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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 SHENOITE, 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 idiolectal 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-idiomatic 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 *tāw* *etw*, *yantey* *ywni*/*ypw*, the notorious “Disiunctio Sinuthiana”", lexical favourites or monopolies — *ywyv* “incense”, *(wv)wr2* “ejec”, *ywb*2 “be withered”, *ywk*2 “be/dig deep”, *koph*, *aomoc* and so on) are well known; numerous others (like *euk*/*mna* *x* - “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 vernachlässigter 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 gelehrt-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 Sprachgefühl”. What Kern here opposes to the “linguistic intuition” must be pre-analytic, aprioristic so-called “scientific informedness”, a kind of proacte-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 *prazent* *oywsc* *h avoywsc* *prai* *mht* (P 130°-19 Pr); 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) xii ff. The serious practical problem of distinguishing Shenoute’s works

---
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which I mean to say”, rhetoric-argumentative figures using Ὄμως, a “Πρωμε ἐν Παί Ετ.” hyperbatric Nominal Sentence pattern, collocations of the “irreversible binomial” type like Pan - σχίμα, Τετε - Οὐκ, Χωμ - Χίδε, Κριμ - Γνώκε, are yet to be properly defined and statistically established in special studies; some have to do with peculiarities of dialectal admixture or “substratal” traces (Shisha-Halevy 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 “Shenouteanisms” resolved here could carry considerable practical-diachronic 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”, “condicio” 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 ἄος αἰ, ΝΕΕ ἄος, ΑΥΜ ὀμ/ΠΩΜ ὀμ/ΜΝΑΜ ΚΕ, 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, ἉΘΝΑΥ contrasts with Shenoute’s own ἈΝΘΕΟΥ ΧΩΜ (§2.5.0.2), ΤΑΡΕΤΟΣΜ with Shenoute’s paradigm of post-imperatival 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 diatessaron, 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 inversive... fervidae illae declarationes... epistolae illae parabolis et paradigmis refertae... scripta stylo plano atque fluido digesta”; on the other hand (ibid., 483) “stylus pedestris et humilis... lectu facilis, stylus placidior... quam quos 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 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 cénobitisme pakhémonien (1898) 151f.; Kuhn, Muséon 66:225f. (1953), 71:376ff. (1958), and in the introduction to his edition of Besa (CSCO 157/copt.21, 1956) p.xiii f. The so-called “Pseudo-Shenoute” texts (ed. Kuhn, CSCO 206-7/copt.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-Halevy 1975:472f., 477, 1976:362f.). 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). 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 codifications; 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 elements: syntagmatic (linear, (co)textual) or paradigmatic (commutative, categorial) 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’accialmie, où sa phrase était limpide... les lions ne rugissent pas toujours, ils badinent quelquefois et jouent avec leurs lionceaux” (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 vole, et avec la plus magnifique désinvolture” (ibid., and see too pp. xxix ff.).

8 Some valuable retrospective surveys and guides for further reading: Lepsch 1972 (see p. 152f. for further state-of-the-art reports); Mohrmann et al. 1961, esp. pp. 126ff., 196ff., 294ff.; articles by Koerner, Engler, Lepsch. Hymes and Fought in Sebek, ed. 1975:717-1176; see also Bazell 1954, Coseniu 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., Coseniu 1969:58ff.: this is the meaning of “grammatical system”: there are no elements outside it.
The simplest oppositions \(^{10}\) are binary (including privative, with two poles or terms related to each other as marked : unmarked \(^{11}\)). Any one member of an opposition may be zero \(^{12}\) or neutral (non-functional). Neutralization (Aufhebung, suppression of opposition) is a syntagmatic-and-paradigmatic event just as significant as opposition \(^{13}\): 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 \(^{14}\), 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 \(^{15}\). 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 \(^{16}\), 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 \(^{17}\)). Consequently, established classes or categories are correspondingly gradable on a scale of varying analytic delicacy \(^{18}\).

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 \(^{19}\): 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 adnerval 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 1967:517ff. (No.1).

\(^{16}\) An example: the converters: e-\text{-sec}, e-sec. tense, etc. (relative), 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: ŋ/n- for the nota relationis, ŋ/n- for the plural article). Another example: AGRE-/AGA- (aorist affirmative base) vs. ASA-/ASA (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.

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. 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 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”. 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. 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 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.

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 like others.

---

50 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.


52 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 1928:411f.): “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.

53 Consider HALLIDAY’s definitions (1961:246ff., 254ff.).

54 Cf. HALL’s “fictions” (1965).

55 Cf. MISTELI’s typologically oriented review of Stern’s Grammatik (1982:448ff., 454 “no words, only groups — larger or smaller, closer or looser”); STERN xi f., STEINHAL-MISTELI 1893:272ff.; and see the discussion of the Coptic “word” below, §6.0.2.3, with further references.


57 In the Saussurean sense (SAUSSURE 1949:170), cf. Frei, Studia Gratulatoria Groot (1962) 139: “combinaison de deux ou plusieurs unités également présentes qui se suivent”. This is also Baudouin de Courtenay’s use of the term (A Baudouin de Courtenay Anthology, tr. and ed. E. Stankiewicz, 1972 p. 267).
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 P₁, and it can be shown that a different pattern, P₂, in which x does occur, is in this respect in complementary (suppletive) distribution with P₁, we may consider the non-occurrence of x in P₁ 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, P₃, including x, is eventually found to be in an “allo”-relationship with P₁).

28 Somewhat in the sense of MARTINET’s use of the term (1967:§4.6 “l’étude des variantes de signifiant”), or Vergote’s in his Grammaire copse (1a, 1973, “morphologie synthétique”).
29 See (for example) KURYLOWICZ 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., 197f.; 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: NETIZE “thus” is absent as predicate in the Bipartite pattern, since it is predicated in the # Predicate ~ # pattern (§1.2.1.2); *MAPEK ~ MIPPEK 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” and “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. 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 and an application of what we know of Shenoute's (and, in general, Byzantine) rhetorical theory and norms, 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 transcendent (in a different sense, "suprasyntactic") category, intersecting others; the "rhetorical dialogue" may include real dialogues, real and rhetorical narratives ("paradeigmata"). (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: EMHACUTM (Second Future) is jussive in a preceptive coxtex; NE- (pret. converter) expresses a durative past outside a narrative stretch, but signals (with NE) "Relief" (Weinrich) or tempo- or dimension-varying in a narrative coxtex; ENANCUTM (circ. perfect) is continuous in a narrative coxtex; the conjunctive is a typical non-narrative form (partly corresponding to AN- (AYUH) AN-, AN- ETPEI- in narration). For the Second Tense, a context-bound, macrosyntactic category par excellence, see Ch. 2. Note that both NE- 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 "Wechselrede", 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 38f.). 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.
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

...αὔω νηνάω αίνθηα αναγνωρίσει αντίατον... (IV 176.3)
εὐχέ τετράγωνον μακάριει εἰς τὸν ἄνθρωπον τῆς ζωῆς (IV 96.12f.)
λακ νεκρίωτερον σημασίας κτέθηταρτον,
νηματικής γνώμης ημνικείας ημικείας (IV 41.9f.)
οὐράγε καὶ τοῖς πολλοῖς ἐπικαλεσθέντος,
νηματικής μνήμης ὑπομνήματος ἀναγνώρισεις ημνικείας...
ηναχεύσας διανοίας συνεχείας; (A 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, adverbial 53, adnexal, 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 lower 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 fragmentated 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; Danel 1970; Gúlich-Heger-Raible 1974; Weinrich 1977, etc.
50 See the excellent Weinrich 1977; a solitary work for (Late) Egyptian, Hintze 1950-2.
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 1969a:§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 "categorial" 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. "Adnexal" ("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 morphological considerations of classification. See Brinker 1972:63ff., and §0.2.1.3 above.
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 *adnental* 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. Several research-historical or state-of-the-art appreciations 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 is as true today as it was a hundred years ago, perhaps more true. 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 1971:55ff.**; **SCHENKEL 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:59ff.** 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 Synaestis, quae ordinem naturalis sequitur, neque inversionem verborum patitur ".

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

classical, almost "nostriatic" 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 predefinition for a dichotomous 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 prejuridical "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 STEINTHAL-MISTELI's "Wo fände sich desgleichen im Indogermanischen oder Semitischen?" (1893:50).


43 I am leaving out here some dichiromatic-tylogological observations, like Hintze, *ZPh* 1:96ff. (1947) and the apt criticism by SCHENKE 1966 a; briefly, MINK 1978:97f. in traditional Humboldtian terminology (analytic, synthetic, "wurzelflektierend")

44 Cf. for Egyptian DAUMAS (1952:34): "L'Egyptien 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 rencontrons en copte 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 vermieden 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 NOTIFICATION

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 ⁶⁶. 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.......</td>
<td>a non-autonomous pattern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># ...... #</td>
<td>an autonomous pattern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>syntagmatic compatibility (not necessarily sequence [continuity])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→</td>
<td>syntagmatic compatibility and sequence (continuity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>unattested (hypothetical) form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(*)</td>
<td>rare or unique form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~</td>
<td>fluctuation, variation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{ }</td>
<td>a morpheme, with its paradigm (unqualified substitutability; e.g. {ne}, {n-}).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>open juncture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>][</td>
<td>juncture boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 Locorum).

⁶⁶ Cf. Lagarde’s "Zwei Beispiele sind etwas wenig, wenn man oft sagt" (*Aus dem deutschen Gelehrtenleben*, 1881, 26).
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 syntags, expanding a determinator: ΟΥΠΑΕΝΟΣ, ΝΩΘΒ ΝΚΑΤΑΚΑΦ etc.

1.1.2 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 → NE #

1.2.1.3 Miscellaneous: 0 N-; # modifier → 0 #; P + 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, ΝΖΟΥΟ

1.3.2 Zero-marked noun syntags in modifier status

1.3.3 Iteration-marked noun syntags in modifier status ('ΚΩΤΥ 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 ΣΙΟΥΚΩΠ

1.3.9 ΤΕΝΟΥ, ΤΕΝΕ

1.3.10 ΑΥΨ "additionally, furthermore"

1.3.11 Greek loan-modifiers

1.3.11.1 -ΨC-characterized modifiers

1.3.11.2 -ΟΝ-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: "formclasses" 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 [συνδεσμός] and "particles") 3. Within this amorphous aggregate, the sole consistently operative, definitional constituent is the adverb as verb qualifying or verb-adjunctal, 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) ≈ 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 1949:152f., Ternière 1965:51f., 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 συνδεσμός, μεσάτης and πανδέκτης see Schmidt 1839:37, 45f., Robins 1966:10ff.; see Pinkster 1972:35ff. for Latin grammatical theory. There are discussions of this approach in Ahlman 1938:19f., Karscvekij 1936:107f., Sechehaye 1950:65, Theleff 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 "vox" (ΧΕΚΑΑΧ); ΑΥΘ is "adverbium" (203ff., see §1.3.10 below); so is ἐπε; ΖΑΘ is "particula seu praeposito", ΝΘ "particula seu adverbium". (I fully concur with Tuki's designation of ΝΘ as a "littera coniunctiva" (96ff.1).) 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 "adverb" in "general" application includes modification of the substantive verb ( — what about true Nominal Sentences?) and ἰδίμως was after all used also for "clause", "phrase" or rather "utterance" (Plato, Cratylus 399b): cf. Steinfeld 1890:137f.
5 Clause Conjunctive forms, the circumstantial conversion, conjunctural sentence-forms, various eventive forms (εἰσείπτερω, μηκοτείπτερω).
6 Cf. Schoemann 1862:360f.
7 See for instance Sechehaye 1950:64f., Regula 1951:75, Kuryłowicz 1964:19f. Among the classical grammarians, see
affinity of two distinct functions, related in a transformational or hierarchic model and by some cor-
responding formal (morphological) correlation — regular at least cardinaly, and at least in the "in-
fecting" 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 subclassitional properties; 
here the syntagmatic satellital 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 8, 
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-Eu-
ropean(-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 18, 
are the exception. The largest group by far among adverbially privileged elements consists of prepositional 
phrases 12, preposition-marked modifiers. Prominent among these are modifiers marked by n-/moo, 
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 perfect adverbium verbis additum, quod adiec-
tiva nominis appellativis nominibus adiuncta "), 11 16 (of the Stoics) "necon etiam adverbia nominibus vel verbis connumerabant, 
et quasi adjectiva verborum ea nominabant "; see Schoemann 1862: Ch. 10 (esp. pp. 136, 157ff.), Pinkster 1972:37. 
* Compare the viesaka in Indian grammatical tradition (Cardona 1973:85 n. 6), possibly also Dion. of Halicarnassus' 
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 conterminous 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 Steinhall 1847, Misteli 1882: 

11 Some noteworthy if not always unexceptionable accounts: Stern §§183, 236, 333ff., 509, 513, 533ff., Kickasola 1975:230, 
Böhl 1977. Crum's struggle to put the morphs in lexicological order (Dictionary 215-6) is telling.

12 Cf. (in a sense) Karczewsnt'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 prepo-
positions, which are often modifiers further expanded, Coptic prepositional phrases are exocentric 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/adverbial; 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 forcation. 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” 17, 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 adverbial status is often explained in transformationalist terms as the result of a “reduction of a relative construction” 18 or as an overall nominalization of a verbal nucleus and its expansion(s) 19. I consider this etiology unhelpful and unnecessary, as is also the underlying assumption that there is something derived, secondary or marginal in the adnominal occurrence of an “adverb” 20: 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 1841:597f. (“prädikativer Genitiv”, adnominal + predicative), also Schoemann 1862:151ff.; von der Gabellentz 1869:383 (adverbial → object, adverbial → predicative); Froboese 1898:30ff., 38f. (adverbial + adnominal + predicative); cf. also Sandmann 1946 on the French parler haut, dire vrai (adverbial → object + predicative).


15 Significantly, we find in (Nitrian?) Bohairic a neat distinction of ≠ κααυς - vs. ≠ κααυς ≠, the former a non-adjunctal, non-satellite, adclausal premodifier, the latter an adverbial adjunctual satellite (cf. also ≠ παιρης - vs. ≠ παιρης ≠). 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 (≠ καιρης καιρος ‘καιρος Heating’ is germine here still has to be established.


18 So Steinhaut 1969:114ff., Brinker 1972:138ff. This is in fact Schenkell’s (1966) analysis of the ME hik 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 Steinhaut 1969:118ff., Brinker, ibid. Obviously, some (notably rection-type) constructions could be advantageously analyzed in 1C-terms as (article) + (verb lexeme + modifier): υφικτω εναιτω (A 2 76), υπωρ εναιτω (IV 32.8), παιρης επιδιακον (Ch. 106.20f.) παιρης επιδιακον (Berl. 1613 2 79), as could — most cogently of all — regular nominalizations: τεμπερππ ενευ (K 9298), τεμπερππ διονυς ενευδειακον (Ch. 9431ff.), τεμπερππ ενευδειακον (P 1633 35 vo), τεμπερππ ενευδειακον (P 1313 19 ro) and so on. The distinction between adnominal and adverbial (“object”) N- is in these circumstances unfounded (see below).

20 “Extrinsicēque” (Secshay 1950:66ff.). Consider Karcevskij’s cognate 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) \(^{31}\) and those analyzable as (article + noun) + modifier, the former with a sub-group of (article) + (nominalization exponent + (verb-lexeme + modifier)): \(\text{ΠΕΨΡ\\-\\2ΠΒ ΕΠΣΟΜΗΤ\\(Κ\\934\) ΤΕΚ\\6Ν\\S\\2ΑΙ ΥΑ} - (III 13.12f.) \(^{32}\), (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 \(^{33}\).

(4) Among the important adnominally occurring verbal modifiers, we find the attributive relative conversion, the adnaxal circumstantial \(^{34}\) and conjunctive (§7.1.3 below, also §§7.3.3-4).

(B) CONSTITUENCY AND PARADIGMS (an open-ended listing) \(^{35}\):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N\-/ΜΜ\-</th>
<th>see §1.3.1, spec. obs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NΤΕ\-/ΝΤΑ\-</td>
<td>spec. obs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΝΤΟΤ-</td>
<td>III 180.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΜΝ-</td>
<td>spec. obs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\varepsilon\-)</td>
<td>spec. obs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\varepsilon\-/ΕΠΟ\-)</td>
<td>Ch. 135.37, Wess. 9 86b 24f., spec. obs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\varepsilon\-)</td>
<td>III 87.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\varepsilon\-)</td>
<td>Ch. 17.47ff., 94.31ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\varepsilon\-)</td>
<td>Ch. 56-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\varepsilon\-)</td>
<td>Ch. 64.34f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\varepsilon\-)</td>
<td>Ch. 117.34f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\varepsilon\-)</td>
<td>Ch. 172.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\varepsilon\-)</td>
<td>Ch. 194.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\varepsilon\-)</td>
<td>IV 29.26f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\varepsilon\-)</td>
<td>IV 32.8, III 72.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\varepsilon\-)</td>
<td>III 141.27f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\varepsilon\-)</td>
<td>IV 106.15f.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{31}\) \(\varepsilon\\-) after Frei 1966, with n- the nucleus (§5.1.1).

\(^{32}\) \(\varepsilon\\-) modifying action-nouns: \(\text{ΠΙΤΙΣ\\(III 87.15\\), ΑΓΑΠΗ\\(Ch. 88.53ff.\\, P131\\4 88 \text{ΡΑΔ\\}), ΜΟΩTY\\(III 135.25f.\\), ΜΝ\\6Ν\\T\\6Ν\\}\\(Ep. 66\\), etc., is specifically adnominal, replacing a simple preposition (mostly n-) in the adverbial status. The actor here is usually expressed pronominally in a possessive article (nε\\-\\, nε\\- etc.), and the whole can be rendered "...which I (you, we... have for...", following (III 172.18) \(\text{ΝΟY\\U03B5\\Y\\6\\E\\7Y\\6\\N\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\E\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\\6\\Y\n
\(^{33}\) Borderline cases like NA\\-\\, EPO\\-\\, ΖΑΠΙ\\6Ν\\- as well as kindred non-augential modifiers like NO\\6Ν\\, ΜΜ\\6Ν\\ are discussed in the present chapter or in chapter 6.

\(^{34}\) A distinction neutralized (in favour of the circumstantial) after a non-n-determined nucleus (Shisha-Haley 1972, esp. 75-128; 1976c:n. 3).

\(^{35}\) 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.
Nagy (§1.3.1.3), Tenoy (§1.3.4), Name, Z&ouml;me (§1.3.5), Al&theta;wsc (§1.3.11.1.2), Z&omega;wsc (§1.3.11.1.1), Kilwsc (§1.3.11.1.3), Z&omega;wsc (§1.3.11.1.4), Z&alpha;wsc (§1.3.11.1.7), Monon (§1.3.11.2.1.1) M&alpha;lon, Mal&theta;ta (§1.3.11.2.1.4), Ayw (§1.3.10).

(C) Special Observations: (1) N−/Mno−, Hte−/Nta−: (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 homonym of adnominal N− (with Pie− a partly suppletive pronominalization) and adverbal N−/Mno−. 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). Adnominal N− occurs, as a nota relationis, in syntags with a value which (say) an Indo-European-oriented observer could identify with that of his own attributive or possessive syntags: 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: (Ite 90.2) (A&alpha;&alpha;ay Npiwme) 2i&beta;o / (ibid. 217.23) (2a2 Ntamejon) N&gamma;tt&gamma; / (Ch. 17.47ffe.) [(Piho) Nkpima] E(2pa1 E&alpha;un) and so on.

(c) N−, the adjunct-characteristic, ντα
conflict especially with instances of ‘Θ- + Ν- (def.)’, e.g. (A 1 133) Ἐμψύχη μμνοεῖθε / (A 2 453, not Sh.) Ἐμψύχη μμνοεῖθε/μνυμὴ ΝΤΟΡΘ / (indef.) + ΝΤΕ- (indef.)’ e.g. (A 2 433, not Sh.) μηνοίκο-

dομή μνεζεμύρη Ἐμψύχη and ‘(def.) + ΝΤΕ- (def.)’ e.g. (A 2 420, not Sh.) νεωναλίκης ΝΤΕΝΠΟΒΕ (ibid.

452) μνυμή ΝΤΕΝΠΟΒΕ / (P 130a 55 τίς) Πούσμυ ΝΤΕΝΠΟΒΕ ΕΕΟΥ / (P 130a 22 ΠΜΘ) ΝΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΣ ΝΤΕ-

ΠΟΧΙΟΣ / even (P 130b 62 οε) ΝΕΥΚΑΤΑΧΕΡ ΝΤΑΥ. 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 (ΜΕΤΕΡΕΖΕΝΚΟΟΥΕ ΑΖΕ ΝΑΥ ΝΤΕΝΠΟΒΕ Ch. 101.38ff.), although Ν- is a regular
direct-object expansion mark (Ch. 3), while ΝΤΕ- is a non-rectional modifier.

(e) See §6.0.1 for Ν- introducing a lexicalizing apposition following a pronominal nucleus: (III 96.21)
...ΖΑΡΟΣ ΝΤΕΛΕ (Ch. 102.9ff.) ...ΖΡΟΥ ΝΤΕΝΩΝ ΝΙΜ, even (A 2 403) (ΠΗΕΟ) ΜΗΣΤΗΝ ΜΝΕΚΑΝ. 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
(A 2 396) ΟΥΒΑΣΚΕ ΕΕΟΥΜ or (IV 152.2) ΟΥΒΩ ΠΑΑ are a case apart: the modification here is dependent
on the environment of the noun syntagm as well as on the formal nucleus. (On ΕΕΟΥΜ Ε- see n. 22.)

(3) ΖΙ-, ΜΝ-: the distinction between the non-coordinating modifier ΖΙ- (e.g. in Ch. 208.43ff. (Ν)ΖΟ
ΖΙΩΘ) and the coordinating ΖΙ- (ΤΒΒΟ ΖΙΜΕ 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]-determinated noun syntagms: ΖΕΝΟΥΜ ΜΝΕΝΣΙ (P 130a 37 ro), ΟΥΣΚΟ ΜΝΟΥΕΙΒΕ (ibid.), ΠΝΟΥΒ
ΜΝΗΣΑΤ (Ch. 116.57ff.), ΜΝΟΥΒ ΜΝΗΣΑΤ (P 130a 59 0); with Θ- ΝΙΜ (§§3.1.1.2.1(3), 5.1.1.0.1) we find
ΑΥΣ-/ΖΙ- /ΜΝ- (P 131b 28 ro) ΖΕΝΟΥΜ ΖΙΡΟΘ ΝΙΜ ΜΝΑΙΚΑΚ ΝΙΜ ΝΝΑΚΙΑ ΝΙΜ, also Ch. 21.33ff., 48.54ff.,
etc. The pronominal state of ΜΝ- is found only in coordinative instances like (III 22.17) ΝΑΝ ΝΝΗΜΕ or
(ΒΜ 209 ΑΘ) ΕΡΙΤΗΝ ΝΗΜΑΝ, see §1.1.2.4.1.

(4) ΛΑ(Ζ)Ν- (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: (III
157.11ff.) ΠΕΛΛΟ ΖΑΣΘΝ-... ΠΑΛΟ ΖΑΣΘΝΤΗΝ... ΝΑΛΟΙ ΕΤΖΑΣΘΝΤΗΝ. 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
ΖΡΑΙ ΝΗΣΗΣ). Does this imply a prosodically conditioned adnominal placement of an adverbal (or ad-
clausal) modifier — the indefinite nucleus, as it were — attracting the modifier to its vicinity? Compare
ΝΙΜ ΕΝΕΣ (§1.3.6 below).

(D) DOCUMENTATION:

Ν-: exx. passim (esp. in §§1.3. and Ch. 4), and consider (P 130a 16 ro) ΖΕΝΚΕΝΟΥΤΕ ΜΝΒΑΛΧΟΣΙΟΣ / (P 130a
140 vo) ΟΥΑ ΝΘΕ ΝΗΛΙΝΘΟΥΤΕ / (III 221.9) ΠΟΥΑ ΠΟΥΑ ΝΝΕΤΕΜΠΟΥΚΤΟΥΟΥ ΕΒΟΑ... / (IV 73.11) ΑΑΑΥ ΝΜΑ

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 (P 130a 21 ro) ΝΕΥΣΠΗΡΕ ΜΝΗΣ-
ΜΕΡΕΕΡ ΝΤΕΝΤΑΚΕΡ proves that “possession” and “ΝΤΕ-appurtenance” are compatible, hence distinct categories.
1.1.1.1 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-exeme 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) ΠΛΑΒΗ ΜΠΟΥΓΕΙ / (A 1 302) ΠΖΟΥΝ ΝΖΗΤΟΥ / (Teza 684) ΠΜΑ ΕΝΕΣ, adpositional after ΠΖΟΥΤΕ (§4.3) / ΠΒΟΒΑ Ν- / (Ench. 89a, P 130° 109 vo, III 114.25, IV 126.29, Ch. 47.49f., Wess. 9 131a 13f., K 9294, P 130° 122, 130° 22, A 1 289, etc.) / (Ch. 97.35f.) ΜΠΡΟΤΙΟΥΣΩ. No instance of the feminine determinator T- is known to me. The possessive determinators: (III 20-1) ΝΑΙΧΙΝΠΑΙΡΟΣ / ΝΕΚΚΑΤΑΚΑΡΕΣ (IV 122.24 cod., A 2 526 etc.).
§1.1.1.1

1.1.2.0.1 Predication-modifying role. The adverbial modifier. Valency. Postadjuncts vs. premodifiers. The adverbial 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 38. 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 39; 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 premodifying construction, §3.4), we analyze the complex as “expansion → nuclear clause” 38.


35 “Adverbial”: in adjectival or at any rate non-lexical relationship with a conjugation form (here “verb syntagm” [VS]). It goes without saying that further subclassification 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 premodify 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 syntagmatic 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 different, if formally sharp, difference between premodifiers preceding an uncharacterized clause-form (‘καυκοκ’ and a focal (nexus-constituent) modifiers. With the latter, the initial position is a feature of the predicative pattern (‘καυκοκ η’). 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 η- “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. 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 lexicohistoric desideratum. A specimen structured display of combination possibilities follows:

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

\((\alpha_1): \text{ (K 9294) } \text{CQWBE NCWOY}
\text{ (K 913) } \text{YAHNWET EMAY}
\text{ (K 913) } \text{YAHNWET EMAY}

\((\alpha_2)\): \text{ rection, "object" (see §3.0.1) or "case".} 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 \(0\), if that. The rection, being par excellence is that of the mediate direct object marked by \(M^\text{N} / M^\text{MOY}\), discussed in detail below (Ch. 3). Some other bivalent lexemes: \text{CUTTI (N-)}, \text{ZAPEZI (E-)}, \text{YWENIC (N-)}, various reflexive verbs (\text{MTON, WYWOY}).

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

\((\alpha_2, \beta_2): \# VS + modifier_1 + modifier_2 \#; matrix: \((0)-(1)-(2)\).

\((\alpha_2): \text{ (I I 130.6) } \text{ETXI MM04 N60NC} / (I V 54.16) \text{ YETCABOOY ENPAAIO} \text{ (I I 204.5f.) } \text{YAPETCIO MNOIEK NPNIYOY} \text{ "satiate thee (2nd fem.) with..." } / (I V 79.14) \text{ ZMPPEYATEI MNOOY MNOOY} \text{ the identity of MNO} - \\
\text{is here structurally definable (§3.1.2.0.1) / (ibid. 82.28) ...E0BCK MNOOY / (I I 166.22) WYI ETOYNAYI MNOO} \text{ the identity of MNO} - \\

\text{is here structurally definable (§3.1.2.0.1) / (ibid. 82.28) ...E0BCK MNOOY / (I I 166.22) WYI ETOYNAYI MNOO} \text{ the identity of MNO} - \\

\text{is here structurally definable (§3.1.2.0.1) / (ibid. 82.28) ...E0BCK MNOOY / (I I 166.22) WYI ETOYNAYI MNOO} \text{ the identity of MNO} - \\

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 \text{XEPO} and \text{XENO} — see Černý, \text{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.", CHERIX’s "absolut".

44 Consider NAY E-/EBOA, where E- cannot be zeroed. (The rection of E- can be zeroed, by replacement by \text{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.

46 "Let the elder be informed about them". So too (\text{A 2 310) TCAE-TETNAO E000YT.} In (I V 198.20)\text{ ATCAAOI EPO4} "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 TAMO00Y E-)
CHAPTER 1. PATTERNING OF MODIFIERS

§1.1.2.1

(3) IC-analytic decisions are essential in certain cases: (a) Denominal derived "compound verbs" 46: ρ-2αλ μμοχ can be analyzed as bivalent (P-2αλ | μμοχ) or trivalent (P-2αλ μμοχ). (b) Occasionally one hesitates between assigning two successive modifiers to a single or two separate slots: ει εραμ αε- (expanded modifier, see §1.1.2.4) or ει εραμ αε-. 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. conjunctural) and lexical elements of the verb syntagm with their modifiers 46 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 conjunctural environments and semasiological syntagmatics. Other desiderata are the investigation of modifier occurrence, collocations and of modifier

46 With syntagmatic (sequential) and structural (analytic) orders conflicting. As a general rule (with some well-known exceptions, see Pollotsky 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 adnalox noun-circumstantial' complex expanding a verb would involve distinguishing between a bivalent lexeme (κει/εκ ε+ direct object) and its trivalent homonym γειτν/εκ ε+, NAY ΕΟΥN, επος ε+ etc. I have found (Shisha-Halevy 1972:77-82) this homonymy also for ξω, τυπ, ξιδ, ταο and other verbs.

48 A striking case of lexemes both rectally and compositionally expandable is that of τ (and xI): τη | εούν/επος/ου- | μνακ-ηε- | εκ- | ξι- | εούν/επος- | μνακ- | ηε- | εούν/επος- | μνακ- | ηε-

49 See §3.1.2.2.2 for a discussion and an extensive listing of these syntagms.

50 Cf. Weinrich 1977 passim (e.g. 71), Seiler 1968, Klum 1961 (esp. 86 ff.), Steinitz-Schälich 1970, etc.
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) ΕΡΕΣΟΟΥΝ ΤΩΝ Η ΕΡΕΣΙΜΕ ΤΩΝ Η ΕΙΝΑΙΕΙΜΕ ΤΩΝ ΑΝΟΚ. So (less regularly) are anaphoric elements included in the expansions: (IV 128.11f.) ΠΝΟΒΕ ΕΝΤΑΝΜΕΕΥΕ ΕΥΑΑΤΣ ΕΒΟΑ ΜΜΟΝ ΕΤΒΝΗΤΥ, ΕΤΒΝΗΤΥ resuming ΠΝΟΒΕ, ΕΥΑΑΤΣ resuming ΠΝΟΒΕ(ΝΟΒΕ), ΠΝΟΒΕ(ΝΟΒΕ) in the preceding context / (P 1304 88 ro) ΝΗΣΟΟΥΝ ΜΜΟΝ ΑΝ ΞΕ-ΝΤΚ-ΝΙΜ / (ibid. 89 vo) ΜΠΡΤΡΕΠΕΚΣΗΜΑ ΒΕ ΚΝΣΕ ΞΕΚΑΣ ΝΝΕΥΤΑΚΟΚ / (III 130.7f.) ΠΑΙ ΕΤΜΜΑΥ ΑΥΣ ΝΕΙΚΟΟΥΕ ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΝΑΚΡΙΝΕ ΕΝΤΗΝΤΕ ΜΠΝΑΙ ΜΝΝΑΙ ΕΤΜΜΑΥ. (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 51.

(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 52, vested 53 (ΚΩ, ΚΩΤΑΝ, ΚΗΝ, etc. + Ε-) and unvested (Ε-) conditional forms and constructions, the coevactive (ΜΝΕΠΕΣ), postevactive (ΜΝΝΕΚΑΤΡΕΠΣ) and precursive (ΝΤΕΠΕΣ) 54, the last being post-adjunctively in marked placement; various conjunctional constructions (including ΞΕ-). 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 adnexal).

(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

Ε- (Α-)/ΕΠΟ- "to, for, concerning etc.", III 184.13, Ch. 127.24, Mun. 104.
ΕΠΑ- "to (chez)", Ch. 155.46f. (Dictionary 303).
ΕΠΝ- /ΕΠΩ-, ΕΠΟ- "to, on the mouth of...", Ch. 48.53f., A I 241, BM 253 ΝΣ, P 1314 154 ΑΕ: P 1304 127 ΜΒ; Z 246 ΡΙΔ. Almost only with ΤΩΝ, ΟΥΝ (Dict. 289b).
ΕΤΝ- /ΕΤΟΟΤ- "to (hand of...)", III 214.1, A I 113, A 2 26 (Dict. 427b).
ΕΖΕΝ- "προς ", Wiss. 18 143a 25ff. Dict. 685a (also in Besa; cf. (Ε)ΕΖΗ-, spec. obs. 3).
ΕΖΗ- /ΕΖΡΑ- "towards the face of...", rare, usually with ΕΖΟΥΝ A I 465 (Dict. 649).
ΕΞΗ- /ΕΞΩ- "on, upon, over, against ", III 40.8, Ch. 198.34f. (Dict. 757-8).
ΑΞΗ-, ΕΞΗ-/ΑΞΩ-, ΕΞΩ- "without ", III 42.5, IV 113.16, A 2 519 (Dict. 25-6).
ΕΤΒΕ- /ΕΤΒΝΗΤ- "about, because of..., for the sake of...", Miss. 279, III 108.19f.

51 Compare the cohesive zeroing of the non-rectional modifier in a ΚΩ ΕΒΟΑ → ΚΩ cotext pattern (see §3.1.1.1.0.1 for exx.); cf. STEINITZ 1969:15ff.
52 SHISHA-HALEY 1972, first chapter.
53 Ibid., Introduction, Chapter 3.
54 Ibid. §§1.4.1-3.
“with, and-”, III 219.24, Ch. 136.5.
“in relation to, in, with, direct object etc.”, III 108.19f., IV 7.5 (spec. obs. 1).
“to, for”, III 173.25, Ch. 131.23f.
“outside of, beside” (exx. in Dict. 33-4).
“in the presence of…, before”, Wess. 9 119a 19f., III 54.19.
“after, behind, beyond”, Ch. 127.45f., III 219.12.
“with, in the hand of…”, IF 123 (apud Dict. 523b), III 145.1 (Dict. 427-8).
“against, opposite”, III 159.11, Ch. 120.42ff., 197.23f.
“between, among”, Ch. 146.33ff.
“(up) to, until, towards”, IV 33.18, A I 16.
“under, on behalf of, for”, Wess. 9 155b 5, Mun. 100.
“under the observation of”, P 1304 59 ro.
“under the mouth of…, before”, Ch. 157.55ff., Rossi 2/3 54, A 2 166 (Dict. 289-290).
“under foot of…”, A 2 299 (Dict. 303b).
“under (hand of…), with, among”, III 27.16, 150.14, 157 passim, IV 62 passim (Dict. 428b).
“on, in, at” III 213 passim, Ch. 174.3f.
“at, upon (mouth doorway…)”, III 118.3, Rossi 2/3 51, IF 307 (apud Dict. 290a) (Dict. 290a).
“by, through”, III 24.22, 196.20 (Dict. 428-9).
“(up)on”, Wess. 9 141a 28, Ch. 18.26f. (Dict. 758-9).
“of”, P-zote IV 156.19, K 9294, Mun. 177, Ch. 151.20, Mich. 158 14a.
“in, at, with, etc.”, Ch. 110.16, IV 7.1; “to” — sp. obs. 3 2N-.

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

ANTI- §1.3.11.5
AUV §1.3.10
ENEZ §1.3.6
ETI §1.3.11.6
EIC- “for” (temporally), III 89.10, 218-9, IV 172.6, P 1305 79 A: ...EICZOYO ECE NPOMIE AUV 2HNEVAGELION (Dict. 85b).
KAN §1.3.11.6
XHIPIC §1.3.11.5
KATA(PO-)- §1.3.11.5
MEIXI- §1.3.11
NOYES- “without”, IV 91.20 (Dict. 502a).
NAME §1.3.5.1
PALEIN §1.3.11.3
PAPA(PO-)- §1.3.11.5
PROS- §1.3.11.5
TAXY §1.3.11.4
TEBOY §1.3.4
TWIN “where/whence?”, see Ch. 2, esp. §2.2 (e.g. A I 33).
The text appears to be a page from a book discussing grammatical patterns, specifically modifiers. The content includes sections on directional and adverbial modifiers, with references to various dictionaries and page numbers for further study. The page is detailed, listing specific examples and their corresponding page numbers in the dictionary. Each entry is followed by a list of references, indicating the sources used for the information. The page includes a table with entries for different modifiers and their usage examples. The text is dense and technical, focusing on the linguistic analysis of Greek constructions.
Chapter 1. Patterning of Modifiers

§1.1.2.1

(OYT) Ch. 90.5f.

(A 2 304 (COOYS), P 1304 103 PKB, Mun. 177 (“hit”) (sp. obs. 3).

(YA) Ch. 23.25.

(N2OYN) TMO ("hit").

(2N/-/N2HT) III 142.25f.

(N) IV 98.6f.

(Ca2OYN) A 1 381.

(WA2OYN) A 2 380, IV 41.24.

(Za2OYN) A 2 26.

(MMO) IV 155.3.

(E2PAI) E/-/EPO- IV 24.13f., Wess. 9 154a 14f.

(" up ", ETOO = IV 20.22.

(" down ") EXN-/EXW = IV 67.18, 200.6.

(“ up + down’’?) 2A- Z 247 PKZ, P 1304 128 TMO (CMME).

(2AZTN) III 27.15f.

(2I) IV 98.2.

(2N-) Ryl. 67 TV45, P 1304 93 RMA.

(TWN) A 2 513.

(OYT) IV 163 (apud Dict. 495a).

(P) P 1304 126 ΛΘ.

(N2P) III 156 passim, IV 204.16, III 193.18.

(CA2PE) “above”, Ench. 57b (Dict. 700).

(ZI2PE) “up”, A 1 150 (Dict. 700a).

(WA2PAI) E IV 142.8.

(E0H) MMO- IV 95.16.

(NCA0H) IV 113.1.

(ZA0H) IV 48.10.

(ZI0H) IV 40.13.

(ZI2H) MMO- IV 95.20.

(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-ΠΙΝΕΕΕΕΕ N- or P-ΠΙΝΕΕΕΕΕΕ N- (adnominal N-; P-ΠΙΝΕΕΕΕΕΕΕ corroborates the second alternative.)

(2) E2PAI in a well-known syncretism; a phonological merger has caused two distinct Egyptian "prepositional adverbs" 44 ("up", r-hry and "down", r-hry) to merge in Sahidic Coptic into a single

44 Edel 1959:18.
entity "'up or down", "inclinably, slopingly". This at least is the communis opinio 54. It remains to be seen whether the "up/down" distinctive feature — the functional burden — is situated in the verbal nucleus (or perhaps in its context), or whether this opposition is neutralized, for any given combination of 'lexeme + εςπαί + preposition', in favour of one or the other sense: KΩ Εςπαί meaning "lay down", ΕΙ Εςπαί ε- "descend" only, ΑΛΕ Εςπαί (III 99.1, [ΣΑΣΟ] IV 156.3) "ascend, go up", and so on: consider (III 107.1, 111.2, Miss. 283) ΕΙ Εςπαί ε- "fall down into", (A 2 192) ΕΙ Εςπαί 2Ν- "sprout up from", (A 1 97) -ΣΑΝ Εςπαί ενεναυψι ΜΠΟΝΗΡΟΝ "deliver (down) to", (IV 24.16) ΕΜ Εςπαί ΕΧ- "trample, tread down", (ibid. 13fl.) -ΝΟΚΡΟΥ Εςπαί ΕΠΙΚΨΤΕ "down to", (Ch. 60) (of the sun) ΕΙ/ΝΗΕ Εςπαί "rise", ΒΛΙΚ/ΜΑ Εςπαί "set", and so on. It may well be that one of the two senses — Εςπαί "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) ΠΕΧΟΤΕ Εςπαί ΖΑΡΙΖΑΡΟΣ, (IV 64.6) ΜΟΚΕ Εςπαί ΕΧ-, (ibid. 55.20f.) ΟΥΣΤΕ Εςπαί ε- etc., where the direction is immaterial.

(3) (Εζούν) 2Ν- "into", pron. Εζούν εςπαί (Dictionary 684b, Polotsky 1939:113 = CP 377, Layton 1981:244f.): (A 1 202) ΝΠΕΕ Εζούν ΕΝΠΕΡΩ (P 1311 139 TMS) + ΑΚΕ Εζούν ΕΝΠΕΡΩ/Εζούν εςπαί; also ΗΙ-ΙΑΤΚ Εςπαί 2Ν- (Z 247 P1B), ΒΛΚ ΕΒΟΛΑ/2Ν- (P 1305 24 Φ1Ε; of viper's venom: "into body"), ΨΑΥΣΙΒΕ ΜΠΙΚΣΙΟΝΕ ΕΝΠΟΝΟΝΕ ΑΫΜ ΠΤΒΒΟ ΕΝΠΟΝΟΝΕ (P 1304 104 ΡΚΓ). ΒΛΚ Εζούν Ν2ΗΤ= (P 1305 16 ΒΟ) seems to indicate a complete merging of this compound preposition with 2Ν-/Ν2ΗΤ= "in" (Akhm. 2ΕΝ- vs. 2ΕΝ-). 2ΕΝ- (e.g. in Besa ed. Kuhn 79 ΝΕΤΝΗΕ ΕΝΠΟΠΕΥΣΤ, also common in "Middle Egyptian" Coptic) is Ε + the same.

1.1.2.2 PREMODIFIERS. ADCLUSAL (ADPATTERN) MODIFIERS

(A) GENERAL OBSERVATIONS: (1) Above (§1.1.2.0.1) the point was made that the modifier preceding the predicative pattern 57 or opening the clause is not adjunctual, but presets or predetermines the circumstances 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. Postadjective modification has a broader potential of paradigmatic/syntagmatic extent (embodifying as it does the valency matrix, rection and complementation) than premodification. Particularly significant is the absence in the case of pre- or adclusal modification of the opposition between rection and complementation, so crucial in postadjective modification. Paradigmatically speaking, the premodifier (insofar as it is opposed to a corresponding postadjective 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 postadjective 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 58. 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-αε-clause integration type. It is interesting to note that the variant -OC of -UC Greek-origin modifiers is much more prevalent in postadjective position, which is apparently sufficiently characterizing, than in premodifier status. Note too the Nitrian Bohairic distinction of # KΑΑΒΑ- vs. -ΝΚΑ-
57 For Ν- with Greek-origin modifiers, see Crum 1926, 1 251f. (n. 8), Kahle 1954:104.
than postadjuncts, since they usually constitute independent cola and may be disjoined by enclitics from the body of the clause.

(3) Criteria for identifying adclausal elements proposed for a modern language, 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.), coevative (ἐντερετικόν, e.g. III 58.21f., IV 128.4ff.), posteventive (ἐντερετικόν, e.g. III 133.24 ff.), precursory (ντερετικόν, in unmarked placement; e.g. III 24.7f., IV 206.1ff.)

§1.1.2.2

conditional forms and syntagms ((ζοτάν/κάν, ευθαν-, ευθημ, ευθε-, ενε-). 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—

NTEIIE §1.3.1.2, NOE N— III 112.16, NKOY §1.3.1.3, NTOORP III 55.15, NOYOEV NIM IV 99.16, NPOOY Teza 683.

ΠΑ—

ΠΑΣΠΑI Ε— A I 171.

Π1—

III 73.10ff., ΝΟΥΥΕ (§1.3.5.2). Wess. 9 141a 25ff., ΕΤΕΒΕ-Ε— A 2 334.

ΑΧ—

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

ΙΘ—

III 113.12.

*ΕΠ2ΑI §1.3.7, ΕΠΑΙ Η— Young passim, ΕΠΑΙ Ε— III 88.8, ΕΠΙΝΗΘ Η Η §1.3.7.3.

ΧΑΙ—

ΧΙΝΗΣΟΥΕΤΕ P 1304 139 ro, ΧΙΝΗΣΕ §1.3.6.

ΠΑΙ 2Π—

III 73.9f., IV 99.16.

ΕΒΛΔ Π—

P 1304 129 ME, IV 36.21.

ΕΙ—

Ch. 173.56ff.

ΜΝΠΑ—

P 1304 111 Μη—Δ.

Ν ΑΣΠΠ—

P 1303 37 ro Ν ΑΣΡΧ ΦΥΕ...

ΝΑΙΜ—

§1.3.5.1

ΤΕΝΟΥ §1.3.4

*ΑΥΘ §1.3.10

0-noun

§1.3.2; esp. CON in ΖΑ2 ΝΟN, CON — CON —, etc.

Greek-origin premodifiers (§§1.3.11 passim): ΑΝΤΙ— (esp. in ΑΝΤΙΤΕΡΕΤΗΣ, ΑΤ—, a favourite Shenoutean figure, e.g. A 2 7-8, ΧΙΨΙΣ—, ΚΑΤΑ—, ΖΩΚ—, ΜΑΛΙΣΤΑ, ΜΑΛΛΟΝ, ΟΥ ΜΟΝΟΝ, ΠΑΝΙΝ ΟΝ, ΕΚΜΕΡΟΥΣ, ΚΑΝ, ΜΟΓΙΚ, ΕΙ, ΠΑΝΗ, ΕΧΕΩΝ, *ΤΑΧΑ.

— 31 —

50 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.


51 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) 2N: '2N-OY + 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 autopodal Second Tense) see §2.1. Some exx. for the Shenoutean tautological infinitive: (P 1309 42 Rh) МН 2NOYPAQH NE-NAPAQH AN / (P 1309 110 ΦΝ) 2NOYXH PAPNXH PNNENPHY / (A 2 49) ...ΣΕΚΚ ΓΗΑΝ 2ΝΑΡΖΕ ΝΙΜ ΝΝΑΖΑΡΖΕ ΕΠΕΝΖΗΤ / (ibid. 380) 2ΝΟΥΕΙ ΚΗΗΥ. 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, 2ΡΑΙ 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 predications is valid in nominal-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* (adjunctal, adlexemic?): ΖΕΝΑΤΝΟΥΤΕ ΦΑΝΕΠΟΝ ΝΕ (A 2 485);
(b) *pattern-final* (adclausal?): ΟΥ ΠΕ ΤΡΗΝΗ ΝΖΕΝΠΜΗΕ ΝΝΑΖΡΜΝΟΥΤΕ (III 75.10);
(c) *prepattern* (adclausal?) — premodifier: ΝΑΜΕ ΝΕΧΗΠ ΠΕ ΤΕΚΚΑΝΚΙΑ (A 2 332).

These possibilities, observable for example in the bimembral ≠ *predicate-[ΝΕ] ≠ pattern* ⁴⁴, must yet be empirically evaluated by reference to syntactic and prosodic motivating factors (for instance, extensive adlexemic modification is usually pattern-final; contrast (Wess. 9 117a 10 ff.) ΟΥ ΕΠΟΝ ΠΕ or (Ench. 87a) ΖΕΝΕΒΟΑ ΝΖΗΝ ΑΝ ΝΕ with (Leyd. 347) ΖΕΝΕΒΟΑ ΝΕ ΖΜΝΗΧΜΑ ΕΤΟΥΑΜ. 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, augentia) occur only as colon-second, i.e. in post-predicate placement. In one pattern, post-predicate and pattern-final placements coalesce: (IV 102.16) ΝΕΝΟΝ-ΖΕΝΠΜΗΕ ΕΒΟΑ 2ΝΤΜΝΤΖΜΖΑΛ ΝΟΥΑΗ / (Leyd. 348) ΑΝΟΝ-ΟΥΚΧΜΑ ΝΟΥΩΤ ΖΜΝΕΧ. More precisely, we note six different cases:

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

---

⁴² 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).

⁴³ The modifier following the pronominal subject or the appositive lexical (or demonstrative) one. I do not include here cases of the modification of a verb syntagm in position (a): (IV 21.16f.) ΟΥΨΗΝ ΕΨΗΝ ΕΒΟΑ ΠΕ.

(2) # pronominal subject → nom. predicate #* 65: (b), (c)

(3) # subject + τον + nom. predicate #* 66 (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.) ΖΕΝΗΠΕΙΚΤΙΑΝΟΣ ΖΝΟΥ ΝΕ: these are left out of the present discussion (see §2.7.3.3).

(5) Basically different is the nominal-focus Cleft Sentence, where a premodifier may precede the verbal glose (theme) constituent: (III 55.15ff.) ΝΤΟΟΥ ΝΠΟΥΝ ΝΕΝΤΑΥΜΕΣΤΙΝ.

(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) ΝΕΚΜΕΑΟΚ ΝΕ ΝΕΙΜΕΑΟΚ ΕΕΚΜΕΡΟΥΣ / (Ch. 59.31ff.) ΝΠΟΥ ΝΠΟΥ ΝΠΟΥ ΜΠΑΚΑΣ, cf. (Miss. 281) ΝΟΕ ΜΠΕΝΤΚΟΤΚ ΕΝΠΑΤ ΕΝΜΠΕΡΙΟ ΓΕΚΛΑΣ-ΠΑΤ ΓΕΚΛΑΣ ΜΙΟΟΚ ΓΕ-ΕΝΝΑΗΑ ΤΕ ΝΕ ΜΠΕΝΤΚΟΤΚ...

(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- 67

(A 1 102) ΟΥΣΙΠΕ ΝΑΙ ΝΕ.

*ΜΜΟ- (Ch. 117.19ff.) ΤΕΙΣΕ ΜΜΟΟΥ ΤΕ; cf. the difficult common formula in the Bruce Codex 'ΠΕΙΡΑΝ ΜΜΟΟΥ ΝΕ'.

*Ν- (A 2 21-2) ΝΤΟΟΥ ΝΟΑΗ ΝΕ ΑΤΥΠ ΝΟΟΟΥ ΝΕ ΑΤΥΠ ΝΤΟΟΥ ΤΟΝ ΝΜΗΝΕ ΝΕ; compare with Ch. 63-4, which finishes with ΝΤΟΟΥ ΝΕ ΝΟΟΧΙΑ ΝΙΜ, i.e. pos. (b).

*ΕΡΩ- (Wess. 9 117a 10ff., 147d 28ff.) ΟΥ ΕΡΠΟ- ΝΕ / (A 2 464) ΤΑΝΑΓΚΗ ΕΡΩ ΤΕ (III 203.8) ΖΕΝΒΟΤΕ ΝΝΑΡΠΕ ΝΕ / (P 1304 141 νο) ΟΥΠΟΝΗΡΟΝ ΝΝΑΡΠΑΣ ΝΕ (sim. ΖΕΝΠΟΝΗΡΟΝ Α 2 512).

ΝΖΟΡΙΟ (§1.3.1.3) (III 19.2) ΟΥΓΑΡΟΝ ΝΖΟΡΙΟ ΝΕ.

ΝΑΜΕ, ΑΛΗΘΙΧ (§§1.3.5.1, 1.3.11.1.2) (RE 11 16a 17) ΓΕΝΕΒΙΗΝ ΝΝΑΜΕ ΝΕ / (Wess. 9 144c 4f.) ΝΤΟΟΥ ΝΑΜΕ ΝΕ / (A 2 402) ΟΥΖΟΤΕ ΓΑΡ ΑΛΗΘΙΧ ΝΕ / (Ryl. 67 ΤΨ) ΟΥΚΑΚΟ-ΔΑΙΜΙΝΙ ΑΛΗΘΙΧ ΝΕ ΠΡΨΜΕ.

ΦΑΝΕΡΟΝ (A 2 485) ΓΕΝΑΤΝΟΥΤΕ ΦΑΝΕΡΟΝ ΝΕ.

ΚΑΤΑ- (Ryl. 67 ΤΨ) ΟΥΡΨΜΕ ΜΕΝ ΚΑΤΑΒΙΚΨΜ ΜΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΝΕ ΠΡΨΜΕ.

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

Position (b):

Ν- 68 (Ch. 64.1ff.) ΝΤΟΟΥ ΝΕ ΝΟΟΧΙΛΕ ΝΙΜ.

* Ν- "for" (IV 92.22ff.) ΖΕΝΠΟΝΗΡΟΝ ΝΕ ΝΕΝΤΑΝΑΜΕΛΕΙ.

Ω- (III 222.8) ΓΕΝΝΙΜΑΕ ΝΕ ΓΕΜΝΟΥΤΕ / (P 1305 58 1d) ΓΕΝΑΤΝΟΒΕ ΝΕ ΝΕ ΑΤΥ ΖΕΝΗΨΙΑΣΟΣ ΓΑΡ ΝΕ ΝΕΝΕΨΒΗΝΕ ΤΡΗΟΥ.

* ΖΙΝ- (III 190.18) ΟΥΚΟΘΝΕ ΝΕ ΖΙΝΤΑΝΕ ΜΠΡΨΜΕ ΝΑΙΚΑΙΟΕ.

---

68 Here belongs ΝΟΕ in (III 118.5f.) ΟΥΔΑΙΑΙΟΣ ΝΕ ΝΟΕ ΝΕΝΤΑΥΝΚΟΤΚ.
* ΝΝΑΣΡΝ-

ΥΔΑ-

ΚΑΤΑ-

*ΕΤΡΕ-

*ΕΠΙΤΡΗ-

*ΕΡΡΑΙ ΕΧΧ-, ΕΒΟΛ ΖΗ-

*ΧΕ-

ΤΕΝΟΥ

NAME

ΦΑΝΕΡΙΟΝ

Position (c):

*ΑΥΗ

*ΟΝΤΙΣCU

*ΠΑΝΤΙΣCU

*ΖΟΜΙΣC

*ΖΟΜΟΙΣC

*ΜΑΛΛΟΝ, ΜΑΛΙΣΤΑ

*ΕΤΙ

ΕΤΒΕΝΑΙ

ΚΑΤΑ-

*ΤΕΝΟΥ ∆Ε-

NAME, ΛΑΝΘΩC

(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 (ΝΞ) + nom. predicate ≠ is prosodically different from the bimembral ≠ predicate + [ΝΞ] + (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 syntagmatically more extensive constituency: (Α 2 76) ΠΥΧΗ ΝΤΕΥΧΗΝ ΝΞΕΡΤΗΜΕ ΕΥΑΡΧΗ ΜΝΗΤΟΥ-ΑΡΧΗ ΜΗΟΤΥ ΣΟΟΣ ΣΕ- / (ibid. 364) ΑΡΑ ΠΟΥΝΟΥ ΝΟΥΝΗΡΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΗΝΤΜΠΡΜΜΑΑΕ ΕΝΤΑΠΕΧΙΨΤ ΤΑΑΣ ΝΑΗ ΠΕ ΟΥΖΟΥ / (IV 51.6f.) ΠΝΑΥ ΝΤΕΥΜΝ ΝΤΕΥΧΗΝ ΕΡ-ΣΗΒ ΕΡΟΨ ΠΕ ΠΑΚΟΥ. 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) ἡμεῖς ὑμῖν ἄν εἰμι τούτοις χρόνον θανάτου μεν ην εἰσερχόμενος προς ἔτοιμα μεν τοις νομίμοις ἃ προσφέρει οὐκ εἰναὶ νόμος. 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 ημετέρω (also of ημετέρω, and other prep. phrases?) may also be regulated by prosodic weight: presuxfixially, 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) τεσσάρας (§1.3.4) may represent the intercolary, conditioned placement of this modifier/particle (τοῖς κατὰ τοὺς διοικητὰς "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 syntagms (ε)ἰκόν, (ε)χώρ, (ε)παραστατικά, 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:

ημετέρω "either, even (more)"

θανάτου "only"

αὐθεντικός "very"

ημετέρω "especially"

σοφία "simply"

See also the following cases, in my opinion of modification rather than rection: ἡμετέρω (+ circumstantial)

ημετέρω (+ conditional/circumstantial) (passim, e.g. III 19.28, 22.9, 40.16, 19ff.), ετοι (+ circumstantial) (III 210.23, IV 191.12). ημετέρωs (§1.3.1.1.1.4) and οἱ ὁμοιοί (§1.3.11.2.1) are likely candidates for the modifier-premodifying 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 αὐθεντικός (§1.3.10) and η and their relation to -ος- and other elements like οὐδενός and ετοι. Αὐθεντικός (ον) and Η (ντοι) are used to coordinate/disjoin modifiers: (III 181.4) ημετέρωs ημετέρωs ἄνωθεν οὐδενός / (IV 210.5 199 O) έμοι Αὑθεντικός έμοι (Ch. 32.19ff.) έμοι ημετέρωs έμοι έμοι στουτάτου ἀνθρώπου / (III 210.23, IV 191.12). έμοιs (§1.3.11.1.4) and οἱ ὁμοιοί (§1.3.11.2.1) are likely candidates for the modifier-premodifying role.

---

70 Although in a general sense — with reference to the semantics of the interrelationship between έμοι στουτάτου and έμοι, ετοι — 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. οὖντος, επί) are rare in Shenoute and are analytically "renewed", replaced by expanded modifiers (επί οὖντος, έμοι τούτων). In certain references, too, prepositions are replaced by "modifier—preposition" syntagms: έμοι "from" (see n. 96) by έμοι τούτων, ήν "from" by έμοι νά ἀπελευθεροῦσαι, έμοι τούτων. 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, Tesnère 1965:127ff., Jacobson 1964:36, Pinkster 1972:108ff.
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 nexeal relationship with a pronoun/noun-syntagma constituent. These patterns do not all form a paradigm: 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 Syntagma/Prefixed Pers. Pronoun → Modifier

(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): [OY-] or θ-determinator/pronoun (+ noun lexeme)/indefinite pronoun/indeterminable; predicate (discontinuous): (affirm.) OYN — modifier, (neg.) MN — modifier. Basic and converted forms of the pattern are considered.

(B) Constituency:

N-

MNOY (A 1 379), NTNE (A 1 245), N2PAI 2N- (III 201.18), N2PAI N2HT= (A 1 119),
N2OYN (III 24.19f.), MNBOA (Ench. 88b), MNEMTTO EBOA (III 27.10), MNEMMA (Ch 162.44), MNEMMOT etc. (IV 120.15f.), NTMNE (Ch. 197.39f.), MNEM(K)WT (Ch. 30.12f.),
N2E (A 1 246) etc. (open-ended list).

---

72 Stern:559. Compare (Ch. 63.6) NOYN NMMAC "ours and his".
73 Cf. Callender 1973a and 1970, Ch. VI. Certain members of his "paradigm" are not considered in the present discussion, namely, the verbal/predicated O (n-), YUNNE (n-), YOON (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 1960a:§119ff., 35; Nagel 1980:77ff. I treat both subpatterns conjointly and do not attribute primacy to either. In superscriptions like (III26.25, IV 22.1) ZENOYI YNAKNE NAAPN- we do not have a Bipartite construction at all (the modifier belongs to the 'nouns + modifier' predicate group, while the heralded text itself — a n2-substitute — is the subject). On the other hand, n2 EIC + noun syntagma + modifier n2 is a deictic presentative alternate (affirmative only) of both Bipartite subpatterns: (IV 91.11) EIC-TEKKANCA GAR MNZOEIC ZMPK2 THPM / (ibid. 161.2f.) EIC-CAQI ZMMA NIM ZMPK2 THPM (see Nagel 1980:80ff.).
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(III 211.4).

(MMO-) 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: (e)KIBE (Ch. 148.37ff.), TΝΣ (IV 96.24, P 130ε 39 PA), AΠΕ (A 1 251), CA "beauty" (K 9320), 6ΙΧ, ΟΥΕΡΗΣ (Ch. 87.9ff. 27ff.), ΝΑΤ (III 143.28), ΒΑΛ (P 131ε 80 ro) and of course GΟΜ (IV 51.14ff.), and possibly many more. This is a field which must be further investigated also in other contexts, notably that of the combinatorics of 'determiner + noun + possessive expansion (Ν-/ΝΤΕ-)'. 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-/ΝΑ- features in a historically interesting, if synchronically problematic pattern 77. ΟΥΟΕΙ (Ν-) occurs in most conversions (ΕΤΕΟΥΟΕΙ Ν- Rossi 2/3 37, P 130ε 139 vo; ΝΕΟΥΟEI Ν- IV 94.24, Wess. 9 142d 9; ΕΟΥΟΕΙ N- [circ.] IV 4.12f.), yet cannot properly speaking be taken as an (indeterminable)

---

76 Cf. HAVERS 1931:929; STEINHAL—MISTELI 1893:292, 299. In Coptic, a "be-language" as regards predication of possession, the opposition ΟΥΝ (ΝΤΕ- : ΜΜΟ-) is one of unmarked vs. inalienable possession. On inalienable possession see also ROSEN, Lingua 8:264-293 (1959).

nouns, but rather as part of a composite predicate. ΝΕΟΥ Ν- is neither convertible nor negativable (moreover, the Ν- determination is here not really pertinent).

(3) ΕΠΟ-: predicative only in the sense "to one's debit, one's duty/responsibility" (cf. Dictionary 51), prenominally ΕΠΟΥ Ν-, not Ε-.

(4) ΕΧΝ-: in three instances where the absence of ΟΥ- with an indefinite noun may be due to special modulation of the utterance (idiomatic exclamation, rhetorical question)²⁸: (A 2 304) ΜΗ ΟΥΓΜΕΝΤ ΑΝ ΕΒΟΛ ΞΗΜΠΟΥΤΕ ΕΖΡΑΙ ΕΧΝΟΥΝ ΝΙΜ... / (ibid. 346) ΜΟΕΙΣΕ ΕΧΝΜΟΕΙΣΕ, but cf. (Cat. 43.29) ΖΕΝ[ΜΟΕΙΣΕ ΕΧΝΜΟΕΙΣΕ] ΝΕ / (A 1 188) ΟΥΑΤΙΝΗ ΕΧΝΟΥΑΤΙΝΗ, ΟΥΘΛΙΨΙΚ ΕΧΝΟΥΘΛΙΨΙΚ ...

1.2.1.2 # MODIFIER — ΝΕ #

(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 ²⁹. 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 determiners (§1.1.1.1) ³⁰. In fact, the Nominal Sentence predicates a determinator pronoun followed by its lexeme ³¹. In our pattern, however, the modifier is invariably non-determined.

(2) The modifier predicate precedes the pronominal subject ΝΕ. 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" predicating a modifier). See §0.2.3.

(4) It may not being too far to suggest that in the ever accumulating instances of 'present/perfect circumstantial + ΝΕ' (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 macrosyntactic level — signalling a "backgrounding" of the evolving action. 'ΝΕΟΥΜΟΘ ΝΕ' might accordingly be taken to contain (beside the actor and verb lexeme) two distinct relational signals: ΝΕ- for the narrative framework characterization, -ΝΕ for the macrosyntactic back-grounding (cf. CALLENDER's "situational" subject, 1970:205f.; also ΝΕ as apodosis marker, with fut. [III 158.7f., P 1308 135 ΤΑΓ]; POLOTSKY 1939:110 = CP 374).

(B) CONSTITUENCY:

Ν- ΝΕ  IV 84.14, see spec. obs.

ΝΕ  III 75.16f., see spec. obs.; ΝΕ ΜΕΝΤΑΧΕΙΠΕ ΝΕ ΘΕ ΜΕΝΤΕΜΠΗΠΕΙΠΕ (IV 159.11f.).

²⁹ See among STERN's exx. on pp. 300 (Marc. 13:33), 302 (I Cor. 9:18), 305 (Ps. 8:1); TILL §248: CALLENDER 1970:37ff.114f. SETHE 1916:§109 treats our construction together with # (det. + adv.) ΝΕ #, apparently considering it a case of "article omitted".
³⁰ 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).
³¹ The not infrequent instances of # bare noun (or zero-determined noun?) -ΝΕ # 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 constituency, possibly also special environmental properties. Some Shenoutean exx.: (Ch. 183.23) ..ΕΡΑΒΕ ΝΕ ΝΑΥ / (A 2 34, 114) ...ΕΜΟΙΣΕ ΝΕ ΝΑΥ... / (A 1 210) ΥΨΙΝΕ ΝΕ ΖΟΟΥ / (A 2 395) Η ΟΡΘ ΑΝ ΝΕ ΖΟΟΣ / (Or. 159.34ff.) ...ΣΕΝΕ ΝΕ ΘΕ... ΕΒΟΤΕ ΝΕ ΘΕ...
PARA-

PARAKEKOYI πε + conjunctive (A 2 390, §7.3.1), PARANECHOYSH GUR πε ε- (RE 10 161a 16ff.), PARATREPH- πε (A 2 75).

KATA-

KATAPHEINEI πε πΕΙΝΕ νΝΕΞΒΥΟΗ (Wess. 9 110a 14ff., IV 65.12ff., neg.)

ΥΛΕΙΜΑ ΤΕ TETNHN-2HT NOYSH NNMAAN (P 1301 135 ΤΑΓ-Δ), Ch. 59-60, 60.7ff. (adaptation of Mark 13:27).

ΧΙΝ-

Ch. 59.55ff., 60.4ff. (adapt. of Mark 13:27).

ΕΠΙΝΑΧΗ

ΕΠΙΝΑΧΗ ΝΑΥ ΤΕ ΤΕΥΞΥΝΟΜΟΗ (IV 46.18, see §1.3.7.3.1; also, in a quotation, III 45.17f.).

ΣΑΘΗ

ΕΝΒΑΘ ΠΕ ΕΜΠΑΤΕΝΟΥΟΕΙΝ ΑΥΘ ΝΙΨΗ ΕΙ ΕΠΙΚΟΣΜΟΣ (A 2 247).

ΣΙΤΟΥΘ-

ΠΕΤΣΩΜΠΙΡΕ Ν ΠΟΥΨΗΕ ΕΒΟΑ ΝΠΟΥΟΕΙΝ... ΣΙΤΟΥΘ ΜΝΣΟΒΕ ΑΕ ΣΖΙΒΟΑ ΠΕ (III 52.18ff.).

ΕΒΟΑ 2N

ΠΕΧΙΝΟ ΑΕ ΕΒΟΑ [ΠΕ] ΣΜΠΙΣΤ... (Wess. 9 147b 10ff.).

ΤΩΝ ΕΒΟΑ ΤΩΝ ΠΕ ΝΙΞΒΥΟΗ ΕΤΣΟΟΜΕ (A 2 333, A 1 8, Ench. 93a; cf. §2.6.3.2).

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

(a) NTEIΣΘ(ON) ΠΕ + noun syntagm (III 103.4, IV 80.21, III 74.17f. codd., Ch. 75.44ff., 194.9ff., 24ff., 65.6ff., 156.56ff., A 2 533, A 2 337, Wess. 9 86a 28ff. etc.).

(b) NTEIΣΘ ΤΕ Ν + noun syntagm (sgl./plur.) (IV 163.25, 164.2, 111.4, Ch. 193.25ff., Wess. 9 86b 17ff.).

(b') NTEIΣΘ ΤΕ Ν + noun syntagm (plur.) (IV 106.2).

(b'') NTEIΣΘ ΤΕ + clause: NTEIΣΘ ΤΕ ΝΑΥ ΝΣΕ ΠΕΤΣΟΥΝΤΑΗ ΜΜΑΥ ΜΝΠΟΟΥΝ... ΕΜΠΛΑΝΑΝ ΑΝ ΕΠΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ

ΑΥΘ ΝΠΟΥΟΝΜ... NTEIΣΘ ΤΕ ΝΙΜ ΠΕΤΣΝΑΟΥΘ... (P 1301 47-8 ΣΚΓ-Δ).

(c) NTEIΣΘ ΓΩΗ- Ν + noun syntagm (III 48.24f.).

This pattern (like other θε-constructions: ΝΘΕ Ν-, ΤΑΙ ΤΕ ΘΕ Ν-, ΤΑΙ ΤΕ Σ(4)ΘΕ...) is expandable by a subnexial constituent: noun + adnexal circumstantial (Shisha-Halevy 1972:82ff and see footnote 99 below): (III 48.24f.) NTEIΣΘ ΠΟΥΟΥ ΝΝΣΕΑΛΗΝ ΝΝΣΑΙΡΕΤΙΚΟΣ ΝΙΜ ΕΜΠΕΕΕ ΝΝΑΣΡΑΗ ΞΕ- / (A I 267) ΝΤΕΙΣΘ ΠΕ ΝΕΥ-

ΣΜΑΛΛΕ ΕΑΙΣΑΙΟΕ ΕΑΥΤΟΥΝΕΚ-ΝΕΤΜΟΟΥΤ, also IV 163-4, Ch. 193.25-39. Here the subnexial unit forms part of the overall nexus in the pattern. Pattern (2) may be regarded as anacoluthic. ΟΝ is clearly an essential (if not indispensable) component of this pattern in its different forms.

(2) In (III 47.19) ΝΕΥΜΠΕΙΚ ΝΕ ΝΘΕ ΕΤΣΗΣ ΞΕ- we have properly speaking a different pattern, the copular ≠ subject - copula - predicate ≠ Nominal Sentence predicating the modifier ΝΘΕ.

1.2.1.3 Miscellaneous patterns

1.2.1.3.1 The stative of ΕΠΕ, 0, supplies a convenient outil grammatical for predicating the important group of Ν-modifiers in a durative framework, which relates paradigmatically to the Nominal Sentence as an incidental vs. inherent predication. ΠΡΙΜΕ ΕΤΟ ΝΑΥ ΝΑΠΕ (A I 251). Whereas the “copular” (i.e. incomplete-predication) -0 is empty of verbal-lexical content, other statives, forming a paradigm with this -0 (Ν-) and expandable by Ν- as well as by other modifiers, supply various Aktionsart characterizations of the basic nexus: -ΨΟΟΝ, -ΟΥΗ, -ΚΗ, ΖΜΟΟΟ... (consider III 98.19, 134.12f., IV 44.25, 50.23, Ch. 57.45ff., 59.46ff., 50.43ff., Ench. 93a, etc.) 84. Ν-modifiers can occur, of course, as predicative (“adnexal”) complements of many other verbs (of which only ΕΠΕ — and ΨΩΝΕ — are in regular trans-


formative relationship with their statives): ΑΥΣΤΟΥ ΝΑΙΧΜΑΛΩΤΟΣ (A 2 252), ΧΝΑΤΩΥΝ ΝΩΜΑ 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-ΠΕΟ (IV 12.21, perf., A 1 162, conj., Wess. 18 127a 30, conj., ΑΡΟ-); Ρ-ΠΗΚ (Wess. 9 171b 25f., perf.); Ρ-ΠΑΡΑ- (IV 3.20, P 130a 105 ΡΚΕ: ΑΑΑΥ ΕΑΗΡ-ΠΑΡΑΤΕΛΕΥΣΙΣ); Ρ-ΖΙΤΡΕ (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) ΕΝΕΕΤΒΗΝΗΤΟΥ (i.e. ΝΕΠΑΝΗΝ) ΠΑΡΑΚΕΥΜΗΝ ΠΕ ΝΤΕ-ΠΕΤΡ-ΠΑΡΕ ΕΡΩ ΣΑΛΑΤΕ ΝΙΖΝΕΗΝ / (A 2 398) ΣΑΜΟΙ ΟΝ ΕΝΕΕΤΒΕΟΥΜΝΤΑΣΟΤΟΥΝ Ν ΩΤΜΝΤΗΝΕ ΥΝΗ (i.e. it was done). Negatively (“were it not for...”), with ΝΟΒΑΝΗΛΑ: (A 2 514) (“people say secretly about me) ΧΕ-ΝΩΒΑΝΗΛ ΕΤΒΗΝΗΤ ΑΥΣ ΧΕΝΕΝ ΜΠΝΕΥΟΙΕ ΝΟΒΑΝΗΛ ΑΝ ΠΕ / (P 131# 56 ΡΩ) ΚΑΙ ΓΑΡ ΛΑΘΩΥChris ΝΟΒΑΝΗΛ ΕΤΒΗΝΕΟΠΟΣ ΜΜΗΧΑΝΑ ΕΤΟ ΝΧΟΒΕ ΕΡΩ ΝΠΕΝΔΑΙΜΗΝ... ΝΑΤΑΚΟ ΝΠΙΝΟΛΙΣ ΤΗΡΩς, but also with ΕΝΕΕΤΒΕ... ΑΝ: (A 1 158) ΕΝΕΕΤΒΕΕΙΠΙΩΒ ΑΝ ΝΕΟΥΝΙΤΟΜΟΝ ΕΤΕΖΕΝΚΟΟΥΝΤΕ ΤΑΜΙΟΥΟΣ, compare (IV 156.26) ΕΝΕΕΤΒΕΤΑΓΑΠΗΝ ΑΝ ΝΙΤ ΝΕΪΧ ΝΝΑΙ...

ΖΝ- also in an unfulfillable protasis: (IV 94.23) ΕΝΕΕΤΝΟΥΜΝΤΣΑΖ ΝΠΑΔΕ, ΝΕΥΝΑΙΤΟΜΟΝ ΑΜ ΑΝ ΝΕΠΑΝ ΝΠΕΤΡΟΕΙΟι...

ΝΝΑ2ΡΠΝ-: (III 107.6) ΑΛΗΘΗΝ ΝΝΑ2ΡΠΝ ΖΩΗ ΕΥΚΕ-ΝΟΥΝΗ ΝΝΑΟΥΝΑ / (Ch. 135.50ff.) ΝΝΑ2ΡΠΝ ΜΕΝ ΖΩΗ ΕΥΚΕ-ΧΜΟΚΣ, ΑΛΗΘΗΝ ΝΝΑ2ΡΠΝΝΟΗΝ ΑΝ / (IV 159.11f.) ΝΝΑ2ΡΠΝΝΟΗΝ ΓΑΡ ΖΩΗ ΕΥΚΕ-ΝΟΗ ΜΠΝ-ΤΑΕΙΠΕ ΕΙΤΕ ΜΠΝΕΥΟΝ ΝΠΕΤΡΟΕΠΕ — in this case ΖΩΗ (ΕΥΚΕ-) may be the theme.

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

ΚΑΛΣ: (III 222.4) ΚΑΛΣ ΝΓΟΥΟ ΕΝΥΑΝΤΑΤΩΝ ΕΒΟΑ ΝΝΕΝΝΟΒΕ — here the conditional may well be the theme / (IV 109.8) ΚΑΛΣ ΟΝ "it is well" / (P 130a 105 ΤΜΓ) ΕΥΚΕ-ΚΑΛΣ ΝΝΟΥΝΑΣ, ΚΑΛΣ ΝΓΟΥΟ ΝΤΕΝΙΝΑΙΔΕ... ΚΑΛΣ ΝΤΜΝΤΑΒΕ... ΚΑΛΣ ΝΤΜΝΤΡΝΝΩΗΤ.

ΚΑΛΣ: (IV 80.2f.) ΚΑΛΣ ΝΕΝΝΑΑΟΣ ΕΥΚΕΝ ΝΝΟΟΥ ΝΝΑΩ 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 syntagm → 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, adjunctual 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 (ΠΛΑΚΣ ΝΜΟΗ ΝΟΥΠΗΜΣ, Ρ-ΚΑΣ ΝΟΥΠΗΜΣ Cat. 42.16f., 43.6, ΥΝΝΕ ΝΝΕΝΠΗΜΣ ΝΤΕΝΝΟΥΕ ΕΝχ. 93a, and so on) while [Ν] 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. TEȘTIÈRE 1965: 186ff.). For Egyptian # mod. - Θ # cf. JUNGE 1978:§7.1.2.

88 Perhaps also (exclamatory, III 146.20) ΠΑΜΝ ΠΝΘΩΕΙΣ ΗΜΠΕΚΣΝΙΜΣ ΑΝ (cf. Ps. 6:2, 37:2).
(Ch. 102.19ff.) ἐρεπβαλ ἡμαυ ἐτβεναι ἀγῳ πναλαξε ἐτβεσσαὶ / (Ch. 46.12ff.) τεττυπρπ ἰμοοο, κοινε
ντινκκη γενκουε γαγενκοι ντιμη / (Ch. 28.18ff.) μενταξδικ εβολ εννεεπεθυμα (sic) πναλακ
ἀγῳ ντοκ ἡμαυ / (III 211.10ff.) ευείρε ἰμοοο (i.e. ὀμντασεβνς) νηθτου ἀγῳ ντοοο εβολ ἱττουτη.

(2) I consider this "zeugmatic" pattern 88 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 in-
completeness and omission, with the rhetoric-stylistic "elleipsis" 89 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
ckan validly regard the 'noun syntagm + modifier' complex as relatively predicative (rhetic), 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.) ζαττυουταου, γοινε νούζηο νηκοο... γενκουε νούζουθ ημαλαξε, γενκουε
ντουρτα / (ibid. 168.3ff.) ντειζε ον πε ουκον νούζον λαγ ουκον νούζων /
(A 2 153) νανενχαρε ετκλ νηκου νηκειοηε ουκ ληειο ηηενεηο ουκ ηηενηο
λαγ ηηενηο νηκειο νηκειο λαγ ηηειο κατηο κατηο λαγηο

Ε-

(A 2 60) σεροου εααυ, πειεμαννοκτ ηετβου, πηα ηεαυ... παλ ηεαμ αξιξι-20, νυνη
κατεια εξαξερ ερου / (Ch. 54.19ff.) τουερηε ερου ηηολμιμα ηετβουουε, ηηηα εκευ-
ζου, ντειζε ον πηνοναχος ετερηςραζτ.

Εζουν ε-

(P 1314 88 παδ) ενηαυουερσ ον ητεχαλαν εζουν ερον, λαγ άνον ζωηην εζουν ενεερηημ.
Εξη-

(? A 1 188, 9χ — in line 6 a lacuna where the nodal verb would have been) ουκοη
εξηοηαυηη, ουβαλης εξηοηαβαλης, ογαληγης εξηοηαληη.

Ζη-/Νζητ-

(JV 60.19ff.) ευμαβηκ ηερηςοη, ηαλα ηεηεηπ-σαββατον, λαγ ουα ηεηεηπ ηπροουου... /
(Ch. 118.26ff.) ακα-τεληςι ζιζιν λαγ ηεηεομ ηζηηη.

Ζα-

(Ch. 89.33ff.) ηειαλα πε ηηαλημηπημιμκε ζαταμηςαηκ... πηκαπος ηζηη ζαπποβε
ηταπυηη.

(Μη-)/Νμμα-

(A 2 20) ζεπηρη μπευρηημ ζαροπ ημμαυ (i.e. the Devil and his followers) λαγ ηηοο
ημμαυ.

Νμαρη-

(III 221.4ff.) ντειζε ον ουεηςον ηαζεβης ημαρηπμεζεβηςο ηευςεβης, λαγ ουαρηη
ημαρηπουαρηη, ουρμμαο ημαρηπουμρμαο... ηαραιε εωλεηςης μπεμεταλοι ημαρη-
ρπμετηαηκαιοι.

Κατα-

(III 220.20)... πουα πουα κατατεταμειςικ / (ibid. 110.8ff., P 1314 90 παη) πουα πουα ηατα-
τετηκεημ... 

Εβολ ηττουτη-

(III 211.10, quoted above).

Ετεβε-

(Ch. 102.19ff., quoted above; 24ff.) ερεπνετρρμαο ουοπ ηετβαν, λαγ ηεοουεια ηετβε-
καπ / (A 2 473-4) ηηολαλα καηαμιε εμητη-βαυουρ ηετβουουτ η πηαηηην ηετβουουιε.

Χε-

(Wess. 9 149b) ηηοιε ηηεης ευκονκε ηε-τη, ηετξιοοο ουοοοο ηε-τη, ηετπηηπ ηαπηο ηηηαρ-

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

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 (~Ψ, ~ΟΝ) cannot be taken as fully analyzable in Coptic, where there is nothing to prove, for instance, that ~Ψ 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 uniqueness⁹¹ — and are thus more "grammaticalized" than, say, TAXY or the native ΤΑΙ and ΤΕΝΟΥ.

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-sytagms. N- precedes noun sytagms (including the infinitives) in various environmentally determined abnodinal 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" preposition⁹⁸, occurring in regular, lexicalized, predictable collocations, which correspond to modal (often de-adjectival) "adverbs" in inflecting languages.

(a) Localization in space⁹⁹: ΜΠΟ(ΟΥ)Λ N- "outside" (III 71.16, P 130 99 vo), ΜΠΚΨΤΕ "around" (Ch. 33.17f.), ΝΟΥΜΑ (ΙV 91.14), ΝΗΙ ΕΗΙ ΑΥΗ ΜΠΕΙΜΑ ΕΝΑΙ "from"⁹⁹ house to house and from this place to that" (IV 92.20).

(b) Localization in time: expressions of occasion, event and duration: ΜΠΟΥΟΓΕΥ (ΙV 185.12), ΝΟΥΓΕΥ "once (upon a time)" (IV 185.1), ΝΟΥΓΟΟΥ (ΙV 54.19), ΝΗΜΕ ΝΗΓΟΟΥ (Ch. 105.52), ΜΝΕΟΝ (ΙV 67.23), ΝΗΝΟΝ (ΙV 83.20), ΝΥΤΟΟΥ ΝΟΟ (ΙV 74.6), ΝΥΝΟΟΥ (ΙV 67.10), ΜΝΕΟΝΗ ΝΗΝΕΗΓΟΟΥ (A 2 82), ΜΝΗΝΑΥ (ΙV 67.25), ΝΗΝΑΥ (ΙV 175.8f.), ΝΑΡΖΑΙΟΣ "of old" (III 19.14, see §4.2.2.1), ΝΚΑΗ "yesterday" (A 5 50), ΝΜΗΝΕ "daily", see below, ΝΥΝΡΗ "at first" (IV 73.12), ΜΠΟΟΥ "today" (III 95.22f.), ΜΠΟΟΥ Η ΝΗΓΟΟΥ (III 114.11), ΝΤΕΝΟΟΥ "at once" (III 99.11), ΝΟΥΝΟΥ ΕΒΑΛ 2ΝΟΥΝΟΥ "at any given hour" (III 87.8), ΝΟΥΚΟΥΙ ΝΑΡΨΗ "for a short instance" (IV 67.19), ΝΥΑΓΕΝΕΣ "for ever" (IV 6.12, see §1.1.1.1), ΝΤΡΟΜΠΕ "this year" (P 130 140 ro) and many more.

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

⁹⁸ ΜΠΟ- enters this issue only as a resumptive representative of N-: (A 2 489) ΜΠΟ ΝΤΑΚΟΝΤΕ ΜΜΟΟ / (ibid. 397) ΝΟΕ ΕΤΕΡΕΝΗΠΕΙΤΟΜΕΝΟΥ ΕΓΑΛΑΨΟΥ ΝΗΝΑΥ ΕΡΟΝ ΜΜΟΟ / (ibid. 65) ΝΟΕΝ ΑΥΗ ΜΝΕΣ ΕΩΝΑΠΑΤΣΕ ΜΜΟΟ.

⁹⁹ Cf. (on the fluctuation Boh. N- ~ ΜΕΝ-) PIEHL 1902, ANDERSSON 1904:11ff.; see ΝΗΝΑΥ (and n. 96 below) on the syncretism of locative ("in") and ablative ("from") semantics in ΤΕΝ etc.
(c) Determination of manner/degree: ΝΕΩ-ΣΙΩ “face to face” (III 153.12, Ch. 208.43ff., P 1304 48 ΡΚΑ), ΝΟΥΚΟΙ (Α 1 150), ΝΕΚΙΟΥ (III 99.12), ΝΟΥΟ “rather”, “even (more)”, see below; ΝΒΜΠΠΕ “anew” (Α 2 314), ΝΤΕΙΖΕ “thus”, see below; ΝΑΥ ΝΣ “how?” (Wess. 9 148a 18ff.), ΝΟΕ Ν-ΕΤ- “in the manner of / that” (III 51.19, 104.26), ΝΧΝΑΖ “violently” (Α 1 44), ΝΜΟΥ “falsely” (P 1303 39 vo); with infinitives: ΝΟΥΗΣΜ “again” (Α 1 74), ΝΣΩΝ “in hiding” (Α 1 465), ΝΞΙΟΥ “by stealth” (Α 2 495), etc.

1.3.1.1 Certain N-syntagms deserve more leisurely attention. First, the cases of “unique” or “near-unique” morphemes, in which the isolation of N- (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” ΜΜΑΙ is a case in point. ΜΜΑΙ does recur in ΣΜΑΙ “thither” (IV 62.3), but nowhere else. ΜΜΑΙ is a pro-modifier (a more grammaticalized, anaphoric modifier, representing ΝΠ-/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 ΜΜΑΤ “only”, which is again in paradigm with Ε-ΜΑΤ as a sole companion, on which paradigm its analyzability is to be based. Both are post-adjectival only, and neither is ever predicative. ΕΜΑΤ “very” is far removed semasiologically: usually adverbal (ΝΑΥΕ-ΝΤΥΨ ΕΜΑΤ: Α 1 29, Α 1 247 written ΜΜΑΤ, III 13.22, IV 70.5, etc.), it is often adnominal: (Α 2 296) ΖΕΝΚΟΥΕ ΕΜΑΤ / (ibid. 499) ΔΙΔΑΙΟΣ ΕΜΑΤ / (ibid. 317) ΝΙΑΖ ΝΑΟΝ ΕΜΑΤ, sim. III 21.20, 169.13 / (Ch. 146.15f.) ΟΥΝΟΟ ΕΜΑΤ ΝΒΝ ΝΕΑΟΩΛ, etc. ΕΜΑΤ is occasionally reiterated (§1.1.2.4.2). ΜΜΑΤ, which has a special affinity with the augens ΜΑΥΑΑ- (§6.1.4.1) is preeminently adnominal, and occurs most typically, stylistically speaking, in (or in conjunction with) a clause including a local (“Satzigied”) 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 ΜΜΑΤ” (IV 62.20) or, less usually, governors: ΕΙΜΗΤΙ ΕΜΑΤ ε- (IV 91.12). ΜΜΑΤ may modify another modifier: (IV 24.6f.) ΖΜΠΕΙΝΑΚ ΜΜΑΤ / (III 50.4ff.) ΖΜΜΠΑΛΗΝ ΝΧΝΟΥ ΝΒΡΒΡ ΜΜΑΤ. I know of no clear instance of adverbal ΜΜΑΤ.

(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 (Α 2 21-2 ΝΤΟΥ ΟΝ ΜΜΗΝΕ ΝΕ) and (rarely) adnominally (ΝΜΑΥ ΝΟΥΗΣ ΜΜΗΝΕ IV 153.22).

*84* Ν + infinitive occurs reactionally after certain verbs: ΑΠΧΕΙ (III 44.12), ΞΗ-ΓΟΜ (III 109.19), ΣΟΥΨ (III 105.18), ΕΙ (Ch. 201.45ff.).


*86* The syncretism of “locative” and “ab/delative” is evident with many other modifiers (notably ΤΥΜ “whence”, Wess. 9 127 b 8ff., 14ff., 128 a 1ff.) and prepositions, esp. ΕΙ (ΖΗΜ ΜΙΓΟ 89b, and ΠΒΟΙΟ III 150.5), ΝΠ-, Α- (resolved in ΕΒΟΑ ΝΗ, ΕΒΟΑ Α-) — see the entries in *Dictionary*. Incidentally, this may add an improvement to my interpretation of the Shenoutean ΤΥ ΕΤ ΤΥ 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) ΤΥ ΕΤ ΤΥ ΚΕΝΟΥ ΣΡΗΜΕ-ΜΕ ΕΚΙ-6ΟΑ, ΚΕΝΜΠΑΙΑΟΝ ΕΝΙΝΟΝΕ, ΚΕΝΝΤΒΟ ΕΠΗΜΘ, where ΝΠ- ε- would agree well with a “whence — whither” frame of reference.

*87* Rare instances of ΜΜΑΤ used for EMAT, “very” (the reverse does not occur, to my knowledge): Α 1 53, 247, 244.

*88* Usually ΕΙΜΗΤΙ ε- (pro)noun ΜΑΥΑΑ- (III 90.3, 124.6, 136.20 etc.), or with no modification (III 45-6, IV 91.17f.); ΕΙΜΗΤΙ + noun (III 52.10f., IV 62.5, etc.). In Shenoute, the paradigm following ΕΙΜΗΤΙ includes: (ε-) (pro)noun ΜΜΑΤ/ΜΑΥΑΑ-, ΕΤΠΕΙΝΟΝΕ, ΕΡ- 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 *nteige* “thus” occurs: (a) *Postadjunctively, adverbially*: (III 222.12) ΜΑΡΧΝΟΚΜΕΚ ΕΠΩΝ *nteige*, typically expanding the verbs άω and έπε (III 18.3, 28.3, 37.7, 49.16, etc.); adnominally: (A 1 65) ΝΕΙΣΒΗΥΕ *nteige*. 

(b) *Initially, as an adclausal premodifier*, in a verb clause: (III 141.20) *nteige* ἄνυψω ζημία ετύμματι *nteige* ΙΩΝ ΜΗΠΟΥΣΩΡ / (ibid. 148.4ff.) *nteige* ΝΕΙΣΒΗΥΕ ιΝΕΥΨΑΜΑ ΙΝΕΤΙΣΠΥΗΑ ΙΝΕΣΠΥΗΕ ΙΠΟΥΟΥ. 

(c) *Initially, in the constructions*: (1) ≠ *nteige* (2ων-) (ον-) noun syntagm (+ circumstantial) ≠: (III 48.24ff.) *nteige* 2ΩION ΝΕΙΣΒΗΥΕ... ΕΜΕΕΕΕΕ ΝΕΙΣΒΗΥΕ 2ΩΙΩΝ ΕΥΣΠΥΗΕ/ (IV 104.7ff.) *nteige* ΙΝΕΣΠΥΗΕ ΙΝΕΤΙΣΠΥΗΑ ΙΝΕΣΠΥΗΕ ΙΠΟΥΟΥ ΙΩΝ ΝΕΣΒΗΥΕ — the circumstantial here is adnominal and adnexit.

(2) ≠ *nteige* ΙΝΕΣΠΥΗΕ ΙΝΕΣΠΥΗΕ ΕΜΕΕΕΕΕΕ ΕΥΣΠΥΗΕ 2ΩΙΩΝ ΝΕΣΒΗΥΕ — the circumstantial here is adnominal and adnexit.

(3) ≠ *nteige* ΙΝΕΣΠΥΗΕ ΙΝΕΣΠΥΗΕ ΕΜΕΕΕΕΕΕ ΕΥΣΠΥΗΕ 2ΩΙΩΝ ΝΕΣΒΗΥΕ — the circumstantial here is adnominal and adnexit.

(2) ≠ *nteige* ΙΝΕΣΠΥΗΕ ΙΝΕΣΠΥΗΕ ΕΜΕΕΕΕΕΕ ΕΥΣΠΥΗΕ 2ΩΙΩΝ ΝΕΣΒΗΥΕ — the circumstantial here is adnominal and adnexit.

(3) ≠ *nteige* ΙΝΕΣΠΥΗΕ ΙΝΕΣΠΥΗΕ ΕΜΕΕΕΕΕΕ ΕΥΣΠΥΗΕ 2ΩΙΩΝ ΝΕΣΒΗΥΕ — the circumstantial here is adnominal and adnexit.

(4a) *nteige* (ον-) πε (nteige) predicative: (§1.2.1.2): (IV 84.14) *nteige* ΙΝΕΣΠΥΗΕ ΙΝΕΣΠΥΗΕ ΙΝΕΣΠΥΗΕ ΙΠΟΥΟΥ — the circumstantial here is adnominal and adnexit.

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

1.3.1.3 *nzoio* occurs: (a) *Postadjunctively, adverbially* (“rather”, “greatly”, “[even] more”, “on the contrary”): (IV 5.8) ΧΩΤΤΙ ΣΤΩΝΟΥ / (ibid. 18.12) ΣΕΝΑΤΑΜΟΝ ΑΥΣΗ ΤΝΕΑΙΜΕΝ ΣΤΩΝΟΥ / (Ch. 23.19ff.) Η ΕΚΙ-ΠΟΟΥΤΗ ΓΛΑΠΤΗ 2ΝΟΥ... ΕΚΟΥΣΗ-ΜΗΝΟΥΤΗ ΝΤΟΥ ΣΤΩΝΟΥ / (III 38.24) ΤΝΕΑΤΗ ΣΤΩΝΟΥ / (A 2 341) (they asked whether) ΝΑΝΟΥ-ΜΕΣΩΒ, (I answered:) ΚΩΝΟΥ ΣΤΩΝΟΥ, also III 115.17ff., 146.16, 163.22, IV 18.12, 82.10ff., Ch. 85.13ff. In a typical figure, *nzoio* combines the sense of “rather, on the contrary” with a Second-Tense autofocus construction (see §2.1.7), e.g. (III 212.8ff.) ΠΕΝΪΟΜΟ ΜΜΟΣ ΕΕΤΕΠΑΟΥΝ-ΙΠ... ΕΝΕΙΠΗ ΝΝΑΙ ΠΤΑΝΡ-ΑΤΟΚΟΥΝ ΜΜΟΣ ΣΤΩΝΟΥ / (Ch. 171.2ff.) (ΖΠΑΙ ΓΑΡ ΣΜΠΗΑΡΟΟ ΕΤΟΥΜΕΕΕΕ ΕΕΠΑΙ... ΕΕ-ΟΥΑΤΗΝ ΠΕ...) ΕΝΟ ΝΝΑΤΗ ΣΤΩΝΟΥ. 

(b) *Adclausally, in a Nominal-Sentence pattern* (§1.1.2.3, “on the contrary”): (III 113.20) ΟΥΛΑΣ ΤΝΕΓΑΣ ΣΤΩΝΟΥ ΠΕ ΠΛΑΣ ΝΝΑΣΒΗΣΣ / (ibid. 115.28) ΕΕΤΕΠΑΟΥΝ-ΑΣΤΟΙΝΟΡΟΣ (sic) ΛΑΝΘΟΣ (sic) ΠΕ... ΟΥΜΑΚΑΡΙΟΟΝ ΟΝ ΑΛΗΝΟΣ ΣΤΩΝΟΥ ΠΕ... / (IV 3.4) ΠΕΤΕΡΕΝΠΡΟΜΕΕΕΕ ΕΡΟΟ ΕΕ-ΟΥΣΟΥΝ ΠΕ ΕΕΟΥΜΡΩ ΣΤΩΝΟΥ ΠΕ, also III 19.2, IV 60.23, 108.27 etc.

(c) *Adnominally* (“too much”, “even, especially, in particular”): (III 221.18) ΚΓΩΞΒ ΣΤΩΝΟΥ / (IV 77.2) ΝΕΥΝΜΠΟΙΤΟ ΣΤΩΝΟΥ / (IV 9.20ff.) ΠΚΕΙΟΥΔΑΣ ΣΤΩΝΟΥ / (Ch. 30.45ff.) ΝΤΟΚ 2ΣΩΚ ΣΤΩΝΟΥ. It is in this status, usually a premodifier, semasiologically close to ΜΑΛΛΟΝ, ΜΑΛΙΣΤΑ (§1.1.1.1.14), in the sense of “especially”, “so much more” — a focusing adjunct: usually ‘ΣΤΟΝΟΥ ΔΕ + noun’ (prosodically a colon by itself): III 37.17ff., 106.12ff., 108.19ff., 112.13, IV 23.7, Ch. 74.18ff., etc.

(d) *nzoio* expanding or premodifying another modifier 100: (III 222.4) ΚΑΛΑΣ ΣΤΩΝΟΥ / (III 181.19ff.) ...ΕΤΕΠΑΣ-ΣΟΜ ΝΤΟΥ ΣΤΩΝΟΥ / (Ch. 18.28ff.) *nteige* ΔΕ ΣΤΩΝΟΥ (A 1 11) ΣΤΩΝΟΥ ΝΗΜ, ΣΤΩΝΟΥ ΔΕ ΝΝΑΚΑΒΒΑΤΩΝ.

---

99 Cf. Shisha-Halevy 1972:75ff., 81ff.: consider ΝΕΙΣΒΗΥΕ ΤΑΙΕ ΤΕ ΕΕ Ν-νουν + circ.] (IV 82.1ff.) ΝΕΙΣΒΗΥΕ ΟΡΟΤΗΜΕΝΟΝ ΕΥΣΠΥΗΕ ΕΤΥΜΜΑΤΗ ΙΝΕΣΠΥΗΑ / (Wess. 9 914ff.) ΤΑΙΕ ΤΕ ΝΗΙΑΤΣΒΙΕ ΕΤΥΜΜΑΤΗ ΕΥΣΠΥΗΕ ΕΒΟΑ ΝΗΙΑΤΣΒΙΕ ΤΕΝΤΕΥΨΗΜΑ ΤΕΝΤΕΥΨΗΜΑ / (A 1 162-3) ΤΑΙΕ ΤΕ ΤΕΝΣΗ ΠΡΑΝ ΑΥΣ ΠΕΚΣΗΜΑ ΕΝΝΑΚΑΑΤΗ ΙΝΕΣΠΥΗΑ / (A 2 138) ΤΑΙΕ ΤΕ ΝΕΙΣΒΗΥΕ ΟΡΟΤΗΜΕΝΟΝ ΕΤΟ ΝΗΙΑΤΣΒΙΕ ΕΥΣΠΥΗΕ ΕΤΟΥΜΡΩΝ ΕΤΟΥΜΡΩΝ ΕΤΟΥΜΡΩΝ ΝΚΑΚΕ. Note in the last example the opposition between the two adnominal expansion forms: ɛτ- attributive, and ɛ- adnexit.

100 ΝΩΟΥ itself is expanded, in the sense of “more than...”, by ɛ + noun (incl. infinitive: III 77.2, A 1 56, III 131.10).
Note here especially NZOYO + circumstantial, in the sense of "especially when": (Wess. 9 138c 19f.) ...

...ENGINE MΠΘΥΝΕ ΝΜΕΤΑΜΠΘΥΝΕ NZOYO ΔΕ ΕΝΙΓ ΜΠΡΟΥΥ ΝΜΕΤΑΜΠΘΥΝΕ-ΡΥΜΕ ΜΜΑΥ.

(c) Initially, NZOYO is rare: (III 147.14) ΝΕΙΝΟΞΥΝΕ ΝΑΙ ΜΑΥΑΑΤ ΞΕΝΑΙΝΟΞΥΝΕ ΟΝ ΝΚΑΝΔΑΛΩΝ... NZOYO ΔΕ ΝΕΙΝΟΞΥΝΕ ΑΝ ΠΕ ΕΤΑΙΝΕ ΝΜΕΤΑΜΠΘΥΝΕ-ΡΥΜΕ ΜΠΙΣΤΟΣ.

1.3.2 ZERO-MARKED NOUN SYNTAXGS IN MODIFIER STATUS are restricted to certain temporal or spatial localizing expressions and the modal pronominal ΑΑΑΥ "at all", "anyhow". Related to this lack of marking is the syntactic zero — the absence of resumption of initial nouns: contrast (IV 58.19f.) ΠΕΖΜΕ NZOYO ΝΝΕΡΕΠΕ ΕΥΚΑΙΩΚ ΝΤΟΟΥ ΕΠΙΤΡΥΠ, with (ibid. 54.29) ΠΕΖΜΕ NZOYO ΤΡΥΠ ΝΝΕΡΕΠΕ ΝΝΤΕ ΕΠΙΤΡΥΠ. This cohesive distinction is indicative, since it determines the noun as modifying the subsequent clause, not serving as its topic (§6.0.1).

(1) ΕΝΕΞ: see §1.3.6.

(2) ΤΕΡΜΝΗ, ΤΡΩΜΝΗ "yearly", "— a year" 102, distributive. Postadjective, adnominal (to CON only): ΝΟΥΝΟΝ ΤΕΡΜΝΗ (P 1318 13 ro), ΝΤΟΟΥ ΝΝΟΝ ΤΕΡΜΝΗ (IV 74.6f.), also ibid. 58.1, 91.8.

(3) CON: initially, as adclausal premodiﬁer: ΖΑΖ ΝΝΟΝ "often" (III 146.28, 147.9.18, etc.) — contrast with the postadjective — ΝΖΑΖ ΝΝΟΝ (III 107.14, 139.11). Postadjective: ΟΥΝΟΝ (A 2 397), ΥΜΝΤ ΝΝΟΝ (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) ΑΥΡΝ ΜΕΝ- "first of all", "at first" is initial and adclausal: III 164.5, IV 128.6, Ch. 204.19f., P 1304 54 πν, 1305 39 vo.

(5) ΖΟΟΥ in ΠΕΖΜΕ NZOYO (IV 58.19).

(6) ΠΟΥΖΕ, ΖΤΟΟΥΕ "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 ΖΙ-, ΥΑ-, Ε-, ΞΙΝ-, Η- (IV 60.14, 61.1, 92.13f., Ch. 51.22, 145.26f., P 1301 139 ΤΜΕ: ΝΠΟΥΣΕ ΑΥΣ ΖΤΟΟΥΕ). ΠΟΥΣΕ ΠΕ (IV 60.21) is inconclusive, in view of the # modifier - ΠΕ# pattern (§1.2.1.2). There is however some basis for considering ΖΙ- in ΖΤΟΟΥΕ (and even in ΖΙΠΟΥΣΕ, IV 92.2 cod. С ΖΑΖΙΠΟΥΣΕ v.l. ΥΑΠΟΥΣΕ) metanalytically fused with the lexeme and somehow connected with the (radical) Ζ in ΖΤΟΟΥΕ 103 — I know of no attestation for *ΖΙ-ΖΤΟΟΥΕ (see Dictionary 728a; consider also Miss. 282, IV 104.4f. ΖΙΠΟΥΣΕ ΑΥΣ ΖΤΟΟΥΕ). Consequently, these expressions may not properly belong here, but are — at least to some extent — modifiers by lexical right, like ΤΑΛΥ or ΤΥΝΟΥ. (ΖΙΠΟΥΣΕ also occurs as an adnominal modifier: P 1313 133 ro ΤΣΑΝΑΖΙΚ ΖΙΠΟΥΣΕ.)

(7) ΑΑΑΥ "at all", "anyhow", "in anything" is postadjective only: (III 137.23) EMΝΙΚΤΙΟΥ ΝΟΝΕ ΑΑΑΥ / (IV 18.18f.) ΝΚΑΝΑΝΑΚΤΕ ΑΑΑΥ ΑΝ ΕΝΙΚΑΙΟΚ / (Thompson D ΝΘ) ΜΗΣΑΓΕΡΑΤΥ ΑΑΑΥ ΟΥΒΕ- (v.l. A 2 246 ΝΑΑΑΥ).

---

101 Cf. Schenkel 1966:58 ("absolute substantives" — they are in fact neither absolute nor "asymptotic", 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" ("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 Ν- as synchronism (see footnote 93).


103 Černý 1976:302f. suggests for ΖΤΟΟΥΕ a hybrid etymology: ἢδ-ιξ + δωξι: Crum gives in Dictionary 727b-728a ΖΤΟΟΥΕ and ΖΙΑΑΥΕ 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 ‘0-noun lexeme ⇀ 0-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.) ΑΥΞΟΒΟΥ ΕΒΟΛ ΠΒΟΛ / (IV 110.9f.) ΣΩΛ ΝΙΜ ΕΤΟΥΝΑΛΛΑ... ΕΥΜΑΛΛΑ ΠΒΟΛ ΜΠΕΤΟΥΝ ΝΓΙΣ ΝΤΑΙΝΑΛΑ... (v.l. ΜΠΒΟΛ), also IV 33.27, 113.24f., A I 70. Adnominally: (IV 112.17f.) ΣΩΛ ΝΙΜ ΠΒΟΛ ΜΠΕΚΑΤΑΔΑΣΕΙ (sic).

1.3.3.2 ‘0-noun ⇀ 0-noun’ is bracketed and marked by n- as the predicative complement of forms of Epei (Miss. 279f., parall. P 1306 69 ro) ΤΖΗΝΗ ΕΤΟ ΜΠΛΑΣΕ ΠΛΑΣΕ / (A I 240) ΑΥΛΑΥ ΝΤΑΙΝ ΝΑΥ / (III 110.17) -Ρ-ΟΥΕΙ ΝΙΣΙ ΣΠΟΥ / (IF 85, apud Dictionary 378a) -ΛΑΛ ΜΠΛΑΣΕ ΠΛΑΣΕ ΝΣΙΒ ΜΣΙΒ (IV 172.10, Mun. 160, P 1306 99 PM, IF 188 apud Dictionary 422b)...ΕΠΟ ΝΕΣΤΖΙ ΣΩΛΣΖ.

1.3.3.3 Adnominally, we find ‘0-noun ⇀ 0-noun’ (with restricted constituency) in -ΜΜΙΝΕ ΜΙΝΕ (ΖΙΑΛΑΝ ΖΑΛΑΝ) (Ch. 183.43f., Wess. 9 127b 8f., A 2 116, P 1306 91 PM) with the sense of ‘each and every...’.

1.3.3.4 In this sense (‘each and every...’), complexive/comprehensive universal plurality107) the iterated ‘determinator + noun’ syntagm occurs in various syntactic statuses even with a definite determinator: (A I 395) -ΖΩΜ ΕΠΑΙΕΙΤΕ ΟΝΑΙΡΙΑΟΙ ΣΟΙΡΙΑΟΙ / (ibid. 155) -ΖΜΗΝΚΑΙΡΟΣ ΝΚΑΙΡΟΣ / (III 126.16) ΞΕΝΗ... ΜΠΕΤΟΥΝ ΝΣΙΒ / (ibid. 204.6f) ΥΑΡΕΤΣΙΟΝ ΟΝ ΜΠΟΒΟΕ ΠΝΟΒΕ / (A 2 21) ΝΖΡ-ΠΡΙΜΕ ΠΡΙΜΕ ΡΗΝΩΝ ΠΚΟΝ ΠΚΟΝ ΡΗΝΩΝ ΤΕΖΙΜΗ ΤΕΖΙΜΗ... / (III 110.8f.) ΠΟΤΑ ΜΟΥ ΚΑΤΑΤΕΜΙΝΕ / (IV 73.19f.) ΠΡΙΜΕ ΠΡΙΜΕ ΕΤΖΜΙΝΗ... ΡΗΝΩΝ ΤΟΥΕΙ ΤΟΥΕΙ... ΕΞΣΖΗΝ ΕΤΟΤΟΥ... ΑΥΛΑΥ

1.3.3.4.1 The iterated lexeme is rarely found expanding (and bracketed by) a single determinator, meaning ‘assorted...’ (plural only): (A I 108) ΣΕΝΖΟΒΩΣ ΝΣΕΝΣΒΟΟΣ Ν ΣΕΝΣΑΝΕ ΣΑΛΝΕ / (A 2 26) ΣΕΝΟΛΑ

---

104 Also ΥΗΝ ΥΗΝ (A I 101) ΑΥΛΑΥ ΑΥΛΑΥ ΑΥΛΑΥ, cf. ΟΥΒΑΛ ΟΥΒΑΛ (A I 150), coordinated with ΚΑΤΑΣΟΛΟΥ ΣΟΛΩ.
105 Cf. (for Turkish and Modern Armenian) Godel 1945:10f.: aci aci güfüyordu (‘adverbe ;’), yumurta çığ çığ yemek (‘prédictat indirect du sujet ou de l’objet ’).
1.3.4 TENOY (once NTENOV, 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 TENOY adverbial, postadjective, often clause-final: “now”, frequently in collocation with other time-indications: (A 2 53) ΕΡΞΟΥΝ YAΣH TΗΝ TENOY / (ibid. 159) ΣΗΤΗ ΨΩΜΗ ΤΕΝΟΥ ΝΗΝ ΠΗΝΥΕ TENOY / (III 203.15f.) ΕΝΕΡΓΟΥΝΤΕ ΝΑΥΔΗΣ ΝΑΜΗΣ 3ΜΗΝΗΚΑΣ TENOY / (ibid. 219.4) (ΝΕΠΑΔΗΣ) ΑΠΟΙΜΕ ΕΡΠ ΤΕΝΟΥ ΝΗΝ ΠΗΝΥΕ ΤΑΙ — note the tense / (IV 1.23f.) ΕΥΥΑΝΠ-ΒΟΑ ΕΝΥΡΣΗΣ ΝΕΝΤΜΑΝΑΣ 3ΜΗΝΙΑ TENOY / (ibid. 98.25f.) +ΣΟΟΝ ΧΕ-ΕΙΡ-ΟΥ ΧΙΝΝΗΡΩΗ ΑΥΨ ΟΝ TENOY / (P 1308 40 ΡΑ) ΟΥΝ ΝΙΜ ΕΤΕΝΙΟΥΜΕΝΑΝΟΙ... ΣΜΗΝΑΜΑ TENOY — again, note the compatibility of the perfect with TENOY; also in (P 1304 126 M) ΝΕΝΩΝ- ΥΡΩΝΔΟΟΥ YΡΩΝ TENOY “even now”. Additional exx.: III 182.19, 188.17f., 206.22, 208.17, 131.5f., 150.7, IV 6.17f., 1.24, Ch. 82.12ff., etc. etc.

1.3.4.1.1 Postadjectively, we often find TENOY in idiomatic collocation (coordinated or disjoined) with other temporal modifiers: (A 1 287) ΣΜΗΝΟΥΣΗΕΥ ΕΤΜΑΝΑ Ν ΑΥΦ ΤΕΝΟΥ / (IV 36.2, 98.26, A 2 107 etc.) ΧΙΝΝΗΡΩΗ ΑΥΨ ΟΝ TENOY / (IV 197.9) TENOY ΑΥΨ ΝΕΝΟΥΕΥ ΝΗΝ / (ibid. 206.22) TENOY Ν ΑΥΦ ΝΕΝΟΥΕΥ ΕΤΜΑΝΑ — note the inverse order on line 28 / (A 1 293) ΤΕΝΟΥ ΑΥΨ ΥΑΔΕΗΣ / (III 194.19f.) ΕΙΤΕ 3ΜΗΝΗΚΑΣ TENOY ΕΙΤΕ 3ΜΗΝΟΥ ΝΗΝΤΑΝ / (P 1304 118 ΡΑ) ΝΑΡΧΑΙΟΙ ΑΥΨ ΟΝ TENOY.

1.3.4.2 TENOY colon-enclitic 108 (— TENOY — -ΓΕ/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: TENOY appears here the role of a superordinating particle, with a corresponding difference in prosodic status, inferable from the placement: (A 1 57) ΜΗ ΝΤΥΝ TENOY ΝΕΤΜΕ ΝΝΕΤΣΙΤΟΥΜΑ / (A 2 65) ΝΟΕ TENOY ΕΤΕΡΕΠΑΡΕΝΟΝ 3ΜΟΥΕ... ΥΑΗΑ (vs. the bride in Song of Songs) / (ibid. 298) ΝΑΥ ΝΕΕ TENOY ΚΑΤΑΝΙΝΑΚΕ ΝΚΕΝΑΝΟΙ ΑΝ / (A 1 335) ΕΤΕΕΟΥ TENOY ΝΕΥ- ΥΜΗΣ ΖΟΥΡΟΤ ΑΝ / (ibid. 297) ΝΕΕ ΨΩΜΗ ΟΝ TENOY ΕΤΡΝ-ΝΟΒΕ / (III 144.26) ΟΥΚΟΥΝ ΝΑΙ TENOY ΕΤΜΑΝ ΝΕΤΝΑΚΑΟΟ ΧΕ- / (Ch. 171.30ff.) ΌΥ ΤΕΝΟΥ ΝΕ- / (IV 183.7) ΕΝΜΕΕΕ ΕΟΥ ΓΕ TENOY. Striking here is the frequent occurrence after ΝΕΕ-/ΚΑΤΑΕ- (also A 2 191, Ench. 85a, 87b, 92-3, III 18.27ff., Wess. 9 148c 9f. etc.) and, in intercolony placement (§6.0.3), after ΤΑΙ ΚΕ ΚΕ 111 (III 142.16, 167.13, 21); also after the antecedent in a relative construction 112 (III 205.22f. ΠΕΙΒΙΟΟ TENOY ΕΤΕΝΗΤΗΤ, also IV 121.26 / III 206.7 ΝΙΤΥΗ TENOY ΕΝΑΙΝΤΕ ΕΚΟΥΝ ΕΡΟΥ / IV 111.14 ΤΑΙ TENOY ΕΤΥΟΟΟ ΝΜΗ ΝΙΠΟ), after the predicate in a Nominal Sentence 113 (A 2 306 ΟΥ ΕΡΟΥ TENOY ΝΕ- / IV 20.10 ΟΥ TENOY ΤΕ ΕΡΕΠΑ / III 170.9 ΝΕΤΥΗΣΕ ΟΝ ΤΕΝΟΥ ΝΕ), and following the focus in focalization ("Cleft Sentences", see Ch. 2): (A 2 451, not Sh.) ΝΑΙ TENOY ΝΕΤΝΟΥΝΣ ΝΝΟΕ ΕΒΟΑ / (Wess. 9 121b 16ff.) ΝΑΥ ΓΕ ΝΕΕ TENOY ΕΤΕΝΚΙΚΑΙ. In all these cases it is the prosodic contour of the clause that motivates the placement of TENOY, and a full temporal value is not rarely found here.

109 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 **TENΟΥ initial**, an adclausal premodifier: TΕΝΟΥ ΔΕ —, ἀλλὰ TΕΝΟΥ — is temporal, often opposed to another foregoing temporal modifier: Ch. 31.27ff. (vs. ΝΟΥOYOΕΙW), sim. IV 185.2f., 13f., Ch. 143.13ff. (vs. ζάχθ MΠΟΟΥ, so too in 150.37ff., A 2 86, P 130 104 vo), Ch. 204.19ff. (vs. ωροΠ MΕΝ-), IV 105.9 (vs. ζάχθ ΜΠΑΤΝ-). TΕΝΟΥ ΔΕ- is relatively rare: "now then", "at this stage of the argument": III 77.4 TΕΝΟΥ ΔΕ ΟΥ ΤΕ ΤΜΗΤΑΣΕΒΗΣ, also A 2 159, 248. **Note ΕΤΙ on ΤΕΝΟΥ (Ch. 91.20f.) a calque of ΕΤΙ καί νῦν?**

1.3.4.4 **TΕΝΟΥ adnominal** to situational nouns: τ(Ε)ΙΜΑ (Ch. 57.45ff., A 2 240, 314, 461, 462, IV 1.24), τ(Ε)ΙΧΥ, NΙΟΟΥ (A 1 463, A 2 87, III 145-6, P 130 126 ΡΜΑ, 130 49 ro), οικοΝ-ΝΙΟΟΥΕΙW (III 106.8ff., 126.17,23, 180.19f.,24f., A 2 427), ΝΕΨΟΝΩ (Rossi 2/3 16), ΤΕΝΟΥΚΙΚ (IV 113.2).

1.3.4.5 **TΕΝΟΥ** is occasionally found in noun-syntagm status (cf. §1.1.1.1) — in origin, of course, it goes back to ΤΕ-determined ΟΥΝΟΥ, when it was a case of the "zero-marked noun as modifier" (§1.3.2): ΧΙΝΤΕΝΟΥ (P 130 50 CK), ΥΑΖΟΥΝ ΕΤΕΝΟΥ (P 130 6 105 ΦΠΖ).

1.3.5.1.1 **NAME** "truly", "really" (cf. ΛΛΗΘΩC, §1.3.11.2), occurs postadjectively, adverbially: (A 2 301) ΧΕ-ΝΕΨΟΥΝΤΟΣ ΝΑΜΕ ΕΒΟΑ ΔΜΠΟΥΤΕ / (A 1 171) AΥΣΟΥΣ ΓΑΡ ΝΑΜΕ ΕΧΜΠΟΟΕΙC / (A 1 213) ΝΕΤ-ΟΥΝΤΕ ΕΒΟΑ ΝΑΜΕ ΧΕ-ΓΕΝΜΑΤΡΥΠΟΣ ΝΕ / (IV 159.8) ΕΤΡΕΨΑΣΤΩC ΝΑΜΕ ΕΤΒΕΝΝΟΥΤΕ / (Ch. 68.6ff.) ΑΝΟΝ ΤΧΟΟΥΝ ΑΝ ΕΛΑΛ — ΤΧΟΟΥΝ ΑΝ ΝΑΜΕ / (Ench. 80a and often in "Vita Monachorum" passages) — ΕΤΥΨΟΝΕ ΝΑΜΕ. More exx.: III 165.20, 170.21, IV 57.17f., 156.24, Ch. 62.11ff., etc.

1.3.5.1.2 As adclausal/adverbial, NAME may occupy the colon-second position (or share it); this may be due to the prosodic contour of the construction: (A 2 371) ΠΕΚΝΟΥΤΕ ΝΑΜΕ ΕΤΕΟΥΝΤΟΥΕ ΑΝ ΠΕ / (RE II 16a 17) ΓΕΝΕΒΙΝΗ ΝΑΜΕ ΝΕ ΝΕΤΜΑΥ cf. RE II 162b 16 ΓΕΝΕΒΙΝΗ ΑΛΛΗΘΟC (sic) ΝΕ and §1.1.2.3 / (IV 32.2f.) ΝΑΙ ΝΑΜΕ ΝΤΑΥΨΘΕ (Sec. Perfect) ΝΟΙΟΥΡ ΕΤΒΕΝΜΤΕΡΟ MΠΟΟΥΤΕ / (III 173.26) ΓΑΜΟΙ ΟΝ ΝΑΜΕ ΕΝΕΥΜΑΤΑ-ΛΟΓΟC ΦΑΡΟΟΥ / (Wess. 9 156c 7 ff.) ΧΕΚΑΣ ΝΑΜΕ ΕΦΕΥΟΤΕ ΕΡΨΤΝ 2ΝΜΟΥ ΝΙΜ. More exx.: Ench. 82a, Wess. 9 144e 4f., Ch. 142.49ff., 155.33ff., Or. 157.3, 165.42f., A 2 27, etc.

1.3.5.1.3 **NAME initial**, a premodifier: (A 1 72) ΝΑΜΕ ΤΕΜΕΕΥΕ ΧΕ-. Here I include cases of ΑΥΣ ΝΑΜΕ —: (A 2 332) ΑΥΣ ΟΝ ΝΑΜΕ ΕΠΗΝ ΠΕ ΤΕΚΚΑΝΙΑ / (III 71.17f.) ΑΥΣ ΝΑΜΕ ΗΜΑΥ ΝΙΜ ΜΠΟΟΥΣΘΤ... / (ibid. 191.22) ΤΕΝΑΥ ΕΡΕΟΥ ΑΥΣ ΝΑΜΕ ΤΕΚΟΟΥΝ ΑΝ MΠΟΟΥ / (Ch. 77.23ff.) ΑΥΣ ΝΑΜΕ ΝΕΝΝΑΙΜΕΝΕ — or ΑΛΛΑ ΝΑΜΕ —: (III 217.2f.) ΑΛΛΑ ΝΑΜΕ ΝΤΑΡΟΥΕΥΘΕ ΝΤΟΥ ΕΤΕΟΥΑΒ... / (III 131.5f. Cod. B, parall. A 2 196) ΑΛΛΑ ΝΑΜΕ ΠΕ ΝΗΟΟΥΝ ΠΕ ΕΤΡΕΨΚΥ ΝΑΥ ΕΒΟΑ, see §6.0.3.3 for the "foreshadowed" ΠΕ; also ΑΡΜΥ ΝΑΜΕ- (III 140.30f.), ΚΑΙΓΑΡ ΝΑΜΕ- (III 146.23), NAME before a conditional complex (III 70.17f.)114.

1.3.5.1.4 **NAME postadjective, adnominal** — very common, occurring with most determinators: "true", "real", "veritable", "genuine": ΠΙΣΤΟC NAME (III 15.16, 137.14, IV 21.5, A 1 14, etc. etc.) / (A 2 96) ΟΥΨΕ NAME / (ibid. 55, Ch. 34.53ff.) ΝΜΠΟΟΥΤΕ NAME / (III 223.16) ΝΕΥΣΒΗΣ NAME / (A 2 402, 407, etc.) ΝΕΧΡΕΙΤΙΑΝΟC NAME / (A 2 60) ΠΛΑΡΟΝ NAME / (IV 80.23) ΖΕΝΗΟΤΕ NAME / (Ch. 168.44ff.) ΟΥΜΝΤΑΚΕ ΕΠΙΝΟΥΤΕ NAME — NAME expands here the whole "noun + modifier" group / (IV 129.11) ΠΕ-ΕΙΣΤ ΑΥΣ ΤΕΝΜΑΛΛΥ NAME / (Ch. 140.20) ΝΣΟΥ NAME / (III 39.26) ΝΚΥΤΠ ΝΑΜΕ ΜΠΟΟΥΤΕ — note the position

114 Consider (Or. 159-160) ΑΥΣ ΕΟΥΕΙ ΝΑΜΕ ΤΕ "she really is one" (i.e. an adulteress), varying with ΑΥΣ ΝΑΜΕ ΕΟΥΕΙ ΤΕ. Both are clear cases of the modifier ΑΥΣ, translatable here as "and what is more", "and moreover" (§1.3.10).
of NAME / (Ch. 93.19ff.) NEVUBEEP NAME ZΜΠΕΞΕ — note placement. Examples of ‘noun - NAME - relative’ are often ambiguous, but occasionally adnominal beyond doubt, with the relative adding further characterization: (Ch. 93.0ff.) TΣΧΕΘΕ NAME ETΓΟΟΞΕ / (ibid. 191.28ff.) ΠΡΕΠΗ-ΝΟΒΕ NAME EΤΡΟΟΥΤ, ΠΑΣΕΒΗΣ NAME ΝΤΑΥΕΙΑ-ΤΟΤΟΥ ΝΚΨΥΘ (contrast with the ambiguous Or. 160.34ff. ΝΑΘΗΤ NAME ΕΤΡ-ΓΡΨΖ ΜΠΟΕΙΚ). Very occasionally, the second-position placement in the group is motivated, NAME modifying the whole complex: (IV 115.15) ΝΑΙ NAME ΝΤΕΙΝΜΕ. Note ΑΖΕ NAME “yes, indeed” : (A 2 106) ΖΨΕ ΑΖΕ NAME ΑΡΗΥ ΝΤΟΤΟΥ “yes, indeed, perhaps even...” / (ibid. 308) ΚΑΝ ΑΖΕ NAME ΕΥΨΑΝ-. 

1.3.5.2 ΖΝΟΥΜΕ is rather less common 115:

1.3.5.2.1 Postadjunctive, adverbal: (Ryl. 67 ΤΗΘ) ΟΥΝΨΨΜΕ ΕΡΕΤΕΚΕ ΝΖΗΠΟΥ ΖΝΟΥΜΕ / (A 2 109) ΝΕΤΡΟΕΙΣ ΕΡΨΤΝ ΖΝΟΥΜΕ / (IV 3.26) ΣΕΙ-ΕΟΟΥ ΝΑΥ ΖΝΟΥΜΕ / (Ch. 26.50ff.) ΠΕΣΟΨΨΜΕ ΕΤΣΜΕ ΜΜΟΟΥ ΝΖΗΠΟΥ ΖΝΟΥΜΕ / (IV 3.26) ΣΕΙ-ΕΟΟΥ ΝΖΗΠΟΥ ΖΝΟΥΜΕ / (III 3.10ff.) ΕΝΕΚΤΝΑΡ-ΠΕΚΟΥΣΨ ΖΝΟΥΜΕ / (III 28.6) ΕΥΡΑΝΑΗ ΜΜΟΟΤΕ ΖΝΟΥΜΕ. Additional exx.: Ch. 21.6ff., 112.21ff., III 185.12ff., IV 108.12ff., A 2 416, 472, etc. More unusually, we find the expression postadjunctively modifying a Nominal Sentence: (III 171.97) ΓΕΝΠΙΣΤΟΚ ΑΝ NE ΟΥΤΕ ΝΕΡΕΨΗ- ΣΒΨ ΑΝ ΣΝΟΥΜΕ. In (A 1 250) ΑΥΣΨΜΕ ΕΒΟΑ ΖΝΟΥΜΕ ΑΞΝΤΨΨΜΑΝ we may have ZΝΟΥΜΕ 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 120.24ff., 27ff.) is a nice case of the focalized modifier, preceding a complex topic made up of its own topic (theme) + comment (rhemé) — see Ch. 2: ΝΕΤΨΨΜΕ ΜΜΟΟ ΙΕ-ΝΤΑΥΧΟΟΥ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΕΨΟΝ, ΕΒΟΑ ΕΞΕ-ΖΝΟΥΜΕ ΝΤΑΥΧΟΟΥ ΕΤΒΕΝΕΤΜΜΑΥ.

1.3.5.2.3 The lower incidence of ZΝΟΥΜΕ compared with ΝΑΜΕ is especially striking in the adnominal status, in which relatively few examples have come to light (almost all from Ch.): (Ch. 53.54ff., 70.38ff.) ΧΡΕΙΣΤΙΑΝΟΣ (ΝΙΜ) ΖΝΟΥΜΕ / (ibid. 25.27ff.) ΠΑΝΕΚΕ ΖΝΟΥΜΕ / (ibid. 79.40ff.) ΝΨΨΜΕ ΜΜΟΟΤΕ ΖΝΟΥΜΕ / (Wess. 9 147c 1 ff.) ΝΣΟΦΟΣ ΑΥΣ ΜΠΙΣΤΟΣ ΖΝΟΥΜΕ — all in commodatory collocations.

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

1.3.6.1 Adverbally-postadjunctively (compatible with the perfect and future, less usually aorist — “the two faces of eternity”) it rarely occurs marked by Ν-: (A 1 295) ΜΨ ΑΓΕΛΑΑΤ ΜΠΡΟΟΦΝΗΣ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΝΕΖΕ ΖΜΠΗΑ, but usually without any marking for modifier status (§1.3.2.): (Ch. 32.36ff.) ΜΠΚΑ- 

ΖΕΡΑΤΚ ΖΜΕ ΕΝΕΖ, ΜΠΕΤΑΙΟ ΟΝ ΥΨΗΑ ΝΑΚ ΕΝΕΖ / (Gol. Jelanskaja 1b) ΜΨ ΥΡΑΝΨΨΜΕ ΥΨΗΝ ΜΜΠΗΝΗΡΟΣ Ν- 

ΨΜΕ ΝΤΕΙΠΖΕ ΝΨΨΜΕΝΕ ΝΨΨΜΕΝΕ ΝΨΨΜΕ ΝΨΨΜΕΝΗΡΟΣ ΕΞΙ-ΟΥΝΨΜΕ ΜΜΨΨΜΕ ΝΨΨΜΕ ΝΨΨΜΕ / (P 130b 17 ΡΖ) ΜΨ ΚΝΑΥ- 

ΧΟΟΣ ΡΨ ΕΝΕΖ ΕΞΕ- / (P 130b 24 ΦΝΔ-Ε) ΑΡΕΤΗΡΕ-ΣΨΣΜΕ ΔΕ ΟΝ ΕΝΕΖ... ΑΡΕΤΑΒΕΡ-ΨΨΜΕ ΔΕ ΟΝ ΕΝΕΖ ΕΠΨΟΨ... / (P 130d 105 ΡΚΕ) ΝΤΑΨΡΜ ΡΜΨΣΟ 6Ψ ΝΑΥ ΡΖΟΟΥ ΕΝΕΖ ΝΟΥΨΨΜΕ ΕΕΡΑΙ / (Wess. 9 120b 3f.) ΜΠΝΨΨΜΑΝ ΑΨΚ ΕΨΟΥ ΕΡΨΜΕ ΕΝΕΖ / (IV 153.10f.) ΜΠΚΛΑ ΕΨΟΝ ΕΕΡΨΜΕ / (IV 17.11f.) ΝΦΑΝΑΚΙ-ΨΨΜΕ ΑΝ ΕΝΕΖ. As in other languages (notably old and modern Indo-European ones), ΕΝΕΖ, which frequently features in interrogative sentences predicating ΝΙΜ “who?”, fluctuates here between the post-verb and post-pronominal (or adpronominial: ΝΙΜ ΕΝΕΖ “whoever?”) placements. From (A 2 518) ΝΤΑΝΙΜ ΕΙΜΕ ΕΝΕΖ ΝΨΝΙΠΟΜΕ ΤΗΡΟΥ... 

ΕΞΕ- / (ibid. 153) ΝΤΑΝΙΜ ΝΨΨΜΕ Ρ-ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣ ΕΕΡΖ, through (A 2 453) ΝΤΑΝΨΨΜΕ ΖΤΙΝΙΜ ΕΕΡΖ ΕΞΕ- / (A 1 77) 

ΝΤΑΥΧΟΟΣ ΕΝΙΜ ΕΝΕΖ ΕΞΕ-, to (A 2 151) ΝΤΑΝΙΜ ΕΕΡΖ... ΖΑΙ / (A 2 18) ΝΤΑΝΙΜ ΝΨΨΜΕ ΕΝΕΖ ΚΑΝΕΝΟΥ ΖΜΠΟΣΕ 

/ (RE 10 162a 5) ΝΙΜ ΕΝΕΖ ΠΕΝΤΑΧΕΙΡΕ ΝΑΚ ΝΨΟΡΝ... / (Young II) ΝΙΜ ΔΕ ΖΨΨΨΜΕ ΕΝΕΖ ΠΕΤΝΑΥΤΡΨΠ-ΑΛΑΥ...

115 Postadjunctive, adverbal ΖΝΟΥΜΕ is a near-synonym (III 158.28, Ench. 80b).

1.3.6.2 Initially, we find only ΧΙΛΕΝΕΣ, 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 ΕΠΣΑΕ “finally”, initial (premodifer) only, usually ΕΠΣΑΕ ΔΕ — (contextually marked): (III 103.20) ΕΠΣΑΕ ΔΕ ΑΥΜΟΥΤΟΥ / (A 1 260) (on children’s playful constructions) ΕΠΣΑΕ ΔΕ ΨΑΥΤΑ-ΚΟΟΥ ΘΡΟΥ / (IV 8.12) ΕΠΣΑΕ ΔΕ ΛΥΖΙΤΟΤΟΥΤΟΥ ΕΠΡΡΟ ΜΠΙΡΨ. Also A 2 166, P 131\(^{4}\) 151 Μ.

1.3.7.2 ΕΠΠΡΨ is the native equivalent (showing also formal similarity) of ΖΟΛΙΨΕ (§1.3.11.1.1):

1.3.7.2.1 Postadjunctively, adverbially (ΕΠΠΡΨ is only postadjunctive): “at all”, “in any way”: (IV 70.23) ΝΝΕΥΚΑΑΕ ΕΠΠΡΨ ΕΓΡΕΥΕΙΡΕ ΖΙΝΑΙ ΖΡΑΙ ΝΖΗΤΝ / (ibid. 72.15) ΝΝΕΡΨΜΕ ΖΡΑΙ ΝΖΗΤΝ ΩΝ ΓΙΙΟΥ ΕΠΠΡΨ / (Ch. 187-8) ΝΕΨΡΑΦΝ ΖΑΓ-ΖΗΥ ΖΜΩΝ ΑΝ ΕΠΠΡΨ / (III 132.3f) ΕΤΜΤΡΕΥΒΝΚ ΕΣΟΥΝ ΕΡΟΥ ΕΠΠΡΨ (scil. ΕΠΣΑΕ ΕΝΤΑΚΕΡΗΤ ΖΜΩΝ ΝΑΥ) / (P 130\(^{4}\) 36 vo) ΠΧΑΑΕ ΑΧΑΝΑΧΨΡΕ ΝΑΥ ΕΒΟΛ ΕΠΠΡΨ. In two instances, we may have ΠΕΠΡΨ for ΕΠΠΡΨ (zeroing ε–? : A 2 310, 311, uncollated).

1.3.7.2.2 Ad nominally: “What(s)ever “, expanding only ΛΛΛΥ, usually ΓΕΛΑΑΥ — note the placement: (A 2 313-314) ΓΕΛΑΑΥ ΝΖΟΝ ΕΠΠΡΨ ΝΤΕΝΨΜΛΑ / ΓΕΛΑΑΥ ΝΡΨΜΕ ΕΠΠΡΨ ΝΕΨΡΕΙΤΑΝΟΣ / (ibid. 258-9) ΓΛΛΥ ΝΜΕΛΟΣ ΕΠΠΡΨ / (IV 59 13) ΑΛΛΥ ΝΡΑΝ ΝΤΕΙΖΕ ΕΠΠΡΨ / (P 130\(^{4}\) 15 ro) ΛΛΛΥ ΝΡΨΜΕ ΖΟΛΙΨΕ... ΛΛΛΥ ΝΝΚΑ ΕΠΠΡΨ... ΛΛΛΥ ΝΖΟΟΥ ΕΠΠΡΨ. Also III 90.1, IV 58.14f., 112.1f., A 2 316.

1.3.7.3.1 ΕΠΝΙΞΨ “in vain. uselessly, with no effect, for no reason, without provocation”\(^{118}\). Postadjunctive, adverbal: (III 124.12) ΑΨΨ ΑΝΟΚ ΝΤΛΨΨΕ ΕΙΜΟΣΤΕ ΜΨΤΖΙΟΤΩΨΙ ΕΠΝΙΞΨ (sim. ibid. 131.4, 139.15.27) / (ibid. 123.8) ΝΑΥ ΔΕ ΝΖΕ ΕΠΝΙΞΨ-ΝΑΙ ΕΤΜΨΑΙ ΝΖΩΝ Ν ΝΤΑΨΜΜΟΟΥ ΕΠΝΙΞΨ / (Ch. 96.5f) ΕΤΣΨΡΜΕΣ ΕΠΝΙΨΨ / (P 131\(^{6}\) 30 ΡΜΕ) ΝΖΙΣΕ ΕΤΨΨΟΟ ΕΠΝΙΨΨ... ΝΤΕΝΤΑΙΟ ΜΜΩΝ ΑΝ ΕΠΝΙΨΨ. Also III 30.22f., 123.8, IV 81.11f., 94.15f., 106.12, 116.22f., P 131\(^{6}\) 19 ro, 130\(^{4}\) 139 ΤΜΣ (+–ΤΨΨΝ ΕΠΝΙΨΨ “without provocation”). ΕΠΝΙΨΨ is often focalized by a Second Tense: (A 1 446) ΕΡΕΨΨΟΥΞΕ ΜΝΨΨΜΨ ΥΨΨΟΝ ΕΠΝΙΨΨ / (A 2 415) ΝΤΛΨΨ-ΖΙΣΕ ΕΠΝΙΨΨ ΑΨΨ ΝΤΛΨΨΑ-ΖΧΙΕ ΕΠΝΙΨΨ ΑΨΨ ΝΤΛΨΨΑ ΕΖΡΑΙ ΖΑΤΕΑΨΨ ΜΜΨΚΣΕ ΕΠΝΙΨΨ / (Berl. 1613 1 ΚΕ) ΕΡΕΣΨΨΡΨΟΨΤΗΣ ΨΑΞΕ ΕΠΝΙΨΨ. Ad nominally, ΕΠΝΙΨΨ is less usual: (IV 94.15f) ΖΕΨΖΙΣΕ ΕΠΝΙΨΨ / (A 1 298) ΖΕΝΑΝΨΨ ΕΠΝΙΨΨ. Premodifier: ΕΠΝΙΨΨ (ΑΝ) ΑΝ–Ψ Α 2 131, Ch. 139. 19f., III 55.14f. For predicative ΕΠΝΙΨΨ see §1.1.2.1.

1.3.7.3.2 ΝΧΨΨΨ “without remuneration, gratis“, (rarely) “for no reason” is mostly opposed to ΕΠΝΙΨΨ: (Ch. 92.25f.) ΝΤΕΨΡΝΨΨΜΕ Ρ–ΨΨΒ ΝΑΥ ΝΧΨΨΨ, sim. (–ΨΨΒ) Berl. 1611 5 ΑΣ, P 130\(^{4}\) 113 vo / (P 131\(^{7}\) 25 ro) ΖΑΕΖΨΡΨ ΝΓΠΣΑΕΝ ΖΙΜΨΡΟ ΕΨΨΨΕ ΝΖΑΨΝΑΨΡΕ ΝΧΨΨΨ / (IV 160.17f.) ΝΧΨΨΨ ΥΝ ΖΑ-ΨΨΨΒΕΚΕ / (III 83.7f.) ΝΧΨΨΨ opposed to ΓΑΖΕΝΨΨΟΥ ΝΤΙΨΨΨ. Rarely, ΝΧΨΨΨ (neutral? consider Ch. 106.62ff.) seems synonymous with ΕΠΝΙΨΨ (A 1 276) ΝΨΨΨΝ-ΑΠΕΙΚΕ ΕΝΨΨΥΤΕ ΝΧΨΨΨ. Both are apparently disjoined in (Ench. 89b) ΝΕΨ ΕΝ[ΤΑΝΑΛΨ ΝΧΨΨΨ ΑΝΟΝ] ΖΨΨΨΗ [ΕΠΝΙΨΨ].

1.3.7.4 ΕΨΨΟΥΟ “too much, in excess”, postadjunctive: (P 130\(^{4}\) 131 vo) ΕΨΨΨΜΨΤΖΕΡΨ-ΕΨΨΤΕ ΕΨΨ–ΝΚΙΒΕ ΕΨΨΟΥΟ... / (III 133.20) ΕΙΜΟΣΤΕ ΜΜΩΝ ΕΨΨΟΥΟ / (IV 155.8) ΝΨΨΨΜΕ ΑΝ ΕΨΨΟΥΟ / (Wess. 9 140c

---

117 ΧΙΛΕΝΕΣ occurs adnominally (§1.1.1), in this status, also marked by Ν– (§1.1.1.1).
118 Cf. Gk. εἰς; Chérix 1979:100, Dictionary 747b (Crum does not indicate a difference between ΕΠΝΙΨΨ and ΝΧΨΨΨ, except for the preponderance of διαζόν as the equivalent of the latter). For the predicative ΕΠΝΙΨΨ (ΝΕ) see §1.2.1.2.
9ff.) ...παν χεκας µενεκαρνε επεζούν. Adnominally, we find (III 200.22ff.) µµαινοβε επεζούν and perhaps (130ś 40 µρ) µενεκτικαναρν µιονε µε επεζούν — unless the last example is adclausal.

1.3.7.5 For έπικλεσθε, see §7.4.

1.3.7.6 επικλεσθε (III 218.5ff.), επικλεσθε επαν (Ch. 114.53ff.) επικλεσθε-εν ζεκλούν επαν (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 ζεκλούν “(all) together” reveals a remarkable distribution:

1.3.8.1 Final, modifying a coordination: ‘Χ ΑΥΨ/ΜΝ-Υ ζεκλούν’: (IV 108.5f.) ΝΤΟΟΥ ζεκλού εγγλευ ΜΝ ΝΕΕΡΕΙ η ζεκλούν / (III 13.13) ΤΕΚΕΝΙΖΑΙ ΙΑΠΑΕΒΙΝ Χ ΑΥΨ ΝΕΕΡΕΙ η ζεκλούν / (ibid. 63.9f.) ΚΕΝΤΗΣΕΝ ΕΝΑΛΕΠΩΝ ΕΜΑΤΕ ΜΝ ζεκλούν ΖΕΚΛΟΥΝ ΕΚΠΟΓΕΝΚΕΝΘΗΣ ΕΓΟΥ / (P 131ś 157 vo) ΕΓΩΝΑΧΕ ΕΡΕΝΕΤΑΧΕ ΜΜΟΥ ΜΝΕΝΙΤΙΚΕΤΕ ΝΑΥ ΝΑΕ ΕΡΕΑΙ ΝΕΚΤΗΣΕ ΝΕΚΤΑΚΕ ΖΕΚΛΟΥΝ.

1.3.8.2 Ad(prenominal) (in fact augential — see Ch. 6, esp. §6.1), modifying a (usually plural) pronoun, often with (and following) θηριω: (P 131ś 87 παλ ΑΥΨ ΕΟΒΑ ΖΕΚΛΟΥΝ / (IV 191.7f.) ΕΓΩΝΟΝ ΤΗΡΙΩΝ ΖΕΚΛΟΥΝ ΝΤΟΟΥ ΡΕΝΤΙΝΟΥΠΕ ΜΜΗΣ / (A 2 299) ΕΡΕΝΕΣΟΥ ΖΕΚΛΟΥΝ (addressed to the congregation), adverbal? Cf. (ΕΟΒΑ ΖΕΚΛΟΥΝ) IV 158.16, A 2 298 / (A 2 292) ΕΡΕΝΕΣΟΥ ΖΕΚΛΟΥΝ / (IV 89.2f.) ...ΝΕΝΝΕ ΜΗ ΖΕΚΛΟΥΝ ΝΑΥ ΖΕΚΛΟΥΝ / (P 131ś 23 [68]) ΑΝΩΝ ΘΗΡΙΩΝ ΖΕΚΛΟΥΝ ΜΑΡΕΝΕΝΟΥ-ΝΟΥΤΕ / (P 130ś 37 vo) ΟΥΟΝ ΝΙΜ ΖΕΚΛΟΥΝ ΝΤΑΤΑΝΤΖΟΥΤΟΥ. Also IV 67.8, A I 68, P 131ś 86 παλ.

1.3.9 ΤΩΝΕ, (rarely) ΤΩΝΟΥ “very (much),” “greatly” is always postadjunctively adverbal, and expands only the present tense: (A I 58) ΤΗΡΘΑΤ ΤΩΝΕ ΝΤΑΤΟΥ, ΤΕΑΥΝΕΙ ΤΩΝΕ / (ibid. 68) ΤΕΑΥΝΕΙ ΤΩΝΕ / (A 2 319) ΤΕΡ-ΤΗΡΗΣΕ ΜΜΧΤΝ ΤΩΝΕ / (III 25.6) ΤΗ ΤΗΡ-ΣΜΟΤ ΤΩΝΕ / (ibid. 117.17) ΤΕΑΥΝΙΚΕΚΕΝ ΜΜΧΤΝ ΤΩΝΟΥ / (IV 193.9) ΑΚΤΕ-ΕΟΒΟΥ ΜΝΟΥΤΕ ΤΩΝΕ ΣΜΝΕΚΣΚΜΑ.

1.3.10 ΑΥΨ “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 coordinative conjunction.120 The modifier status of ΑΥΨ is made conspicuous by the grammatical asymmetry of its flanking constructions (especially — a typical figure — basic tense + ΑΥΨ + circumstantial, mostly Nom. Sentence and perfect)121; this is a significant normal phenomenon rather than a violation of coordination restrictions — indeed, this is not an adjectival modification in its usual accepted sense: (A I 171) ΝΕΑΡΧΕΙ ΚΕ ΝΕ-ΠΕΤΟΣΟΥΝ ΑΥΨ ΕΝΤΟΥ ΤΟΝ ΠΕΤΟΣΟΥ / (Ch. 79.51f.) ΝΑΥ ΝΣΕ ΠΕΟΥΣΟΥ ΑΝ ΝΕ ΠΕΟΥΣΟΥ ΝΝΑΙΜΥΝ, ΑΥΨ ΕΝΟΥΣΟΥ ΝΝΑΙΜΥΝ ΝΕ ΠΕΟΥΣΟΥ / (IV 24.2ff.) ΑΥΨ-ΠΗΙΑΒΟΑΟΣ ΝΒΛΑΕ, ΑΥΨ ΕΟΥΒΛΑΕ ΡΨ ΝΕ / (ibid. 75.20f.) ...ΤΠΟΡΝΑ ΜΝΙΧΙΟΥΕ ΜΝΒΟΑ ΜΝΣΒΒ ΝΙΜ ΕΟΥ- ΣΟΥΣ ... ΑΥΨ ΕΝΑΙ ΠΕΤΟΣΑΕ ΕΟΥΣΟΥ ΕΤΒΗΝΤΟΥΙ ΝΕΓΙΝΑΧΕ (III 125.7f.) ΕΓΩΝΑΧΕ ΝΕ ΕΥΟΡΠΟΜ. ΑΥΨ ΕΞΕΝΟΓΕ

---

119 Cf. the grammaticalized Bohairic επικλεσθε (TEIN) — (STERN §§470-2, MALLON-MALINEE §§271, 273). In Sahidic, we may have a calque of the Greek εις/απεικονισθαι + infinitive (BLASS-DEBRUNNER §402.2.5).


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 up against a gradient, not dichotomic ("loan-words" vs. "foreign words")
phenomenon of assimilation. The assimilation scale can be established in terms of productivity, of inte-
gration in the Coptic semasiological system, and (sometimes) in terms of phonological structure and prop-
erties — 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 2oawc (2oac, 2awa) "at all", "wholly" (similar in function and distribution to eipthyc, §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) mepy-
nobe 2awa / (IV 69.19f.) Nney+2naay 2owa nteize / (Ibid. 99.20f.) nthesite an 2oawc / (Ibid. 93.6)
ncenokz an 2oawc ene1 mmooy / (P 131 156 7ee) N+n-zote an 2oawc / (A 1 105-6) nesywn 2oawc
an... eipthyc 2oawc smpatcwm / (III 43.5f.). (It is blasphemy to say:) Oynshye moy 2oawc emunct-
ncanacxm c'mmooy. More exx.: III 38.16, 135.25ff., IV 62.25ff., 94.1, 124.9, 200.2.25, Ch. 44.35ff., A 1
47, 97, etc. Less frequently, we see 2oawc modifying an affirmative verb, with the meaning "comple-
ently, wholly, totally, altogether": (A 1 251) eehz2 2oawc pwh (−pwh 2oawc in P 131 138 7m, 131 89 PAS) / (IV
124.7f.) nentnankto eynsh eynsh 2oawc. In this position, 2oawc (in contradistinction to eipthyc) may
be intensified by reiteration: §1.1.2.4.3.

(b) 2oawc (2oac) pwh- "actually", "on the whole", is a (relatively rare) premodifier: (K 928)
2oawc pwh nayenqwhm eho nay nape / (P 131 142 K) 2oac pwh eyshe-kyaat nkezwb ahozxy 2pwo / (III
36.15) 2oawc pwh nynaqtlice-pwh an — also A 1 47.

133 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)
Mink 1978:95ff. See now also Vergote in Young (ed.) 1981: 339ff.; Anba Gregorius 1981 is the most recent study in a series unfor-
tunately wanting in theoretical considerations: p. 205ff. on "adverbs".
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(c) *Adnominally, *τοαύτως, τοαυτοκ modifies postadjectively the indefinites ηααγ, ρυμε, τεκουα in the sense of "*what(soever)ever":* (A 14) ηεραυνη νηνευ τοαυτως, sim. IV 87.19f., III 92.9, K 921 / ηεραυνη νηνευ τοαυτως (IV 44.24, 45.4, 87.8f., 206.18, 81.5, etc.) / (P 1301 15 ro) ηααγ ρυμε τοαυτως... ηααγ νηνευ κατηγρι / (IV 107.29) τεγινει νη τεγινει νη τεκουα τοαυτως.

1.3.11.1.2 ΑΛΛΗΘΩΣ "truly" (cf. ΝΑΜΕ, ΝΟΥΜΕ, §1.3.5) occurs

(a) *Postadjectively, adverbally ("truly", "really"):* (A 2 464), parenthetically, καν έκσαν-ηες γε ηηνευ τενου ετβε-αλελεγε-ηες γαρ ΑΛΛΗΘΟΣ... / (A 2 174, Ryl. 67 τηθ) ηηνευ ΑΛΛΗΘΟΣ ηες ηηνη ηεια-καθαρτος, also IV 25.8.

(b) In a Nominal Sentence (§1.1.2.3) it is adnominal/adclausal (status neutralized), with a variation ΑΛΛΗΘΟΣ/ΑΛΛΗΘΟΣ: (A 2 402) ουγοτε γαρ ΑΛΛΗΘΟΣ ηε ναυ... / (RE 10 162b 16) γενεμιη ΑΛΛΗΘΟΣ ηε / (III 115.26ff.) ουταλαιπινηος ΑΛΛΗΘΟΣ ηε... ουμαθαριος ον άλληθος ηνογο πε... Also Ch. 195.3ff., A 2 395, Cat. 43.28.

(c) Initially — always — the premodifier ΑΛΛΗΘΩΣ means "indeed", "really": (A 2 191) ΑΛΛΗΘΩΣ ΚΟ ΜΜΝΠΡΕ ΕΡΟΚ ΜΑΥΑΑΚ / (ibid. 473) ΚΑΙ ΥΑΡ ΓΑΡ ΑΛΛΗΘΩΣ ΟΥΓΟΤΕ ΠΕ ΧΟΟΣ / (IV 25.2f.) ΑΛΛΗΘΟΣ ΟΥΥΠΕ ΑΗΨΗ ΟΥΥΠΗ ΠΕ ΝΑΥ / (III 107.6) ΑΛΛΗΘΟΣ ΝΝΑΡΓΑΙ ΖΗΣΕ ΒΗΣΗ-ηε, see §1.2.1.3.3 / (P 1304 71 ζεω) ΑΛΛΗΘΟΣ ΚΕΝΑΛΚΟΥΝ ΠΑΟΒΙ ΝΙΜ ΕΒΟΟΥ. Also III 114.21, 161.29f., 212.17. Wess. 9 145b 29ff. ΜΑΛΛΟΝ ΔΕ ΑΛΛΗΘΟΣ ΔΕ- (Ch. 129.21ff.) with the varia lectio ΜΑΛΛΟΝ ΔΕ ΑΛΛΗΘΟΣ (III 35.2) could also be interpreted as ΑΛΛΗΘΟΣ expanding ΜΑΛΛΟΝ (§1.3.11.2.5).

(d) *Adnominally, ΑΛΛΗΘΟΣ/ΑΛΛΗΘΟΣ is rather rare compared with ΝΑΜΕ: (A 2 18) ΠΘΟΩ ΑΛΛΗΘΟΣ / (RE 10 164a 4) ΖΕΝΕΒΕ ΑΛΛΗΘΟΣ / (Cat. 42.29) ΠΕΥΒΗΡ ΕΒΟΟΥ ΑΛΛΗΘΟΣ ΝΝΕΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ.

1.3.11.1.3 ΚΑΛΩΣ "well", "rightly", "beneficially" 125 and ΚΑΚΩΣ "badly", "harfully, with evil intent", "ill" occur

(a) *Postadjectively — very often clause-finally, thus probably adclausal rather than adverbal: (III 80.17) το αγη καλως ναυς ΚΑΛΩΣ, sim. ibid. 111.23f. / (ibid. 220.23) ΝΕΝΤΑΥΘΑΚΗ ΕΒΟΑ ΝΕΝΤΑΥΘΑΚΗ ΚΑΛΩΣ, sim. (ΕΗΣΗ ΕΒΟΑ ΚΑΛΩΣ) IV 4.5 / (P 1304 139 ro) ΕΑΥΚΤΗΡΙΟ ΕΑΡ ΚΑΛΩΣ ΕΜΑΤΕ / (IV 157.2f.) ΝΟΙ ΝΝΕΓΡΑΦΗ ΚΑΛΩΣ / (A 2 498) ΠΕΝΝΙΤΑΠΗΤΟΥΑΜ ΧΟΟΣ ΚΑΛΩΣ, ΝΟΤΩΝ ΚΑΛΩΣ / (ibid. 333) ΧΟΥΝ ΚΑΛΩΣ ΝΝ-ΠΑΚΧΕ ΑΗΨΗ ΧΕΑΝ ΚΑΛΩΣ ΝΝΗΒΑΑ / (IV 95.10) ΝΝΕΡΙΜΗΣ ΚΕΚ-ΤΕΓΙΝΟΤΕ ΕΡΩΗ ΚΑΛΩΣ, with many more exx., e.g. III 93.2, 110.1, 119.10f., 153.8, 217.13f., 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 ΑΠΕ-ΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ ΤΚΑΜΩΝ / (IV 8.4) ΚΑΛΩΣ ΑΠΕΧΟΟΣ / (Ch. 104.37f.) ΚΑΛΩΣ ΑΚΚΗ-ΝΑΙ / (P 1304 109 ro) ΚΑΛΩΣ ΟΥΝ ΑΤΕΓΡΑΦΗ ΥΑΙΣΗ — more often, both ΚΑΛΩΣ and ΚΑΚΩΣ tend to predicative status 126: either focalized by a Second Tense/circumstantial topicalization form (§2.6.1): (A 2 338) ΕΤΕ-ΝΑΙ ΚΑΛΩΣ ΕΑΥΣΗ ΜΜΟΣ / (P 1304 122 AΒ) ΚΑΛΩΣ ΑΙΣΗ ΔΙΑΙΚΑΛΩΣ ΕΑΥΣΗ... in the "# modifer -φ - predication pattern (§1.3.1.3.3) or before a conditional topicalization form: (III 222.4f.) ΚΑΛΩΣ ΝΝΟΥ ΕΝΤΑΝΑΓΩΝ ΕΒΟΑ ΝΝΕΝΝΟΒΕ.

(c) *Adnominally, we find ΚΑΛΩΣ modifying only a verb-nominalization: (A 2 547) ΤΕΓΙΝΕΙ ΥΑΡΟΟΥ ΚΑΛΩΣ ΖΗΝΝΑΓΑΕΛΟΣ.

125 See Abel 1876-7:549ff. for a conceptual study of ξαλως (cf. Blass-Debrunner §102.3).
1.3.11.1.4 ZOMWS “nevertheless”, “at all events”, “however that may be, for all that, even so” (licet, quoad minus) and ZOMOIC (often spelled ZOM(A)IC) “likewise, similarly”, are to an extent functionally conflated in our corpus, with ZOMOIC encroaching on the semasiological range of ZOMWS.

(a) Questionably, postadjunctively-adverbially: ZOMOIC only (not ZOMWS): (III 99.14) ΑΜΟΥΤΕ ΕΡΟΥ ΖΟΜΟΙΩΣ / (A 2 262) ΕΥΝΑΙΕΡΕ ΝΑΙ ΖΩΜΑΙΟΣ ΚΑΤΑΠΕΙΝΟΥΧΑ / (Ibid. 378-9) ...ΕΤΡΕΠΑΝΠΙΣΤΟΣ ΠΡΙΜΗΔΑΔ ΑΙΩΝ ΠΡΙΣΜΟΣ ΖΩΜΟΙΩΣ, Ν ΧΕΙΝΕΙΣΕΒΗΣ ΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΣ ΧΕΙΝΕΙΣΕΒΗΣ ΖΩΜΟΙΩΣ — in all cases I would prefer an ad-(pro)nominial interpretation (“to him too”, “the believer likewise”) — compare the adnominal pre-modifier in (III 220.21) ΝΥΟΡΝ ΜΕΝ ΝΕΠΙΚΟΙΝΩΝΟΣ, ΖΟΜΟΙΩΣ ΜΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΕΡΟΣ.

(b) Initially we find both as additive or concessive conjuncts: ZOMWS “nevertheless”: (A 1 382) ZOMWS ΕΕΙΟΥ ΝΑΙ ΜΑΤΗΣΗΕ ΕΡΟΥ ΝΕΙΝΕΣΑΛΟΝΝΗ / (III 13.9) ΖΟΜΟΙΩΣ ΑΝΕΙΝΑΔΑΟΟΟΧ ΑΗ ΧΕΙΝΟΥ / (Ch. 125.10ff.) ΖΟΜΟΙΩΣ ΕΙΝΑΙΤΕΛΛΕ ΕΘΟΛ / (Ibid. 128.33ff.) (even though I do not wish to say it) ΖΟΜΟΙΩΣ ΕΤΕΒΕΥΕΛΕ ΕΘΟΛΝΕΙΣΤΗΜ ΝΙΝΑΝΟΧΟΥ, sim. Ibid. 57.51 ff., 80.15ff. ... ZOMOIC “nevertheless”: (IV 195.8ff.) (Even if there are people who are not able to hear that “the Kingdom of God is not eating and drinking”) ΖΩΜΑΙΟΣ ΜΠΟΥΤΕ ΠΕΤΑΧΩΝ (sic) ΠΟΥ ΧΕΙΝΕΠΙΝΝΑΔΕ ΜΑΛΑ ΕΥΝΑΙΕΤΕΛΛΕ ΑΗ, ... / (A 2 464) ΚΑΝ ΕΘΟΛΝ ΕΗΝΕ ΜΠΟΥΤΕ ... ΖΟΜΟΙΩΣ ΤΑΝΑΓΚΗ ΝΕΡΩΝ ΤΗ ΕΤΡΑΔΑΟΟΟΧ. ZOMOIC “likewise”: (III 66.12f.) ΖΟΜΟΙΩΣ ΔΕ ΟΝ ΤΑΙΝΑΘΗΚΗ ΝΒΡΕ ΕΣΤΙ ΟΥΒΕ ΝΕΠΙΛΟΟΧΕ (v.l. ZOMAIOS); 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. (ZOMAIOS/OMOIWS).

1.3.11.1.5 PANTWS (PANTOS 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 protasis being ΕΙΝΑΙΔΑΔΕ, ΕΘΟΛΝ - or the protasis-equivalent ΠΕΤΘΕΝΔΑΔΕ, ΠΕΤΘΑΔΕ): (A 2 535) ΕΡΩΜΑΝΝΕΠΣΕΤΕΡΘΥ ΕΕΙΟΥ, ΝΕΙΝΕΣΑΛΟΝΝΗ ΕΘΟΛΝΟΥ, ΝΑΙ ΕΘΟΛΝ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΠΑΝΤΩΣ / (Ibid. 360) ΕΘΟΛΝ ΠΡΙΣΜΕ ΟΥΜΕ ΩΥΜΕ ΟΝ ΕΚΑΤΕ ΝΩΗΜ ΕΝΑΝ, ΧΝΑΦΑΛΑΙ ΠΑΝΤΩΣ ΕΝΑΝ / (Ibid. 165) ΕΘΟΛΝ ΠΟΥ ΝΑΙ ΝΑΙΕΝΘΑΔΑ ΑΗΝ ΕΝΑΝ / (Ibid. 249-250) ΠΕΤΘΑΜΕΡΕΙΝΑΝΕΙΣ ΤΑΝΑΔΕ ΠΑΝΤΩΣ ΝΕΠΙΛΟΟΧΟΥ / (Ibid. 214.10f.) ΝΕΠΕΙΤΕΡΘΥ ΠΕΤΘΕΝΔΑΔΕ ΑΗΝ, ΧΝΑΦΑΛΑΙ ΠΑΝΤΩΣ ΕΠΟΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΕΠΟΟΥ / (IV 182.15ff.) ΤΕΤΕΝΟΥΜΕΝΟΝ ΕΘΟΛΝ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΑΝ, ΣΕΝΑΤΑΚΕ ΧΝΑ ΠΑΝΤΩΣ. More exx.: III 24.14, IV 3.17ff., Ch. 134.48ff., 161.28ff., A 2 14, 165 etc. Rarely, adclausal PANTWS is found outside this configuration (“no doubt”): (IV 6.23f.) ΖΑΝΤΩΣ ΕΤΕΒΕΥΕΛΛΕ / (A 2 455) (explication of “ΕΘΟΛΝ ΕΒΟΛΑ”) ΕΠΟΟΥ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΠΑΝΤΩΣ ΤΕ ΠΑΙ ΕΤΕΒΕΥΕΛΛΕ ΝΕΠΙΛΟΟΧ ΝΑΙΔΕ ΕΘΟΛΝ ΕΘΑΙ ΔΕΥΜΩΝ.

(b) Initially, PANTWS 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” 130: (Ch. 55.1ff.) ΠΑΝΤΩΣ ΠΕΚΣΤΟ ΕΘΟΛΝ ΕΠΑΡΑΓΑ / (Ibid. 59.31ff.) ΠΑΝΤΩΣ ΠΗΝ ΜΠΟΥΤΕ ΕΘΟΛΝ ΜΠΑΙΚΑ / (III 196.16) ΠΑΝΤΩΣ ΠΗΝ ΜΠΑΙΚΑΙ ΜΠΑΙΚΑ — also IV 2.6, Ch. 56.29ff., 120. 21ff., A 2 454.

(c) The imported (unanalyzable?) ΟΥ ΠΑΝΤΩΣ 131 “not indeed”, “certainly not”, in a rhetorical question: (IV 2.20ff.) ΕΤΕΒΕ ΟΥ ΟΥ ΠΑΝΤΩΣ ΕΤΕΒΕ / (Ibid. 10.4ff.) ΖΙΝΟΥ ΕΘΟΛΝ ΜΜΟΣ ΧΕΝΕ ΩΝ ΠΡΕ ΟΥ ΠΑΝΤΩΣ ΖΟΕΙΝΕ ΧΕΝΟΥΕ ΩΝ ΖΕΝΟΟΥΕ ΩΝ.

137 Blass-Debrunner §450.2.
138 As early as classical Greek: cf. Kühner-Gertel II 280, 4; Schwyzer II 554, 582f.
139 See Mayser 2:2184, 170 on the placement of adnominal διυοικος.
131 Blass-Debrunner §433.2.
1.3.11.1.6 **Ontwç, Ontoc** "indeed", "in fact, actually", "truly" occurs only in initial position, and often (typically) introduces an apodotic present or future after εύξε- / εύξυον- protases, as a kind of superordinatory ("then indeed..."): (III 37.2, parall. Ch. 132-3) εύξε-θεντούμενει ετββο, οντωç χοιουΞη ληγον ετββον / (III 25.24ff.) εύξε-τεθνούμενει μηνούτε η τεθνή είç οντωç Τεθνημίπα Μηαβογ... / (Ch. 26.40ff.) εύξε-θεντούμενει-τεββαλεν ξε-ευναντίνιν εροç οντωç κούσβεμος Μηού εβολ αλυβ οροο-γοοε εροç / (ibid. 100.52ff.) ητνòν δε ιτετηνιμπρ-ζδβ ζηναι ηθρού ετρ-γοοε ηνòν, οντωç Τεθν-ζτηθν, οντωç τεθναθενει / (ibid. 79.19ff.) εύξε-παθενεθενç πετ-ζομ Μηδαµιμεν εηραι εθσιç, οντωç ουµακαριοç Πε πεςβενεç. 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, οntwç occurs mostly before the present tense or Nominal Sentence: (III 75.16) οntwç ουαοντ ζησιç αλυβ ουσαπε Πε / (215.2ff.) οntwç ηναιενη Πε ον ηναιεθαι, also III 13.5, 114.27 (fut.), 212.9ff., Ch. 169.22ff. It is unusual with the perfect: (IV 7.11f.) Πεςαν ζε... οntwç θεουνει εβολ ηθρηθηθαυμενει ηθρευ ηνòν... 

1.3.11.1.7 **Varià**: (a) (ζαναθε) Γαπαωç 133, usually adnominally to Πωμε Νιµ, Ουον Νιµ, (but also adclusively), 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) ...αλυβ ζαναθε Γαπαωç ζωβ Νιµ εινονορε ζισση / (IV 54.6ff.) (following a list of toilsome tasks) Γαπαωç Γαπαωç ζωβ Νιµ εετομαζηζε νηηηη ιπαρημεγομ / (A 1 16) (following a description of a dog's physical actions) Γαπαωç Μεοοç δοοοοε ινης εααναθε εροοζε ζνοοοον ηεηηηηηηηη, also A 2 260, P 1314 13 vo. With the meaning "simply": (A 2 228) Πεαιεν εύσαβθηκ Αν εθαηη ηνοοον Νιµ Γαπαωç Ερ-παζε θθοο ηροο (hardly even to wealthy patients) — note κεηηεθ Γαπαωç "simply thus" (§1.1.2.4, IV 196.3, Ch. 162.5, A 1 204).

(b) Δικαιωç, Δικαιοç, before the First Perfect: (IV 9.22f.) Δικαιωç αυρωτ εβολ μηοοθυ ηκηνεθοο / (P 1304 54 ζα ηα) Δικαιωç αληθηθονοο εοοο ηεηεηεο, also III 109.13. Focalized by the Second Present/ circumstantial (§2.6.1): (III 47.3ff.) Δικαιωç ηηοοηε Νηηηη εηηηοος Εθηηηοοοο Νηηηη Νηηηη ηηηηηη / (P 1304 122 αβ) Καααωç αλυβ Δικαιωç ηθ... Postadjectival (rare): (Ryl. 69 Νη') "ηαθοο Νηηη ηηηηηηη Νηηηηηηη Νηηηηηηη..." (c) Πιηηπαικουκοç (terminological), postadjectival: (Ch. 208.25ff., Sh. ?).... ευηηηυεη Νηηη πιηηπαικουκοç.  
(d) Τεωç "so long", postadjectival (A 2 254).

(e) Ψαθηηητθουç "just so", premodifier (A 1 258).

1.3.11.2 **-οç-characterized modifiers** may — at least as one possibility — be interpreted as position-marked nouns 135.

1.3.11.2.1.1 The attitudinal Μοοον "but, yet", "only", "however", "besides", "at all events" occurs initially, adclusively: (IV 110.19) Μοοοον ινεθουκε ζραι ινεθθεν (sic) ηνοοιε Νιµ ζλοο... / (ibid. 173.4) Μοοοον ινεθουκε ινεθουκε ουοοου-ζν δεηεηεθεθηθεθ, also III 18.18f., IV 53.15ff., 56.11ff., 60.23ff., 66.12, P 1317 45 vo — all in a typical construction with a negative jussive form; in text- or paragraph-beginning: (III 86.16) Μοοον ηηηαυοο ηνοοον ινοο ηεηηοοο θεηηπεηηκε (sic) ζε... / (ibid. 182.1) Μοοον πεηηεηθα ινεηεηθε Ναιηηηηηηηη Ναιηηηηηηηη, also IV 114.16 / (IV 109.9f.) Μοοοον ηνοοου εηηαηη-λοοοοζ ζραι ινοο "only they" / (A 2 380-1) Μοοοοοο Μοοο ινοοο ινοοοο ινοοοοοο ινοοοοοο ινοοοοοο... Ναιηηηη ινεηηπε ινοοο Εηηηηηηηη... Μηηηη... Μηηηη πεηηηηη Εηηηηηηηη Μηηηηηηηη... "only so long as... ". Premodifying a noun-equivalent: (IV 4.9f.) Μοοον ηεηεηθεηθε ηεηεηθε Μηηηηηηηη Μηηηηηηηη, or a modifier: (IV 54.23f.) Εηηαοοοοοο Ναη..., Μοοοον ηεηποοηαζε Αν, so too (changing Leipoldt's division and punctuation) ibid. 162.21.

135 PrefisiKε 1.155 ( - suppl. 27).
136 It will be remembered here that the ex-adjectival morphs -οç/-οç have an allomorphic distribution in modifier status in Coptic: see §4.
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 (παῖς, πετ-, also ἔξ- with noun/modifier), but after ἄλλα the framework terms are looser, and quite a few possibilities present themselves:

1) 'OY MONON (ἔξ-) 135 noun, ἄλλα- noun’ may be the stereotype: (III 47.24ff.) ὁμιλία γαρ τίμιον, OY MONON ἔξ-νπος, ἄλλα ηκτῆμοι δειμνηθήσοντο... ibid. 68.18ff. (OY MONON ἔξ-νται-, ἄλλα ψάρια ἐν ἔξ-), IV 159.13ff.

2) OY MONON ἔξ-, ἄλλα... (ON) gives the impression of being actually superimposed on various textual segments: OY MONON ἔξ- [prothesis], ἄλλα [prothesis + apodosis] (III 16.19ff.), [extraposition] OY MONON ἔξ-, ἄλλα... ON (IV 15.10ff.), OY MONON ἔξ- [premodifer + verb syntagm], ἄλλα- verb syntagm (III 36.3ff. IV 156.12ff.), OY MONON ἔξ- [adnominal circumstantial], ἄλλα- [adnominal circumstantial] (III 76.11ff.), OY MONON ἔξ- [infinitive], ἄλλα- [conjunctive] (IV 4.10ff.). Simpler cases: OY MONON ἔξ-μευ-, ἄλλα ὑπό-ON (III 31.8ff.), OY MONON ἔξ-ἀυ-, ἄλλα ἀγ- (III 29.10ff.), OY MONON ἔξ-νται- ἀν, ἄλλα (ἐ)νποκε- (III 108.8ff.), OY MONON ἔξ-παγ-, ἄλλα (ON) σεῃ- (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 δὲ παῖς ἐξ-ἀιξούτην, ἄλλα αἰρ-ἀναγώ ON (III 139.10ff.), OY MONON ἔξ-ἀλλα ξ-ἐμοῦ... ἄλλα θεμα ὑπάργυρ αἰσθήματα (IV 22.18ff.), OY MONON ἔξ-ἐπηθεὶκε, ἄλλα οὐδέ 136 ἐν χίλιοι (IV 160.17ff.).

4) OY MONON + verb syntagm, without ἔξ-, is rare: (III 114-5) θανάσων ἔξ-ΟΥ MONON ΝΑΥΕ-ΝΠΟΛΑ... ἄλλα μάχων ON ΝΕΙ-ΜΑΡΓΩΣ.

5) "Solitary" OY MONON: (III 40-1) OY MONON ἔξ-ΟΥ ΝΑΞΑΣ ΕΡΩΘΑ / (ibid. 115.2ff.) OY MONON ΞΕΝΕΝΙΕΙΕ ἀν ἑν ἑνεκαίδη ΜΠΟΝΔΑ ΟΥΔΕ ΝΑΙΖΩΥΗ.

1.3.11.2.2 ΦΑΝΕΡΟΝ "manifestly" is postadjunctive: adnominal (verb nominalization): (Ench. 78b) ἀρχαίον ΟΧΕΠΕ ΦΑΝΕΡΟΝ; adnominal/adclausal: (A 2 485, P 1304 125 ΑΞΖ) ζενατόμετα ΦΑΝΕΡΟΝ ΝΕ / (III 208.17ff.) ΝΕΤΟ ΝΑΚ ΤΕΝΟΥ ΝΕΙ-ΦΑΝΕΡΟΝ. Expanding a modifier: (A 1 204) ΣΗΝΕΥΠΟΝΟΣ ΦΑΝΕΡΟΝ.

1.3.11.2.3 ΣΧΕΣΟΝ "almost", premodifying ΝΕΟΝ "almost like": (Ch. 119.47ff.) ΕΤΑΚΩΝ ΕΥΒΑΝΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΣΧΕΣΟΝ ΝΕΟΝ ΝΙΝΙΛΑΟΥΣ / (P 1304 105 ΡΚΣ) ΚΑΝ ΕΤΑΝΒΟΚΟ...ΣΧΕΣΩΝ (sic) ΝΕΟΝ ΜΠΟΥΕΙΝ ΜΠΟΟΣ, ἢ ΝΑΜΑΖΟΥ ΝΑΚ ΟΝ (i.e. the benefactor's property).

1.3.11.2.4 (?OIOΠΟΝ "well then", "thus", "consequently", initial (attitudinal, dis/conjunct) premodifer: (P 1314 43 P, not Sh.?) ΑΙΠΟΠΟΝ ΝΝΑΑΛΑΥ ΝΗΥ ΕΓΟΥΝ ΥΑΡΩΝ / (ibid. 63 vo) ΑΙΠΟΠΟΝ ΧΑΙΚΟΛΑ-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 ΣΗΝΕΥΛΛΑΜΟΣ / (III 77.19) ΣΗΝΕΖΟΥΥ, ΜΑΛΛΟΝ ΔΕ ΣΗΤΕΥΗ / (A 2 510-511) ΜΑΛΛΟΝ.
DE EGEennonporos ne neteipe MMOY "especially since", also P 1314 92 PMB; (c) MALLOV DAE + noun (=equivalent) "in particular" (III 222.9f., P 1304 122 AB); MALLOV DAE [neg. protasis + apodosis] "especially since": (IV 19.19) MALLOV DAE KE-ENEOYMRA mp an PE... NEVNAIPE AN PE / (ibid. 99.21ff.) MALLOV DAE KE-ENEOYMRA mp AN yay... EKNAPE-BOA AN. In MALLOV DAE AAMOSC KE- (III 35.2, KE-less variant in Ch. 129.21ff.), KE- may alternatively be understood as the formal marking of the inter-dependence of the clause and the premodifier AAMOSC, the conjunct MALLOV or both: cf. MALICTA KE- (below). (d) POCW/POCO MALLOV "how much more...?" is a rhetorical question, in apodosi after EYXE-, usually with a Second Tense/circumstantial topicalization form (§2.6.1: POCW was originally — and is synchronically? — focal): III 97.24ff., Ch. 74.54ff., 119.30ff., A 2 396 (+ First Future). Occasionally, POCW MALLOV occurs in the predication-presupposing pattern (§1.2.3): (III 42.3f.) EYXE-MOCHY AN EYOA NNAK. POCW MALLOV NNPYME / (Ch. 59.17ff.) EYXE-MOCHY AN NNPYME YOON NTEIPE; POCW MALLOV MNYUTE;... also III 29.23.

1.3.11.2.5.2 MALICTA (often similar in meaning to MALLOV) "certainly" 138, "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) MALICTA + predication form: (III 94.3f.) MALICTA MNXOSC KE- "certainly" / (P 1306 39 go) N MALICTA DE ANYMO EYMP EPOX / (III 22.16) MALICTA POCOSC PE KATAPARPE "even" / (III 96.2) MALICTA NETTNORHE... NAI NAME NE NNUOYME-NEUR-PIMEE EBOA "on the contrary" / (IV 178.12) MALICTA POCOSC PE AYSE TEOYIO TNYON GANINHB "so much more", etc.: more exx.: III 110.16, 183.24ff., 203.2ff., IV 86.1f., 153.10, Ch. 100.8ff., etc.

(b) MALICTA + modifier ("even", "especially"): (IV 78.8) NNAK POCOSC, MALICTA MPHAY EYTHANAYME / (ibid. 155.22) ...MALICTA SNTTO NNTSITTOYMPY. Very frequently with a circumstantial ("especially since", "considering that...", "actually"): (III 87.10) MALICTA ENNA EMHAY / (RE 10 161a 31ff.) EMHAY-MPOCO NOYHT... PENTAKTAMIOCH, NTX-OYMOIZE, MALICTA EAKTAMIE-PYMPH "how much more, considering that..." / (Wess. 18 128b 1ff.) MALICTA EKETEGRAPH PE-MNITRE MNYESHAXKE / (Ch. 53.7ff.) ...MALICTA ENH-XBEC PETSX MNOCO / (BMCat. 80, No. 195) MALICTA ENK-OUYO GYMH NNAZMPHSHY NTORCH...; also III 96.12f., 124.5f., 142.23, 200.18ff., IV 33.5f., 100.8f.

(c) MALICTA + 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., 106.1f., 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, MALICTA KE-: (1) a distinctive, well-attested construction of consecutive "prospective" subordination, MALICTA DE KE- + Future III or MALICTA KE- + 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) MALICTA (DE) KE- + conditional complex, "especially since": (III 51.2f.) MALICTA KE-ETITNAMACHTN-CASPION EBOA... NAY NEX ETITNP-BOA... / (IV 42.1ff.) MALICTA DE KE ENHTAYOBYE mo EYXAMOBYE... NPYEEME NNPYME NAYM. Compare Ch. 65.22ff. (MALICTA EYXE-... + apodosis, without KE-).

3) Especially since": (III 86.20) MALICTA KE-PAIPORC GOCE, perhaps also ibid. 103.13, unless here KE- is conditioned by a preceding verb. The nature of the dependence between MALICTA and the KE-clause is far from clear. KE- may be pertinent, (co-)characterizing (a) a consecutive construction premodified

138 Although the sequence introduced by POCW MALLOV is focal in relation to the topicalizing EYXE-protasis, I believe POCW MALLOV itself is focal in the apodosis.


140 Cf. MAYSER 2/1-53 ("adversativ-korrektiv").
by ΜΑΛΙΣΤΑ (cf. ΕΒΟΛΑ ΤΩΝ ΧΕ-ΕΠΙΑ-, §2.6.3.2) or (β) causality. On the other hand, ΧΕ- may be an exponent of an explicit syntactic distinction between the premodifier 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 ΠΑΛΙΝ (ΑΕ) ON "(and/or) again", "but then", "alternatively" — additive/replacive/item-presenting conjunct 145: a premodifier, introducing (often in a series of predications, quotations or in reporting) an additional predication: (III 54.19) ΠΑΛΙΝ ΟΝ ΠΕΚΑΧ / (ibid. 58-9) ΟΥΘΙΣ ΤΕ... ΠΑΛΙΝ ΟΝ ΟΥΟΟΖΕ ΝΕΚΟΟΥ ΤΕ... ΟΥΡΕΙΧΙ-ΣΒΙΣ ΤΕ... ΠΑΛΙΝ ΟΝ ΟΥΡΕΙΧΙ-ΣΒΙΣ ΤΕ / (Ch. 24.27f.) ΣΕΝΑΕΙΜΕ ΕΡΟΚ... ΠΑΛΙΝ ΟΝ ΣΕΤΑΓΟ ΜΜΟΚ... / (III 110.18) ΠΑΛΙΝ ΟΝ ΥΑΤΤ-ΚΕΟΥΕΙ ΕΤΟΟΤΗ. ΠΑΛΙΝ ΟΝ ΧΕ- is common in quotation series (A 2 340, IV 33.3f. etc.); ΠΑΛΙΝ ΟΝ may add a whole premodified complex: (III 71.14f.) ΠΑΛΙΝ ΟΝ ΖΙΝΝΕΙΠΟΜΠΕ ΝΟΥΣΤ ΑΕ ΝΑΙΧΜΑΛΛΗΤΟΣ ΕΑΝΟΟΟΤΟΥ / (IV 45.22) ΠΑΛΙΝ ΟΝ ΟΜΗΝΑΙΕΙΣΒΗΥΕ ΘΗΡΟΥ ΝΕΣΕΝ-ΓΕΝΡΧΙΝΗ... Additional exx.: III 110.1ff., 59.22, 90.7ff., 127.20ff., IV 1.17f., 127.4, 168.9, Ch. 68.15f., A 1 261-2, P 1314 157 vo, etc. ΠΑΛΙΝ ΟΝ may be used as a whole premodified complex (§1.3.10): (III 212.22) ("the roads are different from one another")... ΠΑΛΙΝ ΟΝ ΕΟΥΖΙΗ ΝΟΥΣΤ ΤΕ ΕΝΑΙΣΕ-ΝΟΚΤΣ Η ΜΜΟΕΙΤ ΜΠΕΣΕΣΡΗ / (A 1 75) ("The sins he says you have been forgiven") ΠΑΛΙΝ ΕΑΝΙΚΑΚΕ ΕΙ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΕΙΟΥΗΖ ΝΚΑΝΟΟΟΕΙΝ... ΠΑΛΙΝ ΕΑΡΕΨΙΣΤ ΜΠΙΣΙΗ ΕΕΜΠΕΖΑΟΣ... etc.

1.3.11.4 ΤΑΧΥ, ΤΑΧΗ "quickly". Here (differently from the -ON-group) there is no morphologically related "masculine" or "animate" counterpart 146. This is a fairly common modifier, invariably postadjective but for rare cases of secondary (prosodically motivated) intercalary placement 147: (III 40.6) ΝΕΤΠΙΧΕΤΕ ΤΑΧΥ ΝΥΑΧΗ ΝΙΜ / (Ch. 114.62f.) ΑΥΨ ΝΕΕΟΟΜΟΤ ΤΑΧΗ / (ibid. 132.31f.) ΑΝΤΒΒΟ ΤΑΧΗ / (A 2 5) ΑΛΣΙ ΜΜΑΤ ΤΑΧΗ / (ibid. 121) ΚΟΥΣΕΙΕ ΕΕΙΜ-ΟΥΚΗΤ ΤΑΧΗ / (P 1304 123 ΑΓ) ΣΕΝΑΣΟΙΝ ΤΑΧΗ / (1304 127 ΜΒ) ΕΝΕΜΠΕΝΧΙ-ΠΟΟΥΣΟ ΟΥΜΕΓ ΤΑΧΗ / (Wess. 9 140a 13ff.) ΕΧΗΙΤΕ ΝΚΑΤΚΙΒΕ 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 ΚΕ ΤΑΧΗ ΝΤΑΧΟΥΘΤ ΕΒΟΛΑ.

1.3.11.5 Prepositions of Greek origin

(a) ΚΑΤΑ "according to...", "by" (distributive), and ΠΑΡΑ "beside" 148, "in comparison with", "beyond" are certainly more common in all-Greek, more or less terminological, phrases or clichés: ΠΑΡΑΘΕΟΦΥΣΙΣ (III 224.19, IV 112.24f., P 1304 104 ΡΚΑ, A 2 459), ΠΑΡΑΘΕΣΙ (compound noun?) (III 77.24,

143 Greenbaum 1969:47ff., 59f. Compare the famous humorous application of adjunct-conjunct homonymy in Mark Twain's "Buck Fashaw's Funeral" — "he's dead again".
144 §4.2.2.1.
145 The diachronic question (here acute, but arising in each individual instance of non-native Coptic word) of why a given Greek lexeme was chosen to replace an Egyptian one (or, to put it the other way round, why this or that Egyptian element was destined to be replaced) is not pointless, even if almost hopelessly difficult to answer. (It but paraphrases H. Schuchardt's basic dictum that the history of linguistic forms is written — and must be studied — in terms of individual case histories, and not of wholesale change). Of course, one cannot approach problems of this order without a satisfactory structural-synchronic account of Egyptian and Coptic lexical systems.
146 See von Lemm 1972a:239f., Nagel 1973a:113ff., Anba Gregorius 1981:211ff., 217ff. I have found no instance of KATA in the sense "against" or "as for" (Godron, BIFAO 63:135-7 [1965]).
208.20, 216.4f.), ΚΑΤΑΓΕΦΥΣΙΟΣ (III 219.20, IV 113.2), ΚΑΤΑΣΚΕΥΗ (III 22.16, IV 31.1, etc.), ΚΑΤΑΘΕΜΙΣ (III 22.13, 220.20), ΚΑΤΑΝΕΙΜΙΟΣ (III 74.16, IV 59.16f.), ΚΑΤΑΚΡΟΙΟΣ (IV 21.18, P 1304 118 ΚΓ, Ch. 66.41f., A 2 379), ΚΑΤΑΣΟΦΡΙΑΤΟΝ (IV 54.14, Ch. 51.23, A 1 14, P 1305 28 vo), ΚΑΤΑΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙA (III 219.6, RE 10 162b 23), ΚΑΤΑΠΟΙΚΟΜΟΣ (III 214.6f.), ΚΑΤΑΝΕΟΓΡΑΦ (III 160.28, 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; ΚΑΤΑΘΗ and distributive instances are numerically perhaps more important): ΚΑΤΑΝΕΟΓΡΑΦΗ (IV 2.9) ΚΑΤΑΝΕΟΓΡΑΦΗ (ibid. 12.18f.), ΚΑΤΑΝΕΟΓΡΑΦΗ (ibid. 11.8), ΠΑΡΑΘΕΜΙΟΣ (III 134.19), ΠΑΡΑΘΕΜΙΟΝ (P 1306 65 vo), ΠΑΡΑΘΕΜΙΟΝ (III 143.1), etc. Of all Greek-origin prepositions, only ΚΑΤΑ and ΠΑΡΑ have pre-pronominal allomorphs (ΚΑΤΑΡΑ = ΠΑΡΑΡΑ: III 116.17, 117.5f., 11, RE 10 162b 8, P 1307 37 vo).

(b) ΑΝΤΙ instead of occurs typically before ΤΡΕΧΟΥΜ (less usually before the non-causative infinitive) in a common, indeed distinctively Shinoutean figure instead of (doing this or that), we (etc.) did/doing...: 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) ΖΩC as ..., as if it occurs as a premodifier, vesting 148 a circumstantial form, with or without ΕΥΣΘE (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 87 21ff.). ΖΩC ΕΥΣΘΕ preceding the autofocus Second Tense (§2.1.5): III 96.25, etc. Prepositionally, ΖΩC is well attested with native and Greek nouns: ΖΩΝΟΥΕ (III 88.24), ΖΩΝΟΥΜΟ (ibid. 135.5) ΖΩΥΡΑΡΝΟΟΣ (ibid. 40.14), ΖΟΥΑΡΙΚΟΣ (ibid. 63.8), etc.

(d) ΧΩΡΙΣ without ..., but for ... preceedes ΤΡΕΧΟΥΜ (Wess. 9 108b 21f.), the non-causative infinitive (III 25.4f.) and noun lexemes, usually in recurring expressions, such as ΥΨΩΝΕ and ΑΝΑΚΗ (IV 51.4, 98.7f., P 1307 69 vo); with other nouns: P 1307 15 vo (ΠΙΝΟΜΟC, ibid. 23 ΡΟH (ΝΕΧΕΗΚΟΝ), III 70.2, 11 (ΝΟΥΟΤΕ, ΝΕΥΚΕΤΒΝΟΟΥΕ), IV 95.23 (ΜΝΑΤΚΟΟΥΝ), 125.3 (ΝΑΙ), 157.24 (ΟΥΡΨΕ Ν ΟΥΣΖΕΙΜΕ), etc. ΧΩΡΙΣ is expandable by another modifier — a circumstantial: (IV 108.8) ΧΩΡΙΣ ΕΥΧΜΑΤ.

(e) ΠΡΟΣ relativley rare, seems to occur in fixed expressions: ΠΡΟΣΟΥΝΩΠΥ [ΠΡΟΣΟΥΝΚΟΥ, ΠΡΟΣΟΥΝΚΟΥ] for a (short) while (III 35.4f., 131.17, RE 11 15b 2, 16a 7f., RE 10 16a 25f., P 1307 7), ΠΡΟΣΟΥΝΟΥ for a while (A 2 105, P 1307 114 4, 1307 93 vo), ΠΡΟΣΟΥΝΚΟΥ ΝΣΟΟΥ (P 1307 38 vo, opp. ΥΔΕΝΕZ), ΠΡΟΣΕ (P 1311b 84 ro).

1.3.11.6 Greek loan-modifiers: miscellaneous

(1) ΖΩΝΟΥΕ consequently ..., and so ..., expanded by the conjunctive (§ 7.3.1.1), with ΕΥΣΘΕ (ibid.), premodifying the circumstantial (IV 87.4), Nom. Sentence (ibid. 183.2).

(2) ΚΑΝ ... 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 1307 71 ro (ΕΥΣΩΗΝΑΡ-ΠΑΡΘΕΝΟΣ ΑΝ... ΚΑΝ ΜΗΡΩΝΕΥΕ) etc.; before ΟΥΝ (Ch. 157.55f.), the present (ibid. 31.5ff.) and perfect (ibid. 138.5ff.); adnominally ("even", III 222.15); ΚΑΝ ... ΚΑΝ ... 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, ΕΥΣΘΕ or (rarely) ΥΨΩΝΕ, also with the circumstantial ("even if", "even

148 SHISHA-HALEVY 1972:168 and §0.3.2.
149 ANBA GREGORIUS 1981:221f.
150 BLASS-DEBRUNNER §374b (with Tabachowitz 41).
though": III 19.28f., 28.11, 22.9f., 40.16.19ff., 91.18, IV 3.27f., 114.8, Ch. 139.12ff., Wess. 9 140b 19ff., 179a 22, Ep. 56, etc.); less usually, precedes a basic tense in this role (III 93.20f., 23).

(3) (EN)ΖΟΩΝ, ΕΦΟΣΟΝ 154, "so long (as...)", "insofar (as...)", "as soon (as...)", usually with the circumstantial (ΕΝΖΩΝ is the more common): circ. present (III 27.27, Ch. 70.9, Wess. 9 152a 20ff., etc.), circ. perfect (III 31.23f., RE II 17b 42f.), 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.). ΕΦΟΣΟΝ is rare: (RE II 16a 27f.) ΕΦΟΣΟΝ ΓΑΡ (ΕΝ)ΝΗΧΕ ΕΞΩΥΝ ΚΕΝΝΕΙΣ: ΑΥΘΕ ΚΗ (ΕΝ)ΝΗΧΣΗ ΕΡΩΤΗ, ΧΝΑΟΥΣΗ ΜΠΗΧΑΞΕ ΖΛΑΜΝΟΤΗΤΗ. ΖΟΩΝ occurs (only in Ch.? with Basic Tenses ("insofar as"): Ch. 16.43ff., 125.19ff.; note the disjunctive ΖΩΟΝ... ΖΟΩΝ... ("a little... a little...", IV 162.2f.).

(4) ΖΟΤΑΝ 155, with the circumstantial future (rare: "whenever", Ch. 72.4f.f., in parallel to ΠΕΤΝΑ-. ibid. 73.34ff.), usually with the conditional, in the same sense (III 63.22, IV 63.6, 10.2f. — v.l. conditional without ΖΟΤΑΝ — Ch. 68.3, etc.).

(5) ΜΟΡΙΚ 156, "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 ΕΜΟΡΙΚ, in this case often premodified by ΑΥΘ (§1.3.10; see references in §7.3.1).

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

(7) ΕΙΜΙΤΗ "otherwise", see §7.3.1.1.

(8) ΤΑΧΥ (ΞΕ-) 157 "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 9 39) δια ταχυ ουνοζινε γιμπρευτθη εποις εναοος ξε-. Also for (rhetorical) interrogation? 158

(9) ΠΟΛΛΑΚΙΚ "often" (A 2 415, not Sh., before a conditional complex).

(10) ΕΥΤΑΞΙΑ (ευταξία, "in good order"): (A 2 257) ΔΩΚΙΜΑΣΕ ΜΠΟΣΒ ΕΥΤΑΞΙΑ "precisely" 159.

(11) ΕΚΜΕΡΟΥΣ (A 2 2) ΝΕΜΕΛΕΟΝ ΝΕ ΝΕΠΜΕΛΕΟΝ ΕΚΜΕΡΟΥΣ "in part"/"alternatively" 158.

(12) ΤΟΤΕ "then" (P 130b 83 ΡΙΑ) ΑΜΟΥ ΝΙΟΡΠ ΕΒΟΛ ΣΗΝΕΚΑΚΑΘΑΡΣΟΝ ΤΟΤΕ ΝΕΡΟΟΣ ΢Ε-ΠΑΣΘΗΡ.

(13) ΕΤΙ "still": ΕΤΙ ΌΝ ΤΕΝΟΥ (cf. ΕΤΙ ΤΩΙ ΨΥΡ Ch. 91.20f.); premodifying: a Nominal Sentence (III 89.6f.), a circumstantial form ("when still...", III 210.23, IV 191.12), ΟΥΗ (P 130b 66 ΟΡ) ΕΤΙ ΟΥΝΖΑΣ ΑΙΤΣΑΖΕ; adnominal (Young Τ).

(14) ΟΥΚΕΤΙ "not any more", with a negative clause: (Ch. 80.31ff.) ΑΥΘ ΟΥΚΕΤΙ ΝΤΛΟΝΠΗ-ΣΩΝ ΑΝ ΢Ε ΕΡΟΥ (for this ΣΕ cf. §6.0.3.2).

(15) ΠΑΝΝ "yet", "however" — paragraph opener, subtextual initial-boundary marker (III 117.20, 183.22, 84.8, 200.4f., IV 64.25, etc. 158).

156 Cf. Crönert 1903:98 n. 2; Preissigke 2.113 (+ suppl. 183); Mayser 1/3 120, 2/2 184 (Moric is usually predicative: §§7.1.3, 7.3.1 — cf. Brugmann IF 27:262f. (1910)). For (ΑΥΘ) ΕΜΟΡΙΚ see Shisha–Haley 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) ΠΑΝΝ ΞΕ-ΑΝΚΟΟΟΣ ΞΕ- appears to be explicative: "but since you have said...,", with a second clause (18.3) ΑΛΧΟΟΟ ΝΑΚ ΞΕ- "and I said to you..." and the main clause (18.6f.) ΜΗΝΗΚΑΛΟΥΝΕ ΜΗΝΚΟΟΥΕ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΝΤΑΙΛΟΟΥ ΝΑΚ ΝΑΙΤΑΜΟΚ ΞΕ-...
CHAPTER 2

THE ADVERBAL MODIFIER FOCALIZED: THE SECOND TENSE
IN MICRO-/MACROSYNTACTIC AND CATEGORIAL PERSPECTIVE
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2.6.1 Constituency; documentation
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2.8.1 Prosody
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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 Études de syntaxe copte, where it is treated on pp. 24-97 (with earlier tentative statements in Polotsky 1934:60, 63ff. = CP 368ff. and 1937 for Coptic, and 1940 for Late Egyptian and Coptic. Subsequent restatements of the pan-Egyptian category may be found in Polotsky 1960a:§§11ff., 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 verbal nominalization, with the privilege of actor (nominal grammatical subject) status in the Bipartite (# nom. actor + "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 Neogrammarnian 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).
² See for instance Horn 1980:63f.
³ A neatness more warranted in Old and Middle Egyptian (though rare exx. such as *Coffin Texts III 202 n jest jr.f tm.k swr wsrh" 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").
⁵ 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 absuifs'), 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?
⁷ 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 *m- an*, 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.
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, is 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 adjunctual/adnaxal modifier, with part

* See POLOTSKY 1944:82f. (= CP 186f.), 1964:276f., 1976:§2.1, 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-n-determined nucleus, the circumstantial represents the opposition terms, as it does after a verbal nucleus. Elsewhere an opposition obtains: the circumstantial expressing adnexasal, the relative attributive modification. The Second Tense and preterite converters, on the other hand, have a higher-level or macro-syntactic signalling function. The preterite converter 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. 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. Its incompatibility with Clause Conjugation forms is as much correlatable 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:

(a) (1) ε-, prenominally επε-, before the Bipartite conjugation forms, in fociation patterns (1) to (6). Note the following: επα- Second Future, sec. person sgl. fem. (A 1 50, 445, A 2 8, 11, etc.); the Akhmimoid ε- prenominally, rare (Wess. 9 146c 6ff. επυακε εκ-ζωοουγοιος CH2 TWN, v.l. επε- 129b 30ff.).

(2) ε-ουν- /-μν-18, patterns (1) and (6): Ch. 186.41ff., A 2 45, A I 415. Note (a) εμν- as a "that"-form? K 9316 μννκατπευγοιν-ντιογοιν θρη ω εμνκενουτε καιτ; (5) 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-.

(3) ε-ουντα- /-μντα-19, patts. (1)-(3): III 71.23 (cod. C), 85.14, Cat. 43.16, BMCat. 94 (213 AH), P 1314 19 MR.

12 Shisha–Haley 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 nê 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 vei,te, 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.
20 Polotsky 1960a:§21. 35.
(4) ε + "adjective-verbs" \(a\), patts. (1) and (2): ΕΝΑΑ(Α)- (Ch. 135.44f., Wess. 9 130b 23f. = 147a 2ff.), ΕΝΑΙΑΤ- (A 2 51, Cl. Pr. 33 1), ΕΝΑΝΟΥ- (Leid. 302 = IV 96.3).


(7) ΕΣΝΑ- (?) III 161.30: patt. (2) or (6).

(b) ΕΨΑΨ-, pattern (2): IV 18.2; pattern (1): A 2 479 ΠΗΡΗΠ ΕΨΑΨΠΕΝΒΑΛ ΝΝΕΤΣΩΚ ΠΝΖΕΝΗΡΠ... ΕΡΕ-ΕΣΝΑΨΗΜΕ.

(c) ΝΤ- (ΑΧ-) fluctuates with ΕΝΤ(ΑΧ-) (§2.0.1.1.2); patts. (1) to (4) \(a\).

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) \(a\).

In the Second Present (converted Bipartite) we find as predicate, beside the durative infinitive, also the static and the predicative modifier: (Ch. 76.46f.) ΕΨΗΧΖ ΓΑΡ ΝΤΕΙΖΕ ΧΕ- (A 2 114) ΕΣΨΙΩΝΙ ΤΙΝ (Ch. 19.19f.) ΕΨΕΠΙΒΑΛ ΜΜΑΥ ΕΤΒΕΝΑΥ / P 1306 119 ro ΕΡΕ ΖΝΑΖΗΤ ΖΩΣ ΜΑΥ ΝΟΥΜΗΝΥΣ ΝΟΥΠΗ / (Ch. 159.33f.) ΕΖΝΤΕΥΜΗΝΕ ΝΟΥΡΠ.

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 \(a\), in a second-power conversion ΕΝΣΑΨ- (analyzable, in IC terms, as Ε(ΝΤ(ΑΨ-...)) (pattern 2). This has a practical implication in a corpus where ΕΝΣ- (rel. perf.) is neatly opposed to ΝΤ- (Sec. Perf.). This is not the case in our corpus, where ΕΝ- and ΝT- (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 \(b\), or in "list-/catalogic style" \(c\) and other suitable contextual configurations), absence of coordination or disjunction may imply a (zeroed) circumstantial converter. Some especially striking, recurring or typical instances follow:

---

\[\text{Polotsky 1944:51} (= \text{CP 155}), 1960a:§37.\]

\[\text{Cf. Polotsky 1957a:231f.} (= \text{CP 232}).\]

\[\text{See Quecke 1979:440, Polotsky 1944:95f.} (= \text{CP 199f}).\]

\[\text{In Chassou, ΝΤΑΨ- seems to be the norm (with rare exceptions) for both converters, Sec. Tense and relative, except for line-final Ν- which is often written ΕΝ- (e.g. 42.34, 67.53, 84.12, 102.14 vs. 55, etc.). Elsewhere in Ch. ΕΝΣΑΨ- may be construed as circumstantial + Sec. perfect (e.g. in 150.24ff. ΝΟΕ ΝΤΑΨ (ΕΝΣΑΨΗΜΗΝΕ ΕΣΒΕ-)); not however in 158.1ff., where ΕΝΣ- (rel.) and ΝΤ- (Sec.) are neatly opposed.}\]

\[\text{Polotsky 1960a:§18.}\]

\[\text{See too Funk 1981:184f. (circ. of Sec. Fut. in "Middle Egyptian"). The relative and Second Tense converters appear to be incompatible (cf. Funk, TU 119, 1976, p. 58 n. 2, but see Polotsky 1960:405 n. 3 = CP 251). Examples which could be taken as preterite conversion of the Second Present (cf. in Boh. ΝΔΜΩΝ Ι Cor. 12:17,19): Α 1 241 (collated, Borg. 189 ΠΙΗΝ ΕΝΕΡΓΕΤΟΥΤΕ ΕΝΕΡΓΕΙ ΑΝ ΜΠΑΙΚΑΙΟΝ ΝΝΕΤΣΟΥΝ ΝΕ ΝΟΥΡΕΤ ΝΗΜ, ΝΕΨΙΝΙ ΝΟΗΝ ΝΑΡ-ΠΙΚΟΜΟΣ ΝΚΑΣΕ ΠΕ (not to be confused with the interrogative ΕΝΕ before the Sec. Present: Ch. 95.25ff., P 1306 66 or, BMCat. 79, 194 f. 4).}\]

\[\text{E.g. Ch. 84-5, 132.28ff., III 47.11, IV 198.1ff.; see Layton 1979:184ff., and compare Havers "veni-vidi-vici-style" (1931:153).}\]

\[\text{E.g. Ch. 32.36ff., 57.40ff., 66 passim, III 191.21f., IV 22.5ff. etc.; cf. the so-called "rhetorical asyndeton" and Havers' "enumerative Redeweise" (1931:114, 154).}\]
Chapter 2. The Adverbal Modifier Focalized §2.0.1.1.2

(1) εις -εις: the unique εἰςείς: (IV 107.5ff.) ΑΣΡΟΥ ΖΩΟΤ ΜΝΧΣΙΜΕ, ΕΕΡΕΣΙΜΕ Ο ΝΟΥ ΜΝΖΟΟΥΤ ΖΡΑΙ ΝΕΤΗΤ “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.) Η ΕΡΕΠΝΤΠΟ ΜΗΝΗΥΕ ΕΣΒΤΥΤ ΜΝΖΟΟΥΤ ΜΑΥΑΥ, ΕΝΕΚΕΣΤΥΤ ΑΝ ΝΗΣΙΩΜΕ... “... it being for the women that it is not ready...”.

(2) the recurring and formulaic εἰς όποιοι δὲ- “by which I mean to say...”, a Shenoutean expression, marking and introducing the “hermenia” after an allegory: (Ch. 102.19ff.) ΚΑΙ ΓΑΡ ΕΡΕΠΝΒΑ ΜΗΝΑ ΕΤΒΕΥΤΗΜΕ ΕΙΣ ΜΗΝΑ ΔΕ ΕΡΕΠΝΤΠΡΡΑΜΑ ΥΟΟΠ ΕΤΒΕΥΑ ΑΥΛΗ ΤΕΟΥΙΑ ΕΤΒΕΥ-ΖΑΠ / (P 1301 103 ΡΚΒ) ΕΥΧΕ-ΠΕΙΡΗΣΒ 2ΝΝΕΙΠΙΧ ΑΥΛΗ ΤΕΟΥΑ ΕΤΒΕΥΟΥ ΝΜΟΥΙ ΝΜΠΟΥΙΝΗ ΤΤΡΡΡ ΜΝΓΙΟΟΥ... ΕΙΣ όποιοι δὲ-εὐχε-πειρήςβ-ανον-ζεναβεύου ΑΥΛΗ ΑΝΚΟΥΝ-ΝΖΑΝ ΜΝΙΟΥΕΥ... ΕΤΒΕΥΟΥ ΤΤΝΑΡΑΒΑ ΜΖΑΠ ΑΥΛΗ ΤΝΑΙ ΝΓΟΝΣ. Also P 1314 155 ΑΗ, 156 ΑΘ, 1302 ΡΟΗ, 70 ΡΝΑ, 74 ΡΚΒ, 9316, etc., etc.

(3) εἰς ΝΤΑ-: (Ch. 146.52ff.) ΜΗ ΝΤΑΠΕΞΕΙ ΑΝ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΣΜΠΗΝΑ ΚΑΤΑΣΑΡΕ- ΝΤΑΤΕΚΚΛΑΝΙΑ ΑΙ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΝΖΗΤΥ / (Ming. 318) ΤΜΗΣΕ ΔΕ ΜΝΗ- (say, know or sim.) ΔΕ-ΕΚΣΥΝΩΙΤΑ ΜΜΟΣ 2ΝΑΥ ΝΣΑΜΟΣ ΝΤΑΥΙΙΥΟΥ ΜΜΟΣ ΝΑΥ ΝΣΕ / (A 2 312) ΑΥΛ ΝΑΛΟΣ Ν ΑΥΛ ΝΣΑΓΩΙΩΝ ΕΝΤΑΠΝΟΥΤΕ +ΟΒΝ ΝΑΥ ΝΓΟΥΩΡΧ ΝΤΕΝΣΕ (see §2.5.1.2) / (P 1314 87 ΡΑΒ) ΠΑΝΤΥΣ ΟΝ ΕΝΤΑΠΝΙΤΕ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΕΤΑΚΟΥ ΓΝΟΥΜΤΑΡΙΤΡΟΣ... ΝΑΥ ΝΤΟΧ ΝΣΕ ΕΥΝΑΙ-ΣΟ ΕΤΑΚΟ ΝΤΕΝΣΕ - ΝΕΛ ΚΑΙΔΟΧΡΟΝ - with the circumstantial focalization-pattern preceding a main-clause interrogative one. Note that the syllabicity of the Ν in ΝΤΑ- is maintained after the converter. / (Ch. 41.42ff.) ΝΤΑΠΕΞΕΙ ΝΕ ΝΤΑΤΕΛΛΑΥ ΝΑΥ ΕΥΝΑΠΛΟΥΣΙΣ / (III 95.20ff.) ΠΡΡΜΜΛΑ ΜΜΕ ΝΤΑΨΡ-ΣΗΚΕ ΕΤΒΕΥΤΗΝ ΕΠΑΟΕΙΣ ΝΝΚΑ ΝΙΜ ΝΕ ΝΤΑΨΡΜΖΑΛ ΕΤΒΕΥΠΡΗΜΕ “the true rich one, who became poor for our sake, becoming 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: adnexal complementation to ΤΑΙ ΤΕ ΘΕ/ΝΟΕ ΜΝΗ-, ΝΤΕΝΣΕ ΟΝ ΝΕ-30, or in the ΝΕ- appositive relative clause with a focalized modifier (ΝΑΙ ΕΤ- for unfocal predication) 31: (Ch. 64-5) ΝΕ- ΓΑΡ ΝΜΗΡΩΙ ΝΡΨΜΕ ΕΙΣΠΑΡΑΑΔΕΙΟΣ ΝΤΑΨΡ-ΧΡΟΝ ΝΑΥ ΝΕΙΠΑΚΧΕ ΕΝΕΠΝΟΥΝΕ ΝΚΡΟΥ ΑΝΓΝΟΟΥ ΕΘΥΒΑ “... while it is crying out voicelessly that the Enemy made them stumble by iniquitous counsels” / (Ch. 194.24ff.) ΝΤΕΝΣΕ ΟΝ ΝΕ ΝΠΑΡΙΧΡΗΣΚ ΑΒΡΑΖΑΜ ΕΝΤΑΨΡ ΝΝΙΝΟΣ ΝΜΟΥ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΖΙΤΜΝΟΥΤΕ ΕΤΒΕΥΤΗ- ΝΜΑΠΗΙΛΜΜΟ “... it being because of his love of strangers that he received these great blessings” / (III 142.16ff.) ΤΑΙ ΤΕ ΘΕ ΤΕΝΟΥ ΝΜΑΙ ΜΝΖΕΝΧΟΟΥΕ ΕΝΤΑΨΨΥ ΝΝΕΝΟΙΤΕ ΕΝΤΑΨΨΗΚΤ ΜΝΑΟΤΟΥ ΕΝΕΠΝΟΥΝ ΝΝΜΑΤΩ “... it being the time when they (the Fathers) were still with them that they disdained them” / (III 31.22ff.) ΝΑΙ ΕΡΕΠΝΤΛΑΓΟ ΥΟΟΠ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΖΙΤΜΝΟΥΤΕ ΜΑΥΑΥ “Those whose healing is from God alone” / (III 224.21f.) ΝΕΙΠΑΚΧΕ ΝΑΙ ΖΙΤΗΟΤΟΥ ΕΡΕΠΝΗΩΙΟ ΝΑΑΜΑ. 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 contextually constellations where a regular Sec.-Tense “event” might be expected.

Incidentally, no certain example of the Sec. Tense of ΝΕ- is attested in Shenoute (POLOTSKY 1960a: §18(f.)); a possible instance is III 203.15f. (‘Had you kept all your good deeds,) ΤΗΜΕΥΕ ΔΕ-ΕΝΕΡΕΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΝΑΝΑΧΕ ΝΝΜΕ ΤΕΝΟΥ ΝΕ ΝΤΑΨΡΑΧΕ ΝΑΡΧΑΙΟΣ ΜΝΖΑΖ...
2.0.1.2 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 apriori 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 syntagmatic/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 distribuational structure of ε- and (ε)NT- (again as if we are innocent of all historic and extra-Sahidic knowledge, and not taking (ε)NT-, εWA-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 (§§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>εME</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-, εME- (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 archmorpheme. Moreover, the circumstantial and Second Tense converters are compatible (§2.0.1.2) and

---

32 Diachronic information, at least from pre-Demotic Egyptian, points to the identity of the "emphatic" forms and relative forms (Poletsky 1976: esp. §§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.m.(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 synchronic systemic consequences: it is these we must report on.

33 So already Edgerton (1935:261ff.): "(separating the forms) seems to lack empirical reality".

34 Consider exx. of the type (A 2 463-4) ἔμπνευσαν τὴν ημέραν τῇ ἑτέρην φωνῇ, neatly showing the pattern way to defining identity.

35 No certain examples of adverbal circumstantial for εWA- are known to me (candidates are Wess. 9 91b 1, 140a 12, 145b 20). For εME- we do have some unambiguous exx. (III 94.20, IV 38.4f., Myn. 107). The circ. present appears to supply the circumstantial for the affirmative aorist (consider Ch. 130.46f., III 94.19, IV 15.24 etc.). (A possible "Middle Egyptian" example is Mt. 11:19: λαβεῖτε νεότατον ἢπρόσωπον εὐάνως εὐαγγελίου.

36 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(εvr) ΑΝ for the Sec. Tense, ε(νή/ν ΑΝ) 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 εvr-form as a thematic pre-focal component of a nexus — N.B.: no νή/ν ΑΝ in pattvs. (1), (3), (4)-(6); thematic ενγάν in (5) —, vs. non-thematic (rhematic or a nexus in itself, adnexal); 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: ε-, νή- 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 ζε/-ζέκαας είναι-. Is the converter circumstantial or Second Tense? Did the question have any meaning for the Coptic decoder of this syntagm?

### 2.0.2 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...
organization of the discourse\(^39\), 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)\(^40\) a "point of departure", 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. 199f., 211f.), i.e. on clause level, intra-clausal. (c) Halliday rightly stresses the presence of another independent yet related structure: the informational one, in 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\(^42\): the "given" segment — the (co)text-bound one\(^43\) — 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 reference 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

\(^{39}\) 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".

\(^{40}\) 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.

\(^{41}\) This linear-axis conception of the theme can be traced from Weil’s "point du départ, notion initiale" (1879:20f.), corresponding to von der Gablerentz’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 e.g. 1901:36ff., 369ff.). Similarly, Blümel’s (1901) → Z(iel) (1914); Bally’s (1950: e.g. §32) and Gossen (1951) → the → prop. → MÜLLER-HAUSER (1943) → the → 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 Handein zur Handlung"; see Haselbach 1966:211 — a rappoachment 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 (ρήμα) (Robins 1966:7ff.: Aristotle’s ρήμα, "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" — "which is known or at least obvious in the given context, and from which the speaker proceeds" (apud Firbas 1964) to Dąńık and Firbas’ improved version, separating utterance-level (theme → rheme) from text-level (given → new): Dąńık 1974, Jones 1977:60ff.

\(^{42}\) 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.

\(^{43}\) Sgall 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.
its information unit — prepares us for the focus, the hub and kernel of this structure. (HALLIDAY 1967: 200 ff., 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 (patts. 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 focus (rHEME) (patts. 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 explicit 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 YMMAY),

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 1967:204 ff.). See too DANEŠ 1974:109ff. This corresponds to the “Hauptbegriff” (not subject-dependent) definition of logical predicate (from BECKER 1836: 18ff. onwards).

46 See §2.7.2 for specific ≠ topic → (theme + rHEME/focus) ≠ schemes.


50 Cf. EBELING 1905:113-128 (“Dispiaccere 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), ‘ERAOHE’).

In the case of the Greek “Second Tenses” (ROSEN 1957, esp. pp. 135 ff., 150 ff.), the whole elai + participle syntagm is, in its external relationships, thematic; internally, however, it constitutes a nexus.


52 HALLIDAY 1967:213 ff., 216; DAHL 1974:18 (“emphatic topic”); JONES 1977:169 ff. (see also 3 ff., 6 ff.). 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” (1970:186 ff.) seems to include the prominent topic.

53 Not to be confused with focus or rHEME isolation (e.g. by the “question test”). See JONES 1977:68 ff., 76 ff., 87 ff. 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 focizational 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 "accretion"); (c) the "emphasis" value. This is an elusive, vague notion, evading grammatical frames of reference, subjectively envisaged on a variety of levels, from synonymy with "focality" to being relegated 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 1944:33f. = CP 137f.).

2.0.2.2.3 Focality may be (language-specifically) non-pertinent — conditioned or inherent (in these cases, not subject to co-textual 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 fo (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 (1967:207f.: "The unmarked focus does not imply any preceding information ").
54 Cf. THELEFF 1955:12ff. (semantic-psychologist, with sub-categorization into "emphasis", "intensification", "amplification", "strengthening"); HEIL 1879:9 (types: rhetorical, logical, affective, grammatical; an instance of "rhetorical emphasis", and a logical freak, is the case of two simultaneous focis in a single information unit; see §2.7.1.3.1, below, and cf. LÖPPE 1940:24); MOORHOUSE 1959:73f.; HALLIDAY 1967:203ff., 207f.; DRESSLER 1968:77ff.
56 Cf. the attempt at structuring in LÖPPE 1940:27f.
57 1944:29ff. (= CP 133ff.), 87 (= CP 191); CALLENDER 1971 (esp. p. 21. Callender discusses the relations between topicalization, 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 MÔRC - §1.3.11.6, or KÂWAC - §1.3.11.13; cf. §2.5.0.1). See PAUL 1920:§200; KĂRČEŠKI 1936:109. Strikingly comparable are the Irish "adverbs" which occur usually or exclusively in Cleft Sentence patterns: amhlaith "thus", minic "often", or éigean "hardly", Welsh haidd (y-), cf. our MÔRC in foc. 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 nœxal relationship, realized in Indo-European by the verb “be” as copula, with an additional arrangement (word-order) focalization procedure, viz. preposing 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“ ⁵⁰ 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 patts. (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 “paradeigma”, in the answer to a question, and in a description) ⁶⁰. 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 out 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’ definition ⁵¹: “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 — cohesional — 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). (e) 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>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td><em>NETXOCOE EUXOCOE ETVENEUPIAEIC NAGAION (A I 163).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>(a) <em>EPEPOYOEM MP002 MNNCOY N2HTC</em> (i.e. in the night; not even the nexus is new) (A 2 248).*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>(b) <em>ETVENAI NTAPEIN06 NCA00Y EI E0P0A EXMNEIZHOGMWN (III 26.8ff.; only the nexus is new; all terms are anaphoric).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>EPEPOAI NA0UPGE NAN (Ch. 88.2f.; PAI focal).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>NTAIXE-PAI EICOOGHN XE- (A 2 73).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>(a) <em>NTAYEII TWH (III 87.12ff., context implied).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>(b) <em>ZITNOY EA022 P-0UM0M0 E0P0T0H, MH ZITH- AN (A I 89, prius notum rhetorically assumed).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>(c) <em>EINNAYXOOGY THPOY AN (A 2 238-9), EUXI-60A (IV 51.17).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td><em>NTACSWTM ZITH01M ENE2 XE- (A 2 463).</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scale II:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>&quot;EYKAEEIT&quot; (Ch. 81.7; lemmatic role).*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;EUSUPHNE&quot; (A I 56), &quot;EIMOCOT MNOOY&quot; (III 123.1ff.): §2.1.4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>EYNACEI (IV 61.29, jussive), EUP-NOBE (IV 80.2 — all patt. (1)).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>*EINAOYEM-0Y (Ch. 105.17ff.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>EIO MNAETOI, EIO NA0NUEMWN (A I 43), EIO NAUSH N2E (A I 104).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>(a) *ZM0PO0Y NEOYXAE E0PO0 XEO0 NNAMT, NTAPE-NE0T N00Y0AT01 (III 76.19ff.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>(b) <em>ENAIAT0 AN, XE... ALAA ENAIAT0... EYWA0N (Cl. Pr. 33, 1; the whole configuration has high CD, inequally divided between the constituents).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>NTA0CMNT-MHP0E NAUSH N2E (Ming. 288), ETOBOY EK0 NKPOR0 (A 2 146).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>EPEIOYDA0 W000 TWH TEN0Y (A 2 53), ETOBOY... E0NA0YAT NCA-, ETOBOY NN0NA0YAT AN. NCA- (Ch. 72.1ff.).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td><em>ZITHNOY EA022 P-0UM0M0 E0P0T0H, MH ZITH0N0M0C AN (A I 89).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><em>EPEP0BA MMAH ETBENAY (Ch. 102.19ff.; all terms and nexal relationship - prius nota).</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.0.2.4 The syntagmatics of nexus: a note (see §2.8).

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.\(^{62}\)

this order reflecting the logical "marche des idées" 63, as well as the macrosyntactic "thematic progression" 64, the progression from given to new 65, low to high CD, the rhetorical ϕυσική τάξεως. (Indeed, thematic/thematic role is a matter of position rather than of pattern slot.) However, this ideal arrangement is in opposition 66 to certain focus-initial patterns which, while mostly understated 67 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 adnaxal 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, focalization signal</td>
<td>= information unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)-(3)</td>
<td>heterofocal</td>
<td>topic-constituent or topic-resumptive; theme: given information</td>
<td>less than information unit</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 68</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 69</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>

63 WEIL 1879:12f.
65 HALLIDAY 1967:205, 211.
66 "'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.
67 Mentioned by POLOTSKY 1944:48ff. (= CP 152ff.); cf. STERN §521.
68 Only for pertinent, i.e. not inherent, focality; only for pertinent, i.e. unconditioned, order (§2.6.3.1.2).
69 Often clarified as "given information" after the focus, i.e. the focus resolves the informational structure.
2.1 Theme/topic-initial patterns

2.1 The autofocal second tense construction: second-tense conjugation form — focalization pattern (1)

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 "ειθατμ" (etc., see next paragraphs) and "ειθαναι", with which we shall deal here: a high-CD, low-context-boundedness information unit: ειθαποσ "what they are doing is rejoicing", "they are doing nothing but rejoicing" (cf. Anglo-Irish "It's rejoicing they are"); ειθαναμε "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 ειθων (+ nom. actor): ειθων θανατωθεντ, ειθων θανατω... ειθων δε ναπαι... (A 2 336-7), Επεμενεκες των (A I 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): θαν - θανατ - θανατος, κων, θανος (not in the Bipartite pred. list); the anaphoric θανατος; the expanded modifier θανατος (θαν-). The internal nexus is usually affirmative, sometimes negated by (h) — an (§2.9.1.1.1): "Where is Judas now?" — ειθαναμε (A 2 53) / ΠΟΥΑ ΜΕΝ (of the animals) ειθαναααα θανατωθεντ, ΆΨΗ ΠΚΕΟΥΑ ειθααααααα αθανατωθεντ (Wess. 9 91a 26ff., parall. Sh. quoted in BLOr. 8811 CN) / ειθαςκυν εποβομενο αθανατωθεντ (Ch. 65.13ff.) / ΠΤΑΑ θανατωθεντ ΜΚΡΟΕΙΚ εποβομενο / ειθαςκυν εποβομενο εποβομενο (P 130+ 50 CK, cf. Ch. 138.27ff.) / ΕΠΕΙΡΙΨΜΕΝΟ ΝΤΟΟΤΣ θανατωθεντ ΟΔΕΝΑΜΕ / ΕΠΕΙΡΙΨΜΕΝΟ (IV 12.14) / ΕΠΕΙΡΙΨΜΕΝΟ ΘΑΝΑΑ ΑΝ ΕΝ ΜΠΡΟΜΕ, ΑΝ ΕΝΕΝΙΕΝΤΗΝ (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, ευναικ (=). (Ch. 70.49ff.) ΜΗ ΕΑΝΑΙΟΥΓΕΠΟΒ ΕΠΩΝ ΕΝ ΑΑΑΑΑΑΑ ΝΑΗΚΕ, ΜΗ ΝΕΑΑΝΕΙΕΝ ΝΟΥΚΑΣΟΥ ΕΞΩΝ, ΜΗ ΝΑΓΕΝ ΝΑΙ ΝΟΥΝΤΡΨΜΑ ΕΝ ΑΑΑΑΑΑΑ οιοι ΝΑΝΟΒΟΝ ΕΝ ΑΑΑΑΑΑΑΑ ΝΑΝΑΥΚΕ (the two Basic Future variants predicate -ω-) / (BMCat. 94, No. 213 ΑΝ) ΜΗ ΕΥΝΤΑΝ-ΘΑΝΕ ΜΜΑΥ ΕΞΟΝ / (A I 108 coll.) ΜΗ ΕΥΜΕΝΑΚΟΥ ΑΝ (i.e. the rags) Η ΝΑΡΕΩΚΟΥ / (Ch. 186.41ff.) ΑΝ, ΕΙΝΥΝΖΕΝΗΝΩ, ΜΝΟΥΤΕ ΠΝΑΝΤΟΡΜΑΤΩΡ / (Miss. 279)

76 Polotsky 1960b:§30.
71 Cf. Polotsky 1944:§2f. (= CP 156ff.).
72 Thesleff's (1955:14f.) "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-Polotskian grammar of Middle Egyptian comes here to mind.)
73 Polotsky 1944:§31f. (= CP 135ff.). Cf. Rosén 1957:149(f.) for this role of the Greek 'εμαλ + participle' "Second Tenses".
74 I have no exx. of Basic Tenses on their own as rhetorical questions. ζε-APA + Future I (Ch. 84.17ff.) is not a question, but an instance of the sceptical or half-hopeful nuance of ζεπ (esp. clear in ειλ, ειαζ, ειπ see Denniston 37ff.; Blass-Debrunner §375; Kühner-Gerth II 324ff.). In Coptic, ζε- indicates that APA here is not a second-position particle, but a clause-initial one (for the merging of ζεπ and ζεπ see. i.a. Jannaris §1748c; Kühner-Gerth II 318 Anm.; Denniston 44. Our ζε-APA may simply be: δε ζεπ - (Denniston 38f.).
2.1.3 Jussive/prescriptive/preceptive/promissive ενακωτμ. Affirmative, rarely negated; 3rd person, 1st person, rarely 2nd person.

(III 210.13) ενακαί (Ch. 192.24ff.) ΤΟΡΓΕ ΕΝΑΚΩΤΜΕΝ ΕΡΟΣ ΑΨΗΛΑΚΕΣ ΕΡΟΥΣ, ΑΨΗΛΑΚ ΕΝΑΚΩΤΜΕ
ΕΡΟΥ ("... and let it!") / (III 20.17f.) ΕΠΕΝΝΟΤΔΕ ΝΑΤΑΚΟ ΝΤΑΨΥΧΘ (apototic imprecation, opp. to ΝΝΕΙ-
negative pledge, εε- hopeful solicitation or self-promise) / (III 218.5ff.) ΕΚΕΜΑΣΟΥ ΝΡΨΜΕ ΕΠΙΝΩΣ, ΕΚΕ-
ΜΑΣΟΥ ΝΑΣΑΣ ΕΠΙΝΩΣ... ΕΚΝΑΖΑΡΕΣ ΕΡΟΥΣ ΕΒΟΑ ΝΠΟΡΤΟΡ ΝΙΜ, ΕΚΝΑΜΩΣΟΥ ΝΡΨΜΕ ΕΠΙΝΩΣ; / (III 19.6, promise) ΕΥΝΑΡ-ΒΟΑ ΕΤΟΡΡΗ / (IV 72-3, hortative) ΕΝΑΚΜΝΣ(sic)ΝΕΥΒΕΚΕ ΝΜΜΑΤ, ΕΝΑΣ (sic) ΝΑΤΑ-
ΜΟΥ... Ε ΝΝΑΝΗΣ (sic) ΕΞΕ-ΕΝΑΑΤΩΥ ΕΑΥ ΝΥΒΕΙΘ / (A 2 505-6, neg. hortative) ΕΝΑΚΑΘΙΜΕ ΑΝ ΝΕΝΑ-
ΟΜ Ε ΜΟΤΝΟΥ ΕΒΟΑ / (IV 61.27ff., neg. jussive) ΕΝΑΚΑΘΙΜΕ ΕΡΟΥΣ ΑΝ. Additional exx.: IV 103 passim (ΕΝΑ-,
negative ΝΝΕΙ); 61-2; Ch. 187.2f.; A 2 144; preceptive, IV 53.24, 54.3, 63.19, 71.2, 81 passim, etc.

This Akhmimoid isogloss 78 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 79) and that of its formal and functional relations with the conjunctive future syntags ΕΣΕ/ΣΕΚΑΣ ΕΝΑ-, which are still in need of thorough investigation. The co-existence of the ΕΝΑ- jussive with the classical Sahidic ΜΑΡΕΤ- 80 is noteworthy: the latter is marked as rhetorical, with the former preceptive and unmarked (ΜΠΡΤΕ- is common to both terms) 81.

2.1.4 "Quotation-form", glossing and lemmatic roles 82

2.1.4.1 The Second Tense used in quoting or attributing a subjective 83 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.

---

78 Jones 1977:179ff. ("high/mid-level themes, to define or open a subject area", 184).
80 Cf. Tobler 1899:18ff., Ebeling 1905:137-142 ("Che hai paura?", esp. 140), von der Gabellentz 1901:183. Note also the unmistakable functional affinity with the English tag-construction: "He ran, didn't he?".
84 See §7.2.1.1.2. In the "Vita Monachorum" passages we also come upon the special jussive ΕΤΡΕΤΕ-, 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 ΕΤΡΕ- IV 71.14, neg. ΕΤΡΕ- 66.12 (see Ch. 7, note 63).
85 Cf. Rosén 1957:149 (the Greek "Second Tense" in this function).
86 Cf. Polotsky 1944:39ff. (= CP 143ff.): here at least Stern (§601, 372) is vindicated.


2.1.4.2 LEMMATIC ΕΥΘΥΜ.: rare (cf. §2.7.2.4). (Ch. 81.6f.) KAI TOIGE AYXOC XE EUPHANEIT (Esa; this may however be the circumstantial of Gen. 25:29) / (IV 181.11) ΟΥ ΔΕ ΝΕ “ΕΥΘΥΜ “ (the source text, 181.10f., has ΝΕΤΕΡΕΝΟΥΟΥ ΟΥΗΣ ΝΕΨΟΥ. The answer here reveals a different, somewhat surprising possibility 86: “ΟΥΗΣ ΝΕΨΟΥ” ΠΕ ΧΕ-).

2.1.5 EΒΟΛΑ ΑΝ ΧΕ- (“not because”), 2ΧΗΣ ΕΥΧΗ- (“as if”) + Second Tense. These are two contextual constellations apparently calling (as an option) for a higher focality of the included verb:

(a) EΒΟΛΑ ΑΝ ΧΕ-/EΒΟΛΑ ΧΕ- (less common) + Second Present/Perfect; affirmative only; usually in strongly anthetic 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) EΒΟΛΑ ΑΝ ΧΕ-ΝΤΑΙΠΑΙ ΛΙΒΕ ΑΧΗΣ ΕΡΩΑΙ ΕΠΟΙΜΕ / (A 2 44) EΒΟΛΑ ΑΝ ΧΕ-ΝΤΑΙΠ-ΠΕΨΟΥ ΝΟΨΟΥ ΕΡΩΝ ΑΠΟΨΟΥΕ ΑΨΩΝΤ ΕΡΩΝ ΑΜΨΟΥΤ... ΑΛΛΑ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΧΕ-ΝΤΑ ΝΕΨΟΥΝ ΑΨΑΚ ΕΒΟΛΑ / (K 9315) (“the arrogant man cannot accept the moral principle”) ΕΒΟΛΑ ΑΝ ΧΕ-ΕΥΧΟΣΕ ΕΠΑΛΟΓΟΣ ΝΕΨΟΓΑΡ / (A 2 131-2) (“he violated his oath”) ΕΒΟΛΑ ΑΝ ΧΕ-ΕΨΡ-ΖΟΤΕ Ν ΕΠΟΙΜΕ, ΑΛΛΑ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΝΤΟΕ ΑΝ ΧΕ-ΑΝΠΟΥΣΗ ΝΠΟΨΗΜΕ ΝΤΗ ΕΡΩΑΙ ΕΥΣΑΖΟΥ / (P 1301 139 ΤΜΕ) ΕΒΟΛΑ ΑΝ ΧΕ-ΕΤΕΤΝΗΣΑΤ ΝΤΕΤΗΝΗΣΤΕΙΑ ΜΝΗΤΗΜΕΛΑΤΗ, ΑΛΛΑ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΝΤΟΕ ΧΕ-ΝΤΕΤΝΗΣΚ ΑΝ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΝΤΕΤΕΑΞΕ-ΕΙΑΤΤΥΤΝ. Also A 1 53, III 66.2f., 116.18f., Wess. 9 86b 30ff.

(b) (2ΧΗΣ) ΕΥΧΗ + Second Perfect. Affirmative only; perhaps in complementary distribution with 2ΧΗΣ ΕΥΧΗ + circumstantial for the Bipartite 88 (cf. the Second Perfect allomorph after the irrealis ΕΝΕ): (A 2 33) (2ΑΕ ΕΥΛΑΚΟΥ ΝΠΟΨΟΥΕ) 2ΧΗΣ ΕΥΧΗ-ΝΤΑΟΥΖΑΤΗΥ ΧΕ-ΠΕΨΟΥΤΕ ΕΒΟΛΑ / (III 208.5) ΑΙΝΑΥ ΑΝΟΚ ΕΟΥΑ ΕΥΧΗ-ΝΤΑΗΤΑΖΕ-ΟΥΟΥΡ ΌΥ ΟΥΑΡΑΙΣΟΥ 89 / (III 215.23f.) 2ΧΗΣ ΕΥΧΗ-ΝΤΑΠΗΥ ΥΨΓΙ 2ΧΗΜ Ν ΚΙΜ ΝΩΑΣ ΝΝΟΝ / (A 2 362) 2ΧΗΣ ΕΥΧΗ-ΝΤΑΤΤΥΜ ΝΒΒΑΝ ΝΤΕΙΜΙΝΕ ΝΡΨΗΜΕ—ΝΤΑΤΤΟΜΟΥ ΓΑΡ ΑΛΛΟΣΚ, cf. III 96.25, parall. Or. 161.37ff.; see next paragraph.

86 In (III 45.5) (“raise their hands”) ΧΕ-ΕΥΘΥΜΑ we may have a circumstantial after ΧΕ- “as if...” (sim. to 2ΧΗΣ ΕΥΧΗ- + circ., Shisha-Haley 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. ΧΕ-ΕΨΡΟΥΣ-ΜΗΨΗΜΕ, 133.20 ΧΕ-ΕΨΡΟΤΕ ΜΜΟΝ) or, much more frequently, unshifted person (III 124.17f. ΧΕ-ΕΧΑΙ ΜΜΟΝ ΝΝΟΝ) or, also very common, quoted reference in terms of “real person” (III 123.2 ΧΕ-ΕΧΑΙ ΜΜΟΥ ΝΝΟΝ). These phenomena, which belong in the sphere of “Erläute Rede” (“style indirecte libre”) and the formalities of inclusion and cohesion, need yet to be thoroughly investigated.
88 Cf. RE 10 159a 13f. (parall. BM 253 ΝΗ) ΕΤΕΒΟΥ ΑΥΧΟΚ XΕ-ΤΙΨΗΜΕ (referring to the preceding ΜΝΕΤΟΟΜΕ ΕΡΟΥ ΑΥΨ ΕΤΙΩΤΟΜΕ ΕΡΟΥ) / (A 2 492) (ΑΥΧΟΚ ΝΑΥ ΕΠΑΓΟΥ ΚΟΚΥ ΕΠΑΓΟΥ ΠΕ... / (A 2 245) (ΑΥΧΟΥΝΟΥ ΤΗΝΟΥΝ ΤΗΝ. See §2.7.2.4.
89 Cf. Potoski 1944:39 (= CP 143), 53 f. (= CP 156f.).
2.1.6 The rare parenthetic second tense occurs in interruptions of a narrative stretch, by which
the narrator intercalates (or often "postulates") 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.  
We find the Sec. Perfect, affirmative and negative: (Or. 161.37ff., parall.
III 96.25) ep wv eikxe-ntaymws ec neit — ntaymws gar (sim. A 2 369, quoted in the prec. paragraph) /
(A 2 246) . . . eannay eyon — ntacswth an — eacka-nepwhye ebo 2mpmooy.

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 —, zoine — zoine —, etc.), varying with Basic
Tenses; affirmative only; Second Present.
(A 1 249, coll.) mpwime ne: con men euyayxi-me, con de on euyaxxi-xola; con yaxuwthm, con de yau-
ratcswth; zenooy yaxuwthooy, zenooy de on euyaxxi-xamou; zenooy yaxuw-2my yox neyovbe, zenooy
de on euyayktooy ecpai epyooy; zenooy euyaypime eke-ayaay, zenooy euyaypime epyarywe... zenooy
h zenoompme euyayp-nagabon, zenoompme euyayp-mntacsebim nwm / (III 42.19ff.) (tae te de eterepynote oik-
konome mi pwime katanetznay), zoine men euyaxkaay ncewik 2mpima, zenooy euyaypwhye ebo
atax. Also III 110.9ff., IV 8.11f., perhaps Berl. Sitz. zoine gar euywmm xco xe—-... zenooye de xe—...
zenkooye de xe—... zoine de euywmm xco xe—... mmanciakoe de euywmm xco xe—..., unless here the xe-clauses
are focalized; Ench. 78a.

2.1.7.2 In the second or both terms of antithetic configurations 91; affirmative, negative; Second
Present, Aorist, Perfect.
(Ch. 207.19ff., Sh.?) adaptation of the famous Mark 5:39) mppnackiakoe gar moy alla eynkotk / (III
71.18f., possibly a case of circumstantial + Sec. Perfect) snaaoy nwm eynqowuyxw... alla entayoyxw
epooy nyooy / (III 33.9f.) mpnqowys etooyt yaya... alla nta爽pe-2thn eyxwnebome / (III 108.9)
oy monon xe—-ntaxxe-ayaay nay an, alla (e)nqonpeparakale; for oy monon see §1.3.11.2.11; for -ppke,
§3.3.1 (a similar example: Ch. 157.20ff.) / (III 212.7ff.) ptxwmm xco xe—-axioun-ic, enipe nnaa nta-
pp-actcswon mon nyooy / (IV 157.21ff.) (Instead of plucking the plant) nta爽we mmoq ntcym. 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-Haley 1973): (K 926) euyakpimne
xmoq... eip-noye, ekuyakpimne xmo... ekp-noye; (Wess. 9 110a 11f.) euyakpimoc ne eip-noye / (IV 79-80)
petaqnapay epyo enqoci xmoq xnaax... eip-noye. These examples may, however, all be cases of
focalized object (§2.3.1; cf. "ekk-60a", and (e) below).
(b) "Dramatic" Second Present ("Koinizdeznfall") 92: (III 29.27f.) anoq znwto on eikwth-xlake
xaaxe euiqoyw eptswme, perhaps (IV 64.26f.) pai de euiw xmoq xe—.

90 Cf. Shisha-Haley 1976a:37 n. 18. Basic (durative) tense (opisth-to)parentheses: ...mpwime de on—-mpwime (III 113.13f.)
txaaxei de zoxcop. ebo 2mpwime-2hxwy xmoq (A 1 70) / "menaxay an pe" — mpoq mpoq (IV 96-7: Leipoldt: "locus
(A 1 132) ...xe-epnymn h po 2mpwth / (A 1 150) a pai acen h 2mpxaxai cr — instances of the figura Sinuthiana) / npooy
euyayphne xacocoe xnaax — xero xnaax (A 2 8) / kan epne-2xyep me xmoq temoy... — -xeq gar amnhw — gomyw (sic)... (A 2 464).
91 Polotsky 1944:39f. (= CP 156f.).
92 This may be related to the "synchronous present", "Koinizdeznfall" 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
formulary eicstohxei ("I concur with"), eizomouagenei ("I admit, agree"), eio mwntipe ("I testify"), eipwrk ("I swear"), einkin-
mpye ("I vouch for"), eipw-tupre ("I promise"), as well as the less formulary or non-formulary eit (ebo) ("I sell", Till, Rechts-
(c) Occasional instances of Second Perfect predicating ρ− (cf. (a) above; is the object of ρ−, or the whole ‘ρ+object’ syntagm focalized?): (IV 67.2f.) ΕΕΤΕΡΕΣ ΕΕΑΩ... ΧΕ-ΝΤΑΥΡ-ΑΤ6ΟΜ / (IV 199.7f.) ΑΥΝΨΜΕ (sic) ΕΙ ΨΑΡΟΙ... ΕΤΒΕΝΕΥΤΒΝΟΟΥΕ, ΧΕ-ΜΕΥΑΚ ΕΝΤΑΥΡ-ΖΙΚ ΕΠΟΟΥ.

2.2 The heterofocal second-tense construction: ≠ sec. tense conj.-form → 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.93

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.

ς− (Ch. 16.47ff.), ΕΝΞΙΝΑΧ (§1.3.7.3), ΕΤΡΕ− (Ch. 129.2ff.), ε + inf. (III 191.26f.).
ΕΕΑΩ ΣΗ− (Ch. 34.18ff.)/ΖΙΤΗ− (Ch. 9.9ff.) / ΤΩΝ (Α 1 281, §2.6.3.2)
ΕΕΟΥΝ Ρ− (Ch. 20.31ff.).
ΕΞΚ− (Ch. 152.30ff.).
ΕΤΒΕ− (III 122.24ff.). ΕΤΒΕΞΕ− (III 100.16ff.).
ΚΑΤΑ− (IV 16.2ff.).
Ν−/ΜΜΟ− (dir. obj., IV 51.16ff.; introd. predicative, III 67.12; “in. at. by”, Wess. 9 87a 11ff.).
Ν−/ΝΑ− (III 165.16ff.).
ΜΝ− (III 98.3, 7, 10).
ΝΝΑΡΠΝ− (III 134.15).
ΝΚΑ− (Ch. 55.8ff.).
ΠΡΟΣ− (P 130 8 10 ro).
ΟΥΒΕ− (III 65.14).
ΨΑ− (Ch. 28.38ff.).
ΣΑ− (Ch. 17.24ff.).
ΣΑΣΤΗ− (Miss. 283).
ΣΙ− (Ch. 25.14ff.).
ΣΙΤΗ− (III 28.25ff.).
ΣΙΚΛ− (III 80.25ff.).
ΣΙΝ− (Ch. 14.32ff.).
ΣΨΗ− (Ch. 97.21ff.).
ΧΕ− (var. roles; III 137.23ff., Ch. 62.1ff., Wess. 9 149a-b).
ΧΕΚΑΣ (III 120-7ff.).
ΧΙΝ− (Ch. 65.15ff.).

Clause Conjugations (ΕΥΑΝ−, ΨΑΝΤΕ−, ΝΤΕΠΕ− (?)) A 2 51, 87; not conjunctive)


93 See §2.0.2.3-4. Compare the macro-syntactically marked role of the #SUBJECT-copula-predicate# Nominal Sentence pattern (Shisha-Halevy 1976a:48f.).

---

80
Circumstantial (III 66.5f.).

Iteration-marked noun syntags (§1.3.3).

The theme/topic constituency: ε-/ἐπε- converted Bipartite, aorist (affirmative), adjective-verbs, ὑντα-, ὑς, ἐν-, (ἐ)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 ἐβε-, (ἐβοικά) 2ιν-*, (ἐβαί, ἐβοικά) 2ιν-, 2ι-, ἐκιν-, ἐν- (ἐτεῖει, ἐναί 2ιν-), there is an opposition or a complexly 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 ὑμ-modifiers).

(2) For various focalization figures employing this pattern (the complex focus: ἐγνατίτει ἐπαθ ὑνὶ Wess. 9 117a 5f.; double focalization: ἐναὶ τὸ λόγον ἐνι Wess. 9 110a 9f.; the multiple disjoined focus: ἑτακτικά 2ιτηνι Wess. 9 290a 8f. 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 τῷ, ἀνθ'νη, ἐναί 2ιν-) see §2.7.3.

(4) For the focusing modifiers ἐναί, ἑτακτικά and other augentia, co-marking the focus, see §§1.3.1.1, 2.9.1.2 passim and §6.2.1. ἐις ἔνα ἐναί ἀν ἀποι ἑτακτά (IV 96.13) / ἔνα ζευγᾶς ἐναί ἄνα ἐναί 2ινη ἐναί (IV 24.6f.).

Special observations. (1) For ἐν- / ἐμο- 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 ἐν ἴσοι “how?” features in both focus- and topic-initial patterns, ἐν- as object-expansion always follows its theme, as do most of the more “lexical” syntags of ἐν- (for ἐνοῦ and ἐτεῖει focalized, see III 131.10, Wess. 9 174d 29ff., III 76.8ff., IV 195.4).

(2) ε-: in μητροίκας καὶ ἐπενευρ-τεόμι... ἀλλὰ ἡ καταλύτικα καὶ ἐνοῦ- (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 - rheme’ dependences (the latter is “mapped on” the former).

(3) τῷ “where?”, focalizable also in pattern (1), with an immediate explication of the actor-pronoun by a noun syntagm, §6.0.1: ἐνοῦ τῷ τεόμενον καὶ ἐμού (A 2 114) / ἐπενευρ-τεόμενον τῷ τεόμενον (A 2 53) / ἐγνατίτει ἐπενευρ-τεόμενον (A 2 336; sim. with ἐς or ὅποιον, A 6 62, 306, III 72.9f. etc.). “Whence?” (see Ch. 1, footnote 96): ἐνοῦ τῷ ξε- (A 1 67; sim., with ἐπενευρ-τεόμενον, A 1 72, 122, Wess. 9 143d 1ff. etc.) / ἐπενευρ-τεόμενον τῷ τῶν τῶν ἐπενευρ-τεόμενον (A 2 412). For τῷ 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 # ἐν—ἐν—συνthesis- and the “No sooner... than...” combination: see (with further ref.) §2.7.1.1. Some non-rhetorical examples: ἐν Τῇ ἐν ἐνοῦ ἐπενευρ-τεόμενον (sic) ἐνοῦ τεόμενον (P 130 40 40f.) / ἐν Τῇ ἐν Τῇ Τῇ Τῇ (III 206.13) / ἐπενευρ-τεόμενον ἐν Τῇ (III 25.17f.) / ἐπενευρ-τεόμενον καὶ ἐπενευρ-τεόμενον (Ch. 16-17): these last examples call our attention to the fact that the circumstantial, even when not focal, is an adnexit 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): ἐνοῦ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ (Wess. 9 158a 30ff.) / de tomos ἐπενευρ-τεόμενον (Mun. 96).
(5) ἔκψ- occurs theme-like in a few instances,
always in contrastive context: ἄξιος-ὄνω
ἡμῶν ἄξιος ὡς ἁμαρτολὼς ἔργα ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας
εὐκατάληκα τὸ λόγον. (Ch. 183.2ff.) "... but it is the fruits
of righteousness it sprouted" / ἐπειδὴ η ἑκάστου τον ἰδιοῦ ἐξήλθα
ἐμοί, ἔτη βασιλικά ἐν τῷ έποιεσεν. (Ch. 59.46f.) "... 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 A, not Sh.?) 
πειράζει ἐνὶ ἐπὶ πάντως ἐπὶ πά

Negated nexus (§2.9.1.2): 111.20.1 a ἐνὶ ἐπὶ πάντως ἐπὶ πάντως ἐπὶ πάντως ἐπὶ πάντως ἐπὶ πάντως ἐπὶ πά

2.3 The heterofocal second-tense construction: # second-tense conjugation-form + 

Here we witness 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 structural-delination, 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 ἐπὶ ἔκψ-ου "What do you say?", ἐπὶ  "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 (inerently focal): ὡς "what?", ἦς (ὁ-) "who?", ἤ ὡς "what?... which?...?", ὡς ἦς "how much?". Non-interrogative: noun syntagms - determinators (ὁ-  ὡς - ὡς - ὡς, §5.1.1.0.1) expanded by noun lexemes; ὡς - ex-

---

44 Cf. Polotsky 1944:48ff. (= CP 152f.). See below, §2.5, for ἔκψ- as post-focal theme-topic.
45 Polotsky 1940:245 (= CP 37).
46 See Polotsky 1944:31 (= CP 135), 51ff. (= 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 Rosén's (1957) non-hierarchical 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 (indeterminable substantivized relative ⁹⁹); the possessive pronoun ηα- expanded by a noun syntagm; indefinite pronouns: ου “something”, ουχη “so much”; perhaps also personal pronoun + augens (A 2 238, quoted below). Noteworthy is the focalization of χε-ου “(saying) what?”, where χε- forms part of the valency of χαι “say”, and is cataphorically represented in the verbal nucleus (the theme; again, nasal dependence is mapped on a ‘nucleus - satellite’ phrase). The theme constituency: Second Present and Future, Second Perfect (noticeably less common), εμναντα-, Second Aorist. The nexus is affirmative only for interrogative foci, otherwise both affirmative and negated (by Αν), §2.9.1.3.

**Documentation: **affirmative nexus: (A 2 509) ειναξε-ουρη ηενου; (A 2 512) ειναξαε-αυ μμεος ντακα-αυ, η ειναξ-αυ μμεος νταλαπεςος νταλακαπιζε ναι / (A 2 17) εκρ-ου ντωκ νητογου; (sim. ευ(να)ρου “What does/ will do...?”, “How is...?”, A I 201 / P 130η 75 ρο ευρ-ου ντωρια χινμπεινα νταγουσι / A 2 86, 481, 341, Ch. 117.6f., 166.48f., III 49.19, IV 98.25f., etc.). ειξε-ου (A 2 366, P 130η 99 νον etc.) but more usually ε(χι)χαι μμος χε-ου (A 2 58, Ch. 143.36ff.), also Sec. Future, Perfect (A 2 56, 397, 387, IV 186.13 answered by νεξακε χε-, pointing to suppletion between χαι and νεξακε-).

χε-ου expands other verbs in the Second Tense, without cataphoric reference: ουχαιβ (Ch. 132.26ff., Sec. Perf.); π-τοτε (III 105.29f., Sec. Pres.): +ται (P 131η 86 ρα); (P 131η 19 ηθ) εμπταν-ου μμαι; εμπταν-ποιε μμαι / (Ch. 28.46f.) ειναξαε-νιμ / (Wess. 9 171c 2 ff.) νταλαξε-πεσογοου μμου / (A 2 509) εκοιουμ-μοεε αυη ουχε αν / (Wess. 9 171d 1ff.) ντεοοοον γαρ μμπαλαβολος ουχοουν-ναπαλαβολος αξι-δοη (εχι-δοη) 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) ευξε-μπουκα-πνοντε ναι ειε ευνακα-πμουε:

Negated nexus (rare): (A 2 238-9) εναμαρκουουε ηθπου αν / (Wess. 9 171c 6ff.) οντω ιηξι-δοη αν / (Ch. 96.9f.) νταλαξε-ουσαξε ην ιγοου (“I have not said a single superfluous thing”) / (IV 94.3ff.) εσαμα-ιουςκε-πνεε αν η νεποπαρε νεπεταλαξουπ ροοχ, αλα εσαμα-ιουςκε ιντοου ιηβολ ζιτοοτι (“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: ηιμ, αυ, ουχη (Thompson E νον); non-interrogative foci are rare and mostly found in ambiguous examples: personal pronoun + augens; ηα-: the expanded determinators η-, 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) ντανιμ νουυχ ενεη καλε-κοοουε ουλη τυαπε εμπτρμεουο... (sim. ντανιμ ενεη... ⁹⁹: A 2 151, 153, 518, Berl. 1613 της) / (P 131η 4 νον) ερενιμ ναε ναε / (Ch. 203.51ff.) νταλαξ ηεκαλαξε ρ-ιουβ / (Ch. 24.53ff.) τακσιαμ γαρ ερεούςεαιεις εμνους ουρη νεκε ναερν- (or is νεκε/ναερν- focalized?) / (A 2 299-230) (ιηβολ αν χε-νταλα λευε ανεη ιηεραι ιερμε) νταρεπιουςκ ινετ ιντοε ιερμε ιεραι ιερμε "... it is you rather who have cried yourself into a stupor”; similarly IV 94.3ff. (εσαμα-ιουςκ ινεη αν)... αλα εσαμα-ιουςκ ιντοου ιηβολ ζιτοοτι "... it is they rather who are wounded by it".

⁹⁹ See §3.1.2.2.1.
⁹⁹ See §1.3.6 for the syntax of ενεη.
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 — patts. (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: ΜΑΥ ΝΣΕ, ΕΤΒΕΟΥ, ΕΒΟΑ ΤΨΗ). (e) The existence of a pattern for which the topic form — ΕΙ(ΗΑΑ), ΕΜΑΗ — cannot be disambiguated: 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 patts. (5) and (6), none is here focalized. We find here only the peculiar ΕΒΟΑ ΤΨΗ, dealt with in detail in §2.6.3. Non-interrogative modifiers (in order of frequency): ΕΤΒΕ- (esp. ΕΤΒΕΝΑΙ, ΕΤΒΨΗΤ-); (2ΡΑΙ/ΕΒΟΑ) ΕΗ- (often in the distinctive ΜΗΜΑΙ —); (ΕΒΟΑ) ΕΙΗ-; ΝΤΕΙΣ; ΕΞΗ-; ΜΝΝΙΚ; ΜΟΘΙΚ; ΝΤΕΒΕ-, ΖΟΚΟΝ. Topic constituency: only ΝΤΑΨΕΨΤΜ. Nexus: affirmative; negated (by — ΑΝ after the focus: §2.9.2.1).

Documentation: affirmative: (III 26.8) ΕΤΒΕΝΑΙ ΝΤΑΛΕΙΝΟΓ ΝΚΑΣΟΥ ΕΙ ΕΖΡΑΙ ΕΧΜ- / (Leyd. 410) ΕΞΜΗΛΑΙ ΕΝΤΑΨΕΙ ΕΖΡΑΙ ΕΠΙΨΗΜΕ / (Wess. 9 1312a 2ff.) ΕΒΟΑ ΤΨΗ ΝΤΑΨΕΨΤΜΗΝΗΣ ΣΨΟΥΣ ΕΖΟΥΝ... / (P 1313 67 νυ) ΕΞΜΗΛΑΙ ΟΝ ΝΤΑΨΟΙΧΟΧ ΧΕ... ΝΤΑΨΕΨΤΜΕΙ ΧΟΟΣ ΟΝ ΕΤΒΕΝΑΙ ΧΕ-.. Note the chiastic arrangement, recurring in this pattern combined with pattern (2); also Wess. 9 144b-c, 153b-c, etc. / (Cat. 42.22) ΝΤΕΙΣ ΓΑΡ ΕΤΑΝΕΙΟΥΔΑΙ (sic) ΑΙΒΕ / (Wess. 9 152c 17ff.) ΕΞΜΗΛΑΙ ΟΝ ΝΤΑΨΟΙΧΟΧ ΝΓΙΝΕΡΑΘΗ ΧΕ- / (P 1314 88 ΡΑΙ) ΕΖΡΑΙ ΕΗ ΤΝΨΗΑΗΕ... ΝΤΑΨ-ΖΟΟΥ ΝΓΙΝΑΓΑΗ / (III 210.21ff.) ΜΝΝΙΚ ΝΤΑΨΑΙ ΘΙΨΟΥ ΣΨΌΥΣ ΕΨΟΣ “Only afterwards did all those (scil. demons) gather against it (scil. the misguided soul)”; v.l. Basic Perfect / (A 2 430, not Sh.) ΝΤΕΡΒΕΝΤΣΙΟΜ ΜΟΘ (i.e. of the honey) ΝΤΑΨΗΣΤΜΑΧΟΧ ΑΝΑΤΡΕΠΕ / (IV 162.2ff.) ΖΟΚΟΝ ΑΝΑΠΑΙ +-ΤΨΗ ΕΖΟΥΝ ΝΤΑΨΑΙ ΕΝΤΨΗ (sic) ΕΒΟΑ (i.e. ΤΕΨΑΒΕ; the sense here is “as soon as...”; see §7.2.3.2).

Negated context (affirmative context only)109: (A 1 113) ΕΤΒΕΝΠΕΘΘΟΥ ΑΝ ΜΑΨΑΑΙ 2ΡΑΙ ΝΖΗΤΕ ΝΤΑΨΑΙ-ΨΗΜΕ / (Wess. 9 144c 24ff.) ΕΤΒΕΝΠΕΘΘΒΙΟ ΑΝ ΜΑΨΑΑΙ ΝΤΑΨΟΙΧΟΧ ΧΕ... Additional exx.: III 24.23 (focus: ΜΟΘΙΚ), 76.8 (ΝΤΕΙΣ), Ch. 136.41ff. (2ΡΑΙ ΕΗ), A 2 499 (ΣΡΟΥΣΟΥΤΗΝ), P 1303 68 ΡΠ (ΕΤΒΕ-), 71 ΡΠΣ (ΕΒΟΑ ΖΙΤΟΤ-).

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

---

109 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.

101 See §§1.3.11.6, 7.3.1.

102 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* \(^{105}\)) transcends or cuts across a double modular, historically founded dichotomy of Polotsky's: between the "substantival" (thematic) and "adverbial" (adjunctal) verb-forms \(^{104}\), and between the two complementary Cleft Sentence patterns — one with initial (pro)nominal vedette (focus) and \textit{net- glose} (theme/topic), and the other with initial Second-Tense theme and subsequent modifier focus \(^{105}\). 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{\textit{N}2\textit{A2 N}2\textit{COP} “often”, \textit{ETBENAI “therefore”}, \textit{KAALWC “well”} \(^{104}\) and other, not characteristically focal premodifiers \(^{107}\)!)

2.5.0.2 Two constructions may belong here, which however stand apart: ‘\textit{YANTETEO YWINE} “rarely” \textit{YATNAY “until when...?”}, followed by a circumstantial present or circumstantial negative perfect \(^{108}\), and ‘\textit{EC + temporal expression + EN-/KINTA-’}. (A 2 105) \textit{YANTETEO YWINE EYEIE HNEIBOTE ZEMMA ET- QYAAK} / (III 36.24ff. = Ch. 132.26ff.) \textit{YANTETEO GE YWINE ANON MENTUZS MENTZHT} / (P 131\(^6\) 144 PEH) \textit{YANTETEO GE YWINE EN+ NOY2OOGY NCAOYOGY MENTKON ENNOYTE} / (P 131\(^6\) 47 ro) \textit{YANTETEO YWINE ENHIN EBOA ZHNENNMTAUY2HT} / (K 9068) \textit{YATNAY EMNTANZET-NNOYTE} / (Ryl. Cat. 34, No. 70 CMF) \textit{ECAYOPH NOY- OYQ YINTANAI TA2OY} / (A 1 71) \textit{ECAYOOG EEBOT CNAE ENOYQW ETETNP-OY2HT NOYWT}. Although it is probable that these are two 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{AYN, OYHP; NAY N2E, ZITNOY}; non-interrogative: numbers; \textit{Z2A N-}, \textit{ZEN-}; (N)\textit{Z2A NCON, ZENCON}, \textit{ZEMMNHUE NCON} \(^{109}\); \textit{-WC-modifiers; ETBE-}, \textit{ZEN-}; \textit{EIMHTI E-} \(^{110}\);


\(^{104}\) 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. (= CP 195ff.).

\(^{105}\) See POLOTSKY 1944:57ff. (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-} \textit{glose} markers in the English Cleft Sentence, \textit{a-} \textit{y-} in Modern Welsh (in Gaelic, \textit{a-} is the sole \textit{glose}-marker). For some comparative notes on the circumstantial \textit{glose}-form, see POLOTSKY 1944:59 (= CP 163) n. 2, SHISHA-HALEVY 1978:64ff. In a different approach, our circumstantial \textit{glose} may be conceived of as a zero conversion or \textit{conversion base} (cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 1972:§§2.1.3.1, 2.2.1.3, 2.3.1.2), 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", ROSEN 1957, and SHISHA-HALEVY 1976c). A construction which recalls Gardiner's "missing link", namely a \textit{net-glose} after an "adverbial" \textit{vedette} (Gardiner, JEA 33:97ff. [1947]) actually occurs in Ryl. 368 (Cat. 172).

\(^{106}\) Cf. its native counterpart ‘\textit{OYAFAGON NE + inf.}’, in which \textit{OYAFAGON} is microsyntactically predicative, yet macrosyntactically thematic (see §7.1.3).

\(^{107}\) 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 welel caru} "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 Keink Y Mabinogi}). Is our circumstantial also but a marked non-initial verb form?

\(^{108}\) See (with ref.) SHISHA-HALEVY 1976b:361ff.; add some exx. quoted here, and the unpubl. non-Shenoutean yet Shenoute-emanating BL Or. 8811 BH, with Basic (neg.) Future.

\(^{109}\) Zero-marked noun syntagm in modifier status, §1.3.2.

\(^{110}\) Cf. §§1.3.11.6, 7.3.1.1.
Observations. (1) ἔρχονται: PoLOTSKY 1944:48ff. (= CP 152ff.) offers two alternative explanations: it is either a true circumstantial topicalization or a Sahidic relic corresponding to Fayumic ἔρχονται (see ibid. 71 = CP 175; 94ff. = CP 198ff.). (Compare now the "Middle Egyptian" Second Perfect ἔρχονται, which may still arguably be circumstantial in form.) With reference to synchronic and internal structure, I believe a circumstantial interpretation is inevitable. For ἔρχονται as a possible prefocal theme form, see §2.2, spec. obs. (5).

(2) ἐμπεθερο; replacing ἐτέμπερο (PoLOTSKY 1944:88ff. = CP 192ff., 1960a:§18), yet compare the Demotic i.iir-bn.pn.f sdm (PoLOTSKY 1944:88 = CP 192, JOHNSON 1976:186ff.). (3) ἐμπεθερο; ἀν replaces ἐτέμπερο; ἀν, 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.

Affirmative nexus — affirmative or neg. topic; mostly interrogative focus: (Ryl. Cat. 34 No. 70 CME) οὐχ ἴπνοις ἰπνηνορ εὖχοκοῦ εὐβοῦ / (A I 312) αὐς ἱπνοις ἰπνηνορ εὖχοκοῦ εὐβοῦ. 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?"

(Wess. 9 147c 22ff.) Ναυ ιπνοις ἱπνηνορ εὐβοῦ / (A I 305) Ναυ ιπνοις ἱπνηνορ εὐβοῦ / (Mis. 278) Ναυ ιπνοις ἱπνηνορ εὐβοῦ / (A 2 155) Ναυ ιπνοις ἱπνηνορ εὐβοῦ / (Wess. 9 86b 21ff.) μενων εὐχρεῖον τοῦρον Ναυ ιπνηνορ εὐβοῦ / (A 2 301) γενίμηνος Ναυ εὐχαρίστησεν τότε ἐπιστεύμενον Οὐράνιον Οὐράνιον μενων εὐχρεῖον τοῦρον. (Rosi 2/3 76) Ναυ ιπνοις ἱπνηνορ εὐβοῦ / (P I 1318 111 νο) Ναυ ιπνοις ἱπνηνορ εὐβοῦ / (Wess. 9 86b 21ff.) μενων εὐχρεῖον τοῦρον Ναυ ιπνηνορ εὐβοῦ.
2.6 The heterofocal second-tense/circumstantial construction: # modifier/(pro)noun → e + conjugation-form # — focalization pattern (6)

Here we must be content with pointing out the topological characteristic, which is a syncretism neutralization of the circumstantial and Second-Tense converters. We cannot resolve this e-, 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: οὐχ; nā enm, etbeoy, zitnoy, ηνίαον, ητίων; nōsw maaloon, ἤμπτεοι ηὑρε, ἄτησαι (§2.5.0.2); non-interrogative: determinators (οῦ-, ἐν-); numbers; etbe-, (2pαί, ἑβοά) 2n-, n(τείρε), (εβοά) ζτήν-, εκκε-, ημνα-, -ωμ-marked modifiers: moric, eic + time expression; circumstantial, conditional. Topic constituency: ηνίαον-, ἢνηκα-, e- + adjective-verbs. Nexus: affirmative, negated (both focus and nexus negating: §2.9.2.3) 115.

Documentation. Affirmative nexus: (Ch. 188.40ff.) οὐχ ηπομε ηνιαβολος εὐποολε εἰναγαγον μπακ / (A 2 300) οὐχοιου μποουε οιτε ερηπαι ηογιε ναγ / (III 207.8ff.) γεμισφονθες γενεαλειον γεναιποτολος γεγραψ χαυμοιο τηνετουολαβ γευαγε μενενενοουο... ἐρηπαι μποου εὐθες ερευστιν νκογιο (circumstantial? cf. 206.4ff.). The low-focality context and marked non-initial verb are here in evidence) / (III 69.13ff.) σασυ νκαιει εύθ-παςε / (A 96) ομνταζαιε μποοειρκεν ημιοοο 2πειςκειν κυο / (Ch. 72.1ff.) etbeoy ειαοαυζ ηκαιοαιμιουν; etbeoy ηιαοαυζτ αν νκαηεκ; / (P 1305 55 7ε) ηαν νκαε εηαηαςη μπετεηκοομ αν ιον / (A 233) ηιση ειαηνοηχ, one term of a chiastic figure, see §2.6.3.1.2 (4) / (Or. 163.19ff.) ποκος μαλλον εημακο... (sim. Ch. 74.54ff., 119.30ff., III 97.24 etc.) / (Ch. 135.44ff.) ητιογι εηααηε ευερευphere / (IV 14.10ff.) ετβηντς ον εηαηκτο εβοα ιοηευγινιν / (Mun. 96) ειηοακα εηαςη ηηαι “It is daringly I am saying this” / (A 2 476) ηοικι γαρ εηηααικανέ.

Negative nexus - affirmative topic, negated focus or nexus: (Ch. 38.35ff.) ερυαντιβαυρ ακακ εβοα αη... επεμνοι τπε “It is not when the fox cries out that the lion is afraid” (the all-important an is omitted in the parallel III 79.4ff.) / (A 2 519) ετβήντ αν εκναυγηταςε καιο, ουδε ετβηντνκ αν ειαηπια και ερ-εϊβ νμ... / (IV 117.23) ηνενδηκε μηδην αν εηαςη ηηηαι “It is not shaming you that we tell you this” / (A 114) ηη 2σκαγθ ην ερηπαι ταμο μμο.

More exx.: III 199.23f. (οὐχ αν- επε-), 72.2f. (εβοά των η ζιτνογ ηπε-), A 2 333 (2εν- επ-), III 70.7 (πην εν- εγ-), P 1304 122 αβ (καιεκ αυω δηκαηεκ εγ-), 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 (‘νακαηηεμεν’): Ex. 7:1 (νηει νηει). Clem. (Schmidt) 46.5 (ετβε). Prov. 7:20 (ζτην). 11:31 (morik). Gespr. Jesu 9.11f. (μηρκεκε-ουρη ιπομε). Compare now the clear “Middle Egypt.” evidence for the Sec. Tense (e.g. Mt. 12:26, 29, 34), also Fayumic-ME Joh. 13:28 (ετβεο γαλακτε) and (late) Babnaic exx. of ηαν ηπομη αιλα- etc. (Mon. of Macarius 31.7 ηευαμ νηο αιλα-). Polotsky 1934:64 (= CP 369), 1960a:§37b interprets ητιογ εηαιαα (Ch. 135.44f.) as Second Tense (also 1960a:§32. Ch. 38.35ff.; 1944:39, 44 = CP 143, 148). On the other hand, one finds in Akhmimic ample evidence for e- as a post-focal topic characteristic (cf. Till 1928:§218). This is common in Gespräche Jesu (νυκ-εκ- 10.2. ετβεο-εκ- 32.1. νηει ηευκα- 25.8. καιεκ ε- 30.10ff., 38.10). Compare in Clemens e- 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 etbeoy, nαε ηειε, εβοά των see discussion and more evidence in §2.6.3-4. For καιεκ see §1.3.1.2; for -ωμ-modifiers, §1.3.11.1.
IV 109.8f. (all καλως/δικαιως ευ-); III 114.13, IV 33.22 (ζναι, ζμπαί ευ-, ευα-), A 2 342 (ζπαι νώητα-/εβαί ζιτοοτ- ευαιπε-), IV 161.12 (μμαγ), A 1 107 (εξνοις ευνα-), A 2 147 (ζιτνοις 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 — ETEBOY, NAY N2E, EBOA TUN — the complementary relationship of this pattern with the others will be treated at length in §2.6.3-4118). We find here interrogative and non-interrogative prepositional phrases (notably ETE- (EBOA) ζιτν-, EΠΧΙΝΣΗ). Topic constituency: most frequently ΑΗ- / ΜΠΗ-, ΥΑΗ-, ΝΗ(ΝΑ)- ΑΝ. The Nexus is affirmative or negated (nexus or focus negating, §2.9.2.4).

Documentation (specimenal). Affirmative nexus: (A 2 305) NAY N2E ΜΠΟΥΤΕ ΝΑ-CO ΕΠΑΙ / (A 2 334) EBOA TUN ΤΕΝΟΥ ΝΕΤ-ΖΤΗ ΕΠΕΣΤΑΙ ΜΜΑΤΕ... ΑΥΜΕΕΥΕ ΕΠΕΙΞΥΒ / (P 1309 70 πΗ) ETEBOY ΤΕΤΝΑΙ EBOA ΖΜΗΜΥΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ ΕΤΟΥΑΒ / (III 199.27f.) ETEBOY ΜΠΟΥΑΜΑΖΕΤΕ ΜΜ ΕΤΕΙΜΕΡΕ ΝΝΕΙΒΟΤΕ ΘΗΡΟΥ.

Negated nexus: (P 1309 71 πΗ) ΝΗ ΕΤΕΒΕΤΝΤΣΜΝΤ (sic, for -ζΤΜΝΤ) ΑΝ ΑΝΑΙ ΝΗΚ ΕΒΟΑ ΝΖΒΗ Χ ΙΝ ΕΝΑΝΟΥ, Η ΕΤΕΒΕΤΝΤΣΤΣΤΜΝ ΑΝ ΝΤΟΥ ΑΝΕΙΚΟΟΥΕ ΖΗΚ ΕΒΟΑ ΜΠΕΙΝΗΧΥΕ ΝΠΕΕΟΟΥ (cf. the parall. Wess. 9 106a 7ff. with εα- topics) / (A 1 353) ΕΠΧΙΝΣΗ ΓΑΡ ΑΝ ΑΝΣΩΕΙΣ ΜΕΣΤΕ-ΝΙΟΥΑΙ (sim. 88, 366, 354, Ch. 139.19f., III 55.14f., 56.13) / (A 1 125) ΕΤΕΘΟΥΡΕ ΑΝ ΝΤΟΥ ΝΖΡΚΙΚΟΝ ΝΑΙΟΥΕ ΖΙΒΡΟΥ ΑΝΕΙΡΦΗΜΕ & ΜΠΑΙ ΕΤΟΟΥ ΜΠΟΥΤΕ / (IV 156.26f.) ΕΝΕΕΤΒΕΤΑΓΑΗ ΑΝ ΝΗ ΝΕΙΖΗΚ ΝΝΑΙ, ΝΕΙΟ Ν ΠΑΡΟΟΥΣΥ.

A fociational pattern as unfulfilled-condition protasis, with the topic resuming the irrealsis function already signalled for the whole clause: (P 1314 158 ro) ETENPAI ΓΡΑΙ ΖΤΓΟΜ ΑΝ ΜΠΕΥΑΚΕ ΑΛΑΛΑ ΓΡΑΙ 2ΝΤΕΛΩΡΙΚ ΜΠΕΤΧΜ ΜΜΟΣ ΝΕ... ΤΚΟΜ... ΜΠΕΤΝΙΝΑ ΝΑΥΛΗΝΕ ΕΣΟΥΟΥΕΤ.

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: ETEBOY " why ? " and NAY N2E " how ? " 117. 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 EBOA TUN " whence ? ", " on what grounds ? ".

2.6.3.1 ETEBOY, NAY N2E in focus-initial patterns. This is indubitably the usual placement. The topic is (a) a BASIC TENSE, for (1) affirmative/negative NON-DURATIVE (TRIPARTITE) CONJUGATION (ΑΗ- / ΜΠΗ-, ΥΑΗ-, ΥΨΕ), also NOMINAL SENTENCES, (2) negated bipartite conjugation, (3) (SPECIALLY CONDITIONED) affirmative bipartite conjugation. Topic (b) is morphologically marked: (1) ε- (circumst./ Second): ΕΗ(ΝΑ)-, ΕΥΑ-, ε- + adj.-verb; (2) circumstantial (affirm./neg.): ΕΗ(ΝΗ(ΝΑ)- ΑΝ, ΕΟΥΝ-ε- + Nom. Sentence, ΕΑΗ- (for ΖΙΤΝΟΥ, n. 117). Note that (3) Sec. Tense ΝΤΑΗ-, 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 (NAY N2E ΥΨΕ-), A 2 69 (NAY N2E + neg. Nom. Sent.), A 2 19-20 (ETEBOY ΥΨΕ neg.) etc.; a (2) III 102

114 For several instances of this pattern in configuration with others, esp. (5)-(6), see 9.2.7.3.
117 ΖΙΤΝΟΥ, incomparably less well attested, still gives in miniature the same distributional picture: a (1) RE II 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 (ΖΙΤΝΟΥ ΕΑ-).
passim, IV 99.24f., 42.16f., 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 KN-Θ, A 2 342 (an adaptation of Mt. 15:18f. and Marc. 7:21); ΝΑΥ ΝΣΕ ΝΤΟΥΝ ΤΕΤΝΑΡ-ΒΟΑ... BMCat. 83 (No. 199 TEA), cf. III 51.3f., 65.12, Ch. 169.7ff.; Mt. 23:23, Heb. 2:3: also (non-scriptural) arguments attributed to persons other than Shenoute: Ryl. 69 ΝΓ, A 2 430 (not Sh.).

B. Instances of striking rhetoricity and pathos: "pro forma" or pseudo-topicalization; sometimes, with the flavour of Bible text. Note in particular series of multiple questions: (A 2 388-9) ΕΤΒΕΟΥ ΚΟ ΝΜΑΛΑ... ΕΤΒΕΟΥ ΚΥΝΩΤΑΣΣΕ... ΑΥΣΗ ΚΟΝΣ... ΕΤΒΕΟΥ ΚΜΟΥ ΕΝΜΝΙΤ ΝΤΠΝΕ, ΚΓΗΣΤ ΔΕ ΟΝ ΕΒΟΑ / (A 2 351-2) ΕΤΒΕΟΥ ΝΤΟΟΥΝ ΠΡΙΜΗ Ρ-ΟΥΙΑ ΑΥΣΗ ΕΗΑ; ΕΤΒΕΟΥ ΔΕ ΟΝ ΚΥΝΑΛ ΑΥΣΗ ΧΥΝΧΤΕΥΕ; ΕΤΒΕΟΥ ΧΑΣΚΕΙ... ΑΥΣΗ ΧΡ-ΔΙ-ΚΑΙΟΥΝΝ; ΕΤΒΕΟΥ ΕΝΑΡΠ-ΠΙΣΤΟΣ... ΑΥΣΗ ΕΤΒΕΟΥ ΕΥΝΗ-ΣΗΣΕ... Ν ΕΤΒΕΟΥ ΔΕ ΕΡΕΠΡΙΜΗ ΝΑΥΤΥ ΝΓΟΝΣ... Ν ΕΤΒΕΟΥ ΧΟΥΣΙΜΗ ΜΝΟΥ / (Or. 156.7ff.) ΕΤΒΕΟΥ ΚΗΣΙΚ ΝΤΥΤΤΗΣΕ ΜΠΕΤΝΤΙΟΥΣΗ Ν ΚΟΥΡΨΡ ΝΜΟΣ / (A 2 146) ΕΤ-ΒΕΟΥ ΕΚΟ ΝΚΡΟΥ ΑΥΣΗ ΚΧΙΟΥΕ ΑΥΣΗ ΚΥΝΑΛ Ν ΕΚΚΥΣ ΝΣΤΗΚ... 

C. ΕΤΒΕΟΥ with Basic Bipartite in APODISI (similarly rhetorical topicalization?): (A 1 265) ΕΝΕΧΝΑ-ΣΗΥ ΑΝ ΕΡΠΟΥ, ΝΑΥ ΝΣΕ ΝΗΛΟΟΚ ΧΕ- / (A 1 239) (ΕΝΕΜΕ...) ΝΑΥ ΝΣΕ ΡΚΑΕΡ-ΝΟΙΚ ΕΣΙΜΗ ΜΠΕΤΝΤΙΟΥΣΗ / (P 1304 103 ΡΚΒ) ΕΥΧΕ-ΠΕΡΙΒΓ ΒΝΗΝΓΙΧ ΑΥΣΗ ΤΧΝΗΕ, ΕΤΒΕΟΥ ΠΙΜΟΥΙ ΝΝΟΥΗΝΥΗ ΤΠΡΙΤ ΜΠΕΚΟΟΥ... ΕΥΧΕ-ΑΝΟΝ-ΖΕΝΑΒΕΕΥ... ΕΤΒΕΟΥ ΤΝΑΡΑΒΑ ΜΝΣΑΝ / (BLOr. 3581A 71, No. 202 ΡΝΑ) (ΕΥΧΕ...) ΝΑΥ ΝΣΕ ΝΗΛΟΜΑ Ν ΠΡΙΜΗ ΤΗΡΗ ΝΑΚΜΙΝΕ Ν ΚΡΑΝΑΛ ΜΝΕΝΤΑΧΥΜΑΧ... 

D. Several instances of ΟΥΝ-//ΜΗ- before the durative (almost in complementary distribution with EPE-): (A 2 483) ΝΑΥ ΝΣΕ ΟΥΝΩΜΕ ΑΥΣΗ ΟΥΝΩΜΕ ΝΑΥΜΕ ΝΕΥΤΥΒΟ, also Ench. 80a, Or. 157.39ff.

Topic b (1) Wess. 9 144c 15ff., Ch. 28.13f., 34ff., III 31.12f., IV 49.25f., Or. 156.21ff., 166.14ff.; b (2) Wess. 9 147c 22ff. (ΝΑΥ ΝΣΕ ΕΟΤΥ + pres., III 207.21ff. (ΝΑΥ ΝΣΕ ΕΝΗ - ΑΝ), Miss. 278 (ΝΑΥ ΝΣΕ + Ε- Nom. Sent.), Rossi 2/3 76 (ΝΑΥ ΝΣΕ ΠΝΟΕΙΝ ΝΑΝΟΥΣΕ ΑΝ... Ν ΕΝΕΧΝΑΡΑ ΑΝ...), III 71.19ff., A 2 78.

2.6.3.1.2 ΕΤΒΕΟΥ, ΝΑΥ ΝΣΕ in TOPIC-INITIAL pattern (2). This construction, statistically weaker than the preceding ones in Leipoldt and Chassnat (approx. 33% for ΝΑΥ ΝΣΕ, less than 10% for ΕΤΒΕΟΥ) is marked, i.e. can be shown to be subject to restrictions of special conditions. In the great majority of cases — condition 1 — it is included as marked by ΧΕ-; a characterization of macro-syntactic status.

118 Compare §7.2.1.5.1 for a similar convergence of rhetoricity/quotedness: §2.6.3.1.2 for rhetoricity/apodoticity/quotedness.

119 Not counting the basically different instances of " Ο ΝΑΥ ΝΣΕ ("how is..."?) where the 'topic → focus' arrangement is obligatory, i.e. unopposed to a focus-initial construction. Moreover, the focality grading is here different: Ν- 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 'ΝΑΥ ΝΣΕ'. Some Shenoutean exx. for Ω ΝΑΥ ΝΣΕ: III 74.7, 103.13, IV 6.17, 37.20f., 98.12, 155.2f., Mun. 110, Or. 154.39f. etc.

120 Cf. Polotsky 1934:63f. (= CP 368f.), Layton 1979:187f. I believe that his statement, to the extent that the effect that 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 patterns. 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 different focalization patterns: see §2.6.4. Historically speaking, this conditioning may be described as a preservation, in an "island" of special macro-syntactic circumstances, of the original 'topic → focus' arrangement, the "renewed" inverted focus-initial pattern being restricted to the complementary circumstances. Synchronously, this is of course the Shenoutean situation: it is (as a random check of Wilmet's references for ΕΤΒΕΟΥ and ΝΑΥ ΝΣΕ quickly shows) quite different from that prevailing in the New Testament.
(ε-included focus-initial ἔτβεος/ναυς πές are rare: about 3% of all initial attestations for ναῦς πές, 13% for ἔτβεος). 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 ὧν-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 topicalization of verb occurring previously. Condition 3 concerns yet another macro-syntactic relationship: ἔτβεος/ναυς πές in apodosis, esp. of είκε- (which is after all more of a topicalization marker than a true conditional), also of ἐμνόν "otherwise" 111. Condition 4: certain rhetorical configurations: rhetorical questions, chiasm, "proforma" topicalization, pre-inclusion (§2.7.1.4.2), and multiple focalization (Nav πές corresponding to other post-topic intern. 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 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) ἐ-inclination: A 1 71 (after χω, A 2 251 (εἰσπερεν ἐπολα), A 2 257 (ἀκόμη), 516 (ἐκκομά), 5161 (ναυς), P 1302 70 προ (προ-θεον) ἔτε εἰσαγάγος ναῦς πές / 1305 90 ῥο (ναυς) ἔτε εἰσαγάγος ναῦς πές μνημεύεις εἰκονικος / Ch. 55.24ff. (Ἀμαν), IV 156.19ff. (προσεχε), 188.10ff. (καταγ), 12ff. (κατηγ), etc., etc.: this construction is very common.

(2) Thematic progression: (Ch. 199.23ff.) ΠΑΝΗ ΝΙΜ ΝΗΝΑΡ-ΖΗΘΥ ΑΝ ΝΕΛΔΙΑΚΙΟΣ; ΕΥΝΑΡ-ΖΗΘΥ ΔΕ ΝΑΥΠΠΕΣ / (BMCat. 81, No. 197) ΠΡΟΣΜΕ ΓΑΡ ἔν ΕΜΗΣ ΜΕΠΥΑΑΤ ΕΝΑΝΤΙ ΑΝ ΜΕΠΥΑΑΤ ἔΤΕΒΟΥ / (Ch. 73.44ff.) ΑΠΑΝΤΑΝΑΚ ΒΙΚ ΕΡΟΥΝ ΕΡΟΥΝ ΝΤΑΜΠΙΚ 2ΘΗΧ ΕΤΒΟΥ — lemmatizing topicalization, §2.7.2.

(3) In apodosis: (A 2 19) (If they spare one, many will do so and transgress the law; if so,) ΝΤΑΥΜΟΟΥΤ ΑΝ ΜΕΠΕΚΟΥΣ ἔΤΕΒΟΥ / (A 2 194) ... ΜΜΟΝ ΕΝΑΒΙΒΚ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΣΙΤΟΟΤΟΥ ΝΑΥΠΠΕΣ / (A 1 69) (ΜΠΕΝΕΣΑΧΕΕ Ψ-ΨΑΥ ΝΕ, ΝΝΕΝΕΣ Ψ-ΨΑΥ ΝΑΚ ΝΤΟ) ΝΤΕΙΣΕ ΟΝ ΕΡΕΝΟΥΥΑΑΞΕ ΨΑΥ-ΨΑΥ ΝΑΝ ΝΑΥΠΠΕΣ (Ε)ΜΠΕΝΕΥΑΞΕ Ψ-ΨΑΥ ΝΕ ΑΝ.

(4) Rhetorical configurations: (A 2 385) Η ΕΚΝΑΥΟΥΟΥΜ ΜΜΟΚ ΝΑΥΠΠΕΣ ΠΑΝΟΜΟΚ ΝΙΟΥΔΑΙ / (A 1 158) ΝΑΥΠΠΕΣ ΕΙΝΑΙΕΙΜΕ ΕΝΕΥΜΙ Η ΕΙΝΑΙ-ΨΙ ΕΡΟΥΝ ΝΑΥΠΠΕΣ — a chiastic disjunctio Sinthiana figure / (P 1314 87 ΡΑΑ-Β) ΝΤΑΥΜΟΟΥΤ ΔΕ ΝΑΥΠΠΕΣ ... ΕΡΑ ΣΙΟΝΥΜΝΤΣΑΧΕΕ ... / (A 2 530) ΕΚΝΑΥΟΥΜ ΝΑΥΠΠΕΣ ΣΜΗΝΙ... ΑΧΥΝ ΔΕ ΕΧΝΑΒΜΟΟΚ ΕΤΕΠΑΡΑΝ ΜΜΟΚ / (III 15.21) ΕΤΕΠΑΡΑΝ ΜΜΟΚ ΝΑΥΠΠΕΣ ΧΕΕ ... — idiom? sim. A 1 61 / (P 1304 84 Ν) ΝΤΑΥΜΟΟΥΤ ΔΕ ΝΑΥΠΠΕΣ ΝΕΤΕΝΩΝ ΝΑΥΠΠΕΣ ΑΝ, ΑΧΥΝ ΝΤΑΥΝΑΡΑΓΕ ΝΑΥΠΠΕΣ ΝΕΤΕΝΩΝ ΕΙΝΑΙΕΙΜΕ — pre-inclusion focalization figure / (A 1 71) ΕΝΝΑΥΑΖΕΡΑΝ ΤΨΕΝ Κ ΕΝΝΑΥΨΗ-ΠΡΟΟΥΥ ΜΝΕΙΣΘ ΝΟΥΨΤ ΜΝΕΝΕΡΦΥ ΝΑΥΠΠΕΣ ΑΝΟΝ ΑΧΥΝ ΝΤΟ / (III 207.14ff.) ΕΡΕΝΑΓΨΤ ΝΑΥΠΠΕΣ ΕΡΟΥΝ ΕΣΡΑΚ ΜΠΧΟΕΙΣ... ΕΡΕΝΑΥΨΗ-ΠΟΥΣΟ ΕΣΡΑΚ ΤΨΕΝ... ΕΡΕΝΑΓΨΤ ΝΑΥΠΠΕΣ ΕΡΟΥΝ ΕΣΡΑΚ ΜΠΧΟΥΡΠΝ ΝΕΨΤ / (A 1 62-3) ΕΡΕΝΑΖΕ ΕΠΝΑΨΕ ΕΤΣΗΖ ΤΨΕΝ... ΕΝΝΑΥΑΖΕΡΑΝ ΕΡΟΥΝ ΝΑΥΠΠΕΣ. In (Ming. 318) ΤΜΗΣΕ ΔΕ ΜΠΗ- [...] ΕΧ-ΕΚΣΤΥΝΙΚΑ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΝΕΑΝ ΜΓΑΜΟΚ (Ε)ΝΤΑΥ- ΞΙ-ΟΥΜ ΜΜΟΚ ΝΑΥΠΠΕΣ "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 ναῦς πές is evidently conditioned; cf. category (1) above.

(5) (A 1 80) ΕΙΝΑΨΗ-ΝΑΒΑΛΑ ΕΡΟΚ ΝΑΥΠΠΕΣ ΣΜΠΑΥΛΑ ΚΟΥΙ ΜΜΝΤΖΗΚΕ.

111 Cf. Shisha-Halevy 1972:§4.1.4.1 (on ἐμμόν as circumstantial conversion of ἐμμόν "no, not"). Cf. now the clearly circumstantial ἐμμόν "otherwise" in "Middle Egyptian" Coptic (Mt. 6:1, 9:17; Schenke).
2.6.3.2 The idiosyncratic ἕβοι τιν "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)  

| ΔΕ- | Α 2 111, 140, 334... (unmarked topic) |
| ΕΥΝΑ- | Ρ 1315 42 ro, RE 10 162b 25ff., Α 2 54 |
| Ε- | Α 1 64, Η 72.2f. |

ΕΒΟΙ ΤΙΝ

| ΕΥΝ- | Α 2 412 |
| ΝΤΑΧ- | Wess. 9 131a 2ff. 122 |
| ΞΕ-ΑΧ- | Ρ 1304 120 ΚΗ |
| ΞΕ-ΟΥΝ- | Α 1 67 |
| ΞΕ-ΕΨΕ- | Ρηλ. 69 Ξ, Α 2 62. |
| ΞΕ-ΕΥΝΑ- | Α 2 9, Η 87.7, 26.18ff., etc. |

(ΝΕΒΟΙ ΤΙΝ)

| ΝΕ ΞΕ-ΕΥΝΑ- | Α 2 8 (coll.) 123 |
| ΕΤΡΕ- | Η 19.20f. 123 |

(b) (non-initial)  

ΞΕ + Sec. Tense + ΕΒΟΙ ΤΙΝ Α 1 281, Cl. Pr. 38, 1 124, IV 64.23.

Some representative examples: (Α 2 140) ΕΒΟΙ ΤΙΝ ΑΤΕΤΗΤΑΚΟ ΝΟΕ ΝΟΥΠΕ ΕΥΝΟΥΤΗ / (Α 2 54) ΕΒΟΙ ΤΙΝ ΕΡΕΝΙΣΒΗΟΥΕ ΝΚΑΚΕ ΖΙΓΟΟΜ ... ΝΑΙΛΟΜΑΜ ΕΥΝΟΥ ΕΡΟΝ / (Ρ 1304 48 vo) ΕΒΟΙ ΤΙΝ ΞΕ-ΕΡΕΙΝΑΙ ΝΑΧ ΝΤΕΝΕ ΤΗΡΗΣ / (Α 2 412) ΕΜΝΗΣΘΕ ΞΕ ΨΟΟΠ ΕΒΟΙ ΤΙΝ ΕΥΝΟΥΤΕ ΟΙΝ ΝΑΙΛΟΜΗΣ ΝΑΙΛΙΜΗΣ / (Α 1 64) ΕΤΡΕΟΥΝ Η ΕΒΟΙ ΤΙΝ ΕΙΣΩ ΝΝΑΙ ΝΕ / (Wess. 9 131a 2ff.) ΕΒΟΙ ΤΙΝ ΝΤΑΞΩΡΙΓΕΝΗΣ ΕΣΟΥΤΕ ΕΣΟΥΤΗ... / (Ρ 1304 120 ΚΗ) ΕΒΟΙ ΤΙΝ ΞΕ-ΕΡΕΙΝΑΤΕΛΕΥΧΡΗ Ρ-ΝΟΒΕ ΑΥΤΑΛΕ ΕΠΩΗΜΑ / (Α 2 9) ΕΒΟΙ ΤΙΝ ΞΕ-ΕΡΕΩΥΤΗΡΗ ΝΑΛΥΝΕΙ ΜΝΕΘΕΙΣΤ / (Α 2 8 coll.) ΝΕΒΟΙ ΤΙΝ ΝΕ ΞΕ-ΕΥΝΑΡ-ΝΕΖΒΗΟΥΕ ΝΝΑΙΛΗΜΗ / (Α 2 62) ΕΒΟΙ ΤΙΝ ΞΕ-ΕΡΕΤΚΑΒΕ-ΝΙΑΒΟΛΟΣ ΕΠΩΖΗΤ.

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 ΕΒΟΙ ΤΙΝ proves the exception to the non-interrogative constituency of the focus in pattern (4).

123 ΞΕ- and ΕΤΡΕ- 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 τετυς (τέτυς), Jannaris §§1774b, 1911, pp. 566, 577). Compare the Akhmimic (Gespr. Jesu 32.11f.) ΝΕΣ ΞΕ ΝΕΣ ΕΤΕΡΟΥΕ ΝΟΥΕ ΝΗΜΗ ΝΗΡΑΜ. In ΝΕΒΟΙ ΤΙΝ ΝΕ ΞΕ-, ΞΕ- is appositive to the pronominal subject in the ΝΕ modifier + ΝΕΣ predicate pattern (§1.2.1.2).

124 Rarely, we find ΕΒΟΙ ΤΙΝ following the Basic "imperfectum futuri" (in apodosis), §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.</td>
<td>affirm. dur. (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>non-interr. affirm. (1)</td>
<td>non-dur. affirm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>non-interr. affirm. (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>negative (3) (5)</td>
<td>άκατ- (2)</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circumstantial</td>
<td>non-dur. affirm. non-interr. (1)</td>
<td>non-dur. affirm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></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.</td>
<td>άκατ- (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dur. affirm. (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(c) Significant distinctions (focus-initial patterns):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>affirm.: neg. TOPIC</th>
<th>interr.: non-interr. FOCUS</th>
<th>affirm.: neg. NEXUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>non-durative topic</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>durative topic</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(d) Interpretation. We note the existence of two separate, independent but successive conditioning sets at play: (α) 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) ΑΔΙ- has a full three-member paradigm, ΞΑΔΙ-, 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). ΕΑΔΙ- may be opposed to ΝΤΑΔΙ- 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 — pattts. (2), (5), (6). Note in particular (a) the "Wechselsatz" or correlative "balanced" construction effect, where we have two εν-forms juxtaposed, and pattern (i.e. topic/focus) assignment is impossible and immaterial — the topic-focus structure is reversible: (A 1/68) ΜΗ ΕΜΜΕ ΝΝΟ ΕΜΜΟΣΤΕ ΝΤΑΠΟΛΑΕ, ΕΜΜΕ ΝΜΟΣ ΕΜΜΟΣΤΕ ΝΜΟ ΝΤΟ, Η ΕΜΜΕ ΝΟΥΕΙ ΝΝΩ ΤΟΝ... ΕΜΜΟΣΤΕ ΝΟΥΕΙ, Η ΕΜΜΟΣΤΕ ΝΤΟΥ ΝΟΥΑ ΖΑΤΗΝ ΕΜΜΕ ΝΟΥΑ. Also, instances of the type (Mun. 96) ΕΙΤΟΑΜΑ ΕΙΞΙ ΝΝΑΙ and (Wess. 9 158a 30ff.) ΕΥΜΟΣΤΕ ΜΜΩΤΝ ΑΝ ΕΥΞΙ ΝΗΤΝ ΝΝΑΙ / (P 1302 121 vo) ΜΠΡΕΜΕΤΕ ΧΕ-ΕΙΜΟΣΤΕ ΜΜΩΤΝ ΕΙΞΙ ΝΗΤΝ ΝΝΑΙ, ΑΛΛΑ ΕΙΜΕ ΜΜΩΤΝ ΜΩΝ ΝΝΑΙ

---

125 For some equally distinctive syntactic phenomena, see §§0.1.2, 2.7 passim and the index.
(III 122.20) ΝΑΙ ΔΕ ΕΙΧΩ ΜΜΟΥ ΕΕΙΤΑΜΟ ΜΜΙΤΗΝ / (RE 11 16a 39ff.) ΕΡΕΠΛΑΓΩ ΝΟΓΝΕΝ ΑΝ ΕΙΧΩ ΜΝΑΙ ΟΥΑΕ (Ε)ΝΡΑΞΕ ΑΝ... ΑΛΛΑ (Ε)ΝΛΥΝΗ ΝΤΟΥ ΑΝΟΥΟ.

(b) Instances of the "No sooner... than..." sense of the complex 187: (Ch. 202-3) ΕΥΑΧΕΥΣΕΝΕ ΕΥ ΝΤΟΤΗ ΝΟΥΟ ΝΙΜ ΖΝΕΥΧΡΕΙΑ ΕΥΑΧΕΥΟΥ "(... 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 chiastic. Often, these are Disiunctio Sinthian a cases: (A 2 409) ΕΥΕΙΡΕ ΜΜΟΥ ΝΝΙΜ Ν ΝΙΜ ΠΕΤΝΑΥΒΗΝ ΕΡΟΧ ΝΝΕΥ- ΝΕΤΝΑΝΟΥΗ / (A 1 52) ΕΙΝΑΡ-ΟΥ ΟΥ ΠΕΤΝΑΛΛΗ / (A 2 378) "ΕΙΧΩ ΝΖΤΗΝ ΕΕΙΝΗ " — " ΝΡΗ ΠΕΤΜΟΥΡ ΜΜΟΙ" / (Ench. 67a) ΝΤΑΥΜΗΒΕ ΝΝΟΥ: ΝΤΟΚ ΠΕΤΝΑΚΥΒΕ / (ibid. 74b) ΕΤΕΤΝΗΠΙ ΕΕΙΝΗΠ — ΝΜΟΥ ΠΕΤΝΑΜΩΤΙ ΕΡΟΘ ΝΝΟΥΣΝΕ / (RE 10 163a 15f.) ΝΤΑΝΚΟΜΟΣΝ ΤΗΡΗ ΥΛΝΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΙΤΟΤΚ, ΑΛΛΑ ΠΕΚΣΤΑΥΡΟΣ ΠΕΝΤΑΚΙΜ ΕΝΚΛΑ ΤΗΡΗ / (III 192.4) ΕΥΑΧΕΥΣΕ ΕΝΙΜ Ν ΝΙΜ ΠΕΝΤΑΧΚΟΟ... 

2.7.1.3.1 Double simulataneous (interrogative) focalization: (Cat. 42.27ff.) ΝΙΜ ΠΕΤΠΧ ΜΜΟΣ ΝΝΙΜ 189 / (Wess. 9 110a 9f.) ΝΤΑΝΙΜ ΤΣΑΥΒΟΤ ΕΕΙΝΗ / (A 2 63) ΝΙΜ ΠΕΤΝΑΡ-ΥΟΡΠ ΕΕΙΝΗ / (ibid. 518-9) ΝΤΑΝΙΜ ΕΙΜΕ... ΖΝΕ-ΝΙΜ ΠΕΤΝΑΣΖ ΕΑΝΗΝ ΝΜΟΝ Ν ΖΝΕ-ΝΙΜ ΠΕΤΝΑΤ-ΖΗΝ ΕΤΕΒΕΝΙΜ / (RE 10 160a 37) ΝΙΜ ΠΕΝΤΑΜΕΥΤ- ΝΙΜ. Compare (Ch. 128.43ff.) ΑΟΥΗΡ ΝΕΠΙΚΟΠΟΣ Ρ-ΟΥΗΡ ΝΣΟΟΥ ΜΝΟΥΡ ΝΟΥΗΡ ΝΜΠΑ.

2.7.1.3.2 The extremely common complex (expanded, disjoined) focus: (A 1 64) ΕΤΕΒΕΟΥ Ν ΕΒΟΛ Τ ΥΝ ΕΙΧΩ ΜΝΑΙ ΝΕ / (A 2 8-9) ΝΑΥ ΓΑΡ ΝΣΕ Ν ΕΤΕΒΕΟΥ ΕΡΕΙΣ-ΝΑΡ-ΟΥΗΡ Ν ΟΥΤΟΠΟΣ ΝΟΜΜΟ ΕΡΟΧ / (ibid. 312) ΕΤΕΒΕΟΥ Ν ΕΞΝΟΥ ΝΣΩΒ (sim. 223-4, 111 214.5) / (Miss. 283) ΖΑΣΤΝΗΝ Ν ΝΝΑΤΗ ΝΗΙ / (Wess. 9 151c 24ff.) ΕΞΝΟΥ Ν ΕΞΝΝΜ / (A 1 109) ΕΤΕΒΕΝΙΜ Ν ΖΑΣΤΝΗΝ / (236) ΕΤΕΒΕΟΥ Ν ΖΙΤΝΟΥ / (412) ΤΣΗΝ Ν ΕΒΟΛ ΖΙΤΝΗΝ (sim. P 131b 14 νο) / (III 72.2f.) ΕΒΟΛ ΤΣΗΝ Ν ΖΙΤΝΟΥ (mostly striking instances of the figura Sinthiana).

2.7.1.3.3 Complex theme (see §2.8.4), very common: (A 2 45) ΝΑΥ ΓΑΡ ΕΝΑΡ-ΨΑΥ... Η ΕΟΥΝΟΥΡΑΝ ΕΤΜΑΙΝΗ ΝΑΤ-ΖΗΝ ΜΜΟΥ / (ibid. 525) ΕΝΝΑΒΗΚ Ν ΝΤΑΝΒΗΚ... ΕΤΒΕ ΝΑΙ ΕΤΜΜΑΥ / (Leyd. 410) ΕΞΜΠΑΙ ΕΤ- ΤΑΧΕΙ ΕΡΠΑΙ ΕΠΙΤΗΜΕ Ν ΕΝΤΑΥΝ-ΝΕΤΙΤΗΜΕ ΕΡΠΑΙ ΕΦΑΚ. Chiastically, (Ch. 119.445ff.) ΕΡΕΠΛΑΓΩ ΝΟΥΗΡ ΑΟΥΗΡ ΑΟΥΗΡ ΕΤΑΚΤΗΥ (" discontinuous theme "); sim. Ch. 128.20ff.; compare also the conjunctive subcategorizing 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) ΝΤΑΥΜΒΤΗ ΝΜΕΝΟΤ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΝΙΜ / (IV 105.5) ΝΤΑΥΗΕ ΕΖΟΥΝ ΨΑΡΝΟΝ ΝΝΙΟΥΕ ΕΕΙΝΗ / (Wess. 9 117a 5f.) ΕΥΝΑΤΙΚ ΕΡΑΤΗ ΝΝΙΜ. Note the Basic Tense in (Wess. 9 133b 10ff.) ΑΝΣΕ ΕΡΠΑΙ ΕΟΥΝΕΛΑΙΟΣ ΝΑΥ ΓΕΝΟΤ ΜΜΝΤΑΚΣΗΝΗΣ / (P 130b 103 γο) ΕΖΗΗΝΗ ΕΡ-ΟΥ (sim. IV 94.13: A 2 513 ΕΙΝΑΕΙ ΕΖΟΥΝ ΝΕ ΕΡ-ΟΥ).

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


188 Cf. Polotsky 1944:62ff. (= CP 166ff.).

189 Cf. Plato Republ. 332 c-d: η τινι ουν τι άποδιδουσα ᾧερλόμενον και προστικον τέχνη.
here no formal marking of the dependence, beside the arrangement, which is inverse to the normal nucleus-satellite one in Coptic. \((P\ 130^5\ 74\ \text{PrA},\ \text{parall.} \ Wess.\ 9\ 108b\ 23ff.)\ \text{of}\ \text{PETNATAAT} (\text{sic})\ \text{RWME} \text{NIM COOYN} / (IV\ 64.15ff.)\ \text{E}X\text{OOOC} \text{XE-NAW NSE} \text{H NIM PENTANYXHE}... \text{EMINPHEME COOYN} / (A\ 2\ 223-4)\ \text{E}X\text{OOON EXNOY H ETHEBOY EXWHE-MPEIMHE NMAAZOC AN} / (P\ 131^4\ 156M)\ \text{E}X\text{OOON TWIN TENOY MANPOTANON} / (K\ 9317)\ \text{OF}\ \text{PENATAYXHE NIMCOOYN AN} \text{H OY PENTNATAAT NHEIME AN} / P\ 130^4\ 84\ N\ \text{is}\ \text{quoted}\ \text{above} \ (\S 2.6.3.1.2).\ \text{Compare}\ \text{the}\ \text{related}\ \text{constructions}: \ (Wess.\ 9\ 148b\ 16ff.))\ \text{E}X\text{OOOC DAE XE-NAW NSE MNAAY NCOOYN} / (Leyd.\ 365)\ \text{E}X\text{E}-\text{NAWAYH N CBOOY, NIM NA} \text{NTHTHTYN PETCOOYN AN} / (III\ 210.7f.))\ \text{ETE} \text{E}XWHE... \text{MPEIMHE-MOM ENOEI} / (ibid.\ 24.10ff.)\ \text{PETPENSH DAE MPOTU NPOY NAAY ZHAY PECASHEZ H PENTNAWAYXHE NTHTEN ETHCOOYN} / (P\ 130^5\ 125\ VO,\ \text{parall.} \ Cat.\ 42.14f.)\ \text{E}X\text{OOOC ON ZE-NTHAYXHE NPHYME NAAY NSE}... \text{NTK-NIM} \text{W PRETYW}.\ \text{The}\ \text{governing}\ \text{verbs}\ \text{COOYN, EIME, TAMO, NOEI}, \text{XW}; \text{no}\ \text{resumption}\ \text{is}\ \text{included}\ \text{in}\ \text{the}\ \text{construction}^{130}.\ \text{The}}

2.7.2 \text{RHETORICAL TOPICALIZATION FIGURES (a selection)}

2.7.2.1 \# \text{VERBX} \rightarrow (\text{VERBX} + \text{FOCUS}) \#\). \text{The}\ \text{focalization}\ \text{pattern}\ \text{is}\ \text{coherent}\ \text{by}\ \text{repeating,}\ \text{as}\ \text{theme,}\ \text{a}\ \text{foregoing (usually rhetorical) verb}^{131}, \text{often}\ \text{with}\ \text{a}\ \text{macro-syntactic}\ \text{topicalization}\ \text{marker}.\ \text{Topicalization}\ \text{marked}\ \text{by} \text{EXWHE}: \ (Ch.\ 191.46ff.)) \text{E}X\text{WHE-ARCHA-RWME NAK TACAKA-ZEN-} \text{PATAATACH AWW GENGOYEAXHHE...} / (IV\ 24.6f.)\ \text{EXWHE-CHOOON ON,}\ \text{E}X\text{OOON 2MPEYAC MMATE AWW 2MPHHTH AN} / (III\ \text{32.10f.})\ \text{EXWHE-AYSHHE ON NCAOOUYXHE,}\ \text{EAYAYHHE 2NOUMNTSAK} / (III\ \text{85.13f.})\ \text{EXWHE-ONYNT-2OYGM}\ \text{GAP ON, EODNTACS 2NENNT-MA NAK NTHTOY.}\ \text{Especially}\ \text{typical}\ \text{of}\ \text{Shenoute}\ \text{is}\ \text{the}\ \text{pattern}\ \#\ \text{EXWHE- VERBX} \rightarrow \text{ETBEYO/ÆZPO-/NAAY NSE} + \text{VERBX} \#,\ \text{often}\ \text{with}\ \text{more}\ \text{than}\ \text{one}\ \text{element}\ \text{repeated}^{132}: \ (Ch.\ 64.19ff.) \text{E}X\text{WHE-2NZOM MUPNYMHE XANANAMIA EHTENPUHHE EIRE NMPHYZACIES, ETBEYO NOTOCH 2NZOM MPEZH... NTNEPE}\ \text{AN... XANANAMIA}... \text{sim. ibid. 79.1ff.} / (A\ 2\ 371) \text{EXWHE-MZOM MZOK EIREE NHTPANACH MPOYUOTE, NAAY NOTOCH NSE OYGMHE MZOK ER-POUYU ESYE MPEZHNT MPYHHEPON.}

2.7.2.2 \text{Topicalization}\ \text{marked}\ \text{by} \text{EXAN}: \ (Ch.\ 104.5ff.) \text{E}XWHE-2MPHOMENAXOC NMETEYE MH EXNH-} \text{STEU NAK H EXWHEPE EIMZE MH NTAKAATACH NAK} / (Wess.\ 9\ 110b\ 18ff.) \text{E}XWHE-2MARKE EREPHE EPEPA EPEPA 2REPA 2NTUYN=H = \text{compare}\ (Wess.\ 9\ 111-2) \text{EXWHE-MAEIN ON EHPZOU EIME 2WYY XE-ETBEYNIM H ETHE-} \text{BOY and (IV\ \text{11.9f.}) KAN EZNAC EKTOC ENEKWS H EZNAC AN EAKTOC GS EBOOL AN XE-ACCEI AALLA...}, \text{usually}\ \text{a}\ \text{use}\ \text{of}\ \text{EXWHE- as}\ \text{the}\ \text{adverbial}\ \text{and}\ \text{topicalizing; also (K\ 933) NSENPAR-} \text{WAYHE AN ENEZ NOYIESHT OYTE CON NOKYON, EAYEIE ON, NTAYEPE EXNIXH.}

2.7.2.2.1 \text{EXWANEXOC} \ "If\ I\ say,\ when\ I\ say" \ is\ a\ striking\ topicalizing\ expression\ (cf. \text{EXOOC} \ "as\ to\ saying..."\), \text{exx. in \S 2.7.1.4.2 and n. 130):} (Cl. \text{Pr.} 22 \text{TCE}) \text{EXWANEXOC XE-ZGOOY, EIZOOY NAI MAYEAT} / (A\ 2\ 333) \text{EXWANEXOC XE-NEIZWB NPAZAPETIKOS PE... EBOO TWIN NCE NIZEHYE ETHYOMNE AWW NCUUBE} / (A\ 1\ 281) \text{EXWANEXOC GAP XE-ERPANJUVEOLOCS MEYEE EYONYOHON NZOYO ERYNYHE... NTOKH PZ PETCUMBYLOEUE NAY} / (BLOr.\ 3581A\ f.\ 160, No.\ 253\ NZ) \text{EXWANEXOC XE-ATGEPHAI +-WI ETPBOO MZCMHA... ENNAWAYXOC ON XE-OY ETPENXINGOC.}\ \text{Also}\ A\ 1\ 410, A\ 2\ 295, 482.

---

130 Compare the resumptions in the following case: \((P\ 130^5\ 66\ OG)\ ZOTEI MEN GAP TINAY EPOUO (i.e. desire and anger) -NZH2 PWWX PAI OYON NIM ZOMAODIEME MPNOI / (A\ 2\ 443,\ \text{not Sh.})\ ZOTEI DAE PEZEOY MPHENZHE... \text{EYATKOPROQO MPOC ZITNTPEPARKHIC NHEIMHE EYON NIM COOYN MPNOI.}\ \text{Consider also the resuming and non-resuming constructions of EXOOC} \ "\text{as}\ \text{to}\ \text{saying}"\, \text{a}\ \text{distinctive}\ \text{topicalization}\ \text{figure} \ (\S 2.7.2.1.2.1):} (Ch.\ 61.25ff.) \text{EXOOC DAE XE-ENKJHE MPOC NAYE NSE... OYGMTOM PE EEME EPAI} / (A\ 2\ 392) \text{EXOOC XE-MPOOOXI-BAPTHMCA NIM PETO MMTNPE XE-AHYXI / (Cat.\ 42.14f.) EXOOC DAE XE-NTAAYXHE NPHME NAYE NSE... NTK-} \text{NIM NOTOK W PRETYWH} / (P\ 130^5\ 115\ IZ) \text{EXOOC DAE XE-MAYSHOY MINEMA MNTOCH ETZNTMNTERO MNTHHEPE NIZWB OYONZ EBOO XE-}.

131 Cf. Polotsky 1944:26ff. (= \text{CP} 130ff.).
132 See Müller 1956:62ff.; cf. \S 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.) ΝΕΤΣΟΣΕ ΕΥΖΟΣΕ ΕΤΒΕΝΕΥΠΡΑΣΙΚ ΝΑΓΑΘΩΝ / (ΙΙΙ 115.8f.) ΜΝ ΖΝΑΥ ΝΙΜ ΕΤΕΡΜΠΛΑΝΤ + ΜΝΟΟΥ ΕΤΕ ΜΝΟΟΥ ΑΝ ΖΑΤΕΡΡΥΧΗ ΝΜ ΠΕΚΣΜΗΑ / (Α 2 463-4) ΖΩΒ ΝΙΜ ΝΤΑΧΑΛΛΑ ΝΤΑΧΑΛΛ ΥΘΡΟΥ ΕΤΒΕΝΕΝΟΥΧΩΑΙ.

2.7.2.1.4 Lemmatizing topicalization — topicalization of a quotation or segment of a quotation; very typical of Shenoute 133. 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 patt. (2). (c) “Extraction” of a verbal segment or lexicem component in the quote and its incorporation — in unaltered form 135 — 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 ΖΕ-ΝΑΥ ΝΣΕ ΕΡΕ “ΝΒΑΛ ΜΠΟΣΟΚ ΥΟΟΝ ΖΝ ΤΕΤΑΧΕ” (Eccl. 2:14) / (Ch. 73.5ff.) “ΑΝΠΑΓΑΝΑΣ ΒΙΣΚ ΕΖΟΥΝ ΕΡΟΥ” — ΝΤΑΧΑΤΑΚΙ ΖΩΒ ΗΤΕ ΥΟΥ: (Joh. 13:27) / (Cat. 42.12) “ΑΝΤΝΟΟΥΧ” — ΝΤΑΧΑΤΝΟΟΥΧ ΤΗΝ; (Gal. 4:4 paraphrased) / (Π 1316 19 ΜΓ) “ΕΤΕΤΜΙΑΙ ΑΥΣ ΤΕΤΝΡΟ-ΛΕΜΟΣ ΜΝΤΗΝ ΜΜΑΥ” — ΕΜΤΑΝ-ΟΥ ΜΜΑΥ; ΕΜΤΑΝ-ΡΟΕΙΣ ΜΜΑΥ (Jac. 4:2).

(b) (IV 18.2) “ΖΝΑΖΩΡ ΝΤΕΤΑΧΕ” — ΖΝΑΖΟΡΣΕ ΕΡ-ΟΥ; ΕΥΧΩΥΤ ΝΖΕΝΤΝΟΟΥΧ ΖΝ-ΕΚΔΝΩ ΝΖΕΝΠΡΑΜΕ (Ps. 7:12) / (A 2 339) “ΖΝΑΖΩΡΣΗ ΜΝΕΝΟΥΤΕ” — ΖΝΑΖΩΡΣΗ ΕΟΥ; ΖΝΑΖΩΡΣΗ ΕΠΑΖ-ΚΒΑ (Zach. 9:7) / (Α 2 11) “ΝΚΑΝΙΜ ΑΝ” — ΝΚΑΝΙΜ άΝ ΓΝΟΥ; ΝΚΑΝΙΜ άΝ ΓΝΗΜΝΟΥΤΕ ΕΥΜΝΤΑΤΝΟΥΤΕ, ΝΚΑΝΙΜ άΝ ΓΝΗΜ- ΤΕΥΚΙΣ ΕΡ-ΝΜΑΝΝΑΡΑΡΥΚΙΣ (Ps. 45:5) / (ΙΙΙ 75.13ff., parall. Ch. 169.11ff.) “ΜΜΝΡΑΖΕ ΥΟΟΝ ΝΝΑΣΕΒΙΣ” — ΜΜΝΡΑΖΕ ΥΟΟΝ ΝΑΥ ΤΗΝ, ΖΝΠΑΖΣΗ ΜΕ ΕΤΣΔΝ ΖΝ-ΜΜΟΝ ΠΑΙ (Is. 48:22, 57:21) / (Ch. 183.1ff.) “ΑΝ- ΓΟΤΕ ΑΤΑΑΡΓΣ +-ΟΥΣ” — ΑΧ-ΟΥΣ ΕΟΥ; ΝΟΤΗΝΗΒΕ ΑΝ Η ΝΤΟΧ ΚΕΜΑΔΟ, ΑΛΑΑ ΑΧ-ΟΥΣ ΝΝΑΡΡΠΟΣ ΝΤΑΙ- ΚΑΙΟΥΗ (Ps. 27:7) / (Μων. 142) “ΝΑΙ ΝΑΖΗΙΣΚΑΚ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΝΟΥΜΗ” — ΣΕΝΑΖΗΙΣΚΑΚ ΕΒΟΛ ΤΗΝ ΝΑΥ ΝΖΟΟΥ; (Is. 24:14).

(c) (Ch. 196.10ff.) “ΑΝΤΣΙΟ ΝΟΥΥΧΗ ΕΖΚΑΕΙΤ” — ΕΖΚΑΕΙΤ ΜΝΠΑ ΕΑΛΔ ΑΥΣ ΠΤ (Ps. 106:9) / (ΙΙΙ 54.13) “ΕΟ ΝΣΕ ΝΟΥΚΠΗΟΣ ΕΙΡΟΧ” — ΕΙΡΟΧ ΓΝΠΣΙΤΣΙΚ ΜΝΤΕΡΝΑΛ ΜΝΤΕΣΒ ΜΝΠΩΝ (Cant. 4:12) / (A 2 245) “ΑΎΝΤΝΟΟΥΧ” — ΤΝΟΟΥΧ ΤΗΝ ΝΤΑΡΡΕΤΝΟΟΥΧ ΕΒΟΛ ΓΙΟΟΤΓ ΑΥΣ ΓΑΣΤΖΗ (Gal. 4:4) / (Wess. 99b 11ff.) “ΕΜΝΑΦΑΛΙ ΝΣΗΤ ” — ΠΕΛΑΖ “ ΑΝ-ΟΥΛΑΛ ” — ΕΜΝΑΦΑΛΙ ΝΣΗΤ ΕΝΙΜ ΝΚΑΛΕΣΤΙΩΥΜ (J Cor. 13:2) / (ΙΙΙ 45.17ff.) “ΕΠΑΗΝΗΚΝ ΝΤΗΝ ΠΕ ΥΡΝ-ΘΥΤΝ ” — ΥΡΝ-ΘΥΤΝ ΕΡ-ΟΥ; ΥΡΝ-ΘΥΤΝ ΕΟΥΧΩΥΤ Η ΕΟΥΣΗΝ (Ps. 126:2) / (ΙΙΙ 192.14f.-193.11) “ΜΝΑΖΑΚΕ ΓΙΑΛΑΖΟΜ ΖΝΓΟΝΕΣ” — ...ΑΛΑΖΟΜ ΓΖΛΤΝ ΕΝΙΜ Η Ρ-ΑΖΑΕ ΕΝΙΜ: (source? Note that Ρ-ΑΖΑΕ represents the [non-verbal] expansion of ΜΝΤ-) / (A 2 330-1) “ΕΡ-ΖΟΤΕ ΝΣΕ ΝΗΟΜΝ ΕΤΑΖΕΡΑΤΟΥ” — ΕΤΑΖΕΡΑΤΟΥ ΤΗΝ Η ΕΝΙΜ; ΕΤΑΖΕΡΑΤΟΥ ΕΠΩΟΙΣ... (Cant. 6:4,10).

(d) (A 2 365) “ΠΕΧΕΟΥΗ ΝΛΒΖΚ ΑΝ ΕΠΕΧΤΗ ΝΜΑΛΛΗ” — ΕΠΕΧΤΗ ΤΗΝ ΝΗΛΑΑΜΝΗ (Ps. 48:17).

(e) (Tete 684) “ΑΚΣΟΥΡΗ ΝΝΝΑΟΝΙΑΖ” — ΝΝΝΑΟΝΙΑ ΝΝΤΑΖ; ΝΝΝΑΟΝΙΕΓΜΝ-ΤΟΟΤΗ ΝΝΝΑΟΜΕΑΣ (Gen. 22:1) / (A 2 386) “ΕΝΑΟΟΥΤΗ ΝΑΥ” — ΝΑΥ ΝΜΝΕ ΝΤΑΡΡΕΥΜΕ ΖΕ-ΠΕΤΕΟΥΝΤΑΖ-ΠΥΡΗΡ ΟΥΝΤΑΖ- ΝΕΙΣΤΣΗ; (Joh. 4:23) / (Α 1 113) “ΝΑΖΙ-ΖΑΝ ΝΝΜΗΤΝ ΑΥΣ ΝΑΖΙ-ΖΑΝ ΝΝΜΗΤΝ ΝΕΤΝΠΡΗ” — ΕΤΣΔΝ ΓΖΛΤΝ; (Jer. 2:9: sim. (?) A 2 57, A 1 299) / (Ch. 181.53ff.) “ΟΥΨΥΧΗ ΕΟΥΝΖ ΝΑΚ ΕΒΟΛ ΜΝΠΡΑΛΣ ΝΝΕ- ΘΡΗΠΗΝ” — ΝΑΥ ΝΘΡΗΠ (Ps. 73:19).

133 The Trismembral Nominal Sentence supplies another lemmatizing construction, viz. #—“—” ΖΕ# #—(after a quotation or allegory), e.g. Ch. 122.18ff.,28ff., 142.11ff., A 2 465-6, 491. IV 181.10ff.
134 Thus, I believe, proving the Shenoianity of BLOr. 6954 (12) vo [...]ΕΝ ΆΝ ΓΙΑΥ ΝΖΗΘ; ΖΙΤΣΙΝ ΜΠΡΡΟ ΖΗ-ΖΙΤΣΙΝ ΜΠΑΖΙΕ (B. Layton’s copy), probably our type (b).
135 Cf. BLOr. 3581A 160 (No. 253 ΜΝ, parall. RE 10 159a 13ff.) (“ΜΕΤΟΟΜΕ ΕΡΟΥ...ΑΥΣ ΕΝΤΟΟΜΕ ΕΡΟΥ”) ΕΤΣΔΝ ΔΕ ΑΛΙΖΟΣ ΖΕ-“ΤΗΜΗΕ”; but IV 181.11ff. (ΟΥ ΔΕ ΖΕ-“ ΕΥΟΥΗΣ ΝΙΜΟΥ ΗΤΕ”) “ΟΥΨΖ ΝΙΜΟΥ” ΖΕ-“ΖΕ”-; see n. 86.
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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.) ΜΠΟΥΚΑΣ ΝΑΝ ΕΤΡΕΠ-, ΆΛΛΑ ΝΤΑΥΤΑΑΚ ΝΑΝ Ε-/ (III 38.16f.) ΝΠ-ΖΩΤΕ ΑΝ ΖΩΑΤΝ ΟΥΔΕ ΕΙΣΤΡΚΨΗ ΑΝ (v.l. ΝΠ-ΖΩΤΕ ΑΝ) / (A 2 86) ΣΕΝΑΞΟΝ ΟΥΕΝ ΜΜΟΚ ΕΞΕ-/ (Wess. 9 165c 27ff., parall. III 140.8) ΝΟΥΝΟΥΝ ΜΜΟΣΤΕ ΕΚ- ΝΑΠΟΡΚΝ Η ΑΚΙΝΟΡΚΝ ΕΒΩΑ 2ΝΤΣΥΑΝΑΓΨΗ.

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 ε-topic: §2.6.3.1.1.

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

(a) The focus ΤΩΝ, the theme "ΑΥΣΩΤΜ": (Wess. 9 127b 8ff.) ΑΠΙΝΤΗΘΕ ΜΜΙΝΕ ΜΝΕ ΕΙ ΤΩΝ... Α+ΝΨΡΑ ΤΗΡΗΣ 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 ΝΕΨΡΑΘΕ ΤΩΝ.

(b) The theme NOYHP, the theme: present: (P 1303² 45 CIB) ΥΕΝΟΥΝΖ ΕΒΩΑ ΝΟΥΝΨ ΕΞΕ-/ (P 1303² 65 ro) ΤΟΥΝΟΥΝΖ ΕΒΩΑ ΝΟΥΝΨ ΕΞΕ-/ (IV 35.18) (ΞΕ-)ΤΝΤΓΑΙΝΥ ΝΟΥΝΨ; theme: Basic Perfect: (III 183.3) (ΞΕ-)ΑΥΡ-Α-ΝΑΥ ΝΟΥΝΨ; theme: adjective-verbs: (A 1 374) ΝΕΣΨΨ ΝΟΥΝΨ, ΝΕΓΨΨ ΝΟΥΝΨ / (A 1 227) ΝΑΝΟΥΨ ΑΥΨΨ ΖΩΑΣ ΝΟΥΝΨ. Additional exx.: IV 117.3ff., 47.7ff., Ch. 62.33ff., Berl. 1613 1 A, Ryl. 69 1Γ, Rossi 2/3 26.

(c) The focus: ΝΑΨ ΝΖΕ, the theme: 'ΑΥΣΩΤΜ: ' (P 1303² 36 vo) (ΤΣΗΚΣ ΕΞΕ-)ΑΥΣΩΝ ΝΑΨ ΝΖΕ... ΞΕ.

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 (BKU 1808 8ff.) ΕΝ- ΝΑΨΖΕ ΝΟΥΝΨΝ ΥΑΝΕΝΣ VS. (21) ΥΑΨΖΕ ΝΟΥΝΨΝ ΥΑΝΕΝΣ.

2.7.3.3 Other neutralizations

2.7.3.3.1 "Indifference", i.e. unmarkedness (or rare markedness) for the category of locality: (a) ΝΕ-converted forms (usually with ΤΩΝ) 137: (Wess. 9 149a 16ff.) ΝΕΨΤΩΝ ΝΕ... ΝΕΨΜΟΟΣ ΔΕ ΝΕ ΝΑΨ ΝΖΕ; often the "future imperfect": (RE II 30 162b 23f.) ΝΕΨΜΑΨΨΕ ΤΩΝ / (Cl. Pr. 22 2Γ) ΝΕΨΝΑΣΚΕ-ΟΥΨΡ ΝΨΨΧΘ, also RE II 164b 3f., RE II 166b 16f., P 1303² 87 vo.

(b) Inconvertible conjugation-forms: Future III + ΝΟΥΝΨ (III 181.17ff., 150.26), ΝΝΙΜ (III 111.20), conjunctive (A 2 512) ΕΙΝΑΤΓΑΙΝΕ-ΑΥ ΜΜΕΑΟΣ ΝΤΑΚΑ-ΑΥ Η ΕΙΝΑΡ-ΑΥ ΜΜΕΑΟΣ ΝΤΑΛΛΑΙΨΡΟΚ ΝΤΑΜΑΚΑΡΙΖΕ ΝΑΨ; compare the infinitive expanded by interrogative modifiers (+ ΕΟΥ, ΕΝΙΜ, III 45.18, 193.11).

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

138 Cf. POLOTSKY 1940:245 (= CP 37). Note that both ΤΩΝ and ΟΥΨΡ also are indefinites — the homonymy is in fact resolved syntactically. ΟΥΨΡ in ΟΥΝΟΥΨΡ ΝΒΑΝΑΝΟΣ ΟΥΝΟΥΨΡ ΝΚΑΛΑΙΤΨΡΟΝ ΓΕΕΤ ΕΡΨΨΗΕ... (P 1303² 71 ΩΡΓ, also A 2 333, Wess. 9 143d 12ff.) is a member of a paradigm including also the Second Tense (§2.3.2) and the Cleft Sentence with (pro)nominative 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 *etse* (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)nominial *vedette* is not.

2.7.3.3.2 After *xe*- and *el*-, the opposition of Basic vs. Second Tense is sporadically neutralized; consider *III* 21.14, 34.16, 91.10ff., 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 *an*, 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 138. 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 139. 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) ἐρεύνα ναύς ὀος / ο ἰν᾽ ΧΕΩ "What more can one say?"  / (*A 2 431*) ΝΤΑΙΛΕΡΝΤΕΓΑΡΑΝ / ΝΕΑΚΑ / ΜΠΟΝΗΡΟΣ ΝΚΕΟΥΑ ΔΛΑΝ ΝΑΙ ΜΗΝ ΜΗΠΟΙ / (*Wess. 9 174d 29ff.*) ΝΕΝΚΟΤΙ ΓΑΡ ΑΝ / ΝΕΚΑ / ΝΟΥΟΥ ΕΠΕΝΕΙΟΤΕ / (*IV* 183.7) ΕΝΜΕΕΤΕ ΕΟΥ/ΓΕ ΤΕΝΟΥ — a single colon / (*IV* 16.18ff.) ἔκαστος τούτοις ἤμι / ΝΤΟΚ / ΕΒΟΑ ΓΙΤΟΤΣ / (*III* 209.13ff., codd. A, C) ΕΡΕΝΝΟΒΕ ΓΑΡ ΝΝΕΑΛΑΗΝ ΜΝΗΜΕΟΥΜΕΝΤΟΥΣ ΘΡΟΥΝ ΝΝΕΙΚΩΝ ΝΝΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΟΝ ΕΥΟΥΝΣ ΕΠΝΟΥΕ ΜΑΥΑΛΑ ΠΑΝ (Ἀ... ΑΝ ΕΠΝΟΥΕ ΜΑΥΑΛΑ) ΔΛΑΝ ΕΝΙΚΕΡΜΕ ΟΝ / (*A 2 541*) ΕΡΕΝΝΟΒΕ ΜΝΗΜΑΝΙΚΟΝ ΑΥΣ ΠΕΙΡΜΑΚΚΑΤΕΝ ΕΝΕΥ ΣΚΕ / ΝΟΥ / (*III* 102.12ff., 19ff.) ΝΑΥ ΝΕΕ / ΝΤΟΚ / ΝΚΕΝΑΚΤΕΝΟΛΕ ΕΡΟΚ ΑΝ / (*BLO* 3581A 71, No. 202 μπάν) ΝΑΥ / ΝΤΟΚ / ΝΣΕ ΝΟΜΑ ΜΠΡΕΜ ΝΕΙΚΗΝΕ... ΝΑΥ ΝΕΕ / ΝΤΟΚ / ΕΚΝΑΡΜΑΥΑ; see §§6.1.3.1-4.

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) 140, 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 rhyme groups, with theoretical as well as practical implications 141: the organization of the utterance in a relatively simple hierarchic structure 142, with the first section the verbal theme-topic, and the second the rhyme-focus. Here again we are faced with the decisions of verbal valency — the distinction between rectional (componential) and complementational modification 143. 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

138 Punctuation data are here of some value, though not immediately applicable or readily interpretable in prosodic terms. Several instances of a point or comma marking the Bipartition of focus-initial patterns have been quoted above (also Wess. 9 165c 27ff.). Cf. (for LE) Wente, *JNES* 28:6 n. 37 (1969).


140 In patts. (1), (3) the placement of the focus is unambiguous; as it is in patt. (2) cases like ο ναυ νεε (also the "disguised" focus, §2.7.1.4.1). In focus-initial patterns the focal constituent is by definition initial, and seems to be incompatible with non-focal premodifiers (§1.1.2.2); this point must however be further investigated.

141 Cf. the general arguments in Barr 1978 (esp. p. 256ff.).


143 Junge 1972:36ff.; see §1.1.2.0.1 above and §3.0.1 below.
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) η ΝΤΑΙΝΕΙ ΑΝ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΜΗΝ ΝΤΕΝΜΝΤΚΟΜΙΚΟΝ ΕΤΒΕΤΜΡ-ΝΟΒΕ / (A 2 540) ΕΥΣΩΒΕ ΤΕΝΟΥ ΕΡΟΗ 2ΝΟΥ / (A 2 336) ΕΞΝΑΞΕ ΕΡΟΗ ΤΜΝ / (A 1 71) ΕΙΝΗΝ ΝΜΜΑΣ 2ΝΟΥ / (Ryl. 67 ye) ΕΥΝΑΘΙΜΕ ΝΑΚ ΜΜΕΡΙΤ ΝΟΥΡ / (Ch. 54.19ff.) ΤΟΥΕΡΗΤΕ ΕΞΥΟΟΝ 2ΜΠΟΛΟ ΕΤΒΕΜΟΟΣΕ / (ibid. 183.57ff.) ΕΝΝΑΠΑΡΑΔΙΑΟΥ ΜΜΟΝ ΑΝΩΝ' ΤΕΝΟΥ ΕΣΡΑΙ ΕΠΙΚΩΣΤ ΝΤΕΓΕΝΝΑ ΕΤΒΕzanNOBw / (III 154.11) ΕΥΝΑΣΟΤΕ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΠΝΗΜΑΛΟΣ ΝΟΗΡ / (A 1 100-1) ΕΥΣΩ-ΝΤΑΝΑΙ ΣΩΚΕ ΕΣΡΑΙ ΕΞΥΗ ΝΟΥΤΤΕ ΠΜΕΝΤΟ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΝΝΡΩΜΕ ΞΝΤΡΕΠΑΡΑΒΑ ΝΠΕΙΑΝΑΥ ΞΕ ΕΡΕΝΕΡΠΗΜΕ ΝΑΡ-ΒΟΛΑ ΕΠΙΓΕ 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) (ΕΥΣΗΣΕ ΕΡΠΩΜΕ ΝΟΥΡ ΕΥΑΝΙΑ ΝΣΖ ΝΣΟΝ / (A 1 69) ΕΡΕΜΟΚΣ ΝΟΥ ΝΝΜΑΣ / (III 98.3ff.) ΕΥΝΑΣΑ-ΞΑΝ ΕΝΙΜ ΕΤΒΗΝΝΟΥ / (Wess. 9 128a 29ff.) ΝΤΑΙΝΕΕΕΕ ΔΕ ΤΜΝ ΕΥΚΑΕΣΕΒΙΑ / (IV 35.16ff.) ΕΥΝΑΝΟΓΝΕΣ ΝΟΥΡ ΝΛΚΝΜΝΚΗ 2ΝΟΥΚΜΑΣ ΝΜΟΥΣΑΤΗ / (III 98.14) H ΕΥΝΑΣ-ΞΑΝ 2ΝΟΥ ΕΝΕΤΝΟΥ 2ΡΑI 2ΝΝΕΙΒΟΤΕ / (P 1034 105 pke) ΝΤΑΤΡΗ ΝΠΝΟΟΣ ΞΗ ΝΑΥ ΝΖΟΟY ΕΝΕZ ΝΟΥΤΤΕΕΙ ΕΣΡΑΙ. Consider also III 223.19, IV 154.20ff., 189.7ff.

(2) Focus interrogative, back-extrapolation final 144, adjuncts following the focus: (A 2 396) ΕΝΑΤΒΒΟ ΤΗΡΗ ΝΟΥΡ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΞΝΝΟΒΕ ΝΙΝΓ-ΠΕΤΟΥΒΑΝΙΣΟ ΜΜΟ4 / (III 170.19ff.) ΕΥΝΑΡ-ΚΑΚΕ ΝΟΥΡ ΝΓΖΕΝΡΗΜΕ ΝΑΤΣΜΣΤ / (ibid. 169.23ff.) ΕΥΝΑΣΡ ΝΟΥΡ'ΝΓΖΕΝΡΗΜΕ ΕΥΡ-ΖΟΤΕ ΞΗΤΗ ΝΜΟΥΤΕ / (A 2 114) ΕΞΣΟΟΝ ΤΜΝ ΤΣΕΗ ΕΤΜΜΑΥ.

(c) Focus non-interrogative, back-extrapolation final/non-final (regulated by its extent, i.e. rhythmic factors 145): (III 116.6ff.) ΝΤΑΙΝΑ ΜΜΟΥΝ ΝΑΚ ΝΓΖΕ ΠΕΚΣ ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΑΥΗ ΠΝΗΡΕ ΝΜΟΥΤΕ / (III 117.28ff.) ΝΤΑΧΝΑY ΝΓΠΧΟΟΕΙΚ ΞΕ- / (ibid. 120.9) ΕΥΣΗ ΔΕ ΝΝΑI ΝΓΙΝΕΤΜΜΑΥ ΕΥΤΑΜΟ ΜΜΟΝ ΞΕ-.

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 εινε in a negativated conjunction form: (A 1 118) ΝΚΑΝΓΕ-ΕΝΙΑΗ-ΝΕΒΒΑΛ ΑΝ ΕΣΡΑΙ ΕΝΝΟΥΤΕ ΝΑΥ ΝΖΕ / (A 2 520) ΜΝΟΕ ΕΤΥΝΑΓΕ-ΕΝΙΑΗ-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 1 221), Ch. 33.14ff., 73.19ff. etc. 146. Compare an instance of εμμ-coordinated to a noun in object status: (Κ 9316) ΜΝΝΑΤΡΕΥΚΟΥΝ-ΝΣΟΟΥΝ ΤΗΡΗ ΑΥΗ ΕΜΝΚΕΝΟΥΤΕ ΝΚΑ ΤΕ.

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

144 See §6.0.1. ΝΓΖ- apparently tends to the final position when it introduces a prosodically more weighty noun syntagm.
145 Cf. (for rhythmic considerations) §3.1.3.3.2.
146 Shisha-Halev 1976b:363 n. 33, with ref. (to the Sheneoute 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.) ΠΑΛΑΑΟΟ ΜΝΟΟΝ-ΑΝ-ΝΙΜ, Man. Psalm-Book 156.9 ΜΠΟΥΝ-ΕΥ ΠΕ ΝΜΟΥΤΕ.
(c) The "conjunctival" use in Sahidic of the Sec. Perfect in the unfulfilled protasis after ενε- (e.g. Ch. 29.5ff.). Compare the Sec. Tense after (εω) ενε- §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 disjointed components, individually or conjointly marked for thematicity, in varying grades of mutual cohesion 148. In ascending order of union and subcategorization:

(a) ‘Sec.-Tense conjugation form + ΑΥΨ/Η + Sec.-Tense conjugation form’: (A 2 45) ΝΑΥ ΝΞΕ ΕΝΑΠ-ΛΑ... Η ΕΣΟΝΥΡΑΝ ΕΠΤΜΑΙΝΥ ΝΑΤ-ΘΥ ΜΜΟΥ // (A 2 372) ΝΑΥ ΝΞΕ ΕΗΝΑ- Η ΕΗΝΑ- // (III 73.8ff.) ΕΡΕΠΕΛΤΕ-ΠΟΥΟΥ ΜΟΤΕΝΕ ΜΜΟΥ ΝΤΕΙΖΕ ΑΥΨ ΕΧΛΩΡΙΖΕ ΜΜΟΥ ΧΕ- // (Ch. 119.45ff.) ΕΡΕΠΕΛΤΕ-ΠΟΥΟΥ ΝΟΥΟΥΡ ΑΥΨ ΕΝΤΑΚΗΝ sim. ibid. 128.20ff.; also III 119.2f., 134.16ff., IV 63.24ff., 107.1f., Leyd. 410, etc.

(b) ‘Sec.-Tense Conjugation form (α ΑΥΨ/Η) + “epithematic” circumstantial conjugation form’ (rare) 149: (Ming. 288) ΝΤΑΣΕ-ΜΠΝΥΕ ΝΑΥ ΝΞΕ ΑΥΨ ΕΛΕΦ-ΤΤΙΤΕ ΜΜΟΥ ΤΗΡΟΥ // (III 120.7f.) ΜΗ ΝΤΑΣΕ-ΜΠΝΥΕ ΕΠΡΑΙ ΕΤΤΕ... ΕΑΙΕΙΝΕ ΕΠΕΘΤ ΝΝΕΠΥΟΑΝ (contrast with III 140.17 ΜΗ ΝΤΑΦΒΤ... ΑΥΕΙΝΕ)

(c1) ‘Sec. Perfect/Aorist + ΑΥΨ/Η + Basic Perfect/Aorist’ 150: (III 218.1) ΖΩC ΕΠΣΕ-ΝΤΑΠΗ ΤΗΡΗ ΚΙΜ... Η ΑΛΕΝΟΟΣ // (ibid. 219.3f.) ΝΤΑΣΕ-ΜΠΝΥΕ ΕΛΑΠ ΕΡΟΙ ΑΙΕΙΝΕ ΕΡΟΥ ΤΕΛΟΥ 2ΝΤΕΙΡΟΜΗ ΤΑI // (A I 108) ΜΗ ΕΥΑΡΕΝΩΤΟY ΑΝ Ή ΥΛΕΡΕΟΓΟY. Also III 28.25ff., 140.17, IV 157.22f.

(c2) ‘Sec. Future/Aorist + ΑΥΨ/Η + conjunctive’: (IV 76.20f.) ΝΑΥ ΝΞΕ ΕΡΕΠΝΗΜΕ ΝΣΑΒΕ ΝΑΤΑΧΡΟ 2ΝΤΕΙΡΟΥΠΟΜΗΝ ΑΥΨ ΝΣΕΧΤΕΚ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΝΣΩΒ ΝΙΜ ΕΝΑΝΟΥ / (III 40.11f.) ΕΥΑΛΕΙΡΙΤΗ ΝΤΟΥ ΝΣΟΥΟ ΑΥΨ ΝΣΡΑΥΕ ΕΧΨΨ; also IV 94.3 ff. Chiastically, in (Ch. 85.26ff.) ΕΡΕΠΝΗΧΕΙ... ΝΑΣΜΟΥ ΕΡΟΥ ΝΟΥΗΡ ΑΥΨ ΝΣΥΕ-ΕΟΟΥ ΝΑΥ cf. 89.18ff.). In (IV 14.4f.) ΕΥΑΛ-ΖΑΙΝ ΔΕ ΝΤΟΥ... ΕΒΟΛΑ ΣΙΝΤΝΑΪ (ΑΥΨ) ΝΣΕΚΡΙΝΕ ΝΟΥΟΥ ΝΙΜ ΓΕΒΟΛΑ ΣΙΤΟΟΤC the focus is repeated and the conjunctive not markedly thematic.

2.9 Negation patterns: negative 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 Conjunction System” (1960a:$§32), stating that (N) ΑΝ 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-

150 Note the significant absence of this high-cohesion grade in the Bipartite construction.
151 Mainly 1944:87ff. (= CP 191ff.), 1960a:$§31f.; Kickasola 1975, esp. 103-137. The distinction of nesal 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 nexus vs. thematic negation meaningless: it does not obtain within the "classic" theme/topic initial construction. (Consider A 2 19 ΝΤΥΜΟΟΥΤ ΑΝ ΝΠΕΙΚΕΟΥΑ ΕΤΒΕΟΥ for the classical 'ΕΤΕΜ-

νΟΥσ'-.) (b) It is legitimate to ask whether the two cases of nexus 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 nexus, another thematic. Two other particular localizations to be examined in the present context are the negating of an adjunct (modifier) 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 nexus 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 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 154. Below, I shall enumerate and selectively illustrate the negation patterns corresponding to focalization patterns (1) to (6) 155.

2.9.1 Theme/topic-initial patterns

2.9.1.1 Pattern (1): The autofocal second tense. Present with focal modifier: (Α 2 462) ΤΜΠΕΡΟ ΝΜΠΙΨΕ ΕΓΜΙΜΕΙΜΑ ΑΝ Η ΠΑΙ / (ibid. 340) ΕΡΕΝΩΒΕ ΖΗΝΝΑΣΚΕ ΑΝ ΑΛΛΑ ΖΗΝΕΝΣΗΤ; rhetorical question: (Miss. 279) Η ΕΨΑΓΩΓΕ ΑΝ ΕΓΕΝΑΙΜΟΥ / (Α 1 108) 156 ΜΗ ΕΨΑΡΕΝΑΖΟΥ ΑΝ Η ΖΑΡΟΥΣΟΖΟΥ ΝΟΓΕ ΝΟΓΕ; modal: ΕΨΑ: (Α 2 505-6) ΕΝΝΑΒΑΙΒΕ ΑΝ ΝΖΕΝΑΣΓΟΜ... "Let us not distress" (also IV 61.27ff., 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 Nexus negation. (Ryl. Cat. 32, No. 68 ΣΕΒ) ΝΕΥΨΟΒΕ ΑΝ ΕΓΕΝΨΗΡΕ ΥΨΗΜ / (Α 1 183) ΜΗ ΝΕΝΨΥ ΑΝ ΝΝΙΓΡΑΘ ΝΟΥΨΤ / (Α 2 403) ΝΕΨΝΑΨΑΣΕ ΓΑΡ ΑΝ ΓΑΡΟΥ ΝΑΥΑΑΨ ΑΛΛΑ ΕΨΝΑΣΕ-ΠΕΝΤΑΓΚΟΤ-

ΜΕΨ / (III 131.10) ΝΜΕΙΚΟΤΤΙ ΑΝ ΝΣΟΥΟ ΕΠΑΙ ΝΤΑΨΧΟΟΣ... (also IV 51.16, Wess. 9 140b 3ff.) / (III 21.9f., ΝΤΑΙΟΨΨΕ ΓΑΡ ΑΝ ΝΨΡΕ / (ibid. 17.1ff.) ΝΤΑΨΧΟΟΣ ΑΝ ΞΕ-... ΑΛΛΑ ΝΤΑΨΧΟΟΣ ΞΕ-... (sim. IV 111.20ff.) 46.28ff. etc.). Note also cases with the focusing modifier ΜΜΑΤΕ co-marking the focus: (Α 2 52 ΝΤΑΨ-

ΣΑΙ-ΝΕΨΝΑΣΕ ΜΜΑΤΕ ΕΤΒΕ- / (III 50.4ff.) ΝΤΑΨΝΟΥΣΕ ΥΨΑΡ ΕΡΟΨ ΑΝ ΝΟΥΠΛΑΗΓ ΝΝΟΥΨΥ ΝΨΡΕ ΜΜΑΤΕ


154 Cf. PRĀTORIUS 1881:757f.

155 See SEILER 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 nexus 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 Sachverhalts A, sondern sie weist zugleich ausdrücklich auf diesen 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.

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

157 The case of ΜΗ - ΑΝ is perhaps special (see PRĀTORIUS 1881:757f., SHISHA-HALEVY 1976a:43).
Chapter 2. The Adverbial Modifier Focalized

/ (IV 184.5f.) ΝΤΑΠΡΟΡΟΘΣ ΣΟΟΣ ΑΝ ΜΜΑΤΕ ΕΤΕΝΤΑΙΣΕ-ΑΙΣ ΖΕ-... / (A 2 390) ΕΡΕΝΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΩΝ ΑΝ ΟΥΒΕΜΕΝΕΡΥΝ / (Wess. 9 138b 18ff.) ΕΝΠΑΙΔΕΥΕΙ ΜΜΟΝ ΑΝ ΜΜΕΝΥΣΟΝΤ ΑΛΛΑ ΜΜΕΝΟΥΘΥ ΑΝ. Additional exx. for -AN-negation: III 21.1, 66.12ff., Ch. 136.52ff., 65.15ff., A 2 150, 473, etc.

Negator: — AN (all conj. forms), n — AN (Bip., aor.), nn — AN (Bip.). Theme: affirmative\(^{157}\). Placement: (a) AN follows the theme/topic or its closest (usually rectional) expansion; (b) (with a nominal actor in the Tripartite Pattern) optionally after the actor expression.

2.9.1.2.1 Focal negation (a). (A 2 312) ΕΥΒΑΚΑΝΩΝΗ ΜΜΟΥΟΥ ΕΠΙΧΙΝΔΗ ΑΝ ΑΛΑΑ ΕΡΕΝΕΤΟΥΡΑ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΣΧΑΙ ΝΗΣΤΗΝ ΕΟΟΥΝ ΖΕ-ΕΤΒΕΟΥ Ν ΕΧΝΟΥ ΝΞΩΒ / (III 35.20) ΝΑΙ ΔΕ ΕΙΧΩ ΜΜΟΥΟΥ ΕΙΩΤΑΙΟ ΑΝ ΜΜΟΙ ΜΑΥ-ΛΑΤ / (Ch. 89.12ff.) ΜΑΡΕΠΙΚΣΤΗΝ ΕΠΕΚΡΟΝΙΟΤΗΣ ΕΤΑΙΡΗ ΝΜΑΙ ΕΤΒΗΝΤΗ ΑΝ (circ. of Sec. Present? other instances: IV 64.1f., 65.11ff.) / (A 2 87) ΕΝΤΑΝΕΝΤΑΥΣΕ ΔΕ ΕΓΡΑΙ ΕΡΟΧ (i.e. the mud) ΣΑΠΕ ΝΗΣΤΗΝ ΝΒΕ ΝΗΣΕΙΡΡ ΔΝΤΕΣΙΝΑ ΝΑΝ ΝΑΝΕΥΜΕΡΟΣ Ν ΝΑΝΕΥΜΕΡΟΣ ΑΛΛΑ ΝΑΝΕΤΟΥΡΑΝ ΝΑΝ ΝΑΝΕΥΜΕΡΟΣ ΕΒΟΛΕ ΕΥΛΟΟΜΕ ΑΛΥΣ ΕΥΛΑΑΘ ΝΗΣΤΗ / (III 131.14f.) ΝΤΑΧΙΣΕ-ΠΑΙ ΝΠΙΡΙΠΜΕ ΜΝΗΜΟΝΕ ΖΕΤΙΟΥΝΑΝ ΝΣΗΤΗ ΑΝ ΜΜΑΤΕ / (IV 56.23ff.) ΕΝΤΑΝΕΝΙΟΤΕ ΚΥΡΙΧΙΙΕ ΝΑΝ... ΕΤΒΕΜΝΤΕΓΩΒ ΜΜΑΤΕ ΑΝ.

Negator: — AN. Theme: affirmative. Nexus: affirmative. Placement: immediately following the focus (or, if this is complex, after its first colon)\(^{158}\). 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, expressable 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 Focal negation (b). Second focus negated or: (affirmative + negative) modifier focalized: (IV 24.6f.) ΕΥΒΟΟΝ ΜΜΕΝΑΛΑΣ ΜΜΑΤΕ ΑΛΥΣ ΜΜΕΝΥΖΗ ΑΝ (A 1 380) ΕΥΘΩΝ ΜΜΟΥΟΥ ΝΝΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΟΝ, ΜΝΗΜΟΤΕ ΑΝ / (Ch. 91.1ff.) ΝΑΙ ΜΝΙΝΙΚΟΥΟΥ ΕΥΧΙΝΟΥ ΜΜΟΥΟΥ ΕΤΒΗΝΤΗ ΑΛΥΣ ΕΤΒΗΝΤΟΥ ΑΝ. Also III 29.7f., 34.11f., RE II 16a 33ff., etc.

2.9.1.2.3 Modifier negation\(^{159}\). (a) Expanding a Basic Tense (affirmative or negated): (A 2 464) ι ΑΝ ΣΗΜΗ ΑΛΥΣΛΖΕΣ ΠΝΤΑΠΕΡ ΕΤΒΗΝΤΗ ΑΝ ΑΛΑΑ ΕΤΒΗΝΤΗ / (A 1 151) (ΑΝΝΑΗ) ΑΛΥΣΛΖΕ ΑΡΟΧ ΑΝ ΝΤΕΖΕ ΓΑΠΛΙΣ ΑΛΛΑ ΑΛΥΣΛΖΕ ΜΝΗΜΟΥΟΥ ΜΝΙΝΙΚΟΥΟΥ ΜΝΗΜΟΥΝ ΑΝ / (III 200-1) ΠΝΟΥΡΓΕ ΒΟΛΕ ΜΜΠΡΟΥΟΥ ΑΝ ΜΠΟΣΒ ΝΜΗΓΙΖ... ΑΛΑΑ ΕΒΟΛΕ ΜΜΠΡΟΟΥ ΜΠΙΟΥΤΕ ΜΜΠΑΣΜ / (IV 116.12ff.) ΑΝΟΝ ΣΗΜΗ ΣΗΜΟΤΚΖ ΝΗΣΤΕ ΕΤΒΗΝΤΟΥ ΕΤΒΕΛΕ-ΜΠΟΥΡ-ΖΜΑΛΑ ΝΑΝ ΑΝ ΚΑΤΑΝΕΝΤΟΝ ΝΚΑΡΚΙΚΟΝ (“not because”) / (III 18.18ff.) ΜΝΟΗΝ ΝΝΕΥΡ-ΜΝΤΡΕ ΜΝΡΑΝ ΜΝΧΟΛΙΚ ΜΝΗΜΞΖ... ΧΕΝΝΟΥΝΟΒΕ ΝΙΝ ΑΝ ΝΕΤΝΑΕΙΡΕ... ΑΛΑΑ ΖΕ-ΝΝΕΚΤΧΑΜ ΝΤΕΚΑΓΑΝΗ (“... not in order that... but in order that...”). Also III 20.2f., Ch. 85.8ff., III 116.16ff. (ΑΙΧΟΟΣ... ΝΕΒΟΛΑ ΑΝ ΖΕ-\(^{160}\), 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., 289f.; he obviously does not consider this an essential distinction.

\(^{159}\) KICKASOLA 1975:219ff., 294ff. Note here (a) instances where Shenoutean AN corresponds to non-Akhmimicized Sahidic ON: 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 130a 110 vo) ΝΕΧΑΤ, ΝΕΧΑΝ ΑΝ, cf. (130a 97 ro) ΠΕΞΕ-ΠΝΟΥΤΕ, ΡΧΕΜΕ ΑΝ.

\(^{160}\) Occasionally, ΕΒΟΛΑ ΑΝ ΖΕ- seems to be in an ancoulithic, loosely connected or janus-faced construction: III 19.4f., 66.2, 185-6; cf. ΕΤΒΕΟΥ, ΝΗ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΑΝ ΖΕ- (Ch. 69.27ff., 73.8ff.) and ΝΗ ΕΤΒΕ- ΑΝ (Wess. 9 105a 2ff.).
(b) Expanding a converted or inconvertible tense or extraconjugational (non-tense) verb form; all are unmarked for thematicity: (A 2 119) NEYUSSH NTAIΣH YEOAN H ΝΝΟΥΝ ΑΝ ΧΗΛΑΙ ΑΛΛΑ ΝΝΑΛ ΝΝΟΥΝ / (III 185.24ff.) ΤΑΙ ΤΕ ΒΕ ΝΤΑΙΣΩΡΟΥ 2ΜΠΑΣΘΝ 2ΝΤΕΥΘΝ ΤΗΡΚ ΕΤΤΜΑΥ ΜΜΑΤΕ ΑΝ ΜΝΙΕΣΟΥ... ΑΛΛΑ ΝΝΑΛ ΝΝΟΥΝ ΑΙΖΕΡΟ... 2ΝΟΥΣΝΤ / (A 2 400) ΠΕΙΣΗΜΑ ΠΑΙ ΕΤΝΑΤΩΥΟΥΝ ΣΝΤΑΜΑΣΤΑΣΙΝ 2ΜΠΤΡΕΧ-ΟΥΣ ΑΙ ΣΗΚΕΣΜΑ ΑΛΛΑ ΕΤΡΕΧ-ΟΥΣ ΜΜΟΥ ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΥ / (III 19.16ff.) ΝΤΟΥΝ ΟΝ ΠΕΝΤΑΣΘΩΝ ΜΝΙΝΚΑΡΤΡΕΥΟΥΝΗ ΧΕ-ΝΝΕΚΕΡΚ ΑΝ ΜΝΡΑΝ ΜΝΟΥΤΕ ΑΛΛΑΧ ΑΛΛΑ ΚΕΛΑΑΝ ΝΑΝΑΥ “It is also He who commanded..., not only that... but also... ” / (III 169.12ff.) ΜΝΙΝΚΑΡΤΕΡ-+ ΚΒΛ ΝΑΥ ΝΟΥΝ ΑΝ ΟΥΤΕ ΝΟΥΝ ΑΝ ΟΥΤΕ ΥΟΜΤ ΑΝ ΑΛΛΑ ΝΝΑΛ ΝΝΟΥΝ / (A 2 414) ΟΥΝΑΛ ΕΥΒΛΑ ΝΝΕΡΑΦΗ 2ΝΟΥΣΟΥΤΝ ΑΝ / (ibid. 465) ... ΝΣΕΤΜΡ-ΒΟΑ ΕΠΚΙΨΤ ΕΤΒΕ-ΧΕ-ΜΠΟΥΡ-ΠΝΕΤΝΑΝΟΥΝ ΑΝ ΜΜΑΤΕ ΧΕ-ΜΠΟΥΥΝ-ΖΙΣΕ ΕΤΒΕΝΠΟΓΕΙΚ ΑΛΛΑ ΜΝΟΥΚΑΤΟΟΥΤΟΥ ΕΒΟΑ ΖΜΠΡΙΜΕ. NB. The simultaneous double placement (the “foreshadowed enclitic”, §6.0.3.3): (A 2 475) (ΤΑΟΙΣΕ) ΤΑΙ ΝΤΑΙΣΘΟΥΑΛ ΧΩΟΣ ΑΝ ΕΤΒΝΩΤΟΥ ΑΝ ΑΛΛΑ ΕΤΒΝΗΤΝ ΧΕ-. Additional exx.: Mun. 96, III 111-2, 173. 11ff. (ΥΑΝΟΥ- ΑΝ), 184.16ff. (ΝΒΕ... ΑΝ), IV 47.8ff. (ΖΜΠΤΡΕ ΕΤΒΕ- ΜΜΑΤΕ ΑΝ) 57.17ff. (ΕΝΥΑΝ- ΕΤΡΕΠ- ΑΝ ΟΥΔΕ ΕΤΡΕΠ- ΑΝ). Ch. 177.13ff. (ΠΕΤ- ΕΤΒΕ- ΜΜΑΤΕ ΑΝ ΑΛΛΑ ΕΤΒΕ-) etc.

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

(c) modifier + ΑΥΣ + neg. modifier expanding a verb form (affirm. or negated): (P 130Π 33 ΑΓ) ΔΗΡ-ΝΟΒΕ ΕΡΟΥ ΕΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΑΝ / (III 212.3ff.) ΧΑΜΑΖΕ ΜΜΟΥ ΕΤΡΕΠΥ ΕΠΑΖΟΥ ΕΟΘ ΑΝ / (ibid. 116.23ff.) ΑΧΕΙΤ ΕΩΥΝ ΕΥΚΙΚΕ... ΑΥΣ ΝΕΖΟΥΝ ΕΥΟΥΕΙΝ / (Mun. 96, parall. III 169.14ff.) ΑΥΣ ΝΣΕΤΜΡ-ΣΝΑΥ ΕΣΘΜ ΚΑ- ΤΑΝΟΥΘΥ ΜΝΟΥΤΕ ΑΥΣ ΝΚΑΤΑΝΟΥΘΥ ΑΝ ΜΝΟΥΑ ΝΟΥΑ ΜΜΟΥ / (A 172) ΕΝΕΝΤΑΣΡ-ΝΟΒΕ ΕΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΕΡΟ ΑΝ, ΝΕΡΑΝΟΕΙΧ ΕΒΩΣ / (Ch. 153.36ff.) ΝΕΤΣΟΟΥΣ... ΖΜΠΧΟΚΑ ΑΥΣ ΖΜΠΣΗΤ ΑΝ / (III 168.26) ΝΝΟΥΥΥ-ΣΝΗ ΝΟΥΣΟΥΤΑΝ ΑΝ. 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 ‘ΕΣΘΜ’ + 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.) ΝΤΑΙΣΗ- ΟΥΣΘΑΕ ΑΝ ΝΖΟΥ / (Wess. 9 171c 7) ΕΙΧΙ-ΓΟΛ ΑΝ / (IV 94.3) ΕΥΘΘΘΘΘΠΡΗΘΕ ΜΜΝΕ ΑΝ / (A 2 509) ΕΚΟΥΘΜ- ΝΟΒΕ ΑΥΣ ΟΥΣΡΕ ΑΝ.

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

2.9.2 Focus-initial patterns

2.9.2.1 Pattern (4): # focus → Second Perfect #. (A 1 81) MH ΕΤΒΕΝΑΝΟΒΕ ΑΝ ΝΤΑΚΜΑΣΤΙΓΟΥ ΜΜΟΥ / (Wess. 9 144c 24ff.) ΕΤΒΕΝΕΘΘΘΘΙΟΥ ΑΛΛΑΧ ΝΤΑΧΧΟΟΣ ΧΕ- / (A 1 113) ΕΤΒΕΝΕΘΘΘΘΟΥ ΑΛΛΑΧ ΑΛΛΑ... ΝΤΑΣΑΡ ΥΨΕ.

Negator: - AN. Placement: immediately after the focus (focus: ETBE- only?). No opposition between negal and focal negation. Topic: affirmative.81

81 See §§2.5.1-2 for the negative topics, which seem to exclude a negated nexus or negative focus.
2.9.2.2 **Pattern (5):** # focus → circumstantial #. (Wess. 9 106a 7ff. parall. P 130a 71 Rome, see §2.9.2.4) ἃν ἐτβετμντμς [sic] ἄν ἐναι ἵνα ὑπὸ [the] ἐνανμυνυ ἰμηνης ἐπιθυμοῦ / (A 1 219) ἀν ἐτβενενυμς ὅπω τὸ ἐναμνικες ἰμοου ἵπηνης ἰμηνης ἀναμνεσις ἵνα ἰμηνης ἤς ἐπιθυμοῦ ἰμηνης ἰμηνης ἐτβενενυμς. (A 1 89) γιτθνυ νεκθνυ ἵνας ἰμοου ἵπηνης ἰμηνης ἰμηνης ἤς.

Negator: - an. Placement: imm. following the focus (ἐτβε- only?). Topic: affirmative. No opposition between nasal and focal negation.

2.9.2.3 **Pattern (6):** # focus → e-conj. form (Sec. tense → circumstantial). (A 2 519) ἐτβηνυ ἀν ἐκναγυντας καὶ ὑπὸ [the] ἐτβηνυ τς ἀν ἐναι-πιμα καὶ ἐπιθυμοῦ [the] ἐπιθυμοῦ / (Ch. 38.35ff.) ἐρσατθεμουρ υπακο ἐναι υπο [the] ἐφημι ίμοου τς / (A 1 114) ἄν ἰμηνης ἰμηνυ ἰμηνυ ἰμηνυ / (Wess. 9 158a 30ff.) ἑμοτε [sic] ἢμηνυ ἀν ἐπιθυμοῦ ἰμηνυ καὶ ἰμηνυ [the] ἐφημι ίμοου.

Negators: - an, mn- an (rare). Placement: following or enclosing the focus. Topic: affirmative. No opposition between nasal and focal negation.

2.9.2.4 # focus → Basic Tense # (§2.6.2): (III 16.3ff.) ἃν γιτθνυνας ἀν ἰμηνυνυ ἰμηνυνυ ἰμηνυνυ ἰμηνυνυ ιμηνυ / (P 130a 71 Rome) ἃν ἐτβετμντμς [sic] ἀν ἐναι ἵνα ὑπὸ [the] ἐνανμυνυ ἰμηνης ἐπιθυμοῦ [the] ἐτβετμντμς [sic] ἀν ἐπιθυμοῦ ἰμηνυ / (ibid. 125) ἐτβηνυ

2.9.2.5 Predicative modifier negated: # modifier - 0 # (§1.2.1.3.3). (A 1 158) ἐνε-ἐτβενεις ἰμοου ἐτθεμνικες ταμιοου νας / (III 146.20ff.) πανπ ιλοις ἰμηνυνυ ἰμηνυνυ ἰμηνυ / (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" (Dresdner 1973:70) or a form "of incomplete predication" (Curme) in need of predicative complementation, but rather an index characterizing (a) a verb form as Theme (in the micro-syntactic extent) or Theme-topic (in the macro-syntactic extent), (b) a verb lexeme or modifier as 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 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, suprasegments) as more of a focalizing than topicalizing agent. The functional category of which the Second Tense is but one of the exponents is the characterization of a predicative syntagm for Functional (or Informational) Sentence Perspective and Communicative Dynamism (i.e., thematic and generally contextual 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.

---

161 Cf. Kickasola 1975:134ff. ("Affirmative Second Tense Containing Negative Patterns", "Affirmative Nexus with a Negated AdvP in Frontal Extrapolation"). This is rather a Second Tense + circumstantial syncretism (§2.6). The use here of "extraposition" is unfortunate: the predicative modifier is not extra-, but pre-posed (see also Kickasola's p. 292ff., where he refers to this "adverb" as a "predicative adjunct").
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3.0.1 Definitions: Object, Valency, Diathesis. The object is an expansion of the conjugated or extraconjugational 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, gram-metrically unmotivated, commutable — hence pertinent) modification (§1.1.2.1). The traditional approx-imative, universalistic (yet inherently ethnocentric) 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 morphosyn-tactic 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, clear-cut and predictable relationship: the transformation ‘actor + verb lexeme + direct object’ \(\Rightarrow\) ‘patiens + stative + (instrumental) actor’ \(^4\) being symptomatic of transitives.

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


\(^3\) CHERIX’ exposition (1979:7f.) is a typical one, that (untypically) gives some attention to the matter of definition. Cherix defines as transitive a verb that fulfills one of three conditions: (1) a verb that “has” (i.e. alternates in) construct and 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/IMMO object construction is added by Cherix as distinctive, primarily to cater for Greek-origin verbs and such native ones as “have” no qualitative or morphophonemic-alternation mechanism (without taking into account the possibility that the value of N may differ here from that of N alternating with the construct or pronominal forms; N/IMMO in pattern-oriented view does not enter into Cherix’s definition). See also QUECKE 1981:260ff., 1982:285ff. and cf. SCHUCHARDT, SPITTER 1928:289, 295ff.

\(^4\) POLOTSKY 1960a:99, FUNK 1978a:120f. (an excellent concise overview of the problem), QUECKE 1981:261. The transformation ‘actor + verb lexeme (infinitive, non-dur.)’ \(\Rightarrow\) ‘actor + stative (dur.)’ is a possible criterion for intrasitives (the opposition infinitive vs. stative is suppressed for intrasitives 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. stalt passive). This would mean that TEP, while syntagmatically transitive, is resolvable into two paradigmatically (transformationally) transitive and intrasitive-copular homonyms; for the latter, consider (A 9100) NETO NJOVOEIN AYIP-KAKE / (Wess. 18 99.17ff.) PIOME NIM EYO NECEBIC... EYSAIP-ACEHIC... / (Ch. 98.47ff.) NETO NPMHMAE ZHTN TWEHI EP-WEHE / (III 48.23ff.) WAAP-GUBH H CEO NWUB. 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 1 289) OYON NIM ETO NZOTE ZHTN MIPOIEC (“is fearful of...”) vs. (ibid. 297) OYON NIM ETP-ZOTE ZHTN MIPOIEC (“fears”), vs. (P 1319 94 to) PEZOOY ETO NZOTE (“frightening”, “fearful”); (Ch. 21 passim) NFP-ZOOGT AN OYAE NFP-CZOIE AN NFP-MACE AN OYGTZOE ZIEH... NFP-ZOOG DE AN ON ZIOYOZE... NFP-BAPERAP OR... “you do not constitute...” non-actual.
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 MAY or ZAPOΣ, 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*/ΜΜΟ* (forming the subject matter of the present chapter); N* 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 rection of transitives 8; (d) the absence in Coptic of a single, unambiguous, predictable passive 6 corresponding symmetrically to the "active" 'actor + v. lexeme + object'. Moreover, this definition entails a subordinated, secondary treatment of the so-called "absolute", object-less 7 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 N-construction as a surrogate, alternate or variant direct-object expansion. — On the whole, however, this approach can be said to be the vestige to the one advocated here — namely, one of PATTERN and VAGENCY STRUCTURE.

present (§3.1.2.1.1)?; (4 / 37) (the blessed mountain) ΕΤΟ ΝΟΥΟΞΙΔΗ ΕΤΗ ΟΥΩΙΝΕΝ Ή is alight 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.

6 Rectional N*/(ΜΜΟ* ) being a "case" morpheme, it is really a constituent of the verb and does not belong, structurally-analytically speaking, to the noun syntagm to which it is, by syntagmatic "accident", prefixed (cf. BARRI 1977:29).

8 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 Breviær 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.) ζΕΦΙ ΝΗΜΕΡΡΗΠΗΣ ΟΥΑΙΟΥΗ ΑΝ ΕΖΑΛ ΝΑΗ / (P 131* 44 ρς) ΕΧΕΣ-ΘΟΥΝΗ ΑΟΗ ΕΤΗΘΠΗΗ ΝΟΗΟΗΝ "not to be judged" / (Or. 156.12ff.) (ζΕΖΑΝ ΑΝ) ΕΘΕΙ-ΟΥΩΝΗ ΝΟΥΟΞΙΔΗ ΕΤΙΚ (i.e. into your well) "a stone to be thrown", SHISHA-HALEVY 1975:473. Compare the famous locus (Mi. 22:30, Boh.) (ΣΕΝΤΑΝΑΤΟΙΣΙΣΙ) ΜΑΝΥΑΙ ΟΥΑΙΟ ΜΑΝΥΑΙΣΤΟΤΥΡΟΥ, corresponding to ούτε γαμούσαι ούτε γαμούσιντόνα, Passive diathesis is nowhere explicitly defined for Coptic. The stative of transitive verbs furnishes a morphological stative passive form, predicative (and occurring) only in the durative conjugation pattern (which in turn may be combined with the Tripartite-Conjugation categories by means of the periphrastic-suppletive conjugation with the use of the auxiliary γαμούν). A "Vorgangspassiv" does not exist in Coptic as a true category; in the construction 'C = OY...... (EBOK) ΖΗΠ-', opposable to 'C = OY...... ΝΗ-', the burden of the opposition lies on (EBOK) ΖΗΠ-, 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 27ff.) ΟΥΑΙΟΥΗ ΕΓΕΡΩ ΜΟΗΟΕ ΕΡΟΗ ΖΗΠΗΠΙΝΟΥΗ ΑΟΗ...... / (IV 8.6) ΣΕΝΑΙΟΗΥ-ΘΥΝΗ ΖΗΠΗΠΙΝΟΤΑΝΤΖ ΑΝΤΟΥ (ibid. 41.16f.) ΚΑΝΑΛΕΠΙΤ ΖΗΠΗΠΙΝΟΤΤΥ ΝΗΠΙΝΟΤΤΥ / (ibid. 199.15f.) ΕΠΙΝΗΕ-ΕΡΟΗΜ ΜΟΗΟΕ ΖΗΠΗΠΙΝΟΤΤΥ ΝΗΠΙΝΟΤΤΥ / (Κ 9292) ΝΑΙ ΕΤΟΥΩΣΕΛΕ ΕΡΟΗ ΖΗΠΗΠΙΝΟΤΤΑΛΑ / (Wess. 9 143d 15ff.) ΠΕΝΑΤΑΝΑΙΟΥΔΙΟΥ ΠΕΝΑΤΑΝΑΙΟΥΔΙΟΥ ΕΒΟΑ ΖΗΠΗΠΟΤΥ "who created them or by whom they were created", cf. also III 170.27, IV 24.11, 66.21ff., Ch. 88.35ff., 106.47f. etc. However, since, on the one hand, (EBOK) ΖΗΠ- ("through the agency of") is freely usable as a complement modifier phrase, and, on the other hand, the "indeterminate" 3rd person plural pronoun is a fully privileged actor-expression in its own right — with no agentic specification — it is theoretically difficult to establish in Coptic a clear-cut "syntactic" passive category; consider such cases as (IV 28.5f.) ΕΞΑΛΑΝ ΝΟΗΒ ΕΝΑΝΟΥΗ ΕΝΝΑΛΑΥΗ ΝΗΠΕΡΗΥ ΕΒΟΑ ΖΗΠΗΠΙΝΟΤΤΥ / (ibid. 31.12) ΝΤΕΡΟΡΗ-ΖΗΠΑΝ ΕΒΟΑ ΖΗΠΗΠΙΝΟΤΤΥ / (Ch. 76.36f.) ΤΥΑΚΟ ΖΗΠΗΠΙΝΟΤΤΥ / (III 134.5f.) ΟΥΑΙΟ ΝΑΗ ΕΒΟΑ ΖΗΠΗΠΙΝΟΤΤΥ / (ibid. 47.14) ΚΆΛΑΚΕ ΔΕ ΕΤΟΥΩΣΕ-ΠΑΝ ΝΗΠΙΝ. Again it will be noted that it is the object, rather than the combination of 3rd plural and (EBOK) ΖΗΠ-, that marks a construction as a "passive"-surrogate or translation equivalent — not a true passive transform. POLOTSKY (1957a:228f. = CP 230f.) accepts (in)transitivity as an intrinsic (lexematic) category in Coptic.

7 CHERIX 1979.9 ("absolute", "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 reective expansions — "actants" in TESNIÈRE's terminology. The actential potential of the verb, its valency, can be conveniently stated by the number and nature of potentially or characteristically occupiable reective slots, i.e. the dependences the given lexeme can contract. Thus CUSKim (N−/−) (or rather s-l-p, with [ṣj̣e/ʃʃ] allomorphs of a relational archimorpheme), NAY (e−) are bivalent verbs, MOY2 (-/N− + N−), 2W (e− + e−), ZAPE2 (e− + e−) (cf. ZAPE2 EPOOY ETMTEPO- IV 56.6), TCABO (-/N− + e−) are trivalent, while NKOTk, EI are univalent. This classification is distinctive: bivalent +, GINE, EPE, MOYTE ("give", "find [following upon a search]", "make", "call") are different from their trivalent homonyms (+/N− + N− "bring into a [given] state", GINE -/N− + N− "discover in a [given] state or act", EPE -/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 reection 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, reonal 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 ZAPE2 — is as reonal, as devoid of meaning, as N−/MNO− or the immediate object-construction CETN−, COTT−). 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 reection-construction: CUSKim + 0 "lend an ear" (Ch. 154.42), CUSKim e− "listen to", CUSKim -/N− "hear", CUSKim NCA− "obey" 9. When, however, the isolable meaning of the lexeme does not change as the modifiers commute (EI EBOA/EZOYN/EZPAJ, ZMOOC 21-/2N−/NCA — but ZMOOC M−/−, reective) we have truly free (in the sense of "grammatically unmotivated") substitutability, i.e. non-reotional, meaningful, extraneous (not verb-componental) complement expansion, Tesnière's "circonstant" 10. 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 reection types, viz. the mediate (N−/MNO−) and immediate object-constructions.


10 The distinction between "object"-"actant" and "complement"-"circonstant" is difficult, practically and theoretically, and borderline or ambiguous cases abound. See (in addition to the ref. given in §1.1.2.1) the early discussions by von der Gabelentz (1869:383), Frobend (1878:37), Paul (1920:498). Frie'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 Trubetzkoy 1939:77f., Mathesius-Vachek 1975:140.
3.0.2 CONSTRUCTION: RELEVANT PATTERNS AND ENVIRONMENTS. Two constructions are in unstructured view rival and collateral: (a) the immediate construction: "a", specified as "a_{dur}" ("infinite_{dur} \rightarrow \text{pronom/noun syntagm}") and "a_{non-dur}" ("infinite_{non-dur} \rightarrow \text{pronom/noun syntagm}") and (b) the mediate construction "b", specified as "b_{dur}" ("infinite_{dur} \rightarrow \text{N-noun syntagm/MMO-pronoun}") or "b_{non-dur}" ("infinite_{non-dur} \rightarrow \text{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-conjugal infinitive. The expansion constituency includes the pronoun and noun syntagm. 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: (e.g.) \text{P}/\text{A}/\text{N}, \text{C/}\text{N} - (\text{C/}\text{N}) - (\text{C/}\text{N}). 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; it is particularly common in Shenoute as far as literary Sahidic goes. The instances on my files are analyzed in the following table:

---

\footnote{The scarcity 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, \text{A 174 \text{ΑΥΡΕ-ΝΕΥΥΡΗ}/\text{ΑΥΡΕ-ΝΕΥΥΡΗ}}). Generally, on the construction of the object: \text{STERN} §§490, 491, 493; \text{SCHWARZE-STEINTHAL} 478-484; \text{STEINDORFF} 1951:§389ff.; \text{TILL} §261.}

\footnote{I use "mediate" for an object-expansion marked by an extra-lexemic, post-adjunctal demarcative morpheme, "immediate" for a similar expansion marked intra-lexemically (by a segmental/modulation morpheme).}

\footnote{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 and Ch. 5).}

\footnote{See \text{STERN} 1886:133, \text{ANDERSSON} 1904:28ff., \text{ERMAN} 1915:187, \text{CRUM} 1926:250, Sethe apud \text{KAHLE} 1954:202ff., 213ff., \text{TILL} 1928:§147a-b (also \text{ZAS} 63:146ff., 1928), \text{QUECKE} 1972:45 with further ref., \text{SHISHA-HEALEVY} 1976b:359f. This graphemic veiling is extended (in a comparable dialectological distribution) to the interlocutive ("independent") personal pronoun when a proclitic subject in the bimembral Nominal Sentence: the atomic allomorph (functionally marked as non-predicative) \text{ANF-}, \text{HTK-} (etc.) is graphemically wanting, yet junctorially identifiable. This phenomenon is widespread in Shenoute (\text{SHISHA-HEALEVY} 1976b:359): \text{ANOH-} (Ch. 65.23f., \text{IV} 19.22), \text{ANOK-} (\text{A} 2 70), \text{HTTWN-} (\text{Thompson} K 3 vo, \text{IV} 100.7).}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conjugation form</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>ΟΥΨΜΗ2</td>
<td>Π-</td>
<td>ΝΑΝ ΕΒΟΑ</td>
<td>Ch. 112.16 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fut. I</td>
<td>ΟΥΨΜΗ2</td>
<td>Π-</td>
<td>ΕΒΟΑ</td>
<td>Ch. 103.7f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fut. II</td>
<td>ΟΥΨΜΗ2</td>
<td>Π-</td>
<td>ΕΒΟΑ</td>
<td>Ch. 65.10f., 78.13f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perfect</td>
<td>ΟΨΜΗ</td>
<td>Π-</td>
<td></td>
<td>A 1 109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infinit.</td>
<td>ΟΨΜΗ</td>
<td>Π-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ch. 104.40f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conjunct.</td>
<td>ΣΨΚ</td>
<td>Π-</td>
<td>ΕΠΡΑΙ</td>
<td>IV 168.7f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ΤΡΕ-</td>
<td>ΨΝ</td>
<td>Π-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wess. 9 173b 4ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perf.</td>
<td>ΤΨΜ</td>
<td>Π-</td>
<td></td>
<td>P 130 122 ΛΑ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jussive</td>
<td>ΤΨΜ</td>
<td>Π-</td>
<td></td>
<td>P 130 122 ΛΑ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aor.</td>
<td>ΥΨΨΨΗΕ</td>
<td>Π-</td>
<td>ΑΝ</td>
<td>IV 94.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fut. II</td>
<td>ΤΑΞΡΟ</td>
<td>Π-</td>
<td></td>
<td>P 131 43 Ρ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perf.</td>
<td>ΚΣΑΙ</td>
<td>Π-</td>
<td></td>
<td>IV 72.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conjunct.</td>
<td>ΠΨΡΧ</td>
<td>ΟΥ-</td>
<td></td>
<td>III 219.18f.</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>ΨΟΡΨΨΡ</td>
<td>ΟΥ-</td>
<td></td>
<td>IV 19.13f. (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fut. I</td>
<td>ΚΣΑΙ</td>
<td>ΟΥ-</td>
<td></td>
<td>A 2 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fut. III</td>
<td>ΟΥΨΜΗ</td>
<td>Ω-</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>ΚΣΑΙ</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td></td>
<td>IV 72.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ΤΡΕ-</td>
<td>ΠΨΨΤ</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>ΕΒΟΑ</td>
<td>IV 100.2f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fut. I</td>
<td>ΟΥΨΜΗ2</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>ΕΒΟΑ</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>ΟΥΨΜΗ</td>
<td>Ω-</td>
<td></td>
<td>III 177.18 (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres.</td>
<td>ΟΥΨΜΗ</td>
<td>Ω-</td>
<td></td>
<td>A 2 509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres.</td>
<td>ΟΥΨΜΗ</td>
<td>Ω-</td>
<td>ΣΨΨΨΗ</td>
<td>III 202.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres.</td>
<td>ΟΥΨΨΨ</td>
<td>Ω-</td>
<td></td>
<td>III 145.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres.</td>
<td>ΤΨΜ</td>
<td>Ω-</td>
<td>ΜΜΗΝΕ</td>
<td>III 70.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΡΕΨ-</td>
<td>ΣΨΨΤ</td>
<td>Ω-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ch. 27.11f. (§3.4.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres.</td>
<td>ΨΣΕ</td>
<td>Ω-</td>
<td></td>
<td>IV 159.2f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres.</td>
<td>ΤΑΥΟ</td>
<td>Ω-</td>
<td></td>
<td>IV 159.2f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres.</td>
<td>ΤΑΥΟ</td>
<td>Ω-</td>
<td>ΕΒΟΑ</td>
<td>III 175.24 (A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
determination paradigms:

"n-" incl. demonstratives
"øy-" incl. ÆØ-
θ- zero determinator
(—) indeterminables: 2A2, 2ØINE

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

(a) Determination complementary distribution: n-determination is restricted to the non-durative infinitive, while for (a_{dur.}) 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. 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.

3.1 The opposition mediate vs. immediate object-construction suppressed

3.1.1 Opposition representant: 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 (a_{non-dur.}), 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. It hardly needs special exemplification, as the (a_{non-dur.}) 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 -ΜΜΟC (durative) with -ΟΟC (non-durative) — the neutric fem. pronoun -c-, the formal ("dummy") object, is cataphoric to the subsequent Ξc-. 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 øyum cf. Quecke 1972:45), also (relatively speaking) of c2ai, cka1, and perhaps the low incidence of the causatives (cf., for Subakhkimic, NAGEL 1964:157-8).
16 Cf. TILL 1928:§147a-b, EMMEL 1981:142f. (n. 5). For ξωηιειει ειααι ειααι, ΚΩΥΧ ΧΑΛΕ ΧΑΛΕ "", see §1.3.3 above.
17 Two letters from P. V. Jernstedt to W. E. Crum (Brit. Lib. Add. MS 45685, part II, ff. 302ff., 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 ΕΤΡΕΙΚΟΤΜ), although with a n-øy-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.
coteluchal configurations as the following: (A 1 82-3) ...ΕΥΤΒΒΟ ΜΜΟΥ Η ΕΑΥΤΒΒΟΥ / (Ench. 66b) ΕΚΕΙΠΕ ΜΜΟΥ Η ΑΧΑΑΚ ΜΜΕΑΚ ΜΠΟΡΝΗ / (III 132.17f.) ΕΙΤΕ ΝΕΝΤΑΥΟΥΘΝΙ ΕΙΤΕ ΝΕΝΤΕΝΕΟΟΥΝ ΜΜΟΥ ΑΝ / (IF 108 apud Dictionary 742f.) ΝΕΤΝΩΣ ΜΜΟΥ Η ΝΕΝΤΑΥΟΣΩ."
The objective pronoun paradigm. As may be gathered from §3.1.1.1, 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 subject, is objective only). The objective pronoun occurs:

(a) After a (synchronic) suffix-pronoun in possessor role in the verboids ΟΥNTA-, MNTA- 23. Here the objective pronoun is usually anaphoric to the antecedent (most often, substantivizing article) of the relative verboid: ‘(π)ΕΤΕΟΥΝΤΑ- suffix-pron. = objective pron.’ and therefore not as a rule found in the interlocutive persons 24: Singular, masc.: -4, -ΕΤΕΟΥΝΤΑΧ (A I 41), MNTAΧ (Or. 158.2f.), -ΕΤΕΟΥΝΤΑΧ (A 2 325), ΟΥΝΤΑΥΧ, MNTAΥΧ (ΙΙΙ 172.18, 90.18), ΟΥΝΤΑΧ (A 2 10, P 1301 132 ΤΚΓ); fem.: -c, -ΕΜΝΤΑΚ (P 130.1 94 ct, 131.8 88 ro), ΟΥΝΤΑΝ (ΙΙΙ 85.14, 100.12, Berl. 1613 7 CE), -ΕΤΕΟΥΝΤΑΙ (Mich. 550 13 ap. Dictionary 563b), -ΕΤΕΟΥΝΤΑΥ (P 130.47 76 ro). Plural: -COY (Ch. 23.48f., K 929), ΟΥΝΤΑΝΟΥ (ΙΙΙ 119.1).

(b) After an indefinite 3rd-person-plural suffix, diachronically in actor role, synchronically a semi-analyzable component of the lexeme: ΧΟΟΥ “ send “, ΤΝΟΟΥ “ fetch “”, “ send “, (Τ)ΤΟΟΥ “ make give “ in non-durative environment (see Obs. (3) below): Singular, 1st person: -T, ΕΤΥΜΧΟΟΥ (A I 465); 2nd pers. masc.: -K, ΑΗΤΟΟΥ (IV 193.10), ΤΝΟΟΥK (ΙΙΙ 38.21); 3rd person masc.: -C, ΧΟΟΥ (IV 88.18, Ch. 66.27). (Τ)ΤΟΟΥ (P 131.4 44 PIS); Plural, 3rd person: -COY, -CE, ΤΝΟΟΥCOY (ΙΙΙ 24.23), ΧΟΟΥCE (very common: ΙΙΙ 167.21f., IV 64.20, Ch. 40.23ff. etc.), (ΙΙΙ 187.5).

(c) After ζΑΙ in (variation with ζΑΙ-). API- : 3rd pers. plur. ζΑΙCOY (Ch. 94.15f., 185.23f., 160.2, v.l. ζΑΟY), ΑΡΙΟΥ (ΙΙΙ 25.4): a case of t-final lexemes.

Observations: (1) Morphophonemically, most instances (excepting only ΟΥΝΤΑΚ- (?), API- could be phrased as “VS-pronoun” (S = non-syllabic sonant, to include T).

(2) Only -COY 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 (CE) prefix.

(3) Some examples show the objective pronoun in case (b) to be in alternation with the mediative object-construction, viz. in durative environment: (ΙΙΙ 150.7) ...ΕΕΙΧΟΟΥ ΜΜΟΟΥ (ibid. 187.8) ...ΕΤΕΟΥΝΘΝΟΟΥ ΜΜΟΟΥ; like the suffix-pronoun, then, it is regulated by the Stern-Jernstedt Rule: in case (a), on the other hand, it is not commutatable with ΜΜΟ-.

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, STEINTHAL–MISTEL 1893:293.
24 In (A I 41) ΠΟΥΣ ΕΤΕΟΥΝΤΑΕ ΕΖΟΥΝ 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)ΕΤΕΟΥΝΤΕΝ. Comparable cases are Joh. 16:15 (Chester Beatty and 3 of Horner’s MSS) ΕΤΕΟΥΝΤΕΝ-ΕΠΑΙΤΩΤ “ which my Father has”, / Joh. 4:16 ΤΑΙΑΝΗ ΕΤΕΟΥΝΤΕ-ΠΟΟΥ “ which God has ” and NHC XI 16.10f. ΟΥΝΤΕ-ΝΗ “ they have it “ — all with a non-personal possessor.
25 Discussed by Piehl (AZ 33:40ff. [1895]), Spiegelberg (AZ 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 256) ζωίνε μεν έγγ-καρπος νασαράζονέ ουκαρπος ουκαταε / (A 2
481) Πατ έγγ-πυξε μοιαμασιαλοπ / (ibid. 352) Γρ-αίκαιοσύνη / (P 130² 34) έλεογε-βαρος ουκαρπος δε
γυμφέ εξημπρυμη / (Ch. 154,52ff.) εγώνουσε-ματοι έρων. In more precise rephrasing, this may be taken as 
a phenomenon of mutual exclusion between γ-, the marker of total determination (b), and the zero determina-
tor which, as nucleus of the noun syntagm (§5.1.1.1), 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. [ŋ-]/[ŋv-]ο-, whereas a zero determinator 
in a paradigm not including either of the other two is not incompatible with γ-, and hence does occur in 
construction (b). Consider the following: oy-less paradigm: -κε/-κατε (III 74.8, 19.5f.), |n plus cardinal numbers 
(III 52.8, IV 124.7, Berl. 1613 5 vo [εγώνουσε-ματοι / Π-λογάθρρ] vs. III 157.28, 112.1f., IV 103.6 — 
note IV 67.6 εγνηπέ νασπαμε χαι]|: n-less paradigm: -άαια/μαία (III 94.1, Ch. 130.28f.), -ον/-οι (interr.; 
IV 95.1, A 2 366 εικε-ογ vs. III 45.23, Ch. 166.1). Indeterminables, of course, do not count as zero-
determined, hence ought to be compatible with γ-. I can, however, find examples of (b) only 
for the indefinite πυμε: (IV 80.18) nπημένα προτρέπε νπμένα. For όιν (Ch. 78.46ff.), ουσιον (ibid., III 
107.20ff., IV 80.15), γαζ (Ch. 29.15ff., III 25.4f.), ζωίνε (III 139.4f.) I have only examples of the immediate 
construction.

(2) ηδε (etc.), the substantivized relative syntagm, for which we distinguish (§5.2.3.1) two distinct 
patterns: (a) ηδε/-ηδε/-ηδε, present, future, perfect etc. — not further determinable (i.e. γ-, the nuclear 
determinator, is always initial in this syntagm) and (b) ηδε/-ηδε, further determinable: present tense only, 
γ- uncommutable (hence not a determinator, but a nominalizer morph). Determinators here include 
the definite (not feminine), indefinite (singular and plural), zero, ο-... nim: see (3). Pattern (a) is compatible 
with the object marker γ- (obligatory in the durative, §3.1.2.1): (III 15.23ff.) εγγαπρέκετρρη ηδε 
(ον / (ibid. 109.2f.) όυγαγόν δε ον ηεραφίω όηταν όπεταναγγελένταρεσ... ηνοί έρος / (ibid. 
205.4f.) τεξαγο πτην̃ρνοβε... τεκράνη πνεκτή Όη / (IV 58.26)... ηνους ἡμπετηκονουμή / (ibid. 43.28) 
ηνους πετηεού / (Ch. 55.10ff.) σε-ηναςαι ηχαπ ηπεταεμί, but occurs also in (non-durative 
environment) in the immediate construction: (III 121.21f.) εγγαπρέκετρρη / (IV 88.1) ηνους οη 
ούμεν ουγμ-νεκτομπ. Pattern (b) is, to my knowledge, found only in the immediate construction (incompati-
bility with γ-): durative: (IV 7.11) εγνηπέ πεπεού γαν / (ibid. 128.27, Ch. 63.9f.) — ετρ-πεπεού, 
non-durative: (III 104.1) άχειε-πεεού / (IV 3.17f.) εγγαπρέκετρρηον / (III 150.21) ερ-πεπεούνοι etc.

(3) ο-... nim, the discontinuous determinator, and ... - nim, the postpositive determinator (§5.1.1.0.1) 
are distinct from zero determination, and are both compatible with γ-²⁹: (Wess. 9 179d 7f.) εγγακτε 
ηπεπεού nim / (III 20.5f.) εγνηπέ ημιβ lim ηπεηαγόν / (Ch. 85.7f.) ηκκε ηςαπ lim lim / (III 113.11) 
ανκου 
ηςαμε nim / (ibid. 151.24) ...επκν εμολ... ηπικοε nim. In the immediate construction: (IV 85.22) ηαρι 
περηεκής ηκτι-ζηοοι εμολ.

²⁸ See §5.1.1.0.1: oy- as the number "one" does belong in this paradigm.
²⁹ Pronominal πυμε "(any)one" is the animate counterpart of inanimate άααι, and must be kept distinct from the deter-
minable [ŋ-]/[ŋv-]ο-πυμε ("(usually male) human being", opposed to εγώνε, ουσιον, οπιον, etc. The incompatibility of γ- with zero 
determination is not absolute. A (very rare) instance of the two morphs co-existing is Mt. 10:37 (Sah. and "Middle Egyptian").
3.1.1.2.2 Nominal/Pronominal Object: οὐψω-/οὐψ-, a unique lexico-syntactic overrule οὐψω "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-determined nominal object: (Ch. 93.38f.) ...εὐαγγέλια ἈΓΙΑ ΑΥΣ ΕΙΦΟΥΜΕΝ ΑΝ / (ibid. 167-8) ...ΕΥΟΥΞΕΪ-/ΠΤΒΒΟ ΝΝΓΕΥΗΡΗ / (K 9040) ΟΥΣΑΚ ΤΙΝΕ / (A 2 153) ΜΗ ΝΕΙΟΤΕ ΠΟΥΕΥΞΕΥΗΡΗ ΑΝ Η ΝΥΗΡΗ ΟΥΣΑΚ Η Ν ΠΡΙΜΗ ΟΥΣΑΚ ΤΕΝΚΖΕΜΗ ΑΝ Η ΤΕΚΙΖΕΜΗ ΟΥΣΑΚ ΝΕΚΖΑΙ ΑΝ. When οὐψω "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 ΠΕΤΟΥΣΕΥΡ-Π-ΠΙΣΤΖΟΣ ΑΝ, ΝΙΜ ΠΕΤΟΥΣΕΥΡ ΑΝ-ΠΙΣΤΖΟΣ ΝΙΜ ΠΕΤΟΥΣΕΥΡ-ΖΑΡΕΣ ΑΝ ΕΝΠΑΗ- ΜΟΣ ΠΕΤΟΥΣΕΥΡ ΑΝ-ΠΕΤΝΑΝΟΥΣ ΑΝ, ΝΙΜ ΠΕΤΟΥΣΕΥΡ ΑΝ ΕΚΑ-ΤΕΡΕΣ ΝΑ ΚΝΝΟΥΣΕΥΡ / (Ch. 23.19ff.) ...ΕΚΟΥΣΕΥΡ-ΜΟΟΥΣΕΥ / (ibid. 68.28f.) ΝΟΟΟΥΣΕΥΡ-ΞΟΟΟΥΣΕΥΡ ΑΝ. Note the variation ΕΠΕΟΥΣΕΥΡ- ΤΡΑ-/ΕΠΕΟΥΣΕΥΡ 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 → 0-noun lexeme' in which the verb has the formal-grammatical role of an auxiliary, noun-to-verb deriving element: Π-ΟΥΣΕΙΝ "shine", Π-ΑΝΑΘ "swear", Π-ΠΟΛΕΜΟΣ "fight", Π-ΟΥΡΙΑ "sacrifice", Τ-ΕΟΟΥ "honour", ΠΙ-ΓΟΛΑ "lie" 31, Τ-ΛΟΓΟΣ "report", ΤΙ-ΠΟΥΣΕΥΡ "care for, be mindful of" and the like. This impression of the formal role of the nuclear verb is correlatable with the semantic fusion role — "univerbation" — in turn relatable to a systemic conception of its function: these are the nominal 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 (a non-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-ΠΙΣΒ (Ch. 103.24f.), Π-ΜΝΟΒΕ (Ch. 57.57), Π-ΠΙΛΑΝ, Π-ΝΕΥΖΑΝ (Ch. 86.42, 134.26f.), Π-ΝΕΛ- (Ch. 82.2.5, 182.54), with Π-ΤΕΖΕ (Ch. 189.47f.) and Π-ΤΕΖΕ (III 177.6), Π-ΝΒΟΛ (IV 158.17).

30 Jernstedt 1927:70. Nagel 1964:296f. attributes this aberrant property of οὐψω to its "defectiveness", insofar as what he terms a "personal passive" function (i.e. its intratensive role 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 οὐψω (cf. ἈΒΥΣΘΟΝ ΜΗ ΑΥΣ ΕΙΦΟΥΜΕΝ ΧΡΟΝ Α 1 108 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 οὐψω, a "transitive" verb, is not opposed to a passive stative (οὐψω ζήν-, e.g. Ch. 106.47f. is suppletive), but neither are ΜΟΘΕ "hate", ἘΙΝΕ "find", ΤΗΜΑ "hear", ΖΙΟΥΕ "throw" (in Sah.) and quite a few others — all subject to the Stern-Jernstedt Rule. Semantic incompatibility with durativity cannot be ruled out as the explanation (see 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 ἢρ (Parker 1961:183f., Johnson 1974:59, 61).

31 For ηλ we have four juncture grades ([§6.0.2]: ηλ-, ηε-, ηι-, ηι-(with a weakening link e → i), ηοο- (cf. Steinhale-Mis- Stell 1893:91f., 281 for a grading of the verb-object juncture).

32 These are probably nuclei in their syntagms (Barr 1977:29).

33 Cf. Guillaume 1919:236f. ("mélange 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"); Krámský 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 ΤΗΜΑ | ΜΗΟ-, ΝΑΥ | ΕΠΟ-, ΠΟΣΩΑ | ΜΗΟ-, ΠΩΑΝ | ΕΠΟ- (see §§3.1.2.0.1 and 3.1.2.2.2 below).
and -μ-πενθος (IV 82.17), -μ-τεγον (III 165.11, IV 159.9f.), -μ-πίμεευς, -μ-πενθεευς (Ch. 71.44f., III 146.31), -μ-πιγκυ (Ch. 102.42, IV 49.9 teebyev) vs. -μ-πιγκυ, -μ-πιγκυ (Ch. 101.11f.), -μ-παγκομ, -μ-πιγκυ (III 115.25, Ch. 180.2f.), -μ-πιγκυ, -μ-πενθος (III 134.3f., Ch. 49.53, 100.25f., 134.48f.), -μ-πιγκυρ (Ch. 105.50f.), -μ-τέμνεκυ (IV 155.25), -μ-πενθος (IV 172.21, Wess. 9 154d 20ff.), -μ-τιμε (IV 93.1), -μ-τελανομα (IV 114.1), -μ-πενθος (Ch. 157.5f.), etc.; with indefinite determination: -μ-ουανα (III 16.12), -μ-εγκυ (III 73.13), -μ-ουνα (IV 114.20, Ch. 162.50f.); other auxiliary verbs: -μ-πιγκυρ (III 114.13), -μ-ουνα (Ch. 104.13f., 118.31f.), -μ-πενθος (Ch. 101.5f., III 204.7), -μ-κε “find means” (III 99.6f., 25), -μ-πενθος (IV 49.5, 61.8), -μ-πενθος (IV 119.10; xi-во III 39.22), -μ-νενομε (III 123.7f., 138.6), etc. 34.

(2) The idea that this preference for construction (a) may be symptomatic of the close-junctural contour of these syntags 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-Jernstedt Rule 35: -μ-τιμε (Ch. 100.57f., IV 128.7, 155.7, Ch. 190.7, 191.3f.), -μ-τιμε (IV 94.20f., III 195.3) — all non-durative examples.

(3) -μ- as “verb of incomplete predication” (Curme), i.e. with essential adnexus (“predicative”) complementation, “make... into” 36, enters, in non-durative environment predominantly, the immediate construction: (III 88.1f.) ΠΚΑΣ ΗΕ ΝΠΑΝΟΥΕ Π-ΜΠΩΟΥ ΜΠΙΣΤΟΣ ΝΟΕΙΟΙ ΕΡΩ / (Ch. 17.39ff.) ΕΝΕΜΠΡ-ΠΝΑΓΙΑΝΤΑ ΙΝΤΜΟ / (IV 24.2) ΑΥΡ-ΠΙΝΑΒΟΟΟ ΝΒΛΑΛ / (Ch. 113.9ff.) — ΕΡ-2ΑΖ ΝΙΗΤ ΝΠΕΙΝΕ / (A 2 293) +ΜΑΡ-ΠΠΟΟΥΕ ΝΟΥΚΙΟΥ / note (Wess. 9 118a 23ff.) ΑΚΑΛΛ Ν- ... ΑΚΡ-ΖΕΝΚΟΟΥΕ ΝΜΜΑΚ with anaphoric zero (also Ch. 192.42f.).

(4) -μ- (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 -μ- “become” (“intransitive” -μ-), see n. 4: (Ch. 146.14ff.) ΑΥΡ-ΟΥΜΕΘΕ ΝΜΕ ΝΕ- ΑΟΛΑ / (III 47.21) ΧΑΡ-ΝΥΟΥ / (ibid. 136.4f., 145.1) — ΑΥΡ-ΝΥΟΟΙΚΟΙ (cf. ΝΕΙΟ ΜΠΑΝΟΟΙ ΝΙΟΜΟΝ ibid. 145.3).

One plausible explanation for cases (3) to (5) is prosodic-junctural. Apparently, the whole ‘incomplete-predication verb + nom. object + adnexus 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 adnexus complement is the rhyme ("logical predicate") — is a functional characteristic.

3.1.2 Opposition representant: the mediate construction

3.1.2.0.1 N- / MMO-: 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_{dur.}/non-dur.). As I see it, the synchronic question 37 to be posed cannot be one of material identity ("is N- / MMO- the

34 μ-πενθος fluctuates with the mediate construction (μ- ΜΠΕΝθΟΟΥΕ), 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, 36.1ff., Miss. 283). Exceptions to the rule are relatively infrequent: -μεπενθος (Ch. 104.8f.), -μεπενθος (III 138.7), -μεπενθος (IV 156.4f.) — all naturally in a non-durative environment.


36 The picture for other verbs with adnexus complementation of their object is less clear. However, consider ΚΑ- in (IV 101.17) ...ΛΕΚΑ-ΝΠΑΝΟΟΟ ΝΠΑΝΟΟΟ / (MIN. 177) ...ΜΗΚΑ-ΝΠΑΝΟΟΟ ΕΝΟΛΑΛ, Ch. 88.15ff., 198.14ff.

37 The fallacy that the (per se legitimate) diachronic scanning of N- / MMO- can somehow pass as a synchronic account is not entirely a matter of the past (BÖHLIG 1977). Similarly, the Indo-European-style case interpretation of N- (STEINTHAL-MISTELI 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 adverbial 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) ἄτενιεπε ἕνεκηκεῖν / (A 1 463) γρα (imp.) μμοοῦ / (III 114.9ff.) ζήναι τοῦ νεκροποληρον / (Borg. 247 n) ζήνας μμοοὲ σύν / (III 96.11) εἴμε μμοκ / (ibid. 199.28) μποῦαμάζητε μμο / (Ch. 71.3ff.) οὐ περιέποτις-ζην μμοchai... νεκτρατε-οίε μμοτοί μαυλατ / (ibid. 82.3ff.) ουμματόκοούν τεντάκυπον μμοοῦ / (IV 84.15) οὐ μεταμεθυμοῖς μμοοὐ.

(b) (IV 82.28) ἠγοβκεκ μμοοῦ / (ibid. 79.14) ζήμποτούατε μμοοῦ μμοῖ / (III 166.22) παῖ τε παῖ ζήμποτούατε μμοῖ ἕνεκηκεῖν / (III 66.21ff.)...ζήμποτούου ζήμποτού / (IV 171.20ff.)...ζήμποτούοοοῦ μμοοὲκ ταύτα... (Wess. 9 139a 20ff.) μεροῦς μμοῖ / (Ch. 94.1ff.) ζήμποτούεαι μμοῖ / (A 2 385) ποιάξε εἴρε μμοῖ νατούετε / (IV 173.1) οὐ μεταμεθυμοῖς μμοῖ.

On the basis of this typology one might suggest the following two valency models with N−/Mmo− in the rectional slot(s):

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
0 & 1 & \\
0 & 1 & 2 \\
\end{array}
\]

(a) \( V \) | N−/Mmo− | 
(b) \( V \) | N−/Mmo− | N−/Mmo−

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

"εὐπτι μμοῖ", "ἀμαζτε μμοῖ ", "ὑπεμ μμοῖ ", "οὐε/ούχη μμοῖ" and "ο μμοῖ" are well substantiated by (and correlatable with) their respective paradigmatic properties (e.g., εὐπτι opposed to the static — also with N−/Mmo− opposed to the immediate construction; ἀμαζτε "with" no static, no immediate construction; ὑπεμ with no imm. construction, but opposed to οὐοῦν; ο (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 ΕΒΟΑ ΜΜΟῖ (Ch. 28.36ff.), ΕΟΗ ΜΜΟῖ (IV 95.16), ΜΜΟῖ 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 ΟΥΝΔΟΜ ΜΜΟῖ (IV 51.14ff.), ΠΕΤΕΡΕΝΤΩΣ ΜΜΟῖ (ibid. 96.24), ΜΜΟῖ 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 ΟΥΝ.

(4) The fact that the second-slot N−/Mmo− remains constant in the case of a "passive transformation" (= ζήμποτε Ν−/Mmo−, ζήμποτε Ν−/Mmo−) 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−/Mmo− — "1st-slot N−/Mmo−", "2nd-slot N−/Mmo−") — which is adequate, from a structural viewpoint.

Cf. Tobler 1908:1ff. ("De la maniere dont nous sommes faits").

With a zero-determined object, we usually find the the prenominal allomorph (immediate construction): (III 106.18ff.) ΕΤΡΕΤΜΜΕΝ-ΟΕΙΚ ΝΒΑΝΙΚ... ΑΥΤΗ ΝΩΤΕΣ-ΜΟΟΥ ΝΒΑΝΙΚ, but also (ibid. 104.13) ΑΥΤΕΤΟΥ-ΩΥΜΧ (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 lexeme is predicated in the Bipartite pattern (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 extraconjugational) one:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(4) Cwtn} & \quad \text{vs.} \quad \text{(A4) Cwtn, (N) Cwtn} \\
\text{cotp}^+ & \quad \text{cotp}^- \\
\text{cotp}^- & \quad \text{cotp}^-
\end{align*}
\]

(subject to overruling, §§3.1.2.1-2) giving us a neat formal structural definition of "Cwtn_{dur.}" and "Cwtn_{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. As I see it, the present "durate infinitive" has nothing adverbial 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 1960a:§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 Jelanskaja (1970), with a diachronic-mentalistic bias ("How was the adverbial verbal predication felt?") and by Schenkel (1978), who curiously denies the "verbal rection" 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 condensate 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 stative — are established only by substitution. (Moreover, I would not define as does Schenkel the case of zero-determinated objects as a "Parad whereas in the "standing Wendungen (fixed expressions).) I doubt greatly (to 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 NTEFME [§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 are needed to resolve, e.g., the difference between "he is trying" (pres. progressive tense, historically "adverbial") and "he is doing" (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/irksome/pestiferous" vs. "he is doing/attempting/doing...") — so in our Coptic case too we need the syntagmatic dimension, 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), ἈΡΩΜ ΕΨ- 42. 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 auxiliare. 43. I find no evidence in Shenoute for this particular neutralization, but we do encounter the Aufhebung of durativity expressed in another, namely of the opposition static vs. infinitive (for a lexeme with a "movement" sememe), overruling POLOTSKY 1960a:§9: (Ch. 189.32ff.)ΠΝΟΕΙ.. ΝΑΣΟΥΝ ΕΨΕΙ ΕΙΡΑΙ ΕΝΕΥ- ΑΙΣ (sim. III 105.6ff., Ryl. Cat. 35 No. 70 ΣΜΘ) 44. It is an open question whether both exclusions — of the immediate object-expansion after transitive 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 45. 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 46, various component-modification lexemes ("ΕΙ ΕΙΡΑΙ" - ΒΙΧΕ ΕΡΟΥΝ), 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 47.

3.1.2.2.1 Verbs of Egyptian origin, not compound: 1st-slot, rectional ΜΜΟ-: ΑΜΑΚΕ ΜΜΟ- "hold, grasp" (III 199.28, IV 86.4), ΜΑΤΕ ΜΜΟ- "reach, obtain" (III 100.22); ΡΑΙ ΜΜΟ- "drive off" (Ming. 322, A 1 463); ΚΩΒΕ ΜΜΟ- "mock, ridicule" (III 104.12); ΠΟΥΜΟΥΝ ΜΜΟ- "boast, pride oneself on..." (III 68.5ff., A 1 330); ΕΠΗΤ ΜΜΟ- "pledge" (III 132.2ff., 223.18), cf. (?). ΣΠΟΥΡ ΜΜΟ- "swear by..." (P 1304 96 RNA); ΠΑΛΕΙ ΜΜΟ- "rejoice in..." (Mich. 550 18); ΕΙΜΕ ΜΜΟ- "understand, know" (III 96.11);

42 See also JERNSTEDT 1959:113 n. 8, and cf. POLOTSKY 1960a:§9. Obs. 1.
43 It is only in the perfective ΑΡΩΜ ΕΨ- (with Ά- ΟΥΜ Ε- the discontinuous tense-morpheme of the marked perfect (vs. the unmarked Ά-)) that we find this phenomenon: the negative correspondent here is ΝΑΣΟΤ- (Stern's "perfectum absolutum": ΝΗΜ is unmarked). See SHISHA-HALEVY 1972, Quecke 1979:442ff., Funk 1981:192ff. (Note that ΑΡΩΜ ΕΨ- is the analytic "renewed" successor of ΝΑΣΟΤ-, the original affirmer of ΝΑΣΟΤ — POLOTSKY 1960a:§4 n. 1 (see now Funk 1981:191ff.). ΟΥΜ is of course a descendant of the same ω in that is fused in ΝΑΣΟΤ-. Thus, the familiar analysis → synthesis → reanalysis diachronic spiral is again in evidence.) Shenoutean exx. for this periphrastic tense: III 20.26, IV 108.15, Ch. 15.49ff., 136.49ff. ΟΥΜ in a Clause-Conjugation or post-eventive setting (ΝΑΣΟΤ-, ΥΕΗΗΑΝ-, ΜΝΗΜΑΤΕΝ-) has a different value: terminative Aktionsart ("have finished doing"), with ΟΥΜ fully contributing lexically (e.g. IV 69.23, Ch. 133.8ff.).
44 The case of ΟΥΜ/ΑΙ ΕΥΜΗΝ (III 224.15, Ch. 175.35f.) may be different — a pertinent infinitive, expressing ingressio and opposed to a stative expressing state.
45 SHISHA-HALEVY 1976a:46 (cf. Young 1961:119ff., and §7.24.1 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 ΜΝΗΜΑ'/ΞΩΜΡΗΤΙ- 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. ΝΤΥ ΗΡ ΙΤΙ (and not Μ ΙΤΙ), WenDE 159:96ff., 103ff., Černý-Groll §19.6 and reff. In (III 216.18f.) ΚΤΟΥΝ ΑΝ ΠΕΤΤΩΝ ΜΠΡΩΝ ΟΥΤΕ ΧΑΣΜΕ the second infinitive is not a durative predicate, but hierarchically subordinate, an expansion; §6.0.2, link (3).
46 The typically Shenoutean CEPH ΑΡΕΟΣ ΑΡΕΟΣ (A 1 177, III 74.11, IV 24.20) juxtaposes the actual CEPH "they are awake" and non-actual CEPH "they are vigilant". Other candidates: (III 215.18) ΝΑΣΟΤ-ΛΑΜΟΥΝ ΕΤΕ ΣΩΜΙΤΙΘΥ "fall (as a natural fact)" / (IV 22.21) ΝΙΤΗΝΟΥ ΤΗΠΟΥ ΡΩΜ ΜΕΤΗΝ "those that should die" / (Ch. 22.49f.) ΕΙΚΗΕ ΕΡΟΥΝ "now and again" (but ΕΠΗΤ in line 46!) / (III 44.1f.) ΝΕΡΕΡΕΝΗΩΝ ΕΙ ΕΡΟΥΝ ΕΡΟΥΝ (observe the connection between this present and the determined relative).
47 SERTN §§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 130a 60 ob); P-ANAY MMO- "swear by" (III 19.3.11); P-2MME MMO- "guide" (IV 82.2f., 199.15, both durative); P-SPNPE MMO- "be amazed at, wonder at" (A 2 319, dur.); P-XΠΑ MMO- "need" (IV 56.5 [dur.], A 2 293); XI-ΗΠΕ MMO- "count" (Ch. 197.36f.); XI-KBA MMO- "revenge oneself on" (III 26.11, 64.5f., P 130a 53 TiB, 131a 151 M); XI-TB MMO- "trip up" (P 130a 44 ΡΙΔ, 130a 20 ro); XI-ΜΗΗΕ MMO- "take interest in" (III 65.26); Τ-ΟΕΕ MMO- "lose" (Ch. 71.6f.); Τ-ΗΥ MMO- "gain" (Ch. 71.3ff., 97.6f.); +ΗΛΑΚΕ MMO- "give birth to" (A 2 155 [dur.], P 131a 65 vo); XI-ΜΟΛ MMO- "bleed", trans. (III 73.11); τΑΥΕ-ΟΙΨ MMO- "proclaim, preach" (III 75.20, Wess. 9 147a-b, d 21f.); ΚΑ-ΒΟΛ MMO- "vomit" (Ch. 27.42f.); ΚΜΗ-ΣΝΤΕ MMO- "found" (A 2 146, III 188.14f.); ΟΥΕΣ-ΣΑΣΝΕ MMO- "enjoin" (III 20.3, IV 43.1f.); ΜΕΣ-ΕΙΑΤ 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-ΜΜΘ from adnominal N-ΜΜΘ (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): ΑΝΟΣΤΕΡΕΙ MMO- (III 62.23); ΤΑΥΡΑΤ ΜΜΘ (Ch. 33.8f.); ΝΟΙΜΜΘ (III 204.27); ΔΟΚΙΜΑΣΕ ΜΜΘ (Ch. 13.16f.); ΚΟΑΛΩΝ ΜΜΘ (IV 7.19f.); ΑΠΑΤΗ MMO- (III 138.15); ΦΟΡΕΙ MMO- (III 100.4); and so on.

§3.1.3 Conditioning (selection) of the mediate 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 presuffixal

48 Stern §509. Cf. §§3.0.1 and 1.1.2.1 (gen. obs., on their valency structuring P-2AA|MMMΘ).
allomorph and do enter construction (a), but also (b) (pronominal) — hence, have pertinent expansion (reception/complementation) properties. I am here concentrating on the pronominal object in non-durative environment (exceptions to the statement made in §3.1.1.1): ἔχω ἐν... "read in..." (III 192.20, 193.5); γινώ σαίνω “enjoin”, in the following recurring fixed expression: “ἐντολή/ζυγάςzeug/καὶ συζύγος νησί ἐν...”(εἰ)τελείωσέ τι σαίνω ἐν... "(III 173.5, IV 65.3f., 10, 47.22f., 48.14f., 123.6, 14f., 19, Wess. 9 173d 14ff., A 2 101, 500, P 131* 21 ro etc.) — a cliché reminiscent of (OT) Scripture idiom? Cf. Ruth 3:6, I Sam. 13:13, etc.; cf. also οὐκεῖος σαίνω—, §3.1.2.2.1; σαίνω σαίνω—, σαίνω σαίνω— “slay” (intensive, deliberate, iterative, “augmentative” — occasionally conative?) (Ch. 28.7f., 121.27f., both infinitives: cf. A 1 167 εὑρίσκω σαίνω σαίνω σαίνω σαίνω—, but Ch. 52.50f. ἔστε σαίνω σαίνω σαίνω—); also γινώ σαίνω—: (A 2 345) ἐπηκεφαλέωσέτησεσαίνω σαίνω, (Leyd. 328) ηθανάσωσέτησεσαίνω σαίνω σαίνω—; μεθανάσωσέτησεσαίνω—; μεθανάσωσέτησεσαίνω—: (III 205.28 ἐπηκεφαλέωσέτησεσαίνω—, but see §3.1.3.2.2-3 (also for σαίνω—); αὐτόν σαίνω—: (A 2 513) ἐπηκεφαλέωσέτησεσαίνω... ἐπηκεφαλέωσέτησεσαίνω... αὐτόν σαίνω—. See also (IV 79-80) and σαίνω (ινονικός understood, IV 80.7f.) have probably this section only, differing from σαίνω alone (so too in the NT: Luc. 12:58, Joh. 6:44, 21:11, Act. 16:15 etc.).

### 3.1.3.2.1 COTEXTUAL SECONDARY SELECTION OF MMO— (“NON-REFLEXIVE OBJECT”). Here we encounter a secondary (ad hoc?) opposition or cotextual relevance: a non-reflexive reference of MMO—, resolving the ambiguity of identical 3rd-person pronouns (the numbers indicate the personal reference of the pronoun): (IV 44.5) ἐπηκεφαλέωσέτησεσαίνω σαίνω— / (Ch. 44-5) ἐπηκεφαλέωσέτησεσαίνω σαίνω—σαίνω— / (ibid. 44.49f.)... ἐπηκεφαλέωσέτησεσαίνω— / (ibid. 71.19f.)... ἐπηκεφαλέωσέτησεσαίνω—σαίνω— / (IV 89.1f.) εὐσεβερεῖος σαίνω—σαίνω— / (IV 90.7f.)... ηθανάσωσέτησεσαίνω—σαίνω—. Here the rhythmic factor must be considered, §3.1.3.3.2.

### 3.1.3.2.2 MISCELLANEOUS. (a) Biblical reminiscence: (III 56.1) ἂνεκαγαθῆ ἄνοιξιμονι ἔνοικι (Cant. 2:5) and (IV 79-80) ηθανάσωσέτησεσαίνω σαίνω—σαίνω— (reminiscence? of Act. 16:15): III 196-7 passim, ἐπηκεφαλέωσέτησεσαίνω / ἐπηκεφαλέωσέτησεσαίνω... etc., adaptation of Ez. 20:13.21, 36.18 (etc.).

(b) Paradigmatic and cotextual association (?) (I 196-7 passim) (-) ἄνοιξιμονι ἐπηκεφαλέωσέτησεσαίνω — (-) ἐπηκεφαλέωσέτησεσαίνω—, see (a) / (III 104.15) αὐτόν σαίνω—σαίνω—σαίνω— by association with σουσεσαίνω— (cf. IV 59.10 εὐ-

(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) ἐπηκεφαλέωσέτησεσαίνω—σαίνω—σαίνω— (ibid. 222.12) κατεκτέωσέτησεσαίνω—σαίνω—, and such cases. (IV 157.22f.)... τῇ ἐπηκεφαλέωσέτησεσαίνω—σαίνω—σαίνω—σαίνω—σαίνω—σαίνω—σαίνω—σαίνω—σαίνω—σαίνω—σαίνω—σαίνω—σαίνω—σαίνω—σαίνω—σαίνω—σαίνω—σαίνω—σαίνω—σαίνω—σαίνω—σαίνω—σαίνω—σαίνω—σαίνω—σαίνω—σαί

(d) A residue of unaccountable instances: (III 38.14f.) θανάτωσεσαίνω—σαίνω—σαίνω—σαί

### 3.1.3.2.3 POSSIBLE MORPHOPHONEMATIC/MORPHOSYNTACTIC COMBINATORY CONDITIONING OF MMO—

One must here consider:

(a) instances of the 2nd person singular feminine pronominal object after a lexeme of the biradical (κυτ’ ) class in a case of a medial laryngal: (III 206.10 ἐσσωμοι (reflex.): contrast with (A 2 305)
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 distincito Sinthianan): NETΑΗ Η ΝΕΤΑΧΗΝ Ν- (IV 206-22), ΝΕΤΑΩ Η ΝΕΝΤΑΤΧΗ Ν- (ibid. 42.2), ΝΕΤΑΙΗ Η ΝΕΤΑΕΙΗ Ν- (III 189.27f., sim. Wess. 9 111a 29ff.), ΑΝΣΧΑΗΗΝ Η ΑΝΚΟΛΤΗ Ν- (III 196.5f.); other exx.: III 193.12, IV 13.11, 170.25, A 188, etc. In (IV 44.2) ΑΕΥΡΙΚΕΗΗΕΗ Η ΝΕΝΤΑΤΧΗΝΟΤΟΥ ΕΠΟΟΥ η mediate construction is zeugmatic.

(2) With two (or more) bracketed objects (one nuclear verb), we often encounter the immediate construction: (Ch. 9.8ff.) ΝΕΝΤΑΤΑΗΗΗΗΕΗ-ΤΕΗΕ ΜΝΠΑΚΑ2 / (ibid. 69.45ff.) ΝΕΤΟΙΕΗ-ΝΙΗΝΖ ΑΤΟΗ ΠΟΥΟΕΙΝ (§3.1.1.2.2) / (IV 113.19) ΝΕΝΕΛΨΗΗ-ΝΕΝΥΡΗΗΗ Χ ΝΕΞΕΙΗΗΕΗ Η ΟΥΣΝΑΗ, unless with lexemes where the prenominal allomorphs would, being short, usurp the “rhythmic balance” (§3.1.3.3.2): (III 107.2f.) ΑΚΙΧ ΝΕΝΕΛΨΗΗΕΗ ΕΥΚΟΥΤΗΗ ΛΥΝ ΓΕΝΖΒΗΗΕ ΕΥΖΗΗΚ ΕΒΟΛ ΜΝΙΝΤΕΗ / (ibid. 113.9f.) ΑΝΚΟΛΨ ΤΜΝΤΑΣΗΒΛ ΛΥΝ ΤΜΝΤΑΣΗΗ / (ibid. 113.1ff.) (Ε)ΝΕΛΑΗΗΕΗ ΜΠΑΗ ΑΤΟΗ ΠΙΚΑΗΟΝ ΑΝΤΑΗΕ-ΝΣΑΗ ΜΝ ΠΙΚΑΗΟΝ ΑΝΚΟΛΨ ΜΝΞΗΓΟΝΗ ΜΝΙΤΤΥΡΝ / (ibid. 126.1ff.) ΕΝΤΑΗΗΗΕΗ ΝΕΝΞΟΡΝΗΑ ΜΝΣΕΗΣΗΗ ΜΝΣΕΗΣΗΗ... Also 186.2f., 155.8, 156.4 etc. We have an exception in (IV 40.21f.) ΕΡΕΝΝΟΥΤΕ... ΝΤΑΚΟ ΝΑΥΞΗΗ ΜΝΠΑΣΜΑ 50.

3.1.3.3.2 Rhythmic-euphonic regulation 51. Two basic principles seem to be relevant in this connection: (a) stress patterning: the mediate construction constitutes two separate stress-units (verbnoun) of equal prosodic standing, whereas the immediate construction constitutes a single composite

---

49 Statistics on the widespread n-rection of this class are here essential.

50 (III 113.5f.) (Ε)ΝΧΝΑΗΡ-ΡΝΗΑΡ ΛΥΝ ΝΚΑΗ 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 n-).

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 Czermak 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 η ΝΑΑΗ Ν- see Emmel 1981 (esp. 139ff.).
prosodic unit (probably with primary and secondary stress subunits). The mediate object usually follows an unstrressed (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 88 (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: ΧΕ ΝΑ= Ν- (Ch. 94.23ff.), ΚΥΤ ΝΑ= Ν- (Ch. 75.40ff.), ΚΕΝ ΝΑ= Ν- (III 39.6f.), ΚΕ ΝΑ= Ν- (IV 117.28). ΒΑ ΕΘΩ Ν- (Ch. 74.46ff.), ΧΙ ΜΜΑΥ Ν- (Ch. 108.37ff., Or. 155.49ff.), ΚΕ ΝΑ= ΕΘΩ Ν- (III 123.14ff., 138.12f., IV 10.2f.), ΧΕΝ ΕΠΩ= Ν- (Ch. 142.15f.) ΣΙΝΕ ΝΗΙ= Ν- (Ch. 73.11f.), ΚΥΡ ΕΠΩ= Ν- (III 110.1), ΜΑΤΑΩ ΕΡΑΤΟΥ Ν- (Wess. 9 126b 7f.), and so on.

A case in point is the interplay of (1) 'ΟΥΝ(Α)Η + noun MMYN' and (2) 'ΟΥΝΤΑΥ MMYN N + noun'; exx. for (1): III 71.23, IV 7.8, Ch. 120.7f., 125.20f., 152.27ff., etc.; for (2): III 45.7f., 34.16f., 52.9f., 58.8.11, 60.15 etc. With a zero-determinated object, this alternation is cancelled, only construction (1) being eligible (III 45.1f., 89.4f., 94.1f. etc.).

(b) A second principle seems to be that of RHYTHMIC BALANCING: the avoidance of overshort lexemic body (short, compared with the following — often complex — noun-syntagm and possibly the preceding conjunctural formulation). This may account for the frequent mediate construction with (non-durative) ΕΠΕ, ΣΙΝΕ, ΕΙΝΕ: (III 112.3) ΕΙΝΕ Ν— ΤΑΙΕ-, ΜΕΡΕ-, 9 x / (III 134.2) ΕΠΕ ΜΝΟΥΦΥ ΜΝΟΥΤΥΕ / (A 2 107) ΑΤΕ- ΝΕΠΕ ΝΕΝΣΙΚ ΥΜ / (Ch. 105.5f.) ΕΙΣΑΝΤΕΠΕ ΜΝΑΖΕ ΤΗΡΥ... / (III 178.21) ΝΕΝΤΑΙΕΠΕ ΝΕΝΠΟΡΝΙΑ ΜΝΕΝΚΡΟΥ / (ibid. 205.16f.) ΕΡΕΙΠΕ ΝΕΝΠΟΡΝΙΑ ΜΝΕΝΚΡΟΥ ΩΜ / (III 180.16) ΝΕΤΕΡΕΠΟΤΥΕ ΝΕΑΙΝΕ ΝΕΤΕΡΟΡΡΝ ΜΝΕΝΚΡΟΥ ΕΤΒΝΤΟΥ, consider also III 203.1, 126.1ff., 189.28, IV 4.9, 80.16f., Wess. 9 118a 15f., III 104.8 (ΤΗΜ). The same may go for (non-durative) XI, +, ΥΙ, although in this case the wide-spread mediate construction may also 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.; ΥI N— Wess. 9 172d 23f., III 57.2f., IV 36.1f., 6, 12, etc.; + N— III 90.6, 11, 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.) ΝΕΤΠΟΥΤΕΡ ΤΕΚΠΕ / (A 2 80, cf. A 2 238) ΜΝΝΚΑΤΕΙΠΟΥΝ-ΠΙΟΟΥΝ ΤΗΡΥ — a recurring expression, cf. P 130 136 ΡΝΓ: ΝΕΤΝΑΤΟΜΑ ΕΡ-ΝΟΒΕ... ΜΝΝΚΑΤΕΙΠΟΥΝ-ΠΙΟΟΥΝ, also IV 180.2 / (A 2 179) ΜΝΟΥΤΕΝ-ΤΗΡΕ / (IV 54.3) ΕΥΝΑΤΕΥ-ΝΕΤΥΨΥ.

3.2 The opposition mediate vs. immediate object-construction maintained.

The opposition environment is the non-durative infinitive and nominal object. Having considered possible motivations for selecting constructions (a) or (b), we are still left with an impressive bulk of evidence for both constructions, with no apparent plan du contenu aspect for their opposition. Without being able to correlate them with any functional difference, I would still like to put on record the following impressions of formal distribution as in Shenoute: (a) the class most frequently favouring the mediate construction is the biradical ('ΚΤΕ') one, with 'ΝΠΡ' (triradical, medial sonant) a close second. This impression is of course useless until it is weighted and evaluated against the relative frequency of morphologic classes and of the relevant syntags for each class. (b) An extralexemic environmental factor which may be significant is the formal framework of the lexeme. There seems to be preference for the mediate object with (Ε)ΤΠΕ and the extra-conjunctural infinitive, although this is not pronounced enough to indicate different rectional properties in these cases.

88 See LÖPSHEDT 1956:35-62, with further references on the question of ‘Wortform und Wortumfang’. In our case, ‘avoidance’ may be too strong; ‘stylistic selection’ is perhaps more apt.
3.3 THE "PREDICATION MEDIATORS" 44: VERB-LEXELEMENT PREMODIFIERS

These intriguing elements (Funk: "preverbals", Layton: "preextensions" 54) immediately precede the verb lexeme: πνκέ- 55 "also, additionally, moreover", πζογούμε- "(even) more, rather", (P)-ωπάν(-) "early, first". The mediators raise some serious analytic queries, from both syntactic 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? 56 Indeed, this last phenomenon is, I am sure, the key to the mystery: these elements are VERB-LEXELEMENT/STATIVE PREMODIFIERS — the only means in Coptic to modify unambiguously a verb lexeme alone 57, 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 58:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ατ mapping} & | \quad \text{π-πκέ} \quad || \quad \text{cuτm} \\
\text{nucl. satellite} & \\
\text{satellite(?)} & \quad \text{nucl.}
\end{align*}
\]

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.) ΤΠΠΚΕΠΩΥΟΥissy-+ΣΟΝΤ. The lexeme ΕΠΕ (P-) is compatible with the mediators.

(b) Except possibly for Πζογούμε-, the commutation of the premodified durative infinitive does not exactly match that of the unmodified one: the predicative modifier does not occur after πνκέ-, (P)-ωπάν(-) (mutual exclusion of essentially similar entities?).

(c) (P)-ωπάν(-) 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 1974/6:480f.) is a tangible distinctive stylistic trait. I cannot point in Shenoute to any other

44 On these elements, see JERSTEDT 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.)

45 I have used "conjugation 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.

46 JERSTEDT 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 πνκέ- + infinitive.

47 JERSTEDT 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 ωπάν(-). BÖHLIG 1973 considers the alternation of infinitive/stative after ωπάν(-) a variation, and thus misses the whole grammatical point. Layton (1979:191f.): "verbal preextension... which somehow stand outside the conjugation". (Cf. the transformationalist use of "preverb")


49 So explicitly FUNK 1978b:105f esp. §§4.2.2, 4.3.1; 1978a:119. The infinitive is not dependent on the modifier (pace QUECKE 1970:380).
mediator beside the three discussed here\(^{59}\): -TCP\(^{-}\), more of a conjugation-carrier (probably analyzable as T\(^{-}\) (ncl.) + PE\(^{-}\)), ΧΝΕ\(^{-}/ΧΠ\(^{-}\), -ΕΥ\(^{-}\), and the future characteristic -ΝΑ\(^{-}\), are all nuclear in their respective syntagms, expanded by the “extra-conjugal” infinitive.

### 3.3.1 ΡΡΚΕ\(^{-}\) (selective representative documentation for the premodified lexeme with object-expansion):

(a) Non-durative (rare): (1) immediate construction: (III 33.4) (2nd perf.) ΝΤΑΚΡΠΚΕ\(^{-}\)ΣΤΗ\(^{4}\) / (Ch. 149.27f.) ΑΥΡΠΚΕ\(^{-}\)ΟΥΧ\(^{4}\); (2) mediate construction: (III 57.2f.) ΑΥΡΑΗΝ ΜΜΟΣ ΑΕΡΡΠΚΕ\(^{-}\) ΜΠΕΡΥΗ ΝΣΟΤ\(^{4}\), 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.) ΣΕΡ\(^{-}\)ΠΚΕ\(^{-}\) ΟΝ ΜΜΟΣ / (Ch. 151.4ff. parall. Κ9294) ΣΕΡΡΚΕ\(^{-}\)ΟΡΨΡ ΝΝΕΙΠΕ\(^{-}\) ΥΕ / (A 2486) ...ΕΥΡΠΚΕ\(^{-}\) ΝΣΟΤ ΕΡΩΟΥ (cf. Polotsky 1960a:823 Obs. 1) / (ibid. 356) ...ΕΥΡΠΚΕ\(^{-}\)ΚΣΤ ΜΜΟΥΟΥ / (Rossi 2/3 27) ...ΕΥΡΠΚΕ\(^{-}\)ΚΣΤΕ ΜΑΥ ΝΣΟΤ ΝΟΥΧΡΙΜΑ / (ibid. 34) ...ΕΥΡΠΚΕ\(^{-}\)ΑΣΚΕ ΜΠΕΥΠ\(^{-}\) / (Or. 160.43f.) ...ΕΥΡΠΚΕ\(^{-}\) ΑΣΚΟΜΑ, and so on. Note the frequent instances of -ΡΡΚΕ\(^{-}\) premodifying the static: (A I 96) ΣΕΡΡΚΕ\(^{-}\) ΟΝ ΝΧΑΣΕ / (Miss. 284) ...ΕΥΡΡΚΕ\(^{-}\) ΝΟΥΧΡΙ - contrast with the “intransitive” or copular -Ρ\(^{-}\) in non-durative environment: (P 130\(^{4}\) 137 ΤΑΣ) ΑΥΡΡΚΕ\(^{-}\) ΧΑΣΕ / (Rossi 2/3 77) ...ΕΥΡΡΚΕ\(^{-}\)ΜΗΝ ΕΒΟΑ 2Ν\(^{-}\) / (A 2 301) ...ΕΥΡΡΚΕ\(^{-}\)ΟΝ / (ibid. 322) ...ΕΥΡΡΚΕ\(^{-}\) ΑΑΛ. In (IV 80.9) ...ΕΥΡΡΚΕ\(^{-}\)ΟΥΟΥ ΑΝ Ε\(^{-}\) we have a rare negated case (the only one known to me in Shenoute).

### 3.3.2 Ρ\(^{-}\)ΖΟΥΟ/Ε\(^{-}\) (selective, representative object-expanded documentation):

(a) Non-durative (1) immediate construction: (A 2 7-8) ΜΠΟΥΡΓΟΥΟΟΟΥ, ΑΣΡΡΟΥΕ\(^{-}\)ΑΣΜΕΣ / (ibid. 17) ΜΠΥΑΣΕ ΝΤΜΕ ΝΑΡΡΓΟΥΟΟΟΥ ΑΝ; (2) mediate construction: (A 2 10) ...ΝΤΜΡΓΟΥΕ\(^{-}\)ΣΤΕ ΜΓΕΡΑΝ.

(b) Durative: (B. M. Cat. 104 No. 230 PMZ) ΣΕΡΡΟΥΕ\(^{-}\) ΜΜΟΥ ΝΓΟΝΣ / (A I 234) ΠΕΤΜΟΥΣ ΝΤΜΕ ΑΥΣ ΕΤΜΟΥΣ ΜΠΚΑΣ ΑΥΣ ΕΤΡΡΟΥΟΥΟΥ ΜΠΕΗΝ / (ibid. 304) ΣΕΡΡΟΥΟΧΙΣ ΜΜΟΥ / (III 76.12f., Wess. 9 154d 4f.) ΕΨΡΠΟΥΕΜΕ ΜΜΟΥ / (P 130\(^{4}\) 17 ΡΖ) ΣΕΡΡΟΥΕ\(^{-}\) ΟΝ ΕΒΟΑ ΝΗΕΠΕ\(^{-}\)ΠΙΜΑ. Zero-determinated object: (P 131\(^{4}\) 30 ΡΜΣ) ΕΡΕΠΕ\(^{-}\)ΝΣΗΕΡ ΡΡΟΥΕ\(^{-}\)ΑΣΚΕ-ΠΟΝΗΡΟΝ ΕΒΟΑ / (Or. 159.52f.) ...ΕΨΡΡΟΥΕ-ΠΕΤΜΑΝΟΥ ΝΙΜ. The causative of -ΡΡΟΥ- is illustrated by (I 19.14f.) ...ΝΤΡΡΟΥΟΥ-ΒΡΡΕ. Note here again the static premodified by -ΡΡΟΥ-: (A 2 10) ΠΡΟΥΕ\(^{-}\)ΟΟΝ (sim. A I 204) / (ibid. 21) (O)ΥΡΜΑΛΑΕ ΕΨΡΡΟΥΕ\(^{-}\)ΤΝΗΕΡ ΕΒΟΑ / (ibid. 331) ΣΡΩΡΟΥΟΟΥ / (A I 155) ΠΡΟΥΟΤΗΤ ΟΝ ΝΗΣΤ / (P 130\(^{4}\) 75 ΡΟ) ΧΟΟΥΗ Ν ΠΡΟΥΟΤΗΤΕΝΥΕ / (A I 266) ΠΡΙΜΕ ΕΤΡΡΟΥΩΤΟΡ (a recurring expression, also A I 268, 269, 271, A 2 4, etc.) / (B. M. Cat. 79 No. 194,3) ΣΡΩΡΟΥΟΑΛΕ / (A 2 527) ΘΕΛΠΙΣ... ΕΤΡΡΟΥΟΟΥ / (Ch. 195.21ff.) ΠΙΝΟΒΕ ΖΩΟΥΡ ΡΡΟΥΕ\(^{-}\)ΟΝ.

(c) Special cases of the non-durative lexeme. In the non-actual present (§3.1.2.1.1), etc. \(^{61}\): (A I 276, collated) (Ε)ΝΖΗΗΤ ΑΝ ΝΕΠΙΤΕΡ (sic) -ΝΟΛΛΜΟΣ (sic), ΠΡΟΥΕ\(^{-}\)ΝΤΕ ΖΩΟΥΡ ΝΕΠΙΜΑΤΟΙ / (A 2 245, collated) ΕΑΤΗ-ΝΠΕΗΤ ΕΝΠΑ ΧΕ-ΚΥΟΟΟΥ ΜΠΕΗΕΣΡ ΕΑΓΗ ΜΠΑΥΟΗΜΙ-ΑΛΑΕ, ΕΨΡΡΟΥΕ\(^{-}\)ΤΝΥΟΥ ΕΩΥΑΛΕ ΝΣΗΕΟΥΡΣΗΣ ΣΝΤΕ “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 -ΤΜ- under this heading: it is different formally and functionally. Its position is conditioned and is not always pre-lexemic (ΕΨΡΑΜΠΡΨΡΙΣΜΕ ΣΟΜΗ); it has a different systemic standing. (Note incidentally an instance — unique as far as I know — of -ΤΜ- negating ΤΡΡΕ\(^{-}\)ΟΥΜ in conjunction instead of (N-) AN negating the conjugation form: (P 130\(^{4}\) 98 ΡΟ) ΕΨΡΑΜΠΡΨΡΙΣΜΕ ΣΟΜΗ “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, 101.17f.) an instance of durative ΤΡΟ ΜΜΟ\(^{-}\) Ε\(^{-}\) (cf. Polotsky 1939:111 = CP 375). Exx. like (II Tim. 1:6) ΤΡΡΕΗΕΡΕΡ ΜΠΕΗΕΣΡ are not conclusive, although statistics may here prove illuminating.

\(^{61}\) See Quecke 1975/6:485ff., FUNK 1978b:106 n. 68. In (A 2 376) ΑΛΑΛΑ ΝΣΕΡΟΟΥ ...ΡΡΟΥΕ\(^{-}\) ΕΒΟΑ collation with Zoega 246 ΕΕ 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 -έως (SHISHA-HALEVY 1973).  

(d) The common -προφ- could be taken as predicative modifier premodified by -προφ-: (A 110) ουκειέ τεκμεγενιΣη δεπροφοι γνετεψυχη, also Ch. 33.43f., 104.51ff., Or. 160.41f. etc. Since however we find this also outside the present (A 2 396) έναρποφοι δεμποφδύεβ: (IV 86.3) κνρποφοι δεπφικ αύναι, we must perhaps conclude that P-προφ in this case is nuclear, a fully predicative verb syntagm (“abound”) complemented by 2n-44. That this is the copular (“intransitive”) P- is perhaps indicated by (P 1319 ιό έπετεν ιό προφοι δεμποφδύεβ: in that case -προφ- in the durative could be the mediator.

3.3.3 -πρηπ/-πρηπν/-πρηπον/-πρηπ (selective object-expanded documentation):

(a) Non-durative: (1) the immediate construction: Νύαξη/καταγε/πε/(ε)τναπον ζοο- — a recurring expression, very common: A I 36, 152. Wess. 9 87b 28ff., 125a 15f., III 30.15, IV 7.24, 67.16f. etc. / (Ch. 56.28f.) άπρηπονοια ιαίνε/καταγε/πε/(ε)τναπον ζοο- / (Ibid. 123.18ff.) ηος άνος πετακερφ/πον-μοι εροε / (IV 47.22ff.) Νύαξη έπντηγύνοι ιόοοι έπτοτη ι έπντηγύνοι ναν περρηπονη-τηνίκε ιόοοι ετμεζ...; (2) the mediate construction: (A 2 345) ...έπερεπρηπονωτ ιόοοι μαναάι / (Wess. 9 145a 11f.) ...απρηπονοοοτη ιν-.

(b) Durative (rare): (Wess. 9 148b-c) θεπρηπονη/πε/ (IV 194.1f.) Νεσθηνε έφερεάδαιον (sic) πρηπ-νειπ ιόοοι.

3.4 DEVERBATIVE LEXEME-CARRYING NOMINALIZATIONS AND THEIR OBJECT-EXPANSION

περ-τ-, the analytic, productive nomen agentis prefix, and ατ- - the “privative” deriving one, are both nuclei in relation to a following verb lexeme. (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 περικτωμ μον, 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 especially for close compound verbs (§3.1.1.2.3(2)):

| Object construction | θ-determin. object | Non-θ-determin. object/subst. relat. (determined) or [pron.]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) immediate</td>
<td>περοδι-περοδη (IV 21.8)</td>
<td>Τεμπντρεχή-2θην... (IV 42.4f., 116.8f.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>περετιμ-περείμε (III 61.6f.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>περετιμ-περείλαον (Ch. 110.11ff.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>περοδι-ζεπε (Ch. 126.5f.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42 -τον- is nuclear in [οτ-]τον + noun (A I 400, A 2 12, 155, 402, Wess. 9 144d 29f.) [νε-]τον + noun (A 2 80, P 130 119 ιο) in relation to the following noun lexeme (it expands its determinator).
43 This goes for (Wess. 9 142d 7ff.) Άμανατ άματ άπροφοι εροο and (Ch. 125.23f.) περοδι-τονοι ναον.
44 Cf. FUNK 1978a:115f.
45 STERN §172; WIESMANN 1914:130 (no περ+ -static is known to me in Shenoite). 1917:146; TILL §§46, 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 περον (aoristic, non-actual present) vs. περονον (actual stadal present) see FUNK 1976a:180 n. 1.
46 See §5.2.3.1.
3.4.2 **AT**- *^8^*: here we have a different picture: (a) With a pronominal or non-zero-determined nominal object, the construction is *mediate*: P-/O N- **ATC00YN MMO-** (III 212.8f., IV 2-3, 7.4f., Ch. 66.22f.) / (P 131^6^ 45 vo.) -O **NATC00YN MPEY3MOT.** (ΘΕΕΙΚ ΝΑΤΑΟϚ [III 108.28] is quoted from Athanasius. Note **ATC00YN E-** [IV 83.9, 100.5f.]: I know of no instance of "**ATC00YN-"." Is P- **ATC00YN MMO-** a case of **MMO--** rection of a compound verb (§3.1.2.2.2)?

(b) We find the *immediate* construction with a zero-determined object: (IV 42.12f.) **ZENATWYN-3MOT** and with the compound verb P- **2TQN--**: (IV 49.12) **NATP-2THY.**

3.4.3 **MISCELLANEOUS.** (a) With **WOY-** "worthy of..." we find the immediate construction of a nominal or pronominal object (the pronoun anaphoric-correferent with the determinator or nucleus of the syntagm): (III 64.6f., IV 23.20f., P 131^6^ 15 ro) — **ΝYOYM3T3WYN (IV 84.21) ΝYOYP3NP3WYN (A I 269) ΝYOYC3OYN3W3P3OYN (IV 157.12) ΘΟΙΤΕ ΝYOYP3NW3 (III 96.3) ΝYOYP3T-ΠΕΥΡ-Μ3ΕΕΥΕΥ EBOA / (Ch. 205.48ff.) **ΤΞΗΚ3Ν ΝYOY- M3R3Τ3C** / (ibid. 189.2ff.) **ΝYOYΤΜ3ΤΑΥYE-ΠΕΥΡ3Ν (A 2 84) ΝYOY3ΝW3 (sic), ΝYOY3ΝM3R3Τ3N.**

(b) With **GIN-**, we find the immediate construction of a pronominal object, *mediate*/*immediate*?) for the nominal one: (A 2 234) **ΤΘ3ΗΝΜ3ΝΓ3ΟΥΤ3Y (A I 15) (of the friendly dog) **ΤΘ3ΝΚΙΜ EPOY (i.e. for his master) **Μ3Ν3Π3ΑΟYN H ΠΕΥCAT Μ3Τ3ΝΓ3ΙΝΕΡΡ3 ΠΕΕ3ΗΤ Ν3ΕΥ3Μ3ΛΛ3E.**

(c) **ΕΡΟ ΜΜΑΙΤΑΕΙΟΥ EBOA ΖΙΤΝΝΠ3WME (IV 43.5).**

---

*^8^* **STERN §177; JERNSTEDT 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 pronom-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 syntagm[1], 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 syntagm[2]. Moreover, the grammars shed no light on the vital question of the \textquotesingle nucleus - satellite\textquotesingle arrangement or relative order, actually observing on the irrelevance of placement and non-existence of a significant order — hence, the variation status of [OY-]ΝΟΝΗΠΟϹ ΝΠΩΜΕ and [OY-]ΠΩΜΕ ΜΝΟΝΗΠΟϹ, the latter being nevertheless the \textquotesingle normal\textquotesingle (i.e. predominant) arrangement[3].

[1] TILL\textquoteright s unfortunate \textquoteright Qualitätsgenitiv\textquoteright (p. 70f.; 1928:88a). Cf. STEINDORFF 1951:§§148, 156, STERN §§292ff. Stern\textquoteright s "attributive Relation\textquoteright (§§185-8), distinct from "attributive Annexion\textquoteright (§ 194, the case of -\textsc{he}, -\textsc{e}, etc., considered by Stern in the same light as the \textit{in fine compositi} elements, -\textsc{o}, -\textsc{e}, 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\textquoteright s in \textit{Dictionary}, "adj" vs. "nn", "adj" usually corresponding to a Greek adjective, e.g. in p. 157a, 159b) have a definite ethnocentric flavour (so too GREGORIUS 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 N\textsc{e} etc. "adjectiva quae distinguuntur ex suffixis" (33) or "quae utuntur suffixis" (74f.), ET-\textsc{e}, ET-\textsc{e}... "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 CHAIN\textsc{e} 1933, STEINDORFF 1951, BÖHIG 1979, GREGORIUS 1981, etc.) or evade the issue (so CHERIX 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: KUINE, UHPE: YEEPE, ZAALO: ZAALW, SABE: SABH) 4; (f) (morphologic) countability, more or less regular, widespread but unpredictable (subject to regulation as yet obscure) (CON: CMUH, ZAALO: ZAALOI, CON: CNHIY) 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” predication 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-Γ-ΜΩΛ, Π-Γ-ΝΟΓ, Π-Γ-ΠΜΝ-; nouns compatible with MNT- (until evidence to the contrary is produced, one cannot assume that these constitute an open-ended list); -ΟΣ/-ΟΝ dual-ending Greek loan-adjecitives (see below) or loan-substantives vs. all others; eligibility (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 predication 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-adjecitives: ΠΡΙΜΕ ΝΑΓΑΒΟΣ.) It is nonetheless the Greek loan-adjecitives (ΠΟΝΗΡΟΣ, ΚΟΦΟΣ, ΚΑΛΧΙΚΟΣ) — with some original two-ending compounds, like ΑΝΟΜΟΣ, ΤΑΛΑΝΤΙΨΟΡΟΣ —, 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.

4 Unproductive, and of the same order as lexical motion (EJHT: ΜΑΛΑ). 

5 (III 157.11ff.) ΕΥΧΟΙΛΟΣ ΕΝΑΛΑ ΧΑΤΗΝ ΑΥΣ ΕΥΧΟΙΛΟΣ ΕΘΑΛΑ ΧΑΤΗΝ ΤΗΝ, ΝΕΚΧΟΙΛΟΣ ΕΝΑΛΑ ΧΑΤΗΝ ΤΗΝ. An unpublished monograph by a student of mine, Ms. G. Rozyl, points to an individualizing-concretizing role of the lexemic plural in the Sahidic NT. — Incidentally, OCUNE ΝΚΩΜ (III 94.12ff., see Dictionary 343a) means here “wife-mate” (not “female sister”).

6 A relatively late distinction in grammatical terminology (SCHOEMANN 1862:83ff. — mainly a semantic one). The usual adjectival syndrome, often converging with a conglomerate of specific morphs, is one of adnominal privilege of position, concord governability, morphologic grading (comparative, superlative, adequate, etc.), special semasiological characteristics, and (in some languages) syntactic or morphosyntactic peculiarities, such as special predication patterns, a distinction of attributive vs. predicative status, and so on.

7 See SCHENKEL 1967:77ff.; the Egyptian adjective is primarily a syntactically definable category, yet neither the adnominal position (shared by the so-called “direct genitive”) nor the concord (shared by the appositive noun) are decisive. However, the special “adjectival predicate” pattern, lost between Demotic and Coptic, is. In Coptic this predication pattern is replaced cooperatively by the “adjectival verbs,” the stative in the Bipartite conjugation, and the nominal sentence. Note esp. the pattern with zero-determined predicate: (Or. 159.34ff.) (E)ΝΟΤΕ ΠΕ, (Ε)ΧΙΜΕ ΠΕ / (III 208.8) (Ε)ΜΟΙΡΕ ΠΕ ΝΑΥ... / (IV 23.22) ΜΚΑΣ ΝΙΜ ΠΕ ΕΚΟΤΜ / (Ch. 183.23) ΕΡΑΨΗ ΠΕ ΝΑΥ... / (B.L. Or. 3581A 66, No. 198, f. 2 vo) ΧΙΦΝΕ ΠΕ ΞΕ-ΝΑΙ.

8 STERN §169; TILL §76, etc. See GREGORIUS 1981.
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 syntagms, 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 appurtenative, 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: ТУОРНЕ НОТО [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 МПОНХРОС НПИМЕ and НПИМЕ МПОНХРОС are mere variants: can nucleus and expansion (since the placement of the N-marked noun is fixed and non-pertinent), determinatum and determinans, really exchange status, with no correlated shift on the plan du contenu? In other 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. Guillaume 1919:125ff., Rothenberg 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: НОЮЕМ МИКОСОМ, ОУАЯТТАОС ННЕПИМЕ, ЗЕННОУЕ НУЕ, ОУРОПОМИСИКО НОЙЮ, ОПРУАИОИ НЕАСИКТОН, ОУСИМИ МПОХРОС. The "closeness" of 'N-adjective' vs. the "looseness" of 'N-substantive' (Steinthal-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 §5.1-0.1; Seiler 1960:66. The means of formal concatenation in Coptic are twofold: morphomic (N- mark of satellital dependence) and tagmoric (word-order). This corresponds to pre-Coptic concord + order (see Steinthal-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 coniunctiva"; cf. Steinthal-Misteli's "Nominalcasus" (1893:92), and see also Schwarze-Steinthal 459. The "nomen relatum" is in paradigm with other, verbal adnominal modifiers (relative, circumstantial, conjunctive, ЕТРЕ-; see Ch. 7 n. 31, §7.4). It syntacizes (neutralizes) the distinction between attributive and adnessional modification (§7.1.3): (Wess. 9 110a 59f.) ΝΥΜΕ ΝΑΙΟΕΙ Η ΕΤΝΟΙΑ / (III 166.22f.) ЗЕНПУМЕ НАСОУМ... ΑΥΣ ΕΥΑΕΣΕΙ / (P 131 47 ro) ΝΕΖΒΗΣΗ ΕΤΝΟΙΟΥΟΥ ΑΥΣ ΝΑΙΚΑΙΟΥΣΗ / (A 4 419-420, not Sh.) ΝΕΡΕΛΑΙΣ ΑΥΣ ΕΤΑΙΟΥΟ / (Mun. 104) ΝΕΡΕΛΙΟΥΟ... ΜΝΕΡΕΠΑ- ΚΟΑ ΜΝΕΡΕΠΑΡΟ ΝΟΥΧ ΑΥΣ ΕΤΝΟΙΟΥ ΕΝΚΡΟΝ ΝΙΜ / (A 4 338) ΖΕΝ- ΡΕΤΟΥΜΕ-ΡΥΜΕ ΝΕ ΑΥΣ ΝΕΡΕΛΗΣΤ-ΟΝΟ ΝΗΙΚΗ / (RE 11 16b 9f.) ΝΑΙΚΑΙΟΥΝ ΑΥΣ ΝΑΓΑΒΟΣ: in the last exx., N-/ЕΤ- 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-[ ]” grammatical 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-)PUNE, (T-)WYKH in OPYume MIPONHPOC and TAMOUC MUYXH; belonging to a certain “meaning class”, cf. “form class” for the syntactic nucleus; often, but not necessarily the non-omissible component) is placed first in OPYume MIPONHPOC, where it coincides with the syntactic nucleus, but second in OPYONHPOC NPUME, where semantic satellite coincides with the syntactic nucleus. In binary terms, the arrangement opposition is storable 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 satellitical 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. 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) opposition: ‘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) NEUIME PPUIME (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 pro forma expansion it is often difficult to assign the semantic roles: (Mun. 102) NIPWIK NPEP-PAPE / (Wess. 9 105b 16ff., 24ff.) EUP-PIKAIO NMAHT AHU MUYAY ...EUP-AKHEC NATA NPEP-XINGOMC AHU MNGOK (III 95.15) OYXAIENK NMONTAOCO / (ibid. 123.13f.) NMAHT N.objects ETAMNEMEWA / (ibid. 135.10f.) NPEP-XINGONC NE NPEP-NOBE / (Ch. 108.15ff.) ... (E)NMAHT NE NMAHT WMPIIPOME... and so on. These cases are best understood as additional expansions of a determinator; see n. 12. (A 2 74) ZEAXICTON MNOB 21ZAT / (UV 128.3) NAYOTE NAIOBANOC / (ibid. 153.16) OYXAIEN PPUIME, OYXAIEN NKCME / (A 76) TELEAGHT NKCME; 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.) NATA NMATOCI “that soldier who is ruthless”, (Rossi 2/375) NIPHPOC NIPUIME “every man that is wicked”; yet this is certainly not without exception in Coptic: (P 1304 97 to) TEKETEALIPOMOC MUYXH / (A 2 412) NBIH NMACH / (Wess. 9 149d 20f.) MPAAPANOMOC NIODAI.

14 Witness (Miss. 281) PECNAY H PEYOMNT (scil. MNOY). The so-called “reduction test” (“bad dogs” to “dogs”; Seiler 1960:6f.), 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 selbständig und regierende steht vor dem angeknüpften und abhängigen”; see also Schenkel 1967:71, Fink 1978a: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, e.g. for French. Weil 1879:3ff., Weirich 1966, Barri 1975 suggest semantic union (adj. → N) vs. disunion or autonomy (N → adj.) The inverse is asserted for English (Bolinger 1972). Teysier (Linguar 20:236ff., 1961) distinguishes in English between qualifying and modifying placement; Reiner 1968 suggests for French a distinction of “coaplicative” vs. “co predicative”, “objectivation” (N → adj.) vs. subjective, impressionistic qualification (adj. → N). The comparable opposition in German of böse Hunde vs. böse Hunde is treated by Seiler 1960 (esp. 35f.) in terms of characterization vs. specification, respectively. Weirich’s (1966) and Barry’s (1975) approach to the French constructions is structuralist. Weirich rejects the “emotive” interpretation (covered in more detail below) of “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-μπονηπος-ονηπος-πωμε paradigm. (Note that the distinction of semantic vs. syntactic nucleus and satellite is valid for both adjectives and modifier nouns, the only difference being that for the ‘πωμε-μπονηπος’ 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 ουγκεμενος, ουγκεμενος-μμογ.)

4.2.1 The Placement Opposition Suppressed (Order Neutralization)

4.2.1.1 First-place-position paradigm. This includes (beside determinators)²⁸: (a) Identifiers: ζενκοουε (ΙΙΙ 59.27), άω, ου, ημ (ΙV 75.18f., ΙΙΙ 108.1f., 137.1); (b) Quantifiers: ηνογ: (A 1 281) ουγκον η ζενκοουε μμογθπιον (sic) / (Wess. 9 131b 2ff.) τινογ ηνοβ ινοθε αυιν επ-βοοε εματε / (P 131a 23 η) τινογ ηπιολικ / (A 1 65) ζενκοουε ηνογ ηνομεν ¹⁷; ιναν, ηφιμ “a little”, “a small quantity/number” (άλιγος, παυκυς, πευ δε-: the second-place opposed homonym means “small, little”, μικρός, παρακις); ζενκοοι ηφιμ, ζενκοοι νηνοθε... (Miss. 231) / ημητρεπιποε νονκουι ινοθανους ην-εχει νουνα ιναοι (A 2 502f.) / ζενκοοι ηφιμ ινοθας ηνοθανους (Κ 9028) / ινεκουι ινωνιος (ΙΙΙ 45.27) / ζενκοοι ηφιμος (rare, ΙV 73.14f.); ζας, ζοεινε, ζααν, ουαθ (ΙΙΙ 108.5. 140.27. 107.20); cardinal numbers (from three onwards): ΙV 51.7, 54.29, Ch. 85.56f. With γιαω (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.) πιναγα... ηνομεν ηναεπαλλαίον / (Miss. 283) γιαω ηνομεν / (P 130a 93 vo) γιαω ηπερανοςικος, but (P 1301 36 πνε) ηνομεν γιαω ημενακαιον. For the feminine we find the first place: (ΙV 108.3) ηνομεν ϊνετε ηνομεν. Ordinal numbers: ιπου(οποιοι), μεζ- (Ch. 86.45f., 174.11f., ΙΙΙ 118.14), (A 1 33) ζενθεγουγιοι νην / (ibid. 92) ηπερανοςικος γιαω η ιπερανοςικον ινομεν. ζας “last” (movable, countable) has accordingly first place: (Ch. 161.1f.) ισαγας ινου / (ibid. 198.2f. = Mt. 5:26) ισας ινομαντικος, (17f.) ισας ινεπιχον / (A 2 71) βαθ ιπηνπαλαπια / (Рossi 2/3 12) πινον ιγυς ινεπιχον / (P 1301 136 ιας) ισας ινου / (ΙV 208.10f.) βαθ ιναληπις, etc.; but in certain temporal fixed expressions it occupies second place, namely after time-nouns, with a categorial (eschatological) reference (ζας, zero-determined, is invariably here): ινοεπιεις ιςας (ΙII 126.24, 164.20, 180.15,19f., 181.4f., A 1 90, 285, 290-1 etc.), ινους ιςας (ΙV 76.15): “last days”, “latter days”.

²⁸ 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, Мallon-Malinine §165, cf. Stern §187.

¹⁷ In ζοεινε εννος (sic), ζενκοουε ενσωκ (ΙΙΙ 27.10), ηνοσ 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. Мan. Homilien 27.15 ζανε ιναγι, ζανε ιναμεν, 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 syntagms. Examples are of course ubiquitous, and the lists are open-ended; the following semasiological subgrouping is selective: (a) θ-determined, N-marked abstracts (incl. nomina actionis, infinitive), ΜΝΤ-syntagms, individual lexemes: ΜΕ "truth", ΝΟΥΧ, ΒΟΤΗ, ΚΡΟΗ, ΣΩΦΙΑ, ΑΟΙΜΟΣ, ΝΑΥ, ΜΥΣ, ΝΩΜ and so on; (b) noun lexemes with generic-categoric reference: ΖΩΟΥΤ, ΨΩΜΗ, ΔΑΙΜΩΝ, ΚΑΤΑΝΑΣ, ΔΙΑΒΟΛΟΣ, ΝΠΕΥΜΑ, ΣΗΤ, etc.; (c) noun-lexemes with material-constituence reference: ΥΜΕ, ΙΕ, Η ΚΑΦ, ΣΑΤ, ΝΕΖ, ΟΥΣΙΝ, ΚΑΚΕ, and so on. This class is compatible with the first-place paradigm: (IV 156.19) ΑΑΑΑΝ ΝΟΒΝΟΒ ΝΜΟΥ / (ibid. 108.3) ΚΕΝΟΟ ΣΝΕΤ ΝΣΗΜΕ / (Ch. 146, 15ff.) ΟΥΝΟΓ ΕΜΑΤΕ ΝΘΒ ΝΑΟΟΑΙ. . . 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-determined, dependence-unmarked, invariantable 18 ΥΗΜ (and rarely) ΚΟΥΙ: (IV 99.16) ΠΜΑ ΥΗΜ ΝΚΑΖ / (Ch. 103.35ff.) ΓΕΝΠΡΥ ΥΗΜ ΜΝΣΗΜΕΣ / (P 1314 141 vo, Sh.? ΘΕ ΥΗΜ ΜΜΑΡΙΑ / (P 1306 69 ΣΤ) ΜΕΓΙΟΥΝ ΥΗΜ / (Leyd. 345) ΠΑΡΑΠΤΩΜΑ ΚΟΥΙ / (III 181.18ff.) ΟΥΩΟΝ ΚΟΥΙ ΜΜΟΥ / (A 2503) ΟΥΝΑ ΚΟΥΙ; ΥΗΜ occurs in at least two fixed (lexicalized) syntagms, viz. ΥΗΡΕ/ΥΕΕΡΕ ΥΗΜ "boy", "girl", "child" (IV 61.27 ΓΕΝΟΠΡΥ ΥΗΜ ΕΥΚΟΒ, ibid. 103.14, shows the the semantic weakening of ΥΗΜ, in this compound-like syntagm: "small children "), and ΤΣΥΝΑΤΤΩΜΑ ΥΗΜ (Berl. 1611 7 ΤΕΘ). ΚΟΥΙ (perhaps more usually of quantity than mere size) and ΥΗΜ are compatible 19: ΖΕΝΚΟΥΙ ΥΗΜ ΜΠΕΝΑΝΟΥ / (K 9028) "a few small good (works) ", cf. ΖΕΝΚΟΥΙ ΜΠΕΝΑ- ΝΟΥ / (Berl. 1613 6 ro) "a few good (works) ". This curious, unique attributive syntagm is the last vestige of the pre-Coptic tagmatically 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 ΖΑΦΕ/Η ("wise, clever", III 22.21, 120.18, IV 82.9, etc.) and ΒΡΡΕ ("new", III 65, 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 following examples: (Ch. 191.36ff.) ΟΥΡΜΗΜ ΜΠΑΡΑΝΟΜΟΣ ΝΑΤΝΑ ΡΕΥΠΤΨΡΝ ΝΑΚΑΒΑΡΤΟΣ ΝΚΡΟΥ ΝΖΑΛΗΜ / (III 172.10ff.) ΓΕΝΨΡΨΜΕ ΝΝΑΥΤΕΡΜΕ ΝΑΚΑΙΖΗΝ ΡΕΨΚΨΤΨΡΝ ΝΣΑΠΝΨΟΟΥ ΝΙΜ / (Ch. 111.35ff.) ΟΥΕΙΨΤ ΝΑΓΑΡΟΣ ΑΥΨ ΖΑΦΕ ΑΥΨ ΝΕΥΣΗΒΗΣ / (Ch. 199.37ff.) ΠΨΡΜΕ ΝΝΑΝΖΤΖΗΝ ΜΜΑΡΙΖΗΣ / (III 190.14ff.) ΠΨΡΜΕ ΡΕΨΚΨΡ-ΝΨΟΟΥ ΝΑΤΜΠΥΑ ΝΖΨΝ ΕΡΨΥΝ ΕΠΖΧΟΕΙΣ / (IV 126.6ff.) ΝΖΒΨΡΝΥΕ ΜΜΕ ΑΥΨ ΝΑΙΚΑΙΩΝ / (III 121.23ff.) ΖΕΝΨΨΜΕ ΝΑΤΣΨΤΜ ΡΕΨΚΨΡΨΡΝ ΝΨΨΡΝ-ΑΨΙΚΕ. NB. A complex single attribute ("bracketed", coordinated): (Ch. 79.31ff.) ΓΕΝΟΜ ΝΙΜ ΝΖΑΛΗΜ ΖΙΣΑΙΨΤΙΚΟΣ / (III 34.17) ΝΖΒΨΡΝΥΕ ΝΑΙΚΑΙΩΝ ΑΥΨ ΝΤΒΒΟ ΖΙΜΕ.

---

18 Yet note ΥΗΡΕΕΡΕ ΥΗΜ (Wess. 9 94a 1f., collated).
19 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).
20 "ΨΖΟΥΤ ("wild", ΠΙΨΡΖΟΥΤ, ΠΖΑΖΟΥΤ, A 2 104), "ΜΕ ("genuine", ΜΕΝΕΙ ΙΙΙ 71.5), "ΟΥΒ (ΟΥΒΨΡΝ "day such-and-such", IF 232 apud Dictionary 489a), "ΒΨΨΝ "bad", "ΝΟΥΨΕ "good", "ΨΨΡΕ ("young", in ΥΨΨΡΕΨΡΕ IF 298, Dictionary 486a), "ΑΣ ("old", ΝΠΨ ΑΣ vs. "ΝΨΡΨΡΕ, Α 1 194) are all in our corpus final (close-juncture?) constituents of compounds.
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 homonymic 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 — ποιμένη ποιμένης and ποιμένης ποιμένη — 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: -νος, -ποις, -ιος, -τος, -κός, -κος. Also exocentric (ἀνωμοσ, ζωοουκίος) and other two-ending Greek compounds (παρανομοσ, ταλαι-νΗπΟΣ).

(b) Adjectives of Egyptian origin: prenominal agent nouns, non-analytic (a-vocalized) (hist. “conjectural participles ’): ἤσι-, ἄσι-, ἀπυ-, ἀγώ-, ἀγώ-, ἀγώ- as well as the analytic, productive agent nouns (really syntagms) in ἄτ-: ἄτ- “private” syntagms 21; ἁξε- “imetical, hostile”.

(c) γαλο- “old”, ἄμμο- “alien”; ἐβιθο- “miserable”, ἦμερο- “beloved”, πετούων- “holy”.

Documentation (representative; I am here illustrating the α paradigm;)

(a) (III 41.34f.) γενώξεις νειπωνικός, (49.2) νευσοτος μπώνπος, (78.6) πρωμέ νανομος, (90.18) παισίως ναγαθοκ, (154.15) γενούς ναφκοκ, (IV 156.7) ρωμέ νεύσοβας, (Ch. 12.19f.) ουχρεία... νανάγκαιον, (14.33f.) ουργίμε μαύροματικός, (138.52ff.) αμα νίνις ναγαθάρτον;

(b) (III 53.37f.) πετρείωτ Νάνατης, (57.7) τεχνικότητις Νάτικι, (76.22) γενηρη εντηπική, (70-1) ιαίρως ναξίος, (189.23.30) παγκόσις νατηγον, (Ch. 27.4ff.) πιθυ πρεμάλα, (57.40ff.) ματον προετορίτ, (77.51f.) πρωμέ μμάινοβε;

(c) (III 103.7f., 142.5f.) Πενές/νεπερεράτος ναλο, (IV 172.16) ψαυχός νομό, (III 62.22) πενερ-πογονος νεβιν.

4.2.2.1 Rection 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-systematically in Coptic, though not of course in pre-Coptic Egyptian 23) in aconditioning set of animate (common gender, π μάρτυρος) or inanimate (sexual or natural neuter, π μάρτυρος) or on). 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 rection of personal pronouns and proper names, see below, §4.3; their expansion is appositive. (4) This concord rection operates in adnominal at rubitive adjectives. We need more evidence for predicative adjectives, namely ones expanding the predicate determinator in a Nominal Sentence pattern (‘ΟΥΠΟΡΟΗΠΟΣ ΠΕΣ’, consider [P 1318 Νερκός, Νερκός Τισ-θρίκον Νερκός, Νερκός IV 41.3f., and Τελιαγόντ Νικώντ Εντανόυτε Δέκ Νμμο Α 176, indicating that the rules are different in this adverbial status). (5) This concord is observable in instances of the postposed (α) adjective.

23 The very few movable Coptic adjectives (καλον/κον, ομοεον/ον, κακοι/κακον) are better viewed as double-entry semi-analyzable lexemes, rather than true concord alternants.

— 135. —
exx. of concord in the anteposed (β) adjective are too few to be conclusive (see below). (6) ἢς is invariable (animate only? III 182.3, 221.4, IV 156.7).

(a) -ος: human beings and their parts: some special faculties; groupings: πυγμα (PE- IV 3.20, ρμ- III 220.15); σειμ (IV 28.20); εισω (IV 29.18); ἄθρο, ἄσθερ (III 173.14f., Ch. 169.31a.); σαμ (IV 32.21f., see obs. 1); ματοι (Ch. 70.37ff.); ιοῦδαι (Ch. 143.25f.); προ (IV 29.22f.); ἄρχων (III 95.19.); προφήτης (III 171.14); θηκαίος (III 28.5). Note especially: σος (only in the cliché 'σος ὁ νίκαίος'; see obs. 2; III 166.18, 167.1f., Ch. 174.54f., Thompson A CM); ΒΑΑ (in the cliché 'ΒΑΑ ΜΠΟΝΙΚΟΣ', see obs. 5; IV 88.10, A 2 527); ΜΕΕΥ (Ch. 78.1f., Wess. 9 134a 3ff.); ΣΕΡΜΑ (III 213.13f., Ch. 137.12f., 144.20f.; obs. 3); ὦς (Ch. 140.17ff., obs. 4); ΓΕΝΟΣ (Ch. 102.9ff.); ΑΑΟΣ (P 131 21 vo); ΒΙΟΣ (A 2 368: ΝΣΝΜΟΣ, cliché); ΓΑΜΟΣ (IV 175.2f., obs. 6); ζωοί, οὐοείς (only + ΝΑΡΧΑΙΟΣ, obs. 7; III 164.12f., A 2 22, 247).

(b) -ον: inanimates; abstracts (incl. infinitives); plants, non-human animals: ζωος, σκευος (Ch. 193. 34f.), ζωος (IV 194.5), πρατη, προφητης (Ch. 118.57f., IV 86.21, P 131 42 ro); σος (III 49.2); ΠΝΕΥΜΑ (Ch. 20. 32ff.); ΑΑΟΣ (P 131 56 ν); ΑΓΑΘΟΝ (III 114.27); ΜΠΟΝΙΟΝ (IV 116.14); ΨΩΝ (III 114.29f.); ΟΥΣΟ (Ch. 73. 22f., 28f.); ΥΟΣΗΣ, ΕΠΙΒΟΥΛΗ (Ch. 33.10f., III 89.23); ΜΟΙΚΕ (Wess. 9 131b 30f.); ΣΩ (IV 86.22); ΕΡΗΣ (Ch. 135.17f.); ΛΟΓΟΣ, ΞΑΝΘΟΣ (III 63.20f., 148.16); ΒΣ (A 2 486); ΜΝΤ-ΣΥΝΑΓΓΘΙΟΝ (III 155.16f.); Π 130 20 ΛΑΘ, ΤΕΜΝΣΤΑΤΟΥΝ ΝΣΝΜΟΣ). ΑΓΑΘΙ (Ch. 168.27f.); ΣΥΝΘΗΣΙΑ (III 49.2f.); ΒΙΟΣ (A 2 423, not Sh.), ΠΡΑΣΙΣ (Ch. 120.4ff., A 1 163); ΧΡΕΙΑ (IV 172.12f.); ΡΟΥΤΟΣ (III 100.25.); ΥΣΩΝ, ΡΟΜΟΣ (Sh. 85.4f., 39f.); ΛΟΓΙΣΜΟΣ (Ch. 77.46ff.); ΚΕΙΣ (Ch. 129.24f.); ΨΘΥ (Ch. 207.1ff., Sh.?); ΤΟΣ (Ch. 36.19f.); ΨΟΤΗ (Ming. 318); ΕΝΘΣ (A 2 402). ΑΕΝ (Zeza 683). Note especially: ΒΑΛ (III 185.10, ΜΠΟΝΙΟΝ, obs. 5); ΣΕΡΜΑ (III 208.12, ΜΠΟΝΙΟΝ, obs. 4, 8); ΚΟΜΑ (III 106.4f., IV 190.10, 191.12, obs. 8); ΣΩΝ (K 913, ΜΠΟΝΙΟΝ, obs. 8), ΥΒΝ (III 30.8f., obs. 9); ΣΗΤ (Wess. 9 172a 8f.).

Observations: (1) Occurs once (IV 84.2) with -ον, perhaps to be taken as an ad-pattern modifier: ἐνεπεύειν πνε σ ε νεπαθος ἄσω τεμαμαυτα μενευκεψεν μεν επευος ματρικικον. Compare in this status (N)ΚΑΤΑΚΑΡΣ (IV 81.2f., 159.13).

(2) Only σος (ΝΙΜ) ΝΑΙΚΗΙΟΣ, excerpt quotation from Mt. 23:35.

(3) As against τινα, list (b).

(4) For ΠΕΣΕΡΜΑ ΜΠΟΝΙΟΝ (III 208.12) cf. Is. 1:4, 14:20, 57:3-4, also in A 2 122 ΠΕΣΕΡΜΑ ... ΜΠΟΝΙΟΝ ΑΥΕΘ ΝΚΟΕΩΝ ΠΙΟΡΠΗ.

(5) -ος is the consensus in the source of this excerpt quotation (Mt. 6:23, 20:15, Luc. 11:34); ΟΥΒΑΛ ΜΠΟΝΙΟΝ (III 185.10) is an adaptation to the system of Shenoute.

(6) Only in ΝΕΟΜΟΣ ΝΕΟΜΟΣ (IV 175.2f.), a calque of σεμισκος γάμος? Compare ΟΥΓΑΜΟΣ ΝΕΜΟΝ (Bohairic, Acta Martyrum [edd. Balestri-Hyvern] I 37.29), and see Drescher, Le Muséon 82.92f. (1969): also ΒΙΟΣ ΝΕΜΟΝ/ΝΟΚΙΣΜΟΣ (A 2 368).

(7) Only in ΝΕΟΥΕΙΘΕΣ/ΝΕΟΟΥΡ ΝΑΡΧΑΙΟΣ "past times", "days of old". ΝΑΡΧΑΙΟΣ appears to be an invariable modifier, "of old", "of yore", adverbal as well as adnominal 24 (P 130 118 KT ΝΑΡΧΑΙΟΣ ΑΥΘ ON ΣΕΡΜΟΥ, (P 131 23 [06]) ΕΥΚΕ-ΜΠΟΝΙΟΥΤΕ ΣΟ ΕΠΙΚΟΜΟΣ ΝΑΡΧΑΙΟΣ, (Or. 166.42ff.) ΝΒΕ ΝΤΑΑΑΛΑΣ ΝΑΡΧΑΙΟΣ; consider also III 19.14, 66.21, 203.17 and (A 1 12) ΝΠΟΣ ΜΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ ΣΙΝΝΑΡΧΑΙΟΣ.

(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 "a" (Bodl. Hunt. 345) have ΝΑΝΑΚΑΙΟΝ (ΑΝΑΓΚΕΩΝ) for ἄναγκαίον.

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, ἄγαργαρδος does not occur (to the best of my knowledge) in this construction; however, we do find ταγαγαρδ (Schwizer I 620, II 617f.).
(10) Fixed, "imported complete", often technical, terms and collocations, with the original concord ²⁸, include δήμοιον γράμμα (III 23.22), τερατωμική διασκαλία (A. I 15), ταξιωμική εκκαθαρσία (Thompson K 3 vo, III 61.1f., Ch. 146.50f. etc., very common), ταλαίπωρον (ΑΥΘ/ΝΗ-ΤΟ) καρπή διασκαλία (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.) ταπαβύλις νευματική, (BMCat. 77, No. 192 ΚΟΙΝΩΝΙΚΟΣ ΝΕΜΟΝΗ.) Otherwise, the feminine occurs only in substantivizations, like πόρνη "whore" (the quoted ουτίσις μπόρνη, III 97.14, where formally a modifier, is in anative role), τάναθος μνήμη "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: "attribute + 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" "attribute" ²⁸.

4.2.2.2.1 Constituency: position (β). First and foremost in all groups (§4.2.2) are pejorative, degradatory or disapproving attributes ²⁷: ΡΩΜΗΡΟΣ, ΑΚΟΛΟΥΘΟΣ, ΤΑΛΑΙΠΩΡΟΣ, ΣΑΙΡΕΣΙΚΟΣ, ΑΣΕΒΗΣ, ΑΝΟΜΟΙΟΣ, ΠΑΡΑΝΟΜΟΣ, ΣΙΝΑΙΤΙΚΟΣ, ΑΚΕΡΑΙΟΣ, ΑΡΤΟΣ, ΕΒΙΝΗ, ΧΑΣΕ, ΧΑΣΙΖΗΤ, ΡΕΠΡΙΝΗ, ΡΕΝΚΙΤΣ, ΑΤΝΑ, ΑΘΝΗ, ΑΤΝΟΥΤΕ, ΥΜΜΟ: much less prevalent are non-pejorative ones (§4.2.2.2): ΑΓΑΘΟΣ, ΑΤΝΟΒΕ, ΡΕΠΡΙΝΗ-ΝΟΥΤΕ ΜΑΚΑΡΙΟΣ, ΧΡΗΣΤΟΣ, ΚΟΦΟΣ, ΜΕΡΙΤ.

4.2.2.2.2 Function (1): In the case of pejorative attributes ²⁸ we are obviously faced with some attitudinal differentia 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 μι-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 πωμέ (very frequent), ωβο, ωναγ/ωνο, 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 ⁴⁰: (P 130 ⁴ 97 ro) ΤΕΧΝΙΤΑΛΑΙΠΩΡΟΣ ΜΨΥΧΗ (sim. Ch. 186.7) / (Ch. 123.48ff.) ΤΑΚΑ-

²⁸ GREGORIUS 1981:201.
²⁹ BERGSON'S term (1900:62-98), 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.

²⁸ The usual pejorative (——) ΝΙΝΟΣ "kind of..." shares the marked (β) adjective paradigm: ΝΙΝΟΣ ΝΠΟΜΕ ΝΑΡΡΟΣ (Ch. 62.3f.) / ΝΙΝΟΣ ΝΠΟΜΕ Ναρρος (III 92.10). A significant discovery is: (A 2 486), also III 82.7f., IV 42.3f., 47.24. Contrast this with the unmarked — ΝΤΕΜΟΝ (III 50.13, 110.19, 124.19f., 146.26, IV 59.7 etc.). Rare non-pejorative (neutral) instances, again with πωμέ the semantic nucleus (this seems to be significant): (Ch. 98.44f.) ΝΙΝΟΣ ΝΠΟΜΕ / (A 2 498) ΖΕΝΙΣΜΕ ΝΠΟΜΕ.
²⁹ POLOTSKY 1957b:229 (= CP 231). Observe that μι- too, like β-adjectives, is characterized both affectively and distinctively.
³⁰ Compare (among many other applications of this principle) WEIL 1879:36ff. ("l'ordre pathétique"); GAMILLASCHU 1930:15. 25, 32 (affect including antithesis); REGULA 1951:79, 181d. ("Affektsyntax"); the "emotive order" in Firbas, Časopis pro mod. filologi 39:173 (1957); JONES 1977:63ff. ("the emotive principle"); also REINER 1968:225-244, 256. Other terms for approximately the same factor are "emphatic", "subjective", "impulsive", "figured" order or syntax.
§4.2.2.2 Chapter 4. The Adnominal Nominal Modifier

THEAAODCS NCOYANGW / (A 2 73) PIAAAXICTOC NPWME (sim. Wess. 9 168b 13f.; — NZWON III 47.15, — NAH ibid. 82.28, — N2WAAY A 2 507, etc.) / (IV 82.1) NKEAPROG NPWME / (Ch. 147-8) NAOGHT NPWME / (A 2 412) PEBWNN NCEAEHTH (cf. Cl. Pr. 22 TNN: PEBWNN NPWME, appositive: "1, the miserable"; cf. §4.3) / (Rossi 2/3 75) PONPROC NIM NPWME / (Ch. 56.53f.) PATAA MMATOT / (A 1 194) PATORUTE MAMANXHOC / (P 1318 109 vo) ZEIXAAXE NPWME / (III 87.19) NEEACSCAEHS NPWME. Additional exx.: Ch. 63.55f., 142.39ff., 204.8ff., Wess. 9 149d 20ff., 154a 17f., A 1 14 etc.

FUNCTION (2), with non-pejorative attributes (rather unusual): (a) In distinctive, antithetic role: (IV 127.25f.,29) NAPABOS NPWME, contrasting with PONPROG NPWME, PUPME XULAE in 11.27, 28f., 30.
(b) Stylistic motivation (?) in the chiastic arrangement of (A 1 182-3) (NPWAX) NAPICTOC NAPNOTYBE EBOA

(c) Polite clichés (devaluation of function 1): (III 15.14) PAMAKAPICOC NCON "our late brother" / (III 13.23 = 14.22) PEPXUXMNOYOU TE NCON / (III 25.8) PAMEPET NCON (sim. Mun. 92) / (III 13.15) PAMEPET NEXUT ETCMINAAAT (sim. Mun. 95) / (III 32.4f.) OUMERET NPWBP; compare with (IV 26.15) (NUPMEE) NOUXMHE MUXứt, (ibid. 117.24) SWC-CON MUXerrupt (but also NACXNY MMURATE, III 123.27f., probably appositive — the definite article?): perhaps also (III 147.16) ZEPXURCTOC NPWME "worthy persons", sim. ibid. 128.20f.
(d) A bracketing role, with multiple nuclei: (III 106.11f.) ZEUATOBUE NAPPOSTOC AUYH MORTPHNTS.
(e) Unexplained is still (III 213.9f.) NCOFOC MPRPHNTS NCABE NPMNHNT (cod. A only) — which may be stylistically motivated, with middle placement of the semantic nucleus.

FUNCTION (3): Although several examples seem to indicate an inherent attribution value for position (β) attributes (PATAA MMATOT Ch. 56.53f.), vs. an incidental attribution value for the unmarked placement (N- being the non-predicative counterpart of "O N-"), I have not been able to follow this lead through to achieve a comprehensive description.

4.3 DETERMINATIVE AND APPOSITIVE SYNTAXES: 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; NO6 always precedes the nucleus): CINOYYHOCC PIAAAXICTOC (Mun. 92, 95, III 13.19, 14.15 etc.) / PAIKAKOS ABEA, PAIKAKOS NWE (P 130° 105 TMA) / ABEA PAIKAKOS (III 173.10, P 130° 53 TIA, etc.) / PAIKAKOS EOB (Ch. 38.10f., A 2 367, 478) / PNO6 ABRAOAM (RE 10 162a 10) / PNO6 NAPXHAGELOCS MHAXA (Ch. 33.37ff.) / PNO6 MSHUYCH INCOY

31 See Kurklowicz 1960:182. The present writer is preparing a monographic study of the syntax of the proper name in Coptic.
32 Cf. Callender 1970:297f.: "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 "attrition" in a more restricted sense than I do; the construction in point, while syntactically appositive, is functionally still attributive.)
33 PNO6... NAKPAHHA (A 4 276, collated) is a rare instance of an N-marked proper name semantic nucleus. Under certain contextual conditions, a proper name may be determinated: OTIOYYAC (NOYYUT), ZANIOYYAC, NAIIOYYAC, in De Vis, Homilies copies de la Vaticane I 64f. — the proper name is thus "de-specified", marked as appellative.


34 **CATANAΣ** is a common appellative in (Ch. 65.31f.) ΠΟΥΔΙΟΥ ΠΟΤΑΜΑΣ or else, like ΠΝΟΥΤΕ, part of a proper name with innate determination.

35 Cf. ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΠΥΘΗΝΕ (Terza 864). (A 2 411) ΜΗ ΑΛΛΟ-ΠΡΙΜΗ ΑΝ ΠΑΓΑΒΟΣ... ΑΛΛΟ-ΠΡΙΜΗ ΝΑΓΑΒΟΣ... ΑΛΛΟ-ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΟΝ ΝΑΓΑΒΟΣ ΑΥΣ ΠΕΠΝΟ ΝΑΓΑΒΟΣ (uncollated) may be a contrary example; others are (A 1 130) ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΝΗΛΗΤ (uncollated) / (A 2 376) ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΜΗ. 
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EXCURSUS: NEUTER GENDER AS A SYNTAGMATICALLY MANIFESTED, PARADIGMATICALLY DEFINED CATEGORY

5.1 Coptic gender
5.1.1 Exponents; syntagmatics
5.1.1.0.1 Determinators
5.1.1.1 Phorics and concord
5.1.2 Categorial structure
5.2 Gender neutralization environment: "Neuter Gender"
5.2.0.1 Synopsis of patterns
5.2.1 Cotext patterns: anaphoric reference to a zero article: θ-Noun, θ-Noun-nim, θ-κε-Noun
5.2.2 Cotext patterns: cataphoric reference to a verbal nominalization, "that"-clause or adnexal complementation: "sentence pronominalization"
5.2.3 Non-phoric environment and neuter gender
5.3 A concluding note: pronouns, conjugation bases and the typology of Coptic

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, rectio) 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 EXONENTS; 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 écarter 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: CIWE, 2ΛΛΟ: 2ΛΛΛ, WIPE: WhiteSpace, see §4.0.1), synchronically only semi-morphological and unproductive, — as also are the lexical pairs (ΕΙΣΤ: ΜΑΥ, ΠΩΜΕ: ΚΙΜΕ) — 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 1965:44f.) would be

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{n-o-y-} & \\
\text{PΩΜΕ} & \\
\text{0-}
\end{align*} \]

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 DAMOURRETTE-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 Gaelic bardic-grammatical terminology, imnsge covers both “gender”, “person” and “pronoun-article” (O’Cuiv, Transact. Philol. Soc. 1965:152, Adams, FL 4:160 (1970)). Cf. KURZMICH 1964:210f., KERN 1888:100, 103n., and, the earliest instance to my knowledge of this approach, the Stoic definition of the article (Diocles ap. SCHMIDT 1839:39) ἀξηθόν ὀκτί στοιχείον λόγου πτωτικών δισθέσων τά γένη τῶν ἰδιότων καὶ τῶν ἀξηθών; see too ROBINS 1951:31.

8 See SEILER 1960:12ff.; 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 ‘empioie’ le nom’.”

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-syntax “levelling” issue: the “word-internal” interdependence between article and noun is only jucnturally 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 izäfer dependence is synchronic 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 ΠΥΑΔΩΒ "the (book) of the syllable, syllabary" (BL Or. 8800 4 vo.) 11; ἸΒΩΝ ΤΗΡΟ "he who is all power" (RE 10 161a 27f.); ΠΙΟΙΩΣΙΣ ΤΗΡΟ "he who is all wonder" (ibid. 28); ΠΙΟΙΩΣΙΣ (ibid. 163a 33) 12; ΝΑΜΑΑΑΑ (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: ΠΙΟΙΩΣΙΣ can in principle expand both "masculine" and "feminine" determinator pronouns, just (from the point of view of syntagmatic compatibility) as ΖΩΟΑΑΑ or ΕΒΙΝΗΝ 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): ΟΥΜΟΙΩΣΙΣ ΠΕ ΠΝΟΥΤΕ "A wondrous one is God" (P 130β 46 σκ.) / ΠΥΜΕ ΠΕ ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΑΥΣΤΙΟΥΜΕ ΕΠΕ ΠΕΝΑΙΟΕΙΚ (P 130β 22 σχ.) / the common ΖΕΝΜΥΝ" "phenomena characterized by the quality of..." (e.g. III 206.1-5) / ΖΕΝΨΑΠΕ ΠΕ ΖΙΣΤΟ (P 130β 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-/τ- /η- /η-</td>
<td>&quot;the-&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ουμ′-/ουτ-/ζη-/</td>
<td>&quot;a-&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θ-</td>
<td>&quot;-&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— ΝΙΜ</td>
<td>&quot;all&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΕ-</td>
<td>&quot;other-&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ουμ′-/ουτ-</td>
<td>&quot;one-&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θ- ... ΝΙΜ</td>
<td>&quot;any, every-&quot; (discontinuous)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


9 See below §5.2.1, and §3.1.1.0.1. The Nominal Sentence is a striking case in which the advantages of this conception are clear, being really a pronominal predication pattern: ου- /π- + ΠΕ. This analysis, as Jeremstedt himself points out, would account for syntagms like (a) ΟΥΜΕ- /ΖΕΝΜΥΝΕ- (A 2 417, 421 [not Sh.], RE 11 16a 10), an instance of hyperdetermination, where πε- in commutation with the bare noun, expands the indefinite articles; (b) ΙΩΝΤΑΚ ΝΕ ΠΕ ΙΩΝΤΑΚ ΠΕ ΙΩΝΤΑΚΟΣ (A 2 435, not Sh.), ΠΕΝΚΑΣ ΝΗΣ ΠΕ ΙΩΝΤΑΚ ΠΕ ΙΩΝΤΑΚΟΣ (A 1 77), (ΠΕΝΤΑ ΝΟΙΚ ΠΕ ΙΩΝΤΑΚ) (III 205.23f.). Note ΙΓΝΗΣΙΟΣ ΕΧΝΗΣΙΟΣ ΝΕ ΠΕΝΣΗΒΥ (Cat. 43.29) "His works constitute wonder upon wonder" — for ΙΓΝΗΣΙΟΣ ΕΧΝΗΣΙΟΣ, here expanding ιών-, see §1.2.1.1; the articles here bracket ιω-coordinated, zero-determined nouns (see POLOSΣΕ 1957a:233f. = CP 233). (Incidentally, in BM 991 ro - BM Cat. 411, collated) we find the remarkable ΠΕΝΑΙΟΕΙΚ ΠΑΝΒΥΠΙΕ... ΑΝ ΜΑΥΑΧ ΠΕ ΑΥΣ ΤΣΕΠΕ.)

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 ΜΟΙΩΕΣ, ΥΠΗΡΕΣ, ΠΟΟΝΕ), and also the so-called "overrule" of the "inherent gender" by the article (JERNSTEDT 1949:25). See further instances in KAHL 1954:250 (sub b); ΤΡΑΤΕ ΛΠ 5:36 (Palau Rib. ed. Quecke, see BROWNE 1979b:201); ΠΙΑΛΕΠΙΠΙΑ in (Boh.) Ps. 11:6, 13:3, 39:3; Rom. 3:16, must be accounted for differently.


12 Cf. ΠΕΝΗΜΕΡΕΣ ΠΑΝ. 9:4 (and other exx. in CRUM 581a).

13 Cf. ΠΗΜΕ 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. (KRÜMSKY'S facts [1972:89] are either over-simplified 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-MISTIL 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 off-hand contextual consideration — in an attempt to isolate the function of what is a macro-syntactically operative element par excellence. See NAGEL 1980:77f., LAYTON 1981:261 for recent brief expositions.
5.1.1.1 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 -ŋ-/c-/ŋ- — but also by a non-personal demonstrative, by ŨYA/ŨYEI/ŨINE 18, or, more rarely, zero 19. This linear reference may be either resuming, ANAPHORIC (§5.2.1) to a determinator 20, or assuming, CATAPHORIC (§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:

(a)       n- motivates (governs) masc. + sgl.
        Ũ-             ″         ″ fem. + sgl.
        Ŧ-             ″         ″ (masc. + fem.) + pl.
(b)       ŨYm-        ″         ″ masc. + sgl.
       ŨYf-        ″         ″ fem. + sgl.
       ŦEN-        ″         ″ (masc. + fem.) + pl.
(c)       Ŧ-     ″     ″ suppression of the
       Ŧ- ŦIM  ″     ″  gender-number
       Ŧke-     ″     ″ distinction (§5.2)

(a) In the case of the gender-explicit referate, the concord is resolute and comparatively straightforward:

" n £ PUMP... -ŋ- " (etc.)

(b) With ŨY- we have a superficial syncretism-neutralization of ŨYA/ŨYEI in the nuclear syntagm (JERNSTEDT 1949:§§4, 13) to be resolved in the sequence 22.

16 See Quecke 1979:447. I know of two Sah. instances of ŦIM in compatibility with non-zero determinators: ŨYOY'T ŦIM (Ex. 12:48 Bodmer) and ŦPAPOC ŦIM (NH VII 11.10) — insufficient evidence to modify the above structure (more Boh. exx. in CRUM 225b).
17 See Brondal 1943:25ff.
19 See §5.3.1 and §§3.1.5.7, 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. 87ff.).
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 perspective".
22 A nice question is, what motivates the gender when the ŨY-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 Categorial 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:

\[
\begin{align*}
(\text{neuter gender: masc. } &\sim \text{ fem. } \sim \text{ plur. fluctuation}) \\
\emptyset & \\
\text{MARKED} & \quad \text{UNMARKED} \\
(\text{fem. sgl.}) & (\text{masc. sgl.}) \\
\text{COMPLEX} & \\
(\text{plural, common gender})
\end{align*}
\]

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) "1", "2" and ANOK represent the one case where the animate class overrules 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- νιμ, 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 archmorpheme\(^33\) 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-determinated 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’ ἀσεβής, the Stoics’ όδεστερον, Aristotle’s μεσαζό ("indifferent ", acc. to H. M. Hoenigswald, " Media, Neutrum u. Zirkumflex ", in Festschrift A. Debrunner, Bern 1954, 209-212) — see Robins 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.
privative opposition of gender \(^{34}\). 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 \(^{35}\) 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 CoteXt Patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Cataphoric</strong></th>
<th><strong>Anaphoric</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\Xi\epsilon^\prime)</td>
<td>(\emptyset\text{-Noun}^{\text{fem.}} \rightarrow \emptyset \sim C \sim OY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prep. (-c \sim C \rightarrow \epsilon(TPE)^\prime)</td>
<td>(\emptyset\text{-Noun}^{\text{fem.}} \rightarrow \emptyset \sim C \sim OY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(the pron.: <em>object expansion</em>)</td>
<td>(\emptyset\text{-Noun}^{\text{fem.}} \rightarrow \emptyset \sim C \sim OY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Xi\epsilon^-)</td>
<td>(\emptyset\text{-Noun}^{\text{fem.}} \rightarrow \emptyset \sim C \sim OY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conjunctive</td>
<td>§5.2.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(the pron.: <em>gramm. subject</em>)</td>
<td>(\emptyset\text{-Noun}^{\text{fem.}} \rightarrow \emptyset \sim C \sim OY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># OY-Noun (\rightarrow \pi \rightarrow | \Xi\epsilon^- #)</td>
<td>(\emptyset\text{-Noun}^{\text{fem.}} \rightarrow \emptyset \sim C \sim OY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§5.2.2.1 f.</td>
<td>§5.2.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘ (\pi\alphai \rightarrow | \Xi\epsilon^- )’</td>
<td>‘(\emptyset\text{-Noun}^{\text{fem.}} \rightarrow \emptyset \sim C \sim OY)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\epsilon(TPE)^\prime)</td>
<td>(\emptyset\text{-Noun}^{\text{fem.}} \rightarrow \emptyset \sim C \sim OY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§5.2.2.2.2</td>
<td>§5.2.1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{34}\) In French too we observe the neutric use of the masculine, unmarked term of a privative opposition (Dubois 1965:52, 57; see S. Lampach, “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 \(\varepsilon\gamma\zeta\iota\nu\varepsilon\) “behind”, 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 *te* as an “invariable” subject or occasionally copula in Nominal Sentence 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 *\zeta\nu\nu\nu\nu*, *\eta\nu\nu* (originally phoric too - §§6.1.2.3, 6.1.3.4 - synchronically “phoric” in a macrosyntactic sense, back to a preceding context).  

\(^{35}\) See Guillaume 1919:62, 233ff., 345ff., 303ff.; Dubois 1965:149ff. (“L’absence de tout référent supprime toute forme d’actualisation”), 154ff. (the absence of the article suppresses and negates the existence of the noun syntagm, giving the noun ad-
5.2.1 CONTEXT PATTERNS: ANAPHORIC REFERENCE TO A ZERO ARTICLE

5.2.1.1 REFEREE: θ-Νoun\textsuperscript{fem}; REFERENT (a): masculine singular (always 3rd person; all referents act-expressions in adnominal circumstantial forms): (I) ΙΙΙ 205.17f. ΑΓΑΝ... ΕΥΚΗΚ ΕΒΟΛ (87.2) ΚΑΙΕ (291.30) ΣΕΛΗreek ΕΥΚΗΚ ΕΒΟΛ (195.2ff.) ΜΝΕΣΛΑΕ ΕΥΡ-ΝΟΥΡΕ (307.11f) ΕΙΘΕ ΕΙΘΕ ΜΠΕΡΓΟΣ (A 2 242) ΖΕΛΑΙΝ ΕΥΔΟΥΤΕΙ (289) ΠΙΤΕ ΕΥΚΗΚ ΕΥΚΗΚ (Wess. 9 141d 6f.) ΣΕΛΗ ΕΥΚΗΚ (Or. 160.4f.) ΓΕΙΝΗ ΕΥΚΗΚ (P 130\textsuperscript{2} 6, ΚΝ-ΠΗ) ΣΥΝΕΚ ΕΥΡ-ΠΡΩΣ ΕΥΣΟΥΜ.

REFERENT (b): feminine singular (actor-expression, object expansion of adnominal constructions; reflexive object in adverbial modification): (I) ΙΙΙ 76.6f. ΟΥΣΚΗΖΕ ΟΝ ΕΝΕΜΠΟΥΡΡΙΠ-ΝΟΕΙΚ ΕΡΟΣ ΝΕΚΝΑΙΕΘ. ΑΝ ΧΕ Ι (IV 15.8f.) ΜΝΕΣΗΚΕ ΝΑΜΩΓ-ΓΟΜ ΕΠΟΝΕΣ ΕΒΟΛ... (Or. 153.8f.) ΟΥΣΚΗΖΕ ΕΥΔΟΥΣΟΥΣ... (159.51f.) ΟΥΣΚΗΖΕ... ΕΡΩΣΟΥΡ-ΠΕΤΝΑΟΥΣ (160.47f.) ΟΥΣΚΗΖΕ ΕΚΝΟΡΝΕΥΕ...

Obviously, this evidence\textsuperscript{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-ΩΣΩΜε sex may be overruling gender (in Shenoute I do not recall any instance of θ-ΩΣΩΜε with a masc. anaphora).

REFERENT (c): plural (actor-expression or object expansion, possessor in adnominal constructions): (Or. 160.50f.) ΟΥΣΚΗΖΕ ΟΝ ΟΥ ΜΟΝΟΝ ΕΣ-ΝΩΕΤ-ΛΑΛΑ ΝΑΥ ΑΝ... ΛΑΛΑ ΝΚΕΣΤΕ ΟΙ ΜΝΕΣΑΙ, ΠΕΤΟ ΝΝΟΕΙΚ ΕΡΟΣ ΕΥΧΛΥΜΗΣΤΥΚ ΝΗΤΟΥ “There are women who not only do not receive anything, but even serve those who commit adultery with them, with the products of their husbands’ toil”; note the progressive transition from plur. to fem. sgl.; the inverse is evident in (P 130\textsuperscript{2} 5-6 ΚΝ-ΠΗ) ΟΥΣΚΥΝΑΙΩΝ ΟΝ ΕΥΡ-ΠΡΩΣ... ΔΥΣ ΕΥΣΙ ΖΕΝΕΘΑΙΛΙΣ... ΟΥΣΚΥΝΑΙΩΝ ΟΝ ΕΣΟΥΜ... ΕΥΣΟΥΣ.

5.2.1.2 REFEREE: θ-Νoun\textsuperscript{fem} + ΝΜ; REFERENT (a): masculine singular; no exx. in Shenoute\textsuperscript{28}.

REFERENT (b): feminine singular (possessor in adnominal circumstantial construction or Nominal Sentence): (Wess. 9 132a 4f.) ΣΕΛΗ ΝΜ ΕΜΝΤΑΣ ΜΜΑΥ ΝΤΟΝΑΙΑ ΝΤΝΕ / (Zoega 603.18) ΓΕΝΕΙΚ ΝΜ ΤΕΣΑΕ ΠΕ ΠΤΑΚΟ.

REFERENT (c): plural\textsuperscript{29} (object-resumption of the extrapoed zero-determined noun): (Thompson H 3 ro) ΚΑΡΕ ΝΜ ΚΕΝΑΚΟΡΟΥ.

jectival status and affiliating it to the verb syntagm: “une tarte maison”, “il est médecin”). See too Tobler 1908: 81ff., 1894:96-112, Krámsky 1972:23. Note that the zero-form of the Coptic lexeme does not show the ‘lexemic plural’ (\textsuperscript{27} ζωμο : -\textsuperscript{27} ζωμο), which seems in fact to have a concretizing-individualizing value.

\textsuperscript{27} See Jelanskaja 1965:108, 1967, where she places the phenomenon in its right context, the ageneric function of zero-determination. Jelanskaja 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 (280u), 25:14 (297), Joh. 15:13 (ΑΓΑΝ), Tit. 2:3 (CBW), Sts. 36:29 (297), Clem. 26.1 (Schmidt, Akhm. πηκτικ), Apoc. El. 7:10 (Steindorff, Akhm., CECE); Crum, Short Texts 189 (ΕΩΥΜΗ), 289 (ΑΓΑΝ), BMCat. 511 f. 1 (Fayy., ΖΑΠΤΡΗ), Chassain, Papyrus médical 48, 73, 159 (ΝΟΥΝΕ, ΒΝΝΕ, ΑΡΜΗΚΙΟΣ); Wess. 18 5.20 (ΒΝΝΕ), Zoega 629f. (ΚΑΡΟΓΙΑ, ΒΑΘΟΥΣ, ΚΩΚΟΤΑΡΝΗ); NHC II 128.19f. (Latyon, BASP 14:72f., 1977; ΒΟΝΟΠΑΙΑ), VII 74.18f. (ΤΕΧΝΗ); Stein-Steindorff, Rechtsurkunden 92.35 (ΕΩΥΡΙΟΣ), 10.32 (ΠΑΠΑΚΙ); Till, Osterbrief (Akhm.) A 80 (ΧΟΜΙΑΙΑ), B III 4 (ΖΗΡΗΠΗ); Deut. 22:5 (Budge) “ΟΧΕΥΝ... ΕΠΑ-ΠΕ” raising an interesting question: are we to read here σεκύε (fem. sgl.) or σεκύη (neut. pl. — so apparently understood by Rahlfis, 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.

\textsuperscript{28} Also uncommon Shenoute: Allberry, Man. Psalm Book 151.18 (Subakhm., ΚΝΕ). This is a provisional and probably erroneous statement, to judge by the ample non-Shenoutean evidence: Lev. 7:21 (ΑΣΙΟΣ), Act. 23:1 (ΟΥΝΕΙΑΗΚΟΣ), Tit. 2:10 (ΜΗΤΙΚ), Athanasius (Lefort) 2.23 (ΚΜΗ), Besa (Kuhn) 35.15 (ΕΙΝΕ), Pachom (Lefort) 55.24f. (ΦΥΧΗ), Polotsky, Kephalaia (Subakhm.) 84.27f. (ΚΑΡΕ), 139.2f. (ΑΓΑΝ), 150.26 (ΑΝΑΡΓΗ); Crum, Epiphanius 110.8f., 247.11 (ΑΡΕΘ); Budge, Homilies 88.6 (ΖΗΗ); NHC VII 91.23 (ΝΙΜΗΜΣ); Crum-Steindorff, Rechtsurkunden 23.10 (ΠΟΡΟΛΙΚΗΣΙΝ), 75.53 (ΞΟΜ), 82.37 (ΦΥΧΗ, ΕΩΥΡΙΟΣ), 104.42f. (ΕΩΥΡΙΟΣ).

\textsuperscript{29} Outside Shenoute: Lev. 21:11 (ΦΥΧΗ), 23:29 (ΦΥΧΗ), Jud. 21:11 (ΣΙΜ). See Stern §486. I cannot find a correlation between the number of the referent and the kind of totality expressed by ΝΜ. On the other hand, ΝΜ in the quantifier paradigm is usually expanded by the adnominal circumstantial, not the relative (Shisha-Halevy 1972:105f.).
5.2.1.3 Referents: θ-κε(θε)-Nounfem. (usually after ούν-, μν-) Referent (a): masculine singular (actor-expression in adnominal constructions)\(^{30}\): (III 92.6f.) ΜΝΕΞΑΝΟΜΙΑ ΕΥΘΟΟΥ / (Ch. 125.38ff.) ΜΝΕΞΕΝΑΝΙΚ ΝΑΒΑΘΕΝ ΧΕ-ΝΗΥΟΟΝ ΝΛΕ ΑΝ / (Rossi 2/3 12) ΚΕΘΕΝΙΚΗ ΕΥΘΟ ΝΝΟΟ. Referent (b): feminine singular (actor expression in adnominal circumstantial): (Cat. 42.26f.) ΚΕ-ΜΝΗΜΝΗΠΕ ΕΚΣΗΩΤ ΑΘΛ ΕΚΟ ΝΝΟΟ ΕΠΈΣΩΤΟΥ. Referent (c): plural (actor expression or object in adnom. constructions; for adnominal ΧΕ-clauses see §7.4): (A 1 215) ΟΥΝΙΚΕΧΚΑΝΙΑ ΕΑΥΡ-ΠΑΙ / (A 2 33) ΜΝ ΟΥΝΙΚΕΘΑΙΡΕ ΧΕ-ΜΝΟΥΠΟΡΧΟΥ / (Ryl. Cat. p. 31 No. 67) ΜΝΕΓΠΑΡΑΦΥΣΙΧ ΧΕ-ΜΠΗΑΛΑΥ / (P 130\(^{b}\) 15 go) Ν ΟΥΝΙΚΕΘΑΙΡΕ ΧΕ-ΜΗΝΠΗΑΤΗΜ ΕΠΟΟΥ.

5.2.1.4 Referates: 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) ΡΨΗΕ ΜΠΟΝΗΡΟΣ ΕΠΝΗΤ ΝΑΡΨΗΜ ΜΠΟΝΗΡΟΣ / (IV 85.6) ΖΝΟ ΕΥΝΑΟΥΟΥΝ / (P 130\(^{b}\) 95 vo) ΠΑΡΕ... ΕΨΗΧ-ΜΝΕ / (A 1 72) ΜΑΤΟΙ ΕΝΑΝΟΥΧ / (IV 17.9f.) ΡΨΗΕ ΕΟΥΝΤ-ΝΕΝΖΙΟΟΥΕ ΝΒΨΚ ΕΨΘΝ ΨΗΡΟΥ / (A 1 226) ΟΥΝΥΡΗΡΕ ΥΨΗΝ ΕΧΨΗΟΥΝ ... ΟΥΝΥΡΗΡΕ ΔΕ ΟΝ ΥΨΗΝ ΥΛΦΚΑΡΗΝΟΜΕΙ. (2) 0-Nounmasc. + NIM: (IV 73.8f.) ΨΨΗΕ ΝΙΜ ΝΤΕΙΖΕ ΕΨΘΟΟΝΤ ΕΒΟΛ / (Ch. 161.19f.) ΡΨΗΕ ΝΙΜ ΕΤΕΡΕΤΙΝ ΝΑΟΥΟΥΟΥΟ ΖΑΡΑΤΗ. (3) 0-κε-Νounmasc.: (III 201.16) ΚΕΣΨΒ ΕΑΡΑΨΕ ΝΤΕΨΗ ΜΝΟΥ ΑΝ ΧΕ-ΟΥΝΟΒΕ ΝΕ / (Ch. 21.3f.) ΚΕΣΝΟ ΕΨΑΚΡ-ΠΟΛΕΜΟΣ ΝΗΤΡΗ / (P 130\(^{b}\) 59 vo) ΜΝΕΓΗΣΟΕ ΑΘΛ ΜΝΕΓΕΜΚΑΣ ΝΗΤΡ ΕΨΘ ΝΝΟΟ ... (BMCat. 81, No. 196) ΜΝΕΓΕΨΒ ΧΕ-ΜΗΨΗΚ ΑΝ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΗΤΟΥ ΤΗΡΟΥ.

5.2.1.5 Some remarkable anaphoric constructions

(a) Anaphora to a non-specific referate — either the preceding context comprehensively or any un-bounded component thereof: Referents: feminine singular: ΜΝΕΝΨΕ “thereafter” (IV 200.21, Ch. 18.24f. etc.), ΝΚΣΙ ΕΡΟΙ ΑΝ “this does not concern me” (A 1 52), -ςΕ ΕΡΟΙ “discover this, arrive at this conclusion” (IV 64.18f., Ch. 12.6, A 1 135.6). Note that these cases are easily made for non-choric; the pronouns, however, are invariably referents in a linear sense.

(b) Anaphora to an extra-(pre-)posed, topicalized verbal (“preinclination”) nominalization. Referents: masculine/conditioned feminine/zero (see §2.7.1.4.2 for further exx.): (A 1 199) ΕΨΨΗΚ ΜΕΝ ΕΝ- ΤΟΠΟΣ ΜΜΑΡΤΥΡΟΣ ΕΨΑΝΑ ΕΨΗ ΕΧΑΛΛΕΙ ΕΤΒΒΟΚ ΕΨ-ΤΕΝΡΟΣΨΡΑ ... ΝΛΑΝΟΥΧ; ΕΨΗ ΔΕ ΕΟΥΘΕ ΕΨΗ ΕΨΨΨΕ, ΜΑΛΛΟΝ ΔΕ ΕΠΝΡΝΕΥΕ ΑΘΛ ΕΨΤΒ-ΡΨΜΕ... ΟΥΝΟΜΙΑ ΤΕ / (A 2 443, not Sh.) ΖΟΤΕΙ ΔΕ ΧΕ-ΝΕΨΟΥ ΜΝΕΝΨΕ ... ΕΨΑΥΚΑΤΡΟΤΟΥ ΜΝΟΥ ΖΙΤΝΤΕΙΠΑΡΑΘΡΗΠΣΙΚ ΝΤΕΙΜΙΝΕ, ΟΥΝ ΝΙΜ ΣΟΟΥΝ ΜΠΑΙ / (A 1 405-6) ΕΨΟΟΣ ΔΕ ΧΕ... ΕΕΙΜΕ ΕΝΑΙ ΟΥΑΤΕΩΝ ΝΕ / (IV 64.15f.) ΕΨΟΟΣ ΔΕ ΧΕ-ΗΑΨ ΝΣΕ ΤΗ ΝΙΜ ΠΕΝΤΑΨΟΥΟΙΝΕ... ΜΜΕΝΨΨΕ 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, Adnexal Complementation

5.2.2.1 Referents: masculine ~ feminine (ι ~ ι). 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 (ΕΝΤΟΛΗ), 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 distinctive 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: ΤΑΑ-ς (ΝΑ-=) Ε-(ΤΡΕ-) (ΙΙΙ 191.25f., Ench. 79a); ΚΟΤΠ-ς (ΝΑ-=) Ε- (Α 1 275, ΙΙΙ 39.17f.); ΚΜΝΤ-ς Ε-(ΤΡΕ-) (ΙΙΙ 20.2f.); ΤΟΓ-ς (ΕΠΟ-=) ΧΕ- (Α 2 50); ΧΟΟ-ς ΧΕ- 31 (passim); ΟΠ-ς ΧΕ- (Α 1 44); ΚΑΑ-ς ΖΜΠΕΝΣΗΤ Ε- (Ρ 130a 100 ro); ΖΕ ΕΡΟ-ς + circumstantial (Α 2 543, Wess. 9 159a 8ff., Ρ 130a 105 ro) 32; ΝΓΤ-ς + circumstantial (Ρ 131b 13 vo); Actor expression: (NE)ΝΑΝΟΤΕΞ Ε-(ΤΡΕ-) / ΧΕ-/circumstantial/conjunctive 33 (Α 2 380, Ryl. 69 NZ, Wess. 9 174d 25ff., 158b 24ff.); (Ε)ΣΜΟΚΣ (ΝΑ-=) Ε-, (Ε)ΣΜΟΤΝ (ΝΑ-=) Ε- (Rossi 2/36 63, A 2 266, Ch. 13.49ff.); ΚΥ-ΨΓΘ (ΕΚΑΨΥΨΕ, ΕΚΑΨΥΨΕ, ΝΝΕΚΨΥΨΕ) ΕΤΡΕ- / conjunctive 33 (ΙΙΙ 164.5f., ΙV 102.7) ΣΠΡΕΠΕΙ ΕΤΡΕ- (Α 2 258); ΣΤΟ ΕΤΡΕ- (Α 2 103, 258); ΚΚΜ ΕΡΑΙ ΕΤΡΕ- (ΙV 91.16f.); ΝΠΡ-ΝΟΟΡΝ ΜΗ Ε-(ΤΡΕ-) (ΙV 98.23); ΝΡΤ-ΡΙΑ ΑΝ Ε-(ΤΡΕ-) (Miss. 233); ΝΚΧΙ ΕΡΟ- ΑΝ Ε-(ΤΡΕ-) (ΙV 103.12); ΕΝΚΨΨ- Ε- (Ch. 65.13ff.); ΕΡΟ-ς Ε- (ΙΙΙ 22.22); ΑΚΡΑΝΑ- ΕΤΡΕ- (ΙV 96.10f.).

(b) masculine: Object-expansion: ΓΝΤ-ς ΕΨΧΙ2 ΧΕ- (the second pronoun is non-territorial [conditioned]; ΙΙΙ 21.18, Ρ 130a 137 ΤΑΗ); ΚΑΑ-ς (ΝΑ-=) Ε-(ΤΡΕ-) (ΙV 63.1f., 66.12); ΣΑΓ-ς ΧΕ- (ΙV 108.15f.); ΣΨΙΗ ΕΡΟ-ς ΧΕ- (ΙV 38.4ff., Ρ 131b 42 ro-vo); ΟΠ-ς ΧΕ- (Α 2 256); Actor expression: (Ε)ΜΧΙ2 ΧΕ- (passim); ΦΟ ΝΠΟΟΥΨ (ΦΡΟΟΥΨ) (ΝΑ-=) ΧΕ-/2Λ-ΕΤΕΒΣ (ΙΙΙ 34.9, Miss. 279); ΥΧΟΟΝ ΝΡΟΟΥΨ Ε- (Ming. 325); ΦΟ ΜΜΠΙΣΗ ΧΕ- (Α 2 537); ΘΟΨΥ ΕΡΟ-ς ΧΕ- (Α 2 454); ΚΨΨΕ Ε- (Wess. 9 140c 2f.); ΧΟΨΟΝ, ΥΧΑΨΟΥΨ (ΕΒΟΑ) ΧΕ- (ΙV 8.17); ΥΧΕΠΝΕΝΣΗΤ, ΝΕΧΕΠΝΕΝΣΗΤ ΑΝ, ΝΕΧΕΨΨΕ ΕΧΜΑΠΗΣΗΤ... ΧΕ- (ΙV 18.4ff., A 2 151, RE 10 159b 30ff., Mun. 176); ΝΑΝΟΤΕΞ, ΥΧΟΛΕ ΕΤΡΕ- (Α 1 227) 34; ΧΡ-ΨΑΥ + ΦΡΑΝΑ- ΕΤΡΕ- (ΙV 167.15f.).

5.2.2.11 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>Object expansion</th>
<th>masculine referent</th>
<th>fem. referent</th>
<th>masc./fem. referent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAΣ-</strong></td>
<td>ΧΕ-</td>
<td>ΤΑΑ-</td>
<td>ΟΠ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(**) KAΑ-</td>
<td>Ε-(ΤΡΕ-)</td>
<td>ΚΟΤΠ-</td>
<td>ΧΕ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΣΨΙΗ ΕΡΟ-</td>
<td>ΧΕ-</td>
<td>ΚΜΝΤ-</td>
<td>ΣΕ ΕΡΟ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6ΝΤ-ς ΕΨΧΙ2</td>
<td>ΧΕ-</td>
<td>ΤΟΓ-</td>
<td>ΖΕ ΕΡΟ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ορδ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31 Outside Shenoute, one encounters ΧΟΟΨ, exclusively or alongside ΧΟΟΣ. See KAHLE 126:1 233ff., 252; CUM 1954:150ff.; STERN p. 310. The object-pronoun here is obligatory, hence purely formal (unless it is lexicalized by ΠΠΑΚΕ or sim.); ΧΨΨ "sing" is therefore a different lexeme.

32 A similar instance of circumstantial adnoreal complementation after a neutric cataphoric referent is ΧΕΚΑΑC + circ. Future III (POLOTSKY 1957:233 = CP 233), although it is doubtful whether ΧΕΚΑΑC is synchronically at all analyzable.

33 The conjunctive too is an adnereal modifier, in paradigm with the circumstantial: see §7.1.3.

34 Possibly not cataphoric, at least not purely so: ΝΑΝΟΤΕΞ ΥΧΟΛΕ ΕΝΟΨΨ (sic) ΕΤΡΕΝΨ- ΝΣΕΦΨΑ ΕΙΣΟΥΨ (sic) ΕΤΡΕΝΨΟΥΨ ΕΝΩΨΑ. Cf. earlier on the same page ΝΕΤΝΑΝΟΤΕΞ ΥΧΟ ΝΕΤΝΟΦ, and (p. 257) ΥΧΟΛΕ ΥΧΟ ΝΑΝΟΤΕΞ (here anaphoric, referring to the inside of the fruit). NB: (Ρ 130a ΚΒ, not Sh.?) ΝΑΝΟΤΕΞ ΑΕ ΓΜΨΨΝΕΨΕ ΝΝΕΚΨΕΨ ΕΤΖΨΗΨ ΝΝΕΚΨΨΕ... ΝΑΝΟΤΕΞ ΟΨΨ ΦΡ-ΝΟΨΕ ΝΝΕΚΨΕΑ ΜΝΟΥΤΕ: the second pronoun group is ana-, not cataphoric.
The feminine referent points most often to a following infinitive referate (ε + inf., n + inf., ετρε-), whereas the masculine regularly assumes the sequence of ξε-: this impression is enhanced by a quantitative consideration of the evidence, since, barring ξοο- and ΝΑΟΥ- for the fem., ΚΑΑΣ- for the masculine, all deviations from the alternation ε → ε(ετρε-) → ξε- are extremely rare. Now it is precisely in the case of ξοο-, ΝΑΟΥ-, ΚΑΑΣ- that the different functions of ε(ετρε-) and ξε- are most clearly observable and (after ΝΑΟΥ-) even paradigmatically opposed: ετρε- for a marked prospective reference, ξε- 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 ε- 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 ξοο- (ξε- only), ΝΑΟΥ- ξε- or the (rare) ΚΑΑΣ- ετρε-, οπς ξε- 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 ι Predicate → Subject ι, 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 ξε-: (A 1 150) ουμοίζει πε ξε- / (A 2 465-6) ου πε ξε-' γινάζετε νοός ξε- ' γινομ. ου/ος ' γινάζετε ' γινόμεν ου/ος θε ' γεμος πε ξε-. In the answer we have a different (Subject → Predicate) pattern, with πε copular and of unclear phoric standing (so too A 2 491 ' σοκι επάγομεν' πε ξε-).

(b) Referate ε(ετρε-) - (A 1 307) οὐναίνει πε ετρε- / (IV 89.14) τείχεις ΟΝ πε... ετρερ- (§1.2.1.2) / (A 2 148) ουχάλθει πε ετρε- (5) τείχεις ουμε πε καπνα ντορτίν...

(c) Referate non-specific: (Wess. 9 90b 13ff.) πε γαρ ετεούνος μματαςβής πε εγραφε εξημετα- ξοος... ξε-... ται ον θε ου ευνος μματαςβής θε εγραφε εξημεταςάοος... ξε...

---

35 Note that the conjunctive shares a paradigm with ε(ετρε-) after the feminine-neutric cataphora, as an adnexit-adnexitative 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 conord 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.) ΤΕΧΙΑ ΤΕ Ε- / (Α 2 61) ΤΕΙΖΕ ΥΜΗΝ ΤΕ ΕΤΡΕ- / (Κ 9298) ΤΜΟΙΣΕ ΤΕ ΧΕ- / (III 183.28) ΟΥΜΟΙΣΕ ΤΕ ΧΕ- / (Α 2 3) ΟΥΜΝΤΑΙΘ... ΤΕ Ε- (7) ΟΥΑΝΟΜΙΑ ΤΕ ΕΤΡΕ- / (III 26.4) ΟΥΑΝΟΜΙ... ΤΕ ΧΕ- / (III 184.2) ΟΥΑΤΥΨΗΤ ΤΕ ΕΥΗΑΝ... which brings home to us that in this pattern neither the phoric 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) ΟΥΑΓΑΒΩΝ ΠΕ ΕΤΡΕ- (the lexeme morphologically marked) / (Α 1 1) ΠΕΤΕΖΝΑΙ ΑΝ ΠΕ ΕΤΡΕ- / (Α 2 432, not Sh.) ΜΠΑΡΙΣΜΕ ΓΑΡ ΝΙΜ ΑΝ ΠΕ ΕΤΡΕ-, PE possibly anaphoric to a non-phoric (§5.2.3.3) “neuter” pronoun ΝΑ- — or are ΝΑ- (and ΠΕ) cataphoric to ΕΤΡΕ-? / (Α 1 307) ΟΥΑΤΥΨΗΤ ΠΕ ΕΤΡΕ- / (Ch. 76.23ff.) ΟΥΑΤΥΨΗΤ ΠΕ ΕΤΡΕ-.

### 5.2.2.2

Παί is cataphoric to an appositional xe-/ετρε- serving apparently to accommodate xe-/ετρε- in various syntactical positions: modifying verbs (ΤΟΟΥΗ, ΚΩΤΜ, ΜΕΕΥΕ), governed by prepositions, in actor status, subjective in a Nominal Sentence pattern, etc.: ΠΑΙ ΧΕ- (Ch. 174.22f., III 128.23, IV 2.20, 112.20, Ά 1 161, 230, Ά 2 371, Wess. 9 164d 20ff.); ΠΑΙ ΟΥΟΗΕ ΕΒΟΑ ΧΕ- (Π 131 152 ro); ΠΑΙ ΕΤΡΕ- (Ch. 123.2f., III 61.8, IV 104.9f. ΠΗΙΚΕΟΤΑ 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 xe-/ετρε- referate:

- (a) ΤΗΝΟΟΥ ΧΕ- (III 26.22);
- (b) ΜΠΑΡΙΣΜΕ ΕΤΡΕ- (Α 1 213, Μινγ. 92);
- (c) ΚΑΤΑΘΕ ΕΤΡΗΣ ΧΕ- (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 xe-; (d) Greek loan-elements: the 3rd pers sgl. of finite verbs, treated as if containing a Coptic pronominal element: (ΟΥΚ) ΕΕΕΚΤΙ Ε + infinitive (III 30.16, IV 4.12): note that ΕΕΕΚΤΙ is partly conversible in Coptic, thus assimilated as a predication form; ΓΕΝΟΙΤΟ + conjunctive, ΜΗ ΓΕΝΟΙΤΟ ΕΤΡΕ-, ΑΛΛΑΟ — ΑΛΛΑΟ conj./ΤΕΡΕ-: see §7.3.3.

- (e) Unconjugated lexemes, the valence of which includes, or consists of ετρε- or xe- (as first or second modification: §1.1.2.0.1): 2W ΕΡΟ- ΕΤΡΕ- (Α 1 67, 205), 2W ΧΕ- (Ρυλ. 70 CN), ΆΝΗΕ ΕΤΡΕ- (Α 2 378); compare the contentualization of noun lexemes, usually in predlicative status, by means of ετρε- (ΤΑ- ΝΑΤΗΧ... ΕΤΡΕ- IV 69.16f., (Π)ΚΑΙΡΟΣ... ΕΤΡΕ- III 74.14, perhaps (ΟΥΝ)/ΜΓΟΜΕ 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 (ΟΥΣΗ, ΟΥΕΣ-ΚΑΖΝΕ, ...) modifiable by ετρε-, where the cohesion factor is inherent in the valency spectrum.

- (f) In (III 107.6) ΝΝΑΡΡΑΙ ΓΣΗΕ ΕΥΗΕ=ΝΟΥΗΣ ΝΚΑΟΥΟΥΣ... "It seems to me as if we live apart..." a zero cataphoric referent may be postulated, coinciding with the zero subject of the predicative ΓΣΗΕ ΕΥΗΕ- (§1.2.1.3.3), but it may be preferable to take ΝΝΑΡΡΑΙ as the subject, with no cataphora at all.

#### 5.2.2.3.2

Rare instances of an invariable masculine referent –α, 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 [α + Noun] (§6.0.1.2.3): ΞΗΤΣ ΝΝΕΙΖΕΜΕ (Ενχ. 66a) / ΠΙΑΣΟ ΕΡΑΤΗ ΝΑΡΕΤΗ ΝΙΜ (Α 2 442-3, not Sh.) / ΠΑΧΕ ΕΜΑΙΚΤΗ ΝΤΕΠΝΩΖΕΙΡΕΣΙΣ (Π 130 50 ΣΚΑ), cf., not Shenoutean but emulating his idiom, (ΒΛΟΡ. 8811 17 σαν) ΚΟΥΝΗ ΝΤΕΖΖΗΜΕ 37.

---

36 Πολοτσκύ 1960a:§12.
37 See Πολοτσκύ 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) ούκον αν πενταίκοος ξε- (Borg., -ئ- cataphoric) vs. ούκον αν πενταίκοοι ξε- (Ryl. with 'ئ- seemingly resuming η-); 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) ΠΤΣΨΝ ΝΕΠΕΡΕΠΙΕΠΤΑΕ ΕΤΕΙΖ η ΜΜΟΥ ΕΤΕΒΙΘΥΤΝ ξε-, with two other symptoms of the non-phoricity of η-: the masc. sg1. after a plural vedette and the resumption by a 2nd person plural pronoun. As a rule, the anaphora to substantivizing η- overrules a cataphora in such cases of conflict; consider (Ench. 67b) ΝΕΠΕΡΕΠΙΕΠΤΑΗ η ΜΜΟΥ ξε-, or (Ch. 29.55f.) ΠΕΝΤΑΙΚΟΟΥ ξε-.

5.2.2.3.4 In a case like (RE II 16b 20) ΝΟΥΚ η ΝΕ ΧΑΠΙΜΑ ΝΙΜ, the concord is cataphoric, regrettably 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 η- expanded by a relative conversion (ΝΕΠ-, ΠΕΝΤΑΙ-, 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; η- is the determinator; (b) ΝΕΠ-: present(-equivalent) only, invariable, unmotivating, of "zero determination" status, i.e. further determinable 40; η- 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 η- 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 ΤΕΤ- (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) ΠΕΝΤΑΙΚΟΟΥ / (A 1 1) ΠΕΝΕΙΑΙ / (IV 107.19) ΝΕΠΡΗΙΕΠ (sic) / even (III 119.28) ΠΕΤΣΧΗ, it would perhaps be rash to interpret η- as neutric, as anything but masculine gender, be its associative connection with any specific masculine noun lexeme (ΜΑΧΕ, ΛΟΓΟΣ, ΖΩΑ...) 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)nominial vedette (POLOTSKY 1962:§1f.); although this η- can be traced to the pronominal subject ηε, 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: ΝΟΥΟΝ ΠΕΤΕΡΕΠΡΟΦΡΕΙΤΑ η ΧΗΚ ΕΒΟΛ ΕΣΡΑΙ ΕΧΩΣ ξε- (Ch. 143.44ff.) 41.

38 ΝΕΠ- can be anaphoric, in such context patterns as (Wess. 9 179b 30ff.) ΝΑΣΕΒΝΟΥ ΝΗ ΝΗΝΑΜΟΥ, also III 126.20ff.
40 See NAGEL 1973b, QUECKE forthcoming ("determinierbar" vs. "undeterminierbar"), id. 1981:261ff. Consider ΖΕΝΕΠΟΟΥ (A 1 103), ΚΕΠΕΤΝΑΜΟΥ (Ch. 88.16f.), ΟΥΝΕΤΕΒΕΥ (A 2 256), ΝΗΠΡΗΙΕΠ (Wess. 9 141b 21f.), ΜΠΕΝΠΟΠΙ (III 165.13), ΝΕΠΕΝΕΠΡΗΙΟΟΥ (A 2 471), ΝΕΠΝΑΤΜΟΥ ΝΙΜ (A 1 133), ΝΗΝ ΜΠΕΤΝΑΜΟΥ (P 1304 93 vo), ΣΗΚΟΥΙ ΜΠΕΤΝΑΜΟΥ (III 206.21) which shows the non-motivating nature of Ν-.
41 A basically similar case is ΝΝΑΙ η, ΠΚΑΙΟΟΣ η, ΝΟΥΟΕΠ η (IV 224.20f., IV 29.26, Ch. 167.47f.), for which the "not yet" form is ΝΠΕΠΜΗΡΝΑΥ (Ch. 107.32f.). In a contextually conditioned alternant pattern occurring in the sequence of a Cleft Sentence, ηε is anaphoric and represents the whole glose: (Ch. 103.31ff.) ΜΜΟΝΑΚΟΟ... ΝΗΝΙΕΠ ΗΝΗΣΤΑ η ΝΤΟΚ ηε / (III 68.14ff.) ΝΜ ΠΕΤΕΡΕΠΡΟΦΡΕΙΤΑ ΠΚΟΥΤΕ ΝΑΣΟΝΥ... / (SHISHA-HALEVY 1976a:55) ΑΝΟΚ η Ε ΚΕΩΥΑ ΝΤΑΖΕ, ΖΕΝΚΕΡΡΩΥ ηε...
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 indispensable 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.43 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, ΑΘ[CLUDΜ] is no different, analytically speaking, from ΝΕΘ[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, TEZIÈRE 1965:73, 91, DUBOIS 1965:96f.

* To my knowledge, only Vergote uses "actualisateur" in this connection (Grammaire copte I a, Louvain 1973, p. 84); see BALLY 1950:§119.
THE AUGENS, AN ANAPHRIC-COHESION MODIFIER OF PRONOMINAL REFERENCE.
SYNTACTIC PROSODY

6.0.0.1 Terminology and definition
6.0.1-3 Sentence-prosodic features
6.0.1 Apposition, extraposition; word-order and the placement of the nominal actor
6.0.2 Juncture (cohesion) features; boundaries; the Coptic word
6.0.3 Sub-sentence prosodic units: the colon; enclisis, hierarchies and placements
6.1.0.1-3 The augens: paradigms and compatibilities. A synoptic preview
6.1.1 THP=
6.1.2.1-2 2WW=
6.1.2.3 Non-commuting, non-phoric 2WW4
6.1.3.1-2 {NTO=}
6.1.3.3 Augens and extraposed independent pronoun
6.1.3.4 Non-commuting, non-phoric NTO4
6.1.4.1 MAYAA=
6.1.4.2 MMIN MMO=
6.1.4.3 OYAA=
6.1.4.4 Cotext patterns: 'MMIN MMO= + MAYAA='
6.1.5 Border-line augentia: 2API2APO=, NA=
6.2 The augens as modifier
6.2.1 Focalizability of the augens
6.3 Concluding note: on the functional essence of the augens

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 ¹. 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 ².

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

— 155 —
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)nomin al segment, in a specific prosodic-syntagmatic extent. Functionally, the augens does not precisely \textit{"strengthen"} or \textit{"emphasize"} \footnote{the primary (pro)noun. It expands it, and modifies it in a structurable range of semasiological nuances, including that of \textit{"insistence"}; see below.} The prosodic properties of the augens, related to its functional ones, call for a brief and selective preliminary investigation of \textit{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 \footnote{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 \textit{frontal} extraposition of the primary (pro)noun \footnote{or as segmentation \footnote{of the sentence (cf. the rhetorical-stylistic \textit{"anticipation"}, \textit{"prolepsis"}, \textit{"nominativus pendens"}, \textit{"casus absolutus"}).} Prosodically, the extraposed element is shown by what segmental criteria we have to be an \textit{independent colon} (§6.0.3; see STERN §§484, 635; SCHWARZE-STEINTHAL 465f., 487 on the construction): \textit{(A 1} \textit{333) NTQH GY ΠΑΡΟC ΠΕΝΤΑΜΠ-ΚΑΠΕ} / \textit{(Ch. 50:20ff.) ΝΥΑΝ ΝΥΑΞΕ ΑΥΛ ΝΤΩΛ ΑΙΔΩΥ} / \textit{(III} \textit{18:15ff.) ΑΝΑW ΜΕΝ ΜΠΟΥΕΙΡ} / \textit{(III} \textit{86:4) ΝΤΩΝ ΑΕ ΜΠΟΥΚΛΥΣ} / \textit{(P} \textit{130:5 41a) ΑΝΟΝ ΑΕ ΓΝΩΝ ΜΑΡΗΝ-ΕΒΒ} \textit{ΝΑΜ ΜΑΥΑΝ} / \textit{(III} \textit{197:6f.) ΝΑΥ ΝΣΕ ΝΕΥΧΝΕΙ ΜΝΗΝΕΥΣΕ ΑΥΛ ΝΕΥΣΙΟΝΕ ΣΟΤΥΟΥ ΑΥΡ-ΝΑΖΕΝΚΟΟΥΕ. A functional analysis must regard the thematic structure of the whole pattern. This is a case of TOPICALIZATION, very typical of Coptic, a topic-prominent language (§2.0.2.1), or \textit{theme prominence} (\textit{"thematic foregrounding"}, Halliday’s \textit{"marked theme"}).} \footnote{This relative functional and structural autonomy of the extraposed segment matches, and is correlatable with, its prosodic one.}

and Cymric] pronomina personalia ad maiores emphasi primitus, ut videtur, idque tam absoluta quam infixa vel suffixa, notae quaedam, orta plerumque ex eipsis pronominiibus, quas dicere poterimus notas ampliantas vel augentes; atque pronomina ipsa, si occurrunt vel sine his notis vel cum iisdem, sunt aut formae simplices vel autca aut ampliata \textit{"}. It was Pedersen (\textit{Vergl. Grammatik}, 1913, II 137ff.) who modified Zeuss’ term into \textit{‘Augens’}, pointing out that it is a pronoun in its own right, an enclitic \textit{“pronominal”} which follows the \textit{“pronomaltige Betonungseinheit”}, emphasizing the \textit{“durch die Verbalendung, das infizierte oder suffizierte Pronomen oder die verbundene Genitivform ausgedrückte Begriff”}. For the functional attribute of the augens, Pedersen applies the vague though ubiquitous \textit{“Hervorhebung”} (cf. §§2.0.2.1-2); the native Irish term is \textit{treise} (\textit{“force”}, \textit{“emphasis”}). For some classic discussions, see E. Lewy, \textit{ZCP} 27:10-13 (1957); Greene, \textit{Eriu} 24:121-133 (1973); O’Brien, \textit{ZCP} 14:311-1923 (1923); Pokorny, \textit{ZCP} 18:233ff. (1930); Hull, \textit{Lg.} 16:12-16 (1940).

\footnote{See §§2.0.2.1-2. The idea is that of the \textit{“nachträglicher Hinweis”} kind of emphasis (HOFMANN 1936:37); \textit{“reinforcement”} (MÜLLER-HAUSER 1943:116f.: \textit{“lui + même, seu., pron. personal tonique”}). POLOTSKY’S \textit{“Verstärker”} (1961:294 n. 1 = \textit{CP} 398) is an adaptation of the Arabic \textit{“corroborative strengtheners”}, \textit{at-ia’kid} (Wright II 282).} \footnote{\"Front\" and \"rear\" correspond to the initial and final boundaries of the sentence, respectively.} \footnote{Cf. JEPSEN 1937: Ch. 12.} \footnote{BALLY 1950:§§79-99, cf. SATZINGER 1976:7ff.; see REGULA 1966:131ff., HINTZE 1952:281ff., SCHENKEL 1967, esp. 116ff., and our §2.0.2.1.}
6.0.1.2 Rear extraposition \(^4\) refers to a different set of patterns, in which a noun syntagm or independent pronoun \(^9\) expands, refers back to and as a rule lexicalizes a nuclear pronoun. These patterns give rise to 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 determiner, yet another pronoun) is not essential, but expands the pronoun or is substituted (i.e. in syntagmatic or paradigmatic relation) for it \(^{10}\).

6.0.1.2.1 Rear extraposition marked by *nēi-*: this is a well-known construction, often quoted as a typological showpiece. \(^{11}\) *nēi-* marks an expansion of a third-person "suffix"-pronoun nucleus. This is usually a formal actor, with a verbal predicate: (*III* 160.22f.) [ἈΠΕΘΕΝΕΙΣ ΝΙΓΙΝΕΜΑΓ ΕΥΟ ΝΑΤΑΚΠΟΣ / (*Ch.* 78.22f.) ΝΑΡΕΙΧΧΟΟΣ ΝΑΙ ΝΕΙ / (*ibid.* 141.31f.) ΝΕΙΧΕ ΝΕΙ / (*ibid.* 162.7f., A I 167) ΝΑΙΝΟΥΟ ΝΕΙ-, *vs.* ΝΑΙ- 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 verb syntagm: (A 2 396) ΕΙΝΑΙ ΧΒΑΙ ΤΗΡΗ ΜΟΥΡΗ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΖΝΙΟΜΈ ΝΙΝΓΙΝΕΤΟΥΒΑΝΙΣΗ ΜΜΟΥ / (*ibid.* 449, not Sh.) ΝΑΙ ΖΝΙΟΥΝ ΟΝ ΝΤΑΙΝΟΙ ΜΜΟΥ ΜΠΕΙΜΑ ΖΝΙΟΥΝΣ (sic) ΕΒΟΛΑ ΝΕΙΝΟΟ ΝΕΚΑΗΚΑΙΤΗΣ / (*IV* 5.26ff.) ΝΙΝ... ΝΕΙΝΟΥΜΟΥΕ ΑΝ ΝΟΡΤΗ ΖΟΥΝ ΑΠΟΟΥ ΝΙΓΙΝΗΕ ΤΗΡΗ ΝΑΙΝΑΙΚΑΙΟΟ / (*ibid.* 206.27ff.) ΕΕΕΕΙ ΕΕΕΡΑΙ ΕΧΙΟΥ ΖΝΙΠΟΥΟΟΕΙΤΗ ΕΤΜΑΤΗ ΝΤΟΥΧ ΤΕΝΟΥ ΝΙΓΙΝΙΕΚΑΙΟΟ ΤΗΡΟΥ / (*IV* 68.17f.) ΝΙΝΝΕΕΕ ΕΑΝ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΑΛΑΑ ΜΜΟΟΟΥΕ ΕΠΑΙΝΗ ΝΕΙ-.

Note too the distribution of two appositive constructions with a Second-Tense focalization pattern: (theme/topic → focus) *nēi-* (*III* 116.6, 169.23, 183.3f.) and (theme/topic *nēi*) → focus (*III* 117.2f., 133.11f., *IV* 127.4f.), 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.) ΜΝΤΑΙ-ΣΙ ΓΑΡ ΟΥΤΕ ΝΙΝΓΙΝΖΑ-ΚΒΑ / (*IV* 45.24ff.) ΝΕΝ ΕΝ ΕΤΕΥΣΗΝΟΠΗ ΤΕ ΤΑΙ ΧΙΝΤΕΥΑΡΧΗ ΝΕΗ / (A I 90) ΤΕΥΓΙΝΙΚΗ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΝΕΝΗΝΟΛΕ... ΝΗΝΠΟΥΤΕ (compare ΤΕΥΓΙΝΗ ΥΑΡΟΥ ΚΑΛΩΣ ΖΙΤΝΑΓΓΑΛΟΟ, *Wess.* 9 161c 11f., where *zitn-* introduces a non-appositive "new" nominal actor). The appositive noun syntagm may be indefinite: (A 2 449, not Sh.) ΑΜΕΙ ΝΙΓΙΝΟΟΥΟΕΙ, but is usually *n-* (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.) ΧΨΨ ΕΡΑΠ ΜΜΟΟΣ ΝΤΟΥΧ ΠΧΟΕΙΣ ΧΕ- (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 augen: §3.1.3.3.

\(^{10}\) Cf. Steinhath–Misteli 1893:50, and see §5.3 above.

\(^{11}\) The only monographic discussion of *nēi-* 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" ("unschön", 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) *nēi-* can introduce the shortest appositive actor-expressions (consider *...nēi-*METEME RE II 163a 27, *...nēi-*NAI III 160.22, *...nēi-*PΧΟΕΙΣ III 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 "Betoning" (p. Stf.) 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. Steinhath–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. 43ff.; *ed., "Réactions du verbe et du nom dans l’ennoncé 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 delocutive (third person) pronoun in object status: (BMCat. 83, No. 199 ΤΔΑ) ΝΑΥ ΝΔΕ ΝΙΤΝΙΝΤΥΝ ΤΕΤΝΑΡ-ΒΟΑ ΕΡΟΣ ΤΟΡΤΗ ΕΤΝΗΥ / (Ch. 43.38ff.) ΝΤΕΤΡΕΜΟΥΤΗ ΝΙΚΕΟΝ ΠΕΚΧΙ ΝΙΠΕ-ΓΝ-ΑΛΑΥ ΝΕΙΔΝΑΟΝ ΝΙΥΤΤΥ / (III 21.19) ΆΤΕΤΝΙ ΜΜΟΥ ΝΠΥΡΟΓΟ ΕΤΜΑΜ / (ibid. 88.27) ΝΝΙΤΡΕΜΟΥΣΟΥΝΟΥ ΓΕ ΝΕΡΝΟΥ / (Ench. 66b) ΚΤΑΚΟ ΜΜΟΥ ΝΠΟΥ ΒΙΚΥΝ ΜΝΟΟΤΕ ΝΣΒΟΤΕ ΝΤΑΚΑΛΑΥ. In (IV 36.21f.) ΑΝΤΡΕΧΘΗΝΕ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΜΗΝΔΕ ΜΝΙΚΑΖ, the apposition is to the actor exponent in the causative infinitive; cf. exx. in §6.0.1.2 (a).

(c) Nouns in "vocative" or addressing role, esp. in post-imperative position: (P 130τ 7 υ) ΜΝΙΨΗΝΕ ΤΣΕΙΝΑΓΗΣΗ ΕΡΕ-... / (A I 464 Η ΕΚΝΑΧΟΟΣ ΠΑΒΕΡΨΗΜΕ...

(d) Nominal apposition to the "actor" (third-person pronoun) of a modifier predicate (Bipartite pattern): (III 15.21ff.) ΝΜΖΑΝΤΝΘΥΝΤ ΑΝ ΝΚΑΓΑΝΑΚ. Here probably belongs the regular construction ΕΤΘΥΝ + noun (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: ΕΡΕΕΝΚΕΕΕΣ ΤΥΝ, which means that the pronominal "actor" is a mere "slot filler", a cataphoric index with no nominal substitution; (2) ΕΥ-ΤΥΝ ΝΓΙ- does occur, as a rare variant (e.g. A 2 336, collated: ΕΥΤΥΝ ΤΑΝΟΜΙΑ... ΕΥΤΥΝ ΔΕ ΝΚΑΡΕ... Η ΕΥΤΥΝ ΝΓΙΝΙΝΤΟΤΟΥΝ 2ΝΤΕΤΥΝΑΠΡΟ).

6.0.1.2.3 The n-marked nom. modifier in apposition to a suffix pronoun is of yet more restricted distribution.

(a) A cataphoric pronominal representation of a nominal possessor after one of a closed list of inalienable 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 obligatory slot-filler "heralding" the subsequent noun: "-ινι → N+noun' is structurally the possessor expression: ΧΨΜ ΜΠΙΚΑΖ (RE 10 163a 17f.), ΡΙΤΚΟ ΝΤΑΝΟΜΙΑ (A I 298), but generally as components of prepositions: ΣΑΡΑΤΗ Ν- (III 38.10), ΝΑΙΚΤΗ Ν- (K 9067, P 130τ 50 ΣΚΑ), ΕΤΟΟΤΟΥ Ν- (III 48.3), ΕΖΟΥΝ ΕΖΡΑΥ Ν- (P 130τ 139 ΤΜΣ), ΖΝΤΗ (a preposition in itself) N-, (BLOr. 3581 A 159, No. 253 NΣ), ΖΝΤΟΥΝ Ν- (III 52.16) etc.; the n-mark of dependence is thus complementary (allomorphic) to the immediate (markless) government of non-compound prepositions. Some examples of this kind hint at a tendency to "fossilizing", i.e. immutability of the pronominal exponent in the masc. sgr. 15: ΖΝΤΗ ΝΝΕΖΙΟΝΕ ΕΤΕΕΤ (Ench. 66a).

(b) ΜΠΕΝΚΑΝ "the two", "both/either of...", not in opposition to ΝΓΙ-; the nuclear plural (second, third persons) pronoun is in different roles (not however in actor status?): (A 2 403) ΜΝΙΠΝΕ ΜΜΤΝΤ ΜΠΕΝΚΑΝ / (Miss. 287) ΝΝΕΖΟΟΥ ΕΡΕΕΝΖΒΗΝΕ ΞΙ ΝΜΟΥ ΕΡΟΥ ΑΝ ΜΠΕΝΚΑΝ... ΠΝΟΗ ΕΤΟΟΤΟΥ ΕΡΟΥ ΑΝ ΜΠΕΝΚΑΝ / (Or. 160.27ff.) ΚΣΟΥΟΡΤ ΝΖΙΝΕΣΟΤΟΥΝ ΜΠΕΝΚΑΝ / (A 2 443-4, not Sh.) ΝΣΘΒ ΔΕ ΟΥΟΝΣ ΕΒΟΑ ΖΝΤΟΟΤΟΥ ΜΠΕΝΚΑΝ (sim. ibid. 436, 445); NB. (III 39.11f.) ΕΙΝΕ ΜΠΕΝΚΑΝ ΕΖΟΥΝΣ ΕΒΟΑ ΤΑΧΥ, where ΜΠΕΝΚΑΝ must be appositive to ΝΕ, 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 and are by nature mutual and relative, i.e.

---

13 LAYTON 1981:§6.2 (I would prefer "restricted" to "anomalous").
15 Some non-compound (unanalyzable) prepositions use this mediate manner of governing a noun: ΣΑΡΟΜ ΜΠΠΝ (P 130τ 115 τξ), ΣΑΡΟΜ ΡΠΝ (P 131τ 20 ΡΡΣ, A 2 360, III 96.21, Ch. 195.46 — "ΖΑΝΣΕ" not attested? — also ΣΑΡΟΜ ΡΠΡΝ P 131τ 20 ΡΡΣ, all after Eccl. 3:1, 1:3 etc.), ΕΡΟΥ N- (only in the sense of "to the debit of... ": Ryl. Car. 34, No. 69 NΣ, A 2 59, Ch. 102.2f., Rossi 2/3 58 ΕΡΟΥ ΝΝΗΣΚΕ, uncollated: -ν immutatable?), ΟΥΤΝΗ N- (IF 163 apud Dictionary 495a).
16 See §5.2.3.2 above, with ref.
17 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 \textit{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 \textit{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\textsuperscript{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, \textit{nucleus \rightarrow satellite (determinatum \rightarrow determinans)\textsuperscript{18}}, (b) the sequence in the predication and focalization patterns, (c) a cotext-oriented \textit{thematic} sequence\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{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 sign 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) "\textit{ПРШМЕ СЮТМ}"

(b) "\textit{ПРШМЕ АЧСЮТМ}"

(c) "\textit{АЧСЮТМ НГИ-ПРШМЕ}"

In one analysis, the less common member (a), far from being \textit{synchronously} 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\textsuperscript{21}, is here unmarked, while (b) is the marked member, in which

\textsuperscript{17} \textit{Apud Weil} 1879:2.

\textsuperscript{18} Cf. \textit{Steinthal-Mistelli} 1893:275ff. Although this issue has never been properly treated, it constitutes an essential part of the scholar’s \textit{Sprachgefühl} (cf. P. de Lagarde’s "unkoptische Stellung"; "kein Kopf stellt so", in \textit{Aus dem deutschen Gelehrteneben}, Göttingen 1881, pp. 44, 50, 59).

\textsuperscript{19} \textit{Weil} 1879:11ff., 76ff., 83ff.; \textit{Mathesius} 1941, and subsequently often in Prague School treatments of this question (see §2.0.2.0.1 ff.).

\textsuperscript{20} Note the case of a chiastic placement of nominal actors, (b)-(c) below, also the chiastic arrangement of topic and focus, §2.6.3.1.2: (Z 306 CHZ) \textit{ΣΜΠΑΙ ΟΝ ΝΤΑΠΧΟΣ ΝΝΙΑΝΤΟΠΟΤΟΛΟΣ ΠΑΥΛΟΣ ΧΕ-... ΝΤΑΠΧΟΙΟΣ ΧΟΟΚ ΕΝ ΕΤΕΒΕΝΑΙ ΧΕ-...}

\textsuperscript{21} \textit{Halliday} 1967:239ff.
the thematicity of the actor is specially signalled by segmentation, the thematic structure of the clause being thus made transparent: \textit{Oπινα Μακαθάρτον Αγρ-Ουδαρκήν Αυς Ουζόν Μνούςι, Αυς Ουούςιν \textbf{Αγρ-Ουδαρκή}} \textit{ν (Re 10 160a 27ff.)}. In another view, it is (a) which is unmarked \textit{vis à vis} (b) and (c), in which the thematic structure is overt.

6.0.2 Juncture \textit{(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: \textit{links} \textsuperscript{22} and their negation, \textit{delimitations} \textsuperscript{23}, the former amounting to measure points of \textit{closeness}, the latter of openness or non-closeness, of \textit{"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 \textit{extent of validity}, while delimitations give us \textit{juncture boundaries} \textsuperscript{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 \textit{relative indexes}, exponents of the parameter or level of juncture (even the apparently absolute junctural dichotomies, \textit{initial:final, close:open}, are deceptively so, and in fact equally relative \textsuperscript{25}).

6.0.2.1 \textbf{Links: (morphophonemic} \textsuperscript{26}, morphemic) \textit{(B) \"A short vowel is maintained in an open syllable", valid only in the extent of the lexemic unanalyzable \"word\": \textit{COTΠ, CETΠ, ΥΟΡΠ, ΟΡΞ, ΧΟΤ-Ν, KOT-Μ}.}

(1) \"A labializable \textsuperscript{27} nasal constituting part or the whole of a prefixed morph is assimilated to an immediately following primary (i.e. unconditioned) non-syllabic \textsuperscript{28} labial\", validity extent: the segment \textit{\textquoteleft prefix + noun syntagm\textquoteright}; progressive dependence (allophonic allomorph): \textit{ΕΜ-ΟΥΟΕΠΥ (A 2 117), ΕΡΜ-ΠΧΟΕΙ (A 2 165), ΨΑΝΤΟΜ-ΠΡΙΜΕ (IV 101.16, Ryl. Cat. 34f. No. 70 ΣΜΑ)}, \textsuperscript{29} \textit{ΤΣΤΜΜΝΤΑΟΗΤ (Wess. 9 141a 17)}, \textit{ΠΣΑ ΒΒΟΑ (III 196.28f.)}, \textit{ΕΜΠΝΕΤΑΝΑΠΥΟΥ (III 203.13)}, \textit{ΑΧΜΠΣΛΩ (IV 113.5)}, \textit{ΝΤΜΠΧΟΕΙ (IV 33.22)}.\textsuperscript{30}

(2) \"A \textit{\textquoteleft suffix-paradigm\textquoteright} pronoun is selected as actor expression by an immediately preceding converter morpheme\", validity extent: the converted conjugation form; regressive dependence (allomorph): \textit{ΕΙΚΩΤΜ (ΑΝ)} (closer than \textit{ΕΙΝ+ΚΩΤΜ ΑΝ} \textsuperscript{31}, delimitation 2).

\textsuperscript{22} I adopt here Rosén's terminology of 1964, but extend the notion of juncture to be coterminous 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\".

\textsuperscript{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\".

\textsuperscript{24} Rosén 1964:845.

\textsuperscript{25} The only special study of this subject is Erman 1915, a contrastive Sahidic:Bohairic listing of environments (see Shisha-Halevy 1981:317ff.).

\textsuperscript{26} Not (to the best of my knowledge) attested in Shenoute is the Coptic case of Trubetzkoy's \"corrélation prosodique de gémination\", like \textit{ΟΥΜΕ ΕΕ (Deut. 13:14, see Polotsky 1957c:348f., = CP 390f.).}

\textsuperscript{27} Not, for instance, the \textit{N} in \textit{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, \textit{OLZ 59:253 n. 1, 1964 (note omitted by mistake in CP).}

\textsuperscript{28} Not in ΝΜΚΑΣ (Wess. 9 139a 27).

\textsuperscript{29} Not in Chassinat (\textit{Ν-ΝΟΣΕ, Ch. 56.50f.}). Cf. for this phenomenon Kahle 1954:98ff.

\textsuperscript{30} But \textit{ΕΝΠΝΕΟΥ (III 202.5f.)}, \textit{ΝΜΒΑΜΜΕ (ibid. 219.12).}

\textsuperscript{31} Polotsky 1960a:§28 (obs.).
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(3) “A prenominal converter allomorph is selected by an immediately following nominal actor expression”, validity extent: the converted conjugation form; progressive dependence (allomorph): ἐπὲ/ ἑπὶ/ἐτερεπὶμημεν συντ (ἂν) (closer than ἐνεργημε συντ ἄν (3), delimitation 3).

Syntactic: (4) ‘Determinant [noun-lexeme + ἀν- noun-lexeme]’ juncture between the noun lexemes closer than in ‘determinator + noun lexeme + ἀν ὁ/ον- determinator + noun lexeme’ (delimitation 4); progressive bracketing: Ἴηδεὶς τε ᾿Ιωνίατ ῾Ινπεραμιος (sic) (A 2 435, not Sh.) / ΠΕΜΑΣ ΝΣΘΝ ΣΑΥΜΗ ΣΑΥΜΗΣ ΣΙΝΟΘΗΣ ΣΙΟΥΆΣ ΝΣΘ (A 1 77).

(5) (a) # converter + conjugation base #/converter + actor {verb lexeme + verb lexeme + verb lexeme 34} #; (b) # converter {conj. base + verb lexeme} + (conj. base + verb lexeme) + (conj. base + verb lexeme) # (perfect tense only); (c) # {conjugation base/converter + actor} + (conjug. base/converter + actor) + (conjug. base/converter + actor)... verb lexeme #. Cases of progressive (a-b) or regressive bracketing 35, closer than the juncture of repeated (coordinated, disjoined) (base/converter + verb lexeme) unit (delimitation 5).

Examples: (a) ΑΠΝΑΣ ΟΜΟΚΗ ΣΟΟΥ (IF 268, apud Dictionary 318a-b) / ΝΕΝΤΑΥΡ-ΠΑΙ ΑΥΣ ΣΒΤΕ-ΖΕΝ-ΣΟΤΑΙ ΝΑΥ (A 2 341) / ΕΥΣΑΝΘΟΥΚ Η ΧΝΟΥΤΗ (ibid. 528) / ΝΕΝΡΗΜΕ ΣΕΚ-ΤΕΝΟΙΤΕ ΕΡΑΪ... Η ΜΜΟΝ ΝΣΘ (IV 95.10f.) / ΜΠΝΤΣΙΜΟΣ ΑΥΣ ΧΙΤΕ ΒΕΒΟ (Wess. 9 37a 31ff.) / ΝΤΥΘΥ... ΝΤΑΙΝΟΥΤΕ ΧΟΟΥ Η ΑΑΥ (Ench. 72b) / ΕΠΕ ΠΕΝΣΗΝ ΠΟΝΕ Η ΚΤΗΝ ΕΠΑΣΟΥ (cerc., A 2 24) / ΝΕΠΕΡΕΠΙΜΗΣ ΣΘΣ ΜΜΟΥΗ Η ΩΟΥΣ ΒΕΒΟΙ ΣΙΩΟΥ (ibid. 529) / ΣΕΠΕΠΤΒΟ ΜΠΝΡΗΜΕ ΟΥΛΕ ΧΑΣΜΗΝ, v. 1. ΟΥΤΕ ΕΣΧΩΝ ΝΜΟΥ (A 1 327; note the non-susceptibility of the second infinitive to the Stern-Jernstede Rule, §3.1.2).

(b) ΝΕΝΤΑΥΡΗ-ΣΟΤΕΗ ΑΥΣ ΩΟΘΟΟΥ (III 69.14f., v.l. ΜΝΝΕΝΤΑΥΡΟΘΟΟΥ) / ΟΥΝ ΝΙΜ ΝΕΝΤΑΥΡΗΣ ΑΥΣ ΑΧΙ-ΣΒΩ (ibid. 173.18f.) / ...ΝΕΝΤΑΥΡΗΣ ΕΠΝΟΥΣ ΑΥΣ ΑΥΣΑΝΜΠΕΙ ΕΠΕΧΣ (rel., RE II 17a 12f.) / ΝΕΝΤΑΥΡΗΣ ΑΥΣ ΑΥΣ-ΣΜΕΡΡΟΣ ΖΙΤΗ- (Sec. Perf., III 28.25f.) / ΝΕΝΤΑΥΡΗΣ ΕΠΝΟΥΣ ΕΠΟΙΗ ΑΙΕΙΜΗ ΕΡΟΥ ΤΕΝΟΥ ΝΕΝΤΑΥΡΗΣ ΣΑΙ (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); ΕΝΖΛΩΝ ΑΜΝΗΤΕΑΟΣ ΑΜΝΗΤΕΑΟΣ ΔΩΝΑΜΙΟΝ ΝΑΥΜΟΝ- ΝΟΜΟΝ... (A 2 381) / ΟΥΝ- ΝΑΤΟΙ ΑΦΑ... ΩΙΝΟΚΙΝΟΚΙΚ, ΩΙΝΟΠΟΝΟΚ, ΩΙΝΟΧΑΒΑΡΤΟΚ ΝΙΡΜΗ ΣΜΟΟΘ... (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) 36. Examples: ΜΠΕΤΕΚΑΝΚΙΑ ΜΠΕΧΝ ΝΠΡΕΘ ΝΤΑΙΝΟΤΕΥΕ ΕΡΟΥ, ΕΙΤΕ... ΕΙΤΕ... ΕΙΤΕ

31 Polotsky 1960a:§28.
32 -ΤΕΗ(ΣΥΝΤ) behaves in this respect like a conjugation base (it is a conjugation carrier): ἀντίπρουμπλ ΤΙΜ ΕΡΟΥ (A 2 505), ετερεπη-... ΑΥΣ ΧΙΤΕ ΒΕΒΟ (ibid. 529), δε-ενατρεπημμενος ζαυμην δε-νεπεριμημενος ζαυμην ου μεριτος ηοου (III 107-8), also A 1 173, A 2 81. So does (base + mediator [lexeme premodifier §3.3]: ἀγυρτ-ΜΑΥ ΟΝ Η ΣΙΜΕ (A 2 97), νημευες ιαροφοι... Η ΕΠΕΚ ΕΠΕΚΘΡΑΙΜΕ (IV 61.6f.). Likewise the future characteristic ΝΑ: ΕΝΑΒΑΙΕ ΑΝ ΝΕΝΑΤΟΜ Η ΓΟΤΤΟΙ ΒΕΒΟ (A 2 505-6), ΝΕΝΑΚΑΑΥ ΝΤΟΝ... Η ΚΟΜΙΟΥ, ΠΑΙΡΟΓ ΜΠΟΝΤΕ ΝΑΤΑΙΟΟΟ Χ ΣΟΟΥ (P 130 9 ΣΑΜ), and ΝΠΕ-ΟΥΝ... ΕΝΕΝΑΤΟΜ ΝΧΟΤ Υ ΤΑΞΕ (IV 180.3). Consider also the rare bracketing + base (actor + v. lexeme) + (actor + v. lexeme) + # (ΝΕΝΡΗΜΕ ΕΡΑΪ ΝΣΘΝ ΣΕΥΣΝ-ΣΘΝ Η ΠΕΝΣΗΝ ΟΥΛΑΡΗ ΣΑΙ (IV 85.6f.), and the variation ΔΑΓΜΟΥΜΝΟΣ ΚΟΝ-ΣΘΛΛΑΟΟΣ ΣΔΕ- ΣΜΕ-ΜΟΥΝ (A 1 241).
34 ε + infinitive, ετεη- occur as bracketed verbal predicates: IV 94.27f., 61.7f., 20f. (see Ch. 7 n. 63).
36 Cf. Steinthal-Mistelii 1893:50; Till 1928:202e; Nagel 1969:465ff.; Browne 1976:231; Quecke 1977:77f. The construction is especially common, on the one hand, in Gaotic texts, on the other in late Sahidic ones. Note that a juncture contour noun syntagm... noun syntagm usually characterizes the “Trimembral” # subject + copula + predicate # Nominal Sentence pattern (also the Wechselsch (= N, 0 N 0), in contrast to the # predicate + pron. subject + nominal (lexical) subject # one: πιθ ΜΕΝΗΜΗ ΝΕΝΡΗΜΗ ΕΥΣΑΡΗΚΗ ΜΕΝΕΤΟΡΑΙΚΗ ΕΚΘΡΟΝ ΠΕ ΕΟΟΘ... (A 2 76) / ΑΡΑ ΠΟΥΝΟΚ ΝΟΥΝΗΡΕ ΒΕΒΟ ΕΚΘΡΑΙΜΑΙ ΕΝΤΑΙΝΟΥΤΕ ΤΑΑΣ ΝΑΥ ΡΕ ΟΥΖΟΟΥ (ibid. 364) / ΠΑΝΕΡΘΟΥ ΔΕ ΖΙΩΝ ΝΙΑΙΑΟΣ ΝΤΑΙΝΟΥΤΕ... ΕΡΑΙ ΕΤΟΟΤΟΥ ΡΕ ΠΗΝ-ΚΙΒΑ ΜΜΟΥ (III 90.5f.). Note the punctuation in: ΖΕΝΗΜΗΡΕ ΑΥΣ ΖΕΝΗΜΕΡΕ ΕΡΕΠΘΥ ΡΕ ΣΙΩΟΥ ΡΕ ΖΕΝΗΜΗΡΕ ΕΥΣ ΣΜΙΝ ΣΑΙ... (Or. 153.27ff.)
7. 'XEKAAC ЕРЈ-/€E/NNE'\textsuperscript{7}, closer than 'XEKAAC + (interposition) + conjunctive (delimitation 7; see §7.2.6.1 [e]).

8. '(pronoun \[\rightarrow (resumption)] (in various constructions), closer than '(pronoun \[\rightarrow (no resumption)]' (delimitation 8). Examples: ΟΥΑΙΧΕ... ENANOY EUOY (A 2 462) / ΞΑΣ ΜΕΝ ΝΥΑΙΧ ΛΥ ΝΙΕΒ ΑΙΟΟΥ (Ch. 50.20ff.) / ΠΑΙ ΕΤΜΑΤ ΑΥ ΝΙΕΚΟΟΥΕ ΝΙΟΤΕ ΝΑΚΡΙΝΕ ΣΕΝΤΗΜΤΕ ΜΠΑ ΜΝΑΙ ΝΝΑΙ ΕΤΜΑΤ (III 130. 7f.) / ΛΥ ΝΙΕΚΟΗΣ ΝΕΤΕΜΜΑΤ ΑΝ ΝΙΝΓΚΑΤΑΝΑΙ (ibid. 211.8f.) / ΕΝΜΗΣΕ ΝΤΑΚΧΟ ΧΕ-ΣΕΚΙ-2ΝΑΑΥ ΝΑΙ (Ch. 41.12ff.) / ΝΤΟΚ ΝΕΤΟΥΧΙΚ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΝΗΤΗΚ ΝΝΕΥΠΑΒΟΣ (ibid. 21.18ff.) / ΝΤΟΚ ΝΤΑΚΟΟΣ ΜΠΟΝΗΡΟΝ... ΝΙΣΕ ΕΜΑΤ (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] ΝΕΤΕΜΜΑΤ ΧΕ ΝΗΤΗΚ 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 syncretization and personal maintenance between the nucleus and the conjunctive (adnexal modifier), see §7.1.2.2.

6.0.2.2 DELIMITATIONS. (0) Devalidization of link (0); ensuing boundary: lexeme stem (TAMU-ΤΝ)

(1) Labializable morpheme or morpheme-part not labialized before a secondary (conditioned) labial (cf. link 1); ensuing boundary: prefix [assimilated prefix. ΝΜΜΟΥ (Wess. 9 91a 27f.), ΝΜΜΟΥ (A 2 383), ΝΜΜΟΥ (III 132.15).

(2) Negation of link (2). Ensuing boundary: converter [N-AN negatived Bipartite (pronominal actor).

(3) Negation of link (3). Ensuing boundary: converter [N-AN negatived Bipartite (nominal actor)\textsuperscript{37}.

(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/converter + nominal actor [pred. verb lexeme; examples: Α-... ΑΥ- (IV 205.15ff.), ΝΤΑ-... ΕΝΤΑ- (Sec. Perf., III 90.8f.), ΕΡΨΑ-... ΕΥΨΑ- (Ch. 41.11ff., parall. III 80.15f.), ΕΡΦΕ-... ΕΥ- (Sec. Pres., III 209.13ff.), ΕΝΕΡΦΕ-... ΕΝΕΨΑ- (RE 10 164b 12ff.)\textsuperscript{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 — ΕΚΑΧ — " said he "\textsuperscript{39} antecedent [rel. form (A 1 228, A 2 — 162 —

\textsuperscript{7} One may include here the second person feminine singular: ΕΡΕΣΙΣΜΑ ΑΝ (\(\text{tere-\$\text{\textr{o}-sime an}\)) vs. ΕΝΕΣΙΣΜΑ ΑΝ, perhaps also more open than ΕΝΕΣΙΣΜΑ ΑΝ. Cf. Røsen 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."

\textsuperscript{37} One may include here the second person feminine singular: ΕΡΕΣΙΣΜΑ ΑΝ (\(\text{tere-\$\text{\textr{o}-sime an}\)) vs. ΕΝΕΣΙΣΜΑ ΑΝ, perhaps also more open than ΕΝΕΣΙΣΜΑ ΑΝ. Cf. Røsen 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."

\textsuperscript{39} One may include here the second person feminine singular: ΕΡΕΣΙΣΜΑ ΑΝ (\(\text{tere-\$\text{\textr{o}-sime an}\)) vs. ΕΝΕΣΙΣΜΑ ΑΝ, perhaps also more open than ΕΝΕΣΙΣΜΑ ΑΝ. Cf. Røsen 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."

\textsuperscript{38} See Young 1969:400. Note other cases of morpheme resumption: Ν-... ΝΜΝΑ- ΑΝ (IV 11.15f.), ΜΗ ΕΡΨΑ-... ΜΗ ΡΨ + apodosis (A 2 26), ΕΥΨΑ-... ΕΨΑ- (IV 28.16ff.).
192), extraposed noun) [main pattern (προ — ΠΕΧΑΧ — ΧΝΑΤΑΚΟ A 2 335, RE 10 159a 10f.; NB. ΑΝΟΚ ΓΙ — ΠΕΧΑΧ — ΧΝΑΣΙΤΟΝ III 17.20f. / ΑΠΟΝ ΓΑΡ — ΠΕΧΑΧ — ΑΚΑΤΟΤΟΝ ΕΒΟΛ P 130a 102 vo), conj. carrier] [verbal lexeme (ΣΜΠΡΗΣΑΥΧΗΧ — ΠΕΧΑΧ — ΣΜΠΡΗΣΑΥΓ ΙΙΙ 199.5f.). Second-Tense theme] [focal modifier (Wess. 9 174d 29ff. / ΝΤΑΙΜΠΕΝ ΓΑΡ ΑΝ — ΠΕΧΑΧ — ΜΠΟΝΤΟΡΚ ΝΚΟΥΛΝ Α 2 431), nominal predicate (+ augens)] [pronominal subject (ςε κινετε τηρο — ΠΕΧΑΧ — ΝΕ III 118.15f.), cataphoric referent] [referate (ςε προς κόσμο — ΠΕΧΑΧ — ΧΣ— A 2 430, also ibid. 432-3 [all not Sh.], 453), verbal nucleus] [expansion (III 99.8f., Wess. 9 140a 15ff. / ΣΜ ΓΑΡ — ΠΕΧΑΧ — ΕΠΟΥΕΟΕΙΝ ΝΤΑΙΜΠΕΝ P 131b 20 ΚΔ; between two coordinated clauses, — ΠΕΧΑΧ ΑΥΙ — Wess. 9 161d 10ff.), and, surprisingly, rel. converter (pronominal!) [conv. Nominal Sentence (ταί τε θε ετερε — ΠΕΧΑΧ — ΟΝΕΤΟΙΟΕΙΝ ΝΕ... A 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: ΞΕΣΑΚΑΣ [“eventual”-apodotic conjunctive.

(8) Absence of resumption ⁴⁰ of a (pro)noun (stylistically, anacoluthic construction ⁴¹): (IV 108.17ff.) ΑΝΟΣ ΖΗΝΗ 2ΒΗ ΝΙΜ ΝΑΙΣΕ ΝΗΑ ΓΑΖΤΗΝ ΝΝΑΣΑΖ ΝΗΤΗΝ / (III 24.10f.) ΠΕΤΕΡΠΗΣΕΝ ΕΕ ΜΠΟΥ ΠΟΥΑ ΝΑΥΟΠΟ... ΠΕΤΕΡΠΗΣΕΝ ΝΤΑΙΜΠΕΝ ΕΤΕΟΟΥΝ / (V 85.1ff.) ΝΡΕ ΕΤΚΗΙ-ΡΟΟΥΣ ΓΑΝΕΟΟΥΝ / (IV 26.11) ΤΑΙ ΤΕ ΘΕ ΝΤΑ- ΠΟΙΟΙΚ ΝΘΟΥΡΗ ΝΑΒΡΑΖΑ / (III 21.13f.) Νθοου ΕΤΕΟΟΥΝ Η ΕΤΕΝΕΟΟΥΝ ΚΕ-ΘΑΙΕΙ ΦΑΡΑΗΝ / (IV 80.1f.) ΠΕΟΟΥ Η ΠΜΑ ΕΘΑΤΙΩ ΚΗ ΕΟΥΜ / (IV 34.9f.) ΤΑΠΗ ΝΤΑΕΙΝΤΗΝ ΠΝΤΠΙΜ / (III 68.2f.) ΚΑΙΡΟΣ ΕΝΤΑ- ΒΑΒΡΑΚΟΣ ΥΘΑ / (P 1317 [45 ro] ΠΜΑ ΕΤΕΛΩΥΡ-2ΒΗ ΕΠΗΝΕ (ΙΙΙ 138.26ff.) ΠΕΙΥΑΚΑΕ ΝΝΑΤΑΛΩΜΑ ΝΤΑΙΟΟΟ ΝΝΕΜΠΟ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΝΑΘΗΝ... ΚΕ-... Additional delimitations, treated elsewhere ⁴²: topicalized quotation] [focus (§2.7.2.4, b) topic: ‘Basic Tense + interrogative modifier’, more open than ‘Second Tense + interr. 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, demasiological or prosodic weight are gradient and relative. The definition, tacitly accepted unanimously — “minimal free form” (originally Bloomfield’s) — cannot be uncritically accepted, since “minimal”, “free”, even “form” all beg the question, being values that are questionable, relative or in need of definition (“minimalness”, 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 cohesional definition of anacoluthia, e.g. in cases like (III 104.23ff.) ΞΕΚΑΚ ΝΤΟΚ ΖΗΝΗ... ΚΑ- ΑΝ (opener juncture than for ΞΕΚΑΚ ΕΝΕΚ), or (Ch. 88.22ff.) ΕΡΙΑΝΟΥΑ ΕΕ ΣΟΟΣ ΚΕ-ΘΕΙε ΠΘΟΤΕ ΣΕΝΕΠΗΣ ΚΗ ΚΝΕΙΝΗΣ ΤΗΡΗ... where the 3rd-person pronoun is an exponent of cohesion that would be absent in the 1st person; in the case of (A 1 137) ΕΝΕΝΕΚΗΣ Α ΣΕ ΚΑΝΑΚ ΝΕΤΖΑΤΗΝ... ΝΤΑΝΘΑ-2ΒΗ ΑΝ ΞΑΡΟΟΥ, the protasis - apodosis juncture is looser than in the “orthodox” ΞΕΝΤΑ... ΝΕ- ΝΑ (ΝΕ) irreals 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 ΕΥΘΟΟΤ ΝΤΕΝΟΔΟΥΑ ΝΟΥΤ (P 130a 66 or), not affecting the actor pronoun by “converting” it from the prefix to the suffix paradigm: (Χ)ΞΕΝΤΑ- (Ch. 95.33f.); consider also ΞΕΝΑ- (IV 184.2, vs. ΞΕΝΕΝΤΑ- for the converter), ΞΕΝ- Sec. Tense (BMCat. p. 79 No. 194 F. 4).
⁴³ See Matthews 1974:Chs. 2. 5, 9; Barri 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:

\[ \lambda = \chi = \text{CSTM} \quad \text{vs.} \quad \lambda = \text{PRWME} \prec \text{CSTM} \]

\[ \text{AN} = \text{OURPWME} \quad \text{vs.} \quad \text{OURPWME} \prec \text{PE} \]

\[ -\text{SETP} = \text{PRWME} \quad \text{vs.} \quad \text{CSTM} \prec \text{MPRWM} \]

\[ \chi = \text{CSTM} \quad \text{vs.} \quad \text{PRWME} \prec \text{CSTM} \]

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-NAPOY PE* (Ch. 13.42f.) is opposed to "*PATNOYTE* (ibid. 17.15) and "*PONALEMOS* (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; enclisis, 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: *ζε* is separated (cf. *δε*), so are *ουν*, *πογιαν*, *ετε* *παι* *πε* (vs. *ετε* *ετε*). Misteli's (1893) has maximal separation, employing the hyphen to mark some (not all) special cases of close juncture: *ΕΜΠΕ-ΙΝΑΓΕ ΕΙΩ ΔΙΑΚΙΟΚ ΕΙ ΠΙ-ΣΕΟΕΙ ΚΑΛΑ-ΤΟΝ ΝΕΡΟΥ-ΤΗ-ΝΗΝ-Η/ΜΕ ΣΑΙ ΝΑΙ*. TILL 1941 offers two arbitrary contrasting lists — his aim is clearly diacritic and practical. "Lexical" units are separated, "grammatical" ones are not: ΜΕΕΠ-ΠΕΙΔΙΤ ΠΕΙΔΙΤ vs. ΜΕΕΠ (love) ΠΕΙΔΙΤ; ΝΟΥΛΙΘΟΜΕ vs. Ν (bring) ΟΥΛΙΘΟΜΕ; ΝΤΕΝΟΥΤΕ vs. ΝΤΕΝ (of) ΠΟΥΛΙΤΕ; ΝΤΕΝ (conj.) vs. ΝΤΕΝ ΝΑΒΒΗΠ. 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: ΟΥΛΙΤΕ ΠΕΙΔΙΤ ΠΟΜΗΡΣ, + (inf.) ΡΙΚΕ, ΝΑ ΝΑΙΟΤΕ, ΑΝΡ ΣΑΙ ΝΟΠΟΒ, ΝΙΝ ("with") ΤΕΜΑΙΛΑ, ΑΝΒ ("can") ΤΙΝ. KASER 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: ΠΑ' ΕΤ ΝΑ' ΠΕ' ΠΑ' ΠΕ' ΠΛΟΤΟΣ ΕΝΤΑ' ΠΕΙ' ΠΕΙΔΙΤ ΠΕΤΟΥΑΒ ΜΠΡΟΦΗΤΤΗ ΑΠΑ ΒΕΝΟΥΤΕ ΣΟΟΠΗ ΝΙΝ' ΠΕΤ' ΝΑ' ΝΗΤΡ' ΠΟΝΟΒ... See also Amelineau, Shenouda, I, p. xxxviii and Sphinx 17:177-207 (1913), 18:1-50 (1914-5).

Augsen" 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 syntaxication 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, ΝΤΟ, ΖΩΜΗ, certain augentia). (b) Enclitics ride (not unlike corks on water) the (to us otherwise imperceptible) prosodic scheme. They are "floated" by the suprasegmental contour, and their actual placement is a co-product of their segmental relationships and this contour; 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, extrapoled noun syntags, expanded noun syntags; modifiers, incl. coordinatives or disjunctives: ΑΥΣ, Η, ΟΥΤΕ, ΑΑΑΑ; 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 — ΠΕΚΑΨ — as intercolony boundary marker): ΑΝΟΝ ΔΕ ΖΩΜΗ | ΟΥ ΠΕΤΝΑΚΟΠΟΥ | ΜΑΡΕΠΟΤΑΜΟΥ ΓΑΡ | ΠΟΥΑ ΜΟΥΣ ΤΕ (ibid. 110.6.f.) / ΖΩΤΑΝ ΔΕ | ΠΕΝΚΟΝ | ΕΡΣΑΝ- (ibid. 101.11.f.) / ΝΑΙ ΓΑΡ ΣΙΗΡΟΥ | ΕΡΣΑΝΝΟΥΤΕ Π-ΖΩΝΑΣ | ΣΕΝΑΠΑΡΑΚΕ (ibid. 31.6.f.) / ΖΩΝΙΩΣΗΝΑΣ ΓΑΡ | ΝΤΑΝΙΕ ΕΤΜΑΛ ΧΕΙ... (IV 164.9.f.) / ΑΝΟΝ-ΖΕΝΠΥΜΕ ΓΑΡ | (ibid. 155.1.f.) / ΕΝΝΑ+ΖΗΥ ΓΑΡ | ΝΟΥ (ibid. 184.7) / ΑΡΧΑΛΛΟΣ ΔΕ ΟΝ | ΠΕΝΠΚΟΠΟΣ ΖΩΜΗ ΝΑΡΚΑΡΑΡΙΣ | ΑΣ- (III 109.4.f.) / ΠΟΥΝΙΣΚΕΣ ΔΕ | ΓΕΣ ΕΥΣΕ-ΝΤΑΥΝΨΗΣ ΝΗΤ | ΝΤΑΥΝΨΗΣ ΓΑΡ | ΠΤΟΟΥΤ ΜΕΝ | ΝΤΑΣ ΜΕΠΙΑΙ ΝΟΥΜΙΣΜΟ... (ibid. 96.24.f.) / ΝΥΟΕΕ ΔΕ | ΤΟΥΕΙ ΜΕΝ | ΑΣ-ΠΙΣ ΖΩΜΗ ΟΝ | (ibid. 97.1.f.) / ΟΥΝΙΝΕΑΣ ΓΑΡ | ΨΟΟΝ | ΚΟΠ ΜΕΝ | ΧΩΑ- | ΚΟΠ ΔΕ ΟΝ | ΧΩΑ- (ibid. 48.6.f.) | ΕΠΙΑΝ | ΑΚΟΝΟΣ ΔΕ ΟΝ | ΖΩΝΙΩΣΗΝΑΣ ΝΕΠΡΑ (ibid. 81.12) / ΕΒΟΛΑ ΓΑΡ ΑΝ | ΔΕ-ΕΥΟ ΕΠΙΑ ΝΤΟ | ΝΕ- (ibid. 66.2.f.) / ...ΝΗΥΝΨΗΔ ΟΝ | ΧΟΝΣ ΨΟ (ibid. 113.13.f.) / ΝΕΠΟΤΟΥΥ ΝΕ ΔΕ | ΝΕ ΝΕΧΡΑ ΜΝΟΡΦΑΝΟΣ (ibid. 93.18.f.) / ΖΕΝΕΒΟΛ ΤΩΝ ΖΕ | ΝΕ (v.l. ΖΕΝΕΒΟΛ ΥΕ | ΤΜΗ | ΝΕ, ibid. 216.17) / ΠΑΤ ΒΑΤ ΓΑΡ | (Leyd. 311) 52 / ΑΙΣΕ-ΠΙΣΧΑΣ ΠΑΙ ΟΝ | ΜΠΑΡΚΕΛΑΙΝΟΣ (III 31.27) / ΕΤΡΕΥ-ΝΑΠΡΟ | ΜΝΟΡΠΟ ΟΝ (ibid. 88.18) / ΝΤΟ ΓΕ ΑΝΩΝ | ΖΩΝΤΑΝΙΕΠΙΕΨ ΜΠΟΥ (Ch. 90.8.f., if ΝΤΟ 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 Weiss 1879:90ff.; Wackernagel 1892; Lafer 1959; E. Fraenkel 1964, 1965; Hellwig 1974, esp. p. 160ff. For Egyptian-Coptic, see Czermak 1931:29ff.; Polotsky 1961. Fecht 1964 and Säve-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 "Spitzewort" is often, if not always, a whole colon; cases like ΝΟΕ ΓΑΡ ΝΠΥΜΕ... (III 181.3) are possibly instances of colon-second placement, although even here we may have colon-final or intercolony placement.
ing Wechselsatz "ΝΤΟΥΣ ΠΕ ΑΝΩΝ") / ΟΥΟΕΙ ΔΕ | ΝΑΝ ΝΤΟΥΣ | ΕΡΣΑΝ — (II 174.15,28). Instances of "Kurz-
kolon" 52: MH ΓΑΡ | ΜΝΩΜΗ... (IV 180.12) / ΟΥΤΕ ΡΩ | ΜΝΗΧΥ (A 146) / ΓΙΜΟΕΙΟΤΕΙΝ ΕΣΗΜΑΝ | Η ΟΝ ΤΕ-
ΝΟΥ (IV 205.10f.) / Η ΡΩ | ΛΕΠΑΚΟ ΟΥΣ ΕΙΣ (III 105.6) / ΝΙΜ ΝΤΟΥΣ | ΠΕΤΣΟΥΝ (III 200.22) / ΕΙΜΕ ΝΤΟΥΣ | 
Ω ΝΠΝΗΜΕ ΝΑΣΣΩΤΗ (ibid. 165.19) / ΑΛΑΑ | ΕΒΟΛ ΝΤΟΥΣ | ΧΕ- (P 1301 139 ΤΜΕ) / ΤΑΝΕΙΟΘ ΜΝΗΜΗΝ ΜΝΗΣΑΝ 
| ΑΥΣ ΤΗΡΝ | ΤΝΝΑΡΑΥΕ (A 2 403) / ΑΥΣ ΝΤΟΥΣ | ΧΡΗΝΙΠΝΟΣ (III 32.1f.) / ΑΚΥΛΙΖΕ ΜΠΑΓΝΗΜ | Η ΝΤΟΥΣ | 
ΚΕΣΥΒ (ibid. 62.25f.) / ΑΥΣ ΓΕ | ΜΝΗΜΗΝΕ-ΑΑΑΗΛ (ibid. 185.3) / ΝΤΟΥΣ ΓΑΡ | ΑΥΣ ΠΕΝΗΣΤ | ΟΥΑ ΝΕ (RE 11 
17a 2) / ΕΜΕΕΕΕ | ΕΩΥ ΓΕ ΤΕΝΟΥ | (IV 183.7) / ΑΝΩΝ ΖΩΩΝ | ΣΕΚΩΤΕ ΚΟΝ | ΝΚΛ- (III 142.18f.) / ΑΛΑΑ | 
ΝΑΜΕ ΠΕ | ΠΕΤΟΟΥΜΣ ΠΕ | ΕΤΕΡ- (ibid. 131.15f., cod. B; see §6.0.3.3).

6.0.3.2 ENCLITICS: RELATIVE PLACEMENT AND COMPARABILITIES. 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 com-
bined and relative placement of enclitics, however, is instructive of their prosodic hierarchy and relative en-
cliticity. 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 con-
venience) (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 I |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEN</th>
<th>ΓΑΡ</th>
<th>ΔΕ</th>
<th>ΡΩ</th>
<th>ΓΕ₁</th>
<th>ΝΤΟΥΣ</th>
<th>ΑΝ</th>
<th>ΟΝ</th>
<th>ΖΩΩΜ</th>
<th>ΓΕ₂</th>
<th>ΠΕ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>(—)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΓΑΡ</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>(—)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔΕ</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(—)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΡΩ</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>(—)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΓΕ₁</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>(—)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΝΤΟΥΣ</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>(—)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΑΝ</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>(—)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΟΝ</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>(—)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΖΩΩΜ</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>(—)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΓΕ₂</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>(—)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΠΕ</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>(—)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DOCUMENTATION: MEN ΓΑΡ: P 1314 158 ΤΟ (Denniston 67) 54: MEN ΓΑΡ — ΔΕ — ΔΕ — — ΓΑΡ relating
the whole complex to the preceding context, MEN cataphorically to the ΔΕ-related sequence. MEN ΓΕ: Ench.
77b. MEN ΑΝ: III 33.16f., 34.19, 94.25. ΓΑΡ ΑΝ: III 55.14, 66.2. ΓΑΡ ΟΝ: III 85.13f. ΓΑΡ ΖΩΩΜ: P 1315
65 ΤΟ. ΓΑΡ ΠΕ: III 32.22, 66.4. ΓΑΡ ΑΝ ΠΕ: Or. 168.10f. ΔΕ ΑΝ: A 24, IV 71.13f. ΔΕ ΝΤΟΥΣ: III 46.5f.,

52 Cf. Laufer 1959:70.
54 Other ready-imported Greek particle amalgams are ΑΠΑΡΕ (Denniston 43: A 2 334. To be related in some way to the
very common ΑΠΑ ΓΕ — IV 179.2, 193.8, III 71.23, 220.15f., Ch. 11.9f., 164.18ff. 7f.); ΟΥΧΟΥΝ (both ΟΥΧΟΥΝ and ΟΥΧΟΥΝ, III 24-5, 66.17,
93.14f., Wess. 9 142b 28ff.); MH ΑΠΑ (ΓΕ) (III 80.25f., IV 129.8, 193.8, Ch. 110.26f.); ΚΑΙΤΩΡΕ (Denniston 564: Ch. 81.5f., 138.5f.,
158.11f., Wess. 9 131b 15f.) and ΚΑΙΤΟΙ (IV 38.1f.); ΚΑΙΓΑΡ (καί γερ, Denniston 108ff.; III 32.18, 461f., 135.29, IV 19.16, 92.19,
184.11f.).
145.12f. ΄ΑΕ ζωωμ: III 65.16; this is ΄ΑΕ marked as adversative. ΄ΑΕ έΝ: 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 έΝΝ: III 60.29, 110.20; rather rare, the usual form being ΄ΑΕ έΝΝ έΝ (in III 52.18, 53.25 we have ΄ΑΕ preceding the copular, not pronominal έΝ). ΏΨ ΝΤΟΨ: Ch. 42.10ff. ΏΨ ΆΝ: A 2 87, III 22.19, 211.17, 215.2f. ΏΨ ΏΨ: Ch. 17.4ff., III 164.9ff. 66 ΏΨ ΆΝ: Ch. 157.28ff. 66 ΏΨ έΝ: Wess. 988a 14ff., III 199.10. 66 ΏΨ ζωωμ: Ch. 112-3, Young 15. 66 ΏΨ έΝΝ: III 216.17, Mun. 177, Ench. 94a. ΝΤΟΨ ΆΝ: A 1 135 ΝΤΟΨ έΝΝ ΝΤΟΨ ΆΝ / Ch. 52.37ff. IIς έΩΨΥΨΕ ΝΤΟΨ ΆΝ έΝΝ / ibid. 198.45ff. ΏΨ έΝΝ-ΣΒΨ ΆΝ ΝΤΟΨ ΆΝ. ΝΤΟΨ έΝΝ: III 105.24f., 145.12f. ΏΨ ΝΤΟΨ: only in rhetorical questions (usually introduced by ΏΗ, ΏΗH): III 105.24f. ΏΗ ΏΝΝΑ ΏΝΝ έΝΝ... / ΏΠ 130b 71 ΏΠ... ΏΗ ΏΤΒΕΝΤΜΤΑΣΤΨΤΨ ΏΝ ΝΤΟΨ ΏΝΝΚΟΟΤΨ ΏΨ έΚΨ ΏΒΟΛ... / A I 125 ΏΗ ΏΤΒΕΨΥΨΕ ΏΝ ΝΤΟΨ ΏΝΝΨΚΨΨΨ... ΏΝ έΝΝ: Wess. 9 120a 24ff. 55. ΏΝ ζωωμ: Mun. 177. ΏΝ 66 έΝΝ: “not anymore” / Ch. 80.32ff., Ench. 85b, BLO. 3581A 93 (No. 209 2 vo). ΏΝ έΝΝ: IV 157.15f. ΏΝ ΝΤΟΨ: “at least” / III 93.24. ΏΝ έΝΝ: III 42.23, A I 250. 66 ζωωμ έΝΝ: III 65.16. ζωωμ έΝΝ: IV 207.3.

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 encliticty (no compatibility within each group, only commutation). In syntagm, the particle higher on the list precedes the lower:

(1) ΜΕΝ
(2) ΓΑΡ, ΄ΑΕ
(3) ΏΨ, 66 ΏΨ
(4) ΆΝ
(5) ΝΤΟΨ, ζωωμ
(6) 66 ΏΨ, έΝΝ
(7) ΏΝ

Note: These compatibilities are valid only within a single-colon-extent, and thus constitute a link (§6.0.2.1). Consider (III 93.18) - ΝΟΨΨ ΏΝΨ | ΄ΑΕ ΏΝΨ / (III 97.1f.) ΝΨΨΕΕΨΕ ΄ΑΕ ΏΝΝΑ ΜΕΝ | (A I 123) ΏΨΨΨΕ ΏΝΨ | ΝΤΟΨ | έΩΨΨΨΨ | (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” ΤΕΝΟΥΨ, see §1.3.4.) 66 ΏΨ: 66 ΏΨ: (3:6), based on ΏΝ 66 ΏΨ: “not... anymore” vs. 66 ΏΨ ΆΝ: “not... then” έΝΝ is not a particle but an enclitic pronoun in the Bimembral Nominal Sentence pattern (see §1.1.2.3 and note 36). 66 ΏΨ and ΏΝ are the only absolutely final particles; as such, they form final boundary signals of the relevant junctural extent (colon). ΝΤΟΨ (5) can probably be resolved into ΝΤΟΨ: “on the other hand”, “just”, grade (3), and ΝΤΟΨ: “at least”, “only”, grade (6), before ΏΝ — on the strength of the opposition ΏΝ ΝΤΟΨ: ΝΤΟΨ ΆΝ (for ΝΤΟΨ and ζωωμ 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 54. I find the following enclitics with this property:

54 Cf. (for the Greek τό) Wackernagel 1892:394, 396ff., 399ff. and E. Fraenkel, Beobachtungen zu Aristophanes (Rome, 1962) pp. 88ff., 216 (on με, έμοι, τι, τις). 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. Ballestri-Hyvernat) I 106.26 cod. A, 143.20f., 144.20, all exx. of ΄Ε; II 246.5f. (Ot), 351.24f., 17.26 (�ΑΕ), 323.16 (ΓΑΡ), 306.9f. (ΜΑΣ); (Bohairic) Gen. 43:32 (ΜΕ; see Andersson 1904:39). See Dictionary 256a for two exx. of “repeated” "ON."
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 φωμ 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 referate follows the pattern (differently POLOTSKY 1961:306 [+ n. 4] = CP 410): (Wess. 9 171c 15f.) ουνόμα νοι πε φω’ / (III 179.13f.) πενθυμία γαρ πε γρηγορίων, vs. (III 187.12) ται γρηγορίων τε τετνσε / (P 1301 140 τμ-ν) πενθυμία γαρ πε γρηγορίων νοι / (RE 11 18a 24f.) γεμισται εριενια ιμπ ουρρόμυ ναι / (A 1 260) ται γρηγορίαν ται γρηγορίων νοι / (A 2 45) γεμισται εριενια ιμπ ουρρόμυ ναι φωμ ουρρόμυ ναι φωμ ουρρόμυ ναι φωμ ουρρόμυ ναι φωμ ουρρόμυ ναι φωμ ουρρόμυ ναι φωμ ουρρόμυ ναι φωμ ουρρόμυ ναι φωμ ουρρόμυ ναι φωμ ουρρόμυ

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>THP</th>
<th>φωμ</th>
<th>{NOI}</th>
<th>MMIN MM</th>
<th>MAYAA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Determinator</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sgl.</td>
<td>def.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>indef.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl.</td>
<td>def.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>indef.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actor pronoun</strong></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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referate</th>
<th>THP</th>
<th>ZWW</th>
<th>{NTO}</th>
<th>MIN</th>
<th>MMO</th>
<th>MAYAA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Object Pronoun</strong> (or actor + obj.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sgl. 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| NET-  | (+) | (+) | (+) | (+) | (+) | (+) |
|       | §6.1.1.1(d) | §6.1.1.1(d) |       |       |       |       |
| Noun + έτ- | (+) | (+) | (+) | (+) | (+) | (+) |

| Imperative (+ expansion) |     |     |       |     |     |       |
| Sgl. 1  | 1   | 1   | 1     | 1   | 1   | 1     |
|        | 2   | 1   | 1     | 1   | 1   | 1     |
|        | 3   | 1   | 1     | 1   | 1   | 1     |
| Pl. 1   |     |     |       |     |     |       |
|        | 2   | 1   | 1     | 1   | 1   | 1     |
|        | 3   | 1   | 1     | 1   | 1   | 1     |

| Zero Referate |     |     |       |     |     |       |
|               | 1   | 1   | 1     | 1   | 1   | 1     |

| **nw, ne-** |     |     |       |     |     |       |
| Sgl. 1  | 1   | 1   | 1     | 1   | 1   | 1     |
|        | 2   | 1   | 1     | 1   | 1   | 1     |
|        | 3   | 1   | 1     | 1   | 1   | 1     |
| Pl. 1   |     |     |       |     |     |       |
|        | 2   | 1   | 1     | 1   | 1   | 1     |
|        | 3   | 1   | 1     | 1   | 1   | 1     |

| **Independent Pronoun** |     |     |       |     |     |       |
| Sgl. 1  | 1   | 1   | 1     | 1   | 1   | 1     |
|        | 2   | 1   | 1     | 1   | 1   | 1     |
|        | 3   | 1   | 1     | 1   | 1   | 1     |
| Pl. 1   |     |     |       |     |     |       |
|        | 2   | 1   | 1     | 1   | 1   | 1     |
|        | 3   | 1   | 1     | 1   | 1   | 1     |

| **Pronominal Subject** in Nom. Sent. |     |     |       |     |     |       |
| Sgl. 1  | 1   | 1   | 1     | 1   | 1   | 1     |
|        | 2   | 1   | 1     | 1   | 1   | 1     |
|        | 3   | 1   | 1     | 1   | 1   | 1     |
| Pl. 1   |     |     |       |     |     |       |
|        | 2   | 1   | 1     | 1   | 1   | 1     |
|        | 3   | 1   | 1     | 1   | 1   | 1     |

| **{ne}** |     |     |       |     |     |       |
| Pl. 1   |     |     |       |     |     |       |
|        | 2   | 1   | 1     | 1   | 1   | 1     |
|        | 3   | 1   | 1     | 1   | 1   | 1     |
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 MM0=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>post-referate: 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: 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 MM0=; THP= occupies an intermediate position. (The paradigmatic affinity of 2WW= with NTO= on the one hand, and of MAYAA= with MMIN MM0= 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 IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>THP=</th>
<th>2WW=</th>
<th>{NTO=}</th>
<th>MAYAA=</th>
<th>MMIN MM0=</th>
<th>ΔE</th>
<th>ΓAP</th>
<th>AN</th>
<th>ON</th>
<th>6E</th>
<th>PW</th>
<th>{ΠE}</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>x</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>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMIN MM0=</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔE =</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>ΓAP =</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>AN =</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>ON =</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>6E =</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>PW =</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>{ΠE} =</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>

See Table I

(§6.0.3.2)

--- 170 ---
6.1.1 "All", "entire(ly)" (toton, universus 58): group or unitary totality (integraliety).

6.1.1.1 THP- in cohesion with pronominal refers in verba syntagms. (a) Actor suffix-pronouns: (A 1 48) THNMOIKZ ΝΝΗΤ THPN ΔΙΟΥΝ / (Ch. 155.27f.) ΤΑΙ ΤΕ ΘΕ ΕΤΕΤΝΗΠΤ ΘΡΗΝ / (A 1 381) ΔΗΤΡΕΥΣΙΗΝ ΤΘΡΟΥ (sim. A 2 355, IV 36.21, RE 10 161b 1) / (IV 207.4f.) ΝΕΝΤΑΜΟΥ ΤΘΡΟΥ ΣΕΟ ΝΥΜΜΟ ΕΝΝΟΥΤΕ Η ΝΕΤΟΝΣ ΕΝΗΥ ΤΘΡΟΥ ΕΝΝΟΥΤΕ / (Ch. 90-1) ΑΝΥΣΗΠΕ ΝΕΟΙ ΝΗΝΑΚΑΓΑΡΤΟΣ ΤΘΡΝ / (A 1 302) ΝΕΣΧΗΚ ΕΒΟΛ ΑΝ ΤΘΡΟΥ. Additional exx.: III 87.17, 140.2, IV 67.7, 109.16, 191.7f., Ch. 97.10, 133.35ff., 162.44ff., etc.

(b) Object (expansion) suffix-pronouns: (A 2 238-9) ΕΝΝΑΤΟΥΧΟΥ ΤΘΡΟΥ ΑΝ (sim. Ch. 52.53ff., 11.9f.) / (Ch. 197-8) ...ΤΑΡΝΤΑΓΑ ΤΘΡΟΥ / (III 45.28) ΝΑΚ ΝΕΒΙΛ ΝΕΤΩΝΙ ΝΗΝΩΤΟΥ ΤΘΡΟΥ (cf. ibid. 144.14f. ΖΩΝ ΝΗΜ ΕΙΒΑΙΜΕ ΝΗΝΝΗΝ ΝΑΙ ΝΗΝΖΑΖ ΝΗΝΩΤΟΥ ΤΘΡΟΥ) / IV 36.5f., 49.16f., 5.20f., Mun. 161: ΝΗΝΩΤΟΥ ΤΘΡΟΥ, a recurring collocation, tending to the final position; / (IV 20.20f.) ΗΝ ΜΗ ΝΕΤΟΥΤΕ Ο ΝΟΜΟΣ ΕΠΟΥΝ ΑΝ ΤΘΡΟΥ.

(c) Determinators; nuclei of relative forms/nuclei + anaphoric pronoun: (A 1 87) ΝΕΤΟΥΤΗ ΤΘΡΟΥ ΖΡΑΙ ΝΗΗΤΕ / (Ch. 18.19f.) ΝΕΤΕΝΩΥΟΥ ΤΘΡΟΥ (zero subject, but in 19.4f. ΝΕΤΕΝΟΥ ΤΘΡΟΥ ΝΕ) / (A 2 360) ΝΕΤΕΝΩΤΟΥ ΝΑΚ ΤΘΡΟΥ / (Ch. 17.28f.) ΝΕΤΩΥΝΘΟΥ ΤΘΡΟΥ ΕΡΕΑΙ ΕΚΘΟΥ / (Wess. 9 129a 6f.) ΝΕΤΕΝΝΜΗΤΕ ΤΘΡΟΥ / (P 1304 156 ΤΝΔΑ) ΝΕΤΕΦΕΤΕ ΕΑΑΥ ΤΘΡΟΥ / (P 130b 7 ΝΕ) ΝΕΤΕΚΖ ΜΗΝΟΥ ΤΘΡΟΥ ΕΠΟ / (A 1 121) ΝΕΤΑΣΚΑΛΑ ΝΕ ΤΘΡΟΥ / (RE 10 163a 38) ΝΕΤΕΝΩΤΟΥ ΤΘΡΟΥ (ambiguous; sim. IV 36.22) / (A 1 266) ΝΕΝΤΑΚΒΟΤΟΥ ΕΒΟΛ ΤΘΡΟΥ. Note that here we find only plural refers. Additional exx.: Ch. 130.5f., A 1 388, 446, RE 10 161b 20.

(d) THP- with adverbial reference, in merely formal cohesion with an actor pronoun or nucleus of a relative form (here also singular): (RE 10 162a 1f.) ΝΕΤΟΖΑΛ ΤΣΡΤΑ / (A 1 14) ΠΕΓΝΑΙ ΕΥΣΗΠ ΤΣΡΤΑ / (Ch. 70.43f.) ΠΟΛΑΙΜΝΗ ΕΤΟΥΤΟΥ ΤΣΡΤΑ (sim. IV 175.11f. ...ΕΝΟΥΣΗΠ ΤΣΡΚ) / (A 2 396) ΕΝΝΑΝΤΒΕΟ ΤΣΡΤΑ ΝΟΥΗΡ

57 [ΝΟΤ] follows [ΝΕ] when they belong to different cola: ΖΩΝ ΕΥΣΗΠ ΝΟΤ ΝΕ | ΆΝΟΝ | ΖΜΗΝΗΠΕ ΜΗΝΟΥ (Ch. 90ff.).
6.1.1.2 TP+= IN COHESION WITH PRONOUNS OUTSIDE VERB SYNTAGMS

6.1.1.2.1 Determinators. (a) Plural (definite article, demonstratives, possessive articles): (A 2 247) NENEOITE THPOY NAPXAIOS / (A 1 373) ANAIPEIKIOC ZWOU THPOY ETXAI-OUA... EI EBOA / (Ch. 179.10ff.) NPOEN-PNOBE THPOY MPKAS / (Wess. 18 140b 8ff.) ZNNAI ON THPOY EMPEYGHT GN-APIKE EPOOY AN / (III 118.11f.) MYXAE THPOY NXXIO AYX NCAZOY THPOY ETEREPAL XW MPOOY NTAXYOY THPOY ETEMNTH / (A 1 289) NEPEFOHTHC ME THPOY MnNAPOSTOLOC THPOY MNTETOYAAAC THPOY... / (III 215.24f.) YSANTEIPIKE THPOY YWME.

(b) ZEN- THPOY “all sorts of...”, especially frequent after ZEKE- “all kinds of other...”: (Wess. 9 172d 6ff.) ZENKEBHYES THPOY ENAYOUN (sim. IV 30.28f.) / (IV 14.21f.) ZENKOYOU THPOY NTEIZE (sim. ibid. 115.10) / (A 1 114) NTO PETNAPIEPE ZENPETOYOU THPOY “all sorts of evil” (Amélineau’s translation, “tous les maux”, is wrong) / (A 2 504) TIPS ZENPETEYJOYOU THPOY NPETKMTO EBOA.

(c) Numbers + THPOY “whole”, “complete”: (IV 57.22f.) ELOYNOYO EYOEOIK NOYWS NTOOTOY H CNAY H YXOMY THPOY “three whole (loaves)” / (ibid. 71.4f.) MNNCAOYBET H CNAY H YXOMY THPOY.

(d) Singular definite article: unitary totality: “the whole”, “all of the...”: (P 131# 108 ro, III 168.5, A 2 108) NMOY THPOY “all that is of death” / (Ch. 99.21f.) THEPS THPOY MPYAIOS / (A 2 238) PEKOLO THPOY “all (that is) of sweetness” / (Ryl. Cat. 35 No. 70 CM#) TOSPHN THPOY / (III 184.8) TEUNPE THPOY TE... / (P 138# 52 vo) PEKESMOT THPOY... NAIKIAIOS THPOY, NETOUYAAAC THPOY... NKOYOU THPOY... NCOOUY THPOY... / (RE 10 161a 27ff.) KOSMOHET POM THPOY AYX NPTSHLE THPOY... NOOGEIN THPOY “(thou) who art all might and all strength, all wonder... all light” 89 / Note the recurring idiomatic NTEIZE THPOY “so much” (IV 162.6, Ch. 42.2f., P 134# 48 vo, etc.), cf. Hebrew kol-kax. Additional exx.: Ch. 133.42f., 140.17ff., IV 64.11, 163.4, III 37.20, 185.24ff., etc.

(e) Singular indefinite OY- TP+= “a whole...”, “a complete...”: (IV 153.23f.) OYNAUE NOYOUNOY H OYOUNOY THPOY / (A 1 204) CNAP-OYOUNH MPDIC THPOY / NB. (A 2 16) OYUNAGWYH NPEMOE (sic) THPOY “a congregation of people who are all freemen”.

6.1.1.2.2 The possessor exponent in the possessive article (uncommon): (A 2 315) PANOYKAK THPOI / (III 43.26) PUYNEOY THPOY. 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.) NTINW GAB THPOI NTETN-NUHRPE MPOOYEIN / (III 139.21) NTINW THPOI NMEPATE / (P 131# 88 ro) NTK-OYCAPKIKON THPOK.

6.1.1.2.4 Pronominal subject of a Nominal Sentence. Note the conditioned placement. The predicate noun syntagm is indefinite: (Ch. 22.18f.) ZENFANTACIA THPOY NE / (III 217.11) ZENBOA AN TPIE

89 See §6.1.1.1.1 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 1905:52f., 57ff.
THPOY NE vs. (215.10) ZENEBOL AN NE ΖΜΠΚΑΣ ΘΡΟΥΣ: ΖΜΠΚΑΣ interposes between the referent and THPR-; otherwise, the pre-referate placement is constant / (A 2 16) ZOINE THPOY NE; ZOINE is anaphoric to the determinator in the preceding ZENAK "thieves" / (P 130 2 Π) ΟΥΚΡΟΥ ΘΡΗ ΠΕ / (P 130 22 ΦΜΘ) ZENEBOL THPOY NE ΖΜΠΚΑΣ ΝΕΟΝΤΙΜΗ / (RE 10 159b 7) ΟΥΛΙΟΥ ΘΡΗ ΠΕ.

6.1.1.3 Peculiarities of placement 60. THPR- colon-(or sentence)-final: pre-referate: ΖΕΝΑΝΙΠΟΝ ΘΡΟΥ NE (Ch. 32.48f., §6.1.1.2.4) / ΕΙΣΩΝΙΗΣ ΘΡΟΥ ΑΣΩΚ... (III 61-2, sim. ibid. 89.11f.) / ΣΕΝΑΠ ΕΡΟΥ ΖΜΠΚΑΣ ΝΟΥΣΘ ΘΡΟΥ (Ch. 61.5f.) / ΝΕΝΑΤΥΠΘΕΝ ΕΠΕΧΤ ΕΡΟΥ ΘΡΟΥ (P 131 81 ro).

6.1.2 ΖΩΜΑ "INCLUSIVE/SEQUENTIAL CONFRONTATION" ("he too", "he... in his turn", "he, for his part"); the second term is characterized (§6.3).

6.1.2.0.1 Morphological. 1st person sgl. ΖΩ/ΖΩΜΑ, in variation (variant readings in III 168.15). 2nd fem. sgl. ΖΩΜΑ (III 194.16, Or. 157.8). 2nd plr. ΖΩΤ-ΘΡΗ (IV 60.28) is Akhminoid 61 (ΖΩΟΤ-ΘΡΗ in A I 366, collated). 3rd plr. ΖΩΜΟΥ (IV 105.22, collated). ΖΩΤ-ΘΡΗ and ΖΩΜΟΥ are normal.

6.1.2.1 Post-referate placement.

6.1.2.1.1 In cohesion with pronominal referates: immediate post-referate placement.

6.1.2.1.1.1 Referate in verb syntagms: (a) Actor pronoun: (A 1 39) ΑΥΛΑΟΜ ΑΥΛ + ЭМПΗ ΖΩΝ ΖΜΛΝ / (IV 60.27f.) ΚΑΤΑΘΕ ΕΤΟΥΚΗΕ ΜΜΟΣ ΖΑΤΗΝ ΕΤΕΝΑΑΑΚ ΖΩΤΘΙΝΕ / (Ch. 43.22f.) (ΕΚΚΛ ΣΜΟΣ... ΖΕ-...) ΤΝΑΝΟΣ ΖΩΝΤ ΝΤΕΙΖΕ... ΖΕ- / (ibid. 51.2f.) ΣΑΝΑΕΤΕ ΖΗΜΑΝ ΕΤΑΙ, "we too" / (III 19.23f.) ΤΝΑΝΟΣ ΕΡΑΤΗ ΜΠΟΥΤΕ ΣΕΝΑΒΚΗ ΖΟΜΟΥ / (ibid. 24.12f.) ΤΝΗ ΕΙΑΙΕ ΕΝΕΣΗΓΙΑ ΑΥΛ ΤΕΤΤΗΝΗ ΖΩΤΘΙΝΕ. Additional exx.: III 53 passim, 54.2, 64.28-65.3, RE II 115a 8f., etc.

(b) Actor noun-syntagm (determinator); nucleus of relative; demonstrative: (III 63.21ff.) ΕΥΝΕ-ΠΑΛΑ ΜΗΡΟΜ... ΜΗΠΕΙΣ... ΕΙΕ ΑΜΗΣ ΖΩΜΟΥ... ΕΙΝΑΛΕΙ Η ΕΙΝΑΛΜΟΥΣ ΝΑΥ ΝΣΕ / (A 2 491) ΕΡΨΗΝ ΕΤΩΝΗΧ ΔΕ ΤΟΛΕ ΕΠΙΧΟΕ ΣΑΡΕΠΝΟΕΙΣ ΖΩΜΟ ΝΑ ΑΥΛ ΝΤΕΡΙΤΕ... / (IV 105.22) ΑΝΕΤΜΑΤΕ ΜΕΝ ΝΤΟΥ ΖΝΟΥΟΚΟΥΤΝ, ΑΝΑΙ ΖΟΜΟΥ (sic) ΝΤΟΥ ΖΝΟΥΟΚΟΥΤΝ / (A 1 77) ΣΕΝΑΑΛΕΣ ΕΡΟΥ ΕΙΖΟΟΑΣ... ΖΑΝΤΟΥΤΑΛΙ ΚΟΥΙ ΚΟΥΙ ΝΤΟΤΟΥ ΣΕΝ- ΚΟΥΕ ΝΤΕΝΕΤΜΑΑ ΖΟΜΟ ΟΝ ΝΟΚΗ ΕΖΕΝΖΑΛΤ / (III 45.5f.) ΕΥΝΕ-ΠΑΛΑ ΝΕΝΑΙΟΤΙΚΟΣ ΔΕ ΜΗΝΣΕΛΑΝΗ ΖΝΙΡΥ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΝΕΓΙΖ... ΕΙΕ-ΝΖΑΑΛΕ ΖΟΜΟΥ ΕΙΕΡ ΜΠΑΙ ΝΣΑΙ ΝΚΟΝ. Also: III 65.12,16, A I 373-4.

(c) Object pronoun (exposition): (A 2 462) ΝΕΝΑΛΟΝΟΣ ΔΕ ΕΡΟΥ... ΣΑΝΑΙΟΥΣ ΖΟΜΟΥ ΕΡΟΥ / (A 2 358) ΝΕΠΤΑΛΧΜΤΕ ΕΠΑΘΗΤ ΕΙΝΑΛΜΟΥΣ ΕΡΟΥ ΖΩΝ / (III 144.28f.) ΑΥΑΑΤ ΖΩΝΤ ΝΥΜΜΟ ΝΣΑΙ ΝΚΟΝ ΤΝΑΝΟΣ / (IV 108.21) ΠΕΖΑΙ ΓΑΡ ΝΑΙ ΑΥΛ ΝΗΝΤ ΖΩΤΘΙΝΕ ΠΕ / (III 162.9) ΖΝΩ ΣΜΟΣ ΝΗΝΤ ΑΥΛ ΝΑΙ ΖΩΝ ΟΝ / (A 1 16) ...ΕΖΟΥΝ ΕΟΝΥΝ ΝΙΜ ΖΟΜΟΥ ΕΡΟΥ ΖΩΝ.

(d) Post-imperatival ΖΩΜΑ (cf. independent pronoun + ΖΡΗ + imperative, below): ΖΩΜΑ is gender/number characterizing: (P 130 2 132 ΤΣΚ) ΕΙΣΕ ΖΩΤΘΙΝΕ / (IV 86.8) ΕΡΨΗΝΤΕΝΗΣΜΕ ΝΑΜΕ ΧΙΤΗ ΝΣΑΞ ΕΟΥΝ-ΟΥΣΝΑΛΥ, ΣΑΡΕΠΝΟΕΙΣ ΖΡΑ; ΔΤ ΖΩΜΑ ΝΟΥΣΝΟΥΜ / ΝΒ. (Ch. 182.57f.) ΞΟΟΣ ΖΩΜΑ (inclusive 1st person plural, = "1st + 2nd pers.", cf. P 131 4 44 ΠΙΕ: ΚΛ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΝΕΓΙΖ).

6.1.2.1.2 Determinators; π- etc.: (III 17.6) (The empty sealed tomb is full of bones and impurities) ΠΡΙΜΗ ΖΩΜΑ ΕΡ-ΝΟΒΕ... ΖΩΟΥΕΙΤ, ΜΗΝ ΝΗ ΜΘΜΟΚ ΜΜΩΝ ΚΑΘΑΡΤΟΣ / (Cat. 41 ΦΣ) ΟΥΛΙΟΥ ΝΠΟΜΒΕ ΠΕ ΝΑΙ ΝΝΙΟΥΔΑΙ ΖΟΜΟ "for the Jews too". ΖΕΝ-: (A 2 19) ΕΤΒΕΟΥ ΝΥΣΙΕ ΑΝ ΕΡ-ΖΕΝΡΗΜΗ ΝΚΟΥ ΖΟΜΟ...
The possessive exponent of the possessive article or pronoun: (A 2 280) ETBEPOOY U -... AYU ETBEPOOY U YUTHN / (III 97.2) (P2OYU MNP TAYLI MNP HU YUMMMO) PSEEPE DE TOYI MNP AYU-INSW U YUTHN ON / (IV 50.20) YNAACAI MNEUZUB YU OY NNECNH THPOY / (Ch. 186.40f.) (Everyone’s shadow) AYU ON TWIN ZYMN / (A 1 464) NNE TANMUOYU NEBPIEM UYME EUYUOYK, TEKCBW ZYMK MNEKU-AYZK... NAHYIPE EUYUOY (ZYMUC “illogically” modifying TEK-, instead of TEKCBW MNEKU-AYZK).

Independent pronoun (very common): (A 1 61) ANOK AYUM NTOWO YUOY AN- / (P 1305 133 ro) AYU-INSW YAI, ANOK ZYWUT TAYLI-INSW YAI / (III 29.10) (the foal can be bridled and tamed) ANOK DE ZYMN OY PENTNAKOYY / (Ibid. 38.19f.) EUYHE-NTK-ONYIN YOYNAEGOY EAYGBO ZYMNAYOY, ANOK ZYWUT AYU-INSW TAYLI-INSW YAI / (Or. 153-5, passim) EUYU MMUC NAK W PUYME EUYU ANO YU ZYWUT TECZMME... AYU EUZK ANOK NTOWO YAI MATAMOY... / (A 2 382-3) EUYHE-NTWME YAI AN... EINTWN YUTHN YMNHEM NTMW / (A 2 293f.) MNP TAYLI MNEKU-AYZK, ANOK ZYWUT TAYLI-INSW YAI YAI YUNKUKI EMPOYU, ACNOYHE MNEKU-AYZK, ANOK ZYWUT TAYLI-INSW YAI YAI YUNKUKI EMPOYU... AYU EUZK ANOK NTOWO YAI MATAMOY... / (P 1302 1 oz) KOM MNUOEIC MNEKUZK, ANOK ZYWUT TAYLI-INSW YAI YAI YUNKUKI EMPOYU / (A 2 519f.), especially an illuminating example: NAY NEE ANOK EYINAY KNUUZK EUZK, NTOWO YAI MNP TAYLI-INSW EUYU YOYDE ZAROK MAIAYK. 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). Referere: noun syntagm: (A 1 76) NNE ENTATIEAHT NCIEZM ENTAPNOYK HAC NUMMO ERUZK XOOC ZYMN ON YE- / (Ibid. 87) EUYHE-TAYL-INSW... AYU NTETMILAI H NAI P-BOA YUOY EYINAY... / (Ibid. 104) MNEKAI MNOI ENI 2U NEE YTCHUYYE MNOI (even in the present predicament, let alone if God bring down upon me the retribution or malediction of this oath...).

Pre-referate placement (colon-final (intercolary): (a) Following NEE, KATAHE, TAI (TE YE), NTYEZE 68: (A 1 41) POUYU ETEONYTAH EYOUN EPOY NEE ZYWUT MPOUYU ETEONYTAH EYOUN EPOY / (Ibid. 297) (they sinned) NEE ZYWUT ON TENOY ETNP-NOBE / (Wess. 9 162c 15ff., parall. 113.168f.) ...KATAHE ZYWUT (ETEONYTAH POUYU NTYEZE YAI... / (A 2 468) NTYEZE YUTHN YMNTYNTAHE-INSW MPOUYU... TOTE PENTNAKAYMEKAKAIOS / (Borg. 194 15) NTYEZE ZYWUTTUN, W NEEHAI MMNHHAIEMICO, NTYE-NTAYP-PENTNAYMAY LAN. Also III 48.24ff., 150.28, IV 36.1, Ch. 105.6ff., A 1 61, 366, etc. Compare also the recurring, idiomatic (post-referate) NTAYE ZYWUT ON "like me (too)" (e.g. III 10.20, 162.22, 168.15, 171.10, 184.24, P 1301 139 TME etc.).

(b) Following XEKA(A)C 64: (A 2 49) ...XEKAH ZYWUT ZENAZPS NIM EMMAZPS EYNAYZHT / (A 1 461) ...XEKAH ZYWUT MNEOUA YP-2MOT NTOKTH EMZ / (Wess. 9 115b 8ff.) XEKAH ZYWUT TEPPEZHT MTOK. Sim. (P 1301 134 TA) XEKAH ZYWUT TEPPEZHT MTOK. Compare also the recurring XE(KAC) EKNAK/EYHK ZYW NAI EBOA MNAKAY (III 135.28f., A 1 87, P 1301 139 TME). Additional exx.: III 104.9f., IV 7.16, 194.12f., P 1301 133 TA.

62 POCOTSKY 1961:295ff. (= CP 399ff.).
63 POCOTSKY 1961:301, 304ff. (= CP 405, 408ff.). Polotsky treats NEE with other antecedents; in Shenoute, —OE— clearly has a special standing.
(c) Following a (plural, mostly indefinite) predicative noun syntagm, in a Nominal Sentence: (RE II 18a 24f.) ΔΕΝΟΥΔΑΙ ՁՀՅԻՐ ՆԲԲԵ NE / (IV 90.18) ՑԵՆՌԵՎԵՏԲ-ՊՅԽԸՄԵ ZՀՅԻՐ ՆԵ / (A 2 12) ՑԵՆՌԵՎԵՏԲ-
 XI-GOА ZՀՅԻՐ NE / (P 130° 137 ΤΑΗ) ՆԵՉՆՅՈՒ ՁՀՅԻՐ NE. Also: III 31.15f., IV 52.7, 91.5, A 2 511, etc. For
(III 187.12) ՏԱՅ ZՀՅՈՒԹՅԱՆ ԷՐՆԹԱՆՐԵՎԵՏՏԵՏՆՀԶ, see §6.0.3.4.

(d) Miscellaneous cola: Imperatives: (A 2 320) ՊՕՅՈԵՆ IN ՁՀՅՈՒՄ ԵՐԱԶՆԲՅՈՑ (P 131° 30 ΡՄԵ) ԿԱՅԶՍ ZՀՅՈՒՄ (sic) ՆԱԶՆԱՏԱՅՈՒԹՅՈՒՆՆԵՐԻ ԴԱՆՅԱ / (P 130° 24 ΦՆԱ) ԱՐԵԿՈՒՑ ԴԵ ՕՆԵԿ ՄՊՐՈ... ՏԱՅ ՁՀՅՈՒՄ ՄԻՒՍԵԲ ԶՆՏԵՆՏՈԱՆ. Conjugation-forms (+ expansion): (IV 205.18f.) ԴՑՍՅՈՒԹ ՁՀՅՈՒՄ ԵՐԱԶԲԻ ԵՐՆԹԱՆՀ / (ibid. 105.29) ՑԵՆՌԵՎԵՏԲՅՈՒՆ ZՀՅՈՒՄ ՆՄՅԱՅ חבורה. (Pre)modifiers: (A 2 76) ԵՐՆԹԱՆՀ ԵՐԱԶՆԲՅՈՑ ՄՄԱՏԵ ԱՏԱԳԻՄ ՆԱՍԻՆ ՁՀՅՈՒՄՆԵ... ԵՐԱԶՆԲՅՈՒՆՈՒՆՅՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ ZՀՅՈՒՄ ՄԻՊՐԵՏԵՔԱՅՈՒՉԻՆ ՁՀՅՈՒՄ / (Wass. 9 156a 18ff.) ...ԵՐՆԹԱՆՀ ZՀՅՈՒԹՅԱՆ ԷՐՆԹԱՆ ՆԿԻՇԵԵ."  

6.1.2.3 The non-commuting, non-phoric ՁՀՅՈՒՄ: a "particle", exponent of interclausal cohesion 66: "on the contrary", "on the other hand", "rather", "actually". The "particle" ZՀՅՈՒՄ can be distinguished from the phoric (within clause extent) ZՀՅՈՒՄ in the 3rd person sgl. masculine by criteria of contextual semantics: it is often adverbal, and as a rule not inclusive; by its prevalence in certain configurations (mostly interrogative): (A 1 113, A 2 298) ԵՐՆԹԱՆՀ ՁՀՅՈՒՄ / (III 107.3) ԶԻԹՆԻՄ ՁՀՅՈՒՄ / ՆԻՐ ZՀՅՈՒՄ ՊԵՏԱ- (RE 10 164a 2f., Young ir, etc.) / (RE 11 15b 1) ՕՍ YՀՅՈՒՄ ՊԵՊԱԿԱԶ; of course, also by the significant absence of concord (Polotsky 1961:304 n. 2 = CP 408): (III 161.13) ՆԵ ZՀՅՈՒՄ ՆԶՐՈՒՄՆԱ- ԱՆՈԱՆԵ / (ibid. 163.19f.) ԱՆՊԱՄԱՐՏԱՆԻ ԱՅԿԱՐԵԻ ZՀՅՈՒՄ ՄՅՈՒՆՅՈՆ / (ibid. 51.20) ՔՅՈՒՄ YՀՅՈՒՄ ԿԵՆԱՅ ԵԶԻՆԹ / (ibid. 56.10) (the deviation and evil of the Jewish congregation) ՄՆՈՒԱՅՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ ZՀՅՈՒՄ ՄԹԱ / (i.e. of the Christian one) / (ibid. 202.18f.) ԵՐՆԹԱՆՀ ... ԵՐՆԹԱՆԻՄ-ՆՈԲԷ ZՀՅՈՒՄ. Nevertheless, there is considerable overlapping between the augent, sequential ("... in his turn") and non-commutable ZՀՅՈՒՄ. In many instances, the opposition between the macro-syntactic signal (interclausal relator, "anaphoric-regressive conjunct", referring in a sense to the whole preceding context as to a nucleus) and its augential, 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.) ՕՆԵԿ ZՀՅՈՒՄ ԱՅՍ ՕՏԱՑԵԻԱՆԵ ՊԵ / (ibid. 77.41ff.) (ՊԱՅԱԽԱՆԵ ՊԵՆՈՅՔ...) ՊԱՐԻՄԱՍ ZՀՅՈՒՄ ՊԵ ՆԵ- / (III 52.7) ՊՆՈՈՒ ԵՄԱՐՇԱՐԱՄ ՄՅՈՒՆՅՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ ZՀՅՈՒՄ / (A 1 162) ՊԵՏԵՊՈՒՄԻՇՄԵՄԻԵՔ ԷՐԶՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ ԶՆԵԶՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ ՊԵ.  

6.1.3 [NTO-]: "Non-inclusive (often exclusive) non-sequential symmetric confrontation" ("he, for one", "he insofar as he is concerned", "he, however" 68) 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) ԵՐՆԹԱՆՀ ZՀՅՈՒՄ ԵՆՐԻՄԵ NՊԻԱՆԻ ԵՐԵՊԻՄԵ NԹՕ / (ibid. 267) (they say what they do not know will or will not


67 Cf. Amélineau, Schenoudi II p. xciii (on "МАՏԱԶՄՈԿ ՄԱՐՏԱԶՄՈԿ ԱՆՈԿ"). "Cette tournure de phrase est assez souvent employée par Schenoudi, et c'est une manière de parler tout à fait primitive: les deux personnes y sont toujours opposées l'une à l'autre au sens contraire" (my italics). As a matter of fact, the actual semantics depend on contextual factors, the address tone and interpersonal environment. This is especially striking in the case of the post-imperatival ntok (see below).

68 This is the "Verstärker" par excellence (Schwarze-Stinthall 466 "Verstärkung"; Stern §255 "Hervorhebung"; Czermak 1931 "dynamisch gestärkt", and so on). Here is indeed the nearest thing to bona fide reinforcement, or better insistance, since here a true pronoun — prosodically marked as modifier — corroborates another. For pre-Coptic, cf. Hintze 1952: 290f. ("pronominale Hervorhebung"). (Incidentally, in LE — gr ntf (etc.) [Ermann 1933:§682] "he too" is a striking clause-final construction of this augen. — 175 —
happen) ΤΝΑΤΑΜΙΟ ΕΠΕΚΣΕΟΥΝ ΑΝΟΚ ΕΡΩΤ (sim. ibid. 382, 521, III 128.19ff., a recurring expression) / (ibid. 292) ΜΗ ΑΔΑΜ ΖΥΝ ΥΠΑΥ ΥΖΕ-ΑΚΩΤΜ ΝΚΑΠΕΟΥΝ ΝΤΕΚΕΣΙΜΕ, Η ΑΣΤΖΥΝ ΝΤΟΟΥ ΥΖΕ-ΑΚΩΤΜ ΝΚΑΠΕΟΥΝ ΜΠΟΥ / (ibid. 153) ΝΤΑΝΙΜ ΡΟΥΜΕ Π-ΥΚΑΙΟΤ ΕΝΕΣ ΕΤΕΝΠΑ ΜΗΠΙ ΥΖΕ-ΕΝΑΙΕΠΕ ΑΝΟΚ / (ibid. 374) ΟΥΙ ΝΑΝ ΥΖΕ-ΑΝΑΜΕΛΕΙ, ΕΝΑΙΑΤΟΥ ΝΤΟΟΥ ΝΕΤΟΥΑΛ ΥΨΟΥ / (P 130 6 ΝΠ-ΠΗ) ΕΡΕΟΤΤΙ ΝΤΟ ΕΝΙΜ... ΜΗ ΕΡΕΟΤΤΙ ΝΤΟ ΕΤΑΙ... Η ΕΡΕΟΤΒΕ ΝΤΟ ΕΤΑΙ... ΜΗ ΕΝΕΟΥ ΝΤΟ ΕΤΑΙ... / (III 21.9ff.) ΕΥΧΕ-ΜΠΕΟΥΝΤ ΥΖΑ- ΠΟΟΥ, ΑΙΟΥΜΕ ΑΝΟΚ / NB., in text-initial position (III 44.18) ΘΕΙΜΟΟΤ ΑΝΟΚ 2ΩΝΟΥΤΟΟΥ / (ibid. 208.5) ΘΕ ΑΙΝΑΥ ΑΝΟΚ ΕΟΥΑ / (A 1 122) ΕΠΕΚΣΕΟΥΝ ΤΗΝ ΥΖΕΙΤΕ ΤΗΝ ΥΖΕΙΤΕ ΤΗΝ ΥΖΕΙΤΕ ΑΝΟΚ ΥΖΕ- / (Cat. 42.32) God said: ΜΑΡΝΤΑΜΙΟ ΝΟΥΡΤΗΜΕ, and not: ΤΝΑΤΑΜΙΟ ΑΝΟΚ / (III 156.16) (those who curse their neighbours) ΕΥΧΕΙΝ ΝΤΟΟΥ ΥΖΕΟΥΟΥΡΤ. Additional exx.: IV 38.21, Wess. 9 95a 20ff., RE 10 163a 27, Ch. 117.8, 156.1ff., 183.57f., A 1 123, A 2 18, 78, P 130 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-imperatival [ΝΤΟ*], more patently than in the case of other augenta, 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 *extraposed independent pronoun* (§6.1.3.3) 88. (P 130 35 PMF) ΚΩ ΝΕΟΥ ΝΤΟ ΜΠΑΦΑΙΑΕ / (Cat. 42.33) God said: ΜΑΡΝΤΑΜΙΟ ΝΟΥΡΤΗΜΕ, not: ΤΝΑΤΙΟ ΝΤΟΚ / (III 88.11, 141f.) ΜΠΡ ΣΩΤΕ ΝΤΘΝ, ΜΠΡΤΕΤΑΝΑΚΡΙΝΕ ΜΝΟΟΥ ΝΤΘΝ / (ibid. 145.10) ΜΠΡΕ- ΚΑΚΕΙ ΝΤΘΝ / (IV 86.8f.) ΖΚΟ ΝΤΟΚ ΑΝΑΣΤΕ ΝΤΟΚ ΕΤΜΠΟΡΤΚΕ ΕΒΟΑ / (ibid. 189.3) ΥΗΠΕ ΝΤΟΚ ΡΜΠΣΤΟΣ ΕΚ- ΟΥΑΛ / (A 1 78) ΝΑΣΙ Χ ΝΤΟΚ... ΝΑΤ+ Η + ΝΤΟΚ.

6.1.3.1.2 The referate: *expansion suffix-pronoun* (no "direct object"): (IV 119.20ff., also 120.4, P 130 61 or) ΓΑΘΗΝ Η ΓΑΘΝΥΝΤΗΝ ΝΤΘΝ, a recurring expression / (P 131 23 ro-vo) (if God did not spare the ancients), ΕΙΕ ΕΙΝΑΤ+ ΚΟ ΕΡΟΝ ΑΝΟΚ... / (Ch. 57.44ff.) Η ΕΡΕΚΑΝΝΤΥΑΜΕ ΖΗΝ ΕΡΟΝ ΑΝΟΚ', — note the punctuation / (Wess. 9 147d 28f.) ΟΥ ΕΡΟΝ ΝΤΟΚ ΝΕ ΥΘΕ... 6.1.3.1.3 The referate: *possessor exponent* in the possessive-pronoun syntagm: (A 1 69) ΠΑΝΤΩΣ ΜΠΕΝΕΟΥΑΣΕ Ρ-ΦΑΙ ΝΕ, Η ΜΠΕΝ Ρ-ΦΑΙ ΝΑΚ ΝΤΟ, sim. (A 1 122) ΜΠΗΣΕΡΑΤΧΕ ΕΧΚΜΗ ΝΤΟ your temple, vs. the old Temple / (IV 207.6ff.) ΝΑ-ΝΕΤΙΟΝΣ ΜΑΑΣΑΕ ΝΕ... ΝΑ-ΝΕΤΜΟΟΥΤ ΑΝ ΝΤΟΟΥ ΝΕ. In the two last constructions, the incidence of [ΝΤΟ*] is remarkably rarer than for ψΩΜ*. So too, in the case of the next one.

6.1.3.1.4 The referate: *noun syntagm* (in extraposition): (III 109.19ff.) ΝΕΙΑΤΥΠ-ΣΜΟΤ ΔΕ ΝΤΟΟΥ ΑΥΣ ΝΕΙΑΤΜΠΙΑ ΜΠΕΝΤΑΑΣ ΝΑΥ ΕΕΙΜΕ ΕΜΜΥΤΗΡΙΟΝ.

6.1.3.1.5 The referate: *pronominal subject of interrogative Nominal Sentence* (see also §6.1.3.2), interlocutively only? ΝΤΚ-ΝΙΜ ΝΤΟΚ (Cat. 42.14, 43.8) / ΝΤΚ-ΟΥΟΥ ΝΤΟΚ (A 1 210). The augens appears to be here a rhetoric marker (no answer expected).

6.1.3.2 *Pre-referate placement* 89: [ΝΤΟ*] colon-second or intercolary. (a) Following ΝΟΕ: (A 2 307) ΝΟΕ ΝΤΟΚ ΕΤΚΚΟΟΥΝ / (IV 112.19) ΝΟΕ ΑΝΟΚ ΝΤΑΙΕΜΕ / (Ch. 144.2f.) ΝΟΕ ΝΤΟΚ ΕΤΣΧΩ ΜΜΟΣ.

(b) Following the focus modifier in interrogative (focus-initial) focalization patterns (§2.6): (A 2 519) ΝΑΥ ΝΕ ΑΝΟΚ ΕΝΑΙΕΡΕ ΝΟΥΣΠ ΕΧΣΗΚ / (ibid. 11) ΕΤΕΒΟΥ ΝΤΟΟΥ ΟΥΙ ΝΑΥ ΑΝ / (P 130 24 ΡΠΑ) ΕΤΕΒΟΥ ΑΝΟΝ ΝΤΟΟΥΨ ΑΝ ΕΞΟΕΚ / (Ch. 169.7f.) ΝΑΥ ΝΕ ΝΤΟΟΥ ΕΥΝΑΠ-ΒΟΛ,..., vs. ΝΑΥ ΝΕ ΕΥΝΑΠ-ΒΟΛ ΝΤΟΟΥ, e.g. III 75.12. See §6.1.3.3 on the augens: *extraposed indep. pronoun* issue.

88 Cf. the post-imperatival dependent pronoun in Middle Egyptian (GARDINER §337) and of course comparable constructions in numerous old and modern languages.

89 POLOTSKY 1961:310ff. (= CP 414 ff.).
The referate: 3rd person pronominal subject in the Nominal Sentence: (A 1 108) ΠΑΓΕ ΠΑΓΕ ΝΤΟΥ ΝΕ. (d) Following various predications (augens or extrapoosed pronoun?): (Ch. 90.8ff.) ΖΩΕ ΕΥΘΕ-ΝΤΟΥ ΝΕ ΑΝΩΝ ΖΜΕΝΟΝΕΡΕ ΜΜΟΥ / (A 1 61) ΜΝΣΤΟΡ ΝΤΟΥ ΕΠΟΥ / (A 1 113) ΕΒΟΑ ΧΕ-ΜΝΣΑΝ ΕΠΑΙ / Η ΧΕ-ΜΝΣΑΝ ΝΤΟΥ ΕΝΣΤΜΜΑΤ.

6.1.3.3 [ΝΤΟ-]: augens vs. independent pronoun, extrapoosed. 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 [ΝΤΟ-], 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 colon, occurs as an expansion — an apposed nominal lexeme, lexicalizing suffix-pronouns). Two especially striking such cases are the appositive phrases ‘indep. pron. + noun’ and ‘indep. pron. + ΑΥΘ/ΜΝ + noun/indep. pron.’. In the former we find (a) the pronoun serving to introduce a nominal apposition — in complementary distribution with ΝΕΡ: the interlocutive persons are here prevalent, ‘ΝΤΟΥ + noun’ being uncommon; (b) ‘ΝΤΟΚ + vocative noun’. For the latter, we find naturally only interlocutive persons. Both cola tend to be sentence-final. Polotsky’s “rule of thumb” accordingly, to which an augential [ΝΤΟ-] 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 ($\S$6.0.3), it is questionable whether this distinction is really so tangible. It may imply no more than the variability of the prosodic contour of ΝΑΥ ΝΣΕ. Incidentally, I find in Shenoute no clear instance of ΝΑΥ ΝΤΟΥ ΝΣΕ — (augens), while we do find some of ΝΑΥ ΝΣΕ ΝΤΟΥ with ΝΤΟΥ, the invariable “particle” ($\S$3.1.3.4), evidently enclitic. It is of course not to be taken for granted that [ΝΤΟ-] and ΝΤΟΥ share the same prosodic properties.

Examples: (a) ‘indep. pron. + noun’: (P 130$^1$ 136 ΤΑΕ) ΕΝΤΕΛΗΝΟΥΡ ΑΝΩΝ ΝΕΙΑΣΤΟΤ ΑΝΩΝ ΝΕΙΑΣΤΟΤ / (P 131$^6$ 36 ΣΜΒ) ΠΑΙ ΝΤΑΧΙΛ ΚΑΡΕ ΕΤΕΒΝΗΝ ΑΝΩΝ ΝΕΙΑΣΤΟΤ (sic) / (A 1 74) ΝΗΝΠΙ ΑΝΗ ΝΤΕΙΝ ΑΝΗ ΝΤΟΥ ΤΣΥΝΑΓΩΓΗ / (III 137.25) ...Η ΕΙΣΑΜΑΚΟΝ ΑΝΟΚ ΠΙΕΒΙΝΗ / (ibid. 13.13ff.) ΠΑΕΒΙΝΗ (i.e. “my humble person”) ΑΥΘ ΝΕΒΕΒΙΝΗ ΖΙΟΥΜΠ ΑΝΟΝ-ΝΕΚΜΑΛΑ ΝΕΧΝΗ / (Ch. 56.29ff.) ΠΑΝΤΩΚ ΟΥΝΤΑΝ-ΤΕΝΟΡΕΣ ΖΙΟΥΝ ΑΝΩΝ ΜΜΟΝΑΧΟ ΑΥΘ ΝΟΥΗΝΗ (note the colon-boundary punctuation; also that ΖΙΟΥΝ and the augens [ΝΤΟ-] are not attested as compatible) / (III 60.4ff.) ΧΕΘ ΓΑΡ ΜΜΟΚ ΝΤΟΥ ΠΝΟΕΙ ΧΕ- ΑΔ. Additional exx.: III 68.9, 70.17ff., 96.9ff., 134.25, A 2 31, etc.

(b) ‘ΝΤΟΚ + voc. noun’: (III 47.4ff.) ΔΙΚΑΙΩΣΕ ΕΥΜΟΤΕ ΜΜΒΝ… ΝΤΕΙΝ Ν ΝΣΑΙΠΕΤΙΚΟΣ.

(c) ‘indep. pron. + ΑΥΘ/ΜΝ + indep. pron./noun’: (III 185.6ff.) ΑΝΩΝ ΖΙΟΥΜΚΑΣ ΝΖΗΤ ΑΝΩΝ ΑΥΘ ΝΤΕΙΝ / (A 1 131) ΤΣΚ ΝΖΗΤ ΝΤΟΚ ΑΥΘ ΝΤΕΙΝ / (ibid. 71) ΕΝΑΝΤΗ ΠΡΟΟΥΣ ΜΝΕΙΣΒ ΝΟΥΤ ΜΝΕΝΕΡΡΗ ΝΑΥ ΝΣΕ ΑΝΩΝ ΑΥΘ ΝΤΟ / (IV 38.17f.) ΕΤΕΒΝΗΝ ΠΑΕΙΝ ΕΝ ΝΔΙΝΟΝ ΝΤΟΚ ΑΥΘ ΝΤΟΚ / (Ch. 159-160) ΑΛΛΑ ΖΝΝΕΝΚΕΙΝ ΟΝ ΑΝΩΝ ΜΝΕΝΕΡΡΗ ΑΥΘ ΝΕΝΙΟΤΕ / (ibid. 42.14ff.) ΖΕΝΝΕΒΕ ΝΑΙ ΕΤΚΟ ΝΟΥΓΕΙΕ ΕΠΟΥ… ΝΤΟΚ ΜΝΕΝΕΙΝΕ ΜΜΟΚ / (III 37.12ff.) ΩΥΜΟΥ ΝΑΥ ΝΑΙΗΣ ΝΤΕΖΙΟΥΝ ΑΝΩΝ ΜΝΕΝΕΙΟΤΕ ΜΝΕΝΕΡΡΗ… / (ibid.

70 Polotsky 1961:295 (= CP 399), 309f. (= CP 413f.), 311 (= CP 415) n. 2.
71 In Brøndal's term (1943:103), [ΝΤΟ-] is the “forme substantielle” of the pronoun, vs. the “formes fonctionnelles” [-4], [-4'], [-4T'], [-4E] and the augens (modifier pronoun) [ΝΤΟ-].
72 Czermak 1931:§259.
73 1961:§17.
157.2) ...ΑΥΘ ΝΤΑΤΜΕΙΜΕ ΑΝΟΚ ΟΥΤΕΝΑΛΛΟ ΟΥΤΕ ΝΙΑΛΛΟ... Cases like (ΗΗ 88.11f.) ΕΙΓΕΝΗΤΙΕ ΑΝΟΚ + + ΟΥΒΕ- or (ibid. 36.24f.) ΥΑΝΤΕΟΥ... ΥΑΝΕ ΑΝΟΚ ΜΝΕ- are ambiguous, as are in my opinion ΝΑΥ ΝΕΣ ΝΤΟΥ (etc., §6.1.3.2).

### 6.1.3.4 Non-commuting (non-phoric) ΝΤΟΥ is a “particle” ⁷⁴, an inter-clausal relator, often (like ΤΕΛΗ, §6.1.2.3) accompanied by ΑΛΑΛΑ or ΔΕ. Indeed, its synchronic relation to the commuting (i.e. analyzable) augens [ΝΤΟΥ] is analogous to that of the particle ΤΕΛΗ to the augens ΤΕΛΗ-.

On the formal level, this is a case of “freezing” or fossilization of the pronoun component, which is the cohesion (within-clause-range) 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 discard). 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 discordes and sometimes by placement: (A I 123) ΟΥΘΠΕΡΕΝΕ ΝΤΟΥ... ...ΕΜΑΧ- (A 2 540) ΝΑΥ ΝΕΣ ΝΤΟΥ... ...ΝΕΤΑΝΑΛΕ ΕΤΒΗΝΤΟΥ... ΕΜΑΧ- ΑΕ ΕΡΟΟΥ (also ΗΗ 153.10; ΝΑΥ ΝΤΟΥ ΝΕΣ IV 195.2; in A 1295 ΝΑΥ ΝΤΟΥ ΝΕΣ ΜΙΝΕΑΛΟΥ ΝΤΕΝΗ-ΝΟΥΣ ΝΑΥ ΑΝ ΝΤΟΥ, the augens (post-referente) and particle occur in one clause? ) / (Rossi 23 27) ΑΛΑΛΑ ΕΥΡΙΚΕΣΟΙ ΝΑΥ ΝΤΟΥ ΝΟΥΚΡΙΜΑ / (ΗΗ 174-5 passim) ΟΥΝΕ ΑΕ ΝΑΝ ΝΤΟΥ | ΕΜΑΧ—, a recurring expression / (ibid. 76.15f.) ΠΚΑΙΡΟΣ ΕΤΟΥΜΕΕΥΕ ΝΤΟΥ ΕΠΑΙ ΕΤΕΑΛΕ ΑΕ-.

Note the following indicative cases of the particle in construction with other elements: ΑΥΘ ΝΤΟΥ, Η ΝΤΟΥ “and” and “or” and the like: ΗΗ 32.1. 62.26, IV 80.20, 206.28, 207.25f. et al. (contrast with ΚΕΟΥΑ ΝΤΟΥ, IV 46.29); — ΌΝ ΝΤΟΥ “at least”, 93.24; — ΔΕ ΝΤΟΥ is of course ubiquitous (e.g. ΗΗ 145. 13); ΕΒΟΛ ΑΕ ΑΕ-... ΑΛΑΛΑ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΤΟΥ ΑΕ-... ΗΗ 19.8, 186.5, A I 71, P 130 139 ΤΜΕ, 130 Τ ΤΑΟ ΤΑΟ and others; — ΑΝ ΝΤΟΥ in rhetorical questions, A I 125, 152, Wess. 9 106a 11ff. Consider also the following striking instances of the particle: (ΗΗ 192.19f.) (ΜΠΡΧΟΟΣ ΢Ν ΤΕΙΕΠΙΣΟΛΑ ΑΕ-) ΑΛΑΛΑ ΥΜ ΜΙΟΑ ΝΤΟΥ ΑΕ- / (IV 12.10f.) (ΜΠΡΧ- ΜΕ ΑΝ ΠΕΤΚΤΟ ΜΙΟΑ...) ΝΤΟΥ ΝΤΟΥ ΠΕΤΚΤΟ ΜΠΡΧΕ / (ibid. 13.9) (this is not the occasion to discuss these things) ΑΛΑΛΑ ΥΜ ΝΤΟΥ ΝΟΥΜΕΡΟΣ / (ibid. 15.5) (not in order to slay sinner and innocent alike) ΑΛΑΛΑ ΕΤΕΓΕΝ ΝΤΟΥ ΝΚΨΑΝΤΥΡ-ΝΟΒΕ ΕΤΟΟΤ ΜΠΙΑ...ΚΒΑ / (ibid. 16.18f.) ΨΑΙΞΟΟΙΤΑΝ ΑΝ ΖΗΝΖΕΝΚΟΟΥΕ, ΑΛΑΛΑ ΕΨΑΙΧΕΡ- ΧΙΕ ΝΙΝ ΝΤΟΥ / ΕΒΟΛ ΖΙΟΟΤΤΗ / (ibid. 157.21f.) ΑΝΤΡΕΤΨΗΡΕΚ (sic) ΜΠΙΕΝΘΗ... ΝΤΑΥΤΨΗΕ ΜΙΟΑ ΝΤΟΥ / (ΗΗ 165.19) ΕΙΜΕ ΝΤΟΥ | Υ ΠΡΙΜΕ ΝΑΤΣΤΥΜ: post-imperatival particle (“doch”, “done”, with an additional “rest” prosodic signalling role?). The augens/particle are variant readings in (IV 103.1) ΕΝΤΨΡΝ ΜΙΟΟΥ ΑΝ, ΕΤΨΡΝ ΜΙΟΝ ΝΤΟΥ/ΝΤΟΥ.

### 6.1.4 ΜΑΥΑΛ- : MMN MOO-, OYΑΛ-

#### 6.1.4.1 ΜΑΥΑΛ-: Polemic, contrastive, exclusive, (less usually) reflexive modification: “... alone”, “only”, “... (him)self- (by [his] own agency, with no one’s intervention)” ⁷⁸ (μόνος/ μόνον, έμ-/σε-/εαυτού, κατ' ιδιον).

---


⁷⁵ Compare §5.1.2 above.

⁷⁶ Cf. the illuminating parallel in Old and Middle Egyptian, namely r.f, r.k, r.t... the analyzable augens and modifier, where r- is the modification, and f the cohesion exponent, vs. jffjff (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-range 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 ΝΕΣ ΠΩΜΑ Ν ΠΡΙΜΕ ΤΗΡΑ ΝΑΜΙΝ... ΝΑΥ ΝΕΣ ΝΤΟΚ ΕΚΝΑΡ-ΨΑΥ...

---

⁷⁸ Stern §257, Schwarze-Steinthal 345f., 468 (“allein” → “selbst”).
6.1.4.1.0.1 1st sgl. ΜΑΥΑΑΤ, 2nd sgl. fem. ΜΑΥΑΑΤΕ. Two fluctuating bases, ΜΑΥΑΑ = (with all persons, sgl. and plural) and ΜΑΥΑ(Α)Τ = (all plural persons, but also 3rd sgl. masc. and fem.; 2nd plur. ΜΑΥΑ(Α)Τ-ΤΗΝΤΗΝ); acc. to Dict. 198a, ΜΑΥΑΤ = is Shenoutean.

6.1.4.1.1 ΜΑΥΑΑ = in cohesion with a verb syntagm (or verb lexeme). (a) With a single pronominal referate (NB. This construction is not attested with ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΟ). “adverbal”. Reflexive: (Ch. 71.6ff.) ΟΥ ΠΕΝΗΜΑ=ΖΥΗ ΜΜΟ... ΝΑΤΡΑ=ΖΕ ΜΑΥΑΑΤ / (ibid. 132.15ff.) ΝΚΕΜΕΙΝΟ ΝΝΤΑΣΟΥΝΟΥ ΜΑΥΑΑΤ. “Only” : (A 2 429, not Sh.) ΖΖ ΕΠΕΤΕΥΘΕ ΠΕ ΚΑΤΑΠΣΗΝΤΕ ΕΤΡΑΙΜΟΥ ΜΑΥΑΑΤ ΝΙΓΝΙΠΠΗΝΟΣ / (III 109.16) (ΤΕΤΣΒΗ ΜΜΕ) ΤΑΙ ΝΤΑΣΟΥΝΟΥ ΜΑΥΑΑΤ ΝΔΙΟΝ ΕΡΟΥΝ ΝΓΕΝΙΝΤΑΤΑΣ ΝΑΥ ΕΕΙΜΕ... Non-reflexive, “alone”, “on one’s own”, “by oneself (also = with no outside help)”: (RE 10 163a 36f.) ΝΗΤΕΓΕΤ ΜΑΥΑΑΤ (cf. IV 91.22 ΠΕΤΟΥΟ=ΚΤ ΜΑΥΑΑΤ, 156b, etc.) / (III 159.12) ...ΕΥΜΟΟΕ ΜΑΥΑΑΤ / (RE 10 164b 31f.) ΕΝΕΝΑΛΛΝΟΥΤΕ ΟΥΣΣΥ ΕΤΡΑΙΜΟΥ ΜΑΥΑΑΤ, opp. to line 33 ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΠΕΝΤΑΜΜΟΟΤΥΤ; cf. ΑΥΜΟΟΤΓ ΜΑΥΑΑΤ III 97.19, 204.10 etc. / (IV 161.19) ΝΝΕΡΝΟΜΕ ΤΗ=ΠΚΨΟΤΕ ΜΑΥΑΑΤ / (ibid. 103.15f.) ΝΝΕΥΚΑΑΤ ΜΑΥΑΑΤ / (A 2 31) ΕΝΕΝΑΛΛΝΟΥΤΕ ΜΑΥΑΑΤ “had we alone been pure”. More exx.: IV 107.26, 157.28, A 1 135, A 2 110 (ΝΤΕΤΣΒΗΝΕ ΑΝ ΜΑΥΑΑΤ ΤΗΝ “you are not ashamed of yourselves”), 535, etc.

(b) With a double (identical) referate; here the overlapping with ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΟ = is more in evidence. Reflexive (contrastive, often “with no outside help”): (P 130 54 ΤΙΑ) ΜΑΡΝΗ=ΚΣΒΗΝ ΜΑΥΑΑΤ / (A 2 190) Η ΕΡΕΙΣΖΑΝΝΗΣ ΝΛΑΡΝΗ ΜΜΟ=ΟΥ ΜΑΥΑΑΤ / (Miss. 284) ...ΕΟΥΑΕ=ΚΣΟΥΤΥ ΜΑΥΑΑΤ (also A 2 93, 509) / (A 2 70) ΑΛΙΟΥΘΝΟΥ ΜΑΥΑΑΤ / (ibid. 398) ΕΚΕΙΡΕ ΜΜΟΚ ΜΑΥΑΑΤ ΝΤΑΛΑΙΝΠΟΡΟΣ / (A 2 501, 503) ΜΝΡΝΠΣΕΝΕ ΕΚΕΙΡΕ ΜΜΟΚ ΝΕΙΚΑΙΟΣ ΜΑΥΑΑΤ/ΝΝΤΥΝΤΗΣΤΑ ΜΜΟ=ΟΥ ΜΑΥΑΑΤ ΖΖ ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣ/ΕΤΩΝΜΟI ΜΜΟ=Κ ΜΑΥΑΑΤ ΖΖ ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣ / (RE 10 164a 27f.) ...ΕΝΤ ΜΜΟΝ ΕΣΡΑΙ ΕΠΙΝΟΕ ΜΑΥΑΑΤ / (Cl. Pr. 2f b b ro) ΠΕΥΤΖΙΟ ΕΤΡΕΠΟΥΑ ΠΟΥΑ ΑΠΟ ΜΜΟ=Κ ΝΗΤΖ ΜΑΥΑΑΤ / (III 35.20 parall. Ch. 130.30ff.) ΕΙΤΑΙΟ ΑΝ ΜΜΟΙ ΜΑΥΑΑΤ / (A 2 510) ΝΕΤΟΥΝΟΥ ΕΡΟΥΝ ΜΑΥΑΑΤ / (ibid. 529) ...ΕΥΜΟΟΕ ΕΙΝΨΑΕ ΝΝΜΙΛΑ ΜΑΥΑΑΤ / (ibid. 384) ΑΝΟΝ ΝΕΠΙΝΗΤ ΝΚΨΗ ΜΑΥΑΑΤ; note the recurring expression “ΤΜΩΝΤΡΩΧΑ-ΣΤΗΝ= 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 ΜΑΥΑΑ = in cohesion with a pronoun/pronoun syntagm, mostly as a co-coordinating modifier referring to the predicate of a Nominal Sentence/Cleft Sentence:

(a) Referate: η-, demonstrative, proper noun: (A 2 298) ΚΑΙΓΑΡ ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΑΝ ΜΑΥΑΑ=... ΠΕΤΟ ΜΝΤΡΕ / (ibid. 32) ΣΘΗΚ ΠΙΟΥΜΑΙΟΥ ΜΑΥΑΑ= ΑΝ ΠΕΝΤΑΧΜΕΡΕ-ΝΗΛΑΖΕ... / (A 1 250) ΤΜΣΑΣΤΣΗΤΝ ΜΑΥΑΑΣ ΤΕ (scil. ΤΕΤΣΟΟΝ ΜΠΑΝΙΜΝ ΕΤΤΜΑΤ) / (ibid. 251) ΝΑΙ ΔΕ ΜΑΥΑΑ ΑΝ ΝΗΤΜΜΑΑ / (Ryl. Cat. 32 No. 67 ΤΗΘ) ΝΤΟΚ ΠΕ ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΜΜΕ ΜΑΥΑΑ=: # subject-copula-predicate #: “you are the only true God” (perhaps a solemn pro-/acclamatory [‘‘anacletic’’] “theological” Nominal Sentence pattern [the εγώ ειμί, σο ο type], with both terms of equal informative weight; is ΝΤΟΚ the referate? see (d) below with more exx.); compare the recurring πΝΟΥΤΕ ΜΜΕ ΜΑΥΑΑ= (Wess. 9 161b 10f., A 2 547, P 1316 105 ro), ΜΕ ΜΑΥΑΑ= “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 ΜΑΥΑΑ= ΠΝΟΥΤΕ (P 130 35 ro) / (IV 184.8) ΤΣΥΝΑΓΩΓΗ ΝΝΙΟΥΝΑΙ ΜΑΥΑΑ= (and not ours) / NB. (A 2 354) ΝΑ-ΝΕΤΛΝΠΑ ΜΑΥΑΑ= ΝΕ, sim. (ΤΑ-ΝΕΤΛΝΠΑ ΜΑΥΑΑΣΟΥ) A 1 193. More exx.: Ch. 95.11ff., Wess. 9 143a 9f., A 2 489, 503, etc. Note here the striking prevalence of adjunctive negation (“not only...”, see §6.1.4.1.4), and the very common and typically Shenoutean εΓΗΤΗΕ-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 ΥΑΤΗΝ- ΜΑΥΑΑ- (ibid. 18.51f.).

(b) Referate: ΟΥ=ΖΕΘ- “only...”, “a mere...”; again, usually referring to the predicate of a Nom. Sentence/Cleft Sentence: (A 2 167) ΟΥΝΑ ΜΑΥΑΑ= ΠΕΤΩΜΠΕΣΖΗΤ / (ibid. 408) ΟΥΡΑΝ ΜΑΥΑΑ= ΠΕΤΕΝΤΝΑΓΟ
\[\text{Mмоj} \, \text{"a name, no more"} \, - \, \text{"Пно�те нтпе"} / (ibid. 303) \text{ΙΝΕΣΕΝΥΗΡΕ ΥΗΗ ΜΑΥΑΑΥ, ΝΕΟΥΚΟΥΙ ΝΝΟΓ-ΝΕΗ ΠΕ / (III 212.14f.) ΖΕΝΒΑΛΕ ΝΖΟΟΥΤ ΜΝΖΟΟΥΤ ΆΝ ΜΑΥΑΑΥ ΝΕΤΜΟΟΩΕ... / (Ch. 196.32f.) ΟΤΥΡΕ ΜΝΝΕΥΜΑΤΙΚΟΝ ΑΥΗ ΟΤΥΡΕ ΆΝ ΝΚΥΜΑΤΙΚΟΝ ΜΑΥΑΣ / (IV 107.7f.) ΟΤΥΡΟΟΥΤ ΆΝ ΜΑΥΑΑΣ, ΑΛΛΑ ΖΕΝΣΙΟΜΕ ΟΝ.}

(c) Referate: the possessor exponent in the possessive article; unlike \text{ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΟ-}, not only with a double identical referate. This construction, much rarer than that with \text{ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΟ-}, seems to be restricted to inalienable nouns (see §1.2.1.1 spec. obs. 1). \text{ΝΕΝΤΩΡ ΜΑΥΑΑΝ (A 2 143) / ΝΕΤΟΥΥΜ ΝΝΕΥΚΑΡΕ ΜΑΥΑΑΣ (A 1 239) / (ΞΙ-Μ/ΜΑΙ-)ΝΕΨΜΟΝ ΜΑΥΑΑΣ (etc.), a recurring expression (III 127.15, IV 153.13f., 172.21, P 130\textsuperscript{2} 2 Π ΟΥΜΑΙΝΗΜΟΝ ΜΑΥΑΑΣ ΠΕ ΑΥΗ ΟΥΜΑΙΝΗΜΟΝ ΆΝ ΠΕ ΜΝΗΣΙΟΥΜ) / ΤΗΥΟΥΧ ΜΑΥΑΑΣ (IV 165.10, Ch. 56.51f., III 193.22, Wess. 9 145d 17f., 171c 31f.) / ΝΕΤΑΚΟ ΜΑΥΑΑΣ (Ch. 73.11f., Wess. 9 171b 30f., P 130\textsuperscript{2} 141 Ρ) / ΝΕΚΜΕΕΥ ΜΑΥΑΑΚ (A 1 46) / ΝΕΤΟΥΥΜ ΜΑΥΑΑΣ (IV 98.4f., IV 84.8) / ΤΑΜΝΤΖΗΚΕ ΜΑΥΑΑΤ (Ch. 99.30f.) also ΤΕΚΔΙΚΑΙΟΥΝ (III 90.8f.), ΤΕΚΕΔΕΥΣΙΑ (IV 89.17f.), ΝΕΝΟΥΣΑΙ (A 2 248).

(d) Referate: independent pronoun: (A 2 99) \text{Ω ΝΤΟΚ ΜΑΥΑΑΚ ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΕΤΕΕΣΜΕΝ ΝΕ ΑΥΗ ΖΕΝΖΑΠ ΜΜΕ ΝΕ ΝΕΥΠΗΘΕ ΝΘΡΟΥ — a pattern hybrid, a vocative with a Nominal Sentence (predicating ΝΤΟΚ — or both terms in an acclamatory Nominal Sentence — yet without a formal pronominal subject or copula). Compare ibid. 173 ΝΤΟΚ ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΜΑΥΑΑΚ, v. 1. ΝΤΟΚ ΠΕ... See exx. for “ΝΤΟΚ ΠΕ ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΜΑΥΑΑΗ” and sim., under (a) above; consider (RE 10 161a 30 ΝΤΟΚ ΠΕ ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΜΑΥΑΑΚ / (Wess. 9 160c 24f.) ΝΤΟΚ ΠΕ ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΜΑΥΑΑΗ / (RE 11 16b 9f.) ΝΤΟΚ ΝΑΜΕ ΜΑΥΑΑΚ ΠΕ ΝΠΑΙΚΙΟΣ ΑΥΗ ΝΑΓΑΕΟΣ / (A 1 283) Ν ΝΤΟΚ ΜΑΥΑΑΚ ΠΕ ΝΕΝΤΑΣΠΕΡ-ΠΠΟΝΗΡΟΝ / (A 2 16) ΝΟΟΥ ΜΑΥΑΑ ΑΝ ΕΤΣΜΠΠΑΡΑΔΙΣΟΣ / (III 13.8).}

6.14.3.3 Zero referate: “when on (one’s) own” — “adnominal-circumstantial modification”: (Wess. 9 125b 18f.) (ΤΕΥΜΗΛΑ ΕΤΜΜΑΥ) ΤΑ-ΖΕΝΜΑ ΜΑΥΑΑΝ ΤΕ ΕΝΚΩΠΑΤ (parall. IV 67-8) / (IV 52.21f., 116.22) ΕΤΡΕΨΡΑΜΑ ΝΚΑΟΥΣΚΑ ΜΑΥΑΑΥ (cf. ibid. 146.16, not Shenoute: ΣΝΟΥΣΚΑ ΜΑΥΑΑΥ) / prob. also (Wess. 9 113a 27f. after Mt. 14:13) — ΣΝΟΥΜΑ ΝΚΑΙΕ ΜΑΥΑΑΧ. Compare ΟΥΜΑ ΖΑΡΙΖΑΡΟ- ΜΑΥΑΑ- (§6.1.5.1 below).

6.14.1.4 The affinity of ΜΑΥΑΑ- with the negator: the \text{ΑΝ} adjunctal negation of ΜΑΥΑΑ- (ΜΑΥΑΑ- ΑΝ, see §2.9.1.2.3) is extremely common, as a kind of native Coptic equivalent for \text{ΟΥ ΜΟΝΟΝ} (§1.3.11.2.1): “not only”, “not just”\textsuperscript{79}; ΜΑΥΑΑ- here is, as a rule, ad(pro)nominial. Like its non-cohesive (non-pronominal) counterpart \text{ΜΜΑΤΕ}\textsuperscript{80}, ΜΑΥΑΑ- may occur after \text{ΑΝ}, which then negates not the augens but, locally, a sentence constituent including its referate. This analytic difference is however not correlatable to any perceivable difference in meaning. Compare the contrast of \text{ΜΑΥΑΑ- ΑΝ} (augens neg. as adjunct: ΕΥΟΥΟΝΣΕ ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΜΑΥΑΑΚ ΑΝ ΙΙΙ 209.14f., - ΑΝΟΥ ΜΑΥΑΑΚ ΑΝ ibid. 13.8) vs. \text{ΑΝ ΜΑΥΑΑ-} (augens modifying a neg. sentence constituent: - ΝΒΑΛΕ ΆΝ ΜΑΥΑΑΥ Wess. 9 145b 2ff.), with that of ΜΜΑΤΕ ΑΝ (- ΝΤΕΙΣΕ ΜΜΑΤΕ ΑΝ RE II 18a 4f.) vs. - ΑΝ ΜΜΑΤΕ (ΨΑΡΕΨΨΕ ΕΥΟΤΑΝΕ ΑΝ ΜΜΑΤΕ ΕΛΝ- ibid. 16b 17f.).

6.14.2 ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΟ- “ - own”, “ - self”, Reflexive, non-contrastive, non-exclusive (ευπορ, εσυποντο, εδοτο)\textsuperscript{81}.

6.14.2.0.1 Morphology. The form ΜΜΙΝΕ ΜΜΟ- is attested in Shenoute (e.g. A 2 17), and could give us an etymological clue (no etymology is suggested for this augens): \text{Young 1A, P 130\textsuperscript{6} 40 ΜΓ}; in one MS (Borg. 189) we find ΜΜΕΙΝΟΥ ΜΜΟ- (A 1 233, 239, 241, 271) beside the normal ΜΜΙΝ.

6.14.2.1 ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΟ- 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): (A 2 302) ΧΡΟΟΥΝ ΓΑΡ ΜΜΟΥ ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΥ / (ibid. 108) ΑΤΕΝΤΖΕΤΒ-ΘΥΤΝ ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΙΝΤΝ / (A 1 204-5) ΕΡΕΨΨΕ ΝΚΑ-

\textsuperscript{79} Cf. DAUMAS 1952:128f.

\textsuperscript{80} Cf. KICKAOS 1975:301 and ref. there; our §1.3.1.1(b).

\textsuperscript{81} STERN §298 (ΜΜΙΝ “ Adverb der Hervorhebung eines Suffixes”).
Pime eoucsine nteotei eeo mmin mmo / (Young 1a) mnom de mmon et-piw (i.e. penwsma) garon mmine mmon / (a 2 373) ancovnc naan eouruwrn mmin mmon / (iii 170.22f.) oynhag +-csvbo eboa zitotooy mmin mmooy / (a 2 99) tatacooy eouy mmin mmooy / (re 10 162a 8f.) ...enepe mmooy naac mmin mmooy / (ibid. 14f.) pentacahaay mmin mmooy garon / (a 2 159) morok mmin mmooy 2nzhemprpe nhnwr / (p 130b 40 mrg) (those who wish) eusac mpaow zarooy mmine mmooy / (iii 117.5f.) ang-oykataptwtn an aala ang-oykat- tapow mmin mmooy. (Rarely, the referate of mmin mmo = is included solely in an agentive phrase: [a 2 104] zensotbc ne eboa zitnthyt mmin mmooy [and not by others, contrastive - an exception] / [ibid. 341] ...2nzhemprpeotw yuyn eboa zhoityo mmin mmooy). Additional exx.: a 2 370, 373, III 64.10f., 202.27f., IV 15.11, Ch. 97.6ff., 136.8ff., Wess. 9 117b 4ff., 131b 6ff., RE 10 162b 14f., Rudnitzky A 20ff., etc.

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 1 112) enacorem eboa (the net) eneouyerhte mmin mmooy / (ibid. 97) 2nzhemprpeotw yuyn eouy mmin mmooy / (ibid. 213) ...enepe mmooy etenephaytna mmin mmooy / (iv 1.2f.) seoyun 2nzhemprpe mmin mmooy / (a 2 368) 2nzhemprpeotw yuyn mmin mmooy / (re 10 164b 35f.) 2nzhemprpeotw yuyn mmin mmooy / (III 187.10f.) ayse 2nzhemprpe mmin mmooy. A marginal overlapping with mayaa- (§6.1.4.1.2c) is evident here. This is the case with 2top (mayaa-, A 2 143; mmin mmo =, vik 908 cng, IP 203 ap. Dictionary 727); yayyn (mayaa-, IV 165.10 mmin mmo =, ibid. 51.17f.). Other examples: A 1 233 (pehnyi), 276 (teyp itapiesic), Ch. 175.23f. (pehnyi); note also eboa 2nzhoy mmin mmooy (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 mayaa- (§6.1.4.1.2): (A 2 49) mayax de mnuwaxe nkekse, enepe mnoi exphrume mmin mmooy ("comparing the ship to man himself") / (wess. 9 156a 4ff.) (npehni nkeksw nzerman) etenephttn pe mmin mmooy / (iii 177.5) szhoy mmin mmooy nzhemprpe oynwepcoh.

6.1.4.3 Oyaay- "only...", "... alone" is relatively very rare in Shenuoute, functionally overlapping mayaa-, compatible (in context patterns, §6.1.4.4) with mmin mmo-, but not with mayaa- (to which oyaay- is etymologically related). The forms of this augens on my files are oyaay- (3rd person sgl. and plur.), oyaay- (3rd sgl., 2nd plur.) and oyaay- (2nd plur.).

(a) Double referate in verb syntagms (+ expansion): (A 1 73) atenephttn nozep hodt mmin oyuathyt / (iii 184.15) ...etenepe-ehytn yuathyt / (iv 117.4f.) neto nhcay may oyaay / (A 2 503) ...etnath yuoy oyaay / (p 130b 52 to) tay ettako yuoy oyaay / (b.loc. 8800 18 nz, this line skipped in error in Ench. 72, to follow line 38) nh mh yuathtn an atenetake-thytn oyuathyt.

(b) Referate: noun, indep. pronoun (predicative): (iii 35.6, parall. Ch. 129.36f.) pakote an oyaayty, n efescoc / (ench. 71a-b) nh yuathyt oyuathyt atenephttn 2z nhzeyhpe nacnashtoc.

6.1.4.4 Context patterns: ‘mmin mmo- + mayaa-’, ‘mmin mmo- + oyaay-’. The frequent contextual pairing collocation of mayaa-, mmin mmo- and (rarely) oyaay- 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 ‘mayaa- → mmin mmo-’; (A 1 55) mnuwax-2zthn garon mayaay ep-thye, enzih mnoi ngenec mmin mmon / (A 2 67) yatnay enshu mayaay mmon mayaay aysh enshu mmin mmon / (ibid. 241) uyn-neh-neh nozep hodt mayaay nhoe etchz, perev-nehnaytuh on nacmatu mmin mmooy / (ibid. 458 [not sh.], iii 224.9f.,17f.) oyuzy pe eouycouny mayaay. mpatekhtus ghar cueysh mmin mmooc /

82 Stern §257, Schwarze-Steinthal 346.
§6.1.4.4  Chapter 6. The Augens

(IV 6.18f.) EγγΟΝΤ ΕΡΟΟΥ ΜΑΥΑΤΟΥ ΝΟΥΗΡ... ΑΥΣ ΕΥΧΑΘΥ ΕΡΟΟΥ ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΟΥ / (Ench. 85a) ΝΕΝΤΑΥΡΑΙΡ ΝΑΥ ΜΑΥΑΣΤΕ ΑΥΣ ΕΥΑΘΥΝΕ ΝΑΥ ΝΚΑΝΔΑΛΟΝ ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΟΥ. In (III 146.24f.) ΑΙΧΙΤ ΝΟΓΚΟ ΜΑΥΑΤΕ ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΙ we have true clause-internal compatibility. Additional exx: (III 162.11ff., 14ff., 165.16ff., 176.6ff., IV 51.16ff., A 1 305.

‘ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΙ → ΜΑΥΑΣΤΕ’ : (A 1 219) ΝΙΖΒΗΝΤΕ ΕΤΝΠΚΑΣΕ ΜΜΟΟΥ ΣΜΠΕΝΖΗΤ ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΝ ΑΥΣ ΤΜΝΤΡΕΚΑ ΣΤΕΝΗ ΕΡΟΟΥ ΜΑΥΑΣΑΝ / (A 2 345) ΠΕΤΤΣΒΕΗ ΜΜΟΟΥ ΠΛΑΚΕ ΕΞΟΡΟΥ ΕΡΟΟΥ ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΟΥ ΕΤΡΕΠΡΟΨΥ-ΥΨΤΟΥ ΜΜΙΝ ΜΑΥΑΣΑ / (Wess. 9 176a 22ff.) ΛΥΤΩΨΗΝ... ΕΣΤΑΙ ΕΞΟΡΟΥ ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΟΥ ΕΑΤΤΟΥΝΟϹ ΕΜΑΤΕ ΕΣΤΕΑΙ ΕΞΟΡΟΥ ΜΑΥΑΣΑ ΝΣΒΗΝ ΕΥΚΟΟΥ / (P 1301 1 OZ) ΕΥΧΑ ΜΜΟΟΥ ΝΟΓΚΟ ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΟΥ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΣΙΤΟΟΤΟΥ ΜΑΥ- ΑΤΛΟΥ. Other exx.: A 1 17, A 2 45, RE 16 164 21ff.

‘ΟΥΑΛΕ → ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΙ’ : (A 2 504) ΔΙΚΤΟ ΝΠΕΥΣΑΙΕ ΕΞΟΥΝ ΕΡΟΟΥ ΟΥΑΛΕ ΑΕΤΤΑΙΡΟΥ ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΙ.

Note also the cotellectual combination of the two augmenta in the following instances: ΠΕΥΜΤΟΝ ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΟΥ: ΠΕΥΜΤΟΝ ΜΑΥΑΣΑΝ (A 1 9.4.7); ΑΝΓΟΥΚΑΤΑΡΟΙ ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΙ: ΝΤΕΤΝΣΕΝΚΑΤΑΡΙΩΤΗΝ ΜΑΥΑΤΗΜΟΝ / (III 117.6:11); ΕΤΡΕΠΕΤΖΗΒΕ ΝΑΝ ΜΑΥΑΣΑΝ: ΕΥΡΩΝΤΜΠΡΨΗΜΕ ΝΚΑΖ ΝΣΒΗΝ ΕΞΟΥΝ ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΙ (ibid. 213.14:16ff.).

6.1.5 Border-line augmentia: ΖΑΡΙΖΑΠΟΥ, 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)nominial modifiers (although this distinction is gradient, not dichotomic, to judge by "true" augentia).

6.1.5.1 ΖΑΡΙΖΑΡΟΥ- "apart", "on one's own" (Dictionary 634). (a) Adverbal (ad-lexemic) - usually intransitive verbs: (III 210.9) ΕΥΝΗ ΕΥΚΗΝ ΧΩΚΟΤΗ ΖΑΡΙΖΑΡΟΥ / (ibid. 18ff.) (of the soul) ΝΠΕΠΟΝΤ ΝΠΕΠΟΝΤΕ ΖΑΡΙΖΑΡΟΣ / (ibid. 117.6f.)...ΕΤΡΑΣΘΑΓΟΡΟΗ ΕΙΜΟΚΖ ΝΗΘΤ (also IF 95 apud Dictionary 643b) / (P 1315 45 ro) ΝΙΖΒΗΝΤΕ ΕΤΕΨΗΝΕ ΕΑΑΖ ΖΑΡΙΖΑΡΟΥ / (P 1315 16 vo) ΕΞΟΥΝΕ-ΟΥΝΟΥΑ ΔΕ ΥΨ ΜΜΟΟΧ ΞΕΝΤΒΒΗΝΕ 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) ΤΣΥΝΑΝΨΗΝ ΝΚΟΡΕ ΖΑΡΙΖΑΡΟΟΚΟΝ... ΝΕΝΤΑΥΡΟΝΨΗΝ ΖΑΡΙΖΑΡΟΟΥ, ΝΕΝΤΑΥΡΟΝΨΗΜΕ ΕΥΕΡΚΙΟΥΜΑ ΖΑΡΙΖΑΡΟΟΥ ΑΥΣ ΝΚΟΟΥΕ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΖΑΡΙΖΑΡΟΟΥ / (IV 167.18f.) (every one to his job), ΝΕΤΠ-2ΜΜΕ ΖΑΡΙΖΑΡΟΟΥ, ΝΕΤΖΑΙ ΟΝ ΖΑΡΙΖΑΡΟΟΥ, ΜΝΚΟΟΥΕ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΚΑΤΑΤΑΣΙΓ.

(c) An instance of zero referate? (IV 91.14f.) ΕΥΝΑΘΥΝΕ ΝΟΥΜΑ ΖΑΡΙΖΑΡΟΟΥ ΜΑΥΑΣΑΝ (compare §6. 1.4.1.3).

6.1.5.2 ΝΑ- is a componential modifier of the verb lexeme (intransitives, mostly verbs of movement or posture; note one instance of ΟΥΨΜ intransitivized 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 (Aktionsart); this often amounts to perfective-aspect characterization. Note that, like other augentia, ΝΑ- here also supplies the gender-number characterization. (A 1 73) ΑΝΑΝΨΗΠΕ ΝΗΤΝ / (A 2 224) ΝΕΝΤΙΝΑΝΑΟΝΗ ΝΧΨΜ / (ibid. 398) ΜΟΨΗΜΕ ΝΑΚ ΕΒΟΛΑ / (III 192.1, Ench. 67a) ΜΟΨΗΜΕ ΝΑΚ ΕΣΠΑΙ / (Wess. 9 139d 12ff., 26ff.) ΒΥΚ ΝΗΤΝ ΕΡΑΤΟΥ... ΒΥΚ ΝΗΤΝ ΕΜΑΤ / (IV 104.1) ΕΥΝΑΣΟΤΚ ΝΑΥ ΜΜΑΤ, jussive. Rarely, we find non-imperative verb-forms: ΝΙΨΤ ΝΑ- "run away" (IV 121.27, 172.2f.) and ΟΥΨΜ ΝΑ- "eat away" (Quot. (2) ΤΕΨΧΥΧ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΝΤΕΨΟΥΜ ΝΕ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΣΜΠΕΝΤΑΡΕΠΕΝΤΠΕΙΜΕ ΕΤΡΟ).

83 Stern §503. For the prosodic affinity of ΝΑ- with the augens see POLOTSKY 1961:313 (= CP 417), EMMEL 1981 (esp. 137ff.).
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(pro)nominat illustrative, the augens nevertheless modifies the verb syntagm as a whole or its lexicem component. Two augencia have pronoun-less kindred and functionally close or concurrent associates: MMATE for MATAAA (A 2 18 NTAYMOOUTH AN ETBE NEVNOVE MMATE H NTAYSW EPOY MATAAA, the negation to be referred to both clauses / III 209.1f. ...EYOPOY SYNOYTE MATAAA AN ALAA ENKEMPHE ON, OYTE NTAYWW AN MMATE TETO MMNTPE NEVMYNTACEHIC, ALAA PEOOY ON) and NOYWT "singly", adnominal, which is (as unit-defining) quite different semantically from OYAA-. (NOYWT, like the adnominal MATAAA, is also a focusing adjunct.)

6.2.1 LOCALIZABILITY. Most augencia 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 MMIN MMOV-, MATAAA and OYAA- (where I would impressionistically say this accounts for about a third of all occurrences): (A 2 238-9) ENMAYXOY THPOY AN / (ibid. 99) NTAYCOKOY EXWY MMIN MMOV / (ibid. 403) NEVMAYXEOE AN ZAROC ALAA ENMAYXEOE-NEVMHNTACOHOM / (ibid. 547) EKNAKWH EBOL ETBMEOY MATAAA / (A 1 305) MD EMAUKET-NH ETBMHY MATAAA / (ibid. 239) EYR-NEVNOE EPOY MATAAA / (Wess. 9 144c 24ff.) ETBMEOYMMEOE AN MATAAA NTAYCHOB... / (A 2 473) EXWY AN MMOVYTE ALAA ENCHOY MMOV OYAA-. 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. 88. Compare also the same augencia as co-focal in the "nominal" Cleft Sentence (§§6.1.4.1.2, 6.1.4.2.2): (A 1 251) NAH DE MATAAA AN NEVMHMMIH / (III 177.5) NTOY MMIN MMOVY NEVMHCAE NEVYKAPHEC.

6.3 CONCLUDING NOTE: ON THE FUNCTIONAL ESSENCE OF THE AUGENS

To be precise, one must distinguish between the roles of the "pronominal" and "lexemic" components of the augens: the former serves the purpose of cohesion, gender-number characterization (after the imperative and zero referates) — this component is syntactically operative. The lexicem component, on the other hand, is paradigmatically assignable 87:

- distinctive confrontation: EXCLUSIVE
  - marked (+) MATAAA-
  - neutral (0) MMIN MMOV-

- distinctive confrontation: INCLUSIVE
  - marked (+) YWW-
  - neutral (0) MMIN MMOV-

[NTO-] is, beyond doubt, the most interesting of the group. In the first place, its pronominal and lexicem components coincide — it is after all the pronominal lexeme. (Or is NTO- to be taken as a lexicem isolable constituent? This would still leave us with the unanalyzable first persons.) Secondly, it alone

85 Consider however NHC VII 125.6 vs. line 25f. NTK-OYINNEYMA OYAA NYW EMOV2 vs. NTK-OYINNEYMA NOYWT EMOV2. Note also "adverbial" YWW- in Rom. 11:21 (translating kata phoein); see Dictionary 651b.
86 On the other hand, YWW- occurs as adjunct to the theme/topic: (IV 195.4) MD ETBMXEE YWWY NTAYE AN / (Ch. 106.25ff.) EMOV2 YWW" ETMEOY MMOV, but also co-focally: (III 56.14) NTAY YWWY EPOY MMOV, fcc. pattern (3), §2.3.2.
87 The prevalence of - YWW- ON - compared with -DE [NTO-] is instructive for the semantics of the augens; so also is the fact that whereas YWW- is invariably the second term in the cotextual patterning, [NTO-] is either first or second (although as the second term — in anaphoric contrast — it is undoubtedly more frequent).
of all augelia serves to mark a prominent topic (§2.0.2.1) as: 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 cotextual relations, for which focalization is in a way the archetypal functional category.

---

68 The prominent topic — also marked by extrapolation (§6.0.1) — should be kept distinct from the marked logical predicate (rHEME/focus), pace Callender 1970:180ff.
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
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7.1.3 Non-verbal nucleus: the conjunctive an adnexusal (rhematic) modification form
7.2 Cotext patterns and paradigms - the VERBAL NUCLEUS
7.2.1.1 Nucleus: THE IMPERATIVE SYSTEM: imperative, rhetorical jussive (μαρτή/-μπρέπει-), preceptive jussive (ἐνακ-/ννει-), future III
7.2.1.1.5 The post-imperatival paradigm
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7.2.2 Nucleus: EXTRATEMPORAL PREDICATIONS: Ἐνακτμ/μενεκτμ, Ἐναντικτμ
7.2.3 Nucleus: PRESENT-BASED FUTURE (ἐνακτμ)
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: APERSONAL/PERSOAL 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: adnexusal (rhematic) conjunctive.
7.3.1 Nucleus: PREDICATIVE MODIFIER
7.3.1.1 "Conjunctival" modifier + conjunctive syntagms
7.3.2 Nucleus: PREDICATIVE NOUN (adnominal conjunctive)
7.3.3 Nucleus: MISCELLANEOUS PREDICATIVE SYNTAGMS OR EXPRESSIONS
7.4 Excursus: the conjunctive and "that"-forms in functional assignment

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 fragmented 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 ΑΥΣΗ, Η, ΟΥΣΣΕ, ΑΑΑΑΑΑΛ. 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 leads 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 ΑΥΣΗ vs. Θ-, ΤΑ- vs. ΝΤΑ- in the 1st person sgl., and the functioning and compatibilities ⁵ of the form.

¹ Stern §§440ff., 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 ΝΠΑΒΕΙΣΚΑΤΣΕ ΠΑΝΑΜΟΣ) is not conclusive, since the conjunctive may be taken (in sense, even if not formally) to continue ΝΠΑ+ (cf. the Hebrew בֵּית הָאָרֶץ אֵלָי פַּעַם וּבְאָד אָדָם, Greek διακρίθηκος).

⁵ Most present-tense examples turn out to be either of the prothetic circ. present (our §7.2.4) or non-actual, non-temporal or future (predicating ΝΠΗ). 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 'ΧΕΚΑΛΑ... conjunctive' syntagm. The conjunctive allegedly continuing the perfect (p. 455) is not conclusive, and can be referred to Ν+infinitive.
7.0.2 A Mmorphological 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: νέοικουτμ (e.g. in IV 60.22), Shenoute's conjunctive has the classical Sahidic morphology. For the first person singular, "NTA" is by far the more common form (over thirty occurrences in Ch. and L); "TA" 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 "Tapepcoum (§7.2.1.1.5); "TA" is thus specialized, at the overlap point of the two post-imperativial categories, while "NTA" 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 sattelital 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 (N-, prenominal and pre-zero allomorph NTE-) with N-, 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 homonymous 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 — adnental modification — see §7.1.3 below.

7.1.2 The verbal nucleus: the conjunctive a categorizable, atemporal, amodal form; group categorization; micro-/sub-coordination; Ayw vs. 0-; 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 (TM in its proper slot), or by the disruption of the said concord for the (pro)nominial actor, the conjunctive is auto-categorized for negation and person respectively. The conjunctive is not tense/mode-indifferent, but "co-qualifiable". By itself unmarked for these categories, it is marked cotextually, with the effect of constituting, together with its nuclear verb, a specific

---

* See Polotsky 1944:10f. (= CP 115ff.).

7 Polotsky 1944:1ff. (= CP 106ff.), 1950:87ff. (= CP 222ff.).

8 Variation status for NTA- 'TA' in Shenoute immediately identifies the non-Shenoutean grammatical system of quotation (III 56.1ff., 111.14f., IV 26.22ff., Ch. 193.7ff. etc.).

9 Diachronically, the original form of the conjunctive (acc. to Gardiner's thesis), bn'-ntf-sdm, is analyzable as a preposition governing an (actor + verb) nexus, with its modifier status evident (bn' 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 AN (cf. §2.9.1.2.3 for other clause-conjunctive adjuncts. In 1 Cor. 4:19, AN negates another modifier).

closely knit subtextual unit, its cohesion signalled by syncategorization\(^{12}\): the conjunctive represents\(^{13}\) the nuclear verb in the linear sequence, with reduced characterization. The conjunctive extends, evolves, unravels and contextualizes the nuclear notion, or attaches\(^{14}\) 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"\(^{15}\)) since the two terms are syntactically not on a par. Moreover, their attachment may be either paratactic-asynthetic (juxtaposed) or synthetic, with \(\text{AYW, H (NTOH), LLLL "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 \(\Delta E / \text{MEN} \) and \(\text{NTOH} \) clearly belong in the conjunctive clause. Whatever the hierarchical status of coordinators in other languages\(^{16}\), 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]\(^{17}\). 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 aduce 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 + \(\text{AYW} + \) verb'), resolve its function: MICRO-COORDINATION (hereafter symbolized \(\leftrightarrow; -\text{AYW} - , -\text{H} - , -\text{LLL} - \) etc.; also variant, non-significant absence \(-\) of \(\text{AYW}\) vs. SUBCOORDINATION \(\leftrightarrow\), \(-\Theta-\), \(\text{AYW}\) excluded): the former non-vectorial, undirected, symmetric - reciprocal, antithetic, accumulative, reversible\(^{18}\), synonymous (here we find the figure-like repetition of lexemes) and serializing\(^{19}\); the latter vectorial, directed, irreversible\(^{20}\). Whereas

\(^{12}\) Among comparable "Gruppenflexion" (or "suspended affixation") cases in other languages, one recalls the Turkish (Altaiic) gerund or conjugate (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 converses; the Amharic gerund, being finite, is perhaps a closer parallel (see Lohmann 1965:225ff.; G. Goldenberg, BSOAS 40:458ff., 1977 for the terminological history of the Ethiopian forms). Compare also the well-known "narrative infinitives" in various languages (Latin, Romance languages [c.f. Regula 1951:157ff.], Celtic languages, Semitic languages).

\(^{13}\) "Ablösend" ("continuing + replacing", "relieving") seems to have been a keyword in the early descriptions (Stern §447, p. 277; Steinhart-Mistedi 1893:298ff.); c.f. Tobler 1886:216ff. (on direct speech relieving indirect: "[ein Modus] der den Gedanken fortsetzt und weiterführt und, besonders wenn das Subjekt dasselbe bleibt, sämtliche Verbalformen ablösen kann").

\(^{14}\) C.f. Steinhart-Mistedi's "adjectiv" (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 (1950:686ff.).

\(^{16}\) 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 intervening constituent (see ref. in Dik loc. cit.).

\(^{17}\) Compare in Late Egyptian \(\text{hr} \) and \(\text{m-mjrt} \) preceding the conjunctive (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 \(\text{itaratayoga} \) and \(\text{samuccayya} \) 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, 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.

In the following pages, we shall observe the varying categorization contour of the individual patterns, displaying data regarding personal maintenance (i.e., pronominal concord), negation syncategorization (negative → affirmative), negation encategorization (affirmative/negative nucleus → negative conjunctive, not resuming the nuclear negation), 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 – ΑΥΘ vs. Ω- ( ↔ vs. →) –; this information in fact constitutes the distinctive “profile” of each pattern.

7.1.2.3 Compatibilities. The nuclear verb may consist of (a) an extratemporal or merely contextually temporal verb-form (ΜΑΧ-ΜΕΛ-, ΤΑΝΤΑ-, ΜΑΤΑ-, ἄνερ and so forth) 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 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 ΝΑ- (rel.) ΑΥΘ (IV 40.3), ΝΑΠΟΙΟΜΕΝΟΙ ΑΡΑ (Sec. Perf.: ΑΡΑ ΑΥΘ ΑΑΝ ΝΑΙΣΑ... (III 73.5f.), ΝΑΠΟΙΟΜΕΝΟΙ ΑΥΘ ΕΤΑΖΑΕΣ (IV 21.10); they are paradigmatically relatable to the “verb + conjunctive” syntagm.

22 The “subjective” function of the conjunctive, diachronically regarded (by Steinhald-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 (ΝΟΤΑ ΚΟΤΑ ΜΟΝΟ) → ΝΑ- (IV 32.14f.) or (ΑΑΑ ΑΠΑ ΝΗΜΑ Η ΚΑΤΑ ΝΗΜΑ ΝΤΜΩΝ) → ΝΗΜΑ (Ibid. 35.25f.) the concord is no less in evidence than in a straightforward repetition of the pronoun.

24 Affirmative encategorization is marked by premodifiers such as ΑΑΑ (e.g. III 31.4f.).

25 A frontal extrapolation to the actor of the conjunctive as a rule conditions ΑΥΘ, overruling and neutralizing the micro-subordination opposition (e.g. III 139.1f., IV 66.8ff.). This reduces the tridimensional opposition (a) to a bidimensional one (b) (consider however the construction in A 1 135-6, 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), ymnoiXe (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; motic, etc.) — here the conjunctive may be taken to expand (also contexualize) the modifier, predicative in a single-term clause (# modifier-0 #, §1.2.1.3.2) — 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 predicates (sometimes modifier-equivalent) syntagms or expressions: MEHAI= (K) "perhaps", "(you) do not know"; AAAO= "it is something else...", MH KENOITO "God forbid", ZAMO "would that", (NE)MANOYC (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 nexus in addition to its being expansional. This analysis is, I believe, equally applicable to the adverbial conjunctive: the verb - conjunctive dependency is complex, twofold, combining a nexus relationship with a satellitil (expansional) one. That the two dependencies are not by any means incompatible is amply illustrated by the other important adnexal modifier sentence-form in Coptic, namely the circumstantial — in fact, the conjunctive is often in paradigmatic association with the circumstantial, both adnominally, adverbally, and occasionally in ad-modifier status. Both circumstantial and conjunctive are "wertbezogen", participial (metaXε-), forms, in the sense of "sharing", "participation", "cooperative union" ("Teilhabe eines Vorgangs oder Zustands an einem anderen") of two predication-carrying clauses in an ultrastructural predication com-

---

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 se-clauses after "impersonals" (Rosén 1977:113-5); a special part of speech, definable by this pattern as a "predicative constituent of a sentence nucleus": k’daj se- "it is advisable that...", mutiar/assir se- "it is allowed/forbidden..."; the se-clause is the personal alternate of the infinitive. See also Rosén 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".
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:
(Noun syntagm)
- relative (attributive)
  - circumstantial (adnexit)
  - neutralized after non-r determination
- conjunctive (adnexal, micro/subcoordinating, contextualizing)
  - ETPERV (contextualizing)
  - Kε (generic, "such... as")
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 between the two verbal modifiers, we note the following interrelated structural ones:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIRCUMSTANTIAL</th>
<th>CONJUNCTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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 (*Аναλо ἐν-*, *Ἀναγνωρίζω ἐν-*) in suppletive periphrases (*Ἀνάγνωσις ἐν-*) 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 *Ἀτ* 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 (*CNAYMHE/ECYANYMHE + 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 *jw*. 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 *TAΣΕΙΤΟΝ*). Putting two and two together, it may perhaps not be rash to make the following suggestions:

(a) The conjunctive characteristic *Ν/ΝΤΕ* occupies an intermediate position between a conjugation base and a converter (in the micro- and macro-syntactic sense).

(b) Whereas the first IC-analysis of all other Tripartite Pattern forms is

\[
\text{conjugation base + actor suffix} + \text{verb lexeme (“infinitive”)}
\]

\[
\frac{\text{nucleus} [“pro-verb”; §5.4]}{\text{satellite}}
\]

--- 191 ---

--- 191 ---

33 These are as a matter of fact not as pronounced as might be expected: the circumstantial too is often “coordinative” (consider *Ἀτ* *III 13.15, 203.19f.*, and especially *Ἐν* *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).

34 *SHAHA–HALEVY 1972:§1.3* (pp. 57-66).

35 See §2.0.1.1 above.
— or, in the thematic structure, actor  
  (theme)  \[ \text{base + verb lexeme} \]  
  (discontinuous rheme) —

that of the conjunctive is different:

\[
\text{N} \quad \text{[actor + verb lexeme]} \\
\text{(NTE)} \quad \text{(theme)} \quad \text{(rHEME)}
\]

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 IC 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\text{CUTM} is the representative of the whole class of verbal predications 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\text{CUTM} the quintessential verbal modifier — and this is correlatable with its present-like bipartite ≠ theme - rheme ≠ schematic structure 38.

(c) Following the base, the rest of the conjunctive form — noun-syntagm/prefix-like pronoun + verb lexeme — must be further IC-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, (TM) — 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) ὑμῶν ἐν τῷ ἔθιστῳ, inclusive 1st person plural: "you and us" / (A 1 206) ὑμῶν ἐν τῷ, — "irreversible binomial", cf. ibid. ὑμῶν ἐν τῷ, ἔξω ἐν γῆ, ἐκτὸς ἐν γῇ. However, in the light of (A 2 437) Νῦν ἐν ἑαυτῷ ὑμῶν ἐν τῷ ἐστὶν, (RE II 18a 11ff.) μηδὲ ἐν ἑαυτῷ ὑμῶν ἐν τῷ, (ἐκτὸς ἐν γῇ, ἐκτὸς ἐν γῇ), (IV 66.17) ἐν τῇ ἑαυτῷ ὑμῶν ἐν τῷ, etc., one must conclude that subordination is not the rule in Coptic in this case. / (III 210.15f., 19f.) ἐκτὸς ἐν ἑαυτῷ ὑμῶν ἐν τῷ / (Ibid. 16.12, 18.1) ἐκτὸς ἐν τῇ ἑαυτῷ ὑμῶν ἐν τῷ

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-Steinthal 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 Kahle 1954:160ff. for an interesting analysis of N—zeroed forms of the conjunctive in various dialects. Incidentally, this approach ties in with Mattha's reconstruction of the conjunctive as ƀnı́ nṯr-jw.f ḫr ṣḏm (BIFAO 45:43-55, 1947: rejected by Černý, JEA 35:25-30, 1949; see Volten 1964:79f.).


39 Kأئ Kأئ, not attested in the Sahidic New Testament, occurs in the Old Testament (Job 10:20), Bohairic (Kующ Kأئ Kאئ, Kאئ Kאئ), and especially (?) in Akhmimic (cf. Till 1928:§139c).
1.14) СУТМ ТАТАМОК ΕΜΜΝΤΥΛΑΝΣΤΗΝ ΜΠΕΤΝΩΞΟΕ. Note that both instances of the 1st person sgl. are causative (lexically or grammatically): see §7.2.1.1.4 / (Ch. 185.48ff.) ΣΨΨΤ ΕΞΝΝΕΚΑΡΝ ΝΗΝΑΥ ΥΞΕ-ΟΥ ΝΕ ΠΙΚΝΟΜ ΝΨΨΒΖΙ (cf. IV. 200.14) / (Ch. 72.25ff.) ΚΑ-ΝΟΥΧΨΝ ΝΣΟΥΒΑΓΟΥ ΝΣΑΝΟΥΨΗ / (ibid. 102.5ff.) ΜΠΡΣΨΤΜ ΝΤΟΥ ΕΡΟΙ ΝΠΝΑΙ ΝΠΕΙΤΝΒΥΝ-ΘΥΤΝ ΕΝΖΟΟΥ ΝΝΗΣΤΕΙΑ ΕΤΤΝΨ, consecutive. Syncategorized negation / (P 1317 25 ρο) ΛΟΙΟΝΝ ΜΠΡΡ-ΑΜΕΛΝΣ ΝΣΕΥΤΑΜ ΕΡΨΗΝ ΕΜΠΡΟ (sic) ΝΨΜΑ ΝΧΖI-ΠΑΖΡΕ / (RE 10 160a 32ff.) ΒΨΚ ΝΤΕΤΝΨΧΟΟΣ... / (III 29.26) ΥΨΛΑ ΕΞΨΨΝ ΝΤΕΝΙΕΡ ΚΑΤΑΝΕΝΤΑΚΣΧΟΟΥ ΕΡΟΝ / (ibid. 63.20ff.) +ΤΗΝΚ ΔΕ ΖΨΨΗΝ ΕΠΑΛ-ΓΟΣ... ΝΨΨΨ ΝΑΚ... / (P 1308 33 ΡΙΑ) ΑΜΟΥ ΝΨΟΡΙΠ ΕΒΟΑ ΝΨΝΕΚΑΧΑΦΡΑΣΙΑ, ΤΟΤΕ ΝΨΟΟΧΟΥ ΥΞΕ "ΝΑΣΨΘΕΡ": the temporal sequence is explicitated; not so in (Ch. 55.4ff.) ΤΑΛΟ ΕΡΟΝ ΝΤΟΤΟΒΨΧ ΝΡΨΨΘΚ ΕΨΡΑΙ ΝΓΕΙ "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.) +ΤΗΝΤΗΝ ΑΨΨ-ΝΣΕΤΝΨΟΙΕΣ ΝΤΕΤΝΨΗΑ / (IV 41.9ff.) ΑΛΑΝ ΝΕΑΛΑΧΙΟΝ ΣΨΨΨΑΣΕ ΝΣΕΤΝΑΝΠΡΟ ΝΓΑΛΑΚ ΝΑΤΝΟΕΙ ΤΙΤΜΗΝ ΝΝΣΑΒΕΕΥ (cf. III 90.4ff. ΑΝΑΝ... ΝΤΕΤΝΝΑΥ ΔΕ ΖΨΨΗ) / (III 193.3ff.) ΥΨΝΕ ΝΣΑΨΡΗΝΝ ΝΨΨΤΨΤ ΝΨΨΨ / (ibid. 63.9ff.) ΣΨΨΟΥΣ ΔΕ ΕΨΟΥΝ... ΝΨΤ(ΜΨΨΧ)ΞΝ ΕΠΑΖΟΥ.

7.2.1.1.2 The rhetorical jussive ΜΑΕΡΨ- / ΜΠΡΡΣΨ-. 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 autotelic Second Future ΕΨΝΑΣΨΤΜ (§§2.1.3, 7.2.1.1.3) is used (with ΝΝΨΒ-, a suppletive negative form, apart from the rare ΕΨΝΑ- ΑΝ and perhaps ΜΠΡΡΣΨ-): ΜΑΕΡΨΣΨΤΜ and ΕΨΝΑΣΨΤΜ 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) ΜΑΡΟΨΕΙ ΝΣΨΕΞΑ-ΠΑΣΕ ΕΨΟΥΝ ΕΨΡΑΝ, also ibid. 201.12 / (ibid. 18.24ff.) ΜΑΡΕΝΤΝΑΠΑΡΑΒΑ ΜΠΤΨΨΨ... ΟΨΕ-ΝΟΒΕ ΕΞΝΝΕΨΝΟΒΕ ΝΤΕΨΡΑΝ ΜΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΨΨΨΗΝ ΕΨΟΥΑΒ / (IV 39.4ff.) ΜΠΡΡΣΨΟΥΑ ΣΨΨΤΜ... ΥΞΕ-... ΝΣΕ- ΝΕΣΕΥΕ... ΥΞΕ-..., subcoordination of neg. syncategorization / (ibid. 37-8) ΜΠΡΡΣΨΝΠΡΟΣΕΧΕ ΕΡΟΝ 2ΖΤΝΕΤΣΨΨΖΜ... ΝΝΣΕΓΝΤΜ ΕΡΕΝΕΝΣΗΤ ΝΜΝΕΨΨΧΨ ΨΨΨΕΤ, neg. syncategorization. Note the discontinuous actor exponence (for a passive-equivalent form), remarkable for ΤΨΨ-, ΥΨΨ- + ΤΖΨΨ- + ΒΨΨ-.

(b) (⟵⟶): Nuclear verb: affirmative/negative; conjunctive: affirmative only; neg. syncategorization; personal maintenance. (Ch. 163.31ff.) ΜΑΡΟΥΑΙΟΝΑΕ ΑΨΨ ΝΣΕΨΤΜ ΕΠΕΤΨΨΜ ΜΨΜΣ ΔΕ- / (ibid. 165.22ff.) ΜΑΡ- ΡΡΝΟΕΙΣ ΝΣΝΗΨΖΕ / (RE 11 18a 11ff.) ΜΑΡΕΨΟΥΜ ΑΨΨ ΝΨΨΨ: see under §7.2.1.1.1(a) / (P 1308 22 ΦΝ) ΑΝΟΝ ΖΨΨΨΝ ΡΝΗ ΜΑΡΝΨ-ΤΜΕ ΑΨΨ ΝΤΨΨΨ ΝΤΨΕ... ΑΨΨ ΝΤΨΡ-ΜΠΨΑ ΜΠΝΟΥΤΕ... / (IV 5.21ff.) ΜΠΡΡΤΕΑΝΝ ΝΨΜΜΟ ΕΝΝΟΥΤΕ... ΑΨΨ ΝΤΨΨΨΝΨ ΝΑΑΞΕ... — neg. syncategorization.

7.2.1.1.3 The preceptive/unmarked jussive: ΕΨΝΑΣΨΤΜ / ΝΝΨΒΣΨΤΜ. This is the form intruding (in diachronic view) into the neat Scriptural suppletive imperative paradigm imperative / ΜΑΕΡΨ-, disturbing its equilibrium and acting to confine the classical jussive ΜΑΕΡΨΣΨΤΜ to its specialized rhetorical value. Note the following distinctive characteristics of this cotext pattern: (a) The opposition microcoordination: subcoordination is here virtually neutralized, as pertinent ΑΨΨ 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 114.18ff.) ΜΑΡΜΠΨΑ ΝΝΑΥ ΕΡΟΨ... ΑΨΨ ΜΑΡΕΨΚΟΛΑΖΕ ΜΜΟΙ proves the rhetoric of the Shenoutean ΜΑΕΡΨΣΨΤΜ.

⁴¹ Barring the overruling conditioning of ΑΨΨ before a frontal extrapolation 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.) EYNAYA EPREÚNAXH T ΕΡΟΥ ΝΟΕΙΚ... NCEXITON NAH N2MPCHY MΠΝΤΨΗ / (ibid. 61-2) EYNAYE N2NECNYH NCEΦΑΛΑΛΕΙ ΕΡΟΥ Ν3TOMCOY / (ibid. 160.2f.) EYNAYAIC0YO NCETNNOOYCOY NAH NCENAY EPREÚΨΗΕ ΕΑΑΥ / (ibid. 161.21f.) EYNAYE-NPE- ΠΕ-ΛΟΟΕ ΕΠΙΜΟΥΤ ΝΤΕΣΕΝΝΟΥ NΡΨΗΕ ΧΕΙ ΖΑΨΨΥ ΑΨΥ ΔΑΡΑΤΗ... ΕΠΕ-ΝΤΕΗΕΙ ΕΡΨΑI ΝΑΝ-ΤΕΝΝΑΛΕΒΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΤΕΝΝΑΛΕΙ +-ΤΨΗ ΕΡΟΥΝ / (ibid. 83.14f.) EYNAYEΦΑΛΑΛΕΙ ΝΨΟΜΤ ΝΟΕΙΝ... NCEΦΑΗΑ ΝΨΟΜΤ ΝΟΕΙΝ... A solitary instance of the personal maintenance disrupted is rhetorical (Ch. 187.2ff.) EYNAY+ΨΤΗΥ ΧΕ-ΕΡΕΝΕΡΨΑΦΗ ΧΕ-ΟΥ ΑΨΥ ΧΕ-ΟΥ ΝΕΝΤΑΥΣΦΗΑΙΟΥ... ΑΨΥ ΝΤΝΤΜΤΝ ΜΜΝΜ 2ΓΝΕΨΨΑΗ ΝΟΥΕΙΝ (although here the 1st person plural may be taken to resume anacoluthically the preceding ΡΨΗΜ ΝΙΜ). Additional exxs.: IV 46.5f., 50-1, 66.2ff., 7ff., 83.12f., 17f., 20f., 111.9f., 14f., etc.

The negative counterpart of jussive ΕΨΝΔΨΤΜ appears to be ΝΨΕΨΨΤΜ, syncategorizing the conjunctive: (IV 73.10ff.) ΝΨΕΑΑΑΨΥ... ΧΕΕΨ-ΨΨΤΓ ΕΑΑΑΨΥ ΜΜΑ ΜΜΨΟΥ... Η ΝΕΕΨΙ-ΣΝΟΨΥ ΜΜΨΟΥ / (ibid. 88.1f.) ΝΨΕΨΥΑ 2ΝΟΗΕ ΟΥΕΜ-ΝΕΤΣΟΤΨ... ΝΤΕΚΕΟΥΑ Η ΖΕΝΚΟΟΥΕ ΟΥΕΜ-ΝΕΤΣΟΞΨ Η ΝΕΤΣΟΥΨ / (ibid. 103.5f.) ΝΨΕΨΨΜΕ Ν2ΤΗΝ ΓΨΨ ΝΨΨΨΜΨΚ ΕΠΟΥΨΜ — a striking case of subordination: the neg. conjunctive does not maintain the negation of ΝΨΕ-, but contentualizes ΓΨΨ; consider the variant reading ΓΨΨ ΝΟΥΕΨΨΝΨΨΨΨ and the parallel in (IV 66.24f.) ΓΨΨ ΕΨΨΨΜΨΚ.

7.2.1.1.4 ΕΨΝΔΨΤΜ, properly speaking the optative (§7.2.1.2), is also used as a polite or restrained imperative and jussive \(^{42}\): (IV 43.23) ΕΨΝΔΨΑΗ Ν2ΝΝΕΨΝΑΗ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΝΨ2ΨΨΥ ΕΤΟΟΤΨ ΕΤΡΕΨ-... / (ibid. 62. 15f., 24) ΕΤΕΝΝΕΜΟΟΨΥ ΓΙΝΑΨΟΥΑ ΝΨΕΨΗΥΗ ΝΤΕΝΨΨΥ ΕΤΕΤΝΟΥΨΥ ΜΜΨΟΥ... ΕΤΕΤΝΕΨΥ ΝΤΕΤΝΗΑΗΑ / (III 157. 11f.) ΕΨΝΔΨΟΟΕ ΕΝΨΑΛΟ ΖΑΗΝΨ ΑΨΨ ΕΨΝΔΨΟΟΕ ΕΟΑΨΨ ΓΑΖΑΨΝΨΨΨΨ Η ΝΨΕΨΟΟΕ ΕΝΨΑΛΟΙ ΕΤΖΑΨΝΨΨΨΨ / (IV 207.26) ΕΨΝΟΨΨΨΨ ΝΨΕΨΟΟΕ ΧΕ-... (more exxs.: III 157.21, IV 43.9ff.).

7.2.1.1.5. THE POST-IMPERATIVE PARADIGM: MEMBERS AND FUNCTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TARPETΣM</th>
<th>rhetorical, affective; archaic-Biblical stylistically marked; ensured desirable result (§7.2.1.1.5.1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>imperative</td>
<td>ΑΨΨ + fut. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'CWTM'</td>
<td>0 + fut. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'ΜΠΨΡCWTM'</td>
<td>ΑΨΨ + imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conjunctive</td>
<td>ΑΨΨ + rhet. jussive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΕΤΡΕΨ-</td>
<td>deliberate purpose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Rhetorical Jussive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Rhetorical Jussive</strong></th>
<th><strong>ΔΥΣ + fut. I</strong></th>
<th><strong>Unmarked consequence:</strong> Ch. 37.10ff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'ΜΑΡΕΣΣΩΤΜ'</td>
<td><strong>ΔΥΣ + rhet. jussive</strong></td>
<td>Two coordinated jussives: mutually independent (<em>IV</em> 38.6ff., 114.18ff.), or reciprocally symmetric (<em>IV</em> 156.7, Ch. 165.30ff.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'ΜΠΡΕΣΣΩΤΜ'</td>
<td><strong>Conjunctive</strong></td>
<td>Micro-/subcoordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ΕΠΕΚ-</strong></td>
<td>Deliberate purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ΤΑΡΕΣΣΩΤΜ</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stylistically marked consequence (§7.2.1.1.5.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Preceptive Jussive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Preceptive Jussive</strong></th>
<th><strong>ΔΥΣ + prec. jussive</strong></th>
<th><strong>Mutually independent, non-sequential coordination:</strong> Two separate enjoins; reciprocal symmetry (<em>III</em> 157.11ff., <em>IV</em> 58.15, 99.17ff.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'ΕΨΑΝΤΩΤΜ'</td>
<td>(very rare)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'ΕΧΕΣΣΩΤΜ'</td>
<td><strong>ΔΥΣ ΕΧΕΣΣΩΤΜ (rare)</strong></td>
<td>Sequential micro-coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ΤΑΡΕΣΣΩΤΜ (rare)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>§7.2.1.1.5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7.2.1.1.5.1

Like ΜΑΡΕ-, **ΤΑΡΕΣΣΩΤΜ**, 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) that has encroached on its territory, but rather the coordinative **ΔΥΣ + future I**. Generally speaking, three statements (illustrated below) may be made on the Shenoutean **ΤΑΡΕΣΣΩΤΜ**: (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 and generally final environments (inside the imperative system, we find **ΤΑΡΕΨ** following the jussives ΜΑΡΕ- and ΕΨΑΝ-); 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.


45. **PoloTSKY** 1944:1ff. (= *CP* 102ff.), 1950: 87ff. (= *CP* 222ff.).
46. Consider (*Ch*. 198.44ff.) ΜΗ ΕΕΙ-ΣΜΩ ΝΑΝ ΝΤΟΤ ΑΝ ΝΤΕΙΖ ΕΕΙΜΠΕΚΕΝΔΕ ΤΑΡΝΚΝ ΝΚΟΝ ΝΤΕΝΜΝΤΑΝΛΛΤΕ, where **ΤΑΡΕΨ** is focalized by a Second Present, showing itself to be a true modifier-clause.

47. **PoloTSKY** 1944:5f., §38 (= *CP* 110ff.).
Chapter 7. The Conjunctive

(2) Ponderous, turgid categoric style (similar to (1))? Note the high incidence of εἴμε or its paraphrases, which may be indicative of a certain tone of address: (A 2 64) ΜΟΥΤΕ ΝΤΟ ΤΠΑΡΘΕΝΟΣ ΝΚΟΣ ΚΟΤΕ ΝΝΟΥ-ΣΝΑΥ ΥΡΟΥ ΤΑΡΕΙΝΕ ΙΕ... / (ibid. 121) ΚΨ ΔΕ ΝΑΚ ΖΝΙΙΚ ΝΤΕ ΤΑΡΕΠΥΑΣΚΕ ΧΟΟΣ ΝΑΚ ΔΕ... / (A 1 234) ΣΨΗΜ ΑΥΨ ΜΑΡΑΦΕ-ΖΗΤΕ ΜΠΕΛΝΕΖΝ ΝΤΕ ΑΥΨ ΕΤΣΟΥ ΜΠΚΑΣ ΑΥΨ ΕΤΡΟΥΚΟΜΕΝΟΥΣ ΜΠΕΛΝΕΖΝ ΤΑΡΕΙΝΕ-ΙΕ... / (A 2 72) ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΕΜΜΤΝΤΑΖΤΝΚ ΝΙΜΙΝΕΙΝΕΝΝΙΑΚ ΝΜΠΚΑΣ ΝΑ ΤΑΡΝΙΑΜΕΤΕΧΕ ΕΠΙΤΝΨ / (P 1318 13 νο) ΕΣΨΗΒΕ ΝΤΚ-ΟΥΟΚΝΕ ΑΜΟΥ ΕΤΕΚΚΑΝΚΑΣ ΑΥΨ ΚΝΑΙΤΠΗΝ ΝΠΝΜΑΝ ΝΝΑΝΝΙΟΥΤΕ; ΕΣΨΗΒΕ ΔΕ ΟΝ ΝΤΚ-ΟΥΡΜΙΑΟ ΑΜΟΥ ΕΤΕΚΚΑΝΚΑΣ ΤΑΡΕΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΣΜΟΥ ΕΡΟΚ 2ΝΤΕΚΜΝΤΡΜΑΝ ΕΣΨΗΒΕ ΟΝ ΕΝΜΑΓΚ-ΨΗΜΕ ΜΜΑΥ, ΑΜΟΥ ΕΤΕΚΚΑΝΚΑΣ ΑΥΨ ΚΝΑΙΤΠΗΝ ΝΠΝΜΑΝ ΝΝΑΝΝΙΟΥΤΕ — suppletion of ΑΥΨ + future I for the 2nd person?

(3) A special rhetorical effect or figure: ΤΑΡΕΠ- repeats the imperative verb: (A 2 224-5) ΣΕΙ ΝΗΤΝ ΝΕΝ- ΤΝΗΔΟΝΗ ΝΧΩΝΜ ΖΙΘΥΨ... ΤΑΡΕΠΤΕΝΣΕΙ ΟΝ ΜΠΡΖΚ ΜΝΚΖΗΣΤ ΕΤΕΜΕΨΤΨΜ / (ibid. 461) ΥΟΠΕ ΕΡΟΚ (i.e. the Kingdom) ΝΜΝΙΕΙΑ ΤΑΡΕΨΟΥΚΕ ΕΡΟΚ ΖΠΟΥΣ ΕΜΠΑ ΥΤΜΝΑΥ (cf. 462: ΝΕΝΤΝΑΥΟΝΤΕ ΕΡΟΟ... ΝΝΑΝΟΥ ΖΨΟΥ ΕΡΟΚ) / compare here (Ch. 98.21ff., 199.88ff.) ΝΑ ΤΑΡΟΥΝΑ ΝΗΤΝ + ΤΑΡΟΥΝ ΝΗΤΝ and (P 1318 43 νο) ΝΑ ΤΑΡΟΥΝΑ ΝΑΚ, ΖΕΝ-ΤΨΗΚ ΤΑΡΟΥΝ-ΣΕΝΤΘΥ ΖΑΡΟΚ, ΚΨ ΕΒΟΛ ΤΑΡΟΥΚΨ ΝΑΚ ΕΒΟΛ, adaptations of Luc. 6:37-8.

(b) ΤΑΡΕΨΟΥΜ in other environments than post-imperative: (1) as a rhetoric post-interrogative apodosis ("that he may...") - (A 2 510) ΕΤΤΨΝ ΠΟΥΨΗΝ ΤΑΡΕΨΟΥΣ ΠΨΤ ΝΤΨΨΜ / (Ch. 197-8) ΟΝ ΠΕΤΨΨΟΝ ΝΑΝ ΤΑΡΝΤΛΑΥ ΥΡΟΥ... ΝΤΝΤΑΥ ΝΤΝΨ-ΒΟΛ (note the conjunctive subordinated to ΤΑΡΝΤΛΑΥ).

(2) Following final constructions: (P 1318 43 νο) ΕΙΨΑΣΕ ΝΝΝΗΤΝ ΖΕΚΑΣ ΕΤΕΤΛΑΤΑΖΡΟ-ΠΥΑΣΕ ΜΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΝΖΗΘΤΗΤΨΝ ΤΑΡΕΨΤΕ-ΖΗΥ ΨΟΥΚΟΥΙ / (Thompson K 3 νο) ΝΕ ΕΡΟΚ... ΕΝΤΨΝ ΝΔΤΝΤ ΕΥΤΑΥΟ ΠΕΙΝΕΤΝ ΝΕΝ- ΤΝΩΥΤΕ ΕΨΟΥΨΜ ΜΙΟΟΥ ΕΠΟΥΨΝ ΕΒΟΛ ΕΝΤΨΨΝΤΕ ΥΡΟΥ ΤΑΡΕΨΤΕΝΣΕ ΖΕ-ΟΥΚΡΜΗΣ ΚΕ ΝΕΤΝΤΨΝΤ. Compare in the post-interrogative paradigm the apodotic-retrospective conjunctive (§7.2.7) (III 148.25ff.) ΕΤΤΨΝ ΝΕΝΨΒΕΕΡ... ΕΤΜΟΥΤΕ ΕΡΟΚ ΖΕ-ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ ΝΝΕΤΝΑΥ ΕΝΕΝΚΑΚΙΑ 48).

7.2.1.2 The optative (ΕΕΕΨΤΜ/ΝΝΕΕΨΤΜ) 49 is relatively rarely expanded by a subcategorized conjunctive (there is not a single instance in Ch.). Multiple είμε-periods are more common as nuclear. Personal maintenance is the rule; ΑΥΨ is not attested; negation is syncategorized or uncategorized; nucleus/conjunctive affirmative or negative.

(a) (→→): (III 179.11ff.) ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΕΕΕΕΜΟΥ ΕΡΨΤΝ ΝΧΑΣΛΕΝΕ ΝΗΤΝ ΝΝΕΝΤΣΙΕ ΝΝΩΜΚΟ ΜΠΣΑΣΕ ΝΝΑΖΡΗΤΝ / (III 20.16, IV 40.19f.) ΕΣΨΗΒΕ ΕΙΨΑΝΑΠΑΒΑ ΜΝΕΠΑΙΖΟΜΑΛΟΓΕΙ ΜΜΟΥ, ΕΙΝΑΥ ΕΤΜΝΤΕΡΟ ΜΡΝΟΥΤΕ ΝΤΑΜ-ΒΨΙΚ ΕΖΟΥΝ ΕΡΟΚ, oath formula; neg. encategorization (adversative sense): "... may I see the Kingdom... but not enter it".

(b) (←←), very rare: (IV 50.9ff.) ΝΝΕΝΕΨΖΗΤ ΤΑΚΟ... ΝΝΕΡ-ΠΨΨΒΥ ΖΕ-ΝΕΟΥΝ ΟΥΧΗΜΑ ΡΨ ΜΜΟΛΝΑΧΟΣ ΤΟ ΖΙΨΟΥ.

7.2.1.2.1 The post-optative paradigm includes in addition to the conjunctive also the coordinated optative (ΑΥΨ ΕΕΕΨΤΜ): (IV 116.4ff.) ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΕΕΕΕΜΟΥ ΕΡΟΟΥ ΑΥΨ ΕΕΕΖΑΡΕΖ ΕΡΟΟΥ ΑΥΨ ΕΕΕΖΗΜΟΤ ΝΑΥ / (ibid. 171.3ff.) ΕΕΕΨΗΒΕ ΕΕΣΖΟΨΡΤ ΑΥΨ ΕΕΕΤΕ ΕΙΡΑΙ ΕΕΨΗΒ ΝΕΝΕΙΚΑΖΟΥ ΥΡΟΥ / (III 131.5f.) ΠΝΟΥΤΕ

48 Yet another member of the post-interrogative paradigm is ΜΑΡΕΨΓΣΤΜ: (III 149.16ff.) ΕΤΤΨΝ ΝΕΤΟΥΜΟΥΤΕ ΕΡΟΟΥ ΖΕ-ΖΕΝΡΠ-ΝΟΒΕ ΝΕ... ΜΑΡΟΥΕΙ ΝΣΕΝΣ-ΠΑΞΣΕ ΕΖΟΥΝ ΕΡΨΝ / (P 1314 160 μ) ΕΥΨΟΠΙΝ ΤΥΝ ΤΕΝΟΥ ΜΑΡΟΨΤΑΜΩΝ. Post-imperative ΜΑΡΕΨΓΣΤΜ is perhaps more common in Bohairic, e.g. Mt. 13:30, Luc. 7:7 (cadd.), Joh. 18:8, corresponding to Sah. conjunctive, ΜΑΡΕΨ-, ΕΤΡΨ- (Horn.), TAPε (Chester Beatty A, B.). Cf. Kahlfe 1954:190 for the post-imperative and final paradigm (featuring also ΕΤΡΨ-, ΤΑΡΕΨ- final constructions, 190ff. for ΤΑΡΕΨ- 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".
7.2.1.3 Final/consecutive conjunctival syntagms. Here we encounter the well-known difficulty of determining the opposition between ΞΕΚΑΑΣ vs. ΞΕ-ΕΧΣΣΤΜ and ΞΕ vs. ΞΕΚΑΑΣ ΕΧΝΑΣΤΜ — an opposition the functional resolution of which must await some future study. The conjunctive expands all constructions. Note that άνου-microcoordination is here incomparably more frequent than with the post-imperatival conjunctive.

(a) (→→), usually with άνου: (III 158.28ff.) ΕΥΕΤΑΜΟΝ ΞΙΟΥΜΝΤΜΕ ΕΝΕΤΑΛΝΑΥ ΕΡΟΥ ΞΕΚΑΑΣ ΕΥΕΤΙΜΗΝ ΕΥ- ΕΜΑΑΑΤΤ ΞΙΟΥΜΝΤΜΕ ΥΘΡΟΥ άΝΟΥ ΝΞΕΓΙΕΙ ΕΞΡΑΙ ΕΧΑΟΥ ΝΓΙΝΕΚΟΥΜ ΥΘΡΟΥ ΕΤΖΗ / (Πidine 40.27ff.)... ΞΕ-ΕΡΕ- ΖΝΗΣΤΗΝ ΝΑΤ-ΖΗΥ ΆΝΟΥ ΝΞΕΓΙΕΙΝΤΖΗΝ ΑΧΦΕ ΑΠΑΤΗ ΝΙΟΝΤΟΥ 5ΝΣΤΤΒΟ ΝΜΟ / (IV 18.16ff.)...ΞΕ-ΕΝΑΕΝΕ ΝΟΥΝΑ ΕΞΡΑΙ ΕΞΡΑΙ άΝΟΥ ΝΞΕΓΙΕΙΝΤΖΗΝ ΝΙΟΝΤΟΥ ΝΠΑΝΑΑΤΤΕ ΟΥΜΟΥ άΝΟΥ ΝΓΙΝΕΚΟΥΜ. Additional exx.: III 78.19ff., 99.6ff., 122.3ff., 194.18ff. Without άνου: (IV 155.11ff.)...ΞΕ-ΕΝΑΕΝΕ ΝΟΥΝΑΕ ΝΜΠΟΝΗΠΟΝ ΝΤΑΝΑΑΤΤ. Also Ch. 18-19, 101.44ff.

(b) (→→), considerably less common: (III 119.7ff.) ΞΕΠΙΤΑΤΜΑ ΝΑΝ ΕΝΤΚΑΤΑΑΛΑΤΤ ΟΥΔΕ ΕΤΜΚΡΩΜ... ΞΕ- ΚΑΝΩΝΤΟΥ ΔΩΝΤΕ ΕΡΟΝ ΝΓΣΑΚΟ ΝΝΖΗΣΤΗΝ / (Ch. 148.47ff.)...ΞΕ-ΕΝΑΕΝΕ ΝΟΥΝΑΕ ΝΞΕΓΙΕΙΝΤΖΗΝ ΝΠΑΝΑΑΤΤΕ. Also IV 51.8ff.

7.2.2 Extratemporal predications

7.2.2.1 ΕΧΣΣΤΜ (and conversions): I know of no certain instance of άΧΣΣΤΜ subcategorized by the conjunctive. Conjunctive: affirmative only. Personal maintenance is the rule (only 3rd persons, sgl. and plur.).

(a) (→→) (άνου very rare): (III 110.2f.) ΥΑΤΑΣΡΑΟΥΟΥ ΕΡΟΥ άΛΟΥ ΝΓΕΥΡΑΝΕ ΜΜΟΟΥ ΝΞΗΤΟΥ / (Πidine 176.3) ΝΞΕ ΔΕ ΕΤΣΑΤΑΥΝΟΟΥ ΝΓΕΥΡΑΝΕ ΝΜΠΟΝΗΠΟΝ ΝΞΗΤΟΥ / (IV 24.19ff.)...ΞΕΤΑΚΑΡΟΤΟΥ ΝΓΕΥΡΑΝΕ ΝΓΕΥΡΑΝΕ ΝΓΣΑΖΑΝ ΝΓΣΑΖΑΝ — repeated lexeme / (Πidine 38.29) ΟΥΝΖΑΖΑΝ ΝΞΕΓΙΕΙΝΤΖΗΝ ΕΝΤΚΑΤΑΑΛΑΤΤ ΑΧΦΕ ΑΠΑΤΗ ΝΓΣΑΖΑΝ — etymologically related lexemes / (Πidine 82.11) ΥΑΤΤ-ΟΣΕ ΝΞΕΓΙΕΙΝΤΖΗΝ ΥΑΤΙΝΖΚΑΡΟΤΟΥΝ — — repeated lexeme / (Ch. 80.21ff.)...ΞΕΝΑΤΑΤΤΕΙΝΤΖΗΝ ΝΓΣΑΖΑΝ ΝΓΣΑΖΑΝ — — antonyms / (P 1314 157 vo) ΠΟΤΕΝΕ ΝΓΣΑΖΑΝ ΝΓΣΑΖΑΝ — — paraphrase. Also III 45.3ff., 152.24ff., 163.14ff., IV 94.3ff.

(b) (→→): doubtful, perhaps (IV 25.25ff.) ΥΑΠΕΝΟΝΤΕΙ ΝΓΣΑΖΑΝ ΝΧΕΥΡΑΝ ΝΓΣΑΖΑΝ ΝΓΣΑΖΑΝ ΕΝΤΚΑΤΑΑΛΑΤΤ ΤΗΡΗ / (Πidine 70.17ff.)...ΞΕΤΑΚΑΡΟΤΟΥ ΝΓΣΑΖΑΝ — — antonyms / (Πidine 31.9) άΛΟΥ ΝΓΣΑΖΑΝ. Also III 179.2ff., IV 26.4 (a rare case of the personal maintenance disrupted), 113.6f.

7.2.2.2 ΣΑΛΑΓΜΗ: affirmative conjunctive only; no pers. maintenance.

(a) (→→): (IV 24.13ff.) ΝΓΣΑΖΑΝΕ ΝΓΣΑΖΑ ΝΓΣΑΖΑ ΝΓΣΑΖΑ ΝΓΣΑΖΑ ΝΓΣΑΖΑ / (Ch. 121.6ff.)...ΞΕ-ΣΑΛΑΓΜΗ ΝΞΕΓΙΕΙΝΤΖΗΝ ΟΥΔΕ ΝΓΣΑΖΑΤΟΥ ΝΓΣΑΖΑΤΟΥ... Also 197.
7.2.2.3 The present-based future (κνασμύσις and conversions)

7.2.3.1 Basic Tense: κνασμύσις.

(a) (→→): no personal maintenance; negation encategorized, affirmation encategorized. (III 123.27) κνασμύσις δὲ ντασθι κυμαιαί / (ibid. 36.17f.), parall. Ch. 132.9ff.) ετθούος κνασμύσις ημερ νακαι αν κυμαιαί εκβαλλα μπερνεθι / (Ch. 49.8ff.) κνασμύσις-γολάς γαρ αν ἐπ-αμεια λακ (and so) κυμαιαί-εκβαλλα κυμαιαί-γολάς, addressed to God; affirmative encategorization / (IV 3.18f.) σεκακαλλ τοντως κυμαιαι / (Ch. 83.13ff.) ετθούος κυμαιαί ημερούς-περεφοίνας αν κυμαιαί κατει / (ibid. 93.22ff.) καικύμευς κτημεθησι / (A I 135-6) η κτημεθησι αν κτερρικα η κτημεθησι εκπονεύςε μερος. Εν εκβαλλα κυμαιαί-60α / (P 1306 56 ΝΒ) ουκούνεις γαρ κυμαιαί κτημεθησίουε ιερ ουκούνεις (see §7.2.3.6 below).

7.2.3.2 Circumstantial future: uncommon. Usually adnominal (or open to attributive adnominal interpretation) although a prothetic role is not excluded (in fact, both functions are neutralized in the adnominal syntactic slot). No negation; no - αυς - : subcoordination only? (Ch. 190.31ff.) υψηταιμυ επισε ημερ ουκούνεις ευκαιρεια εκποια 6μηρναμα κυμαιαί γαρεθηρια κυμαιαί ημερούς κυμαιαί αν ανεπεκακαλλ τοντως κυμαιαι, cf. ibid. ibid. 52ff. ημερούς εκβαλα / (IV 162.2ff.) ...ζοκόν αναι + τυί εκβαλα, αναι ημερ νακαι εκβαλα. Αυς ζοκόν επεραι αναι εκβαλα, ημερ νακαι + τυί εκβαλα. 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, ζοκόν αναι and ημερ (Second Perfect), and, on the other hand, ζοκόν
EPE- NA- and the conjunctive; while the former is well understandable as a circumstantial clause (2OCON A-) focalized by a Second Tense, in the sense of "no sooner... than..." (§2.7.1.1), the latter seems anacoluthic, conflating a subcoordinative role (actual sequence, preceptive 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 — foci. 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.) EPEΠΧΟΕΙΣ ΝΕΚΕ ΝΑΜΟΥΝ ΕΡΟΟΥ ΝΟΥΡΝ ΑΥΞΗ ΝΥ+ΕΟΟΥ ΝΑΥ / (III 65.3ff.) ΕΤΒΕΟΥ ΕΚ- ΝΑΜΟΥΣΧΕ ΕΠΕΝΚΟΤΜΟΥΣΗΝ ΧΟΟΥ ΧΕ-... ΝΟΜΗΜΑΤΩΝ ΝΟΥΡΝ ΕΠΕΝΚΟΤΜΟΥΣΗΝ ΧΟΟΥ ΧΕ- — neg. encategorization / (ibid. 123.7ff.) ΝΑΥ ΕΝ ΝΕΚΕ ΕΙΝΑΧΕ-ΝΑΙ ΕΤΜΑΜΑΥ ΝΕΟΝΟΥ ΝΗΤΑΟΜΟΥΣΗΝ ΕΝΙΜΝΗΝ. Also: IV 14.4ff., 76.20ff., 161.12ff. (jussive ΕΤΑ-?).

(b) (→→): (III 188.20ff.) ΕΝΣΕΝΤΑΚΕ ΝΗΜΕ ΝΑΚΗ ΑΝ ΝΗΣΕΝΜΑΤΟΙ ΖΑΡΑΤΥ ΝΥΚΛΟΥΝΕ ΝΗΤΕΝΣΤΙΤΙ ΝΑΥ ΝΗΜΟΥ ΝΥΚΟΥ ΕΠΙΝΣΗ/ (IV 101.15ff.) EΡΕΠΟΥ ΠΟΥΑ ΝΑΗ-ΝΗΣΜΑΚΕ ΑΝ ΕΒΟΑ ΖΑΝΝΑΣΒΕΘ ΕΤΒΕΟΥΡΑΝ ΝΣΕΚΑ-ΝΤΑΛΛΑϊ- ΝΙΡΟΣ ΕΥΤΑΛΑΙΝΙΨΕΙ — neg. syncategorization.

7.2.3.4 The preterite future, ΝΕΜΝΑΤΕΣΤΙ: always apodotic to an irrealis protasis (ΝΕ, when present, immediately precedes the conjunctive). No ΑΥΞ-microcoordination; negation syncategorization, affirmation encategorization. (III 88.25ff.) ΕΝΕΝΤΕΝΚΟΟΥΝ ΝΝΕΠΕΟΥ ΝΕΤΕΝΣΑΡΖΟΤΕ ΑΝ ΖΕ ΝΕΤΣΕΝΚΑΒΑΝΕ ΕΖΟΥΝ ΕΝΙΝΟΥΤΕ: the negative syncategorization does not extend to the conjunctive (= affirmation encategorization) but this depends on the sense of ΑΙΣΚΑΜΕΝ ΕΖΟΥΝ Ε- (as far as I know, a unicum; cf. αλδάδες έξερε το, with an adverbial sense of "feel against"? This could suit a neg. syncategorization) / (IV 42.3ff.) ...ΝΕΡΕΤΕΙΜΕΝΕ ΝΡΗΜΕ ΝΑΗΜΕ ΝΗΣΕΝΜΑΤΕ ΝΗΜΑΤΕ ΝΗΣΑΜΕ / (IV 96.25) (Ε)ΝΕΥΟ ΓΑΡ ΑΝ ΝΑΤΕΝΚΟΟΥΝ ΝΕΥΝΑΣΜΟΟΣ ΑΝ ΝΕΣΑΧΕΣΕ ΕΡΟΙ ΝΑΙΟΥΕ.

7.2.3.5 The relative future ΕΤ-ΝΑ- only in the following two cases:

(1) the "substantivized" relative ΝΕΤ-ΝΑΤΩΤΗ (i.e. ΕΤΝΑ- expanding the determinator series Ν-); ΕΤΝΑ- expanding indefinite pronoun nuclei (ΟΥΥΝ ΝΗΜ, ΡΗΜΕ (ΝΗΜ)) — paraphrasing the foregoing case —, temporal nouns (ΝΕΣΟΟΥ) paraphrasing a conjunctive 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. (III 74.3ff.) ΟΥΟΕΙ ΔΕ ΝΕΤΣΕΝΜΑΤΣΟ ΑΥΣΗ ΝΥΧΕΡΟ... ΝΥΣΤΟΥΜΕΥ / (ibid. 154.27ff.) ΝΕΤΣΕΝΜΑΤΣΟ ΝΕΣΑΧΕΣΗ ΝΥΓΥΘΕ ΕΖΩΟΟΥ ΡΓΑΙ ΝΕΤΣΙΝ... ΑΥΣΗ ΝΕΤΣΕΝΜΑΤΣΟ ΕΡΑΤΥ ΝΕΣΑΧΕΣΗ Ν ΡΖΩΘ... — neg. encategorization / (IV 113.5ff.) ΝΕΤΣΕΝΜΑΤΣΟ ΕΖΩΟΥΝΕ ΝΥΣΤΟΥΜΕΥ ΕΝΕΝΤΕ ΕΡΟΟΥ / (ibid. 171.1ff.) ΝΕΤ- ΝΑΡ-ΝΟΒΕ ΝΥΓΥΘΕ... ΑΥΣΗ ΝΥΣΤΟΥΜΑΤΣΟ ΝΕΤΣΕΝΜΑΤΣΟ — neg. encategorization / (Ch. 25.39ff.) ΕΝΕΣΟΟΥ ΕΤΕΝΣΕΤΩΡ... ΝΕΣΕΝΜΑΤΣΟ ΝΟΒΕ ΝΟΥΚΡΑΜΕΝ ΑΥΣΗ ΝΣΕΤΣΑΚΕ ΝΥΓΥΘΕ ΕΒΟΑ ΝΖΑΜΝΗΣ, also IV 182.3ff., 208.11ff. Additional exxs.: IV 122.5ff. (ΝΕΤΝΑ-, ΟΥΥΝ ΝΗΜ ΕΤ- ΝΣΕΤΝ-), 125.20ff., 126.8ff., 166.21ff., 169.11, 207.27ff., Ch. 34.34ff.
(2) ΠΕΤΝΑ-, the *glose* constituent in a rhetorical-interrogative Cleft Sentence³³. Frequent negation encategorization (a rhetorical figure); neg. syncategorization.

(a) (→→): (III 33.26ff.) ΠΑΙ ΠΕΤΝΑ-ΠΠΕΝ ΝΤΜΝΤΡΕΧΑΙ-ΖΟ ΝΩΕΥΟΡΑΝΕ ΜΝΠΟΥΣΤΕ / (IV 4-5) ΝΙΜ ΓΑΡ ΠΕΤΝΑΚΑΛΡΟΝΟΜΈ ΓΝΗΜΥΗΕ ΝΣΗΜΗΥΗΕ ΕΥΟ ΝΠΡΟ / (ibid. 32.19ff.) ΝΙΜ ΝΥΗΡΕ ΝΡΜΗΝΣΗΤ ΝΕΤΝΑΕΠΟΥΜΗΣ ΑΝ ΕΡ-2ΩΒ ΕΝΕΖΗΒΗΕ ΕΤΕΡΙΝΕΥΕΙΤΕ ΕΤΖΝΗΜΠΟΥ Π-ΖΩΒ ΕΡΟΟΥ. . . ΑΥΛ ΝΣΗΟΥΑΖΟΥ ΝΣΑΛΕΣΜΟΤ ΝΝΗΓΕΣΟΣ (sim. III 200.14ff.) / (Ch. 56.46ff.) AΥ ΜΗΑ ΝΕΤΝΑΝΑΠΤΕ ΜΝΗΟΥΗ Ν ΝΗΗΒΙΚ ΕΖΟΥΝ ΕΡΟΟΥ ΝΣΗΜ-ΠΟΣΕ ΝΤΕΦΨΥΧΗ — second conjunctive subordinated, neg. encategorized. Additional exx.: III 186.24ff., IV 88.10ff., 164.13ff., Ch. 203.20ff.

(b) (-----) (A 2.240) ΝΙΜ ΠΕΤΝΑΣΧΤΜ ΠΑΙ ΝΤΝΜΚΨ ΝΑΧ ΝΝΕΕΒΟΟΥΕ ΝΝΕΡΑΦΗ — neg. encategorization / (IV 74.25) ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΝΤΟΚ ΕΤΝΑΚΟΤΚ ΝΤΗΝΑΖΟΝ / (ibid. 156.19ff.) ΝΙΜ ΠΕΤΝΑΠΡΟΣΚΕΚΕ ΑΝ ΞΕ-ΕΟΥΟΥΜ ΝΑΥ ΝΖΕ ΝΤΕΤΝΗΕΥΒΗΕ ΕΡ-ΖΟΥΟ ΣΡΑΙ ΝΖΗΤΗ ΠΝΑΛΟΥΗΕΡΣΟΣ "so that... not"; negation maintenance / (Ch. 120.25ff.) ΝΙΜ ΝΕΤΝΑΑΑΑ ΝΑΥ ΕΝΕΞΕΥΖΗΤ ΝΣΕ6Ω ΖΗΜΝΤΣΩΒ ΤΗΡΚ "and still...".

### 7.2.3.6 Paradigm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ΠΕΤΝΑΣΧΤΜ</th>
<th>ΑΥΛ ΠΕΤΝΑΣΧΤΜ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>conjunctive</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Observations*: (1) ΑΥΛ + *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 ΑΥΛ + *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 - ΝΗΥ present predicate (cf. I Cor. 4:19, II Tim. 4:4).

(4) Following ΠΕΤΝΑΣΧΤΜ, the paradigm is joined by ΕΤΡΕ-, a "that"-form heralded by -C- (§5.2.2.1).

(5) *Circumstantial future*. I have found no evidence 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.) ΝΕΡΕΝΝΟΥΤΕ ΝΑΖΟΥΕΡ-ΚΑΕΙΝ ΑΝ ΠΕ ΑΥΛ ΝΕΤΝΑΕΝ-ΠΜΟΥ ΑΝ ΠΕ ΕΞΝΑ-ΝΑΙΑΝ ΝΝΑΠΠΙΑ ΡΕΤΖΙΜΕ.

(8) ΠΕΤΝΑ- ΑΥΛ ΠΕΤΝΑ- is extremely rare³³ (III 198.14ff. ΠΕΤΝΑΧΙΟΥΕ ΚΑΤΑΛΑΧΥ ΝΗΟΤΟΥ ΑΥΛ ΠΕΤΝΑΚΙ ΕΒΟΛ 2ΝΝΚΑ ΝΤΙΔΑΙΚΟΝΙΑ); so is ΕΤΝΑ- ΑΥΛ ΕΤΝΑ- (III 137.19ff. ΟΥΝ ΝΙΜ ΕΤΝΑΡ-ΒΟΛ ΜΠΠΥΙ ΑΥΛ ΕΤ- ΝΑΧΕΣ-ΝΕΧΩΝ paraprases and transforms I Thees. 4:6 ...ΕΤΜΡ-ΒΟΛ ΜΠΠΥΙ ΑΥΛ ΕΤΜΨΣ-ΝΕΧΣΟΝ).

### 7.2.4 Conditional and Temporal Protatic Syntagms³⁴. The frequent negative and affirmative encategorization here is stylistically distinctive (a figure). Distinction between (→→) and (-----) is difficult, perhaps not warranted.

³³ The two syntags, ΠΕΤ- ("'substantivized relative'") and ΠΕΤ-/ΠΕ ΕΤ-/ΕΤ- ("glose") are diachronically and synchronically to be kept apart, as regards both external and internal relationships. However, they coincide as nuclei of the conjunctive. See Polotsky 1962, esp. §6, and Quecke forthcoming.

³⁴ In (IV 204.21ff.) ΟΥΝ ΝΙΜ ΕΤΝΑ- ...Η ΠΕΤΝΑ- two categories of persons are enumerated. ΑΥΛ 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- ΑΥΛ ΕΤ-, e.g. III 21.10, 74.11ff., 93.17ff., 127.16ff.); with *glose-forms*: III 46.613, 215.14ff., Ch. 27.32ff., 95.13ff., Wess. 9 108a 13ff.; cf. Shisha-Halevy 1972: 114ff. For the perfect, we find (n)ΕΤΝΑ- (ΑΥΛ) ΑΜ-/ΕΑΜ-, cf. III 69.14ff., 177.24ff., Ch. 29.37ff., 40.18ff. etc.

(1) The Conditional: ΕΥΘΑΝΑΤΩΜ unvested or vested 56 with ΚΑΝ, ΖΩΤΑΝ, ΕΥΘΗνΕ. Note the following data regarding the 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 (ΕΥΘΑΝΑΤΩΜ (ΑΥΘ) ΝΗΤΜ-, IV 106.5ff.); negation maintenance, (ΕΥΘΑΝΑΤΩΜ- ΑΥΘ ΝΗΤΜ- III 65.25ff., 131.20ff.); affirmation encategorization (ΕΥΘΑΝΑΤΩΜ- + conjunctive + ΑΥΘ ΑΑΑΑ, ΑΕ, III 19.4ff., A I 88).

(a) (←→), personal maintenance: (III 19.4ff.) ΕΥΘΑΝΑΤΩΜ-ΑΝΑΤΗ ΜΠΑΑΝ ΜΠΟΥΤΕ ΝΣΕΙΠΕ ΑΕ ΝΚΕΑΝΑΤΗ- affirm. encategorization / (ibid. 125.14ff.) ΕΥΘΕΙΝΕ ΕΥΘΑΝΑΤΣΜΘΤΝ ΝΣΕΙΠΟΜΟΘ- ΑΥΘ ΝΗΤΜΘ-ΓΗΝ ΕΜΠΑΡΑΔΟΟΙΣ ΝΝΕΝΘΟΤΕ — neg. maintenance / (IV 3.17ff.) ΕΥΘΑΝ-ΠΕΠΝΑΟΥΜ ΝΖΝΤΟΥΝ Η ΝΣΕΣΜΕΙΠΕ — neg. encategorization / (ibid. 106.5ff.) ΕΥΘΑΝΑΤΣΜΘΤΝ ΑΥΘ ΝΣΕΙΠ-ΣΒΘ — neg. syncategorization / (Ch. 117.14ff.) ΚΑΝ ΕΥΘΑΝΑΤΣΜΘΤΝ ΝΣΕΙΠ ΝΤΕΘΒΡΑ ΝΤΑΥΒΘΚ ΕΡΟΣ ΑΥΘ ΝΣΕΘΘΟΣ / (A I 88) ΕΥΘΕΙΝΕ ΕΥΘΑΝΑΤΣΜΘΤΝ ΜΜΟΝ ΝΕ- ΤΑΝΟΙ ΑΑΑΑ ΝΤΣΜΘΤΝ ΝΑΝ... — 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.) ΕΥΘΕΙΝΕ ΡΗ ΕΥΘΑΝΑΤΘΝ-ΤΜΘΕΣ ΕΣΟΥΝ ΝΗΤΜΑΑΣ (v.l. Cod. Α ΝΗΘΑΑ) ΝΟΥΚΕΦΑΛΙΟΝ ΝΣΘΙ-ΜΜΘΕ ΟΝ ΜΜΟΘ — variant reading neg. syncategorization/maintenance / (ibid. 16.22ff.) ΚΑΝ ΕΥΘΑΝΑΤΘΟΤΕ ΡΗ ΟΥΘΘ ΕΒΘΟΛ... ΝΣΕΡ-ΑΝΑΤΗ ΜΜΘΟΥ ΕΥΘΑΝ ΕΡΟΘ ("and so...") / (ibid. 220.2ff.) ΕΥΘΑΝΑΠΟΡΟΟΥ ΕΒΘΟΛ ΝΕΨΘΡΘΟΥ ΝΝΕΟΟΥ ΜΕΝ ΝΣΕΝΤΟΝ ΜΜΘΟΥ ΝΘΝΕΘΜΑ ΝΝΘΑΜΝΕ ΑΕ ΝΣΕΣΡΑ ΝΝΚΘΟΥ ΕΘΕΝΜΑ ΝΣΑΘΕΙΕ... / (IV 69.13, A I 136 etc.) ΕΥΘΑΝΑΤΘΟΘΝΕ... ΝΤΕ- — the conjunctive sharing this slot with ΕΤΡΕ- after the cataphoric — (§5.2.2.1). Peculiarly, — ΑΥΘ occurs here in cases of actual sequence: (III 150.14ff.) ΕΥΘΑΝΑΤΘΟΥΝ ΕΘΘΘΟΘ... ΑΥΘ ΝΤΑΘΕΙ ΕΒΘΟΛ.

PARADIGM: complete coordinated sets of protasis + apodosis excepted, "concurrent" constructions are here rare. For ΕΥΘΑΝ- ΑΥΘ ΕΥΘΑΝ- I have very few examples; one (IV 155.14ff.), in ponderous rhetorical style, with relatively independent protases: ΕΥΘΑΝΚΟΥΘΡΕΤ ΜΑΥΑΑΤ... ΑΥΘ ΕΥΘΑΝΜΝΕΤ ΕΤΜΘΗΜ- ΟΕΙΚ...; another (III 121.8ff.) with protases too incommensurate to be microcoordinated: ΕΥΘΕ-ΕΥΘΑΝ-...ΑΥΘ ΖΩΤΑΝ ΕΥΘΑΝΘΜ... (2) ΕΥΘΕ, ΕΥΘΘΕ: ΕΥΘΕ- | ΑΥΣ- | ΕΥΘΘΕ | Ε- | see under (3) ΕΥΘΑΝ-, ΕΤΜΘ- | ΟΥΝΘΘ- | ΝΤΑΥΘ- (§2.1.5)

(a) (←→): neg. encategorization/maintenance; no personal maintenance. (III 139.18) ΕΥΘΕ-ΟΥΝΘΘΘΕΙΝΕ... ΕΥΚΡΗΜΘΡ... ΑΕ-ΕΙΘΙ ΜΜΘΘΟΥ ΝΘΟΟΘ ΑΥΘ ΝΤΟΟΘ ΝΣΕΤΜΘΑΟΙ... — neg. encategorization / (A I 99) ΕΥΘΕ- ΝΤΑΝΠΙ ΧΘΟΟ ΜΝΘΝΘΓΘΕ ΝΘΕΘΒΡΘ ΑΕ-ΓΑΡΙΜΘΟΥ ΝΤΕΝΑΙ ΧΘΝΖ... ΑΥΘ ΝΣΕΜΘΟΥ... / (Wess. 9 122d 11ff.) ΕΥΘΕΘΕ ΟΥΝΘΘΘ-ΟΥΝΘΘ ΜΝΘΝΘΓΘΕ ΝΤΕΝΘΑΘ ΕΥΘΘΘΟΣ ΝΘΡΘΗΘΘ... / (Ch. 195.8ff.) ΕΥΘΕ-ΑΝΘΕΟΥΘΤΑΘ- ΣΟΥ ΓΘΘ-ΓΘΘ ΑΘΑΑΘ ΝΑΚ ΝΤΕΝΘΘ-ΓΘΘ ΑΕ ΝΤΟΚ... ΑΘΑΑΘ ΓΑΝΘΤΘΕ ΝΤΕΘΒΡΘ... — neg. encategorization. Also A I 97, P 1304 111 ΦΘΘΓ (ΕΥΘΕΘΕ ΝΤΑΘ- ΑΥΘ ΝΤΟΟΘ ΝΕ-), Ch. 85-6.

(b) (→→) (?): (IV 101.8) ΧΕΚΑΑΕ ΕΥΘΕΘΕ ΧΕ-ΣΘΘΘΥΕ ΣΘΑΕΡΘ ΕΡΟΘ; ΕΥΘΘΕ ΜΜΘΘ ΝΣΕΤΜΘΑΙΤΟΥ... (i.e. the applicants to join the community. The neg. conjunctive [neg. maintenance] contentualizes ΜΜΘΘ).
(3) **Circumstantial-converter** protases (unvested or vested with **ἐγνωκε, καν, ζαμωι**):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>εγνωκε</strong></th>
<th><strong>καν</strong></th>
<th><strong>ε</strong></th>
<th><strong>ζαμωι</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ουνται-</strong>/<strong>μνται-</strong></td>
<td><strong>αυ</strong>-</td>
<td><strong>μη</strong>- (here the conv. is often realized as zero)</td>
<td><strong>μη</strong>-/<strong>νται-</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) (**——**): characteristic frequent neg. encategorization; neg. syncategorization/maintenance; no personal maintenance. *(III 157.1ff.)* (ζενθυμε νεκοοιν αν) ἡ ντοκ ευςουν ντατμεις ανοκ ούτε παλα... — neg. encategorization / (ibid. 40.20ff.) καν ειςλαν νμμαϊ καν ειςλαν νμμαϊ καν ειουεμ-οεικ νμμαϊ ευςουμ νμμαϊ ἐρετοτ ους τοουτ ζηπειαοεις ους τιετηρπαεα ους νετολαμα ετακο νμταιοι μπ-νυτε... / (ibid. 139.25ff.)...ετετνινοον μεγε λει-αλι-1οεινε νγονς... ους ντουτ ντετντμαιοι... — neg. encategorization / *(P 130* 41 *πς)* **εγνωκε** ουειςτ μνοομαιαυ εουνται μμαι νεκοοινε μμαιευεεε ους ντεταζ ους τοουτ 2ε επαια ζνοουσεε... / *(IV 31.3ff.)* ζενπρεμε εμεπαι μκουοι νεκοοινε ή ντουτ εουνται ηεαποτας μμουοι νεκοοινε μμαιευεεε ους ντεταζ ους τοουτ 2ε επαια ζνοουσεε... / *(Ch. 63.12ff.)* ουατομ πε ετεπειαβαοις τρεψεμε ρ-νοβε μεπειονους αμ-ορφοι επειμεε μπιαβαοις ή νηςοτρ νμμαϊ / (ibid. 195.53ff.) (''Will our heart be capable of receiving love towards our neighbour'' Μνοοιμοιε μνορι πνομεταινομ αυς ντεταζ ους ηεαποτας μμουοι νεκοοινε μμαιευεεε ους ντεταζ ους τοουτ 2ε επαια ζνοουσεε... / *(P 130* 75 *ρο)* Νιμ πνεμαι-ναι εμπινονοιτε ρππηπαζε-πεπο ους μμουοι αυς νιαν αν ναμεν ονημαι... / (ibid. 196.14ff.) (ευς-ουνταιεν... νεκοοινε αν εςεςινοουμε εους... ή ντουτ καν εαυοκε μεμετασαγους εβολ αμμουοι... (i.e. from the victuals) — neg. encategorization / (ibid. 98.14ff.)...εαιτοςι εζενθυμε μπιεματικοι ητωμ εζενθυμε νεκοοινε... / *(Ch. 63.12ff.)* ουατομ πε ετεπειαβαοις τρεψεμε ρ-νοβε μεπειονους αμ-ορφοι επειμεε μπιαβαοις ή νηςοτρ νμμαϊ / (ibid. 195.53ff.) (''What is his worth'') καν επικα-κεζανα με-μπιπρευςεμε ναα... αυς καρ-ρμαι λαι ους... — affirm. encategorization / *(Wess. 9 88b 11ff.)* Ενεμενησθη ννουςγ 2νοταμ αμμοοεις γααμε εβολ αμμοι ους Ντεευςυχρ ρππηπαζεμε μμα νααμιμ... νευνααιμαλλητιζ αε πε μπηα / *(Zoea 200 τια)* Ενεμπεμπηναπαφυςες των νβαλ νετςιμ μμπην ννετειε εμμουοι... / *(A / 202)* ζαμωι ενευςουοι νμμαι ηεονι νεςετμαιες-νενσειετε Γιαςυ... — neg. encategorization / *(K 928)* (καιει) ζαμωι ενεμπεμπηρ-λααυ ηαηαν ένες νυττιμοοντ ηε ον νουατνοε. (ιουδας) ζαμωι ενεμπεμπηρ-αποστολος ενες νυτμπαραδαιους ον μπιοεις. (καιας) ζαμωι ενεμπεμπηρ-ονυκμ ενες νυτιμαι-ωδινε ον εμοουτ μπιοεις — neg. maintenance / *(IV 9.18ff.)* ζαμωι ενεταταμοφορ νονυς νικε επευμακζ νεκοοιμους μπιπλαλαγος νααλακαα. Also: *IV 123.20ff.* (ευςεις εν-ν εντοκ εν-αυς ντεταζ)... 163.2ff. (μπο-με-κε-), Ch. 165.16ff. (ενεμπο- αυς κε-), Wess. 9 119b 9ff. (ζαμωι ενεμπο- μεθ-).

(b) (**——** (?): *(III 111-2)* ζαμωι ενεταλιαεις... ννιννυτε νζατ ενινμου... μαλιτη οικις μμνου τα επηρ νεκε μμαιε ναιες αυς κοου νονυς ντατζεςτς η ντατζεςτου... / *(A 2 526)* ηααιει πε παι μπιπζ ηεςοογ εκαζαρτος μπιρμε έναω τομελ αυς καρ ηεςιαοε ηεςιαοε ηεςιαοε ηεςιαοε... — 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 **54**, (b) (**——** (?)): *(III 111-2)* ζαμωι ενεταλιαεις... ννιννυτε νζατ ενινμου... μαλιτη οικις μμνου τα επηρ νεκε μμαιε ναιες αυς κοου νονυς ντατζεςτς η ντατζεςτου... / *(A 2 526)* ηααιει πε παι μπιπζ ηεςοογ εκαζαρτος μπιρμε έναω τομελ αυς καρ ηεςιαοε ηεςιαοε ηεςιαοε ηεςιαοε... — incommensurate protases (the second non-verbal).

---

OYN− or the verboid OYNTA−, or (b) the non-narrative, gnomic-parabolic perfect tense 57 — as a rule in relative and adnominal-circumstantial conversion, the equivalents of a generic relative clause ("such... as...") or of a gnomic supposative hypothetic protasis ("supposing...", "should it ever happen that...") 58. (Note the frequent negation encategorization, cf. §7.2.4.)

(1) Present: (a) (→→→): (Ch. 26.12ff.) NEKESWΩH ETEΟΥΝΓΟΜ ΝΗΣΛΗΨΗΡΕΥΗΜ ΕΣΟΥΝΘΟΥ ΑΥΨ ΝΣΕΤΜΨΨΝ ΕΝΕΤΚΥΨΜΗ ΜΜΩΚ — neg. encategorization / (IV 122.5ff.) NEΤΝΑ+ ΔΕ ΟΝ ΜΝΗΨΟΥΟΕΙ ΕΣΟΥΝ ΕΡΟΝ ΕΤΡΕΦΟΥΨ ΝΜΜΑΝ... ΟΥΝ ΝΙΜ ΕΤΟ ΝΚΟΙΝΨΟΟΝ ΝΜΜΑΝ... ΝΣΕΤΜΛΑΟΤΑΣΕ ΝΝΚΑ ΝΙΜ ΕΤΣΟΟΝ ΝΑΥ... — here the conj. is probably microcoordinated to the substantivized future / (Leyd. 355) ΝΕΤΣΨΨΝ ΜΜΩΝ ΝΨΥΨΝΟΜΙΝΕ (sic) ΖΙΟΥΜΝΤΡΕΨΗΙ-ΔΑ / (IV 156.9ff.) (ΟΥΡΨΜΕ Ν ΟΥΣΙΜΕ) ΕΥΑΜΑΛΕΙ ΕΤΑ΢ΟΟΥ ΕΡΑΤΟΥ ΑΥΨ ΝΣΕΨΗΝΕ ΑΝ ΖΗΤΟΥ ΝΝΚΡΑΨΗΣ ΝΑΜΕ ΑΥΨ ΕΤΣΟΕ... ΑΥΨ ΝΣΕΤΜΨΨΝ ΝΑΥ ΕΡ-ΝΕΡΨΜΑ ΝΑΥ ΝΣΗΜΑΛ... / (Cairo 8007) ΟΥΡΨΜΕ ΕΥΑΛΨ-ΤΡΕΨΨΟΥΝ ΜΠΑΨΣΜΟΟΣ, ΝΕΟΥΨΕΥ-ΤΡΕΨ ΜΟΟΟΣ...].

(b) (→→): (III 41.5) ΝΕΤΨΟΟΥΝ ΕΝΕΥΨΒΗΨΕ ΝΣΕΨΨΧΙ ΕΨΑΨΟ — lexical equivalence of neg. encategorization: "...and (should they) not tell" / (Ch. 195.1ff.) ΝΕΤΕΟΥΝΤΑ-ΨΟΥΝ ΝΨΤΜΝΑ ΝΖΗΣΟΥ — neg. encategorization 59 / (IV 120.3ff.) ΟΥΝ ΝΙΜ ΖΡΑΙ ΝΖΗΤΝ ΕΨΡ-ΝΟΒΕ Ν ΕΨΑΨΡ-ΝΟΒΕ... ΑΥΨ ΝΣΕΤΜΨΨ ΝΨΝΟΒΕ ΝΤΑΨΑΛΑΝ — NA- nucleus? / (Wess. 9 94b 10ff.) ΝΙΜ ΝΕΤΨΟΟΥΝ ΑΝ ΖΕ-ΝΖΑΛΑΤΕ ΜΝΗΨΟΟΝΕΙ ΑΥΨ ΝΨΚΕΣΕΝΕ ΝΖΨΟΝ ΣΕΜΕ ΝΝΕΨΡΨΡ ΝΤΝΤΡΨ-ΝΨΝΕΨΕΥΕ ΑΝΩΝ ΜΝΗΨΨΝ ΕΝΕΨΡΨΨ — neg. encategorization, the conjunctive expanding the generic present SEME — or better neg. maintenance, with ΝΕΤΨΟΟΥΝ ΑΝ the nucleus (ΤΨΝ Ε− "be familiar with").

(2) Perfect: (A 2 363-4) ΟΥΡΨΜΕ ΠΕΝΤΑΝΙΨΟΥΣΤ + ΝΑΨ "There was a man to whom God had given...") ΝΟΨΜΝΤΡΨΜΑΝ ΝΜΣΕΝΤΨΡΨΧΟΝΤΑ ΑΥΨ ΟΥΣΨΕΥ ΑΥΨ ΝΣΕΤΜΨΨΤΝ + ΕΡΨΟΥΣΙΑ ΝΑΨ ΕΨΩΨΜ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΝΖΗΤΨΤ... ΟΥΡΨΜΕ ΕΨΑΨΟΥΣΤ + ΝΑΨ ΝΟΨΜΝΤΡΨΜΑΝ ΖΙΑΨΜΑΨΡ ΝΨΤΜΝΑΨΡ ΝΝΨΨΑ ΝΖΨ-ΓΟΜ ΝΑΨ ΝΠ-ΝΕΤΣΨΟΥΝ ΝΖΗΤΣΤ — neg. encategorization / (III 204.12ff.) ΝΕΨ ΓΑΡ ΝΟΨΨΡΨΜΕ ΕΨΖΝΕΨΝΘΕΨΟΥΟΕ ΕΨΑΨΕΙ ΜΝΟΨΕ ΕΤΡΕΨΨΨ-ΝΟΨΨΡΨΜΕ ΑΥΨ ΝΤΕΨΟΟΣ ΝΑΨ ΖΕ-ΤΒΒΟΚ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΝΨΝΕΨΡΨΡΟΕΨΡΕΨΟΥ ΕΨΡΨΟΟΝ ΝΤΟ ΖΡΑΙ ΜΝΟΨΟΩΨΟΟΥΟ. Very striking, with the whole protasis-apodosis complex hypothetic, is (A 2 453, not Sh.) ΟΥΚΟΨΕΥ ΕΨΨΨΕ ΑΟΥΑ ΝΨΨΜ ΜΝΨΝ ΝΨΨΡΨΡ ΠΝΨΨΡΕ ΨΙΨΣΨΟΤΕ ΕΨΑΨΣ ΝΤΕΨΕΨΟΥΣΙΑ ΝΤΕΨΕΨΕΝΑ (sic) ΤΑΙ ΑΝΑΙ ΩΨΝ-ΠΚΑΙΡΟΣ ΝΤΝΑΑΚΕ ΕΤΝΑΝΟΥΣ ΑΥΨ ΝΨΡΨΕΥ.

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 60, is expanded by the conjunctive.

(1) The infinitive in adjunct status (expanding another verb: * (Ε)ΨΨΤΜ*):
(a) (→→): AΥΨ-microcoordination is the rule. Personal maintenance; negation syncategorization. (III 40.14ff.) ΕΨΣΑΡΕΨ ΕΤΜΠΑΨΤΨΡ ΝΟΨΑΙΜΟΙΨΟΝ ΑΥΨ ΝΨΨΨΕΡ ΕΑΣΕΨΟΥΣΙΑ ΝΟΨΨΨΑ... / (ibid. 143.23ff.) ΕΙΑΝΑΤ-ΚΑΖΕ ΜΜΨΨΝ ΕΑΣΕΨΕΨΗΥΝ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΜΝΟΨΟΥΣ ΑΥΨ ΝΣΕΤΨΡ-ΘΨΙΑ ΝΨΝΕΨΨΕΝΑ. Also: III 92.8ff., IV 38.12ff. (here Leipoldt emends the text unnecessarily to Ε + inf.).

(b) (→→): personal maintenance; neg. encategorization. (A 2 405) ΜΗ ΟΥΨΟΝΓΟΜ ΝΟΨΑΙΜΟΙΨΟΝ ΕΨΨΨΗ Η ΕΨΟΨΨΝΨΕ ΕΨΨΕ ΝΨΨΨΕ ΝΨΨΨΕ ΝΤΟΨ ΝΨΨΨΕ ΝΟΥΖΑΤ ΑΝΤΙΖΟΜΝΤ — the first conj. premodified by the circumstantial present / (P 1303 38 ΨΟΨΟΝΨ ΝΑΝ ΕΡ-ΚΟΨΟΨ ΝΤΝΚΑΨΨΟΝΟΜΕΙ ΝΨΜΕΨΟΥ ΝΨΟΨΟΥ ΕΡ-ΑΨΗΤ ΝΤΗΨ-ΨΨΤΙ ΝΑΝ ΝΨΨΨΕΥ ΕΨΑΣΟΕ... ΝΨΝΟΥΣ ΝΑΝ ΕΘΨΨΙΟΝ ΝΤΝΞΙ ΝΟΥΖΜΟΤ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΖΙΤΜΝΟΥΣΤΕ ΝΨΟΥ ΕΡ-ΨΑΨΔΙΖΗΤ

58 Cf. the similar role of EΨΨΑΝ− (+ conjunctive), e.g. Ch. 190.49ff., or of ΕΨΨΨΑΕΟΥΨ− (+ conjunctive), e.g. IV 24.5.
59 Cf. (Bohairic) Jac. 4:17 Φ ΕΤΨΟΨΟΝ ΝΟΨΨΟΝΑΝΕΙ ΕΑΙΨ ΟΨΟΨ ΝΤΕΨΨΨΕΝΑI.
60 See Rudnitzky 1956:48ff.
NTENNOYTE + OYHN / (III 118.25ff.) EYXE-YSWE EYXNE 2HTOY NNENIOTE ENTAUKOTK NTONYMONIME — an instance of "generic" personalization (encategorization of person), see under (2). Also III 135-6, 140. 13ff., IV 196.11.

(2) The infinitive in subject/predicate status. In this case we find the generic personalization of the infinitive (i.e. person encategorization): for the generic (rhetorical) person 41, Coptic uses the 3rd person sgl. masc., the 2nd person sgl. masc. or the 1st plural. (III 65-6) OYMNTNACKAPIOC PSE + MNHPIKE NTONMI XI NTONYTPH, H EKAXI ON GNSW EPOK ETWBEUSW NNTENAKTAAY NAY / (Ch. 104.28ff., 39ff.) OYNWBE PSE OYXH-POEIK NOUSWME NTONPY-NEQW — here the non-generic (anaphoric) 3rd person precludes its use as a generic person / (A 1) NANOY-WHEE TAPNQINE NOK ETCHH — reminiscence of Mt. 7:7 (etc.) / (Ming. 89) PWN AE GSWW PSE XITOY N EKAXY GSWW NTONYTHTOU MMAY GSWW — neg. encategorization. Cotextual categorization of person / (III 67.5ff.) MNPIKE AN EBOA MNNOMIC PSE MERE-PETQTHIOUK NNGEMTE-NEKAXAEE ... ALLE PAXH EBOA MNNOMIC PSE MERE-NEKAXAEE GSWMA [...] — the infinitive is the predicate constituent in the Copular (≠ subject-copula-predicate ≠) Nominal Sentence pattern (reminiscence of Mt. 5:43-4 with Rom. 10:4, 13:10).

7.2.5.1 The causative infinitive (E-)TEPH-CWTH

(1) In adverbal adjunctal status (incl. object expansion): ETPHCWTH

(a) (→→) very common; as a rule, personal maintenance: (III 36.5ff., parall. Ch. 131.24ff.) ACHPHEH NAY ON ETEREYSHM NCESW NNMAH GYXHETNTPANAXE, cf. ibid. 202.4 ...ETEREYSHM AWH NNCESW, see §7.2.1.1.1 / (ibid. 31.3ff.) +PAPIAKALEI NTEXPNTWRMHT ETMPTETETNOMAEI NTHTOU, ALLE NTONMAY-2RHTH ENYXHAE ET- OYAAAB — affirmative encategorization / (ibid. 112.24ff.) (ENYXHAE ETOYU-+CBW NAY NTHTOU) ETPHENMXTAE-PIE- THOY NTNEME-PTETNANOUY / (IV 65.6ff.) (NETONSW) ETEREYSHM PSEIDIS EC OMIO EPOOY AWH NKKW MNNPHNA GSWW ... AWH NKKWEP EPOOY / (Ch. 33.16ff.) (NETAPYXH) ETERH TAKOK AWH NKKWEP EBOA / (P 1315 65 vo) ...ETERHSHM EBOA NTWTHYTHN AWH NTONYTHM NTONTH-AYXAE MMOPH. Additional exx.: III 106.18ff., IV 30.25ff., 176.2ff., Ch. 51.7ff., 86.21ff., etc.

(b) (→+) rarer: (IV 56.6ff.) NTNOY GSWW EYXAPES EPOOY ETMPTETAPATA MMOPH NCESW NCGOY / (ibid. 122. 15ff.) ...ETEREYSHM EPOOY NKKWEP EBOA NCESW NCHNOY / (Ch. 189.18ff.) ...ETERHEN-ONNEKYES NCE- ROKTOY EYON2 actual sequence - irreversable.

(2) Adnominal, ad-modifier, assorted adjunctal roles: ETPHCWTH -(III 211.2f.) ACHPHEH NNOYN06 NKE- PAYNOC EXWONY ...GWSCE ETERHCHONS ZNNSCWA ETOYHSHTOU AWH NKKWNC-NNSCWA NNMAY — microcoordination / (IV 187.9ff.) MM NNYXHAE N NZBHNE NE NAY ETERHCWTH EROOY NTONSHM ETOYTN EP-NOBE AWH NTNEM- NMOOC NAY XE — neg. encategorization of a second conjunctive (coordinated by - AWH -). For adnominal ETEP- see §7.4 below.

(3) In subject/predicate status: ETPHCWTH

(a) (→→): no AWH; personal maintenance. (III 182.20ff.) ...OYTE OYANOMIA AN TE ETPHMELETA NNYXHAE THPOY NNEXAPAHEY ... NTIONYES DE GSWW GSNETH-THIN ... NTIONAYA AN TE ETENP-GENHNHHEIA NNXHAE MMYME TMYXHAE GSWW NKOY 2P1 NNYBH NMM EWYSHOY / (Ch. 160.15ff.) (KEQW) ETENP N TE ENP-2OTE GSNETH NTIONYES DE ON 2HTOY NNCHXEGHATOCS.

(b) (→+): (III 104.19ff.) MM OYANOMI NAY PSE ETENPKEP NWS NKKWMCNTUXNAYGHNMMPOHROC / (ibid. 150.18ff.) ETENPHE PSE ETENHI EBOA ZITTNAI ETNHY NAY ZBOA EMMOKZ 2HTH ETPHNTHTOY ... NTNEEI EYNYN ETONUNGNAYGHNMMYXHAE — actual sequence.

41 Another case in which personalization is called for is the object-slot of a reflexive infinitive: (A 1 199) EWSH MHN EHTOPOC NNHAPYRTWOC EYXAH EWSH EWAALVE ETPTHBOK ... NANOM; consider also (P 1315 13 vo) MIPRTENBUXH EFMTH 2GTHYQROC ... NCHNTS ETERHSHM MNOYYTE PORDY EBOA. For the "generic person" see Jespersen, Philosophy of Grammar (1924) 215ff.
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(4) Conjugation carrier in the coevertive (2ΜΠΡΕΨΕΨΗΜ) and posteventive (ΜΝΝΣΑΤΡΕΨΕΨΗΜ) forms: -ΤΡΕΨΗΜ (Nuclear verb affirmative only). Only (→→); personal maintenance disrupted; neg. encategorization. (III 169.12ff.) ΜΝΝΣΑΤΡΕΨΗ+ΣΕΣΗΛ ΝΑΥ ΝΟΥΣΟΤ ΑΝ ΟΥΤΕ ΣΝΑΙ ΑΝ ΑΛΑΛ ΝΩ ΑΕΓ ΝΟΜΕ ΑΥΨ ΝΣΕΣΤΕΡΗ-ΣΕΣΗΛ ΕΧΣΗΜ (also IV 52.6, 156.11) / (A 4 203) 2ΜΠΡΕΨΗ-ΟΥΑ ΝΟΥΣΗ ΜΝΝΣΑΤΡΕΨΗ ΕΣΗΛ ΑΥΨ ΝΤΕ-ΑΠΗΗΑ ΕΤΟΥΑΒ Ρ-ΟΥΑ ΝΟΥΣΗ ΝΜΜΑΗ / (III 134.3f.) ΜΝΝΣΑΤΡΕΨΗΜΣΗ ΕΒΩΛ ΕΤΜΑ ΕΤΟΥΜΕΕΥΕ ΕΡ-ΟΥΣΗ ΜΝΝΟΥΤΗ ΝΣΗΗ ΑΥΨ ΝΣΕΕΙΕΡΕ ΕΙΨΗΛ ΕΩΗΑ ΕΤΜΜΑΗ ΝΝΕΟΥΟΥΗ ΝΣΗΗ ΕΘΗΗ. Also III 49.1ff., Ch. 66.18ff.

(5) Personal infinitive after prepositions: -ΤΡΕΨΗΜ: (Wess. 9 118b 11ff.) ΑΝΤΙΤΡΕΨΗ-ΜΟΕΙΗΕ ΕΞΗΝ- ΤΑΜΙΟ ΜΠΝΟΥΤΗ ΜΝΝΗΤΗΜΑΛΟΝ ΣΗΡΟΥ ΝΤΗΗ-ΕΘΗΗ ΝΑΗ ΑΚΤΡΕΠΑΣΡ Ρ-ΜΟΕΙΗΕ ΕΞΗΝΤΑΚΟ / (Ch. 178-9) ΝΕΘΩΟΥ ΝΕ ΝΤΕΡΕΨΗΛΑΡΕ ("they" - heaven, earth and its inhabitants) ΝΤΕΝ ΜΠΝΗΕ ΟΥΨΗ... ΝΣΕΣΗΛ ΕΣΟΥΝ ΝΣΗΗΤΟΥ — actual, dramatic succession of apocalyptic events. All these are apparently subordination instances.

(6) ΤΡΕΨΗΜ causative, predicated in a conjugation form — very rarely expanded by the conjunctive (subcoordination only?): (III 131.20) ΕΙΨΑΝΤΙΤΡΕΨΗΚΑΣ ΟΥΨΗ ΝΡΨΗ ΝΣΟΜΜΟΥ — neg. syncategorization; sim. (Ch. 114-5) ΝΕΨΑΝΤΙΤΡΕΨΗΜΝΤΕ ΟΥΨΗ ΝΡΨΗ ΝΣΟΜΜΟΥ ΝΣΘΑΗ.

7.2.5.3 Paradigms: It is striking that, whereas coordination of multiple infinitives is much more common for the simple infinitive than micro-/subcoordination by the conjunctive, the inverse ratio is observable for the causative-personal infinitive ΕΤΡΕΨΗ-, where micro-/subcoordination is more usual by far than coordination of terms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) ΕΧΣΗΜ</th>
<th>(b) in-conjugation</th>
<th>(c) ΝΣΗΗΜ</th>
<th>(d) ΕΤΡΕΨΗ-</th>
<th>(e) ΕΤΡΕΨΗ-</th>
<th>(f) ΜΝΝΣΑΤΡΕΨΗ-</th>
<th>(g) 2ΜΠΡΕΨΗ-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ΜΝΣΗΗΜ</td>
<td>ΑΥΨ ΕΧΣΗΜ</td>
<td>ΑΥΨ ΕΧΣΗΜ</td>
<td>ΑΥΨ ΕΧΣΗΜ</td>
<td>ΑΥΨ ΕΧΣΗΜ</td>
<td>ΑΥΨ ΕΧΣΗΜ</td>
<td>ΑΥΨ ΕΧΣΗΜ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III 107-8, 215.7f., Ch. 165.30ff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 203.24ff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>independent coordinated adjuncts (III 86.9f., IV 33. 16ff., 183.9f., Ch. 67.17ff.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV 91.2f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III 169.10ff. (3×)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III 138.8ff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anew coordinated numeral to abstract nouns: Ch. 41.43ff. (parall. III 80.24ff.), 98.45ff.

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 "concessive" role of Ε + infinitive/ΕΤΡΕΨΗ-. Upon examination, these are classifiable as follows:
7.2.6 The rhetorical apodotic-retrospective role of the conjunctive; poorly documented or inadequately established functions

7.2.6.1 The rhetorical apodotic-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.) ΕΥΞΕ-ΟΥΝΡΨΜΕ ΕΥΑΥΘΗ (sic) ΑΥΨ ΕΡΕΨΗΣΗΝ ΓΗ-ΑΡΙΚΕ ΕΡΟΥΟΥ ΕΥΣΤΜΠ ΕΝΙΠΑΛΑΝΟΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΣ (sic) ΑΟΟΥ... ΕΙΕ-ΝΟΥΧΑΙ ΝΤΟΚ ΕΟΡΤΗ ΕΚΑΠΑΤΑ ΑΥΨ ΕΚΟΥΜΗ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΖΗΝΤΡΑΠΕΖΑ ΝΝΑΙΔΙΜΟΝΙΟΝ... Η ΝΠΨΗ ΕΞΟΥΝ ΕΤΜΝΠΕΡΟ (Leipoldt's suggested emendation, adding - ΑΝ, is 1 believe unacceptable) / (ibid. 190.2ff.) Η ΕΥΞΕ-ΠΑΡΑΚΕΟΥΙ ΝΣΕΤΡΨΨΙΤ-ΣΑΓ ΝΝΟΨΗ ΝΗΝΚΕ ΕΒΟΛΑ... ΝΣΕΤ-ΣΟ ΕΕΨΤ-ΘΥΤΝ ΝΤΨΘΝ (for ΠΑΡΑΚΕΟΥΙ + conj. see §7.3.1 below) / (Ch. 15.14ff.) ΜΗ ΠΑΡΗ Ρ-ΟΥΟΕΝ ΑΝ ΖΝΙΕΟΟΥ Η ΝΤΝΨΨΤ ΑΝ ΝΝΑΣ ΝΚΟΟ... ΝΨΑΡΑΙ ΕΠΕ... ΑΥΨ ΝΝΡΝΑΥ ΑΝ ΕΛΑΑΥ ΑΝΩ ΝΨΑΝΤΖΗΝ ΟΝ ΝΙΜΝΤΚΑΒΕ-ΝΕΜΕΒΗΝ — 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) ΑΥΝΕΨ-ΠΣΑΤΑΝΑΣ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΖΝΤΠΕ ΞΕ-ΑΨΚΩΗΤΕ ΝΚΑΘΕ ΝΠ-ΝΕΨΒΟΤΕ, ΝΙΑΑΥ ΔΕ ΖΨΨΗ ΑΥΨ ΝΗΦΚΟΥΟ ΕΒΟΛΑ; "... and wilt thou too do and carry out these abominations?" / (A 210) ΠΕΞΑΥ ΞΕ-ΕΝΣΟΒΤΕ ΝΤΑΠΑΝΗ ΜΠΨΒΑ ΕΒΟΛΑ ΜΠΨΑΚΑ, Η ΝΗΤΜΠΧΞΚ ΖΝΟΥΜΙΟΥ ΑΥΨ ΝΙΜΝΤΑΚΣΚ ΝΟΥΝΣΕ Η ΝΗΦΚΟΜΕΚ ΑΥΨ ΝΙΤΣΑΚΣ ΜΝΚΑΣ ΤΗΡΨ ΜΠΨΑΣΕ; / (Ch. 167-8, parall. III 74.14ff.) ΠΙΚΑΡΟΣ ΠΕ ΕΡΕΨΗΕΙΣΤ ΑΥΨ ΟΥΜΑΑΥ ΥΨΗΝΗ ΝΕΟ ΝΟΥΒΑΡΒΑΡΟΣ ΕΝΕΨΨΗΡΕ ΑΥΨ ΝΕΨΨΕΡΕ... ΝΤΕΣΕ ΟΝ ΠΕ ΥΟΟΚΥ ΝΟΥΚΟΝ ΑΥΨ ΟΥΚΨΝΗ ΝΟΥΚΨΝΗ. ΑΡΑ ΝΤΕΨΟΥΥΑΙ ΥΨΗΝΗ ΝΝΑΣ; "... and may this perhaps mean that salvation of many will ensue?" — an ironic-sceptical question / (ibid. 13.8ff.) ΝΤΟΚ ΖΨΨΗ ΤΗΟΜ ΜΠΕΚΨΜΑ ΥΨΟΝ ΝΤΗΤΚ, ΜΜΨΨΗΝΕ, ΜΜΝΤΚΑΣ, ΜΜΝΕΙΨΑΚΨΜΝ ΝΨΨΜΕ... ΑΥΨ ΝΗΤΜΨΨ-ΤΛΨΒΕ... ΟΥ ΜΝΟΝ ΞΕ-ΠΨΨΜΗ 'Ε ΜΠΑΑΥ', ΑΛΑΑ ΞΕ- ΣΕΡΨΟΥΣΟΥΡΤΟΝ ΝΦΝΙΕΕΙΨΕ ΜΜΨΟΥ', ΝΤΑΜΨΨΗΝΕ ΑΝΟΚ ΕΙΣΓΟΥΡΤΕ ΕΙΨΑΝΑΑΥ; / (Wess. 9 139a 24ff.) ΣΨΤΜΕ ΕΝΕΙΜΝΤΑΚΕΒΗΣ. ΖΕΝΙΕΒ ΝΒΑΨΟΡ. ΖΕΝΑΝΕ ΝΨΟΨ. ΖΕΝΑΑΑΕ ΝΜΝΑΖ... ΝΤΕΨΨΗΜΕ ΚΑ-ΣΘΥ ΕΡΟΥΟΥ ΞΕ-ΕΨΝΑΜΤΩΝ ΕΤΒΨΗΝΤΟΥ... — 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)!"). Compare here the use of the conjunctive (and of ΤΑΡΕΨΨΜΤΩΝ) following a rhetorical interrogative. See exx. in §7.2.1.1.5 — e.g. III 148.25ff. ΕΤΨΨΝ ΝΕΨΨΒΕΡ... ΕΤΜΟΥΕ ΕΡΝ ΞΕ-ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ ΝΣΕΝΑΥ ΕΝΕΝΚΑΙΑ.

(2) The conjunctive non-rhetorical, following a formal or logical temporal protasis: (A 1 204ff.) ΕΡΕΨΥΝΕ ΝΚΑΨΙΜΕ ΕΟΥΨΕΝΕ ΝΤΕΤΕΙΤ ΕΡΟ ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΟΥ ("... and you end up by...") / (A 2 505) ΖΝΙΕΟΟΥ ΕΤΟΥ-

(a) Following jussive ΝΝΕΨ (IV 110.19ff.), ΕΨΝΑ- (IV 93.1ff.), neg. imperative (IV 104.22): here ΕΤΡΕΨ- 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 Rudnitsky rightly observes) is here probably the primary factor; but see a case of initial jussive ε + inf, ΕΤΡΕΨ-: (IV 68.10ff.) ΑΥΨ ΕΡΟΨΨΨΟΥ... ΕΝΤΟΥ ΖΡΑΙ ΖΝΟΥΜΝΤΥΟΥΨΟΥ ΑΥΨ ΟΝ ΕΤΨΨΜΗ ΕΒΟΛΑ... ΟΥΔΕ ΟΝ ΕΤΜΨΨΨΗΝΕ ΝΕΟ ΝΕΨΗΘΗΝ... 

(b) ε + infinitive as a subcategorization form after ΠΕΝΣΗ- (IV 90.7ff.).

(c) ΕΤΡΕΨ- ancolautically coordinated to another verb: (III 181.18ff.) ΖΝΙΕΟΟΥ ΕΤΕΝΣΕΚΑΨΑΣΤΝ ΑΝ ΝΟΥΓΟΝ ΚΟΥΙ ΜΜΟΥ ΕΖΡΑΙ ΕΨΟΥΟΥ ΑΛΑΑ ΕΤΡΕΨ-ΩΝ ΝΤΟΚ ΝΗΨΟΥ ΜΝΨΑΣ ΜΨΑΚΨΤΕΤ ΕΤΨΑΝ.

(d) ΕΤΡΕΨ- coordinated to ε + infinitive: (IV 80.24ff.).

(e) ΕΤΡΕΨ- ancolautically expanding another verb (III 179.20ff., the nucleus ΜΨΑ). I do not include here the frequent occurrence of this construction in Leipoldt's No. 76 (not Sheneoute; IV 133.17ff., 136-7 passim, 146 passim, 149.17ff. etc.). Compare also Dictionary 52a (III: "(ε + inf) coordinating a 2nd verb ") and 430a (" elliptical jussive use of ΕΤΡΕΨ- ").

64 Cf. CRUM 1926:1 250ff., II 373. For earlier stages of Egyptian, see ERMAN 1933:585; HINTZE 1952:227f., FRANDSEN 1974: 148-152; SPIEGELBERG'S instances of the "independent" conjunctive are all open to this interpretation (1925:§§152-3); VOLLEN 1964:65ff.; LICHTHEIM 1964:3ff. expresses some doubts concerning this function (however, the alleged "independent injunctive" role is far from established for Coptic).

65 Cf. DENNISTON 46 (σε): "a sceptical tone", "leaving the question open", or even presupposing a negative answer. Or do we here have the inferential σε in initial position (BLOMQUIST 1969:128ff.)?
Nausine ncaneyebe h cnetmentoy, h eygntoy o ncegi-wine exwoy / (IV 60.2ff.) cecoti nna2pminoyte
nginenta2x00c xe `t ntnaoywmu (on an eating day)... ayw nctemoyum, n2oyo epentatayx00c xe `t
ntnaoyum an` zmeneoyt natayx00c xe `t ntntnaoyum an n2ntu` ayw nceoyum — the conjunctive with an
eventual sense: `... and (they) finished by eating/not eating'.

(3) A few instances of `ekac + 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 `ad verbal' (really
protatic) interposition is not the conditioning factor for the conjunctive, which must have here a special
(`volitive') modal value and stand in a `liaison grammaticale vague', and anacoluthic syntax, with
ekac. Nevertheless, he does not entirely renounce the interpretation of the conjunctive as `copula-
utive' — 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 ekac.66 (Thompson L ro) ...ekac ean-
kw ncswn nmntw4xayte mnnpipouymia nkomikon, ntnw2 en oumnpweh2 mnoumweycsw2hc / (P 131b
94 ro) ...ekac erwannoyeowh nneyxhyma [.....] ntektepikis mpinoyt ouw2 ebo. (Ch. 87.46ff.) alla
kan mapncaw2n ebo enin06 nnooe ekac kan ntn-2hy enkkooyi nargnon etnnaaygm-60m naay
is admittedly difficult. Can the conjunctive here be in construction with and adnexal to kan `at
least', to ekac, or syncategorized by mapncaw2n (§7.2.1.2)?

7.2.6.2 The conjunctive in action-advancing (promotive) role: ayw ncwywne (IV 52.16, 53.23...ayw
ncwywne erwannetmmy p-ibbo nnetoywha nmyay meyewgm-60m ewhna / [...] n netywfe yym n netya
h zalw 2pny n2ntu, ayw nceywyne (sic) etpoywoum ncon cnaw mmhne... This role, already more or less
stereotyped in Late Egyptian 67, is not really established by these exx., since the lacunae may have con-
tained a nuclear verb form subcategorizing the conjunctive.

7.2.6.3 Questionable cases. In (III 108.12f., collated) eyxex-akr-nan nntnyat n+y+noyc nay, 
eye-..., `an should perhaps be added, since the stative yaat shows the form to be the (circumstantial)
negative present.

7.3 The Non-verbal Nucleus: Adnexal (Rhetic) Conjunctive

Both nucleus and conjunctive are here essential sentence constituents, with the conjunctive the ad-
nexal ("predicative") expansion of an element which, in its own extent, constitutes or contains a pre-
dicative unit (§7.1.3). With reference to the following conjunctive-rHEME, the initial constituent is the-
matic (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) papa/-eti kekoyi ne + conjunctive — a recurring, typical (though by no means exclusively Shen-
notean 69) expression, for which we also find the variant papaekwym ne: `shortly, nearly, almost...
(ξη/παμ /μηρνϊ) ― affirmative, negativated, even converted. (Although strictly speaking kekoyi ne is a

66 Cf. ekac + conjunctive in Bohairic, Stern §§448, 511, Mallon–Malinine §250. For LE and Demotic (dd + conj.)
68 Cf. Prov. 5:14 (papakechw + perf), Ps. 36:10 (eti kekoiyi ne + conj.), 72:2 (papakekoyi + perf), Sap. 15:8 (mm-
cakekoiyi eina-), Is. 10:25 (eti gab kekoiyi ne + conj.), 28:10, 13 (eti kekoiyi ne [xe eyc]), 29:17 (mkekoiyi an ne + conj.),
Joh. 14:19 (eti kekoiyi ne + ayw + neg. fut.), 16:16ff. (kekoiyi ne + conj.), Apophth. Patr. (Chaine) 101.3 (papakekoyi... eina-
ne), Levy 1909:85.
case of predicative noun — §7.3.2 — I suspect this is the modifier predicated by πε, §1.2.1.2; anyway, both are neutralized in this environment. (RE 11 15a 7ff.) έτει κεκουνί πεντεπετσξ αβικ εβολ... (A 2 390) πιανιςς τεπετακεκουνί πε νηςψηνε χμπακοκ κεμπεςβιρ / (ibid. 140) έτει γαρ κεκουνί πεντεπετσξυψε επικερι / (ibid. 113-4) ένε-επικεριν, παρακεκουνι πεντεπετ-παξε ερον σαλατε... / (P 130 4 116 ιβ) Χ κεκουνί ο πε νεκρινε μμο μεγαψιδιειαξε (also P 131 160 vo) / (P 131 79 πα) Νκεκουνί αν πεν πνονωσμ ωπυρεψκειντ / (III 173.28f.) Νκεκουνί αν πε πενεικαίνε μαν Νικεραψξ μαυαα / (IV 100.2ff.) ευξε-παρακεκουνι νηςψηνεψκετ-αας ιμνυ ινκερε εβολ...

(2) Μορικ "hardly", "almost... not" ("kaum, schwerlich") with the conjunctive is used as an elegant rhetorical negation, a striking distinctive Shonouean trait. Εμορικ is a circumstantial/relative-converter, syntactically marked alternate. (IV 67.21f., parall. Wess. 9 125b 3ff.) ένεαλεγερατημ σνού- ουτεν γενοψε μμο Αυς Εμορικ Ντενπιμκεφ Μεντπαλε Μματε Μποιον ενεβαλεριαζε μμο / (Ming. 84 παλειν εμαγις γενοι στρα τονον Νιμ γαρακες ερημ παξε εροον, Μορικ γαρ νηςψηνε χμπακοκ νπαρεκ ρε μπαλμα ("hardly even to the Governor...") / (P 130 4 100 vo) ευξε-καταπταγεσχεις Μπευψειελαγεία- Μορικ Ντενπιμκεφ Νιμου Μπευψειεστ Μπευψειελαγε... Β-μπιμ ηε, εεε... / (IV 111.1f.) εμαγις δε τεπρι τε, Μορικ Ντενπιμκεφ-τεςπαρες νερ-νοεβερεμ Εονειαπ / (III 39.9f.) εμαγιςμενμοι γε εμαγιςμενμε εμεθοοει εμαγιςμενμε εμαγιςμενμοι... (3) Μονακς, Μονακς- + conjunctive. (A 2 430, not Sh.) ειμενε ννοα εαγτξεον Εον νκεβεις εμαγιςμενμε εμαγιςμενμε εμαγιςμενμοι γενοι πενεικαλαται, Μονακς Νηςψηνε ωτα Νηςψηνε κεκουνι μμοενμενμενμαται μμε Νηςψηνε γεαν μμοενμενμενμενμενμοι — possibly a case of the conjunctive subcategorized by a non-temporal "parabolic" perfect, §7.2.4.1(2) / (Wess. 9 138b 3ff.) (Μη εμαγιςμενμοι κα μμο Μπεπτοκ) Μονακς κεκουνι μματε μμο — the conjunctive expanding εμαγιςμενμοι? / (IV 83.22ff.)...Μονακς κεκουνι μμοις in a preceptive context — conj. subcategorized by ευμα — ? / (Ch. 18.13ff.) ιοεγαρ ννορρο ναικακος εμεθες-εμαγιςμενμοι... εμαγιςμενμοι επενεντονει νηςψηνε γενοι τοντου εμαγις, εμαγιςμενμοι εμεθες-εμαγιςμενμοι τοντου Εονοπον, Μονακς κεκουνι μμοενμενμενμενμοι επενεντονει γενοι — the conj. microcoordinated to εμπερε-ν, or a case of the conj. after the parabolic perf.7 / (IV 45.22f.) Παλαιον Μονακςειβσμενμενμενμενμοι γενοι Νηςψηνε ννορρο εμεθεςβις μαυαα... / (P 130 4 37 ηνζ)...Μαι νταγισμενολοτει Μνομ Εονοοι νταγισμενολοτει Μεμαρα Νηςψηνε...

69 See §1.3.11.6 with exx. For the "conjunctival syntax" of correspondents in other languages, TOSLER 1912:15f. ("a de peine si..."), JEPSEN 1962:38ff. ("hardly"), LÖFSTEDT 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 moric lies in the peculiar negation categorization of the conjunctive: moric marks a non-contrastive, "uninduced" negation.

70 Although moric is not prolific (witness moric ορ ης-; Wess. 9 144d 8ff.), it is but rarely separated from its following conjunctive, and is to a degree univ erbied with it. This is symptimized by the conversion of the whole complex (the conjunctive cannot of course be converted — probably another reason why moric + conj. is so converted). Cf. the double conversion in ιοε γαρ εμορικ επερε- (Luc. 23:53 Horner codd., ιοε εμορικ επερε- Quecke).

71 The Coptic conjunctive recalls here the LE "narrative-continuative" ("Clause Conjugation") jw.f br sdm following br-br-s3 phrases (HINTZE 1950:14ff., FRANDSEN 1974:91ff.).
CHAPTER 7. THE CONJUNCTIVE

§7.3.1 CONJUNCTURAL 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 "conjunctural" 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 "conjunctives", the latter not entering any dependency with it: this last analysis would account for many, though not all, of the following examples:

(1) ζωοτε ἡμών, ἡμιοτε "consequently (... not...)", "as a result (... not...)", "so that... (not)/lest" (see footnote 66); (Wess. 9 142a 1ff.) οὖν καὶ ἡμῶν ἦσαν οὐκ οὐκ οὖσαν ἔφρων, ἕως ἡμῶν τὴν οὖσαν (Ch. 85.21ff.) ἐγέρετε ἐξ ἐνῆστε ἐπεκτείνας ζωοτε ἡμών υποὺ ἔργον / (IV 23.10ff.) τοῦτο διὰ τὸ πᾶνών οὐκ έπεκτείνας ζωοτε υποὺ ἔργον / (IV 95.21, 155.3ff.)... Note that ζωοτε + conjunctive negatives only ζωοτε + conjunctive;

(2) εἰμιτή "otherwise", "unless", "be it not that..." — the conjunctive affirmative; the conjunctive may be taken here as entering a protatic syntagm (§7.2.4). (III 138.1ff., parall. Wess. 9 163-4)

After ζωοτε we find the thematic Second Perfect (focalizing ἐπικάθη: Wess. 9 131b 25ff.).

[Note: This (and more) brings us again to the question of the premodifiers (considered above, §1.1.2.2). Rosen's suggestion (1979:462ff.) that Hebrew pre-še 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 rheumatic 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 rheumatic subordination form.]

Somewhat like the the Greek opposition of ζωοτε + finite verb vs. ζωοτε + infinitive (Blass-Debrunner §391, Mayser II/1 298ff.).
Chapter 7. The Conjointive

The conjunctive follows the following finite pred. syntags:

- **ε-** (III 144.17, 183.16, IV 34.27 etc.)
- conjugative - tense-unmarked.

(3) ἢ (- ἢ) “alternatively”, “unless” 76. With the disjunctive ἢ 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: (Leyd. 328) ...ε- ενεντωυαι ενεντωυαι ενεντωυαι ενεντωυαι ενεντωυαι ενεντωυαι ενεντωυαι ενεντωυαι ενεντωυαι ενεντωυαι ενεντωυαι ενεντωυαι ενεντωυαι ενεντωυαι ενεντωυαι ενεντωυαι ενεντωυαι ενεντωυαι ενεντωυαι ενεντωυαι ενεντωυαι ενεντωυαι ενεντωυαι ενεντωυαι ενεντωυαι ενεντωυαι ενεντωυαι ενε

74 For **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, **ε**+(pro)noun also precedes modifiers (III 168.8f., 12, IV 120.11).

75 In most instances **ε-** may be interpreted as complementing (expanding) a preceding nucleus, not in construction with **ε** (which is but a premodifier). However, in view of the frequent **ε** expanded by **ε**+(pro)noun (preceding note) I think **ε**+(pro)noun too is a case in point. For the construction of **ε** in the NT and in general, see LEFORT 1948b and JELANSKAJA 1977; for **ε** as a protasis form, cf. SHIKA-HALEVY 1974:374.

76 See Blass-DEBrunner §448(8) and reff.; KÖHNEN-GERTH II 297f. (4) (ἡ = alioquin) cf. SCHWYZER II 578 n. 3 ἄλλας.

77 Cf. the same dilemma with regard to Hebrew 'o σε-: Blau apud ROSÉN 1979:464f. (ROSÉN doubts that the adverbial nature of 'o "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-adnaxial (contentualizing) to non-predicative nouns: (IV 10.2f.) (I truly wonder that, seeing how much they blasphemed), ἀποκαλύπτων εἰς ὑμᾶς ἐγκαθιστάνω καὶ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ μετατρέπων... "the Gospel did not remain unwritten, as a sign that Christ (did) not forgive them... " / (ibid. 113-4) ἦν οὗτος (sic) ὑποθεμένους ἀνέγερτος... ἐπὶ τιμητικά... (ibid. 121.22f.) ἔγνωκεν ἑαυτοῦ ἑαυτοὺς ἀνεγερτός τοῦτο ἐν οἷς ἔστο ἐξωτερικά ἡμέρᾳ — here the conjunctive could be formally subcategorized by the conditional (§7.2.4).

Here too the conjunctive shares the paradigm with ἐπέθεσθε (§7.4).

7.3.3 Nucleus: Miscellaneous Predicative Syntagms or Expressions

(1) ΜΕΣΑΚ + conjunctive: (Ch. 28.40ff., 78.31ff., IV 160.18, A 2 147, etc.

The paradigm after ΜΕΣΑΚ includes:

| ΜΕΣΑΚ  | ΝΕΟΥΝ- (P 1314 86 PA)  |
|        | perfect (Wess. 9 164c 26ff., parall. III 139.4f.) | tense-marked |
|        | future (III 219.20ff., IV 97ff.) | |
|        | conjunctive | tense-unkmarked |

Not in opposition with the preceding are:

| ΜΕΝΑ-  | ΧΕ-78 / (Θ-) Nom. Sentence (A 1 76, Ch. 201.30f.)  |
|        | Second Tense (ΜΕΝΑΙ ΧΕ- Ep. 66; Ch. 188.19ff., P 1304 116 1θ)  |
|        | ΟΥΝ (IV 72.16f.)  |

(2) ΑΡΗ + conjunctive: (III 117.8) (ΕΕΙΜΕΘΑΝΟΕΙ...) ΑΡΗ ΝΤΕΟΥΝΑ ΕΙ ΕΞΕΙ ΜΕΝΕΜΤΟ ΕΒΟΑ ΜΠΧΟΕΙΣ / (IV 128.6f.) ΕΟΥΜΥΗ ΝΠΧΟΕΙΣ ΕΤΡΕΠΤΥΑΛΤΕ ΕΒΟΑ ΜΜΟΝ... ΧΕ-ΑΡΗ ΝΥΡ-ΣΤΗΣ. The paradigm after ΑΡΗ 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 ΝΤΕΜΠΥΑΣΘΕ ΤΑΒΑΘΝ ΕΖΕΝΚΕΚΙΜ... / (ibid. 164.7f.) ΖΑΜΟΙ ΝΤΕΤΜΠ-ΒΟΤΕ ΜΠΝΟΥΤΕ Μ ΝΔΥΤΜΑΥ ΝΒΟΤΕ / (Ch. 183.27f.) ΖΑΜΟΙ ΝΕΕ ΕΤΕΜΕΕΥ-ΟΥΝ ΝΖΕΝ-ΟΥΝ ΝΑΡΑΘΟΝ... ΝΣΥΜ-ΟΥΝ Ν ΝΠΝΟΥΝ ΝΝΠΟΝΡΗΝ / (P 1304 139 νοι) ΖΑΜΟΙ ΝΤΕΤΜΝΤΜΛΛΚΟΤΟΥ ΝΑΥ Π-ΓΡΩΣ / (Wess. 9 117a 15θ.) ΖΑΜΟΙ ΝΤΕΤΜΗΝ ΝΤΕΨΥΨΧΗ ΝΧΗΤΗΝ ΝΧΟΥΡΘΗ. Also Ch. 113.14ff. After ΖΑΜΟΙ, the conjunctive is in paradigm with ΕΝΕ- (ΝΑΣ) (Wess. 9 120b 16ff., III 173.26, P 131b 94 ro) and ΕΡΕ- ΝΑ- (IV 116.23f.); ΝΕ + Nom. Sentence is a non-pertinent member (IV 92.18).

(4) ΓΕΝΟΙΤΟ (ΓΕ/ΔΕ) + conjunctive: (III 112.16f.) ΓΕΝΟΙΤΟ ΓΕ ΝΕΕ ΝΤΑΝΝΟΥΤΕ ΝΑΖΜΕΝ ΝΕΝΟΣ ΝΙΜ ΝΡΙΨΗΜΕ ΝΗ+ΓΟΜ ΝΝΑΝ ΟΝ ΝΤΝΤΑΕΙΟΥ / (Wess. 9 124a 12ff.) ΓΕΝΟΙΤΟ ΓΕ ΝΤΕΤΝΤΡΕΟΥΜΙΝΕ ΥΨΗΝ ΝΜΝΕΤΡΕΦΗ ΝΤΕΝΑΣΗΤ ΜΤΟΝ / (Ch. 118.31f.) ΓΕΝΟΙΤΟ ΓΕ ΝΤΗΝΟΥΝΑ ΜΠΝΟΤΟ ΕΒΟΑ ΜΠΝΟΟΥ ΝΝΤΑΝ. ΜΗ ΓΕΝΟΙΤΟ "God forbid" is construed with επέθεσθε (IV 29.16f., 41.15, IV 15.4).

(5) ΑΛΑΛΟ 79 + conjunctive: (IV 85-6) ΑΛΑΛΟ-ΝΤΕΤΜΠΖΗΤ ΧΕ-ΑΛΑΛΥ ΧΕ-ΨΥΗΝΕ, ΑΛΑΛΟ-ΤΡΕΚΑΝΑΝΚΑΖΕ ΜΜΟΚ ΠΑΡΑΝΤΑΝΑΝΚΖΗΤΤ ΥΝΟΥΝ. 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 ΧΕ- appears to be the valency-rectification of the verbal lexicem component -ώ- in ΜΕΣΑΚ-. this analyzability significantly coincides with conjugability: ΜΕΣΑΚ ΧΕ- (A 1 76), ΜΕΣΑΙ ΧΕ- (Ep. 66): "you / I do not know that... ".

79 Not in the NT (yet cf. I Cor. 15.39). See BLASS-DEBRUNNER §127(1), PREISIGKE 59, MAYSER 11:3:16f.
responsible for the selection of either form. ΑΑΑΑΟ- is elsewhere followed by a noun(equivalent): IV 3.2, A 1 161-2, 191, A 2 52, 391, 411 (note the position of ΑΝ in ΑΑΑΑΟ + noun ΑΝ... ΑΑΑΑΟ...) etc. I doubt that ΑΑΑΑΟ in Coptic is by itself predicative; it is probably (like ΟΥΕΥ in the synonymous ΟΥΕΥ—ΟΥΕΥ—, a favourite Shenoutean constellation which does not contain the conjunctive, Dictionary 495-6) a predicative-frame (ΑΑΑΑΟ − ΑΑΑΑΟ − ) component.

(6) (ΝΕ)ΝΑΝΟΥΣ (ΝΕ) + conjunctive: (Wess. 9 158b 24ff.) ΝΝΑΝΟΥΣ ΆΝ ΝΤΝΠ-ΟΥΣΟΥΥ Ν ΝΑΥ Ν ΟΥΕΥΩΤΟ Ν ΥΡΟΜΗΤΕ... ΕΝΙΙ ΕΡΑΙ ΖΑΖΕΒΑΚΑΝΟΣ — note the Ν- ΑΝ negation / (P 130f 37 PM) ΝΕΝΑΝΟΥΣ ΠΕ ΝΝΕΝΜΜΑΝ ΝΕΞΟΟΟΧ ΥΕ- Δ. The conjunctive here is in paradigm with the non-rhetic (adjunctal) (Ε)-ΤΡΕ-), cataphorically heralded by -c- (§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 ΤΡΕΧΕΟΤΜ and ΥΕ-, nominalizing tense-marked verbal predications, Nominal-Sentence patterns, ΟΥΝ-ΜΗ-, adjective-verbs and various focalization patterns. These (conj./ΕΤΡΕ-) paradigms are defined by the following environments:

(a) adnominal: ΕΠΝΑ ΕΤΡΕ (III 146.15, 163.19f., 186.15, IV 68.19; Mich. 158 17b; Ch. 130.11f.); after predicative nouns: pred. time expressions 81: ΚΕΥΟΟΥΝ ΠΕ ΕΤΡΕ (III 224.20), ΠΚΑΙΡΟΣ ΠΕ ΕΤΡΕ (Ch. 167.47ff., parall. III 74.14), ΠΝΑΥ ΠΕ ΠΑΙ ΕΤΡΕ (IV 29.26); ΠΝΑΥ ΠΕ ΠΑΙ ΕΤΡΕ (Mich. 158 14a 6); cf. IV 33.20f. (ΠΕΝΜΟΤ...), 51.7 (ΠΝΑΥ ΝΝΨΟΜΤΕ ΝΟΥΝΟΥ).

(b) ad-modifier: ΕΙΜΗΤΙ, ΔΙΣΤΕ ΕΤΡΕ (§7.3.1.1); ΕΤΙΚΕΚΟΥΙ ΠΕ ΕΤΡΕ (Rossi 2/3 90).

(c) adverbial, after ΚΑΝΑΥΝΗΕ, ΕΟΥΝΑΥΝΗΕ, ΝΑΝΟΥΣ (§7.2., 7.2.4, 7.3.3, see §5.2.2.1); after ΜΗ ΓΕ- ΝΟΙΤΟ (III 29.16f.).

This substitution must be pointed out, even if we cannot at present isolate a real functional difference between ΕΤΡΕ- 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 ΕΤΡΕ-.

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 (III 82.18ff., parall. Ch. 45.4ff.) ΕΠΝΑ ΚΩΤΡΕΥΡ-ΖΗΒΕ... ΤΗΣΝΤΡΕΥΣ-ΑΟΥΑΛΙ, ΤΡΕ- is fully causative.

81 A nominal time-expression displays the broadest paradigmatic spectrum of adnominal expansion in Coptic:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ΠΝΑΥ, ΠΚΑΙΡΟΣ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>circumstantial: adnexal, contentalizing (IV 102.15 cod. C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relative, no anaphora: attributive (III 68.2f., 83.12, IV 94.25f., 102.15 codd. A, B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relative, with anaphora: attributive (III 21.1, 189.20f., IV 87.7, 179.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ΠΝΑΥ/ΠΚΑΙΡΟΣ ΠΕ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ΕΤΡΕ: prospective, contentalizing (III 74.14, 224.20, IV 29.26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ΟΥΚΑΙΡΟΣ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>circumstantial: adnexal + attributive, neutr. (III 181.10f., 23f.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conjunctive: adnexal, contentalizing (IV 113.4, 121.22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 overplayed 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 opposition 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</td>
<td>sdmw.f / sdmn.(tw).f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject =</strong> theme in Nominal Sentence</td>
<td>EΤΡΕ—</td>
<td>p3y.f sdm / p3 sdm j.jr.f</td>
<td>mrr.f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(grammatical) subject of verb/adjective</strong></td>
<td>(Ε)ΤΡΕ—</td>
<td>p3y.f sdm / p3 sdm j.jr.f</td>
<td>mrr.f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predicate of Nominal Sentence</strong></td>
<td>ΧΕ— (gloss, after ΠΕ) (Ε)ΤΡΕ—</td>
<td>p3y.f sdm / p3 sdm j.jr.f</td>
<td>mrr.f, sdmn.(tw).f; (passive sdmw.f?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>&quot;Wechselsatz&quot;</strong> (&quot;balanced construction&quot;)</td>
<td>ΕΥ— (§2.7.1.1)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>mrr.f</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 ntr-/wtr- 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: ΕΤΡΕ—? (cf. III 218.14), ΧΕ— (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 ΕΤΡΕ— (Ch. 160.14f.); after the copular ΠΕ: III 184.7.8, 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>TPE- (E-, N-, NCA-, ANTI-, 2ITN-, MNNCA-)</td>
<td>p3y.f sd m</td>
<td>mrr.f / prosp. sd m.f, (sd m.w.f), (sd m.n.f) / sd m.t.f; ntt- (lexeme valency/sentence-form distribution)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΞE- (ΕΤΒΕ-, ΕΒΟΑ) (conjunctive)</td>
<td>j. jr.f; prosp. sd m.f (after m-dr-, m-ht-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| in initial modal role: jussive-optative-hortative | | |
|---------------------------------------------|--------|---------------|---------------------|
| Second Future (ΕΝΑ-) (§2.1.3) (ΕΤΠΕ-, n. 63) | prospective sd m.f | prospective sd m.f, mrr.f (?) |

| adnominal | (Ε)ΤΠΕ- | (n-)sd m j. jr.f / p3y.f sd m |
|---------------------------------------------|--------|---------------|---------------------|
| ΞE- (conjunctive) | (n-)sd m | (n-)mrr.f, (sd m.f, sd m.n.f) |

---

92 Not analyzable synchronically, according to GROLL 1970:409ff.
93 III 218.14 (ΟΥΑΟΟΟΟ), IV 118.24 (ΤΕΧΣΕΙΑ), 61.24f. (ΤΕΝΤΗΝΗΝΑΑ), see above §7.4 (a), and note 81; exx. in RUDNITZKY 1956: 131ff.
95 See De Cenival, RDe 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.

BKV

BMCat.
W. E. CRUM, CATALOGUE OF THE CPCFIT 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 ÉPITRES DE SHENOOUTI (MIFAO 23, Le Caire 1911). (Bibl. No. 19). Parallels with A 1, 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 (CSCO 42/copt. [ser. 2] 4, Paris 1908) and IV (CSCO 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, Jernstedt and others. Translation by H. Wiesemann (CSCO 96/copt. 8, 1931, and CSCO 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 [CSCO 159/copt. 23] xxiiif.). Among other linguistic phenomena betraying non-Shenoutean authorship, observe the frequent jussive ἐπεις- (e.g. 133.20, 136.13, 145.12), extensive non-rhetorical use of ἀφεις- (e.g. 129.22, 131.20, 135.4); peculiar use of the conjunctive, esp. the conj. continuing or relieving ἐπεις- 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 ἐπεις- preceptive jussive. Way of expression different from the Shenoutean: 132.26f., 140.12, 143.5; a special use of ἐς-, 131.27, 136.11, 138.12, 24, 143.5, 145.4; different sentence structure, with frequent anacoluthia, 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.  
PLEYTE-BOESER, Manuscrits coptes du Musée d’antiquités des Pays-Bas à Leide (Leiden, Brill, 1897): Sh. Nos. 57, 58, 61, 63-5, 67, 72, 73, 75-7, 79-81, 84, 89; Sh.? Nos. 60, 68, 69, 89, 90. (Not in Bibl.). See Crum Papers XI 54, also observations in VON LEMM 1972b:44ff., 1972a:401.

Lucchesi  

Ming.  
G. L. MINGARELLI, Aegyptiorum codicum reliquiae... (Bologna, Typis Laelii a Vulpe, 1785): Nos. IV, V, XIII, XIV (according to Gabrielli, Manoscritti e carte orientali p. 56, “Marciani 9, 10, già orientali 192-3”). (Not in Bibl.).
Miss. E. C. Amélineau, Monuments pour servir à l'histoire de l'Égypte chrétienne aux IV*, V*, VI* et VII* siècles (Mém. de la Mission Archéol. Française 4/1, Paris 1888) 277-287 ("Fragmentum", Δ - ΓΔ, see p. xlvi); pp. 229-236, although somewhat unusual in genre for Shenoute, is nevertheless Shenoutean in style. (Not in Bibl.).


Or. A. Shisha-Haley, “Two New Shenoute Texts from the British Library”, Orientalia 44:149-185 (1975), with plates IX-X. (Bibl. No. 121). New parallels: B.L.Or. 8664, here publ., from AE 34 to AZ 46; P 131472 parallels MB 17 to MA 20. Prof. B. Layton informs me that the originals for B.L.Or. 7561 have been located; that fragments CIII, CIV, CV and CVII cannot have belonged to the main MS (pp. 4θ-5α), 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. Wesely, 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.

Wess. 18 C. Wesely, Studien zur Paläographie und Papyruskunde XVIII (= Griechische und koptische Texte V, Leipzig, Haessel, 1917): Sh. No. 287; Sh.? No. 281. (Bibl. No. 145). Quoted by page, column and line.
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Young


Z, Zoega

G. Zoega, Catalogus codicum copticorum manusciptorum qui in Museo Borgiano Vetritis 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 BMCat. numbering):
Sh. (B.L.Or. 3580A) 144 (publ. in BMCat.)
(B.L.Or. 3581A) — all (partly = 9) published in BMCat. —
192b, 194b, 195b, 196b, 198b, 199, 201, 202b, 203b, 205, 206, 209b, 210b, 211b, 212, 232b, 231b (parallel to RE 10 159a 1-24), 991, 992b.
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 BMCat.), 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* 30:231f. (1908); *RdE* 1:106 n. 2 (1933). (*Cl.Pr. 39 is “Pseudo-Shenoute”.*)

**France**

**Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale**

_Fonde copte_ (I have used microfilms):

103: ff. 14-19, 35-7, 124-142 (ff. 14-16 were edited in P. Cauwenbergh, _Étude sur les moines d’Égypte_, Paris 1914, p. 176ff.; other isolated passages have been edited elsewhere).

104: Sh. ff. 1-11, 24, 25, 44-8, 49-64, 65-74, 75-6, 78, 80-1, 89-6, 97-100, 103-4, 105, 109-111, 112, 115, 116, 117-9, 123, 124, 126, 128, 130, 132; *Sh.?* ff. 32-7, 38-43, 106-8, 120.

105: _Sh._ ff. 90, 93-4, 95-6, 97-8, 100-5, 107, 110-111, 115-130, 139-142 ro (“Florilegium Sinuthianum”), 155-160 (“Florilegium Sinuthianum”); _Sh.?_ ff. 84-9, 99, 114.


108: ff. 37, 75.


110: *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.

111: *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.

112: *Sh.* ff. 32, 39, 40, 45, 46, 57, 65, 71; *Sh.?* ff. 11, 25.

113: *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

Parchment (♯ 25), photograph in Crum Papers I 101.

ANN ARBOR, University of Michigan Library

Mich. Ms. 158 (Crum's "550"), 14a, 17 (D. W. Young's copies), 15, 16, 18, 19 (quoted from Dictionary).
The Michigan Shenouteana are being edited by D. W. Young. See Young p. 348 and now Young 1982.

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)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>ASA</em>E</td>
<td>Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>BASP</em></td>
<td>Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>BIFAO</em></td>
<td>Bulletin de l'Institut français d'Archéologie orientale (Le Caire)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>BO</em></td>
<td>Bibliotheca Orientalis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>BSAC</em></td>
<td>Bulletin de la Société d’Archéologie Copte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>BSL</em></td>
<td>Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>BSOAS</em></td>
<td>Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>CdE</em></td>
<td>Chronique d’Égypte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>CFS</em></td>
<td>Cahiers Ferdinand de Saussure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>CSCO</em></td>
<td>Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>FL</em></td>
<td>Folia Linguistica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>GGA</em></td>
<td>Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>GLECS</em></td>
<td>Groupe linguistique d’Études chamito-sémitiques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>GM</em></td>
<td>Göttinger Miscellen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>IF</em></td>
<td>Indogermanische Forschungen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>IJAL</em></td>
<td>International Journal of American Linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>IOS</em></td>
<td>Israel Oriental Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>JAOS</em></td>
<td>Journal of the American Oriental Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>JE</em>A</td>
<td>Journal of Egyptian Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>JL</em></td>
<td>Journal of Linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>JNES</em></td>
<td>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>JPs</em></td>
<td>Journal de Psychologie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>L</em>g</td>
<td>Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>MDAIK</em></td>
<td>Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>MH</em></td>
<td>Museum Helveticum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>MIFAO</em></td>
<td>Mémoires de l’Institut français d’Archéologie orientale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>MIO</em></td>
<td>Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>MLR</em></td>
<td>Modern Language Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mus</em></td>
<td>Le Muséon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>OLP</em></td>
<td>Orientalia Lovanensia Periodica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>OLZ</em></td>
<td>Orientalistische Literaturzeitung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Or</em></td>
<td>Orientalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>PICL</em></td>
<td>Proceedings of the International Congress of Linguists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>PSBA</em></td>
<td>Proceedings of the Society for Biblical Archeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>RdE</em></td>
<td>Revue d’Égyptologie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>RE</em></td>
<td>Revue égyptologique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>RT</em></td>
<td>Recueil de travaux relatifs à la philologie et à l’archéologie égyptiennes et assyriennes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>SL</em></td>
<td>Studia Linguistica</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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
ZePh  Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie
ZDMG  Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft
ZPh  Zeitschrift für Phonetik und allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft
ZRPPh  Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie
ZV  Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie und Sprachwissenschaft
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§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: **είει + temporal expression.** είει is here not a preposition but a focussing element. A series of work-notes by the author on the syntax of είει, είει ἢντε and various existential clauses in the Sahidic New Testament, published in the *Göttinger Miscellen* (77:67ff., 1984), suggests that είει— 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 'veräusserlichen' und 'unveräusserlichen 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 martyrological 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 *noun*-syntags, Coptic employs for this purpose the Nominal Sentence predicating the pronominalized *possession* [with a pronominal possessor: (*III* 90.19f.) *πυκ κε πνούμε, πυκ κε πατ, πυκ κε τοικοῦμεν*; nominal possessor: (*ibid.* 47.20) *πανειρπιον αν κε*].

§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 after 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", *πανειρπιον πνομε, signals a higher degree of Communicative Dynamism than placement "α", πνομε μπανεηρπιοc, 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
distant goal. Particular constituents of this theory will be the functional definition of zero-determination (different zeroes, according to the various commutations and paradigm extent) and proper names.

§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; ἈΝΑΛΥΕΙ ΜΕΝ ΜΠΟΥΕΙΠ (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 "tautological 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 (ΗΒΟΤΗ, ΝΙΟΥΔΑΙ vs. ΝΕΡΒΟΥ, ΜΕΧΝΗ). With lexemes of Greek origin, we find (in Chassinat's edition) both ΝΑΡΧΗ and ΝΑΡΧΗ, ΝΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΣ and ΝΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΣ, 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 ΣΗΠ-ΠΡΩΜΗ), 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) ΕΙΝΑΙΜΗΝ ΆΝΩΧ ΜΠΙΣΤΟΧ ΧΕ-, sim. Ch. 156.1f. or (Cat. 42.14, 43.8) ΝΣΚ-ΝΙΜ ΝΤΟΚ.

§7.1.3.1 (The conjunctive base and the nota relationis): See also Schleicher, "Zur Morphologie der Sprache" (reference in add. to §5.3, above), p. 24.

§7.2.1.1.5.1: See now M. Green, "The TAPE Pattern in Coptic Non-Biblical Texts", ZAS 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: ΝΖΟΚΗΝ ΆΠΑΙ ΕΙ ΕΒΟΑ ΆΠΑΙ + ΤΡΗΝΑΣΒ ΕΖΟΥΝ ΝΖΟΚΗΝ ΆΠΑΙ + ΤΡΗΝ ΕΖΟΥΝ ΆΠΑΙ ΕΙ ΕΒΟΑ.

§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 (ed. Bierwisch and Heidolph, The Hague 1970) 143-173, applies to Coptic "that"-forms: ΧΕ- factive or unmarked, ΕΤΡΕ- marked non-factive, the conjunctive a marginal non-factive form. (Consider the variation of ΤΡΕ- and conjunctive after ΜΝΗΜΑ- in Ruth 2:11 (Shier), although ΤΡΕ- does not share the markedness for non-factivity of ΕΤΡΕ-.)
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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
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Adjuncts and focus (negation): 102ff.
Adnexal modification: §0.3.2; 1134, 64f., 11686, 190f.
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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: 2037, 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-determined 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
Article, definite plural: 6¹⁹, 160²⁷; *Addenda* ad §6.0.2
—, indefinite: 142ff.
—, 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: 155f.
—, 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, 132¹⁴, 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: 18¹⁶, 21³², 87¹¹⁴

Cataphora: 81, 146, 148ff.
Category: §0.2.1.2-3
Chiasmus: 84, 87, 90, 94, 159²⁰
Circumstantial: 26, 31, 64f., 66f., 68f., 416, 149f.
—, adnexal: §7.1.3.1; 39, 44⁴⁰, 64f., 81, 148f.
—, adnominal: 6¹⁴, 19, 34⁴⁰, 146ff.
—, adverbial (of aorist): 68⁸⁵
—, 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: 85¹⁰⁰

Cleft Sentence and circumstantial *glose*: §2.5
—, devaluated: §2.5.0.1
—, *ne* representing *glose* of: 152¹¹
—, with (pro)nominial *vedette*: 33, 152
—, and Second Tense: §2.7.2; 82, 85
Clitches, fixed expressions, collocations (selection): 3f., 58f., 138; see also under *Figures*
Coeventive (ανάτομος): 26, 31, 205
Cohesion: 26, 100, 144²⁰; 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: 6¹⁵, 6¹⁶

— 240 —
Compatibility (selection): §§2.0.1.1.2, 7.1.2.3-4; 141ff., 142a, 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: 161^3
"Conjunct participle" nomina agentis: 114^38
Conjunctive: Ch. 7: 10^46, 12, 19, 146, 149, 150, 216
—, adnexitential 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; 6^16, 64ff.
—, bracketing: 161
Coordination and the conjunctive: 187ff.
—, of modifiers: §1.1.2.4.2; see also under AYW, MN, 21^—
Coptic, typology of (selection): §§0.4.1, 5.3; 7ff., 12ff., 157^11
Cotext vs. context: 10^42

Descriptive order (selection): §2.6.4; 8, 89^120, 131
Determinators: §§5.1.1; 82, 83
—, and concord: 135ff., 144ff.
—, additional expansion of: 131^12, 132^13
—, 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: 109^13, 112^21, 113ff.
—, in expansion concatenation: 133^16, 135, 142ff., 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: 107^6
Disiunctio Sinuthiana: 3, 90, 94, 112^18, 122
Durativity and object construction: §3.1.2.1

Emotive principle in adjective placement: §4.2.2.2
Emphasis and related notions: 71ff., 155ff., 175^67
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): 3º, 79, 121, 123, 125, 171, 176, 178, 179, 195f., 200f., 207f.; see also under Antithetic configurations, Cliches, Chiasmus, Disiunctio Sinuthiana, Focus (complex), Focus ("disguised").
— figura etymologica (cognate object): 123
— focalization: §2.7.1
— opistho-parenthesis: 79º
— topicalization: §2.7.2
Final-consecutive syntagms: §§7.2.3.1, 7.3.1.1; 69
Focal modifiers: Ch. 2 passim; 12, 23º
Focality: §2.0.2.2.1 ff.
— inherent: 72
— marked: 71f.
— 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; 38º; 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; 165º, 166º, 167º

Halliday, M. A. K.: 69f., 106º
Hyperdetermination: 143º, 13
Identity, analytic: 6f.
—, and homonymy: §0.2.1.3 with 610, §2.0.1.2, §3.1.2.0.1
Idiobloc: §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 alternation mechanism of: §§3.0.2.1, 3.1.2.2
Information unit, organization, structure of: 69ff.
Interrogative, 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-interrogative 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 (εμαχη): §§2.1.3, 7.2.1.1.3
—, rhetorical (μαρέχη): §7.2.1.1.2
—, ετείτρηχη: 7781

"Koinzidenzfall": see Performative discourse

Macrosyntax: Chs. 2, 5, 7 passim; §0.2.5
Metanalysis: 23
Microcoordination: Ch. 7 passim
"Middle Egyptian" dialect of Coptic: 1814, 6810, 8714, 90181
Models: §0.2.1.3
—, Listener's model: 7
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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., 102\textsuperscript{159}
—, focal: 102
—, of focalization patterns: §2.9.1.1 ff.
—, and "emphasis": 101\textsuperscript{154}
—, encategorization, maintenance, syncategorization of: Ch. 7 passim; 187ff.
Neutralization: §§0.2.1.1, 3.1; 145ff. etc.
—, of adjective placement opposition: §4.2.1
—, of attributive: adnaxial expansion opposition: 6\textsuperscript{14}, 19\textsuperscript{84}, 131\textsuperscript{12}
—, 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., 96\textsuperscript{139}, 143\textsuperscript{9}, 146\textsuperscript{24}, 150f., 167, 168, 175, 179f., 180f.
—, with anaphoric pronominal predicate: 112\textsuperscript{19}
—, 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., 161\textsuperscript{36}
—, with zero-determined predicate: 38\textsuperscript{81}, 130\textsuperscript{7}, 143\textsuperscript{14}

See also "Wechselsatz".
Nominal time-expression: 45, 212\textsuperscript{81}
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; 115\textsuperscript{33}
—, 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, 115\textsuperscript{38}, 124, 126, 142f., 191f.
Nucleus and satellite, semantic vs. syntactic: §4.1; 142\textsuperscript{7}

Object vs. complement: see Adverbial expansion, rectional vs. complementational
Object, non-reflexive, marked by $\text{MMO}^-$: §3.1.3.2.1
Object-expansion: Ch. 3; 79, 82ff., 146ff., 149f.
—, mediate vs. immediate: Ch. 3, §3.0.2
—, pronominal: §3.1.1.1
Objective pronoun: §3.1.1.1.0.2
Optative ($\text{ΕΘΕ}$), 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, 1153, 1154
Passive in Coptic: §3.0.1.1 with 1076
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
Polenicity: 72
Polite cliches, with anteposed adjectives: 138
Polotsky, H. J. (selection): §2.0.0.1; 179, 155
Posteventive ($\text{MNNCAΤΡΕΨ}$-): 26, 31, 205
Precursive ($\text{ΝΤΕΡΕΨ}$-): 26, 31
Preinclusion 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, 6658, 67
Primary : secondary functions: 8
"Proforma" expansion: 13218
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
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—, of augens: §6.1.0.2 ff.
—, of modifiers: §1.3.1 ff. passim
—, of Nominal Sentence patterns: 34f., 161^36
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: 98^38, 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.
—, TAPE^4−: §7.2.1.1.5.1

Rection: §4.2.2.1.4; 5, 24ff., 108, 144f.
Relative conversion: 6^4, 19, 68f.
Relative, substantivized (determined): §5.2.3.1; 83f., 114, 152^38
—, 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": 65^44, 72
Resumption as junctural symptom: 94f., 162; see also Zero, resumption of
RHEME: 69ff., 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: 9^41; see also under Figures
Rhetorical focalization/topicalization figures: §2.7.1-2
Rhetorical narrative: 10^46; see also Perfect, non-narrative
Rhetorical questions, Second Tenses and focalization patterns: §2.1.2; 76f., 89, 90, 94
—, apodosis of (TAPE^4− 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 exraposition: 99
Rosén, H.B.: 8, 160^42

Second Tenses: Ch. 2; 8^44, 10^46, 183, 191
—, autofocal: §2.1
—, and Basic Tenses: §2.7.3.1; 65^18
—, 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
Index of Subjects Discussed

—, extensions in use of: 63
—, following focus (in dialects other than Sahidic): 87
—, 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
Steinthal, H.: 1815, 1817
Stern, L., as structuralist: 1360
Stern-Jernstedt Rule: Ch. 3 passim, esp. §3.1.2.1
Subakhmimic: 98
Subcoordination: Ch. 7 passim; 188ff.
Syncategorization: §7.1.2 and Ch. 7 passim
Synchrony vs. diachrony: §0.2.4
Syntagm, defined: 727
System: 59

"Tautological infinitive": 32, 1567; 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: 102157, 103161
—, prominent (marked): §6.0.1.1; 41, 71
Theme-focus seam: §2.8.2
Theme/rheme, linear-axis conception of: 7149
Time expressions: §1.3.2; 85, 21281
Topic/focus: 69ff.
Topic form, conditioning of: §2.6.4; see also Theme(-topic)
Topicalization, lemmatizing: §2.7.2.1.4
—, "proforma": 89ff.
—, relative in form: §2.7.2.1.3
—, ω εξε-, ω ηκάναν: §2.7.2.1.1-2
Totality: §6.1.1; 144
Transformation: 830
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\textsuperscript{96}
Word in Coptic: §6.0.2.3; 6, 725, 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\textsuperscript{97}
Zero subject of predicative modifier: §1.2.1.3.3; 151
Zeroing, anaphoric: 112f.
I. OF GREEK ORIGIN

ΛΛΗΘΩΣ: §1.3.11.1.2
ΛΛΑΣ: §1.3.11.6
ΛΛΙΟ: §7.3.3
ΑΝΤΙ: §1.3.11.5
(ΖΩΡΑ) ΖΩΡΑΣ: §1.3.11.1.7
ΑΡΑ: 76
ΑΡΧΑΙΟΣ: 136

ΓΑΡ: see Greek particles, Enclitics
ΓΕΝΟΙΤΟ: §7.3.3

ΔΕ: see Greek particles, Enclitics
ΔΙΚΑΙΩΣ: §1.3.11.1.7

ΕΙΜΙΤΙ: §§1.3.11.6, 7.3.1.1
ΕΚΜΕΡΟΥΣ: §1.3.11.6
(ΟΥΚ)ΕΙ: §1.3.11.6
ΕΥΤΑΞΙΑ (ευταξία): §1.3.11.6

Η (- Η): §7.3.1.1

ΚΑΚΘΣ: §1.3.11.1.3
ΚΑΛΘΣ: §1.3.11.1.3; 72, 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

ΜΟΓΙΣ: §1.3.11.6; 52, 70, 72, 84, 208
(ΟΥ) ΜΟΝΟΝ: §1.3.11.2.1

ΖΟΜΟΙΘΣ: §1.3.11.1.4
ΖΟΜΘΣ: §1.3.11.1.4
-ΟΝ-marked modifiers: §1.3.11.2
ΟΝΤΘΣ: §1.3.11.1.6
-ΟΣ, -ΟΝ, concord in adjectives of Greek origin:

4.2.2.1
ΖΟΘΟΝ, ΕΝ-, ΕΦΟΘΝ: §1.3.11.6
ΖΟΤΑΝ: §1.3.11.6

ΠΑΙΝ ΟΝ: §1.3.11.3
(ΟΥ) ΠΑΝΤΘΣ: §1.3.11.1.5
ΠΑΡΑ: §1.3.11.5
ΠΑΘΘΣ: §1.3.11.6
ΠΟΛΛΑΚΙΣ: §1.3.11.6
ΠΡΟΣ: §1.3.11.5

ΣΧΕΔΟΝ: §1.3.11.2.3

ΤΑΧΑ: §1.3.11.6
ΤΑΧΥ: §1.3.11.4
ΤΟΤΕ: §1.3.11.6

ΦΑΝΕΡΟΝ: §1.3.11.2.2

ΧΩΡΙΣ: §1.3.11.5
-ΘΘΣ-marked modifiers: §1.3.11.1; 81

ΖΘΣ: §1.3.11.5; 59, 80
ΖΘΣΤΕ: §§1.3.11.6, 7.3.1.1
II. OF NATIVE COPTIC ORIGIN

\( \text{AN, N- AN: } \) §§2.9., 6.0.3.3; 63°, 69
\( \text{ARPHY: } 211 \)
\( \text{AT-: } \) §3.4.2
\( \text{AYW, and enclitics: } 165 \)
\( \rightarrow \), coordinating modifiers: 35
\( \rightarrow \), a modifier: §1.3.10
\( \text{AYW vs. zero, coordinating the conjunctive: } 188f. \)

\( \varepsilon- \), preposition in adnominal status: 21
\( \text{EM-: } 104^a, 82, 86 \)
\( \text{EPO AN \varepsilon-: } 78, 102^60 \)
\( \text{EIE: } 98 \)
\( \text{EMATE: } \) §1.3.1.1
\( \text{ENE, converter vs. interrogative marker, juncturally distinct: } 163^42 \)
\( \text{ENE, interrogative marker: } 66^26 \)
\( \text{ENZ: } \) §1.3.6; 23
\( \text{EP- marked modifiers: } \) §1.3.7
\( \text{EP- + infinitive: } \) §1.3.7.6
\( \text{EPHPI: } \) §1.3.7.2
\( \text{EPZAE: } \) §1.3.7.1
\( \text{EPZYOY: } \) §1.3.7.4
\( \text{EPZINKH: } \) §1.3.7.3.1
\( \text{EPOA-, predicative: } 38 \)
\( \text{EPOA- as "that"-form: } \) §7.4
\( \rightarrow \), as topic: 91
\( \rightarrow \), jussive: 205^48
\( \rightarrow \), with conjunctive: §7.2.5.2
\( \text{EUXE-, topocalizing: } \) §2.7.2.1.1
\( \text{(SEC) EUXE-: } 78f. \)
\( \text{EZOYN E-: } 19^42 \)
\( \text{EPOAI, "up/down": } 29f. \)
\( \text{EX-, predicative: } 38 \)

\( \text{EPE, with N- + iterated noun as predicative complement: } \) §1.3.3.2
\( \text{O N-: } \) §1.2.1.3.1
\( \text{P-, object of: } \) §3.1.1.2.3
\( \text{P-/O N-, allomorphs of "intransitive" P-: } 106^4 \)
\( \text{P-, + modifier: } \) §1.2.1.3.2
\( \text{P-, with Second Tense: } 80 \)
\( \text{PNIKE-: see Conjugation mediators} \)
\( \text{PZOYO/E -: see Conjugation mediators} \)
\( \text{EIC + time expression: } \) 85, Addenda ad §1.2.1.2 B
\( \text{EIC +(Nom. Sentence + modifier): } 36^78 \)

\( \text{KE-/\varepsilon-: } \) 143ff., 146ff.; see Determinators
\( \text{KOYI, ETIKEKOYI PE: } \) §7.3.1
\( \text{KOYI, YHMY: } 134 \)

\( \text{ME, ZNOYM: } \) §1.3.5.2
\( \text{MMITE: } \) §1.3.1.1
\( \text{MMIN MO-: } \) §6.1.4.2
\( \text{MMATE: } \) §1.3.1.1
\( \text{MMAY: } \) §1.3.1.1
\( \text{MN-, preposition, in adnominal status: } 21, 36 \)
\( \rightarrow \), coordinating modifiers: 36
\( \text{NMMA-, coordinating a second pronominal rectum of a prepositional phrase: } 36 \)
\( \text{MINE: } 137^28, 143^9 \)
\( \text{MNNMCA-: } \) §7.3.1
\( \text{MAYAA+: } \) §6.1.4.1
\( \rightarrow \), and MMATE: §6.2; 43
\( \text{MEYAK: } \) §7.3.3
\( \text{MEOIZE EXMEOIZE: } 38, 143^9 \)

\( \text{N-, conjugation "base" of conjunctive: } \) §§7.1.1, 7.1.3
\( \text{N-, "notar relations": } \) §1.0.1-2; 6^19, 131^18 and passim; Addenda ad §7.1.3.1
\( \rightarrow \), adnominal: Ch. 4 passim (esp. §4.0.1 ff.);
\( \rightarrow \), adnominal: Ch. 3 passim; 27, 29, 81
\( \text{N-modifiers: } \) §§1.0.1.2, 1.3.1; 2, 11f.
\( \text{N-/MMO-, predicative in Bipartite Pattern: } 36f. \)
\( \rightarrow \), identity and homonymy issues: §3.1.2.0.1
\( \rightarrow \), rection: Ch. 3 passim (esp. §§3.0.1.1, 3.1.2)
\( \rightarrow \), "belongs" to the verb, not the governed noun: 172^13, 107^6
\( \text{NA-, preposition: } \) §6.1.5
\( \rightarrow \), predicative: 37f.
\( \text{-NA-, future characteristic, bracketing: } 161^33 \)
\( \text{ME-, converter: see Preterite converter} \)
\( \text{NAME: } \) §1.3.5.1
\( \text{NIM, determinator: } \) 143ff., 144^14, 146ff.
\( \rightarrow \), Ø...NIM, as object: §3.1.1.2.1
\( \text{NIM ENE2, "whoever": } \) §1.3.6.1; 83
\( \text{NANOY-: } 150 \)
\( \text{NNAZPN-: } 35 \)
\( \text{NTA-/TA-, conjunctive, 1st person sgl.: } \) §7.0.2
\( \text{NTA- /ENTAN-, Second/relative perfect: } 68f. \)
\( \rightarrow \), circumstantial + Second Perfect: 67
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—, pronominal object of: §3.1.1.0.2
OYHP, NOYHP, following Basic Tenses: 97
OYWY, object construction of: §3.1.1.2.2

YWNE, WANTEOY YWNE: §2.5.0.2; 4
—, c-YWNE, with conjunctive or ETREH-: 148f., 200
—, WRPN(γ): see Conjugation mediators

ZAE: 133

ZE
—, NAY NZE: §2.6.3; with Basic Tense: 97; -O
NAY NZE: 89119
—, in various syntagms preceding enclitics:
§§1.3.4.2, 6.1.2.2, 6.1.3.2
—, -GE N-: 39, 47, 67
—, NTEGE: §1.3.1.2; 834, 39, 67; predicated by
PE: §1.2.1.2
ZI -: adnominal, coordinating: 21, 1439
ZWWM -: §6.1.2
ZAPOM: §7.3.3
ZN -: 32
ZN-, "into": 30
ZWNN, "enjoin", pronominal object of: §3.1.3.1
ZAPIZARAXO -: §6.1.5
ZTOOEY: 45
-ZOYOY-, nuclear: 12663
ZAO(2)TN-, adnominal: 21
ZWWM, invariable: §6.1.2.3; 14644; see also Enclitics

XE-inclusion, adnominal: §1.1.1; 148
—, adverbal: 149f.
—, and selection of focalization pattern: 89f.
—, with Basic Tense as prefocal theme: 97
XE-, "as if": 7884
XE-/ETREH-, as topic: 91
XW: 83, 11531, 14931
—, EIYANXOOC, topicalization: §2.7.2.1.2.1
—, EIWX MPAI XE-: "by which I mean to say, that...": §2.0.1.1.2
—, EKXEY, EKXW MMOC XEY: 83f.
—, EXOCXOC XE-topicalization: 95130
XEKAAC: §6.1.2.2; 14931, 162, 163, 207
—, resumed by conjunctive: 207
XOOEM, pronoun object of: §3.1.1.1.0.2

-GE -: 216
GEI, GEI: see Enclitics

GINE, focalization pattern as direct object of: 99
<p>| Amélineau | 88 | 104, 112, 201 | 165 | 208 | 298 | 50, 158 |
| A 1 | 89 | 74, 104 | 167 | 121, 157 | 302 | 22, 171 |
| | 90 | 157 | 171 | 48, 51 | 304 | 125 |
| | 92 | 133 | 173 | 112 | 305 | 34, 86, 183 |
| 9.4.7 | 95 | 168 | 175 | 139 | 306 | 22 |
| 9 | 96 | 87, 125 | 177 | 119 | 307 | 150, 151 |
| 11 | 97 | 30, 181 | 181 | 151 | 312 | 86 |
| 12 | 98 | 37 | 182, 9 | 138 | 327 | 161 |
| 14 | 99 | 201 | 183 | 101 | 331 | 156 |
| 15 | 100 | 46, 12 | 193 | 179 | 335 | 47 |
| 16 | 101 | 33 | 194 | 138 | 353 | 88 |
| 17 | 102 | 139, 152 | 199 | 148, 204 | 365 | 152 |
| 21 | 103 | 74, 82, 174 | 202 | 30, 202 | 373 | 172 |
| 33 | 104 | 139 | 204 | 56, 125, 172 | 374 | 97 |
| 34 | 105 | 22 | 206 | 192 | 381 | 171 |
| 37 | 107, 204 | 52 | 204 | 180, 206 | 380 | 102 |
| 39 | 108 | 174 | 209 | 121 | 395 | 46 |
| 41 | 74 | 101, 115 | 177 | 48, 151, 181 | 405 | 148 |
| 44 | 78 | 94 | 213 | 412 | 94 |
| 45 | 109 | 126 | 215 | 148 | 446 | 50 |
| 46 | 110 | 86 | 219 | 174, 182 | 456 | 174 |
| 48 | 111 | 126 | 215 | 148 | 461 | 174 |
| 51 | 112 | 86 | 219 | 148 | 461 | 174 |
| 52 | 113 | 126 | 215 | 148 | 461 | 174 |
| 55 | 114 | 87, 104, 172 | 233 | 87 | 464 | 158, 174 |
| 56 | 115 | 87, 104 | 172 | 233 | 125, 194 | 465 | 22 |
| 57 | 116 | 88, 96, 99 | 227 | 97, 149 | 463 | 117, 173 |
| 58 | 117 | 110, 175, 177 | 233 | 87 | 464 | 158, 174 |
| 59 | 118 | 88, 96, 99 | 227 | 97, 149 | 463 | 117, 173 |
| 61 | 121 | 171 | 239 | 89, 180, 183 | 465 | 22 |
| 62f. | 122 | 174, 177 | 241 | 66, 161 | 117, 173 |
| 64 | 123 | 167, 178 | 241 | 66, 161 | 117, 173 |
| 65 | 124 | 167, 178 | 241 | 66, 161 | 117, 173 |
| 66 | 130 | 139 | 250 | 49, 179 | 49 |
| 67 | 131 | 177 | 251 | 39, 52, 179, 183 | 86, 151 |
| 68 | 132 | 173 | 251 | 39, 52, 179, 183 | 86, 151 |
| 69 | 133 | 173 | 251 | 39, 52, 179, 183 | 86, 151 |
| 70 | 134 | 173 | 251 | 39, 52, 179, 183 | 86, 151 |
| 71 | 135 | 173 | 251 | 39, 52, 179, 183 | 86, 151 |
| 72 | 136 | 173 | 251 | 39, 52, 179, 183 | 86, 151 |
| 73 | 137 | 173 | 251 | 39, 52, 179, 183 | 86, 151 |
| 74 | 138 | 173 | 251 | 39, 52, 179, 183 | 86, 151 |
| 75 | 139 | 173 | 251 | 39, 52, 179, 183 | 86, 151 |
| 76 | 140 | 22, 46, 125 | 299 | 106, 172 | 20 | 41 |
| 77 | 141 | 22, 46, 125 | 299 | 106, 172 | 20 | 41 |
| 78 | 142 | 22, 46, 125 | 299 | 106, 172 | 20 | 41 |
| 80 | 143 | 22, 46, 125 | 299 | 106, 172 | 20 | 41 |
| 81 | 144 | 22, 46, 125 | 299 | 106, 172 | 20 | 41 |
| 82f. | 145 | 22, 46, 125 | 299 | 106, 172 | 20 | 41 |
| 87 | 146 | 22, 46, 125 | 299 | 106, 172 | 20 | 41 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>22, 34, 179</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>78, 148</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>38\textsuperscript{f}</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>94, 100, 168</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>32, 174, 181</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>47, 74, 76, 81</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39\textsuperscript{f}</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>91, 99</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>41, 48</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>91, 112\textsuperscript{f}</td>
<td>223\textsuperscript{f}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>224\textsuperscript{f}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>42\textsuperscript{r}, 47, 228</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>238\textsuperscript{f}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>74, 138</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>132\textsuperscript{r}</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>18\textsuperscript{r}, 34, 161\textsuperscript{r}</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>104, 123</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>25, 102</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>20\textsuperscript{f}</td>
<td>249\textsuperscript{f}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>161\textsuperscript{r}</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>180, 181, 183</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>258\textsuperscript{f}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>172, 180</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>40, 208</td>
<td>293\textsuperscript{f}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>38\textsuperscript{r}, 66, 81, 99</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>58, 196</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>299\textsuperscript{f}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>91, 208</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>74, 89</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>41, 49, 112, 115, 176</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--- 254 ---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>486</td>
<td>125, 132, 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>489</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>491</td>
<td>150, 173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>492</td>
<td>78, 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>498</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>499</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501</td>
<td>48, 179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502f.</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>134, 179, 181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504</td>
<td>172, 182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505</td>
<td>161, 206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505f.</td>
<td>77, 101, 161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>507</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>509</td>
<td>83, 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510</td>
<td>179, 196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510f.</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512</td>
<td>33, 83, 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513</td>
<td>94, 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>514</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518f.</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>519</td>
<td>35, 87, 104, 174, 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520</td>
<td>99, 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>526</td>
<td>22, 202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>528</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529</td>
<td>161, 161, 179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>535</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540</td>
<td>99, 178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>547</td>
<td>53, 179, 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>548</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>551</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>557</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>558</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>559</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561f.</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>562f.</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>563</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>564</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>566</td>
<td>132, 138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>567</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>568</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>569</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>571</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>572</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>573</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>574</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>575</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>576</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>577</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>578</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>579</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>581</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>582</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>583</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>584</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>585</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>587</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>588</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>589</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>590</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>591</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>592</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>593</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>594</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>595</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>596</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>597</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>598</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>599</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>606</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>607</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>608</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>609</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>613</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>614</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>615</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>616</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>617</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>618</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>622</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>624</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>625</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>626</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>627</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>628</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>629</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>631</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>632</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>633</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>634</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>635</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>637</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>638</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>639</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>641</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>642</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>643</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>644</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>645</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>646</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>647</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>648</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>649</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>652</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>653</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>654</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>655</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>656</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>657</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>658</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>659</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>660</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>661</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>662</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>663</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>664</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>665</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>666</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>667</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>668</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>669</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>670</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>671</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>672</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>673</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>674</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Chassinet (Ch.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

BMCat. see: Unpublished

MSS — BL Or.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ch.</th>
<th>Index Locorum</th>
<th>Ench.</th>
<th>L III</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>99.2ff.</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>132ff.</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>102.9ff.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>141.31ff.</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.19ff.</td>
<td>41, 66, 67, 74</td>
<td>143.44ff.</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.24ff.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>144.2ff.</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>104.8ff.</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>104.37ff.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>146.52ff.</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.39ff.</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>147.14ff.</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105.3ff.</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>147ff.</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105.17ff.</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>148.14ff.</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105.55ff.</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>148.47ff.</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.20ff.</td>
<td>18*</td>
<td>149.27ff.</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.25ff.</td>
<td>183**</td>
<td>150.24ff.</td>
<td>66**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.47ff.</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>155.27ff.</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.47ff.</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>156.48ff.</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114.62ff.</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>158.14ff.</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114ff.</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>158.25ff.</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116.36ff.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>159.33ff.</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116.57ff.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>159ff.</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117.14ff.</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>160.15ff.</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117.19ff.</td>
<td>22, 33</td>
<td>161.1ff.</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>162.7ff.</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118.31ff.</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>162.18ff.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118.44ff.</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>165.22ff.</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>167.4ff.</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>167ff.</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>125.23ff.</td>
<td>126**</td>
<td>169.7ff.</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>171.2ff.</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>173ff.</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129.36ff.</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>175.32ff.</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130.30ff.</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>178ff.</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--- 256 ---
<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</td>
<td>115.26ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.11f.</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>115.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.14ff.</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>116.6f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.12f.</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>116.16f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.19f.</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>116.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.7</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>116.23f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.7f.</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>116.25ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.21f.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>117.5f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.2f.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>117.6.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.1</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>117.6f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.4f.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>117.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.13</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>117.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.15</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>117.27f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.19f.</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>117.28f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.23ff.</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>118.5f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105.6</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>118.11f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105.24f.</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>118.15f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>118.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.11f.</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>118.25f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.18f.</td>
<td>25, 117</td>
<td>119.7ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>120.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>120.7f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.2f.</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>120.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.6</td>
<td>40, 53, 151</td>
<td>120.24f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.8f.</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>120.27ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>121.8ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.17f.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>121.21f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.23f.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>121.23f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107f.</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>122.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108.9</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>123.1f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108.12f.</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>123.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108.13f.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>123.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108.28</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>123.13f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109.2f.</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>123.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109.4f.</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>123.27f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109.16</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>124.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109.19ff.</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>124.17f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109f.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>124f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110.2f.</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>125.7f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110.6f.</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>125.14ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110.8f.</td>
<td>41, 46</td>
<td>125.18ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110.17</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>126.1ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110.18</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>126.5f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111.2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>126.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111f.</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>126.20f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112.10f.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>126.23f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112.16ff.</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>127.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.1ff.</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>128.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.5f.</td>
<td>122°</td>
<td>128.20f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.9f.</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>130.3f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.11</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>130.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.13f.</td>
<td>79°, 165</td>
<td>130.7f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.19f.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>131.5f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114.9f.</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>131.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114.12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>131.14f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114f.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>131.13f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115.2f.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>131.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115.8f.</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>132.3f.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>150.4</th>
<th>168</th>
<th>184.7</th>
<th>165</th>
<th>Miss.</th>
<th>RE 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>152.2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>184.8</td>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td>159a 13ff. 78**, 96**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153.13f</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>187.9ff.</td>
<td>204</td>
<td></td>
<td>159b 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153.16</td>
<td>132**</td>
<td>189.3</td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
<td>159b 30ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153.22</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>191.7f.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td>160a 16ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153.23f.</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>193.9</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td>160a 27ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154.22</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>194.1f.</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
<td>160a 32f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155.1f.</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>195.2</td>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
<td>160a 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155.8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>195.4</td>
<td>183**</td>
<td></td>
<td>160b 17f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155.11ff.</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>195.6ff.</td>
<td>206</td>
<td></td>
<td>161a 27ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155.14ff.</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>195.8f.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td>161a 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155.22</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>195.14</td>
<td>20**</td>
<td></td>
<td>161a 31ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156.3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>195.14f.</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
<td>162a 1f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156.7</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>197.9</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>162a 2f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156.9ff.</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>198.20</td>
<td>24**</td>
<td></td>
<td>162a 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156.19</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>199.2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td>162a 8f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156.19f.</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>199.7f.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>162a 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156.26</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>199.15f.</td>
<td>107**</td>
<td></td>
<td>162a 13ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156.26f.</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>200.20</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>162b 14f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157.2f.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>204.21ff.</td>
<td>200**</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>162b 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157.12</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>205.10f.</td>
<td>166</td>
<td></td>
<td>162b 23f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157.15f.</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>205.18f.</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td>163a 15f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157.21ff.</td>
<td>79, 178</td>
<td>206.12f.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>163a 17f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159.8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>206.18</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>163a 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159.11f.</td>
<td>38, 40</td>
<td>206.22</td>
<td>47, 122</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>163a 36f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159.13</td>
<td>20, 22, 23</td>
<td>206.27ff.</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
<td>163a 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160.2f.</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>207.4f.</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>164a 2f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160.17f</td>
<td>50, 56</td>
<td>207.6f.</td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
<td>164a 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161.2f.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>207.26</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
<td>164a 27f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161.19</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>207.28ff.</td>
<td>197</td>
<td></td>
<td>164b 31f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161.21f.</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>208.10f.</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
<td>164b 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162.2ff.</td>
<td>84, 198</td>
<td>247</td>
<td></td>
<td>159.155 passim</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162.5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>153.8f.</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>164b 35f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163.22ff.</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>153.27ff.</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164.7f.</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>153-155 passim</td>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164.9f.</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>156.7ff</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165.10</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>156.12ff. 107*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166.3f.</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>159.34ff. 38**, 130**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167.18f.</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
<td>159.51f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171.1f.</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>121, 210</td>
<td>159.52f.</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171.3f.</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
<td>159.9f. 48***, 112**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172.10</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>160.3f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172.16</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>160.4f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173.1</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
<td>160.27f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173.4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td>160.34ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175.2f.</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td>160.34f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175.10f.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>84, 94</td>
<td>160.47ff.</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175.11f.</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>74, 100</td>
<td>160.50ff.</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>67, 90</td>
<td>161.37ff.</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180.3</td>
<td>161**</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>208</td>
<td></td>
<td>163.19f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180.12</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>204</td>
<td></td>
<td>166.42ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181.11</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181.11ff.</td>
<td>96**</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>74, 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181.13</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>67, 90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183.7</td>
<td>47, 98, 166</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184.2</td>
<td>163**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184.5f.</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quot.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index Locorum</td>
<td>Ryl.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF (Cairo)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paris, Bibl. Nationale (P)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130¹ 15 ro</td>
<td>50, 53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 p. 143</td>
<td>113, 176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 p. 153</td>
<td>123, 133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 p. 157</td>
<td>208, 212</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132 p. 327</td>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134 p. 331</td>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 p. 333[f]</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136 p. 335</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136 p. 336</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137 p. 338</td>
<td>52, 175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139 p. 345</td>
<td>45, 78, 166, 174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139 p. 346</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140 p. 347[f]</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130² 1 p. 77</td>
<td>174, 182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 p. 80</td>
<td>173, 180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 p. 85</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 p. 87[f]</td>
<td>147, 176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 p. 88</td>
<td>162²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 p. 89</td>
<td>171</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 p. 90</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 p. 238</td>
<td>161²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 p. 549</td>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 p. 550</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 p. 554</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 p. 554[f]</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 p. 555</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 p. 33</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 vo</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 ro</td>
<td>21, 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 p. 104</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 p. 106</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 p. 108</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 p. 219</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 p. 220</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 p. 223</td>
<td>86, 143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47-8 p. 223[f]</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 p. 224</td>
<td>20³, 22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 p. 309</td>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 p. 311</td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 p. 314</td>
<td>156, 179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 p. 316</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 p. 70</td>
<td>21, 35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 p. 73</td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 p. 75</td>
<td>21, 35-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 p. 77</td>
<td>22, 35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--- 263 ---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thompson (Cambridge)</th>
<th>ViK (Vienna) (K)</th>
<th>Index Locorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 59</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 1 ro</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 vo</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ro</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 3 vo</td>
<td>137, 196</td>
<td>933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L ro</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24, 25, 125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--- 264 ---