΑ / (A 2 455) (explication of “ΕΨΑΛ ΕΒΟΛ”) ΠΕΤΝΑΚΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΠΑΝΤΣΕ ΠΕ ΝΑΙ ΕΤΕΡΕ-ΠΥΛΑΔΕ ΝΤΕΦΡΙΣ ΝΑΨΚ ΕΒΟΛ ΕΣΡΑΙ ΕΨΙΨ.

(b) Initially, ΠΑΝΤΒΣ occurs before the present (or present-equivalent) tense, less usually before the perfect, with the sense “no doubt”, “as is well known”, but also with nuances of “possibly”, “perhaps”\(^{138}\): (Ch. 55.1ff.) ΠΑΝΤΣΕ ΠΕΚΣΤΟ ΕΙΜ-ΕΙΜ ΠΑΡΑΓΑΣ / (ibid. 59.31ff.) ΠΑΝΤΣΕ ΠΣΙΝ ΝΤΙΕ ΠΕ ΠΣΙ ΜΠΑΚΑΣ / (III 196.16) ΠΑΝΤΣΕ ΠΨ ΜΠΕΝΝΟΕΙ ΜΠΥΛΑΣΕ — also IV 2.6, Ch. 56.29ff., 120. 21ff., A 2 454.

(c) The imported (unanalyzable?) ΟΥ ΠΑΝΤΒΣ\(^{131}\) “not indeed”, “certainly not”, in a rhetorical question: (IV 2.20ff.) ΕΤΒΕ ΟΥ... ΟΥ ΠΑΝΤΣΕ ΕΤΒΕ... / (ibid. 10.4ff.) ΖΗΝΟΥ ΕΥΛΧ ΝΜΟΣ ΑΝ... ΟΥ ΠΑΝΤΣΕ ΖΟΕΙΝΕ ΑΝ... ΖΕΝΚΟΟΥΕ ΑΝ...

\(^{137}\) Blass-Debrunner §450.2.
\(^{138}\) As early as classical Greek: cf. Künner-Gerth II 280, 4; Schwyzter II 554, 582f.
\(^{139}\) See Mayser 2/2:184, 170 on the placement of adnominal διοικός.
\(^{131}\) Blass-Debrunner §433.2.
1.3.11.1.6 **ONTWÇ, ONTOÇ** "indeed", "in fact, actually", "truly" occurs only in initial position, and often (typically) introduces an apodotic present or future after **EU∑XÊ/ EU∑ΥΑΝÊ** protases, as a kind of superordinant ("then indeed... "); (**III 37.2, parall. Ch. 132-3**). **ΕΥ∑ΧÊ-ΤΕΝΙΠΟΥΜΕΙ ΕΤΒΒΩ, ΟΝΤWÇ ΧΧΟΥΜW ΝΗΓΟΥ ΕΤΒΒΩΝ / (III 25.24ff.) ΕΥ∑ΧÊ-ΤΕΤΝΜΟΥΝ ΜΠΝΟΥΤΕ Η ΤΕΤΝΠΗ ΕΙΣ ΟΝΤWÇ ΤΕΤΝΜΠΙΑ ΝΜΑΣΩΓΩ... / (Ch. 26.40ff.)** ΕΥ∑ΧÊ-ΤΕΝΙΠΟΥΜΕΙ-ΤΕΒΒΩΛΗ ΧΧÊ-ΕΥΝΑΤΝΤΩΝ ΕΡΩΣ ΟΝΤWÇ ΚΟΥΣΤΒ ΜΜΟΣ ΕΒΟΛ ΑΥΨ ΚΡ-ΖΟΥO ΕΡΩΣ / (ibid. 100.52ff.) ΝΤΝΜΤ ΔΕ ΕΤΕΝΝΥΑΝΤΜΡ-ΖΩΒ ΖΝΑΛI ΤΗΡΟΥ ΕΥΡΩ-ΖΟΥO ΝΗΓΟΝ, ΟΝΤWÇ ΤΕΤΝΓ-ΖΤΗΝ, ΟΝΤWÇ ΤΕΤΝΑΣΥΝΙ / (ibid. 79.19ff.) ΕΥ∑ΧÊΠΛΛΣΕΒΗΣ ΠΕΤ+ΖΟΜ ΜΝΔΛΙΜΩΝ ΕΝΝΑΠ ΕΚΗΡΥ, ΟΝΤWÇ ΟΥΜΑΚΑΡΙΟΣ ΝΕ ΠΕΥΣΕΒΗΣ. Also **III 40.9f.** (with the apod. preceding the protasis), 67.22, 22.20ff., **IV 21.14, Ch. 116. 53ff.** (before the whole cond. complex). Elsewhere, too, **ONTWÇ** occurs mostly before the present tense or Nominal Sentence: (**III 75.16**). **ΟΝΤTHING ΖΗΨΩ ΑΥΨ ΟΥΛΑΝΤΖΕ ΠΕ / (215.2f.)** ΟΝΤWÇ ΗΝΥΛΕΙΝ ΡΩ ΑΝ ΣΑΣΡΑΙ, also **III 13.5, 114.27** (fut.), 212.9ff., **Ch. 169.22ff.** It is unusual with the perfect: (**IV 7.11f.**). **ΠΕΚΑΛΥ ΖΗ-... ΟΝΤWÇ ΛΥΚΥΨΝΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΤΕΝΜΠΑΤΝΟΥΤΕ ΕΣΥΝΗ ΜΝΤΟΡΓΗ...**

1.3.11.1.7 **VARIA:** (a) **ΖΑΝΑΣΖ ΖΑΝΑΛWC** 132, usually adnominally to **ΠΨΜΕ ΝΙΜ, ΟΥΟΝ ΝΙΜ, ΖΩΒ ΝΙΜ,** (but also ad casualia), typically recapitulating and summing up (as an "attitudinal conjunct") the idea or category underlying a preceding detailed list or account: (**A 2 416**). (following a list of useless items)... **ΑΥΨ ΖΑΝΑΣΖ ΖΑΝΑΛWC ΖΩΒ ΝΙΜ ΕΜΝΟΥΡΓΡΕ ΓΙΩΜΨ / (IV 54.6ff.)** (following a list of toilsome tasks) **ΖΑΝΑΣΖ ΖΑΝΑΛWC ΖΩΒ ΝΙΜ ΕΤΟΥΜΑΖΙΣ ΝΖΗΤΟΥ ΠΑΡΑΤΕΓΚΩΜ / (A 1 16**) (following a description of a dog's physical actions) **ΖΑΝΑΛWC ΜΕΝΟΣ ΝΕ ΝΤΑΧΓΝΛΕ ΕΡΟΝ 2ΝΟΥΝΩΝ ΝΑΠΕΛΗΝ, also A 2 260, P 131f. 13 vo.** With the meaning "simply": (**A 2 228**). **ΠΣΑΕΙΝ ΕΥΗΛΨΨΚ ΑΝ ΕΡΑΤΗ ΝΟΥΟΝ ΝΙΜ ΖΑΝΑΛWC ΕΡ-ΝΑΣΡΕ ΕΡΟΟΥ (hardly even to wealthy patients) — note ΝΤΕΝΙΖ ΖΑΝΑΛWC "simply thus" (**§1.1.2.4 **). **IV 196.3, Ch. 162.5, A 2 204**.

(b) **ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣ, ΔΙΚΑΙΟC**, before the First Perfect: (**IV 9.22f.**). **ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣ ΑΧΝΗΠΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΜΜΟΥΝ ΝΗΠΕΝΜΟΥ / (P 130f 54 ΧΑ) ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣ ΑΛΕΘΡΟΝΟΣ ΝΕΟΟΥ ΜΕΤΣΨΟΥ, also III 109.13.** Focalized by the Second Present/circumstantial (**§2.6.1): (**III 47.3f.**). **ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣ ΕΥΜΟΣΤΕ ΝΝΑΨ ΕΤΟΥΨ ΕΝΚΩΝΝΑΨ ΝΙΜ ΝΑΚΑΘΑΡΤΟΝ / (P 130f 122 ΑΒ) ΚΑΛΑΣΨ ΑΥΨ ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣ ΥΨ...** Postadjective (rare): (**Ryl. 69 ΝΓ**). **ΧΗΑΟΟΝ ΝΑΥ ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣ ΖΗ...**

(c) **ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙΚΨΣ (terminological), postadjective:** (**Ch. 208.25ff., Sh. ?)**. **ΕΥΨΥΜΕ ΝΑΥ ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙΚΨΣ.**

(d) **ΤΕΨΨ "so long", postadjective (A 2 254).**

(e) **ΖΨΚΑΤΨΨ "just so", premodifier (A 2 258).**

1.3.11.2 **-ON-CHARACTERIZED MODIFIERS may — at least as one possibility — be interpreted as position-marked nouns** 133.

1.3.11.2.1.1 The attitudinal **ΜΟΝΟΝ** "but, yet", "only", "however", "besides", "at all events" occurs initially, ad casuallia: (**IV 110.19**). **ΜΟΝΟΝ ΝΝΕΡΨΨΜΕ ΖΡΑΙ ΝΖΗΤΕΝ (sic) ΝΟΥΟΕΨ ΝΙΜ ΖΟΟΚ... / (ibid. 173.4) ΜΟΝΟΝ ΝΝΕΡΨΨΜΕ ΟΥΨΜ-ΖΝΟΝ ΝΤΕΙΖΕ... , also III 18.18ff., IV 53.15ff., 56.11ff., 60.23ff., 66.12, P 131f. 45 vo — all in a typical construction with a negative jussive form; in text- or paragraph-beginning: (**III 86.16**). **ΜΟΝΟΝ ΢ΤΑΥΟ ΝΟΥΟΝ ΝΙΜ ΕΤΟΥΨ ΖΕΜΠΕΝΗΣ (sic) ΖΗ... / (ibid. 182.1) ΜΟΝΟΝ ΝΗΠΕΝΜΑ ΝΝΕΝΕΙΟΤΕ ΝΑΨΨΝΗ ΖΕΝΕΖΣ ΝΕΝΕΖΣ... , also IV 114.16 / (IV 109.9f.) ΜΟΝΟΝ ΝΤΟΟΥ ΕΝΤΑΓΛ-ΛΟΓΟΣ ΖΑΣΨΒΨ ΝΙΜ "only they" / (A 2 380-1) ΜΟΝΟΝ ΟΥΝΟΜ ΜΟΝΟΝ ΕΨΥΤΗ ΕΝΝΟΥΤΕ ΕΝΖΟΚΟΝ ΕΜΝΑΓΓΕΛΑΟΣ... ΝΑΤΨΟΜ-ΓΟΜ ΕΠΟΡΑΧ ΕΤΑΓΑΝ ΜΠΝΟΤΕ "only so long as... ".** Premodifying a noun-equivalent: (**IV 4.9f.**). **ΜΟΝΟΝ ΝΗΠΑΕΙΡΕ ΝΝΕΝΕΒΨΝΕ ΜΠΡΑΝ ΣΕΝΑΨΨΝΕ ΜΜΑΚΑΡΙΟΣ ΝΜΑΓ, or a modifier: (**IV 54.23f.) ΕΥΜΑΝΟΥΜΨ ΝΑΥ... , ΜΟΝΟΝ ΕΥΝΟΥΔΑΖΕ ΑΝ, so too (changing Leipoldt's division and punctuation) ibid. 162.21.

132 Preissigke 1.155 ( - suppl. 27).

133 It will be remembered here that the ex-adjectival morphs -ον/-ον have an allomorphic distribution in modifier status in Coptic: see §4.
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1.3.11.2.1.2 OY MONON... ἄλλα... "not only... but (also/even)...", the well-known Greek configuration\(^{134}\), occurs in Shenoute in an interesting array of constructions. Generally speaking, OY MONON is followed (as in the Greek original) by a noun or noun-equivalent (πᾶς, πέρας, also ἄλλα- with noun/modifier), but after ἄλλα- the framework terms are looser, and quite a few possibilities present themselves:

(1) ‘OY MONON (ἐκ...)\(^{135}\) noun, ἄλλα- noun’ may be the stereotype: (III 47.24ff.) ΤΑΜΙΟ ΓΑΡ ΝΙΜ, OY MONON ἐξ-νηπθμε, ἄλλα ΝΚΕΤΒΝΟΟΥΕ ΜΝΝΕΠΘΡΙΟΝ..., ibid. 68.18ff. (OY MONON ἐξ-νετάγ-, ἄλλα υπερεις ών ε-), IV 159.13ff.

(2) OY MONON ἐκ-, ἄλλα... (ON) gives the impression of being actually superimposed on various textual segments: OY MONON ἐκ- [protasis], ἄλλα [protasis + apodosis] (III 16.19ff.), [extraposition] OY MONON ἐκ-, ἄλλα... ON (IV 15.10ff.), OY MONON ἐκ- [premodifier + verb syntagm], ἄλλα- verb syntagm (III 36.3ff. IV 156.12ff.), OY MONON ἐκ- [adnominal circumstantial], ἄλλα- [adnominal circumstantial] (III 76.11ff.), OY MONON ἐκ- [ infinitive], ἄλλα- [conjunctive] (IV 4.10ff.). Simpler cases: OY MONON ἐκ-μευ-, ἄλλα ὑπακ- ον (III 31.8ff.), OY MONON ἐκ-αὐ-, ἄλλα ἀχ- (III 29.10ff.), OY MONON ἐκ-ντν- - ἄν, ἄλλα (ἐ)ντπκε- (III 108.8ff.), OY MONON ἐκ- ὑπακ- ον, ἄλλα (ON) σεα- (III 48.9), and so on (more exx.: III 90-1, 93.24ff., 104.1ff., IV 21.2ff., 30.19ff., 95.19ff., Ch. 93.35ff., etc.).

(3) Mixed construction: OY MONON ἄν ΧΕ-ἈΙΧΝΟΥΝ, ἄλλα ΑΙΡ-ἈΝΑΥ ΟΝ (III 139.10ff.), OY MONON ἐκ-ἀλλαξ ΧΕ-ΣΟΥΟ... ἄλλα ΝΕΤΑ ΟΝ ΕΡΑΤΗ ΜΝΝΟΥΥΤΕ (IV 22.18ff.), OY MONON ἐκ-ανεψηκει, ἄλλα ΟΥΔΕ 136 ΟΝ ΝΧΙΝΗ (IV 160.17ff.).

(4) OY MONON + verb syntagm, without ἐκ-, is rare: (III 114-5) ἰπαξαοσ ΧΕ-ΟΥ MONON ΝΑΥΕ-ΜΕΤΗΨΘΒ... ἄλλα ΝΑΤΟΥΟΥ ΟΝ ΝΓΙ-ΝΑΡΓΟΣ.

(5) "Solitary" OY MONON: (III 40-1) OY MONON ΧΕ-ΤΟ ΝΑΞΑ ΧΕ EPOOY / (ibid. 115.2ff.) OY MONON ΧΕΝΕΕΙΠΕ ΑΝ ΝΑΤΕΞΡΙΑ ΜΠΙ΢ΗΜΑ ΟΥΔΕ ΝΑΤΕΨΥΧΗ.

1.3.11.2.2 ΦΑΝΕΡΟΝ “manifestly” is postadjectival: adnominal (verb nominalization): (Ench. 78b) ΝΔΕΡ-ΦΟΒΕ ΦΑΝΕΡΟΝ; adnominal/adclausal: (A 2 485, P 1304 125 ΑΖ) ΖΕΝΑΤΜΟΤΟΕ ΦΑΝΕΡΟΝ ΝΕ / (III 208.17ff.) ΝΕΤΟ ΝΑΧ ΤΕΝΟΥ ΝΗΕΙ ΦΑΝΕΡΟΝ. Expanding a modifier: (A 1 204) ΣΙΝΝΕΥΤΟΠΟΣ ΦΑΝΕΡΟΝ.

1.3.11.2.3 ΣΧΕΔΟΝ “almost”, premodifying ΝΕΕ "almost like": (Ch. 119.47ff.) ΕΥΤΑΚΗΝΥ ΕΥΒΗΝΑ ΕΒΟΑ ΣΧΕΔΟΝ ΝΕΕ ΝΗΙΓΑΛΟΟΥΣ / (P 1304 105 ΡΚΣ) ΚΑΝ ΕΥΣΑΝΕΒΟΚ ...ΣΧΕΔΟΝ (sic) ΝΕΕ ΜΠΟΟΕΙΝ ΜΠΟΟΩ, ΙΚ ΝΑΜΑΣΟΥ ΝΑΧ ΟΝ (i.e. the beneficiary's property).

1.3.11.2.4 (?) ΛΟΙΠΟΝ “well then”, “thus”, “consequently”, initial (attitudinal, dis/conjunct) premodifier: (P 1314 43 P, not Sh.?) ΛΟΙΠΟΝ ΜΠΑΑΑΑ ΝΗΕ ΕΞΟΥΝ ΥΑΡΟΝ / (ibid. 63 vo) ΛΟΙΠΟΝ ΥΑΥΚΟΛΑ- ΖΕ..., also 1314 42 ro (Sh.?), 1317 25 ro — no instance in texts of certain Shenoutean authorship.

1.3.11.2.5 ΜΑΛΛΟΝ, ΜΑΛΙΣΤΑ

1.3.11.2.5.1 ΜΑΛΛΟΝ (ΔΕ) “rather”, “even more, so much more”, “especially”, attitudinal dis-/conjunct. (a) ΜΑΛΛΟΝ ΔΕ 137 + predication (III 24.21ff., 68.9ff.); (b) ΜΑΛΛΟΝ ΔΕ + modifier: (Ch. 93.46ff.) ...ΜΑΛΛΟΝ ΔΕ ΖΝΕΥΩΛΑΜΟΣ / (III 77.19) ΖΝΕΩΖΟΟΥ, ΜΑΛΛΟΝ ΔΕ ΖΝΕΨΥΧ / (A 2 510-511) ΜΑΛΛΟΝ

---

\(^{134}\) See Kühner-Gerth II 257, Maysr 2/3:118; cf. Daumas 1952:128f.

\(^{135}\) ἐκ- before a noun, predication form or modifier, appears to be part of the ‘OY MONON ἐκ- ἄλλα- ‘ framework rather than sharing in the paradigm after OY MONON.

\(^{136}\) Kühner-Gerth II 257.

\(^{137}\) Maysr 2/3:127.
ΔΕ ΕΓΕΝΝΟΝΙΔΟΣ ΠΕ ΝΕΤΕΙΠΕ ΜΜΟΥ “especially since”, also P 131⁴ 92 PMB; (c) ΜΑΛΛΟΝ ΔΕ + noun (-equiv-
valent) “in particular” (III 222.9f., P 130⁴ 122 AB); ΜΑΛΛΟΝ ΔΕ ΧΕ- [neg. protasis + apodosis] “especially since”; (IV 19.19) ΜΑΛΛΟΝ ΔΕ ΧΕ-ΕΝΕΟΥΡΜΑΥ ΑΝ ΠΕ... ΝΕΥΝΑΩ ΑΝ ΠΕ / (ibid. 99.21f.) ΜΑΛΛΟΝ ΔΕ ΧΕ-
ΕΥΣΑΝΤΗΜ ΝΛΥ... ΕΚΝΑΡ-ΒΟΛ ΑΝ. In ΜΑΛΛΟΝ ΔΕ ΛΑΝΘΩΣ ΧΕ- (III 35.2, ΧΕ-less variant in Ch. 129.21ff.);
ΧΕ- may alternatively be understood as the formal marking of the inter-dependence of the clause and
the premodifier ΛΑΝΘΩΣ, the conjunct ΜΑΛΛΟΝ or both: cf. ΜΑΛΙΣΤΑ ΧΕ- (below). (d) ΝΟΣΗ/ΝΟΣΟ ΜΑΛΛΟΝ
“how much more...?” is a rhetorical question, in apodosi after ΕΥΧΕ-, usually with a Second Tense/cir-
sumstantial topicalization form (§2.6.1: ΝΟΣΗ was originally — and is synchronically 139 — focal): III
97.24f., Ch. 74.54ff., 119.30ff., A 2 396 (+ First Future). Occasionally, ΝΟΣΗ ΜΑΛΛΟΝ occurs in the pre-
dication-presupposing pattern (§1.2.3): (III 42.3f.) ΕΥΧΕ-ΝΗΣΙΩΕΡ ΑΝ ΕΥΣΑ ΝΝΧΕΑ, ΝΟΣΗ ΜΑΛΛΟΝ ΝΡΗΜΕ
/ (Ch. 59.17ff.) ΕΥΧΕ-ΝΗΣΙΩΕΡ ΕΥ ΝΝΡΗΜΕΝ ΝΟΟΝ ΝΤΕΙΖΕ, ΝΟΣΗ ΜΑΛΛΟΝ ΝΙΟΥΤΕ...; also III 29.23.

1.3.11.2.5.2 ΜΑΛΙΣΤΑ (often similar in meaning to ΜΑΛΛΟΝ) “certainly” 139, “not to mention, let
alone”, “so much more”, “even”, “most of all, above all”, “on the contrary” 140, “especially
since, considering that...”, “what’s more.”

(a) ΜΑΛΙΣΤΑ + predication form: (III 94.3f.) ΜΑΛΙΣΤΑ ΝΝΧΟΚ ΧΕ- “certainly” / (P 130⁴ 39 ro) Η
ΜΑΛΙΣΤΑ ΔΕ ΛΑΝΘΩΣ ΕΥΡΗ ΕΡΟΥ / (III 22.16) ΜΑΛΙΣΤΑ ΝΟΥΧΟΝ ΠΕ ΚΑΤΑΚΑΡΕ “even” / (III 96.2) ΜΑΛΙΣΤΑ
ΝΕΤΠΟΡΝΕΥ... ΝΑΙ ΝΑΜΕ ΝΕ ΝΠΟΥΧΕΤ-ΠΕΥΡ-ΝΜΕΥΕ ΕΒΟΑ “on the contrary” / (IV 178.12) ΜΑΛΙΣΤΑ ΝΟΥΚΙΩ
ΠΕ ΑΥΛ ΤΕΥΝΟΥ ΝΤΡΟΥΝ ΖΑΙΝΗΒ “so much more”, etc.: more exx.: III 110.16, 183.24ff., 203.2f., IV 86.1f.,
153.10, Ch. 100.8ff., etc.

(b) ΜΑΛΙΣΤΑ + modifier (“even”, “especially”): (IV 78.8) ...ΝΝΑΣ ΝΟΣΗ, ΜΑΛΙΣΤΑ ΝΝΧΕ ΜΕΝΝΑΚΕ
ΕΤΝΑΚΙΩΝ / (ibid. 155.22) ...ΜΑΛΙΣΤΑ ΖΝΝΤΟ ΝΝΖΤΖΙΟΥΝΟΥ. Very frequently with a circumstantial (“especially
since”, “considering that...”, “actually”): (III 87.10) ΜΑΛΙΣΤΑ ΕΝΝΑ ΕΜΑΥ / (RE 10 161a 31ff.) ΕΜΑΥ-
ΜΕΡΟΣ ΝΟΥΣΤ... ΠΝΤΑΚΤΑΜΙΧ, ΝΤΚ-ΟΥΜΟΙΖΕ, ΜΑΛΙΣΤΑ ΕΑΚΤΑΜΙΕ-ΠΘΡ “how much more, considering
that...” / (Wess. 18 128b 1ff.) ...ΜΑΛΙΣΤΑ ΕΡΕΤΡΑΓΡΑΦ Ρ-ΜΝΤΡΕ ΝΝΝΕΧΙΑΚΕ / (Ch. 53.7ff.) ...ΜΑΛΙΣΤΑ
ΕΠ-ΧΟΕΙΣ ΠΕΤΑΧ ΜΜΟΣC / (BMCat. 80, No. 195) ΜΑΛΙΣΤΑ ΕΝΚΚ-ΟΥΟΥ ΓΗΜΗ ΝΝΝΑΡΜΕΝΗΝΤ ΝΤΟΡΓ...; also III
96.12f., 124.5f., 142.23, 200.18ff., IV 33.5f., 100.8f.

(c) ΜΑΛΙΣΤΑ + noun (“even”, “especially”, “not to mention, let alone”, “namely”): IV 1.8f.,
4.8, 30.16, 110.3f., 112.2, III 82.8f., 91.7f., 106.1ff., 112.1 — “especially”; III 36.16, 43.7f., IV 161.9f.,
172.8f. — “certainly not”; III 74.16, 213.3f. — “even”; IV 100.18, Ch. 26.8ff., P 130⁴ 139 ro — “not
to mention”; Ch. 67.21ff., 71.39f., 78.51ff. — “namely”.

(d) Most striking of all, ΜΑΛΙΣΤΑ ΧΕ-: (1) a distinctive, well-attested construction of consecutive
“prospective” subordination, ΜΑΛΙΣΤΑ ΔΕ ΧΕ- + Future III or ΜΑΛΙΣΤΑ ΧΕ- + Second Future: III 150.25f.
(“especially so as to...”); 159.29f. (“certainly [not] so as to...”), also IV 115.13, 52.18; III 166.28f.,
17.19f. (“let alone that...”); 181.117f. (“so much more/certainly that...”).

(2) ΜΑΛΙΣΤΑ (ΔΕ) ΧΕ- + conditional complex, “especially since”: (III 51.2f.) ΜΑΛΙΣΤΑ ΧΕ-ΕΤΕΤΨΑνΤΗ-
ΜΑΣΗΤΝ ΕΒΟΑ... ΝΑΥ ΝΕ ΕΤΕΤΨΑ-ΒΟΛΑ... / (IV 42.1ff.) ΜΑΛΙΣΤΑ ΔΕ ΧΕ ΕΝΕΤΑΥΒΟΥΨΟΥ Ν ΕΥΨΑΝΟΒΟΥΨΟ
ΝΕΡΕΤΕΙΜΙΕ ΝΡΗΜΕ ΝΑΙΝΗΚ. Compare Ch. 65.22ff. (ΜΑΛΙΣΤΑ ΕΥΧΕ-... + apodosis, without ΧΕ-).

(3) “Especially since”: (III 86.20) ΜΑΛΙΣΤΑ ΧΕ-ΠΚΑΙΡΟΣ ΓΟΣΣΕ, perhaps also ibid. 103.13, unless here ΧΕ-
is conditioned by a preceding verb. The nature of the dependence between ΜΑΛΙΣΤΑ and the ΧΕ-clause
is far from clear. ΧΕ- may be pertinent, (co-)characterizing (α) a consecutive construction premodified

138 Although the sequence introduced by ΝΟΣΗ ΜΑΛΛΟΝ is focal in relation to the topological ΕΥΧΕ-protasis, I believe ΝΟΣΗ
ΜΑΛΛΟΝ itself is focal in the apodosis.


by МАЛІЦА (cf. ΕΒΟΑ ΤΨΗΝ ΧΕ-ΕИНА-, §2.6.3.2) or (β) causality. On the other hand, ΧΕ- may be an exponent of an explicit syntactic distinction between the premodifie and its sequence 143, characteristic in Coptic of pre-elements of Greek extraction. A third alternative, that ΧΕ- is in these cases a mark of the predicative status of the premodifier 144, cannot be entirely dismissed, even though the usual cotextual tests for topic/focus isolation cannot be applied here.

1.3.11.3 ПАЛАЙ (АΕ) ON “(and/but) again”, “but then”, “alternatively” — additive/replacie/ item-presenting conjunct 143: a premodifier, introducing (often in a series of predications, quotations or in reporting) an additional predication: (III 54.19) ПАЛАЙ ΟΝ ΠΕΚΑΧ / (ibid. 58-9) ΟΥΨΗΣ ΤΕ... ПАЛАЙ ΟΝ ΟΥΡΟΟΕ ΝΕΚΟΟΤ ΤΕ... ΟΥΡΕΠΧΙ-ΟΥΡΕΠΧΙ ΤΕ... ПАΛΑΙΝ ΟΝ ΟΥΡΕΠΧΙ-ΟΥΡΕΠΧΙ ΤΕ... (Ch. 24.27ff.) СЕΝΑΕΙΜΕ ЕΡΟΚ... ПАΛΑΙΝ ΟΝ ΣΕΠΑΣΟ ΜΜΟΚ... / (III 110.18) ПАЛАЙ ΟΝ ΥΑΤ-ΚΕΟΥΣΙ ΕΤΟΟΥ. ПАЛАЙ ΟΝ ΧΕ- is common in quotation series (A 2 340, IV 33.3f. etc.); ПАЛАЙ ΟΝ may add a whole premodified complex: (III 71.14f.) ПАЛАЙ ΟΝ ΣΝΕΙΡΟΜΕ ΝΟΥΣΤ ΥΣ ΝΑΙΚΜΑΛΑΠΟΣ ΕΑΝΟΟΟΤΟΥ / (IV 45.22) ПАЛАЙ ΟΝ ΟΝ ΝΗΝΚΑΝΔΗΒΗΥΣ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΝΕΟΝ- ΕΙΝΟΜΑΙ... Additional exx.: III 110.1ff., 59.22, 90.7ff., 127.20f., IV 1.17f., 127.4, 168.9, Ch. 68.15ff., A I 261-2, P 1314 157 vo, etc. ПΑΛΑΙΝ (ON) + circumstantial — “moreover” — is used much in the same way as ΑΥΨ premodifying a circumstantial form (§1.3.10): (III 212.22) (“the roads are different from one another”) ...ПАЛАЙ ΟΝ ΕΟΥΣΗ ΝΟΥΣΤ ΤΕ ΕΝΑΕ-ΝΗΚΤΟΣ Ν ΜΜΟΗΤ ΜΠΕΟΣΜΡ / (A / 75) (“The sins he says you have been forgiven”) ПАЛАЙ ΕΑΝΠΑΚΕ ΕΙ ΕΒΟΑ ΕΙΟΥΝΗ ΝΕΑΠΟΥΟΕΙΝ... ПАΛΑЙ ΕΑΡΕΠΨΤ ΝΜΟΗΕ ΕΧΜΗΕ- ΖΑΛΟΕ...

1.3.11.4 ТАХΗ, ΤΑΧΗ “quickly”. Here (differently from the -ΟΝ-group) there is no morphologically related “masculine” or “animate” counterpart 144. This is a fairly common modifier, invariably post adjunctive but for rare cases of secondary (prosodically motivated) intercalary placement 145: (III 40.6) ΝΕΠΤΙΣΤΕΥΕ ΤΑΧΗ ΝΥΑΛΕ ΝΙΜ / (Ch. 114.62f.) ΑΥΨ ΝΕΟΟΜΟΥ ΤΑΧΗ / (ibid. 132.31f.) ΑΒΤΒΟΤ ΤΑΧΗ / (A 2 5) ΑΛΟΤΝ ΜΜΑΤ ΤΑΧΗ / (ibid. 121) ΚΟΥΡΟΥ ΕΕΩΝΟΥ-ΟΥΧΙΣΤ ΤΑΧΗ / (P 1304 123 Λ) ΚΕΝΑΒΤΟΥΝ ΤΑΧΗ / (1304 127 ΜΒ) ΕΝΜΠΝΕΤΗΣ-ΠΟΟΥΣΥ ΟΥΜΑ ΤΑΧΗ / (Wess. 9 140a 13ff.) ΕΚΛΗΣΤΕ ΝΙΚΑΤΙΚΕ ΤΑΧΗ. Also III 35.4ff., 87.12f., 198.10f., IV 85.4, 155.7f., Ch. 130.23f., A 2 47, 390, Miss. 279, K 9040, etc. Aberrant conditioned placement: (A 2 53-4) ΤΑΙ ΤΕ ΘΕ ΤΑΧΗ ΝΤΑΥΟΥΣΤΒ ΕΒΟΑ.

1.3.11.5 Prepositions of Greek origin

(a) ΚΑΤΑ “according to...”, “by” (distributive), and ΝΗΡΑ “beside” 146, “in comparison with”, “beyond” are certainly more common in all-Greek, more or less terminological, phrases or clichés: ΠΑΡΑΤΕΝΟΥΠΣΙΑС (III 224.19, IV 112.24f., P 1304 104 ΡΚΑ, A 2 459), ΠΑΡΑΦΟΤΙΣ (compound noun?) (III 77.24,
208.20, 216.4f.), ΚΑΤΑΘΕΨΥΣΙΣ (III 219.20, IV 113.2), ΚΑΤΑΣΑΡΦΕ (III 22.16, IV 31.1, etc.), ΚΑΤΑΒΔΙΟ (III 22.13, 220.20), ΚΑΤΑΘΕΨΥΣΙΣ (III 74.16, IV 59.16f.), ΚΑΤΑΚΑΡΩΡΙΟΣ (IV 21.18, P 1304 118 Kr, Ch. 66.41f., A 2 379), ΚΑΤΑΘΕΨΥΣΙΣ (IV 54.14, Ch. 51.23, A 1 14, P 1305 28 vo), ΚΑΤΑΘΕΨΥΣΙΣ (III 219.6, RE 10 162b 23), ΚΑΤΑΘΕΨΥΣΙΣ (III 219.6), ΚΑΤΑΘΕΨΥΣΙΣ (III 162.28, IV 34.22f. etc. Both occur freely in collocation with Egyptian nouns (also in recurring clichés — yet not zero-determined?) — statistically (by number of occurrences) predominantly so; ΚΑΤΑ is by far the better attested (with almost 400 occurrences in Leipoldt, vs. less than 40 for ΠΑΡΑ; ΚΑΤΑΘΕ and distributive instances are numerically perhaps more important): ΚΑΤΑΘΕΨΥΣΙΣ (IV 2.9) ΚΑΤΑΘΕΨΥΣΙΣ (ibid. 12.18f.), ΚΑΤΑΘΕΨΥΣΙΣ (ibid. 11.8), ΠΑΡΑΘΕΨΥΣΙΣ (III 134.19), ΠΑΡΑΘΕΨΥΣΙΣ (P 1306 65 vo), ΠΑΡΑΘΕΨΥΣΙΣ ΝΙΜ (III 143.1), etc. Of all Greek-origin prepositions, only ΚΑΤΑ and ΠΑΡΑ have pre-pronominal allomorphs (ΚΑΤΑΡΟ = ΠΑΡΑΡΟ: III 116.17, 117.5f., 11, RE 10 162b 8, P 1306 37 vo).

(b) ΑΝΤΙ “instead of” occurs typically before ΤΡΕΨΥΣΤΣ (less usually before the non-causative infinitive) in a common, indeed distinctively Shenoutean figure “instead of (doing this or that), we (etc.) did/do...”: III 51.10f., 115.5ff., IV 82.10f., 24f., 107.18, A 2 53, 54, 48, 466, Wess. 9 94a 3ff., 118b 11ff., 127b 26ff., etc. (see §1.1.2.2). With infinitives: IV 92.11f., Wess. 9 117a 20f. With non-verbal nouns: III 213.14, 214.14.

(c) ΖΩ ‘as’, ‘as if’ 147 occurs as a premodifier, “vesting” 148 a circumstantial form, with or without ευξε– (Ch. 207.18f., Leyd. 366, Wess. 9 143a 17ff., IV 92.6, etc.), rarely with an unconverted predication (Nominal Sentence, Cleft Sentence: Ch. 30.36f., Wess. 9 87b 21ff.). ΖΩ ευξε preceding the autosofocal Second Tense (§2.1.5): III 96.25, etc. Prepositionally, ΖΩ is well attested with native and Greek nouns: ΖΩΝΟΥΣΙ (III 88.24), ΖΩΝΟΜΜΟ (ibid. 135.5) ΖΩΤΥΡΑΝΝΟΣ (ibid. 40.14), ΖΩΣΚΑΡΚΙΚΟΣ (ibid. 63.8), etc.

(d) ΚΩΡΙΣ “without”, “but for” precedes ΤΡΕΨΥΣΤΣ (Wess. 9 108b 21f.), the non-causative infinitive (III 25.4f.) and noun lexemes, usually in recurring expressions, such as ΣΩΜΕ and ΑΝΑΓΚΗ (IV 51.4, 98.7f., P 1306 69 vo); with other nouns: P 1306 15 vo (ΠΕΝΟΜΟΣ, ibid. 23 ΡΟΙΝ (ΝΕΚΩΝΟΝΙΝ), III 70.2, 11 (ΝΟΥΟΤΕ, ΝΕΥΚΤΕΜΟΝΕ), IV 95.23 (ΜΝΑΤΕΟΥΝΘ), 125.3 (ΝΑΙ), 157.24 (ΟΥΡΩΜΕ Η ΟΥΡΑΖΙΜΕ), etc. ΧΩΡΙΣ is expandable by another modifier — a circumstantial: (IV 108.8) ΧΩΡΙΣ ΕΥΘΕΙΑ.

(e) ΠΟΡΟΣ, relatively rare, seems to occur in fixed expressions: ΠΟΡΟΤΕΟΘΙ, ΠΟΡΟΤΕΟΥΙ “for a (short) while” (III 35.4f., 131.17, RE 11 15b 2, 16a 7f., RE 10 16a 25f., P 1306 7), ΠΟΡΟΤΕΟΥΙ “for a while” (A 2 105, P 1306 114 ΧΕ, 1306 93 vo), ΠΟΡΟΤΕΟΥΙ ΝΖΟΟΥ (P 1306 38 vo, opp. ΆΛΕΝΕΖ), ΠΟΡΟ (P 1318 84 ro).

1.3.11.6 Greek loan-modifiers: miscellaneous

1. The be consequent”, “and so”, expanded by the conjunctive (§ 7.3.1.1), with ετρετ– (ibid.), premodifying the circumstantial (IV 87.4), Nom. Sentence (ibid. 183.2).

2. Kan “at least”, “even”. Before the jussive or imperative (III 66.6f., IV 37.22, Ch. 82.7f., 87.46f., 116.30f., A 1 256, A 2 369-370, P 1317 71 ro (ΕΥΧΕΝΘΑΡ-ΠΑΡΘΕΝΟΣ ΑΝ... ΚΑΝ ΜΠΙΠΡΟΝΕΥΕ) etc.; before oyn (Ch. 157.55f.), the present (ibid. 31.5ff.) and perfect (ibid. 138.5ff.); adnominally (“even”, III 222.15); kan... kan... is a disjunctive framework (“either... or...”, “be it... or be it...”), usually for circumstantial forms (III 222.8f., IV 11.9, 109.20f., 111.8f., 154.12, etc.). As a concessive premodifier 151, with the conditional, euze or (rarely) euze, also with the circumstantial (“even if”, “even

148 Shisha-Halevy 1972:168 and §0.3.2.
150 Blass-Debrunner §374b (with Tabachowitz 41).
though’: III 19.28ff., 28.11, 22.9ff., 40.16.19ff., 91.18, IV 3.27ff., 114.8, Ch. 139.12ff., Wess. 9 140b 19ff., 179a 22, Ep. 56, etc.); less usually, precedes a basic tense in this role (III 93.20ff., 23).

(3) (EN)ZOCON, EΦOCON 152, ‘‘so long (as...’’, ‘‘insofar (as...)’’, ‘‘as soon (as...)’’, usually with the circumstantial (EN)ZOCON is the more common): circ. present (III 27.27, Ch. 70.9, Wess. 9 152a 20ff., etc.), circ. perfect (III 31.23ff., RE 11 17b 42ff.), circ. Nominal Sentence (IV 74.15, 75.1,12); rarely, with a Basic Tense (perfect or present, IV 20.2, 104.21, Ch. 112.16ff.). EΦOCON is rare: (RE 11 16a 27ff.) EΦOCON GAP (EN)THG EΩYΩH EΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΑΥH (Ε)ΝΣΕΛΙΖΕ ΕΡΟH, ΧΝΑΟΥΨΗΨ ΜΠΑΧΕ ΖΑΝΝΕΟΥΨΕΡΗΣ. ZOCON occurs (only in Ch.? with Basic Tenses (‘‘insofar as’’): Ch. 16.43ff., 125.19ff.; note the disjunctive ZOCON... ZOCON... (‘‘a little... a little...’’, IV 162.2f).

(4) ZΩTAN 153, with the circumstantial future (rare: ‘‘whenever’’, Ch. 72.41ff., in parallel to ΝΕΤΝΑ-, ibid. 73.34ff.), usually with the conditional, in the same sense (III 63.22, IV 63.6, 10.22f. — v.l. conditional without ZΩTAN — Ch. 68.3, etc.).

(5) ΜΟΡΙC 154, ‘‘hardly’’, also a rhetorical negation: see §7.3.1 — with the conjunctive, focalized by the Second Perfect (III 24.23), also converted with its clause as ΕΜΟΡΙC, in this case often premodified by ΑΥH (§1.3.10; see references in §7.3.1).

(6) ΑΑΑ ‘‘but, however’’, passim; opening apodosis ‘‘nonetheless’’ (A 2 333); before modifiers (IV 56.6, Wess. 9 173c 19ff.), with conjunctive.

(7) ΕΙΝΗΤΗ ‘‘otherwise’’, see §7.3.1.1.

(8) ΤΑΧA (ΔΕ-) 155, ‘‘possibly’’, ‘‘by chance’’, ‘‘perhaps’’, ‘‘apparently’’, with conjunctive (A 2 369), Second Tenses — present (A 2 434, not Sh.), future (ibid. 440, not Sh.), Basic Tense (ibid. 434, not Sh., P 1317 39 το ΤΑΧA ΟΥΝΖΟΙΝΕ ΣΜΙΤΡΕΨΩΤΗ ΕΡΟH ΣΕΝΑΧΟΟC ΔΕ-...). Also for (rhetorical) interrogation? 156

(9) ΠΟΛΛΑΚΙC ‘‘often’’ (A 2 415, not Sh., before a conditional complex).

(10) ΕΥΤΑΞΙΑ (ΕΥΤΑΞΙΖ, ‘‘in good order’’): (A 2 257) ΔΟΚΙΜΑΣΕ ΜΠΗΒ ΕΥΤΑΞΙΑ ‘‘precisely’’ 157.

(11) ΕΚΜΕΡΟΥC (A 2 22) ΝΗΜΕΛΑΟC ΝΕ ΝΗΜΕΛΑΟC ΕΚΜΕΡΟΥC ‘‘in part’’/‘‘alternatively’’ 158.

(12) ΤΟΤΕ ‘‘then’’ (P 1306 83 ΡΙΑ) ΑΜΟΥ ΝΥΟΡΠΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΝΕΚΑΚΑΧΑΡΣΙΑ ΤΟΤΕ ΝΗΧΟΟC ΔΕ-ΠΑΣΛΗΡ.

(13) ΕΤΗ ‘‘still’’: ΕΤΗ ΟΝ ΤΕΝΟΥ (cf. ΕΤΗ ΢ΧΙ ΨΥΨ Ch. 91.20f.); premodifying: a Nominal Sentence (III 89.6f.), a circumstantial form (‘‘when still...’’, III 210.23, IV 191.12), ΟΥH (P 1306 66 OR) ΕΤ ΟΥΝΖΑΣ ΑΙΚΤΑΖΗ; adnominal (Young τ.).

(14) ΟΥΚΕΤΙ ‘‘not any more’’, with a negative clause: (Ch. 80.31ff.) ΑΥH ΟΥΚΕΤΙ ΧΝΑΟΥΨΗΨ-ΣΟΜ ΑΝ ΔΕ ΕΡΟH (for this ΔΕ cf. §6.0.3.2).

(15) ΠΑΝΗ ‘‘yet’’, ‘‘however’’ — paragraph opener, subtextual initial-boundary marker (III 117.20, 183.22, 84.8, 200.4f., IV 64.25, etc. 159).

154 Cf. Cróner 1903:98 n. 2; Preissigke 2.113 (+ suppl. 183); Mayser 1/3 120, 2/2 184 (ΜΟΡΙC is usually predicative: §§7.1.3.7.3.1 — cf. Brugmann IF 27:262f. [1910]). For (ΑΥH) ΕΜΟΡΙC see Shisha-Halevy 1976a:33 (cf. Browne 1979b:202, on Luc. 23:53).
158 Here reminiscent of I Cor. 12:27. Cf. Mayser 2/2 38, 390; Preissigke 1.75.
159 In (III 17.27) ΠΑΝΗ ΔΕ-ΑΧΧΟΟC ΔΕ- appears to be explicative: ‘‘but since you have said...’’, with a second clause (18.3) ΑΧΧΟΟC ΝΑΚ ΔΕ- ‘‘and I said to you...’’ and the main clause (18.6f.) ΜΝΗΜΑΝΗΧΑΣΕ ΜΝΗΜΟΝΟΥΣ ΤΗΒΟΥ ΝΤΑΙΧΟΟΥ ΝΑΚ ΑΙΤΑΜΟΚ ΔΕ...
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2.0.0.1 Research-historical: Polotsky's Treatment of the Second Tense

In retrospect, there is no denying that the story of the redemption of the Second Tense, the Sleeping Beauty among Coptic grammatical categories, is, in more than one way, the story of modern Coptic linguistics. The unveiling of the nature of this category initiated a renaissance of grammatical scholarship, which is thus precisely datable to 1944, the publication year of Polotsky's momentous \textit{Études de syntaxe copte}, where it is treated on pp. 24-97 (with earlier tentative statements in Polotsky 1934:60, 63f. = \textit{CP} 368f. and 1937 for Coptic, and 1940 for Late Egyptian and Coptic. Subsequent restatements of the pan-Egyptian category may be found in Polotsky 1960a:§§1ff., 30ff., 1965:§§16ff., 22ff., 1970:566ff., 1973:136ff., 1976:§§2.3-7, 3.9). A brief resume: according to Polotsky, the Second-Tense conjugation form is to be conceived of as a \textit{verbal nominalization}, with the privilege of actor (nominal grammatical subject) status in the Bipartite (\# \textit{nom. actor} + "\textit{adverbial" predicate}\#) pattern. The "adverb" (our modifier) following the Second Tense is thus its predicate; the ensuing construction is typologically (formally and functionally) comparable to "Cleft Sentence" patterns in other languages (§2.0.2.2.4 below), where a nominalized verb construction ("that..., "que...") serves as logical subject ("glose", topic) for a non-verbal ("adverbial") logical predicate ("vedette", focus: see below for my terminology). In
Polotsky’s more recent transformational formulation (1976), the nominalization of the verb by means of the Second-Tense converter is correlated to its demotion to subject status and the promotion of an “adverbial” adjunct to predicate status.

In setting out from, and taking issue with, Polotsky’s conception and systematization (which, if the truth be told, have not yet been properly digested and applied by the Copto-Egyptological community at large, even today 1), despite its truly awe-inspiring elegance and simplicity, shaping order out of chaos, and its law-like standing 2, I wish once more to state my conviction that his statements are not invalidated by the following observations; they are as cogent as ever — in their own procedural frame of reference. What I offer here is an alternative assignment of the facts, motivated by a different set of methodological principles. One may recall here von der Gabelentz’s typically Neogrammarians proviso (1875:159): “Es dürfte hier... streng zu scheiden sein zwischen dem Gesetze und den Einschränkungen” (in our case, extensions, rather) “welche dieses durch den Sprachgebrauch erlitten hat”. I mean to portray in this chapter Shenoute’s Sprachgebrauch, no more, no less, and let the rule look after itself. My alternative to the Master’s neat scheme 3 is less elegant, amorphous, and non-modular though not unstructured, but perhaps less reproachable for what I regard as a methodological flaw insofar as strictly synchronic description is concerned: the postulation of an “orthodox” or normal-and-original functional core 4 with a periphery of secondary, extended sub-functions 5, with no integration of all roles in the framework of a unified (even if complex and fragmented) functional theory, or its paradigmatic association with other relatable forms or patterns. I can hardly conceive of any synchronic meaning for “extension” or “divergence”. Within the terms of reference of his own orientation, Polotsky’s description is of course impeccable. If you reject it, you are faced with the realization that the syntax of the Second Tenses is so complex as to rule out any simple one-rule statement to define its workings.

My reservations concerning Polotsky’s view of the Second Tenses may be condensed into the following comments:

(a) I confess myself agnostic about the alleged substantival nature of the form. This claim (in Polotsky’s argumentation for Coptic 6) is unmistakably traceable to the model (Bipartite or Bipartite-like), to which the form is assigned, and not to argument from independent or cross-evidence from other, intersecting patterns 7 which would pin down the form as nominal (cf. the corresponding Middle Egyptian mrr.f form, which features in subject/predicate status in Nominal Sentence patterns, governed by pre-

---

1 See Horn’s apt remarks (1980:64 n. 6).
3 A neatness more warranted in Old and Middle Egyptian (though rare exx. such as Caffin Texts III 202 n jst jr.f tm.k swr wsf “But why wilt thou not drink urine?” still remain unintegrated in the main theory unless the topic here is “adverbial”).
4 Possibly representing this core as the norm derives less from a conviction of a synchronic state than from a subtle, perhaps not conscious historical bias induced by the successive juxtaposition of all phases of Egyptian in the second Étude (which is as much a study of a diachronic category as a series of synchronic accounts). Obviously, a possible statistical preponderance of this core pattern (a preponderance never really established) is irrelevant as a synchronic argument. (Incidentally, the “Middle Egyptian” “[Oxyrhynchite]” dialect of Coptic which is generally not innovative, goes even much further than Sahidic in favouring these so-called “extensions”.)
4 POLOTSKY 1944:51-3 (== CP 155-7), 1960a:§32 Obs. “Such ‘exceptions’, which are relatively not at all numerous, can be brought under a limited number of heads and understood as extensions of the basic function... Inasmuch as they deviate from the structure of the ‘Second Tenses’ they are secondary (‘emplois abusifs’), but it is not in the least suggested that they should be dismissed as improper uses’. They can be ‘dismissed’ only in the sense that they do not invalidate the definition of the basic function”. Is there not more than a suggestion of circularity in this definition?
6 The “actual Coptic usage” which is argued as amply demonstrating this nominal nature (Polotsky 1960a:408 = CP 254) is not specified, unless this refers again to the Bipartite pattern (subject) assignment of the form; see (b) below. Negation by means of N AR, added as proof, is hardly conclusive, as this is the general negator of non-verbal nexus, adjunct and component, rather than an index of the nominal character of a term.

---

§2.0.0.1
positions, object-expansion of transitive verbs, and so on). This statement (of the nom. nature of the form) is therefore circular. It is also (at least in implication, but explicitly in 1976) dependent on a transformational approach to syntactic analysis, and also on some "diachronic inertia" or extrapolation from established historical facts. This question acquires a special edge when the circumstantial (modifier-paradigm) topicalization form (§2.5) is considered, and when the whole question is approached from the "signalling", i.e. listener's, angle: of what function is the Second-Tense converter an exponent? What does it signal, in the unfolding of the discourse? More on this subject in §2.8.3.

(b) The association of the Second Tense with the Bipartite pattern, while historically well-founded, synchronically "leaky" and aprioristic. At issue here are the very rudiments of the definition of at pattern: the substitution and prosodic features do not match in the Second-Tense and Bipartite patterns (for the latter, see §1.2.1.1); the nominal status of the Second Tense — a sine qua non for the Bipartite assignment — is actually dependent on this assignment; finally, the Second-Tense modifier construction is only one in a set of at least five major patterns featuring this and related forms. There is hardly any synchronic justification for considering this particular one primary, even if all the indications suggest it is original, historically speaking.

(c) Clauses, like other grammatical unities, should be classified in terms of inner structure and in terms of their function in the larger units of which they are part. This, the macrosyntactic aspect (in my view a key factor in the description of our form) has been under-treated in Polotsky's analysis, which does point out the value of contextual configurations favouring the occurrence of the Second Tense, but nowhere formalizes the context (or rather the cOtext, i.e. the syntactically and not merely situationally relevant segment of the text) as part of an ultra-clausal pattern, which may not only lead to greater predictability of a Second-Tense "event" but is inevitable and indispensable at some stage of a descending analysis and in the treatment of the question as one of category exponence and signalling.

2.0.1 Morphosyntax

2.0.1.1 On conversion in general. I retain here this term of dynamic implication (POLOTSKY 1960a:§10; later understood as exponence of "transpositions"), which I use to mean the mark or signal of a specific definable syntactic standing, not a transformationally conceived shifting of status, either within or outside a preconceived set of part-of-speech compartments. I can see no reason for tagging the converters as "syntactic" or "non-syntactic". The circumstantial and relative converters have internal (micro-)syntactic function, marking a conjugation-form as adjectual/adnral modifier, with part

---

* See POLOTSKY 1944:82f. (= CP 186f.), 1964:276f., 1976:§82.1, 2.3-7; FRANDSEn 1975. The affinity of the "emphatic" with the relative forms, so cogently put by Polotsky, is problematic in the case of some allomorphs of the Coptic converter, and for others, out of the question.

* POLOTSKY 1944:66f. (= CP 170f.), 1960a:§11, 30. In his forthcoming work, Polotsky comments for the first time on the differences (in prosody and constituency) between the Bipartite and the Second-Tense constructions, yet retains the old affiliation as a kind of sub-pattern of the Bipartite (this is indeed inevitable in the "transpositional" verbal system, where the Second Tense constitutes the substantival term).


11 Cf. the distinctions made by POLOTSKY 1960a:§10-11 (the Sec. Tense kept apart from all other converters). Although he does not here specify or define how "conversion" is to be understood, his current transposition theory of the converters as exponents of adverbial (circumstantial), adjectival (relative) and substantival (Sec. Tense) transformation of the verb could be referred to. However, this would leave the preterite converter a case apart, outside this system.
neutralization: after a non-in-determined nucleus, the circumstantial represents the opposition terms, as it does after a verbal nucleus. Elsewhere an opposition obtains: the circumstantial expressing *adnexit*, the relative *attributive* modification\(^\text{12}\). The Second Tense and preterite converters, on the other hand, have a higher-level or macro-syntactic signalling function. The preterite converter\(^\text{13}\) marks a transition, "gear shift", change of tempo (into "slow motion"), perspective ("low relief", in WEINRICH's term) or dimension (into "setting") in the narrative structure. The Second Tense highlights and delimits a stage — and thus resolves the structure — in the thematic or informational development of the dialogic or expository discourse\(^\text{14}\). Neither are satellites, but prime filaments in the texture of discourse — the "imperfect" in the narrative, eventual — the Second Tense in the thematic non-eventual texture. Both realize a *staging* option (see below) exercised by the speaker/narrator.

2.0.1.1.1 Morphology. The Second Tense converter is an exponent of a category different from and intersecting that of tense\(^\text{15}\). Its incompatibility with Clause Conjugation forms is as much correlative with their extra-temporal standing as with their non-autonomous syntactic one (indeed both aspects must be but different faces of the same coin). Its incompatibility with Nominal Sentence patterns (which however do have their own topicalization forms, §2.5) may also be due to the special para-temporal type of predication but may also have historical roots.

The following allomorphs of the converter are found in Shenoute\(^\text{16}\):

(a) (1) ε-, prenominally ἐπε-, before the Bipartite conjugation forms, in focalization patterns (1) to (6). Note the following: ἐπα- Second Future, sec. person sgl. fem.\(^\text{17}\) (A I 50, 445, A 2 8, 11, etc.); the Akhmimoid ε- prenominally, rare\(^\text{18}\) (Wess. 9 146c 6 ff. ἐπιστάμεθα δὲ τοιοῦτον τὸ χάριν, v.l. ἐπε- 129b 30ff.).

(2) ε-ΟΥΝ-/ΜΝ-\(^\text{19}\), patterns (1) and (6): Ch. 186.41ff., A 2 45, A 1 415. Note (a) ΜΝ- as a "that"-form? K 9316 ΜΝΗΚΕΠΟΥΝ-ΤΟΟΥΝ ΤΗΡΗ ΑΥΘΝ ΜΝΗΚΕΟΥΤΕ ΝΟΤΣΙ; (b) ΟΥΝ-/ΜΝ — the existence predication, not the indefinite-actor allo-form for the Bipartite syntagmeme; the Sec. Tense form in this case is not without ΟΥΝ-/ΜΝ—\(^\text{20}\).

(3) ε-ΟΥΝΤΑ-/ΜΝΤΑ-\(^\text{19}\), patts. (1)-(3): III 71.23 (cod. C), 85.14, Cat. 43.16, BMCat. 94 (213 AH), P 1314 19 MF.

---

\(^{12}\) SHISHA–HALEVY 1972:§2.1.1, 1976c:134 n. 3; see §§7.1.3, 7.3, 7.4 below.

\(^{13}\) An adequate functional account of preterite conversion — for once without reference to the Greek imperfect — is long overdue. For the mysterious ΜΝ with this, otherwise converted or basic forms, see §1.2.1.2, gen. obs. 4.

\(^{14}\) In fact, WEINRICH's "relief" (1977:91ff., etc.) would, in a somewhat different sense, apply to both roles; this is "subordination" or "inclusion" (pace FUNK 1981:196) on a higher, macrosyntactic, level of analysis.

\(^{15}\) The question of whether or not this is a "mood"-type category (CERNY–GROLL Ch. 26, §10.6: "polemic mood") is one of terminological taste rather than of essential policy. Our category is tense-intersecting, functionally definable by intra- and inter-clausal relationships as an option of "staging". (Incidentally, the "mood"-definition would have to apply to the [equally polemic] Cleft Sentence with nominal *vedette*, which however is not treated as a 'mood' by Prof. Groll.)

\(^{16}\) NB. This inventory gives an overall picture of the distribution of the allomorphs; the actual constituency, drastically curtailed in many patterns, will be added under the relevant headings. Moreover, circumstantial (§2.5) and Basic tense themes (§2.6.2) in the distributional picture, should, properly speaking, be included in the morphological muster.

\(^{17}\) POLOTSKY 1960a:§59.

\(^{18}\) SHISHA–HALEVY 1976b:360f.


\(^{20}\) POLOTSKY 1960a:§21. 35.
(4) ε + "adjective-verbs"\, (Ch. 135.44ff., Wess. 9 130b 23f. = 147a 2ff.), εναιάτικαι (A 2 51, Cl. Pr. 33 1), εναντός (Leid. 302 = IV 96.3).

(5) Εὕρε, patt. (2): Εὐρε... ΝΟΥΡ (A 2 464).


(7) Εναντίον (?)\, III 161.30: patt. (2) or (6).

(b) Εὐαγρί-\, pattern (2): IV 18.2; pattern (1): A 2 479 ΠΗΡΙΝ Εὐαγρί Peninsula ΝΕΣΤΕΡΙΚΕΣ ΣΧΕΣΗΣ ... ΕΡΕ-ΕΝΑΓΚΩΜΕ.

(c) ΝΤ-(ΑΝ-) fluctuates with ΕΝΤ(ΑΝ-) (§2.0.1.1.2); patt. (1) to (4)\,.

I have found no evidence in Shenoute for this converter before Tripartite negative bases or Ν-ΑΝ negativated patterns. Indeed, a drastic reductive change seems to have taken place here, compared with the system depicted in the Études and "Coptic Conjugation System": negative conjugation forms are either unmarked as themes or (much more rarely) so marked by the circumstantial (in focus-initial patterns, see §§2.5-6 below)\,.

In the Second Present (converted Bipartite) we find as predicate, beside the durative infinitive, also the stative and the predicative modifier: (Ch. 76.46f.) ΕΥΧΗΣ ΓΑΠ ΝΤΕΙΣΕ ΧΕ- (A 2 114) ΕΥΧΟΟΠ ΤΩΝ / (Ch. 102. 19f.) ΕΡΕΠΑΒΑΛ ΜΜΑΥ ΕΤΕΒΕΝΑΥ / (P 1306 119 ro) ΕΠΕ ΖΗΜΑΖΗΤ 2ΣΗΣ ΜΑΥ ΝΟΥΜΗΝΥΡ ΝΟΥΡ / (Ch. 159.33f.) ΕΥΖΗΝΤΕΥΜΗΤΕ ΝΟΥΡ.

2.0.1.1.2 Second-power conversion. Polotsky (1957a:232 = CP 232, 1960a:§§11 Obs., 18) points out the compatibility of the circumstantial and Second Perfect converters\, in a second-power conversion ΕΝΤΑΣι- (analyzable, in IC terms, as Ε[ΝΤ(ΑΣ-)...]) (pattern 2). This has a practical implication in a corpus where ΕΝτ- (rel. perf.) is neatly opposed to ΝΤ- (Sec. Perf.). This is not the case in our corpus, where ΕΝ- and Ν- (and generally ε + nasal/syllabic nasal) fluctuate. The situation seems even more hopeless for the circumstantial converter before the ε-allomorph of the Sec. Tense (see below for a solitary instance of ΕΕΡΕ-). Here, zero is clearly the norm. Nevertheless, in cases where an "asynthetic para-
taxis" is improbable (that is, outside the narrative perfect\, or in "list-/catalogic style"\, and other suitable contextual configurations), absence of coordination or disjunction may imply a (zeroed) circumstantial converter. Some especially striking, recurring or typical instances follow:
(1) εἰ/θ-εῖ - 28: the unique ἐγεῖ- (IV 107.5ff.) ἀγαθῶν ζῷοιτ ἡμών μνημεῖο, ἐγεῖςιμεῖο ὁ νῦν μνήμον ό παλ νήθτα "What has a man to do with a woman, while in what capacity is a woman to be with a man among us?"; circ. + negated Sec. Present: (IV 38.22ff.) ἦ ἐπετίμητο ἡμᾶς γέμνυ εὐεργετήτων μνήματι / (P 1301 103 PΧ) ἐμαυξίας ἑξευκτοῖας ἀγαθή διπέπεται εὐεργετής μνήμονας τῶν πρῶτοι ἡμών. Also P 1314 155 ἀν., 156 θ., 1308 ῥ., 70 ὀ., 74 ρ., 9316, etc., etc.

(2) the recurring and formulaic εἰς εἴματι ἄξι- "by which I mean to say...", a Shenogetean expression, marking and introducing the "hermenia" after an allegory: (Ch. 102.19ff.) KAI ΓΑΡ ΕΡΕΠΒΑ ΧΑΙ-ΕΙΣΙ ΕΤΒΕΣΙΗΤΕ, ΕΙΣΙ ἔπειραι εὐεργετής ἡμᾶς μητροποιήσα λοιπόν εὐεργετής ἀγάθους ἡμῶν. Also Π 1314 155 ἀν., 156 θ., 1308 ῥ., 70 ὀ., 74 ρ., 9316, etc., etc.

(3) εἰ/θ ντα- (Ch. 146.52ff.) ΜΗ ΝΤΑΠΕΚΣ ΕΙ ΑΝ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΒΙΝΗΝΙΑ ΚΑΤΑΚΑΡΕΣ ΝΤΑΠΕΚΣΙΝΙΑΣ ΕΙ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΝΗΤΗΤ / (Ming. 318) ΤΗΝΚΕ ΔΕ ΜΗΝ- (say, know or sim.) ΔΕ-ΕΞΕΥΣΙΣ ΤΑ ΜΗΝΟΣ ΓΝΑΘΗΝ ΝΤΑΠΕΚΣΙΝΙΑΣ ΜΗΝΟΣ ΝΗΤΗΤ / (A 2 312) ΑΥ ΝΔΑΟΝ ΔΕ ΝΣΤΕΝΩΝ ΤΕΝΟΥΝΤΕ / ΚΒΠΕΤ ΝΔΑΟΝ ΝΣΤΕΝΩΝ (see §2.5.1.2) (P 1314 87 Ρχ.) ΠΑΝΤΙΚΣ ΤΟΝ ΕΝΤΑΧΗΣΙ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΕΤΑΚΟΟΝ ΓΝΟΥΜΗΤΑΡΙΟΥΣ ΝΗΤΗΤ ΝΪΝΟΣ ΝΣΤΕΝΩΝ ΕΥΝΑΓΟΝΤΟ ΕΤΑΚΟΟΝ ΝΣΤΕΝΩΝ - a clear instance, with the circumstantial focalization-pattern preceding a main-clause interrogative one. Note that the syllabic of the Ν in ΝΤΑ- is maintained after the converter. / (Ch. 41.42ff.) ΝΑΠΕΚΣ ΝΕ ΝΤΑΠΕΚΣΙΝ ΝΕ ΝΔΑΟΝ ΝΣΤΕΝΩΝ (III 95.20ff.) ΝΤΑΠΕΚΣΙΝ ΝΕ ΝΔΑΟΝ ΝΣΤΕΝΩΝ ΕΤΑΚΟΟΝ ΝΣΤΕΝΩΝ "the true rich one, who became poor for our sake, being the Lord of all things, it being for man's sake that he became a slave..."; III 71.18f. quoted below in §2.1.7.2.

(4) Two special cases where the postulation of the zero-variant of the circ. converter is called for by the syntactic structure: adnical complementation to ΤΑΙ ΤΕ ΘΕ/ΝΕΟ ΜΗΝ-, ΝΤΕΙΣΙΣ ΟΝ ΝΕ 30, or in the ΝΕ- apexitive relative clause with a focalized modifier (ΜΗ ΤΕ- for unfocal predication) 31: (Ch. 64-5) ΝΕΕ ΓΑΡ ΝΔΑΟΝ ΝΣΤΕΝΩΝ ΤΕΝΟΥΝΤΟ ΕΤΑΚΟΟΝ ΝΕΟΝ ΝΤΑΠΕΚΣΙΝΙΑΣ ΕΒΟΛΑ "... while it is curling out voicelessly that the Enemy made them stumble by iniquitous counselors" / (Ch. 194.24ff.) ΝΤΕΙΣΙΣ ΟΝ ΝΕ ΠΑΝΤΙΚΣΙΝΙΑΣ ΑΒΡΑΑΜ ΕΝΤΑΧΗΣΙ ΝΝΙΝΟΣ ΝΔΑΟΝ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΕΤΑΚΟΟΝ ΝΣΤΕΝΩΝΕΤΕ ΝΤΑΠΕΚΣΙΝΙΑΣ ΝΕΝΗΜΟΝΟΜΟ ΝΗΤΗΤ "... it being because of his love of strangers that he received these great blessings" / (III 142.16ff.) ΤΑΙ ΤΕ ΘΕΟΝ ΜΗΝ ΝΣΤΕΝΩΝ ΝΝΙΝΟΣ ΤΕΝΟΥΝΤΟ ΕΤΑΚΟΟΝ ΝΗΤΗΤ "It being the time when they (the Fathers) were still with them that they disdained them" / (III 31.22ff.) ΜΗ ΤΕ ΗΡΕΠΕΠΙΛΛΟΤΟ ΝΔΑΟΝ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΕΤΑΚΟΟΝ ΝΣΤΕΝΩΝΕΤΕ ΝΑΙΑΝ "Those whose healing is from God alone" / (III 224.21ff.) ΝΣΤΕΝΩΝΕΤΕ ΜΗ ΦΙΛΟΤΟΥ ΕΡΕΠΕΠΙΛΛΟΤΟ ΝΑΙΑΝ. Also III 206.10ff., Ch. 84.29ff., 130 37ff. One must bear in mind that our hesitation in several of the exx. above between the 'circumstantial + adjunct' and 'circumstantial + (Sec. Tense + modifier nexus)' stems from the inability to predict with any confidence the occurrence of a Sec.-Tense construction - to place the boundary-line between the formal mise en relief and the construction plane. This selection may however be taken as fairly representative of those contextual constellations where a regular Sec.-Tense 'event' might be expected.

Incidentally, no certain example of the Sec. Tense of ΝΕ- is attested in Shenoget (Polotsky 1960a: §18f.); a possible instance is III 203.15ff. ("Had you kept all your good deeds,") ΤΕΕΕΕΕ ΕΞΕ-ΕΡΕΠΠΟΥΝΤΟ ΝΣΤΕΝΟΥΝ ΝΣΤΕΝΟΥΝ ΝΕ ΝΤΑΠΕΚΣΙΝ ΝΣΤΕΝΟΥΝ...
On a question of identity and homonymy: sec. tense vs. circumstantial, sec. tense vs. relative. On a strictly Sahidic-internal and synchronic basis, there is, on the one hand, no a priori distributional reason to reject the morphological identity of Second Perf. (ε)NTA- with the rel. perfect or of Second Aorist εWA- with the relative or circumstantial aorist, or of Second Tense ε- in all other cases, with the circumstantial converter, all featuring here in a set of patterns with remarkable functional affinity (and to this extent too belonging together). On the other hand, if we apply a strict structural-analytic definition of identity, every single pattern occurrence of the morph, i.e. its syntactic/paradigmatic localization, must be considered its "name", leaving us with a fragmentation of at least five possible entities, some homonymous. Let us take a closer look at the distributional structure of ε- and (ε)NT- (again as if we are innocent of all historic and extra-Sahidic knowledge, and not taking (ε)NT-, εT-, matter-of-factly as allomorphs of ε-). We must bear in mind that this structure is (a) somewhat distorted, since it is incomplete without the suprasegmental distinctive feature of each pattern, and (b) arbitrary to a degree, since the definition of the critical extent is variable ($\S 0.2.1.2, 0.2.5.1$). Moreover, not all environments considered are commensurate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ε-</th>
<th>εA-</th>
<th>εM-</th>
<th>εWA-</th>
<th>(ε)NT-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adnominal (adnexal:attributive)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adverbal</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>initial, non-thematic</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>initial, thematic (patts. 2-3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>final, non-thematic</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>final, thematic (patts. 4-6)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>autofocal (patt. 1)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>final, focal</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>initial, focal</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One notes the maximal distribution of ε- and the similar distribution of (ε)NTA- and εWA-, εM- (for the latter, the evidence is inconclusive), but most instructive are the patterns in which all are opposed as one paradigm, namely, (4) to (6); we cannot therefore interrelate them as allomorphs of the same arch-morpheme. Moreover, the circumstantial and Second Tense converters are compatible ($\S 0.1.1.2$) and

\[\text{Diachronic information, at least from pre-Demotic Egyptian, points to the identity of the "emphatic" forms and relative forms (Polotsky 1976: esp. $\S 2.1, 2.3$, with the absence of gender-number concord — i.e. a tagmemic feature — the sole distinctive feature of the former: mrr.f and sdm.n.(tw).f, j.jr.f sdm are relative forms, with further bifurcation purely functional, i.e. their formal Merkmal as "emphatic" or "relative" is their very construction, not a mere correlation with this construction. The inference from dialects in which the two are distinct (e.g. Funk 1981:194, from "Middle Egyptian") is, I believe, unwarranted: the merger in Sahidic, a diachronic event, has synchonic systemic consequences: it is these we must report on.}

\[\text{So already Edgerton (1935:261ff.): "(separating the forms) seems to lack empirical reality".}

\[\text{Consider exx. of the type (A 2 463-4) 2UB NIM NTAAAY, NTAAAY TPROY ETBEHENOUXAI, neatly showing the pattern way to defining identity.}

\[\text{No certain examples of adverbal circumstantial for εWA- are known to me (candidates are Wess. 9 91b 1, 140a 12, 145b 20). For εM- we do have some unambiguous exx. (III 94.20, IV 38.4ff., Mun. 107). The circ. present appears to supply the circumstantial for the affirmative aorist (consider Ch. 130.46ff., III 94.19, IV 15.24 etc). (A possible "Middle Egyptian" example is Mt. 11:19: 2ΛΗΝΗΝΙΠΗΡΕ ΜΠΡΟΜΕ ΕΘΑΟΥΟΝ ΕΘΑΤΑ).}

\[\text{Historically speaking this is hardly surprising, as this is a merger of the functional ranges of both jw- and j.jr-.}
thus prove their categorial disparity (unlike the relative and Second Tense converters). The negation test — $n(\epsilon^4\epsilon N \cdot) \text{ AN}$ for the Sec. Tense, $\epsilon(\text{NTH-AN})$ for the circumstantial — used by Polotsky (1960:28 Obs.) to establish their distinctness, does not seem to me conclusive, since it might be argued that it is this arrangement (or, from a different angle, juncture) *differentia specifica* which characterizes the $\epsilon^4$-form as a thematic pre-focal component of a nexus — N.B.: no $\text{NTH-AN}$ in patt. (1), (3), (4)-(6); thematic $\text{Theta}$- $\text{AN}$ in (5) —, vs. non-thematic (rhetic or a nexus in itself, adnexual); the negation arrangement here assumes the functional burden. To sum up my view on this subject 37: On the analytic plane, I accept the homonymy of the Sec. Tense and circumstantial, Sec. Tense and relative, perhaps even with a greater fragmentation: $\epsilon-$, $\text{NT-}$ are signals of different purport in different environments. On a more synthetic plane of description, I would prefer to regard the circumstantial as a component in a pattern set, the Sec. Tense a component in another, due consideration being given to their paradigmatic and syntagmatic encounters. This policy is adopted in the present discussion.

An altogether different matter is the practical question of distinguishing the circ./relative from the Second-Tense converters. Since we are not here concerned with “forms” but with patterns, this is rarely of consequence. Consider, for instance, the final-consecutive $\text{ZK}/\text{ZKAA AC ANA}$. Is the converter circumstantial or Second Tense? Did the question have any meaning for the Coptic decoder of this syn-
tagm?

2.0.2 The theoretical background. Even a superficial attempt at an IC and functional analysis of Second Tense constructions brings home two points: (a) The components are not of necessity reflected in the clause structure, but must be referred both to information in the preceding stretches of the text (“cotext”) and to this cotext as syntactically relevant to and in cohesion with the Second-Tense construction. The resolvable units, “predication”, “subject”, “predicate”, “predicative component” etc., constitute a whole structure which, quite apart from (and beyond) the pattern-specific syntactic realization and articulations, is meaningful in an ultra-clausal “logical” or rather informational system of reference 38. (b) We realize there are, even in this sense of structure, predicates and predicates, subjects and subjects; we feel the difference between a “non-emphatic” or paradigmatically unmarked subject/predicate and an “emphatic” one (to use provisionally one of a host of semi-opaque and cryptic synonyms for “strengthening”). This is a real opposition with formal correlates, a paradigm of grades or types of predication, of thematicity and of focality — see below.

2.0.2.0.1 Theoretical-terminological systems: topic - comment - focus / given - new; cotext-sensitive grammar. Without pretending to span within these limits the considerable questions involved, I shall give below a brief review of some important theoretical systems. (a) A preliminary step, very important for our purpose, is to recognize the optional, subjective nature of the informational


38 Polotsky 1944 (e.g. 30f. = CP 134f., 57ff. = CP 161ff.), 1962:414ff. (= CP 419ff.). Polotsky was the first to replace (for Coptic) “grammatical subject” by actor (1960a:§3) and thus restore “subject” — and “predicate” — to their original “logical” frame of reference, brilliantly demonstrating the analytic advantage of this essential reinstatement: in Coptic, “grammatical predicate” — a contradiction in terms — has no analytic meaning. An early statement (the earliest in modern linguistics?) on the distinction of logical and grammatical structures, may be found in Becker 1836:15ff., and later 1841:579ff. (In what is in fact the early edition of [1836], namely the Deutsche Grammatik of 1829, the “grammatical predicate” still reigns supreme. See Haselbach 1966:198ff., 209ff.) Next we find the “psychological” subject/predicate in von der Gabellentz 1869:378; Weil 1879 (see pp. 14f., 20f.); Tobler 1886:55ff., 88ff., and on in the typologicist-psychologicist trend of 19th-century “Sprachwissenschaft”, parallel and antagonistic to the Neogrammarian mainstream. (The fact that the “psychological” terms are preeminent in Paul 1920 shows how over-simplifying it is to regard him as the “spokesman of the Neogrammarians” in all respects.)
organization of the discourse\footnote{Halliday 1967:220: ‘‘The concept of theme is based on the notion of choice — it represents an option on the part of the speaker’’; Grimes 1975:323ff.: ‘‘...choice of one of a number of possible ways of staging the information’’}. Like numerous other phenomena of grammar (some cases of word-order regulation, selection of ‘‘particles’’ and other inter-clausal relators, some tenses, etc.). This is not the grammaticality of dependence and conditioning. This realization is vital, lest we look in vain for a single simple ‘‘responsible factor’’ for the occurrence of a Second Tense, and lest we lose sight of our main task, which is to clarify the signifié of the Second-Tense signifiant or mark; it is not to attempt to account for its presence. (b) Within clause boundaries, we have a ‘‘theme + rheme’’ structure. Theme — in Halliday’s definition (1967:212)\footnote{Also 1967:464. I generally adopt and apply here Halliday’s main ideas and terminology. For a good summary of his own scheme, see Halliday 1967:241ff.; 1972:162ff.; also Jones 1977:81ff. However, I use the term ‘‘topic’’ and extend the application of ‘‘information unit’’ up to and beyond the paragraph.}, a ‘‘point of departure’’\footnote{This linear-axis conception of the theme can be traced from Weil’s ‘‘point du départ, notion initiale’’ (1879:20ff.), corresponding to von der Gabellenz’s ‘‘psychological subject’’ (1869:378: ‘‘das, woran, worüber ich den Angeredeten denken lassen will’’ — while the psych. predicate is ‘‘das, was er sich darüber denken soll’’, that is, the predicate in a subject-dependent definition; see too idem 1901:365ff., 386ff.). Similarly, Blümel’s A usgangspunkt → Z(eif) (1914); Bally’s (1950: e.g. §32) and Gossen (1951) thema → propos, Müller-Hauser (1943) thème → énoncé Theme → rheme is used by Ammann (1920), and, following him, Löffle (1940), yet he occasionally mixes or approximates the logical and grammatical structures, e.g. on p. 22, talking of word-order — ‘‘vom Thema zur Aussage, vom Handeln zur Handlung’’; see Haselbach 1966:211 — a rapprochement of unfortunate and far-reaching consequences, traceable to the belief in ‘‘the natural’’ vocation [of certain word-classes] to symbolize subject and predicate’’ (Sandmann 1954:101). Compare here the equally formalistic classical ἐπιμέλης (Robins 1966:7ff.: Aristotle’s ἐπιμέλης, ‘‘set of words functioning in their capacity as the second component of a two-part sentence’’; for the Stoic definition see Schmidt 1839:61). In the Prague School we find an evolution: from Mathesius’ two-faced definition of the theme, covering both our ‘‘theme’’ and ‘‘topic’’ — ‘‘that which is known or at least obvious in the given context, and from which the speaker proceeds’’ (apud Firbas 1964) to Danes and Firbas’ improved version, separating utterance-level (theme → rheme) from text-level (given → new): Danes 1974, Jones 1977:60ff.}, what is being talked about, what I am talking about now’’; Rheme — ‘‘what is being said about the theme’’. This is the thematic structure, grammatical in the sense that it is ‘‘purely syntactic’’ (ibid. 199ff., 211ff.), i.e. on clause level, intra-clausal. (c) Halliday rightly stresses the presence of another independent yet related structure: the information block or unit, which may, or may not, coincide with clause extent. The weak point — ‘‘bridge’’, overlap or liaison factor between the two structures where it is all too easy to slip from one to another and confuse them, is the identity or disparity of the ‘‘given’’ (‘‘what you were/I was talking about’’, in Halliday’s definition) with the theme. They can be identical, but this is not always the case. ‘‘Givenness’’ is a cotextual factor\footnote{The ‘‘original sin’’ of many a terminological stumble in this context is carelessness in distinguishing between ‘‘known’’ (‘‘assumed as known’’), ‘‘accepted’’, ‘‘given’’, anaphora nucleus and ‘‘basis of the énoncé’’. See Chafe 1976, Allerton 1978.} the ‘‘given’’ segment — the (co)text-bound one\footnote{Scall 1974:28: ‘‘[Elements the speaker reminds of as elements] known from the context, from the situation or from general conditions of the given utterance’’; this is too comprehensive, and again mixes clause- and cotext-levels.} — I would here name topic. It is the cotextual component or representative in the clause, ideally coinciding with the theme but often distinct from it, with the theme in cohesion with it in one way or another — always in a different structure and to a different extent (the subtextual segment of the information unit, which may even include the paragraph and larger textual subdivisions). Halliday’s ‘‘theme proper’’ (1967:200) is my ‘‘theme’’ and ‘‘topic’’ combined. The theme is Janus-faced, with relations of one grammatical kind inside its clause, and of a different kind backwards with its cotext. The Second Tense can be treated properly only in terms of a cotext-sensitive grammar, since it involves the speaker’s option of ‘‘staging’’ the information. It is a cotext-form par excellence, in evaluating which the degree of cotext boundness is crucial; it must be examined both in terms of ‘‘theme - rheme’’ and ‘‘topic - focus’’ structures. (d) In parallel with the rheme, predicated (‘‘installed’’) on the theme inside the clause, the topic — in
its information unit — prepares us for the focus, the hub and kernel of this structure. (HALLIDAY 1967: 200ff., 207, defines it in prosodic terms which are not much help for Coptic, although they do not conflict with what we know of the tonicity of focal segments.) The focus is new in relation to the topic — a matter of relative, not absolute value 44; it is usually coincident with the rHEME. The focus is the message nucleus.

The Second-Tense form may, in correlation with and as a component of certain cotextual patternings (§2.0.2.4), be the theme (often ≠ topic) 46, focalizing its rHEME (patt. 2-3). It may be self-focalizing, with topic and focus, theme and rHEME, all in one (pattern 1). It may be a topic (= theme), following its rHEME (patt. 4-6).

2.0.2.1 Topicalization, thematization: means and paradigm 48. In the first place, one notes measures applied to the nominal theme: its "isolation" by various means, especially its extrapositive detachment from the main structure — so-called segmentation 47, with or without additional marking 48, with or without resumption. The verbal thematic component may be nominalized and treated as a nominal theme; it may be de-finitized, with its lexemic and grammatical constituents separated 49. However, the theme may also be unmarked in any way except by its slot in the clause (compare the actor noun/pronoun in the Coptic conjugation form 50). It may then receive an additional, "over-" characterization, usually by prosodic and/or placement-shift (such as segmentation) highlighting, thus realizing what amounts to a distinct member in a binary paradigm of thematicity, the prominent theme 51, which ought to be explicitly related to the unmarked member and not impressionistically subsumed under "emphasis" or "Hervorhebung".

2.0.2.2.1 Focalization and focality: means, paradigm, values. Focalization — the marking as focus 52 — and thematization are two faces of the same coin, since theme or topic-marking constructions achieve by the same token the effect of focus-marking. Still, there are patterns in which only the focus is marked (e.g. prosodically or by a particle) and others where both focus and theme/topic are marked (notably the Cleft Sentence, §2.0.2.2.4). Here too we must distinguish between a focus indicated by virtue of basic syntactic properties — an unmarked member in the focality paradigm (MMAY in YMAY),

44 Consider the distinction between "structurally new", i.e. "anaphorically new" (also "inherently new" in the case of closed systems, such as prepositional sets) and non-anaphoric, situational "newness" (HALLIDAY 1967:204ff.). See too DANES 1974:109ff. This corresponds to the "Hauptbegriff" (not subject-dependent) definition of logical predicate (from BECKER 1836: 18ff. onwards).
45 See §2.7.2 for specific # topic → (theme + rHEME/focus)# schemes.
49 Cf. Ebeling 1905:113-128 ("Dispiacecre non mi dispiacete"); GOLDENBERG 1971; also the use of English "do" outside the interrogative/negative allomorphic role ("do go", "he did say so" — functionally very close to our pattern (1), 'ERAOE'). In the case of the Greek "Second Tenses" (Rosén 1957, esp. pp. 135ff., 150ff.), the whole elmi + participle syntagm is, in its external relationships, thematic; internally, however, it constitutes a nexus.
51 HALLIDAY 1967:213ff., 216; DAHL 1974:18 ("emphatic topic"); JONES 1977:169ff. (see also 3ff., 6ff.). Compare REGULA's "mise en relief thématique" (1966). In a somewhat different, currently used sense of "prominent", Coptic is a topic-prominent language, a language that marks its topics rather than its "subjects" or directly marking the focus. CALLENDER's "focusing" (1970:186ff.) seems to include the prominent topic.
52 Not to be confused with focus or rHEME isolation (e.g. by the "question test"). See JONES 1977:68ff., 76ff., 87ff. The two issues are of course related, since it is with the marking of a focus (or the focalization value of a mark) that we are concerned.
and one in the framework of a marked topicalization "truss" or a special fociization pattern (EMMAY), the marked member \(^{53}\). The Second-Tense converter is either a prominent-thematization (often also topicalization) signal or (pattern 1) a mark of self-focality. The pattern-initial focus (§§2.4-6) appears to be yet another member of this paradigm, half-way between the unmarked and high-focality extremes.

2.0.2.2.2 Although focality is an absolute grammatical category, it has relative functional values, resolved by the macrosyntactic structure: (a) Polemicity determined and varied by the cotext (it is, for instance, different in text-initial position, different in the response-substructure of dialogue, yet again in reference to a contrast); (b) a high "Communicative Dynamism" level (see definition of CD in §2.0.2.3), i.e. a high degree of contribution to the development of the informational progression (high "acceleration"); (c) the "emphasis" value. This is an elusive, vague notion, evading grammatical frames of reference, subjectively envisaged on a variety of levels, from synonymity with "focality" to being delegated to extra-grammatical territories \(^{54}\). I adopt a broad definition, close to Weinrich's "Relief": any divergence or variance from the textual environment level, with appropriate sub-categorization. We may, for instance, have an emphasis of contrast \(^{55}\), of specification (vs. characterization) \(^{56}\), distinctive or isolating emphasis (cf. POLOTSKY 1944:33ff. = CP 137ff.).

2.0.2.2.3 Focality may be (language-specifically) non-pertinent — conditioned or inherent (in these cases, not subject to cotextual macrosyntactic analysis, and not in opposition to a non-focal occurrence outside the scheme of values referred to above). This is the important case of the interrogative modifiers and pronouns, cogently applied by POLOTSKY in his study of the Second Tense \(^{57}\). This is of consequence, not only for the informational patterning of these cases, but also for the very placement of the foci (see §2.8.1 below).

2.0.2.2.4 The cleft sentence and the second tense. Probably the most familiar set of focalization patterns, well known in a certain European Sprachbund and (thanks to Polotsky) in Egyptian-Coptic, is the so-called CLEFT SENTENCE ("phrase coupée") \(^{58}\). In general terms, these are patterns

\(^{53}\) See HALLIDAY'S definition (1967:207ff.: "The unmarked focus does not imply any preceding information").

\(^{54}\) Cf. THEBLEFF 1955:12ff. (semantic-psychologicist, with sub-categorization into "emphasis", "intensification", "amplification", "strengthening"); WEIL 1879:9 (types: rhetorical, logical, affective, grammatical; an instance of "rhetorical emphasis", and a logical freak, is the case of two simultaneous foci in a single information unit: see §2.7.1.3.1. below, and cf. LÖPPE 1940:24); MOORHOUSE 1959:73ff.; HALLIDAY 1967:203ff., 207; DRESSLER 1968:77ff.


\(^{56}\) Cf. the attempt at structuring in LÖPPE 1940:27ff.

\(^{57}\) 1944:29ff. (= CP 133ff.), 87 (= CP 191); CALLENDER 1971 (esp. p. 21. Callender discusses the relations between focalization, Cleft-Sentence focalization and the inherently focal interrogatives, in a generative framework). We still need an investigation of non-interrogative modifiers of inherent focality (like İMPIC, §1.3.11.6, or İKANIC, §1.3.11.3; cf. §2.5.0.1). See PAUL 1920:200; KARCEVSKI 1936:109. Strikingly comparable are the Irish "adverbs" which occur usually or exclusively in Cleft Sentence patterns: amhlaith "thus", minic "often", or ēgean "hardly", Welsh braidd (y-), cf. our İMPIC in foci. patt. (4).

focalizing a (pro)noun or modifier by means of a nominalizing (less frequently, "adverbializing", see §2.5) thematization of the verb. The focus and its theme are in a nexus relationship, realized in Indo-European by the verb "be" as copula, with an additional arrangement (word-order) focalization procedure, viz. preparsing the focus to the theme, with (in most cases) the entailed syntactic feature of a formal cataphoric pronominal subject, to which the theme is appositive: "It is... who/which/that...", "C’est... qui/que...". Polotsky's identification of the Egyptian and Coptic Second-Tense verb form with the glose (Cleft Sentence theme) presents the following difficulties: (a) Formally the comparability is imperfect, since there is no "clefting" in Egyptian and Coptic — the order of the terms which Polotsky has in mind is theme → rheme or topic → focus, and (b) the nominalness of the theme is not incontestably established. I suggest that it would be preferable to regard the Second Tense as a form which plays a role in several patterns, some of which — our patt(s) (4-6) — are formally closer to the particular Indo-European Cleft Sentence than others. The Second-Tense converter, an exponent of thematicity or focality — in short, a signal of specific Functional Sentence Perspective / Communicative Dynamism (§2.0.2.3) properties — should not, I believe, be confined in a descriptive Procrustean bed. Like other focalization patterns, the Cleft Sentence is still in need of more precise statements of value. It is (for instance) cataphoric, i.e. non-polemic, "presentative", in certain textual slots (e.g. in text-initial position, at the opening to a parable or "paradilemma", in the answer to a question, and in a description)⁵⁰. Needless to say, subsuming all these as allo-patterns under one heading a priori is largely unwarranted, since we lack those suprasegmental features which would distinguish them formally. Also, the paradigmatic standing of the Cleft Sentence, i.e. its relation to unmarked-focality members of its paradigm, varies considerably from one language to another. (On a selective [impressionistic] scale ranging from advanced devaluation [Welsh], through ever higher pertinency roles in Irish, French, British literary English, to full focality status in other Germanic languages, I would grade Coptic somewhere between Irish and French, rather in the proximity of the latter.)

2.0.2.3 THE ORGANIZATION OF INFORMATION. This organization, static and dynamic, is what one has to look for when attempting to formalize the relations of the thematic/topical component with its environment. We must apply some gradient notion like COMMUNICATIVE DYNAMISM ("CD"), in Firbas' definition⁶¹: "The extent to which the element contributes towards the development of the communication", higher cotextual interdependence meaning a lower grading of CD; always considering, however, that there is always some noticeable development and some factor of cotextual boundness (absolute idling [Leerlauf] is as much a myth as is absolute cotextual independence), and that constructing a scale of CD is difficult because of the continuous spectrum-like nature of such a scale, with countless subjectively postulated intergradations between the extremes of very low and very high grading. The arbitrariness and subjective quality of the following schematization are therefore to be expected. The following points must be borne in mind: (a) Attention must focus on the skeleton — the extremes and major intermediate points of reference — in this gradation, rather than the minor ones, which are not always formally correlatable. (Note that CD is essentially a junctural — cohesiveal — concept, hence by nature a continuum; see §6.0.2.) (b) We cannot predict the degree or contour of CD. This is decided, i.e. made clear, only after the pattern in question, with all its constituent signals, is completed. (c) Often one must distinguish between the CD-grading of the Second-Tense form and that of its construction, in which case we have rather a CD-contour in the given extent. (d) The CD gradation cuts across other formal typo-

⁵⁰ In transformational jargon, "clefting" is synonymous with "focalization".
logies of the focus (interrogative/non-interrogative, word-class, rhetorical/non-rhetorical). (c) The two scales below, I and II, must be superimposed symmetrically onto each other. The higher and lower CD in these scales (like topicalization and focalization) are but the two faces of one and the same coin (we are after all concerned here with *links*, i.e. formal indications of cohesion, various grammatical and semantic anaphoric signals referring back to *prius dicta* or *prius nota*, and with *delimitations*, i.e. indications of the absence or negation of a link; see §6.0.2). (f) Note the high incidence of grades 3-4 on both scales.

**Scale I:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td><em>/netoce euxoce etbeneyprasic nagasom</em> (A I 163).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td><em>epenoyein mouso mninooy n2htic</em> (i.e. in the night; not even the nexus is new) (A 2 248).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td><em>etbenai ntaienog ncaogy e1 egrai exmenizhgemen</em> (III 26.8ff.; only the nexus is new; all terms are anaphoric).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>epenai nayyme nan</em> (Ch. 88.2ff.; nai focal).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>ntaixe-nai eicooy my xe-</em> (A 2 73).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td><em>ntaye1 twn</em> (III 87.12ff., context implied).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td><em>einauxyooy thpyoy an</em> (A 2 238-9), <em>eyxi-60a</em> (IV 51.17).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td><em>ntancwthm zithnmin eney xe-</em> (A 2 463).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scale II:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td><em>'eykaeit</em> (Ch. 81.7; lemmatic role).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;<em>eunyume</em>&quot; (A I 56), &quot;<em>einecke mmooy</em>&quot; (III 123.1ff.): §2.1.4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td><em>eunaei</em> (IV 61.29, jussive), <em>eyp-nobe</em> (IV 80.2 — all patt. (1)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>einaoyemy-oy</em> (Ch. 105.17ff.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td><em>eio mmatoi, eio n2htemyn</em> (A I 43), <em>eio nay nse</em> (A I 104).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td><em>zmyneoxoy eyotuxae epyo xeio nnaht, ntaiph-ble ntoch nyoatna</em> (III 76.19ff.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td><em>enaity an... xe..., alla enaity... eunyan</em> (Cl. Pr. 33, 1; the whole configuration has high CD, inequally divided between the constituents).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>ntachwnt-mhbye nay nse</em> (Ming. 288), <em>etbenoy eko nkooy</em> (A 2 146).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>epenoydac woon twn teqoy</em> (A 2 53), <em>etbenoy... einaoyazt nca-, etbenoy nnaoyazt an. nca-</em> (Ch. 72.1ff.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td><em>zityno eazag p-yymo ephyn</em>, mh zithnnomoc an* (A I 89).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><em>epenval mmay etbenay</em> (Ch. 102.19ff.; all terms and nexal relationship - <em>prius nota</em>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### §2.0.2.4 The syntagmatics of nexus: a note

In considering the # theme + rheme # limited unit we set out (as did Polotsky) from a pattern arranged 'theme → rheme'. The association of the theme with the initial position is often pointed out and considered a basic or normal placement.  

---

this order reflecting the logical "marche des idées" \cite{Weil}, as well as the macrosyntactic "thematic progression" \cite{Firbas, Danes}, the progression from *given* to *new* \cite{Halliday}, low to high CD, the rhetorical ϕιστυκή τάξις. (Indeed, thematic/thematic role is a matter of position rather than of pattern slot.) However, this ideal arrangement is in opposition \cite{Polotsky} to certain *focus-initial* patterns which, while mostly understated \cite{Stern} in pan-Coptic or diachronic exposition, are nevertheless fully constitutional, even decisive features of the synchronic picture: they realize yet another type, constitute yet another member in the paradigm of focality.

Although nucleus - *satellite* dependence analysis does not necessarily suit or match the *theme - rheme* analysis (Barri 1978), the latter can be mapped onto the former, the two being compatible (witness the adnalex modification of the circumstantial and conjunctive; see §7.1.3).

### 2.0.2.5 The second tense: an integrated view of information structuring and function.

With the reminder that any syntaxization we may carry out must be incomplete without suprasegmental data, we arrive at the following correlational picture (note in particular the characteristics of pattern (1), accounting for its being our point of departure in the present description, at variance with Polotsky's):

#### (a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pattern</th>
<th>function</th>
<th>Sec.-Tense/circumstantial</th>
<th>clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>autofocal</td>
<td>theme + rheme, ≠ topic; formal topic,</td>
<td>= information unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>focalization signal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)-(3)</td>
<td>heterofocal</td>
<td>topic-constituent or topic-resumptive;</td>
<td>less than information unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>theme: given information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)-(6)</td>
<td>heterofocal</td>
<td>theme = topic: given information</td>
<td>less than information unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### (b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pattern</th>
<th>nexus structure</th>
<th>inform. structure contour</th>
<th>inform. unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>no information resumption</td>
<td>Sec. Tense form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)-(3)</td>
<td>Sec. Tense → focus</td>
<td>direct inform. resumption</td>
<td>Sec. Tense + focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)-(6)</td>
<td>focus → Sec. Tense</td>
<td>indirect inform. resumption</td>
<td>Sec. Tense + focus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pattern</th>
<th>clause CD contour (inform. development)</th>
<th>converted-form CD grading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>high ungraduated rise</td>
<td>very high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)-(3)</td>
<td>moderate graduated rise</td>
<td>very low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)-(6)</td>
<td>high ungraduated rise + dip</td>
<td>moderately high</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\cite{Weil} 1879:12f.
\cite{Firbas} 1966, 1967; \cite{Danes} 1970.
\cite{Halliday} 1967:205, 211.
\"Tension\" is Firbas' expression (Jones 1977:65ff.). In Coptic there is quite possibly some "tension" between the Egyptian topic-initial patterns and the typically Coptic, "Indo-European" fronting of the focus.
\cite{Polotsky} 1944:48ff. (= CP 152ff.); cf. \cite{Stern} §521.
Only for pertinent, i.e. not inherent, focality; only for pertinent, i.e. unconditioned, order (§2.6.3.1.2).
Often clarified as "given information" after the focus, i.e. the focus resolves the informational structure.
2.1 Theme/topic-initial patterns

2.1.1  # + ει + modifier #. Differing with Polotsky, I begin my exposition with the autonomous Second Tense, a self-contained unit, thus simpler in the macro-syntactic view (even if historically problematic): the self-focalizing "ευκρίνωμ" (etc., see next paragraphs) and "ευμαντήσω", with which we shall deal here: a high-CD, low-cotext-boundness information unit: ευπαθείς "what they are doing is rejoicing", "they are doing nothing but rejoicing" (cf. Anglo-Irish "It's rejoicing they are"); ευμαντήσω "he is in Hell, and nowhere else." The verb lexeme or modifier is focal, but in a different or higher degree of focality than in the basic conjugation-form. This applies where the opposition obtains, and not in the case of ευτυχή (+ nom. actor): ευτυχή τοναίμωμεν, ευτυχή ταναίμω... ευτυχή δέ ναικίζε... (A 2 336-7), έπεμενεκκες τυχ (A 1 212), sim. A 2 393, Ch. 166.28ff., III 67.17ff. etc. In this focus of inherent focality we have an instance of neutralization of focality grading (§2.0.2.2.3). The modifiers of pertinent focality occurring here (needless to say, in the Sec. Present only: an open-ended focus paradigm, yet incomparably more restricted than and not overlapping the §1.2.1.1 inventory): 2ν -/2νθη-, 2τ-, ντόοτ-, νκω- (not in the Bipartite pred. list); the anaphoric ΜΜΑΥ; the expanded modifier 2παί (2η-). The internal nexus is usually affirmative, sometimes negated by (Ν) — (Ν) (§2.9.1.1): "Where is Judas now?" — ευμαντήσω (A 2 53) / ποια μέν (of the animals) ευνονάζομαι έτε κκμμοού, αὐς πιέουα ευνονάζομαι έτε κκκακότας (Wess. 9 91a 26ff., parall. Sh. quoted in BLOr. 8811 CH) / ευκρίνω εἰ-νοβεί αὐς έτενείπει (Ch. 65.13ff.) / ΠΑΝ άν δί ευτενείπεια μπαδεοι επάνω, ευκρίνω εμύτεμπενερ (P 130a 50 СК, cf. Ch. 138.27ff.) / εμποίμενα μνοτοτεις έπανομόμενα έμιπομένε (IV 12.14) / εμποίμενα εμμαζάξε αν, αλαα αμμαζάξε (A 2 340); sim. A 2 248, Ch. 93.55ff., etc.

We encounter an analogous construction with verb lexemes, in durative and non-durative conjugation patterns. In the following paragraphs, I shall present certain context-functional categories typifying this verbal marked focus and more or less stereotyped, i.e. predictable.

2.1.2 Topical ("rhetorical") questions. Second Future, rarely Sec. Aorist, εύνῃ(τια-). (Ch. 70.49ff.) μί ευναί-ουγέρυβε ετραί ετρό ς ευνεάττ ιηκέ, μί ςεαινέω νούκαζοι εξώ, μί ςεαιν- ιοι νουμπρομποι ιε ευσειμε-ταί ομί μάβον ευναλαίοι ευναύμε (the two Basic Future variants predicate -ψ-) / (BMCat. 94, No. 213 ΑΗ) μί εύςει-ωάζε Μείμας έξω / (A 1 108 coll.) μί εςειακαζού Αίν (i.e. the rags) μί ςαρεκαζού / (Ch. 186.41ff.) Απα εδώντους ουνούτη παντόκρατορ / (Miss. 279).

70 Polotsky 1960b:§30.
71 Cf. Polotsky 1944:52f. (=CP 156ff.).
72 Thesleff's (1955:14ff.) "We do not think of degrees of walking " is simply not true (cf. Dressler 1968). It is not, however, with "degrees (of a verbal concept)" that we are concerned, but with the phenomenon, common in Indo-European as well as outside it, of a verb-form privileged to occur in marked focalization patterns. (Curiously, the "imperfective" or enhanced Aktionsart postulated for the "emphatic" form in the pre-Polotskyan grammar of Middle Egyptian comes here to mind.)
74 I have no exx. of Basic Tenses on their own as rhetorical questions. ετέ-Απα + Future I (Ch. 84.17ff.) is not a question, but an instance of the sceptical or half-hopeful nuance of σε (esp. clear in ελ, εξε σε see Denniston 37ff.; Bless-Debrunner §375; Kühner-Gerth II 324ff.). In Coptic, ετε- indicates that APA here is not a second-position particle, but a clause-initial one (for the merging of σε and σε see. i.a. Jannaris §1748c; Kühner-Gerth II 318 Anm.; Denniston 44. Our ετε-APA may simply be: δτι σε- (Denniston 38ff.).
2.1.3 Jussive/precative/preceptive/promissive ενακώς. Affirmative, rarely negated; 3rd person, 1st person, rarely 2nd person.

(III 210.13) ενακέi (Ch. 192.24ff.) τοπικ ενακώςις επος αυστικ ορος, αυστικ ενακώςις ερος ("... and let it!") / (III 20.17f.) επεννούτε... ηατακο νταωπυχ (apodotic imprecation, opp. to ηατιε—negative pledge, ειε—hopeful solicitation or self-promise) / (III 218.5ff.) εκεμαζονι ηπικε ηπις, εκε-

-μαζον ηατιεη ηπις... εκεμαζεις εποοι εβοα 2ηντωτηπ ηιμ, εκεμαζο+α—μαζον ηπικε ηπις; / (III 19.6, promise) ευκα+βολ ιοτη (IV 72-3, hortative) ενακωςις—(sic)επεννεκθηκε ηπικε, η ενα+ (sic) ηατι—

-κονι... η ηκαηαξι (sic) ήε—εκεηα+ουη ηαη ηπικει (A 2 505-6, neg. hortative) ενακωςις ειε ηε ηεπικε—

-γον η 3οτηπο εβοα / (IV 61.27f., neg. jussive) ενακωςις εποοι ηιη. Additional exx.: IV 103 passim (ενακ—, negative ηιε—); 61-2; Ch. 187.2f.; A 2 144; preceptive, IV 53.24, 54.3, 63.19, 71.2, 81 passim, etc.

This Khmimoid isogloss is intriguing both from the syntactic point of view (does it have a "that" clause role? cf. the OE-ME prospective sdm.f in this function) and that of its formal and functional relations with the conjunctival future syntags ήε—/εκακ ηεα—, which are still in need of thorough investigation. The co-existence of the ηεα— jussive with the classical Sahidic ηερειε— is noteworthy: the latter is marked as rhetorical, with the former preceptive and unmarked (Μπετειε— is common to both terms).

2.1.4 "Quotation-form", glossing and lemmatic roles

2.1.4.1 The Second Tense used in quoting or attributing a subjective claim, thought or statement that is thereby more or less strongly discredited ("... so they say" would approximately convey this meaning); Second Present (very rarely, Sec. Perfect); all persons; affirmative only.

76 JONES 1977:179ff. ("high/mid-level themes, to define or open a subject area", 184).
77 Von der GabeLentz 1975:136ff., 156.
78 Cf. TOBLER 1899:18ff., EBELING 1905:137-142 ("Che hai poara?", esp. 140), VON DER GABELENTZ 1901:183. Note also the unmistakable functional affinity with the English tag-construction: "He ran, didn't he?".
81 See §7.2.1.1.2. In the "Vita Monachorum" passages we also come upon the special jussive ετηπειε—, very common in the non-Shenoutean Leipoldt's No. 76 (IV 129-153, see note in the Appendix) but also found in IV 171.17: jussive ετηπειε— IV 71.14, neg. ετηε— 66.12 (see Ch. 7, note 63).
82 Cf. ROSEN 1957:149 (the Greek "Second Tense" in this function).
83 Cf. POLOTSKY 1944:39ff. (= CP 143ff.): here at least STERN (§§601, 372) is vindicated.
(2.14.1) LEMMATIC EYHUNT: rare (cf. §2.7.2.4). (Ch. 81.6f.) KAITOGE AYHOCXE EYE EYKAEIT (Esa; this may however be the circumstantial of Gen. 25:29) / (IV 181.11) OYE PE “EYOUGH NCWOY” (the source text, 181.10f., has NETEPOYOYO OYHN NCWOY. The answer here reveals a different, somewhat surprising possibility 86: “OYHN NCWOY” PE XE-).

2.1.5 EBOA AN XE- (“not because”), ZWC EYWHE- (“as if”) + Second Tense. These are two contextual constellations apparently calling (as an option) for a higher focality of the included verb:

(a) EBOA AN XE-/EBOA XE- (less common) + Second Present/Perfect; affirmative only; usually in strongly antithetic environment (focus of contrast) 87; the Sec. Tense in the first or both terms of the antithesis, occasionally varying with a Basic Tense. (A 2 299-300) EBOA AN XE-NTAPA LIBE AYHE EYPAE EYPMHE / (A 1 44) EBOA AN XE-NTAH-PEBOOY YNOOY EPOOY APIPOOYE GYWW NTW EPOOY AYMOOTY... ALAA EBOA XE-NTA NEYOOGY MPEYOOGY NWK EBOA / (K 9315) (“the arrogant man cannot accept the moral principle”) EBOA AN XE-EYKOCX EYPATOGH NPYRAK / (A 1 138-2) (“he violated his oath”) EBOA AN XE-EP-2OTE H EYWPHE, ALAA EBOA NTOO EYHE-AYPOOY NPYPMHE NTW EYPAY EYSCAYOY / (P 130 139 13911)... EBOA AN XE-ETENSMALT NETEYNHECTEA NETEYNMEMATHT, ALAA EBOA NTOO XE-NTETNAXKH AN EBOA 2NTMEZ-ETATHTYN. Also A 1 53, III 66.2f., 116.18f., Wess. 9 86b 30ff.

(b) (ZWC) EYWHE + Second Perfect. Affirmative only; perhaps in complementary distribution with ZWC EYWHE + circumstantial for the Bipartite 86 (cf. the Second Perfect allomorph after the irrealis ENE-): (A 2 33) (ZAC EYATUKO ZNOOWYNE) ZWC EYWHE-NTAYZATHY YEC-PEYOOSY EBOA / (III 208.5) AIMAY ANOK EYOA EYWHE-NTAHZAY-OYOG H OYDRAK / (III 215.23f.) ZWC EYWHE-NTAHNII THM 2MOOC H KIM N2AG NCOP / (A 2 366) ZWC EYWHE-NTAYTUM NNOAG NTEIMHE NPYPME — NTAYTOMOUY GAP ALANOY, cf. III 96.25, parall. Or. 161.37ff.; see next paragraph.

86 In (III 45.5) (“raise their hands”) XE-EYWHEA we may have a circumstantial after XE- “as if...” (sim. to ZWC EYWHE- + circ., SHISHA-HALEVY 1972§3.2.4.5).
87 When the person indicated is different from the speaker, we may have here instances of indirect-speech shifting (III 91.15f. XE-EYKOCX-NNYIN, 132.20 XE-EYPMHE MMOM) or, much more frequently, unshifted person (III 124.17f. XE-EYKOCX MMOM) or, also very common, quoted reference in terms of “real person” (III 132.3 XE-EYKOCX MMOM). These phenomena, which belong in the sphere of “Erlebte Rede” (“style indirecte libre”) and the formalities of inclusion and cohesion, need yet to be thoroughly investigated.
88 Cf. RE 10 159a 13ff. (parall. BM 253 93) EYHOCX EYOHME (referring to the preceding NETTOOME EPOO AYH EYTOOME EPOO) / (A 2 492) (AYOYKXX MPEYNOO YOEKOY YPO... / (A 2 245) (AYPMEOOE) TNOOY YOIN. See §2.7.2.4.
89 Cf. POLOTSKY 1944:39 (= CP 143), 53 f. (= CP 156f.)
90 SHISHA-HALEVY 1972§3.2.4.3-4. Consider ZWC EYWHE + circum. future (Ch. 22.34ff.), rarely, + circum. perfect (IV 92.6), + neg. circum. pres. (IV 115.25). Note the zero alternation before a Nominal Sentence (Ch. 30.36f., Wess. 9 87b 21f., IV 182.7f. etc.). I admit the evidence for the circumstantial (as against Sec. Present) allomorph is not strong; however, the evidence for (NOE) ZWC - with EAN- and circ. Nominal Sentence (ibid. §§3.2.4.1.2) is corroborating.
91 Cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 1972§3.2.4.4 for the syntax of “reporting a vision”.
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2.1.6 The rare parenthetic second tense occurs in interruptions of a narrative stretch, by which the narrator intercalates (or often "postcalates") his opinion or personal attitude ("narrator's aside"), but also meets the need to clarify or justify a particular choice of words. Note the unmistakable role which particles play here.80 We find the Sec. Perfect, affirmative and negated: (Or. 161.37ff., parall. III 96.25) ζωκ ευχ-εν-πα-ντα-υμ-νους νησν — ντα-υμ-νους γαρ (sim. A 2.369, quoted in the prec. paragraph) / (A 2.246) ...εαν-ανα εισ-ων — ντα-υμ-νους άν — εικαι-εν-ποτε ην ονομα.

2.1.7 Less schematizable, but still to some extent predictable, are miscellaneous circumstances in which the autofocal Second Tense occurs:

2.1.7.1 In disjunctive configurations (con — con —, ζοεινε — ζοεινε —, etc.), varying with Basic Tenses; affirmative only; Second Present.

(A 1.249, coll.) ΜΠΕΝΑΙΚΑΙΟΣ ΓΑΡ ΜΟΥ ΆΛΛΑ ΕΥΝΚΟΤΚ / (III 71.18ff., possibly a case of circumstantial + Sec. Perfect) ζνάαν νίμ ημποιογιστ... ΆΛΛΑ ΕΝΤΑΥΟΥΜΙ ΕΠΟΥ ΝΡΟΥ / (III 33.9ff.) ΜΠΕΝΟΥΗΣ ΕΤΟΟΤΧ ΕΥΑΚ... ΆΛΛΑ ΝΤΑ-ΥΚΙΚΕΡ-ΤΗΝ ΕΧΗΝΙΟΒΟΕ / (III 108.9) ΟΥ ΜΟΝΟΝ ΕΛ-ΝΤΑΧΕ-ΛΛΑΥ ΝΑΥ ΑΝ, ΆΛΛΑ (Ε)ΝΡΠΙΚΕΠΑΡΑΚΑΛΕΙ; for ΟΥ ΜΟΝΟΝ see §1.3.11.2.1.1; for -ΠΙΚΕ-, §3.3.1 (a similar example: Ch. 157.20ff.) / (III 212.7ff.) ΨΕΤΗΣ ΜΟΝΟΝ ΕΛ-ΝΤΟΥΝ-ΙΣ, ΕΝΕΠΕ ΝΝΑΙ ΝΤΑΝ-Ρ-ΑΤΕΟΥΝ ΜΜΟΗ ΝΟΥΟ / (IV 157.21ff.) Instead of plucking the plant ΝΤΑΤΥ职能 ΜΜΟΗ ΝΤΟΜΙΑ. Similar exx.: III 40.11ff., 76.19ff. (parall. Ch. 171.7ff.), A 2.241.

2.1.7.2 In the second or both terms of antithetic configurations91; affirmative, negative; Second Present, Aorist, Perfect.

(Ch. 207.19ff., Sh. adaptation of the famous Mark 5:39) ΜΠΕΝΑΙΚΑΙΟΣ ΓΑΡ ΜΟΥ ΆΛΛΑ ΕΥΝΚΟΤΚ / (III 71.18ff., possibly a case of circumstantial + Sec. Perfect) ζνάαν νίμ ημποιογιστ... ΆΛΛΑ ΕΝΤΑΥΟΥΜΙ ΕΠΟΥ ΝΡΟΥ / (III 33.9ff.) ΜΠΕΝΟΥΗΣ ΕΤΟΟΤΧ ΕΥΑΚ... ΆΛΛΑ ΝΤΑ-ΥΚΙΚΕΡ-ΤΗΝ ΕΧΗΝΙΟΒΟΕ / (III 108.9) ΟΥ ΜΟΝΟΝ ΕΛ-ΝΤΑΧΕ-ΛΛΑΥ ΝΑΥ ΑΝ, ΆΛΛΑ (Ε)ΝΡΠΙΚΕΠΑΡΑΚΑΛΕΙ; for ΟΥ ΜΟΝΟΝ see §1.3.11.2.1.1; for -ΠΙΚΕ-, §3.3.1 (a similar example: Ch. 157.20ff.) / (III 212.7ff.) ΨΕΤΗΣ ΜΟΝΟΝ ΕΛ-ΝΤΟΥΝ-ΙΣ, ΕΝΕΠΕ ΝΝΑΙ ΝΤΑΝ-Ρ-ΑΤΕΟΥΝ ΜΜΟΗ ΝΟΥΟ / (IV 157.21ff.) Instead of plucking the plant ΝΤΑΤΥ职能 ΜΜΟΗ ΝΤΟΜΙΑ. Similar exx.: III 40.11ff., 76.19ff. (parall. Ch. 171.7ff.), A 2.241.

2.1.7.3 Varia. (a) The Second Tense in apodosis (cf. Shisha-Halevy 1973): (K 926) εισπάκηνε ΜΜΟΚ... ΕΙΡ-ΝΟΒΕ, ΕΚΥΑΝΚΙΝΕ ΜΜΟ... ΕΚΡ-ΝΟΒΕ; (Wess. 9 110a 11ff.) εισπάκηνε ΝΕΙ ΕΙΡ-ΝΟΒΕ / (IV 79-80) ΠΕΤΝΑΡΑΝΑΥ ΕΠΟΙ ΣΗ ΚΑΙΚ ΜΜΟΙ ΝΤΑΝΕ... ΕΙΡ-ΝΟΒΕ. These examples may, however, all be cases of focalized object (§2.3.1; cf. "εκ-κι-60α", and (e) below).

(b) "'Dramatic" Second Present ("Koinzidenzfall")92: (III 29.27ff.) ΆΝΟΧ ΖΩΝΤ ΟΝ ΕΙΚΟΤΗ-ΣΑΛΛΕ ΆΛΛΕ ΑΥΘ ΕΙΝΟΥΧ ΕΤΤΜΗΕ, perhaps (IV 64.26ff.) ΝΑΙ ΔΕ ΕΙΚΘ ΜΜΟΗ ΕΛ-.


91 Poloptyk 1944.39ff. (= CP 156ff.).

92 This may be related to the "synchronous present", "Koinzidenzfall" or, as it is usually known today, "performative discourse" role of the Second Present, which I find well attested outside Shenoute (esp. in documentary or epistolary formulae); "hereby...", an act meant to be considered as carried out at the very time of — and by — being announced. Consider the formulaire εικατοει ("I concur with"). εικατοορει ("I admit, agree"). εικου εμπτερε ("I testify"). εικατορκα ("I swear"). εικαινιαξε ("I vouch for"). εικοτυφτε ("I promise")., as well as the less formulaic or non-formulary ειτ (ΕΒΟΑ) ("I sell", Till. Rechts-
(c) Occasional instances of Second Perfect predicating \( \text{P}^- \) (cf. (a) above; is the object of \( \text{P}^- \), or the whole \( \text{P} \) + object) syntagm focalized?): \( IV \) 67.2ff. \( \text{EOYON} \) \( EBOA... \text{X} \text{E-M} \text{TA} \text{Y}-\text{AT} \text{SOM} / \text{IV} \text{199.7f.} \) \( \text{SNPME} \) (sic) \( \epsilon ι \text{ΨΑΡΩΙ...} \text{ETBE} \text{EYT} \text{BNO} \text{YOE}, \text{X} \text{E-M} \text{ΕΥΑΚ} \text{Ε} \text{TA} \text{Y}-\text{ΖΙΚ} \text{EPOOY}.

2.2 The heterofocal second-tense construction: \# sec. tense conj.-form \( \rightarrow \) modifier \# — focalization pattern (2)

In Polotsky's analysis, this is the original, core model: a master structure, which he identifies with, or approximates to, the Bipartite pattern, and from which he deduces the nominal (substantival) nature of the Second Tense, its "transposed" status and the transformative shift of the modifier, from adjunctal to predicative status. The 'theme → rheme' arrangement of the nexus terms is here the "classic" one which (when pertinent, i.e. not conditioned by internal — focus — or external factors) is integrated in a thematic progression, or gradual, concatenated evolvement of the communication.

2.2.1 The focus constituency is here the largest of all focal paradigms, and is impressively close to that of the adverbial adjunctal modifier (§1.1.2.1). Both lists being open-ended, it is difficult to estimate to what degree they overlap.

\( e^- (\text{Ch. 16.47ff.}), \text{ΕΠΙΝΙΚΗ} (\text{§1.3.7.3}), \text{ΕΠΕ}^- (\text{Ch. 129.2ff.}), \epsilon + \text{inf.} (\text{III} 191.26ff.). \)

\( \text{ΕΒΟΑ} \text{ΖΗ}^- (\text{Ch. 34.18ff.}), \text{ΖΙΤΝ^-} (\text{Ch. 9.5ff.}) / \text{ΤΩΝ} (A I 281, §2.6.3.2) \)

\( \text{ΕΩΟΝ} \text{Ε^-} (\text{Ch. 20.31ff.}). \)

\( \text{ΕΚ^-} (\text{Ch. 152.30ff.}). \)

\( \text{ΕΤΒΕ^-} (\text{III} 122.24ff.), \text{ΕΤΒΕΞΕ^-} (\text{III} 100.16ff.). \)

\( \text{ΚΑΤΑ^-} (\text{IV} 16.2ff.). \)

\( \text{Ν^-/ΜΜΟΣ^-} (\text{dir. obj.}, \text{IV} 51.16ff.; \text{introd. predicative}, \text{III} 67.12; "\text{in. at. by}"; \text{Wess}. 9 87a 11ff.). \)

\( \text{Ν^-/ΝΑ^-} (\text{III} 165.16ff.). \)

\( \text{ΜΝ^-} (\text{III} 98.3, 7, 10). \)

\( \text{ΝΝΑΠΡΜ^-} (\text{III} 134.15). \)

\( \text{ΝΚΑ^-} (\text{Ch. 55.8ff.}). \)

\( \text{ΠΡΟΣ^-} (\text{P} 130^\text{a} 80 \text{ro}). \)

\( \text{ΟΥΒΕ^-} (\text{III} 65.14). \)

\( \text{ΨΑ^-} (\text{Ch. 28.38ff.}). \)

\( \text{ΣΑ^-} (\text{Ch. 17.24ff.}). \)

\( \text{ΣΑΣΤΝ^-} (\text{Miss. 283}). \)

\( \text{ΣΙ^-} (\text{Ch. 25.14ff.}). \)

\( \text{ΣΙΤΝ^-} (\text{III} 28.25ff.). \)

\( \text{ΣΙΧΝ^-} (\text{III} 80.25ff.). \)

\( \text{ΣΝ^-} (\text{Ch. 14.32ff.}). \)

\( \text{ΣΩΚ^-} (\text{Ch. 97.21ff.}). \)

\( \text{ΧΕ^-} (\text{var. roles}; \text{III} 137.23ff., \text{Ch. 62.1f.}, \text{Wess}. 9 149a-b). \)

\( \text{ΧΕΚΑΚ (III} 120-7ff.). \)

\( \text{ΧΙΝ^-} (\text{Ch. 65.15ff.}). \)

Clause Conjugations (\( \text{ΕΨΑΝ^-}, \text{ΨΑΝΤΕ^-}, \text{ΝΤΕΠΕ^-} (? A 2 51, 87; not conjunctive)} \)

\text{urk}. 27.12; \text{Crum}, \text{Coptic Ostraca} 139.4), \text{ΕΙΜΙΚΟΥ} ("I lease"; \text{Krail}, \text{Reiner} 127.9), \text{ΕΙΝΑΔΑ} ("I beg, appeal"; \text{Till}, \text{Ostraca} 243), \text{ΕΙΜΙ} ("I get"; \text{Stefanski-Lichtheim}, \text{Ostraca} 158), \text{ΕΙΜΙΟΥ} \text{ΕΙΨΧΤΝ} ("I bless you"; \text{Crum}, \text{Coptic Ostraca} 282), \text{ΕΙΜΩΥ} ("I am dying"; \text{ibid.} 267). For this functional category in general and comparative view, see \text{Koschmieder} 1965:26-34, 46ff.; \text{R. Harris} 1972; \text{Grimes} 975:71ff.; \text{Weinrich} 1977:57.

23 See §2.0.2.3-4. Compare the macro-syntactically marked role of the #subject-copula-predicate# Nominal Sentence pattern (\text{Shishe-Halevy} 1976a:48ff.).
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Circumstantial (III 66.5f.).

Iteration-marked noun syntags (§1.3.3).

The theme/topic constituency: ε-/ΕΠΕ- converted Bipartite, aorist (affirmative), adjective-verbs, ΟΥΝΤΑ-, ΥΨΕ-, (Ε)ΝΤ-converted perfect. The nexus is here affirmative or negated: §2.9.1.2.

2.2.2 General observations. (1) For relatively few — even if, in absolute numbers, common — members of the above list, notably ΕΠΕ-, (ΕΠΟΑ) ΖΙΝ-, (ΖΚΑΙ, ΕΠΟΑ) ΖΙ-, ΕΞ-, Ν- (ΝΗΙΕΣ, ΝΑΣ Ν-), there is an opposition or a complexy conditioned alternation with the focus-initial patterns: see §§2.4-6 below, esp. 2.6.4; those patterns have their own focus constituency paradigms, which feature some foci here absent (notably -ωC-modifiers).

(2) For various focalization figures employing this pattern (the complex focus: ΕΥΝΑΞΙΤΚ ΕΡΑΤΗ ΝΝΙΝ Wess. 9 117a 5f.; double focalization: ΝΤΑΝΙΜ ΤΚΑΒΟΥ ΕΝΙΜ Wess. 9 110a 9f.; the multiple disjoined focus: ΝΤΑΥΚΑΛΑ ΖΑΤΝΗΝ Η ΝΑΥ ΝΗΙ Miss. 283) see §2.7.1; for details concerning the syntagmatics of this pattern, for the coordination/disjunction of several themes, and for the isolation of the focus among several modifiers, see §2.8.4.

(3) For basic tense themes with several of these foci (notably ΤΩΝ, ΝΟΥΝ, ΝΑΣ Ν-) see §2.7.3.

(4) For the focusing modifiers ΜΜΑΣ, ΜΑΤΑΛ and other augentia, co-marking the focus, see §§1.3.1.1, 2.9.1.2 passim and §6.2.1. ΕΙΞΑ ΜΜΟΥ ΑΝ ΣΑΡΟΙ ΜΑΥΑΑΤ (ΙV 96.13) / ΕΥΝΟΟΥΝ ΖΜΗΕΑΛΚ ΜΜΑΣ ΑΥΑ ΖΜΗΕΑΝ ΑΝ (IV 24.6f.).

Special observations. (1) For Ν-/-ΜΜΟ- and the problems involved, see §§1.0.1, 1.1.2.1, etc. It is evident that not all of its functional spectrum shares the same focalization properties: while ΝΑΥ ΝΖΕ ""how?"" features in both focus- and topic-initial patterns, Ν- as object-expansion always follows its theme, as do most of the more ""lexical"" syntags of Ν- (for ΝΟΥΝ and ΝΗΙΕΣ focalized, see III 131.10, Wess. 9 174d 29ff., III 76.8ff., IV 195.4).

(2) ε- in ΜΠΟΥΤΑΛΑ ΝΑΝ ΕΠΕΝΟΥΝ-ΤΕΖΗΝ... ΑΛΑΑ ΝΤΑΥΤΑΛΑ ΝΑΝ ΕΚΟΥΝ- (III 191.25ff.) we have a remarkable instance of the focus being heralded by a cataphoric element in the theme (§5.2.2.1), indicating yet again the compatibility of the 'nucleus - satellite' and the 'theme - rhyme' dependences (the latter is "mapped on" the former).

(3) ΤΩΝ ""where?"", focalizable also in pattern (1), with an immediate explicatio of the actor-person noun by a noun syntagm, §6.0.1; ΕΠΟΩΝ ΤΩΝ ΤΕΖΗ ΕΤΜΝΑΥ (A 2 114) / ΕΡΕΙΩΥΔΑΛ ΥΟΟΝ ΤΩΝ ΤΕΝΟΥ (A 2 53) / ΕΝΑΖΕ ΕΠΟΝ ΤΩΝ (A 2 336; sim. with έσε ή ΓΙΝΕ, A 1 62, 306, III 72.9f. etc.). "Whence?" (see Ch. 1, footnote 96): ΕΡΕΙΟΥΝ ΤΩΝ ΧΕ- (A 1 67; sim., with ΕΙΜΕ or ΚΟΟΥΝ, A 1 72, 122, Wess. 9 143d 1ff. etc.) / ΝΤΑΙΝΗΕΝ ΤΗΜΗ ΕΙ ΤΩΝ ΕΠΑΙ Ε- (III 72.24f., sim. ibid. 17f., 87.12) / ΕΠΕΝΤΩΝ ΝΑΥΝΕ ΤΩΝ Η ΕΠΟΑ ΖΙΤΗΝΜ (A 2 412). For ΤΩΝ following a Basic Tense, see §2.7.3.2.3.

(4) The circumstantial focus features in some typical focalization figures, such as the "Wechsel-satz" "like # ΕΠΕ- ΕΠΕ- # construction and the "No sooner... than..." combination: see (with further ref.) §2.7.1.1. Some non-rhetorical examples: ΝΑΙ ΔΕ ΕΙΞΗ ΜΜΟΥΕ ΕΙΟΥΕΥ-ΤΝΟΟΥΕΡ (sic) ΕΝΕΡΕΠΗΚΤΑΝ (P 130° 40 ΜΓ) / ΝΑΙ ΕΡΕΙΕΠΕ ΜΜΟΥΕ ΤΕΝΟΥ ΕΡΕΙΟΥΝ (III 206.13) / ΕΤΕΝΜΠΙΝΕ ΜΜΟΥΕ ΕΙΖΑΤΗΘΥΤΝ ΑΝ (III 25.17f.) / ΝΤΑΜΠΙΟΕΙΚ ΚΑΑ ΑΝ ΕΗΓΗ-60Μ ΕΡΠΙΜΗΕ, ΑΛΑΑ ΕΡΕΠΙΡΗΜΕ 6Μ-60Μ ΕΡΟΥ (Ch. 16-17): these last examples call our attention to the fact that the circumstantial, even when not focal, is an adnexual modification form, i.e. it adjoins a nexus or predicative dependence to a verb or noun (§7.1.3). In the focalized circumstantial we have a "promoted" or marked degree of adnexation. Some figure-type instances of this kind may belong rather to the focus-initial pattern (6): ΕΥΝΟΟΤΕ ΜΜΩΤΝ ΑΝ ΕΙΞΗ ΝΗΤΗ ΝΝΑΙ (Wess. 9 158a 30ff.) / ΕΙΤΟΛΜΑ ΕΙΞΗ ΝΝΑΙ (Mun. 96).
(5) ΕΛΗ- occurs theme-like in a few instances, always in contrastive context: ΑΕΙ-ΟΥΞ ΝΟΥ; ΝΟΥ-ΤΗΝΒΕ ΑΝ Ν ΝΤΟΥ ΚΕΜΕΛΟΣ, ΑΛΛΑ ΕΛΗ-ΟΥΞ ΝΝΚΑΡΠΟΣ ΝΤΑΙΚΑΙΟΥΣΗ (Ch. 183.2ff.) "... but it is the fruits of righteousness it sprouted" / ΕΡΕΤΤΕ Ν ΠΕΣΤΕΡΕΙΜΑ ΚΗ ΑΝ ΕΡΕΛΕ ΕΧΕΝΖΕΜΑ ΝΤΕΝΚΑΖ ΝΕ ΝΤΗΜΕΛΤ ΕΤΚΗ ΕΧΜΗΝΗ, ΑΛΛΑ ΕΛΗΟΥΣΤΡ ΣΝΤΕΦΣΟΜ (Ch. 59.46ff.) "... but it is with His power that He fastened it". As appears from two other examples (Ch. 171.10ff. = III 76.20ff. and III 163.19ff.), these are perhaps better interpreted as cases of the non-thematic circumstantial premodified by the constrastive conjunct rather than focalization patterns.

2.2.3 Some assorted examples. Affirmative nexus: (P 1305 79 Α, not Sh.? ) ΝΤΑΙΝΕΙΔΑΧΕ ΕΛΑΠΑ ΕΡΟΙ ΔΕΙΜΕ ΕΡΟΙ ΤΕΝΟΥ ΣΝΤΕΙΡΟΜΕ ΤΑΙ / (ibid. 61 ΑΕ) ΕΡΥΑΝΙΤΕΣΜΟΥ ΔΕ ΒΑΛΑΒΕ ΞΥΝΑΜΟΑΖ ΝΟΥ / (Α 1 104) ΝΤΟΚ ΓΑΡ ΕΤΣΟΟΥΝ ΞΕ-ΕΙΟ ΝΑΥ ΝΖΕ ("... how I am (physically)"; sim. A 2 516 "... how they stand", Or. 154.39ff.) / (Ch. 54.19ff.) ΤΟΥΕΡΗΤΕ ΕΦΡΟΟΝ ΣΜΠΙΚΣΑ ΕΤΒΕΜΟΟΥΕ / (Wess. 9 86a 16ff.) ΝΤΑ- ΝΕΙΤΑΚΟ ΝΤΑΙΝΗΣ ΕΙ ΕΡΕΛΕ ΕΧΕΝΜΕΙΝΗΝΕ ΝΕ ΝΠΙΨΑΙΣ ΝΟΥΚΑΙΑΛΚΟΜΟΣ ΝΜΠΟΟΕΙΣ ΞΕ-ΟΥΝΟΝΟΝ ΞΕ-ΜΠΟΟΥΑ ΝΟΥΣ ΝΟΥΑ, ΑΛΛΑ ΞΕ-ΝΕΥΡΙΚΕΡΑΤΕΣ ΣΝΤΜΝΤΑΣΕΝΗΣ / (III 45.22ff.) ΕΤΕΤΝΙΟΥΡΗ ΝΜΖΗΤΝ ΝΝΙΜ; ΕΤΕΤΝΙΟΥΡΗ ΝΝΙΜ; ΕΤΕΤΝΙΑΤ-ΣΗΝ ΝΟΥ ΕΤΕΤΝΙ-ΝΟΥΤ ΝΝΤΖΗΝΤ; / (Α 1 80) ΕΙΝΑΛΗΡΗ ΝΝΝΑΒΑΛ ΕΡΟΙ ΝΑΥ ΝΖΕ / (Ch. 55.24ff.) ΑΝΑΝ ΕΡΡΟΥΕΝΡΟΦΗΘΗΣ ΣΝΖΑΝΝΗΣ ΞΕ-ΕΧΜΑΧΕ ΝΑΥ ΝΖΕ. For the last two exx. see §2.6.3.

Negated nexus (§2.9.1.2): (III 21.10) ΝΤΑΙΟΥΝΕΥΝ ΓΑΡ ΑΝ ΝΒΡΕ / (A 2 403) ΝΕΝΑΙΧΑΧΕ ΓΑΡ ΑΝ ΝΑΡΟΥ ΝΑΤΑΛΛ, ΑΛΛΑ ΕΝΑΙΑΔΕ-ΠΕΤΥΝΑΣΟΤΑΜΕ / (IV 51.16ff.) ΝΕΝΑΙΟΒΕ ΑΝ ΝΕΝΧΧΟΟΥΕ, ΑΛΛΑ ΕΝΑΙΟΒΕ ΜΜΟΟΥ ΜΑΤΑΛ / (III 74.4ff.) ΜΟΝΟΝ ΕΝΑΙΥΚΩΤ ΑΝ ΝΗΝΙ ΠΝΙΟΟΕΙΝ ΠΝΟΟΤΕ ΞΕ-ΕΝΝΑΜΟΥΤΝ ΞΕΝΗΗΟΤΥΝ ΑΛΤΝ ΞΕΝΗΕΝΟΤΝ, ΑΛΛΑ ΞΕ-ΕΝΝΑΜΟΤΝ ΑΝΟΝ ΝΖΗΤΝ ΞΕ-ΕΝΟ ΝΑΥ ΝΖΕ / (A 2 51) ΕΝΑΙΑΤΝ ΑΝ ΞΕ-ΟΥΝ-ΟΥΡΑΝ ΞΖΧΝ, ΑΛΛΑ ΕΝΑΙΑΤΝ ΕΡΥΑΝΙΤΕΣΜΗΡ ΙΚ ΝΑΖΜΕΝ.

2.3 THE HETEROFOCAL SECOND-TENSE CONSTRUCTION: # SECOND-TENSE CONJUGATION-FORM + PRONOUN/NOUN SYNTAGM # — FOCALIZATION PATTERN (3)

Here we note the focalization of the actants: (pro)nominal actor as well as the object-expansion. According to Polotsky, this is again a secondary use, even in synchronic view. In broader structuradelineation, our pattern will have to be confronted with the Cleft Sentence with (pro)nominal vedette (Polotsky 1962a), and arrive at a statement of opposition and neutralization, of macro-syntactic circumstances favouring the one construction or the other. The concurrence of the two patterns is especially striking with the interrogative, i.e. inherently focal, members of the focus paradigm. Here I believe we are dealing with a stylistically variant construction, rather than a functionally opposed one. Note the unmistakably colloquial flavour of idiomatic expressions like ΕΚΕΙ-ΟΥ "What do you say?", ΕΚΡ-ΟΥ "How are you doing?". Here, however, I shall simply present the classified evidence for the Second-Tense pattern in Shenoute.

2.3.1 FOCALIZED OBJECT-EXPANSION. The focal constituency: interrogative pronouns (inherently focal): ΟΥ "what?", ΝΙΜ "who?", ΑΕΙ (Ν-) "what...? which...?", ΟΥΡΗ "how much?". Non-interrogative: noun syntagms - determinators (Ν- ΟΥ- Θ-, §5.1.1.0.1) expanded by noun lexemes; Ν- ex-

44 Cf. Polotsky 1944:48f. (= CP 152f.). See below, §2.5, for ΕΛΗ- as post-focal theme-topic.
45 Polotsky 1940:245 (= CP 37).
44 See Polotsky 1944:31 (= CP 135), 51f. (= CP 155f.). This is, in a way, tantamount to describing as "secondary" the use of the English " that..." as gloss-form in Cleft Sentences with a (pro)nominal vedette ("It was my father that gave me the tie as a present"), cf. Polotsky 1944:§21. This is worth considering diachronically, but is synchronically unhelpful. See Rosen's (1957) non-hierarchic presentation (esp. p. 141ff.) of the foci for the Greek "Second Tenses".
47 Cf. Polotsky 1944:§20, 22; see §2.7.1.2 below for Cleft Sentence + Sec. Tense configurations.
panded by a relative form (indeterminate substantivized relative #); the possessive pronoun πα- expanded by a noun syntagm; indefinite pronouns: οὐ “something”, οὐχ “so much”; perhaps also personal pronoun + augens (A 2 238, quoted below). Noteworthy is the focalization of ξε-ου “(saying) what?”, where ξε- forms part of the valency of ξω “say”, and is cataphorically represented in the verbal nucleus (the theme; again, nexus dependence is mapped on a ‘nucleus - satellite’ phrase). The theme constituency: Second Present and Future, Second Perfect (noticeably less common), ἐμνατ-, Second Aorist. The nexus is affirmative only for interrogative foci, otherwise both affirmative and negated (by an), §2.9.1.3.

Documentation: affirmative nexus: (A 2 509) ἐναξ-ουρη τενού; (A 2 512) εἰναταίε-αυ μμελος ντάκα-αυ, εν εἰνα-αυ μμελος νταλαίπωρος νταμακαριζε ναυ / (A 2 17) ἐκρ-ου ντοκ νζητου; (sim. εν(α)πον “What does/will do...?”, “How is...?”, Α 1 201 / P 130# 75 ρο ευρ-ου νομαρια ξινμπεινανταουρπν / A 2 86, 481, 341, Ch. 117.6f., 166.48f., III 49.19, IV 98.25f., etc.).

ειξε-ου (A 2 366, P 130# 99 vo etc.) but more usually ε(ε)ξω μμος ξε-ου (A 2 58, Ch. 143.36ff.), also Sec. Future, Perfect (A 2 56, 397, 387, IV 186.13 answered by πεξαξ ξε-, pointing to suppletion between ξω and πεξα).

Ξε-ου expands other verbs in the Second Tense, without cataphoric reference: ουσυβ (Ch. 132.26ff., Sec. Perf.); π-τωτε (III 105.29f., Sec. Pres.); +-ζαπ (P 131# 86 PA); (P 131# 19 ΤΡ) εμνατ-ου μμα; εμνατ-ποεις μμα (Ch. 28.46f.) εναταζε-ρωμ / (Wess. 9 171c 2 ff.) νταλιξε-ποειουν μμου / (A 2 509) εκουμ-νοβε άωυ ουρπ άιν / (Wess. 9 171d 1 ff.) ντοσυρον γαρ τηνπηαβολος ευακουν-τηνπηαβολος ή-60α (εξι-60α) is focal only (III 187.18f., IV 51.17, 64.26f., Ch. 185.34f., etc. — it can of course be circumstantial, i.e. non-initial: Ch. 185.45f., 187.51) / (Mun. 102) ευαξε-μπούκα-πνούτε ναυ ειε ευ-ινακα-ρωμε:

Negated nexus (rare): (A 2 238-9) εναξανξου τηνπού ταν / (Wess. 9 171c 6f.) οντσω ειξι-60α ται / (Ch. 96.9f.) νταλιξε-ουσαξε ταν ομοου ("I have not said a single superfluous thing") / (IV 94.3ff.) ευαξ-ουσαξε-νηνε αη νητενλαξε ημινενενεαξα εροε, αλα αεαξουσε ημοον εβολ ατοτιοτι ("It is not the stone which is wounded or cut by those who stumble against it; it is rather they who are wounded by it" — the first part of the translation is not literal).

2.3.2 Focalized Actor Expression is much less usual. Focus constituency: interrogative pronouns: ημοι, αυ, ουρη (Thompson E vo); non-interrogative foci are rare and mostly found in ambiguous examples: personal pronoun + augens; παί; the expanded determinators π-, ου. Theme constituency (in order of frequency): Second Perfect (the only form with interrogative foci), Second Future, Present. Nexus: affirmative only.

Documentation: (A 2 18) ηταξινιμ κα-νιςου ενες κα-νιςου εμναξε άωυ τυαιρε εμπτραιου... (sim. ηταξινιμ εμες... #9; A 2 151, 153, 518, Berl. 1613 T19) / (P 131# 4 vo) επενιμ νανα ναν / (Ch. 203.51f.) ηταξικαξι εκκαλαξια τ-ρωμ / (Ch. 24.53ff.) ηαξηεμεμεμε εκαηους καςεικα καςεικα-καςεικα-καςεικα-καςεικα-καςεικα-καςεικα-καςεικα-καςεικα... (or is ηκαςεικα-καςεικα-καςεικα- focalized?). / (A 2 299-230) (Εβολ ομ ηξε-ηταξια ηηνε άωα ερπειε ερπειε) ηταξιπιπικ νητο επεπιε ερπαε εκμα "... it is you rather who have cried yourself into a stupor"; similarly IV 94.3ff. (ευαξουσαξε-νηνε άα... αα αεαξουσε ημοον εβολ ατοτιοτι "... it is they rather who are wounded by it".

#9 See §3.1.3.1.
#10 See §1.3.6 for the syntax of εμες.
2.4.6 Focus-initial patterns

2.4 Heterofocal second-tense construction: # modifier → sec.-tense conjugation-form # — focalization pattern (4)

2.4.0.1 In the following paragraphs, we consider a set of patterns (which are reminiscent of Western-type Cleft Sentences, §2.0.2.2.4) in which the focus precedes the topicalization form, and the focalization is (co-)signalled by a tagmemic feature of arrangement — the initial placement of the focus. I shall consider the following complexities involved: (a) Pattern selection — patt(s). (2) vs. (4-5) —, rule-ordered, determined by the macro-syntactic relationships of the patterns. (b) The distinct focality type or grade of the initial focus, wherever an opposition obtains between it and the post-theme focus. (c) In the focus-initial patterns, the determination of the topic form by morphosyntactic factors: Tripartite/Bipartite, affirmative/negative topic and nexus. (Among topic forms here we must consider the morphologically unmarked Basic Tenses [§2.6.2.]). (d) Idiosyncratic properties of focus classes or individual foci (interrogative/non-interrogative: NA, NE, ETBEG, EBOA TUN). (e) The existence of a pattern for which the topic form — ἔστιν(NA) — cannot be disambiguaed: a syncretism neutralization of Second Tense and circumstantial: pattern (6). In §2.6.4. below, I shall attempt to sketch the structural picture emerging from the data of §§2.4.1-2.6.3.

2.4.1 Focalization pattern (4). Focus constituency. Of the interrogative foci so typical of patt(s. (5) and (6), none is here focalized. We find here only the peculiar EBOA TUN, dealt with in detail in §2.6.3. Non-interrogative modifiers (in order of frequency): ETBE — (esp. ETBEPAL, ETBENHT-); (2P/AI EBOA) ZN — (often in the distinctive 2P/AL —); (EBOA) ZTN —; NTEI2E; EHN —; MNNSUC; MORTIC; NTEP —, ZIΣOΓ. Topic constituency: only NTAΣHΣ. Nexus: affirmative; negated (by — AN after the focus: §2.9.2.1).

Documentation: affirmative: (III 26.8) ETBEPAL NATAIΣΟΓ NCAΣOY EI 2P/AI EHN — / (Leyd. 410) 2P/AL ENTAΣAI 2P/AI EHN —E / (Wess. 9 131a 2ff.) EBOA TUN NTAPΣHΣ ΣΗΣΟΥΣ EΣOYΝ... / (P 1313 67 vο) 2P/AL ON NTAPΣHΣ ΞΕ... NTAPΣHΣ EΣOYΝ ΞΕ... ON ETBEPAL ΞΕ—. Note the chiasitic arrangement, recurring in this pattern combined with pattern (2); also Wess. 9 144b-c, 153b-c, etc. / (Cat. 42.22) NTEI2E ΓΑΡ ENTAΣHΣAI (sic) AHE / (Wess. 9 152c 17ff.) ZETAI2E ΝON NTAPΣHΣ ΝΗΣΙΕΡΟΟΗ ΞΕ— / (P 1314 88 PAG) 2P/AI ZN ΤΙΣΗΣΗΣΗ EΣOYΝ NTAPΣHΣ ΞΕ— / (III 210.21f.) MNNSUC NTAPΣAI ΣΗΠΟΥΣ ΣΗΣΟΥΣ ΕΠΟC "Only afterwards did all those (scil. demons) gather against it (scil. the misguided soul)"; v.l. Basic Perfect / (A 2 430, not Sh.) ΝΤΕΡΙΤΗΣΙΟΝ ΜΗΘΟ (i.e. of the honey) NTAPΣHΣΤΟΜΟΧΟΣ ΑΝΑΤΡΕΠΕ / (IV 162.2f.) ΖΙΣΟΓ ΝΤΑΣAI + ΤΙΣΗΣ ΣΗΣΟΥΣ NTAPΣAI ENTAΣΗ (sic) EBOA (i.e. ΤΕΨΝΑΣΒΕ; the sense here is "as soon as..."); see §7.2.3.2).

Negated (affirmative topic only)109 (A 1 113) ETBEPΣΕΘΟΥ ΣΗΠ ΜΑΣΑΚAI 2P/AI ΝΣΗΕ ΝΤΑΣΗΣΗΙΣΗ / (Wess. 9 144c 24ff.) ETBEPΣΕΘΙΒΙΟ ΣΗΠ ΜΑΣΑΚAI NTAPΣΗΣΗ ΞΕ... Additional exx.: III 24.23 (focus: MORTIC), 76.8 (NTEI2E), Ch. 136.41ff. (2P/AI ZN), A 2 499 (ΣΗΠΟΥΣΟΥΝ), P 1302 68 ΡΗ (ETBE—), 71 ΡΗΣ (EBOA ZΙΣΗΣΗ—).

2.5 The circumstantial topicalization: # modifier/(pro)noun → circumstantial conjugation-form # — focalization pattern (5)

108 Mentioned in passing by POLOTSKY 1944:44 (= CP 148), and (with reference to negation) in 1960a:§32. If one is to judge by these statements, Polotsky recognizes solely a # focus + Sec. Tense # pattern. See also STERN §521.
109 See §§1.3.11.6, 7.3.1.
108 Cf. POLOTSKY 1960a:§32.
2.5.0.1 As may be gathered from the topic and focus constituency lists, this pattern (not mentioned as such in the Études\textsuperscript{103}) transcends or cuts across a double modular, historically founded dichotomy of Polotsky's: between the "substantival" (thematic) and "adverbial" (adjunctal) verb-forms\textsuperscript{104}, and between the two complementary Cleft Sentence patterns — one with initial (pro)nominal vedette (focus) and net-\textit{glose} (theme/topic), and the other with initial Second-Tense theme and subsequent modifier focus\textsuperscript{105}. This pattern could be considered separately as a lower-grade member in the focality paradigm, with its topic verging on a marked NON-INITIAL VERB-FORM. This is perhaps due to the devaluing effect of the inherently focal, hence (in terms of focality grading) not pertinent, interrogative pronouns or modifiers. (This is somewhat corroborated by the high incidence of \textit{N2A2 NCON} "often", \textit{ETBENAI} "therefore", \textit{KAANEC} "well"\textsuperscript{106} and other, not characteristically focal premodifiers\textsuperscript{107}.)

2.5.0.2 Two constructions may belong here, which however stand apart: ‘\textit{YANTEOY YWUNE}’, rarely \textit{YATNAY} "until when...?", followed by a circumstantial present or circumstantial negative perfect\textsuperscript{108}, and ‘\textit{EIC} + temporal expression + \textit{EIC}/\textit{XINTA}’’. (A 2 105) \textit{YANTEOY YWUNE EYIEPE HNEIHITE 2NMMMA ET-}

\textit{OYAAW} / (\textit{U}I3 36.24f. = Ch. 132.26ff.) \textit{YANTEOY GE YWUNE AONN MPENUWE MNENZHT} / (P 131\textsuperscript{4} 144 \textit{PH}) \textit{YANTEOY GE YWUNE EN} + \textit{NOYOOY} NCAOYOOY MNEPNKTEN ENNOUTE / (P 131\textsuperscript{4} 47 to) \textit{YANTEOY YWUNE ENMHN EBOA ZNENMNATNYZHT} / (K 9068) \textit{YATNAY EMHTANZET-ENNOYTE} / (\textit{Ryl. Cat. 34, No. 70 CM}) \textit{EICAOYHP NOY-}

\textit{OEY YINTANLAI TAIOY} / (A 1 71) \textit{EICYOYO EEBOT CNAI ENOYWY ETPENP-OY2HT NOYWT}. Although it is probable that these are true focalization patterns with the circumstantial, a thematic topicalization constituent, one cannot help feeling that the circumstantial is (also?) in a complementation or contextualization relationship with the focus. These constructions must be further investigated, with the syntax of time expressions in general.

2.5.1 Focus constituency: interrogatives: \textit{AY}, \textit{OYHP}; \textit{NAY N2E}, \textit{ZITNOY}; non-interrogative: numbers; ZA2 N\textsuperscript{−}; ZEN\textsuperscript{−}; (N)ZA2 NCON, ZENCON, 2ENMMHYE NCON\textsuperscript{109}; -WC-modifiers; \textit{ETBE}; ZEN\textsuperscript{−}; \textit{EIMHTI} E\textsuperscript{−}\textsuperscript{110};


\textsuperscript{104} Cf. the Cleft Sentence with \textit{pronominal vedette} and circumstantial \textit{glose}, cf. \textit{Brown1} 1978b, 1979b:202.

\textsuperscript{105} Cf. Polotsky's most explicit and elaborate exposition of this thesis in 1976, also 1965 (esp. 99 47-50); an early sketch is 1944:91ff. (= \textit{CP} 195ff).\textsuperscript{108}

\textsuperscript{106} See Polotsky 1944:57ff. (\textit{CP} 161ff.). Striking analogies to the (partial) overlapping of the Cleft-Sentence patterns are to be found in the ongoing blurring of the functional boundaries of the \textit{that/wh-re/glose} markers in the English Cleft Sentence, a\textsuperscript{−}/y in Modern Welsh (in Gaelic, a\textsuperscript{−} is the sole \textit{glose}-marker). For some comparative notes on the circumstantial \textit{glose}-form, see Polotsky 1944:59 (= \textit{CP} 163) n. 2, \textit{Shisha-Halevy} 1978:64ff. In a different approach, our circumstantial \textit{glose} may be conceived of as a zero conversion or conversion base (cf. \textit{Shisha-Halevy} 1972:2.2.1.3, 2.2.1.3.2), thus perhaps analogous to the zero-marked \textit{glose} in English: ‘It's on Wednesday the show opens’. A third alternative would be the interpretation of the circumstantial as a \textit{participle} form (cf. the Greek "Second Tenses", \textit{Rosén} 1957, and \textit{Shisha-Halevy} 1976c). A construction which recalls Gardiner's "missing link", namely a net-\textit{glose} after an "adverbial" vedette (Gardiner, \textit{JEA} 33:97ff. [1947]) actually occurs in \textit{Ryl.} 368 (\textit{Cat.} 172).

\textsuperscript{107} Cf. its native counterpart '\textit{OYAFAGON} NE + inf.', in which \textit{OYAFAGON} is microsyntactically predicative, yet macro syntactically thematic (see \S7.1.3).

\textsuperscript{108} Compare the devaluated status of the Welsh (Old to Modern) so-called "abnormal order" (as distinct from the "mixed order" or "mixed sentence", a true functionally operative Cleft Sentence): if any element other than the verb opens the clause, it is followed by a "phantom" relative: \textit{Ef a wele ciw} "He saw a stag", \textit{At y cwn y doeth of} "He went to [look at] the dogs", \textit{Y march a gymerth} "He accepted the horse" (from the MW \textit{Pedeir Keinik Y Mabinogi}). Is our circumstantial also but a marked non-initial verb form?


\textsuperscript{110} Zero-marked noun syntagm in modifier status, \S1.3.2.

\textsuperscript{111} Cf. \S\S1.3.11.6, 7.3.1.1.


2.5.2 Observations. (1) **εαχ**; Polotsky 1944:48f. (= CP 152f.) offers two alternative explanations: it is either a true circumstantial topicalization or a Sahidic relic corresponding to Fayumic **ααχ** (see ibid. 71 = CP 175; 94f. = CP 198f.). (Compare now the “Middle Egyptian” Second Perfect **εαχ**- which may still arguably be circumstantial in form.) With reference to synchronous and internal structure, I believe a circumstantial interpretation is inevitable. For **εαχ** as a possible prefocal theme form, see §2.2, spec. obs. (5).

(2) **εμπ**; replacing **ετεμπ** (Polotsky 1944:88f. = CP 192f., 1960a:§18), yet compare the Demotic **i.ir-bn.pn.f.sdm** (Polotsky 1944:88 = CP 192, Johnson 1976:186f.). (3) **εν** — **αι** replaces **ετεμπ** — **αι**, still uniquely attested (Polotsky 1944:89 = CP 193). Incidentally, in all cases of a negated topic, the arrangement factor is neutralized — the focus is always initial.

2.5.3 Documentation. **Affirmative nexus** — affirmative or neg. topic; mostly interrogative focus: (Ryl. Cat. 34 No. 70 СМЕ) **ουρν** **ντυποσ** **μπουρλον** εαυχοκου **εβωλ** (A 1312) αυη **ναλοας** αυη **νκυναγαφη** ενταννουτε κεμους **ντενες** (This may be an instance of circumstantial + Sec. Perfect, §2.0.1.1.2, i.e. a topic comprising a whole included Cleft Sentence: “What people or what congregation did God like us, firmly teach?”) (Wiss. 9 147c 22f.) **ναας** **νες** ειναιαμα ειοομεν ιατερης (A 1 305) αυη **νες** ευνοια **αν** αν περιμε / (Miss. 278) **ναω** **νες** ειναιοβε ναας **αν** αν **πε** / (A 2 155) **ναω** **νες** τενοι ειοοι **αν** πε **νετςκ** νυερφερ εραι εινειετ οτιμαμ **νκακε** 16οςκα / (P 130 47 Κκρ) ναω **νες** πετεουτας **μμαν** ειμεων κεμους κεμους ανομηραθε**αν** ενταγελος... (Rosti 2/3 76) **ναος** **νες** πνοεις ναουοας αν... εραι εαυ, **νε** ενταναραε εαυ εανκενταιειπε νεκτανοου / (P 1316 117 νοη) **ναω** **νες** ενταναρεοις αν εναγο / (Wiss. 9 866b 21f.) ίτιονον πενταρ-ναι ιατουρ ναας νεμαλα... εαυρ-εβειν ιατουρ νεκτανανμον ειταμα / (A 2 301) γεμιμερης νονο εματε εματε εαυας οντειμε νπομε + ουβετμε, αυω εαυας ρ-ωμμο ετκαναγηθ / (A 2 7) ου γαρ νπαζε... εμπουργουεαου κεμους νεκτους 2νενετοπος / (A 1 111) εαυρ ανοικοεις νποντες... ουσς (sim. III 145.25, 146.8, 147.9, 148.11ff.) / (A 2 90) εαυρ νπαζε ντενες εαυκοο δεμακακαζ νθτα... (Sim. Cat. 42.25) / (III 206.4ff.) γενεμπτωμας γεμεωνις γεκονομις γεγονον ειοναυη (sic) γενεμπτωμας γεγονον ειοναυη / (A 1 113) γεμεωνις γεγονον ειοναυη... / (III 69.18f.) τα-ιουμ ομναμα εαυκοονο αυω εαυοκο εβωλ ενταγελομε νπευχρα / (A 2 318-19, coll.) ετεμπενισμης μενεν- κεμακ... ποεις ειοκ παγελος εαμπαμελο δεμαν (v.l. μπατε) / (Wiss. 18 140b 8ff.) γιναι ον γερου εμπουγετ κρα-απικε εροφν αν / (Or. 160.3ff.) εναρευτα ανεβαθον ανεμουο ανειρομε γενομε γενομε γενομε / (BMCat. 92, No. 211 2 γο) δικαιος εαυρ-συμμο ερο / (III 56.17f.) μεναια γαρ ειοκιμας ντετα- γαφη εαυκομε ερο πνουκοκογοι.

**Negated nexus** — affirmative topic: (Leyd. 390) μη ετεμενεψηνυε αν ντειμε εαμπας ετεχς χοος **ναας** / (Wiss. 9 106a 7ff.) μη ετεκτημεντκηντ ανειαμ ειταμμα **κυκ** εβωλ νεμανομεν εαμανου... (cf. the parall. P 130 71 πνε, quoted §2.6.2).

111 Earlier discussions: Stern §423 (Ming. 119 = III 50.1, transl. as a Cleft Sentence with conditional gloss); Steindorff 1904:§328 (“main clause”); Levy 1909:§254 (“main clause”); Spiegelberg 1909:156f.; Edgerton 1935:260; Till §334 (“Sec. Tense”, following Polotsky).

112 Some non-Shenoutean exx. for the circumstantial topic (see Polotsky 1944:48f. = CP 152f.): Besa ed. Kuhn 32.16 (NA 230), Bologr. 8811 ζα (εμπ-, bis), Sap. 16:1 (ετεμεια) durative negative, εμη(να)-αν: Rom. 8:32 (Morgan; NA 230), II Cor. 3:8 (NA 230), Heb. 2:11 (ετεμεια), Col. 2:5 (EM), Eccles. 8:16 (EM).

113 Note the specially high incidence of this pattern in Leipoldt’s No. 40 (III 116-151, esp. 141ff.), with its numerous paragraphs introduced by ετεμεια.
2.6 THE HETEROFOCAL SECOND-TENSE/CIRCUMSTANTIAL CONSTRUCTION: # MODIFIER/(PRO)NOUN → ε + CONJUGATION-FORM # — FOCALIZATION PATTERN (6)

Here we must be content with pointing out the topicalization characteristic, which is a syncretism neutralization of the circumstantial and Second-Tense converters. We cannot resolve this ε-, internally at least, although for some individual foci (esp. those with a low grading of focality, §2.5.0.1) one is tempted to identify the morph as circumstantial. In terms of segmental signalling, however, there is no escaping the fact that this is a case of neutralization 114.

2.6.1 Focus constituency. Interrogatives: ΟΥΨΗ; ΝΑΨΕ, ΕΤΒΕΟΥ, ΖΙΤΝΟΥ, ΕΧΝΟΥ, ΕΤΨΗ; ΠΟΨΟ ΜΑΛΛΟΝ, ΥΑΝΤΕΟΥ ΥΨΗΝΕ, ΥΑΤΝΑΥ (§2.5.0.2); non-interrogative: determiners (ΟΥ-, ΖΕΝ-); numbers; ΕΤΒΕ-, (ΞΡΑΙ, ΕΒΟΑ) ΖΙΤΝ-, ΖΩΨ-, ΜΗΜΑΤ-, ΖΨ-κατακράτος: ΖΕΝΨΗΝΟΥΛΟΥ ἔνοψα, ἔνοψα, ἔ; γεγορίας, αὐτός, + time expression; circumstantial, conditional. Topic constituency: ΕΨΗ (ΝΑΨ)-, ΕΨΗΑΨ-, ε- + adjective-verbs. Nexus: affirmative, negated (both focus and nexus negating: §2.9.2.3) 115.

DOCUMENTATION. Affirmative nexus: (Ch. 188.40ff.) ΟΥΨΗ ΝΡΨΗΕ ΝΑΙΑΒΟΛΟΣ ΕΨΟΥΟΟΛΕ ΣΝΝΑΓΑΒΟΝ ΜΨΑΣΑ (A 2 300) ΟΨΟΥΟΟ ΝΡΨΗΟΥ ΟΝΤΕ ΕΡΕΝΑΙ ΨΟΧΗΝ ΝΑΨ / (III 207.8sft.) ΖΕΝΨΡΟΨΗΝΤΗΣ ΖΕΝΨΑΓΑΒΕΙΩΝ ΖΕΝΨΩΣΟΣΟΛΟΣ ΖΕΝΨΡΑΨΗΝ ΕΝΑΨΟΥΟΟΥ ΖΕΝΨΑΨΗΝΕΙΣΟΥΣ ΝΤΕΝΠΕΤΟΥΑΒ ΖΕΝΨΑΨΗ ΖΩΝΨΖΚΟΟΥΟΥ... ΕΡΕΝΑΕΡ ΜΨΟΟΥ ΑΥΨ ΕΡΕΨΙΤΗ ΝΨΟΥ (circumstantial?) cf. 206.4ff. The low-focality context and marked non-initial verb are here in evidence) / (III 69.13ff.) ΖΑΨΗΝ ΝΩΕΞΗ ΕΨΗ-ΝΑΨΗΕ / (A 1 96) ΙΟΨΝΤΑΧΑΕΡ ΜΨΟΟΥΕΙΡΙΨΗΝ ΕΨΟΥΟΟ ΖΝΤΕΙΝΚΨΑΕΡ ΕΒΟΑ / (Ch. 72.1ff.) ΕΤΒΕΟΥ ΕΙΝΑΟΥΑΣΤ ΝΩΕΞΗΔΑΙΜΨΗΝ; ΕΤΒΕΟΥ ΝΨΝΑΟΥΑΣΤ ΑΝ ΝΩΕΞΗΣ; / (P 1305 ζΨ) ΝΑΨ ΝΨΕ ΕΙΝΑΕΨΗ ΜΨΕΝΤΕΨΕΨΟΥΝ ΜΨΟΟΥ ΑΝ / (A 1 233) ΕΤΨΗΝ ΕΨΟΥΟΟΧΨΗ. One term of a chiastic figure, see §2.6.3.1.2 (4) / (Or. 163.19ff.) ΠΟΨΟ ΜΑΛΛΟΝ ΕΨΗΑΨΟ... (sim. Ch. 74.54ff., 119.30ff., III 97.24 etc) / (Ch. 135.44ff.) ΖΙΤΝΟΥ ΕΝΑΑΨΣΗ ΕΝΕΨΗΡΨΗ / (IV 14.10ff.) ΕΤΒΨΗΝΤΩΣ ΟΝ ΕΨΨΑΚΨΤΟΥ ΕΒΟΑ ΖΝΨΖΚΨΜΨ / (Μον. 96) ΕἸΟΤΑΜΑ ΕΨΑΨ ΝΝΑΨ ή “It is daringly I am saying this” / (A 2 476) ΜΟΡΙΓ ΕΡ ΕΝΝΑΙΑΙΒΑΝΕ.

Negative nexus - affirmative topic, negated focus or nexus: (Ch. 38.35ff.) ΕΡΨΑΝΤΒΑΨΟΡ ΑΨΚΑΚ ΕΒΟΑ ΑΝ... ΕΡΕΝΨΗΟΥ ΤΨΡΕ “It is not when the fox cries out that the lion is afraid” (the all-important ΑΝ is omitted in the parallel III 79.4ff.) / (A 2 519) ΕΤΒΨΗΝΤ ΕΝ ΕΨΝΑΓΨΤΟΑΤΣΕ ΝΑΨ, ΟΨΗΔ ΕΤΒΨΗΝΤ ΤΑΝ ΕΝ ΕΝΑΡΨΜΑ ΝΑΨ ΕΡ-ΨΩΒ ΝΙΜ... / (IV 117.23) ΝΝΕΨΨΗΝΟΥ ΝΗΨΤ ΝΑΝ ΕΨΑΨΗ ΝΗΨ ΝΝΑΨ “It is not shocking you that we tell you this” / (A 1 114) ΜΨ ΖΨΨΑΨΟΗΤ ΕΝ ΕΡΕΝΑΙ ΤΑΜΟ ΜΜΟ.

More exx.: III 199.23ff. (ΟΥΨΗ Ν- ΕΨΗ-), 72.2ff. (ΕΒΟΑ ΤΨΝΗ ΖΙΤΝΟΥ ΕΨΗ-), A 2 333 (ΖΩΨ- ΕΨΗ-), III 70.7 (ΤΨΡ Ν- ΕΨΗ-), P 1304 122 ΑΒ (ΚΑΛΨΑΨ ΑΨΨ ΑΙΚΑΨΗ ΕΨΗ-), Rossi 2/3 86, A 2 413, 338, III 46-7 passim.

114 Not that extra-Sahidic evidence is of great help. On the one hand, Akhmimic instances point to a Second Tense (‘ΑΨΝΑΡΨΜΑ’): Ex. 7:1 (ΗΕΣ ΝΨΕ), Clem. (Schmidt) 46.5 (ΕΤΒΕΟΥ), Prov. 7:20 (ΖΙΤΝ-), 11:31 (ΜΟΡΙΓ). Gespr. Jesu 9.11ff. (ΜΝΕΝΕΚΕ-ΟΥΨΗ ΝΨΨΗΟΕ). Compare now the clear "Middle Egypt." evidence for the Sec. Tense (e.g. Mt. 12:26, 29, 34), also Fayumic-ME Joh. 13:28 (ΕΤΒΕΟΥ ΑΨΑΨ- and (late) Bobaric exx. of ΝΨΨΗ ΨΨΨΗ- ΑΨΨ- etc. (Mon. of Macarius 31.7 ΣΕΝΨΨ ΝΞΟ ΑΨΨΑ). Polotsky 1934:64 (= CP 369), 1960a:§37b interprets ΖΙΤΝΟΥ ΕΝΑΑΨΨ (Ch. 135.44f.) as Second Tense (also 1960a:§32. Ch. 38.35ff.; 1944:39, 44 = CP 143, 148). On the other hand, one finds Akhmimic ample evidence for ε- as a post-focal topic characteristic (cf. Till 1928:§218). This is common in Gespräche Jesu (ΜΨΨ-ΕΚ- 10.2, ΕΤΒΕΟ-ΕΚ- 32.1, ΝΨΕ ΗΨΗΑ- 25.8, ΚΑΛΨΑΨ ε- 30.10ff., 38.10). Compare in Clemens ε- for the initial topic (our patt. 2), when occurring after an extraposition, i.e. prominent topicalization of the actor/object, 7.1, 19.1, 20.5, 20.8. At any rate, the Sahidic situation must be judged internally.

115 For ΕΤΒΕΟΥ, ΝΑΨ ΝΨΕ, ΕΒΟΑ ΤΨΝΗ see discussion and more evidence in §§2.6.3-4. For ΝΤΕΝΠΕΤ see §1.3.1.2; for ΖΨ-κατακράτος, §1.3.11.1.
IV 109.8f. (all καλως/δικαίως εύ-); III 114.13, IV 33.22 (ζωναι, επαι ευ-, ευα-), A 2 342 (επαι νηθ- / εολα ζιτοοτ- ευα-), IV 161.12 (μμαι), A 1 107 (εύνοο ευα-), A 2 147 (ζιτνοο επε- να-).

2.6.2 An unmarked member of the focalization paradigm: # MODIFIER → BASIC TENSE #. This is, of course, the case only when the context warrants the distinction from the non-focal premodifier (see §1.1.2.2). With the proviso that suprasegmental features, unknown to us, probably constitute the most prominent feature of this pattern, one may say that here the topic is (segmentally) marked only by position — this being morphologically a zero-member of the post-focal topicalization paradigm. Focus constituency: the listing cannot be even attempted here (for certain foci — ετβεο-εν, μακο νεκ, ηεβο τω — the complementary relationship of this pattern with the others will be treated at length in §2.6.3-4). We find here interrogative and non-interrogative prepositional phrases (notably ετβε-, (εολα) ζιτ-, επαξω). Topic constituency: most frequently αι- / μπα-, υα-, να- (ακο)- αν. The NEXUS is affirmative or negated (nexus or focus negating, §2.9.2.4).

Documentation (speciminal). Affirmative nexus: (A 2 305) μακο νεκ πνοτε ντα-/κο επαι / (A 2 334) εολα τω πνοτε ντα- / ζιτυ νεκ επεκαϊ μμαι... αεμεεεε επεεε / (P 130 75 πο) ετβεο τεκτα- εολα 2μμυςτρησιον ετοοεαβ / (III 199.27f.) ετβεο μπνοναματε μμο ετεμπε ννειβοτε ηθρού.

Negated nexus: (P 130 71 πω) μν ετβεοςτςιματ (sic, for -ςτςματ) αν αεκα ζακ εολα νσωβ αμ ημ ειναου, ενετεμπταςιματ αν ντοκ αεκιοουε ζακ εολα μεινυμεε εμεοοοο (cf. the parall. Wess. 9 106a 7f. with ηα- topics) / (A 1 353) επαξωνω ΓΑΡ ΑΝ ΑΠΟΕΙ ΜΕΣΤΕ-ΝΙΟΥΑΛ (sim. 88, 366, 354, Ch. 139.19f., III 55.14f., 56.13) / (A 1 125) ετβεοςπε αν ντοκ νακρικον ναιουε ζικρο υαειρουε + μπαι ετοοτρ μπνοτε / (IV 156.26f.) ενεεετεγαγη αν ανι αεκα νακιο, νεου πο παρουου.

A focalization pattern as unfulfilled-condition protasis, with the topic resuming the irreals function already signalled for the whole clause: (P 131 158 ro) ετβεοαι γαρι γαρτομ αν μπετακε άναλ γαρι 2παξια το γακω το γακω το γακω... τρό... μπετνώνα μακοντε ναουε εευογειν.

2.6.3 A selective examination of foci:

Aiming for a complex, full-dimensional paradigmatic picture of the patterns introduced in §§2.4-6, I shall now present the evidence from a different angle: topic alternation for a constant given focus. For this purpose, two foci are chosen, no doubt statistically the best represented of their kind: ετβεο "why?" and μακο νεκ "how?". Since they feature also in the topic-initial pattern (2), this too must be integrated in the picture and related to the focus-initial patterns. A third, rather peculiar interrogative focus examined here for its topic paradigm is εολα τω "whence?", "on what grounds?".

2.6.3.1 ετβεο, μακο νεκ in focus-initial patterns. This is indubitably the usual placement. The TOPIC is (a) a BASIC TENSE, for (1) affirmative/negative non-durative (tripartite) conjunction (αι-/ μπα-, υα-, υψε), also nominal sentences, (2) negated bipartite conjunction, (3) (specially conditioned) affirmative bipartite conjunction. TOPIC (b) is morphologically marked: (1) ε- (circumst./ Second): εν (ακο)-, ευα-, ε- + adj.-verb; (2) circumstantial (affirm./neg.): εν (ακο) αν, εουν-ε- + Nom. Sentence, εα- (for μπνοε, n. 117). Note that (3) Sec. Tense ντα-, patt. (4), is not attested.

Assorted representative examples: a (1) III 199.27f., Ch. 76.40f., Wess. 9 118a 23f., A 1 68, A 2 458 (μακο νεκ υψε-), A 2 69 (μακο νεκ + neg. Nom. Sent.), A 2 19-20 (ετβεο υψε neg.) etc.; a (2) III 102

116 For several instances of this pattern in configuration with others, esp. (5)-(6), see 9.2.7.3.
117 μπετνοε, incomparably less well attested, still gives in miniature the same distributional picture: a (1) REI 11' 16a 15f., A 1 2, A 2 114; b (1) Ch. 135.44f., III 72.2f., IV 10.4, 23.2, A 1 175; b (2) Wess. 9 86b 21ff., A 1 89 (μπετνοε εα-).
passim, IV 99.24ff., 42.16ff., Ch. 64.2ff. etc.; a (3) instances are mostly classifiable as follows (some fall into more than one category):

A. Quotations or reminiscences of Scripture texts: RE II 18b 25f., Wess. 9 148b 2f., Ench. 66a, Wess. 9 171d 7f., Cl. Pr. 44 ΚΗ-Θ, A 2 342 (an adaptation of Mt. 15:18f. and Marc. 7:21); NA W E NTU N TETUP-BOA... BCM Cat. 83 (No. 199 ΤΕΑ), cf. III 51.3ff., 65.12, Ch. 169.7ff.; Mt. 23:23, Heb. 2:3; also (non-scriptural) arguments attributed to persons other than Shenoute: Ryl. 69 ΝΙ, A 2 430 (not Sh.).

B. Instances of striking rhetoricty and pathos: “proforma” or pseudo-topicalization; sometimes, with the flavour of Bible text. Note in particular series of multiple questions: (A 2 388-9) ΕΤΒΕΟΥ ΚΟ ΝΗΜΑΛ... ΕΤΒΕΟΥ ΚΩΝΤΑΚΙΣ... ΑΥΣΙ ΚΟΝΤ... ΕΤΒΕΟΥ ΚΟΜΟΥ ΕΝΟΥΝΤ ΝΤΕΠ... ΚΩΝΤΗΣ ΔΕ ΟΝ ΕΒΟΛ / (A 2 351-2) ΕΤΒΕΟΥ ΝΤΟΟΥΝ ΠΡΙΖΕ Μ-ΟΥΑ ΑΥΣ ΤΗΝ... ΕΤΒΕΟΥ ΔΕ ΟΝ ΥΝΑΛΑ ΑΥΣ ΤΗΝΣΤΕΥΕ; ΕΤΒΕΟΥ ΧΑΣΚΕ... ΑΥΣΙ ΧΡ-ΔΙ- ΚΑΙΟΠΟΥ; ΕΤΒΕΟΥ ΕΠΑΡ-ΠΙΣΤΟΣ... ΑΥΣΙ ΕΤΒΕΟΥ ΕΠΑΡ-ΡΙΣΣΕ... Η ΕΤΒΕΟΥ ΔΕ ΕΡΕΠΠΙΣΤΕ ΝΑΧΙΤ ΝΟΝΚΕΝ... Η ΕΤΒΕΟΥ ΧΟΥΛΙΜΕ ΜΜΟΤ / (Or. 156.7ff.) ΕΤΒΕΟΥ ΚΩΤΣ ΝΤΟΟΥΝ ΜΠΕΤΙΤΖΟΥΣΗ ΚΥΠΟΡΨ ΜΜΟΣ / (A 2 146) ΕΤΒΕΟΥ ΕΚΟ ΝΚΡΟΥ ΑΥΣΙ ΚΩΙΤΟΥΕ ΑΥΣΙ ΚΥΨΑΛ Η ΕΚΚΙ ΝΗΤΗΚ... 


D. Several instances of οΥΝ-/ΜΝ- before the durative (almost in complementary distribution with ερεντ)-: (A 2 483) ΝΑ W E ΟΥΝΠΙΜΕ ΑΥΣΙ ΟΥΝΖΙΜΕ ΝΑΥΝΙΜΕ ΜΝΟΥΤΤΙΒΟ, also Ench. 80a, Or. 157.39ff.


2.6.3.1.2 ΕΤΒΕΟΥ, ΝΑ W E in topic-initial pattern (2). This construction, statistically weaker than the preceding ones in Leipoldt and Chassinat (approx. 33% for NA W E, less than 10% for ΕΤΒΕΟΥ) is marked, i.e. can be shown to be subject to statements of special conditions. In the great majority of cases — condition 1 — it is included as marked by ξε-"a characterization of macro-syntactic status.

118 Compare §7.2.1.1.5.1 for a similar convergence of rhetoricity/quotedness: §2.6.3.1.2 for rhetoricity/apodoticity/quot-
edness.

119 Not counting the basically different instances of "ο NA W E ("how is...?") where the 'topic → focus' arrangement is obligatory, i.e. unopposed to a focus-initial construction. Moreover, the foality grading is here different: "ο marks the predicative complement (adngal modifier) of the "copular" (i.e. incomplete-predication) - ο -. This, I believe, is the most important distinction between the two phrases "NA W E". Some Shenoutean exx. for "ο NA W E: III 74.7, 103.13, IV 6.17, 37.20f., 98.12, 155.2ff., Mun. 110, Or. 154.39f. etc.

120 Cf. Polotsky 1934:63f. (= CP 368f.), Layton 1979:187f. I believe that his statement, to the effect that in indirect questions we have a Second Tense with ΕΤΒΕΟΥ, skips an all-important descriptive step, namely the conditioning of arrangement. Also, "postverbal whenever a Second Tense is used" (188) is simply an inversion of terms: a Second Tense is used in the topic-initial pattern. We must here observe the following descriptive order: (1) arrangement ruling, (2) topic-form selection ruling. A similar inversion of these terms occurs in Wilson's statement (1970:78 n. 3): "Questions with Future III which place the main stress of the sentence on the adverbial extension usually avoid putting the interrogative at the head of the sentence". I see both arrangements as constituting distinct focalization patterns: see §2.6.4. Historically speaking, this conditioning may be described as a preservation, in an "island" of special macrosyntactic circumstances, of the original 'topic → focus' arrangement, the "renewed", inverted focus-initial pattern being restricted to the complementary circumstances. Synchronically, this is of course the Shenoutean situation: it is (as a random check of Wilmet's references for ΕΤΒΕΟΥ and NA W E quickly shows) quite different from that prevailing in the New Testament.
(όκε-included focus-initial ETBOY/NAY N2E are rare: about 3% of all initial attestations for NAY N2E, 13% for ETBOY). Here belong also cases of pre-inclusion — see (4) below; circumstantial conversion of the whole focalization pattern, see §2.0.1.1.2, and adverbal expanding focalization pattern (the -εν-Sec.-Tense constr. type, §2.8.3). Condition 2 is another, probably related macro-syntactic characterization: THEMATIC PROGRESSION §§2.0.2.4, 2.7.2), with resuming and linking topocalization of a verb occurring previously. Condition 3 concerns yet another macro-syntactic relationship: ETBOY/ NAY N2E in apodosi, esp. of ενέκε- (which is after all more of a topocalization marker than a true conditional), also of EMNΩN "otherwise" 111. Condition 4: certain RHETORICAL configurations: rhetorical questions, chiasm, "proforma" topocalization, pre-inclusion (§2.7.1.4.2), and multiple focalization (NAY N2E corresponding to other post-topic intert. foci). Condition 5: Scripture QUOTATIONS or REMINISCENCES or emulation of Scriptural (archaic, authoritative) style. Note however that for topic categories a (1) (neg.), a (2), b (2) (neg.) — that is, for the negative topic (the nexus is here invariably affirmative) — the arrangement is not pertinent. A negative topic does not occur as Second Tense, but only as Basic or circumstantial, and then only post-focally.

DOCUMENTATION: (1) άκε-inclusion: Α 1 71 (after άω), Α 2 251 (ΕΙΘΡΜ ΕΒΟΛΑ), Α 2 257 (ΔΩΚΙΜΑΣΕ), 516 (ΕΙΜΕ), 541 (ΝΑΥ), Π 1304 70 ΡΠ (τ-ΖΗΚ) άκε-ΕΥΑΝΥΛΚΟ ΝΑΥ Ν2Ε / 1305 90 ΡΟ (ΝΑΥ) άκε-ΕΥΑΝΥΛΚΟ ΝΑΥ Ν2Ε ΜΗΝΗΝΤΑΙΕΙ ΕΚΙ-ΒΑΝΤΙΣΜΑ / Ch. 55.24ff. (ΑΝΑΥ), IV 156.19ff. (ΠΡΩΣΧΕΓ), 188.10ff. (ΨΗΜΕ), 12ff. (ΚΟΟΥΝ), etc. etc. — this construction is very common.

(2) Thematic progression: (Ch. 199.23ff.) ΠΑΝΝ ΝΙΝ ΝΕΝΤΑΡ-ΖΗΘΥ ΑΝ ΝΣΑΝΑΙΚΑΙΟΣ; ΕΥΝΑΡ-ΖΗΘΥ ΔΕ ΝΑΥ Ν2Ε / (ΒΜΕΤ 81, No. 197) ΠΡΩΣΧΕ ΓΕ ΕΥ ΕΜΗΣΕ ΜΠΟΣΧΑ ΕΝΑΝ ΑΝ ΜΠΟΣΧΑ ΝΑΥ ΕΤΣΟΥ / (Ch. 73.4ff.) 'ΑΠΑΝΤΑΝΑΙ ΒΙΚ ΕΙΣΟΥΝ ΕΡΟΤ' ΝΤΑΝΒΙΚ ΖΗΘΥ ΕΤΣΟΥ — lemmatizing topocalization, §2.7.2.

(3) In apodosi: (A 2 19) (If they spare one, many will do so and transgress the law; if so,) ΝΤΑΝΜΟΟΥΤ ΑΝ ΜΠΟΣΧΑ ΕΤΣΟΥ / (A 2 194) ... ΕΜΝΩΝ ΕΝΑΝΒΙΚ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΖΙΤΟΟΤΟΥ ΝΑΥ Ν2Ε / (A 1 69) (ΜΠΟΣΧΑ Ρ-ΤΟΥ ΝΗ, Ή ΜΠΟΣΧ Ρ-ΤΟΥ ΝΑΥ ΝΤΟ) ΝΤΕΤΕΙΝ ΕΝ ΕΡΕΝΟΥΣΚΑ ΝΑΡ-ΤΟΥ ΝΑΥ ΝΑΥ Ν2Ε Ε(Ε)ΜΠΟΣΧΑ Ρ-ΤΟΥ ΝΗ ΑΝ.

(4) Rhetorical configurations: (A 2 385) Η ΕΚΝΑΥΟΥΥΟΥ ΜΜΟΚ ΝΑΥ Ν2Ε ΠΑΝΟΜΟΣ ΝΙΟΥΔΑΙ / (A 1 158) ΝΑΥ Ν2Ε ΕΙΝΑΙΕΙΜΕ ΕΝΕΓΥΙ Η ΕΝΑ-ΤΙ ΕΡΟΥ ΝΑΥ Ν2Ε — a chiastic disiunctio Sinthiana figure / (P 1314 87 ΠΑΑ-Β) ΝΤΑΥΟΥΜΕ ΔΕ ΝΑΥ Ν2Ε... ΑΡΑ ΜΠΟΣΧΑ ΝΗ... / (A 2 530) ΕΚΝΑΥΟΥΥΗ ΝΑΥ Ν2Ε ΓΜΗΝΗ... ΑΥΜ ΑΥ ΤΕ ΕΕ ΕΝΑΙΜΟΟΣ ΕΤΕΤΡΑΝΣΟ ΜΜΟΚ / (III 15.21) ΕΤΕΤΡΑΝΣΟ ΝΑΥ Ν2Ε ΄ΕΔΕ... — idiom? sim. A 1 61 / (P 1304 84 Ν) ΝΤΑΥΟΥΝ ΔΕ ΝΑΥ Ν2Ε ΝΗ ΝΝΟΥΜΑΝ ΑΝ, ΑΥΜ ΝΤΑΥΠΑΡΑΓΕ ΝΑΥ Ν2Ε ΜΠΟΣΧΑ — pre-inclusion focalization figure / (A 1 71) ΕΝΑΝΤΑΦΩΝΤΙ ΤΩΝ Η ΕΝΑΝΤΙ-ΠΡΟΟΥΥ ΜΠΟΣΧΑ ΝΟΥΜΗ ΜΗΝΗΝΘΥ ΝΑΥ Ν2Ε ΑΝΟΝ ΑΥΜ ΝΤΟ / (III 207.14ff.) ΕΡΕΝΑΥΓΥΤ ΝΑΥ Ν2Ε ΕΙΣΟΥΝ ΕΣΡΑΦ ΜΠΟΣΧΑ.. ΕΡΕΝΑΥΓΥΤ-ΠΟΥΤΟΥ ΕΣΡΑΦ ΤΩΝ... ΕΡΕΝΑΥΓΥΤ ΝΑΥ Ν2Ε ΕΙΣΟΥΝ ΕΣΡΑΦ ΜΠΟΣΧΑ ΝΟΥΜΗ ΝΕΙΘΤ / (A 1 62-3) ΕΡΕΝΑΕ ΕΠΟΥΥΛ ΕΤΣΧΖ ΤΩΝ Η ΕΚΝΑΥΟΥΥΗ ΕΡΟΥ ΝΑΥ Ν2Ε. In (Ming. 318) ΤΜΗΜΕ ΔΕ ΜΠΟ- [...] ΕΕ-ΕΚΝΑΥΟΥΥΗ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΖΙΤΟΟΤΟΥ Ν2Ε ΜΜΟΚ (Ε)ΝΤΑΥ- ΥΣΙ-ΟΥΥ ΜΜΟΚ ΝΑΥ Ν2Ε "Of the interest we do not (know) in what wedlock it is begotten, having been conceived in what way" we witness a case of the circumstantial conversion of a pattern (2) focalization construction (§2.0.1.1.2) — here too the non-initial placement of ΝΑΥ Ν2Ε is evidently conditioned; cf. category (1) above.

(5) (Α 1 80) ΕΙΝΑΛΙ-ΝΑΒΑΛΑ ΕΡΟΚ ΝΑΥ Ν2Ε ΜΠΟΣΧΑ ΚΟΥΙ ΜΗΝΗΝΘΚΕ.

111 Cf. Shisha-Halevy 1972:§4.1.4.1 (on ΕΜΝΩΝ as circumstantial conversion of ΜΜΟΚ "no, not"). Cf. now the clearly circumstantial ΕΜΑΗ "otherwise" in "Middle Egyptian" Coptic (Mr. 6:1, 9:17; Schenke).
2.6.3.2 The idiosyncratic ΕΒΟΑ ΤῪΝ "whence?", "on what ground?", "how come?" enters the following constructions, with the topic paradigm following it including several members absent in other post-focal environments:

(a) (initial) Α阋 A 2 111, 140, 334... (unmarked topic)
ΕΝΑΜA- P 1315 42 ro, RE II 162b 25ff., A 2 54
Ε- A 1 64, III 72.2f.
ΕΒΟΑ ΤῪΝ
ΕΟΥΝ- A 2 412
ΝΤΑΗ- Wess. 9 131a 2ff. 122
ΧΕ-ΑΘ- P 1304 120 ΚΗ
ΧΕ-ΟΥΝ- A 1 67
ΧΕ-ΕΠΕ- Ryl. 69 Ε, A 2 62.
ΧΕ-ΕΝΑ- A 2 9, III 87.7, 26.18ff., etc.
(ΝΕΒΟΑ ΤῪΝ)
ΠΕ ΧΕ-ΕΝΑ- A 2 8 (coll.) 123
ΕΤΠΕ- III 19.20f. 123

(b) (non-initial) ΧΕ + Sec. Tense + ΕΒΟΑ ΤῪΝ A 1 281, Cl. Pr. 38, 114, IV 64.23.

Some representative examples: (A 2 140) ΕΒΟΑ ΤῪΝ ΑΤΕΤΗΤΑΚΟ ΝΕ ΝΟΥΜΕ ΕΥΟΥΟΥΕ / (A 2 54) ΕΒΟΑ ΤῪΝ ΕΡΕΝΙΖΕΒΟΥΕ ΝΚΑΚΕ ΖΙΓΟΟΜ ... ΝΑΣΟΜΑΜ ΕΕΥΟΥ ΕΡΟΝ / (P 1304 48 vo) ΕΒΟΑ ΤῪΝ ΧΕ-ΕΡΕΠΑΙ ΝΑΙ ΝΤΕΙΖΕ ΤΗΡΗΣ / (A 2 412) ΕΜΝΙΚΖΤ ΧΕ ΥΟΟΕ ΕΒΟΑ ΤῪΝ ΕΟΥΝΟΟΟΕΝ Ν ΥΑΣ ΝΚΨΣΤ ΝΑΨΨΕ / (A 1 64) ΕΤΕΒΟΥ Ν ΕΒΟΑ ΤῪΝ ΕΙΣΧ ΝΝΑΙ ΝΕ / (Wess. 9 131a 2ff.) ΕΒΟΑ ΤῪΝ ΝΤΑΖΨΡΙΓΕΝΗΣ ΕΨΟΥΖ ΕΕΥΟΥ... / (P 1304 120 ΚΗ) ΕΒΟΑ ΤῪΝ ΧΕ-ΕΡΨΡΑΝΕΨΨΨΧΥΡ Ρ-ΝΟΒΕ ΑΤΑΑΣ ΕΨΨΨΜΑ / (A 2 9) ΕΒΟΑ ΤῪΝ ΧΕ-ΕΡΕΨΨΨΡ ΝΑΨΨΕΙ ΜΨΕΨΗΣ / (Α 2 8 coll.) ΝΕΒΟΑ ΤῪΝ ΠΕ ΧΕ-ΕΝΑΡ-ΝΕΖΒΟΥΕ ΝΝΔΑΙΨΨΝ / (A 2 62) ΕΒΟΑ ΤῪΝ ΧΕ-ΕΡΕΨΨΨΕ-ΝΠΑΙΨΨΛΟΕ ΕΨΨΨΖΗΤ.

2.6.4 Focus-initial patterns: structural assignment and evaluation. The following chart and tables are based on the data presented in §§2.4–2.6.3. They are fairly complex yet not entirely satisfactory in accounting for functional intricacies. To understand correctly the relationships of pattern form and topic constituency, one must resort to proper descriptive ordering.

(a) Descriptive-order ("multiple-choice") flow chart (→ : conditioning or entailment; "no opposition": ←→ : opposition; choice or selection).

---

122 ΕΒΟΑ ΤῪΝ proves the exception to the non-interrogative constituency of the focus in pattern (4).
123 ΧΕ- and ΕΤΠΕ- may be understood either as true "that" -form topicalizations, albeit with a distinct prospective colouring (not unlike the "prospective emphatic" in Old and Middle Egyptian, Polotsky 1969:473ff., 1976:§2.7; cf. the analogous Greek use of ητε (νά), Jannaris §§1774b, 1911, pp. 566, 577). Compare the Akhmimic (Gespr. Jesu 32.11f.) ΝΕΖ ΧΕ ΝΤΕ ΑΤΕΡΟΥΕ ΝΟΥΕ ΝΖΗΝΕ ΠΡΙΣΜΑΤ... In ΝΕΒΟΑ ΤῪΝ ΠΕ ΧΕ-, ΧΕ- is appositive to the pronominal subject in the # modifier + # predicate pattern (§1.2.1.2).  
124 Rarely, we find ΕΒΟΑ ΤῪΝ following the Basic "imperfectum futuri" (in apodosi), §2.7.3.
That is to say, we obtain five environments with five paradigms which must be expounded, at least prima facie. Closer inspection shows we can eliminate the very rare opposition (1), practically also (3).

(b) **Neutralizations/Oppositions in Given Environments/Circumstances**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>topic form</th>
<th>Basic Tense</th>
<th>Second Tense</th>
<th>circumstantial</th>
<th>ε− (Sec. + circ.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Tense</td>
<td>non-interr.</td>
<td>perf. affirm. (2)</td>
<td>non-dur. affirm. interr. (1)</td>
<td>affirm. dur. (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Tense</td>
<td>perfect affirm. non-interr. (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>non-dur. affirm. non-interr. (2)</td>
<td>non-dur. affirm. non-interr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circumstantial</td>
<td>non-dur. affirm. interr. (1)</td>
<td>non-dur. affirm.</td>
<td>non-dur. affirm. non-interr. (2)</td>
<td>ωΔψ (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>non-interr. affirm. (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dur., non-dur. negative (3) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ε− (circumst. + Sec.)</td>
<td>non-dur. affirm. non-interr. ωΔψ (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dur. affirm. (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(c) **Significant Distinctions (Focus-initial Patterns):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Durative Topic     | +                   | -                          | -                   |

(d) **Interpretation.** We note the existence of two separate, independent but successive conditioning sets at play: (a) Pattern (arrangement) Conditioning, (β) Topic-form Conditioning. The "outputs" (a provisional one, of arrangement; a final one, of topic form) give us five paradigms or opposition environments. (1) The circumstantial member is extremely rare as compared with the bulk (dozens of occurrences) of the Basic Tense. (2) έαν- has a full three-member paradigm. έαν-, a two-member one. (Note that focus constituency may also be operative.) Basic Tenses are opposed to converted ones as unmarked:marked topics (for the Nom. Sentence the circumstantial is the only way of marking). έαν- may be opposed to Νταν- as low-focality (or non-initial verb) marking vs. high-focality marking topicalization. Alternatively, the circumstantial belongs perhaps to a more colloquial system. (3) Here again circumstantial instances are very rare, and cannot be viewed as on a functional par with the Basic Tense. (4) Stylistic characterization? (5) See (2). Note that for the interrogative focus, topic-marking is redundant (focality being inherent).

2.7 **Stylistic Syntax: Cotext Patterns, "Figures".** In internal, non-contrastive view, "style" and "syntax" cannot be kept apart. The idiosyncratic realization of the grammatical potential of the langue, i.e. the idiolectal grammatical norm, is nothing but the writer's/speaker's style. This is no less true of macro-syntax: favoured or distinctive sub-textual stretches and configurations are nonetheless part and parcel of the functional system of grammar. In the following pages I review some of the familiar and recurring Shenoutean figures — those germane to the subject under discussion. Beyond the significance of their formal definition and their diagnostic value for identifying the Shenoutean text, they have some importance in an as yet non-existent frame of reference, that of COPTIC STYLISTICS.

2.7.1 **Rhetorical Focalization Figures**

2.7.1.1 **The Second-Tense Theme/topic and the Circumstantial Focus — Pattas.** (2), (5), (6). Note in particular (a) the "Wechselsatz" or correlative "balanced" construction effect, where we have two έν-forms juxtaposed, and pattern (i.e. topic/focus) assignment is impossible and immaterial — the topic-focus structure is reversible: (A 168) ηή έμμε ημο ημοστε ηταπολε, έμμε ημοσ ημοστε μμό ντο, η έμμε ηνοι ημωθ μθητην... ημοστε ηνοι, η έμμοστε ητον ηνοι ζαθν έμμε ηνοι. Also, instances of the type (Mun. 96) έτοαμα έιχω ηναι and (Wess. 9 158a 30ff.) έμμοστε ημωθ άν έιχω ημωθ ηναι / (P 130α 121 νο) μπρομπευε ήκ-ειμοστε ημωθ έιχω ημωθ ηναι, άλλα έιμε ημωθ ζωκον

---

125 For some equally distinctive syntactic phenomena, see §§0.1.2, 2.7 passim and the index.
§ 2.7.1.1 Chapter 2. The Adverbial Modifier Focalized

(III 122.20) NAI DE EIXW MMDOY EEITAMO MMWN / (RE 11 16a 39ff.) EPELOLOGOC NOGNEG AN EIXH MPAI OYAE (E)NPAWE AN... ALA (E)NAYNEI NTOC NOYO.

(b) Instances of the "No sooner... than..." sense of the complex 127: (Ch. 202-3) EYHAEYWNH EYH NTOOC NOYON NIM ZFTEYXPEIA EYAWSOU "(...) Walking heavily in his eagerness;...) and no sooner does he get the opportunity to aid somebody in need than he (walks) more lightly"

2.7.1.2 Two complementary focalization patterns, coordinated/disjoined: Second-Tense construction, patt. (2) + Cleft Sentence with nominal/pronominal focus 188. This is very common; the rhetorical effect of this juxtaposition of the focus-initial and theme/topic-initial patterns is of course chiasitic. Often, these are Disjunctio Sinuthiana cases: (A 2 409) ΕΥΕΙΡΕ ΜΜΟΥ ΝΝΙΜ Κ ΝΙΜ ΠΕΤΝΑΥΝΗ ΕΡΟΥ ΝΝΕΥ- ΠΕΤΝΑΟΥΝ / (A 1 52) ΕΙΝΑΡ-ΟΥ ΟΥ ΠΕΤΝΑΑΛ / (A 2 378) "ΕΙΧΩ ΝΖΗΗ ΕΗΝΗ'" — "'ΝΗΡ ΠΕΤΜΟΥΡ ΜΜΟΙ" / (Ench. 67a) ΝΤΑΥΝΗΒΕ ΕΝΟΥ; ΝΤΟΚ ΠΕΝΤΑΚΥΒΕ / (ibid. 76b) ΕΤΕΤΗΝΗ ΕΗΝΗ / ΝΝΟΥΝΗΜ — ΝΜΟΥ ΠΕΤΝΑΤΝΜΤ ΕΡΥΤΗ ΝΝΟΥΝΕ / (RE 10 163a 15f.) ΝΤΑΝΚΟΜΟΣ ΤΗΡΗ ΥΨΗΕ ΕΒΟΑ ΖΙΤΟΟΤΚ, ΑΛΛΑ ΠΕΚΣΤΑΥΡΟΣ ΠΕΝΤΑΧΚΙΝ ΕΠΚΑΣ ΤΗΡΗ / (III 192.4) ΕΥΑΧΕΥΕ ΕΝΙΜ Κ ΝΙΜ ΠΕΝΤΑΧΣΟΟΣ...

2.7.1.3.1 Double simultaneous (interrogative) focalization: (Cat. 42.27f.) ΝΙΜ ΠΕΤΣΧ ΜΜΟΣ ΝΝΙΜ 129 / (Wess. 9 110a 9f.) ΝΤΑΝΙΜ ΤΣΑΒΟΥ ΕΗΝΗ / (A 2 63) ΝΙΜ ΠΕΤΝΑΡ-ΥΟΡΠ ΕΗΝΗ / (ibid. 518-9) ΝΤΑΝΙΜ ΕΙΜΗ... ΞΕ-ΝΙΜ ΠΕΤΝΑΚΖ ΖΑΝΗΜ ΜΜΟΝ Κ ΞΕ-ΝΙΜ ΠΕΤΝΑΥ-ΨΗΝΥ ΕΤΕΒΕΝΗ / (RE 10 160a 37) ΝΙΜ ΠΕΝΤΑΧΜΕΥΤ- ΝΙΜ. Compare (Ch. 128.43ff.) ΑΟΥΗΡ ΝΕΠΙΚΟΠΟΣ Ρ-ΟΥΗΡ ΝΟΥΝΥ ΜΝΩΥΝ ΝΝΙΜΑ.

2.7.1.3.2 The extremely common complex (expanded, disjoined) focus: (A 1 / 64) ΕΤΒΕΟΥ Η ΕΒΟΑ ΤΨΗ ΕΙΧΧ ΝΝΑΙ ΝΕ / (A 2 8-9) ΝΑΨ ΓΑΡ ΝΖΕ Η ΕΤΒΕΟΥ ΕΡΕΙΤ ΝΑΡ-ΟΥΗΡ Η ΟΥΤΟΠΟΣ ΝΝΜΜΟ ΕΡΟΥ / (ibid. 312) ΕΤΒΕΟΥ Η ΕΧΧΟΥ ΝΖΩΒ (sim. 223-4, 211.45) / (Miss. 283) ΖΑΤΤΝΗΜ Η ΖΝΑΨ ΝΝΗ / (Wess. 9 151c 24ff.) ΕΧΧΟΥ Η ΕΧΧΝΗ Μ / (A 1 / 109) ΕΤΕΒΕΝΗ Η ΖΑΤΤΝΗΜ / (236) ΕΤΒΕΟΥ Η ΖΤΙΤΟΥ / (412) ΤΨΗ Η ΕΒΟΑ ΖΤΙΤΝΗΜ (sim. Π 131 14 νο) / (III 72.2f.) ΕΒΟΑ ΤΨΗ Η ΖΤΙΤΟΥ (mostly striking instances of the figura Sinuthiana).

2.7.1.3.3 Complex theme (see §2.8.4), very common: (A 2 45) ΝΑΨ ΓΑΡ ΕΙΝΑΡ-ΨΨΑΥ... Η ΕΟΥΝΟΥΡΝ ΕΤΜΑΗΥ ΝΑΤ-ΨΗΥ ΜΜΟΥ / (ibid. 525) ΕΝΝΑΒΨΗ Κ ΝΤΑΝΒΨΗ... ΕΤΒΕ ΝΑΙ ΕΤΜΜΑΥ / (Leyd. 410) ΕΧΜΠΑΙ ΕΝ- ΤΑΕΙ ΕΡΨΑΙ ΕΠΙΨΗΝΗ Μ ΕΝΤΑΥΝ-ΝΕΨΗΜΕ ΕΡΨΑΙ ΕΧΨΗ. Chiasistically, (Ch. 119.445ff.) ΕΡΕΠΕΨΗΤ ΟΥΨΨΗ ΝΟΥΨΡ ΑΨΨ ΕΤΨΑΚΨΗY ("discontinuous theme"); sim. Ch. 128.20ff.; compare also the conjunctive sub-categorizing the theme (Ch. 7: e.g. Ch. 85.26ff., 89.18ff.).

2.7.1.4.1 The indirect or "disguised" focus, with the interrogative included in an expansion of the Second-Tense verb (note again the compatibility of the nucleus - satellite and theme - rhyme relationships). (A 2 413) ΝΤΑΥΝΨΤΗ ΜΠΕΝΤΟ ΕΒΟΑ ΝΝΗΜ / (IV 105.5) ΝΤΑΨΕΙ ΕΖΟΥΝ ΨΑΡΟΝ ΝΝΙΟΥ ΕΗΝΗ / (Wess. 9 117a 5f.) ΕΥΝΑΤΝΗΚ ΕΡΑΤΗ ΝΝΙΜ. Note the Basic Tense in (Wess. 9 133b 10ff.) ΑΨΨΕΙ ΕΡΨΑΙ ΕΟΥΝΕΛΑΓΟΣ ΝΑΨ ΓΟΤ ΜΜΝΤΑΣΗΚΗΒ / (P 130 103 νο) ΕΖΟΥΝΗ ΕΡ-ΟΥ (sim. IV 94.13; A 2 513 ΕΙΝΑΕΙ ΕΖΟΥΝ NE εΡ-ΟΥ).

2.7.1.4.2 The preincluded focalization construction is a very distinctive figure. There is


128 Cf. PoLOTSKY 1944:52ff. (= CP 166ff.).

129 Cf. Plato Republ. 332 c-d: ή τίςν οὖν τί ἀποδιδοὺσα ἀφειλμένων καὶ προσήχων τέχνη.
here no formal marking of the dependence, beside the arrangement, which is inverse to the normal nucleus-satellite one in Coptic. (P 130§ 74 ΡΗΔΑ, parall. Wess. 9 108b 23ff.) ου πετεθαλαξής: (sic) πρωμε νίμ ουνού / (IV 64.15ff.) ΕΙΧΟΟΟ ΚΕ-ΝΑΥ ΝΖΕ Η ΝΙΜ ΠΕΝΤΑΛΥΤΟΧΝ. ΕΜΠΥΝΥΘΜΕ ΣΟΟΥΝ / (A 2 223-4) ΕΥΘΟΟΟ ΕΙΧΟΟΟ Η ΕΤΒΕΟΥ ΕΥΘΕΝΗΣΕ ΝΠΗΝΑΙΟΟ ΑΛΕΣ / (P 131§ 156m) ΕΥΘΟΟΟ ΤΩΝ ΜΕΝΟΥ ΜΑΡΣΟΥΤΑΜΕΝ / (K 9317) ΟΥ ΠΕΝΝΑΛΥΤΟΧΝ ΝΠΗΝΑΙΟΟ ΑΛΣ / (IIV 210,7f.) ΕΙΟΤΕ ΕΥΘΕΝΗΣΕ Η ΕΥΘΕΝΗΣΕ ΜΠΗΧΥΜ-ΟΟΜ ΕΙΟΤΕ / (ibid. 24.10f.) ΠΕΤΕΡΕΜΠΗΓΕΝ ΜΠΟΥΑ ΠΟΥΑ ΝΑΥΝΟΥ ΕΙΛΗΡΕ ΖΗΝΑΣΝ Η ΝΠΗΝΑΛΥΤΟΧΝ ΝΤΙΣΝΤ ΕΤΒΟΟΟ / (P 130§ 125, parall. Cat. 42.14f.) ΕΙΧΟΟΟ ΟΥ ΚΕ-ΝΤΑΚΥΙΩ ΝΕΡΟΟΜ ΠΡΟΦΕΝΗΣΗ ΝΑΥ ΝΖΕ... ΝΤΙΜ ΟΥ ΠΡΟΦΕΝΗΣΗ. The governing verbs are COOYN, EIME, TAMO, NOEI, ΞΨ; no resumption is included in the construction 130.

2.7.2 RHETORICAL TOPICALIZATION FIGURES (a selection)

2.7.2.1 # VERBX → (VERBX + FOCUS) #. The focalization pattern is coherent by repeating, as theme, a foregoing (usually rhematic) verb 131, often with a macro-syntactic topicalization marker.

2.7.2.1.1 Topicalization marked by ΕΥΘΕ-: (Ch. 191.46ff.) ΕΥΘΕ-ΑΚΑ-ΡΖΗΜΕ ΝΑΥ ΝΤΑΚΑΚΑ-ΓΕΝ- ΣΠΑΤΑΛΑΣ ΖΗΝΩ ΖΗΝΩΥΞΑΧΑ... / (IV 24.6f.) ΕΥΘΕ-ΧΨΟΩΟΝ ΟΥ, ΕΥΘΟΟΟ ΡΗΝΕΤΑ ΑΛΣ ΖΗΝΩ ΖΗΝΩΥΞΑΧΑ... / (III 32.10f.) ΕΥΘΕ-ΑΥΘΗΝΕΙΝ ΟΥΝ ΝΑΡΑΟΥΞΩΑ, ΕΙΝΕΥΘΗΝΕΙΝ ΖΗΝΩΥΞΑΧΑ / (III 85.13f.) ΕΥΘΕ-ΟΥΝΤΖΥ-ΟΥΥΟΟΜ ΓΑΡ ΟΥΝ, ΕΟΥΝΤΑΧΗ ΖΝΕΤΑΚΑ-ΜΑ ΝΑΥ ΝΖΕΤΟΥ. Especially typical of Shanoute is the pattern # ΕΥΘΕ- VERBX → ΕΤΒΕΟΥ/ΑΡΩΝ-ν/ΝΑΥ ΝΖΕ + VERBX #, often with more than one element repeated 132: (Ch. 64.19ff.) ΕΥΘΕ-ΖΝΟΜΟΜ ΜΠΗΧΥΡΝ ΝΤΑΝΟΜΙΑ ΕΝΤΕΡΝΟΜΑΝΕΙ ΕΙΕΡΜ ΜΠΗΧΥΡΝ, ΕΤΒΕΟΥ ΝΤΟΣ ΖΝΟΜΟΜ ΜΠΗΧ... ΝΤΕΝΕΙΠΕ ΑΛΗ... ΝΝΑΤΕΝΟΤΥΣΙΣ — sim. ibid. 79.1f. / (A 2 371) ΕΥΘΕ-ΜΝΟΜ ΜΜΟΚ ΕΙΕΡΗ ΝΝΕΤΡΑΝΑΚ ΜΝΟΤΟΥΕ, ΝΑΥ ΝΤΟΣ ΝΖΕ ΟΥΝΟΜ ΜΜΟΚ ΕΡ-ΠΟΥΣΗ ΤΩΡ ΜΠΕΡΖΝΤ ΜΝΟΤΟΝΩΝ.

2.7.2.1.2 Topicalization marked by ΕΥΖΑΝ-: (Ch. 104.5ff.) ΕΥΖΑΝΜΟΝΟΧΑΣ ΝΝΟΤΕΥΕ ΜΗ ΕΝΣΟΝΤΕΥΕ ΝΑΚ Η ΕΥΖΑΝΕΙΡ ΜΠΑΝ Η ΝΤΑΚΑΑΑ ΝΑΚ / (Wess. 9 110b 18ff.) ΕΡΕΥΖΑΝΙ-ΑΡΙΚΕ ΕΡΕΠΙΕΝ ΕΠΕΤΑ ΓΕΡΑΤΥ ΖΝΤΟΥΜΣΤΗ — compare (Wess. 9 111-2) ΕΥΖΑΝΤ-ΜΑΕΝ ΟΝ ΕΠΑΖΟΥ ΕΙΕΜ ΖΗΝΩ ΖΗΝΟΚΗ ΚΕ-ΤΕΒΟΥΝΗ ΚΕ-ΤΕΒΟΥΝΗ / (IV 11.9f.) ΚΑΝ ΕΖΝΑΚ ΕΚΤΟС ΕΝΕΚΣΚ Η ΕΖΝΑΚ ΑΝ ΑΕΚΤΟΣ ΖΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΑΝ ΖΕ-ΑΣΕΕΙ ΑΛΑΑ,... actually a use of ΕΑΗ- as both adverbial and topicalizing: also (K 933) ΝΝΕΝΑΡ-ΤΗΡΗΕ ΑΝ ΕΣΕΖ ΝΟΥΕΙΣΤ ΟΥΤΕ ΚΟΝ ΝΟΥΚΟΝ, ΕΑΗΕΙΡ ΟΥΝ, ΝΤΛΑΕΙΡ ΕΠΝΗΧΝΗ.

2.7.2.1.2.1 ΕΙΘΑΝΖΟΟΟ Κ’ If I say, when I say’ is a striking topicalizing expression (cf. ΕΙΧΟΟΟ ‘as to saying... ’, exx. in §2.7.1.4.2 and n. 130): (Cl. Pr. 22 ΤΕΕ) ΕΙΘΑΝΖΟΟΟ ΚΕ-ΖΟΟΥ, ΕΙΣΟΟΥ ΝΑΙ ΜΑΥΑΛ / (A 2 333) ΕΙΘΑΝΖΟΟΟ ΚΕ-ΝΕΙΖΒ ΖΩΝΑΞΗΡΓΙΚΟΚΣ ΠΕ... ΕΒΟΛ ΤΩΝ ΝΕ ΝΙΖΘΥΕ ΕΤΒΟΟΟΜ ΑΛΣ ΝΗΒΩΒΕ / (A 1 281) ΕΙΘΑΝΖΟΟΟ ΓΑΡ ΚΕ-ΕΡΕΠΑΝΔΑΛΟΟΛ ΜΕΕΥΕ ΕΥΝΟΝΗΡΝ ΝΖΟΟΥ ΕΝΡΗΜΕ... ΝΤΟΣ ΡΨ ΠΕΤΣΟΜΒΟΥΛΕΥΕ ΝΑΥ / (BLOr. 3581A f. 160, No. 253 ΝΖ) ΕΙΘΑΝΖΟΟΟ ΚΕ-ΑΤΕΡΓΑΝ-ΤΕΠΕΒΟ ΜΝΟΜΑΜΑ... ΕΝΝΑΛΖΟΟΟ ΟΝ ΚΕ-ΟΥ ΕΤΒΕΠΝΖΩΝ ΟΝΣ. Also A I 410, A I 295, 482.

130 Compare the resumptions in the following case: (P 130§ 66 ΡΗΣ) ΖΩΤΕΙ ΜΕΝ ΓΑΡ ΤΙΝΝΑΥ ΕΡΟΟΥ (i.e. desire and anger) -ον ΖΩΤΕΙ ΖΗΝΩ ΠΑΙΟΥ ΝΙΜ ΖΟΝΑΟΓΕΡ ΜΜΟΑ / (A 2 443, not Sh.) ΖΩΤΕΙ Υ ΝΖΕΤΟΥ ΜΝΗΝΩΗΥΣ... ΕΜΑΕΥΚΑΤΟΡΙΟΟ ΜΜΟΧ ΖΖΝΕΤΕΝΑΠΑΡΒΗΚΗΚ ΝΗΕΝΤΗΜΕ ΟΥΝ ΝΙΜ ΩΟΥΝ ΜΗΠΑΙ. Consider also the resuming and non-resuming constructions of ΕΙΧΟΟΟ ‘as to saying’; a distinctive topicalization figure (§2.7.1.2.1.2): (Ch. 61.25ff.) ΕΙΧΟΟΟ ΓΑΡ ΚΕ-ΕΚΤΟΣ ΜΜΟΧ ΝΑΥ ΝΖΕ... ΟΥΥΟΜ ΡΕ ΕΙΕΙΝ ΕΠΑΣ / (A 2 392) ΕΙΧΟΟΟ ΚΕ-ΜΝΟΥΧΙΑ-ΒΑΛΤΗΝΑ ΝΙΜ ΠΕΣ ΜΜΟΘΕ ΚΕ-ΑΥΘΗ / (Cat. 42.14f.) ΕΙΧΟΟΟ ΓΑΡ ΚΕ-ΝΤΑΚΥΙΩ ΝΕΡΟΟΜ ΝΑΥ ΝΖΕ... ΝΤΙΜ ΟΥΝ ΝΤΟΣ Ώ ΠΡΟΦΕΝΗΣ / (P 130§ 115 ΙΖ) ΕΙΧΟΟΟ ΓΑΡ ΚΕ-ΝΑΥΣΟΥ ΝΙΜΜΑ ΝΜΟΝΟ ΕΤΖΝΤΝΙΤΕΡΟ ΝΝΘΗΜΕ ΠΣΘΒ ΟΥΝΟΟΖ ΕΒΟΛ ΚΕ-.

131 Cf. PoloTSkY 1944:26ff. (= CP 130ff.).

132 See MÜller 1956:62ff.; cf. §3.1.1.1.0.1. for the anaphoric objects.
2.7.2.1.3 Relative topicalization. The antecedent is a pronominal or indefinite antecedent: (IV 4.2f.) νετσοε ευσσοε ετβενεαρισεις ηαγαβον / (III 115.8f.) μθ 2θαν NIM ΕΤΕΡΕΝΘΑΝΝ + ΜΩΩΟΥ Ε+ ΜΩΩΟΥ ΑΝ ΓΑΤΕΨΥΧΗ ΜΝ ΠΕΨΥΗΑ / (A 2 463-4) ΣΩΒ ΝΙΜ ΝΤΑΛΑΛΥ ΝΤΑΛΑΛΥ ΣΡΟΥ ΕΤΒΕΝΕΟΥΧΑΙ.

2.7.2.1.4 Lemmatizing topicalization — topicalization of a quotation or segment of a quotation; very typical of Shenoute. Note the following formal types: (a) Second-Tense marking of the full quote or its verbal part. (b) No formal marking of the verbal lemma, which is nevertheless a theme in our pattern (2). This is the most interesting construction, and argues for a level of cohesion (or grade of junctural delimitation [§6.0.2.1]) between the lemmatic topic and its focus different — lower — from that between the usual theme/topic and its focus in pat. (2). (c) "Extraction" of a verbal segment or lexicem component in the quote and its incorporation — in unaltered form — in a focalization pattern. (d) Extraction of a non-verbal segment of the quote and its incorporation in a focalization pattern. (e) No further explicit topicalization, but an annexation of an interrogative focus (with a zero topic?) to the quote.

(a) (A 2 422, not Sh.) ΑΝΕΙΜΕ ΔΕ-ΝΑΥ ΝΙΕ ΕΡΕ "ΝΒΑΛ ΜΠΟΦΟΣ ΥΟΟΝ ΖΝ ΤΕΝΑΠΕ" (Eccl. 2:14) / (Ch. 73.5ff.) "ΑΝΓΑΛΑΝΑΣ ΒΤΩ ΕΤΟΥΝ ΕΡΟΥ" — ΝΔΑΤΑΚΙΝ ΓΧΩΗ ΕΤΕΒΕ ΟΥ: (Joh. 13:27) / (Cat. 42.12) "ΑΝ-ΤΗΝΝΟΟΥ" — ΝΤΑΤΗΝΝΟΟΥΤΝ ΤΝΩΝ; (Gal. 4:4 paraphrased) / (P 131e 19 MΓ) "ΕΤΕΤΝΙΜΕΙ ΑΥΣ ΤΕΤΝΡΟ-ΛΕΟΝΟΚ ΜΝΗΤΗΝ ΜΜΑΥ" — ΕΜΣΤΑΝ-ΟΥ ΜΜΑΛ; ΕΜΣΤΑΝ-ΡΟΕΙΣ ΜΜΑΛ (Jac. 4:2).

(b) (IV 18.2) "ΦΑΝΑΣΘΡ ΝΤΕΤΧΑΝΣ" — ΦΑΝΑΣΡΟΣ ΕΡ-ΟΥ; ΕΥΩΨΥΤΝ ΝΖΝΤΕΝΝΟΟΥΤ ΨΗΝ-ΕΚΨΝΙΚ ΝΖΝΤΕΝΨΜΕ (Ps. 7:12) / (A 2 339) "ΦΑΝΑΣΘΡΙΝ ΜΝΕΝΝΟΥΤΕ" — ΦΑΝΑΣΘΡΙΝ ΕΟΥ; ΦΑΝΑΣΘΡΙΝ ΕΠΙΚ-ΚΒΑ (Zach. 9:7) / (A 2 11) "ΝΤΕΧΑΚΙΝ ΑΝ" — ΝΤΕΧΑΚΙΝ ΑΝ ΓΝΟΥ; ΝΤΕΧΑΚΙΝ ΑΝ ΓΖΝΤΕΝΝΟΟΥΤΕ ΕΤΕΝΝΤΑΝΜΟΤΕ, ΝΤΕΧΑΚΙΝ ΑΝ ΓΖΝΤΕ-ΤΕΥΣΙΣ ΕΡ-ΝΑΜΠΑΡΑΨΟΥΣΙΣ (Ps. 45:5) / (III 75.13ff., parall. Ch. 169.11ff.) "ΜΜΝΡΑΥΕ ΥΟΟΝ ΝΝΑΣΒΕΒΙΣ" — ΜΜΝΡΑΥΕ ΥΟΟΝ ΝΑΥ ΤΝΩΝ, ΓΜΠΑΙΝ ΒΕ ΕΤΝΗΝ ΨΗΝ-ΜΜΜΟΝ ΠΑΙ (Is. 48:22, 57:21) / (Ch. 183.1ff.) "ΑΙΡ-ΖΟΤΕ ΑΤΑΚΑΡιΣ +ΟΥΥΘ" — ΑΣΤ-ΟΥΘ ΝΟΥ; ΝΟΥΤΝΗΒΕ ΑΝ Ν ΝΤΟΣ ΚΕΜΕΛΟΣ, ΑΛΑΑ ΑΣΤ-ΟΥΘ ΝΝΚΑΡΠΟΣ ΝΤΑΙ-ΚΑΙΟΥΝΗ (Ps. 27:7) / (Mun. 142) "ΝΑΙ ΝΑΙΧΨΧΑΚ ΕΒΟΛ ΓΖΝΟΨΜΗ" — ΣΕΝΑΣΧΨΧΑΚ ΕΒΟΛ ΤΝΩΝ ΝΑΥ ΝΖΝΟΟΥ; (? Is. 24:14).

(c) (Ch. 196.10ff.) "ΑΤΝΣΙΟ ΝΟΤΨΨΥΚ ΕΣΚΑΙΕΝ" — ΕΣΚΑΙΕΝ ΜΨΝΑ ΕΑΑΤ ΑΥΨ Ν+ (Ps. 106:9) / (III 54.13) "ΕΟΚ ΝΕΔ ΝΟΥΚΠΗΝΩΣ ΕΝΟΡΚΑ "ΕΝΟΡΚΑ ΕΝΟΡΚΑ ΕΝΟΡΚΑ ΕΝΟΡΚΑ ΜΝΕΤΣΒΗ ΜΨΝΖ (Cant. 4:12) / (A 2 245) "ΑΤΝΝΟΟΘΥ" — ΤΝΟΟΘΥ ΤΝΩΝ ΝΑΤΡΕΨΝΝΟΟΘΥ ΕΒΟΛ ΓΖΤΟΥΤ ΑΥΨ ΓΖΤΘΥ (Gal. 4:4) / (Wess. 9 98b ff.) "ΕΜΝΑΦΑΙΝ ΝΖΗΤΝ" — ΠΕΧΑΚ — "ΑΝ-ΩΤΑΛΑΑ" — ΕΜΝΑΦΑΙΝ ΝΖΗΤΝ ΕΠΙΜ ΝΑΛΑΤΩΣΙΟΥΣ; (I Cor. 13:2) / (III 45.17ff.) "ΕΠΝΙΝΚΝ ΝΖΗΤΝ ΡΕ ΥΨΡ-ΘΥΤΝ Γ" — ΥΨΡ-ΘΥΤΝ ΕΡΩΥΨΡ Ν ΕΨΥΨΝΤ (Ps. 126:2) / (III 192.14f.-193.11) "ΜΝΑΧΕΣ ΓΖΑΛΖΟΜ ΓΖΝΟΛΓΕΣ" — ...ΑΛΖΟΜ ΓΖΨΨ ΕΝΙΜ Ψ ΧΑΚΕ ΕΝΙΜ; (source? Note that Ψ-ΧΑΚΕ represents the [non-verbal] expansion of MΝΤ-) / (A 2 330-1) "ΕΡΕ-ΖΟΤΕ ΝΕΜ ΝΕΩΝΟΤ ΕΤΑΖΕΡΑΤΟΥ" — ΕΤΑΖΕΡΑΤΟΥ ΤΝΩΝ ΕΝΙΜ; ΕΤΑΖΕΡΑΤΟΥ ΕΠΙΟΧΕ ΙΔΣ (Cant. 6:4.10).

(d) (A 2 365) "ΠΕΧΕΥΟΤΕ ΝΑΒΨΚΗ ΑΝ ΕΝΕΠΣΗ ΝΡΜΑΛΥ" — ΕΝΕΠΣΗ ΤΝΩΝ ΝΚΑΑΜΝΤΕ; (Ps. 48:17).

(e) (Tετς 684) "ΑΣΥΨΨΗ ΜΝΝΚΑΨΧΑΚ" — ΜΝΝΚΑΨΧΗ ΝΨΨΗΚ; ΜΝΝΚΑΨΧΗΝ-ΤΟΥΤΝ ΜΝΑΒΙΜΕΛΑΧ (Gen. 22:1) / (A 2 386) "ΕΥΝΩΨΥΨΤΝ ΝΑΨ" — ΝΑΨ ΜΨΝΕ ΝΑΤΡΕΨΕΙΜΕ ΝΕ-ΠΤΕΨΟΥΤΝ-ΠΨΨΡΕ ΟΥΝΤΑΨ-ΝΕΨΥΤ; (Joh. 4:23) / (A 1 113) "ΝΑΛΑΧΙ-ΖΑΝ ΝΜΜΗΤΝ ΑΥΨ ΝΑΛΑΧΙ-ΖΑΝ ΝΜΜΗΤΝ ΝΕΤΨΨΥΡΕ" — ΕΤΕΣΘΩ ΣΨΨΡ; (Jer. 2:9: sim. (? A 2 57, A 1 299) / (Ch. 181.53ff.) "ΟΨΨΨΥΚ ΕΨΨΨΨΨΗ ΝΑΚ ΕΨΨ ΜΠΡΑΣΛΑΚ ΝΝΕ-ΘΨΡΙΟΝ" — ΝΑΨ ΝΘΨΡΙΟΝ; (Ps. 73:19).

132 The Trimembral Nominal Sentence supplies another lemmatizing construction, viz.: "— ες χες — (after a quotation or allegory), e.g. Ch. 122.18ff., 28ff., 142.11ff. A 2 465-6. 491. IV 181.10ff.
133 Thus, I believe, proving the Shenouteanity of BLoR. 6954 (12) vo [...] ΙΝΑΓ ΝΖΗΝ; ΙΝΖΗΝ ΜΠΡΡΟ ΧΝ-ΙΝΖΗΝ ΜΨΧΑΙ (B. Layton’s copy), probably our type (b).
134 Cf. BLoR. 3581A 160 (No. 253 MΨΝ, parall. RE 10 159a 13ff.) (ΝΕΤΤΟΝΕ ΕΡΟΥ ΑΥΨ ΕΝΤΟΝΕΕ ΕΡΟΟΥ) ΕΤΕΣΘΟΥ ΑΕ ΑΛΙΟΟΣ ΧΝ-ΤΨΜΗ; but IV 181.11ff. (ΟΥ ΔΕ ΕΣ ΧΕΣΣ" ΕΤΕΤΨΨΡ ΝΩΘΟΥ""); "ΟΨΨΨΡ ΝΩΘΟΥ ΝΕ χες; see n. 86.
2.7.3 Basic and Second Tenses: Compatibility, Opposition and Neutralization

2.7.3.1 Compatibility. Coordination/disjunction; often, the Basic Tense (usually the first term) is negated and/or non-durative (see also some of the exx. in §§2.1.2, 2.4-6). (III 191.25ff.) ΜΠΟΥΤΑΑΣ ΝΑΝ ΕΠΕΝ-, ΑΛΛΑ ΝΑΤΑΑΑΣ ΝΑΝ Ε- / (III 38.16f.) ΝΠΡ-ΖΟΤΕ ΑΝ ΖΟΛΑΗΚ ΟΥΔΕ ΕΠΕΝΤΡΨ ΑΝ (v.l. ΝΠΡ-ΖΟΤΕ ΑΝ) / (A 2 86) ΣΕΝΑΧΩΟΥΝ Η ΕΥΚΛΕΙ ΜΜΟΥ ΕΕΛ- / (Wess. 9 165c 27ff., parall. III 140.8) ΝΠΟΥΝΟΥ ΜΜΟΣΤΕ ΕΚ-ΝΑΠΟΚΚΗ ΕΒΟΛΑ 2ΝΤΣΥΝΑΓΙΨΗ.

2.7.3.2 Paradigms and Alternation

2.7.3.2.1 The Basic Tense as a member in the post-focal topic paradigm (usually negated and/or non-durative): §§2.6.2, 2.6.4.

2.7.3.2.2 The Basic Tense as a macro-syntactically conditioned alternant of the e-topic: §§2.6.3.1.1.

2.7.3.2.3 The Basic Tense (usually in ΕΣ-inclusion) as an unmarked prefocus theme (interrogative foci) 138.

(a) The focus ΤΩΝ, the theme “ΑΠΣΤΩΜ’” (Wess. 9 127b 8ff.) ΑΠΝΙΝΘΗΕ ΜΜΙΝΕ ΜΙΝΕ ΕΙ ΤΩΝ... ΑΠΟΥΜΠΑ ΤΗΡΗ ΕΙ ΤΩΝ...; also 128a 1ff., Ch. 166.24ff., BMCat. 80 (No. 195). A 233; one instance of the Basic Present: (Wess. 9 117a 23ff., coll.) Η ΠΕΝΑΡΕΥ ΤΩΝ.

(b) The theme NOΥΡΠ, theme: present: (P 1302 45 316) Η ΕΓΥΟΝΟΥΕ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΝΟΥΥΡΠ ΕΕΛ- / (P 1302 65 60) ΤΝΟΥΟΥΣ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΝΟΥΥΡΠ ΕΕΛ- / (IV 35.18) (ΕΕΛ-) ΝΤΔΑΙΗΥ ΝΟΥΥΡΠ; theme: Basic Perfect: (III 183.3) (ΕΕΛ-) ΑΥΡ-Α-ΝΑΥ ΝΟΥΥΡΠ; theme: adjective-verbs: (A 1 374) ΝΕΥΚ ΝΟΥΥΡΠ, ΝΕΥΧ ΝΟΥΥΡΠ / (A 1 227) ΝΑΝΟΥΨ ΑΥΡ ΧΡΟΝΟΥΕ ΝΟΥΥΡΠ. Additional exx.: IV 117.3f., 47.7f., Ch. 62.33ff., Berl. 1613 1 A, Ryl. 69 49, Rossi 2/3 26.

(c) The focus: ΝΑΨ ΝΕ, the theme: ‘ΑΠΣΤΩΜ’ (P 1302 36 vo) (42ΤΗΝ ΕΕΛ-) ΑΨΥΜ ΝΑΨ ΝΕ... ΕΕΛ.

2.7.3.2.4 The Basic Tense is very rare (perhaps significantly so) as a varia lectio for a marked theme/topic form: III 38.17, patt. (1); 210.21, patt. (4); IV 14.10, patt. (6); consider also (BKV 1802 88ff.) ΕΝ-ΝΑΨΟΥΕ ΝΟΥΦΝΟΥΕ ΦΑΕΝΕΖ ΧΣ. (21) ΣΝΑΨΟΥΕ ΝΟΥΦΝΟΥΕ ΦΑΕΝΕΖ.

2.7.3.3 Other neutralizations

2.7.3.3.1 “Indifference”. i.e. unmarkedness (or rare markedness) for the category of focality: (a) ΝΕ-converted forms (usually with ΤΩΝ) 137: (Wess. 9 148a 16ff.) ΝΕΥΤΩΝ ΝΕ... ΝΕΥΜΟΟΘ ΝΕ ΝΑΨ ΝΕ; often the “future imperfect”: (RE 10 162b 23f.) ΝΕΥΝΑΨΨΝΙΝ ΤΩΝ / (Cl. Pr. 22 ΤΕΡ) ΝΕΥΝΑΤΑΚΕ-ΟΥΡΠ ΜΝΟΥΧΗ, also RE 10 164b 3f., RE 11 166 16f., P 1304 87 vo.

(b) Inconvertible conjugation-forms: Future III + ΝΟΥΥΡΠ (III 181.17f., 150.26), + ΗΝΙΜ (III 111.20), conjunctive (A 2 512) ΕΙΝΑΤΔΑΙΕ-ΑΥ ΜΜΕΑΟΣ ΝΤΑΚΑ-ΑΥ Η ΕΙΝΑ-ΑΥ ΜΜΕΑΟΣ ΝΤΑΛΑΙΨΟΝΤΟΣ ΝΤΑΜΑΚΑΠΙΖΕ ΝΑΨ; compare the infinitive expanded by interrogative modifiers (+ ΕΟΥ, ΕΝΙΜ, III 45.18, 193.11).

(c) Nominal Sentence: + ΝΟΥΥΡΠ (Ch. 104.47ff.), + 2ΝΟΥ (A 2 26), + ΝΑΨ ΝΕ (A 2 69, 154, 334, 403),

138 Cf. POLOTSKY 1940.245 (= CP 37). Note that both ΤΩΝ and ΟΥΡΠ are also indefinites — the homonymy is in fact resolved syntactically. ΟΥΡΠ in ΟΥΝΟΥΨ ΕΠΟΝΟΥΝΟΥ ΝΚΟΛΑΣΤΗΠΙΟΝ ΕΕΛΕ ΕΡΨΜΕ... (P 1304 71 ΚΡΓ, also A 2 331, Wess. 9 143d 12ff.) is a member of a paradigm including also the Second Tense (§2.3.2) and the Cleft Sentence with (pro)nominal vedette.

137 Compare however POLOTSKY 1960b.25 (= CP 396) note 1. Has this something to do with the Akhmimic Second Perfect (ΜΑΨ-)?
Cleft Sentence (nom. *vedette*) following *etbeoy* (*Wess.* 9 105a-b). Note that while the Nom. Sentence is convertible *postfocally* (§§2.5.1, 2.6.3.1.1), the Cleft Sentence with (pro)nominal *vedette* is not.  

### 2.7.3.3.2 After ἔ- and ε-ε-, the opposition of Basic vs. Second Tense is sporadically neutralized; consider *III* 21.14, 34.16, 91.10f., 167.6ff., *Wess.* 9 117b 31ff., etc.  

### 2.8 Second-tense constructions: notes on prosody and syntagmatics

#### 2.8.1 Prosody. All we know of the prosodic characteristics of focalization patterns is that the juncture between theme/topic and focus is open (§6.0.2). One notes the placement of ἀν, different from and more interesting than in the Bipartite (§2.9); that is about all, in patterns for which the suprasegmentals are of crucial diacritic significance. There cannot be any doubt of the fundamentally different prosodic structure of topic-initial and focus-initial pattern groups, and of the existence of a gradation of differences between the individual patterns. Consider the following instructive cases, indicative of the intricate network of prosodic states superimposed on the segmental skeletal pattern. We note that the focalization pattern usually consists of more than one colon (§6.0.3); also, the instances of strikingly extensive interposition between the theme-topic and focus components: (*III* 72.21) ἐρεως πανίδιον οὐ / ἔκρισιν / *Wess.* 9 174d 29ff.) ἡμεροπανίδιον ἔρισι χαί / ἐρεως ον / (*IV* 183.7) ἐμελείας ἐρεως / ἔκρισιν / a single colon / (*IV* 16.18f.) ἐφανομένης νεφέλης / ἐν τοῖς / ἐφανομένης νεφέλης / *III* 209.13ff., codd. A, C) ἐρωτοκόρον / ἐρωτοκόρον ἔρισι / ἐν τοῖς / ἐρωτοκόρον ἔρισι / (*Ⅲ* 102.12f., 19f.) ἐφανομένης νεφέλης / ἐν τοῖς / μεταφρασμένης ἀληθείας / *Bλορ* 3581 Α 71, No. 202 ΡνΔ) ἐφανομένης νεφέλης / ἐν τοῖς / μεταφρασμένης ἀληθείας...  

#### 2.8.2 Nexus arrangement; location of the theme-topic | focus seam: focus isolation. The question of identifying the focus on the basis of our segmental data arises in the common predicament of a topic-initial pattern (2), where a non-interrogative focus is included in a group of modifiers of which any — or, conjointly, some — could be focal. The crux here is obviously the IC-analysis of the utterance into theme and rheme groups, with theoretical a well as practical implications: the organization of the utterance in a relatively simple hierarchic structure, with the first section the verbal theme-topic, and the second the rheme-focus. Here again we are faced with the decisions of verbal valency — the distinction between rectional (componential) and complementational modification. This, however, supplies us with a post-analytic model rather than a heuristic tool. I would like to point out here, in bold simplification, some facts regarding the arrangement of the pattern and placement of the focus. Generally
speaking, two main groups are to be distinguished, with final and non-final focus. In cases of an inherent-focality (interrogative) focus, the placement (established by complex considerations) is immaterial, non-pertinent. For the non-interrogative focus, however, the precise placement has an essential functional value. The following illustration is representative of the main types; see §2.8.1 for the separation of theme and focus and §2.8.4 for the discontinuous theme.

(a) Final focus, the "ideal" arrangement (§2.0.2.4). The focus is interrogative or non-interrogative. Adverbial modifications — rectional and complementational — follow the verb: (A 2 54) ἢ ΝΤΑΜΕΙ ἄν ἙΒΟΑ 2ΜΗ ΝΤΕΝΜΝΤΚΟΜΙΚΟΝ ΕΤΒΕΤΜΡ-ΝΟΒΕ / (A 2 540) ΕΥΨΟΒΕ ΤΕΝΟΥ ΕΡΟΗ ΣΝΟΥ / (A 2 336) ΕΣΝΑΖΕ ΕΡΟΗ ΤΙΝ / (A 2 71) ΕΙΜΗΡ ΝΜΜΑΚ ΣΝΟΥ / (Ryl. 67 ye) ΕΥΝΑΨΗΝΕ ΝΑΚ ΜΜΕΡΙΤ ΝΟΥΗΡ / (Ch. 54.19ff.) ΤΟΥΡΗΝΤΕ ΕΨΟΟΝ 2ΜΠΟΜΗΑ ΕΤΒΕΕΜΟΟΕ / (Ibid. 183.57ff.) ΕΝΝΑΠΑΡΑΔΙΑΟΥ ΜΜΟΝ ΑΝΟΝ' ΤΕΝΟΥ ΕΣΡΑΙ ΕΠΙΚΩΣΤ ΝΤΕΝΣΕΝΝΟΒΕ / (III 154.11) ΕΥΝΑΨΗΤΕ ΕΒΟΑ 2ΜΠΕΛΑΑΟΣ ΝΟΥΗΡ / (A 2 100-1) ΕΥΨΕ-ΝΤΑΝΑΠ ΣΙΚ ΕΣΡΑΙ ΕΨΗΝ ΝΟΥΗΝΕ ΜΜΕΤΟ ΕΒΟΑ ΝΜΡΙΣΜΕ ΕΜΠΡΕΠΕΡΑΒΑ ΝΜΕΙΑΝΑΥ ΧΕ ΕΡΕΝΕΙΡΨΗΜΕ ΝΑΡ-ΒΟΑ ΕΨΗΝΕ ΤΗΡΗ... Some more striking exx.: III 100.16ff., 107.11ff., 122.24ff., Ch. 23.15ff., Wess. 9 86a 16ff.

(b) Non-final focus. (1) Focus interrogative, adjuncts final: (A 2 464) (ΕΥΨΕ ΕΠΙΡΨΗΜΕ ΝΟΥΗΡ ΕΥΑΗΑ ΝΣΑΣ ΝΝΟΡ / (A 2 69) ΕΡΕΜΟΚΖ ΝΟΥ ΝΜΜΑΚ / (III 98.3ff.) ΕΥΝΑΗ' ΖΑΠ ΕΝΙΜ ΕΤΒΕΝΝΤΟΥ / (Wess. 9 128a 29ff.) ΝΤΑΣΜΕΕΥΕ ΔΕ ΤΙΝ ΕΨΗΝΕΕΒΑΙΑ / (IV 35.16ff.) ΕΥΝΑΝΩΓΝΕΙΣ ΝΟΥΗΡ ΝΝΕΚΡΝΜΗΝ 2ΝΟΥΚΛΜΗΝ ΜΝΟΥΨΙΤΜΙ / (III 98.14) Η ΕΥΝΑΗ' ΖΑΠ ΝΝΟΥ ΕΝΕΤΜΟΥ 2ΡΑΙ 2ΝΝΕΙΒΟΤΕ / (Π 1304 105 ΚΕΚ) ΝΤΑΡΡΗ ΜΝΠΟΟ 2Μ 2ΝΝΟΥ ΕΝΕΖ ΝΟΥΕΝΕΙΣ ΕΣΡΑΓ. Consider also III 223.19, IV 154.20ff., 189.7ff.

(2) Focus interrogative, back extraposition final143, 144, adjuncts following the focus: (A 2 396) ΕΥΝΑΤΒΒΟ ΤΗΡΨ ΝΟΥΗΡ ΕΒΟΑ 2ΝΝΟΒΕ ΝΙΜ ΝΓΙ-ΠΕΤΟΥΒΑΝΤΙΖΕ ΜΜΟΥ / (III 170.19ff.) ΕΥΝΑΡ-ΚΑΚΕ ΝΟΥΗΡ ΝΓΙΖΕΝΨΗΜΕ ΝΑΤΣΟΤΜ / (Ibid. 169.23ff.) ΕΥΝΑΨΠΤ ΝΟΥΗΡ' ΝΓΙΖΕΝΨΗΜΕ ΕΥΡ-ΖΟΤΕ 2ΗΝΤ ΜΝΟΥΤΕ / (A 2 114) ΕΨΟΟΝ ΤΙΝ ΤΕΝΙ ΕΤΜΜΑΥ.

(c) Focus non-interrogative, back extraposition final/non-final (regulated by its extent, i.e. rhythmic factors144): (III 116.6ff.) ΝΤΑΣΗ ΜΝΟΟΥ ΝΑΚ ΝΓΙΡ ΠΕΣΚ ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΑΥΨ ΝΟΥΗΡ ΜΝΟΥΤΕ / (III 117.28ff.) ΝΤΑΣΜΕΥ ΝΓΙΝΝΟΕΙΚ ΧΕ- / (Ibid. 120.9) ΕΨΗΝ ΔΕ ΝΝΑΙ ΝΓΙΝΕΤΜΜΑΥ ΕΥΤΑΜΟ ΜΜΟΝ ΧΕ-.

2.8.3 The second tense as a "that"-form. Above (§2.0.0.1) the point was made that nothing in the synchronic set of relations of the Second Tense points unambiguously to its substantival nature. Let us reconsider this issue, reviewing several constructions that may be taken as hinting at substantival syntactic roles, probably integrated in a previous system but at any rate not perceptively so in the synchronic one. I have in mind

(a) The Second Tense (or at least an ε-form) in patt. (2)-(3) focalization constructions as object-expansion of εϊνε in a negativated conjugation form: (A 2 118) ΝΙΧΝΑΓΗ-ΕΝΑΗΗ-ΝΕΒΒΑΛ ΑΝ ΕΣΡΑΙ ΕΝΝΟΥΤΕ ΝΑΥ ΝΕΣ / (A 2 520) ΜΝΟΕ ΕΤΨΑΗΓΗ-ΕΝΨΑΡ -ΟΥ ΑΝ (AN probably negatives the rel. future — "it is hardly possible that he will not find what to do..."; I have however not collated the text); also III 13.9 (= A 2 221), Ch. 33.14ff., 73.19ff. etc.145. Compare an instance of ΕΜΨ-coordinated to a noun in object status: (K 9316) ΜΙΝΝΑΤΡΕΨΝΥΝ-ΝΙΟΟΥΝ ΤΗΡΨ ΑΥΨ ΕΜΝΚΕΝΟΥΤΕ ΝΚΑ ΤΕ.

(b) An instance of a Second Present, non- or auto-focal, patt. (1), predicated by πε: (A 1 113 coll.) ΝΤΕΨΝΥΝ ΑΝ ΧΕ-ΕΡΕΝΚΟΤΚ ΠΕ "You do not know that it means that you are asleep".147.

143 See §6.0.1. ΝΓΙ- apparently tends to the final position when it introduces a prosodically more weighty noun syntagm.
144 Cf. (for rhythmic considerations) §3.1.3.3.2.
145 Shisha-Healey 1976b:363 n. 33, with reff. (to the Shenoutean instances add those quoted here). Note that this may well be a case of a (non-nominal) interrogative clause in direct-object status. Consider Is. 1:3 (Ciasca: quoted by Shenoute, in Wess. 9 153c 2ff. parall. 178a 25ff.) ΠΑΚΑΑΑΝ ΝΤΜΕΨ-ΑΝ-ΝΙΜ, Man. Psalm-Book 156.9 ΝΠΟΥΕΝ-ΕΥ ΠΕ ΝΝΟΥΤΕ.
(c) The "conjunctional" use in Sahidic of the Sec. Perfect in the unfulfilled protasis after ēnē- (e.g. Ch. 29.56ff.). Compare the Sec. Tense after (wac) uōxē- §2.1.4-5. I believe these unpredictable, isolated or fixed cases are inconclusive, and cannot be the basis for a synchronic "that"-form interpretation of the Second Tense (see nn. 146-7).

2.8.4 The complex theme/topic is made up of two or more (often discontinuous) coordinated or disjoined components, individually or conjointly marked for thematicity, in varying grades of mutual cohesion. In ascending order of union and subcategorization:

(a) 'Sec.-Tense conjugation form + AYH/H + Sec.-Tense conjugation form' : (A 2 45) NAY NGE EHYR-AY... H EYNOYRAN EYMTAIHY NAH-2HY MMOV / (A 2 372) NAY NGE EYNA- H EYNA- / (III 73.8ff.) EYEHNY-POOYUH MMOV MMOV NTEIE AYH EYLYOIE MMOV XE- / (Ch. 119.45ff.) EREPEY2HTY YOONHY NOOH1 AYH EYTAHY sim. ibid. 128.20ff.; also III 119.2f., 134.16ff., IV 63.24ff., 107.1f., Layd. 410, etc.

(b) 'Sec.-Tense Conjugation form (: AYH/H) + "epithematic" circumstantial conjugation form' (rare): (Ming. 288) NTAYCHMT-MPHYH NAY NGE AYH EAYR-GITYYE MMNOY THYPOU / (III 120.7f.) MHN TAYBH EYPAL ETYEE... EYAYE YOENHT YNAYENTH (contrast with III 140.17 MH NTAYBH... AYAYE).

(c1) 'Sec. Perfect/Aorist + AYH/H + Basic Perfect/Aorist' : (III 218.1) YGC EYXH-NTAYHY THYR KIM... H AYHSMOC / (ibid. 219.3f.) NTAYCHXXE GYAN EPOI AYHME EROH TENOH 2NTAYHMOE TAI / (A I 108) MH EYAPENAOY AN H YARGC2OY. Also III 28.25ff., 140.17, IV 157.22ff.

(c2) 'Sec. Future/Aorist + AYH/H + conjunctive': (IV 76.2f.) NAY NGE EREPHWNE NCHASE NATAYPO 2NTAY2NYYOMOHY AYH NCEXYK EBOA NNOY BM EYANOY / (III 40.11f.) EYAYCERITH NTAYO NHNOY AYH NYPAE YXHN; also IV 94.3 ff. Chiastically, in (Ch. 85.26ff.) EREPHXOC... NYAMOY EROH NOOH1 AYH NY1+EEOY NAY cf. 89.18ff.). In (IV 14.4f.) EYNAY-2AH DE NTAY... EBOA GITMTHAI (AYH) NCEKHPE NOYON BM EBOA GITOOTC the focus is repeated and the conjunctive not markedly thematic.

2.9 Negation patterns: negated focalization patterns, negated nexus, negated adjuncts and pattern components

2.9.0.1 The gist of Polotsky’s discussion of the negation of Second-Tense constructions is the distinction between the negation of the theme-focus nexus ("main" or "primary" nexus, in Polotsky’s current terminology) and the componental negativizing of the theme (constituting in itself a "sub" or "secondary" nexus). I would comment: (a) This distinction is tailored and indeed appropriate for the topic-initial construction, Bipartite-like focalization pattern (2). We have yet to specify the negation syntagmatics for the autofocal and focus-initial patterns. Polotsky treats the negation of these, esp. of pattern (4), briefly in the "Coptic Conjugation System" (1960a:§32), stating that (h)- AN is used, while the Second-Tense topic remains affirmative. One observes, however, that a negative topic is quite usual in focus-initial patterns. We must remember that these patterns replace in our corpus the theme/topic-

\[\text{140} \quad \text{Cf. (for relative conversion) Shisha-Halevy 1972:§2.1.3.1, 1976a:51.}\]

\[\text{141} \quad \text{Cf. Shisha-Halevy 1972:137.}\]

\[\text{142} \quad \text{Note the significant absence of this high-cohesion grade in the Bipartite conjugation.}\]

\[\text{143} \quad \text{Mainly 1944:87ff. (= CP 191ff., 1960a:§31ff.; Kickasola 1975, esp. 103-137. The distinction of nexeal vs. special negation is of course Jespersen’s, in the fifth chapter of his classic "Negation in English and Other Languages" (1917; 1962:42ff.).}\]
initial patterns for negated themes, which as a matter of fact do not occur here. This renders the opposition of nexeal vs. thematic negation meaningless: it does not obtain within the "classic" theme/topic initial construction. (Consider A 2 19 ΝΤΑΥΜΟΟΥΤ ΑΝ ΜΠΕΚΕΤΟΤΑ ΕΤΕΒΟΥ for the classical 'ΕΤΗΜ- ΝΟΥ'—.) (b) It is legitimate to ask whether the two cases of nexeal and thematic negation are not just two particular cases in a series of possible incidence of the negator, of different localizations of which one is nexeal, another thematic. Two other particular localizations to be examined in the present context are the negating of an adjunct (modifier) \(\text{158}\) and of the focus, both with an affirmative nexus. As a general rule one may say that for theme/topic-initial pattern (2) the nexeal negation is located between the theme and the focus; otherwise (as a rule, with rare, prosodically motivated deviations) the ΑΝ-negation follows the segment it relates to \(\text{153}\). (c) We should try to relate the affirmative form of each pattern to its negative one (whether or not the latter is regarded as a transform), and the placement of the negator to its incidence and functional role, in contributive relation to the focality of the pattern \(\text{154}\). Below, I shall enumerate and selectively illustrate the negation patterns corresponding to focalization patterns (1) to (6) \(\text{155}\).

### 2.9.1 Theme/topic-initial patterns

**2.9.1.1 Pattern (1): The autofocal second tense. Present with focal modifier:** (A 2 462) ΤΜΗΣΣΕΡΟ ΝΗΜΠΤΗΕ ΕΞΗΜΠΕΙΝΑ ΑΝ Η ΠΑΙ / (ibid. 340) ΕΡΕΝΟΒΕ ΧΝΗΝΑΞΕ ΑΝ ΑΛΛΑ ΧΝΗΝΕΣΗΣ; rhetorical question: (Miss. 279) Η ΕΨΑΥΝΕΕΣΤΕ ΑΝ ΕΠΕΝΤΑΜΟΥ / (A 1 108) \(\text{156}\) ΜΗ ΕΨΑΥΡΕΠΑΓΟΥ ΑΝ Η ΨΑΡΟΥΟΚΩΤΟΡ ΠΟΓΕ ΠΟΓΕ; modal: ΕΝΗΚΑ-: (A 2 505-6) ΕΝΝΑΒΑΙΒΑΝ ΑΝ ΝΕΝΑΤΕΤΟΜ... "Let us not distress" (also IV 61.27f., jussive; 154.14, hortative).

**Negator:** ΑΝ. **Placement:** after the pattern or single expansion of the verb.

**2.9.1.2 Pattern (2): # theme/topic → modifier #**

**2.9.1.2.1 Nexeal negation.** (Ryl. Cat. 32, No. 68 ΣΕΒ) ΝΕΥΣΟΒΕ ΑΝ ΕΞΕΝΥΒΗΡΕ ΥΝΗΜ / (A 1 183) ΜΗ ΝΕΝΑΥΝΑ ΑΝ ΝΗΝΓΡΑΓΝΟ ΝΟΥΘΤ / (A 2 403) ΝΕΧΝΑΥΞΕ ΒΑΡ ΑΝ ΝΑΡΟΥ ΝΑΛΑΗΑ ΑΛΛΑ ΕΥΝΑΞΕ-ΝΕΝΑΤΑΚΟΤ- ΜΕΝ / (III 131.10) ΝΗΝΙΚΟΤΗ ΑΝ ΝΟΥΟ ΕΠΑΙ ΝΤΑΧΟΟΚ... (also IV 51.16, Wess. 9 140b 3ff.) / (III 21.9f., ΝΤΑΙΟΥΨΕΕ ΓΑΡ ΑΝ ΝΒΡΠΕ / (ibid. 17.1ff.) ΝΤΑΧΧΟΟΚ ΑΝ ΧΕ-... ΑΛΛΑ ΝΤΑΧΧΟΟΚ ΧΕ-... (sim. IV 111.20ff.) 46.28ff. etc.). Note also cases with the focusing modifier ΜΜΑΤΕ co-marking the focus: (A 2 52) ΝΤΑΥ- ΠΑΘ-ΕΙΝΑΥΞΕ ΑΝ ΜΜΑΤΕ ΕΤΕΒΕ- / (III 50.4ff.) ΝΤΑΝΝΟΥΤΕ ΥΛΑΡ ΕΡΟΥ ΑΝ ΝΟΥΠΑΗΓ ΝΧΝΟΥΧ ΝΒΡΠΕ ΜΜΑΤΕ

---


\(\text{153}\) Cf. PRÄTORIUS 1881:757f.

\(\text{154}\) See SELER 1952:79ff., 85f. He points out the tendency of the negator to be attached to the predicate, which is in a tug-of-war for the negation with the verb (see also MOORHOUSE 1959:4f.; JESPERSEN 1962:56ff.). In our case of focalization patterns, this tension is between the nexeal and special (local) negation. The negation (acc. to Seiler) co- or over-characterizes the focus, contributing (macro) syntactically to its focality. The negation delimits two statements, evoking the contrary one; cf. (p. 80) "Die Negation führt eine Affirmation nicht bloß zum Nullpunkt, sondern darüber hinaus in die entgegengesetzte oder gegenüberliegende Position... Die Negation konstituiert nicht bloß... das Nichtvorhandensein des Sachverhaltes A, sondern sie weist zugleich ausdrücklich auf dieser Sachverhalt A hin". On the affinity of negation and "emphasis", see also MOORHOUSE 1959:73ff. The affirmative focalized nexus (cf. "he did go", "you are stupid") is expressed in Coptic by means of the autofocal Second Tense.

\(\text{155}\) I cannot unfortunately report arriving at any definite statement regarding the distribution of ΑΝ vs. Ν- ΑΝ (cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 1976b:363f.). Pattern-specific information will be given below.

\(\text{156}\) The case of ΜΗ - ΑΝ is perhaps special (see PRÄTORIUS 1881:757f., SHISHA-HALEVY 1976a:43).
NEGATOR: — an (all conj. forms), n — an (Bip., aor.), nn — an (Bip.). Theme: affirmative. Placement: (a) an follows the theme/topic or its closest (usually rectional) expansion; (b) (with a nominal actor in the Tripartite Pattern) optionally before the actor expression.

2.9.1.2.2.1 Focal negation (a). (A 2 312) ευβακανιζει μμοου επικινδυνη αν αλλα ερενητους τηποι γυαι νηθην κοουν ξε-ετβεου η ελκου νωμ / (III 35.20) ηαι δε ειξου μμοου ειταιο αν μμοι μαυ-ατ / (Ch. 9.19.11ff.) μαρεκεσιμ ηποποις εις τηποιτες ειξου μμοι ειτβντη ηαν (circ. of Sec. Present? other instances: IV 64.1ff., 65.11ff.) / (A 2 87) ενταναντησε ηεγαι ερος (i.e. the mud) σαντη μηνειξρ πασομεναις τας πανευμερος τηανουσαις απο μαλαντοιμες εβκοει ετβνειεις αλλα ευλαλις νηθην / (III 131.14ff.) ντακτ-παι ενεπρομε πηνουτε ενουμκας αλλα εματε / (IV 56.23ff.) ενταμειετε σερκλφειει ανα... ετβ-εκτιετμερκε μματε αν.

NEGATOR: — an. Theme: affirmative. Nexus: affirmative. Placement: immediately following the focus (or, if this is complex, after its first colon). Observe that an in all probability co-marks the focus as such. This is the functional value of the adfocal placement. The opposition nexal vs. focal negation, existing only for this focalization pattern, is not easily reflected in English translation (cf. the subtle distinction, expressible in terms of Immediate Constituents, between “I am not feeling that well” and “I am feeling not that well” — a difference even more difficult to reproduce for the high-focality focalization pattern). Nevertheless, the distinction is unmistakably there in Coptic syntagmatics. Both the affirmative nexus and the enhanced negative focus must play their part on the plan du contenu.

2.9.1.2.2.2 Focal negation (b). Second focus negated or: (affirmative + negative) modifier focalized: (IV 24.6ff.) ειςουν ρμπειαμε μματε αλιο εμεπειτ αν (A 1 380) ευσους μμοου νδαλ-αμοιονιον, μπησετε αν / (Ch. 91.11ff.) ηαι ηνεκεν ητας ειςου πποου ετβντην αμ μεβηστον αν. Also III 29.7ff., 34.11ff., RE II 16α 33ff., etc.

2.9.1.2.3 Modifier negation. (a) Expanding a Basic Tense (affirmative or negated): (A 2 464) η εις παμη ηνποις ειτειαρει ετβντητ ηαι αλλα ετβντην / (A 1 151) (αυγα) αυγα ερος αν ιετησε επαραις ηαι ειςους μποους μπηναςεις ιετησας / (III 200-1) μπουερεις εβερα μμποοους αν νησωβ μπεγιας... ηαι εβερα μμποοους μπησσετε μπιαςωτε / (IV 116.12ff.) ενον εηπης ηθοις ηνθη ετβντον ετβεικε-μποον-γκαλα αην ηαι καιτανετον κα-ακπικιον ("not because") / (III 18.18ff.) μμον ημηνυρ-νπτερε μπραν μπηοειεικ μπηπεξης... ηπενευοντε ειν ηνεπταιερε... ηαι ηε-ηνέλεικας ηηταναγη ("...not in order that... but in order that... "). Also III 20.2ff., Ch. 85.8ff., III 116.16ff. (αιςοος... νεβολ αν ηε- 100), etc.

157 Kickasola 1975:173; the example Rom. 14:6, quoted by Polotsky 1944:89 (= CP 193) for the neg. durative theme, is still unique, to the best of my knowledge.

158 Cf. Kickasola 1975:103ff., 289ff.; he obviously does not consider this an essential distinction.

159 Kickasola 1975:219ff., 294ff. Note here (a) instances where Shenoutean αin corresponds to non-Akhmimicized Sahidic άν: III 16.7, IV 213.9 (not IV 116.13, as I erroneously suggested in 1976b:356); (b) a striking case of componential negation of a bound morpheme, non-adjunctive (P 1304 110 vo) πεξατ, πεξατ αin, cf. (1304 97 to) πεξα-θνούτε, πυμε αin.

160 Occasionally, εβερα αι ηε- seems to be in an ancologitic, loosely connected or janus-faced construction: III 19.4ff., 66.2, 185-6; cf. ετβεου, μη εβολ αι ηε- (Ch. 69.27ff., 73.8ff.) and μη ετβε- αin (Wess. 9 105α 2ff.).
(b) Expanding a converted or inconvertible tense or extraconjugational (non-tense) verb form; all are unmarked for thematicity: (A 2 119) NEYSWYH NTAIÆYOY EBOA NTHYOY NOYCSOP AN H CAYAJ ALLAA N2AL NCONP  / (III 185.24ff.) TAIE TE 2E NTÂIÆSYWYH 2SNEWYH THERS ETHMAY MMAYE AN MMNEZOOY... ALLAA N2AL NCONP AJEPE... 2NSWYH  / (A 2 400) NEYSWYH PAI EHTACWYNSN NTHAMAGAIC 2MTTPE-ÆYSH AN NKESEMYA ALLAA ETEPE-ÆOYY MMAY 2MMAY MMAY / (III 19.16ff.) NTAC ON PENTÅIÆSYWYN MNNEZOOY SÎH XE-NEKÆSJW 2H MMAYE MMAYE KALLAJZ ALLAA KEALAY MANAY “It is also He who commanded... not only that... but also...” / (III 169.12ff.) MNNEZOOY-ÆSYY AN MMAYE AN XE-NEKÆSJW 2IICE ETBÉNKOECIC ALLAA MMAYE MMAYE EBOA ZMPHÂE. NB. The simultaneous double placement (the “foreshadowed enclitic”, §6.0.3.3): (A 2 472) (TAIÆSYW) TAIE NTÂIÆYOYJAIL XOOS AN ETHEEYNSN AN ALLAA ETHEEYNSN XE-. Additional exx.: MUN. 96, III 111-2, 173. 11ff. (YAMAYOY- AN), 184.16ff. (NEE... AN), IV 47.8ff. (ZMPHÂE- ETHEE- MMAY AN) 57.17ff. (ENNEAN- ETHEE- AN OYDS ETHEE- AN). CH. 177.13ff. (NEE- ETHEE- MMAYE AN ALLAA ETHEE-) etc.

Negator: (N?)- AN. Placement: following the modifier; rarely preceding it (intercolary, §6.0.3), or double.

(c) modifier + ÅYSH + neg. modifier expanding a verb form (affirm. or negativated): (P 130P 33 AF) ÅYSH-NOBOE EPOY ENPOYYE AN / (III 212.3ff.) CHÄMAYE MMOOY ETHEE+ ENPOYYE EOH AN / (IBID. 116.23ff.) ÅYSH EYOYYE EYOYYE... ÅYSH N2OYYE AN EYOYOEIN / (MUN. 98, parall. III 169.14ff.) ÅYSH NCEYMW-2NOY EYSHNM KATPOYUHYI MMAYE ÅYSH NKATPOYUHYI MMAYE MMAYE NOYSA MNOOY / (A 172) ENTAEP-NOBOE ENPOYYE EPO AN, NEPACONIC EYSHIC / (CH. 153.36ff.) NECYYOYJ... 2MMCEMAY ÅYSH 2MM2HT AN / (III 168.26) NANOY-2HY NOYCBW NOYSAJ AN. Additional exx.: III 108.4ff., IV 100.17ff., 153.24ff. etc.

Negator: (N)- AN. Placement: following the second modifier or (N- AN) enclosing it. I consider the modifier in these cases (a-c) to be on the borderline of adjunct and focus, probably a gradient (non dichotomic) distinction: the two relationships are not mutually exclusive (§2.7.1.4.1). Here again, the negator seems to contribute towards enhancing — and co-marking — the focality of the modifier(s); consider the not uncommon case of ‘EHÜMM-’ + neg. modifier, where we are at a loss to decide between the circumstantial and (circ. -) Second Present, e.g. IV 64.7ff., 65.11ff.

2.9.1.3 Pattern (3): Non-modifier focalization (object only, §2.3.1). (Ch. 96.9ff.) NTAYE- OUYWSJE AN N2OYY / (WESS. 9 171c 7) EIXI-GOO AN / (IV 94.3) EYAYYYSH-ÊONE AN / (A 2 509) EKOYYMB- NOBOE ÅYSH OYJPE AN.

Negator: AN. Placement: following the object. Theme: affirmative. No opposition between focal and negation.

2.9.2 Focus-initial patterns

2.9.2.1 Pattern (4): # focus → Second Perfect #: (A 1 81) MH ETBENANOBE AN NTAHMAGATYOY MNOO / (WESS. 9 144c 24ff.) ETBENEBOBO AN MAAYAY NTÂAYOOC XE- / (A 1 113) ETBENNEBOOY AN MAAYAY... NTAPAI YWYNE.

Negator: - AN. Placement: immediately after the focus (focus: ETBÉ- only?). No opposition between nasal and focal negation. Topic: affirmative 181.

181 See §2.5.1-2 for the negative topics, which seem to exclude a negated nexus or negative focus.
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2.9.2.2 Pattern (5): # focus \(\rightarrow\) circumstantial \#. (Wess. 9 106a 7ff. parall. P 130\textsuperscript{2} 71 \textsc{pne}, see §2.9.2.4) \(\text{MH ETVEMTNCMT} \text{HN} \text{EANAI XWIK EBOA N2WB NIM ENANOUY} \text{HN ETVEMTNCSTM} \text{AN NTOC EAI}-\text{NEIKOOYE XWIK EBOA MPEIMHNYE MnET2OY} \) \(/ \) \(\text{A I 219} \) \(\text{MH ETVENZBHUE RW AN ETNLPASCE MNOOY 2MPENHT MMIN MMON AYSH TEnvNTEPEKKA-2THN EROV MAAAND EAYXOOC NGEINPOFRHTC ETOUAAV... XE}^{\text{-}}.\)

\textit{Note} (A I 89) \(\text{ZITNOY NECNHU EAZA}^{\text{P-RYMMO EPWTH} \text{MN} \text{ZITNNNOMOC AN}.} \)

\textbf{Negator:} - AN. \textbf{Placement:} imm. following the focus (\textit{ETBE-} only?). \textbf{Topic:} affirmative \textsuperscript{161}. No opposition between naxal and focal negation.

2.9.2.3 Pattern (6): # focus \(\rightarrow\) e-conj. form (Sec. tense + circumstantial) \textsuperscript{162}. \(\text{(A I 2 519) ETVHHT AN EKAXAYNCPACE NAI OYAE ETVHHTK AN EINAI-PME NAK EP-2WB NIM/ (Ch. 38.35ff.) ERWANTBAOW AUKAK EBOA AN... ERPEIMOCI TPER/ (A I 114) MH ZWSAHT AN ERPEAI TAMO MNO/ (Wess. 9 158a 30ff.) EYMOTCE MNWTH AN EYXW MHTN NNAI MZENKOODE EKSAWYOH.} \)

\textbf{Negators:} - AN, MM- AN (rare). \textbf{Placement:} following or enclosing the focus. \textbf{Topic:} affirmative \textsuperscript{161}. No opposition between naxal and focal negation.

2.9.2.4 # focus \(\rightarrow\) Basic Tense # (§2.6.2): \(\text{(III 16.3ff.) MH ZITMPAYAI AN MPEUYWSNT NPEPOFRHT} \text{XAIOSOC XE-.../ (P 130\textsuperscript{2} 71 \textsc{pne}) MH ETVEMTNCMT (sic) AN ANAI XWIK EBOA N2WB NIM ENANOUY H ETVEMTNCSTM AN NTOC ANEIKOOYE XWIK EBOA MPEIMHNYE MnET2OY (parall. to Wess. 9 106a 7ff., see §2.9.2.2) } \(/ \) \(\text{A I 124} \) \(\text{H ETVENPESOYOY AN MZENH-TW} \text{AN} \text{APKA2 OYSH NRPH AUKAK MnETMAMAY/ (ibid. 125) ETVENZOMT AN H MAAB NRAT ANPETMAY PAPADIAOU MPEYTTAHCONTV } \) \(/ \) \(\text{A I 80} \) \(\text{MH ZITMPENZYOONOGN8E6 AN NTOC... AI} \text{XW MPEYWSXAE } \) \(/ \) \(\text{A I 88} \) \(\text{EPXINIXH AN AKXOOC... (sim. 354, 366). For more exx., see §2.6.2.} \)

2.9.2.5 Predicative modifier negated: # modifier - 0 # (§1.2.1.3.3). \(\text{(A I 158) ENE-ETBENZ2WB AN NEOUWSGOM ETVPZENKOODYE TAMOOGOY MNY/ (III 146.20ff.) NAIN PAXOEIC ZMPEKGGWNT AN... OYTE ETVHHT AN (cf. Jer. 10:24).} \)

2.10 Concluding note on the functional essence of the second tense

In view of the data here presented, one can hardly consider the Second Tense an \"unsatisfied sign\" (Dressler 1973:70) or a form \"of incomplete predication\" (Curme) in need of predicative complementation, but rather an index characterizing (a) a verb form as \textsc{theme} (in the micro-syntactic extent) or \textsc{theme-topic} (in the macro-syntactic extent), (b) a verb lexeme or modifier as \textsc{focus}. The distinction between (a) and (b) is resolved or signalled by the informational structure of the context: the identification of the focus, and therewith the determination of the function of the Second Tense itself, is effected by the isolation or non-isolation of a \textsc{topic} in the extended environment of the converted conjugation form. I see the Second Tense, in association with other phenomena (word order, negation incidence, focusing modifiers and particles, suprasegmentals) as more of a focalizing than topicalizing agent. The functional category of which the Second Tense is but one of the exponents is the \textit{characterization of a predicative syntagm for Functional (or Informational) Sentence Perspective and Communicative Dynamism} (i.e., thematic and generally cutextual boundness). This way of phrasing the functional essence of the form may appear banal: yet I believe it is preferable, highlighting the all-important macrosyntactic role of this conversion.

\textsuperscript{161} Cf. Kickasola 1975:134ff. \("\text{Affirmative Second Tense Containing Negative Patterns}\", \"\text{Affirmative Nexus with a Negated AdvP in Frontal Extraposition}\"). This is rather a Second Tense + circumstantial syncretism (§2.6). The use here of \"\text{extraposition}\" is unfortunate: the predicative modifier is not \textit{extra-}, but \textit{pre}-posed (see also Kickasola's p. 292ff., where he refers to this \"adverb\" as a \"predicative adjunct\").
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DEFINITIONS: OBJECT, VALENCY, DIATHESIS. The object is an expansion of the conjugated or extraconjugal verb lexeme, consisting of a pronoun (personal, indefinite, interrogative, demonstrative) or determinator expanded by a noun lexeme. This object is either (a) preceded or (b) not preceded by a marker relating it to its verbal nucleus. Obviously, this definition as it stands would subsume under (a) all prepositional-phrase expansions. To narrow down and delimit that range of adverbial modification which is functionally a case apart and formally predictable — i.e. regulated — there is, I believe, no other way but that of applying the structural distinction between rectional (grammatically motivated, uncom-mutable — hence non-pertinent but a co-constituent of the verb) and complementational (optional, grammatically unmotivated, commutable — hence pertinent) modification (§1.1.2.1). The traditional approximative, universalistic (yet inherently ethnoncentric) conception of “direct” vs. “indirect” objects, of “transitive” vs. “intransitive” verbs, must not be uncritically imported into Coptic grammatical description (and then be post-hoc justified), but must be examined with a view to giving it structural meaning.

3.0.1.1 Trying to accommodate the conventional concept of (in)transitivity to the Coptic data, one can approach the problem at a semasiological angle 1, a transformative-paradigmatic angle (with an incidental morphologic aspect) 2, a syntagmatic ("constructional") angle (again involving the morphosyntactic regulation of construct and pre-pronominal verb-lexeme allomorphs) or — and this is the usual practice — with a definition based on an unequal and individualistic admixture of all three 3. The first approach, grouping some verb lexemes as transitive by semasiological criteria, would furnish a list partly coextensive with those lexemes selected by the other criteria, but this approach may be dismissed as essentially ungrammatical, also as largely subjective, arbitrary and uncontrollable. The transformational approach would refer the transitive active in a relatively simple way to a passive transformation. This assumes the existence in Coptic of a passive diathesis such as we know in Indo-European and Semitic, or at least the existence of a regular, cut-and-predicate relationship: the transformation ‘actor + verb lexeme + direct object’ → ‘patiens + stative + (instrumental) actor’ 4 being symptomatic of transitives.

1 CHERIX 1979:12f. SAUVAGEOT 1950:158f.; SCHMIDT 1973:118f. calls this an “unsyntactic” differentiation. It is the basis of the generativist “subcategorization” and the structuralist distinctive feature in semasiological and morphologic functional analysis.


3 Chérif's exposition (1979:7f.) is a typical one, that (untypically) gives some attention to the matter of definition. Chérif defines as transitive a verb that fulfills one of three conditions: (1) a verb that “has” (i.e. alternates in) construct and pro-pronominal forms of the lexeme, (2) that “has” (i.e. is transformable into) a qualitative, the (grammatical) subject of the state expressed by which is identical (i.e. correlative) with the actor of the infinitive, (3) the N/MMDM object construction is added by Chérif as distinctive, primarily to cater for Greek-origin verbs and such native ones as “have” no qualitative or morphophonemic-alteration mechanism (without taking into account the possibility that the value of N may differ here from that of N alternating with the construct or pro-pronominal forms; N/MMDM in pattern-oriented view does not enter into Chérif's definition). See also QUECKE 1981:260f., 1982:285f. and cf. SCHÜCHARDT, SPITZER 1928:289, 295f.

4 POLOTSKY 1960a:89, FUNK 1978a:120f. (an excellent concise overview of the problem), QUECKE 1981:261. The transformation ‘actor + verb lexeme (infinitive, non-dur.)’ → ‘actor + stative (dur.)’ is a possible criterion for intransitives (the opposition infinitive vs. stative is suppressed for intransitives in the Bipartite Pattern — i.e. it is maintained in the [rather limited] circumstances of transitives predicated in the Bipartite, with the functional opposition of durative action vs. stastive passive). This would mean that EIP, while syntagmatically transitive, is resolvable into two paradigmatically (transformationally) transitive and intransitive-ocular homonyms; for the latter, consider (A 1900) NEOF NOYOE S A H M K (Rev. 18. 199.17f.) EIP. NNEJ NED NEFNEF... (Ch. 54.10f.) NEEJO NOYOE S A H M K (Rev. 18. 199.17f.) EIP. NNEJ NED NEFNEF. There are still some problems here, esp. since the two lists, combinations and respective meanings have still to be established; witness such hairline oppositions as (A 1298) EIP. NNEJ NED NOYOE S A H M K (“is fearful of...”) vs. (ibid. 293) EIP. NNEJ NED NOYOE S A H M K (“fear...”). There are still some problems here, esp. since the two lists, combinations and respective meanings have still to be established; witness such hairline oppositions as (A 1298) EIP. NNEJ NED NOYOE S A H M K (“is fearful of...”) vs. (ibid. 293) EIP. NNEJ NED NOYOE S A H M K (“fear...”).
However, this test can hardly be accepted as adequate on its own, in view of (a) the considerable group of lexemes for which a stative is not attested (which, on the other hand, cannot be said to constitute a separate class in any sense but this morphological one); (b) the important group of bivalent or trivalent ("one/two-expansion") "intransitives", such as ἔΦΩ or μεθίζω, stative-less, which are for all structural-functional purposes not different from "true" (by extra-Coptic standards) transitives; (c) the case of verb syntags expanded by the prepositional phrase Ν-ΙΜΠΟ- (forming the subject matter of the present chapter); Ν- is, on the one hand, a direct-object marker after transitives under given conditions, yet on the other hand an "adverbial" i.e. modifier signal (§3.1.3.1), and is thus in fact an "inset" of the "indirect" object as section of transitives; (d) the absence in Coptic of a single, unambiguous, predictable passive corresponding symmetrically to the "active" "actor + v. lexeme + object". Moreover, this definition entails a subordinated, secondary treatment of the so-called "absolute", object-less transitive — which is unsatisfactory in a structural descriptive framework. Some of the foregoing objections will be touched on in the following pages. Cumulatively, they seem to rule out the transformational definition as greatly over-simplifying. The syntagmatic definition is hardly ever adopted independently, but usually appears as a not overly important component of a complex definition. Based on constructional data, including the compatibilities of the combinatory allomorphs of the verb lexemes, it is wanting in depth: it still lacks a categorial point of view, to account (inter alia) for the Ν-construction as a surrogate, alternant or variant direct-object expansion. On the whole, however, this approach can be said to be the vestibule to the one advocated here — namely, one of PATTERN and VALENCY STRUCTURE.

present (§3.1.2.1.1)?; (A / 37) (the blessed mountain) εὐοικοτοις in εὐφοικών "is allight or sheds light". On this issue, see CALLENDER 1970:248ff., 1973b:194 n. 2, 195, SHISHA-HALEVY 1976a:32. The recurring cases of infinitives of usually intransitive lexemes in durative environment (non-actual present? §3.1.2.1.1) weaken somewhat the distinctive value of the durative pattern for this purpose. Since it is conceivable that the burden of the functional opposition of actual vs. non-actual present falls on the formal opposition of stative vs. infinitive (intr.), we need yet an independent test for defining the intransitive.

Verb diathesis is a pattern-related phenomenon, determined by the verb-actant(s) structure, rather than one related to the verb alone. This (well put by H. SCHUCHARDT, see Brevier 214f.) is almost a truism, but its ramifications are all too seldom fully realized. Consider the dependence of a "passive" value of the infinitive in Coptic on the presence of a (nominal, often pronominal) object: (Ch. 52.15ff.) ζυγίον ηετερώπημεν οὐανοίν ο ἐξαρχή μας. (P 131* 44 πειραμάτω δε εὐθείαν μην "not to be judged" / (Or. 156.12ff.) (ζηταται ΕΝΑΚ ΕΝΕΚ-ΟΥΜΕΝ ΝΟΥΝΤΕ ΕΤΙΚ (i.e. into your well) "a stone to be thrown", SHISHA-HALEVY 1975:473. Compare the famous locus (Mt. 22:30, Bo:h.) (ΣΕΝΑΝΕΤΟΙ ΜΑΝΤΙΟΥ ΓΟΥΕΣ ΜΑΝΤΙΟΥ, corresponding to οὔ δε μανητιον οὔτε μανήτινιον. Passive diathesis is nowhere explicitly defined for Coptic. The stative of transitive verbs furnishes a morphologystat passive form, predicatable (and occurring) only in the durative conjunction pattern (which in turn may be combined with the Tripartite-Conjunction categories by means of the periphrastic-suppletive conjunction with the use of the auxiliary ςωφεν). A "Vorgangspassiv" does not exist in Coptic as a true category: in the construction 'ἐν-ου..... (ΕΒΟΑ) ζήνα-, opposed to 'ΜΕΝ-ΟΥ..... ΜΕΝ-', the burden of the opposition lies on (ΕΒΟΑ) ζήνα-, which does no more than instrumentally introduce the noun-lexical or pronoun-lexical content of an indefinite personal pronoun. Consider the following striking instances: (Wess. 9 119a 21ff.) οὐνπρονιον εὐξυχίας ΜΟΔΟ ζητένοιτο δε.... (IV 8.6) ΠΕΝΤΑΝΤΑΤΟΙ ΜΑΝΤΙΟΥ ΤΗΝ ΠΕΝΤΑΝΤΑΤΟΥΣ / (ibid. 41.16f.) ΣΕΝΑΜΠΥΡ ΡΗΓΗΝΟΤΟΥΣ ΜΗΝΟΤΟΥ / (ibid. 199.15f.) ΜΗΝΗΡ ΠΕΡΙ-ΡΗΓΗΝ ΜΗΝΟΤΟΥ ΜΗΝΟΤΟΥ / (K 9292) ΜΑ ΕΓΟΥΗΑΖΕ ΕΠΟΘΕ ΖΗΤΕΝΕΠΑΘ / (Wess. 9 143d 15f.) ΠΕΝΤΑΝΤΑΤΟΙΟΥ ΜΠΕΝΤΑΝΑΤΟΙΟΥ ΕΒΟΑ ΖΕΤΟΤΟΥ "who created them or by whom they were created", cf. also ΜΠΙΑ 170.27, IV 24.11, 66.21ff., Ch. 88.35ff., 106.47f. etc. However, since, on the one hand, (ΕΒΟΑ) ζήνα- ("through the agency of ") is freely usable as a complement modifier phrase, and, on the other hand, the "indefinite" 3rd person plural pronoun is a fully privileged actor-expression in its own right — with no agentive specification — it is theoretically difficult to establish in Coptic a clear-cut "syntactic" passive category; consider such cases as (IV 28.5f.) ΕΠΕΚΟΥΛ ΝΝΟΝΤΟΥ ΝΕΜΑΝΤΟΓΕΝΗ ΕΒΟΑ ΖΗΤΕΝΟΤΟΥ / (ibid. 31.12) ΝΠΕΡΙΠΟΥ-ΡΗΓΕ ΕΒΟΑ ΖΗΤΕΝΟΤΟΥ / (Ch. 76.36f.) ΨΑΙΚΟ ΖΗΤΕΝΟΙΤΟΥ / (IV 134.5f.) ΟΥΟΕΙΑ ΕΒΟΑ ΖΗΤΕΝΟΙΤΟΥ / (ibid. 47.14) ΚΑΛΟΝΕ ΕΩΕΥΕ-ΡΗΓΗΝ ΜΕΘΙΟΝ. Again it will be noted that it is the object, rather than the combination of 3rd plural and (ΕΒΟΑ) ζήνα-, that marks a construction as a "passive"-surrogate or translation equivalent — not a true passive transform. POLOTSKYY (1957a:228f. = CP 230f.) accepts (in)transitivity as an intrinsic (lexematic) category in Coptic.

7 CHERIX 1979.9 ("absolut", "moyen").
3.0.1.2 To replace the three related imported dichotomies of transitive:intransitive verb, direct:indirect object, object:non-object ("adverbal") expansion, I propose a dependency, pattern definition — the adaptation to Coptic of an analytic strategy which, although certainly not novel in any of its essential details, has found more and more adherents in the last three decades (in Coptic grammatical description it has not been applied hitherto) — the pattern (i.e. syntagmatic/paradigmatic) compatibilities of the verb lexeme, leading to a non-dichotomous, gradient classification. In a simplified outline (see also §1.1.2.1):

(a) The matrix: The verb occupies a slot ("Leerstelle") — a nuclear one — in a pattern or matrix in which other slots are occupiable by its actor and by reative expansions — "actants" in TESNIÈRE's terminology. The actantial potential of the verb, its valency, can be conveniently stated by the number and nature of potentially or characteristically occupiable reative slots, i.e. the dependences the given lexeme can contract. Thus CUTF (N-/E-) (or rather r-i-p, with [ɔ]/e/o] allomorphs of a relational archimorphic), NAY (E-) are bivalent verbs, MOY2 (-/N- + N-), IW (E+ + E-), 2APEZ (E-+E-) (cf. 2APEZ EPOOY EMTTPYE- IV 56.6), TCABO (-/N- + E-) are trivalent, while NOKOK, EI are univalent. This classification is distinctive: bivalent +, GICHE, EIPE, MOYTE ("give", "find [following upon a search]", "make", "call") are different from their trivalent homonyms (+-/N- + N- "bring into a [given] state", GICHE-/N- + N- "discover in a [given] state or act", EIPE-/N- + N- "make into...", MOYTE E- + XE- "name") — different by the structural definition of identity. Transitive verbs are bi- or trivalent; intransitive ones, univalent (there are no zero-valents, like "it rains", in Coptic). The zero-filled rectio slot is very important: the case of + OYBE-(EZOYN) E- (etc.) or — syntagmatically — the zero-anaphora (§3.1.1.1.0.1).

(b) Slot paradigms, object vs. complement: some of the positions in the matrix are occupiable by one member only (or zero). These are conditioned, rectional or "case" expansions — a distinctive component of the verb lexeme (see n. 5). Since it is not opposed to another term, this satellite has no proper meaning, but contributes to the complex meaning of the verb syntagm (the preposition E- when non-commutable — i.e. after NAY or 2APEZ — is as rectional, as devoid of meaning, as N-/MMO= or the immediate object-construction CUTF-, CUTF=). When a verb governs a paradigm of several rectional expansions — different prepositions, with an ensuing change of the overall meaning — we have homonymy of distinct verb lexemes, differing in meaning and rectio-construction: CUTF + Ø "lend an ear" (Ch. 154.42), CUTF E- "listen to", CUTF -/N- "hear", CUTF NCA- "obey". When, however, the isolable meaning of the lexeme does not change as the modifiers commute (EI EBOA/EZOYN/EPAT, 2MIOC 2I-/2N-/NCA — but 2MIOC MN-, rective) we have truly free (in the sense of "grammatically unmotivated") substitutability, i.e. non-rectional, meaningful, extraneous (not verb-componental) complement expansion, Tesnière's "circrconstant". A thorough study of Coptic verb valency and compatibilities, as also extensive and precise valency listing of all verb lexemes, awaits future scholarship; my concern in the following pages will be the distributional structure and role relationship of the two major rectio types, viz. the mediate (N-/MMO=) and immediate object-constructions.


10 The distinction between "object"-"actant" and "complement"-"circrconstant" is difficult, practically and theoretically, and borderline or ambiguous cases abound. See (in addition to the reff. given in §1.1.2.1) the early discussions by von der Gabellentz (1869:383), Frobhen (1878:376), Paul (1920:698). Free's model does not distinguish between the two (1966:47), although he insists (1961:35f) on their being kept distinct. Sauvageot (1960:348) relegates this distinction to an extra-grammatical level. See also Trubetzkoj 1939:77f., Mathesius-Vachek 1975:140.
3.0.2 CONSTRUCTION: RELEVANT PATTERNS AND ENVIRONMENTS. Two constructions are in
unstructured view rival and collateral\(^{11}\): (a) the immediate\(^{12}\) construction: "a", specified as "a\(_{dur}\)"
('infinitive\(_{dur}\) → pronoun/noun syntagm') and "a\(_{non-dur}\)" (infinitive\(_{non-dur}\) → pronoun/noun syntagm')
and (b) the mediate\(^{12}\) construction "b", specified as "b\(_{dur}\)" ('infinitive\(_{dur}\) → N+noun syntagm/MMO
pronoun') or "b\(_{non-dur}\)" ('infinitive\(_{non-dur}\) → N+noun syntagm/MMO-pronoun'). In the pattern code, the
subscript refers to environment factor (of the nuclear verb): durative, the (in a sense) marked
environment (almost only the present tense in the Bipartite Pattern) and non-durative, unmarked (for
Aktionsart and in a sense morphosyntactically), the Tripartite Pattern and extra-conjugational
infinitive. The expansion constituency includes the pronoun and noun syntagm\(^{13}\). The descriptive
statements below refer to two kinds of structurally significant environments: (a/b) neutralization
environment (§3.1), where patterns (a) and (b) are mutually unopposed and represented by either (a)
(§3.1.1) or (b) (§3.1.2); (a:b) opposition environment (§3.2), where (a) and (b) are mutually opposed. I
must concede in advance that these last statements are much less confident and decisive than the
neutralization statements. My principal concern in this chapter is to examine the functional load
of the opposition (a:b).

3.0.2.1 THE MORPHOPHONEMIC ALTERNATION MECHANISM OF THE VERB LEXEME. As is well
known, the Coptic verb lexeme may alternate in two pre-object allomorphs marked for syntactic
dependence, often prosodically correlated as sandhi-forms (both are related to the syntactically unmarked
"absolute" or dictionary form). These allomorphs signal the verb - (satellite) noun ("construct") or verb - (satellite)
pronoun ("pronominal") syntagmatic links: (eip) P/π. (eipw) CEP-COT. Both are specifically non-final (the
"absolute" is unmarked in this respect). This mechanism, where available, provides the sole
signalling of the verb - object interdependence in pattern (a). The sporadic absence (or rather
graphemic "veiling") of the construct allomorph is therefore noteworthy and must be correctly
understood. This phenomenon, normal in Akhmimic and quite frequently encountered in Bohairic, is sporadic
in Sahidic\(^{14}\); it is particularly common in Shenoute as far as literary Sahidic goes. The instances on my
files are analyzed in the following table:

\(^{11}\) The scarceness of a varia lectio fluctuation of both constructions ought on principle to prompt the
question of some functional difference, be it ever so tenuous (such rare cases are III 72 n. 19, A 174
\(\alpha\alpha\gamma\nu\epsilon\mu\nu\mu\alpha\nu\gamma\mu\nu\pi\epsilon\mu\eta\) / \(\alpha\alpha\lambda\nu\nu\mu\nu\nu\nu\mu\nu\pi\epsilon\mu\eta\)). Generally, on
the construction of the object: STERN §§490, 491, 493; SCHWARZ-STEINTHAL 478-484; STEINDORFF
1951:§§389ff.; TILL §261.

\(^{12}\) I use "mediate" for an object-expansion marked by an extra-lexemic, post-adjunctive demarcative morpheme, "imme-
diate" for a similar expansion marked intra-lexemically (by a segmental/modulation morpheme).

\(^{13}\) This is in Coptic the meeting point par excellence of nominal and verbal syntagmatics. What expands the verb
is in fact the determinator (a pronoun!), which is in turn expanded by a noun lexeme (§3.1.1.2.1 and Ch. 5).

1954:202ff., 213ff., TILL 1928:§1474a-b (also ZAS 63:146ff., 1928), QUECKE 1972:45 with further reff., SHISHA-HALEVY
1976b:359f. This graphemic veiling is extended (in a comparable dialectological distribution) to the interlocutive ("independent"
personal pronoun when a proclitic subject in the binominal Nominal Sentence: the atomic allomorph (functionally marked as non-predicative) \(\text{AM}^{-},\text{MTK}^{-}\) (etc.) is
graphemically wanting, yet juncturally identifiable. This phenomenon is widespread in Shenoute (SHISHA-HALEVY
1976b:359): \(\text{ANON}^{-}\) (Ch. 65.23f., IV 19.22), \(\text{ANOK}^{-}\) (A 270), \(\text{WTW}^{-}\) (Thompson K 3 vo, IV 100.7).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conjugation form (non-dur.)</th>
<th>Verb lexeme</th>
<th>Determination paradigms</th>
<th>Subsequent indication of juncture</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>perfect</td>
<td>ΟΥΨΝΩς</td>
<td>π-</td>
<td>ΝΑΝ ΕΒΟΛ</td>
<td>Ch. 112.16 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fut. I</td>
<td>ΟΥΨΝΩς</td>
<td>π-</td>
<td>ΕΒΟΛ</td>
<td>Ch. 103.7f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fut. II</td>
<td>ΟΥΨΝΩς</td>
<td>π-</td>
<td>ΕΒΟΛ</td>
<td>Ch. 65.10ff., 78.13ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perfect</td>
<td>ΟΥΨΝΩς</td>
<td>π-</td>
<td></td>
<td>A I 109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infinit.</td>
<td>ΟΥΨΝΩς</td>
<td>π-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ch. 104.40f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conjunct.</td>
<td>ΣΧΚ</td>
<td>π-</td>
<td>ΕΖΡΑΙ</td>
<td>IV 168.7f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ΤΡΕ-</td>
<td>ΥΠ</td>
<td>π-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wess. 9 173b 4ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perf.</td>
<td>ΤΧΜ</td>
<td>π-</td>
<td></td>
<td>P 1304 122 ΑΑ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jussive</td>
<td>ΤΧΜ</td>
<td>π-</td>
<td></td>
<td>P 1304 122 ΑΑ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aor.</td>
<td>ΥΨΨΨΕ</td>
<td>π-</td>
<td>ΑΝ</td>
<td>IV 94.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fut. II</td>
<td>ΤΑΧΡΟ</td>
<td>π-</td>
<td></td>
<td>P 131 Α 43 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perf.</td>
<td>ΖΣΑΙ</td>
<td>π-</td>
<td></td>
<td>IV 72.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conjunct.</td>
<td>ΠΙΡΧ</td>
<td>ΟΥ-</td>
<td></td>
<td>III 219.18ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ΤΡΕ-</td>
<td>ΧΟΟΥ</td>
<td>ΟΥ-</td>
<td>ΝΑΝ</td>
<td>IV 107.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perf.</td>
<td>ΥΟΡΨΡ</td>
<td>ΟΥ-</td>
<td></td>
<td>IV 19.13ff. (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fut. I</td>
<td>ΣΧΑΙ</td>
<td>ΟΥ-</td>
<td></td>
<td>A 2 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fut. III</td>
<td>ΟΥΨΝΩς</td>
<td>ο-</td>
<td></td>
<td>IV 173.4,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conjunct.</td>
<td>ΧΟΟΥ</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td></td>
<td>IV 102.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perf.</td>
<td>ΖΣΑΙ</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td></td>
<td>IV 72.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ΤΡΕ-</td>
<td>ΠΙΣΤ</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>ΕΒΟΛ</td>
<td>IV 100.2ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fut. I</td>
<td>ΟΥΨΝΩς</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>ΕΒΟΛ</td>
<td>Ch. 67.26ff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(dur.)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pres.</td>
<td>ΟΥΨΝΩς</td>
<td>ο-</td>
<td></td>
<td>III 177.18 (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres.</td>
<td>ΟΥΨΝΩς</td>
<td>ο-</td>
<td></td>
<td>A 2 509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres.</td>
<td>ΟΥΨΨΨ</td>
<td>ο-</td>
<td>ΖΨΨΨ</td>
<td>III 202.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres.</td>
<td>ΟΥΨΨΨ</td>
<td>ο-</td>
<td></td>
<td>III 145.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres.</td>
<td>ΤΧΜ</td>
<td>ο-</td>
<td>ΜΜΗΝΕ</td>
<td>III 70.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΡΕΩ-</td>
<td>ζΨΤΒ</td>
<td>ο-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ch. 27.11ff. (§3.4.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres.</td>
<td>ΖΣΩ</td>
<td>ο-</td>
<td></td>
<td>IV 159.2ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres.</td>
<td>ΤΑΥΟ</td>
<td>ο-</td>
<td></td>
<td>IV 159.2ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres.</td>
<td>ΤΑΥΟ</td>
<td>ο-</td>
<td>ΕΒΟΛ</td>
<td>III 175.24 (A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
determination paradigms:

"ŋ" incl. demonstratives
"oy" incl. ŽEN-
θ- zero determinator
(—) indeterminables: 2ă2, ŽOINE

The three essential tell-tale features in this distributional picture are:

(a) *Determination complementary distribution*: ŋ-determination is restricted to the non-durative infinitive, while for (aₜₜₜ) only zero-determination of the noun is attested, this being reflected in the statements made in §§3.1.2.1, 3.1.2.1, 3.2.0.1.

(b) *Prosody*: in most instances we have clear indication of the close juncture of the verb - object link, while the rest do not counterindicate this.

(c) *Lexeme morphology*: the class distribution shows all principal lexemic patterns proportionately represented 15. We may conclude that this phenomenon constitutes neither an infringement of the Stern-Jernstedt Rule (§3.1.2.1) nor a special zero-marked construction 16.

3.1 THE OPPOSITION MEDIATE VS. IMMEDIATE OBJECT-CONSTRUCTION SUPPRESSED

3.1.1 OPPOSITION REPRESENANT: THE IMMEDIATE CONSTRUCTION

3.1.1.1 The pronominal object in non-durative environment. The following statement, found to be true: "unless contrary overruling factors are involved (§3.1.3.3), and when morphologically feasible, the pronominal direct object occurs exclusively in pattern (aₐₜₜₜₜ), with the pronominal state of the verb lexeme expanded by a suffix pronoun ", extends the Stern-Jernstedt Rule (§3.1.2.1) to part of the non-durative environment "uncharted" in JERNSTEDT 1927 17. It hardly needs special exemplification, as the (aₐₜₜₜₜₜ) pattern is attested on practically every other line in the corpus (many instances will be given passim in this chapter). A striking instance is the almost ubiquitous alternation of -XW MIOCC (durative) with -XOCC (non-durative) — the neutric fem. pronoun -c-, the formal ("dummy") object, is cataphoric to the subsequent xe- This (and similar) alternation is clearly observable in such

---

15 As a matter of fact we have no general statistics by which to evaluate or weight the class incidence of this phenomenon. Striking is the high incidence of the biradicals ("kut"; on oyum cf. Quette 1972:45), also (relatively speaking) of ŽAI, ŽAI, and perhaps the low incidence of the causatives (cf., for Subakhamimic, Nagel 1964:157-8).

16 Cf. Till 1928:§147a-b, Emmel 1981:142f. (n. 5). For ŽIWI A ŽMAŽ ŽMI, ŽUAI XAI KAI KAI, see §1.3.3 above.

17 Two letters from P. V. Jernstedt to W. E. Crum (Brit. Lib. Add. MS 45685, part II, ff. 302f., 379ff.) prove that Jernstedt was well aware of this. He had started investigating the non-durative environment (using as corpus Budge's Martyrdom of Viktor; "Later on" — he writes — "I shall not forget Shenoute"). In his first letter, dated the 26.3.34, he announces his intention to extend the basic formulation of the rule, and reports his interim impression that (for Trachtenberg), although with a ŋ-oy-determined object the mediate construction occurs as a rule, with the personal pronoun "the treatment is contrary to that in the praesentia". In the second letter written five years later (1.3.39) Jernstedt, in a criticism of Chaine's grammar, remarks on the rarity of the mediate construction with pronominals, stating this to be a fact of Shenoute's usage (and incidentally advocating the Spezialgrammatik approach). The existence of these letters was kindly brought to my attention by Prof. Bentley Layton.
categorical configurations\(^{18}\) as the following: (A I 82-3) \(\text{ΕΥΤΒΒΟ} \ \text{ΜΜΟΟΥ} \ \text{Ε} \ \text{ΕΛΥΤΒΒΟΟΥ} / (\text{Ench.} 66b) \ \text{ΕΚΕÎPE} \ \text{ΜΜΟΟ} \ \text{Η} \ \text{ΑΚΑΛΗ} \ \text{ΜΜΕΑΟΣ} \ \text{ΜΠΟΡΗ}) / (III 132.17f.) \ \text{ΕΙΤΕ} \ \text{ΝΕΤΑΥΚΟΥΜΗ} \ \text{ΕΙΤΕ} \ \text{ΝΕΤΕΝΣΕΟΟΥΝ} \ \text{ΜΜΟΟ} \ \text{ΑΝ} / (IF 108 apud Dictionary 742f.) \ \text{ΝΗΣΩΣ} \ \text{ΜΜΟΟ} \ \text{Η} \ \text{ΝΕΤΑΥ22C}.

3.1.1.1.0.1 Cotext patterns: the anaphoric pronoun object - suffix vs. zero. When a pronoun object is anaphoric to a noun syntagm\(^{19}\) — and this is the usual case — it is observable that the form of the object varies and indeed alternates with the referent determinator (§5.1.1.0.1). This is fully in keeping with — indeed corroboration of — the general theory of the noun syntagm in Coptic (§5.1.1), according to which the determinator is the prime nucleus, the lexeme its first expansion: the referent of the anaphoric object is the article, not the noun lexeme:

(1) \{'[η-]/[ΟΥ]-/0- \text{ΝΙΜ} \to \text{suffix pronoun}' / (Ch. 104.8f.) \text{ΕΚΥΑΝΕΙΡΞ} \ \text{ΜΝΗ} \ \text{ΝΤΑΚΑΛΗ} \ \text{ΝΑΚ} / (158.14ff.) \ \text{ΟΥΝ}... \ \text{ΕΜΝΑΤΑ} \- \text{ΝΟΕΙΚ} \ \text{ΕΥΟΜΗ} / (III 38.3) \ \text{ΝΙΣ} \ \text{ΑΙΝΑ} \ \text{ΕΡΩ} / (ibid. 34.28f.) \ \text{ΕΥΟΛΕ} \ \text{ΝΗΣΗ} \ \text{ΕΤΕ} \- \text{ΡΕΥΣΙΤΥ} \ \text{ΑΥ} \ \text{ΝΚΑΝΕ} \ \text{ΘΥΕ} \ \text{ΝΗΤΑ} \ \text{ΕΑΛ} / (A I 256) \ \text{ΧΙΝΤΕ} \ \text{ΕΤΗ} \ \text{ΕΝΑ} \ \text{ΕΧΟ} \ \text{ΙΑΝ} \ \text{ΜΕ} \ \text{ΕΑΛ} / (III 128.18) \ \text{ΝΕΘΟΟΥ} \ \text{ΑΤΕΝΤΑΛΑ} \ \text{ΜΑΝ} / (ibid. 25.3f.) \ \text{ΣΩ} \ \text{ΝΙΜ} \ \text{ΕΤΕ} \ \text{ΝΟΥΑ} \ \text{ΥΟ} \ \text{ΑΥ} \ \text{ΑΡ} \- \text{ΣΟΥ} / (A I 468) \ \text{ΧΙ} \ \text{ΜΠΟ} \ \text{ΜΠΟ} \ \text{ΜΠΟ} \ \text{ΜΠΟ} \ \text{ΝΗ} \ \text{ΕΑΛ} / (ibid. 396) ... \ \text{ΟΥΣ} \ \text{ΕΧΟ} \ \text{ΟΤΗ} / (A I 88) \ \text{ΝΗΣΘΟΟΥ} \ \text{ΕΑΛ} / (ibid. 45) \ \text{ΑΝΝΟΥΤΕ} \ \text{ΣΘ} \ \text{ΝΑΚ} \ \text{ΕΙΕΙ} \ \text{ΝΗΣΘΘΥΕ} \ \text{ΕΥΝΑΥΤ}... \ \text{ΜΠΗΤΗ} \ \text{ΝΑΚ} \ \text{ΧΕ} \- \text{ΜΠΡΑΛ}.

(2) '0- determinator \to 0 object expansion': (A 2 392) \text{ΕΧΟΟΟ} \ \text{ΔΕ} \- \text{ΕΜ} \- \text{ΜΠΟΥΧΙ} \- \text{ΒΑΠΤ} \ \text{ΚΑ} \ \text{ΜΕ} \ \text{ΝΗΤΟ} \ \text{ΜΝΗ} \ \text{ΤΡΕ} \ \text{Ε} \- \text{ΑΥ} \- \text{ΔΙ} / (ibid. 59) \ \text{ΝΕΡΘΥΕ} \ \text{ΓΑΡ} \ \text{ΝΕΤΡΕ} \- \text{ΘΥ} \- \text{ΑΥ} \- \text{ΖΩ} \- \text{ΕΡΩ} \ \text{ΑΥ} \ \text{ΝΛΟΥΣ} \ \text{ΕΤΥ} / (A I 39) \ \text{ΑΥ} \- \text{ΖΩ} \- \text{ΟΜΟ} \ \text{ΑΥ} \ \text{ΤΗ} \ \text{ΝΗ} \ \text{ΜΗ} / (IV 82.11) \ \text{ΘΑ} \- \text{ΟΟΕ} \ \text{ΝΩΟΟ} \ \text{ΝΥΤ} \ \text{ΝΤΕ} \ \text{ΕΚΟΟΥ} / (ibid. 83.3) \ \text{ΕΚΟ} \- \text{ΕΙΣ} \ \text{ΘΕ} \ \text{ΕΚ} \ \text{ΝΑΚ} / (Ch. 113.47ff.) \ \text{ΕΥ} \- \text{ΕΝΥΟΥ} \ \text{ΓΑΡ} \ \text{ΧΙ} \- \text{ΕΟΟ} \ \text{ΘΝΗ} \ \text{ΝΕΟΥ} / (ibid. 173-4) \ \text{ΕΙΣ} \ \text{ΘΟΜ} \ \text{ΘΝΟΜ} \ \text{ΟΝ} \ \text{ΕΙΘΝ} \ \text{ΘΝΗ} \ \text{ΣΘ} \ \text{ΘΝΗ} / (Ryl. Cat. 32 No. 68 CE) \ \text{ΜΝΗΘΟΥ} \- \text{ΛΑΛΥ} \ \text{ΝΗ} \ \text{ΕΧΩ} / (Ch. 91.17ff.) ... \ \text{ΕΝΧΑΘΗ} \ \text{ΕΚΘΘΘΥΕ} \ \text{ΕΕΙΕ} / (P 131² 105 rο) \ \text{ΠΕΓΝ} \- \text{ΑΠΙΚΕ} \ \text{ΓΑΡ} \ \text{ΕΘΗ} \ \text{ΕΝ} \ \text{ΘΘΥΕ} \ \text{ΑΛΑΙ} \ \text{ΕΠΟΛΟ} / (A I 2 153) \ \text{ΝΤΑΝΜ} \ \text{ΝΡΙΜ} \ \text{Ρ} \- \text{ΘΙΚΟ} \ \text{ΕΝΗ} \ \text{ΕΤΕ} \ \text{ΕΝ} \ \text{ΕΝ} / (III 165.17) \ \text{ΝΕΤΟΥΣΘ} \- \text{ΕΤ} \- \text{ΑΤ} \ \text{Θ} \ \text{ΜΑΡ} \- \text{Ε} / (ibid. 18.15f.) \ \text{ΑΝΝΟ} \ \text{ΜΠΟ} \ \text{ΜΠΟ} \ \text{ΟΤΗ} / (cf. 17.25) / (K 933) \ \text{ΝΣΟΓΝΑΙ} \- \text{ΘΗ} \ \text{ΑΝ} \ \text{ΘΟΤ} \ \text{ΘΗ} / \ \text{ΕΕΠΙ} \ \text{ΕΝ} \ \text{ΘΝΑΙΘΕ} \ \text{ΕΠΙΘΝΗ} / (Ch. 71.31ff.) \ \text{ΕΙΘΘΝΑΘΘΟ} \ \text{ΘΗ} \ \text{ΘΘΝΘΜΘΗΕ} / (also ibid. 65.14ff., 66.7, 74.50ff., III 93.21, P 130ι 37 PΝΖ, etc. Anaphorically, then, there is only a binary opposition of zero-non-determination, the equipollent opposition \{'[η-]/[ΟΥ]-/0-\' being specified\(^{21}\).

(3) In passing, let us look at two other noteworthy anaphora patterns: (a) (A I 9) \text{ΕΥ} \text{ΘΗ} \ \text{ΜΜΟΟ} \ \text{ΧΕ} \- \text{ΕΟ} \ \text{ΝΙΚΟΙΝΟΙΑ} / (sic) \ \text{ΜΝΗΘΟΨΥΡΗ} \ \text{ΝΕΟ} / (2ΝΟΥΣΘΟΥΝ} — anaphoric zeroing of a predicative-constituent modifier phrase\(^{22}\) ('\text{ΝΕΟ} / (sic) \ \text{ΝΙΜ} \ \text{ΕΤ} \-
3.1.1.1.0.2 The objective pronoun paradigm. As may be gathered from §3.1.1.1.1, the suffix-pronoun paradigm, when expanding the verb, is post-lexemic. When, on the other hand, the pronominal object does not bound on the lexeme (and in isolated, morphologically peculiar cases where it does) we find an allomorphic paradigm — that of the objective pronoun (which, in contradistinction to the suffixes, is objective only). The objective pronoun occurs:

(a) After a (synchronic) suffix-pronoun in possessor role in the verboids **oynta=**, **mna=**. Here the objective pronoun is usually anaphoric to the antecedent (most often, substantivizing article) of the relative verboid: ‘(n)entoynta= suffix-pron. -objective pron.’ and therefore not as a rule found in the interlocutory persons: Singular, masc.: -ις, -ετεούντακ (A.I 41), **mnaκι** (Or. 158.2f.), -ετεούντακ (A 2325), **oyntaικ, mnaτι** (III 172.18, 90.18), **oyntaικ (A 2 10, P 1301 132 κρι); fem.: -ης, -ετεούντακ (P 1304 94 ιτ, 1314 88 ρο), **oyntaικ (III 85.14, 100.12, Berl. 1613 7 ες), -ετεούντακ (Mich. 550 13 ap. Dictionary 563b), **ετεούντακ (P 1304 76 vo). Plural: -εις, -κοι (Ch. 23.48ff., K 929), **oyntaικ (III 119.1).**

(b) After an indefinite 3rd-person-plural suffix, diachronically in actor role, synchronically a semi-analyzable component of the lexeme: **ξοοι “ send ”, τννοοι “ fetch ”, “ send ”, (τ)τοοο “ make give ” in non-durative environment (see Obs. (3) below)): Singular, 1st person: -ις, **ετεούντηνους (A I 465); 2nd pers. masc.: -ικ, **ανάουκ (IV 193.10), τννοοκ (III 38.21); 3rd person masc.: -ις, **ούκ (IV 88.18, Ch. 66.27). (τ)τοοο (P 1314 44 ΠΙΣ); Plural, 3rd person: -εις, -εις, **τννοοκοι (III 24.23), **ούκε (very common: III 167.21f., IV 64.20, Ch. 40.23ff. etc.), (III 187.5).

(c) After **caι** (in variation with **caιοι**), **πι** : 3rd pers. plur. **caικοι (Ch. 94.15f., 185.23f., 160.2, r.l. **caιοι**), **πικοι (III 25.4); a case of i-final lexemes.

Observations: (1) Morphophonemically, most instances (excepting only **oyntaκ** (?), **πι** could be phrased as “VS-pronoun” (S = non-syllabic sonant, to include η).
(2) Only -είς ²⁵ is, properly speaking, a distinctive exclusive member of this paradigm: all others (and the list is probably incomplete) are homonymous with the corresponding suffixes or (ες) prefix.
(3) Some examples show the objective pronoun in case (b) to be in alternation with the mediate object-construction, viz. in durative environment: (III 150.7) **εικοίοι mmoοι / (ibid. 187.8) **ετεούντηνοι mmoοι; like the suffix-pronoun, then, it is regulated by the Stern-Jernstedt Rule: in case (a), on the other hand, it is not commutable with **mmoοι.

3.1.1.2 Nominal/pronominal object: zero-determinated noun, substantivized relative, indeterminables. (1) The zero-determinated nominal object enters exclusively the constructions

---

²³ See Stern §§316, 342, Steinhall-Misteli 1893:293.
²⁴ In (A I 41) **ποος ετεούνται κε έοον επον “ the desire thou (fem.) hast for him ” the order of elements may be conditioned (but in Joh. 4:18 also P 1301 10, not. Sh.) we do find (n)ετεούνται). Comparable cases are Joh. 16:15 (Chester Beatty and 3 of Horner’s MSS) ετεούνταικαμίωτ “ which my Father has ”, J oh. 4:16 ταφαίκε ετεούντηκοοικ “ which God has ” and NHC XI 16.10f. **οντεκ-κιν “ they have it ” — all with a non-personal possessor.
²⁵ Discussed by Piehl (ΛΖ 33:40ff. (1895)), Spiegelberg (ΛΖ 53:133f. (1917)) and Till (WZKM 33:128 ff. (1926)), who typically considers these combinations “ unsinnig “.
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(a dur.), (a non-dur.) 28: (A 1 256) ZOINE MEN EY-ΚΑΡΠΟΣ ΝΑΣΑΡΑΪ ZΕΝΚΟΟΥΕ ΔΕ ΕΥ- ΜΠΕΥΚΑΡΠΟΣ ΝΤΑΤΠΕ / (A 2 481) ΠΑΙ EΤΣΕΕΤ-ΡΨΗΜΕ ΝΗΥΣΙΑ ΜΠΙΑΒΑΛΟΚ / (ibid. 352) ΧΡ-ΑΙΚΑΙΟΥΝΗ / (P 1304 341) ΟΣΕΟΥΣ-ΒΑΡΟΣ ΔΕ ΖΙΨΗΧ ΕΧΙΝΡΨΗΜΕ / (Ch. 154.52ff.) ΕΥΣΑΝΟΝΥΕΣ-ΜΑΤΟΙ ΕΡΩΝ. In more precise rephrasing, this may be taken as a phenomenon of mutual exclusion between -ν-, the marker of the object (b), and the zero determinator which, as nucleus of the noun syntagm (§5.1.1), is really the object. This is a secondary statement, overruling others (§3.1.2); it does not invalidate them or constitute a deviation. It is absolutely essential here to define the zero for which this statement is true: it is only that zero which is commutable in a full paradigm with the two other determinators (§5.1.1.0.1), viz. [ν-]/[ΟΥ-]/Ο-, whereas a zero determinator in a paradigm not including either of the other two is not incompatible with Ν-, and hence does occur in construction (b). Consider the following: ΟΥ-LESS paradigm: -ΚΕ-/ΝΚΕ- (III 74.8, 19.5f.). —/Ν + cardinal numbers 27 (III 52.8, IV 124.7, Berl. 1613 5 νο [ΕΝΑΝΟΥΡΗ-ΜΑΑΒ-/Ρ-ΣΟΥΤΡ] vs. III 157.28, 112.1f., IV 103.6 — note IV 67.6 ασειερη ΝΨΗΡΜΕ ΝΨΗΡΜΕ) η/λιον LESS paradigm: -ΑΑΑΥ/ΝΑΑΑΥ (III 94.1, Ch. 130.28f.) -ΟΥ/ΝΟΥ (interr.; IV 95.17, A 2 366 ΕΙΣΕ-ΟΥ vs. III 45.23, Ch. 166.1). Indeterminables, of course, do not count as zero-determined, hence ought to be compatible with Ν-. I can, however, find examples of pattern (b) only for the indefinite ΨΗΡΜΕ 29: (IV 80.18) ΝΠΕΥΡΜΕ ΠΡΟΤΡΕΠΕ ΝΨΗΡΜΕ. For ΝΙΜ (Ch. 78.46ff.), ΟΥΜΠ (ibid., III 107.20ff., IV 80.15), ΣΑΖ (Ch. 29.15ff., III 25.4f.), ZΩΙΝΕ (III 139.4f.) I have only examples of the immediate construction.

(2) ΝΙΜ-(etc.), the substantivized relative syntagm, for which we distinguish (§5.2.3.1) two distinct patterns: (a) ΝΙΜ-/ΤΕΤ-/ΝΙΜ-, present, future, perfect etc. — not further determinable (i.e. Ν-, the nuclear determinator, is always initial in this syntagm) and (b) ΝΙΜ-, further determinable: present tense only, Ν- uncomutable (hence not a determinator, but a nominalizer morph). Determinators here include the definite (not feminine), indefinite (singular and plural), zero, Ο... - ΝΙΜ; see (3). Pattern (a) is compatible with the object marker Ν- (obligatory in the durative, §3.1.2.1): (III 15.23f.) ΖΑΠΡΕΤΚΙΨΡΨ ΝΠΕΤΕΟΥΚ ΑΝ ΝΕ / (ibid. 109.2f.) ΩΥΑΓΑΡΟΝ ΔΕ ΟΝ ΠΕ ΕΤΡΑΧΨ ΝΗΤΝ ΜΠΕΤΝΑΟΥΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΕΡΟΣ... ΧΝΟΙ ΕΡΟΣ / (ibid. 205.4f.) ΣΤΕΤΑΙΟ ΝΝΤΕΠΡΟΒΕ... ΣΑΣΠΙΝΕ ΝΠΕΤΗΝΗ ΝΕ / (IV 58.26)... ΝΟΥΟΥΜ ΜΠΕΤΝΑΟΥΜΥΚ / (ibid. 43.28) ΜΠΟΥΤ ΝΠΕΤΕΟΥΚ / (Ch. 55.10ff.) ΖΕΝΝΑΛΨ ΝΑΤΨ ΜΠΕΤΕΥΨΗ, but occurs also (in non-durative environment) in the immediate construction: (III 121.21f.) ΕΥΘΑΝΤΜΕ-ΠΕΤΕΥΨΗ / (IV 88.1) ΝΝΟΥΑ Η ΖΩΙΝΕ ΟΥΜ-ΝΕΤΟΤΨ. Pattern (b) is, to my knowledge, found only in the immediate construction (incompatibility with Ν-?): durative: (IV 7.11) ΕΝΕΜΠΑΙ Π-ΝΠΕΟΥΝ ΑΝ / (ibid. 128.27, Ch. 63.9f.) — ΕΤΡ-ΝΠΕΟΥΝ, non-durative: (III 104.1) ΑΛΧΕ-ΝΠΕΟΥΝ / (IV 3.17f.) ΕΥΘΑΝΠ-ΠΕΤΝΑΟΥΝ / (III 150.21) ΕΡ-ΠΕΤΝΑΟΥΝ etc.

(3) Ο-... - ΝΙΜ, the discontinuous determinator, and... - ΝΙΜ, the postpositive determinator (§5.1.1.0.1) are distinct from zero determination, and are both compatible with Ν- 29: (Wess. 9 179d 7f.) ΕΥΜΟΧΣΤΕ ΝΠΕΟΥΝ ΝΙΜ / (III 20.5f.) ΑΓΚΕΡΗ ΝΨΥΒ ΝΙΜ ΝΑΓΑΡΟΝ / (Ch. 85.7f.) ΕΚΜΕ ΝΡΑΠ ΝΙΜ ΜΜΕ / (III 113.11) ΑΝΛΨΨ ΝΝΟΒΕ ΝΙΜ / (ibid. 151.24) ...ΕΥΚΨ ΕΒΟΛΑ... ΝΑΙΨΝΕ ΝΙΜ. In the immediate construction: (IV 85.22) ΥΑΡΕ- ΠΕΤΨΗΤ ΣΤΕΤ-ΖΝΟ ΕΒΟΛΑ.

28 So explicitly in Jernstedt 1927:70, in terms of compatibility. It is interesting to note that the residual pre-object nomina agentis (construct participles, historically) have almost exclusively zero-determinated objects: ΧΑΙ-ΡΟΟΥΥ (Ch. 199.34f.), ΧΑΙ-ΝΟΤΤΕ (III 120.15), ΧΑΙ-ΟΝ ΝΨΥΟ (Ch. 110.10f.), ΜΑΣΓ-ΣΗΚΕ (Ch. 104.25), MΑΣΓ-ΨΨΗΜΕ (III 120.13), and so on. It may have been this generic, cliché-like or terminological application of these syntagms which was responsible for their survival into Coptic. (For the similar behaviour of the productive, remodelled analytic ΡΕΓ-, see §3.4.1.)

27 See §5.1.1.0.1: ΟΥ- as the number "one" does belong in this paradigm.

29 Pronominal ΨΨΗΜΕ "(any)one" is the animate counterpart of inanimate ΑΑΑΥ, and must be kept distinct from the determinable-[ν-]/[ΟΥ-]/Ο-ΨΨΗΜΕ "(a usually male) human being", opposed to ΖΩΙΝΕ, ΝΟΤΤΕ, ΟΥΜΠ, etc. The incompatibility of Ν- with zero determination is not absolute. A (very rare) instance of the two morphs co-existing is Mt. 10:37 (Sah. and "Middle Egyptian").

30 ΟΥΜ ΝΙΜ in (Rossi 2/3 13) ...ΕΥΣΑΝΟΥ ΟΥΜ ΝΙΜ is different in that ΟΥΜ is in Shenoutean Sahidic indeterminable.
3.1.1.2.2 Nominal/pronominal object: οὐγε–/οὐάγε–, a unique lexicosyntactic overrule οὐγε “desire”, “love” constitutes a well-known (though as yet unexplained) deviation from the Stern-Jernstedt Rule. This lexeme enters the immediate construction only, even with non-zero-determinated nominal object: (Ch. 93.38f.) ...εὐγοῤπυ ΝΑΧ ΑΥΗ ΕΝΗΟΥΑΨΗ ΑΝ / (ibid. 167-8) ...εὐγοῤπυ∕ΠΠΒΒΟ ΝΝΕΥΗΠΕ∕ (K 9040) …ΟΥΑΨΨ ΤΩΝΕ / (A 2 153) ΜΗ ΝΙΕΟΤΕ ΟΥΓΕ–ΝΕΥΗΠΕ ΑΝ Η ΝΥΗΠΕ ΟΥΓΕ–ΝΕΥΙΟΤΕ ΑΝ Η ΝΥΗΠΕ ΟΥΓΕ–ΤΕΥΣΙΜΕ ΑΝ Η ΤΕΥΣΙΜΕ ΟΥΓΕ–ΤΕΥΣΙ ΑΝ. When οὐγε “wish” has an infinitival object, we find either the immediate construction or the “absolute” form of the lexeme expanded by (ε + infinitive): (A 2 238) ΝΙΜ ΓΕ ΤΕΝΟΥ ΠΕΤΟΥΨΨ–ΠΠΙΣΤΟΣ ΑΝ, ΝΙΜ ΠΕΤΟΥΨΨ ΑΝ ΕΡ–ΙΚΑΙΟΣ ΝΙΜ ΠΕΤΟΥΨΨ–ΖΑΡΕΣ ΑΝ ΕΡ–ΙΚΑΙΟΣ ΝΙΜ ΠΕΤΟΥΨΨ–ΝΑ ΑΝ... ΝΙΜ ΠΕΤΟΥΨΨ–ΠΠΝΑΝΟΥΨΨ ΑΝ, ΝΙΜ ΠΕΤΟΥΨΨ ΑΝ ΕΚΑ–ΤΕΥΣΙΜΕ ΑΝ ΝΟΥΤΕ / (Ch. 23.19ff.) ...ΕΧΟΨΨ–ΜΟΟΥΤΨΨ / (ibid. 68.28f.) ΝΟΟΥΨΨ–ΧΟΟΨΨ ΑΝ. Note the variation ΕΡΕΟΨΨ–ΤΡΑ–ΕΡΕΟΨΨ ΕΤΡΑ– in A 2 513.

3.1.1.2.3 A trend: the definite nominal object of deriving verbs. (1) The statement made in §3.1.1.2.1 is no doubt most pertinent for those syntagms of the form ‘construct verb-lexeme → θ-noun lexeme’ in which the verb has the formal grammatical role of an auxiliary, noun-to-verb deriving element: Π–ΟΥΟΕΙΝ “shine”, Π–ΑΝΑΨΨ “sweat”, Π–ΠΛΕΙΜΟΣ “fight”, Π–ΟΥΙΑΨΨ “sacrifice”, Π–ΕΟΟΥ “honour”, ΞΙ–ΓΟΑ “lie” 31, Π–ΛΟΟΟΣ “report”, Π–ΠΟΟΥΨΨ “care for, be mindful of” and the like. This impression of the formal role of the nominal verb is correlatable with the semantic fusion role — “univerbation” — in turn relatable to a systemic conception of its function: these are the denominal derived verbs, the Coptic answer to the Indo-European (notably Greek) derivational suffixes 32: the verbal element is the marker of their verbal compatibilities (hence, the nucleus) and of their privileges of occurrence, while the zero-determined lexeme, providing the lexical content, is equivalent to the root constituent in the Indo-European derived stem, a “forme base de motivation” — accordingly, the zero determination is here operative 33. Now it is my impression, which I offer here for what it is worth and which must still be confirmed or disproved empirically and on a statistical basis, that determination of the object in similar syntagms does not affect the construction — still (ανον-dur.), immediate — nor perceptibly the semantic univerbation; the only difference is that the nominal constituent is in this way accommodated to expan-dability and is characterized as (relatively) independent (a junctional indication). A few representative instances: -Π–ΠΠΨΒΨ (Ch. 103.24f.), -Π–ΠΠΨΒΕΨ (Ch. 57.57), -Π–ΠΨΑΠΨ, -Π–ΠΨΕΨΑΠΨ (Ch. 86.42, 134.26f.), -Π–ΠΕΨ (Ch. 82.2.5, 182.54), with -Π–ΠΨΕΨ (Ch. 189.47f.) and -Π–ΠΨΕΨ (III 177.6), -Π–ΠΨΟΑΨ (IV 158.17).

30 JERNSTEDT 1927:70. NAGEL 1964:296f. attributes this aberrant property of οὐγε to its “defectiveness “, insofar as what he terms a “personal passive” function (i.e. its intransitive reference in a non-durative environment) is concerned. I doubt that this reference is so much a property of the lexeme as a function of its environment, or that it is unique to οὐγε (cf. ΑΝΟΥΨΨ Ν ΑΥΟΥΨΨ ΝΝΟΨΨ Α / 108 and FUNK 1977:27ff., 30, 34) and that this accounts for this unusual phenomenon — the absence of a syntagmatically identifiable durative infinitive. It is true that οὐγε, a “transitive” verb, is not opposed to a passive statical (εὐγοῤςΨΨ ΖΗ–, e.g. Ch. 106.47f. is suppletive, but neither are ΜΟΤΕ “hate”, ΕΙΝΕ “find”, ΕΙΨΨΨ “hear”, ΖΙΟΥΕ “throw” (in Sah.) and quite a few others — all subject to the Stern-Jernstedt Rule. Semasiological incompatibility with durativity cannot be ruled out as the explanation (note the comparable exclusion of “verbs of perception and feeling” from the progressive category in English), but can only be inferred, not proven. We must for the present content ourselves with pointing out the special treatment of this lexeme — unless one accepts as “explanation” the parallel Demotic idiosyncrasy of μρ (PARKER 1961:183ff., JOHNSON 1974:59, 61).

31 For ξψι we have four juncture grades (§6.0.2): ξψι:, ξψε-, ξψι + (with a weakening link ε → i), ξψο= (cf. STEINHAL-MISTEL 1893:91f, 281 for a grading of the verb-object juncture).

32 These too are probably nuclei in their syntagms (BARRI 1977:29).

33 Cf. GUILLAUME 1919:236f. ("mélangé de mots" in "traitement zéro entre verbe et régime direct"); DUBOIS 1965: 150f., 154f. ("l’absence de l'article supprime l’existence du syntagme nominal"); KRÁMÁRSKY 1972:36 (Collinson’s definition), 58. The valency model of the compound verb is not straightforward: I suggest the assignment of the whole syntagm to the zero slot of the matrix: like ΤΗΨΨ | ΜΟΟΨΨ, ΝΑΨΨ | ΕΠΟ=, so ΠΨΑΠΨ | ΜΟΟΨΨ, ΠΨΑΠΨ | ΕΠΟ= (see §§3.1.2.0.1 and 3.1.2.2.2 below).
and —Π-ΠΕΙΒΩΛ (IV 82.17), —Π-ΤΕΥΓΩΜ (III 165.11, IV 159.9f.), —Π-ΠΜΕΕΥΕ, —Π-ΠΧΜΕΕΥΕ (Ch. 71.44f., III 146.31), —Π-ΠΘΒΥ (Ch. 102.42, IV 49.9 θεωμω) vs. ΑΡΕΠ-ΠΘΒΥ, —Π-ΠΝΗΣΤΕΙΑ (Ch. 101.11f.), —Π-ΠΓΑΒΟΝ, —Π-ΠΠΕΝΑΝΟΥ (III 115.25, Ch. 180.2f.), —Π-ΠΘΤΥ —Π-ΠΧΟΥΘΥ (III 134.3f., Ch. 49.53, 100.25f., 134.48f.), —Π-ΠΠΕΝΗΡΠΝΟ (Ch. 105.50f.), —Π-ΤΠΝΗΣΙΚ (IV 155.25), —Π-ΠΧΝΙΤΩΝ (IV 172.21, Wess. 9 154d 20ff.), —Π-ΤΜΕ (IV 91.3), —Π-ΤΕΙΑΝΟΜΙΑ (IV 114.1), —Π-ΠΕΓΟΥ (Ch. 157.5f.), etc.; with indefinite determination: ἐΠ-ΟΥΑ-ΝΑΥ (III 16.12), —Π-ΖΕΝΟΥΣΙΑ (III 73.13), —Π-ΟΥΝΑ (IV 114.20, Ch. 162.50f.); other auxiliary verbs: ΣΓ-ΠΠΥΓΟΣ (III 114.13), ΣΓ-ΟΥΝΑ (Ch. 104.13f., 118.31f.), ΣΓ-ΠΠΟΥΣΙΕΥ (Ch. 101.5f., III 204.7), ΣΓ-ΘΕ „find means“ (III 99.6f., 25),——ΓΜ-Π(ΕΥ)ΜΗΝ (IV 49.5, 61.8), —ΣΧΙ-ΠΟ (IV 119.10; ΣΧΙ-ΠΟ III 39.22), ΣΧΙ-ΝΓΟΝΕ (III 123.7f., 138.6), etc. 34.

(2) The idea that this preference for construction (a) may be symptomatic of the close-juncture contour of these syntagms is perhaps corroborated by the verbs compounded with an “inalienable” noun (and its obligatory possessor-suffix), not all of which are subject to the Stern-Jernstetd Rule 35: —Π-ΤΩΘ (Ch. 100.57f., IV 128.7, 155.7, Ch. 190.7, 191.3f.), —Π-ΤΘΘ (IV 94.20f., III 195.3) — all non-durative examples.

(3) —Π- as “verb of incomplete predication” (Curme), i.e. with essential adnalex (“predicative”) complementation, “make... into” 36, enters, in non-durative environment predominantly, the immediate construction: (III 88.17f.) ΠΚΡΑΣ ΆΝ ΠΑΝΠΟΥΤΕΡ-ΠΕΙΡΗΣΟΥ ΜΠΙΣΤΟΣ ΝΧΟΕΙΚ ΕΡΩΤ / (Ch. 17.39f.) ΕΝΕΜΠΙΡ-ΠΝΓΑΝΑΚ ΝΑΣΟΜ / (IV 24.2) ΑΥΡ-ΠΝΛΑΒΟΑΟΣ ΝΒΛΑΣ / (Ch. 113.9f.) —ΕΡ-ΣΑΖ ΝΖΗΤ ΝΡΗΜΕ ΝΡΝΕ... / (A 2 293) ΣΗΡ-ΠΝΨ ΝΟΥΣΙΕ / note (Wess. 9 118a 23ff.) ΑΚΑΚ Ν-... ΑΚΡ-ΖΕΝΚΟΥΣΕ ΝΜΜΑΚ with anaphoric zero (also Ch. 192.42f.).

(4) —Π- (often with predicative complementation) “spend (time)” : III 28.5f., 42.25ff., 41.12, 132.22, IV 104.4 etc. also enters the immediate construction.

(5) So does —Π- “become” (“intransitive” —Π-, see n. 4): (Ch. 146.14ff.) ΑΥΡ-ΟΥΝΟΕ ΕΜΑΤΕ ΝΒΛΕ ΝΕ-ΛΟΟΣ / (III 47.21) ΥΑΗΡ-ΠΙΘΟΥ / (ibid. 136.4f., 145.1) — — ΑΥΡ-ΠΕΧΘΟΕΚ (cf. ΝΕΟ ΜΠΑΧΘΟΕΚ ibid. 145.3).

One plausible explanation for cases (3) to (5) is prosodic-junctural. Apparently, the whole ‘incomplete-predication verb + nom. object + adnalex complement’ complex constitutes a functionally significant prosodic patterning, in which the close juncture of the first two elements — both of which together constitute the theme (“logical subject”) to which the adnalex complement is the rheme (“logical predicate”) — is a functional characteristic.

3.1.2 OPPOSITION REPRESENTANT: THE MEDIATE CONSTRUCTION

3.1.2.0.1 Ν-/*ΜΜΟ-: A QUESTION OF IDENTITY. Before proceeding to the core of the object-construction regulation — namely, the durative environment, in which construction (b) is the primary rule — let us briefly examine some verifiable facts regarding the characteristics of this construction, (b<sub>dur./non-dur.</sub> As I see it, the synchronic question 37 to be posed cannot be one of material identity (“is Ν-/*ΜΜΟ- the

34 ΧΙ-Π(ΕΥ)ΠΟΟΥΣ fluctuates with the mediate construction (ΧΙ ΝΠ(ΕΥ)ΠΟΟΥΣ), which may be due to the homonymy of the absolute and construct allomorphs of this lexeme (IV 166.3, 40.4, 19.6, 28.4.11, 36.1f., Miss. 283). Exceptions to the rule are relatively infrequent: —ΣΙΠΕ ΜΠΑΣ (Ch. 104.8f), —ΣΙΝΕ ΝΟΥΝΑ (III 138.7), —ΣΙΠΕ ΜΠΠΙΠΟΣ (IV 156.4f) — all naturally in a non-durative environment.

36 The picture for other verbs with adnalex complementation of their object is less clear. However, consider ΚΑ- in (IV 101.17) ...ΝΣΕΚΑ-ΝΠΛΑΠΠΟΣ ΕΥΔΑΠΠΟΣ / (Mun. 177) ...ΝΣΚΑ-ΠΕΠΝΑΤΟΥΕ ΕΝΘΑΡ, Ch. 88.15ff., 198.14f.
37 The fallacy that the (per se legitimate) diachronic scanning of Ν-/*ΜΜΟ- can somehow pass as a synchronic account is not entirely a matter of the past (Bohlig 1977). Similarly, the Indo-European-style case interpretation of Ν- (Steinthal-Mistieli 1893:92, 293ff., Stern [see his index, under the various case-names], Till 237, etc.) cannot be considered adequate as a descriptive statement. (See Quecke 1981:260f. on the synchronic predicament.)
"same" lexical entity, throughout its adverbal occurrences?" — a question meaningless anyway as a structural-descriptive inquiry), but rather a taxonomic one of role relationship, i.e. of categorial (functional), tagmemic identity. It would advance our understanding to pause here and consider some typical positions and compatibilities:

(a) (A 2 107) ἀπεφείπε ηζηνήσωμ / (A 1 463) ἔρα (imp.) μμοῦ / (III 114.9ff.) χναει ηζηνήσωμηνρόν / (Borg. 247 ν) κναει μμοῦ σά / (III 96.11) εἰμέ μμοκ / (ibid. 199.28) μπούαματε μμό / (Ch. 71.3ff.) ού πελαν—ζή μμόν... ματρα—ος μμοι μάλλατ / (ibid. 82.37ff.) ουμματόωνυ ουμμύ τεντασάμε μμοῦ / (IV 84.15) νέε ετή μμο μμος 38.

(b) (IV 82.28) ἐγνόωςκ μμοῦ / (ibid. 79.14) εποτουάτει μμοῦ μμοχ / (III 166.22) παί πε προ ἐτούατς μμόν / (III 66.21f.)...εποτούς ουμμόσωβ / (IV 171.28ff.)...ἐπετρομμοου ηζηνήσωμηγι Αὑσ ηντοκιόυ ηζηνήσωμ / (A 1 34) τμμοού ουμμος σφικ 39 / (Wess. 9 139a 20f.) μποοου μμομ / (Ch. 94.51ff.) τσμμέ ητάκοκιε ερο μμόχ / (A 2 385) παίακε εἰρε μμομ νάτνουτε / (IV 173.1) νέε ετούατς μμο μμος.

On the basis of this typology one might suggest the following two valency models with \(N^-/\mu\mu\sigma^-\) in the rectonal slot(s):

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
0 & 1 \\
\hline
1 & \end{array}
\]

\( (a) \)

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
0 & 1 & 2 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

\( (b) \)

Observe: (1) The obvious shortcoming of this scheme is (as far as the nucleus verb is concerned) that it is two-dimensional. The semasiological differences of nucleus — expansion relationship between "cωτι ιμος — "", "αματε ιμος — "", "ωπο - ιμος — "", "ομε/οιμου ιμος — "" and "ο ιμος — "" are well substantiated by (and correlatable with) their respective paradigmatic properties (e.g., cωτι opposed to the static — also with \(N^-/\mu\mu\sigma^-\) opposed to the immediate construction; αματε "" with "" no static, no immediate construction; ωπο with no imm. construction, but opposed to ομοο; o (\(N^-\)) alternating with \(P^-\) in non-durative patterns). However, they are not reflected in the syntagmatic models, which do not display the substitution properties of the verbal nucleus (hence are not patterns in the true sense).

(2) In cases like Εβολ ιμος (Ch. 28.36f.), Εθο ιμο (IV 95.16), ιμο is a secondary modifier of a modifier nucleus (§1.1.2.4.1), a hierarchy which can be reflected in a syntagmatic model.

(3) In cases like Ονιοκ ιμος (IV 51.14f.), Πέπεπετνης ιμοο (ibid. 96.24), ιμο is predicative (predicating "inalienable" possession, in the second position of the Bipartite pattern, §1.2.1.1) and thus not in the valency range of ομο.

(4) The fact that the second-slot \(N^-/\mu\mu\sigma^-\) remains constant in the case of a "passive transformation" (\(=\) χναειτ ιμος — , χνεος \(N^-/\mu\mu\sigma^-\)) hardly invalidates this structural resolution (cf. QUECKE 1981:261):

(a) our matrix is a non-dynamic characteristic of the active, not the passive pattern; (b) on the contrary, the invariability of the second-slot \(N^-\) is an important distinctive trait of it, adding a paradigmatic aspect to its differentiation from its first-slot homonym.

The above model resolves the identity of \(N^-/\mu\mu\sigma^-\) — "1st-slot \(N^-/\mu\mu\sigma^-\", "2nd-slot \(N^-/\mu\mu\sigma^-\")" — which is adequate, from a structural viewpoint.

38 Cf. Tobsler 1908:1ff. ("De la manière dont nous sommes faits").
39 With a zero-determined object, we usually find the the nominal allomorph (immediate construction): (III 106.18f.) επετρομμοο—οικ ιμομοικ... αυσ ιστεπ—μοοι μμοικ, but also (ibid. 104.13) αυτεκ—ουμαξ (cf. Emmel 1981:136).
3.1.2.1 Nominal/pronominal object: pattern-symptomatic (categorial) neutralization: the "stern-Jernstedt" rule. The core statement regarding the exclusion of the immediate object construction in durative environment was made by P. V. Jernstedt in clear, albeit non-structural terms (1927:70), in a true milestone of Coptic linguistic writing: "Der Gebrauch des Absolutus ist im Präsensstamm obligatorisch, a) wenn das Objekt, sei’s äusserlich, sei’s an sich determiniert ist, und b) wenn das Objekt mit unbestimmtem Artikel ist". The two bound (pre-nominal and pre-pronominal) allomorphs of the verb lexeme are excluded before a non-zero-determinated noun or a pronoun, when this lexem is predicated in the Bipartite pattern 40 (see §3.1.2.1.1 for an inverse exclusion before zero determination. Both cases mean neutralization of the opposition between constructions (a) and (b)).

3.1.2.1.1 This exclusion is a distinctive feature of the durative predicative verb lexeme, providing yet another vital diagnostic datum — a syntagmatic one — to formally define and distinguish between it and the homonymic non-durative (Tripartite and extraconjugal) one:

\[
(\gamma)\text{cwn\text{t}}\text{t}\quad \text{vs.}\quad (\alpha\gamma)\text{cwn\text{t}},\quad (\eta)\text{cwt}\text{n}
\]

\[
\text{cotn}^+\quad \text{vs.}\quad \text{cotn}-
\]

(subject to overruling, §§3.1.2.1.2-2) giving us a neat formal structural definition of "cwn\text{t}\text{n}_{dur."} and "cwn\text{t}\text{n}_{non-dur."}. I prefer not to take here a stand on the question — essentially speculative and non-descriptive — of whether this exclusion is a consequence or a symptom of the "adverbiality" of the Bipartite predicative verb-lexeme, the wherefore and rationale of this phenomenon 41. As I see it, the present "durative infinitive" has nothing adverbal about it — it is not a modifier: it is adequately differentiated from its non-durative homonym by both paradigmatic and syntagmatic (pattern and expansion) properties. As far as synchrony goes, I find its structural assignment the only necessary, and quite satisfactory, "explanation".

An all-important issue which is but marginally within the scope of the present discussion is the correlation of the expansion properties of the present-tense predicate with its two semasiological distinctive features, durativity and actuality. Under certain circumstances, functional suppression of the durativity feature takes place and is manifested in the invalidation (or overruling) of the Stern-Jernstedt Rule: Jern-

---

40 Polotsky 1960s:§23 Obs. 1-4, Funk 1978a (III). This issue was treated by the early scholars: the outlines were first described by Stern (§490-40); Spiegelberg, RT 36:159f. (1912). The last to ignore the rule was Till (1928:§147f.).

41 This aspect of the question has been treated by Jelanskaia (1970), with a diachronic-mentalistic bias ("How was the adverbial verbal predication felt?") and by Schenkell (1978), who curiously denies the "verbal recit" capabilities of "adverbial" verb forms. The "adverbiality" of the Bipartite predicate vs. the "nominality" of the Tripartite predicate is not an explanation, but a tautology, or condensed restatement of pattern (esp. substitution) facts. I cannot see that the "adverbiality" of the durative infinitive is responsible for the exclusion of the immediate construction (where it is excluded): synchronically, the "adverbiality" of this predicate — and of the statical — are established only by substitution. (Moreover, I would not define [as does Schenkell the case of zero-determinated objects as a "Paradbeispiel" of stehende Wendungen [fixed expressions]). I doubt greatly (on return to the "adverbiality" question) that substitutability alone is sufficient to qualify the Bipartite verbal predicate as a modifier except in a vague, general manner of speaking. (Analogously, we would have to consider the predicate in NTEIKE [§1.2.1.2, as nominal!]) Substitution alone is a notoriously unreliable, lopsided guide for grammatical definition, without the vital syntagmatic ordinate. Just as expansion properties are needed to resolve, e.g., the difference between "he is trying" (pres. progressive tense, historically "adverbial") and "he is trying" (adjectival predication): "he is very trying", vs. "he is trying hard" — "he is more trying than..." vs. "he is trying harder than...", in addition to the paradigmatic information "he is trying/*ke some/*pestiferous" vs. "he is trying/*atempting/*doing...") — so in our Coptic case too we need the syntagmatic dimen ion, the expansion differentiae specificae, to reach a formal distinction. (The parallel between the English -ing, tense and gerund [historically, preposition + nominal " infinitive"] with its superficial merger with the nomen actionis, and the Coptic "gerundial" infinitive, can be carried a long way.)
STEDT 1927:70(3), ἈΠΟΣΤΕΥΧΕΙΝ. Jernstedt himself attributed this to the "grammatical union" in the complex "auxiliary + circumstantial present", the conjugation base ("Tempuscharakter") of the auxiliary dictating the treatment of the lexically more important but grammatically subordinate auxiliates.

I find no evidence in Shenoute for this particular neutralization, but we do encounter the Aufhebung of durativity expressed in another, namely the opposition static vs. infinitive (for a lexeme with a "movement" sememe), overruling Polotsky 1960a:§9: (Ch. 189.32ff.) ΠΗΛΟΝΟΣΙΟΝ ἘΧΕΙ ἘΦΑΙ ΕΝΕΚΕΝΣΙΔΙΧ (sim. III 105.6ff., Ryl. Cat. 35 No. 70 CMO).

It is an open question whether both exclusions — of the immediate object-expansion after transitives and of the infinitive with intransitives — are at all co-extensive, or whether either is symptomatic of any temporal-aspectual distinctive feature; if this is the case, we may glimpse here the syntagmatic-paradigmatic differentiation between an actual/durative and non-actual (atemporal, "aoristic") present, the latter yet to be empirically established and documented as a formal category. Note, however, that until an independent unified definition of "intransitive" and (grammatically relevant) "movement sememe" is achieved, one runs here the risk of circularity, in basing a categorial definition on an exclusion feature: there are too many ambiguities, various componential-modification lexemes ("ΕΙ ἘΦΑΙ", "ΒΙΕΕΙ ΕΠΟΥΝ"), to assume an easily definable lexical "category" of this kind.

3.1.2.2 Nominal/pronominal object: morphological (lexemic) absence of morphophonemic alternation. The mediate construction is the sole one — even in non-durative environment — where the morphophonemic-alternation mechanism is not available.

3.1.2.2.1 Verbs of Egyptian origin, not compound: 1st-slot, rectional ΗΜΙΟΝ -: ἈΜΑΖΕΙ ΗΜΙΟΝ - "hold, grasp" (ΙΙΙ 199.28, IV 86.4), ΜΑΤΕ ΗΜΙΟΝ - "reach, obtain" (ΙΙΙ 100.22), ΖΡΑ ΗΜΙΟΝ - "drive off" (Ming. 322, A 1 463), ΞΥΒΕ ΗΜΙΟΝ - "mock, ridicule" (ΙΙΙ 104.12), ΗΠΟΤ ΗΜΙΟΝ - "boast, pride oneself on..." (ΙΙΙ 68.5f., A 1 330), ΕΠΧΘ ΗΜΙΟΝ - "pledge" (ΙΙΙ 132.2f., 223.18), cf. (?) ΕΠΚΩΝ ΗΜΙΟΝ - "swear by..." (P 130496 PNA), ΠΑΤΕ ΗΜΙΟΝ - "rejoice in..." (Mich. 550 18), ΕΙΜΙ ΗΜΙΟΝ - "understand, know" (ΙΙΙ 96.11);

42 See also JERNSTEDT 1959:113 n. 8, and cf. POLOTSKY 1960a:§9 Obs. 1.

43 It is only in the perfective ἈΠΟΣΤΕΥΧΕΙΝ (with Α- ὠς ε- the discontinuous tense-morpheme of the marked perfect (vs. the unmarked Α-)) that we find this phenomenon; the negative correspondent here is ΜΝΗΜΗ (Stern's "perfectum absolutum": ΜΝΗΜΗ is unmarked). See SHISHA-HALEVY 1972, QUECKE 1979:442ff, FUNK 1981:192ff. (Note that ἈΠΟΣΤΕΥΧΕΙΝ is the analytic "renewed" successor of ΖΡΑ-, the original affirmer. counterpart of ΜΝΗΜΗ — POLOTSKY 1960a:§9 n. 1 (see now FUNK 1981:191ff.). ὠς is of course a descendant of the same w3h that is fused in ΖΡΑ-. Thus, the familiar analysis → synthesis → reanalysis diachronic spiral is again in evidence.) Shenoutean exx. for this periphrastic tense: ΗΛΕΚΤΡΗ 20.26, ΗΛΕΚΤΡΗ 108.15, Ch. 15.49ff., 136.49ff. ὠς in a Clause-Conjugation or post-eventive setting (ΜΝΗΜΗ, ΕΠΧΘ, ΜΝΗΜΑΤΕΠΗ-) has a different value: terminative Aktionsart ("have finished doing"), with ὠς fully contributing lexically (e.g. IV 69.23, Ch. 133.8ff.).

44 The case of ὠς ᾧ ἔχωμεν (ΙΙΙ 224.15, Ch. 175.35ff.) may be different — a pertinent infinitive, expressing ingressio and opposed to a static expressing state.

45 SHISHA-HALEVY 1976a:46 (cf. YOUNG 1961:119ff., and §7.2.4.1 below). According to SCHENKEL (1978:15) the present is generally "tempus-indifferent"; yet this is not strictly true, since, with its durative Aktionsart reference, it does have some absolute temporal systemic standing (unlike the extratemporal ΜΝΗΜΗ -/ΜΝΗΜΑΤΕΠΗ- or atemporal Clause Conjugation forms). Historically, the category of non-actual present has yet to be traced. For Demotic, cf. JOHNSON 1974 exx. E44B and E46B: for LE, cf. nτυ hr jτ (and not m jτ). WENTZ 1959:96ff., 103ff., ČERNÝ-GRÜLL §19.6 and ref. In (ΙΙΙ 216.18ff.) ῬΙΟΟΥ ΑΝ ΠΕΤΤΕΒΟΥ ΠΡΟΒΟ ΖΑΜΜΕΝΟΙ the second infinitive is not a durative predicate, but hierarchically subordinate, an expansion; §6.0.2, link (5).

46 The typically Shenoutean CEPHΗ, ΑΠΟΣΤΕΥΧΕΙΝ (A 1 177, ΙΙΙ 74.11, ΙΙΙ 24.20) juxtaposes the actual ΣΕΡΟΣ "they are awake" and non-actual ΣΕΡΟΣ "they are vigilant." Other candidates: (ΙΙΙ 215.18) ΧΑΝΕΙΑΝΟΥΣ ΕΣΕΙ ΣΙΤΙΝΘΙ "fall (as a natural fact)" / (ΙΙΙ 22.21) ΕΝΕΚΟΙΝΟΥ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΖΡΑΙ ΧΡΙΝΤΝ "those that should die" / (Ch. 22.49f) ΕΚΕΙ ΕΠΟΥΝ "now and again" (but ΕΠΧΘ in line 46) / (ΙΙΙ 44.1f) ΝΕΤΕΡΕΝΕΝΟΑ ΕΠ ΕΠΟΥΝ ΕΜΟΥ (observe the connection between this present and the determinative relative).

47 STERN §§493, 495.
§3.1.2.2.2 Compound verbs of Egyptian or Greek origin:

- P-MNTPE MMO= “testify” (III 17.10); P-2AA MMO= “beguile” (III 221.28, P 1304 60 OB); P-ANAY MMO= “swear by” (III 19.3.11); P-2MME MMO= “guide” (IV 82.2f., 199.15, both durative); P-ENRP MMO= “be amazed at, wonder at” (A 2 319, dur.); P-XPIA MMO= “need” (IV 56.5 [dur.], A 2 293); XI-HLE MMO= “count” (Ch. 197.36f.); XI-KBA MMO= “revenge oneself on” (III 26.11, 64.5f., P 1304 53 TIB, 1314 151 M); XI-IBC MMO= “trip up” (P 1304 44 PID, 1304 20 ro); XI-MHCE MMO= “take interest in” (III 65.26); +-OCE MMO= “lose” (Ch. 71.6f.); +-NH Y MMO= “gain” (Ch. 71.3ff., 97.6f.); +-NAKE MMO= “give birth to” (A 2 155 [dur.], P 1314 65 vo); XI-CNO MMO= “bleed”, trans. (III 73.11); TAE-DEY MMO= “proclaim, preach” (III 75.20, Wess. 9 147a-b, d 21f.); KA-BOA MMO= “vomit” (Ch. 27.42f.); CMN-CNTE MMO= “found” (A 2 146, III 188.14f.); OYEZ-CAZNE MMO= “enjoin” (III 20.3, IV 43.1f.); MEZ-ELAT MMO= “gloat over, look one’s fill at” (Ench. 71a). At first sight, with the nominal object we face the difficulty of distinguishing adverbial N-/MMO= from adnominal n-MMO= (cf. §§1.0.2, 1.1.1, chapter 4) — the former expanding the verb syntagm, the latter its nominal component; but this distinction is irrelevant in this syntagm, where the two are neutralized.

3.1.2.2.3 Verbs of Greek origin (a specimen selection): APOTEPEI MMO= (III 62.23); STAYPOY MMO= (Ch. 33.8f.); NOI MMO= (III 204.27); DOKIMAEE MMO= (Ch. 13.16f.); KOLAEE MMO= (IV 7.19f.); APATA MMO= (III 138.15); FOPEI MMO= (III 100.4); and so on.

3.1.3 Conditioning (selection) of the mediative construction (pronominal object, non-durative environment)

3.1.3.1 Lexemes with pertinent MMO= rection. This group should be carefully kept apart from the non-alternating lexemes (§3.1.2.2.1): here we are concerned with verbs that do “have” a presuffixed

---

*STERN §509. Cf. §§3.0.1 and 1.1.2 (gen. obs., on their valency structuring P-2AA | MMO=).*
The "Direct Object"

3.1.3.2.1 COTEXTUAL SECONDARY SELECTION OF ΜΜΟ= ("NON-REFLEXIVE OBJECT"). Here we encounter a secondary (ad hoc?) opposition or cotextual relativization: a non-reflexive reference of ΜΜΟ=, resolving the ambiguity of identical 3rd-person pronouns (the numbers indicate the personal reference of the pronoun): (IV 44.5) ...ΕΤΡΕΨΚΙ ΜΜΟ= ΝΑ= (Ch. 44-5) ...ΕΤΕΤΝΕΤΡΕΨΟΥΕ ΜΜΟ= ΝΕΕΩΟΥ (ibid. 44.49f.) ...ΕΤΡΕΨΚΙ ΜΜΟ= (ibid. 71.19f.) ...ΕΑΤΣΗ ΜΜΟ= ΝΤΗΤΕ (IV 89.1f.) ΕΥΝΑΤΑΟΟΥΣΟΥ ΕΠΕΙΜΑ ΝΩΤΕΙΣ ΜΜΟΥ ΝΑΥ. Here the rhythmic factor must be considered, §3.1.3.3.2.

3.1.3.2.2 MISCELLANEOUS. (a) Biblical reminiscence: (III 56.1) ΑΤΕΨΑΓΑΝ ΑΗΟΧ ΧΙ ΜΜΟΙ (Cant. 2:5) and (IV 79-80) ...ΝΤΥΧΙ ΜΜΟ= ΝΧΝΑΣ (reminiscence of Act. 16:15): III 196-7 passim, ΠΝΣΤ ΜΜΟ= ΜΠΕΨΓΩΝ... etc., adaptation of Ez. 20:13.21, 36.18 (etc.).

(b) Paradigmatic and cotextual association (?): (III 196-7 passim) (-)ΑΜΑΣΤΕ ΜΠΕΨΓΩΝ — (-)ΠΝΣΤ ΜΜΟ= ΜΠΕΨΓΩΝ, see (a) / (III 104.15) ΑΥΝΟΓΝΕ ΜΜΟ= by association with ΣΒΕΕΕ ΜΜΟ= (cf. IV 59.8 ΕΥ-ΣΩΚΕ (sic) Η ΕΥΝΑΤΑΟΕ); this may be a case of pertinent ΜΜΟ= (§3.1.3.1), but we need more evidence here.

(c) On rhythmic-euphonic motivations we know exceedingly little (§3.1.3.3.2). The wish to avoid a sequence of overshort forms and dissonance may explain (III 150.1) ...ΝΠΗ ΜΜΟΥ ΕΤΟΟΤΥ ΜΠΕΣΟΕΙ, (ibid. 222.12) ΜΑΡΜΟΚΜΕΝ ΜΜΟΝ, and such cases. (IV 157.22f.) ΝΤΑΥΤΙΣΕ ΜΜΟ= ΝΤΟΣ; the presence of enclitic particles (§6.0.3) between two fully stressed units apparently constitutes a desirable rhythmic contour (§3.1.3.3.2); consider (III 163.22f.) ΕΝΜΑ ΕΤΡΕΨΒΒΙΟΥ... ΕΑΤΣΗ ΔΕ ΡΥΨΗ ΜΜΟΥ.

(d) A residue of unaccountable instances: (III 38.14f.) ΠΣΤΕΕ ΕΤΡΑΨΤ ΜΜΟ= (cf. ΟΣΤ= in Dictionary 540b): a case of "augmentative" construction (§3.1.3.1)? (ibid. 219.10f.) ...ΝΤΕΤΑΟΟΥ ΕΡΑΤΟΥ ΜΠΕΨΓΩΝ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΤΥΨΙΡΧ ΜΜΟΥ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΕΥΡΗ (RE 10 162a 2f.) ΠΝΣΤΡ ΠΝΕΤΜΕ ΜΜΟ= ΑΥΗ ΕΝΙΤΑΤΕΙΣ ΜΜΟ= ΜΜΟ=.

Is this a case of assimilation to the construction of the durative predicate? Note that ΜΜΟ= here expands an extra-conjugal infinitive (see next paragraph).

3.1.3.2.3 POSSIBLE MORPHOPHONEMATIC/MORPHOSYNTACTIC COMBINATORY CONDITIONING OF ΜΜΟ=.

One must here consider:

(a) instances of the 2nd person singular feminine pronominal object after a lexeme of the biradical ('ΚΨΤ ') class in a case of a medial laryngal: (III 206.10) ΑΧΨΨΜ ΜΜΟ (reflex.): contrast with (A 2 305)
ηνακού. Note the relatively high incidence of the ‘κυτ’ class among instances of the pronominal mediate construction (preceding paragraphs), esp. with medial-laryngeal lexemes: also υπο-μοο (Leyd. 328, A 2 345), κυσ-μοο (IV 83.23). More 2nd pers. fem. instances (also in other classes): (III 205.28)
...νευθυ κοο / (P 130 67 ΡΟΗ) γεπενηκαι ευ Μοο γιπυκ ηάαά (‘planted you’) / κοο ηεμπουκο ευ μοο ρω 606ς 236πηκα.

(b) Alternatively (or conjointly) significant may be the many instances of μοο expanding the extra-conjunctival infinitive (esp. N + inf.), (τε)κε- or the conjunctive (III 150.1, 219.10f., IV 83.23, 89.2 twice, Ch. 62.42f.; see §7.1.3 for the structural affinities of the conjunctive with the Bipartite pattern); this construction is relatively rare in Sentence Conjugation infinitives.

These facts may prove to be no more than so many red herrings, but then they may well give glimpses of significant morphologic or morphosyntactic properties, providing an alternative explanation to that of §3.1.3.1.

3.1.3.3 Nominal object: discernible stylistic motivation for the selection of the mediate/immediate construction. In the following paragraphs I indicate tentatively several factors of stylistic relevance that may possibly be responsible for the choice of the mediate or immediate construction. These are not statements of conditioning: contrary exx. are commonplace. Pending full empirical implementation, esp. statistical corroboration, let this be taken as a mere impressionistic record. (These elusive cases are by their very nature explicable ad hoc rather than predictable, at least until an explicit theory of Coptic literary stylistics is evolved, relating stylistic to syntactic function.)

3.1.3.3.1 (1) The mediate construction bracketing two conjugation forms (with identical or semasiologically close lexemes — usually in the disjunctio Sinithiana): (Ch. 9.8ff.) ηετανταμε-τεο δηπκας / (ibid. 69.45ff.) γεπούεψ-νυντ αυμ πούεψ (§3.1.1.2.2) / (IV 113.19) ηευγθένθη-παρπη η τέγοαθη ε νεγαα, unless with lexemes where the prenominal allomorphs would, being short, upset the ‘rhythmic balance’ (§3.1.3.3.2): (III 107.2ff.) αθκ ηενψαξε ευκοτωθ αυμ ζενζθηε εφακ εναμ ματαθα / (ibid. 113.9f.) αλκθυ τονκατθεβ αυμ τομκακοσθ / (ibid. 113.1ff.) (ε)νεγαεμε μοαεν αυμ πακαθαο ηαταε-πεαε μη πακαθαο αλκθυ μακκογονκ μακκουρθ / (ibid. 126.1ff.)...επενεεμε δηνβορνηα δηαπκαθμ δηακκακαα. Also 186.2ff., 155.8, 156.4 etc. We have an exception in (IV 40.21ff.) επέννουθ... ηετάκο ηάαηε κοοκακα.

3.1.3.3.2 Rhythmic-euphonic regulation. Two basic principles seem to be relevant in this connection: (a) stress patterning: the mediate construction constitutes two separate stress-units (verb-noun) of equal prosodic standing, whereas the immediate construction constitutes a single composite

---

49 Statistics on the widespread N-resection of this class are here essential.
50 (III 113.5f.) (ε)μπαμπ-πεκαμ αυμ ηεακ is a curious case of expanding (coordinating) the ‘object’ of the intransitive P (note 4), marking it as predicative complementation by means of N (and not 2th-).
51 The rhythmic factor in syntax is notoriously elusive, subjective and speculative, open to the pitfall of circularity and unverifiable. Nonetheless, it incontestably exists. Once again, we need first a full theory based on junctural-prosodic data, for which we hardly have even the rudiments (compare however Czernak 1928 and 1931: esp. 129ff., 156ff., 165ff.). On the rhythmic and similar factors and object constructions, see Stern: 319, Spiegelberg 1912:159f. (on motivation by the extent of the object), Quecke 1979:447. For the ordering factor in 2 Β Α- Ν see Emmel 1981 (esp. 139ff.).
prosodic unit (probably with primary and secondary stress subunits). The mediate object usually follows an unstressed (or relatively weakly stressed) element, thus forming a rhetorically effective, syllable-like rhythmic patterning or contour: ‘stress - ( ) - stress’ (‘peak - dip - peak’). + NA- N- is here especially striking 82 (e.g. III 33.24, 59.13, Ch. 70.55ff., 83.24ff., IV 74.27, 117.9f., 155.9f., 173.14, etc. etc.). Consider also: XIW NA- N- (Ch. 94.23ff.), CUPP NA- N- (Ch. 75.40ff.), εψυκ NA- N- (III 39.6f.), KÜ HCSW- N- (IV 117.28), Biała EBOA- N- (Ch. 74.46ff.), VI MMay N- (Ch. 108.37ff., Or. 155.49ff.), KÜ NA- EBOA- N- (III 123.14ff., 138.12ff., IV 10.2ff.), Yi EPO- N- (Ch. 142.15f.) GINE N2HT- N- (Ch. 73.11f.), Yi UPO- N- (III 110.1), ΜΑΣΑΝΕ ΕΡΑΤΟΥ- N- (Wess. 9 126b 7f.), and so on.

A case in point is the interplay of (1) ‘OYNT(Η)M + noun MMay’ and (2) ‘OYNT(M) MMay N + noun’; exx. for (1): III 71.23, IV 7.8, Ch. 120.7f., 125.20ff., 152.27ff., etc.; and for (2): III 45.7f., 34.16f., 52.9f., 58.8,11, 60.15 etc. With a zero-determinate object, this alternation is cancelled, only construction (1) being eligible (III 45.1f., 89.4f., 94.11f. etc.).

(b) A second principle seems to be that of rhythmic balancing: the avoidance of overshort lexiceme body (short, compared with the following — often complex — noun-sytagm and possibly the preceding conjugalational frame). This may account for the frequent mediate construction with (non-durative) EIPÉ, GINE, ΕΙΝΕ: (III 112-3) EIPÉ N- : TAIÉ-, MÉPÉ-, 9 X / (III 134.2) EIPÉ MNOYWY MNOYTYE / (A 2 107) ATE- 

TNEIPÉ ΝΖΕΝΧΨΨ / (Ch. 105.55f.) EIYΑΝΤΕΠΕ MΗΝΑΖΕ ΤΗΨΨ... / (III 178.21) NIUTEYIPE ΝΖΕΝΠΡΝΙA ΜΝΖΕΝΚΡΨΨ / (ibid. 205.16f.) ΑΠΕΙΠΕ ΝΖΕΝΠΡΝΙΑ ΝΖΕΝΧΨΨΨΨ ΜΝΖΕΝΚΡΨΨ / (III 180.16) ΝΤΕΡΕΠΙΝΟΥΤΕ 

ΝΑΕΝΕ ΝΤΕΡΟΡΝ ΝΝΠΕΨΨΨΨ ΕΤΨΨΨΨΨΨ, consider also III 203.1, 126.1ff., 189.28, IV 4.9, 80.16f., Wess. 9 118a 15f., III 104.8 (ΤΨΨΨΨΨ). The same may go for (non-durative) XI, T, ΨΨ, although in this case the wide-spread mediation construction may be preferred, as the only means to mark the verb-object interdependence. Since for these lexemes the absolute and construct allomorphs are homonymic, the functional burden falls on N- (XI N- Ch. 95.56, 107.14f., III 127.15, IV 3.19, 36.16f., etc.; VI N- Wess. 9 172d 23f., III 57.2f., IV 36.1f., 6,12, etc.; + N- III 90.6,7, 117.30, IV 26.13, 122.5 etc.).

3.1.3.3 Miscellaneous. (a) "Inner", lexically cognate object ("figura etymologica"): immediate construction: (Ch. 27.13ff.) ΝΗΤΕΝΠΟΥΤΕ ΤΕΚΨΝΕ / (A 2 80, cf. A 2 238) ΜΝΝΚΑΡΕΨΟΥΝ-ΠΙΚΟΟΥΝ ΤΗΨΨΨΨ ΨΨΨΨ — a recurring expression, cf. P 1301 36 ΡΨΨΨΨ: ΝΕΤΝΑΤΟΛΑ ΜΠ-ΝΟΒΕΨΨΨΨΨΨ... ΜΝΝΚΑΡΕΨΟΥΝ-ΠΙΚΟΟΥΝ, also IV 180.2 / (A 2 179) ΜΠΟΥΤΕΝ-ΤΗΨΝΕ / (IV 54.3) ΕΥΨΝΑΤΕΨΨ-ΝΕΤΨΨΨΨΨΨ."
3.3 The "predication mediators": verb-lexeme premodifiers

These intriguing elements (Funk: "preverbals", Layton: "preextensions") immediately precede the verb lexeme: PTIKE- "also, additionally, moreover", P2OYO/E- "(even) more, rather", (P)-ΨΡΡΡ(Ν)- "early, first". The mediators raise some serious analytic queries, from both syntagmatic and paradigmatic angles: What is their formal role? What "slot" positions do they occupy in the conjugation pattern, and how is it they do not disrupt it, the lexeme having precisely the same categorial definition (by commutation and expansion properties) as in the mediator-less conjugation pattern? Indeed, this last phenomenon is, I am sure, the key to the mystery: these elements are verb-lexeme/stative premodifiers — the only means in Coptic to modify unambiguously a verb lexeme alone, not the whole predication pattern (adpattern modification). The verb lexeme is the nucleus in this syntagm; the premodifier belongs, in IC terms, to the verb component:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{AΨ} & \mid \text{P-ΠΚΕ} \parallel \text{ΚΤΜ} \\
\text{nucl.} & \quad \text{satellite} \\
\end{align*}
\]

I query the satellital status of the lexeme/stative premodifiers, since we do not find elsewhere in Coptic the sequence 'satellite → nucleus', inverse to the basic Coptic syntagmatic sequence, and because premodifiers (hence lexeme premodifiers?) are not adjuncts, properly speaking, but rather "presetting" modifiers (§1.1.2.2). Given this basic articulation, we must still bear in mind the following qualifications:

(a) The mediators are not (at least in part) mutually exclusive, and are therefore not a single category: (Ch. 105.3f.) ΝΠΙΚΕΡΕΠΟΥΕ→ΓΟΝΤ. The lexeme ΕΠΕ (P-) is compatible with the mediators.

(b) Except possibly for P2OYO-, the commutation of the premodified durative infinitive does not exactly match that of the unmodified one: the predicative modifier does not occur after PTIKE-, (P)ΨΡΡΡ(Ν)- (mutual exclusion of essentially similar entities?).

(c) (P)ΨΡΡΡ(Ν)- is quite rare in the durative pattern (probably for reasons of semasiological incompatibility); in Shenoute it does not, to the best of my knowledge, premodify a stative form. Consequently, it cannot really be tested for nuclearity. Shenoute's pronounced predilection for the mediators (QUECKE 1975/6:480f.) is a tangible distinctive stylistic trait. I cannot point in Shenoute to any other

63 On these elements, see JERNSTEDT 1925; QUECKE 1962, 1970:380ff., 1975/6 (here treating Shenoutean usage); FUNK 1978a: 119, 1978b (with Shenoutean exx.); LAYTON 1979:191f.; BÖHLIG 1973; SHISHA-HALEVY 1975:473. Funk's study of this subject is undoubtedly the most penetrating and careful; Quecke's (and to an extent Funk's) is strikingly contrastive, regarding the mediators as translation-equivalents of Greek preverbs. (Whether or not they are "docile calques" remains outside the scope of an internal description.)

64 I have used "conjunction mediators" (1975:473) only in the tagmemic sense of "zero slot" elements, i.e. elements that are not pattern constituents — have no formal, operative standing in the pattern — but transparent and phantom-like, manage to transmit the nasal or nucleus-satellite interdependences between the formal-grammatical (actor, conj. base, determinator...) and the lexical constituent.

65 JERNSTEDT 1927:71 discusses this lexeme premodifier, concluding that it is "frozen", P- being no longer functional as a verb (as evidenced by the stative following it). He does not refer to the object construction after PTIKE- + infinitive.

66 JERNSTEDT 1925, FUNK 1978a:119, 1978b:105ff., SHISHA-HALEVY 1975:473. QUECKE 1970:380ff. raises unnecessary doubts as to the legitimacy of the 'mediator + stative' construction with ΨΡΡΡ(Ν)-. BÖHLIG 1973 considers the alternation of infinitive/stative after ΨΡΡΡ(Ν)- a variation, and thus misses the whole grammatical point. Layton (1979:191f.): "verbal preexensions... which somehow stand outside the conjugation". (Cf. the transformationalist use of "preverb")


mediator beside the three discussed here 59: -τρε- 60, more of a conjugation-carrier (probably analyzable as τ- (nucl.) + ρε-), ξπε/-ξπε-, -(ε)υ-, and the future characteristic -να-, are all nuclear in their respective syntags, expanded by the "extra-conjugal" infinitive.

3.3.1 προκέ- (selective representative documentation for the premodified lexeme with object-expansion):

(a) Non-durative (rare): (1) immediate construction: (III 33.4) (2nd perf.) ΝΤΑΡΠΗΚΕΡ-ΣΤΜΗ / (Ch. 149.27f.) ΑΥΡΠΙΚΕΟΥΧΥ; (2) mediate construction: (III 57.2f.) ΑΥΡΑΝΘΗ ΜΝΟ ΕΥΡΠΗΚΕΙΝ ΜΠΕΡΤΕΥΝ ΝΤΟΟΤΣ, also IV 44.2.

(b) Durative (this is the usual environment. Very often, we find here the circumstantial present; also exx. of the autofocal antithetic Second Present: "not only... but also"; (Wess. 9 119a 21 ff.) ΣΕΡΠΗΚΕΝ ΟΝ ΜΝΟ / (Ch. 151.4ff. parall. K9294) ΣΕΡΠΗΚΕΝ ΝΕΡΝΠΗΥΕ / (A 2486)...ΕΥΡΠΗΚΕΝ ΝΗΣΘΥ ΕΡΟΥ (cf. Polotsky 1960a:§23 Obs. 1) / (ibid. 356) ΕΥΡΠΗΚΕΚΝΤ ΜΝΟΟΥ / (Rossi 2/3 27)...ΕΥΡΠΗΚΕΚΝΤΕ ΝΑΥ ΝΤΟΟ ΝΟΥΚΡΙΜΑ / (ibid. 34)...ΕΥΡΠΗΚΕΝΣΕΗ ΝΕΡΝΠΗΥΕ / (Or. 160.43ff.)...ΕΥΡΠΗΚΕΚΝΤ ΝΠΟΙΜΑ, and so on. Note the frequent instances of -προκέ- premodifying the static: (A I 96) ΣΕΡΠΗΚΕΝ ΟΝ ΜΝΑΧΕ / (Miss. 284)...ΕΥΡΠΗΚΕΝ ΝΟΥΓΜΗ — contrast with the "intransitive" or copular -π- in non-durative environment: (P 1304 137 tάζ) ΑΥΡΠΗΚΕΚΝΣΗΕ / (Rossi 2/3 77)...ΕΥΡΠΗΚΕΚΝΗ ΕΒΟΛΑ 2Ν- / (A 2 301)...ΕΥΡΠΗΚΕΒΗΤ / (ibid. 322)...ΕΥΡΠΗΚΕΞΑΤ. In (IV 80.9)...ΕΥΡΠΗΚΕΟΥΧ ΑΝ Ε- we have a rare negated case (the only one known to me in Shenoute).

3.3.2 προβού/ο- (selective, representative object-expanded documentation):

(a) Non-durative: (1) immediate construction: (A 2 7-8) ΜΠΟΥΡΠΟΤΟΥΧΟΥ, ΑΕΡΓΟΥΕΚΑΜΕΣ / (ibid. 17) ΜΠΟΥΧΕΝ ΝΤΜΕ ΝΑΡΠΟΥΕΚΟΥΧ ΑΝ; (2) mediate construction: (A 2 10)...ΝΗΤΡΠΟΥΕΧΗΤΕ ΝΠΥΡΑΝ.

(b) Durative: (B. M. Cat. 104 No. 230 PMZ) ΣΕΡΠΗΚΕΛΙ ΜΝΟΟΥ ΝΟΟΝΣ / (A 1 234) ΠΕΤΜΟΥΣ ΝΤΜΕ ΑΥΣΟΥ ΖΝΟΥΖ ΜΠΑΚΑ ΑΥΣΟΥ ΕΤΡΟΥΕΟΥΣ ΝΠΥΡΗ / (ibid. 304) ΣΕΡΠΗΚΟΤΣΕ ΜΝΟΟΥ / (III 76.12ff., Wess. 9 154df. 4f.) ΕΥΡΠΗΚΕΩΕΜΕ ΜΝΟΟΥ / (P 1306 17 ΡΖ) ΕΥΡΠΗΚΕΣΚ ΜΝΕ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΝΕΡΝΠΗΥΕΙΣ. Zero-determined object: (P 1314 30 PMS) ΕΡΡΠΗΚΕΝΣΗΕ ΡΟΥΔΕΤΑΗΕ-ΠΟΝΘΡΟ ΕΒΟΛΑ / (Or. 159.52ff.)...ΕΣΡΠΗΚΕΡ-ΠΕΤΝΑΝΟΥ ΝΙΜ. The causative of -προβο- is illustrated by (IV 19.14ff.)...ΝΠΗΤΡΠΟΥΟΥ-ΒΡΠΕ. Note here again the static premodified by -προβο-: (A 2 10) ΠΡΟΥΕΟΟΝ (sim. A 1 204) / (ibid. 21) (Ο)ΥΖΝΑΑΑ ΕΥΡΠΗΚΕΤΣΗΕ ΕΒΟΛΑ / (ibid. 331) ΣΕΡΠΗΚΕΝΟΥ / (A 1 155) ΚΡΟΥΟΤΗΤ ΟΝ ΝΖΗΤ / (P 1306 75 ro) ΩΟΥΟΥ Χ ΚΡΟΥΟΤΒΒΗΥ / (A 1 266) ΠΡΙΜΕ ΕΤΡΟΥΕΟΟΤΡ (a recurring expression, also A 1 268, 269, 271, A 2 4, etc.) / (B. M. Cat. 79 No. 194,3) ΚΕΡΠΗΚΕΟΑ6 / (A 2 527) ΘΕΛΝΙΣ... ΕΤΡΟΥΟΤΟΥ / (Ch. 195.21ff.) ΠΙΝΟΒΕ ΖΩΟΥ ΡΟΥΕΝΑΤ.

(c) Special cases of the non-durative lexeme. In the non-actual present (§3.1.2.1.1.), etc. 61: (A 1 276, collated) (Ε)ΝΗΡΤΗΤ ΑΝ ΝΓΙΝΕΤΕΡ (sic) ΝΟΑΑΗΜΟΟΣ (sic), ΠΡΟΥΕΝΤΝΤ ΖΩΟΥ ΝΓΙΝΗΜΑΤΟΙ / (A 2 245, collated) ΕΑΥΤΗ-ΠΕΖΗΤ ΕΝΔΙ ΧΕ-ΧΟΟΝ ΜΠΕΡΗΚΕΝΣΓΑΝ ΝΠΑΟΤΤΟΜΑΤ-ΑΔΑΑ, ΕΥΡΠΗΚΕΝΣΤΝΟΥ ΕΟΥΣΑΛΛ ΡΝΤΕΤΕΟΗΡΤΗΣ δώνε „having shut their hearts to the fact that He had been in existence with His Father

59 Cf. FUNK 1978b:97ff., 101. I would not include -τρε- under this heading: it is different formally and functionally. Its position is conditioned and is not always prelexemic (ΕΡΑΝΤΜΠΟΡΝΕΤΜΠΟΤΕΝ ΚΟΤ); it has a different systemic standing. (Note incidentally an instance — unique as far as I know — of -τρε- negating τρε+κέω in conjunction instead of (ν-) αν negating the conjugation form: (P 1306 98 ro) ΕΡΑΝΤΜΠΟΡΝΕΤΜΠΟΤΕΝ ΕΑΝΗΜΕ "Were I not long-suffering, I should not let them exist any longer ")
60 Although exceedingly rare in Sahidic, we find as close to Shenoute as Besa (ed. Kuhn, 101.17ff.) an instance of durative τρε ΜΝΟ Ε- (cf. Polotsky 1939:111 = CP 375). Exx. like (II Tim. 1:6) ΗΠΡΕΚΕΙΝΕ ΜΠΕΡΗΚΕΝΕ are not conclusive, although statistics may here prove illuminating.
61 See QUECKE 1975/6:485ff., FUNK 1978b:106 n. 68. In (A 2 376) ΑΑΑΑ ΝΕΡΟΟΥ ...ΡΟΥΕΓΕ ΕΒΟΛΑ collation with Zoege 246 ff shows that Amélineau omitted the perfect base.
before anything was created, they rather resemble a man crippled in both legs — possibly an instance of an apodotic, Tripartite -ἐνθέωθ (SHISHA-HALEVY 1973) 62.

(d) The common -προγαν- could be taken as predicative modifier premodified by -προγαν-: (A 110) οὐκείνει παραπτωμένοις εἰςπρογαν εἰςτρίπτωμεν, also Ch. 33.43ff., 104.51ff., Or. 160.41ff. etc. Since however we find this also outside the present (A 2 396) θναπρογαν ζωμπαθουσάθ (IV 86.3) μηπρογαν ζωοκ ερνεάθ, we must perhaps conclude that προγαν in this case is nuclear 61, a fully predicative verb syntagm ("abound") complemented by 2η — 64. That this is the copular ("intransitive") P- is perhaps indicated by (P 1315 19 ΜΓ) ἐτέκανο προγαν ζωμπαθουσάθ: in that case -προγαν- in the durative could be the mediator.

3.3.3 -πουπν/-πουπν/-ποπν/-πουπν- (selective object-expanded documentation):

(a) Non-durative: (1) the immediate construction: ημαξεκαταθεπειθειπ ζοο — a recurring expression, very common: A 1 36, 152. Wess. 9 87b 28ff., 125a 15ff., III 30.15, IV 7.24, 67.16ff. etc. / (Ch. 56.28ff., ) Άποπλοπποπροπποπ / (ibid. 123.18ff.) ΗΤΟΕ ΓΑΡ ΠΕΝΤΑΧΡΟΠΟΠΙΡΟΠΟΥΙ ΕΡΟΪ (IV 47.22ff.) ημαξεκαταθεπειθειπ ζοομο00

(b) Durative (rare): (Wess. 9 148b-c) ΠΕΠΡΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠΟΠΠ00

3.4 Deverbative lexeme-carrying nominalizations and their object-expansion

πεί-, the analytic, productive nomen agentis prefix, and άτ-, the "privative" deriving one, are both nuclei in relation to a following verb lexeme 65. (They themselves, of course, expand a foregoing determinator.) A check of the object-expansion of their respective verbal components yields the following results:

3.4.1 πειςτώμην 66, historically an antecedent + adnominal present syntagm, still reveals (with some exceptions) the expansion properties of a present tense (§3.1.2.1) for a nominal object, but of a non-durative pattern for a pronominal one (§3.1.1.1) and for especially close compound verbs (§3.1.1.2.3(2)):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) immediate</td>
<td>πέχει-πείςΧν (IV 21.8)</td>
<td>ΤΕΥΜΝΤΡΕΠΚΑ-2ΘΥ... (IV 42.4f., 116.8f.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>πέχειτεδ-πείςΠΧΣ (III 61.6f.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>πέχειμε-ειλασων (Ch. 110.11ff.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>πέχε-ΞΑΠ (Ch. 126.51ff.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

62 -πογαν- is nuclear in [ον-]πογαν + noun (A 400, 400, 402, Wess. 9 144d 29ff.) [πε-]πογαν + noun (A 2 80, P 130 119 ΚΠ) in relation to the following noun lexeme (it expands its determinator).
63 This goes for (Wess. 9 142d 7ff.) ΑΛΑΑΥ ΑΘΥ ΑΠΡΟΓΑΝ ΕΡΟΙΝΟΥ and (Ch. 125.23ff.) ΠΕΠΡΟΓΑΝ ΝΑΚ.
64 Cf. FUNK 1978a:115ff.
65 Cf. STERN §172; WIESSMANN 1914:130 (no πεί- + static is known to me in Shenoute). 1917:146; TILL §§146, 260b, following JERNSTEDT 1927:70f. (4), who observes (without enlarging on this syntagm), that his rule does not fully apply here. CHERIX 1979:11 (71, 75, 83 etc.) subsumes this under the Bipartite Pattern cases. For the opposition πείμοοού (aoristic, non-actual present) vs. πείμοοού (actual statal present) see FUNK 1976a:180 n. 1.
66 See §5.2.3.1.
3.4.3 **Miscellaneous.** (a) With *ὧν*—"worthy of..." we find the immediate construction of a nominal or pronominal object (the pronoun anaphoric-correferent with the determinator or nucleus of the syntagma): *(III 64.6f., IV 23.20f., P 131*°* 15 ro*) — **Ἠνοικότατα σημαίνει** / *(IV 84.21) Ψαλμοπορία / (IV 157.12) Θόρια δύναμις / (III 96.3) Ψάλμοι-ψηφ-ψηφεύει εβολα / (Ch. 205.48ff.) Τζέικαος Ψαλμο-μεριτικ / *(ibid. 189.2ff.) Ψαλμοτάτα-ψηφεύει / (A 1 84) Ψαλμοαδος / (sic), **Ψαλμομεριτος.**

(b) With *διν*, we find the immediate construction of a pronominal object, mediate/immediate?) for the nominal one: *(A 2 234) Τηνδιντατατικατα / (A 1 15) (of the friendly dog) Τζεικαος Επος (i.e. for his master) Ψαλμοπορία Ψάλμοιντατατικατικατα Ψαλμοπορία.

(c) **...Ενω Μάηαιαταίου εβολ αινηνπρομε.** *(IV 43.15).*

**Stern §177; Jeremstedt 1967, Funk 1976 are concerned mainly with the semantics and diathesis of this deverbal adjective (see §4.2.2.2.1).**
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4.3 Determinative and appositive syntagms: suppletive neutralization for pronominal and proper-noun nuclei

4.0.1 The so-called "adjective" in Coptic: a research-historical note. Both early and current scholarly opinion speaks for the existence in Coptic of a grammatical category of "adjectives" as well as a syntactic device to form attributive syntagms¹, viz. the "nota relationis" N- (§§1.0.1.2, 1.1.1 spec. obs.). This amounts to a contradiction in terms, seeing that the so-called adjective is in fact such a syntagm². Moreover, the grammars shed no light on the vital question of the 'nucleus - satellite' arrangement or relative order, actually observing on the irrelevance of placement and non-existence of a significant order — hence, the variation status of [oy-]NONHPOC NPWM and [oy-]PWM WMNONHPOC, the latter being nevertheless the "normal" (i.e. predominant) arrangement³.

¹ Till's unfortunate "Qualitätsgenitiv" (p. 70f.; 1928:§88a). Cf. Steindorff 1951:§§148, 156, Stern §§92ff. Stern's "attributive Relation" (§§185-8), distinct from "attributive Annexion" (§ 194, the case of -WHM, -KOYI etc., considered by Stern in the same light as the in fine compositi elements, -O, -WIPE, -NYM etc.).
² Stern §§168-9, 177, 185-8, 194 (Stern stresses the morphologic similarities of "adjective" and "substantive"); Till §§114ff.; Steindorff 1951:§§148, 156. Most expositions (including Crum's in Dictionary, "adj" vs. "nn", "adj" usually corresponding to a Greek adjective, e.g. in p. 157a, 159b) have a definite ethnocentric flavour (so too Gregorys 1981). Stern, as usual, shows the most insight and offers the most pertinent discussion of this issue. Pre-Stern grammars are even less consistent. Peyron (1841) calls HNEM etc. "adjectiva quae distinguentur ex suffixis" (33) or "quae utuntur suffixis" (74f.), ET- ≠- "adjectiva composita", "participia vel adjectiva" (34), (Steindorff 1951:§157 calls the augentia "Adjectiva mit Suffixen"). Modern treatments assume the existence of such a category and do not bother with definitions (so Chaine 1933, Steindorff 1951, Böhlig 1979, Gregorys 1981, etc.) or evade the issue (so Cheriex 1979:14 "nom à valeur adjectival, utilisé sans article, dans la construction attributive"). One often finds "adjective" and "attributive" (construction or noun) used as if synonymous.
4.0.2 The problem: noun, substantive, adjective. Some or all of the following characteristics apply as a rule to — and indeed define — the Coptic nominal lexemic substitution group: (a) eligibility as expansions (satellites) of pronominal (determinators, §5.1.1.0.1) and semi-pronominal nuclei (MNT−, PM−, AT−); (b) eligibility (within noun syntagms) as expansions of verb lexemes (in the construct state, the immediate object construction, §3.0.2); (c) the privilege (within noun syntagms) of occupying the actor slot in various conjugation patterns, often conditioning special base/converter allomorphs; also of occurring in various appositive and extrapositional status (cf. §6.0.1); (d) compatibility with immediately preceding modifier markers (“prepositions”); (e) (morphologic) movability, irregular and extremely restricted (CON: CUNI, BHEP: BEEPE, ZAAO: ZAAW, CBE: CBAB) ⁴; (f) (morphologic) countability, more or less regular, widespread but unpredictable (subject to regulation as yet obscure) (CNH: CNHWH, ZAAO: ZAAOJ, CON: CUNI) ⁵. Returning to (d), one notes the modifier and relator signal par excellence, the “nota relationis” N, often discussed in the course of this work. Yet all these formal criteria do not warrant the differentiation in Coptic of nomen substantivum and nomen adjectivum, whatever the justification for this distinction in other languages ⁶ and for that matter pre-Coptic Egyptian ⁷: the special “adjectival predicate” predicative pattern is absent in Coptic, and the adnominal privilege is restricted to a closed lexical list of few members. This is not to say, however, that nominal subgrouping cannot be achieved on the strength of other formal criteria, for instance, the distinction of alienable and inalienable nouns (cf. §1.2.1.1, spec. obs.); nouns compatible with the determinators of one or both genders (§5.1.1.0.1), including cases of syntactic movability like π−/ι−Τ'=MΣΛ, π−/ι−ΝΟΓ, π−/ι−Τ=PMN−; nouns compatible with MNT− (until evidence to the contrary is produced, one cannot assume that these constitute an open-ended list); -OC/-ON dual-ending Greek loan-adjunctives (see below) or loan-substantives vs. all others; eligibility as “in initio compositi” or “in fine compositi” elements (for the unmarked, juxtaposed adnominal modifier, Stern’s “attributive Annexion”, see below); verb lexemes, that is to say nouns privileged to occupy the predicate slots in certain verbal predicative patterns, vs. all others. There are, of course, also many possible semantic subdivisions which are no less “formal” in the frame of reference of contextual compatibility. Yet none of these sub-categories can appropriately be termed “adjective”, to the exclusion of some or all of the others. (Note that all nouns, except for the few on the list of juxtaposed attribution, must be N-marked to occur adnominally; this applies also to Greek loan-adjunctives: ΠΡΩΜΗ ΝΑΓΑΘΟΣ.)

It is nonetheless the Greek loan-adjunctives (ΠΟΝΙΡΟΣ, ΣΟΦΟΣ, ΕΛΑΧΙΣΤΟΣ) — with some original two-ending compounds, like ΑΝΩΜΟΣ, ΤΑΛΑΙΠΩΡΟΣ —, that are implicitly taken as adjectives in Coptic ⁸ and constitute the core and major constituent of this vague class. Indeed, it is my impression that it is this considerable and prominent group grammarians have in mind when referring, with no formal or theoretical foundation,
to Coptic "adjectives". In the following pages I attempt to trace a way towards gaining a formal basis for a nominal sub-class, for which the name "adjective", although still somewhat arbitrary, may not be amiss.

4.1 Determinative-subordinative syntagmatics: adnominal expansion; syntactic vs. semantic nucleus and satellite

Let us first examine the syntagmatics of adnominal nominal modification. One (or more) N-marked noun syntagm following (in open juncture) another constitutes the Coptic attributive syntagm. But this is merely a special case in a whole paradigm of two-noun syntags, where the formal changing factors are (a) the determination of either or both constituents, (b) the relator morph N- or NTE-. This corresponds, on the plan du contenu, to a semasiological spectrum ranging from possessive, through appurtenant, to attributive relationship between the two constituents. Although the intricacies of this paradigm are, as yet, far from clear (see §1.1.1 spec. obs. for N-/NTE- distribution), it is certain that the relative determination of the constituents (or the determination contour of the complex) is a primary factor regulating the selection of their relator, and zero determination of the second constituent corresponds to an attributive connotation of the adnominal modifier: the generic reference effected by the zero article (§5.1.1-2) for the second noun determines the qualitative relations between it and the first. The 'noun → N + noun' phrase is analyzable into nucleus and satellite (expansion) It is beyond controversy that the "nomen relatum" (Tuki's term) or modifier noun is syntactically satellital, the expansion of the unmarked noun. The placement of the N-marked noun is fixed — invariably second in the syntagm. Since both constituents are nominal, the usual paradigmatic ("word-class") test for identifying the nucleus cannot be applied here. However, it is the first term that carries the determinators (and subsequently relator morphs) for the whole complex syntagm (thus also the gender-number motivating factor: TOPOUKE NCOUPE [P 130 67 vol]). It is nuclear also in accordance with the basic nucleus → satellite syntagmatic sequence in Coptic. But if this is so, one cannot but query the statement that PIONHPOC PNPOMK and PNPOMK MIONHPOC are mere variants: can nucleus and expansion (since the placement of the N-marked noun is fixed and non-pertinent), determinatium and determinans, really exchange status, with no correlated shift on the plan du contenu? In what words, what is the functional load of this arrangement opposition?

---

9 Other languages employ a genitive-type morpheme to cover a similar semasiological range. This is striking in Romance, esp. French (cf. GUILAUME 1919:125ff., ROBENHELM 1970:238ff., 245ff.). But while in French one is concerned with an idiomatic, stylistically marked turn of phrase, in Coptic N-modification is the only systemic means to attribute the quality of one noun to another.

10 Not the other way round, as is implied in Till's description; PPOEOIN NOKOEMES, OYATEIE CO NTEIPOYUTE, KENNOOTE NE, OUPOPOCMOTO NKOY, OUTPOIM NEAAXICTON, OYCIME MIONHPOC. The "closeness" of 'N-adjective' vs. the "looseness" of 'N-substantive' (STEINHAL-MISTELI 1893:276) is equally traceable to the different degree of determination. Incidentally, NTE- does not play a role in the "genitive" attributive opposition (pace Till §122 n. 3), since it is as a rule incompatible with the zero determination of the second noun.

11 See §5.1.1-0.1; SEILER 1960:6f. The means of formal concatenation in Coptic are twofold: morphematic (N-, mark of satellital dependence) and tagmemic (word-order). This corresponds to pre-Coptic concord + order (see STEINHAL-MISTELI 1893:275f.). Cf. SCHMIDT 1974:446f. for a typological-comparative approach to this issue.

12 TUKI 84ff. and passim, in my opinion an excellent term. Elsewhere, Tuki defines N- as a "littera conjunctiva"; cf. STEINHAL-MISTELI's "Nominalcasus" (1893:92), and see also SCHWARZE-STEINHAL 459. The "nomen relatum" is in paradigm with other, verbal adnominal modifiers (relative, circumstantial, conjunctive, etc.); see Ch. 7 n. 31, §7.4. It syntcretizes (neutralizes) the distinction between attributive and adnominal modification (§7.1.3): (Wess. 9.110a 5ff.) POMNE MKE G ETEVUH / (III 166.22f.) ZEHPME NATSUM... AYOU EYASTEI / (P 131 47 ro) NEZBUNE ETANOYUO AYOU NAIAJOYUH / (A 2 419-420, not Sh.) NEINPESGHK AYOU ETASUO / (Mun. 104) NPEINYO... MNEQOEI-CO MNEPESGHK NONKYO AYOU ETOMOYH ZKROU NIM / (A 2 338) ZEHPME-POUMHE NE AYOU NEPMEZ-CHOU NHOKE / (RE 11 16b 9f.) NAIAJOCH AYOU NAFABOC: in the last exx., N-/ET- introduce an additional expansion of the determinator (§5.1.1).
Note, however, that whereas the syntactic nucleus — the first noun — is always the first term, the syntactic satellite is always the second, it is otherwise with the non-grammatical "incumbents" in the (determinator) [ ] N [ ] gramatical framework. The change in placement means that the two noun lexemes turn or revolve symmetrically around the n-dependence mark (which, although in the scheme of Coptic juncture is attached to the second term, belongs as a matter of fact to the whole syntagm). In this sense, there does take place a reversal of centre and periphery. The semantic nucleus (contextually essential, representing and integrating the syntagm in the semantic context; (OY-)PUWE, (T-)WYXH in OYPUWE MIPONHPOC and TANOMOC Mwuxh 13; belonging to a certain "meaning class", cf. "form class" for the syntactic nucleus; often, but not necessarily the non-omissible component 14) is placed first in OYPUWE MIPONHPOC, where it coincides with the syntactic nucleus, but second in OYIPONHPOC NPUWE, where semantic satellite coincides with the syntactic nucleus. In binary terms, the arrangement opposition is stable as one of coincidence vs. non-coincidence of syntactic and semantic constituents. Put differently (but amounting to the same thing): a noun lexeme has a different value in syntactically nuclear or satellital status. These are, in strict structural analysis, non-identical homonymic signs, and it is our task to find out under what (environmental) conditions the one or the other occurs 15. This reformulation of the problem is, I believe, preferable to a formulation based on order — "usual", inverted, motivated, etc. — which is more difficult to reduce to non-transformational, static opposition terms. Instead of arrangement opposition, we are dealing with opposition of placement.

4.2 Relative-order (arrangement) (position): 'semantic nucleus ≠ satellite', in terms of placement opposition

The superficial impression that the arrangement in determinative-attributive groups is free or arbitrary is proved wrong by a careful sorting of the material. In the first instance, we observe that place-

13 Consider (A 2 486) NEAUME NPUWE (of hypocrites. Amélineau: "ces hommes de pierre", n. 4: "mot à mot: ces pierres d'hommes, c'est à dire: ces pierres insensibles"). In cases of proforma expansion it is often difficult to assign the semantic roles: (Mun. 102) NIPHEK NIPHEP-TAPE (Wess. 9 105b 16ff., 24ff.) EYP-DIKAIOS NIAHT AYW Mwuxh...EYP-ACEBHS NATNA NEATAKINGONCN AYW NNOCIK (II 95.15) OYXAIHNY NKOIANDOOS (ibid. 123.13f.) PNEAHTY NEAPAHT YETENAMPEVNA (ibid. 135.10f.) ZENPAKINGONCN NE NIPHEP-HOBE (Ch. 108.15ff.)...NEAPAHTY NE APAHTVMAIPUWE...and so on. These cases are best understood as additional expansions of a determinator; see n. 12. (A 2 74) ZENPAKICON NNOYB ZIAT (IV 128.3) PATNOYTE MIAOBOAZ (ibid. 153.16) OYXAIK NPUWE, OYXAIK NLZIHE (A 176) TEIATH NLZIHE; see also the exx. in §4.2.2. Compare here the switch in position of class and selector, non-identical with (synt.) nucleus and expansion (Seiler 1960:19ff.), resulting in a role of specification (synt. nucleus = class, expansion = selector) or characterization (nucleus = selector, expansion = class). Consider the following cases of specification: (Ch. 56.3ff.) NATNA MMATONI "that soldier who is ruthless", (Rossi 2:3 75) NIPONHEC NNIPUWE "every man that is wicked"; yet this is certainly not without exception in Coptic: (P 1304 97 ro) TEPKELAAPUNPUC Mwuxh (A 2 412) PEBHIN NEEIAHNN (Wess. 9 149d 20f.) MPAANOMOC MIOYAL.

14 Witness (Miss. 281) NECHAY H NECHOMNT (scil. NOODY). The so-called "reduction test" ("bad dogs" to "dogs"; Seiler 1960:6ff.), leaves us in Coptic with the semantic, rather than syntactic nucleus. The latter is identifiable mainly through the "centrifugal" basic syntagmatic sequence of Coptic (Stern 635: "Das selbständige und regierende steht vor dem angeknüpften und abhängigen"); see too Schenkel 1967:71, Funk 1978:117.

15 For the extensive literature on the problem of adjectival placement in various languages, see the bibliography in Reiner 1968 (also the General Introduction). This issue has been studied, with interesting and often varying results, exp. for French. Weil 1879:53ff., Weinrich 1966, Barri 1975 suggest semantic union (adj. → N) vs. disunion or autonomy (N → adj.) The inverse is asserted for English (Bolinger 1972). Teysier (Lingua 20:236ff., 1961) distinguishes in English between qualifying and modifying placement: Reiner 1968 suggests for French a distinction of "coapellative" vs. "co predicative", "objectivation" (N → adj.) vs. subjective, impressionistic qualification (adj. → N). The comparable opposition in German of hase Hunde vs. hase Hunde is treated by Seiler 1960 (exp. 35f.) in terms of characterization vs. specification, respectively. Weinrich's (1966) and Barri's (1975) approach to the French constructions is structuralist. Weinrich rejects the "emotive" interpretation (covered in more detail below) as "mystification" ("les sentiments n'y sont pour rien", p. 89) and advocates a distributional examination (p. 83f.); postposed adjectives are then found to be distinctive. While anteposed ones, morpheme-like, form a closer union with the following noun.
ment opposition obtains with a well-defined, restricted (even if extensive) list of noun lexemes (§4.2.2).
For other nouns, the placement is fixed, i.e. non-pertinent, out of opposition, in our corpus — either invariably first-place (§4.2.1.1) or a second-place position (§4.2.1.2). In the latter case, a shift from second to first position entails a drastic shift — indeed, often a complete reversal — of the meaning of the syntagm: e.g., “a vessel of wood” becomes “vessel wood”, “women’s passion” becomes “a woman of passion”; the interrelationship between the constituents is completely reversed. An “adjective” will be defined below as a nominal modifier for which a shift in placement (or rather replacement by a different-position homonymic alternant) does not bring about an internal semantic reversal of that order, but selects another member of an externally determinable paradigm, while the inter-constituent relationship remains constant. From another point of view, the specificity contour is different in the two cases: sharply rising or dipping in the non-adjectival postposed nom. modifier, it is moderate in the πωμε ΜΠΟΗΡΟΣ: ΠΟΝΗΡΟΣ ΝΨΩΜΕ paradigm. (Note that the distinction of semantic v.s. syntactic nucleus and satellite is valid for both adjectives and modifier nouns, the only difference being that for the ‘ΠΟΝΗΡΟΣ ΝΨΩΜΕ’ type of syntagm the nuclei and satellites are semantically on a par or commensurate, in partial equivalence [i.e. can be substituted for each other]; this is not the case with ΟΥΣΗΤ ΝΨΩΜΕ, ΟΥΝΟΒΕ ΜΜΟΥ.)

4.2.1 The placement opposition suppressed (ORDER NEUTRALIZATION)

4.2.1.1 First-place-position paradigm. This includes (beside determinators)18: (a) Identifiers:
ζενκούε (III 59.27), α袆, ου, νιμ (IV 75.18f., III 108.1f., 137.1); (b) Quantifiers: νοος: (A 1 281) ουνος
ή ζεννος μημθήπιον (sic) / (Wess. 9 131b 2ff.) ΝΙΝΟΣ ΝΣΩΒ ΝΒΟΤΕ ΑΥΣ ΕΤΡ-ΒΟΟΝΕ ΕΜΑΤΕ / (P 131* 23 Ν)
ΤΝΟΣ ΝΠΟΛΙΚ / (A 1 65) ζεννος πωμε... ζεννος νεζίμε17; κοιυ, ιγιο “a little”, “a small quantity/number”
(δίλιος, παυς, πει δε;— the second-place opposed homonym means “small, little”, μικρός, παρεμ);
ζενκούι ιγιομ, ζενκούι νονοοτε... (Miss. 231) / ΕΤΜΡΕΠΕΙΠΕ ΝΟΥΚΟΥΙ ΜΠΕΤΝΑΝΟΥ / ΕΕ-ΕΗΧΙ ΝΟΥΝΑ ΚΟΥΙ
(A 2 502f.) / ζενκούι ιγιομ ΜΠΕΤΝΑΝΟΥ (K 9028) / ΝΕΙΚΟΥΙ ΝΖΩΝ (III 45.27) / ζεννος ιγιο... (rare, IV 73.14f.);
ζαζ, ζοείνε17, ιααα, ουρπ (III 108.5. 140.27. 107.20); cardinal numbers (from three onwards): IV 51.7,
54.29, Ch. 85.56f. With χαή (masc.) the evidence is conflicting: we find both first-place (“a pair of...”) and the by far more common, historic appositive second-place position, with no detectable difference in meaning: (Ch. 86.50f.) ιπιαί... ΝΣΩΒ ΝΚΕΦΑΛΑΙΟΝ / (Miss. 283) ζαά ΝΨΩΜΕ / (P 130* 93 νο) ζαά
ΜΠΕΤΝΑΝΟΥ, but (P 130* 36 ΡΝΓ) ΝΣΩΒ ΝΠΑΝΑΙΚΑΙΟΝ. For the feminine we find the first place: (IV
108.3) ΚΕΟΟΟ ΝΣΠΕΝ ΝΖΩΜΕ. Ordinal numbers: ζψ(ο)πε(ε), μεζ- (Ch. 86.45f., 174.11f., III 118.14), (A I 33)
ζενμεζζαή νην / (ibid. 92) ΠΓΕΖΖΟΟΥ ζααή ΝΠΕΓΙΟΜΝΤ ΝΖΟΟΥ, ζεα “last” (movable, countable) has accordingly first place: (Ch. 161.1f.) ΠΖΕΟΟΥ ΤΖΟΟΥ / (ibid. 198.2f. = Mt. 5.26) ΠΖΑΕ ΝΚΟΑΡΑΝΤΗΣ, (17f.)
ΠΖΑΕ ΝΑΗΠΟΝ / (A 2 71) ΩΑΗ ΝΑΝΙΑΛΟΓΙΑ / (Rossi 2/3 12) ΠΓΕΟΟ ΑΥΣ ΠΖΑΕ ΝΑΠΩΝ / (P 130* 136 ΤΑΣ) ΠΖΑΕ
ΤΖΟΟΥ (sim. Rossi 2/3 83) / (IV 208.10f.) ΩΑΗ ΝΚΑΛΙΟΓΙΑ, etc.; but in certain temporal fixed expressions it occupies second place, namely after time-nouns, with a categorical (eschatological) reference (ζαζ, zero-determined, is invariably here): ΝΕΟΥΟΕΙΙΙ ΠΖΑΕ (III 126.24, 164.20, 180.15,19f., 181.4f., A I 90, 285,
290-1 etc.), ΤΖΟΟΟΥ ΠΖΑΕ (IV 76.15): “last days”, “latter days”.

18 The determinators are really in “zero” or “pre-first” position; in fact, they constitute the prime nuclear paradigm, the initial boundary signal, the beginning of the concatenation of expansions. On the first-place paradigm see Till §119, Mallon-

17 In ζοείνε ΕΝΝΟΣ (sic), ζενκουε ΕΠΣΟΚ (III 27.10), ΝΟΟΣ is overruled by ΖΟΕΙΝΕ, due perhaps to the contrast figure. As
distinct from ΖΕΝΝΟΣ “some great ones”, this perhaps means “some (persons) who are great” (cf. Man. Homilien 27.15
ΖΑΙΝΕ ΝΣΑΤ, ΖΑΙΝΕ ΝΖΩΜΕ, also in disjunctive contrast).
4.2.1.2.1 SECOND-PLACE-POSITION PARADIGMS (a). Here an inversion is possible, but entails a reversal of the interrelationship between nucleus and expansion (§4.2): this proves these cases to be sociative or appurtenant rather than attributive syntags. Examples are of course ubiquitous, and the lists are open-ended; the following semasiological subgrouping is selective: (a) θ-deteminated, n-marked abstracts (incl. nomina actionis, infinitive), ΜΝΤ-syntagms, individual lexemes: me “truth”, ΜΟΥΧ, ΜΟΤΕ, ΚΡΟΗ, ΣΟΥΙΑ, ΛΑΟΜΟΣ, ΚΑΛ, ΜΗΣ, ΜΗΝ and so on; (b) noun lexemes with generic-categoric reference: ΣΟΥΤ, ΣΩΜΕ, ΡΗΜΕ, ΔΑΙΜΟΝ, ΚΑΤΑΝΑΣ, ΔΙΑΒΟΛΟΣ, ΝΕΥΜΑ, ΧΤ, etc.; (c) noun-lexemes with material-constituence reference: ΜΕ, ΜΕ, ΚΑΠΙ, ΖΑΤ, ΝΕΖ, ΟΥΟΕΙΝ, ΚΑΚΕ, and so on. This class is compatible with the first-place paradigm: (IV 156.19) ΑΑΑΑ ΝΣ omega καλος ΜΜΟΥ / (ibid. 108.3) ΚΕΝΟΓ ΚΝΤΕ ΝΚΖΙΜΕ / (Ch. 146. 15ff.) ΟΥΝΟΓ ΕΜΑΤΕ ΝΒΑ ΝΕΑΟΑΕ... and, unlike members of the latter, attributes in the second-place list can be compiled “freely”. They cannot therefore be taken as constituting a single paradigm but several, according to position and compatibility in a complicated system of semasiological principles (see footnote 19).

4.2.1.2.2 SECOND-PLACE-POSITION PARADIGM (b). Here we find the zero-deteminated, dependence-unmarked, invariable ΥΜΗ and (rarely) ΚΟΥΙ: (IV 99.16) ΠΗΛΑ ΥΜΗ ΝΚΑΖ / (Ch. 103.35f.) ΖΕΝΩΠΗ ΥΜΗ ΜΝΤΖΗΚΕ / (P 1314 141 vo, Sh.?) ΘΗ ΥΜΗ ΜΜΑΡΙΑ / (P 1305 69 ΙΤ) ΤΕΣΕΓΟΥΝΟΥ ΥΜΗ / (Leyd. 345) ΠΑΡΑΠΙΤΩΜΑ ΚΟΥΙ / (III 181.18f.) ΟΥΟΓΟΝ ΚΟΥΙ ΜΜΟΥ / (A 2503) ΚΟΥΙ ΚΟΥΙ; ΥΜΗ occurs in at least two fixed (lexicalized) syntags, viz. ΥΗΡΕΙ/ΥΗΕΡΕ ΥΜΗ “boy”, “girl”, “child” (IV 61.27 ΖΕΝΩΠΗ ΥΜΗ ΕΥΟΣΚ, ibid. 103.14, shows the the semantic weakening of ΥΜΗ, 14, in this compound-like syntagm: “small children”), and ΣΥΝΤΑΓΜΗ ΥΜΗ (Berl. 1611 7 ΤΕΘ). ΚΟΥΙ (perhaps more usually of quantity than mere size) and ΥΜΗ are compatible 20: ΚΕΝΚΟΥΙ ΥΜΗ ΜΝΤΖΑΝΟΥΙ (K 9028) “a few small good (works)”, cf. ΖΕΝΚΟΥΙ ΜΝΤΖΑΝΟΥΙ (Berl. 1613 6 ro) “a few good (works)”. This curious, unique attributive syntagm is the last vestige of the pre-Coptic tagmeneically marked attributive dependence — this marking being only partial, since in Coptic there is in this case no concord to (co-)mark this dependence.

4.2.1.2.3 ΚΑΒΕ/Η (“wise, clever”, III 22.21, 120.18, IV 82.9, etc.) and ΒΡΙ ("new", III 65.10, 103.16, Ch. 44.45f. etc.) appear to have the privilege of only second-place position, although additional attestation is necessary; a glance at Dictionary 43a, 319a shows this is correct, with few exceptions, for Coptic generally 20.

4.2.1.3 In the case of MULTIPLE-ATTRIBUTE SYNTAGMS, the phrase loses its basic binary form, and n-symmetrical inversion is impossible. This probably means a neutralization of the arrangement factor. Consider the examples (Ch. 191.36ff.) ΟΥΡΙΜΕ ΠΙΑΡΑΝΟΜΟΣ ΝΑΤΝΑ ΝΕΡΤΖΙΡΝ ΝΑΚΑΒΑΡΤΟΣ ΝΚΡΟΗ ΝΖΕΛΑΝ / (III 172.10f.) ΖΕΝΩΜΕ ΝΝΑΤΕΙΜΕ ΝΛΑΚΙΖΗΤ ΝΡΕΚΧΗΤ ΝΟΠΕΘΟΥ ΝΙΜ / (Ch. 111.35ff.) ΟΥΕΙΘ ΝΑΓΑΟΝ ΑΧ ΚΑΒΕ ΑΧΝ ΑΧΝ ΝΙΖΕΒΗΣ / (Ch. 199.37ff.) ΠΙΡΜΕ ΝΝΑΤΗ ΝΥΑΝΤΖΗΘ ΜΜΑΡΖΗΚ / (III 190. 14f.) ΠΙΡΜΕ ΝΡΕΚΡ-ΠΕΘΟΥ ΝΑΤΜΠΝΑ ΝΖΕΝ ΕΖΟΥΝ ΕΠΙΛΟΕΙ / (IV 126.6f.) ΝΕΖΗΜΕ ΤΕΜΕ ΝΑΙΚΑΙΟΝ / (III 121.23f.) ΖΕΝΩΜΕ ΝΑΤΣΜΗ ΝΡΕΚΡΜΠΡΝ ΝΡΕΚΗΝ-ΑΡΙΚΕ. NB. A complex single attribute (“bracketed”, coordinated): (Ch. 79.31f.) ΓΕΝΟΙ ΝΙΜ ΝΖΕΛΑΝ 21ΑΡΙΝ ΚΙΚΟ / (III 34.17) ΝΕΖΗΜΕ ΝΑΙΚΑΙΟΝ ΑΧ ΝΤΒΒΟ ΖΗΜΕ.

20 Yet note ΖΕΝΩΠΗ ΥΜΗ (Wess. 9 94a 1f., collated).
20 I know of no other instance in Coptic of the compatibility of similar, paradigm-defined attributes (of the type “The Good Old Bad Old Days”, a programme on BBC Radio 4, 1979).
4.2.2 Placement opposition maintained: I define here the adjective as any specific noun lexeme (N*) featuring in both following paradigms: (α) ‘N */N °*’ (parad. α); (β) ‘N °* /N °*’ (parad. β), i.e. having the privilege of both first- and second-place positions; analytically speaking, the adjective comprises two homonymous signs, formally opposed and distinguishable by placement properties. Note that whereas in this class the conception of a category or paradigm of two non-identical homonyms — ρωμε μποντρος and μποντρος νρωμε — is feasible, this is not so with second-position modifier nouns (§4.2.1.2). There the total reversal of the constituent interrelationship brought about by a change in their arrangement, precludes their analysis as two different signs; a paradigmatic association of α- and β-sequences is not meaningful in that case.

Adjectives comprise the following subgroups:

(a) Loan-adjectives of Greek origin. Various Greek morphologic types: --ος, --ος, --ος, --ος, --ος. Also exocentric (ανομος, ζομοογιος) and other two-ending Greek compounds (παρανομος, ταλαι-πωρος).

(b) Adjectives of Egyptian origin: prenominal agent nouns, non-analytic (α-vocalized) (hist. "conjunct participles ‘) μακατ-, μαγι-, μαρη-, μαυτ-, ματ- as well as the analytic, productive agent nouns (really syntagms) in ρεµα: ατ- "private” syntagms; μαξα "inimical, hostile”.

(c) γαλο "old”, ωμο "alien”; ιειν "miserable”, μεριπ "beloved”, πετοιμ "holy”.

Documentation (representative; I am here illustrating the α paradigm):

(a) (III 41.2f.) γεμακειο ηειφηνικος, (49.2) νευκότο μποντρος, (78.6) πρωμε μπανομος, (90.18) παεις ηαβος, (154.15) ρεμου μαρκικος, (IV 156.7) πρωμε νευκεβος, (Ch. 12.19ff.) ουχρεια... ναμαχαιον, (14.13ff.) ουρωμε μνεματικος, (138.52ff.) πα αιμ νακαποτοων;

(b) (III 50.3f.) πετειπ ηαβος, (57.7) τσεκςικης γατκιμ, (76.22) ρεμου ματσβος, (70-1) μειαμε ηαβακε, (189.23-30) παγεκος ηαμα, (Ch. 27.4ff.) πιτσιν ηειβατζο, (57.40ff.) ματοι ιειβατζοτ, (77.51f.) πρωμε μμαινεοβε;

(c) (III 103.7f., 142.5f.) πετειπ/νεπεμπεβερος ηαλο, (IV 172.16) ουχρε τωμος, (III 62.22) πετειπ- ποβε νειβον.

4.2.2.1 Reaction in ‘noun + adjective’ syntagms: Concord. As has long ago been noted and often restated since 22, the Greek loan-adjectives have in Coptic partly kept their movability, alternating (extra- or sub-systemically in Coptic, though not of course in pre-Coptic Egyptian 23) in a conditioning set of animate (common gender, πο/πο → ρο/ρο) inanimate (sexual or natural neuter, πο/πο → ρο/ρο). Since this has never, to my knowledge, been put to the test in an extensive and homogenous corpus, let me specify here the nuclei governing each of these concord alternants in the Shenoutean texts. Note: (1) The motivating element is the determinator of the nucleus, the initiator and prime nucleus of the expansion concatenation. (2) The nucleus may be either singular or plural. (3) For the reaction of personal pronouns and proper names, see below, §4.3; their expansion is appositive. (4) This concord reaction operates in adnominal at rebuttal adjectives. We need more evidence for predicative adjectives, namely ones expanding the predicate determinator in a Nominal Sentence pattern ('ΟΥΡΝΩΡΟΣ ΡΕ', consider [P 1.318 88ro] τοκερκοκον ΤΗΡΑΚΩ), or N-marked adnexally modifying ειμιο/ο (consider οι μαρονον III 34.15f., ακ ομαχικον IV 41.9f., and τεεαφης ηοτης επιονυτε άας τομος Ι 76, indicating that the rules are different in this adverbal status). (5) This concord is observable in instances of the postposed (α) adjective;

23 The very few movable Coptic adjectives (ζαλο/ου, ομοο/ου, αεικ/ου, αβε/ου) are better viewed as double-entry semi-analyzable lexemes, rather than true concord alternants.
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exx. of concord in the anteposed (β) adjective are too few to be conclusive (see below). (6) -οικ is invariable (animate only? III 182.3, 221.4, IV 156.7).

(a) -οικ: human beings and their parts; some special facultics; groupings: ΠΥΜΗ (ΨΕΥ- IV 3.20, ΨΜΗ- III 220.15); ΞΕΜΗ (IV 28.20); ΕΙΨΤ (IV 29.18); ΥΨΡΗ, ΨΕΡΕ (III 173.14f., Ch. 169.31a.); ΚΩΝ (IV 32.21f., see obs. 1); ΜΑΣΟΙ (Ch. 70.37ff.); ΙΟΥΔΑΙ (Ch. 143.25f.); ΡΡΟ (IV 29.22f.); ΑΡΧΩΝ (III 95.19.); ΠΡΟΦΑΣΗ (III 171.14); ΔΙΚΑΙΟΙΟΣ (III 28.5). Note especially: ΚΟΥ (only in the cliché -'ΡΟΣ ΝΑΙΑΙΟΣ', see obs. 2; III 166.18, 167.1f., Ch. 174.54f., Thompson A CM); ΒΑΑ (in the cliché - 'ΒΑΑ ΜΠΟΝΗΡΟΣ', see obs. 5; IV 88.10, A 2 527); ΜΕΕΥ (Ch. 78.11f., Wess. 9 134a 3ff.); ΣΠΕΡΜΑ (III 213.13f., Ch. 137.12ff., 144.20f.; obs. 3); ΨΥΧΗ (Ch. 140.17ff., obs. 4); ΓΕΝΟΣ (Ch. 102.9ff.); ΑΛΟΟΣ (P 1313 21 vo); ΒΙΟΣ (A 2 368: ΝΣΕΜΝΟΣ, cliché); ΨΑΜΟΣ (IV 175.2f., obs. 6); ΖΩΟΥ, ΟΥΟΣ (only + ΝΑΡΧΑΙΟΣ, obs. 7; III 164.12ff., A 2 22, 247).

(b) -οικ: inanimates; abstracts (incl. ininitives); plants, non-human animates: ΝΟΟ, ΝΗΕΟΣ (Ch. 193. 34f.); ΖΝΒ (IV 194.5), ΖΡΕ, ΤΡΟΦΗ (Ch. 118.5ff., IV 86.21, P 1314 42 ro); ΣΜΟΤ (III 49.2); ΠΝΗΜΑ (Ch. 20. 32ff.); ΔΑΙΜΟΝ (P 1315 56 N); ΑΓΑΘΟΝ (III 114.27); ΜΤΩΝ (IV 116.14); ΨΝΙΩ (III 114.22f.); ΟΥΨΗ (Ch. 73. 22f., 28f.); ΟΥΨΗ, ΕΙΜΙΟΥΝ (Ch. 33.10f., III 89.23); ΜΟΙΚΗ (Wess. 9 131 30ff.); CW (IV 86.22), ΕΡΗ (Ch. 135.17f.); ΛΟΨ, ΩΨΗ (III 63.20ff., 148.16); ΑΒΣ (A 2 486); ΜΝΤ-συνταγμα (III 155.16f., Π 1303 10 ΨΑΘ, ΤΕΝΜΝΤΑΤΟΥΝ ΝΑΚΡΙΚΩΝ); ΑΓΑΘΗ (Ch. 168.27f.); ΣΥΝΘΗΣΙΑ (III 49.2f.); ΒΙΟΣ (A 2 423, not Sh.); ΠΡΑΕΣ (Ch. 120.46ff., A 163); ΧΡΕΙΑ (IV 172.12f.); ΡΟΟΥ (III 100.25); ΖΑΠ, ΝΟΜΟΣ (Ch. 85.4f., 39f.); ΛΟΓΙΜΟΣ (Ch. 77.46ff.); ΚΩΕΙ (Ch. 129.24f.); ΨΗΨΗ (Ch. 207.3ff., Sh.?); ΤΚΑΣ (Ch. 36.19f.); ΩΨΗ (Ming. 318); ΕΝΘΗΣ (A 2 402), ΚΩΝ (Teza 683). Note especially: ΒΑΑ (III 185.10, ΜΠΟΝΗΡΟΝ, obs. 5); ΣΠΕΡΜΑ (III 208.12, ΜΠΟΝΗΡΟΝ, obs. 4, 8); ΣΥΜΑ (III 106.4f., IV 190.10, 191.12, obs. 8); ΖΥΟΝ (K 913, ΜΠΟΝΗΡΟΝ, obs. 8), ΥΨΗΡ (III 30.8f., obs. 9); ΖΗΤ (Wess. 9 172a 8f.).

Observations:
(1) Occurs once (IV 84.2) with -οικ, perhaps to be taken as an ad-pattern modifier: ΕΝΕΝΕΕΙΨΗΤ ΠΕ Η ΝΕΨΥΡΗ ΑΥΨ ΤΕΜΥΜΑΝΕ ΝΜΤΕΥΣΥΝΕ ΧΝΕΨΟΝ ΝΑΚΡΙΚΩΝ. Compare in this status (Ν)ΚΑΤΑΑΠΕΡΣ (IV 81.2f., 159.13).
(2) Only ΚΟΥ (ΝΙΜ ΝΑΙΑΙΟΣ, excerpt quotation from Mt. 23:35.
(3) As against ΦΝΑ, list (b).
(4) For ΣΠΕΡΜΑ ΜΠΟΝΗΡΟΝ (III 208.12) cf. Is. 1:4, 14:20, 57:3-4, also in A 2 122 ΣΠΕΡΜΑ ... Π ΜΠΟΝΗΡΟΝ ΑΥΨ ΝΗΟΝ ΙΩΠΝΗΡΗ.
(5) -οικ is the consensus in the source of this excerpt quotation (Mt. 6:23, 20:15, Luc. 11:34); ΟΥΨΗ ΜΠΟΝΗΡΟΝ (III 185.10) is an adaptation to the system of Shenoute.
(7) Only in ΝΟΟΥΟΕΙΨΗ/ΝΕΖΟΟΥ ΝΑΡΧΑΙΟΣ "past times", "days of old". ΝΑΡΧΑΙΟΣ appears to be an invariable modifier, "of old", "of yore", adverbial as well as adnominal 24: (P 1304 118 ΚΡ) ΝΑΡΧΑΙΟΣ ΑΥΨ ΟΝ ΤΕΝΟΥ, (P 1314 23 [96]) ΩΨΗ-ΜΠΕΨΗΝΟΥΤΕ ΤΟ ΕΠΙΚΟΜΟΣ ΝΑΡΧΑΙΟΣ, (Or. 166.42f.) ΝΒΕ ΝΤΑΚΑΛΑΣ ΝΑΡΧΑΙΟΣ; consider also III 19.14, 66.21, 203.17 and (A 12) ΝΟΟΥ ΜΠΡΟΦΑΣΗ ΧΙΝΝΑΡΧΑΙΟΣ.
(8) Influence of Greek gender?
(9) This would be difficult to explain without referring to Act. 10:14, where all Boh. MSS and Horner's "α" (Bodl. Hunt. 345) have ΝΑΝΑΚΑΙΟΝ (ΑΝΑΚΕΟΝ) for άναγκαιος.

24 Cf. Brugmann, IF 27:233ff. (1910), for a comparative study of the nominative masc. sgl. Greek adjective in "adverbial" status (esp. p. 240ff.). Incidentally, άναγκας does not occur (to the best of my knowledge) in this construction; however, we do find τάραξαν (Schwyzer I 620, II 617f.).
(10) Fixed, "imported complete", often technical, terms and collocations, with the original concord ²⁸, include ΔΗΜΟΣΙΟΝ ΓΡΑΜΜΑ (III 23.22), ΤΕΠΑΤΙΩΝΙΚΗ ΔΙΑΣΚΑΛΙΑ (A 15), ΤΚΘΩΛΙΚΗ ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑ (Thompson K 3 vo, III 61.1f., Ch. 146.50f. etc., very common), ΤΠΑΔΑΙΙ (ΑΥΣ/ΜΗ-Τ-)ΚΑΙΝΗ ΔΙΑΣΘΗ (Ch. 175.32f., 186.52ff., A 2 244, Duke 2 vo etc., very common); here we find the feminine form of Greek adjectives.

(11) The feminine occurs also in collocations which are Coptic in construction, but are still calques of Greek terminological and fixed clichés: (A 2 440, not Sh.) ΤΑΠΩΛΑΥΣΙΣ ΝΑΙΜΟΒΙΚΗ (BMCat. 77, No. 192 ΦΩΡ) ΝΕΙΝΑΡΘΕΝΟΣ ΝΕΚΜΗ. Otherwise, the feminine occurs only in in substantives, like ΠΟΡΝΗ “whore" (the quoted ΟΥΣΙΩΝ ΠΟΡΝΗ, III 97.14, where formally a modifier, is in appositive role), ΤΣΑΙΝ ΜΠΙΝΗ “the beautiful spiritual (woman)” (Teza 683).

4.2.2.2 Definition of the opposition terms: unmarked (second-place-position adjectives) vs. marked (first-place-position adjectives). The paradigm of first-place-privileged adjectives, (β) is lexically and semasiologically much more restricted, and its functional value specifically definable: "attraction + X", "X" being either (a) a detectable affective or emotive charge, or (b) a contrastively distinctive role (it is probable that (a) and (b) are but two aspects of one and the same semantic range; see n. 29). This characterization is unspecified (though not incompatible) with second-place (α)-adjectives. One is therefore led to regard (β)-adjectives as marked, and (α)-adjectives as unmarked members in a binary (privative) opposition: the first-place adjective is characterized, the second-place adjective, an uncharacterized or neutral term: "banal" "attrition" ²⁸.

4.2.2.2.1 Constituency: position (β). First and foremost in all groups (§4.2.2) are pejorative, degradatory or disapproving adjectives ²⁷: ΠΟΝΗΡΟΣ, ΑΚΑΘΑΡΤΟΣ, ΤΑΛΑΙΠΩΡΟΣ, ΖΑΙΡΕΤΙΚΟΣ, ΑΣΒΗΣ, ΑΝΟΜΟΣ, ΠΑΡΑΝΟΜΟΣ, ΕΛΛΑΧΙΣΤΟΣ, ΑΚΕΡΑΙΟΣ, ΑΡΤΟΣ, ΕΒΙΝ, ΖΑΙΔΙΤΗ, ΡΕΠΡΟΒΕ, ΡΕΚΥΚΙΟ, ΑΤΝΑ, ΑΘΗ, ΑΤΝΟΥΤΕ, ΥΜΜΟ: much less prevalent are non-pejorative ones (§4.2.2.2): ΑΓΑΘΟΣ, ΑΤΝΟΒΕ, ΡΕΠΡΟΜΕ-ΝΟΥΤΕ ΜΑΚΑΡΙΟΣ, ΧΡΗΣΤΟΣ, ΣΟΦΟΣ, ΜΕΡΙΤ.

4.2.2.2.2 Function (1): In the case of pejorative attributes ²⁸ we are obviously faced with some attitudinal differetia specifica which, though hardly traceable formally in the context, is nevertheless inferable from the semasiological peculiarity of the adjectives themselves. This is, I believe, sufficient mark for some context-oriented property. Another, even more "formal", is the frequent η-identification ²⁹ in this construction. Yet another, relative formal index may be the very high incidence of such indefinite or low-specificity semantic nuclei as ΠΘΗΜΕ (very frequent), ΖΩΒ, ΖΝΑΙΑ/ΖΝΟΤ, etc. The (β)-adjective may have been marked also by a special stress or intonation contour. "Affect" is as good a cover-term for this as any ³⁰: (P 1304 97 ro) ΤΕΧΕΤΑΛΑΙΠΩΡΟΣ ΜΥΘΗ (sim. Ch. 186.7) / (Ch. 123.48ff.) ΤΑΚΑ-

²⁸ GREGORIUS 1981:201.
²⁹ BERSON’s term (1960:62-98), opposed to "emphatic" (logically or affectively).
³⁰ In the unmarked term (postposed adjective) the proportion of pejorative vs. non-pejorative attributes is decidedly different. Obviously, both the subject-matter and Shenoute’s stylistic temperament and predilections must be taken into account. All one can hope to establish is an inner consistency, a norm of usage proving the privileges of position to be more than whimsical variants.
³¹ The usually pejorative (—) ΜΝΕ N- (“kind of...”) shares the marked (β) adjective paradigm: ΜΝΗΜΕ ΝΠΡΗΜΑ ΝΑΡΠΟΣ (Ch. 62.3f.) / ΤΜΗΝΕ ΝΠΡΟΜΑΣΟΧ (III 92.10) / ΤΕΜΙΝΕ ΝΠΡΗΜΑ ΝΑΡΠΟΣ (A 2 486), also III 82.7f., IV 42.3f., 47.24. Contrast this with the unmarked — ΝΤΕΜΙΝΕ (III 50.13, 110.19, 124.19f., 146.26, IV 59.7 etc.). Rare non-pejorative (neutral) instances, again with ΠΝΕΜΗ the semantic nucleus (this seems to be significant): (Ch. 98.44f.) ΤΕΜΙΝΕ ΠΝΠΜΗ / (A 2 398) ΖΝΕΚΜΗΝΕ ΠΝΕΜΗ.
³² POLOTUSKY 1957a:229 (= CP 231). Observe that η- too, like β-adjectives, is characterized both affectively and distinctively, Compare (among many other applications of this principle) WEIL 1879:36ff. ("l’ordre pathétique"); GAMIILSHEU 1930:15, 25, 32 (affect including antithesis); REGULA 1951:79, 181d. ("Affektsyntax"); the "emotive order" in Firbas, Æcasos pro mod. filologi 39:173 (1957); JONES 1977:63f. ("the emotive principle"); also REINER 1968:225-244, 256. Other terms for approximately the same factor are "emphatic", "subjective", "impulsive", "figured" order or syntax.
4.3 Determinative and Appositive Syntagms: Suppletive Neutralization for Pronominal and Proper-Name Nuclei

Proper names and personal pronouns, neither determinable, since both are extreme on the scale of specificity (the pronoun of maximal specificity and maximal phoric applicability, the proper name of maximal specificity, minimal phoric applicability) are as a rule nuclei of an appositive attributive syntagm, i.e. are expanded by a “determinator (definite article) + adjective” syntagm and not by an N-marked modifier adjective or substantive. Thus it is the satellite that carries the overt determination, when the nucleus does not. Here are some examples for this allosyntagm of the attribution syntagmeme:

Proper names (adjectives occupy here first or second-place positions; Νόε always precedes the nucleus): ΚΙΝΟΥΘΙΟΣ ΠΙΕΛΛΙΑΧΙΣΤΟΣ (Μυρ. 92, 95, III 13.19, 14.15 etc.) / ΠΑΙΚΑΙΚΟΣ ΑΒΕΛ, ΠΑΙΚΑΙΚΟΣ ΝΗΣΕ (P 130 ΤΜΔ) / ΑΒΕΛ ΠΑΙΚΑΙΚΟΣ (III 173.10, P 130 ΤΜΔ) / ΠΑΙΚΑΙΚΟΣ ΙΩΒ (Ch. 38.10ff., A 2 367, 478) / ΠΝΟΕ ΑΒΡΑΑΜ (RE 10 162a 10) / ΠΝΟΕ ΝΑΡΧΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ ΜΙΧΑΗΛ (Ch. 33.37ff.) / ΠΝΟΕ ΜΙΣΥΧΗΣ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ

---

31 See Kurylowicz 1960:182. The present writer is preparing a monographic study of the syntax of the proper name in Coptic.

32 Cf. Callender 1970:297ff.: “a proper noun cannot form part of an attribution but may form part of an apposition”. (The modals “cannot”, “may” would be out of place in a descriptive statement. Callender uses “attribution” in a more restricted sense than I do; the construction in point, while syntactically appositive, is functionally still attributive.)

33 ΠΝΟΕ... ΝΑΒΗΡΑ (A 2 376, collated) is a rare instance of an N-marked proper name semantic nucleus. Under certain contextual conditions, a proper name may be determinated: ΟΙΩΟΥΑΟΟ (ΝΟΥΤ), ΖΑΝΙΟΥΑΟΟ, ΝΑΙΟΥΑΟΟ, in De Vis, Homélies copies de la Vaticane I 64f — the proper name is thus “de-specified”, marked as appellative.
NAUN (Ch. 76.3ff.) / ПМАРШМЕ АІЕРИОС (Ch. 200.2f.) / ΠΑΣΕΒΗΣ ΣΑΤΑΝΑΣ 34 (Ch. 148.14f.) / ΠΙΑΝΟΜΟΣ ΝΑ-
ΒΟΥΧΟΔΟΝΟΣΚΟΡ (Ch. 49.17ff.) / ΙΩΖΑΝΝΗΣ ΠΜΕΡΙΤ (P 131° 23 π). With pronouns, the nucleus invariably
precedes the appositive attribute: ΑΝΟΝ ΝΙΤΑΛΑΙΝΜΠΟΣ (A I 175, Ch. 99.2f., etc.) / ΑΝΟΚ ΠΙΕΛΑΧΙΣΤΟΣ
(A I 16) / ΝΤΥΤΝ ΝΑΤΣΒΝ, ΝΤΥΤΝ ΝΡΕΚΚΡΔΝ (III 144.1.16). (For the ‘pronoun + noun’ apposition to
a preceding personal pronoun, see §6.1.3.3.) Note that ΠΝΟΥΤΕ usually behaves like a proper name 35:
ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΝΑΓΑΒΟΣ (Ch. 13.31, A I 154, etc.) / ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΝΠΑΝΣΤΗ (A 2 178) / ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΝΓΑΡΥΣΗΤ (III 123.13)
/ ΝΒ. ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΝΠΑΝΣΤΗ ΝΠΑΝΣΤΗ ΝΓΑΡΥΣΗΤ ΝΑΓΑΒΟΣ (A I 87, uncollated) / ΝΑΓΑΒΟΣ ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΝΠΑΝΣΤΗ (IV 34.7f.) / ПМАРШМЕ ΝΔΣΗΡ ΠΝΟΥΤΕ (III 23.21). So too do ΠΝΟΕΙΣ and of course ΠΕ: ΠΝΟΕΙΣ ΝΑΓΑΒΟΣ
(A 2 287) / ΠΝΟΕΙΣ ΝΠΑΝΣΤΗ (A 1 103) / ΠΕ ΝΠΑΝΣΤΗ ΝΝΑΗΤ (A 1 105, uncollated). ΠΑΣΧΑ is apparently
not considered a proper name: ΠΚΕΝΟΣ ΜΠΑΣΧΑ (Ch. 44.52f.).

34 ΣΑΤΑΝΑΣ is a common appellative in (Ch. 65.31f.) ΠΟΥΗΣΗ ΣΑΤΑΝΑΣ or else, like ΠΝΟΥΤΕ, part of a proper name with
innate determination.
35 Cf. ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΠΝΑΛΕΝΣ (Teza 684). (A 2 411) ΜΗ ΑΛΛΟ-ΠΜΗΜΕ ΑΝ ΝΑΓΑΒΟΣ... ΑΛΛΟ-ΠΜΗΝ ΝΑΓΑΒΟΣ... ΑΛΛΟ-ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΟΝ
ΝΑΓΑΒΟΣ ΑΥΤ ΠΕΝΗΡΕ ΝΑΓΑΒΟΣ (uncollated) may be a contrary example; others are (A I 130) ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΝΝΑΗΤ (uncollated) / (A 2
376) ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΜΝΕ.
EXCURSUS: NEUTER GENDER AS A SYNTAGMATICALLY MANIFESTED, PARADIGMATICALLY DEFINED CATEGORY
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5.1 Coptic gender

The observation of gender in Coptic ¹ provides the occasion for a study in structural description with several interesting theoretical aspects, the more specific ones being those of environment (conditioning, reaction) and neutralization, the more general and basic ones being gender exponence, option and selection, as well as the definition of a category in general. The relevance of this study to our examination of Coptic modifiers lies in its contribution to an understanding of the nucleus-satellite nominal/adnominal syntagmatics, in a classic illustration of the advantages of a structuralist approach to a difficult grammatical issue.

5.1.1 Exponents; syntagmatics. It is well known that Coptic gender is syntagmatic and pronominal rather than lexematic or morphematic (Funk 1978a:110): the article-pronoun or determinator is, insofar as it is marked for gender, the primary exponent or carrier of this category. The noun lexeme (a satellite expanding the article nucleus, see below) does not usually carry any intrinsic mark of gender. Of course, the question of concord does not yet arise here, within the 'article → noun' minimal noun syntagm, but only when this is further expanded, in cotext patterns involving other pronouns in cohesion with the article (§5.1.1.1) ². The interdependence of the article and its expansion I see as one of mutual selection, i.e. the compatibility of a lexeme with either — or both ³ — of the two singular definite articles,

¹ Some conventional discussions of Coptic gender: Stern §§302, 487; Till §§75f., 79; Mallon-Malinine p. 44ff.
² Meillet ("Le genre grammatical", 1919, in Linguistique historique et linguistique générale p. 206) calls these movable pronouns "débris de genre"; English, he says, "a profité de la destruction totale de la fin de mot où figurait la marque du genre pour écarte une distinction inutile". The "usefulness" of any grammatical distinction may be arguable, but in Coptic — and, in a different way, in English — the pronouns have proved staunch custodians of the historic category.
³ Fodor's general definition of gender (1959) as "the concord between a variable and an invariable" is hardly applicable
n-, τ-. The question of "where" the gender is, is not one of descriptive relevance; the article is the concord motivant. The general thesis of the so-called inherence of grammatical (i.e. signifié-less) gender in the lexeme itself is therefore nowhere put to the test in Coptic. The few instances of "nomen mobile", the sex-referable residue of a pre-Coptic system (CON: CIWME, ΚΑΛΟ: ΚΑΛΩ, ΥΨΕ: ΥΨΕΕ, see §4.0.1), synchronically only semi-morphological and unproductive, — as also are the lexical pairs (ΕΙΨΤ: ΜΑΑΥ, ΠΟΜΕ: ΚΩΜΕ) — are not really marked for gender, but stand in semasiological-paradigmatic opposition, which must grammatically be related to the same pronoun-compatibility or mutual selection.

5.1.1.0.1 Determinators. It is the articles or gender-characterized determinators that carry the gender mark for the minimal noun syntagm. This is by no means a novel observation or one peculiar to Coptic, but it is certainly not banal or trivial, since it opens our eyes to a crucial fact, namely the nuclear status of the article in the noun syntagm, with the noun lexeme its satellite (expansion). This analytic statement, although by no means communis opinio as far as general and European linguistics is concerned, is upheld by some eminent syntacticians, and constitutes in fact the major and most noteworthy contribution of Jernstedt’s study of Coptic determination (1949). To be exact, he asserts this of the indefinite articles, pointing to a subordination relationship between them and their nouns not unlike that between a noun and its attribute: “one (of the category...)” ; see JERNSTEDT 1949 passim, esp. §§10,14, 18, 20ff., 25. The same is true, however, of all determinators: the article is the prime nucleus, the initial boundary signal and beginning of the concatenation of adnominal modification (Ch. 4). Indications that this analysis is correct abound in many constructions involving the noun syntagm, a model of which (after FREI 1965:44ff.) would be

\[
\text{n- oy- PUME}
\]

It is the determinators that establish

here, where we have two lists, a very short one (a) of determinators (n-, τ-) and a much longer one (b) of noun lexemes, with a member from (b) compatible and coupled with either one or both members of (a). It is possible to describe this in terms of presupposition — a given member of (a) presupposing a certain member of (b), or vice versa — i.e. as determination or rection (BAZELL 1949:8ff.).

4 Cf. Hamp, Archiv Orientalni 40 (1972) 344 (on Western Iranian dialects): "The gender is inherent in the noun and is transplanted to pronominals... by a simple but far-reaching concord rule"; cf. also DAMOURETTE–PICHON §303: "L'article reçoit la sexussemblance et ne la confère pas... elle leur [i.e. to substantives] est donnée en dehors de lui par l'acte mental, qui conçoit la substantialité". Jernstedt, whose study of Coptic gender-determination phenomena is by far the most penetrating, says (1949:§4): "Gender is a lexical characteristic of the noun" — with which it is difficult to differ; but when he claims (ibid.) to know that the determinator "agrees in gender with the determined noun", he risks circularity, for the gender of the determined noun is made manifest only by, and in, the determinator. Moreover, when he says (§25) that the article "overrules the inherent gender of the noun", he is again begging the question. Generally speaking, the major flaw in Jernstedt’s discussion lies in its overemphasis of the mentalistic and dynamic aspects of concord phenomena, this making many of his statements (esp. in §§13, 19) hard to accept. I also disagree with his assertion (§23) that the lexeme embodies both (abstract) property and (concrete) substance; it contains neither, except as a potentiality realized and resolved in syntagm with the actualiser pronom.

6 See, for instance, BALLY 1950:§139, DUBOIS 1965:56 (the article opposition "met en évidence la marque du genre"). In Gaeic bardic–grammatical terminology, insigne covers both "gender", "person" and "pronoun-article" (O’CUIV, Transact. Philol. Soc. 1965:152, Adams, FL 4:160 (1970)). Cf. KURYLOWICZ 1964:210f., KERN 1888:100, 103f., and, the earliest instance to my knowledge of this approach, the Stoic definition of the article (Dioeces ap. SCHMIDT 1839:39) ἐρωθεῖν ἐστὶ στοιχεῖον λόγου πτωτικῶν διαθέσεων τῆς γένους ἀνθρώπων καὶ τοῦ ἄρθρου ἡμιπόδιον; see also ROBINS 1951:31.

8 See SEILER 1969:12ff.; FREI 1956:163-5, idem 1968:§3.2.3.1, 3.3.2.1; BARRI 1975a:75-83. We find this idea expressed by GUILLAUME as early as 1919 (p. 25), though in a somewhat different sense: "L’article est quelque chose qui ‘emploie’ le nom”.

7 The same view is held by SCHENKEL 1966:129. See also (for Egyptian) Edel, BiOr 25 (1968) 36. This has an immediate bearing on the morphology-syntact "levelling" issue: the "word-internal" interdependence between article and noun is only jucturally different from that between the two-word nucleus and satellite (cf. Hjelmslev, Prolegomena 26). Incidentally, the distinction between syntactic and semantic nucleus is as valid for noun-syntagm analysis as it is for the ‘NS + expansion’ one (§4.1).

8 Probably also of other prefixed morphs in the minimal syntagm, like at- and mnt- (FUNK 1978a:116); the izifer/ and mnt- is also in Coptic too (pace NAGEL 1980:89f.).
the class status ("nominal" syntax) for the whole syntagm; it is to them that anaphoric reference is made. This analysis conforms to the basic non-predicative syntagmatic sequence in Coptic: nucleus → satellite. Only thus can account (and account elegantly) for instances of apparent inconsistency like ПСЯААБН "the (book) of the syllable, syllabary" (BL Or. 8800 4 vo.) 11; ΡΟΘ ΜΣ ΜΠΝ "he who is all power" (RE 10 161a 27f.); ΠΗΟΛΕ ΜΠΝ "he who is all wonder" (ibid. 28); ΠΗΟΛΕ (ibid. 163a 33) 12; ΠΜΕ ΜΑΥΑΑ (Ch. 59.20f.) 13 "he who alone is of truth." This seems to prove that (a) it is not the lexeme which selects the gender; (b) the determinator/noun dependence is a mutual one of compatibility, rather than of rection: ΠΗΟΛΕ can in principle expand both "masculine" and "feminine" determinator pronouns, just (from the point of view of syntagmatic compatibility) as ΖΜΑΑΑ or ΕΒΙΝ can, and with precisely the same internal relationship. The same, of course, applies to the indefinite determinators, which, however, are either unmarked or indirectly marked for gender (see below): ΟΥΜΟΛΕ ΠΕ ΠΝΟΥΤΕ "A wondrous one is God" (P 1302 46 CX) / ΟΥΜΕ ΠΕ ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΑΥΜ ΟΥΜΕ ΠΕ ΠΕΝΣΟΙΕΙΣ (P 1302 22 ΦΗΝ) / the common ΖΕΝΜΙΝ - "phenomena characterized by the quality of..." (e.g. III 206.1-5) / ΖΕΝΙΑΠΕ ΝΕΙΝ ΣΙΖΟ (P 1302 86 ro, not Sh.) "(persons) characterized by ass and horse-flesh", and so on. Although it is true that the above are isolated, rare instances — lexemes have their "usual" (i.e. statistically prevalent) compatibilities with either Π- or Τ-; hence "are" masculine or feminine —, it is important to remember that the rarer compatibility is an open possibility 14, a productive procedure.

Paradigmatically, I would suggest the following scheme as the structured inventory of the main determinators, all quintessentially nuclear, expandable by noun lexemes: 15:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>determinators proper</th>
<th>quantifiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Π-Τ-Ν-</td>
<td>ΚΕ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΟΥΜ-ΟΥΦ-ΖΕΝ-</td>
<td>ΟΥΜ-ΟΥΦ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΟΥ-</td>
<td>ΟΥ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— ΝΙΜ</td>
<td>— ΝΙΜ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;the-&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;other-&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;a-&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;one-&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;-&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;any, every-&quot; (discontinuous)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations: Π-Τ-Ν- = masc. sgl./fem. sgl./masc. + fem. pl. — represent the whole demonstrative and possessive series.

9 See below §5.2.1, and §3.1.1.0.1.0.1. The Nominal Sentence is a striking case in which the advantages of this conception are clear, being really a pronominal predication pattern: ΟΥ-/ΠΝ- + ΝΕ. This analysis, as Jernstedt himself points out, would account for syntagms like (a) ΟΥ-ΖΕΝ-ΤΕΛΕΙΝ (A 2 417, 421 [not Sh.], RE 11 16a 10), an instance of hyperdetermination, where ΤΕΛ, in commutation with the bare noun, expands the indefinite articles; (b) ΖΕΝΚΑΚ ΜΕ ΕΖΙΟΝΤ ΖΕΝΙΑΠΕ (A 2 435, not Sh.), ΠΕΝΚΑΖ ΝΗΤ ΖΙΑΤΗ ΖΗΑΑΖΟΜ ΖΗΑΑΖΟΜ (A 1 77), (ΠΙΕΥΜΕΝΟΕΙΣ ΙΩΕΙΣ (III 205.23f). Note ΖΕΝΑΙΟΛΕ ΕΞΝΟΙΛΕ ΝΕ ΝΕΛΗΜΕ (Cat. 43.29) "His works constitute wonder upon wonder" — for ΜΕΙΛΕ ΕΞΝΟΙΛΕ, here expanding ΕΝ-, see §1.2.1.1; the articles here bracket ΖΗ-coordinated, zero-determinated nouns (see POLOTSKY 1957a:233f. = CP 233). (Incidentally, in BM 991 ro - BMCat. 41l, collated) we find the remarkable ΠΕΝΑΙΟΛΕ ΠΑΓΙΠΕ... ΑΝ ΜΑΥΑΑ ΠΕ ΑΥΜ ΣΕΛΕΕ.

10 One suspects that a misunderstanding of the true nature of the article-noun relationship underlies "fluctuating gender" in CRUM'S Dictionary (e.g. in ΜΕΙΛΕ, ΥΠΗΕ, ΠΟΟΝΕ, ΕΝΟΝΕ), and also the so-called "overrule" of the "inherent gender" by the article (JERNSTEDT 1949:25). See further instances in KAHLE 1954:250 (sub b); ΠΗΑΙΕ ΛΕΕ 5:36 (Palau Rih. ed. Quecke, see BROWNE 1979b:201); ΠΠΑΛΕΠΙΑ in (Bos.) Ps. 11:6, 13:3, 39:3; Rom. 3:16, must be accounted for differently.


12 Cf. ΠΕΝΕΥΕ ΠΑΝ 9:4 (and other exx. in CRUM 581a).

13 Cf. ΠΜΕ Αποκ. 3:7, 19:11. Again, these cases may be viewed as instances of hyperdetermination (definite article before zero-determination).

14 There may be a connection between the compatibility of a lexeme with both masculine and feminine articles and its occurrence as zero-determined predicate in a Nominal Sentence (see Ch. 4, n. 7).

15 It is amazing that a hundred years after Stern's Grammatik we have no adequate account of noun determination in Coptic. (KRAMSKY'S facts [1972:89] are either oversimplified or inaccurate; so, for that matter, are his Greek and Celtic systems. This is of course a constant danger in this genre of linguistic reporting, and yet the difference in the quality of the information given by modern typologists and that found in nineteenth-century studies such as STEINHAL-MESTELI is truly staggering.) I see the major obstacle here in the too narrow patterning, the scrutiny of the noun syntagm alone — at best with some offhand contextual consideration — in an attempt to isolate the function of what is a macrosyntactically operative element par excellence. See NAGEL 1980:77f., LAYTON 1981:261 for recent brief expositions.
OY-: in a structurally different way, all numbers are pronominal nuclei of their noun syntagm.

Kē-: the plural of keōya is zēnkooye, just as that of oya is zōine; cf. IV 88.1f.

θ-: see below, §5.2.0.1. It is not strictly true (Layton 1981:261) that zero and oY- share the same privileges of occurrence: oY- (not zēn-) is excluded before kē-, θ- isn't; θ- is compatible as immediate expansion of the durative verbal predicate, oY- is not.

— NIM, θ- NIM: (discontinuous): NIM, like zero determination, suppresses (overrides) the gender-number category, and is accordingly incompatible with gender-number-explicit determinators 16. As a rule, though with not infrequent deviations, — NIM expresses universal, θ- NIM distributive, THP- (§6.1.1) integral totality 17.

5.1.11 PHORICS AND CONCORD. When the minimal noun syntagm is in any way expanded or included, there may arise the occasion of a cohesive secondary exponent of gender, usually in the form of an amalgamate person-gender-number pronoun — third-person ʷc/-c/-oY- — but also by a non-personal demonstrative, by oya/oýe/ozyme 18, or, more rarely, zero 19. This linear reference may be either resuming, ANAPHORIC (§5.2.1) to a determiner 20, or assuming, CATAPHRIC (§5.2.2) 21. In either case, but especially in the former, CONCORD RULING between the referent (pronoun) and referate (determinator) constitutes an important feature, a junctural link (§6.0.2) in the context pattern: concord exists here in the sense of rection only in the ultra-noun-syntagm extent:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>θ-</th>
<th>motivates (governs)</th>
<th>masc. + sgl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T-</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>fem. + sgl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>(masc. + fem.) + pl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>oYm-</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>masc. + sgl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oYe-</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>fem. + sgl.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zèn-</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>(masc. + fem.) + pl.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>θ-</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>suppression of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θ- NIM</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>gender-number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θkē-</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>distinction (§5.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) In the case of the gender-explicit referate, the concord is resolute and comparatively straightforward:

\[ \text{"n} \sqsubset \text{PUME}...... \sqsubset \text{\( \overline{\text{\( \theta \)}} \)} \] (etc.)

(b) With oY- we have a superficial syncretism-neutralization of oya/oýe/ozyme in the nuclear syntagm (Jernstedt 1949:§§44, 13) to be resolved in the sequence 22.

---

16 See Quecke 1979:447. I know of two Sah. instances of NIM in compatibility with non-zero determinators: oyzooyt NIM (Ex. 12:48 Bodmer) and nbaaad NIM (NHC VII 11.10) — insufficient evidence to modify the above structure (more Boh. exx. in Crum 225b).

17 See Brondal 1943:25ff.


19 See §§5.2.1.5 and §§3.1.1.0.1, 6.0.2 (delimitations) for zero resumptions.

20 Two typologically important points of consideration are the redundancy of gender signals in the noun syntagm (cf. Dubois 1965:64ff., comparatively low in Coptic, and the cohesive value of the respective resumptions (ibid. 87f.).

21 See Dressler 1973:§12.4, pp. 20ff., 57, with further literature on "phorics" in general; also Palek (1968), Halliday-Hasan (1976) for English. The cataphoric direction of reference is called by Guillaume (1919:224ff.) "extension anaphoric prospective".

22 A nice question is, what motivates the gender when the oY-determined noun syntagm is the predicate of a Nominal
(c) It is pre-eminently in patterns with the zero-determination referate that one observes the masc. ~ fem. fluctuation, indicating a neutralization which I propose to call "neuter gender" (§§5.2.0.1, 5.2.1).

5.1.2 CATEGORICAL STRUCTURE. I suggest the following categorial model (after Kuryłowicz 1964: Ch. 1 §10 and Brøndal 1943:15ff.) as a convenient summary diagram for displaying the paradigmatic (role) relationship within this category:

\[
\text{(neuter gender: masc. ~ fem. ~ plur. fluctuation)}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{MARKED} \\
(\text{fem. sgl.)}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{UNMARKED} \\
(\text{masc. sgl.)}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\text{COMPLEX}
\]

(plural, common gender)

*Observations:* (a) The masculine:feminine opposition in Coptic is really *equipollent*, but some of its former characteristics of privative opposition still survive (§5.2).

(b) "-", "-" and *ANOK* represent the one case where the animate class overrides the category of gender: elsewhere, the inverse is true: animate-inanimate is a transsecting distinction in Coptic.

5.2 GENDER NEUTRALIZATION ENVIRONMENT: NEUTER GENDER

It is mainly in two phoric patterns — the anaphora to a zero article (θ-, θ- ἱμ, θ-κε-) and the cataphora to a verbal nominalization, content clause, adnexal complementation etc. — that a masc./fem. neutralization takes place. This I now propose to define as a NEUTER GENDER ARCHIMORPHEME\(^\text{33}\) neutralization, as defined by Trubetzkoy: replacement of a feature (in our case, gender) by zero in a given environment. Needless to say, the neutralization takes place in the expansion, not in the nominal nucleus itself. This neutralization is in favour of the masculine term of the opposition, that is to say, no zero-determined noun with masculine-article compatibility is resumed by a feminine pronoun, whereas the contrary is true (exx. below). Thus the masculine reveals itself as the *unmarked* term or node in a

---

33 Naturally, taking the term not in its usual morphologic Indo-European-oriented sense, but as a descriptive designation of a syntagmatic-paradigmatic phenomenon. Some delving into the original purport and tortuous terminological history of "neuter" may here prove rewarding: Protagoras' πελατις, the Stoics' οὐδέπροσ, Aristotle's μετέχον ("indifferent", acc. to H. M. Hoenigswald, "Media, Neutrum u. Zirkumflex", in Festschrift A. Debrunner, Bern 1954, 209-212) — see Robin 1951:22. The connection between neuter gender and masc./fem. neutralization is not unknown outside Coptic, notably in Rumanian (with a complementary distribution, masc. in the sgl. and fem. in the pl., see Rosetti, "Sur la catégorie du neutre", Proc. 9th Intern. Congr. Ling., 1964, 779ff., criticised by R. H. Hall, Word 21:421ff. [1965]). One ought however to make a distinction between the diachronic issue — the transition from a morphologic 3-gender to a 2-gender system — and the purely synchronic one.
prative opposition of gender. This is fully in agreement with pre-Coptic morphology. This zero or "neuter" node of the categorial structure is realized through "flottement", a fluctuation between masc. and fem. of which the signifié is gender indifference, "neither" gender, Ungeschlechtigkeit — not to be confused with the complex node, common gender, conflating both masculine and feminine. The apparent choice between masc. and fem. resumption is but a false option, since it does not entail a corresponding change on the plan du contenu — insofar as one can judge by contextual information.

Without enlarging on the semantics of the zero article, the referate of this neutralization, one cannot but note that its deindividualizing effect corresponds, as far as gender is concerned, to an ageneric (as well as anumeric) functional standing of the noun syntagm: a negation of all noun categories, pronominally and adnominally manifested in Coptic.

### 5.2.0.1 Synopsis of reference context patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cataphoric</th>
<th>Anaphoric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>infin.</td>
<td>'θ-Noun\text{\textasciitilde} \rightarrow \nu ~ c ~ o'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>§5.2.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circ. conv.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(the pron.: object expansion)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§5.2.2.1 f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\chi\varepsilon)</td>
<td>'θ-Noun\text{\textasciitilde} \rightarrow \nu ~ c ~ o'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># (\nu \sim c \sim \text{conj. form} \rightarrow \epsilon(\text{TPM})) # conjunctive</td>
<td>§5.2.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(the pron.: gramm. subject)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§5.2.2.1 f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># (\nu \sim c \sim \text{OY-Noun} \rightarrow \nu \rightarrow \chi\varepsilon) # (\epsilon(\text{TPM}))</td>
<td>'θ-κε-Noun\text{\textasciitilde} \rightarrow \nu ~ c ~ o'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§5.2.2.2.1</td>
<td>§5.2.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘(\text{ΝΑΙ} \rightarrow \chi\varepsilon)’</td>
<td>'θ-Noun\text{\textasciitilde} / θ-Noun\text{\textasciitilde} / \nu \sim c \sim \text{OY}'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\epsilon(\text{TPM}))</td>
<td>§5.2.1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[24\] In French too we observe the neutic use of the masculine, unmarked term of a prative opposition (DUBOIS 1965:52, 57; see S. LAMPAH, "La relation des genres dans le système de pronoms de la 3e personne en français"; Word 12:51ff. [1956]; S. A. SCHANE, "The Notion of Markedness and its Morphosyntactic Consequences", Proc. 10th Intern. Congr. Ling. II, 75ff.; critically, C. E. BAZELL, "The Correspondence Fallacy in Structural Linguistics", in E. P. HAMP et al., Readings in Linguistics II, Chicago 1966, p. 276ff.). In Coptic the unmarkedness of the masc. gender is semasiologic rather than morphologic: "masculine gender" means "masc. + indifferent", while "feminine gender" means "feminine". Feminine-oriented gender neutralization does occur in Coptic: a well-known instance is εἰκοσίτε "behold", where the feminine, originally anaphoric, synchronically → f at all analyzable — cataphoric, is normal, although both masc. and pl. marked alternants are frequent. CRUM has an impressive collection of exx. for ΤΕ as an "invariable" subject or occasionally copula in Nominal sentences patterns (391b): these must be further examined and classified before they can be appreciated. On the whole, however, it is the masculine that is the "freezing" gender: beside the phoric cases discussed here, consider the particles ΖΩΩΩ, ΝΤΟΘ (originally phoric too - §6.1.2.3, 6.1.3.4 - synchronically "phoric" in a macrosyntactic sense, back to a preceding context).

\[25\] See GUILLAUME 1919:62, 233ff., 241f., 303ff.; DUBOIS 1965:149ff. ("L'absence de tout référent supprime toute forme d'actualisation"), 154f. (the absence of the article suppresses and negates the existence of the noun syntagm, giving the noun ad-
5.2.1 COTEXT PATTERNS: ANAPHORIC REFERENCE TO A ZERO ARTICLE

5.2.1.1 REFERENT: θ-<noun><feminine>; REFERENT (a): masculine singular (always 3rd person; all referents; actor-expressions in adnominal circumstantial forms): (III 205.17ff.) ΑΓΑΝ ... ΕΧΘΗΚ ΕΒΟΛ / (87.2) ΚΑΪΕ (ΕΥΡΝΗ / (93.10) ΣΩΒ ΝΑΜΕ ΕΣΧΗΚ ΕΒΟΛ / (195.2ff.) ΜΝΤΖΑΚΕ ΕΠΡ-ΝΟΥΡΕ / (IV 154.22) ΕΠΝΥΣ ΕΝΟΥΡΕ / (Ch 144.10ff.) ΕΚΟΠΕ ΕΔΡΟΥΡ ΜΠΥΡΟΣ / (A 2 242) ΖΔΑΝΙΣ ΕΝΟΥΟΥΕΤ / (289) ΝΤΕ ΕΝΟΟΗΚ Η ΕΝΟΚ / (Wess. 9 141d 6f.) ΣΩΒ ΕΝΟΟΟΕ / (Or. 160.4f.) ΓΡΑΝΔΕ ΕΝΟΟΟΥ / (P 130v f.6, ΝΖ-ΝΗ) ΣΥΝΕΝΑΓΙΓΚ ΕΥΡ-ΕΡΨΕ ΕΝΟΟΟΜ.

REFERENT (b): feminine singular (actor-expression, object expansion of adnominal constructions; reflexive object in adverbial modification): (III 76.6f.) ΩΝΚΖΙΜΕ ΩΝΕΝΜΟΠΟΥΡΡΙΠΡ-ΝΟΕΚ ΕΡΟΟ ΝΕΚΝΑΛΙΓΚ. ΑΝ ΝΕ / (IV 15.8ff.) ΜΝΤΖΙΚΕ ΝΑΗ-ΓΕΟΜ ΕΠΝΟΟΗΕ ΕΒΟΛ... / (Or. 153.8ff.) ΩΝΚΖΙΜΕ ΕΥΡΑΚΟΥΣΤ... / (159.5ff.) ΩΝΚΖΙΜΕ ... ΕΠΡΣΟΥΕΡ-ΠΕΝΤΑΝΟΥΟΥ / (160.47ff.) ΩΝΚΖΙΜΕ ΕΝΟΟΠΝΕΥΕ... Obviously, this evidence 27, which is quantitatively weaker than that for the masc. referent, raises the possibility that in fact the masculine is the normal anaphoric referent in this case. Moreover, one cannot gainsay the possible argument that in cases of θ-<noun> sex may be overruling gender (in Shenoute I do not recall any instance of θ-<noun> with a masc. anaphora).

REFERENT (c): plural (actor-expression or object expansion, possessor in adnominal constructions): (Or. 160.50ff.) ΩΝΚΖΙΜΕ ΩΝ ΟΥ ΜΟΝΟΝ ΞΕ-ΝΕΤΕΤ-ΑΛΛΑ ΝΑΥ ΑΝ ... ΆΛΛΑ ΝΕΚΖΙΚΕ ΟΝΕΝΜΟΠΟΥΡΡΙΠΡ-ΝΟΕΚ ΕΡΟΟ ΟΝΕΝΑΛΙΓΚ.

5.2.1.2 REFERENT: θ-<noun><feminine> + ΝΙΜ; REFERENT (a): masculine singular; no exx. in Shenoute.28 REFERENT (b): feminine singular (possessor in adnominal circumstantial construction or Nominal Sentence): (Wess. 9 132a 4f.) ΣΩΒ ΝΙΜ ΕΜΝΤΑΣ ΝΑΤΤΑ ΝΤΟΦΙΑ ΝΤΠΕ / (Zoea 603.18) ΓΕΝΕΚΙΚ ΝΙΜ ΤΕΕΖΑΕ ΝΕ ΠΤΑΚΟ.

REFERENT (c): plural 29 (object-resumption of the extrapoosed zero-determined noun): (Thompson H 3 ro) ΚΑΠΕ ΝΙΜ ΚΕΝΑΖΟΧΚΟΡΥΟΥ.

jectival status and affiliating it to the verb syntagm: "une tarte maison", "il est médecin"). See too Tobler 1908: 81ff., 1894:96-112, Kramský 1972:23. Note that the zero-form of the Coptic lexeme does not show the 'lexemic plural' (ΣΩΒ -ΣΒΗΥΕ), which seems in fact to have a concretizing-individuating value.

27 See Jelanskaia 1965:108, 1967, where she places the phenomenon in its right context, the ageneric function of zero-determination. Jelanskaia was the first to interpret this remarkable construction correctly (see also Crum 1926 I 189 n. 1, 250). As a rule, editors have either emended (so occasionally, though not always, Leipoldt) or ignored the masc. readings without further deliberation. Some non-Shenoutean exx. on my files: Deut. (Budge) 22:11 (ΣΒΗΥΕ), 25:14 (ΟΝΕΚ), Joh. 15:13 (ΑΓΑΝΗ), Tit. 2:3 (ΣΒΗ), Str. 36:29 (ΓΙΜΕ), Clem. 26.1 (Schmidt, Akhm. ΝΙΣΤΙΚ), Apoc. 2.10 (Steindorff, Akhm., ΠΕΤΕΤΕΣ); Crum, Short Texts 189 (ΓΟΥΚΕ), 289 (ΑΓΑΝΗ), BMCat. 511 f.1 (Φαγ., ΠΨ); Chassinat, Papyrus medical 48, 73, 159 (ΝΟΥΕ, ΒΝΝΕ, ΑΡΜΕΚΙΟΣ); Wess. 18 5.20 (ΒΝΝΕ), Zoea 629f. (ΚΑΡΟΓΙΑ, ΒΑΣΓΟΥΟΥ, ΚΥΚΚΟΤΑΦΗΝ); NH CII 128.19f. (Layton, BASP 14:72f., 1977: ΒΟΗΟΓΙΑ, VII 74.18f. (ΤΕΧΝΗ); Crum-Steindorff, Rechtsurkunden 92.35 (ΞΕΝΟΥΚΙΑ), 10.32 (ΠΑΙΚΙΟΣ); Till, Osterbrief (Akhm.) A 80 (ΧΟΜΑΙΑ), B III 4 (ΠΡΟΡΕΠ); Deut. 22:5 (Budge) "ΣΚΕΥΗ... ΕΝΑ-ΝΕ" raising an interesting question: are we to read here σκεύη (fem. sgl.) or σκέυη (neut. pl. — so apparently understood by Rahlf, Swete, also Hatch-Redpath)? The former seems preferable: the uniqueness of the Coptic adnominal construction here as regards gender must be weighed against the difficulty of assuming a Greek construction (neut. pl. + sgl. verb) with a Greek plural noun in the Coptic text.

28 Also uncommon Shenoute: Allberry, Man. Psalm Book 151.18 (Subakhm., ΚΝΕΚΕ).

29 This is a provisional and probably erroneous statement, to judge by the ample non-Shenoutean evidence: Lev. 7:21 (ΒΟΤΕ), Act. 23:1 (ΞΕΝΟΥΚΙΟΣ), Tit. 2:10 (ΠΗΣΜΙΚ), Athanasius (Lefort) 2.23 (ΓΜΗ), Besa (Kuhn) 35.15 (ΞΕΝΟΕ), Pachom (Lefort) 55.24f. (ΨΥΧΗ); Polotsky, Kephalaia (Subakhm.) 84.27f. (ΧΠΕ), 139.2ff. (ΒΑΜΕ), 150.26 (ΑΝΑΚΗ), Crum, Epiphanius 110.8ff., 247.11 (ΑΡΕΤΗ); Budge, Homilies 88.6 (ΖΗ); NH CII 91.23 (ΓΝΗΜΗ); Crum-Steindorff, Rechtsurkunden 23.10 (ΠΡΟΣΑΠΕΣΙΚ), 75.53 (ΓΟΜ), 82.37 (ΨΥΧΗ, ΓΟΥΚΙΑ), 104.42f. (ΞΕΝΟΥΚΙΑ).

Outside Shenoute: Lev. 21:11 (ΨΥΧΗ), 23:29 (ΨΥΧΗ), Jud. 21:11 (ΓΙΜΕ). See Stern §486. I cannot find a correlation between the number of the referent and the kind of totality expressed by ΝΙΜ. On the other hand, ΝΙΜ in the quantifier paradigm is usually expanded by the adnominal circumstantial, not the relative (Shisha-Haley 1972:105f.).
5.2.1.3 Referents: 0-κε(γε)-Nounfem. (usually after ὑμν-, μν-); Referent (a): masculine singular (actor-expression in adnominal constructions)\(^{30}\): *(III 92.6f.)* ΜΝΗΓΕΑΝΩΜΑ ΕΥΩΟΥ / *(Ch. 125.38ff.)* ΜΝΗ- 
ΓΕΑΝΩΜΑ ΝΑΣΑΟΝ ΧΕ-ΜΠΟΥΡΧΟΥ ΝΑΣ ΆΝ / *(Rossi 2/3 12)* ΚΕΓΝΗΜΙΕ ΕΥΟ ΝΝΟΓ.
Referent (b): feminine singular (actor expression in adnominal circumstantial): *(Cat. 42.26f.)* ΚΕ-
ΜΝΗΜΝΤΡΕ ΕΧΝΖΟΤ ΑΥΣ ΕΚΟ ΝΝΟΓ ΕΠΕΖΟΥΟ.
Referent (c): plural (actor expression or object in adnominal constructions; for adnominal ΧΕ-clauses see §7.4): *(A 1 215)* ΟΥΝΚΕΕΚΑΝΧΙΑ ΕΑΥΡ-ΠΑΙ / *(A 2 33)* ΜΗ ΟΥΝΚΕΕΚΑΝΧΙΑ ΧΕ-ΜΠΟΥΡΧΟΥ / *(Ryl. Cat. p. 31 No. 67)* ΜΝΗΓΕΑΝΩΜΑ ΧΕ-ΜΠΟΥΡΧΟΥ / *(P 1306 15 go)* Ν ΟΥΝΚΕΕΚΑΝΧΙΑ ΧΕ-ΜΠΟΥΡΧΟΥ ΕΠΟΥΟ.

5.2.1.4 Referents: 0 - Nounmasc., 0 - Nounmasc. + nim, 0 - κε-Nounmasc.; Referents: masculine singular; plural. The masculine referent *per se* is not as significant as is the absence of a feminine variant i.e. the absence of fluctuation. This definitely means that the neutralization is masculine-oriented. Where it not for the (scant) evidence of feminine variants and the cataphoric referents (see below), one could conclude that the masculine term is the sole exponent of neuter gender. The exemplification is selective:

1. 0-Nounmasc.: *(A 2 16)* ΡΨΗΜΕ ΜΠΟΜΝΙΡΟΣ ΕΨΗΝΤ ΝΑΚΡΨΗΜΕ ΜΠΟΝΙΡΟΣ / *(IV 85.6)* ΥΝΟ ΕΝΝΑΟΥΜΥ / *(P 1306 95 vo)* ΠΑΖΕΡΕ... ΕΨΗΜΕ-ΜΑΗ / *(A 1 72)* ΜΑΤΙΚΗ ΕΝΝΑΟΥΜΥ / *(IV 17.7f.)* ΡΨΗΜΕ ΕΟΥΝΤΣ-ΝΕΖΙΟΥΜΕ ΝΒΨΚ ΕΨΟΥΝ ΥΑΡΟΥΟΥ / *(A 1 226)* ΟΥΝΥΡΗΡΕ ΥΨΜΕ ΕΨΟΥΜΥ... ΟΥΝΥΡΗΡΕ ΔΕ ΟΝ ΥΨΜΕ ΥΑΥΚΑΛΡΟΝΕΙ.  
2. 0-Nounmasc. + nim: *(IV 73.8f.)* ΨΨΗΜΕ ΝΙΜ ΝΤΕΖΕ ΕΨΟΥΜΥ ΕΒΟΛΑ / *(Ch. 161.19ff.)* ΡΨΗΜΕ ΝΙΜ ΕΤΕΡΕΙΨ ΝΑΟΥΜΥΟΥ ΖΑΡΑΤΗ.  
3. 0-κε-Nounmasc.: *(III 201.16)* ΚΕΣΒΒ ΕΑΡΑΑΨ ΝΤΕΨΨΗ ΜΜΟΥ ΆΝ ΧΕ-ΟΥΝΟΒΕ ΝΕ / *(Ch. 21.3ff.)* ΚΕΣΒΒ ΕΨΑΚΡ-ΠΟΛΕΜΟΣ ΝΖΗΤΗ / *(P 1306 59 vo)* ΜΝΗΓΕΑΝΟΣ ΑΥΣ ΜΝΗΓΕΑΝΚΑΣ ΝΖΗΤ ΕΨΟ ΝΝΟΓ... / *(BM Cat. 81, No. 196)* ΜΝΗΓΕΑΝΒ ΧΕ-ΜΨΑΧΚ ΆΝ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΝΖΗΤΟΥ ΥΘΡΟΥ.

5.2.1.5 Some remarkable anaphoric constructions

(a) Anaphora to a non-specific referate — either the preceding context comprehensively or any unboundable component thereof: Referents: feminine singular: ΜΝΗΓΕΑΝΟΣ “thereafter” *(IV 200.21, Ch. 18.24f. etc.), NCΣΙΙ ΕΡΟΙ ΆΝ “this does not concern me” *(A 1 52)*, -ςε ΕΡΟΣ “discover this, arrive at this conclusion” *(IV 64.18f., Ch. 12.6, Α 1 135.6)*. Note that these cases are easily mistaken for *non-phoric*; the pronouns, however, are invariably referents in a linear sense.

(b) Anaphora to an extra-(pre-)posed, topicalized verbal (“preinclusion”) nominalization. Referents: masculine/conditioned feminine/zero (see §2.7.1.4.2 for further exx.): *(A 1 199)* ΕΒΨΚ ΜΕΝ ΕΝ-
ΤΟΠΟΣ ΜΝΗΜΑΡΤΥΡΟΣ ΕΨΑΗΑ ΕΨΥΝ ΕΨΗΑΛΛΕΙ ΕΤΒΒΟΚ ΕΨΙ-ΤΕΡΟΦΟΡΑ... ΝΑΝΟΥΜ; ΕΨΥΝ ΔΕ ΕΟΥΜΗ ΕΨΥΝ ΕΨΥΒΕ, ΜΑΛΛΟΝ ΔΕ ΕΠΟΡΝΕΥΕ ΑΥΣ ΕΨΤΒ-ΡΨΗΜΕ... ΟΥΑΝΟΜΙΑ ΤΕ / *(A 2 443*, not Sh.) ΖΟΤΕΙ ΔΕ ΧΕ-ΠΕΖΟΥΟΥ ΜΝΗΜΝΨΥ... 
ΕΨΑΥΚΑΤΟΡΘΟΥ ΜΜΟΥ ΓΙΤΝΤΕΠΑΑΡΑΘΡΗΣΙΣ ΝΤΕΙΜΙΝΗ, ΟΥΝΟΤ ΝΙΜ ΣΟΟΥΝ ΜΠΑΙ / *(A 1 405-6)* ΕΞΟΟΣ ΔΕ ΧΕ... ΕΕΙΜΕ ΕΠΑΙ ΟΥΑΤΟΜ ΝΕ / *(IV 64.15f.)* ΕΞΟΟΣ ΔΕ ΧΕ-ΝΑΨΕ ΝΣΕΗ ΝΙΜ ΠΕΝΤΑΨΟΥΟΝΕ... ΜΝΗΜΝΨΥΜΕ ΣΟΟΥΝ (sim. Wess. 9 148b 16ff.)

(c) The case of anaphoric-cataphoric concord “conflict”: see §5.2.2.3.3.

5.2.2 “Sentence pronominalization”: Cataphoric reference to a verbal nominalization, “that”-clause, adnexus complementation

5.2.2.1 Referents: masculine ~ feminine (ψ ~ ζ). These pronouns herald and represent the referate noun (equivalent) in the nuclear verb syntagm, and cannot be replaced by it — that is, they are

\(^{30}\) Outside Shenoute: *Marc. 12:31 (ΕΝΤΟΑΗ), with fem. variae lectiones.*
in an exclusively syntagmatic relationship with it; this is the formal cohesion-factor of the pattern. The ‘pronoun → noun’ discontinuous component may be considered the distinct grammatical feature here (and in fact the kernel of the typological correspondence with the Indo-European ‘impersonals’, to which this pattern is in part the Coptic answer):

(a) feminine: Object-expansion:  
\[ \text{feminine: Object-expansion: } \text{TA} = \text{C (\text{na-}) } \text{E(TPE)-} \text{ (III 191.25ff., Ench. 79a); COTIN = C (\text{na-}) } \text{E-} \text{ (A 1 275, II 39.17ff.); CMNIT = C (E(TPE)-} \text{ (III 20.2ff.); TOG = C (EPO)-} \text{ E-} \text{ (A 2 50); X0O = C } \text{E-} \text{ (passim); ON = C } \text{E-} \text{ (A 2 44); } \text{KA = C } \text{2230112HT E-} \text{ (P 1308 100 ro); ZE EPO = C + circumstantial (A 2 543, Wess. 9 139a 8ff., P 1302 107 ro); 6NT = C + circumstantial (P 1318 13 vo); Actor expression: (Ne)NANOYC E(TPE)-/XE-/circumstantial/conjunctive 33 (A 2 380, Ryl. 69 NZ, Wess. 9 174d 25ff., 158b 24ff.); E)CMOYKZ (NA-) E-; (E)CMOTN (NA-) E- (Rossi 2/3 63, A 2 266, Ch. 13.49ff.); C-USHNE (CNAUSHNE, ECFANUSHNE, NNECUSHNE) ETPR-/conjunctive 33 (III 164.5ff., IV 102.7) CTPRNEI ETPR- (A 2 258); CTO ETPR- (A 2 103, 258); CKH EPRAI ETPR- (IV 91.16ff.); NPC-NOCHP AN E(TPE)- (IV 98.23); NPC-XPIA AN N- (Miss. 233); NCKI EPO- AN E(TPE)- (IV 103.12); ECHCUI = E- (Ch. 65.13ff.); CEP = E- (III 22.22); AKPANA = ETPR- (IV 96.10ff.).

(b) masculine: Object-expansion: GNZ = 4 EYCH2 XE- (the second pronoun is non-pertinent [conditioned]; III 21.18, P 1308 137 TNH); KA = C (NA-) E(TPE)- (IV 63.1ff., 66.12); CA2 = C XE- (IV 108.15ff.); CWTM EPO- C XE- (IV 39.4ff., P 1314 42 ro vo); ON = C (A 2 256); Actor expression: (Ne)CMYKH XE- (passim); NI NPOOYU (= PPOOYU) (NA-) XE-/2A-/EETBE- (III 34.9, Miss. 279); CHOU NPOOYU E- (Ming. 325); CK KWTNEE XE- (A 2 537); CWS Y EPO- XE- (A 2 454); CHNNE E- (Wess. 9 140c 2ff.); CHNNE2, CHNNEU2 (EBOA) XE- (IV 8.17); CMNNEZHT, NCMNNEZHT AN, MNECWK EKMAHT... XE- (IV 18.4ff., A 2 151, RE 10 159b 30ff., Mun. 176); NANOYC, CHAAG ETPR- (A 2 227) 34; CH-MA + CH2ANA = ETPR- (IV 167.15ff.).

5.2.2.1.1 Analysis of the distributional structure of the above patterns, carried out on the basis of the classification shown below, reveals several unmistakable combinatorial features (the symbol * means a very rare or unique attestation):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>masculine referent</th>
<th>fem. referent</th>
<th>masc./fem. referent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA2 = XE-</td>
<td>TA = E(TPE)-</td>
<td>ON = XE- (*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(*) KA = C E(TPE)-</td>
<td>COTIN = E(TPE)-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWTM EPO- C XE-</td>
<td>CMNIT = E(TPE)-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6NT = EYCH2 XE-</td>
<td>X0O = XE-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(*) TOG = XE-</td>
<td>ZE EPO- circ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31 Outside Shenoute, one encounters X0OC, exclusively or alongside X0OC. See KAHLE 126:1 233ff., 252; CRUM 1954:150ff.; STERN p. 310. The object-pronoun here is obligatory, hence purely formal (unless it is lexicalized by PIAE or sim.); XU "sing" is therefore a different lexeme.
32 A similar instance of circumstantial adnaleral complementation after a neutric cataphoric referent is XEKAAC + circ. Future III (POLOTSKY 1957:233 = CP 233), although it is doubtful whether XEKAAC is synchronically at all analyzable.
33 The conjunctive too is an adnaleral modifier, in paradigm with the circumstantial: see §7.1.3.
34 Possibly not cataphoric, at least not purely so: NANOYC AUY 2AG ENUPri (sic) ETPEN- M3024 2004COP (sic) ... ETPEN2U2 EPIH. Cf. earlier on the same page NETNAOHY AUY NETNM, and (p. 257) 200AG AUY NANOYC (here anaphoric, referring to the inside of the fruit). NB: (P 1308 KB, not Sh.7) NANOYC AY EGM-PHUE NNECNY ET2HY NNEHUNE... NANOYC AY 2H-PHOPE NNEH2A MINHUTE: the second pronoun group is ana-, not cataphoric.
Table 5.2.2.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>masculine referent</th>
<th>fem. referent</th>
<th>masc./fem. referent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>() CH2</td>
<td>XE-</td>
<td>() TO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>() O MPOOUW</td>
<td>XE-</td>
<td>() KH EUPAI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>() OBH EPOH</td>
<td>XE-</td>
<td>() P-RAIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(??) PSHYE</td>
<td>E-</td>
<td>() P-RAIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(??) OUNWG</td>
<td>XE-</td>
<td>() P-RAIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(??) OUNWG</td>
<td>XE-</td>
<td>() P-RAIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(??) OUNWG</td>
<td>XE-</td>
<td>() P-RAIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(??) OUNWG</td>
<td>XE-</td>
<td>() P-RAIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(??) OUNWG</td>
<td>XE-</td>
<td>() P-RAIA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The feminine referent points most often to a following infinitive referate (ε + inf., N + inf., ETPE-), whereas the masculine regularly assumes the sequence of XE-: this impression is enhanced by a quantitative consideration of the evidence, since, barring XOOY and NANOY= for the fem., KAA= for the masculine, all deviations from the alternative C = E(TPE)-/Μ → XE- are extremely rare. Now it is precisely in the case of XOOT, NANOY, KAA= that the different functions of E(TPE)- and XE- are most clearly observable and (after NANOY) even paradigmatically opposed: ETPE- for a marked prospective reference, XE- for an unmarked general inclusion of various constructions (notably the Nominal Sentence, Second Tense and tense-marked predications). It may therefore be stated as a general rule that C- is used to herald prospective expansions of the nuclear syntagm whereas the masculine pronoun assumes the sequence of an included clause in general. However, this statement cannot well be reconciled with the feminine in XOOT (XE- only), NANOY XE- or the (rare) KAA= ETPE-, ONC XE- etc. where we have true neutric fluctuation (neutralization) 35.

5.2.2.2 Referents: ΠΕ, ΠΑΙ: masculine only.

5.2.2.2.1 ΠΕ, the pronominal subject in a Nominal Sentence of the pattern ≠ Predicate → Subject ≠, may serve to represent formally a following noun or noun equivalent; in the latter case, we may have instances in which the masculine gender of ΠΕ must be cataphoric, since it can hardly be anaphoric to a predicate which is either feminine or not gender-characterized:

(a) Referate XE-: (A 1 150) ΟΜΟΙΟΣ ΠΕ ΧΕ- / (A 2 465-6) ΟΥ ΠΕ ΧΕ- ΖΡΑΣΟΥ ΜΜΟΥΟΥ ’Η ΧΕ- ’ΖΡΗ ΜΜΟΥΟΥ ’ΖΡΑΣΟΥ ΠΕ ΧΕ-, ’ΖΡΗ ΠΕ ΧΕ-. In the answer we have a different (Subject → Predicate) pattern, with ΠΕ copular and of unclear phoric standing (so too A 2 491 ‘ΣΟΚΗ ΕΝΑΣΟΥ’ ΠΕ ΧΕ-).

(b) Referate E(TPE)-: (A 1 307) ΟΥΑΤΣΗΝΕ ΠΕ ΕΤΡΕΥ- / (IV 89.14) ΝΤΕΙΖΕ ΟΝ ΠΕ... ΕΤΡΕΥ- (§1.2.1.1) / (A 2 148) ΟΥΑΛΙΦΙΣ ΠΕ ΕΤΡΕΥ- (5) ΝΤΕΙΖΕ ΩΝΜ ΠΕ ΚΑΜΠΑ ΝΤΟΡΓΗ...

(c) Referate non-specific: (Wess. 9 90b 13ff.) ΠΕ ΓΑΡ ΕΤΕΟΥΝΟΣ ΜΜΝΤΑΣΕΒΗΣ ΠΕ ΕΡΩΙ ΕΧΙΝΗΤΝΑ- ΧΟΟΟ... ΧΕ-... ΤΑΙ ΟΝ ΤΕ ΘΕ ΕΥΝΟΣ ΜΜΝΤΑΣΕΒΗΣ ΤΕ ΕΡΩΙ ΕΧΙΝΗΤΝΑΧΟΟΟ... ΧΕ...

35 Note that the conjunctive shares a paradigm with E(TPE-) after the feminine-neutric cataphora, as an adnereal-subcoordinative modification of the verb, not expansion of the pronoun: §§7.2.4(a), 7.3.2, 7.4.
We see that when the predicate is marked for gender, the subject-pronoun may concord anaphorically with the predicate — or, to put it differently, the anaphora may overrule the cataphora as regards gender (see § 5.2.2.3.3): (IV 166.3f.) ΘΕΙΡΙΑ ΤΕ Ε- / (Α 2 61) ΤΕΙΞΕ ΕΗΜ ΤΕ ΕΤΡΕ- / (Κ9298) ΤΜΟΙΓΕ ΤΕ ΕΧΕ- / (III 183.28) ΟΥΜΟΙΓΕ ΤΕ ΕΧΕ- / (Α 2 3) ΟΥΜΝΙΑΤΗΓ... ΤΕ Ε- (7) ΟΥΑΝΟΜΙΑ ΤΕ ΕΤΡΕ- / (III 26.4) ΟΥΑΝΟΜΙΑ... ΤΕ ΕΧΕ- / (III 184.2) ΟΥΑΤΥΨΗΡΕ ΤΕ ΕΗΜΑΝ-... which brings home to us that in this pattern neither the phonetic status nor the concomitant concord are predictable. In a manner of speaking, ΠΕ/ΤΕ are Janus-faced, with either face apt to take concord precedence with no discernable environmental conditioning or consequence. When the predicate bears a masculine gender mark, it is of course impossible to refer the gender of ΠΕ: (Α 1 181) ΟΥΑΓΑΒΟΝ ΠΕ ΕΤΡΕ- (the lexeme morphologically marked) / (Α 1 1) ΠΕΤΕΖΝΑΙ ΑΝ ΠΕ ΕΤΡΕ- / (Α 2 432, not Sh.) ΜΠΑΡΧΗΜΕ ΓΑΡ ΝΙΜ ΑΝ ΠΕ ΕΤΡΕ- Ε, ΠΕ possibly anaphoric to a non-phonoric (§ 5.2.3) "neuter" pronoun ΠΑ- — or are ΠΑ- (and ΠΕ) cataphoric to ΕΤΡΕ-? / (Α 1 307) ΟΥΑΤΥΨΗΡΕ ΠΕ ΕΤΡΕ- / (Ch. 76.23ff.) ΟΥΑΤΥΨΗΡΕ ΠΕ ΕΤΡΕ-.

5.2.2.2 ΠΑ is cataphoric to an appositive ΞΕ-clause or ΕΤΡΕ-, serving apparently to accommodate ΞΕ-/ΕΤΡΕ- in various syntactical positions: modifying verbs (COOYN, CWITM, MEEYE), governed by prepositions, in actor status, subject or appositive subject in a Nominal Sentence pattern, etc.: ΠΑ ΞΕ- (Ch. 174.22f., III 128.23, IV 2.20, 112.20, Α 1 161, 230, Α 2 371, Wess. 9 164d 20ff.); ΠΑ ΟΥΟΝΙΣ ΕΒΟΛ ΞΕ- (P 1315 152 ro); ΠΑ ΕΤΡΕ- (Ch. 123.2f., III 61.8, IV 104.9f. ΠΕΙΚΕΟΥΑ ΕΤΡΕ- 107.19f.).

5.2.2.3 Some remarkable cataphoric constructions

5.2.2.3.1 Major types and representative examples of a zero cataphoric referent — thus no explicit cohesion with the ΞΕ-/ΕΤΡΕ- refer: 

(a) ΤΜΟΙΓΕ ΞΕ- (III 26.22); (b) ΑΠΑΝΕ ΕΤΡΕ- (A 1 213, Ming. 92); (c) ΚΑΤΑΒΕ ΕΤΡΗΣ ΞΕ- (III 118.20) and similar cases where ΕΤ-, marking the adnominal status of the verb syntagm, also occupies the actor slot of the Bipartite pattern 36, leaving no room for an exponent of cohesion with ΞΕ-; (d) Greek loan-elements: the 3rd person sgl. of finite verbs, treated as if containing a Coptic pronominal element: (ΟΥΚ) ΕΕΕΚΤΗ Ε + infinitive (III 30.16, IV 4.12): note that ΕΕΕΚΤΗ is partly convertible in Coptic, thus assimilated as a predication form; ΓΕΝΟΙΤΟ + conjunctive, ἘΝ ΓΕΝΟΙΤΟ ΕΤΡΕ-, ΛΑΛΑΟ — ΛΑΛΑΟ conj./ΤΡΕ-: see § 7.3.3.

(e) Unconjuncted lexemes, the valence of which includes, or consists of ΕΤΡΕ- or ΞΕ- (as first or second modification: § 1.1.2.0.1): ΦΩ ΕΡΟ- ΕΤΡΕ- (A 1 67, 205), ΦΩ ΞΕ- (Ryl. 70 CN), ΑΛΑΝΕ ΕΤΡΕ- (A 2 378); compare the contentualization of noun lexemes, usually in preditative status, by means of ΕΤΡΕ- (ΤΑ- ΝΑΓΗΚΤΗ... ΕΤΡΕ- IV 69.16f., (Π)ΚΑΙΡΟΣ... ΕΤΡΕ- III 74.14, perhaps (ΟΥΝ)/ΜΝΩΜΕ ΕΤΡΕ- III 145.11 — here ΕΤΡΕ- is in paradigm with the conjunctive: see §§ 7.3.2, 7.4), and of course the numerous verb lexemes (ΟΥΤΗ, ΟΥΕΣ-ΚΑΖΝΕ, ...) modifiable by ΕΤΡΕ-), where the cohesion factor is inherent in the valency spectrum.

(f) In (III 107.6) ΝΝΑΡΓΑΙΤΝ ΩΚ ΕΥΗΞΕ-ΝΟΥΡΙΣ ΝΚΑΟΥΣΑ... "It seems to me as if we live apart..." a zero cataphoric referent may be postulated, coinciding with the zero subject of the predicative ΩΚ ΕΥΗΞΕ- (§ 1.2.1.3.3), but it may be preferable to take ΝΝΑΡΓΑΙΤ as the subject, with no cataphora at all.

5.2.2.3.2 Rare instances of an invariable masculine referent "Φ, the formal obligatory exponent of inalienable possession (cf. § 1.2.1.1, spec. obs. 1), expanded by a noun syntagm (even fem. or plural) and really part of a discontinuous possessor morph [Φ + Noun] (§ 6.0.1.2.3): ΧΙΤΝ ΝΝΑΩΙΟΜΕ (Ench. 66a) / ΧΙΤΝ ΕΡΑΤΗ ΝΑΡΕΤΗ ΝΙΜ (A 2 442-3, not Sh.) / ΠΑΚΕ ΕΝΑΙΚΤΗ ΝΤΕΝΠΟΖΑΙΡΕΣΙΣ (P 1305 50 CA), cf., not Shenoutean but emulating his idiom, (ΒΛΟΡ. 8811 17 ΣΑΝ) ΚΟΥΝΗ ΝΤΕΖΣΙΜΕ 37.

36 ΠΟΛΟΤΣΚΥ 1960a:§12.
37 See ΠΟΛΟΤΣΚΥ 1930:874 (= CP 343).
5.2.2.3.3 Anaphora vs. cataphora in a single syntagm: an interesting instance of *varia lectio* reflecting a conflict of anaphoric and cataphoric references: (*A 2 169*) οὐκ ἂν πετεταγμένοι ξέ- (Borg., -c- cataphoric) vs. οὐκ ἂν πετεταγμένους ξέ- (Ryl. with -c- seemingly resuming π-); however, this is not the substantivizing pronominal nucleus (§5.2.3.1) but the formal subject/glose marker, which does not usually motivate anaphoric reference, and here anaphora is by no means the rule: (*A 1 365*) Ντων ΠΕΤΕΤΑΓΜΕΝΟΥΣ έτης ξύι ΜΜΟΥ ΕΤΒΕΤΗΤΥΝ ξέ-, with two other symptoms of the non-phoricity of π-: the masc. sgl. after a plural *vedette* and the resumption by a 2nd person plural pronoun. As a rule, the anaphora to substantivizing π- overrules a cataphora in such cases of conflict; consider (*Ench. 67b*) ΠΕΤΕΤΕΡΓΑΦΗ ξύι ΜΜΟΥ ξέ-, or (*Ch. 29.55f.*) ΠΕΤΕΤΑΓΜΕΝΟΥ ξέ-.

5.2.2.3.4 In a case like (*RE 11 16b 20*) ΝΟΥΚ ΓΕ ΝΕ ΧΑΠΙΜΑ ΝΙΜ, the concord is cataphoric, regressively motivated.

5.2.3 Non-phoric Environment. Here neuter gender is realized by a "freezing", i.e. a greater or lesser degree of *incommutability* of the masculine pronoun.

5.2.3.1 In the nuclear π- expanded by a relative conversion (ΝΕΠ-, ΠΕΝΤΑ-, etc.) 38. The analysis of this difficult syntagm is by no means straightforward 39. In brief, one notes here two different patterns: (a) ΝΕΠ-/ΤΕΤ-/ΝΕΠ- (etc.): any conjugation-form; "definite", i.e. not further determinable, so really *outside* the determination category; π- is the determinator; (b) ΝΕΠ-: present(-equivalent) only, invariable, unmotivating, of "zero determination" status, i.e. further determinable 40; π- is a substantivator morpheme. Pattern (b) is paradigmatically restricted as regards both the conjugation-form and its predicate constituency (NAGEL 1973:120). Now it is difficult to see what the invariability of π- in pattern (b) could mean, unless it is the same indifference to gender that we have called "neuter": note, however, that this ΝΕΠ- is compatible only with masculine-marked or unmarked determinators: ΝΕΠ-, ΝΙΝΕΠ-, ΖΕΝΕΠ-, excluding ΤΟΤΕΤ- (NAGEL op. cit. 118f.); that is to say, the gender-explicit, marked feminine nucleus Τ- is incompatible with the substantivator (homonymic with the unmarked masculine determinator): this is, I daresay, a case of systemic, not haphazard non-attestation. In instances of pattern (a) like (*IV 112.20*) ΠΕΤΕΤΑΓΜΕΝΟΥ / (*IV 11 179.19*) ΠΕΤΕΤΡΗΝΗΣ (sic) / even (*III 119.28*) ΠΕΤΩΣΘΕ, it would perhaps be rash to interpret π- as neutric, as anything but masculine gender, be its associative connection with any specific masculine noun lexeme (ΜΑΧΕ, ΛΟΓΟΣ, ΖΩΒ...) doubtful as it may; the opposition of this ΝΕΠ- to ΤΕΤ- and ΝΕΠ- is sufficient grounds, as the only pertinent, necessary and sufficient datum for a definition of gender in Coptic.

5.2.3.2 In the *glose* segment ΝΕΠ- (etc.) of a Cleft Sentence with (pro)nominal *vedette* (POLOTSKY 1962:§1fl.); although this π- can be traced to the pronominal subject πε, it is in the crystallized Cleft Sentence pattern not the anaphoric pronoun, referring to a specific identifiable nominal or pronominal element, but the formal, non-phoric mark of the logical subject: ΝΤΟΣ ΝΘΟΥΠ ΠΕΤΕΤΡΗΝΟΡΕΙΑ ΧΗΚ ΕΒΟΛ ΕΓΡΑΙ έΓΧΩΣ ΠΕΣ- (Ch. 143.44ff.) 41.

---

38 *ΝΕΠ- can be anaphoric, in such context patterns as (*Wess. 9 179b 30ff.*) ΝΑΣΕΒΗΣ ΝΣΤΑΥΟΥ ΝΗ ΝΣΤΑΝΟΥ, also *III 126.20ff.*


40 See NAGEL 1973b, QUECKE forthcoming ("determinierbar" vs. "undeterminierbar"), *id. 1981:261f.* Consider ΖΕΝΕΠΟΥ (A 1 103), ΚΕΝΕΠΑΝΟΥ (Ch. 88.16f.), ΟΥΝΕΤΕΡΥΣ (A 2 256), ΝΙΝΕΠΟΥΕΤ (Wess. 9 141b 2f.), ΜΠΟΝΟΠ (III 165.13), ΝΕΠ-ΝΕΠΑΝΟΥ (A 2 471), ΝΕΠΑΝΟΥ ΝΙΜ (A 1 133), ΝΑΥ ΝΕΠΑΝΟΥ (P 1304 93 vo), ΖΕΝΚΟΗ ΝΕΠΑΝΟΥΟΥ (III 206.21) which shows the non-motivating nature of π-.

41 A basically similar case is ΝΑΙΝ ΠΕ, ΠΚΑΙΡΟΣ ΠΕ, ΝΕΠΟΥΕΥ ΠΕ (*IV 224.20f., IV 29.26, Ch. 167.47f.*), for which the "not yet" form is ΝΠΑΝΠΑΥ (Ch. 107.32f.). In a contextually conditioned alternant pattern occurring in the sequence of a *Cleft Sentence*, πε is anaphoric and represents the whole *glose*: (Ch. 103.31ff.) ΜΜΟΝΑΧΟΣ... ΝΕΠΗ ΕΡ-ΝΧΙΣΤΑ ΧΗ-ΝΤΟΚ ΠΕ / (*III 68.14ff.*) ΝΙΜ ΠΕΤΕΤΡΗΝΟΕΙΣΙ ΝΙΟΥΤΕ ΝΑΗΝΟΥ... / (SHISHA-HALEVI 1976a:55) ΑΝΟΚ ΠΕ Χ ΚΕΟΥΑ ΝΤΑΖΕ, ΖΕΝΚΕΡΨΩΥ ΠΕ...
5.3 A CONCLUDING NOTE: PRONOUNS, CONJUGATION BASES AND THE TYPOLOGY OF COPTIC

We have seen that the prime nucleus in the noun syntagm and noun phrase is the determinator pronoun ("article"). Indeed, in Coptic grammar, so to speak, the pronoun reigns supreme: with the possible exception of the stative, the entire grammatical system may be phrased in terms of a pronominal core and an indispensably yet inessential (indeed satellital) lexemic periphery: the patterns are formulable for the nuclear pronoun, which is given a lexical content by lexemic expansion. Within this frame of reference the "pronouns" in verbal syntagmatics are the conjugation bases. They (with their pronominal actor) are the nuclei of the verb syntagm, representing the verb in the system and incorporating it in the discourse. Like the determinators, they are of necessity expanded (by verb lexemes: these are also privileged to occur after the determinators, and prove the noun syntagm to be — in this respect at least — hierarchically different from the verb syntagm. While both noun and verb lexemes are "nominal", only the verb-lexeme subdivision features in verb syntagms). Allowing for the difference in semasiological categories, ΑΒ [CΩΤΩΜ] is no different, analytically speaking, from ΝΕΩ [ΚΟΝ]. In a final reckoning, then, in Coptic we are left with verb/noun lexemes and pro-verbs/pronouns to "grammaticalize" and actualize them. (The stative — neither a lexeme nor a grammeme, but a typically pre-Coptic "synthetic" blending of both — does not fit in this scheme: neither do the "adjective-verbs", another piece of "historical left-over" in Coptic.)

43 Cf. already Aug. Schleicher (Zur Morphologie der Sprache, 1859, p. 21) who, at a time when the Coptic conjug. bases were conventionally termed "Tempuscharakteristik" or "Tempuszeichen", suggested they were "original demonstratives". For a comparable conception of a lexically empty auxiliary verb as a grammaticalized substitute ("verbum vicarium", "verbal pronoun") see Bally 1950:87, Tessière 1965:73, 91, Dubois 1965:96f.
44 To my knowledge, only Vergote uses "actualisateur" in this connection (Grammaire copte I a, Louvain 1973, p. 84); see Bally 1950:§119.
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6.0.0.1 Terminology and definition. The pronoun-containing group of modifiers has had scant special attention hitherto, and nowhere can I find a discussion of its functions, compatibilities or paradigms. The prosodic properties of the augens (né "Verstärker") have in part been the topic of an important paper by Polotsky (1961), yet with no functional or categorial definition; other discussions are scattered, meagre and inadequate. Polotsky's "Verstärker" is in fact the only cover-term for this group. This I propose to replace by the Celtological "augens", which is earlier, more cosmopolitan and in the general run of grammatical terminology, and, from the functional point of view, remarkably apt.

1 Stern §§256-8 (the felicitous "adjunctive pronomina"), Schwarze-Steinthal §§345-6, 468-9 ("Pronominalstämme"), Till. §§194-6, p. 390.
2 "Nota augens" was coined by Zeuss (Grammatica Celtica, 1853, 332ff., 341, 344f.), for the Gaelic (old Irish) -se/su/som, etc., the Cymric "reduplicated" and especially the "conjunctive" pronouns (mod. Welsh minnau/tithau/yntau, etc.). However, his terminology is not uniform: he employs in a similar sense "nota amplians", "positio ampliata", "ampliatio" (347), "augmentum" (344), "amplificatio" (379ff.), "emphatica forma" (of the Breton pronoun, 375). The primary pronoun is "auctum" or "ampliatum". His main statement runs as follows (332): "Comitantur saepissime in utraque quoque lingua [i.e. in Gaelic
The augens is by no means a single category, in the strict sense of the word; it is here used as a common cognomen for the class of modifier morphs, typically of secondary prosodic status, that include or constitute a secondary pronominal element, in cohesion with a primary (pro)nominial segment, in a specific prosodic-syntagmatic extent. Functionally, the augens does not precisely “strengthen” or “emphasize” the primary (pro)noun. It expands it, and modifies it in a structurable range of semasiological nuances, including that of “insistence”: see below. The prosodic properties of the augens, related to its functional ones, call for a brief and selective preliminary investigation of sentence-prosodic features, before we proceed to introduce the data and their paradigmatic/syntagmatic structuring: this will be but a sketch, aiming at the boldest simplification.

6.0.1 Apposition; extraposition; word-order and the placement of the nominal actor

6.0.1.1 Frontal extraposition 4. A noun syntagm or independent pronoun may be followed in the same pattern extent, by a pronominal resumption or representation. This is known (from a formal point of view) as (frontal) extraposition of the primary (pro)noun 5 or as segmentation 6 of the sentence (cf. the rhetorical-stylistic “anticipation”, “prolepsis”, “nominativus pendens”, “casus absolutus”). Prosodically, the extrapsed element is shown by what segmental criteria we have to be an independent colon (§6.0.3; see STERN §§484, 635; SCHWARZE-STEINTHAL 465f., 487 on the construction): (A I 333) ἀνάμνῃ καὶ προοίμιον (Ch. 50:20ff.) ἀνάμνῃ καὶ προοίμιον; (III 18.15f.) ἀνάμνῃ καὶ προοίμιον.

7 See §§2.0.2.1-2. The idea is that of the “nachdrücklicher Hinweis” kind of emphasis (HOFMANN 1936:37); “renforcement” (MÜLLER-HAUSER 1943:116f.: “lui + même, seul., pron. personal tonique”). POLOTSKY’S “Verstärker” (1961:294 n. 1 = CP 398) is an adaptation of the Arabic “corroborative strengthener”, at-tā’idayd (Wright II 282).

8 Cf. JESPERSEN 1937: Ch. 12.


10 See §3.1.1.1.1 for this “zero” resumption of a zero article; §2.7.1.4.2 and note 130 there for the resumptions of extrapsed ἀνάμνῃ καὶ προοίμιον; for resumption generally as an exponent of cohesion, see §§6.0.2.1; for concord issues, §§5.2.1. In ANĀMÑH KAI PRONOEIPHE (III 18.15f.) WE witness the only way of focalizing the lexical component of a compound verb, an idiomatic native equivalent of the “tautological infinitive” (GOLDENBERG 1971).

6.0.1.2 Rear extraposition refers to a different set of patterns, in which a noun syntagm or independent pronoun expands, refers back to and as a rule lexicalizes a nuclear pronoun. These patterns give one a recurrent typologic impression that in Coptic the minimal patterns of grammar are all "custom-built" for the pronoun: the grammar may be phrased in terms of a system in which the pronoun rules supreme. The pronoun is grammatically essential, nuclear; the noun (which as a matter of fact is actualized in the parole as a noun syntagm by its determinant, yet another pronoun) is not essential, but expands the pronoun or is substituted (i.e. in syntagmatic or paradigmatic relation) for it.

6.0.1.2.1 Rear extraposition marked by Νη, -: this is a well-known construction, often quoted as a typological showpiece. Νη - marks an expansion of a third-person "suffix"-pronoun nucleus. This is usually a formal actor, with a verbal predicate: (III 160.22f.) ΕΤΕΡΕΥΘΝΗ ΝΗΓΙΝΙΤΜΑΙ ΕΥΟ ΝΑΤΚΑΡΝΟΣ / (Ch. 78.2ff.) ΜΑΡΕΙΧΟΟΟΣ ΝΑΓ ΝΗΙ - / (ibid. 141.31f.) ΝΕΧΑΝ ΝΗΙ - / (ibid. 162.7f., Α I 167) ΝΑΙΗΟΥΟΥ ΝΗΙ -, VS. ΝΑΥΕ-176.16f. etc. Here Shenoute agrees with Gnostic Sah. usage (cf. NHC VI 28.28). This extraposition is as a rule placed after other expansions (rectional and complementational) of the verbal syntagm: (A 2 396) ΕΙΝΑΙΤΦΒΟ ΤΗΡΗΝ ΝΟΥΝΕΡ ΕΒΩ ΣΗΡΤΥΜΕ ΝΗΙ ΝΗΓΙΝΟΤΥΒΑΝΩΤΕ ΜΜΟΥ / (ibid. 449, not Sh.) ΝΑΙ ΣΗΡΤΑΘ ΟΝ ΝΤΑΧΟΝΙ ΜΜΟΥ ΝΕΙΜΑ ΣΗΝΩΤΜΟΥΣ (sic) ΕΒΩ ΝΗΓΙΝΟΝΟΕ ΝΕΚΚΑΝΗΣΑΣΤΗΣ / (IV 5.26ff.) ΝΙΜ... ΝΕΤΟΥΝΑΥΝΟΥΣ ΑΝ ΝΟΡΘ ΕΖΟΥΝ ΕΠΟΟΥ ΝΗΓΙΘΝΗ ΤΗΡΗΝ ΝΝΑΙΚΑΙΟΣ / (ibid. 206.27ff.) ΕΥΕΕΙ ΕΠΒΑΙ ΕΧΙΟΥΝ ΣΜΠΕΟΥΟΥΕΙΝ ΕΝΜΑΤΑΝ ΝΤΟΥΧ ΝΕΟΥ ΝΗΓΙΝΕΙΑΖΟΥ ΤΗΡΟΥ / (IV 68.17ff.) ΝΥΜΕΕΕΥΕ ΕΝ ΕΒΩ ΕΛΑΛ ΜΕΟΟΟΥ ΕΝΜΦΙΗ ΝΗΙ -. Note too the distribution of two appositional constructions with a Second-Tense focalization pattern: (theme/topic — focus) ΝΗΙ - (III 116.6, 169.23, 183.3f.) and (theme/topic ΝΗΙ —) — focus (III 117.28f., 133.11f., IV 127.4ff.), where the type of focality plays a role (§2.8.2). Rarely, the nucleus may be the possessor, in the possession verboid or possessive determinator: (Ch. 192.31ff.) ΝΝΑΙ-ΕΙ ΓΕΡ ΟΥΤΕ ΕΙ ΝΗΓΙΝΑΙ-ΚΒΑ / (IV 45.24ff.) ΝΗΙ ΝΕ ΟΕΤΕΥΝΙΝΗΕΙΑ ΤΕ ΤΑΙ ΧΙΝΤΥΑΡΚΗ ΝΗΙ - / (Α I 90) ΤΕΥΓΙΝΙΚΕ ΕΒΩ ΝΗΝΗΝΟΒΕ... ΝΗΓΙΝΟΥΤΕ (compare ΤΕΥΓΙΝΕΙ ΥΛΑΡΟΥ ΚΑΛΑΣ ΖΙΤΝΑΓΓΕΑΟΣ, Wess. 9 161c 11ff., where ΖΙΤΝ- introduces a non-appositive "new" nominal actor). The appositive noun syntagm may be indefinite: (Α 2 449, not Sh.) ΑΜΕΙ ΝΗΓΙΟΥΟΥΟΕΤΕ, but is usually π - (or equivalently) determined.

6.0.1.2.2 Cases of zero-marked rear extraposition in special circumstances:

(a) An appositive noun introduced — mediated — by an appositive independent pronoun (all persons): (III 60.4f.) ΧΙΧ ΓΕΡ ΜΜΟΟ ΝΤΟΥΧ ΠΙΧΟΙΕΙΧ ΞΕ- (see §6.1.3.3).

9 Here we come up against the difficulty of distinguishing (with the segmental data at our disposal) between pronominal apposition and the augens: §3.1.3.3.

10 Cf. Steinthal—Misteli 1893:50, and see §5.3 above.

11 The only monographic discussion of Νη - is by Morenz (1952), who looks to Shenoute for his source material. What Morenz has in mind, however, is the rhetorical or stylistic motivation for the selection of this construction, rather than its structural definition and function. Considerations like the alleged "inelegance" ("unshön", pp. 4f., 7) of an inserted extensive nominal "subject" (i.e. actor) which has therefore to be deferred until after the completion of the conjugation form are rather dubious. Even if such considerations were true, this cannot constitute a descriptive statement, particularly since (on the one hand) Νη - can introduce the shortest appositive actor-expressions (consider...ΝΗΙ-ΝΕΤΜΑΤ ΚΕ I 163a 27, ...ΝΗΙ-ΝΑΙ ΙΙ ΙΙ ΙΙ 160.22, ...ΝΗΙ-ΠΙΧΟΙΕΙΛΙ ΙΙ 117 28), while, on the other hand, very long complex nominal phrases are found in mid-conjugation actor position (witness the constructions in §6.0.2.1, link 6). Nor is the "Betonung" (p. 5f.) of the "subject" an independently determinable and controllable factor. It is rather the tendency of the language to separate ("isolate") the lexical from the grammatical which underlies the widespread incidence of this construction (cf. Steinthal—Misteli 1893:50, 284, and see §5.3 above). Typologically speaking, one recalls the "complément explicatif" of Berber dialects (cf. Galdan, CFS 21:33-53, 1964, esp. pp. 43f.; ead., "Re-ations du verbe et du nom dans l’énoncé berbère", in: LACITO-documents [EURASIE, 2]. Colloque: Relations Prédicat-Actant(s), 1, Paris: SELAF, 1979, 131-146, esp. 132ff.) completing the purely grammatical information of the person index and localizing it in the "infinite" (so Galdan, meaning "long out of all comparison", but of course closed) list of the lexicon. Here, too, Celtic supplies a striking parallel (studies by O’Nolan, Pokorny, MacCana and others). I believe the "Hellenizing" interpretation of the Shenoutean phenomenon (Weiss 1972: n. 112) is as doubtful as the stylistic one.
(b) Nominal apposition to a *de locutive* (third person) pronoun in object status: *(BMCat. 83, No. 199 TzA)* 

\[
\text{ταύτα ουδεματία φθαρμένη} / \text{(Ch. 43.38ff.)} \text{ντέρειομουτή μνεκόν πέκκη μπήσ-
}
\text{μεν-λακών ηειδωμάν μηντή} / \text{(III 21.19) άτυχη καθώς πυρρήγος ετιμαμεν} / \text{(ibid. 88.27) άνατρεττοήςφουνο}-
\text{γενερού} / \text{(Ench. 66b) κτάκο μμος τιον θικών μνούτες ζηνιοτε ρτικάλωυς. In (IV 36.21f.) αντρέ-
}
\text{πημεν θηρου ηννύε μνήμης θηροκας, the apposition is to the actor exponent in the causative infinitive; cf. exx.
}
\text{en §6.0.1.2 (a).}\\

(c) Nouns in "vocative" or addressing role, esp. in post-imperative position: *(P 130° 7 ρ) μμορύεμ
}
\text{τιγνάντων ερ-... / (A I 464) η κεκάναιος ζωπερώταν...}\\

(d) Nominal apposition to the "actor" (third-person pronoun) of a modifier predicate (Bipartite pattern): *(III 15.21ff.) μνεράτνηθυτν άν ηεκατονάν. Here probably belongs the regular construction ετιμα
}
\text{δων (III 31.13, 107.15, Ch. 200.43, 48ff., 206.31ff., etc.) where (1) no real opposition obtains with
}
a mid-conjugation nominal actor (a rare example of this is A I 212: ερεθενηκειες του, which means that the
}
pronominal "actor" is a mere "slot filler", a cataphoric index with no nominal substitution; (2) ετιμα
\text{δων υρ- does occur, as a rare variant (e.g. A 2 336, collated: ετιμακεν τανομία... ετιμακεν δε ηκαρέ... η ετιμα
}
\text{κενητούοφουμ 2ητευθαρον).}\\

6.0.1.2.3 The ν*-marked nom. modifier in apposition to a suffix pronoun is of yet more restricted dis-
}
tribution 12.

(a) A cataphoric pronominal representation of a *nominal possessor* after one of a closed list of inal-
ienable nouns as *possessum* (cf. §1.2.1.1 spec. obs.). This is again a case where no noun is substitutable
for the pronoun, which is thus a formal obligato slot-filler "heralding" the subsequent noun: "-ν → ν+noun' is structurally the possessor expression 13: οοον ηπηκας (RE 10 163a 17f.), ρις ητανομία (A I 298), but generally as components of prepositions: γαρατεμ ν- (III 38.10), κατηκτε ν- (A 9067, P 130° 50
}

\text{σκα), ετουτευ ν- (III 48.3), εξουν εξαυ ν- (P 130° 139 TMS), ζητα (a preposition in itself) ν- (BLO
}
\text{r. 3581A 159, No. 253 NS), ζητευμεν ν- (III 52.16) etc.; the ν*-mark of dependence is thus complementary
}
(allomorphic) to the immediate (markless) government of non-compound prepositions 14. Some examples of this kind hint at a tendency to "fossilizing", i.e. immutability of the pronominal exponent in the

\text{masc. sgl. 15: ζητευ μμεζιομε ετετ (Ench. 66a).}\\

(b) μπεκαναν "... the two", "both/either of...", not in opposition to υρ-; the nuclear plural (second, third persons) pronoun is in different roles (not however in actor status?): *(A 2 403) ηπημε
}
\text{μματμε μπεκαναν / (Miss. 283) μμεζιομε ερεθενεβμεν ζι μμοον έροον αν μπεκαναν... οον ετουτευμεν
}
\text{εροον αν μπεκαναν / (Or. 160.27f.) ηεισοφυρε τηπηεσοφουμε μπεκαναν / (A 2 443-4, not Sh.) ζηεβαν ωε οοον
}
\text{εβου μπεκαναν (sim. ibid. 436, 445); }\text{NB. (III 39.11f.) ειενε μπεκαναν ηοονευρε μμβαλα εβαμε ταχε, where μπεκα
}
\text{ναν must be appositive to με, itself with the same reference as the actor-suffix.}\\

6.0.1.3 Word order; the placement of the nominal actor, a paradigmatic evaluation. Turning our attention to placement rules for individual pattern components, we find they combine a conditioning by a great many factors in several parameters 16 and are by nature mutual and relative, i.e.

---

12 Layton 1981:§6.2 (I would prefer "restricted" to "anomalous").
14 Some non-compound (unanalyzable) prepositions use this mediate manner of governing a noun: γαρομ μπτι (P 130° 115 ii), γαρομ κτημ (P 131° 20 PRZ, A 2 360, III 96.21, Ch. 195.46 — "κατηκτε" not attested? — also γαρομ μπτι (P 131° 20 PRZ,
all after Ecc. 3:1, 1.3 etc.), εροον ν- (only in the sense of "to the debit of...": Ryl. Cat. 34, No. 69 NS, A 2 59, Ch. 102.9f., Rossi
2/3 58 εροον μμεζιομε, uncollated: "ν immutatable?"), οοον ν- (IF 163 apud Dictionary 495a).
15 See §§5.2.2.3.2 above, with ref.
16 See for instance §§2.6.3-4.
influenced by other rules regarding the placement of other elements in a given extent. This calls for a multivariate analysis for which I doubt that Coptic grammatical research is yet ready. Generally speaking, one assumes word order is not "free"; it involves either taxemes, i.e., features of arrangement, or a distinctive feature of placement (for example, with the adjective: see Ch. 4). In either case, a change in order entails a corresponding change (often too subtle to be detected by the linguist or to be transposed into another language) on the plan du contenu. What we can supply, however, are (1) statements on the relative placement of isolated pattern constituents (modifiers, Chs. 1 and 4; the augens, particles, see below). (2) Statements on the relative placement of constituent groups (theme/topic and focus, Ch. 2). This is obviously not adequate by any standard, when the call is for a "general theory of Coptic word order". It is nevertheless an indispensable stage in evolving such a theory: the individual placement-consideration of individual constituent categories. Word-order statements are the aftermath and culmination of the description process, not an early phase of it, nor an issue to be resolved on its own. In Coptic, where the mobility of most of the basic constituents of patterns is low or nil, this approach is even more requisite; here one can hardly concur with Dionysius of Halicarnassus' dictum\(^{17}\) that "the order of words is more significant than their selection".

Among unmistakable circumstances with greater or lesser bearing on the arrangement of constructions and placement of elements, we note (a) the typologically significant "Grundrichtung" or basic syntagmatic phrase sequence, nucleus → satellite (determinatum → determinans)\(^{18}\), (b) the sequence in the predication and focalization patterns, (c) a context-oriented thematic sequence\(^{19}\), (d) the prosodic contour(s) of the utterance, correlated with (c) and mapped on (a) and (b), and (e) motivation of a rhetorical, stylistic, rhythmic-euphonic order\(^{20}\), mapped whenever required and possible onto (a), (b), (c) and (d). This is a notoriously slippery ground, where the dangers of circular statement are plain to see, since we do not have any working knowledge of these factors; they constitute mere post-analysis judgements of interpretation, not pre-analysis principles. All (a) to (e) factors concur to give the actual arrangement and placements; we cannot hope to resolve these into its several sets of conditioning, except in a very imperfect, approximative and always speculative manner.

As regards the placement of the nominal actor ("grammatical" and, unless there is some signa
to the contrary, "logical" subject, i.e. theme/topic, §2.0.2.0.1) of a verbal predication, we note the following ternary (double-binary) paradigm and opposition (the Tripartite is chosen as representative):

(a) "ПРИМЕЕ СУМ"  
(b) "ПРИМЕЕ АЧСУМ"  
(c) "АЧСУМ НГІ-ПРИМЕЕ"

In one analysis, the less common member (a), far from being synchronically the unmarked "neutral" term (which is historically the case), is revealed as being marked by the synthesis of lexical and grammatical components. Members (b) and (c) are opposed to (a) as "isolating" (see n. 11) and analytic, and mutually opposed in their thematic structure. I would say that (c), strictly speaking a case of "delayed theme" and secondary information point\(^{21}\), is here unmarked, while (b) is the marked member, in which

\(^{17}\) Apud Weil 1879:2.

\(^{18}\) Cf. Steinthal-Misteli 1893:275ff. Although this issue has never been properly treated, it constitutes an essential part of the scholar's Sprachfühl (cf. P. de Lagarde's "unkoptische Stellung", "kein Kopte stellt so", in Aus dem deutschen Gelehrtenleben, Göttingen 1881, pp. 44, 50, 59).

\(^{19}\) Weil 1879:11ff., 76ff., 83ff.; Mathesius 1941, and subsequently often in Prague School treatments of this question (see §2.0.2.0.1 ff.).

\(^{20}\) Note the case of a chiascstic placement of nominal actors, (b)-(c) below, also the chiascstic arrangement of topic and focus, §2.6.3.1.2: (Z 306 CNZ) ЗМІІАІ ОН ΝΤΑΙΧΙΟΣ ΝГІΙΠΑΠΟΣΟΛΟΣ ΠΑΛΑΟΣ ΧΕ... ΝΤΑΠΙΧΙΟΣ ΧΟΟΣ ΕΝ ΕΤΕΠΑΙ ΧΕ...

\(^{21}\) Halliday 1967:239ff.
the thematicity of the actor is specially signalled by segmentation, the thematic structure of the clause being thus made transparent: ΟΥΠΑΝ ΝΑΚΑΘΑΡΤΟΝ ΑΛΦ-ΟΥΔΡΑΚΩΝ ΑΥΘ ΟΥΣΙΟ ΜΝΟΥΧΙΤ, ΑΥΘ ΟΥΟΥΗΝ ΑΛΦ-ΟΥΒΑΝΟΡ (RE 10 160a 27ff.). In another view, it is (a) which is unmarked *vis à vis* (b) and (c), in which the thematic structure is overt.

6.0.2 JUNCTURE (COHESION) FEATURES. BOUNDARIES. The COPTIC WORD. Any two segments and elements of an utterance join each other in a way that is gradable on a scale exposing the gradient or parameter of cohesion. As criteria for the hierarchic assignment of inter-segment cohesion, we isolate juncture (cohesion) features: LINKS 22 and their negation, DELIMITATIONS 23, the former amounting to measure points of *closeness*, the latter of openness or non-closeness, of "looseness". By links and delimitations, phonological or ultra-phonemic, we can characterize any given syntagmatic constellation: the more links there are, the closer the attachment — the more delimitations, the more open. Links are symptoms of the *extent of validity*, while delimitations give us juncture boundaries 24. I do not offer here a systematic scale-related gradation of juncture. This must be done as part of a special study, preferably based on examination of homogenous MSS. I simply give selective lists of the more striking cohesive patterns: links and delimitations. Note that these are no more than *relative indexes*, exponents of the parameter or level of juncture (even the apparently absolute junctural dichotomies, *initial:final, close:open*, are deceptively so, and in fact equally relative 25).

6.0.2.1 LINKS: (morphophonemic 26, morphemic) (B) "A short vowel is maintained in an open syllable", valid only in the extent of the lexemic unanalyzable "word": СОТΠ, СΕΤΠ-, ΨΟΡΠ, ΟΡΦ, ΧΟΤ-Ν, ΚΟΤ-Ψ. (1) "A labializable 27 nasal constituting part or the whole of a prefixed morph is assimilated to an immediately following primary (i.e. unconditioned) non-syllabic 28 labial", validity extent: the segment ‘*prefix + noun syntagm*’: progressive dependence (allophonic allomorph): ГΩΜ-ΟΥΟΕΙΥ (A 2 117), ΕΡΜ-ΠΧΟΕΙΣ (A 2 165), ΨΑΗΤΗΜ-ΠΡΙΣΗΜ (IV 101.16, ΡΥΙ. Cat. 34f. No. 70 СМА) 29, ΤΕΤΜΜΜΝΑΟΗ (Wess. 9 141a 17), ΝΚΑ ΒΒΩΑ (III 196.28f.), ΕΚΜΠΕΤΝΑΟΥΟΥ (III 203.13) 30, ΑΞΜΙΝΠΛΑΟ (IV 113.5), ΝΤΜΠΧΟΕΙΣ (IV 33.22).

(2) "A ‘suffix-paradigm’ pronoun is selected as actor expression by an immediately preceding converter morpheme", validity extent: the converted conjugation form; regressive dependence (allo- morph): ΕΙΣΨΤΗΜ (ΑΝ) (closer than ΕΠΗΕΣΤΗΜ ΑΝ 31, delimitation 2).

22 I adopt here Rosén’s terminology of 1964, but extend the notion of juncture to be coterminal with "cohesion". Rosén 1964:160: "A dependence that exists between two parts of the same order if they occur in a segment not exceeding their arrangement, but which does not exist if they occur in separate utterances".

23 Rosén 1964:163: "A dependence that exists between two parts of the same order if they occur in two different utterances, but which does not exist if they occur in a segment not exceeding their arrangement".

24 Rosén 1964:845.

25 The only special study of this subject is Erman 1915, a contrastive Sahidic: Bohairic listing of environments (see Shisha-Halevy 1981:317f.).

26 Not (to the best of my knowledge) attested in Shenoute is the Coptic case of Trubetzkoy’s "*correlation prosodique de gémination*", like OYMEE RE (Deut. 13:14, see Polotsky 1957c:348ff., = CP 390f.).

27 Not, for instance, the N in ΜΝ-, ΖΕΝ-, ΧΙΝ-. Another link:delimitation opposition is signalled by the syllabic:non-syllabic status of the plural definite article before the initial (stressed:unstressed) vowel of a noun lexeme, regularly at least for native lexemes. Cf. Polotsky, OLZ 59:253 n. 1, 1964 (note omitted by mistake in CP).

28 Not in ΝΜΚΑΖ (Wess. 9 139a 27).

29 Not in Chassinat (M-PΟΓΟΣ, Ch. 56.50f.). Cf. for this phenomenon Kahle 1954:98ff.

30 But ΕΝΝΗΕΓΟΤΤΟΥ (III 202.5f.), ΝΠΝΑΑΜΕΘ Ιβιδ. 219.12.

31 Polotsky 1960a:§28 (obs.).
(3) "A prenominal converter allomorph is selected by an immediately following nominal actor expression", validity extent: the converted conjugation form; progressive dependence (allomorph): επε/ κατεπρή συμφωνία (an) (closer than επιφράσματος συμφωνία (an)) (delimitation 3).

Syntactic (4) 'Determiner [noun-lexeme + -н- noun-lexeme]' juncture between the noun lexemes closer than in 'determiner + noun lexeme + αΥω-NN- determiner + noun lexeme' (delimitation 4); progressive bracketing: ЗИТАКАΣ ΝΕ ΣΙΓΩΝΤΙΝ ΙΝΩΝΙΑΚΟΣ, ιΝΟΝΙΑΚΟΣ ΝΕΝΟΠΗΝΤΙΝ (Α 1 77).

(5) (a) # converter + conjugation base (b) converter + actor [verb lexeme + verb lexeme + verb lexeme] #; (b) # converter [(conj. base + verb lexeme) + (conj. base + verb lexeme) + (conjugation base + verb lexeme)] # (perfect tense only); (c) # [(conjugation base/converter + actor) + (conj. base/converter + actor) + (conj. base/converter + actor)...] verb lexeme #. Cases of progressive (a-b) or regressive bracketing as, closer than the juncture of repeated (coordinated, disjoined) (base/converter + verb lexeme) unit (delimitation 5).

Examples: (a) ΑΝΑΚΛΗΣ ΜΟΥΚ ΝΕ ΑΟΥ ΣΤΕ-ΣΕΝ- ΣΟΤΕΚΑΝΤΙΝΙ (Α 2 341) / ΕΥΣΑΝΑΖΟΥΚ ΝΕ ΟΥΝΤΙΝ (ibid. 528) / ΜΟΝΔΡΩΜΕ ΕΚ-ΤΕΙΒΙΟΝΤΟΙ ΕΡΑΙ... Η ΜΜΟΝ ΝΤΟ (IV 95.10f.) / ΜΠΘΩΜΕ ΑΥΘ ΧΙΤΕ ΕΒΟΑ (For. 9 87a 31ff.) / ΝΤΟΥΣ... ΝΤΑΙΝΝΟΤΕ ΠΟΟΥ Μ ΚΤΗΝ ΕΙΛΑΙΟΥ (circ., A 2 24) / ΝΕΝΟΠΗΝΤΙΝ ΕΤΩΣ ΜΜΟΝ Μ ΕΥΝΟ ΟΥ ΣΕΙΡΑΙ ΕΙΘΩ (ibid. 529) / ΝΕΝΟΠΗΝΤΙΝ ΟΥΣΕ ΧΩΣΑΜΕΝ, v. 1. ΟΥΤΕ ΕΤΩΣΜΕ ΝΜΟΟ (Α 1 327; note the non-susceptibility of the second affirmative to the Stern-Jernstedt Rule, §3.1.2).

(b) ΝΕΝΑΣΧΙ-ΣΟΤΕ Μ ΑΥΘ ΩΩΟΟΟΥΟΥ (III 69.14f., v.l. ΜΠΝΝΤΑΙΝΩΟΟΟΥΟΥ) / ΗΟΤΑΝ ΝΗΝ ΝΕΝΑΣΧΙΣΜΕ ΑΥΘ ΑΥΣΧΙ-ΣΒΟ (ibid. 173.18f.) / ΝΕΝΑΠΙΣΤΕΤΕ ΕΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΑΥΘ ΑΥΣΗΑΝΙΣ ΕΠΝΟΥΤΕ (rel., RE II 17a 12ff.) / ΝΕΝΑΤΣΑΒΟ ΑΥΘ ΑΥΣ-ΣΕΝΙΜΟΡΟΣ ΝΤΙΜ- (Sec. Perf., III 28.25f.) / ΕΝΤΑΠΙΣΤΕΤΕΣΕ ΕΝΑΙ ΕΩΡΟΙ ΑΙΕΙΜΕ ΔΡΟΧ ΣΕΝΟΥ ΝΕΝΑΠΙΣΤΕΤΕ ΝΑΙ (Sec. Perf., ibid. 219.3f.).

(c) base + zero-determined actor (ΜΠΕ- repeated 26 times, A 2 383; 7 times, A 1 80; 9 times, Ch. 26-7; ΜΠΕ- 5 times, A 2 25); ΕΝΑΓΟΝ ΕΝΜΑΚΕΙΟΧ ΕΜΜΑΝΑΚΗ ΕΜΜΑΝΟΜ ΝΑΥΜΟΝ-ΙΜΟΝ (A 2 381) / ΥΝΟ- ΝΑΤΟΙ ΓΑΡ... ΟΥΝΟΠΕΧΙΟΝΟΜΟ, ΟΥΝΟΙΚΩΛΟ, ΟΥΝΟΠΟΡΝΟΣ, ΟΥΝΑΚΑΒΑΡΤΟΝ ΝΕΝΟΠΗΝ ΣΕΜΟΟ... (Ch. 57.40ff.).

(6) # (conjugation base/converter) + (interposition) + (pred. verb-lexeme) #, closer than # (conj. base/converter + nom. actor) + (interposition) + (conj. base + anaphoric pronoun + pred. verb-lexeme) # (delimitation 6). Examples: ΜΠΕΤΕΚΑΝΙΟΝ ΜΠΕΧ ΑΝΑΡΟ ΝΒΡΕ ΝΕΝΑΠΙΣΤΕΤΕ ΕΡΟΧ, ΕΙΤΕ... ΕΙΤΕ... ΕΙΤΕ...
§6.0.2.1 Chapter 6. The Augens

ΟΥΝ ΝΙΝ ΝΤΑΤΤΕΙ ΝΤΑΤΜΕΝ ΝΝΕΙΝΑ ΕΤΟΥΛΑ ΚΟΤΟΥ (Ch. 150.42ff.) / ΕΡΕΝΕΤΟΥΗΣ ΤΤΗΝΟΠΟΛ ΜΑΛΛΑΝ ΔΕ ΝΠΡΜΕ ΝΤΑΤΙΑΝΤΖΟΥΤΟΥ Ο ΜΜΝΤΡΕ (IV 84.15ff., circ.) / ΝΤΟΠΟΣ ΝΤΑΤΙΕΝΟΤ ΜΠΟΝΗΠΡΟΝ ΝΝΕΤ+ ΟΥΒΕΝΕΥΕΡΠΥ ΕΤΕΠΑΡΑΣζΕ ΝΠΡΑΝ ΓΑΝΟΥΒ ΝΝΕΤ ΕΜΑΥ (III 35.22ff.) / ΜΗ ΕΡΕΝΕΤΟΥΗΣ ΜΝΙΚΑΚΗ ΜΠΟΝΟΚΤ ΝΤΑΤΥΠΝΤ ΝΟΕ ΝΝΕΗ- ΒΑΤΥΡ ΕΥΝΗΓ ΓΑΝΩΖ ΝΝΟΜΟΙ ΝΝΙΚΙΟΝ ΝΑΚΟΟΥ... (ibid. 87.22ff.) Also III 128.19ff., 221.24ff., IV 46.8ff., 108.2ff., 163.7ff., 56.11ff., 17.9ff., A 1 150-1, etc.

(7) 'ΧΕΚΑΛΑΚ ΕΥΕ-/ΔΕΙ(Ε)ΝΕΗ'-, closer than 'ΧΕΚΑΛΑΚ + (interposition) + conjunctive (delimitation 7; see §7.2.6.1 [e]).

(8) '(pronoun -> (resumption))' (in various constructions), closer than '('pronoun -> (no resumption)') (delimitation 8). Examples: ΟΥΒΑΚΕ... ΕΝΑΝΟΥ ΕΙΣΟΟΥ (A 2 462) / ΖΑΣ ΜΕΝ ΝΥΑΚΕ ΛΥΝ ΝΗΞΒ ΑΙΣΟΟΥ (Ch. 50.20ff.) / ΠΑΙ ΕΜΑΤΑ ΛΥΝ ΝΕΙΚΟΟΥΕ ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΝΑΚΡΟΝ ΠΝΤΗΜΕ ΝΠΑΙ ΝΝΝΑΙ ΕΤΜΑΤΑ (III 130.7ff.) / ΛΥΝ ΝΡΥΑΧ... ΝΕΠΗΜΑΝ ΑΝ ΝΩΝΙΚΑΤΑΝΑΣ (ibid. 211.8ff.) / ΕΝΝΗΝΥΣ ΝΤΑΚΟΟΣ ΧΕΣ-ΕΣΕΙ-ΣΝΑΑΑ ΝΑΦ (Ch. 41.12ff.) / ΝΤΟΚ ΠΕΤΟΥΧΚ ΑΒΟΝ ΝΖΗΣΚ ΝΝΕΥΠΑΒΟΣ (ibid. 21.18ff.) / ΝΤΟΠΟΣ ΝΤΑΤΙΕΝΟΤ ΜΠΟΝΗΠΡΟΝ... ΝΝΕΤ ΕΜΑΥ (ibid. 129.23ff.). There is no doubt a need to refine further the gradation of cohesion (e.g. by kind and "strength" of anaphoric exponents; consider [Ench. 74-5 ΝΕΤΕΡΕΠΑΙ ΧΕ ΝΤΗΝ ΝΝΑΙ] and relate it to anaphoric concord, which similarly displays allomorphic "assimilation" conditioning: the derelevantization in a given environment of a morphological opposition that is elsewhere pertinent. Additional links discussed elsewhere (see n. 26): the compatibility and ordering of enclitics (see §6.0.3.2); negative syncategorization and personal maintenance between the nucleus and the conjunctive (adnential modifier), see §7.1.2.2.

6.0.2.2 Delimitations. (0) Devalidation of link (0); ensuing boundary: lexeme stem (ΤΑΜΕ-ΤΝ)

(1) Labializable morpheme or morpheme-part not labialized before a secondary (conditioned) labial (cf. link 1); ensuing boundary: prefix) [assimilated prefix]. ΝΝΜΟΟΥ (Wess. 9 91a 27ff.), ΝΝΜΟΥ (A 2 383), ΝΝΠΟΛΙΣ (III 132.15).

(2) Negation of link (2). Ensuing boundary: converter] [N-AN negated Bipartite (pronominal actor).

(3) Negation of link (3). Ensuing boundary: converter] [N-AN negated Bipartite (nominal actor).

(4) Opposition to link (4). Ensuing boundary: determinator] [several coordinated noun lexemes.

(5) Opposition to link (5). Ensuing boundary: (several) base/converters] [several) predicative verb-lexemes.

(6) Opposition to link (6). Ensuing boundary: base/converters + nominal actor] [pred. verb lexeme; examples: Α... Α- (IV 205.15ff.), ΝΤΑ... ΕΝΤΑ- (Sec. Perf., III 90.8ff.), ΕΡΠΑ... ΕΥΡΑΝ- (Ch. 41.11ff., parall. III 80.15ff.), ΕΡΕ-... ΕΥ- (Sec. Pres., III 209.13ff.), ΕΡΕ-... ΕΥ- (RE 10 164b 12ff.) 38. The extended intervening segment in this case is symptomatic of the open(er) juncture. A similarly telltale phenomenon is the intercalability of the parenthetic — ΠΕΧΑ — "said he" 39; antecedent] [ref. form (A 1 228, A 2

ΕΚΟ γυν ΝΗΤΕΡΕΠΟΡΤΗ ΝΑΕΙ ΕΙΣΟΥ ΕΒΟΝ ΧΕ-ΜΝΑΠ-ΤΕ ΜΜΑΥ ΧΕ... ΤΕ ΒΕ ΟΝ ΕΤΟΥΛΑΧΚΑΝ... (Ch. 185.8ff.; also A 1 131, 234, III 223.10ff.). One could formulate the distinction also by postulating two [he] morphemes, differing in prosodic properties (see §1.1.2.3, spec. obs.). — Note the punctuation in (Besa 48.7ff.) ΤΕΤΝΣΕ ΤΕ ΤΝΖΕ, ΝΕΤΝΖΗΥΗ ΝΕΝΕΖΗΥΗ, vs. lack of punctuation in other types of Nom. Sentence (42.23, 48.17, 42.17, 51.13).

37 One may include here the second person feminine singular: ΕΡΕΝΤΣΗΑ ΑΝ (έρε-θοίμ αν) vs. ΕΝΤΕΚΤΗΜ ΑΝ, perhaps also more open than ΕΝΤΣΗ ΑΝ. Cf. Rosen 1964:182: 'Two segments apparently adjacent, but separated by a zero segment, join in a different degree of juncture than either of them would join with a medium segment that was not zero'.

38 See Young 1969:400. Note other cases of morpheme resumption: Ν... ΝΝΑ- ΑΝ (IV 11.15ff.), ΜΗ ΕΡΠΑ-... ΜΗ ΡΠ + apodosis (A 2 26), ΕΚΟ... ΕΚ... (IV 28.16ff.).

192), extraposed noun [main pattern (ΠΡΟ — ΠΕΧΑ — ΤΝΑΣΚΟ Α 2 335, RE IO 159a 10f.; ΝΒ. ΑΝΟΚ ΖΩ — ΠΕΧΑ — ΤΝΑΣΚΟΝ III 17.20f. / ΠΕΠΤΗΝ ΓΑΡ — ΠΕΧΑ — ΑΑΚΑΤΩΤΕΙ ΕΒΟΛ Π 1304 102 vo), conj. carrier] [verbal lexeme (ΞΗΡΩΤΑΞΥΧΗ — ΠΕΧΑ — ΣΤΟΙΧΗΜ III 199.5f.), Second-Tense theme] [final modifier (Wess. 9 174d 29ff. / ΝΤΑΙΣΝΗΛΕ ΓΑΡ ΑΝ — ΠΕΧΑ — ΜΠΟΡΩΝ ΝΔΟΥΕΥΕΝ Α 2 431), nominal predicate (+ augens)] [pronominal subject (ΞΗΡΩΤΑΞΥΧΗ — ΠΕΧΑ — ΝΕ III 118.15f.), cataphoric referent] [referate (ΝΑΤ ΗΕ ΚΤΗΝΗ ΝΜΟΣ — ΠΕΧΑ — ΣΕ— Α 2 430, also ibid. 432-3 [all not Sh.], 453), verbal nucleus] [expansion (III 99.8f., Wess. 9 140a 15ff. / ΖΩ ΓΑΡ — ΠΕΧΑ — ΕΘΕΟΥΕΘ ΝΤΑΙΣΝΗΛΕ ΕΠ 1318 20 ΚΑ; between two coordinated clauses, — ΠΕΧΑ ΑΥΗ — Wess. 9 161d 10ff.), and, surprisingly, rel. converter (pronominal)] [conv. Nominal Sentence (ΤΑΙ ΤΕ ΘΑ ΕΤΕΡΕ — ΠΕΧΑ — ΟΥΥΡΩΝΕΙΤΙ ΠΕ ... Α 2 435 [not Sh.], collated]. Yet another symptom, still in need of being refined, is the prosodic slot open for enclitics (§6.0.3, and note the position of enclitics in the exx. quoted above).

(7) Opposition to link (7). Ensuing boundary: ΞΕΚΑΚΣ [‘eventual’-apodotic conjunctive].

(8) Absence of resumption 40 of a (pro)noun (stylistically, anaclitonic construction 41): (IV 108.17f.) ΑΝΟΝ ΕΤΟΝ 2ΒΕ ΝΗΜΟΣ ΝΤΑΙΣΝΗΛΕ ΝΗΤΗΝ / (III 24.10f.) ΕΠΕΡΙΝΗΝ ΗΕ ΕΠΟΥΑ ΝΠΑΙΟΥΧΗ / ΠΕΤΧΑΛΩΣΟΥ ΝΤΗΤΗΝ ΕΤΧΟΟΥΝ / (ΧΧ. 85.11f.) ΝΕΕ ΚΑΤΗΚΘΟΥΣ ΗΕ ΠΙΝΑΚΑ / (IV 26.13) ΤΑΙ ΤΕ ΘΑ ΝΕΑ / ΤΑΙΣΝΗΛΕ ΤΟΙΟΥΘΕΝ ΝΑΒΡΑΓΑΜ / (III 21.13f.) ΝΕΟΥΗΝ ΕΤΧΟΟΥΝ ΗΗ ΕΤΤΗΝΘΟΟΥΝ ΣΕ—ΝΑΙΕ ΥΑΡΨΗΝ / (IV 80.11f.) ΝΕΟΥΗΝ ΗΝ ΝΑΛΗ ΕΤΗΛΑΘΗ ΑΝ ΕΟΥΗΝ / (IV 39.4f.) ΤΑΡΨΗ ΝΤΑΙΣΝΗΛΕ ΜΠΡΩΜΕ / (III 68.2f.) ΠΚΑΙΡΟΣ ΕΝΤΑ— ΒΑΡΒΑΡΟΣ ΥΨΑ / (P 1317 45 ro) ΠΝΑ ΕΤΕΤΑΥΡ—2ΒΕ ΕΠΟΥΑ / (III 138.26f.) ΠΕΙΤΟΤΕ ΕΝΑΤΟΠΑ ΝΤΑΙΣΝΗΛΕ ΜΠΡΩΜΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΜΑΤΗΝ... ΣΕ—...

Additional delimitations, treated elsewhere 42: topological quotation [focus (§2.7.2.4, (b) topic: ‘Basic Tense + interrogative modifier’, more open than ‘Second Tense + interrr. modifier’).

6.0.2.3 The question of the definition and delimitation of the word, far from being banal or trivial is as perplexing in Coptic as it is in other languages or in general linguistics. The futility of the attempt to apply universally any of the criteria currently suggested was admitted as early as 1949 (at the Sixth International Congress of Linguists, Oslo) 43. Different “words” — semantic, lexical, prosodic, syntactic, morphologic, paradigmatic — are not coextensive; such properties as autonomy, separability, bondage, semasiological or prosodic weight are gradient and relative. The definition, tacitly accepted unanimously — “minimal free form” (originally Bloomfield’s) — cannot be uncritically accepted, since “minimal”, “tree”, even “form” all beg the question, being values that are questionable, relative or in need of definition (“minimalism”, also in Martinet’s “signe minimum”, is as illusory as contextual independence; “freedom” and prosodic weight vary with the pattern; “form” is just an empty terminological head-word). Often, a vague conception of the word is carried over from languages for which it has in some way been crystallized and as it were legitimized and perpetuated in word-dividing print, to serve as a model for unwritten languages and generally exotic ones. This is, however, hardly relevant.

40 To be distinguished from zero resumption, §3.1.1.1.0.1.

41 One might aim at a general cohesive definition of anacoluthia, e.g. in cases like (III 104.23ff.) ΞΕΚΑΚ ΝΤΟΚ ΖΩΝΚ ... ΕΚΑΚ ΑΝ (opener juncture than for ΞΕΚΑΚ ΕΝΝΕΚ), or (Ch. 88.22ff.) ΕΡΧΑΝΘΟΤ ΔΕ ΣΟΟΚ ΕΝ—ΓΕΗΣ ΜΠΟΡΩΝ ΠΟΥΗΤΕ ΜΠΡΩΝΤΗ ΝΤΗΤΗΝ ΜΠΟΡΩΝ ΥΨΑ.. where the 3rd-person pronoun is an exponent of cohesion that would be absent in the 1st person; in the case of (A 137) ΕΝΕΝΕΝΕΝΤ ΔΕ ΤΝΑΣΚΟΝ ΝΤΑΙΣΝΗΛΕ ΤΗΡΩΝ, the protasis - apodosis juncture is looser than in the ‘orthodox’ ΕΝΕ—, ΝΕ— ΝΑ (ΝΑ) irreversible complex.

42 Juncture would distinguish the two seams — and eventually the two morphs — in ΕΝΕ + conjugation form; interrogative ΕΝΕ is followed by more open juncture; ΕΝΕ ΑΠΑ ΕΥΚΟΟΡ ΤΝΕΝΟΥΛΑ ΝΟΥΗΤ (P 1306 66 or), not affecting the actor pronoun by “converting” it from the prefix to the suffix paradigm: (Ξ)ΕΝΕ— (Ch. 95.33f); consider also ΕΝΕΑ— (IV 184.2, rs. ΕΝΕΑ— for the converter), ΕΝΕ—, Sec. Tense (BM Car. p. 79 No. 194 f. 4).

43 See Matthews 1974:Chs. 2, 5, 9; Bari 1977, for some discussions and further reff. to the extensive literature on this subject (and the related issue of morphology/syntax stratification).
to Coptic, where scriptio continua is the rule, and no length of intimate contact with Greek could change this; indeed, other than the isolated instances of syllable-division marking, this is almost the only consistent piece of evidence we have reflecting native grammatical theory. As a matter of fact, word-division in Coptic texts has ever been a pseudo-issue, purely the preoccupation of Western scholarship, rather than a meaningful issue of grammar 44. In Coptic, we have SYNTAGMS — patterns of ordered categories, with distinctively varying juncture contours:

\[\begin{align*}
A = \chi &= \text{SWTM} & \text{vs.} & A = \text{PRWME} \sim \text{SWTM} \\
\text{AN} &= \text{OURPME} & \text{vs.} & \text{OURPME} \sim \text{PE} \\
\text{\textasciitilde{SETP}} &= \text{PRWME} & \text{vs.} & \text{SWTM} \sim \text{MPRWME} \\
\chi &= \text{SWTM} & \text{vs.} & \text{PRWME} \sim \text{SWTM}
\end{align*}\]

Unless we use “word” as synonymous with these patterns, I cannot see that the term is called for by the system. Of the precise role of manuscript punctuation we are still ignorant. Both its purpose (rhetorical, dictional?) and system(s), probably idiotextual or idiosyncratic with every scribe, must be decided for every text separately 45, in conjunction with its grammatical norm. Punctuation marks, far from being “sinnlos gesetzt”, “nicht eben wichtiger oder notwendiger, sondern der Übersichtlichkeit eher hinderlich” 46, where not reading instructions, may be optional signals of junctural boundaries of different levels. NEK-\text{NAP\textoe{O}Y PE} (Ch. 13.42f.) is opposed to -PATNOYTE (ibid. 17.15) and -P\textoe{O}LEMOS (ibid. 21.28); the comma before PE (ibid. 25.23, 59.13) indicates prosodic characteristics of a distinct Nominal Sentence pattern; commas mark the opening and closing of a parenthesis (Or. 161.40f.), and so on. (Attention is drawn passim to punctuation in connection with syntactical issues.)

6.0.3 SUB-sentence PROSODIC UNITS: THE COLON; ENCLUSIS, HIERARCHIES AND PLACEMENTS. Beyond information on the parameter of cohesion inside patterns, the placement of certain kinds of element supplies us with data on the boundaries of prosodic units which make up, as constituent elements, the prosodic structure of the whole: the COLA. These are more easily isolated than defined in a dead language where we are in the dark regarding phonetic realities, and can see only their traces. We must content ourselves with those that are objective, non-circular and striking enough even to “syntaktisch unbewaffnete

44 Cf. Steinhall–Misteli 1893:290 (on “looseness” and independence of elements). There is to date no theoretical discussion of the Coptic word; various proposals for word-division systems have been a poor substitute (we do not even have a passable working definition of the “word” in Coptic). Initially devised with a practical view to facilitating the analysis of the text, these systems have acquired through time and use a kind of theoretical authority and significance, although none are based on a preliminary set of theoretical principles. Often, technical and grammatical considerations are inextricably mixed. To mention the main systems proposed or in use: Stern 1886 is the most reflective of all, and combines junctural-prosodic, semasiological and functional considerations, none quite consistent with the others: \(\text{AE}\) is separated (cf. 6cc), so are OY, \(\text{NOYEN} +\), 

EPE \(\text{PIE}\) (PE). Misteli’s (1893) has maximal separation, employing the hyphen to mark some (not all) special cases of close juncture: EMPE-I NAY E OY \(\text{DIKAROS} +\) A \(\text{P-SOEIC KAA-\textoe{O}}\) NCUW-\(\textoe{O}-\text{NEMI-1/MPNE ZA1 NAY} \). Till 1941 offers two arbitrary contrasting lists — his aim is clearly diacritic and practical. “Lexical” units are separated, “grammatical” ones are not: MEPE-NEW \(\text{PEW} +\) MEPE (love) PEW; NOUWAME \(\text{MEW}\), N (bring) \(\text{OUTAME}\); NTEPEYOTE \(\text{MEW}\) — vs. NTE (of) NOYOTE; NTEPN- (conj.) vs. NTEPN NAWSHP. So too in Till 1960: here the professed motivation is to “enhance the perspicuity of the text”; whatever combination is juncturally close may be written as a single stretch, but is divided to eliminate ambiguities: OYOTE NEPW \(\text{MEW}, +\) (inf.) ZICE, NA \(\text{NIPUYE}, \text{NPE} \text{ZA1 NPOYIE}, \text{MN} (“with”) TEPWAYE, \(\text{AN}\) (“can”) WIL. Kasser 1965 introduces — together with separation of words — the apostrophe, thus applying a native Coptic division mark, albeit without precise statement of its role in MSS. It is used in close and open junctures alike: \(\text{P} +\) EPE \(\text{P} \text{PACET}\) PEP \(\text{PACET}\) PEP \(\text{PACET}\) ETOYAVE \(\text{PACET}\) PEW. See also Amelineau, Schenoudi, I, p. xxxviii and Sphinx 17:177-207 (1912), 18:1-30 (1914-5).


Augen’ ⁴⁷, and we must bear in mind that they are probably phantom-images of a colon, definable as ‘‘an expiratory complex with a main stress unit’’ ⁴⁸. One cannot say what the significance of our written cola is, in terms of ‘‘real’’ prosody (intonation, stress, pauses), just as no syntaxization can be really valid without suprasegmental data; yet these textual hints must be exploited for what they are worth.

6.0.3.1 Foremost among the syntactic phenomena indicative of colon boundaries is the placement of the so-called ‘‘enclitics’’ — the amorphous class of words which are found to occupy the second position in the sentence ⁴⁹. Yet this is thin ground, and we must walk with care, for it is after all by means of these self-same enclitics that the first (initial) position is defined. The circularity of the definition and the inadequacy of the conception of ‘‘sentence’’ as a prosodic unit become apparent once we extend our attention to native Coptic particles. On the basis of examples (a selection of which is given in §6.0.3.1.1) we arrive at the following statements: (a) enclitics are indexes of some prosodic articulation, following the distinction of an immobile Greek-origin core (ΜΕΝ, ΔΕ, ΓΑΡ) and a mobile native-origin periphery (ΓΕ, ΠΩ, ΟΝ, ΝΤΟΥ, ΣΩΜΑ, certain augentia). (b) Enclitics ride (not unlike corks on water) the (to us otherwise imperceptible) prosodic scheme. They are ‘‘float’’ed by the suprasegmental contour, and their actual placement is a co-product of their segmental relationships and this contour ⁵⁰; this placement is neither secondary nor shifted. (c) Enclitics are placed as (1) COLON-SECOND, (2) COLON-FINAL (as colon-boundary signals ⁵¹; in a different view, this amounts to intercolony placement, the enclitics being disjunctors, signalling something like a musical ‘‘rest’’). (d) The following syntactical units (as isolated by enclitics) occur as separate cola: conjugation forms (+ expansion); Nominal Sentence patterns; noun syntags, extrapoosed noun syntags, expanded noun syntags; modifiers, incl. coordinatives or disjunctives: ΑΥΘ, Η, ΟΥΕ, ΑΛΛΑ; in focalization patterns, the theme, focus or both together may constitute a colon.

6.0.3.1.1 A representative selection of examples — colon boundaries for which I believe there is segmental signalling — are indicated (see also §6.0.2.2 (6), for — ΠΕΣΑΧ — as intercolony boundary marker): ΑΝΩΝ ΔΕ ΥΨΗΜ | ΟΥ ΠΕΤΝΝΗΛΔΟΥΟΥ (III 29.10) / ΜΑΡΕΠΟΥΑ ΓΑΡ | ΠΟΥΑ ΜΟΥΤΡΗ (ibid. 110.6f.) / ΖΟΤΑΝ ΔΕ | ΠΕΝΟΝ | ΕΡΧΑΝ- (ibid. 101.11f.) / ΝΑΙ ΓΑΡ ΤΗΡΟΥ | ΕΡΧΑΛΝΠΟΤΕ Ρ-ΣΑΝΑΧ | ΣΕΝΑΠΑΡΑΚΕ (ibid. 31.6f.) / ΖΜΗΠΙΧΑΡ ΓΑΡ | ΝΤΑΛΑΙ ΕΤΜΑΥ ΧΕΙ... (IV 164.9f.) / ΑΝΩΝ-ΓΕΝΠΟΜΕ ΓΑΡ | (ibid. 155.1f.) / ΕΝΝΑ-ΖΗΥ ΓΑΡ | ΝΟΥ (ibid. 184.7) / ΑΡΧΕΑΛΟΟ ΓΕ ΟΝ | ΠΕΠΚΟΠΟΣ ΥΨΗΜ ΝΚΑΡΧΑΠΙΚ | ΑΧ- (III 109.4f.) / ΖΝΟΥΣΝΕ ΔΕ | ΖΩΣ ΕΥΧΕ-ΝΤΑΛΙΠΟΥΣ ΝΑΤ | ΝΤΑΛΙΠΟΥΣ ΓΑΡ | ΠΣΟΟΤ ΜΕΝ | ΝΤΑΛ-ΜΠΕΛΙ ΝΟΥΣΜΟ... (ibid. 96.24f.) / ΝΥΕΕΕ ΔΕ | ΤΟΥΕΙ ΜΕΝ | ΑΣ-ΠΙΣ ΥΨΗΜ ΟΝ | (ibid. 97.1f.) / ΤΟΥΝΖΕΑΖ ΓΑΡ | ΥΟΓΟΝ | ΚΟΠ ΜΕΝ | ΙΑΠΥ- | ΚΟΠ ΟΝ | | (ibid. 48.6ff.) / ΠΕΙΑΜ | ΑΚΚΟΟΟ ΟΝ | ΣΥΝΚΩΣΓΧΑΡ ΕΝΠΑ (ibid. 81.12) / ΕΒΟΛΑ ΓΑΡ ΑΝ | ΔΕ-ΟΥΟ ΕΠΑΙ ΝΤΟΥ | ΝΕΙ- (ibid. 66.2f.) / ...ΝΗΠΗΖ ΔΕ ΟΝ | ΤΗΝΓ ΠΟΥ | (ibid. 113.13f.) / ΝΕΤΟΥΝΟΥ ΝΕ ΔΕ | ΝΕ ΝΕΧΡΑ ΜΝΩΝΡΟΠΑΝΟΟ (ibid. 93.18f.) / ΖΕΝΟΒΟΛ ΤΙΤΝ ΒΕ | ΝΕ (v.l. ΖΕΝΟΒΟΛ ΔΕ ΤΙΤΝ | ΝΕ, ibid. 216.17 | ΝΑΑ-ΠΑΛ ΓΑΡ | (Leyd. 311) ⁵² / ΑΙΧΕ-ΠΙΛΑΛΑ ΠΑΙ ΟΝ | ΜΚΑΡΚΕΙΝΟΟ (III 31.27) / ΕΤΡΕΥ-ΝΑΝΠΡΟ | ΝΠΡΟ ΟΝ (ibid. 88.18) / ΝΤΟΥ ΠΕ ΑΝΟΝ | ΖΝΟΠΕΝΙΚΕΠ ΠΟΟΟ (Ch. 90.8ff., if ΝΤΟΥ is taken as an augens and not as a term in an identify-

⁴⁷ E. Fraenkel 1964a:73. Fraenkel’s classic studies (1964a-c, 1965), with those of Wackernagel 1892 and Polotsky 1961, have been the main source of inspiration for the present discussion; see also J. J. Fraenkel 1947.


⁴⁹ Wiel 1879:90ff.; Wackernagel 1892; Laufer 1959; E. Fraenkel 1964, 1965; Hellwig 1974, esp. p. 160ff. For Egyptian-Coptic, see Czermak 1931:29ff.; Polotsky 1961. Fecht 1964 and Saxe-Söderbergh 1949 are motivated rather by metric and not essentially syntactic considerations: ‘‘stress’’ and ‘‘accentuation’’ have within this frame of reference a connotation different from (though certainly related to) that of non-metric sentence prosody. For further references, see Polotsky 1961: 313 n. 2.)


⁵¹ Cf. Polotsky 1961:esp. 295ff., 303ff. Polotsky’s ‘‘Spitzenwort’’ is often, if not always, a whole colon; cases like ΜΕ ΧΑΡ ΝΝΟΠΜΕ... (III 181.3) are possibly instances of colon-second placement, although even here we may have colon-final or intercolony placement.

6.0.3.2 ENCLITICS: RELATIVE PLACEMENT AND COMPATIBILITIES. As suggested above, the placement of any member of a pattern is a facet of its categorial, i.e. functional essence. A study of the combined and relative placement of enclitics, however, is instructive of their prosodic hierarchy and relative encliticity. Observe in the following table: (1) Since factors of semasiological as well as prosodic compatibility are at play here, it is extremely difficult to classify non-attestation in this case as significant (systemic) or accidental. However, presumably accidental (provisional) non-occurrence is indicated by parentheses: (—). (2) One must remember that this presentation is extremely simplified, ignoring (for the sake of convenience) (a) the interdependence of word and pattern prosodic properties, (b) the possible influence of various prosodic patterns transcending the syntactic ones, (c) the influence of the environment in general, and neighbouring particles in particular, and (d) the possibility, not to be ignored, of mobility — flexible placement — of individual enclitics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΓΑΡ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔΕ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΡΗ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΝΤΟΨ rescue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΑΝ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΟΝ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΖΨΨΨΨ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΕΕ2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΠΕ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


55 Cf. LAUER 1959:70.

94 Other ready-imported Greek particle amalgams are ΑΡΙΣ Ε — IV 179.2, 193.8, III 71.23, 220.15ff., Ch. 11.9f., 164.18ff. 7:; ΩΙΟΚΟΥΝ (both ΩΙΟΚΟΥΝ and ΩΙΟΚΟΥΝ, III 24-5, 66.17, 93.14f., Wess. 9 142b 28ff.; ΜΗ ΑΡΙΣ (GE) III 80.25ff., IV 129.8, 193.8, Ch. 110.26f.); ΚΑΙΤΟΙΡ (DENNISTON 564; Ch. 81.5f., 138.5f., 158.11f., Wess. 9 131b 15f.) and ΚΑΙΤΟΙ (IV 38.1f.); ΚΑΙΓΑΡ/kατι γάρ, DENNISTON 108ff.; III 32.18, 461f., 135.29, IV 19.16, 92.19, 184.11f.)
145.12f. ΑΕ ζωομ: III 65.16; this is ΑΕ marked as adversative. ΑΕ ον: III 37.4; ΑΕ marked as additive or non-adversative. An extremely common combination, more frequent than ΑΕ alone (ΑΕ in its various combinations is the most frequent of all Greek-origin particles in Shenoute). ΑΕ ΠΕ: III 60.29, 110.20; rather rare, the usual form being ΑΕ ΠΕ (in III 52.18, 53.25 we have ΑΕ preceding the copular, not pronominal ΠΕ). ΠΟΒ ΝΩΟ: Ch. 42.10ff. ΠΟΒ ΑΝ: A 287, III 22.19, 211.17, 215.2f. ΠΟΒ ΡΟΒ: Ch. 17.4f., III 164.9f. ΑΕ2 ΑΝ: Ch. 157.28ff. ΑΕ2 ΠΟΒ: Wess. 988a 14f., III 199.10. ΑΕ2 ζωομ: Ch. 112-3, Young 15. ΑΕ 2 ΠΕ: III 216.17, Mun. 177, Ench. 94a. ΝΟΤΟΥ ΑΝ: A I 135 ΝΟΤΟΥ ΑΝ ΠΟΒ ΑΝ / Ch. 52.37ff. ΟΥΚ ΕΥΡΑΠΕ ΝΟΤΟΥ ΑΝ ΠΕ / ibid. 198.45ff. ΜΗ ΕΥΗ—ΛΩΜ ΑΝ ΝΟΤΟΥ ΑΝ. ΝΟΤΟΥ ΠΕ: III 105.24f., 145.12f. ΑΝ ΝΟΤΟΥ: only in rhetorical questions (usually introduced by Χ, ΜΗ): III 105.24f. ΜΗ ΑΡΧΑΝ ΑΝ ΠΕ... / Π 130 71 ΡΕ... Η ΕΤΒΕΤΜΝΤΑ-

Needless to say, this exposé covers no more than a paragraph in some future comprehensive work on Coptic prosody, written to integrate “particles” with other pattern constituents (especially modifiers). One can nonetheless make out at least seven prosodic paradigms (or fillers of prosodic slots) on a scale of decreasing encliticity (no compatibility within each group, only commutation). In syntagm, the particle higher on the list precedes the lower:

1. ΜΕΝ
2. ΑΡΑ, ΑΕ
3. ΠΟΒ, ΑΕ1
4. ΑΝ
5. ΝΟΤΟΥ, ζωομ
6. ΑΕ2, ΠΟΒ
7. ΠΕ

Note: These compatibilities are valid only within a single-colon-extent, and thus constitute a link (§6.0.2.1). Consider (III 93.18) - ΝΟΤΟΥ ΠΕ | ΑΕ ΠΕ / (III 97.1f.) ΝΥΩΗΕΡΕ ΑΕ | ΤΟΤΕΙ ΜΕΝ | (A I 123) ΟΥΚΗΡΕ ΠΕ | ΝΟΤΟΥ | ΕΩΗΑΝ (for the compatibility and relative placement of particles and augentia see §6.1.0.1). Group (6) is closest to the modifier hypercategory. (To this group may be assigned the "particular" ΤΕΝΟΥ, see §1.3.4.) ΑΕ1: ΑΕ2: (3:6), based on ΑΝ ΑΕ2 “not... anymore” vs. ΑΕ1 ΑΝ “not... then”. ΠΕ is not a particle but an enclitic pronoun in the Bimembral Nominal Sentence pattern (see §1.1.2.3 and note 36). ΑΕ2 and ΠΕ are the only absolutely final particles; as such, they form final boundary signals of the relevant junctural extent (colon). ΝΟΤΟΥ (5) can probably be resolved into ΝΟΤΟΥ1 “on the other hand”, “just”, grade (3), and ΝΟΤΟΥ2 “at least”, “only”, grade (6), before ΠΕ — on the strength of the opposition ΑΝ ΝΟΤΟΥ2: ΝΟΤΟΥ1 ΑΝ (for ΝΟΤΟΥ and ζωομ see also §§6.1.2.3, 6.1.3.4).

6.0.3.3 “The case of the ‘foreshadowed enclitic’”. One of the most intriguing phenomena to do with the linear behaviour of enclitics is their occasional double simultaneous occurrence in a single syntactic unit — once in the colon-second/final conditioned “secondary” (or better in the prosodic-structure overrule) position, and again in the constructional syntactic-structure (“primary”) position. This provides us with a neat junctural index confirming the colon delimitation. 56. I find the following enclitics with this property:


56 Cf. (for the Greek βα) Wackernagel 1892:394, 396ff., 399ff. and E. Fraenkel, Beobachtungen zu Aristophanes (Rome, 1962) pp. 89ff., 216 (on με, ξυλοί, τύ, τιτ). For Coptic, this phenomenon has not (to the best of my knowledge) been discussed; it is usually credited by the editors and “buried” in apparatuses. Outside Shenoute, I note (Bohairic) Acta Martyrum (CSCO, edd. Balextri-Hyvernet) I 106.26 cod. A, 143.20f., 144.20, all exx. of ΠΕ; II 246.5f. (ον), 351.24f., 17.26 (ΑΕ), 323.16 (ΙΑΡ), 306.9f. (ΜΑΛ); (Bohairic) Gen. 43:32 (ΠΕ; see Anderson 1904:39). See Dictionary 256a for two exx. of “repeated” on.
(a) ΝΕ, by far the most common: (IV 52.27) ΑΥΘ ΝΟΟΥ ΝΟΟΝ ΣΠΟΥΣΕ ΠΕ ΥΜΟΤ ΝΟΟΝ ΝΕ (subject, predicate - ΝΕ) / (A 2 447, not Sh.) ΟΥΜΕΤΡΟΝ (sic) ΝΕ ΝΚΟΙΝΟΝ ΝΕ (predicate - ΝΕ) / (A 2 111) ΜΗ ΝΝΑΙ ΑΝ ΝΕ ΝΕΠΙΟΜ ΜΗ ΖΕΝΟΟΥΕ ΕΝΑΙΜΟΥ ΝΕ ΝΝΙΟ (predicate - ΝΕ, subject) / (IV 104.9 cod. A) ΟΥΝΑΓΚΑΙΟΝ ΔΕ ΟΝ ΝΕ ΝΤΕΙΚΕΣΕ ΝΕ ΝΠΕΙΟΥΑ (predicate - ΝΕ, subject) / (A 2 196, parall. III 131.15f. cod. B) ΑΛΛΑ ΝΑΜΕ ΝΕ ΝΤΕΟΥΣΗ ΝΕ ΝΤΕΡΥΣ (subject - ΝΕ - predicate; Amélineau's note: "lisez: ΑΛΛΑ ΝΑΜΕ ΝΠΕΟΥΣΗ ΝΕ; le mot ΝΑΜΕ s'employant comme adverbe et ne comportant pas la présence d'un enclitique qui se trouve d'ailleurs après le mot suivant, comme il doit s'y trouver d'après la grammaire.") / (Mun. 103) ΕΤΕΝΕΝΤΑΥΨΗ ΝΜΛΛΑΚΟΣ ΝΕ ΖΡΑΙ ΝΝΗΤΕ ΝΕ (rel. - predicate - ΝΕ). Perhaps also III 22.12ff., 75.16f., both alternatively interpretable as instances of the "modifier - ΝΕ" predicate, §1.2.1.2. Compare also instances of (ΝΕ) ΕΙΣΠΕ ΑΙ — ΝΕ in irrealis apodosis, e.g. (A 1 95) ΕΝΕΥΖΕΝΚΕΝΑ... ΝΕΝΑΚΟΝΟΥ ΠΗ ΝΝΕΙΣΠΕ ΑΥΚΟΝΟΥ ΝΕ, also ibid. 107.

(b) ΑΝ: (A 2 475) (ΤΑΟΙΣΕ) ΤΑΙ ΝΤΑΝΕΤΟΥΛΛΑΒ ΧΟΟ ΑΝ ΕΒΗΝΟΤΟΥ ΑΝ ΑΛΛΑ ΕΒΗΝΤΗ ΧΕ.. (cf. 476, with a single negator; §2.9.1.1-2) / (ibid.) ΟΥΤΕ ΠΚΟΜΟΣ ΑΝ ΝΝΕΣΗ ΕΤΑΥΕ ΕΡΟΥΗ ΝΑΥΝΑΖΜΟΥ ΑΝ ΕΜ.ΗΣ.

(c) ΟΝ (IV 150.4, not Shenoute) ΑΥΘ ΟΝ ΝΚΟΜΟΥ ΟΝ ΝΚΟΜΟΕΙ.

(d) ΝΤΟΥ (A 1 295, quot. from Deut. 31:27) ΝΑΥ ΝΤΟΥ ΝΣΕ ΜΝΝΚΑΝΜΟΥ ΝΤΕΤΝ-ΝΟΥΙΣ ΝΑΥ ΑΝ ΝΤΟΥ.

6.0.3.4 Polar placement. Another intriguing placement phenomenon, which I cannot integrate in a broad theory, is the polar placement of the augens ΖΩΜ in the Nominal Sentence pattern. The augens is colon-(or at least pattern)-final when referable to a pronoun inside the pattern, but colon-second when its referent follows the pattern (differently Polotsky 1961:306 [+] n. 4] = CP 410): (Wess. 9 171c 15f.) ΟΥΝΟΒΕ ΝΑΙ ΠΕ ΖΩΜ / (III 179.13f.) ΠΕΤΝΜΠΙΑ ΠΑΡ ΠΕ ΟΛΩΗΤΗΝ, vs. (III 187.12) ΤΑΙ ΟΛΩΗΤΗΝ ΤΕ ΤΕΤΝΖΕ / (P 1301 140 ΤΨΖ-Ν) ΝΕΠΕΤΕΤΕΤΕ ΖΩΜ ΟΝ ΠΕ ΤΕΡΕΤΑΛΛΑ ΝΑΣ / (RE 11 18a 24f.) ΖΕΝΙΟΥΝΑΙ ΖΩΜ ΝΒΡΡΟ ΝΕ / (A 1 260) ΤΑΙ ΖΩΜ (sic) ΤΕ ΟΙ ΜΝΑΙΔΟΝΟΥΣ / (A 2 45) ΖΕΝΠΡΩΘΗΣ ΖΩΜ ΠΡΕΟΥΣΟΥΕ ΑΥΠΗ ΝΑΠΟΧΑΙΗΣ ΝΕ.

6.1.0.1-3 The augens: paradigms and compatibilities, a synoptic preview

In the following tables, "++" signifies normal (strong) documentation, "(+)", "+-" significantly weak documentation, "—" significant non-attestation, "(—)" (probably) accidental non-attestation.

6.1.0.1 Minimal combinatory (reference) patterns (augens/referate framing)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referate</th>
<th>ΤΗΡ-</th>
<th>ΖΩΜ-</th>
<th>{ΝΤΟ-}</th>
<th>ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΟ-</th>
<th>ΜΑΥΛΑ-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Determi**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>def.</th>
<th>indef.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sgl.</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl.</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Actor Pronoun</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sgl.</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II

<p>| Table II |
|----------|------|------|--------|------------|-------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referate</th>
<th>ΤΗΡ-</th>
<th>ΖΩΜ-</th>
<th>{ΝΤΟ-}</th>
<th>ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΟ-</th>
<th>ΜΑΥΛΑ-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Determi**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>def.</th>
<th>indef.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sgl.</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl.</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Actor Pronoun</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sgl.</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

— 168 —
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referate</th>
<th>THP</th>
<th>Z翁</th>
<th>〔NTO〕</th>
<th>MIN</th>
<th>MMO</th>
<th>MAYAA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Object Pronoun (or actor + obj.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sgl.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>net-</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(−)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>(−)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§6.1.1.1(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun + et-</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(−)</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§6.1.1.1(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative (+ expansion)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sgl.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>(−)</td>
<td>(−)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(−)</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero Referate</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§6.1.1.1(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§6.1.1.1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i翁, ne-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sgl.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>(+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>(+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>(−)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>(−)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Pronoun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sgl.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>(−)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>(−)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>(−)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>(−)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronominal Subject in Nom. Sent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sgl.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{ne}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6.1.0.2 Augens Placement: Table III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>augens placement</th>
<th>THP-</th>
<th>2WW-</th>
<th>{NTO-}</th>
<th>MAYAA-</th>
<th>MMIN MMO-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>post-referate:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immediate</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-immediate</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(−)</td>
<td>(−)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-referate:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immediate</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-immediate</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Non-immediate placement:** The augens is separated from its nucleus (referate) by an element (or elements), which is not a grammatical entity, nor an enclitic, nor a simple expansion. Two prosodic groups emerge: on the one hand, 2WW- and NTO-; on the other hand, MAYAA- and MMIN MMO-. THP- occupies an intermediate position. (The paradigmatic affinity of 2WW- with NTO- on the one hand, and of MAYAA- with MMIN MMO- and THP- on the other hand, is also corroborated by the data presented in Table IV.)

### 6.1.0.3 Augens/Augens and Augens/Enclitic: Compatibilities and Arrangement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>THP-</th>
<th>2WW-</th>
<th>{NTO-}</th>
<th>MAYAA-</th>
<th>MMIN MMO-</th>
<th>ΔE</th>
<th>ΓAP</th>
<th>AN</th>
<th>ON</th>
<th>6E</th>
<th>PW</th>
<th>{PE}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THP-</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2WW-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{NTO-}</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAYAA-</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMIN MMO-</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ΔE | + | + | + | + | (−) |
| ΓAP | + | − | − | (−) | (−) |
| AN | + | − | + | + |     |
| ON | + | − | + | − |     |
| 6E | + | + | − | − |     |
| PW | − | − | + | − |     |
| {PE} | − | + | − | − | + |     |

See Table I

(§6.0.3.2)

---
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DOCUMENTATION: THP= ΑΝ: Wess. 9 143b 4ff., A 2 238-9, Ch.52.53ff.; THP= ΟΝ: III 73.2; THP= [ΝΕ]: see §6.1.1.2.4. ζωώ= ΟΝ (very common): III 66.8, P 130^1 139 ΤΜΕ, etc.; ζωώθυτην ΤΣΥΤΗΣ: A 2 468; ζωώ= [ΝΟΤ]= Ν Σε Νάρκις: Ch. 56.30ff., A 1 I ΕΣΩΤΗΡ ΕΣΟΥΝ ΝΗΜΑ ΑΛΥ ΕΣΩΤΗΡ ΕΠΟΙ ΖΩΝ ΑΝΟΣ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΤΙΣΤΟΣ; ζωώ= ΜΗΝ ΜΗΝΟΣ ΑΛ Α 261; ζωώ= Α 1 373; ζωώ= [ΝΕ] see §§6.0.3.4 and 6.1.2.2c. [ΝΟΤ]= ΑΝ: Ch. 156.1ff., III 65.8; [ΝΟΤ]= [ΝΕ]: §6.1.3.2 (c). Wess. 9 147d 28ff., IV 207.7. ΜΑΙΑΑ= ΜΗΝ ΜΗΝΟΣ= III 146.24ff. (cf. ΜΑΙΑΑ= + ΜΗΝ ΜΗΝΟΣ=, §6.1.4.4); ΜΑΙΑΑΤΝ ΑΝΟΣ + ΝΑΥΝ: Α 2 31; ΜΑΙΑΑ= [ΝΕ]: Wess. 9 125b 18ff., IV 207.6. ΔΕ ζωώ= A 1 374, III 65.16 (ΔΕ ζωώ ΟΝ), A 1 261 (ΔΕ ζωώ ΜΗΝ ΜΗΝΟΣ); [ΔΕ ΝΟΤ]=: Ch. 86.3ff., 15.28ff., A 1 192, IV 12.7; ΔΕ ΤΗΡΗΣ: A 1 289, III 46.10ff.; ΔΕ ΜΑΙΑΑ=: III 46.12. ΓΑΠ= ΤΗΡΗΣ= III 31.6 Ch. 165.44ff., A 2 546, P 131^1 20 ΚΑ. [ΑΝ]= [ΝΟΤ]=: IV 207.7, A 2 78, A 1 74, 205, III 211.17, IV 38.21, 193.15; ΑΝ ΤΗΡΗΣ=: A 2 151, IV 20.20ff.; ΑΝ ΜΑΙΑΑ=: Wess. 9 144c 24ff.; ΑΝ ΜΗΝ ΜΗΝΟΣ=: A 2 459. ON ΤΗΡΗΣ=: Wess. 18 140b 8ff.; ON ΑΝΟΣ: P 130^2 65 vo. ΓΕ ΤΗΡΗΣ=: A 2 520; ΓΕ ζωώ=: III 67.17ff., 107.14. ΡΥ= [ΝΟΤ]=: III 188.18ff., Ch. 42.10ff., Wess. 9 95a 20ff. [ΝΕ] ΜΗΝ ΜΗΝΟΣ= III 202.27ff., Wess. 9 156a 4ff.

We note that (a) ΓΑΠ, ΔΕ, ΓΕ, ΠΥ all precede the augens, (b) some augentia ([ΝΟΤ]=, ΤΗΡΗΣ=, ΜΑΙΑΑ=) precede [ΝΕ], ΜΗΝ ΜΗΝΟΣ follows it, while ζωώ= occurs in both positions, under a special conditioning (§6.0.3.4) 57; (c) the placement oppositions: ΑΝ ΤΗΡΗΣ= ΤΗΡΗΣ= ΑΝ, ΑΝ [ΝΟΤ]= [ΝΟΤ]= ΑΝ, ΑΝ ΜΑΙΑΑ= ΜΑΙΑΑ= ΑΝ are all formally definable as the difference between adjunctal negation of the augens (‘augens→ΑΝ”) and augential modification of a locally negated(pro)noun (“ΑΝ→augens”). [ΝΟΤ]= ΑΝ is much less common than [ΝΟΤ]= (the former occurs in focalization patterns). ΤΗΡΗΣ= ΑΝ too occurs in focalization patterns, while ΑΝ ΤΗΡΗΣ= is characteristic of rhetorical questions. I cannot find any regulation for ΜΑΙΑΑ= ΑΝ vs. ΑΝ ΜΑΙΑΑ=.

6.1.1 “All”, “Entire(Ly)” (totus, universus 58): group or unitary totality (integralitas).

6.1.1.1 ΤΗΡΗΣ= in cohesion with pronominal refers (in verb syntagms. (a) Actor suffix-pronouns: (A 1 48) ΤΜΟΚΑΖ ΝΗΥΗ ΤΗΡΗΣ 2ΕΙΟΥΝ / Ch. 155.27ff.) ΤΑΙ ΤΕ ΘΕ ΕΤΕΝΠΗΤ ΤΗΡΗΣ / (A 1 381) ΑΤΡΙΟΥΣΗΘ ΤΗΡΗΣ ΘΡΟΥ (sim. A 2 355, IV 36.21, RE 10 161b 1) / (IV 207.4f.) ΝΕΤΝΗΜΟΥΡ ΤΗΡΗΣ ΑΓΙΟ ΝΗΜ ΝΗΝΟΥΡ ΝΕΤΝΗΜΟΥΡ / ΝΕΤΝΗΜΟΥΡ ΝΕΤΝΗΜΟΥΡ / ΝΕΤΝΗΜΟΥΡ ΝΕΤΝΗΜΟΥΡ ΝΕΤΝΗΜΟΥΡ. Additional exx.: III 87.17, 140.2, IV 67.7, 109.16, 191.7f., Ch. 97.10, 133.53ff., 162.44ff., etc.

(b) Object (expansion) suffix-pronouns: (A 2 238-9) ΕΝΝΑΙΝΟΥΡ ΤΗΡΗΣ ΑΝ (sim. Ch. 52.53ff., 11.9f.) / Ch. 197-8) ...ΤΑΡΝΙΑΑΥ ΤΗΡΗΣ / (ΙΙΙ 45.28) ΝΑΙ ΝΕΒΙ ΝΕΤΟΥΝ ΝΗΟΥΡ ΤΗΡΗΣ (cf. ibid. 144.14f. ΖΑΒ ΝΗΜΣΕΗΝ ΝΑΙ ΝΗΜΖΑΑΖ ΝΗΟΥΡ ΝΗΟΥΡ) / IV 36.5f., 49.16ff., 52.0ff., Mun. 161: ΝΗΟΥΡ ΤΗΡΗΣ, a recurring collocation, tending to the final position; (IV 20.20f.) ΜΗ ΝΗΜΟΥΡ ΝΟΝΟΣ ΕΠΟΙ ΑΝ ΤΗΡΗΣ.

(c) Determinators; nuclei of relative forms/nuclei + anaphoric pronoun: (A 1 87) ΝΕΤΟΥΡ ΖΗΡ ΤΗΡΗΣ 2ΡΗ ΝΗΥΗ / (Ch. 18.19f.) ΝΕΤΝΟΥΡ ΤΗΡΗΣ (zero subject, but in 19.4f. ΝΕΤΝΟΥΡ ΤΗΡΗΣ ΝΕ) / (A 2 360) ΝΕΤΝΟΥΡ ΝΑΙ ΤΗΡΗΣ (cf. Ch. 17.28f.) ΝΕΤΝΟΥΡ ΤΗΡΗΣ ΕΡΑΙΕ ΕΧΙΟΥΡ / (Ch. 9 129a 6f.) ΝΕΤΝΙΜΗΥΗΕ ΤΗΡΗΣ / (P 130^1 156 ΤΗΑ) ΝΕΤΝΗΜΕ ΕΑΛΥ ΤΗΡΗΣ / (P 130^2 7 ΝΕ) ΝΕΤΕΖΗ ΜΗΝΟΣ ΤΗΡΗΣ ΕΠΟ / (A 1 121) ΝΕΤΑΤΑΑΥ ΝΕ ΤΗΡΗΣ / (RE 10 163a 38) ΝΕΤΗΝΟΥΡ ΤΗΡΗΣ (ambiguous; sim. IV 36.22a) / (A 1 266) ΝΕΤΑΛΥΒΟΤΟΥ ΕΠΟΤ ΤΗΡΗΣ. Note that here we find only plural refers. Additional exx.: Ch. 130.5f., A 1 388, 446, RE 10 161b 20.

(d) ΤΗΡΗΣ= with adverbial reference, in merely formal cohesion with an actor pronoun or nucleus of a relative form (here also singular): (RE 10 162a 1f.) ΝΕΤΝΩΑΖ ΤΗΡΗΣ / (A 1 14) ΝΕΤΝΗΣ ΕΕΥΗΣΗ ΤΗΡΗΣ / (Ch. 70.43ff.) ΝΑΙΜΗΝ ΕΕΟΤΟΥΣΗ ΤΗΡΗΣ (sim. IV 175.11f. ...ΝΟΥΡ ΤΗΡΗΣ) / (A 2 396) ΕΕΝΑΤΕΒΕ ΤΗΡΗΣ ΝΟΥΡ Π

57 [ΝΟΤ] follows [ΝΕ] when they belong to different cola: ΖΩΝ ΕΕΥΗΣΞΕ ΝΟΤ ΝΕ | ΑΝΟΣ | ΖΜΝΗΜΕΠΗΕ ΜΗΝΟΣ (Ch. 90.9f).

6.1.1.2 THP= IN COHESION WITH PRONOUNS OUTSIDE VERB SYNTAGMS

6.1.1.2.1 Determinators. (a) Plural (definite article, demonstratives, possessive articles): (A 2 247) ΝΕΝΕΙΟΣ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΝΑΡΠΑΙΟΝ (A 1 373) ΑΝΤΑΡΑΙΟΤΗΚΟΣ ΣΕΛΟΥ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΕΤΣΑΙ-ΟΥΛΑ... ΕΙ ΕΒΟΛΑ (Ch. 179.10ff.) ΝΠΕΡΟ- Π-ΝΟΒΕ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΜΠΚΑΣ (Wess. 18 140b 8ff.) ΣΕΝΑΙ ΟΝ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΕΜΠΕΥΣΕΝ ΓΗ-ΑΡΙΚΕ ΕΡΓΟΥ ΑΝ (III 118.11ff.) ΝΥΛΛΑΖΟΥ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΝΧΙΟΤΑΙ ΑΥΘ ΝΕΝΕΙΟΥ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΕΤΕΡΕΝΑΙ ΧΦ ΜΕΠΟΥ ΝΤΑΣΧΙΟΥ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΕΤΒΗΝΤΝ (A 1 289) ΝΕΠΡΟΦΗΝΗΣ ΔΕ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΜΝΝΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΣ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΜΝΝΕΤΟΥΑΛ ΤΗΡΟΥ... (III 215.24ff.) ΧΩΝΤΕΝΕΙΠΙΚΕ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΥΨΙΚΕ.

(b) ΖΕΝΕ- ΤΗΡΟΥ "all sorts of...", especially frequent after ΖΕΝΚΈ-“all kinds of other...” (Wess. 9 172d 6ff.) ΖΕΝΟΣ ἘΠΙΒΗΕ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΕΝΑΝΤΙΟΥ (sim. IV 30.28ff.) / (IV 14.21ff.) ΣΕΝΚΟΥΕΥ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΝΤΕΙΣΕ (sim. ibid. 115.10) / (A 1 114) ΝΤΟ ΠΕΝΤΑΙΠΕ ΣΕΝΕΠΕΝΟΥ ΤΗΡΟΥ “all sorts of evil” (Amédineau’s translation, "tous les maux", is wrong) / (A 2 504) ΕΙΠΕ ΝΖΕΝΤΕΠΝΑΟΝΟΥ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΜΝΕΚΜΤΟ ΕΒΟΛΑ.

(c) Numbers + THPOY “whole”, “complete”: (IV 57.22ff.)...ΕΟΥΝΤΟΥ ΕΟΥΚΟΕΘ ΝΟΥΣΤ ΝΤΟΠΟΥ Χ ΝΑΤ Χ ΥΕΠΟΝΤ ΤΗΡΟΥ “three whole (loaves)” / (ibid. 71.4ff.) ΝΜΝΑΚΟΥΕΒΟΤ Χ ΝΑΤ Χ ΥΕΠΟΤ ΤΗΡΟΥ.

(d) Singular definite article: unitary totality: “the whole”, “all of the...”: (P 1318 108 ro, III 168.5, A 2 108) ΝΜΟΥ ΤῌΡΗ “all that is of death” / (Ch. 99.21ff.) ΘΕΑΠΙΣ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΜΠΑΙΟΣ / (A 2 238) ΚΕ ΠΕΝΖΕΩΣ ΤῌΡΗ “all (that is) of sweetness” / (Ryl. Cat. 35 No. 70 CMΘ) ΤΟΡΙΝ ΤῌΡΗ / (III 184.8) ΤΕΜΠΕΡ ΤῌΡΗ ΤΕ... / (P 1308 52 vo) ΠΕΙΚΣΕΜΟΤ ΤῌΡΗ... ΝΑΙΚΑΙΟΣ ΤῌΡΗ, ΝΕΤΟΥΑΛ ΤῌΡΗ... ΝΧΟΥΕΥ ΤῌΡΗ... ΝΕΣΟΥΕΥ ΤῌΡΗ... (RE 10 161a 27ff.) ΚΟΜΑΛΑΣ ΝΙΟΜ ΤῌΡΗ ΑΥΘ ΠΛΗΜΠΡΕ ΤῌΡΗ ΠΝΙΩΕ ΤῌΡΗ... ΝΟΥΟΕΙΝ ΤῌΡΗ “(thou) who art all might and all strength, all wonder... all light” 58 / Note the recurring idiomatic ΝΤΕΙΣΕ ΤῌΡΗ “so much” (IV 162.6, Ch. 42.2ff., P 1304 48 vo, etc.), cf. Hebrew kol-kax. Additional exx.: Ch. 133.42ff., 140. 17ff., IV 64.11, 163.4, III 37.20, 185.24ff., etc.

(e) Singular indefinite ΟΥ- ΤῌΡΗ “a whole...”, “a complete...”: (IV 153.23ff.) ΟΥΝΑΤΕΙ ΝΟΥΟΝΟΥ Χ ΟΥΟΥΝΟΥ ΤῌΡΗ (A 1 204) ΝΑΝΟ-ΟΥΚΟΘ ΝΡΟΕΙΣ ΤῌΡΗ / NB. (A 2 16) ΟΥΣΟΥΑΝΘΓΙΝ ΝΡΗΣΕ (sic) ΤῌΡΗ “a congregation of people who are all freemen”.

6.1.1.2.2 The possessor exponent in the possessive article (uncommon): (A 2 315) ΝΕΝΑΙΚΑΚ ΤῌΡΗ / (III 43.26) ΝΕΣΟΥΕΥ ΤῌΡΗ. Also ibid. 13.3, IV 34.5f. Plural only, most often 1st person plural.

6.1.1.2.3 Independent pronoun (rare): (Ch. 165.44ff.) ΝΤΟΤΩΝ ΓΑΡ ΤῌΡΗΝ ΝΤΕΝ-ΝΥΠΡΕ ΜΝΟΥΟΕΙΝ / (III 139.21) ΝΤΟΤΕΝ ΤῌΡΗΝ ΝΜΕΡΑΤΕ / (P 1318 88 ro) ΝΤΚ-ΟΥΣΑΡΚΙΚΟΝ ΤῌΡΗ.

6.1.1.2.4 Pronominal subject of a Nominal Sentence. Note the conditioned placement. The predicate noun syntagm is indefinite: (Ch. 22.18ff.) ΖΕΝΦΑΝΤΑΣΙΑ ΤῌΡΗ ΝΕ / (III 217.11) ΖΕΝΕΒΟΛΑ ΑΝ ΝΤΡΕ

58 See §5.1.1.0.1 for the significance of such cases of ‘masc. determinator + “feminine” noun lexeme’. For the sense of the modified syntagm (“he is all heart and no brain”), cf. Ebeling 1905:52ff., 57ff.
THPOY NE vs. (215.10) ZEVEBOA AN NE ZMPKAS THPOY: ZMPKAS interposes between the referent and THP-; otherwise, the pre-referate placement is constant / (A 2 16) ZOINNE THPOY NE; ZOINE is anaphoric to the determinator in the preceding ZENWXX "thieves" / (P 130° 2 π) OUKROU THPOY NE / (P 130° 22 ΦΜΘ) ZEVEBOA THPOY NE ZMNEPHERMA MNNEIWAIT / (RE 10 159b 7) OYUASL THPOY NE.

6.1.1.3 Peculiarities of placement 60. THP- colon-(or sentence)-final: pre-referate: ZENNONHPOE THPOY NE (Ch. 32.48ff., §6.1.1.2.4) / EICZHNTE THPOY CECHE... (III 61-2, sim. ibid. 89.11ff.) / CENAY EPOUE ZMNEI- YWXX NOUH TN THPOY (Ch. 61.5ff.) / NENXAYWK ENECEHT EPOE THPOY (P 131° 81 ro).

6.1.2 ZWXX- "INCLUSIVE/SEQUENTIAL CONFRONTATION" ("he too", "he... in his turn", "he, for his part"); the second term is characterized (§6.3).


6.1.2.1 Post-referate placement.

6.1.2.1.1 In cohesion with pronominal refers: immediate post-referate placement.

6.1.2.1.1.1 Referate in verb syntagms: (a) Actor pronoun: (A 1 39) AYAZOM AYH WYW SW NMMY / (IV 60.27ff.) KATASF ETOYIFPE MOKOS ZATNY ETENAAAC WTTNHE / (Ch. 43.2ff.) (EXW MMOS... XE-...) TNAOXW ZWWT NTIEZ... XE- / (ibid. 51.2ff.) YANHNUEY ZWYN EIPA, "we two" / (III 19.23ff.) TNAOXW ERTY MPYNOEY ZEMBWK ZWYOY / (ibid. 24.12ff.) THNY ERPAY ENEGLIX AYW TETNHNHE ZWTTNHTN. Additional exx.: III 53 passim, 54.2, 64.28-65.3, RE II 15a 8f., etc.

(b) Actor noun-syntagm (determinator); nucleus of relative; demonstrative: (III 63.21ff.) EYXHE-TYAAL MPYHM... MENCEI... EIE AMYNE HWYY... EWYCNEI N EYXHMOY AYW HNE / (A 2 491) ERYAN TEYWIK DE TOSC EIPYOEIC YRANPYOEIC ZWYN NA AYW NNHEPITC... / (IV 105.22) APEMMAK MEN HTOY ZNYOYQOTN, ANAI ZWYOY (sic) HTOY ZNYOYQOTN / (A 1 77) ZENAYAEQ EPOE EYCOOY... YANTOYTAAK KOYI KOYI HTOOY ZEN- KOOYE NTENEMAY SWYOY ON NOXH ESNHMAH / (III 45.5f.) EYXHE-WAPIE NPAIPEIOE K ENEPAWYHN NPYR... EBOA NNYEGL... EIE-NZAAAK EYHOY EYPE NPAI NZEA NCON. Also: III 65.12.16, A 1 373-4.

(c) Object pronoun (expansion): (A 2 462) NETWSOCPE DE EPOO... CAYAONPOY ZWYOY EPOE / (A 2 358) NETWSOCPE EYHTPE EYCHNUSCPE EPOE ZW / (III 144.28ff.) AYAAT ZWYT HNYMOMO NZEA NCON ZPEEYHN / (IV 108.21) NENZAI GAF NAY AYW HNTN ZWTNTHLN PE / (III 162.9) EYXHE-MMOS HNTN AYW NAY ZW ON / (A 1 16) ...EZWN YOYON NIM YW YOYON EPOE ZW.

(d) Post-imperatival ZWXX- (cf. independent pronoun + ZWXX- + imperative, below): ZWXX- is gender/number characterizing: (P 130° 132 TK2) EYNE ZWTNHTN / (IV 86.8) EYHANTMTETUSHE NME ΧΗΧ ΧΝΑ2 EYOYWN-OUWAAY, YARAPNEISHT ΥΡΑΞ; ZW ZWYY NGYEYNOYWN / NB. (Ch. 182.57ff.) XYCPE ZWYY (inclusive 1st person plural, = "1st + 2nd pers."); cf. P 131° 44 PIE: KW EBOA NNENEPHY.

6.1.2.1.2 Determinators; π- etc.: (III 17.6) (The empty sealed tomb is full of bones and impurities) ΠΡΨΗΜΕ ZWYY EΠ-ΝΟΒΕ... ΥΨΟΥΟΥΙΤ, ΜΕΕΣ ΔΕ ΟΝ ΜΟΜΟΚΕΚ ΜΝΜΝΑΚΑΒΑΡΤΟΣ // (Cat. 41 .5f.) OYUASL NCWBE PE PAI ΝΝΝΟΥΔΑΙ ZWYOY "for the Jews too". ZAN-: (A 2 19) ETYEOY ΝΥΨΕ ΑΝ ER-ZENΨΗΜΕ ΝΧΟΥΨ ZWYOY...

---

60 Cf. POLOTSKY 1961:308f. (= CP 412f.).
The possessive exponent of the possessive article or pronoun: (A 2 280) ΕΤΒΕΝΠΟΟΥΩ Ν-...
ΑΥΗ ΕΤΒΕΝΠΟΟΥΩ ΖΩΤΤΥΘΝ / (III 97.2) (ΝΠΟΟΥΤ ΜΕΝ ΝΤΑΣ-ΕΝΟΥ ΝΟΥΜΜΟ) ΝΕΒΕΕΡΕ ΔΕ ΤΟΥΓΕ ΜΕΝ
ΑΣ-ΤΙΣΙΣ ΖΩΗΣ ΟΝ / (IV 50.20) ΕΥΝΑΣΙΑΛ ΜΕΠΥΣΩΒ ΖΩΟΥ ΝΒΕ ΝΑΕΝΗΝΟΥ ΤΗΡΟΥ / (Ch. 186.40f.) (Everyone'
shadow) ΑΥΗ ΟΝ ΤΙΝ ΖΩΗ / (A 1 464) ΝΒΕ ΝΤΑΝΜΟΟΥ ΝΕΒΡΙΕΙΜ ΥΨΗΛ ΕΥΣΙΩΒΟΥΣ, ΤΕΚΚΒΒ ΖΩΗΚ ΝΝΕΚ-
ΨΑΧΕ... ΝΑΙΒΨΕ ΕΥΣΙΩΒΟΥ (ΖΩΗΚ "illoslogically" modifying ΤΕΚ-, instead of ΤΕΚΚΒΒ ΝΝΕΚΨΑΧΕ).

Independent pronoun (very common): (A 1 61) ΑΝΟΚ ΑΥΗ ΝΤΟΟΥΖ ΖΩΟΥ ΑΛ- / (P 1303
133 ΡΟ) ΑΛ-ΕΟΟΥ ΝΑΙ, ΑΝΟΚ ΖΩΗΤ ΝΝΑΤ-ΕΟΟΥ ΝΑΥ / (III 29.10) (the foal can be bridled and tamed) ΑΝΟΚ
ΔΕ ΖΩΗΝ ΟΥ ΠΕΤΝΑΧΟΟΥ / (ibid. 38.19f.) ΕΥΣΗ-ΝΤΝΩ-ΟΥΝΠ Ν ΟΥΑΓΕΛΟΟ ΕΑΕΕΙ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΖΙΤΜΠΟΟΥΤΕ, ΑΝΟΚ
ΖΩΗΤ ΑΝ-ΠΕΖΗΜΑΑΛ / (Or. 153-5, passim) ΕΥΣΗ ΜΜΟΟ ΝΑΚ W ΠΨΙΜΕ ΑΥΗ ΝΤΟ ΖΩΗΤ ΤΕΣΧΙΜΕ... ΑΣΙΚ ΕΡΟΙ
ΑΥΗ ΝΤΟΚ ΖΩΗΚ ΜΑΤΑΜΟΙ... / (A 2 382-3) ΕΥΣΗ-ΝΨΙΜΕ ΝΑΙ ΑΛ- EΠΙΕΤΨ ΖΩΤΤΥΘΝ ΜΠΡΛΝΜΕ ΝΗΤΝ / (A
2 293f.) ΜΠΙΛ-ΤΗΣ ΜΠΝΑΨΑΧΕ, ΑΝΟΚ ΖΩΗ ΣΗΚΑΚ ΝΝΟΟΥ ΝΝΑΡΑΠ ΝΒΕ ΝΟΥΝΚΑ ΕΡΕΒΑΤΗ ΧΙ ΜΜΟ ΕΠΟΥΕ,
ΑΣΝΟΥΣΕ ΝΝΑΨΑΧΕ ΖΗΝΑΤΝΕΤΤΑΤΜΤΩ, ΑΝΟΚ ΖΩΗΤ ΝΤΑΚΡΨΕ ΙΜΟΟ ΜΠΕΘΙΜΕΡΟΣ... ΑΣΛΥΕΙ ΜΜΟΙ, ΑΝΟΚ
ΖΩΗ ΝΝΑΛΑΚ ΕΤΟΟΤΥ ΜΠΕΝΚΑΣ ΝΖΗΤ / (P 1303 Ο ΩΖ) ΚΟ ΜΠΧΟΕΙΚ ΜΠΕΚΖΒ, ΑΝΟΚ ΖΩΗΤ ΦΟ ΜΠΧΟΕΙΚ ΜΠΑΖΒ
/ (A 2 519), an especially illuminating example: ΝΑΥ ΝΒΕ ΑΝΟΚ ΓΕΙΝΑΙΕΙΡ ΝΟΥΖΒΕ ΕΧΣΗΚ, ΝΤΟΚ ΖΩΗΚ ΜΧ-
P-ΑΑΑΥ ΕΧΣΗ ΟΥΔΕ ΓΑΡΟΚ ΜΑΥΛΑΚ. Additional exx.: III 29.27f., 94.15, 124.22, 176.20f., IV 56.5f., 108.5,
Ch. 39.8f., 62.38ff., Or. 157.50ff., 158.14ff., 165.20ff., etc.

Non-immediate post-referate placement (relatively rare). Referate: noun syntagm: (A 1
76) ΝΒΕ ΕΝΤΑΤΕΙΑΓΘ ΝΖΙΜΕ ΕΝΤΑΝΝΟΤΕ ΑΑΑΣ ΝΥΜΜΟ ΕΡΨΝ ΖΧΟΣ ΖΩΗΣ ΟΝ ΕΞ- / (ibid. 87) ΕΥΣΗ-ΣΗΚΑ-ΝΑΧΕ-
ΠΝΙΟ... ΑΥΗ ΝΤΕΤΝΙΑΙ Η ΝΑΙ Ρ-ΒΟΛ ΖΟΟΥ ΕΠΕΧΠΟ... / (ibid. 104) ΜΝΟΜ ΜΜΟΙ ΕΛΙ 2W ΝΒΕ ΝΤΑΣΨΗΨΕ ΜΜΟΙ
(even in the present predicament, let alone if God bring down upon me the retribution or malediction
of this oath...).

Pre-referate placement 63, ΖΩΗ- colon-final (intercolary): (a) Following ΝΟΕ, ΚΑΤΑΘΕ,
ΤΑΙ (ΤΕ ΘΕ), ΝΤΕΙΖΕ 63: (A 1 41) ΠΟΨΥΘ ΕΤΣΟΥΝΤΑΤΧΙ ΕΓΟΥΝ ΕΡΟ ΝΒΕ ΖΩΗΤΕ ΜΠΟΥΨΥΣ ΕΤΣΟΥΝΤΑΤΧΙ ΕΓΟΥΝ
ΕΡΟΥ / (ibid. 297) (they sinned) ΝΟΕ ΖΩΗΝ ΟΝ ΤΕΝΟΥ ΕΤΝΠ-ΝΟΒΕ / (Wess. 9 162c 15ff., parall. III 136.28f.)
...ΚΑΤΑΘΕ ΖΩΗΤ ΕΤΣΟΥΝΤΑΟΨΥ ΝΝΕΣΤ-ΣΒΒ ΝΑΥ... / (A 2 468) ΝΤΕΙΖΕ ΖΩΤΤΥΘΝ ΕΤΣΟΥΝΤΑΤΧΑΙ-ΠΛΟΟΣ
ΜΠΝΟΥΤΕ... ΤΟΤΕ ΤΕΤΝΑΨΗΨΕ ΜΑΚΑΡΙΟΣ / (Borg. 194 15) ΝΤΕΙΖΕ ΖΩΤΤΥΘΝ, Ψ ΕΣΛΑΝΜ ΜΝΑΠΑΙΤΙΚΟΣ, ΝΤΕ-
ΤΝΑΨΡ-ΠΕΤΝΑΝΟΥ ΑΝ. Also III 48.24f., 150.28, IV 36.1, Ch. 105.6ff., A 1 61, 366, etc. Compare also
the recurring, idiomatic (post-referate) ΝΤΑΖΕ ΖΩΗΤ ΟΝ "like me (too)" (e.g. III 150.23, 162.22, 168.15,
171.10, 184.24, P 1304 139 ΤΜΕ etc.).

(b) Following ΧΕΚΑΑ(Α)Σ 64: (A 2 49) ...ΧΕΚΑΑ ΖΩΗΝ ΖΝΑΡΕΖ ΝΙΜ ΕΝΝΑΖΑΡΕΣ ΕΡΕΝΣΗΤ / (A 1 461)
...ΧΕΚΑΑ ΖΩΗΝ ΝΝΕΟΥΑ ΥΠ-ΖΜΟΤ ΝΤΟΟΤΚ ΕΝΕΣ / (Wess. 9 115b 8ff.) ΧΕΚΑΑ ΖΩΗΝ ΕΡΕΝΣΗΤ ΜΤΟΝ, sim.
(P 1304 134 ΤΑΑ) ΧΕΚΑΑ ΖΩΗΝ ΕΡΕΝΣΗΤ ΜΤΟΝ. Compare also the recurring ΧΕΚΑΑ ΕΚΝΑΚΕ/ΧΕΚΕΣ,
ΖΩ ΝΑΙ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΝΝΑΝΟΒΕ (III 135.28f., A 1 87, P 1304 139 ΤΜΕ). Additional exx.: III 104.9f., IV 7.16, 194.12f.,
P 1304 133 ΤΑ.

63 Poletsky 1961:395f. (= CP 399ff.).
64 Poletsky 1961:301, 304ff. (= CP 405, 408ff.). Poletsky treats ΝΟΕ with other antecedents; in Shenoute, — ΘΕ —
clearly has a special standing.

64 Poletsky 1961: 304f., 307 (= CP 408f., 411).
(c) Following a (plural, mostly indefinite) predicative noun syntagm, in a Nominal Sentence: *(RE II 18a 24f.) ζηνιούαλαι ζωοῦ νππει νε (IV 90.18) ζηνρεξετμ" ψυχή ηνωμεί ζωοῦ νε (A 2 12) ζηνζούετερε-ξα-γοά ζωοῦ νε (P 130 137 τα) ηενχυ ζωοῦ νε. Also: III 31.15f., IV 52.7, 91.5, A 2 511, etc. For *(III 187.12) τα ζωηθυτν τε τετεξε *§6.0.3.4.

(d) Miscellaneous cola: *Imperatives: (A 2 320) πο-οειν ψε ζωηθ ηπεντοχαι / (P 131 8 30 Ρμε) κοουν ζωοῦ (sic) ηενταιακοεικ ηοουτε ηατ / (P 130 24 φναι) απεκικνει δε ον ενες ηποιο... κωμ ζωηθ ηοοβε ηεντοχαι. Conjugation-forms (+ expansion): *(IV 205.18f.) Αχξουτ ζωηθ ηεμαι εξωκει εξωκα / (ibid. 105.29) κεξεξειυεπηνοεινοου λνμαι ζωοῦ λμμαι " with them too " *(Pre)modifers: (A 2 76) εισκε-ετθεουκοτε επιλοτε λματε ατισιε ναυτ νπωμε... ετθεουποκοκικικ ζωηθ ηοοβε μπρετέε ηψυχη ηπωμε / (Wess. 9 156a 18ff...) έτθεοουοο ζωηθυτν ερουν ντεισε.

6.1.2.3 The non-commuting, non-phoric ζωηθ: a "particle", exponent of interclausal cohesion *65; "on the contrary", "on the other hand", "rather", "actually". The "particle" ζωηθ can be distinguished from the phoric (within clause extent) ζωηθ in the 3rd person sgl. masculine by criteria of contextual semantics: it is often adverbial, and as a rule not inclusive; by its prevalence in certain configurations (mostly interrogative): *(A I 113, A 2 298) ετθεου ζωηθ / (III 103.7) ζηννεινο ζωηθ / ηεμ ζωηθ ηετμαι (RE 10 164a 2f., Young ir, etc.) / (RE II 15b 1) ου ζωηθ ρε ηεκαζε; of course, also by the significant absence of concord (Polotsky 1961:304 n. 2 = CP 408): *(III 161.13) νεο ζωηθ ηενμαηαι νε- λαολαι / (ibid. 163.19f.) ηεμαι ετθεοουειπο κακαγον αυειπο ζωηθ ηοοουνηρον / (ibid. 51.20) θουηθ ζωηθ ηεμαι επισητ / (ibid. 56.10) (the deviation and evil of the Jewish congregation) ηεκαλοο λματιο ζωηθ ηεται (i.e. of the Christian one) / (ibid. 202.18f.) ηεκαλεικ ε... ηεκαλοο-νοε ζωηθ. Nevertheless, there is considerable overlapping between the auguent, sequential ("... in his turn") and non-commutable ζωηθ. In many instances, the opposition between the macro-syntactic signal (interclausal relator, "anaphoric-regressive conjunct ", referring in a sense to the whole preceding cotext as to a nucleus) and its auguent, clause-extent phoric homonym (referring to a noun or 3rd pers. sgl. masc. pronoun) cannot be maintained unless by subjective semasiological interpretation. Some such ambiguous instances: *(Ch. 169.22ff.) οντως ουαιη ζωηθ ους ομηταιεν ρε / (ibid. 77.41ff.) ηαλακενε ους ουνε... ηαλρομε ζωηθ ρε νεξ- / (III 52.7) (νμοοο ηεκαλακηκ ηεμηορ ηεκηρ-ουα εουηθ) ηηρσαμε ους ζωηθ ηοοουτε, εηκαλεκτεκε εεηκαινα ετθεοειλ ηεκηρ-ουα εουηθ ημμαθ / (A I 162) ηετθεοπομε ηεηεηε εηρε ηε-οουου ηε ουητως ζωηθ ηνοου ηε.

6.1.3 {ντο=}: "non-inclusive (often exclusive) non-sequential symmetric confrontation" ("he, for one", "he insofar as he is concerned", "he, however" *66) or reinforcement *67; the second term is characterized.

6.1.3.1 Post-referate (immediate, non-immediate) placement.

6.1.3.1.1 Referate in verb syntagm: *(a) Actor pronoun (more rarely, actor noun syntagm): *(A 2 298) ετθεου ζωηθ εκρεμε ηεγαιαι η επερεμε ντο / (ibid. 267) (they say what they do not know will or will not*85.*86.*87.
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happen) ΤΝΑΤΑΜΙΟΝ ΕΠΕΚΕΚΟΥΝ ΑΝΟΚ ΕΡΟΩ (sim. ibid. 382, 521, III 128.19f., a recurring expression) / (ibid. 292) ΜΗ ΑΑΔΕΗ +ΖΗΥ ΝΑΑΛΥ ΨΕ-ΑΧΥΤΜ ΝΚΑΛΕΡΡΟΥΟΥ ΝΤΕΤΖΙΜΗΣ, Ν ΑΣ+ΖΗΥ ΝΤΟΟΥ ΝΑΑΛΥ ΨΕ-ΑΧΥΤΜ ΝΚΑΛΕΡΡΟΥΟΥ ΜΠΟΥ / (ibid. 153) ΝΤΑΝΙΝ ΜΡΟΥΕ Ρ-ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣ ΝΕΕΣ ΕΒΕΝΑ ΜΠΗ / ΨΕ-ΕΝΑΙΕΙΡΕ ΑΝΟΚ / (ibid. 374) ΟΥΟΙ ΝΑΝ ΨΕ-ΑΝΑΜΕΛΙ ΕΝΑΙΑΤΟΥ ΝΤΟΟΥ ΝΜΕΤΟΥΟΥ ΑΛΘΟΥ / (P 130\(a\) 8 ΝΠ-ΠΝ) ΕΡΕΘΗΤΙ ΝΤΟ ΕΝΙΜ... ΜΗ ΕΡΕΘΟΤΡ ΝΤΟ ΕΤΑΙ... ΜΗ ΕΡΕΘΟΠΕ ΝΤΟ ΕΤΑΙ... ΜΗ ΕΝΕΚΩ ΝΤΟ ΕΤΑΙ... / (III 21.9f.) ΕΥΣΕ-ΜΝΕΡΟΠΟΥΤ ΨΑ-ΝΟΟΥ, ΑΙΚΟΥΛΕ ΑΝΟΚ / NB., in text-initial position (III 44.18) ≠ ΕΙΖΜΟΟΝ ΑΝΟΚ ΞΙΝΟΥΟΤΟΥ / (ibid. 208.5) ≠ ΑΙΝΑΥ ΑΝΟΚ ΕΟΥΑ / (A I 122) ΕΠΕΚΕΚΟΥΝ ΤΨΗΝ Ν ΕΡΕΣΗΤΕ ΤΨΗΝ Ν ΕΝΑΙΕΙΡΕ ΤΨΗΝ ΑΝΟΚ ΨΕ- / (Cat. 42.33) God said: ΜΑΡΝΤΑΜΙΟΝ ΝΟΥΡΨΗΜΕ, and not: ΤΝΑΤΑΜΙΟ ΑΝΟΚ / (III 156.16) (those who curse their neighbours) ΕΥΣΕΨΗΜΕ ΝΤΟΟΥ ΕΥΣΕΨΥΟΡΤ. Additional exx.: IV 38.21, Wess. 9 95a 20f., RE 10 163 a 27, Ch. 117.8, 156.1ff., 183.57f., A I 123, A 2 18, 78, P 130\(a\) 65 vo, III 65.8, 144.1, 201.9, 211.17 and many more; this is undoubtedly the commonest construction of this augens.

(b) Post-imperative {ΝΤΟ=} is far less common than in the case of other augentia, supplies gender-number characterization of the imperative form. Accordingly, the augens is here evidently different in syntactic status and the ensuing function: it is often indistinguishable from the exposed independent pronoun (§6.1.3.3) 68. (P 130\(a\) 35 \(ΡΜΓ\) ΚΨΗ ΝΚΟΥ ΝΤΟ ΜΠΑΥΞΑΕ / (Cat. 42.33) God said: ΜΑΡΝΤΑΜΙΟΝ ΝΟΥΡΨΗΜΕ, not: ΤΑΜΙΟ ΝΤΟΚ / (III 88.11.141.) ΜΠΡΕ-ΖΟΤΕ ΝΤΣΥΝ, ΜΠΡΕΤΡΑΝΚΡΙΝΕ ΜΜΟΥΝ ΝΤΣΥΝ / (ibid. 145.10) ΜΠΡΕ-ΚΑΚΕΙ ΝΤΣΥΝ / (IV 86.8f.) ΖΚΟ ΝΤΟΚ ΑΜΑΖΕ ΝΤΟΚ ΕΤΜΠΟΡΙΧ ΕΒΟΑ / (ibid. 189.3) ΥΨΗΝΕ ΝΤΟΚ ΜΠΙΣΤΟΣ ΕΚ-ΟΥΑΛΑ / (A I 78) ΝΜΑΣΗ Ν ΨΥΝ ΝΤΟΚ... +ΝΑ+ Η + ΝΤΟΚ.

6.1.3.1.2 The referate: expansion suffix-pronoun (no "direct object") : (IV 119.20f., also 120.4, P 130\(a\) 61 or) ΓΑΣΗΝ Ν ΓΑΣΗΝΤΥΝ ΝΤΣΥΝ, a recurring expression / (P 131\(a\) 23 ΡΟ-ΡΟ) (if God did not spare the ancients), ΕΙΞ ΕΙΝΑ+ΚΟ ΕΡΟΝ ΑΝΟΚ... / (Ch. 57.44ff.) Η ΕΡΕΘΑΝΤΥΑΝΤΕ ΖΗΝ ΕΡΟΩ ΑΝΟΚ’, — note the punctuation / (Wess. 9 147d 28f.) ΟΥ ΕΡΟΩ ΝΤΟΚ ΝΕ ΥΨΗΝE...

6.1.3.1.3 The referate: possessor exponent in the possessive-pronoun syntagm: (A I 69) ΝΑΙΤΨΗ ΝΕΠΕΝΣΑΚΕ Ρ-ΨΑΥ ΝΕ, Ν ΝΕΠΕΝ Ρ-ΨΑΥ ΝΑΣ ΝΤΟΚ, sim. (A I 122) ΜΠΑΥΞΕΡΑΤΧ ΕΞΙΜΨΗ ΝΤΟ your temple, vs. the old Temple / (IV 207.6f.) ΝΑ-ΝΕΤΟΝΣΜ ΜΑΥΑΣΨΗ ΝΕ... ΝΑ-ΝΕΤΜΟΟΥΤ ΑΝ ΝΤΟΟΥ ΝΕ. In the two last constructions, the incidence of [ΝΤΟ=] is remarkably rarer than for ΨΨΗ=. So too, in the case of the next one.

6.1.3.1.4 The referate: noun syntagm (in extraposition): (III 109.19ff.) ΝΕΙΑΤΥΝ-ΣΜΟΤ ΔΕ ΝΤΟΟΥ ΧΨΗ ΝΕΙΑΤΜΠΨΑ ΜΠΕΥΣΑΑΝ ΝΑΥ ΕΞΙΜΕ ΕΜΜΥΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ.

6.1.3.1.5 The referate: pronominal subject of interrogative Nominal Sentence (see also §6.1.3.2), interlocutive person only? ΝΤΚ-ΝΙΜ ΝΤΟΚ (Cat. 42.14, 43.8) / ΝΤΚ-ΟΥΟΥ ΝΤΟΚ (A I 210). The augens appears to be here a rhetoric marker (no answer expected).

6.1.3.2 Pre-referate placement 69: [ΝΤΟ=] colon-second or intercalary. (a) Following ΝΟΕ: (A 2 307) ΝΟΕ ΝΤΟΚ ΕΠΕΚΕΚΟΥΝ / (IV 112.19) ΝΟΕ ΑΝΟΚ ΝΤΑΙΕΙΜΕ / (Ch. 144.2f.) ΝΟΕ ΝΤΟΚ ΕΤΕΧΨ ΜΜΙΣ.

(b) Following the focus modifier in interrogative (focus-initial) focalization patterns (§2.6): (A 2 519) ΝΑΨ ΝΕΣ ΑΝΟΚ ΕΝΑΙΕΙΡΕ ΝΟΥΣΨΒ ΕΨΙΚ / (ibid. 11) ΕΤΕΒΟΥ ΝΤΟΟΥ ΟΥΟΙ ΝΑΥ ΑΝ / (P 130\(a\) 24 ΡΝΑ) ΕΤΕΒΟΥ ΑΝΟΝ ΝΤΟΟΥΨΗ ΑΝ ΕΞΩΚ / (Ch. 169.7f.) ΝΑΨ ΝΕΣ ΝΤΟΟΥ ΕΥΝΑΠ-ΒΟΛΑ... vs. ΝΑΨ ΝΕΣ ΕΥΝΑΠ-ΒΟΛ ΝΤΟΟΥ, e.g. III 75.12. See §6.1.3.3 on the augens: extraposed indep. pronoun issue.

68 Cf. the post-imperative dependent pronoun in Middle Egyptian (GARDINER §337) and of course comparable constructions in numerous old and modern languages.

69 POLOTSKY 1961:310ff. (= CP 414 ff.).
(c) The referate: 3rd person pronominal subject in the Nominal Sentence: (A 1 108) ΠΑΓΕ ΠΑΓΕ ΝΤΟΥ ΝΕ.

(d) Following various predicaions (augens or extraposed pronoun?): (Ch. 90.8ff.) ΖΥΚΕ ΕΞΕ-ΝΤΟΥ ΝΕ ΆΝΟΝ ΖΜΕΤΝΕΙΡΕ ΜΜΟΥ / (A 1 61) ΝΣΤΟΥ ΝΤΟΥ ΕΠΟΥ / (A 1 113) ΕΒΟΑ ΞΕ-ΜΝΣΑΝ ΕΝΑΙ... Η ΞΕ-ΜΝΣΑΝ ΝΤΟΥ ΕΝΕΜΜΑΤ.

6.1.3.3 [ΝΤΟΥ*]: augens vs. independent pronoun, extraposed. On the face of it, the independent pronoun — the prosodically full (or unmarked) pronoun lexeme — is conspicuous in that, like a noun syntagm, it may constitute a whole colon or be the initial component of one. The augens [ΝΤΟΥ*], on the other hand, being prosodically marked as dependent (as a modifier?) can only join (or “fasten onto”) and boundary-mark an existing colon. In the reality of the written parole, however, there are few cases in which this difference can be detected or formally determined in the text (the more so since the pronoun, like the post-referate, occurs as an expansion — an apposed pronominal lexeme, lexicalizing suffix-pronouns). Two especially striking such cases are the appositive phrases ‘indep. pron. + noun’ and ‘indep. pron. + άΥΜ/ΜΝ + noun/indep. pron.’. In the former we find (a) the pronoun serving to introduce a nominal apposition — in complementary distribution with ΝΗ: the interlocutive persons are here prevalent, ‘ΝΤΟΥ + noun’ being uncommon; (b) ‘ΝΤΟΚ + vocative noun’. For the latter, we find naturally only interlocutive persons. Both collo tend to be sentence-final. Polotsky’s “rule of thumb” according to which an augential [ΝΤΟΥ*] occupies second position, whereas the independent pronoun does not, assumes that the augens, like Greek-origin enclitics, is invariably colon-second (pronoun: ΝΑΥ ΝΣΕ ΝΤΟΥ — vs. augens: ΝΑΥ ΝΤΟΥ ΝΣΕ —). Since I believe the augens can (like other enclitics) be colon-final, marking the colon boundary, as well as colon-second; and since the augens (like other native enclitics) may have properties different from the “core” group of Greek-origin ones (§6.0.3), it is questionable whether this distinction is really so tangible. It may imply no more than the variability of the prosodic contour of ΝΑΥ ΝΣΕ. Incidentally, I find in Shenoute no clear instance of ΝΑΥ ΝΤΟΥ ΝΣΕ — (augens), while we do find some of ΝΑΥ ΝΣΕ ΝΤΟΥ with ΝΤΟΥ, the invariably “particle” (§3.1.3.4), evidently enclitic. It is of course not to be taken for granted that [ΝΤΟΥ*] and ΝΤΟΥ share the same prosodic properties.

Examples: (a) ‘indep. pron. + noun’: (P 1301 136 ΤΑΕ) ΕΝΤΕΑΙΗ ΝΟΥΗΡ ΆΝΟΝ ΝΕΙΑΤΔΣΤ / (P 1315 36 ΣΜΒ) ΠΑΙ ΝΤΑΧΙΣ-ΧΑΡΕ ΕΤΒΗΝΤΝ ΆΝΟΝ ΝΕΙΡΜΗ (sic) / (A 1 74) ΝΗΝΙΗ ΆΝ ΝΤΕΙΗ ΆΝ ΝΤΟ ΤΣΥΝΑΓΗ / (II 137.25) ΆΝΕΠΑΝΟΚΟ ΆΛΟΚ ΠΠΕΙΒΗΝ... / (ibid. 13.13fs.) ΠΑΕΒΗΝ (i.e. “my humble person”) ΆΛΟΥ ΝΕΗΕ-ΒΗΝ ΖΙΟΥΟΥΝ ΆΛΟΝ-ΝΕΚΜΟΤΑ ΝΕΝΗΥ / (Ch. 56.29fs.) ΠΑΝΤΟΤΕ ΟΥΤΑΝ-ΤΕΝΟΡΓΕ ΖΙΩΝ ΆΛΟΥ ΝΣΟΝΑΧΟΣ ΆΛΟΥ ΝΟΥΗΒΗ (note the colon-boundary punctuation; also that ΖΙΩΝ and the augens [ΝΤΟΥ*] are not attested as compatible) / (III 60.4f.) ΧΣΗ ΥΠΕ ΜΜΟΥ ΝΤΟΥ ΝΣΟΕΙΣ ΞΕ-. Additional exx.: III 68.9, 70.17fs., 96.9fs., 134.25, A 2 31, etc.

(b) ‘ΝΤΟΚ + voc. noun’: (III 47.4fs.) ΔΙΑΚΙΑΙΣΕ ΕΥΜΟΧΟΣ ΜΜΙΣΤΗ... ΝΤΣΤΗΝ Ά ΝΣΑΠΕΤΙΚΟΣ.

(c) ‘indep. pron. + άΥΜ/ΜΝ + indep. pron./noun: (III 185.6f.) ΆΛΟΥΧΝ ΖΝΟΥΜΧΑΣ ΝΣΤΗ ΆΛΟΥ ΝΤΣΤΗ / (A 1 131) ΤΗΚ ΝΣΤΗ ΝΤΟΚ ΆΛΟΥ ΝΤΣΤΗ / (ibid. 71) ΕΝΝΑΛΥΧΗ-ΠΡΟΟΥΘΝ ΜΠΕΙΣΘΝ ΝΟΥΘ ΜΝΝΕΝΕΠΡΥ ΝΑΥ ΝΣΕ ΆΛΟΥ ΝΤΟ / (IV 38.17fs.) ΕΤΕΒΟΥ ΝΗΛΑΕΙ ΑΝ ΕΝΑΙΝΟΚ ΆΛΟΥ ΝΤΟΚ / (Ch. 159-160) ΑΛΑΛΑ ΖΝΝΕΝΚΕΙ ΟΙ ΆΛΟΥ ΜΝΝΕΝΕΠΡΥ ΆΛΟΥ ΜΝΝΕΙΟΤΟ / (Ibid. 42.14fs.)...ΖΝΝΕΒΟΝ ΝΑΙ ΕΤΚΟ ΝΟΥΘΕ ΕΠΟΥ... ΝΤΟΚ ΜΝΜΕΝΙΚΕΙΝ ΜΜΟΚ / (III 37.12fs.) ΟΥΧΟΥΡ ΝΑΥ ΝΕΗΗΣ ΝΕΤΖΙΚΜ ΆΛΟΥ ΜΝΝΕΝΕΙΟΤΕ ΜΝΝΕΝΕΠΡΥ... / (ibid.
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157.2) ...ΔΥΛΗ ΝΤΑΤΜΕΙΜΕ ΑΝΟΚ ΟΥΤΕΝΛΑΛΑ ΟΥΤΕ ΝΣΑΛΑΙ... Cases like (III 88.11ff.) ἘΙΣΚΗΝΤΕ ΑΝΟΚ ὂνομα- or (ibid. 36.24ff.) ΣΑΝΤΕΟΥ... ὙΠΕΡ ΑΝΟΚ ΜΝΗ- are ambiguous, as are in my opinion ΝΑΥ ΝΣΕ ΝΤΟΥ- (etc., §6.1.3.2).

6.1.3.4 Non-commuting (non-phoric) ΝΣΟΥ is a “particle” 74, an inter-clausal relator, often (like ΙΣΩΣΩ, §6.1.2.3) accompanied by ΑΛΛΑ or ΔΕ. Indeed, its synchronic relation to the commuting (i.e. analyzable) augens [ΝΣΟΥ-] is analogous to that of the particle ΣΩΣΩ to the augens ΣΩΣΩ-. On the formal level, this is a case of “freezing” or fossilization of the pronoun component, which is the cohesion (within clause-extent) or segment-reference factor, in the unmarked gender, namely the masculine (3rd person sgl.) 75. This cancels its segment-reference, its phoricity (a cancelling evident in instances of discord). On the functional level, this entails a shift from intra-clausal modification to inter-clausal relation 76. Some typical and instructive cases of the particle, distinguishable from the augens (3rd pers. sgl. masc.) mainly by discord and sometimes by placement: (A I 123) ΟΥΣΙΗΡΕΝ ΦΕΝ ΝΤΟΥ-... ἘΠΛΗΡΕ- / (A 2540) ΝΑΥ ΝΣΕ ΝΤΟΥ... / ἘΠΛΗΡΕΝ ΦΕΝ ΝΤΟΥ... ΕΝΝΑΤΕ- / (ibid. 76.15ff.) ΠΟΛΛΡΟΣ ΕΤΩΜΕΕΥΕ ΝΤΟΥ ΕΝΑΙ ΕΤΥΧΑΣΕ ΔΕ-... 

The following indicative cases of the particle in construction with other elements: ΑΥΛΗ ΝΤΟΥ, Η ΝΤΟΥ “and moreover”, “or even” and the like: III 32.1, 62.26, IV 80.20, 206.28, 207.25ff. etc. (contrast with Η ΚΕΟΥΑ ΝΤΟΥ, IV 46.29); — ΟΝ ΝΤΟΥ “at least”, III 93.24; — ΔΕ ΝΤΟΥ is of course ubiquitous (e.g. III 145.13); ΕΒΟΑ ΑΝ ΔΕ-... ΑΛΛΑ ΕΒΟΑ ΝΤΟΥ ΔΕ-... III 19.8, 186.5, A I 71, P 1301 139 ΤΜΕ, 1301 10 ΦΡΟ etc.; — ΑΝ ΝΤΟΥ in rhetorical questions, A I 125, 152, Wess. 9 106a 11ff. Consider also the following striking instances of the particle: (III 192.19ff.) (ΜΠΡΑΟΟΟΣ ΖΝ ΤΕΙΝΙΣΤΟΛΑΝ ΔΕ-) ΑΛΛΑ ΣΙΤΗ ΜΜΩΝ ΝΤΟΥ ΔΕ- / (IV 12.10ff.) (ΜΠΡΑΟΟΟΣ ΑΝ ΠΕΙΤΚΤΟ ΜΜΩΣ...) ΝΤΟΥ ΠΕΙΤΚΤΟ ΜΠΡΑΟΟΟΣ / (ibid. 13.9) (this is not the occasion to discuss these things) ΑΛΛΑ ΕΞΩ ΝΤΟΥ ΑΝΟΥΜΕΡΟΣ / (ibid. 15.5) (not in order to slay sinner and innocent alike) ΑΛΛΑ ΑΕΡΗΣΤΙΟΛΟΝ ΝΝΕΝΤΑΜΠΡΟΒΟΤΕΕΝΤΟΟΜ ΜΠΛΙΚΑ / (ibid. 16.18ff.) ΕΒΑΤΙΚΟΣ ΑΝ ΔΙΣΝΕΝΚΟΟΥΕ, ΑΛΛΑ ΕΒΑΤΙΚΟΣ ΑΝ ΔΙΣΝΕΝΚΟΟΥΕ, ΕΒΟΑ ΑΝ ΔΙΣΝΕΝΚΟΟΥΕ... ΜΠΡΑΟΟΟΣ... ΝΤΑΤΜΕΙΜΕ ΔΕ- / (IV 165.19) ΕΙΜΕ ΝΤΟΥ / ΙΣΩΣΩ ΝΤΟΥ - ΤΑΙΝΗΣΥΜΠΑΙΝΕ: post-imperatival particle (“doch”, “done”, with an additional “rest” prosodic signalling role?). The augens/particle are variant readings in (IV 103.1) ΕΝΤΩΡΝΤΟΟΟΜ ΜΜΟΟΥ ΑΝ, ΕΤΥΧΑΣΕ ΜΜΩΝ ΝΤΟΥ/ΝΤΟΟΥ.

6.1.4 ΑΝΑΛΗ- ΜΜΗΝ ΜΜΟΟ- ΟΥΑΛΑ- 

6.1.4.1 ΑΝΑΛΗ-: Poetic, contrastive, exclusive, (less usually) reflexive modification: “...alone”, “only...”, “... (him)self- (by [his] own agency, with no one’s intervention)” 78 (μόνος/, μόνω, ἕμ-/σε-/ἐκατοῦ, κατ’ ἰδίαν).

75 Compare §5.1.2 above.
76 Cf. the illuminating parallel in Old and Middle Egyptian, namely ṣ, ṣk, ṣl., ṣ... the analyzable augens and modifier, where ṣ is the modification, and ṣl the cohesion exponent, vs. ḫē/ḫēf (the latter, at least in the Coffin Texts, a prosodically included alternant), an unanalyzable, invariable particle, “frozen” in the unmarked gender and non-phoric within clause-extent but signalling inter-clausal relation. Celtic parallels are Irish leis (3rd sgl. masc. form of the preposition le-) and Welsh ynteu (old 3rd sgl. masc. “conjunctive” pronoun).
77 Cf. (particle vs. augens/extraposed pronoun) ΝΑΥ ΝΤΟΥ ΝΣΕ ΠΣΙΜΑ Ν ΠΡΙΜΕ ΝΤΡΝ ΝΑΜΕΝΗ... ΝΑΥ ΝΣΕ ΝΤΟΚ ΕΚΝΑΡ-ΨΑΥ...

(BOlr. 3581A 71, No. 202 PDA).
78 Stern §257, Schwarzer-Steinthal 345ff., 468 (“alone” → “self”).
6.1.4.1.0.1 1st sgl. ΜΑΥΑΑΣ, 2nd sgl. fem. ΜΑΥΑΑΤΕ. Two fluctuating bases, ΜΑΥΑΑΣ (with all persons, sgl. and plural) and ΜΑΥΑΑ(Τ) (all plural persons, but also 3rd sgl. masc. and fem.; 2nd plur. ΜΑΥΑΑ(Τ)-ΘΥΤΝ); acc. to Dict. 198a, ΜΑΥΑΤ- is Shenoutean.

6.1.4.1.1 ΜΑΥΑΑΣ in cohesion with a verb syntagm (or verb lexeme). (a) With a single pronominal referate (NB. This construction is not attested with ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΣ); “adverbal”. Reflexive: (Ch. 71.6ff.) ΟΥ ΠΕΝΑΙ-ΖΗΝ ΜΜΟΣ... ΝΚΑΡΑ-ΟΣΕ ΜΑΥΑΑΣ / (ibid. 132.15ff.) ΝΚΕΜΕΛΟΣ ΝΤΑΝΤΆΚΟΟΥ ΜΑΥΑΑΣ. “Only” (A 2 429, not Sh.) ΥΣΕ ΕΠΕΤΕΤΥΜΕ ΡΕ ΚΑΤΑΠΛΗΜΑ ΕΤΈΡΗΜΟΥ ΜΑΥΑΑΣ ΝΓΙΝΗΝΠΗΡΟΣ / (III 109.16) (ΤΕΣΒΥ ΜΜΕ) ΤΑΙ ΝΤΑΥΜ-ΓΌΜ ΜΑΥΑΑΣ ΝΥΩΝΟΣ ΕΡΟΟΥ ΝΓΙΝΗΝΤΑΥΤΆΑ ΝΑΥ ΕΕΗΜΕ... Non-reflexive, “alone”, “on one’s own”, “by oneself (also = with no outside help)”: (RE 10 166a 36f.) ΝΕΤΣΕΕΤ ΜΑΥΑΑΣ (cf. IV 91.22 ΝΕΤΟΥΕΝ-ΕΥ ΜΑΥΑΑ, 156b, etc.) / (III 159.12) ΕΥΣΜΟΣ ΜΑΥΑΑ / (RE 10 164b 31f.) ΕΝΕΤΑΝΝΟΥΣΕ ΟΥΣΥ ΕΤΈΡΗΜΟΥ ΜΑΥΑΑΣ, opp. to line 33 ΠΝΟΥΣΕ ΠΕΝΤΑΧΜΟΟΥΣΤ; cf. ΑΣΜΟΟΥΤΕ ΜΑΥΑΑΣ III 97.19, 204.10 etc. / (IV 161.19) ΝΝΕΡΙΜΕ ΧΙ-ΠΚΩΥΣ ΜΑΥΑΑΣ / (ibid. 103.15f.) ΝΝΕΥΚΑΑΥ ΜΑΥΑΑ / (A 2 31) ΕΝΕΝΟΥΑΒ ΜΑΥΑΑΤΝ “had we alone been pure”. More exx.: IV 107.26, 157.28, A 1 135, A 2 110 (ΝΤΕΝΥΜΠΕ ΑΝ ΜΑΥΑΑΤΘΥΤΝ “you are not ashamed of yourselves”), 535, etc.

(b) With a double (identical) referate; hence the overlapping with ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΣ is more in evidence. Reflexive (contrastive, often “with no outside help”): (P 130 54 ΤΙΔΑ ΜΑΡΗΝ-ΚΒΘΝΑΝ ΜΑΥΑΑΣ / (A 2 190) Η ΕΡΕΙΣΙΑΝΗΝΗΣ ΝΑΡΝΑΚ ΜΜΟΥ ΜΑΥΑΑΣ / (Miss. 284) ...ΕΟΥΕΥΗ-ΜΟΟΥΣ ΜΑΥΑΑΣ (also A 2 93, 509) / (A 2 70) ΑΥΣΟΥΜΟΥ ΜΑΥΑΑΑΤΥ ΜΑΥΑΑΣ / (ibid. 398) ΕΚΕΙΡΕ ΜΜΟΚ ΜΑΥΑΑΚ ΝΤΑΛΛΝΙΠΡΟΣ / (A 2 501, 503) ΜΡΥΨΗΞΕ ΕΚΕΙΡΕ ΜΜΟΚ ΝΑΙΚΙΑΙΟΣ ΜΑΥΑΑΚ/ΝΗΣΥΝΙΣΤΑ ΜΜΟΧ ΜΑΥΑΑΑΖ άΣΥ ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣ/ΕΙΤΑΜΙΟ ΜΜΟΟ ΜΑΥΑΑΑΖ άΣΥ ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣ / (RE 10 164a 27f.) ...ΕΝΤ ΜΜΟΝ ΕΡΓΑΙ ΕΙΝΟΒΕ ΜΑΥΑΑ / (Cl. Pr. 2f b 90) ΠΕΥΞΙΟ ΕΤΕΡΕΠΟΥΑ ΠΟΥΑ ΞΠΙΟ ΜΜΟΘ ΝΤΖΗΤ ΜΑΥΑΑΣ / (III 35.20 parall. Ch. 130.30ff.) ΕΙΤΑΙΟ ΑΝ ΜΜΟΙ ΜΑΥΑΑΣ / (A 2 510) ΝΕΥΟΟΥ... ΝΕΤΟ ΝΟΥΜΝΥ ΕΡΟΟΥ ΜΑΥΑΑΣ / (ibid. 529) ...ΕΝΕΣΜΟΣ ΕΙΝΑΙΕ ΝΜΜΑΙ ΜΑΥΑΑΤ / (ibid. 384) ΑΝΟΝ ΝΗΠΙΗΝ ΝΝΩΝ ΜΑΥΑΑΣ; note the recurring expression “ΤΜΝΗΡΕΩΣΑ-ΓΗΝ- ΕΡΟ- ΜΑΥΑΑ-” (III 176.5f., IV 42.4f., 116.8f., Mun. 163, A 1 219, etc.). This is a very common construction; additional exx. are III 168.1f., 221.21f., IV 32.12f., 92.6f., Ch. 180.15ff., Wess. 9 87a 9f., A 2 118, 372, 519, etc.

6.1.4.1.2 ΜΑΥΑΑΣ in cohesion with a pronoun/synonym syntagm, mostly as a co-locating modifier referring to the predicate of a Nominal Sentence/Cleft Sentence:

(a) Referate: το-, demonstrative, proper noun: (A 2 298) ΚΑΙΓΑΡ ΠΝΟΥΣΕ ΑΝ ΜΑΥΑΑΡ... ΠΕΤΟ ΜΜΝΤΡΕ / (ibid. 32) ΣΔΗΚ ΠΙΔΟΥΜΑΙΟΣ ΜΑΥΑΑΣ ΑΝ ΠΕΝΤΑΧΜΕΡΕ-ΝΥΤΑΕΣ... / (A 1 250) ΤΜΝΑΤΤΣΙΤΜ ΜΑΥΑΑΣ ΤΕ (scil. ΤΕΤΫΝΝΟΟΝ ΜΠΑΔΙΑΙΝ ΕΤΜΜΑΥ) / (ibid. 251) ΝΑΙ ΔΕ ΜΑΥΑΑΣ ΑΝ ΝΤΗΜΜΑΥ / (Ryl. Cat. 32 No. 67 ΤΡΘ) ΝΤΟΚ ΡΕ ΠΝΟΥΣΕ ΜΜΕ ΜΑΥΑΑΚ: ≠ subject-copula-predicate ≠: “you are the only true God” (perhaps a solemn pro-/acclamatory ‘‘ananetic’’ ‘‘theological’’ Nominal Sentence pattern [the έγκ έιμι, σύ είτype], with both terms of equal informative weight; is ΝΤΟΚ the referate? see (d) below with more exx.); compare the recurring ΠΝΟΥΣΕ ΜΜΕ ΜΑΥΑΑΚ (Wess. 9 161b 10f., A 2 547, P 131 105 ro), ΠΜΕ ΜΑΥΑΑΣ “the only true One”, “the only One who is of truth” (Ch. 59.29ff.; for the masc. determinator see §5.1.1.0.1), ΠΟΥΑ ΜΑΥΑΑΣ ΠΝΟΥΣΕ (P 130 35 35 vo) / (IV 184.8) ΤΤΥΝΑΤΤΣΙΤΜ ΝΝΙΟΥΔΑΙ ΜΑΥΑΑΣ (and not ours) / NB. (A 2 354) ΝΑ-ΝΤΗΜΜΑΥΑ ΝΕ, sim. (ΤΑ-ΝΤΗΜΜΑΥΑΤΟΥ) Α 1 193. More exx.: Ch. 95.11ff., Wess. 9 143a 9f., A 2 489, 503, etc. Note here the striking prevalence of adjectival negation (“not only...”, see §6.1.4.1.4), and the very common and typically Shenoutean εΙΜΗΤΙ Ε-/ΕΡΟ- ΜΑΥΑΑ- “but for X alone” (with pronoun: III 90.3, Wess. 9 147b 22f., 162a 9f.; with noun syntagm: III 186.28, IV 62.11f., 171.15, 205.21f., Ch. 99.55ff., Wess. 9 162b 14ff.); this has a native Coptic equivalent in ΝΑ- ΜΑΥΑΑ- (Ch. 60.40f., 109.24ff.) and ΞΑΤΝ- ΜΑΥΑΑ- (ibid. 18.51f.).

(b) Referate: ΟΥ-ΖΕΝ- “only...”, “a mere...” ; again, usually referring to the predicate of a Nom. Sentence/Cleft Sentence: (A 2 167) ΩΝΑ ΜΑΥΑΑΑ ΠΕΤΕΝΜΠΕΣΗΤ / (ibid. 408) ΟΥΡΑΝ ΜΑΥΑΑΑ ΠΕΤΕΤΝΤΑΥΟ
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ММОЧ “a name, no more” — “ПИОУТЕ НПЕ" / (ibid. 303) ЕНЕЗЕНЫНРЕН ЫНМ МАЯА Я НЕ, НЕОЙКОЙ ННОГ-НГЕП ПЕ / (III 212.14f.) ЗЕНАЛНУ ЗНЮЮТ МНЗЕНЮЮТ АН МАЯАЯ МЕТООУСЕ... / (Ch. 196.32f.) ОУЗЕ МННЕУНАТКОН АЮУ ОУЗЕ АН НСУМАТКОН МАЯАЧ / (IV 107.7f.) ОУЗООУТ АН МАЯАЧ, АЛЛЯ ЗЕНЗИОМЕ ОН.

(c) Referate: the possessor exponent in the possessive article; unlike ММИ ММО=, not only with a double identical referate. This construction, much rarer than that with ММИ ММО=, seems to be restricted to inalienable nouns (see §1.2.1.1 spec. obs. 1). ПЕНЗЭР МАЯААН (А 2 143) / НЕОУОУМ ННЕУЛФОР МАЯАА (А 1 239) / (ЗI-M/МАI-) НЕУМТРОН МАЯАА (etc.), a recurring expression (III 127.15, IV 153.13f., 172.21, P 1304 2 П: УОУМЕПТРОН МАЯААЧ ПЕ АУЮ МУОМЕПТРОН АН ПЕ МПЕГИОУУШ) / ТЕУОУШ МАЯАА (IV 165.10, Ch. 56.51f., И 193.222, Wess. 9 145d 17f., 171c 31f.) / ПЕУТКО МАЯАА (Ch. 73.11ff., Wess. 9 171b 30f., P 1304 141 ro) / НЕКМЕЕ МАЯААК (А 1 46) / НЕОУОУМ МАЯАА (III 98.4f., IV 84.8) / ТАМНТНЗЕ МАЯААТ (Ch. 99.30f.) also ТЕКДИКАЮСУН (III 90.8f.), ТЕКЕОУС (IV 89.17f.), ПЕНОУАЙ (А 2 248).

(d) Referate: independent pronoun: (А 2 99) Ψ ΝТОК МАЯААК ПИОУТЕ ЕТЕЗЕНМЕ НΕ ΛΥЮ ΖΕΝΣΑΠ ΜΜΕ ΝΕ ΝΕΥΕΗНΕΥΕ ΘΡΟΥ — a pattern hybrid, a vocative with a Nominal Sentence (predicating ΝТОК — or both terms in an acclamatory Nominal Sentence — yet without a formal pronominal subject or copula). Compare ibid. 173 ΝТОК ПИОУТЕ МАЯААК, в. 1. ΝТОК ПΕ... See exx. for “ΝТОК ΠΕ ΠΙΟΥΤΕ ΜΑΥΑΑΧ” and sim., under (a) above; consider (RE J0 161a 30) ΝТОК ΠΕ ΠΙΟΥΤΕ ΜΑΥΑΑΚ / (Wess. 9 160c 24ff.) ΝТОК ΠΕ ΠΙΟΥΤΕ ΜΑΥΑΑΧ / (RE J1 16b 9f.) ΝТОК ΝΜΕ ΜΑΥΑΑΚ ΠΕ ΠΑΙΚΑΙΟΣ ΑΥΨ ΝΑΓΑΒΟΣ / (А I 283) Ψ ΝТОК ΜΑΥΑΑΧ ΑΝ ΠЕНТАЧΕΡ-ΠΙΟΝΗΡΩΝ / (А 2 16) ΝΤΟΥΥ ΜΑΥΑΑΑ ΑΝ ΕΤΜΗΝΠΑΡΑΔΙΕΣΟΥ / (III 13.8).

6.1.4.1.3 Zero referate: ‘when on (one’s) own” — “adnominal-circumstantial modification”: (Wess. 9 125b 18ff.) (ΤΕΙΥΜΑΛΑ ΤΕΜΜΑΥ) ΤΑ-ΖΕΝΑ ΜΑΥΑΑΑ ΤΕ ΕΝΕΚΡΑΤ (parall. IV 67-8) / (IV 52.21f., 116.22) ΕΤΡΕΥΝΑΑ ΝΚΑΟΥΜΑ ΜΑΥΑΑΑ (cf. ibid. 146.16, not Shenoute: ΖΝΟΥΜΑ ΜΑΥΑΑΑ) / prob. also (Wess. 9 113a 27f. after Mt. 14:13) — ЗΝΟΥΜΑ ΝΚΑΑΕ ΜΑΥΑΑА. Compare ΟΥΜΑ ΖΑΡΙΓΑΡΟ- ΜΑΥΑΑΑ — (§6.1.5.1 below).

6.1.4.1.4 The affinity of ΜΑΥΑΑА with the negator: the ΑΝ adjunctal negation of ΜΑΥΑΑА — (ΜΑΥΑΑΑ- ΑΝ, see §2.9.1.2.3) is extremely common, as a kind of native Coptic equivalent for ΟΥ ΜΟΝΟΝ (§1.3.11.2.1): “not only”, “not just”79; ΜΑΥΑΑА here is, as a rule, ad(pro)nominal. Like its non-cohesive (non-pronominal) counterpart ММАТЕ 80, ΜΑΥΑΑА may occur after ΑΝ, which then negates not the augens but, locally, a sentence constituent including its referate. This analytic difference is however not correlative to any perceivable difference in meaning. Compare the contrast of МАУΑАА- ΑΝ (augens neg. as adjunct: ΕΟΥΟΝΣΕ ΕΠΙΟΥΤΕ ΜΑΥΑΑΑ ΑΝ III 209.14f., ΑΝΟΝ ΜΑΥΑΑΑ ΑΝ ibid. 13.8) vs. ΑΝ ΜΑΥΑΑА (augens modifying a neg. sentence constituent: - ΝΒΑΛΕ ΑΝ ΜΑΥΑΑΑ Wess. 9 145b 2ff.), with that of ММАΤΕ ΑΝ (- ΝΤΕΙΖΕ ΜΜΑΤΕ ΑΝ RE J1 18a 4f.) vs. - ΑΝ ΜΜΑΤΕ (ΨΑΡΕΠΤΙΟΣ ΕΙΟΠΑΝΕ ΑΝ ΜΜΑΤΕ ΕΝ- ibid. 16b 17f.).

6.1.4.2 ММИ ММО= "own", "self", reflexive, non-contrastive, non-exclusive (έκτος, ξεκτυμ, ξειός) 81.

6.1.4.2.0.1 Morphology. The form ММНΕ ММО= is attested in Shenoute (e.g. A 2 17), and could give us an etymological clue (no etymology is suggested for this augens): Young 1α, P 1304 40 ΜΓ; in one MS (Borg. 189) we find ММΕΙΝΟΥ ММО= (А 1 233, 239, 241, 271) beside the normal ММИ.

6.1.4.2.1 ММИ ММО= in cohesion with actor + expansion pronoun in a verb syntagm — more rarely, subject + expansion in a Nom. Sentence. Double identical referate (contrast §6.1.4.1.1): (А 2 302) ΣΧΟΟΥΝ ΓΑΡ ΜΜΟΧ ΜМИ ММО= / (ibid. 108) ΔΕΤΝΣΕΤΒ-ΘΥΤΝ ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΙΝΤΝ / (А 1 204-5) ΕΡΕΥΝΕ ΝΚΑ—

80 Cf. Kickasola 1975:301 and reff. there; our §1.3.1.1.(b).
81 Stern §298 (ММИ "Adverb der Hervorhebung eines Suffixes").
6.1.4.2.2 Referate: pronoun/noun syntagm: (a) the possessor exponent in the possessive article or pronoun: "(his) own"; as a rule, with a double referate; almost exclusively in delocutive (third) persons; as a rule, with inalienable nouns: (A 112) ΕΠΑΝΟΡΤΗ ΕΒΟΛΑ (the net) ΕΝΕΚΟΥΛΗΤΕ ΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΥ / (ibid. 97) ΕΜΠΝΕΤΑΛΑΙ ΕΡΑΙ ΕΝΕΚΟΥΛΗ ΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΥ / (ibid. 213) ...ΕΕΡΚΕΛΕΣΙΑ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΜΜΟΥ / (IV 1.2F) ΕΕΡΚΕΛΕΝ ΗΝΕΚΟΥΛΗ ΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΥ / (A 2 368) ΑΚΙΝΗΤΟΡΟΥ ΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΥ / (RE 10 164b 35f) ΥΠΟΕΚΟΥΛΗ ΗΝΕΚΟΥΛΗ ΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΥ / (III 187.10F) ΑΥΣΙ ΗΝΕΚΤΑΛ ΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΥ. A marginal overlapping with ΜΑΒΑΑΑ- (§6.1.4.1.2c) is evident here. This is the case with ΣΤΟΡ (ΜΑΒΑΑΑ- Α 2 143; ΜΜΟΥ ΜΜΟΥ-, ΒΙΚ 908 σν, IP 203 ap. Dictionary 727); ΨΥΧΗ (ΜΑΒΑΑΑ-, IV 165.10 ΜΜΟΥ ΜΜΟΥ-, ibid. 51.17F). Other examples: A 1 233 (ΠΕΧΝΗ), 276 (ΤΕΥΠΡΟΖΑΙΡΗΣΣΙ), Ch. 175.23F. (ΠΕΧΝΟΥ); note also ΕΒΟΛΑ ΝΗΤΟΥ ΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΥ (A 1 292-3, A 2 341).

(b) Referate: determinators; independent pronouns (predicated in Nom. Sentence/Cleft Sentence): extremely rare, compared with the incidence of the exclusive МАВААΑ- (§6.1.4.1.2): (А 2 49) ΜΑΒΑΑΑ ΔΕ ΜΠΛΑΔΕ ΝΚΕΚΕ, ΕΝΕΚΝ ΜΠΛΟΥ ΕΚΜΠΡΙΜΕ ΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΥ ("comparing the ship to man himself") / (Wess. 9 156a 4ff) (ΗΝΡΠ ΝΚΕΚΒΙ ΝΖΕΡΜΑΝ) ΕΤΕΝΤΩΤΗ ΠΕ ΜΙΝ ΜΜΩΤΗ / (III 177.5) ΝΤΟΥΟΥ ΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΥ ΝΕΤΑΚΑΕΙ ΗΝΕΥΚΑΡΠΟΣ.

6.1.4.3 ΟΥΑΑΑ- "only...", "... alone" is relatively very rare in Shenoute, functionally overlapping МАВААΑ-, compatible (in context patterns, §6.1.4.4) with МИΝ ΜΜΟΥ-, but not with МАВΑΑΑ- (to which ΟΥΑΑΑ- is etymologically related). The forms of this augens on my files are ΟΥΑΑΑ- (3rd person sgl. and plur., ΟΥΑΑΑΑ- (3rd sgl., 2nd plur.) and ΟΥΑΑΑ- (2nd plur.).

(a) Double referate in verb syntagms (+ expansion): (A 1 73) ΑΤΗΣΤΗΜΕΝΗ ΝΗΡΠΗ ΟΥΑΑΑΑΤΗΜΗ / (III 184.15) ...ΑΤΗΣΤΗΜΕΝΗ ΤΗΤΤΥΝ ΟΥΑΑΑΑΤΗΜΗ / (IV 117.4F) ΝΕΤΟ ΝΚΕΒΕ ΝΑΥ ΟΥΑΑΑΑ / (A 2 503) ... ΕΓΚΑΙΟ ΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΥ ΟΥΑΑΑ / (P 130b 52 τ9) ΑΑΙ ΕΠΑΑΟ ΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΥ / (B.L. Or. 8800 18 NZ, this line skipped in error in Ench. 72, to follow line 38) ΜΗ ΝΤΟΤΗΝ ΑΝ ΑΤΗΣΤΗΜΕΝΗ ΤΗΤΤΥΝ ΟΥΑΑΑΑΤΗΜΗ.

(b) Referate: noun, indep. pronoun (predicative): (III 35.6, parall. Ch. 129.36F.) ΡΆΚΟΤΕ ΑΝ ΟΥΑΑΑΤΗ, Ν ΕΦΕΣΟΣ / (Ench. 71a-b) ΝΤΟΤΗΝ ΟΥΑΑΑΑΤΗΜΗ ΑΤΕΝΣΒΕΤΕ-ΤΗΤΤΥΝ ΝΖΝΕΚΒΥΕ ΝΑΟΙΜΟΣ.

6.1.4.4 Context patterns: ‘ΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΥ- + ΜΑΒΑΑΑ-,’ ‘ΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΥ- + ΟΥΑΑΑ-’. The frequent contextual pairing collocation of МАВААΑ-, ΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΥ- and (rarely) ΟΥΑΑΑ- is a striking stylistic-rhetorical device, one that can be put to diagnostic use. The prevalent arrangement, more than twice as common as the other, is ‘МАВААΑΑ- → ΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΥ-’: (A 1 55) ΜΗΝΧΟΝ-ΣΤΗΝ ΖΑΡΟΝ ΜΑΒΑΑΑΑ ΒΡ-ΤΕ, ΕΝΖΙ ΜΙΝ ΜΝΟΝ ΝΓΟΝΔ ΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΥ / (А 2 67) ΥΑΤΝΑΥ ΕΝΣΥΡΟΥ ΜΙΝ ΜΑΒΑΑΑΑ ΑΥΣ ΕΝΣΥΡΟΥ ΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΥ / (ibid. 241) ΕΥ-XΕ-ΠΕΡΙ-ΝΟΒΕ ΝΑΤΑΚΟΥ ΜΑΒΑΑΑΑ ΝΗΒ ΕΣΤΗΖ, ΠΕΡΙ-ΠΕΡΙΝΑΟΥΝ ΟΥ ΝΑΣΜΥΤΥ ΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΥ / (ibid. 458 [not Sh.], III 224.9f., 17f.) ΟΥΖΝΥ ΠΕ ΕΥ-ΑΝΚΟΥΝΥΝ ΜΑΒΑΑΑΑ. ΜΠΑΤΕΤΓΕΝΣΗΣ ΓΑΡ ΟΥΑΑΑΑ ΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΥ /

Stern §257, Schwarze-Stenthal 346.
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(IV 6.18f.) ΕΥΓΟΝΤ ΕΡΟΟΥ ΜΑΤΑΤΟΥ ΝΟΥΗΡ... ΑΥΣ ΕΥΧΑΙΩΥ ΕΡΟΟΥ ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΟΥ / (Ench. 85a) ΝΕΝΤΑΥ-ΞΡΟΙ ΝΑΥ ΜΑΤΑΤΟΥ ΑΥΣ ΕΑΥΨΙΓΕ ΝΑΥ ΝΚΑΝΔΑΛΟΝ ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΟΥ. In (III 146.24f.) ΑΙΧΙΤ ΝΟΓΚΟΝ ΜΑΤΑΤΟΥ ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΙ we have true clause-internal compatibility. Additional exx: : III 162.11ff., 14ff., 165.16ff., 176.6ff., IV 51.16ff., A 1 305.

'MΜΙΝ ΜΜΟ= ΜΑΤΑΤΟΥ=': (A 1 219) ΝΙΞΒΗΥΕΕ ΕΤΠΛΑΣΕΕ ΜΜΟΟΥ ΖΜΠΕΝΖΗΤ ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΥΝ ΑΥΣ ΤΗΜΝΤ-ΡΗΚΑΙ-ΤΗΝ ΕΡΟΟΥ ΜΑΤΑΤΟΥ / (A 2 345) ΠΕΤΤΥΒΕΕ ΜΜΟΟΥ ΠΛΑΚΕΕ ΕΞΟΡΟΥ ΕΡΟΟΥ ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΟΥ ΕΤΡΕΨΥΡΨΙ- ΥΨΙΓΕ ΜΜΙΝ ΜΑΤΑΤΟΥ / (Wess. 9 176a 22ff.) ΑΥΤΨΟΥΝ... ΕΖΡΑΙ ΕΞΟΡΟΥ ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΟΥ ΕΑΥΤΟΥΝΟΣ ΕΜΑΤΕ ΕΖΡΑΙ ΕΞΟΡΟΥ ΜΑΤΑΤΟΥ ΝΗΣΒΗΥΕΕ ΕΛΨΟΥΝ ΕΡΟΟΥ ΟΥΑΛΥ ΑΥΣ ΕΑΥΜΑΤΟΥ ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΥ. Other exx: : A 1 17, A 2 45, RE 16 146b 21ff.

'ΟΥΑΛΥ= ' 'ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΟ=': (A 2 504) ΑΙΧΤΟΝ ΝΙΞΒΗΥΕΕ ΕΛΨΟΥΝ ΕΡΟΟΥ ΟΥΑΛΥ ΑΥΣ ΕΑΥΤΟΥΝΟΥ ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΥ.

Note also the cotelxual combination of the two augentia in the following instances: ΝΕΥΜΤΟΝ ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΟΥ: ΝΕΥΜΤΟΝ ΜΑΤΑΤΟΥ (A 1 9.4.7); ΑΝΓ-ΟΥΚΑΤΑΡΟΙ ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΙ: ΝΤΕΝΤ-ΖΕΝΚΑΤΑΡΨΗΝ ΜΑΤΑΤΩΝ ΝΤΕΝΤ-ΖΕΝΚΑΤΑΡΨΗΝ (III 117.6:11); ΕΤΡΕΨΠ-ΖΗΒΕ ΝΑΝ ΜΑΤΑΤΟΥ: ΕΨΡΑΝΤΝΠΡΨΗΜΕ ΝΚΑΣ ΝΗΣΤ ΕΛΨΥΕ ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΥ (ibid. 213.14:16f.).

6.1.5 Border-line Augentia: ΖΑΡΙΖΑΡΟ=, ΝΑ= are adjunctive prepositional modifiers pronominally cohesive ("reflexive"), with greater or lesser regularity and predictability of this cohesion. On the whole, however, they are adverbial (ad-lexemic) rather than ad(pro)nominal modifiers (although this distinction is gradient, not dichotomic, to judge by "true" augentia).

6.1.5.1 ΖΑΡΙΖΑΡΟ= "apart", "own", "on one's own" (Dictionary 634). (a) Adverbial (ad-lexemic) - usually intransitive verbs: (III 210.9) ΕΧΝΑ ΕΧΝΗΥ ΕΧΚΙΜ ΖΑΡΙΖΑΡΟΥ / (ibid. ibid. 18ff.) (of the soul) ΠΕΝΙΨΤΗ ΠΕΝ- ΚΨΤΕ ΕΖΡΑΙ ΖΑΡΙΖΑΡΟΣ (v.l. ΖΑΡΟΣ) / (ibid. 117.6ff.) ΕΤΡΑΣΧ ΖΑΡΙΖΑΡΟΙ ΕΙΜΟΚΖ ΝΗΣΤ (also IF 95 apud Dictionary 643b) / (P 1317 45 vo) ΝΕΣΒΗΥΕ ΕΤΨΟΥΕ ΕΑΑΥ ΖΑΡΙΖΑΡΟΝ / (P 1318 16 vo) ΕΨΡΑΝΤΝΟΥΑ ΔΕ ΕΛΨΥΕ ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΥ ΖΑΡΙΖΑΡΟΥ (note the partial personal concord with the referate — "mixed" concord, an inverse kind of "style indirect libre" or "erlebte Rede"). Additional exx: : A 2 14, Ch. 42.26ff., P 1301 135 ΤΑΕ.

(b) Adnominal ("apart"): (Wess. 9 176a 3ff.) (they sinned against him, every one in his own way) ΤΣΥΝΑΨΗΝ ΝΚΟΡΕ ΖΑΡΙΖΑΡΟΣ... ΝΕΝΤΑΨΗΡΝΥΕΕ ΖΑΡΙΖΑΡΟΟΥ, ΝΕΝΤΑΨΗΡΝΥΜΕΕ ΕΤΨΟΥΕ ΖΑΡΙΖΑΡΟΟΥ ΑΥΣ ΝΚΟΟΥΕ ΥΘΡΟΥ ΖΑΡΙΖΑΡΟΟΥ / (IV 167.18f.) (every one to his job), ΝΕΤΡ-ΖΜΕΕ ΖΑΡΙΖΑΡΟΟΥ, ΝΕΤΖΑΜ ΩΝ ΖΑΡΙΖΑΡΟΟΥ, ΝΜΝΚΟΟΥΕ ΥΘΡΟΥ ΚΑΤΑΣΑΗ (compare §§ 6.1.4.1.3).

(c) An instance of zero referate? (IV 91.14f.) ΕΥΝΑΨΗΝΕ ΝΟΥΜΑ ΖΑΡΙΖΑΡΟΟΥ ΜΑΤΑΤΟΥ (compare §6.1.4.1.3).

6.1.5.2 ΝΑ= 83 is a componental modifier of the verb lexeme (intransitives, mostly verbs of movement or posture; note one instance of ΟΥΨΜ intransivialized by ΝΑ=), which occurs as a rule as imperative; ΝΑ= signals here a special address tone, corresponding (in non-imperatives) to a self-centered mode of action (Aktionart); this often amounts to perfective-aspect characterization. Note that, like other augentia, ΝΑ= here also supplies the gender-number characterization 84. (A 1 73) ΑΝΑΞΨΠΕΙ ΝΗΤΝ / (A 2 224) ΕΙ ΝΗΤΝ ΝΝΕΤΝΖΑΟΝΝΗ ΝΧΨΜ / (ibid. 398) ΜΟΨΡΕ ΝΑΚ ΕΒΟΑ / (III 192,1. Ench. 67a) ΜΟΨΡΕ ΝΑΚ ΕΖΡΑΙ / (Wess. 9 139d 12ff., 26ff.) ΒΨΚ ΝΗΤΝ ΕΡΑΤΟΥ... ΒΨΚ ΝΗΤΝ ΕΜΑΥ / (IV 104.1) ΕΥΝΑΝΚΟΤΚ ΝΑΥ ΜΜΑΥ, jussive. Rarely, we find non-imperative verb-forms: ΠΨΤ ΝΑ= "run away" (IV 121.27, 171.2f.) and ΟΥΨΜ ΝΑ= "eat away" (Quot. (2) ΤΕΨΨΧ ΥΘΡΟΥ ΝΤΕΨΟΥΜ ΝΕ ΕΒΟΑ ΖΜΝΤΑΡΕΠΕΙΨΝΜΕΕ ΕΨΡΟ).

83 Stern §503. For the prosodic affinity of ΝΑ= with the augens see Polotsky 1961:313 (= CP 417), Emmel 1981 (esp. 137f.).

84 On the so-called "ethical dative" in Egyptian — a term singularly infelicitous — see Hintze 1950:82ff., with further literature.
6.2 The Augens and Modification

Beyond the paradigmatic identity of the augens, by itself amply indicative of its modifier status (as are also, without exception, the respective etymologies), we have encountered several instances where, even if formally in ad(nominal) cohesion, the augens nevertheless modifies the verb syntagm as a whole or its lexicem component. Two augenia have pronoun-less kindred and functionally close or concurrent associates: **MATE** for **MAAYAA=** (A 2 18 NTAEMOYYUC MATE H NTAYSH EGNY MAAYAAH, the negation to be referred to both clauses / III 209.1f.  EYNYOYNE EYNOYTE MAAYAAH AN ALAA ENKKEEME ON, OYTE NTAYSH AN MATE TETO MNMTPE NNEYNMATCETONIC, ALAA NENOY ON) and **NOYSH** "singly", ad-nominal, which is (as unit-defining) quite different semantically from **OUAA=**. (NOYSH, like the adnominal MAAYAA=, is also a focusing adjunct.)

6.2.1 Focalizability. Most augenia occur in focalization patterns (Ch. 2), where they either co-mark the focus or, more rarely, constitute together with their referate a complex (pronoun + augens) focus; this is common with **MIN MMOM=**, **MAAYAA=** and **OUAA=** (where I would impressionistically say this accounts for about a third of all occurrences): (A 2 238-9) EYNYOYNE THROU AN / (ibid. 99) NTAYSHOC EYNYH MIN MMOM / (ibid. 403) NEEANAYXAE AN ZAROCH ALAA EYNYXAE-NEYXACOTMC / (ibid. 547) EYNYXAK EBOA EYNYXAKAN MAAYAAH / (A 1 305) MH EYNYXET-THI EYNYXETI MAAYAAH / (ibid. 239) EYNY-NOYNE EROOY MAAYAAH / (Wess. 9 144c 24ff.) EYNYXOC AN MAAYAAH NTAYSHOC... / (A 2 473) EYNYXH AN MNNOYTE ALAA EYNYXH MMOM OYAAH. More exx.: III 78.23ff., 165.16ff., IV 38.22ff., 96.13,17, RE II 17a 1, Ch. 28.32ff., 72.49ff., 76.52ff., 109.36ff., Wess. 9 110b 7ff., etc. Compare also the same augenia as co-focal in the "nominal" Cleft Sentence (§§6.1.4.1.2, 6.1.4.2.2): (A 1 251) NAI DE MAAYAAH AN NENNMMAH / (III 177.5) NTOOY MIN MMOMOY NENNCI NENYKAPGC.

6.3 Concluding Note: On the Functional Essence of the Augens

To be precise, one must distinguish between the roles of the pronominal and lexicem components of the augens: the former serves the purpose of cohesion, gender-number characterization (after the imperative and zero referates) — this component is syntagmatically operative. The lexicem component, on the other hand, is paradigmatically assignable:

- **distinctive confrontation**: **Exclusive**
  - marked (+)
  - neutral (θ)

- **distinctive confrontation**: **Inclusive**
  - 2W= **NUO=**
  - MIN (θ)

The prevalence of - 2W= on - compared with -DE [NUO=] is instructive for the semantics of the augens; so also is the fact that whereas 2W= is invariably the second term in the cotextual patterning, [NUO=] is either first or second (although as the second term — in anaphoric contrast — it is undoubtedly more frequent).

---

85 Consider however NHC VII 125.6 vs. line 25f. NTK-AYNWYNEA OYAAH AYSH EYNZ vs. NTK-AYNWYNEA NOYSH EYNZ. Note also "adverbial" 2W= in Rom. 11:21 (translating κατά φῶνα), see Dictionary 651b.

86 On the other hand, 2W= occurs as adjunct to the theme/topic: (IV 195.4) MH EYNYXAE ZW=OYNE AN / (Ch. 106.25ff.) EYNZ ZW=TIM TEPEX MMOMAXOC, but also co-focally: (III 56.14) NTOC ZW=NKE MMOMOC, fusc. pattern (3), §2.3.2.

87 The prevalence of - 2W= ON - compared with -DE [NUO=] is instructive for the semantics of the augens; so also is the fact that whereas 2W= is invariably the second term in the cotextual patterning, [NUO=] is either first or second (although as the second term — in anaphoric contrast — it is undoubtedly more frequent).
of all augentia serves to mark a prominent topic (§2.0.2.1) \(^{88}\): like other well-known syntactic phenomena, augential modification (esp. by \{NTO\}) constitutes an option of staging (§2.0.2.0.1) and a means of information structuring. The augens is essentially a dialogue, not narration element (first-person egocentric "reporting" narration excepted). It is not per se "emphasizing"(§2.0.2.2), although it does often play a contributive part in focalization: confrontation does after all cover a considerable section of the spectrum of inter-clausal coextexual relations, for which focalization is in a way the archetypal functional category.

---

\(^{88}\) The prominent topic — also marked by extrapolation (§6.0.1) — should be kept distinct from the marked logical predicate (rheme/focus), pace Callender 1970:186ff.
THE CONJUNCTIVE: AN N-MARKED CONJUGATED ADNEXAL MODIFIER

7.0.1 Research-historical: grammatical opinion
7.0.2 A morphological note on the Shenoutean conjunctive
7.1 Categorial and macro-syntactic characterization of the conjunctive
7.1.1 A non-initial, inherently satellital verb-form: a modifier
7.1.2 Verbal nucleus: the conjunctive a categorizable, atemporal, amodal form; group categorization; micro-/sub-coordination; ἄνω vs. θ-; compatibilities; text-grammatical properties; paradigms
7.1.3 Non-verbal nucleus: the conjunctive an adnexual (rhetic) modification form
7.2 Cotext patterns and paradigms - the VERBAL NUCLEUS
7.2.1.1 Nucleus: THE IMPERATIVE SYSTEM: imperative, rhetorical jussive (Μάπτε- /Μπττε-), preceptive jussive (ἐναλ- /Νενα-), future III
7.2.1.1.5 The post-imperatival paradigm
7.2.1.2 Nucleus: OPTATIVE (ἐνευσκτ/Νεναςκτ); paradigms
7.2.1.3 Nucleus: FINAL/CONSECUTIVE CONJUNCTURAL SYNTAGMS; paradigms
7.2.2 Nucleus: EXTRATEMPORAL PREDICATIONS: ἔνικτ/Μενικτ, ἔναιτ/Μεναιτ
7.2.3 Nucleus: PRESENT-BASED FUTURE (Μναςκτ)
7.2.4 Nucleus: PROTATIC SYNTAGMS AND VERB FORMS
7.2.4.1 Nucleus: ATEMPORAL, GENERIC VERB FORMS: relative-protatic present, parabolic perfect
7.2.5 Nucleus: APERSOINAL/PERSOINAL VERB NOMINALIZATIONS: the infinitives; the generic person; paradigms
7.2.6 The rhetorical apodotic-retrospective role of the conjunctive; poorly documented or inadequately established functions
7.3 The NON-VERBAL NUCLEUS: adnexual (rhetic) conjunctive
7.3.1 Nucleus: PREDICATIVE MODIFIER
7.3.1.1 "Conjunctural" modifier + conjunctive syntagms
7.3.2 Nucleus: PREDICATIVE NOUN (adnominal conjunctive)
7.3.3 Nucleus: MISCELLANEOUS PREDICATIVE SYNTAGMS OR EXPRESSIONS
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7.0.1 RESEARCH-HISTORICAL: GRAMMATICAL OPINION

The conjunctive is, I believe, the most intriguing of Coptic verb forms: with the circumstantial (§7.1.3) it is probably the most important systemically. While its general semasiological value is fairly well understood, we are in the dark regarding its true nature, its syntagmatic and paradigmatic relationships, a comprehensive theory to cover all its functions. We know approximately what the conjunctive does environmentally; we do not understand its mechanism, nor its own value. Whereas the pre-Coptic (esp. Late Egyptian) conjunctive has had to date no less than nine monographs devoted to it (by Gardiner, Mattha, Černý, Wente, Sauneron, Lichtheim, Volten, Callender and Borghouts, in that order), not to
mention lengthy grammar and textbook discussions, we have had none for Coptic. This is unfortunate and redolent of the prevailing complacency about "familiar" Coptic grammatical categories. One suspects that giving the form a traditional "Indo-European name" has to some extent blunted the need for a fresh, unbiased examination, as well as prejudiced the appreciation of the function of this form, unconsciously and perhaps inevitably (witness the modal overtones rashly attributed to the Coptic conjunctive). In Egyptian, on the other hand, the strangeness has not been so damped ("conjunctive" in Egyptian is second- or third-hand terminological transference). Whoever hopes to find a consistent, integral systemic picture in the grammarians' descriptions 1 is due for a disappointment. He will have to become reconciled to the unaccounted-for, functionally dual nature of the form — "conjunctival" ("continuing") and "subjunctival" roles; to statements in terms of ellipsis, of various whims of this peculiar form, not to mention the fragmentated account: no taxonomy or descriptive statements in terms of functional load, compatibilities and generally système de valeur can be found. Corpus-specific statements are rare. Stern's account is, as usual, the most careful and reliable, and his presentation of the data is precise and cannot be faulted, even if his interpretation of them is sometimes open to objection. A paraphrase (in the original terminology) of the average impression would run as follows (no criticism is offered at this point): the conjunctive is a subordinated-clause form, serving as a coordinated ("copulative") continuation of preceding verb forms — it can be introduced by such conjunctions as ἈΥΘ, Η, ΟΥΤΕ, ἈΛΛΑ. Being too weak to constitute an autonomous sentence, it connects mostly subject-identical sentences to the main verb-form. In Bohairic, and to a lesser degree in Sahidic, it also has a "subjunctive" role 2. It may have various modal values ("subjective", final-consecutive, with or without suitable conjunctions). In independent status, it expresses modal, deliberative or future nuances of will or obligation. It can also be dependent upon a Nominal Sentence 3; it can be adnominal 4. Callender's pan-chronic remarks (1973a:69ff) call for special attention. In the framework of a generative model, he says, the conjunctive can be handled in a "natural" way ("a natural explanation", p. 72). This is by no means a description, let alone a categorial or role appraisal, but one possible schematization of conjunctive constructions (meant to illustrate the advantages of a generative model). Although helpful (if one subscribes to, and deems instructive, "deep structure" realities), this presentation does not in any way add to our understanding of the Coptic system of grammar.

While I do not offer here a critical appraisal of the above statements — my own stand will be made clear in the course of the following paragraphs — I must point out that a careful examination of the examples on which they are based lends one to reject the modal functions alleged for the conjunctive. Moreover, there is no doubt that a dialect-internal, or better corpus-based investigation would make for better insight into the issues of ἈΥΘ - vs. Θ-, TA- vs. ΝΤΑ- in the 1st person sgl., and the functioning and compatibilities 5 of the form.

1 Stern §§40ff, 595; Steindorff 1951:§§366-372, 386; Till §§321ff, 366, 401, 416, 485, etc.
2 On this "subjunctive" role (mainly in the 1st person) see Stern §§442-6, Till 1928:§139d, Steindorff 1951:174, Till §421, Nagel 1969b:§55b; often it is obvious that the alleged modal value stems from misinterpretation of the construction or from the "quicksands of translation".
3 Till 1928:§139d.
4 A most important observation (see §7.3.2 below). However, the sole example offered by Till and Steindorff (Job 10:21 ὥτασι ἐγνώκατα ΝΤΑΜΚΟΤ) is not conclusive, since the conjunctive may be taken (in sense, even if not formally) to continue ὥτασι (cf. the Hebrew בָּאשִׁית בֶּן בֶּן הָעָלִים הַבָּנִים, Greek ἢκα οἴκος ἀναστήρισης).  
5 Most present-tense examples turn out to be either of the protatic circ. present (our §7.2.4) or non-actual, non-temporal or futuric (predicating NH). Stern's one example of the conjunctive continuing past tense (Act. 27:33) is emended into the circ. present (so Thompson); the conjunctive in Steindorff's example (Joh. 12:5) is apodotic rather than continuitive (our §7.2.6). Nagel's exx. of the "independent" conjunctive in NHC II (1969b:453) may all be interpreted as apodotic or governed by η (our §7.3.1.1; on the issue of the "independent" conj., cf. Polotsky 1962b:479 = CP 270). His "final" conjunctive (p. 455) is in fact part of the discontinuous ΧΕΚΑΛ... conjunctive syntagm. The conjunctive allegedly continuing the perfect (p. 455) is not conclusive, and can be referred to Ν+infinitive.
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7.0.2 A morphological note on the Shenoutean conjunctive. But for occasional instances of transmission of a phonetic actualization of the conjunctive, with the supralinear stroke in its base replaced by the vowel ε: NEKCIUTM (e.g. in IV 60.22), Shenoute’s conjunctive has the classical Sahidic morphology. For the first person singular, ΝΤΑ- is by far the more common form (over thirty occurrences in Ch. and L); ΤΑ- is attested almost exclusively in the post-imperative paradigm (§7.2.1.1.1) where the conjunctive has assumed part of the functional load of the classical ΤΑΠΕΚΙΤΜ (§7.2.1.1.5); ΤΑ- is thus specialized, at the overlap point of the two post-imperatival categories, while ΝΤΑ- has been generalized; at any rate, the two are not mere variants in Shenoute.

7.1 Categorial and macro-syntactic characterization of the conjunctive

7.1.1 A non-initial, inherently sattorial verb-form: a modifier. The Coptic conjunctive is a non-autonomous finite Tripartite Clause conjugation form. Non-initial by nature, it is a specific modifier verb expanding (a) a verbal nucleus (§7.1.2, 7.2), (b) a non-verbal nucleus (other modifiers or nouns, often in predicative status; §§7.1.3, 7.3). The homonymy of its base (Ν- pnominal and pre-zero allomorph ΝΤΑ-) with Ν- the modifier marker par excellence, is in all probability meaningful (its pre-Coptic forms notwithstanding); so is its synchronically peculiar personal morphology (the only Tripartite Conjugation base not followed by a ‘‘suffix’’-paradigm pronoun). Except for the 1st person singular, this is homonymic with the Bipartite Pattern pronominal actor. This, no less than the base of the conjunctive, must be a constituent part of its distinctive feature, symptomizing its functional speciality as an inductible, categorizable form. More on the correlation of its formal composition and functional value — adnexal modification — see §7.1.3 below.

7.1.2 The verbal nucleus: the conjunctive a categorizable, atemporal, amodal form; group categorization; micro-/sub-coordination; ΑΥΩ vs. Θ-; compatibilities; text-grammatical properties; paradigms

7.1.2.1 The conjunctive is a categorizable verb-form, that is not only retro-dependent but impressed with the characteristics of the nuclear form expressed by a conjugation base, converter or any other formal indications of tense, mode or syntactic status. Of its own, the conjunctive has only (beside the ability to predicate a verb lexeme) the exponents of person (nom. and pronominal actors) and negation categories; yet even for those the conjunctive may still be induced by the nuclear verb: this is signalled by the negative fact of non-assertion (zero) of negation, by the junctural linkage of pronominal-personal concord. By the assertion of negation (ΤΜ in its proper slot), or by the disruption of the said concord for the (pro)nominal actor, the conjunctive is auto-categorized for negation and person respectively. The conjunctive is not tense/mode-indifferent, but ‘‘co-qualifiable’’ 11. By itself unmarked for these categories, it is marked cotextually, with the effect of constituting, together with its nuclear verb, a specific

---

6 See Polotsky 1944:10ff. (= CP 115ff.).
7 Polotsky 1944:1ff. (= CP 106ff.), 1950:87ff. (= CP 222ff.).
8 Variation status for ΝΤΑ-/ΤΑ- in Shenoute immediately identifies the non-Shenoutean grammatical system of quotation (III 56.10ff., 111.14ff., IV 26.22ff., Ch. 193.7ff. etc.).
9 Diachronically, the original form of the conjunctive (acc. to Gardiner’s thesis), ΒΝ-NTF-SDM, is analyzable as a proposition governing an (actor + verb) nexus, with its modifier status evident (BΝ features in all reconstructions. See Borghouts 1979 notes 2 and 9).
10 I have no example of the nucleus - conjunctive dependency being adjunct-negated by ΑΝ (cf. §2.9.1.2.3 for other clause-conjugation adjuncts. In I Cor. 4:19, AN negates another modifier).
closely knit subtextual unit, its cohesion signalled by syncategorization\(^\text{12}\): the conjunctive represents\(^\text{13}\) the nuclear verb in the linear sequence, with reduced characterization. The conjunctive extends, evolves, unravels and contextualizes the nuclear notion, or attaches\(^\text{14}\) and often serializes additional verbal notions, in a construction that is paradigmatically related to (and in contrastive analysis is comparable with) a coordinated complex.

7.1.2.2 The 'verb - conjunctive' dependence does not strictly fit the usual narrow definition of coordination (cf. Dik 1972:25ff.: ‘the coordinated terms are equivalent as to grammatical function and bound together at the same level of grammatical hierarchy’\(^\text{15}\)) since the two terms are syntactically not on a par. Moreover, their attachment may be either paratactic-asyndetic (juxtaposed) or syndetic, with \(\text{AYW, H} (\text{NTO}4), \text{AAAA}\) "mediating" between them. (These elements are hierarchically in the conjunctive immediate-constituent: they are its premodifiers [§1.1.2.2]. The pre-modification of the conjunctive is not less free than for other verb clauses; it may be fairly extensive, making it — together with intercalations and expansions of the nucleus — often difficult at first sight to refer the conjunctive to its nucleus. Some striking exx. are IV 74.4ff., 92.10ff. Particles too, like \(\text{AL/MEN}\) and \(\text{NTO}4\) clearly belong in the conjunctive clause. Whatever the hierarchical status of coordinators in other languages\(^\text{16}\), I cannot see any cogent reason for assigning the Coptic ones as a separate IC in the analytic model; \(\text{AYW, even if regularly used in a coordinating role,}\) is for all that a premodifier [§1.3.10]\(^\text{17}\).) The opposition between syndetic and asyndetic conjunctives is complicated, being regulated by numerous juncture-significant parameters: concord/discord of person, of negation; extent of intercalation between nucleus and conjunctive. In the main paragraphs below, I shall adduce specific data on the distribution of both constructions. However, it is possible to present the - \(\text{AYW}\) - vs. -\(\theta\)- opposition in the nucleus - conjunctive syntagm as a binary privative one, and, by referring to its paradigmatic relationship with the real coordinate syntagm ('verb + \(\text{AYW} + \text{verb}\)'), resolve its function: MICRO-COORDINATION (hereafter symbolized \(<->\); \(\text{AYW} - , \text{H} - , \text{AAAA} - \) etc.; also variant, non-significant absence [\(\neg\)] of \(\text{AYW})\) vs. SUBCOORDINATION (\(\rightarrow\); \(\theta\)-, \(\text{AYW}\) excluded): the former non-vectorial, undirected, symmetric - reciprocal, anthropic, accumulative, reversible\(^\text{18}\), synonymous (here we find the figure-like repetition of lexemes) and serializing\(^\text{19}\); the latter vectorial, directed, irreversible\(^\text{20}\). Whereas

\(^{12}\) Among comparable "Gruppenflexion" (or "suspended affixation") cases in other languages, one recalls the Turkish (Altaic) gerund or \(\text{converb}\) (esp. the -ip gerund, called by Kononov the "conjunctive gerund"); it is, however, not finite — with the progressive reduction in characterization being more drastic — and cannot be concatenated in a series of converbs; the Amharic gerund, being finite, is perhaps a closer parallel (see Lohmann 1965:225ff.; G. Goldenberg, \textit{BSOAS} 40:489ff., 1977 for the terminological history of the Ethiopian forms). Compare also the well-known "narrative infinitives" in various languages (Latin, Romance languages [cf. \textit{Regula} 1951:157ff.], Celtic languages, Semitic languages).

\(^{13}\) "Ablösend" ("continuing + replacing", "relieving") seems to have been a keyword in the early descriptions (\textit{Steinthal-Misteli} 1893:298ff.; cf. \textit{Topler} 1886:216ff. (on direct speech relieving indirect: "[in Modus] der den Gedanken fortsetzt und weiterführt und, besonders wenn das Subjekt dasselbe bleibt, sämtliche Verbalformen ablösren kann").

\(^{14}\) Cf. \textit{Steinthal-Misteli's "adjunctiv" (1893:298ff.)}.

\(^{15}\) Cf. Sandmann 1954:208ff. ("interchangeability, morphological uniformity, common relationship to a third element"). The 'verb + conjunctive' complex does enter Bally's broader definition of coordination (1950:468ff.).

\(^{16}\) Cf. Dik 1972:52ff. for the two views on the hierarchic structure of coordination. I cannot see how one can be dogmatic on this point in general, seeing this is a decided language-specific issue. On English and, though, I would agree with Wells, de Groot and others (against Blümel, Bloomfield and others, incl. Dik himself) assigning and in "he huffed and he puffed" to the second IC, rather than regarding it as a third intermediating constituent (see reff. in \textit{Dik} loc. cit.).

\(^{17}\) Compare in Late Egyptian \(\text{br}\) and \(\text{m-mjrt}\) preceding the conjunctive (\textit{Borghouts} 1979:16 n. 19). Note that the junction of nucleus and conjunctive is by no means the same as between two conjunctives in a series — even though \(\text{AYW, H}\) etc. do occur in both slots. I concentrate here on the former; the latter is comparatively uninteresting, not differing (acc. to my analysis) from coordinated adjuncts.

\(^{18}\) Cf. the Sanskrit \textit{itaratayoga} and \textit{samuccaya} dependencies (Gonda 1957:59ff.).

\(^{19}\) Not catalogic, but rather as "enumerative Redeweise" (Havers 1931:15, 114, 154, 203; IF 45:229-251, 1927) breaking the action up into stages and presenting them one by one.
the former differs from true coordination only in terms of closer juncture realized by the link of syncategorization 21, the latter may express logical nuances of purpose, consequence, circumstance and content, which would (in contrastive consideration) correspond to a hypotactic rather than paratactic manner of expression 22.

In the following pages, we shall observe the varying categorization contour of the individual patterns, displaying data regarding personal maintenance (i.e. pronominal concord 23), negation syncategorization (negative → affirmative), negation encategorization (affirmative/negative nucleus → negative conjunctive, not resuming the nuclear negation) 24, negation maintenance (neg. nucleus → neg. conjunctive, resuming the nuclear negation) and the special personal encategorization (§7.2.5, infinitive + conjunctive). All must be correlated with the formal/functional distinction - ΑΥΨ - vs. -O- (↔ vs. ↔) 25; this information in fact constitutes the distinctive "profile" of each pattern.

7.1.2.3  Compatibilities. The nucleus verb may consist of (a) an extratemporal 26 or merely contextually temporal verb-form (ἈΝΑΓ-/ΜΕΝ-, ἸΑΝΤΥ-, ΜΠΑΤΥ-, protatic syntags, infinitive, ἘΠΕΒΕΧΩΤΙΜ) or (b) modal verb-forms (imperatives, optative [alias "Third Future"] or (c) the present-based "imminent" future (— ΝΑ—), a complex temporal function or (d) the perfect and present tenses in certain non-temporal roles. The conjunctive is compatible only with a transcending, temporally non-specific, equivocal, non-actual, uncharacterized or irrelevant frame of reference.

7.1.2.4  On the text-grammatical level, the conjunctive (again, compatible with [rhetorical] dialogue and exposition, not with narrative texture and its catalogic, time-axis serialization) constitutes with its nucleus a specific subtextual unit, comparable (esp. in the case of a concatenation of multiple conjunctive

---

20 Not necessarily in cases of "irreversible binomial" collocations (Malkiel 1959) like "live and die", "eat and drink" (see §7.2.1.1.1 and passim for the latter collocation in Coptic).

21 Other comparable types of the group-categorization link (§6.0.2): the narrative ὑπα (rel.) ἈΝ-/IV 40.3, ἙΓΟΡΟΣ ΕΡΑΣ (Sec. Perf.) ΑΝΩΚ ΑΥΨ ΑΝΝ ἩΜΗΠΑ... (III 73.5f), ΗΕΡΟΟΣ ΑΥΨ ΕΤΑΞΙΩ (IV 21.10); they are paradigmatically relatable to the "verb + conjunctive" syntagm.

22 The "subjunctive" function of the conjunctive, diachronically regarded (by Steinthal-Misteli 1893:298) as the last phase of a transition from a coordinative "adjective" to a subordinative role, as a "parataxis" (in the sense of "conjunction-less hypotaxis").

23 Not necessarily simple concord: in cases like (ΠΟΤΑ ΠΟΤΑ ΠΟΜΟΝ) → ΝΤΝ- (IV 32.1ff.) or (ἈΑΑΑ ΖΡΑΙ ΝΗΤΗΝ Η ΖΑΝΤΝΥΤΗΝ ΝΤΩΤΗΝ) → ΜΞΣ- (ibid. 35.25ff.) the concord is no less in evidence than in a straightforward repetition of the pronoun.

24 Affirmative encategorization is marked by premodifiers such as ΑΑΑΑ (e.g. III 31.4ff.).

25 A frontal extrapolation to the actor of the conjunctive as a rule conditions ΑΥΨ, overruling and neutralizing the micro-: subcoordination opposition (e.g. III 139.1ff., IV 66.8ff.). This reduces the tridimensional opposition (a) to a bidimensional one (b) (consider however the construction in A I 135-6, III 220.2ff.).

---

forms) with our (Western) paragraph — a polyarthic unit with unmistakable initial and terminal signals and exponents of cohesion, which (at the thematic level) sets forth and "embroiders" a specific topic.

7.1.3 The non-verbal nucleus. It is somewhat more difficult to conceive of the conjunctive as expanding any element but the verb; yet this construction is most important, a key pattern furnishing a clue to the functional mystery of the form. On first analysis, here too the nucleus is predicative (in its limited extent): a predicate noun (KEKOYI (PE), OYMOSIOΣ (TE) etc.) with the conjunctive both an expansion and (in the larger complex) a sentence-constituent in its own right; a modifier (mostly of Greek origin; MOTOΣ, ZYCTE, EIΣHNI, KAN, MNNCUC etc.) — here the conjunctive may be taken to expand (also contextualize) the modifier, predicative in a single-term clause (≠ modifier-0 ≠, §1.2.1.3.2) 28 — yet also having a role of sentence-constituent in the larger extent of modifier + conjunctive; a modifier in another predicative pattern (NAPAKEKOYI (PE), §1.2.1.2); other predicative (sometimes modifier-equivalent) syntagms or expressions: MEOΣ- (K) "perhaps", "(you) do not know"; ΑΛΛΟ- "it is something else...", MH GENOITO "God forbid", ZAMOI "would that", (PE) NANOYC (PE) "it (were) better". (The individual nuclei will be studied in paradigmatic detail below, with the paradigms of substitutables for the conjunctive.)

7.1.3.1 As noted, all these nuclei can be shown to be, in their own extent, predicative. In terms of overall information-structure, however (FSP, §2.0.2.3) careful evaluation shows them to be essential first-position sentence constituents — themes — with the conjunctive the second, rhematic constituent; the relationship between the nucleus and the conjunctive is nexal in addition to its being expansional. This analysis is, I believe, equally applicable to the adverbal conjunctive: the verb - conjunctive dependency is complex, twofold, combining a nexal relationship with a satellital (expansional) one. That the two dependencies are not by any means incompatible 29 is amply illustrated by the other important adnexal modifier sentence-form in Coptic, namely the circumstantial 30 — in fact, the conjunctive is often in paradigmatic association with the circumstantial, both adnominally 31, adverbially, and occasionally in ad-modifier status. Both circumstantial and conjunctive are "wortbezogen", participial (μετοχήν) forms, in the sense of "sharing", "participation", "cooperative union" ("Teilhabe eines Vorgangs oder Zustands an einem anderen") 32 of two predication-carrying clauses in an ultraclausal predications with...

---

28 This is TESNIÈRE's analysis (1965:188f.) of such French constructions as "heureusement que...", "probablement que..." (see TOBLER 1886:51-4, 102f., for two comparable que-constructions in Old French). Comparable are Israeli Hebrew še-clauses after "impersonals" (ROSEN 1977:113-5; a special part of speech, definable by this pattern as a "predicative constituent of a sentence nucleus": K'day še- "it is advisable that...", mutarishir še- "it is allowed/forbidden..."); the še-clause is the personal alternant of the infinitive. See also ROSEN 1979:462f.). I would not term the Coptic nuclei "impersonal", which has a specific morphological and morphosyntactic Indo-European connotation, but rather define them as "non-verbal elements adnexally expanded by the conjunctive".
29 Cf. Ch. 2 (p. 81) on III 191.21ff. (cf. BARRI 1978).
30 SHISHA-HALEVY 1972:§0.4 and PASSIM, 1976a:47, 1976c:134 n. 3.
31 The interesting adnominal paradigm, which has yet to be further investigated, is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(NOUN SYNTAGM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>relative (attributive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circumstantial (adnexal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conjunctive (adnexal, micro/subcoordinating, contextualizing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΕ- (contentualizing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(contentualizing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(generic, &quot;such... as&quot;)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See further in §7.4 below.
32 LOHMANN (1965:224ff.) studies this category in languages of different type.
plex (Satzgefüge). Beyond the basic semasiological differences \(^3\) between the two verbal modifiers, we note the following interrelated structural ones:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CUMSTANTIAL</th>
<th>CONJUNCTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) &quot;Converter&quot;: a &quot;vertical&quot;, transecting syntactic category; self-characterizing for grammatical categories.</td>
<td>Non-transsecting. Unmarked for most grammatical categories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) With no significant syncategorization.</td>
<td>In syncategorization cohesion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Also initial.</td>
<td>Non-initial.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes.* (b) The circumstantial is syncategorized (for person) when it is a predicative complement of auxiliary "descriptive" verbs (ἈΝΑΛΕΙ ΕΠ-, ᾽ΑΝΟΥΣ ΕΠ-), in suppletive periphrases (ἈΝΑΨΗΝΕ ΕΠ-) \(^4\) or generally after verbs "of incomplete predication". (c) It is an open question whether the conjunctive can occur in absolutely initial position (i.e. after ΣΕ- or in text-initial position). The view that it is found initially is held by most grammarians: I do not share this view, which is not corroborated by Shenoutean usage. (d) I do not know of any unequivocal instance of the conjunctive focalized by the Second Tense or any other topicalization form, yet some exx. indicate that the conjunctive can complement verbs "of incomplete predication", in paradigm with the more usual circumstantial ( Crisis Word, + conjunctive, exx. below).

Needless to say, point (a) subsumes the elementary difference between a converted syntagm and a "basic" (i.e. unconverted — but, in our case, unconvertible) "conjugation-form" syntagm; this distinction makes for others, in the negating procedure and other syntactic phenomena. But in this respect it will not do to be too dogmatic: one realizes, with some surprise, that here the morphological oddity of our form somehow falls into place. Historically, this is the only Tripartite Pattern form the base of which does not go back to an auxiliary-verb nucleus or to ἸΔ-. Synchronously, it is the only Tripartite Pattern form in which the actor-expression is not a suffix pronoun, but a paradigm coincident with that of the prefix pronouns (except for the 1st person sgl. which, it may be argued, is "heteroclitic", suppletively imported from ἀντικείμενα). Putting two and two together, it may perhaps not be rash to make the following suggestions:

(a) The conjunctive characteristic ἸΔΕ occupies an intermediate position between a conjugation base and a converter (in the micro- and macro-syntactic sense) \(^5\).

(b) Whereas the first IC-analysis of all other Tripartite Pattern forms is

\[
\text{conjugation base + actor suffix} \quad \text{verb lexeme ("infinitive")} \\
\underbrace{\text{nucleus ["pro-verb"; §5.4]}} \quad \text{(s t a l l i t e)}
\]

\(^3\) These are as a matter of fact not as pronounced as might be expected: the circumstantial too is often "coordinative" (consider ΣΕ- III 13.15, 203.19f., and especially ΕΛΙ- Ch. 54.58, 93.30f., III 18.3, 113.18, Cat. 42.39), while the conjunctive may express various "subordinative" shades of meaning (cause, effect, result, content).

\(^4\) SHISHA–HALEVY 1972:§1.3 (pp. 57-66).

\(^5\) See §2.0.1.1 above.
— or, in the thematic structure, actor (theme) ] [base + verb lexeme (discontinuous rhyme) —

that of the conjunctive is different:

N (NTC) [actor + verb lexeme (theme) (rheme)

and is to a degree analogous to the structure of a converted conjugation form: N, the syntactically signalling "nota relationis" is a full constituent, not in the same I.C as the actor exponent. Thus, we cannot claim full material identity of the converter-like base of the conjunctive with the prepositional — adjunctal, but often also adnexal — N, but the similarity in form and function cannot be ignored. I see the conjunctive base N as the signal or exponent of a specific syntactic status: N is the representative of the whole class of verbal predicates in the modifier-conversion form. Just as the nota relationis N is the modifier-mark par excellence (§1.0.1 and passim), so is N the quintessential verbal modifier — and this is correlatable with its present-like bipartite # theme - rheme # schematic structure 36.

(c) Following the base, the rest of the conjunctive form — noun-syntagm/prefix-like pronoun + verb lexeme — must be further I.C-analyzed (second analysis) as two pattern constituents of equal syntagmatic standing: theme + rheme, and not in terms of a nucleus - satellite dependency. This returns us to the Bipartite Pattern, and this ties in with the functional "indifference" or unmarkedness of the conjunctive with regard to most temporal-modal categories 37. (Incidentally, -NTC — characteristic of all Clause Conjugations, POLOTSKY 1960a:§27 — is the verbal-modifier negation in Coptic, apart from its use to negative the infinitive.)

7.2 COTEXT PATTERNS AND PARADIGMS

7.2.1 # MODAL PREDICATION + CONJUNCTIVE #

7.2.1.1 THE IMPERATIVE SYSTEM

7.2.1.1.1 THE IMPERATIVE

(a) Subcoordination (→→): nuclear verb affirmative/negated; conjunctive affirmative; personal maintenance disrupted: negation syncategorization 38 (III 181.10) twoyn nτνμετανοι, inclusive 1st person plural: "you and us" / (A 1 206) ουν αυτους αντιστατους — "irreversible binomial", cf. ibid. ουν αυτους αυτους, ουν ουν ουν. However, in the light of (A 2 437) ΝΑΜ ΘΕΟΥΜ ΑΥΤΟΥΑΝΤΙΣΤΑΤΟΥΝΑΝ ΑΗΝΤΑ, (RE II 18a 11ff.) ΜΑ ρεγυμους αυτους αντιστατους, (περιεργας αυτους εκτος, ευγαμαις αυτους εκτος), (IV 66.17) ΜΠΑ ΘΕΟΥΜ ΑΥΤΟΥΑΝΤΙΣΤΑΤΟΥΝ, etc., one must conclude that subcoordination is not the rule in Coptic in this case. / (III 210.15f.,19f.) ΑΜΟΥ ΝΓΝΑΥ ΕΤΕΙΙΨΧΝ ΕΝΑΠΑΝΤΑΕΝΑΤΑΚΑΝ ΑΑΑΝ ΝΒΛΑΝ / (ibid. 16.12, 18.1) ΚΑΑΤ ΤΑΤΡΕΝΕΝΚΗΝ PSI-ΟΥΑΝΑΥ ΝΑΙ / (IV

36 The non-actual, non-durative present (§3.1.2.1.1) being tense-unmarked, is here called to mind.

37 This analysis (already suggested in outline by SCHWARZE, SCHWARZE-STEINHAL 451: "die Verbindung des Relativs... mit den Verbal-Präfixen des Präsens") is here advocated for Sahidic (and "Middle Egyptian") only. The Akhmimic conjunctive (and some other non-literary forms) in which the pronominal form is truly homonymic with the present, might be similarly analyzed, although the zeroing of the N must be accounted for. In Bohairic, the conjunctive base + actor seems a veritable "pro-verb" (§5.3). See KAHLÉ 1954:160ff. for an interesting analysis of N-zeroed forms of the conjunctive in various dialects. Incidentally, this approach ties in with Matthäus's reconstruction of the conjunctive as bn ntw-f hr sm (BIFAO 45:43-55, 1947: rejected by Černý, JEA 35:25-30, 1949; see VOLTE 1964:79f.).


1.14) σὺ ταταμόκ εἰμι ντυξαντηθι ιπταιομ. Note that both instances of the 1st person sgl. are causative (lexically or grammatically): see §7.2.1.1.4 / (Ch. 185.48ff.) σωτς εξθεκας αι ιπς δου δε πε πίκικος νυξωρ (cf. IV 200.14) / (Ch. 72.25ff.) κα-νουμνυς ινιογαγούς ινεοουμγυν / (ibid. 102.5ff.) μπρέειτων ιπτς ιπς εις ιπς νουμνιεπ-θυς ιπς ενζουμ νηυστεια ενθυς, consecutive. Syncategorized negation / (P 1317 25 ro) αυς αμππρ-αμελεις ινετμμ ιπς εμπρο (sic) ιπνα ιπγε-παριε / (RE II 160a 32ff.) βακ ιπταιομ... / (III 29.26) υαλ εις λεπιε κατανεπλακα ιπς ερομ / (ibid. 63.20ff.) -ετηκ δε εις επαλογο... ινει ιπ... / (P 1306 83 Ρα) αμυς νουρι ιπς ερολ ιτονακαναριας, τοτε ινοξιομ ιες "πατόγη": the temporal sequence is explicitated; not so in (Ch. 55.4ff.) ταλα ερομ εις ταλβες ιπς εραι ινει "Mount it (your horse), and spur it, and go up (to the sky) and come away".

(b) Microcoordination (→→) is here less usual. Nuclear verb — affirmative only; conjunctive; affirmative/negative (very rare); personal maintenance; negation syncategorization (very rare): (Ch. 164.19ff.) + -ετηκ δε ιες ιπταιοεις ιες ιπταιομα / (IV 49.1ff.) αλα ιεακικον ιμποιαξ δε ιπταιοπαρ ιακ ιντοι ιπταιοτε ινεππε ιες (cf. III 91.4ff.) αμα... ιες ιπταιομα δε εις εραι / (III 193.3ff.) ιυινι ιντροιν ιπς δε ιακο / (ibid. 69.3ff.) ιες ιπους δε εις ινει... ιντμιους ιες επαλομ.

7.2.1.1.2 The Rhetorical Jussive Μαρεί-/Μπρεί-. This form, in Scripture Coptic the causative imperative, functionally coextensive with the jussive ("third-person imperative") 40, has in Shenoute a different standing. As a jussive, it is curtailed in function, specialized and marked for rhetorical and "figurative" jussive mode, while for the objective, "real", usually preceptive and generally unmarked jussive the autofocus Second Future Εινακετμ (§§2.1.3, 7.2.1.1.3) is used (with Ννεν-, a suppletive negative form, apart from the rare Σκα- ΑΝ and perhaps Μπρεί-): Μπρεϊτωμ and Εινακετμ are to be regarded as allo-forms, in rhetorical and preceptive/unmarked environment respectively.

(a) (→→): Nuclear verb: affirmative/negative; conjunctive: affirmative only; neg. syncategorization; personal maintenance disrupted (note that as a pronominal actor we find only the 3rd person plural): (III 149.19) Μαρούμει ινενεα-πασε εζουμ εραν, also ibid. 201.12 / (ibid. 18.24ff.) Μαρετναπαραβα ιμππυ... ουες-νοβε εξθεκενοβε ιντιπαμ ιμνουτε ιμπμε ιευααβ / (IV 39.4ff.) Μπρειτουα συμ... ιε... ινενεει... ιε..., subcoordination; neg. syncategorization / (ibid. 37-8) Μπρειπαγροιε ιπς ιιτνεκτεμ... ινεκτιν ιπκες κει ιινεωνυμ ιμυειτ, neg. syncategorization. Note the discontinuous actor exponence (for a passive-equivalent form), remarkable for Τνη- + Επ- + Ζη- + Τη- + Ν-.

(b) (→→): Nuclear verb: affirmative/negative; conjunctive: affirmative only; neg. syncategorization; personal maintenance. (Ch. 163.31ff.) Μαρούαοιανει ιες ινεκετωμ επεκτωμ ιμος δε / (ibid. 165.22ff.) Μαρεινοεις ιντηνηε/ / (RE II 18a 11ff.) Μαρειουμει ιες ιακ: see under §7.2.1.1.1(a) / (P 1306 22 Φα) Ανοι ιες η ινενυν μαρει-τεμει ιες ιες ιες ιες ιντρ-παγα ιμπτουτε... / (IV 5.21ff.) Μπρειταλαν ιακεμ ιμπτουτε... ιες ιες η ινενυν υακε... — neg. syncategorization.

7.2.1.1.3 The Preceptive/Unmarked Jussive: Εινακετμ/Ννενκετμ. This is the form intruding (in diachronic view) into the neat Scriptural suppletive imperative paradigm imperative/Μαρεί-, disturbing its equilibrium and acting to confine the classical jussive Μαρείτωμ to its specialized rhetorical value. Note the following distinctive characteristics of this context pattern: (a) The opposition microcoordination: subcoordination is here virtually neutralized, as pertinent Αυς does not occur here at all 41, and the conjunctive as a rule specifies the actual (logico-temporal) sequence of phases in the execution of the instructions. (b) Personal maintenance is here usual. (c) The textual distribution is in this case understandably

40 A (typically non-classical?) case like (IV 114.18f.) παριπμουα ιπαν ερατ... Αυς Μαρειοκοαζε ιμοι proves the rhetoricity of the Shenoutean Μαρείτωμ.

41 Barring the overruling conditioning of Αυς before a frontal extraposition to the actor of the conjunctive, see n. 25.
limited: almost all instances occur in non-rhetorical "Vita Monachorum"-type textual stretches (a single instance in Chassinat). Nuclear verb: affirmative/negative; conjunctive: affirmative/negative; personal maintenance (see below); neg. syncategorization, encategorization. (IV 93.1f.) ἘΥΝΑΔΥ ἘΠΕΤΟΥΝΑΧΙΤΗ ΕΡΟΥΝ ΝΧΕΙΚ... ΝΧΕΠΙΤΟΥ ΝΑΥ ΖΜΗΣΗ ΜΠΝΗΣ / (ibid. 61.2f.) ΕΥΝΑΔΥ ΝΧΕΠΙΤΟΥΝΑΧΙΤΗ ΕΡΟΥΝ ΝΧΕΠΙΤΟΥ / (ibid. 160.2f.) ΕΥΝΑΔΥ ΝΧΕΠΙΤΟΥΝΑΧΙΤΗ ΕΡΟΥΝ ΝΧΕΠΙΤΟΥ / (ibid. 161.2f.) ΕΥΝΑΔΥ ΝΧΕΠΙΤΟΥΝΑΧΙΤΗ ΕΡΟΥΝ ΝΧΕΠΙΤΟΥ. A solitary instance of the maintenance pattern disrupted is rhetorical (Ch. 187.2ff.) ἘΥΝΑΔΥ-ΖΥΝΗ ΔΕ-ΕΡΕΝΕΓΡΑΦΗ ΔΕ-ΟΥ ΑΥΣ ΔΕ-ΟΥ ΝΕΝΤΑΥΚΑΙΩΝ... ΑΥΣ ΝΤΕΝΜΤΟΝ ΜΜΟΝ ΓΝΕΥΡΑΧΕ ΝΟΥΟΕΙΝ (although here the 1st person plur. may be taken to resume anacoluthically the preceding ΡΨΗΜΕ ΝΙΜ). Additional exx.: IV 46.5f., 50-1, 66.2ff., 7ff., 83.12ff., 17ff., 20ff., 111.9ff., 14ff., etc.

The negative counterpart of jussive ἘΥΝΑΔΥ ΝΧΕΤΜΤΡΟΜΕΤ Michał Polotsky 1950:84ff. ( = CP 219ff.).

3 Cf. Michał Polotsky 1944:7ff. ( = CP 112ff.). In Shenoute, the future is not restricted to the 1st person singular.

4 Compare (A 1 57) ΖΑΡΕΙ ΠΕΡΡΕΥΤΑΖΩΝΤΕΝ ΩΤΕ ΠΕΡΡΕΥΤΑΖΩΝΤΕΝ ΩΤΕ, ibid. 234 ΚΧΤΜ ΑΥΣ ΖΑΡΕΠΠ-20ΤΕ.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>rhetorical jussive</strong></th>
<th><strong>ΔΥΨ + fut. I</strong></th>
<th>unmarked consequence: Ch. 37.10ff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'ΜΑΡΕΨΣΤΜ'</td>
<td><strong>ΔΥΨ + rhet. jussive</strong></td>
<td>two coordinated jussives: mutually independent (IV 38.6ff., 114.18ff.), or reciprocally symmetric (IV 156.7, Ch. 165.30ff.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>ΜΠΡΡΕΨΣΤΜ</code></td>
<td><strong>conjunctive</strong></td>
<td>micro-/subcoordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ΕΤΡΕΨ'</strong></td>
<td>deliberate purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>ΤΑΡΕΨΣΣΤΜ</code></td>
<td><strong>TAKEIVEDTΝG</strong></td>
<td>stylistically marked consequence (§7.2.1.1.5.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>preceptive jussive</strong></th>
<th><strong>ΔΥΨ + prec. jussive</strong> (very rare)</th>
<th>mutually independent, non-sequential coordination: two separate enjoins; reciprocal symmetry (III 157.11ff., IV 58.15, 99.17ff.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>`ΕΝΑΣΤΜ'</td>
<td><strong>ΔΥΨ ΕΨΕΨΣΙΤΜ (rare)</strong></td>
<td>sequential micro-coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>`ΕΨΕΨΣΤΜ'</td>
<td><strong>TAKEIVEDTΝG (rare)</strong></td>
<td>§7.2.1.1.5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7.2.1.1.5.1

Like ΜΑΡΕΨ', ΤΑΡΕΨΣΣΤΜ, the classical "Future Conjunctive", is in Shenoute restricted and shifted in value compared with its role in the Scripture idiom  — the post-imperatival apodotic form with a promissive overtone. In Shenoute, it is not the conjunctive (with which ΤΑΡΕΨ' has synchronically the satellital status in common — the same kind of modification dependency in relation to the nuclear verb 46) that has encroached on its territory, but rather the coordinative ΔΥΨ + future I. Generally speaking, three statements (illustrated below) may be made on the Shenoutean ΤΑΡΕΨΣΣΤΜ: (a) It is stylistically marked as rhetorical, affective, redolent of archaic-Biblical overtones and typical of passages in which this atmosphere (often conveying an authoritative aura) must be effected, or in otherwise stylistically striking stretches. (b) The distribution of ΤΑΡΕΨ' has been extended to post-interrogative 47 and generally final environments (inside the imperative system, we find ΤΑΡΕΨ' following the jussives ΜΑΡΕΨ' and ΕΝΑΣΨ'); the "promissive" semantic component of ΤΑΡΕΨ' has been greatly weakened. (c) Where it is opposed to other final constructions in cases (a) and (b), ΤΑΡΕΨ' seems to convey the sense of final desirable result rather than downright deliberate purpose.

(a) **Stylistic effect:** (1) archaic-Biblical simulation: (III 84.14ff., parall. Ch. 48.28ff.) ΥΨΔΓΤΗΜ ἘΓΩ ΤΑΡΕΨΣΣΤΜ ΝΤΣΟΟΤΟΥ... ΤΑΡΟΨΣΗΨ ΕΕΙΜΕ ΧΕ-ΜΝΕΝΟΥΤΕ ΝΒΑΛΑΑΚ, addressed to God; an argumentative application of Ps. 45:11. Similarly, III 84.20ff. (parall. Ch. 48.52ff.) ΤΨΜ ΔΕ ΕΠΝΑΝΟΜΙΑ ΝΙΜ ΜΝΧΙ ΝΓΟΝC ΝΙΙ... ΤΑΡΕΨΣΣΤΜ ΝΜΚ ΚΡΨΕ ΕΡ-ΖΗΜΑΑ ΝΑΚ. Indeed, ΤΑΡΕΨ' is an unmistakable sign of a Biblical quotation or reminiscence in the Shenoutean texture: A 2 228 (Prov. 7:2), CI. Pr. 22 ΤΕΑ (Ps. 36:37), A 2 388 (Ps. 68:33), A 2 235 (Rom. 11:35), III 112.20f. (Prov. 7:1a), A 2 189 (Mt. 11:3) and many more.

45 Polotsky 1944:1ff. (= CP 102ff.), 1950: 87ff.(= CP 222ff.).
46 Consider (Ch. 198.44ff.) ΗΨΔΓΤΗΜ ΝΑΝ ΝΤΟΨ ΑΝ ΝΤΕΙΖΕ ΓΙΤΙΝΠΙΙΕΓΑΔΕ ΤΑΡΝΚΨ ΝΟΝΙΝ ΝΤΕΝΜΙΝΤΝΑΤΝΑΣΤΕ, where ΤΑΡΕΨ' is focalized by a Second Present, showing itself to be a true modifier-clause.
47 Polotsky 1944:5f., §3B (= CP 110f.).
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(2) Ponderous, turgid categoric style (similar to (1))? Note the high incidence of εἰμι or its paraphrases, which may be indicative of a certain tone of address: (A 2 64) μοῦτε ντό τιπαγένος νοσοί κυτε ννού-ζνααν θηρού ταρηέμεικε χέ-... / (ibid, 121) κώ νει νωικει ντέρειψαξε κοοκ νακ δέ-... / (A 1 234) χώμης αύων θαρη-ζσοτή μετάτοποι δεντε ντέοιμε χέοι καλας ντεόμε χερούμενοσς κατεταγιτείνας χερεικειαimmer... δέ- / (A 2 72) πνοούε εμμπτικεύτησθι (sic) νίμ εφαπαν νμπηα καμίωσε χαγα ταραμεμεκειαε εμπθηρ / (P 131⁸ 13 10) ευθωνειε ντοι-ούξκει αμούς τεθκεκαλίας αύων καμάπισι πινκοια 2νιναπούτε; ευθωνειε δέ εν ντο-ούρμπιαοι αμούς ετθκεκαλίας ταρηόνογυτε γσοι εροκ 2νεκμπτεουμαο. ευθωνειε εν ειματάκ-ψχρε ΜΜΑΓ, αμούς ετθκεκαλίας αύων καμάπισι πινκοιειες νουμμυνυιε νιμπρε — suppletion of αύω + future I for the 2nd person?

(3) A special rhetorical effect or figure: ταρηέ- repeats the imperative verb: (A 2 224-5) σεί ντήτο νεκτήτησο κναηκνκειο γκεκωγκ εμμπτικεύτησθι / (ibid. 461) γωνικο ερόκ (i.e. the Kingdom) γκεκαμεια ταρηέγουξκ ερόκ γκεγκεκ δεμπμα εκτεκτάει (cf. 462: ηνερτάρων εροού... ηναλονην 2γούκο εροκ) / compare here (Ch. 98.21ff., 199.8ff.) κά ταρούνα ντήτο + ταρούνα ντήτον and (P 131⁸ 43 ro) κά ταρούνα νακ, γκε-γκεκ αμούς ταρούνεγκγκ γκεγκ ζαροκ, κώ εβολ ταρούκκάκ νακ εβολ, adaptations of Luc. 6:37-8.

(b) ταρηέσωμι in other environments than post-imperative: (1) as a rhetoric post-interrogative apostasis (“that he may...”): (A 2 510) ευθωνειε ποούνυ ταρηέσωμι πινκο νσκμ / (Ch. 197-8) ου πετσοοι ναν ταρπτάαν θηρού... ντητάαν ντήτ-βολ (note the conjunctive subordinated to ταρπτααυ).

(2) Following final constructions: (P 131⁸ 43 P) εηκεκε νημμπηε δεκας ετεταξαταρπ-πιακέε μπούτε νσκκοτυν καμεκεπέ 2ήναη νοοκγια / (Thompson K 3 νον) νεμπηε εβολ... ευθωνειε ντηταν εγκεκο ενεκτετοε νεκτήτησο εγκεκο εροους εβολ εμμπτικεύτησθι ενεκτετείνες εε-καρκέες / νεκτήτησθι. Compare in the post-interrogative paradigm the apodotic-retrospective conjunctive (§7.2.7) (III 148.25ff.) ευθωνειε εεκεκεηγηε... ετθκευτε εροκ δε-κατεοοε νεκκανα εκεκακια 48.

7.2.1.2 The optative (εεκεσωμι/νενεκσωμι) 48 is relatively rarely extended by a subcategorized conjunctive (there is no single instance in Ch.). Multiple εκε-periods are more common as nuclei; personal maintenance is the rule; αύω is not attested; negation is syncategorized or encategorized; nucleus/conjunctive affirmative or negative.

(a) (→→): (III 179.11ff.) πνοούε εεκεκούο εροού γκεθκέε γκαηκνκειο ντήτο τιπαγένοκ νιεκνκτειε νιεκνκεο κοκαζηκε νακσρπην / (III 20.16, IV 40.19ff.) ευθωνειε εηκεκεηκαβα μενοκαισκολογιει κοκαοι, εεκανε ετετεπο ννοούε ντακ-σκ-εκ εγκούο εροκ, oath formula; neg. encategorization (adversative sense): “… may I see the Kingdom... but not enter it”.

(b) (←→), very rare: (IV 50.9ff.) ννεκεκεηγήνλε τακο... νεκκ-πλιμπν δε-κανεκον ωηκκημπε ρη ηοκακνκκο κο γκεγκο.

7.2.1.2.1 The post-optative paradigm includes in addition to the conjunctive also the coordinated optative (~ αύω εεκεσωμι): (IV 116.4ff.) πνοούε εεκεκούο εροού αύω εεκεκεηε εροού αύω εεκεκεηην καν / (ibid. 171.3ff.) εγκεκονε εεκεκούρτ αύω εεκεηε εεραι εεκκοε νηεκεκαζού τιηρού / (III 131.5f.) πνοούε

48 Yet another member of the post-interrogative paradigm is μαρεκεσωμι: (III 149.16ff.) ευθωνειε νεκτομούοε εροού δε-καπρεη-νοπε νε... μαρεοειε νεκκανα-πακκε εγκούο εεραν / (P 131⁸ 160 M) ευθωοοι τικε ντοου μαροκταοοοο. Post-imperatival μα-ρεκεσωμι is perhaps more common in Bohairic, e.g. Mt. 13:30, Luc. 7:7 (codd.), Joh. 18:8, corresponding to Sah. conjunctive, μαρε-, ετρεθ- (Horne) / ταρεθ- (Chester Beatty A, B). Cf. Kahlé 1954:190 for the post-imperatival and final paradigm (featuring also ετρεθ-; χερει- final constructions, 190ff. for ταρεθ- as the apodotic component of oath formulae).

49 Polotsky 1950:84ff. (= CP 219ff.). I use the term not as a name for a mood (in the Indo-European or Semitic sense, of a regularly transsecting morphological subsystem) but for a specific conjunctive-form pair, affirmative and negative “Future III”.
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7.2.1.3 Final/consecutive conjunctival syntagms. Here we encounter the well-known difficulty of determining the opposition between ΞΕΚΑΑΣ vs. ΞΕ-ΕΥΕϹϹΤΜ and ΞΕ vs. ΞΕΚΑΑϹ ΕΥΗΑϹΤΜ — an opposition the functional resolution of which must await some future study. The conjunctive expands all constructions. Note that ΑΥϹ-μicrocoordination is here incomparably more frequent than with the post-imperative conjunctive.

(a) (→→), usually with ΑΥϹ: (III 158.28ff.) ΕΥΕϹΤΑΜΟΝ ΖΝΟΥΜΝΤΜΕ ΕΠΕΝΤΑΪΛΦΑΥ ΕΡΟΨΑΙ ΞΕΚΑΑϹ ΕΥΕϹϹΤΗΕ ΕΥΕϹϹΤΑΜΑΑΤ ΖΝΟΥΜΝΤΗΤ ΒΗΡΟΥ ΑΥϹ ΝϹΕΕΙ ΕΡΟΨΑΙ ΕΧΨΩΟΥ ΖΝΙΝΕϹΤΜΟΥ ΒΗΡΟΥ ΕΤϹΖΗΤ / (ibid. 40.27f)... ΞΕ-ΕΡΕϹΑΖΨΗΥ ΖΝΗ-$ΗΨΥΗ ΑΥϹ ΝΤΕΖΗΨΗΥΧ ΒΨΨ ΕΡΑΠΗ ΝΤΕΠΝΟΤΗΤ ΖΝΟΤΒΟΒ ΝΗΜΑ / (IV 18.16f.)...ΞΕ-ΞΝΑΞΕΗΝΕ ΝΟΥΝΑ ΕΡΟΨΑΙ ΕΧΨΩΟΥ ΑΥϹ ΝϹΡΟΥΤΑΛΑΤ ΝΑΥΜΑ / (IV 21.3f.)...ΞΕ-ΞΝΑΞΕΗΝΑΤΑΤ ΖΜΟΟΥ ΑΥϹ ΖΝΗΜΟΟΥΤΟΥ. Additional exx.: III 78.19f., 99.6f., 122.3f., 194.18f. Without ΑΥϹ: (IV 155.11ff.)...ΞΕ-ΞΝΑΞΗΝΟΤΕ ΝΟΥΒΕΚΕ ΜΠΙϹΤΗΝ... ΝΤΕΝΑΛ ΖΗΜΠΙϹΤΗΕ ΖΝΟΠΟΝΗΡΟΝ ΝΤΕΝΑΛΑΥ. Also Ch. 18-19, 101.44f.

(b) (→→), considerably less common: (III 119.7ff.) ΞΕΠΙϹΤΗΑΜ ΝΑΝ ΕΤΜΚΑΤΑΛΑΛΑΙΙ ΟΥΔΕ ΕΤΜΚΡΨΜ... ΞΕ-ΞΝΕΠΝΟΤΕ ΖΗΜΠ ΕΡΟΨΑΙ ΖΝΗΤΑΚΟ ΖΝΟΥΜΝΤΗΤ / (Ch. 148.47ff.)...ΞΕ-ΞΝΑΞΕΗΝΑΤΕ ΝΤΕΝΑΖΚΕΙΚΕ ΖΑΨΑΝΕ ΜΠΑΚΑ. Also IV 51.8f.

7.2.2 Extratemporal predications

7.2.2.1 ΞΕϹϹΤΜ (and conversions): I know of no certain instance of ΜΕϹϹΤΜ subcategorized by the conjunctive. Conjunctive: affirmative only. Personal maintenance is the rule (only 3rd persons, sgl. and plur.).

(a) (→→) (ΑΥϹ very rare): (III 110.2f.) ΞΑΡΤΜΑΒΟΟΥ ΕΡΟΨΑΙ ΑΥϹ ΝϹΕΥΡΨΑΝΕ ΖΜΟΟΥ ΖΝΗΤΟΥ / (ibid. 176.3) ΝΕΕ ΞΕ-ΞΕΨΑΖΨΗΥΟΥΕ ΝΕΥΡΨΑΝΕ ΝΤΑΚΑΡΠΟΣ / (IV 24.19f.) ΝΕΞΕΨΑΖΨΗΥΟΥΕ ΖΜΟΟΥΑ ΑΥϹ ΝϹΕΨΟΟΥΤ ΖΜΟΟΒΕ ΖΝΗΤΟΥ — repeated lexeme / (ibid. 38.29) ΟΥΝΖΑΒ ΟΝ ΖΝ΢Ι΢ΗΕ ΕΥΑΥΡ-ΞΨΨΗΕ ΚΑΤΑΚΑΙΡΟΣ ΑΥϹ ΝϹΕΖΡΟ — etymologically related lexemes / (ibid. 82.11) ΥΑΨΨ-ΟΣΕ ΖΝΟΟΥ ΖΝΗΕΖΨΝΚΟΟΥΞΕ + — repeated lexeme / (Ch. 80.21ff.) ΞΑΡΝΑΡΑΙΖΕ ΖΜΟΟΨΗ ΕΡΟΨΑΙ ΝΕϹϹΤΜΤΗ ΝΑΥ ΖΜΑ΢ΑΒΟΝ — antonymy / (P 1314 157 ΒΟ) ΖΟΟΨΕΙΝ ΠΕΨΑΨΗΛ ΖΜΑΨΗΝ ΖΜΑΚΗΝ ΖΝΑΑΨΗΕ ΜΕ ΖΝΗΤΕΨΛΨΨΟΟΝ ΑΝ — paraphrase. Also III 45.33f., 152.24f., 163.14f., IV 94.33f.

(b) (→→): doubtful, perhaps (IV 25.25f.) ΥΑΡΗΠΟΟΝΕ ΞΕ ΖΝΕ΢ΑΑΛ ΖΜΟΟΥ ΖΝΕΨΗΨΗΜΑ ΣΠΡΗ / (ibid. 70.17f.) ΥΑΡΕΨΚΡΑΤΕΙΕ ΖΜΟΟΥ... ΝΕϹϹΤΨΟΤ ΕΥΨΑ΢ΗΤ Ν΢ΕΕΙ ΕΒΟΑ ΖΝΕΨΨΟΜ / (III 31.9) ΞΑΡΚΣΟΤ ΟΝ ΖΝΟΨΨΑΗΕ ΕΒΟΑ. Also III 179.22f., IV 26.4 (a rare case of the personal maintenance disrupted), 113.6f.

7.2.2.2 ΞΑΨΤΨΨΜ: affirmative conjunctive only; no pers. maintenance.

(a) (→→): (IV 24.13f.) ΝΕΨΝΑΝΕΚΞΗ ΖΜΟΟΥ ΑΝ ΠΕ ΞΑΡΟΨΟΝΟΨΟΥ ΕΡΟΨΑΙ ΕΠΙΚΨΨΤ ΑΥϹ ΕΡΟΨΑΙ ΕΠΙΜΨΟΥ ΑΥϹ ΝϹΕΨΑΨΤΟΥ ΕΠΙΚΑΖ / (Ch. 121.6f.) (ΑΞΨΝΛΟΟΣ ΕΡΟΨΑΙ ΜΠΙΑΒΑΛΟΛΟΣ ΑΥϹ ΖΑΨΑΤΟΥ ΖΝΑΛΨΜΨΗΝ) ΞΑΡΟΨΟΝΛΑΡΕ

50 See Stern §611-2, Steindorff 1951:§440-3, etc. Wilson 1970:23-51 is no help. Note that the distribution of the four terms of this complex category varies from one Shenoute text to another: Chassinat clearly favours ΞΕ-σyntagms (ΕΥΗΑϹΤΜ-σyntagms appear to be rather more frequent — less specialized? — in Shenoute than in the Scriptures).

51 For Shenoutean instances of ΞΕΚΑΑϹ resumed by the conjunctive — a typical New Testament construction — see §7.2.6.1 (3) below.
7.2.2.3 μπατσμ (rare): (a) (→→): (IV 66.16ff.) ζάμοι on ενέδοκιμαισε μμοο γυορς πε μπατσμ (sic) έβο λόμειόι αυς νεσσω εβολα γιμπατοί.
(b) (→→): (IV 97.11ff.) μεσάκ +ναρ-παι νούσηνε ένιμ μπατσμ-τε τε τετεπέρωσα μπατσμε γίμμα.

7.2.3 The present-based future (χνακωτμ and conversions)

7.2.3.1 Basic Tense: Χνακωτμ.
(a) (→→): nuclear verb/conjunctive: affirmative, negative; negation syncategorization/encategorization; no personal maintenance. Note the frequent prophetic style: (III 124.5) ΑΥΣ ΠΕΥΤΟΡΤΡ ΜΠΝΠΙΤΙΣ ΝΣΤΗ ΜΠΑΤΜΗΝ ΜΠΑΤΜΑΖΟΜ. ΝΑΡ-ΣΟΙΟΙΚ ΕΠΟΟΥ ΝΕΣΕΩΣ ΝΑΥ ΝΜΣΑΛ / (ibid. 219.8ff.) ΤΟΤΕ ΧΝΑΩΜΟΣ ΕΓΡΑΙ ΕΧΜΠΕΥΡΟΝΟΣ... ΝΣΕΙΣΟΥΙ ΕΖΟΥΝ ΝΕΣΕΝ ΝΙΜ... ΝΣΕΤΑΣΟΥΙ ΕΡΑΤΟΥ ΜΠΕΥΜΟΤΟ ΕΒΟΛΑ... ΝΥΨΡΑ ΜΜΟΟ; also with coordinated ΑΥΣ + future subunits: (III 101.14ff.) ΤΟΤΕ ΚΝΑΝΙΩΝ ΝΕΣΕΝΩΝ ΝΤΕΠΕΚΣΗΤ ΑΥΣ ΚΝΑ- ΣΜΠΕ ΜΠΕΥΡ-ΣΟΙΚ 2ΝΝΕΚΜΕΙΣΕ ΑΤΕΝΕΠΤΖ ΜΠΕΠΝΑ ΡΥΣΚ ΝΝΚΕΣΑΟΝ ΑΥΣ ΝΣΒΗΣ ΜΝΙΟΤΥΕ ΝΑΡ-ΟΥΟΕΙΝ ΕΡΟΚ. Compare also IV 104.12, characteristic of quotations; consider III 123.6ff., 12f., 173.20ff., 195.18ff., IV 8.5f., 9.11f. / (III 125.18ff.) ΟΥΝΑΣΑ ΝΑΡ-ΤΩΜΟ ΕΠΙΟΧΙΟΙ ΙΣ ΓΡΑΙ ΝΣΤΗΝ ΚΙΤΕ ΖΟΟΥΤ ΚΙΤΕ ΣΜΙΣΕ ΝΣΕΡ-ΓΑΣ ΕΒΒΚ ΕΖΟΥΝ ΕΝΙΜΑ ΝΜΤΟΝ... / (ibid. 158.7f.) (apodotically) ΤΝΑΡ-ΒΟΛ ΠΕ ΕΖΕΝΝΟΓ ΝΚΡΙΜΑ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΖΙΤΜΠΟΝΤΗΣ ΝΤΝΑΙ ΝΣΕΝΜΟΥ ΑΥΣ ΤΝΑΔΜ-60Μ ΠΕ ΕΓΡΑΙ ΕΧΜΠΕΤΑΝΑΣ / (IV 97.22ff.) ΟΥΖΗΤ ΠΑΡ ΕΝΣΗΕ ΝΟΠΑ ΝΑΥΡ-ΤΗΜΕΕΥΕ ΑΝ ΝΣΕΝΒΙ ΝΑΟΙΜΟΣ ΕΚΑΛΥ ΝΥΨ-ΤΗΜΕΕΥΕ ΝΝΕΣΒΙ ΥΕΣΕΡ ΝΥΠΝΟΝΤΟΥΕ ΝΑΛΑΥ ΝΣΕΒΟΩΟ ΝΤΟΡΡΗ — repeated lexeme: neg. syncategorization? / (Ch. 94.10ff.) ΧΝΑΤΑΜΥΝ ΕΝΕΝΤΑΧΣΙ-60Λ ΕΡΟΝ ΝΣΗΤΟΥ ΑΥΣ ΝΤΑΤΣΑΒΤΗΝ ΕΝΕΝΤΑΧΣΑΙΟΥ ΝΑΓ — synonyms. Other exx.: (repeated lexeme) III 115.17f., Ch. 107.14ff.
(b) (→→): no personal maintenance; negation syncategorized, affirmation encategorized. (III 123.27) ΧΝΑΤΟΜΑ ΔΕ ΝΤΑΞΗ ΜΠΕΠΙΥΑΣΗ / (ibid. 36.17ff.), parall. Ch. 132.9ff.) ΕΤΒΕΟΥ ΝΤΝΑΖΑΙΟΥ ΜΜΟΗ ΑΝ ΝΕΕ- ΡΑΠΕΥΕΙ ΕΝΒΑΛ ΝΠΕΝΖΗΤ / (Ch. 49.8ff.) ΝΣΕΝΑΖΜ-60Μ ΠΑΡ ΑΝ ΕΡ-ΜΣΑΛ ΝΑΚ (and so) ΝΣΕΡ-2ΜΣΑΛ ΝΝΕΡΧΙΣΧΝ- 6ΟΝΣ, addressed to God; affirmative encategorization / (IV 3.18f.) ΕΝΕΚΑΛΑΝΤ ΠΗΝΤΛΟΥ ΝΕΣΕΒΙΚ / (Ch. 83.13ff.) ΕΤΒΕΟΥ ΝΕΚΟΟΥ ΝΑΣΟΥΝ-ΠΕΕΡΟΥΟ ΑΝ ΜΠΕΠΙΣ ΜΜΕ... ΝΣΕΝΠΙΤ ΕΡΑΤ / (ibid. 93.22ff.) ΣΜΑΥΠΕΙΣ ΝΤΕΝΟΜΕΝΤΙ / (A I 135-6) Η ΝΣΑΝΕΠΟΥ ΑΝ ΠΕΤΑΙΣ ΝΑΗ ΝΕΝΜΟΚΕ ΕΡΟΥΝΣΕΕ ΕΡΟΣ... ΕΚΟ ΝΡΕΧΙΑ-60Λ / (P 1306 56 NB) ΟΥΝΟΥΕΙΟΥ ΓΑΡ ΝΑΥΣΗΕ ΤΕΝΕΝΟΥΟΕΙΕ ΥΑΡ ΝΝΕΥΣΥΡΕ (see §7.2.3.6 below).

7.2.3.2 Circumstantial future: uncommon. Usually adnominal (or open to attributive adnominal interpretation) although a protatic role is not excluded (in fact, both functions are neutralized in the adnominal syntactic slot). No negation; no - ΑΥΣ: subcoordination only? (Ch. 190.31ff.) ΟΥ ΠΕΤΑΠΟΜΗ ΕΠΙΟΥ ΝΟΥΡΜΕ ΕΧΝΑΗ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΖΜΠΟ΢ΜΑ ΝΣΒΙΚ ΓΑΣΤΜΠΟΞΟΙΚ ΑΥΣ ΝΝΕΣΕΝ ΜΝΙΟΣΟΙΚ ΝΟΥΣΙΕΙΝ ΝΙΜ, cf. ibid. ibid. 52ff. ΕΜΥΑΝΕΙ ΕΒΟΛΑ / (IV 162.2ff.) ...ΖΟΚΟΝ ΑΝΑΙ +7ΥΣ ΕΖΟΥΝ, ΝΤ ΑΝΕΙ ΕΝ-ΤΥΣ ΕΒΟΛΑ. ΑΥΣ ΖΟΚΟΝ ΕΡΕ- ΠΑΙ ΝΑΗ ΕΒΟΛΑ, ΝΤΕΝΑΙ +7ΥΣ ΕΖΟΥΝ. The construction here is difficult, although the sense is clear: (talking of the pall-bearers) "As soon as one puts his (shoulder) in (under the pall), the other takes his (shoulder) out (from under the pall); and as soon as one withdraws, the other puts his (shoulder) in." More specifically, difficult here are (a) the past tense in a preceptive context, (b) the apparent parallelism in the interdependence of, on the one hand, ΖΟΚΟΝ A- and ΝΤΑ- (Second Perfect), and, on the other hand, ΖΟΚΟΝ
EPE- NA- and the conjunctive; while the former is well understandable as a circumstantial clause (2ΟCOPYN Α-) focalized by a Second Tense, in the sense of “no sooner... than...” (§2.7.1.1), the latter seems anacoluthic, conflating a subordinative role (actual sequence, prepositional stage sequence) with a main-clause (jussive?) one. The juxtaposition of perfect and future tenses makes perhaps for vividness and a scenic dramatic effect in portraying the desired execution of this instruction.

7.2.3.3 Second Future. Cases of the conjunctive subcategorized by a thematic (topical) future in a focalization pattern — foc. patterns (2), (6), §§2.2, 2.6.1; the conjunctive is impressed also with the thematicity category. Note that in pattern (2) the conjunctive follows the focus, and is thus a case of the dis. continuous multiple theme figure (§2.7.1.3.3). Negation syncategorization (by the nexus negator – AN not the negated theme), negation encategorization.

(1) (→→): (Ch. 85.26ff.) ΕΡΕΠΧΩΕΙΣ ΠΕΝΣΗ ΝΑΜΟΥ ΕΡΟΟΥ ΝΟΥΝΡ ΑΥΘ ΝΥΤ′-ΕΟΟΥ ΝΑΥ / (ΙΙΙ 65.3ff.) ΕΤΒΕΟΥ ΕΚ- ΝΑΠΡΟΧΕΕ ΕΠΕΝΤΑΜΥΧΗΣ ΧΟΟΥ ΧΕ′-... ΝΤΜΥ′-ΤΘΗΚ ΝΤΟΥ ΕΠΕΝΤΑΙΖΕΚΙΗΛ ΧΟΟΥ ΧΕ′ — neg. encategorization / (ibid. 123.7ff.) ΝΑΥ ΕΕ ΝΣΕ ΤΕΝΟΥ ΕΙΝΑΧΙ′-ΝΑΙ ΕΤΜΑΥΝ ΝΣΟΝΤ Η ΝΤΑΘΜΟΟΥ ΕΠΙΝΘΕΝ. Also: IV 14.4ff., 76.20ff., 161.12ff. (jussive ΕΘΝΑ-?).

(b) (→→): (ΙΙΙ 188.20ff.) ΕΡΕΝΤΙΑΧΕ ΝΜΜΕ ΝΑΚΧ ΑΝ ΝΣΕΝΜΑΤΟΙ ΖΑΡΑΤΖ ΝΧΚΛΑΥΕ ΝΝΕΤΣΥΤΙ ΝΑΥ ΝΜΜΟΥ ΝΓΟΟΥ ΕΝΨΥΝ / (IV 101.15ff.) ΕΡΕΠΟΥΛ ΠΟΥΑ ΝΑΜ-ΝΕΦΜΑΚΣ ΑΝ ΕΒΟΑ ΖΑΝΝΑΣΒΕΧ ΕΤΒΕΟΥΡΑΝ ΝΣΕΚΑ-ΝΤΑΛΛΗ- ΝΠΡΟΣ ΕΥΤΑΛΑΙΝΨΕΙ — neg. syncategorization.

7.2.3.4 The preterite future, ΝΕΜΝΑΚΥΤΗ: always apodotic to an irrealis protasis (NE, when present, immediately precedes the conjunctive). No ΑΥΘ-microcoordination; negation syncategorization, affirmation encategorization. (ΙΙΙ 88.25ff.) ΕΝΕΤΕΝΚΟΟΥΝ ΝΝΕΡΙΟΥ ΝΕΤΣΥΑΡ-ΖΟΤΕ ΑΝ ΠΕ ΝΕΤΣΝΑΙΣΒΑΝΕ ΕΚΟΥΝ ΕΝΟΝΤΕ: the negative syncategorization does not extend to the conjunctive (= affirmation encategorization) but this depends on the sense of ΑΙΣΒΑΝΕ ΕΚΟΥΝ € (as far as I know, a unicum; cf. αλαθανεσθε αει, with an adversative sense of “feel against”? This could suit a neg. syncategorization) / (IV 42.3ff.) ...ΝΕΡΕΤΕΙΜΕ ΝΡΨΙΤΕ ΝΝΑΜΕ ΝΣΕΝΜΕΤΕ ΝΜΜΑΥ... ΝΕΜΝΑΡ-ΑΤΣΑΥ ΠΕ ΝΣΕΑΛΓΕ ΝΣΑΥΑΥ ΝΜΜΑΥ / (IV 96.25) ((ΕΝΕΥΟ ΓΑΡ ΑΝ ΝΑΤΚΟΟΥΝ) ΝΕΝΑΖΜΟΟΣ ΑΝ ΝΕΨΑΧΕ ΕΡΟΙ ΝΧΙΟΥΕ.

7.2.3.5 The relative future ΕΤ-ΝΑ- only in the following two cases:

(1) the “substantivized” relative ΝΕΤ-ΝΑΚΥΤΗ (i.e. ΕΤΝΑ- expanding the determinator series Ν-); ΕΤΝΑ- expanding indefinite pronominal nuclei (ΟΥΡΝ ΝΙΜ, ΡΨΜΕ (ΝΙΜ)) — paraphrasing the foregoing case —, temporal nouns (ΝΕΡΟΟΥ) paraphrasing a conjunctural construction. Note here the affinity with the various specific protatic or “fallsetzend” (case-presenting) conditional, relative or temporal syntagms (§7.2.4) and with cases of the hypothetic non-actual/non-narrative present/perfect (§7.2.4.1), as nuclei of the conjunctive. (→→)/(→→) not in opposition. As with the protatic nucleus, we find here too frequent negation encategorization. (ΙΙΙ 74.3ff.) ΟΥΡΕΙ ΔΕ ΝΕΤΣΝΑΜΗΣΟ ΑΥΘ ΝΥΤΕΡΟ... ΝΤΜΟΥΜΕΥ / (ibid. 154.27ff.) ΝΕΤΝΑΧΝ ΔΕ ΝΟΥΨΑΧΗ ΝΥΣΒΨΕ ΕΚΟΟΥ 2ΡΑΙ ΝΣΤΝ.. ΑΥΘ ΝΣΕΤΜΑΖΟ ΕΡΑΤΨ ΝΨΑΨΑΝΗ Ν ΝΨΥΒ... — neg. encategorization / (ΙΙ 113.5ff.) ΝΕΤΝΑΖΑΡΗΣ ΕΖΕΚΝΟΥΝ ΝΨΥΨΗΝΕ ΕΝΖΗΣΟΤ ΕΡΟΟΥ / (ibid. 171.1ff.) ΝΕΤ- ΝΑΡ-ΝΟΒΕ ΝΨΟΥΨΗ... ΑΥΘ ΝΥΤΜΑΧΝ ΝΠΕΝΤΑΚΛΑΥ — neg. encategorization / (Ch. 25.39ff.) ΝΕΡΣΕΝΟΥ ΕΤΕΡΕΟΡΘ... ΝΑΣΕΣΧΨΚ ΝΟΕ ΝΟΥΡΜΕΣ ΑΥΘ ΝΣΖΙΤΚ ΝΨΑΨΗΚ ΕΒΟΑ ΝΖΑΜΝΤΕ, also IV 182.3ff., 208.11ff. Additional exx.: IV 122.5ff. (ΝΕΤΝΑ-, ΟΥΡΝ ΝΙΜ ΕΤ- ΝΣΕΤΜ-), 125.20ff., 126.8ff., 166.21ff., 169.11, 207.27ff., Ch. 34.34ff.
(2) ΠΕΤΝΑ-, the close constituent in a rhetorical-interrogative Cleft Sentence. Frequent negation encategorization (a rhetorical figure); neg. syncategorization.

(a) (→→): (III 33.26ff.) ΠΑΙ ΠΕΤΝΑ-ÂΓΙΝΕ ΝΤΜΝΤΡΕΧΙΣ-20 ΝΤΕΥΦΟΡΑΝΕ ΜΠΟΥΤΕ / (IV 4-5) ΝΙΜ ΓΑΡ ΠΕΤΝΑΚΑΛ- ΡΟΝΟΜΕΙ ΝΤΜΝΤΡΟ ΝΧΙΠΗ ΝΣΕΤΜΙΣΙΝΕ ΕΥΟ ΝΠΡΟ / (ibid. 32.19ff.) ΝΙΜ ΝΧΙΠΗ ΝΡΜΝΣΗΤ ΝΤΕΝΑΕΨΙΟΥΜΕΙ ΑΝ ΕΡ-2UB ΕΝΕΣΦΗΝΕ ΕΤΕΡΕΠΕΝΙΕΥΤ ΕΤΕΝΜΙΣΙΝΕ ΕΡ-2UB ΕΡΟΟΥ... ΑΥΥ ΝΣΕΟΥΑΖΟΥ ΝΣΑΝΕΜΟΤ ΝΝΑΓΓΕΑΟΣ (sim. III 200.14ff.) / (Ch. 56.46ff.) ΑΥΜ ΜΜΑ ΝΛΝΝΑΛΑΨΕ ΜΜΟΥΟ Ν ΝΧΙΠΗΚ ΕΖΟΥΝ ΕΡΟΟΥ ΝΤΜΝΙ-ΝΠΟΣ ΝΤΕΝΨΨΧΗ — second conjunctive subordinated, neg. encategorized. Additional exx.: III 186.24ff., IV 88.10ff., 164. 13ff., Ch. 203.20ff.

(b) (+→) (A 240) ΝΙΜ ΠΕΤΝΑΣΨΤΜ ΕΝΑΙ ΝΤΜΝΚΨ ΝΑΨ ΝΝΕΣΒΟΟΥΕ ΝΝΕΓΡΑΨ — neg. encategorization / (IV 74.25) ΜΠΟΥΤΕ ΝΤΟΚ ΕΤΝΑΚΟΤΚ ΝΝΤΑΝΖΟΝ / (ibid. 156.19ff.) ΝΙΜ ΠΕΤΝΑΝΨΟΣΚΕ ΑΝ ΝΕ-ΕΟΥΜΥ ΝΑΨ ΝΣΕ ΝΤΕΝΜΝΕΣΖΗΝΕ ΕΡ-2ΟΥΟ ΓΡΑΙ ΝΣΗΤΗ ΠΑΡΑΟΥΧΕΡΨΟΣ “so that... not”: negation maintenance / (Ch. 120.25ff.) ΝΙΜ ΝΕΤΝΑΚΑΛΑΨ ΝΑΨ ΖΜΕΨ9ΖΤΝ ΝΣΕ6ΨΖ 2ΝΜΝΤ6ΨΖ ΤΗΨ “‘and still...”.

7.2.3.6 Paradigm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ΧΝΑΣΨΤΜ</th>
<th>ΑΥΨ ΧΝΑΣΨΤΜ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>conjunctive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations: (1) ΑΥΨ + future is very common in prophetic, promissory or threatening textual stretches (e.g. III 114.9ff., 89.7ff., 136.22ff., 198.18ff., IV 104.11ff., Ch. 178.31ff., 103.1ff., 128.36ff., 148.10ff.).

(2) For ΑΥΨ + future in post-imperatival status, see §7.2.1.1.5.

(3) I have found no evidence in Shenoute for the conjunctive following a futuric - ΝΜΨ present predicate (cf. I Cor. 4:19, II Tim. 4:4).

(4) Following ΧΝΑΣΨΤΜ, the paradigm is joined by ΕΤΡΕ-, a “that”-form heralded by -C- (§5.2.2.1).

(5) Circumstantial future. I have found no example of any form or construction in opposition to the conjunctive after this nucleus.

(6) Second Future. I have found no example of coordinated thematic Sec. Future units (as distinct from jussive Sec. Future, §7.2.1.1.3) opposed to the conjunctive here.

(7) A rare example of coordinate irrealis apodoses (with no common thematic denominator calling for microcoordination): (IV 157.15ff.) ΝΕΡΕΝΜΟΥΤΕ ΝΑΖΟΥΨΕ-ΚΑΕΙΝ ΑΝ ΠΕ ΑΥΨ ΝΕΤΝΑΕ-ΠΜΟΥ ΑΝ ΠΕ ΕΚΝΑ- ΝΑΝΙΑΚ ΜΝΑΙΠΠΑΡΑ ΤΗΕΨΙΜΕ.

(8) ΠΕΤΝΑ- ΑΥΨ ΠΕΤΝΑ- is extremely rare (III 198.14ff. ΠΕΤΝΑΧΙΟΥΕ ΚΑΤΑΛΛΑΧ ΝΟΜΟΤ ΑΥΨ ΠΕΤΝΑΨΙ ΕΒΟΛ ΓΝΝΝΚΑ ΝΤΕΙΑΚΟΝΙΑ); so is ΕΤΝΑ- ΑΥΨ ΕΤΝΑ- (III 137.19ff. ΟΥΟΝ ΝΙΜ ΕΤΝΑΡ-ΒΟΛ ΜΝΨΙ ΑΥΨ ΕΤ- ΝΑΨΕ-ΝΕΨΗΝ ΕΤΝΑΝΨΟΜΕΝΑΡ ΜΝΑΠΠΑΡΑ ΠΑΡΑΕΨΙΜΕ).

7.2.4 Conditional and Temporal Protatic Syntagms. The frequent negative and affirmative encategorization here is stylistically distinctive (a figure). Distinction between (→→) and (+→) is difficult, perhaps not warranted.

---

53 The two syntags, ΠΕΤ- ("substantivized relative") and ΠΕΤ-/ΨΕ ΕΤ-/ΕΤ- (close) are diachronically and synchronically to be kept apart, as regards both external and internal relationships. However, they coincide as nuclei of the conjunctive. See PoIotsky 1963, esp. §6, and Quecke forthcoming.

54 In (IV 204.21ff.) ΟΥΟΝ ΝΙΜ ΕΤΝΑ- ...Η ΠΕΤΝΑ- two categories of persons are enumerated. ΑΥΨ ΕΤΝΑ-ΠΕΤΝΑ- is coordinated to a relative present (III 198.10ff., IV 49.1, 90.13) as a rhetorical figure (the relative present is mainly subcategorized as (n)ΕΤ- ΑΥΨ ΕΤ-, e.g. III 21.10, 74.14ff., 93.17ff., 127.16ff.); with close-forms: III 46.6ff., 215.14ff., Ch. 27.32ff., 95.13ff., Wess. 9 108a 13ff.; cf. Shisha-Halevy 1972: 114ff. For the perfect, we find (n)ΕΤΝΑ- (ΑΥΨ) ΑΗ-/ΕΑΗ-, cf. III 69.14ff., 177.24ff., Ch. 29.37ff., 40.18ff., etc.

(1) The *Conditional: εὐγένεταν* unvested or vested \(^{55}\) with καν, ζωτάν, ἐσωπε. Note the following data regarding the negation encategorization (εὐγνω- (Ἀγω) νῦττα-), the neg. conjunctive signifying "the next (negative) stage", "and not...", "so that... not", "even though... not...", "nevertheless/but/still... not..." (III 158.10ff., IV 3.17ff.; III 121.8ff., IV 85.3, Ch. 45. 16ff., 72.12ff.). Negation syncategorization (εὐγνω- (Ἀγω) νῦττα-, IV 106.5f.); negating maintenance, (εὐγνω- (Ἀγω) νῦττα- III 65.25ff., 131.20ff.); affirmation encategorization (εὐγνω- conjunctive + ἄγω ἄμα, ἀς, III 19.4ff., A I 88).

(a) (←→), personal maintenance: (III 19.4ff.) Εὐγνωτερα-Ἀναὺ Μπαν Μπούτε νεκειπε Δε Νκεαιναυ—affirm. encategorization / (ibid.) 125.14ff.) Εὐσβον Εὐγνωτερα Νκαινομος... Αὐγ Ντουτα-Ζη την Εμπαραδοσικ Νενειοτε — neg. maintenance / (IV 3.17f.) Εὐγνω-Πετανκού Νκειαν Πετανκειφε — neg. encategorization / (ibid.) 106.5f.) Εὐγνωτερα Αὐγ Νκεικ-Σβου — neg. syncategorization / (Ch. 117.14ff.) Καν εὐγνωτερα Νκειον Μτεχαρα Νταβούκ Ερος Αὐγ Νκεικομος / (A I 88) Εὐσβον εὐγνωτομον Μμοη Με- ταιον Αμα ντουτα-παν... — affirm. encategorization. Additional exx.: III 36.8ff., 110.17ff., 153.23 (repeated lexeme), 183.7ff., IV 56.15ff., 94.4ff., 102.18ff. (repeated lexeme), Ch. 28.44ff., 82.50ff., 88-9, 166.2ff., etc.

(b) (→→) (?), no personal maintenance: (III 65.24ff.) Εὐσβον ρω εὐγνωτομ-Τμηκες εὐγων ουτα-μας (v.l. Cod. A Μηας) Νουκεδαλιον Νκεικ-Μμος on Μμο—variant reading neg. syncategorization/maintenance / (ibid.) 16.22f.) Καν εὐγνωτομοτε ις ουσφο εβολο... Νκερ-Ἀναυ Μμοευ Ευγνφ ερο ("and so...") / (ibid.) 220.2ff.) Εὐγνωτομον εβο Μμοευρη Ντεκου Μμονου Μεκτον Μμοου 3κνευμα Μμοονε νταμπι τε Νκερα- Νκωου Εγειμα Μαηαιε... / (IV 69.13, A I 136 etc.) Εὐσβονσυνην... Ντε— the conjunctive sharing this slot with Ετερ— after the cataphoric -ς (§5.2.2.1). Peculiarly, - Αὐγ — occurs here in cases of actual sequence: (III 150.14f.) Εὐγνωτομον Εἰςμοος... Αὐγ Νταει Εβολα.

_Paradigm_: complete coordinated sets of protasis + apodosis excepted, "concurrent" constructions are here rare. For Εὐγνω- Αὐγ Εὐγνω- I have very few examples; one (IV 155.14ff.), in ponderous rhetorical style, with relatively independent protases: Εὐγνωτομοτε ραματα... Αὐγ Εὐγνωτομετε Ετομουμ- Οείκ... another (III 121.8ff.) with protases too immensurate to be microcoordinated: Εὐχε-Εὐγνω-...Αὐγ Ζωταν Εὐγνωτα...

(2) Εὐχε, Εὐσβον: Εὐχε- ουρ- ντατα- (§2.1.5) ε- see under (3)

(a) (→→): neg. encategorization/maintenance; no personal maintenance. (III 139.18) Εὐχε-Ουρονοινε... Ευκριμπα... Αὐγ-Εἰκας Μμοου ντοου Νκετμταμοι... — neg. encategorization / (A I 99) Εὐχε- Νταπαί Χοος 3κνονογεε Ντεποκυχ Αὐγ-Ἐμαιμου Ντεκαϊ Ψο Αὐγ Νκεμου... / (Wess. 9 122d 11ff.) Εὐσβον Ουτατα-Ουρων Μμοευρη Ντεκναυ Ευτυπος Νειρανο... / (Ch. 195.8ff.) Εὐχε-Αντετουρα- Σου ςμ-ςομ Εταυν Νακ Ντουτα-Μμον Αν Ντοκ... Εταυν Γαίκυτε Ντεποκυχ... — neg. encategorization. Also A I 97, P 1304 111 ΦνΓ (Εὐσβον Ντατα- Αὐγ Ντοκ Ντα-), Ch. 85-6.

(b) (→→) (?): (IV 101.8) Χεκας Εὐγειμε Χε-Ευσβον Εςαρες Ερος; Εὐσβον Μμον Νκεμτατου... (i.e. the applicants to join the community. The neg. conjunctive [neg. maintenance] contextualizes Μμον).

\(^{55}\) Shisha-Halevy 1972:§0.3, Ch. 3.
(3) Circumstantial-converter protases (unvested or vested \^55 with ΕΥΘΝΗ, ΚΑΝ, ΖΑΜΟΙ):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ΕΥΘΝΗ</th>
<th>KAN</th>
<th>ΖΑΜΟΙ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bipartite</td>
<td>OYNTAΓ-/MHTAΓ-</td>
<td>NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AΓ-</td>
<td>MHT- (here the conv. is often realized as zero)</td>
<td>MHT-/NHT-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bipartite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) (→→): characteristic frequent neg. encategorization; neg. syncategorization/maintenance; no personal maintenance. (III 157.1ff.) (ΕΝΕΝΒΗΝ ΝΕΚΕΩΝ ΑΝ) Η ΝΤΟΥ ΕΥΘΝΗ ΝΤΕΤΝΟΥΕ ΑΝΟΚ ΦΥΤΗ ΠΛΑΛΟ... — neg. encategorization / (ibid. 40.20ff.) ΚΑΝ ΕΥΘΝΗ ΝΜΜΑΥ ΚΑΝ ΕΥΘΝΗ ΝΜΜΑΥ ΚΑΝ ΕΙΟΥΕΜ-ΟΕΙΚ ΝΜΜΑΥ ΕΥΘΝΗ ΝΜΜΑΥ Η ΕΡΕΤΟΤ ΑΥΛ ΤΟΟΤΟΥ ΖΗΜΠΕΙΖΟΝ ΝΟΥΣΤ ΖΗΤΕΙΤΡΑΝΕΖΑ ΑΥΛ ΝΣΕΤΟΜΑ ΕΤΑΚΟ ΝΝΤΑΜΙΟ ΝΜΤΟΥΤΕ... / (ibid. 139.25ff.)...ΕΤΕΝΟΟΥΝ ΝΑΙ ΧΕ-ΑΧΙ-ΖΕΟΕΝ ΝΓΟΝΣ... ΑΥΛ ΝΤΕΤΝ ΝΤΕΤΝΤΖΑΜΟΙ... — neg. encategorization / (P 130^a 41 PS) ΕΥΘΝΗ ΟΥΕΙΤ MΝΟΥΜΑΑΤ ΕΟΥΝΤΑΓ ΝΜΜΑΥ ΝΕΚΕΩΝ ΚΗΝΖΕΥΣΕΡΕ ΑΥΛ ΝΤΕΣΑΖ ΝΗΤΟΤΟ 2Ε ΕΡΕΙΑ 2ΝΟΥΕΥΝ... / (IV 31.3ff.) ΖΕΝΜΡΗΕ ΕΜΝΤΑΓ ΝΜΜΑΥ ΝΕΚΕΩΝ ΚΗΝΖΕΥΣΕΡΕ Η ΝΤΟΥ ΕΝΤΑΓ ΝΣΕΛΟΤΑΣΣΕ ΜΜΟΥ ΝΣΕΚΖΗΝΤΑΡΧΟΝΤΑ ΕΝΑΗΤΟΥ... / (ibid. 196.14ff.) (ΕΝΕΝ-ΟΥΝΣΟΕΝ- ΝΣΕΟΤΗΝ ΆΝ ΕΥΘΝΗ ΝΟΥΣΕΥΟΥΝ...Η ΝΤΟΥ ΚΑΝ ΕΑΥΟΥΣΗ ΝΣΕΤΜΑΣΑΤΤΟΥ ΕΒΟΛ ΜΜΟΥ... (i.e. from the victuals) — neg. encategorization / (ibid. 98.14ff.)...ΕΑΥΤΟΥΚ ΕΕΝΕΝΒΗΝ ΝΝΜΕΥΜΑΤΙΚΟΝ ΝΤΕΣΖ ΝΖΕΝΒΗΝ ΝΕΚΣΜΑΤΙΚΟΝ... / (Ch. 63.12ff.) ΟΥΛΚΟΜ ΠΕ ΕΤΡΕΠΑΙΔΙΒΑΛΟΣ ΤΡΕΨΗΜΕ Ρ-ΝΟΒΕ ΝΜΕΝΟΥΟΥΡ Ρ-ΨΟΡΗ ΕΝΜΕΕΥΕ ΜΠΙΩΑΛΟΛΟΣ Η ΝΗΤΖΟΤΡ ΝΜΜΑΓ / (ibid. 195.53ff.) ("Will our heart be capable of receiving love towards our neighbour) ΜΝΠΟΥΦ ΝΟΥΡ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΜΝΜΝΤΜΑΙΟΜΤ ΑΥΛ ΝΤΕΣΑΑΓ ΑΥΛ ΝΣΕΚΖΗΣΗΜΕ ΣΨΡΗ... / (P 130^a 75 ro) ΝΙΜ ΝΤΕΝΑΡ-ΝΑΙ ΕΜΠΕΝΟΟΥΝΤΕ ΡΗΠΡΑΣΕΣ-ΨΕΡΟ ΕΒΟΛ ΜΜΟΥ ΑΥΛ ΝΤΕΑΑΓ ΝΛΟΥΜΕ ΕΝΕΝΠΑ... / (A 2 357) ("What is his worth") ΚΑΝ ΕΜΠΦΚΑ-ΚΕΘΝΑΑΤ ΧΕ-ΜΠΙΩΤΕΥΟΥΣΗ ΝΛΟ... ΑΥΛ ΝΨΡ-ΡΜΜΑΟ ΝΗΤΟΥ... — affirm. encategorization / (Wess. 9 88b 11ff.) ΕΝΕΝΕΝΗΣΗΤ ΝΝΤΕΟΥΝΣΕ ΧΝΙΩΝΗΣ ΜΝΜΟΟΕΥΕ ΧΝΑΗΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΜΜΟΥ ΑΥΛ ΝΤΕΤΕΨΤΕΥΣΗ ΡΗΠΡΗΜΝΟΕΥΕ ΜΜΑ ΝΔΑΜΙΜΝ... ΝΕΥΝΑΑΑΗΧΑΛΑΛΤΗΣΖ ΑΝ ΠΕ ΜΠΗΛ / (Zoega 200 TIA) ΕΝΕΝΕΝ-ΠΑΡΑΦΥΣΙΣ ΤΗΜ ΝΒΑΛ ΝΣΕΤΜΗ ΝΜΖΗΤ ΝΝΕΤΕΠΕ ΜΜΟΥ... / (A / 202) ΖΑΜΟΙ ΕΝΕΝΣΟΤΟΥ ΝΜΜΑΝ ΤΕΝΟΥ ΝΣΕ- ΤΜΗΣΗ-ΝΝΕΝΣΟΕΤΕ ΙΓΗΣΗ... — neg. encategorization / (K 928) (ΚΑΕΙΝ) ΖΑΜΟΙ ΕΝΕΝΕΝΗΡ-ΛΑΑΥ ΝΑΓΑΝΟΝ ΕΝΕ ΝΟΥΤΜΜΟΥΟΥΤ ΞΕ ΟΝ ΝΟΥΤΜΝΒΕ. (ΤΟΥΑΝΣ) ΖΑΜΟΙ ΕΝΕΝΕΝΗΡ-ΑΠΟΝΤΟΛΟΣ ΕΝΕΖ ΝΣΤΝΜΠΑΡΑΔΙΔΟΥ ΟΝ ΜΝΩΟΕΙ. (ΚΑΙΦΑΣ) ΖΑΜΟΙ ΕΝΕΝΕΝΗΡ-ΟΥΝΛΒ ΕΝΕΖ ΝΣΤΝΜΑΙ-ΨΟΣΗΝ ΟΝ ΕΝΜΟΥΤ ΜΜΟΣΕΙ — neg. maintenance / (IV 9.18ff.) ΖΑΜΟΙ ΕΝΕΝΑΤΤΥΜΟΥΡ ΝΟΥΣΗ ΝΣΙΚΕ ΕΝΕΝΜΑΚΖ ΝΕΚΟΜΟΥ ΝΣΕΜΕΛΑΓΟΣ ΝΩΑΛΑΚΑ. Also: IV 123.20ff. (ΕΝΕΗΝΕΝ ΞΕ-Η ΝΗΤΟΥ ΞΕ- ΑΥΛ ΝΣΕ Κ-), 163.2ff. (ΜΝΨΟΥ- ΝΣΕ-), Ch. 165.16ff. (ΕΝΕΝΜΟΥ- ΑΥΛ ΝΣΕ-), Wess. 9 119b 9ff. (ΖΑΜΟΙ ΕΝΕΝΜΟΥ- ΝΣΕΜΤ-).

(b) (→→) (?): (III 111-2) ΖΑΜΟΙ ΕΝΕΝΤΑΛΙΖΕΝ ΝΝΙΝΟΥΤΕ ΝΣΑΤ ΓΙΝΟΥΒ... ΜΑΛΙΣΤΑ ΘΙΚΥΝ ΝΝΟΥΥ ΤΑΙ ΕΤΙΡΕ ΝΣΕ ΝΜΑΣΗ ΝΣΙΚΕ ΑΥΛ ΣΟΟΥ ΝΟΥΥΣΗ ΝΣΑΤΕΤΣΗΣΗ ΝΣΗ ΝΣΑΤΕΤΣΗΤΟΥ / (A 2 526) ΝΛΑΕΙΝ ΠΕ ΝΑΙ ΝΜΖΗΤ ΕΤΣΟΟΥ ΝΑΚΛΑΡΣΤΟΣ ΜΝΠΙΜΕ ΕΝΘΑΝ ΌΥΜΕΛΟΣ ΝΤΕΝΕΤΣΗΜΑ ΝΨΡ-ΑΗΤΑΥ[Υ] ΖΝΗΕΣΣΕΥΕ.

Paradigm: ΕΚΕ - ΑΥΛ ΕΚΕ- (rare): (Ch. 36.11ff.) ΕΝΕΝΟΥΓΚΟΜ ΓΑΡ ΜΜΟΚ, ΑΥΛ ΕΝΕΤΒΟΗΕΙΑ ΑΝ ΤΕ ΝΝΕΚΞ... — incommensurate protases (the second non-verbal).

7.2.4.1 Atemporal, generic verb forms: (non-actual) relative-protatic present, parabolic (non-narrative) perfect. We encounter here either (a) the present form with no actual or durative reference \^56,
OYN- or the verboid OYNTO-, or (b) the non-narrative, gnomic-parabolic perfect tense — as a rule in relative and adnominal-circumstantial conversion, the equivalents of a *generic relative clause* ("such... as...") or of a gnomic suppositive hypothetic protasis ("supposing...", "should it ever happen that...") (Note the frequent negation encategorization, cf. §7.2.4.)

(1) Present: (a) (→→→): *(Ch. 26.12.f*) NEKΣWUH EΤΕΟΥΝΩM ΝΗΓΕΝΥΡΕΨΗΝΟΝ ΕΥΧΟΥΝΟΥ ΑΥΨ ΝΣΤΕΤΜΠΝ ΕΝΕΤΚΘΜΨ ΜΜΟΚ — neg. encategorization / *(IV 122.5f*) ΝΕΤΝΑΤ ΑΕ ΟΝ ΜΠΕΟΥΟΕΙ ΕΥΖΟΥΝ ΕΡΩΝ ΕΤΡΕΨΟΥΨ ΝΜΜΑΝ... ΟΥΟΝ ΝΙΜ ΕΤΟ ΝΚΟΙΝΨΟΟΝ ΝΟΜΜΑΝ... ΝΣΤΕΤΜΠΝΑΤΤΣΕ ΝΝΚΑ ΝΙΜ ΕΤΣΟΟΝ ΝΑΥ — here the conj. is probably microordinated to the substantivized future / *(Leyd. 355) ΝΤΕΤΣΩΗ ΜΜΟΝ ΝΤΕΥΨΟΟΝΙΜΣ (sic) ΖΙΟΥΜΝΤΡΕΨΖΙΑ-ΑΑ / (IV 156.9f) (ΟΥΡΨΜΕ Η ΟΥΣΙΖΜΕ) ΕΥΑΜΑΛΕΙ ΕΤΑΖΟΟΥΝ ΕΡΑΤΟΥ ΑΥΨ ΝΣΕΨΙΝΕ ΑΝ ΗΣΤΟΥ ΝΝΕΚΘΨΗ ΝΕΚΡΑΡΨΗΣ ΝΑΜΜΑ ΑΥΨ ΕΤΖΟΟΣ... ΑΥΨ ΝΣΤΕΤΜΨΤΜ ΝΑΥ ΕΡ-ΝΕΤΨΟΜΑ ΝΑΥ ΝΜΜΑΑ... / *(Cairo 8007) ΟΥΝΨΟΜΕ ΕΥΑΥΨΟΥ-ΤΡΕΨΤΨΟΥΝ ΜΠΑΤΨΜΟΟΣ, ΝΣΕΟΥΟΥ-ΤΡΕΨ ΜΜΟ(ΟC)...*.

(b) (→→): *(III 41.5) ΝΤΕΤΣΟΟΥΝ ΕΝΕΥΣΨΗΝΕ ΝΣΕΨΙΝΕ ΕΧΩΥΟΝ — lexical equivalence of neg. encategorization: "...and (should they) not tell" / *(Ch. 195.1f) ΝΕΤΕΟΥΝΤΑΣΟΥ ΝΤΤΜΝΑ ΝΖΗΤΟΥ — neg. encategorization / *(IV 120.3f) ΟΥΟΝ ΝΙΜ ΠΡΑΙ ΝΖΗΤΝ ΕΥΡ-ΝΟΒΕ Η ΕΥΝΑΡ-ΝΟΒΕ... ΑΥΨ ΝΣΤΕΤΜΞΕ-ΠΝΟΒΕ ΝΤΑΛΑΛΑν — na- nucleus? / *(Wess. 9 94b 10ff) ΝΙΜ ΝΤΕΤΣΩΟΥ ΑΝ ΧΕ-ΝΣΑΑΛΑΤΕ ΜΝΤΝΤΝΟΟΥΝΕ ΑΥΨ ΠΚΕΕΣΕΝΕ ΝΣΨΩΝ ΣΕΜΕ ΝΝΕΨΕΨΗΡΨ ΝΤΝΤΜΡ-ΠΝΜΕΕΥΕ ΑΝΟΝ ΜΙΤΤΨΝ ΕΝΕΨΗΡΨ — neg. encategorization, the conjunctive expanding the generic present CEME — or better neg. maintenance, with ΝΤΕΤΣΩΟΥ ΑΝ the nucleus (ΤΨΨ Ε- "be familiar with ").

(2) Perfect: *(A 2 363-4) ΟΥΡΨΜΕ ΠΕΝΤΑΝΝΟΥΤΕ + ΝΑΨ "There was a man to whom God had given..."

ΝΟΥΜΝΤΡΜΜΑΜΕ ΝΝΕΖΕΝΥΡΑΡΚΟΝΤΑ ΑΥΨ ΟΥΟΕΥΟΝ ΑΥΨ ΝΤΕΤΜΨΤΜΟΟΝ ΕΥΡ-ΕΞΟΥΙΑ ΝΑΨ ΕΥΖΟΥΜ ΕΒΟΛΑ-ΝΣΗΤΣ... ΟΥΡΨΜΕ ΕΑΝΝΟΥΤΕ + ΝΑΨ ΝΟΥΜΝΤΡΜΜΑΜΕ ΖΙΑΜΝΑΚΑ ΝΤΤΜΑΑΨ ΝΜΝΨΑ Ν-ΓΟΜ ΝΑΨ ΝΡ-ΓΕΤΝΑΝΟΥΝ ΝΣΗΤΣ — neg. encategorization / *(III 204.12ff) ΝΕ ΑΡ ΝΟΥΡΨΜΕ ΕΨΖΕΝΝΕΨΕΨΟΟΥ ΕΥΑΗΜ ΜΠΟΥΕ ΕΤΡΕΨΨ-ΝΟΨΟΜΕ ΑΥΨ ΝΤΕΤΜΨΟΟ ΝΑΨ ΧΕ-‘ΤΣΒΟΚ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΝΕΚΨΕΨΟΟΥ’ ΕΡΕΨΟΟΝ ΝΤΟ ΠΡΑ1 ΝΜΝΩΠΝΕΟΟΥ. Very striking, with the whole protasis-apodosis complex hypothetic, is *(A 2 453, not Sh.) ΟΥΚΟΥΝ ΕΨΨΨΕ ΑΟΥΑ ΑΨ ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΨ ΝΨΨΡΕ ΠΕΝΝΟΥΤΕ ΖΙΤΝΤΑΡΨΗ ΕΑΨΖΗ ΝΤΕΤΕΨΟΟΥ ΝΤΕΓΕΝΙΑ (sic) ΤΑΙ ΑΝΑΙ ΣΟΥΨ-ΠΚΑΙΡΟΣ ΝΤΝΑΑΚΕ ΕΤΝΑΝΟΥΝ ΑΥΨ ΝΨΡΑΨΕ.*

7.2.5 A personal/personal verb nominalizations: the infinitives

7.2.5.1 The apersonal (non-causative) infinitive, in varying syntactic statuses and the full range of meaning nuances, is expanded by the conjunctive.

(1) The infinitive in *adjunct* status (expanding another verb: ‘(ε)ΣΤΨΜ’):

(a) (→→→): ΑΥΨ-microcoordination is the rule. Personal maintenance; negation syncategorization. (III 40.14f.) ΕΞΖΑΡΨΕ ΕΤΖΜΨΑΤΥΝ ΝΟΥΝΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΟΝ ΑΥΨ ΝΨΨΡΕ ΖΑΤΕΕΟΥΙΑ ΝΟΥΨΝΑ... / *(ibid. 143.23f) ΕΙΑΝΑΤ-ΚΑΖΕ ΜΜΨΨΗ ΕΣΑΖΕΘΨΡΝ ΕΒΟΛ ΜΠΟΥΤΕ ΑΥΨ ΝΤΕΤΨΡ-ΕΟΣΙΑ ΝΝΕΕΨΑΛΝΑ. Also: III 92.8ff, IV 38.12f. (here Leipoldt emends the text unnecessarily to ε + inf.).

(b) (→→→): personal maintenance; neg. encategorization. (A 2 405) ΜΗ ΟΥΟΝΓΟΝ ΝΟΥΝΔΑΙΜΟΝ ΕΨΒΨΤΗ Η ΕΠΟΨΝΕΕ ΕΗΨΝ ΝΨΨΡΕ ΝΨΨΡΕ Η ΝΤΟΨ ΝΨΨΡΕ ΝΟΥΣΑΤ ΑΝΤΙΣΩΜΝ — the first conj. premodified by the circumstantial present / *(P 1305 38 vo) ΝΑΝΟΥΣ ΝΑΝ ΕΡ-ΣΟΨΟΕ ΝΤΝΚΑΡΨΟΝΟΜΕ ΜΠΕΟΥΝ ΝΖΟΟΥ ΕΡ-ΑΨΗΤ ΝΣΤΨΤΗ ΝΑΝ ΝΟΥΨΨ ΕΨΖΟΕΣ... ΝΑΝΟΥΣ ΝΑΝ ΕΦΒΒΙΟΝ ΝΤΝΣΗ ΝΟΥΖΜΟΤ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΙΤΝΜΠΟΥΤΕ ΝΖΟΟΥ ΕΡ-ΑΨΗΤ ΑΗΣΗΤ.*

56 Cf. the similar role of ΕΨΨΨΝ- (+ conjunctive), e.g. Ch. 190.49ff, or of ΕΨΖΕ-ΟΥΝ- (+ conjunctive), e.g. IV 24-5.
50 Cf. (Bohairic) Jac. 4:17 Φ ΕΤΣΟΨΥΝ ΝΟΥΝΕΨΟΝΑΝΕΝ ΕΑΨΗ ΟΥΟΣ ΝΤΕΤΨΤΕΜΑΝ.
60 See RUDNITZKY 1956:48ff.
The causative infinitive (ε-)τρέχ-σωτμ

(1) In adverbial adjunct status (incl. object expansion): 

ατρέπτεσσω
(a) (→←→) very common; as a rule, personal maintenance: (III 36.5ff., parall. Ch. 131.24ff.) ετρέπτεσσω αν ανεπίτυχτος για 
επίτυχτοντελεία, cf. ibid. 202.4 ...ετρεπτικές 
άπειρης ετρεπτικές ...ετρεπτικές απειρής. 

(2) Adnominal, ad-modifier, assorted adjunct roles: 

ατρέπτεσσω (III 211.2ff.) αρετοί 

(a) (→←→): no αυθ; personal maintenance. (III 182.20ff.) ...ουτε 

(b) (←→): (III 187.9ff.) ανεπάρκος επάνω

Conjugation carrier in the coactive (2MPTRECSWMT) and postactive (MNNSATRECSWMT) forms: 

- TPECSWMT (Nuclear verb affirmative only). Only (→→); personal maintenance disrupted; neg. enclosure.
  (III 169.12ff.) MNNSATRECS+CSW NAY NOYCON AN OYTE CNAY AN ALAA NA22 NCON EMMTE AYWS NCETMP-2WAY ECWMT (also IV 52.6, 156.11) / (A 2 403) 2MPTRECS-OUA NOYMT MNPENINA ETOYAAV AYWS NTE- PENINA ETOYAAV OUAY NOYMT MMMAH / (III 134.3f.) MNNSATRECSWMT EBOA EMTMA ETOYMEEVE ER-POUWU MNPOTTE NSETM ECWMT 2MPTW ETMMAY NNEUYOUWU N2HT EBOOY. Also III 49.1ff., Ch. 66.18ff.

5) Personal infinitive after prepositions: TPECSWMT: (Wess. 9 118b 11ff.) ANITPRECS-MOIEIS ECXMY- TAMIOM MNPOTTE MNHAMELOS THROU NTM+EBOOY NAY AKTREZAG P-MOIEIS ECXMYTAKO / (Ch. 178-9) NEBOOY PE NTREPARAG ("they" - heaven, earth and its inhabitants) NTEMYAH MNPHYE OYUH... NCESWIK EBOUY N2HMYOY — actual, dramatic succession of apocalyptic events. All these are apparently subordination instances.

6) TPECSWMT causative, predicated in a conjugation form — very rarely expanded by the conjunctive (subordination only?): (III 131.20) EYYANTMREKKASS OYUH NPWCH N4OMKOY — neg. syncategorization; sim. (Ch. 114-5) NECHATPEAMNTTE OYUH NPWCH N4OMKOY 2N8AH.

### 7.2.5.3 Paradigms: It is striking that, whereas coordination of multiple infinitives is much more common for the simple infinitive than micro-/subordination by the conjunctive, the inverse ratio is observable for the causative-personal infinitive ETRECH, where micro-/subordination is more usual by far than coordination of terms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) ECWMT NCSTMT NCSTMT</th>
<th>AYWS ECWMT</th>
<th>(1) adverbial adjuncts: coordinated series of co-nuclear adjuncts (e.g. III 122.7f., IV 37.11, Ch. 87.19ff., 107.25ff., etc.; very frequent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b) in-conjugation WCSTMT</td>
<td>AYWS ECWMT</td>
<td>III 107-8, 215.7f., Ch. 165.30ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) NCSTMT</td>
<td>AYWS ETRECH</td>
<td>Ch. 203.24ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) ETRECH</td>
<td>AYWS ETRECH</td>
<td>independent coordinated adjuncts (III 86.9f., IV 33.16ff., 183.9f., Ch. 67.17ff.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) ETRECH</td>
<td>AYWS ECWMT</td>
<td>IV 91.2f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) MNNSATRECH</td>
<td>AYWS MNNSATRECH</td>
<td>III 169.10ff. (3 ×)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) 2MTPRECH</td>
<td>AYWS 2MTPRECH</td>
<td>III 138.8ff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

62 AYWS E + infinitive coordinated to abstract nouns: Ch. 41.43ff. (parall. III 80.24ff.), 98.45ff.
63 An even more radical cohesive syncategorization (reduction of categories) than with the conjunctive. This is a very close junctural link in paradigm with constructions of looser juncture (§6.0.2.1). RUDNITZKY 1956:56-8 quotes many instances of a "conjunctive" role of E + infinitive/ETRECH. Upon examination, these are classifiable as follows:
7.2.6 THE RHETORICAL APODICTIC-RETROSPECTIVE ROLE OF THE CONJUNCTIVE; POORLY DOCUMENTED OR INADEQUATELY ESTABLISHED FUNCTIONS

7.2.6.1 The rhetorical apodictic-retrospective-eventual role of the conjunctive 64

(1) The conjunctive as a non-initial rhetorical question or asseveration, following a formal or logical rhetorical protasis ("given that..."; "in view of this..."): (IV 195.6ff.) ΕΥΣΧΕ-ΟΥΝΡΗΜΕ ΕΥΑΙΗ (sic) ΑΥΣ ΕΡΕΥΣΗΤΘ ΙΝ-ΑΡΙΚΕ ΕΡΟΟΥ ΕΥΣΧΗ ΕΠΙΤΑΠΑΝΟΣΤΟΛΟΣ (sic) ΑΟΥΘ... ΕΙΕ-ΝΟΥΟΥΑΙ ΝΤΟΚ ΕΤΟΡΤΗ ΕΚΑΠΑ ΑΥΣ ΕΚΟΥΜΕ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΠΝΤΕΡΑΝΤΙΚΕ ΝΝΔΕΑΙΜΟΝΗ... Ν ΝΠΥΘΚ ΕΥΩΥΝ ΕΤΜΝΕΡΟ (Leipoldt's suggested emendation, adding - ΑΝ, is I believe unacceptable) / (ibid. 100.22ff.) ΕΥΣΧΕ-ΑΝΑΒΑΚΟΥΝΓΙΕ ΝΣΕΡΜΕΝΗΣΤ-ΤΑΣ ΝΝΟΥΝ ΝΗΦΗΚΕ ΕΒΟΛΑ... ΝΣΕΤ-ΣΟ ΕΙΕΤΤ-ΘΥΤΝ ΝΤΤΥΝ (for ΠΑΠΑΚΟΥΝΓΙΕ + conj. see §7.3.1 below) / (Ch. 15.14ff.) ΜΗ ΠΑΡΓ Π-ΟΥΟΕΙΝ ΑΝ ΠΝΕΟΟΟΥ Η ΝΤΤΥΝΥΤ ΑΝ ΝΝΑΖ ΝΝΟΙ,... ΕΑΥΡΑΙ ΕΤΕ... ΑΥΣ ΡΤΝΝΑΥ ΑΝ ΕΛΑΑΥ ΑΝΟΝ ΠΥΑΗΘΝΗΝ ΟΝ ΝΥΤΓΤΑΚΕ-ΝΕΝΕΒΗΝ — negation maintenance: the conjunctive realizes the ΜΗ ("nonne") rhetorical question after the protasis-equivalent circumstances expressed by the preceding present forms: "Isn't the air full of light in daytime, and do we not often look up at the sky, and still do not see anything, nor does God enlighten us miserable ones" / (B.M.Cat. 82, No. 198 f.1 vo) ΑΥΝΕΛ-ΠΣΑΤΑΝΑΣ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΠΝΤΕΑ ΧΕ-ΑΥΚΩΣΗ ΝΡΑΘΕ ΝΠ-ΝΕΥΒΟΤΕ, ΝΗΛΑΑΥ ΔΕ ΓΕΦΗΚ ΑΥΣ ΡΤΥΧΟΚΟΥ ΕΒΟΛΑ; "... and wilt thou too do and carry out these abominations?" / (A 1 / 210) ΠΕΛΑΚ ΧΕ-ΕΝΟΟΒΕ ΝΕΤΑΠΑΝΗ ΝΜΠΒΑΛ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΜΠΑΧΚΑ, Ν ΝΓΤΜΑΚΚΕΜ ΝΣΟΥΟΟΟΥ ΑΥΣ ΝΓΤΓΤΑΚΕ ΝΚΟΥΝΗ Η ΝΓΤΚΟΜΕΚ ΑΥΣ ΝΓΤΓΤΑΚΕ ΝΚΑΖ ΤΝΡΚ ΝΜΑΛΑΣ; / (Ch. 167-8, parall. III 74.14ff.) ΠΙΚΑΙΡΟΣ ΠΕ ΕΤΡΕΟΥΕΙΣΤ ΑΥΣ ΟΥΜΑΑΥ ΥΣΗΝΕ ΝΗΕ ΝΟΥΒΑΡΒΑΡΟΣ ΕΕΝΥΒΗΡΗ ΑΥΣ ΝΕΥΣΒΕΡΕ... ΝΤΕΙΖΕ ΟΝ ΠΕ ΟΥΟΟΝ ΝΟΥΟΝ ΑΥΣ ΟΥΚΕΝΕ ΝΟΥΚΙΕΝΕ. ΑΡΑ ΝΤΕΥΟΥΟΥΑΙ ΥΣΗΝΕ ΝΝΑΖ; "... and may this perhaps mean that salvation of many will ensue?" — an ironical-sceptical question / (ibid. 13.8ff.) ΝΤΟΚ ΓΕΦΗΚ ΤΓΟΝ ΝΤΕΚΕΚΜΑ ΝΝΟΟΝ ΝΣΗΤΚ, ΜΜΝΥΣΗΕ, ΜΜΝΤΚΑΣ, ΜΜΝΗΠΑΡΣΜΟΣ ΝΡΗΜΕ... ΑΥΣ ΝΓΤΜΑΕΤΨΟΥ ΟΥΒΕ- ΝΠΟΝΕ; "... and still thou canst not fight against sin?" / (ibid. 58.15ff.) ΕΤΡΕΟΥΕΙΝΑΡ-ΠΝΠΑΡΦΥΣΙΣ ΜΜΝΤ- ΑΣΕΒΗΣ; ΟΥ ΜΟΝΟΝ ΧΕ-ΤΩΜ ΑΥΣ ΡΜΑΠΑΥ', ΑΛΑΑ ΧΕ- ΚΕΡΩΥΟΥΟΡΤΝ ΓΝΕΙΤΕΙΡΕ ΜΜΟΟΥ, ΝΤΑΤΥΜΗΨΕ ΑΝΟΚ ΕΙΕΣΓΟΥΟΡΤ ΕΙΘΑΝΑΙΤ; / (Wess. 9 139a 24ff.) ΣΤΜΝ ΕΝΕΙΜΙΤΑΤΕΒΗΣ. ΖΕΝΕΙΒ ΝΒΑΤΟΡ ΖΕΝΑΝΕ ΝΒΟΥ. ΖΕΝΑΝΕ ΝΟΤΡ. ΖΕΝΑΝΑΑΚΕ ΝΜΑΖΑ... ΝΤΕΝΨΨΕ ΚΑ-ΙΤΟΥ ΕΡΟΟΥ ΧΕ-ΕΥΝΑΜΤΟΝ ΕΤΒΗΝΤΟΥ... — a case of rhetorical dependent exclamatory asseveration (overlapping the adnominal adnexal role of the conjunctive, §7.3.2): "foxes' nails, snakes' heads, crocodiles' teeth, and people should trust them to, allay (their pains)!"><br>Compare here the use of the conjunctive (and of ΤΑΡΕΨΨΜΟΥ) following a rhetorical interrogative. See exx. in §7.2.1.1.5 — e.g. III 148.25ff. ΕΥΤΝΨΕ ΝΕΥΣΒΕΡΕ... ΕΤΜΟΥΤΕ ΕΡΟΝ ΧΕ-ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ ΝΟΝΕΝΑΥ ΕΝΕΝΚΑΙΑ.<br>

(2) The conjunctive non-rhetorical, following a formal or logical temporal protasis: (A 1 204ff.) ΕΡΕΥ- ΣΗΝΕ ΝΚΑΠΙΜΕ ΕΟΥΚΙΕΝ ΝΤΕΟΕΤΙΕ ΕΡΟ ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΟ ("... and you end up by...") / (A 2 505) ΖΝΠΕΟΟΟΥ ΕΤΟΥ- (a) Following jussive ΝΝΕΥ (IV 110.19ff.), ΕΘΑ- (IV 93.1ff.), neg. imperative (IV 104.22): here ΕΤΕΨΕ- apparently serves as a jussive form (by virtue of its "that"-form nature?), while ε + infinitive is a true subcategorization form. The jussive context (as Rudnitzky rightly observes) is here probably the primary factor; but see a case of initial jussive ε + inf. / ΕΤΕΨΕ- (IV 68.10ff.) ΑΥΣ ΕΡΟΨΗΟΥ... ΕΝΙΤΟΥ ΦΡΑΙ ΚΟΥΝΥΟΥΟΥΟΥΟΥ ΑΥΣ ΟΝ ΕΤΨΗΨΕ ΕΒΟΛΑ... ΟΥΑΕ ΟΝ ΕΤΜΡΨΗΨΕ ΝΗΕ ΝΓΕΠΙΝΗ...<br>(b) ε + infinitive as a subcategorization form after ΝΕΤΗΑ (IV 90.7ff.).<br>(c) ΕΤΕΨΕ- anacoluthically coordinated to another verb: (III 181.18ff.) ΖΝΜΕΟΕΨΗΕ ΕΝΕΙΜΚΑΜΠΣΗΤ ΑΝ ΝΟΥΟΝΕ ΚΟΥΙ ΜΜΟΟΥ ΕΡΑΙ ΕΥΟΟΥ ΑΛΑΑ ΕΤΡΕΨΕ- ΚΟΜ ΝΤΟΚ ΝΟΥΟΤ ΜΜΠΑΣ ΜΠΙΝΣΤΧ ΝΤΕΜΑΤΗ.<br>(d) ΕΤΕΨΕ- coordinated to ε + infinitive: (IV 80.24ff.).

46 Cf. CRUM 1926:1 250ff., II 373. For earlier stages of Egyptian, see ERMANN 1933:585; HINTZE 1952:227ff., FRANSEN 1974: 148-152; SPIEGELBERGER's instances of the "independent" conjunctive are all open to this interpretation (1925 §§152-3); VOLKEN 1964:65ff.; LICHTHEIM 1964:3ff. expresses some doubts concerning this function (however, the alleged "independent injunctive" role is far from established for Coptic).
Nayine ncaneyzbhye nctmentoy, h eayntoy on nceixi-wine exwoy / (IV 60.2ff.) cecotin nna2pmiyou te nsigneyzoxoc xe-‘ tnaoywym ’(on an eating day)... Ayw ncetmoyum, n2oy0 epentayzoxoc xe-‘ ttnna oyun an’ smiezooy ntaoyzoxoc xe-‘ tntnaoywym an n2nth ‘ Ayw nceoyym — the conjunctive with an eventual sense: “... and (they) finished by eating/not eating”.

(3) A few instances of ‘ ΞΕΚΑΚ + conditional/circumstantial + conjunctive ’, where the conjunctive is both apodotic and resumptive-constitutive of the final clause. This famous construction, frequent in the New Testament, has been studied by LeFort (1948a): he concludes that the “adverbial” (really pro tactic) interposition is not the conditioning factor for the conjunctive, which must have here a special (“votive”) modal value and stand in a “liaison grammaticale vague”, and anacoluthic syntax, with ΞΕΚΑΚ. Nevertheless, he does not entirely renounce the interpretation of the conjunctive as “copulative” — which raises the question: To what is the conjunctive coordinated? The construction is uncommon in Shenoute; it can here be interpreted as an apodotic-resuming role, or (less probably, I think) as the conjunctive in construction with and adnexal to ΞΕΚΑΚ 66. (Thompson L ro) ...ΞΕΚΑΚ εανκω K ι G ι Ν ι Ν ι Ν Π ι Ν ι Ν ι Ν ι Ν ι Ν ι Ν Π ι Ν ι Ν ι Ν Π ι Ν ι Ν ι Ν Π ι Ν ι Ν ι Ν Π ι Ν ι Ν Π ι Ν ι Ν Π ι Ν ι Ν ι Ν Π ι Ν ι 67

7.2.6.2 The conjunctive in action-advancing (promotive) role: Ayw nclywne (IV 52.16, 53.23) ...Ayw nclywne 68. (P 1318.94 ro) ...ΞΕΚΑΚ ερμανπογινν ΝΥΕΤΗΡΗΜΑ [.....] ΝΤΣΕΤΙΚΙΝ ΜΠΟΥΤΕ ΟΥΡΗΝΕ ΕΒΟΛ. (Ch. 87.46ff.) ΑΛΛΑ ΚΑΝ ΜΑΡΝΗΣΩΝ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΝΙΝΟΣ ΝΝΟΒΕ ΞΕΚΑΚ ΚΑΝ ΝΤΝ-ΤΗΚΥ ΕΚΕΚΟΙΥ ΝΑΓΑΟΝ ΕΤΝΝΑΟΥΜ-ΓΟΜ ΝΑΚ is admittedly difficult. Can the conjunctive here be in construction with and adnexal to ΚΑΝ “at least”, to ΞΕΚΑΚ, or syncategorized by ΜΑΡΝΗΣΩΝ (§7.2.1.1.2)?

7.2.6.3 Questionable cases. In (III 108.12f., collated) ΞΕΚΑΚ-ΑΚΡ-ΝΑΙ ΝΑΝ ΝΤΝΥΑΑΤ ΝΤ-ΝΟΥΣΕ ΝΑΚ, ειε—,..., ΑΝ should perhaps be added, since the stative ΥΛΑΤ shows the form to be the (circumsticial) negative present.

7.3 The non-verbal nucleus: adnexal (rhematic) conjunctive
Both nucleus and conjunctive are here essential sentence constituents, with the conjunctive the adn exal (“predicative”) expansion of an element which, in its own extent, constitutes or contains a predicative unit (§7.1.3). With reference to the following conjunctive-rheme, the initial constituent is them atic (topical), often passing judgment, appreciating, expressing an opinion (about probability, imminence, significance etc.) or attitude.

7.3.1 Nucleus: predicative modifiers (predicative - in their own extent).

(1) ΠΑΡΑ-/ΕΙΤΙ ΚΕΚΟΙΤI ΝΕ + conjunctive — a recurring, typical (though by no means exclusively Shenoutean 69) expression, for which we also find the variant ΠΑΡΑΚΕΚΘΗΜ ΝΕ: “shortly, nearly, almost...” (ΕΙΤI/ΠΑΡΑ μικρον) — affirmative, negativ ed, even converted. (Although strictly speaking ΚΕΚΟΙΤI ΝΕ is a

case of predicative noun — §7.3.2 — I suspect this is the modifier predicated by ἔνε, §1.2.1.2; anyway, both are neutralized in this environment. (RE 11 15a 7ff.) έτει κεκούοι πε ντετετοσχ χωκ έβολο... / (A 2 390) παντοτις ετεπαρακεκούοι πε νύφεψε 2μπάκο μπεμπάβρ / (ibid. 140) έτε έβολο κεκούοι πε ντετετμυψε πέτρυθ / (ibid. 113-4) ενε-εντπνιάζον, παράκεκος πε ντετετ-πάζρε ερόν σαλατε... / (P 130 116 16) η κεκούοι αν πε νεκρόηνε μμόν ζηνμειαυάξε (also P 131 146 νο)/ (P 131 157 79 πα) νκεκούοι αν πε ννγους ουάνπρεπεύσιν / (III 173 28ff.) νκεκούοι αν πε ντενμινε νάν νκέραφη μαγαν / (IV 100.2ff.) ενε-παρακεκούοι νεετρυψίμ-ταζ μπού ντενκε νεκάκε έβολο...

(2) ἐμοίκις ’’hardly’’, ’’almost... not’’ (’’kaum, schwerlich’’) with the conjunctive is used as an elegant rhetorical negation, striking a distinctive Schenoutean trait. ἐμοίκις is a circumstantial/relative-converter, syntactically marked alternate. (IV 67.21ff., parall. Wess. 9 125b 3ff.) ένεαλεβατιν ηνους ημε άυομ έμοίκις ντενκώκαι ντεναμίλε ηματε μμόνον ετεναφατόνει μμόν / (Ming. 84) ιπάει ήναγβάκ έν έρατο κνούον νίμ ζαλώς ερ-πάζρε ερόου, έμοίκις ήναγκέ έρατο μπλαρχίν η ηπαμαί (’’hardly even to the Governor’’)/ (P 130 100 νο) ενε-κατανταμεγους μεσετηλεον- ἐμοίκις ντενετκως ημούς ήμενευες μητεμαλλα... πη-μπυα νιε, ειε... / (IV 111.1ff.) ενε-περ τε, έμοίκις νέε-τευπρέπτε νεσ-ήσκη νιε-ούσ / (III 39.9ff.) ενεανεμύσμε νε ενακόκα ρεβοτοε έμμαναντ έροο, έμοίκις ντενεταμεγους έροο ταρκουν εμείεμεες ηνειε — the conjunctive is here in paradigm with the thickening expression III 24.23 ἐμοίκις ηντα- τεςτονού ετοοτ: (A 1 51) ηπαμαί ημε έμοίκις ηντεννούτε Γοραμ έρο — ’’almost’’, synonymous with (παρα-)κεκούοι πε (Amélineau: ’’peu ne s’en est fallu’’)/ (ibid. 165) κεκούοι ντεμαλ ηκαταβαρσά με- τανομία άυομ έμοίκις ηντενου ρόλου εβολο ηνθτου / (III 181.15ff.) ...ενειπτρ πω εξερας εμμού νεν- έμούς ενεανέσομαι, άυομ έμοίκις ηπού ηκούοι / (RE 10 160b 17ff.) (ουγκομ ηνα-ενεεζε... έβολ εμμοιοινκ άυομ πενκοτκ άυομ έμοίκις ητεεμούοι ηνεθ / (Wess. 9 144d 8ff.)...έμοίκις άυομ ηντενταμεγους πατούς ηνε- ούσιτ αγα καταμπαλα / (Miss. 234) ένεταμο μμόν ηπαι ηε-ηντον ηγαρετ εμού εβολο ενεπεμυκει ερο ηναθ ημί. Additional exx.: III 149.8ff., 200.10 (ἐμοίκις), IV 86.4, 109.7. 167.26, 192.11, A 1 157, 202. 26 24, (ἐμοίκις), P 130 76 76 ro ecc.

(3) Μνονούς, Μνονας- + conjunctive. (A 2 430, not Sh.) ένειε νονα έεντςονο εβολο ένγοουςβι ενυν- ούσαρε εντακμή ηντη ηνομηνταματη, Μνονούς ηντεμηνταματοζε ηνκυσε Γραπλην ηνθον ενυσιος ηνπονος — possibly the case of the conjunctive subcategorized by a non-temporal “parabolic” perfect, §7.2.4.1(2) / (Wess. 9 138b 3ff.) (Μη ενεανήσων ηε Σμοοι ημποτ) Μνονούς ηνθερεπέμεε έμκο — the conjunctive expanding ένανέσωσ? / (IV 83.22ff.)...Μνονούς ηκεκωσ μμουν in a preceptive context — conj. subcategorized by ήσυα? / (Ch. 18.13ff.) Νοε Γαρ Νούρρο νακαλος εκατερτ-πέακαξε... εακ- ξος έετρετοηνού ηθρου η-ηοτου ενου, έναγβακ έντερυξν-ενου ηθρου ιοντον, Μνονούς ηκτοτ νέμτε ηλεκαλα δίκαμ — the conj. microcoordinated to ετερα — or a case of the conj. after the parabolic perf.? / (IV 45.22ff.) Παλιον Μνονανεισβυνε ηθρου ηνεές-Γενπμα Γραπλην ηνου Νηοκε ενεεπύεξη μαγαν... / (P 130 137 PHZ) ...Ναι ηταςκομολογει ημισβ ένγους ητααά άυομ Μνοναοοιους ηνεκαρα ηνομηντ-

See §1.3.11.6 with exx. For the “conjunctival syntax” of correspondents in other languages, TOBLER 1912:15ff. (’’à peine si...’’), JEPPESEN 1962:38ff. (’’hardly’’), LÖSTEDT 1936:48 (’’vix: Adverbium in konjunktionaler Funktion’’). In Irish, the equivalent ar eigean usually enters a Cleft Sentence construction as the formal theme (’’vedette’’), although one suspects that here too it is not focal. The grammatical significance of ἐμοίκις lies in the peculiar negation categorization of the conjunctive: ἐμοίκις marks a non-cotextual, “uninduced” negation.

70 Although ἐμοίκις is not proclitic (witness ἐμοίκις Γαρ ὴτε-, Wess. 9 144d 8ff.), it is but rarely separated from its following conjunctive, and is to a degree univ eribed with it. This is symptomatic by the conversion of the whole complex (the conjunctive cannot of course be converted — probably another reason why ἐμοίκις + conj. is so converted). Cf. the double conversion in Ναι ἐμοίκις ετερα— (Luc. 23:53 Horner coed., Ναι ενεμοίκις ενεπε- Quechua).

71 The Coptic conjunctive recalls here the LE “narrative-continuative” (“Clause Conjugation”) jw.f br sdm following br-br-s3 phrases (HINTZE 1950:14ff., FRANSDEN 1974:91ff.).
7.3.1.1 **Conjunctival modifier + conjunctive syntagms.** Here the already difficult question of a modifier preceding a non-autonomous verb form to create a new autonomous whole becomes even more critical: here are elements which (I believe) are still bona-fide modifiers, expanded by the conjunctive, but which are nevertheless difficult to envisage as thematic sentence constituents (or, on their own, as predicative). As I see it, three alternative approaches present themselves here. (a) This difficulty stems from ethnocentric prejudice — either because of the status of these elements in Greek or their equivalents in other Indo-European languages; (b) the conjunctive functions here in fact as a "conjunctival" alternant-form of the verbal sentence, or (c) the conjunctive is really integrated in the verbal framework — i.e. it is subcategorized by some verbal element or other preceding the "conjunctions", the latter not entering any dependency with it: this last analysis would account for many, though not all, of the following examples:

1. **συντελεῖον, μηνοείδεις, μηνοειδείς** "consequently (... not...)", "as a result (... not...)", "so that... (not)/lest" (see footnote 66). (Wess. 9 142a 1ff.) οὐ συνείδειον ἡ τωμή ἡ εἰς οὐκογουμίνῃ ἠθέλειον τῷ μενοειδείς μηνοειδείς...
2. **τοῦτον, μηνοείδεις** "consequently (... not...)", "as a result (... not...)", "so that... (not)/lest" (see footnote 66). (Wess. 9 142a 1ff.) οὐ παρεῖ συνέκογοι μηνοείδεις μηνοειδείς μηνοειδείς...

The conjunctive after **συντελεῖον** is in paradigm with **εν** + infinitive and the "that"-form **ετρύχωσιν** (§ 7.4); the conjunct usually expresses an **intended** consequence, whereas **ετρύχωη** conveys the meaning of a consequence naturally or automatically ensuing, objective, unintentional and even undesirable.**3**; consider such a typical instance as **Παλαια οικονομίας ἡμετεροτζικής** μηνοείδεις μηνοειδείς μηνοειδείς...

After **μηνοείδεις** we find the thematic Second Perfect (focalizing **επιστάσθη**: Wess. 9 131b 25ff.).

(2) **ειμίχτιο** "otherwise", "unless", "be it not that..." — the conjunctive affirmative; the conjunctive may be taken here as entering a **prostatic** syntagm (§ 7.2.4). (III 138.11ff., parall. Wess. 9 163-4)

---

**3** This (and **μορικ** above) brings us yet again to the question of the **premodifiers** (considered above, §1.1.2.2). Rose's suggestion (1979:462ff.). that Hebrew pre-*Je* adverbials are invariably focal ("logical predicates", in a construction comparable to the Cleft Sentence) is hardly acceptable without further qualification: the (essentially contextual) question of their thematic or thematic status can only be settled on the basis of (a) contextual (FSP), (b) suprasegmental data. Be that as it may, the Coptic conjunctive is, I believe, a specifically **thematic** subordination form.

**3** Somewhat like the the Greek opposition of **στητε** + **finite verb** vs. **στητε** + infinitive (Blass-Debrunner §391, Mayser II/1 298ff.).
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ΕΙΜΗΤΙ ἡ ἐμεθυμάτω σε μοναδική ἐνεργεία ἑίν θησαυροῦ, ἐμενον συναίνεις χειρανίστατο / (K 933) ΜΝΗΜΑ ΠΕΝΕΙΡΗ ΕΙΜΗΤΗ ΟΡΑΜΗ-ΜΝΗΜΗ / (Ch. 158.25ff.) ΝΝΗΜΑΤΟΥΝ ᾿ΕΙΜΗΤΗ ΝΤΗΡ-ΣΝΑΚ / (III 107.8f.) ΟΥ ΓΑΡ ΠΕΝΕΙΡΗ ΕΙΜΗΤΗ ΝΤΗΡ-ΣΝΑΚ ΜΑΥΑΝ / (IV 60.15) (ΝΝΕΙΗΤΗΡΗ ΝΗΜΗ-ΜΗΘΗ... ΒΥΧ ΕΠΕΙΔΟΥΣ...) ΕΙΜΗΤΙ ΝΕΚΕΙΑΣ ΝΥΩΡΠ. The paradigm following ΕΙΜΗΤΙ includes the following finite pred. syntags 74:

| ΤΕ- | extraposition + Sec. Present (A I 64 ΕΙΟΥΨΗ ΤΕΡΕΠ-ΒΟΛ... ΕΙΜΗΤΗ ΤΕ-ΑΝΟΚ ΑΥΕ-ΝΤΟ) |
| ΜΕ- | circumstantial present (ΕΙΜΗΤΗ premodifier, IV 61.2) |
| ΕΙΜΗΤΗ | Cleft Sentence with nom. veldette (K 9067) |

| ΕΙΜΗΤΙ | ΜΕΣΗ- + Nom. Sentence (A 2 75) |
| ΕΙΜΗΤΗ | perfect (A I 122f., A 2 392, IV 36.16) |

| ΕΙΜΗΤΗ | present (Wess. 9 142d 2ff.) |
| ΕΙΜΗΤΗ | (i.e. non-verbal predicators, converted/complex syntags or tense-marked verbal predicators) |

| ΕΙΜΗΤΗ | conjunctive - tense-unmarked. |

(3) Ἡ (- Ἡ) "alternatively", "unless" 76. With the disjunctive Ἡ the difficulty in analysis is acute. The conjunctive may be here a means to give the disjoined term(s) a marked form of alternative members in a disjunction framework 77: (Leyd. 328) ... ΤΕ-Η ΝΕΣΤΡΩΥΝ ΕΣΧΗ Η ΝΕΤΡΩΥΝ ΕΣΧΗ Η ΝΕΣΤΡΩΥΝ ΜΝΟΙΗ Η ΝΥΩΡΠΗ ΛΜΟΟΥ ΝΤΟΥ / (III 38.17) ΚΑΝ ΕΚΕΙΑΝΓΩ, ΝΝΑΓΩ ΑΝ Η ΝΤΑΜΟΙ "I shall not desist unless you tell me...".

7.3.2 Nucleus: Predicative Nouns

(1) ΚΕΚΟΥΙ ΠΕ + conjunctive ("it is a small [matter] that...") (IV 81.25f.) Η ΚΕΚΟΥΙ ΠΕ ΝΤΕΠ-ΤΩΡΗ ΝΝΕΙΟΥΡΓΗΣ ΑΥΕ-ΝΤΝΑΝΑΣΧΕΣ ΝΝΕΙΟΥΡΓΗΣ...

(2) ΟΥΡΙΚΕ ΥΨΗ ΠΕ + conjunctive ("it is (but) a small turn whether...") (Ch. 68.43ff.) ΟΥΡΙΚΕ ΥΨΗ ΠΕ ΝΤΕΡΠΙΜΕΝΕ ΥΨΗ ΜΥΝΗΡΗ ΝΜΝΟΥΤΕ Η ΝΥΩΡΠΗ ΜΗΜΗΡΗ ΝΔΑΙΒΟΛΟΣ.

(3) ΟΥΜΟΙΖΕ ΠΕ + conjunctive ("it is a wonder that...") (III 156-7) ΜΝΟΝ ΟΥΜΟΙΖΕ ΠΕ ΝΤΕΤΕΙ-ΥΟΜΗ ΝΣΥΝΑΓΩΓΗ ΜΟΥΖ ΝΝΕΖΜΒΥΕΝ ΝΕΤΕΟΥΝ ΑΝ Η ΝΤΟΥ ΕΥΧΟΟΝ ΝΤΑΜΕΙΜΕ ΑΝΟΚ.

(4) ΟΥΜΗΝΕ ΠΕ + conjunctive ("it is a shame that...") (P 131a 76 vo, not Sh.?) ΟΥΜΗΝΕ ΓΑΡ ΠΕΝΟΥΧΡΗ- ΤΙΑΝΟΣ. ΝΣΑΖΕΡΑΤΗ ΕΠΕΝΟΥΤΕ ΕΡΕΤΕΥΨΗ ΜΕΣ...

The conjunctive is here in paradigm with the "that"-forms, ΤΕΡΕΠ- and ΥΕ- (§7.4). This is striking in an instance such as (P 130a 116 κ) ΖΕΝΒΕΒΗ ΝΑΙΜΙΝΙΝΙΟΝ (sic) ΝΕ, ΖΕΝΨΑΣ ΝΕ ΝΑΙ ΝΤΕΤΕΡΨΗΜΕ ΞΟΥ (and not divine truth). (Read ΝΤΑ-?)

74 For ΕΙΜΗΤΗ ε+(pro)noun (e.g. III 45-6, 90.3) in the sense of "except for...", see §6.1.4.1.2 and Ch. 1, n. 98. In that sense, ΕΙΜΗΤΗ also precedes modifiers (III 168.8f.,12, IV 120.11).

75 In most instances ΤΕΡΕΠ- may be interpreted as complementing (expanding) a preceding nucleus, not in construction with ΕΙΜΗΤΗ (which is but a premodifier). However, in view of the frequent ΕΙΜΗΤΗ expanded by ε+(pro)noun (preceding note) I think ΕΙΜΗΤΗ ΤΕΡΕΠ- too is a case in point. For the construction of ΕΙΜΗΤΗ in the NT and in general, see Lefort 1948b and Jelanskaja 1977: for ΕΙΜΗΤΗ as a protasis form, cf. Shisha-Haley 1974:374.

76 See Blass-Debrunner §44(8) and ref.; Kühner-Gerth II 297f. (4) (ἡ = aliquosin) cf. Schwyzter II 578 n. 3 ἄλλος.

77 Cf. the same dilemma with regard to Hebrew 'ο σε-: Blau apud Rosén 1979:464f. (Rosén doubts that the adverbial nature of 'ο "or" is sufficiently established by its syntax). See note 72.
7.3.2.1 A few examples raise the question whether the conjunctive can also be adnominal-adnexal (contentualizing) to non-predicative nouns: (IV 10.2f.) (I truly wonder that, seeing how much they blaspheomed, ΜΠΕΟΥΜΕΝΑΓΙΝΑ έν ΝΟΥΣΙΚΑΣ ΕΥΘΗΜΕΝΑ ΝΤΕΝΤΙΝΕΧ έν ΝΑΥ ΕΒΟΑ "the Gospel did not remain unwritten, as a sign that Christ (did) not forgive them..." / (ibid. 113-4) ΜΗΙΟΣ (sic) ΝΤΕΝΤΙΝΕΧ ΕΥ- ΚΑΙΡΟΣ ΝΤΕΝΤΑΡΧΕΙ ΕΞΝΝΕΗΤΟΝ... ΕΠ-ΓΕΙΑΝΟΜΑ / (ibid. 121.22f.) ΕΣΥΠΗ ΕΣΥΠΕΑΝΕΙ ΝΕΙΟΥΚΑΙΡΟΣ ΝΤΕ- ΝΟΒΕ έμ-ΓΟΝ ΕΣΡΑΙ ΕΞΝΝΕΤΟΥΗΣ ΖΜΕΙΜΑ — here the conjunctive could be formally subcategorized by the conditional (§7.2.4).

Here too the conjunctive shares the paradigm with ΕΣΡΕΣΙΣΤΟΝ (§7.4).

7.3.3 Nucleus: Miscellaneous Predicative Syntagms or Expressions

(1) ΜΕΨΑΚ + conjunctive: (Ch. 124.54f.) ΜΕΨΑΚ ΝΣΕΤΟΥΜΕΝ ΝΜΑΝΤ ΧΟΟΣ ΖΕ-... / (Berl. 1611 5 AS) ΜΕΨΑΚ ΕΣΤΕΒΕΘΕΙΝΠ-ΣΩΒ ΜΠΟΝΗΡΟΝ ΝΤΕΝΑΙ ΝΑΥ... (read ΝΤΑ-?). Add. exx.: Ch. 28.40ff., 78.31f., IV 160.18, A 2 147, etc.

The paradigm after ΜΕΨΑΚ includes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ΜΕΨΑΚ</th>
<th>ΝΕΟΥΝ- (P 1314 86 PA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>perfect (Wess. 9 164c 26ff., parall. III 139.4f.)</td>
<td>tense-marked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>future (III 219.20ff., IV 97ff.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conjunctive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tense-unmarked</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not in opposition with the preceding are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ΜΕΨΑΚ-</th>
<th>ΖΕ-78 / (Θ-) Nom. Sentence (A 1 76, Ch. 201.30f.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second Tense (ΜΕΨΑΙ ΖΕ- Ep. 66; Ch. 188.19ff., P 1304 116 ΘO)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΟΥΝ (IV 72.16f.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) ΑΡΦΥ + conjunctive: (III 117.8) (ΕΕΙΜΕΝΑΕΙ...) ΑΡΦΥ ΝΤΕΟΥΝΑ ΕΙ ΕΣΧΕΙ ΕΝΠΕΜΤΟ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΜΠΟΞΟΕΙC / (IV 128.6f.) ΕΝΟΥΜΕΝ ΝΠΟΞΟΕΙC ΕΤΡΕΨΥΤΑΛΤΕ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΜΜΟΝ... ΖΕ-ΑΡΦΥ ΝΨΡ-ΣΤΗΝ. The paradigm after ΑΡΦΥ includes also the (tense-marked) perfect (III 140.30f.), and the (non-pertinent) Second Present (ibid. 184.20).

(3) ΖΑΜΟΙ + conjunctive: negative conjunctive only — thus in suppletive neutralization with ΓΕΝΟΙΤΟ + conj. (4). (IV 96.4f.) ΖΑΜΟΙ ΝΤΕΤΜΠΑΖΑΕ ΤΣΑΒΩΤΝ ΕΞΕΝΚΕΚΣΙΜ... / (ibid. 164.7f.) ΖΑΜΟΙ ΝΣΕΤΜΡ-ΒΟΤΕ ΜΠΟΝΥΤΕ Ν ΝΣΕΤΜΑΑΥ ΒΝΟΤΕ / (Ch. 183.27f.) ΖΑΜΟΙ ΝΕΕ ΕΤΕΜΕΣ-ΟΥΝ ΝΣΕΝΗ-ΟΥΝ ΝΑΡΑΟΝ... ΝΣΤΜΤ-ΟΥΝ ΟΝ ΝΜΟΝΗΡΟΝ / (P 1304 139 vo) ΖΑΜΟΙ ΝΤΕΤΜΝΗΤΑΛΚΟΤΟΥ ΝΑΥ Π-ΓΡΨΩ2 / (Wess. 9 117a 15ff.) ΖΑΜΟΙ ΝΣΕΤΜΗ ΝΤΕΠΨΛψ ΝΩΓΤ ΖΝΟΥΡΓΗ. Also Ch. 113.14ff. After ΖΑΜΟΙ, the conjunctive is in paradigm with ΕΝΕ- (ΝΑ-) (Wess. 9 120b 16ff., III 173.26, P 1319 94 ro) and ΕΡΕ- ΝΑ- (IV 116.23f.); ΝΕ + Nom. Sentence is a non-pertinent member (IV 92.18).

(4) ΓΕΝΟΙΤΟ (ΓΕ-ΑΣ) + conjunctive: (III 112.16ff.) ΓΕΝΟΙΤΟ ΓΕ ΝΕΗ ΝΣΕΝΟΥΝΤΕ ΝΑΖΜΕΝ ΝΕΝΟΣ ΝΜ ΝΡΨΜΕ ΝΨΥ-ΓΟΜ ΝΑΝ Ν ΝΣΝΤΑΕΙΟΥ / (Wess. 9 124a 12ff.) ΓΕΝΟΙΤΕ ΓΕ ΝΣΕΤΝΤΡΕΟΥΜΙΝΕ ΝΨΨΕ ΝΜΝΕΤΝΕΡΦΥ ΝΤΕΝΑΖΗΤ ΝΜΟΝ / (Ch. 118.31f.) ΓΕΝΟΙΤΟ ΓΕ ΝΣΝΚ-ΟΥΝΑ ΜΠΟΝΤΟ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΜΝΕΣΟΥ ΜΡΑΠ. ΜΗ ΓΕΝΟΙΤΟ "God forbid" is construed with ΕΣΡΕΣИ (IV 29.16f., 41.15, IV 15.4).

(5) ΑΛΛΑ 79 + conjunctive: (IV 85-6) ΑΛΛΑ-ΝΤΕΤΜΠΗΣΗ ΧΙ-ΑΛΛΑ ΖΕ-ΨΨΜΕ, ΑΛΛΑ-ΤΡΕΚΑΝΑΡΑΚΑΖΕ ΜΜΟΚ ΠΑΡΑΝΤΕΝΑΠΚΖΗΤ ΥΟΨΟΥ. One cannot say which (if any) of the differences between the conjunctive and the "that"-form ΤΡΕ- here (neg.:affirm., nom.:pronom. actor, non-reflexive/reflexive object) is

78 ΖΕ- appears to be the valency-rectiion of the verbal lexicem component -Ψ- in ΜΕΨΑΚ, this analyzability significantly coinciding with conjugability: ΜΕΨΕ ΖΕ- (A 1 76), ΜΕΨΑΙ ΖΕ- (Ep. 66): "you /1 do not know that..."

responsible for the selection of either form. ΑΑΑΟ - is elsewhere followed by a noun(-equivalent): ΙV 3.2, A 1 161-2, 191, A 2 52, 391, 411 (note the position of ΑΝ in ΑΑΑΟ + noun ΑΝ… ΑΑΑΟ...) etc. I doubt that ΑΑΑΟ in Coptic is by itself predicative; it is probably (like ΟΥΕΤ - in the synonymous ΟΥΕΤΟ - ΟΥΕΤ-, a favourite Shenoutean constellation which does not contain the conjunctive, Dictionary 495-6) a predicative-frame (ΑΑΑΟ - ΑΑΑΟ - ) component.

(6) (ΝΕ)ΝΑΝΟΥΣ ΑΝ (ΝΕ) + conjunctive: (Wess. 9 158b 24ff.) ΝΑΝΟΥΣ ΑΝ ΝΤΕΝΠ-ΟΥΣΟΟΥ Η ΧΝΑΥ-Η ΟΥΕΒΟΤ Η ΟΥΡΩΜΕ-... ΕΝΗΙ ΕΡΠΑΛ 2ΑΖΕΝΒΑΚΑΝΟΚ -- note the Ν- AN negation / (P 130' 37 PMZ) ΝΕΝΑΝΟΥΣ ΝΕ ΝΕΝΤΜΜΑΝ ΝΙΣΧΟΟΟ ΧΕ-'. The conjunctive here is in paradigm with the non-rhetic (adjunctal) (Ε)-ΤΡΕΨ-, cataphorically heralded by -ς- (§5.2.2.1).

7.4 Excursus: the conjunctive and "that"-forms in functional assignment

In certain environments, the conjunctive is in substitution not only with specifically adjunctal, modifier verb-forms but also with such as display elsewhere a typically nominal syntax: "that"-forms. The question whether or not the conjunctive itself is an adjunctal "that"-form is per se irrelevant. What is significant is that the conjunctive contracts extensive substitution relationships with two Coptic "that"-forms: the prospective ΕΤΡΕΨΟΨΤΜ and ΧΕ-, nominalizing tense-marked verbal predications, Nominal-Sentence patterns, ΟΥΕΤ- /ΜΗ-, adjective-verbs and various focalization patterns. These (conj./ΕΤΡΕΨ-) paradigms are defined by the following environments:

(a) adnominal: ΕΠΝΑ ΕΤΡΕΨ- (ΙΙΙ 146.15, 163.19ff., 186.15, ΙV 68.19; Mich. 158 17b; Ch. 130.11f. 80); after predicative nouns: pred. time expressions 81: ΠΕΝΟΥΟΝΠΕ ΕΤΡΕ- (ΙΙΙ 224.20), ΠΚΑΙΡΟΣ ΠΕ ΕΤΡΕ- (Ch. 167.47ff., parall. ΙΙΙ 74.14), ΠΝΑΥ ΠΕ ΠΑΙ ΕΤΡΕ- (ΙV 29.26); ΠΝΑΥ ΠΕ ΠΑΙ ΕΤΡΕ- (Mich. 158 14a 6); cf. ΙV 33.20f. (ΝΕΣΜΟΤ...), 51.7 (ΠΝΑΥ ΝΟΤΜΕ ΝΟΥΝΟΥ).

(b) ad-modifier: ΕΙΜΗΤΙ, ΖΗΣΤΕ ΕΤΡΕ- (§7.3.1.1); ΕΤΙΚΕΚΟΥΙ ΠΕ ΕΤΡΕ- (Rossi 2/3 90).

(c) adverbial, after ΝΑΚΑΝΠΕ, ΕΚΑΝΑΝΠΕ, ΝΑΝΟΥΣ (§§7.2., 7.2.4, 7.3.3, see §5.2.2.1); after ΜΗ ΓΕ- ΝΟΙΤΟ (ΙΙΙ 29.16ff.).

This substitution must be pointed out, even if we cannot at present isolate a real functional difference between ΕΤΡΕΨ- and the conjunctive in those environments; note that in case (a), it is at times impossible to distinguish between adnominal and ad-pattern status of ΕΤΡΕΨ-.

The following table is a display of functional domains of "that"-forms (finite verb nominalizations, "abstract relative" forms or syntagms), for Shenoutean Sahidic and (for a comparative-contrastive rather than diachronic view) two earlier stages of Egyptian 82. This issue awaits yet special monographic study, for every dialect and stage of the language (in Coptic, the difference between Sahidic and Bohairic is very

---

80 In (ΙΙΙ 82.18ff., parall. Ch. 45.4ff.) ΕΠΝΑ ΝΤΕΝΠΡ-ΖΗΒΕ... ΑΤΕΝΤΡΕΨΕΥ-ΑΟΥΑΑΙ, ΤΡΕ- is fully causative.

81 A nominal time-expression displays the broadest paradigmatic spectrum of adnominal expansion in Coptic:

| ΠΝΑΥ, ΠΚΑΙΡΟΣ | circumstantial: adnemal, contentualizing (ΙV 102.15 cod. C) |
|               | relative, no anaphora: attributive (ΙΙΙ 68.2f., 83.12, ΙV 94.25ff., 102.15 codd. A, B) |
|               | relative, with anaphora: attributive (ΙII 21.1, 189.20f., ΙV 87.7, 179.1) |
| ΠΝΑΥ/ΠΚΑΙΡΟΣ ΠΕ | ΕΤΡΕΨ: prospective, contentualizing (ΙΙΙ 74.14, 224.20, ΙV 29.26) |
| ΟΥΚΑΙΡΟΣ      | circumstantial: adnemal + attributive, neutr. (ΙII 181.10f.,23f.) |
|               | conjunctive: adnemal, contentualizing (ΙV 113-4, 121.22). |

striking); the picture needs further resolution in Coptic no less than in pre-Coptic Egyptian. The thematic function (in focalization patterns) has, for obvious research-historical reasons, been overlaid to an extent at the expense of others. Note that the presentation below is schematic and incomplete, not taking into account (a) "concrete" nominalizations — participles, relative forms; (b) the infinitive with no actor in immediate syntagm; (c) the negated "that"-forms (incl. "that"-forms after negators of existence), not necessarily coextensive with affirmative ones. The exclusion of these important elements cannot but distort the picture. Furthermore, some less central functional categories are omitted as well: "that"-forms as headings (superscriptions); in initial (protatic) "casus adverbialis" status; in apposition to an anaphoric or cataphoric pronoun.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>theme-topic in focalization patterns</th>
<th>COPTIC</th>
<th>LATE EGYPTIAN</th>
<th>MIDDLE/OLD EGYPTIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Ch. 2) Second Tense/relative; circumstantial</td>
<td>j.jr.f sdm / j.sdm.f circumstantial</td>
<td>mrr.f / sdmw.f / sdmn.(tw).f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subject = theme in Nominal Sentence</td>
<td>ἔτεο-</td>
<td>p3y.f sdm / p3 sdm j.jr.f</td>
<td>mrr.f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(grammatical) subject of verb/adjective</td>
<td>ἔτεο-</td>
<td>p3y.f sdm / p3 sdm j.jr.f</td>
<td>mrr.f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>predicate of Nominal Sentence</td>
<td>ἔτεο- (gloss, after ΠΕ)</td>
<td>p3y.f sdm / p3 sdm j.jr.f</td>
<td>mrr.f, sdmn.(tw).f; (passive sdmw.f?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Wechselsatz&quot; (&quot;balanced construction&quot;)</td>
<td>Εύ- (§2.7.1.1)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>mrr.f / sdmw.f / sdmn.f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>object of verb</td>
<td>ἔτεο- (prosp.)</td>
<td>p3y.f sdm / p3 sdm j.jr.f; r-dl; prosp. sdm.f (lex. valency distr.)</td>
<td>mrr.f / prosp. sdm.f, sdmw.f, (sdmn.f); nit-/wnt- (lexeme valency/sentence-form distribution)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(non prosp.)</td>
<td>ἔτεο-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

83 In ME/OE, for instance, the distribution of sdmw.f and its relationship with mrr.f and the non-"emphatic" prospective are far from clear; so are the distributional schemes of nit-/wnt-, and of mrr.f/sdmn.f ("emphatic") outside focalization patterns. For Demotic, almost all of the assignment work awaits to be done.
84 ME: mrr.f; LE: infinitive + jr.n.? Coptic: ἔτεο-? (cf. III 218.14), ἔτεο- (Ch. 153.5ff.).
85 Cf. SHISHA–HALEVY 1974 (see §2.8.3 here for the Sec. Tense as a "that"-form outside focalization patterns).
87 III 26.4, Ch. 155.44ff.
88 III 26.4, Ch. 47.42.
89 III 29.16f., 105.14, IV 85-6, Ch. 197.19f.
90 III 214.17, Ch. 122.18ff., 137.30ff., 142.11f.
91 Also after ἔτεο (Ch. 160.14f.); after the copular ΠΕ: III 184.7, 224.20f.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>governed by prepositions, expanding modifiers</th>
<th>Coptic</th>
<th>Late Egyptian</th>
<th>Middle/Old Egyptian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TPE (έ-, η-, NCA-,ANTI-, 2ITN-, MNNCA-)</td>
<td>p3y.f sdm</td>
<td>mrr.f / prosp. sdm.f, (sdmw.f), (sdm.n.f) / sdm.t.f; ntt- (lexeme valency/sentence-form distribution)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΞE (ΕΤΒΕ-, ΕΒΟΑ)</td>
<td>j.jr.f; prosp. sdm.f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(conjunctive)</td>
<td>(after m-dr-, m-ḥr-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in initial modal role: jussive-optative-hortative</td>
<td>Second Future</td>
<td>prospective</td>
<td>prospective sdm.f, mrr.f (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ΕΟΝΑ-) (§2.1.3)</td>
<td>sdm.f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ΕΤΕ)-, n. 63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adnominal</td>
<td>(Ε)TPE</td>
<td>(n-) (p3) sdm j.jr.f</td>
<td>(n-)mrr.f, (sdm.f, sdm.n.f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΞE</td>
<td>p3y.f sdm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(conjunctive)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

92 Not analyzable synchronically, according to GROLL 1970:409ff.
93 III 218.14 (ΟΥΛΟΡΟΣ), IV 118.24 (ΤΕΧΕΙΑ), 61.24f. (ΤΕΙΗΜΑ), see above §7.4 (a), and note 81; exx. in RUDNITZKY 1956: 131ff.
95 See De Cenival, ReE 24:42f. (1972); JUNGE 1978.
APPENDIX

TEXTUAL SOURCES CONSTITUTING THE CORPUS

Observations on editions follow the bibliographical information. For reasons of space, I have limited cross-references to a minimum (parallels between A, Ch., L and Wess., also with numerous unpublished fragments, are not specified here, neither are codicological interrelationships. The following is not a bibliography of Shenoutean philology, the need for which is met elsewhere (Bibl. = P. J. Frandsen and E. Richter-Aerøe, "Shenoute: A Bibliography", in: D. W. Young [ed.] 1981:147-176). For some surveys of editions, see R. McL. Wilson, ed. 1978:21 n. 122 (Krause), 156f. (Orlandi).

A. Editions of Published Manuscripts
(arranged in alphabetic order of abbreviations or reference codes)

A 1, 2
E. C. Amélineau, Œuvres de Schenoudi, Paris, Leroux, 1907-1914. (Bibl. No. 1). Quoted by page. A 2 268-285 is by Besa (Kuhn, CSCO 157/copt. 21 [1956] p. X f.), 530-2 by Basilius (Lucchesi, Analecta Bollandiana 99:78 [1981]). Amélineau's fragment XXI (A 2 415ff.) has now been identified as a translation (at first sight, expert and faithful) of some of Gregory of Nyssa's homilies on Ecclesiastes: Orlandi, Vetera Christianorum 18:337f. (1981). In special cases, quotations from this fragment have been retained, marked as "not Sh." — This, the first extensive edition of Shenoute's works, is on the whole negligent and not always reliable. Wherever possible, I have collated Amélineau's more suspect readings with the Naples MSS and, when necessary, emended them; sometimes I quote the MS in preference to Amélineau's text. Reviews and critical remarks by Nau, Leipoldt, von Lemm and others.

Berl. Sitz.

BKU

BMCat.
W. E. Crum, Catalogue of the Coptic MSS in the British Museum (London, The British Museum, 1905): see below for fragments described and/or edited here. (Not in Bibl.).

Cat.

Ch.
E. Chassinat, Le quatrième livre des entretiens et épîtres de Shenouti (MIFAO 23, Le Caire 1911). (Bibl. No. 19). Parallels with A I, BMCat., L III, Wess. and unpublished MSS. Part translations, commentaries, glossaries etc. by Du Bourguet, Barns, Koschorke-Timm-Wisse and Cherix. The attribution of Ch. 200-209 (206,56-208,22 is paralleled in Kahle, Bala‘izah, No. 50) is problematic: the authorship of "Liberius" is historically impossible, and in my opinion the Shenoutean authorship is still a pos-
sibility (a commented edition and translation has been prepared by F. Wisse). Quoted by page and line.

**CO**


**Gol. Jelanskaja**


**Ench.**


**Ep.**


**L III, IV**

J. LEIPOLDT, *Sinuthii Archimandritae Vita et Opera Omnia*, III (CSO 42/copt. [ser. 2] 4, Paris 1908) and IV (CSO 73/copt. [ser. 2] 5, Paris 1913). The best extensive critical edition to date. *(Bibl. No. 80, see the index of references, p. 175f.).* Reviewed by Spiegelberg and Junker. Numerous observations by von Lemm, Jerstedt and others. Translation by H. Wiesemann (CSO 96/copt. 8, 1931, and CSO 108/copt. 12, 1936), partial translation (of No. 20-22) by Leipoldt himself (in *Festschrift Barnikol*, Berlin 1964, 52-56). Parallels in A, Ch., Wess. etc. (some noted by Leipoldt, with many additions), also in unpubl. or recently published fragments (e.g. Leipoldt’s No. 22 - III 76.16-77.10 - in ViK 922; No. 32 in B.L. Or. 8664, see Or. below; Nos. 71, 74: see Lucchesi below; others are noted above, following relevant quotations). Leipoldt’s No. 76 (IV 129-153) is not by Shenoute (see IV pp. x-xiii; LEIPOLDT 1903:11ff., with various indications of non-Shenoutean composition; Lefort, *Œuvres de S. Pachôme* [CSO 159/copt. 23] xxiiif.). Among other linguistic phenomena betraying non-Shenoutean authorship, observe the frequent *jussive ἐρέμη* (e.g. 133.20, 136.13, 145.12), extensive non-rhetorical use of *μάρεμêt* (e.g. 129.22, 131.20, 135.4); peculiar use of the conjunctive, esp. the conj. continuing or relieving *ἐρέμη* at a distance (e.g. 130.7, 131.8, 133.8, 141.22f., 147.19f. etc.): the conjunctive supplies the details in a framework of *ἐρέμê* preceptive jussive. Way of expression different from the Shenoutean: 132.26f., 140.12, 143.5; a special use of *ἐνê*, 131.27, 136.11, 138.12, 24, 143.5, 145.4; different sentence structure, with frequent anacluthia, which is unusual in *preceptive* Shenoutean texts. For III p. 244 (Gregory of Nyssa) see above, on Amélineau fgt. XXI. — Quoted only by volume (III, IV), page and line.

**Lemm**


**Leyd.**


**Lucchesi**


**Ming.**
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Miss. E. C. AMÉLINEAU, *Monuments pour servir à l'histoire de l'Égypte chrétienne aux IV*, *V*, *VI* et *VIIe siècles* (Mém. de la Mission Archéol. Française 4/1, Paris 1888) 277-287 ("Fragmentum", *n* - *sA*, see p. xlvi); pp. 229-236, although somewhat unusual in genre for Shenoute, is nevertheless Shenoutean in style. (Not in Bibl.)


Or. A. SHISHA-HALEVY, "Two New Shenoute Texts from the British Library", *Orientalia* 44:149-185 (1975), with plates IX-X. (Bibl. No. 121). New parallels: *VIK* 9292 parallels *B.L.Ori*[i]. 8664, here publ., from *AE* 34 to *AZ* 46; *P* 131*1* 72 parallels *MB* 17 to *MA* 20. Prof. B. Layton informs me that the originals for *B.L.Ori* 7561 have been located; that fragments *CIII*, *CIV*, CV and *CVII* cannot have belonged to the main MS (pp. *θφπA*), also that *CI* is paralleled by the fragment of Crum, *Papyruscodex*, Appendix. It would therefore seem that the Shenoutean authorship of all fragments on pp. 172-5 is at best doubtful. Quoted by page and line.


Wess. 9 C. WESSELY, *Studien zur Paläographie und Papyruskunde IX (= Griechische und koptische Texte I*, Leipzig, Haessel, 1909): Sh. Nos. 29-32, 35, 36, 38, 41, 42, 44-49, 50-54 (No. 50 is an incipit catalogue of Shenoutean works, to be published and translated, with identifications and additional incipits, by F. Wisse); Sh.? 37, 39, 43. (Bibl. No. 144). Parallels in some editions and unedited fragments. Textual observations etc. by von LEMM 1972b:217. Quoted by page, column and line.

Young  

Z, Zoega  
G. Zoega, Catalogus codicum copticorum manuscriptorum qui in Museo Borgiano Velitris adservantur (Roma 1810). (Not in Bibl.). Forty-eight Borgian codd. are attributable, with greater or lesser certainty, to Shenoute. Of these 15 were edited in A and L; 17 in L (two in L alone), 27 in A alone (No. 230, Leipoldt's No. 76, is not by Shenoute: see above). Nos. 301 (IB 15, 474 - a copy of 300), 233* (IB 9, 408, copy of 233), and 287-8 (Sh.?? IB 14, 461) have not been edited to date. I quote Zoega, where applicable, in lieu of the unreliable A.

B. Unpublished Fragments

This list is not meant as a check list or repertory of unedited sources of Shenoute's writings, but as a reference listing of all MSS actually scanned and utilized in the present work. A few words on the procedure of sifting out unedited Shenoute fragments: I have relied heavily on Crum's opinion, in his Dictionary, Catalogues and Papers (Large blue "S": XI 14, XI 54 are here especially relevant). His opinion is used as an authoritative starting point for further examination, never as a last word. I have not as a rule touched upon the question of codex assignment of fragments. This important project (of which the main proponent is Prof. Tito Orlandi of Rome) should be undertaken by competent palaeographers, with all the material before their eyes, and should be combined with the compilation of such a repertory as is mentioned above (see §0.1).

ENGLAND

LONDON, The British Library,  
Dept. of Oriental MSS and Printed Books

Fragments (in BM Cat. numbering):
Sh. (B.L. Or. 3580A) 144 (publ. in BM Cat.)
(B.L. Or. 3581A) — all (partly = *) published in BM Cat. —
192*  194*  195*  196*  198*  199  201  202*  203*  205  206  209*  210*  211*  212  232*  253* (parallel to RE 10 159a 1-24), 991, 992*.

B.L. Or. 6954 (12) vo, one of the "Horner fragments"; I have used a copy made by Prof. Layton.
Sh.? (B.L. Or. 3581A) 215 (partly publ. in BM Cat.), 251. Sh.?? 252.
No. 214 contains a Shenoute quotation (Von Lemm 1972b:27f.).

MANCHESTER, The John Rylands University Library

Nos. 67-70 (partially publ. in Ryl. Cat.; No. 67 is included in L, No. 22, cod. D, where however Leipoldt merely reprinted the Ryl. Cat. text). I have used photographs and Crum's copies (Crum Papers II 10).

CAMBRIDGE, University Library

Or. 16/1699 (H. Thompson's MSS ("Thompson", "HT"), presented in 1939), fragments E (1f.), F (1f.), G (1f.), H (4ff.), J (2ff.), K (4ff.), L (1f.), X (1f.). This is part of a collection of approx. 80 fragments, previously in the possession of Hyvernat. Some Shenoutean ones (A, C, D, E) have been published. A
large box (Or. 16/1700) contains various items, including the paper and envelopes which previously held these fragments, slips with Thompson's transcripts, notes regarding the fragments, correspondence, etc. Thompson seems to have paid special attention to the Shenoutean texts, to judge by his notes on parallel MSS, Biblical quotations and a detailed list of the Shenouteana of the collection.

OXFORD, The Bodleian Library

(Volume b 4) Sh. Cl.Pr. 22, 36; Sh. Cl.Pr. 33. The "b 4" fragments, originally Woide's, were bought following his death for the Clarendon Press, then deposited in the Bodleian. Abbé Hyvernat's handwritten catalogue of 1887 is very detailed in the description of the fragments. For further information on this collection, see Crum Papers II 1; PSBA 30:231ff. (1908); RđE 1:106 n. 2 (1933). (Cl.Pr. 39 is "Pseudo-Shenoute").

FRANCE

PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale

Fonde coppte (I have used microfilms):
130¹: ff. 14-19, 35-7, 124-142 (ff. 14-16 were edited in P. Cauwenbergh, Étude sur les moines d'Égypte, Paris 1914, p. 176f.; other isolated passages have been edited elsewhere).
130³: Sh. ff. 90, 93-4, 95-6, 97-8, 100-5, 107, 110-111, 115-130, 139-142 ro ("Florilegium Sinuthianum"); Sh.? ff. 84-9, 99, 114.
130⁴: Sh. ff. 15-7, 18, 19, 20, 21-2, 23-4, 27, 37-9, 48-9, 52, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 61, 64, 65, 66, 67, 69, 70, 80, 81, 83, 86, 87, 88, 90, 92, 93, 94-5, 97-8, 100, 101, 103, 105, 106, 108, 111, 112, 113, 115-9, 121, 125, 128; Sh.? ff. 33-4, 50, 51, 96, 99, 133.
130⁵: ff. 153.
131¹: ff. 37, 75.
131³: Sh. ff. 4-6, 8, 19, 20, 47, 52, 56, 65, 67, 118, 126, 128, 133-5, 144, 149; Sh.? ff. 13, 16, 17, 22, 28, 42, 43, 64, 79-82.
131⁴: Sh. ff. 13, 14-5, 16, 23, 29, 30, 31, 32, 44, 56-7, 66-7, 80, 81, 105, 117; Sh.? ff. 20, 21, 28, 42-3, 64, 71, 90, 110.
131⁵: Sh. ff. 32, 39, 40, 45, 46, 57, 65, 71; Sh.? ff. 11, 25.
131⁶: Sh. ff. 84, 94, 109; Sh.? ff. 91, 92, 105, 119.

(NB: there is a wide margin of error in including or excluding fragments in this list.)

AUSTRIA

VIENNA, Nationalbibliothek

ViK: Sh. 912, 913, 918, 920, 921, 924, 926, 927, 928, 933, 940, 9006, 9028, 9040, 9099, 9291, 9292, 9293, 9294, 9298, 9315, 9316, 9320; Sh.? 929, 9066. (Crum, who identified in Dictionary as Shenoutean also Nos. 919, 9100, 9343, 9598, 9764, 9868, was well aware of the existence in Vienna of unedited Shenouteana. See also Till in Or. 41:388 [1935] and ZDMG 95:169 [1941].) I have used microfilms.

GERMANY

BERLIN (WEST), Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz

MS Or. 2° 1611.5-7, 1613.1-7 (microfilms and copies).
UNITED STATES
New York, Columbia University Library


Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Library


Durham (North Carolina), Duke University Library

Duke Univ. Coptic MS (unnumbered), 2ff. (in the Perkins Rare Books Room), kindly copied by Mr. D. Spanel. Possibly Shenoute.

REPUBLIC OF EGYPT
Cairo, Egyptian Museum

No. 8007 (photographs).

Cairo, Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale (IF)

Cod. 1, quoted from Dictionary.
ABBREVIATIONS (OF PERIODICALS AND SERIALS)

ASA E  Annales du Service des Antiquités de l’Égypte
BASP  Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists
BIFAO Bulletin de l’Institut français d’Archéologie orientale (Le Caire)
BO  Bibliotheca Orientalis
BSAC Bulletin de la Société d’Archéologie Copte
BSL Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris
BSOAS Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies
CdE  Chronique d’Égypte
CFS  Cahiers Ferdinand de Saussure
CSCO Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium
FL  Folia Linguistica
GGA Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen
GLECS Groupe linguistique d’Études chamito-sémitiques
GM  Göttinger Miscellen
IF  Indogermanische Forschungen
IJAL International Journal of American Linguistics
IOS Israel Oriental Studies
JAOS Journal of the American Oriental Society
JEA Journal of Egyptian Archaeology
JL  Journal of Linguistics
JNES Journal of Near Eastern Studies
JPs  Journal de Psychologie
Lg  Language
MDAIK Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo
MH  Museum Helveticum
MIFAO Mémoires de l’Institut français d’Archéologie orientale
MIO  Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung
MLR Modern Language Review
Mus Le Muséon
OLP Orientalia Lovanensia Periodica
OLZ Orientalistische Literaturzeitung
Or Orientalia
PICL Proceedings of the International Congress of Linguists
PSBA Proceedings of the Society for Biblical Archeology
RdE Revue d’Égyptologie
RE Revue égyptologique
RT Recueil de travaux relatifs à la philologie et à l’archéologie égyptiennes et assyriennes
SL Studia Linguistica
TCLP  Travaux du Circle linguistique de Prague
TLP   Travaux linguistiques de Prague
TUGAL Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur
VR    Vox Romanica
WZKM  Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes
ZÄS  Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde
ZcPh  Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie
ZDMG  Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft
ZPh   Zeitschrift für Phonetik und allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft
ZRPh  Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie
ZV    Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie und Sprachwissenschaft
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Zoega, G. 1810 *Catalogus codicum copticorum manuscriptorum qui in Museo Borgiano Velitris adservantur*, Roma: Typis Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide
§0.0.1 My investigation, analytic (not synthetic), microscopic (not macroscopic or panoramic), aims at a description of (sub-)systemic structure, not language structure. However, this work does not constitute a monography in the strictest sense, or claim the last word on any of the issues treated therein. As a matter of fact, it embodies a compromise between the need for a broad basis and for a charting as detailed as possible.

§1.1.2.1 B2 (p. 27) and p. 36 n. 75: \( \text{εἰκ} + \text{temporal expression} \). \( \text{εἰκ} \) is here not a preposition but a focussing element. A series of work-notes by the author on the syntax of \( \text{εἰκ} \), \( \text{εἰκ ἦντε} \) and various existential clauses in the Sahidic New Testament, published in the Göttinger Miscellen (77:67ff., 1984), suggests that \( \text{εἰκ} \) is a hic-et-nunc-deictic member in the existential-statement paradigm.

§1.2.1.1, spec. obs. (1): On "inalienable" possession, see Lévy-Bruhl’ s classic study, "L’expression de la possession dans les langues mélanésiennes", MSL 19:96-104 (1914); also H. B. Rosén, "Die Ausdrucksform für 'veräusserrlichen' und 'unveräusserrlichen Besitz' im homerischen Griechisch", Lingua 8:264-293 (1959), reprinted in Strukturalgrammatische Beiträge zum Verständnis Homers, Amsterdam 1967; idem, "Sur quelques catégories à expression adnominales en hébreu-israélien", BSL 53:316-342 (1958). Lévy-Bruhl’s term is not satisfactory, since many of the items intimately related or belonging to their owner can nevertheless be "alienated" from him—note the rather extreme and macabre example of limbs being severed from the body (e.g. in martyrlogical context; in the Bohairic Martyrologies they then cease in fact to be grammatically treated as existing in a special relationship with their owner).

The predication of possession is of course a more comprehensive issue. Observe that, beside \( \text{οὐν} \)-syntags, Coptic employs for this purpose the Nominal Sentence predicating the pronounalized possession [with a pronominal possessor: (III 90.19f.) \( \text{πουκ} \text{ πε} \text{ πνούβ}, \text{πουκ} \text{ πε} \text{ πσατ}, \text{πουκ} \text{ τε} \text{ τοικούμενη}; \) nominal possessor: (ibid. 47.20) \( \text{πα} \text{-νεσθριόν} \text{ αν} \text{ πε} \).]

§2.0.2.1 (Thematization): A germane question not treated here is the determination of the actor noun in the verbal topic, more specifically the correlation of prominent thematization with the definite or referential actor.

§2.0.2.4, §2.8: The possible correlation of complement placement with relative rhematicity is a direction worth pursuing. A hypothesis: cases of conditioned/non-pertinent placement excepted, the further in the clause an element is placed, the more rhematic it is.

§4.2.2: It appears often all viable to integrate the phenomenon of "Affective Placement" in a general theory of the information-functional structure of the text; that is to say, placement or paradigm "β", \( \text{ποινήρος} \text{ πνώμε} \), signals a higher degree of Communicative Dynamism than placement "α", \( \text{πρώμε} \text{ μπονήρος} \), this opposition in information weight being in either case mapped onto the basic attributive dependence.

§5.1.1.0.1: A general theory of Coptic determination — of noun definiteness, indefiniteness, specificity, genericity, in relation to such discourse-oriented phenomena as reference and indication — is yet a
§5.3 n. 42: A. Schleicher’s study was published as Mém. Acad. St.-Pétersbourg, ser. VII, 1859, I No. 7.

§6.0.1.1 (Frontal extraposition): The significance of “definitization” of the fronted noun must be correlated with topicalization in the framework of a general theory of discourse-oriented determination. It appears that all grades of formal determination are represented in this status, although zero determination is very rare; ἀναλώσιμος μπούκε (III 18.15 f., cf. §3.1.1.1.0.1) is instructive: the noun is the lexical component of a compound verb, and here is the only way of focalizing this component, with the zero resumption completing an idiomatic native equivalent of the “tautologizing infinitive” (Goldenberg 1971).

§6.0.2 (Links and delimitations): Another link:delimitation opposition is symptomized by the non-syllabic:syllabic status of the plural definite article before the initial vowel of a noun lexeme, regular (inside the noun syntagm) at least with native lexemes (ἡμε, ἰούδαι vs. ἀειῳγύ, ἡξῆ). With lexemes of Greek origin, we find (in Chassinat’s edition) both ἁρχὴ and ἁρχή, ἁπτομακός and ἁπτομακός, and so on; it is my impression that these cases too may be accounted for as conditioned by factors outside the noun syntagm, e.g. sandhi with the preceding word. (See Polotsky, OLZ 59:253 n. 1, 1964 - note omitted by error in CP.) See now, for the “Middle Egyptian” dialect, CDE 58/115-6, p. 316.

§6.0.2.3: Generally speaking, two lexemes join in relatively open juncture, unless one contains an active grammeme (the case of στη-πρώμε), whereas grammemes and mixed grammeme-lexeme syntags join in relatively close juncture.

§6.1.1.2.1 (d), ad RE 10 161a 27ff.: The augens may have a special standing when the referate is a noun syntagm in address (“vocative”) status: here the definite article is situation-conditioned, hence (like a proper name) not really (i.e. pertinently) “definite”.

§6.1.3, §6.2.1: The prominence of personal indication marked by the augens may overlap and coincide with thematic prominence, especially in the case of coincidence with a different marking of topicalization; consider (III 137.27) εἰναιαυτής ἀνεξ ἄπώτος ξέ-, sim. Ch. 156.1f. or (Cat. 42.14, 43.8) ἄτικ-νῖμ ἐντόκ.


§7.2.1.1.5.1: See now M. Green, “The TAPE Pattern in Coptic Non-Biblical Texts”, ZĀS 110 (1983) 132-143, arriving at very similar conclusions regarding the rhetorical role of this form.

§7.2.3.2, ad IV 162.2ff.: Compare the variant text in K 9223 p. 67, where the same effect of vivid, dramatic action is achieved by the juxtaposition of perfect forms: νεοκόντ απαί εἰ εβολ απαί + τεταθασβ εἰσοῦν νεοκόντ απαί + τυῳ εἰσοῦν απαί εἰ εβολ.

§7.3.1.1 with n. 73 and §7.4: The distinction of factive and non-factive introduced by P. and C. Kiparsky in Progress in Linguistics (edd. Bierwisch and Heidolph, The Hague 1970) 143-173, applies to Coptic “that”-forms: ξέ- factive or unmarked, ετάκε- marked non-factive, the conjunctive a marginal non-factive form. (Consider the variation of τεκε- and conjunctive after μνιμα- in Ruth 2:11 (Shier), although τεκε- does not share the markedness for non-factivity of ετάκε-.)
INDEX OF SUBJECTS DISCUSSED
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Absence, systemic: see Non-attestation
Actants: see Valency
—, focalized: §2.3
Actor expression: 146ff., 149f.
Actor, nominal, placement of: §6.0.1
Adclausal modification: §§1.1.2.2-3, 1.3.1 ff. passim
Adjectives: Ch. 4
—, defined: §4.2.2
—, in marked/unmarked placement: §4.2.2.2
—, Greek loan-adjectives: §4.2.2
Adjuncts and focus (negation): 102ff.
Adnexal modification: §0.3.2; 1154, 64f., 11638, 190f.
—, dependence, compatible with nucleus-satellite dependence: 81, 19029
Adnominal expansion: §§1.1.1 f., 1.3.1 ff. passim, Ch. 4; 1154
Adnominal paradigm: 19031
Adverb: see Modifiers
— vs. adjective: §0.3
Adverbal expansion: Chs. 1, 3, 7
—, defined: 2335
—, rectional vs. complementational: §3.0.1.2; 24f.
Affect: see Emotive principle
Akhmimic: 2097, 87114, 102158, 109
Anacoluthia, cohesional definition of: 16341
Analysis, delicacy of: 6, 9f.
—, descending continuous: 2, 6, 9
Anaphora and cataphora, conflict of: 152
Anaphoric reference, masculine to "feminine" zero-determinated noun: §5.2.1.1-3
Antithetic configurations: 79, 13337
Aorist, Second — circumstantial — relative: 68f.
Apodosis, Second Tense in: 79
—, focalization-pattern selection in: 89f.
Appositive relative construction: 67
Appositive syntagms expanding pronouns and proper names: §4.3
Arrangement, in adnominal syntagmatics: Ch. 4 passim
—, in focalization syntagmatics: Ch. 2 passim
—, of adverbal/adclausal modification constructions: Ch. 1 passim
Article(s): see Determinators

— 239 —
Article, definite plural: $6^{19}$, $160^{37}$; *Addenda* ad §6.0.2
—, indefinite: $142^{ff}$.
—, zero: *see Zero article*
Assimilation as link/delimitation: $160$, $162$
Asyndetic parataxis: $67$
Atemporal, generic verb forms, followed by conjunctive: §7.2.4.1
Augens: §0.3.2, Ch. 6; 12, 19; *Addenda* ad §§6.1.1.2.1(d), 6.1.3, 6.2.1
—, defined: $155^{ff}$.
—, functional essence of: §6.3
—, modifier: §6.2
—, paradigms and compatibilities of: §6.1.0.1-3
Auxiliary verbs, deriving: §3.1.1.2.3

Basic and Second Tenses, interrelationship of: §2.7.3
Basic syntagmatic sequence ("Grundrichtung"): 18, 23, 131, 132$^{14}$, 159
Biblical style: §7.2.1.1.5; 1, 90
Bipartite Pattern, predicking a modifier: §1.2.1.1
—, Second-Tense conversion of: 65, 76
Bohairic: $18^{16}$, $21^{32}$, $87^{114}$

Cataphora: 81, 146, 148ff.
Category: §0.2.1.2-3
Chiasmus: 84, 87, 90, 94, 159$^{20}$
Circumstantial: 26, 31, 64f., 66f., 68f., 416, 149f.
—, adnexal: §7.1.3.1; 39, 44$^{49}$, 64f., 81, 148f.
—, adnominal: $6^{14}$, 19, $34^{49}$, 146ff.
—, adverbal (of aorist): $68^{35}$
—, before Second Tense: §2.0.1.1.2
—, coordinated/disjoined in complex theme/topic: 100
—, focalized: 81
—, *glose*-form: §2.5
—, with *ne*: 38
—, preceded by *AYW* following a Basic Tense: 51f.
—, zero-conversion form: $85^{106}$

Cleft Sentence and circumstantial *glose*: §2.5
—, devaluated: §2.5.0.1
—, *ne* representing *glose* of: $152^{41}$
—, with (pro)nominial *vedette*: 33, 152
—, and Second Tense: §2.7.2; 82, 85
Cliches, fixed expressions, collocations (selection): 3f., 58f., 138; *see also under Figures*

Coeventive (*ΩΝΩΠΩΝ*): 26, 31, 205
Cohesion: 26, 100, 144$^{20}$; *see also* Juncture
Colon: §§2.8.1, 6.0.3; 156
Colon-second, colon-final/intercolary placement of enclitics, augentia: Ch. 6 *passim*
—, of modifiers: §1.3.1 ff. *passim*
Communicative Dynamism ("CD"): 73ff., 104
Commutability, function of analyzed extent: $6^{15}$, $6^{16}$
Compatibility (selection): §§2.0.1.1.2, 7.1.2.3-4; 141ff., 142¹, 144; see also Mutual exclusion Compound verbs, object of: §3.1.2.2.2
Concord: §4.2.2.1; 144
Conditional: 26, 31; see also Protasis
—, as topicalization form: §2.7.2.1.2
Conjugation bases, bracketing: 161ff.
—, "pro-verbs": §5.3
Conjugation (predication) mediators: §3.3
—, bracketing: 161³³
"Conjunct participle" nominum agentis: 114³³
Conjunctive: Ch. 7: 10⁴⁶, 12, 19, 146, 149, 150, 216
—, adnexitx thematic expansion-form: §§7.1.3, 7.3
—, its "base" not nuclear, converter-like; its actor + infinitive a nexus: §7.1.3
—, inductible categorizable verb-form: §7.1.1 f.
—, object construction of: 122
—, quintessential verbal modifier: §7.1.1
Conversion, second-power: §2.0.1.1.2
Converters: §2.0.1.1; 6¹⁶, 64ff.
—, bracketing: 161
Coordination and the conjunctive: 187ff.
—, of modifiers: §1.1.2.4.2; see also under ἈΠΩ, ΜΝ-, ΖΙ-
Coptic, typology of (selection): §§0.4.1, 5.3; 7f., 12f., 157¹¹
Context vs. context: 10⁶²

Descriptive order (selection): §2.6.4; 8, 89¹²⁰, 131
Determinators: §5.1.1; 82, 83
—, and concord: 135ff., 144ff.
—, additional expansion of: 131¹², 132¹³
—, bracketing: 161
—, expanded by iterated noun: §1.3.4.4.1
—, expanded by modifier: §1.1.1.1
—, expanded by relative: 113, 114
—, expanding the verb in object construction: 109¹³, 112²¹, 113ff.
—, in expansion concatenation: 133¹⁶, 135, 142f., 144ff.
—, pronominal object anaphoric to: §3.1.1.1.0.1
Dialogue: §0.2.5.2.1
—, response substructure of: 72
Diathesis: §3.0.1.1-2
—, pattern- (not lexeme-) referred: 107⁶
Disiunctio Sinuthiana: 3, 90, 94, 112¹⁸, 122
Durativity and object construction: §3.1.2.1

Emotive principle in adjective placement: §4.2.2.2
Emphasis and related notions: 71ff., 155ff., 175⁶⁷
Enclisis: §6.0.3
Encliticity, scale of decreasing: 166
Enclitics, placement of: §6.0.3
—, polar placement in Nominal Sentence: §6.0.3.4
—, relative placement and compatibilities: §6.0.3.2
—, simultaneous double occurrence: §6.0.3.3; 103
Extraposition, frontal: §6.0.1.1; Addenda ad §6.0.1.1
—, rear: §6.0.1.2; 99
Extratemporal verb forms and predications, continued by conjunctive: §7.2.2

Figures and recurring expressions (selection): 3\textsuperscript{3}, 79, 121, 123, 125, 171, 176, 178, 179, 195ff., 200ff., 207ff.; see also under Antithetic configurations, Cliches, Chiasmus, Disiunctio Sinuthiana, Focus (complex), Focus ("disguised ").
—, figura etymologica (cognate object): 123
—, focalization: §2.7.1
—, opistho-parenthesis: 79\textsuperscript{80}
—, topicalization: §2.7.2
Final-consecutive syntagms: §§7.2.3.1, 7.3.1.1; 69
Focal modifiers: Ch. 2 passim; 12, 23\textsuperscript{88}
Focality: §2.0.2.2.1 ff.
—, inherent: 72
—, marked: 71ff.
—, paradigm: 71f.
—, values of: 72
Focalization, preincluded (figure): §2.7.1.4.2
—, simultaneous double (figure): §2.7.1.3.1
Focalization patterns: Ch. 2
—, conjunctive in: §7.2.3.3
—, focus-initial: §2.4-6
—, negativizing of: §2.9.1.1 ff.
—, structural assignment of: §2.6.4
—, topic-initial: §2.1-3
Focus, complex (figure): §2.7.1.3.2
—, final vs. non-final: 99
—, indirect or "disguised" (figure): §2.7.1.4.1
—, interrogative vs. non-interrogative: 99
—, marked, pattern-initial: 71ff.
Functional Sentence Perspective ("FSP"): 11, 73ff., 140
Future, present-based, followed by conjunctive: §7.2.3

Gender: Ch. 5
—, feminine/masculine: 141ff., 154f.
—, neuter: 145f.
"Glose" (topic of Cleft Sentence): §2.7.3.5; 38\textsuperscript{80}; see also under Cleft Sentence
Greek-origin loan adjectives in Coptic: 130, 135
Greek-origin loan modifiers in Coptic: §§1.3.11.1 ff., 1.3.11.6
Greek-origin loan prepositions in Coptic: §1.3.11.5
Greek-origin particles in Coptic: §6.0.3; 165\textsuperscript{80}, 166\textsuperscript{84}, 167\textsuperscript{84}

Halliday, M. A. K.: 69ff., 106\textsuperscript{8}
Hyperdetermination: 143\textsuperscript{9,13}
Identity, analytic: 6f.
—, and homonymy: §0.2.1.3 with 618, §2.0.1.2, §3.1.2.0.1
Idiölect: §0.2.4
Immediate-constituents ("IC") analysis:
—, of adnominal modification syntagms: 19, 209
—, of adverbal modification syntagms: 24f.
—, of compound verb + object: 25
—, of conjunctive: 191f.
—, of prepositional phrases: 1713
Imperative, followed by conjunctive: §7.2.1.1.1
—, post-imperatival paradigm: §7.2.1.1.5
"Inalienable" (inherent) possession: 37, 151, 157, 180; Addenda ad §1.2.1.1
Indeterminables as object: §3.1.1.2.1
Infinitive (verb lexeme), extraconjugational, object of: 122
—, morphophonemic alteration mechanism of: §§3.0.2.1, 3.1.2.2
Information unit, organization, structure of: 69ff.
Interrogative clause, in direct-object status: 99146
Interrogative focus: Ch. 2 passim (esp. §2.6.3-4); 834, 72, 99
Interrogative modifier and Basic Tense, a delimitation: 96
Interrogative, post-interrogatival apodosis: 195f.
Irrealis (remote-condition) protasis: §1.2.1.3.3
Isolation of grammatical and lexical elements: §5.3; 15711
Iteration of modifiers: 36
Iteration-marked noun syntagm in modifier status: §1.3.3

Jernstedt, V.: 11117; see Stern-Jernstedt Rule
Juncture contour: §3.1.1.2.3; 143, 163f.
Juncture, close: §3.1.1.2.3
—, and CD: 73ff.
—, delimitations: §6.0.2.2; Addenda ad §6.0.2
—, of lexemes and grammemes: Addenda ad §6.0.2.3
—, links: §6.0.2.1; Addenda ad §6.0.2
—, open: §6.0.2.2. See also under Cohesion
Jussive: 193f., 216
—, preceptive, precative, unmarked (ΞΠΝΑ-): §§2.1.3, 7.2.1.1.3
—, rhetorical (ΜΑΡΕΨ-): §7.2.1.1.2
—, ΞΠΜΕΡΙΨ-: 7781

"Koinzidenzfall": see Performative discourse

Macro syntax: Chs. 2, 5, 7 passim; §0.2.5
Metanalysis: 23
Microcoordination: Ch. 7 passim
“Middle Egyptian” dialect of Coptic: 1816, 6832, 87114, 90131
Models: §0.2.1.3
—, Listener's model: 7
Modifier-predicating patterns: §1.2.1.1ff.
Modifiers, expanding determinators: §1.1.1.1
—, focal: Ch. 2 passim; §§2.2, 2.4
—, in general: Ch. 1; §§0.3, 1.0.1.1-2
—, nuclear, expandable modifiers: §1.1.2.4.1; 28ff.
—, pronoun-containing: see Augens
Morphology vs. syntax: 7f.
Mutual exclusion: §3.1.1.2.1

Negation:
—, adjunctal: 102f.
—, componential (local): 100ff., 102159
—, focal: 102
—, of focalization patterns: §2.9.1.1 ff.
—, and "emphasis": 101164
—, encategorization, maintenance, syncategorization of: Ch. 7 passim; 187ff.
Neutralization: §§0.2.1.1, 3.1; 145f. etc.
—, of adjective placement opposition: §4.2.1
—, of attributive: adnaxal expansion opposition: 614, 1984, 13112
—, of mediate: immediate object-construction opposition: §3.1
Nexus, syntagmatics of: §§2.0.2.4, 2.8
"No sooner... than...": 94
Nominal actor, placement of: 159f.
Nominal Sentence patterns: 22, 32ff., 96139, 1439, 14624, 150f., 167, 168, 175, 179f., 180f.
—, with anaphoric pronominal predicate: 11219
—, placement of augens in: §§6.0.3.3-4, 6.1.2.2, 6.1.3.2
—, modified: §§1.1.2.3, 1.3.1 ff.
—, pro-/acclamatory: 167f., 179
—, prosodic properties of: 34f., 16136
—, with zero-determined predicate: 3881, 1307, 14314
See also "Wechselsatz".
Nominal time-expression: 45, 21281
Nominalizations of the verb: §§5.2.2, 7.4
—, followed by conjunctive: §7.2.5
Non-attestation: §0.2.3
Norm: §0.2.4
Nota relationis: see under n- and see Steinthal, H.
Noun in Coptic: §4.0.2; 11583
—, focalized: §2.3
—, movable: 142
—, predicative, contentualized-expanded by conjunctive: §7.3.2
Noun syntagm: Ch. 5 and passim
Nucleus, article as: 142f.
Nucleus/satellite analysis: §5.3; 22f., 75, 81, 11598, 124, 126, 142f., 191f.
Nucleus and satellite, semantic vs. syntactic: §4.1; 1427

Object vs. complement: see Adverbial expansion, rectional vs. complementational
Object, non-reflexive, marked by **MO**: §3.1.3.2.1
Object-expansion: Ch. 3; 79, 82f., 146ff., 149f.
—, mediate vs. immediate: Ch. 3, §3.0.2
—, pronominal: §3.1.1.1
Objective pronoun: §3.1.1.1.0.2
Optative (εΘΕ-), followed by conjunctive: §7.2.1.2
Order, descriptive: see Descriptive order
—, determinans/determinatum: §4.0.1 ff.
—, structural: 891

Paradigm: §0.2.1.2 and passim
Particles: see Enclitics, Greek-origin particles
Parts of speech: §§1.0.1.1, 4.0.1; 7, 1158, 1154
Passive in Coptic: §3.0.1.1 with 1078
Pattern: §0.2.1.2
Pejorative attribute: §4.2.2.2.1
Perfect, non-narrative (generic), parabolic: §7.2.4.1
—, Second vs. relative: 68f.
Performative discourse: 7992
Person, generic: 204
—, unshifted in indirect speech: 7885
Personal encategorization/maintenance: Ch. 7 passim; 189
Personalization of infinitive: §7.2.5.1
Phorics (ana-, cata-): Ch. 5 passim
Poeticity: 72
Polite cliches, with anteposed adjectives: 138
Polotsky, H. J. (selection): §2.0.0.1; 179, 155
Posteventive (**MНCAТРЕЧ-**): 26, 31, 205
Precursive (**НТЕРЕЧ-**): 26, 31
Pre inclusion of extraposed noun: 148
—, of focalization pattern: §2.7.1.4.2
Premodifiers: §§1.1.2.0.1, 1.1.2.2, 1.3.1 ff. passim; 88
—, lexeme premodifiers: see Conjugation mediators
Prepositions, compound vs. non-compound: 158
—, "locative" syncretized with "ablative": 4386
Present, non-actual generic: §§3.1.2.1.1, 7.2.4.1
Preterite converter: 38, 6628, 67
Primary: secondary functions: 8
"Proforma" expansion: 13213
Pronominalization of a sentence: 148ff.
Pronoun, independent, and the augens: §6.1.3.3
Pronouns, personal, nuclear: §4.3
Pronouns, prime nuclei: Ch. 4, 5 passim
Proper names, nuclear: §4.3
Prosodic hierarchy: §6.0.3.2
Prosodic "rest": 165, 178
Prosody: §§6.0.1-3, 6.0.3.2
—, of augens: §6.1.0.2 ff.
—, of modifiers: §1.3.1 ff. passim
—, of Nominal Sentence patterns: 34f., 161
Protasis: 100, 201ff.
Protatic “fallsetzend” forms, followed by conjunctive: §§7.2.3.5, 7.2.4
Protatic forms, followed by conjunctive: §7.2.4
Pro-verbs, conjugation bases: §5.3; Addenda ad §5.3
—, conjunctive “base” not one: 191f.
Punctuation: 98, 164

Quantifiers: 143f.
Questions, multiple: 90; see also Rhetorical questions
Quotation, topicalization of (figure): §2.7.2.4
Quotations in Shenoute: 4, 198
—, topic and focalization-pattern selection: 88ff.
—, TAE: §7.2.1.1.5.1

Rection: §4.2.2.1.4; 5, 24ff., 108, 144f.
Relative conversion: 64, 19, 68f.
Relative, substantivized (determined): §5.2.3.1; 83f., 114, 152
—, as object: two distinct syntags: §3.1.1.2.1
—, of future tense, followed by conjunctive: §7.2.3.5
—, of present tense, followed by conjunctive: §7.2.4.1
“Relief”: 654, 72
Resumption as junctural symptom: 94f., 162; see also Zero, resumption of
Rhem: 69f., see also Focus
Rhetorical apodosis, eventual role of conjunctive in: §7.2.6.1
Rhetorical dialogue: §0.2.5.2.1
Rhetorical figures and schemes: 94; see also under Figures
Rhetorical focalization/topicalization figures: §2.7.1-2
Rhetorical narrative: 104; see also Perfect, non-narrative
Rhetorical questions, Second Tenses and focalization patterns: §2.1.2; 76f., 89, 90, 94
—, apodosis of (TAE and conjunctive): 196
—, and particle placement: 171
Rhetoricity: §0.2.5.2.1
Rhythmic factors regulating object construction: §3.1.3.3.2; 121
—, and placement of rear extraposition: 99
Rosén, H.B.: 8, 160

Second Tenses: Ch. 2; 84, 104, 183, 191
—, autofocal: §2.1
—, and Basic Tenses: §2.7.3.1; 65
—, circumstantial conversion of: §2.0.1.1.2
—, conjunctural uses of: 100
—, constituents of Bipartite Pattern: 62ff.
—, and converters: §2.0.1.1
—, coordination + disjunction of, with Basic Tenses: §2.7.3.1
—, extensions in use of: 63
—, following focus (in dialects other than Sahidic): 87\textsuperscript{14}
—, functional essence of: §2.10
—, lemmatic: §2.1.4.2
—, morphology of: §2.0.1.1.1
—, parenthetic: §2.1.6
—, predicated by ne: 99
—, quoting discredited claim or statement: §2.1.5.1
—, signalling focality/thematicity: Ch. 2 passim; §2.10; 71ff.
—, "that"-form: §2.8.3

Second-Tense construction, prosody and syntagmatics of: §2.8.1-2
Segmentation: 71, 156
Shenoutean corpus and sources: §0.1, Appendix
Shenoutean style: §0.1.1-2; 216
Staging: 65, 69f.
Steinthal, H.: 18\textsuperscript{15}, 18\textsuperscript{17}
Stern, L., as structuralist: 13\textsuperscript{60}
Stern-Jernstedt Rule: Ch. 3 passim, esp. §3.1.2.1

Subakhmimic: 98\textsuperscript{39}
Subcoordination: Ch. 7 passim; 188f.

Syntagm, defined: 72\textsuperscript{7}
System: 5\textsuperscript{9}

"Tautological infinitive": 32, 156\textsuperscript{7}; Addenda ad §6.0.1.1
Texture, texteme: §0.2.5.2
"That"-form: §2.8.3, 7.4; Addenda ad §7.3.1.1

Thematic progression and selection of focalization pattern: 90
Thematic structure: 44, 79ff.; Addenda ad §§2.0.2.1, 2.0.2.4, 2.8, 4.2.2

Thematicity, paradigm of: 71
Thematization: §2.0.2.1

Theme(-topic):
—, complex (figure): §§2.7.1.3.3, 2.8.4
—, negative: 102\textsuperscript{357}, 103\textsuperscript{41}
—, prominent (marked): §6.0.1.1; 41, 71
Theme-focus seam: §2.8.2
Theme/rheme, linear-axis conception of: 71\textsuperscript{49}

Time expressions: §1.3.2; 85, 212\textsuperscript{81}
Topic/focus: 69ff.

Topic form, conditioning of: §2.6.4; see also Theme(-topic)

Topicalization, lemmatizing: §2.7.2.1.4
—, "proforma": 89f.
—, relative in form: §2.7.2.1.3
—, ε̈μεγα-, ε̈μανα-: §2.7.2.1.1-2
Totality: §6.1.1; 144
Transformation: 8\textsuperscript{30}
Transitive/intransitive verb lexemes in Coptic: 106
Transitivity/intransitivity: §3.0.1.1-2
Tripartite Conjugation bases, pro-verbs: §5.3
Tripartite Conjugation pattern, IC-analysis of: §5.3; 124, 191f.

"Unique morpheme": §1.3.1.1

Valency: §§3.0.1.1-2, 3.1.2.0.1; 24ff.
"Vedette": see Cleft Sentence, Focus
Verb lexeme, marked as focal: 76ff.
—, morphology of: §3.0.2.1
Verbal predicate, durative/non-durative, homonymous: §3.1.2.1.1
Verboid of possession: 113
Verbs of incomplete predication, object construction of: §3.1.1.2.3
"Verstärker": see Augens

"Wechselsatz": §2.7.1.1; 33, 81, 161
Word in Coptic: §6.0.2.3; 6, 7, 9
Word order: §§2.8.2, 6.0.1.3; 14 and passim

Zero: 6
—, anaphora: §3.1.1.1.0.1; 133
—, cataphora: 151
Zero article: Ch. 5 passim (esp. 142ff.)
—, resumption of: Ch. 5 passim (esp. 146ff.); 109
Zero determination: see Zero article
—, incompatibility with N in object construction: §3.1.1.2.1
—, pronominal object anaphoric to: §3.1.1.1.0.1
Zero-marked nouns in modifier status: §1.3.2
Zero morpheme (2nd person sgl. feminine) in juncture contour: 162
Zero subject of predicative modifier: §1.2.1.3.3; 151
Zeroing, anaphoric: 112f.
I. OF GREEK ORIGIN

ΛΔΗΘΩΣ: §1.3.11.1.2
ΛΛΛΑ: §1.3.11.6
ΛΛΛΟ: §7.3.3
ΑΝΤΙ: §1.3.11.5
(ΣΑΠΑΣ) ΣΑΠΑΘ: §1.3.11.1.7
ΑΡΑ: 767a
ΑΡΧΑΤΩΣ: 136

ΓΑΡ: see Greek particles, Enclitics
ΓΕΝΟΙΤΟ: §7.3.3

ΔΕ: see Greek particles, Enclitics
ΔΙΚΑΙΩΣ: §1.3.11.1.7

ΕΙΜΗΤΙ: §§1.3.11.6, 7.3.1.1
ΕΚΜΕΡΟΥΣ: §1.3.11.6
(ΟΥΚ)ΕΙΤΙ: §1.3.11.6
ΕΥΣΕΙΑ (εὐσεία): §1.3.11.6

Η (– Η): §7.3.1.1

ΚΑΚΒ: §1.3.11.1.3
ΚΑΛΛΒ: §1.3.11.1.3; 7257, 85
ΚΑΝ: §1.3.11.6, 7.3.1
ΚΑΤΑ: §1.3.11.5

ΛΟΙΠΟΝ: §1.3.11.2.4

ΜΑΛΙΣΤΑ: §1.3.11.2.5.1
ΜΑΛΛΟΝ: §1.3.11.2.5
ΜΕΝ: see Greek particles, Enclitics
ΜΗ... ΑΝ: 10156

ΜΟΥΣ: §1.3.11.6; 52, 70, 7257, 84, 208
(ΟΥ) ΜΟΝΟΝ: §1.3.11.2.1

ΖΟΜΟΙΩΣ: §1.3.11.1.4
ΖΟΜΨ: §1.3.11.1.4
-ΟΝ-marked modifiers: §1.3.11.2
ΟΝΤΨ: §1.3.11.1.6
-ΟΣ, -ΟΝ, concord in adjectives of Greek origin:
4.2.2.1
ΖΟΚΩΝ, ΕΝ-, ΕΦΩΝ: §1.3.11.6
ΖΩΤΑΝ: §1.3.11.6

ΠΑΛΙΝ ΟΝ: §1.3.11.3
(ΟΥ) ΠΑΝΤΨ: §1.3.11.1.5
ΠΑΡΑ: §1.3.11.5
ΠΑΝΝ: §1.3.11.6
ΠΟΛΛΑΚΙΣ: §1.3.11.6
ΠΡΟΣ: §1.3.11.5

ΣΧΕΔΩΝ: §1.3.11.2.3

ΤΑΧΑ: §1.3.11.6
ΤΑΧΥ: §1.3.11.4
ΤΟΤΕ: §1.3.11.6

ΦΑΝΕΡΩΝ: §1.3.11.2.2

ΧΨΜ: §1.3.11.5
-Ψ-Ψ-marked modifiers: §1.3.11.1; 81

ΖΨ: §1.3.11.5; 59, 80
ΖΨΣΤΕ: §§1.3.11.6, 7.3.1.1
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II. OF NATIVE COPTIC ORIGIN

АН, Н-АН: §§2.9., 6.0.3.3; 637, 69
АРНУ: 211
АТ-: §3.4.2
АЙУ, and enclitics: 165
—, coordinating modifiers: 35
—, a modifier: §1.3.10
АЙУ vs. zero, coordinating the conjunctive: 188f.

Е-., preposition in adnominal status: 21
ЕАМ- 1048, 82, 86
ЕБОА ΑΝ ΘΕ-: 78, 102160
ΕΙΕ: 98
ΕΜΑΤΕ: §1.3.1.1
ΕΝΕ, converter vs. interrogative marker, juncturally distinct: 16342
ΕΝΕ, interrogative marker: 6626
ΕΝΕ2: §1.3.6; 23
ΕΠ- marked modifiers: §1.3.7
ΕΠ- + infinitive: §1.3.7.6
ΕΠΩΡΗΣ: §1.3.7.2
ΕΠΩΡΕ-: §1.3.7.1
ΕΠΩΡΟΥΟ: §1.3.7.4
ΕΠΩΡΟΥΝΑ: §1.3.7.3.1
ΕΡΕ-, predicative: 38
ΕΘΡΕ- as "that"-form: §7.4
—, as topic: 91
—, jussive: 20548
—, with conjunctive: §7.2.5.2
ΕΤΘΕ-, topicalizing: §2.7.2.1.1
(ΘΣ) ΕΤΘΕ-: 78f.
ΕΡΟΥΝ Ε-: 1948
ΕΡΟΠΑΙ, "up/down": 29f.
ΕΧΝ-, predicative: 38
ΕΙΒΕ, with Н- + iterated noun as predicative complement: §1.3.3.2
Ο Н-: §1.2.1.3.1
П-, object of: §3.1.1.2.3
П-/Ο Н-, allomorphs of "intransitive" Π-: 1064
П-, + modifier: §1.2.1.3.2
П-, with Second Tense: 80
ΠΙΚΕ-: see Conjugation mediators
ΠΙΟΥΟΥ-/Ε-: see Conjugation mediators
ΕΙΚ + time expression: 85, Addenda ad §1.1.2.1 B
ΕΙΚ + (Nom. Sentence + modifier): 3678
ΚΕ-/ΘΕ-: 143ff., 146ff.; see Determinators
ΚΟΥ, ΕΤΙΕΚΟΥ ΝΕ: §7.3.1
ΚΟΥ, ΥΝΜ: 134
ΜΕ, ΖΝΟΥΜΕ: §1.3.5.2
ΜΗΜΗΝ: §1.3.1.1
ΜΗΝΙΝ ΜΗΝΟ-: §6.1.4.2
ΜΗΜΑΤΕ: §1.3.1.1
ΜΗΝΑ-, preposition, in adnominal status: 21, 36
—, coordinating modifiers: 36
ΝΗΜΑ-ω-, coordinating a second pronominal rectum
of a prepositional phrase: 36
ΜΙΝΕ: 13728, 1439
ΜΝΝΑ-: §7.3.1
ΜΑΥΑΑω: §6.1.4.1
—, and ΜΜΑΤΕ: §6.2; 43
ΜΕΨΑΚ: §7.3.3
ΜΟΕΙΣΕ ΕΧΝΜΟΕΙΣΕ: 38, 1439

Н-, conjugation "base" of conjunctive: §§7.1.1, 7.1.3
Н-, "nota relationis": §1.0.1-2; 619, 13118 and
passim; Addenda ad §7.1.3.1
—, adnominal: Ch. 4 passim (esp. §4.0.1 ff.);
20ff., 131ff.
—, adverbial: Ch. 3 passim; 27, 29, 81
Н-modifiers: §§1.0.1.2, 1.3.1; 2, 11f.
Н-/ΜΗΜΟ-, predicative in Bipartite Pattern: 36f.
—, identity and homonymy issues: §3.1.2.0.1
—, rection: Ch. 3 passim (esp. §§3.0.1.1, 3.1.2)
—, "belongs" to the verb, not the governed
noun: 172a, 1079
ΝΑ-, preposition: §6.1.5
—, predicative: 37f.
"ΝΑ-, future characteristic, bracketing: 16133
ΜΕ-, converter: see Preterite converter
ΝΑΜΕ: §1.3.5.1
ΝΙΜ, determinator: 143ff., 14416, 146ff.
—, Θ...ΝΙΜ, as object: §3.1.1.2.1
—, ΝΗΝΕ2, "whoever": §1.3.6.1; 83
ΝΑΝΟΥ-: 150
ΝΝΑΠΡ-: 35
ΝΤΑ-/ΝΑ-, conjunctive, 1st person sgl.: §7.0.2
ΝΤΑΑ-/ΕΝΤΑΑ-, Second/relative perfect: 67f.
—, circumstantial + Second Perfect: 67
{NTO-}, augens vs. independent pronoun: §6.1.3.3
NTOM, invariable: §6.1.3.4; 14624
N2OYO: §1.3.1.3
N2XSH: §1.3.7.3.2
NGI-: §§2.8.2, 6.0.1.2; 99144

{PE}, pronoun, concord of: 150f.
—, double simultaneous occurrence of: §6.0.3.3
PE, “backgrounding” signal, macrosyntactic focusing signal: 38
—, with preterite converter: 1042, 6513
{PH-}, “affective” determinator: 137f.
NANOYE, proper name: 139
PHEX-, colon-boundary signal: §6.0.3.1.1
—, delimitation signal: §6.0.2.2

PW, see Enclitics
PWME, indefinite pronoun: 11428
TEPMNE: §1.3.2
PHE-: §3.4.1
POYSE, ZIPPOYSE: 23, 45

CNAY: 134
CON, in modifier status: §1.3.2
—, ZIOYCON: §1.3.8
CZAI: §3.1.1.1.0.2

TENOY: §1.3.4; 35
TUNE, TUNOY: §1.3.9
TNNOY: §3.1.1.0.2
TAPHE-: §§7.2.1.1.5.1; 4, 187; Addenda ad §7.2.1.1.5.1
TUR EUW: 3, 4396
THP-: §6.1.1
TUN: 76, 81, 97
—, EBOA TUN: §§2.6.3.2; 84
TPEH: §1.3.11.5; 12548, 16133, 204f.
—, negated by TM- in Tripartite Pattern: 12559

OY, XEOY, “(saying) what?”: 83
—, ETBEOY: §2.6.3
OYAA-: §6.1.4.3
OYW, durativity neutralized in OYW EU-: 118f.
—, AYOYW EU-, marked perfect: 11943
OYOYE N-: 37
OYN-/MN-, in Bipartite: §1.2.1.1
—, bracketing: 16133
OYNTA-, continued by conjunctive: §7.2.4.1
—, object of: 123
—, pronominal object of: §3.1.1.0.2
OYHP, NOYHP, following Basic Tenses: 97
OYWW, object construction of: §3.1.1.2.2

YWNE, WANTEOY YWNE: §§2.5.0.2; 4
—, C-YWNE, with conjunctive or ETPH-: 148f., 200
YPW(N)-: see Conjugation mediators

ZAE: 133
ZE
—, NAU N2E: §§2.6.3; with Basic Tense: 97; -O
NAU N2E: 89119
—, in various syntagms preceding elicitics:
§§1.3.4.2, 6.1.2.2, 6.1.3.2
—, -BE N-: 39, 47, 67
—, NTEZE: §1.3.1.2; 834, 39, 67; predicated by PE: §1.2.1.2
ZI-: adnominal, coordinating: 21, 1439
ZWW-: §6.1.2
ZAMO: §7.3.3
ZN-: 32
ZN-, “into”: 30
ZWN, “enjoin”, pronominal object of: §3.1.3.1
ZAPIZARO-: §6.1.5
ZTOOYE: 45
-ZOYEC-, nuclear: 12663
ZAI(2)TN-, adnominal: 21
ZWW4, invariable: §6.1.2.3; 14684; see also Enclitics

XE-inclusion, adnominal: §1.1.1; 148
—, adverbial: 149f.
—, and selection of focalization pattern: 89f.
—, with Basic Tense as prefocal theme: 97
XE-, “as if”: 7884
XE-/ETPH-, as topic: 91
XW: 83, 11531, 14931
—, EUYANOY, topicalization: §2.7.2.1.2.1
—, EIXW MPAL XE-: “by which I mean to say, that...”: §2.0.1.1.2
—, EKXEY, EKXW MNOY XEOY: 83f.
—, EXOOX XE-topicalization: 95130
XEOAAC: §§6.1.2.2; 14931, 162, 163, 207
—, resumed by conjunctive: 207
XOY, pronominal object of: §3.1.1.1.0.2

-GE-: 216
GE1, GE2: see Enclitics
GINE, focalization pattern as direct object of: 99
INDEX LOCORUM

Amélineau

A 1

1 151, 152 95 168 175 139
9 112 96 87, 125 177 119°
9.4.7 182 97 30, 181 181 151
11 35, 44 98 37 182f. 138
12 46, 136 99 201 183 101
14 48, 53, 171 100f. 99 188 38, 41
15 127, 137 101 46° 193 179
16 22, 55, 139, 171, 173 102 33 194 138
21 125 103 139, 152° 199 148, 204°
33 133 104 74, 82, 174 202 30, 202
34 117 105 139 204 56, 125, 172
37 107°, 204 105f. 52 204f. 180-1, 206
39 35, 112, 173 106 22 206 192
41 113°, 174 108 46, 47, 76, 100, 101, 115°, 177 212
43 74 109 94 213 48, 151, 181
44 78 110 126 215 148
46 166, 180 111 86 219 104, 179, 182
48 171 112 126 226 148
51 208 113 99 227 97, 149°
52 94, 148 114 87, 104, 172 234 125, 194°, 196
55 181 115 103, 175, 177 233
56 74, 78 118 99 236 94
57 47, 194° 121 171 239 89, 180, 183
58 51 122 26, 176 240 46
61 174, 177 123 167, 178 241 66°, 161°
62f. 90 124 104 248 78
64 91, 94, 210 125 88, 104, 167 249 79
65 133 130 139°
66 81 131 177 251 39, 52, 179, 183
67 51, 93 131f. 78 256 112, 114
68 90, 99, 176 132 79°
70 76, 79°, 172 133 21, 152°
71 85, 90, 99, 177 135 79°, 167
72 48, 103, 148 135f. 198 266 125, 171
73 181, 182 136 201 267 39
74 177 137 163°
75 58 150 22, 46°, 79°, 150
76 132, 135, 174, 211 151 102 281 95, 133
77 46, 49, 143°, 161, 167, 173, 198 154 139 283
78 176 155 22, 46, 125
80 82, 90 158 40, 90, 104
81 103 162 175 293 34, 47
82f. 112 162f. 44°
87 139, 171, 174 163 74 297 47, 106°, 174

A 2

2 50, 158
3 22, 171
5 125
6 34, 183
7 22
8 150, 151
9 86
10 125
11 156
12 33
13 150
14 737
15 172
16 97
17 54
18 461
19 46
20 171
21 373
22 172
23 374
24 395
25 171
26 420
27 102
28 380
29 381
30 395
31 46
32 148
33 463
34 117, 173
35 50
36 446
37 412
38 94
39 174
40 174
41 174
42 461
43 174
44 146
45 174
46 174
47 174
48 174
49 174
50 174
51 174
52 174
53 174
54 174
55 174
56 174
57 174
58 174
59 174
60 174
61 174
62f. 174
63 174
64 174
65 174
66 174
67 174
68 174
69 174
70 174
71 174
72 174
73 174
74 174
75 174
76 174
77 174
78 174
79 174
80 174
81 174
82f. 174
87 174
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<p>| 31 | 179 | 155 | 66, 86 | 307 | 176 | 157, 171-2 |
| 32 | 22, 34, 179 | 159 | 47, 181 | 308 | 49 | 397 | 25, 42* |
| 33 | 78, 148 | 165 | 54 | 310 | 24* | 398 | 40, 137<em>8, 179, 182 |
| 34 | 38</em> | 167 | 179 | 312 | 67, 94, 102 | 400 | 103 |
| 45 | 94, 100, 168 | 169 | 152 | 313f | 50 | 401 | 40 |
| 49 | 32, 174, 181 | 173 | 180 | 315 | 172 | 402 | 33, 48 |
| 51 | 82 | 174 | 53 | 317 | 43 | 403 | 21, 82, 101, 158, 166, 183, 205 |
| 52 | 101 | 177 | 52 | 318f | 86 | 405 | 203 |
| 53 | 47, 74, 76, 81 | 178 | 139 | 319 | 51 | 406 | 103 |
| 53f. | 74 | 179 | 123 | 320 | 175 | 407 | 48 |
| 54 | 91, 99 | 190 | 179 | 322 | 125 | 408 | 179-180 |
| 55 | 48 | 191 | 53 | 330f | 96 | 409 | 94 |
| 59 | 112 | 192 | 30 | 332 | 32, 34, 48 | 411 | 139* |
| 60 | 41, 48 | 194 | 90 | 333 | 39, 53, 95 | 412 | 81, 91, 132<em>9, 138 |
| 61 | 151 | 196 | 48, 168 | 334 | 88 | 413 | 94 |
| 62 | 91, 112</em> | 223f | 95 | 335 | 163 | 414 | 103 |
| 63 | 94 | 224 | 182 | 336 | 81, 99, 158 | 415 | 50 |
| 64 | 196 | 224f | 196 | 336f | 76 | 418 | 23 |
| 65 | 42*, 47 | 228 | 55 | 338 | 53, 131* | 419f. | 131* |
| 67 | 181 | 234 | 25, 127 | 339 | 96 | 420 | 21 |
| 70 | 179 | 236 | 23 | 340 | 76, 101 | 422 | 96 |
| 71 | 133 | 238 | 115, 172 | 341 | 44, 161, 181 | 429 | 179 |
| 72 | 196 | 238f | 74, 83, 171, 183 | 343 | 22 | 430 | 84, 163, 208 |
| 73 | 74, 138 | 240 | 200 | 345 | 121, 126, 182 | 431 | 98, 163 |
| 74 | 132* | 241 | 181 | 346 | 38 | 432 | 151 |
| 76 | 18*, 34, 161* | 175 | 242 | 147 | 351f | 89 | 433 | 21 |
| 80 | 104, 123 | 244 | 137 | 352 | 114 | 435 | 143*, 161, 163 |
| 84 | 127 | 245 | 22, 78* | 96, 125 | 354 | 179 | 437 | 192 |
| 86 | 97 | 246 | 45, 79 | 356 | 125 | 440 | 137 |
| 87 | 25, 102 | 247 | 39, 172 | 357 | 202 | 442f | 151 |
| 90 | 86 | 248 | 74 | 358 | 173 | 443 | 95<em>19, 148 |
| 92 | 20</em> | 249f | 54, 79 | 360 | 54, 113, 171 | 443f | 158 |
| 96 | 48 | 252 | 40 | 361 | 25 | 447 | 168 |
| 97 | 161* | 254 | 112* | 362 | 78 | 449 | 157 |
| 99 | 180, 181, 183 | 256 | 22, 152<em>o | 363f | 203 | 451 | 20</em>9, 47 |
| 100 | 23 | 257 | 60 | 364 | 11, 34, 161* | 452 | 21 |
| 102 | 22 | 258f | 50 | 365 | 96 | 453 | 21, 203 |
| 104 | 181 | 262 | 54 | 367 | 138 | 455 | 54 |
| 105 | 85 | 265 | 52 | 368 | 181 | 458 | 181 |
| 106 | 49 | 267 | 175-6 | 371 | 34, 48, 95 | 461 | 196 |
| 107 | 117, 123 | 280 | 174 | 372 | 100 | 462 | 101, 162, 173, 196 |
| 108 | 172, 180 | 287 | 139 | 373 | 181 | 463 | 49 |
| 109 | 49 | 289 | 147 | 374 | 176 | 463f | 68<em>4, 74, 96 |
| 110 | 179 | 292 | 51, 176 | 376 | 125</em>4, 138<em>13, 139</em>13 | 464 | 33, 53, 54, 66, 79<em>8, 99, 102 |
| 111 | 168 | 293 | 116 | 378 | 94 | 465 | 22, 23, 103 |
| 113f. | 40, 208 | 293f | 174 | 378f | 54 | 466 | 150 |
| 114 | 38</em> | 66, 81, 99 | 295 | 168 | 380 | 32 | 465f | 150 |
| 119 | 103 | 296 | 43 | 380f | 55 | 468 | 112, 174 |
| 120 | 22 | 298 | 47, 175, 179 | 381 | 161 | 471 | 152* |
| 121 | 58, 196 | 299 | 51 | 382f | 174 | 473 | 53, 183 |
| 122 | 136 | 298f | 78, 83 | 384 | 179 | 473f | 41 |
| 138 | 44 | 300 | 87 | 385 | 90, 117 | 475 | 103, 168 |
| 140 | 91, 208 | 301 | 22, 86, 125 | 386 | 96 | 476 | 87 |
| 143 | 180 | 302 | 180 | 388f | 89 | 478 | 138 |
| 146 | 74, 89 | 303 | 180 | 390 | 102, 208 | 479 | 66 |
| 148 | 150 | 304 | 22, 35, 38 | 392 | 95<em>19, 112 | 481 | 114 |
| 151 | 49 | 305 | 88 | 395 | 38</em> | 483 | 89 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ch.</th>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Locorum</th>
<th>Ench.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>98.36ff.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>131.24ff.</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.44ff.</td>
<td>137**</td>
<td>132.9ff.</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.47ff.</td>
<td>106*</td>
<td>132.15ff.</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.2f.</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>132.26ff.</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.21ff.</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>132.31ff.</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.30ff.</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>132f.</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.52ff.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>135.44ff.</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.35ff.</td>
<td>20**</td>
<td>135.50ff.</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.38ff.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>138.52ff.</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.5ff.</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>140.20</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.9f.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>141.31ff.</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.19ff.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>143.44ff.</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.24ff.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>144.2f.</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.18ff.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>144.10ff.</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.31ff.</td>
<td>152**</td>
<td>144.46ff.</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.35ff.</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>146.14ff.</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.5ff.</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>146.15ff.</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.8f.</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>146.20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.28ff.</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>146.50ff.</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.37f.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>146.52ff.</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.39ff.</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>147.14f.</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105.3f.</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>147f.</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105.17f.</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>148.14f.</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105.55ff.</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>148.47ff.</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.20f.</td>
<td>18*</td>
<td>149.27f.</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.25ff.</td>
<td>183**</td>
<td>150.24ff.</td>
<td>66**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.47f.</td>
<td>115*</td>
<td>150.42ff.</td>
<td>161-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.32ff.</td>
<td>152**</td>
<td>151.4ff.</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108.15ff.</td>
<td>132*</td>
<td>153.36ff.</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111.35ff.</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>154.52ff.</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.9ff.</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>155.27f.</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.47ff.</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>156.48f.</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114.62f.</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>158.14ff.</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114f.</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>158.25ff.</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116.36ff.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>159.33f.</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116.57f.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>159f.</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117.14ff.</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>160.15ff.</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117.19f.</td>
<td>22, 33</td>
<td>161.1f.</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117.49ff.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>161.19ff.</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118.26ff.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>162.7f.</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118.31ff.</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>162.18f.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118.44f.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>163.31ff.</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119.45ff.</td>
<td>94, 100</td>
<td>164.19ff.</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119.47ff.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>165.22f.</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120.25ff.</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>165.44ff.</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121.6ff.</td>
<td>197-8</td>
<td>167.47f.</td>
<td>152**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123.18ff.</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>167.56ff.</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123.48ff.</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>167f.</td>
<td>115, 206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124.54ff.</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>168.3ff.</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125.10ff.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>168.44ff.</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125.23f.</td>
<td>126**</td>
<td>169.7f.</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125.38ff.</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>169.11ff.</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128.33ff.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>169.22ff.</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128.43ff.</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>171.2f.</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129.21ff.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>171.30ff.</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129.23ff.</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>173f.</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129.36f.</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>175.32f.</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130.30ff.</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>178f.</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--- 256 ---

Ep. 

Jelanskaja (Gol.)

Leipoldt

I. III

| 66 | 211 |

1b | 49 |

13.8 | 180 |
13.9 | 54 |
13.12f. | 19 |
13.13 | 51 |
13.13f. | 177 |
13.15 | 138 |
13.23 | 138 |
14.15 | 138 |
14.22 | 138 |
15.14 | 138 |
15.16 | 15.17 | 48 |
15.21 | 90 |
15.21f. | 158 |
15.23f. | 114 |
16.3f. | 104 |
16.12 | 192 |
17.1ff. | 101 |
17.6 | 173 |
17.27 | 60** |
18.1 | 192 |
18.3.6f. | 60** |
18.15f. | 112, 156 |
18.18ff. | 102 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L III</th>
<th>Index Locorum</th>
<th>L III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99.14</td>
<td>54 115.26ff.</td>
<td>53 132.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.11ff.</td>
<td>165 115.28</td>
<td>44 133.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.14ff.</td>
<td>198 116.6f.</td>
<td>99 134.3f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.12ff.</td>
<td>98 116.16f.</td>
<td>35 134.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.19ff.</td>
<td>98 116.17</td>
<td>23 134.5f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.7</td>
<td>175 116.23f.</td>
<td>103 135.10f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.7ff.</td>
<td>135 116.25ff.</td>
<td>25 135.28f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.18ff.</td>
<td>46 117.5f.</td>
<td>23, 181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.20</td>
<td>50 117.6.11</td>
<td>182 136.28f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.1</td>
<td>114 117.6f.</td>
<td>182 137.1f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.4f.</td>
<td>45 117.8</td>
<td>211 137.19f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.13</td>
<td>117 117.17</td>
<td>51 137.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.15</td>
<td>121 117.27f.</td>
<td>78 137.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.19f.</td>
<td>204 117.28f.</td>
<td>99 138.1ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.23ff.</td>
<td>163** 118.5f.</td>
<td>33** 138.26ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105.6</td>
<td>166 118.11f.</td>
<td>172 139.10f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105.24ff.</td>
<td>167 118.15f.</td>
<td>163 139.18f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.2</td>
<td>46 118.20</td>
<td>151 139.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.11ff.</td>
<td>138 118.25f.</td>
<td>204 139.25ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.18f.</td>
<td>25, 117 119.7ff.</td>
<td>197 140.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.29</td>
<td>25 119.28</td>
<td>153 140.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.1</td>
<td>30 120.7f.</td>
<td>100 140.30f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.2ff.</td>
<td>122 120.9</td>
<td>99 141.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.6</td>
<td>40, 53, 151 120.24f.</td>
<td>49 141.31f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.8ff.</td>
<td>210 120.27ff.</td>
<td>49 142.5f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.12</td>
<td>25 121.18ff.</td>
<td>201 142.16ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.17ff.</td>
<td>23 121.21ff.</td>
<td>114 142.18f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.23ff.</td>
<td>34 121.23f.</td>
<td>134 142.28f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.9</td>
<td>79 123.1f</td>
<td>74 143.7f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108.9</td>
<td>79 123.1f</td>
<td>74 143.23f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108.12ff.</td>
<td>207 123.2</td>
<td>78, 78** 144.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108.13f.</td>
<td>49 123.8</td>
<td>50 144.14f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108.28</td>
<td>127 123.13f.</td>
<td>132**, 139 144.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109.2f.</td>
<td>114 123.27</td>
<td>198 144.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109.4f.</td>
<td>165 123.27f.</td>
<td>138 144.28f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109.16</td>
<td>179 124.12</td>
<td>50 145.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109.19ff.</td>
<td>176 124.17f.</td>
<td>78** 145.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109f.</td>
<td>44 124f.</td>
<td>198 145.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110.2f.</td>
<td>197 125.7f.</td>
<td>51-2 146.20ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110.6f.</td>
<td>165 125.14ff.</td>
<td>201 146.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110.8f.</td>
<td>41, 46 125.18ff.</td>
<td>198 146.24f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110.17</td>
<td>46 126.1ff.</td>
<td>22, 122 147.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110.18</td>
<td>58 126.5f.</td>
<td>22 147.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111.2</td>
<td>30 126.16</td>
<td>46 148.4f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111f.</td>
<td>202 126.20f.</td>
<td>152** 148.25ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112.10f.</td>
<td>25 126.23f.</td>
<td>35 149.16ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112.16ff.</td>
<td>211 127.15</td>
<td>180 149.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.1ff.</td>
<td>122 128.18</td>
<td>112 150.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.5ff.</td>
<td>122** 128.20f.</td>
<td>138 150.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.9f.</td>
<td>122 130.3f.</td>
<td>35 150.14f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.11</td>
<td>114 130.6</td>
<td>24 150.18ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.13f.</td>
<td>79**, 165 130.7f.</td>
<td>26, 162 150.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.19f.</td>
<td>44 131.5f.</td>
<td>196-7 150.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114.9f.</td>
<td>117 131.10</td>
<td>101 151.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114.12</td>
<td>34 131.14f.</td>
<td>102 153.10f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114f.</td>
<td>56 131.15f.</td>
<td>48, 166, 168 154.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115.2f.</td>
<td>56 131.20</td>
<td>205 154.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115.8f.</td>
<td>96 132.3f.</td>
<td>50 154.27ff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--- 258 ---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L III</th>
<th>Index Locorum</th>
<th>L IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>183.28</td>
<td>205.28</td>
<td>220.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184.2</td>
<td>206.4ff.</td>
<td>220.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184.8</td>
<td>206.10</td>
<td>221.4f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184.15</td>
<td>206.7</td>
<td>221.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184.21f.</td>
<td>206.13</td>
<td>221.11ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185.3</td>
<td>206.21</td>
<td>221.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185.6f.</td>
<td>207.8ff.</td>
<td>222.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185.10</td>
<td>207.14ff.</td>
<td>222.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185.17f.</td>
<td>208.5</td>
<td>224.4f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185.24ff.</td>
<td>208.8</td>
<td>224.4f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187.8</td>
<td>208.12</td>
<td>222.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187.10f.</td>
<td>208.17</td>
<td>223.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187.12</td>
<td>208.17f.</td>
<td>224.9f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188.20f.</td>
<td>209.1f.</td>
<td>224.17f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189.23</td>
<td>209.13ff.</td>
<td>224.20f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189.27f.</td>
<td>209.14ff.</td>
<td>224.21f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189.30</td>
<td>210.9</td>
<td>211.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190.14f.</td>
<td>210.7f.</td>
<td>211.6f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190.18</td>
<td>210.13</td>
<td>211.6f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191.22</td>
<td>210.15f.</td>
<td>211.6f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191.25ff.</td>
<td>210.18</td>
<td>211.6f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192.1</td>
<td>210.18f.</td>
<td>212.2f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192.4f.</td>
<td>210.19f.</td>
<td>212.3f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192.19f.</td>
<td>211.2f.</td>
<td>212.4f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193.3f.</td>
<td>211.8f.</td>
<td>212.4f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193.6f.</td>
<td>211.10f.</td>
<td>212.4f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193.11</td>
<td>211.11</td>
<td>212.4f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193.22</td>
<td>212.3f.</td>
<td>212.4f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194.19f.</td>
<td>212.7ff.</td>
<td>212.4f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194.22</td>
<td>212.8f.</td>
<td>212.4f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195.2ff.</td>
<td>212.14f.</td>
<td>212.4f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196.5f.</td>
<td>212.22</td>
<td>212.4f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196.16</td>
<td>213.9</td>
<td>212.4f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196.6f.</td>
<td>213.14</td>
<td>212.4f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197.6f.</td>
<td>213.16f.</td>
<td>212.4f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198.14ff.</td>
<td>213.19</td>
<td>212.4f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199.5f.</td>
<td>214.10f.</td>
<td>212.4f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199.27f.</td>
<td>214.18</td>
<td>212.4f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199.28</td>
<td>215.2f.</td>
<td>212.4f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200.22</td>
<td>215.10</td>
<td>212.4f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200.22f.</td>
<td>215.18</td>
<td>212.4f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200f.</td>
<td>215.23f.</td>
<td>212.4f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201.16</td>
<td>215.24f.</td>
<td>212.4f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202.4</td>
<td>216.17</td>
<td>212.4f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202.18f.</td>
<td>216.18f.</td>
<td>212.4f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.8</td>
<td>217.2f.</td>
<td>212.4f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.15f.</td>
<td>217.11</td>
<td>212.4f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204.5f.</td>
<td>217.23</td>
<td>212.4f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204.6f.</td>
<td>218.1</td>
<td>212.4f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204.8</td>
<td>218.5ff.</td>
<td>212.4f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204.10</td>
<td>218.14</td>
<td>212.4f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204.12ff.</td>
<td>219.3f.</td>
<td>212.4f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205.4f.</td>
<td>219.4</td>
<td>212.4f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205.16f.</td>
<td>219.8ff.</td>
<td>212.4f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205.17f.</td>
<td>219.10f.</td>
<td>212.4f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205.22f.</td>
<td>220.2ff.</td>
<td>212.4f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205.23f.</td>
<td>220.20</td>
<td>212.4f.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--- 259 ---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>38.29</th>
<th>197</th>
<th>64.6</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>84.14</th>
<th>44</th>
<th>104.4f.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39.4ff.</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>64.15ff.</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>84.15</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.19f.</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>64.26f.</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>84.15ff.</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>104.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.21f.</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>65.6ff.</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>84.21</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>105.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.9f.</td>
<td>11, 135, 193</td>
<td>66.16f.</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>105.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.16f.</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>66.17</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>85.6f.</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>105.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.2ff.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>66.21f.</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>85.22</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>106.5f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.2.</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>66.24f.</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>85f.</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>106.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.3ff.</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>67.2f.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>107.5f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.4f.</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>107.7f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.5f.</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>67.7f.</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>86.8f.</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>107.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>67.2f.</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>87.8f.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>107.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.23</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>67.24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>108.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.28</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>67f.</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>88.1ff.</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>108.5f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>68.10ff.</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>89.1f.</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>108.17f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>68.17f.</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>89.2f.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>108.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.24</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>69.13</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>89.14</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>109.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>69.15f.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>90.18</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>109.9f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.22f.</td>
<td>58, 208</td>
<td>69.19f.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>91.11</td>
<td>36i</td>
<td>110.9f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.24f.</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>70.17ff.</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>91.14f.</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>110.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>70.23</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>91.22</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>111.1f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.22ff.</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>71.4f.</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>23, 45</td>
<td>111.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.12</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>72.15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>92.20</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>112.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.9f.</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>72f.</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>92.22f.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>112.17f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.20</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>73.8f.</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>93.1ff.</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>112.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.6f.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>73.10ff.</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>112.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.16f.</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>73.11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>112.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.17</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73.14f.</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>94.3ff.</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>113.5f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.16</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>73.19f.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>94.15f.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>113.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.21f.</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>74.6f.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>94.23</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>113f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.27</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>74.13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>95.10</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>114.18f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>74.25</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>95.10f.</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>115.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.23</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>75.20ff.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>95.17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>116.4f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>76.15</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>96.4f.</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>116.8f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.6f.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>76.20ff.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>79ii</td>
<td>116.12f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>96.12f.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>116.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.23f.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>78.7f.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>96.13</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>117.4f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.29</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>96.24</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>117.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.20f.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>79.14</td>
<td>24, 117</td>
<td>96.25</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>117.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.6f.</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>79f.</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>97.11f.</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>119.20f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.23ff.</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>80.1f.</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>97.22f.</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>120.3f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.22f.</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>98.14f.</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>120.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.19f.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>80.2f.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>98.25f.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>120.12f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.26</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>98.26</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>121.22f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.10</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>80.18</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>99.16</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>122.5ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.13</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80.23</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>99.20f.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>122.15f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.2ff.</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>23, 53</td>
<td>99.21f.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>122.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.15</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>81.25f.</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>100.2ff.</td>
<td>206, 208</td>
<td>124.7f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.19f.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>101.8</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>126.6f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.21</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>82.1f.</td>
<td>44**</td>
<td>101.15ff.</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>127.23f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.27f.</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>82.11</td>
<td>112, 197</td>
<td>101.17</td>
<td>116**</td>
<td>127.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.28</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>82.28</td>
<td>24, 117</td>
<td>102.16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>128.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>161**</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>103.1</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>128.6f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.27f.</td>
<td>77, 134</td>
<td>83.14f.</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>103.5f.</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>128.11f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.29</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>83.22f.</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>103.6f.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>128.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61f.</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>103.14</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>129.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.15f.</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>46, 180</td>
<td>103.15f.</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>146.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.24</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>84.10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>104.1</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>146.20f.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--- 260 ---
| 150.4 | 168 | 184.7 | 165 | Miss. | RE 10 |
| 152.2 | 21 | 184.8 | 179 |
| 153.13f | 180 | 187.9ff | 204 | 231 | 133 |
| 153.16 | 13211 | 189.3 | 176 | 234 | 208 |
| 153.22 | 43 | 191.7f | 51 | 278 | 86 |
| 153.23f | 172 | 193.9 | 51 | 279 | 76, 101 |
| 154.22 | 147 | 194.1f | 126 | 279f. | 46 |
| 155.1f | 165 | 195.2 | 175 | 280 | 37 |
| 155.8 | 50 | 195.4 | 18344 | 281 | 33, 13244 |
| 155.11ff | 197 | 195.6ff | 206 | 282 | 45 |
| 155.14ff | 201 | 195.8f | 54 | 283 | 30, 81, 94, 133, 158 |
| 155.22 | 57 | 195.14 | 2011 | 284 | 125, 179 |
| 156.3 | 30 | 195.14f | 202 |
| 156.7 | 135 | 197.9 | 47 |
| 156.9ff | 203 | 198.20 | 2411 | 159.8 | 48 | 206.18 | 53 | 142 | 96 |
| 156.19 | 134 | 199.2 | 46 |
| 156.19f | 200 | 199.7f | 80 | 92 | 138 |
| 156.26 | 40 | 199.15f | 1074 | 95 | 138 |
| 156.26f | 88 | 200.20 | 78 | 96 | 81, 87, 93 |
| 157.2f | 53 | 204.21ff | 20011 | 98 | 103 |
| 157.12 | 127 | 205.10f | 166 | 102 | 83, 13211 |
| 157.15f | 200 | 205.18f | 175 | 103 | 168 |
| 157.21ff | 79, 178 | 206.12f | 22 | 104 | 13112 |
| 159.8 | 48 | 206.18 | 53 | 142 | 96 |
| 159.11f | 38, 40 | 206.22 | 47, 122 | 160 | 46 |
| 159.13 | 20, 22, 23 | 206.27ff | 157 | 163 | 179 |
| 160.2f | 194 | 207.4f | 171 |
| 160.17f | 50, 56 | 207.6f | 176 |
| 161.2f | 36 | 207.26 | 194 |
| 161.19 | 179 | 207.28ff | 197 |
| 161.21f | 194 | 208.10f | 133 |
| 162.2ff | 84, 198 | 162.5 | 23 |
| 163.22ff | 121 | 164.7f | 211 |
| 164.9f | 165 | 301 | 25 | 153.8f. | 147 |
| 165.10 | 180 | 302 | 36 | 153.27ff. | 161 |
| 166.3f | 151 | 311 | 165 | 153-155 passim | 174 |
| 167.18f | 182 | 328 | 121, 210 |
| 171.1f | 199 | 345 | 134 |
| 171.3f | 196 | 347 | 32 |
| 172.10 | 46 | 348 | 32 |
| 172.16 | 135 | 355 | 203 | 160.27f. | 158 |
| 173.1 | 117 | 365 | 95 |
| 173.4 | 55 | 390 | 86 |
| 175.2f | 136 | 410 | 84, 94 |
| 175.10f | 25 |
| 175.11f | 171 |
| 176.3 | 11 |
| 178.12 | 57 |
| 180.3 | 16113 | 84 | 208 |
| 180.12 | 166 | 89 | 204 |
| 181.11 | 78 | 92 | 151 |
| 181.11ff | 96113 | 288 | 74, 100 |
| 181.13 | 112 | 318 | 67, 90 |
| 183.7 | 47, 98, 166 |
| 184.2 | 16311 |
| 184.5f. | 102 |

| RE 11 |
| 15a 7ff. | 208 |
| 15b 1 | 175 |
| 16a 17 | 33, 48 |
| 16a 27f. | 60 |
| 16a 39ff. | 94 |
| 16b 9f. | 13113, 180 |
| 16b 17f. | 180 |
| 16b 20 | 152 |
| 17a 2 | 166 |
| 17a 12f. | 161 |
| 18a 4f. | 180 |
| 18a 11ff. | 192, 193 |
| 18a 24f. | 168, 175 |

<p>| Quot. |
| (2) | 182 |
| Rossi 2/3 |
| 12 | 133, 148 |
| 13 | 11419 |
| 27 | 125, 178 |
| 34 | 125 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duke</th>
<th>RSSI</th>
<th>Index Locorum</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15814</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>124a 12ff.</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1323, 138</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>125b 3ff.</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86, 89</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>125b 18ff.</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>127b 8ff.</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158b 24ff.</td>
<td>128a 29ff.</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160c 24ff.</td>
<td>129a 6f.</td>
<td>171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161a 27f.</td>
<td>129a 30ff.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161b 10f.</td>
<td>131a 2ff.</td>
<td>84, 91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161c 11f.</td>
<td>131a 9f.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161d 10ff.</td>
<td>131b 2ff.</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162c 15ff.</td>
<td>132a 4f.</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163f.</td>
<td>132a 28f.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165c 27ff.</td>
<td>133b 10ff.</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168b 13f.</td>
<td>133b 3f.</td>
<td>208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171b 30f.</td>
<td>133b 18ff.</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171c 6f.</td>
<td>133c 19f.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171c 7</td>
<td>138c-d</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171c 15f.</td>
<td>139a 20f.</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171c 31f.</td>
<td>139a 24ff.</td>
<td>206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171d 1ff.</td>
<td>139d 12f.</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172d 6f.</td>
<td>139d 26f.</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174d 29ff.</td>
<td>140a 13ff.</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176a 3f.</td>
<td>140c 9ff.</td>
<td>50-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176a 22ff.</td>
<td>141a 17</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178a 25ff.</td>
<td>141b 24f.</td>
<td>15248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179b 30ff.</td>
<td>141d 6f.</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179d 7f.</td>
<td>142a 1ff.</td>
<td>209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142d 7ff.</td>
<td>145a 11f.</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145b 2ff.</td>
<td>145d 17ff.</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145d 17ff.</td>
<td>144c 4f.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84, 103, 183</td>
<td>144d 24ff.</td>
<td>208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.17ff.</td>
<td>144d 8ff.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128b 1ff.</td>
<td>145a 11f.</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140b 8ff.</td>
<td>145b 2ff.</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 6, 104</td>
<td>147b 10ff.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147c 1ff.</td>
<td>147d 28ff.</td>
<td>33, 176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147d 28ff.</td>
<td>148a 1f.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>148a 16ff.</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148b 16ff.</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>95, 148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148b-c</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>149b</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>150a 14ff.</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>150d 22ff.</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>151c 1ff.</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>152c 17ff.</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9944</td>
<td>153c 2f.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1613 3 p. 320</td>
<td>1613 6 ro</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1613 3 p. 320</td>
<td>192 p. 273 (Cat. 77)</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1613 6 ro</td>
<td>194 f. 3 (Cat. 79)</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1613 6 ro</td>
<td>195 (Cat. 80)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196b (Cat. 81)</td>
<td>197 (Cat. 81)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198 3 vo (Cat. 82)</td>
<td>199 p. 361 (Cat. 83)</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199 p. 361 (Cat. 83)</td>
<td>202 p. 184</td>
<td>89, 98, 178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202 p. 184</td>
<td>204 p. 77</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204 p. 77</td>
<td>209 p. 39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209 p. 39</td>
<td>211 2 ro (Cat. 92)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213 p. 38 (Cat. 94)</td>
<td>230 p. 147 (Cat. 104)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253 p. 57 (Cat. 112)</td>
<td>253 p. 57 (Cat. 112)</td>
<td>78, 95, 96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253 p. 57 (Cat. 112)</td>
<td>991 ro (Cat. 411)</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>992 vo</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3581 A</td>
<td>66 (No. 198) f. 2 vo</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 (No. 202) p. 184</td>
<td>131 p. 252f.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6807 (2)</td>
<td>6954 (12) vo</td>
<td>96114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8800 4 vo</td>
<td>18 p. 57</td>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>8007</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211 ro</td>
<td>22 p. 357</td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 p. 363</td>
<td>22 p. 365</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 1</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The table represents a portion of the Duke University Library's catalogue, listing various references and their corresponding pages and notes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IF (Cairo)</th>
<th>Index Locorum</th>
<th>Ryl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Paris, Bibl. Nationale (P)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1301</th>
<th>15 ro</th>
<th>50, 53</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 p</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>113, 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 p</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>123, 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 p</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>208, 212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132 p</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134 p</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 p</td>
<td>333 f</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136 p</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136 p</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137 p</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>52, 175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139 p</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>45, 78, 166, 174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139 p</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140 p</td>
<td>347 f</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1301 | 1 p | 77 | 174, 182 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 p</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>173, 180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 p</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 p</td>
<td>87 f</td>
<td>147, 176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 p</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>162 f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 p</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 p</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 p</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>161 f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 p</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 p</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 p</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 p</td>
<td>554 f</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 p</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 p</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 p</td>
<td>vo</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 ro</td>
<td>21, 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 p</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 p</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 p</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 p</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 p</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 p</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>86, 143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47-8 p</td>
<td>223 f</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 p</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>201, 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 p</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 p</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 p</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>156, 179</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 p</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 p</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>21, 35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 p</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 p</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>21, 35-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 p</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>22, 35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Ryl. (Cat.) (Manchester)

<p>| 67 p. 395 (Cat. 31) | 148 |
| 67 p. 396 | 33 |
| p. 399 (Cat. 32) | 49, 53, 179 |
| p. 405 | 99 |
| 68 p. 260 (Cat. 32) | 112 |
| p. 262 (Cat. 32) | 101 |
| 69 p. 53 | 55 |
| 70 p. 242 (Cat. 34) | 85 |
| p. 244 (Cat. 34 f.) | 160 |
| p. 245 (Cat. 34) | 85, 86 |
| p. 249 (Cat. 35) | 172 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thompson (Cambridge)</th>
<th>ViK (Vienna) (K)</th>
<th>Index Locorum</th>
<th>ViK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78, 133, 134</td>
<td>18*, 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 59</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>913, 24</td>
<td>9068, 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9040</td>
<td>9315, 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 1 ro</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9100, 106*</td>
<td>9317, 65, 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 vo</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>927, 22</td>
<td>9223, Add.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ro</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>928, 52, 202</td>
<td>9291, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 3 vo</td>
<td>137, 196</td>
<td>933, 95, 112, 210</td>
<td>9292, 107*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L ro</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>934, 19</td>
<td>9294, 24, 25, 125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>