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Heavens, what a tough job Egyptian grammar is if one takes it seriously!
(Battiscombe Gunn to Alan Henderson Gardiner, 26/4/21 (AHG Archives
[Oxford, the Griffith Institute] 35.17)

Coptic is indeed “lingua sapientissima”, but we are constantly and often
rudely reminded that we are not “sapientes” enough.
(Hans-Jakob Polotsky, 1984, p.15)

0.1 General and Methodological

The present work, a long time in the making, has a quintuple ambition
and raison d’être. First, it aims to depict in detail, using a strictly struc-
tural analytic method, some central subsystemic components of the
synchronic system of a much-neglected dialect of Coptic: beyond the
need to understand how Coptic functions — in F.L.L. Griffith’s words1,
“an intelligent study of the linguistic remains” — a description which
would be an adequate basis for typological and/or diachronic studies.
While not exhaustive (and far from answering all questions raised), this
account attempts to isolate and address the main Problematik of the said
subsystems; I believe in the progressive unveiling of grammatical intri-
cacies, as it were opening phenomenological vistas, with ever-increasing
delicacy of resolution. At the same time and to the same extent, I wish to
supply a description that would put Coptic once again on the map of
General Linguistics, as it was in the nineteenth century: for modern
General Linguistics, and its history, have mostly passed Coptic by,
regressing in the insightful comprehension of Coptic achieved in the
nineteenth century (the typology of Coptic — in contradistinction to
pre-Coptic Egyptian — was basically understood and applied by
M.G. Schwartze, H. Steinhalt and F. Misteli, and even Aug. Schlei-
cher)2. Thirdly, my aim is to assess, on a broad canvas and with “minor”

1 F.L.L. Griffith, “The Study of Egyptology” (Inaugural Lecture, the Ashmolean Mu-
seum, May 8, 1901).
2 Thus, in ENTWISTLE 1953:354 we read “The grammatical distinctions in sha-f-sotm
‘he is accustomed to hear’ are presented before the verbal stem is reached” (my italics):
an analytically wrong statement one would not expect to find in the old typologists. Or, [“do” with the infinitive] “reflects usage in ordinary speech”, Fewster in ADAMS et al.
(eds.) 2000:223 n.7, a statement purely speculative and again heedless of dialectal differ-
ences and the importance of eπ- in this context in Bohairic. Or, and especially critically,
as well as major traits, the nature and degree of the influence — or absence of influence — of Greek on Coptic; by examining and questioning the bias of “Greeknness” in Coptic usage, I would return Coptic linguistics to the broader scope of Egyptian linguistics; and, simultaneously, formulate ideas towards a Coptic-Greek contrastive grammar. However, this is not a contrastive investigation — neither Coptic vs. Greek, nor Bohairic vs. Sahidic. At the time an excellent 2000, 2004 Sahidic Grammar (Layton 2004) has just appeared in its second edition, one that represents the language as “Coptic”, I wish to assert, or rather reassert, Bohairic as a linguistic system, as worthy (from the viewpoint of grammatical interest) as Sahidic — nay, worthier than Sahidic, a considerably levelled-out dialect. For we have had practically no in-depth study of Bohairic in the twentieth century; even H.J. Polotsky’s work was entirely Sahidic-oriented. Sahidic still stands for Coptic tout court (as represented in encyclopedic accounts, in teaching, in “Coptic information” included in Egyptian grammars, such as Fr. Junge’s introductory grammar of Late Egyptian, or in typological-comparative essays). Bohairic grammar has ever been a “sub-Coptology” subject, second (with the false Renaissance of Manichaean and Gnostic Coptology) to Lycopolitan (alias Subakhmimic), to recently emerging dialects such as Oxrynchite. Therefore, as a fourth aim, I have in mind what H.J. Polotsky called (in his 1959 review of Mallon-Maline’s Bohairic Grammar) “Neugestaltung der koptischen Grammatik”, in the sense of restoring Bohairic grammar to its proper place in the over-all Coptic picture. Fifth and last, I have in mind the rigorous application of the methods of structural analysis in text-linguistics scope, with a view to testing these models “in the field”, discovering their effectiveness and weaknesses and perhaps contributing to refining and improving its heuristic power. Here belongs the systemic interdependence of these “topics” which, although presented separately, are but facets and feature clusters in a single close-knit system: only structural analysis can combine in presentation these two — the isolated phenomenon and its associates in the system.

in current Egyptian linguistics, which is still often lamentably dependent on Till’s Grammatik (see for instance Jansen-Winkel 2000 in an otherwise important and insightful article).

3 When Gardiner 1937:20f. exults “the logicality and clarity of Egyptian syntax”, Coptic is excluded: “Coptic being in the main a language of translation from the Greek, is as regards word-order almost completely under the influence of the originals”; this is all wrong, and tells us more about Gardiner than about Coptic or Egyptian.

4 Despite certain curious Coptic references which seem non-Sahidic: επεισοτη, σεπισοτη (135), μπεισοτη (164), άντοκ οτως (193), εντρπωτη an (257).
0.1.1 Basic structural-analytic procedure: methodological principles in brief\(^5\).

It is near-impossible to adequately codify the structuralist analytic procedure, except in very general principle; this is due to the fact, once we leave phonology for "grammar", that is syntax, unsolved theoretical problems abound, notably in principles of commutation and paradigms, opposition and neutralization, environment, analysis and synthesis. The following principles must therefore be considered provisional, approximative and personally conceived.

(a) "The objects of interest to linguistic theory are texts. The aim of linguistic theory is to provide a procedural method by means of which a given text can be comprehended through a self-consistent and exhaustive description [...]. Linguistic theory starts from the text as its datum and attempts to show the way to a self-consistent and exhaustive description of it through an analysis — a deductive progression from class to component, and component of component [...]. A totality does not consist of things but of relationships [...]. Analysis we can define formally as description of an object by the uniform dependences of other objects on it and on each other. The object that is subjected to analysis we will call a class, and the other objects [...] we will call components of the class" (L. Hjelmslev, Prolegomena to a Theory of Language [translated by Whitfield, Madison 1961], from Chapters 9-10; my italics). These lines sum up the basic analytical principle of the structural method.

The heuristic procedure is data-based, empiric (and therewith repeatable or reconstructable and refutable) and analytic. In a ‘listener’s role’ ("modèle de récepteur") decoding direction, we isolate in a given corpus simple or complex signifiants, which have by definition their respective individual signifiés. These signs are presented in a statement of functional value: any formal (signifiant) difference must, as a heuristic axiom (and indeed as the basic definitive property of language as a semiotic system of simple and complex signs) be correlatable with a signifié difference. A language element or combination of elements can be described as having a value (role, function) only in terms of its relationships to other elements or combination of elements, on two axes: syntagmatic (linear, [co]textual) or paradigmatic (commutative, categorial)\(^6\). The former can

---

\(^5\) To some extent adapted from the methodological Introduction to Shisha-Halevy 1998.

\(^6\) Following a vigorous inner struggle, I have decided not to react here at length to the
be interpreted and qualified in terms of environment, dependence, junc-
ture, recton (government), conditioning, compatibility or incompatibil-
ity, sequencing (placement, arrangement, texture); the latter in terms of 
opposition and its negation, neutralization; of significant or pertinent 
substitution (ceteris paribus, in a given syntagmatic environment and 
slot) and its signifié, its category; or of conditioned alternation (and 
other types of neutralization). Zero ('significant absence') is a normal 
member of any paradigm, if a 'no element' significant is privileged to 
 occur at the paradigmatic slot. The category is the building-block of the 
pattern, which is the syntagm matrix, the 'syntagmatic blueprint' 
subtextual unity. The pattern is definable as a bounded (delimited) and 
ordered junctured sequence of categories.

The decoded-analytic identity-definition of an entity of language is 
effected by the conjoint coordinates of positional and commutational 
localization; its 'role-name', its analytic identity or individual essential 
profile consists of its simultaneous syntagmatic and paradigmatic coor-
dination. This 'ID' names the entity, and distinguishes it from any possi-
ble homonym(s), for which one or both coordinates might be different. 
This is, in fact, the quintessence of analytic information we can supply 
on this entity. To this we may add synthetic statements about its vari-
ous allo-forms, or its cumulative profile, consisting of several categories

The current trend of rapping the so-called "Standardtheorie" of Middle Egyptian grammar, 
a concept and term coined by L. Depuydt in the late Eighties as a code-name for 
H.J. Polotsky's "School", in which commutation plays a decisive role in isolating gram-
matical categories. Early on carried by J.P. Allen (ALLEN 1986), then by M. Collier (e.g. 
COLLIER 1992), it has recently been turned by Pascal Vernus from informed critique to a 
brutal attack in his tellingly named "Les parties du discours en Moyen Égyptien. 
Autopsie d'une théorie", Genève 1997: see SATZINGER and SHISHA-HALEVY 1999. I find 
that this trend, blending well in the near-total programmatic disregard, dismissal and 
miscomprehension of De Saussure's real thought (as distinct from the canonical Cours) 
and of the basic principles of Saussurean-Hjelslevian structural analysis, wrongs, by its 
facileness, both Polotsky (who was, so far as I know, annoyed by the "Standardtheorie" 
canonizing appellation of his thought) and his followers. I shall allow myself one sen-
tence of response (cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 2006b). Polotsky did not conceive of "parts of 
speech" as a priori logical categories, to be forced on the "grammatical world": he con-
considered the text as his analytic starting-point and the syntagmatic-slot-filling paradigm as 
a heuristic tool — certainly, having syntax overruling morphology! — for establishing 
the main building-elements ("stoikheia"). This is hardly a denial of "verbal categories", 
of which he has been accused. By describing a verb form as "substantival" or "adver-
bial" he never envisaged renouncing the characterizability of its temporal or aspectual 
functions, or any other analytically evident sophistication. What he strictly adhered to 
was the overrule of syntactical identity over word-morphological "form", text-referred 
function to sentential one, and analytically resolved categories over a priori, ethnocentric 
one. Thus, Polotsky's "adverb", for example, has a tightly-knit paradigmatic + 
syntagmatic value, significance and identity.
relevant to it, various angles or perspectives from which it can be illuminated, or broader subsystems in which it is subsumed. The stratification of analysis, the so-called 'levels of analysis', I consider extrinsic to linguistic analysis and have tried to avoid as far as possible.

The analysis is in principle continuous and descending, from text-scope downwards, and patterns are resolved in the course of this descending analysis, primarily by the isolation of delimitative (boundary) signals. The only hierarchy I consider heuristically helpful as well as structurally valid, is the gradient junctural one; others (e.g. of primary vs. secondary functions) are dismissible as non-analytic. It follows that the value of the paradigm-representant in the linear syntagmatic sequence is determined by its (and its pattern's) entire textual syntagmatic as well as paradigmatic environments. That is to say, every feature or fact or subsystem of grammar must primarily be considered as a phenomenon of text-grammar. Patterns, not sentences or clauses, are the main items presented; their enveloping system of grammar is by definition text-grammatical or macro-syntactic, with cotextual formal features an integral part of their pattern attributes.

(b) Syntagmatics: the Compatibilities axis. Staticity and dynamicity.

Analyzability is a basic, indeed definitive property of the linguistic textual complex, with the so-called Immediate-Constituent analysis a simple analytic tool for resolving structure elements that are compatible, in a distinct in prae sentia interdependence. Sequencing is a complex issue, not exhaustible in schematic sweeping statements of 'word-order'. A basic distinction of actual syntagmatic sequencing and structural (not necessarily of adjoining elements: 'dis continuous') sequencing is essential. Elements representative of categories often 'reside' in actual locations that are structurally, albeit not typologically, a matter of coincidence. Constituent ordering is not a prime, independent, overruling, governing or motivating feature of syntax. It is one of several cumulatively definitive features of any pattern. Word or constituent order does not 'exist' on its own in a given language, as one of its typological traits. The unfolding of the text — the linear and peripheral sequence of segmental and suprasegmental signals — is all there is to la parole: it has no underlying form (its complexity is both syntagmatic and paradigmatic, in what has been described as what has been oxymoronically called "la profondeur de la surface"). This unfolding in time is the only dynamic factor in the synchronic structure of language: the grammemic and tagmemic 'networks' are static. The syntagmatic se-
quence has no hierarchies, other than the linear hierarchical Immediate Constituents bracketing model and linkage/delimitation scale exponency; ‘dichotomic’ statements of rank (as in ‘main’ or ‘subordinate’) are logic-based and non-analytical, and must be replaced by syntactic-status and discourse-signalling statements.

There are several (not a great many) types of interdependence between compatible signs in their syntagm. The two basic ones are **phrasal interdependency**, obtaining between nucleus and expansion (satellite), and **nexus interdependency**, between a thematic and a rhematic constituent; these two interdependencies are not mutually exclusive, that is, they are mutually combinable (as in an adnexusal satellite).

In text-scope, what the linguist aims at describing is the **text-grammar**: the **texture**, consisting of cohesion, juncture and discourse signalling. (No “system sentences”, in J. Lyons’s terminology, are envisaged; only “text sentences”). These and other formal means build up the Functional Sentence Perspective and Communicative Dynamism of subtextual units, constituting the **information** or ‘thematic’ structuring of the text. **Topic marking** and **Focus marking**, text-referred representant information nodes in the clause, and **Theme** and **Rheme**, constitutive nexusal nodes of the same, combine in the information structure of the text — always intricately, and differently for different textemes (e.g. dialogue and narrative ones).

**(c) Paradigmatic: the Commutabilities axis.**

The linguistic form or pattern occurring in *la parole* or in the text is, for the decoding listener-receiver, never the result of a dynamic transformation or transposition procedure. The decoder compares oppositively the signal-complex and various signal configurations continuously received, with other signal complexes and configurations that stand in paradigm with the received one: this is in fact the **decoding process** itself (presupposing choice in the encoding — the speaker’s — model). The interdependence *in absentia* between commutables is correlated to their **incompatibility** (or mutual exclusion) in a given slot of a specific environment, with the variable — the paradigm representant — not motivated or regulated or conditioned by any other element of this environment. Paradigms, too, are (internally) structured, and (externally) opposed to other paradigms, forming molecule-like multi-dimensional complex categories. The Immediate Constituents model is also applica-

---

ble to paradigms, reducing multi-term ones to constitutive binary ones. Binary signifié or sign oppositions may be semantically defined — in given contexts and pragmatic constellations, and therefore always with a measure of uncertainty — as marked vs. unmarked; some binary oppositions are privative, opposing zero to non-zero signifiants. The value of signs in a paradigm is determined and indeed defined by the number and structure of paradigm terms. Again, the paradigmatic tension is static, and terms in paradigm are not hierarchically structured: no term is primary or secondary, more or less important; no term (by definition of the opposition) motivates or conditions another; no term underlies another — all are co-present in the paradigm in la langue, although only one represents the paradigm (category) in a given slot in la parole.

(d) **Terminology: the tyranny of terms.**

This is an issue much more important than generally realized (relevant terminological issues are discussed in details in the actual studies below). Terms are usually loaded, by connotation, by direct simple or complicated association or by evocation, and strongly condition descriptive conceptualization. With terms, familiarity breeds entrenchment and compartmentalization. Most terms in common use (and even those considered ‘General-Linguistics’ ones) carry Indo-European or Eurocentric ‘squinting’, (Greco-)Latin-based — connotations, often compounded by diachronic-perspective ones\(^8\). Almost all concepts we commonly use must be elucidated and often redefined; the effect of ‘terminological importation’ is especially biasing and insidious in the case of languages relatively new to modern linguistic research. This problem (often compounded with the diachronic bias, and succinctly summed up for French linguistics by Ch. De Boer as “la tyrannie du latin”), is certainly not negligible for Coptic and Egyptian grammar; see STERN 1880:312 n. 1 on Latin cases (earlier still, STEINHAL 1847:47). This persistent 18/19th century terminological tradition — based on a still earlier one — was, in the case of Coptic, to converge with the terms of the Greek grammatical categories in the Vorlage text; these together furnished much of the modern grammatical terminology of Coptic, at least until Polotsky’s “Coptic Conjugation System” of 1960 and subsequent work.

(e) **“Was ist Syntax?”**

My own personal answer to this question — the title of John Ries’s seminal book of 1894, a query as freshly relevant today as it was a hun-

\(^8\) For instance, the use of ‘genitive’ for associative noun phrases.
dred years ago — would be: “almost all there is to grammar”. That is to say, I see ‘syntax’ as coterminous with ‘grammar’, since the paradigm is valid, meaningful and definable syntagmatically, in its slot. However, the status of syntax, which ought to be seen as overruling all other scopes or putative ‘levels’ of analysis, is (and has ever been in the Western linguistic traditions) usurped and encroached upon. This is a Eurocentric Neo-Grammian morphological bias, often blended with a diachronistic inclination (De Boer’s ‘superstition de la forme’ [meaning word-centered morphology] coupled with ‘la manie de l’explication historique’); syntactic analysis is also impaired and handicapped by carried-over terminological overtones and ethnocentrism. Coptic is a striking case in point; indeed, this crucial methodological lesson — all is syntax, syntactic or syntactic — is reason enough to get acquainted with Coptic. Moreover, the diachronic dimension of the stratificational issue, namely the popular “syntax to morphology” evolutorial cycle which is currently gaining new vigour in the framework of the (again) fashionable “grammaticalization” phenomenology, is also affected: the facile dictum, “today’s morphology, yesterday’s syntax” loses famously most of its meaning in Egyptian-Coptic (see SHISHA-HALEVY 2000).

(f) “Parts of Speech”.

Parts of Speech are (in De Saussure’s words)10 “[un] principe purement logique, extralinguistique, appliqué au dehors sur la grammaire” (my emphasis). They constitute anything but grammatical categories: as a matter of fact, they correspond to often random conglomerates of categories, grouped together and made to cohere non-analytically, aprioristically by logico-semantic considerations. This super-imposed blue-

9 Cf. POLOTSKY, 1957a:231. The subordination of morphology to syntax as the essence of “grammar” was of course the general response to “Question III” in the Sixth Congress of Linguists (Paris, 1949).

10 Apud Engler. Lexique de la terminologie saussurienne 39. Cf. also Hjelmslev’s “illegitimacies” as phrased in his “La catégorie des cas” (1935): It is illegitimate “to impose on the language a set of categories which has not been established intra-linguistically...to impose on the language a logical analysis of judgement...”. Parts of Speech are not of a kind, ontologically and epistemologically. The verb, of course — in Indo-European or outside it — is not a single irreducible ‘part’, but a sentence, clause, a Theme-plus-Rheme nexus complex; the noun — substantive and adjective — is very often definable syntactically (e.g. respectively by expanding a determinator, or by the attributive-slot privilege); the adjective is (at least in Indo-European and Semitic languages) dubious as an entity, unless syntactically endorsed; the adverb is a last-resort, odds-and-ends mixed-bag part of speech, for elements not fitting in the other pigeonholes. Of course, word-classes may be language-specifically, “locally” characterized and defined as “parts of speech”.
print, aprioristic, praeter analytical, universal (as in ‘universal adaptor’) is surely the most informing and pervasive, the most heavily, insidiously biasing analysis-programming model. It is one that enables us to enjoy in all languages the false security of ethnocentric ‘normalcy’, but at the same time inexorably leads us astray, especially by imposing the need to ask irrelevant, even false questions that obscure or distort the comprehensibility of the actual structure of a given linguistic system in its most sensitive and typologically telling points.

(g) Dead-language linguistics.

This methodologically special brand of linguistic enquiry has been much neglected in the second half of the 20th century, with the growing sophistication of text linguistics and discourse analysis from the Sixties to the Eighties and Nineties. I will here no more than quote the cogent final paragraph of Jamieson 1993, concerned with Sanskrit: “…in the end the best way to approach the writing of the synchronic syntax of a dead language is to try and cultivate a pseudo-Sprachgefühl, which we can only acquire by the diligent and careful reading of texts. This was, of course, the ‘secret’ of the great syntacticians of the 19th century, one that seems all too often forgotten now”, with her own quotation (1993:219 n.1) of Visser’s admonition, which is of a special poignancy in Coptic philological linguistics, indeed seems to be taken verbatim from a Coptologist’s agenda: “…it often happened that a collocation that at first, in its uniqueness, looked like a solecism, an error, a misprint or a corruption, turned out to represent regular idiom when more and more collocations of the identical build were met with. On the strength of the material thus gathered it became possible to solve a number of syntactical puzzles…where rash editors thought ‘emendations’ were called for”.

(h) Grammatical variation.

This issue, generally difficult to come to terms with in the structuralist model, is especially sensitive in the case of dead-language scripta, where sociolinguistic correlates are extremely speculative to apply11. However, a somewhat comparable set of parameters may govern the various variant readings in a text so rich in sources as the New Testament, where questions of witness hierarchy and quality must be settled.

11 Cf. Wahlgren 1995 (Hellenistic Greek), e.g. on final/consecutivt constructions, where variation is a vexed question in Coptic too (see below, Chapter Three).
In what may be called the paradigmatics of variant readings, the grammatical features commute (with weak oppositional tension, often reduced to "style" opposition) within a single textual category, no carrying difference in apparently environment and representing equivalent linguistic signs, as "textual isoglosses". We need to talk here of "texts in context", the way we consider "language in context". The frequency, absence or rarity of variation are significant: compare for instance the frequency difference between e.g. ὁσος and zero, different prepositions — e.g. ν-/ΣΕΝ- or γίαω/διαρχ/εξων (frequent); ακ- and ἀκ- and εακ-, Ἴη ετ-/πετ, πετ-/ετ- in the Cleft Sentence (infrequent); εκεκωτεμ and ζηλωτεμ. First and Second Tenses, μπα- and ηνε- (rare). Lexical variae lectiones form a class of their own (εμι/κωον, τατο/ασωρι, ταεο/ασαρζο, etc.), as do morphological variants (αινα-/εινα-, ατετεν-/απετεν-, τετεν/τετεν) and the correlation with variae lectiones in the Greek Vorlage (insofar as we have it) is of course always an essential factor. It is a fascinating question whether we have here an equivalence of signifieds and therefore different systems, or differing textual registers — or rather different renderings by the translators.

A second type of "variation" in Bohairic is provisional, pending the definitive description of language varieties: the different systems of OT Scripture (further subclassable), NT Scripture, Nitrian (further subclassable) etc.

(i) Like loan-words, grammatical "Grecisms" (see further below) are of different grades of integration in the overall systems concerned. Just as Greek-origin lexemes may be structurally ranged with Egyptian ones (e.g. ἀγαθος with πετναςες), or alternatively belong to a parallel "technical-register" lexical system, so too Greek particles or conjunctions/adverbials, such as θεκει, οτι άε-, ζινα μηπως, γαρ ουν, μητι γαρ, μενονες, οται ζινα γαρ (all occurring in NT Bohairic) may be either pertinent importations, enriching the overall Coptic lexicon of morphs, or, superimposed on the text in a different rank, toning code-switching elements. The same may apply for εκτω άε or ου παρα τοτο, even αρε — but not for Φιλίππη or θανιστη, which grammatically encroach on Coptic forms. By and large, our corpus is (as might perhaps be expected) sparing in this kind of loans, which bring the Coptic text closer to the unseen, yet behind-the-scene, operative system of living Greek, both spoken and written. See further below.
0.2 On the structure and style of the exposition.

The presentation in this work is analytical, rarely synthesizing, and hierarchically in three ranks: the main running exposition; “Obs[ervations]” interpolated in the main text, for discussion of implications, extra-corpus illustration, discussion in the literature, comparative information and so on; and thirdly, footnotes for marginal reflections and references. The need for analytical microscopy — my personal preference over macroscopy — makes often for a “user-unfriendly” face and, I fear, tediousness and “hiccuping” flow of the text. An inelegant, repetitious, cluttered, even occasionally chaotic presentation is inevitable in the multidimensional, non-linear reality of linguistic detailed systems and subsystems, which do not lend themselves to progressive, economic description: the multifarious interconnectedness of features and phenomena cannot be reflected in linear discourse\textsuperscript{12}. Abundant illustration and comparative view angles may add to the denseness, but are, I believe, of the essence.

0.3 The corpus described.

The descriptive statements made in this study will be based on the unpublished 14th-century MS Paris BN coopel (see Appendix I, by Anne Boud’hors), containing the text of the Bohairic Coptic Pentateuch (with a marginal Arabic text, apparently not based only on the Coptic by its side: see here, Appendix II by O. Livne-Kafri)\textsuperscript{13}, and well known as one of the oldest Bohairic texts we have. It was briefly described by BROOKE 1902 (there coded “A”), and more thoroughly in RHODES 1921:30, 35ff., 46ff. (coded “C”; Rhodes, an Arabist, was enthusiastic about the competence and scholarly virtues of the Arab philologist-scribe: “The scribe whose work we have before us deserves special notice as a grammarian and a text-critic of no mean order”, 1921:48. Rhodes was not equipped to comment on the Coptic text). On the Paris Pentateuch: see also FUNK 1992, an important annotated collation of the first chapter of Deuteronomy. As W.P. Funk says (1992:17), we have excellent Bohairic sources for the Pentateuch — which also accounts for my choice of this Scripture component for my syntactic study. A second,

\textsuperscript{12} I have always been fascinated by the tension between the “inelegance” of language structure — the inherent multilayered and multidimensional systems — and the schematic neatness of the systematization we impose on this structure.

\textsuperscript{13} The Arabic text was added to the margin of the Rome Val. coopel I Pentateuch (9/10th century) several centuries after the Coptic one.
older (10th century) MS contains the Pentateuch, namely the Bibl. Vaticana copto I (Hebbelynck-Lantschoot [1937] 1-6, Brooke’s “V”, Rhodes’s “A”), which is for the present purpose outside the main corpus: however, comparison will occasionally be made (where judged grammatically important) with its readings. On the whole, I find the Paris Pentateuch in many grammatical respects the more interesting of the two MSS.

**Obs.**

### 0.4 Bohairic and Coptic

Let us return now to the history and background of the exiling of Bohairic to the margins of Coptic studies. The implicitly disparaging evaluation of Bohairic as an “inferior” component of the Coptic dialectological spectrum has been usually attributed to its late documentation (until recently, in 13th-14th, very rarely earlier: 9th-10th century MSS at the earliest), wholly ignoring the flagrant linguistic *non sequitur* involved, which it is hardly necessary to spell out here. Not unlike the Turkish admiral who could not find Malta (“Malta yok!”), Lefort (1931), the great derogator of Bohairic, denied the dialect any early — indeed, any genuinely Coptic — literary status (1931:135 “sahidique, seul dialecte littéraire de l’égypte jusqu’à la maine mise de l’arabe sur l’Égypte...”), arguing also from wrong information and miscomprehension of Bohairic grammar and in particular of Nitrian (it seems that for him Nitrian was all the Bohairic there was). Today, his opinion is generally rejected, and Sahidic, without losing its representative standing, is dethroned as a linguistically special dialect. (See Kasser 1965:291f. on Sahidic: “le plus évoluté (ou le plus neutralisé) ... il perdit peu à peu ses caractéristiques les plus marquantes”). The traditional consensus of the Sahidic Bible translation as the only early and important one is also being slowly dislodged by the early Bohairic sources coming to light (see the Göttingen Septuagint Genesis (ed. Wevers, 1974), p. 74f.).

### 0.4.1 The Study of Bohairic: notes and some highlights

Athanasius Kircher’s *Prodromus Coptus sive Aegyptiacus* (Rome 1636) is of course exclusively Bohairic — both grammatical material
and Bibliotheca Vaticana catalogue. So is his *Lingua Aegyptiaca Restituta* of 1643/4; we are acquainted with the dialect itself from at least the 13th century. The earliest Coptic grammar — best, among early works of grammatical scholarship — by P. Bonjour, edited by N. Bosson and S. Aufrère (see Aufrère and Bosson 2003, 2006), is Bohairic.

The story of the rise to eminence of Sahidic and the decline of Bohairic scholarship is very much the story of one Polish-German-English scholar, namely Karl Gottfried Woide (1725-1790). Equipped with the authority and scientific material of his teachers, Paul Ernst Jablonski and Christian Scholtz, Woide seems to have been the main drive behind the speedy rise of Sahidic in the second half of 18th century to the status it still occupies today. The documents proving Woide’s Sahidic interest and activities are all housed in the Bodleian (New Bodleian) Library, Oxford, the Woide Papers in the Clarendon Press group of MSS (with an autograph catalogue of 1886-7 by H. Hyvernat in the Bodleian Oriental Reading Room, the MS Cl. Press d.0, shelfmarked ZCat.2). For instance, in 1762 (Cl. Press d.15 “Farrago ad Grammaticam Aegyptiam”) we find, on a Bohairic basis (D. Wilkins’s 1715 Bohairic New Testament), Sahidic New Testament notes, collations and variant lists.

Around 1770, Woide circulated in the scholarly world of Europe a “pro memoria” inquiry and request for information about Sahidic (in Italian and English; Cl.Press c.3; Bohairic is still “Coptic” *tut court*): “Exclusive of the Coptic, there has been another Dialect in Upper Egypt that varies a Little from the former, but has the same Letter. We call it the Dialect of Upper Egypt, or the Sahidic or Thebaic Dialect” (a somewhat later Latin version occurs in Cl.Press e.30, a draft of what was soon to appear as the Scholtz-Woide double grammar). In the rich correspondence reacting to this (of the 1780’s: Cl.Press c.2) we already find much material on Sahidic (or “Thebaic”).

In the programmatic introduction to his autograph “Dissertation upon the Egyptian Language” (1773/4, Cl. Press e.21, p. 4), Woide writes: “I will inquire into the nature of the Egyptian language, and its two Dialects; that of Lower Egypt, the Coptic; and that of Upper Egypt, the Sahidic, or Thebaic”. In this work he pays attention to the grammatical differences between the two dialects (p. 45ff.), states that Sahidic “has more marks of Antiquity”, and makes public his intention to promote the study of Sahidic and its texts (47f.). Here is also an early mention of the Askew Codex (p.26, “ms πικθεν κοφιας”).

Chr. Scholtz (1697-1777), Woide’s teacher and friend, left Woide several comprehensive works, all dated “Berlin 1748 or 1747”: a three-
volume autograph Latin draft of his "Dissertatio de Lingua Coptica vel Aegyptiaca", which was still monodialectal: a Bohairic grammar. Dated a year earlier, we have Scholtz's autograph "Grammatica Aegyptiaca utriusque Dialecti, tam communis, quam Sahidica s. superioris Aegypti" which, its title notwithstanding, is still mainly Bohairic (Bodl. Oriental 474-5). Then (Cl. Press e.t0), "Analysis Grammatica Vocum Aegypticarum Partium Nonnularum S. Scripturae" — a verse-by-verse transcription, translation and grammatical interpretation, Bohairic (pp. 1-283). However, an additional part (Second Part, pp. 1-120) contains "Fragmenta quaedam SSa in Dialecto Thebaica seu Sahidica conscripta". On the much-abridged basis of these, Woide finally compiles his famous dual-dialect grammar, appearing under both names in 1778; yet Scholtz-Woide (Oxford: the Clarendon Press) is not a dual Bohairic/Sahidic grammar like L. Stern's of a century later, but gives one the impression of having the Sahidic "grafted" onto a Bohairic stock, the latter called here "Memphitic" (an old name, going back at least to P. Bonjour's grammar of the late 17th century: "memphytica sive baheirica"; until the late eighteenth century still standing for "Coptic" esp. in England and Germany). The introduction is Woide's (p. vii: "Duplex autem est linguae Aegyptiacae Dialectus Inferioris Aegypti, quae Coptica plerumque appellatur, sed potius Memphitica appellanda est; et Superioris Aegypti, quae Dialectus Sahidica, vel Thebaïtica, sive Thebennitica, vocatur")14. Three years earlier, Woide published, indexed and annotated Scholtz's edition of an abridged version of La Croze's Lexicon Aegyptiaco-Latinum (see QUATREMÈRE 1808:94ff.). The indexes are titled "Indices ad Glossarium Copticum utriusque Dialecti", and there is a separate Sahidic index; the Coptic is again basically Bohairic, mixed with occasional Sahidic forms. Rarely, an independent Sahidic entry appears; but at the end (p. 183ff.) we have a "Sylloge Quarundam Vocum Dialecti Sahidicae sive Superioris Aegypti", with cross-references to the Bohairic.

Earlier still, Paul Ernst Jablonski (1693-1757), Scholtz's brother-in-law, was also Scholtz's (and Woide's) teacher. He knew Coptic well (a fact not mentioned in the Coptic Encyclopaedia entry, vol. 4 p. 1318, 1991). His papers on Coptic grammar ("Grammaticalia Coptica" — of

14 This grammar seems to have played an obstructing role in Champollion's career, in causing being used as pretext for the rejection of his own Coptic grammar and dictionary; yet another manifestation of Berlin/Paris hostility. It is conceivable that Champollion's Coptic information derived also from some knowledge of P. Bonjour's autograph grammar of 1698 (see H. Hartleben, Champollion, Berlin:Weidmann 1906, t 79ff., 228, 355 n.2).
the 1740’s? — Cl. Press d.17) are all Bohairic; however, it seems certain that he was well acquainted with Sahidic texts, as is evident from the first (“Voces Aegyptiacae”) of the four volumes of his Opuscula, posthumously published (by I.G. Te Water, Leyden 1804-1813), although in the notes, and often in the text, it is the editor who speaks: (298) “…dialecto Aegypti superioris, quae hodie Sahidica vocatur”; (362) “…[fragmenta] quae dialecto Thebaidis sive Sahidica sunt conscripta”; (204 n.(x)) “Colligit Georgius…dialectum Memphiticam fusisse antiquiorem Sahidica sive Thebaica”, and so on. However, his grammatical notes and the quoted forms are all Bohairic.

Another grammar to appear in 1778 was Tuki’s (Rome), compiled on the basis of Bonjour’s autograph grammar (1698, MS 475 of the Bibl. Angelica, Rome). Quatremère’s criticism of Tuki (1808:92f.) is just: the work, purporting to be of both dialects, is an uncouth, at times barbaric compilation, compared to its source, which is often impressive for its insights.

In Quatremère’s Recherches Critiques (1808), the general lines of the Jablonski-Scholtz-Woide German/English connection are drawn, mostly on the basis of the last-named published articles (also as authority for the early years of British Coptic studies, 60ff.): see pp. 80, 85f., 94, 99ff. etc. (104ff. on the development of Sahidic research in Italy and France). Quatremère already uses “Sahidic” and “Memphitic” as fully established terms. He praises (p. 141) Sahidic as being “more literary” and “more scientific”, and must have played a decisive role in establishing the view of Sahidic as the scientifically most important of all Coptic dialects.

In the nineteenth century, Amedeo Peyron preferred Sahidic for “grammatico-aesthetic” reasons (1841:xix, 14 “magis regularis atque ad analogiam exacta”… “quod facile colligitur sive ex natura sermonis proprius ad analogiam exacti, ac minus foedati Graecis vocabulis” — the exact opposite of Schwartz’s verdict, see below; and I believe the latter is right), while Ludwig Stern preferred Bohairic (1880:11f., with a certain satisfaction, “in Deutschland von je mehr gepflegt” — as against Italy/England? or England?), and as a general policy presents Bohairic first, for its “lautliche einfachheit”, although he programmatically claims a balanced treatment of the two dialects. So, in fact, did the more perceptive Coptic grammarians before Polotsky. M.G. Schwartz (1802-

---

1848), Professor Extraordinary of Coptic in Berlin, was the insightful information source of the typologists H. Steinthal’s and F. Misteli’s Coptic information (in Steinthal-Misteli 1893; see Polotsky 1984:10ff.). He too explicitly preferred Bohairic, as “more regular”, less Grecized and more “Egyptian” than Sahidic (in Das Alte Ägypten [1843] pp. 1039ff., 2033ff.) and his insightful Bohairic grammar (posthumously published by Steinthal in 1850, as “Koptische Grammatik”, dedicated to Alexander von Humboldt) is still the only general-linguistics-oriented one; see p. 8f. on the controversy as to which dialect is superior in “Alterthümigkeit und Sprachrichtigkeit”: “Memphicitam dialectum, olim toti Aegypto communem, tanquam antiquiorem et alienum matrem habendam esse”; here, “Memphitic” is still “Koptisch κατ’ ἑξοχήν”. For behind-the-scene reasons unknown to me, L. Stern (1880:ix) grumpily ignored the Schwartzte-Steinthal grammar completely. He does mention Das Alte Ägypten critically and sarcastically, and says, quite unjustly: “...viel blätter und wenig früchte. Was sollen wir auch von einer linguistischen methode erwarten, die ihre argumente nur zu oft in der speculation sucht?”  

Stern uses the Pentateuch little for his Bohairic exemplification. Like H.J. Polotsky a century later, he prefers the NT and the Psalms, probably also because of his decision to present as much as possible parallel Bohairic and Sahidic texts. On the other hand, we must mention here the brilliant, if modest dissertation by Ernst Andersson (1904), with insightful observations on the Bohairic Pentateuch (Lagarde’s edition) and on Coptic grammar, in one-way dialogue with Stern’s Grammatik.

The preference for Bohairic was usually shared by those Egyptologists who considered Coptic to be within their brief (W. Spiegelberg, probably K. Sethe — on A. Erman, see below; B. Gunn, later H.J. Polotsky in classroom practice rather than in published research) and by

---

16 Ludwig Stern’s animus against Adolf Erman and the Egyptological establishment may have been among the reasons for his disappearing from the Egyptological stage following the Koptische Grammatik, to reappear as Ludwig Christian Stern, eminent Celtic philologist, authoritative editor of the Würzburg Old Irish glosses and of the Welsh poet ab Gwilym, with Kuno Meyer the co-founder and co-editor of the Zeitschrift f. Celtische Philologie. I know nothing of Stern’s relations with Schwartzte or Steinthal. (Incidentally, Stern does not mention Father Bonjour at all among the early grammarians of Coptic). The fascination of nineteenth-century Coptic and Egyptian philology (and typological linguistics) in Germany is intensified by the mystery still enveloping its protagonists, their background and their mutual relationships.

17 Polotsky’s opinion is hardly more complimentary (1984:10ff): “an unreadable monstrosity”, “a grotesque failure”, but he notes “valuable observations on Coptic”. In his Grundlagen, and in classroom discussion, Polotsky’s high esteem for Schwartzte was always evident.
general linguists — typologists — such as H. Steinhall, referred to above (Steinhall 1847:19, 44ff.). Still, Steinhall and Misteli’s typological account of Egyptian uses Sahidic as the default, as the “older dialect”: 1893: 78f., 56f., 267ff.; 273 n. 1). In the Berlin tradition, Adolf Erman appears to have been greatly responsible for stamping Bohairic as a “younger” dialect (Erman 1915:180f.), and Sahidic as the proper tool of Egyptology; Coptic, for A. Erman and K. Sethe, was a means instrumental for reconstructing or comprehending Egyptian, and not a descriptive end in itself. Erman even waxes poetic: Bohairic is a “trübe Quelle”, compared with the “reine Born der alten Sahidischen Texte”. Yet even he saw in Bohairic juncture-marking a more original phase; and indeed, he conveys here a double message, complaining of the preference of Sahidic by grammarians, and calling for the promotion of Bohairic grammatical research. L. Stern’s illustration starts with Bohairic, in his Koptische Grammatik (1880)

By the twentieth century, Sahidic, generally speaking, has gained full ascendance, first in view of the great variety and quantity of its documentation (not least the corpus of Shenoute’s works and the White Monastery library generally), then by the impetus lent by new instruments of study. It is the first dialect documented in Crum’s 1909 Catalogue of the Coptic MSS in the British Museum, as it is in Bentley Layton’s sequel Catalogue; Bohairic is in fact last, after Sahidic, Akhmimic and “Middle Egyptian”. And of course, the entries to Crum’s Coptic Dictionary, while carefully noting all dialectal forms known to its author, are Sahidic. So are almost all grammars, from Steindorff’s Koptische Grammatik (1904) to Till’s and Lambdin’s still widely used works (and B. Layton’s excellent recent grammar, mentioned above), and even Polotsky’s “Coptic Conjugation System” of 1960; in the encyclopaedic “Coptic” (Polotsky 1970), Bohairic hardly features among Coptic dialects (559ff.). (Bohairic featured much more prominently in Polotsky’s classroom discourse than in his publications). In such compendia as Loprieno 1995, important mainly as source of information on Egyptian for non-Egyptologists, Sahidic represents Coptic, and Bohairic is included for divergent morpho(phono)logy only. Exceptions are Mallon (-Malinine’s) special and to date only Bohairic Grammar (1926, 1956), and of course dialectal grammars (M. Chaîne’s of 1933 is especially rich in its treatment of Bohairic, to which it gives preferred status: see there, p. xxxiii). Polotsky’s Grundlagen (1987-1990) treat Sahidic, pointing out Bohairic idiosyncrasies.

Even today, while a need to apologize for Bohairic is no longer really felt (cf. Polotsky 1959:453ff., Kasser 1987:226 n. 2), and the scepti-
cism about the existence of an early literary Bohairic is being proven unwarranted (cf. Kahle 1954:195 against 248ff.; his assignment of Bohairic attestation to the 4th century, 1954:275ff., is now certainly proven right by the Vatican P. copto 9, the still inedited Bohairic Twelve Prophets), the biased attitude to Bohairic as “late”, hence corrupt, or decadent, or unauthentic, warranting the status of Sahidic as a point of reference to Coptic, persists still. Interest and good or adequate treatment of Bohairic grammar, other than for its (morpho-)phonology, are rare; Funk 1991 is a brilliant exception; he even uses (1991:50, 52 + n. 92) the irresistible and exquisite “non-Bohairic dialects”, coined by Polotsky in the *Études de syntaxe copte* (1944:10), implying the appreciation of “Bohairicity” as a typological property. Bohairic is certainly still “not sufficiently known” (Kahle, 1954:232). The present work aims to expand our acquaintance with this fascinating dialect, as also to challenge Polotsky’s opinion (1959:454) on the “unidiomatic character of the Bohairic Bible translation”.

Obs.

(1) A word on the Arabic grammars of Coptic (see Bauer 1972:7ff.). G. Bauer’s late dating of Athanasius of Qūs’s famous work (13/14th, not, as was believed, 10/11th centuries; see V. Frederic, “Bishop of Qūṣ of the eleventh or fourteenth century”, *The Coptic Encyclopaedia* vol. 1:303f., 1991) does not necessarily accord with the actual Bohairic material. Moreover, Bauer’s conviction (12ff.) that the Sahidic version is original, the Bohairic added, and that Athanasius did not speak (Bohairic!) Coptic himself, and that what we have here is a grammatical-glossographic tradition unrelated to the Coptic in use at the time of writing (39f.) is, I think, unwarranted, or must at least be qualified. The editor’s Coptic observations are indifferent, to say the least; consider p. 40, 156,1S; p. 44, 194B: p. 43, 185, 15B and so on, τωνοντα (p. 45, 208B/11S) is perfectly correct Bohairic (των-τωνη), according to syllabicity of suffix). Generally speaking, there are no gross inaccuracies in Athanasius’s text, and there is evidence of a fine perception of both dialects. In the grammatical introduction (by Es-Samanûdi) to 13th-century BN 44 Scala (ed. Munier, 1930), the Bohairic is evidently the core, the Sahidic a later addition (see *The Coptic Encyclopaedia* 7:2356).

(2) Bohairic was the dialect for the Coptic study of the brilliant grammarian of Egyptian, Battiscumbe Gunn (1883-1950). Browsing in his unpublished papers (in the Griffith Institute archives, Oxford), one sees that Gunn seems to have worked on Coptic especially in the Nineteen Twenties. Thirties and Forties. When he quotes Coptic in his Egyptian stud-

---

18 A frank and outspoken reaction to the first edition of Gardiner’s Egyptian Grammar: cf. Gunn MSS V 73-5 (also in letters to Gardiner, e.g. AHG 142.124.38); it is not clear to what extent these numerous observations and suggestions were incorporated in subsequent editions. It seems Gunn was really the linguistic conscience behind the EG. In *My Working Years* (London 1962, privately printed), Gardiner warmly acknowledges Gunn’s contribution (see pp. 31, 41); see also the Introduction to the EG, p. xii. On Gunn, somewhat of a mystery figure in early 20th century Egyptology, see the obituaries in *JEA* 36 (1950) (Barnes) and *Annales du Service* 1950:421-427 (Bakir).
ies, it is usually Bohairic, and non-Scripture Bohairic at that. The Gunn Papers V(A) 1.5, p.37, VII passim reveal favourite topics in Bohairic grammar, such as noun determination, determinated relative forms, n- and nτε-, εἰς-. In letters to A.H. Gardiner (AHG 42.124.27 [10/7/20], 142.124.77 [2/3.41] we find extensive notes on Bohairic phonology; also Gunn’s intention to study Bohairic word-order. In the present work, I shall often find occasion to refer to Gunn’s studies of Bohairic syntax.

0.5 Bohairic documentation: genres, varieties, attestation

“Langue véhiculaire du delta ou la Basse-Egypte” (Kasser), Bohairic has, until the Nineteen-Eighties been documented only for religious literature, in relatively late MSS. This has now changed: the holdings of the Bibliotheca Vaticana in Rome (see ORSATTI 1996:106ff.) are paradigmatic: scriptures: the Twelve Prophets (P. copto 9, 4th c., hopefully soon to be edited by R. Kasser, N. Bosson and Eitan Grossman), Penta- teuch (copto 1, 9th-10th c.), Psalters (13th-14th c.), Gospels (13th to 18th c.); hagiographical and patristic texts — homilies, martyrologies, lives (9th-10th c.); grammatical and philological texts, scalae (13th to 18th c.); liturgical (rites, horologiae, missals, lectionaries and hymnaries etc.), mostly 18th c. Other early Bohairic texts (7-8 c.) are the thousands of Kellia inscriptions, mostly published now, edited by N. Bosson. Non-literary Bohairic is relatively rare (cf. Rylands Coptic [Crum] 460, BM [Crum] 545, 590, 608, 626 etc.; Crum, Monastery of Epiphanius I 232 n. 2).

When Polotsky says (1949:26, à propos of the Jinkim or syllabic point) that the testimony of Bohairic MSS “cesse en général d’avoir beaucoup d’autorité” after the 14th century, he probably has scribal (graphemic) systems in mind (our own Paris copte 1 is thus at the limit of the “authoritative range”, but, as will be seen in Chapter 2, well thought out, precise and even sophisticated). As regards grammar stricto sensu, this is certainly not true. “Classic” Bohairic — as still used (e.g. in KASSER 1994:112, 116, n. 13; also by Funk), has little meaning for syntactic investigation, except as a convenient general code for Scripture Bohairic, but it is misleading and imprecise even when applied to the Scriptures as a whole.

In the early days, Polotsky considered only Scripture Bohairic a valid testo di lingua; in his review of Till’s Dialektgrammatik (1934:63) he describes the “Canones Apostolici and similar” unambiguously as “late translations from the Sahidic, which do not count as a source for Coptic grammar”, yet Polotsky’s own grammatical work on Bohairic includes a fine review of De Vis, Homélies II (1930:871-882).
Obviously, the late attestation of the bulk of Bohairic has little
dialectological significance. The “official” dialectal varieties under the
“Bohairic” general heading have been minutely described, defined and
refined by Rodolphe Kasser, in an evolving view for the last quarter of
the century. Kasser’s subdivisions of Bohairic are based on graphemic-
phonological and (to a lesser extent) morphological scanning, never on
systems of “grammar” in the sense applied in the present work: B5
“classical B.”, “classic Bible Bohairic (Funk)” “B. en tant de koinè”
B4 “an early subdivision of B.”, B74 “a kind of south B.” B74! “a
metorthographic version” thereof. See Kasser 1973:88f., 1980:56, 76,
Kahle’s “semi-Bohairic” contrasting with Bohairic proper (1954:196,
231f., 377f.), with absence of combinatory aspiration and the grapheme
\$ as symptoms. I use “B4” for all Early Bohairic sources.

While there are structural discrepancies between varieties of Bohairic,
all are “well formed”, to borrow a rather meaningless term from a dif-
ferent, non-descriptive school of linguistics. By definition, grammati-
cally pertinent types of Bohairic are difficult to define pre-analytically
and a priori, yet are impressionistically very striking (see Shisha-Ha-
levy 1991a: esp. 57f.). More than for other dialects, the Bohairic lin-
guistic systems differ drastically not only from one genre to another, but
even within the Scripture genre:

- The Twelve Prophets/John/Genesis (B4)
- The Pentateuch
- The New Testament (with subgroupings?)\textsuperscript{19}
- Job/Psalms/Proverbs\textsuperscript{20}
- The Major Prophets\textsuperscript{21}
- Scripture hermeneutics (Lagarde’s *Catena*)

And then:

- Patristics
- Homiletics
- Liturgical texts
- Philological works
- Inscriptions and graffiti.

\textsuperscript{19} Preferred by Polotsky to OT Bohairic sources, the striking “Nitrian” features of NT
texts notwithstanding.

\textsuperscript{20} Polotsky 1944:5, on the Psalms: “un texte qui se distingue par la pureté de sa lan-
gue”.

\textsuperscript{21} Tattam’s very late MSS (the edition must be constantly collated).
The Nitrian subtypes of Bohairic, far from being a mere fact of provenance for almost all Bohairic texts, will be familiar to any student of Coptic; it is to a degree, by its quantitative prevalence (especially in the Vaticana) often taken as representative of Bohairic. As a rule, ex silentio, it is considered to be “B5” (although it is drastically different from e.g. Pentateuch language), and, by implication, a degraded or adulterated form of “pure” Bohairic, a judgement I heartily reject (see now Grossman 2007). Generally, the huge patristic and homiletic corpus has as far as possible been avoided by grammarians as if tainted, a practice implicitly justified by a general consensus or rather belief (never really proven) that all Nitrian texts are spurious and “translated from the Sahidic”, to my knowledge explicitly stated thus only by Crum, in Evelyn White 1926:xxiii ff.; cf. also Evelyn White 1932: 151ff., 355, where the evidence is anything but conclusive; then Polotsky 1934:63 (on the Canones Apostolici and similar texts: “late translations from the Sahidic, which do not count as a source for Bohairic grammar”; also, with a question mark, in 1959:582, with n. 2; L. Stern did not yet share this bias). This conception — which, even if true, would hardly warrant neglect of this corpus by descriptive linguistics — stems from a fallacious normative view of the Scripture idiom as “pure classic Bohairic”. But Nitrian Bohairic goes back to the fourth century at least (see Evelyn White 1932). As a matter of fact, the New Testament and all Old Testament texts save the Pentateuch are more or less heavily dyed with what may be called Nitrian features and form a spectrum in which the Pentateuch is one extreme, and the patristic and homiletic texts another — are these degrees of admixture with a written colloquial system? This is quite obviously the tension between two very different linguistic over-systems of the Bohairic dialect. The Nitrian one is in all probability closer to the colloquial register, “the spoken language”. I have to declare here an interest, and believe a strong case can be made for the existence of a Nitrian system or systems, probably colloquial and idiomatically “Egyptian”, perhaps even with a claim to being the original core of Bohairic, if the western Delta was indeed its original location (Kasser 1965:295).

And yet, a dichotomy, advocated in the past by the present writer, of “Scripture” (or “pure”, or “classic”) and Nitrian Bohairic, is only broadly useful; in fact, it is inadequate, even misleading, in view of the Nitrian features in the bulk of the NT, Psalms, Job, the Prophets. Also, there is a difference between patristic-martyrological-homiletic and hermeneutical “technical” (Catena) usage. It is also not clear how (stystematic)
listic) genre distinctions fit in this grammatical picture. What does a text’s “being Nitrian” actually mean? After all, Nitria is almost the only source for Bohairic MSS — this is where even the highly respectable Vat. copto 1 probably came from (the Monastery of Macarius: cf. EVELYN WHITE 1926:xxx, and his excellent account of the library, xxiii ff.). The answer to these queries would have to await precise linguistic description of non-Scripture and Scripture. The Nitrian question is hardly cleared up. Nitrian Bohairic features — pervading also OT and NT texts — still await description; its features are not of a kind, and not of one rank and the same status: epe-oson, wanta-, mpanteq-; teta- future; final tape-; e- and a- for the focalizing (Second Present/Future); an with various negative forms; and so on.

The linguistic distinctiveness of genres or types involves cumulative grammatical idiosyncracies — from graphemics to syntax and text grammar — including such elusive parameters as “Grecity”, not only in the per se risky matter of imported syntax and calque translation, not only in lexical borrowing, but also in such elements, syntagms and values that bridge grammar and lexicon, that make, for a striking instance, the Bohairic New Testament far more “Greek” than the Bohairic Pentateuch, while fully as “Scriptural”: osoxi de, menoqen, os-pantos, epoqen, palinoto, osnpato, ecoie, verbal “particle” forms like ektw de or are or xaiqete, gia “that”, gnavmpo, anomepoto, adverbial fetc, gikh, vocative filyppe, etnystu, and so on and so forth. These and similar Grecisms, in patristic Nitrian texts, might be accommodated as deriving from a bilingual or texts-in-contact situation.

The Kellia graffiti and inscriptions (7th-8th centuries), of a genre sui generis, are as yet unresearched grammatically. They too are subsumed under the “B5” type. Cf. KASSER 1994b:125, BOSSON 2003 (N. Bosson, currently editing the corpus, has been active publishing and discussing the texts for nearly two decades).

0.6 Bohairic Coptic, Greek and Pre-Coptic Egyptian

“Bey den vielen Hülfsmitteln zur Aufklärung dieser Bastardtochter der alten ägyptischen Sprache, die wir dem Fleiß verdienstlicher Gelehrten in den letzten Jahren verdanken, ist es doch ein unangenehmer Gedanke, daß ihre Bemühungen durch so sparsamen Gewinn belohnt werden”.

Thomas Christian Tychsen, GGA 1786, 284

22 My thanks to Dr. Jürgen Horn, Göttingen, for this excerpt.
While Tychsen’s regret (echoed a century later by Ludwig Stern’s [1880:xv] despairing “Das Koptische wird sobald keiner auslernen”) is perhaps no longer called for today, it is still all the more unfortunate that his genealogical (for him probably not pejorative) characterization of Coptic is still current among Egyptological linguists, making the rift between Coptic and “Egyptian” (cf. Polotsky 1984) deeper than ever: Egyptian linguistics ends at Demotic (which too, for various reasons, is progressively seceding from Egyptology’s main body).

Part of the low attractiveness of Coptic, and a fortiori Bohairic Coptic, lies in a mostly implicit apocryphal communis opinio, or rather subjective feeling, that Bohairic is “unidiomatic”, reproducing rather the Greek mould of its original23. Most discerning grammarians of Egyptian and Coptic have rejected this view, but the prejudice persists even today, although no basis for this has ever been produced and defended (see Polotsky 1959:454f.; Mink’s 1972 scanning of the Greek of the individual versions is extremely superficial). As stated above, ours is descriptive approach, a reader- (“decoder-”) oriented perspective, not focussing on the dynamics of textual generation; and the reader did not, I hold, see the Coptic text as a Grecized Coptic. The translator, for his part, must have read the Greek, understood and digested it, then rewritten what he understood in Coptic, in the style he considered appropriate: Biblical Coptic, most certainly; Greek Coptic, certainly not.

Psichari’s words on the Greek/Hebrew translation interface for the Pentateuch, though a century old, still cogently underline the question (1908:198): “une traduction, si ce n’est toujours servile, du moins toujours, surtout pour le Pentateuque, étrangement fidèle”... “la Septante constitue...une juxta de tout repos. Et ce n’est pas seulement la syntaxe, ce n’est pas l’ordre de mots seulement qui suit l’hébreu...Le style n’est pas grec”. Can we make this assertion for the Coptic Pentateuch? Admittedly, the texture of Greek influence on Coptic is very complex. A preliminary query must concern both the special “Languages in Contact” situation prevailing, both the translation — inter-textual24 — one and the cultural-sociolinguistic one, and then the “Holy Ghost Greek” (Stamps 1995:134) concerned. Do we have a “Holy

23 Probably the first case of an Egyptian text said to be “adulterated” by a Greek Vorlage is probably that of the Rosetta and Kanopus decrees: see Spiegelberg 1922, in a complex sophisticated polemic against K. Sethe’s Verhältnis.

24 One of the differences between the Coptic and Greek textual spheres is that we cannot apply the “variant psychology” of the Greek copyist (cf. Frösén 1974:206ff.) to the Coptic one: we simply have no data.
Ghost Coptic”? It would be interesting to compare Scripture Coptic to Septuagint Greek: while the latter is often, perhaps usually, considered basically un-Greek, with so many features or preferences triggered by the Vorlage Hebrew environment\(^\text{25}\), the former is neither peculiar nor uneasy.

A different, if related question concerns the translation technique. Here again we may apply the sophistication achieved for the Greek/Hebrew interface. I shall refer here only to J. Barr’s wise and by now classic essay of 1979 (see some relevant highlights below). It is important to note that, much like our Bohairic corpus, the Greek Pentateuch, too, belongs as one single component to the older or oldest translation stratum.

Obs.

(1) BARR 1979:281: there exist “different kinds of literality, various kinds of departure from the literal”; literalism is highly complex. The very juxtaposing of two texts involves “a semantic judgement, the setting forth of a semantic path which may reasonably be taken to have led from one text to the other” (285f.) — “the solution had to be semantic, in correct representation of the meanings, and not formal, in exact following of the formal patterns of the original” (325); (314ff.) “accuracy and the level of semantic information encoded” as a translation criterion; I would say this is even higher in the case of the Coptic translation: some Greek varieties are in a sense a component of Coptic; the accessibility of the Coptic translator to the Greek text is probably higher than that of the Greek translator to the Hebrew (291); (288f.): a salubrious warning against judgemental postulation of error of rendering.

(2) Beside Hebrew/Greek (see NICCACCI 1903), another striking case of “Languages in Biblical-Textual Contact” interface, instructive (always mutatis mutandis) for Coptic is suggested by BROWNE 1987 for Old Nubian/Greek. Browne makes a subtle case for the need for internal resolution, pointing out (309) “the limitations placed upon Nubian in expressing Greek grammatical categories”. Nubian has marked structural typological affinities with Coptic. Therefore, the fact that “the relationship between the Nubian and the Greek Tense Systems is far from a one-to-one correspondence” (319) is of interest to us. For example, the fact that Nubian’s two narrative tenses (316ff.) do not match the Aorist/Imperfect opposition in Greek is of immediate relevance for resolving Coptic narrative grammar (see Chapter One below)\(^\text{26}\).

A few reflections upon re-reading one of the classics of Egyptian linguistics, namely K. Sethe’s painstaking attempt to determine, on the ba-

\(^{25}\) Cf. for instance VERBOOMEN 1992, on ἕν διάδασκων. For some classic discussions of the argued Hebrew or Semitic component of Scripture Greek, see PORTER (ed.) 1991 (reprinted; see especially the contributions by Deissmann, Nigel Turner, Moulton, Silva and Gehman).

\(^{26}\) It would for instance be most interesting to see whether the Bohairic opposition between ἀκρωτος and ἀσυλο多数 matches a similar distinction in the narrative Comment Mode in Nubian; cf. also the correspondence of Nubian Preterite and Greek Historical Present (BROWNE 1987:320).
sis of catalogued features, the main boundary in the evolution of Egyptian (Sethe 1925). His conclusion was that Demotic still belongs to the “Egyptian” type with Late Egyptian, as it were closing the Egyptian phase, while Coptic manifests an essentially different structure.

However, thanks to the extension and sophistication of Egyptian linguistic research in the 20th century, our sensibilities to both Coptic and Demotic have been greatly heightened, and more and more subtle affinities of Coptic to pre-Coptic have emerged (see for example Shisha-Halevy 1981, 1989\textsuperscript{27}; Simpson 1996 \textit{passim}). It is therefore, I believe, rash to see a “tiefgreifende Divergenz zwischen Demotisch und Kopfisch” (Sethe 1925:299); not surprisingly, Roman Demotic is closest to Coptic. (The affinities of Coptic and even the earliest Demotic are manifold; but one must remember the Continuity Fallacy — the Coptic \textit{scripta} is not derived from the Demotic \textit{scripta} — and the different graphematic encoding of the two languages. We are now indeed approaching the core questions concerning the essential typological identity of Coptic and the nature of Egyptian diachrony — not only because of the distortion of the Continuity Fallacy, but since, in the course of the evolution of Egyptian, “now you see them, now you don’t”, “they” being features of systemic and subsystemic status as well as isolated diacriticals, surfacing and disappearing in the tantalizing capricious whirlpools of documentation. But we still have neither precise synchronic descriptions of individual phases, nor adequate diachronic accounts of individual subsystems. Nor any valid pre-Coptic dialectal resolution\textsuperscript{28}.

In fact, there is an “Egyptian” feel to Bohairic when compared with Sahidic, both typologically and textually, in the measure of formal similarity to the Greek \textit{Vorlage}, cf. Polotsky 1950:78f., but later the opposite in 1962:417 n.1; Chaine 1933:xx (“la version de la Basse Égypte...moins grécisée que celle de la Haute Égypte”). Simpson 1996:170\textsuperscript{29}, and already Schwartzze 1843:2033ff., presenting the bias

\textsuperscript{27} I bow to the first part of the barbed criticism by G. Vittmann (1998:274 n.60), explaining shortcomings in my “Demotic Worknotes” as due to “mangelnde praktische Erfahrungen mit demotischen Texten”, but must take exception to the gracious second part, in a long-standing German Egyptological tradition of linguist-bashing: “die man von einem linguistisch orientierten Ägyptologen auch schwer verlangen kann”.

\textsuperscript{28} Discovering the Coptic dialects in Egyptian — a long-standing ambition among Egyptian linguists, is, in the present state of our knowledge, a hopeless task, especially because of the problematic vowelless graphematic representation, but also because the puzzle of Coptic dialects, with “new” dialects emerging almost yearly, is only in part (if at all) geographically assignable, with sociolinguistic and other factors wholly unapproachable for early Egypt (see Satzinger 1990).

\textsuperscript{29} An early verdict of “Grecization” of a Demotic text was reached by Spiegelberg
of the ‘Grecized Bohairic’ as a “Grundübels”. This impression must yet be founded empirically, but it seems almost all Coptic/pre-Coptic diasslosses are either exclusively Bohairic or at least shared by Bohairic. The **lexical** properties of Coptic dialects have not been determined, but even the superficial specimen account of Mink 1972 (for the NT) reveals that Bohairic prefers Egyptian lexemes, Sahidic Greek ones: consider Mt. 13:39, 17:27, Luke 20:4, Acts 11:21 (no cases of Boh. Greck/Sah. Egyptian; some cases of Boh. and Sah. Greek, as in Mark 14:43, Heb. 11:8). As for the **grammatical** diasslosses, a tentative check-list was attempted in Shisha-Halevy 1981; the present compilation of studies may supply the basis for fuller and better founded argumentation in this respect.

Obs.
The following selected features of Egyptian, which Sethe (1925) excluded from Coptic, are arguably shared by it, albeit sometimes in the idiosyncratic form called for by the Coptic system: (291) jr+infinitive; (292) Preterite jr.f sdm ( çevirm is not a descendent of the LE Sequential), hr.f sdm, the causative conjugation; (293f.) p3-dd.f nb (cf. Boh. ΦΗ NIBEN ET-), Preterite/Perfect participial jr-; (294) Substantive + Adjective noun phrase; (295) an “early” Future tense (Boh.); (296) the γνα-less Conditional (Boh., Oxyrhynchite, even Sahidic). Sethe’s cases of Coptic diverging from Old or Middle Egyptian need reconsideration as well. For instance, the “invariable pw” Nominal Sentence pattern (304, 314) does occur in Coptic, especially Bohairic (see below, Chapter Three); the feminine has a neutric role in Coptic too (305), as does ‘the feminine over-rule’ feature — see Chapter Four; the discontinuous nexeal negation occurs in ME too (306), as does the Circumstantial abondinal to non-specific nuclei, and so on. All in all, there are pronounced affinities between Coptic and Old Egyptian: Edel 1955/1964 passim testifies to many.

Sethe does admit LE/Coptic “convergence” in the expression of the pronominal object, and here does Bohairic indeed make its appearance (297f.). Sethe must have been the first to recognize the “Historical Continuity Fallacy” (1925:300ff.: “Coptic not descendant, but ‘sister’ of Demotic”; the Romance/Latin parallel is here invoked for the first time). Coptic is, in Max Müller’s words, “die durch das Christenthum und griechische Schrift befreite Volkssprache” (my italics), which well may bring us back to Nitrian Bohairic.

### 0.7 Coptic:Greek Contrastive View.

The verb-centered structure of Greek (as of all typical Indo-European languages) belongs to what is sometimes naively called, in pseudopsycholinguistic mode, “the Greek mindset” (Porter 1996:29ff.). However, we are dealing here with much more than this — with a sharp typological difference, which must be considered in any evaluation of the (1922). While he may be right about the primacy of the Greek version of the decrees, his syntactical arguments (184f.) are untenable today, especially those concerning the cataphoric neuter.
"hidden" Greek element in the Bohairic text. In R. Jakobson’s words (1959): “the grammatical system of a given language determines the aspects of each experience that must obligatorily be expressed... Languages differ essentially by what they must express, not by what they can express”. This realization is not only relevant to the grammatical analysis of the Bohairic text; it is crucial. The “rule of thumb”, according to which a divergence of the Coptic construction from the Greek one indicates “Egyptian grammar”, is in fact a sensitive reagent for measuring the idiomaticity and sophistication of the Coptic feature. But suggesting a situation where every phenomenon of Coptic grammar is caught in a tug-of-war between equal forces of Greek influence and “native Egyptian-ness” (so for instance POLOTSKY 1950:73) is wrong. Coptic features are, first of all, Coptic, meaningful and operative within Coptic subsystems. They are either called for by systemic factors, in the course of the translator re-writing the text he has read, or/and triggered — sometimes rather subtly and elusively — by elements in the Greek original. Here is a partial and selective list of cases, treated below, of categorial asymmetry or disparity between Coptic and Greek, with the Coptic categorization more complex than the Greek one. (Unfortunately, we do not yet have any Coptic-Greek contrastive grammar or any preliminary discussion towards one)\textsuperscript{30}.

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textbf{Coptic} & \textbf{Greek} \\
\textit{\texttt{Naq}} & Aorist vs. Imperfect \\
\textit{\texttt{Naq}} & Binary \textit{\texttt{agens}} placement paradigm \\
\textit{\texttt{Naq}} & \textit{\texttt{Nep}} & \textit{\texttt{Ap}} & \textit{\texttt{Ag}} \\
\textit{\texttt{Momon}} & (§1.1.3) & (§1.2.5.1) \\
\textit{\texttt{Mph}} & Quaternary \textit{\texttt{agens}} placement paradigm \\
\textit{\texttt{Mq}} & (in narrative) (§1.1.5, 2.4.7 [f.]) \\
\textit{\texttt{Epe}} & \textit{\texttt{Qna}} & Futures \\
\textit{\texttt{Meq}} & (§1.2.5.2) & (§2.0.3) \\
\textit{\texttt{IC}} & \textit{\texttt{Ghmp}} & \textit{\texttt{IC}} & \textit{\texttt{Ghmp}} \\
\textit{\texttt{IC}} & \textit{\texttt{Ghmp}} & \textit{\texttt{IC}} & \textit{\texttt{Ghmp}} \\
\textit{\texttt{IC}} & \textit{\texttt{Ghmp}} & \textit{\texttt{IC}} & \textit{\texttt{Ghmp}} \\
\textit{\texttt{Nominal}} & \textit{\texttt{Sentence}} & \textit{\texttt{Ol/wompi}} & \textit{\texttt{N-}} \\
\textit{\texttt{Ol/wompi}} & (§§2.1-2.2) & \textit{\texttt{Ol/wompi}} & (§§2.1-2.2) \\
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{30} See DAUMAS 1952 (Greek/Egyptian), NICCACT 1993 (Greek/Biblical Hebrew).

\textsuperscript{31} A rich pattern set. In ROSÉN 1975b, the author uses, on structuralist principles, the Coptic text to resolve the Biblical Hebrew opposition of the 1st sgl. pronouns ‘\textit{ny} vs. ‘\textit{nky} in Nominal Sentences, as if the Greek was not an intermediary link. Indeed, it is often illuminating to confront Coptic and Hebrew, skipping the Greek, for their typological affinities.
\( \text{οντ}, \text{κα}, \text{οι} \) \( \text{n} \) - noun predicates
(\$\$2.2.1-2.2.2)

\( \text{n} / \text{θ} / \text{θ} / \text{zero} \) — Rheme
(\$\$2.3, 3.2, 3.3-3.4)

Focalization patterns (Cleft Sentence, Augens, Particles) (\$2.4)

π (\( \text{n} \))-πι-/θι-/zero determinator set
(\$\$3.1-3.6)

(πι-/πι-) \( \text{n} \) vs. \( \text{n} \)τε- associative sphere-constituence noun expansion patterns
(\$3.9)

Lexemic-morphological vs. syntagmatic plural of nouns (ternary category)
(\$3.0.3)

ε+ infinitive / εθεπερ-επεπεπερ(θεπερ) etc.
(\$\$3.13)

δε-οθηι γαρ / γαρ
(\$4.5.4)

(ειγατ), noun apposition
(Rhemes of ειγατ)
(various focalization signalling)
(\( \text{zero} \) det.; ειζ + vn.)
Genitive case
Sgl. vs. pl. morphology
(binary category)
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1.1.1 Narrative Grammar: Narrative. Models, Terminology and Concepts

(a) Pre-Coptic and Coptic Egyptian Narrative Grammar: a Note

The observation of pre-Coptic Egyptian Narrative Grammar, a central chapter in the grammar of Egyptian still almost entirely to be written, will not only give us an illuminating diachronic-evolutionary grammatical perspective of the Coptic phenomena. It will let us break free of the prejudice of viewing Coptic syntax as derivatory of the Greek one. In this first study of the two text-linguistic ones presented here, I shall recurrently attempt a succinct contrastive evaluation of grammatical highlights of Egyptian narrative, and will have occasion to comment on the "Egyptianess" of features unfolded in the course of the Coptic account see, for instance, §1.1.3(c) (3) Obs. 1; (e) Obs. 5; 1.1.5 (a) (3) Obs. 1, 2, etc. Indeed, Narrative Grammar is one of the "feature clusters" that would most benefit from observation across the unique time depth of Egyptian, for the diachrony of Narrative Grammar is perhaps the most striking multidimensional complex evolutive phenomena in the language.

Whereas the categorial system of the verb as such, abstracted of textemic assignment, will be found to have changed remarkably little through Egyptian diachrony, the most striking change regards the very narrative textemic system itself. First, the loss or, structurally considered, neutralization (formally in favour of the marked term, the "perfectum praeens", functionally in favour of the unmarked one, the Preterite) of the Perfect vs. Preterite opposition. This opposition is present in all phases of Egyptian (even down to Demotic), continuously renewed concomitantly with a continuous attrition and neutralization, but is by and large absent in Coptic (certainly not under the influence of Greek!)<sup>1</sup> Second, the disappearance en bloc of all special compound narrative verb-forms, as well as many delimitation-signalling adverbials and particles. In Coptic, on the other hand, we find the primary opposition of Preterite (conventionally and misleadingly called "perfect") and a verb-form called by the loaded name "Imperfect" (with the temporal Graeco-Romance, rather than the aspecltal Semitic associations of the term), along with the so-called pluperfect ne-<i>aqemotem</i>.

---

<sup>1</sup> This neutralization is famously encountered in a European Sprachbund, including dialects of Romance and Germanic. Incidentally, in such Coptic dialects, notably Oxyrhynchite, and texts as show the morphological opposition <i>q</i>a<i>q</i>- vs. <i>aq</i>-, undertaking the quest for the "lost perfect" (decended from <i>w</i>ḥ<i>f</i> <i>s</i>dm) is surely worth while (see Richten 1997/8).
Study of Egyptian Narrative — from the Pyramid Texts (Old Egyptian), through the Middle Egyptian Coffin Texts and various familiar “Stories” (the early Eloquent Peasant, later Story of Sinuhe and the Shipwrecked Sailor, the even later Papyrus Westcar, all in different subgenres), through the Late Egyptian Stories and the so-called Tomb Robbery accounts (a formal legal-proceedings record with a confession-reporting sub-texteme), to the Demotic Narratives of Papyrus Rylands IX, P. Vandier, Stories of the High Priests, the Mythus der Sonnenauge, the Petubastis Cycle — repays the effort by giving us an idea of the rich tapestry of its impressive grammatical and narratological sophistication and complexity, which, at first sight, makes Coptic Narrative seem minimal, flat and primitive. Of course, we have in Coptic very little untranslated straightforward Narrative that can be directly compared with pre-Christian “Egyptian” Narratives. Still, a careful microscopy of narrative grammar, both Coptic and pre-Coptic, reveals formal functional matching and affinities, and modifies considerably the impression of Greek calque in the value of the Coptic grammatical forms — indeed, Coptic Narrative is often considerably more sophisticated than its Greek Vorlage; and, although no salient grammatical symptoms of orality or narrator/audience interaction are isolable, the richer Egyptian narrative code still echoes in the sophistication of Coptic narrative structure.

Obs.

A.H. Gardiner’s 1937 “Some Aspects of the Egyptian Language”, which, by the way, reveals the eminent British Egyptologist’s deep ignorance of Coptic grammar, justly focusses on Egyptian narrative tenses (p.10ff.), but gives way to a morose feeling of inferiority which I am confident no one will share today, even for Coptic, let alone for pre-Coptic Egyptian — the Romantic nineteenth-century blend of Völkerspsychologie, grammatical symbolism and glottogetic speculation apart: “Perhaps it is not wholly fantastic

---

2 There are few special studies of Egyptian narrative grammar. Cf. Hintze 1952 for Late Egyptian, Doret 1986, Malaise and Winand 1999:653ff. for OE/ME; for Demotic we have no special discussion, apart from F.L. Griffith’s notes on his Rylands Papyri, especially Rylands IX (1909) and his Stories of the High Priests (1900).

3 Two noteworthy authentic (= untranslated) Sahidic instances are such (rhetorical) Narratives as occur in the writings of Shenoute (see Shisha-Halevy 2007b) and the Apophthegmata Patrum, if originally Coptic; in Bohairic we have the numerous Nitrian patristic and martyrological narratives.

4 This I have found to be especially true for early Demotic Narrative, in particular the Rylands IX papyrus, where the signifiers are different, but the signified narrative-texture details remarkably similar to the Bohairic Coptic ones.

5 See pp. 5 and 10: “My knowledge of Coptic is that which every competent Egyptologist must have, no more” (in Charles Allberry: a Portrait. By Patricia K.G. Lewis, privately published. Cambridge 1984).
to link together the passivity of the originating participles with the notorious tendency of the Egyptians to look backwards rather than forwards, and to associate the nominality of those same participles with the immobile rigidity of Egyptian statues and figured representations. How different the liveliness of the Greek narrative tenses, a quality that we might be inclined to associate with the adventurous quality of Hellenic enterprise, no less than with the physical movement which a Phidias was so well able to impart to marble for the benefit of future generations!”. I shall try to show that Bohairic Coptic narrative grammar is in many respects more complex than the Greek one; the Egyptian narrative systems are often more sophisticated still.

(b) “Narrative”. Narrative Grammar. Narrative Texteme and Narrative Texture.

“Narrative” is conjointly and cumulatively definable pragmatically, (a) by a special monologic situation, (b) by relatively little extratextual pragmatic presupposition; formally, (c) by the sequence of events presented as detached and disjoined from the situation of narration itself, (d) by specific textual cohesion factors and (e) by the rhetorical operation of a dominant presenting and staging factor. Narrative grammar is the function of the narrator’s design, will and purpose, his preferred poetic staging and presentation of the facts as “linguistic events” (Fleischman 1990) — later chunked or packaged as scenes or episodes — and not as segments of “objective reality” (say, in the sense of historical facts, or historiographical events). “The same information can be packaged alternatively as foreground or background”, says Helen Dry (apud Fleischman 1990:180), pointing out “…the fragility of intrinsic importance as a criterion for identifying the background of a text”. “Grammar” is used here as an umbrella term for the total system, comprising numerous subsystems, of oppositions and neutralizations of elements in the syntagmatic scope of a whole text (not of a “sentence”), with the paradigmatic dimension of all commutations observable in all slots and any slot of the same text. These are isolated in the course of a descending analysis of the text. A grammatical system being, by definition, only valid for its textual (corpus) basis, the sum of features of grammar defines the abstract texteme realized in this text, and, in a sense, signify its role: the narrativity of the prime narrative texteme, for instance, relates to its grammatical system much as a signifié to its signifiant. It must be stressed that the value of individual features and elements is determined by the very fact of the textemic framework or système des valeurs. Thus, the Preterite and Imperfect

---

6 This recalls “Mumiengeist”, attributed to “the Egyptians” in Steinthal and Mistelli 1893.
tenses in narrative clearly have a functional definition different from their value in dialogue. On the other hand, the texture of our text is the multidimensional macrosyntactic patterning made up of (a) juncture signals, i.e., links and delimitations or boundary demarcation signals (both types graded on mutually inverse scales); (b) signals of text-grammatical and narratological hierarchy, such as foregrounding/backgrounding shifts, (c) signals of information structuring, often coextensive with (a) and (b), such as focussing or highlighting; (d) signals of narrative pacing or rate or of narrative acceleration, surges, or spurs. A Narrative Tense is a convenient code name for any form or construction in narrative texture, whether verbal or non-verbal, carrying either of the two major narrative Modes.

Obs. Some definitions and conceptions of narrative:
(1) DAHL 1985:112 distinguishes narrative discourse (defined as "[a discourse] where the speaker relates a series of real or fictive events in the order they are supposed to have taken place" from actual texts, where "such ideal or pure narrative discourses are...relatively seldom found. Normally, the main story-line is continuously interrupted by various kinds of flashback and points of background information". I find here the postulation of (chrono)logical sequentiality, even on the emic plane, arbitrarily and unnecessarily restrictive. Thus also Dahl’s derived notion of "narrative context", environmentally defining the “Narrative Tenses” (112f.: “We shall say that a sentence occurs in a narrative context if the temporal point of reference...is determined by the point of time at which the last event related in the preceding context took place”), and the apparently no less derived “basic” that (113) “a narrative discourse typically starts with the verb in some non-narrative past form” respectively, are at least not of universal usefulness and validity. See KALVERKÄMPER 1981:257, 287 s.v. “Erzähltexte”, “Erzählen”; ADAMIK 1995; OCHS and CAPP 1997; SCHMIDT-KNAEBEL 1999.
(2) Many current ideas concerning Narrative Grammar were first really developed for or on English Narrative (not so narratological models). Some instances: SCHRIFTER 1981 is an important seminal study of English Narrative, narrative structure and grammar, in the context of the present/past "alternation" (our shifting or transition). Ann Banfield’s classic Unspokable Sentences (1982) is another seminal work on the nature of narrative, although more narratologically oriented. Basic in her conception is the distinction of narrative from “representation” (264ff.); the prime characteristic of narrative for her is its sequential or linear ordering. I must differ (beyond her basically generative orientation — witness her “acceptability” judgements) with her viewing Narrative as non-communication (143ff.), also the two-dimensional linearity view of Narrative, as well as the Benvenistean Preterite-centred view of narrative tensing. ADAM 1990 is a useful modern-traditional sketch of the conventional constituent structure of narrative. For other cogent linguistic definitions of narrative see COMBE 1989:165; interestingly, Combe introduces “phrase narrative” (163ff. — also the narrative itself as a “hyperphrase”), cogently objecting to the claim of catalogicality in Narrative, and again considering sequentiality and (chrono)logical development paramount. See also VIRTANEN 1992:302ff. (Narrative as a discourse "hyptertype"). It would seem to me that none of the more theoretically conceived conceptions of Narrative does justice to the complexity of actual, language-specific Narrative Grammar, recoverable only by structural analysis and description.
(c) The Narrative Texteme. Narrative Modes

The narrative texteme consists, in its rough, emically and schematically conceived informational macrostructure and in conventional current terminology (discussed in some detail below), of (a) a foreground main-line “layer” and its components, (2) a background “layer” and components, to which I add what I would loosely call the “narrator’s channel” of data not properly speaking sequentially narrative. In a closer and more precisely nuanced consideration, I would subsume the different “grounding” components as modes (preferring this to the conventional back- and foreground, as being less metaphorical and less flat, as multi-dimensional, as non-hierarchical, but especially in order to reinstate “background” as one important and typical constituent of the Comment spectrum). I oppose the Comment Mode of the narrative texteme to the Progression or Evolution one. The former is extrinsic and typically anaphoric to the plot, but often internal to the narrator’s perspective, in the sense of “internal information”; the narrator quintessentially extraneous to the narrative, even to a narrating participant therein; commenting, resuming, condensing, explaining, giving reasons for main-line acts and states and information on prior and anterior action; making meta-narrative statements*. This is not so much authorial interruption of the plot mainline, but an always open “Narrator’s channel”, amounting to a kind of constant “voiceover”. On the other hand, the Evolution Mode is markedly diegetic, vectored, successive or sequelling, carrying the course and unfolding of the plot — “advancing the plot or moving narrative time forward”9. The Comment Mode (henceforward ‘CM’) is essentially static, often anaphoric, and typically reduces or condenses intrinsically or contextually dynamic information to a static form (sometimes beyond the opposition of static and dynamic. Background, not in the strictly metaphorical pictorial sense but as roughly synonymous to “setting information”, is but one component of the CM); the Evolution Mode (EM) is typically dynamic, albeit at drastically differing rates of dynamism. Yet states may form an essential part of the EM, as may descriptions10; condensed episodes/event sequences, amplified or elaborated episodes/events; summing-up of “the story so far”. EM no less than CM is complex and subsumes sub-modes. Obviously, the interweaving/intermeshing, proportions and relative

---

* Consider: “It is of week-days, though, and of evenings that I write” (Osbert Sitwell, The Scarlet Tree, London 1947, p.118).
10 Cf. Hamon 1974:140.
weight of the two modes and their constituents in a given narrative text is a decisive and distinctive stylistic staging parameter as well as an index of the narration’s structuring and pacing. In the shift from EM to CM and back we have the prime delimitation of narrative, while in the complex signalling of EM and CM we have the prime poetic signification of narrative — that of maintaining a dominant reality (EM) vs. the distancing and deviation (in CM) from this reality to narrator/readership alternative ones, or to no reality at all.

Obs.
(1) Schiffrin 1981 introduces the dichotomous concepts of “complicating action” and “orientation”, later applied by Fleischman 1990, roughly corresponding respectively to our EM and CM; her “internal evaluation” (58ff.) would certainly be a case of CM. See Touratier 1989, a brief outline concerned with French, a system very similar to ours.
(2) “Comment” is used, in a restricted sense, for certain constituents of our Comment Mode, by Niccacci 1990 (see 22ff., 33).
(3) Comment Mode distinctive features, but also Evolution Mode focussing, may be considered phenomena of modality. See De Vogüé 1990. Compare approximately Labov and Waletzky’s “Orientation” (1967); Wienold 1983:421f. (condensation, summary, orientation).

In its microstructure, the narrative texteme reveals its texturing relational exponents, the prime grammatical signals — mode and sub-mode signalling components, as it were the “landmarks” for the two modes; also mode-switching signals, various focussing signals, information-blocking and chunking signals, linking and delimiting boundary (juncture) signals, inner-hierarchy exponents, and so on. Obviously, the linguist’s task is here difficult and tricky, and his findings open to criticism of at worst subjectivity and circularity, at best intuitive and subjective handling; but, when all is said and done, there is no denying that we are dealing here with a system of linguistic signs, for which the signifieds (functions) and their distribution must be isolated and properly stated.

Obs.
(1) Special varieties of narrative textemes or sub-textemes, some of which will be looked at more closely below, include Dream Narratives (e.g. Gen. 41:10ff., 17ff.), in locutive (1st-person) and delocutive forms, with special striking textural features (see below). Several “micronarrative textemes” or “Narrative Fragments” (see Shishia-Halevy 2007b), with reduced and simplified grammatical systems: “resumé” or condensed narrative (Ex. 5:1ff.); “chronicling narratives” (e.g. Gen. 5:31); aetiological naming or identification narrative (Gen. 30:6:8, Num. 20:13 — recalling the “microrécit” in proverbs). “Recycled reminiscent narrative” as in Deuteronomy (e.g. Chapters 1-10, also Gen. 31:7ff., 38ff.), condensed, featuring mostly narrative highlights, with fast pacing and change of the personal axis from delocutive to interlocutive; Report Narrative (“Bericht”,
“Tatsachenbericht” [see ROSEN 1975], “Verkündigung”, “Mitteilung”), which, essentially locutive (egocentric), features in Coptic the Focalizing Conversion and almost no CM or Narrator’s Channel\(^\text{11}\). Note also hypothetic scenarios; legal “protatic” or “case-raising” (“fallsetzende”) Narratives (often in Lev. e.g. 5:17ff.); prophetic or predicted prospective Narratives or scenarios (e.g. Ex. 3:13, Deut. 24:1ff., 28) which have an immediate relevance for the syntax of the so-called Future tenses (see below). See SIMMLER (ed.) 1997, especially Schwitalla (41-62) and Babenko (205-213); SCHMIDT-KNAEBEL 1999.

(2) Pivotal-person varieties of Narrative are distinguishable by grammatical specifics (cf. CASPARIS 1975:39ff., 75ff.):

1st sgl., e.g. Gen. 3:10, 24:34ff., 42ff., 31:39ff., 41:10ff., Num. 20:16
1st plur., e.g. Deut. Chapters 2-3
2nd sgl. Ex. 15:1ff., Deut. 24:18:22.; ΝΑΚΟΙ ΜΕΒΩΚ ΠΕ implies a condensed allocutive micro-narrative, (Deut. 5:15, 25:17ff. etc.)
2nd plur., e.g. Deut. Chapters 1-2, 8-9-10, with a “recycling” transformation of the delocutive narrative (esp. of Exodus) to the 1st sgl/2nd plur. interpersonal axis.

(2) BENVENISTE 1959 is a famous structural discussion of narrative and its grammar, seminal both for subsequent narratology and narrative text-linguistics. However, within the French Problematik, his main preoccupation is the opposition of the Perfect (perfectum praesens, expressed by the passé composé) and Preterite (passé simple), which does not concern Coptic. The Preterite vs. Imperfect opposition, the main grammatical (if not narratological) problem of Coptic and indeed European narrative, is not discussed at all. Incidentally, Benveniste uses here “aoriste” for the Preterite carrier, initiating a usage later adopted by Barthes and other narratologists, argued for unconvincingly (“le terme ‘aoriste’ n’a pas d’ailleurs de connotations assez différents et assez précises pour créer ici une confusion” 71 n. 2), yet with its useful points (especially in view of the non-part essence of the Greek δόρπιστος, in the Stoic conception of “undefined tense” and the familiar generic roles of the Greek tense; the narrative carrier is after all not really past — Narrative is not essentially temporal, and certainly not primarily or intimately connected with past time reference: see BANFIELD 1985b:6). Among the important insights of Benveniste’s essay, I find the following, again having the passé simple vs. passé composé in mind, directly pertinent to our EM (αρχ. νε- Ω)/CM (νε- ΠΕ), and the poetic tension between them (see below): (73) “Le temps fondamentale est l’aoriste, qui est le temps de l’événement hors de la personne d’un narrateur” (my italics). Among the more exceptional statements are the author’s evasion of the concept of “narrative tense” and the choice of temps du récit historique (see 74 with n. 2): “historique” is misleading and needlessly exclusive, and, more importantly, what is evaded here is no less than the crucial structural issue of opposition between tenses in narrative.

(3) WILMET 1976:61ff. is among the best discussions, historical and synchronic-structural, of the rare poetic use of the passé composé in Narrative (Pagnol: “un temps imprécis, médiocre, bête et mou”), with the secondary literature on the famous case of Camus’ L’étranger (often discussed also elsewhere).

\(^{11}\) Cf. POLOTSKY 1985 for the formal distinction between Report and Narrative stricto sensu, esp. in Demotic and Late Egyptian. Report in its turn is different from oral Narrative, pace WEINRICH 1982:172ff. See FLEISCHMAN 1990:399ff.
(d) Traditional Hierarchy Models in Narrative Grammatical Analysis. Grounding.

The dichotomy proposed above between EM and CM is not hierarchical: the EM is not more important or primary than the CM, although it is true that the latter presupposes the former, and not *vice versa*. The current structuring principle generally applied to narrative is hierarchical; I refer to the by now familiar *grounding*. Analytical Narrative Linguistics is just past its model-making phase (with the bridging between narratology and text-linguistics proper still in early stages), and a satisfactory balance between empiricism and more or less “pure” theory is not always achieved. For the hierarchical structuring of narrative, the basic and classical, even canonical dichotomy of *foregrounding* and *backgrounding*, now more or less conventional, was proposed (on the basis of several languages) in HOPPER 1979 and then HOPPER and THOMPSON 1980, with several correlative parameters of “foreground” suggested, of which transitivity is the most important; others (in the authors’ terminology) are punctuality, volitionality, action participants, kinesis (dynamicity), aspect (telicity), subject topicality, affirmation. In the earlier formulation, the foreground carries the “discrete, measured events of the narrative” (HOPPER 1979:215), and an association between background and non-topicality as well as with the imperfective aspect is suggested (1980:216). See also FLEISCHMAN 1985 (foreground characteristics: what is humanly important; the main line of story — sequence of temporally ordered clauses; causality or importance for plot development; contextual unexpectedness); see also FLEISCHMAN 1990:168ff. and under “foreground”, p.434; SCHIFFRIN 1995. In subsequent and recent developments of this model, *salience* or prominence is added as a rank property or an overlap parameter of foregroundedness (see CHVANY 1985, 1990; WÄRVIK 1990a, BJÖRKLUND 1993:181ff., 207ff.)., with vividness, speaker-motivation or topicality as constituent features (cf. also Fleischman’s “contextual unexpectedness”), or even substituted for the foreground as a narrative structure constituent. The problem here is the subjectivity of the notion (“presented as salient” might be preferable). Background(ing) is typically considered a kind of subordination (“which rests on an analogy between sentence and text”, FLEISCHMAN 1985: 853ff.). Viewing the foreground information as “more important, the background as “less important” carries, beside dangers of simplism, subjectivity and especially circularity, the same dangerous associations of “omissibility” as are encountered in the naively reductive conception
of "periphery" or expansion\textsuperscript{12}; moreover, the sentence or clause is \textit{per se} and \textit{a priori} not a valid syntactical unit in Narrative, nor is the binary "ordination" (subordination/main clause) model (see here, Chapter Two).

Obs. Some approaches to grounding.

(1) A seemingly irreconcilable double conception of grounding, the tense-based Romanistic one (following H. Weinrich) and the discourse-pragmatic Anglistic one (following Labov) is merged into a compound one by S. Fleischman in Fleischman 1990. In this important work, Fleischman also presents the conventional, almost banal association of foregrounding with the imperfective, foregrounding with the perfective aspect as an absolute, general, even universal, principle (see 9ff., 24f. etc.). One may have reservations regarding the exclusive association of foregrounding with plot progression (see Couper-Kuhlen 1989:9ff.) and change, also of background as "setting" (1990:175ff.; see also Covet 1991). But Fleischman also holds (loc.cit) that fore- and background are two extremes of a continuum, admitting of grading — see also Givón 1987, who stresses the non-binary nature of the grounding opposition, and the complexity of the correlation between backgrounding and syntactical subordination; Tichy 1999 expresses the same scepticism regarding the conventional dichotomy, with regards to Greek (Homer and NT) tense and aspect. Now I believe "setting" to be a grammatical phenomenon more complex and multifarious, part and parcel of information-packaging decisions, and not exclusively a background constituent: the "obtaining situation", for instance, is an EM option. However, an \textit{emic} narrative-mode dichotomy does exist, as CM and EM, within the texteme. Its realization in the text is less sharply divided, albeit with transitions often fuzzy, and above all willed and stylistically, dynamically manipulated by the author-director throughout.

(2) The original definitions of grounding (as in Hopper and Thompson 1980:280f.) are loose and open to some objections of subjectivity and petitio principii, and show, moreover, that the concepts were meant as of broader scope than narrative discourse: "That part of a discourse which does not immediately contribute to a speaker's goal, but which merely assists, amplifies, or comments on it, is referred to as BACKGROUND. By contrast, that material which supplies the main points of the discourse is known as FOREGROUND... The foregrounded portions together comprise the backbone or skeleton of the text, form-

\textsuperscript{12} "A nice day" is not really reducible to "a day" in any sense: it does not mean the same thing. It is thus important to bear in mind that "stating that the [present] S[tem] clauses serve the purpose of supplying subsidiary information of different kinds is, of course, not to say that, without them, the narrative still would be what it is: leaving them out would make a captivating story into a dry enumeration of the main facts...So the material presented by means of PS main clauses, although it is, from a viewpoint of information, of secondary importance, enhances the aesthetic and dramatic quality of the narrative, adds relief to the \textit{faits et gestes} of the \textit{dramatis personae}, so as to enable the audience to understand and appreciate its content" (Sicking and Stork 1996:94). Consider Wallace's definition of grounding, which I believe is problematic, simplistic and circular (apud Fanning 1990:74f.): "Included in the foreground, for instance, are the more important events of a narrative, the more important steps of a procedure, the central points of an exposition, the main characters or entities involved in an episode. The background includes events of lesser importance, subsidiary procedures, secondary points, descriptions, elaborations, digressions and minor characters or things".
ing its basic structure; the backgrounded clauses put flesh on the skeleton, but are external to its structural coherence”.

(3) The correlation of foreground with main or independent, background with subordinate or dependent clauses is postulated by Tomlin 1985, but I believe does not always agree with the empirical facts regarding strategies of foregrounding (see Givón 1987 and D epr aë ter e 1996, the latter examining foregrounding in English relative clauses, but stating categorically that “main clauses carry the action forward, subclauses do not” — see pp. 671f. and 714ff.). See also Thompson 1987:440f., Mattheisen and Thompson 1988. In fact, it is in the narrative texteme that the traditional binary “ordination” (subordinate/main predication) model, itself metaphorical, aprioristic and non-analytical13 fails us most patently.

(4) The essentiality of event time sequencing, and thus iconicity, in the foreground is, I believe, exaggerated (cf. Declerck 1996:114f. “the distinguishing feature of the foreground... is a sequence of chronologically ordered bounded situations whose sequence is reflected in the linear order in which they are reported”). Narrative Evolution can well move back and forth or, for that matter, stand still: as I have pointed out, states and change of states can well be part of plot progression, in our Evolution Mode: see Dry 1981.

(5) Hopper 1986 presents several tagmemic means of grounding and advances the possibility of correlating grounding in Germanic with the relative order of verb-clause constituents, suggesting ‘VS’ is “more dynamic and foregrounded” while ‘SV’ is “typical of background”. (Non-verbal signals are generally left out of the discussion, which is pronouncedly Eurocentric). Observe that in Romance, the famous “Arriva le général” ‘inversion’ case (see Cliff ord 1973 and Wehr 1984, with a bibliographical survey) is indeed a foregrounding landmark, but simultaneously and primarily a special “restart” delimitation one: see below, on Acq unr i et al.

(6) The possible view of foregrounding vs. backgrounding as high-level Rheme and Theme respectively is suggested in König 1981, e.g. p. 11; this would seem to disagree with the Coptic facts (both naq- zero and naq- πε, EM and CM respectively, would for instance be thematic or focalized: see below) and with Weinrich’s suggested model for Romance, where “relief” covers background but presumably also part of foreground (as “low” and “high” relief, respectively). On this issue, see also Bybee et al. 1994:55. “Salience” as an intrinsic property of foreground recalls high-level thematicity: see Wärwik 1990a.

(7) Fundamental, and also very pertinent to the understanding of Coptic narrative grammar, is the question whether “description” belongs in the foreground or the background: see Schifferin 1995:301ff. My own view here is that this is a spurious question: while “description” is not a meaningful grammatical-functional concept compatible with narrative structure as envisaged here, a situation can be either dynamically or statically conceived. The former alternative is not paradoxical, for a situation may be a component of the development of the plot.

(8) Grounding structure is often applied in modern narratological and Narrative-Grammar analyses of Biblical texts14 alongside similar concepts, see e.g. Revell 1985 (rather simplistic; distinguishing “narrative”, “descriptive”, “contextualizing” and “incidental”);

14 See also Eriksson 1943 for the genre distinction of Biblical historiography and narration.

(10) On Weinrich’s Tempus (1977, 2001, first edition 1964). A carefully structuralist seminal work, unparalleled in its field for raising ferment and controversy, had almost invariably adverse reviews, with sometimes fierce (and unjustly slurring) criticism (see Thomas 1974:39 n.31). It has proved an irritant to both Romanists and scholars of poetics and literary theory. Despite some justified reproaches (e.g., the rather forced analysis of Pirandello’s stories) and some inbuilt weaknesses of premises and argumentation (see, for instance, Berschin 1979), I believe the fundamental influence of this insightful and often brilliant book has not only been beneficial within the short lifespan of Text Linguistics (of which Weinrich was a Founding Father) and after, but no less than an inspiration. His subordination of semi-morphological Tempuslehre to text-linguistics; his dethroning of the tense-form as a unit of importance per se (cf. de Boer’s “supersition de la forme”); the conceptualization of tense-marked grounding (and, by the “relief” concept, its association with information structuring); stressing of the all-important narrator’s attitude (staging, perspective); and, last but certainly not least, overruling and replacing “subordination” etc. by Narrative Grammar and even narratological parameters. (In Coptic narrative, indeed, ηε-τρε is a fine case of text-grammatical “subordination”). Yet another of Weinrich’s invaluable pioneering insights is the signalling conception of narrative grammar. The seminal Tempus, once a cult book of text-referred linguistics, is now somewhat passe, yet will ever be a classic of structural analysis.

(11) The differentiation of cataphoric vs. anaphoric grounding (Givon 1995:64ff.) uses “grounding” as coterminous with coherence and mental connectivity. See below for the ana-/cataphoric vectoring factor in Comment Mode.


(e) A note on artistic, photographic and cinematographic terminology in the analysis of Narrative.

In the different semiotic systems of linguistics/literature and visual-art actualization, terminology and para-terminology have drawn extensively upon each other’s resources. The emerging discipline of visual studies enriches our own discipline with terms that stand for concepts that have no name within linguistics. This exceeds mere metaphorical usage, since semiotic nature, textuality and (especially for film and drama) sequen-

16 We find an early application of photographic/cinematographic terminology to the study of Greek Akzionart in Meltzer 1904/5:211, 246.
tiality and basic linearity are common to the two groups, referring to comparable signals for comparable signifieds; consequently, they are not metaphors, and I shall generally dispense with quotes when employing them\textsuperscript{17}.

Obs. See Toolan 2001:103ff. Chatman 1977 on cinematic narrative discourse (in Citizen Kane): note the use of “event” as a narrative signifiant; the chinese-box nested, not linear, structure (10f.); “speed pans” to represent elapsed time-intervals (15f.); “narrator’s summary statement” (15f.); “…when the camera stops recording strict visual reality and puts things together in terms of what contextually would be a character’s illusions” (15); the on-screen and off-screen narrator, the narrator as witness (9). On “frame” and “framing”, and on the “scene” in literature and film/theatre, see Grande 1991. Tomlin 1985:91ff. (analysis of film as an aid to understanding a written narrative). Metz 1969 (“sequence”, “scene”); Weinrich 1977 (“Relief”); Casparis 1975 (“Camera-eye technique”); “slow-motion”, “slow camera” (often, e.g. Fleischman 1990:213, 298 etc.): “dilate”, “photo-finish” (Le Goffic 1995:136). I find the following terms are useful for conceptualizing features of narrative structure, texture, pacing and juncture as well as tensing: “out of focus”; “camera-eye narratives”; “freeze frame”, “time-lens”; “zoom (in/out)” “cut (away to)…”, “cut away (to)”, “cut back and forth”, “continuity cut” (or “jump”), “camera panning or rotating”; “dissolve”; “shot”, “successive shots: close-in”, “close-up”; “tight shot (on)”, “offscreen”, “backdrop”. “frame”, “framing”, “opening up the frame”, “sequence”; “strolling camera”; “out of focus”.

1.1.2 Narrative Tensing and Texture: General. The Coptic system in macroscopy. European and Classical Languages.

(a) Tense and Time.


Like other grammemic linguistic signs, tenses have no meaning per se, but are valorized by their structural (commutation/combination) identity. Being grammatically more loaded (or their connotations more finely tuned) than other linguistic signs, tenses are texteme-sensitive, and narrative tenses have relational signifiés that are really functions or roles, and often not easy to grasp (and paraphrase). Much has recently been written about so-called “tense systems”, in the satellite’s-eye-view typological genre, e.g. works that are by now classics, like Dahl’s (1985)

\textsuperscript{17} I find it remarkable that cinematic grammar enables us to give a shape to and get a better view of role categories that have been with us in verbal narrative since time immemorial.
or Comrie’s (1990), without taking the syntagmatics and paradigmatics of the forms and patterns in question into account, let alone their textemic environment. This is a fundamental, and disastrous, fault, since it gives a synthetic, flat and agrammatical picture of the forms concerned. (It is almost only in the philological linguistics of Graeco-Roman that the link, and the sensitivity it entails, between form and text is still maintained; also in Biblical philology). Moreover, it is not easy to accept the basic narratological differentiation between “tenses of the language” and “tenses of the Narrative”, since the former do not analytically exist outside the textemic tenses, of which the latter constitute a major class: language is not realized other than in, and by, texts. (Barthes’s narratological “narrative functions” are after all carried by grammatical means).

As an introduction to the detailed description of Bohairic narrative tensing, I shall address briefly the general issue of narrative tensing in European languages, then generally Coptic tensing. Without offering here any elaboration of narrative-tense theory or even an adequately comprehensive survey of the subject, I shall also wish to make a few theoretical points.

Obs.

(1) I can see no unmarked (or “default”) vs. marked opposition in narrative tensing, other than the main carrier as against any tense regularly breaking it or deviating from it. The foreground (or the EM) is not unmarked vis-à-vis the CM.

(2) “There’s no ‘meaning’ of the present tense”, FLUDERNIK 1991:386: this is in principle true of other tenses, but certainly of Coptic nē-, which is not a tense, properly speaking.

(3) WILMET 1976:82 “situation objective, impressions affectives, structure des adverbes, mode d’action des verbes, personne grammaticale…niveau de langue” must all be taken into account as factors for the choice of a narrative tense; MCKAY 1992:227, on New Testament Greek tensing: “Ultimately we need to weigh up the evidence of the whole context, verb forms, time markers, sentence structure, the nature of the paragraph, the chapter, even the book, and beyond that the personal, social, political and other assumptions which the writer brought to his task…”

(4) The textual (syntagmatic) inter-tense shift seems to be the main narrative operator: Weinrich’s Tempusübergang, Bonomi’s “glissement de perspective” (1993:11f., 14f.) — this is the delimitation (like the photographic cut) that, together with the event-concatenation linkage in EM, makes juncture the main factor in narrative: see SCHIFRIN 1981: 45, 51ff. and see below.

(b) The main tense oppositions.

Prominent and probably primary among the narrative grammatical signals are what are loosely known as “narrative tenses”. The unstructured tense repertory gives a particularly misleading picture, stemming
also from what may be called “associative terminological programming”. Here is probably the most instructive instance of a grammatical form being devoid of “meaning” outside its specific systems: for in the narrative *système des valeurs* the tenses have a very different functional definition from the one they have in the dialogic system. Indeed, “tense” has no absolute intrinsic meaning outside of its texteme. In the unstructured inventory, the picture is even more misleading. This last distortion is often compounded by the terminology, for the terms conventionally used for the tenses bear strong alien associations that potentially and, in point of fact, bias our judgement of and blunt our sensitivity for the specifics of Coptic.

The Coptic system of narrative tenses seems a greatly reduced one in comparison with the European ones: no Narrative Present, no narrative infinitive; no *perfectum praesens* for report are present. It is certainly also reduced (especially in boundary signalling) compared with its highly complex Egyptian predecessors, a simplification evident already in Demotic. I find this, together with the apparent evolution of a Greek-type narrative Preterite/Imperfect tense system, one of the most intriguing diachronic phenomena of Egyptian. The first reaction, *viz.* that what we have in Coptic is but a calque- replica of the Greek system, must immediately be modified by the numerous “Egyptian” (or anyway “un-Greek”) features that emerge upon careful examination. (The issue as a whole requires precise dialectal resolution, and is of course not limited to tensing).

(c) Coptic Tenses.

The mutual opposition between the Coptic tenses traditionally called “Perfect” (\(\text{אככטמ}\)) — to which I shall henceforth refer as “Preterite” - and \(\text{נאככטמ}\), the “Imperfect”, testifies to Latin/Greek terminology and conceptualization\(^{18}\), compounded with the presupposition or bias of Greek influence, which is not founded on precise study but taken for granted (Chaîne [1933:267f.] thus lightly pronounces, *ohne weiteres*, that the Coptic \(\text{נאכ}\) has “le sens de l’imparfait grec”; or Stern 1880 §373 “dauerzeit der vergangenheit in die beschreibung... entspricht als solche dem griechischen imperfect”). This aspectual opposition is valid

---

\(^{18}\) On the “tyranny” of Latin grammatical conceptualization terminology, cf. De Boer 1928; see also Stern 1880:312 “lateinische schulausdrücke”, referring to case-names (his own terminology is Greco-Latin). This is the non-diachronic Coptological version of De Boer’s *tyrannie du latin.*
only in a text-detached, “lexical” and loose sense. The Imperfect is a non-specific, fuzzy, diffuse when in contrast with the specific Preterite. Of course, this traditional synthetic “Tempuslehre” description is a non-textual, sentence-grammatical, so to speak “lexical” one. Conventionally and traditionally, in the European genealogical, diachronic and geographic Sprachbund that may conveniently be called “Graeco-Romance”, the imperfective aspect is associated with a durative Aktionsart and description narrative background (broadly seen as a “view from the inside”). As we shall see, for Coptic such statement is inadequate and imprecise.

Certainly, there is matching between the Egyptian-Coptic value system and the Greek one, a matching possibly due to contact interaction through the Sacred Texts and through general Greek/Coptic adstratic or superstratic transfer as well as to convergence of functional features: this makes alertness and sensitivity to what is typologically “Egyptian” even more de rigueur.

Coptic, it seems, is at the junction of the Greek/Latin/Romance-oriented European tradition and the still largely uncharted Egyptian phenomenology. The opposition of and inter-shifting between Preterite and Imperfect (the former under several names, the latter always “Imperfect”) is a weighty subject with a long and deep and ongoing research tradition. In Coptic as in Greek, the Imperfect (neqcwmt / naq-cwtem, in its conventional associations and favourite traditional appellation, even going occasionally back to its probable Late Egyptian structural and probably formal predecessor wn.f hr sdm) is “transparent”, containing a present-tense stem with additional exponent features signalling past time: the augment (which is an Indo-European converter) and the secondary personal endings. (Hence, the conception of the Greek Imperfect as “back-shifted present”: GOODWIN §36, SCHWYZER II 275). Not so in Latin or Romance; the Preterite is a morphological special term everywhere. There is no denying the Imperfect (in this morpho-lexical sense of a past-shifted present) is an eminently Indo-European phenomenon: its presence and importance in Coptic is certainly noteworthy.

19 A viable statement so far as it goes; cf. KLEIBER 1987, JANSSEN 1991, EGGS 1993:10ff. However, specificity, indefiniteness and genericity are difficult notions even when applied to nominals; and, for verbal nexus forms, the difficulty is compounded by the co-presence of nominal actants.

20 See NEVEU 1994:200. See POLOTSKY 1990 on the history of Egyptological usage of “perfect” and “imperfect”.
Obs.
The Coptic Preterite (ṇq-) is compatible with adverbs of time extension that show its temporal-deixis compatibility-value to be neutral or unmarked: ܢ-ܗܰܡ ܢܓܘܘܬ (Num. 20:29), ܢܟ-ܯܐ ܢܓܘܘܬ (Gen. 8:10), ܢ-ܬܐ ܢܪܘܡܐ (Gen.9:28). It is however difficult to conclude much from deictic-modifier compatibility of tenses to their time indication. (See VETTERS 1996, esp. Chapter 3).

The two following diagrams depict, in (respectively) (a) three- and (b) two-dimensional graphic representations, the categorial model for the main narrative tense oppositions of Coptic:

with each plane opposed to the all other adjacent ones. Or, in two-dimensional projection:

An impressionistic Greek/Coptic contrastive scanning results in the following broad structuring of “tense” ranges:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Septuagint Greek</th>
<th>Pentateuch Bohairic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aorist</td>
<td>Preterite / (Imperfect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect</td>
<td>Imperfect / (Preterite)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present</td>
<td>Preterite / (Imperfect)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While a closer specimen check of the respective Greek correspondences of **نة- Ø**, **نة- πε**, **لى-**, **وىلى-** and the Nominal Sentence (see in detail below) shows the following correlations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pentateuch Bohairic</th>
<th>Septuagint Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>نة- Ø</strong></td>
<td>Imperfect, Aorist, infinitive, Present, Perfect, (participles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>نة- πε</strong></td>
<td>Imperfect (also ἢνv-periphrases); (Aorist)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>وىلى-</strong></td>
<td>Imperfect (also ἢνv-periphrases); present; (Aorist)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>لى-</strong></td>
<td>Aorist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom. Sentence</td>
<td>εἰρώμεν constructions (also ἢνv-periphrases)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is surely sufficient to prove, as a structural point of departure, the basically different functional spectrum of the Coptic narrative forms, as well as the independence of their selection of the Greek Vorlage. As Roman Jakobson cogently said in his “On Linguistic Aspects of Translation” (1959): “Languages differ essentially in what they must convey, and not in what they may convey... as Boas neatly observed, the grammatical pattern of a language... determines those aspects of each experience that must be expressed in the given language”. The use of **نة- πε** for switching to and marking the Comment Mode is peculiarly Egyptian, although, paradoxically, the construction as such is as yet not attested before Coptic; we have here, I believe, a specifically Coptic expression of a functional category well existing in pre-coptic Egyptian, still relatively uncharted territory in all phases of the language.

Obs.  
(1) Three contrastive notes at this point. The first is banal: the warning that we can never be entirely sure of the tenses the Coptic translator found in his Vorlage, or that we are aware of all his motives for translating as he did. Obviously, the text we have must be

21 Cf. SCHWARTZ 1843:1926f. Obviously, many factors determine the precise correspondence, the primary one being lexical, the secondary con(n)textual; we still need a comprehensive contrastive grammar (MINK 1972 is far from adequate, even as jottings towards such a work).
taken as a valid testo di lingua and we must make the best use we can of what data we do have. But let us always remember that the Coptic translator did not translate Greek tenses; he translated a Greek text, following a careful reading and interpretation.

(2) The second observation refers to a key question, viz. the influence (if any) of Greek tensing on Coptic\(^{22}\). I see three ideal means of determining and resolving this, to be applied conjointly: defining the narrative grammar of pre-Coptic Egyptian; of Septuagint Greek; and, most elegant of all, isolating specifically Coptic signals, that is, such features as do not find matching correspondents in the Greek system of grammar. In parenthesis: the similarity between the systèmes des valeurs of the Preterite: Imperfect oppositions in Coptic, Romance, Greek are occasionally uncanny. The reason may be a universally similar partition of the semantic ranges in narrative — the plot-carrier, background-channel-carrier etc. Be that as it may, let me say that, while the translation of the Holy Word attempts, in Coptic as elsewhere, to be as precise as possible, it is in the Bohairic here studied (unlike often in the Septuagint) not a calque translation, but one based on a serious, sensitive, attempt to understand the original, and then make full use of the means to reproduce this comprehension in Coptic. The translation is thus a meaningful and fully valid document of Coptic. It would of course be possible to speculate on the Greek and "Egyptian" components of the Coptic narrative. To identify the latter correctly we would need synchronic and diachronic studies of the Egyptian texteme; but the former, too, is not simply "Greek", but Koine and Byzantine Greek. A curious fact: despite the obvious importance of Greek for the Coptic text — Greek is after all the "language in contact" with Coptic, in both textual and sociolinguistic interface with it —, typologically speaking Coptic is, I believe, more Romance (and especially Franco-Romance) than "Hellenic": Latin is more relevant to its structure. The special role of French — as against German or English — grammatical phenomenology for inspiring insights into Coptic, as also the special felicity of French translations from Coptic, would be a familiar experience for Coptic scholars: "Qu'on remarque en égyptien tant de gallicismes", E. Revillout, RE 11 (1904) 111: "J'ai parmis les égyptiens de race de bons amis, dont la tourmente d'esprit toute française m'étonne toujours", apud POLOTSKY 1955a:96 (+ n. 12); see also POLOTSKY 1957b:227 n. 1.

(3) In a sense — and it's another curious reflection — Coptic returns the grammar of our Scripture narrative closer to the Hebrew pre-Greek Vorlage, since typologically Coptic has definitely more affinities with Semitic than with Indo-European, even if some traits, perhaps even in the narrative-tense system, were arguably acquired by contact with Greek. (See BARR 1961 Chapter 4; 72ff.; 83 n.1).

(4) The third point concerns the absence of the Narrative Present in Coptic, unlike Greek and pre-Coptic Egyptian narratives (also, though with lesser importance, the narrative infinitive and Narrative Perfect), in a word the verb-forms described by Barthes (1953:50) as "des formes moins ornementales, plus fraîches, plus denses et plus proches à la parole" which, when substituted for the narrative Preterite, change the récit drastically. In fact, the Coptic nie-less ne- clauses merge the roles fulfilled in European languages by parts of the spectrum of the Imperfect and of the Narrative Present.

(5) In Biblical Hebrew, in broad schematic outline, the carrier of the Evolution Mode seems to be the wayyiqtol form, of the Comment Mode w-qatal and w-NOM.-yiqtol, of

---

\(^{22}\) Cf. recently GRIESEMANN 1991/2: 70ff., with n. 15.

\(^{23}\) Cf. KRETCHMER 1910; LOMBARD 1936. The infinitive in Latin mainly hurries narrative pacing (into what J. B. Hofmann called "die fliegende Hast der Erzählung").
the background proper $w$-NOM.- qatal, with the respective transition patterns. This is an average view or current consensus, see N ICCACCI 1990; cf. also ROSEN 1969; POLOTSKY 1985, for a functional parallelism of wayyiqtol and Late Egyptian sequential jw.f hr sdm. See also N ICCACCI 1994:236ff. for an attempt to apply the Bibl. Hebrew system to Moabite. Some further features relevant for narrative grammar and common to Coptic and Hebrew are the Nominal Sentence, existential expressions, $hnh$ presentatives (Coptic $qnh\breve{p}e$ etc.), the “indigenous” Tautological Infinitive (GOLDENBERG 1971, SHISHA-HALEVY 1990).

(6) See SCHWARTZE 1843:1926f. for the correspondence Greek Pres. = Copt. Impf., Greek Aorist = Copt.Perf. + Impf. (Schwartzes does not find a difference between the absence and presence of $\pi$ with $\pi\breve{-}$: p. 1923ff.).

(7) The Narrative Present occurs in Septuagint Greek, yet in an extremely poor variety and functional range compared with other, early and late, Greek texts, including the New Testament. See THACKERAY 1978:24. We find it especially common in dramatic narrative episodes, with protagonist-delocutive forms of “say” ($\lambda\varepsilon\gamma\varepsilon\iota, \lambda\varepsilon\gamma\omega\sigma\iota$), “see” ($\delta\rho\iota$) and (far more rarely) some verbs of motion ($\kappa\alpha\tau\varepsilon\beta\varepsilon\alpha\iota\nu\varepsilon\nu$), that is to say in initial-boundary delimitative slots. It corresponds to Coptic $\pi\acute{e}x\acute{e}$, $\pi\acute{e}x\acute{a}$ (Ex. 5:3, 10:7:9:28:29, Num. 14:28, 20:19, 22:16:28:30 etc.; $\zeta\varepsilon\varepsilon\omega$ $\mu\mu\breve{c}$ in Gen. 38:22 is not narrative, but reporting) the verb $\delta\lambda\nu\alpha\nu\varphi\alpha\iota$ etc. (Gen. 29:2, Ex. 2:6:13, 3:2, 32:19, Num. 22:31 etc.); $\varphi\acute{a}x\acute{e}$ $\pi\acute{e}c\acute{h}$ (Num. 11:9). A rare instance of the Coptic (Sahidic) Narrative Present is Shenoute. Leip. IV 22: a cataloging listing of the Fathers’ action highlights. See SHISHA-HALEVY 2007b.

(8) Incidentally, the only references I can find to the problem of the Greek/Coptic interface as regards the tense system are in SCHWARTZE 1843:1926f., and Gerd Mink’s very summary Coptic contribution to Die koptischen Versionen des Neuen Testaments (1972). SCHWARTZE 1843:2015f. rejects Greek influence deeper than the surface (note his felicitously worded recommendation, “ein Vergleich der koptischen Sprache mit sich selbst”). Mink asks the question from the textual tradition angle, but states and illustrates the want of matching between the Greek Aorist/Imperfect/Present and the corresponding Coptic ones: the same impression is reported by Schwarze. However, such untypically simplistic wording as Ludwig Stern’s (1880 §373) (the Imperfect) “ist die dauerzeit der vergangenheit in der beschreibung und entspricht als solche dem griechischen imperfect” gives an utterly wrong impression.

(d) Discussions: a classified report

I cannot even attempt to report here adequately on the extensive literature treating the “grammatical personality” (WILMET 1976:79f.) of the Greek, Latin and Romance tense called “Imperfect” (usually in the opposite context of that other Preterite narrative tense, called simply Preterite, Aorist or Perfect, passé simple or passato remoto), revealing the lasting fascination of what Marc Wilmet, ever felicitously, calls “l’éternel imparfait”. Generally speaking, the Graeco-Romance Imperfect is conceived of as static, “fuzzy”, diffuse, non-specific, in contrast with the sharply demarcated, specific, dynamic Preterite. As for the Greek contrast of Imperfect (unlike Latin and like Coptic, a morphologi-
cally transparent past-shifted present) the cumulative functional impression found in comprehensive grammars as well as monographs is close to the Romance picture24; both Aktionsart ("plurality", descriptive narration for the Imperfect) and aspect roles (attempted and/or unachieved as against "perfective" completed action) are claimed. Greek, however, unlike Latin or Coptic, and like Romance, has a real Perfect tense — a perfectum praesens; unlike Coptic, but like Latin and Romance (and Celtic), Greek has a Narrative or Historical Present, which makes the contrasted systems actually incommensurate. As a general, almost instinctive statement, one recalls the school-class maxim "perfecto procedit, imperfecto insistit oratio".

Following classic seminal discussions (such as LABOV and WALETZKY 1967 — see now LABOV 1997), modern or relatively recent discussions feature cumulatively in the bibliographies and reference-lists of comprehensive treatments of Narrative Grammar, such as WEINRICH 1977, or FLEISCHMAN 1990, and of course in "total grammars" of the languages concerned. Most well-discussed, and most sensitively studied, is the French imparfait, well in the center of narratological science in the West. One of the interesting science-sociology phenomena involved is the rift between Anglophone Narrative-Grammar theorists, who centre on the English Narrative Present — there is no English (or Germanic) "Imperfect", pace WEINRICH 1977, who considers the past progressive an Imperfect in effect ("he was going" is structurally very different, being marked for durativity and not merely a past-shifted present), and between (on the one hand) the Romance philologist-linguists and Modern French narratologically-oriented linguists, and (on the other hand) the classical philologists and linguists, including here the "Sacred Philologies" of the Old and New Testament. The rift is also to a degree one between a philological-linguistic, a narratological-linguistic and a discourse-linguistic orientation.

I shall here briefly mention only such general conceptualizations as have relevance for the functional discussion of Coptic, with some corresponding terminology; for reference to specific functions, see further below (a certain extent of duplication is unavoidable; the use of the index is here recommended).

(1) General — Tempuslehre, narrative tensing and tenses in narrative. Greek: the grammars (esp. Kühner-Gerth and Mayser); RUIPÉREZ 1982; RIJKSBARON 1984; RUIUGH 1991, with basic literature (presenting the the-


Obs. To my knowledge, only in Italian grammatical tradition, the attribute “narrative” is terminological (= “a specific kind of *imperfetto*”) and more often than not carries a prescriptive censuring purist overtone, as being an “improper” expansion of a written usage not originally “proper”. See BERTINETTO 1986:381ff, 392ff. for a Romance-oriented description, evading the internal issues and often begging the question: 1987; only in French, it seems, the category has been studied unapologetically: see also POLLAK 1988:124ff.; DAUSES 1981:35ff. calls the traditional *pittoresque* Imperfect “narrative”.

(1) The Imperfect as a diffuse, “fuzzy”, “indefinite” verbal temporal/aspectual category; as an “imperfective aspect” form: “staged durativity”. Durativity and salience. A “fuzzy reality” form. ANSCOMBE 1986 on the *zero*-article determination as a “substantival Imperfect”: insightful concerning specificity and genericity as a unified theory of language, and specifically important in helping to come to terms with the noun/verb interface (important in Coptic).\(^{25}\) JANSSEN 1991 treats the other side of the issue, namely the Preterite as a “definite description” (see also GERSBACH 1982:202).

SERBAT 1976 is a lucid and important survey of the terminology of the Imperfect, from classical tradition to modern grammar, in aspectual focus.

The Stoics’ and conventional Greek term for the Imperfect, παρωκήμενος παρατατικός “extensive past”, calls for an inquiry into the original conception of this “paratasis”, which may have referred, not to extended action but to a distance between its “world” and eventing anchored in the main-line reality, and thus is close to the “detachment from reality” or “parallel” or “fuzzy reality” role of the tense: HOFFMANN 1983.

The alleged durativity (or duration) factor in the functional spectrum of the Imperfect — in Coptic as in the Graeco-Romance isogloss — is, I believe, overplayed.\(^{26}\) Consider, for more precise observation and formu-

\(^{25}\) It would be interesting to think in this context of the Old/Middle Egyptian *mrr.f* form as a non-specific verbal substantive; for a view of its event-focussing role in certain configurations, see SATZINGER 1993:202ff.

\(^{26}\) The combination of Coptic *n3q* with temporal adverbs indicative of “verbal plurality” (*n3nhw n3crof*, Gen. 21:20f.:34, *nchot niben* Num. 9:16) means
lation, Goodwin’s “dwelling on the course of an event”, thus following MELTZER 1904/5 and KÜHNER-GERTH’s (§383.1) “Verlauf, Entwicklung” (and not duration!); GILDERSLEEVE 1980:88 (§206) “the continuance is in the mind of the narrator; it has nothing to do with the absolute duration of the verb”, or (251) “the seat of duration [must be] put where it belongs, in the eye of the beholder, in the heart of the sympathizer, and not in the action itself. Describe a rapid action and you have the Imperfect. Sum up a long action and you have the aorist”.

DE BOTH-DIEZ 1985 on the aspectual approach to understanding the *imparfait: passé simple* opposition, with sensitivity to textemic environment of the forms.

DECLERCK 1991 on the Imperfect for “unbounded situation”: e.g. Chapter 3, 119ff., 261f. etc.

DELAUNOIS 1988:183f. introduces the concept of “durée psychologique”, which signals “l’importance que le locuteur attribue à l’action”: cf. Coptic ΝΑΩ- (without ΠΕ, with zero) for event highlighting and indeed focussing (below). MELLET 2003 on the Imperfect in the context of the Preterite; also on the Imperfect as “action viewed from inside”.

More broadly, forms of imperfective aspect (including the Imperfect proper) are treated within the modality framework (FLEISCHMAN 1995: 522) as marked with respect to “(a) the reality, realization, or referentiality of an event or sequence of events predicated in an utterance; (b) the realization of an agent’s wishes, hopes, or intentions, as expressed in the propositions of an utterance; (c) the authenticity of an utterance or chunk of discourse (i.e. a sequence of utterances); or (d) what, for want of a better term, I shall call the canonicity or normalcy of a discourse or of a communicative situation”. Consider also the so-called (pre-)ludic role of the forms in Romance (see WILMET 1976:110ff.) and English (KAPER 1980)\(^{27}\); see below.

(2) The Imperfect as a “paintbrush” depicting tense. The Imperfect “descriptive”.

“Imperfekt der lebhaften Darstellung” (LERCH 1930).

FANNING 1990:249: the Imperfect primarily descriptive.

“Imparfait pittoresque”: Brunetièr *apud* POLLAK 1988:125 “tenant de composer et de fixer des tableaux... L’imparfait...sert à prolonger la

\(^{27}\) In Modern Hebrew, the simple past is used for the verbal planning of game scenario.
durée de l’action exprimée par le verbe, et de l’immobiliser en quelque sorte sous les yeux du lecteur. Le parfait est narratif, l’imparfait est pittoresque”.

(3) Tensing hierarchy in narrative: the Imperfect marked, the Preterite unmarked term of the narrative carrier category or vice versa. The Imperfect thematic. The Imperfect a “relative tense”. The Imperfect both backgrounding and prominencing? Backgrounding and delimiting? The Imperfect anaphoric.

Although the Imperfect is more of a narrative tense than the Aorist (Delbrück 1879:103f., 114), the former hierarchy is the most prevalent, indeed the default approach: Togoby 1955:390f., Bertinetto 1987 and many others.

Rijsbaron 1988: the Imperfect a narrative past par excellence, the Aorist non-past (atemporal, even future) but signifying primarily “closedness”.

(H.) Rosén 1980, Rijsbaron 1988, Le Goffic 1995:134f., and others see the Imperfect as thematic to its thematic environment, in particular the main-line event. This is interesting in view of the prominence (relief) function attributed by others (e.g. Weinrich) to this tense.


Kleiber 2003, on the Imperfect as an anaphoric tense.

See also Weinrich 1977 (a relief tense), Eggs 1993:7ff.

(4) The Imperfect a past-shifted Present:

This too is, or has been, consensual, explicit or implicit. Schwyzler II 275 “Versetzung in die vergangenheit”, “a shifted tense”, Banfield 1982:103ff. (cf. Polotsky’s view in “The Coptic Conjugation System” [1960], retracted in 1987, of nē- as a Preterite converter).


See also below, under the respective Coptic feature heading, for details of general literature on the following functional aspects of the Imperfect:

“episode amplification” in the foreground;
delimitative/narrative-break role;
situation-opening, initial situation;
explorative and parenthetic roles;
a “removedness/detachedness from reality” or “parallel reality”
signal;
the Imperfect for anaphoric abstracting; thematization and similar;
the Imperfect tense-marking of *verba dicendi*;
“internalizing” role;
the dilation/slow-motion effect; camera-eye technique.

(5) The Narrative Present, not operative in Coptic, constitutes a
much-discussed, ever fascinating sub-topic of narrative tensing, as
intriguing as the Imperfect. Indeed, it is kindred to the Imperfect in its
typical opposition to a Preterite (or “Aorist”) main-line narrative carrier.
Some selective references to general works and functional highlights,
especially those relevant to Coptic tensing.

Greek and Latin: GILDERSLUEAVE “annalistic or note-book Present”
(1903: §201); KIECKERS 1915; THACKERAY 1978:24; 1923:20ff. and
*apud* OSBURN 1986:493ff. (on Septuagint Greek, thus directly relevant to
our corpus): “(the Present) serves to introduce new scenes in the
drama”, “a fresh paragraph in the narrative”, “to introduce a new scene
like a stage-direction”…a “mise en scène”; “[to] introduce a date, a
new scene, a new character, occasionally a new speaker; in other words
a fresh paragraph in the narrative…a curtain-raiser”. OSBURN 1986
(New Testament Greek); the Present marking “a major shift to another
aspect of the story”; “cataphoric…to set the stage for an event”. See
also LEVINSOHN 1977, 1992, MALONEY 1989; RUIPÉREZ 1982 Chapter 10
(“[dans le présent] prennent du relief des moments nouveaux ou décisifs
d’une série d’événements passés exprimés grammaticalement au temps
passé. La narration devient ainsi plus vivante…[le présent] désigne le
moment culminant d’une narration, un événement qui coupe le souffle,
un moment si surprenant que le temps paraît être suspendu…”). MCKAY
1988 is an interesting and inspired discussion of generic tenses in Greek
narrative (referred to below, à propos de Coptic *(nē)γαq-)*. PARAS-
KEVAS 1993 (Modern Greek, spoken and written); MELLET 1985: in
Apuleius, the Present “temps banal du récit”, and the Perfect marked as
conveying dramatic tension. THOMAS 1974:75 n.155 (sudden important
events; highlights in summary narratives). VON FRITZ 1949: narrative
peak moments. In Caesar’s Latin, the Present is unmarked as fore-
grounding and main clause, the Perfect backgrounding and subordinate
(186f.). In an important structuralist essay, BARRI 1978 discusses, fol-
lowing H.-J. Seiler, the Greek Present (Xenophon) as a foreground (or our EM) carrier in non-actualized narrative stretches, with the Aorist remarkably supplying the background (our CM.) The Present is perfective, non-durative, actional.

Similarly, the Narrative Present as a foregrounding (¬EM) tense: foreground with a high degree of unexpectedness: CHVANY 1985:257ff.; not in CM, SZNAJDER 1996:318f. (Latin); SERBAT 1976:367-405 on the present as a non-tense; 385ff. on the atemporal present.

CASPARIS 1975 for the "focal particularity" of the Narrative Present in a general study.

THOMAS 1974:31ff. is an important general and specific Indo-European study, reviewing and contributing to the research on the Historical or Narrative Present and Preterite/Present tense-shifting in narrative. Note the important note (p. 39 n.31) on Harald Weinrich's treatment of the issue in Tempus. (WEINRICH 1977:89 on Franz Werfel's Das Lied von Bernadette) and Bronzwaer's treatment of Weinrich. W. sees it as "un-narrative", thus heralding FLEISCHMANN's "anti-narrative": "um der Wahrheit der Geschichte willen...schreckt Werfel von den Erzählungstempora zurück". Thomas rejects, for older phases of Indo-European, Kiparsky's statement made for modern European languages that "in using the present the narrator becomes closely involved in the story and relates it as if he were an eyewitness to the action, or wished to convey to the listener the dramatic feeling of being an eyewitness" (KIPARSKY 1968:30).

WILMET 1976:9ff. is a brilliant structuralist study of some narrative roles of the French Present; the author sees the Present as the junction between the chronicling and the narrative, thus in fact suggesting a solution for the puzzle of the familiar double nature of the Present in narrative (STEN 1964:32ff.).

EK 1996 on the German Present as "non-past" — again, essentially negative membership in an opposition of tenses. (see esp. 40ff.).

COWPER 1998:14f. ("the discourse anchor is distinct from, and earlier than, the moment of speech").

RAUH 1978:323ff. examines the Narrative Present from a deictic point of view.

FLEISCHMAN 1990:437 s.v.: an especially important discussion (in my opinion, among the best), again dealing with the ambiguity of the Present in narrative.

FLUDERNIK 1991 is an important structural-narratological treatment of the Present. She stresses that not the meaning of the Present is of impor-
tance, but switching to it (394: "the Present marks a differential value in relation to the past tense"). The Present is used as an initial delimitation (388). "[It signals] tellable events, dynamically relating them to statements in the Preterite that guide the listener's evaluation of these events, marking the 'point' of the story" (386ff.)

SCHIFFRIN 1981 comments especially on the paramount importance of "syntagmatic opposition", that is, alternation or switching (45, 51ff.).

1.1.3 The Coptic System in microscopy: specifics, details and documentation

(a) The opposition **ne- + Ø** vs. **ne- + πε**: Rich (Enhanced) Evolution Mode vs. Mode Switching.

In the shift from Evolution to Comment Mode and back, we have the prime delimitation (other than the linkage and, dynamically, the "throb" of EM) of narrative. The syntagmatic coupling of **nq**- with **ne- πε**, in different sequences and combinations, is the most immediately important grammatical tool in Bohairic Coptic narrative texturing. But within EM, we observe a no less important (and equally frequent) alternation between two types of evolution staging: between normal and enhanced, rich or amplified narration.

The converter **ne-**, with or without **πε**, the so-called "Preterite converter"28, is a marked narrative carrier. In either case, it is non-autonomous in Narrative, signalling both link and delimitation; this strikingly recalls the "double incomplétude" observed by Le Goffic of the French **imparfait** (1995, see esp. 133ff.). Moreover, "time location is neither a constant part of its meaning nor its most fundamental value" *(ibid.*). Its name ("Preterite converter") and the common "morphological" conception of **nagwtem** as a "praesens in praeterito"29 notwithstanding, I believe it does not function in Narrative as an augment-like back-shifter of the converter into anteriority, but as a marked delimitative narrative-texture and narrative-function exponent: a narration mode and signal of narrative Focus, pace, scope and staging. The point I find most essential is that the converter **ne-** itself, with or without **πε**, does not primarily express time, tense or aspect. (I shall nevertheless refer to it here as "Imperfect", for the sake of convenience and a not unwelcome association

28 Probably as early in Egyptian diachrony as the Circumstantial *jw* : see MALAISE and WINAND 1999:262ff.
29 POLOTSKY 1960:399f.
with the Gracco-Romance category of the same name). As I have suggested regarding Demotic and Coptic (1989b:49f.), ne- is functionally kindred to the Second Tense (Focalizing) converter: both are (depending on textual configurations) thematic and/or rhematic exponents and components of the textual and/or clausal information structure, and, more specifically, of what H. Weinrich called "Reliefgebung".

Now πε is mainly familiar in Coptic as a pronominal Theme in delocutive Nominal Sentence patterns, a deictic thematic element marking the syntactic unit (prosodically, the colon) preceding it as rhematic. When this preceding unit consists of a whole nexus, as is the case of ne- πε, this can only mean πε is a high-order discourse-referred rhematizing element, occurring almost only as a narrative (or narrative-evoking) form: a nexus formally marked as high-order rhematic by a formalized "it's", "c'est" element. (As a matter of fact, ne- and πε may be considered the two constituents of an embracing discontinuous morpheine).

Obs.
(1) Shisha-Haley 1999a is a tentative sketch for the present discussion; 2003a is a study of Oxyrhynchite narrative; 2007b describes the rhetorical narrative in Shenoutean Sahidic.
(2) Loprieno 1995:232 combines in his definition of ne- both the traditional and the textual views of ne-, ignoring the role of πε (when present): "converts any verbal form into a background Preterite" (my italics). The attribution of CM or backgrounding role to ne- alone is usual, cf. Layton 2004 §§435, 439 "a temporary shift, a stepping away from the primary line of discourse"..."background information", a statement where both EM-CM switch (ne- πε in our Bohairic) and EM-internal "gear-shift" (ne- Ø in our Bohairic; see below) are conflated.
(3) Biedenkopf-Ziehner (1999) assigns the "Reliefgebung" role to πε, "Sprechhaltung" — "Perspektive" to ne-. Her discussion is penetrating, and her conclusions in many points close to my own.
(4) πε is known outside Narrative and/or with other conjugation forms than the Imperfect, for EM-CM switching, as a signal of the commencement of "parallel reality", or (which may be the same, from a different perspective) as a superordinating signal of high-level rhematicity; for the second role, note its use in irrealis and in irrealis wish; for the

30 See Shisha-Haley 1987:163ff. In fact, Stern 1880 §373 identifies ohne weiteres the Theme with the "preterite" πε. By the way, to judge by his illustration, πε occurs more frequently in Bohairic (certainly in Nitrian Bohairic) than in Sahidic. The only dialect I am aware of that formally distinguishes the two πε elements is a variety of Oxyrhynchite, in the Codex Schøyen Matthew (ed. Schenke 2000): πε is the pronominal Theme in the Nominal Sentence, πε a "backgrounding particle", "textual marker" (so Schenke in his index, p. 216). In this corpus, πε occurs as a real backgrounding exponent, also with gαq- and Temporalis ετgαq- (consider Mt. 9:2, 14:8); see also Shisha-Haley 2003a.
latter, consider πε as an apodotic superordinator, especially with εκε- (apodotic ορογ- εκε-...πε in our corpus, Num. 34:5). In our corpus, we find πε also with the Circumstantial, not in narrative (Lev. 4:22, Deut. 32:12 etc.), with the Focalizing Conversion (Second Tense) and once with πεξαη: see below.

(4) While Polotsky in his Grundlagen still considers πε- to be a “präteritale Transposition”, he retracts here (1987:3) the first converter status accorded it in the “Conjugation System”, since it is not assignable to any Part of Speech: “Die Präteritale Transposition betrifft weder Wortklassen noch Gliedsätze, sondern verschiebt Vollsätze in die relative Vergangenheit...Es war ein Fehler meines “Conjugation System” §18, ihr die erste Stelle unter den Transpositionen anzuweisen”.

While both πε- Ø and πε- πε are non-autonomous, i.e., they are functionally resolved only within a more or less extensive “chunk” of the text, the latter has phoric or referential force, and that in a double sense: πε, a non-commutable pragmatic-situationally referent “it’s” element anchors the whole narrative tense-form in the narrator/audience-centered hic-et-nunc world, the whole πε- πε complex is Narrative-anaphoric, relative in the textual-situation-oriented sense, either formally resuming a verbal element or staged as strongly referred to it.

Now πε- alone, without πε, is a delimiter, a narrative shifting signal on its own — a narrative “gear-shift” or rather, a focus-shift, zooming-in, close-up or amplifying exponent, a narrative focussing staging index. The tension here is between the main concatenating and measured narrative Evolution Carrier (αφ-) and the essentially non-narrative (cf. Fleischman’s “anti-narrative”), non-concatenating, unmeasured and holographic “depicting” πε-. On the other hand, πε- πε supplies a more drastic and deeper change, viz. a switch of Mode — opening Comment Mode, closing Evolution Mode, or (according to configuration) vice versa. The πε- πε segment is as a rule a far stronger break/delimination in narrative, a true cut-away to offscreen or backdrop, much more highly delimitative than πε- alone (-αφ πε is a particularly delimitative compound signal, but, on the other hand, -αε-, a link and weak delimitation, typically integrates the evolutive πε- Ø). What πε- πε achieves is a break with the prevailing reality and world of discourse, that is, narrative evolution albeit in reference to it; this is the effect of the anchoring of a clause, thematically and indeed lexically, in the narrator/audience’s own pragmatic reality, which is precisely what the exophoric “pragmatic” πε does. It sets the “discourse anchor” (Cowper 1998) in the Narrator’s world of discourse, together with a for-
malized measure of what Damourette and Pichon called "réinvasion nynégocentrique" (1936 §§1604, 1722 etc.).

The absence of πε is thus meaningful, i.e. structurally a real zero element, and, functionally speaking, a highly loaded one at that. Of course, this staging exponent (stemming from a poetic decision of the translator-writer to present the facts relating to the narration in a certain way, and the ratio of its double opposition, to ne- πε and to λυ- — cutting back and forth between the three narrative forms — is a text-specific factor and a stylistic-poetic balancing, making for a desired variable pace, complexity and compactness of the narration. As we have seen, there is no simple and direct way for us to turn to the Greek Vorlage to understand Coptic narrative structure; it must be resolved internally, generalizing and applying (to avoid circularity) the insight won from clear striking passages to such as are less unambiguous, complex or more blurred. It must be remembered that both ne- Θ and ne- πε refine the narration beyond the original and introduce nuancing absent in the Greek. (Incidentally, P and Vat. copto l, generally agreeing in the balancing of the two delimitations, seem to differ most when the translator-subjectivity factor is at its most sensitive. These are cases of causal staging or the anaphoric internal-evaluation handling of the foregoing EM events in the "Narrator's Channel": see in detail below).

I find it difficult to consider ne- Θ and ne- πε with the main EM carrier λυ- in simple terms of high-level thematicity and rhematicity, especially since ne- Θ marks "Obtaining Situation" stretches (thematic?) as well as narrative focal points, and ne- πε stands in opposition of rank to both ne- Θ and λυ-, that is, to the EM as a whole, often supplying information or data that may be seen as incidental, but as often signalling a switch to a parallel world or reality that cannot be related to the basic narrative world in terms of Theme or Rheme. The answer, of course, lies in the realization that the intricate valeur interplay of thematicity and rhematicity is, like any grammatical function, not only, dependent upon and resolveable by syntagmatics and paradigmatics, but also dynamic. That is to say, ne- Θ is only thematic in certain configurations with a rhematic environment or segment; and so is ne- πε, which is thematic in both λυ- and ne- Θ environments.

Obs.
(1) As said, it is the tension between the EM carrier λυ- and the EM/CM exponents (respectively) ne- Θ and ne- πε that is the prime regulator of narrative pace and texture. Narrative stretches with "flat" EM λυ- only acquire a special "ornamental" (Barthes) or lapidary chronicling character: consider Gen. 1:4f. ωτος λυφωρς εβολα ne-πε
The opposition \textit{ne-} θ vs. \textit{ne-} πε has a decidedly different value in Nitrian narratives; \textit{ne-} πε is there apparently much less marked, judging by its relative frequency (\textit{na-} θ is uncommon), in some texts seemingly unmarked (e.g. in De Vis, \textit{Homélies} and the CSCO \textit{Acta Martyrum}). It characterizes descriptive and durative narrative, rather than the Comment Mode. See (on Nitrian πε) the Gunn Papers (at the Griffith Institute, Oxford) VII 19. The distributional-functional system is also different in New Testament narratives (these statements are made impressionistically, and need to be implemented by precise corpus-special analyses), and seems to be more similar to that resolved in our corpus, and somewhat in a mid-way position between the latter and Nitrian Bohairic. For instance, \textit{ne-} θ does concatenate in Acts; \textit{verba dicendi} occur with πε. The system of the early Bohairic B4 Twelve Prophets (P. Vat. copt. 9) is different still.

The colon-final placement of πε is remarkably consistent, as the exx. presented below will show, and exceptions are few (one such is Gen. 40:4 \textit{οτός θυμηθης πάσας δύνατον ετούθ Μαρκούς πάσας ναπάγης οσιότατος} \textit{απε πε} \textit{θενομένως κυρίω}. In fact, this is apparently the most conspicuous final boundary-signal among delimitative elements in the language. (In Nitrian it often occurs in sets of two, as “foreshadowed”, e.g. De Vis II 36, AM II 106, 136, 194, 198, 204 etc. For some strikingly \textit{final} occurrences in Nitrian, cf. AM I 80, II 99, 148, 188 etc.; it seems often to be shared by several \textit{ne-} clauses (e.g. De Vis I 116f., II 79, AM I 81).

(b) \textit{ne-}/\textit{naq-} + θ: functional specification.

“Narrative gear-shift” or shift or change of focus: I would define its function as the \textit{expanding of the narrative dimension}, in leaving the flat, 2-dimensional narrative reality for a marked 3-dimensional (or even 4-dimensional, taking time extent as an important event component) one. It marks detail-rich, holographic or amplified evolution or episode/scene amplification, for event or state: this is, so to speak, enhanced or “boosted” flow of narrative.

The semantic spectrum of enhanced narration — Rich or Enhanced Evolution — includes the following (note that the ideally resolved roles enumerated below often combine, overlap or converge in the actual occurrences). Occasionally, the assignment of individual occurrences to this or the other role is subjective and might be contested:

(1) Shift of focus: close-up or zooming-in focussing on action (dynamic) as a slow-motion presentation, or on state as a \textit{tableau}, static or dynamic. Signalling prominence or urgency of the storyline. Dramatic event presentation; holographic depicting narrative focussing

or highlighting. Narrative Peak; “freezing the moment”, visually vivid “freeze-frames”; “blow-up”, “Paintbrush narration”.

Following נָב “see”: the perceived in dramatic close-up or slow-motion (“camera-eye” focus). Here is a unique opposition environment between נָ- and נָ- תֵ: the former occurs as focussing object of “see”, introduced by עֵירֵה יֹכ (cf. Biblical Hebrew ר' ה w-hnh), the latter as second-object actant (נָב + Obj. + אֶ-נָ- תֵ).

(2) Essential narrative information: basic narrative situation enmeshed within EM.


All these must be kept carefully distinct from background setting in CM.

(5) Cut-away, focus-shift and zoom-in (on events); “panning” or “rotating camera” effect.

(6) Totalizing-iterative or resultative-iterative Aktionsart action-amplifying role; ensuing condition or state. Pointing out the significance of an act, action or state.

(7) Non-punctual, diffused-action reiterated Aktionsart action-amplifying role.

Numerous cases where the plural-actor נָ- Ø form seems to contrast with a singular-actor Preterite (“Perfect”, פֶ-), consider Ex. 18:13, Deut. 9:10 etc., would be symptomatic of this role.

(8) Verba dicendi, cognition verbs (affirmative)

Not common (נָפַס is more of a Narrative/Dialogue switching or delimitation signal).

The transition from פֶ- carried to נָ- Ø- carried EM slows down narrative pacing and enriches, deepens the narrative scope; the inverse configuration speeds narration up, simultaneously “flattening” it. In the Initial Situation, the pace halts, yet we do not leave EM. Arguably, נפִ- does not deepen or enrich a state: it is, after all, the main, if not only means of expressing a state in narrative EM.

Obs.

(1) Zooming-in focussing or narrative peak in Demotic Narrative is marked, as in Coptic, by (is ) wn-nɔw + durative Rheme (P. Spiegelberg 4/1.2, P. Krall 24/21).

Of the Greek Imperfect, cf. GILDERSEEVE's (1903) "particularization", MANDILARAS 1973:132ff. ("...a sort of emphatic Aorist, where the Imperfect is used to stress the activity or the action of the verb"). Cf. FLEISCHMAN 1990:193ff. on description, which may verge on event focussing; also 1990:276 and Longacre apud FLEISCHMAN 1990:140; MELLET 2003, on the "inferred causality" of the imperfect. For the Narrative Present in similar roles, see CASPARIS 1975. Of course, "focalization" has different connotations in narratology, signifying (shift of) narration perspective or point of view: "Le narrateur s'efface derrière ce personnage qui est au centre de l'action et qui nous impose alors son propre regard sur les événements en cours" (MELLET 1988:173ff.): FLEISCHMAN 1991a:27ff. Yet grammatical narrative focalization is very different from dialogic or expositive one.

(3) On the special focussing camera-eye technique, zooming-in or slow-motion ('pianosequenza') and tableau-ruption in Narrative: Jespersen's lentolalegrosa pace musical metaphors (e.g. apud SCHWYZER II 277): METZ 1969:222f., POLLAK 1988:124ff., 144 (the "time-lens" effect); Longacre apud FLEISCHMAN 1990:140, FLEISCHMAN 1990:397 n.193.


(7) The ne- marking of verba dicendi "say, speak" (αω, κακάκι) as basic narrative situation constitutes a striking parallel to the Imperfect marking of Romance and generally European and Indo-European verba dicendi in Narrative, an intriguing phenomenon that has drawn many discussions and various explanations. Consider two recent studies, on Old French and Modern English: FLEISCHMAN 1990:82ff., 1995: 536ff.: FLEISCHMAN: "a narrative signal that what follows is not the direct speech quote, though it may have all the formal trappings of the direct-quotation style. Rather, it is a verbalization of something the quoted speaker was turning over in his or her mind. On this reading it would be the "ruminative" quality of the quoted material... that motivates the imperfective"; J. Bybee apud FLEISCHMAN ibid.: "a quoted utterance is "in progress" and perhaps also backgrounded given that what it reports is an ongoing mental attitude...when what is be-

Latin: Mellet 1988:132ff., 248ff. for the Imperfect tense of Latin verba dicendi; the early Løfstedt 1911:152ff. too discusses the verba dicendi in the pluperfect in later Latin as thematic or background: "...etwas Nebensächliches, mehr bei Seite oder im Hintergrund (jedenfalls nicht auf gleicher Linie) Stehendes... ein Nebenfaktum". (See already Hultsch apud Hartmann 1918/20:40). Cf. also (I.) Rosén 1980; also, more generally, the opposition of a thematic tense (and tense segments) — the Imperfect — to a schematic one (the Perfect).

Greek: Rukbriton 1984:18 (the verba dicendi tense is thematic, since it is "intended to obtain a reaction from the interlocutor"), much earlier, Mayer II/1:135 (the verb of saying as thematic or incomplete); Köhner-Gerth II §383.3 ("wenn die berichtete Rede dem Erzähler nicht schon als abgeschlossenes Ganze vorschwebt, sondern in ihren einzelnen Momenten entwickelt wird"); Schwyzer II 277ff., Kieckers 1915:7f. and Thackeray 1923:21 for Greek verba dicendi in the Present tense; Svensson 1930:10ff., 30ff., 68ff., 120ff. is one of the best treatments of Greek verba dicendi (in the Present and Imperfect tenses) in Narrative; another (for post-classic Greek) is Eriksen 1943:16, 21, 64f., 88ff. (8) See below for the delimitative/narrative-break role of the Imperfect; Thackeray 1923:21 for the Narrative Present in Septuagint Greek ("The tense as a rule is, I believe, ‘dramatic’ in the sense that it serves to introduce new scenes in the drama" — original italics); in 1923:22 Thackeray writes of a mise en scène role of the present. Svensson 1930:92ff., 96ff., 120 writes of "dramatic tension" and "dramatic eventuality" of this tense in Greek. Mellet 1988:230ff. for narrative-break and ‘gearshift’ nature of the Imperfect in Latin. See also De Both-Diez 1985:18 for the homolexemic shift imparfait-lo-passer simple with the effect of "discours dramatisé"; also Mellet 2003.

Typically, then, ne- Ø is non-phoric, i.e. does not resume, herald or at all refer to a foregoing or following narrative context. (This lower cohesion value means a relatively high Communicative Dynamism grading). It is affirmative only. It is very rarely concatenating: or rather never really concatenating at all, but occurring in short series (unlike ne- πτε), and thus very different in its combinatorics from the narrative Preterite Άq- (alias Perfect). It also has an otherwise differing syntax (for instance, in its incompatibility with inclusion by Δε-). (Note again that all above roles regard "linguistic eventing", that is, staging decisions and options of the narrator, and not attempts at the objective reproduction of real event ["change of situation"] features).

(c) ne-/naq- + πτε: functional specification.

Here (ana-)phoric association, even a general or vague one with the information given in some foregoing narrative segment or stretch, is almost de rigeur; πτε is a hyper-clausal referent. Somewhat paradoxically,
ne- πε information is often more "important" for the plot, being of immediate relevance to main-line neighbouring events, than the evolutive ne- Ø information; ne- πε information as it were supports the narrated plot as it is (being) (re-)considered by the narrator; but ne- Ø information is the plot, albeit in a privileged rank. The delimitative junctural value of ne- πε is strong. Negation is very common, even characteristic of certain functions (note for instance naqemi/cwovn an πε or naqâemâem an πε); ne- πε too does not concatenate or occur in series, but in isolated "islands". It is interesting to note that, judging by the Coptic facts, the "background" is superordinated to its context and rhematic, not thematic. The CM information is by no means less important than EM information. The pivotal point here is the deviation from the narrative world of reality to another, simultaneous and parallel one, the internal one of the narrator vis à vis his audience, in which the event or state are anchored by means of πε, which also anchors the presented information in the Narrator's Present and marks the information as represented, not narrated. It will be seen that, while the background (lato sensu) constitutes a multifarious complex category; it is but one component of our Comment Mode, which, if anything, is even more complex.

The semantic spectrum of Comment Mode staging as occurring in our corpus includes:

(1) "psychologistic" information on internal mental/emotional/intellectual/cognitive background states (and/or their physical manifestation) as motive or cause or as the reason why for Evolution Mode context.

Note the typical (albeit not constant) occurrence of râp, ze-, eπidê... in this kind of background.

(2) Explicatory-relevance background: the (physical or metaphysical) ground, motive, or reason why for Evolution Mode co(n)text; also cataphorically anticipating the reason for, or the reason for stating, a following action or state. The particle râp, which is definitely not a narrative-discourse signal, is typical here.

(3) "Omniscient Narrator's Channel" — narrator’s interference — shift (or cut) away from the narrative world to narrator/audience situation, while maintaining the internal cohesion of the Narrative itself. Synoptic, panoramic or "bird’s-eye" view, zoom-out; "from then on...". "Voiceover"-type telling of "what is happening". Nar-

33 Casparis 1975:129.
rator’s anaphoric (reprise) abstracting, chronicling, generalizing, paraphrasing, condensing, reviewing, reworking or elaborating of EM plot information. Internal evaluation of the facts as fraught with significance; “authorial comment”\textsuperscript{33}, “und zwar”, “and (he) did”, “and in fact...” etc. Narrator’s perspectives on goal, intention, significance of Evolution Mode context. “Behind the scene” information. Metanarrative information. Anaphoric scenic setting: recalling, recapturing, recapitulating or otherwise anaphoric narrative; anaphoric narrative-situation closeup.

Often, an und zwar (approx. “and that...”) rhematizing of additional information is in evidence. On the whole, ne- πε marks in this role Metanarrative, rarely even meta-narration (“as I told you earlier”, etc.) information. This is certainly the most subtle and finely nuanced functional category of ne- πε, to be considered with suspense-building and otherwise audience-oriented narrating tactics. Occasionally, the reprise (itself typically paraphrastic) resumes the Narrative after some break (e.g. conversation or detailed specification), as in Gen. 32:22, 37:28. As well as resumptive cohesion, we often observe also narratological cataphoricity, in the sense that this strong backward-looking delimitation, in itself topicalizing, acts simultaneously, Janus-faced, as a “springboard” for gathering momentum for a forward narrative spurt, conveying the sense that “something is about to happen”. (Greek/Coptic μεν [“μεν solitare’’] comes to mind as a comparable device). The condensation of the plot makes for rapid pacing, the opposite of the slow-down effected by the shift from ακ- to Νακ- Ω, which is probably the most striking narrative modulation in Coptic.

(4) Marked and significant simultaneity with narrative events “and/but at the (very) same time...”, shifting, as it were, the focus to a parallel world, which is cataphorically significant for the plot (that is, turns out to be important in the sequel).

This too has an anaphoric referential component, with a narratologically cataphoric direction. The discourse marker χε is here typical.

(5) Specification Content (second object actant) of seeing (Νακ) — the scene or presented as external to narrative reality.

This category may be related to ne- πε in dreams and visions (see below in detail), that is, signalling different, remote and inner parallel or subjective reality. This role is of special interest, for in the χε- clause serving as object to νακ we find a rare slot of striking opposition between ne- πε and ne- Ω, the former “flat”, in CM, following the seen object; the latter only object actant, dramatic, closeup or slow-motion.
Obs.
(1) In Demotic, the metanarrative "Narrator's Aside" in the Comment Mode uses wn-n3w-, i.e. the Imperfect (ἐνέ- (Setne 4/3 "I was referring to..."); see Quack 1991:199ff., also on Comment Mode resuming by the delimiting construction INFINITIVE + relative j′r.f. But it is in the earliest extensive Demotic Narrative known — the 6th century B.C. P. Rylands IX, edited in 1909 with a brilliant commentary and annotation by Frances Llewelin Griffith — that supplies the striking structural parallel to Bohairic narrative grammar: it is sometimes almost as if the Coptic Bible translator was performing in an old tradition of narrative technique, using specific Coptic means. For in Ryl. IX we find, in addition to Evolution Mode carriers and delimitation signals, a clear distinction between the Evolution Mode "obtaining situation" signals (j′r.s hprjw-, e.g. 17/1, 19/1) and true ne- marked "backgrounding" Comment Mode, e.g. 5/14, 12/19 (delimited as j′r.s hpr wn-n3w-, e.g. in 2/20, 11/9ff., 12/1).


(4) "Detachment or removedness from reality"; cf. Gildersleeve 1903 §213ff., Goodwin §36ff., Mayser II/1:138ff., McKay 1992:212ff. (Greek). Cf. Le Goffic's "Fictivity": fictif, as against "true-ness": le vrai, comes close to our "removedness from reality" (Le Goffic 1986).

(5) Anaphoric abstracting of preceding Narrative, metanarrative, internal evaluation and similar: Casparis 1975:119ff. for the English present tense used for synopsis, authorial comment, résumé condensing etc.; Fludernik 1991:368, 377ff. for the English present in internal evaluation and "consequences, results and reactions that occur in the wake of items"; Gildersleeve 1903 §218, Goodwin 1965 §§39-40, on the Greek Imperfect ("Imperfect of points assumed... the result of a previous discussion" "a fact just recognized as such"); also Sicking and Stork's important discussion of the Herodotean Imperfect ("P[resent] S[tem]"); 1996:66f. ("... by using a PS Herodotus invites his audience to connect the subordinate clause and the main clause in question so as to form one complex and integrated whole rather than two separate units of information... From a viewpoint of reference, the subordinating conjunction ἔπειρ suggests to the reader that, in the reality referred to, the situation mentioned in the subclause in some significant way relates to the situation that is the referent of the main clause..."; also ibid. 85, 93 (Historical Present for expressing the "hard core of the narrative"). Gildersleeve 1903:8220 on the Greek Imperfect expressing the "sudden appreciation of a real state of things"). See Ruksbaron 1988 for the cataphoric functional component of the Herodotean Greek.
Imperfect (in the sense of “something is about to happen”: “signalling that the author will continue his story elsewhere...raising expectations as to what is going to happen next”); in NT Greek, the Present marks “a major shift to another aspect of the story...cataphoric... to set the stage for an event” (Osburn 1986). On the narrative functions in point in general, beyond specific tenses, see Schiffrin 1981:59 for internal evaluation; Hamon 1974:6 for Narrative-Grammar “anaphoricity” (“linguistic forms which may refer with concession to anterior and remote mentions”). On anaphoric grounding see Givón 1995:68ff. Kleiber 2003. For the author’s “high level evaluative generalization” (in English and general), cf. Tomlin 1985:116 (though I cannot accept his absolute correlation of “foregrounding with the syntactically independent, backgrounder with dependence”, e.g. p.87ff.; this last issue is investigated also by Matthesen and Thompson 1988). See also Ehrlich 1990 on resumé condensing. The concept of the Imperfect as a “stratigraphical” tense — signalling partly overlapping actions, a kind of multilayer condensing — also recalls ἐν- πέ (Stavinhová 1978:18ff.).

(6) It is possible to view the Narrator’s interventions as “parentheticals” (see Banfield 1982:42ff., 71ff., 76ff., 189ff.); but it is then difficult to accept her “parentheticals allow no true negation” (47, 84ff.) — in our CM negation is typical. See Pollak 1988:144ff.; For the special asymmetry of the negative Imperfect in Greek, see Svensson 1930:103ff.


A contrastive chart of combinatory parameters of ἐν- + zero and ἐν- πέ in narrative:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters:</th>
<th>ἐν- πέ</th>
<th>ἐν- zero</th>
<th>ἐν-ἀ- πέ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἐκφ., ἐπιδή</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἔκ</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑπόθ -shift</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἔκ-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>further conversion</td>
<td>(*)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>topicalization + (ἔκ)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presentation</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negation</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static Rheme</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“infinitive” Rheme</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adverbial Rheme</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) rarely attested; (-) unattested
(d) Representative commented documentation

(1) ne-, nape-/naq- -Ø

(1) Dramatic focus-shift: closeup zooming-in, focussing on an action (dynamic) as slow-motion presentation, or on a state as a tableau; dramatic event presentation; narrative focussing or highlighting, narrative peak; “freezing the moment”; “blow-up”, visually vivid “freeze-frames”. Observe cases of ghippe ic presentative superordination:

Ex. 34:29 γως δε επινόητ επεσέπτ ἥζε-μώτσχες εβολ δεπιτώσως νεκνὰ + οτορ γιχπε ναρε-τπλαξ σνοτ+ νωνι χν δεπένεκαξαξ μωτσχες + επινόητ δε επεσέπτ εβολ γιπιτώσως + οτορ ναφεμέι αν νε ἥζε-μώτσχες δε
dεπιπώσων ἥζε-ντο μπανομ ηπεπεφμ — EM and CM in syntagmatic contrast: the first ne- Ø depicting a tableau, the subsequent ne- πε supplying background information for the action (see below), for negative cognition verbs. So too:

Gen. 29:2 γιχπε ic οτωμαι νακχ νεκτκοι νακχ δε

Gen. 7:17f. οτορ αθαμαι ἥζε-πιμωτον οτορ αρτωσων
κτέβωτος οτορ ακακι θεόλ γαπκαγι οτορ ναπαμαγι

Gen. 25:25 αρι δε εβολ ἥζε-πεσωρι πεσωρι μμικι...

Gen. 24:45 οτορ ασωπι μπατζεκναιαξαξ εβολ δε

Gen. 47:11f. οτορ άινσχφ οτερεπιζωτ δεμνεπεννητον
νωποι οτορ αρντ νωτοι ηνναμαγι ... οτορ ναρε-ίωςφ

Ex. 14:22 οτορ αρι εκσοτον ἥζε-νεσωρι μπολ ειμητ

— the dramatic-tableau effect here is striking, with the moment frozen: a fine instance of EM state.
Gen. 32:24 ἄρχομαι δὲ νάξε-ιακώβ μνασάτη οὐσός νῆπιον μετάναξε-ιακώβ ἑλείναι ὑπέρφηρι.

See below, for the “blurred-reality” (dream-quality) interpretation of this strange, even eery passage.

Ex. 5:10:19 νασάνης δὲ νοσῶν νάξε-νιοργοδίωζκτης... νασώου ἐπολα ἐσαρχὸν μῆνος Νέ-ναιον ἐν ἔτεαξι μὴνος νάξε-παράφ... νασάνης δὲ ἐρσώος νάξε-νιοργοδίωζκτης ἑλείναι ἀποκρύψεις... — this is an uncommon case of chronicling sequencing (rather than concatenation) in Enhanced Evolution Mode.

Num. 13:23 οὐσός αὐχετετόκαινα νηματός νασάνης νάξε-παράφ... νασάνης μηνοῦς ἡγάρων ὑπέρφηρι ὑπέρφηρι νασάνης μηνοῦς... — a nice instance of a zoom-in slow shift, flanked by normal-pace narration.

(2) Verbs of cognition/perception — the perceived, in dramatic close-up or slow-motion (“camera’s-eye” focus):

Gen. 19:28 ἄγνασις ἐπιπέπεις νασάνης ἐπολα νάξε-παράφ ἐπολα σεντκαρια μὴρ ἑπιπέπεις νοσάμενος περσί.


Gen. 19:14 αὐχετετό καὶ Νξεναώνων μεμτό Νξεναώνων (Greek ἔδοξεν δὲ γελοιωτείν).

Ex. 3:2 ἄγνασις Νξε-ναρε-πιβατός ὁς Νξρωμ οὐσός πιβατός ναρόκαρ οἱ πε (= Vat) — a striking contrast: ἑς- Ὠ “paint-brush”, ἑς- πε “but at the same time...” CM (negative!) staging.

(3) Closeup zooming-in or “lingering camera” on an initial obtaining situation, essential to the plot and/or to protagonist characterization. A common and important category:

Gen. 22:6ff. αὐχετετό Καὶ Νξε-ἄβραμ Νξιροκάρ Ντεπισίλια Αἀ-ταλανοῦ εξενικακ... οὐσός αὐχετετό αὐχενωτὸς Νξε-μπάτ ετοξοπ Πξέ-ιακάκ δὲ νάξπραμ [... ἀπέ- άβραμ ἃς [... οὐσός αὐχετετό Αἀ-μπὰτ ετοξοπ αὕτι εφικτάς αὐξανακ ἀνάχι — the dynamic situation (“they walked”) is here resumed in closeup or slow motion as an initial delimitation (“they were walking”) following an intervening Dialogue.

Gen. 30:36 ιακώβ δὲ ναμόνι Νξενεκσωτὸς Ντελαβάν... Αἰακώβ δὲ-ναξον Ναςώμπος Νξε Ντετράκ — this is the initial situation to the passage describing Jacob’s magical “genetic engineer-
ing" of Laban’s cattle, strongly recalling the marked role of the conjunctive in Late Egyptian narrative, opening a salient (and magical) characterization of the protagonist (P. D’Orbigny 1.4ff., see Shisha-Halevy 1995a:301ff.).

Gen. 1:1-2 ἐνοπτῆρον αὐτὸ θεαίον πτερο υπό νεότατον ἐρωτήρια αὐτοὶ οὐκ ἦν ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ οὗτος αὐτὰς τιθέται ἐνεμφανίσοντο ἄνθρωπον θεαίον λαβώνῳ εἰς ἐνεμφανίσοντο... — the ultimate initial situation.

Gen. 42:6 ἰωσήφ δὲ πατὴρ αὐτῶν εὐπρεπής οὐκ ἦν ἱππος ἱππάς ὁ πατὴρ ἦν ἑπρεπής ἑπρεπής

Gen. 39:2f. οὗτος ἐναρεμένος εἶναι οὐκ ἦν ἰωσήφ οὗτος οὐκ ἦν ἱππάς ἱππάς... (Vat om. ὁ πατὴρ). ἐν-περ marks CM that gives the reason for the subsequent text. ὁ πατὴρ is difficult, but existence is here well attested, and a Nominative Sentence would be lectio facilior.

Gen. 22:1 οὗτος ἰσώμπι καὶ ἐνεμφανίσοντο ἐναρέ-μένος... ἐναρέ-μένος ἰσώμπι καὶ ἐνεμφανίσοντο... ἐναρέ-μένος... (Vat om. ὁ πατὴρ). ἐν-περ marks CM that gives the reason for the subsequent text. ὁ πατὴρ is difficult, but existence is here well attested, and a Nominative Sentence would be lectio facilior.

Gen. 37:3 ἦν κακόςα ὁ πατὴρ οὗτος ἦν κακόςα ὁ πατὴρ οὗτος ἦν κακόςα...

Gen. 18:22 οὗτος ἐναρέ-μένος... ἐναρέ-μένος... ἐναρέ-μένος... (Vat om. ὁ πατὴρ). ἐν-περ marks CM that gives the reason for the subsequent text. ὁ πατὴρ is difficult, but existence is here well attested, and a Nominative Sentence would be lectio facilior.

Gen. 27:23 ἐναρέ-μένος... ἐναρέ-μένος... (Vat om. ὁ πατὴρ). ἐν-περ marks CM that gives the reason for the subsequent text. ὁ πατὴρ is difficult, but existence is here well attested, and a Nominative Sentence would be lectio facilior.

(4) Essential narrative information: basic or enframing or “obstinate” obtaining narrative situation (typically initial, sometimes medial):

Deut. 9:9 εἰς ἐξωτερικήν καὶ ἀνεμένωμεν καὶ ἐνεκουσάμενοι ἐκκεντροποιοῦσμεν ἐκκεντροποιοῦσμεν ἐκκεντροποιοῦσμεν ἐκκεντροποιοῦσμεν... — the situation here is not part of the setting, but a basic component of the evolution.
Gen. 11:1f. οτος Ναρε-παρι οι Νοτσφωτος Νοσωτ νεμ οτσιν Νοσωτ οτος Αςωμπι ετακιν Μμωσι ... ατακιν Νοτσφωτος οτος Αςωμπι Μματ ... οτος Νεδιοσρινι Μπερφιρ.

Num. 11:1 (and 4:2) οτος πιλας Ναξρεμρεν Νγακπετ-γρωσι Μπεμεο Μπετ οτος Αςωτεμ Νξε-πετ.

Gen. 42:7 εταηνας Νξε-ιωσιν Ενενσνιν Ενσωμν Νακρινι Μμου Νμεμο Εβολ Εσρων — οπαρε τιντ Νεπρουν καταρα τιςπ τηςςΝτενενπνρι Μπέλ Νωσο Νε Νατριν Εντενι-ρωσι Ντεμοκρην.

Deut. 9:15 (cf. also 5:23) εταικοτ ται επεεσ υνι-των οτος πιτων Νακρον Νξρων τπα θ τοι νατε Νενες Ενταξι ς τ (= Vat) — locutive “recycled” reminiscent narrative.

Gen. 23:10 Εφων Νε Νακγεμι Ενεμθ Ννενσρον Νξετ Αςερων Νε Νξε-εφων Πικτετος Ναβραμ Πε- ηαρ Εςωτεμ Νξε-νενσρον Νξετ Νεμ οτον Νιμ Ετνα Ενσον ετουκι...

Deut. 25:17ff. νως Ναργι Οτσικ Ετινυτ Οτος Αξοσι Μπεκατ ... Νοοκ Νε Νακροκερ Οτος Ναξνοι (= Vat).

Ex. 24:17f. πιινι Νε Μπιων Ντεψεν Νανοι Μφρη Ννι- ξρων Εξηωσι Ενταξινι Μπιτων Μμεμο Ννενπρι Μπέλ Οτος Αξεναν Νξε-Μμωσεις Ενσον Εεμθ Ντεψην...

Gen. 41:46 (and often sim.) ιωσι Νε Ναξκενι Νρομπι ετα- ηογι ερατι Μμεμο Μφραμ ... οτος Αι Νξε-ιωσι...

— age specification as enframing Obtaining Situation.

(5) Verba dicendi:

Deut. 1:25 ετακινωτες ατας Ενενσνιας Εβολ Ενενσνι- ηνατας Ντεψερι ατα επεεσ Εαρων οτος Ναξσω Μμος Ζε - a case of speech quoted in “recycled” revisited Narrative (see below).

Ex. 12:33, 19:19 Μμωσεις Νε Ναξκαζι Ζι Νε Ναξερων

Ex. 17:2 οτος Νακγεμροςι Νξε-πιλαος Εμωσιςς οτος Ναξσω Μμος Ζε-Μαμωντ Ναν...
(6) Verbs of cognition:
Ex. 20:18 ὅτῳς πιλάδος τὴν ἁμαρτίαν εἶχαν οὐκ ἦν ἡ μισθοπάθεια ἡμῶν ὀτε ἐπταταύν ὑποτηκορος.

(7) Essential narrative information: incidental statal-nominal predication:
Gen. 10:8-9 χωρὶς δὲ ἀρχαίων ἡμερῶν διανεργήτης ναο-νατζεπίνταγι ναοῦ οἶνος οἰνόν οἶνος οἶνος
Cf. also Gen. 42:6, Ex. 14:22 etc.

(8) Essential narrative information: statal-adverbial predication:
Gen. 2:12 πινοῦσα δὲ ντεπίνταγι ετεμμασ νανευ ὅτῳς ναπε-πιείνι ναοταν ναζεσι μνασ (= Vat).

(9) Cut-away, focus-shift and zooming-in:
Gen. 18:16 ἀντιμνοσ δὲ εβολα μνασ ... ἀντιανοτε ἐξεν-προ νεοδομα ... ἀβρααμ δὲ ναμβονι δεμνωσ ερτζο μμουσ εβολ.

(10) Resultative-iterative Aktionsart action-amplifying role:
Gen. 30:38f. ...οτῷς αἰχανιοὺςτε ἑτακκοκον οἰνοπι οἰνοπι ντετεμις ντετεμις ινα αρρααν ναζενιεσως εοω
νεσεσιμπον ενιούς σιοδος ναζενιεσως οτῳς ναρμις ναζενιεσως ναραντον ετῳ νεοιοθοι νοσωβυ...

(11) Totalizing-iterative Aktionsart action-amplifying role:
Deut. 9:22 ξεπιρωξε ξεπιρωματικος ξεπιρωματικος ξεπιρωματικος ξεπιρωματικος — second-
person-plural recycled reminiscent narrative.

(12) Diffused-action “plurality” Aktionsart action-amplifying role: iterative:
Ex. 18:13 οτῳς αἰσχωμι μενενκαπεφας διαγεμις ναζε
μωτσεσ ετζαπ επιλαος οτῳς ναρογι ερατς ναζε-πιλαος
τὴν μπκκωτσι μμωτσεσ.

(II) ΝΕ-, ΝΑΡΕ-/ΝΑΩ- + ΠΕ

(1) “Psychologistic” information on internal mental/emotional/intellectual/cognitive background states (and/or their physical manifestation) as motive or cause or as the reason why for Evolution Mode context:
Gen. 29:20 ἀφερῆςκεν ἦν ἀρμόπὶ ὅς ἀπὸ τὴν ἀλήθειας διεμέναι σὲ μὴ δέχαται νοσθεμένοι αὐξάνοντο καὶ ἀρξάμενοι ἂν γε-ἀναφεραμεν ἡμὸς σὲ — the same information is presented as EM (Preterite) in verse 18: ἰακὼβ δὲ ἀφερῆςκεν πράξας.

Gen. 37:4 εὐταράντος διὸ περὶ ἡμῶν ἐκεῖνος δὲ αὐξάνεται ἡμῖν αὐξάνεται ἡμῖν ἃ ἐστὶν ἡμᾶς.

Ex. 1:21 εἰπέως ἂν ἀληθῶς ὁ μήτε σὲ ἂν λέγει τῷ ἐνυγαλοὶ... ἐκεῖνοι ἡμῖν.

Ex. 2:15 ἄνευ τὸν καὶ ἂν ἑλείῳ ἦρεμον ἑλείῳ τὸν καὶ ἀνθρώπων κρατοῦν ἀρνὸς κρατοῦν ἂν ἐκεῖνος κρατοῦν κρατοῦν ἀρνὸς κρατοῦν... (κρατοῦν super lin.).

Gen. 37:11 ἀρχηγὸς ἐτῶν ἑτῶν ἀρχηγὸς ἐτῶν ἑτῶν ἐτῶν... περί άν ἡμᾶς ἐν αὐξάνεται ἡμῖν.

Gen. 24:21 πηρωμὶ δὲ ἡμῶν ἡμῖν ἐστὶν τόπων ἐγὼ ἐγώ... (ἀρχηγὸς ἐτῶν... in Dialogue, below).

Gen. 31:2 αὐτῶν ἄνασα τὸ δὲ ἀρχηγὸς ἐτῶν ἀρχηγὸς ἐτῶν ἀρχηγὸς ἐτῶν... εἰ δὲ ἐστὶν ἡμῖν ἡμῖν... (ἀρχηγὸς ἐτῶν... in Dialogue, below).

(2) Explicatory-relevance background: the (physical or metaphysical) ground, cause, motive or reason why for Evolution Mode context.

Num. 22:3 αὐτῶν ἀφερῆςκεν ἀρχηγὸς ἐτῶν ἀρχηγὸς ἐτῶν... (ἀρχηγὸς ἐτῶν... in Dialogue, below).

(3) “Narrator’s Channel”: shift-away from the narrated world to narrator/audience present situation. Synoptic, panoramic or “bird’s-eye-view”; “from then on”. Narrator’s anaphoric (reprise) abstracting, chronicling, generalizing, paraphrasing, condensing, reviewing, elaborating of foregoing EM plot facts. Internal evaluation of the facts as fraught with significance; cases of “und zwar”, “and (he) did”, “and in fact...” etc. Meta-narrative information.

Ex. 1:19 θανμίκι γαρ ιακιν-μπατοτι εξοτιν γαρωσ
ναε-νιερομειο οτορ γαμμίκι πε — “and indeed they did (in this case)” — anaphorically reaffirming an atemporal “event” and applying this to a historical past event.

Num. 9:16 παρπιν τανμπον πε νχοτ ιεβεν οτορ ναρε-
τσηνι εωοε μμοε πε.

Deut. 2:14f. οτορ νιεοοτ ετανατοσ μμογι... αε ινομπι
με γατεγει ειολ ναε-τγεεα τχρ ψενειρομι μπολε-
μιςσΗε ειολ ςεντψασμβλολ... οτορ ναρε-ταϊκ ημετ
χθ γααωοε πε εσοοτ ειολ ςεντψασμβλολ γατεγει...
— a metaphysical perspective is added here to the reworking of the narrative development in EM (in a Narrative that is itself “recycled”): a clear und zwar case of with explicatory relevance. So too:

Gen. 37:25 ηηπην ει γαιιχμαλατης εημογι ιηηηηωιηη
εηηνοε ειολ ιηηηηηηηηη... ναμογι δε πε ετηννο
εηφη εηηημι — a different (and just briefly hinted-at) story — that of the Medianite traders — converging at this point with the main one, viz. “Joseph and his Brothers”.

Gen. 26:13 οτορ αρηιν ναε-πιερομι ναμογι εαιι πε
γατεγερνηντι εμαιω — a rapid, condensed paraphrastic resumé of the plot.

Ex. 2:9 (“απε επιαλοο ετορ μαγιναη ηη”)... αεηη αε
ναε-τςηιηι τππηελεο ετορ ναηςηιαη πε (= Vat) — another clear case of “and so she did”.

Ex. 9:23f. ανμοόο ναε-ππε νπηελ εηφη εηζεηπηκαη
tηηηη ηενεημι ιαημπον δε ναε-πηε ιε ετορ πηηρο
ηαηιηεη ειολ ςενπιαλ πιηλ δε ιαημο εμαιω πε
εμαιω (Vat ιαημπον δε ναε-πηε ιε ... ιαηιηεη ειολ
ςενπιαλ πε πιηλ δε ιαημο εμαιω εμαιω) — a nice alternation of narrative back-stepping and slow, closeup progress.
Ex. 14:8 οὐκ ἀπε-πριν πάραρω νῦνοτ νεμ νεκα-
λωτι οὐρ θάσσοι καθάρω οὐνεψηρί μπίςα νε-
ησηρὶ δε μπιςα νασσομίν εβόλο πε σενωτιξ εσο-
δοι. — condensed, resulting, summing-up conclusion.

Gen. 8:3 οὐρ θαταγνο νάε-πιμωνας δι οὐρ ναγ-
τοτι νάε-πιμωσι οὐρ θαμαμίν εβόλο γαπαρι ναγ-
τοτι πε δι οὐρ ναμνον νσβκοι πε νάε-πιμωσι με-
νενσα-πιν ινεος δι οὐρ ασγερι νάε-κικψτος... — a
complicated passage, specifying Joseph’s duty and functioning in a
sophisticated way, in Coptic as in Hebrew, but flattened and simplified in
the Greek.

Gen. 7:18 οὐρ οςε κα νσκνοι νάε-κικψτος καιβσι
μπιμωσι δι πιμωσι δε οςκαμαρι πε εμαυμ ριενπικαρι
οὐρ αργωςι οντυ ρως τηςω εσοδι...

Gen. 32:22 οὐρ ανταρψωρι μμωι πε νάε-ντατο
μπεκμεν ινεο δε ηνκεροι ηεπιεξφρρ εκεμινη;
ηενταρεβολη ακτωνι δε μπιμωρρ εκεμινη... con-
densing of verses 17-21.

Several particularly difficult loci probably belong here:

Num. 21:6... οὐρ απε-στι ασσωρι ουνποι εκοτν επιλογ
ειωαδωτεβ οὐρ νασκιλαπι οσκιλαο πε οὐρ αγ-
μοτ νάε-οτινιπι μμνετ οτενεψηρι μπιςα — the
non-narrative information is here anaphoric and thematic, a narrative pause
making for suspense. Clearly similar are:

Gen. 44:12 αξοται ροται αται οσκικο... νασκητο-
ετ δε ρε απερστοτε καιενψηρι γατεψτοσ επικοτα
οὐρ αδκιμι νέψταλη δενποκ μενειαμι (= Vat).

Gen. 40:4 οὐρ απίμνοτητ ταρχων νεμ ιωσιφ άκθιτο-
τοτι ναγτζερθο εροσν οὐρ ναρογι ασνοτ οσκο
δε πε δενπιστεκο νγανεος.

(4) “Parallel shots”: marked and significant simultaneity with narra-
tive EM events “all this time” “and/but at the (very) same time...”,
shifting to a parallel world that is typically cataphorically significant
(i.e. turns out to be important in the sequel):

Gen. 33:3 αθέρεψβακι εοτ εσκ οτηθν νεμ ντο-
σηρι λια δε Μεμ οκαλωτι διφαρω μμων οὐρ ραχα
λεμ ιωσιφ επιε ανεο δε οαρσκ βαξων πε οὐρ
αγωσνυτ ι-ξ ινοπ...

Gen. 17:23ff. αἰγὶ ἄβρααμ ἀνίκητα ΠΗΕΩΡΙ ΝΕΜ 
ΝΕΚΜΕΓΕΝΗΙ ... ΩΤΟΤ ΑΠΟΣΩΒΕΤΣΑΡΝ ΝΕΤΕΠΜΕΤΑΤΣΕΒΙ 
... ἄβρααμ δέ ΝΑΧΧΗ ΣΕΠΝΟΡΝ ΝΡΟΜΝΙ ΕΤΑΠΟΣΩΒΕΤΣΑΡΝ 
ΝΕΤΕΠΜΕΤΑΤΣΕΒΙ — Moses’s vision of the burning bush may also 
have a dreamlike quality, formally verging on the Dream Narrative 
texteme (discussed and illustrated below); note that it is the second, 
negated clause that is staged as CM.

Ex. 3:2 ἈΡΝΑΤ ΔΕ-ΝΑΡΕ-ΠΙΒΑΤΟΣ ΜΟΡ ΝΧΡΩΜ ΩΤΟΤ ΠΙΒΑ-
ΤΟΣ ΝΑΧΡΟΚΖ ΑΝ ΠΕ (= Vat).

(5) “Omniscient Narrator’s Channel” — information on goal, inten-
tion, significance of Evolution Mode context:
Gen. 37:34 ΙΑΚΩΒ ΔΕ ΑΦΙΩΡΗ ΝΝΕΡΚΒΩΣ ... ΝΑΧΡΟΡΗΒΙ ΠΕ.

(6) Specification content (second object actant) of seeing — the scene 
seen being presented as external to, and removed from, narrative reality 
(see above on ΝΑΤ ΔΕ-ΝΑΡ-, without ΠΕ):
Gen. 6:12 ΩΤΟΤ ἈΡΝΑΤ ΝΔΕ-ΦΠΤ ΕΠΙΚΑΡΙ = ΩΤΟΤ ΝΑΤΑΚ-
ΗΝΟΥΤ ΠΕ.
Gen. 42:27 ἈΡΝΑΤ ΕΦΜΟΤΡ ΜΠΕΡΓΑΤ + ΝΑΧΧΗ ΓΙΡΨΝ ΜΠΗ-
ΣΟΚ ΠΕ.
Gen. 31:2 ἈΡΝΑΤ ΝΔΕ-ΙΑΚΩΒ ΕΠΓΟ ΝΑΛΑΒΑΝ + ΔΕ-ΝΑΡΟΙ 
ΜΦΡΗΤ ΝΧΑΡΝ ΝΕΜ ΓΕΦΟΟΤ ΝΕΜΑΡ ΑΝ ΠΕ...

Consider the dialogic projection of the same text in verse 5, without 
ΠΕ: ΤΝΑΤ ΑΝΟΚ ΕΡΓΟ ΜΠΕΤΕΝΙΩΤ + ΔΕ-ΧΟΙ ΜΦΡΗΤ ΤΝΧΑΡ 
ΝΕΜ ΓΕΦΟΟΤ ΝΕΜΗΙ ΑΝ.

Compare also ΝΕ-Α- ΠΕ in the actential-content slot:
Ex. 39:43 ἈΡΝΑΤ ΝΔΕ-ΜΨΧΗΣ ΕΝΙΓΒΗΟΤΙ ΜΠΡΟΤ ΩΤΟΤ 
ΝΕΤΕΑΜΙΩΤΟΤ ΠΕ.

(7) Some instructive ΝΕ- ΠΕ cases of special interest:
(a) ΝΑΚΟΙ ΜΒΨΚ ΠΕ ΑΕΝΠΚΑΡΙ ΝΧΗΜΗΙ (ect.) (Deut. 6:21, 
15:15, 24:18:20), interlocutive (1st/2nd persons, sgl. and plur.), always 
with ΠΕ, presented as a narrative fragment, or as a meta-narrative con-
densed circumstance that is simultaneously also a narrative epitome 
(précis of a story, such as Deut. 26:5ff.), and a permanent reminder, ever 
evocative of the entire complex narrative of “Israel’s Captivity and Lib-
eration by God” (still the core-sentence of the Haggadah or main text in 
the Jewish Passover Seder ritual: “For Ye Were Slaves in the Land of 
Egypt”). Contrast this with (Deut. 25:18) ΝΕΧ ΑΕ ΝΑΚΓΟΚΕΡ
οτόν ΝΑΙΣΟΞΙ, which are truly narrative and amplified at that. Similarly, in Ex. 23:9 we have ΝΑΡΕΤΕΝΟΙ ΓΡΑΦ ΜΠΟΡΕΣΙΤΟΣ ΓΩΤΕΝ ΠΕ. Only in Ex. 22:21 ΝΑΡΕΤΕΝΟΙ ΓΡΑΦ ΝΩΣΜΗΝ ΓΩΤΕΝ ΠΕ we find Vat — not P — omitting ΠΕ.

(b) Equally dialogic, and equally causal, is Num. 31:15f. ΕΕΒΕΟΥ ΑΡΕΤΕΝΑΝΣΕΓΙΜΙ ΝΙΒΕΝ ÷ ΝΑΙ ΓΡΑΦ ΝΑΤΨΩΠ ΠΕ ΝΩΤΡΙΚΙ ΝΝΕΝΨΗΡΙ ΜΠΙΚΑ...

(c) ΝΑΝΕΣ ΠΕ, ΝΕΝΩΣ ΠΕ: Gen. 24:16, 26:7 ΑΚΕΡΓΟΤ... ΔΕΟΤΗ ΓΡΑΦ ΕΝΕΝΩΣΕ ΠΕ Π (Vat ΝΕΝΕΣΕ ΠΕ — also staging as cause?), 29:17, 39:6.

(d) Comparing our manuscript with Vat in cases like Gen. 13:5ff. (really very rare) brings home the "translator-subjectivity" factor in staging and presenting events as causal (CM) or as non-causal (essential Obtaining Situation): λωτ δε γων ΦΙΗ ΕΝΕΛΟΥΝ ΝΜΕΑΒΡΑΜ ΝΑΤΨΩΠ ΝΑΨ ΠΕ ΝΔΕ-ΣΑΝΕΝΣΟΥ ΝΗΜ ΓΑΝΕΓΨΟΥ ΝΗΜ ΓΑΝ-ΣΚΗΝΗ ΝΑΡΕ-ΠΙΚΑΓΙ ΔΕ ΕΤΕΜΜΑΤ ΨΨΠΙ (sic, for ΨΨΠΙ) ΜΜΨΟΥ ΑΝ ΠΕ ΕΕΡΟΤΨΨΨΙ ΞΙΟΤΜΑ ΔΕ-ΝΑΡΕ-ΠΕΤΕΝΤΨΟΥ ΟΨ ΝΑΤΨΨΗΜΔΟΜ ΑΝ ΠΕ ΕΨΨΠΙ ΞΙΟΤΜΑ ÷ ΟΤΟΥΡ ΓΨΨΠΙ ΝΔΕ-ΟΨΨΟΥΝ ΟΤΤΕ-ΝΙΜΑΝΕΝΨΟΥ ΝΤΕΝΙΤΕΝΨΟΥΝ ΝΕΑΒΡΑΜ ΝΗΜ ΟΤΤΕ-ΝΙΜΑΝΕΝΨΟΥ ΝΤΕΝΙΤΕΝΨΟΥΝ ΝΤΕΛΨΤ ΝΙ-ΧΑΝΑΝΕΟΣ ΔΕ ΝΗΜ ΝΙΨΕΡΕΕΟΣ ΝΑΤΨΨΠ ΠΕ ΞΙΩΝΠΙΚΑΓΙ ΜΠΙΝΨΟΥ ΕΤΕΜΜΑΤ ΠΕΔΕΑΒΡΑΜ ΔΕ ΝΛΩΤ... (Vat ΝΑΤΨΨΠ ΝΑΨ/ΝΑΡΕ-ΠΙΚΑΓΙ ΔΕ ΕΤΕΜΜΑΤ ΨΨΠΙ ΜΜΨΟΥ ΑΝ ΠΕ / ΔΕ-ΝΑΡΕ-ΠΕΤΕΝΤΨΟΥ ΟΨ ΠΕ / ΝΑΤΨΨΗΜΔΟΜ ΑΝ ΠΕ ΕΨΨΠΙ ΞΙΟΤΜΑ / ΝΑΤΨΨΠ.

(e) Passages difficult to assign or judge are remarkably few, considering the bulk of the evidence:

Deut. 5:4 ...ΟΤΟΥ ΑΝΟΚ ΝΑΙΟΓΙ ΕΡΑΤ ΠΕ ΟΤΤΕΝΣΟ ΝΕΜΨ- ΣΟΝ ... ΕΤΑΜΩΣΟΝ ΕΝΙΚΑΙΝΙ ΟΤΤΕΝΣΟ ΔΕ-ΑΡΕΤΕΝΕΡΡΟΤ† ΞΑΤΗΝ ΜΠΙΟ ΜΠΙΧΡΨΜ — reminiscent Narrative.

Deut. 5:24 ...ΟΤΟΥ ΝΑΡΕΤΕΝΔΨ ΜΜΟΣ ΠΕ ΔΕ-ΨΗΠΠΕ ΑΡΤΑΜΟΝ ΝΔΕ-ΠΙΣ ΔΙΕΝΕΨΟΥ ΠΟΤΟΓ ΤΕΨΜΗ ΑΝΝΟΜΨΜΕΝ ΔΕΝΟΜΗΝ† ΜΠΙΧΡΨΜ ΕΨΨΠΙ ΑΝΨΨΝΟΤΡΨΤΟΤΝ ... ΤΕΝΝΑ- ΜΟΤ (= Vat) — ΝΑΡΕΤΕΝΔΨ ΜΜΟΣ ΠΕ may here be external to the narrative proper, this being a "recycled" first-person-centered reminiscent one.

(8) Striking paradigmatic or syntagmatic EM:CM opposition cases (ΝΕ- Ø vs. ΝΕ- ΠΕ):
(See also above for paradigmatic opposition following ΝΑΣ “see” and with age specification);

(a) ΧΗ — copula with adverbial Rhemes:
Gen. 41:56 ΝΑΡΕ-ΠΙΡΚΟ ΓΑΡ ΧΗ ΕΙΔΕΝΕΠΠΟ ΜΠΙΚΑΙ ΤΗΡΗ ΠΕ ΛΨΩΝ ΔΕ ΝΑΣ-ΙΨΗΧΦ ΝΝΙΔΕΨΡ ΤΗΡΟΤ ΝΟΣΟ ΟΤΟΡ ΝΑΨ† ΕΒΟΛ ΝΝΙΡΕΝΜΧΗΜ ΤΗΡΟΤ.

(b) Existence and possession:
Existence is properly speaking a pre-predication introduction into discourse, not predicative nexus, and thus in a sense a special preparatory type of setting; yet a distinction is formally signalled by means of ΠΕ between incidental and plot-pertinent existential (and possessive) settings, the former Narrator’s “bonus” information, the latter of true “Obtaining Situation” status:

NE-ΟΤΟΝΤΕ-Ø: obtaining possession-situation — plot-essential:
Gen. 16:1 ΑΡΑ ΔΕ ΤΩΓΙΜΙ ΝΑΒΡΑΜ ΝΑΣΜΙΚΙ ΝΑΨ ΑΝ ΠΕ ΝΕΟΤΟΝΤΕΣ-ΟΤΒΨΚΙ ΜΜΑΣ ΝΡΕΝΜΧΗΜ ΕΠΕΡΑΝ ΠΕ ΑΓΑΡ ∕ ΠΕΝΕΚΑΡΑ ΔΕ ΝΑΒΡΑΜ...
Ex. 2:16 ΠΙΟΣΝΗ ΔΕ ΝΤΕΜΑΣΙΑΜ ΝΕΟΤΟΝΤΑΨ Ν-Σ ΝΨΕΠΙ ΜΜΑΣ ΕΤΩΝΙ ΝΝΙΕΣΨΟΤ ΝΤΕΙΟΨΟΡ ΠΟΨΙΨΤ.
Gen. 24:29 ΡΕΒΕΚΚΑ ΔΕ ΝΕΟΤΟΝΤΕΣ-ΟΤΣΟΝ ΜΜΑΣ ΕΠΕΡΑΝ ΠΕ ΛΑΒΑΝ.
NE-ΜΜΟΝ-Ø (very rare) — dramatic obtaining situation:
Gen. 45:1 ...ΟΤΟΡ ΝΕΜΜΟΝ-ΓΛΙ ΟΓΙ ΕΡΑΤΨ ΝΕΜ ΙΨΗΧΨ ΗΣΟΤΕ ΕΠΛΝΟΤΟΝΨΕ ΕΝΕΨΚΝΗΣΟΤ.
As against
NE-ΟΤΟΝ-/ΜΜΟΝ(ΤΕ-): explicatory-relevance background, The Omniscient Narrator’s “inside information”:
Gen. 8:9 ΔΙΑΤΑΚΟΟ ... ΕΞΩΝ ΕΤΕΚΨΒΩΤΟΣ ΔΕ-ΝΕΟΤΟΝ-ΜΨΟΤ ΠΕ ΕΙΔΕΝΕΠΠΟ ΜΠΙΚΑΙ ΤΗΡΗ.
Ex. 12:30 ΔΟΝΨΙΨ† ΝΑΨΩΝ ΨΨΨΙ ΔΕΝΠΙΚΑΙ ΤΗΡΗ ΝΤΕΨΧΗΜ ΝΕΜΜΟΝ-ΗΙ ΓΑΡ ΠΕ ΜΝΕΟΤΟΝ ΜΟΓ ΝΛΗΨΥ.
Num. 20:2 ΝΕΜΜΟΝ-ΜΨΟΤ ΠΕ ΔΕΝΤΣΕΝΑΓΨΗΝ ΔΣΨΨΩΝ†.
Num. 3:4 ΟΤΟΡ ΔΨΜΟΤ ΝΑΣ-ΛΑΛΨ ΝΕΜ ΛΒΙΟΤΑ ... ΟΤΟΡ ΝΕΜΜΟΝΤΟΤ ΨΨΡΙ ΜΜΑΣ ΠΕ ΟΤΟΡ ΔΨΡΟΤΗΒ ΝΑΣ-ΕΛΑΖΑΡ ΝΕΜ ΛΩΜΑΡ ΝΕΜ ΔΡΨΨΗΝ ΠΟΨΙΨΤ.
Gen. 41:8 ΑΦΑΡΑΨ ΔΕ-ΤΕΨΡΑΣΩΤΙ ΝΨΟΤ ΟΤΟΡ ΝΕΜΜΟΝ-ΨΗ ΕΤΣΑΜΟ ΑΦΑΡΑΨ ΕΡΟΣ ΠΕ.
Cf. NE- ΠΕ in the environment of “being unable”.
Also Gen. 41:49, 43:32, 45:1.
(c) Some other striking instances of ἐν vs. zero opposition:

Gen. 8:3 οὗτος ἀρέτα ἐφημείρει ἕνωσε ... οὗτος ἀρέτα ἐνοικιαζόμενοι ... οὗτος ἀρέτα ἐνοικιαζόμενοι ... οὗτος ἀρέτα ἐνοικιαζόμενοι ἐνοικιαζόμενοι ... οὗτος ἀρέτα ἐνοικιαζόμενοι ἐνοικιαζόμενοι ... οὗτος ἀρέτα ἐνοικιαζόμενοι 

Gen. 34:19 οὗτος ἡμείς ἐνοικιαζόμενοι ... οὗτος ἡμείς 

Ex. 34:29 οὗτος ἡμείς ἐνοικιαζόμενοι ... οὗτος ἡμείς ἐνοικιαζόμενοι ... οὗτος ἡμείς 

Num. 20:2f. οὗτος οὗτος ἐνοικιαζόμενοι ... οὗτος οὗτος ... οὗτος οὗτος ... οὗτος 

(d) Narrative dynamics — complex textual configuration: “Tempus-übergang” or Tense-switching; Mode-switching:

(1) ἀρ- > ἐν- Ø: “gear-shifting” or focus-change within Evolution Mode-expanding of the narrative dimension (zoom-in): Plain to Rich or Enhanced Narrative (very common):

The tension existing between the two modes and, within EM, between the “linear” two-dimensional and the “three-dimensional” focussing is in a sense the prime motor factor in narrative development. With junc-tural-delimitative and linking elements (see below), it is a prime dy-namic technical instrument for regulating narrative pacing and depth. The triple paradigmatic opposition of narrative carriers, projected onto the syntagmatic axis, becomes the texteme’s most important poetic device.

Gen. 7:17f. οὗτος ἄγαθος μὴ ἐνοικιαζόμενος ἐνοικιαζόμενος ... οὗτος ... 

Gen. 9:23 οὗτος ἄγαθος μὴ ἐνοικιαζόμενος μὴ ἐνοικιαζόμενος ... οὗτος ἄγαθος μὴ ἐνοικιαζόμενος μὴ ἐνοικιαζόμενος ... οὗτος ἄγαθος μὴ ἐνοικιαζόμενος μὴ ἐνοικιαζόμενος μὴ ἐνοικιαζόμενος ...
(2) **aq- > naq- pe**: Evolution-to-Comment Mode Shift (very common):

Gen. 25:21 icaoq de aqmenpe-ncat ... rebeeka de nace-mei naqyovw pe.

Gen. 37:11 aqyov de epyq nace-neqrynqyov peqiwt de naqyovqey epilacaxi pe.

Gen. 37:24 aqyvqey ebyvzi epilakqoc pilakqoc de nace-nyovqow pe.

Gen. 4:2 aqmyvci nkaiv ... acovcavtyc vot acmici mpeqcon abev + otov aqyovqy nace-abev norymecwov nteqane-cwov + kain de naqyovqey epvqvay (Vat).

(3) **naq- pe > aq-** Comment-to-Evolution Mode shift (anticipatory or cataphoric Comment. Common)\(^{34}\):

Gen. 48:10 neaqavrvo de pe nace-nenval niakwv otov naqyvmqxvov nnat mvov an pe otov aqyovqeyvq mpy orov aqyvqevv yeqv.

Gen. 37:28 otov naynhyt pe nace-nipwov myalineov otov aqvkw aqvenixvpy epqvov qyvqeyqyq epilakqoc + aqv niixvpy qyvol.

Gen. 21:20 otov nary-emv xh nem piylov pe qayaqi otov aqyovqy...

Num. 15:32 otov nary-nenqvpry nipvo xh qipvqay pe otov aqymyvi...

Ex. 14:10 naqyqyqyovv pe nace-qyfavoq ovov aqymyqyt...

(4) **naq- Ø > aq-**: “gear-shift” — Focus change, reducing Narrative dimensions (zoom-out) (relatively uncommon):

Ex. 1:20 qyq de naqyovqeyvq nniqyovqemecio otov aqyvq y nace-pyiqv.

Gen. 31:39 nqyovq qyniqmav ... nqyvqyqyq qyvol qyvqvqsal.

(5) **aq- > naq- Ø > naq- pe**: Evolution to Rich (Enhanced) Evolution to Comment Mode (relatively uncommon):

Gen. 8:3 otov naqyntqv nace-pimwvov ovov naqmvovqy qyvol qypyqvay naqyntqv y otov naqyqhytqyq nqyqvq y

\(^{34}\) Na. 2:9-10 (B4) nemeqmon-qvpyqvqyt pe evyovqem mipqvqy nemy npqwov ovov nemeqmon aqvqevvy mpvqvqeyy qyvol aqvqvqvqy... is a striking instance of cataphoric Comment Mode.
nēe-πιμως — a striking case of the anaphoric CM resuming the immediately foregoing EM.

Gen. 7:17f. ὁσος ἀρκαυι nēe-πιμως ὁσος λυτωςὶς
νυκτιβωτος ὁσος αςιςὶς εβολ γαπκας ὁσον ναγαςαγι
nēe-πιμως ὁσον ναγκριστ αρας ειςες ριζεςς
ὁσον νεκαςι νακκρινος νηκες-πιμως καπκος ρημιως
πιμως ἄε ναγκριστι πε εμας ειςες ριζεςς ὁσον λυ-
σωςς σνητωςς τηρος...

Obs.
(1) On tense switching and its functional correlates, see Weinrich 1977:164ff., 190ff., among the first to realize the prime role of tense-shifting, more important than the tenses themselves; Bonomi 1993[1994]:14ff. (“glissement de perspective”, “écart de perspective”); Fleischman 1985:865ff. (Past/Present); 1990:439 s.v.; esp. 199ff.; 378 n.39 (cf. our mode-switching). Cf. also Gildersleeve 1903 §211: interweaving of Imperfect and Aorist “so combined that the general statement is given by the Aorist and the details of the action by the Imperfect, or the situation is described by the Imperfect and isolated points presented by the Aorist”.

(III) ne-λε/-μπες- πε: high CM (“background”) setting

Instances of ne-λε- πε, neg. ne-μπε-..., πε are relatively rare, concentrated mostly in Genesis and Exodus. While, as has been pointed out, ne- itself is, not a past-tense or anteriority shifter, but a dynamic in narrative information-structuring signal, integrated and integrating in narrative texture35, ne-λε- πε constitutes a strong explicatory bracketing CM delimitation, with built-in temporal back-shifting, for events already completed at narrative time with consequent narrative-synchronous (narrative-present) states. This “natural background”36 (with πε here a discontinuous obligatory sequel of ne-λε-, and the opposition with ne-λε-∅ very weak) is also a striking case of “text-syntactic subordination” (which, in fact, H. Weinrich inspiredly reformulated as narrative “reliief”). The particle rαρ too is here virtually a pattern constituent, a CM initial boundary signal in complementary distribution with oσος.

(1) neλε- πε:

(a) physical or psychological “reason why” background (rαρ an integral part of the λε- > ne-λε- πε configuration):

Gen. 28:11 λϕνκοτ κκατ ρως + neλερρ rαρ γωττι πε.

35 Just as the Circumstantial Preterite eαq- in Sahidic narrative or the Circumstantial sdm.n.f in Middle Egyptian have a narrative-foreground progression-marking continuous role.

36 Weinrich 1982:195ff. qualifies [+retrospectivity] (in addition to [+inconspicuousness] and [+narration]) as a distinct type of background. See also Fanning 1990:307ff., 321.
Gen. 18:15 ἀκαώλα δε εβολ ΝΔΕ-σαρπα εεδω μμως ΑΕ-πικιωβι ἄνεασεργο γαρ πε. — “she had become frightened”, rather than “she was afraid”.

Ex. 9:11 οτορ ΝΔΕ-ζεδεμωδιν αν πε ΝΔΕ-ΝΙΦΑΡΜΑΚΟΣ εορι ερατος ... ΝΕΛΑΨΩΠΙ ΓΑΡ ΠΕ ΝΔΕ-ΝΙΨΑΩ ΣΕΝΝΙΦΑΡ-

MAKOC.

Ex. 9:31 πιμαγι δε νεμ πιωτ αμωι = πιωτ Γαρ ΝΕΔ- 
ΦΟΓ ΠΕ = ΟΤΟΡ ΠΙΜΑΓΙ ΝΕΑΕΡΨΡΟΓ ΠΕ.

Gen. 45:26 οτορ ΑΤΨΩΜΤ ΣΕΝΝΕΨΡΗΤ ΝΔΕ-ΙΑΚΩΒ = ΝΕΜ-
ΝΕΑΨΤΑΝΓΟΤΤΟΙ ΓΑΡ ΠΕ.

Gen. 48:10 ΝΕΛΑΨΡΟΥ ΔΕ ΠΕ ΝΔΕ-ΝΕΝΒΑΛ ΝΙΑΚΩΒ ΟΤΟΡ 
ΝΑΖΕΝΜΩΜΝ ΝΝΔΩ ΜΒΟΛ ΑΝ ΠΕ ΟΤΟΡ ΑΤΨΟΡΑΨΩΝΤ ΕΡΩΠ 
ΑΤΨΙ ΕΡΨΩΝ.

Cf. Ex. 17:12 ΝΕΔΖΙΔΑ ΔΕ ΝΜΩΤΧΙΣ ΝΕΛΑΨΡΟΥ ΠΕ ... 
ΟΤΟΡ ΑΡΨΩΝ ΝΕΜ ΓΨΡ ΑΣΤΑΣΡΟΨ ΝΝΕΨΩΧΙΔ.

Gen. 26:18 παλιν αίσακ ψεκνιωτ ντεπιμωσ πν 
ΕΤΑΨΟΡΟΤ ΝΔΕ-ΝΙΛΑΛΨΩΝ ΝΤΕΑΨΡΑΑΜ ΠΕΙΨΩΤ ΟΤΟΡ 
ΝΕΛΑΨΡΟΤ ΠΕ ΝΔΕ- (ΠΕ SUPER LIN.).

Also Gen. 18:11, 19:29, 45:3, Ex. 12:39.

(b) Content — second object-actant — of seeing (cf. νε- Ø and νε-
νε above, and νεω- below):

Ex. 39:43 ΑΖΝΑΡ ΝΔΕ-ΜΨΤΧΙΣ ΕΝΙΓΒΝΟΙ ΤΗΡΟΤ ΟΤΟΡ 
ΝΕΛΑΨΩΜΟΤ ΠΕ.

Probably also (although here the verb of perception is absent — note the 
presence of Ψαи, as it were an object actant of the missing “see” verb):

Lev. 10:16 οτορ πεβαμπι ετεεεθεθνοβι ΣΕΛΟΣΑΚΨΤ ΑΤΨ 
ΚΨΤ ΝΕΩΨ ΝΔΕ-ΜΨΤΧΙΣ + ΟΤΟΡ ΨΑΙ ΝΕΛΑΨΡΟΓΨΠ ΠΕ ΟΤΟΡ 
ΑΤΨΩΝΤ ΝΔΕ-ΜΨΤΧΙΣ.

Obs. 

νεω- Ø is extremely rare. I find only Deut. 9:24 αιτ-ζο μπεμεο μποεο νο 
νεοοτ νεμ γο 

νεωρε ΕΝΕΑΨΡΟΤ ΕΡΩΠ ΝΔΕ-ΠΣΩΚ ΕΧΕΣΘΝΟΤ ΕΒΟΛ 
(Vat. νεω-, no πε). This is probably a case of the Focalizing (Second Tense) conversion of νε-, and therefore without πε (Recycled Condensed Narrative).

(e) Dream or Vision narratives

The fine and poetically essential balancing between Enhanced Evolution Mode Narrative (νε- Ø) and variously functional Comment Mode (νε- πε) collapses, by design, in Dream Narratives (DNs). Or, put 
structurally: the opposition between the two embracing complex mor-
phemes νε- Ø and νε- πε is neutralized in the DN texteme as a poeti-
contrivance, a special formal combination of the two being opposed to the Evolution Mode Preterite ak-. This means no less than the perfection of a new and even finer poetic device. Not the obliteration of "semantics" (signifié) differences between the two narrative modes, but that to the "flat", as it were chronicling or recording EM carrier ak-, the DN texteme opposes a special blend of the egocentric or personal perspective (cf. the Narrator-sphere Comment Mode ne- πε), the removed-from-reality (or blurring of reality: ne- πε again), the précis-fraught-with-significance (ne- πε, yet again) — all these with the dramatic closeup zooming-in effect of ne- Ø, slow-motion or tableau blow-up; the narrator's personal deepening “antinarrative”, which is also non-actual and shifts to a parallel-reality. This is the subtle semantic structure of the Coptic reported dream. While the inter-mode tension characterizing usual Narrative is absent in DN, the Preterite may be considered here marked, as against the unmarked combined ne- Ø / πε.

The book of Genesis supplies us with several sophisticated instances of the telling or reporting of visions and dreams. This narrative subtexteme — with a very impressive, and no less grammatically fascinating history, as yet untold, in Egyptian — is of descriptive and comparative-general interest. Dream Narratives are distinct, and instructive for Narrative Grammar and Narrative Theory in general, on three counts: (a) the evolving plot is experienced by its Narrator as beheld and perceived, beyond any participation of his in the story; (b) the narrative is "timeless" - that is, it is extratemporal, coinciding in "happening time" with the time of perception by the Narrator; (c) in the cultural domain we are dealing with, Dream and often Vision Narratives are emblematic narrativized metaphors, fraught with prophetic significance.

As said, we find here ne- Ø and ne- πε opposed to the Preterite; πε occurs almost always, though not with every ne- form, but, applying to a ne- grouping, it as it were characterizes the narrative carriers collectively. The blurring of reality expressed by the variation nax- πε / Ø gives the eventing in DN an out-of-focus framing: we are distanced from our own reality and transferred into a different alternative one, a parallel world, in a narrator's present perspective and constant a zooming-in, slow-motion focussing (the absence in Coptic of the Narrative Present is thus compensated for to an extent). The ne- forms carry the basic tableau situation; ak- the culmination or climax of the dream. Let me quote here from FLEISCHMAN 1990 (p. 248f.): “In verbalizations of dreamwork the boundaries of events are often blurred, and temporal sequence is confused... the ordered language of consciousness provides a
mediation and the linguistic form through which the chaotic and unarticulated contents of the unconscious can be mapped onto narrative" (see also op. cit. 378 n. 40, 395 n. 182; Fleischman 1989).

The main distinctive formal characteristics of the dream sequence (of course, always differentially, in opposition to "real" narrative) are:

(a) tensing (see above);

(b) special opening/closing boundary signals: (1) the "seam" or interface of the narrative/dream narrative textemes, enframing phrases containing "dream" and, as a rule, "see" (ἀνάθεμα ευπραγοῦν, ἀνάθεμα ερωτών ὑπάλληλον ἐπικατορθοῦν, εἰπερεθοῦς et al. εἰπερεθοῦς ἐποῦς, ἀνάθεμα επικατορθοῦν, ἀνάθεμα ευπραγοῦν... and so on; "see" only, in Moses's vision of the burning bush); (2) ἀριστερῶς τοῦ ἡμέραν (ἡμέρας ἡμέρας) ἱκανός signally the opening of the Dream Narrative itself37; (3) (optional) the final boundary or enframing signal closing the dream texteme and resuming the "real" Narrative: ἀπετύχων, ἀπετύχων... ὥστε ἐπικατορθοῦν τε;

(c) The absence or extreme rareness of negation; hence, the virtual absence of polarity.

(d) Several types of textemic structure, specified below in order of increasing complexity. Note that we witness in the DN dynamic or multi-layered static/dynamic tableaux, rather than plot development properly speaking; there is no clear distinction between durative/recurrent and punctual/single action; any movement may be contained either in the basic dynamic tableau or proceed from a static one, animating it; that as a rule the Preterite ἀρ- carries the culmination or dénouement and message of the dream, schematically to the basically thematic ἀρ- and ἀρ- πε. (The verbum dicendi used is πεδακαί).

(1) Dynamic tableau (single layer): action in progress (ἀρ- πε) (Gen.37:9)

(2) Dynamic tableau (single layer): action (ἀρ- Ø) and quality state description (ἀρ- πε + ἀρ- + ἀρ- in coordination: πε is shared) (Gen. 31:10)

(3) Static tableau becoming dynamic ("coming alive" or animated): basic thematic situation (ἀρ-) from which simple outline movement action (ἀρ- αρ- αρ-) starts (e.g. Gen. 37:6ff.): this latter action is thematic (the message, "point" or climax of the DN).

37 By this token, "dreaminess" is observable in Num. 24:5 and even in the monologic Gen. 28:17.
(4) Static tableau becoming dynamic: thematic background picture [NOUN PHRASE + Circumstantial present/NE- existence + πΕ/description NE- πΕ ], across the foreground of which recurrent movement is in progress (NE- πΕ) (Gen. 28:12ff., 40:16ff.); or from which simple outline movement action starts (αΙ- αΙ-) in a given Obtaining Situation (NE-) (Gen. 40:9ff.). The recurrent movement or the movement action are thematic (the message, “point” or climax of the DN).

(5) Pharaoh's First Dream (Gen. 41:1ff.): dynamic tableau (multiple layer). Thematic initial state of dreamer (NE- πΕ); new participants joining the dreamer in movement (NE- πΕ ) to form a thematic grouping; still new participants entering the stage (NE-) to effect the culmination or climax in one simple thematic act (ΑQ-). Pharaoh's Second Dream is apparently staged as sequel of the first or second half of a complex dream (notwithstanding the enframing “he woke up, slept some more and saw another, second dream” and the introductory ΑΗΠΠΕΕ): new participants coming on stage (NE-), yet others entering (NE-) and bringing about the culmination (ΑQ-).

Note that Pharaoh's own report of his dreams as distinct from the “official” Narrator's version has a different texture, one that recalls "real" rather than dreamed Narratives, and is apparently staged more as a real plot development — Pharaoh presents this scenario as reality: initial obtaining situation (NE-); first slow-motion or closeup plot development (NE-); concluding stage of first episode (NE- πΕ); new slow-motion or closeup plot development (NE-); [Narrator's Channel interposition: ΜΠΙ-]; culmination (ΑQ-); Narrator's final evaluation (NE- πΕ). The second Dream (abridged): static tableau (NOUN + Circumstantial); movement (NE- πΕ; cf. types [1] and [2] above), culmination (ΑQ-). Only in Pharaoh's dreams does Vat's reading vary from P's, as a rule omitting πΕ. This is not the case in other dreams or in “real” Narrative. (A difference between Locutive [1st-person] and Delocutive DN's is observable in Coptic as in pre-Coptic Egyptian).

The texts themselves (I have entered the lemniscus delimiter, see Chapter Four below):

Gen. 28:12f. ΑΠΝΑΤ ΕΟΕΡΑΚΟΤΙ ΑΗΠΠΕ ΙΣ ΟΤΗΟΤΙΚΙ ΕΣΤΑΚΡΗΟΤ ΣΕΝΠΙΚΑΙΙ ΕΡΕ-ΑΧΣ ΙΙ ΝΑΙΡΒΗΙ ΕΠΕ ΟΤΟΡ ΝΑΡΠΕΝΙΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ ΝΤΕΦΤ ΝΑΤΝΑ ΕΠΩΙΙ ΝΑΝΗΟΤΕ ΕΠΕΣΗΤ ΓΙΩΤΣ ΠΕ + ΠΤΠ ΑΕ ΝΑΡΤΑΚΡΗΟΤ ΓΙΩΤΣ ΠΕ + ΟΤΟΡ ΠΕΣΑΙ ΑΕ - ΙΤΥΝΤΟΝΚ ΔΕ ΝΔΕ-ΙΑΚΩΒ ΝΤΟΟΙ (P = Vat).

Gen. 31:10 ΑΙΝΛΑΤ ΕΡΒΟΣ ΝΝΑΒΑΛ ΝΕΡΑΚΟΤΙ ΑΗΠΠΕ ΙΣ ΝΙΒΑΡΗΙ ΝΕΜ ΝΙΔΩΙΛΙ ΝΑΤΝΑ ΕΡΠΗΙ ΕΡΕΝΝΙΕΕΚΟΤ ΝΕΜ
νιβαδεμπὶ νατοτοβὺ πε οτος νατοὶ νατοτομπὸν νεμ 
αοταν νκερμὶ εσμοδὲ (= Vat).

Gen. 37:6ff. σωτεμ εταρακοὶ + θαλ εταινας ερος + ιε- 
δεκ νανχὶ δενωμὴ + ηνκοι ενμοσρ νγανχαν οτος αγ-
τωνὶς νξε-πανχας ανοφι εραθυ αστασεο νξε-νετεν-
χας αροσωτὶ μπανχας (= Vat).

Gen. 37:9. γηππε αινας εκερακοὶ + μφρη + ιεδεκ πηρ 
νεμ πιογγ νεμ ιὰ νιςοι νατοτοωτὶς μμοι πε (= Vat).

It is as if Joseph invites his brothers to join in a private game he has 
invented for himself: this is strikingly like the so-called “(pre)ludic” 
role of the Romance Imperfect. So too perhaps Ex. 1:10.

Gen. 40:9ff. νξρξι δενταρακοὶ + νεοτον-ντωβ ναλοι 
ξη μπαμεο πε οξξρι δεντμὲ ναλοι ναρε-νων-(Vat 
νεοτον-) η νεομεν πε οτος θαλ νασφορι εβολ πε εαςε-
γασμαρ εβολ ετθερ νξε-νιγμαρ ναλοι οτος ναρε-πια-
φοτ ντεφαραω + ξη δεντακαξ ειςι νιναλοι + αιονομ 
εξρξι επιαφοτ ενεκενεκς μξαραω (= Vat).

Gen. 40:16f. αινας εοςπακοὶ + αινας ιεδεκ-ναιξι νη 
νκανων ννοναριτς γιαζεντακε = νξρξι δε δενπικα-
κανων εταγανυπ νεοτον ννηττη πε + εβολ δεννη 
θρων ευαρε-ποτρο φαραω ντομος νξρω ναρε-νιγαλα + 
ντωμ μμων πε + εβολ δενπικανων ετξη γιαζε-
ντακε (= Vat).

Pharaoh’s Dreams — the official version:

Gen. 41:1ff. φαραω δε αινας εοςπακοὶ + ιεδεκ-ναποξι 
ερατη πε (Vat om. πε) γιαζενφιαρο + γηππε μξρη 
νεο- 

βολ δενφιαρο νανινος ενιωπ πε (Vat om. πε) νξε-
ξἰς νεςε ενανετ δενπουτσομ + νατομο πε δενπυκανι 
κεξ 

δε νεξε + νανινος ενιωπ + μενενανai εβολ δε 
νφιαρο + εταλιωτ δενπουτσομ οτος ευσόμ δε 
σσνο-

τατσοι + νατομο ιατεν-νιγσων ιεκενφιαρο + οτος 
ατξἰς νεξε εταλιωτ δενπουτσομ οτος ευσόμ δε 
σσνο-

τατσοι + ατσωκ μπξἰς νεξε + ενανετ δενπουτσομ οτος 
ευσόμι 

δε 

νξξε-φαραω + οτος 

δε 

αγενκοτ ετι + οτος αινας εκερακοὶ μμαρξἰ 

γηππε 

νανινος ενιωπ νξξἰς νξςεμ δεντακαξ ενσωτ + 

εταλιον + οτος ενανετ οτος ιε κεξ 

δε νξςεμ ευσόμ + 

ενοι ανα 

νξξεμ ευσόμ + 

ενοι ανα 

φαραω νξξϊς νξςεμ ετ-

ποι 

οτο 

εταλιον + 

λα 

νξξεμ ευ 

ενοι 

νξξεμ
Pharaoh’s slightly abridged and differently worded locutive version (square brackets enclose Pharaoh’s additions):

Gen. 41:17-24 Ναψη Σενταραγος + Ιςεκ Ναψη Ερατ 
εκεν-νενκαφος Μηνιαρι οτος Μηνιαριν Νανήν Ευαίσ 
Σενταραγος + Ναψη Εκεν Εναντ Σενταραγος οτος ετ 
κτιν Σεννταραγος + Νανήν Πε Σεννταραγος (Val add. οτος, 
ομ. Πε) + Ενπη Πε Κяз Νανήν Ευαίσ Καμενθος 
(Vat add. Πε) Εβολ Σενταραγος + Ετρων Σενταραγος οτος 
ηςων Σεννταραγος + [Μπινατ Ετρων Εγγαίων Μπορ 
-ρης Σενταραγος Τηρα Νκεμ Πε] + οτος αττν Να 
εκεν Ετρων οτος ηςων Σεννταραγος + Ατωμκ Ντς 
εκεν Εναντ οτος ετκτιπ [Ατκενθος Ετρων Ετοτεδι 
+ οτος Να 
ηςων Ετρων Ναψη Εκεν Εναντ Καζ] (Val om. Πε) + 
Ατικτ Πε Εικνκοτ + Αινατ Πε Σενταραγος Μηνιαρι ε 
κεν Νενςες Ετη Ευαίσ Σεννταραγος Νοτετ Εν 
κτιν + οτος εναντ Κεν Δε Νενςες Ετσων + Ετοι Να 
ζεφεις Νανήν Ευαίσ Ετος Πε (Val om. Πε) οτος απ 
τις Νενςες Ετσων + Ετοι Ναζεφεις Ατωμκ Μπι 
τις Νενςες Ενα 
νετ + οτος Εν 
κτιν Αικεταραγος Ποι Νανιφρανσ...

Obs.
(1) Interestingly, the Narrative Peak in Jacob’s “genetic-engineering” ruse (Gen. 30:10) is presented as a vision, or at least a parallel-reality happening (compare the cinematographic haze or veiled photography in similar cases): Ενπη Πε Κε Νειμαρί Πε Ν 
ινατ Ναλτα Εγρη...Ναντοτομοσ Πε... etc.
(2) Other dream reports in Coptic. In Bohairic, Daniel’s dream (ed. Bardelli, e.g. Ch. 7 Ποραςις Μηνιαρι) which uses only ne-, ne-πε and Ακ-πε, but remarkably Αινατ 
πε (most often), Αινατ and Αινατ in mid-dream: also 2:31.
In the Early Bohairic Twelve Prophets (B4, in the unedited P. Vat. cko 9), we find the same visionary blurring of EM and CM; note also the use of the demonstratives, and the Presentatives with Circumstantial present carried on by Ακ-πε:
Zach. 5:9 Αινατ Ενπη Εις-πειμι Ποτα τ Εναντ Εβολ Ετ 
κτιν Εναντ Εναντ Εκε 
ηςων Εναντ Επ 
κτιν Ποτα τ Εν 
κτιν Εκε 
ηςων Ποτα τ Εν 
κτιν Ποτα τ Εν 
κτιν Ποτα τ Εν 
κτιν Ποτα τ Εν 
κτιν Ποτα τ Εν 
κτιν Ποτα τ Εν 
κτιν Ποτα τ Εν 
κτι 
νατα Πο 
κτι 
να 
νατα Πο 
κτι 
να 
να 
να 
να 
να 
να 
να 
να 
να 
να 
να 

For Nitrian Bohairic, there are numerous instances of visions, dreams and apparitions, by 
and large no different from "real" narratives except for the opening: Mac. No. 8 B, 
p. 55f. (initial Ποραςις Ιςεκ Ειν- and in the course of the text Ιςεκ Εινατ; 
otherwise only Ακ- and Πεμπε/Πεμπε/Πεμπε/Πεμπε); AM I 46-51, 73, 110, 126, II 33f. 
etc. Obviously, the adequate description of Nitrian Bohairic dream narrative must be 
carried out on the background of Nitrian “real” Narrative.
In Sahidic, (Σωκ) Εγγαί + Circumstantial/Focalizing (Second) Preterite characterizes 
the opening: The Circumstantial alone serves as a DN carrier (Αινατ Επ 
κτιν Ποτα τ Εν 
κτι 
νατα Πο 
κτι 

following as the Circumstantial (Present) or Focalizing (Second) Preterite (Ντα-
past) generally introduce a dream or vision; outside Shenoute, we also find *ευκεφίτης*, *ευκεφίτης* ηευκεφίτης- and even ηευκεφίτης- (with Circumstantial). Remarkably, we find *ψαλμόσια* in *Apocalypse Sinuthii* (Leip. IV 198), see SHISHA-HALEVY, 2007b.

(3) Scholars have commented on the dreamlike quality of Jacob’s strange night wrestling (Gen. 32:25): * νακτός ἔχειν — ο ντενικ στους κοσμος. (Vulg.) et ecce vir lactabatur cum eo usque mane, (Vetus Lat.) lactabatur/(con)llactatus est; Greek ἐπάλατεν (v.l. ἐπάλατεν). (The variation an intertextual-paradigmatic indicant of the distinctness of the DN texteme?) Structural narratologists have viewed this episode as a specifically instructive narrative “in nutshell”: see Barthes in Barthes et al. (eds.), *Analyse structurale et exégèse biblique*, Labor et Fides, 1972. (See also special discussion below).

(4) The Bohairic Apocalypse merits special study. This is a case of DN extended, drastically blown-up, to a complex dreamlike Narrative, in a heady mixture of narrative and prophetic subtextemes. I find remarkable the paucity of ακτός / ἀκτός variant reading against the prevalence of ηευκεφίτης-ηευκεφίτης- / ηευκεφίτης-variants reading (e.g., 4:3, 5:4, 13:2 etc.): the Narrative Present (e.g. 6:16, 11:6, 14:5:12, 17:8 etc.), the Aorist (4:10), the Focalizing Conversion (13:12) and various Nominal Sentence patterns (11:4, 12:3:5:18, 13:18 etc.); the “obstinately” recurring initial signals *ψαλμόσια* ρηπειν ιετ and Νώτ-ευκ- insist on the textemtic identity.

(5) For dreams and visions in Shenoute’s Sahidic, see SHISHA-HALEVY 2007b §§2.7, 2.8.

(6) No need to enlarge on the importance of dreams in pre-Coptic Egyptian linguistic and literary culture. For Demotic, see RAY 1976, Texts 8, 9 ("*n j n rswt*"; episodes/dreams introduced by *jw.w dd*; main carrier: perf. *sdm.f* and wkh.f *sdm*; Obtaining Situation: Present, 8/3, 9/5, 12f. *twj hr t3-hny Mn-Nfr “I was upon the necropolis of Memphis”*); TAIT 1977, No. 16 p. 56ff. and No. 17, with discussion and references: SMITH and TAIT 1983, text 2 (p. 116 + n. bh, p. 116), introduced by Second Tense or Empathic, *jrf pryn-n-rswy*; DUPEYRT 1994:60 (No.2, with n.29): — the Present (discussed in the context of Stern-Jernstedt’s Law); Setne II 1/1 (Circumstantial opening and resumé: *rswy jw.w md*...). See below, for notes on Egyptian narrative grammar. For Late Egyptian see the famous Chester Beatty dream-interpretation papyrus (GARDINER 1935:9ff.), where the dream itself is condensed in the “adverbial paradigm”: Stative, prepositional phrase, circumstantial *sdm.f*, the *hr* + infinitive converb.

(7) For the dramatic narratological significance of Biblical dreams, see ALTER 1981:163. EHRLICH 1953 is an illuminating comparative literary-folkloristic, linguistically conscious but not grammatical study of OT dreams. BAAYEN 1997:258ff. for Biblical Hebrew *w-hnh* used in a dream sequence.

(8) Some references to studies and features of Dream Narrative grammar in European and other languages. On the whole, while general, “oneirocritical”, oneiromatical and literary studies of the dream are extensive (e.g. KESSELS 1978 for Greek, or STEINER 1952 for Latin), we find relatively little special attention is given to DN grammar. See LAMBRECHT 2000 (“internal contextualization”, following Fillmore). Even in such a fascinating and satisfying collection of essays on dreams and dreaming as the one edited by Shulman and Stroumsa (1999), there is no consideration, no mention even, of the formal poetic aspects of DN, or of the relevance this might bear for both message and cultural significance. Dennis Tedlock’s contribution (104-118), attempting a comparison of DN to myth, tantalizingly brushes what I have in mind, but does not touch language.

(9) For Greek, see SVENSSON 1930:96ff. (Present for events, Imperfect for description); GOODWIN claims (§33) that the Historical Present is absent in Homer; but see Penelope’s second dream (Odyssey T 535ff., see KESSELS 1978:91ff.), which has an especially so-
phisticated structure, featuring almost all tenses: Present switching to Aorist, with the Imperfect and Pluperfect. This, by the way, is the only instance of the Narrative Present in Homer (similarly in Pindar: only in Pyth. 4.159ff.). In the papyri, the intermeshing of all three narrative tenses — Imperfect, Aorist, Present — characterizes dream reports: see Mayser II/1 §33.1 Anm.b, II/1:140 (a) for the Perfect, signalling personal emotional involvement, in dreams.


(11) For Italian, see Bertinetto 1986:368ff. (Imperfect). A.L. Lepschy (1996:112ff.) seems to misconstrue the transition from imperfetto to passato remoto in the following dream passage from Pulci’s Morgante (43.2ff.) — my italics:

Jo ho fatta una strana visione:/Che m’assaliva un serpente feroce;/non mi valeva, per chiamar, Macone;/onde al tuo Iddio,.../Rivolto...e mi soccorse.

Consider in Italian the “classic” structure and texture of the following dialectal dream text (“Er Sogno Bello”, in the fumetto series Sonetti in vernacolo pisano by Fucini and Terreni, in Pisa Informazioni, 15/9/97). Unfortunately, I cannot reproduce here the main pictorial text, which contains its own plot and is a co-text for the verbal narrative, but only the accompanying balloon “supertitles” with a resumé of the cartoons. Finite narrative tense forms are given in italics:

Metanarrative and opening signals:

“Stanotte ho fatt’ un sogno, e mi pareva,
Da tanto ch’era bello, di sognare.”

[husband recounting his dream to his wife in bed]

Obtaining initial situation:

“S’aveva l’ale tut’t’dua,
S’aveva,
E si volava via, rasente ar mare”

[winged, nightgowned husband and wife hovering over the sea]

Dream Narrative development:

“E ’n der guarda’’n dell’acqua
Si vedeva
Perle, oralli e tante robbe rare;”

[wife admiring submarine treasures]

DN continued: presentative narration device:

“E un dorfino parlante che diceva:
‘Le volete?
Venitel’ a pigliare.’”

[Smiling dolphin addressing pleased wife]

Narrative focussing — peak buildup: crisis. Verbum dicendi marked as external and thematic by passato prossimo:
“Te nun volevi, Rosa! E io t’ho detto:
‘Lassami fa’, nun c’è nulla di male.
Guarda, ne piglio una manatta e smetto’”.

[husband importuning — in close-up]

**Narrative peak; dream-closing signal; pluperfect already outside dream:**

“Stendo la mana, così tal e quale;
Mi sveglo...Destinaccio maldetto!
L’avevo messo drent’ all’urinale”

[back in bed: husband, upset, with hand in bedside pot; wife turning away and getting up].

Note that Italian uses the Imperfect for the retelling or reporting on film narratives, as a shift to a parallel reality: (Carlo Cassola, *Un Cuore Arido*) “Finalmente cominciò il film.
Subito Anna provò l’acuto piacere di essere trasportata in un altro mondo. Una ragazza usciva correndo da una casa e si recava da un fabbro: un giovane ricciuto, col baffi. Questi interrompeva il lavoro, sorridendo con tenerezza alla giovane donna, che gli diceva: “Mio padre acconsente alle nozze”. I due, allora, si bacivano. Poi la giovane fuggiva via e per la strada incontrava un uomo vestito di nero, che camminava appoggiato a un bastone. Lo ferma, gli si inginocchiava davanti e gli diceva: “Benediemi, padre”.
— Ah, quello è il padre, — commentò Livio. — Ma che dici? Quello è un prete, — disse Lina...” — note the persistent use of the Imperfect, obliterating all texture distinctions as well as main/included clauses; also the transition to the present tense in the watching characters’ discussion “in real time” of the film.

(12) STEN 1964:99 n.1, 135 (on French): the “evocative” effect of the Imperfect; when a series of Imperfects is broken by the Preterite, one can see the Preterite as marked, in extreme cases as a “brutal” break in the dream.

(13) The Present tense is used for DN in European and classical languages (CASPARIS’s “symbolic particularity”, 1975:79ff., 86, 101ff.) as well as in Modern Hebrew, pre-Coptic Egyptian — either for the basic DN carrier or for the dénouement and narrative peak. The absence of this form in Coptic narrative (itself an interesting typological change-feature) correlates with the polysemantic range of ne-nte.


(15) On the removal-from-reality and imagined/parallel world role of the Imperfect, cf. perhaps the “reminiscent” Imperfect in Greek and Latin (SCHWYZER II 277ff., LOHMANN-HOFMANN-SZANTYR II 317). See WILMET 1976:83ff. for the French “hypocoristic” Imperfect, involving also the switch from allocutive to delocutive person when addressing a child (“and did he hurt his little finger?”); 101ff. for the “prudic” roles; 87 for the exclamative role; CAPALLO 1986. FLEISCHMAN 1989; 1995, e.g. 522 (“a speaker’s lack of belief in or lack of commitment to (a) the reality, realization or referentiality of an event or sequence of events...”); p. 525ff. on the prudic role. EK 1996:122ff. (the scenic present in French); ANSCOMBRE 2004:81 (ex. 45) and 83 (ex. 56); IMBS 1960:98 “un écarts modal entre le réel et l’imaginaire”; LE GOFFIC 1986:64ff., 1995:134ff. “a world inaccessible to the utterer’s ‘here and now’” (which forms part of the “double incomplétude” of the Imperfect, the other being its absence of autonomy); BERTINETTO 1986:368ff. (also the prudic role).

(16) In literary Modern Welsh, the essentially narrative tense called Imperfect (present base, secondary personal suffixes) expresses distance- or removedness-from-reality (including potentiality) and thus features in dream and fantasy narratives (the Imperfects are italicized): “Dychmygwc el a hunain ar y daith, yn cerdded drwy’r mwd gan deimlo’r...
tir yn gwegian oddi tanoch. Un cam seithug... a galleg hwypio i ddyfoedd duon pwll diwaedol. Byddai’r gwyt yn mwmlai ym gwnfannus ym mrigau’r llwyni bedw, a byddai rhaid gochel thag llihir o ar y mwsgl... Codai tarth o’r dyfoedd duon ymhobman”, approx. “Imagine yourself on the trip, walking through the mud, feeling the ground swaying under your feet. One missed step, and you could tumble into the black water of a bottomless pit. The wind would mumble mournfully in the branches of the birch groves and you would have to beware lest you slip on the moss. Vapour would rise from the black water everywhere....”

(f) ne- converted

Conversion of narrative ne- means in effect practically only Relative forms (in our corpus as a rule ene-, not etene-). Relative converted forms of ne- in narrative are, as a rule, not accompanied by pe (the irrealis protasis, which may be Circumstantial in form, is dialogic or expositive). They are not properly speaking narrative clauses, or at least stand outside of the pe vs. Ø Narrative-Mode opposition:

Gen. 19:11 NIPUMI ENAEPIREPAE.
Gen. 21:17 aFt cWYEM ETCMH MPMALO EBOA ENENPIA ENAEH MMOQ.
Gen. 39:13 NH ENACXAXI MMWOT NEMAO.
Deut. 3:2 NAMORESEX NH ENATWOP XIMHP MPMORDANIE
Deut. 4:46 CHWON PHTRO NTCXAMORESEX RP ENAEPWOP ENECBEW.

The only exception to this I am aware of is negative, predicating cWOTN (“psychologistic” Omniscient Narrator’s information):

Ex. 1:8 AQTURYU NAEKEOTPO EXENXYMI RP ETENAP-CWOTN AN PÆ NIWCHF (= Vat).

(Deut. 32:17 [Vat] ZAPEPI ATP YNOTX NH ENAPNOTIOE YCWTN MMWOT AN PÆ has ne in our manuscript; emend to pe? but see below, Chapter Two, on the mysterious qYOWN NE).

(g) pe with other conjugation forms

(1) Circumstantial (eq- / eao-) pe in narrative — Comment Mode:

These forms appear to be the nearest in structural essence to the CM ne-/ne- pe clause forms discussed above (Circumstantial / ne- variant readings corroborate this view; generally speaking, there is a definite macrosyntactical affinity between the two conversions).

Deut. 32:12 PÆC MMATIQP EPE ETAPENST MMON-KENOT YNMEMO NEMWOT PÆ (= Vat).

No need to restore here ne- (pace Andersson 1904:143, Schenke 1987:548).
Lev. 4:22 εὐσωπὸν ὦτν ὧτε-πιαρχων εἴρνοβε ... εὐηναρ ἀν πε (πε super lin.) (= Vat).

Gen. 18:11 καρπα δὲ ἀσκωτεμ εἰκαστεφρόν ὧτεκκνή γίγαγος ἄμον ἀβρααμ δὲ ἐνε καρπα εὐσωτέρολο πε ἐνταλὰί σεννοτεποῦ ... (Vat near-).

Gen. 29:17 λε ἀν ὡνταλὶ ὧτε Ῥαιχα ἀν ὡνταλὶ ὧτε ὧτεκανε γε σεννεκςμοτ ὠτογ εἴνεςσε κε σεννεκσο ἐμαῶω, sim. Gen. 39:6 (both = Vat) — these are instances of the formal Circumstantial “carrying on” ne- as its conversion base.

Num. 15:34 οὐτοὶ ἀρτοῖτ ἐπέστεκοι μπατοςμένι γαρ πε ἄτεους πετεπότει νασίαν ἄτα. μπατος- is probably not Circumstantial, judging by γαρ; it may still be considered a case of “psychologic inside information” staging.

Obs.
(1) Andersson 1904:100f. considers, like certain modern editors, this to be a case of “redundant” or “pleonastic” πε (“verdächtig und darf gestrichen werden”)38. The phenomenon, which still awaits in-depth study, has been primarily discussed and documented by G. Browne: Browne 1978a:200; 1978b:7*(53). Significantly, several of his exx. have ne- variae lectiones. See also Shisha-Halevy 1986a:38.

(2) Our corpus supplies no example of narrative ἄτα- πε, which is, however, a familiar feature of Nitrian Bohairic (see Stern 1880:217, and the Gunn Papers [at the Griffith Institute, Oxford] VII 19); it often expresses “behind the scene” action or intention. As already pointed out, πε in Nitrian texts seems to have a different distribution from πε in our corpus, in terms of its CM and backgrounding roles: we even find ὑπερ- πε (AM II 194), but ἄτα- πε may mean that the devaluation of ne- πε correlates with and is compensated for by a new narrative CM form. Consider AM I 37, II 75, 165, 200, 208, 214, 224, 240, 241 etc. etc. This form apparently endows an act with behind-the-scene intentions and desired significance (this often verges on a final purpose or goal of the action). The same is also typical of Circumstantial + πε, e.g. ετοσωμεν πε (very common; e.g. AM I 34); generally speaking, ὑφωμ, ερωμ, εμι occur most frequently accompanied by πε, in the Imperfect, Preterite and Circumstantial; other themes characteristic of conjunction forms often coupled with πε are the thematic Statives τοι, τοι and ὑμ. Obviously, this issue needs to be carefully studied in specific corpora. More important, however, is the narrative Comment Mode example ἄτα- πε in the early B4 John (19:24) ἔντατοι ἄτερναι πε (27:42) ἑιμνωμ ἡν... τατε ἐποξ πε — not only for documenting a “Nitrian” feature in earliest Bohairic, but for illustrating neatly the anaphoric/cataphoric “Janus-faced” function of this πε. Sahidic has here ἡν (itself ana/cataphoric, topicalizing and forward-pointing); the B5 text has here οὐν.

38 Similarly but more hesitantly, W. E. Crum’s marginal notes (in German) in his copy of Stern’s Grammatik, at the Griffith Institute, Oxford: “Bohairic + πε ohne (?) Sinnesänderung”, adding exx. from the NT and Nitrian texts. Stern himself (1880 §375 on ἄτα- πε) identifies cryptically “die copula πε, die als ursprünglich neutral zu fassen ist...”).
(2) **nagnostarpne** — explicationale relevance:

Gen. 35:18 ἀγωμία με εκνατμε ηςεψηση ηςαναμοσ ταρνη με ητερένηςκαντοκε.

(3) Superordinative **πε** (not narrative):

Especially striking is **πε** in apodosis, where **πε** is not speaker/narrator-referent, but internally anaphoric, to the preceding textual segment (whether marked as protatic or not). The superordinating and the detach- ing-from-reality roles of (nagnost- ) **σ** **πε** converge in irrealis apodoses:

Num. 22:33 enempecrīki pe ntosntoθ meke nainasboθek pe θh de nainatanδoc pe (= Vat).

Not wholly clear to me, but apparently superordinative, is also

Num. 34:5 ουςρ ερεαμία nδε-πιμωιτ εβολ φίοιμ pe (= Vat) Greek ἐσται ἢ διέξοδοι ἢ θάλασσα

Obs.

(1) On **πε** with apodotic Future tenses⁹⁹, cf. Polotsky 1939:110, quoting also ετε- **πε** (Job 31:7f.) and Jer. 43:3, where the protasis is not marked as such, concluding with the reservation that “these observations do not apply to B”. See also Polotsky 1960:26. This is, I believe, not a “contingent “ (pace Depuydt, the Introduction to CSCO 544/ copt.47, Encomiastica from the Pierpoint Morgan Library, Leuven 1996, p. xxi) or sequelling Future “then I will...”, as would be ερε- (see below), but rather superordinating pe and superordinated future.

(2) Mac. No. 20 p. 109 enakwem ωκροοι pe resp. είνητ pe has **πε** in both Allocation and Response, both in Focalizing Conversion.

(3) The Preterite (nagnost- ) occurs in Shenoutean Sahidic with **πε** in superordinating nexus-focussing function: emmon erpa apnot pe wac pαρεπτικος (Shenoute Amel. II 341) “...otherwise, they would have been considered heretic”: enempekenka...netnakonot h nekipec apkonot pe (Amel. I 95) “Were they in other places, they would be slain — or indeed they were slain”.

(4) **πε** for signalling remoteness of event possibility (irrealis protasis, wish — backgrounding role?):

Num. 11:18 nancen nan eantwpi snejhm pe (= Vat).

Num. 14:2 amoi enanmop pe snekapi nxejmi (Vat enanmop pe).

Num. 22:33 enempecrīki pe ntosnθ mek meke nainasboθek pe θh de nainatanδoc pe.

---

⁹⁹ This construction is hardly the “functional heir” of Egyptian sdmk3f (pace De- puydt apud Loprieno 1995:261 n.199; and rightly Vernus 1990c:96f.); yet **πε** is not a sequelling, but a superordinating-hyper-rhetamizing exponent, and at that rather the “heir” of Egyptian #NEXUS + πω#. 
(5) Focalizing Conversion (Second Tense + πε)
Ex. 16:8 οτραπ τεκας ΝΑΨΩΝ ΣΑΨΩΝ ΑΝ πε (Ν super lin.; Vat ναψ-, no πε).

In Bohairic, outside the corpus:
eπε-ναιιαζαι Νως Ντοτ κ πε (AM II 238).

Obs.
(2) In Coptic narrative (unlike pre-Coptic Egyptian), the Focalizing Conversion is never part of EM, but a typical CM form. This agrees well with the construction in point here.
(3) Although the Focalizing Conversion in Coptic (rarely if at all) functions as a "that" form, some instances recall Egyptian "mrr.f pw," "It means that..." and even "c'est que..." (Polotsky 1976 §26.4). We have as yet no attestation of πε following nexus in Demotic and LE cf. Sethe 1925:§15; Loprieno 1995:109ff. and the reference to Sasse on p. 263 n. 26.

(6) Lev. 8:31...οτορ πεζεμωτες πε ρατων (Vat om. πε)
This example is, I believe, unique. I cannot account for πε here.

(h) Micronarrative subtextemes and their systems

Chronicling narrative: carriers λα- vs. ναψ- πε (age correspondence):

Gen. 5:31 οτορ λαψωνι ναε-νεροοτ ηκοτ ντελαξεχ ΨΗΓ ΝΡΟΜΠΙι οτορ λαμοσ οτορ νοι ναψΧ ΝΕΝΦ ΝΡΟΜΠΙ πε οτορ ΑΝΕΕ ΖΕΕ-Γ ΝΩΗΡΙ.

Aetiological Narrative (especially for naming or identification):
Gen. 11:9, 16:14, 30:6, 32:33, 36:24: only the husk of a story, in minimal sequences of the “flat” λα- carrier, with νε- wholly absent.

“Recycled reminiscent condensed Narrative”: Deut. 1-3, 5:22-25, 9:8-10. Note the change of personal axis (3rd plur. to 1st sgl./2nd plur.);
carriers εταλ-, λα-; νε- rare: νε- γατ without πε (9:24:25); νε- Ξ for concomitant (“obtaining situation”, 5:23, 10:3) but also νε- Ξ for Enhanced Evolution (9:9), in this special edited narrative sequence which is in fact almost entirely made of highlights; very rarely νε- πε, that is (2:15 [=Vat] is evidently a case of und zwar; in 5:24 ΝΑΨΕΝΔΩ ΝΜΟΟΧ πε [=Vat], the people’s declaration is presented as cataphorically significant and even crucial). Cataloguing, not sequencing λα- λα- λα- (e.g. 3:7ff., 10:3), with a different οτορ vs. zero ratio and function; also, a different dialogue / narrative ratio.
1st-person-centered “locutive” Narrative: Gen. 1:29, 27:2:6 ἔννυ-
πε ἄι: “nynegocentric” perfectum praesens; Gen. 3:10 (Cleft Sen-
tence); Gen.24:34-37 (Report merging into Locutive Narrative)40.

Report (historical or generic-hypothetical) reveals dialogic features:
Gen. 3:12f. ἐστίνι εἰκανίς ἃδη θεος ἀσίνι ἕννυ-
πε ἄι ... πιηθηνεραε μμώι ἄιστα — topi-
calization, focussing (Cleft Sentence).

Deut. 26:13f. αἰτασβ ονν εδοσαι εβολ δεπανία αἰτι-
τοτ ηπεπίτεις νιμ πιηθηνε νιμ πιρφανος νιμ
τασρα ... μπισοσ νεβιν νεκεντολιν στογ ηπερπενσων
στογ ηπεπισωι δενοθκαρ νηθε εβολ μμώσοι μπιταλο-
saia μμώσοι επισωδειμ μπητ εβολ μμώσοι ... — strings of
negative Preterite (the negative Preterite not delimitative, see below),
recalling the Egyptian so-called “negative confession” (Book of the
Dead, Chapter 125)

Deut. 22:16 ηπερει ονηι αἰςε (Greek. δεδωκα) μπίρωμι
ενεσιν ετακχεστως ηποιο ηποιο ηποιο πταλα πιπακι
εδωσ — topicalization; compatibility with the Present tense.

Also Gen. 39:14ff. δεπανίανθηηεπ -; appositive φαι ετ-
relative construction; interlocutory pronominal compatibility; Gen. 41:10-13;
42:30f.; Ex. 32:23 πεδως γαρ...

Rather surprisingly, we do not find the Focalizing Conversion in Re-
port narratives (the FC occurs in Narrative included, as object of cogni-
tive verbs, e.g. Gen. 43:25; or else in true CM, as in Gen. 25:10; or in
poetic textiemes, e.g. Deut. 33:21). See further below.

I find especially fascinating the catechetically “responsive” Set
Narrative:

Deut. 26:5ff. στογ εκεερασω εκεεος μπεομ οοεε
πεκνοσφ ἕε-ταρια ακοτας νηε-παιντ ακωνλ έυ-
πη εκεμι σεογ εμασ δεπανίακα Δηπιι εκολο
καμ εοονιστ νιλαο ... άσεμκαρ ηαα νιεμενκε
στογ αεθεβισ ετεενε αεθεβισ ετεενε αεθεβισ εσσ
στογ αεθεβισ εμενεβισ ... αεθεβισ εβολ δεπ-

40 The quintessential delocutivity of the written French “Preterite [passé simple] Nar-
rative” was pointed out by Roland Barthes; see BANFIELD 1985a (see p. 7, n. 9 on 1st-
person Narrative) and 1985b:6. The famous case (Camus. L’étranger) of the poetic de-
vice of having the French Perfect (passé composé) as the narrative carrier proves the
point. Moreover, this delocutivity signifies the detaching of the narrative grammar from
the Narrator’s “I” (Benveniste apud BANFIELD 1985b:7), making the tension and alterna-
tion between the EM and Narrator/Audience-oriented CM so real and important as a po-
etic principle.
The generic hypothetical scenarios in Leviticus and elsewhere are instances of legal or preceptive narrative scenario, case-raising (“full-setzend”) that postulate complex possible event sequences akin to generic conditional protasis-apodosis complexes, even when not introduced by εὑρίσκω “should it happen”. The preceptual dénouement is a true superordinated apodosis, either the Absolute Future (see below, dialogue tensing) — for the instruction itself, presented as an unconditional, not-to-be-questioned ensuing event, rhematic to the entire foregoing thematic narrative stretch; or the Preterite, expressing the legal or ritual significance and definition of the foregoing plot. The Conjunctive is here the main carrier, conditionals are delimitations, the negative Conjunctive or negative Conditional and Circumstantial forms supply the restrictive stipulation:

Lev. 5:1 εὑρίσκω ἐν κτεινότεροι οἴνοβι οὗτος κτεινότεροι ετελείωσα ὅσον θαῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ πε πε θάνατο ιε θέμει εἰπώθη καθεμένως εἰπώθη μνείαι μνείαι.

The Preterite, when it occurs in this case as a narrative background component, is interesting, but does not really conflict with the temporal genericity (cf. Shisha-Halevy 1986a:202f.); it varies with the Conjunctive (cf. Lev. 5:4 οὗτος θαῦμα οὗτος ημετεροπήμη), may share in coordination or disjunction with the unconverted Nominal Sentence, or with the definitely generic verbal noun (cf. Lev. 5:21 εἰ εἴθεσθαι ἡμετερόφθηρε εἰ εἴθεσθαι θαῦμα ιε θάνατον ιε θέμει οἴνοβι οὗτος κτεινότεροι κτεινότεροι ετελείωσα.

Lev. 5:17ff. οὗτος θαῦμα οἴνοβι οὗτος κτεινότεροι κτεινότεροι ετελείωσα.
The Preterite may convey the significance of the events as explanation basis for the outcome, with \( \text{\_\_\_\_r\_\_\_\_} \):

Lev. 20:12 εμφ αλαστάι Νχοντ νεμον ερελλετ νταγ μα-

The “adulterous woman” episode (Num. 5:12-31) is especially sophisticated and rich in grammatical information. Starting off with οτσωμι αρεβανεβεσιν ερπαβενίν οτσον ηντζινγο

The Nominal Sentence with \( \text{\_\_\_\_r\_\_\_\_} \) for legal significance and definitions (15), dialogue with allocution (19f.) and the preset Response (22), conclusion, summing-up and resumé with an embryonic narrative (29ff.).

In the case of the ‘ineluctable prophetic scenario’, e.g. in Deut. Chapter 28; 31:20, the Narrative Carrier is the Absolute Future (\( \text{\_\_\_\_r\_\_\_\_} \), see Dialogue Tensing below), with an interplay of \( \text{\_\_\_\_r\_\_\_\_} \) and zero for linkage: εισιτον γαρ εξον επικαρ α มาθαιν... εβεβον

Obs.

It is of interest to note that the original Hebrew uses ki-yiqtol for initiating these legal narratives, and distinctively w-qatal both for the main carrier (contrast wa-yyiqtol for the EM in non-generic narratives) and the dénouement-outcome-apodosis-instruction. Both Greek and Coptic make a clean and clear formal break, the former between the Conjunctions following ἢσυ or ὃς ἢσυ and the future.

1.1.4 Atemporal / Extratemporal/ Present / Non-Verbal Nexal Forms in Narrative

These are of interest especially, on the one hand, since Bohairic Coptic does not use the narrative or the so-called Historical Present, so
typical of Greek, as of most other IE languages. On the other hand, the two narrative forms in question, namely the Aorist ωακωτεμ and the Nominal Sentence, do not have a specific Greek formal correspondent at all, and so indicate, as peculiarly "Egyptian", an internal authentic functional value in Coptic uninfluenced by the Vorlage (which is not to say that there isn't in the Greek some signal that triggers the choice of one of these Coptic specialties). Yet another point of interest is the cohesive aspect: these clause forms are not necessarily marked as Narrative (by ηε-) and therefore optionally, and positively, markable (by zero) as excluded from the overall textemic frame. Needless to say, this latter case proves again the point that past tense (let alone past time reference) is not a necessary constituent of Narrative.

(I) The Nominal Sentence

This pattern set (see Chapter Two) is especially intriguing, since we have here a truly "Egyptian" phenomenon — a special nexus pattern (not verbless, or verb-zeroed, but non-verbal: see Shisha-Halevy 1998:108ff. and 1999:156ff.), and the syntactic pattern does not exist in the Greek Vorlage. The NS, a much-discussed pattern set or sets, is atemporal, i.e. tense-indifferent. When it is ηε-converted, this does not tense-mark it for the past, but serves cohesively, as a link, to "narrativize" it, to integrate it in Narrative or as a specific component of Narrative. The patterns occurring in Narrative (all delocutive) are, according to my typology of 1987: the delocutive Theme, expanded, or (a typical Bohairic choice) topicalized; the Endophoric-Theme pattern; the Copular Naming Pattern (see Chapter Two).

(1) The NS unconverted by ηε-: included; metanarrative; extra-Narrative (chronicling); naming.

(a) The Delocutive pattern, included ("subordinated"), by converter or conjunction ("that"):

Gen. 25:3 αγμο σευσέλλα πε εγξεκ εβολ.


Gen. 38:16 μπεζεμί γαρ άηε-τεςψελεε τε — άηε- conditioned by the verb.

(b) Expanded Delocutive (demonstrative Rheme) — metanarrative, extra-Narrative, chronicling:

Deut. 33:1 φαί πε πιςμοσ ετάκσμοσ ημοσ ηάε-μώτεςχε.
Gen. 36 passim nai ne niǎfo nte-ncaw ... nai ne nenwuri nala tocimi nhcaw ... nai ne nihemenw ntenenwuri nhcaw.

(c) The Copular Pattern — naming:
Gen. 2:11-14 fran notai mmowo pe fhcwn fai pe fh etkwa† epikazi thra nevlaat ... otog piwaro mmag-† pe pitirhc ... piwaro mmag- tabindex fai pe pieiφrathnc.

(2) The NS ne- converted:

(a) The Topicalized Delocutive NS — Evolution Mode: cataphoric-descriptive slowdown; characterization of a Narrative participant (as a rule, a singular individual) as preparatory for follow-up. Thus, in terms of texture and juncture, it is a delimitation. The Topic, always highly specific and typically a Proper Name, effects Theme-switching or Theme (re-)introduction. The Rheme is always indefinite:
Gen. 1:2 nikari de neotatnae eroq pe otog natcov†.
Gen. 3:1 pigaq de neotscave pe eboλ osto neπriπiion treto.
Gen. 6:9 nwe de neotrwmi nehmhi pe.
Gen. 25:27 otog hcaw neotrwmi pe eπcswotn ntemet-derhe nepemnkoi.
Ex. 32:16 nilkax neotswwb nteφ† pe.

(b) Comment Mode: anaphoric background situation
Gen. 11:30 ...otog carpa neotaratpni te otog nacφeφwmi an pe.

(c) Comment Mode: Narrator’s Channel: extra-narrative glossing.
Ex. 16:36 pigotaφor de neotrepmt pe nte-piŋ nωi.
Contrast, in a dialogic locutive report, no ne- conversion:
Gen. 46:32 nirmwi de gamanecswot ne gampwi gap nrapefanew-tebn ne.

(d) ne-converted unexpanded Delocutive (rare) — anaphoric Comment Mode characterization:
Gen. 14:18 otog melixedeck potro ncalim aqenpanwik eboλ nem ganhri pefotonb de pe mf† etsoici.

(e) ne-converted expanded Delocutive (rare) — explicative background Comment Mode:
Gen. 43:32 neotscwq gap pe nπemenxhni + pe ma necswot niben nteniecwot.
Note here the “foreshadowed" πε, common in Nitrian Bohairic (Shisha-Halevy 1986a:167f.; see Chapter Four).

(f) ne-converted Endophoric Pattern: Evolution Mode dramatic development — Narrative Peak. Obtaining Situation in Evolution Mode development:

Gen. 29:25 ἀγωστὶ δὲ ετατοῦσι σωτὶ θηπὶ νελὶα τε.
Gen. 15:17 επὶ ἐν νεφνατ νρωτπι μφρν πε ÷ οτσλαγ
ἀγωστὶ — the Greek has here ἐπεὶ δὲ ἔγινε τὸ ἡλιος πρὸς
δυσμαῖς; Coptic seems to read the confirmative ἐπεὶ with δὴ “al-
ready”, and not a subordinated clause.

Gen. 40:20 ἀγωστὶ δὲ σενπιεγοοτ μμαζ-Γ τε ÷ πεγοοτ
μμἰconsin μφαραῳ τε. This locus is somewhat problematic: the separa-
tor in ne ÷ πεγοοτ is unique (Vat has here no separator until after
πε), and raises doubt as to the converter status of ne- (the Hebrew has
no verb or pronominal Theme).

(g) ne- converted zeroed-Theme Delocutive (rare): unexpected de-
velopment in Evolution Mode:

Gen. 25:24 οτογ αομοζ εβολ νξενεγοογ εζεεμικοι
οτογ νξαλεθετς ενκε σεντεκ νεζι.

(h) The Relative-Topic Cleft Sentence, based in Bohairic, not on the
Endophoric NS subpattern but on the Immutable pragmatic-Theme (πε)
one, is very rare in narrative. It gives CM information:

Gen. 2:6 οτσυσμι δὲ εψατει εψωι εβολ βενεδεμ οτογ
ψαυτςο μπρο μπκας τῃρ.
Gen. 2:10 οτιαρο δὲ εψατι εβολ βενεδεμ.

Obs.

See Biedenkopp-Ziehner 1999. I believe it is not the Theme πε alone that signals
CM information (62. 66f.), but the pattern as a whole: πε is rather a referent to a prag-
matic situation.

(II) The Aorist ωαζκωτην in Narrative:

This is an especially interesting form for our examination from sev-
eral points of view, both contrastively — Greek has no special corre-
spondent for it — and internally, both synchronically and diachronically
ωαζ- (especially discussed below, among other Dialogue/Exposition
tenses and as a tense opposed to the Present tense) is not merely (like the
Narrative Present in such languages as feature it) a generic tense: it has
inter alia a sequelling or ensuing-resultative semantic component which,
however, is not used in the corpus for narrative-event linkage; it is typi-
cally apodotic to the extratemporal Conditional ἀκομάν-, and superordi-
nated. Its affirmative and negative constituent "correspondents" have
proceeded diachronically apart, just as they integrate differently in the
synchronic system: they are asymmetrical, perhaps more than any tense
subsystem. ἡμι- differs from the Generic (or Non-actual) Present in
ways that will be precised below. One is its very occurrence as a "ha-
bital" narrative tense. It is extratemporal in narrative as well. It is not
turned into a past tense by νέ-, but rather given narrative compatibility
and cohesion. Note that ἡμι- almost never occurs delimitatively, in
Theme-switching (ὡρε-), but always in personal linkage (ὡρα-).

Obs.
Sahidic narrative νέ-ἡμι-, perhaps typically, corresponds often to unconverted ἡμι-
in Bohairic: Ex. 33:8, Num. 9:17:18 — although Sahidic too occasionally documents the
unmarked narrative Aorist\(^4\). See De Vis II 133 for the rare narrative ἡμιμανία.

(1) Unconverted ἡμιμανία

(a) Comment Mode: Omniscient Narrator's Channel, explicative extra-narrative information:
Gen. 50:4 πάντα ἔριθτον ἁγγενείσον τεθνείκωκε.

(b) Non-specific action in Evolution Mode Narrative: features of
regularity, procedure and protocol. Typically, sequelling in apodosis to
narrative eventual-temporal protases (ἀκομάν-, μενενέα:, Ν νιβέν
et., εὐμανπα), i.e. superordinate. Affirmative and negative.
Ex. 18:26 ἀκομάν ἐπητείος ... ὀνόματα ἀπέχεν ἐπιλακόν
πε Ν νιβέν νιβέν + πικαδί ετανθω ἄκομαν επιστέ ακα-
κομάνια = καδί νιβέν εταίοιοι ὀνόματα ἀπειρο ἐρμον
νιβένοτ.
Ex. 33:7 ὀνόματα ἐπητείος ὀσον νιβέν ετκωτ κατάκτη
μαπανία ἐμολα ἐπίσκοφη.
Num. 9:17 εὐμαν ἰπεραντῆσθηνι γενεσ ἐπιγενεναι
μαπανίτευκ... (Greek Aorist).
Num. 9:23 ἐμοὶ ἀπειρο ἰπεραντῆσθηνι γενεσ ἐμολαττεὐε
ματαρεὶς εἰποτε ἰπεραντῆσθην (= Greek Aorist).
Ex. 33:11 ὀνόματα καθι ἀπατευτος σορο ὀσβεύο ... ὀνόμα
ἡμιμαν ἐμοὶ ἐποτε ἐπίπαρεμβολή.
Ex. 40:37 ἐμοὶ ἐπ ήμπατας ἐμοτε καταμετωποῦ εἴσεπι
μαπανίωτη ἰπεραντῆσθηνι εἰσεμπατε
μαπανίτευκ ἐμογενεσ εἰσεμπατε καταμετού ἐμοτε ἰπεραντῆσθηνι.

\(^4\) The conversion system of the Aorist is not straightforward, testifying to the intri-
cate synchronic and diachronic profiles of this very special form. Cf. Quecke 1979:441,
Gen. 30:42 εὐσπὶ δὲ αὕτων τὸν ἴδιον ἄνθρωπον ἐποίησεν θεοὶ 

Also Ex. 33:8f., Ex. 34:34, Ex. 40:36f.

Obs.


(c) Non-specific eventual sequelling — Evolution Mode:

Num. 11:4-10 οὗτος ἰδρυμικὸς ἰδρυμικὸς περὶ πολλῶν ἔργων 

Note that the Aorist resumes here the Preterite narration after a long interposition of the Israelites' complaint, the description of the manna and the manner of collecting it: events are reported by the Aorist tense.

(d) Pre-narrative cosmological scenery (creation geographics) (Omniscient Narrator's Channel?):

Gen. 2:6 οὗτος δὲ εὐσπῆλθεν ἐπιλεγμένος ἐγένετο οὗτος 

Gen. 2:10 ὡς μᾶς ἐπιλεγμένος ἐγένετο.

Note here the Cleft Sentence, as a rule excluded from Evolution Mode. In both instances the Greek has the Imperfect.

(e) Scenario: μακρινον for marked resultative sequel — Evolution Mode.

Inevitability in ensuing is an essential semantic component of μακρινον, and one of its more striking affinities with the Absolute Future εἰκότε (see below). Natural processes are typical:

Ex. 17:11 οὗτος ἰδρυμικὸς ἰδρυμικὸς περὶ πολλῶν μακρινον τὸν κύριον ἐπείποτε εἰς τὸν κόσμον τοῦτον εἰς τὸν κόσμον (in Greek, the Imperfect).
Num. 21:8f. God’s instructions to Moses: ὁτοὺς εσκύπτοις ἀρε- 
ωπημεν σιλαντὶ εὐτρωμὶ ὁτοὺς εὐκάμῳς εἰποὺ ἀν- 
ζωτὸν ὁτοὺς εὐκάμας. The narrative realization of the same pro- 
gram: ἐσκύπτοις ἁρωμεν ἀρεωπημενες σιλα- 
τὶ ἀνζωτὸς εἰποὺς ἀνζωτὸν εὐκάμας (= Greek Imper- 
flect).

Ex. 16:21 ἀραβανιμοὶ ΝΕ-ΦΡΗ χαββαὶ ἐβολ (i.e. the 
manna).

Gen. 39:3 ΝΑΨΗΜΙ ΝΕ-ΝΕΡΟΠΣΕΝ ΝΕ-ΝΣΕ ἕν ΝΕΜΑΙ ὁτοὺς 
χαββ βίβη ἐραβανιτὸς ΧΑΡΗ-ΝΣΕ ζοῦντες 
παρανυμβέλες.

Ex. 1:19 ΝΕΞΕ-ΝΙΡΕΣΙΜΕΙΟΣ ΝΕ ΜΦΑΡΑΙΣ = ΝΕ-ΜΗΡΗΣΤΟ 
ΑΝ ΝΙΡΓΙΟΜΙ ΝΙΣΚΗΜΙ = ΝΕ ΝΙΡΓΙΟΜΙ ΝΙΣΚΗΜΕΡΕΟΣ = ΝΑΡΜΙΚΙ 
ΓΑΡ ΚΑΙΝΗΜΙΑΣΟΝ ἐξορνητὸς ΝΕΞΕ-ΝΙΡΕΣΙΜΕΙΟΣ = 
ὁτοὺς ΝΑΡΜΙΚΙ ΠΕ (= Vat). Properly a narrative scenario-in-allocation 
(Dialogue) form, ΝΑΡΜΙΚΙ here expresses regular (“natural”) inevi-
table procedure, and the same verb recurs, coordinated and marked by 
ΝΕ-ΝΠΕ, Greek καὶ ετίκτον (not so in Hebrew, where “and they give 
birth” (w-qatal) expresses a regular generic superordinated sequel); this 
can only be the Narrator’s own comment on what happened in Egypt, 
“and in fact they did give birth”.

(2) The Aorist ΝΕ-converted: ΝΕΨΑΨΩΤΕΝ (ΝΠΕ) (rare).

(a) Comment Mode: natural content (second object actant) of seeing 
(cf. ΝΕ-ΝΠΕ above), or background information:

Gen. 13:10 ὁτοὺς ἀγαπὶ ΝΝΕΡΒΑΛ ἐποίῳ ἀγαπὸς ΝΕΠΕΡΙΧΩ-
ΡΟΣ ΤΗΡΕῖ ΝΤΕΝΙΠΡΑΝΗΣ ΝΕ-ΝΕΨΑΣΤΕΩΝ ΠΕ (= Vat) (Greek ἡν 
ποτιζουμένη).

Gen. 29:3 ἐβολαίς καὶ θεντῶντες ετεμμαῖς 
ΝΕΨΑΣΤΕΟ 
ΝΝΟΙΖ = ΝΕΨΑΣΤΕΟ-ΟΡΝΙΣΤΙ = ΝΕΝΩΝΙ ΤΟΙ ὁτοὺς 
ΝΕΨΑΣ-
ΘΕΟΥΣ = ΤΗΡΟΤ ΕΜΑΣ ΝΕΞΕ-ΝΙΜΑΝΕΣΒΟΤ 
ΝΤΟΥΣΚΟΡΚΕΡ 
ΜΠΙΩΝΙ ἐβολαὶς ΓΙΡΨΕ ΝΣΥΖΕΝ = 
ὁτοὺς ΝΕΨΑΣΤΕΟ ΝΝΙΣΕΒΟΤ 
ὡς 
ΣΧΕΣΕΟ ΜΠΙΩΝΙ ΕΡΟΤ (Vat ΕΡΟΤ) ΝΣΥΖΕΝ = 
ΕΠΕΨΜΑ 
(Vat ΝΑΣ-ΝΕΨΑΣΤΕΟ-ΝΕΨΑΣ-) (Greek Imperfect).

Obs.

(1) See McKay 1988, 1992 for insightful studies of “timeless” verb forms (Present, 
Aorist, Imperfect) and contexts in Ancient and New-Testament Greek Past Narrative, as 
opposed to the past-reference Aorist and Imperfect. See especially 1992:212ff. and
220ff., the last for the distinction of gnomic “paradigmatic” atemporality (e.g. in similes, parables) and Past-Narrative timelessness; the Imperfect is used for a “more emphatic and deeper level of generality”, and rarely, included or background-explicative (1988:197); also the resolution of “mythological Narrative” as an important narrative subtexteme (1988:202ff.); for our neμαq- cf. 1988:205ff. See also PORTER 1989:217ff., 233ff. for the opposition “timeless”‘ vs. “omnitemporal”.

(2) See PERL 1989, SHISHA-HALEVY 1989a:92ff. for atemporal naming in Narrative (Coptic άφιμοι άνθρωποι etc., our ceφιοι, ceμθοι Deut. 2:11:20, 3:9; ERIKSSON 1943:56ff. for the Greek Present used in genealogical history.

(3) See DEPUYDT 1994:64 for the diachronic perspective on what the author calls “aoristus in praeterito”, with examples for wn-ηνσ- + Aorist in Demotic, attested from Ryl. IX on. Incidentally, the fact that ωμαq- is typically apodotic to άκωμαq- does not receive any synchronic systemic attention, see DEPUYDT 1994:83f.

(III) The Present Tense in Narrative

As pointed out above, Bohairic Coptic — and indeed Coptic in general, possibly against pre-Coptic Egyptian — does not share in the “Historical” or “Narrative” Present isogloss (used in other languages either/ and as an “anti-narrative” device, for chronicling or cataloguing or for vivid, dramatic, focussed or highlighted narration, that is for episodal enhancing expressed in Coptic by ne- without πε). This absence is structurally important; I take it as yet another symptom of the independence of the Coptic translation of Vorlāge constraints, for the Narrative Present belongs to the Septuagint Greek tense-system, although to a restricted degree. Nonetheless, the present does occur in our narrative corpus, with a significant restriction of scope.

(a) άε- included or converted Present/Adjective Verbs, following nατ “see” (see further below). Since Coptic does not feature the preterital overrule stylistically and normatively known as consecutio temporum, the present is normal in included status:

Gen. 1:4 οτορ άνατ άνάς-φ† έποτώνι άε-πάνεq
Gen. 29:3 ετάνατ άνε άε-πνός φ† άε-κεμοκτε άαια...
Also Gen. 42:1, Num. 24:1.

Obs.

Note that, following nατ “see”, we encounter an actantial-content opposition paradigm of naq- πε vs. the present: in the latter case, nατ is cognitive-perceptual (“perceive”) rather than visual, and evidently has a different valency: άε- + verb-form is second actant.
(b) Converted: Relative
Gen. 15:11 ἄνει ἐνεκεντ ΝΔΕ-ΝΙΓΑΛΑ ἙΞΕΝΝΙΚΩΜΑ
ἐτφής.

(c) Converted: adverbal, adclausal, adnexal, adnominal Circumstantial:
Gen. 21:22 ΠΔΕ-ΑΒΙΜΕΛΗΣ ... ἑφῶ ΜΜΟΣ ΔΕ...
Gen. 34:25 άσωπι δε ΝΡΗΙ ΣΕΝΠΙΕΡΟΣΝ ΜΑΡ-Γ-ΤΕΧΗ
ΣΕΝΟΤΜΗΚΑΓ...
Gen. 27:34 άσωμ βεβαλ ΣΕΝΟΤΜΗΓ ΝΜΗ ΕΣΕΝΔΑΨΙ
ΕΜΔΩ.
Gen. 26:8 άνασ ΕΙΚΑΚ ΕΡΣΩΒΙ...

(d) The unincluded Present is rarer:
(1) Comment Mode (“Omniscient Narrator’s Channel”): general in-
formation; ethn/o-geographics:
Gen. 2:12 ΠΙΝΟΤΒ ΔΕ ΝΤΕΠΙΚΑΓΙ ΕΤΕΜΜΑΤ ΝΑΝΕΨ.
Deut. 2:11 ΣΕΤ-ΠΑΝ ΕΡΨΩΝ ΔΕ-ΝΙΟΜΜΙΝ.
Cf. also Deut. 2:20 (ΣΕΜΟΤΠ ΕΡΨΩΝ).
Num. 13:21 ΟΤΟΓ ΠΙΧΕΤΕΕΟΣ ΝΕΜ ΠΙΕΒΟΤΣΕΟΣ ΝΕΜ ΠΙΑ-
ΜΟΡΡΕΕΟΣ ΕΣΩΠ ΣΕΝΠΙΑΝΤΤΟΣ.
(2) Comment Mode: Descriptive/backgrounding (+ πε)
A single instance: Gen. 26:7 ΔΕ-ΟΥΙ ΥΡ ΕΝΕΕΨΣ ΝΕ ΣΕΝ-
ΠΙΕΡΟ (= Vat, Greek +ήν).

Obs.
ΜΠΑΤΕΨ- in narrative is always Circumstantial (zero-converted: see below, Chapter
Four), as a rule following the Preterite:
Gen. 41:50 ΛΩΣΙΨ ΔΕ ΑΨΗΡΙ ά ΨΨΝΙ ΝΑΡ ΜΠΑΤΟΤΗ ΔΕ-ΤΣ ΝΡΟΜΠΙ ΝΕΚΟ
Num. 13:22 ΟΤΟΓ ΑΚΕΤΕΧΕΡΨΝ Ν-ΤΣ ΝΡΟΜΠΙ ΜΠΑΤΟΤΚΕΤ-ΖΑΝΙ...
Also Gen. 19:3, 24:45, 44:4, Ex. 12:34, Deut. 33:1.
Possible main-clause cases constitute a shift to CM:
Gen. 36: 31 ΝΑΙ ΝΕ ΝΙΟΤΨΩΝ ΕΤΑΕΡΟΤΡΟ ΣΕΝΕΔΨΝ Γ ΜΠΑΤΕΟΤΡΟ
ΨΨΝΙ ΣΕΝΠΙΤΑ
CM, explicatively backgrounding, are also the rare instances of ΝΕΜΠΑΤΕ-, with ΓΡ:
Gen. 2:5 ΝΕΜΠΑΤΕΓ ΓΡ ΕΡΨΩΝ ΕΙΞΕΝΠΙΚΑΓΙ ΟΤΟΓ ΝΕΜΜΟΝ-ΡΨΜΙ ΝΕ
(also in the NT: John 3:24, 11:30).


Discussing the transition configuration of tenses, above, we were con-
cerned with the syntagmatics of Narrative. Yet this is only one aspect of
the manifold phenomenology of narrative juncture. Gradient linkage and
delimitation make for a complicated textural patterning and of course development rate (pacing) and development manner (cf. the functions expressed for cinematic Narrative by numerous delimitation-procedure signifiers, such as are called: cut (to) and cut-away, fade (to), intercutting, break in action, dissolve, continuity jump or cut as against sequence). Three tightly intermeshed issues are involved, the first two comprising signifier, the third signified features. First, the sophisticated interplay of variously graded links and their negative counterparts, delimiters, is signifier of a textual contour or patterning of juncture. Juncture signals and environments are examined under (a) below. Juncture patterning as eminently, perhaps primarily applied to information structure: first, blocking or chunking (which is a special case of narrative staging and information packaging); then, the high-level thematicity/topicality or thematicity/focality signalling for narrative events, (b) below. Among juncture exponents, the hierarchical marking of events plays a striking role; this is discussed under (c).

Obs.
(1) Absolute narrative-initial delimiters, such as those described for European Narratives (e.g. German by Harweg 1968; French, Bossong 1984, Gálich, 1990; Irish, see van Hamel 1940:221+ n.1; MacCana 1996) occur in pre-Coptic Egyptian, in Old Coptic (Satzinger 1994 217[a]) and, and in Coptic NT parables, but not in our corpus. For general discussions, see Gálich, Hecker and Raible 1974; Wienold 1983.
(2) Narrative juncture is of course just one set of juncture signals among numerous others: see below, Chapter Four, for a systematic scanning of juncture features in the corpus studied. On punctuation in Coptic texts, the earlier grammarians were curiously agreed that it hinders rather than guides analysis; so too Lagarde (Pentateuch Kopisch, Introduction, ix: "Nicht des Redens darüber wert") and Stern (1880 §9 [punctuation] "meist ganz sinnlos gesetzt""). See in some detail below, Chapter Four.

(a) Juncture Signalling: Narrative Cohesion and Delimitation. Juncture Environments
(1) Zero vs. non-zero linked concatenation. The formal opposition evident in contrasting combined events such as Num.26:10 ἀνάκατα ὑπερβάλλειν ἀπομονωθείτων with Num. 11:31 ἀνάπτυξιν ἐβολοῖς ἀπερχόμενος is familiar from many texts in various dialects. It has been variously identified as carrying a junctural function, with zero a link, signifying, through inner cohesion, a certain grade of event blocking; this is the marked term of the opposition (the narrative asyndesis is very "Egyptian", yet with a specific Coptic inversion of

42 εκενκατακτα in 101 is not a Cleft Sentence, but probably a Focalizing Conversion ("a different textual situation"), pace Satzinger op. cit. 218(s).
43 See Chapter Four for the junctural terms and concepts.
marking, for in pre-Coptic Egyptian, it was overt coordination between clauses that was marked; not so noun coordination). Non-zero coordination is a delimitation, signifying an inner weakness of cohesion (the unmarked term). Note that zero coordination does not correspond to prosodic close juncture between the coordinated terms.

Obs.

(1) It is important to point out that this is no “colloquial-register parataxis” phenomenon (SORNICOLA 1985:15, with ref. to Hofmann’s Lateinische Umgangssprache), but in certain cases (cf. Gen. 27:14:22 (vs.21):25ff., Deut. 9:17, 32:6, recalls the pacing effect of what HAVERS 1931 called the “Enumerative Redewiese” and described as the “veni-vidi-vici-Stil” (treated earlier in IF 45 (1927) 229-251). Cf. the cataloguing-enumerative listing in Ex. 39:15ff., Deut. 28 (prophetic scenario), 32:15ff., and perhaps even Deut. 9:17 ΔΙΟΡΒΕΡ ΝΠΑΛΑΙ ἔτ ΕΒΟΛ ΔΙΕΝΑΔΙΧ ΑΙΣΚΗΣΑΝΟΥ ΝΠΗΤΕΝΜΕΘΟ ΕΒΟΛ and Num. 12:11 ΔΕ-ΩΝΗ ΑΝΕΡΑΤΕΝΙ ΑΝΕΡΝΟΒΙ.

(2) Sahidic, and rarely Nitrian Bohairic (cf. AM II 158 ΔΡΚΟ ΩΤΩΡ ΔΕΡΡΗΝΙ ΕΧΚΦΩΝΤ ΝΠΗΤΟΥ ΩΤΟΡ ΑΥΤΑΣΕΟΥ... use also the Circumstantial εακ- as a (sub-coordinated) concatenating narrative link-form. This use of the Circumstantial Preterite may go as far back as the narrative use of the Circumstantial σελ.ι.τ in Middle Egyptian.

(3) ΝΕΜ does not coordinate narrative event forms, although it does coordinate clauses: Gen. 2:5, Deut. 29:6. See below, Chapter Four.

(4) For the linking force of zero coordination, cf. the micro-coordination and sub-coordination by means of the Conjunctive (SHISHA-HALEVY 1986a Chapter Seven). For the analogousness of the zero coordinated Preterite to the post-imperatival Bohairic ΜΑΡΕΩ-, see POLOTSKY 1987b:161, and further below (Dialogue).

(5) Consider zero coordination also in the special resumé reminiscent-narrative texteme (Deut. 1:40ff.).


(8) Evolution Mode events — concatenated — are strikingly more tightly linked than Comment Mode ones, which are non-concatenating. Cf. BAAYEN 1997:260ff.

(9) As pointed out above, “past-tense concord” in narrative is not really cohesive, as a deictic temporal category; it is however anaphorically cohesive in the very recurrence of ΔΩ in concatenating sequences.

(2) Tense and Mode Shifting. The high delimitative value of ΝΑΕ- and Mode-switching and the relatively low delimitation within Evolution Mode to Enhanced Evolution (ΔΩ- to ΝΑΕ-) have been treated above. (Note that, its delimitative force notwithstanding, ΝΑΕ- still includes some fuzzy anaphoric reference, i.e. linkage, to preceding context).

(3) ΜΝΕΩ:- the negative Evolution Mode delimitation. In Comment Mode (ΝΑΕ- ΑΝ ΜΕΩ), negation does not delimit per se, while it is

KLEIBER 1993 objects to the application to tense-categories of the much-discussed distinction of deictic and anaphoric.
a co-delimiter. In Evolution Mode, however, in the dynamic main-line, a Preterite chain sequence is typically "broken", delimited by a negative Preterite. This (often with other delimiters, such as topicalization and/or particles) constitutes a very common device for pacing and rhythm-setting. Narrative concatenation, it may be said, is essentially unnegatable, and is broken by negation, which signals the final boundary of an event sub-chain:

Gen. 15:10f. αἰχί δὲ ναὶ νιᾶτης οὐκ ἀφασῶσιν ἀρχαῖον μπεθύνειον νιώμπινεβίον νειπμενίον τὸ δὲ μπεθύμενον.

Ex. 16:24 οὖς ἀφεωξὶν ἐβολὰς μὴ οὐρωγοὺς θαλαττάς αὐτὸν ἑπαργύρας ἐν ὁικός οἰκεῖ ὁμμέλαις ἐν οἰον ἁμεθύμενος.

Num. 9:6 οὖς ἀφοίτωτος ... οὖς ἀφοίτιοι οἰκεῖ ἁμεθύμενος εἰρίκ ἐμπακχά.

Gen. 30:40 ...οὖς οἰκεῖ ἁμεθύμενος ἔρωτοι ναὶ νιῶροι μπεθύμενος ἐνεμοῦντος δὲ νιῶροιν μπεθύμενος.

Gen. 38:15 αἰχί δὲ ἁμαρ σπάμενος περακύρος ἐπιράμε οὖς βαρμένος μπεθύμενος ἕρω ἁμαρ καρ αὐτοῦ ἀμεθύμενος τὸ ... οὐκ ἁμεθύμενος.

Gen. 38:20 ἀνερθεῖ ὁ δὲ ναὶ νιῶροις ἐμπακχάτοις οἰκεῖ ἁμεθύμενος ὁμμέλαις ἁμεθύμενος ὁμμέλαις ... οὐκ ἁμεθύμενος.

Obs.
(1) The main difference between Old/Middle Egyptian and Coptic formal narrative texturing seems to be in the rich repertory of special delimitation signals of the former. In Old and Middle Egyptian, both the "Obtaining Situation" (in Evolution Mode) and "Omniscient Narrator's Information" (in Comment Mode) components of narrative, Comment Mode and Enhanced Evolution components are characterized by the durative-present, adverbial-Rheme or Nominal Sentence nexus patterns, typically preceded and marked by a paradigm of particles (sk, st, jhr, jsk, jst), but also by zero as "absence of jw". Indeed, the familiar, only apparent paradox of the "relief" form — "important" yet "incidental" or "marginal" — is well explicable by the duality of CM and Enhanced Evolution. Without this marking particle, the same pattern expresses Enhanced Evolution: description, close-up slow-motion and so on (consider The Shipwrecked Sailor 25ff., 59f., pace VERNUS 1990a:172f., 192f.); the Static expresses the "obtaining situation" (Shipwrecked Sailor, 23ff.). The "narrative backbone", or evolution carrier, is the $sdm.n.f$ form (Actor + Static for verbs of movement and some other intransitives). $Wn$ peripheral forms express i.a. enhanced evolution, also the past durative or habitative, while 'h' and jw- /w- hpr.n, wn-jn- etc. are Evolution Mode "foregrounding", accelerating, chunking delimitations. Other important EM delimitations are hpr.n., the specific narrative $sdm.jn.f$; and the periphras-

45 JUNGE 1989:98 "Following Weinrich, Tempus, it should be enough to translate forms like that as Preterite (French: imparfait), the ('zero-stage') 'tense' of narration" is inaccurate: the unmarked narrative tense (Benveniste's and Barthes's "Aorist") is the French passé simple; the imparfait is not a Preterite: and $sdm.jn.f$ is a chunk-initial delimitation signal.
tic Cleft Sentence #INFinitive (movement) *pw jr.n-*#, the latter signalling the inter-episodal seam and "narrative change".

(2) Several Evolution Mode delimitations (beside the negative perfect\textsuperscript{46}, the reasserted Proper Name\textsuperscript{47} and so on) occur in Demotic, varying in role: *hprf jw-r* /Temporal/adverbial, *w-r wwnwt t3-jr hpr, (hpr) t3-wnwt n- j-r-f*. Cleft Sentence and other constructions to express "immediately", "suddenly" and "as soon as..." (P. Spiegelberg 3/15, 13/10, 14/18, P. Krall 7/33-8/1, 9/3f.7, 10/14f. etc. Mythus 4/2, 12/28, Setne II 1/15, 2/32, 3/16, Volten 1962 ("Ägypter und Amazonen") 2/21.29; Hor (ed. J. D. Ray) 8): in Mythus, consider the *hprf + ADV. paradigm + sdmf* foregrounding or EM "propulsion" or "forward spurt" configuration (3/8, 12/9f., 18/12, 19/12f., 20/4ff/24f. etc.). Especially striking in Mythus is *e-hwnn3w-wn* - to introduce a story-within-a story (2/8, 16/1ff., 17/9f., see Smith 1992:83) and *j.jr.w. hpr e-hwnn3w-wn* for episode opening (18/2ff.). The Circumstantial converter too is a common delimeter, of a higher linkage value (Setne II 6/23ff.). On the important delimitation signal *j.jr.s hpr*, in Ryl. IX preceding the Circumstantial *jw sdmf* (cf. *acwmtw eaq*), see Vittmann 1998:269ff.; "ein Stilmittel, nicht durch grammatisch-syntaktische Erfindnisse bestimmmt" (271) ignores macro-syntax; "Für die Übersetzung bleibt es gleich, da *i.jrij s hpr [...]* eine im Deutschen nicht unbedingt wieder zugebende stilistische Funktion hat" (271 n.52) is incomprehensible to me. A sensitive translation into German or any other language must account for narrative chunking and texture in general, and particle-rich German, no less sophisticated in discourse signalling than Egyptian, seems ideal for this purpose. See also Vittmann 1998:330 for 2/15, 3/5 the CS delimitation.

(3) Cf. Baayen 1997:268ff. on negation as a narrative link/delimiter; also Hwang 1992:331ff. on negatives marking high-tension points in Narrative.

(4) On the Narrative Present as link/delimiter in NT Greek (Mark), and see Levinsohn 1977, 1992 "detachment of events from their contexts — detached events introducing a new paragraph when that paragraph represents a new section of a larger incident", see Maloney 1989.

(4) Deixis, Anaphora and Cataphora in Narrative. The deictic system of Coptic is relatively simple, even when compared with pre-Coptic Egyptian. In our Bohairic narrative, {Φαί, Φαί}, actually the locutive ("I-deixis") and interlocutive (I/you-deixis) deictic index, is generally used, as for information supplied by the Narrator-Locutor: *menēncanāf* (e.g. Gen. 38:30), *menēna-nai-eqōt dē etōw etēmmat* (Ex. 2:23), *arōstwtes ebol taī* (Gen. 37:17; seemingly equivalent here to *mmā* "there", e.g. Ex. 10:7), *taī dē naṣxh...* (Gen. 38:5) where the demonstrative is the topical and cohesively marked alternant of the personal pronoun; the same pronoun occurs in EM as well as CM: (Gen. 38:10) * irqōb dē ḫwmt eqśwot mpēmōn mpf* *dē-qāpiri mpāqwət etōt quśwtes mpnixet, nai ne...* (e.g. Gen. 36 passim), *Φαι πε πεςμοτ ηταχμοτ ἡμοι νάζε-μαχσε* (Deut. 33:1), *ebol θēnai atūwpa ebol* (Gen. 10:5),

\textsuperscript{46} Cf. Setne 4/37f., 6/9 etc. In *bn-pw;j swr jrp bn-pw;j wnm jwf bn-pw;j dkm j n mw*, (Eriksen 1956 3/4), we have, not a concatenation but a "negative catalogue".

\textsuperscript{47} Cf. Setne 4/14-20.
eisdepi evdeoc... (Gen. 10:9). Note the unchanging “dialogic”
deixis in Gen. 29:27-8 δεκ-νῦν οὖν εβολ ηνδεια οτορ εινέκ
ντχε νακ / ἄλληκ-τῷ εβολ ηνδεια οτορ ἄλλαν τῇ... 
Note that the Φαι series is used cataphorically as well as anaphorically; for the former, consider for instance Deut. 1:5.

Obs.
(1) It is in Dialogue that the opposition Φαι (proximal) vs. ΦΗ (distal) really becomes
operative: consider Gen. 37:22:32f. This opposition is also functional as nuclear to the
relative, Φαι-ΦΗ et-: see SHISHA-HALEVY 1994:228ff. (with complex reference differ-
ences of phoricity and “deictic tone”).
(2) The Preterite, the main narrative carrier, is evidently compatible with the “hic and
nunc” τότε (“now”) only in strongly presentative locutive dialogue, where it is then
resolved as a perfectum praesens (cf. BERSCHIN’s review of H. WEINRICH’s Tempus³,
BERSCHIN 1979:89): (Ex. 3:9) οτόρ γαρ τι τότε ιη εἰ πάρων ννεωγηρί
μπικα αλι ενωτο εϊποι.
(3) The temporal/local deictics of the “then”/“there” type (German da, Welsh yna, Italian
alora, Hebrew az and so on), Evolution-Mode onset (“foregrounding”), episode-de-
marcation and narrative-hierarchy exponents, familiar from European and other nar-
ratives, do not occur in Coptic in a comparable role (τότε “then” is a full temporal initial
clause-modifier, e.g. in Deut. 1:5). Similarly absent are the temporal backgrounding
signals like “now”, French or (Old/Middle/Late Egyptian seems to have used ɪṣ in a
similar role). For some discussions of general issues involved, cf. STAMMERJOHANN 1977,
(co)text-deictics, typically with true context-deictic homonyms.
(4) EM onset and episodes, as defined by Van Dijk apud BRINTON 1993:73 (“Coherent
sequences of a discourse, grammatically marked for beginning and/or end, and further
defined in terms of some kind of ‘thematic unity’ — for instance, in terms of identical
participants, time, location or global event or action”) are in Bohairic marked by narrative-
onset delimiters such as ἀνωτάτης (ἐπιγ- ἀγ- (see below) and/or agent topization,
usually with ἀε. See EHRLICH 1990:62ff., BRINTON 1993 for a general discussion of the
episode and its demarcation. Earlier, LONGACRE 1979 and HINDS 1979 postulated the
“paragraph” as the basic building-block of narrative, understood mainly as an extent of
thematic unity and in the framework of pragmatic-semantico-cognitive-communication
theory.
(5) On phoricity vectors in English Narrative, see GUTWINSKI 1976, e.g. 65ff., 112ff.;
79ff., 118ff., 138ff. on lexical cohesion.

(5) Proper Names (and specific substantives/pronominals) are reasserted as strong delimitations (often as Topics, but also as differently
constructed Themes; almost invariably with other delimiters; often following a dialogic insert in the Narrative), while their pronominal repre-
sentation constitutes a common link. The reassertion grading of PNs
seems to be a measure of their narratological (protagonistic) importance
or text-absolute (“pragmatic”) status (reassertion is definitely preferred
for God or the Pharaoh); it is also associated with the very complex paradigm of nominal-Theme construction in or out of conjugation forms (see in detail below, Chapter Four):

Ex. 24:18 ὁ ρύγνας ἦ θεός· ἔστων ... ὁ ἄλλος ἂν ἔστων ... ἐπιτυχεί Εώς ἂν ἔστων...

Gen. 20:4 ἃ ἄλλος ἦ θεός· ἔστων ... ὁ ἄλλος ἀλλοί ἄλλος ἦ θεός· ἔστων ... ἐπιτυχεί ἄλλος ἦ θεός· ἔστων...

Gen. 38:15 ἐατερ ἦ τὸ ναός· ἔστων ... ἐπιτυχεί ἄλλος ἦ θεός· ἔστων ... ἐπιτυχεί ἄλλος ἦ θεός· ἔστων...

Gen. 47:22 ... ἐσιδονταῖς ἄλλος ἦ θεός· ἔστων ... ἐπιτυχεί ἄλλος ἦ θεός· ἔστων...

Obs.

(1) See Ross 1996 for the junctural interplay of (repeated) Proper Names and appellatives with pronominals, especially in Latin (520ff. for the noun as delimitation); Shisha-Halevy 1989a:112ff. for Coptic.

(6) “ἄιακος ἁρμανας”: the nexus-topicalizing delimitation.

This is a construction of importance in most Coptic dialects, discussed below, under Narrative Information Structure; though marginal in our corpus, it is still macro-syntactically operative and fully valued (and marked) in its paradigm, used superordinatively in the final part of a narrative EM chunk:

Gen. 25:33 ἄκατος ἦ ἄλλος ἡμετέρων μικροφορον νια-κωβ.

Gen. 32:2 ἄκωσι τό ναός· ἔστων ... ἐπιτυχεί ἄλλος ἦ θεός· ἔστων ...

Internally, however, this construction constitutes — when opposed to “ἁρμανας” — a striking delimitation, topicalizing the basic core nexus (“ἄιακος”), then and thus marking, prominencing, “ἁρμανας”.

Obs.

See Shisha-Halevy 1983, 1986a:162ff. Polotsky 1990:181. Bosson 2006b on Oxyrhynchite. Generally speaking, we find nexus constituents topicalized; but the fact that a nexus may be focalized per se (see Shisha-Halevy 1995b:162ff.) and that textual stretches may be comprehensively topicalized by anaphoric representatives (e.g. English “[...] and that [...]”, or German “[...] und zwar...”: Shisha-Halevy 1999b:182ff.) supports the expectation that a nexal dependency may also be topicalized; see also Goldenberg 1971, Cohen 2001.
(7) The Narrative/Dialogue interface involves several striking intertextemic delimitations and boundary environments:

(a) Dialogue in Narrative is of course ubiquitous, with δε- an obligatory boundary signal for the “suspension of narrative” (“he said” — πεζαξ etc. — is fully on narrative ground). This is a theoretically difficult issue, which I cannot address here: Dialogue is not merely integrated into Narrative, but it is part thereof, and part of the main-line narrative development.

(b) The narrative projection of a dialogic texteme (in the configuration Dialogue > Narrative), marked by appropriate personal shift, is of particular interest for the zero-coordinated Preterite as projection of the Post-Imperatival Conjunctive:

Gen. 18:25 "Ἀνιστήνητε νησίν ηταοστύμ" οτόρ ἄρινην ναχ ἄροστυμ.

Gen. 18:26 "Γενκ ἐρωι δα-οσφι ἐρωι" οτόρ ἄργηνθ ἐρωι ἄρτι-Φι ἐρωι.

Gen. 27:21f. "Γενκ ἐρωι παῦρηι δα-ταζεμζημ ἐρωι" ἄργηνθ ΝΙΞΕ-ΙΑΚΩΒ ξαίςαακ πεικναιτ ἄρζομζημ ἐρωι.

Ex. 10:21f. "κωλτενεκζζημ επωϊν ετφε οτορ καρεκ-

γωπιν ΝΙΞΕ-ΟΑΧΑΚι" — ἀμωτγις κωλτενεκζζημ επωϊν ετφε οτορ αργωπιν ΝΙΞΕ-ΟΑΧΑΚι sim.14:26f. etc.

Gen. 29:27/8 "Δεκ-ΠΖ οταν εβολ ντεωαι οτορ ειετι ντξε

νακ" — ΑΔΖΞΕΚ-ΠΖ εβολ ντε-θαι οτορ αλαβαντ ...

(c) Dialogic projection of Narrative (Narrative > Dialogue):

Gen. 31:2/5 Ανας ΝΙΞΕ-ΙΑΚΩΒ επγο αλαβανδ δα-ΞΕ-ΝΑΠΟΙ

μπρτι ναχαν ν εφοοτε νεμασι νεπ νε... "νας ανοκ

επγο μπετενιωτ δα-ΞΕ-ΠΟΙ μπρτι ναχαν ν εφοοτε

νεμηιαν".

Note here the telling of dreams. Observe the persistence of the fuzzy-reality signal πε in the telling:

Gen. 41:1ff/17ff. Φαραω Ανας εοτρακοτι δαΞΕΚ-ΝΑΠΟΓΙ

ερτγ πε ζιζεν-Φιαρο γηπμε μπρτι ναεβολ ζενφιαρο

νας ννοσ επωϊν πε ΝΙΞΕ-Ξιε επωιν ενανετ ετ... βαλτων

δε ΝΙΞΕ-Φαραω οτορ άρκηνετ ετι οτορ Ανας εκερακοτι

μμαγ δή γηπμε νατννοσ επωϊν ΝΙΞΕ-Ξιε ΝΣΕΜΕ ζενον-

αζεμν νοτωτ ετδοτ οτωρ ενανετ οτωρ ικεξι ΝΣΕΜΕ

48 The astounding ζινγ (dd.n.f?) in the Schøyen Matthew (Oxyrhynchite dialect, ed. Schenke 2000), 8:32, is certainly part and parcel of the plot.
(d) Narrative-in-Allocation: a compressed embryonic narrative sub-texteme:

Deut. 24:18 ὄτος εἰκερπόμενοι ζέ-νακοι μβυκ πε ζεππ-
καρί νχομί ὀτο ᾨγοτκ ηᾨ-ποτε πεκνοῦτ᾽ εβολ μματ
(often in Deuteronomy).

Obs.
(1) The special stylistic device known as “Free Indirect Discourse” (Erlebte Rede, style indirect libre) may be fundamentally interpreted as the superposing or overmapping of the dialogic textemic system or components thereof onto a narrative one. See LORCK 1921, for an early discussion of an issue central to most modern narrative-grammatical studies; FLEISCHMAN 1990:227ff. and often, for a recent narratological-grammatical discussion.

(2) Some classic or striking discussions of general considerations concerning dialogue in narrative, including the familiar issue, also pertinent for Coptic ἰερα, of the “— said he—” narrative incise (or “Schaltesatz”) and its placement: KIECKERS 1912 (cf. especially the constructions discussed p. 173ff.), 1913; Herrmann 1973, Rosier 1993; Longacre 1994.

(b) Narrative slots (or paradigms) in Evolution Mode

The following are the main formal bounding landmarks of EM configurations:

(1) Narrative-opening signals. Unlike the New Testament, our corpus is remarkably poor in initial boundary markers: this, however, is not true for Dream Narratives and micronarrative textemes, on which see special discussions above.

Obs.

(2) ἐτακ— ἀκ—, in conjunction with ἀκ— ἀκ— ἀκ— marked concatenation sequences, is an important configuration in narrative evolution. It
serves to delimit a new EM segment, but also to integrate narrative events and event-groups. In a formalized hierarchical set of events, we find an iconic association between earlier and subsequent acts, through the formal statement of a time-lapse. Within its complex and in clause scope, etaq- is Topic, and signals a textually rhematic status for the subsequent events. This, beyond “jolting” the plot, refreshes, consolidates and indeed reorganizes it. This is a well-known delimitative slowdown-plus-accelerating, forward-propelling device for “foregrounding” or EM, but we must distinguish in our text at least three subtypes of preceding etaq-:

(a) Theme-agens maintained:
Gen. 24:16 etaci acmacy ntegrapiia.
Gen. 24:63 etaqhouswet nneqbal aqnay.
Gen. 25:8 etaqmobtnk aqmov.

(b) Theme-agens switched or asserted:
Ex. 32:1 etaqnam nxe-pilaooc xe-aqwck nxe-mwhchc...
aqmov† nxe-pilaooc.
Gen. 37:4 etaqnam xe nxe-neqcnhoq xe-peqiwt me
mmq evoal osteneqwphri thrw aqmtqwc nxe-neq-
cnhq — note here the dynamic nxe-construction of the Theme-
agens, signalling narrative development (see in detail below).

(c) No topicalization is present, but rather adverbial clause pre-modification:
Gen. 38:29 qwc xe etaqyen-teqaxiqaq catotq aqi evoal
nxe-neqcon. — catotq resumes here the pre-modifying clause,
while the temporal “protasis” is a form of high-level topicalization⁴⁹;
the inverse sequence, aq- ... etaq- is very different, the Temporal oc-
cupying a modifier-adjunctual slot: Gen.32:31 afph xe wai epoq
taqcini ...

(3) (εὐφτί) aqyan- ... waq-. The so-called “Conditional” is not
conditional in narrative. It is, like etaq-, topical, but not to the tempo-
rally oriented aq-, but to waqcwtem (see further below), initializing
extratemporal narrative-event units. Note the Theme-switching, typical
but not obligatory (the inverse is true for etaq- aq-):
Ex. 17:11 otop qasmq aqyanmwhchc qai nneqzix
waqzennom† nxe-pica.

Ex. 33:8 εὑστηλ ἄε ἄκετακομοην ΝΑΕ-ΜΑΣΤΗΚ ΕΥΑΓΟΥΕΡΜΕΤ ΝΑΕ-ΠΙΑΓΟΣ.

(4) ακεμωνι [Adverbial] ακ-, with the adverbial setting a topical adverbial-status (converbal) verbal paradigm; ακ- is thus super-ordinated, the new EM episode sharply demarcated, and the evolution, as it were, vigorously propelled forwards:


[ΜΕΝΕΝΚΑΘΕΠΕ]- Gen. 27:1 — see detailed discussion below, Chapter Three.

[ΣΕΝΝΑΚΕΠΕ]- Gen. 19:29, 24:52 — see detailed discussion below, Chapter Three.


Similarly Topic + superordinated narrative events are the following cases of dramatic evolution buildup to a narrative peak:

ακεμωνι [ΜΠΑΤΕ-] ΓΗΠΝΕ ΙΣ + NOUN. ΕΠ- (Gen. 24:15).

ετακ- ... ΓΗΠΝΕ ΙΣ ΝΑΛ- (Gen. 18:2).

And the non-adverbial topicalization:


ακεμωνι itself is firmly anchored in the Hebrew-Greek ‘calque’ correspondent (ἐγιέτο), yet continuing an Egyptian narrative device using hpr “become” from the oldest phases on — is conjointly the formalized delimiteter and the Narrator’s cataphoric signalling of new developments to come.

Obs.
(1) Dialogic/locutive εκεμωνι too is followed by the adverbial-Topic slot: Gen. 9:14f., 24:14, 39:10 etc.

(2) Functionally comparable to a degree to these delimitations is the familiar French (and Italian) narrative inversion, close to an “at that point” deictic, generally known as the inversion or the “Arriva le général” construction, a verb-clause thematicization reintroducing a Theme and signalling an “Evolution Onset”. Cf. BLINKENBERG 1928:88ff.; LERCH 1939, CLIFFORD 1973, WALL 1980, WEHR 1984:30ff.

(3) See ZAKRZEWSKA 1999 on the function of ετακ- among other delimitations in Bohaitic Narrative ("providing for the temporal, referential and action coherence of the text").

(5) The paradigm following ΝΑΤ ΔΕ-/ΟΤΟΓ:

The constructions of ΝΑΤ are here presented in a dependence actant matrix:

| ΝΑΤ [Ø 1st OBJ. ACTANT] | ΔΕ- ΛQ- Gen. 8:13  
|                         | ΝΑΝΕς Gen. 1:10:12 etc.  
|                         | ΠΡΕΣΕΝΤ Gen. 28:8, 29:31  
| ΤΗΜΕ | ΘΗΠΠΕ IC ΛQ- Gen. 33:1  
|           | ΔΕ- Nominal Sentence Ex. 2:2  
|           | ΛQ- Ex. 34:35  
|           | ΟΤΟΓ ΝΑQ- ΠE Gen. 6:12  
|           | ΟΤΟΓ ΘΗΠΠΕ ΝΑΝΕς Gen. 1:31  
|           | ΟΤΟΓ ΓΘΗΠΠΕ IC SUBST. ΛQ- Ex. 14:10  
|           | ΟΤΟΓ ΝΕΑQ- ΠE Ex. 39:43  
|           | ΓΘΗΠΠΕ (SUBST.) ΝΑQ- Gen. 19:28, 29:2  
| (ΡΗΜΕ) | (THEME) |

This scheme is, I believe, of interest for the insight of a zero 1st object actant in the case of ΔΕ- complementation, for the actantial exponents, and for the occurrence of both EM and CM in the second object actant, which is evidently rhematic in the subtextual information structure of this configuration.

Obs.
(1) Cases like (Gen. 24:45) ΨΑΤΟΤΣ IC ΡΕΒΕΚΚΑ ΝΑΣΗΝΟΥ ΕΒΟΛ, or (Num. 25:6) ΟΤΟΓ IC ΟΠΡΩΜΗ ... ΑΓΙΝΗ ΜΠΕΚΝΟΝΩ, while certainly evolution onset or even peak delimitations, differ in the Presentative used (IC, not ΘΗΠΠΕ (IC)), which does not complement ΝΑΤ “see”.

(2) In Dream Narratives, ΝΑΤ ΕΟΤΡΑΓΟΣ “see a dream” is arguably also continued actationally by the specific narrative sequence (see above).

(c) Connectors and disjunctors: ΟΤΟΓ, ΔΑΛΑ etc. Particles: ΡΑΡ, ΔΕ, ΔΕ, ΟΤΝ. The Augens

ΔΕ and ΡΑΡ are by far the most common particles occurring in narrative. The special junctural property of these and other particles (of Greek origin) lies in their being, conjointly and simultaneously, both linking and delimiting devices, in their respective ways connecting their clauses (placed following the 1st prosodic position in the clause’s colon) or clause-complexes with the foregoing context, but also initiating a new narrative textual subunit (see below, Chapter Four).

(1) ΔΕ is adversative in Dialogue (consider for instance Gen. 18:27, 24:31, 26:27, Ex. 33:12:12, 25:13 etc.), but in narrative links a new unit or complex, typically with marked Theme/Topic-switching, to its preceding context. Note here the complex linked delimitation signal SUB-
STANTIVE/Pronoun Δέ (νθος) | ——, in EM, CM (background information) or locutive Narrative:

Gen. 4:2 ...οὔτοι δικυβόντα ηφίσται οὐδε-αθέλ νομοθετοντός ἐκαίν 
Δέ φιλήν επικαίριο πε.

Gen. 24:27 qσμάτισεται ηφίσται-τέσσαρες φίλην μπάθει καθαράς φίλη 
ετερονυόμενον νομοθετοντός ... ἄνοικ Δέ από τον τετελεσμένον...

Gen. 27:32 οὔτοι πέτα-εισάκει πεψιμένον φιλήν Δέ ... οὔτοι Δέ 
πέτα- ... 

Non-thematic high-level topicalization:

Gen. 29:31 εταγματευόμενον δια ηφίσται-τέσσαρες φίλην ἀνδρικονικόντα 
ναία 
αποστίλων περικάτεστον.

Topicalization as episode-opening delimitation:

Gen. 41:50 ἰωμήφος δια φιλήν ἐν οὔτοι φιλήν.

Gen. 26:8 πέτα-περικάτεστον τε περικάτεστον τέριον τε ... ἀνομία 
δια καθαράς νομοθετοντός ἀνομία 
πέμψιμένον διά ηφίσται-αμιστεφέλεια εβολον δεσποινώσιτο...

Obs.

On δέ as boundary marker in Classical Greek narrative, see Bakker 1993: note especially 284ff., 290ff. δέ marking event or “participant discontinuity”, shifts in perspective or point of view; 279f. (δέ linking clausal intonation units: marking the Topic; marking frame-setting preposed adverbials). See also Rosen 1973:318ff., 1975a, for superordinative δέ: Reiser 1984.

(2) γαρ (described for Greek by Denniston as “asseverative, confirmatory and causal, inferential”) has such a marked affinity with the Comment Mode that, especially with negative clauses, it may be considered a co-marker with ηφίσται-πε (it is certainly part of the pattern in ηφίσται-πε cases). However, it is often coupled with Evolution Mode Preterites (true evolution) or ηφίσται- (obtaining/relevant situation, etc.) as well: but reason-giving may well not be restricted to the Comment Mode, and γαρ alone does not necessarily imply background or comment. Indeed, this particle uniquely raises the fundamental question of whether it by its occurrence alone shifts the Narrative to CM. Is γαρ — or some occurrences thereof — part of a metatextual utterance? I believe we are dealing with two distinct entities or two roles of γαρ: the first, delimiting, parenthetic, in the (“Omniscient”) Narrator’s Channel, not immediately relevant to the preceding segment; the second, linking within the narrative chain, linear with the evolving plot, explicatory to the preceding segment.
(a) The case of γαρ linking within Enhanced Evolution or “Amplified Episode”: nαν.-

Gen. 47:22 ωτεν-πάργι ννίονιβ μματατι βπειωσχφ

γόπα = σενοταίο γαρ = nαρφταίο “and this, since…”

Gen. 27:23 nαρε-νεψικ γαρ ου δε μφωι (see above, under ne- Ο).

Gen. 29:9 nεου γαρ nαμοι ννιεωςον δεπεσιων.

(b) In the more usual and perhaps even more interesting case of linking γαρ with Evolution Mode Preterites, i.e. the main plot carrier, γαρ links what is the important, often the most important new foreground / evolutive information, with an explicative or justificative event / action. This last is just as much part of the event chain, beside and beyond its inter-eventual relevance to the foregoing narrative segment as its explanation, specification, logical grounding: not explicatively commenting on background, nor giving a meta-narrative reason, but associating its clause (e.g. as the reason for foregoing events, for saying, for naming) with the foregoing evolution context. Like subordination, explication can well be part of the Narrative Evolution, as an “und zwar” thematic addition: “…and this he did and he did so, since…”:

Gen. 19:30 λι γε επωτι ναε-λωτ...λεψοτ γαρ (sim. 20:2, 26:7): the message is his being afraid. This is a neat case of mode opposition, for nαφ- πε is of course usual for “psychologic” Comment Mode (see above). In our case, though, we had best translate (in an und-zwar form): “…and he went up/he did so since he was afraid”.

Reason given for name-bestowing:

Gen. 35:7 λιτρεπβαν μμιά εθεμπατ νε-βεωνα λιε-

παμα δαρ εκαματ λφτ ονονγκ ερου (cf. also Ex. 2:22, in dialogue).

Gen. 38:16 (“He said to her: let me come in unto thee”) μπεψομι

γαρ νε-τεσκελεσε τε.

“For (he) said...”, introducing internal dialogue, is especially striking:

Gen. 38:11 ιπε-ιοτας γε νιαμαρ... αρξοις γαρ νε-

μπωσ εκεμοτ (sim. 21:16).

Ex. 13:17 μπεψιμωι δακωσ ναε-φτ... αρξοις γαρ

ναε-φτ νε... (sim. 12:33, 42:4).

Contrast the Narrator’s background comment with the subsequent evolutive reason-giving for an evolution event in:

Gen. 41:56f. nαρε-πικο γαρ ινειενπεο μπικαγι θρη

πε αροτων γε ναε-ιωσχφ ννιασπ τροτ νεοτο οτο.
TENSING AND STRUCTURE IN NARRATIVE AND DIALOGUE

νάχτ εβολ ... ἀπιγκο γαρ ἐκενομτις εἰκενπαρι τηρε “and he did this, since...”.

Deut. 34:9 ἀνεσον πνεῦμα ναχτ καὶ οὐκαὶ ἀπα-κεχριστι γαρ ἐκδικήν ἡ μοὴ ἀπε-κεκρισθε.

Ex. 13:19 ἀπεκρισθε ως ἐν ἑλληνικα κειμενομ ἀναπα ἰστομ ἐλευσινθηρι ἐπικα...

Locutive Narrative:
Gen. 37:17 ἀγοράσεν ἐβολ ταὶ αἰκώτερον γαρ ἐρωτε ἐγ-καὶ ἐμοὺ ἀδε-μαρων εἰσιωταίμ.
Deut. 2:10 ἀνεργοπ τιρ γαρ ἀπο-άστω καὶ χρόνος ἀπο... νιο-μμων γαρ νάρων ναστωτ ξωτε νε.

(c) Delimiting γαρ with νε-πε (Comment Mode):
Gen. 31:32 (28:11, 29:9 and often) νακεμι γαρ ἀν πε.
Ex. 12:30 λεμονο ἐκ γαρ πε νπεοτην-μοτ νηνττα.
Gen. 29:2 μενεφρ γαρ ηττπ πε.
Gen. 45:26 λεμπερεπταττοτν γαρ πε.

Clearly parenthetic is
Gen. 35:18 λεμπιν δε εκεντι ντεκφταν — λεμκανοτ γαρ πε...

Other particles are rare, or virtually excluded, from Narrative in our corpus (see Chapter Four). In Gen.22:7, άε corresponds to ἀε in Vat. The typically dialogic or expository οὐν, so very common in Greek and NT Coptic narrative (“narrative coherence by suggested quasi-causal relationship”, used “between larger narrative episodes”, Poythress 1984), is extremely rare in the Bohairic Coptic Pentateuch, occurring once in locutive narrative:
Gen. 41:24 λε-ταραποτι οὐν ονικφγρανω... (= Vat).
And once in Delocutive Narrative:
Gen. 27:35 δελαγ οὐν ναγ άε... (Vat άε), apparently similar to Gen. 22:7 νεοτι άε δελαγ άε... (Vat άε)

Obs.
In Greek Narrative, οὖν seems to signal return to EM (Poythress 1984:327f.), whereas δε typically marks the reverse mode switching (ibid. 326f.). On narrative CM γαρ, see Sicking and Van Ophuijisen 1993:131ff.

(3) The Augens in Narrative. The Augens50, essentially a pronominal-linkage modifier, is a typically dialogic element and unusual in narrative.

As a junctural element (see Chapter Four) it is rather tricky, since it may occur as colon-second, and thus as a prosodic-unity boundary signal, but is typically also an ultra-clausal link, and has an immediate association (and, often, placement) with a preceding nominal or pronominal.

γω-
Gen. 22:20 ίς ΜΕΛΑΑ ΓΩC ΑΣΙ.
Gen. 30:42 ΑΣΙΩΒΙΝ ΔΕ ΝΞΕ-ΝΙΑΤΜΗΝΙ ΝΛΑΒΑΝ ΝΑΝΙΜΗΝΙ ΓΩΣΟΤ ΝΙΑΚΩΒ.
Gen. 27:31 ΑΑΘΑΜΙΟ ΓΩΗ…
Ex. 7:11 ΑΣΙΡΙ ΓΩΣΟΤ ΝΞΕ- … ΜΠΑΙΡΗ†.

νεο= (cf. Subst. ΔΕ ΝΕΟQ-, above)
Num. 22:22 ΑΓΥΕΝΑQ ΝΕΟQ = ΩΝΟQ ΩΤΑΝΓΛΟC … ΑQ-
Also Gen. 29:37, 30:1.

ΜΑΣΑΤ=  
Gen. 32:4 ΑΚΩΧΑΝ ΔΕ ΝΞΕ-ΙΑΚΩΒ ΜΜΑΣΑΤQ.

ΤΗΡ=  
Ex. 4:19 ΑΡΗΟΣ ΡΑΡ ΤΗΡΟΣ ΝΞΕ-
Gen. 24:36 ΑQ† ΝΑΡ ΝΗΝ ΕΝΑΣΗΝΑQ ΤΗΡΟΣ.

(d) Narrative Information Structure:
(1) Information Blocking (“Chunking”): Event and Event-Block Boundaries. In Coptic narrative, the asyndetic combination of Preterites in narrative, as opposed to ΩΝΟQ coordination, constitutes a special junctural link, the signifié of which is the marking of eventual information blocking, inner cohesion of complex eventing (signalling complex-event boundary) or close concatenation, and, iconically, a flowing narrative pace. This is an extension and refinement of the striking iconicity of narrative grammar. As pointed out above, zero coordination, historically unmarked, is here a link (signifying eventual blocking, through inner cohesion, though not closest juncture), while ΩΝΟQ constitutes a delimitation (signifying an inner want of cohesion), the boundary between event blocks or chunks — it coordinates such blocks or chunks. In fact, and somewhat paradoxically, the peculiarly Coptic ΩΝΟQ/ΑΣΗ (sprouting in Demotic, but not really operative until Coptic) loosens up the texture rather than tightens it up. In Coptic Narrative, on the other hand, close parataxis does not signal foregrounding, but a grade of pacing and the constituents of a tight information block. In the paradigm:

# aq-…aq-…aq- #  
# aq- # ΩΝΟQ aq- # ΩΝΟQ aq- …
the first term is tightly linked into a “compound event” or hyperevent (Shisha-Halevy 1997), the latter either sequenced or unsequenced (cata-
logic), expressing relatively isolated or independent events. This “hor-
izontal hierarchy” or juncture distinction, like other information-arrange-
ment, focus-shifting or pace-changing options, is a staging decision of
the narrator, of far-reaching poetic-communicative significance; not
merely in the segmentation of the text (the decision of where an event
and an event block begins and where it ends), but also in the “pack-
ing” of an event as expanding another, as of different rank — indeed,
we are dealing here with no less than the management of the information
flow. Now, while the construction of the Greek original certainly trig-
gers or prejudices the Coptic translator’s choice, it must yet again be
pointed out that the Hebrew “first original” offers a sequence of wa-
yyiqtol forms, which is closer to the Coptic than to the Greek grammar.

Observe the following formal parameters in the exx. below, param-
eters which, in interchange and combination, formally define, by their
convergence, a gradation of chunking:

(a) the presence or absence of the lemniscus delimiter “÷”, which, in
interplay with the others (point and colon: see below, Chapter Four;
only a few of these are reproduced here in the documentation) marks
rhythm between Preterites as the formal signifier of pace (juxtaposed
zero-linked events are not expressed by close juncture). The delimiter ÷
overrules zero linkage, that is, like ὀρῶς, it signals a boundary between
event chunks;

(b) the physical extent of the Preterite forms, which is not necessarily
short (by no means “staccato” rhythm), either of the zero-coordinated
terms may be expanded and modified;

(c) the persistence or switching of the Theme-agens;

(d) the concatenation of the number of asyndetic forms is restricted to
two or three links;

(e) the lexical classes of verbs coordinated — (1) the initial, (2-3) the
subsequent.

The numbers enclosed in square brackets below refer to the construc-
tion of the Greek Vorlage; (1) = Aorist participle + finite Aorist, (2) fi-
nite Aorist + finite Aorist.

Obs.
(1) The narrative infinitive coordinated to finite narrative carriers, in Romance, Celtic and
other IE and non-IE languages may be compared here: see Shisha-Halevy 1997.
(2) The Late Egyptian “Sequential” *jw.f hr sdm* is a comparable close-concatenation form in EM. Earlier, in Middle Egyptian, a sequence of *sdm.n.f* forms seems to be the “tighter” eventual foreground form opposed to the delimited *jw sdm.n.f*.

(3) Cf. Fleischman 1990:162ff., 185ff., 192ff. on event boundaries, event coordination and foregrounding; 189ff. for “and” coordination in Narrative; 205ff. for “co-subordination”, especially apt for the Coptic construction in point.

(a) Zero-coordination for event blocks or hyperevents, also combined with single events:


Gen. 29:11 [1] οὗτοι διακωβ μενεράξας + ἀποσθε ἐβολ


Gen. 27:14 [1+2] ἀρσεναλ ἀρσίτων ἀρουσον ντενθαμ +


Gen. 25:1 [1] ἀγωνιστοτε ἀτοπούμα ἀρσίνοντες...

Ex. 32:20 [1+2] οὗτος ἀρσίνονίσα τοιούτων ἐταύθιον ἀφορκήθη 

ΣΕΝΟΥΧΡΩΜ ὁ οὗτος ἐταύθιον ἐμαθεντομανος ῬΩ ἐκατρά

ἐφρία εποίησα εὐστατος ὁ οὗτος ἀττορνενς ῬΡΙ εφθα.


Gen. 26:30f. [1+2] οὗτος ἀρσίνον ἐποίησα ἐξώσα υἱοῦν ἐποίησα ἀττοτομ ἐποίησα ἐποίησα εἰρων...

(c) Zero coordination may narrate dramatically:

or else be the narrative projection of a post-imperatival Conjunctive:
Gen. 27:21f. [2] ("γενέ κ εροίν πασηρίν χ ητάδωμώζεμ εροκ")
γεγένην ΝΑΣ-ΙΑΚΩΒ ΓΑ-ΙΑΣΑΚ ΠΕΙΩΤΩ = ΑΡΑΔΟΜΩΖΕΜ ΕΡΟΙ.

(d) Oppositions of single and double event blocking for the same verbs:
Gen. 30:14 [2] άρωνην ΝΑΣ-ΡΟΤΒΗΝ ΜΕΝΝΙΕΓΟΟΤ ΝΤΕ-
πως-κοτο άρξημι ΝΓΑΝΔΕΜΦ έσ, vs. Gen. 30:10 [2] άρω-
νην άε ΝΑΣ-ΙΑΚΩΒ ΕΣΟΤΝ ΖΑΡΟΣ οτόρ ΑΣΕΡΒΟΚΙ ΝΑΣ-
υελπα (and not Leah).
ΑΙΑΗΙ ΕΙΝΙΔΑΜΑΤΑΙ ΑΡΩΝΗΟΤ... vs. Gen. 4:8 [2] ΑΣΤΩΝΩΝ
ΝΑΣ-ΚΑΙΝ ΕΓΕΝΑΒΕΛ ΠΕΙΩΣΟΝ οτόρ ΑΡΩΒΕΒΕΚ.

(2) Theme-agens placement. Topicalization in Narrative. Theme-
switching. Information structure in the narrative clause. The place-
ment paradigm of the nominal and to a degree pronominal (not personal-
pronoun) actor-Theme in the Coptic verb phrase (conjugation form) is
complex, and constitutes a junctural and information-structuring gram-
meme of high importance, a key exponent of a complex formal/func-
tional system. I shall here no more than touch upon this issue, which is
only one special case in the broader issue of clause-to-text-scope infor-
mation structure in form and function.

In Coptic, a four-member arrangement paradigm corresponds to a
relatively simple binary paradigm in Greek:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coptic</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Theme &gt; conjugation-form</td>
<td>(1) Theme &gt; finite verb-form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Base + Theme &gt; conjugation-form</td>
<td>Theme &gt; participle Rheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Theme infixed in conjugation-form</td>
<td>(2), [(1)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Conjugation-form &gt; (ΝΑΣ-ε-) Theme</td>
<td>(2) verb-form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(participle or finite verb) &gt; Theme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

51 Compare, for instructive typological-comparative information regarding Berber, the
classic structural account in GALAND 1964. We encounter a formal system complex as the
Coptic one: a triple placement paradigm, with important post-rhematic “mutation” mark-
ing and concord, “inner-verbal” (Zakrzewska’s term, ZAKRZEWKA 1993) placement and
intra-clausal reference.
While the Coptic constructions (a), (d) respectively match almost perfectly the Greek (1) and (2), (b) and (c) most often correspond to (2), yet cases of (1) do occur (e.g. Gen. 19:23f., 28:12, 32:2, Ex. 9:23, 12:36). In any case, a mechanical response of Coptic to the Greek, which could mean non-pertinence of the Coptic paradigm, is, I believe, ruled out: one cannot speak of a simple reflection in Coptic of Greek word-order. Obviously, the functional value of the Coptic and the Greek forms is structurally different, and we are up against the situation of a partial formal/functional overlapping between the two languages. (In Greek, construction [2] is the unmarked term of the opposition).

I am afraid I cannot offer here a confident, predictive statements for the distribution of these four sequences. This will eventually be done in the framework of a unified theory of Theme placement in various textemes, narrative and dialogic, actant noun extrapolation in general, and perhaps even an overall theory of word-order; all this is as yet Zukunftsmusik. The emerging picture, which is as yet fragmentary, points to Theme specificity, textual cohesion (including Theme recall) and relative textual thematicity of the actor and the verb phrase as primary operative factors. The following investigation protocol seems to be indicated:

1. Internal analytic interpretation of the individual constructions;
2. Examining their possible correlation with formal (a) clause-internal and/or (b) text-grammatical (combinatory, narratological and narrative-grammar) parameters. Among the former, Theme-agens extent, Theme-agens specificity, internal “Flexionsisolierung” (grammeme/lexeme-separating structure), tense and negation of verb component etc.; among the latter, opposition or gradience of switching vs. persistence of the Theme, thematicity of the verb clause, cohesiveness or linkage, disruptivity or delimitation, concatenability, narrative status, compatibility or incompatibility with discourse signalling etc.;
3. Examining their possible correlation with Narrative-Grammar and narratological functions, such as information chunking, pacing; dramatic highlighting; Narrative Mode, and so on;
4. Scanning markedness / unmarkedness gradience or opposition;
5. Examining the difference between Theme-switching vs. Theme (re)introduction; or between various hierarchical Theme repertories or “folders” (narratologically more or less prominent or significant); or the possibility that the Themes of the four constructions are drawn (“recalled”) from different cumulative “Theme folders” (differing, for instance in narrative depth or immediacy of presence), or from a single
“folder” but four different “recall triggers” signalling the extent of re-winding required for decoding the reference.

I have applied this check-list to a limited, random specimen group of occurrences with their contexts in the corpus, with certain conclusions, which must be considered impressionistic pending a full exhaustive study. (Only instances of narrative θωτεμ and νασωτεμ πε were included; all constructions occur also in non-narrative textemes, although with a significantly different proportion of frequency). It will be seen that the quaternary construction paradigm constitutes a primary — perhaps even prime — poetic means for marking narrative hierarchy and continuity — indeed, narrative texture.

(a) Formal topicalization: # Theme [+ discourse signals] + conjugation-form #.

Gen. 4:1 άδαμ ἰς θωτεμνετα τεσσεριμυ.

Num. 14:6 ινκοσ πυθρι ρνασθι πεν παυρ πυθρι νιε-ψωνθ + εβολ δεννη εταξερ-πνκαζι + ανφουρ ηνναθ-βυς...

Gen. 16:1 καρπα ἰς τεσσεριμυ νασραθ αμμισι...
Gen. 15:12 ερε-ψρι νασωτπι οστωμπι αρι εδεμναβραμ.
Gen. 4:2 ορσορ ανφουρι νσε-αβελ ... καιν ἰς νασρρσβ
επκαζι πε.
Gen. 12:6 ηνεανανεον νινων φιενπικαζι μπινχον ετεμματ.

This is in Bohairic not merely, and not always, a prominencing Topic-marking construction, with the conjugation thematic to the thematic Topic, nor indeed a homogenous pattern. The topicalized agens construction, with a venerable history in Middle Egyptian (# Subst. + sdm.f #) is non-concatenating, has a low (lowest?) grade of backward textual cohesion, and is consequently and simultaneously a high (highest?) delimitation — and forward action-propelling device. It signals a clean break in the narrative chain (typically, accompanied by ἰς, weak link and strong delimiter): an episode/scene-initial boundary (e.g. Gen. 5:24), a parenthesis or “cut-away” (e.g. Gen. 25:6, 41:11, Ex. 11:10, 12:35, etc.); “side-stepping” or “backstepping” from the evolution mainstream, also summing-up or supplying Obtaining Situation information (e.g. Ex. 11:3, 12:6, 16:35); transition to Comment or Evolution Mode or to Enhanced Evolution (e.g. Gen. 4:2, 15:12, Ex. 2:16, 3:1, 5:13, 9:31, 14:8, 17:2, Num. 14:6 etc.) — the construction is very common with ναυ- (πε) or νεαν- πε; narrative superordination (“at that
point...”, e.g. Gen. 15:12); it occurs with contrastive, alternating or reciprocal Theme/Rheme configurations (e.g. Gen. 27:30, Ex. 9:31f., 14:29 etc.) Its Theme-agens recall is usually relatively distal (from a not immediately present “Theme folder”). This is not so much Theme switching as the (re)introduction of Theme. The Theme-agens is usually specific, but may be indefinite (Gen. 15:20), yet not generic (zero-determined).

Obs.
(1) In a case like Num. 14:6 ἵνα εἰς τὴν Πρώτην Ἡμέραν ἐκλέγῃ Πρώτην τινὲς ἄνθρωπος ἔβολ αὐτῇ ὑπερθέρμανα ἀρρήτως ἄνθρωπος, the Topic extent is striking, and may prejudice the selection of construction, ruling out (b) and (c).
(2) Relatively rare are cases of focussing, not topicalizing extraposition (§2.4.7). In Dialogue or Exposition, focussing instances are Gen. 37:20 οὕτων εἰς αὐτὸν ἣμνον. Ex. 21:13 θὰ ἄρθρα ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐνεκταίκη. Gen. 21:6 ὥστε αὐτῷ ἀπαίτηθαι. From the indefinite noun to the thematic verb, the information contour in this case is distinctive.
(3) Zero determination does occur in a special non-narrative group of object-actant topicalization (note the regulation of zero/non-zero anaphoric pronoun by Topic determination):
Deut. 29:6 ἔκλεψαν τοὺς Πρῶτους Ηρώδης ἐπηγαίνεσαν. Num. 8:26 ἐκεῖ ἐνεπαφηγέττεθα.
(4) I must point out in this connection the importance — and devaluation — in Bohairic of the topicalized-Rheme Nominal Sentence pattern: see Chapter Two (§2.1.1 III).
(5) Coptic topicalization may correspond to the Greek prepositional of articulated Proper Names with a passive verb: Gen. 2:2 Down de Πρῶτος-Βασιλεὺς καὶ, 10:20 ὅτε εἰς τὸν Πρῶτον ἰδιοτίτικα. Passivization does not serve in our corpus for FSP exponence purposes.

(b) #Base + Theme + Conjugation-form#
This, an infrequent construction, is, I believe, the most intriguing of all four: the Preterite (rarely, Imperfect) base/converter + agens occurs first without a governed verb lexeme, then is represented pronominally in a full conjugation form. This is a [Base+Theme] topicalizing construction, that is, a case of formal-nexus topicalization.
Gen. 25:33 ἰσχατ ἐκ ἄρτη ἐκτοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἀπεκτάσατο ἀπὸ τοῦ διδομένου ἡμᾶς ἐδωκαν.
Gen. 32:2 ἀπόθετο ἐκ τοῦ ἀπεκτάσατο ἀπὸ τοῦ διδομένου ἡμᾶς ἐδωκαν.
Gen. 33:17 ἀποκαθοπτρίζεται ἐκ τοῦ ἐκθεσπόμενου ... ἐκεῖ ἐκπορευμένος ἀπὸ τοῦ διδομένου ἐκπορεύεται ἐκ τοῦ διδομένου.

52 ANDERSSON 1904:8 considers this ungrammatical. Note the indefinite Topics in Gen. 9:4 ὁταν ὑπερθέρμανα ἄνθρωπου, also ὁταν ὑπερθέρμανα ὑπερθέρμανα, also ὁταν ὑπερθέρμανα ὑπερθέρμανα (De Vis 19192).
Lev. 8:21 οτοσ ἀμώσης αἰσιναὶ μπικιαὶ τηρή (cf. 24 οτοσ ἀμώσης αἰσιναὶ ἐπικεφαλής πάρων...).

Gen. 28:12 ...οἱ ὁμοτικοὶ εὐσεβὴς βεσσικαῖς ὁτος ἀπειρήματι ἐνναίεννεται ἐνεπέρικαν ἤτοι βασιλεῖα ἐρρίσσεται.

Gen. 41:4 οτοσ ἁξίωσ ὁγανα ἑκατονταμώτερον ὁτος ἐφοβετ εὐσοφεταῖς τῆς μέσης ἐπέρατο ἐστίν ἐναντιέτ.

(Dream Narrative: sim. 41:7:24). The complex, previously introduced Theme-agens in this last example may also indicate a formal motivation of construction (b) by its Theme-agens.

The discontinuous Theme-agens in this construction is always specific; its extent ranges from short to very long. This construction seems to be used in the final part of a narrative development superordinatively, for the dénouement, outcome, point or condensed summing-up of the foregoing chain of events. Like (c), it delimits a final boundary, but, unlike (c), it is not dramatic or highlighting. It occurs as the main-point tableau or event in a dream sequence and even in its “dream-telling” version (Gen. 41:4:7:24); in the latter role, construction (c) comes close: Ex. 7:12...οτοσ ἀνθρώπος πάρων ομίλοι πνεύματος ἀνθρώποι which is, however, more dramatic and solemn.

Obs.

(1) The marked [base+Theme]-topicalizing construction (b) # α- Theme ακυστήμ # — with its discontinuous Theme — is formally opposed to both (a) (topicalized) # Theme ακυστήμ # and to (c) # α- Theme κωτήμ #. In the case of (b:a), the formal distinctive-feature opposition is of the respective presence vs. absence (zero) of the nuclear conjugation base; in (b:c), of the presence (delimiting) vs. absence (zero, linking) of pronominally repeated base. The (b) pattern is remarkably “right”, in the diachronic and synchronic “holographic” view of the base (and converter; whether a “verbum vica-rum” or not) — as a nuclear constituent, not in need of a lexemic expansion; it is certainly not a case of anacoluthia.

(2) The formal-nexus topicalizing construction occurs sometimes in dialogue (Gen. 19:13 ἀνομον τεννακταρφ κα-ποιαρνοῦνας αἰσκελο ἑπέμερο ἕπες ὅτος αὑταρν ναε-ποτε εὐκατ ἐνθαμ βατακε αὐτακε (to be understood as “at last...”?), but is prevalent, even as a formalized (formulaic) Absolute Future form, in the Levitical preceptive injunctions, again with a special tone focussing: επε-πιονδιβ επε:- see Chapter Four.

(3) This construction is common in some types of Sahidic (e.g. Gnostic texts), and in Oxyrhynchite (esp. the Schøyen Matthew), and is almost typical of the Early Bohairic (B4) Twelve Prophets (consider Soph. 3:8, Na. 1:8, 2:3, 3:19, Hab. 3:3, Zach. 3:1, 7:7, 8:10, Hag. 2:18, Jon. 1:2, Soph. 3:8:16 etc.) and some parts of the Bohairic NT (e.g. Apocal.), expressing solemn prophecy.

(5) The nuclearity of the 'pro-verbal' base/converter is certain. In Shenoute we even find an instance (Leip. IV 96f.) of a nexus-focussing base occurring anaphorically alone, with a zeroed lexeme: ορος ΝΕ-ΕΠΕΓΟΥΣ ... ορος ΛΕΓΕΝΙ ΑΥΣΤΙΣΙ ΑΥΣΤΙΣΙ ΜΠΕΓΟΥΣ ΝΕΟΤΙΣ (contrast the preceding concatenating construction [d]: 1:2f. ΑΥΣΤΙΣ ΝΕ-ΟΡΟΣΙΝΙ ΟΡΟΣ ΑΥΣΤΑΣ ΝΕ-Φ).

Gen. 4:26...ορος ΑΦ ΧΑΟΡΜΗΝΙ ΝΚΑΙΝ...

Gen. 30:22 ΑΦ δε ΕΡ-ΦΕΤΙΝΙ ΝΡΑΧΗ ΟΡΟΣ ΑΥΣΤΕΤΗΝ ΕΡΟΣ ΝΕ-Φ ΑΥΣΤΙΝ ΝΕΤΣΕΝΤ.

Gen. 16:3 (Sarah did not bear children for Abraam. She told him to come to her handmaid Agar...) ΑΣΑΡΡΑ ΤΣΙΝΙ ΝΑΒΡΑΑΜ + ΩΙ-ΑΡΑΡ ΤΕΣΒΙΚΙ...

Gen. 19:23f. ορος ΑΦΡΗ ΥΑΙ ΓΙΩΝΙΠΙΚΑΡΙ ΑΠΙΕ ΓΟΥΜΕΝΟΧΟΜΑ ΝΕΜ ΡΟΜΩΡΡΑ ΟΡΟΣ ΑΛΥΤ ΑΥΣΑΓ ... ορος ΤΣΙΝΙ ΝΑΤΩΤ ΑΥΣΤΕΤΗ ΕΦΑΓΟΤ...

Gen. 41:50ff ΜΟΥΧΦ ΑΦΕ ΑΥΝΗΡΙ ΕΑΥΣΝΙ ΝΑΚ ... ΑΤΡΕΝ-ΦΡΑΝ ΜΠΕΓΟΥΡΠ ΜΗΣΙΗ ΔΕ-ΑΦ ΑΘΕΡ-ΠΩΒΕΝ ΝΑΜΕΧΑΙ ΝΗΤ ΤΗΡΟΤ ... ΑΤΡΕΝ-ΦΡΑΝ ΜΠΙΜΑΧΕ ΔΕ ΑΤΡΕ-ΡΕΝΩ ΝΕ-ΕΦΡΕΝ ΔΕ-ΑΦ ΑΘΡΙΑΙΑI ... (Cf. also Gen. 4:26 ορος ΤΣΙΝΙ ΑΥΣΤΗΡΗ ΑΥΣΝΙ ΝΑΚ).

Gen. 30:18 ΝΙΕ-ΛΙΑ ΔΕ-ΑΦ ΑΡΙ ΜΠΑΒΕΧΕ ΝΗI ... ορος ΑΤΡΕΝ-ΠΕΡΡΑΝ ΔΕ-ΙΑΧΑΡ.

Gen. 35:7 "He called the place 'Beth-El' (i.e. 'House of God')", ΑΝΕΝΠΙΜΑ ΓΑΡ ΕΤΕΜΜΑΤ ΑΦ ΑΡΟΝ ΕΡΟ."}

Ex. 35:6 ("ΒΕΥ-ΘΡΟΥ ΝΝΕΝΕΝΤΟΣΑΝ ΝΕΜ ΝΕΝΕΤΟΛΕΑ")... ορος ΑΝΕΝΨΗΡΗ ΜΠΙΣΑ ΑΥΣΗΡ ΜΠΟΣΟΛΕΑA...

Ex. 10:20 etc.... ορος ΑΠΙΕ ΘΡΕΨΗΝΤ ΜΦΑΙΡΑΠ ΝΗΩΤ.

Ex. 20:11 ΝΑΡΠΗ ΓΑΡ ΝΕ-ΕΠΕΓΟΥΣ ΑΠΙΕ ΘΑΜΙΟ ΝΤΦΕ ΝΕΝ ΠΙΚΑΙ.

Consider also Gen. 27:30, 30:41; Ex. 2:24, 7:12, 9:5:12:23, 10:13, 12:36, 19:8:17, 24:4 etc.

The infixed-Theme construction, in a sense the formally unmarked structure of a nominal agens, where the noun is substituted for a per-
sonal pronoun, is in our corpus a functionally strongly marked construction. It breaks narrative continuity (cf. Ex. 30:11, 33:11 vs. 30:17:22). It is non-concatenating, but, often following narrative development, we find it expressing a Narrative Peak, culmination or dramatic sequel (thus typically a narrative-chain-final boundary; it may then appear to be the initial boundary for its own subsequent development, with ἐν-joined Theme: so for instance Gen. 12:7:36, 30:22 etc.). Also, superordinatively, in the narrative projection of an imperative (Ex. 33:6) and with superordinating ὁρᾷ (see below; consider Gen. 7:6, 17:1, 27:30 etc.). The construction also occurs, in a solemn, ceremonial and ritual tone, in aetiological name-bestowing, Condensed Narrative. Generally speaking, this construction highlights significant and consequential acts (cf. Gen. 30:41 and the recurring "...and God hardened Pharaoh’s heart" in Exodus). Note significant cases of locutive “Present Perfect”: Gen. 27:46 ἀπελήθη γροῦ επαυμάς; cf. also Ex. 13:3 οὐρα ἔνοτείξαντι εκ κατὰ ἐν-ληθνοτ ἐβολα μνῖα, also 14): it is as if the narrator suddenly shifts into a hic-et-nunc perspective, thereby adding a dramatic dimension. Much more rarely, the construction expresses an outcome apparently devoid of any prominence, a mere chain-final boundary signal (so Ex. 4:28, 19:8).

Non-specific and specific Themes occur, but not zero determination. The Theme is usually short (in number of syllables), and never extensive. In accordance with the functional profile depicted above, the Theme is typically recalled from a “prominent protagonist folder” mostly extra-textual, most frequently featuring in our corpus Φ†, ἐβολα, ματνής.

(d) # Conjugation-form ἐνέ- + Theme #

Gen. 1:3-4 πένε-Φ† ... οὐρὰ ἐνέ-Φ† οὐρὰ ἐβολα ἐνέ-Φ† ...
Gen. 4:15ff. ἐνέ-Φ† ἐθ-ομάνι ἐνέ-ΚΑΙΝ ἐβολα γαρ Φ† ...
Gen. 31:55, 32:3 ἐβολα ἐνέ-λαβαν ἐνέ-ΚΑΙΝ ἐβολα γαρ Φ† ...
Gen. 21:2 οὐρὰ ἐβολα ἐνέ-ΚΑΙΝ ἐβολα γαρ Φ† ...
Gen. 27:38 πένε-ΗΣΑ ς ... οὐρὰ ἐβολα ἐνέ-ΗΣΑ...

Non-specific quantified Themes occur here, including οὐρα (Gen. 14:13) but again no zero determination. This is certainly the most common, and, accordingly, perhaps the least marked construction. Yet it re-
veals the highest cohesivity as well as dynamicity. The Theme-
exponent is also unmarked, with Theme persistence or Theme alterna-
ting, as it were Theme-selecting from a given, intratextual most imme-
diately (and constantly) present repertory of potentially thematic
nominals and pronominals (consider for instance the fact that “Φ†” oc-
curs here anaphorically — it does not occur in construction [a]). This
construction does not delimit: it is, as said, the most dynamic, used as
the non-initial links of concatenated fast-pacing eventing (οσόγ or Αξ
are typical), also return to movement after a narrative “still” or break.
Some striking instances are Gen. 1:3ff. 19:36ff., 33:6ff., but the construc-
tion is ubiquitous. (The fact that this is the Coptic Flexionsisolierung —
lexeme/grammememe separating — construction par excellence must be
related to its “dynamic event link” role, since the grammeme / lexeme
dichotomy has a motor effect). Let me stress again the superficial, text-
anaphoric nature of the Theme recall in this construction.

Obs.
(1) Extreme Flexionsisolierung makes possible such cases as the series (x13) of
φηςοφιτ ΝΣΕ- in Deut. 27:15ff., where the nominal agentes are not text-anaphoric,
but thematic: this is certainly not a case of anti-topic (see LAMBRECHT 1996:202ff.).
(2) For the Narrative/Dialogue seam marker πεζάνγ with a nominal agens, the un-
marked (“normal”) form is clearly πεζα-, while the ΝΣΕ- construction is rare or ex-
cluded.
(3) Construction (d) is often used in and following ΕΤατ- topicalization (e.g. Gen. 32:31,
37:4, 38:29).
(4) Combination and contrasts of Theme placements in a stretch of text are common.
The same of examples (a) + (d):
Gen. 19:1ff. Δι ε ΝΣΕ-πιαγελος ή έρθη εκοδομα.
λωτ δε ΝΣΕ-γεμι...
ετανατ δε ΝΣΕ-αλωτ λατων ... ουοφ αλοτωντ ... ουόφ πεζα...
ουόφ ινρωμι ντεμβάκι νίρεμελομα αρκωτ ... ουόφ ναμοτε ελώτ
νε.
Δι ε ΝΣΕ-αλωτ αγοφι ερατγ...
νιρωμι δε ε ατισοτεννοταξ ηβολ αρκεκας ουοφ αλωθαμ...
ηνιρωμε δε ε ανάκινεμος-φρο μπονι ανωταρι εραωθ ...
Note also a case of topicalization like Gen. 41:50 ιωστφ δε αψηφι έ ωτπι ναμ
μπατοι ΝΣΕ-† † πρωτοι Νζοκ. 
Num. 22:22 ουόφ αλωθατ ΝΣΕ-† ΝΣΕ-αλωθαναρ ηνοφ + ουόφ οταγελομ
ντεμυτά ερατγ ...
(c) + (d) Gen. 1:2ff. vs. 5 ουόφ αφι ιννοτ ... ουόφ αννατ ΝΣΕ-† ... ουόφ
αφηνατ ηβολ ΝΣΕ-†.
(5) ZAKRZEWSKA, in her important study of 1993 of Bohairic narrative grammar, based on
Hyvernat’s Acta Martyrum (an important corpus of Nitrian Bohairic), investigates, in the
framework of T. Givón’s functionalist model, Theme-switching and cohesion in general,
introducing several parameters correlated to functions in a taxonomic hierarchy: intro-
duction of a new Theme; reintroduction of Theme, and so on. She also examines the topicality and rhematicity of the respectively placed Themes. In general, she finds the preverbal placement correlates with forward and backward continuity, while "inner-verbal" placement, according to Z. unmarked (which is certainly not the case in our corpus — see above), and of a higher rhematicity, effects mainly backward discontinuity (actually in agreement with the Topic's context anchorage). Especially interesting are her findings regarding the lexemic, narratological and specificity constituency of the actor nominals: for the "inner-verbal" placement, non-specific, collective, inanimate, narratologically marginal. It is evident that my own findings for the Bohairic Pentateuch are very different.

(3) High-Level Topicalization, Rhematization and Focalization in Narrative

(a) Protatic/Temporal Clause topicalized

For presetting, "constituting the temporal frame or ground for the following episode" (BRINTON 1993:84f.), narrative ∂qwa∂n- and etaq- are topicalized, with the subsequent narrative stretch high-level rhematic by that token. (See above, for etaq-...... q- configurations). Some exx. of ∂qwa∂n-: Gen. 30:38:42, 33:8:9:9:9, Ex. 16:21, 17:11, 33:8:9, 34:34). This is a common feature of narrative information structure in Indo-European and outside it (see REVELL 1985:420f., for "contextualizing clauses" in Biblical narrative). While the familiar Coptic configuration of # Clause Conjugation + Narrative Carrier # correspond as a rule to the Greek # (Aorist) participle + finite verb", Coptic (as often) brings us closer to the pre-Greek Hebrew construction of a succession of finite narrative forms in iconic sequence.

Obs.

(1) q- etaq- or naq- etaq- (as e.g. in Gen. 32:31, 25:20) are very different as regards information structure, for we have in these cases one high-level nexus constituent, not two.

(2) The iconic staging device of depicting one event as "antefact", as anterior and Topics important in many languages. For the topicalizing segmentation of "adverbial clauses" in Late Egyptian, cf. SATZINGER 1976 on jr- segmentation; ROSS 1991 (Latin); RYCHNER 1968 (Old French); THOMPSON 1987, COUPER-KUHLEN 1989:12ff. (with further references); DECLERCK 1996 (English). The Topic status or rhematic importance are not necessarily bound up with the "subordination" vs. "main clause" marking — cf. the Latin cum inversum figure and its correspondents ("He was still smoothing soil over the forehead when suddenly a dark figure was standing over him"). Another issue involved here is that of "sloppy simultaneity" (DECLERCK 1991:41ff.) or, in the case of etaq-, rather "sloppy anteriority".

(3) On "Conditionals as Topics", see SCHIFFRIN 1992 (esp. 183ff.).
(b) The Focalizing Conversion (Second Tense) in Narrative.

Probably the most striking, even surprising feature of Bohairic Coptic narrative, in diachronic view, is the almost total absence of the Focalizing Conversion or Second Tense, in Scripture Bohairic marking predominantly *circumstant* (adverbials) as focal. In pre-Coptic Egyptian, even in Roman Demotic, the so-called emphatic form (as well as other types of Cleft Sentence) is an important narrative device. On the other (the functional) hand, Narrative Focalization is a complex, not self-evident notion, far beyond the contrastive-Focus dialogic essence of the Focalizing Conversion. The Focalizing Conversion of the Preterite does occur in Report, in special Narrative textemes (such as the aetiological, locutive “Naming Narrative”):

Deut. 22:16 ταίσηρι ἄνθις οὐκορομή ἑσχίμι οὕτως εὑαμετάτως ἵνα.

Ex. 2:10 οὕτως δέρην-περπαν δε-μωσρχε εἰδώς ἡμος δε-εταίνεμ εὐάμω δενιμωτ.

Moreover, the FC is not excluded of the cognitive-contents narrative slot (following “see”, “hear”):

Gen. 43:25 δεσωτεν γαρ δε-αρεισχφ μετί εορτωμ νεμωσι μπιμα ετεμμαι.

Deut. 33:21 οὕτως αἵρατα εὐεπαρχη δε-ετατφεψπικαρι

And in the “Omniscient Narrator’s Channel”, that is in Comment Mode:

Gen. 38:9 εὐαμετί δε νδε-αναν δε-αρε-...ναυωμι ναπ αν.

Num. 13:22 οὕτως αἵματι νδε-αχιμαν νεμ σειν νεμ θαλων νιγωσι τενακ.

Gen. 25:10 πιογι νεμ πιογατ ὥν ετααβρααμ αψοκ ντοοτος ννεναπρο ατεχετ ετααμεμε αβρααμ μματ νεμ καρα τευζείμε.

Obs.

(1) H.J. POLOTSKY’s categorical “Un Parfait Second...ne se trouve jamais dans une phrase purement narrative” (1944:141) calls for some modification: it does not distinguish between dialects, and, more importantly, begs the question of what is “purement narratif”. But this statement was made à propos of Stern’s attribution of subjective value

54 The Second or Focalizing Imperfect is very rare, and to my knowledge not attested in our corpus: ἑναγιγην πε δενπεχστ ευσιν εβολ αν (Mac. Νν. 6 p. 45: CM).
to the Second Tenses (1880:212), which is an apt description of the main semantic feature of the Comment Mode.

(2) In New Testament Bohairic narrative, we find ἀρχ- corresponding, in classic topicalizing configurations, to a Focalizing Conversion in Sahidic, or in clear CM cases: Gal. 2:1-2 ἀρχικὴ ἐφθαν...ἀρχὴ ἐφθαν κατάστημα ἐνωλ (Sah. ἀρχη...νταρχη ἐν...) — note the absence of ἄνδῃ in the thematized verb.

John 21:1 ἀρχοτόμη...ἀρχοτόμη ἐν Μαρίαντ — an instance of the Boh. ἀρχ- Focalizing Preterite (cf. §2.4.2(b)3).

John 6:6 σοὶ ἐγὼ ἐν σοὶ εἰσπράπτω ἐμοὶ (Narrator’s Channel, CM; Sah. σοῇ). (B4 John εἰσὶν ἐμοὶ)

John 21:23 ἀπαραῖοι ἐν Εἰρήνῃ ἔχειν εἰς... (Sah. εἰς).

Acts 16:18 σοὶ ἐν σοὶ ἐκείνῳ τῷ Νεκταρίῳ ἐναποστέλλω (Sah. εἰς - πε, a rare case of Foc. Imperfect in CM).

John 19:36 Ναί γὰρ ἀργυρίῳ ἕνα ντετεράγματο ἐν τῷ ἑκάτην ἐνωλ (Narrator’s Channel, CM; Sah. νταταῖ). A FC does however occur in the Comment Mode and especially the meta-narrator’s Channel (with a Basic Preterite v.I.):

John 11:13 Ιησοῦς ἐν Εὐσαρχῷ ἐν τοῖς ἔμπνεοντι.

John 11:51 ἐν Μαρίαντ ἐγὼ ἐν Εὐσαρχῷ ἐν τοῖς ἔμπνεοντι.

John 21:19 ἐγὼ ἐν Μαρίαντ ἐφερμοῖν.

(3) In Shenoutean Sahidic, the lexeme-focussing or nexus-focussing Focalizing Preterite in Narrative marks sharply the CM: (Leip. III 96) εἰς εὐσαρχῆς ἐν τῇ ἑτερίᾳ ἐν τῇ ἑτερίᾳ ἔλημ — ἐν τῇ ἑτερίᾳ ἔλημ “It was as if they became crazed — and indeed they did”. But the narrative FC is also found Egyptian-like, in detailed episodal descriptive amplification (Amplified or Enhanced Evolution): (Amél. II 87) ἐντα-ἐντατεράγματο ἐπάρχω ἐν ἔμπνεοντι ἐν τῇ ἑτερίᾳ ἐ

See SHISHA-HALEVY 2007b.

(4) Pre-Coptic Egyptian. In the Old Kingdom autobiographical narrative, the Emphatic form features especially in the thematic verbs of movement (DORET 1986:69ff., 152ff.). In Middle Egyptian, cases of verb of clear “Emphatic” sdm.n.f (verb of movement and some intransitives, passive sdm.n.twf: — see POLOTSKY 1965:79ff.) are well attested in Locutive/Allocutive Narrative, e.g. in autobiographical Narratives (cf. POLOTSKY 1965:84f., etc.; also in the so-called “Poetical Stela” of Thutmosis III. In the story of Sinuhe, the Emphatic in Condensed Narrative (92ff.); also, in meta-narrative and meta-textual CM (see exx. 3-4 in POLOTSKY 1957:45); in descriptive Enhanced Evolution (POLOTSKY 1957:47 ex. 21, 48 ex. 25). On p. 48f., the famous Sinuhe B 199-200 is discussed at length: a striking instance of zoom-in “freeze-frame”, or “paintbrush” slow-motion Enhanced Evolution (following the unmarked EM event of Sinuhe receiving a letter from Pharaoh): “It was as I was standing amidst my family that the letter arrived; it was (only) after I had prostrated myself that it was read out to me”.

(5) The “Emphatic” form i.j.rf sdm is important in Late Egyptian as a behind-the-scene “psychologist” and intentional as well as background-information Comment Mode form, especially in locutive “confession” 1st-person reporting Narratives (“Tomb Robberies”), but also for descriptive and close-up Enhanced Evolution: BM 10052 13/19f. “It is in order
to put it in NN’s home that he stole the silver”, P. Mayer A 6/16f. “It was out of fear that I said it” P. Mayer A 2/19 “It was when I was young that I killed my father”, LRL 7/11f. “It was only when they met me that I found that he had sent a boat to collect me”.

(6) It is in Demotic that the narrative FC is most prevalent. We encounter here several narrative roles of the Second Tense (pace JOHNSON 1976:115 “not a narrative tense”). Here we even have a recent pioneering special study (WIDMER 1999). Indeed, the Demotic Second Tense / Empathic thematic and cataphorically focussing verb-form is an important feature of Demotic Narrative, both as a special Enhanced or Rich Narrative form (our naq + zero) and as a Comment Mode (our naq - τίς) delimitation, combining a cataphoric kind of episodal amplification with a narrator’s supply of relevant particulars. Not so much for narrative peak marking, but to express a significant narrative change or development — an episode delimitation, inter-episode seam, or foregrounding “springboard”, usually with thematic lexemes of ancillary narratological status (“find”55, “see”, “hear”, “happen”, “say”, and verbs of movement: “arrive”, “turn to”, “leave”, “descend, ascend”, “reach”, “embark” and so on), cataphorically highlighting Circumstantial details and motives, and on the whole with a delimitative function. Instances of j.j.r.f...jw- (Circumstantial focalized) are frequent from Ryl. IX on, and seem to be cases of “no sooner...than”. Consider Ryl. IX 3/7, 5/10, 11/8.13, 14/3 etc., P. Spiegelberg 2/9, Ankhsh. 3/10ff., P. Krall 17/22ff., Setne 3/30.31.38, 4/23.38, 5/11.13.15.30.31, Setne II 1/15, 2/2ff.; Mythus 8/6ff., 10ff.). Widmer’s “glossing Second Tense” (1999:184ff.) is closest to our Comment Mode signalling; she also (1999:174ff.) points out the use of the Second Tense “simply (sic) to delimit a macrosyntactic unit”.

(7) The Narrative Present too may express “high-Focus events” (FLEISCHMAN 1990:193ff., see PARASKEVAS 1993): but this is a different kind of narrative focalization, one that merges into narrative “relief” and borders on the episodal or eventual amplification expressed in Bohairic by naq- (above). (See JUNGE 1989:18ff., 63ff.).

(c) The “Tautological Infinitive” in Narrative

This is another special focussing construction, not of circumstnats but of verb lexemes and/or the verbal nexus itself. Familiar and much-discussed in Semitic and (Indo-)European (especially Romance. Cf. GOLDENBERG 1971), it is well attested in Egyptian from the Pyramid Texts on. I have tried to show (1990), that we have in the Biblical instances a case of converging or merging of the Hebrew/Greek calque with the genuine Egyptian feature. The construction is rare in our corpus, and always corresponds to a Greek “Tautological Infinitive” or “Tautological Participle”:

Gen. 20:18 οινεότεονον ακό θεόν σαβόλ αυτον ηνεβ ηνιεων ημεδελε εαμε σαρπα (συγκλείον συγκλείσε).  
Ex. 13:19 οτιρ αντιτογωλ γα νικων ντεισχιον ημαυ οινεοη ναρ αισχην ταρκε νεσνηρι μπιαλ ειπω εμος ζε... (δρκω γάρ ὠρκιεν).

55 It must be pointed out that gm hardly conditions an Emphatic form: cf. Ryl. IX 8/4, 9/1 etc.
Lev. 10:16 ΣΕΝΟΤΚΩΤ ΑΨΚΩΤ ΝΔΩΝ ΝΔΣΕ-ΜΩΤΧΣ (ζητών εξεζητήσεων).

(d) Narrative Highlighting: Presentatives (see discussion and illustration below, Chapter Two, §2.0.3).

As has been pointed out, Amplified or Enhanced Evolution (distinct from a “boosted” flow of narrative) is related to narrative superordi-
native highlighting by means of χόπιε (1c), which may, beyond its
delimitative junctural role, be viewed as true narrative focussing.56

Gen. 37:25 ΑΞΕΜΕΠΙ ΔΕ ΕΟΤΩΜ ... ΧΠΠΕ ΚΙ ΣΑΝΙΜΑΛΑΙ-
ΤΗΣ ΕΤΜΟΥ... 

This Focus construction is often formalized as the “object of seeing”
(here also ορογ may mark the superordination); even here the char-
acterization of “unexpectedness” or “counter-expectation”, or “sudden-
ness” is striking:

Gen. 29:2 ...ορογ ΑΨΝΑΡ ΓΠΠΕ ΚΙ ΟΡΩΨΤ ΝΔΧΗ ΑΣΕ-
ΚΟΙ ΝΔΧΗ ΔΕ ΜΜΑΣ ΝΔΣΕ-Τ ΝΟΓΙ ΝΕΓΩΤ.

Ex. 14:10 ΑΣΟΤΩΜ ... ΑΝΜΑ ΑΡΟΓ ΓΠΠΕ ΚΙ ΝΕΡΕ-
ΜΧΗΙ ΑΤΕΩΤ ΕΓΓΩΤ ΜΜΩΤ.


(e) Ordination Hierarchy in Narrative

In a text such as ours, which is by and large unarticulated, the iso-
lation of narrative segments — blocks, chunks — by various means, in-
cluding verbal and non-verbal signals such as particles and adverbials,
links and delimitations, is essential. Formalized different-rank config-
rations of non-autonomous or lower-autonomy units, “included” or em-
bedded with main-clause narrative carriers are, in this respect, important.
However, one must, I believe, carefully evaluate one’s terminology in
this context. The famous (apparently oxymoronic) Egyptian “non-initial
main clause”57 is usually illustrated by the Late Egyptian narrative “se-
quential”, jw:f hr sdm58. The concatenated and concatenating narrative-

56 See SHISHA-HALEVY 1997, for presentative focalization in Celtic and Romance nar-
rative.

57 “Main” is delusive, and always relative, on a scale of cotextual dependence, inte-
gration and linkage; “non-initial” is even more problematic, since “initiality” is both
relative and dependent on the unit contemplated.

58 Cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 1973 for the apodotic jw:f hr sdm and its Coptic “Clause Con-
jugation” εικοτωμ descendant. Compare also (to a degree) the sequelling Conjunctive
in Egyptian (SHISHA-HALEVY 1994). Late Egyptian jw:f hr sdm is considered a close-
concatenation form in EM (see DEPUNTDT 1993:26ff.). However, it is not clear to which
looser-juncture narrative-event forms it stands opposed; structurally, the LE form is sui
event unit does often not comply with the conventional hypotactic vs. main clause dichotomy⁵⁹. The interdependence of the links in the narrative chain is, of course, tautological. In Coptic, there is no morphologically distinct EM carrier, yet it is certainly arguable that the ne- conversion is a type of "non-initial clause", marking a dependent, environmentally pertinent discourse function. On the other hand, the cohesion inside a "narrative block" constituted by a sequence of asyndetic perfects is effected by a specific kind of "co-subordination"⁶⁰. Generally speaking, the converters should not be taken simply as embedding or integrating signals, but as linking or delimiting junctural signals (below, Chapter Four), and/or structuring discourse- or textual-hierarchy ones (both "Preterite" and Focalizing converters, on the information-structure level)⁶¹. The Coptic "Clause Conjugation" acquires, in narrative text-grammar, a new signalling significance: they are "subordinate" only in the sense of the Hjelmslevian determination dependency, that is, they presuppose and determine the existence (in their immediate environment, in the Coptic case in point) of some non-Clause-Conjugation nexus form, while the inverse is not true: non-Clause-Conjugation nexus forms do not determine Clause Conjugations. By this token, the ne-naq- (ne) narrative tense forms are not subordinate (pace Weinrich 1977, on forms expressing relief). Be that as it may, the most useful operative "ordination" principle in narrative is superordination, that is, the marking of the narrative "linguistic event" or chain of "linguistic events" as salient or prominent in relation to their preceding environment. This is effected in different syntactical ways:

1. ḫτq- ḫ-, ḫqyān- ḫ- configurations were discussed above. Here the superordination of the narrative-evolution segment is marked by a topicalized "antefact" Clause Conjugation form.

2. The per se superordinative infixed Theme-agens construction; also the (a) formal topicalization Theme-agens construction:

Gen. 4:1 άδμ ἢ ἀκομένη τε θογάμιν.

generis, as B. Gunn notes in a letter to A.H. Gardiner (20/7/39, Gardiner Papers at the Griffith Institute, Oxford, AHG 142.124.90): "But in describing ḫw ḫr ṣd m as a continuative construction, one must have regard to the mere position of it in the text rather than to the sense..." [Gunn shows the form to be also apodotic to a temporal protasis, occurring also after an 'initial relative'] "even when it cannot be taken as a continuation of the relative...Thus the 'continuative' force of ḫw ḫr ṣd m is pretty vague; all that seems to matter is that it should not come at the beginning".

(3) The superordinating ὦτος in apodosi (with the foregoing context either marked or unmarked), a clear case of high-level thematicity of a nexus (see below, Chapter Four; and see ANDERSSON 1904:27f., with numerous exx. from our corpus):

Ex. 1:12 καταφρήτι δε ἐνατθεῖον ἀμψώτ ομωψ ὀτογ ητήνητον ημαί... (cf. ANDERSSON 1904:74 “etwas verdächtig”).

Gen. 17:1 αὑσσπι δε ὧτε-αβραμ ἑνὲ προμπι δ τογ ἀντε ὦτογ ρεαρμ.

Gen. 27:30 αὐσσπι δε εταψ ἐβολ ὧτε-ιακωβ... ὀτογ ἀνεψ πεοκον ἰν ἐβολ ἑνταρπε.

Gen. 7:6 ἰως δε ἵαξη ἑνὲ προμπι δ τογ ἀμψωτ ηκατακατχος ἰ εφεππικαί.

(4) Superordinating highlighting by means of ἡππε (1c) (discussed above and below, Chapter Two), which may, beyond its delimitative junctural role, be viewed as true narrative focussing.

(5) Transition to Evolution Mode or to Enhanced Evolution (e.g. Gen. 4:2, 15:12, Ex. 2:16, 3:1, 5:13, 14:8, 17:2, Num. 14:6 etc.)

(6) The CM forms ἑαγ- (πε) or ἑιαγ- πε are fuzzily superordinate (and anaphoric) to their preceding context.

Obs.

(1) Above, I have contested the validity of a simple correlation of grounding and “ordination”, as postulated for instance by TOMLIN 1985 and (in a more sophisticated model) MATTHIESEN and THOMPSON 1988. The nucleus/satellite analytical principle hardly applies to narrative hierarchy, unless overmapped by the Theme/Rheme one; I certainly find it difficult to view ἑαγ- πε and the CM as “satellital” to a “nuclear” EM. In fact, the EM/CM model is textural, not structural in the hierarchical sense; there is a “determination” dependence between the two Modes, since the CM presupposes an EM, while the inverse is not true.

(2) For some discussions contesting or rejecting the old, logic-oriented binary model of “subordinated clause” vs. “main clause”, see HAMP 1973; PFISTER 1995; SHISHA-HALEVY 1995b:139f., 2006a.

(3) On cataphoric ταί πε ος “thus”, serving to focalize and delimit subsequent narrative events, see SHISHA-HALEVY 2007b (Shenoutean Sahidic; see for instance Leip. IV 26f.) Irish is amhlaidh a-, is é an choit a- provides a striking parallel.
1.2 Dialogue Tensing and Texturing

1.2.2 Specifically dialogic features: a brief check-list.
1.2.3 The Allocution.
1.2.3.1 The interrogative Allocution. Questions. “Rhetorical Questions”.
   (a) General.
   (b) Nexal questions; unintroduced assertive-focal formal questions.
   (c) Specially introduced assertive-focal formal questions.
   (d) Rhetic questions.
   (e) Inclusion/coordination of questions.
1.2.3.2 Allocution, exclamation, address. Imperatives.
   (a) Attention-forcing address.
   (b) Imperatives. μαρεψκωτεμ: the jussive/causative imperative. Sequeling μαρεψκωτεμ.
   (c) The imperatives — extended construction: the Post-Imperatival Allocutive slot.
1.2.4 The Response.
1.2.4.1 Response forms and constructions: “apocritics” and “reactives”.
1.2.4.2 Detailed contrastive Allocution/Response repertory.
1.2.4.3 Special responsive_ALLOCUTIVE clauses.
1.2.5 Tensing in Dialogue: the main tenses.
1.2.5.1 The two Futures.
   (a) The problem.
   (b) General considerations: parameters.
   (c) Diachrony
   (d) The Absolute-Definite (“specific”) Future (eηεκωτεμ, ηηεκωτεμ).
   (e) The Contingent-Indefinite Future (ηναςκωτεμ): present-based “tempus instans”.
   (f) Absolute-Definite and Contingent-indefinite Futures combined/opposed
1.2.5.2 The Present, non-actual Present and Aorist.
   (a) The Present.
   (b) The Aorist.
   (c) The Non-actual Present.
1.2.5.3 The adverb-rheme Present: a note on copular χν.
1.2.5.4 The Imperfect in Dialogue.
1.2.5.5 The Preterite ηαςκωτεμ in Dialogue: some problem highlights.


In “Sentence Grammar”, the dialogic clause has ever been considered as a default or “normal” sentence type. (Even Discourse Analysis, which has replaced the Text-Linguistics of the Nineteen-Sixties and Seventies, is mostly concerned with dialogic discourse, as if “discourse” were dialogic by default.) And yet, far from being a mere juxtaposition of
clauses, the basic or minimal Dialogue Texteme is a tightly and subtly
knit complex, which comprises, in its ideal, classic or most explicit form
of "alternating discourse" or Wechselrede, two recurring substructures
or subsystems: the allocutive and the responsive ones. These reveal spe-
cial kinds of interdependence (and respectively "insufficiency"), and
consequent cohesion, which differs sharply from cohesion in narrative,
although the basic linear succession is typical of both textemes. Indeed,
Dialogue is defined primarily by this design (of course, Dialogue differs
from Narrative also in pragmatic presupposition, which furnishes the
pragmatic environment for the linguistic patterning): the progressive,
dynamic intermeshing of two texts by two different locutors, with the
prime cohesive factor between one Allocation-Response unit and the
concatenated subsequent one being the fact that one Response forms the
allocutive basis — in fact, a thematic base — for another. Needless to
say, there are numerous variations on the basic Alternating Discourse
configuration. The Dialogue is not a broken text or an integrated sum of
text fragments, but a textemic system maximally combining two for-
mally (and pragmatically distinctive) subsystems. In the following
pages, I shall try and depict the basic structure of Bohairic Coptic dia-
logue and its constituents, as it occurs in the studied corpus, focussing
(a) on the syntagmatic-and-paradigmatic profile of the Interrogative and
Implicative Allocation and Response, as well on the syntagmatics of ad-
dress and exclamation in the given corpus, with some contrastive data
from Nitrian Bohairic; (b) on Dialogue tensing in the corpus.

Obs.
(1) "Sentence Grammar" is, and has ever been, typically dialogic. I suspect this stems
from the implicit belief that dialogue is "more realistic," reflecting spoken language, a
prejudice stemming in turn from the greatly mistaken belief that the spoken linguistic va-
riety is more "authentic" or in some way "more true", and anyway primary, to the written
variety. Note the compatibility of the Dialogue and Narrative textemes — both real
syntagmatic compatibility and the blend or overmapping of a "dialogic perspective" on
Narrative (Free Indirect Discourse); see above.
(2) See SHISHA-HALEVY 1981 for a pragmatically striking type of allocation/response:
"the Oracular Dialogue" (Late Egyptian).
(3) Some important or recent state-of-the-art reports on various aspects of Dialogue Analy-
sis: HELBIG 1975 (German); KALVERKAMPER 1981:257 s.v., HUNDSNURSCHER and WEI-
GAND (eds.) 1995, with research-historical overviews; ADAMZIK 1995:286f. s.v.; FRITZ
and HUNDSNURSCHER (eds.) 1994, with contributions on Dialogue typology, question-
answer sequences, Dialogue Grammar; STATI and WEIGAND (eds.) 1992 on methodology.
Dialogue Grammar, cohesion in dialogue; BAZZANELLA 1996 (ed.), on repetition in Dia-
logue; LOFFLER 1993 (ed.).
1.2.2 Specifically Dialogic Features: a Brief Check-list


The personal reference in Dialogue is inter- or delocutive, but interlocutive pronouns are pivotal, in a typical speaker's-role-switching interchange of locutive (1st-person) and allocutive (2nd-person) reference. This switch is a main delimitation factor. As for juncture, The internal junctural mechanism of the Allocution and its Response is very complex.

Theoretically, two constituent types of linkage are conceivable in a dialogic text, viz. (a) internally, between the Allocution and Response substructures, (b) between the #Allocution + Response# complex and its linearly preceding or successive one. Ideally, (b) is operated by reacting to the last Response, or part thereof, or its Allocution, that is linking to it by (a). It is important to realize that the Allocution + Response configuration (1) constitutes a single complex textual matrix unit, not two texts, and (2) that each of its two constituent parts is independent as grammatical structure and system. The implication and consequence of (1) is that, only when the end of the matrix is reached can the exact function (and logical status) of the allocution be resolved by the decoding reader/listener. Thus, whether or not a Response is required/expected/solicited “by” a Question is not a valid query, and must be replaced by whether a Response is present as non-zero, or whether it is zeroed; and then, in actual analysis, whether the Response is governed (i.e. conditioned).

(b) Specific Allocution/Response signals and forms are encountered: see below.

(c) Particles and particle roles specific to Dialogue, e.g. ṭα ṭ in Response (e.g. Gen. 20:11). See below, Chapter Four.

(d) Focalization (Focalizing Conversion [alias Second Tenses], Cleft Sentences, particles, Augens) is in our variety of Coptic peculiar to dialogue, or nearly so; at most, common to Dialogue, Exposition and the Comment Mode of Narrative: see above, and below, Chapter Two (the Focalizing Conversion and Cleft Sentence) and Four (the Augens).

Obs.
Cf. Schiffrin 1995:77 “Question-answer pairs are structurally complete after the provision of their second part”. However, I cannot simply accept that “a question defines a set of answers” (Hudleston 1994:413f.) In the text, there is a compatibility and selection

62 Note for instance the following cases: formalized allocutive generic person (ἐκ-) ἦν ἡτ (Gen. 11:10, 25:18 etc.); number neutralized: ἱν ἐκ-/ἱν ἤτ- e.g. in Lev. 19.

1.2.3 The Allocution

1.2.3.1 The interrogative Allocution. Questions. “Rhetorical Questions”.

(a) General

The interrogative Allocution (“Question”) is formally distinct in that it is part of a specialized dependency matrix that opens a slot for reaction (“Response”) — a slot that may, like most valency slots, be occupied by zero; the Question governs its Response, which is thus actantial; the Question being of the Response, in terms of high-level information structure, topical and thematic to its rhematicity. (Other Allocutions may be reacted to, yet as free complements, not governed and actantial).^53 Two sharply diverging formal types of Questions are distinguishable: one (a) nexus-referred, querying the validity of a nexus and eliciting confirmation or refutation of this validity (alias polar or yes/no Questions), the second (b) Rheme-referred, or rather using a special (“interrogative”) Rheme to elicit rhematic information. Type (a) is in a sense “rhematic” too: its high-level “validity Rheme”, potentially explicit in the pro-clausal “yes/no” Response, is the confirmation or repudiation of the validity of the very nexus; and a high-level Rheme may be the assertion of the validity of the nexus, or such assertion presented allocutively, soliciting agreement or challenging disagreement. The only Response solicited by high-assertiveness questions is one of (dis)agreement.

Both types may, according to conventional typology and terminology, be “rhetorical”, although the so called Rhetorical Questions — better Assertive-Focal Formal Questions — are immediately associated with the first. Assertive-Focal Formal Questions take on an interrogative form — are, so to speak, “disguised” or “packaged” as Questions — but actually take a place on an interrogation-assertion-exclamation gradient continuum of modality, mapped onto nexus or rhematic interrogative patterns. However, not only is it the case that no sharp boundaries

\(^{53}\) Arguably, by the very occurrence of a Response, an Allocution is retrospectively defined as elicitive and “incomplete”.

\(^{54}\) The two types are compatible in certain languages, e.g. Turkish, where rhematic elements can be followed by -mI, which converts the whole to nexus interrogation.
are determinable between the traditional and still prevalent distinction of "rhetorical" and "non-rhetorical" (unmarked? at any rate, not a unitary type) ones, but, like many a "logical" notion disguised as grammatical phenomena, it is often in Coptic not a grammatically meaningful dichotomy at all — that is, when it is not signalled by any or some or all of a repertory of markers (see below), yet when it is so marked, we might suggest that the greater the number of assertivity signals found in a given instance, the higher its grade of assertivity.

Rhetorical Questions are in fact assertions that are focussed along the bipolar yes — no axis, uniquely rendering the yes vs. no truth-value opposite one of focus.

From the communicative angle, it is, I believe, wrong to relate "rhetoricalness" to the speaker's absence of expectation of response, for some reaction is invariably expected and in fact and in effect solicited. Certainly, the difference — only superficially binary — between zero and non-zero Response is not coextensive with the non-binary semantic differentiation of logical types of Questions.

Obs.
(1) On Rhetorical Questions, their distinctive textual status, their statement value, the role of negation in them, etc., see Grésillon 1980; Korzen 1985:126ff. Hoff 1983 (Latin) correlates the typology of Questions (p. 124) with the speaker "knowing" (or "not knowing", as the case may be) the answer, and presupposing the same of his interlocutor. However, one may object that this dichotomy is too coarse by far: there are in-between cases in which the speaker is doubtful about the answer — or believes he knows it, needing confirmation — or suspects it, waiting for admission — or is really impatient for an action to take place ("Will you leave?") — or is confronted with an obvious state of things ("Are you still alive?"), and so on. The special case of Deliberative Questions (cf. Gen. 33:15 αν ντα-, below) is treated by Rouchota 1983 for Modern Greek, and defined pragmatically (see esp. p. 180): this too is a kind of Question subject to numerous nuances but entirely indifferent to the notion of "knowing the answer". Huddleston 1993 too relates the difference between English exclamatory and interrogative clauses to pragmatic parameters. However, written-language (text) data must, and do, suffice to resolve the nature and profile of Questions. In fact, the Dialogue texteme is a case where the issue of the relationship — synchronic as well as diachronic — and interaction (if any) of spoken and written diastems is sharply brought into focus.

(2) The insight that Questions are a kind of Topic for their Responses (Hiz 1978:100ff.; Shisha-Halevy 1981, 1995b:175ff.) which is formally confirmed in certain languages may, I believe, be at least in part extended to allocution/reaction in general.

(3) Huddleston 1994 distinguishes the grammatical category of "Interrogatives" from the semantic one of "Questions". I use here the latter as specific instances, subsystems and cases-in-point of the former.

(4) The tone of inquiry, part of the signifié of interrogative signalling, is essential to its assertiveness. It may be marked (even in the written text, by its own signals) as impatient,
aggressive, surprised, indignant, ironic... cf. RENCHON 1967:112 on exclamation “étonnement un peu sceptique... la stupéfaction, le défi, la bravade, la déception, l'ironie”.
(5) One striking grammatical criterion of a high-assertiveness formal Question is the low-to-zero functional load of negation (where present) — see below: KNAGH EPOK... KNAGH EPOK AN “Will/Won’t you have done...?”
(6) A very interesting case of an interrogative-focal shape to an emphatic-description exclamatory assertion are the Modern Irish constructions of the type “Nach iad atá socair suaimhneas!” “Aren’t they calm and peaceful!”. In form, this combines two matrices, viz. a negative-interrogative conversion (like: “Á! Nach iontach é an grá?” “Oh, isn’t Love wonderful?”) with a Cleft Sentence matrix (like “Is an bhean ramhar féin a bhí ann” “It was the fat woman herself who was there”). Formally, then, “Isn’t it they who are tranquil (and) peaceful”, but functionally “Aren’t they tranquil (and) peaceful!”. This phenomenon is also instructive with regard to the affinity, observable in Coptic — though less so in Bohairic? — of “Rhetorical” Questions with focalization (and thus the Cleft Sentence), more specifically with nexus focussing.

The marking paradigm of Nexal Questions includes a zero-marked term. This is in itself striking in a written text, where one cannot fall back on suprasegmentals (especially intonational contours). It is also striking that zero-marking is in Nitrian most typical of Allocutive (2nd person) Questions. On the other hand, Rhematic Questions are always primarily marked for interrogativity by their very interrogative Rheme (ōW ŽWN NIM), which, however, has in Coptic a non-interrogative indefinite-specific homonym (“so-and-so”, “a certain place” etc.): this is in fact a “pro-Response”, representative responsivity cancelling the primary interrogativity. Secondarily, therefore, these Questions contain and are marked by focalizing forms and/or constructions.

(b) Nexal Questions. Unintroduced Assertive-Focal Formal Questions
These are characterized by the non-rhematic, prefixed Question markers, and by the pertinence of negative/affirmative modulation.
AN: marked term
zero: unmarked term (mostly allocutive; almost only affirmative. Present or Nominal Sentence/Cleft Sentence). Often Assertive-Focal (then especially marked).

Obs.
In spite of frequent graphemic delimiters (points, colon: or lemniscus +) separating AN from its clause (Gen. 8:7 3E-AN + ἀπόρεων 3E-θν: 29:6 AN: qonB, Ex. 17:7 3E-AN + πείρα qon N3THN Num. 16:22 3E-ΑΝΤΜΩ.flato ŁuN3N... etc., see Chapter Four), AN seems to be inseparable from it by non-graphemic elements (except clause modifiers, which structurally belong to the clause: Ex. 4:18). This may be a rare marking of an intermediate (close, non-closest) grading of juncture.
Examples:
(I) 

(1) In quoted or indirect Questions — object actants of *verba dicendi*, *sentiendi* etc. (all Greek ἐν):

Gen. 8:7f. ἐναὶ ἥν ἄν-ἀνιμύνων ἀρώμ (εβολ) (Greek ἐν).
Gen. 18:21 ἐναὶ ἄν-καταποστρωτ ... ἥν ἄν-εξωκ 

MMQ ἐβολ.

Ex. 4:18 

ντανα ἄν-ἐτι ἐγον (contrasted with the “di-

rect” Gen. 43:27).

Num. 13:18ff. (καὶ) ἥν ἄν-ΚΩΡ ἰε-ἀν-οτάβωβ πε ἰε ἄν-

οοὐκοῦνι πε ἰε-ἀν οὐνψ το ... ἄν-ἀνινει ἰε-ἀν-

 HttpServletResponse  ... ἄν-ἀν-οτόνοπτ κω ... ἐρωτ ἰε-ἀν-παντοτ 

ετ ... ἄν-ἀν-κφενυότ ὁμ-μον.

Deut. 4:32ff. (μὴ) ἄν-ἀκωττὶ καταπακακὰ ... ἄν-

ἀποκοττὲ ἑρωβ μπαρῆ ... ἄν-ἀσφων εὐτεμ ἐτσι κη ἑτ 

ἔτοι ἐκακὰ ... ἰε ἄν-ἀκφων ἡκ-φ.”

Gen. 27:21 ... ιτακῶμημ ἐρο ἄν-ντοκ ἰε-ἀν-ποκ 

πε παψρ 

 наук (contrast Gen. 27:24 

τοκ πε παψρ 

 наук).

Gen. 42:16 (ὀσων ἐβολ, transitive) ἄν-ἀν-τετεν ἄν-

Μοθμ.

Num. 14:30 (χρηπτο) ἄν-ἀν-τετενὼσθεντ ...

Ex. 17:7 ἀργεντ-ποτ εξω 

Μοθ ἄν-πτε δω 

μο νθ-

τεν ὁμ-μον.

Gen. 43:7 (The man asked us:) ἄν ἐτι μεκαννῳ ὁν ἰε ἄν-

οτόντετεν-κων 

Μοθ.

Gen. 44:19f. 

ντοκ ἄν Ἄδω 

Μοθ ἄν-ἀν-οτόντετεν-κων 

Μοθ ἰε-κων.

Gen. 24:23 

ντο-θερπ 

ΝΝΜ Ματαμοὶ ἰ ἀν ὁτον-τοπο ... 

NB: no ἄν e-marking of the interrogative as actantial, but 

Ματαμοὶ, 

while being delimited from its sequel, is both retrospective and prospective.

Obs.

(1) For the formal distinction and opposition of “quoted interrogation” vs. “direct interro-

gation”, cf. John (B4) 21:15ff.x3 ΚΕΙ ΜΝΟΙ but delocutively quoted 21:17 as ΑΝ-

ΚΕΙ ΜΝΟΙ (not so in Homer’s ΚΕΡΑΠΑΝ ΜΝΟΙ/ΧΙΜΕΙ ΜΝΟΙ).

(2) The suprasegmental (probably intonational) markers of interrogation in spoken 

Bohairic — in correlation with zero or non-zero segmental markers — are, of course, enti-

tely unknown; but I believe they are in any case irrelevant or non-essential for the written 

marking of interrogativity.

(3) On so-called “direct” vs. “indirect speech”, an issue of linkage and delimitation 

(Chapter Four), see Quecke 1990; Peust 1996 for Late Egyptian (74f. for interrogation 

marking, 72 for vocative allocation as exponent of “Direct Speech”).
(2) In rhetorical, formal, solemn or ceremonious, affective, expressive, ironical or emphatic proclamatory interrogation. Often, Assertive-Focal Question (in the Greek, various markers):

Gen. 45:3 ἀνὰκ πε ἰωχψφ ἀν-ετί υός τάκε-παϊωτ (Greek zero).

Gen. 24:58 ἀν-τεπάγενε# (Response: ἀ-ναγμένη) (Greek zero).
Num. 16:22 ἑ τ ἑ ἄτενίππα νέμαρα λίβεν ισκε-οτρώμι θέρπνοβι ἀν-πάωντ MPs τά ψ ι να έξεντεταρνάργη τήρε (Greek zero).

Num. 16:9:13 ἀν-οτκαζί εωτεν πε (Φαι) ζε ... (Greek μή).
Ex. 14:11 ἀν-ετεμμόν-μγχθ ςενπκαζί ξνχμί (Greek zero).

Num. 22:37 μή μπίασωρτ πεςοττ ηροκ εςβεοσ μπεκί γα-ποί ... οντως ἀν-ταγγεκαζόμ γερτί ψαμ μμοκ ἀν (Greek zero).

Ex. 14:12 ἀν-Φαι ἀν πε πιαζί εταντσν Νάκ... (Greek ὦ).

Obs.
It will be observed that ἀν- introduces in Bohairic (not in Sahidic?) Assertive-Focal ("Rhetorical") Questions; this is, of course, a feature of Demotic and of earlier Egyptian, cf. Ryl. IX 5/10, and SPIEGELBERG 1924:§485f.

(3) In a Question/Response concatenation:

Gen. 29:5f. νωτεν-πανεβαλ θων — εβολ ςενακκαν / ἀν-τετενκωταν ναπαν ... τεντκωταν ΜΜΟΚ / ἀν-πόνς υός (Greek zero).

(4) ἀν- with the Absolute ("Definite") Future is very rare: expressing doubt and thus, as it were, a paradoxical collocation. I find only Gen. 17:17 (Greek ϑι + Fut.) ἀν-εεκμίς ..."will she really give birth?" (See below, on the unquestionability of the Absolute-Definite Future). This is in fact an Assertive-Focal Question.

Obs.
Otherwise, ἀν- + allocutive Absolute Future is not interrogative, but used to express objuration: (again, Greek ϑι). Synchronously, we seem to have here a different homonymous ἀν entity:

Gen. 14:23 ἀν-εεκςι εβολ ςενητεντακ τῆρον.
Gen. 31:50 ἀν-ννακεβίο ηναγκις ἄ-ἀν-ννακε'κιθήι εξεκαζωπι.
Deut. 1:35 αῦσερκ εκαζ ΜΜΟΚ ἄ-ἀ-ερεσταϊ ηνιρψμι ξατ επικαζ.

(5) Gen. 33:15 ἀν-τακωταν νεμάκ εβολ ςενινμώχ ετνεμή (Greek zero + Fut.) is a rare instance of ἀν- introducing a
Deliberative Question. This is not a case of ellipsis of a verb (so ANDERSSON 1904:66f.), but one of the locutive functional and morphological merger of Conjunctive (quâ non-factive “that”- form) and deliberative ταρεψ- (very marginal in Bohairic).

Oibs.
In the context of deliberative “that”- Questions, Modern Greek υά- Questions come to mind: see ROUCHOTA 1993 for a pragmatic basis; seemingly a Mediterranean isogloss, it occurs also in Modern Hebrew (יר- and colloquial Arabic) — “shall I?”. Sahidic does not have ἐνε- in this case.

(II) Zero (in the Greek, various interrogative markers) — also Assertive-Focal Questions:
Ex. 2:7 τεσωμυ ψταμοτ† νε... (Greek zero).
Gen. 43:27f. ζοροξ νε-πετεινιτ ... ети qονι answered #ζοροξ νε-πεκαλον пенииωτ ети qονι (Greek ελ/zero) — observe that Gen. 46:30 ети гαπ kονι nοοk is not a question (note гαπ).
Gen. 27:24 nοοk πε пαψρι νθαρ “Are you my son E.”? (Greek zero).

Assertive-Focal Questions, even when not specially introduced, may be marked by any or some or all of the following: negation; special introductory signals; focalization; the Augens:
Gen. 27:38 οτχμοτ μηατατε еτεγακ пαιωτ (Greek μή).
Ex. 2:14 ...ъαν еκοσωμυ εθοβετ nοοk... (“...or is it that it is to murder me you wish...?”) (Greek μή).

Note here the Circumstantial Present as Cleft Sentence Topic (see Chapter Two).
Gen. 44:15 тетенцουσм аν άε... (Greek zero).

Oibs.
“Intonation Questions” for zero-marked Questions (JUNGE 1983) characterizes a syntactic pattern by spoken-language prosodic data that are not merely absent, but irrelevant in the written-language text. “Pseudofragen” or “emotionel-konstatierende Fragen” for the traditional Rhetorical Questions (ibid.) is, I believe, inadequate.

(c) Marked Assertive-Focal Formal Questions
The following Greek-origin elements introduce marked argumentative (“rhetorical”) assertions. While their Greek correspondents do introduce Formal Questions, it is arguable that clauses not introduced by αν-, the only certain interrogative marker in Coptic, are in reality not Questions at all, but instances of enhanced — focalized — nexus, often with added
attitudinal characterization. The attestations often do not match their Greek correspondents in the Vorlage: note μητι for μή, μη for οὐκ and οὐχι, which do not occur in the corpus as initial elements. This means no more, no less than the advantage taken by Coptic of the possibility of markedness-enhancing grammemic borrowing, like (for some examples) καν and γοταν with the Conditional, or ειμητι and γως (τε), μποτε and μπως with the Conjunctive, γοτε with the Circumstantial, Sentence Particles like γαρ, δε, μεν, and so on and so forth — at the same time giving these elements a systemically independent value in Coptic. (In fact, the elements listed below are initial, discourse-signalling sentence particles, and, like the other particles of Greek origin, have their own valeur in Coptic):

μη “it is surely not the case that...”

μητι similar?

(ιε)...αν (discontinuous, self-cancelling negatives) “it is surely the case that...!”

ζαρα (sceptical tone)

ιε- (attested only once in the corpus): affective (emotionally loaded) Question — reproach, disbelief.

Note the frequency of focalization in the Assertive-Focal Question clauses.

αυθ inferential (?) or amazed (?) question, reactive to a (pragmatic) situation (once, Greek αρα γε): see, however, Obs. below.

Gen. 30:2 μη ανοκ-τωβιω μηφ (in Greek focalizing word order).

Num. 11:12 μη ανοκ αιερβωκ μπαιααοσ θηρ πε ανοκ αιεραστ"

Num. 12:2 μη μωτσεν γματαθε εταπσεν καζι γεμαγ μη μπεκαζι γεμαμ ανον (Greek μή... ουχι...).

Lev. 10:19 μη ηναυωπι εκραναγ μπσε “It will surely displease the Lord!”

Num. 11:22 μη νιεσωτομ νεμ νιεσωτον ασωνκαελασιωλοσ μη σεναρωσ.

Deut. 20:19 μη οτρωμι πε πισκην ετσιενκοι...

Deut. 29:17 μητι οτον-οτρωμι ει-οτεριμι ει-οσπατρια ει-οθεταν εανοληθ πικι καδαλ μπεσ (= Vat) (Greek μή).

Num. 20:10 μητι τενανινι νοτιωσωτ νωτεν εβολ δεσταιπεπα (Greek: adverbial-focalizing word-order; Sahidic: Focalizing Future) (= Vat) (Greek μή).

Gen. 29:25 μη νεταιερβωκ νακ αν ετε-ρακα (Greek ού).
Num. 16:29 ἡν ποτέ ἂν πεταφτάσωι (= Vat) (Greek οὐχί; apodosis, not Question).

Ex. 4:11 ΝΗΜ ην ηταάφρο έρωμι ουτον ΝΗΜ ην ηταάφτασοι-εβο νέκκοτρ ... ΝΗΜ άνοκ άν ην ποτέ Φῦ (Greek οὐκ).

Num. 22:37 ΝΗΜ ΜΠΟΥΜΡΡ έμονήπ έροκ έεβεοτ ΜΠΕΚΙ ΓΑΡΟΙ ... ΟΝΤΩΣ ΆΝ ΤΑΝΝΑΞΙΜΩΝ ΝΕΡΤΙΜΑΝ ΜΜΟΚ άΝ (Greek οὐχί ... οὐ).

Num. 22:30 ΝΗΜ ΑΝΟΚ-ΤΕΚΕΘ άΝ ... ΝΗΜ ΣΕΝΟΣΠΙΝΓΟ ΑΙ-ΓΙΝΓΟ ΜΜΟΚ ... (Greek οὐκ, Μή).

Gen. 34:23 ΝΗΜ ΑΣΝΑΧΩΜΠΙ ΝΑΝ άΝ (Greek οὐχ; focalizing word-order).

Num. 23:12 ΝΗΜ ΝΗ ΆΝ ΕΤΑΕΠΤΗ ΝΑΘΘΙΤΟΥΕ ΕΣΩΤΝ έρωμ ΝΑΙ ΝΕΤΝΑΑΡΕΣ ΕΣΩΤΟΥ (Greek οὐχί...).

Ex. 4:14 ΝΗΜ ην ΑΑΡΩΝ ΠΕΚΟΝ ΆΝ ΠΙΛΕΝΤΗΣ ΤΕΣΩΤΝ ΕΙ-ΣΕΝΟΣΠΙΝΓΟ ΟΝΑΣΙΔΙ ΝΕΜΑΚ ΝΕΟΝ (= Vat).

Deut. 11:30 (ΠΤΩΘΟΝ ΝΠΡΙΖΙΝ ... ΠΤΩΘΟΝ ΝΠΑΒΑΛ) ΝΗΜ ην ΝΑΙ ΟΝ ΓΙΜΗΡ ΜΠΙΟΡΝΑΗΣ ... (read with Vat ην ΙC ΝΑΙ ΆΝ?).

Deut. 32:34 ΝΗΜ ην ΙC ΝΑΙ ΝΑΝ ΑΣΕΘΟΝΤ ΝΤΟΤ (= Vat) (Greek οὐκ ιδοῦ).

Gen. 37:13 ΝΗΜ ην ΝΕΚΣΝΗΘΟΝ ΆΝ ΑΣΜΟΝΙ ΣΕΝ ΣΙΧΕΜ (Greek οὐκ).

Gen. 18:13 ΓΑΡΑ ΤΑΦΗΜΗ ΤΝΑΜΙΚΙ (Greek ἀραγε).

Gen. 37:10 ΤΑΙΡΑΚΟΣ ΟΥΤΕ ΠΑΛΗΡΙ ΕΤΑΚΝΑΤ ΕΡΟΚ ΓΑΡΑ ΣΕΝΟΣΠΙ ΤΕΜΝΑΙ ...

Gen. 27:36 ΕΙ-ΜΠΕΚΣΕΖΠ ΩΤΟΜΟΥ ΝΗΙ ΡΨ ΑΝΟΚ ΠΑΙΩΤ (Greek οὐχ-)

Gen. 26:9 ΑΨ ΤΕΚΣΓΙΜΗ ΤΕ "She is your wife then?" or "What! is she your wife?!" (Greek ἀπε γε).

Obs.

(1) Unlike άν-, ΝΗ is resumable (and repeatable), like a converter or conjugation base: see Shisha-Halevy 1986a:162 n. 38.

(2) The semantic affinity and compatibility of Assertive-Focal Allocations with focalization (of actants, circumstantial or nexus) is well known and instructive concerning the structural meaning of the assertivity sememe. However, in Pentateuch Bohairic (unlike Sahidic, Nitrian and the early Bohairic (B4) P. Vat. copto 9 and Bodmer III), the Focalizing Future δκμά- is not a conditioned (grammaticalized) form of άν- Assertive-Focal Questions.

(3) We do not find in the corpus an enclitic γάρα (Greek ἀρα), a homonymy situation occurring e.g. in the NT: ΝΗΜ ΓΑΡΑ ΝΕ Mt.18:1, ΝΗΜ ΤΙ ΓΑΡΑ II Cor. 1:17.

(4) See Stern 1880 §526 for “interrogative” ie-, ie- in Nitrian: AM I 29 indignant exclamation: ΙΕ-ΜΠΕΚΣΙ ΕΡΟΚ ΔΕ-ΕΚΦΩΝ ΝΝΑΙΝΟΒΝ ΝΑΘΝΟΒΙ ΕΒΟΛ. This
would agree well with the LE etymology of this proclitic (Hannig, *Handwörterbuch* 21 “Gefühlssausbruch”); cf. j3 ḫ (Wb 1 25, 9 “Was soll?”, ERMAN 1933:§687, “was soll es heissen”, “was fällt euch ein?” “unwillige Redensart”. Compare Nitrian Bohairic impatient/indignant 蓂.sell, see below). However, the “reinforcing” roles in LE must yet be related to this; and the three main functions of Coptic e1e/ὃ — interrogative marking, superordinating role in apodosis and (typically Bohairic, for Sahidic ḫ) disjunctive “or” (e.g. Gen. 31:14, 43:7 in disjoined Questions), often interrogative — still remain to be precisely defined, integrated within one functional spectrum or else assigned to several homonyms. For interrogative Ṝe- in L* (Kellis) cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 2002:308. (The interrogative/disjunctive/connector fuzziness certainly recalls the Greek “doubles” ᾳὰρ ὅπως and ἦ ἦν, and may have been influenced by them: see several studies in RIJKSBARON [ed.] 1997).

(4) Question-initiating 蓂.sell (structurally different from the cataphoric pro-form interrogative Rheme 蓂.sell which, by the way, is more typically Sahidic than Bohairic, which often responds with Ṣim and ṣer) is a colloquial Nitrian feature: see POLOTSKY 1934:64f., quoting several examples (蓂.sell παλατι πε “Here then is the child!” or similar AM 1 228 (and not “where is the child?” pace Crum, *Dictionary* s.v. 蓂.sell). Also Mac. No. 29 fgt. 5: ἦ ἃς ὅν νεότατα ἀντικείμενον στομάχης... “Nay, could one (on the contrary) detract from the marvel...?”. The inferential role is corroborated by the post-classic Greek ᾳὰρ γε (so, not ᾳὰρ see BLÖMQVIST 1969:128f.) in Gen. 26:9 and probably by Egyptian precedents. However, an alternative view, perhaps better suiting the respective contexts, would see 蓂.sell as expressing amazement: “What!...?” or, more moderately, “Why,...!” 65 Battiscombe Gunn compiled a brilliant diachronic and comparative profile of 蓂.sell (Egyptian ḫ), a study originally meant for his seminal *Studies in Egyptian Syntax* (Paris 1924), discusssing also its inferential sense, and other interrogatives and particles in Egyptian, Semitic and Indo-European. This study has not been published, and constitutes item VII 58 in the Gunn Papers (the Griffith Institute, Oxford). (This study may form part of a new edition of Gunn’s *Studies*, currently being prepared for publication at the Griffith Institute, Oxford).

(d) Rhematic Questions

These contain an intrinsically interrogative grammemic Rheme, with which a lexicem, pronominal or Proper-Name element in the Response (if any) may cohere in a special “matching” Rheme forming rhematic linkage: “...who...?” “John”, “...where...?” “...London...”. They have the distinctive and definitional coherence of naxal pro-clausal Responses (“yes/no”) with the nexus in the Allocation. The Response is here a higher level “validity Rheme”, being rhematic on the same level as the Question. The Rhematic Question is thus definable by its formal “incompleteness”, that is, by the junctural distinction of opening a slot fillable in the Response: indeed, the joint or conjoined complex Rheme (“...where...?” — “...London...”) is distinctive of these Questions.

65 Note also that the Hebrew original has here ‘āk hinneh, that is a Presentative, non-inferential element, which may indicate that ᾳὰρ is after all the proper reading.
(1) Rhematic Questions may be Assertive-Focal ("Rhetorical") Formal Questions:

Num. 16:11 ὠς οίμ πε ἁρων ἰε-αρτενχρεμψεν περὶ ὁμοθ - Theme specific, therefore οίμ "rhetorical" and the whole Assertive-Focal, not interrogative.

Ex. 10:7 ὁδόσα ἰε ὁτος-θοπ ναβωτ...
Deut. 1:12 πως ἡνάξεμαυτον μνατατ ἐθαλ μπετενμνικι.
Gen. 18:13 ἐθε-οτ ακαπρα ωβι νάρη νάητε.
Gen. 26:10 οτ πε θαί ετακαὶ να.
Gen. 4:10 οτ πετακαὶ.
Also Gen. 21:26, 43:44, 44:4, Num. 31:15.

Obs.
(1) For ὁδόσα ἰε cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 1986a:85 and reff. For ἰε here, see §4.6.1 below.
(3) πως is the only Greek-origin interrogative Rheme I find in the corpus.
(5) In ἠπολαμμχ οίμ ετεκχτιν περὶ ὁμοθ AM II 124 we see the syntax of the identifying interrogative Rheme applied to a Proper Name: "Which John...?" (SHISHA-HALEVY 1989a:43, 108).
(6) οίμ is the only interrogative pronoun privileged to occur in initial position followed by a verb clause. This is only apparently Topic placement: it is a different, focal slot and not the topicalized actant (e.g. Num. 11:12 ονόκοκ λοβωκ....ιο-οκ λαμακοτ; for the focal noun-initial construction, see Chapter Two below, and SHISHA-HALEVY 1986a:85f.). When the Theme in nexus with οίμ is co-specific with it (i.e. a Proper Name), we have an Assertive-Focal ("rhetorical") Allocation (see above, Num. 16:11).

(2) Rhematic Questions (with the same Rhemes) may be truly interrogative, that is, may be answered by matching non-interrogative Rhemes:

Gen. 27:32 νοκ-οίμ νοκ — άοκ πε πεκχωπρι πεκ-

Gen. 32:27 οίμ πε πεκχαπ — ιασκβ.
Ex. 4:2 οτ πε θαί — οταβωτ (νε super lin.).
Gen. 24:23f. νοο-τχερι ννιμ ... ά οτον-τοπος ... εερε

Gen. 15:8ff. πως ἡλαμε θε-... — σι ηνι νοτβαγκι...

(3) αρτενετεροτ "How are you?" is an historically rooted but iso-
lated idiomatic clause-form:

Gen. 43:27 ἀρτενετεροτ ἰε ἰε-αρτενετεροτ.
TENSING AND STRUCTURE IN NARRATIVE AND DIALOGUE

Obs.
This is a unique case of interrogative actant focalization with the Focalizing Present in Pentateuch Bohairic: cf. POLOTSKY 1940.

(4) ερων μα νε- is another old, colloquial locutive (1st-person) affective idiom, expressing weary, despairing or agitated renunciation (Greek τι μοι + neutr./infinitive, άνα τι ημίν + infinitive):
   Gen. 25:22 ερων τι ημίν μπορεί.  
   Gen. 25:32 ερων τι ημεταμείλι.  
   Gen. 27:46 ερων τι ημαών.  
   Num. 11:20 ερων ναν ει ένοικηλ ένεκιμι.

Obs.
For this expression, also attested outside the Pentateuch (Job 30:2, I Cor. 5:12), cf. Late Egyptian ν- Ʌ-Τ-Η ...ν Ʌ-Τ-Η κτ η τημ-δι. Černý-Gardiner, Hieratic Ostraca, Pl. XXXIII No. 2 (Ostr. Leipzig 16) ro 3 and Pl. LXIX No. 3 (Ostr. Staring) ro 3 n- Ʌ-Τ-Η ην - not distinctly infinitival forms. To my knowledge, there is no Demotic attestation. See SHISHIA-HALEVY 1981:328, STERN 1880:124 (“elliptical”). The “accusative” ν- is indeed difficult, and reminds one of ν- following the Shenoutean τω ετω, also an “Egyptian” colloquialism (SHISHIA-HALEVY 1978).

(c) Inclusion / Coordination of Questions.

(1) All Questions — indeed, the dialogue texteme itself — are inculcable as object actants in the valency matrix of verba dicendi by means of Δε-, with the verb Δω “say”, which is famously distinctive for a valency actantial slot filled by the formal “neutric” pronominal object -c or -q as cataphoric referent to Δε- (Δοος Δε- etc.). It is interesting to observe the junctural delimitation by means of the “heavy” lemniscus delimiter + between Δε- and its verb, clearly indicating the belonging of Δε-, as an inclusion marker, to the dialogue. Question clauses may be marked by sentence particles (also signalling interrogative tone) as part of textual cohesion, although this is not common (see below for Nexal Questions with ον, τοιν, πω).

Obs.
"Inferential Questions", like Greek τι ού (PALMER 1995) and Egyptian interrogative + (j)řp (SHISHIA-HALEVY 1986b), combine an interrogative with a Sentence Particle (see Chapter Four §4.6.1).

(2) Rhematic Questions (interrogative or Assertive-Focal) are coordinated or disjoined by ους or τε respectively:
   Ex. 4:11 ΝΩΝ ΕΙ ΕΤΑΡΤΡΟ ΕΡΩΗΙ ΟΥΣ ΝΩΝ ΕΙ ΕΤΑΡΤΑΜΙΟ- 
   ΕΒΟ ΝΕΜΚΟΥΡ.
   Gen. 44:16 ΟΤ ΠΕΤΕΝΝΑ ΟΤΑΜΗΕΙ ΜΠΕΝΣΤΕ ΤΕ ΟΤ ΠΕΤΕΝΝΑ 
   ΚΑΣΙ ΝΜΟΓ ΤΕ ΑΝΝΑΘΜΑΙΟΝ ΣΕΝΟΥ.
For Nexal Questions, ὁταὶ seems excluded in favour of ἰε or zero, with ὃν (unlike Sahidic ἠ) not connective but truly disjunctive:

Num. 11:12 ἦν ἀνὸκ διερήσωκ μπαίλασες θηρᾷ ἰε ἀνὸκ ἀἵμακότω.

Gen. 43:7 ἀν-ἐτι πετένιωτ ὁνὶ ἰε ἀν-οὐοντετεν κον ἡμᾶς.

Ex. 2:14 ὃν ἑκόσῳ ἐξοτεβετ νὸοκ... “... or is it that you wish...”

Num. 12:2 ἦν ἐμώτσης ἡμᾶςάτῃ ετανότε σαδὶ ἡμᾶς ἔρεν ἰε ἀἈίμην ἀἈίμον.


1.2.3.2 Allocution, Exclamation, Address. Imperatives

Formally marked Questions, both nexal and rhythmic, can in Coptic (as in other languages) almost always be exclamative. Indeed, Assertive-Focal Formal Questions are in a sense exclamations, if we define this for written language, in a way that would include prominence of an utterance but exclude (or disregard, or not depend on) suprasegmental features. Address is the prototypical allocutive signal:

(a) Attention-forcing address, an almost ideal dialogue-opening discourse signal, typically takes the form of an allocutive Proper Name or its equivalent, with no further allocution marker except for reiteration (also in the Greek original). Note the delimiters, indicating the relative prosodic autonomy of the addressed element:

Gen. 27:1 παύμηπι ἐγιππε ἀἈοκ.

Gen. 27:18 παὐτ ἐγιππε ἀἈοκ.

Note the Coptic possessive, corresponding here and often to the Greek vocative of the “inalienable” kinship noun.

Gen. 22:7 παὐτ ὑ ἐπτωπον παύμηπι.

Gen. 31:11 ἰακωβ ὑ ἐπτωπον.

Gen. 46:2 ἰακωβ ἰακωβ ὑ ἐπτωπον.


Ex. 3:4 ἐμώτσης ἐμώτσης ὑ ἐπτωπον.
(b) A complex, extensive address to a single addressee may constitute the entire allocution, in an acclamation:

Ex. 34:6f. ποσε ποσε θεσ ποσε

(c) Different is the address preceding or following an interrogative Allocation:

Num. 16:22 θεσ θεσ θεον γενε καρδιοι ενομεν εις τον ανθρωπον πας ησην της θεος της θεος.
Gen. 15:2 πανες + ου πε ετεκναθη νηπι.
Gen. 16:8 αρπαθ κεκρικι ναιρον ελεος εβολ θεων.
Gen. 22:7 ου πε ετωον παλαι.

(d) A case of address appositive to allocutive pronouns:
Gen. 19:18, Ex. 4:10 + + έρον πασε.

(e) Quite different still, formally and functionally, is the allocutor address accompanying an imperative form, as referate of the injunction and agent of the act. Here both (syntagmatic) complexity and (paradigmatic) commutability are distinctive:

Gen. 4:23 άδα γενε κελλα εστελιον ηδονην επελεμε ης εις.
Gen. 48:16 πιστελεσ ενοµεν µοι εβολ δεννηπετ-

(f) Address placed in final / intercolary position in the colon, as in the Greek (following the Hebrew):
Gen. 22:8 ερεθ + νασ νασ εοσεωσ επεσεια παλαι.
Gen. 23:11 ςατι εαροι πασε.
Gen. 23:15 µον πασε.
Gen. 27:13 πεκαρον ερπι εκει επιεικε εστελιο.
Gen. 27:20 ου πε θεον ετακτον εκει επεσεια παλαι.
Gen. 48:19 θεον παλαι θεον.
Ex. 4:10 + + έρον πασε.
Deut. 27:9 χαρωκ ους εστελιον πικα.
The placement of the allocutive-augential accompaniment of Imperatives may differ from that of correspondents in the Greek:

Gen. 18:25 ἡφωρ ἰμεριπι θεοκ μπαζακι (Greek μηδαμος σοι ποιησεις).

Obs.
(1) See Svennung 1958; Gerard 1980; Renchon 1967. For an instance of the fine or blurred boundary between interrogation, "Rhetorical Question" and exclamation in English, see Huddleston 1993: the author claims only pragmatic differences between these.
(2) We have in the corpus no instance of the morphological Greek vocative case as in the NT or Nitrian (such as κρατικε θεοφιαξ, παρε Luke 1:3, 22:35, φιλαππις John 4:9, καινσε Philipp. 4:3) and formalized imperatives (are James 4:13, χαιρε/χερε/χερετε etc.).
(3) On the pragmatic specificity in address and vocative determination, in Bohairic nτ- or nτ (see SiuSHA-HALEVY 1989a:49ff.): ποτρο; φερρι AM II 295, φη ετ- AM II 306; see also Chapter Three.
(4) The allocutive system is especially register-sensitive: in the Nitrian and "Nitrian-constituent" texts we find allocutive signals and elements — native and esp. Greco-Coptic — which may well be colloquial, and are absent in the Pentateuch: ὢ νεμ Mac. No. 6, SV 66; De Vis I 69, ὢ Ε- AM II 322, θια (Νεμωτεν) De Vis II 191, AM I 31; κα το χεφαλα AM I 19; χερε Luke I 27, χερετε AM II 276; πινμα πινμα AM I 229; τιπινν Νωτεν AM I 116 τιπινν Νακ Mac. No. 18; άθοκ μπαζις AM II 75, άθοκ νεμαχ SV 46, 59, AM II 323, άθοκ εκ- De Vis I 149, 163, άθοκ εκ Ακ Cat. 9.

(g) ὢ, the familiar attention-forcing opening discourse signal is absent in the Pentateuch. Greek ὢ occurs only twice in the Septuagint: Gen.27:20, with no Coptic correspondent (μαωηρι); for the doubled ὢ ὢ — not Address but emotion signal — in Num. 24:23, Bohairic has one ὢ.

Obs.
Coptic ὢ is lexicographically considered a "native" element (Crum, Dictionary 517b), but the reflex of the Egyptian j3 (etc.) — if it is one — must no doubt have merged functionally with the Greek ὢ ὢ. The presence vs. absence of the Greek element in exclamation and address is an issue in the synchrony and diachrony of Greek. Arguably, the two slots or roles define two homonyms (cf. Schwyczizer II 600f.); the early zeroing, or alternatively presence of ὢ may be due to “affect” or address tone: Cf. Gildersleeve 1903 §20 (“the omission of ὢ in prose is passionate or late”); Kühner-Gerth II/1:48ff., 310ff.; Mayerer II/1 55: in the Greek Papyri, ὢ marks in “vocative” formulaic or solemn address. Needless to say, in Coptic, the distribution and value of the corresponding element are different.

(b) Imperatives. Μπερκωτετ
(1) The Imperative is a grammatical phenomenon that is far from simple, in every respect, starting with its structural identity and nature. In
pre-Coptic Egyptian it is a morphologically distinct entity; in Coptic it is partly morphologically distinct, partly homonymous with the verb lexeme ("infinitive"), but even in the latter case, it constitutes a "cwtem_3" — distinct from cwtem_1 and cwtem_2, mainly on the basis of its commutation with Ṁṽp- (the nuclear proclitic form of Ṁṽwp "Don't!", expanded by the verb lexeme) and with the morphologically marked imperatives (ἂπιωνι, ἡλ- etc.). In our corpus, the usual morphologically distinct Imperatives are:

ἀπεμι Gen. 20:7, 38:25.
Ἀνατ ( prostituerade Gen. 20:7.
Ἀμοσἄν Gen. 24:33

Ma-, Ἐπί (†) Gen. 27:26, 34:8ff., 42:37, Deut. 3:28, ὅλος Ἡλ Ex. 34:11ff.

Ma-✝-go Deut. 3:28.
Ma Ἡσαν Gen. 7:1, 19:34.
Ma- imperatives of causative lexemes:
Ma-τοσβων Εξ. 19:23.
Ma-τασῖον Εξ. 32:27.
Ma-τακόι Gen. 24:17.
Ma-πφοι Gen. 24:54.
Ma-τασκε-τεσσεράκι Gen. 34:12.
Ma-τακε-πεκίιτ Deut. 5:16.

Obs.

(1) Layton 2004, Chapter Sixteen is an excellent account of the Sahidic Imperative. In Coptic, the Imperative has a tenuous non-lexical connection with the verb, unlike Greek, where the Imperative is marked for aspect (Mckay 1985) and diathesis ("voice"). It is a moot question whether the Imperative is a nexus form or not; settling its "finiteness" is perhaps less of a problem in Coptic than in Indo-European or Semitic (cf. Davies 1986: 118ff.). The combination of the Imperative with the Augens supports the view that a covert allocutive "person" is present in the Imperative form (cf. Davies 1986: 134ff., 138ff., 144ff.). The structural allocutivity of the Imperative is of course evident, e.g. by the absence of allocutive forms of Ἳαρε- (Ἱαρεκ- is attested in Late Sahidic).

(2) The problem of Imperative negation (in Coptic as in Egyptian, by a special grammemic negative Imperative) is shared by other languages: see Davies 1986: 67ff. Zanuttini 1994. In Coptic, the semantic incompatibility of lexemic (as against grammemic) "Imperativehood" and negation is formally manifested in the obligatory auxiliation in negation — the negation resides in the Imperative auxiliary, to which the verb lexeme is an expansion, while the "affirmative" Imperative is a distinct morphological entity.
(3) I find no correspondent in the corpus to the Sahidic rhetorical (and focalizing?) ἢπωρ ετρε-, common in Shenoute and Besa (also in other dialects).

(2) ἡμερεσωτετ: the Jussive / Causative Imperative. Sequelling ἡμερεσωτετ

(a) Delocutive ἡμερ-/ἡμος-

(1) Affirmative Jussive (delocutive imperative), not causative (Greek Jussive) — very often sequelling (“and / then / therefore let him...”), or summing up, following a Topic. Cf. also the # imperative + οτος ἡμερ- # constructions below). Negative Jussive not sequelling:
Ex. 10:11 ἡμοσωσωτι δε ηδε-νηρωμι οτος ἡμοσω-σεμωι μὴ.
Gen. 27:41 ἡμοσεωςι ηδε-νιεροις ητεφιθς μπαϊτι ηνα ντασωτεβι ηιακωβ (= Greek) — impatient wish.
Lev. 24:16 εὔξω δε μὴ αναμεναν μπτε βεθενοις μαροσωτι ηδε-σοβειης ηεγανωμινι ηποτιονι εποι... ηεπαὶνηερετ- χεσαν αφιαν μπτε οτος ἡμερεσωτ.
Gen. 30:24 ἡμεστι τω ημιςηρι μιαγ-νηι.
Gen. 34:21 ηηηρωμιν γανηηηθηκικοι δε μαροσωτι κε-μαν γιηηεπηκαρι οτος μαοηερ-ιεβουσ ηερθη.
Gen. 33:14 εὐωπε διαναςωδι ικωσι οηεροις ηοωτι ζεραμοης ηθρος ηδε-νιεβνωσιν ηερποας ηοηι ηα- δυηθη μπεκαλωτ ανοκ δε ειεδεμδοι ζιπιμπιοτ.
Deut. 20:5ff. ηιμ πε πρωμι ντακκωτ ηοωηι μβερι ... ἡμερεσωμας τεπειηι ειε.
Lev. 19:3 ανοκ πε πτε ηετεννωτι τησας ησας ἡμερεστοι τω ηηηεριηνωτη ηηηεριηνωτη ηερποας ηοηι ηα- δυηθη μπεκαλωτ ανοκ δε ειεδεμδοι ζιπιμπιοτ.
Gen. 33:9 οηεροτ-οημιηη μιαγ κατη μπτε δε μαρεπετενοτι ηηητι νακ
Ex. 36:6 ηρωμι νιβεν ηε ηεηιμ νιβεν μπεκατεηερρωβ βε.
Lev. 14:17 οτος μπεκαπεκηρομι γοηξεηδ μπεκαπεηηρ οτος εκεεροτι τησας μπτε δεκνοτι — a summing-up of the preceding verses. Note the allocutive Absolute Future sequelling the Jussive (see below).

(2) Polite wish:
Gen. 17:18 ιςμαλα διά μηερεσωηζ ηπεκιμβω.
Gen. 13:8 ἡπεθερ-οὐσώμεντ ὡστὶ ὠστώι νεμ ὠστὼκ.
Gen. 45:5 ἡπεθερ-πετενήγητ ἦνα ὀτα ἡπεθερηπε

(3) Delocutive ἁρευ-/μαρον-: Absolute-Definite Future + ἁρευ-., ἁρευ- in apodosis etc.: sequelling delocutive causative: “(...) and then / as a result / so that you) make/cause him to/let him...”; affirmative only (cf. also below, on post-imperatival ἁρευ-):
Gen. 2:18 νανες Ἄν εὐρεπιρωμί ὡστὶ μμανταὶ ἡ μα
ρεθεσμίῳ ναὶ ἵησονθεος καταρφιοσ.
Num. 35:28 ἃ ἁρευσύμπτῃ ἄροι ἐπαυβαὶ ντενεφαμα μφωτ.
Also Ex. 14:15:16, 19:10, 26:24.

(4) Locutive plural μαρεν-: non-causative, textually sequelling hortative “(and) let us...”, “let us then / therefore...”:
Gen. 19:34 εὑπε αἰενκτο ρεαν ἡπεθεροτ μαρεντεςχ
νοτηροπ ἑνπαικεεδωρε...

(5) #μαρεν-, negative ἡπεθερον-: hortative “let us (not...)”;
often pragmatically sequelling (“let us then....”):
Gen. 1:26 μαρεθεσμίῳ νοτρῳμί.
Gen. 24:57 μαρενσουττ νταλον ντενσενε εφαρως.
Ex. 15:1:21 μαρεντος ενετ.
Deut. 13:13 μαρενσεναν ντενσεμεγι νγεκενεντ.
Gen. 37:21 ἡπεθερενδοεβετ εοσφυσχ.

(6) μαρον + “illative” local adverbial: hortative movement (Greek verb of motion).
Gen. 4:8 μαρον ψατκοι.
Gen. 35:3 μαρον εεθη εεθηα.

(7) Locutive Singular #μαρι- “May I....” — politely expressing wish, in response to a pragmatic situation:
Gen. 25:30 μαριζεμττι εβολ ἱενπαἵξι (Greek factitive: ἕπσον με).
Gen. 46:30 μαριμοφ δε ἱεζεμττνος δε-αινατ επεκγο
(Greek ἀποθανοῦμαι).

Obs.
(1) ἁρευ- is a specifically allocutive dialogic form, a synchronic effect and structural implication of its ἁ- imperative component. The Jussive is not used even in instructions, the legal code or injunctions or precepts, for which we have the Absolute-Definite
Future εἰπεί: this is neutral or indifferent to the Locution/Allocution/Delocution perspective distinction and the Allocution/Response systemic one. The synchronic issue is one of homonymy: Causative Imperative (έα-+ περ-, like τ-περ- and τα-περ- wash) vs. Jussive (μαψε- modal base). In our Bohairic, the causative reading is rare and probably affirmative only (unlike the affirmative μαψε-). The Bohairic negative μπενοερε π- formally detached from the negative Imperative μπερ). At any rate, the semantic distinction between the two is less sharp in Coptic than in European or Semitic languages, but the reading or decoding of the form as one or the other must often be correlatable with its syntactic and/or pragmatic environments. (The form is certainly not “optative”, pace Peust 1996:51; see Polotsky 1950:81ff., 1987:144ff.; Layton 2004:268f.).

(2) κατά is the only clause-form expressing movement without a verb of movement — the local adverb is an essential constituent of this pattern (in Middle Egyptian, ḫw with an illustrative prepositional phrase constituted a non-modal similar clause). κατά is not more of an “interjection”, so Layton 2004:186, than other imperatives; it is a fully-stressed “lexicalized” pro-nexal grammeme, with a zeroed lexeme.

(c) The Imperatives — extended constructions. The Post-Imperatival Allocutive Slot.

(1) Imperative + Allocutive Pronoun/Address Noun

(a) (οσογ) νοοκ (Δε) + Imperative (= Greek [= Heb.]):
Ex. 28:3 οσογ νοοκ ιδινι...
Ex. 28:1 οσογ νοοκ συνίσι...
Ex. 14:14 οσογ νωτεν καιρωτεν.
Gen. 9:7 νωτεν Δε ισχιο οσογ μαγνικαγο οσογ λαλι 

(c) Imperative + νοοκ (rare): Gen. 18:25 μφωρ μπεριποι νοοκ

(c) Imperative + νοοκ (rare): Gen. 18:25 μφωρ μπεριποι νοοκ

(c) Imperative + νοοκ (rare): Gen. 18:25 μφωρ μπεριποι νοοκ

(c) Imperative + νοοκ (rare): Gen. 18:25 μφωρ μπεριποι νοοκ

(d) Imperative + Address.  
Gen. 27:26 γεκ εροι + μα-οσφι ερωι παστρι (= Greek). 
Gen. 19:7 μφωρ ναουνος μπερερ-παινετσων (Greek μπερερ μη ποντευσεσθε).
Ex. 8:25 μπεροταςτεκ Δε ψαρω εεργαλ... (= Greek).
Num. 23:18 τωνκ βαλλακ οσογ ιωτε (Greek).

(e) Address + Imperative — not attested (? )

(2) Imperative + Post-Imperatival Extension: the post-imperatival Allocutive Slot. High-level Rheme/Apodosis to Imperative.
(a) In the post-imperative slot resides the second pre-eminent syntactic paradigm of dialogue. We have here another dependency matrix, where the initial position is again allocutive, and the second exhibits certain affinities with the Response, such as the informational implicative “dependency and foundedness” on the Allocution. Formally, another point of similarity is the essential asyndetic or rather paratactic linkage to the imperative (“ostende bellum pacem habeabis”) — a prospective “apodotic” reference. The post-imperatival sequel is indeed schematic to the “in case the injunction is performed” Topic “packaged as” Imperative, which is in many respects similar to conditional protases. In this, the sequel resembles the Response. Formal similarities include the occurrence here of the Absolute-Definite Future $\epsilon \xi \epsilon \varsigma \omega \tau \epsilon \mu \epsilon$, against the propensity of the Contingent-Indefinite (nū-) Future with the Allocution and especially Question (below). However, the post-imperatival sequel is juncturally distinct from the Response. Its prime trait is that it does not entail role-switching: it is within the Allocution boundaries. In fact, it is in a way an Allocutive Response, a seeming oxymoron and paradox: a response “packaged” in the allocution. Needless to say, all members of the post-imperatival paradigm have — by structural implication — a valeur and “reference” different from their value in other slots, such as locutive or allocutive.

Obs.

(1) The post-imperatival paradigm studied here (see also Shishe-halevy 1986a:194ff.) is synthetic to a degree: that is, it must be further refined in better resolution. Moreover, the imperative initial to this construction (as it were, the “pre-post-imperative imperative”) is obviously heterogeneous in internal information structure. For instance, the grammaticalized or auxiliary $\Delta \eta \nu$, $\Delta \nu$,... differ from full-value lexemic imperatives.

(2) The post-imperatival paradigm must be kept carefully apart from the coordinated imperative (not $\nu \alpha \rho \epsilon \mu \rho \kappa \varepsilon \eta \zeta$-): see below.


(4) $\tau \alpha \rho \epsilon \mu \kappa \omega \tau \eta \mathrm{em}$ is not attested in the Pentateuch, but is not excluded from Nitrian Bohairic, nor from Scripture (where it is very rare; cf. Polotsky 1987:160 n.13), in the Psalms (twice, 33:6, 45:9), which Polotsky described as “un texte qui se distingue par la pureté de sa langue” (1944:5). The form is well attested in the B4 early Bohairic John (Bodmer III) 11:35 $\Delta \mu \omega \tau \nu \tau \rho \epsilon \kappa \nu \tau \alpha \nu \rho \varsigma$ (Homer $\Delta \eta \nu$) and 21:12 $\Delta \mu \omega \mu \nu \iota \eta \nu \iota \nu \iota \mathrm{in \tau}$. 

---

$\mathrm{66}$ I find “Promissive” (so Loprieno 1995:230f. — no word about the post-imperatival $\nu \alpha \rho \epsilon \mu \rho \kappa \varepsilon \eta \zeta$- too coarse as a descriptive term: the “personal guarantee” (or egocentric subjectivity; not promise) same in $\tau \alpha \rho \epsilon \mu \kappa \omega \tau \eta$- is only one component in its semantic structure; the sequelling feature is just as important. “Future Conjunctive” (so Layton) is quite acceptable; “Prospective Conjunctive” I believe is best.
τετενόων (Homer ὀσωμ imp.). However, ταρεκ- “and I will let/make you see/ eat” here is neatly opposed as the allocutively marked term in-paradigm to the normal Bohairic post-imperative sequelling, delocutive μαρεκ-: consider John 11:44 καὶ εἰσολ μαρεκέμενα “and let him go...” as well as to the interestingly paratactic Contingent-Indefinite Future, consider John 16:24 Βροχήν τετενάκαί (Homer also οὐσον), in the very “guarantee apodosis” marked role typical of the Biblical Sahidic ταρεκέμενα: “Come and (I guarantee that) ye will receive”.

(1) IMPERATIVE + zero + IMPERATIVE: complex hyper-injunction or injunctive scenario (different-rank concatenated, directed, successive-sequenced constituent injunctions). Up to three constituents are found. The Coptic construction usually differs from the Greek one:

Ex. 10:28 μασένακ ... μασένκ ερόκ μπεωταστοκ άε- sim. Gen. 24:6, Deut. 4:23.

Gen. 27:19 τωνκ γεμεί οσωμ ... (Greek ἀναστάς κάθισον καὶ φάγε) sim. Gen. 28:2, 19:14f.

Lev. 10:4 Διωνίνη άλι-νετενκηνος εβολ (Greek καί).
Gen. 31:12 Δοσωτ επωμι... άνας (Greek καί).

Gen. 38:24 άνιτς εβολ ροκς (Greek Imperative + καί + Jussive).
Gen. 34:9 άρι-ωμ ερον νετενκερι μητωτ οικ ους νενωτερι σίτωτ...

Gen. 45:13 ήλεκ ανιπαιωτ εδρή... (Greek ταχύναντες καταγάγετε).


Gen. 18:6 ένες ητοτ οσωμεν ή-ύ μεντ νεκεδελλοιον (Greek καί).

Gen. 29:7 μασένωτεν κοιν (Greek ἀπελθόντες βόσκετε).
Gen. 21:18 τωσιν σί μπολοκ ακοι ομοι (Greek Imper., Imperative καί + Imperative).

Gen. 27:43f. ἡσον οτιν παςβρι κωτεμ ετασμυ τωνκ μα- σένακ... (Greek άκουσον...καί ἀναστάς ἀπόδραθι).

Obs.
See DONHAUSER 1982 on Imperative coordination.

(2) IMPERATIVE + οφος / δε / zero + IMPERATIVE: catalogic listing (same-rank injunctions). The Coptic construction closely resembles the Greek one:

Deut. 12:28 δερεκ κωτεμ οφος δριστι ηναθαξι θροτ (= Greek).

Gen. 14:21 μανιρωμι ΝΗΙ έσ ή δε ΝΑΚ ΝΝΙΟΩΡ (= Greek).

(3) IMPERATIVE + οὗτος + IMPERATIVE: same-rank (non-catalogic) successive-sequenced coordination of injunctions. The Coptic construction usually resembles the Greek one:

Gen. 1:22 Ἀλλὰ οὐκ ἂν ἦν οὐκ ἦν μὴν οὗτος (= Greek).

Gen. 45:13 ματαสาธารณτ ἐπάλωσον θηρύ ἐθέρμνηκεν ἡμεῖς ἐν ἰτατήναις ἐρωτὶ πρὸς ἑαυτόν ἁντι-παιδώς εἴσπρην... (= Greek).

Ex. 17:5 μοῦ ἦν ἄρα μπαιλλος + σι νεμακ εβολ ἰνα-νικεβλαϊ... οὗτος πιθώτ... + σετὴ δρφη ἱεντεκάιξ ὁτὸς μοῦ... (Greek δε, καί).

Gen. 9:7 μαμ-πικαὶ οὗτος ἂν ἦν οὗτος (= Greek).

Num. 3:6 σι πικτήλη ἱνελεσι οὗτος ματαγωσός (Greek Imperative + Future).

Ex. 14:13 άειμνόντι οὐ μετενεκνθέντος οὗτος ἀνά... (= Greek).

Ex. 23:21 μαθεκ εροὶ οὗτος κωτεν νεὼμοι μπερ-ερατ-ερατὶ νήτα νεμακ (Greek καί χ3).

Ex. 25:2 άκος της νηνήσωρ μπικλ οὐκ οὐ μη ελεα-πάρχη (= Greek).

Num. 20:26 βαρὺ παρὼν ητεκτον οὗτος μης εξεν-ελεαταρ (= Greek).

Gen. 15:5 άκοςτι επωμὶ οὗτος δέιμπι... (= Greek).

(3) IMPERATIVE + οὗτος + allocutive-sphere Absolute-Definite Future: sequelled main point of Divine Command. The Coptic construction usually resembles the Greek one:

Ex. 3:16 μαθενάκ μαθοτετνιζέλλαι... οὗτος εκδοκ νωτ... (Future = Greek)

Deut. 31:26 σιμπαιζόμ... χαρ σαπεζίρ ηκτηβωτος... οὗτος ερευωπάτι μακ ματα ετεμεισερ (Greek λαβόντες... θέσεται... καί έσται)

Num. 8:2 κακί δεμαρὼν οὗτος εκδοκ άρῳ άει... (= Greek).

Gen. 44:4 των άοδι σαμεννη ἀνηπωμὶ... εκτερωσον εκδοκ νωτ (Future = Greek).

(4) IMPERATIVE / άαρεψ- + οὗτος / zero + non-allocutive Absolute-Definite Future: assured sequel/result (see below). The Coptic construction usually resembles the Greek one:
Gen. 24:44 θαοκ σω + ειετον νενεκκεδαμανι (Greek και).
Ex. 8:12 κοστεν-νεκβωτ ... ουρον μαρασμα επιστηναντα
ντεγκαρι ουρον εσεσεων ηε-γανελαιμ ... (= Greek).
Num. 20:8 ...ουρον και δει νεμφτερια μποντπεο ουροε εσετ
μπεσιμωου (Greek λαβε... και λαλησετε... και δωσει...).
(5) Imperative + ουρο / zero + interlocutive-sphere Contingent-In
definite Future: locutive: undertaking, promise, assurance. The Coptic
construction resembles the Greek one:
Gen. 34:12 ματασε-τεςεργαλ εμαω ουρο ετνηθηνικ (= Greek).
Ex. 24:12 αμον επουι εροι ειετεπιτων ουρον υσπι
μματ ουρον ηνιηνατ ηακ ηεπαλαα (= Greek).
Num. 22:19 οι οεμν ουρον ηηαεμι ηε-εσε πετεπιερι
ηαξον ηαηι (= Greek).
Deut. 32:7 ηεπεκιουτ ηναταμοκ νεκεελλοι εεεεα-
ζωε ηακ (= Vat) (= Greek).
(6) Imperative + ουρο / zero + locutive Conjunctive: successive-
sequenced willed result / consequence. The Coptic construction never
really resembles the Greek one:
Gen. 19:34 μασεε εεςοτν εεκκοτ οεμν οουε ηηε-
tονοςοεσαρεα ... (Greek ειεελθοεσα...κοομηθητι... και εσα-
ατησομεν).
Gen. 11:7 αμωιν ηερενε εεςεητ ηετεφερεζπογηλαε
μματ (Greek δευετ και καταβαντεσ συνχεμεν).
Ex. 3:10 αμον κατεοορεικ (Greek δευρο ηποστειλω).
Gen. 49:1 ηωουε ηεταταμωητεν (Greek συναχθετε ινα ηαα-
γειλω).
Gen. 31:44 αμον ηετεσεμεν νοταιλαεκη (Greek δευρο
Gen. 27:21. γενκ εροι πασηρι νταζομζεμ εροκ (Greek
ηγιγουν ... και ηπηλαφησω).
Gen. 38:16 κατ νται ερο (Greek ηαζον με ειεελθειν) sim.
Deut. 9:14.
(7) Imperative / ηαρεφ + οουε / zero + delocutive Conjunctive:
successive-sequenced unwilled result / consequence. The Coptic con-
struction does not resemble the Greek one:
Gen. 18:23 μπερτακο μπιοεμι οεμ πισαετ ηνεφωππι
ηα-πηοεμι μεβηηι ημπιαεβεσ (Greek interrogative Futures)
Gen. 1:6 ηαρεφωππι ηα-οηταξρο ... οουε ηνεφωππι
eσεσερε εβολ ... (Greek two Jussives).
(8) Imperative / ἄρεια- + γίνα + Conjunctive: purposed result/sequel (consecutivum or finalis). The Coptic construction resembles the Greek:

Deut. 31:28 ἔωστε† ννιαρχᾶν ... γίνα ντακαΐ ένον-μαξά (= Greek).

Gen. 24:14 πεκτετιεράπια γίνα ντακω (= Greek).

Gen. 27:41 μαροτεύσων νἀ-νεγοσον ντέφ μοσ μπαϊωτ γίνα νταίςωτεν νιακωβ (= Greek).

Ex. 2:20 μοσ† οτν εςον εροφ γίνα ντεγοτωμ νοτώικ (Greek ὅπως).

Ex. 20:12 ματαιεπεκιωτ νεμτεκμαρ γίνα ντε-πιπενα-νεφ ωπι μμοκ οτογ γίνα ντεκερ-οτινιωτ† ονοον γι-ζενπίκαγι... (= Greek).

(9) Imperative + οτογ / zero + ἄρεια- (delocutive).

(a) οτογ / (very rarely) zero — causative/result sequelling (“and so / thereby make [...] happen...” etc.). Affirmative only. The Coptic construction usually resembles the Greek one:

Ex. 10:21 κοττεντεκαίξ επσωι ετφε οτογ μαρεμ-

ωμι... (= Greek).

Ex. 14:16 κοττων-τεκαίξ εβολ εξεν-φιομ οτογ θορξ

οτογ μαροτι εςον νἀ-νενώμπρι μπιαλ — temporal/logical

sequelling (“and then make them go in...”) (= Greek) sim. Ex. 19:10.

Gen. 31:37 κεμνητοτ μπαία...οτογ μαροσογι ντεν-

μη† (= Greek).

Deut. 32:50 μοσ ερπη έξεππιτωρ ... οτογ μαροτξακ

ζατενπεκαλος (= Greek Imperative + passive Imperative).

Gen. 41:33f. κοσνι νακ μοτρωμι νκαβε οτογ νκατςη... οτογ μαρεμχι νἀ-φαρω μαρεξω νεγαντοπζιες ει-

ζεπικαζι οτογ μαροσι μπιρε-ε ... οτογ Μαροσομελ-

νιςρονι θφοτ ... μαροσομελ-πικετ ... οτογ ετεζω-

πι νἀ-νιςροτι... (= Greek).

Also Gen. 18:3f., Deut. 10:11.

(b) οτογ / zero contents of verbum dicendi: affirmative or negative.

The Coptic resembles the Greek:

Num. 5:2 οταγεαγι έτοτο... οτογ μαροσοτι εβολ (= Greek).
Ex. 14:2 καὶ νενεφυρί ἡπίστα ὁτιό ταροτοσκεψε (= Greek).
Lev. 16:2 καὶ νοτσον πεκκόν ὁτω ἀποτερεψύφε-
ναψ γονατος ὀντιον εὐσών... (= Greek).
Lev. 24:2 γονατος ἀπετος ἀπενεφυρί ἡπίστα ὁτιό τα-
ροτας ναψ νοτσεψ... (= Greek).
Num. 21:7 τωβ γον ὁτω ταρεψα ἀρεψψλα ὀναψγς εβο-
αγον (Greek και sim. Ex. 8:4 (ὁτως), 10:17 (ὁτως).
Deut. 15:9 μαρενκ εροκ ἀπενεφυρ-οτασκεψ εφψν ωψπι-
... (Greek μη γενηται) sim. Deut. 11:16.
(c) Zero - plural locutive, affirmative: grammaticalized (auxiliary) Imperative. The Coptic differs from the Greek:
Ex. 14:12 καὶ ταρες- (Greek παρες ἡμας όπως + conj).
Gen. 19:32 ᾗν ταρεςτσε-πενιςτ νοτσρπ (Greek δεῦρο και
ποτισμεν).
(d) The delimited negative Jussive is not in the post-imperatival slot. The Coptic resembles the Greek:
Ex. 19:24 μαρενακ εφρη... ὁτως ἀμος αποψε... νιοτθμ
μενερπστ εψψ... (Greek).
Deut. 4:9 ἀπερεπσψβψ ὁνικαςκε τρος τη ἐπανεκβαλ
νας ερως ὁτως ἀμαρεσρσψλ εβο... (= Greek).

Obs.
(1) For the Imperative + καρεψ- configuration POLOTSKY 1987:165ff. establishes two
classes:
(I) IMP. + καρεψ- Boh. (Sah. ταρεψ-, ετρεψ-, ε-, Conjunctive) — contentually weak
Imperative, and καρεψ- independent of the Greek;
(II) IMP. ὁτως καρεψ- Sah. = Boh., Greek Jussive, rhematic Imperative67.
The evidence above considerably refines this scheme.
(2) Some interesting post-imperatival cases in Ntitan: Luke 6:37f. (ὁτως μνουτ- +
ὁτως ϛπενα- αν); ὁτως μαιρί- is attested only in Ntitan: AM I 99 ἴμαιροκκγ... ὁτως καρπασ
ironic “and then I will see”, in AM II 86 ἀμος καροι αφοσ τας
τε τεκτοσ ανη καριερψτσψα..., μαιρι- expresses desired conse-
quence.

1.2.4.1 Response Forms and Constructions: “apocritics” and “react-
tives”

(a) The Response, presupposing an Allocution, relates to it in a rather
special kind of dependency, which has affinities to types of high-level

nexus — responsive rhematicity based on allocutive thematicity. In some respects, the responsive system is even more intriguing than the allocutive one. To respond to Nexal Questions, Coptic has a special system of tensed affirmative and negative responsive pro-clause-forms, which may also be combined with fuller responsive constructions. These pro-forms are always formally related to non-responsive proclitic grammemes: either tonic (unreduced) forms of conjugation bases (nuclear auxiliaries or pro-verbs); or formally related to such bases (ἀγα — not in our corpus — and the Preterite base α-, μφι and μπε-, ννο and ηνε-, ωο and ωα-), or one homonymous with the statement of non-existence μμον-; or (not attested in the corpus) one homonymous with the form of a plural/neuter pronoun thematic to a presental predication (ἐε). While ἐε responds in Nitrian and NT Bohairic to the actual Present, ἀγα responds (i.a.) to Generic Present clauses (e.g. the Nominal Sentence); only μμον and μφι (and of course ννο and ωο) are always representative pro-forms, usually responsive to past Questions; μμον, ἀγα and ἐε are also clause-initial asseverative Dialogue particles, responding as it were to an implicit denial or sceptical Nexal Question. Neither ννο, ωο and ἐε are attested in the Pentateuch. The negatives μμον and μφι occur as pro-forms also in the second term of an alternative Question (…ωαν-μμον/μφι “…or not?”).

Obs.

(1) On responsive syntax in general, see Fugier 1995 (Latin); Shisha-Halevy 1995b: §3.3.2 (Welsh, with references for the Celtic phenomenon). I cannot accept in a simple fashion that forms of Response resolve the Question type (so for instance Junge 1983:545 n.3): see the evidence for the Question-Response correlation, presented in tabular form below.

(2) As already pointed out, the Response is in all probability apodotic/thematic to the Question’s protaticity/topicality, on a high (textual) level of predication; the responsive pro-forms are formal Rhemes, often cataphoric to a whole responsive clause (cf. Welke 1992:39ff.).

(3) Coptic does not have the famous European ternary pro-clausal Response system of a single negative opposed to two affirmative Responses, one unmarked, the other marked for repudiating/refuting/protesting its allocation: French non/oui: si (cf. Wilmet 1976b, a brilliant study of the complexities of Allocation/Response modalities). Wunderlich 1975 and 1976:209ff. relates si and oui anaphorically to negative and affirmative nexus proposed in the respective Allocations. I cannot accept Schiffrin’s view of no as elliptical (Schiffrin 1995:77) — but ellipsis of what? Surely not of the Question clause — cf. the use of Coptic μμον. Coptic ἐε occurs also in cases of “si”, “doch”, cf. Mt. 15:27 = Mark 7:28, Mt. 17:25.

(4) Terminology. "Negative-pronominal particles" (Schwartz-Zeitenthal 1950:366) is more perceptive than Stern’s "adverbia der bejahung" (1880 §528) and Layton’s "interjections" (2004 §241, 245). These elements were studied in the 1930s and later by B. Gunn for Nitrian (Gunn MSS VII 3, 46 at the Griffith Institute, Oxford: unpublished).

(5) The pro-form is included in the Question as a "forestalled" Response, corresponding to the Question’s tense: ἡμον: γόκ-ἀπτιοκικ ἵμ-ἐμον ἀμ II 125, χάναρ-ἐφια... ἰθμ-ἐμον ἀμ II 102; ηῆθ in ἕπαρ ἅθμον ἰθμ-ἐθῆθ ἀμ II 18, ἀπί

(6) ἡμον "It isn’t so", "It isn’t true", "Non è il caso" or sim. (e.g. Gen. 42:12, but also many of the apparently pro-formal examples) is probably the basic meaning (cf. Turkish yok), related to the existential one of ἦμος- (already in the earliest Demotic, Ryl. IX 17/3, and probably earlier). The affirmative counterpart of ἡμον, ἐς- in Jer. 44:17 Tattam; ἐς-ἐξον ἡμον to ἐς-ἐξον ἤμον ἡμωτεν, Mt. 20:22, Mark 10:39.

(7) ἡμον (ἀλλά...) responds as refusal form to an Imperative (Gen. 19:2). Pro-form ἡμον occurs often as a negative alternative in protases ("if not...") and disjunctions ("or not..."), "otherwise", "or else"). The Demotic protatic ἰν ἐκ "if not" (see already Ryl. IX 13/2, 14/5f, 17/3) seems to have modal or future reference (i.e. to be a pro-form of the negative future?). For Demotic mn (tων σκτ..., Erichsen 1956 1/8), we unfortunately want the preceding dialogue.

(8) ἡμον "no" is the only naxal pro-form to be substantivized by ὡτ- in Mt. 5:37, II Cor. 1:18 (in focus and Rhetus status, probably conditioned), ὡτ- in II Cor. 1:17 etc. (Cf. Wunderli 1976:214ff. for French oiu, ὡτ substantivized). Consider also the famous ἐκ ἔκ ἡμον ἀμον, ὡτ-ἐκ, ὡτ-ἀμον II Cor. 1:17ff.; ἐκ ἐκ πετ- with ὡτ-conditioned by the focal status, II Cor. 1:19.

(9) In cases like Gen. 30:1 ἱαπκπ ἑρ ἠμον ἠνόμοτ, ἡμον is the Circumstantial adverbial protatic ("otherwise", "or else", ελ (δε) με, Lat. alioquin); so too in Gen. 42:16 (in Nitrian and the early "B4" we form the link ἐμον, with the converter unzeroed, e.g. Mac. No. 95).

(10) J. Černý’s Etymological Dictionary 145 refers εκ εκ etymologically to Roman Demotic st (Erichsen, Glossar 470), referring to Mag. 18, 31 (Griffith-Thompson I, 122 (1904)); Spiegelberg, Gramm. §138 Anm.: n st n-e-n j m-p3-αρῳ? — St. "Will they inquire for me today?" — "They (will)". Frankly, I find it difficult to see a thematic plural pronoun in pro-clausal role (Černý does not mention ἤμος, and gives no etymology for ἐκ or ἐκ/ἀκ). However, a neutric anaphoric pronoun is conceivable in this function60, and a distinctive Theme may well represent a nexus. While ἐκ, ἐκ, ἐκ (Crum, Dictionary, 64f. — Crum chooses ἐκ as the master form) may, formally speaking, all be tonic, non-

60 Cf. Modern Irish see, neg. ni shea, which, however, contains a rhematizing element (i)is: "it-is it".
p. Spiegelberg col. X), and the affirmative jw.j “I will” (ibid) (I thank Dr. Mark Smith, Oxford for the information). In Shenoutean Sahidic Coptic, we find once a similar finite pro-form in nexus focalization: ncaha etbhntq...mennasw an ne mopw pow “Were it not for him... we would not have stayed (as indeed they did not)” (Leip. IV 97, condemned by the editor). In Gen. 42:21, aq is both allocutive and reactive-to-situation. (11) ce in “Old Coptic”, SATZINGER 1994:214 line 101, is neither responsive, nor question-invoking, but something like “Yea,...” (cf. Luke 11:51 etc.). Both aq and ce may serve, initially, to reinforce an asseveration (Boh. ce corresponding in this role to Sah. aq).70 Often following an argumentative question or another allocution: Luc. 7:26; 12:5 aq, with a reiterated injunction; Mt. 11:9, Luke 11:51, 18:8 ce ἔσκο ἡμοῖς ΝΩΤΝ...(cf. the use of (ε)εμνήν); ce ἔσκο ἐρομεῖ Phil. 4:3. Consider also the solemn rhetorical addresses — “Yes, Father...” Luke 10:21, Mt. 11:26; Apoc. 16:7 ce πατέ ΜΠΙΠΑΝΚΡΑΤΙΨΡ ΠΙΨΜΗΝ HΝΕΚΡΑΝ ΤΡΟΨΡ ΠΑΝΜΕΘΜΗΝ NE.

(12) aq and ce may constitute the whole Response, and are then immediately followed by an addressed “Vocative” (e.g. πατέ); or they may precede a responsive clause (see below). The Question may indeed be evoked by aq, and may not be explicit at all: ἔσκο ἀν εἰμι... εἰς-αρα ἐν ἰερονεποιχτά τροψρ...σίτοσ HΝΑ ΑΜ Λ 117.

(13) The admittedly impressionistic statement that Bohairic seems to prefer the Present to the Aorist agrees with the contrast between Boh. ce and Sah. ὅω in Mt. 17:25.

(14) On ϕΗ, see ANDERSSON 1904:122f.; see STERN 1880 §528 on aq and ce.

(15) In Gen. 17:17, God's aq responds remotely and fuzzily to Abraham's doubting an ekeioumv... an ekeomh, which, however, is followed by icha ψαί να-ρεψρήν... to which God's Response is also referable.

(16) See KASSER 1999 on special delimiters of Dialogue subunits in the B4 Bodmer III.

1.2.4.2 Detailed contrastive Allocation/Response repertoire

(a) As will be seen from the tables below, the Pentateuch usage of the responsive elements is, compared with Nitrian and the NT, restricted and infrequent; except for a rare instance of ϕΗ, none of them ever responds to a question; they are not pro-forms strictly speaking, in the dialogic Allocation/Response extent cohesive role71. On the other hand, the Nitrian (specimen check) and NT (the exhaustive evidence) usage is conversational (and colloquial). Note the following restrictions and combinations:

ce does not respond to an interrogative Nominal Sentence;

aq does not respond to a Present Tense;

aq responds to non-specific foregoing textual stretches containing various tenses;

ϕΗ responds only to ακ- (νε-ακ-), and is always a pro-form;

70 CAT- for the 3rd plural theme prefix in Hag. 2:13 (B4, P. copto 9, collated) is remarkable. CAT-NAWQ answers the polar question MΗΧΑΙ CENA CWQ. Seeing that aI is not attested for ε elsewhere in the MS — and would be unique indeed where a native Coptic grammeme is concerned — I wonder whether it would be daring to suggest that we have here a marked responsive form, confirming the nexus as Focus.

71 In the B4 Twelve Prophets, we find an instance of ϕΗON responding to МΗΧАΙ (i.e. МΗΤΗ) + ΝΑ-Future (Hag. 2:12).
ΜΜΟΝ responds to the Present, Contingent-Indefinite Future, Nominal Sentence, Imperative; ΜΜΟΝ ἄλλα to non-specific foregoing textual stretches.

The Pentateuch

Responsive responding to (clause):

ἀγα-
non-specific context/pragmatic situation/instruction (ἀγα...ἀπ) Gen. 42:21.
non-specific context/remote doubting ἄν ἐκε...-?/Jussive (ἀγα ἐν πε...ικ...)
Gen. 17:19.

κε
Not attested in the corpus.

ΜΜΟΝ

ἀγα-
non-specific context/pragmatic situation/instruction (ἀγα...ἀπ) Gen. 42:21.
non-specific context/remote doubting ἄν ἐκε...-?/Jussive (ἀγα ἐν πε...ικ...)
Gen. 17:19.

κε
Not attested in the corpus.

ΜΜΟΝ

ων-μμον
ἄν- + Contingent-Indefinite Future Num. 11:23,
Deut. 8:2.

ων-μμον

ων-μμον

ικαι-μμον
ἄν- + Present Gen. 18:21.

ικαι-μμον

ΜΜΟΝ
Contingent-Indefinite Future Deut. 8:2.

Nominal Sentence Gen. 42:9f.

ΜΜΟΝ ἄλλα + Cont. Fut.
non-specific context/pragmatic situation Num. 13:30.
ΜΜΟΝ ἄλλα + Cont. Fut.
request/proposal (Imperative) Gen. 19:2.
ΜΜΟΝ + Voc.
request/proposal (Imperative) Gen. 23:15.
ΜΜΟΝ ἄλλα ἀρεκωβι
(neg. Preterite statement: "I did not laugh") Gen. 18:15.

ΜΡΗ

ΜΡΗ + Preterite Num. 22:30.

ων-μρη

Nitrian, New Testament:

Responsive responding to (clause):

ἀγα, ἂν

[pragmatic allocation — falling movement of idol] AM II 303.
Imperfect (?) AM I 51.

ἄν- + Nom. Sentence ("Ὁὐκ ἐκείνα;") AM I 96
στόκων + Nom. Sentence ("ὢντο τὸν Μαυδεμών ἐκείνος?")
AM II 300.


(ων-) + Nom. Sentence (Subst. ἀγα- πε) Rom. 3:29.

zero + Nom. Sentence ("Ἄγα περικείμενος") AM II 124.

zero + Nom. Sentence ("ὢντο τὸν Μαυδεμών ἐκείνος;") AM II 28.
(b) Interrogative Allocation + Response configurations: two joined substructures and subsystems. The information in the following schematic tables, typologizing interrogative Allocation/Response combinations, is based on our corpus and on a specimen of Nitrian texts and therefore is not definitive, but as nearly representative as possible; it will serve to show the broad structural scope and variety of Nitrian, compared with the rather pedestrian Pentateuch. The following formal features should be noted (see also below, following the tables):

1. Some tenses do not occur in the Question subsystem at all, such as the Absolute-Definite Future and the Aorist, or are very rare, like the Imperfect.

2. Some Nominal Sentence patterns do not occur in the Question at all, or are typical of Response, such as # άνοικτος πεί # (see below, Chapter Two).

3. Rhematic Questions are not negated. Rhematic Questions are inherently interrogative, by token of special cataphoric interrogative proforms. No Response marker (pro-form) introduces the Response to Rhematic Questions. (See Chapter Two for Rhematic Questions consisting of a Focalizing Conversion form).

4. In the Question-Response complex, neither Question markers nor Response markers are in themselves essential; but a representative of either class is as a rule present, with few exceptions.

72 I include here only Responses more or less directly associated with its Question.
(5) Nitrian: Nexal Question markers occurring are: (affirmative) *zero, ἂν, ἔρασ*; (negative) *μή, ὀσκοῦν, ἵε, zero*. Zeroed Responses occur with the Question markers *μή, ὀσκοῦν, zero*. Non-zero Response markers occur with the following Question markers list: *μμόν with zero; ἂγα with zero, ἂν, ὀσκοῦν; κε with zero.*

(6) Pentateuch. Nexal Question markers occurring are: (affirmative) *zero ἂν, μή(τι), ἔρασ*; (negative) *μή, ἂν, ἵε, zero*. Zeroed Responses occur with: *zero, ἂν, μή; Response markers occur — μμόν with ἂν; μῆ with μή.*


(8) Only the Nominal Sentence and Present (incl. Contingent-Indefinite Future and Existential) occur as Question-echoing Response.

(9) Note below several instances where it is the Response that resolves the nature and structure of the Question. (The trivial case is of the zeroed Response, which marks the Allocation as Assertive-Focal ([Rhetorical] Question).

(10) Interrogative Responses mark non-interrogative Allocations or are meta-allocutive (i.e. reacting to the very asking of the Question).

(11) A specific question, in need of special study, concerns the formalities of Response to focalizing constructions and to Nominal-Sentence-type nexus: some evidence is presented below. It appears that Response by Rheme or Focus alone is rare or excluded: Response is generally made by full pattern.

(12) Responses are not zeroed, but are *nil*, with actantial ("indirect") Questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nitrian</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question marker</td>
<td>Question clause</td>
<td>Response pro-form</td>
<td>Response clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>ὑνοκ-ος-</td>
<td><em>zero</em></td>
<td>echoed² AM I 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>ὑνοκ-ος-</td>
<td>μμόν zero</td>
<td>AM II 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>ὑνοκ ὀς-</td>
<td>ἂγα</td>
<td>echoed² AM II 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>ὑνοκ πε X</td>
<td><em>zero</em></td>
<td>ἄνοκ πε AM II 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>ὑνοκ πε X</td>
<td>ἂγα</td>
<td>ἄνοκ πε AM II 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question marker</td>
<td>Question clause</td>
<td>Response (pro-form)</td>
<td>Response clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>PN + πε</td>
<td>άγα</td>
<td>νεοξ πε AM II 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀν-</td>
<td>νεοξ πε</td>
<td>άγα</td>
<td>ανοξ πε AM I 96, 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀν-</td>
<td>νεοξ πε X</td>
<td>άγα</td>
<td>εχοεδ AM I 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΜΗ</td>
<td>Φαί πε X</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>νεοξ αν πε AM II 139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὈΤΚΟΘ</td>
<td>Topic. Nom. Sent.</td>
<td>άγα</td>
<td>εχοεδ AM II 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὈΤΚΟΘ</td>
<td>νεοξ-οψ- αν</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>ανοξ-οψ- αν AM II 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Preterite</td>
<td>άγα + voc.</td>
<td>zero AM I 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>θε + voc.</td>
<td>zero AM I 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>θε</td>
<td>εχοεδ AM II 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>θε</td>
<td>εχοεδ AM II 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Foc. Present</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>εχοεδ AM II 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Voc. + Present</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>οτ ρεντον + Voc. AM II 318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td></td>
<td>άγα</td>
<td>νεοξ πε Φ ι AM II 303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Topic + Imperative AM I 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Voc. + Preterite</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>νεοξ-νιθ + Voc. AM I 36f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Contingent Future</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>neg. Contingent Future AM I 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Cont. Future</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>neg. Contingent Future AM I 1 1, 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>+ θαν- Μθον</td>
<td></td>
<td>Contingent Future AM I 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Νεοξ-Rheme</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Νεοξ-matching Rheme AM I 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>+ θαν- Μθον</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Pluperfect +</td>
<td>[oblique Response]</td>
<td>AM II 290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>θαν- Μθον</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>ΟΤΟΝ-</td>
<td></td>
<td>AM I 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>[dialogue-arresting Response]</td>
<td>AM I 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΜΗ</td>
<td>Foc. Present</td>
<td>[oblique Response]</td>
<td>AM II 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Foc. Present</td>
<td>ΟΤΩΝ + Contingent Future</td>
<td>AM I 232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Contingent</td>
<td>[oblique Response]</td>
<td>AM I 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Future + Voc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Contingent Future</td>
<td>[dialogue-arresting Response]</td>
<td>AM II 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Contingent Future</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Contingent Future AM I 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Present + Voc.</td>
<td>[self-supplied Response]</td>
<td>AM I 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Preterite +</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>AM I 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Preterite +</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>AM I 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Preterite</td>
<td>[oblique Response]</td>
<td>AM II 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Preterite +</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>AM I 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>AM I 29, 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Contingent Future</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>AM I 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ ΤΝΟΣ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question marker</td>
<td>Question clause</td>
<td>Response (pro-form)</td>
<td>Response clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Present + ρω</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>AM II 318f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>nωντεν</td>
<td>αγα</td>
<td>ΑΝΟΝ ΠΕ De Vis II 265&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>Preterite</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>AM I 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΞΑΡΑ</td>
<td>Foc. Future</td>
<td>[zero]&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>AM II 248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΞΑΡΑ</td>
<td>Contingent Future</td>
<td>[zero]&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>AM II 212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>Preterite +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>Imperfect +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>Preterite +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>Preterite</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>AM II 56f.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rhematic (selection):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response clause</th>
<th>Response form</th>
<th>Response clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(ถอน) Ναωκ-οτρεμ-</td>
<td>Ανοκ-οτρεμ-X</td>
<td>AM II 76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θων</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ΝΗΜ) Νιμ ρε φαι</td>
<td>Φαι ρε Χ&lt;sup&gt;m&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>AM I 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ΝΗΜ) Νιμ και τε</td>
<td>Ταμάρ Μαί-</td>
<td>AM II 11f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ΝΗΜ) Νιμ και τε</td>
<td>Χ και παράν</td>
<td>AM I 66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ΝΗΜ) Ναωκ-και-</td>
<td>Ανοκ-Χ</td>
<td>AM I 37, II 111, 125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πεκράν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ΟΥ) Οτρ Πέ Ετρω Ον</td>
<td>ΑΓΕΝΣ — ΠΕ ΕΤ&lt;sup&gt;j&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>AM II 105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ΟΤΗΡ) Οτρ Προμπτι</td>
<td>ΠΡΟΜΠΤΙ ΠΕ-Χ</td>
<td>AM II 290</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ΣΕΝΑΥ-Ν-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΕΠΕ-ΝΕΩΝ/</td>
<td>ΕΠΕ-ΣΕΝ-ΧΗ</td>
<td>AM II 76, 149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΣΕΝΑΥ ΜΗΣ&lt;sup&gt;o&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ΟΤ, ΝΗΜ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΕΚ-Γ ΕΒΕΟΤ/</td>
<td>ΕΚ-Γ ΕΒΕΟΤ/ΝΗΜ</td>
<td>AM I 75, 229</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΕΒΟΝ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ΟΜΝ) ΑΕΝΑΙΕ ΝΑΚ</td>
<td>ΕΙΓΑ ΕΡΑΤΥ</td>
<td>AM II 74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΕΒΟΝ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ΝΗΜ) ΕΚ-+ ΝΗΜ</td>
<td>[self-supplied</td>
<td>AM II 273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Address</td>
<td>Response]&lt;sup&gt;g&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ΟΜΝ) ΑΕΘΟΝ ΝΕ ΤΟΝ</td>
<td>ΑΕΘΟΝ ΝΕΡΙΟΤΟΝ</td>
<td>AM II 280f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ΕΒΕ-ΟΤ) ΕΒΕ-ΟΤ ΝΤΕ-</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>AM II 122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΤΙ + ΝΤΕ-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Combined — Rhematic / Nexal**

1. **(όμν) Νωτον-γανρημοθων +**
   - Present: [Condensed Response]<sup>l</sup>
   - AM II 122

2. **(ΝΗΜ)**
   - X-ΝΗΜ ΕΤ- +
   - X ΠΕ + ΤΩΝ-
   - AM II 124
Pentateuch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question marker</th>
<th>Question clause</th>
<th>Response (pro-)form</th>
<th>Response clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>nexal:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Contingent</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>neg. Absolute-Definite Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gen. 18:24, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Nοok pe</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Anok pe* Gen. 27:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ Rheme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Φαι pe</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Gen. 43:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ Theme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Gen. 44:15, Ex. 2:7f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>[oblique Response]*</td>
<td>Gen. 24:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Foc. Present</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Ex. 2:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ Augens*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Os - Μαθατατηριανετ*</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Gen. 27:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ Address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ον-</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>echoed* Gen. 29:5f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ον-</td>
<td>οτων-</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>echoed* Gen. 44:19f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ον-</td>
<td>Contingent Future</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Deut. 8:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ον-</td>
<td>MMON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ον-</td>
<td>Contingent Future</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Num. 16:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ον-</td>
<td>Conjunctive</td>
<td>[dialogue-arresting Response]*</td>
<td>Gen. 33:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ον-</td>
<td>Foc. Conv.</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Ex. 14:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ον-</td>
<td>Existential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ον-</td>
<td>Φαι ζε...</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Num. 16:9:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ον-</td>
<td>Παι-πεπι-</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Ex. 14:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ζε-ον-</td>
<td>Contingent Future</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Num. 22:37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ζε-ον-</td>
<td>Nom. Sentence</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>Num. 13:18:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ζε-ον-</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>Num. 13:19:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ζε-ον-</td>
<td>Verboid</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>Num. 13:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΜΗ</td>
<td>Preterite</td>
<td>ΜΦΗ</td>
<td>Num. 22:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΜΗΠΙ</td>
<td>Preterite</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Gen. 20:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΜΗ</td>
<td>Οτων-ϋδομ</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Num. 22:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΜΗ</td>
<td>Νοοκ ετνα-</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Num. 11:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΜΗ</td>
<td>Μωτχεσ</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Num. 12:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΜΗ</td>
<td>MMαθατηρετα-ετα</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Num. 11:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΜΗ</td>
<td>Anok αι-η</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Gen. 18:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΜΗ</td>
<td>Οτων- Contingent Future</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

73 C super lin., with -q crossed out.
74 Vat ΑΝ πε.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question marker</th>
<th>Question clause</th>
<th>Response (pro-form)</th>
<th>Response clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MHTI</td>
<td>Contingent Future [zero]</td>
<td>Num. 20:10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHTI</td>
<td>oton-</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Deut. 29:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHTI + AN</td>
<td>Present +</td>
<td>Gen. 31:14f,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>ánok- Rheme</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Gen. 4:9, 30:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>Rheme - πe -</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Deut. 20:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>ánok-tekew</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Num. 22:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH + AN</td>
<td>Contingent Future [zero]</td>
<td>Num. 11:22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH... MH</td>
<td>Preterite</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Num. 23:26, 24:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH... AN</td>
<td>Focus—πetaq-</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Num. 16:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH... AN</td>
<td>áńok πe Rheme</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Num. 22:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH... AN</td>
<td>ánok πe</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Ex. 4:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH... AN</td>
<td>Topic + nai</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Num. 23:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH... AN</td>
<td>ne†na</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH... AN</td>
<td>Contingent Future [zero]</td>
<td>Num. 23:19:19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH... AN</td>
<td>Topic + Present</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Gen. 37:13, Ex. 4:14, Deut. 32:34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAPA</td>
<td>Contingent Future [zero]</td>
<td>Gen. 18:13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAPA</td>
<td>ἐνομίτεναι</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Gen. 37:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(foc. nexus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>Preterite</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Gen. 27:36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHTI</td>
<td>Conditional (deliberative?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>neg. Absolute Future</td>
<td>Gen. 18:30:32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Address + Topic + Contingent Future +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rhematic (selection):

(NIM) áńok-nim áńok πe- Rheme Gen. 27:32
(NIM) min πetaq- [zero] Gen. 21:26, Ex. 4:11
(NIM) mir πe darpw [zero] Num. 16:11
(NIM) neȯ-tweπi ánok-tweπi X Gen. 24:23f.
(NIM) nimir nimir # X # Gen. 32:27
(NIM) mir πe πekpán
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question marker</th>
<th>Question clause</th>
<th>Response (pro-)form</th>
<th>Response clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(NIM)</td>
<td>ΝΗΝ ΝΗΝ ΝΕ</td>
<td>ΝΗΝ ΝΕ —</td>
<td>Rheme Gen. 24:65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(OY)</td>
<td>ΔΟΝΟ-ΟΤ...ΔΕ-</td>
<td>[zero]*</td>
<td>Ex. 16:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(OY)</td>
<td>ΔΕ-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(OY)</td>
<td>ΟΤ ΝΕ ΝΕΚΝΑ-</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Gen. 4:10, Num. 23:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(OY)</td>
<td>ΝΕΝΕΚΝΑ-/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ESE-OT)</td>
<td>ESE-OT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ESE-OT)</td>
<td>ESE-OT</td>
<td>[Dialog-arresting</td>
<td>Num. 22:32f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ESE-OT)</td>
<td>+ Preterite</td>
<td>Response*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(OY)</td>
<td>ΤΟΠΙ + ΟΤ ΝΕ</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Ex. 4:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(OY)</td>
<td>+ Address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(OY)</td>
<td>ΟΤ ΝΕ ΦΑΙ</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Gen. 37:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(OY)</td>
<td>ΕΤΑΙΙΑΙQ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gen. 26:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(OY, SEN-OT)</td>
<td>ΟΤ ΝΕΤΕΝΝΑ- +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(OY)</td>
<td>ΙΕ ΟΤ ΝΕΤΕΝΝΑ- +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(OY)</td>
<td>ΙΕ ΑΝΝΑ-</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Gen. 44:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(OY)</td>
<td>ΕΝΟΟ +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(OY)</td>
<td>ΝΗΡΗΡ ΝΕ/ΝΕ</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>Num. 13:18:19:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ΠΟΙΟ)</td>
<td>Contingent Future [zero]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deut. 1:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ΘΩΝ)</td>
<td>ΝΩΤΗΝ-ΓΑΝΕ-</td>
<td>ΕΒΑ ΕΝΕΟ-ΕΝΕΟ-</td>
<td>Gen. 29:4, 42:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ΘΩΝ)</td>
<td>ΑΣΘΩΝ</td>
<td>ΙΚ ΖΗΠΕ (ΓΕΝ-</td>
<td>Gen. 18:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ΘΩΝ)</td>
<td>ΑΙΝΑΖΕΝ-ΑQ</td>
<td>ΣΟΝ ΕΝΕΖΟΝ-</td>
<td>Num. 11:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ΘΑΕΝΝΑ)</td>
<td>ΖΑ-ΘΕΝΝΑ ΔΕ</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Ex. 10:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ΘΩΝ)</td>
<td>ΟΤΟΝ- + Contingent Future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

(a) The Question clause echoed in the Response, with interlocutive personal switch, and (where relevant) anaphoric reference to Question. Note that the Response to the topicalized Nominal Sentence occurs without Topic.

(b) The Response consisting of the echoed Question with further expansion.

(c) No verbal allocation. The Response here is either pragmatically reactive to the falling movement of the idol, or textually implicit, invoked by the Response.

(d) On “yet, again” marking an ironic Rhetorical Question; so too γάρ + Focalizing Future/Basic Contingent-Indefinite Future with prepronoun+Augens focalized: will you send me there, too?"; so too the Contingent-Indefinite Future with preceding ΤΟΝ (AM II 15), and the Augens in Ex. 2:24.
(e) Dialogue-arresting Response: allocutive "Why do you ask?", "Who are you?"; "I know nothing (but...)") "What is this for me?" and so on.
(f) "Oblique Response": "Wont you have done with this misguided magic...?" - "It isn't I who misguide..."; "Is it to die badly that you wish?" "This world's death is no death", "Shall I return...?" "Beware not to return..." and so on.
(g) "Self-supplied Response" in the Allocation: "Don't you know me? I am..." "To whom do you make me sacrifice — Peter or Apollo?"
(h) ⌣NOW ⌣now" marking an impatient Question? (impatience is perhaps also marked by the negative). In AM II 15 a preceding ⌣NOW is ironic; the Augens too may mark assertiveness and irony.
(i) "Matching Rheme": affirmation of a cohesive non-identical Rheme: "Are you an inhabitant of the city of the Kingdom...?" "I am an inhabitant of the city of Antioch..."
(j) Apocritic-explanatory presentationale nexus. This is the case of the apocritic (non-poletic) Cleft Sentence (cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 1987 and refl.)76, or a special noun-initial, verb-second construction superficially coinciding with a topicalizing construction: see below, Chapter Two.
(k) Interrogative nexus focalized by the focussing particle πω — amazed Question: "Are you really alive...?!
(l) "Condensed Response": "Where are you from? Do you know the land of X?" — "The land you're looking for is..."
(m) The Copular Pattern responding to the interrogative Delocutive one (see below, Chapter Two).
(n) Affirmative-form Question incorporating negative pro-form Response: "Did Christ come into the world or not?" (cf. also AM I 18).
(o) Isomorphic Question and Response: Response including pron. representant of Question's nominal Theme; Response supplying non-pronominal representants to Question's pronouns.
(p) Homolexemic and isomorphic Question and Response: Response supplying non-pronominal representants to Question's μίμ and οὗ.
(q) While ζε is (not unlike οὗ) an anaphoric interclausal connector of the whole Allocation/Response complex, ⌣NOW and the Conjunctive seem to be markers of Assertive Focality ("rhetoricalness") of the Question.
(r) An example from a different Nitrian corpus (De Vis, Homélies), included because of the interest of the special endophoric pattern ἀνὸκ πε, normally representing a Cleft Sentence, but here responding to a focalizing #Initial Pronoun, Second Verb.#
(s) ἄριάτηνος μεν ἀνὸκ-οταί ("ich bin einer" "j'en suis un") responds here to the opening Allocation ἄνῳκ-οταίναι. It is of interest to find οταί representing here a zero article, and, for that matter, to find a zero article in Topic status.
(t) Deliberative Question.
(u) The "ἀνὸκ πε" Nominal Sentence pattern (below, Chapter Two), responsive to the special naming-identitive pattern (SHISHA-HALEVY 1989a:91f., 103f."Are you Esau?" "I am").
(v) Noun-initial agens-focalizing construction, resembling a topicalizing one.
(w) In these cases, both the high-specificity Themes and consecutive ζε- + Conjunctive mark the Assertive-Focalness of the "Rhetorical" Questions.

75 Cf. the questions marked in Russian, Yiddish and Israeli Hebrew by the prefixed nu.
76 Also in ἕκωοντι μνο ὧν (?) ἕκωοντι μνο ἐν ἄλαλ πυρο 
εταπροφητ επον (AM II 124).
(x) The (Assertive-Focal) Question itself is in this case a self-offered Response.
(y) Question in protasi.

Obs.

Two interesting instances of the Focalizing (Second) Present in Dialogue: the non-allocutive (expository) John 10:20 μυθιστει is instructively opposed to the allocutive ἄρεναι αοι δ' ἀρετεναοι (1 Cor. 14:23). On the other hand, in John 10:32f. (B4) the Second Tense occurs in the Response, not the Question (see below, Chapter Two): ἐσθε ἡ νύμη μισος τετεναγισμενοι ἔδωκε — ἔπιστασαν ἔδωκεν ἐν θεο-πέπλε τα αλλ ἐπεβαζεν.

1.2.4.3 Special responsive/allocutive clauses

(a) In Response status one encounters clauses which are adverbial Rhemes with their Themes zeroed:

(1) #μητότε / μητωκ + Conjunctive# constitutes an autonomous clause, following ἀποκαλεῖ, πεσακ “he said” with the particle γαρ, expressing hidden fears or suspicion in internal (Gen. 27:12, 31:31, 38:11, 42:4, 50:15, Ex. 13:17) or external (Gen. 24:5, 47:18) allocation. #ἐξαντεταν# (Gen. 33:8) constitutes the “affirmative” (hidden purpose) term.

(2) #μελάφηταν# Ex. 10:11 (μη οὖτος) is both allocutive and responsive (note that negation is essentially dialogic).

(3) #σένοταν# “Fortunately”, Gen. 30:11.

Obs.

For the typically Bohairic dialogic predication #μελάφηταν#, #μπορήται # (no πε) “not thus”, “not like…”, cf. also Ps. 1:4, 118:85, Job 5:8, Is. 16:6f., Ez. 16:28. Another predicative-adverb (or clause modifier with a zeroed clause) is # καλωκ #, Job 39:24, Mt. 25:23.

(b) The Performative (Austin 1975: not however the “expository” performative. See Shisha-Halevy 1995b:187ff.) is a par excellence locutive allocutive form; one, however, that excludes Response; or else, it is arguably a case of Allocation/Response neutralized. See Shisha-Halevy 1986a:79 n.92, for the performative role of the Focalizing Present: Bohairic examples are all Nitrian, with the converter form ε-., not α-(Circumstantial topicalization? — see below, Chapter Two): εἰτωβε (AM II 36), εἰσορωβε + Conjunctive (AM II 273; ed.'s note “sic more sahidico. Lege Τορωβε” is uncalled for), εἰερετη μισκ (AM II 86ff.), perhaps εἰκαζε (AM II 270). In our corpus, the unmarked Τῃτο εποκ in Gen. 44:18 is in function Performative proper77.

77 I have not studied the applicability of Koschmieder's (1965) broader term and concept, “Koinzidenzfall”, in the Bohairic systems.
1.2.5 Tensing in Dialogue: the Main Tenses

“Tempus hat nichts mit Zeit zu tun”.  

Tenses are textemic entities par excellence, probably the most environment-sensitive entities in grammar. The reference to tenses — their very identity — are only structurally resolvable, by combination and commutation. The formalities, distribution and functionalities of the formal category conventionally called “tense”, with time reference one possible — but not necessary — component of its complex signifié, have in dialogue a particularly salient place. The three-pronged temporal reference-points Presentation, suspiciously European-ethnocentric, aprioristic and logic-founded, is for Coptic obviously wrong, not merely simplistic. The profile of the tenses presented here — the main tenses occurring in the corpus — is analytic, viewed structurally. The tense form itself does not function apart from its environment — lexical, morphological and syntactic — and a specific role of valeur cannot be attributed to it per se. (See Shisha-Halevy 2003a).

1.2.5.1 The Two Futures

(a) The Problem

Students of all Coptic dialects are familiar with the terminological and conceptual issue of the “double Future”, namely the so called “Third Future” ἐγεέωτμ/ἐγεέωτεμ, of restricted convertibility and of certain familiar modalities, alongside the periphrastic (“go” ἥ) First (and, Focalizing) Future, structurally Present-based, immediately and eminently comparable to the “going to” periphrastic future in some European and other languages, and of primarily temporal, not modal, semantic range. This is indeed very much a “Romance” predicament, and, once again, an instance of Coptic complexity sophistication “having to choose” where the Greek Vorlage has by and large only a single form. The opposition between the two forms obtains in all dialects, yet differs between dialects.

In fact, “the Problem of the Future” looms large in general and special discussions of Indo-European and language-specific studies of future tenses, synchronic as well as diachronic, chiefly in dichotomic terms of “Tense or Mode?”. “Is There a Future [Tense]?” , or are we dealing with a complex entangled continuum of modal components, slipping through our fingers if we attempt to capture them temporally, and their synthesizing into a form epitomizable as a tense expressing futurity (whatever this may mean or however definable), from a bird’s-
eye-view, can only be at the expense of their individual essential features? Or is the same true of temporality? Or ought we rather to give up the "Tense" vs. "Mode" preconceived dichotomic distinction as misguided, wrong, blurred, not rigorously or even adequately definable and in fact misleading, replacing it by different, finer distinctions of modality within a prospective frame of reference, that is, reconcile the two perspectives?

Obs.
(1) Some instructive or notable treatments of the Coptic future tenses. Tattam in his generally indifferent Compendious Grammar (London 1863) distinguishes between εἰς-
"future tense definite", -ἐνα- "future tense indefinite", comparing proportionally ἐνα- and ἐνα- (respectively). This conceptual symmetry is not all wrong, in fact it is insightful, since specificity is arguably applicable to verbal base forms — which, with Theme segments, constitute nasal or predicative syntagms — to environment as well as to noun syntagms. As I will attempt to show, this characterization and appellation is in principle acceptable.

Chain 1930:§625ff. understandably compares the ἐνα- Future to the French "futur prochain", and describes the semantics of the Bohairic "Fut. III" in terms of "assurance" and "certitude".

While for 18th-century still Bohairic-oriented Coptic grammarians like Scholtz and Woide (§106, p. 166), ἐπί- was "Futurum I" and the ἐνα- future was "Futurum II", the "Futurum Tertium vel Optativus" was ἐπί- the Berlin School 19th-century Second-Tense terminology, together with the shift of attention to Sahidic, formed the terminological system still by and large prevailing. In P. Bonjour's grammar of 1698 (Auffrère and Bosson 2005), the terminology is "Futurum Primum" for both forms (see pp. 117f, 119 etc.).

Stern 1880 §367ff., 379ff.: [ἐνα-] "instans" but also "Futurum I": "der nächste ausdruck der zukünftige handlung...wechselt im gebrauche mit dem dritten [futurum] in beiden dialeken"; [ἐπί-] "das dritte futurum" — "bestimmter (whence Tattam's "definite")? und nachrücklicher" "...[hat] oft die feierlichkeit einer versicherung" (so stressed by Stern himself). This Future is said to be more frequent in Bohairic; §381 documents B ἐπί- for S -ἐνα- . Stern compares the opposition between the two Futures to that between English will and shall.78

Polotsky, Grundlagen discusses only the Sahidic Futures (1990:193ff., 213ff.): ἐπί- "simple Future"(while stressing its modal role!) and "(Tempus) Instans" for -ἐνα- (following Stern 1880 §367; see Marouzeau, Lexique 100).

Polotsky 1959, in his only special discussion of Bohairic grammar: "Fut III": -ἐνα- "auxiliary", without a special name. "Energetic Future" is still current (even for other dialects than Bohairic, e.g., Sahidic and Oxyrhynchite — it is i.a. used by Schenke in his edition)79. The term derives from Arabic grammar, where the "energetic forms of the imperfect" (Wright 1967 vol. II [Part III], p. 24 §14, p. 41ff. §19) are characterized by

78 Horner's policy in his Bohairic New Testament (1898-1905) is explicitly stated (Introduction, p. xxiv): ἐπί- to be translated by "shall", ἐνα- by "will". This tells us more about his English usage than about any founded consideration of Coptic tenses.
79 So i.a. Funk 1991b:103f. "the interfix of the affirmative energetic future".
la- prefixed, -(a)nna, -an suffixed, and a functional range certainly recalling that of Bohairic εqε-; without la-, we have the "Energetic" jussive/imperative (Wright 1967 vol. I [Part II] 97ff.). It is of interest for the syntactic quality of Bohairic εqε- that the Semitic -na suffix, generally known in Semitic linguistics as the "Nun nergicum", is currently taken to be a superordinating sequelling mark (occurring for instance in the El Amarna letters as apodotic): see Fassberg 1994 Ch. 2 (esp. 63ff.). Polotsky objects to "Energetic" in Coptic, as unwieldy. Athanasius of Qādis (Bauer 1972:182ff.) is instructive on the Future, for he combines the affirmative εqε- and ṭnα- in a suppletive complex paradigm, while illustrating them with respectively delocutive and allocutive personal forms: this agrees with the functional profile in our corpus (see in detail below).

Shisha-Halevy 2003a:254ff is a pilot study for the present discussion, describing the Oxyrhynchite Future tenses.

(b) General Considerations and Parameters

(1) Some semantic and syntactic-semantic parameters of Future Tenses to be considered for their characterization (in part overlapping or inclusive):

- affirmative/negative;

(typical negative Future: [+ Genericity])

- the actantial personal sphere: interlocutive (locutive/allocutive) or delocutive;

(the theoretical significance of the "person-sensitive" paradigm, especially in modal forms: is this really a single paradigm, or a collage of several fragmented ones? In the structural-theoretical context, does the personal variable mar the ceteris paribus stipulation?)

- [± Sequel], [± Superordination] (i.e. sequelling / non-sequelling, superordinative / non-superordinative);

(of which [± Apodoticity] is a special subclass)

- [± Specificity] (temporal); [± Time-Reference/Time-Limit], [± Telicity]

- eventing static, complexive or dynamic

- eventing situation bounded vs. unbounded

- macro/micro-eventing: overhead, overall vs. detail eventing

- [± Personal Involvement/Engagement/Obligation]

(or [± Actant/Locutor Instigation])

- [± Volitionality], [± Intentionality]

- [± Voluntary Participation/Agency]

- [± Authoritativeness]

- [± Assurance/Certainty]⁸⁰

- [± Ineluctability]

⁸⁰ Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca 1994:248f. "rather than the speaker's confidence in making the prediction, what is at issue is whether the speaker is offering an assurance that an event will take place at some definite time or is not offering such an assurance".
• [± Absolute Validity].
• [± Questionability]
• [± Conditionability]
  • included/integrated or non-integrated ("independent", "autonomous")
  • compatibility with modifiers (esp. temporal)

(modified/unmodified eventing)

Obs. — General and Comparative

(1) For some similar semantic parameters of Future tensing, cf. Matzel and Ulvestad
reference" (i.e. prospectivity) is arguably the dominant, and perhaps the only constant
semantic feature (Dahll 1985:106f.), although it too may be complex (i.e., include the
present locutor's Present). For insights on parameters of futurity, see Chapter Seven in
"scheduled", obligatory Futures; immediate future. On volitionality and telicity
(endpoint view) in analysis of the Future, see Hopper and Thompson 1980:252f., 270f.

(2) The discussion of Future tenses in English (and to some extent in General Linguistics)
is famously characterized by a fierce controversy between the so called "Modalists" and
the "Futurists" (Rotgé 1995). The question is, in a nutshell, whether "There is a Future"
in the temporal sense. However, this is once again a case of dichotomist simplism, for the
concepts of "modality" and "temporality" in the case of prospective reference are flawed
by apriorism: most tenses, including even "past" tenses, present a rich spectrum of "objective"
and "subjective" perspectives. The palette of prospectivity in particular is never
detachable from actantial volition, intent, obligation, fear etc. Comrie 1989 concludes,
tentatively and somewhat helplessly, that "it is possible for future tenses to exist", but
that "the question whether any particular form in any particular language is an instance of
future tense, or to what extent it is an instance of Future tense, is a question that requires
detailed and insightful analysis", which is really a statement of perplexity. The gradience
of "tensehood" (and equally of modality) implied in Comrie's statement is nevertheless
of interest.

(3) Romance, Egyptian and general: Fleischman 1982 is an important tractate. Here as
often elsewhere, it is instructive to compare the Egyptian synchronic and diachronic facts
with the Romance ones. However, Egyptian does not on the whole conform to the general
(if not universal) diachronic scenarios offered in this work, and often adopted in later
studies of "grammaticalization". The Future as a case in point of both "yesterday's syn-
tax is today's morphology" (1982:126f.) rather begs the question of stratal syntax/mor-
phology delimitation, and is ethnocentrically tailored for IE: nα- is still synchronically
operative as a lexeme (Stative of "go"), and the grammaticalization of the preposition r-
"to" is arguably synchronous with the earliest jw.front sdm Future. Neither do we have here
a clear case of "analytic ousting synthetic" (1982:32ff., Chapter 5), for jw.front (r) sdm has
been synthetic since late ME, and qnαcwrtem is still analytic in Coptic, almost two
millenia later; and anyway, we know now the analytic-to-synthetic development is but
one sector of a cyclic evolution (Shisha-Halevy 2000. Fleischman does recognize the
cyclic factor). The Romance case of "obligation modality to future temporality" is cer-
tainly not paralleled in Egyptian. If anything, Egyptian jw.front sdm evolved in the long run
from a locative-deictic Present-based type of temporality to a non-temporal, but not sim-
ply modal, futurity in Bohairic Coptic, and pronounced modality in Sahidic; the nα-
"go" analytic Future from temporality to temporality. But temporality is, or may be, no less complex than modality — "Aktionsart to Tense" is here an important possibility of evolution. "Futures evolve from modals and are likely to be put to modal use" (1982:24, 108ff.) is generally unsatisfactory — in fact, this aspect of the grammaticalization of future categories is always the most dubious. On the other hand, Egyptian is certainly a case of "future tenses [being created] from spatial categories" (1982:24, 161 n.24), which applies also to the LE-to-Coptic "go" Future (p. 78ff. "verb of spatial advance"). As for "the future as a projected Present" (1982:30) — *jwr fr sdm* was such a Present, and is so no more, while the *naa-* Future is the new futuric "imminent" Present. I cannot see in Egyptian any support for correlating the analytic/synthetic change with SOV to SVO word-order change which, it is only fair to observe, Fleischman does not offer as a "total explanation" (p.50): in fact, through the very long history of Egyptian, true "word order" variation-over-time is exceedingly rare: see SHISHA-HALEVY 2000. (The entirely modal Old Egyptian-to-Demotic "prospective" *sdm*/*f* form, which disappeared in Coptic outside the purely grammatical *p eq*- auxiliary following ח, must be part of the diachronic account). As for the synchronic parameters of futurity, Fleischman does not really consider the personal factor in the function of Future modality/temporality; nor does she convincingly separate the temporal from the modal spectra, or consider the distinct nature of negativity.

(4) On the diachrony typology of the Future, its striking propensity for grammaticalization, see also PAGLIUCA 1987 (modal- to-temporal is again presented as a general tendency). Also BYBEE, PAGLIUCA and PERKINS 1991 (lexical sources for futures, and again modal / aspectual / Aktionsart-to-temporal development). On analytic-to-synthetic typological diachronics (the Germanic Future), see MÜLLER 1964.

(5) The literature on the many English Future tenses is too extensive to encompass here. See only DECLERCK 1991:87f., 185ff. (the synthesis into a future tense is but a bird's-eye view of an intricate continuum of modal components); HUDDELSTON 1995 (pragmatic-semantic); ROTGÉ 1995 (the future as a "modalized time", an interplay between time and modality).

(6) For some highlights on the analytic French "futur proche", dwelling especially on its semantics of affect and its modalities (impatience, anger, threat, promise, wish...), and its oppositions with the synthetic Future "simple", see STEN 1964:55ff. 237; 1964:55f., 235f. on its affinity with the Present and compatibility with "now" (cf. our חא, below); TOGEBY 1982 §§1027f.; note especially the cases of syntagmatic contrast of the two forms, with the FP opening the complex (again, as in Coptic, cf. below) — the FS is then essentially consequential (as in Coptic); JEANJEAN 1988 (esp. 243f., 251ff.). EMIRKONIAN and SANKOFF 1986 (spoken French; statistical-sociolinguistic); WAUGH and BAHLOUL 1996 (journalistic French; the FP has a link between the utterance [speaker] situation and the future, while the FS has no such explicit link; the FP has affective, subjective personal engagement which the FS lacks). See also BLANCHON 1988 (note especially 171ff. — [+humanly controlled], human conditioning vs. fatidical conditioning vs. natural conditioning.

(7) MS variation (variant readings) of the two futures is very rare in the Pentateuch. Some cases (I take the following from Peters's critical editions, not always reliable): Gen. 26:24 חא דת רמאק דת אמא. Gen. 34:17 (fatidical) חא דת יאעתי/אעתי. Ex. 26:17, 30:13, 31:11.

(8) Still, why is it that the dialects differ from one another in the Futures used in independent translations of the same Greek text? Three theoretically possible answers, are (a) a different interpretation of the same Greek forms, (b) different values and range struc-
tures for the morphologically corresponding ("same") forms, or (c) different decisions and choices governing the rendering in Coptic. All these, operative conjointly, make drawing contrastive conclusions very difficult, if not impossible. However, agreements and disagreements, considered qualitatively (by form and function) and quantitatively, are instructive. As an instance, let me take B/S/Oxyrhynchite Matthew (in Horner’s and Schenke’s respective editions):


(II) B=O=S: BO eiqe-, S na- (7:16, 8:11:13, 12:27, 16:18 etc., modal / prophetic injunction; 24:9:14, 25:34 following tote, 10:12 BO eiqe-, S naep-).


(9) New Testament Bohairic Futures — some noteworthy cases:

(a) Relatively rare variant readings are found, contrary to Horner’s statement in his Introduction (e.g. John 8:28:33, 11:12, Luke 1:35, 19:26).


(c) Note Luke 1:31ff. τεραπωκι...οτιον ερνοντ... eiqe-ενιωθ... του τεραπωκι... οτοι κυνερωντο... (v.l. eiqe-τρεπο) where the prophecy seems to be subdivided in three constituents, with na- marking the final peak;

(d) Argumentative na- Future (Rom. 9:19);

(e) na- Future in a “helpless” query (Rom. 6:1:2);

(f) na- in a "prophetic scenario" or confident prediction (Mt. 20:18ff., 21:3:25, 24:47, 26:2:24, Mark 14:21);

(g) The interlocutive:delocutive sphere opposition is not as pronounced as in the Pentateuch. Cf. Acts 18:6, Apoc. 18:7);

(h) Generally speaking, the na- Future seems in the NT to express the normal, eiqe- the transcendental, divinely perceived order of things; the blend of the two in Jesus’ language is not the least point of interest in its grammatical characterization in Coptic, over and beyond the system of its Greek Vorlage. Consider (for some striking exx.) Mt. 20:30, 24:48:50, 26:2:33, Mark 14:21.

(10) Old Testament Bohairic Futures: Psalms (ed. Lagarde):

(a) One gets an impression of a true variation of futures, often with the same verb lexeme (cf. 28:5:8f., 29:13, 51:6f., 68:36, 93:14, 118:15ff., 138:16ff., 145:9ff.);

(b) no interlocutive/delocutive distinction (cf. 55:7f., 68:36, 74:2, 118:15ff etc.);

(c) Note (12:2) ωθνατ πε ειε- , inconceivable in our corpus;

(d) In 134:16ff., the negative Future expresses an absolute negation rather than inability: "on no account will they..." ρωτοι μημωτοι οτοι οτοι οτοι σατι νομισαν μημωτοι οτοι οτοι... etc.

(11) In Nitrian Bohairic, the eiqe-/na- relationship is yet again different, with the na-range broader and encroaching on that of eiqe- (cf. na- vs. na- πε).

(a) Assured or divine prediction, promise, assured result: na- Future (AM I 3, 4, 8, 10, 66, 84 etc.);
In Sahidic, these are closely connected. Not so in Bohairic, where the final /consecutive conjunctions or adverbs usually govern the Conjunctive as a "that"-form, but in special junctural circumstances also enter other, intriguing constructions: ἡπέως ητω- Deut. 9:28, γωτε κατε- Deut. 28:35, γινα [γοταν ἁτωγα-] γεω- Ex. 40:32. Outside the corpus, consider Δε-αγνα- (B4) Zach. 5:10; Nitrian: Δε-γινα εγνα- AM I 13, Δε-αγνα- AM I 182, II 105, 298, Δε-εγνα- AM I 124, 68, Δε- + Conj. AM I 4, 7, 150 (content), Δε-γινα- + Conj. AM I 4, 5, 14, 16, 207 (consec.), 89 (content) γινα- + Conj. AM I 12, 16, 120, 121 (content), Δεγινα επεμ- AM I 3, 246, II 123. Δεγινα εγνα- AM I 7, 104, 2 (content). Obviously, the rich variety of constructions, conjunctions and adverbs (including επεμ-. ενδεικνυμεν- etc.) — and functions: a continuous spectrum stretching across purpose, goal, consequence and content — makes a special study essential (see below, Chapter Three; cf. HULT 1990 for the comparable complexity of these constructions in 5th century Greek).

(c) Diachrony. The historical extent of Egyptian makes the Egyptian Future a show-piece and test-case for studying the evolution of grammatical categories. However, even without invoking the "Continuity Fallacy", the overall picture of the Egyptian Future, in synchrony and diachrony, is still largely blurred, and the systemic significance of such central forms as the so-called Prospective sdmf and future reference of the all-important Present-tense matrix not yet fully realized. Here too the distinction of tense and mood is fuzzy.

Obs.

(1) Loprieno's diachronic account in 1995 is inaccurate and open to objections on several counts. (94) εγνα- (in LE "Objective Future") "has invaded the domain of mood" (see also pp. 82f., 96, 176f., 222f.) — this is certainly not true for Bohairic, whose εγνα- in no sense continues the prospective sdmf. This is yet another case of the obfuscation brought about by seeing Sahidic as the typological representant of Coptic. -να- is by no means a converter, in any sense of the term (pace LOPRIENO 1995:94). 1995:177 is inexact: Bohairic (with other dialects) does have a # εγνα- NOUN ε-γωτε # form.

(2) "Objective" is used of the ME r-future by Vernus (VERNUS 1990c, e.g. 9ff.; also by Loprieno 1995 of LE) in a semantic spectrum ("threats, assurances, obligation, omena, prediction, prophecies") which matches almost perfectly the functional range of the Bohairic Absolute-Definite Future (below): this is yet another conservative trait of Bohairic against Sahidic. The prospective sdmf is Vernus's "subjective" future (1990c:

81 It is certainly not the case that Latin amare habeo was "modally neutral" while the Romance (j')aimerai is modal (So LOPRIENO 1995:272 n.71).
20ff.), but this is synonymous with “modal” and not the notion of agent-subjectivity and contingency which we apply to the Bohairic na- future (below). Familiar roles of the εγε- future are discernible already in LE and in religious pre-Demotic: VERNUS 1990a: 172ff.

(3) Two notes on Demotic Futures. (a) The Demotic future jw f sdm is generally speaking non-modal. In certain texts, it is opposed to the traditional “Prospective sdm.f.”, negativized as bn-jw sdm or nn sdm.f. Thus in the BM mortuary text edited by M. Smith (1987), the affirmative form expressing (beside the old optative) also confident prediction, assured wished-for result of the performance of the mortuary ritual. (b) In Demotic, we have a full-fledged opposition of periphrastic vs. non-periphrastic future forms. But in early Demotic, we already find ṣm used as the auxiliary in a periphrastic Present-based Future, much like Coptic now ε-: see SPIEGELBERG 1925 §139, VITTMANN 1998: 445f.

(d) The Absolute-Definite (“Specific”) Future (εγεβωτημ, nneq-cwtem)

(1) This form (“definite” in the sense of [OED] “having clear or exact limits, clearly defined, determinate, fixed, certain”) is an exponent of complexive, intensive, absolute-validity, ineluctable macro-futurity. It is more-over quintessentially a superordinated follow-up or sequelling syntactic category. Not a temporally nuanced tense, but “pure prospectivity” in a prospective scenario. In a more detailed semantic and formal-syntactic-parameter profile, we have here:

- [+ SEQUELLING]
- [+ INELUCTABILITY]: unrepealability; confident tone
- [+ DIVINE INSTIGATION / INVOLVEMENT FACTOR]: this Future is part of the “Divine (or, less commonly, Royal) Word Grammar”
- [+ DEFINITENESS OF EVENTING]
- [- TEMPORALITY]: out of time and place: extratemporal, extra-local
- [- SENSITIVITY TO THE AGENS INTERPERSONAL SPHERE], the interlocutive: delocutive and locutive-allocutive perspective or sphere of reference.
- [- DEIXIS]
- [- CONDITIONABILITY]: incompatible with protatic status markers
- [- INSTIGATOR INTENT/HOPE/ENGAGEMENT]
- [- VOLTIONALITY]
- [- INSTIGATOR/SPEAKER ORIENTATION]
- [- QUESTIONABILITY]: incompatible with nexal (incl. Assertive-Focal [“Rhetorical”]) or rhetematic interrogation markers
- [- AFFECT/MODALITY] = [+ IMPASSIVITY]
- [- DETAILING OF EVENTING]: complexive “Macrofuture”
- [- ANCHORING IN LOCUTOR’S TIME FRAME].

The form is or is characterized by

- Actor/instigator: typically plus habens or plus habens-oriented
• Eventing complexive/indifferent to dynamic/static opposition
• Eventing indifferent to bounded/unbounded situation. It is
• Not put in question: incompatible with Nexal or Rhematic interrogation, "Rhetorical Question" (Assertive-Focal Formal Interrogation), Modality Question πνω, and so on
• Never responsive
• Incompatible with protatic environment (ιςΔιςε) (in apodosis, un-marked by ιε)
• Rarely compatible with presetting temporal adverbials: typically un-modified (see Obs. below)
• Incompatible with particles: οςν, ταρ
• Typically and quintessentially sequelling, thus apodotic (οςνογ εγε-)
• Not occurring in protasis; when apodotic, then unmarked by ιε
• Theme-agens specific in affirmative environment
• Non-disjoinable by ιε, yet coordinated by οςνογ
• Conversion highly restricted
• Incompatible with Presentative (ξηππει ει, ξηππει)
• Rarely compatible with Theme-agens topicalization\(^{82}\)
• Incompatible with focalization
• Rarely compatible with Augens
• Juncturally marked as link
• Rarely subcategorizable ("carried on") by the Conjunctive
• Normally not included ("subordinated", e.g. by [εβεβε] Δε-).

Obs.

(1) Sequelling. This is probably the most interesting and syntactically most important function and quality of the Absolute-Definite Future, which is typically or even exclusively affirmative. The syntactic and morphosyntactic verbal category of superordinated, often thematic sequel is of prime importance in Egyptian synchrony and diachrony: let me mention only sdm.hr.f, sdm.k3.f, sdm.jn.f; the apodotic (prospective) sdm.f (in Old and Middle Egyptian); the Sequential jw.f hr sdm, hr sdm.f (in Late Egyptian); the Conjunctive (SHISKA-HALEVY 1995a). ιωκωτειν (see below and SHISKA-HALEVY 2003a), the apodotic εσκωτή (SHISKA-HALEVY 1973) in Late Egyptian, Demotic and Coptic. (In Demotic, the important injunctive role of jw.f sdm is arguably yet another facet of its superordinative nature). As is evident from the examples below, the sequelling role of εγε-, being essentially syntactic and not only semantic, is fully compatible with most semantic components of the form.

(2) (Pre-)modification. The very rare case of Gen. 30:20 αφυ τ τυ κ νοται εναν
neq ναιφι εσμαλον τεν νότνο εκομπηνπ ιτ νιε-παμ is instructive: the
adverb here accents the consequential and apodotic-superordinating effect of εγε-. An-

\(^{82}\) Not, however, with nexus topicalization (ερεπονθα εγε-...): see above and below.
other striking instance is Gen. 50:25 ὅσον διώσχυ τάρκο νανογνηπρι ηπίκα 
εἰς ἤμος ζε ναμηνινι ετεθής, ηαι ναμηνι ερωτε 
τενεκανάκκε ἐβολ θαί νεμωτεν, which may perhaps also be understood as 
a causal "on the occasion of...", or "should God visit...".
(3) The unique ἄν-εγεμίσι in Gen. 17:17 proves the rule rather than contradicts it, for 
Abraham does not really question the Divine statement about Sarah: he is sceptical, and 
restates it as a paradox.
(4) Among the rare compatibilities of this Future we find γναθ ἔκε- Ex. 6:1. Temporal 
post-modifiers (adjuncts) do occur, yet rarely: Gen. 15:13 εὐεγεσίωτ Ν- 
τοιμπις. Presentative instances are even rarer: Ex. 32:34 Ἀνοτ ζε γαγενακ 
ὁσον μνω μελκ ἡπίλος σπιτ ... μπιπε ιε πανελος εὐεπ-σωσ 
μικ. The combination of presentation with topicalization is significant.
(5) Association of the Absolute-Definite Future with the Divine Law-giving Locutor 
makes it an important constituent of "Divine Word Grammar" (cf. NORDEN 1913) and in 
particular the "Pentateuchische Gesetzsprache" or "modus mandativus" (POLOTSKY 
(6) The unrepealability of the εὔγε- Future derives also from its "intensity" (cf. GLINZ 
1969:56 "intensive Zukunftserwartung") or "energeticity" (cf. the Arabic term still 
current), but is mainly a factor of its indifference to contingent utterance-incident circum-
stances.

(2) Roles and documentation (classified by prime syntaxic / semantic-
pragmatic roles and associations)
(a) Affirmative
(1) Affirmative only: inevitable/ineluctable/inexorable sequel (with 
ὁσον or zero) apodotic/non-apodotic superordinating sequelling (af-
firmative only?); follow-up (even concatenating), dénouement: "(and) 
then...", "(and) so...", "(and) consequently...". The Absolute-Definite 
Future is here high-level-rhematic.

Obs.
(1) The Absolute-Definite Future, even without ὅσον, is as a rule separated from its 
"prosiga" by the lemniscus delimiter  (Chapter Four), as in Gen. 30:15 or 42:34 and 
often: this is normally the case with "conditional" prosiga/apodosis complexes.
(2) For the Absolute-Definite Future in the post-imperativ slot, see above.
(3) Note the important Future configuration ἄνα... (ὁσον) εἰὲ- (etc., for various 
persons) discussed below, which, I believe, strongly corroborates the sequelling role of the 
Absolute-Definite Future.
I believe — attributing this to ὅσον rather than the future form.
(5) Note below numerous cases of Sahidic and/or Greek "and" for the Bohairic 
asynthetic Future; comparison with a sensitive modern version (e.g. Luther's German one) is also 
 instructive in these cases.
(6) DEPUYDT 1993:244f. "The sequence ρναγωτον πε — as distinct from ρναγωτο 
without πε — typically occurs in the apodosis of conditional sentences" is factually 
correct. It is a marked superordinated construction of the να- Future, occurring in apodosi
(see above, on ἐν with narrative verb-forms) as “it is/means...that...”, but hardly enough to warrant “the (functional, ASH) equation $sdm.k3.f = \etaπατωμ$ ἐν seems obvious”. As it is, beside the residual apodotic εὐκατωμ (significantly not attested in Bohairic, unlike its protatic homonym: cf. Kasser 1994), ἐπὶ and ἐπὶ- are typical apodotic forms, but neither, and certainly not ηπατωμ ἐν, is simply or obviously equivalent to the essentially OME $sdm.k3.f$.

Gen. 42:34 ἄνιοσι ἴηπενκοταξι ηνον γαροί ὑπειπομ ζε-
νωται-γανδραι ἄν.

Gen. 30:20 ὧν ὑπειπομ ενανεψ λεπροι ζεπηπνας-
κοτον εὐκατωμνε πνευματιτ ηπατωμ.

Gen. 4:14 ἵδε ηινακιττ δοιος εβολ γαρος ἰπκαρι οτορ
εἰςωσιν εἰπαρολομ οτορ εἰςεσβερτερ γιδεπκαρι...

Gen. 18:5 οτορ εἰςει ηνουκι επετενεοτωμ μενενε-
και επετενεοτωτεν.

Gen. 24:46 εἰς ὡνοεικ εἰςετος ηπεκκεσαμανι (Arabic wa-;
Greek καὶ), sim. 24:44.

Gen. 26:2ff. οτορ δε ζεπηπναςι εἰςδαϊος ηνον οτορ ἀπ-
ρεσιεσκαι ηιδεπκαρι οτορ εἰςωσιν λεπρο ηποκ εἰςτε
ἱπκαρι τηρατη ηνον.

Real concatenation: every ηπ- form sequels the form preceding it.

Gen. 27:45 οτορ λεπρο λενεγεσος ραταπεμπονομ λε
παως ηπεκον κοτε εβον γαροκ ... οτορ εἰςεταιοτ ηνωκ
εβολ ηματ.

Gen. 29:27 ζεκαξ οτον εβολ ηνεβαι οτορ εἰςτον ηἰξε
ηνον.
Gen. 30:15 μανεγαί ηνον ὑπειπομ ητε νηιδεμφες.
Gen. 31:3 ματασοο επκαρι ητενεκιωτ λεμπεκαινος
οτορ εἰςωσιν λεμακ sim. 32:9.

Gen. 42:20 οτορ ηπεκογοκταξι ηνον άνιτη γαροι οτορ
επετενε-επετενεκαξ.

Ex. 8:25 ηἰςεωνη εβολ ητοτκ οτορ εἰςτωβεθ μεῖον
(cf. the narrativization of this Allocation [verse 26] ἂν ... οτορ ἡπ-
τωβεθ...).

Ex. 14:4 ἀνοκ γαρ εἰςεηρε-πνηττ μὴ παρω ηφω αυτορ εἰς-
δοξι ηιδαγαος μμως οτορ εἰςεσθων λεηπροι ζεπη-
παρω...

Lev. 18:5 ηαι ετεφρωμη νασιτοτ εἰςεωνη.
Ex. 22:3 εὐσων δε μμοναθ μματ εἰςετιη εβολ...
Ex. 5:21 εἰςεσθω επετοκ ηπεη-φετερα.

Num. 8:2 καζι ἄτησεν οτορ εκεζος ηνον ἄτε... sim.
Lev. 17:2, Lev. 19:2.
Num. 20:8 ...οὐσὶ γαῖα ἐνε ἠπετρα ἡμῶν ὡς ἔστη ἡμῶν.
Deut. 30:1ff. οὐσὶ εἰσεύθη ἄρσανι ἔδωκ νᾶε-ναίκαξα ἡχρον ἡττεινενομ ... εἰσείλετε-νέκνοβι ἡχρον νᾶε-πτέρ νους ἐπέφει νᾶεν ἡχρον...
Deut. 2:28 εἰσεπέρ ηὐ ἁρατ εἰεύοιμω (Greek. καί, Sah. ἄσω).
Deut. 5:27 εἰσεικάξα ... εἰνεοθεμον νους εἰκειςιοτ.
Num. 16:30 εἰρεπκαρι στο μν ὡτρη εἰεομκοτ.
Gen. 28:15 γνηπε ανοκ ἡ ἅμακ νους εἰεκεφε ἐροκ ... νους εἰεταεκοκ.
Deut. 29:13 ...εἶλα νθεσκςμνητκ νᾶε νοσᾶλακ νους νους εἰσεύθη νᾶε ἡμῶν. Not balanced or symmetrical — ἐφε— is here resultative.
Deut. 7:4 εἰσεφεσκεκυρη Ῥε ἔβολ γαροι εἰσεφεκμων ἡγκεκενοτ νους εἰσέκετοντι νῆμον εἰρωτε νᾶε-πτέρ εἰσεφεθ-θηνον ἐβολ ἡκωλεμ — a real “narrative” future scenario.
Gen. 18:26 εἰσωπα άιωάνδεκας-ῖ νηομ ναθει σκεκοδομα ἰβακα εἰεκαπιμα ἡχρον ἐβολ εἰεβιτιοτ.

(2) Numinous “Divine Word”: “Divine Promise”, “Statement of Divine Intent” (often, but not necessarily, sequelling):
Gen. 28:15 γνηπε ανοκ ἡ ἅμακ νους εἰεκεφε ἐροκ... νους εἰεταεκοκ — note the coordination of the Absolute-Definite Future to the Present, which is no less promissory.
Gen. 46:4 ...νους ανοκ εἰει νηομ εἰρπη εἰκαρι ανοκ εἰκενκ εἰσωπι ἐκάσε.
Gen. 6:18 εἰεκεσκοι νήδιαοκκη νηομ.
Ex. 14:4 ανοκ γαρ εἰεκεφε-πέχτ μφαραω νήοτ νους εἰσοδι εἰδηγος μμωσον νους εἰεσιωσον νῆρηι σκεκα-ραω... Contrast the “nynegocentric”—presented “I am going to...” in
Ex. 14:17 γνηπε ανοκ ἡμαρε-πέχτ μφαραω νήοτ.
Ex. 9:5 νους ἁπασ τότε ἵδε τόνοιεν εἰκαω μμος νηε-νηρηι σκεκαετε εἰεπέκεντε ἵπει μπιακάξα.
Ex. 21:13 εἰετ ἡκα νηομ εἰεκεφεκτ εματ νηε-φη εταεμοτεβ.
Gen. 6:7 εἰεκετπρομι ἐβολ εἰεβιδαμιον.
(3) Benediction, Malewitchion (“Divine Partner”):

Lev. 26:5f ...οσοι πικαὶ ηεῇ εὐεληθησαί ουσων ηισωμην ητελημεχυσων ετεη ηπουσωταρ ουσων ερπησημων ταιγη νωτην ηπισολ ουσο εμετηγη-πιση ... 

Gen. 3:19 εκενοιμη ηπεκωικ ηενπηκη τηςπηκης ηπεκωικ εεπηκη ηεασειτκ εβολ ηνηκη.

Ex. 7:28 ...οσοι ερεθιαρο βεβι εηευωι ηνακηροιρ ... 

Gen. 9:25 ηεεσοςορ ηαε-καααη αεεουωπη ανιαλον ηαε-καααη.

(4) Fatidical Prediction, Prophetic Word; “Prophetic Future Scenario” (“Divine Partner”):

Gen. 4:14 ουσων ειεεωπη ειειαγον ουσων ειεεεερτερ ειε-ξενκαεη ... 

Gen. 18:10 κατααειον ηεανουεοοι ηεεσι ηνουηρι ηαε-εραρη τεκνηιμη.

Gen. 15:13 ηενοεμει εκεεει ηε-ερεεκεκροξ ερ-ηεηε-κεεεε, ... ηεεηιμον ημεκ ουσων ειεεεεκεκμων ειεεε- 

Gen. 24:14 ουσων εεεεωπη παρειεοο ηε ηνεο ηηηηα 

Gen. 41:30f. ηεεενααει ηεει ηαε-κε-ζ ηομπη ηπηωι ουσων ειεεεεπησηι κηιδει ερεαεηκ ηομηκ ηπικαη ... 

Gen. 28:14 ουσων εεεεκεκροξ ερ-μεσηης απηις εεεεωπηες επεα ηεηιον ηεηιπειη ηεηιηεηεηη κηηειοεου ουσων εεεεηειοοη ηεηιη απηηηηκηη ηαε-ηιηαη 

Num. 23:9 εηηπηε ιε ουλαοε εεεεωπηη κηααατη.

Could this be the case of the adnominal Circumstantial converter zeroed before εηε-? See below, Chapter Four.

Deut. 31:20 εεεεηοον γηα εεηοεε εηηεκηι ηαααοεη.

Deut. 7:4 εηεεεηεηηεκηηηπι γηα εβολ εαροι εκεεωηι ηαρηαιοοιι.

Also: Deut. 28 passim, Num. 33:52f.

Obs.

Prophecy is, properly speaking, non - or extra-temporal: it is a case of the ineluctable “future scenario”. Note the neutralizing (in the allocutive forms εεε-, εεεεεε-) of directives or injunctions and the “Future Scenario”.

Obs.

(1) Note the difference between the Future and the Jussive μαρεφ- (above): the former is in reality not a Jussive, but a delocutive prospective constation.

(2) I find of interest the cotextual combination of the negative Absolute Future with the statements of Non-Existence and the Preterite in De Vis II 119f. οὐχότα ζε-μνόνιτι ησυχα παρα λα τιθερεσκο οτάε ηνεργι βιο οταε ηνεργιτι οταε μνόνιτι ησυχα τνειγηριανι ης αυτοι ενοι τνηχας γως νοτ † † † † † etc.: ηνεργ- appears here to be virtually aoristic.

(3) The discontinuous-Theme construction ερε- [nominal Theme-agens] ερε-, occurring for the Future only in this role (with nominal + delocutive Themes), is not triggered by any special Greek syntax. Above, we found it used in narrative as marked. Here, too, it may signal solemn or enhanced preceptive pronounciation: Lev. 4:6f. οτον ερε- πιονθι ερεωπι ηπερθι δημηθινον † † † † and so often in Leviticus; Num. 19:19 οτον ερεφη εοτας ερενοτζε εβολ † † †. This is obviously not a straightforward case of agens topicalization (the priest is the constant Topic of the text and indeed the texteme), but the topicalization of the whole nexus.

(4) Mayser II/1:212ff., 229ff. discusses the complicated distribution and interplay of Hellenistic Greek Imperative, Jussive and Future, e.g. in edicts and decrees (for which we have of course a contrastive dimension with Demotic: cf. SIMPSON 1996:116ff., 120ff.): the “jurisdiction” feature is joined here by the “Royal/Di vine Word” one. Generally, in Greek legal language, the Future, Jussive, Optative and Infinitive are the main carrier, in a distribution that is rather complex. For examples of the use of the legal Jussive in Greek (e.g. in wills), see for instance the texts in CLARYSSE 1995; for wills and obligations, see TAUBENSCHLAG 1995: the Future is used in locutive undertakings/obligations, e.g. in the texts in SUPENSTEIN 1963. For the Demotic legal Future (for obligations, guarantees, liabilities, sureties) cf. for instance SETHE 1920; CRUZ-URIBE 1985; MARTIN 1995. Neither Demotic nor Coptic use the μαρεφ- Jussive in these genres: in Bohairic, as we have seen, μαρεφ-, if not Post-Imperatival, is rather a rather circumlocutory request-form.

(6) Oath-taking, adjuration (interlocutive, delocutive) (Divine Oath or Divine Partner). άν homonym:

Gen. 50:25 οτον αυωσφ ερκε ννενασπι ημια εγκω μμον ζε εσφι δημηθπι ετεφ † ηναπι ερωτ πε ημοι ηετεγνενακε εβολ ηαι νεμοντει.

Another case of the Absolute-Definite Future pre-modified, by a causal “on the occasion of...”.

Gen. 14:22 ειεκτατενακε ζεφι εαφ † ετξοι.

Gen. 24:7 αυωρκ ηα εγκω μμον ζε-ειε † ηπαικαι νακ. Num. 32:11...ζε-αν-επαγωνι επικαγι...

Gen. 31:49f. ερεσι ναζ-Φ † οτωι νεμακ... ζε-αν-ννεκ- ηεβιο ννασερπι ζε-αν-ννεκσισεμει εζεννασερπι.

(7) Prayer and Request (addressed to plus habens, or to numinous authority) (uncommon):

Gen. 27:28 οτον ερεφ † † ηα ηνολ ζετιων † ητε-τφε.
Gen. 32:20 ειεκτατατ ηνεφη... ειεσε επεφη.
(8) Statement of Resolute Intent (rare)
Gen. 45:28 εἰευθενή ἡ ἡτανά τὸ ἐρῶ τὴν θρόνον.
Gen. 24:19 εἰτετοί οὐκεκεδάμαλι ὑμᾶς ἐν θρόνοι πάντων.

Some striking or prevalent converging / overlapping combinations of semantic-pragmatic roles and associations:
result + promissiveness: Deut. 5:27, Lev. 26:4:19, Num. 4:19, 16:30.
result + injunctiveness: Gen. 32:18, Deut. 1:17, 2:28.
result + prayer invocation: Gen. 28:2f.
sequelling + fatidicality: Gen. 9:6.
fatidicality + injunctiveness: Gen. 3:19(!), 4:2, 8:22, 3:14-18.
fatidicality + benediction: Gen. 27:39f.

(b) Negative — non-sequelling. Much more restricted distribution
(1) Delocutive, allocutive — "official" categoric prohibition; generic interdiction:
Gen. 41:44 ἀσφαλεῖ ἡ τεκατειχί εἰσεχματαί τῆς θρονίας.

Gen. 41:16 ἀσφαλεῖ τὴν ποταμόν καὶ τὸ ἱεράπω.
Gen. 32:32 εἰς ὑμᾶς τὸ τέλος τοῦ πόλεμος ἡ ἡτανά μετακάλεσεν ἠλπίζεται μὴ ἀποκαλέσεται.

Gen. 31:32 ἄλλον ἡμέραν διακόπτων τοῦ τεκατειχί ἡτανάς ἡ προγενεσθε
Ex. 12:43 ἄλλον τεκατειχί ἡμέραν διακόπτων τοῦ τεκατειχί ἡ προγενεσθε

Ex. 23:24 ἡμέραν τούτων τοῦ τεκατειχί ἡ προγενεσθε ἡμέραν τούτων τοῦ τεκατειχί ἡ προγενεσθε.

Ex. 22:30 ἡμέραν τούτων τοῦ τεκατειχί ἡ προγενεσθε τοῦ τεκατειχί ἡ προγενεσθε...

Gen. 9:4 τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ τοῦ τεκατειχί ἡ προγενεσθε τοῦ τεκατειχί ἡ προγενεσθε.

Gen. 17:15τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ τοῦ τεκατειχί ἡ προγενεσθε τοῦ τεκατειχί ἡ προγενεσθε.

Deut. 31:15τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ τοῦ τεκατειχί ἡ προγενεσθε τοῦ τεκατειχί ἡ προγενεσθε.

Deut. 31:15τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ τοῦ τεκατειχί ἡ προγενεσθε τοῦ τεκατειχί ἡ προγενεσθε.

— an interestingly irregular example: the negative Absolute-Definite Future is here illustrated as (a) sub-categorized ("carried on") by the Conjunctive, a rare phenomenon; (b) included by ἐρωτο—(rare as well), (c) included by ἐρωτο— in a final construction (very rare).
The Decalogue: Deut. 5:18ff. ΝΝΕΚΕΡΝΨΙΚ ΝΝΕΚΑΣΤΕΒ ΝΝΕΛ-
ΣΙΟΙΤΙ ΝΝΕΚΕΡΜΕΟΡΕ ΣΑΝΕΚΨΩΡΗ ΣΕΝΟΤΜΕΟΡΕ ΝΝΟΤΑ ΝΝΕΚΕΡΠΕΙΘΡΙΝ ΕΤΣΙΓΙ ΜΝΕΚΨΩΡΗ ΝΝΕΚΕΡΠΕΙΘΡΙΝ
ΕΠΝΙ ΜΝΕΚΨΩΡΗ... — the Greek negated Future, and not μη ου, renders here the “Divine Negative Imperative” (and not an especially emphatic command / prohibition).

(2) Locutive: Divine Promise:

Gen. 19:22 ΗΙΝ ΟΥΝ ΜΜΟΚ ΕΕΡΕΚΝΑΡΟΕΚ ΕΜΑΤ ΝΝΑΨΑΕΜ-
ΔΟΜ ΓΑΡ ΕΙΡΙ ΝΟΤΓΩΒ ΝΑΤΕΚΨΕΝΑΚ ΕΩΤΟΝ ΕΜΑΤ — this is a nicely paradoxical locus: declaration of Divine Inability!

Gen. 18:31 ΝΝΑΤΑΚΟΟΕ ΕΘΕΖΙ-Κ.

(3) Oath-taking, adjuration (Divine Partner):

Gen. 31:49f. ΕΓΕΝΑΤ ΝΑΕ-ΨΙ ΟΤΩΙ ΝΕΜΑΚ ... ΝΕ-ΑΝ-ΝΝΕΚ-
ΘΕΕΙΟ ΝΝΑΨΕΡΙ ΝΕ-ΑΝ-ΝΝΕΚΣΙΓΙΜΙ ΕΘΕΝΝΑΨΕΡΙ.

Gen. 42:15 ΨΕ-ΝΟΤΖΑΙ ΜΨΑΡΨ ΝΝΕΤΕΝΨΕΨΝΤΕΝ ΕΒΟΛ
ΤΑΙ...

(3) Conversion of the Absolute-Definite Future

The Absolute-Definite Future is convertible, albeit in a very restricted manner. In a taxonomic sense, we may consider the unrestricted conversion of the Contingent-Indefinite Future (ναι-, below) to be the “active” suppletive correspondent for the Absolute-Definite one, while the reduced convertibility of εφε- may be attributed to its syntactically inert nature, to its built-in sequelling syntactic properties (somewhat like the unconvertible “Clause Conjugation” forms) and perhaps also to its prevalent “Divine Word Grammar” absolute nature, rather than to any inherent atemporality, modal essence or qualities.

(a) Relative: attested only in certain restricted syntags (cf. ANDERSSON 1903:62ff.; POLOTSKY 1960:400):

(1) in Topic of Cleft Sentence — always allocutive: -πε ετεκε- or ετεκε-

Ex. 3:14:15 ΠΑΙΡΨΙ ΠΕ ΕΤΕΚΕΔΟΣ — adverbal Focus, sim. 26:17.

Ex. 20:9 Ξ ΝΕΓΟΤ ΠΕ ΕΤΕΚΕΓΡΨ ΜΜΨΩΣ — nominal/ad-
verbal Focus Ex. 19:3 Ν ΠΕ ΕΤΕΚΕΔΟΤΟΣ - pronominal Focus;
sim. 20:22, Num. 23:16.

Ex. 22:30 ΠΑΙΡΨΙ ΠΕ ΕΤΕΚΕΑΙ - nominal focus; sim. 26:24.

Deut. 20:20 ΝΕΩΟ ΕΤΕΚΕΟΡΨ.

Deut. 6:13 ΠΤΣΕ ΠΕΚΝΩΤΙ ΠΕΤΕΚΕΓΡΟΤΙ ΔΑΤΕΨΗ ΝΕΩΟ
ΜΜΑΤΑΨΙ ΠΕΤΕΚΕψΝΨΙΨΙ ΟΤΟΟ ΝΕΩΟ ΠΕΤΕΚΕΣΧΟΜΚ ΕΡΟΨ
ΟΤΟΟ ΕΚΕΨΡΚ ΜΨΕΨΡΑΝ - nominal/pronominal Foci; note the coor-
dinated subcategorization by the unconverted Future.
(2) In expansion of Theme in Nominal Sentence:
Ex. 23:22 ΝΑΙ ΜΕ ΝΙΚΑΙΙ ΕΤΕΚΕΔΩΤΟΤ...
Deut. 19:4 ΦΑΙ ΜΕ ΝΙΟΤΑΡΑΓΗΝΙ ΕΤΕ-ΕΠΕΨΩΝΙ ΜΠΙΡΕΨΩ-ΤΕΒ.

(3) Negative: rare. Negative generic “cannot”, “does not by nature…” (cf. the negative Aorist, below). Appositive (the actual antecedent ΦΗ or ΦΑΙ).
Gen. 32:13 ΜΦΡΗΤ ΜΠΙΨΩ ΝΤΕΦΙΟΝ ΦΗ ΕΤΕ-ΝΝΕΨΩΝΨΙ.
Deut. 28:50 ΟΨΨΟΛΟ ΝΑΤΨΨΙΤ…ΦΑΙ ΕΤΕ-ΝΝΕΨ∆ΟΨΥΤ ΕΠΟ ΝΟΤΨΕΛΛΟ.

(b) Circumstantial.
In our variety of Bohairic, the Circumstantial converter is systematically zeroed before syllabic nasals, that is, before negative conjugation-forms (below, Chapter Four; see SHISHA-HALEVY 1994:226ff.); this, with the fact that the conjunctival use of ΝΝΕΨ- with ΞΕΧΑΣ is absent in the corpus, makes the Sahidic conditioned Circumstantial in ΞΕΧΑΣ ΕΝΝΕΨ- out of place in Bohairic. However, there are in our corpus quite a few loci where the Circumstantial converter — always zeroed — structurally exists before the affirmative ΕΨΕ- and negative ΝΝΕΨ-:
Gen. 1:6 ΜΑΡΕΨΨΨΙ ΝΞΕ-ΟΣΤΑΓΡΟ...ΟΤΟΡ ΝΤΕΨΨΨΙ ΕΨΕΨΨΨΡΑ ΕΒΟΛ... (Greek ΕΣΤΩ ΔΙΑΧΨΡΙΤΩ).
Ex. 34:7 ΦΑΠΙΝΙΨΤ ΝΝΑΙ ΟΤΟΡ ΠΙΑΛΗΨΗΝΟΣ ΟΤΟΡ ΕΨΑΡΕΓ ΕΟΣΘΕΨΜΗΝΙ ΟΤΟΡ ΕΨΙΡΙ ΝΟΤΝΑΙ ΨΑΡΑΝΨΟ ΕΨΩΛΙ ΝΝΙΑΝΟ- ΜΙΑ...ΟΤΟΡ ΝΝΕΨΤΟΤΒΟ ΜΦΗ ΕΤΟΙ ΝΕΝΟΧΣ.
(ANDERSSON 1903:62 “eigentlich e + ΝΝΕΨ-, partizipial aufzufassen”; but the Greek has καί οὐ καθαρεῖ).
Num. 23:9 ΕΗΠΙΠΕ ΙΣ ΟΥΛΑΟΣ ΕΨΕΨΨΨΙ ΜΗΑΖΑΤΨ (but Greek ΜΟΨΟΣ ΚΑΤΟΙΚΗΣΕΙ)
Lev. 25:6 ΟΤΟΡ ΕΨΕΨΨΨΙ ΝΞΕ-ΝΙΓΕΝΗΜΑ ΝΤΕΠΙΚΑΡΙ ΕΚΕ- ΎΣΟΜΟΤ ΝΕΟΚ ΝΕΜ ΠΕΚΒΨΚ (Greek ΕΣΤΑΙ ΒΡΨΜΑΤΑ ΣΟΙ).
Lev. 26:6 ΟΤΟΡ ΕΙΕΤ ΝΟΨΨΡΗΝΗ ΓΙ∆ΕΝΠΕΤΕΝΚΑΡ ΟΤΟΡ ΕΡΕΤΕΝΕΝΚΟΤ ΝΝΕΨΨΨΙ ΝΞΕ-ΨΗ ΕΝΟΨΨΨΨ (Greek καί οὐκ ΕΣΤΑΙ...).
Lev. 23:7 ΕΨΕΨΨΨΙ ΝΩΤΕΝ ΕΨΕΜΟΣΤΨ ΕΡΟΨ ΔΕ-ΨΟΤΑΒ (Greek ΚΛΗΤΗ ΑΓΙΑ ΕΣΤΑΙ ΨΡΨΝ).
Deut. 20:8 ΟΤΟΡ ΕΤΕΟΥΤΨ-ΤΟΤΟΤ ΝΞΕ-ΝΙΨΨΕΙ ΕΨΕΑΖΙΝ ΝΕΜ ΠΙΛΑΟΣ (Greek ΠΡΟΘΨΗΣΟΥΣΙ... ΛΑΛΗΣΑΙ).
Ex. 28:35 ΕΨΕΨΨΨΙ ΝΞΕ-ΛΨΨΗΝ ΞΕΝΨΨΨΨΕΨΨΨΨΙ ΕΤΕΨΨΨΨΕΤΕΜ ΕΤΕΨΨΜΗ ΕΨΨΧΨΟΤ ΕΞΟΤΨΝ ΕΨΕΨΨΨΨ...ΝΕΜ ΕΨΨΨΝΗΤ ΕΒΟΛ (Greek ΆΚΟΨΤΗ ή ΦΡΨΗ ΑΥΤΟΤ).
Lev. 11:2 ΝΑΙ ΝΕ ΝΙΤΕΒΝΩΤΩΙ + ΕΡΕΤΕΝΕΟΣΟΜΟΣ is difficult (= Vat, but Greek Relative): the delimiting punctuation mark may be a clue, but does not rule out the adnominal Circumstantial.

Ex. 34:2 ΥΨΩΝ ΕΚΕΙΣΤΩΤ ΝΨΨΡΩΝ ΟΤΩΡ ΕΚΕΙ ΕΨΨΨΙ ΕΧΕΝΠΙΤΨΩΝ ΝΤΕΚΙΝΑ ΟΤΩΡ ΕΚΕΙΟΙ ΕΡΑΤΚ ΝΗΙ ΜΜΑΣ (Vat ΕΚ-; Greek γίνονται έτοιμος) is different, for here we have a Stative Rheme with ΕΚ-. So too in:

Deut. 28:33...ΕΚΕΙΣΘΟΥ ΝΣΘΟΝ ΕΚΘΩΤΠ... (Greek έση άδι-κούμενο). This last passage was understandably condemned by Funk (1992:25), but historical evidence (Winand 1996) supports this “hybrid” form, and I suggest we wait for further evidence. (A possible case is also Lev. 11:26 [Vat Circ. Present]).

(4) The Absolute-Definite Future in conjunctional-final construction (very rare).

ΔΕ-ΝΝΕ-

Lev. 10:7 ΝΝΕΤΕΝΙ ΚΑΒΟΛ ΜΨΡΟ ΝΤΣΚΝΗΝ ... ΔΕ-ΝΝΕΤΕΝ-

ΜΟΣ.

Deut. 17:15f. ΝΝΕΚΨΔΕΜΖΟΝ ΝΕΡΟΤΡΨΜΙ ΝΨΕΜΜΟ ΝΑΡ-

ΧΨΝ ΕΨΡΨΗ ΕΨΨΚ ... ΕΘΨΕ ΔΕ-ΝΝΕΨΡΨΕΨΟΝ ΝΤΩΙ ΝΑΙ ΟΤΩΡ

ΝΤΕΨΤΨΑΕΟΝ ΜΠΙΛΛΟΣ ΕΨΡΨΗ ΕΧΨΜΙ ΔΕ-ΝΝΕΤΕΝΟΥΣΨΤΕ-

ΨΝΗΝΟΥ ΕΝΑΣ ΕΨΑΜΨΙΤ ΔΕ.

Obs.

(1) The final / consecutive constructions are connected in the corpus with the functional status of the Conjunctive as a “that”- form, so different from Sahidic. Consider (ΔΕ- + Conjunctive, consecutive) Ex. 3:11, Deut. 30:13 and of course γίνα (not ΔΕΨΑΣ).

(2) In Deut. 13:17, 20:18, Lev. 6:15, Gen. 12:13, 3:22, 27:12. In Nitrian, NT and OT corpora, the Sahidic-like constructions are far more usual. Final ΝΝΕ- De Vis I 76; ΔΕ-ΝΝΕ- ibid. 32, 89, 90; “lest” De Vis II 206; ΔΕ-ΕΨΕ- De Vis I 60, II 22; ΔΕΨΑΣ is uncommon.

(e) The Contingent-Indefinite Future (ΨΝΑΡΨΘΕΝ): Present-based “Tempus Instans”

(1) This form, an extension of the Present-tense matrix, is sharply opposed to the Absolute-Definite Future in its semantic and formal-syntactic-parameter characterization:

• [- SEQUELLING]. [- APODOTALITY]
• [- AUTHORITATIVENESS]
• [- DIVINE INVOLVEMENT FACTOR]
• [- ABSOLUTE VALIDITY] — of relative, reserved, limited validity
• [- TELICITY]
• [+ Temporality]
  • [+ Contingence] in the sense of “the quality of uncertain and circumstance-conditioned occurrence”
  • [+ Undertaking]
  • [+ Volitionality]
  • [+ Instigator/Locutor/Actant Involvement/Intent/Hope/Engagement]
• [+ Questionability] including Assertive-Focal (“Rhetorical”) Questions
  • [+ Instigator/Locutor Orientation]
  • [+ Affect/Modality]
  • [+ Sensitivity to agent Interpersonal Sphere] the interlocutive locutive-allocutive perspective or sphere of reference (even with a delocutive referent): this is rephrasable as
• [+ Deixis (interlocutive)]
The form is / is characterized by
  • Distinctively protatic case-raising (“fallsetzend”)
  • Unbounded-situation eventing
  • Anchoring in speaker’s Present
  • Hesitant tone: unmarked for ineluctability
  • Detailing, specifying Aktionsart
  • Dynamic (processual) Eventing. Detailing. “Microfuture”
  • “Indefiniteness” (non-specificity)
  • Basically locutive-allocutive (interlocutive) perspective.
  • Freely subcategorizable (“carried on”) by the Conjunctive
  • Syntactically active (not inert)
  • Compatible with _within, ephir,  שלה
  • Freely compatible with specific time-indications
  • Freely compatible with modifiers
  • Freely included or embedded (e.g. by [eborough] שלה-)
  • Compatible with Presentative.getOrElse (1c)
  • Compatible with topicalization (esp. pronominal  algun)
  • Compatible with interrogation, Rhetorical Question, Modality Question  פורא;
  • Compatible with Focalization and focussing Presentation
  • Compatible with Augens
  • Compatible with explicative environment
  • Compatible with protatic (1caleigh) and with apodotic environment
    (when apodotic, it is marked by 1e; in apodosis, the two Futures are strikingly in opposition)
• _Minus/plus habens_ agens / instigator/ partner status irrelevant.

• Compatible with Response

• Compatible with unrestricted conversion

• Disjoinable by _τε_

• Juntcurally unmarked.

Obs.


(2) Contrary to general opinion, it is the _να-_ Future that lends itself to affects and modalities, whereas the Absolute-Definite one is “impassive” and detached; the Contingent-Indeinite Future is detailing and circumstance-sensitive _Aktionsart_-wise, as against the complexive Absolute-Definite Future. This opposition, which in a sense resembles the one between the contingent and inherent nominal predications (ος _να-_ vs. Nominal Sentence, respectively; see below, Chapter Two), is entirely “value added” above the Future tensing in the Greek original.


(2) **Compatibilities:**

  temporal adverbials:

  _τνοτ _(_ραπ, _δε, _ον_): Gen. 47:4, 19:9, Ex. 9:15, Num. 24:17

  _τνατομοσ_ _οσον_ _τνοτ_ _αν_.

  _ον_ _τνοτ_ Gen. 24:50.

  _νηπι_ _ςεντθαιοι_ _ντεπαεξορε_ Ex. 11:4.

  _μπαινατ_ _νακτ_ Gen. 29:18, Ex. 9:18, 10:4.

  _ν-νεγοτ_ _μμογι_ Ex. 5:3.

  _ετθαν_ _μπαμοτ_ Deut. 32:29.

  _ετι_ _ραπ_ _κε-ς_ _νεγοτ_ Gen. 7:4.

  _μφοοτ_ Deut. 20:3.

  _μαενατ_ _δε_- Focus Ex. 10:7.

  Interrogative/presentative/protatic environment:

  _αν_ Ex. 16:4, Num. 14:30, Deut. 8:2.


  _zero_ interrogative marker Ex. 5:16.


  _εννηπε_ Ex. 7:17, 8:17:25, 10:4, 14:17, Num. 25:12.


  Explicative environment:


  _οτρ_ _ραπ_ Deut. 2:5:19, 4:22, 18:12.
(eābe) ἔ inclusion, Gen. 44:34, Ex. 4:1, Deut. 5:25, 32:43.
Augens.
Gen. 31:5 τὰ ἀδικοῦν.

(3) Conversion: unrestricted⁸³.
(a) Relative:
All constructions, all persons (e.g. Gen. 18:17, 20:13, Deut. 5:31; Gen. 19:19, Ex. 4:15:17, Num. 23:13, Deut. 5:31; Gen. 44:9:10, Ex. 12:10:15, Lev. 22:2, Deut. 5:27).
Note especially the protatic-role “case-raising” ἐπιθ/πραξία ἐτοι, often and typically combined with “apodotic” ἐπιθ-, which is after all the “official” law-setting form (e.g. Gen. 6:21, 44:10, Ex. 12:10:15, 18:20, 19:12, Lev. 4:4, 7:27, 18:5(!), 22:6, Num. 6:16, 22:35).
(b) Circumstantial:
All persons (e.g. Lev. 23:43; Gen. 35:1; Gen. 20:9, Ex. 33:22, Lev. 22:29).
(c) Focalizing Conversion (Second Tense):
all persons (e.g. Gen. 3:4, 34:23, 37:36, 43:16, Ex.10:26).
(d) ἐτοι- (e.g. Gen.31:27).

(4) The Locutive (Speaker, 1st-person) Sphere
The speaker’s personal axis, perspective and sphere, anchored in the speaker’s pragmatic here-and-now, is the most typical and prevalent; the difference, even in the case of a Divine “Speaker”, between the Present-based declaration of personal disposition and the Divine Numinous Word is well demarcated semantically — the Contingent-Indefinite Future is not marked for Divine involvement (and the locutor is not typically divine), while it is marked for intent-oriented future action. Typical environmental semantic features, in English resolution equivalents:

*foreground locutivity factor:*
“l'm going to…”
“l intend to (see to it that)”, “l mean to”.
“I’m willing/prepared/disposed to…”
“I promise/undertake to…”
“I’m disposed to…”
*Background locutivity factor:*
“l saw to it that…”, “l’ll see to it that…”
“I know/believe that…”

⁸³ ANDERSSON 1903:62 suggests explicitly that ἐπιθ serves suppletively to convert ἐπιθ- (cf. Deut. 17:16 ἐπιθ ΝΑ- ἐπιθ ἐτοι ἐπιθ...).
“You’ll see that...”
“If I wish, then...”

(a) Affirmative — declared will, disposition, design or intention:
Gen. 7:4 eti gar ke-ζ negos η naini nosoph nkatalkosmoc ekenpaki — Divine instigator and intent, precisely timed by temporal adverbial.

Ex. 11:4 nephi sensori senthawm tepaniexwpp η nai...
Ex. 19:9 ghippe anok η nai gapor...
Ex. 7:17 ghippe η namiwi sensoriywbt...
Ex. 23:20 ghippe η naiotwrp mpaaagelos daswkk.
Ex. 9:18 ghippe anok η nagwos egrhi daswkk sim. Ex. 16:4.
Ex. 8:25 ic ghippe anok η nagnwenni ebal kitotk sim. Ex. 3:13.
Ex. 16:4 ghippe anok η nagwos nwtan napanwik ebal sensor.
Ex. 33:14 anok eγanomowi das&Wk oror η nat-emton nak.

Ex. 2:9 anok de η nat ne mpébexe.
Num. 22:17 η natatok gar emaww oror nh eteknawto ση η naiotwrp nak.
Ex. 32:33 teknatotwr oror teknacotomw.
Ex. 33:19 anok η nacini daswkk.

Deut. 4:22 anok gar η namow... — the Coptic for “I’m dying” (“je meurs”)?

Ex. 33:1 pikaγi etaiwprk mmoq nabraam nemicaak nemiaakwβ eiaβ mmos de-η nathiq mpetenazroa.
Num. 12:8 η nacadi nemaq nro otuβero.
Num. 14:12 η nashari erwot oror ntatakwet.
Num. 14:19f. (xa-γnobi mpailaoq naq ebal...) η naxw nwot ebal katapexcaβi.

(b) Assertive-Focal Formal Questions — affirmative:
Gen. 41:38 μh teknacem-otpwmh nəpaimτ.
Gen. 37:10 gara senohi tekna anok nem tekmwv nem nekenwos nteñosowyw mmoq.

(c) In Response — affirmative and negative:
Gen. 19:2 μmon alla teknamton mmon gipwteβ sim.
Num. 13:30.
Gen. 29:8 teknacemxom an wantingoswot τ nax-e-nima-
negwot τhrou nttokcerker mpwini...
Gen. 38:16f. η naiotwrp ne nosmac mbaempi.
(d) *In apodosi*, including post-imperatival-slot apodosis — affirmative:

The opposition *ephe-* vs. *-na-* is here especially striking:
- *-na-* is not marked for sequelling;
- *ephe-* is absolute, impersonal, detached-objective, marked for sequelling;
- *-na-* expresses will, intention etc.

Ex. 8:17 ἔσωπ αὐτός τοὺς ἀκούστεν ἐστιν ἐφεβοῦς ὡς ὁ Ἰωάννης ἔρθη εἰς ἥν ἔδωκ ... 

Ex. 24:12 ἀνοίκε ἐπεξείρησεν ἦτορ ἤκουν ἤγει στιλη 

Nak nganpaase ṉwini.

Num. 22:34 ἄνοιξεν ισχυρὲς ὀνεῖρα ἃν ἄναταιεο. 

Num. 20:18 ἀνεκεῖνε ἐβολήν γίγαντο εἰμὶ ἀναπαυσ ἄν 

Nak egepak.

Deut. 12:20f. "τῆς ἀνάστασις ἐν θυσιαστηρίῳ τῶν ταύτων ἐστὶ...ἐκείνου ἀν — an instructive example, sharply confronting and contrasting the personal with the impersonal-detached categories of Futurity.

Deut. 2:27f. ἡ ἀνάστασις ἐβολῆς περίπλοκα θνητοῦ ἐνι-

Nak εἰσιναμένη ἡ ἀνάστασις ἐν κακίᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἀν — another interesting example, illustrating (a) the switch from Contingent to Absolute Future concomitant with the personal-sphere switch, (b) the sequelling role of the Absolute-Definite Future regardless of person.

Ex. 32:33 θνητεροματικὸς ἐρώτησε ἀπὸ ἀναφοτήσει ἐβολήν εἰσαζόμενοι ἡ ἀνάστασις ἐβολήν εἰσαζόμενοι.

(e) Negative (+ affirmative) — refusal:


Ex. 21:5 ἄνακτορσε ἀντὶ ἐγώ ἐν ἀν ἐκείνῃ ἐν ἀν ἐκείνῃ. 

Num. 23:20 ἄνακτορσε ἀντὶ ἄναταιο ἀν. 

Num. 16:14 ἄνακτορσε ἀν. 

Nak egepak.

Num. 13:31 ἄνακτορσε ἀν. 

(f) Focalization cases (not Focalizing Conversion).

Deut. 9:6 ἐκείνη ἡ κόσμου ἡς ἐν ἑωβε-τεκμεθηνι ἁν πατε 

Nak egepak, ἄν...

Deut. 18:12 ἑωβε-τεκμεθηνι γάρ ἀν πατε ἀναφοτήσει ἐβολή.

(g) Some striking or typical lexical compatibility environments:

ἡσυχασέως ἃνακτορα ἀνεκεῖν (Greek Fut. τελευ-

τῆσαν)

Gen. 30:4 ἡρμηρῇ ἢ ἢ ἐν πατε ἄνακτορον ἐβολή (Greek Pres. ἀποθήκης).

Gen. 50:24 ἀνεκεῖν ἄνακτορα δενοτεθνίνει ἢ ἡ τετε 

ἐρωτεμένε (Greek Pres. ἀποθήκης).
Gen. 48:21 ἔγινεν ἄνοικ ἦν Ναμοῦ (Greek Fut. τελευτήσω). Ex. 12:33 ἄνοικ τῆρος44 τενναμόν (= Vat; Greek Pres. ἀποθνήσκομεν).

Deut. 4:22 ἄνοικ γὰρ ἦν Ναμός δεννακαρι οὐσος ἡ Ναερσκινιόρ ἰν Μπιοράνας (Greek Pres. ἀποθνήσκω).

Allocutive cases: Gen. 20:3 ἄγινεν κακὸν κχαμοῦ (Greek present).

Delocutive apodotic cases (see below): Gen. 33:13f. (If I rush them...)

κεναμόν τῆρος (Greek Future).

Gen. 44:22 εὑσπὶ δὲ ντεκα-πεκιωτ ζηαμοῦ (Greek future). Note the contrast with the resultative Absolute Future in Ex. 11:4-5 ἦν...οὐσος εὔημον Ναε- (= Vat) (Greek Future).

ϝενα-: mostly 1st plural. Interrogative, responsive, Presentative.


Gen. 22:5 ἄνοικ δὲ Νεμπιαλοῦ τενναγεναν Ͻαμναί.

Ex. 3:18 τενναγεναν ὅτι Ν-τ νεγοῦ Μμούγι sim. Ex. 5:3:8, 8:23.

Ex. 10:9 ἄνοικ τενναγεναν Νεμνενέσελῳρι Νεμνενέσσελοι...

Ex. 3:13 ἔγινεν ἄνοικ ἦν Ναγεννής Γανεσγις Μπις.

Num. 13:30 Μμον ἦλα Σενοσιε τενναγεναν εὑσω.

Num. 13:31 τενναγεν εὑσωι αν.

Num. 14:40 γίνεν κακὸν τενναγεναν εὐπτωτοι.

Deut. 1:41 ἄνοικ τενναγεναν εὑσω.

Gen. 44:34 πως γὰρ ἦν Ναγεννής εὑσωι Γαναϊωτ...

Gen. 46:31 ἦν Ναγεννης Νταταμε-Φαρω.

Especially interesting in this connection is the differentiation of the Future ζηαμᾱ and the actual-prospective reference of ζηαμοῦ “he is coming”. It would appear that this verb stands outside the ζηα- vs. εὐκ- opposition, unlike the deictically different ωμα-, but the opposition between the two forms is unclear to me (the Greek fluctuates between Present and Future):

Locutive: ἦν Ναμοῦ, τεννησοῦ.

Num. 10:30 ἦν Ναμοῦ ἦν κακὸν εὐσων Ναγεννής... (= Vat) “I'm not coming, but I shall go...” (Greek Fut.).

Num. 16:12 Τεννησοῦ αν (= Vat) (Greek Pres.).

As against

Num. 20:18 ἦν (Greek εξελεύσομαι).

Num. 16:14 τενναί εἰρηνί ἄν (= Vat) (Greek Pres.).
Delocutive: ζνήσω + Adverbal.
Gen. 24:13:43 σενναστ εβολ εμαψων (Greek 13 Pres.; 43 Fut.).
Gen. 41:29 γηππε ἢς ξ ηρομπι ηνενοτη σενναστ ενα-
ψων δενπκαζι τηρη ηνηητι (Greek Pres.) — not fatidical
(which would be ευε-), but oneirontical, a grammatical distinction
as crucial as the one between Dream Narrative and “Reality Narrative”
(see above).
Ex. 18:15 αντι ζνηστ εαροι ξε-πιλας (Greek παραγί-
νεται).
γηππε (ις) ζνηστ + Adverbal (γηππε ις for true Speaker’s
here-and-now perspective):
Gen. 48:2 γηππε ις ιςιςεφ πεκκωρι ζνηστ εαροκ (Greek
Pres.).
Ex. 18:6 γηππε ις ιςορ πεκκωμ ζνηστ εαροκ (Greek
παραγίνεται).
Ex. 9:3 γηππε ις οτζιςα ητπος ηνοτ ιερη εξεν-
λεντεβνωτι ετζεντκοι (Greek ἐπέσται) — note that the Pre-
sentative is here revealed to be of the same category as οτον-/-ηνον,
preceding the non-specific οτζιςα.
Ex. 7:15, 8:16 γηππε ηςορ ζνηστ εβολ ηξε-πιμωσ (Greek
ἐκπορεύεται).
The periphrastic ηςορ ε- expresses “be about to…”, always in pro-
tasi (?):
Ex. 1:16 εμμπ αετενσαυτη ηςορ εμεςει-ηςεβρευς
αασαμι ετζεμςι… (Greek ὅταν μαίοουθε τὰς Ἑβραίας καὶ ὁσιν
πρὸς τίκτευν).
Ex. 30:20 αασαμαστητι ει εςοτν εμζκκης…
While the verb in μοωι ε- is a lexically loaded descriptive
(Aktionsart) auxiliary:
Gen. 25:32 τζμοωι εμωσ (a calque of the Greek πορευομαι
τελευτἀν?) and
Gen. 26:13 ηαιμοωι εαιαη πε (= Vat) (Greek προβαίνων μει-
ζον ἐγίνετο).
Different still is the case of ηαιμνοτ η- + INFINITIVE: gradual
Aktionsart.
Gen. 7:17 οτορ ηαιμνοτ (i.e. πιμωτο) ηαιαι εμαψω γι-
ζεν-πικαζι (Greek καὶ ἐπληνθονθη τὸ ὅφηρ).
ηζενκαμ (always formally or contextually-virtually negative):
Present reference.

Num. 13:31 ἀντάξεσώμενος αἰν ὀτε-παίεινος.
Ex. 1:9 τίναξεσώμενος μμαται αἰν εὐαι μμωτων.
Gen. 29:8 τίναξεσώμενος αἰν γαντογεσων αἰν να-νι-
μανεσων τηρον ντοσκερκερπινι.
Deut. 7:18 πως ἀντάξεσώμενος νησοτο εβολ.
Assertive-Focal ("Rhetorical") interrogation: "how can I?" = "I can-
not":
Deut. 1:12 πως τίναξεσώμενος μμαται εὐαι μμωτων,
cf. 9 τίναξεσώμενος μμαται αἰν εὐαι μμωτων.

(5) The Allocutive (2nd-person) Sphere

This is strikingly rarer than the locutive perspective. Note however
the same compatibilities as those specified above; note also the fre-
quency of queried, hypothetical, doubtful, hopeful or conjectured Future
modalities:

Gen. 20:4 οὖσοι οὐτεμι ουφος νεμθι χνατακον ("I can-
not believe that...").
Gen. 24:42 ιεξε χνακοστων-παμωτ ηπα τὸνο επιμωθι
γιατυ.
Gen. 37:8 τι θεομοτοσεπ χναερ-ουπο εγρι εδων
ιε θεομοτοσεπ χναερ-ουπο έπον.
Ex. 5:16 θασει επεκαλος ουν ηανος.
Gen. 42:36 ιωςιφ θοπο αν ειαμενιθ ηθον αν ηετεναναθ
επεκεβηακιαίαν...
Num. 14:30 αν-ηετενακεσων πεν εδων επικαζι... —
God’s oath.
Deut. 8:2 εορεθεμι... ᾿αη-αν-κηαρηκ εηεογετολιη χαν-
μωθον.
Gen. 20:3 γηηπηε νηοκ χναμων.
Gen. 42:15 θενθαι τετενακουνε έπολ.
Deut. 3:27 αναθ νεκβαλ θε-καρηζηινιορ αη ηπαιορ-
δανιε.
Deut. 31:29 τημι γαρ θε-ετιαν ηπαμοσ τετενακεπα-
μωθ.
Gen. 44:29 επωπ ουν αρετενακουια μπαιχετ έπολ
γαναγο... τετενακελ-ηαμετηεελο εαμεντ θεομοτοκα
νηθ.
(6) Delocutive reference
Again, this case is relatively rare. In fact, most examples still show interlocutive syntagmatic or pragmatic anchoring or embedding or perspective, e.g. with an interlocutive object actant or circumstantial; "I know/say/claim that..." is, for instance, a typical locutive anchoring environment. The interlocutive deixis is thus usually present. Conjointly or alternatively, these delocutive na-Future clauses are marked as explicative by ἢε-, rαp; or as addressed (or deictically proximal, pragmatically allocutive); or as assertively "rhetorically", interrogative again, pragmatically allocutive; or as apodotic (also post-imperative). Some delocutive cases express a possible ("might happen") or potential scenario:

Gen. 29:32 ἡνος ναμενπιτ.
Gen. 49:29 ανοκ σεναχατ.
Gen. 43:7 μη νανεμι ανον πε δι-ναδος ναν... — sim. "I know that..." cases: Gen. 18:19, Ex. 3:19.
Ex. 8:22 ευσων ῥαπ ανωνσετνιβοτ τενεπεμνχμι μποσεο σεναξωνι εδων.
Gen. 44:31 ευσων αρωνασ ερον μπιαλον νεμαν αν νανοσ οτορ νεκαλωτι σεναλεκτελελο μπεκα-λον...
Gen. 3:5 σεναςοιμ ναε-νετεβαλ τετενηαρμφηρτ νγαννοτ.
Ex. 5:10 σεναττω β νωτν.
Ex. 4:1 σεναδος γαπ νηι.
Ex. 4:14 αρωνασ εροκ ωναρωυι νηρι νηητι δι-δενοταζι ωναζαζι — apodotic.
Ex. 11:9 θαρω ναωτεμ ναεννοτ αν.
Ex. 19:13 σεναςετ-ωνι σεναςελκ-κοενεο.
Deut. 9:6 εκεμι δεθε-τεψμεθμι αν πςε νανι-καγι εενανεο νακ.
Ex. 10:7 θανατ δι-οτον-ερον ναωπι ναν.
Lev. 9:4ff. (addressed) νηρι δεθουου πςε ναοντογι... οτορ ωναςονι δενεννοτ δι-οτον.
Num. 14:3 εεβεοτ ωναολεν δι-πςε εβοταν επικαγι...
Num. 14:8 οικε δεςωτι μμον δι-πςε ωναολεν εβοταν επικαγι...
Deut. 32:7 ωενεκικωτ οτορ ωνασμοκ νεκελλοι οτορ σεναδος νακ.
Deut. 32:43 οὐνομ ημῶν οἰοςον ημπεξὶας οτος
μαριστὸν ονομ ημῶν ημενιαξηλος τηρον ητεφη λε-
σαι ημπεξιω ημενον ητενεψωρ.
Deut. 5:25 οτος ηνοσ ημποτε ητενον δε-ημανκ-
τεν εβωλ ημε-ηαινιω ηνξρωμ.
Gen. 33:13 (If I guide them...) ηεναμορ.
Num. 14:41 πετεινωτι ηαεωτοτεν ην.
Ex. 4:8f. ευωπ δε ητοωτεμνατ ηποκ δενσμον ημι-
μινι ηγοτι ηενανατ ηποκ δενσμον ημιμοι ηεμα-
βι.
Num. 22:4 ηνοσ ηαεωταναγωνη ηαειεξη-ην ηητοτ ηεκωτη
ερων...
Ex. 1:10 ...οτος ησβανβωτε ερων ηεναχεωτον εβωλ
ηεφεπηκαζι.
Gen. 18:14 ηηοτ-ονοταξι ηεερ-ητηκοορ.
Ex. 33:16 πως εναωπη εκσωτον εβωλ ηταςμοι ηε-
εικιμι ηνοτμον ηναγρακ...
Num. 23:19 ηηηαιρι ηεν...ηενακαζι.
Ex:16:4 επσειηασσηντος δε-ηαν-ηεναμοι ηεαν-ηεμον.
Num.16:22 (if one has sinned, ) ηα-ηαησμη ηεντ-
ηεσαλωρη εητρ.

For ηα-Future statements explicating, specifying and detailing pre-
ceeding εεε- statements, see below.

(f) Absolute-Definite and Contingent-Indefinite Futures Combined/
Opposed

Here is a stylistically and poetically important phenomenon, which
must be considered a stylistic/rhetorical figure. The evident structuring
indicates that this is no less than a macrosyntactic (textual) patterning.
(In fact, these figures serve to corroborate the functional statements
made above about the respective Future forms):

1. ηα- > εεε-: ηα-: chain-opening; typically locutive.
   εεε-: sequelling, follow-up, dénouement, summing-up.
also used to achieve a crescendo rhetorical effect.
Examples (selected from among many others):

Gen. 7:4 ετι γερ κε-7-εγοοτ ηαιηη εηταξια οτορ εειεη-
ηενεψωρ ημικα.
Gen. 4:14 ικεε ηαιριητ ημφοοτ εβωλ γαπρο ημκαρι οτορ
εειηπη εβωλ ... οτορ εειεωπη εηιαρομ...
Gen. 40:13 ετι κε-ηεγοοτ ηαιερφμετι ηαε-ηαραου ητε-
καρκι οτορ εεεκακ ... οτορ εκετ ... οτορ εεηηη ηεηηηκ...
οτορ εεηηερ-φμετι ... οτορ εεεηεη ...
Ex. 3:18 σενασώτεν ζενάπεκαρτοσ οτορ εκεσσενακ οτορ εκεζοκ...

Ex. 4:14ff. γνηπε τεότι ζηνοτ εβολ ερρακ οτορ ζενάπαρεν αξόρι ζηνάρας ζέλυρι ζήνητη οτορ εκεζοκ ζαν οτορ εκετ ζνακάζι εζοτι ζερφι.

Ex. 8:17ff. γνηπε ανοκ ζνασωρπε ερρι ζαξωκ... ζοταζ ζοτισορ οτορ ετεμορ ζηξε-ζηνον ζεπιζίμεζημι εβολ ζεννιαζ ζοτισορ... οτορ ειετζωτ ανοκ ζεπιζζοοτ ετεμαζ θπικαζι θρεζεμ...

Ex. 8:25 ζηςαζεμι εβολ οτορ ειετζωτ θμιζ (Vat zero + ειετζω).

Ex. 10:4f. γνηπε ζναζι θπαλθαζ θρεζι ζοτιζεζε ερρι εζηζηνεκζιν θηροτ οτορ εζζεφωθε θηζο θπικαζι.

Ex. 11:4 ζερρι ζεπιζζοε θπεπλεξζωρα ανοκ ζναζι εζοζι ζενζομιζ θαμι οτορ ετεμορ ζηξε-ζαμιζθζι θεζεν ζενζηζηζι θαμι.

Ex. 13:19 ζεζουζζι ποζε ζαζζι ζερτζεν οτορ ζερετζηζελ θπαλζζ εβολ θα πεζθμεν.

Ex. 14:17 οτορ γνηπε ανοκ ζναζερενζθ θμεραθ ζωζ ζεμπιζζομζμι ερρι οτορ εζζεθοθ εζοζι εζζαζ ζμμωζ οτορ εζζιζωζορ ζερρι ζεζεραθ...

Ex. 33:19 ανοκ ζναζιζ ζαξωκ οτορ εζζεζαζ ζεζεραθ θμιζεζ θπεζκμεζη.

Lev. 18:5 θαι εθεζθρζμι θζζιτζο θζζεζζ. θα.

Lev. 10:3 ζναζοτζζ ζεζζη εθζεζ θζοι οτορ εζζεζωζ ζεζζζζζζζζ θεζζ. θα.

Num. 10:30 ζνιοζ αν αλλα εζζεζζζι (δεμ. 14:31).

Num. 14:31 ζναζλοζ εζζοζ επικαζ οτορ ζεζεθκαζξομιζ θπικαζι...

Deut. 11:31 ζεζεζεζζζζινορ θπιζαζζζζζζζ ζεζεζεθθζ

Deut. 32:41 ζναζερετζζζζ θζοζ... οτορ εζζ αμοζι ζοτζζα εζζε-θαζζάζ οτορ ειεθεζζζ ζναζαζαζ.

Deut. 31:16f. γνηπε θζοζ θζζζκτζ... οτορ ζκαζθζ ξζε-θεζαζ ζκαζθζ θζζζζ οτορ ειεθζομ οτορ ειεθζ.

Deut. 31:29 θεμι γαρ ζε-ζεζθ αμοζι ζεζεζεζζζζζζζ οτορ ζεζεζεζζζζζζ εβολ... οτορ εζζ εζζοζ εγезε-θζον ζεζε-ζηζον ζηξε-ζηζεζζζζζ... 

Also Gen. 18:19, Ex. 16:4.
(2) ἐφε- > να- ( > ἐφε-).

να- a “Micro-Future” explicating/specifying/detailing a preceding ἐφε- “Macro-Future” statement:

Gen. 41:40f. ηνοκ ἐκείσκπι ἐξενανθή ... γῆπε ἔνακω μὴου ἐξεντπκαρ θηρ τυχπτεν. 

Lev. 26:6 ὅτος εἰετ ὀνορπηκὴν ἐξἐντεπεντκαρ ὅτος ἐρέτενενκοτ οὐνεφσκπι Νὔ-Φή ετνοσπμ ὅτος Νιεηρο-πιον ετφων ἔνακων ἐνακκψν.

Ex. 19:12f. σεναονοτ ἐεκμοτ σεν-γανώνι οεαετ-μων ερο ἐσενανκονένα κενεζεκ-κοενένα ερον.

Ex. 7:3f. ἄνοκ δὲ εἰεθεγεθητ ἑφαρν νψοτ ὅτος ἔναρσαφαίι ὅτος ναφθρὶ ἐνεκαρι νυχμὶ ὅτος νεκεκετεν ηναονσοτ ἑφ-ἴφαρν ὅτος ἔναρι Ναφπεκκόδε ὅτος εἰενεκάκαζον (sic) παλαοο νεκροὶ μπικα εβολ ... ὅτος εεκμεν τηροτ Νὔ-νερεκπκί με-ἄνοκ πὲ πνε ἐκεκετεν Ναφπεκκόδε ενεκθκ — this is a particularly instructive example, with a sophisticated interplay of the two Futures, in a double ascending contour: the last Absolute-Definite Future is certainly the culmination of a dramatic rhetorical buildup. Consider also Ex. 3:20ff.

Obs.

(1) Cases like Ex. 32:34 ἔνατ δὲ ναοεκακότορ细心 εἰκωτ ἕκασῳ παλαοCSI ...

(2) The alternation of the two Futures in the prophecy of Daniel 8:19ff. (ed. Bardelli) is instructive — the presented Contingent-Indefinite Future opens the subtext, and then replaces the Absolute-Definite Future for modified and thematized prophetic predictions: γῆπε ἄνοκ ἔναται ... εἰεκτσημ ... ἐκεθεσαρ ἐν καθακ ... ὅτος εεκορ ... εεκεδαι. Consider also the whole of Chapter Eleven.

(3) French “Écouté maman, je vais mettre ma pêlerine avec le capuchon et Lili prendra celle de Paul” (Pagnol) illustrates nicely both the personal shift and the sequelling/superordinating factor.

(3) Gen. 34:11-12, 15, 16 (generally = Vat) is perhaps the most literally striking and instructive, if difficult instance, bringing home conjointly (a) the neutralization of the interlocutive/delocutive parameter in the Absolute-Definite Future, (b) the difference in tone, perhaps modal-
ity between the two Futures — Jacob’s sons using the confident, unconditional Absolute-Definite Future, Sichem the hesitant, even fawning, tentative, suggestive Contingent-Indefinite Future — and (c), the detailing, specifying Aktionsart role of the Contingent-Indefinite Future against the complexive Aktionsart of the Absolute-Definite Future:

Sichem: ἐπιστάσανθεν οὗτος τεναθθικ ... οὗτος ερετινοῦς ντιαλούς οὐκ οργίζει...  
Jacob’s sons’ deceitful ruse: ἅπειρα εἴεινι μμωτεν οὗτος ενεψυτι ζενηθοῦ ... οὗτος τεναταίρης ημωτεν + τενασικείμἐι ... οὗτος ενεψυτι ζενηθοῦ ενεερμάθρφτ οὐστενοὰς οτωτωτ.

Note Sichem’s recycled version (verses 22f.), reporting this conversation, emotionally involved(?) in the Contingent-Indefinite Future: μονὸν ἅπειρα κεναινὶ μμων ... μονὸν ἅπειρα μαρενινὶ μμωτοτ οὗτος ενασωπινὶ νεμαν.

(4) Some cases of striking paradigmatic oppositions of the two Futures:

Gen. 29:32 ἀκε-τοτον οναμενπιτ locutive, naming explication
Gen. 49:29 ἀκοὶ κεναξατ... θομκτ
Gen. 13:17 ἀκε-τατικὶ νακ expressive and specifying
Gen. 46:31 ἀκαρένῃ γνταταμεθφαραω locutive, intention

Gen. 30:20 ἱσπόγα ζεναπιχοτον οτετινοὶ εκεμεπιτ: non-explicative (sim. 29:34)
Gen. 50:5 ερετενομκτ reported recycled instruction
Gen. 13:15 εηεθῆκη νακ solemn declaration
Gen. 45:28 εκεσκεμενὶ γντατατε ρεπομ μπατ- 
mero sequelling, relieved rhetorical exclamation, upon learning that Joseph is alive: “Now I can go and see him...”

1.2.5.2 The Present, Non-Actual Present and Aorist

(a) The Rheme in the so-called Coptic Present nexus pattern is, formally, a rhematic verb either the Stative — Static Converb — or the “adverbial infinitive”, “gerund”: the Dynamic Converb, homonym of the verb lexeme (“substantival infinitive”)85, the adverbiality of which is synchronically immanent86. The whole nexus is eminently comparable

85 For the term, its applications and related topics, see HASPELMATH and KÖNIG (eds.), esp. 1995.
86 Cf., for the immanence of adverbiality, the more marginal, but analogue case of ῆθες, an adverb-slot pronominal-cohesion Augens (SMISHA-HALEVY 1966a:171ff.) which is historically traceable to a prepositional phrase (τ-δρω). Cf. STRICKER 1962:46 §60.
to the English progressive (and, historically, to Goidelic and Brythonic Celtic periphrastic Present tenses). Since it is the only real Present form in Coptic, it cannot be simply characterized as durative or progressive. However, there are in Coptic instances of the Present used generically, as a Non-Actual Present tense, and formal features coupled with this reading; which raises a synchronic question of its relationship with the Aorist, and a diachronic one of the existence and history of the “affirmative generic” verbal feature.

Obs.

(1) On the adverbiality of the Present-matrix Rheme, see Schenkel 1978. Against Polotsky 1960:395 (“Within the framework of Coptic there is nothing adverbial about the predicative Infinitive and the Qualitative”; a statement not modified or retracted in 1990:216f., despite the synonymy of “der Adverbialsatz” and “das Präsen”; Polotsky evidently considers both lexical and “Present” “infinitives” identical, for the issue he finds in need of explanation is the predicativity of the latter), I agree with Schenkel, that the “infinitive is adverbial”, both historically and synchronically: in fact, it is not an infinitive but a converb. Its adverbiality is complex, syntagmatic-and-paragraphic. (This is by the way nice example for the multi-dimensional “holistic” profile of a grammatical element, with the diachronic dimension present in the structural synchrony, adding “holographic” depth to the synchronic systemic valeur). This is not to say that the Present-Rheme converb is synchronically — or ever was — really “locative” (pace Polotsky 1985c:21); the pattern itself is existential-statal.

(2) We have now, I believe, a good (albeit not final) discussion and documentation of the Generic Present in Demotic: Simpson 1996:141ff. (see Shisha-Halevy 1986a:118ff., 202f.). This is a distinct form, often or mostly homonymous with the Durative Present, and not a “use” thereof, pace Depuydt 1994:63ff. (cf. his n.48 on p. 64). Another aoristic “relict” in Bohairic (B4) Coptic with Demotic documentation is the participial eP- (Shisha-Halevy 1983:315f.).

(3) For the “durative” and generic use of the Present in Shenoutean Sahidic, see Young 1961, with a Present/Aorist variation and distribution thesis. My own findings point rather to a lexical-semantic factor of difference in Theme constituency for the opposition range: human agency in the Present, “natural” non-human (e.g. astronomical, plant, animal, Satanic...) for the Aorist.

(4) I use “actual”, of the Present, in the sense of “tense-specific and actualized by coincidence with a Speaker’s ‘now’”; and not as Marc Wilmet applies it in his brilliant study of the Scenic Present (Wilmet 1976a:9-40).

(5) Variation and variae lectiones of Aorist and Present are rare in the Bohairic NT. An interesting case is the Bohairic for “which is called...” and similar: έκκαθη τ ηρως (e.g. Mt. 26:36, Luke 2:4, 9:10 etc.) alongside μαρτυρης ηρως (etc.) Mt. 27:33, Luke 19:29, 26:3:14 v.l. ετωρ. Acts 10:1; with ονομμα translate, render” we invariably find the Aorist: (θω) μαρτυρης ηρως δε... etc. Acts 9:36, 13:8, 1 John 38:42 etc.

87 An additional example, with a striking contrast between the actual and the generic for the same verb, is NHC III 139 ΝΑΩ ΝΕΤΜΟΟΣΤ ΕΜΟΤ.
(6) Luke 7:8 is a nice example for the opposition of Present to sequelling Aorist within the [+ HUMAN] range: ἀκω μνοι ἔφαι ἐξαγγελάκας ἡθηται οἰκονομὸς οἰκον ὑμᾶς.

(b) The Aorist οὐμωτε / ΜΠΑΣΟΤΕΜ — a Coptic tense-form not matched by a special correspondent in the Greek — is formally and functionally complicated, by no means a "simple" generic tense (if generic tenses can ever be simple): see Shisha-Halevy 2003a, for the Aorist in Oxyrhynchite. οὐμωτε and ΜΠΑΣΟΤΕΜ diverge sharply, and indeed constitute two autonomous formal-functional verbal entities. Like the Absolute-Definite Future έκειωτε, the affirmative Aorist contains a sequelling syntactic component, probably associated with the diachronic conjunction or converter ἵν. As a matter of fact, I believe ἵν, from early Egyptian on but especially in Late Egyptian, to be a superordinating element rather than a coordinating one. Its sequelling role, prominent in the affirmative οὐμ — not however in ΜΠΑΣ — derives from this superordination. More than with most tenses, the asymmetry between the negative and affirmative "correspondents" is here marked. The affirmative Aorist is among the "newest" tense-forms of Egyptian-Coptic; it does not exist as a separate morphological category in LE. The negative ΜΠΑΣ-, on the other hand, is extremely old, and goes back, formally and functionally, directly and exactly to the O/ME negative generic ἃ ἑσμεν, well discussed by B. Gunn in his Studies in Egyptian Syntax (1924:110ff.). Functionally, the two could not be more dissimilar. Differently from οὐμ-, ΜΠΑΣΟΤΕΜ has a prominent "inability" and "impossibility" seme, with perhaps an "against nature" subseme; an emphatically negative ("by no means") quality, not unlike that of ΜΠΑΣ-, is also in evidence. Most significantly, ΜΠΑΣ (exceedingly rare in Nitrian) is, as said, not sequelling or ensuing like οὐμ-, although it does (like many other unmarked forms) occur apodotically to ΑΙΩΝΑΝ; unlike οὐμ-, ΜΠΑΣ often occurs initially in its cotextual unit.

The convertibility of the Aorist is limited. The relative of οὐμ- occurs in a few formalized fixed phrases, while the adverbial Circumstantial conversion of οὐμ- is rare or non-occurring; this, possibly related to the inbuilt sequelling role, associates the form yet again with the έκε- Future. The adverbial Circumstantial of the Aorist is very rare, if at

88 The OE and ME jw.f ἑσμεν is a complex periphrastic form, meaning "nexus in the Present" — the present occurrence and validity of a convert (Circumstantial ἑσμε): it is non-sequelling.
all attested. The Focalizing Conversion εὐδοκ- is well attested, 

νεὐδοκ- is not Evolution Mode narrative (see above). The conversion of 

μηδοκ- is similarly rare: its Focalizing Conversion is not attested (a fact arguably associated with the historical “emphatic” component of the form). 

νε-μηδοκ- is rare in Bohairic, and seems to be attested in Nitrian only\textsuperscript{89}. However, the Circumstantial is fairly common. Observe that it is the Relative Present, not the Aorist that normally occurs as Topic, pointing to the suppletive role of the Present.

Obs.

(1) Generic vs. “Episodic” Tenses. Gnomic, Generic and “Habitual” tenses. Genericity and Statives, in general: D\textsc{ahl} 1995; cf. especially 417ff. Coptic, like Hindi and Turkish (among other languages)\textsuperscript{90}, offers the opposition of a non-generic Present and a generic “Aorist”. The “Imperfect” tense is basically non-generic (D\textsc{ahl} 1995:419ff.; cf. R\textsc{uíperez} 1092 §275). See also D\textsc{ahl} 1995:420ff., 424 with reffs., on the relationship between generics and habituals, which are temporal generic sentences. The diachronic evolution of — in terms of primary/secondary functions — even diachronic “direction” is held to be “generic from habitual”; the “past of a general habitual” (our νεὐδοκ-). K\textsc{rieka et al.} 1995, esp. 36ff. Note in particular the role of actant categorization [+ NATURAL], with cases of [+ HUMAN] as “animal”, in the opposition of Aorist and Present in Coptic. I find good contrastive semantic definitions in S\textsc{mith} 1997:33f. “a pattern of events other than a specific situation [denoting] a state that holds consistently over an interval” for habituals, but “[generics] ascribe a property to a class or kind...the verb constellations of generic sentences are usually associated with dynamic situation types at the basic level of classification”. Gnomic, generic and omnitemporal (in English): D\textsc{elecrck} 1991:280ff. For French, K\textsc{lieder} 1987 on the semantics of habituals. (Ch. I on habituality and genericity — both, according to K\textsc{lieder}, subcategories of gnomicity, itself opposed to “episodicity”;

Ch. IV on habituals and “frequentatives”).

(2) On the Greek Gnomic Aorist, see G\textsc{ildersleeve} 1903: 244ff., not always really matching the Coptic Aorist; P\textsc{orter} 1989:217ff., 233ff. (NT Greek); R\textsc{udig} 1971 §231ff. (“faits itératifs permanents”, constituted by “un nombre indéterminé de répétitions du procès”); §237 comp. with the “historical Present”); R\textsc{uksbaron} 1988:245 n.14 and further literature (consider the apodotic ΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙIIId ΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙΙIIId quoted in R\textsc{uksbaron} 1988:412); C\textsc{omrie} 1990; H\textsc{offmann} 1983:4ff. on the Greek Present, Aorist and Future, the ἀπορριπτικός common to them and the Present as an “extensive” (παρατητικός) tense. See B\textsc{arr} 1981:4f. for the Modern Greek “Aoristic Present” (“indefinite, general non-past reference”, often futuric).


\textsuperscript{89} An instance is Mac., p. 160 No. 29 fgt. 3.

\textsuperscript{90} Cf. P\textsc{sichiari} 1908:188 “Il y a donc des coïncidences fortuites entre des langues qui n'ont entre elles aucun contact historique. Par exemple l'aoriste gnomique est très employé en turc osmanli...et n'a rien de commun avec l'aoriste gnomique ancien”, a nice insight encountered in a monograph on the grammatical independence of Septuagint Greek, by a Neohellenic philologist.
notes that a certain sequence which often appears in discussions of the ritual...is often found ‘ausserhalb des eigentlichen Rituals’. I call this ‘the aorist of assured result’. Its global aspect renders the aorist suitable for serving as the ‘pre-t’ tense in Old Indian (=time of reference; cf. Gonda, The Aspctual Function of the Rgvedic Present and Aorist, IV: ‘The Aorist of the Antecedent Process’).” It is worth considering whether the Coptic (and earlier Egyptian) Aorist, expressing the immediate desirable result of magical or medical procedures (“κατά τον τόμον” etc.), is not comparable. In Migron’s words “Operation p has been/is performed, (thereby) result q has been/is produced”. Note the definition of generic tenses as “naturally inevitable” or “essentially inevitable” (in DAHL 1995). The alleged future meaning of the Aorist (for which, see also the Gunn Papers in the Griffith Institute, Oxford, VII 63) must derive from this relative temporal quality.

(4) On genericity as a component of temporal (non-)specificity, see MUMM 1995: 170ff.; ANSCOMBE 1986a,b; HOPPER and THOMPSON 1980:251ff.

(5) The Aorist is not the only sequelling form in Egyptian. This is in fact a typologically important category in Coptic and pre-Coptic Egyptian: the Conjunctive (cf. SHIHAHLEVY 1995), The Absolute-Definite Future (above), Apodotic ἐκκατόμα (SHIHAHLEVY 1973); in LE, the Sequential Ἰῳ ὑπὲρ σάμα. Indeed, S. Groll’s “Non-Initial Main Clause” for LE, while leaning over too dangerously to translation-inspired terminology, must be decoded as “sequelling”.

(6) Tait 1977 claims sequelling function for the Demotic bw-jr base, which expresses “the result that will not follow provided one obeys an instruction given in the first half of the line...or provided one is the kind of person specified in the first half”.

(7) The special combination of the sequelling (syntactic) and generalizing (semantic) natures of the Aorist is not a matter of neutralization (pace DEPUYDT 1989:16ff.), since they are not anywhere in opposition. More importantly, Depuydt seems to mistake the quintessentially Egyptian syntactic feature of sequelling for semantic “contingence”. In fact, Depuydt seems to continue therein Polotsky’s “ein Contingens” of the Aorist (POLOTSKY 1985c:22) which is meant semantically, as a feature of “potential/uncertain occurrence” (almost synonymous with “Potentialis”). Polotsky seems to consider the apodotic role of the Aorist central and even quintessential (1990:194). Cases of non-generic/non-habitual sequentiality are legion (so CRUM’s marginal note on his copy of Stern’s grammar, at the Griffith Institute, Oxford, p. 218)91. On the other hand, Depuydt is way off the mark when he writes of the “implied condition” in the Aorist (1993:208ff.): this is trivializing, since a conditional implication is inherent in genericity itself, as indeed is potentiality, futurity and so on.

(8) GREEN 1987:89 (cogently reviewed by H. Satzinger in 1991 in BiOr 48:143-148) seems to have the sequelling retrodependence of the Aorist in mind when he defines its essential semantics as the “expression of a ‘fact’ in the form of a neutral (‘indicative’) statement which expresses the logical consequence or deduction stemming from the premise(s) expressed in the preceding statement(s)”.

(9) Extratemporality (KOSCHMIEDER 1965) is the Aorist’s main semantic distinctive feature; its habitual reference is usually contextual (see POLOTSKY 1959:460; YOUNG 1961: 118 n.17): I believe it is in essence a generic, not habitual form.

Incidentally, Depuydt’s treatment (1989:23f.) of ἐκκατόμα πε (and ἔκκατόμα πε, as if the personal parameter here is of no account) as “contingent future” is for me unacceptable, and underlines the pervasive confusion of syntactic and semantic consideration; πε superordinates here the future in apodosi.
(10) On the problematic conversion system of the Aorist, also historically, see Quecke 1979:441.

(c) The Aorist: token documentation

Somewhat surprisingly, the dialogic Aorist seems to be rarer in the corpus than the narrative one (see above). In narrative Comment and Evolution Mode, the affirmative Aorist most typically expresses explicative extranarrative information (Comment Mode, Omniscient Narrator’s Channel); non-specific action or marked inevitable resultative sequel in Evolution Mode; prenarrative cosmological reality (creation geographics):

Affirmative

(1) The Sequelling Aorist (in exposition)

Gen. 31:8 apodotic: ἐσθέναυσεν δὲ ἡμεῖς καὶ οἱ ἱδρυματίτες τὴν θέσιν ἡμῶν ἐσθέναν... 

Ex. 18:16 apodotic: ἐσθέναυσεν δὲ ἡμεῖς καὶ οἱ ἱδρυματίτες τὴν θέσιν... τὴν θέσιν τῆς ἱδρύματος πισταὶ ποιοῦσιν οὕτως τοῖς ἤθελοις... 

Num. 12:6 apodotic: εὐσέβὴς ἡμεῖς καὶ εὐσεβῶντας τὴν θέσιν τοὺς διδασκόντας... τὸ φόρον τῶν ἔργων ἡμῶν... 

Deut. 16:19 οὑσιν γὰρ ἔστησεν ἡμεῖς καὶ οἱ ἱδρυματίτες τὴν θέσιν τῶν ἱδρυματῶν τῆς ἱδρύματος (Greek καὶ ἔζησεν...).

(2) Habitual

Deut. 5:24 μακάριοι ἡμεῖς καὶ οἱ ἱδρυματίτες.

Negative: Impossibility

Gen. 18:12...εἰσὶν δὲ γενημάτων καὶ αἰτομάτων καὶ ἐκείνων... ἡμεῖς δὲ... (Greek Perfect: γέγονεν).

The temporal adverb here is interesting: probably not “this has not happened to me until now” (as in the Greek, unless the Perfect here too has a generic-potential role), but “this has not been possible for me so far”.

Gen. 29:26 ἐξελέβαντες δὲ γενημάτων καὶ αἰτομάτων καὶ ἡμεῖς καὶ οἱ ἱδρυματίτες τῆς ἱδρύματος (Greek ὡς ἐσθενοῦσα δεινοῦσα τῆς ἱδρύματος ἐσθέναν... ἡμεῖς καὶ οἱ ἱδρυματίτες — infinitive, expressing impossibility or rather formal negative obligation = prohibition).

Converted negative (Relative):

Lev. 11:47 ἡμεῖς... ἡμεῖς... ἡμεῖς... (Greek τῶν τοῦ ζωογονούντων).

Num. 20:5 πίνακες... οὐδεὶς... (Greek τῶν τοῦ ζωογονούντων).
Note here the combination with an existential statement, very different from the Present, in that it neutralizes the actual vs. non-actual (generic) distinction.

(d) The Non-Actual Present

As said, the Aorist is typically generic-potential, while the Present is — again, typically or rather statistically — non-generic, actualized, more specific. Yet I suspect the Present Tense is functionally more complicated and less monolithic than it is generally made out to be. The actual or statal Present is in Coptic generally taken to be representative of the Present *tout court*; this, I suggest, is erroneous.

The case for the generic, non-durative or non-actual (or better yet, non-statal Present), elusive like a hypothetical sub-atomic particle, is still frail, if striking yet rare cases like the Shenoutean Sahidic εἰσπνωτ (ed. Amél. I 276, II 33; cf. Funk 1978a:106 n.68.; Shisha-Halevy 1986a:125f.) are all there is to go on for establishing this formal entity (corroboration of which is now forthcoming from Demotic;) beyond doubt. Still, I suggest the Stern-Jernstede Rule may be broadly applied as a diagnostic. Being a prime symptom of durativity (Shisha-Halevy *ibid.*), its negation in the solid evidence-base of cases like “κοσμεμαχή”, i.e. the Present with a rhematic transitive converse verb directly attached expanded) to a zero-determinated nominal object — one of Jernstedt’s original exception sub-rules — is a powerful criterion: for while the zero determinator is here arguably the genericity marker for the whole syntagm, this is semantically not a neutralization of the actual vs. non-actual opposition: *it is non-actual only* (with the object actant overtly signalling this). Or, put more precisely, it has a generic reading. Obviously, for other constructions the actual vs. generic opposition is indeed neutralized in the form itself. The case of οὐσωμα is even more interesting: this verb occurs rhematically only in non-actual nexus (cf. the exclusion in some types of English of *want, wish, love…* from the progressive verbal pattern). So do of course certain movement-semantic lexemes (like εἰ, ἕκα, πωτ) where a Stative static verb represents both dynamic and statal verbal Rhemes.

Obs.

(1) I believe the historical existence of a formal/functional generic or non-actual Present has now been conclusively established at the Demotic stage by Robert Simpson (1996:141, §9.4, with references). It would seem this form was marginalized and almost ousted in Coptic by the Aorist, except for zero-article object cases.

(2) The “Antecedentless Relative” and “Adverbial” roles of εղ (cf. Shisha-Halevy 1975, 1976) appear to be cases of the Generic or Non-Actual Present, and may, I suggest, be taken as corroborating its existence.
(3) Bohairic seems to maintain the Present vs. Aorist opposition more carefully than Sahidic (cf. exx. in Polotsky 1990:196f.).


(5) The full case of the "violation" of the Stem-Jernstedt Rule and other diathesis features as symptomatic of the Non-actual Present still remains to be presented. Cf. also Browne 1978:248 and 1979:53 No. 13 ro 4 (+ ed.'s note, p.55f.). Cases like Shenoute ed. Young (Vienna 1993) 69 άριστω εμχτω εβολ "he has already died" are anything but rare.

(6) It is in the B4 Early-Bohairic John that almost all Bohairic instances of the formally marked cases of Circumstantial non-actual Present as complement of ορω are concentrated, in an impressive strength of documentation (kindly re-collated by the editor at my request): αιτω εικως 9:27; αιτω εικαςτη δια 19:22 (immediate object construction) and αριστω εμοις 19:33, αιτω εις 16:32 (infinite, not Stative, with intransitives). See Funk 1977:33 n. 49.

(7) A brief word on the pre-Coptic career and formal/functional details of the non-durative Present. The first indicative trait may be very early: B. Gunn (Gunn MSS V 74. The Griffith Institute, Oxford) ad Gardiner, Grammar §304, 2: "m replaces hr with intransitive verbs of motion" (Gunn's italics). See Collier 1994:60ff. on the distinction of grammatic ("aspectual") and lexemic homonyms of this element, and the different infinitive paradigms respectively following the two. I fully agree with Winand 1997:229 that the LE post-negator jwn3 can on no account be seen as a durative marker. What is needed is a generous collection of hr-converbs for intransitives at the ME and LE phases.

(8) For the famous correlation of a "partitive" object (cf. Coptic ε-κηος) and durativity or "impefectivity" in Finnish and Estonian, cf. Hopper and Thompson 1980:264f.

(9) See Young 1961 for a structural, corpus-based study of the specific value of the Shenoutean Aorist as opposed to the Present (animals incl. the Devil, inanimates, natural phenomena — the Aorist; humans — the Present). The Aorist in these cases is clearly not a "Potentialis", even in allegories or parables — for this see a nice instance in Behlmer 1996:106f. (the shepherd with the sheep and rams). In the NT, the Present:Aorist opposition must yet be studied. An especially intriguing case is εμωθος/ετωθος εποq vs. εμαθος εποq (e.g. Mt. 26:3:14:36, Luke 2:4, 9:10, 19:29 etc.).

Some examples:

Gen. 42:18 ςε-γαφ ανοκ δεγος δακεγη.

Observe that the opposition of Actual vs. Non-actual Present is limited to the dynamic conversational Rhemes; the Stative (as also the non-verbal adverbial) Rheme occurs in actual and non-actual semantics:

Gen. 6:20 νιγαλα τευχα (Greek πετεινος) the generic Relative Present.

Gen. 34:10 παρε ηοεεον νιπηεεμο.
Lev. 15:2 πεντετετελ εαεεμ.
Obs.

Another case where the non-actual Generic Present is arguably to be looked for is the "Koinzidenzfall" and the Performative, discussed above as essentially locutive. Somewhat paradoxically, this type of utterance is as a rule non-durative, although pragmatically actual and utterance-synchronous. Mumm 1995:175, 180ff. considers this a case of "pragmatic" specificity: it is in any case different from the syntactico-semantic type of specificity we associate with non-generic or deictic reference. Consider B. Gunn’s (1949) "synchronous Present" sdμm.n.f, certainly not durative, in ME. Cf. also two letters by Gunn to A.H. Gardiner (in the Gardiner Archive, the Griffith Institute, Oxford): AHG 142, 124.102 (24/11/34) and 124.58 (6/5/42). This phenomenon has to date not been studied for other phases of Egyptian.

Cases like ἔμει, ἔκος, ἔταν, ἔστωμ, while of course non-transparent (consider for instance Gen. 12:11, Ex. 10:26, 9:2, 3:19, Num. 20:14, Deut. 25:7, 31:29 etc.) are thus possibly non-actual. Consider:


Gen. 23:11 ποιηθεν ενεμαντεν μησταν μηος νακ.

Num. 12:13 Φεπ τεσρε μηοκ.

Gen. 24:5 λιβούμον εντασθεν κοκλει επικατε εθακ εβολ μεσταν.

Presentative cases — γηπειε c.c. (e.g. Gen. 5:5, 6:30, 24:13 etc.) border on, or have affinities with the Performative, and may also be non-actual (cf. “Here he comes”, “There he goes”).

1.2.5.3 The adverb-Rheme Present: a note on copular ἄν

This is a construction of outstanding typological significance, in a way a breaking out of the original mould, arguably even the evolution of an “IS” statal Copula, verbalizing the non-verbal adverbial-Rheme matrix — the oldest and, I believe, most important nexus pattern of Egyptian. Here our Bohairic diverges from the Greek original as well as from the Sahidic and a claim of external Indo-European influence can hardly be maintained. Moreover, this is a specific Bohairic trait, unlike the copular Stative οίν-, annexing noun Rhemes, which is common to all Coptic dialects. All these considerations make a precise and extensive study of ἄν (with other copular elements, such as ὅπο) truly indispensible — a study which is outside the scope of the present exposition (see more information in Chapter Two, §2.2.2). Rhematic adverbials may be mediated by ἄν in various environments and parameters:

Gen. 28:16 πεστι ἄν μπαίμα (Greek ἔστιν κύριος ἐν …)92

Gen. 47:1 γηπεεε εσείν ηεπκαίεν ηεκεμ (Greek ἐστιν ἐν…)

Gen. 47:6 ειν παρά ηεμήν ἄν μπορμηθο (Greek ἐναντίον σού ἐστιν).

Gen. 26:24 ἄν γαρ μεάκ (Greek μετά σοῦ γάρ εἶμι).

92 Greek ἐστι is expressed in Coptic also by ὅπο: Ex. 17:7 αν-πεστι ὅπο νησταν ὄς-μην.
Gen. 26:28 Μηνοσνατ ανατ άε-ναρε-ϕτ χν ημακ (Greek ὅτι ἦν κύριος μετὰ σοῦ).
Ex. 33:21 οτον-οτα μχ καροκ (Greek ἵδοι τόπος παρ' ἐμοί).
Ex. 23:21 παραν γαρ ετχν διάωθ (Greek τὸ γὰρ ὄνομα μου ἐστὶν επ' αὐτῷ).
But may also occur unmediated:
Gen. 42:35 ναρε-ϕμοσρ μπατ μποται πιοται ςενπες-
cok.
Gen. 18:9 ἵ επινυε σενδοντ ςεντακκήννη.
A tentative impressionistic statement may be made concerning the (at least partial) disparity of the adverbial list occurring as Rhemes in the respective constructions, but they seem to overlap (again, partially). Another statement may consider χν (typical of a Divine Locutor or Partner?) clearly marked as physically localizing, while zero (for we may in Bohairic take the absence of a copula in the slot in point as zero) neutralizes some distinction concerning the nature of rhematic localization in this nexus pattern.

1.2.5.4 The Imperfect in Dialogue

This issue is keenly interesting, in view of the zero vs. πε opposition discovered in Narrative (above, §1.1), and the fact that ναρ-, even in Narrative, is not concatenating. In fact, these questions touch the core of the theory of textemics, for we see that dialogic ναρ- is still relateable to narrative roles: 1st-person Locutive/Allocutive Narrative, and Dream/Vision Narrative.

(a) ναϊ/ν εμη γαρ (αν) πε: background:
Also Gen. 18:19 (God's reason for blessing Abraham).
Gen. 28:16 πση χν μπαμαι ανοκ δε ναιεμι αν πε.
Gen. 43:7 μη νανεμι ανον πε άε-κακος ναν άε-...
Gen. 3:5 (the snake to Eve) ναεμι γαρ, which has no πε (= Vat), is not difficult, for it is not a background.
(b) Reminiscence, record, history; Recycled Narrative: allocutive only?
— no πε:
Gen. 26:28 Μηνοσνατ ανατ άε-ναρε-ϕτ χν ημακ.
Deut. 25:18 πως ασορι ερατη οτβικ γιπμωιτ οτος ας-
ξαζει μπεκετ ... θεοκ δε νακγκρει οτογ νακοισι.
Deut. 28:62 ηνεβιαω άε-ναρετεοι Μηρην ποςιους
ντετφε ετεεξθπιος ... (Vat + πε):
(c) A special rhetorical topos:
ναρετεοι γαρ νωζεμο γωτεν πε σενπκαρι νχμι Ex.
22:21, Deut. 10:19.
Ex. 23:9 ΝΑΡΕΤΕΝΟΙ ΓΑΡ ΜΠΡΟΧΑΙΤΟΣ ΓΩΤΕΝ ΜΕ ΣΕΝΝΑΓΙ ΝΧΗΜΗ.

... ΞΕΝΑΚΟΙ ΜΒΒΚ ΜΕ ΣΕΝΝΑΓΙ ΝΧΗΜΗ Ex. 15:15, 16:12, 24:18: 20:21, Deut. 5:15.

Despite their allocutive dialogic guise, these are cases of an embryonic narration, represented only by its Comment Mode condensation, rather than dialogue. Or rather, they illustrate the overmapping compatibility of Dialogue and Narrative. They are neatly in contrast with the naming-aetiologological ναι- (no πε), truly focalizing, in

Ex. 18:3 (“γερσαμ”) εξάω μνος ξε ναιοι νεμναξωλι Σενναγι Νγεμμο.

(d) Ex. 1:10 ναι εωσ νατί-τοτος νεμ νη ετι οτινην (Greek προσεθήσονται και ουτοι προς τους ύπεναντιος) — this unique instance is interesting: The Imperfect seems to express here a hypothetical scenario.

Obs.
Ex. 16:3 ανοι εχεαν- πε is modal, and the Imperfect form conditioned.

1.2.5.5 The Preterite ακωτεμ in Dialogue: some problem highlights

Preterite or Perfect? It is easy to forget that ακωτεμ, the Narrative Carrier par excellence, also occurs in Dialogue. The first question to be asked is, whether we can find data to specify a formal definition for a reading of ακ- as Perfect (i.e. perfectum praesens), not Preterite; say, in locutive or presentative environment (Report being such a locutively marked sequence), or combined with τινος. Can we contrast — and oppose — the two in Bohairic Coptic? Or else, in such a passage as

Gen. 20:6 ανοις εως αιμι ΞΕ-ΣΕΝΟΓΧΗΤ ΕΧΟΤΑΒ ΑΚΕΡΦΗΙ εεβεβαί ιπτακο εροκ μπιακ εερνοι εροι εεβεβαί μπιακ εσί νεμας

we must reconcile ourselves to a merging neutralization of the two (kept distinct, in an opposition periodically neutralized and periodically renewed, throughout Egyptian diachrony, up to and almost not including Coptic)93. However, numerous cases of “nynegocentric” (“speaker’s-

93 The periphrastic Perfect, using the auxiliaries κης ερ-(Nitrian) or (B4, Pent.) οτω with the Circumstantial Present convorb has in my opinion not yet matured into fully developed Perfect tenses. (οτω is in all probability an alloform of οτως, the Coptic form of ως, the auxiliary of the Demotic periphrastic Perfect tense). See SHISHA-HALEVY 1986:119 n.43, RICHTER 1997/8; LAYTON 2004 §304f. does not refer to a perfectum praesens value of the Preterite, yet often translates the form by an English Present Perfect (he describes it as “past tense conjugation”).
here-and-now”, Damourette-Pichon’s term) may be read as Perfects (quite a few instances have a Perfect or a Present in the Greek Vorlage). Note especially Presentative occurrences of the Preterite, diagnostic Preterites in Leviticus, and Preterites with presental temporal modification:

\[ \text{γνώστη διά } \text{αγόρι } \text{Gen. 27:36, Ex. 3:9, 18:11.} \]


\[ \text{Num. 14:40 ἀνήρνομι.} \]

\[ \text{Gen. 27:36 αργεῖον ἐπὶ οἱ Φαῖνα Φαίοντα-θε} \]

\[ \text{Ex. 5:23 ικένηταις γαρ εἰσόην γαθαρακε ἐκατον ἄνω ... αργεῖον ἐπὶ οἱ Φαῖνα Φαίοντα-θε} \]

On the other hand, real Preterite cases have time-specifying modification, or are part of lists:

\[ \text{Num. 20:24 ἰκένηταις οἵον ἐκατον φαῖναν ἀνωτάτου ἱκένηταις} \]

\[ \text{Gen. 21:26 μπαίμει ... ὀτάξῃ νησίκας μπέκταις οἵον μπάιμει} \]

Obs.
The basic question here, of course, is whether the perfectal reading of αγόρι, triggered by environmental signalling, is due to an innate component, diachronically isolable, or to the environment alone.

---

94 RAUH 1978:9ff., 21ff. rejects the possibility of combining past tense with non-past adverbials.
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2.0.1 Basics of Coptic Rhematicity

The Theme and the Rheme are the basic constituents of clausal-scope information structure. They constitute the nexus terms: the Theme is the information base, a higher-*signifiant* of “what the nexus is about”, and the Rheme the higher-*signifiant* of “what is the message or point made about the Theme”. The nexus itself, the (inter)dependence of Theme and Rheme, is an additional, grammemic constituent, *signifié* of a copula (which is not always segmentally present in Coptic nexus patterns) or of the very contact of Theme and Rheme — a clause element that may be focussed, topicalized, queried or stated as (non) existant. Coptic has three nexus matrices or patterns, and one pre-nexal matrix:

- The (Pro)nominal-Rheme Pattern (“Nominal Sentence”): ΑΝΟΚΠΕ, ΦΑΙΠΕΠΙΝΟΜΟΣ.

- The Adverbial-Rheme Pattern, for specific Themes, predicking the Dynamic and Stative Converbs, in which case it is the “Bipartite Conjugation Pattern”; predicking the Contingent Future; predicking a class of adverbials: ἸΓΩΝΓΕΝ, ΘΟΝΣ, ΤΕΝΝΑΜΟΣ, ΤΕΝΝΓΡΗΙΓΑΡΣΕΝΝΕΝΝΟΒΙ.

- The Pro-Verbal Rheme (Verbal Nexus) Pattern predicing provental auxiliaries, expanded by and governing verb lexemes (“infinitives”), of nominal/pronominal Theme-actors: ΑΤΕΤΕΝΕΡΟΤΩ, ΕΚΕΧΩΤΕΝ.

- The Existential/Presentative Pre-nexal Clause, which introduces nominals into discourse so as to make them eligible for occurrence in the nexus patterns: ΜΝΟΝ-ΠΟΡΝΗΜΝΑΙΜΑ, ΓΗΠΕΙΚΓΑΝΙΜΑΛΗΣΕΕΣΜΟΥΙ.... This pattern serves to predicate adverbials and verbal converbs indirectly, of non-specific nouns or pronouns. Non-specific (“indefinite”) existants and presentates may be expanded by adverbials, or by converbs; the latter are by nature adnexal (rhematic), and supply an alternant to the Adverbial-Rheme Pattern, for non-specific themes.

Other nexus types (ΟΤΟΝΤΑΙ, ΝΑΝΟΤΑΙ, ΠΕΔΑΙ) are either derivatives or expansions of the main three, or “diachronic residue”, i.e. remnants of an earlier system of grammar.

The Focus and the Topic (not at all symmetrical) are discourse-referred or marked for discourse-“chunk”-scope roles, prominent landmarks in the information texture.

---

1 The remarkable similarity, in this as in so many other features, to Celtic is by now almost common knowledge, albeit still surprising, and still somewhat beyond the pale of scholarly discussion. See SHISHA-HALEVY 1995:131ff.; 2003b.
Obs.
(1) The theoretical issues associated with the information structure of syntactical units, from the utterance ("sentence") to the text, are complicated and extremely controversial. The literature on the problems of Theme-/Rheme conceptualization and terminology is vast, and I cannot in the present scope even begin to refer the reader to central discussions. See Shisha-Halevy 1986a:69ff. and references; Weigand 1979; Welke 1992 (esp. 32ff.).
(2) While the essentiality logic-oriented "Predicate" may be used as synonym of "Rheme", "Subject" should not, I believe, owing to its pervasive and still current association with the verbal nexus pattern ("verb clause") as the first argument or actant in the verbal valency matrix; "Grammatical Subject", an oxymoron, since "Subject" is no less "logically" conceived than "Predicate", is still very much with us, a nonsensical and ethnocentric terminological misnomer. This terminological asymmetry goes usually unobserved.
(3) On the verb as a naxal pattern, in general-theoretical and Semitic view, see Goldenberg 1998 — a brilliant essay which ought to be a cornerstone of any grammatical theory. Needless to say, this alone collapses the traditional Parts-of-Speech model.
(5) Thematicity/rhematicity and nucleus/satellite status are compatible: witness the Circumstantial, Conjunctive and n- Rhemes (the last also "object-actantial"). See Barri 1978:263f.

2.0.2 Existence. The Statal-Existential Nexus Pattern.

Existence and Presentation, treated in some detail below and in Chapter Three as reduced-determination environments for noun determinators, must be briefly discussed here too, in the context of rhematic nouns and naxal matrices. Existence, unlocated (absolute) or located, basically atemporal\(^2\), is in Coptic not verbal\(^3\), nor, in point of fact, at all naxal; it is marked by the prefixes ότον- (affirmation of existence) and μμον- (affirmation of non-existence). Needless to say, the fact that ότον-/μμον- is often a translation of εἶναι in the Greek Vorlage, or are typically translated by the "be" set of forms in English and other West European type languages, hardly sheds a descriptive light on its nature and structural identity in Coptic. ότον- and μμον- form a pair of sui generis, asymmetrically associated atemporal clauses\(^4\) that, in

\(^2\) This accounts in part for such hybrid constructions (ότον + Nom. Sentence) as Gen. 39:2 νεότον-ορφωμιν πε ειφιατι (Vat ne-).

\(^3\) Its synchronically non-verbal nature is also symptomized by peculiar actantial properties: consider Gen. 40:17 νεότον ναητη πε εβοα δεν νη ηνοτω ευαρε- ρητονοφ θαιρω ότομοτ.

\(^4\) The Stative Converb ωοπ, expressing a verbal type of existence (ψωπ άν Gen. 42:36), enters a present-tense nexus pattern.
macro-syntactic view, actualize and introduce nominal “Existants” and “Non-Existants” into discourse. These nouns are neither rhematic — οτόν does not predicate a noun — nor is οτόν-/μμόν- itself a Rheme.

Absolute (Non-)Existence is well attested in the corpus. Non-existence seems in this case to be more common than existence:

Num. 21:5 μμόν-ωικ οτόνε μμόν.

The existential locator slot (if any) — of restricted adverbial commutability: mainly μμάρ and a few prepositional locatives, many of which mark possession — is as a rule adjunctal (occasionally, adnominal), not rhematic:

Num. 20:2 νεμμόν-μμόν πε ζεν-†σναργνη.
Num. 22:24 ...ετόν-οσοβτ ςάμναὶ νεμ οσοβτ ςάμναὶ.
Deut. 32:12 μμόν-κενος† νυεμμο νεμμόν πε.
Lev. 11:21 ...ετεόν-θβι μμόν.
Lev. 11:23 ...ετεόν-κτο μφατ ερμον.
Deut. 21:18 ευομ θε ετόν-οσυωρι ιντεινα.
Gen. 24:22 γανλεων ννοσβ ετόν-οσκιν† ιον επιοσαι πιοσαι μμόν.

However, the converses (specific adverbial verb-forms), typologically very important in the history of Egyptian⁵, are, when formally adjunctal to the statement of (Non-)Existence, and, in point of information structure, always rhematic. In pre-Coptic Egyptian, they could also be adnexal (adjunctly rhematic) in other environments. This status is in Coptic expressed analytically, by the Circumstantial conversion of a rhematic verb; but in Coptic too the rhematic verb itself is probably adnexal — adnominal to a non-specific existant of οτόν-/μμόν-. These are, by the same token, grammaticalized to copular (in the sense of nexus-mediating) status, annexing non-specific Themes with converbal (statal) Rhemes in a real, if periphrastic, nexal pattern.⁶ The Coptic converses are of two types — eventual or Dynamic (rather rare in combination with existence and non-specific Themes) and Statal (Stative) (for some reason more common; including the Future auxiliary ηα-):

⁵ A verbal category typical of Egyptian-Coptic (esp. ME and Demotic-Coptic) as it is of Celtic: cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 2003b.
⁶ It may be that οτόν focusses its Existent, so as to render its thematicity (in nexus with a verb) lower than a regular definite Theme; where the definite Theme is anaphoric, the “existential Theme” is cataphoric.
Gen. 47:13 *Nemnon-coto de wop pe.*
Ex. 10:4 *Oson-erop nashwpi.*
Gen. 23:6 *Mmon-xai Mmon taφno mpexm2at eboλ zarpok.*

It is important to remember that these rhematic converbs are still locations of the Existential, and not direct nexus constituents; also, that even here the existential role of *Oson-* and *Mmon-* is operative. Even here, we still face the impossibility of directly predicking an adverbial of a non-specific noun or pronoun, a phenomenon encountered in many languages and transcending genealogical and typological boundaries, one that sets adverbial predication apart from other Rhemes. Adverbial predication of non-specific Themes is represented as the location of an Existential Statement.

2.0.3 Presentation

(a) The elements *γhππε* and *1c*, extremely common, usually but not always triggered by Greek ἰδού, mark Presentative clauses which have a marked affinity to Existentials: indeed, they are “Deictic Existentials” (never negative). We encounter a wide variety of constructions, of which the majority is in Dialogue (see Chapter One, for narrative focussing by means of Presentative signals). The actual forms found in the corpus are three: *γhππε, 1c* and *γhππε + 1c*, with the original Greek an undifferentiated ἰδού; *1c γhππε* is extremely rare in the corpus; *1c* occurs, preposition-like, before absolute, extraposed or topicalized or thematic nouns, and is incompatible with extraposed pronouns or pronominal forms of the verb — the actual differentiation is thus of *γhππε vs. 1c vs. γhππε 1c*, before specific nominal Topics, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presentative: Non-Specific Noun/Pronoun</th>
<th>Noun/Pronoun Topic/Theme/Focus (noun specific)</th>
<th>Nexus, <em>Oson-</em>/ <em>Mmon-</em> (adv. may precede)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>γhππε</em></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>γhππε-1c</em></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>1c-γhππε</em></td>
<td>+ (-)</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>1c γhππε</em></td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *1c* does not precede a personal pronoun.
The opposition is thus in fact only between ις and γιππε ις. Generally, proclitic ις- (rarely alone, usually as γιππε ις-) introduces all kinds of noun-initial constructions; γιππε pronoun-initial ones, including nexus patterns with pronominal Themes. Sahidic, on the other hand, opposes εις to εις-γηhte εις — both before nouns only —, while εις-γηhte (no γηhte alone) occurs before pronouns or nœnal constructions. Bohairic γιππε ις is not bound in closest juncture (again, unlike Sahidic εις-γηhte).

Functionally, the Presentatives, compatible with the Present, Future and Preterite tenses, occur mostly in hic-et-nunc allocative environment, but are also encountered in narrative as highlighting (narrative focusing) exponents. In dialogue, the Presentative-marked Preterite (γιππε ας-) seems to be a true perfectum praesens, with cases of Perfect and Present in the Greek Vorlage. Other observed roles of the Presentative exponents are: Performative or Synchronous Present ("Koinzidenzfall"), including "Divine-Intervention" Performatives; Response; imminent action; assertive or expressive (focussed) Allocutions, marked allocutivity ("you know, for your information"), incl. prophetic pronouncements; diagnostic observation; preceptive superordination ("at that point the priest shall observe..."); narrative backgrounding; narrative tableau superordination; dramatic narrative highlighting7; superordinate narrative episode introduction; Narrative-Peak Focalization; Dream Narrative introduction; nexus focussing. Note the frequent Presentatives combined by ορογ with ης and ξονς.

Obs.
(2) LAYTON 2004 §476ff. is the only one to treat Sahidic εις alongside the existentials. Bohairic differs from Sahidic in the relative order of the two Presentatives (Sah. εις γηhte etc., unlike Bohairic, also concording - γηhte, γηhne) which makes for a marked difference in the Presentative construction between the dialects (the only instance of the inverse sequence in the corpus is Lev. 13:21).

No less than twenty-seven formally and, to a degree, functionally discrete Presentative constructions are observable, as follows (the Greek has ιςού unless differently specified):

(1) γιππε + Pronoun: Response to Address:

(2) θήππε ει + Specific Noun: presentative Allocation:
Ex. 24:8 θήππε ει πιενου.
Gen. 30:3 θήππε ει ταβωκι βαλλα.
Gen. 31:48 θήππε ει παιταλ νεμ ταιτραν.
(3) μη ει [...] αν + specific Noun/Pronoun + Present (Greek ουκ ἵδοι): focalization of nexus (by means of Assertive-Formal (“Rhetorical”) Question):
Ex. 4:14 μη ει απων πεκον αν πελετήθης ἕβωσων...
Gen. 13:9 μη ει πκαζι τηρη χν μπεκμεο αν.
Deut. 11:30 Βατ μη ει ναι αν γίμηρ μπιορανεμς (ον).
(4) θήππε ει + NOUN εφ- / ελ- / να- (affirmative): signalling narrative focalization, strikingly in Dream or Vision Narrative (see Chapter One), through protagonist’s or dreamer’s eyes: internal contextualization; 8 presenting a narrative tableau; superordination:
Gen. 22:13 αυνας θήππε ει ουεσωσ εσταγνο μμο ενενεταν ηνεσσωμαν δε-ςαβεκ.
Gen. 29:2 αυνας θήππε ει ουσων ηναξι δεντκοι.
Gen. 37:25 δεζεμκι δε εουωμ θήππε ει γανικαραλιθς ετμωσι...
Gen. 18:2 αυνας θήππε ει η νρωμι νατοι ερατον.
Gen. 28:12 θηππε ει οιμορκι εσταξωντε δεπικαζι οτοι ηπενιαξγελος ητεθ η ιανοι επεμπι η ιανηοτ επεχον εηςτε πε.
Gen. 41:19 θηππε ει κέζ νεπε ιανηοτ επεμπι σιμ. 41:6.
Gen. 15:17 επιδε κε νεπια ηρωπι μηρι πε ουσω λαυσπι θηππε ει οθεριη εοι νκρεμτε νεμ γαναλμπας νκρωμ εαθενι δεναμενητ ηνοκαμα ετθυν.
Gen. 31:10 αυνας ννβαλ ηρακου θηππε ει νιβαρνητ νεμ νιωτι ιανοι ερπι εδενειςων νεμ νιβαεμπι να- ηοτοσμυ πε οτοι νατοι ιανοσοναν νεμ δοηα περκπι ετηοε.
(5) θηππε + να- (affirmative): superordinative Narrative-Peak Focalization (see Chapter One):
Ex. 34:29 εωσ δε επηνοτ επεχον νε-μωρχς εβο ενεπιτων νκια οτοι θηππε ναρε-τπλαξ ινιοτ η εδενεξδη ημωρχς.

8 Fillmore’s term. The Circumstantial, adnexal, recalls in these cases the French thematic relative in presentative cases such as “La voilà qui arrive”: see LAMBRECHT 2000. The Imperfect, a specific narrative focalization tense, alternates here with the thematic Circumstantial.
Gen. 19:28 ἀγνασ ὅτογ γηπε ναψνοσ εφωι νάε-οὔως — focalization through protagonist’s eyes.

(6) γηπε + εγ-: (affirmative): preceptive “scenario”:
Lev. 13:6 ἐγενασ ερον νάε-πισθν ... ὅτος γηπε εφοι

(7) γηπε + εγε-: Absolute Future: preceptive superordination (“at that point the priest shall observe...”):
Lev. 13:20 γηπε εγενασ νάε-πισθν...

(8) γηπε + {ἀνοκ} + Present, affirmative: locutive/allocutive dialogue — Performative or Synchronous Present, incl. Divine-Intervention Performatives (all persons); allocutive instruction scenario; locutive Report (incl. delocutive pronouns):
Gen. 25:32 γηπε ἀνοκ ἔρωι εμοσ.
Gen. 28:15 γηπε ἀνοκ ἔρι ἐμακ.
Ex. 7:15 γηπε νεον ἡνοσ sim. 8:16.
Gen. 32:18 γηπε νεον γώγ ἐμανεγνι.
Gen. 32:7 ἁνι γανσατ γηπε νεον ἡνοσ.
Gen. 16:11 γηπε νεον τερβωκι.
Also Ex. 6:30, Deut. 11:26.

(9) γηπε + {ἀνοκ} + να- Future (affirmative; see above, Chapter One): locutive/allocutive imminence (also in apodotic superordination).
Gen. 48:21 γηπε ἀνοκ ἐναμον sim. Gen. 20:3 (Greek Present).
Num. 25:12 γηπε ἀνοκ ἐνα ... sim. Ex. 16:4.
Num. 14:40 γηπε ἀνον τεναμεναν επιτωοτ...
Ex. 10:4 γηπε ἀνοκ ἐναινι αἵναρ νακτ ἡνοθγε
Ex. 8:17.

(10) γηπε + ἀνοκ + Preterite (rare): narrative background (?)
Gen. 27:6 γηπε ἀνοκ ἀκώτεμ επεκιτ εφακι νεμ

(11) γηπε + (Adv.) + Preterite, affirmative and negative: Allocation (perfectum praesens); diagnostic observation; 1st-person Narrative.
Num. 24:10 γηπε ἐνακτομεν ακσμον ...
Num. 22:32 ὅτογ γηπε αἰ ...
Num. 23:20 γηπε ἀεργτης νεμοτ ...
Deut. 26:17 γηπε μφοοτ ακσωττι μήτ (no Greek correspondent).
Num. 17:27 γηπε ἀνουτ εβολ ὅτογ αντακο.
Deut. 17:4 ζηππε ταφανι αρωμη.
Deut. 5:24 ζηππε αρταμον ...
Gen. 37:9 ζηππε αιναι αεκαρακοτι.
Gen. 42:2 ζηππε αικωτεμ αε ...
Gen. 48:11 ζηππε μποτωνεγ ζηππε αφι ταμοι - a rare instance of negative nexus.
(12) ζηππε ιε + Specific Nominal Topic + Preterite (affirmative; negative only in the diagnostic-observation case). Diagnostic observation; superordinative narrative episode-introduction; dramatic narrative highlighting; Allocution (perfectum praesens):
Deut. 19:18 ζηππε ιε οτσεθε ιερον αρτωνη.
Ex. 3:9 ζηππε ινο τινασου αιπνωουρι ινιελ ααι επαξωι ζαροι — ζηππε ιε not in close juncture.
Gen. 38:13 ζηππε ιε πευωμ αραλνη.
Ex. 14:10 ζηππε ιε ιπεμνηνιμι αεωουτι (no Greek correspondent).
Num. 12:10 οτογ αφειναι ζενας εβολ αφακηνι οτογ ιε μαριαμ ακωκ νεειτ...αξοσουτ νζελαρων εμρι εζε
μαριαμ οτογ ζηππε ακωκ νεει.
Num. 25:6 οτογ ιε οτρωμι ... ακι ιεπεκνομ.
Lev. 13:32 οτογ εκενατ νκε-πιοινθρ οτογ ζηππε ιεπε
κωμ εβολ νκε-πιοισεμ — note the negative nexus, exclusive to the diagnostic presentation.
Gen. 27:36 ινο τιε πακεςομ ακρημ.
(13) ζηππε + Present/να- Future (affirmative): Allocution; diagnostic observation; in the 1st person often Performative or Synchronous (when Coptic-να- corresponds to a Greek Present):
Deut. 1:10 ζηππε τετενοι μυοου μμηντι ινιειοτ ιε-
τιε.
Deut. 26:3 ζηππε ινοτωγ εβολ μυοου (no correspondent in the Greek).
Ex. 23:20 οτογ ζηππε ιναοσωρι μπαλγελος.
Num. 24:14 οτογ ινοτ ζηππε ιναωελη.
Gen. 38:24 ζηππε ιεμκτι.
Gen. 42:22 ζηππε ιεκωτι ιεπεκνομ.
Ex. 17:9 ἄνοικ γνηπέ ἡναογι ἐπάτ ἐκηταφε μπίτων (= Vat; Greek Perfect ἔστηκα as Synchronous Present:)
Gen. 34:21 πικας γνηπε ποτεςοων ἡποτμεο.
Lev. 13:39 ασογ εκηνατ ηδη-πιοτη β οςογ γνηπε ε-σενπιωαρ ... ηδη-γαναλ - diagnostic observation.
(14) γνηπε + οτον-/μμον-: Allocation; diagnostic observation:
Ex. 33:21 γνηπε οτον-οτα κα γαροκ (Greek has here no existential, but a located Presentative).
Gen. 31:44 γνηπε μμον-γαι νεμαν.
Lev. 13:21 αραματα ... οςογ ιε γνηπε μμον-γωι νοτ-οβω ναητρ (= Vat).
This, with Gen. 18:9 (= Vat) and Ex. 8:25 (Vat 7c), are the only instances I am aware of the “Sahidic” sequence ιε γνηπε; note exactly the same wording with γνηπε alone in Lev. 13:26. (See no. [27] below).
(15) γνηπε + {άνοικ} ιειε- Absolute Future (see above, Chapter One): Divine Promise (Greek Present — Performatives?):
Ex. 34:11 γνηπε άνοικ ειειγωι εβολ δαηωτεν μπια-μαρροεος...
Ex. 7:27 γνηπε άνοικ ειειγωρ ενεκσιν ηρωφ δεγαν-σοτρ — apodotic.
(16) γνηπε + Topic + ιειε- Absolute Future (see above, Chapter One): Divine Promise:
Ex. 32:34 γνηπε ιε παγγελος εεε ερωπ ημωι δα-
ξοκ (Greek Present!).
Num. 23:9 γνηπε ιε οταλος εεε ερωπ ιιαται οιςογ
ννοτογη γεννιεηνος.
(17) γνηπε + ιειε- Absolute Future: Divine Promise:
Gen. 48:4 γνηπε ειεερκαια.
(18) (γνηπε) ιε + Nominal Theme + κα (Present) — Allocation:
Gen. 20:15 γνηπε ιε πικας κα κα μπεκμεο.
Ex. 24:14 γνηπε ιε αρων νεμη γαρ σεξ καμωτεν.
Gen. 12:19 ηνογ ιε τεκερεμι κα μπεκμεο.
Gen. 16:6 ιε τεβωκι κα γενεεξια.
Gen. 47:6 ιε πικας ηκαμι κα κα μπεκμεο.
(19) γνηπε ιε + Nominal Topic/Theme (Present, affirmative — negative nexus only in cases of diagnostic presentation): Allocation: prophecy; diagnostic observation:
Gen. 37:19 Ἰηνότ εἰς Πιεράκως ἐτην Υδνώτ.
Gen. 41:29 Ἰηνότ εἰς Ὄνομπι Σενήνωτ.
Ex. 9:3 Ἰηνότ εἰς Οὐξίν Ντε-Πιεράκως Νήσων Εἱρνί Εἴζεννεκτεβνώσει.
(20) τις + Specific Nominal Topic/Theme (Present, affirmative): allocation; diagnostic observation:
Gen. 45:12 τις Νετενβαλ Κενάτ.
Gen. 34:10 τις Πικάζι Ποτεσώμ Μπετενμη (vs. 34:21 Πικάζι Ιηνότ Ποτεσώμ Μποτμη).
Gen. 32:20 τις Πεκαλόκ Ιακώβ Υδνώτ σιμ. 48:2, 27:42.
Lev. 13:56 Όσον Αμάναντ Νάτε-Πιεράκως Όσον τις Πιεράκως Ποιν Νιλαλ — diagnostic observation.
(21) τις + nominal Focus (Cleft Sentence): focussing (?)
Gen. 31:44 Ιηνότ μμον-ξαλ Νέμαν τις Γάρ πετερμηθερε.
(22) Ιηνότ + Nominal Sentence.
Deut. 10:14 Ιηνότ Γάρ Νά-Πιεράκ Πεκνους τις Νάτε-Τφεν τις Νεμ ντεπενφε Πικάζι Νεμ νη Τθον Ετενζητη (= Vat ).
(23) Ιηνότ τις + nominal Topic (Nominal Sentence Pattern III): expressive descriptive exposition (in Allocation).
Deut. 3:11 Ιηνότ τις Πεκάλοκ Οτενινι τις τις Γάρ Πξίν Τζε Σεν...
(24) τις + Preterite (extremely rare — the only instance in the corpus): Divine Performative.
Deut. 1:21 Ανάρ τις Ανότε Πετεννους τις Πικάζι Σαζη Μπετενγο (Vat τις Δι).  
(25) μφρήτ + τις + Noun + eq.: sub-initial vision in Dream Narrative reporting.
Gen. 41:22 Ανάρ Ον Σανόναρκοι μφρήτ τις Κεξ Νάκεμ Σενννοτ επσώι... (Vat add. Όσον, om. τις).
The all-initial vision in Pharaoh's first dream is introduced by ΙΣκε Νακ- πε (verse 2; see Chapter One); in the second dream by Ιηνότ Νακ-. Reporting his dream, he starts with ΙΣκε Ναί- (verse 17), going on to sub-episodic Ιηνότ τις (verse 19).
(26) Ιηνότ μφρήτ Νε:- sub-episode in Dream Narrative.
Gen. 41:2 Ιηνότ μφρήτ Νε-Εβόλ Σανφιαρο Νασνην Επσώι πε Νάτε-Γε Νεγε Ενενέτ.
(27) τις Ιηνότ + (Pron.) + nexus: apocritic (responsive) signal:
(b) ἀναθ. This "particle", always clause-initial, is truly mysterious: it has no Greek correspondent, nor is it triggered by any apparent feature in the Greek text, a rather uncommon state of things. It is exclusively and idiomatically Bohairic, occurring in all the varieties (Pentateuch, OT, NT, B4 — very common; Nitrian). Sahidic usually has no equivalent for ἀναθεί; in Crum’s exx., Sah. has once ὀντωκ, once παντωκ. Sah. ἀναθ. is a hapax: Crum Dictionary 422a “advb showing consent”, Westendorf 268 “Partikel der Bekräftigung: ‘ja, gewiß’ which may be related. But ἀναθεί, for some no less mysterious reason, is always included by explicative ξέ-, and thus cannot be simply asseverative. It seems often to focalize the nexus, with an “after all...” nuance: indeed, this is the only functional statement one feels entitled to make. Occasionally, it is combined with ἐπι, which is curious, firstly for the unusual occurrence of this particle in ξέ-included clauses, secondly for the double explicative marking. In fact, this is an embarrassing case where we are not even sure of the Coptic meaning (no Egyptian etymology is forthcoming):

**Σε-οθή + Preterite in Narrative Comment Mode**

Gen. 6:12 ὀτόρ θνατ ΝΣΕ-πτζ θπ τεπικαρι οτόρ ναπτακνοτ πε Σε-οθή θαγαρ ηβε κεμεμωι γιζενπικαρι.

Gen. 26:7 αιεργοθ έδοι εξε-τακζι τε ηθηποτ πςε-ζοεβε θ... ζεβε-ρεβεκκα τερζηζι Σε-οθή Γαρ ένεεες ρε Σενπεθζο — “she was lovely”

**Σε-οθή in Dialogue:**

Gen. 29:15 Ννεκεπγωβ ηθι Νανιζθ Με-οθη Γαρ Νεκ-πακον — “you are my brother, after all”.

Deut. 28:40 Γανζοειτ ετεωμπι ηκ... Ννεκοσνοι Εβολ μμομ Σε-οθη ετεβοβεθ Γαρ-Νεκζοειτ.

Also Gen. 6:13, Deut. 32:51x2, 33:19.

**Σε-οθή in preceptive Exposition:**

Lev. 22:20 Βά-οθη Γαρ ζεωπ Νωτεν ηκ.

Lev. 21:21 Βά-οθη οτον-αζη Νάθηθ.

Deut. 21:14 Σε-οθη Ακεβιοσ “since you did humiliate her, after all”.

Also Deut. 23:21.
2.1 (Pro)Noun Rhemes: The Nominal Sentence

2.1.0.1 Preliminary

The foci of tension in the description of this much discussed nexus-pattern set of sets, of central typological interest and much-discussed in Egyptian and Coptic, are its constituent sequence ("Word Order") and correlated or signified information structure; the copula constituent (if any); the time reference of the pattern; and what we may call "the meaning of verblessness". The last mentioned issue is, I think, the most easily addressed. We have here a clause form apart, with no relevance or bearing on or of the verbal nexus. The question of exponence of "be", which is of interest in Indo-European, simply does not arise in the Coptic formal interdependence of (pro)nominal Theme and Rheme. Thus, it is not "verb-less". "Non-verbal" would not be much amiss, were it not for the implied attribution of primacy to the verb. The question of "tense" is related: "tense" being a verbal category, it must not be looked for in a nexus pattern set that has no relation to the verb. This will be evident in the consideration of individual patterns, below. As against these non-questions, the points of Copula and sequence are real, and must be carefully examined for the specific constructions. The copula ("the signifiant of which the signifié is the nexal interdependence itself") is, in general syntax, immediately associated with Nominal-Sentence-type clauses. But in Egyptian and Coptic, as often in Semitic — and this is a major typological trait — the copular exponent is mainly a suprasegmental — prosodic — feature contained in the pronominal Theme, which has traditionally (and still currently) led to miscomprehension and confusing of Copula and Theme. (The definition of Copula given above detaches it from the exclusive domain of the verb). In our variety of Bohairic, in fact, the pattern, important in Sahidic, that includes a segmental Copula among its constituents is marginal: see below.

As for sequencing, it is, by definition of "pattern" ("ordered, juctured and bounded sequence of paradigms/categories"), a pattern constituent, and not an independent or separate property; it is anyway in Coptic non-grammemic, i.e. non-distinctive. Rheme-to-Theme and Theme-to-Rheme sequences are indeed encountered, but not as opposed terms in a sequence paradigm. The latter sequence, outside the Interlocutive Pattern very rare in our Bohairic, is a special linking device in Sahidic and other types of Bohairic, whereas the former is associated
with various linkage by means of the pronominal Theme πε τε νε. In contradistinction to the determinatum/determinans sequence (including determinator + lexeme noun phrase), which may be considered a Grundrichtung in Coptic, the NS sequences vary from the interlocutive and copular patterns (Theme-to-Rheme) to the delocutive ones (Rheme-to-Theme); the sequencing of other nexus patterns is as rigid as the noun-phrase one.

The paradigmatics of the NS is not concerned with the verb (nor has to do with tense: the NS is as tense-less as it is non-verbal), but with the οι n- copular pattern of non-essential, descriptive, incidental predication (see in detail below). Generally speaking, the constituency of the Theme is pronominal only; but what is striking in Bohairic is that this applies to the Rheme as well — or rather to the nuclear determinator pronoun (definite or indefinite articles: see Chapter Three), which are the real Rhemes, just as the pro-verbs (alias conjugation bases) are the real Rheme for the verbal nexus.

Obs.
(2) The Gunn Papers, item V A 1.14 contains a veritable monograph, “Notes on a Peculiar Class of non-verbal Propositions”; incidentally, Gunn often corrects “verbless” to “non-verbal”: OE, ME are studied; there is much material in response to SETHE 1916, isolating patterns, discussing terminology, dwelling on topics such as constituent placement, specificity etc. Gunn avoids “subject / predicate” and statements made in terms of “major / minor / equivalent / doubtful (relative) significance” (fn.: “there are all degrees of ‘majority’ and ‘minority’ in the terms of various propositions”). On the ME NS, see also Gunn’s letters to Gardiner (AHG papers 142.124.123, letter of 3/2/21, Gunn informing Gardiner of his plans to study the NS: see also in his notes on Gardiner’s Egyptian Gram- mar (Gunn Papers V 73ff.). B. Gunn’s perceptive notes (the Gunn Papers 45.1.1) on the MS of Alan Henderson Gardiner’s Theory of Speech and Language, alongside notes by J.R. Firth, V. Brøndal, C.H. Armbruster and others), p. 15 (cf. Theory of Speech and Language 57 n.2) “Anyone who is thoroughly used to speaking such a language as Arabic, feels, when he has to speak much in another foreign language which has always to express the copula, that this expression is something cumbersome and superfluous” are certainly worthy of notice.
(3) The early conception of πε as “Copula” (e.g. “expressing the substantive verb esse” SCHWARTZE and STEINHAL 1850:418ff., 472: not however STEINHAL and MISTELI 1893!) must have stemmed from an ethnocentric slip. Spiegelberg’s lasonic 1925:203 “…mit selbständigem demonstrativem Subjekt (sog. Copula)” more or less sums up the communis opinio. This is still the usage in Pre-Coptic Egyptian linguistics, e.g. SCHENKEL 1984:166f.; LOPRIENO 1995:69, 133, 105 “(pw) acquires the function of a semantically empty copula” (“this [is] > “is”). The Polotskyan tradition (for Egyptian and Semitic)

(4) See HERBERMANN 1994 on the special properties of the delocutive pronouns and their distinction from the interlocutive ones.

(5) Typological-comparative. Berber: GALAND 1964, esp. 34, 42, 52f. Semitic: GOLDENBERG 1983; ZEWY 1996. Welsh and Irish, SHISHA-HALEVY 1998 (Chapter Three) and 1999. Already in STEINTHAL-MISTELI 1893:56f., 296ff., the NS is seen as a prime typological feature: pw a thematic pronoun (but, with Hebrew and Chinese, "used as copula"), with anaphoric "force" only. Not a verb "be" (so explicitly 56f.). Note also the insight (57) that in Coptic what we really have is an "articular sentence" — the lexeme is grammatically marginal.

(6) Diachrony, in general (below, particular observations will be offered). We do not have to date any consistent diachrony of the NS comparable to SETHE 1916, not to mention any systemic exposition (e.g. on the relationship between the development of the Nominal Sentence and, less directly, the Cleft Sentence to the evolution of the articles, or the "devolution" of the adjectives). "Pan-Egyptian": SETHE 1916; JUNGE 1981:435ff. (compatibility-constituency overview); LOPRIENO 1995 has many slips, especially regarding dialects other than Sahidic. O/ME: GILULA 1976, with an excellent discussion of the nature of pw; WESTENDORF 1981/2. L.E.: GROLL 1967; JUNGE 1981, SATZINGER 1981. Demotic: JOHNSON 1981; SHISHA-HALEVY 1989b. (It is of interest to note that both Copular and Delocutive-Expanded Theme patterns are rare or absent in Early and Ptolemaic Demotic). In fact, the NS sets seem to differ dramatically from one phase of Egyptian to another (the only exception being the similarity of Roman Demotic to Coptic), a fact in keeping with the realization that the individual phases do not derive from each other, except in a broad and "popular" sense.

(7) The conversion properties of the respective patterns differ, and will be discussed below as a distinctive trait added to and deepening the pattern's definition. ne- does not indicate time but narrative linkage: see Chapter One.

2.1.1 The Delocutive Pattern Set

(a) Theme and Rheme

\( \pi \varepsilon \) or \( \{ \pi \varepsilon \} \) - pronominal Theme (mostly) or copula (in one pattern) — is certainly the characteristic of this pattern set; as a formal Theme, it is also a Rheme-marker or Rheme-index. It is the only delocutive pronoun not commutable with a noun syntagm (i.e. determinant), demonstrative pronoun, or Proper Name. Its usual high encliticism is the main internal link for the pattern set. The reference or phoricity vectorial principle (cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 1987, with a basic reference typology as pattern classifier) takes care, as a junctural cohesive factor, of external linkage. It is thus a crucial junctural classificatory principle for the set, which is the most sophisticated of all, and includes seven main patterns:
(I) # Rheme πε # (1) — anaphoric-Theme (high referential-formal
textual linkage through πε)
   (Ia) # Rheme zero # — zero-Theme pattern
(II) # Rheme πε Theme # (lower linkage) — separating formal
   (cataphoric) and non-formal Themes
   (III) # Topic (Theme) Rheme πε # — Theme topicalized, Topic of-
ten turned Theme (high internal linkage: topical, fuzzy (non-formal) ex-
ternal linkage)
(IV) # Rheme πε # (2) — endophoric Theme (very low external
linkage = high delimitation; high internal linkage)
   (IVa) # Topic Rheme πε # — the Endophoric Pattern topicalized:
(V) # Rheme πε # (3) — Immutable-Theme — Exophoric (no tex-
tual linkage, but pragmatic, not textual linkage). A pattern highly im-
portant, since it is in Bohairic the core construction of the Cleft Sentence.
Internal linkage is very low.
   (VI) # Theme πε (copula) Rheme # - the Copular Pattern
(VII) Special Nexal Patterns with no formal Theme or Copula

Obs.
(1) On πε, comparatively. Berber: "pronom personnel sujet", "indice de personne",
   "particule prédicative" and "sujet", GALAND 1964:33ff.; in 38 + n. 9, 43 # d-/t- N # a
   our — πε ("particule prédicative" — rather a nexally operative "it"?). The comparison
   with French "c'est" is instructive: cf. WAGNER 1980:87ff. It's, Tis (dialectal, also Anglo-
   Irish; also Irish is) are also hematizing exponents for whole nexus (French c'est in
   presentational cases like C'est maman qui me bat (answering "Why are you crying?") is
different: ce is here pragmatically situation-referential, see below, and cf. our "Immutable
   πε" pattern (below). In Coptic, we have high discourse-level nexus-rhematizing with
   converted forms: naq- πε, eq- πε, eaq- πε (see above, Chapter One).
(2) We see that at least three patterns have the appearance "NOUN/PRONOUN πε":
two patterns, "NOUN πε NOUN"; two patterns, "NOUN NOUN πε". However, under
the structural definition of pattern as 'ordered, junctured and bounded sequence of catego-
ries or paradigms", and the structural definition of identity (see the Introduction), this ho-
mony of patterns is immediately and sharply resolved by distinct and distinctive para-
digmatic and syntagmatic specification.

The Rheme constituency consists of "nominals" only in a manner of
speaking, for in Bohairic (unlike Sahidic, see SHISHA-HALEVY 1984a) re-
ally no zero-article or (alternatively) bare-lexeme Rhemes occur. Thus,
pronominals (including and most prevalently, determinators) are predi-
cated in this pattern. However, the few adverbials that share the rhematic
slot in two patterns, namely (I) and (III), are bare lexemes, i.e. not
determined; in their case, we have πε remarkably predicate a lexeme,
not a pronoun.
(b) The individual patterns:

(I) The Delocutive Pattern, Theme anaphoric: “Rheme πε” (1)
This, in a sense the minimal pattern of the set, is relatively uncommon
in the corpus, compared with its topicalized or expanded co-patterns.

Distinctive Profile:

- Only here we find the “Jernstedtian” partitive syntax of the indefi-
nite article (JERNSTEDT 1949, JERNSTEDT [NAGEL] 1978: ος...τε with
the Rheme of usual masculine compatibility).
- This pattern is very often — indeed, as a rule — included by άε-,
typically following a prolepsis to which πε is anaphoric. It is a pattern
of high or highest linkage with its preceding context, either by direct re-
ference by πε or by such links as άε-, or by the Relative converter
jointly with reference by πε. It is the absence of such linkage that dis-
tinguishes the Endophoric Pattern (see below).
- The pattern is but very rarely negated, almost only in its relative
conversion: η-...άν in converted, zero...άν in unconverted status (cf.
SHISHA-HALEVY 1994 and below, Chapter Four).
- Rheme constituency and specificity: indefinite article; possessive
pronoun and articles; indefinite/interrogative pronouns; πετ- (very
rare). Exclusions: zero; {πι-},{ π-}.

Adverbials — prepositional phrases: έβολ άεν- (Gen. 17:12 rela-
19:37, Deut. 20:15, 32:32); έοβε- (Lev. 9:10 relative): Rhemes not
predicated by the Adverbial-Rheme Nexus matrix.

- Theme Constituency: πε τε νε. Its encliticity depends on the
nature of the cola: thus, Num. 13:28 άεν άν άε άαι but
Gen. 27:11 άατ πακον οτρωμι εφρι άε λω νε.

- Conversions: restricted. Circumstantial; Relative, only for posses-
sive-pronoun and adverbial Rhemes or negated nexus.

- Text-grammatical notes. The pattern is of Narrative/Exposition/
Dialogue compatibilities. In Dialogue it is responsive (Ex. 4:2), or inter-
rogative-allocutive (e.g. Ex. 14:12, Num. 13:18, 16:13, 32:8), or pre-
sented by οιν άα ε or άε άπε ιc (e.g. Lev. 5:9:12, 14:31:52). As
pointed out, its macrosyntactic integration is very high, and its linkage
close.

Selective representative Documentation

Gen. 29:12 άταμεραχα άε-πον άεπιςοι οτος άε-
πυρι πρεβεκκα πε — see the sensitive discussion in ANDERSSON
1904:59.
Gen. 30:29 ΝΕΟΚ ΕΤΣΩΤΝ ... ΟΤΟΡ ΝΕΚΤΕΒΝΩΤΟΙ ΤΗΡΟΤ ΕΝΑΡΝΕΜΗΝ ΖΕ-ΟΤΗΡ ΝΕ.
Deut. 23:7 ΝΝΕΚΜΕΣΤΕ-ΟΤΡΩΔΟΡΜΕΟΣ ΖΕ-ΠΕΚΚΟΝ ΝΕ.
Num. 13:18 ...ΙΕ ΑΝ-ΟΤΖΩΒ ΝΕ ΙΕ ΑΝ ΟΤΚΩΣΙ ΝΕ ΙΕ ΑΝ-ΟΤΝΙΩΤ ΝΕ.
Ex. 2:2 ...ΕΤΑΡΝΑΤ ΕΡΟΥ ΖΕ-ΟΤΑΧΤΙΟΣ ΝΕ ΣΙΜ. Num. 13:18.
Ex. 16:15 ΟΤ ΝΕ ΦΑΙ ΝΑΤΣΩΤΝ ΜΜΟΥ ΑΝ ΝΕ ΖΕ-ΟΤ ΝΕ.
Deut. 14:7f ...ΟΤΑΚΑΘΑΡΤΟΝ ΝΩΤΕΝ ΝΕ.
Gen. 12:18 ΕΘΕΒΟΤ ... ΜΠΕΚΤΑΜΟΙ ΖΕ-ΤΕΚΣΙΜΙ ΤΕ.
Gen. 28:17 ΙΔΞΕΚ ΠΑΙΜΑ ΟΤΡΟΤ ΝΕ ΦΑΙ ΑΕ ΑΝ ΝΕ ΑΛΛΑ ΠΗ ΜΦΤ ΝΕ ΟΤΟΡ ΘΑΙ ΤΕ ΤΠΑΛΗ ΝΤΕΤΦΕ (= Vat) (Greek ώς φοβερός δά τόπος ούτος ούκ εστίν τούτο άλλη η οίκος θεού... “nothing but...”) — note here the remarkable contrast of three Delecutive NS patterns: topological Delecutive Theme opening, Delecutive and Expanded Delecutive Theme carrying on. This is also a rare case of our pattern negated.
Deut. 32:28 ΖΕ-ΟΤΕΒΝΟΣ ΝΕ ΕΤΑΡΝΑΤΚΟ ΜΠΕΚΣΟΣΝΙ — not a Cleft Sentence: if ΕΤΑΡΝ- isn’t Relative, following as it does the indefinite Rheme, then it must be either the Temporal or the Circumstantial Focalizing Preterite.
Lev. 27:28 ...ΠΕΤΟΤΑΒ ΝΕ ΝΤΕΝΗ ΕΒΟΤΑΒ.
Gen. 38:15f. ΑΜΕΤΙ ΖΕ-ΟΤΑΡΠΝΗ ΤΕ ... ΜΠΕΚΜΙ ΓΑΡ ΖΕ-ΤΕΧΣΕΛΕΤ ΤΕ.
Gen. 19:37 ΕΒΟΛ ΤΕΝΝΑΙΤ ΝΕ — adverbial Rheme.
Also Deut. 24:15, 32:20.
Conversions:
Circumstantial:
Gen. 31:31 ΟΤΝΧΑΙ ... ΕΟΤΣΙΟΤI ΝΕ.
Lev. 4:21 ...ΕΦΑ-ΟΤΝΟΒΙ ΝΤΕΟΤΣΥΝΑΙΤΗΡ ΝΕ.
Lev. 2:5 ΕΨΗΝ ΔΕ ΕΟΤΣΩΤΒΨΩΡΩΤΙ ΝΕ...
Relative:
Lev. 4:7 ΕΤΕ-ΦΗ ΝΕ ΕΤΣΕΝΤΦΣΚΗΝΗ — note (rather than a remarkable position of ΝΕ) that the converted NS is here ΦΗ ΝΕ, with the Rheme ΦΗ expanded by the Relative form.
Num. 17:5 ΝΑΙ ΝΨΕΜΜΟ ΕΤΕ-ΕΒΟΛ ΑΝ ΝΕ ΣΕΝΝΕΝΨΗΡΙ ΝΑΡΨΝ (= Vat) — note here the non-specific Rheme expanded by the Relative, characterizing generic Relatives (see below, Chapter Four).
Deut. 32:21 ΦΗ ΕΤΕ-Ν-ΟΤ-ΝΟΤ ΑΝ ΝΕ ... ΦΗ ΕΤΕ-Ν-ΟΤ-ΕΘΝΟΣ ΑΝ ΝΕ.
Note the adnominal predicative pronominal-possessive system:
nominal possessor — ἐτε-ἡ-Φα-ν ἔν τε (Ex. 29:26, Lev. 7:20), negatived as ἐτε-ἡ-Φα-ν ἔν τε (Gen. 47:26); pronominal possessor — ἐτε-ἡ-Φα-ν ἔν τε (Lev. 5:24), negatived as ἐτε-ἡ-Φα-ν ἔν τε (Gen. 15:13).

See below, for the zeroing of the Theme in similar cases.

Obs.
(1) Gen. 37:32 ἔν-τι θαν-θεον ἡμείς ὑπερηφανείται θεον ἐγκατέστησαν is Endophoric (Vat τις θαν) (2) In Gen. 20:3 θανόντως εἴης ἐσθίνι εὐτάκεις καὶ θαλάττων οὐκ έστιν (Vat θαλάττων, Greek αὐτῷ δὲ εἶται συναφείς), is τε here a writing of ἓκ; (3) In Apoc. 2:2 Ο πάντως διά θεόν εὐφυεῖς θεοῦ διαπεριστεροῦσαν οὐ θεόν εὐφυεῖς διά ἑαυτὸν καὶ θεοῦ διαπεριστεροῦσαν οὐ θεόν (sim. verse 9) we have a remarkable instance of Rheme in the Nominal Sentence pattern, see SHISHA-HALEVY 1986a:38ff. This is not the adverb adnominally expanding the articles (ibid. 22f.), but the adverb as adverb lexeme. The repertory of adverbial Rhemes is richer in Nitrian and OT texts outside the Pentateuch:

AM I 47 ὑπαίτια ἔν τε.
AM I 57 παρερθείντε ἔν τε (see below, the topicalized-Theme pattern).
Dan. 7:28 ὑπάρχων ἔν τε.
Dan. 12:6 ὑπάρχω ἔν τε.
Dan. 11:36 οὐκ ὑπαρχόντε ἔν τε.
(5) I would now like to suggest that the zero- determinated Rhemes of the type εἰς τε (Shenoute, SHISHA-HALEVY 1984a) are really cases of “properization” — as “generic notion name” of the abstract or verb-noun (SHISHA-HALEVY 1989a §§0.2. (d), 0.4 (b), 1.1 (c) and passim). See Chapter Three below.

(6) The famous II Cor. 10:7 Κατὰ-ἡ-Φα-ν ἐν-θεό-νος-Φαίνεις ἐνον θανεῖ is still unique (consider however John 21:21 ὑποκριτικὸς and Cat. 5 ὑποκριτικὸς uncollated). Were it not for the absolute consensus, the two supporting exx. and the diachrony of the construction, one would wonder with Hans Quecke (letter of 14-10-87): “kann man diesen [Ausdruck] überhaupt als einen regelmäßig gebildeten Satz betrachten?”. At any rate, this is obviously a relativization of the immediately preceding Φαίνεις τε: if “ad-hoc” meant anything when it comes to syntactic structure, this would be a case in point. See GILULA 1976:167 + n.44 for the diachronic dimension.

(7) The special (in the sense of ‘idiomatic’) and as yet not entirely clear construction ὑπερθείμεν ἐν τε (FUNK 1991 §4.4.3), with Bohairic, Oxyrhynchite, Fayyumic Sahidic and Subakhmimic distribution, both interlocutive and delocutive (John 18:37, B4 and 9:34, B5, Gen.2:23 B4 ξε-νίνι εὖ βολή διενεργεῖ, yet no instance in our corpus). For Oxyrhynchite, see SCHENKE 1997/8a:169f. has the fem. ὑπερθείμεν ἐν τε formal Rheme, and an expanding infinitive (of a closed group: ἐν τε).

9 John 21:21 ὑποκριτικὸς (Greek οὗτος δὲ τί) is relevant here: the reading ὑπερθείμεν ἐν τε (codd.) changes the meaning “What about him?” altogether (Bodmer III — B4 — has here ὧν ὑποκριτικὸς ἐναρέωτε. ὅταν ὑποκριτικὸς (Shenoute, ed. Amel. II 257 uncollated) may be a companion example, evoking the Pauline one. Sahidic has here the mysterious interrogative ὧν (also found after ἔνωσις, e.g. Ex. 2:20): παρερθείντε. See POLOTSKY 1990:251 n.14, FUNK 1991:27f. n.50.
mice, Δπο and εβεε attested so far). τε is anaphoric to a specific textual environment. However, the partitive syntagm of article and infinitive is not straightforward. Consider Funk’s cogent words (1991:60): “Die Infinitiv...können wohl nicht einfach als “verbalsubstantiv...” angesehen werden. Nicht der von ihnen benannte Vorgang wird prädiziert, sondern die wesentlich durch die Modifikatoren ausgedrückten Eigenschaften, zu deren nominalen Zuordnung man sich des Infinitivs als lexikalischen Nukleus bedient. Der Infinitiv allein bildet daher nur in prosodischer Hinsicht die Komplettierung des durch οτ- gegebenen Rahmens. Syntaktisch umfaßt die den Prädikator expandierende unmittelbare Konstituente die gesamte Infinitivphrase...Innerhalb dieser hat wiederum... nur die adverbiale Ergänzung rhematisch Funktion...”. I would not go so far as to say that the infinitives are of no informative value. What worries me is rather the semantics of the combination of “one” or indefinite article with the nomen verbale - substantive, not participle! The striking affinity with Focalizing Conversion paraphrases (e.g. in parallel versions), with the infinitival verb corresponding to the “that”- conversion (e.g. in John 1:13, 7:28, 9:35) does certainly support Funk’s view of the thematic infinitive. Still, this does not clarify, I believe, the joining of infinitive and article and the way to “one, who...” (“Du bist ganz in Sünde geboren” for Νος-οταξιο τηρκ σεξινομι John 9:35), rather than the indefinite infinitive “a case of”.

(8) Deut. 17:15 ορομα ιωσηνο ... ιε πεκκον Αν πε (Vat Δε-οθι πεκκον Αν πε) is perhaps to be seen as Circumstantial (haplography of ιε- following τε), but the zero... Αν negation speaks somewhat against this analysis (I cannot see the reading of Vat as the source of our text).

(9) οτ- εφωτι πε “a...of his” is Nitrian (e.g. SV 30 etc.), and noteworthy as a means to by-pass the specificity of the possessive articles. See below, Chapter Three.

(Ia) The Delocutive Pattern, Anaphoric Theme Zeroed

This is a rare and sporadic subpattern, yet one of considerable importance, in that it (alongside the Immutable-τε pattern) is core for a Cleft Sentence type. Also, for its various synchronic, contrastive and diachronic echoes, such as the “ΝΤΑΚ ετε-” Oxyrhynchite Cleft-Sentence-like construction discussed below, or the Late Egyptian correlation of extraposition/topicalization and zero Theme (below). The construction, of close external juncture, is still largely obscure, and probably comprises several different varieties; we need a systematic muster of examples.

(1) Some cases of Relative Conversion

(a) The Relative possessive-pronoun Rheme, with ΦΗ- or π- as formal antecedent, is the most conspicuous. The structural difference between the pronoun “ΝΟΣΚ” and the substantivized Relative “ΝΕΤΕΝΟΣΚ” is not clear (and yet, there are very few instances of varia lectio here: cf. Gen. 33:9), nor the structural reason for the association of Theme zeroing with the Relative Conversion, which may have to do with the very mechanism of NS Relative Conversion, diachronically very rare and, for the Delocutive-Theme NS, probably not attested at all.
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ΦΗ ΕΤΕΦΨΩΤ/ΝΕΤΕΦΨΩΤ (Ν-) (ετ.) (vs. - ΦΨΨ άν πε).

νετενοστ θηροσ (ετ.) (Gen. 20:7, Num. 31:9): does θηροσ here exclude άν?

νετενοστ (Gen. 33:9), άν έτε-νοστ (Num. 16:5).

ἐν ετεθωτεν μπατρια ... Φοταί Φοταί ετεθωτι οκθη-

κίς (Lev. 25:10, 27:2).

(b) Adverbial Rheme, substantivizing Relative Conversion:

ΦΗ ΕΤΕ-ΕΟΒΕ-ΦΟΝΟΙ ΜΠΙΛΑΟΣ (Lev. 9:15 cf. ANDERSSON 1904:

101).

(c) Hermeneutical syntax:

Num. 33:6 αν i εβοτεαν ετεομερος ιντεμια σε (Vat +

πε).

(2) Non-Relative cases:

(a) Gen. 13:13 νε-γανρεθερονι (Vat + άν εμαωω) (Greek

οι δε έξεροηοι οι ... ποηροι).

Gen. 25:24 νε-γανοθεσ ενας ηηετενεξα (= Vat) (Greek

τηδε άν δεδημα εν τη κολια αυτης) νετον- or ιαρε-

would have meant a rhematic ηηεν- cf. POLOTSKY 1960 §§35,54 + obs. 3, and con-

trast

Gen. 38:27 νετον-γανοθεσ ηετενεξα νε.

(b) (μ)πωριντ άν (Gen. 4:15, 48:18, Ex. 10:11), also outside the

corpus (Greek ουκο/μη ουτως)

(c) Gen. 23:15 σε άς Φαι παςτε (Vat + πε; Greek ουχοι ηυρε)

σε άς ν.ε νε άς πε Rom. 6:15, Act. 21:22.)

Obs.

(1) The ΦΗ ΕΤΕΦΨΩΤ possessive construction is certainly not restricted to Bohairic, nor,
in Bohairic, to our corpus. Shenoutean Sah. exx. (πετεψΨΩΤ) are sporadic: Leip. III 69
πετεψΨΩΤ, Wess. 9 118a 22f. ΝΤΧ-πετεψΨΩΤ οι άν, Chass. 18 ΝΕΤΕΝΟΣΤΙ
θηρος, Or. pp. 155, 156 ΝΕΤΕΨΨΩΤ, ΤΕΤΕΨΨΩΤ varying with πωκ, τωκ. Bohairic,
outside the corpus: τετεψΨΩΤ ΜΑΚΙ John 4:44, 15:9, πετεψΨΩΤ 16:15; Mt.

(2) One cannot help recalling, when considering ε-/ετε-ΦΨΨΩΤ (πε), the syntactically
per se very different Demotic possession-predicating pattern, basic in sales contracts etc.
(nty)- mntw, neg. bn-(jw)- mntw- ιη s (e.g. P. Berlin P 13633 10, see ed.'s note, p. 5, nega-
tive e.g. in P. Hauswaldt 2a ro 8 etc.; this last pattern, of great antiquity, seems to stand in
complementary distribution with wn-mntw=, the former with anaphoric-pronominal and
specific possessa (including π3-nty- and ... nb), the latter with indefinite and zero-deter-
mination ones, and in formulaic combination with possessive-article Rhemes (π3y.k... π3y). Incidentally, the form bn-jw-mntw:st ιη "it is not yours (2nd fem.)", P. Hauswaldt 3a
ro 5, 7a ro 8 would seem to correspond to a Sahidic οποτακ-ε "You (fem.) have it/
them " (see LAYTON 2000 §82 and p. 309ff.).
(3) Another possible case of Theme zeroing in Oxyrhynchite is ὅσον ἦν “how...?” occurring in Psalms, Matthew (e.g. Mt. 26:54). However, this is properly zeroing in the Expanded-Theme Pattern (II, below), or even an isolated case of unmediated binominal (bimembral) Rheme — Theme construction.

(4) Cases of Theme-zeroing in the hermeneutical Relative conversion (of the Endophoric Theme?) in Nitrian Bohairic: ἐπε-κοτή... AM II 90, ἐπε-παραὶ ἠφίστη... ibid. 104. Hermeneutical zeroing of Theme in Demotic: SIMPSON 1996:167 (R23 and 27) “nty-ỉw-p3yyyyf ὧμ Ἱ.”

(5) In Luke 20:20 ἐπεζω ὡς ἐρωτή ἐπε-ἐπερείκ (v.l. + πε) we have a different environment, historically attested, favouring the zeroing of the anaphoric Theme; cf. also Acts 24:14 ἐπε-ἐπερείκ., Shenoute Chass. 63 ἐπεζω ἐπε-ἐπερείκ ὧμ Ἱ. πε-ετεκνσαγοράς.

(6) Note a case of zeroed Theme in a Circumstantial conversion (v.l. πε) in 1 Cor. 6:11.

(7) ME ἱώ ἁτο ὢτ (Sinuhe B 43) is a special case of incidental Theme zeroed, although ἱω is here still a formal Theme. In a sense, this is a correspondent of the Coptic Endophoric pattern.

(8) LE D’Orb. 8/3 zeroed Theme after topicalization: ἱρ ἱρ π3-nty-ἰw.κ ἱρ ἱρ π3yyyyf ἵτ... See ČERŇÝ-GROLL 1978:524f.

(9) The unbearable light-handedness of a “grammatical philology” is here in evidence: BROOKE 1902:271 “No importance can be attached in Bohairic to the insertion or omission of the copula before a verb”. Forbes Robinson apud BROOKE 1902:271 n.1 “…in latter copies the genius of the language asserted itself and caused the omission”. TILL 1951:401 “nicht ernst zu nehmen”.

(II) The Delocutive Pattern, Theme expanding the cataphoric Formal Theme

A very common, perhaps the most common pattern. {πε} is here not anaphoric, but a “provisional” formal Theme cataphorically co-referential with an articular or demonstrative non-formal specific Theme. From the communication-contour angle, it is symmetrically inverse to the Topicalized Delocutive NS. The expansion is specific, yet not necessarily cotext-anchored, and often pragmatic-situation anchored. Whereas the unexpanded pattern (I, above) is closely linked to its preceding cotext, and indeed constitutes a close junctural link, the Topicalized-Theme (III below) and the expanded ones both are relative junctural delimitations (they as it were carry their referates — their lexical “non-formal” Themes — within their bounds). However, the topocalized-Theme pattern is, through its Topic, anchored in the preceding cotext; the expanded-Theme one is not, and is strongly delimitative. Thus, we isolate a double opposition: Rheme — πε (unexpanded Theme), pronominally anaphoric and juncturally closely cotext-bound (high linkage) opposed to both Topic — Rheme — πε (topicalized Theme) and Rheme — πε -Theme (expanded Theme), which, in turn, are opposed to one another as a link (via the topic) and a strong delimiter, respectively. I suggest that πε is a formal Theme, conditioned when the actual
(= non-formal) Theme follows its Rheme: the Rheme-to-Theme sequence must be pronominally mediated (in Coptic and, I suggest, in ME as well), whereas the inverse (Theme-to-Rheme) sequence is either not mediated at all, or, marginally in our corpus, marked as nēxal by means of a copula. (In fact, the construction closest to ours, but belonging to verbal nexus syntagmatics is the specification of delocutive pronominal Themes by means of nēxē-). The expansion is therefore thematic, not an "afterthought", but rather an "antitopic", and the linkage it provides with the preceding context or situational context often recalls topical anchoring. This is not surprising, in view of the frequent grammaticalized thematic nature of the formal Topic in Pattern III below.

Obs.
(1) The expansion-syntagmatics mechanism. It is illuminating to compare our expanding Theme with the "Antitopic" [Lambrecht 1996:202ff., following Chadwick 1976: "lexical topic NP positioned AT THE END of the clause containing the information about the topic referent"]). In English, the Antitopic is a specialized construction; not so in Coptic, where this characterizes almost all unmarked Rheme-Theme pattern. Is our expansion an "afterthought" (203) — note the prevalence of non-lexical anaphors (Φαι etc.)? "Unaccented" (203): while the enclitic status of the thematic πε is fairly certain (Shisha-Halevy 1986a:34f., 161 n.36), we know next to nothing about the prosodics of the expansion inside the whole complex. On the other hand, "an implicit request from the speaker to the hearer to put the propositional information 'on hold' until the antitopic is uttered" (203), "high accessibility of the referent as a general condition for appropriate use of the antitopic construction across languages" (203), "discourse context in which the topic referent is already highly salient", whereas "left-detachment constructions" are "reserved for topic announcing or topic-shifting contexts" (204) — all these add up to a functional difference between the two kinds of topic, with the clause-final one, at least in English, especially marked. This is hardly the case in Coptic, neither for the expansion of πε nor the nēxē- construction. (Consider, however, the Gunn papers [the Griffith Institute, Oxford] V 75 [ad Gardiner §146 "Emphasis by Anticipation", in an unbound copy of the Egyptian Grammar, keenly annotated by Gunn]: "I disagree with much of this; it is often the part left to the end that is emphasized").

Distinctive Profile:

- The pattern is dialogic or expository, distinguished from the topicalized-Theme one (Pattern III) as responsive (see below).
- Theme constituency and specificity: always specific; deictics and highly specific elements (Φαι Deut. 9:3 etc., τοστι/τοσσ Ex. 16:23: 25, Proper Names), for non-specific Rhemes; possessive article, for personal-pronoun Rhemes. This implies specificity for nēbèn syntagms (probably "all", not quantifying "any", "every"10), as well as for nē

et- (see Chapter Three). Φαι κε-, rarely κε-, is the "that"-form Theme.

• Rheme constituency and specificity is broadest (thus different from the Delocutive Pattern [1]): all determinators occur except zero\(^{11}\); τι is very rare, occurring only in poetic language; demonstrative, interrogative and indefinite pronouns; delocutive personal pronoun — only with possessive-article Themes; Proper Names; adverbials (again, different from Pattern [1]). I find no example of either a zero-article or a Proper-Name Rheme in the corpus (polemic or apocritic naming, see Shisha-Halevy 1989a:87ff., 102ff. and passim).

• The distinctive internal cohesion of the pattern is effected by the near-absolute concord of the expansion (the non-formal Theme) with the formal Theme. There is low or no linkage with textual environment of the clause, other than through the specificity of the non-formal Theme.

• Negation of the pattern is attested, but very rare: I frankly cannot explain this, nor correlate it with any other factor.

• Conversion too is relatively rare — in the corpus only Relative and nē (the Circumstantial is relatively common in Sahidic).

• Textgrammatical profile. Juncture, reference and concord contours. Prosody. Special configurations:
  
  (a) In the case of demonstrative Rheme, the Rheme reference is often cataphoric nai nē nipan / nipompi..., an introductory unit of listings (e.g. Gen. 25:7:13:17, Ex. 1:1, 6:14ff., Deut. 15:2); anaphoric reference seems to be less prevalent (e.g. Deut. 32:49).

  (b) The demonstrative Φαι is also (perhaps even more) frequent in the expansion (non-formal Theme) constituent, mainly for non-specific and interrogative Rhemes. Its reference is anaphoric: Num. 3:9 ovtai oeqtoi nhi nē nai (cf. ...nē Φαι in 8:16), unless we have Φαι κε- or Φαι et-, which are cataphoric.

  (c) See above, on the internal and external linkage of our pattern.

  (d) The expansion (non-formal Theme) is the concord-motivating factor, for demonstrative-pronoun Themes and in general: Num. 3:9 ovtai oeqtoi nhi nē nai (cf. nē Φαι in 8:16); see below, for some rare exceptions.

  (e) The foreshadowed nē — a structurally single nē occurring twice, in two different prosodic cola (see Shisha-Halevy 1986a:167f. and below, Chapter Four) — is found only in this pattern, in two very similar texts:

Gen. 43:32 ἐνεσκώφ γαρ πε ἡνιρεμενξημή πε μανεσωτ
νίβεν (= Vat).

Gen. 46:34 οτωρεβ γαρ πε ἡνιρεμενξημή πε μανεσωτ
νίβεν (Vat ΔΕ).

This teaches us something about the prosodic contour of the pattern, the encliticity of the formal Theme and especially the considerable weight of the expansion (Theme).

Obs.
(1) Conspicuous by their absence as Theme in our corpus are indefinites (but Nitrian οὐχαίωθις πε οὐάι Cat. 151) and e-+ infinitives (Mt. 20:23 Φωι γαρ πε
eviiq).
(2) Diachrony. On the ME forerunner of our pattern, cf. SETHE 1916 §§116-7, GILULA

The pattern is rare in Demotic (SPIEGELBERG 1925:§459, SIMPSON 1996:166), attested from Late Roman Demotic on (and even then evidently restricted: e.g. Myth 16/10f., with a demonstrative expanding Theme; Mag. 2/13, 19/17, 15/20; converted and negated in Petubastis (Krafft) W 11f.), and earlier only in OE and ME: The topicalized-Theme Delocutive (below, Pattern III), on the other hand, has a continuous documentation and is also attested in LE and from Early Demotic. However, all attempted statements concerning relative chronology of the individual patterns must take the Continuity Fallacy or “parallax” into account: one documented phase did not evolve from the respectively “preceding” ones; the absence of data for the sociolinguistic, stylistic or dialectological parameters is drastically distorting (these are rather written disjoined “chronolects” — F. Kammerzell’s coinage: language varieties and diasystems separated by the time dimension — rather than phases of one and the same language).

Selective representative Documentation
Indefinite-Article Rheme

Gen. 45:28 ὀνήνιωτ τα Φαί sim. Gen. 22:23, 32:2, 38:25,
50:11, Deut. 32:47 etc.

Ex. 16:23:25 γακκαβατον πε ετόταβ μπιετε πε τοτοτι...

NENKABATON ΜΠΕΤΕ ΠΕ ΠΟΟΤ — foreshadowed Theme.

Num. 13:19f. οσ-αγ ηρήτ το πικαζι...

Ex. 18:11 ονηνιωτ τη μπετε.

Num. 16:9 ἀν-οτκοτας νατνη πε Φαί ΔΕ- sim. Num. 16:13,
Ex. 9:27; ΔΕ- Num. 16:12. — Φαί here is cata-, not anaphoric.

Deut. 22:5 οτωρεβ ντεπετε πε οτον νιβεν...

Gen. 49:9 οτμακ μμοτι πε ιοτακ.

Deut. 32:33 οτματοτι ναρακων πε ποτηρι πε σακα-
θοτι νεοή ναττεκο.

Obs.
In the Nitrian Martyrologies, the recurring “οὐδὲν ἐφ’ Ν...” (e.g. AM I 6) calls for some attention, for it means, not “One is NN’s God”, but “One is God, und zwar NN’S”, or “NN’s is the one God”; Proper-Name generic and “inalienably associated” Φ’ merging. Compare also AM I 38 παραν νεμ Φωκ οὐδὲν (not νε).

**Interrogative-Pronoun Rheme**

Ex. 10:8 ΝΙΜ ΝΕΜ ΝΙΜ ΝΕ ΝΗ ΕΤΝΑΛΕΝΒΕΝΟΤ.
ος ΝΕ ΝΙΜΕΤΜΕΕΡΕΣ (Deut. 6:20).
ος ΝΕ (περπάν) (Gen. 31:36, Ex. 3:13).
ος / ΝΙΜ ΝΕ ΦΑΙ / ΠΑΙ- (Gen. 33:5:8, Ex. 5:2, 13:14, 16:15, Lev. 25:11, 45:28, Deut. 29:24 etc.).
Gen. 47:8 οσθρ ΝΕ ΝΙΡΟΜΠΙ.
ΝΙΜ ΝΕ (Proper Name) (Num. 16:11), ΠΑΙ- (Deut. 20:5ff.).

Obs.
A special case is ος ΝΕ ΦΑΙ ΕΤΑ- (mostly with the Relative Preterite; e.g. Gen. 20:9, 26:10, 27:20, 29:25, 42:28, Ex. 4:2, 14:5:11, 18:14 etc.), which constitutes a Cleft-Sentence-like construction (see below).

**Personal-Pronoun Rheme + Possessive-Article Theme.**

This is the only pattern clearly predating the personal pronoun. See below, for the distinctive and distinct ΑΝΟΚ ΝΕ with an Immutable-Theme and the proclamatory / introductory ΑΝΟΚ ΝΕ...

Gen. 49:3 ΝΘΟΚ ΝΕ ΤΑΧΩΜ.
Num. 18:20 ΑΝΟΚ ΝΕ ΤΕΚΤΟ.
Deut. 10:9 ΝΘΟΨ ΝΕ ΠΟΤΚΛΗΡΟΣ.
Deut. 18:2 ΝΘΟΨ ΝΕ ΤΟΤΤΟΙ.
Deut. 10:21 ΝΘΟΨ ΝΕ ΠΕΚΝΟΤ.

**Rhematic (π-): rare**

Num. 24:20 ταρξη ντενιεθνος νε πιαμαληκ.
Gen. 37:33 τωονον μπαυρι νε θαι.
Deut. 33:29 τσχι πε πεκωσβων — a gnostic generic sentence (see Chapter Three for the generic-name article).

Probably most prevalent are cases of demonstrative Rheme (usually cataphoric):

NAI NE NH ETEXAΩ MMWOS — a recurring formulaic construction (e.g. Ex. 4:22, 8:16, 9:1, 10:3 etc.).

ΦΑΙ ΠΕ ΝΗ ΕΤΝΑΨΩΠΙ (Num. 34:2f.); see also Ex. 29:1:38, Gen. 24:14, 45:9.

Possessive Rhemes:
Ex. 19:5 ΦΩΙ ΓΑΡ ΠΕ ΠΙΚΑΡΙ ΤΗΡΙ SIM. Gen. 26:20.
Gen. 26:20 ΦΩΝ ΠΕ ΠΙΜΩΒΩ.
Gen. 12:12 ΤΕΨΧΙΜΕ ΠΕ ΘΑΙ.
Ex. 4:22 ΠΑΨΟΡΙ ΜΜΙΙΙΙ ΠΕ ΠΙΓΛ.

Adverbial RHEME:
Deut. 32:32 ΕΒΟΑ ΓΑΡ ΣΕΝΘΕΒΩ ΝΑΛΩΛΙ ΝΣΟΔΟΜΑ ΠΕ ΤΟΨΒΩ ΝΑΛΟΛΙ (= VAT) (vs. 32:32f., topicalized ΟΣΕΒΟΛ ΣΕΝ-) — a rare and junctorially instructive case of discord between formal and non-formal Theme, probably due to the ungendered RHEME.

Lev. 23:28 ΕΒΕΒΕΟΨΧΩ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΩΤΕΝ ΠΕ ΝΑΙΤΨΒΡΓ ΕΒΕΒΕΟΨΗΝΩΤ.

Lev. 2:5 ΕΒΟΛ ΣΕΝΟΤΕΧΧΑΡΑ ΠΕ ΠΕΨΑΨΡΩΝ.

Ex. 1:19 ΜΨΡΗ ΑΝ ΝΝΙΓΙΟΜΙ ΝΤΕΧΧΗΜΙ ΝΕ ΝΙΓΙΟΜΙ ΝΤΕΝΙΓΕΒΡΕΟΣ — negated (rare). The placement of ΑΝ is remarkable, and may indicate a focalizing negation of the RHEME (cf. the Focus negation in Focalizing Conversion syntax, below).

Deut. 22:26 ΠΑΙΡΗ ΠΕ ΠΑΙΨΩΒ — as usual for ΠΑΙΡΗ, no marking of adverbial status here. Note P. VAT. copio 9 (B4) Jon. 1:14 ΦΨΡΗ ΕΤΕΟΨΩ(Ψ) ΠΑΙΨΗ ΑΚΙΡΙ.

Obs.
1 In (Ex. 3:14) ΠΑΙΨΗ ΠΕ ΕΤΕΚΕΨΑΡΩ,..., the Relative is not “simply” in commutation with the substantive in the Deut. 22:26 example; it is rather a Relative-expanded Endophoric pattern, a Cleft Sentence (see below). (Observe that ΠΑΙΨΗ ΠΕ is old in Bohairic: cf. James 2:17 Quecke Or. 43 (1974) 388).
2 Note ΜΨΡΗ as Theme: Gen. 32:4 ΦΑΙ ΠΕ ΜΨΡΗ ΕΤΕΨΑΨΜΩ ΜΜΟΣ; Num. 32:8 ΑΝ ΔΙΑΙ ΠΕ ΜΨΡΗ ΕΤΑΨΑΙΨ.
3 The adverbial RHEME in general is old in Bohairic: cf. ΜΗ ΙΣΔΕΝ-ΖΗ ΑΝ ΠΕ ΠΣΙΣ ΠΑΝΟΥΡΗ Hab. 1:12 VAT. copio 9 (B4).

Conversions
Relative: possessive-pronoun Rhemes only?
Gen. 38:25 ΠΙΡΨΜΙ ΕΤΕ-ΝΟΤΨ ΠΕ ΝΑΙ.
Lev. 27:24 ΦΑΙ ΕΤΕ-ΨΨΨ ΠΕ ΠΙΙΟΓΙ.
Lev. 6:8 ΩΣΨΟΙΝΟΙΨ ΠΕ ΠΕΨΜΕΨΙ ΠΕ ΠΣΙΣ (= VAT; (Greek appositive: ΟΣΨΗ ΕΨΨΙΑΣΤΟ ΜΠΗΨΟΨΛΨΟΝ ΑΥΤΗΣ ΣΟΨ ΚΨΡΨ) — note the indefinite antecedent of the hermeneutical Relative.
NE-
Gen. 30:30 negankotzi rap ne nh throv enansnak.
Gen. 43:32 neotcwq rap pe nniremenxhmi pe manecwot
niben.

Obs.
The Relative NS pattern expands a non-specific nucleus in Nitrian and nt too:
De Vis II 55 ganghug... ete- anok pe pirovit mmwov; AM I 205 nireqer-
nobi throv ete-anok pe pirovit eteθshtov; Philipp. 3:19:19 naí ete-
totoxe pe ptao naí ete-potnovi pe totnezi is a case of the Copular
Pattern converted.

Assorted remarkable cases:
(1) Although the normal appositive syntagmatics, viz. juxtaposition, is
the rule between {πε} (nucleus) and its expansion, for numbers we find
n- apposition:
Deut. 23:12 ganbote ne mp-θ.
(2) A unique example of naxe- apposition, properly belonging in the
verb clause system: I cannot account for it, but the Presentative is also
remarkable:
Deut. 10:14 γησπε γαρ na-πσε peknowt πε naxe-τφε nem
tφε nτετφε πικαγι nem nh throv eteθshtq (= Vat)12.
(3) Gen. 32:4 φαι πε μφρητ ετεθωρ:mmoc — μφρητ , ad-
verbial, is here the Theme.
(4) The expanded Theme may be topicalized (see pattern III below) in
a rare solemn asseveration, where Topic and Theme are not only co-
present, but co-referent and almost synonymous: Deut. 7:9 πσε
peknout φαι πε φη.
(5) Ex. 16:23:25 gancabaton ne etostab mpsoe pe toot...nencabaton mpsoe pe poos.
An especially nice instance of the "foreshadowed enclitic" (Shisha-
Halevy 1986a:167f., and see Chapter Four) combined with pattern
switching (I to II or IV). It is clear that ne and pe belong here to the
same prosodic category.
(6) Ex. 1:19 μφρητ αν nnigioimi nteθsθmi ne nnigioimi nte-
nigeθpoc.
An instance of affirmative nexus but negative Rheme. Cf. the opposition
between negative Focus and negative nexus (the Focalizing Conversion,
below).

12 Compare the probably Copular ntaq pe nimaith an nevite naxe-pwarp
pwme (Man. Ps. 22.6f.; cf. Wurst apud Schenke 1997/8b:190), where naxe-
specifies the Theme ntaq, not the Copula pe, which is phorically inert.
(7) Deut. 33:17 γανταπ ντεφαοτταν νοσωτ πε νεφταπ.
Poetic language — homolexemic Rheme/Theme: note the singular formal Theme.
A unique case of the zero article as Rheme: however, in view of τψθην in verse 33 (so Vat too), I would suspect the same form in our verse too (phonetic simplification of a difficult cluster?).
(9) Ex. 30:13 (τφαψι ντκιτ) ... ἐντεβι πε τκιτ.
A noteworthy locus. I see this as an instance of the Immutable-Theme pattern (V), with the final τκιτ not appositive Theme, but distributive-adverbial (“It’s 20 bricks per Kitī”).

(III) The Delocutive Pattern, Theme topicalized
This pattern is very typical of Bohairic, and typologically important in Bohairic more than in any other dialect. In fact, the devalued Bohairic Topic is encountered not only in NS patterning: contrast John 9:3 Φαι μπεψερνοβι with Sah. Μπεψερνοβε. However, topicalization as a general issue must be studied further; by general impression I would suggest that the Topicalized Nominal-Sentence Theme is still a case apart. In a superficial sense, this pattern is the mirror image of the Expanded Delocutive (II), and these two patterns are the only ones of the Delocutive set to be “in concurrence”, i.e. in paradigmatic opposition.
A key feature in this pattern is the devaluation of topicality — the Topic being formally defined by its conditioned resumption by a pronominal, formally thematic anaphor — into a clause-initial Theme. This is a devaluation by no means absolute and complete, yet no doubt more than incipient. In fact, it is probably a gradient feature; but the real “topicality of the Topic” is usually maintained through special signalling, e.g. by μεν... Δε... and other exponents of contrastive prominence (cf. Gen. 27:22 ἔσερκε μεν τσμ ιακωβ τε ιακια Δε ιακια ιακια). Or, by macrosyntactic linkage to the preceding context or context (consider the pragmatic Topic in Ex. 12:26 Φαιψεμψι ος πε); or by the determination of the Rheme and the relationship of its lexeme to that of the Topic. On the other hand, Lev. 13:21 Φαι οςγαλ λει illustrates the Topic-turned-Theme extreme. This is a case of what is too generally known as “grammaticalization” (an unfortunate term really, since any attested linguistic form or combination is “grammatical” by definition of grammatical structure. Better, “formalization”). A formal feature that strongly corroborates this analysis is the inclusion of the Topic in the conversion of the clause. However, an even more important distinctive feature of the pattern, its raison d’être in fact, is the high
cohesivity of its Topic: I believe this is the main difference between the two concurring patterns (II) and (III) — the former Rheme-initial, Theme-final, essentially delimitative, the latter Theme-initial, in structural sequence Theme-final, and highly cohesive. (The Topic of [III] is also generally speaking of higher specificity than the Theme of [II]).

**Distinctive Profile:**

- The pattern is essentially dialogic — rarely narrative, unless 
  ne-converted; then in Comment Mode (e.g. Gen. 46:32)
- The prevalence of demonstratives as Topics is very striking indeed:
  yet they also occur also as expansions in pattern (II), which calls for a
  resolution of the paradigmatic opposition between the two patterns (see
  below).
- The Rheme constituency is as varied as that of Pattern (II), but
  subtly different from it, in that cases of specific Rheme are rare, and the
  typical Rheme is non-specific or specificity-indifferent.
- Topic constituency, syntagmatics and specificity. The Topic is
  highly specific and cohesive, not only by determinators (consider Gen.
  29:31; also, Proper Names and the frequent {φωι} and possessive
  articles). {φωι} ({πωι}-) is, I believe, particularly important. As a rule
  combining with non-specific Rhemes, it is the most striking case of
  Topic-to-Theme formalization (in fact, neutralizing the distinction be-
  tween Topic and Theme).

  Note: (a) extensive topics are rare: Gen. 48:5; (b) the Topic may be
  expanded by a (Preterite) relative form, which is placed as final in the
  clause (a construction to be carefully distinguished from the Cleft Sen-
  tence): Gen. 37:10 ταίρας αν τε παυρια ετάκνας ερος. On
  the other hand, Present-tense relatives occur within the Topic units —
  the Topic may then be fairly extensive (Gen. 41:27); (c) cases of Topic/
  Rheme balance — equi-specificity, homolexemicity — are very rare,
  and favour balanced or correlative Wechselsatz reading: Gen. 25:28
  άε-νε-τεψδορας τεψδε τε (for more examples, see below; in
  this, too, our pattern corresponds to the Sahidic Copular Theme-to-
  Rheme pattern). In fact, the specificity imbalance — highly specific
  Topic, non-specific Rheme — is a prime factor, the most striking char-
  acteristic of this pattern.
- Generally speaking, in cases of “real” prominent Topics (see above),
  this pattern focalizes the Rheme (Deut. 9:13 παίαςος γαναφατ-
  ναρίνε) and is opposed to the expanding Theme (Pattern II) as typi-
  cally allocutive, not reactive: Ex. 12:27 φαυκεμενι ωτ α — οι-
  ωσωουωνωμεν μνες τε παίαςα. The Topicalized-Theme
Pattern, through its initial Thematization, is typically part of thematic progression, and is strikingly anaphorically-linked or context-referred: Deut. 1:17 πῆγαν ψαφίνευσε... follows (verse 15ff.) μανα... ὀφείλει... ἀφειλει... τελευταί... 

- Negation is but rarely attested. In this, the locutive Topicalized Theme pattern is again associated with the Copular Pattern. (Theme-initial NS nexus patterns seem generally to be less compatible with nexual negation). The only instance I find in the corpus follows the Presentative χηππεν εἰκ, and is thus not straightforwardly topicalized:

   Lev. 13:31f. ἀρχιναταὶ... εἴσοδος ὁσῶς χηππεν εἰκ πεξγοὶ ὀνάζανε καὶ πε... ὁσῶς χηππεν μπεξάωρ ἑβολ... ὁσῶς πνέον τεπισογμεν νωταζανε καὶ πε (exactly = Vat, even to the alternation of zero ... καὶ and (non-Circumstantial?) καὶ ... καὶ — an alternation I cannot explain).

- Conversion is well attested, in two constructions. The first converts the Rheme + Formal Theme core alone, with the Topic preceding the converters, the second converts the whole Topic + clause complex. The former delimits the Topic from the Rheme + Formal Theme core, the second links the Topic to the rest of the pattern in especially close junction.

Obs.
(1) This pattern is, as said, typically Bohairic: see POLOTSKY 1987:32, 45f., not considering topicalization but different “clause rhythms”.
(2) See SHIBATANI 1991 for the “grammaticalization of Topic into subject”, which here calls for comment on several counts. First, the terminological “subject”, which I would replace by “Theme”, because of the terminological association of “Subject” with verbal nexus (see above). Second, and more importantly, “grammaticalization” (or better formalization) can, I believe, be meaningful both — or either — synchronically or diachronically. Pronouncing on this phenomenon in the latter perspective is rather fool-hardy in the case of Egyptian (“Demotic-to-Bohairic”?), while the former requires a study of Bohairic topicalization at large, to establish opposition paradigms that would allow us to identify, qualify and possibly quantify the first term as clause-referred, i.e. thematic, rather than discourse-referred, i.e. topical. We will have to characterize types of differences or perhaps transition or gradation between Topics — “weakly cotextual” — and wholly non-cotextual Themes. Moreover, Shibatani does not take into account the junctional factor, of the gradation of cohesion of the clause to its environment. Finally, the whole conceptualization is unfortunately non-structural.
(3) The Topicalized-Theme pattern may, in a broad view, be taken to correspond in Bohairic to the copular pattern (Theme-copula-Rheme) in Sahidic — cf. POLOTSKY 1987:36ff.; LOPRIENO 1995:267 n.76.
(4) Diachronic precedessors are considered in a Sahidic view of things, e.g. SETHE 1916 §128ff. Ours is a pattern of importance in the diachrony of the Egyptian NS — indeed, Sethe reflects on its primacy (in relative diachrony) in the later phases of Egyptian over
the expanded-Theme pattern. See also Johnson 1981 (Demotic); Westendorf 1981/3:86ff. (LE too seems to prefer this pattern! — see Groll 1967; Junge 1981; Satzinger 1981).

(5) Demotic # N N p3y #: see Johnson 1981:419; “anomalous” — yet this pattern is anything but rare (in Johnson 1991:16f., this is the only NS pattern to be illustrated in the corpus-based grammar). It is very common, indeed it is, from the earliest Demotic on (cf. Ryl. IX 3/17f.) almost the first pattern that comes to mind for predicating one noun of another. Consider Oracle 5/10, Ins. 9/23, Mag. 12/26, Myth. 17/15, I Setne 5/12 etc. (Cf. also the “Your elder son is my elder son” formulaic clause in marriage contracts).

(6) In Nitrian Bohairic, the reference contour for this pattern is distinct, also, endophoric-like, anaphoric to the Rheme: De Vis I 98 τετια μπαρι... τωκ πε παιω, AM I 38 παραι νεμ φωκ ουται πε.

(7) The Topicalized Delocutive is used hermeneutically (in Sahidic, the Copular pattern is used in this case), cf. De Vis II 106, 107; Cat. 10. Note Cat. 40 τετια τοια τε ετε-θυνορ πω πε πορινα, combining both topicalized and endophoric constructions.

(8) Is AM I 54 Νηνοττη μετενοττον τε ταμετοσορο τετενοτσορο τε the Bohairic version of the Wechselsatz or correlated or balanced construction (cf. also Gen. 25:28, quoted below)? For Coptic and Demotic, see Shisha-Halevy 1984a:184ff., 1989b:59.

(9) Non-anaphoric resumption in topicalizing the final-Theme pattern (II) yields cases like ανωκ οτει τε ταμετοσορο John 8:14 (B4). AM I 128 Ανωκ Ναγωνικι νρωμι πε resumes the topicalized plural personal pronoun lexically, as if it were a pronominal determiner — actually the only way of resuming it.

(10) A special Bohairic proleptic topicalizing pattern: cognition verbs contract an idiomatic clause-object construction for Nominal Sentence clauses (Pattern I), in which the Theme of the clause joins the lexeme as object antecedent, and is then resumed in the content-(δε-) clause. It is thus topicalized:

Ex. 2:2 εταυματ δε ἐρον δε-οτανιος πε.
Ex. 16:15 δαμεθων δηνοι αν πε δε-οτ πε.
Ex. 21:36 δαμεθων-πιακι δε-οτρεψοβολδελ πε.
Num. 11:16 ην... ετεκωτων δηνων δε-γανπρεβουτερος ντεπαλαος πε.

In Nitrian: δαμεθωντ δε-ανωκ Νιμ Mac. No. 8 B αυοιν δε-...πε Mac. No. 6; sim. ονι De Vis I 168, II 165; δαμεθωνταλ αν πε δε-...πε De Vis I 69, II 172, Cat. 76 δαμεθων δε- + NS De Vis II 75; Cat. 96, 100 etc.

Selective representative documentation

Indefinite-Article Rheme: most common

Deut. 32:4 Φ ηγαμνανι νε νεψαθοντος ὁτορ νεψασλι νηνοτ λεν.

Gen. 2:23 Φαι νοτος: τοκας πε εβωλ δεννακας νεμ ντορ καρπας εβωλ δεντακαρπας.

Note the colon prosodic unit following Topic + Particle separator.

Gen. 4:13 Πανοι οτεθην πε sim. 18:20.

Gen. 27:11 κατα ιανον οτρωμι ειρητ νωμι πε.

Ex. 12:42 Φαι οτοτερποι ντεπεινι τε — contrast this with the Immutable-Theme Ex. 12:42 οτοτερποι ντεπεινι πε).
Lev. 19:20 οτορ θαί οστωκι τε.
Gen. 28:17 ισθέκ παιμα οτορ所所.
Gen. 46:32 ΝΙΡΨΜΗ ΔΕ ΓΑΝΜΑΝΕΩΣΟΤ ΝΕ ΓΑΝΨΜΗ ΓΑΡ 
ΝΡΕΨΜΗΝΤΕΒΝΗ ΝΕ — a rare unconverted narrative (Comment 
Mode) instance.
Deut. 12:23 περσνοη οτιτπχ τε.
Lev. 27:28 ΤΕ-ΠΕΘΟΤΑΒ ΝΕ ΝΤΕΝΕΘΟΤΑΒ ΜΗΣΤ.
Deut. 3:11:17, 4:24, 7:16);
Rheme: number, quantifier
Deut. 6:5 ΝΤΗ ΠΕΚΝΟΤΤΟΤ ΟΤΑΙ ΝΕ.
Gen. 41:25 ΑΡΑΚΟΙ ΝΘΑΡΑΜ ΟΤΙ ΤΕ.
Gen. 41:27 λς νες έτσωμ ΕΤΖΑΙΟΤΟΤ ΟΤΟΡ ΕΤΣΟΤ 
ΕΘΝΟΣ ΕΠΩΣΙ ΚΑΜΕΝΘΟΤ Τ ΝΡΟΜΠΙ ΝΕ.
Ex. 12:40 ΠΙΖΙΝΣΑΛΙ ΝΤΕΝΕΝΨΗΡΙ ΝΠΙΣΑ ... ΤΑ ΝΡΟΜΠΙ 
ΠΕ (Vat. ΝΕ) — the concord with the Rheme, as in Vat, indicates a 
different pattern (the Endophoric Theme, Pattern IV).
Also Gen. 46:26f., 47:9.
Interrogative-Pronoun Rheme: ΝΙΜ, ΟΤ
Gen. 24:65 ΝΑΡΨΜΗ ΝΙΜ ΝΕ ΕΤΤΗ — not Cleft Sentence, but 
Relative expansion of the Topic (not the Rheme!), which is pragmatically 
cohesive and syntactically final.
Gen. 44:15 ΝΑΙΨΒ ΟΤ ΝΕ ΕΤΑΡΕΤΕΝΑΙQ ΣΙΜ. EX. 1:18.
Gen. 29:15 ΠΕΚΒΕΧΕ ΟΤ ΝΕ ΣΙΜ. GEN. 46:33 = 47:3.
Gen. 37:10 ΑΡΑΚΟΣ ΟΤ ΤΕ ΝΑΨΗΡΙ ΕΤΑΚΨΑΤ ΕΡΟΣ.
Also Ex. 12:26, Deut. 7:1.
Specificity-indifferent Rhemes:
Deut. 33:7 ΦΑΙ ΦΑΙΟΤΑΔΑΣ ΝΕ.
Deut. 1:17 ΠΕΝ ΦΑΦΤ ΝΕ — the possessive pronoun is specificity-indifferent: see Chapter Three.
Ex. 13:2 ΙΣΘΕΚΡΨΜΗ ΨΑΡΤΕΒΝΗ ΝΟΤΗ ΝΕ ΣΙΜ. GEN. 48:5 — 
adverbial Topic.
Num. 20:19 ΝΙΨΒ ΕΛΙ ΝΕ.
Also Ex. 9:29.
Specific Rheme: Π- Ν- /-ΝΣΕ- (rare)
Deut. 21:17 ΦΑΙ ΤΑΡΧΗ ΝΤΕΝΕΨΗΡΗ ΝΕ ΣΙΜ. EX. 12:2 — note 
that this article ({{p Per}}) is not specifying per se: see Chapter Three. How-
ever, in Deut. 21:17 we find a Relative clause coordinated to the Rheme: 
οτορ ετεσχε ναχ εσι ντιμετωρ μμικι, a remarkable com-
patibility, which must mean a pronominal, not converter role of the Relative.

Ex. 13:6 πιεγοστ ηε μμαγ-ξ πωλη μποιε πε — possibly a Topicalized Endophoric ("On the seventh day, it's/there is the Lord's Holiday").

**Specific Rheme: Possessive Article** (rare)

Gen. 25:28 ηε-τεγκοραξε τεσάμε τε — almost Wechselsatz.

Gen. 31:43 ναβερι ηε ναβερι νε οτοο ναιτεβνωνοι νατεβνωνοι νε ναι τηροε ηετεναο ερλοο: ηοην νε νεμ ναβερι — two instances of the Wechselsatz or correlative/balanced construction.

**Adverbials as Rheme** (uncommon)

Ex. 29:14 Φαλ εφενσονια ηαρ πε (= Vat).

Num. 11:7 πιμανα ηηφηη νοπερβηνοσ πε.

**Conversions**

**Relative:**

The only instance has the converter bracketing the whole [Topic + core] complex:

Lev. 14:35 Φη ετε-πινη Φωι πε.

Obs.

The same construction in Dan. 6:2 (Bardelli) ετεδανινα οτσι ηοητοι πε.

**Circumstantial:**

Gen. 11:3 οτοο ατοστων οσων ηυνι νωοο ηυνι οτοο ποτ-και εοσπερι πε — ποτκαι stands here in symmetry to τοστωνο, and the Circumstantial is schematic complement to ηυνι, and thus not properly topical.

**νε-:** in Narrative, all instances of "Narrator's Channel", Comment Mode — see above.

Gen. 25:28 ηε-νε-τεγκοραξε τεσάμε τε (= Vat) — this locus — one of the Wechselsatz kind, with the Topic and Rheme of equal specificity — is marked by especially close linkage of Topic to clause, as against the normal delimitation of the Topic from the clause by the conversion, in a homogenous series of passages, all predicating a quality or property, all coordinated, with a Proper-Name Topic, all background-supplying in narrative Comment Mode:

Num. 12:3 οτοο πηρωνι μωτηςη νεοτρεμποαι πε εμα-υω.
Gen. 29:31 Ράχαλ ἀπό νέος νεοτάσφρην τε.
Gen. 24:1 οὕτως ἀβραάμ νεομένελλο πε.
Ex. 16:36 πιγοσμορ ἀπὸ νεοτρεμίτε πε ντεπι-Ὴ νῳ.
Gen. 29:17 λῶς ἀπὸ νεοτάσφρειν νιατε τε.
Num. 12:3 οὕτως πιρσμή μεταχε νεοτριπτάῳ πε ἐμαγω.
Num. 35:23 οὕτως νεομένελλοι ντοτά ταν πε.
Lev. 24:10 οὕτως άχι εβολ νάε-πτομάρι ντοτόγμι νικρα-λίτης οὕτως παλ νεοτόμιρι νε πε νεοτρεμνημι νέουν-ωμάρι νικά.
Also Ex. 33:11, 22:4.

Obs.
Again, conversion before Topic may be an indication of grammaticalization into Theme.
An Early Bohairic example: εὐαράβαλλον ἀπὸ νομον πε John 18:40 (B4).

Assorted Remarkable Cases

(1) Gen. 45:6 οὕτως ἀφαρ ομαγρομπί νητε τε ἐπατόψωμι...
This is a case of the Topicalized Endophoric Theme: see below. This is characterized by the concord of the formal Theme with the Rheme, not the Topic, and the placement of ἀφαρ: contrast Ex. 29:14, quoted above. (Vat has Pattern (II)). Note discord with ἐπατ-, in P and Vat.

(2) Gen. 41:26f. νήε νεγε νέοπατον τε νομπομπί νε οὕτως πι-νήε νεμε νέοπατον τε νομπομπί νε — note the plural reference to the "complexive", formally singular Topic. This instance is hermeneutic, and in Sahidic would probably be copular (the Theme-to-Rheme sequence applies to our pattern too).

(3) In Ex. 31:15 πεγασς ἀπὸ μμαγ-νασκάβατον τον νε [οὐχ] εμπότον ἐμοταβ μπάζε (οὐχ super lin.) (= Vat) we have the Topicalized Endophoric Pattern (below).

(4) Deut. 8:9 οτάρτι νέ-νεκφωνι μβενιντι νε.
The Circumstantial- νε- conversion is probably in adnominal status; like the relative, converting the whole topicalized complex. The Rheme would then be adverbial (a unique example of the rhematizing ν- as Rheme of NS). Vat has here επενεκφωνι μανβενιντι νε, which is remarkable too, in the form επε- of the Circumstantial converting a NS.

(5) Lev. 11:41 σατιν μεν ... ορόρεβ νητεν πε φαλ (= Vat).
This again is a topicalization of the Endophoric Pattern (IV), showing a resumption of the Topic in a peculiar demonstrative extension, thus, in effect, topicalization of Pattern (II).

(6) Num. 16:3 ταιτναγωγιν θηρκ γανρωμι ετοσαβ νε (= Vat) — an instance of ad sensum reference to the Topic.
(7) Deut. 4:35 πέρικνοντι ννον πε φτ — it is doubtful whether this is the Topicalized-Theme pattern (II) and not a Topicalized Delocutive variety of the "Divine Acclamation" construction: see below.

(8) Num. 22:3 αἰκίας σαβολ μοι φαί φικρι λνον πε.

Here the Nominal Sentence has adverbial status ("for the second time").

(IV) The Delocutive Pattern: Theme Endophoric. (IVA), The Endophoric Pattern Topicalized

Gen. 37:27 ιε-πενκον πε ονογ τενκαξ τε.
Ex. 20:10 πενπυγοσ αε μμαγ-ιπ νενκαβατον μπε-πεκνοντι πε.

This pattern, common in the corpus, is an intriguing one, important, I believe, both for its unique internal juncture and reference mechanism and for the fact that it is in Sahidic the core of the much more familiar Cleft Sentence. In this pattern, the Theme πε/τε/νε is even "more formal" than elsewhere: it refers back — mechanically, in a manner of speaking, and purely as a means of internal cohesion — to the determinator nucleus (Chapter Three) in the Rheme, in a kind of automatism that makes its phoricity non-pertinent, and functional only as a junctural signal and suprasegmental signifiant of copula. Quoting from Shisha-Halevy 1987:164f. "the theme is empty, a 'dummy' slot-filler, formal constituent...indeed a mark of the preceding segment's rhematic status... [the formal theme] is neither commutable with [n]or referent to any lexeme and is thus paradigmatically as well as macrosyntactically inert".

The Endophoric Theme is thus internally phoric and has no real referent deictic role, either in the cotextual environment or in the pragmatic situation of the clause. This approximately matches Karl Brugmann's "freie Impersonalien" and "Subjektlose Verba"13, in Indo-European a verbal diathesis and valency feature; or "It's..." / "C'est..." (occasionally. "There is...") clauses. (However, the zeroed-Theme pattern is in Bohairic essentially different: see above).

If this pattern is somewhat problematic, it is not in the systemic fact and details of its very existence and structure, but, technically, in identifying and distinguishing it from the final (expanded) Theme pattern (II)

and the Topicalized-Theme one (III). It must also be carefully distinguished from the “Immutable Theme” one (V, below), in which πε is pragmatic and situationally or exophorically referent. This is difficult for the sgl. masculine determinators, but can nevertheless be based on formal and semantic evidence.

Obs.
(2) The Existential-Presentational reading of the Endophoric pattern, triggered by the conjunction of an adverbial modification with an non-specific Existant/Presentate-Rheme, is shared by some varieties of the Immutable Theme one (see below): the unedited. (B4) Zach. 3:9 εἰς ποιῆσαι πρό τις να ἄναρχει μὴ εἰς “There are seven eyes” or “Seven eyes are observable” (Greek existential ἔστα τὰ διακλίματά εἶναι). Evidently, there are two different kinds of existence or existentiality relation expressed here (οὐκ-μὴ would have here a different meaning): our locus is presentative and explicative.

Distinctive Profile

- Textemics. The distribution of the pattern is broad: legal, diagnostic, expositive textemes; dialogue; narrative (when πε- converted).
- Juncturally, the pattern is more highly linked than the final-Theme pattern (II). It is often reactive: responsive to questions — especially Cleft — or reactive to querying pragmatic situations; also resultative, grounding-explicative (explicative ΄ε- or Ρα are significant components), constative, diagnostic, summing-up, definitional. It usually occurs at the end of its macro-unit (usually demarcated by the lemniscus graphemic delimiter “÷” [see Chapter Four], which properly belongs to the preceding text, as it were a colon or semi-colon), constituting itself a final boundary signal or delimiter. (All this does not apply to the dialogic occurrences, to the negated or converted or modified pattern, or to the Topicalized Endophoric). The Endophoric pattern also follows a presetting adverbial phrase.
- Negation is relatively well attested.
- Conversion is well attested. πε- narrativizes the pattern; most often in Comment Mode, but occasionally for the Narrative Peak (Gen. 29:15 ξηππει πε-αι σε).

Obs.
(1) I find in the corpus no instance of the type ταῖς περὶ ταῖς περὶ τε (I Cor. 15:32), Endophoric (not Topicalized) Theme, with its real Rheme the lexemic reiteration (Common in Shenoute, cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 1984a). In Nitrian, νοεπ νοεπ πε πάσωις ποιτυ νοποτε πνευματικόι νοποτε ναποτε ναποτε (Cat. 230) belongs rather to the Immutable-Theme or “ἀνοκ πε” pattern (below).
(2) A suppletive alternant of this NS is conjugated ηὔπνι: ἡπατέφναυ ηὔπνι (Gen. 29:7)

(3) The Endophoric responsive to a Cleft Sentence, even without the formal Theme π-:
#οτ ετ-# #γαν- ne# De Vis II 92; Cat. 229.

(4) The Endophoric/unexpanded Delocutive responsive to the final-Theme expanded delocutive: Cat. 32, 33, 36, 40, 58 — hermeneutic syntax.

(5) The Endophoric pattern is well attested in Demotic, from its earliest phase on: SHISHA-HALEVY 1989b:55ff. Consider Ryl. IX 3/17f., 6/15, 8/9,13 etc. A Demotic predecessor of the hermeneutical Relative Conversion following a Proper Name (Or. 2/12f.) Kmj nty-jw i3-wmn p3y, also Mag. verso 1/8. Negativated: P. Berlin 13619 line 10f. bn t3y.w prt-sht in t3y (ed. Zauzich, Papyri der Insel Elephantine, Berlin 1978) “It’s not their seed-grain”. Converted: Circumstantial, Setne II 5/15. In Demotic, we seem to have most often zero-determination of the Rheme: ἱμ p3y Ankhsh. 9/16 (pragmatic?), or Ryl. IX 17/5 (negativated): bn dnty jw-n3w-mtw.f įn t3y. P. Berlin P. 13549 12 (ed. Zauzich 1993) mdt jw-jw.s p3-4 s3w t3y “It's a matter concerning the four phylai”. This may be essentially different, for here the reference — and the concord linkage — is to a gender/number exponent or occurrence-slot contained in the lexeme itself, like the residual case of Coptic con/cwñi, eço/eqw and such. In written language, one must consider this slot still fully operative (cf. French written language) — Ryl. IX 10/21 rmt-swg.w n3w, P. Berlin P. 15628 line 7f. md.t 3.i m-s3 t3y, also II Setne 2/17; Oracle 6/7 zero-determined but specific: ĥrw n3-nr tw p3y Or. 6/7; indefinite: w'-msh...p3y Loeb 10/4f., w'-nr...p3y Mag. 3/17. However, this is the case in NS generally; consider P. Berlin P. 13549 12 to 15 (ed. Zauzich 1993), where we have instances of the Endophoric, Delocutive and Topicalized Delocutive patterns, all with zero-determined Rheemes, and it seems that the determination opposition in this slot is between p3- and zero, with the indefinite playing a marginal role, if any: this needs further study. (In P. Berlin P. 13549 verso 5 we find a mysterious t3y which seems to sum up (neutrally) a preceding context, but, since its following adverbial sequence appears to be rhematic, may be endophorically thematic to an unexpressed feminine Rheme such as mdt: i3y r t3m sgyb r-jr.f Zauzich “Das ist (ein Wort) um ihn nicht zu verletzen”...“Für den Sprecher liegt damit eine Art Nominalsatz vor: (mt) t3y”. See also below, for the Topicalized Endophoric in Demotic.

Selective representative Documentation

Lev. 3:3 οτογ ετείνι εζότν εβόλ εσεπισουσωσύ ι

Ex. 12:11 οσογ ερετεινώτωμε εσενοίως = οσπασχα

Lev. 6:10 αἰθίη νοτοί εβόλ εσσιοτταγ ετυπη μπὰ

Lev. 18:17 ηνεκει ιντωπερι εντεπεσύ ι

Gen. 37:27 ες-πενονέες οτος ήτοπατά τε.

Lev. 16:4 οσιβος ινασ εκτοσωβο ηεθηι ηιθηι ι

Osvboc ινασ εκνουν ιονερ ιονερ ιονερ ιονερ ιονερ ιονερ
Lev. 20:14 δι' ενασιν νοσεῖмι νέμες τεκμαρτ δι' ουτομοίια τε εὐεργετήρι γενοῦσιν.

Num. 15:26 ουσιν εὐεργετόντας τόπος ... ἔνθετεταιμε τε.

Gen. 28:17 ζείδαν τε ἀλλα πνε Μήθ τε ουσιν ἔθεοι μπλε τε ἀλλα πνε Μήθ τε.

Ex. 31:16 ουσιν εὐεργετόν τατε-μενωρὴν μπίελ ενακαββατον εὐεργετόντων ... ἃ οὐδε ἐν οὐδέ μεγάλῳ νενεχετε.

Num. 18:19 ην εὐτιλίκον μπλε ... αἰθητὸν ἀν καὶ ... οὐ-νομος μενεικ ... οὐδε ἐν οὐδέ μεγάλῳ νενεχετε τε ... μπλε μπλε τε νακ ἐν καὶ ην εὐεργετόν μένεικω.

Num. 28:17 ουσιν διηνικέες γνωμοί τω μπλενοτομοτίμετο πωσιν πε.

Ex. 32:5 πωσιν μπλετ τε παρτοτ — παρτοτ is here a clause modifier (adverbial) and not an appositive Theme (Pattern II).

Lev. 23:5f. δηνππιγοττ ταμπτοτ σενγοτ-ιαδ μπλενοτομοτ τε-κεμήτ ἡν ἀναροφοτοσ οὐπασχα πε μπλε τε ουσιν δηνππιγοττ μπλε-κοττ-ιαδ μπλενοτομοτ ... οὐσινοτε μενεγκακωπ τε μπλε τε.

Lev. 27:7 εὐστιν μεν οὐσιοτομοτ πε εὐστιν δε οὐσεῖμι τε.

παντοτ / τασσιτι τε / τασσιτι τε / παντοτ τε / πατιματικα τε etc. (Gen. 20:2:5:12, 26:7:9, 37:27 etc.); very probably also τεκμαρτ γαρ τε / τεκκονιτ γαρ νενειωτ τε (Lev. 18:7:11).

Obs.
(1) Some Nitrian and NT documentation for the Endophoric Pattern:
Mac. 6 άνοι γενεπωτοτι μματατοτοτ
Mt. 5:34 μπεργτρκ υτεχε δε-πενονοσ μήθ τε πε ... οτατε ιάνμ δε-εβακι μπινμπιμήτ οντροτ τε seems on its way to the Topicalized Endophoric pattern (IVa below).

Ez. 13:15 (εἰεδωκ εβολ μπαδωντ εδενταυτοτι) μη ταίδωτι αν τε μη μη
Ιτατούει μμοκ ματ ιατι "
John 5:10 παπατατοτ τε.
John 10:22 ττρμω τε.
John 9:4 πεποοτοτ πε (πι - "day" contrasted with "night").
John 12:31 ττοτοτ παπ απ πε (topicalizing premodification?).
The Endophoric responsive to Cleft Sentence: John 9:2.
I Cor. 7:4 (she/he has no authority) αλλα τεγείμι τε / πιγαι τε.

Neg: οτε γε 
Nep: μενεμε 
Nep: παπατ 
Nitrian ταναγκι τε or ταναγκι εροι τε (+ e- + INF/εορε-)- De Vis I 87, 100, or ἀναγκι τε 
εορε- Cat. 49 or ἀναγκι εορε- Cat. 49 (cf. Mt. 18:7), or ἀναγκι ε-
+INF (zero Theme) Rom.13:5. Bodmer III (B4) John 10:16 has ἀναγκι + Conjunctive
(cf. the "Rhematic Word-class" (SHISHA-HALEVY 1998:157ff. for Welsh, with references to other languages).
(2) Zeroed-Theme-Endophoric instances are found in Luke. This is instructive, being indicative of the highly formal slot-filling nature of this Theme: #πορεύομαι Luke 24:29 (v.l. πορεύομαι); #κανονίζω Luke 20:20.

Conversions:

Relative: hermeneutic, following Proper Name as formal antecedent:

Gen. 35:6 λογὸς ... ετε-βεβαία πε.
Ex. 1:11 ἡμ ἐτε-βεβαία μὴ ρή τε.

Circumstantial:

Ex. 29:18 ὅσοι εἰκοί μπιωίλα θήρ οἰκεννίμα νερ-πωρουμοϊσι μπτέ ... εορμωροισυ μπτέ πε.

πε-: the most common conversion:

Gen.29:25 νελια γαρ τε.
Gen.29:15 γινπε νε-λια τε.

πε- + time-expression + πε (Gen. 15:17 Φωτι κατ Ν-, 40:20 πεσοῦνν μπικί, πεσοῦντ ντεγι μπαλοι Num. 13:20 etc.).

Obs.
(1) Hermeneutical [...] ετε- + Rheme πε De Vis I 43, 46, 48, 193, 194, II 23, 162, 34, 95, 106, 111, 118 (ετε-ἀνοικ πε — a different pattern, discussed below; also in our corpus: Gen. 44:15), Cat. 132, 169, ετε Rheme πε vs. ετε-φαι πε Rheme Cat. 14, 34 (also with πω ον). Also Cat. 4, 7, 28, 41, 60, 63, 64, 66; Col. 1:6, Heb. 9:10, Eph. 1:14:23, 5:23 v.l. πε/τε; zeroed πε (at least as a variant reading): Col. 1:15:24:27, Heb. 10:20 and so on. Note that πε in these constructions is always a final boundary signal (this is striking in Demotic: e.g. II Setne 2/10). The Rheme is always highly specific, with a specificity-raising apposition. In fact, this Relative is not a converter; consider οσ- ετε-Ν πε (again, rising specificity) Cat. 89, 187, and the in itself remarkable Relative following a Proper-Name antecedent.

(2) The hermeneutical Endophoric "ετε-Ν πε" varies with the converted copular ετε-φαι πε Ν.

(3) πε may be zeroed in the hermeneutical Endophoric pattern ετε-Rheme πε Col. 1:15:24:27, Heb. 10:20. Consider also, De Vis II 15 ΦΝ ετε-θνον πε πιώνας, De Vis II 29 θαι ετε-πεσαθον πε πιώνας.

(4) Narrativization of the pattern is quite frequent outside the corpus:
AM II 299 περοῦντι γαρ πε.
SV 38 οπισθοκ γαρ μπιομπν πε.
SV 54 πε-ταρμπ γαρ τε.
AM I 151 νεοτρακοι πε.
John 13:30 νεαὼρτε δε πε (note the zero article).

(5) Note Cat. 211 ενε-φαι γαρ πε "if it were so" see Gen. 28:19 quoted below.

Assorted Remarkable Cases

(1) Gen. 31:38:41 Ναίκ νπομπι νε εἰξη νεμακ is not a Cleft Sentence, but a kindred, Presentational pattern. Similarly:
(2) Deut. 2:14 ἵνα προσπιὰν σατερίζῃ...
(3) Gen. 44:6 φαι γαρ ἐμαγρομπίνι β’ τε εἰς ἀνωττώπι.
(4) Gen. 28:19 φαι ἂν πε “This/it isn’t so” may be Endophoric, but
(5) Num. 32:8 ἄν-φαι ἄν πε μφρήτ’ ετασαυρόμενα να-νετενιοτ’ is probably a case of Pattern (II), with thematic μφρήτ’.
(6) Num. 11:19 νοτεροῦσαν ἄν πε ερετεννατοῦσωμ χάρι τ’ ὁδε β’ ἄν πε ὁδε β’ νεροῦσαν ἄν πε ὁδε ἰ ἄν πε — this catalogue of negated Endophorics represents the Focus of a foregoing Cleft Sentence (with Circumstantial Topic: see below).
(7) Ex. 10:9 ἀνον τενναψεναν ... πνευμα γαρ τττττ τεν-νοστ’ (Vat πνευμα γαρ... πε). A rare instance of zeroed Endophoric Theme (cf. Pattern I above for the zeroing of the anaphoric Theme).
(8) Gen. 45:8 τ’ πνευμα τε νεωτερα εν τοι θενοτεριτ’ εποναι αλλα ττττ τ’ πε is interesting, combining the Endophoric or the Immutable Theme pattern — it is impossible to ascertain which — with a non-Cleft focalizing construction (focussing ἄν; see below).

Obs.
(1) Contrast Mac. No. 29 κε-ι νρομπι πε σαται with Mac. No. 5 κε-εροοτ’ ε ετ-, which has a zero-Theme Cleft Sentence.
(2) Consider Nitrian and NT: φαι (ἐγώ/ ἰὼ ὁν) πε μφρήτ’... Cat. 2, 38, 105, 194 etc. Rom. 5:15. Relevant are also Cat. 3, 4 πατρητ’ πε, Cat. 4 πασρήτ’ πε ἐναπ-, Cleft Sentence, contrasted with πασρήτ’ ... ἐπε-πασωτ νανάπ Cat. 52, a zero-theme Cleft Sentence; Cat. 211 ενε-φαι γαρ πε “if it were so”.

(IVa) The Endophoric Pattern Topicalized
In the Topicalized Endophoric, a sub-pattern, the formal Theme does not agree with the Topic (there is thus a considerable delimitation between Topic and kernel pattern). This pattern does not share the special macro-syntactic linkage of the Endophoric (above):
Ex. 31:15 περγεωτ’ δε μμαρ-ς γανκαββατον ≠ νε [οτμ] κ’τον εφοιται μπτε’ (οτμ super lin).
Ex. 32:16 ΝΠΠΛΑΝ ΝΟΣΡΩΒ ΝΤΕΦ’ ΠΕ ΟΤΟΓ ΤΓΡΑΦ ΝΟΣΑΓΡΑΦ ΝΤΕΦ’ ΤΕ (= Vat).
Lever. 11:10 ην τθροτ ... οτσρεβ πε.
Nicely contrasted with the clearly Endophoric case of γανωρεβ ΝΤΕΝ ΝΕ (Lever. 11:10:12:13). See ANDERSSON 1904:103f.
Ex. 12:42 θαι οτσερψι ΝΤΕΝΣΤΕ ΤΕ.
Lever. 25:33 ΝΙΗΙ ΝΤΕ-ΝΙΒΑΚΙ ΝΤΕΝΙΛΕΤΙΤΗΣ ΟΤΑΜΑΡΙ ΝΤΣΟΤ ΠΕ (= Vat)
Ex. 35:2 περγεωτ’ δε μμαρ-ς ΝΕΤΟΝ ΠΕ (= Vat).
Φαι Φμας-νος πε (Gen. 27:36, Num. 22:28:32, 24:10) — adverbal status: "for the... time".

Ex. 30:13 (τελωι ηντιτι...) κντεβι πε ηκιτι — possibly a Topicalized Immutable-Theme (Pattern V) case. ηκιτι is adverbal, not thematic: "per kiti".

Obs.
(1) Nitrian and NT examples: Cat. 171 παίαποτ ηκαορκ ιμερι πε.
1 Cor. 15:56 τσοτρι Γαρ μφοντ φνοβι πε ταομ δε μφοντ φνομος πε:
A sorites syllogism, in Bohairic not Copular (as in Sahidic) but Topicalized Endophoric. Rom. 6:23 ηνφωνιοι ... φνοτ πε.
1 Cor. 11:3 ταφε η-... X πε + ταφε η- πε X.
(2) In Demotic: P. Berlin (ed. Zauzich) P. 15530 x+10f. Ht-ntr Yb jrpy '3 ραγ: note the anaphora to the Rheme, not to the Topic.

(V) The Delocutive Pattern: Immutable ("Pragmatic-situation" / Exophoric) Theme (πε)

The existence of this pattern as distinct from the Endophoric-Theme one is certain, although it is difficult to distinguish between the two in cases of masculine (sgl.) Rhemes. First, it is the pattern predating interlocutive personal pronouns. Second, it is formally the core pattern for the Bohairic Cleft Sentence (see below; in Sahidic it is the Endophoric which is the core):

Ex. 19:4 νωτεν πε ιπατεννατ.
Num. 23:16 ναι πε ητεκεκαξι μμοσ (Vat ναι πετεκε-).
Ex. 23:12, 35:2 ζ ηκοσ πε ιτεκιρη ηνηκηβητι.
Gen. 43:11 ικαι ηαριτπι πε ιριοτι ιμαι.

Two types of this special construction are observable. In the first, the pragmatic πε enters into nexus with an interlocutive pronoun or (rarely) a non-specific noun. Rather, a pronoun or noun are predicated of an existent situation; this is a "Rheme" in a very different sense than one segmental element predicated of another. In the second, it is an entire nexus, between an interlocutive pronoun and a Proper Name, which is predicated of the existent situation.

Distinctive Profile:

- The referentiality of the Theme is external (not to the Rheme), yet not anaphoric to a preceding textual segment or to the Topic, but to a pragmatic environment or basis, in which it anchors its nexus.
- A prime formal distinctive feature of the pattern is the discord of the Theme (always πε) with a feminine singular or a plural Rheme.
- Topicalization of the Pragmatic Theme is extremely rare, if at all attested.
• Theme constituency: πε only.
• Rheme constituency: interlocutive pronouns (common); delocutive (very rare); indefinite noun; παίρθ.
• Conversion: Relative only, in hermeneutical glossing.
• Negation: attested only responsively.

Obs.
(1) See Polotsky 1987:117ff. on the “starres πε” in the basis of the Boh. Cleft sentence.
(2) A formally and functionally comparable contrast is expressed in the Modern Hebrew Nominal Sentence by the difference of a gender/number-movable prefixed thematic pronoun ḥū-ḥī-ḷpl. hēm- and an immutable ze-. The formal opposition of a movable personal pronoun and an inert deictic or personal pronoun, in English it’s vs. he is..., French il est... vs. c’est... is not on a par functionally, since the immutable sector is in those cases much broader than in Coptic.

Several subpatterns are observable here:

(a) # PERSONAL PRONOUN πε # - interlocutive and (very rarely) delocutive. ἀνόκ πε, {νοῦς} πε. Dialogic. Not negated in the studied corpus. Of very restricted conversion; never interrogative; almost never modified. The pattern or patterns in point are either presentative or textually representative: in either case, the information structure “Rheme to Theme” is far from certain. On the contrary: while the formally apparent structure advocates seeing πε as thematic, functional evidence contradicts this, and speaks for an a-nexal structure, somewhat similarly to Existential or Presentative ζήτει πε statements which is not to say that ἀνόκ πε expresses the same notion as ζητεῖς ἀνόκ (e.g. Gen. 27:18).

(1) Proclamatory (in “Divine Self-Assertion”) or acclamatory — presentational-existential: interlocutive persons only

Deut. 32:39 ἀνόκ πε οὐσε μμον-κεοταὶ ἐβηλ ἐροὶ.

Obs.
(4) ἀνόκ πε in John 8:24 and 13:19 (“believe that...”) expresses the mystical “theological-existential identity”. Interestingly, negated in Acts 13:25 ἀπετέναθεται ζε-ἀνόκ οὕτως ἀνόκ γαρ ἀν πε, ἀλλα ζητεῖ εἰςνότ θεοῦ μενενίκει must in Coptic mean something like “It’s not me (you’re waiting for)”, but the Greek means something
like “Whatever you think that I am, I am not (it)” (τι ἐμὲ ὑπονοεῖτε εἶναι οὐκ ἐμὲ ἔγω — may ἡρ be the Coptic answer to the focalizing inversion of ἔγω in the Greek?
(5) How is Gen. 44:18 νοοκ πε μενενεκα-φαραω (Greek σου εἰ μετά Φαραώ) to be analyzed, and what does it actually mean? Is the adverbial constituent here thematic? or is it rheumatic? or an adjunctual modification of νοοκ πε?
(6) A kindred construction to the one studied here, is Heb. 1:12 νοοκ δε νοοκ πε “you are you” = “you are immutable” (cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 1984a), Ps.101:28 νοοκ δε νοοκ πε οὐρον νεκρομπι σεκαμοτκ η, Heb.13:8 νοοον νοοον πε νεμ χανεν: I do not find in the corpus an attestation for this construction.
(7) Deut. 24:10 εγώπι δε ευτον-οτνκαι επεκάκηρ πη ετε-νοον πε εζεροη — approx. “Whatever it be that he owes” is syntactically mysterious (=Vat; Greek δεξίλαμα δτιον’). See POLOTSKY 1987:67; cf. Sah. Ruth 3:10 (ed. Shier — not in the Greek) πετηνοη πε νηντον “whoever he be”.

Conversions:

Relative: in hermeneutical glossing only. The Relative converter ἐτε- is in hermeneutical syntax not an expansion of the lemma, but only a link between lemma and gloss (often even without a formal antecedent). Consequently, πε in our NS pattern does not refer to the nucleus:

Gen. 44:15 πιρωμι ετε-ανοκ πε.
Deut. 10:15 αρκωτπι μποτροξ μενενεκωτ ετε-νοω-τεν πε.

Obs.
(1) See POLOTSKY 1987:86 on Φη ετεοτ- πε; also 104f. on ετε- πε in the hermeneutical NS.
(2) Acts 27:23....ετε-ανον πε δα-νη (δα- is used almost exclusively for interlocutive apposition, perhaps in a colloquial register; it is rare in our corpus, Gen. 42:10; see SHISHA-HALEVY 1981:329 and Chapter Three below) ετε-ανον πε Rom. 9:24. ετε-νοωτ πε Cat. 64 etc. The special character of this conversion is proven by the occurrence of non-specific antecedents: Cat. 118, SV 32 οπερεφνοβι ετε-ανοκ πε.

(2) Responsive, reactive or otherwise text-anaphoric, in cohesion to rheumatic specific noun syntags or Proper Names. It is probably not the phoric force of the deictic Theme πε that is the operator of this strong anaphoric / representative linkage, but its specificity, enabling the representation of the specific determinators (and their commuters, Proper Names) in the scope of affirmation of the whole nexus. For some reason, which still escapes me, ανοκ πε is also the realization of a theoretical interlocutive “ανοκ-Φαι” which is not attested, where the second constituent is a rheumatic specific anaphor, as it were le in a “je le suis”; what seems to be the difficulty is the very conjunction of
rhematic and anaphoric; the non-specific representant οὗτος, αὐτός is also excluded in our corpus from the Rheme slot of the Interlocutive Pattern, although not from the Delocutive one (our Pattern [I]):

Gen. 27:24 θεοκ πε πανηρπι ηκας — θεοκ πε.

Ex. 4:11 ΝΙΜ ΠΕΤΑΨΕΑΜΙΟ-ΕΒΩ ΝΕΜ ΚΟΣΡ ... ΜΗ ΘΕΟΚ ΑΝ
πε.

Obs.

(1) Outside the corpus: θεοκ πε responsive to "θεοκ πε ...?", Mark 14:61f. θεοκ πε πχ ευρηρι ηφι ετεμαρωστ — θεοκ πε: ΑΝΟΝ πε responsive to the expanded ΝΙΜ πε... in Cat. 36, 40, 60, 69. AM I 55 θεοκ πε ΠΑΦΝΩΤΑ ΑΠΑ ΑΝΟΝ
πε. ΑΝΟΝ πε responsive to initial-position focalization, DV II 265.

(2) Anaphoric ΑΝΟΝ πε: John 11:10 (B4) ΠΙΡΕΨΤΕΒΩ ΠΙΣΕ ΑΝΟΝ ΓΑΡ
πε "Je le suis": John 8:28, 18:5:8 (Cat. 221), 13:13 (Cat. 213)


(b) # PRONOUN πε + Proper Name #: interlocutive persons only

(1) Self-introduction, self-presentation: proclamatory (of plus habens), acclamatory (to plus habens) — Divine or royal "signature" to pronouncements or edicts. The action expansion or sequel (or preceding cotext) are here a significant component of the macrosyntactic construction for this pattern: our NS pattern, formally a final or initial delimiter (boundary signal), validates these acts as of Divine Agency. Consider: ΑΝΟΝ πε Φσ Ex. 3:6, 6:2f. [+ άσοψ άσωσντ...], 6:6
[άσοψ ειενθηνον] 14:4 [άσοψ διρπι μπαρθ] or ΑΝΟΝ πε
ΠΣΕ ΠΕΤ- (Lev. 22:16, Ex. 6:2:7 etc.).

Gen. 41:44 ΑΝΟΝ πε ΦΠΑΨΩ.


Gen. 31:13 ΑΝΟΝ πε Φσ εταψωυνη εροκ.

Ex. 3:14 ΑΝΟΝ πε Φθ ετωπον.

Ex. 20:5 ΑΝΟΝ ΓΑΡ πε ΠΣΕ ΠΕΚΝΟΣΥη.

ΑΝΟΝ πε ΠΣΕ ΠΕΤ... (Lev. 22:16, Ex. 6:2:7, 7:5:17, 14:4,

Gen. 45:3 ΑΝΟΝ πε ΙΨΗΦΨ.

Gen. 24:34 ΑΝΟΝ πε ΠΑΛΟΣ ΝΑΒΡΑΜ ΑΝΟΝ ΠΣΕ ΔΕ ΑΡΧΟΤ
επαψε εμαψω... — remarkably, we have here a Proper-Name-
equivalent noun syntagm, and a rare instance of the Augens.

Obs.

(1) The exclusion of the Proper Name from Rheme status in the Interlocutive Pattern (below; cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 1987:163ff., 1989a:38, 90; FUNK 1991:23ff.) does not necessar-
ily imply that our “ἈΝΟΚ Ἐ + PN” pattern predicates the Proper Name; it rather presentatively states a PN identity — the highest-specificity PN is not predicated of an (equally-specific) interlocutive pronominal Theme. In AM II 294 ἈΝΟΚ ῞ΑΡ ἈΝΟΚ Ἐ + ἘΠΕ + ἈΛΑ + ἈΝΟΚ-ΒΩΚ (v.l. ὈΣΒΩΚ) ΝΤΑΨ or Hos.11:9 (B4) ἈΝΟΚ Ἐ + ἘΠΕ + ΟΣΩΡΕ ἈΝΟΚ ΟΤΡΨΜΙ Ἐ +, we have nice instances of the Presentational Pattern alternating with the Interlocutive, and apparently occupying a suppletive functional slot for predicating a Proper Name of a locutive (and allocutive?) personal pronoun, a predication that apparently cannot be direct and immediate.


(3) Outside the corpus. Mal. 1:6 B4 ἈΝΟΚ Ἐ + ΠΕΤΕΝΣΕ +, ἈΝΟΚ Ἐ + ΠΕΤΕΝΩΡΤ; royal “diatagmatic” pronouncements, decrees and edicts: De Vis III 193 ἈΝΟΚ Ἐ + ΝΑΒΟΥΧΑΒΟΝΟΣΡ ΠΩΡΟ + ΤΣΟΡΟ ΟΤΡΟ + ΤΣΙ ΟΤΡΟ + ΤΣΟΡ... AM I 122 ἈΝΟΚ Ἐ + ΔΙΟΚΛΗΤΙΑΝΟΣ; Mac. No. 16 ἈΝΟΚ Ἐ + ΤΟΤΕΣΤΟΣ ΠΕΙΒΗΝ; AM I 14 ἈΝΟΚ Ἐ + ΠΕΣ + ἘΣ + ΠΕΣΕ; De Vis II 266 ἈΝΟΚ Ἐ + ΓΑΒΡΙΗΛ. Also incantatory, in magical texts, e.g. Kropp Zauberexie (G) ἈΝΟΚ Ἐ + ΜΑΡΙΑ ἈΝΟΚ Ἐ + ΜΑΡΙΓΑΝ ἈΝΟΚ Ἐ + ΤΜΑΣ ΜΠΝΩΓ ΜΠΚΟΧΟΣ ΤΗΨ.

(4) Our pattern (and ἈΝΟΚ Ἐ above) is related to the various constructions, many of which are Presentational types, used in Coptic to open letters and for sender identification: AM I 123 ἈΝΟΚ Ἐ + ΕΙΣΑΔΙΑ...; ἈΝΟΚ Ἐ + Χ... ΕΙΣΑΔΙΑ + Ν - SV 29, 33 etc.

(5) The prosody of the pattern is not clear. A case such as (NHC II 93) ἈΝΟΚ ΠΕΣΑΨ ΤΕ ΤΜΝΤ - is at least an indication that {Ἐ} is not enclitic, and is possibly, but not conclusively, Copular (see below).

(6) The pattern and its Presentational role is well founded in Egyptian diachrony: see Seth 1916 §143ff. For ME ḫw, see Schenkel 1984:168 “be (there)”; it may be effectively negated in LE (cf. Vernus 1985) as ḫw “not be there, be deficient, not disponible”. On the OE/ME pattern ḫw + PN and ḫw + PRONOUN, see Gilula 1976 and again Schenkel 1984:168. (With an adnexal extension — ḫw + CONVERBS: Circumstantial or Stative forms) — this pattern is attested from OE through Coptic. In Demotic, conclusive instances (as against the Endophoric Theme) are rare on my files: a possible example is m3ʿr 3y “It’s the truth", P. dem. Strassburg 12 (see Spiegelberg 1925:203, where he suggests emending it, I believe unnecessarily; see also his original translation. I have not collated the text of 1902 [Strassburg:Schlesier & Schweikhardt] p. 34). In Mag. ḫw + PN, only twice, at the very beginning of the text (1/21.28), against numerous ḫw + PN (2/8.22, 5/9 etc.); τκ + PN 2/21: ḫw + PN responsive to τκ-nym, 9/32 —, differently from Coptic, where the PN is usually not predicated in this pattern: see Shisha-Halevy 1989a:105, Funk 1991.

(2) Identifying-by-name. This pattern is allocutive, or supplies the aporitic (responsive) identification-by-name to the interlocutive ἉΝΟΚ-ΝΙΜ (ἈΝΟΚ)

Gen. 27:24 ἉΝΟΚ Ἐ + ΠΑΨΗΡΗ ΗϹΑΥ — ἈΝΟΚ Ἐ.

Two possible analyses and interpretations are “Is it you, my son Esau?” (see [a] above), or “Are you my son Esau”? The Greek σὺ εἶ δό νιος μου Ἡςαυ does not resolve this dilemma. On the other hand, Gen.
27:21 άε-αυ-ςνόκ πε πασβηρι ηκατ ωαν-μμον (the Greek has the same), being included by άε- seems to be “whether you are my son Esau, or not”.

Gen. 27:32 θοκ-νιμθοκ άνοκ πε πεκσβηρι πεκσωρπ μμικ ηκατ.

(c) # NOUN SYNTAGM (non-specific) + πε #

Conclusive and unambiguous as a special invariable situational, pragmatic or exophoric Theme is πε following indefinite feminine singular or definite and indefinite plural Rhemes. Instances are rare:

Lev. 11:20 άανουρεβ νωτεν πε (Vat πε) — ANDERSSON 1903: 103f. objects here rightly to Lagarde’s emendation to ... πε, explaining πε as (my wording) “an unmarked form of the Copula”.

Ex. 12:42 οτσνεραψι ιντεπςε τε strikingly contrasted with the Topicalized Endophoric άαι οτσνεραψι ιντεπςε τε ibid.

Lev. 13:23 οτσαλ ιντεπερβοτ πε (= Vat).

Lev. 13:28 οτσαλ ινε-αορκωκ πε (= Vat) — judging by these two last exx., we may ask ourselves — albeit with no conclusive answer — whether the many other diagnostic Nominal-Sentence cases in Leviticus, Chapter 13 etc., with indefinite masculine singular Rheme are not in fact instances of our pattern: οτσοτε πε, οτσωινε πε, οτσουρεβ πε, οτσάνε πε, οτσεςτ πε.

Obs.

(1) In Num. 14:22 άιαμ-10 ηκοπ πε άαι it is άαι that refers pragmatically, while πε is cataphoric to it — this is not a case of the Endophoric Theme.

(2) Diachrony. While it is fairly established that the thematic πω is invariable in Old and Middle Egyptian, and variable in Late Egyptian and Demotic, this may be a misguided consensus, in the absence of more precise pattern resolution in the respective phases, especially the differentiation between anaphoric, endophoric, and situational-exophoric reference of the pronoun. See ROQUET 2006 for πω in prosodic view.

There is much material on ME πω and constructions in OE and ME (“Non-Verbal Sentences in πω”) — dozens of pages, with perceptive, penetrating notes and rich exemplification in Gunn’s papers at the Griffith Institute, Oxford (V A 1.14: around and after 1914), with many points of French equivalence and correspondence (Gunn was a competent Francophone). Gunn was interested in ME πω and apparently intended to publish a study of it (his letter to Gardiner, 3/2/21, AHG papers at the Griffith Institute, 142.122.123). Consider for instance Gunn’s papers V A 1.14 p. 2f.: “explanatory […] taking the word in a wide sense: its function is to state that something or other is more or less equivalent to some events… the sentence which is predicate to πω constitutes practically a reason for, or a justification of, what has just been said…” Cf. narrative άαμ- πε in our Comment Mode, a narrative correspondent to the expository σδμf πω: (Chapter One above). Gunn’s extensive documentation illustrates numerous sub-functions.
(3) For the diagnostic exx. in Leviticus, cf. the immutable *pw* in the ME medical texts, e.g. mwjt-r3 *pw* "It's the mouth-liquid", Eb. 855b; pl. *qs.w* *pw* nw *q3b.tf* "It's his breast- bones" Sm. 42. cf. SETHE 1916:101f., WESTENDORF 1962:282f., 1981:88ff. Very important are the cases of *sdm.f* *pw* "it means that…", also — and typically — following the ir- marked Topic e.g. Eb. 97/13ff. *jr-*...*sdm.f* *pw* (cf. Gunn MSS V A 1.14), in which *pw*, rhematising the *sdm.f* nexus, is probably related to our *πε*. 

(4) OE: EDEL 1955/64 §959ff., the invariable *pw* attested already from the 4th Dynasty, i.e. the earliest documents; its opposition with the Endophoric seems to be as early, consider Pyr. 577a Jst tw *hn* "Nbt-H.t."

(5) Bohairic and OE/ME: cf. Sethe (1925:304, 314 No. 4) who sees in this a feature of special significance. See Spiegelberg, ĀZ 55 (1918) 85 (*srt* *pw* *nn rh.s h3k*, 18th Dyn.).

(6) LE: SATZINGER 1981:481f., 491f. — this seems to be yet another diagloss between Bohairic and LE (cf. Pyr. 577a quoted above). Cf. p. 490, exx. 22-3; BM 10052 5/20, P. Anast. IX 7-8. We find here also the endophoric type, as in HS 9/2.11f. 3st t3y. Consider the "legal definition" in GROLL 1967:6 ex.12; the very problematic concord in the Topicalized-Endophoric instances, GROLL 1967:6 exx. 16-17, while jnk *p3y*, (ČERNÝ- GROLL 1978:522 ex. 1478) may well be a case of immutable *πε*. Cf. JUNGE 1996:184ff. "der p3y-Satz".

(7) Demotic: remarkably jnk t3y Myth.9/20, mtwf p3y P. Spiegelberg 2/14: Mag. 14/31, 27/30, perhaps 10/21 (the hermeneutical relative *nty-jw-smmt pw*). See Quack, Enchoria 25 (1999) 42. The practical differentiation in Demotic between Endophoric and Exophoric Immutable *πε* is not any easier than in Coptic: *šm p3y* Ankhsh. 9/16 "It is summer" may be pragmatic-situational (exophoric) and not Endophoric. Of Simpson’s examples from the Decrees, we have two hermeneutical relative cases of *nty-jw-p3-...p3y*: T36 probably, Can. 15/55 which may be either Endophoric or Exophoric, and one (Rph. 24/10) which is clearly Endophoric: see SIMPSON 1996:166f.

(8) Note the peculiar construction in NHC I (Tripartite Tractate), where a Relative-Topic *πε(α)-Cleft Sentence focusses an adverb*: this would presuppose an #Adverbial + *πε*# core (see our [e] below and pattern (I)): the adverbs in question are ΔΧΗ-, ΓΝ-, ΔΒΑΛ ΓΗ-, ΔΒΑΛ ΓΗγν-: see THOMASSEN 1990:428f.

(9) I do not find the Immutable Theme topicalized in our corpus. Note John 13:26 ΦΗ ΔΗΝΟΧ ΕΤΝΑΕΝ-ΠΙΛΑΜ ΝΤΑΘΗΝ ΝΑΩ ΝΟΩQ πε (Pal. Ribes ΠΕΤΙΜΑΤ πε) or the lemmatic Topic in 1 Cor. 11:3 υφαριστε ... νωτεν πε.

(d) # NOUN SYNTAGM (specific) + *πε* #: resumptive/responsive (anaphoric) to focalization constructions (incl. Cleft Sentence)

Gen. 45:8 ἄνοιγε νεώτεν αν δρετηνοτοπήτ εμναί ἀλλα Φή πε.

This may well be a case of the Endophoric Theme pattern.

(e) # Adverbial (παρηθή)+ *πε* #

Gen. 43:11 ἰεσε παρηθή πε αριστοι μφαί — "if this is so,…": see above, for παρηθή as Rheme in various patterns.

Assorted Remarkable Cases

One verse (Ex. 20:22) combines two remarkable instances of the Cleft Sentence, generally based in Bohairic on the Immutable-Theme pattern:
NAI πE ETEKEDOTOV (= Vat), extending πE beyond the personal pronoun, also to the plural demonstrative;

Ν НовоN ΝΕΤΑΡΕΤΝΝΑΥ is remarkable not only for its Topic form (which would be rare even in Sahidic), but for its non-contrastive focussing function.

Obs.
A negative case from the Psalms, the pattern anaphoric to a non-Cleft focussing construction: Ps. 99:3 ΝΟΟΚ ΔΕΘΑΜΙΟΝ ΟΤΟΓ ΕΝΟΝ ΑΝ ΠΕ “HE created us, and not we”; see below, for initial-position foci. Also De Vis II 265 ΝΕΟΤΕΝ ΣΣΕΤΕΝ-.-. ΑΣΑ ΑΝΟΝ ΠΕ. Also, ΑΝΟΚ ΑΝ ΠΕ responding to an indefinite Rheme (as would be “Je ne le suis pas” for “Je n’en suis pas un”); Luke 22:58 ΝΟΟΚ ΟΥΕΒΟΑ ΜΗΨΩΤ — ΑΝΟΚ ΑΝ ΠΕ.

(VI) The Copular Pattern: # Theme — copular πΕ — Rheme #
This pattern, well established in Sahidic, where it is idiosyncratic in constituency, constituent properties including prosody, and especially in macro-syntactic and information structure, distinct from the expanded-Theme Delocutive (Pattern II), is much rarer and even more specialized in Bohairic. (It is more usual in Nitrian, yet still presenting a different functional picture from the Sahidic one).

Obs.
(1) On this pattern in Sahidic and some of its properties, see POLOTSKY 1962:418, 425ff., 430ff.; SHISHA-HALEVY 1986a:34ff., 161f. n.36, 1987: 165ff. It is also well attested in Oxyrhynchite (e.g. Mt. 4:18, 5:13, 10:14, 13:37-39, 14:33); also in Nitrian-Bohairic hermeneutical textemes such as Cat.
(2) Anyone familiar with the texts concerned would notice how much more extensive is the use of this pattern in Sahidic, compared with Bohairic, in which the Sahidic Copular pattern corresponds especially to the Topicalized-Theme and Endophoric Patterns (III and IV): see POLOTSKY 1987:41f. This is yet another indication of the thematic status of the formal Topic in (III).
(3) Diachrony. The ME correspondent of this pattern is well established: SETHE 1916: §142; GILULA 1976: 161, 163f. on #pron — pw — Ndef#; JUNGE 1981:440ff., 450ff., 457f. I must disagree with WESTENDORF 1981/3 (OE), who sees this predication as “Es ist der Fall: A ist B”, which seems to be the presentational role of the “pragmatic Theme”. Like Westendorf, SCHENKEL 1987 claims the Copula “represents the subject” (266) (thus, = our ‘Theme’). However, he accepts Depuydt’s view that the Rheme is contrastively ‘emphatic’, i.e. focal. This is certainly not the case in Coptic. In fact, Schenkel combines Westendorf’s and Depuydt’s views: the first formal and, I believe, unnecessary, the second functional and factually wrong. I agree with WESTENDORF 1989 (for OE) that this predication is not ‘emphatic’. The Copular pattern is rare in Demotic (SIMPSON 1996:166) and in LE, focal; # jnk pw X #, which is well attested, is again different.
(4) I must take issue with DEPUYDT 1986, who characterizes this pattern in Coptic as “emphatic” in the Egyptological terminological sense. The ‘Emphatic’ (= Second Tense, Focalizing Conversion) is by no means in Coptic exclusively Theme-initial. The Emphatic is not always or even prevalently a Thematic Progression, low-CD construction,
although Polotsky’s orthodox model would certainly suggest this. But, most importantly, unlike the Focalizing Conversion, the Copular NS, or any NS, is not a focalization pattern. (See also Funk 1991:57ff., Satzinger 1991:299). As a matter of principle, I cannot accept W.P. Funk’s view, that the difference between # Rheme — formal Theme — Theme # (our Pattern II) and # Theme — Copula — Rheme # is gradual (Funk 1991:5 n.13): these are fundamentally different matrices. The former differs from the latter in constituency and in clausal information contour, which integrates with textual information structure; they link differently with their context, and differ in any conceivable property that contributes to the definition of a pattern.

**Distinctive Profile**

- Theme constituency: always highly specific: demonstratives; फ़र न- or {पेक-}पान or Proper Name; perhaps also delocutive personal pronoun (नेओ).  
  - Rheme Constituency: Proper Names (highly specific); {पी-} (rare). Note the Theme/Rheme equispecificity.
  - Copula: प्वे, प्तें (for demonstrative Themes).
  - This, often (not always) a classic Thematic Progression, low-Communicative-Dynamism construction (‘ascending nexus’14), is in Sahidic the most macrosyntactically marked pattern of all, most strikingly in its retrospective linkage to its context. In Bohairic, however, its linkage to preceding context is rather simple and as a rule grammemic.
  - Prosodically, the Sahidic copular NS has a junctural boundary between the Theme and the copula (Shisha-Halevy 1986a:34ff., 161f. n.36); in our Bohairic, punctuation delimiters do not corroborate this. Note, however, the extensive expandability of the Theme as against the Rheme.
  - Conversion: only adnominal (Relative, Circumstantial).
  - Negation: not attested.

**(a) Basic naming:**

Gen. 29:16:16 फ़र नित्वत प्वे • लिय ओतो फ़र नित्कोवः प्वे प्राखः.

Gen. 36:32 फ़र नैवबाकी प्वे • अन्नावाः.

Gen. 35:10 पेक्याप ने इकोब.

फ़र (न-....) प्वे + Proper Name . (Gen. 11:29, 16:1, 25:1, Ex. 1:15, 18:3ff., Lev. 24:11, Num. 25:15, 26:59).

**Obs.**

(1) Contrast पेक्याप here, initial Theme, with its equally thematic correspondent in Ex. 3:13 ओ ने पेक्याप, or Ex. 3:15, 6:3 फ़ा पे पारान नैए-...., or Gen. 28:18,

Ex. 15:3... πε περγαμ, or Cat. 123 ἀνατολὴ πε περγαμ, where it is an expanding final Theme. The difference is in the Communicative Dynamism of the naming: in our Copular pattern, it is basic or Existential or a Thematic-Progression kind; in the Expanded Formal Theme pattern, it is polemic, higher or focussing CD. There are different types of naming besides basic naming: name-assigning, identitive naming, epistolary naming, polemic or focalized naming, all formally affected by the parameters of locutivity/allocutivity/delocutivity and focality: see Shisha-Halevy 1989a:87ff.

(2) The Copula is always πε: the “feminine” Proper Name, just like the feminine personal pronoun, does not motivate feminine concord (Shisha-Halevy 1989a:12, 14, 20ff.).

(3) The Bimembral Rheme-initial pre-Coptic Egyptian naming pattern # PN - rn.f#, prevalent in Demotic, is not attested in our corpus, but occurs residually in Sahidic as #X πιντιγ #: see Westendorf 1981:3:81ff., and below, on binominal patterns in the corpus.

(4) In Mal. 1:2 μν πεντα αν πε ιακωβ we have the nearest case to a Wechselsatz (with μν...αν a discontinuous Assertive Question marker).

(b) Responsive to an interrogative Expanded-Theme Pattern:
Ex. 16:15 ου πε φαι — φαι πε πνωκ εταφθην νωτεν.

(c) Hermeneutical — Proper-Name equivalence; name glossing:

Gen. 36:1:8 ἡκατον δε νοον πε ιαωμ... — a rare case of Topicalized Theme preceding the Copula, and a Delocutive Theme.

Gen. 15:2 πσηρι δε μμασκεκ... + φαι πε δαμασκος ελευσερ (Greek ουτος...).

Gen. 23:2 ἤβακι ιαρβοκ ον ετη ηεπιδιγον + θαι τε χεβρων (Greek ουτη έστιν χεβρων).

Gen. 23:19 ιπεμεθο μμαμφρ + θαι τε χεβρων (Greek ουτη έστιν χεβρων).


Assorted remarkable cases:
Lev. 17:11:14 ἢψεργαρ ιτσεαρας νιβεν πε πεσκνου (= Vat).

A difficult locus, where the interpretation as a copular construction is perhaps slightly less probable than an Expanding-Theme one, judging by contextual criteria (“blood” is the theme of the passage) and the higher specificity of πεσκνου as compared with ἢψεργαρ. This seems to conflict with the Greek rendering (11 το γαρ αιμα αυτου αντι της ψυχης εξειλασται, 14 η γαρ ψυχη πασης σαρκος αιμα αυτου εστιν). However, another possibility, more attractive in view of the re-
stricted and somewhat banal application of the Copular Pattern, is to see here a gnomic-proverbial *Wechselsatz* or balanced construction, predicating the equivalence of “soul” and “blood”.

**Conversions:**

*Relative:*

Gen. 22:24 ο η ετε-πεσκαν πε ρενμα.

*Circumstantial — always adnominal:*

Gen. 16:1 οτσωκι επεσκα πε λαρ.
Gen. 25:1 ...νοστριμι επεσκα πε χεττοτρα.
Also Gen. 38:1:2.

Obs.

(1) Some occurrences from outside the corpus: The hermeneutical function, familiar in Sahidic, is well attested in Nitrian, although its range seems to be somewhat reduced in Bohairic by the topicalized delocutive used hermeneutically (e.g. De Vis II 106, 107, 169). De Vis II 90f. πιροτιτ/πιμακ-α πε + P. The glossing hermeneutical Copular Pattern (no comme) selects and thematizes individual lemmata: Cat. 9, 1, 66, 72, 84 etc. πακα λαρ πε γοταν; γικν ραρ πε.... πας† πε... (note the accompanying tell-tale particles: πακ, (ας) ουν.

(2) The Copular as a responsive pattern: Cat. 214 οτ τε τετολι μερι... θαι τε
θι ινα ηνεξω ναενεαν ερπι (“that” clauses as Rheme occur only in this pattern); AM I 50 ημ πε θαι θαι πε πιαξι ημ†.

(3) Note the naming topicalized Copular SV 55 ναι- ... θαι πε Χ. The Relative Copular is typically Nitrian: De Vis II 15 θαι ετε-νουο πε πιωνσ, 29 θαι ετε-πεςελον πε πιωνσ.

(4) Copular πε is invariable: Cat. 102 ιπου ηνεκε ουν πε οτυχυ οπρε κοπο ονος επεβικ, which, however, may vary (inexplicably for me) with a gender-number concording movable Copula: Cat. 158 τατα ουν εοπον τε τετεμελες... οσο τοτεια δε ετακξορε εβολ πε πποπερεσιε... (also Cat. 154, 157).

**(VII)** Special nexal patterns with no formal Theme or Copula

(a) Theme-initial binominal patterns, recording-chronicling, are often encountered in lists (we find here as a rule consensus of Paris with Vat, and no οινωι in the Greek) — specifying name-identity or quantity or constituency: # N — [number or quantity “name”]#. Note the frequent *lemniscus* between Theme and Rheme.


30ff., 7:12 etc.).

οσο ψη ετγιξεν... [X] (Num. 10:15ff.:19:20 etc.) ψη 

ετγιξεν...[X] Num. 10:15ff.
\[\pi\rho\chi\omicron\upsilon\nu\ldots \div [X] \text{ (Num. 2:10 etc.)}\]

N (material) \div [quant.] (Ex. 38:29, Lev. 23:13, Num. 2:26:31ff., 7:85ff., 28:20ff., 29:9, 31:38ff. etc.).

\[\varepsilon\beta\omicron\ \delta\epsilon\nu\ [X] \text{ (Num. 1:6ff.)}\]

\[\phi\alpha\ [X] \div \pi\alpha\mu\omicron\omicron\ [X] \text{ (Num. 26 passim).}\]

\[\nu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu\pi\iota\nu\omicron\ [X] \div [Y] \text{ (Gen. 10:1, Num. 26 passim).}\]

\[\nu\n
2.1.1.1 Some assorted configurations: transitions between delocutive Nominal-Sentence patterns / macrosyntactic patternings; paradigmatic oppositions

Lev. 13:21 ὶς ἐνπεὶ μμον-ψωι νονταβαν νήτην οτορ φερ-θιοντ ἀν εitizenωμᾶν ἵτετεκασαν οτορ φαί εσχλα τε — descriptive Present and non-descriptive (diagnostic) NS.

Deut. 21:20 πενύμπρι φαί ηοι νατμαντ οτορ οστεψωνην πε ηοι νατωτεμ.

(a) Expanded-Theme ⇒ Binominal (below) (Question ⇒ Response).
Gen. 47:8f. οσθρ πε νιρομπι νεσουν ντετεκων — νι-ρομπι ντενιρομπι ντεναωνη νη εψωπ ηνητουν πα νηρομπι.

(b) Expanded-Theme ⇒ Copular (Question ⇒ Response).
Ex. 16:15 ου πε φαί — φαί πε πιωικ εταφθην νωτεν.

(c) Anaphoric-Theme ⇒ Expanded-Theme (shared or bracketing ap- positive Theme).
Lev. 10:13 ου νομιμον ηακ πε οτορ ου νομιμον ηνεκωυρι πε φαί.

(d) Topicalized-Theme ⇒ Anaphoric-Theme
Gen. 46:32 νιρωμι δε γαν μανεκωσε νε γανρωμι γαρ ντεφωμασε-τεβνη νε.

(e) Topicalized-Theme ⇒ Topicalized Interlocutive (below).
Gen. 27:11 ηκαν πανον οσρωμι εψρντ νομι πε ανοκ δε ανοκ-πσρωμι εψρν.

Two cases of tensed environment for the Nominal Sentence:
(f) Present ⇒ Nominal Sentence (⇒ Present).
Deut. 14:7f. κεκαμι ναε-ναι κεφωρά δε αν ... ναι γανακαρπτον νωτεν νε — descriptive Present Tense in contrast with non-descriptive (preceptive) NS.

Ex. 5:17 τετεκρψιτ οτορ νωτεν-γανρεκρψιτ (vs. κεκρψιτ ν. 8) - allocutive incidental description vs. essential character- ization (vs. delocutive description); Greek σχολάζετε σχολασται έστε (σχολάζουσιν ...).

(g) Nominal Sentence ⇒ Present.
Lev. 14:21 εψωπ δε οσρακ πε οτορ τεφξαξ ξιμι αν...
Inherent-characterizing NS and incidental corollary Present.
(h) Absolute-Definite Future (εσε̱) ⇒ Nominal Sentence.
Deut. 33:29 εσεερναυτ εροκ ναε-πεκβοννος τεηνι πε πεκσωτσω - an interesting conjunction of the extratemporal Absolute-Definite Future (see above, Chapter One) and the atemporal Nominal Sentence.
(i) Cases of paradigmatic opposition:
Lev. 25:25 εὐοί νήκοι vs. οὐνήκοι πε Lev. 25:35 — no difference in the Greek, which is verbal in both cases (πένηται).
Lev. 13:34 εὐοί νάζανε αν (Greek οὐκ ἔστιν κοῖλη) vs. οὔ- 
ζανε αν πε Lev. 13:31 (Greek οὐχ ἦ δοξίς ἕγκοιλοτέρα) — description vs. negated diagnostic characterization.
Deut. 20:21 πενώνηρι φαί qoi nατματνος οσαργος οσρεφψθο-
νην ρε qoi nατωτεμ — differentiation of inherent quality (NS) and behaviour (Present Tense; in the Greek, three Present verbs).

Obs.
Outside the corpus, note:
Expanded-Theme ⇒ Copular (Question ⇒ Response):
AM 150 NIM ρε Φαί ⇒ Φαί πε ...; but
Expanded-Theme ⇒ Expanded-Theme:
AM 166 NIM πε πεκραν ... πε παραν, and
Expanded-Theme ⇒ Expanded-Theme ⇒ Copular:
AM 12 NIM πε πεκραν ... πε παραν — παραν πε...
Copular ⇒ Topicalized:
1 Cor. 11:3 ταφε [...] πε πεξε ταφε δε n[...] πεςεαι πε
ταφε δε μπεξε φφ↑ πε.
Topicalized ⇒ Relative Endophoric:
Cat. 40 ἀπειρο τε ετε-θνον ρω πε πεξε.

2.1.2 The Interlocutive Pattern Set

Generally speaking, this pattern is in no way formally or functionally associated with the Delocutive patterns. It differs from them in almost every non-trivial formal aspect. The Interlocutive is not suppletive in any structurally precise sense to the delocutive NS (I must thus completely retract my statement to that effect, made in 1984a; see FUNK 1991:3), unless in the approximate and almost trivial or tautological sense of the “classroom paradigm” of person, which is nowhere part of linguistic reality. The Delocutive set does not “exist for” Interlocutives, and vice versa: no ceteris paribus opposition can be established, but no complementarity and environmental alternation can be established either, for the person is not a prime conditioning factor. (Generally speaking, suppletivity is untenable outside of and beyond the traditional ferotuli-latum scope, unless complementarity between patterns can be established, which is difficult if not impossible). Cotextual combinations such as Gen. 12:12f. τεῇςἡμι τε θαι ... ἀξις οὖν δε-ανόκ-
τεψωνι may account for this easy fallacy. For why should there be "a delocutive form for the Interlocutive", any more than “a past form
for the future” — such synthetic paradigms are convenient “presentation” constructs, and have no analytic basis: the Interlocutive and Delocutive sets are not alternants, any more than the Preterite and the Future forms are.

**Distinctive Profile:**

- Theme constituency: proclitic homonyms of the entire interlocutive pronoun system:
  - **Ἀνόκ**- Ex. 3:11 **Ἀνόν**- Ex. 16:7, Gen.42:10
  - **Ναόκ**- Gen. 29:14 **Ναό**- Gen. 24:60, 39:9 **Ναωτήν**- Gen. 42:34
- Substantival apposition to the Theme is marked by **Σα-** (probably a colloquial feature, very rare in our corpus\(^{15}\), used here to characterize *minus habentes*? It is well attested in Nitrian). The Augens marks rhetoricity or topicalization.
- Rheme constituency:
  - {π- } Gen. 4:9, 30:2
  - {πεο-} Gen. 12:13, 29:15, 39:9, Num. 22:30,
  - **Φα-** Gen. 32:17, 50:19 (specificity-indifferent)
  - **όυ**- Ex. 33:3, Deut. 7:6 **Γαν**- Ex. 5:17
- **Νίμ** “who?” Ex.3:11 (+ sequelling **ζε**- + Conjunctive, which marks the question as assertive ["rhetorical"])
- **όυ** “what?” Ex.16:7 (+ sequelling **ζε**- + Conjunctive, which marks the question as Assertive ["rhetorical"])

Significant are here the *exclusions*: zero-determination; Proper Names\(^{16}\), personal pronouns, demonstratives; in our corpus also {πι-} (?), **Οταλι,— Νιβεν**\(^{17}\). This is the only pattern to exclude the specificity extremes from rhematic status. The exclusion of zero implies a different “sense” assigned to **όυ**-; however, the exclusion of the Proper Names does not mean that the equally interlocutive **Ἀνόκ πε + PN** predicates the Proper Name: it presents a Pronoun — PN identity (see above).

Obs.
Outside the corpus and dialect (see also Funk 1991:22ff.):
(1) Epiph. 105 **Ἀνόκ-Φακ Καπ** Is. 43:1 (Tattam) **Ναοκ-Φωι** **Ναοκ**, Oxyrh. Ps. 118:94 **Ἀνκ-Ποκ**: confirming the specificity-indifference of **Φω=**.

---

\(^{15}\) Occurring only in Genesis, also following verbal nexus or, Augens-like, following interlocutive pronouns: Gen. 47:4, 42:13.

\(^{16}\) Cf. Shisha-Halevy 1989a:44ff. for affinities between Proper Names and zero-determination generic “Notion Names”.

\(^{17}\) Structurally two different homonymous entities, the first specifying determinator (“all”), the second quantifier, compatible with zero-determination (“any”, “every”: Shisha-Halevy 1986a:114, 143ff., 146ff.)
(2) Oxyrh. Ps. 101:28  nətak de ntk-ntak is surprising (Schenke 1996:105) — Boh. nəok de nəok pē, Sah. ntok de ntok on pē in a different pattern, expressing a different meaning.


(4) esol (sën-) predicated in John 8:23, 16:19 (Funk 1991:67ff.).

(5) The absence in our corpus of rhematic oτai (gαnōton) is attested in B5) is of consequence, since this is the text-cohesive mechanism for predicative anaphoric reference to the indefinite article (see Funk 1991:31ff.): AM II 28 xpićtiānoc men anok-øai even resumes a zero-article Topic.

(6) I have no statistics to evaluate the preference stated by Funk (1991:50ff.) in Bohairic for the indefinite in complex noun syntagmas (oτ-/gαn- nte-p-, where Sah. prefers p-/n- n-p-). It is possible that this preference involves the basic values of the respective articles (e.g. in the generic role), and is thus practically unverifiable.

(7) We have in the corpus no instance of the rhematic oτ-īni esol... (B4) Gen. 2:23 and elsewhere, only in the NT: see Funk 1991:57ff., nor is oτ- + Proper Name (ibid. 64ff.) attested.

(8) nəok-ntim mπaipht. nəok-oτ mπaipht SV 65, 67, and often in Nitrian, may be colloquial. The adverb has here pattern significance.

(9) The virtual exclusion of the Proper Name as Rheme is Coptic, and does not go back as far as Demotic: consider Setne 4/27, II Setne 5/10, Mag. 9/17, 12/15 etc.

• Conversion: none attested in the corpus, except for a single possibly Circumstantial negated instant (Gen. 42:24 ἀε-νωτεν-γάνιπνικος νωτεν-γανξηρ παν). This too indicates the distinctiveness of the pattern.

• Negation by postpositive παν is well attested.

• Prosody: closest (?) internal juncture. Bohairic orthography — as is the norm outside the “pure Sahidic” domain18 — does not reflect the thematic nature of the interlocutive pronominal Themes by a special reduced morphophonological homonym. This prosodic feature is symptomized by the placement of enclitics after the Rheme syntagm19 (rāp Gen. 50:19, Ex. 16:8; Augens Gen. 23:6, 24:24, 27:32 and so on). The proclitic nature of the Theme is simultaneously also the prosodic formal Copula signifiant for the “nexus” signifié.

• Two peculiar linkage features are observable: number concord of Theme and Rheme indefinite article (anωn-/ntωten-γαν-, anok-/nəok-oτ-) seems to be the rule. In the topocalized subpattern, the Topic is exactly echoed in the Theme, yet these two are homonyms: “lexemic” personal pronoun and pronominal Theme, respectively. Note that the topocalized subpattern (locutive [1st] persons only?) is found as

18 See Funk 1991:4ff., 13ff. The prosodically unmarked variant in Shenoutean Sahidic (anok- Amel. II 70, ntωtн- Leip. IV 100 etc.) may perhaps be considered an Aknomicism.

a rule with particle or Augens\textsuperscript{20}, which adds to the segmentation and topicalization marking, beside their rhetoricty value. The Topic is fully functional, in context anchoring.

Obs.
(1) The best treatment to date of the Interlocutive set — indeed, the best descriptive account, in my opinion, of any NS pattern in Coptic — is Funk 1991, a brilliant monographic pan-Coptic discussion, based mainly on the NT corpus. See also Shisha-Halevy 1987:163f.
(2) Diachrony. The forerunner of the Interlocutive may be included among the \textit{jnk-nb.tn} patterns: SETHE 1916:§59ff., 63; part of the diachronic difficulties comes to light here, and the difference between interlocutive and delocutive pronouns is manifest; Groll 1967:29ff., Gilula 1976:167f. Schenkel 1984:162ff. sees \textit{jnk-}, \textit{ntk-} as a case of focussing. It is clear that a Rheme-initial pattern is also written in this way, and the master matrix may be the binominal one, which is not the case in Demotic or Coptic (although the Theme-initial matrix accommodates the Interlocutive too). At any rate, the orthographic opacity of Egyptian surpasses even that of Bohairic, and prosodic data have not to date been mustered to resolve the individual patterns. Here too, the development of determinators may be associated with pattern definition as well as constituency. In LE through Demotic, the pattern seems to be only Theme-initial, as in Coptic: I shall only quote the negative \textit{bn mtkrm jn}, in Ryl. IX 1/18 with its LE antecedent (Vittmann 1998:310f.)
(3) The well-known instance of \textit{m0q-} (Sah. \textit{ntq-}-)\textit{φω-(pω-)}, II Cor. 10:7, apparently cast in the Interlocutive NS matrix, is still unique: see above.
(4) \textit{n0eten-} occurs in Early Bohairic (B4) Hag. 2:16. See Funk 1991:12ff.
(5) Rosen 1975b applies the Coptic \textit{anr-/anok} paradigm to resolving the Biblical Hebrew \textit{ANJ} — \textit{ANKJ} dilemma, purely typologically, it seems, without considering the Greek intermediate stage: both \textit{anok} and \textit{ANKJ} are rhametic as well as unmarked.

Selective representative Documentation
Gen. 47:3 \textit{an0n-panmanecwot sa-nekalwoti an0n nem neni0}.\textsuperscript{\textdagger}
Ex. 33:3 \textit{m0q-otlaoc nnwnwtnwbi}.
Ex. 3:11 \textit{anok-nim xe-ntawenhi gaφaraw}.
Gen. 24:24 \textit{anok-twepi mba0thn ò anok : npw0pi mmew1k} — the Augens \{\textit{n0o=}\} only?) is here topicalizing rather than a signal of rhetoricty.
Gen. 23:6 \textit{m0q-otpo m0q ebol giten0}.\textsuperscript{\textdagger}
Gen. 50:19 \textit{anok-φωφ} \textdagger\textsuperscript{\textdagger} rap \textit{anok} — note here the compatibility and sequence of the two enclitics\textsuperscript{21}. The Augens focalizes the Rheme rhetorically in the two last exx.
Gen. 27:32 \textit{m0q-nim m0q} is rhetorical and sarcastic.

\textsuperscript{21} Shisha-Halevy 1986a:166f.
Conversion
Circumstantial?

Gen. 42:24 ἰε-νωτεν-γανηρηνικος νωτεν-γανανπρ ἃν — the second sentence is probably Circumstantial, zeroed before syllabic nasal in negation (see Chapter Four).

Obs.
Conversion, out of corpus — Relative: Acts 27:23 φίν τε-ανοκ-φως, Cat. 220 μιπρήν τέν ετε-ανοκ-οτεβολ...ἀν; νε- Hag. 2:16 (B4) νε-νωτεν-νηρ γαρ. Obd. 1:11 οὐτον νε-νοοκ οταν γωκ εβολ ηπτντον πε. Job 4:19 μη δι ετων δενανη νομι ετε-ανοκ εγὼ ανον-γανεβολ δενπαιοι γοςωτ is a striking topicalized and converted example, irregular both in the expansion form of the indefinite antecedent-nucleus and in the anacoluthic resumption. No less remarkable is John 17:14 (B4) καταφην τε-ανοκ γω ονανοκ-εβολ δενπι-κοκομοκ ἃν with an adverbial Rheme, undetermined.

Negation:

Deut. 11:2 νωτεν-γαναλωτι ἃν.
Gen. 42:10 ανον-γανανπρ ἃν σα-νεκαλωτι.
Gen. 42:24 ἰε-νωτεν-γανηρηνικος νωτεν-γανανπρ ἃν — probably Circumstantial, zeroed before syllabic nasal in negation (see Chapter Four).

Num. 22:30 μη ανοκ-τεκεω ἃν — discontinuous μη...ἀν.
Deut. 32:6 νωτεν-οταλοκ νκαρ οταο αναβε ἃν — coor-
dinated Rheme negation.

Topicalized subpattern — locutive only

Gen. 27:11 κατα παον οτρωμι ειρηντ νκωι πε ανοκ αὐ το ανοκ-οτρωμι ειρην.
Ex. 6:12 ανοκ γαρ ανοκ-οταταζι.
Ex. 22:27 ανοκ γαρ ανοκ-οτρωμενκτ.
Gen. 42:11 ανον τρεν ανον-νωνηρπι οτρωμι νοσωτ.
Ex. 16:7f. ανον αὐ το ανον-οτρ.

2.2.1 Verbal copular elements in Bohairic: οιν- / επ-: incidental (circumstance-referred, non-inherent) noun predication

(a) A familiar, historically rooted and typologically important construction employs the Stative converb of ἵπι “do” with the rheme-marking ν- in a complex copula οιν- ν-, the core auxiliary nucleus of a Present-tense noun-predication pattern. This is in fact an analytic and verbalized construction for the historical one, which predicated a noun, adverbialized and marked by μ- (Coptic ν-) in the adverbial-Rheme
("Bipartite") matrix. Structurally, the primary opposition #qoi n-Rheme# vs. #Rheme — ne# is much weakened by the fact that the unconverted construction of the former and the converted form of the latter are rare. Indeed, it would seem that the Circumstantial e qoi n- is a suppletive alternant of the NS. As a matter of fact, it is not easy to find lexemes for which the full opposition exists (one such is qoʃ "fear": see below). This said, it is, as a general principle and for the bulk of the evidence, still suggested that this formal opposition of the NS and o1 n- copular predication corresponds to the functional signifié distinction of (respectively) inherent, categorial, essential quality as against incidental, contingent, non-permanent, changeable, non-categorial attribute characterization. The semantic load of this opposition is thus only in part due to — or symptomized by — lexical disparateness of the Rhemes, a factor that ranks hierarchically lower; matrix semantics is the overruling factor.

One of the two main formal differential factors between the NS Rheme and the o1 n- one lies in the determination of the Rheme for o1 n- usually zero (generic) or indefinite (individualizing, substantival). The other factor is of course the nexal matrix itself, which predicates the Rheme locatively, "in the status/state/role/capacity/form/consistence of..."

The conversions attested in the corpus are the Circumstantial (adnexal — adnominal to both specific and non-specific nominal nuclei, and adverbal); ne- (in narrative and narratival allocation), and Relative (attributive, expanding only specific nuclei). Interestingly, the Focalizing Conversion alias Second Present is absent in the corpus (it is well attested in Sahidic, Oxyrhynchite and in other Bohairic corpora).

Obs.
(2) 1 Cor. 15:10 ἐμεν ἔμι ἐμ δέν "ἐμι ὃ ἐμ" is contrasted to the Divine Proclamatory (Ex. 3:14) ἄνοικ πε θων ἐτω οπ "ἐμι ὃ ὅν": "I am what I am" does not precisely convey the sense of the former.

Selective representative Documentation

Ex. 21:8 qoi neθ an ethic naq ebol — an uncommon negative instance.
Gen. 23:4 ἔτοι πρεσβυτεροὶ ὅτοι ἔτοι νωμένοι.

Gen. 10:9 Ναχοὶ παυσὶν ἑρρὰ ἡμεθένοις ἡμεθένοις ηὲ θρήςτη ἑπεδοκοὶ ἔσβετος ἐξεστοὶς ἔκε-μφρήτης ἐθνῶν. Παυσὶν παυσὶν ἑρρὰ ἡμεθένοις ἡμεθένοις ηὲ θρήςτη — observe that the nominal expansion of the determinator is not characterized in any formal way for inherence or incidentality.

Ex. 19:16 Ναχοὶ ροπνίσχτη νοέντες.

Ex. 22:21 Ναρέτενοι γαρ νωμένος ὁμοί πε (above, Chapter One).

Gen. 14:10 ἔςελλος δὲ οἰκολόγ Ναχοὶ Νουσίως ἔστεν ἔτει

Ex. 25:33 ἀ πραθρό ἔτοι Νπομοτ Νκαριά.

Ex. 26:8 Νταραβσίπι Ντοι Ν-α Μμάντι.

Ex. 26:24 Αμπόησιν Αμπόησι Νάδε-Νακεκάλαι Ντοι Νοτάι.

Ex. 26:32 Νοτκέκάλαι Ντοι Νοτάβ ... Οτος τοσ-α Μμασίκ Ντοι Νσάτ.

Ex. 30:23 Οτκάναμομόν Ντοι Νκατσότι.

Ex. 21:5 Νταραβσίν Αν Ντοι Νπρέα.

Lev. 20:20 Αμπόησι Ντοι Νενοχός.

Lev. 26:13 Φή Ετρανήνωτ Εβολ Ανταπαγι Νκαμά Ετετενοι Μπωκ.

Gen. 17:14 Πιγκοῦρ Ντοι Νατσέβι.

Deut. 1:19, 8:15 Πλαξε Θρη ἔτεματ Ντοι Νγοῦ "frightening" (ερ-γοῦ "fear" Gen. 28:17 etc.) Ex. 3:6, Deut. 2:4:8.

Gen. 31:47 "Πισάλ Ντοι Μιμέρο" — the name of the "Witness Caim": contrast Gen. 31:46 Πισάλ Πετ-Μιμέρο οστώ Νέμακ "It is this cairn that testifies (or: "is witness") between me and you".

(b) Copular ερ- + Noun Syntagm (same determination profile) provides the non-durative (or better non-statal), alternant for οι Ν-. By the same token, copular ερ-/οι Ν- is characterized as intransitive. In this syntagm set, ερ- is thematic, the noun syntagm rhematic. Within the opposition indicated here in-conjugation, ερ- signals non-durativity:

Ex. 7:15 Άκερ-οτρών "it turned into a snake".

Num. 7:87...εκερ-ουρομπί.

Gen. 48:19 Ακερ-οτρών Ερόν — ον- probably conditioned here by the comparative expansion ερόν.

Ex. 16:20 Ακερ-κεντ.

Ex. 7:19 Ακερ-κοντ.

Ex. 38:23 ἰερός πεταφερ-ἀρχιτεκτων.
Num. 12:11 οὕτι ἀνεπ-ατεμί.

Some striking pairings of the επ / οἱ Ν- alternation and, where ex-
tant, their NS opposita:
-οἱ νατκωτεμ Deut. 9:24.

επ-μεθερε- εεροςμεθερε νοξι Ex. 23:1.
-οἱ μεθερε Gen. 31:47.

However, θερμεθερε, θερμεθερε Gen. 31:48, Deut. 19:18 may
be a case of the rarer “play the role of”, “act as” (see Obs. below, dis-
ussion of Shenoute. Chass. 20ff.).

επ-γοτ† Gen. 28:13 "fear": μπερεργοτ†.

Gen. 28:17 ἄγε καίμα σωγοτ† πε (= Vat) “awe-inspiring”,
“terrible”. Cf. (De Vis I 76) σωγοτ† πε ευρκ μμή μαλιτα
ευρκ μμεθνοτα.
-οἱ Νγοτ† Deut. 6:22 “frightful, terrible” ελανυφήρη εκάνετ
σωγ τος τοι Νγοτ† — possibly supplying the Circumstantial con-
version of the NS σωγοτ† πε? Similarly the Relative in (De Vis I 201)
τοσατο ετεμματ ντεφμοτ ον ετοι Νγοτ† παρεπρωμι
νιβεν.

επ-ννωικ Lev. 20:10.
-οἱ ννωικ Lev. 20:10 ὕπ ετοι ννωικ νεμ ὅν ετοσοί
ννωικ ερος.

επ-φρητ† Ν- Gen. 34:15 ευσπερ ντετενερ-πενρη† 23.
παρητ† πε is common, outside of the -οἱ Ν- / επ- alternation.

επ-οτε Ex. 15:9 ...ντεταξιξ επ-οτε, Gen.1:28 ἀρι-οτε εαυτ (i.e. πικαζί).
Ex. 21:8 οἱ οτε ἐν εθικ Νας εβολ.

23 Note the difference between the noun-predicating επ-{...}ρη† and παρηπ†
παρηπ† Ex. 7:10, where we have the lexemic, not grammemic ιπ with παρηπ† its
object. It is of interest that it is Ν- in the mediate-object construction that carries the
junctural differentiantion in this case (cf. Shisha-Halevy 1986a Chapter Three).
ep-ἀκαί Deut. 2:9 ἀπερεπ-ἀκαί enimwabithc.
Num. 35:23 ὦρος νεον υπερἐκαί ἄνηακ αν 

ep-νιατ, ep-ονιατ (Num. 15:8, Gen. 43:34) “be big, great”.
ονιατ 

Lev. 25:25 εἰοι νῆκι vs. οὐνήκι 

Lev. 13:34 εἰοι ΝΧΑΝΑ 

Deut. 20:21 πενωψρυ ρκα 

Although it is the pattern and its grammemic constituents that carry the special predication function, the rhematic lexemes — an open yet special class — may be characterized semantically. It is significant that none of these lexemes is abstract — this would enable an indefinite Rheme of a NS pattern with adjectival role (“οὐαμε 

Human status, role, class, institution, relationship, state, age, quality:
+ κοσμι Deut. 7:7.
+ νιατ Gen. 21:8, 43:34 ἀτερνιατ, de ΝΧΕ-ΤΤΟΙ ΜΒΕΝΙΑ-

Gen. 48:19 ἀτερνιατ ἐρος, with ὀρ- probably conditioned by the expansion ἐρος.
+ βωκ Gen. 44:9 ενεπβωκ μπενςτ, 30:26 θν εταιεπβωκ ἀκε 

+ πεμγ Εξ. 21:5.
+ παμαο Gen. 30:43.
+ ηκι Lev. 25:25.
+ οτρωμι ανεμπενκοι Gen. 16:12.
+ γὐσι Ex. 15:9 ΝΤΕΣΑΙΣ ἐρς, Gen. 1:28 ἀπισς 

(i.e. 

πικαζ), Ex. 21:8 qoi 

+ ηντρομενος εξενπιλαος Deut. 20:9.
+ ευρο Gen. 37:8 εναερωσρο ερνη εξων.
+ ἀδῳφ Gen. 10:9.
+ οὐηβ Deut. 10:6, Ex. 30:30.
+ ἐμνάξωλι Gen. 21:23.
+ ώμ Deut. 7:3.
+ ἥφν νοτν Gen. 48:20.
+ ἅς Deut. 2:7.
+ νωίκ Lev. 20:10.
+ κεφεπ Deut. 19:8.
+ βονθοκ Ex. 2:22.
+ ναῦτ Gen. 15:1.

Non-human constituency or attribute: material, shape, form, modality, emotion, language and speech, colour:
+ ῥήτ (± ν- or possessive): (Gen. 27:12:14:27).
+ γοτ Deut. 6:22, 8:14.
+ μαξε Deut. 7:2.
+ σνοκ Ex. 7:17.
+ γεντ Ex. 16:20.
+ γοκ Ex. 7:15 (νυ-).
+ δρακων Ex. 7:9:10:12 (νυ-, γαν-).
+ ωβυτ Ex. 4:4 (νυ-).
+ ζανε Lev. 13:34.
+ ἐερβενι Num. 33:55.
+ δοτιαοταν nem δοταν νκερμι Gen. 31:10f.
+ ωυτ γωτ νεμ βρεγι Gen. 14:10
+ οτοκοτοσ νοτωτ, ντομη νοτωτ Gen. 11:1 — the only case in the corpus of νυ- determination following οι ν-: not indefinite article, but a focussed quantifier: discontinuous νυ νοτωτ.

In some special cases, the Rheme following copular ερ- — strangely only in the Absolute Future (thus perhaps "suppletive" to the NS) — is possessed and in fact determination-indifferent (see Chapter Three);

Ex. 21:34 εεερ-φωq.
Ex. 13:12 εεερ-ναπετ.
Ex. 4:16 εεερ-ρωκ.

(c) Several other ερ- entities, structurally distinct from the copular ερ- that alternates with οι ν-:
(1) \textit{ep-} + Adverbial (see \textit{Polotsky} 1959:459) in non-durative environment, alternating with the rhematic adverbial in the Present; rare in the corpus, but well attested elsewhere:

\begin{quote}
Gen. 44:4 ετανεπεκαβαλ αε νταβακι...
Gen. 3:5 τετενναερμφρην ηγαννοντ.
\end{quote}

(2) Non-copular \textit{ep-} + zero article + NOUN: marking ("deriving") the denominal stem of verb lexemes, in durative and non-durative environments:

\begin{quote}
+ \textit{nob} Gen. 40:1 (note the degree modification in Ex. 32:31 \textit{epnob} αερνιγινηντ νηνοβί).
+ \textit{qwb} Gen. 31:29, Ex. 31:4.
+ \textit{caanizin} Num. 10:10.
+ \textit{osw} Num. 11:28, 32:31.
+ \textit{oswini} Gen. 1:15:17.
Gen. 31:46 παιδαλ ετερμεθερ εστων νεμακ — here, however, we may have an instance of the rare \textit{ep-} "constitute, play role of", "act as" (see below).
\end{quote}

(3) \textit{ep-} + Greek morphological infinitive, serving in Bohairic as a Coptic/Greek buffer or interface grammeme, to integrate Greek verb lexemes in the Coptic grammatical system (Sahidic integrates Greek zero-stems without an auxiliary). Durative and non-durative environments. The \textit{ep-} + Greek -\textit{n} form syntagm is only semi-analyzable, like the famous "cranberry" case; alternatively, it is arguable that the Greek-origin element has lexemic status in Bohairic Coptic, but hardly a nominal one (see below, Chapter Three); it is certainly not on the same structural standing as "\textit{cwtem}" "native" infinitives.

\begin{quote}
Ex. 34:16 ετερεπεκαβκηρι \textit{ep-}πορπεσεν.
Ex. 5:16 ετερεπ-\textit{mactirtoin} αμων.
Also Gen. 21:10, 29:18:20, Ex. 16:30, Lev. 26:34, Num. 27:14, 11:25, Ex. 32:4 and \textit{passim}.
\end{quote}

(4) \textit{ep-} + Egyptian verb lexeme. Extremely rare: \textit{api-em} (imperative only? e.g. Deut. 2:7). Perhaps \textit{ep-xiniop} (Num. 32:5).

(6) **επ- n-/ε-:** επ- “render”, “verb of incomplete predication” (Curme) — trivalent επ-/αι-. The Rheme with zero or indefinite determination.

- Ex. 5:21 ἀριστερός απελευθερώθη μπροστά.
- Gen. 42:36 ἀτεκνοὶ πατρὸς ἡπιοῦ.
- Gen. 14:23 διερ-αβραμ παρασκευᾶ.
- Ex. 8:10 ἀριστοί νασυνῶν αὐτῶν.
- Gen. 34:31 διπλάνα τεντωκοί μῆρα τοῦ αὐτοῦ.

(7) **επ- lexeme**, not auxiliary grammeme: “commit, execute”, “do”, “make”, “exercise, practice”, “spend (time)” “reach” (age, number) and similar; in non-durative and durative environment. Object with full determination paradigm, including zero. (Zero-object and no-object cases are also encountered: Gen. 41:34, 48:20). Here, too, one may find nouns entering the copular επ- construction as well as the deriving επ-. Except in extreme cases, it is not always easy to distinguish between lexemic and deriving επ-; the danger of subjectivity and translation-view is usually present:

- + πεθανεῖ Num. 10:32.
- + μπόρ ημή ην. Gen. 27:38.
- + θεμενι τοῦ. πεθαμεί Gen. 41:9.
- + πωτωπι Gen. 43:9.
- + τιμή Lev. 27:8 + τεττίμη Lev. 27:13.
- + ξινιοπ Gen. 32:10:23, Num. 32:5:7, perhaps “execute crossing” vs. ξινιοπ *ibid.* “cross”.
- + οσταί Gen. 24:12.
- + οστιψοτι N- Gen. 21:8.
- + οστανω Lev. 5:22.
- + βωκ Ex. 14:5.
- + θεμενι, πεθαμεί Gen. 8:1, 40:14, Num. 10:9.
- + θεμενι Deut. 32:10.
+ ἔλαι Gen. 12:18.
+ age Gen. 35:28, Num. 28:3.

(7) ἐρβοκι, ἐμβοκι “conceive, be/become pregnant” — alternation between non-durative and durative environments.
(a) ἐρβοκι vs. ἐμβοκι “conceive” vs. “[be] pregnant” (ἐρβοκι non-durative)
Gen. 38:24 ξηππε εεμβοκι.
Num. 11:12 θε εεμβοκι.
Gen. 16:5 ετακνατ ἐκ ἐκ-εεμβοκι — Focalizing Present.
Gen. 38:25 ἐβολ ἑνπιπωμι ετενοτq νε ναι αιμβοκι ἀνοκ (v.l. αἱερβοκι).
Focalizing Present “It is by the man whose these are, that I am pregnant” (v.l. Basic Preterite “... I have conceived”).
Gen. 38:18 ἄμερβοκι ἐβολ μμωq (Preterite).
Gen. 16:4 ἄμερβοκι (Preterite).
(b) But performatively (“Divine-Intervention Performative”), ἐρβοκι occurs even in the (non-actual?) Present:
Gen. 16:11 ξηππε νέο τεερβοκι.
Gen. 25:23 ώλλοι ἁ εαιερβοκι μμωτ.
These are instances of the biological condition being not only simultaneous, but taking effect simultaneously with, and by, the Divine Utterance in a kind of “induced Performative”. We have here very probably the Non-Actual Present, see above, Gen. 25:23 is a case of Focalizing Present and not Preterite (note the Greek Present), in a special Cleft Sentence pattern with an initial nominal Focus (see below).

Obs.
(1) It is possible that the paradigmatic opposition between the Inherent and Incidental is not binary, but ternary: shared, at least in Shenoutean Sahidic, by ἐπ- + zero article, not alternating with ον- in durative nexus24. The sense here is “act as”, “play the part of” or “assume the likeness of” or similar, as against “be by nature or form”: Shenoute ed. Chass. 20ff. (said to Kronos-Satan) ἄν οταν ἄν γεμισε ἄν ἄν-μας ἄν οταν ἄτο ζηκι ἄν ἄν γιοισος ἄν ξαπαθή νιμ ... ἄν ἄτα γεμισε ἄν οταν ἁμοι ... ζηκ ... ζηκ ... ζηκ ... ζηκ ... ζηκ ... ζηκ ... ζηκ ... ζηκ (for

24 There is always the possibility that we have here the case of the Non-Actual (Generic) Present, which does not allow the ἐπ-/ον n-alternation.
the final Nominal Sentences, see Shisha-Halevy 1984a:186). (It may well be that similar cases of "act as" hide among the έρ- occurrences in Bohairic, consider Deut. 10:6 άριστον ονοελαιαχρ). Thus the Demotic ιρ.ιο ιοιη jw.ιο m hml is probably "I became male/assumed male nature, while/from being female", "I played the part of a male" (Isis' declaration on the conception of Horus), Smith 1987:62f. Compare Romance "do" as in "faire la tigre", "faire l'idiot" (see, for the broader role spectrum in French, Girys-Schneider 1987, Spence 1988).

(2) άμωτι έγοι ι- is non-durative — either Future (Greek έσται): Num. 29:13, also Ex. 27:1, 30:1, Deut. 6:8, 33:5; or else Jussive/Imperative: Ex. 26:8 άνεμεμμωτι έγοι ιν ηοιαι, also Gen. 27:29.

(3) It is possible to see έρ- as suppletive to the Nominal Sentence (Funk 1991:29 n.54), since οι ι- is in partial opposition to the latter; however, since this opposition is neutralizable, έρ- and the NS do find themselves often alternants.

2.2.2 ΧΗ, άμωτι

So far as I know and my documentation goes, the distinctly and peculiarly Bohairic Copula ΧΗ — occurring only with prepositional Rhemes in the Present — is not a trait of pre-Coptic Egyptian; Demotic or even LE may yet yield attestations of the grammaticalized, auxiliary Stative of b3', for the first radical of which Coptic κ should strangely be the reflex — but such a two-laryngeal root may easily be irregular (see Černý, Etym. Dict. 52 with references to attestations for this form as early as the 20th Dynasty).25 Cf. Crum, Dict. 95b "qual + prep or advb, be, exist, lie". Where Boh. ΧΗ corresponds to Sahidic κΗ, we normally have a full lexical value (e.g. Greek κείσθαι), while "Bohairic only" means normally Greek είναι. This feature is doubtlessly of the few major innovations of Bohairic, generally a conservative dialect (it is very rare in B4). Now the question is not so much why is ΧΗ "necessary", but what is its functional charge in opposition with the zero determined by it; and only in Bohairic is a zero term at all observable in the Present, a momentous first analytic interposition and expanse of overtness in this, the ancient pivotal and (at least in Old/Middle Egyptian) certainly the prime nexal matrix of Egyptian. One possibility to be considered is that ΧΗ is the correspondent, or even alternant of non-inherent οι ι- introducing adverbial Rhemes. This is also the first breach in the old symmetry between the adverbial and converbal (Stative or Dynamic Converb) Rhemes. I can make no satisfactory statement as to the function of ΧΗ vs. zero opposition in the corpus (with no correspondence in the Greek). The only real working hypothesis, I believe, is that ΧΗ is not a mere

---

25 Rarely in Demotic (late only?), so P. Insinger 14/9 and probably 35/8, but apparently never as Copula.
Copula, i.e. nexus *signifiant*, but an overt signal of marked stativity and focussed situationality. A clue to this may be the frequent occurrence of *XH* in presentative clauses (see above); in the fact that *XH* is as a rule found in affirmative, not negative nexus; that *XH* is in the corpus unusual in age-specification by *Sen*. On the other hand, in cases where there is no real opposition, as e.g. for *membo N* or *esoth Sen*, *XH* may have no more than the value of a segmental copula. Similarly for the narrative *naq*—*XH*... (consider Gen. 40:9:11, 29:2, Ex. 34:29, Num. 15:32 etc.). *XH* seems favoured in the Relative Conversion. On the other hand, *XH* does not seem to occur in purely metaphorical location, unless in presentative, solemn, Divine-Locutor context (including age specification) — *etth*, *etemmaw* seem never to have *XH*. It seems clear that the mere adverbial repertory alone does not prejudice *XH* or its absence. However, pending an exhaustive study, all these reflections have no more than impressionistic and speculative value, and conflicting evidence is ample.

Obs.

*XH* is rarely in evidence in the early B4 Bohairic of the Twelve Prophets or Bodmer III John, see John 17:13 *eixh Senpikoscoc* (zero e.g. in 10:38, 11:61, 11:15:21:31, 12:8:9 etc), Mal. 1:12, 2:6.

Consider the following representative documentation:

Ex. 33:21 *gpppe vson orma xh g'rok*.
Gen. 47:6 *ic pkapi ... xh mpopmeo*.
Gen. 42:28 *ic fai qh Senpaceok*.
Gen. 42:13 *gpppe ic pikome qh Sateppequw*.
Gen. 16:6 *ic teboki xh Sennecki*


Gen. 42:32 *qh nem peniwt*.

*Ph* *etxh egphi egSenpeqhi* Gen. 43:16, 44:1.

Gen. 27:15 *en eacsh esoth Senpechi*.
Gen. 7:22 *nxa noben etxh egSenpeqiw*.

Gen. 37:22 *naiakcoc etxh gnapae*.
Gen. 25:9 *Ph* *etxh membo mmanph*.
Gen. 17:23 *nh etxh Senphi nabraam*.

Gen. 35:9 *af* *de ovnoqi ekakob epxh Senlouga*.

Compare instances, frankly disconcerting, of *zero copula opposita*:

Gen. 42:21 *aga tenepphi rap Sennennobi*.

Gen. 42:35 *nape-pmop Mppat mpioi pioi Senpeq-cok*. 
Gen. 38:21 μμον-πορνη μπαιμα — located Non-existential.
Gen. 19:11 νηρωμι αε ενατζιπενφ ρο μπινι...
Gen. 23:8 ικε εςεντετενψηνχ...
Gen. 18:9 ιε γηπη οενσον σεντκχηνη.
Also, zero is usual in age specification: Gen. 17:1 etc.
(b) The Copular Stative Converb ωοπ, much rarer than χη, seems to
be lexically active, and express real human (or Divine) Existence-in-Lo-
cation; ωωπι is an important auxiliary, either integrating the converses
(with Circumstantial conversion, the analytic expression of what used to
be their adverbial commutability) in non-durative environment, or char-
acterizing ingressive Aktionsart.
Gen. 24:3 όη ετωοπ νςητοσ.
Gen. 24:62 ναρωοπ πε σενπικαζι ετεπανετ.
Gen. 25:27 ερωοπ σενωθι.
Gen. 20:3 ερωοπ νεμ ντρα.
Gen. 21:20 αρωωπι ειπωαζε illustrates the dynamic counterpart
of Copular ωοπ.

2.3 Rhematicity-Marking n-.

As a second or third “predicative” actant, or, outside the valency de-
pendency matrix, as a rhematic “adverbial” adjunct, n- (Egyptian m-)
with noun syntagm (zero or indefinite-determined — consequently a
double opposition, oι n- vs. n-, zero vs. indefinite, not in the Greek —
is a specifically rhematic-expansion marker; its alternation with e- (see
Chapter Three, §3.2 [d]) is a definite Egyptian trait. It is a moot point
whether the object marker n- (ΜΜΟ=) and the adnominal attributive
nota relationis n- (attributive, determinative, appurtenative, possessive,
principally according to expansion determination — arguably formal-
ized-rhematic; see Chapter Three)26 — are synchronically part of the
distribution system of this same element or homonyms; at any rate, the
adverbal object-actant / predicative / adverbial slot is certainly remark-
able:

Lev. 6:9 εεωοοωογ ΝΑΤΚΩΒ.
Ex. 39:1 αεαωαωοτ ΝΓΑΝΣΤΟΛΗ.
Ex. 7:1 ΑΙΤΗΚ ΝΝΟΤΓ.
Ex. 5:21 ΑΡΕΤΕΝΕΡ-ΠΕΝΣΕΟΙ ΜΒΟΓ.

26 See Barri 1978:263 (Theme — Rheme structure inside the phrase).
Ex. 7:1 ἐκεκυμπτί nακ ὀντὶ ὑποκάθητος (contrast Ex. 30:2 ἐκεκυμπτί εἰς τὸ τῆς ἀργων).
Deut. 28:44 οἴνος ἐκεκυμπτί οὐδὲ ὲνκ ἀκ οἱ ἐκεκυμπτί
Gen. 38:11 ἡμικὶ ναὴρα.
Gen. 14:14 αὐτὲλ-ἀντ πέκκον ναὶχμαλωτὸς.

When it is nexus that occupies the second or third “predicative” actant slot, or is otherwise adverbal, or is adnominal, we find the Circumstantial conversion (which is an analytic converb or adverbial-privileged finite verb-form) signalling this adnexal expansion status (see also in detail below, Chapter Four, on the junctural final-delimitation role):
Gen. 15:2 Ἀνὰκ κενακατ εβόλει εἰς ὁ οἀτὐχρι.
Deut. 22:4 ἀκολογνάτ εἶα ὁμεκκον ἰε πεκάκα εἰςεἰ
Gen. 16:1 οὐσία καὶ ἐπεκραν ἰε ἀγαρ.
Ex. 26:24 ἐκεκυμπτί εἰς ἱμα−νηκεφαλίς ἐτοῖ νοτί.

The Conjunctive, still most enigmatic of Coptic verb-forms and hitherto almost neglected in Bohairic linguistics, is another adnexal converb. (See, on Sahidic, Shisha-Halevy 1986a, Chapter Seven; 1995a). In Bohairic, it is characterized by some striking substantival privileges, as a final or consecutive “(so) that”-form (observe the Conjunctive following ἄς in Ex. 3:11 Ἀνὰκ ἀμ ἄς, Ex. 5:2 ἀμ πε τοι ἄς, Ex. 16:7 Ἀνον-οε ἄρι ἄς, or following ζία, γοπῶς, ψωτε, μηποτε/µηπός passim, or in protasi after ἐγὼν: see below, Chapter Three), but its specific role as post-imperatival (above, Chapter One) and generally sub-coordinating form is certainly compatible with an adnexal or nexus-adjointing higher-level rhematic sequel.

Obs.
(1) In Welsh, leniting yn−, but for the lenition homonymous with the preposition yn− “in”, is both rhythmicity marker and denominal adverbial-adjunct deriver (the latter role much like Romance -ment, -mente). Another interestingly relevant Welsh feature is the formal merging (as lenition morphophonemic marking of the first consonant of a noun) of predicative, adverbial and object: see Shisha-Halevy 1995:190ff., 1999:211ff.
(2) The Nucleus — Satellite (attribute) dependency is well compatible with the Theme-Rheme one: see Barri 1978.
(3) For rhematic slots of the French adjective, see Rottenberg 1975. Such scanning of adjectival slots reveals interesting parallels and differences between Coptic n− attribution
and the French *de-* and *zero + concord* linkage constructions: "immobile, le chat guette la souris" and "Paul me regarde, silencieux" (1975:232ff.), absent for Coptic *n*- bring home the fact that *n*- is essentially satellitial. Cases like "le chat demeure immobile" (250ff.), "cette réponse l'a rendu furieux" (250ff.) would have *n*- Rhemes in Coptic, as are the *de*- cases in "il y a une fenêtre d'ouverte" (246ff.), "quelque chose d'intéressant" (238ff.).


(5) The very special morphology of the Coptic Conjunctive (Sah. etc. *n*-, Boh. *nte/-n-*) indicates a rhematic converge (Shisha-Halevy 1986a Chapter Seven) in paradigmatic opposition to the equally rhematic adnexal Circumstantial one; both occur adnominally or adverbially.

(6) Gen. 32:27 ἐρεπεκαν ὑμνιὰ τὸ πιθανὰ has ἀς commuting with *n*- as rhamaticity marker.

(7) The familiar morphological puzzle of the two 3rd-plural forms of the Conjunctive, viz. *ntos*- ("regular" in its paradigm) and *nco*- (deviant, Sahidic-like yet equally Bohairic in distribution) was to my knowledge tackled only by L. Stern (1880:274, 282), who was confident he could correlate the forms with respective different meanings: *ntos*- "wirkliche folge" — "die form des objektiven modus der vorstellung", *nco*- "beabsichtigte folge" — "die Form des subjektiven modus der folge". I have not studied the Conjunctive in the corpus.

### 2.4 Focalization.

The grammar of focalization, which I will here define, loosely and inadequately, as "the syntax of any formal rhamatic marking of a clause constituent for prominence or salience beyond clausal-rheme-hood, within information-block scope", is among the more essential, if more difficult issues of grammar. Its difficulty is no doubt also due to the imponderables and intangibles involved on the semantic (*signifié*) plane, once we leave the doubtful support of the logic-of-contrast behind, and enter the realm of the expression of what is subjectively and attitudinally considered of relative importance: but mainly because it is a feature of macro-syntax, comprehensible only as a component of information structure, pragmatics, and ultra-clausal scope, and we still find it difficult to exceed the limits of the sentence in our formal analysis. Focalization, or, more elegantly, *mise en relief*, is one of the more familiar features of Coptic and pre-Coptic Egyptian, as any scholar of Egyptian diachrony will concede. Indeed, the history of modern Egyptian linguistics is entwined with focalization grammar, and not a little of the typological affinity of Egyptian and French, that makes for the affinity of idiom and turn of phrase between the two, can be traced to similarity in focalization constructions and their structural value.

The multifarious means and devices of focalization in Coptic: the Cleft Sentence and Focalizing Conversion patterning, the so-called Rhe-
torical Questions, noun, pronoun and adverbial extraposition, the Tautological Infinitive, the Augens, on, negating and others, provide signals not only for various applications or locations of Focus, but also for types and degrees and the very nature of focality.

For reasons of space, I shall not dwell here at all on current trends in Focus grammar; my impression is that, barring some specifically descriptive insightful treatises, the common understanding of grammatical Focus is still rough and ready, not to say approximate, with some areas (such as focalization in Narrative) almost wholly uncharted, and the very terminology highly individualistic and often confused. Moreover, Sentence Grammar is still the basis for discussion, explicitly or implicitly. I shall discuss here briefly five specific focalizing devices which, in their essential complementarity and considerable overlap, seem to corroborate comprehensive “envelope” focussing of a clause as an emic overhead notion, with localized focussing marked specifically and/or cotextually; the focalizability of the nexus itself, well established in Coptic, is part and parcel of this notion. A question that is sometimes raised in Indo-European and Semitic focalization grammar, namely the relationship of Focus and modality — or at least subjectivity — seems of little import in Coptic. On the other hand, since our corpus is a translated one, it is important to address the question of the relation of Greek and Coptic Focus phenomena; that is, the existence and nature of triggers in the Greek Vorlage for the choices and decisions of the Coptic translator. Nevertheless it is crucial to remember that (a) there can be no one-to-one correspondence between the two systems, (b) there is no reason to suppose the Greek-to-Coptic rendering proceeded by clauses (or by smaller units): it is rather information blocks that are the units to be contrasted, and the respective information structures that inform the translator’s choice; (c) quantitative (“grading of focality”) considerations cannot be simply applied; (d) discrepancies between the two texts, and in particular instances of “no focality feature in the Greek” with Coptic focalization prove that the translator’s decisions are primarily motivated by exigencies and demands of the Coptic system, not dictates.

27 See SHISHA-HALEVY 1986a Chapter Two (the Shenoutean Second Tense); 1990, for nexus focussing in Coptic; 1998:28ff. for Modern Welsh Narrative, dialogic and expository focussing; 1999:194ff. for Middle Welsh narrative focussing; DEPUYDT 2001, on the logic of Focus. COHEN 2001 on Focus in Old Babylonian, with general ramifications. GOLDENBERG 1971, a descriptive essay on the so-called Tautological Infinitive, in language-specific and general view; DÍK 1981; LAMBCRECHT 1995; SORNICOLA 1996. A special number of Linguistics (39-3 [2001] was recently devoted to focalizing constructions, especially Cleft constructions, more or less presenting the state of the art on this topic.
or constraints of the Greek one. All in all, the various constructions marking focality in Coptic discussed here in outline, including the Cleft Sentence, the Focalizing Conversion, Augens construction (in Chapter Four) and the Tautological Infinitive, constitute an impressive array, albeit one less rich than the one found in earlier Egyptian — Narrative Focalization is conspicuous by its sparseness in Coptic. Shisha-Halevy 2002, a pilot study on focalization in Oxyrhynchite, covers part of the ground examined here. I shall here present, discuss and document focalization patterning.

2.4.1 Focalization (I): the Focus-Initial, Relative-Topic Cleft Sentence ("CS"): a basic formal-functional account

(a) We have here a strikingly dichotomous matrix (often referred to as "Cleft Sentence" tout court\(^{28}\)), in which the first Immediate Constituent (pronoun or noun syntagm, thus in Coptic always pronominal; no zero determination is attested. Adverbials are attested outside the corpus, almost only παρῇν† is the Focus, while the second, a nexus (verbal or adverbial Rheme) marked by ἐτ-; πε- ἐτ- (one closed-juncture unity) or πετ- is the Topic. The Topic is thematic, either given or presented as given. The main formal descriptive problem concerns the difference between the Topic forms (with formal parameters, e.g. Focus/Nexus constituency, Focus/Nexus negation or affirmation, or else different functioning, theoretically responsible). Structurally, is there a core nexus pattern within the complex matrix (an issue, not of reduction\(^{29}\), but of analysis), and, if so, which? The answer, I believe, is that the πε(ε)τ-CS is analyzable as a co-referent appositive Relative expansion of the Immutable πε- Pattern (above, Pattern V: πε situation-phoric or pragmatic). In fact, this is the major difference between the Bohairic and Sahidic Cleft constructions: the latter uses the Endophoric-Theme pattern, where πε is determinant-anaphoric Theme, with the prime role of internal link, as core. In either case, \{πε\} is not copular, but a formal Theme, a post-signal of rheomaticity of the segment preceding; it is neith-er anaphoric nor cataphoric, and, in the complex CS clause, it is glossed or specified, appositively expanded by the Relative, which marks the topical or thematic nexus, that turns the initial Rheme into a Focus. This formal Theme is zeroed in the case of ετ-, which may be

\(^{28}\) So for instance in Widmer 1999:180 n.76, simplistically: "There is a close relation between Second Tenses and cleft sentence, since they both indicate that something is emphasized".

combined with a πε(ε)τ-Topic CS: Deut. 32:27 τετενδίκα ετοσκοι ὁταν πὲς ἀν πὲ εταφερναι θηροτ. (zero Theme excluded for a negated nexus and Preterite Topic).

Obs.
(1) POLOTSKY 1962; 1987:106ff., 114ff. sees the Delocutive-Theme pattern as core pattern, but does admit to the existence of a “starres πε” (107ff.); see also POLOTSKY 1987:113ff., 1990:267, 430. However, it is not the case that Bohairic is indifferent to the Focus gender/number distinction; this is not freezing, but syntagmatic aphory or exophory, and the conclusion that the Copula is not the antecedent of the Relative is I believe unwarranted. See SHISHA-HALEVY 1987:167ff. on Coptic and Egyptian; 1998: 169ff. and 1999 for the Welsh CS, which is formally close to the ετ- CS in Coptic. In both Sahidic and Bohairic, {πε} is comparable with the it’s (c’est) constituent of the North-West European (not Celtic!)30 CS, which is appositively expanded by a specifying (indeed glossing, whence Damourette and Pichon’s term for the Topic) Relative form, which merges with it prosodically.

(2) Some special discussions of the CS in other languages (beyond the general classical ones, such as Sandfeld’s, Jespersen’s, Damourette and Pichon’s, referred to in POLOTSKY 1944 and 1962): TAILLON 1975 on adverb CS focalization in French; ROTHEBERG 1971b, THUN 1975, LAMBRLEHT 1988, 2000 on the Presentativonal (or nexus-presenting, nexus-thematizing) CS in French; SORNICOLA 1988, DELIN and ÖBERLANDER 1995 on English (I find of interest the discussion of the CS in Narrative, e.g. 477ff., 483ff., 488ff.) on English; KAPELJUK 1988, Chapter Three for Amharic; SORNICOLA 1991 on the CS in Romance; SHISHA-HALEVY 1998:169ff. and 1999:186ff. for Welsh.

(3) The Immutable-Theme Nominal Sentence pattern is in Bohairic the normal combinatorial resumptive pattern for the CS (e.g. in responses or in otherwise anaphoric negation/interrogation):

Ex. 4:11 ΝΙΗ ΠΕ ΕΠΑΘΟΜΙΟ-ΕΒΟ ΝΕΜ ΚΟΥΡ ΠΕΝΩΤΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΕΜ ΒΕΛΕ ΜΗ ΑΝΟΚ ΑΝ ΠΕ ΠΣΕ (ΠΣΕ appositive to ΑΝΟΚ). Corroborative of the Endophoric NS — CS affinity even in Bohairic are also such cases as Num. 11:19 ΝΟΤΕΓΟΥΡ ΑΝ ΠΕ ΕΡΕΤΕΝΝΑΟΤΩΝ ΝΗΙΤΗ + ΟΤΑΕ Ε ΑΝ ΝΕ + ΟΤΑΕ Ε ΝΕΓΟΥΡ ΑΝ ΝΕ + ΟΤΑΕ Ι ΑΝ ΝΕ... (Circumstantial Topic; Vat has ΕΡΕΤΕΝΝΑΟΤΩΜ). Contextual support for the affinity of the Endophoric to the Cleft Sentence is also the atheoretic Ex. 32:18 (= Vat): ΌΣΜΗ ΑΝ ΠΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΣΕΓΝΑΡΧΟΥΝ ΕΤΕΧΟΡ ΔΑΛΑ ΌΣΜΗ ΕΒΟΛ ΣΕΓΝΑΡΧΟΥΝ ΝΤΕ-ΟΤΗΡΤΙ ΕΤΣΩΤΕΜ ΕΡΟΣ ΑΝΟΚ, or Gen. 45:8 ΝΟΤ ΑΕ ΝΟΤΕΝ ΑΝ ΑΡΕΤΕΝΟΤΟΡΠΙΤ ΕΜΝΑΙ ΔΑΛΑ ΦΤ ΠΕ, which has the Endophoric- or Immutable-Theme contrastively linked to a sequence-marked focalization; also Am. 7:8 B4, B5 ΟΤΑΤΑΜΙ ΠΕ responding to ΟΤ ΝΟΚ ΕΤΑΚΛΑΤ ΕΡΟΨ.

(4) In Sahidic, and more frequently in Bohairic, we find a CS pattern without a formal Theme at all, or rather with the formal Theme zeroed: Focus + ετ- (etc.); see POLOTSKY 1962 §9; 1987:121ff., 1990:429f. (Copula-less); also SHISHA-HALEVY 1983:318ff., 1987:171ff.; already STERN 1880 §306 (“suppression of copula”), ANDERSSON 1904:40ff., with a selection (for our corpus) of the most striking Foci; SETHE 1916 §§54, 74, 77. In Sahidic this construction is associated with the personal-pronoun Focus (POLOTSKY 1962:425 n.1); in the Theban dialect (ibid.), it is correlated with indefinite nominal Foci, before a new actor-theme (that is, not coreferent with the Focus). This last construction is

typical also of the Bohairic usage, but not without exception. (Generally, indefinite foci combine in Bohairic with πετ-). Beyond its diachronic interest, this pattern may, in view of its prevalent construction, imply a non-converter, but *pronominal*, role of the relative; an alternative analysis, however, might postulate here a zeroed-Theme subpattern (see above, for Theme zeroing in the Nominal Sentence patterns) as core. Owing to Focus specificity in Sahidic and Theban, the interdependence between Focus and Topic precludes any interpretation but the nexal one; this is not the case in Bohairic.

(5) Depuydt’s discussion of 1994, more or less rephrased in 1998, is seriously flawed by simplistic exposition and argumentation, and often wrong. To give this exposition the critique it deserves, one would have to respond more or less to each and every paragraph in the work on a very basic level (cf. 1994: 67, 68, 69, 70; 1998:58, 59, 60, 61). Depuydt, ignoring or misrepresenting all preceding discussion since Polotsky’s “Nominalsatz und Cleft Sentence” of 1962, says of πε: “πε may be sometimes interpreted by scribes (sic!) as either copula or definite article and at other times neither” (1994:70). General miscomprehension of the CS or NS as pattern sets is in evidence: (1994:65ff.; 67) “The Late Egyptian nominal sentence as a rule, does not have a Copula, and therefore neither does the Late Egyptian or Demotic cleft sentence” — incidentally, a patent *non sequitur*: *pw* did not “disappear in Egyptian”, but survives in Coptic πε. It is a fatal error to consider such elements (and diachrony in general) entirely unsystemically and in detachment from the micro- and macro-syntactic details of the patterns in which they occur. Another error is the “diachronic continuity” fallacy, as if one corpus-attested phase evolved from the preceding one (“later on, in latest Demotic, and especially in Coptic, trimembral nominal sentences became common again”). Depuydt’s diachronic scenario is no less unnecessary than unfounded. A third error is to treat Coptic as monolithic, ignoring the considerable dialectal differences (see e.g. pp. 69ff., 1998:59, 60, 64). It is certainly not true that “cleft sentences are not analytically transparent” (R. Simpson’s statement about Demotic) “applies to all Coptic cleft sentences” (p. 59). Obviously, Depuydt (p. 70) does not understand the significance of the Endophoric or the Non-phoric (Immutable) πε.

(6) The complementary functional status of our CS to Focalizing Conversion, stipulated by Polotsky as early as 1944 (see also 1987:136ff.), is marred by the fact that prepositional phrases can either be focussed by the Focalizing Conversion or in the Relative-Topic CS, with the nominal Focus resumed by and in the prepositional phrase. According to A. Boud’hors, Bohairic “prefers” the latter way, “reducing the functional range of the Second Tenses” (1993:228ff.). In fact, there is an important *opposition* between the two constructions.


(8) A possible instance of “that”-form ετα- following πε: De Vis II 118 ορωμ, πεταπωρι ης τις κεφαλε ορωμ, ης αν, on πε ετατς γινοτα νταιαρα (ετατς: could well be the so-called Temporalis).

(9) Notes from Diachrony. SATZINGER 1981:491, 505 n. 83: as in Bohairic, we have in the Topic an expansion of the “N pw” core. Arguably, the # Focus + ετ- # subpattern “continues” (structurally, not physically) the old Participle Statement construction, which is thus alive in Coptic (*pace* SATZINGER 1981:498). On the latter construction, see also VERNUSS 1990:188f. For LE, see RITTER 1994 (*pw* “subject” in the “syntactic dimension”, as against pragmatic and semantic ones).

(10) The Demotic CS points to an Endophoric pattern as core: P. Berlin P3633 (Elephantine) line x+25 τξ-η mdt τξ-nty-jw tn rh s “It’s the exact state of things that you
know”. Ryl. IX 2/5 ss sbkw n3-jjr hprr, I Setne 4/8 w’t wnw t3-jjr hprr etc. etc.; even with pronominal Focus: mtrw n3 nty- Ryl. IX 13/6, mtrt t3 nty- Ryl. XI 7, mtrws t3-wnw... P. Spiegelberg 1/16. As in Coptic, we do find mtrw p3-jjr- in Mag. 21/22. Sahidic-like, in the attested Demotic it is also the Endophoric Pattern that represents the CS in the textual sequel (anaphoric, e.g. in Responses, e.g. II Setne 4/9f., 11f.). See briefly Johnson 1981:420, Simpson 1996:167ff. Vittmann 1998:238ff seems to misconstrue the structure of the Demotic and general CS, characterizing it as a clause “with relative predicate”.

(11) The e- Topic. Generic and past tense, is not attested in our corpus, but is in the B4 John (7:19, 15:16, 18:14), always with a highly specific Focus (personal pronoun or Proper Name). Incidentally, in Oxyrhynchite, e-, where not substantivized as περ-, πολε e- or similar, seems specialized for the CS Topic (CS with personal-pronoun or Proper-Name Focus), and has little or no “normal” adnominal occurrence (cf. Shisha Halevy 1983:315 on Matthew; the same obtains for Acts and Psalms). See Bosson 2006a:64ff. for the Codex Schøyen Matthew.

(b) The Circumstantial Topic. I find in the corpus only Num. 11:19 as an instance of the Circumstantial thematization form for a nominal Focus (see below, for e- as a Focalizing Conversion form): notegou an pe epetennawbm nṣhtq ovde b an ne ovde ē nqou an ne... (Vat etetenna-)

Obs.

Outside the corpus, cf. De Vis II 49 nigm nṣhtov epe  qedaww  etbhtq, etc. Clearly, in Nitrian Bohairic the status of the Circumstantial Conversion is very different, in adnominal and other slots as well: Am II 129 ov pe ḫai ekaw mwq, and especially as Topic with adverbial Foci (concurring with the Focalizing Conversion, see below), an historically established role (Shisha Halevy 1978).

(c) Focalization — Morphologically Unmarked Topic (I)

The interrogative pronoun nigm combines with the unconverted Preterite to form a peculiar subpattern with unmarked Topic, in a construction typical of Nitrian texts but attested in all types of Bohairic, viz. nigm (own) 4q- (Gen. 27:33, 43:22, Deut. 5:26).

Obs.

(1) This construction, typical of Bohairic, may have belonged to a more colloquial register. See already Praetorius 1881:180; Polotsky 1934:64, 1990:180. Outside the corpus, consider:

Job 38:5 nigm 4q- icē kequwnb 4n nigm pe etaq-
Rom. 11:34f. (consensus) nigm petaq- 4n 4q- 4n nigm 4q-
Cat. 194f. ḥw mērcic aymot epec 4e-wik ntepunb ...

(3) Unlike other interrogative adverbials, nown and (sometimes) own enter for some reason unmarked-Topic constructions:
Mark 15:4 ἀνατέσσαρα τίμησεν ἐξορθώσαρεν ἐμετρήθη (cons.).
AM I 235...ἀρτοὶς εὐαγγελίζον ἐμετρήθη.
AM II 112 ἀλκόω ἐγών.
Cat. 227 ἐπιστρατεύω ἐγών (John 20:2; 13:15).
The Relative-Topic CS is not triggered by ἐμετρήθη either:
SV 20 ἀρτοὶς ἐμετρήθην ἐμφανίζονται.
De Vis 1 190 ἀρτοὶς ἐμετρήθην οὐ θεός σεμνότατοι.

(d) Focalization — Morphologically Unmarked Topic (II)
There are instances of initial non-interrogative Focus, and unmarked Preterite Topic (resuming the actantial Focus), which differ, by context — especially by the thematicity of the verb clause — and/or by low / indifferent specificity, from topicalization cases (see below):
Gen. 25:23 ὁλοκαυτώματι τιμήσατε μμωτό.
Gen. 21:6 οὐκ ἔδεισεν οὐκαὶ οὐκ ἔνθα.
Lev. 25:5 ἐκείνης τῶν καινῶν ἐκατέσχες ἐπικαλέσῃ.
Deut. 16:15 ἦν ἐκεῖνης εὐχαριστήτωσ.
Gen. 44:27 ἔγραψεν ἐκεῖνοι ἐταίρια των οὐσιών.
Deut. 28:38 εἰκόνας ἔκβεβλητο.
Gen. 37:20 ἀποκρίθην εἰρέων οὐχὶ ἀναιρεμέν — here we have, similarly to the “Presentational” CS (below), focussing or rhematization of the entire nexus of nominal and verbal constituents: “(The situation/matter is) that a wild beast has devoured him”.
There do occur occasional cases of high-specificity Focus, beside personal pronouns. None is context-bound:
Deut. 8:17 τανομῷ τῆμι ποιήσας πνεύματα ἐκ τούτων οὐκ ἠπαντήσες.
Gen. 45:8 ἵππος ἄλος ἡσυχάσας ἐμοί ἐν παρακλήσει τεσσεράνων ἀλλὰ ὁ ἐπίκειται ναῷ τῷ πνεύματι — the Focus is here triply marked: by its initial placement, by ἄν and, retrospectively, by the conjunct Nominal Sentence with the formal or situational Theme πε deadline (see above).
In a case of an initial non-anaphoric adverbial, like Deut. 9:6 ἐπετελέσθη τῷ πνεύματι ἀν ἐν τῷ άντρι τοῖς πνεύματι ἀν, both sequence and ἀν signal focalization.

Obs.
(1) Outside the corpus:
Mt. 16:17 ὅτι οὐκ ἐνοπλοὶ ἀν ἀγωνίσθη ἀλλὰ συνεχείᾳ ἀντιπαλώσας.
Mt. 13:27 ἢ μὴ ἀποκρίθη ἐναντίον ἀν ἄκατω σέανει ἡ ἤτοι.
(e) The adverbial Focus. In the corpus, it is rather restricted:

Ex. 3:14f. παρθὺ πε ἐτεκεῖχος (Vat -ζου -: not necessarily adverbial).

Ex. 22:30 παρθὺ ὅν πετεκεῖα (not necessarily adverbial).

παρθὺ πε ἐτ- is especially well attested (Ex. 3:14, 22:30, 23:11, 26:17, 27:11), which may indicate that it is formally and functionally not a CS, but means “This is the manner in which...”.

Ex. 23:12 ζ νεγουτ πε ἐτεκιρίννεκβνοτ, also Ex. 20:8, 34:21, 35:2.

Obs.

(1) Adverbials of all kinds are sporadically attested as Focus in varieties of Bohairic:
John 5:28 (B4) Σηουαν ἐτεκουο νηβεν ετχη Σηουιβανεν σενακωτεμ.
John 15:27 (B4) Σεθη εικανεν-γει ετετενυνοπ νεμή (the Circumstantial would in this text probably be ερετεν-).
John 14:27 μωρθυ τὴν ετεπικοσμοῦ τὴν μνοε ετνάτ.".
Cat. 4 παρθυ πε εναφκοι.

I believe all these cases, along with the peculiar construction in NHC I (Tripartite Tractate) where a Relative-Topic πετ(α)- focusses an adverb (the adverbials in question are all prepositional phrases: αῖν-, εν-, άβαλ εν-, άβαλ ετν:- see THOMASSEN 1990:428f.), presuppose an Adverbial + πε core.


(f) A major descriptive question concerns the functional difference — or else allotagmic complementarity — between the Topic forms ετ- (no formal Theme) and π(ε)ετ-, where πε, I suggest, is the Immutable Pragmatic-situation Theme (more important in Bohairic than elsewhere; see above, for the Nominal Sentence pattern as the core of the CS). Now such cases as Deut. 30:12f. ΝΙΜ ΠΕΤΝΑΣΨΕΝΑΨ ΕΠΨΒΙ ΕΤΨΕ ... ΝΙΜ ΕΤΝΑΣΨΕΡΞΙΝΙΟΡ..., together with an undifferentiating view of the bulk of the documentation, in the corpus and outside it, might give the impression of overlapping or variation. However, there are sections in the overall spread of the evidence which point to a tendency of preference for one of the two constructions31. The following approximative statement seems to apply to our corpus:

31 Similarly in the extensive listing (ongoing research; an interim report in the 7th Coptic Congress, Leiden 2000) presented by W.P. Funk for NT, OT and Nitrian, B4 and B5 sources.
The \textit{et}- Topic is affirmative only, most typically co-referent with the Focus, and converting the "Converbial" Conjugation Pattern (Present and Future). (This supports the diachronic identification with the Participial Statement, still fully functional in LE\textsuperscript{32}, rather than analysis as a zeroed-Theme core + appositive Relative expansion). The higher the specificity of the Focus, the higher the probability of finding \textit{et}- as the Topic form. But quantifier Foci (including indefinite determinators), also combine with \textit{et}- . On the other hand, middle-range determinators tend to combine with \textit{πε(ε)τ-} (details below). Thus, interlocutive pronouns combine more usually with \textit{et-} rather than \textit{π(ε)ετ-}; delocutives with \textit{πετ-}; \textit{π-} and \textit{πε-} with \textit{πετ-}, demonstratives usually with \textit{ετ-}; indefinites and interrogatives with \textit{πετ-}. The \textit{zero} determinator is entirely absent in the CS Focus, as in the NS in general\textsuperscript{33}. With all four parameters applied, it is possible to predict the choice of \textit{et-} or \textit{π(ε)ετ-} with a degree of confidence. But no more than that: a tendency, not conditioning or selection.

(1) Focus listing for the \textit{et-} Topic in the corpus:
Focus: high- and low-specificity is typical; middle-specificity is rare. \{\textit{πε-}\} is extremely rare.

- Indefinite articles; quantifiers.
  \textit{γιν-} (Lev. 22:25).
  Ex. 11:1 \textit{ετί keep'DET MMHATAQ ετNAENQ.}
  [number name] (Ex. 23:10).
  Gen. 23:15 \textit{,epi NKI'T NPIAT ETOTTTWI NEMAK (= Vat.)}

- Interrogative Pronouns (also \textit{πετ-}: below).
  \textit{ος} (Gen. 49:1).
  \textit{νιΜ} (Gen. 49:9, Ex. 32:24, Num. 11:4:18:29, 24:9:23, Deut. 5:29, 30:12f.).
  \textit{δω} (Deut. 4:7:8).

- Personal Pronouns, interlocutive:
  \textit{ανοκ} (Gen. 42:37, Ex. 4:12:15, Deut. 32:39).
  Gen. 31:39 \textit{ανοκ enai'T EBAQITOT} (note the conditioned theme-pronoun in interlocutive personal linkage; also \textit{νοκ enak} - Num. 22:34) — the possibility of a Focalizing ("Second") Imperfect must not be entirely dismissed.
  \textit{νοκ, neWTE} (Ex. 20:22, Num. 11:29, Deut. 9:1, 20:20).
  Ex. 32:22 \textit{νοκ etcwOTN}.

\textsuperscript{32} Gardiner 1957 §§227, 373; Groll 1967:47ff.
\textsuperscript{33} Unless it be before the quantifier \textit{κε-}.
• Personal Pronouns, delocutive (rare):
  Gen. 44:20 νεος μματαρν ετωον.

• Demonstratives:
  φαι (ναι-) (Gen. 5:29, 25:22).
  Deut. 3:28 φαί ετναρφορμμωψ.
  Gen. 31:46 ναιαλ ετερμεψε ωττωι νεμακ.

• Proper Names:
  Num. 12:2 μν μωρχς μματαρν εταγς εαοι νεμακ.
  Ex. 2:22 φαι γαι μπαιωτ ετοι μβνθος νι.
  {πι-}: extremely rare; not anaphoric.
  Num. 7:9 νιψεμωι ντεπεθοταβ ετεντοτον (= Vat).

• Possessive article {πεκ-}, rare:
  Gen. 3:10 τεκσμιν ετα[ι]ςομεψ is formally deviant, and, functionally, clearly Presentational (that is, τεκσμιν is not focal at all). In a remarkable near-consensus, all MSS except Bodmer III (B4) have here for some mysterious reason the masculine object resumptive pronoun; Vat reads πεταςομεψ. Formally, both the Relative Preterite and the Topic, not co-referent with Focus, are remarkable too. (See below, [g]).
  Ex. 23:21 παραν γαι ετκν χεψ.

Obs.
(1) Three rare, apparently negative instances in the NT call for observation:
  Mt. 7:21 οτον νιβεν αν ετκω μμους νι με-πος πος εναι εβον
  λπημοτοσω ντενιψοτοι νι. εναι εβον αν. Apparently a case of truly negative
  nexus, this locus is noteworthy for the position of the post-negator, which raises
  the possibility of a specially located focal negation being an option besides nexal
  and topical negation (this is, I believe, a real term in the negation paradigm
  for the Focalizing Convo., see below). (Luke 12:6, Cat. 146) μν καιαν αν ετοτα
  μμοψε εβολ... is not really negative, but marked by μν...αν as enhanced “Rhetorical”
  Assertion (see above). Zach. 3:2 (B4) μν αν φαι αν πε μπορητα
  νοσψε... Greek ὥς ὦ αν
tοτο ας δολος εξεσπαρμνος — a very rare Theme-initial, Adverbial-Rheme.
  Copular NS pattern: αν, part of the μν... αν Assertive Question, is here repeated as
  a “foreshadowed enclitic”.

(2) The specifically Oxyrhynchite pattern # λτακ ετε- + Proper Name/PN-equivalent is
  and still not quite understood (SCHENKE 1978:*55f. (101f.), 1996:106; SHISA-HALEV
  45:11, 141:6; a few similar instances from Nag Hammadi are discussed in

34 It is worth noting that this construction is attested in early Bohairic epistolography,
in the presentative CS as opening formula “PN ετκδαι”: see Worrell, Coptic Texts
175ff.
pronoun here is by no means focal or always rhematic; on the contrary, there are clear instances of the highly specific noun being the Rheme. Can this be a special CS pattern, focussing a Nominal-Sentence Rheme by zeroing its πε Theme (Immutable? Endophoric? See above, the Nominal Sentence patterns) - "It is Christ that you are"? A possible, but doubtful instance of πε not zeroed is Ps. 118:11 ντακ ετε-περοτατ μιαρηπ πε, with most letters doubtful (see SCHENKE 1996:106 n.56). And yet I must confess I do not see how this information structure is effected by the complex construction in point, unless there be here some similarity to the Focalizing Converter + Theme Topic in cases like ακασι "It is mad you are". At any rate, this peculiar pattern hints at the association and mutual implications of the following four issues: (1) the zeroing or absence of π- in the CS Topic, (2) zeroing of the Theme πε in the NS, (3) the uneasy Relative conversion of any NS, (4) the remarkable privilege of a NS instead of verbal nexus in the CS Topic. Macrosyntactically and pragmatically, this pattern is pro-acclamatory (as a rule interlocutive — only Act. 9:20 and 22 are delocutive cases). Incidentally, the construction range for ντακ ετ- (etc.) recalls, but does not exactly match our corpus: see SCHENKE 1996:107f. (on Psalms); BOSSON 2006a:64ff for Codex Schøyen.

(2) Focus listing for the πετ- Topic (with the πε ετ- variant, sometimes significant). As already pointed out, this — even for normally ετ- Topic Foci — is the form of preference outside the Present/Future and cases of absence of co-reference between Focus and Topic. Also, a tendency of preference with mid-range of Focus specificity.

• Intergenerative pronouns (var. πε ετ-):
  
  οὐ, νημ (Gen. 21:26, 27:18, Ex. 17:4, 10:26, 15:24, Num. 9:8, 16:30 etc.).
  Deut. 3:24 νημ γαρ ννομ† πετναίρι...
  Ex. 4:1 οὐ πετναζου ννομ.
  Gen. 46:3 οὐ πετζοπ (so always; οὐ πε ετ- a common variant, Ex. 3:4, Gen. 21:29, 27:37, 44:15).

• Demonstratives (less typical?):
  Num. 23:2 δαι πετναζη.
  The πε ετ- variant seems to be here especially significant (Ex. 30:13, Num. 22:38).
  Ex. 19:3 ναι πε ετκαζοτος and similar 20:22, 23:16 etc.
  Delocutive personal pronouns (πε ετ-):
  Deut. 6:13 νηου πετεκετομκ ερου.
  Deut. 1:38 ηοπ πε εηναθηι (= Val)
  Ex. 38:23 ειλαβ δη ντε-αξιακακ... νηου πε εταρεπα-
  xικτουν.

• Interlocutive personal pronouns (rare) (πε ετ-):
  Ex. 19:4 ννωτεν πε εταρεπεναν.
  Note the interlocutive reference linkage.
• Determinators: \( \{ \text{πι-} \} \):
  Gen. 3:13 \( \text{πισχυ } \text{πεταφερακ } \text{μμοι} \) — presentational, not focussing.
• Proper Names:
  Gen. 31:32 \( \text{παρξα } \text{τεφσιμ } \text{πετακολοπος} \).
  Deut. 6:13 \( \text{πεκ } \text{πεξνοτ } \text{πετεκεερροφ } \text{εατεφη} \), also \( \text{πε } \text{ετ-} \) Deut. 32:12, Ex. 14:14:25, 15:3.
  Ex. 16:6 \( \text{πε } \text{πεταφε Theta } \text{εβολ } \text{εππκαι } \text{νακμι} \).
  Gen. 31:44 \( \text{φ } \text{πετερμε } \text{οτ } \text{ωτ } \text{νεμακ} \).
• Possessed Focus:
  Gen. 45:12 \( \text{πωι } \text{πετακ } \text{νεμων} \).
• Indefinite article (Sgl.) (very rare: only Preterite?):
  Gen. 43:12 \( \text{ουμετα } \text{ταιμ } \text{πετακυμι} \).
  Ex. 15:15 \( \text{ουσ } \text{εεε } \text{πετακεθιτος} \).
  Arguably, \( \text{ουμετα } \text{ταιμ } \) and \( \text{ουσ } \text{εεε } \text{πετακεθιτος} \) are here not focal: this is in all probability a Presentational pattern, with \( \text{πε } \) rhematizing both noun and verb in nexus (see below).
  Deut. 32:28 \( \text{ου } \text{νος } \text{πε } \text{επ } \text{εταφθ } \text{μπε } \text{θ } \text{ο } \text{ο } \text{ο } \text{ο} \) (= Vat). This is not a CS, but a NS with expanded Rheme.
• Adverbials; \( \text{παιρθ } \text{ε } \text{πε } \text{ε } \text{πσ } \text{τ } \text{ο } \text{τ } \text{ο } \) only.
  Gen. 39:19 \( \text{παιρθ } \text{πε } \text{τακα } \text{πικ } \) also Ex. 23:11.
  \( \text{παιρθ } \text{πε } \text{ε } \text{τ } \text{ο } \text{τ } \) is especially well attested (Ex. 3:14, 22:30, 23:11, 26:17, 27:11), which may indicate that it is not a CS (but means “This is the manner in which…”): it seems to be an expansion of \( \text{παιρθ } \text{πε } \text{ε } \text{τ } \text{ο } \text{τ } \) “That is how it is”.
  Ex. 23:12 \( \text{ζ } \text{νεγου } \text{πε } \text{ετ } \text{ε } \text{κπι } \text{νι } \text{εκ } \text{β } \text{θ } \text{ο } \text{ι } \text{o} \), also Ex. 20:8, 34:21, 35:2.

Obs.
1) In Ex. 4:2 \( \text{ο } \text{πε } \text{φι } \text{ε } \text{ε } \text{π } \text{ε } \text{ο } \text{κ } \text{α } \text{ι } \text{α } \text{ς } \) we have, I believe, a special formalized allocutive-deixis case of the Expanded-Theme Delocutive NS (as a rule with the Relative Preterite; also Gen. 20:9, 26:10, 27:20, 29:25, 42:28, Ex. 4:2, 14:5:11, 18:14 etc.) which constitutes a Cleft-Sentence-like form that is not based on the Endophoric or Immutable-Theme pattern.
2) The expanded NS with a substantival Relative expansion (\( \text{N } \text{πε } / \text{N } \text{ε } \text{φι } / \text{N } \text{θ } \text{ε } \text{τ } \)) is often the Bohairic correspondent of the CS in other dialects. It is also correlatable with high-specificity Foci: see POLOTSKY 1962 §8-9, with a special treatment of the Bohairic phenomenon. It seems a typically Bohairic rendering of certain Greek phrases. Also POLOTSKY 1990:426f., quoting e.g. Gen. 24:14, Ex. 3:14, 10:8, 29:1; for the copular “\( \text{N } \text{πε } \text{πε } \text{τ } \text{ο } \text{τ } \text{ο } \)” (#Theme + Copula + Rheme#) in the Sahidic Bible and non-Biblical Sahidic, see POLOTSKY 1962 §11. (Is this the Coptic “Pseudo-Cleft” pattern? Cf. NEVEU 1994).
(g) A functional note. Pending a comprehensive macro-syntactical appraisal of Coptic focalization, to include the CS, the Focalizing Conversion, the Augens and minor constructions in an information-structure scope\(^{35}\), we can only hope for some fleeting impressionist functional understanding of the CS Focus. Generally speaking, the CS focalization is less sophisticated, less nuanced than focussing by the FC: this derives mainly from the functional value difference resulting from the difference between (mostly high-specificity) actants and circumstants (adjuncts). One must indeed observe here on the asymmetry of the CS and the Focalizing Conversion (below): the focality of the latter is certainly more contextual and cotextual — thus much more varied — than the former, where it is largely absolute; the CS never to my knowledge enters a "Thematic Progression" configuration; junctorally it is more highly delimitative than the linking FC. Significant is also the typical high specificity of the CS Focus, where the FC has nothing comparable.

Interrogative pronouns enter in Bohairic the CS as a conditioned construction, hence have no special functional load in this pattern (\textit{nim \textalpha q-} is not really opposed to \textit{nim \textepsilon \textalpha q-}). Non-interrogative Foci are pertinent, unless they are triggered by preposed personal pronouns in the Greek (often following the Hebrew) e.g. in Deut. 3:24, 9:1. For pertinent pronoun and Proper-Name focussing, as well as for the rarer possessed and definite nouns, we find cases of "only..." (Deut. 20:20), "...and not...", "...in person", "none other than...", "no less than..." (Gen. 31:32:48, 39:19, 45:12, Ex. 2:22, 23:21, Deut. 1:39, 3:22, 31:3). For the rare indefinites we have true contrast (Ex. 32:17:18). For the few focal adverbials, especially \textit{\	extalpha i\phi}†, the pattern expresses "only" ("only thus", "in this very way", "just so").

(h) The non-focussing Presentational Pattern (rare). This nexus-rhematizing, non-polemic construction is macro- and micro-syntactically distinct (\textit{Shisha-Halevy} 1987:172ff., esp. 174). It occurs in narrative/report-initial role (as against the dialogic or expositive noun/pronoun-focussing CS), and in apocritic (responsive) and explicative slots (with no special formal marking in the Greek). The formal theme \textit{\textepsilon}, where present, is situational; the relative is Rhematic or adnexal.

\(^{35}\) The present writer is engaged on a comprehensive study of rhetorical focalization in Shenoutean Sahidic.
Gen. 3:10 τεκσμος έτα(ι)σομετ εκμοι σενππαραπα-
ς λειπος (consensus of all codd.), answering “Where are you?”

Ex. 2:18-19 ασρωμι νρεμεξκπμι πε εταξιναγμεν εβολ
ντοτς, answering “Why did you hurry back?”

Probable cases are:
Gen. 43:12 ασμετατεμι πεταξωμι.
Ex. 15:15 ασκερτιερ πεταξίτιτς.
Gen. 3:13 προσ πεταξεργαλ μμοι.

Obs.
(1) Outside the corpus, consider:
John 9:15 (“How did you come to see?”) ασρωμι πεταξραξ εξεδαλ αοσι
εναλ εβολ ανατ μκολ (B4 απεκαινι ανατομι αθηιν επαλι
μκωσ εβολ ανατ μκολ).
John 12:29 (B4) άξειζκαραλ πεταξωμι...(άξεισιεραλ πεταξκαλ
ξεια (explaining the voice from heaven).
Luke 9:7f. Three explanations: ιανκέρκνετ πεταξτωμεν εβολ θενν εομοτσι...
δαι κεταξονκεν εβολ... οσπροφινεπ θενκαρκεοενεοεοενεκατωμεν.
Luke 19:31 ποες πετεκρπια μκολ (answering “Do you untie the colt?”).
De Vis II 168 σε πε ετών λενταπολει ερεπαμελ ηθη περι
ανκρωμι πε εταςιερπρωετ ετερπωμ.
(Welsh); THUN 1975. Krötsch and SABBAN 1990: 93, 95f. “Le c’est...qui/que cohésif”,
with a resuming element (not Focus but “thématisation forte”), 93, 95 “le c’est qui/que
présentatif” answering “Qu’est-ce que si passe?” — “entièremen rhématique”;

2.4.2 Focalization (II): the Focalizing Conversion (alias “Second
Tense”): a basic account

(a) Preliminary. In 2002, I attempted a succinct discussion of the
Problematik and main descriptive facts of the FC in the Oxyrhynchite
dialect. Apart from a few general statements, I shall not repeat here what
was said about tensing, Focus and focalization, synchrony and diachrony
of the FC, Greek motivation of Coptic focalization and of course the ac-
tual typology of the Oxyrhynchite constructions. In the actual FC picture
that emerges in our corpus and in Bohairic in general, there are sections
that differ from the Polotskian “orthodoxy” and the communis opinio: I
shall treat those in more detail.

The FC, by and large the core of Polotskian Egyptian linguistics, and
a showpiece of Egyptian-Coptic grammar, is a high-level thematizing
device, within which the built-in Topic/Theme, also marker of textual
and contextual cohesivity, is (a) a FC nexus, essential and integral in the
FC construction — the converted nexus, with its own Theme and Rheme; or, more difficult to understand, for adverbial or (rarely) Stative converbal Foci, (b) the special nuclear formal nexus of the converter itself with its (pro)nominal Theme: ḥq/-hpe-.  

In the FC construction set, Coptic (and especially Sahidic) breaks a three-thousand-years-old historical matrix, viz. the familiar adverbial-rheme one, the “Bipartite” Pattern, pivotal throughout the history of Egyptian: this was presented by Polotsky — in 1944, 1960, 1965 and still in basically the same way in 1990:136ff., as the proper syntagmatic framework of the FC. The exclusiveness and indeed primacy of this model is contestable already in Demotic (perhaps before then)\(^{36}\). The disruption of this association — both in Topic placement and in Focus word-class, as well as in numerous other details — is certainly related to the withdrawal of the FC, complete by Late Egyptian, from practically all substantival-privilege slots. It is also the case that the initiality of the FC conversion evident in this matrix (among the neatest instances of initiality in the earlier stages of Egyptian) is impaired in Coptic in two ways, viz. (a) the zeroed Circumstantial conversion of the FC and (b) the spread of Focus-initial matrices, perhaps also encouraged by Greek syntactic-prosodic influence. Bohairic, while relatively conservative in its FC patterning as well as in focal word-class, shares this general Coptic tendency.

The most satisfactory way of describing the subtleties of functional hypercategories is the structural procedure of isolating precisely formulated oppositions in precisely defined environments, that is, accounting for all observable parameters, in the syntagmatic and paradigmatic dimensions. On the paradigmatic axis, pertinence of linguistic signs (the formal/functional quality of not being conditioned, of standing in opposition in-paradigm to other signifiers/signifieds) is scalar: the smaller a paradigm is, the weaker the opposition and hence the pertinence of its members, the richer a paradigm the higher its members’ pertinence. It is thus not simply the case that the members of a paradigm cover each their share of a semantic continuum, and that their functional load expands and shrinks as their paradigm grows more or less rich. (Conditioning is de-pertinentization. When an opposition of the focalizing conversion or other focalizing constructions to unmarked tense forms is cancelled or weakened — as often in the case of interrogative adverbs or pronouns — the Focus, although still formally marked, is functionally non-pertinent.)

Contrary to general intuitive opinion, the Focus is most often not contrastive — that is, not in opposition to one specific lexemic element, but (at least potentially) to all elements in any associative paradigm with it; which explains why the non-focal rest of the clause is not contrasted as a specific semantic entity to the Focus. The dichotomous conception of a Focus-and-Topic constituenue of the sentence, with clear-cut edge to each constituent, is implied in all treatments of the FC. Yet there is a difference between the syntagmatic spread of focal information within the sentence and the paradigmatic structure of the Focus, which is a correlate of the number and nature of the opposed terms commutable with (a) the focus and (b) the construction in point (POLOTSKY 1957:110 n.1 "There is admittedly no ‘objective’ criterion for determining the degree of emphasis borne by an adverbial complement. The only way is to examine whether, in a given context, it is the verb or the adverbial expression which contributes more to the predicational contents of the sentence" is disheartening, because of the very subjectivity and inherent circularity involved).

The Focus is superimposed onto the Theme-Rheme basic nexus. What is focussed in the first instance is the whole clausal complex — actants, verbal lexeme, circumstnats (adverbial adjuncts) and even their nexus — in a kind of overall ‘Envelope Focussing’\(^{37}\). In the second instance, i.e. one stage ahead in the focalized reading, in the decoding based on the special marking of a clausal constituent\(^{38}\) conjointly with co(n)textual information structure and blocking, a specific constituent of the verb clause is resolved as being in focus: a circumstant (‘adverbial adjunct’), an actant, a verb lexeme, even the nexus itself — after all, the nexus interdependency is a fully privileged clause constituent, and as such is focalizable (and topicalizable). Nexus focalization has a rich range of semantic references, correlativey with various discourse and pragmatic environments. (Cf. COHEN 2005:17ff., 29-68).

\(^{37}\) Cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 1998:28ff. on the concept of Envelope Focussing (mainly effected by the periphrastic use of the auxiliary gnnneud “do”) in Modern Welsh, with reference to Herodotean Greek (see ROSENDEN 1957, 1967) and Coptic. In Welsh, a special converter (fe-) is used for higher-level rhematizing or focussing ("highlighting") of a verbal nexus, especially in the narrative texture: see SHISHA-HALEVY 1995 §§3.1.1-3.2.1.

\(^{38}\) Focalization (rhematization, applied to any constituent of the clausal complex), and topicalization (thematization — applied to a nexus) occur and are marked conjointly, indeed are inseparable. The marking can reside in either the Focus itself or in the topic, or in both; but when only the Focus is marked, this does not mean (as in the Rheme-Theme structure) that the rest is unimportant or basic or given or presupposed: it is only "unhighlighted".
The placement of the Focus is of some importance as a typological index of constructions, and of course from the information-structure angle, but should not, and cannot, be understood in isolation from the whole matrix or pattern. For Topic-initial constructions — the great majority of cases — it is as a rule the *valency matrix* that serves as delimiter, that is, when the valency matrix is concluded, the Focus commences. On the other hand, for the relatively limited Focus-initial construction, the Focus/Topic structural boundary runs just after the Focalization Converter.

Obs.

(1) The distinction (Lombardi Vallauri 1998) between broad ("esteso") and narrow Focus ("ristretto e contrastivo") is useful, partly coextensive with my "envelope focussing". See also Dik et al. 1981 on the "non-cotextual Focus" (pragmato-semantic, logically abstract, incl. underlying structures); ROBERT 1993 on the complexity of focal categories (in French, Berber, Chinese).

(2) Boud’Hors 1993 is the only attempt to date to confront different dialects in their focalization usage. On the basis of the Gospel of Matthew (B5), she confirms the "Egyptian orthodox" usage of Bohairic (and yet, the Bohairic FC is by no means limited to postposed adverbal Foci).

(3) That Bohairic prefers the Relative-Topic CS, "reducing the functional range of Second Tenses" is an impression, not really measurable diachronically or synchronically: see Polotsky 1944:64, Boud’Hors 1993:228ff. Cf. already Stern 1880 §375. In fact, the statements made 1944:31 + n.2 are valid by and large for Scripture Bohairic, not Nitrian ("'bohaïrique pur' par opposition au bohaïrique de Nitrîe"): "...Ann. Serv. XL 244, ou il aurait fallu dire que l'état du bohaïrique à l'égard du normal égyptien est déjà celui du démoticque". But early Bohairic is here less conservative: see Quecke, Or. 43 (1974) 388 James 2:18, or άλ-τόνα- Zach. 5:10, in P. Vat. copto 9 (B4); see further below.

(4) Is the FC substantival (see discussion in Shisha-Halevy 1986a:63f., 99ff.)? This is today still in consensus, and a cornerstone of Polotsky’s model from 1944 to 1990 (129ff.), where "Substantivische Transposition" reaffirms his conviction of this, argued thus: "...weil sich in ihnen die Nominalisierung auf der Verbalbegriff als Kern des Satzinhaltes konzentriert". Polotsky takes the substantivity of the FC, an essential factor in his model, as given, with no special proof other than the pattern itself: an obvious petitio principii. Therefore, I wholly agree with Depuydt 1995a:47f. that the "substitution identity definition" is here a weak component in Polotsky’s grammatical analysis and heritage; much less, that there is any call for intuitive or language-philosophical insight to establish analytical identity structurally. (Adverbs are not difficult because they are "morphologically less distinct" [cf. Depuydt 1995a:48] — the morphological form has nothing or little to do with our analysis [De Boer 1928] — and anyway, in Coptic, the FC has broken out of the adverbal-predicate frame or matrix.) The substantive is anyway definable paradigmatically, by substitution in specific slots: actantial occurrence, rhematic status in Nominal Sentence, compatibility with prepositions, and other, more language-specific criteria. The synthesis or conglomerate of several paradigms may be taken as the definition or "name" (or even synthetic identity) of a word class such as "Substantive". By this test, with the matrix break mentioned above, the Coptic FC has nothing conclusively substantival about it. All syntagmatic and paradigmatic distinctive substantival properties, barring the compatibility with demonstrative articles and adjec-
tives, with attributive adjectives and with gender-number categorial exponents, were shared by the Middle Egyptian emphatic forms.

A few isolated traces of possibly substantial FC syntagmatics do remain in Coptic\(^39\). Sahidic ξηνταχ-, past alternant of ξην εχ-, may be a prepositional governance of “that” (ἐνε-νταχ- is more difficult by far); ηνταχ- ... πε (John 11:13 Sah. codd. AB, Palau Ribes and Thompson, not Boh.), which STERN 1880:217 translates “das/was... das ist...” recalls ME “mrr,f pww,” which predicates a “that” form of the situational pww: “this means... that...,” but may be a case of πε signalling Comment Mode. The occurrence of an interrogative FC as object-actant following “find” (Oxyrh. Acts 4:14 ον-ανερον, different in Boh.) is not of the FC as such, but of the whole interrogative clause (in fact, we famously find in Manichaean Lycopolitan interrogative clauses, including FC cases as object actant of negated ενε)\(^40\). The instances of injunctive αλμα- (e.g. Hos. 2:9, John 14:17 B4), or the final ξε-αλμα- rare in Bohairic (e.g. Zach. 5:10: not rare in Sahidic) may also point to a “that”-form essence of the FC at least combinatorily.

(5) The Bohairic non-durative FC-homonym (SHISHA-HALEVY 1972) occurs twice in protatic roles. First, the αυ- of αυμον-, the Bohairic negative Conditional, a form by now best established in Oxyrhynchite; second, the ηαμ- Temporal, topocalizing narrative action (or packaging it as topical) so as to accelerate and “jolt” narrative pace (see Chapter One), is sharply distinct from the Focalizing Preterite by a complex array of macrosyntactic signalling on either flank of the opposition, which in general indicates the respectively different junctural boundary, for the FC following the focal adverbial, for the Temporal the “main clause”. (The basic textemic distribution of the two forms is complementary as well: the Temporal a narrative configuration, the FC dialogic). In the following passages, the main signalling segments for the Temporal are underlined\(^41\):

Gen. 6:1-2 ὁτορ απομπα ταινιρωμ еφρητε ναιαί γιανιπακαί οτορ αμικη νωου νανιεφε ταινιρα και κε ναιε-νιαγκλοκ νεθι τεποι ταειφοντο.

Gen. 6:5 ταιματα και κε ναι-πογ και ενακακα ταινιρωμ γεσαταμα γιανιπακαί οτορ οτορ νιβεν εψακα χενποντ εαμαω εξεντιμηπτεσεωτ ηυνοεφον τηρο οτορ αμοκκαμ και κε-κα.

Ex. 2:10 ταιεριπιον και κε ναι-πελλον γεσει γουν (absence of adverbial adjunct).

For the Focalizing Preterite, consider (see more examples below):

Ex. 20:23 νωτεν εταπετεννατ γε-ετακακα ενωτεν εβολ χενπον νηντενομειο νωτεν νανονοθον και νατ χενονοτον νηνοθ.

\(^39\) Interestingly and perhaps aptly (pace BUAER 1972:45), Athanasius of Qus assigns to the converter α- the substantival value of Arabic ‘an’ (208/14).

\(^40\) Consider Man. Ps. 151.27 χαισ-ειαοντωμ αειμ, 156.9 κησεν-ετ κε πνοοτε etc.

\(^41\) ετε-νηεφ- is extremely rare in the corpus. The mysterious Num. 2:33 νηε-φιτε ετεμποτ [space] ωηιν ερφοω νηηιηι νηηηοτ καταφρη ἐταπεο δογεν ετοτγ μηυελεκ ετογ ατηρ... (= Vat) is non-conclusive. Of course, this is the form of the FC for negative Topic, interrogative Focus and affirmative nexus: Jer. 3:2 ετεπεσεδωκε σεναω ημα. Na. 3:19 (B4) ετεπε-τεκακα ταυ ετεμπεεφοζ ωηηιη ιενοι νινε, with the subnexus ηηε- and τεκακα itself topocalized. The Bohairic Temporal is considered by some (Schenke, Funk) a secondary role of the Relative Preterite; in some dialects the two are morphologically distinct: see POLOTSKY 1944:53; also in a “classic” type of Sahidic, such as Budge’s Psalter.
Gen. 45:7 εταχ却没有 εντοι γενομένων εν τούτωι ἡμέρας εν των γενε-

πικαί προς εργασίων εν των γενομένων ἡμέρας ημερών οὖν.

Gen. 47:4 εταγε ἡμερών δεν ἡμικαὶ τῆ ημερήσια τῆς ἡμέρας εν τούτωι ἡμέρας ημερών οὖν.

In fact, the difference between the FC construction and the Temporal + apodotic-clause construction is one of information level, since in both cases εταχ - is either thematic or topical.

(6) Grossman 2007 offers a fresh perspective on εταχ - in Nitrian Bohairic, viz. as a Circumstantial conversion form, more or less replacing εαχ -. In my opinion, we have here a protatic application of the Relative, used as a “that”-form, and not a Clause Conjugation.

(7) I find keenly interesting B. Gunn’s opinion of Polotsky’s Études, esp. in the Middle Egyptian context, not least because Gunn knew the weak points of Gardiner’s Egyptian Grammar very well indeed — indeed, he inspired or suggested (re)writing parts of it — and, unlike Gardiner, undoubtedly fully understood Polotsky’s argumentation. In a kind of loyal attempt to console him, Gunn writes to Gardiner (8/6/44 AHG Papers at the Griffith Institute, Oxford, 42.124.35): “I do not think their [the Sec. Tenses’] use is restricted to the emphasizing of the adverbial predicate”. Indeed, Gunn has a point here.

(7) Widmer 1999 is a discussion of the Demotic FC, with a survey of the morphological aspect (166ff.). I find most interesting the haziness of the tense/time distinction in Demotic (167), where the later Egyptian temporally unmarked “Emphatic” jrr.f-sdm may exist alongside the focalizing Converter jrr.f-prex fixed to tense forms: is the Bohairic focalizing Present really a Present-Tense? “Simply used to ‘stress’ an adverbial adjunct” (170) is trivializing and begs the question. The treatment of Coptic ερματ as a case of “verb omitted” (169 + n.16) is wholly unacceptable.

(8) The ‘inmnmd cataphoric focalization in Arabic (see Horn 1980) is not found to correspond to the FC in our text (consider e.g. Deut. 27:22, 29:14ff., 32:27ff.). This is probably due to the different value of the respective constructions, discernible even in the Coptic Greek contrastive picture (in Greek, marked placement of adverbials; in the NT, also periphrasis? See Rosen 1957, 1975a:34ff., 35 n.23). The respective structures of the Greek and Coptic focalization category are very different; the Coptic translator, having read and interpreted the Greek text, rendered it in Coptic according to the systemic exigencies of his language, and not according to the dictates of any “triggering” features of the Greek. See Shisha-Halevy 2002.

(9) The difference in value between Bohairic and Sahidic is striking. The FC is more valued (“less grammaticalized”, or less “easily triggered”) in Bohairic. Again, it is in this respect closer to ME/LE/Demotic. In fact, all the following point to a greater refinement, variety and sophistication of structure-explicit means in Bohairic (this amounts, speaking metaphorically, to precise “focal sharpshooting” of Bohairic compared with a more “broadside” focal envelope of Sahidic). Some impressions from Exodus and Deuteronomy, pending a systematic contrastive inter-dialectal investigation:


Sah. FC ~ Boh. topicalization: Ex. 2:6

Sah. FC ~ Boh. NS: Ex. 33:17.

Sah. FC ~ Boh. inversion of Focus: Ex. 7:7:17, 2:7, 10:22.

Using for Sahidic Kasser’s Bodmer Exodus and Budge’s 1912 Deuteronomy (coll. by Thompson).
(b) Notes on Morphology and Morphophonemics.

Though simpler in Bohairic than in many other dialects of Coptic (e.g. in the morphological differentiation of Focalizing vs. Relative Preterite (vs. Temporal in Fayyumic), the morphology of the Bohairic FC in the corpus and outside it still calls for some observations:

1) The Second-Tense converter is the odd one out in POLOTSKY 1960 (actually to my knowledge the only publication of H.J. Polotsky's to use the "converter" terminology); differently in the Grundlagen, where it is ne-, not assignable to, or matching, any Part of Speech, that is rather lamely exiled from the conversion triad, POLOTSKY 1987:3: "Die Präteritale Transposition betrifft weder Wortklassen noch Gliedsätze, sondern verschiebt Vollsätze in die relative Vergangenheit... Es war ein Fehler meines "Conjugation System" §18, ihr die erste Stelle unter den Transpositionen anzuweisen". (However, in the "Coptic Conjugation System" Polotsky did not explicitly or implicitly introduce the transformationally dynamic notion of "transposition", but of conversion, fuzzily defined and anecdotically described as syntactic-role markers). The morphosyntactic and functional close affinity of the FC and ne- is, I believe, as evident as that of the Circumstantial and Relative (see FUNK 1986:104, SHISHA-HALEVY 1989:49f., 2006a).

2) The Problem of focalizing ε-: Circumstantial, FC, non-conversion: identity and homonymy.

(a) While in Pentateuch MSS ε-/α- variation appears to be very rare (an instance is Gen. 43:25), we find in the corpus, and especially outside it ε- well established as FC:

Deut. 12:30 δε-ερετενονος ιπ αναφορας να γυνη (Vat apc).

Gen. 18:14 ΜΗΤΙ οτον-δει δει-ερετενος δενεφι εινατακεο γαροκ καταπαχος εγανονωτι (= Vat).

And, more remarkably still, ε- as special FC for focalizing other clause-constituents than the adverbial adjunct, including perhaps the in-junctive modal role. Here we seem to have a real Circumstantial-Topic focalization (SHISHA-HALEVY 1986a §2.5).

Deut. 7:7 οτοχοι δε ερετενος μμης (= Vat).

Ex. 15:18 πες εκοι νοτρο ελενεγ νεμ ελενεγ ντεπιενεγ οτος ετι.

Deut. 31:29 ετγαν μηναγον ερετεναερονομιν (Vat te-

τε-).

Gen. 18:9 ενθοσων (responsive to ακοων) (Vat ενθοσων).

Ex. 12:18 εηερπρητε νοτρ-ια μπιαβοτ νγοτι.
Lev. 3:7 ἐφανέρη ἔσοτον μπεθοῦ μποὶ (= Vat).

Ex. 18:14 εἴσθεδον νεοκ μασακ εκεμεί (Vat et-, i.e. CS. This may mean that νεοκ μασακ is focussed in P too).

Lev. 13:6 οσο φηππε εφοι νελολ (Gk καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀμαυρά ἢ ἀφή...).

Ex. 2:14 νιμ πε εταχάκ ναρχων ... ὣς εκοτως εξοδετὸν νεοκ μπιρὴν ετακδώτεβ μπερμνηχμι νεας (Vat ακ-).

(b) Rarer instances of focalizing ε-, not in opposition to α-, are even more baffling:

Gen. 44:15 δενοσίσιμοι εωφασίσιμοι.

Deut. 29:19 Δε-ειμούι δεντσόμεσε μπαρθ (= Vat).

Gen. 26:8 Δε-οσθι γαρ εενεςωε πε δενπεςγο (Vat νε-) — ε- before νεςω is not conclusively a converter. Also Gen. 29:17.

Deut. 9:25 ενεακδος (Vat νεας-) — the case of εενε- is again different: εενε- forms occur throughout Coptic as the main clause or basic form of this converter, as yet inexplicably.

Obs.
(1) Focalizing ε- is common in the Bodmer III (B4) John, in various constructions:
11:4 παϊσωνι ννοισωνι μμυσ δα λεε εφω εξεισιοσων ντεφιτ.
4:11 εγεντοτκ ὁτον εβολ των ναε-πιμωτ ετον.
15:27 ειςενερη ετενεςων νεμηι.
4:51 Δε-εφονει ναε-πεκωνρι (B5 νονη).

Also 12:6:26 (no conversion in B5). John 14:7 Δε-ονι απανωντι νεμωτεν ενανουντι δενθνοτ (B5 Δε-απων νεμωτεν οσο εφωνωνι δενθνοտ, but both focalizations in the Greek) appears to be a case of Circumstantial FC, well attested in pre-Coptic Egyptian, rare in Coptic; attested in Oxyrhynchite Acts 4:12 (ed. Schenke) οταε μμα-κεπαν γατπ μαςεν εαςτεμ ναρομε οενενοιγοιι αενθσ.

(2) The regular Bohairic FC α- is of course well attested in various focalization patterns, in a pattern spectrum broader than in our corpus, in B4 John 19:24 αςερ-ταμιν.

13:18:22 νναεξερωτεν αν αξενέμεν and 16:13 αανακαζε γαρ αν εβολ ειτατν (as in Nitrian, α- seems preferred for negative constructions); ας(να)-
16:14:15, 17:20 (nil det.!), ααναερον 21:21 etc. δεναυ μμυτ ααναμον 18:32.
21:19.

(3) Focalizing ε- occurs even more frequently in the B4 Twelve Prophets, in various focalization patterns (I have not collated most of the readings):

Injunctive-Hortative: Hos. 2:9, Jon. 2:3 ειναευ εψωνι εαρκ πδε πασωτ.:
Mch. 6:8 ετνανταικ φρωμι Δε... also Hos. 2:9 coll. This is an old role of the α-...

Focus-initial, interrogative Focus: Mich. 6:6 ἡγην ένατα παφε. These, beside the "orthodox" Topic-initial construction: Na. 3:7, Obd. 1:5, Jon. 1:8:10, Mich. 6:7, Zach. 2:6, probably Am. 8:5; but ἡγην (as always!) Hos. 13:10, Zach. 1:5 ἡγην νε και Hos. 11:9 ἡγην ι την οτακήν. Zach. 2:12 ἡγην τι ν- and Hab. 3:8 ἡγην κεκμουλ σομ έννενε. Another favourite environment for η- is the "Rhetorical" ην ... και (Joel 3:4, Hab. 2:6). Zach. 5:10 άρεναι νάωλι ... έων and Zach. 2:4 άρεναι ηνότιν ιτοτεροτ.

(3) The ε-/η- alternation and variation of FC is a familiar landmark, especially of Nitrian Bohairic. As in other cases, there is no basis for seeing this as a Sahidicism (consider the B4 systems). Some general tendencies are detectable on first examination, but on the whole the exact environmental-distributional factors are still obscure, and the distribution does not yet lead to understanding the nature of this formal opposition of the two focalizing exponents. Some classified highlights from outside the corpus:

(a) ἡγην De Vis I 30, II 140, Cat. 4, 13, 107, 205 (!). AM I 24, 98, 214 — ἡγην is much less usual, but does occur.

ἡγην ηντοτ πλασμουν De Vis II 231.

ἀε-αιν-εων De Vis I 102.

ἀκρα έων De Vis I 195.

αιν-ηνων SV 21, 23, 28.

ἀε-εκκη ηνων De Vis II 172.

ειν-εκκη-ηνων De Vis I 181, II 137.

(b) εισχω ϑε (ερε)- De Vis II 168, 246ff., 250, AM I 15, 66, 126, εισχω ε- SV 11, 14, 22, 34, 50.

εισχω ῶθε Rhet. AM I 11, 112.

ειερεπισθηνιν SV 18.

AM I 64 ἐκσω ηναλι ναηαλι ννηαθανα λων (otherwise ε-).

ἀρετων ηνα- λωτ-/ εισχων ηνα- De Vis I 39f.

ἀκσων ηνα- AM I 64, 69.

(c) ερεερ-οτ ερεερμει De Vis I 27.

ερεερμει ερεεροτ AM I 191.

(d) Negative constructions have usually η-, not ε-.

(e) Cases of apparently real variation:

ἄε-αινο- ϝρήτ De Vis I 84.

ἄε-αινα-αινο- ϝρήτ De Vis I 143.

εοε άε-αινα- De Vis I 24.

ἄε-αινα-αινα- νι. De Vis II 171.

αιεροτ De Vis I 65.

ειναιοετομον De Vis I 156.

ἄε-αιναυνος άε-οτ De Vis II 195.

εκαυοονος άε-οτ (common phrase) Mac. 6.

ἀπεταινοοονος άε-αινο-νιν Cat. 45 = Mt. 16:15

καινητιτι άε-αινο-νιν νε Cat. 94.

παπα εκματ έεβε-οτ ? answered εκματ έεβε- De Vis I 59.

αν-ειναμοτ ήποκ ιτεκμουν Job 1:12.

(4) Focalizing εα-, well established in Sahidic (especially in Shenoute), is rare in Bohairic and absent in our corpus:

Cat. 134 ουτα βοσμην άα ειερφαλ άε-...
(3) A cloud of doubt seems to hover over Bohairic ἀρε-τεν- apparently Focalizing Preterite. Is this a fleeting remnant of the old (even Demotic) "Emphatic" ḟ r.f sdm, past tense or atemporal, ousted almost completely by the analytic, converter ḟ r and its allomorphs? While Gen. 43:27 ἀρετενερον is, somewhat surprisingly, the Focalizing Present in Bohairic and Late Egyptian (Polotsky 1940), and it is Sahidic that responds here in the unconverted τετνερον, the following loci — past tense — are difficult out of corpus:

AM I 214 ἀρετενξω ντετενπολικ νκαθνοτ εθεοτ.
AM I 19 ἀρετεννατ εοτ γωτεν Δε-ἀρετεντιν ννετεν-
σωκ εβολ.
Cat. 208 ἀρετενξω ναζαρος εθων.
John 11:3 ἀρετενναχ θων (B4).

(4) Second-power conversion. In Bohairic, we find only ἐνε- as a possible instance of synchronic double FC conversion: not attested in the studied corpus.

Obs.
(1) Consider Mac. No. 6 p.45 ἐνακωλα πε δεπεκνητ εκωγ εβολ αν. Mac. No. 20 ἐνακωλα χαλφον πε ρεπ. ειψήτ πε. The construction is especially well attested in Cat. (5, 21, 28, 37, 47, 56, 77, 86.31.35.36 etc.). A case of unconverted focalizing να- is De Vis II 151 ναο- οι ναω νρήρ.
(2) For Demotic, see Quecke 1979:440, 446 and Shisha-Halevy 1989:49ff.

(c) Patterning
(I) Affirmative nexus and constituents
(1) Focus-Initial Patterns: Topic ε-/α- marked (very rare): ε- Circumstantial?
Ex. 18:14 εοβε-οτ θεοκ μματατκ εκγεμει.
Gen. 38:25 εβολ δεπερωμε ετενοτι νε ναι διμβοκι
άνοκ.

Topic unmarked (usual):
Neg.: Ex. 5:14, Num. 11:11, 22:37.

44 See Shisha-Halevy 1986a Chapter Two for FC patterning in Shenoutean Sahidic; 2002 for Oxyrhynchite.
RHEMES AND RHEMATICITY


οἰνα εɵβε-οτ Gen. 18:13, 26:9, 29:5.
+ Pres. Deut. 32:30.


Focus Constituency

Interrogative adverbials: (οἰνα) εɵβε-οτ “why”, “for what reason”, πως “how”, ωθενατ “until when”.
Non-interrogative adverbial: εβολα ζεν-.

Topic Constituency

Conjugation forms:
Unmarked (basic) conjugation (see also above).
α- FC (Present) (very rare).
ε- FC (Present) (very rare).

Text-Grammatical Characterization

Low thematic cohesion — no essential linkage (this is typical, but not invariable, in the case of interrogative Foci). Pragmatic thematicity is in evidence.

Obs.

(1) Outside the corpus. The rich Focus constituency, with the FC following all types of Focus, is a landmark not only of Nitrian and NT Bohairic, but also of early OT usage, or the “B4” variety. The picture seems to be still confused:
John 13:35 ζεναις ααναμι B4 (B5 cενα-).
ζημη ζεν-αω ... αρετηνυ罚 μμα Ατες Acts 4:7 (cons.).
ετεναμι ηηηη ετεηη- Mac. No. 33.
ναω νρηνετ εεη- na- Cat. 100.
ζεναμι νηγο ααι- Mac. No. 31.
ναω νρηνετ ακηα- ιε ναω νρηνετ ηα- Cat. 9.
ναω νρηνετ εεηα- Cat. 48, 67 etc.
εβολα ζεν- προ — γοτ Acts 19:25 (v.l. basic).
Mark 3:22 ζεναρηχων ντεηεδεψων τηγιοη ηηηεδεψων εβολ.
Cat. 134 οηηερ εεηηηηη ηε εεηερ-ζαν ηε-....
ετεηηεηε εταη- Cat. 228.
CHAPTER TWO

The formulaic "Φαί ετε-εβόλ γιότσι έπε-ώσι Nīben έρ-πρεπή Nαψ Nεμ-περιωτ", e.g. AM I 109.

(2) No FC follows άρα άλ άλ (ά-έ-) "Until when?" (Num. 14:27, pace Andersson’s emendation, 1904:120); we encounter either a Circumstantial or basic Topic (Polotsky 1960:25f. does not discuss Bohairic); see Shisha-Halevy 1986a:85).

(3) Other interrogative adverbials occur in the corpus in final placement: ... Νυτ ντο Ex. 22:27, ... Σον ντο Gen. 30:30, ... Nαψ Nρή† Deut. 28:67.

(4) Initial Foci have not yet been recognized, let alone studied, for pre-Coptic Egyptian (see however Johnson 1976:119 n.188 for a possible Demotic instance).

(2) Topic-Initial Patterns, historically the sole construction, still constitute by far the prevalent FC syntax in Bohairic.

(a) Interrogative Focus: except for πας and ιβεωθ, invariably final:

Num. 11:13 αινακεμαφ άλων.
Gen. 37:16 αφαμοι άλων.
Gen. 37:30 αινακεμαφ άλων.
Gen. 37:15 άκκω † Νυτ ντο.
Gen. 42:7 εταπετεν εβολ άλων.
Gen. 16:8 άρεννοι εβολ άλων οτο νοι αρενα άλων.
Gen. 30:30 † άν αφ αινακεμαφ άλων άνοι άλων άλων.
Gen. 44:16 ανακεμαφ άλοο.
Deut. 28:67 άφ-τονι Ναψ Nρή† Nον άλων ... άφ-τονι Να-
ωψι Ναψ Nρή†.

(b) Non-interrogative Focus. For the Topic, verbs-of-movement\(^{45}\) or verbs-of-incomplete-predication lexemes are typical. The Focus is as a rule final. Note that (a) άε- and ά-actant-specification stands outside the sequencing scope; (b) ε- + infinitive Foci are not necessarily final, being apparently always focal in FC environment; (c) some adverbials, like άφ άφνοι "today", may follow the Focus as final adver-

bial “Antitopics”. Note that, of two successive adverbials, either the last is focal or both are, as a coordinative or compound group:

Num. 13:33: άνοι άφ άφη† Ανακεμαφ Άποθεο.
Deut. 24:15 άρη άη άη οπον.

\(^{45}\) An old Egyptian feature: Polotsky 1944:83f.
Gen. 44:30 τεφθυθη ακαβι θετφθηθη θπιαλον.
Gen. 43:25 ασωτεμ γαπ θε-θρε-θινθηθι μετι εοθομ
μπιαλα ηθμμαθ.
Gen. 34:31 αλα ακαβι λθεσθοι ηθπθηθι θπφθη ηθσπθορηθι.
Num. 20:17 ακαβοιι δημπισθσι ηθσορθ.
Gen. 30:16 θκινθσθ εσθοθ θπαρι θπφθηθ.
Gen. 44:30 ηθσθ δε ακαββέθηθι εθσθοθ θκαθκαλοθ εθπεθε
πισθ θε θπιαλοθ θκ θεμθι αθ — Circumstantial negativ
θθ θθς ηα Φοθς.
Gen. 45:7 εθαθ ηθ θαρθσθ θακθτεθ εθεθπ-θθθθοθ
θπθθν εθηπθπθκαθ θθορ ηθθπθσθθηθι ηθ θθπθθπ θθ-
θθθθθ....
Gen. 24:50 εθαθι εθθο ηθηπθπθκαθ ηθ θθ-παιρθ
Gen. 47:4 εθαθι εθθθι θθθπθκαθ.
Gen. 42:9 εθαθεθεθι εθ ηθ-θθθθθθθ ηθιαθθθ κεθ-
θθθθθ.
Gen. 42:10 εθαθι εθθφθπαθφθθθ θθα θαθ-θθκαθθοθ.
Gen. 42:12 κολα αλα εθαθεθεθ κεθθ εθαθθ κεθθκαθ.
Gen. 45:5 θπποθρφπεθεθθθ θκαρ ηαθ δε θπποθρθπθκαθ
θπθθοθ θθθθθθ θθ-θθθθθθθκαθ θθαι + εθαθ ηθ θαρθσθ κεθ-
θπθθθθθ... 
Num. 22:20 ιαθε ηθαθ ηθ θθ-παιρθθθ κεθθθ ηθ θπθθθ.
Gen. 49:31f. εθαθεθμεθκαθκαθ κκαθ: ηθθ καθθ κεθ-
θκαθθ κεθθθκαθ ηκκαθ κκαθ: ηκκαθ κεθκαθ κεθθκαθ καθθκαθ κκαθ.
Deut. 10:6 εθαθθθοθ κκαθ ηθ θθ-θθθκ.
Deut. 22:27 εθαθκεθκεθ θθθκοθ.
Ex. 2:10 εθαθθθ εθθθι θθθπθθθθθ.
Ex. 20:22 θθ-θθκαθκαθ κκαθκαθ εθθο ηθθθθ.

Focus Constituency:
Adverbials (the broadest definition): singly, or in clusters.

Topic Constituency
FC-marked conjugation forms.

Text-Grammatical characterization
In Dialogue (the overwhelming majority of the cases) and Narrative,
the Topic is in general pragmatically (situationally), more rarely textu-
ally, cohesive (for the latter, cf. Gen. 49:31f.). The Focus may effect the linkage (consider focal μμασ). However, it consists as a rule of verbs of incomplete predication (i.e. inherently thematic), which is not the case with the Relative-Topic CS (above). The FC occurs in 1st-person-centered (locutive) Report; far less in Narrative, but then only in Comment Mode, thus not in the primary plot line: see above, Chapter One.

(3) One important resolution of Envelope Focussing is the focussed rhematic lexeme. The cases, uncommon but well established, are varied, but occur typically in the allocutive or responsive subsystems of Dialogue. (Similarly, the case of whole-clause or of nexus focussing).

(a) In reactive or responsive Dialogue; in Narrative (internal Evolution Mode narrative carrier), always focussed converbal Rheme of the durative conjugation pattern:

Gen. 16:5 εταναται ης ης-αναμβοκι — object of verb of perception: in fact, a type of Free Indirect Discourse.

Gen. 44:5 σενοσιωμα ηςιωμα (Focalizing Present or Pretterite?) — co-focussing with the Tautological Infinitive; more clearly still in Gen. 44:15 σενοσιωμα εψαςιωμα.

(b) Responsive [lexeme + adverbial] focussing:

Gen. 16:8 ("Whence and whither are you going?") αιφητ άνοκ εβαλ γατήν μπρο ναπαρα ταβι.

Gen. 37:16 ("What are you looking for?") αικωπι ηςκανάκνηθος.

Obs.

(1) Nothing like the quintessentially allocutive άκλοβι "It is crazy you are" occurs in the corpus. The delocutive Basic Tense qαοβι John 10:20 (B4) is neatly opposed to the allocutive "άκλοβι": Acts 12:15 αρεκλοβι; but also the delocutive άρε-ναι λοβι 1 Cor. 14:23 cons. (Acts 26:24 v.l.): ετετεθαλοβι AM I 114, also in Shenoutean Sahidic (εκλοβι Shenoute BLOr 8664 A (6) f.6 ro with parallels in BLOr 3581A). Perhaps similar is άρε-ναι ηςβι Acts 2:13 (cons).

(2) No clear performative FC is attested in the corpus. Consider the following (and see Chapter One [Dialogue] and Shisha-Halevy 1986a:79 n.92).

(a) ποτομ να...άλλα ειστομυ... AM II 11: Performative or contrast-induced focalization? οτομυ occurs often in the FC.

(b) αικεροκ "I mean you!". SV 17, 37, 67 (vs. εικω ερο- SV 42); εκαιενιαν...εικερε... AM I 128.

εκαιερε- almost always ε- in Cat. 46, 6, 17, 32, 54, 133 etc.. άκαιερε-νιμ Cat. 214 (John 13:22-24). This is not a late feature: consider John 13:22 (B4) άκαιενιν, or ητετεθανηθεν ηθον of John 13:1: αικερο π. ει- Mark 5:41. Somewhat similar is εικαζιν ε- Cat. 1, 36, 128, 214 etc.

(c) Crum & Bell, Jews and Christians: 97.4 δινην ειχτ "I am coming north".

(d) John 8:11 ειπαν (αν).
(c) In Dialogue, Exposition or poetic passages, we find focussed the adverbial Rheme of the adverb-rheme nexal pattern:
Gen. 3:9, 4:9 ἀλλὰ αἰκωνίζων.
Deut. 33:13 ἀκροανομοὶ μὴς νάε-πεικαγί.
Num. 36:7 καὶ ἀπεικονισείς πιστεῖς σέν τεκταυρονομία.
Num. 13:22 ἀκματοῦν νάε-ακωσάς καὶ ἑστιν ἡλικιώτερον θαλάμιν.
ἀκμάρην τόν... Deut. 33:25, 32:31.
Deut. 33:13 ἀκροανομοὶ μὴς νάε-πεικαγί.

Obs.
For Ex. 2:20 ἀκωνίζων καὶ οὐ (= Vat), compare Zach. 1:5 ηνεπίλεος καὶ ἀκωνίζων οὐ, and perhaps Oxyrh. Ps. 88:50 (SCHENKE 1996: 105 compares Ps. 103:8). I do not understand this construction: is οὐ an interrogative enclitic particle? Can οὐ be related to the mysterious interrogative we find in Sah. John 21:21 πᾶ τοι καὶ οὐκ ὠνεί (Boh. νόησ-ωτ)?

(4) Actant focussing with the FC is extremely rare in the corpus, actually found only in the very old phrasal construction for “how are you?” Gen. 43:27 ἁπετεμέρωσε (cons.) (POLOTSKY 1940). This means, of course, that the Relative-Topic CS is the only actant-focussing construction in the described system.

(5) So-called Rhetorical Questions, a typical focalization environment, are common in the corpus. As pointed out above, these are not real questions, but enhanced assertions focussed along the yes/no axis, and only formally “packaged as” interrogative (see Chapter One). They are marked by μὴ (also with a negative nexus: μὴ +...αν) and μὴ...αν. In a sense, these are cases of layered, double — for μὴ...αν, triple — focalization, higher on the focality scale. In the following instances, the adverbial Focus of the FC, always final, is underlined:
Gen. 34:23 οτικὸςν ὄντεβνωστι δὲν νοτσε-φατ δὲν
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The focalization in the following passages is different, not bearing on an adverbial but on the entire nexal or existential statement including its locating adverbial — real, unresolved Envelope Focussing:

Ex. 2:14 γιάν-ακοτφυ εδοεβετ ηεοκ μφφη† ετακφω-τεβ...μπεμνακεμι ακαφ

Ex. 14:11 αν-επεμνον μγατ ζεκακαγι αγκαθυ.

The unconverted basic tense — unmarked Topic — may occur with a “Rhetorical Question” marked assertion (unlike normal Sahidic):

Num. 23:19 μη κναιφι αν κνακαζι μη κναοζι αν κε-φι ετακφωq.

Num. 20:10 μητι τεναινι νοτμωντ νωτεν εβοι ζεν-ταμετα.

And, for actant focussing, the Relative-Topic CS is used:

Num. 16:29 μη ποτε αν πε εταματαιοι.

Obs.

(1) Note the following cases of “Rhetorical” focalization outside the corpus:
Cat. 107 μη εποι ιατεμων τε-αφουν.
Cat. 79 οτεκον εποφ† χαφ ναμφ — nexus or lexeme focussing.
John 8:22 (B5) μη ακελαόοεβεμ μματατυ.
Mal. 2:10 (B4) μη νοτνοτε νοτνετ αν τεεκετενθοτ αν.
Joel 3:4 (B4) μη τανακαλ μπεεναρα μνοσ αματνοι αν.
Job 1:9 μη αρε-ιωβ ωεμυα μπε τε ακιαζι.
Jer. 8:22 μη επε-επεμ-κον† δεκαλακε μη ωε-επον-καθι μματ.
Mt. 26:53 ιε ακμετι δε-επεμνον-ωζομ μκοι εταμφι μπαιωτ... — content clause focalized, in which Non-Existence is focalized in its turn.
Ps. 61:2 μη αρε-ταπυτι ανεκεθμε αν.
Ps. 87:11 μη κναπι κεκυφυφι κοπεκμωστ.
Hab. 2:6 (B4) μη ηαι ηηρον αν δαεματατον εαροφ — Augens or object actant or both focalized.

Zach. 3:2 (B4, collated) μη αν χαι αν πε - Foreshadowed negator Enclitic?

(2) A nice unrecognized Demotic example (P. Berlin P. 13549 verso 14f). bn-jw j.r.j hpr n Yh n p3 hrw jn, (“Am I not present in Elephantine today?” or sim.), which was I believe mistaken by the editor for an assertion (“Heute bin ich nicht in Elephantine”), with the consequent need to postulate an error, as if the writer began with a neg. Fut. III and switched anacoluthically to a negative j.jr.f. Contextually, an assertion does not make sense here: preceding “It’s the people who hate me that say these things...”, and following “the people who are saying these calumnies are not hidden from me”. Similarly from Elephantine, P. 13633 verso 5f. is probably rhetorical-interrogative as well (the text has the same bitter polemic tone as P. 13549): bn j.jr Dd-hr hb n.j m-jm.f jn “Hasn’t Teos written to me about it?” makes better sense than Zauzich’s “Darüber hat mir Teos nicht geschrieben”. The actantial m-jm.f seems to me out of the question as Focus of j.jr; the translation would have been in any case “Nicht darüber hat mir...”, while “It is not to me that Teos has written” is meaningless in the context. (In Ryl. IX 12/12 we have jn- introducing a Rhetorical Question with the Emphatic form).

46 Zauzich’s note (p. 5) “Die Verneinung des 2 Tempus ist in Demotischen selten” is incomprehensible to me.
2.4.3 The Focalizing Conversion and Negation. The evident affinity and partial overlap of negation and focalization makes for a special heady effect of their combination in Coptic. The Assertive-Focal (alias Rhetorical) Question is one environment where the semantic truth-value opposition of negation and affirmation signifiés is neutralized, leaving only the focussing effect of negation. The observed incidence of negation is as follows. (Note that the Focus-initial construction is extremely rare with negation of nexus, which is a corollary of the incompatibility of nexal negation and interrogative Rhemes). The Focus-initial negative construction does occur with the negation of the Focus, the nexus being affirmative):

(a) Nexus (affirmative vs. negative — may be affirmative with nexus constituents negativéd): n...an, an following the Topic or enclosing the whole nexus;

(b) Focus (nexus affirmative, Topic affirmative): an following the Focus;

(c) Topic (nexus affirmative, Focus affirmative): Topic variously negativéd.

The difference between (a) and (b), while formally clear, is semantically difficult and tenuous: its functional essence may on occasion be a higher focality for (b), but usually we can only observe the tendency of the negation signal to gravitate towards the Rheme or Focus — towards a nexal constituent — rather than, in a Copula-less nexal pattern, be truly nexus-referred or vaguely referred. The negation signal is intrinsically focalizing.

(a) Deut. 30:12f. načnēphē sentfé an otāe nacgimhph... an.

Gen. 3:4 nape-tennamot an sēnortmot, also 16:8.
Deut. 8:3 nape-pírwmi nawnē ewik mmatatq an.
Num. 20:17 nannacini an ebol qitennikoi otāe ebol qitennialalojī otāe tennacemwot an ebol sēnor-lakkoc ntak allā annamowī gīmnwīt nōṣro (= Vat).
Ex. 16:8 ṣṭavra ṅaqwop ṣaron an pe + nē-peṭenxrem-rem.
Deut. 29:14 naixw ntaidaiænkī anok nemwten mmataten-œnnot an méfōot allā nem nh etempaima nemwten méfōot (= Vat).
Num. 23:19 nape-fāj ōi an méfrīt méfrwmi eswarṣpan e-roq otāe méfrīt an notuwīp nrwmi (= Vat).
Deut. 11:10 naqol gar an méfrīt mpikagī nteξhmī.
Deut. 30:13 načnēphē sentfé an otāe nacgimhph méfīom an.
(b) Deut. 5:3 ἐτανός σεμνεταιδασθήκης νεμ νιετνιοῦν (add. supra. lin. P) ἀλλὰ νεμώτεν — cf. the famous Ryl. IX 13/11f. bn-jfr(j) ir.w n ntn-jt.w 3n...
Num. 16:29 μὴ ρήτ ἂν εὐσαμοῦ ... ἀρη-ναι ναμοῦ νεξ ἀρη-μὴρήτ ἐ⎤εναμενωνινι ρωμί νιβεν ἀρη-πορδεμπνωνι νασώπι (= Vat).
Gen. 38:9 (he knew) ἄταρ-πιξροξ νασωπι ναξ ἂν.
Deut. 32:31 νοσνοῦτ ἄμμηρήτ ἑπεννούτ ἂν (= Vat)

(c) Not conclusively attested in the corpus.

Obs.
(1) Num. 2:33 Νίλενιςς ετεμποτυνινι ερως ναρη ρην σόντον καταμμήτ ἐτανός γονεν ετοτης μωτσιςς σοτοι ατηρη ναε-νενοήρη σπίςσα makes better sense as a case of negative "Temporal" (ἐτανό-) and superordinative-apodotic σοτοι ατ- than as Relative. For a negative Topic, consider ετεμπετεκαξιας γάρ ετεμπετεκφόρ ωα-νιν νεχοτ νιβεν Na. 3:19 (B4).
(2) In Gen. 44:30 ἄτοτα Να εινασωνινι εξοτα Σανακαλων ετεπενιωτ πε Νιαλων χε νεμιν ἂν, all three constituents are affirmative, with the Focus a negated Circumstantial clause ("the child not being with me").
(3) There is actually no formal negation in instances like Ex. 14:11 ἀν-ετε-μμον μητ σενπακαξι νεκιμι, where we have a Rhetorical Question, with [Existential + Locating Adverbial] focussed, and a positive statement of non-existence.

2.4.4 The Topicalized or Focalized (so-called Tautological) Infinitive. This construction, brilliantly discussed by G. Goldenberg (1971) and studied for Coptic by the present author (1990), might be considered a Hebrew-Greek calque in Coptic, but should be regarded in the diachronic context of the corresponding Old and Middle Egyptian focalized-infinitive construction (Shisha-Halevy, op. cit.) as well as the synchronic focalization (and generally rhetorical) system. For this common pattern, like other cases of "native" Coptic syntax triggered and statistically enhanced by Greek correspondents), must have been decoded by the reader as a pertinent Coptic linguistic sign, probably with stylistic overtones of "Scripturality", regardless of any special Greek history attached to it.⁴⁷ (This construction is stylistically typical of, but not exclusive to, plus habens, especially Divine, Allocution; cf. the "Divine Grammar" nature of the Definite-Absolute Future eeqx-, Chapter One).

⁴⁷ It is OT-Scriptural when we find the Tautological Infinitive in the NT: John 3:29 ἕσοντας οὐκας, or in homiletic texts: De Vis II 118 ἕσοντας ἀγεμι.
The pattern consists usually of the repetition (including equivalence repetition), in resonance of a :selected-marked verbal-noun lexeme or verbal abstract, the initial occurrence marked as Topic or Focus, the second included in a conjugation form. The effect of this is a focalization of the lexeme and eventually the *nexus* in the said conjugation form. Almost invariably occurring in autonomous clauses (unincluded, except for *ē*: inclusion following *verba dicendi* or *sentiendi*; not Relative or Circumstantial), the pattern is as a rule affirmative, which may hint at its nexus-focussing role. On the other hand, it is often connected by *rap* or *ē* to its context.

The construction occurs in Dialogue:

Gen. 26:28 ἡενοτον ἀνατρ ἅε... in Response.
Gen. 19:17 ἡενοτονοεμ νοεμ, imperative Allocation.
Gen. 44:5 ἅε· ἡενοτόζιψαμ ἀναψίψαμ — probably Focalizing Present — which would co-focalize the lexeme; the Greek has here the Present. Also, less ambiguously, Gen. 44:15 ἡενοτόζιψαμ ἐωάξασιψαμ. (In Gen. 3:4 (B4) (= Vat) χαρενηναμοεσ ἄν ἡενοτόμοσ we even have explicit FC with nexal negation, focussing adjunctal ἡεν-οτ-+ infinitive, which, despite the inverse internal information structure, results in the same macrosyntactic effect.

In preceptive generic-legal exposition:

Lev. 20:2 ἡενοτόμοσ καροφθομερ, focussing injunctions.
Ex. 15:26 ἡενοτοτεμ ντεκκωτεμ νεκτεμή μπετ.
Lev. 7:24 εορομ ἀε ἡνοτότομοι — a less formalized topicalization.
Lev. 14:48 ἡενότοξωμ ραχω ἄν — a rare Stative, a rarer negative instance: “by no means”, not focussing an injunction: “spread it has not”.
Ex. 22:17 ευπ Inputs ἡε ἡενοτωτ πνρ τηεφότεμεσωτ πνρ.

Two formally remarkable variations on the pattern:
Ex. 21:28 ἡενανων ταεεετ- wnd consider also Lev. 20:27 ἡενωνι... Andersson 119f. (unnecessarily) suggests emending to ἡενωνι; Num. 14:10 γιωνι ερμοπ ἡεν-πωνι or Num. 15:35 εεγιωνι εφοη ἡενωνι may be different.

Num. 8:26 ἔωβ ἀε ἱεθεπρ — here the bare lexeme, not zero-determined one, serves as action abstract (otherwise, we should find ἔωβ ἀε ἱεθεπ). This is the normal construction for topicalizing and focalizing compound (auxiliary + abstract) verbal nexus.
In Allocution, Narrative and Report; in poetic Narrative — in parenthetical status (Narrator’s Channel, Comment Mode Narrative):
Gen. 22:17 ἄνωτρον εἰς τὸν ἔρωτον.
Ex. 3:16 ἄνωτρον ἰαίων ἐρωτεύσεν (sim. Gen. 50:24).
Num. 22:30 ἄνωτρον ἰαίων ἀμοκ — interrogative Allocution.
Gen. 37:8 μὴ ἄνωτρον κατέρριψε — Allocution — Rhetorical Question (see below, comment on Gen. 43:3). Compound verb focalized (different ε- auxiliary from Num. 8:26 above).
Gen. 43:3 ἄνωτρον κατέρριψε ἄνωτρον ἀμοκ — compound (auxiliary + abstract) verb focalized (different ε- auxiliary from Num. 8:26 above).
Gen. 20:18 ἄνωτρον λέγει διὰ τοῦ παλαιοῦ νεκροῦ...
Gen. 43:7 ἄνωτρον λέγειν.
Gen. 31:30 ἄνωτρον θύμα γὰρ ἄρτερμων — compound (auxiliary + abstract) verb focalized (different ε- auxiliary from Num. 8:26 above).
Gen. 47:22 ἄνωτρον ταύτα τῶν Ναυσίνων — compound (auxiliary + abstract) verb focalized.
Ex. 15:1 εἰς ἄνωτρον γὰρ ἄρτερμων — compound (auxiliary + abstract) verb focalized.

2.4.5 Focussing Particles. The Augens

Prosodically marked “floating”, colon and segment-referred (often clitic), pronoun-cohesive adverbial elements that signal focalization of segments, relationship (including possession) or nexus:
Gen. 27:36 ἐν μεσινθεῖον-ορόσκοτος ἔθη πῶ ἀνόκ Παϊώτ.
Deut. 21:14 ἕξορος ἀκολούθος “for you did humiliate her, after all”.
Deut. 29:14 Ναῖς ἁταλαἰαία ἀσκότος Νεμωτεν Ῥάιστ-νοτος ἀν Μήστος ἀλλα Νή ἑτερομαίνα Νεμωτεν Μήστος.
See in detail below, Chapter Four.

2.4.6 Issues of Negativity: negator morphology. Negation and focalization

The essential affinity of special negation and constituent focalization has been commented on by Seiler (1952) and Moorhouse (1959:73ff.), while nexeal negation (Moorhouse 1959:1ff., following O. Jespersen),
bearing on the very interdependence of Theme and Rheme, is close to nexus focussing in a paradigm of nexus-referred elements signalling, e.g., the (non-)existence of the nexus, the querying or the predicating of nexus, and so on. It is by token of the very specific-associatedness and incidence of negation and its signal (an incidence not necessarily coinciding with its location) to a segmental or non-segmental element, that its focalization or co-focalization role comes into effect. In Coptic, I have in mind only \( \text{\textsc{\&n}} \) and \( n-...\text{\textsc{\&n}} \), for the negative conjugation bases are not negators, and \( \text{\textsc{\&t\&e\&m-}} \) is a negator of the verb lexeme or infinitive.

Obs.

(1) The negation of nexus between the FC Theme-Topic and its Focus is different from the durative nexus-pattern negation (cf. Polotsky 1944:87ff). This constitutes yet another formal difference between the two patterns, and is significant for the issue of negative focalization.

(2) So-called Embracing Negation (a topic recently again much discussed, especially in typological and historical general grammar) is old in Egyptian, but I would hesitate to trace it simply back to ME \( n...js \) (Satzinger 1967). Only in some sources of Demotic does the embracing negation seem to be almost fully established (but consider Rhind I 2.4 \( jw \ bn \ Wsir \ mw \ r-rj \), unless this is a neg. Future [Quack]). However, in Bohairic, at least Nitrian and NT, \( n- \) seems occasionally (not in our corpus) to be more than a mere Vorsignal of negation (Weinrich 1982:710ff.), but the carrier of negativity, and \( \text{\textsc{\&n}} \) (not \( \text{\textsc{\&z\&e\&r...\text{\textsc{\&n}}} \), in clause-final placement, a true negation focuser, compatible with non-nuclear negative elements such as \( \text{\textsc{n\&nê\&q-}} \), \( \text{\textsc{\&m\&n}} \) and \( \text{\textsc{\&m\&e\&p-}} \). The case of \( \text{\textsc{\&n}} \) following other full negatives in Bohairic (Shisha-Halevy 1981:324f.) cannot but mean a synchronic negative-focussing for the “post-negation”. It is mostly attested in Nitrian and the NT, and could well be a colloquial — and archaic, i.e. conservative — feature:

\[ \text{\textsc{\&m\&n...\text{\textsc{\&n}}} : De \text{\textsc{\&v}} \text{\textsc{i}} 65.3, 145.1, \text{AM II} 208, \text{Mac. No. 9}, \text{emphatic “by no means”}, \text{AM I} 29, 128, 165, 207, 46; \text{gnomic} 73. \]

\[ \text{AM I 120 \text{\textsc{\&m\&n}} \text{\textsc{o\&t\&p\&o \&n\&e\&h\&e\&n\&o\&t\&a \text{\textsc{\&n}}} \]. \]

De \text{\textsc{\&v}} \text{\textsc{\&i}} 109 \text{\textsc{\&m\&n-\&w\&x\&o\&m \&n\&t\&e\&f\&\&m\&o\&t \&s\&w\&n\&t \&e\&p\&o\&q \text{\textsc{\&n}}} \].

De \text{\textsc{\&v}} \text{\textsc{\&i}} 266 \text{\textsc{\&m\&n-\&\&g\&a\&i \&n\&t\&a\&n \&m\&p\&a\&i\&p\&t \text{\textsc{\&n}}} \].

\( \text{\textsc{\&m\&e\&p-}} \ \text{\textsc{\&n}} \) appears to be an emphatic, expressive, affective-tone negation (+ \( \text{\textsc{\&e\&t\&h\&p\&q}} \) “by no means”; SV 19, 28, AM I 8 (same verb repeated), 163, (!) 216, De \text{\textsc{\&v}} \text{\textsc{\&i}} 117, 149 (+ \( \text{\textsc{\&e\&t\&h\&p\&q}} \); without \( \text{\textsc{\&n}} \) rather weak and phraseological: “don’t say...” “don’t be angry”, De \text{\textsc{\&v}} \text{\textsc{\&i}} 216, 224), I 123, II 149 (\( \text{\textsc{\&n}} \) marking final boundary in Nitrian, unlike Sahidic). Note in the Pentateuch Ex.12:13 \( \text{\textsc{n\&nê\&k-\&\&n}} \) \text{\textsc{\&n}} codd. (not P: condemned by Andersson 1904:80), NT Bohairic \( \text{\textsc{n\&t\&o\&w\&\&y\&t\&e\&m-}} \text{\textsc{\&n}} \) Mark 6:11 (cod. A).

(3) For LE, see Winand 1997:227: \( jwn3 \) probably still functional as a negation focuser (“pas du tout, vraiment pas, absolument pas”). W. is convinced that the grammaticalization process is complete in Coptic (232). And yet, we find in LE similar cases to Nitrian /NT Bohairic \( \text{\textsc{\&m\&n...\text{\textsc{\&n}}} \), \( \text{\textsc{n\&nê\&q-\&\&n}} \) (227: still focussing “particle”), 226. There seems to be no attestation of \( sw \) \( \text{\textsc{\&h\&r \&s\&d\&m}} \) with \( bn-...\text{\textsc{jwn3}} \), 229, which means that the Present is not negated nuxally.

(4) The Embracing Negation as a typological Sprachbund isogloss, bridging Western Europe and North Africa: MOLINELLI 1984, BERNINI 1984, BERNINI and RAMAT 1992 (not properly recognizing the Egyptian construction); SHISHA-HALEVY 1998:136ff. O. Jespersen’s seminal Negation in English (and other treatments of negation), the starting-point of all modern discussion of the issue, call in the present context for two research-historical observations. First, on the fact that he succeeded in gaining an insight into the difference of naxal and “special” negation primarily on the basis of North-West European languages, in which this distinction is much obscured by negation morphology and syntactical inerterion. Second, on the fact, probably not coincidental, that, beside negation syntax, Jespersen was much preoccupied by focalization constructions (not least the Cleft Sentence, the term coined by Jespersen’s teacher and senior colleague, Chr. Sandfeld).

(5) “Jespersen’s Cycle”: in our text, there is no indication that n- alone has any standing. On the contrary, an alone is the unmarked negative, n-...an being syntactically marked. In Egyptian, the negation load transference cannot be correlated to a drastic word-order change (in the transition to a verb-first order, a transition not attested for Egyptian, which is verb-first from the “sdmf system” to the “aqcawtm system” — cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 2000), nor to a tendency to have the negation located “as near to the verb as possible” (cf. BURRIDGE 1993:198ff., 203ff.). But then, the evolutive process of PREVERBAL TO EMBRACING TO POSTVERBAL cannot really be traced in Egyptian diachrony, probably because of the “spasmodic” historical documentation and inadequate synchronic resolution.

(6) The negation in “Rhetorical Questions”, actually focussed assertive statements (see Chapter One) is special in that it meets and is effectively neutralized with its usual affirmative oppositum in a focalization along the yes/no axis. See TOBLER 1886-1912 (IV):69ff.

(7) The n-...an vs. an distribution — opposition, alternation and variation — is an issue never seriously tackled on corpus basis. As often, M.G. Schwartz in his “white elephant”, Das alte Ägypten (1843), makes some insightful statements on the Bohairic dialect: he believes (1460ff.) n — an to be a “stronger” (our focussed) negation, and attempts to formulate distribution and frequency patterning. He associates zero-...an with Bohairic. Somewhat later, in the posthumous Schwartz-Steinthal 1850:436, n-...an is clearly associated with the Circumstantial. See also STERN 1880 §431: “e- n — ...an, with e- usually lost” (STERN 1880 §§388ff. too seems to associate the full n-...an form with Sahidic, as against Bohairic); cf. ANDERSSON 1904:110 on Lev. 7:10: almost always n-...an; 115f. ad Num. 6:12 ḥncbth an “also eigentlich ḥncbth an”, with further exx. See FUNK 1987 on the dialectal spread of the two negation-forms.

n-...an alternates in the corpus with zero...an (cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 1994 and Chapter Four below), the latter unmarked, the former as a rule marked as a Circumstantial Conversion form (extremely rarely, syntactically marked instances of eq- an constitute a third oppositum)49:

Gen. 44:26 ṭbŋktv t i n n x b nhmn t an.

49 It may be no coincidence that the ME negators n- and nn, in being incompatible with jw, neutralize Circumstantial/autonomous opposition. GUNN 1924:105, 114ff., 165f., 150ff. (“nn used attributively to a general (undetermined) noun”) on adnominal n sdmf: n sdm n f, nn sdm f, n wnt etc.
Num. 6:12 ἐσεύσωτι νσῆναι ἀν.
Deut. 8:9 ὄρκαὶ νκναὸσσωμὶ μπέκωικ ἀν... Deut. 28:36 τσεηνοκ ὑρωμὶ νκεφωσσὸν μμοὐ ἀν (= Vat).
Lev. 22:14 ἄρωμὶ ετναὸσσωμ ἐβολὴν ἑσσῆνε ὑθοταβ νηκεμὶ ἀν.
Lev. 19:27 νοὐσσωτ ἀν πὲ is in Coptic circumstantially construed (Greek affirmative: ἄθυπτον ἐστὶν).
Deut. 22:2 ἐσσωπ ἐγκεντ ἑπόκ ἀν (= Vat); also, with the same Stative — a mere coincidence? — Deut. 25:4 ὑρωμὶ ἐγκεντ ἑπὸκ ἀν (note disparity of the two 3rd person sgl. pronouns) — frankly, I do not see the connection between this specific lexical convert and its deviant construction.
Lev. 11:26 ὅτορ σεηνιτεβνωτὶ τὴροτ ὑὴ νιβὲν ετε-νισότον ἀνερατὶ φορὰ ὅτορ ἐσεωλὶ ναἐψεβ ὅτορ ὅτορ ὅτορ να-σαμὶ επεσαμὶ μμοὐ ἀν — the nom. extraposition seems significant.

Obs.
Nitrian texts have ὑὲ ἀν very frequently: De Vis I 90, 133, 134, 161, II 17, 190, 210, 211 — but also Circumstantial — ἀν — De Vis I 101, 25, νηκεμὶ ἀν De Vis II 176, 278, ἐνηκ(ἐμὶ) ἀν II 195, 238 ἀν — ἀν unconverted De Vis II 16, 172.

Unmarked (rather than “independent”) syntactical status is signalled by zero—...ἀν:

quota ἀν Deut. 25:7 ὑοσσωτ ἀν Deut. 25:8, also 30:11, 31:2, Num. 11:6, 14:41:43.

Gen. 31:29 ὅτορ ταξία δεμᾶξων εἰπ-πτηρωτὶ νακ ἀν — note the final placement of nexal-negation, non-focalizing ἀν.

Both zero- ἀν and -ἀν follow Relative Conversion in the corpus:

Lev. 7:10 ὑοσσωτοσ ὑὲν ἑστουσσω ἀν.
Two rare exceptions are Deut. 31:13 ὅτου ὑῃ ἐτε-κεκωταὶ ἀν: rhythmic factor?
Deut. 32:21 ὕῃ ἐτε-νοτοτοτ ἀν πὲ ... ὕῃ ἐτε-κοτοτοσ ἀν πὲ — Relative Nominal Sentence.

For the FC, ἀν...ἀν negates the nexus between Theme-Topic and Focus, while ἀν is Focus-referred: see above. However, it is probably a postfixed form — ἀν, not zero...ἀν, that signals “local” focalizing negation in the corpus:

Deut. 32:6 οὐκαὶος Νκωδ οτορ Νκαβε ἀν.
Gen. 30:15 κήν ἀν ἰχν.  
Deut. 9:5 εὐβετέκεμψα ἡν πὗὖ ἐβάλ ὑπαικογ κακ — this preposition seems to be especially prone to focalization; this is true from the earliest Egyptian phase on. Also  
Num. 35:22 Σένωτζαμίνα εὐβετόμετζαμί ἀν — here, and often, ἀν marks a delimitation (Chapter Four).  
Lev. 15:25 Σενήπνον ἀν πτέτεκτερ.  
Num. 16:28 εισεβολ φιτοτ ἀν (= Vat) — protasis.  
Gen. 27:12 πνοταργν ὀτορ πνοταμόν ἀν.  
Deut. 28:13 εγεάκ...πνοταφ ὀτορ πνοταμάν.  
Num. 12:8 Σενοτνατ ὀτορ Σενοτχμότ ἀν.  
Num. 24:17 ἤναταμογ ὀτορ ἤνοτ ἀν.  
Gen. 45:8 νέωτεν ἀν ῥετανοτοπτ ἐμναὶ ἀλλὰ φῖν ἀν.  
Focal negation by -ἀν seems neatly opposed to nexal negation by ἀν—ἀν, for FC constructions: see above.  
In ἀν—ἀν, the high-focality term in paradigm with either ἀν or ἀν—zero alone (see above), we have ἀν signalling highest co-focalization (in this sense, ἀν here is anything but “expletive”50):  
Gen. 31:15 ἀν ντανοτπεν κακ ἀν μῆρην ἀν ἀνανεκολομικ also Gen. 20:5, Deut. 32:34, Ex. 4:14 ἀν ἱε ἀρπὶν ἐκκον ἀν πλετιθθε ...  
The placement of ἀν in these cases is environmentally conditioned, while ἀν is initial (see above for more examples).  

Obs.  
(1) Some instances of focalizing ἀν in the NT:  
Imperative + ADV. - ἀν John 6:27.  
Preterite — ADV. - ἀν John 7:10.  
John 14:22 ἵτοτε ὕμηκαρινῳ τος ἀν B4 (B5 ἀν alone): a nice instance of delimiting negation.  
John 6:32 ἡμωτης ἄν ἀρτι ἡντεν ἡμικ Β4 (B5 ἀν alone), also 7:19, 15:16, 1 Cor. 15:10, Eph. 6:77.  
ἀλαλα ἔτον ἀν- ἀν— ἀν—Rom. 4:12.  
II Cor. 10:8 περιφραὶ τινη εἰς ἀν ἐκκωτ ὀτορ ἀν ἐπετενρωττ ἀν.  
Rom. 8:12 ὄτον ἐπον ἐνεαρ ἀν.  
(2) FUNK 1986:103f. n.3, 31 points out the need to distinguish (for Akhimic) between zero and nil, with ἐν “alone”, the Relative ἐπε-ἐκ— ἐν has zero. The same obtains for Oxyrhynchite (SHISHA-HALEVY 1983:314f.); the opposition obtains only in converted state.  

50 Cf. ORLANDINI 1993.
(3) On an negating a clause component, cf. Stern 1880:227. This use is found as early as Demotic (Gilula 1972); probably earlier, with n-js (continuous, not embracing), as against the embracing discontinuous n...js (Gilula 1970:208ff.; Cf. Junge 1979). The logic of the focalizing n-an is also diachronic: focalizing continuous n-js (in ME).

(4) Negation-signalling structure is very different outside the corpus.


eq... an ơơơơ n-... an Luke 7:33.


n(n)- an autonomous or unmarked in John (B4) 5:24, 6:36, 7:19, Hos. (B4) 11:9 (interlocutive NS), Hab. 1:2. In B4 John one discerns a distinctive system, with zero-... an often a "local negation";

n- n an agra- John 6:32.

n- adv an agra- John 6:58.

n(n)- verb an John 5:13:36:39, 6:22:27 etc.

(5) ne-etaq... an seems to be an established form in Cat. of the Preterite FC construction, negated nexus (e.g. Cat. 97, 137, 8, 33, 184, 208 etc.). Cf. (?) the Demotic prenegator bn-jw- (Spiegelberg 1925 §472ff., Exx. 213ff., even for j,r,f sdm in negated nexus: Johnson 1976:122 E207; Simpson 1996:138).


2.4.7 Focalization and topicalization: some notable constructions

(a) In Coptic, as in other Topic-prominent languages, the noun or pronoun or adverbial preceding, extraposed to and resumed by a syntactically unmarked verb clause is not necessarily topical ("Topic" — a cotextually or contextually given, thus anchoring-in-discourse element of the clausal information structure, typically co-referent with its Theme. It is typically of high specificity, and may be grammaticalized into Theme in certain NS patterns: see above). Extraposition is often focalizing, a function signalled by non-specific or determination different noun syntags and/or the absence of cotextual, external (as against internal or pragmatic) linkage and cohesion, and/or special co-focalizing elements. The Topic is in these cases verbal (thematic lexemes are typical). Clear focalization is at the conjunction of several of or all these features. Focalization in these case is junctionally a delimitation, whereas Topicalization is a strong linkage (Chapter Four).

Gen. 25:23 ωλολ δ αρεερβοκι μμωοτ.
Gen. 21:6 οσεσβι άααιη ιηιη.
Lev. 25:5 οσροππι ηεσεθτοη Αεσεωπη Μπικαι.
Deut. 16:15 ζ ζενοο οοκειτοτ.

tenendoemec.

Gen. 45:8 νοσθέν ἂν ἁρετενοσορπτ ἐμναὶ ἀλλὰ Φερμοτινιπτ — a rare instance of pronominal focussing, resumed, like a Cleft Sentence, by the Immutable-Theme or Endophoric Nominal Sentence.

(b) Topicalization is signalled by specific extrapoed nouns, contextually cohesive, and no restriction of the verb lexeme.

Gen. 22:5 γεμείς ἡπαίμα ... ἀνοικ ἀν ἐνεὰς τεννα− 

ωειναν. Gen. 27:37 νοοὶ ἄν ὅσ ἐπε εὐναὶ ὄνακ. Ex. 6:12 ἄνοικ γαρ ἄνοικ−οὐκατακί. Ex. 5:16 πιτοὺς γαρ σε ἐὰν ὅμοι ἃν ινεκεβίακ ἀτοὺς σένα 


Topicalization extends to adverbials, pre-setting circumstance (time or place, modality only in the case of the “Tautological Infinitive”) to a clause:

Lev. 11:26 ὅτι ἀποκ ιδεντενιωτοι θῆτος ἡμὲν ιενι− 

ταοτιπ ἄποξ ἄτος ἐφεσωτι ἁνεπιεβ ἀτοὺς ἁτκαμάλι 

ἐφεσωτ άμοὶ ἄλλα. The non-specific extrapoed Topic is less common by far, and never contextually anchored:

Lev. 10:9 οὕτηπ ἐνεός τις εἰκερα ἁπετεντιωτο. Deut. 8:13 οὑγατ ἐνεός τις ἁπαναγαναι ὄνακ... Gen. 31:39 ἀταὶ εἴποιγιον ἀτομή ἁπεσίν ὄνακ. Deut. 29:6 μικ ἁπετεντιωτο ἀτομ ἄτρ γέμης ἁρτε 

τεντοκύ — zero-determined generic Topic, resumed by zero.

(c) In poetic language, a third construction is encountered:

Ex. 15:2 στόχονος ομοίος ουράνιος εβολ αρτι αρκντι
NH1.

Ex. 15:4 γαντωπι ηναβαθις ητρεπανος αρζωλκος
Σενφιομ.

Ex. 21:8 κενονος ομομις ρο ηνε ην εθικ ραη.

In this case, the extraposition seems to be thematizing, not topicalizing or focalizing.

For infinitives (verb lexemes) and other abstracts, the indefinite Topic is the rule: witness the so-called Tautological Infinitive nexus focussing construction (above), where Σεν- (rarely η-) is a grammaticalized preposition marking the topicalization:

Gen. 22:17 Σενοτςκος ειςκος εροκ.
Gen. 43:7 Σενοτσκινι αρκντε
Gen. 43:3 Σενοτκεμεθερε αρκεμεθερε ην — topicalizing a compound verb.

Num. 8:26 γωβ δε ηνεπερκωβ — topicalizing a compound verb.

(d) The Presentatives γηπηε, γηπηε ις, ις are devices enabling one type of topicalization, not focalization (see above):

Ex. 6:30 γηπηε ανοκ ενομ ηαε-ταςμ - note that ηαε-
does not signal topicality52, but is simultaneously a “Flexionsisolierung” (cf. Polotsky 1990:171 n.5) and a Theme-recall device:

Ex. 4:14 ις ααπων πεκεν αν πιλεσιθες ηωνα εν Σενοτςεαδε γκεαδε.

Gen. 42:13 γηπηε ις πικοταδε ικη ηατεπεπεικατ.
Lev. 13:31f. αρκανατ ... επιγον οτον γηπηε ις πεπο
οταδε αν ις.

(e) The preposition εβε- is a rare topicalization signal: so is ε- for infinitives (cf. LE ις-):

Gen. 17:20 εβε-ιςκαλα δε γηπηε αιςκτιμε εροκ γηπηε
αιςκτιμ εροκ.

Lev. 7:24 εοςκινι δε ηνοτσκος.

(f) Topicalization in Narrative, as a Theme-recall device, one of several, in Theme-switching delimitation juncture: see above, Chapter One,

52 Pace Loprieno 1995:224; not even “antitopicality”.
tentatively on the different topicalized term in the four-term Theme-agens placement paradigm, which also includes (beside the topicalized Theme, the nāsē-marked Theme, the Theme in commutation with the delocutive suffix-pronoun\(^5\)) a nexus-topicalizing term:

Gen. 17:24 ἀβράαμ ἐναντίον τῆς σέληνος προσέπα... 
Gen. 25:33 ανάστη ἐν αὐτῷ ἡ μεταφορὴ μὴνίς ἐβολή νια-κωβ.

Obs.

(1) On # Noun + sdm.f # thematization in ME, with the subsequent nexus rheumatic as a whole, adverbial-converbal, “Circumstantial sdm.f”: see WESTENDORFF 1953, DORET 1980, JUNGE 1978 (1979); LOPRIENO 1995:187ff. The feature of Topic specificity is heuristically useful in an article-less language such as Middle Egyptian (SHISHA-HALEVY 2007a). It is of interest to note cases where the topicalization is conditioned, as in the thematic status of an “inalienably possessed” noun, when the possessor is the formal Topic. The possessed the Theme: s3 j f nht “My son, his arm is strong” = “My son’s arm is strong”. See also PANHUIS 1984.

(2) Topicalization is common in Demotic, beyond the topicalized delocutive NS, at least in some stylistic categories such as letters; in fact, so prevalent as to give the impression of devaluation or grammaticalization. So for instance the Berlin Elephantine texts (Ptolemaic and earlier) in ZAUZICH 1993: t3y-jht ty.j jnw.s P. Berlin P. 15513 x+4f. “This cow, I had them bring it”, x+ 12f. p3-šn r-hb.k n.jtb3t.f jw.j jr p3y.w rwš ’n “The request you sent me, I will take care of them (sic) too”.

(3) On topicalized adverbials (presetting starting-point for the subsequent clause), see SATZINGER 1971 (IE: nominal, pronominal and adverbial Topics are jr- marked), SHISHA-HALEVY 1986a (Shenoutean Sahidic); BLUMENTHAL 1975:306ff. (French); POPPE 1991 (Middle Welsh).

(4) On topicalization as the “introduction of new Theme” cf. PANHUIS 1984. See SORNICOLA 1985a, excellent on topicalization and discourse strategy in the IE range of languages.

(5) See STEMPPEL 1981 and KRÖTSCH and SABBAN 1990 on initial-placement marked focalization in modern French.

(6) Initial-position focalization is common outside the corpus: DV II 265 nēwten ateraentonmo nnieprathc mnoow a2a anon pe.

---

\(^5\) It is certainly not true that any delocutive pronoun commutes in a general straightforward way with a noun syntagm and *vice versa*. Value factors must be introduced in a système des valeurs; placement slots “come with” their syntagmatic/paradigmatic identity profile; some terms are more marked than others; and, moreover, text-grammatical functions render the “Sentence-Grammar” functional evaluation almost trivial.
CHAPTER THREE
THE NOUN SYNTAGM
AND THE DETERMINATION SYNDROME

3.0.1 Preliminaries: the determination syndrome. Actualization. Specificity. Determination and articles
3.0.2 The Coptic lexeme. "Nounhood". Lexeme and noun syntagm. Lexeme and determinator interdependence
3.0.3 Exponence, "residence" and marking of the gender-number category
3.0.4 Morphosyntax: determinator nuclearity

3.1 Determination-sensitive environments
3.2 Six reduced determination subsystems
(a) Determination of infinitives
(b) Determination of Exsistants and Non-Exsistants
(c) Presentative clauses introduced by (ῥτππε) ῶκ-
(d) Determination in inherent and non-inherent rhematic status
(e) Theme determination following κακε-
(f) Theme-agens determination following a negative conjugation base or in negative environment

3.3 The zero article. Zero article or articlelessness?

3.4 The indefinite articles. Particular vs. non-particular indefiniteness. ὦται, ὠτὸν and ἦλι

3.5 πτ- and π- "two definite articles"?

3.5.1 {πτ-} the deictic, cohesive specifying article
3.5.2 {π-} — the non-cohesive, non-deictic, pure actualization designative or naming article
3.5.3 Possession and determination

3.6 Generics: a retrospect and synthesis

3.7 The substantivized and determinated Relative Forms
Excursus: A brief note on demonstrative deixis

3.8 The Proper Name: five observations

3.9 The noun syntagm expanded: the notae relationis. Associative relationships. Constituence ("inalienable") Personal-Sphere Association

3.10 Attribution: the adnominal noun syntagms. The "Adjective"
3.11 The noun syntagm/pronoun/Proper Name) expanded: some appositive constructions

3.12 The reiterated noun syntagm

3.13 “That”-forms, nexal substantivation forms, infinitives and conversbs. Final clauses and related forms

3.0.1 Preliminaries: The Determination syndrome. Actualization. Specificity. Determination and articles

Determination — primarily conceived of as nominal determination — is one of the most difficult and least successful topics of grammatical description. Clearly, we don’t see deeply, structurally and multi-dimensionally enough in this case. It will, I believe, sharpen our focus to list and examine the reasons for this failure. I see four major complicating factors:

(a) Determination is a signalling complex, a syndrome, a set or orchestrated ensemble of features; it is a cluster or conglomerate, not a simple category. But we tend to watch for a formal/functional category in word scope (which accounts for the pseudo-paradigmatic and pseudo-analytic synthesis of mutually commutable articles) rather than in the macrosyntactic, cotextual environment (e.g. adjacent verb forms, expansions, constituents in nexal interdependence with the element under scrutiny, negative environment, preceding textual stretches and “landscape”). All determination gradings, like any paradigmatic dependence, are only valid in specific slots. In the word extent, the articles themselves and the articular slot command our analytic attention, distracting us from giving due consideration to the environment. It is the environment of a noun that is specific, or non-specific, or of middle-specificity grading. A most salubrious exercise is the study of determination-signalling environments in article-less (or definite-article-less) languages, such as Old/Middle Egyptian or Turkish: the insight of the associations of specificity with FSP in the latter (Johansson 1977) is inspiring for Egyptian and Coptic.

(b) The functions themselves and the signifieds signalled in the determination syndrome are elusive, subtle, highly abstract and not easy to paraphrase or translate. This is in part accountable for (d) below.

1 In Shisha-Halevy 2007a, the author studies determination-signalling environmental factors in article-less Old and Middle Egyptian where, somewhat like the absence of vocalic graphemes in the Hieroglyphic, Hieratic and Demotic scripts, this lack turns out to be a blessing in disguise, freeing us from “la superstition de la forme” (De Boer) and forcing us to consider syntagmatic factors.
(c) The complexity of the categorial cluster itself, due to the interaction and interference of three sets of parameters, is bewildering: (1) the lexico-semantic makeup, semes and sememes (of lexemes) — abstracts, (non)countables or amorphous, and subvarieties thereof, in combined effect with determinators; (2) syntactic status, in micro ("prepositional phrase", "actant", "Rheme" etc.) and macro (i.e. textual syntax, thematicity and topicality, rheumaticity, reference etc.); (3) any "meaning" (in the sense of signifié) of the determinator itself (deixis, genericity, "one", "zero").

(d) More than any other linguistic phenomenon, this is prone to ethnocentrism, an implicit assumption of close matching and correspondence of categorial structure in the language under study with our own; but our own systems are consciously or subconsciously applied, not analytically present.

Obs.
(1) Almost all special discussion regarding the syntagmatics and nature of determination in Coptic has hitherto been on Sahidic. TILL 1927, while simplistic and undiscreem, seems to be aware of the complexity of the issue, the importance of environment and the fact that no specific article has a "meaning". See JERNSTEDT 1978; SHISHA-HALEVY 1986a Chapter Five; LAYTON 1990 and 2004 (see entries in the Subject Index).

(2) Serious discussions are even rarer for pre-Coptic phases of Egyptian. JOHNSON 1987 is not always helpful, since generative in conception and formulation. Studying the "article-less" phases, namely Old and Middle Egyptian, is worthwhile, enhancing our sensitivity to environmental symptoms of specificity. But the inverse is equally true: a sensitive understanding of Artikellehre is an advantage in tackling determination in articleless languages. Article-less languages and linguistic phases are generally ignored in studies of nominal determination; see BIRKENMAIER 1979, CHVANY 1983 on Russian and Bulgarian; on Latin ROSÉN (H.) 1994; on Turkish (no definite article), JOHANSSON 1977 (discussing mainly the FSP aspect of word-order-signalled specificity), NILSSON 1979 (rather basic, on the marking of specificity by the genitive and accusative cases).

(3) Of the vast literature on determination and articles, I have picked out such treatments, few in number, that reveal structuralist sensibilities. Observe that most default references to "article" are to the specifying ("definite") one; indefinites are taken up far less frequently. Incidentally, the French system seems most similar to the Coptic one: WINKELMANN 1978 is noteworthy in its textual approach, with the binary oppositions of referential (generic vs. non-generic = particular), particular (specific vs. non-specific), specific (text-internal [anaphoric vs. cataphoric], vs. text-external); KORZEN 1996 (Italian), CORBELIN 1987, WILMET 1983, 1986, HARRIS 1987 (all on French); CHRISTOPHERSEN 1939, YOTSUKURA 1970 (of the best discussions of determination in English), HAWKINS 1978 (English); GIVÓN 1978 (structural; important in associating such parameters as plurality, gender, negation, case-marking, topicality); EROMS 1988 (German). NOCENTINI 1996 is a typology of European articles and their evolution (in Romance and German), on the basis of twenty binary traits, oppositions and compatibility (combination) properties. Coptic does not seem to be essentially different from the West-European profile (cf. NOCENTINI 1996:4ff.).
(4) The ever-fascinating evolution of the “European” Germanic and Romance articles is described in NOCENTINI 1996: I find it difficult to share his view, expressed elsewhere mostly in German writing, of the article as “sign of linguistic progress” (HÖDLER 1954:15 “danach wären also die Sprachen, die zu einer Artikelentwicklung nicht gekommen sind, gewissermaßen als rückständig zu beurteilen...”, or SNELL 1946:199f. “Es ist... nicht abzusehen, wie in Griechenland Naturwissenschaft und Philosophie hätten entstehen können, wäre nicht im Griechischen der bestimmte Artikel vorhanden”; see even Schuchardt in SPITZER (ed.) 1928:212 on the article as “Kulturvorschritt”. This is an ethnocentric view that does not consider specificity as much as metalinguistic abstraction, and moreover confuses “article” with “definite article”. The correlation of an evolving article with loss of case (40ff.) does not apply to Egyptian. While the significance of the transition from demonstrative to article as a reduction-indeixis grammaticalization is acceptable (although this is an imponderable, and in a sense a petitio principi), it is difficult to agree that the construction “in which the transition began” is identifiable. See also PRESSLICH 2000:27ff. — structural, always in the scope of specific syntactical roles. The issue is problematic, as timing the emergence of a “waschecht” article is difficult, as with any grammaticalization process, and is tightly related to the very definition of an article (definite and indefinite ones are drastically different); the evolutionary phases and relative chronology may be agreed on. Of course, the articles evolved in Egyptian too, by an internal mechanism and independently of any external influence (see SCHWARZTZE 1843:1073ff.), the “written articles” between the written phases we call Middle and Late Egyptian; but this is only to say they are part of the systems — not really chronologically contiguous — that happened to be represented in writing; we encounter, after all, articles in such glimpses of the colloquial language as are forthcoming even in the earliest period of Egyptian. In fact, it is not so much a question of “when” (the articles emerge) as of “where”, in the sense of slots and functional sectors. For various reasons (not least the vowelless graphemics and the corpus situation) we cannot resolve the specific systems with much certainty, and have to make do with the essentially approximative “definite” — “indefinite” — zero state: the quaternary system found in Bohairic (see below) may well have been anticipated in some phase or variety of Egyptian.

Actualization. As noted, noun determination is a syndrome — a scatter of characterizations of a noun on the basis of formal signalled differentiations: “la condition nominale”, no less than the core issue of nominal syntax. Determination is all-involving, but has little to do with nominal morphology, and everything to do with nominal syntax. The article itself, a “young” feature in most familiar languages, of which the birth can be detected or traced in every language having one, is but one component of this syndrome. However, one of the immediate effects of the combination of a lexeme with a determinator (even a zero one: see below) is the actualization of the former — enabling it to function as a syntagm constituent. This is distinct from, but conjoint with, specification: it means rather priming the lexeme for specificity or non-

2 In Coptic no more than Egyptian (pace LOPRIENO 1995:55ff.)
specificity characterization, thereby turning it from lexeme to noun and a constituent of the noun syntagm. One specific determinator, viz. {n-}, seems to effect pure actualization, without concomitant specification — see below.

Obs.
See BALLY Ch. 3, p. 87; COSERIU 1975. Noun actualization seems to be kindred to verbal finiteness — “finite noun” (cf. AGEL 1996, esp. 16ff.).

“Definiteness”, specificity or familiarity may be textual or extratextual, pragmatic-situational: in its simplest formulation, it “presents the element designated by the noun as something known in the particular context in which it is mentioned” (NILSSON 1979:119ff.), where at least “presents”, “context” and “known” are open to considerable further sophistication (for instance, “known to be a fact” in the case of infinitive specificity). Many relevant questions are still unanswered: genericity (“reference to all individuals of a certain class”, NILSSON 1979:122) — normally conceived of as non-specific — may be metaphorically “disguised” as specific or non-specific. (Since it is after all a decoding analysis we are engaged in, how do we account for “reading” a noun as specific or generic?). Is anaphoricity a signalization of the “known or familiar” higher-specificity property, or a mere representation/substitution, or both? Specificity, a syndrome of resoluteness on several parameters (including those of quantification, individuation and concretization), is clearly cumulative and scalar, on a gradient of converging signalization and marking of environment around the noun in point. So far as I know, little adequate descriptive work has so far been done on any language to do justice to this multi-dimensional characterization of textual constituents, which seems no less than a principle — or a component of a principle — informing language (quâ text) as a whole. This characterization, which is scope-referred and eminently junctural, is both and conjointly syntagmatic (e.g. by reference, phoricity, specification; by the very fact an element is prius dictum or in cohesion with a coreferent), paradigmatic (the extent of commutability in inverse proportion to specificity) and intertextual or pragmatic (prius nota playing a role as consequential as that of prius dicta).

Specificity types, as well as grades for individual types, must be distinguished — textual-referential, combinatory yet non-referential (for instance, the specificity of cases like ðωq “his mouth”, or of Proper Names), pragmatic-situational. Another necessary distinction is that between specific (of noun syntagms and their environment), and lexeme-specifying (which must also be specific: e.g. some determinators).
A striking instance of primary specificity — certain grades, conditioning alternant environment in Coptic — is the Theme of the Durative Conjugation Pattern (converbal Rheme), where the high to highest specificity range (ττι- / Proper Name / specific pronoun) is a distinctive part of the basic pattern, while the low to lowest specificity range conditions the statal-existential subpatterns or allo-patterns ὄτων-/ΜΜΟΝ- + οὐ-/zero article/non-specific pronoun + Rheme. Another instance is the nexal or phrasal expansion and specification of a noun in its interplay both with the determinator paradigm of the nuclear noun and the form of expansion. Yet another noteworthy instance is the status of {ΦΑ-}, specificity-indifferent since it is in contact with the determinator (or the noun syntagm as a whole), out of contact with the noun lexeme: a case of juncturally-signalled specificity characterization.

Obs.
(1) See discussions of specificity in the works quoted above, à propos of the definite articles in the individual languages; also HARRIS 1980 (for Romance); HAWKINS 1978:114, 167f.; TIRANE 1980, esp. 77ff., 171ff., 191ff. (familiarity = “location in the immediate situation of the utterance”; countability and quantifiedness count as components of specificity). Our specificity subsumes identifiability and cotextual and/or contextual “anchoredness”: PRINCE 1981, LAMBRECHT 1994.
(2) The environment of the determinator co-signals specificity type and grading. However, in “article-less” phases of a language — Old through Middle Egyptian, in our case — it is the environment (e.g. lexeme + actualizers such as gender-number exponents, expansion, verb forms for which the noun is actant) that is the prime field and signalling carrier of the determination syndrome. See SHISHA-HALEVY 2007a.
(3) While the specificity parameter is certainly an attribute of pattern constituents, Coptic word-order (or better constituent ordering) is not directly correlated with it, unlike, e.g. Greek (cf. ROSEN 1975).
(4) Specificity may extend to the verbal nexus, although we are as yet far from having a “unified theory of specificity of linguistic entities”: see MÜMM 1995:170ff. Note for instance the pragmatically specific performative, or the oppositions in various Aktionsart categories.
(5) PRESSLICH 2000:36ff., with most earlier discussions, presents specificity as a binary category (genericity and referentiality probably separate features, (47ff.). However, genericity is not opposed to particularity where it is disguised as “particular kind”.

**Determination and article set.** As stressed above, the “article system” is essentially synthetic, not analytic, since it is only in isolated environments that the determinators constitute a true paradigm.

Note the following simplified scheme for our Bohairic (following and modifying WINKELMANN 1978. See below for actual details, discussion and illustration):
SPECIFIC

REFERENTIAL, TEXTUAL, DEICTIC
{τι-}

ana-phoric
cata-phoric
exo-phoric
(text and pragmatic “world”)

NON-REFERENTIAL, NON-DEICTIC
{π-}

uniques (τιφε), genus name (τχνη)
“naming” metalinguistic actualizator
lexeme representant for inalienable
association (π- ι-)

ΟΤΡ-
“a certain...”
specific-indefinite

NON-SPECIFIC

GENERIC

{τι-}
genus name

zero
abstract, extensional
unstructured
(genus-representing
genus member)

ΟΤΡ-
“a quantity unit”
“instance genericity”

ΠΙΓ-
intensional
genericity

NON-GENERIC OR PARTICULAR

ΟΤΡ-, ΠΑΝ-

indefinite
“one/any instance/case of...”
“some instances/cases of...”

Obs.
Greek/Coptic typological contrast is here sharp, with the Coptic system considerably
more sophisticated. This has a deep significance for the relation between the Greek
Vorlage and its Coptic re-writing:

Greek  Coptic (Bohairic — see below)
definite — actualizing, non-phoric, naming
definite — actualizing, phoric, deictic, non-naming

zero  indefinite
(nil)  zero
(nil)
3.0.2 The Coptic lexeme. "Nounhood". Lexeme and Noun Syntagm. Lexeme and determinator interdependence. Famously, Coptic (as has recently also been attributed to Polotsky's model for Middle Egyptian) has no verb. Or rather, verbality and verbhood are in Coptic first of all a matter of rhematicity and occurrence privilege in specific nexus patterns, and not of a specific lexico-morphological subsystem. By the same token, nominality and nounhood are not lexemic, but are a matter of pattern compatibility — in the noun syntagm — but here the lexical inventory does come into play. Barring the converb (i.e. adverbial-privilege verb-form) known as "Stative", as well as a small inventory of sentence particles, prepositions and adverbials, the entire lexicon is of nominal privilege. "Infinitives" are merely lexemes with a special combinatory morphology (pre-object actantial linkage marking, the so-called construct and pronominal states), and, unlike the other nouns, actualizable not only by combination with determinators in the noun syntagm, but also by its combination with "pro-verbs", alias conjugation bases, the real verbs of Coptic: Ḑ-NOBI is thus eminently comparable with ḏq-CQTEM (incidentally, so is also the specific noun with the finite verb)³. As is well known, the compatibility with the articles or better determinators extends to adverbials and even grammemes (such as ṛNOW "no"); this ensues from the nuclearity of the determinators, which are expandable by lexemes or any non-nexal element (see below). This is therefore not a firm test of noun-hood. Nor is compatibility with the auxiliary (rather auxiliaries) ḐP-, also combinable with adverbials (see Chapter Two); or rhematic status in the Nominal Sentence (i.e. predicability by ḐE, see Chapter Two), or compatibility with the nota relationis ḐN-, or with some prepositions, also shared by certain adverbials. Actant or Existant status is exclusively nominal, but this, like rhematicity and thematicity, is arguably an articular rather than a lexemic privilege.

3.0.3 Exoponence, "residence" and marking of gender/number category: lexemic, morphemic, morphosyntactic. Grammatical gender is primarily — arguably even solely — a junctural phenomenon: it has only a junctural "meaning". This regards first of all reference phenomena, with linkage, mostly anaphoric, between pronouns and noun syntagms — that is, between personal or demonstrative pronouns and

³ M.G. SCHWARTZE (in BUNSEN 1845:641f.) explicitly states the nuclearity of the bases-with-Theme as an auxiliary verbal nexus; see also STEINTHAL-MISTELI 1893:293, probably Schwartz's teaching. (Also SHISHA-HALEVY 2000:83ff.).
determinator pronouns (*alias* articles) — or Proper Names, or other pronouns. The category is here quaternary, and its structure straightforward: sgl. masculine vs. sgl. feminine vs. plural (feminine+masculine vs. a complex neuter, expressed by the sgl. feminine, by the sgl. masculine or by a sgl.masc./sgl.fem./plur. fluctuation (e.g. in reference to a zero determinator. See Shisha-Halevy 1986a Chapter Five). However, the prime gender linkage, of lexeme to determinator pronoun (article or demonstrative), is difficult, for we encounter two distinct junctural dependencies inside the noun syntagm, namely a *compatibility/selection* and a *determination* one. In the first relationship, individual singular lexemes constitute two lists, which select "their" determinator, respectively masculine or feminine: *t-∅e*, *∅-nobī*, *ni-∅w∅* and even *t-∅wimi* (for the plural, see below). Following this selection, the subsequent gender reference of the combined noun syntagm is determined and motivated by the determinator, indeed conditioned by it⁴. In the second dependence, less common but certainly well established, the determinator — singular or plural, masculine or feminine in reference to another noun syntagm, pronoun or proper name, is expanded by *any lexeme* (this applies also, and even more commonly, to two homonymous masculine and feminine *∅w*- singular indefinite articles). Sahidic examples for this are *π-me* "the true one (masc.)", or *π-sPalaboth* "the syllabary" (Shenoutean Sahidic), or *t-πa∅e* (Luke 5:36): none in our corpus; any in Bohairic? A second difficulty concerns the interference — if any — of the lexeme itself in the gender/number reference "career" of the noun syntagm. It is, for instance, a fact that a zero-determined "masculine" noun (that is, one that has a selection dependence with a masculine determinator) is never represented by a feminine anaphor, while a zero determinator with a "feminine" noun is famously resumed by masculine/feminine/plural neutralization.

Gender is morphologically marked in very few lexemes by final-vowel lengthening (or by the laryngal morphophoneme? This could even include the pair *con* vs. *cw:n1*): *cabh* vs. *cabe*, *Selaw* vs. *Selao* and so on. In almost all lexemes, however, there is no marking to replace the pre-Coptic "motion" suffix *-t* for the marked feminine, vs. the unmarked masculine *zero*. Pronominal and lexemic gender categorizations are thus drastically different, the former regulating, motivated and motivating, the latter determinator-pronoun-triggering, but intrinsically unmarked for the category.

---

⁴ This is certainly true of homonyms like (*π-*)*hmr*l and (*t-*)*hmr*l (a Sahidic phenomenon), where the gender-motivating signal is by necessity the determinator.
Very different is the case of the morphological or morpho-lexical plural. Here we have the lexeme — of Egyptian and even Greek origin — in syntagm with a plural suffixed or infixed morph:

\{LEXEME\} + suffix \{-\o\r\n\}
or \{LEXEME\} + suffix \{-i\}
or \{LEXEME\} + suffix \{-\o\r\n\}, \{-\o\r\n\}, \{-\o\r\n\}
or \{LEXEME\} + infix \{no breaking in Bohairic\}: e\i\i\i\i\k, \\o\r\p

Theoretically, three possible analyses present themselves:

(a) The plural morph is autonomous and pertinent, i.e. is not motivated by the plural determinator pronoun, which is merely compatible with it; it is a distinct lexeme, or rather “lexico-syntagm”;

(b) The plural morph is motivated by a plural determinator morph;

(c) The plural morph is part of a discontinuous complex including the determinator exponent of plurality.

I do not have precise statistics on the prevalence of these forms in Coptic in general or in Bohairic, nor their distribution over dialects and texts (B. Layton reports one-hundred entered in Crum’s Dictionary). In the corpus studied, I count just over thirty individual plurals, many of which are not opposed in the corpus to a singular lexeme (pluralia tantum are \\o\p\o\p, which may be suppletive to the singulars \\o\p\p\p/\\o\p\p, and \\o\p\o\o\o\o). While I can find no correlation of the attestation (\- existence) of this form with any formal lexemic structure, lexical semantics may seem to hint at a coherent class of classes: kinship, administrative, legal and social roles and status, household animals, anatomical parts of animals and humans, architectural features — all components of closed systems and, incidentally, involving a personal-sphere (“inalienable”) association, see below. Almost all are expanded, mostly by the notae relationis \-n- and \-n\e-. Not contained in these classes are \\o\o\o\o\o Gen. 39:11, \\o\o\o\o\o Lev. 25:37 (both inalienable), the magical staves (\\o\o\o\o\o Gen. 30:37), and the ensemble of Egyptian waterways (\\o\o\o\o\o Ex. 8:1). Significantly, no abstracts and mass nouns are represented. Since those last mentioned are clearly collectives or “set” system plurals (in the sense of Italian le mura, le ossa, equally re-organized remnants of an earlier morphological system), it is conceivable that all these morphological plurals express in some way an isolated (but productive) specially marked plurality, “set” collectives. These would be survivors (in a re-organized, rather than collapsed, system) of the pre-Coptic Egyptian plural formation. (Note that the Coptic here shows once again — according to its means, which must be used — considerable sophistication over the Greek Vorlage).
In view of the above, structure possibilities (a) and (c) above seem most probable; this is corroborated by the fact that the plural determinators "ni", "gan", "nen" with the unmarked lexeme are well attested for these lexemes, presenting an opposition of fragmentated vs. "set" plural. It is significant that none of the marked plurals is compatible with zero determination, which must mean they do not occur generically (see below): the few instances of quantified morphological plurals, with no article theiroutil grammatical, apparently do not count as true zero article. Indeed, this is a cogent argument to see these as a nil article case (see below), and one of discontinuous quantification.

οτμήνυ νιεφωσι Gen. 26:14.
οτενεβνωσι νεγωσι Gen. 26:14 — a peculiar case (two plurals, nuclear and satellital).

30 νακασαλοι Gen. 32:14.
νισεμμωσι Ex. 12:19.
νιαλωσι Ex. 50:7:23.
νεναλωσι N- Gen. 21:25.

νεσεβιακ Ex. 5:15ff., 32:13.

νεκσοτι Ex. 5:14:19.

νικαβεσ Ex. 28:3.

νιεσελαοι Ex. 3:16.

νιμετμεθεσ Num. 17:25 νιμεθεσ.
νιγιομι Ex. 1:19.

γανγιομι Gen. 34:9.


νεσεσελαοι Ex. 10:9.

νεσιντοτ N- Gen. 23:3.

νοτιοτ Ex. 6:17, 4:5, 10:6.

νικφιρωσι Ex. 26:13.


νεκφιρωσι Ex. 30:4.


νικαλασζ Gen. 24:32.

νιαφοτι Ex. 29:34.

In opposition to (selection):

In opposition to (selection):

**GANBWK, GANBWKI** (marking gender) Gen. 20:14, 24:35.

**GANHI** Ex. 1:21, Deut. 8:12.

**NIHI** Ex. 6:17.

**GANWOM** Gen. 19:12.

**NOTIOP** Ex. 7:19.

**NIaq** Ex. 29:31, Lev. 7:15.

**EBOL SENNIaq (tòw kρeòw) — EBOL SENNIaqORI (tòw kρeòw) — NNEqaqORI (tà kρeà) Gen. 12:4ff.**


**Obs.**

(1) **LAYTON 1990:85f.** "...specific gender (or lack of specific gender) is a potential that is actualized only in the...Determinators” “the lexeme express[es] two closely related types of meaning man/human, truth/true etc...two actualizations of a single (though bivalent)
lexical potentials". The first statement is very true. The second is problematic: the lexeme is decoded as entity or quality according to environment, including its determinator and the referential connections thereof. Layton's "gendered" and "genderless common noun" (2004 §§104-125) really begs the question, since "noun" may be conceived of as either a noun syntagm or a noun lexeme.

(2) Cases like ṣepwq/ṣerwq nṯwŋmt Gen. 29:2, varying with ṣeqw nṯwŋmt Gen. 29:3:10: ṭeqw nṯeqmt Luc. 21:24 (v.l. ṭeqw), or keqn nṯeq (Polotsky 1930:84; this is a common Bohairic form, to judge by the entry in Crum's Dictionary), and even more cogently the lexemicized possessive in ṣeqp eqw (Polotsky 1934:66), all seem to point to the masculine singular as unmarked term of the gender category, as in Semitic and Romance.

(3) The morphological plural, a feature almost entirely unresearched, for any corpus and any dialect, was discussed by Stern 1880 §209ff., esp. §225 ("mostly unumgänglich"); see Layton 2004:87 "individual concrete plurality". The form was never restricted to native Egyptian lexemes (cf. the early ṭeqp eqmt B4 John 5:39) - the only non-syntactical "Egyptian intervention" in these imported elements; not occurring in our corpus.

(4) In the Sah. NT, we find (in about 500 occurrences, with cnw and ṣbhe accounting for most of those) 28 lexemes with morphmatic plural, of which exactly half are attested with "syntactical" plural (moq, phn, cbe, cn, tbn, qh, ṣwb, zoi, ṣoic, ṣadd, ṣwb, ṣbot, ṣeic, ṣeb, ṣeq, qhp), and only few coincide with the Boh. ones in our corpus; however, the number of lexemes is similar in the two dialects. I have no statistics for the Bohairic NT or for Nitrian texts.

(5) The morphological "set" plural may be considered higher on the specificity scale than the unmarked lexeme, in such cases where both stand in opposition (i.e. following n- and ṣqān-). See Givón 1978, Valentin 1986:263, Flaux 1997 for correlations and mutualities of number and specificity.

(6) In Old and Middle Egyptian, article-less phases, a built-in gender-number exponent nucleus (-zero / -w number, then + zero / -t gender) was suffixed to the lexeme (also to adjectives, participles and Relative Forms).


(8) The gender of abstract deriving morphs is not entirely clear: ḫin-, masculine in the grammaticalized action noun -nphinx- (see below), is opposed to a feminine verbal abstract (†phin-); perhaps even cases like the variation in ḫeqw/ẖeqw ḫmq/ẖmq Rom. 6:19.

3.0.4 The nuclearity of the determinators

"The prefixation of grammatical information" (Jacob 1990:59ff.) with lexemic information an expanding satellite or periphery is an important typological principle of Coptic as it is in French (and in Romance generally, and often in Germanic). In fact, the nuclear status of the determinator slot in the noun syntagm (nucleus = categorial segment of a syntagm, the segment encoded with grammatical information on the relationships and status of the whole syntagm) is more evident than other prefixed grammemes on Coptic, such as the word-formational
met- and ἀτ- or the grammaticalized pem-, peq-. It seems that statements of the nucleus of the Coptic article predate the European formulations of the Nineteen-Fifties and Sixties, by H. Frei (for French) and H.-J. Seiler (for German): P.V. Jernstedt’s seminal paper of 1949 (translated into German by P. Nagel in 1978), one of the most brilliant treatises of Egyptian linguistics (see passim, §§7ff., 14ff., 25 etc., referring only to the Sahidic indefinite article; and the “partitive izafei” dependence between determinator and lexeme). Subsequently, see Shisha-Halevy 1986a, Chapter Five, with references to other discussions.

The nucleus of the Coptic determinators is established first of all by the gender-number and zero/non-zero concord test of anaphoric references to a noun syntagm, which “are to” or represent the article rather than the lexeme — this is of importance, inasmuch as it reduces or cancels the interference of the semantic sublexical classes such as abstracts, countables etc. — but also by numerous other indicants. Striking among these is the evidence of resumption and resumption concord; of hyperdetermination, like ὁσπαρθήτ (AM II 72 — not in our corpus; Sah. ὁτ-τεί-μινε: Jernstedt 1978, §14f.; the substitute status of ὁτ- and ἀν-); bracketing determinators, with the nota relationis and Circumstantial conversion as operators of the expansion status inside the brackets; and, of course, the prosodic relationship of the former to ὁσαί/ὑσι. ἀν- does not have in Bohairic a non-proclitic counterpart, ἀνθομον corresponding to ἀνάνε etc. Consider the following representative loci, all indicative of a nuclear determinator:

Num. 6:7 ὑσαχНик НИБЕН ΕΝΑΜΟΣ (= Vat).
Num. 7:1 ἐνγειβι ΕΑΜΕΡ ΟΥΡΟΜΠΙ (Vat еατ-).
Num. 14:18 ΠΑΙΝΙΩΤ ὉΝΑΙ ΟΤΟΓ ΝΘΜΗΙ.
Ex. 23:7 ΠΕΤΤΟΤΒΗΟΤ ΟΤΟΓ ΝΘΜΗΙ.
Deut. 28:64 ΓΑΝΚΕΝΟΤ ΠΑΓΑΚΕ ΝΕΜ ΓΑΝΝΙΝΙ.
Deut. 33:25 ΟΤΒΕΝΙΝΙ ΝΕΜ ΟΥΡΟΜΤ ΠΕ ΠΕΨΩΝΟΤΙ.
Gen. 34:7 ΠΙΝΙΩΤ ΟΤΟΓ ΠΙΛΑΡΙΝΟΤ ΟΤΟΓ ΕΑΜΕΡΖ...  
Deut. 25:15 ᾱϊνι ΝΑΛΗΘΙΝΟΝ ΝΕΜ ΝΘΜΗΙ.
Deut. 9:9:18 ΨΙΚ ΜΠΙΟΤΘΜ ΜΝΟΤ ΜΠΙΚΩ, sim. Deut. 29:5,
Ex. 34:28.

Ex. 10:10 ΟΣΠΕΤΖΩΟΣ (cf. ΟΣΕΝΑΝΟΤΨ Mt. 11:30 Oxyrhynchite: see Schenke 1996:11ff.).

Cat. 57 ...ΕΑΝΟΚ-ΟΣΝΟΤ ΟΤΟΓ ΝΥΗΡΙ ΝΝΟΤ.
Ps. 85:10 ΝΘΟΚ-ΠΙΝΙΩΤ ΟΤΟΓ ΕΠΙΡΙ ... 
AM I 164 ω ΠΙΟΖΟΤ ΟΤΟΓ ΝΑΗΤ.
Ps. 68:30 ΟΤΡΗΚΙ ΟΤΟΓ ΕΨΜΟΚΕ.
The systemic implications of the nuclearity of the determinators go deep. Just two examples: first, the Nominal Sentence, which turns out to be rather a “Pronominal Sentence”, predicating only determinator pronouns\(^5\), not even the noun syntagm. This accounts for the dramatic restrictions in the Interlocutive Pattern Rheme (see Chapter Two). Second, the existence in Coptic of a special construction predicating “adjectives” or rather quality-expressing nouns, replacing an old pattern of Egyptian (Gardiner’s “Sentence with Adjectival Predicate”\(^6\)). The determinated noun is prominent among the various Coptic answers to the Greek and Egyptian adjective (“οὐς θεός”).

Obs.

(1) The general realization of the grammatically nuclear status of the articles is very slowly gaining ground (cf. BARRI 1975:75ff.; articles nuclear in Cappadocian Modern Greek, BARRI 1977; HARRIS 1980, JACOB 1990, NOCINTINI 1996:17ff. — earliest for French: GUILLAUME 1919 defines the article simply as “quelque chose qui emploie le nom”, a brilliantly laconic characterization; Foulet as “une sort de simple signe grammatical qui annonce le nom”, but the conventional presentation (“the article an auxiliary appendage to the noun”) is still traditionalist, even in Romance, see for instance WILMET 1986a or PERROT 1994:25, FLAUX 1997, FLAUX et al. (eds.) 1997; RENZI 1989:357 “L’articolo accompagna spesso il nome”; KORZEN 1996:689: “gli articoli si aggiungono alla testa nominale come particelle di carattere morfemático” — no less than French, Italian makes impressive use of the anaphoric nuclear article (“la Simeone” — the Simeone Law [la coreferent with legge]). Coptic indicates the nuclearity of determinators most unequivocably (JERNSTEDT 1949; SHISHA-HALEVY 1986a, Chapter Five; LAYTON 1990:84ff.: the lexeme is “a completer” qualifying the determinator).

(2) POLOTSKY 1989:471f. addresses some strong critical remarks on the present writer’s statements in 1986a Chapter Five, and especially on the discussion of the familiar cases of πάντα, πάντως etc., according to Polotsky “syntaktisch bedingt”. I, too, see them as “syntaktisch”, but cannot see their being conditioned in any way. Polotsky seems to agree about the nuclearity of the article here, but (self-contradictorily, it seems) not about the partitive dependence of article and lexeme; he disagrees (471 n. 13) that πάνταθι belongs here, apparently misunderstanding my use of “compatibility”, by which I meant Hjelmslev’s special type of interdependence. Polotsky disagrees also with my suggestion that lexemes do not in Coptic have an inherent gender (the significance of the masculine pronominal anaphor to zero-determinated “feminine” lexemes is not addressed); and rejects (without arguments) my admittedly speculative suggestion that θεός of θη-πας (Luke 5:36 Palau Ribes, like the οὗ-γεν-τει-μενε construction, may be a case of hyperdetermination — specific determinator + generic zero: zero docs indeed have a “positive Zähllwert”, but that may and typically does signify the “genus” (See BROWNE

---

\(^5\) At least in Bohairic: consider the ωις θεός pattern predicating the bare lexeme in Shenoutean Sahidic, see SHISHA-HALEVY 1984a.

\(^6\) “Godly” is at least possible (and, I understand, hermeneutically acceptable) interpretation of the Coptic ΝΕΟΝΟΥΤ† πε ΠΙΚΑΞΙ Ιoh 1:1, corresponding to the Greek rhamatic zero-determinated θεός. It may well be that “the Word was God” would be rendered as ΝΑΡΕ-ΠΙΚΑΞΙ ΟΙ ΝΝΟΥ† and not by a Nominal Sentence.
1978a: 201). I must still insist that this is a probable analysis, replacing, and I feel preferable to, Polotsky's (1989:471) περίκορας "syntactically conditioned", for Polotsky = "derived from predicative deep structure". Moreover, I do not think we need a different term for the determinator in cases like περίκορα (pace Polotsky 1991:242).

3.1 Determination-sensitive slots (environments). Because of the different structures of the determinator paradigms in the individual slots, one cannot really establish a structurally sound synthetic hyper-paradigm; the familiar ternary "category", almost entirely synthetic, is valid for few environments other than the trivial word scope. It is instructive to scan some of the most important slots of the noun syntagm, examining the specific category and participation role of determination in the given environments. Many of these may (as in Givón 1978) be presented as parametrical properties (Rhematicity, Topicality etc.). The following characterization of thirteen selected slots is tentative and based on the findings in the studied corpus.

(1) INHERENT or ESSENTIAL RHEME, THEME of Nominal Sentence, FOCUS of Relative-Topic Cleft Sentence: [+/- specific, + particular, +/- quantified].

This is an especially privileged slot, not least since the tension between specificity of RHEME and THEME is in a sense copular, that is, exercises a nexal operative role, and has beside a constitutive role in the pattern signifié as identificative or descriptive. The individual patterns have their own individual specificity contours, with a particular divide between Interlocutive and Delocutive Patterns: see above, Chapter Two. See also Jernstedt 1949 [1978], Polotsky 1989.

(2) INCIDENTAL, CONTINGENT non-INHERENT RHEME marked by επ-, (οι, 1) και-, (ωκος) ε- [-specific, - particular, +/- quantified].

See above, Chapter Two; and see below.

Gen. 17:8 ειςεωματι ενωσα πνεοματι — never πνεοματι.
Gen. 28:3 εκεωςπι εξωλωσιτε νοενομος.
Gen. 34:9 στοσ μνεωσωμιε σταωσιομι.
Gen. 34:4 σι νεαΙαος νοι ενωσιμι.
Gen. 28:22 ωκος ε[πηι μενοςι] — counter-intuitively, πι- is not specific qua determinator: see below (§3.9) for the Personal-Sphere ("inalienable") Association.

Ex. 12:14 επιεωματι πνεοματι.
Ex. 21:5 νταψενηθί εν εἰοὶ νπεμές — ν- cannot in Coptic be a non-rheematic adverbial adjunct.

(3a) EXISTANT οὐσιων- [- specific, +/- particular, +/- quantified].
(3b) NON-EXISTANT μμονιω — [- specific, – particular, – quantified]: lowest determination profile.


(4a) Possessum ουσιωντα= μμοντα= [+/- specific, +/- particular, +/- quantified].

This seems to be one of the slots characterized by a maximal determination category.

(4b) Possessor [+/- specific, + particular, – quantified].

(5a) Segmentation (extraposition) — context-anchored Topic [+ specific, +/- particular, – quantified]:
Deut. 29:5 ἑνεγὼς μποσεραπας ἑνεγὼς μποσ- σιπ έβαλ.
(5b) Segmentation (extraposition) — cataphoric Focus (§2.4.7) [- specific, – particular, +/- quantified]:
Deut. 23:25 оσιά ννεσίωτι (cf. Andersson 1904:8f.).
Deut. 9:18 ωικ μπιοσωμ μωσ ηπικω.
Lev. 10:9 οσίππ ννεσίσκεπα ννεσίνζωος.
Deut. 8:13 οσιαπ ννεσίσωος άσωανάπαι νακ ...

(6) Ναηε-Theme [+/- specific, + particular, +/- quantified].

In poetic language, we find: Gen. 27:29 οτος μαροσερψωκ νακ Ναηε-γανενος οτος μαροσφωωτ νακ Ναηε-γαναρψων.

Outside the corpus we find the rare zero determination in negative environment:
Jer. 30:33 ννεψψηπι Ναηε-ρψμι/Ναηεψηπι ητεψκαψι Tattam (collated).
Jer. 28:43 ννεψτακαψ αρος Ναηε-ψηπι νρψμι Tattam (collated).
Deut. 21:5 εψέψηπι Σεψψως Ναηε-κω εβαλ νιβεν Νε- ανταλοηηηα νιβεν is probably not a case of zero determination (and quantification: “every case of…”), but of totality (“all forgiveness”) with Niben a determinator.

(7a) Object Actant (I – non-durative; unmarked) [+/- specific, +/- particular, +/- quantified].
(7b) **OBJECT ACTANT** (II — marked for durativity) [+/- specific, + particular, +/- quantified].

A status in which it is often the “case-marking” that carries the burden of specificity signalling. So in Turkish (Johansson 1977, Nilsson 1979), Amharic (Kapeliuk 1972), Modern Greek (Roussou and Tsimpli 1994). In Coptic, the n- object is apparently incompatible with extensional genericity (cf. the Non-Actual Present: above, Chapter One; Shisha-Halevy 1986a, Chapter Three.)

(8a) **AGENS ACTANT** (I — affirmative nexus) [+/- specific, +/- particular, +/- quantified]

Another environment of maximal determination.

(8b) **AGENS ACTANT** (II — negative nexus) [+/- specific, +/- particular, – quantified]

The following three terms (9a-c) of a polysyntagm paradigm constitute a classic case of a syntactical environment or frame functioning combinatorially with the determined noun syntagm, to signal a specific dependence. The divide of specific vs. non-specific nucleus, generally considered the motivating factor of Relative vs. Circumstantial Conversion (which are therefore considered non-pertinent) turns out to be more fuzzy and less sharp than it is conventionally supposed to be, and the two conversion forms are found to be rather in opposition following specific nuclei: the Circumstantial rhematic or adnexual, the Relative attributive. In fact, the attributive clause expansion is (co-)specifying, while the adnexual one is non-specifying.

(9a) **NUCLEUS OF ADNOMINAL CLAUSE (II) + Circumstantial Conversion:** rhematic (“predicative”, adnexual) expansion [+/- specific, +/- particular, +/- quantified] — a very broad determination range for the nucleus.

Exx. for the specific nucleus, including pronouns, with clear rhematic status of the Circumstantial (see Chapter Four):

---

7 Polotsky's functional "attributive" for the formal "adnominal" (1990:241ff.) obscures this fine functional shading of adnominal clauses (see here also his discussion of nai + Circumstantial, a clear adnexual construction). See Rotherenberg 1972 ("propositions relatives adjoineés").

8 The adnexual adnominal role of Circumstantial converbal forms is well established in early Egyptian (Amenemope X 12 p3-jn jw:f wbn, exactly corresponding to the Coptic "ΦΡΗ ΕΝΝΑΠΗ" construction, e.g. in 但不限 ΜΠΡΗ ΕΝΝΑΠΗ, Shenoute Leip. III 87, and its variants): Daumas 1962:30.
Deut. 22:4 ἀκυρωμαι ε-ΦΙΩ ΜΠΕΚΚΟΝ ΙΕ ΠΕΡΜΑΣΙ ΕΑΤΡΕΙ ΕΓΙΤΜΩΝ.
   Ex. 23:4 ΑΚΥΡΩΜΑΤ Ε-ΤΕΡΕ ΜΠΕΚΚΑΙΞΙ ΙΕ ΦΙΩ ΕΥΣΟ- 
   ΡΕΜ...
Lev. 14:52 ΝΕΜ-ΠΙΚΟΚΚΙΝΟΣ ΕΩΣΑΤ (ἐν τῷ κεκλωσμένῳ κοκ- 
   κίνῳ).
   Gen. 15:2 ΑΝΟΚ ΕΝΑΧΑΤ ΕΒΟΛ ΕΙΟΙ ΝΑΤΨΗΡΙ.
   Gen. 20:3 ΄ΩΙ ΤΕ ΕΨΩΠΝ ΝΕΜΟΤΡΑΙ.
Occasionally, and often in Nitrian, the difference between the Cir- 
   cumstantial and the Relative is to our sensibilities elusive; the former is 
   typical of place-and-time characterizations, as if it were a grammat- 
   icalized conjunctival conversion. Formally speaking, ερε- is doubt- 
   lessly predominant. All in all, this is still one of the riddles of Nitrian 
   Bohairic)

Deut. 14:14 ΝΑΙ ΝΕ ΝΙΤΕΒΝΩΤΟΙ ΕΡΕΤΕΝΕΟΤΟΜΟΥ (ANDER- 
   SΩΝ 1903:34f.).
Gen. 2:4 ΠΙΕΓΟΥΝ ΕΑΦΤ ΕΛΙΜΕΤΦΕ ΝΕΜΠΚΑΖΙ ΝΣΗΤΤ (B4).
   SV 27f. ΠΙΧΩΝ ΕΡΕΠΙΠΡΑΓΜΑΤΕΥΤΗΝΣ ΤΑΛΝΟΥΤ ΕΡΟΥ (VS. ΝΙΝΕΡ 
   ΕΤΓΙΔΨΨΛ).
   Cat. 112 ΠΙΧΩΝ ΔΕ-ΟΥΝ ΕΡΕΠΙΤΝΑΝΙΟΝ ΤΟΙ ΓΙΩΤΤ.
   {ΕΗ} ερε- De Vis II 76, Cat. 106, 108, 115, 134 etc., {ΕΩΙ} ερε- Cat. 94.

(9b) NUCLEUS OF ADNOMINAL CLAUSE (I) + Relative CONVERSION: at- 
   tribute expansion [+ specific, +/- particular, +/- quantified].
   The uncommon contrary exx. of low nucleus specificity are all cases 
   of non-particular (generic), non-specific reference, often in legalistic 
   “case-presenting” usage,10 supporting the opposition “Relative = at-

Num. 15:30 ορψιχθ ΕΝΑ- (= Vat). Also Lev. 5:4, cf. 5:17 
   (ορψιχθ ΕΝ ΕΝΑ-).
   Lev. 27:12 ΟΡΩΙ ΕΝΑΝΕΨ ...ΟΡΩΙ ΕΨΩΝ (= Vat) — see AN- 
   DERSSON 1903:108.
   Outside the corpus, the construction, well established, has a broader 
   range:

9 A Demotic example: t3 dnyt jw.s ph r-jej Parker, JARCE 3 (1964) 95 (A. line 6. 
   Parker emends to ηψ-jw.s).
10 A feature well attested from Old Egyptian on and apparently residual in Coptic. See 
   for Egyptian: EDL 1955/1964 §1049, DAUMAS 1962:24f., GRIFFITHS 1968, SHISHA- 
   HALEVY 1981 §2.5. A typical instance is the medical usage s nty... (Westendorf 
   Medizinische Texte 5.9ff.20).
Zach. 2:8 (B4) ἐγὼ νρωμὶ νεμεβνὴ ετεκετεσμήτ (collated).
De Vis II 108 οὐσνοφ νρωμὶ εἰςμωττ πε.
De Vis I 77 γανρωμὶ εἰςοταβ.
zero + έταφ- De Vis I 75 μὴ μμον-ρωμὶ μματ μφοοτ
ετατέρωμιο μποτμανμικι (alongside εὐσεβὴ εὐταξὶ
and, for σχιμί, εὐαρεπιγορο-νὴρ ὑ ERC TH).}
De Vis II 217 παρεενος ετακερμονακὴ ετακταεος
eφάγον...
De Vis I 100 οτταφ εηνανεφ.
De Vis II 45 μφρὴν ονταί έταφνεψει ... 
De Vis I 158 ίτε-ζήκι ίτε-ρεμαο ίτε ὧκ ίτε ρεμηζ ίτε-
γωοτ ίτε σχιμί εηναμοτ.
Cat. 175 ἦς εηληκ may be different, resuming the foregoing
πιςε εηληκ.
Also De Vis I 76, 77, 147, 201 etc.: apparently, for the Present the
construction is most common with Statives.
Is. 65:20 ηνεφωμπι ΝΔΕ-ΟΣΟΝ ΕΗΝΑΜΟΥ (Tattam, collated:
consensus).

(9c) (NUCLEUS OF ADNOMINAL CLAUSE (III): NEGATIVE ENVIRONMENT +
ΔΕ- + NEGATIVE ENVIRONMENT: the adnominal paradigm to a generic
zero-determined nucleus, in a doubly negative environment "(there is
no...) such as... [not]" — [- specific, - particular, - quantified]11.
A lowest-determination nucleus, due to the non-existence semantics
of the expression.
A sole example in the corpus is Deut. 3:4 (Vat: P has here ΔΕ)
νεμομον-βακί... ΔΕ ΜΠΕΝΖΙΤΟC.
Exx. in the Bohairic NT: Luke 8:17:25, 12:2, Mt. 10:26 ΜΜΟΝ-
πετροβε γαρ ΔΕ-ΩΝΑΣΩΡΠ ΕΒΟΛ ΑΝ ΜΜΟΝ-ΠΕΤΖΗΠ ΔΕ-ΕΕ-
ΝΑΕΜΙ ΕΡΟΨ ΑΝ. We encounter here the convergence of three
features:
(a) Expansion of zero-article, as Non-Existant.
(b) Expansion of Non-Existence or its semantic equivalent (para-
phrastic or rhetorical equivaent)12.

11 This is a striking case of "doubt regarding existence" (cf. M ETHNER 1913, on the
Latin generic pronoun used in similar configurations).
12 Cf. in early Demotic Ryl. IX 10/16 μν-μτλ=μφρΙ (ΜΝΗΣΟΨΕ) jw-βην-Ρρ c3 djt
jr.w s n.
(c) The expanding adnominal clause — as a rule negative. This is a special case of rhematic (predicative) adnexal expansion; it is a striking environment for the “syntactic neuter” gender-number fluctuation, in reference to the zero article.

In Sahidic, this is a familiar landmark of Shenoutean idiom (Shisha-Halevy 1986a:148, 213):

Amél. II 33.10f. ').'ον-σε-ώμαιρε Δε-μποτσάργον η οτυν-ρεω
ει-κοβτ Δε-μποτσάρτον.
Paris 130' 28 p. 42 ΜΝ-ΤΌΠΟΣ ΌΤΑΕ ΚΑΡ ΔΕ-ΝΚΕΝΑΝΟΕΙΝ ΔΝ.
Leip. III 215 οτ ράπ ΝΩΔΑΤ ΓΝΝΕΝΤΑΡΓΩΒ... ΝΓΗΤΟΥ... ΔΕ-
ΓΕΝΕΒΟΛ ΔΝ ΝΕ ΡΝΠΚΑΡ ΝΓΡΟΥ... οτ ΓΩΛΗ ΠΕΤΟΓΡ-ΞΩΒ... ΝΓΗΤΥ... ΔΕ ΓΕΝΕΒΟΛ ΔΝ ΓΩΤΠΕ ΝΓΡΟΥ ΝΕ.
Orientalia 44 (1975; p. 156, BL Or. 8664 f. 2 p. ΑΓ) ΝΤΟΟΟΤΝ ΔΝ ΔΕ-
ΚΝΑΣΝΟΤΡΩΜΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΓΝΩΡΑΙ ΕΠΟ ΝΝΟΕΙΚ ΕΒΙΜΕ ΜΠΕΟΙΤΟΤΩΨ
ΑΨ ΓΕΡΒΕΙΡ ΔΕ-ΜΠΟΤΕΙΡ ΝΤΟΥ ΕΤΩΨ ΑΨ ΓΕΡΩΨ
ΟΤΝΕΕΡΕ ΝΤΩΝΕ ΝΟΤΡΩΜΕ ΔΕ-ΜΠΟΤΣΩΨ ΝΤΩΨ ΝΤΟΥ.
Chass. 97. οτ ΠΕΤΟΟΟΝ ΔΕ-ΝΟΤΨ ΔΝ ΝΕ.

3.2 Six reduced determination subsystems. In the following slots, the determination paradigm is not ternary, but binary and occasionally suppressed altogether.

(a) The determination of infinitives. Generally speaking, the determinators with the infinitive are highly grammaticalized, constituting with select prepositions or with the notae relationis the grammemic frameworks of syntactical patterning into which the infinitive is integrated lexemically. It may be of interest to note that the determinators (often interpreted as operators of substantivity) do not always, or even typically substantivize the verbal noun except formally, and do not on their own concretize it; its semantic verbality remains unaffected and often operative in all its determinated forms. The determinator slot in the infinitive also allows the signalling of actants (see below for the “personal infinitive”, with agens). While final personal suffixes are unequivocally objective, personal components of the determinators are either agentive or objective: the possessive articles neutralize the first and second actants. The determinators are compatible with objective signalling; this means that, unlike the possessive suffixes with non-verbal lexemes, objective suffixes do not render the infinitive specific.

(1) The zero determinator has a different value in the pre-infinitive slot than with non-verbal lexemes (nil determination is the case of the infinitive in-conjugation: Ex. 4:9 εσε-ώμιν, Ex. 4:12 οτογ ητα-
tσαβοκ, or following the auxiliary ηα- in the Future: Ex. 4:12 άνοκ έτηλα-οτων, or in the causative infinitive or other following cases:
Ex. 7:3 εἰς ἑρπετήν μὴ ἀραβῶν ὥστος ὂν ἕνα ἑρποτάσματι 
Νادة-ναμνηίνι.
Ex. 2:4 εἰς ἑτὸς ἑτείρα περί 
Ex. 2:18 εἴθεος ἀρετενχωλημ εἰ.
Deut. 23:6 ταίε-νοστ.
Deut. 19:3 καὶ μὴ ὕπτ.
Note that in the discontinuous construction of ἕρω, ἑ- + infinitive 
has nil, not zero determination:
Deut. 18:10f. Νοτορίμι Νήστηκ εὐθρότ ἐπεροτύρρι ὶ ἑπε- 
{Name} ἑνίς ἑνοτόρωμ. Similarly in the case of Νοτορ ἑ- + in- 
finitive and other periphrastic constructions: Ex. 1:12 Νασνὸσ 
Νασημνοτ, 
Ex. 4:10 ἕναμεγο 
(2) The singular indefinite determinator with the infinitive is gram- 
maticalized, typically rhematic or thematic (including topicalization):
Lev. 20:2 ἑνοτόμος ἀποτοσθενεῖ (see Chapter Two for the 
Tautological Infinitive).
Num. 27:7 ἑνοτοτ 
Lev. 23:37 ἐν ἑτετανάμοτο 
Gen. 34:14 οὐσιπ 
Ex. 30:32 ἐφευσσίνι 
(N) _NPC 
Num. 17:25... ἔσταρεῖ 
The indefinite article is no less grammaticalized when following other 
prepositions, adverbializing the infinitive:
Ἀριμι 
Nοςιμι Gen. 46:29, 37:10; also Lev. 16:32 
(ἔθησ).
Obs.
Note ὑ- + infinitive (rhetorical, in a focalizing construction): Gen. 2:23 ὄσινι 
τε Β 4 (in our corpus a focalizing ἐτασθεῖθι ε βαλ ἐν-): see FUNK 1991:57f., 57 
97; cf. SCHENKE 1981:45f. for the comparable Oxyrhynchite ὄσι 
(ortigo. 
(3) The plural indefinite γας- is very rare with the infinitive, fully 
concretizing it:
Gen. 49:26 (in poetic language) γαςκοτ 
Nετεκτοι 
Nικότο 
Nεσγ 
Nικότο 
(4) ὑ-, The non-phoric, actualizing, notion name generic determinator 
is typical of infinitive determination. The isolated form 
Nες- serves
suppletively as its plural only in associative expansions with \( \text{n-} \) and \( \text{n} \), and is a case apart — plural only\(^{13}\).

(a) \( \text{e-n} \) + infinitive is an idiomatic concurrent of \( \text{e} \) + infinitive (which seems to be rarer in Bohairic than in Sahidic), semantically elusive but probably indicating a marked intended and desired purpose: "for the (express) purpose of" (often, perhaps mostly — but by no means always = \( \text{tō} + \) infinitive in Greek). This grammaticalized role is strikingly generic:

Ex. 16:33 \( \text{ἔκκει} \, \text{μνημεῖο} \, \text{μὴ} \, \text{ἐπάρεξ} \, \text{ἐρο} \).

\( \text{ἐπαίτιος} \) Deut. 27:26.

\( \text{ἐπασοθε} \) Deut. 17:7.

\( \text{ἐφισθαμη} \) Lev. 19:23.

\( \text{ἐπ} \) Ex. 16:8, Lev. 25:19.

\( \text{ἐπισισθαμη} \) Ex. 12:13.

\( \text{ἐπ} \) Num. 31:4:5.

\( \text{ἐφησθαμη} \) Gen. 32:8.

\( \text{ἐπωμε} \, \text{n-} \) Ex. 10:26.

\( \text{ἐφωμε} \) Ex. 17:11.

\( \text{ἐπιφωμε} \) Num. 8:24 contrasted with \( \text{ἐφωμε} \), Num. 8:22.

(b) The concretization and semantic focussing of the infinitive is signalled combinatorily, by \( \text{n-} \) with \( \text{n-} \) or \( \text{n} \). In this construction, \( \text{n-} \) (which in non-infinitival lexemes signals special "inalienable" or Personal-Sphere constituency association: see below) marks actantial, \( \text{n} \)-appurtenative dependence. The plural \( \text{n} \, \text{n-} \) is especially rare with infinitives, and, as usual, higher in individualizing-concretizing-specializing value than the singular.

Gen. 32:30 ‘\( \text{φ} \, \text{να} \, \text{μὴ} \)’ as Place Name: "the occasion of ...".

Gen. 21:16 \( \text{φ} \, \text{μοσ} \, \text{μπωφαρι} \) "the event of ...".

Num. 20:3 \( \text{πτακο} \, \text{ννε} \, \text{θανησ} \) "the occasion of ...".

Gen. 23:1 \( \text{πωνθ} \, \text{νκαρπα} \) "the length of life".

Lev. 25:26 \( \text{πω} \, \text{πνηρομπι} \) "the number".

Deut. 33:13 \( \text{νισκομ} \, \text{μπωθ} \) "the blessing" (vs. 14 \( \text{νισκομ} \, \text{ντε} \, \text{γαν} \, ...) cataphoric).

Ex. 4:25 \( \text{πεσβι} \, \text{ντεπιαλοσ} \) "the foreskin".

Lev. 18:8 \( \text{πωμπι} \, \text{ντεπειειιοσ} \, \text{μπεκιωρ} \) "the shameful parts".

Deut. 8:17 \( \text{παμαρι} \, \text{ντεπειειιοσ} \) "the grasping power".

Deut. 5:25 \( \text{νενασκι} \, \text{μπαιλοσ} \) "the speech-words".

---

\(^{13}\) Cf. Silverman 1981 for the origins of this form.
(c) πι- + infinitive: generic — concept/notion name:
Gen. 35:2 πεμτον πε.
Lev. 8:14 and passim πκω εβαλ.
Deut. 28:48 πικο νεμ πιιβι νεμ ϕβωγ ωιειον 
(d) πι/πι- infinitive: variation? some difficult cases of apparent variation:
πιφωγεν ντε- varying with πιφωγεν ντε-
Num. 4:28:33 etc.
Ex. 34:21 σεπιγιντν εμ πιως.
Deut. 28:48 πικο νεμ πιιβι νεμ ϕβωγ ωιειον— all
apparently generic.

(5) πι- + infinitive is usually cataphoric:
Num. 1:44 πιζεμπυινι εταφαια.
Ex. 3:17 πιεμκο ντεπεμξημι.
Gen. 49:26 (in poetic language) γιακμον ντεπεκιωτ νεμ-
τεκατατ νικμον ντεγακαλαμφο νενεγ νικμον ντενι-
tων μμαμμον
Gen. 49:18 πινωεμ ντεπιτε.
Gen. 49:25 πικμον ντεπει.
Num. 3:35, 4:41:45 πιζεμπυινι ντε-.
Much more rarely, anaphoric:
Gen. 34:27 νισωτεβ "the corpses", "partitive" or rather associ-
tive: "the... of slaying".

Obs.
(1) Hermeneutical syntax supplies numerous instances of anaphoric reference for πι- +
infinitive:
πιωτεμπονσει Cat. 3
πωκε δε- Cat.3:21, 155
πιωνειδει Cat. 4.
The pronominal object is non-specifying, not incompatible with the definite article: it
may even be that it conditions it, in which case the article is both anaphoric (signalling a
factive (known-as-fact) infinitive14) and cataphoric.

(6) Deictic characterization of the infinitive:
Deut. 31:26 παναχι θροισ ντεκαγωα.
Deut. 29:24 παμβον ντεπαιινιατν ιαωιτ.
Deut. 13:14 παναχι.
Gen. 42:21 πιροκαζε.

14 Cf. the definite article in such cases as "William O'Shaughnessy, responsible for
the setting up of the telegraph system in India...".
(7) Possessive Article + infinitive — a construction of syntactical importance in Late Egyptian and Demotic: πε̄q- neutralizes the fine distinctions of π̄- ... n̄-, π̄- ... n̄ε̄- and π̄ῑ ... n̄ε̄-:
(a) Valency and actance opposition indifferent or neutralized:
Deut. 10:22 πον̄αψαλ. 
Lev. 8:33 πε̄τε̄νισ̄ωκ ἔβολ.
Deut. 26:7 πε̄νε̄βιο νε̄μ πε̄νισ̄ινε̄ νε̄μ πε̄γκο̄ξ̄ε̄ς.
Lev. 9:7 πε̄κκω ἔβολ (possessive of πκκω ἔβολ — ritual name and concept, Lev. 8:14 and passim).
Num. 4:47f. πον̄ζε̄μπ̄ψινε̄, πον̄ζε̄μπ̄ψινε̄. 
Lev. 25:26 πε̄ψ̄ ἔβολ. 
(b) Actantial status — as agens or object actant — resolved by subsequent resumption in a Relative construction:
Ex. 16:8 πε̄τε̄νε̄χρ̄ε̄μ̄π̄ Γ̄ν̄ νων̄τ̄ε̄ν̄ ετε̄τε̄νε̄χρ̄ε̄μ̄π̄ μμο̄ν̄. 
Deut. 28:57 πε̄κκμαρ ν̄γ̄ν̄τ̄ νε̄μ πε̄γκο̄ξ̄ε̄ς ετε̄νε̄κ̄ας̄ῑ εγ̄̄ζ̄̄ε̄ς̄κο̄ μμο̄ν̄ 
Deut. 28:67 ν̄ῑατ̄ ντε̄νε̄κ̄βαλ ν̄η ετε̄κ̄ασ̄τ̄ ερ̄π̄ωγ̄. 
Lev. 25:50:51 πε̄τ̄θηῑκ̄ ἔβολ one pronoun agentive, the other objective (diachronically "correct"). Contrast πε̄ψ̄ ἔβολ Lev. 25:27 (the pronoun objective) and π̄ῑ ἔβολ n̄τ̄ē- Lev. 25:25.

(b) The determination of the Existent/Non-existant.
(1) The Existential Statement, non-verbal in Coptic (unlike pre-Coptic Egyptian) and not a nexeal or predicative clause pattern, has been discussed in Chapter Two above. The Existential Statement introduces nominal entities into discourse, actualizing them, and is logically presupposed, not only by specificity or definiteness (cf. VERNUS 1985) but by indefiniteness, indeed by any particularity of nominal elements. But οτο̄ν- clauses state the existence of nouns and noun equivalents that are already actualized; in our Bohairic corpus, the only constraint is on the existant’s specificity, for it may be particular or quantified (see §3.1 above, under 3a). However, when the Existent is qualified in any way, or the Statement of Existence is located — as it most often is — the overall combinatory specificity grade is necessarily higher, with a corresponding heightened thematicity of the Existential Statements (and in it the existant) within the broader textual scope. The formal locator μματ̄ does not occur with Existential Statements, but is essential to existential-possess possession verboids. Note the following representative exx., of variously determinated Existants, in unlocated, located and qualified-Existent Existential Statements:
CHAPTER THREE

Gen. 45:11 ὄσον-κε-Ἔ ἢρμπη.
Lev. 25:26 εὑὰν δὲ εὐοῦο-ὀριαὶ ἡμον-πέταξϊν ἦρον.
Ex. 2:1 νεοτὸν-οὐαι δὲ εὐολ θεντ琲αλ ἥλτην.
Deut. 25:11 εὑὰν δὲ εὐοῦο-ρωμὶ ὶ εὐῳὸντ εὐοὶν.
Gen. 38:27 νεοτὸν-καὶερετ ἥλεκενεδι πε.
Gen. 39:2 νεοτὸν-οὐρωμὶ πε εὐηματ—not located.
Gen. 24:23 άν-νεοτὸν-τοπὸς δατενπει⊊τ έερεκμτὸν ἡμον.
Gen. 24:25 νεοτὸν-τοξ ἰμ ἐκοτβεν έαρον ἐνασσωσ
ντὸν νεοτὸν-τοπὸς έερεκμτὸν ἡμοκ.
Gen. 24:22 γάλλεων ἡμοσὶν εὐοῦο-οτκὶ ἰς ἐπιοῦα
πιοῦα ἡμοὶ.
Gen. 18:24 εὑὰν εὐοῦο-.FromSeconds ἰς ἰγτβακι.

• Note: zero Existant?
Perhaps also Gen. 40:17 νεοτὸν ἡντητ πε εὐολ θενν
τροπ εὐαρεποττσρ θαραω ντομοτ
(2) ἡμον-, Affirmation of Non-Existence. Here we find a
different and the very lowest determination profile, with no specificity, particular-
ity or quantification (κε-, a quantifier following zero determinator, is an
exception). Statements of absolute, i.e., unlocated, Non-Existence are
more common than Statements of absolute Existence
Num. 21:5 ἡμον-ωικ ὁταε ἡμοτ.
Num. 20:5 ἡμον-μωσ εκω.
Gen. 38:21 ἡμον-πορνη ἡπαίλα.
Gen. 39:9 ἡμον-κλι εὐφτοὶ εροι γμπεψη ὁταε ἡμον-

Deut. 32:12 ἡμον-κενοτ ἰς ἥμεμο ντομοτ πε.
Ex. 9:14 ἡμον-κενοται ἡπαρτ ἱδαντκαϊ τηρη sim.
Deut. 4:35.
Num. 20:5 ἡμον-κεντε ἡντητ ὁταε άλοι ὁταε ἐρμα
ὁταε ἡμον-μωσ εκω.

ἡμον-ὑκομ Gen. 43:32, 44:22, 19:19 etc.
Deut. 8:15 ἡμον-μωσ ἡματ sim. Num. 20:5.
Num. 23:22 ἡμον-σιψμ γαρ θενικωβ ὁταε ἰγνην
ἡπεικα.
Deut. 32:28 ἡμον-ἐπικτῆμη νητῆτοτ.
Lev. 13:31 ἡμον-και ναοταν μφηρῳ νητῆτ.
Ex. 12:30 ἡμον-ἱ γαρ πε μπεοτον-መצ νητῆτ.
Special to μμον-, affirming Non-Existence and mostly Circumstantial, are the substantival Relative forms πετ- (Stative Converbs) and ἕν ἐτ- (dynamic converbs) as Existant. The determination grading of these forms is discussed below: these are equivalents of non-specific, non-particular, non-quantified nomina agentis:

Gen. 41:8 νεμμόν-ἡ ἐτταμὸν μῆκαρω ερος πε.
Lev. 25:26 εὐώπιν ἀδε εὐτόν-ὁις μμον-πεταηήα ἵσαρον.
Lev. 26:17 ...μμον-πετσοδί νσαήνον sim. Lev. 26:36f.

(3) The location of the Existential Statement is grammaticalized into a regular verb of possession, with the location expressing the possessor (οτόντε- / οτόντα-, discussed and illustrated below); or, for a special lexical list of possessa and a correlated limited list of formalized or semi-formalized prepositions to introduce and mark the possessor, the location expressing the marked association of “inalienable” distinctive and definitive part to its enframing “whole” — predicative Personal-Sphere Constituenance Association (§3.9), opposed to the unmarked οτόντα=/μμοντα= possessive verbs:

οτον-
κεταλ ευτον-ῥβομ μμον Gen. 41:38, Ex. 4:13 etc.
Deut. 14:9:10 ...ετεστον-τενγ μμωσ sim. Lev. 11:9f.:12.
Deut. 1:15 γαρσωμι νκαβε ευτον-επικτομη μμωσ.
Deut. 29:18 μητι οτον-νοτνι αενεθνω.
Lev. 22:21 οτον-αενι νςθοπ — contrast the non-grammaticalized preposition in Num. 5:2 οτον νιβεν ετεστον-αενι ειωτη.

Lev. 11:21 ...ετεστον-χβι μμωσ.
Lev. 11:23 ...ετεστον-χτο μητα ερποω.


μμον- is much rarer in this construction.

Deut. 32:20f. μμον-κατμ μμον ... μμον-νας τι μμον.

See §3.9 for a discussion of Personal-Sphere Constituenance Association.

(4) The dependence between οτον-/μμον- and the (Non-)Existant is, I believe, not nexal: like the Presentative Statements (Chapter Two), which have marked affinities with the Existential Statements, the latter
is a "pre-predication" clause, not a predication. However, the Existant is often seen to be focussed by οὐσίων- or μμον-, which would prima facie seem to conflict with the thematic status of the Existential Statement when it is followed by adverbial locations of existence which seem to be thematic in the broader information structure, and especially when followed by the verbal commutables of the adverbial locations, the dynamic and Stative Converbs, which are always thematic. The solution of this conundrum may lie in the very non-specificity of the Existent, which makes for a special, cataphoric type of thematicity, one that is compatible with Focus (paradoxically, the verbal Rhemes attested are all almost formal, of lexically thematic or less informative verbs):

οὐσίων-
Gen. 40:9:10 νεόουσίων-οτιβ ιλαοίι χν μαμβον πε.
Gen. 31:14 μντι άν ούσιο-κέτοι εφαν ταν ίε κεκαλ
πονομια.
Num. 13:18f. άν-ούσιο-κοβ† κω† ερωσ.
Ex. 10:7 ούσιο-σρον λαωπι.
Ex. 10:10 ούσιο-οπετρωσ χε Σκαωτεν.

μμον-
Gen. 47:4 μμον-μαμμονι γαρ ϊοπ.
Gen. 20:9 οτρωβ μμον-γλι νααις.
Lev. 25:31 άν ετεμμον-κοβτ θακθιοστ ερωσ.
Gen. 16:16 ιπον μμον-άρικι ήι εροκ σιμ. Num. 35:27.
Gen. 23:6 μμον-γλι μμον-ταγνο.

Obs.
(1) Polotsky explicitly, even emphatically considered οὐσίων/-μμον- to be predicative, even if not verbal: 1960 §33 "existence and non-existence are predicated by οὐσίων 'there is' and (μ)μον 'there is not'...the predicates of existence and non-existence"...§34 “That οὐσίων and μμον can be self-sufficient predicates, results from their being intransitive...”, §34 Obs. 2 “From the point of view of Coptic they can only be described as predicative expressions of existence and non-existence”. He does not discuss or adduce any arguments in support of this view. As a matter of fact, this — I feel an ethnocentric and logic-derived perspective — is the general view or at least reference to existentials (cf. also Martin 1993).

(2) See Shisha-Halevy 1984b on Existence Statements in NT Sahidic. Comparison of Sah. and Boh. (NT) shows that Boh. shies away from the quantified Non-Existant (consider Gal. 1:7 Boh. κεσται πε for Sah. μν-κεστα, also John 11:9, Acts 27:22:34). Bohairic also seems to avoid cases of οὐσίων- + zero determination in conversion): cf. Polotsky 1960:§35 + obs. 1, 3. (Polotsky does not mention ναηε-ουσίων- and similar forms, which are typically Nitrian, but occur in the NT and even some OT corpuses).
(3) On ṣw-u3- - cf. Quecke 1985:263f. Both Existence and Non-Existence with the Relative Existant have early pre-Coptic precursors. Cf. the generic Existant in LE mn-p3-nity- (by “morphologically definite”, he must mean “formally”; not “subject”, pace Vernus 1985:155), and Demotic mn-lnw p3-nity-, familiar from gnomic didactic literature (P. Insinger) and well attested elsewhere (note the plural substantivized relative in mn-n3-nity-ph n-di-f “There are no things that reached...”, Zauzich, Papyri aus Elephantine [1978] P.15519 line 9f.).

(4) m3on-n3eqhu Job 2:3 is, I believe, a strong argument for the non-specificity of ūq-wq and n3eq- (below, §3.5.3). De Vis Ll 212 m3on e3pe- is remarkable: a “that”-form Existant.


(5) ṣw3ont(ə)b / m3on3nt(ə)b. The possession verboid locates existence or non-existence with the possessor, by means of the grammaticalized preposition n3tə-/n3tə=, neutralizing appurtenance, belonging and possession. The possessum is presented, not as Existant, but as (object) actant.

• The possessum determination in the corpus is [- specific] but [± particular] and [± quantified], which interestingly concords with the existant status of the possessum. On the other hand, the possessor is, in the corpus, always specific, and almost exclusively pronominal (or Proper Name, which shares many pronominal properties).

• Two prosodically different allomorphs are encountered:

A “full” form (swn/m3ontə=, swn/m3on3ntə=) which is prosodically unmarked (“absolute”), occurring with indefinite and number-name possessa, introduced and marked as possessed object by n-;

A reduced marked form (swn/m3on3ntə=, realized before the pronominal constituents as -tn-, -teq-, -tek-, -ten-3n-) that is prosodically linked to an immediately following possessum (“construct”) — occurring with a zero-article possessum (including n3n3en nıb3en and “two”, which are constructed as zero- with postpositive “ብ”), as well as with zero possessum.

For a nominal possessor, the pre-nominal form is swn3nte- (in which case, the “two” possessum is constructed as non-zero, introduced by n-).

Interestingly, we find in the corpus several instances of swn-nte- and m3on-nte-, i.e. a form indicative of an incomplete fusion of the original constituents of the verboid, and incidentally also of their semantic autonomy. It may well be a form distinctive of the written idiom.

The formal locator m3nx= is usual, but not conditioned, with either of the two verboids. It seems excluded by a non-formal adverbial. Its place-
ment is enclitic: either following the *possessum* in the construct construction, or following the verboid and preceding the verboid in the n-mediated construction. It cannot be argued that *Mess* is a discontinuous part of the existence component of *ont*-, since it does not occur with Existence or Non-Existence Statements: this is frankly perplexing.

Non-possessive *nte*- is but rarely attested:

Deut. 21:18 ἐγώπι δὲ ἔοςοντοσηψρεν τεοται ἐγοὶ νατιω-τεμ ότοσ νρεπψζην (Greek ἐὰν δὲ τινι ἦν υιός ἄπειθης) — generic, case-raising, in this passage the possession or possessedness has little informational weight, indeed is thematic: “should a man’s son be disobedient…”.

Yet for the Relative, in the case of antecedent = *possessum*, the *ont* (not *monont*) verboid is replaced by an allotactic construction — no existence, *nte*- rhematic. Bohairic avoids thus wholly the delocutive anaphoric pronominal *possessum* (“whom... has/have”), so familiar in Sahidic, and the special “Dependent Pronoun” objective pronominal paradigm (Layton 1999, 2004 §88). This is a conservative feature in the predication of possession, which characterizes *ont* here as an *outil grammatical*.

Gen. 39:4 ἡβρ βιεν ενεντακ.
Gen. 45:10 ἐνεντακ.
Gen. 46:32 ἡ ενεντωτ.
Gen. 30:30 ἡ θρόσ εναντακ.
Deut. 19:15 τεκωρπ ή ενεντακ.

Contrast Bohairic and Sahidic in cases such as

1 John 4:16 Ἰαγον ύενοντας-πνοςε νηθν “the love God has in us”, corresponding to Bohairic Ἰαγον ύενθ *nte* ἀ ενςθεν, illustrating the role of adnominal *nte*-, further grammaticalized into a *nota relationis* introducing thepossessor.

Job 2:4 ἰκ ἃ μεν ενεντας- ἢ μπρωμε has both pronominal and nominal possessors, the latter marked by the preposition ἰ.-

*nte*- occurs also adnominally, following low- and high-specificity nuclei:

Deut. 15:7 ὁτι *nte*νεκβακι.
Lev. 11:32 ὁται *nte*αι.
Gen. 43:34 ἰτοι θρόσ *nte*ωσ “all their lots” (lit. “all-lots of theirs”.

And, more generally, as an associative-appurtenative *nota relationis* : see below.
• Note:

(1) Infinitive as possessum (cf. Shisha-Halevy 1989b:31ff. for the Demotic correspondent of this periphrastic modal form):

Gen. 18:31 οὐσονθ᾿ι εκαζὶ "I must needs speak".

(2) Probable instances of zero possessum (cf. the zero Existant in Lev. 20:13:16:27).

Deut. 25:5 μμοντεξ μματ (note the proclitic allomorph!)

Representative examples:

Num. 31:4 οὐσοντων-τεβνη μματ.


Gen. 44:20 answered by: οσονταν νοτζελαο νιοτ μματ.

Deut. 3:19 οσοντατεν μματ νοτμνω ντεβνη.

Deut. 4:7 ...ετεοσονταξ μματ νοτνοοντοξ.

Deut. 4:8 ...ετεοσονταξ νηανμεθμη.

Ex. 33:12 οσοντακ νοτζιμοτ ναγραι.

Ex. 32:24 νιμ ετεοσοντεξ-νοτβ μματ.

Gen. 19:8 οσοντξ-ωεξι β μματ (vs. Gen. 29:16 νεοσον-ντελαιατ νωεξι β μματ πε and Deut. 19:15 τεκωεξι β ετεξ-

τακ).

Gen. 19:12 οσοντακ νοτζια μπαίμα.

Ex. 2:16 νεοσονταξ η-ζη νωεξι μματ.

Gen. 33:11 οσοντξ-νξαε νιβεν.


Num. 27:8 circ. μμοντεξ-ωηρι νγωοτ μματ.

Deut. 25:5 μμοντεξ-ξροξ μματ.

Num. 5:8 ευσων δε μμοντε-πιρωμι ναακιζηθ μματ εψτε ε† is remarkable, for the rare compatibility of η- with zero determination of the possessum, and the apparently different syntax of the nominal possessor.

Difficult is

Gen. 33:9 οσοντξ-οσμνω μματ - a rare case of non-zero determination with the proclitic allomorph (but οσμνω "much, a lot” may not really be a case of non-zero, bare or zero μμω not being admissible).

(c) Presentative clauses introduced by (γχππε) τιε are to a considerable extent complementary to Existentials, also as regards determina-
tion. In their minimal construction, their presented actant ("Presentate") is specific only:

Ex. 24:8 ἔγινε εἰς πίνακα.
Gen. 30:3 ἔγινε εἰς ταβωκά βαλαά.
Gen. 31:48 ἔγινε εἰς πάταλ νεμ ταίτιαν.
When the Presentative presents a clause Theme, the latter is specific:
Gen. 16:6 εἰς ταβωκά χή δεννεδία.

Otherwise, they contract topical constructions, usually with high-to-highest specificity, rarely with particular-indefinites, see discussion and illustration above (2.0.3) — always to the exclusion of zero and generics.

(d) Determination in inherent and non-inherent rhematic status. The association of rhematic (predicative) functions with non-specific indefiniteness and zero determination is as commonplace as that of specificity with thematicity and topicality. Still, it is not absolute and certainly not simple, and therefore calls for some consideration. Rhematic environments were examined below, in Chapter Two: I will here dwell only on some aspects of determination.

(1) The Nominal Sentence. An imbalance of specificity is clearly operative in establishing the nexus (see Chapter Two for Rheme-determination details). We must here distinguish between the two patterns groups — the great Delocutive-Theme set, and the much smaller, but very intriguing, Interlocutive pattern. Zero determination is excluded from the Rheme in the Delocutive set; this excludes the diffuse, extensive, non-particular, generic Rheme (but still allows for other subtypes of genericity, see below). The indefinite Rheme is predominant in the entire Delocutive pattern set; the high-specificity demonstrative (with possessives and personal pronouns) is second in frequency. More than in any other pattern, the rhematic indefinite determinator acts in the delocutive as "adjectival matrix" or adjectival deriving morph (semantically adjectival), with the expanding lexeme its lexical base:

Deut. 9:8 γὰρ βενετζίν έπε "Sie sind eisern".

Num. 13:18:20 οὐ/γάναγω νηθνπ έπε — the indefinite determinator does not determinate αδω, but [αδω νηθνπ] as a whole.

Another point of interest in this pattern set, in the context of the said imbalance or asymmetry of specificity, or inequispecificity, concerns the extreme rareness of {πη-} - determined Rhemes, while demonstratives are relatively common (even the unusual non-phoric {η-} is here better
attested than \{πι-\}). In fact, the phoric \{πε\} has a textual representing specificity that is higher than the deictic one. This imbalance, which is so essential for the n naval dependent that it may be regarded as copular, obtains also between Topic and Rheme.

The Interlocutive-Theme pattern, distinct in all the possible distinctive traits of a pattern, is special also in its Rheme determination. Here it is the “notion name” Proper-Name-forming, very-high-specificity zero determination that is excluded, together with the high-specificity demonstrative and personal pronouns — all to maintain the same copular inequispecificity, for the \{ἀνωκ-\} interlocutive paradigm is as specific as a proper name, as the Stoic grammarians knew (see SHISHA-HALEVY 1989a: 29ff., 44ff., 89ff., 105 on the notion-name zero and the Interlocutive NS Rheme, also POLOTSKY 1987:24, FUNK 1991 on the latter.)

(2) Non-inherent nominal-Rheme-introducing \(\eta\) + zero/indefinite; \(\epsilon\) + indefinite: Here the generic zero is opposed to the equally non-specific and generic (non-particular, albeit quantified: see below) \(\sigma\) -, the instansial metaphor of generics, which is more concrete (sometimes even more specialized, specified and limited: consider Deut. 22:21 quoted below), but no more particular: “any [single or several] specimen(s) of the kind representing the whole kind”: “as / in the capacity or form of a-”. This opposition is not triggered by any feature in the Greek Vorlage, and in fact does not exist in the Greek: yet another sophistication of the Coptic over its original.

This paradigm occurs even in the third actantial slot (“predicative object actant”):

Deut. 32:14 ἄρ ο ὑπ ηράρχη.

Ex. 7:1 Νίτηικ ηνοτάρ τι μφαραάω οτος Αρων πέκ-

Gen. 14:14 Ατέλλωτ πέκκ σπλαχνικό ν αίκμαλωτος — note here the striking “adverbial Rheme” role.

Deut. 26:19 μφρωτ ι ἑταρκίκ ἄνομακτος.

Num. 22:18 ... λί ἡ ν κοτακι ε ν ωτ.

Ex. 6:5 Φή ετενιπρέμνχιμι ιρ ι Μ κ οτ ι Μ β ι η κτ ι Τ ο γ.

as against

Deut. 28:9 ε βετοντυκ ην τ ελατος ε βοτ.

Lev. 19:32 των Μαξων ντοπρέμμχιμ.

Gen. 22:2 Ανίτηι ην κατ ντοσιλ.

Gen. 23:9 Μαρεβττιι ην Ν τ ή φ ο.

Ex. 29:2 Εκεθαθιωτ ην τ τ έλ η ν τ ε κ μ ε αλίων — οτ- 100

marks the noun as non-adverbial, but predicative and actantial.
Gen. 22:13 ἐφραὶ εὐρήν ἔργαλα.
Gen. 28:22 παῖσιν εὐερέταρα ἐρατή Ννοῦταν.
Gen. 44:33 ἔναϊ ὶ ἱ αρωκ νοσάλοι.
Deut. 22:21 εὐρήνι ἱπεῖσίν Ννοῦτι ἰπορᾶν.

But most often, and typically, in the case of lexically thematic verbs, like οἱ and ἐμπὶ. Here too the rhematic complement seems to enter into the valency matrix, or a valency matrix, as is indicated by the common co-presence of yet another actant, namely νας:

Lev. 26:12 εἰς εἰς Ννοῦτ ὠρῳ ... ἐπετενεφθεὶν nḥi nοσάλος.

Ex. 7:1 ἐπὶ πε ῧαντικ Ννοῦτ ἐφραὶ ωτοὶ αἰρών εὐε-

ζε ὠμὶ νὰκ νοσαλεῖν (Vat ἰπορᾶν). Νοσάλος.

Deut. 29:12 εἰς ἱπεῖσίν νὰ npj νοσαλοῖ ὠρῳ νεοὶ εὐεφθεὶ

nāk Ννοῦτ.

— Ννοῦτ in these passages is hardly generic, nor can it be instantiational:

Gen. 17:7 εὐφθεὶν νὰκ Ννοῦτ.

Deut. 26:18 ... ἐμπὸι νὰ npj νοσαλοῖ ἐφοινἐ σιμ. 7:6, 14:2.

26:19 Deut.

Gen. 44:10 ... ἐμπὸι nḥi nοσάλοι.

Lev. 16:29 εὐφθεὶ Ννοῦτ ὠτοὶ νοτίνομιομοὶ νενεγ (the

modal alterant of ἰποῖ. 34 ἰ αι οτίνομιομοὶ νενεγ ὠτοὶ νε).

Ex. 30:32 εὐεφθεὶς νοτίτοτοῦ.

Ex. 14:22 βασκερ ὄτοι νοσάλοτα άοτινάμ ῖεν να-

κασὶ μμως.

Gen. 29:24 ὀλλα βαν δὲ ἔν τρελα θεῖβκι ναϊα οοσβκι

nac.

The distinctive role of ε- (always with οῦ- or γαν-), while well es-

established historically, is elusive. For one thing, the verb lexeme reper-

tory is here more restricted than in the case of ν-; plural cases are truly

quantifying; the nominal Rheme is often expanded and qualified; narrat-

ive, actual-history and prospective (promised) sequences and scenarios

are typical; ἐος-/γαν- expresses a willed, intended, final goal and

product. In general, and in impressionistic terms, this construction is

considerably more concrete and focussed, even more specific than the
diffuse, abstract, extremely generic, non-specific ν- + zero and even ν-

οῦ-. Observe that here is once again a subtle distinction introduced by

the exigencies of the Coptic system, with no correlation to any single

feature in the Greek (or Hebrew) texts;

Gen. 24:67 άκ ἐμπὶ νάμ ενεγκώμι.

Gen. 34:9 άτοι σατοῖος νετενσῆπι επανζώμι.
Gen. 34:4 ἓν ηταίρον νηὶ ἐοςχίμι.
Deut. 21:11 ἰτεκσίτε πακ ἐοςχίμι.
Gen. 38:14 μπερηθήνα ταξ ἐοςχίμι sim. (affirmative) Gen. 16:3.
Gen. 28:9 ᾿αχαὶ μμαιλεθε ἐοςχίμι (contrasted with non-narrative, non-factive Deut. 24:4 εὐστατικά ἀπὸ ἁμένι, corresponding in both instances to the Greek γυναῖκα).
Gen. 22:3 αὐθεσείρου ἐνοχὼν.
Other narrative or scenario cases: Gen. 20:12, 29:24, 38:14 (neg.), Deut. 21:11, 25:5.
Gen. 24:60 ὑψίπη εἰς τιμία.
Gen. 28:3 εἰκεσεύπη εἰς τιμίαν τόκτο τιμία.
Ex. 22:30 ερετεσεύπη νηὶ εἰς τιμίαν εἰς τιμίαν.
Gen. 28:22 ... ὑψίπη ε[πιὶ μμῶν] - a remarkably specific (even particular?) instance.
Gen. 17:6 άιξαὶ νιῷτ οὐτμνιῦ τιμίαν ... εἰξακ εἰς τιμίαν.
Gen. 9:3 εἰκεσεύπη μνότεν εἰς τιμία.
Gen. 9:13 εἰκεσεύπη εἰς τιμία.
Ex. 12:14 εἰκεσεύπη νομεθείμερι.
Gen. 21:30 άιξα ντοσεύπη νηὶ εἰς τιμίανερα sim. Gen. 31:44.
Also Gen. 12:2, 21:13, 46:3, 47:4, Ex. 32:10.

Obs.
(1) In Gen. 34:22 εὐχετε εὐστατικά οὐτμνιῦ τιμία “a single people” we are, I believe, still in the generic range: ἐοςτατικά is not necessarily more concrete than the “exemplary” οὐτμνιῦ. See also Gen. 11:1.
(2) In Deut. 21:15 αὐθεσείρου εἰς τιμίαν ταξ ἐοςτατικά we have a nice instance of a ν- homonym: this is the possessive ὑψίπη ἀπὸ τιμία.
(3) Mt. 5:37 καὶ πεταντείκα μὲν ἡμοῖον ἡμοῖον has οὐ- substantivizing the whole “yes-no” phrase in a non-specific rather than indefinite grading, which cannot in this case be zero (so also II Cor.1:18, against the specific πι- in II Cor. 1:17).

The copular auxiliary Stative Converb -οὶ combines in the Present tense with ν- for the incidental or contingent predication of nouns in the analytic version of Gardiner’s familiar “m of predication” pattern of Egyptian (see above, Chapter Two). Here the occurrence of rhematic οὐ- is extremely uncommon:

Ex. 19:11 νακοὶ νοτίωντοι νοτίωτ νεμ οτιμίωνοτ οτίωτ — not the indefinite article.
However, the non-durative or unmarked alternant of -οι ον-, namely επ-, does combine frequently with concretizing / individualizing ος- and γαν-: a non-specific, quantified, particular Rheme:

Ex. 7:12 ἄσερ-γαναρᾶκων.
— οὐσαρᾶκων Ex. 7:9:10.
— οὐσογ Ex. 7:15.
επ-οὐλαος Deut. 4:20.
Or with an anaphoric “substitute” ος- (“one”):
Gen. 15:1 πεκβεκε εεεερ-οσνιωτ.
(3) The unique Gen. 5:2 ἄγεμιοοτ οτζοοτ ημ οτζιμι (= Vat) has a rhematic “Third Actant” in an instantial generic determination and no segmental mark of rhematicity.

(e) Theme determination following ἕξε-. While the actant-Theme slot following the Conjugation Bases allows for maximal determination, ἕξε- introducing the postpositive Theme coreferent with the grammatic pronominal one in the Conjugation form never introduces zero determination, while both specific and non-specific (indefinite) nouns and pronouns occur (see above).

(f) Theme-agens determination following a negative conjugation base or in negative environment - the indefinite determinator is excluded, with the zero generic overruling:

Deut. 22:5 ηνεγκωντι ἔκτολοι ηνζιμι γιωττι.
Deut. 3:3 σατέσετεμ ἄροξ ηνταφ ωστι.

3.3 The zero article. Zero article or articlelessness?

This feature and issue, infinitely fascinating, involves several difficult and theoretically problematic notions. First, the zero element in general, and the zero article in particular, which is among the most useful applications of the structural principle (“significant absence”): zero presupposes the presence of non-zero in-paradigm. But since a paradigm is absolutely, constantly and dynamically dependent on, specific to and distinctive of its environment, it ensues that there are different-value zeroes. Another question, which must be posed but cannot be answered in the present context, concerns the nature of a zero significant and implication its special form may have for its sign. The subtle interplay and interaction of lexicon (e.g. prepositional lexical subsystems) and determi-
nation acquires in the case of zero a special significance.\textsuperscript{15} Zero appears to be the only determination signifiant that is primarily, if not only generic (below), in the sophisticated double — and surprisingly not contradictory — sense of abstract-diffuse-extensional and notion/genus name: at once negating all characterization, lowest of all specification grading, and yet as high-specificity as a Proper Name.

Obs.
(1) Apart from the Nominal Sentence, H.J. Polotsky paid little attention to noun syntax until his 1989 and 1991 articles — indeed his very last ones to be published before his death. In his structuralist years, around his \textit{annus mirabilis} of 1960, his writing and especially teaching explicitly included the zero notion and the zero article or Nullartikel (cf. 1960:411). But in his late writings — 1987/1990, 1989, 1991, simultaneously with his embracing of a transformationalist and even “deep structure” model, abandoning the structuralist one, he slid back to vague “Artikellos[igkeit]”, “indeterminiert”, or “bare substantive” even in clear cases of structural zero (e.g. 1987:24, 1990:219, 241ff.). Polotsky’s late total rejection of zero element, implied in the vituperative (1989:464 n. 2) “In Bezug auf das nackte Substantiv von “Nullartikel” oder gar “zero-determined” zu reden ist um nichts besser als wenn man das nackte \textit{cωτύμ} als “Nulltempus” oder “zero-conjugated verb” bezeichnen wollte”. Now the “bareness”of \textit{cωτύμ} in \textit{nexus} — or better as governed by the conjugation bases - is indeed very different from the absence of an article in paradigm with πι- and οσ-, which is a real case of zero determination; “zero tense” has nothing to do with either. “Artikellos” is of course the common judgement (or rather evasion of judgement).
(2) For some general and special treatments of zero determination, see Jespersen 1949 (1961):449ff., Yotsukura 1970:68 (English), Guillaume 1919; Anscombe 1986a, b, generally on zero determination and articlelessness esp. in French, semantic functions and interface with the verb (imparfait).
Flaux 1997 (French again; 54ff. on the interaction of negation and determination). “No phonetic realization of the presence of the article” (Korzen 1996, on Italian: 694). “Senza determinante” (ibid. 139ff., 693, but usually coded as ‘SNÖ’): is structurally unclear and under-resolved.
(3) Borghouts 1980:78 n.59 comments on “overdetermined” and “underdetermined” nouns sharing the property of being highly specific and unique (in a positive or respectively negative way).

As an introduction, some representative cases of relatively straightforward zero article in its distinctive slots may give an idea of its broad distribution in Coptic:

Deut. 32:39 \textit{m\textit{m}on-ke\textit{tai}}.
Num. 32:4 \textit{ow\textit{onta}-\textit{t}ebnh \textit{mm\textit{at}}.}
Deut. 24:20 \textit{c\textit{ek}-\textit{\textit{awit}}: compound verb}\textsuperscript{16}.

\textsuperscript{15} Consider for instance the near-complementary distribution of French \textit{en} and \textit{dans}, or English \textit{by} (as in “by car”) and \textit{in}.
\textsuperscript{16} Cf. “None of my stories really happened, of course...I’m not writing autobiogra-
Gen. 42:16 ἀε-μεθομί: not compound?
Deut. 11:11 ἐγε-μωσ — famously constituting an “exception” to the Stern-Jernstedt Rule. In fact, probably an instance of the Non-Actual (Generic) Present.
Gen. 18:11:13 ἀθερπέλλο: ερ- auxiliary verb (Chapter Two)\textsuperscript{17}.
Ex. 16:20 ἀθεργεντ.
Deut. 10:6 ἀθεροτείμ.  
Ex. 4:27 ἀκτύθη ἐρωκ.  
Deut. 32:6 οὐλαοκ νοωξ οτοι οὐκαβε ἀν.
Deut. 2:28 ἐκεντηπε/μωσ νηι ἐβολ ἀγατ.
Deut. 19:3 μα μηὐτ.
Num. 5:20 οὐσγιμε ἀγατ.
Num. 1:44 οὐσρωμί καταφυλ.
Num. 14:18 πνη περσων νητ ἰαπίνιωτηannels...
Num. 12:7 νρο οὐβερο.
Ex. 19:13 εἰς ἐνηρμ.  
Num. 31:18 μποστοκενμμπί ογωστ.

3.3.1 The following issues are distinctive and salient in the syntagmatic and paradigmatic environments of zero determination:

(a) The cohesion to zero (see Chapter Four) is typically gender/number-neutral.

Num. 6:7 ἦρεχ ἔβεν εαυμοε (= Vat).
Num. 7:71 ἔν-γεβεν εαυεσροσεμπι (Vat εαφ-).\textsuperscript{18}
Gen. 6:17 ταπξ ἔβεν ετεοτον-πνα νωνξ λεητη.
Gen. 31:10 ατάν νκερμι ετνοξε.
Gen. 43:31f. (καμικ εισπι) ἄρωξ δαρω μματατ οτοξ ἄρωξ δαρω μματατ οτοξ δαρω μματατ οτοξ δαρω μματατ οτοξ δαρω μματατ οτοξ δαρω μματατ οτοξ δαρω μματατ.
Ex. 15:22 ματζεμμωσ άν οε εκω.
Deut. 9:9:18 οικ μποστωμ μωσ οπικω.
NB: Ex. 12:16 ἕβω ἐβεν ... ονετενατος: not zero determined: “all works”, with ἐβεν determinant, not quantifier.
NB: Num. 8:26 ἕβω ννεοεπεγωβ — a nice illustration of the difference between the ερ- homonyms: here we apparently have the derived ερεγωβ “work”, not the compound ἕβω ἕγωβ “do a job”.

\textsuperscript{17} See above, and Chapter Two.
(b) Different-value zeroes. The signifié of zero determination. In Bo-
hairic, zero determination seems to be distributionally slightly less im-
portant than in Sahidic: the respective systèmes des valeurs are different.
There is virtually no difference in Coptic between “SNØ sgl” and
“SNØ pl.” (to use the codes of Korzen 1996) with the “zero plural” a
higher concretization grade, since we have quantification as an added
factor. Zero is found — according to its slot — opposed to ος- to {πι-}
and{πι-, to non-zero as a composite paradigmatic term, or to all other
determinators. Iconically simulating the lexeme itself, zero determina-
tion expresses abstraction: extreme and absolute non-quantification,
non-referentiality19, non-particularity (genericity) — this is in fact the
only determinator to express genericity as a primary seme20; the absence
of specificity and quantifiedness, or, in notion naming or in naming in
general, the metalinguistic external perspective (a function properly as-
sumed by the special determinator {πι-, see below). Needless to say, all
these depend on the specific opposition prevailing in each individual
paradigm/slot. For instance, in opposition to ως- and ϖα-ν-, as in the
case of the Existant, zero signifies extensional genericity; similarly in
ternary opposition, with {πι-} and ως-/ϖα-ν- (e.g. as object actant); in
opposition to {πι-} in naming, as a notion (genus) name (see below, dis-
cussing generics); again in opposition to ως-/ϖα-ν-, in thematic status,
as absolute and abstract attributeless predicate.

The fascinating and somewhat paradoxical convergence, under zero,
of extreme generic abstraction and extreme Proper-Name uniqueness,
derives from the already mentioned iconic simulation of lexemicity —
Guillaume’s “nom en puissance” and the lexeme-actualizing zero, and
the very tension between zero and nil discussed below.

(c) Zero vs. nil determination. This — and tertium non datur (although
{πι-} determination comes close) is the prime distinction, one that is
evaded by such pseudo-descriptive characterizations of a noun as
“articleless”, “indeterminate”, “bare” — indeed pseudo-descriptive,
since ignoring a crucial distinction. My main objection to this evasion is

20 This is in fact the main difference between the Coptic and Egyptian zeroes: cf. 
even, paradoxically and counter-intuitively, a possibly specific zero, “a certain...", see 
Vernus 1990:191 (pre-Demotic). We are familiar with pragmatically specific zero deter-
mination (as in “percorso mostra”, “in zona”, “DO NOT USE TOILET WHEN TRAIN 
IS IN STATION”); “telegraphic” journalistic zero, not specific or generic but rather re-
placing the whole articular system (“YOUTH BREAKS NECK IN SUMMER CAMP”),
or cotextually closed-system specificity (“There was mutual understanding between
mother and son”). On the Proper-Name (“Notion Name”) specific zero, see below.
that it is unstructural, heedless of the linguistic sign and its structure, as also of basic structural analysis: the difference between an absence that is paradigmatically opposed to a presence (non-zero) and one that is not. A formal characteristic that has a semantic counterpart (signifié) must by the same token be a signifiant, and a real segmental entity. The informational analytical implications of distinguishing a zero article from nil (non-significant absence — indeed, not “absence” at all, since a “presence” is not contemplated) determination are many. The former constitutes, and signifies, a negation neutralization of all categories that are elsewhere compatible with the noun; the latter signifies inertness — indifference to and rejection of the determination syndrome as a whole: no less than cancellation of the determinator slot. The former characterizes the noun lexeme as noun-syntagm constituent; the latter, as a lexicem base for grammemic processes. Contrast the infinitive in aqcwtem or treqcwtem or atcwtem with the infinitive in ecwtem; or — on a higher level of analytic sophistication, among the various επ- homonyms (Chapter Two), the deriving word-formational επ- with both the copular and the “lexical” επ-. Moreover, subsuming zero and nil determination under “articlelessness” makes us lose sight of features of exclusion and compatibility; different values of zero in different paradigmatic environments, the diachrony of transition from a binary to a ternary article system.

While the zero vs. nil commutability test is usually straightforward and useful, e.g. for junctural characterization (Chapter Four), there are still non-conclusive cases, like the absence feature following quantifiers and numbers (cf. Ex. 1:9 ούνιντ υπ το μμυ, Ex. 4:8 πινενίνι μμαγ-β, Ex. 10:22 το η νεκοός, Gen. 32:14f. σ αδεηπι κ μβάρητ σ νεκωσ κ ϋωλι... Num. 29:13:20 and so on), while the zero following other cases of nota relationis is fairly certain. The rare instances of quantified morphological plurals, with n- {+ no article} their outil grammatical, apparently do not count as true zero article: Gen. 26:14 ούνιντοσ νιεφωσον (ibid. γαντεβνωσον νεκωσον is difficult). Gen. 42:2, 43:2:4 γανκοοσοι νεφοος, Gen. 32:14 κ ναξαμαται. As a bracketing base, we apparently have zero rather than nil, since it is arguably the very choice of the former that defines the constructional hierarchy and constitutes its internal linkage: Gen. 45:8 οωιωτ νεμ στ, that is, οωιωτ νεμ στ. On the other hand, following the in initio compositi (“participial”) pre-object verb-lexeme (as in Deut. 23:25 ιαρ-κοοο, Gen. 46:32 περωνενυ-τεβνη, Ex. 14:9 σακι-ρηο, Ex. 30:25 φακ-κοζεν), where determination commutation is not attested in the corpus, the situation is not entirely clear. Sahidic construc-
tions such as the Shenoutean "gen-mai-pentmon matan" may indicate elsewhere a zero article following the i.i.c. component (the specificity of περ- is occasionally low; see below); this is probably supported by such compounds as


πεμ-n-hi Lev. 18:12f., πεμ-n-γωβ Gen. 32:3, πεμ-n-βεξε
Lev. 19:3.


— all with a medial conditioned grammeme selected (conditioned) by the initial lexeme; not so in the case of

qte-φατ Num. 35:3.

In these cases the zero itself — that is, in its very selection — is part of the high-linkage mechanism of compounding, alongside the prosodic reduction of the in initio compositi lexeme. This does not seem to be the case in the more grammaticalized word-formation cases:

μετ-ξελλο Gen. 21:2, μετ-μεθερε Gen. 31:47f.

The iconic resemblance of zero and nil determination has some consequences of importance, notably the apparent incompatibility of the "possessive pronoun" Φα- with a following zero article: Φα- is non-specifying, or rather specificity-indifferent, because it has no contact with the noun lexeme, but the difference between the zero-determinated noun syntagm and the noun lexeme\(^{21}\) is too fine; see more below.

Nil determination itself is not monolithic.

(d) Nil determination: a brief classification. The following types are grammatically significant:

1. No determination commutation before any lexeme in certain environments: see (c) above.

2. No determination commutation before certain lexemes, in any environment: τοοι, μερη, ποργι.

3. No determination commutation before certain pronominal grammemes, in any environment: οτον, νοθοι, φαι.

4. Proper Names (which may be rendered phoric by demonstratives: Shisha-Halevy 1989a:11f.; or may be de-properized by determinators: *ibid.*) still have nil.

\(^{21}\) The compatibility of Φα- with ΝΗΜ or ΟΣΗΡ does not invalidate this, since these are pronouns, not lexemes. Incidentally, welsh *un*, elsewhere "one", is eminently comparable to Φα-, in being determination-indifferent in anaphoric linkage and pre-determination position: Shisha-Halevy 1998:74ff.
(5) ἐπὶ- “one/he of-”

(6) ἐπὶ εἰς-, the formal nucleus of substantivized Relatives is indifferent to determination: see below.

Obs.
(1) γάρ and ὁς are in Bohairic compatible as Rhemes with Themes in the Interlocutive NS, hence are not cases of zero determination (Sahidic integrates these pronouns in the NS patterns by means of the indefinite article), cf. Funk 1991:28.
(2) The Focalizing Present ἀκουστημία (John 19:24 B4) proves that {ἐπὶ-} — not aspirated here! — is not a determinator (it is compatible with most determinators: see below).
(3) The Non-Existant following μὴν-, when nominal, is invariably zero-determined. In this sense, there is no real commutation case to base a zero on; nevertheless, there is some commutation in the post-μὴν- slot; and the overhead hyper-paradigm of (non-) existence must possibly also be taken into account.

(e) Zero and Indefinite. This, at first sight probably the most tangible affinity of zero determination, must still be carefully reviewed, for the indefinite may, on occasion, be particular, may be anaphoric (and is frequently cataphoric) and is always to some extent quantified — in all these respects unlike zero. Both are non-specific, but their main association is in that the indefinite is the next grade on the individualizing or concretizing scale, after and above the zero — which makes for a frequent rhetorical figure of various contextual contrast:

Deut. 8:8 ὄσκαρι νὸς ἄτομος οὐ καὶ ἡμῖν σαφηναλοῖς γανηβω γα-

Gen. 44:19f. ἄν-οτοντετεν-ιώτ μμετ ἰε κον, answered

Ex. 12:15 ὀσμ-ἀτημηρ ἀπο-ἀσμηρ.

Ex. 19:13 ἄνεπανων...καται-ων only and similar phrases.

Moreover, zero Non-Existant (μὴν- + zero) contrasts neatly with indefinite Existant (οὐ- + ὁς- / ἀγν-), e.g. Lev. 13:21:30:31.

Deut. 22:5 ἄν-εκτοτος ἄγωντας ὑπι πιοτεγιμι (= Vat) — observe the zero / indefinite alternation.

In Lev. 26:12 εἰπαττι νωτεν ννοτεὶ ὁτος... επετενη-

22 And not the specific “he of”, as translated in Shisha-Halevy 1985.
lexemes ("[a single] Godhead", taken in abstraction, but "[one out of
many] people[s]", concrete and individualized).

(f) Special affinity of zero with negative environment\(^\text{23}\). In actantial,
existential and possessum status in negative nexus, zero as expressing
the "nulligeneric" seems to exclude the indefinite (not the definite!) al-
together: negativity and indefiniteness are incompatible:


Deut. 15:11 \textit{nnephki} γαρ \textit{motn}k ...

Deut. 18:1 \textit{nneto}i \textit{wπi} ...

Num. 21:5 \textit{mmon-wik} \textit{otαe} \textit{mwos}.

Gen. 38:21 \textit{mmon-pοrn}h \textit{mpa}ma.

Deut. 12:13 \textit{mmontep}tοi \textit{otαe} \textit{kρ}poc.

A case like Deut. 25:13f \textit{nne-otw}i \textit{nym} \textit{otw}i \textit{wπi} \textit{nak} (= Vat) with the [\textit{otw-} \textit{nym} \textit{otw-}] constituent unity bracketed by \textit{nne-}
apparently does not constitute an exception: \textit{otw-} here is not an indefinite
article, but \textit{otw-} \textit{nym} \textit{otw-} a discontinuous correlative phrase meaning
something like "one... another... [on different occasions]."

(g) \textit{Zero and rhematicity}

In the inherent or essential predication by the Nominal Sentence, it is
the indefinite or definite determinator that are rhematic, and (unlike
Sahidic: \textit{Shisha-Halevy} 1984) zero is excluded. But in non-inherent or
incidental rhematic status, it is the definite or specific determinators that
are excluded, and \textit{zero} and indefinite determination stand in a fine oppo-
sition, as specified above.

(h) \textit{Zero article in coordination: bracketing}

In noun-syntagm coordination, primarily a case of determinator con-
nection, the lexemes "make themselves felt", that is, interfere in the
grammatical mechanism, more than in any other construction (note again
the effect of the resemblance of \textit{zero} and \textit{nil}). The existence, in Coptic
as in pre-Coptic Egyptian\(^\text{24}\), of special connectors for \textit{zero}-determinated
coordinates, has in our Bohairic a special significance, for, while \textit{nym} is

\(^{23}\) Indeed, \textit{zero} may carry the negativity: cf. "There is small sign in the McCready
book that either Eames or his biographer has weighed the alternative proposition" (TLS,
December 3, 2004).

\(^{24}\) Gunn Papers V 75, and letter to Gardiner 24/11/34 \textit{ad Egyptian Grammar} 1927 §91
p. 69 (AHG 142.124.102): "I have no doubt that words coupled by \textit{hr} are undetermined
words...the usage is thus as with Coptic \textit{ţi}".
the normal coordinator for this determination, ẓ1 is also used (alongside nem) as a closer link — almost as of a coordinative compound — in the phrases “(flowing/oozing with [n-]) milk-and-honey” and (much more rarerly) “(full of) silver-and-gold”:

ερωτ nem ebiv Ex. 3:8, Num. 14:8 (Vat ẓ1).
Deut. 27:3 ερωτ ebiv (Vat + [ebol] ẓ1).
ῳῳο νερωτ ebol giebw Deut. 26:15, 31:20.

Here ẓ1-, which is in Sahidic the normal inter-zero connector, is restricted to a few closely-knit phrases, bracketed by n-; however, it is not the bracketing that is accountable for ẓ1:- witness Gen. 45:8 οὐ[ιωτ nem ἐκ] or Deut. 8:8 οὐκαὶ nb νεμ womb ἀναγκαλολι ἐκαθ ἐναμπαν.

Other groups are as a rule coordinated with nem, which is in Bohairic considerably more extended in function:

Deut. 14:15 εἰοτα nem ἐγκει nem ὁτοτ.
Deut. 10:18 ἐκ nem ἐβοε.
Ex. 4:11 ἐβο nem κατ πενήνατ ἐβοε nem βελαλ.
Lev. 26:1 ΝΝΝΕΝΕΝΕΝΙΟΧΙΟΝ ἐντεν ἐκαθομοτονκ ἐκαθ ὁτε εφτε.

Ex. 36:6 πωμι nem σγιμι — in Topic.
Ex. 35:31 στινα ναθ nem σοφια.
Deut. 26:19 μνριτ εταβίκ ννομυκετος nem ὁτοτοσ nem ὁτο.

ἀναμιονι ιγκωστ nem σγιμι Gen. 1:27, 5:2.
Deut. 11:11 οσκαὶ τενοτ ne nem μευσωτ (Vat οτεμευ-

Gen. 37:25 ὁπτ ιοσονοτι nem κοντ nem στάκθ.
Disjunctors occur in commutation with nem:
Deut. 12:13 μμοντεκτοὶ οτας κανποε.
Num. 22:18 εαιπ νκοταὶ εν νιωτ.
Num. 20:5 μμον-κεντε νῃτῃ οτας ἀλοι οτας ερμαν

Lev. 12:7 ἀγ οναμικι ιτε γωστ ιτε σγιμι.
Gen. 1:6 ...ητεμπατυ εεφευρώ ἐβοε οτε μωσ nem

(Vat; Greek ἀνὰ μέσον θατος και θατος) — we would expect here an indefinite after οτε, unless the asymmetry is based on a distinctive interpretation of this locus.
3.4 The indefinite articles. Particular vs. non-particular indefiniteness. οὐόη, οὐόν and γαί.

(a) The indefinite articles or determinators, οὐ- and γας-, by no means simply the negative binary counterpart of the definite, are in a sense even more complicated, synchronically and therefore diachronically. The indefinite is characterizable in function as a grammaticalized quantifier, actualizing and individualizing a nominal notion as generic or particular, without cotextual or pragmatic referentiality or familiarity, yet with a possible specificity (as in “I’m expecting a friend”): “a [certain] case / instance / specimen / kind / manifestation of...”. The generic indefinite is instantial and metaphorical (“an instance of” = “any conceivable individual case of”). The said individualization subsumes and is informed by a basic quantification and it is probable that οὐ- and γας- are operative as homonyms in two distinct paradigms, one determining, the other quantifying. In the singular, gender differentiation (that is, οὐ masc- and οὐ fem-) is called for, especially because of reference features such as those discussed in JERNSTEDT 1978 [1949].

(b) The instantial or casual (“care-raising”) genericity — which is intensional — of the singular indefinite article, as in:

Ex. 8:12 γηπείε άνοκ ἥναστωρπ ερόπη εξάκκ ... Νοταγ Νοτορπ.
Ex. 9:18 γηπείε άνοκ ἥναστον ερόπη εξάκκ Μπιανάτ Νπάκτ Νοταλ.

Perhaps also:

Deut. 17:8 οὐκον νεμ οὐκον, οὐγαν νεμ οὐγαν.
Deut. 17:11 εοτινάμ (i.e. εοτ-οτινάμ?) οὐσε οὐδαμάν.
Ex. 21:24f. ὑβαλαλ Σαοτβαλ οτανάξι Σαοτνάξι οτάξι Σαοτδάξ.

and, I believe, the rhematic slots following ν- and ε-, discussed above (statistically certainly most numerous), even with the Rheme specified and concretized:

Gen. 9:3 ἐσευμπιν νωτεν ἐτῆπε.
Gen. 9:20 εὑρωντες ΝΟΤΡΨΜΙΑ ΝΟΤΡΨΙ."  
Gen. 12:19 διολεις ΝΗΤΕΨΙ."  
Ex. 14:22 ΝΑΡΕ-ΠΙΜΨΩΩΤ ΟΙ ΝΟΤΡΨΟΤ ΝΑΟΝΤΙΝΑΜ ΝΕΜ ΝΑ- 
ΔΑΧΗ ΜΜΨΩΩ."  
Noteworthy is the unique  
Gen. 5:2 ΑΥΘΗΜΙΟΟΤ ΟΡΓΟΟΤ ΝΕΜ ΟΤΡΨΙ." (consensus),  
where the absence of segmental rhematicity marking is probably corre-
latable to the exclusion of zero determination; genericity almost over-
laps here with true indefiniteness ("an instance of malehood/female-
hood").

The instancial generic is opposed (still only in the singular?) to indefi-
nite specificity ("a certain, particular...", JOHANSSON 1977 esp. 1189ff., 
NILSSON 1979:119):  
Gen. 1:2 ΟΤΨΝΑ ΝΤΕΨ."  
Gen. 32:30 ΑΙΝΑΤ ΓΑΡ ΕΩΝΟΝΤ ΝΓΟ ΟΤΨΒΕΨΟ.  
Num. 5:20 ΟΤΡΨΙΜΙ ΜΑΨΑΙ.  
Perhaps it is to be found also in the numerous occurrences of the in-
definite article in legal and/or ritual case-raising context (as in Lev. and 
Num. 5, 6 passim).  
(c) The non-generic (particular) role of the indefinite article is ubiqui-
tious:  
Ex. 3:22 ΔΑΛΑ ΕΕΕΕΡΕΙΝ ΝΑΕ-ΟΤΡΨΙΜΙ ΝΤΟΤΚ ΝΤΕΕΟΨΕΕ 
ΝΕΜ ΤΕΨΨΕΡΙ ΝΓΑΝΚΕΤΟΣ ΝΓΑΤ ΝΕΜΓΑΝΝΟΨΒ, sim. Ex. 11:2.  
Ex. 4:25 ΕΤΑΕΣΙ ΑΔ ΝΑΕ-ΣΕΡΨΨΡΑ ΝΟΨΑΛ...  
Note that it is in such cases as the last example that the functional 
opposition of indefinite and zero determination is most salient: the 
former a true object actant, the latter bordering on a compound lexeme 
(στο-αλ would be "to flint-take").

(d) The indefinite article is often, perhaps typically, non-referential 
and non-cotextual. However, it may be anaphoric, yet not deictically (as 
in the case of πι-) but as pro-form, substitute or representant, represent-
ing descriptively a preceding indefinite syntagm:  
Ex. 3:22 ΔΑΛΑ ΕΕΕΕΡΕΙΝ ΝΑΕ-ΟΤΡΨΙΜΙ ΝΤΟΤΚ ΝΤΕΕΟΨΕΕ 
ΝΕΜ ΤΕΨΨΕΡΙ ΝΓΑΝΚΕΤΟΣ ΝΓΑΤ ΝΕΜΓΑΝΝΟΨΒ.  
Deut. 28:36 ΓΑΝΚΕΝΟΤΨΓ ΓΑΝΨΕ ΓΕΜ ΓΑΝΨΝΙ."  
(e) Like other determinators, and more conspicuously than others (see 
JERNSTEDT 1978 [1949]; and above, §3.0.4), the indefinite article is nu-
clear in the noun syntagm, contracting with its expanding lexeme a rela-
tionship that can be described as partitive: "one/an instance/case... of 
the class/kind X", a relationship compatible with the anaphoric
(proform) role of οὖν/ὡς. This insight of Jernstedt’s is all-important, accounting for most peculiarities from the very common “adjectival” — rather “denominal” — reading of the indefinite (esp. as Rheme), to the rarer phenomenon of πμε (Sah.) “the true one” (alongside τμε “Truth”), ἥγο n- “she with/characterized by [a] face of…” (and πιγο n-: “he with the face / the face of…” ) and similar. The difference, also with junctural implications, of τ-με and π-με may be correlated with the distinction of determinator + bare lexeme and determinator + zero-determined lexeme (“hyperdetermination”) respectively, the latter characterized with an internal boundary (delimitation) and accordingly richer nucleus grammemic paradigm (Chapter 4).

(f) The indefinite article is especially familiar in essential (inherent) rhematic status, that is, in the Nominal Sentence. Here, in fact, it replaces or rather subsumes the zero article, which is excluded25 (both in the Delocutive and Interlocutive-Theme pattern sets: for the latter, see Funk 1991:41), and is therefore the only non-specific determinator. Indeed, in both NS sets it is part of the grammatical matrix of the pattern, and grammatically indispensable:

Ex. 6:12 ἀνοκ ῬΑΡ ἀνοκ-οτατκαζί. 
Num. 13:18 ...ιε ἀν-οτακβε πε ιε ἂν ὁκοταζί πε ιε ἂνοτνππτ πε.

Gen. 29:31 παραλ αε νεος νεότασφην τε.

(g) The indefinite article covers the entire lowest-specificity range and is grammatically indispensable also with abstract lexemes after the preposition ἰεν-, and for all lexemes in some constructions. In these cases, its semantic opposition to zero is of course neutralized:

Ex. 4:18 μαχενακ ἰενοτοτοζί.
Ex. 12:9 εγήζει ἰενοτομωτ.
Ex. 7:11 ἰενοτομετίαρμακος.
Ex. 15:21 ἰενοτομωτ ῬΑΡ οταζίωτ.
Ex. 13:19 ἰενοτομίνι ποτε ναπιν — the Tautological-Infinitive construction (Chapter Two).
Deut. 12:6 μβρι τ νοτμωτ.
Ex. 16:14 μβρι τ νοτίωτ.
Ex. 3:22 αλλα εεεεπετιν ηε-οτεςζιμι...

25 In Demotic, it seems to alternate with or be opposed to zero: the distribution is still problematic, synchronically and diachronically. w’tbw p3y in H.J. Thissen, Demotische Graffiti... Medinet Habu (1989) 89 No. 115, and of course in Mag.; yet already in Ryl. IX 3/18 (Focus of Cleft Sentence).
(h) While the singular indefinite article, also (homonymically) operative in the quantifier category, is as a rule not combined with other quantifiers, rare exceptions do occur:

Ex. 2:13 ἁρσεῖον ὀστρωμὶ ὁ ἐνεβρεός ὁ ἄφοιτον ὁδοτ (Vat ὀστρῳ). (ὀστρῳ ὁ ᾿ (“a pair of men”?) is attested also in BM Or 8780 f. 23 vo in marg.: see Layton, Cat. 405ff. BM 8780 f.23 vo and ref.).

Also Gen. 25:24 ἐγαναθεὶς κατὰ σεντεκνεῖ (= Vat). Not commonly, ὁ- acts as quantifier (“one”):

Deut. 1:23 ἢ πρωμὶ ὀστρῳ καταφθάν.

Obs.

(1) The alleged “cataphoricity” of the indefinite article (WEINRICH 1982:263ff.), for instance in a case like “Never play poker with a man called Doc... Never sleep with a woman whose problems are worse than your own” (actually generic!), or “we boarded a ship that went to Marseilles”, is non-referential and non-vectorial, pragmatic rather than grammatically formal — very differently from the cataphoric definite, as in “the restaurant where we had dinner”, where the expansion and definite article are two constituents of a discontinuous reference chain, and the latter, representing the former, is meaningless without it.

(2) Diachrony and synchrony. In Late Egyptian and the 1000-year span of Demotic, the distribution and function of the indefinite article are still very much variables of text and texteme, probably (at least in the former) a matter of the ternary system ousting or replacing the binary one. What may be stated with confidence is that the indefinite article evolved considerably later than the definite article. For Greek — another instance of binary to ternary, in the written language from Byzantine Greek onward — see KUHLMANN 1997/8:86ff.; for Germanic and Romance, with a general exposition and theoretical foundation, see PRESSLICH 2000 (41ff., 75ff. on the association of the indefinite with partitivity and its universal derivation from “one”; its relation to zero is also investigated [e.g. 68]. HOPPER and MARTIN 1987 study the development in English (“decreasing referentiality; weakening of presentative functions; grammaticalization — evolution from lesser to greater contextualization”); NOCENTINI 1996:30ff.: the indefinite is as a rule more recent in relative chronology than the definite (in W. Europe, but also in Egyptian). HEWSON 1997 attempts to relate the two articles, the indefinite (as unmarked) and the definite (as marked, but are they at all relatable, even synchronically?). See NOCENTINI 1996:16 for correlation between existence of indefinite and incompatibility of demonstrative with determinator. While the very emergence of an indefinite article and perhaps the rate of its evolution seem to be independent of the definite article, it is true that binary systems of zero and indefinite, with no definite, are rarer (Turkish). For descriptive accounts of various European languages, see also CORBELIN 1987:243, EROMS 1988:271, 281ff., VAN DE VELDE 1994.

(3) For LE, see the Gunn Papers (Oxford, the Griffith Institute) V 53 “Use of the word w in Wcnamùm and the Leopold II and Amherst Papyri”: “a certain...”, “simply the indefinite article”, “the partitive sense of ‘one of’”, “‘one’ as opposed to ‘other’”. IV A 21 (“Late Egyptian Stories: Grammatical Notes”) “w as indefinite article with/without n-”, “w before nouns stressed not article”, “preceded by possessive article: one...of hers” (e.g. W 2/76, TB 9/3), “before noun, with m”, “following noun”.
(4) For indefinites and phoricity, see Cole 1974; see also Obs.1 above.
(5) On the specific indefinite in Turkish, see Johanson 1977 (pointing out complicating factors of Functional Sentence Perspective and information structure), Nilsson 1979:119 ("presents the element as known in the particular context in which it was mentioned"... "reference to a particular individual...may be particular in a given situation, although indefinite", 122f.) Cf. also Korzen 1996:278ff. Kapeliuk 1972 on Amharic, with its well-known affinities to Turkish: here too the overt accusative marks specificity also with the indefinite.
(6) Jernstedt 1978 [1949], one of the three "founding" treatises on Coptic linguistics, treats only (Shenoutean) Sahidic, and only for the "reduced pronominal" indefinites ὰκο (οὐκ) and ἕν (ἐόν). But in the third part of his essay, discussing τελ-μινη η- as expansion of the demonstrative and the possessive pronoun, J. extends the "partitive" ("Izafet") analysis beyond the indefinite. Indeed, I think the extension of Jernstedt's model of partitive determinator/lexeme relationship to the deities is not ad-hoc but structurally unavoidable, as is implied in the Bohairic τι- ὀτογ η-: Num. 14:18 πα-νηϊον ὁνα ὀτογ ηονηι: Deut. 8:9 θειηηιηη πεδι of NS (Greek σιδηηρος) (Vat 3572beni).
(7) Polotsky 1989:468ff. (and 1991) suggests a "shift of subst. to adjectival meaning" in the non-specific (indefinite) thematic noun. This is begging the question. In fact, he conceives of the "definite adjectivals" ποιη or ἰηε as derived from a deep-structure nεξαλ οτη... ηε, ἕν... ηε by conjoint transposition and condensation. I believe the partitive or associative relation is here perfectly applicable: as in ἡ-[οηο η-]. ἡ-[ηο η-] so too in the case of ποιη. This relationship is thus distinct from that of {θα-}, pace Polotsky 1989:471f.

(i) Several syntactical slots of the indefinite article have already been examined above in this chapter. Three other difficult ones with noteworthy properties are:

**Topic, Focus.** Cases of indefinite extrapolation or segmentation do not constitute a thematic link — the initial noun is not anchored in preceding context, like specific topics. In all these instances the extrapoosed noun seems to carry prominence (not generally to be found in Bohairic topicalization) and *rhematic Focus* rather than thematicity. This is not a topicalization construction, but a focalization one, distinct by its very determination (see Chapter Two above, for the focal extrapolation of an indefinite noun).

Gen. 31:39 ὀται εἰκενηπιον ὀτομη μπιενη νακ - a case of "not even" focalization.

Ex. 12:46 οτκας ηνετηνκαυ κ ηβολ ημοη — a case of "not even" focalization.

Ex. 15:2 οτβοηθος ηεμ οτερεθγωβε ηβολ εκνη ακυμπη

NHI.

Differently prominent, and equally non-rhematic, are the initial nouns in:
Lev. 10:9 ὦ θρηπν ενοτοκεπα νεντενςωσκ
Deut. 8:13 οτρηπ ημινοτοσοφ ασσαναςαι νακ.
Different still is
Ex. 15:4 εγανωτι παναμαθες ντρικταθες ακιλκοτ ησην-
πιομ.
Deut. 1:28 ἀλλα νεμ πανεψερη παφωπ ἁνηατ εραωσ
(νεμ focussing “even”).

Obs.
Topicality and high or higher specificity are two aspects of one and the same phenom-
enon. This does not, I think, extend to thematicity (pace Birkenmaier 1979 42-70, esp.
49ff.). In situations of article-less determination (e.g. Old and Middle Egyptian), the
Topic “counts as” specific by its very Topic-hood: consider two central cases of
grammaticalized topicalization — the much-discussed “Topic + sdm inclination” construc-
tion (see Westendorf 1953, Jünge 1978 (1979), Doret 1980) and the “s3j f nht” construc-
tion, with an inalienable possessed Theme following the extraposed possessor; the Topic
placement here is conditioned.

Actantial and non-actantial apposition to specific nucleus; nu-
cleus to specific apposition:
Ex. 15:14 αντωτεμ νξε-γαλενος.
Ex. 14:20 οτρογ ακουπι νξε-οτινοφος νεμοτακι —
ote note the coordinated phrase appositively to a singular agent pronoun.
Gen. 33:18 σαλομ οτεξακι.
Num. 32:36 αβραμ νεμ βεοαραν γαπολικ.
Gen. 39:1 πετεφηρ οτρωμι νρεμενχαμι.

Distributive-quantifier reiteration:
οτρεμεντ οτρεμεντ ε/μπης ἐμ Num. 29:10:15.

Excursus: οτραι, οτον, ζαι
(a) οτραι. The indefinite article’s synchronic-systemic relation to a
prosodic allomorph οτραι / οται (in Bohairic, obtaining only for the sin-
gular) sets it apart from the definite determinator. οται/οται, the full
prosodic alternant, is compatible with πι- or zero determinators (and by
this token lexemic rather than grammemic — or at least not fully
grammatical) and has several clear-cut grammatical roles and several
structural entities; unless anaphoric (i.e. syntagmatically grammemic), it
refers to animates only. Note that οται, οται is not compatible with

NIBEN (οτον replaces οται in this slot: see below):
(1) οται η / πτε- (either πι- or zero determinated) is juncturally
and functionally opposed in-paradigm to οτ-; οται μμοσ is its pro-
nominal form. Unlike ὠτὸν (below), the environment of ὡταί is primarily affirmative:

“One/first of two”:

Ex. 37:8 ὡταί ντερόσβιμ εἰσενπιοταί Ναάκης Ντεπιιλακτηρίον ὡτος πικεροταί ντερόσβιμ εἰσενπιλακής Μμας-ὔ Ντεπιιλακτηρίον.

Deut. 21:15 (ἐγκαίτιος ὑμῶν) ὡταί μμωστ εἰμει Μμος ὡταί μμωστ εἰμοςτ ὑμῶν.

“One” (number):

Lev. 23:28 Ζ Νυήβ Ναάςιν... ὡταί Μμας.

Deut. 12:14, 17:2 Σενοτι Ννεκβακι (for ὡταί Ννεκβακι Deut. 15:7 see below, 3.9 [f]).

(2) ὡταί formal nucleus, whether anaphoric or not:

Lev. 27:11 ὡτεβνφν εὐφάσεμ... ὡταί εβολα Σενην ετενσέ ον εινι εβολα Νηντοτ.

Lev. 27:33 ὡταί ενανεφ Σαοταί εὐγκων.

Lev. 5:22 ὡταί εβολα Σενκυβ Νίβεν.

Lev. 21:14 ὡτεχρα νεμ ὡταί εὐγκωνεἰ εβολα Νεμ ὡταί εὐκοα.

(3) Human indefinite or generic pronoun: “one”, in actantal status:

Lev. 15:24 εὐμπι ἀρεσοντοταῖ Νκοτ Νεμας.

Deut. 22:28 εὐμπι ἀρεσοντοταῖ Ξιμι Νοταλοτ.

Deut. 24:5 εὐμπι ἀρεσοντοταῖ ΣΙ Νοτςγιμι...

Deut. 21:22 εὐμπι ἀρεσοντονοβι υσμι Σενοταί.

For the plural of ὡταί, Σννοτον, morphologically the indefinite plural of ὠτὸν as a lexeme, stands structurally as the pro-enclitic alternant of Σαν-; Σννοτον too is often anaphoric, by dint of Σαν-.

Gen. 30:39 Σννοτον ὡτοὶ Νεοιβοι Νοτσβυ Νεμ Σαν-Σαν Νκερμι.

(4) Correlative ὡταί... ὡταί (“one...another”) configuration (always anaphoric)26:

Ex. 28:7 ὡταί ὡτε ὡταί.

Ex. 21:12 ἀρεσοντοταί ἀνονσωνυ Νοταλ.

(5) πισταί πισταί and δοταί δοταί. The difference in form of these very common phrases, often combined, for the adverbial-distributive “each”, less usually “one by one” (not really concurring with ὠτὸν Νιβεν; both forms are resumed by the singular), is frankly baf-

26 AM II 165 εβολα Σενοτοπι εἰμί... εβολα Σενοτοβακι εβακι is remarkable in the zero determination of the second term of the correlation.
fling: the functional difference between πιστάι and θυσία escapes me. While it is on the whole clear that πιστάι is anaphoric and specific, and πιστάι πιστάι usually opens the sequence that is carried on appositively and adverbially by θυσία θυσία (as in Ex. 12:3f., Num. 16:17f. and often), θυσία θυσία, non-specific, non-phoric, often following in statu adverbiali actantial pronouns, there are too many exceptions for this to be the full picture. The difference must be fine, and evidently not founded on the Greek original.

Ex. 16:18 ἢ πιστάι πιστάι εὐκίς ναά...  
Ex. 12:3f. μερεπίσται πισταὶ σὲ ναὰ νοσεκσωτ ... εφεσι ... θυσία θυσία μπερσσωι.
Ex. 12:22 Ννετεν εβολ θυσία θυσία μερμο ντεπεκγι.  
Ex. 32:29 ᾿απετεπωκ ννετεναξ ... θυσία θυσία σεπεψωικι νεμ πεκγον.
Num. 2:34 γαροσωτεβ μπιστάι πιστάι.
Consider also the following adverbial (or predicative, or appositive) instances:

πισταὶ πισταὶ Num. 4:19, 6:54, 7:5, 33:54, etc.
πι... πισταὶ Num. 29:9.
eφθαρα Ex. 16:22 (but: εγερα Ex. 26:5).

(b) οτόν is another “lexico-pronoun”, pronoun with dominant lexemic properties. Attested in most dialects (albeit with different values), it has a plural form, γανόσον, the plural correspondent of οτόν, and is famously compatible with οπλο — a syntagm more important in Sahidic27, with zero and (in Bohairic, outside the corpus) Νί(κε)- and νάι. οτόν alone has zero-determination status. Like οτόν, οτόν, much more important, refers to animates (incl. human and animal; etymologically, probably a participle of ων(ν) “exist, be”) and is gender-indifferent (in certain configurations, masculine; resumed by masculine only). It is in Bohairic (not in Sahidic) homonymous with the non-existence-stating elements (both compatible in Ex. 13:7 οτόν εοτόν-ωθεμπμ ιμομ, Deut. 33:26 εομο-οτόν μερμφμ Ρμφμ). The singular does not enter partitive constructions as οτόν does.

Zero-determined singular οτόν, like a lexeme, favours, and indeed is practically conditioned by, negative environment, as an alternant to affirmative οτόν:

27 οτόν οπλο is in the corpus expanded by the Relative, οπλο being the determinator, not quantifier.
NNEOTON epia vs. erwan-otai epia Deut. 15:4:7.
Ex. 13:7 NNEQTONGQ NAK EBOA NAE-OTON EOTON-WEHMHP MMOQ.
Ex. 23:26 NNEOTON ENQAMICIAN OTAE ASPHN WOPN.
Deut. 23:17 NNEPORNH vs. OTON EQRPNPETERIN WOPN — OTON supplying here a masculine term.
NNEOTON- also Ex. 10:14, 11:6, 23:26, Num. 8:19, 17:5, 18:5.
Ex. 10:6 MFINAT EOTON MPEQRP†, cf. also Gen. 41:19.
Non-animates are rare: (“any”, always anaphoric, almost only in negative environment):
Ex. 9:24 MPEOTON WOPN MPEQRP† (i.e. hail)
Ex. 13:7 NNEQTONGQ NAK EBOA NAE-OTON (scilicet “food”) EOTONWEHMHP MMOQ.
Non-negative occurrences are very rare, and as a rule correlative (beside the ubiquitous OTON NIBEN):
OTON CA-OTON “one after the other” Ex. 10:1 (Greek ἄγετης), Deut. 2:34.
Ex. 35:5 MPEOTON SI NTEOTON MMMTEN.

The plural GANOTON is very different, and its syntax closer to that of OTAI (above). Semantically, it is not restricted to animates, and often lexically fuzzy (even absent in the original):
Gen. 30:39: (anaphoric) GANOTON ETOI NGOIHOI NEM GAN-DOAIOTAN NEM GAN-DOATAN NKERP.
Ex. 16:20 ATCHWAT NGANOTON EBOA MMOQ sim. 19:22, 29:34.
Ex. 16:27 GANOTON SENPILADOC.
Ex. 29:34 WOPN DE APEWAN-GANOTON CWAH EBOA SENNIJ.
GANOTON corresponds in Bohairic to Sah. (etc.) 20INE, not attested in Boh. but presupposed by 2AN-.

Obs.
(1) OTAI in negative environment means “not (even) a single one”: MPEOTAI MMAR-
ATQ CWAH Ex. 8:27, 14:28, 24:11.
(2) Phraseological NIOTON MPAIRHP† Luke 18:16, Cat. 7 NAKOTON MPAIRHP† Cat.
58; 1 Cor. 16:18, Cat. 189: see Crum. Dictionary, 482a.

(c) GA1, corresponding in many ways to Sahidic λας, is usually inanimate in reference (thus sometimes contrasted with OTAI for animates. In fact, non-anaphoric GA1 may be seen as the inanimate alternant of OTON in negative environment). Unlike OTON, GA1 is combined, by
the *notae relationis* *n*-., *nte*-., pronominally *nta=*, with other noun lexemes (“any…”) while it is not compatible in the corpus, unlike Nitrian Bohairic, with any determinator (i.e. a true grammemic pronoun). This is the prime difference between ὁτον/ὁταὶ and ἡλί:

Deut. 24:5 ἡλί ὅσωβ.
Deut. 28:55 ἡλί ἡνἐκαὶ.
Gen. 37:24 ἡλί ἡμῶτω.
Num. 17:5 ἡλί ἡνἐκκεκαὶ.
Ex. 19:12 ἡλί ἡνταὶ (i.e. any part of the mountain).

ἡλί occurs often in negative environment ("nothing/no-one"; it sometimes even acquires negative semantics of its own):

Num. 16:15 μπεργαὶ ἁντοτο ὁταὶ μπετζεμκο ὁταὶ ἡμῶτ.

Ex. 16:19 μπενεργαὶ σωκεπ.
Gen. 37:24 ἁμον-ἡλί ἡμῶτ ἃνῃτρ.
Deut. 16:18 μνεικεργαὶ ὅσωβ.
Ex. 19:12 ἢ...εὐτεμενὶ ἃν ἡλί ἡνταὶ.

Rhematic, ἡλί is inherently negative — "nothing", "a trifle" (Greek οὐδέν):

Num. 20:19 ποῖ ὅσωβ ἡλί πε.
Ex. 22:9 θὴ ὁταὶ ἅρ-νοτραὶ (v.l. BGY ἡλί AGLα ὁτραὶ πε) is still mysterious: ὁταὶ, ἅρ-, ἅ- (?) are wholly enigmatic, while the Theme πε may be zeroed in our MS.

Obs.
(1) In the Interlocutive NS as well as the Delocutive pattern, ἡλί (and ὅ; cf. Ex. 16:7, 16:15) occur without the indefinite article only in Bohairic: FUNK 1991:28; however, ὅ-ἡλί does occur in Bohairic (e.g. v.l. John 8:54, often in Nitrian), almost always rhematic in the NS.
(2) ἃν ἡλί "at all" Luke 19:8 does not occur in the corpus.

Human animate ἡλί is somewhat less usual. Apparently occurring only in negative environment, this raises the question of the opposition of ἡλί with ὁτον; the frequent combination of ἡλί with ἁμον- may be significant, although Deut. 33:26 ἁμον-ὁτον ἁφρητ ἁφητ still points to some distinction between ὁτον and ἡλί.

Ex. 10:23 μπεργαὶ πνευμὸν ὁταὶ μπεργαὶ τωνκ...
Ex. 22:10 ὁτος ἁντεστημ-ἡλί ἐμι.
Ex. 34:24 μνεικερκαὶ ἀποικωτημ.
Gen. 39:11 ἁμον-ἡλί ἀζοῦτ ἁμενῆ — ἀζοῦτ is here remarkable for "inside".
3.5 \{π-\} and \{πι-\} — “Two definite articles”?

Bohairic has a four-term articular system, with separate and asymmetrical singular and plural subsystems for all non-zero articles:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>{π-}</td>
<td>nηn-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{πι-}</td>
<td>nι-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ω-</td>
<td>ξαn-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The prevailing consensus concerning the two “weak and strong” articles of Bohairic, a reputation based on a Sahidic “squinting” viewpoint rather than on true observation, and dependent on a pseudo-prosodic, pseudo-quantitative imponderable — why then isn’t παι- the “strongest article”? — is misleading rather than helpful. As it is, a complicated environment-dependent system of oppositions — a sophisticated système des valeurs — relates between the two determinators. Viewing them through the epistemological filter of the West-European article system (and we are of course talking about a difference in code, and not in the reflection of objective reality), in a simplistic traditional conception of determination, and not as valued by the syntagmatics-and-paradigmatics of varying construction, cannot but obscure for us the fine mesh of opposition and especially the functional range of \{π-\}. This is not to deny the obvious morphological relatedness of \{π-\} and \{πι-\}, synchronically referable to their nuclearity and the fact that both carry primary gender and number exponence; nor even their deictic interdependence as respectively zero and “marked” terms.

Obs.
(1) The diachronic aspect of the quaternary system, peculiar if not exclusive to Bohairic\textsuperscript{28}, escapes me. To my knowledge, no Demotic (let alone LE) data are indicative of a similar

\textsuperscript{28} W.P. Funk (I quote from a letter of July 24, 2000) points out that F4 “is, I think, relatively close to Bohairic. Especially in the plural article usage: very rarely an article other than nι- at all, and if something other than nι-, then the usage is almost evenly di-
system. And yet, Bohairic is generally conservative, and has in general few important innovations compared with the other dialects. DEPUYDT 1985a: 51 facilely “derives” n- from ni-, through what he lightly calls “a loss of the vowel”. This is meaningless — is it a feature of diachronic evolution? What does “derivation” mean in this context? Synchronously, n- and ni- are not prosodically related alternants29; both are proclitic, and postulating a prosodic derivation dependence between them is tantamount to derive Sah. article ni- from the demonstratives meN-mi-.

(2) Comparative. For a similar phenomenon in Germanic (I don’t know of any instance outside Germanic),30 see EBERT 1971 (on Northern Frisian) — two morphological articles for the “Bekanntheit des Referenten”: (a) obligatory in (“cumulative”) non-specific reference; also for unica: “water”, “the sun”; “the door” — situationally unique, with no further specification: cf. our n-; (b) deictic, specified by preceding or following context: Bohairic ni-. See also D. HARTMANN 1982 (NHG dialects), MARKEY 1985b, EROMS 1988:269ff. (one article stressed, the other proclitic); HARWEG 1989 (spoken NHG, dialectal, but also standard).

(3) The ni- / n- distribution issue is closely associated with the alternation n- / nte, discussed in detail below. Consider the Gunn MSS (the Griffith Institute, Oxford) VII 12-14: “Rule: when the rectum is undetermined (semantically — ASH) and has no article and is not a proper name, the genitival n, not nte, and if the regens has the definite article this must be of the ni-series, not the n-series” (Gunn mentions “nouns which can take the ni-series” — he has obviously identified here a specific lexical group — ASH)... “Rule: nouns which can take n-articles take ni-articles (a) in the vocative... [but:... Φ† eTONe...], when followed by a relative expression (including etemmat and et- + qual.), (b) often before nte + determined noun (the question still is why nte is employed in some cases and not in others)”. This was obviously one of the foremost topics of interest to Battiscombe Gunn, who was very attentive to Bohairic (and especially, against the prejudice of his day, to Nitrian Bohairic).

(4) In CHAINE 1933 we find the most detailed — indeed, the most serious — discussion of this difficult issue (see pp. 125-132, §§267-285). True, Chaine falls for the red herring of the “fort vs. faible” approach; yet such formulations as (§275) “noms communs de sens

vided between a and... almost all such cases are “pre-genetival” (pre-n-, avoiding the nte-convention valid for ni-), resemble very much the conditions and rarity of Bohairic n-... whereas mi- is the only plural article occurring in a relative-clause expanded NP. In the singular, however, the situation is clearly different from Bohairic: ni-i is not normally used, for instance, with highly abstract notions or other things of “higher deixis”...I would say, the singular is just about the situation as in dialect M...”. The difference between the singular and plural subsystems is again striking; and, while the determinator forms themselves are all present in the inventories of other dialects (including, of course, Sahidic), their values differ drastically.

29 Kasser 1994 attempts a prosodic assignation of the stable, three-millennia-old n- t

-series, on a ternary scale of tonicity; however, one misses Φ H / th and n- (Sah. or Boh.), and thus we gain little insight into the functional and structural value of either, in relation respectively to Φ διάθ and n-. Viewing n- as “strong” (trad. terminology) with relation to n- is unfounded, for while the former is a zero-grade of th, the latter does not really have a “guna” grade correspondence (unless it be the n- of τε- q-., as Kasser maintains).

30 It is possible, of course, that the complicated and still controversial story of the pre

Romance article and determinator system hides the presence of two higher-specificity (“definite”) articles.
3.5.1 {πι-} the deictic, cohesive Specifying Article. {πι-} is a high specificity article, with its specificity and lexeme-specifying force stemming from syntagmatic and/or paradigmatic dependence on another noun syntagm, specific or non-specific, co-textual, intertextual or contextual. This, in a nutshell, is what distinguishes it from π-.

In Bohairic, the association of {πι-} with the demonstrative determinator Φ in is severed (while Φ in is still directly opposed to Φ in, albeit not as distal to proximal, as in most other dialects: witness the pre-Relative slot, this is not the case between πι- and πι-. This ensues in a different value to πι-, as is evident, e.g., in {πι-} νοσωτ, I Thessal. 2:14): {πι-} is an article — the in some senses unmarked definite article of Bohairic (Note that the following roles of {πι-} are not mutually exclusive). In fact, {πι-} is simple in comparison with {π-}.

L. Stern’s characterization (1880 §227) of the πι- series as of “ver-eintzelnd und unterschiedend bestimmende bedeutung” is still unexceptionable. Indeed, {πι-} — and only {πι-} amongst articles — characterizes a noun as familiar, as of high specificity.

{πι-} is in essence a cohesive linking element, phoric on the textual plane, and referential both textually and extra-textually: it is in fact a striking case for the “world-of-discourse as text”. The phoricity of {πι-} — a textual-linkage application of its basic deixis — is double:

(a) Anaphoric — reintroducing a noun as already mentioned or familiar from the text:

1) Representing:
Ex. 8:12-13 ὀρφονοχρον... παρονοχρον.
Ex. 9:22-25 αρχα... πιλα (cf. 9:24 αρχωνον ηξ-περ αναλ...
... ναμψων ας πιλα πε).
Deut. 10:1-3 πλαξ κνουτ... πιλα... πλαξ κνουτ.
Num. 25:6ff. ις ορφωμι εβοα ζέννηνηρι μπιλ απινι...
πιραμι νιρκαλιθε.
Gen. 30:32 εκωνον νιβεν ναοταν... νεμ νιαοτιαοταν.
Gen. 30:35 η τθρος ετεοσιν-ετοσρωθι ναθτωρ ... νιο-σωμβ.

(2) Fuzzily anaphoric — recalling from a cumulative database or folder:

Gen. 32:22 ασιν τεσιμι ην ηεμ ηβωκι ην ηεμ πει-ια
νωρπι...

Gen. 41:56 ατσωλν ... ννιαξωρ τθρος ννοτο ννογ ναντ
εβολ ννιρεμνκομι ηθροσ.

(3) In specificity concord — anaphorically cohesive in apposition:
Gen. 41:45 ων ηβακι.
Ex. 3:1 κωρμβ πιτωσ.
Gen. 21:33 θη πιωελεσ.
Gen. 22:21 ως πιωερπομμικι.
Gen. 3:22 γαβαν πιστρωσ.

(b) Cataphoric — heralding reference. This is juncturally (Chapter Four) both a boundary (retrospective) and a link (prospective).

(1) Introducing a noun as to be subsequently specified, and in fact heralding its expansion.

Gen. 23:9 πιμεωε ετοι ναηπιοτολη.
Gen. 20:3 τεσιμι ετακολας.
Gen. 26:2 πικαγι ετνακηου νακ.
Gen. 25:6 νινρθο ητεηπαλακη ντεαβρααμ.
Ex. 22:5 νικεπη ητεπηριαγαλολη.
Gen. 28:12 ηιαζελος ητεεπι.
Gen. 28:20 νιεετι θαι ανοκ ετημεωε γιωτη.
Gen. 26:18 νιεωθι ητεπεμεωου νη ετασηοκου νηε-νιε-
λησωτι ντεαβρααμ.

Gen. 17:13 ηπεπηε ετεμματ.
Deut. 1:17 πικακι ετηναφ ητεηηνυτολ.
Ex. 16:2 ηεηαξωρ ηθρη ητεηεηρηπι ηπιελ.
Gen. 32:22 πιδεινεικι ητεαβωκ.
Num. 34:6 πιειος ηρμο.

(2) In specificity concord — cataphorically cohesive in apposition:
Gen. 23:2 ηβακι ερβοκ.
Gen. 19:9 πιρωμι ηε-λωτ.

(c) A third type of reference is non- or extra- (inter-) textual ("exophoric"). It is typically dialogic-situational, but not really restricted textemically. Here we find singulares as well as plurals, as prius nota, not prius dicta; or simply as familiar in the world of current discourse:
Gen. 22:5 γεμενέματα ἐν τῷ.
Gen. 24:55 καταμάρτευμα ὑπώρημα.
Gen. 42:9 ηττεταχμένα.
Gen. 26:1 ποτάμια ἐξωθάλαθισμα.
Gen. 43:8 οὐκοτοίμα μητέρα.
Deut. 19:18 εὕρεσιν πεζε-νηπτέρα.
Deut. 20:5 κοινοὐσιν πεζε-νικαρ.
Deut. 9:28 μηπωθεινήτοις πεζε-νή εὐπορία θεμπίκαρ.

(d) \{πιπι-\} occurs *generically* as a closed-system-deictic, which is probably the same as the always singular “category-caption” generic (very different from the Notion-Name generic role of \{πι-\}: see below); this occurs often in catalogic enumeration. This is a system of paradigmatic specificity: a structured and finely delimited lexical system of systems, in which every term is “definite” in the Saussurean sense of expressing “that which all others do not express”.

Deut. 24:19 πηγκίονι ἐν πισθεμοὶ ἐν πιοφανος ἐν
τῷπῳ.

πισθεμοὶ ἐν πισθεμωίσι Num. 35:15.
Deut. 7:1 πιθετείσας ἐν πιθετείσας ἐν πισθετείσας ἐν πισθανανεκς ἐν φερεθείσας ἐν πιστοει (Vat πιθετείσας) — the zero article here is a mystery for me; the Greek has here only definite generic nouns.

Deut. 2:12 πισθανανεκς ἐν πισθανανεκς ἐν σέμπιστορ.
Deut. 2:20 κεταρπι授予 πιστοει.

Checklists of animal species: Deut. 14:12-18 πιστοφωρον σεντριστοσκοι ονθετον πιστεπει οπνεωμενα πειρεμα ἐν πάρον αροδιόν κανον ει—... The switch to zero-article generic terms is remarkable.

It is here that \{πιпι-\} (metaphorically generic) and \{πι-\} (quintessentially generic) are closest to one another, even up to the syntagmatic adjacency of both articles — as a rule, not in haphazard admixture but in separate groups:
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Deut. 28:48 πικό νεμπηβε ην εμ φβωυ νεμ φμον.
Deut. 30:15 πωνε ον εμ φμον πιπενανεξ ην πιπετ-γων.
Deut. 1:17 πιγαν φα-φ† πε.

Or in paradigmatic adjacency — {πι-} for a term in a structured closed system (typically in syntagmatic compatibility), {πι-} for an isolated term as unicum:

πικάγι Gen. 7:23, 8:11.

πιρν, πιιογ Gen. 37:9, Deut. 17:3.

πιστε Ex. 21:4 “the master” (of a slave).
πιστε (passim) “the Lord”.

(e) High-to-highest specificity is a prominent trait in the name paradigm, following Ζε- of the naming one. Here {πι-} commutes with Proper Names and with {πι-} genus and notion names (see below, 3.8):

†-ρενον/περπαν Ζε-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gen. 1:5:10, 2:23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>πι-</td>
<td>Deut. 2:11:21, Gen. 32:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πι-</td>
<td>Ντε- Gen. 35:8, 31:47f. (see below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πι-</td>
<td>(genus/notion name) Gen. 30:18, Num. 1:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πι-</td>
<td>Gen. 32:30, 35:18, 50:11, 21:31 (see below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPER NAME Gen. 16:11, 3:20, 17:19 etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Νιμ</td>
<td>Gen. 2:19 (pro-PN).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause in PN status Gen. 22:14, Num. 28:18.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obs.
Gen. 30:13 ασχρ Ζη-οθητρημεν is a case of Proper Name “translation” rather than naming. See SHISHA-HALEVY 1989a: 25, §2.3.1.4 and 141 s.v. Naming.

3.5.2 {πι-} — the non-cohesive, pure-actualization designative or naming article

This intriguing determinator is non-referential; it is “autistic”. Unlike {πι-}, it does not relate “its” lexeme syntagmatically to another noun syntagm, whence πι- draws its specifying force. But {πι-} specifies its lexeme metalinguistically: “the sign that signifies SKY, SEA, SIN”, isolating, demarcating and delimiting it in a sense from its syntactical
environment, much as double quotes would do\textsuperscript{31}. It is solely actualizing — a generic, designative, *naming* article — a special determinator definitely absent in the Greek system. It is singular only. *nēn*— (and the residual *n*—: POLOTSKY 1968; see also Chapter Four), conventionally assigned as its plural form, are in fact very different: they occur only in the discontinuous *nēn*— *n*—. The article *π*— does not occur in apposition to a proper Name, unless in the discontinuous Constituence Personal-Sphere Association construction *π*— *n*— described below. Here, in fact, is the hub of the problem of {π—}. What is the common ground of, say, the *unicum* Φιομ and the first term in Ex. 21:22 Παλ Ντζεμι and in Num. 20:24 Φμωτ ντζαντιαιοια? Since, generally speaking, outside these constructions, {π—} is syntactically inert, relatively speaking: it itself is non- phoric, and is but rarely expanded attributively or even resumed (even the article + οτογ *n*— construction, testifying to partitivity, is excluded for {π—}; and so is the combination of Φωσαι and *n*—, while Πιοσαι *n*— is well attested). This type of generic is but rarely expanded:

Unique: Deut. 34:12, 11:24 Φιομ Νδαε.
Unique: Num. 34:12 Φιομ εεμολε.
Unique: Deut. 8:15 Νμαε Πινιντ ετεμματ οτογ ετοι Ντοτ (expressive).

Generic: Num. 31:50 Φρωμι εταξι Νοτκετος Ννοτεν.
Generic: Num. 21:5 Πωκ ετωσειτ (expressive; Arabic demonstrative!).

Generic: Num. 23:19 Ναρεφ Οι Αν Μφρητ Μπρωμι εουατ- γαπ εροε — not conclusively relative; most probably adnexal Circumstantial, as often following Φρητ *n*—.
Generic: Gen. 27:27 Τκοι ετζακ εβολ (poetic-expressive).
Address Status: (extra-corpus): Mark 10:17f. Φρεφ τεβω ναμαεο.
I suggest that {π—} *n*— (almost only specific nouns or PNs follow here) does not constitute an expansion of a nuclear {π—}, but is a complex frame or matrix of discontinuous elements, in which the article is an initial constituent (details below). In this case {π—} is not nuclear, and does not specify its lexeme alone, but combinatorily, by induction — it is the element following the *notae relationis* that is marked as specific (cf. the combinatory specificity of “age” in “Johnson’s age”, as contrasted with “The age of Johnson”\textsuperscript{32}. On the other hand, {π—} + Ντε-

\textsuperscript{31} Cf. ROSEN (H.) 1999:41f. for the use of Latin ille and hic for the same purpose.

\textsuperscript{32} It is of course probable that specificity is here overruled by the signalling of distinct homonyms by the different constructions.
(specific) is a special and near-unique case of \( \pi - \) expanded, and not discontinuous: see further below.

Obs.
(1) The plural article \( n - \) does occur in the corpus as a morphophonemic alternant (\( \text{ΝΑΛΩΝΤΙ ΝΙΚΑΚ} \, \text{Gen. 26:25 (= Vat)} \); see \text{POLOTSKY 1968}) before unstressed vowel — arguably, a case of "signalling of preservation of initial lexeme-boundaries", \text{ASH}; cf. \text{OLZ 59:253 n. 1 1964}, omitted in \text{Collected Papers 438}. The "n<-V" rule is valid only for Egyptian lexemes. The fact that \( n \pi n - \) is not attested alone does not mean, I think, that n\pi - and n\pi - are neutralized in the plural, but only that generic-name n\pi - is singular only. The genericity of \{n\pi -\} is stated, following \text{STERN 1880:227}, also by \text{DEPUYD'T 1985a} (n\pi - "Element-genus", ZERO "genus"; \text{D.} uses \text{Mallon-Malinine's examples and is not corpus-based}).

\textbf{3.5.2.1 Different roles of \{n\pi -\}:}

(a) The article \{n\pi -\} actualizes-by-naming unique geographical and cosmic notions — a closed lexical list — such as
\begin{enumerate}
\item \text{πΚΑΓΙ Gen. 8:1:9:11.}
\item \text{τΦΕ Gen. 8:2.}
\item \text{ΦΝΟΣΝ Gen. 1:2.}
\item \text{ΦΙΑΡΟ Gen. 41:1.}
\item \text{ΦΙΟΜ Gen. 22:17.}
\item \text{ΦΡΗ Lev. 22:7.}
\end{enumerate}
The four cardinal points: Gen. 28:14, 24:62.
πΣΣ, Φ† passim, which have the status of highest-specificity Proper Names.

(b) \{n\pi -\} in the name slot:
\begin{enumerate}
\item \text{Gen. 16:14 ...†ΠΑΝ ΞΕ-ΤΨΩ† ΕΤΑΙΝΑς (= Vat).}
\item \text{Gen. 1:8 ΑΦ† ΜΟΤ† ΕΠΙΤΑΡΟ ΞΕ-ΤΦΕ.}
\item \text{Num. 11:3 ΑΡ†ΠΕΝ-ΦΡΑΝ ΜΠΙΜΑ ΕΤΕΜΜΑΣ ΞΕ-ΦΡΩΚΓ.}
\item \text{Gen. 21:33 Φ† ΠΙΨΛΕΝΕΓ.}
\item \text{Gen. 30:18 ΞΕ-ΦΒΕΧΕ.}
\item \text{De Vis 1 181 ΑΡΨΩΠΙΙ ΕΠΕΨΡΑΝ ΝΕ ΦΝΟΒΙ.}
\item \text{Ez. 13:10 (Tattam, collated) ΕΣΞΩ ΜΜΟΣ ΞΕ-ΤΨΙΡΝΗ ΤΨΙΡΝΗ ΟΤΟΣ ΜΜΟΝ-ΤΨΙΡΝΗ}
\end{enumerate}

(c) \{n\pi -\} with lexemes in general (open-listed), which it designates by forming their Notion Names and actualizes metalinguistically. This role coincides with \{n\pi -\} forming genus names, often in enumeration. (\text{BALLY 1950 §115} ["l'emploi générique des substantives] présente à l'imagination des entités existant à un seul exemplaire et échappant à toute quantification"):
πέριον Gen. 31:39.

Φησωσ Ex. 1:22.


πκνονq Deut. 15:23.

Φθησιν Gen. 9:12.

τερω† Gen. 21:8.

Φρωμι + πτεβνη Num. 31:11, 8:17.

ικην-Φρωμη ωα-πτεβνη Ex. 9:25, 12:12 etc.

εκην-Φνοι Num. 29:25.

δα-πκνοq Num. 35:25 (subsequently — but generically still — δανικνοq in Num. 35:27; always definite in Greek).

ε-π† Num. 31:4.

ε-Φουμq Lev. 19:23.

ε-ππολεποq Num. 32:6.

π- in grammaticalized noun phrases:

εκηα δε- Gen. 26:5 etc.

μφρη† n-, ετ-, θμη† n- passim.

Φνατ n- premodifier (see below).

πκε- “also”, with Proper Names or personal pronouns.

Obs.

(1) Ex. 7:15 ποβωτ εταφωνη δανονσαq - non-generic — is difficult: Vat has here πι-. εταq- is not relative but Temporal. Is this article due here to the mystical uniqueness of a magic wand?

(2) πι- in the rare, if not (in the corpus) unique Ex. 2:14 μπηρή† ετακκωτεβ μπρεμωκημη nξaq (Vat Φρη†) is either marked as affective, or else is cataphoric: “in the very manner in which …”.

(d) π- + quantifier: non-phoric article, combinatory specificity:

θμαq [num.] νρομπι Num. 33:38.


πκεβενιαμιν Gen. 42:36 (cf. νακειορανης, Num. 32:5, Deut. 3:27).

(e) π-ετ- actualizing, lexemizing the relative conversion to zero-determination. Here π- (masculine only) is not really opposed to ΦΗ, since it is severely restricted. Structurally, this is a different, homonymic entity, since ετ- is not lexemic. At any rate, this is a non-phoric element (see in detail below):

πινετςονq Deut. 24:7.


ζαννεθηνανσε Num. 10:30 (= Vat).
πκε is distinctively common in the NT and Nitrian sources with Proper Names and their commutables, personal pronouns: ΝΕΜ ΠΚΕΝΘΩQ ΓΩQ Cat. 31, 47, Mac. No. 6; ΠΚΕΝΘΩQ ΓΩQ AM I 214 — exx. on p. 128 of Crum’s personal copy of Stern’s Koptische Grammatik (1880, rebound 1929, at the Griffith Institute, Oxford); John 12:10 ΠΙΝΑ ΝΕΚΣΩΤΕΒ ΜΠΙΧΑΛΑΡΟC; also Gal. 2:1, Acts 12:25, 19:15, Philipp. 4:3, ΚΕΝΤΚΕΡΨΗΝ Acts 23:11.

(f) Π- Ν- (almost only specific33): discontinuous close (“inalienable” or Personal-Sphere Constituence Association) non-possessive association, see in detail below: combinatorial high specificity. The article itself is of neutral specificity (which is why it occurs here):

ΦΜΑΣΙ ΜΠΕΚΚΟΝ Deut. 22:1.
ΘΝΑΤ ΜΠΙΔΛΟΤ Ex. 2:8.
ΠΚΟΝ ΜΠΑΣΙ Deut. 25:7f.
ΤΦΩΝ ΝΛΕΤI Num. 17:2.
ΘΟΣΗΨΙ ΜΠΙΑΣΩ ΝΙΑΚΩΒ Gen. 32:24.

Obs.
(1) ΦΝΑΣ Ν- is grammaticalized in ΦΝΑΣ ΝΡΟΣΤΩI. ΦΝΑΣ ΝΓΑΝΑΤΟΤΩI Ex. 16:6:12 as an adverbial pre-modifier, contrasted with: — ΜΦΝΑΣ ΝΓΑΝΑΤΟΤΩ, ΜΦΝΑΣ ΝΓΑΝΑΡΩΣI, post-modifier, Ex. 16:8:13. Ex. 16:13 ΜΦΝΑΣ ΔΕ ΝΨΨΡΙ ΝΣ-ΨΨΠ... is not in conflict with the above statement, since this is in contrastive focus: nor is Num. 28:16, where МФНАТ is coordinated to МПΙАВОТ.
(2) Num. 21:29 οФΛΑΟΣ ΝΧΑΜΩΣ (= Val) in address may be a case of “pragmatic Proper-Name”, cf. Shisha-Halevy 1989a:49ff., but is possibly another instance of Π- Ν-.
(3) Note instances of appositive {Π-} Ν- (following Proper Names, delimitative in contrast to Π- ΝΤΕ-):
Ex. 3:1 ΙΟΘΩΡ ΝΣΨΨΜ # ΦΟΣΗΒ ΝΝΑΗΙΑΗ.
Gen. 24:10 ΕΓΓΕΝΟΨΩΤΑΗΑ # ΕΦΒΑΚΗ ΝΝΑΧΨΡ.
Gen. 41:46 ΦΑΡΨΨ # ΠΟΤΡΟ ΝΧΗΜΙ.
Deut. 33:1 ΜΨΩΨΗΣ # ΦΨΡΨΗΙ ΜΨΨ.

(g) Π- ΝΤΕ- (specific34): an especially intriguing environment for {Π-}, here singular only (no ΝΕΝ-). Probably not another discontinuous construction, yet still not entirely clear to me: it is strongly suggestive of being an opposition construction for the Π- Ν- one, reducing or annuling the Personal-Sphere Constituence Association (see below):

ΤΣΟΡΜΕΝΣ ΝΤΕΨΑΖΗΤ Deut. 29:19.

33 Unless in poetic language.
34 Unless in poetic language.
πξηρηρημ ανηνεψθη ηπία Νυ. 14:27.
ποίημα αντεξιμα ανεκωτ Λυ. 18:8.
παρημ αντεπικώτ Γεν. 31:3.
φυκωθ ανταινιαλον Νυμ. 20:24.
τσαρημ αντεπαλεβι Γεν. 17:24f.

(h) π- ... π- reiterative compound phrases:
The reiterative noun syntagm35 is a feature of importance and still
some mystery in Coptic in general. In our Bohairic, the indefinite article
(in Sahidic: “all sorts of...”) does not reiterate; we encounter all three
other articles in these idiomatic phrases. Observe that these are as a rule
real compounds, with their constituents linked in close juncture.

(1) Φρωμι Φρωμι totalizing: “each and every man”, Λυ. 20:9,
22:18 (+ ετνα-); 17:13, 18:6 (resumed by Νηεγ- Sgl! Greek άνθρω-
πος άνθρωπος):

(2) Φοσαί Φοσαί, opposed to πιοσαί πιοσαί: adverbial “each”,
“one by one” — see above, under οταί. Πιοσαί seems to be ana-
phoric and specific, Πιοσαί Πιοσαί usually opening the sequence car-
ried on by Φοσαί Φοσαί, and Φοσαί Φοσαί non-specific, non-
phoric; Φοσαί Φοσαί is typically appositive. However, this is no
more than an impression, with numerous contradictory examples, and
the opposition in the actantial slot (always agent actant) escapes me alto-
gether (Greek always έκαςτος):

Gen. 44:11 Απιοσαί Πιοσαί ορος Μπεγκοκ γεζεμπικαί
ορος Α Φοσαί Φοσαί οτασ Μπεγκοκ.

Num. 16:17 Μαρεπιοσαί Πιοσαί ει Ντεκσοσθρ ορος ερε-
Φοσαί Φοσαί ιν Ντεκσοσθρ.

Ex. 16:16 Φοσαί Φοσαί Μαρεπσκαί (cf. Ex. 32:27 Μαρε-
Φοσαί Φοσαί Αυτεβ).

Ex. 16:29 ...Φοσαί Φοσαί Σενπεμα — appositive, adverbial
and rhematic.

Ex. 36:4 ...Φοσαί Φοσαί καταπικαβ.

(3) Φα-πιεκσοσ πιεκσοσ Ex. 16:4f. proves the compound nature
of the reiteration phrase: “each day’s (ration)”.

(4) Zero determination reiterated, following Rheme-introducing η-,
expresses focussed fragmentation:
-οι ημωτ ημωτ Γεν. 14:10 (Greek φρέατα φρέατα).

3.5.3 Possession and determination. In this brief note, I will try and examine the contact area or interface of lexeme and pronominal (or rather grammemic) exponent of possession (in point of fact, possessor) or, more generally, possessedness, in its determination aspect. As will be seen in following paragraphs, “possession” is not a clear or even generally suitable notion. It is conventional, and as if generally well-understood; but in fact, both it and its kindred terms “belonging” and the (for Coptic) almost nonsensical “genitive”, are more obscuring than descriptively helpful. For neither παρει πνηματικοι, nor τερωπι πνευματικοι, nor πρεμπτιμ πνευματωμενοι, all corresponding to Greek genitive cases, are well served by being described as “genitive” or “possession” — these terms short-circuit the sophisticated relations expressed by the Coptic syntax. This reservation advanced, I still use here “possession” as a cover term, as code, for convenience and brevity.

First, it must be realized that the ‘pronom — noun lexeme’ and ‘nound syntagm — noun syntagm’ dependencies are in this context so drastically different as to be different phenomena: employing the dubious “pronominalization” as a bridge between these two sets of features — using the nominal set to explain the pronominal one (so Polotsky 1985: see below, Obs. 1) is, I believe, basically wrong and muddles the issue. Indeed, only the former, usually close-junctured, is properly speaking possessive (approximately signifying “belonging”); the latter, all open-junctured, all formally linked by the notae relationis n- and nte-, are associative-appurtenative, with “inalienable” (Personal-Sphere Constituence Association) relationship a specially marked case.

(a) {Φα-} is neither a determinator, nor it is possessed; it is specificity-indifferent, non-specifying and non-actualizing, since it inhabits a pre-determinator slot, adjoining the noun syntagm and out of
contact with the lexeme (this is a rare, if not unique case of two grammemes in contact in a nucleus — expansion dependence). Notably excluded before the zero article, but not before nil in non-lexemic cases (can this be for the iconic reason that zero article resembles the bare lexeme too closely?):

Φα- πι- Num. 29:11, Ex. 34:6, 16:7 etc.
   πι-... πι- Ex. 16:4.
   ηθ... Gen. 44:34.
   πι-... Gen. 50:19, Ex. 13:12 only Φ†, πις.
   περι... Deut. 12:17, Gen. 32:18 — compatibility of kindred.
   νιμ Gen. 32:17, 38:25.
   οσ...notωτ Deut. 12:8: also indefinite article?
   πως Gen. 24:57.

Appropriately, Φα- has non-specific or rather specificity-indifferent syntax\(^{36}\); it is an anaphoric-substitute “pro-form”, gender-number cohesive (never cataphoric; non-deictic).

Deut. 12:17 Νιψορη Μιμιή Ντενεκεσωσ νεμ Νανακεσωσ.

Deut. 18:15 Νεκσνοσ... Ναπάρη†.
   Deut. 33:7 Φαι Φα-ιονας τε.
   Ex. 16:4f. Φα-περσοος περσοος.

(b) {Φως} is the personal pre-personal-pronoun alternant of {Φα-}. It too is non-specific, or rather specificity-indifferent. Anaphoric (non-deictic; gender-number-cohering substitute or pro-form); often rhematic (with possessedness, not possession predicated, as with Φα-). Its syntax reflects specificity-Indifference:

Gen. 38:25 Πιριμι ετε-νοτσ νε Ναι.
   Lev. 22:22:24 Φη ετλας Ννεκαλ... Φη ετακοδεξ Ννοτσ.
   Deut. 20:18 Πνητ Μπεξκον ... Φως...
   Ex. 21:34 εμεερΦως.

Noteworthy — and in my opinion indicative of specificity-indifference — is the construction:

Gen. 49:25 Φ† Φωι (Greek ο θεός ο εμός), an appositive attributive construction (in the corpus, only here in poetic language; possibly reflecting idiomatic Coptic and early Egyptian syntax (see also below).

\(^{36}\) Cf. Modern Welsh un-, a “one”-type nuclear pro-form (Shisha-Halevy 1998: 74ff.) which, like our Φα-, is specificity-indifferent.
(c) {πεq-}, which is related prosodically to Φωq as its pre-lexeme proclitic alternant, is structurally a true determinator (hence “possessive article”), specific and specifying by virtue of its pre-lexemic position - its contact with the lexeme.

(d) A specific and specifying grammaticalized paraphrastic counterpart of {Φω=}, very common outside the corpus, is {πετεΦωq} / {Φη ετεΦωq} (πε), or lexeme-specifying {πετεΦωq} n- (Φω= n- occurs too in Nitrian Bohairic; the last two possibly expressing focussed possession in opposition to the unmarked πεq-). See above, Chapter Two (the Delocutive-Theme Nominal Sentence, for Theme zeroing):

**νετενοτος θυσις** (etc.) Gen. 20:7, Num. 31:9.
**Νετενοτος** Gen. 33:9, ΝΗ ετε-νοτος Num. 16:5.
**Λεβ. 5:24** ΦΗ ετεΦωq πΕ εφεθιq ναq.
ΦΩΤΑΙ ΦΩΤΑΙ εΤΕΘΩΨΙΚ ΝΚΘΣΙC ... ΦΩΤΑΙ ΦΩΤΑΙ ...ΕΕΘ ΕΤΕΘΩΤΕΝ ΜΠΑΤΡΙΑ ... ΤΤΙΝΗ ΝΕΒ ΕΤΕΘΩΨΙ ΜΦΣΗΗ ... (Λεβ. 25:10, 27:2) — special reference to ΦΩΤΑΙ ΦΩΤΑΙ?

(e) ΝΤΑ= is used to introduce the attributive pronominal possessor for a quantified or low-specificity (indefinite, zero-determination) or marked specific (including high-specificity) nominal possessum:

**οτκώνι Νταq Μπαθηνος** Lev. 21:3.
[number] Ν... Νταq Ex. 36:38, 38:10ff.
**Δωρον Νιβεν Ντωτεν** Lev. 2:13, Deut. 5:14, 28:42.
**Σρός Νταq** Deut. 3:3.
**Σταφερι Νθι** Deut. 22:16.

Obs.
(1) In the unedited B4 Twelve Prophets (P.Vat. coppto 9) Zacharias we find four intriguing examples of ΠΙ- ΝΤΑ= (Zach. 9:17 ΠΙΑΘΕΟΝ ΝΤΑQ, 11:6 ΠΙΟΤΡΟ ΝΤΑQ, 11:10 ΠΙΩΒΟΤ ΝΘΗ, 11:5 ΝΙΜΑΝΕΣΛΟΤ ΝΤΟΨΟΤ) — all apparently not deictic — which must indicate some difference from πεq-, either as expressing a different marked semantics of association (closer?), or a higher specificity of {πι-} as against a specificity neutrality of {πεq-}. The prevalence of special constructions for under- or over-specific possessa (English “a this friend of mine”, Welsh hen drowsus i'm hewythr “old pants of ['to'] my uncle's” and so on) implies structurally a possessive determinator (“my” etc.), or specifying possession, on (almost) the same grade as — or even slightly higher than — median definite article. See PALERMO 1998.

(2) Luke 5:3 **ἀποφετε ννικοι εφάκιμων πΕ** hints at the possible nominal-possessor alternant of the ΝΤΑ= construction following low-specificity possessa.

(f) A few lexemes of a lexically well-defined closed group, have, preposition-like, a special pronominal (“pre-suffix-pronoun”) morphological allomorph linking them directly to possessor pronouns. These are
all instances of "inalienable" association (in reality almost only body parts). Linkage with noun syntags (not zero-determined?) is effected by the complex means of n- following a cataphoric deictive possessor pronoun. Very often, the lexeme in point is grammaticalized as part of a complex preposition (or even as an unanalyzable one). All these lexemes have combinatory (but not intrinsic) specificity.

Deut. 13:6 kενκ.
Lev. 13:12 ιαξεν-αωφ ωαρατη.
Num. 32:24 ρωτεν.
Num. 4:27 πωφ ναρφχν.
Deut. 28:64 αυρχαμ μπαργι.
Ex. 12:28 υτοτη μμωρχε υμεν ναρφχν.
Lev. 14:17 εντενι τεφξικα νοτιαμ.

Obs.
(1) The acute terminological and conceptual problem triply addressed in 1985 (Polotsky 1985, Depuydt 1985b, Shisha-Halevy 1985) reflects different analytical approaches to a basic structural puzzle, namely the contradiction between the non-specific, non-specificifying Φα- / Φωφ and the proclitic lexeme-expanded alternant of the latter, namely the specifying possessive article {περ-}. H.J. Polotsky's explanation is essentially dynamic and indeed generative: progressive pronominalization (of possessor — περ- of possessum — Φα-, of both — Φωφ); the aspiration of Boh. Φα- is explained (Polotsky 1985:91f.) by "[die] Ellipse des Substantivs, zu dem das anlautende Φ/θ- gehört: das Substantiv, an das Φ/θ- sich unter Aufgabe seines Tones und damit seiner Aspiration anlehnen würde, wenn es vorhanden wäre, ist eben von vornherein im Plane der Konstruktion "erspart" und kann keine de-aspirierende Wirkung ausüben" — that is, by postulating deletion in surface structure. The possessives must be explained after the "genitival" construction: "die Possessiva die Genetivkonstruktion bzw. ihre Kenntnis voraussetzen und daher nach derselben zu besprechen sind" (Polotsky reproaches Stern for "putting here the cart before the horses", whereas Stern is here nothing if not scientific — ASH) "daß es mit der sachgemäßen Reihenfolge auch nicht getan ist: eine rationelle Darstellung müßte die Genetivkonstruktion eng mit den Possessiva verbinden; auf diese Weise erschien die Unterordnung eines Substantivs (des Besitzers) unter ein andres (ein Besitz) als Ausgangspunkt einer progressiven Pronominalisierung, die mit dem beiderseits pronominalen πωφ σχ ihr Ende erreicht". As often in his later work, Polotsky mixes here linguistic-systemic analysis and metalinguistic-dynamic synthesis. Depuydt 1985b sees πωφ as "substantival", περ- as "adjectival", which makes no syntactical sense and contradicts just about everything in the Coptic system of grammar. Like Polotsky, Depuydt sees the "genitive" syntagm as underlying, that is, operates in a generative model.

(2) The puzzling aspiration of Φα- is indeed remarkable and telling37. R. Kasser attributes this to its being half-stressed (1994: 289ff., 294f. etc.), in an argumentation that is rather ad-hoc. Polotsky 1985:91 sees it as consequence of a deletion of an underlying substan-

37 No aspiration in the lexicalized and lexemic (further determined) πατωξελετ "bridegroom": Crum Dictionary 561a.
tive (Obs. 1). I suspect the answer is rather a structural and functional one: Φα- (historically p3-n-, which alone may account historically for its prosodic nature in Coptic — pace Loprieno 1995:69, p3-n- does not refer to specificity) is a bound form, yet not proclitic, in the usual sense, for it unusually occupies the pre-determinator slot. This prosodic feature must indicate both its precise paradigmatic functional identity with Φω- and, syntagmatically, its pro-form (substitute) nature as well as the fact that it is not a determinator. (Incidentally, this element is not always aspirated in the Bodmer III B4 John: cf. 7:16, 19:24; see Kasser’s note, p. ix).

(3) Φα- and its various constructions are remarkably well attested in John (B4) ΝΕΤΕΝΟΝΤΙ ΤΗΡΟΤ ΝΟΤΚ ΝΕ ΟΤΟΥ ΝΟΤΚ ΝΟΤΙ ΝΕ 17:10, also 8:44, 16:14f., 17:17:18:35. Contrast John (B4) 14:27 ΤΕΤΕΘΩΝ ΝΓΙΡΠΟΝ (Greek εἰμίνη τὴν ἐμιν), 17:17 ΤΕΤΕΘΩΝ ΝΓΑΣΙ with ΤΕΤΕΘΡΗΝ 14:10 (αὐτοῖ): does the former focus the possession? John 19:24 (B4; B5 ACNA-) ΑΣΕΡ′ ΤΑΝΙΝ in the Present proves by the waiving of the Stem-Jemstedt Rule that ΤΑ- (ΕΑ-) is not specific.

(4) Note also the following representative instructive exx. outside the corpus: characterizing possessum specificity AM II 202 ΟΤΩΣ ΕΠΩΝ ΩΝ “a boat of mine” — cases illustrating the focusability of Φω-, De Vis II 232 ΑΝΟΝ-ΝΟΤΚ ΝΕΓΡΑΠΟΤΗ: its pro-form nature, Luke 22:42 ΤΕΤΕΘΝΗ ΑΝ ΑΛΛΑ ΦΩΚ ΝΑΡΕΓΡΑΨΙΝ.

(5) Appositively attributive (colloquial?) Nitrian ΠΑΙΣΙΟΝ ΦΩΙ ΜΑC. No. 4 fgt 3, ΝΕΤΡΙΠ ΝΟΤΝ, with other exx., p. 118 in W. E. Crum’s copy of Stern’s Koptische Grammatik by Stern (1880, rebound 1929, at the the Griffith Institute, Oxford, with many marginal annotations in German. Apparently, Stern was the main source for Crum’s Coptic grammatical information). This construction is idiomatic and specifically allocutive (pace Andersson 1904:73 on Gen. 49:25 (“servility to Greek: in good Boh. ete-. Sounds strange to Coptic ears”)). May this be the descendant construction of LE possessive -jenk (cf. Gilula 1968)39, also allowing for specificity marking of the possessum, and — mutatis mutandis — comparable to attributive-rhematic “mine” in earlier English (and Germanic), as in “father mine”? The ΤΕΤΕ-ΦΩΕ Ν- construction is well attested in Nitrian: cf. AM I 96, 104, 170 — it appears to be typically allocutive, usually affective or rhetorical.

(6) For the ancestor of Φα-, viz. p3-n-, often written p-n-, see Spiegelberg 1918: this article brings home the close association Φα- has with Proper Names, both as nucleus for a Proper-Name expansion, then as a Proper Name itself. For the syntactic phenomenon in a general perspective, cf. Old Italian [il di lui]-amico, Palermo 1998 (with associated constructions, such as l’[ADJ] di lui [NOUN]); also the Modern French possessive article (cf. for Early French: Posener 1988), Togoby 1982: I 475f., Weinrich 1982:310ff., Jacobs 1990:67f.; Cf. also, French celui de Substpec, see Veland 1996 esp. 127f., 136ff.

(7) In LE, a special attributive postpositive pronoun set (jenk, twt, swt) expresses the possessor after low- or high-specificity nominal possessum, under almost the exact conditions of our attributive ντάκ- (e) above: Ermann 1933 §107ff.

(8) Cases like ΕΡΩΤΕΙΩΝ ΝΓΙΡΜΩΤΕΙΝ Gen. 29:2, varying with ΕΡΩΤΕΙΩΝ ΝΓΙΡΜΩΤΕΙΝ Gen. 29:3:10; ΡΩΣ ΝΤΑΚΩΔΙ Gen. 21:24 (v.l. ΡΩΣ), ΚΕΝΩ ΝΤΕΚΙΑ (De Vis II 7, Polotsky 1930:84), and, even more cogently, the lexemicized possessive in ΕΡΩΤΕΙΩΝ.

38 See Chapter Four for grading of boundness (close juncture).
39 Predicative Φω- may be related to an important and as yet unclarified phenomenon of pre-Coptic Egyptian, where we have three distinct Nominal Sentence patterns for predicating possession, namely the old nk + POSSESSEUM, n.k-jm[t] + POSSESSEUM, and the late (but not Coptic) nj-sw + POSSESSEUM, historically an adjective-Rheme pattern.
3.6 Generics: a retrospect and synthesis

The passage just quoted from Revelation uses different signals, with different lexical categories, for expanded and unexpanded nouns, all to express the generic in formal topic status.

How — in what forms and environments, with what semantic distinctions — does Bohairic express the generic? This topic, central in the phenomenology of the determination syndrome in any language, and largely unresearched in Egyptian-Coptic, is as difficult and elusive as it is fascinating and crucial for optimal translation. Apparently, the “generic sense” is rather a generic — i.e. non-particular — reading of the determinators in their lexical and syntactic environment, under circumstances that are not easy to isolate and define. In fact, it is a cluster of perspectives of determination, from various semasiological angles. The very fact that all articles are compatible with generic readings is instructive as to the essence of this semantic range (rather than “category”). As will be seen, Bohairic has a complex system of generic markers, a system more sophisticated than the Sahidic or the Greek ones (Greek has a binary article system but makes use of number, and even gender markers, such as the plural neuter, for generics).

When Östen Dahl says (1995:425): “to my knowledge, there is no language which has a “generic’ article”, he makes a claim too sweeping; in Bohairic Coptic, both zero and {θ-} articles are — or so I suggest — “generic articles”, that is, for both, a generic reference — generic reference of two kinds — is a prime signifié, namely, extensive-diffuse “lexeme-simulating” and naming genericity, respectively. For
the two other determinators presented above, {πι-} and {σω-}, genericity seems to be incidental (I prefer this to "secondary") and "metaphorical", triggered by a special textual environment. I find noteworthy the formulation in Jacobsson 1997:151, that genericity is a function of the total context and as such not a feature of articles, noun phrases or verbs. The distinction between generic and non-generic is one of degree along a continuum, and linguists have drawn the dividing line between the two concepts at varying points along this continuum. I would question here only the scalar conception, and replace it with the perspectival one — arguably compatible with the said continuum — suggested below.

Obs.

Four determinator signals for generic reading are encountered in our variety of Bohairic, making for four distinct genericity types, namely {πι-}, zero, {πι-}, σω-. All determinators, perhaps even γαν-, are susceptible of generic decoding. The Bohairic system of generic marking is thus considerably more sophisticated than the Sahidic one. Of these determinators, the first two are actually "purpose-built" exponents of genericity; with the first primarily a naming exponent; the others are decoded as generic in a metaphorical or "masked" view of the class: πι-masked, σω- (γαν-) masked. (Zero too may be considered as masking "as a bare lexeme"). Except for a certain grammatically alternant overlap between σω- and zero, these four types, corresponding to distinct semantic perspectives of genericity, are not conditioned or excluded grammatically — indeed, by definition; they would not have a meaning otherwise — and yet, they are typical of specific grammatical environments. Indeed, it is the environment that operates the generic de-

coding, for genericity has no single absolute synthetic meaning. (The following detailing observations will occasionally review statements made above on the respective determinators).

(a) \{\pi\text{-}\}, the pure-actualization determinator (above, 3.4.2), is directly metalinguistic: its deictic force is in this sense external - it refers from outside "la parole" in, and not, as with exophoric \pi_{1\text{-}}, from inside discourse out. It expresses two denotative notions, namely unica — the names for unique entities — and a distinct type of genericity. I suggest the latter is no other than the genus and notion name: not "the class of X" but "the class called X", just as for uniques we have "the thing called X". In fact, both roles are one: naming. We encounter here the genus named, or — if one prefers — masked as an unique, in isolation from any or all other kinds. This forms a sharp contrast with the \pi_{1\text{-}} masked generic, which relates the kind to others in a class system, opposing kinds and ranges. Thus, \pi_{-} is the nearest Coptic has (other than zero) to a specialty generic article.

Note the following functional and distributional highlights of \{\pi\text{-}\}, which I believe to be symptomatic and telling:
- Prevalently determinating abstracts, especially verbal nouns of all kind (infinitives, \epsilon\pi_{-} + infinitives, \epsilon\pi\chi\iota\nu\iota\eupsilon\eupsilon\epsilon\rho\epsilon\varsigma\gamma\,-, \epsilon\pi\chi\iota\nu\iota\eupsilon\iota\nu\eupsilon\eupsilon\epsilon\iota\varsigma\,-, lexical abstracts)
- Rarely occurring with Greek loans (unlike \pi_{1\text{-}}); strikingly rare with \epsilon\rho_{-} integrated Greek infinitives.
- Very rarely predicated (thematic), either in the essential-inherent predication patterns (Nominal Sentence, see Chapter Two) or as incidental Rheme: here rather the zero (extensional) and indefinite (instantial) generic types are found.
- \{\pi\text{-}\} is the determinator occurring in real naming and as quote form:
  \begin{align*}
  \text{Gen. 16:14} & \quad \Gamma\rho\alpha\nu \varepsilon\text{-}\tau\omicron\omega\omega\upsilon \varepsilon\tau\alpha\iota\iota\alpha\varsigma (P = \text{Vat}). \\
  \text{Gen. 1:8} & \quad \alpha\phi\tau\varphi \mu\omicron\omicron\upsilon \varepsilon\pi\tau\alpha\varsigma\rho\omicron \varepsilon\text{-}\tau\Phi\epsilon. \\
  \text{Num. 11:3} & \quad \alpha\varphi\tau\rho\alpha\nu \pi\mu\iota\mu\alpha \varepsilon\tau\omicron\eta\mu\mu\tau\alpha \varepsilon\text{-}\Phi\rho\omicron\omega\kappa\gamma.
  \end{align*}
- \{\pi\text{-}\} is the determinator used in grammaticalized (adverbial, conjunctival) noun phrases:
  \begin{align*}
  \epsilon\pi\omega\omega\iota, \epsilon\pi\epsilon\sigma\epsilon\varsigma\tau\upsilon, \epsilon\Phi\omicron\omicron\upsilon\iota \text{Gen. 37:18.} \\
  \epsilon\Phi\omicron\mu\alpha \varepsilon\text{-}, \mu\Phi\rho\tau\upsilon \epsilon\text{-}/\nu\text{-}, \nu\omicron\nu\mu\nu\iota \text{-} \nu\text{-}; \pi\kappa\epsilon\text{.}
  \end{align*}
- For the important role of \{\pi\text{-}\} as main constituent part of the discontinuous \pi_{-} \text{ n-} and \pi_{-} \nu\tau\epsilon\text{-}, see below. This is still the named genus,
representing it here almost iconically as non-referent ‘token’, in an associative (“inalienable” [for ν̃-], or [for ντε-] non-possessive) dependence with a specific noun, which lends the whole phrase its specificity. ν̃- itself is again specific only in the “external” meta-lexical sense suggested above; the absence of phoricity and the total non-informativeness on anything to do with lexeme specificity, but on the lexeme as such, is of the essence.

- Perhaps the case of metalinguistic determination par excellence, namely lemmatic and gloss determination, features {ν̃-}.

Obs.
(2) On ν̃- as lemma/gloss form: SHISHA-HALEVY 1994:234f. with n.31; on properizing {ν̃-}, SHISHA-HALEVY 1989a:12, 33f.; VERNUS 1990a:191 (LE-Demotic). Lexicographical determination is of course a separate topic of interest. In Kircher’s Scalae, the lemmata are but rarely zero-determined, especially in Greek-origin words (and naturally in Proper Names, astrological and other terms etc.): ἈΙΚΗ, ΑΚΤΡΑ, ΚΟΙΞΙΟΝ, ΑΠΟΔΕΙΣ, ΦΟΡΙΧΔΑ, ΙΠΙΣ, ΘΕΡΩN — then often articulated in the Arabic gloss. Usually, however, the Arabic article glosses the definites in Bohairic (-paym, napum, nizim; less usually qran, τιτε). In Crum and Bell’s “Greek-Coptic Glossary” (Aegyptus 6, 1925, 266) it is hardly the case that (183) “there is no system in the use of the article”. Parts of the body have the Coptic definite (5-48, 131-180); animals — the Coptic zero (65ff., 405ff.). Agricultural instruments and installations — the Coptic definite (111ff., 205ff., 284); human types and properties — the Coptic zero (172, 233f., 335, 263ff., 327ff.). Materials, forms of water etc. — the Coptic zero (187ff., 231ff.); professions — the Coptic definite. Glosses of Proper Names — the Coptic definite (247ff., 250ff.). νετ- corresponds to the Greek definite article with participle or agent noun (221ff., 381ff.); “zero-antecedent” eq.: ληγατονεψμν 344. A few exceptions: 195 κύδος ἑξ τὴν τίνι (275-8, 294ff., 296ff., 299, Greek words 350ff., 191).

Generic:
ΠΘΡΙΟΝ Gen. 31:39.
ΦΜΠΟΤ Ex. 1:22.
ΦΜΗΝΙ Gen. 9:12.
ΠΝΟΟΙ Deut. 15:23.
ΦΜΗΝΙ Gen. 9:12.
ΦΝΟΒI Num. 29:31.
ΦΡΩΜΙ ΠΤΕΒΝΗ Ex. 9:25, Num. 18:15, 31:11, 8:17.
ΤΕΡΩ+ Gen. 21:8.
ΦΟΣΩΝI Ex. 10:23.
(b) The zero article (3.3): the iconic, lexeme-simulating masked generic. This article, for which genericity is the sole signifié, is another metalinguistic device, more obliquely and more sophisticatedly metaphrastic, exploiting and, as it were, playing on the iconic similarity of zero (actualizing determinator in la parole) and nil (no determinator, bare unactualized lexeme as in la langue) — integrating the lexeme in discourse, but as it were isolating it from its syntactic environment and treating it as a pristine, non-actualized and still “potential” entity of la langue. The zero article signifies or denotes diffuse, extensional class-constituency, class as an unbounded, amorphic mass of class-members; it is an extensional, unstructured, frameless view of the genus. It is, incidentally, also more grammaticalized or more grammemically operative. Note zero following μμον- the “nulli-generic” is closely associated with non-existence: CHRISTOPHERSEN apud JESPERSEN 1949 (1961): 438ff.; less typically, it follows οτον as existant; in derived verbs (ερνομί, σι-κεδ); in attribution (ν- άγαθος), zero as non-essential i.e. incidental Rheme (following η-), or following prepositions in generic collocations. Unlike European and Semitic languages, zero is in
Coptic incompatible with plurality (see above, on the Coptic “morphological plurals”).

Some typical roles of zero determination illustrated:

1. Object generic — zero marking verbal compounding or following auxiliaries (as derivation basis — derived verbs: nil?).
   
   ce-mwot Ex. 7:21.
   o'cem-wik, xem-wemhp Ex. 12:19.
   si-wot Ex. 2:19.
   ep- (“do”) Gen. 41:9 (Chapter Two).
   ep- (“be”) Gen. 25:23, 29:32 (Chapter Two).
   Ṿ-τοκ Ex. 5:10.
   o'cem-atwemhp Ex. 12:15.
   Ṿanew-tebhn Num. 32:4.
   cotem-waipi ngwot Num. 31:18.
   xem-memhp Gen. 42:16.

2. Attributive generic — “adjective” — easily the most prevalent use of the zero-article generic. The genus here expands a lexeme as quality attribute (see below):
   o'vatcebi nprwhi Gen. 34:14.
   sgime niben ncaβε Ex. 35:25.
   oswi nαληθιον nem nemhi Deut. 25:15.
   Ṿsgimi neθowwi Num. 12:1.

3. Incidental rhematic generic — rhematic second or third actant (see above, and Chapter Two):
   Ex. 16:20 ἀτερ-κεντ.
   Ex. 7:19 ἀτερ-κονοκ.
   Ex. 26:32 Νοτκεφαλικ ετοι Ννων ... οτογ τογ-ά Μβακικ ετοι Νγατ.
   Ex. 30:23 oτκεσμωμον εφοι Nοθενωψη.  
   Gen. 42:36 ατετεναιτ Nατωψη.  
   Gen. 14:23 δεραβαμ Nραμσ.  

4. Zero as negative-environment generic. Zero represents the low-specificity (with the indefinite instantial generic excluded) in negative environment:
   Deut. 24:16 Ννειωτ μοτ εςενψηπ υταε Ννεψηπ μοτ εςενψητ.
   Deut. 12:13 μιμνετεπ-τοι υταε Κανψς.  
   Gen. 38:21 μιμ-πορνη Μπαίμα.  
   Deut. 17:16 Ννεψορεψο αψαι Ναψ σιμ.17.
   Deut. 15:11 Ννεψκι γαρ Μοτνκ.
Ex. 19:15 ἐχθρώμη ἐχθρώμῃ.
Gen. 36:31 μπατευρό ωπτή.
Ex. 16:24 μπετέντ ωπτή.
Deut. 8:3 παρεπιρώμει ναων ἐσωτερ κοίταζέναν.

Obs.
Note here also the highly formalized configuration, already referred to in several connections, viz., NEGATIVE-EXISTENTIAL (Non-Existence) ENVIRONMENT + ΔΕ- + NEGATIVE ENVIRONMENT: the adnominal paradigm to a generic zero-determined nucleus, in a doubly negative environment "[there is no...]...such as...[not]" — [- specific, - particular, - quantified].

(c) The singular {πι-} (3.4.1) — the "definite generic", familiar from many languages, poses the difficulty of resolving deictic phoricity from the denotative generic definitude, which is yet again a mask — this time of high deixis-induced specificity. Only superficially paradoxical "specific and generic", this determinator, condensing as it were the whole kind into a single class-member item, characterizes the class-set or system-of-classes or inter-genus generic; πι- is class-forming — class-bounding, class-contrasting, intensional. The genus is presented as a sub-range or component in a structured world-of-kinds spectrum. Genericity is here categoric and concretized.

Num. 11:12 πιθανὸν τὴν διάφορα.
Ex. 17:7 "πιστωτὴς δὲ πιθανὸν εἶναι" (in naming).
Num. 35:15 ὁ πυρετὸς καὶ ἡ πυρέπνεων.
Deut. 7:1 πιθανόντων δὲ πιθανόντων πιθακτοίτων πιθακτοίτων πιθακτοίτων πιθακτοίτων πιθακτοίτων, also Deut. 20:17 etc.
πιθακτοίτων δὲ πιθακτοίτων πιθακτοίτων πιθακτοίτων πιθακτοίτων πιθακτοίτων
Deut. 24:19ff., 26:12.
Deut. 26:12 πιθακτοίτων.
Gen. 31:40 πιθακτοίτων εἶσαν ἐβολὰς εὐαναλάλος.

(d) The plural πι- is encountered, less usually, in a different, if evidently related type of genericity, a "lower genericity" which is often difficult to distinguish from the exophoric or intertextual particular definite and the collective of class members ("all members but not the species itself", Jespersen 1949 [1961]:492). It may be significant that the plurals here correspond as a rule to a (Hebrew)-Greek definite plural:

Lev. 1:2 ἐβολὰ σεπνὴμνωτὶ ἐν ἐβολὰ σεπνὶκώτῳ ἐν ἐβολὰ σεπνὶκώτῳ.
Gen. 30:32 ἁννοῖς ἃννοιμοῖ (Greek definite plural).

Num. 21:6 νιγότω ... εὐαστωτέβ (ANDERSSON 1904:104, Greek definite plural)

Gen. 15:11 νιγαλατ (ANDERSSON 1904:41 attributes this to a "slip of the Coptic translator": Greek ὀρνεα).

Gen. 31:35 μφρήτ νιγιομοι — μφρήτ ννι- is idiomatic in Bohairic and very common outside the corpus (e.g. Hab. 14 B4), e.g. notably in the Psalms; but Greek definite plural here too.

Gen. 32:28 ὀτόν-αδον μμόκ ἁννοπωμί (Greek indefinite plural).

Obs.

(1) FUNK 1991:50 seems to deny genericity of definite determination outside Bohairic. However, on no more than two successive pages of Shenoutean Sahidic (Leip. III 146f.), I find τπαος, τεκοισημη, πραιτετικος, παλακη, παγεμβιο; πεξπιτιανος, νιγαλατε, πραιτετικος, πεξπιτιανος, ναλλιος, νιμωμε, ναγελος. What this boils down to is the very semantic conception of genericity, whether narrow or broad, the latter, with which I concur, envisaging any kind of non-particularity as generic.

(2) I find it hard to agree with DEPUYDT 1985a:59 "πι- ...[indicates] one element as the representative of the genus independently from other elements", whereas οω- and πι- "determine one element as part of a genus". Rather, πι- calls a genus by name, while πι-represents it in a world of genera.

(3) For the "discriminative generic", cf. TOBLER 1886/1912:102 (an article) "mit der besonderen Kraft die Gesamtheit der einen gewissen Namen tragenden Dinge oder Wesen, jede irgendwo und irgendwann vorhandene Menge eines so oder so benannten Stoffes allem anders Heissenden gegenüber zu stellen (le mammifère, l’oxygène), oder auch den einheitlichen Begriff von dieser oder jener Kraft, Tätigkeit, Bewegung, Form, Zahl, Eigenschaft u. dgl., zu dem wir von vielen einzelnen Wahrnehmungen aus gelangt sind, zu allem dem in Gegensatz zu bringen, was nicht unter jenen Begriff fällt (la vie, la beauté, la faim)". See also TOBLER op. cit. 44, 46, 110f.


(5) Exx. for μφρήτ ννι-, on p. 116 of Crum’s copy of Stern’s Koptische Grammatik (at the Griffith Institute, Oxford); consider De Vis 1 142, 191f. There are certainly non-generic cases of the plural where the specification, cataphorically referred to by ννι-, is merely implied: Jan. 3:7 B4 νιπωμι νεμ νιτεβιοτι νεμ νιεγωτ (sic) νεμ νιεγωτ ("those in the city of Nineve").

(6) Generic abstracts, to my knowledge not occurring in our corpus, are attested elsewhere: τμαη, τγοοίς Luke 2:52; Mac. passim (e.g. 35B): τγαην, τγενητικ. τμεθαη-γενμο/κων/πωμι/πεμπατω; plurals ibid. 35C ινισωτεβ, ινιωνια, ινιοτι, ινεγμνηνα.

e (οω- (ἀπο-) (3.3) — the instantational casual generic: the generic is here masked as "any instance of...", "any given case of...", "a kind of...": This is, I find, the most elusive type of genericity, difficult to isolate, with the generic / particular distinction most tenuous. It is possibly
old (found in Demotic) and peculiarly Bohairic (I say this with some hesitation). This genericity is part of the grammar of case-raising, so important in ritual, legal and medical textemes and their blending: consider Num. Ch. 5, the generic scenario in Deut. 21:10ff. and similar passages, and of course Leviticus *passim*. Instructive for understanding this is its apparent incompatibility with negative environment; its conditioned occurrence as alternant of *zero*, e.g. following *νας-* in Topics and object actants; its formalized role in the so-called Tautological Infinitive and generally with the infinitive and abstracts.

Lev. 21:2 *εξενοτιωτ* *νεμ οτμα* *νεμ εξενοσψη* *νεμ γανψει ρι εξενοσκον...*
Deut. 8:18 *πυαχε φι ετεψματ νας-οτσον εξειλαντι* *νεμ οτσαλ νεμ οτσιβι.*
Deut. 22:22 *εψεκοτ νεμ οτσιμι εκβεκμι* *νεμ ρατ.*
Deut. 10:18 *οσπρανοσ οτσεμμο οταρα* (Sah. π-, τ-)
Consider also the following grammatically conditioned cases: *εκβεκμι* *ΣΕΝΟΤΡΑΝΟQ ΝΤΑΣ* Lev. 12:5, οτσιμι ητεκμωνι *μεκιωτ* (Topic) Lev. 18:12, *ΣΕΝΟΤΟΤΧΑI* Gen. 28:21, *οτςίκ* Gen. 28:20 obj. (*ΓΑΝΨΙΚ* Ex. 16:4), *οτζοτο* *οτρηπ* Gen. 27:28,
ΟΤΝΟΣΟ ΝΑΣΟΝΟΒΙ Deut. 21:8.

Two instances of the plural *γαν-* , occurring in object status, may be read generically but may well be non-generic indefinite plurals, as in the Greek original (“some…”):

Gen. 41:15 *κωτεμε ΕΓΑΝΨΑΡΟΤΙ ΌΤΟΓ ΚΒΑΛΑ ΜΜΨΩΜ.*
Ex. 16:4 *ΠΗΠΕ ΑΝΟΚ ΤΗΝΑΨΩΟΝ ΝΨΤΕΝ ΝΓΑΝΟΕΙΚ.*

Obs.
(1) On the indefinite generic, see JESPERSEN 1949 (1961):67 (“all-representative” use, “the sb refers to all members (or any member), but only as a representative of the members. It does not denote the class or species in itself”) “To begin with” said the Cat, “a dog’s not mad”/ “A dog growls when it’s angry”. “You’re enough to try the patience of an oyster!” (Lewis Carroll); “a cat may look at a king”. See also BURTON-ROBERTS 1976 (English), SEPPANEN 1984:116 (English): “a description of the indefinite article can suggest...that its generic sense may be due not to the inherent meaning of the article itself but rather to semantic material present elsewhere in the sentence”.
(3) Generic *γαν-* occurs following *μφρ* in B4: Soph. 1:17 ΕΤΕΜΟΨΙ ΜΦΡ* ΝΓΑΝΒΑΛΕΤ, Soph. 2:3 ΜΦΡ* ΝΓΑΝΜΟΤΙ, ΜΦΡ* ΝΓΑΝΟΨΩΝΨ ΝΤΕΤΑΡΑΒΙΑ.
(f) Oppositions, alternations and combinations: classified striking examples

(1) The case of ovarian vs. zero (see also above, 3.2 [e]) is especially instructive, revealing the largely alternant nature of this opposition; zero realizing the nullgeneric in negative environment. Note also the differentiation between actants and circumstnats, the junctural exploitation of the zero vs. indefinite opposition and the frequent ovarian following initial zero.

(a) Deut. 22:5 non-ektenoc ngwost wophi gioorzi - zero and ovarian - generic, in alteration (actant vs. circumstant).

Ex. 12:15 neg. ormatwemhr. vs. affirm. takoorwemhr

(b) Deut. 25:14 non-oroiih μmenent nemoskozai wophi.

Deut. 25:13 non-oroii nem oroii wophi — correlative framework.

(c) Deut. 22:22 ejenkont nem orci -ic nem egemci nem za — casual generics vs. compound verb.

ekeelawot inor b senorinor Ex. 30:5, 36:38 etc.

Ex. 30:6 ejencreorqiv ebo l senorcreorqiv.

ej ej bo shtr nxe-ornwot vs. aqibi nxe-pi οοoc ncæ-

mwoz Ex. 17:3:6 — syntactically conditioned alternation.

Ex. 19:13 ...cet-wni senganwi.

(d) zero for the interrogation, ovarian- in the response: Gen. 44:19f. anoronteten-iot mmar ie con — oronttan norzelalo

niot mmar nem oralo...

(e) Lev. 26:1 nnetemamio nwten nganmonk naxa

orçe φωτ — zero inside non-generic indefinite bracketing (a more complex hierarchy is signalled by bracketing)

Ex. 35:31 orça nkat nem cofia nem orkat nem orpi-

cthm.

(2) πι- vs. πι-, for specific lexemes:

πκαρ Gen. 1:2, 8:1:9:11 — usually in collocations, e.g. with τφε, "the earth", vs. πκαρ "the land, the world" Gen. 7:23, 19:31.

φρυ Lev. 22:7 otob nteφrh gwtm vs. πιογ, πιρ Deut.


φμώς Ex. 1:22 vs. πιμώς Gen. 8:1 (water of the Deluge),

πισόαφ Gen. 8:2.

ρως nχqι Deut. 20:13 (Vat nτχqι = ἐν φόνῳ μαχαίρας).
νεοκονομ ουσαχη πε Deut. 12:23 = Vat (Greek ν.ι. αυμα/το αυμα αυτου)

(3) πι- vs. π- vs. zero in lists.
Catalogic-list generics may be a case apart. The variation π- / πι- is still baffling. We do have some cases of evident grammatical constraint (that is, of alternation):
Deut. 30:15 πωνια νεμ ιφων πιπεθανανεθ νεμ πιπεθων.

Gen. 7:23 ιεκενφρωμι ιατεβνη νεμ ιατι νιβεν νεμ ιεθκανι ντετιφε.
Deut. 11:24 πυατε — πιανιλιβανος — φιαρο — φιομ ετ— — πιιουντε φιφιφατις: generics vs. Proper Names?
Deut. 16:19 ηννονιη-αυρον ηιδαυρον γαρ ιατθεσιμ ηννηινιαλι ντεκιακασι.
Or of various hierarchical arrangements, also combined with grammatical factors:

Deut. 28:48 πιηκο νεμ πηιλι νεμ ιφωνι νεμ ιφων.
Note the recurrent ιεκενφρωμι ιατεβνη Ex. 9:25, Num. 8:15:17, 31:11, never differently.

Gen. 31:40 ιαροκφ ιεικακαμι ιπιεκου νεμ ιζακ ιτεθπιεκαργ.
Deut. 10:18 ημει ιπιεκαμμο ετθικ ναα νεμ ουθθος — three different generic types combined.

Deut. 8:3 ιαρε-πιρωμι πωνι ιθικ ιματατην ιπι.
Deut. 4:19 ιφθι νεμ πηιλογ νεμ ιικιον (+ ττιφι).
Still, in the longer lists the semantic ground for shifting from one genus expression to another wholly escapes me (P and Vat seem to differ. Vat adheres rather more to the Greek; P seems to be freer):
Deut. 14:4-8. 12-18. — animal species catalogue:
ου-μακι, ιινβι, βαροθη
t-zero — ειοσα, ιαροι, ωομ, ριαλαπαραλικ / σερογ-
εθος, ειθωβ, ιαρον, ιρθαιον, ιινον, ιιπ etc.
t-παθλαφο.
πи- — ιαροθοροα, ιαμοια, παεθι, ιιροιλιοιον, ιιπ, ιωθιι, ιιστρι, ιιστρι, ιιετον, ιοπε.
ιβωκ νιβεν.

3.7 The substantivized, determinated and generic Relative Forms

This is one of the typologically most interesting and consequential issues of Egyptian syntax, still far from perfectly understood. While antecedent determination and its correlation with relativization is a familiar object of study, Relative-clause determination is still conventionally ignored (the affinity in certain Indo-European languages of the definite article and Relative pronoun has been commented upon). Here once again the Coptic system outdoes Greek in sophistication and sheer elegance of the formal means. We find, not a lexeme, but the Relative Conversion of verbal or adverbial-Rheme or nominal/pronominal-Rheme nexus expanding either $\Phi H$ or $\pi -$ in close or closest juncture. The Bohairic system is very different from the Sahidic one, on which almost all discussion has so far focussed, and seems to have finer distinctions. The following four structural questions must be addressed (cf., for Shenoutean Sahidic, Shisha-Halevy 1986a:83f., 114, 152).

(a) How is the notion of specificity applicable to the Relative Form?

(b) How is the notion of specificity correlatable here with genericity, and what types of genericity are here observable? How is marking the generic related to lexemization?

(c) What are the external and internal junctural syntagmatic properties and paradigmatic properties of $\Phi H \text{ et-} / \Phi \lambda \iota \text{ et-}$ and of $\pi - \text{ et-}$?

(d) What (if any) are the deictic properties of the Relative Forms in point?

Excursus: a note on demonstrative deixis

The approximate synthetic functional notion which we have of the demonstratives must be properly corrected by precise analytical data, including environment and pattern, distribution and commutability. Here I present no more than a few, rather disjointed, illustrated preliminary observations towards such an account.

(a) Away from Relative environment, $\Phi \lambda \iota$ ($\pi \lambda 1$-) and $\Phi H$ are in Bohairic asymmetrical (to a far greater degree than in Sahidic): $\Phi \lambda \iota$ is a broad-range, $\Phi H$ a narrow-range deictic. Their opposition is mostly neutralized: $\Phi H$ does not occur at all as focus or Rheme (cf. Stern §245): what is more, $\Phi \lambda \iota$ is the only text-phoric representant of the two. The functional assignment of $\pi 1$- to $\Phi H$ (following Sahidic) must be reviewed, for $\Phi \lambda \iota$ takes on in Bohairic certain expressive roles associated in Sahidic with $\pi 1$- (Polotsky 1957:229f.), cf. $\pi 1$- $\text{notw}$ (De Vis I 123, Cat. 225), Num.14:18 $\pi 1$-$\text{niw}^+ \text{nna} 1$, and $\omega \pi 1$- (De Vis I
196), consider De Vis I 175 ταίνιωτον ωθοφηριν νεμ ταιμετ-

ταλεπωρος τεταπαραμασο νεμ ταιμαει υ τεταπαρηκι...

(b) The typical textual phoricity of Ψαί is not shared by Φη. {Ψαί} has a double mobility. First, the neutric Ψαί/ναι, or Ψαί/εια for grammatical gender, which are always text-phoric, and mostly anaphoric; second, the masculine as opposed to the feminine and plural: Ψαί/εια/

ναι, rarer and of different referentiality, and typically carrying sex-

marking function. In the first case, Ψαί and ναι, in Narrative or Exposi-


αί, Num. 15:22, 26:51 εια τε τεπίκοππις τετενεψαίρι

πισαλα... Lev. 11:13 αισος ναι ὤρβος εβόλα σενδίγαλατα...; Lev.11:21 ναι ερετενεσεομοσο...; Num. 16:9 ψαί ζε-β.). In No-

minal Sentence Topics or Themes the reference is as a rule anaphoric (Lev. 21:9:13, 22:11f., 26:27, Ex. 8:18, 12:47, Lev. 16:29:34, 5:1:4, 10:16f., Deut. 9:3, Ex. 12:16, 21:8, 31:14, 37:16x10 Ψαί αγ-ας, Gen. 37:22). It is always anaphoric in the case of ζε-Ψαί/ναι (Ex. 14:3, Lev. 11:6, 13:37 etc.). Note Ψαί for cohesive summing-up (Num. 7:17:35:41), Ψαί πε as a grammaticalized clause for “that is” (e.g. Gen. 14:2:8, 15:3, 19:38 etc.).

(c) The second case (full gender mobility) is typically, but not essentially, dialogic.

Here and in Narrative/Exposition, Ψαί/εια may replace the personal pronouns as a highly cohesive alternant of νεομ / νομ:

Gen. 17:18 ικμανα Ψαί μαρεοσκνα — a remarkable locus: Ψαί either resumes the topical ικμανα, or characterizes it for deixis (πει-

would mark it as anaphoric, not as situationally prominent).

Gen. 16:12 Ψαί εεεροτρομι νρεμκοι.

Deut. 3:11 ηπηνε ιε πεφσλοσ οτομενι πε Ψαί αλξα σεν-

τακρα ...

Gen. 42:6 ιωχφ πε ναυοι ναρξων επικαγι αισος Ψαι

ναφτεβολ...

Or it may refer to contextually (pragmatically) familiar specific enti-

ties, situation or background:

Gen. 12:12 τεκσιμι τε οια.

Gen. 12:18 εεβεοσ ακερΨαι ναν.

Gen. 37:32 αναμεθαι.
παίλαος Num. 11:11f. and passim.
Num. 32:5 παίπορανής.
Gen. 20:10 οὗ πετάκνατ εροφ εάκερφαί.
Gen. 42:14 Φαί πεταίκων νώτεν εἶχω μμοι δε.
Num. 22:33 ἀερίκι καβολ μμοι Φαί Φιμαξ-ἴ κοπ πε.
Gen. 19:34 ξενταίκεκεδωρε (also Ex. 11:4).
Expressive deixis (see [d] below) (cf. Sahidic πι-):
Num. 14:18 παίνιοτ το ΝΝΑΙ.
Consider also Gen. 18:25, 19:12:20, 20:11, 22:14, 24:13, 26:10,
26:26, 24:58, 35:17, 37:32.
It is Φαί that is focussed:
Gen. 26:24 καταφαί Φαί.
Ex. 30:37 παίσεμνι Φαί.
Ex. 12:2 παίαβοτ Φαί.
(d) The above notwithstanding, there are still two slots of opposition
between Φαί and Φή (and, unlike Sahidic, παί- and πι-, the former a
deictic demonstrative, the latter article), of which the most conspicuous
is the slot preceding the Relative, Φή / Φαί ετ- , where, inversely, it is
Φή that is unmarked (see below). In this slot, Φαί is clearly marked for
locutivity or allocutivity (the I-you-deixis), and is often affectively ex-
pressive (SHISHA-HALEVY 1994:228ff.). In this environment, Φαί sig-
nals the “situation-at-hand deixis” and more generally the interlocutive
sphere (HARWEG 1968, 1990:167f.). Note that the selection of Φαί and
Φή is not triggered here by the Greek Vorlage — indeed, the Coptic is
considerably more sophisticated in this point than the Greek; also, that,
unlike Φή ετ-, Φαί ετ- is always anaphoric:
Gen. 11:4 (Let us build) οὔππροσ Φαί ετετειαφε ναυστή
ωοερην ετφὲ “a tower such as has a peak reaching the sky” (Greek
όυ ἦ κεφαλή...).
Gen. 39:17 πεκαλοτ νέβρεος Φαί ετακεν...: pejorative,
disparaging: affective.
Gen. 3:11 προδή Φαί εταγεγερκν εροφ δε-Φαί μμα-
ατη μπεροτωμ εβολ μμοι: focussing.
Ex. 10:11 μαροσμεμωι μφι το Φαί γαρ νηωτεν ετετε-
κωτ τοι ΝΩΩΩ: affective, disparaging.
παί ετ- occurs also in concord to {παί-} determination of the nu-
cleus:
Deut. 4:8 παινομοι τηρη Φαί ανοικ εττ μμοι... also Ex.
4:17. Deut. 20:16 etc.
Different perhaps is Gen. 27:20 οὐ πε ϕαί + εταξακεμή (Isaac to Esau, who has just invited him to eat of his game (Greek τι τούτο δ...).

Obs.
Both Stern 1880 §246 and Polotsky 1987:90f. attribute to ϕαί “deictic prominence”; according to Polotsky, ϕαί lends more prominence to the appositive (“parathetic”) nature of the Relative clause.
Stern claims that ϕαί ετ- is scarcely admissible in Boh. appositive Relative; p. 116: “mit nachdruck hinweisend”... “ϕαί weist energisch auf das folgende hin, ϕη schwächer auf das vorangegangene zurück”.

(e) In the second opposition slot, much rarer, {ϕη} is strongly marked as affective, as the second antithetic term of two, referring to an inferior or even downright contemptible term of a comparison or contrast:

In Dialogue, in contrast to an interlocutive signal:
Num. 22:33 (but the Angel to Balaam) θεοκ μεν ναίναξοθ- βεκ πε θη δε (the she-ass) Ναινατανδοκ (sic) πε.
In Narrative, in contrast to another delocutive:
Ex. 7:12 άνωβοτ ναᾱρών ομκ ννιωβοτ† ντενν (of the Pharaoh’s magicians).
Ex. 24:2 ημώνιν καιρατή εχεδώντ χαφτ ην δε (but the Children of Israel) Ννωσώντ — marking for inferiority.

(f) The local adverb τη (always rhematic in Relative Conversion) seems to have in our Bohairic a markedly pejorative value similar to that of ϕη (stronger than ετεμμαγ; ται is purely local):
Gen. 37:19 πιρεχεππαςον εττθ (said contemptfully by Joseph’s brothers).
Num. 16:14 πιρωμι εττθ (said disparagingly of Korah and his followers).
Deut. 13:5 πιροφήνθς δε εττθ pejorative, contemptful.
Gen. 24:65 παρωμι νιμ πε εττθ ετσωκ εγοτη ερπαν — uniquely non-pejorative, but distal? Greek τίς εστιν δ άνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος δ πορευόμενος; ἐκεῖνος is not usually rendered by εττθ.
Contrast ται in εβολ ται (locutive narrative) Deut. 9:12; Gen. 37:17 ατοπωτεβ εβολ ται.

Documentation and observations to Question (a) above:
The specificity grading of Relative constructions, as such — from synthetic or analytic close-knit “Relative Forms” such as in pre-Coptic Egyptian, Celtic, Turkish, or Ethiopian languages, to the sometimes
looser (Indo-) European or Semitic type of pronominally marked or converted Relative clause — is an essential part of their individual profile. The question, of course, is how best to quantify, or at least establish absolute points of reference and relative grades of specificity. The following constructions are arranged on a rising specificity scale.

(I) π-ετ-, ν-ετ- (the latter specific only — grades [7] and [8]). A manifold cluster of homonymys.

(1) Determination-basis lexeme — restricted lexico-semantic constituency: only "good" and "bad".

Expanding the determinators (only πετ-):
πηθετγωσ Deut. 24:7.
γαλπηθηνανεξ Num. 10:30.
γαλπηθηναναq Num. 11:1.
ποτηθετγωσ Num. 11:10.
Probably also
Gen. 37:26 oτ πηθηναναq ετηναια (zero article!).

(2) Non-specific, non-particular: zero-determination grade (zero generic), agent-noun-lexeme equivalent. Non-restricted lexical constituency.

In coordination and parallelism with zero-determinated lexemes:
Ex. 4:11 εβο νεμ κοτρ, πεθηνα νηβαλ νεμ βελλε.
As Existent or Non-Existent (zero / οτ-):
Lev. 25:26 ...ομον-πετκηγ ναροq (Circumstantial).
Ex. 10:10 οτον-οτιπτγωσ κα δακωτεν.
As object of derivational ερ-, Ξε- (lexeme iconic simulation):
Num. 10:29 ερπηθηναναq.
Lev. 19:14 ομκζεπτγωσ.
In discontinuous combination with ιβεν (zero):
Lev. 7:19 πεθθοβηκσται ιβεν επεσωτσ.

(3) Non-specific, non-particular: generic "genus-name" type (cf. {π-} above). Non-restricted lexical constituency? Morphologically restricted (Present tense: Statives only):
Num. 23:3 πηθετγωστων (cf. πηθηναq...).
Lev. 11:39 πεκμωστε ιε ξη ετανθριον οτομq.
Lev. 13:10 ἰδέα ἐν τῇ καταθήκῃ.
Lev. 27:10 πεθανει "σανετγων", different from the particular and specific Lev. 27:14 οὕτως ἐστὶν ἐττανει "οὕτως ἐστὶν εττγων" (= Vat).
(4) Non-specific, appositive-neutric (a unique instance):
Gen. 19:19 ακρετεκμεθεσμη ερνίατι πετεκμαϊνι ημί ετεκμαϊνι ὅνε (= Vat) (Greek ...τὴν δικαιοσύνην σου ὁ ποιεῖς...).
(5) Particular, specific by reference: anaphoric. Morphologically restricted (Present tense: Statives only):
Deut. 21:1ff. οὐάι ἐκμαϊ ... ἐτκωτ ἐπεκακαϊ ... ἐτπεικακαϊ.
(6) Particular, specific by combination: appositive to highly specific nucleus. Non-restricted lexical constituency? Morphologically restricted (Present tense):
Deut. 28:58 ...εἰπὶ ηναιακαϊ τηροτ πετεκακαϊ ηναιακαϊ ηνοτταττοτ.
Lev. 22:16:32 άνοκ πε πῶς πετοτοβο μμωω (not Cleft Sentence!)
(7) Particular, specific by combination (see above) — "πετε-φωη". πετενοτοτοτ τηροτ (etc.) Gen. 20:7, Num. 31:9, πετενοτοτ Gen. 33:9.
(8) Particular, specific: named as unique — cf. the article {π-} above. Morphologically restricted (Present Tense):
πεθοταβ "the Holy (usually: "of Holies", Greek ἄγια (τὸν) ἄγιον and some variants, with no apparent correspondence in the Coptic). This is a technical term, a concept both architectural and ritual — which appears to have caused some difficulty and ensuing variation in rendering. Note that πετ- is attested only here:
πεθοταβ ντενή εσοταβ Num. 4:4, Ex. 30:36, Lev. 27:28.
Σενπεθοταβ Num. 4:16.
Φραν μπεθοταβ Lev. 22:32 — a case of "inalienable" association (below), incidentally proving the non-zero and specific nature of πεθοταβ.
†τστοιν ντενεθοταβ Ex. 29:29.
Compare the following plural phrases:
Nh εσοταβ ντενεθοταβ Lev. 10:12.

42 πεθοταβ is early as a concept in Egyptian: see Vittmann 1996:466ff. (Ryl. 9 11/8).
CHAPTER THREE

\textit{Nētēnērētēneētēnētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνētēνēτēνēτένενοι ου περιβληται μη μνημειωθει ηεμερα...
Lev. 27:14 ὢτε ΦΗ ἔτνανεῇ ΝΕΜ ὢτε ΦΗ ἔτγωωτ.
Lev. 11:36 ΦΗ ἐνασί ἐν ΝΗ ἐθμωοῦτ ηνεαί.

Obs.

**niben** is a post-positive determinator and a quantifier homonym — so at least in Sahidic (Shisha-Halevy 1986a:143ff.); the former (“all”) combines with the bare lexeme, the latter (“any, every”) modifies a zero-determined one. This element has remarkable prosodic properties. On ΦΗ NIBEN ET- see Quecke 1985:264 “Rest der älteren Sprache”; Polotsky 1987:84ff. In fact, NIBEN behaves here prosodically like an Augens (Ex. 16:23 ΦΗ θρη ιενα- etc.). However, NIBEN does not always occupy the colon-second position: Deut. 21:5 κω εβόλ NIBEN, possibly Num. 18:13 ωοπιτ ΝΟΤΑΓ NIBEN (Greek τὰ πρωτογενήματα πάντα). In Demotic, nb seems to be a determinator, judging e.g. by the relative expansion of the nb-phrase, cf. Stricker 1962 §41ff.: §46 on nty nb... “all that...”, an immediate correspondent to our ΦΗ NIBEN ET-. A symptom of the non-determinator status of NIBEN would be its compatibility with non-zero determinators. While ΝΤΗ ΟΥ- ωοπιτ ΝΗΗΙ C NIBEN (Num. 8:17 Lag.) is Lagarde’s own Coptic, and similarly fictive is οΥ- NIBEN ΝΤΗ (Lev. 21:19, 22:18; see Crum Dictionay *sub nih*), probably Wilkins’ own translation into Coptic from the Greek (Brooke 1902:262), we do a few genuine instances in Bohairic and Sahidic: ΝΟΡΗ ΝΗΗΙ C NIBEN Num. 3:13 (Val ωοπιτ), ΝΕΝΕΣΩΟΤ NIBEN (letter of H. Quecke 2/780), Choiak-Psalmody, ed. Labib 1955 p.333; def. plural in Sahidic Ruth (ed. Shier) 4:7 ΝΥΑΣΚΕ ΝΗΙ; ΠΨΨΟΣ ΝΙΗ in *NH*C VII 11, and in Demotic p3-rmt nb p3-t3 always in the Hauswaldt Pap. corpus; Hawara 20.10 p3 hrw nb n p3 t3. Telling, of course, is also the very compatibility with the specific ΦΗ in the construction under discussion (Simpson 1996 §1.4.5 t3-nty...nb).

(c) ΦΗ ΕΤ-) appositive to a non-specific nucleus, translatable as “such as...”. Non-restricted in pattern, tense or lexeme:

Deut. 11:2 εναλωοτι νη ετενεκεωσοην αν (Greek δοσι οικ οιδασι) — the negative is unusual.

Lev. 27:14 ΦΡΨΜΙ ... ΦΗ ΕΤΝΑΕΡΑΙΑΖΗΙ (Greek ἀνθρωπος δς ἄν ...).

Lev. 15:2 οτρψμι ΦΗ ΕΤΕΟΤΟΝ-ΟΤΤΕΤΕΛ ΝΑΨΨΜΙ ΣΕΝΠΕΨΨΗΜΑ (Greek ἀνδρί, ἀνδρί ὁ ἄνω...).

(2) Specific and particular: “the (particular one) that...” — comprehensive, unrestricted tense and gender/number repertory:

Ex. 39:13 ΦΗ ΕΤΑΣΕΠΙ.
Ex. 21:19 ΦΗ ΕΤΑΨΜ ΜΠΙΕΡΒΟΤ.
Lev. 24:14 ΦΗ ΕΤΑΨΚΑΒΟΤ.
Lev. 25:30 ΦΗ ΕΤΑΨΨΟΨΨ.
Lev. 5:24 ΦΗ ΕΤΕΨΨΨ ΠΕ ΕΨΗΕΙΨΨ ΝΑΨ.

It is in cohesion with the quantifier NIBEN combined with zero determination that we encounter the masculine/feminine neuter neutralization: Num. 6:7 ΨΨΧΗ NIBEN ΕΑΨΗΟΤ, Lev. 17:12 ΨΨΧΗ NIBEN ΝΝΕΨΟΤΨΜ-ΣΝΟΨ.
Ex. 21:22 ἐγεῖςοι καταφῆ ετενεῖα Ντιςιμι Ναγιτ. 

νη ετένοτη Ex. 16:13 σιμ. Num. 16:5. 

ἡ ετεοστὶν Μπατρίια Ἐοταί Ἐοταί ετεοστη Νκθςις 

Lev. 25:10, 27:2. 

Num. 17:13 ἡν εεμωστ ... ἡν ετος. 

Ex. 16:23 Ἐη τηρη εεναερροτο.

(3) Specific and particular: in appositive-anaphoric linkage with a 
specific and particular nucleus: 

Deut. 21:1 πικάγι ὧη ετεπικτε πεκνοντι ναθιιγ νακ. 

Num. 14:31 πικάγι ὧη νωστεν εταρετενεγενθνοσ κα-

βολ κκκεθ.

Lev. 4:5 πιοσμβ ὧη ετεας. 

Deut. 9:12 πεκλαος νη ετακενοτ εβολ ἕεν-πικαγι νχκμι.

(4) Specific and particular: ὧη (εετε-) ἐεβεφνοβι (ritual term: 
namme and type of a specific sacrifice). 

ὦη εετε-ἐεβεφνοβι ... Lev. 9:15, 14:13:19. 

A zero-conversion variant is 

Lev. 7:7 ὧη ἐεβεφνοβι (= Vat) (Greek το περι της ἀμαρτιαις). 

cf. Lev. 8:14 πιμαι εεβεφνοβι.

Another variant is 

Lev. 14:17 ὧη ντε-εεβε: the morphemic-orthographic merging of εετε- and ντε- may have Demotic precedents, and even LE ones, as 

nty- ADV. Compare Lev. 8:2 πιμαις ντε-εεβε-φνοβι (= Vat). 

Lev. 7:7 ὧη εετε-μετεβαλη (Vat ντε-), and cases of ντε- + ad-

verb like πιωσωσωσωςι ντε-μμκκκκκ Num. 4:16. However, 

{ὦη} occurs as nucleus of ντε- especially in affiliation: Proper Name 

+ {ὦη} ντε- + Proper Name (Ex. 35:34, 37:20), cf. also ὧη ντε-

αρων Ex. 29:29.

(5) Two special cases in poetic language: 

(a) Specific and particular. 

Num. 23:8 ὧη εετε-φι σαροτι εροκ αν — peculiar on two 
counts: the negative — unique in my files — and the object actant nu-

cleus. 

(b) Non-specific, non-particular — instantial generic (above): 

Deut. 32:25 ὧη εετεακσιμνοτ νεμ οτπαθενοσ ὧη εετειμνοτ 

νεμ οτεκελλο.

44 See Borghouts 1980:74ff.
Observation to Question (b):

The following isomorphemic correlation between the generic determination-signals before lexemes and before converters of verbal nexus, as exponents of *agens* actential genericity, cannot, in my opinion, be dismissed as coincidental (in order of ascending genericity):

1. \{πι-\} \{Φι- ετ-\} — *agens hypothetically particular* in a case-raising hypothetic 
   “generic scenario”\(^{45}\)

2. \{π-\} π-ετ- — “named” genericity of *agens*: “type name”

3. ος- ος-ενανοτην, ος-γοτανανοτην (Oxyrh.)\(^{46}\) — casual instantial genericity of 
   *agens* (also Φι ετ-: Deut. 32:25)

4. zero Ο-ευ- — zero-grade genericity of *agens*.

ος-ενανοτην (Oxyrhynchite) Mt. 11:30, see Schenke 1996:111ff.,
ος-γοτανανοτην (Oxyrhynchite) Ps. 85:5.

ευ- “(any) one who” (Shisha-Haley 1976), is a case of zero 
   determination grade, and like it is typical — indeed the alternant of other 
   actential-generic — of negative environment:

Deut. 18:10f. Νοπτομινι Νηθκ ευθρο μπεθψηρι εε τερ-
   ωρη εει ζενοτωρωμ — ρεταερπ — απεβεν — εγ-
   μοτι εβολ ζενεξι — έγανωτι εγαναμνινι — εγινι 
   Ννιπεθμωττ.

\(^{45}\) Greek “potentiality” ου in Relative and conditional clauses may well be the trigger, 
   or a trigger, for this type of genericity in the Coptic text.

\(^{46}\) Mt. 11:30 ed. Schenke. The (early) Sahidic τ-επε- and νετντ-ν in the Palau 
   Ribes Luke (2:5, 18:24 ed. Quecke), appositive to Proper Names or substantival, are in 
   juncture analogous to ος-ενανοτην.
Deut. 12:9 ΝΠΕΤΕΝΟΤΩΝ ἙΒΟΛ ΝΩΗΤΟΥ ἙΦΩΤΗ ὅτα ἐγ-
ΦΟΙ ᾽ΑΛΛΑ ἙΦΞΕΦΑΩΨ (= Vat).

Obs.
(1) The zero-grade agential generic is used outside the corpus for glossing Arabic adjectives (in the Paris scalac, Vat. copto 71: Shisha-Halevy 1976:136f.), and also outside negative environment:
Apos. 2:15 ΠΑΙΡΗ ΠΩΚ ΟΤΩΝΝΤΑΚ ΜΗΑΣ ΕΓΑΜΟΝΙ ΝΤΕΒΩ ΝΝΙΚΟΛΑΙΤΩΝ.
(2) The probably related adverbial and adverbial role of ἑγ- with an invariable 3rd person sgl. masculine (Shisha-Halevy 1975) is discernible only by position, and often cannot be clearly distinguished from the zero-generic ἑγ-:
Ex. 30:32 ΝΠΕΤΕΝΟΤΑΜΙΟ ΠΝΑΙΡΗ ΕΓΟΤΑΒ.
Mark 7:10 ΜΑΡΕΚΗΜΟΤ ΝΟΤΗΜΟΤ ΦΗ ΕΘΝΑΚΑΙΖΙ ΕΦΓΩΝΟΤ ΝΣΑΝΕΠΙΩΤ ΝΕΜ 
ΤΕΝΗΜΑΣ (v.l. ΟΤΚΑΙΖΙ).
Mark 7:35 ΝΑΣΚΑΙΖΙ ΠΕ ΕΓΚΟΡΤΩΝ (consensus).
(3) Note the zero-generic coordinated to the rhematic indefinite article: Ps. 68:30 ΟΤΡΗ-
ΚΙ ΟΤΟΓ ΕΓΜΟΚΕ Ps. 85:10 ΝΒΩΚ-ΟΤΝΙΨΙΤ ΟΤΟΓ ΕΓΙΡΙ....

Observations to Questions (c) and (d)
(1) Contrasting such cases as
Ex. 39:13 ΦΗ ΕΤΑΓΚΕΠΙ.
Ex. 21:19 ΦΗ ΕΤΑΓΙΤ ΜΠΙΕΡΨΟΤ.
Gen. 41:24 ΝΕΜΜΟΝ-ΦΗ ΕΤΤΑΜΟ ΜΜΟΙ ΕΡΟΣ.
Lev. 12:7 ΦΝΟΜΟΣ ΝΤΕΕΝ ΕΤΝΑΜΙΚΙ.
with
Deut. 21:1 ΠΙΚΑΖΙ ΦΗ ΕΤΕΝΣΕ ΠΕΚΝΟΤΙ ΝΑΘΗΙΩ ΝΑΚ.
Deut. 11:2 ΖΑΝΑΛΟΨΙΝ ΝΗ ΕΤΕΝΕΕΣΨΟΤΝ ΑΝ.
Lev. 15:2 ΟΤΡΨΙΝ ΦΗ ΕΤΕΝΟΤ-ΟΤΤΕΛΕΛ ΝΑΨΨΙ ΖΕΝ-
ΠΕΚΨΩΜΑ,
we conclude that {ΦΗ ΕΤ-}, which may be considered a kind of analytic Relative pronoun\textsuperscript{47}, operates in two junctural manners, namely as initial boundary or as backwards link (in the latter case, its gender/number characteristics cohere and enhance the retrospective linkage). On the other hand, π-ετ- is not backwards cohesive. The rare appositive πετ-, as in:
Deut. 28:58 ...ΞΙΡΗ ΝΝΑΙΚΑΖΙ ΜΘΡΟΤ ΝΤΕΝΑΙΝΟΜΟΣ ΠΕΤ-
ΣΗΟΤ...
Lev. 22:16:32 ἌΝΟΚ ΠΕ ΠΣΕ ΠΕΤΤΟΤΣΟ ΜΜΨΟΤ, is, I suggest, not linked anaphorically at all, but a case of an apposed highly specific

\textsuperscript{47} Cf. an almost exact parallel in Middle Welsh yr hyn/yr hon a-: Shisha-Halevy 1995:144ff.
and particular named entity: see above. Indeed, πετ- constitutes, or is preceded by, a boundary signal in the environment in point.

(2) Both π- and ΦΗ in the constructions in point are proclitic to their relative converter. The linkage of ΦΗ — cataphoric to its naxal attribute — is looser, as indicated by the occurrence of niben following ΦΗ and Augentia (τηρωτ, Δοκ, Δοκ, Δωτον) following NH. This in turn correlates with a different commutability profile on both flanks of either seam: different grades of close juncture or boundness (see Chapter Four).

(3) The only substitute found for π- in the case of πετ- is n-, in restricted cases; the converted conjugation form is the Present only, with certain limitations even in the Present, and “good”/“bad” (“Adjective Verb”). πετ- is affirmative only. For ΦΗ ετ-, on the other hand, the commutabilities are maximal — the full gender/number range for ΦΗ, most of the naxal types and patterns in Relative Conversion.

(4) The considerable distal and (metaphorically) affective deictic value of ΦΗ is drastically reduced before the Relative to a mere anaphoric potentiality, while ΦΔΙ, elsewhere an undifferentiated phoric representative, forms in ΦΔΙ ετ- a marked interlocutive and expressive analytic Relative pronoun.

Obs.

(1) For (a), the grammatical literature has been restricted to the basic definite vs. indefinite opposition, which is evidently inadequate. See the early Till 1927:60ff. (“Indeterminierte Ausdrücke mit dem Best. Artikel im Koptischen”, begging the question in most constituents of the title), Nagel 1973, Quecke 1985:262f. (corrective to Nagel): Polotsky 1987:80, 85 (on πετ- and ΦΗ ετ-). On Bohairic, we find Quecke 1985:266. On the πετανανουρ type, Quecke 1985:273f. Quecke explicitly states the leximation role: 1985:265ff. “…bestimmte substantivische Relativsätze den Rang eines Nomens erhalten, und syntaktisch entsprechend behandelt werden”; also 279 n. 31.


(3) For (c), on the “parapheric” (my “appositive”) ΦΗ ετ- (“a looser link”; ΦΔΙ ετ- even looser) Polotsky 1987:89ff.

(4) Diachronic. Already Demotic poses some intriguing questions in this context, especially concerning the relationship between “adjective” leximation and types of genericity — p-nty-n3-km vs. km “black” (Quack 1999 A4); in Ryl. IX, p-nty-w’b the

48 Like other Augentia, ΤΗΡΟΣ may occur at a later, colon-final position: Gen. 31:18 NH ETENTΛΑΧ ΤΗΡΟΣ, Gen. 27:45 NH ΕΤΑΚΑΙΤΟΤ ΝΑΤ ΤΗΡΟΣ. However, the placement following NH is usual (Gen. 34:28, 35:2, 41:17 etc.). Exx. for ΔΟΚ etc.: Ex. 23:27, 24:21, Lev. 22:15, Deut. 4:2:8 etc.
specific "the Holy of Holies", VITTMANN 1998:466f., beside p3-w'b, n3-w'b-w. In gnomic-didactic textemes such as Papyrus Insinger, p3-nty- shows a gamut of grammatical roles and slots, specific and non-specific, particular and generic (including our "hypo-
theitical particular" generic), and must, like our ΦΗΕ-T-, structurally be considered a cluster of homonyms: (1) existant (19/1, 20/8ff. etc.; rarely negative); cf. also jw-mn-nty-
gibt, das den Gott verletzt"; (2) in address (4/11), (3) topical-protatic (18/18, 33/19); (4) both protatic and apodotic, in a Theme-Rheme Wechselsatz (# p3-nty-.... p3-nty-.... #) (5/2, 6/12, 6/22ff.) — perhaps the most interesting pattern; (5) both focal and topical, in a Cleft Sentence (# p3-nty-.... p3-nty-.... #) (33/14, 34/23).

3.8 The Proper Name: five observations. In my 1989 study of the Coptic Proper Name on a pan-dialectal basis, I have attempted to show, on the basis of syntactical properties, that this important element of la parole is not a class or an entity of la langue but the "occupant" of a high-grade location on a scale of a signalled property of nominals: there is certainly no essential binomy or dichotomy of PN ("PN") vs. appellative, except as a convenient breviloquy. "Properization" ("God", "The Supreme Court") and "deproperization" ("a grip that would do credit to a Conan Doyle or an Agatha Christie") are relative, environmentally signalled notions. In its syntactical behaviour, the PN shows an affinity to certain pronouns, and especially to interlocutive (locutive and allocutive) ones, notably in its marked non-phoric or referentially inert nature.

In this section, I would like to contemplate briefly the Bohairic PN in the studied corpus, in the light of the discussion of the noun syntagm so far, focussing on four aspects, generally not repeating statements and observations made in 1989a.

Obs.
Literature update (studies of grammatical and especially syntactical aspects of the PN, also of its grammatical — not of semantic or of philosophical — nature, beyond those listed and discussed in SHISHA-HALEVY 1989a). French and German are especially prominent among the languages treated: SLOAT 1969 (English), LE Bihan 1978, TOGEBY 1978 (40ff on the articulated, possessed PN; see also TOGEBY 1851:157ff. ); SWIGGERS 1982; MOLINO 1982 (see esp. 7ff. no unambiguous coextensive criteria: "il n'y a pas une caractérisation définie du nom propre ni dans une langue donnée ni encore moins dans une perspective générale"; 10 "everything may be a PN"; 11f. a syntactic characterization — esp. "tolerance" for the articles), KLEIBER 1983; LOMHOLT 1983, esp. the Introduction; a unique pioneering treatment of geographical names, dicussing such aspects as cohesion (52ff.), apposition, prepositional phrases (21ff.) and of course the articulated PNs. Kubczak 1985; GARY-PRIEUR 1994 is a good account of PN syntax in French, the most comprehensive work to date (see esp. Chapter 4 for ce + PN, pragmatics, affect, anaphoricity, ostension, metaphoric roles and so on; Chapter 5 for the articulated PN and PN metonymy); JONASSON 1994; HARWEG 1999 (especially on the nature of the PN, its realization in la parole, communicative roles); WILLEMS 1996; FLAUX 1997.
(a) Naming signals (Shisha-Halevy 1989a:141 s.v. “naming”) are not of a kind, and generally reflect in our corpus the Greek (and earlier Hebrew) original. And yet, these differences must be real, associated with different aspects of the complicated phenomenon of naming. They form a discontinuous unity with Δε-, which introduces rheantically the well-demarcated name paradigm itself:

†_pen= Δε- Num. 32:42.
_μος† eph Δε- Lev. 23:3:4.
..._περαν ωπι Δε- Gen. 17:15, 32:28.
Gen. 17:5 _ννον_μος† επεραν Δε-αβραμ ἀλα ερεπεραν ωπι Δε-αβραμ.

The name paradigm itself is remarkably not limited to high-specificity elements or combinations — it is its environment alone that marks its “name-hood”:

“Name Paradigm”

πι- Gen. 1:5:10, 2:23
_νι- Deut. 2:11:21, Gen. 32:2
πι- _ντε- Gen. 35:8, 31:47f.
πι- (genus/notion name) Gen. 1:8:10, 26:20ff., 30:18, etc.
πι- _ν- Gen. 32:30, 35:18, 50:11, 21:31 (see §3.9)49
Proper Name Gen. 16:11, 3:20, 17:19 etc.
νιμ (indef.) Gen. 2:19
Clause Gen. 22:14, Num. 28:18

(b) Expanded and expanding PN: PN and apposition

The PN, well capable of further specification and hardly “incompatible with restrictive criteria” (pace common language-philosophical non-analytic opinion, e.g., Hawkins 1978:285f.), is not expanded by πι- (unless as part of the “inalienable” association construction, §3.9), but may well be appositively expanded by higher-to-lower specificity coreferent determinators, two facts that inform its specificity profile:

Gen. 26:34 ελω_μ_ πιετεος, βεηρ πιετεος.
PN πιτωσι Num. 20:22, Ex. 3:11.

49 The actual name in _Φ_παν n-, in the Personal-Sphere Constituence Association construction (§3.9), is not possessed, but representative of the whole “person-hood” of the named.
Num. 3:4 αἰρων ποτιωτ.
Ex. 14:31 μωτσχε πεναλωτ.
Ex. 3:1 ιωθορ πενσωμ ψοψνε μμαδιαμ.
PN ἐκ PN γανοπολικ εταξορ Num. 32:36.
Gen. 39:1 πετεφρν ὡς ὀσρωμι νρεμνχνμι.
Δε- following a PN introduces “translation naming” (SHISHA-HALEVY 1989a:2.3.1.3f.)
Gen. 30:18 ισαχαρ Δε-Φβεξε.
Gen. 30:13 Ασσιρ Δε-οτρμμαιο.
The expanding or satellital PN following Δε- as a special rhematic naming apposition is the abnodinal packaging of naming, adjoined to a higher- or lower-specificity nucleus. In Dialogue, with human reference and when it follows παὶ- or πι-, this apposition is as a rule disparaging:


Φαι Δε-μωτσχε Ex. 32:1:23 — disparaging.
πεταξορ ιάκωβ Gen. 49:24 — this (in poetic language) is different (Greek δυνάστου Ιακωβ).

Obs.
Outside the corpus:

τομι Δε-ΠΝ Apos. 2:20.
παὶ Δε-ερσβανς De Vis I 37 disparaging; so too
οσρωμι/παίρωμι Δε-ἰκ Mac. No. 6.
παϊκετ Δε-λοτκας Mac. No. 6.
παϊσλοα Δε-χρηστανος AM I 218.
παϊραν Δε-ἰκα AM I 122, 125.
οται Δε-ΠΝ AM I 51.
οσπολικ Δε-τεμπωρι AM I 110, 202.
πιρωμι εττροπιος De Vis II 263.

As a rule, sequence opposition in appositive phrases containing PNs follows the Greek (and Hebrew) original. Generally, the PN follows in Allocution:

† βακι ερβοκ Gen. 23:2.


παυρηπι ιεατ Gen. 27:21.

50 Hermeneutical PN translation has distinct constructions: Act. 13:9 σαλος Δε ἐτε-πασλος πε (SHISHA-HALEVY 1989a 2.3.1.3)
πεκαλοτ εικωβ Gen. 32:5.
ταβωκι βαλαα Gen. 30:3 dialogue, vs. βαλαα τεσωκι Gen. 30:4.
παιωτ αβρααμ Gen. 32:10.
ααρων ποτιωτ Num. 3:4.
πακων ηκατ Gen. 32:17.
πεκαλοτ εικωβ Gen. 32:18.
πεκυνρι πεκγραπ ημις Gen. 27:32.
παγυνρι ιωκεφ Gen. 45:28 — inverse sequence in the Greek.

(c) The PN and determinators. Generally speaking, the absence or “freezing” of the determinator slot is in itself enough to mark the PN or the highest-specificity grading (shared by personal and deictic pronouns) — consider τοοσι, ποτει, ωφηπ (Gen. 1:5, 29:23:25, 32:24:26, 44:4, 49:27, Ex. 18:15, 27:2). However, Bohairic has a special concept — naming metaphrastic determinator, viz. {π-} (Φεβτ, πεις, etc., in a range of grades: see above, §3.5.1). And PNs are compatible with determinators, for deictic characterization and without depropertization:

πειορανις Deut. 3:27.
πεκεβελιαμ Gen. 43:14, 42:36.

Obs.

πκενθοε γωνι, πκεανον γων (Cat. 31, 47 etc.) is a familiar trait of Nitrian Bohairic. For reasons obscure to me, πκε- seems to vary with a marginal πικε- reading before a PN (e.g. Gal. 2:1, Philipp. 4:3).

(d) The Proper Name in allocutive Dialogue. The addressed noun (“vocative”) has a special kind of pragmatic specificity, and indeed is an ad-hoc pragmatic allocutive PN (see Shisha-Halevy 1989a §1.2, with further references to discussions of this pragmatic “definitude”, familiar in several languages). In Bohairic, this is confirmed by the occurrence of the naming article {π-}:

Num. 21:29 ω Φλαος νκαμως.
Num. 20:10 cvtm ερωι νιατσωτεμ.
(Mt. 22:16 Φρευτςβω.
Mark 10:17f. Φρευτςβω παγαθος.)

Other dialogic roles of the PN (see above, §1.2.3.2):
- Attention-forcing Address, an almost ideal dialogue-opening discourse signal, typically takes the form of an allocutive Proper Name or its equivalent:

Gen. 27:1 παγυνρι + εηπεε ανοκ.
Gen. 27:18 παλτ + εναπε ανοκ.
Gen. 31:11 ιακωβ + ος πετων.
Gen. 46:2 ιακωβ + ιακωβ + ος πετων.
• Complex, extensive address to a single addressee may constitute the entire Allocation, in a Divine Acclamation:

Ex. 34:6f. παλτ παλτ Φα ντενιμετωγγιεν ημε νιμετ- 

ναντ πιρεβων νγθ Φα-νινιω + ρα ναι οτογ πιλεθνος
οτογ εφαρεξ εοτεσθηνι...

• The Address preceding or following an interrogative Allocation:

Num. 16:22 Φα Φα ντενιππα νεμε καρα Νιβεν ια- 

ερπωνι απρονοβι αν. παλτ Μπαλτ Ναι εξεντεστναργων
θερο.

Gen. 15:2 παναβ + ος πε ετεκναθιη ρι.

Gen. 16:8 αγρο : εωσκι καρα : αρπνον εβολ οφω.

(e) The Proper Name in Narrative. Above (Chapter One, §§1.1.4,
1.1.5a, d), narrative-texturing roles of the PN in juncture and informa-
tion structuring were pointed out. PNs are reasserted as strong delimita-
tions (often as Topics or Themes). The reassertion grading of PNs seems
to be a measure of their narratological (proagonistic) importance or
text-absolute (“pragmatic”) status (SHISHA-HALEVY 1989a §2.4). PNs
occur in all Theme-(re)asserting constructions, including the highly
marked, superordinative nexus-topicalization delimitative one:

Gen. 6:9 νατε ανε-οτρωμη νομη πε.

Gen. 25:27 οτογ οκατ νεοτρωμι πε ερεσων ημεμ-

τερνας ντεινκαι.

Ex. 24:18 οτογ αφεφανη να-ντε-ντρμη εβετον...οτογ
αφεφανη επωρι επιτωο.

Gen. 20:4 αφεφανη να-Φα γαβιμελεξ ... οτογ πεδα
παρ ανε- ... αβιμελεξ ανε μπεφσορ ερος...

Gen. 25:33 ακατ ανε Φα νιμετωρομ μομε εβολ νια-
κωβ.

Gen. 32:2 ακώτη Φα-λαβαν αφεφανη οτογ αιακωβ αφ-
θεφανη.

3.9 The noun syntagm expanded: the notae relationis. Associative
relationships. Constituence Personal-Sphere (“Inalienable”) Asso-
ciation

3.9.1 General preliminary notes. The following is a re-formulation of
the statements (tentative, in pilot format) made in SHISHA-HALEVY 1994:
233ff. on the Associative Construction set, comprising (among others) three formally and functionally distinct and opposed constructions, namely \( \pi-\text{N}- \), \( \pi-\text{NT}_\text{E}- \) and \( \pi\pi-\text{NT}_\text{E}- \). In structural terms, what we find at first sight is a double opposition of \( \text{N}- \) with \( \text{NT}_\text{E}- \) and \( \pi\pi-\text{NT}_\text{E}- \), a multidimensional opposition constituting, with other determinators, several combined constructions and, for some early scholars of Coptic, the main typological interest of Bohairic: it is at any rate unique to our dialect, enabling sophistication of association and possession semantics unmatched elsewhere in Coptic or, for that matter, in the Greek original.

The quest for a functional differentiation between \( \text{N}- \) and \( \text{NT}_\text{E}- \) constructions goes back to L. Stern’s grammar, if not earlier. Stern (1880: 183ff.) first made the distinction between possession and appurtenance; in \( \pi-\text{NT}_\text{E} \), probably the most puzzling of the three main constructions, Stern sees “specification, not possessive association” (§295), “…wo das unwesentlichere antecedens von allgemeiner, abstrakter bedeutung ist, durch den davon abhängigen genitiv aber mit nachdruck auf das besondere, concrete bezogen werden soll”. In the only grammar, half a century following Stern’s, which tries to do justice to the subtleties of Bohairic, namely CHAINE 1933, somewhat frantically convoluted statements such as the following (§§203ff.) testify to the difficulty of the descriptive task: “\( \text{N}- \) introduit le complément déterminatif après un nom de sens générique qui est alors pris dans son acception première marquée par l’article faible…la particule \( \text{NT}_\text{E}- \) introduit toujours le complément déterminatif après un nom d’action et après un nom de sens générique lorsque celui-ci est pris dans son acception particulière ou individuelle marquée alors par l’article fort”. As for the case of \( \pi\pi-\text{NT}_\text{E} \), an insightful opinion was offered almost en passant by Borghouts (1980:78), making the distinction of “natural” vs. “accidental appurtenance”. Taking here up again this difficult and important issue, I must first point out that the mystery is still anything but cleared up: several questions remain, while others may be answered, and not all puzzling cases of “variation” (§3.9.2 [g]) — to my mind, almost certainly alternation or opposition — can yet be accounted for.

The problem begins in the very general terms accepted for its phrasing. As already stressed above, neither the pre-analytical or universalist concept of “possession”, nor the “belonging” sub-ranges match the Bohairic Coptic division of the “association” continuum. The prevalent pairing of “inalienable” with “possession” is equally misguided, for, closely observed, true “inalienables” are not possessed. Nor do they “belong”: a priest is neither possessed by, nor belongs to, God; a half is neither possessed by, nor belongs to, the whole; the land is neither pos-
sessed by, nor belongs to, Egypt — it is Egypt. We do not possess our name, or parts of our body: they are essential, distinguishing, definitional constituents, representative parts or aspects of us, characterizing us as inherently distinct from others, and in this is quite different from incidental, contingent association, which may indeed include a bona-fide possessive one. My further objection to the “inalienability” or terminology is not ideological, but epistemological: the term, basically legal, ill suits semantic-linguistic epistemological needs; it does not lend itself to gradience and environmental annulment or invalidation; and, most important, it means little or nothing in cases such as “παρινεκσειμ”, “τηρον κατη” “φωστορυμι”, “φωνομος μπι-
παξαλ” and the like. I would like to combine here a new term, namely “Constituence Association” (“CA”) with Ch. Bally’s “Personal-Sphere” concept (BALLY 1926), for the projection onto a multi-dimensional core-and-periphery syntactic structure of the essential, inherent relation between constituent part and including whole, the former potentially representing the latter or an essential aspect thereof. The first term is a representative constituent part of a whole that is adequately presented by the second, but is enriched and enhanced by the combination of first and second.

As will be seen, this very striking relationship between two (always two) nominal (always nominal) concepts is expressed by a peculiar construction, which stands in opposition to two others, one expressing unmarked association and the other “non-CA” or “reduced-CA” one; the whole triad being completely asymmetrical, as asymmetrical, in fact, as the triad itself is in relation to (a) cases of predicative possession (possession verboids and related constructions) and (b) “his-” pronominal-possessor phrases ({{πεη}}, — {{νταή}}).

Obs.

(1) L. Stern devoted a special chapter (1880 Chapter IX) to “die Relation”, to an extent building on, but profiting little from the theoretical-comparative basis laid in H. Steinthal’s brilliant 1847 dissertation on the nota relationis: (one would like to have some information on contacts — if any — between Stern and the typologist Steinthal, who had made these elements, patterns and dependencies of Coptic his own). Consider STEINTHAL. 1847:47f. Όψωμι ναθοίμι: “homo, qui “sine-peccato”, ein Mensch welcher sündlos”, quite rightly objecting to the “genitive” terminology, unfortunately still persist-

51 See LOPRIENO 1995:55ff.: “genitive (direct/indirect)”, a familiar Egyptological rather than linguistic landmark. Incidentally, η- is not a “determinative pronoun” (56), and πρωμηνος is about the worst “synthetic” illustrative construction conceivable for the nota relationis in Coptic.
ent today, Steinthal says: "Praeterea quum id, profecto verum sit, Coptos, qui omnes casus in denotarent, denotasse nullum: nos quoque, quum sententias Aegyptias ad verba vertamus in nostros sermones, casus omnino evitare debemus, ac ne supplere quidem quos Copti non supplerentint". However, Stern kept to the "genitival" terminology: 1880 §293: "genitiv der relation", §294: 

(2) STEINTHAL and MISTELI 1893:277f. "Das koptische ν ist, wie neupers. i, ein ausschließlich syntaktisches Zeichen der Attribution allgemeinsten Sinnes, das sich mit den Wortarten oder Redeteilen nicht berührt" — this is insightful, allowing also the subsuming of other n- morphs. We also find here (272ff.) the junctural gradation of association ("Angehörigkeit"), from the compositional ἀνή-ν-nοττε to ἀνή-ν-ντε-πρωμί (actually not attested?) — calling for mid-grade π- ντε-. Stern's "Relation" and "Annexion" (1880 Chapter X) refer to the same junctural continuum (1880:85 "werkette der relation", for both composition and nota relationis.

(3) As might be expected, B. Gunn addressed this issue too (Gunn Papers MS VII 12-14 in the Griffith Institute, Oxford). To give an idea of his shorthand style in these worknote: "Rule: when the rectum is undetermined (semantically, ASH) and has no article and is not a PN, the genitival n. not ντε, and if the regens has the definite article this must be of the πι-series, not the π-series" (Gunn mentions "nouns which can take the π-series", having identified here a lexical group). "Rule: nouns which can take πι-articles take πι-articles (a) in the vocative... [but... Φ† ετόν...], when followed by a relative expression (including ετόνμακ and ετ- + qual.), (b) often before ντε + determined noun (the question still is why ντε is employed in some cases and not in others) (are exceptions incorrect?)."

(4) Diachrony is here greatly neglected. See BORGHOUTS 1980 for Late Egyptian, a study discerning also in its Coptic statements; 66f. briefly on Demotic, for which see also SIMPSON 1996:67ff. We have to bear in mind that the Coptic (sub)systems do not continue Demotic ones, and, like the determination systems themselves, Demotic n-/nte- (with an absent — or zero? — nota relationis for a third term) do not always match their Coptic correspondents.

3.9.2 The individual constructions: brief characterization, comment and representative documentation.

(a) Pattern (I): \{π-\} n-, nen- n- two noun syntagms connected by n-, the first determined by \{π-\}, the second by any specific determination, in a discontinuous framework for "inalienable", or Personal-Sphere, Constituence Association. CA relates, as it were, a fragment part in a jigsaw puzzle, to its complete picture, integral, emblematic and inherently essential parts constituting the complex Whole, which subsumes them — wants them, so to speak, for its completude; this whole clusters, so to speak, around a nuclear or core as its "Personal Sphere". It is deeply significant, and paralleled in numerous other languages (see below the reference to literaturn on possession and "inalienability"), that the part is not marked in this construction either as specific or as non-
specific, but as generic, and a special "name" metaphoristic generic at that — it is rather in the relationship between the two terms that re-
sounds the essentiality which is one term of that haunting opposition of
inference vs. incidence, which we find in nominal predication (Chapter
Two). I would quote here my tentative definition of "INALIENABLE ESSENTIAL ASSOCIATION" (so called in SHISHA-HALEVY 1994:237): "...a highly marked type of essential association spectrum, including inter alia as
components: inherent attributes, intimate personal ties, natural (physi-
cal, biological, geographical and conventional), including by-definition
part/whole association, permanent and significant possession, close per-
sonal association". Paradoxically, this is not a type of possession (we
are tautologically and circularly guided by "of", associating this with
possession), but both componental and representational: "N¹ represents
N²" (compare Gen. 41:46 ΠΧΑΕΙ ΤΗΡΩ ΝΧΗΜΙ with the Città di Roma
type of appositive construction).

N- + (non-zero, usually specific determinator) are here the prime ex-
ponents, although the non-phoric, non-specific, naming article π- ("na-
mimg generic" — see above) is an essential component too. Note the
absence of zero article in this construction; also that it is purely nomi-
nal — any pronominal term (such as the possessive articles or ΝΤΑΞ)
neutralizes at once all associative distinctions. Also, the clear predomi-
nance of the singular, both in the strength of attestation and the variety
of categories represented (category [a] absent; see below). In fact, ΝΕΙ
is not clearly connected or related to π-: even beyond the fact that the
plural and singular systems are independent of each other and asym-
metrical, ΝΕΙ- (rarely n-) really belongs only in the associative
phrase, while π- is the number-neutral (morphologically singular) "no-
tion name" and "named generic" meta-linguistic actualizer, not specific
per se52. In fact and significantly, plurality of the first noun — the con-
stituent element — or possessedness of the second, seems to reduce in
degree, or even to cancel the CA, replacing it by a less marked or un-
marked ΝΤΕ- signalled association. Another factor that reduces CA
grading is the switch from a PN to an apppellative: see below, (g). This
scale of "personalization" of the associative relationship — PN, singular
appellative, plural appellative for the second term, expansion or specifi-
cation of the first — gives us an intimation of the nature of the CA.

The correlation of this special associative construction with the lex-
icon is not straightforward. A well-defined core lexeme repertory is typi-

52 Consider cases such as Deut. 23:18 ΦΒΕΧΕ ΝΟΥΠΟΡΝΗ (instantial generic) and
the remarkable, equally generic, ...ΨΩΠΙ ΕΠΗ ΜΠΝΟΥ† Gen. 28:22.
cally, statistically, connected with this construction, while a considerable fuzzy lexeme periphery is also found sharing this slot. What ought to be realized, however, is that the construction is not conditioned or selected by the very presence of any lexeme; the inverse is also true: a non-core lexeme is "read", decoded as constituentual, often with implications for translation, by its occurrence in this pattern, of which the signifié is "Personal-Sphere Constituence Association". In 1994 I suggested that this is indeed a lexico-semantic property, of a specific closed group ("the X lexemes") as grammatical nucleus: "the inalienably associated lexemes", with various sub-ranges. However, it is clear that these lexemes (a) interact with the expansion and (b) receive their value from their being in the lexical constituency of the "discontinuous grammeme π- η-" pattern. It would seem that, while the core "lexeme group X" is certainly statistically connected with the first-noun constituency of this pattern (the expansion is not primarily restricted lexically), this list, together with the pattern itself, has a motivating and signalling effect — any lexeme occurring in the nucleus would be decoded as sharing in an "inalienable" association (CA); the pattern itself has a "distinctive relational meaning", as in evidence when "untypical" lexemes occupy it; also, the "same" lexeme can be "relative" and "absolute". This instance of grammar/lexicon, lexeme/environment permeability and interaction-loop is also of theoretical interest, raising questions of theoretical import: is the CA signification primarily a valential function of the lexeme, as "nomen relativum"? If a lexeme occurs twice, in two different patterns, do we have a case of homonymy (so for instance ֖ת ֖ת "[one's own] silver [money]") and ֖ת ֖ת "silver (metal)")? Is there a "lexical group for which CA is potentially signalled by construction"?

"Inalienability" or CA — which may be metaphorical — is marked by its construction. It is neither absolute nor the property of a single pattern, but evidently a radial gradient, with a core lexical list for which different "symptomatic" constructions converge. One such construction, for instance, predicates the very existence of a constituent part in an usually animate Whole, by the formal means of ֣וֹ and ַו, instead of (n)ת with ֣ for the existential predication of possession by means of the special verboid:

Deut. 1:15 ֔ונ- ֖יתֵ ֣ו ֣ו (opposed to non-grammaticalized Deut. 32:28 ֣ו- ֖יתֵ ֣ו "in them").
Lev. 11:9f.:12 ֔ונ- ֖ן ֣ו ֣ו also Deut.14:9:10.
Ex. 13:7 ֔ונ ֔ונ- ֖ע ֣ו ֣ו.
Lev. 11:21 ֔ונ- ֖ ֣ו ֣ו.
Lev. 11:23 ετε-οσιον-quito μφατ ερως.
Deut. 32:20f. μμον-κατ μμοq.
Deut. 32:20f. μμον-νας μμοq.

In this sense, the π- Ντε- construction, which in effect negates, reduces or annuls the CA, stands half-way between the CA-marked and marking π- ν- and the totally unmarked πι- Ντε: see below.

It is crucial to bear in mind that, much like staging choices in narrative (Chapter One above), the formal “packaging” of the relationship between two nouns — as any of the π- ν-, π- Ντε- or πι- Ντε- types of interdependence — has nothing objectively inevitable about it, but involves a personal representation choice by the writer-translator, his suggestion of a world-view at any given textual and pragmatic situation. There is thus no natural or necessary link between the participant lexemes and their mutual relation.

Three major lexical groups enter the CA construction most typically, no doubt further refinable. As already pointed out, these are indicative, not of simple lexical motivation for the construction but of the special relationship signified by π- ν-. Note that some lexemes occur in more than one group, also that there are some borderline cases for which the class assignation is debatable, and subjective (this classification does not necessarily replace the semantically more concrete one into six groups, offered in SHISHA-HALEVY 1994:237ff.):

(a) the first noun is representative of or coreferent with the second, or rather of/with the Whole. It may even be its typical manifestation. This is, I find, the most telling of semantic cases: the interdependence of the two terms is almost appositive, not subordinative. “He has” predication is here not possible;

(b) the first noun is a relational abstract constitutive part of the identity profile or Personal Sphere of the second: kinship; social/religious order and status. “He has” predication is possible;

(c) the first noun is a concrete constitutive part of the identity profile of the second: anatomical parts (incl. extensions and metaphors), physiological and physical properties, attributes, faculties and their manifestation; personal effects and possessions. “He has” predication is possible.

Documentation (speciminal or selective — see SHISHA-HALEVY 1994: 237ff. for the exhaustive listing. An asterisk marks items occurring in more than one pattern)\(^{53}\):

\(^{53}\) I count in the corpus 115 items in this construction, of which about one-third occur in both π- ν- and π- Ντε- patterns.
Singular:

(a) ΠΤΩΣΟΤ ΝΑΕΡΜΩΝ Deut. 3:8.
ΠΤΩΣΟΤ ΝΚΙΝΑ Lev. 25:1 and often.
ΠΚΑΓΙ ΝΓΕΣΕΜ Gen. 47:4, 23:2, 41:46, 48:7 and often.
ΝΙΡΟΜΠΙ ΝΤΕ-ΠΩΝΣ ΝΑΒΡΆΜ Gen. 25:7(!).
ΤΨΑΛΝ ΝΛΕΤΙ Num. 17:2.
ΦΝΑΤ ΝΡΩΤΙ, ΦΝΑΤ ΝΓΑΝΑΤΟΩΤΙ Ex. 16:6f.
ΤΗΠΙ ΝΝΙΕΓΟΟΣ Num. 14:34.
ΝΙΕΓΟΟΣ ΝΤΕΝΓΗΒΙ ΜΨΡΙΜΙ ΜΜΩΤΧΣΗ Deut. 34:8.
*ΠΚΑΓΙ ΝΝΕΝΨΗΡΙ ΝΧΕΤ Gen. 23:7.
ΦΛΑΟΣ ΜΠΚΑΓΙ ΝΝΕΝΨΗΡΙ ΝΧΕΤ Gen. 23:7.
ΦΝΟΜΟΣ ΜΠΙΝΑΧΧΑ Num. 19:14.
ΩΡΑΟΣΙ ΜΠΙΞΩΨΡ Gen. 20:3.
ΜΨΡΘ Τ ΜΠΙΝΟ ΝΤΕΨΙΟΜ Gen. 32:12.
ΤΨΑΛΝ ΤΨΑΛΝ ΜΜΑΝΑΧ Deut. 3:13.
ΤΨΩΤ Τ ΜΠΙΝΑΨ Gen. 21:14.
*ΦΝΑΤ ΜΨΡΘGen. 32:30 in naming; not actantial association (Greek είδος θεού); contrast the anaphorically marked ΝΙΝΑΤ ΝΤΕ-ΦΘ Gen. 32:31.
Num. 33:8 ΦΜΩΤΙ Ν-Γ ΝΕΓΟΟΣ may belong here, but is probably different: non-specific, quantified second noun.

(b) ΤΡΩΙΜΙ ΝΛΩΤ Gen. 19:26.
ΘΝΑΣ ΜΠΙΑΛΟΥ Ex. 2:8.
*ΠΝΟΝ ΜΠΑΓΙ Deut. 25:7f..
*ΤΡΩΙΜΙ ΜΠΕΨΚΟΝ Deut. 25:7 (ΠΕΨ- does not condition ΝΤΕ-).
ΦΘΨΒ ΜΨΡΘ Gen. 14:18.
ΜΜΩΤΧΣΗ ΦΒΨΚ ΜΠΙΣΣ Deut. 34:5.
ΦΝΨΒ ΜΠΙΨ Ex. 22:8.

...ΨΨΠΙ ΕΠΗΙ ΜΠΝΟΨΡ Τ Gen. 28:22 — in rhematic status, generic — unique among zero and indefinite articles.

(c) ΤΣΑΡΨ ΝΟΤΡΨΜΙ Ex. 30:32.
ΠΝΟΨΨ ΜΠΣΕΒΙ Ex. 4:25f.
*ΤΨΦΕ ΝΙΨΧΨΨ Deut. 33:16.
ΠΑΛΩΣ ΝΙΑΚΨΒ Gen. 32:24.
ΘΩΣΨΣΙ ΠΑΛΩΣ ΝΙΑΚΨΒ Gen. 32:24.
*ΤΣΨΗ ΝΙΑΚΨΒ Gen. 27:22.
*ΠΡΟ ΝΤΣΚΨΝΝ (vs. ΝΙΡΨΗΩΤΙ ΝΤΕΡΤΣΛΗΗΝ) Num. 4:30.
ΤΕΟΤ ΝΙΑΣΨΚ Gen. 31:42.
Plural — note the drastic reduction in constituence:
(b) *νενοψηπὶ n- Num. 27:1 sim. Gen. 23:7 (Num. 10:8 ΝΙΟΣΗΒ ΝΙΨΗΠΙ ΝΤΕΑΡΨΩΝ is not CA, but genealogical status attribution).
νενοψηπὶ n- Gen. 25:3ff., 37 passim, etc. (in genealogical lists).
νενοψηπὶ ΝΙΩΨΗΨ Gen. 45:16.
(c) νενοφωτὸς μφιόμ Ex. 14:30 — here, and usually in this class, metaphorical (not for n-).
νενοκαζη μπιλαος Deut. 5:25.
νενοβαλ μπιθε Deut. 11:12.
νενοσωτη νικακ Gen. 26:25 — for the morphophonemic allo-morph n-, see Polotsky 1968.

Obs.
(1) On "nomina relativa", Ars Anonyma (Cod. Bern), ed. Keil VIII “Sunt alia ad aliquid dicta, quae ad aliam personam referuntur, ut magister dominus pater, quae relativa dicuntur, quia ad alias personas referuntur, id est ad personam discipuli et serui et filii; quando enim magister dicitur, intellegitur et discipulus, et quando dominus nomenatur, intellegitur et seruus: sic et pater quando dicitur, reuelatur et filius.”. Thus both intrinsically and extrinsically (by possessor) specified, hence the generic article. See Swiggers and Wouters 1995.

(2) Recent general and specific studies of so-called inalienable possession, with valuable bibliographical surveys, are Spanoghe 1995 (Romance), Velazquez-Castillo 1996 (Guaraní), Baron et al. (eds) 2001. Jacob 1993 is a good résumé of the inalienability phenomenon all the way back to Lucien Lévy-Bruhl’s original anthropo-linguistic study of Melanesian languages of 1916 (MSL 19:96-104), and Bally’s criticism of 1926 (in the Festschrift Louis Gauchat: Bally 1926). This paper, mainly discussing the problem of French sonle [bras] and associated constructions, stresses the importance of pragmatic factors involved, and the primacy of reference and reference-domain explicitation by the syntactical mechanisms involved. Diem 1986 is a survey of the phenomenon in Semitic
(see p. 228ff. for a general discussion), reporting briefly on individual languages: it uniquely takes into account narrative structures and discourse constellations. Diem arrives at much the same main conclusions as the present discussion, viz. the relativity and gradience of the inalienability feature, and its dependence on specific syntax. See also SEILER 1983:10ff., 17ff. etc. KORZEN 1996:557ff., on the marked lexical constituent in special Italian patterns with predicative ("gli occhi chiari"). Inalienability must be distinguished from focussed possession (cf. MARKEY 1985b). MITHUN 2001 is a study of the participation of verb clauses in the possession and inalienability phenomena in American-Indian languages. Incidentally, the collection of articles of which Marianne Mithun's forms part, as well as VELEZ-CASTILLO 1996, bring home the subtlety, sophistication with the rich variety of means and implications of the grammar of possession and inalienability in the world's more esoteric languages; also, the advisedness of isolating the "grammars" of kinship and body-part terms. On inalienability in English as a special case of more general distinctions within noun-modification structures, see BRUGMAN 1996. By far the most comprehensive programmatic modern compilation on what is by now known as "inalienable possession" is to my knowledge CHAPPELL and Mcgregor (eds.) 1996. Here, beside the extensive and detailed descriptive accounts, we find an excellent bibliography, with a certain bias for the more esoteric languages. In the introduction by the editors, research-historical and theoretical observations, with definitions which reveal the inadequacy of the prevalent semantic approach; "inalienability" itself, "indissolubility" (consider body-part syntax in the Coptic martyrlogies!) and "possession" (in the context of the usual focus on kinship terms, body parts, even part/whole), all do not do justice to the intricacies and sophistication of the phenomenon. Bally's "personal domain" or "sphere" ("sphère personnelle"), in his seminal essay mentioned above, is clearly superior as a cover notion.

(3) DE LA GRASSERIE 1906 is an early, if not the earliest general and comparative study of this special lexicostyntactic phenomenon. I find noteworthy the terminology: "subjective nouns" certainly comes closer to its special identity-expressing function than "inalienable"; also, the explicit (see the introduction, p.2f.) reference to the part verbal and other non-nominal word-classes play in expressing this; also, the association of Proper Names and pronouns in this connection: "personalized" is a term used below for the idiosyncrasy (Second and Third part).

(4) I find cogent and relevant to many issues touched on in the present chapter, and even deeply affecting, R. Langacker's statement of 1972 (Apud SPANOGLHE 1995:23), which I shall here quote in full: "Suffice it to say that the syntax of "have" and "be" involves many peculiarities, and that there is some important but as yet dimly understood linguistic relationship holding among such notions as existence, identity, possession, location and tense. The elucidation of these relationships will have profound consequences for our understanding of the structure of human language". The very relationship of "inalienable" association and possession (and possessedness) is but rarely pondered in the literature: it is precisely here that Coptic may contribute towards a clearer understanding of the phenomenon.

(5) For older Egyptian, one construction marking inalienability is the formal and obligatory separation of possessor and inalienable (body part) as Topic and Theme respectively, of the type "š3j $f nh3", see EDEL 1955/64:412, GARDINER 1957:163. Another may be the occurrence as the in fine composit following the adjective as i.e.c. At least part of the spectrum of the so-called "Direct Genitive" construction may be considered in this light. Incidentally, B. Gunn (the Griffith Institute, Oxford, MS V A 3.1) also embarked on a study of the OE and ME "Direct" and "Indirect Genitive": we have a listing of nuclear

(6) At least three abnominal n- homonyms of the nota relationis are easily resolved by structural analysis (four, if we include the Rheme-introducing n- before zero and indefinite articles: see above and in Chapter Two):

Deut. 32:9 τοι μνήσθε.
Ex. 17:13 οταὼτες nτηχύι.
οτ τῆ ομπατ Ν μνήμοπαλλοχν.
Deut. 27:2 ημι τη πολλοπαλλοχν.

(7) τηχύι n-: the singular γίμε, shown by Young 1971 to be a specific and specialized form for inalienable “wife” in the Sahidic n- n- construction, is not attested in Bohairic.

(8) Remarkably, ὑπακοσι n- has CA both with the night and with the dreamer: πικάρι n- CA both with the place and with its inhabitants.

(9) The nota relationis n- features in yet another construction, familiar in Semitic, in which “inalienable” nouns — more specifically, parts of the body — are nuclear and expanded by their nominal “possessor”. The grammatical mechanism here is different: the inalienables are not determined, but formally and cataphorically marked as possessed by a delocutive suffixed pronoun, which is then expanded and nominally specified for possessor or “the Whole” by a mediating n-+ noun or PN. This pattern also serves as the nominal construction of some compound prepositions:

πως nτηχύι Gen. 34:26.
ἐγραφέ ναβραμ Gen. 14:17.
ψητά Ντέκαίξ νοβιάμ Lev. 14:36.
δαράξ nπκαρ Deut. 28:64.

(b) Pattern (II) (π- ) + nτε-. Probably the most intriguing of all in this set of constructions54. This pattern is the only case of nτε- opposed to n-, and indeed the only case of nτε- pertinent (= non-conditioned, meaningful: nτε- is conditioned, i.e. obligatory, following all other determinators but {π-}). It signifies primarily the suppression or annulment or negation of the special Constituence Personal-Sphere Association or “inalienability” link expressed iconically or even emblematically by n-. nτε- expands here the π- marked genus name (this is not any more a case of discontinuous matrix) and, as a delimitation, breaks up and invalidates the “personalized” relation, by “depersonalizing” it. This allows, for instance, the marking of “τεχμη nτεπος” or “nεn- ταπ nτεπιμανερ-μωτυμωτυ” as metaphors, but especially — for the core lexicemic “X” repertory referred to above as typical or even

54 De Puydt’s statements (1985a:53) “π- requires n- to follow it ”, “π- nτε- is almost entirely absent” are untenable.
valient in Pattern I — when the first term is further specified, or when
the expanding noun has the possessive article, i.e. is marked as pos-
sessed: we then have the (negative) signalization of non-Constituence
association. Note that the expanding noun is here very often, almost as a
rule, not the Whole, but a merely larger constituent of which the nuclear
noun is part and possessed, e.g. (ατ) σεβι, μορτ, αφε. In this pattern,
{πι-} stands in opposition to {πι-} (construction III), which is phoric
and specific/specifying on its own, with its whole construction signify-
ing unmarked association; π- ντε-, on the other hand, signifies and ex-
presses the suppression or reduction of Constituence Association:

τςαζ ε νοτρπ\\(\text{ω}\\(ι\)  Ex. 30:32.
πκαζ ι ννεν\\(\text{ω}\\(η\) ι \(\text{ν}\\(\text{η}\\(ε\) \(\text{τ}\\(\text{η}\\(ε\) \(\text{ι}\\(\text{ο}\\(τ\) Gen. 23:7.
πςο κπκαζ ι \(\text{n}\\(\text{τε}\\(\text{πι}\\(\text{xωρος} Gen. 19:28.

is in opposition with
πκαζ ι ντεν\\(\text{ε}\\(κιωτ} Gen. 31:3.
τςαζ ι ντεν\\(\text{ε}\\(κατ\\(\text{ε}\\(βι Gen. 17:24f.
πςο ντεν\\(\text{ε}\\(το}\\(\text{ν}\\(\text{ο}\\(ρ} Lev. 19:27.

φτ ναβρα\\(\text{μ} and φτ ντεν\\(\text{ε}\\(κιο}\\(\text{τ} in the same verse (Acts 7:32).

Otherwise, ντε- characterizes the nucleus as associated to its expan-
sion in a non-possessive relationship — appurtenance, in the broadest
sense.

ντε- is incompatible with zero determination (cases like ντε-πας\(\text{τ},
ντε-\(\text{ω}\\(ρ} are PN's, not zero-det. lexemes), and is in this pattern almost
always combined with a specific noun. As in Pattern (I), the specificity
of the whole phrase is combinatorial, dependent on the expanding noun, and
not signalled in the nucleus alone; the phrase has no deictic value.

Documentation:
The core repertory of Pattern (I):

Singular
Gen. 49:24 τςιξ ντεν\\(\text{ε}\\(τω}\\(ρ\(ι\) Gen. 17:24f. τςαζ ι ντεν\\(\text{ε}\\(κατ\\(\text{ε}\\(βι\) Gen. 17:24f.
Num. 12:12 τοι ντεν\\(\text{ε}\\(κατ\\(\text{α}\\(τ\) Lev. 18:8 πςιπι ντεν\\(\text{ε}\\(κιω}\\(μι Gen. 17:24f.
Num. 27:21 πκαζ ι ντεν\\(\text{ω}\\(η\) Gen. 37:3 πς\\(\text{η}\\(πι} \(\text{n}\\(\text{τε}\\(\text{ε}\\(κ}\\(\text{ε}\\(μ}\\(ε}\\(λ}\\(λ\) Gen. 49:6 νεν\\(κοβ}\\(ξι} ντεν\\(\text{α}\\(κι\) and
Gen. 27:28 πς\\(\text{α}\\(ι ντεν\\(\text{ο}\\(γ}\\(ο} νεν\\(ο}\\(κι\)
Deut. 5:28 ΤΣΘΗ ΝΤΕΝΕΤΕΝΩΝΔΙ “sound”.
Deut. 28:45 ΤΣΘΗ ΝΤΕΝΟΣ ΝΕΚΝΟΣ “voice”.
Gen. 18:1 ΦΡΟ ΝΤΕΤΕΓΚΗΝΗ.
Lev. 19:27 ΠΡΟ ΝΤΕΝΕΤΕΝΜΟΡΤ.
Gen. 34:33 ΠΡΟ ΜΠΑΝΟΜ ΝΤΕΝΕΡΓΟ.
Lev. 19:27 ΠΨΗ ΝΤΕΤΕΝΑΦΕ.
Deut. 33:15 ΤΑΦΕ ΝΓΑΝΚΑΛΑΜΦΟ (poetic).
Deut. 8:17 ΝΑΜΑΓΙ ΝΤΕΤΑΖΙΑ.
Ex. 4:25f. ΠΣΕΒΙ ΝΤΕΠΙΛΩΤ.
Gen. 31:3 ΠΩΑΓΙ ΝΤΕΝΕΚΙΩΤ.
Ex. 12:22 ΦΡΟ ΝΤΕΝΕΡΗΙ (vs. the unexpanded, anaphorically specific ΠΙΡΟ ibid.).

Deut. 31:29 ΕΠΙΒΕ ΝΤΕΝΙΕΓΟΟΤ.
The nuclear noun is an abstract or verbal noun:
Deut. 29:19 ΤΣΟΡΜΕΣ ΝΤΕΝΑΙΓΗΤ.
Deut. 33:16 ΤΣΟΣΟΤΕ ΝΤΕΤΕΓΑΦΕ.
Gen. 27:28 ΠΑΨΑΙ ΝΤΕΟΤΣΟΤΟ ΝΕΜ ΟΤΗΡΠ.
Num. 14:27 ΠΧΡΕΜΡΕΜ ΝΤΕΝΕΝΨΗΡΙ ΜΠΙΚΑ.
Num. 20:24 ΦΜΨΟΤ ΝΤΕΤΑΝΤΙΛΟΙΑ.
Deut. 31:10 ΠΨΑΙ ΝΤΕΤΑΚΗΝΟΠΑΙΑ.
Ex. 26:8 ΤΨΗ ΝΤΕΠΙΟΟΤΑΙ ΝΕΡΨΙΝ.
Num. 16:22 ΦΨ ΦΨ ΝΤΕΝΙΠΝΑ in address.
Plural (rare):
Ex. 29:2 ΝΕΝΤΑΝ ΝΤΕΠΙΜΑΝΕΡΨΟΤΨΟΤΨΙ.
Gen. 49:6 ΝΕΝΚΟΒΓ ΝΤΕΟΤΜΑΣΙ (= Vat; poetic).
Num. 27:1 ΝΕΝΨΕΡΙ ΝΤΕΣΕΛΠΑΑ ΨΨΗΡΙ ΝΟΨΕΡ...

(c) Pattern (III): {πι-} + ΝΤΕ-. This very common construction is (semantically) unmarked for precise manner of association, in the broadest sense of appurtenance (in Sahidic, ΝΤΕ- seems to be marked as against the unmarked Ν-: cf. LAYTON 2004:113f.). It is, however, characterized, for the familiar special lexeme group of patterns (I — II), by the phoricity of the phrase as a whole, as signalled in the nucleus, which is anaphoric and/or cataphoric; by the further specification and expansion of the first term; by the predominance of plurals. In all these cases there is signalization of the total annulment of the CA, or rather indifference there to. The pattern is characterized by the broad (free) range of determination of the satellite (expansion), and by the openness of the lexeme repertory:
Num. 27:7 ΝΙΣΗΝΟΤ ΝΤΕΠΟΤΙΩΤ.
Num. 4:41 ΠΙΔΕΜΠΩΙΝΙ ΝΤΕΠΑΝΜΟΣ ΝΤΕΝΕΝΨΗΡΙ ΝΓΕΔ-ΨΩΝ — verbal nouns with actant.
Num. 4:45 ἌΣΜΗ ΝΤΕΠΣΈ- metaphoric?
Num. 4:44 ΝΙΗΙ ΝΤΕΝΟΣΙΟΤ- metaphoric.
Deut. 31:14 ΝΙΡΨΟΤ ΝΤΕΤΣΚΗΝΗ.
Num. 19:18 ΝΙΚΑΣ ΝΤΕΝΙΡΕΨΗΜΨΩΤΤ — no longer “inalienable”.
Gen. 49:18 ΠΙΝΟΓΕΜ ΝΤΕΠΣΈ — actantial.
Gen. 23:22 ΠΙΧΙΝΙΝΙΝ ΝΤΕΙΑΒΟΚ — actantial.
Lev. 14:28 ΠΙΗΑ ΝΤΕΝΙΨΙΝΟΨΝΤΕΦΗ ΝΤΕΤΜΕΤΨΑΨΤΕ.

When the nucleus is of higher or lower specificity, that is, on either side of πι- in the specificity scale\textsuperscript{56}, nτε- is conditioned i.e. is non-pertinent. However, nτε- enables the individual determination of individual constituents: Patterns IIIa-b-c.

(d) Pattern (IIIa) πα- / ΦΗ + nτε-: deictic (high specificity) nucleus. Here, for the first time, we find a pronoun eligible to follow nτε-; the expansion is of the here-and-now locutive deictic range. nτε- itself is non-pertinent, and expresses the most general kind of association.

Gen. 30:20 παίχυοτ ΝΤΕΤΨΟΤ.
Deut. 31:26 ΝΑΙΚΑΣΙ ΤΗΡΟΤ ΝΤΕΤΑΙΨΑΨΑΗ.
Deut. 29:24 ΝΑΙΜΒΟΝ ΝΤΕΝΑΙΝΙΨΤ ΝΔΨΝΤ.
Deut. 22:16 ΤΑῚΨΕΡΙ ΝΘΗΙ — a deictic correspondent to “τα-ψερι” or to ςΨερι ΝΨΗΙ? See Obs. below.
Deut. 29:24 ΝΑΙΜΒΟΝ ΝΤΕΝΑΙΝΙΨΤ ΝΔΨΝΤ.
Lev. 4:29 ΦΗ ΝΤΕΨΨΟΒΙ — we have here a rare case of a generic rectum of nτε-.

PN ΦΗ ΝΤΕ- PN Ex. 35:34, 37:20.

(e) Pattern (IIIb): {πεψ-} + nτε- is significant also for the compatibility of the possessive article with nτε-, which is thus revealed as non-possessive. The possessive article is higher than πι- on the specificity scale, and has a personal-deictic component.

Gen. 31:6 ΠΑΒΕΧΕΣ ΝΤΕΤΜΗΨΤ ΝΘΙΕΒΙ.

\textsuperscript{56} I must disagree with BORGHOUTS 1980:66, who attributes the selection of nτε- following πς- or πεψ- to the absence of deixis. As in the case of LE adnominal postpositive (enclitic) jnk etc., this is rather a matter of specificity grading; and the higher-specificity grades, deictically marked, condition nτε- just as the lower-specificity grades do (cf. this/a friend of mine): πα- nτε- etc.
Num. 8:16 τεφτόν τνενεψωρ πνικα.
Num. 5:29 ...ερπεςγαὶ ντας — ντε- here is not expanding-adnominal, but rhematic (in the Stative-Durative Nexus Pattern).

(f) (IIIc): οὐ- / zero — + ντε-: non-specific nucleus, specific or non-specific expansion; broadest/unmarked association (non-pertinent ντε-).

Deut. 3:2 ἀλεφπερτοδρόμος ντενεψωρ πνικα.
Lev. 2:14 Σέλιν ντενεκοτας.
Num. 30:10 οὔτενκ ουμοτας.
Ex. 3:15 ουμεγι ντεςγανδωτ νδωτ.
Lev. 11:32 οὐαὶ ντεναι.
Deut. 15:7 οὐι ντενεκβακι.
Gen. 19:12 κεοται ντακ.
Ex. 38:10ff. Κ ονταλος ντωτ, Κ Μβαδικ ντωτ.
Num. 21:28 ουβακι ντεχων.
Deut. 4:25 γανσωρ ντενεκωρι.
Deut. 23:19 Μβιν νγατ νεμμινι νδπε νεμ μενι ντευωμ
NIBEN.
Num. 30:14 ετχ ΝΙΒΕΝ ΝΕΜΑΝΑΥ ΝΙΒΕΝ ΝΤΕΟΤΣΝΑΤ.
Note also (specificity-indifferent nucleus):
Deut. 32:14 ουτω νιηβ νεμ ντεγανωιλι — poetic languages.
Note the alternation ν- / ντε- gamma.

Lev. 17:13 Φρωμι φρωμι ντενεψωρ πνικα.
Lev. 10:12 ΝΗ εοτωβ ντενεοτωβ.
Lev. 19:30 ΝΗ εοτωβ ντηι.
πεοτωβ ντενε εοτωβ Ex. 30:36, Lev. 27:28.
Gen. 33:5:8 ου ντακ νε ναι.
Gen. 48:8 ΝΗΜ ντακ πε Φαι.

Obs.
In the unedited B4 Twelve Prophets (P.Vat. copto 9) Zacharias, we find four examples of πι- ...ντας, concentrated in Chapter 9 and 11: Zach. 9:17 πιαγαιон ντας. 11:5 Νίμανεςσωτ ντωτ 11:6 πνοτρο ντας. 11:10 πνυμοτ ντηι. With no apparent trigger in the original Greek, this construction must be opposed to νεζ-, either as expressing a different — marked — semantics of association (as the pronominal form of πι- ντε-, which is not possessive); or a higher specificity of {πι-} as against a specificity neutrality of {νεζ-}; or a special rhetorical-emotive and focussing deixis, in Constitute Association environment. In fact, the three functional possibilities mentioned are compatible and potentially related. For the affective function with apparently intimately-associated nouns, compare “the nerve of her!” “the smell of you...” in English
— Zach. 9:17 πιθανόν ντατι is indeed clearly rhetorical-exclamatory: εἰ τι αγαθὸν αὐτῶ; the others seem not to be affective, but may well be instances of "inalienable" association.

(g) (I) vs. (II) vs. (III) — "same"-lexeme paradigmatic opposition cases (selection). These sets are instructive for illustrating the differences between CA and non-CA relationship, and the reduction and gradation of CA: (a) the weakening or annulment of the CA in the case of possessed or associated expansion nouns, occasionally in long association chains, (b) the generally associative, non-marked syntax of (1) non-CA with the same lexemes (which in effect are not the same), (2) plurality of the first and especially second terms, as reduced or annulled CA, (3) appellatives, as reduced CA (generally speaking, PNs as second term favour the CA construction), (4) grammatically conditioned ντε-, e.g. in the case of pronominal, not nominal expansion or non-specific nucleus; (c) "variation" — frankly baffling, even if (I believe) provisionally so; by no means rare.

Gen. 26:25 Φραν μφί.
Gen. 25:13 Νιράν ντενενωψρι νιςμάηα.

Gen. 23:13 Νενμάωξ μπιλαος ντεπικαρι.
Ex. 5:3 ...ενενμαώξ ντενετενωψρι.

Ex. 2:8 τουερι μφαραω.
Gen. 26:34 ιοταῖν τουερι μβενρ.
Gen. 9:19 νωψρι νε ναι ντενεω.
Ex. 5:3 ...ενενμαώξ ντενετενωψρι νεμνιψρι ντενετενωψρι.
Gen. 27:46 νουερι ντενενςρον νξέτ.
Gen. 27:46 νουερι ντεπακαρι — not (or reduced) CA: metaphor.
Gen. 28:1 νουερι ντενιχανανος — removed affiliation, reduced CA.
Deut. 9:2 νιψρι ντεενακ — not CA?
Gen. 25:6 Νιςρον τντεπαλακη ντεαβρααμ.

Gen. 28:21 πηι μπαιωτ.
Gen. 24:67 πηι νακραα.
Num. 3:35 παρχων ητενη πνειμανσωπι ητεπανμος μμεραπι — Merari belongs to his tribe no less than his tribe belongs to him! a nice instance of “Personal-Sphere”.

Lev. 25:33 ΝΗΙΗ ητενεβακι ητεποταμαγι.
Num. 1:2 ΝΗΙΗ ητενοτιοτ — not CA?

Lev. 25:15 ΤΗΠΙ ΝΝΗΡΟΜΠΙ.
Num. 4:40 ΤΗΠΙ ητενοτοταν.

Gen. 36:10, Deut. 5:21 ΤΣΗΙΗΜΙ ΝΗΚΑΣ, ΤΣΗΙΗΜΙ ΜΝΕΚΨΥΨΗΡ.
Gen. 37:2 ΝΙΓΙΟΜΙ ητεπεψιωτ.

Ex. 14:30 ΤΣΙΗΧ ΝΝΗΡΕΜΝΧΗΜΙ.
Lev. 26:25 ΝΕΝΔΙΧ ητενετεναξι.

Ex. 6:3 ΦΓΗΙ ΝΑΒΡΑΑΜ, ΦΓΗΙ ΝΙΚΑΑΚ, ΦΓΗΙ ΝΙΑΚΨΒ, ΦΓΗΙ ΝΝΕΚΙΟΓ.
Ex. 5:3 ΦΓΗΙ ητε-ΝΙΓΕΒΡΕΟC.
Num. 16:22 ΦΓΗΙ ΦΓΗΙ ητενιπηνα in address — not CA.

Deut. 1:4 ΠΟΣΡΟ ΝΕΒΑΚΑΝ.
Deut. 9:26 ΠΟΣΡΟ ητενειενονος — not CA.
ΠΟΣΡΟ ητενιαμορρεος Deut. 1:4, Num. 21:21 — not CA.

Num. 25:15 παρχων ημαδιαν.
παρχων ητεΓΗΙΦΗΗΑΝ ηκααακ Num. 7:18:24:30 etc. — not CA?
Num. 3:35 παρχων ητενη πνειμανσωπι ητεπανμος μμεραπι

Ex. 24:6 ΤΒΑΨΗΙ ΜΝΙΣΝΟQ.
Num. 31:30 ΤΒΑΨΗI ητενεψψηΡΙ ΜΠΗΣΛ.
Ex. 24:6 ΤΙΚΕΒΑΨΗI ητενιςνοQ — ke reducing CA.

Deut. 31:29 ΕΤΔΑΗ ΜΠΑΜΟΣ “after my death”.
Deut. 31:29 ΕΠΙΑΕ ητενιεγοος “the last day”, not CA.

Deut. 1:2 ΠΤΨΟΓ ΝΗΨΗΡ.
ΠΤΨΟΓ ΝΚΙΝΔΑ Ex. 34:32 etc.
Deut. 1:9 ΠΤΨΟΓ ητενιαμορρεος — not CA.
Ex. 34:29 ΠΤΨΟΓ ΝΚΙΝΔΑ- very remarkable, even strange; extremely rare.
Deut. 4:48 ΠΤΨΟΓ ητεκανιωρ.
Gen. 14:24 ττοι ννιψωμι.
Gen. 43:34 πνιτοι θυρωυ ντως — grammatically conditioned (pronominal expansion); not νεττοι probably to disambiguate the assignment of the Augens θυρωυ.

Gen. 36:8 ἔματ μμονι ντερεβεκκα.
Ex. 2:8 ἔματ μπιαλοτ.

Wholly mysterious is the following variation:
Gen. 26:25 ναλωτι νικακ.
Gen. 26:19 νιλωτι ντεικακ.
Gen. 24:59 πιαλοτ ντεαπραα.

Ex. 23:16 πναι μπιως ντενεκσωρπ νοσταγ.
Ex. 23:15 πναι ντενιατσεμηρ.

Lev. 16:18 εβολς ηπνσνος ντεπιμας νεμ εβολς ηπνσνος μπιαμπι (no differentiation in the Greek).

πκαγι ντξεμι passim.
πκαγι νξανααα passim.
πκαγι ντεξανααα Gen. 11:32, Num. 27:12 (τὴν γῆν χανααγ).
Out of over 30 cases in Genesis, only two instances of ν- following καγι correspond to the definite τὴν γῆν χανααγ (the other is the remarkable, almost unique 17:8 πικαγι θρπ νξανααα). It would appear that the overall determination here hints at a non-coreferent “of” association value for ντε-, against a coreferent “City of Rome” type construction for π- ν-, which would support the constitutental nature of “inalienability”.

Deut. 5:25 τζμη μπισε.
Deut. 28:45 τζμη ντεπισε πεκννυ (no difference in the Greek form).
Deut. 33:7 τζμη νιοτααα.
τζμη ντενετενκαζι Deut. 1:34, 5:28.

Deut. 9:5 ομεταεβις ντεναιεθνος.
Deut. 9:4 ἑμεταεβις ντεναιεθνος (no difference in the Greek form).
3.10 Attribution — the adnominal noun syntagm: the “Adjective”.

The disappearance of the essentially appositive, concord-linked adjective in “proto-Coptic”, conjointly with the much earlier emergence of the gender-number-marked and gender-number-marking definite article (surely the most striking phenomenon of Egyptian diachrony), is a typologically fascinating feature with several implications. An early concomitant symptom of its impending demise is its detachment from the verb, of which it is, Semitic-style, a participial form in Old and Middle Egyptian. Synchronously, however, it is a haunting question whether we can speak of attribution as a special construction at all. What we find is apparently a sub-case of the associative syntagm, with the zero-generic expanding noun linked by the familiar nota relationis n-. Num. 21:8 οὗτος ὁ γόμτ or Lev. 4:28 οὗτος οὕτως τοις νογέμ is essentially the same as Lev. 4:28 οὗτας νέγιμ, or Lev. 4:23 οὗτος τὸ νατας. However, since it is hardly the case that zero article is in this slot commutable ceteris paribus with non-zero, as n- is part of a discontinuous π- n- morph, and nτε- a conditioned link in other circumstances, it is arguable that we do not have a zero here at all, and n- is a true attribute marker prefixed to the bare lexeme, forming once again a “morphological” adjective entity. Or, even if preceding a zero, n- may be a homonym, the familiar Rheme-introducing (“predicative”) element in a generalized adnaxal adnominal role. In brief, the Coptic n-attribute is far from clear, and “of”, “de” parallels (even in the strikingly similar “frippon d’enfant”, “monster of a woman” construction) are not really explication.

And yet, the Adjective as a word-class, syntactically and structurally conceived, might be postulated for Bohairic Coptic too. In Coptic Grammatical Categories (1986a, Chapter Four), I suggested that, for Shenoutean Sahidic, the familiar Sahidic “double placement” and paradigmatic opposition in a specific list of nouns, including and mainly loan-

---

57 The adjective, and in particular the Egyptian adjective, is quintessentially a phenomenon of syntax (cf. Malaïse and Winand 1999:79).

58 On the famous Romance (especially French) problem of adjective placement. Wilmet 1993 is a very readable, loaded humoresque (a relatively late study in a long tradition, including Wilmet’s own in RLR 45 (1981), and others, partly enumerated in Shisha-Halevy 1986:132 n. 15). Cf. also Togoby 1984 IV §1537, 1539ff. for the expressive (often pejorative) “frippon de valet” type; Rothenberg 1970 includes “un frippon d’enfant” (II, 86ff.) as appositive. This is interesting, since the Coptic construction is arguably predicative and appositive (and not “partitive”): see for French also Schmitt Jensen 1988, on the relationship between adjectival attributive and predicative-ad-clausal status.
nouns from Greek that are in the Greek system true adjectives — co-
φοις ἡμεῖς and ἡμεῖς co-φοις — might be applied to define a
paradigmatic class of synchronic, syntactically defined Coptic adjectives.
This tagmemic paradigm is almost flimsy in our corpus of Bohairic. The
regular sequence has the Greek loan-noun satellital, not nuclear (I have
no detailed information concerning other varieties of the dialect):

Deut. 3:25 πνεύμων πανταχών.
Deut. 28:47 εἰς πάντα πανταχών.
Deut. 20:11 γηναξίιν γενιθνῖκοιν.
Gen. 37:4 ναξίιν γενιθνῖκοιν.
Lev. 21:20 ὀπώρα ναυριον.
Ἐνθνῖος ναυριον Deut. 7:22, Lev. 26:22.
Num. 16:2 γεννεωμὶ νονομαστος.
Ex. 28:39 ὀπωβ μποϊκοιτον.
Deut. 25:15 ὀς τις ναλαεινον νεμ νεμαι — θεμι is one of
the very few lexemic Egyptian adjectives in this slot.
Ex. 2:13 ὀγρωμὶ ἐν ἕρεος.
Gen. 38:2 ὀγρωμὶ νανανεος.

In our corpus, however, ἐν ἕρεος and κοηξί do occur exclusively in
the nuclear position, and for them no real opposition of placement ob-
tains; this may be seen as an extension of the usual nuclear position of
quantifiers — Ex. 23:13 μανκενοντι, Lev. 26:26 μὴ ἐν γεμί —
which in turn form a sub-class of nuclear grammemes:

Deut. 25:14 ονώτι ἐμεν νεμ ὀσκοξί: no “one” — the
determinator nucleus is sufficient.
Deut. 9:1 μανωτί μμακι.
Num. 14:23 κοηξί ναλασν ἱβεν νατεμι.
Gen. 42:15 πετενκοηξί νκον.
(Deut. 8:15 πνωγε πηνωτί ἐτεμματ hints at another construc-
tional possibility, but here the primary nucleus is name-generic).

However, ordinals (μαγ from two on) do have a double placement:
Gen. 8:13 πιαβοτ νγοτιτ.
Gen. 8:4 πιαβοτ μμαγ-7.
Gen. 10:2 ὀπωρυπ μμαγ-2.
As against:
Gen. 15:16 πιμαγ-4 ἦκως, which may be marked as focussed
(“only the fourth generation”).
And we also find isolated cases like
Gen. 34:14 ὀνατσεβι μγωμ — focussed as pejorative and affective (“We cannot do this thing, give our sister to an uncircumcised man,
for it is a shame for us” (a Greek relative: ἄνθρωπῳ δὲ ἔχει ἄκροβυ-
στίαν),

in opposition to
Gen. 16:3 τεσσωρί εξεμνηκα.
Gen. 20:4 συνλαολ Νατεμί οτορ Νεμκί.
Lev. 4:23 οτρωσσοτ Νατασνί,
in contrast to the functional charge of placement opposition in “non-
adjectival” cases like
Num. 12:1 τσγίμι νεβωι.
Ex. 2:7 στσγίμι νρεκσμων (“a woman”).

Compared with Lev. 4:28 στσβαεμπι νσγίμι (“female”), this may point to traces of a semantically distinctive, tagmernically sensitive
group of nouns that could be tagged as adjectival. These would include
as a sub-class Greek loan-adjectives that feature in Coptic gender con-
cord linkage (animate -οκ, inanimate -ον), a mechanism not always
active also in non-attributive status:
Ex. 27:1 ευοι ντετραγωνον.
Num. 4:6 ευοι ντακινονον.
Deut. 25:16 γανακικος (deeds).

Cases of marked feminines are arguably non-adjectival, but substanti-
val, with no necessary feminine concord even for movables:
Lev. 21:7 στσγίμι μπορνη.
Num. 12:1 τσγίμι νεβωι.
Ex. 21:8 κεενονε ακ νσεμμο.
Gen. 41:33 οτρωμι νκαβε.
Ex. 35:25 ςγίμι νιβεν νκαβε (cf. ςαβο νςγίμι Prov. 14:1,
which may be focussing as well).
Deut. 32:6 ςταλοντ ννοζ οτορ νκαβε ἀν.

Obs.
(1) Demotic as we know it from our sources shows a state of transition from the old
“morphological adjective” (which of course is no less a syntactical feature) to the syntac-
tic n- attribute, a panoramic impression probably to be corrected by precise corpus-based
study, which may result in a picture of balanced distribution between the two construc-
(2) On the evolution of the Egyptian attribute, see Steinhals and Misteli 1893:270ff.;
also 96ff., 276ff. on the nota relationis generally, as a typological trait.
(3) Goldenberg 1995 is a brilliant and elegant essay on attribution, the Semitic adjective
and on the Adjective as a phenomenon in general linguistics. I find thought-provoking in
the context of the Coptic constructions in point especially the relation, very convincingly
delineated and for Semitic inescapable, of the adjective to the genitive and the Relative
(see especially pp. 2ff., 8ff., 11ff.). The aptness of this is especially striking when we con-
sider the analytic, systemic, and practical correspondence of Coptic ἀνοκ- to Greek adjectives (cf. "an adjective constitutionally includes a pronominal head", p. 9); also illuminating is the functional affinity of our possessive pronoun ἕκκ- etc. to the Semitic 殍-, 窊- etc., elements which have a deictic pronominal basis (see Cohen Forthcoming). Even Goldenberg’s view of the adjective as “downgraded predication” (2f.), which I would on methodological principle find exceptional as non-signalling and essentially transformational, may score a descriptive point for Coptic, since, as suggested, our own ἀ- may be an adnominal role of the Rheme-marking (“predicative”) element, etymologically ἀ-.

(4) Outside the corpus, we do encounter rhetorically motivated first (nuclear) position of Greek loan-adjectives — the issue needs obviously to be studied further: Mac. Nos 18-20 πιστευεῖν ...πιστεύειν ...πιστεύειν ...πιστεύειν ...πιστεύειν ...πιστεύειν ...

3.11 The expanded pronoun/Proper Name/noun syntagm: some appositive constructions.

Apposition, a non-associative substitutive-and-amplificative construction, is of interest in the context of ἀ-marked rhematic expansion “packaging”. In fact, the attributive adjectival construction in pre-Coptic Egyptian was also appositive in formal principle, with concord linkage added to juxtaposition. The following constructions are noteworthy:

(a) Specifying apposition: relative (rhematic appositum) and direct expansion. Note that the Greek triggers the relative and rhematicity of the appositum in two different Coptic ways:

πιρσμι ετε ἄνοκ πε Gen. 44:15 (Greek ἄνθρωπος οἶος ἐγώ).

πιρσμι ετε-περιωτ πε Gen. 44:24:30:31 (Greek τόν παῖδα σου πατέρα δὲ ἠμῶν, τοῦ παιδός σου πατρός δὲ ἠμῶν).

πιρσμι περιωτ Gen. 44:27 Greek δ παῖς σου δ πατὴρ ἠμῶν.

(b) ἅκ-: colloquial-register or otherwise stylistically marked apposition, lexically specifying interlocutive pronouns. This distinctively Bohairic construction occurs in the corpus locutively, in the “Egyptian Episode” of Genesis, used by Jacob’s sons as minus habentes usually with ἰκαλωσι and once with its equivalent: do they address their superiors (Pharaoh and the still unrecognized Joseph) in a lower — or lowly — register?

Gen. 47:4 ἰκαλωσι ἅκ-ν ικαλωσι ἰκαλωσι ιονκαρι ιεκεκαμ.
Gen. 42:13 ἰκαλωσι-η ικαλωσι ικαλωσι.
Gen. 42:10 εταὶ εἰκαλωσι-η ικαλωσι ικαλωσι ικαλωσι.
Only once do we find the construction outside Genesis, allocutively, mediating between the allocutive pronoun and the specific Relative Form. What is the peculiar deictic tone in Moses’s address that is expressed or evoked by this element?

Deut. 4:4 ὥστεν ἐς ΕΑ-ΝΗ ἐθούτης ΝΣΑΠΙΣΕ ΠΕΝΝΟΥΤ ΤΕΤΕΝΟΝΣ ΘΡΟΤ ΜΦΟΥΤ.

Beyond any special stylistic charge this construction may carry, a question worthy of being raised is the way in which essentially delocutive referential and non-referential elements — anaphoric pronouns, nouns and Proper Names — may be adjoined to interlocutive pronouns. This is an interface that involves a significant shift of perspective and correspondingly an interesting junctural linkage and delimitation environment.

Obs.

(1) Needless to say, ΕΑ- is not an obligatory construction in our corpus: consider such loci as Num. 3:13:41:45 (Andersson 1904:113) and Deuteronomy passim; also Ex. 12:22. And yet, the precise environmental configuration of the instances of ΕΑ- is uncommon enough to make its occurrence almost predictable (see Jelanskaja 1962:95f.). This is a strikingly Nitrian and Nitrian-component (NT and OT) construction. The element ΕΑ- introduces PNs, specific nouns, τι- in associative syntagms, that is with Ν- or ΝΤΕ-, and ΚΝ-ΕΤ-; that is, not indefinites and zero-generics. Cf. AM II 199, 211, De Vis 131, II 88, 109.; Cat. 79 ἐθούτης ἐν ΕΑ-ΝΗ ΕΤΑΦΤ ΧΑΝ ΝΣΟΝΤ... ἐθούτ ΘΕΟΥ ΕΑ-ΠΕΚΩΝΠΙ. In Biblical texts: Ps. 113:26 ΑΝΟΙΚ ΕΑ-ΝΗ ΕΤΟΝΣ; Dan. 1:12, 3:4, 9:8. Early exx. in Kellia I 104 No. 28 (early: 6-8 centuries; ed. Daumas and Guillaumont, 1969) ΑΝΟΙΚ ΕΑ-ΠΗΛΟΝ, ed. Bosson 2003 — in a slightly different construction (and broader distribution?): ΔΡΙΤΙΝΑΙ ΝΕΜΗΙ ΕΑ-ΠΙΡΕΠΕΡΝΙΟΙ No. 91; probably also ΔΡΙΤΙΜΕΡΙ ΝΕΜΗΙ ΠΟΛΕΜΟΚΟΣ No. 10, ΑΝΟΙΚ ΕΑ-ΠΗΛΟΝ No. 98. (2) This construction is compatible with the Augens, which it follows: ΝΕΜ ΑΝΟΙΚ ΓΩ ΕΑ-ΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ (AM I 49). In Nitrian, the construction may also (albeit rarely) be delocutive: Cat. 154 ΕΤΕΝΟΥΟΤ ΟΝ ΝΕ ΕΑ-ΝΙΑΤΥΠΕΡΝΟΤ ΝΙΤΟΛΛΙ; also Cat. 106 ΕΑΤΕΡΚΑΤΑΝΙΚΑΖΙΝ ΜΝΟΥ ΕΦΝΟΤ... ΕΑ-ΖΗ ΕΤΕΝΠΕΡΝΟΒΙ. Note that ΕΑ- does not always occur with PNs (which, again, are by this token marked as essentially different "appellatives") and never with number names: AM I 155 ΕΡΟΤ ΑΝΟΙΚ ΙΟΤΛΙΟΣ, AM I 165 ΝΕΩΤΕΝ ΜΠ-Τ.

(3) So far as I know, we have no real etymology for this element, nor a clear Demotic precedent attestation for it. Crum Dictionary 633a (d) identifies here a prepositional "in respect of, on behalf" role; see also 629a (with variant forms ΓΑ-, ΥΑ-). Of course, this would hardly account for its special preferred interlocutive environment.

3.12 The reiterated noun syntagm is no less a case of determinator construction and slotting than the non-reiterated one (see, for Shenu-tean Sahidic, Shisha-Halevy 1986a:§1.3.3; to the references there add Bol-

59 In fact, ΝΗ ΕΤ- in Deut. 4:4 means "you who...", i.e. is allocutive.
Lée 1978). In the corpus examined here we find prevalent the *adverbial-
status distributive focussing* role of reiteration:

(a) πι- πι- for totalizing “each and every”, but also distributively
(“in each respective/individual instance”):

for πιοράι πιοράι, φοράι φοράι, see above.

Gen. 32:16 άρθητων νεκραλωτί πιορά πιορά καορά κανάτατι.

Ex. 16:4f. Φα-πιεροσ πιεροσ.

(b) π- π- totalizing:

Φρωμίν Φρωμίν... (Φή) ετνα- Lev. 20:9, 22:18, 26:2.

(c) οτ- οτ- quantifying “one (in each case)”.

οτρεμέντι οτρεμέντι ε/μγιόη Νum. 29:10:15.

(d) Reiterated *zero* determination seems to occur only following the
Rheme-introducing ν-, expressing focussed fragmentation:

Ex. 8:10 άτατων νεκρωτον νεκρωτον.

See above (3.3).

(e) Miscellaneous, distributive or focussing, following κατα- or ν-
καταφάι φάι “exactly thus” Ex. 26:24, Gen. 26:24.

Lev. 6:5 ονατοτοτε ονατοτοτε.

Obs.

Outside the corpus, cf. κεσωβ κεσωβ “any other thing (of the kind)”, in disjunctions
with ite and ie Cat. 143, 220; Rhematically, 1 Cor. 15:39 καρα ηιεν ταικαρα

3.13 “That”-forms, nexal substantivation forms, infinitives and
converbs. Final clauses and related forms.

In this, to the author probably the least satisfactory section of this
work, two related topics, namely (a) “that-” forms and related nexus-
substantival construction forms, and (b) final, purpose and consecutive
construction forms will be no more than lightly visited — with some
prominent questions raised, the syntax illustrated and possible hints at
distribution and function indicated. This is an important issue in Coptic,
but a crucial one in early pre-Coptic Egyptian grammar, where finite
nominal and substantival verb forms, alongside adverbial conterval
ones, play important roles in verbal-nexus and focalization matrices, as
well as in general substantive-privilege slots (e.g. following prepositions,
Nominal-Sentence Rhemes). Following the reduction and elimina-
tion of the synthetic substantival Relative Form (while the ‘adjectival’
oneS are still fully operative in LE and even linger on in Demotic), nexal
substantivation changes dramatically, and is very different in the analytic and synthesized-analytic phases, from Late Egyptian on. Here the infinitive, finitized in various ways, takes over from the rhematic finite converbs, e.g. in the time-honoured syntagms grammaticalizing *rdj* (†, “give, let, cause”) as *agens* carrier, or the possessive articles.

Somewhat surprisingly, substantivity and the broader nominality turn out to be gradient qualities: not all slots or environments, structurally symptomizing, determining and, in the long run, defining this quality, concur and are coextensive. One instance of this is the privilege of being combined with — actually expanding — determinators, a privilege restricted to lexemes. Arguably, it is not a higher nominality, but lexemicity that enables this. Another instance is the blurring of the borderline — in another metaphor, the leakage in the partition — between nominal (substantival or adnominal) and adverbal status: examples are certain converbs (Circumstantial Conversion) used appositively, or as a prospective “that”-form (see Obs. 3-4 below), or as Topic and Theme forms in focalization patterns, usually following their adverbal or (pro)nominal focus in a role typically substantival. As a matter of fact, it is an extreme grammaticalization of a lexically frozen converb, namely *r-đđ* “saying”, that gives us the one and only native Coptic substantivizing (and general-subordinating) “conjunction”, namely Ζ€-. 

As for “finality”, it covers a very complex and fluid semantic gradient spectrum from scope and effect of action, through content of will or intention, through expressly willed purpose, to will-indifferent “objective” outcome or sequel. This spectrum is difficult to demarcate using the familiar naive and logic-based (and thus non-analytic) “purpose” vs. “consequence” dichotomous structure. The gamut seems to be richer in Coptic, where the different forms and constructions concur, i.e. stand in opposition in one and the same corpus, than in Greek, where the considerable variety of conjunctions, with not a little sophistication of distinctions, serves also the stylistic characterization of texts and registers⁶⁰; it is certainly more sophisticated in Bohairic than in Sahidic. (The Greek Vorlage does certainly not throw here any light on the Coptic system). The tentative functional principles listed below, all rudimentary, imprecise, impressionistic and far too broad, are suggestions preliminary to rigorous study. I firmly believe, here as generally, in the basic difference

⁶⁰ Cf. Goodwin 1965:vii “It is interesting to know that in all the Attic prose, except Xenophon, ὅς final occurs only five or six times while ἵνα occurs 999 times (see his Appendix III).
of significés for the various signifiants, however subtle and elusive this
difference may be (and the main difficulty here is the unfamiliar semantic
landscape and the tenuousness of certain distinctions), whatever areas of
overlap there may be between functional ranges and sectors. The scar-
city, almost total absence of variant readings of “that”-forms and final
constructions between manuscripts (e.g. ours and Vat) must add confi-
dence to the pursuit of their individual semantics.

A second, theoretically important and structurally unsurprising reali-
ization is that forms are valued also by combination, i.e. by syntagmatic
contrast. In a passage featuring, say, ε- + infinitive, ἐπερεξ- and ένα
+ Conjunctive, in that order, at least the last two have different value
from their value in other combinations.

Obs.
(1) For OE and ME, see Steinthal and Misteli 1893:298f.; Frandsen 1975 is a pri-
vately circulated sketch following Polotsky’s year of teaching at Copenhagen; Polotsky
1976. The Egyptian “that”-form certainly merits synchronic and diachronic monographic
 treatment. See also Junge apud Peust 1996:39 with n. 148.
(2) The concurrence between a personal/finite “that”-form and the infinitive, variously
agent-characterized, poses a universal problem across typological and genetic borders.
Lemhagen 1979 describes the complexity, hierarchy and variety of parameters involved
(for French); the largely diachronic case of Latin quod as against the AcI is of course a
permanently open issue. On the other hand, Latin makes intensive and sophisticated use
of “word-formational” verbal nouns as a third pole of the complex nominalization cat-
gory: see Rosten (H.) 1981 for a structural account. For Modern Welsh “i- cum
infinitivo” and the substantivizing converter y(r)-, mai- (with some Modern Irish corre-
(3) The Circumstantial converb as appositive “that”-form (in Nitrian) mostly occurs in a
single phraseologically specific NS pattern (note the interlocutivity, and the constant
presence of ηαὐς):
AM II 115 οὐπινι ηαὐς ηαὐς εκνητου εβαλι.
AM II 97 οὐτηθου ηαὐς ηαὐς εκαμοιν ηνιδαμηπι.
AM II 97 οὐπινι ηαὐς ηαὐς εκνητου επιαωτ ηα-πιρεμεναιμι.
AM II 96 οταικεον ηαὐς ηαὐς εκκωουη ηνικωρα ηνιημι.
But also rather frequently in: AM II 113 οτε ετακημπι εροκ εκριμι.
(4) ωταεκωτεμ, another converb, is used in Nitrian as a prospective or sequelling
“that” form, in some cases renderable as final:
AM II 145f. ανοκ-ηνιμ ανοκ ζατακαζι ηεμ-ξαι sim. De Vis II 127.
AM II 147 ακατ ϶ατακαζι ηεμαι.
De Vis II 127 ηαι υ ηαι ετατ-ηοτωτ ηεμαι ... ωτεκωτ ηνοθαρπι-
pion.
De Vis II 183 ηηαινιαμ θηργ ζατηαι...
A similar feature occurs in “late” (really colloquial?) Sahidic — indeed, it is one of its
characteristic traits — and is even one of Shenoute’s register-switch rhetorical devices.
(a) ἰδε- “that”-form: a grammaticalized and fossilized verb of ἰκω “say”, proclitic (in closest juncture) to any non-converted clause or clause complex, in a broad range of substantival roles, this is the closest in Coptic to a “general subordinator” conjunction.

(1) Discontinuous component of the verb lexeme, interpretable as its valency characteristic (rection) and its contentual object (as a rule second or third) actant; introducing contents of speech (verba dicendi, loquendi, cogitandi, sentiendi, etc., with ἰκω and other lexemes, ἰδε- is incorporated in the verb, proleptically represented by the neutric -c (see [2]).

Gen. 1:4 ἀνώτατον ἰδε-ἐφ' ἐφ' ὦτοιν ἰδε-νανεὺ.
Ex. 16:15 ἀνωτεροί Μιμον ἰδε-οτ πε.
Gen. 42:24 (ὑσιν ἔβολ), 49:15 (ναώ), Deut. 2:7 (ἐμι).
Ex. 8:1 ἰδος ἀνάρνων πεκκόν ἰδε-κοτετεπεκὼβωτ.
Ex. 8:5 ἐκεννητε νεμνί ἰδε-νταταβγ... (Greek πότε εὐδώμαι).

(2) Variously appositive to neutric pronouns and pronominals; appositive Theme in Nominal Sentence:

Num. 16:13 ἀν-οτκοτζι πε ἰδε-ακεντεν ἐβολ ἀεπκαρι... Num. 16:9 ἀποτκοτζι νωτεν πε φαί ἰδε-αφ' ἅπιελ ὅτετ-θνόσ ἐβολ ἀε-τεκναργωνή.
Num. 16:3 χας νωτεν ἰδε-αεκασαργων θηρ ετονρωμὴ ετοντα βε.
Gen. 45:5 μπουρεπ-πυψβ ντοτ ντεν-θνόσ ἰδε-εταρετενθι εμναι.

(3) Explicative or causal ἰδε- grounds (metaphrastically, much like ῥαρ, but less finely nuanced) the actual existence of the preceding text:

Gen. 33:11 σι θναικοτ εταινοτ νακ ἰδε-ἀκναι τε ἰδε-ἀφ'.
Deut. 12:12 ετετεντονομ μπουρο μπιετ' νεμ νετενθηρι νεμνετενσεμπ νεμ νετενβωκ νεμ νετενβωκι νεμ πιλετηθς ετσενετεπταν ἰδε-μμοντεπτοι μματ οται κληρος νετωτε.

It is especially striking following questions, giving the basis for asking the question (“seeing that …”):

Num. 11:11 εἶβεοτ ἀκθεμκο μπεκβωκ ὄτοι εἶβεοτ μπι-ἀκιμι ντονσοτ μπεκβωο ἰδε-ἀκσελεπδωντ μπαλαδος εροι.
THE NOUN SYNTAGM AND THE DETERMINATION SYNDROME

Num. 11:12 ΜΗ ἈΝΩΚ ΔΙΕΡΒΩΚΙ ΜΠΑΙΛΑΟΣ ΤΗΡῊΙ Ἐ ΑΝΩΚ ΔΙΜΑΚΟΩ ΑΕ-ΚΑΩ ΜΜΟΣ ΝΗΙ ΔΕ-ΣΙΤῊ ΕΩΦΗΙ ΕΚΕΝΤ.

Num. 11:13 ἈΝΩΔΕΜΑΨ ΘΩΝ ΕΤ ΜΠΑΙΛΑΟΣ ΤΗΡῊΙ ΔΕ-ΣΕΡΙΝΙ ΕΩΡΗΙ ΕΩΛΙ...

(4) ΔΕ- + Conjunctive expresses the potential modal consecutive sequel: “(So) that (I can should...)” (“so dass ich imstande bin/soll...”). Often in So-called Rhetorical Questions, or with affect: self-deprecation or contempt, mockery, indignation. It is either locutive or allocutive. This clearly seems to be an idiomatic “native” Coptic rhetorical-semantic category — observe the varying Greek equivalents:

Ex. 3:11 ΑΝΩΚ-ΝΙΜ ΔΕ-ΝΤΑΨΕΝΗΙ ΓΑΨΙΡΑΩ (Greek ὅτι + Fut.).

Ex. 5:2 ΝΙΜ ΠΕ ΦΑΙ ΔΕ-ΝΤΑΚΩΤΕΜ ΝΚΑΤΕΨΜΗ (Greek ὅτι + Fut.).

Ex. 16:7 ΑΝΟΝ-ΟΤ ΓΑΡ ΔΕ-ΝΤΕΤΝΧΡΕΜΡΕΜ ΣΑΡΩΝ (Greek ὅτι + Pres.).

Gen. 20:9 ΜΗΤΙ ΔΑΙΡΝΟΒΙ ΕΡΟΚ ΔΕ-ΑΚΙΝΙ ΕΩΡΗΙ ΕΩΛΙ...

(Greek ὅτι + Perf.).

Deut. 30:12f. ΝΑΧΡΗΙ ΔΕΝΤΙΕ ΔΑ ΔΕ-ΝΤΕΚΔΟΣ ΔΕ- ... ὙΔΕ ΝΑΧΙΜΗΡ ΜΨΙΟΜ ΔΑ ΔΕ-ΝΤΕΚΔΟΣ (Greek καὶ + Fut., καὶ + Conj. Aor.).

Non-rhetorical consecution “so that I may ...”:

Ex. 8:5 ΚΕΜΝΗΤΗΣ ΝΕΜΗΙ ΔΕ-ΝΤΑΨΒΕ...

Lev. 22:33 ...ΕΛΙΕΝΟΝΗΝΟΣ ΕΒΟΛ ΔΕΝΠΚΑΓΙ ΝΧΗΜΙ ΔΕ-ΝΤΑΨΨΙΝ ΝΩΤΕΝ ΝΝΟΤΥ† (Greek ὅστε + infinitive).

A unique, to me unexplainable case of seemingly real purpose-clause, is also the only delocutive instance on my files:

Ex. 22:7 ΕΨΩΝ ΔΕ ΑΡΨΑΝΟΤΑΙ † ΝΟΤΩΤ ΜΠΕΨΨΗΡ ΙΕ ΓΑΝΚΕΤΟϹ ΔΕ-ΝΤΕΨΑΡΕΡΕΡ ΕΡΨΟΤ (= Vat) (simple infinitive in the Greek).

ΔΕ- does not condition the Conjunctive here (nor any other clause-form). In fact, since the Conjunctive itself often has a “that”-form role, the paradigm is ternary:

ΔΕ- + Conjunctive.

Conjunctive.

ΔΕ- (CLAUSE).

(5) ΔΕ- as universal subordinator:

ΕΒΕΕ-ΔΕ- Deut. 9:28 etc. — apparently a case (the only one) of a prepositional rectum.

ΟΤΧΟΤΙ ΔΕ- Deut. 7:7.

Obs.
Not attested in our corpus, but in NT or/and Ntarian:
ΕΩΣ ΔΕ- “as if” De Vis II 54, 89 etc. (ΕΩΣ ΔΕ- in Sahidic etc.)
ΕΩΣ ΔΕ- (†ΕΨ/ΑΨΛΗ-) final, De Vis I 123, II 39.
ΜΨΡΗΤ ΔΕ- De Vis II 33 (cf. ΜΨΡΗΤ ΕΟΡΕ- De Vis II 47 [POLOTSKY 1930:876 “Sahidicism”]), Cat. 194.

(b) The Conjunctive: a continuing or sequelling “that” form?

The “that”-role of the Conjunctive, familiar in Bohairic, is still difficult to reconcile with the sub-coordinative function of this form, which I believe is converbal in essence (SHISHA-HALEVY 1986a, Chapter Seven). The Conjunctive is an elusive form, in any dialect: despite its long continuous history, we do not yet have a coherent impression of its functional nature for any phase of Egyptian. The conjunctival roles of the Conjunctive are much more pronounced in Bohairic, although its subcategorizing function is well-established, albeit perhaps not central; it may be that this latter role, prevalent in Sahidic, is what distorts the overall functional picture, and that it is the substantival status that is primary and may even account for its “carrying-on” brand name. The correlation of its distinctive roles in Sahidic and Bohairic with its respective morphological characteristics, namely Ν- and ΝΤΕ- — the latter, after all, an almost exclusively adnominal morph in Bohairic — still remains to be attempted.

I suggest the Conjunctive — a converb in Bohairic too — is an adnecal case of that quintessentially Egyptian category, namely the sequelling “that” form (see SHISHA-HALEVY 1995a, esp. 311ff.) This is, I believe, historically plausible too. In fact, it is probably the only functional heading for its disparate roles in Demotic (see Obs.).

(1) The “conjunctival” Conjunctive:

The Conjunctive is in our Bohairic the normal conjugation form following the Greek imports ΓΙΝΑ, (ΓΙΝΑ) ΜΗΠΙΩΣ, (ΓΙΝΑ) ΓΟΠΙΩΣ, ΓΩΣΤ/ΔΕ, ΜΗΠΙΩΣ, ΜΗΠΟΤΕ. The frequent absence of agreement with the Greek construction must indicate the meaningfulness of the choice of Coptic forms, with the Greek-origin elements being, so to speak, naturalized in Coptic, even if it is true that the Greek text does prejudice the choice of the Coptic construction.

Ex. 20:20 ΓΙΝΑ ΓΑΡ ΝΤΕΠΕΡΙΠΑΖΕΝ ΜΜΩΤΕΝ ΑΠΙ ΜΝΑΙ ΓΑΡΩΤΕΝ ΓΟΠΙΩΣ ΝΤΕ-ΤΕΨΓΟΤ ΨΩΠΙ ΖΕΝΘΝΟΤ ΔΕ-ΝΝΕ-
τενερνοβι εροq (Greek ένεκεν... τού πειράσαι... ὤπως ἂν γένηται... ἵνα μὴ ἀμαρτάνητε).

Deut. 8:2-3 εκεεπρήμενι μῆμετι τηρη πίς εταενκ ἔιωτι νζε-πςε πεκνοντί ριπωαε γεοπως ντεπεεμκοκ... οὐογ αρεεμκοκ αρεεκρόκ ὤτογ ρτεεμκοκ μπιμαννα... γινα ντεπταμοκ Δε... (Greek ὤπως ἂν... ἵνα...).

Ex. 9:16 εςου-φαί αταρει εροκ γινα-νταοτυουν νταζομ εβολ νςητκ οτόγ ντοτφίρι επάρραν ειζενπκαζ Τηρη (Greek ένεκεν τούτου... ἵνα ἐνδείξωμαι... καὶ ὤπως διαγγελὴ).

Ex. 5:3 ΦΠ ντενιεβρεος αραγμεν ερον τενακεναν οτρι η-νεροσ μμωγι εεργι ριπωαε γινα ντενετ- ωουωουφωγι μπςε πεννοστι μπεγγ ντεν-ομον ταγον (Greek ὤπως θύσωμεν...μὴ ποτὲ συναντήση).

Ex. 10:1f. Ανοκ γαρ ειεερε-πεεγνυ νςον νεμνεεμλαωοι γινα ντεναμενί άλα εεργι εεζωον... γραπος (sic) ντετε- τεναζι εεργι εενεμαωζ ντενετενηφρι νεμνιφρι ντενετενηφρι (Greek ἵνα εξεμίς επέλθη... ὤπως διηγήσογοε).

Ex. 12:42 ντοτερώ ντεπςε πε γώςας εενογ εβολ σενπκαζ ηκιμι ντοτερώ ντεπςε πε γώςας ντενε γωαπι ννενηφρι μπιζα ωανόζωου (Greek ὡς τε + ininfitive, twice).

Gen. 34:22 σενφαί γενανι μμον... εερτσωωπι νεμαν γώςτε εωαπι ηνοζανο οτμων τηρω γινα ντενοτζε νενγωστ (Greek τοῦ κατοικείν... ὡςτε εἶναι... ἐν τῷ περιτεμνεσθαῖ — note the surprising Greek correspondent for the Coptic γινα + Conj.).


γινα and μμοτε with the Conjunctive may constitute complete superordinative clauses on their own:

Gen. 18:21 ιςε δε μμον γινα νταεμι — apodotic.

Gen. 24:5 μμοτε ντεεωτεμοτους νζε-ςειμι εμωι νεμεί — responsive.

γινα- with the negative Conjunctive differs from μμοτε + affirmative Conjunctive, as Greek ἵνα μη- is opposed to μη-:

Ex. 28:35 οτογ εεεσωπι νζε-αρφων σενεζινερεσ- ωέμωφι εεεσοτι εεεοκμη... γινα ντεεσωτεμοτου...

(Greek ἵνα μη...).

(2) μμον-μδομ ντε- Gen. 44:22, Ex. 8:22, 19:23 etc. is a familiar landmark of Bohairic: only Non-Existence?
(3) “That”-form Conjunctives may occur appositively to neutric pronoun + ὧντι: Gen. 44:7 ὥνεσινοι ννεκαλωςι ὁτοιρι μπαίκαζι.

(4) Following εὑρι (historically containing a neutric pronoun, and the precursor of ὧντι in a grammaticalized protasis): Gen. 34:15, Ex. 15:26, Num. 30:12 etc.61

(5) In locutive deliberative questions, the “that”-form Conjunctive, following ὅρωμι or interrogative marker, corresponds analytically to the deliberative τα- of Sahidic (see Polotsky 1944:17f., §9):

Ex. 2:7 τεσσωμψ νταμοντ νε...
Gen. 24:5 κοτ σωμψ ντατασθο
Gen. 33:1 ἀν-νταςψιν (Vat ἀν-τα-).

(6) The “continuing” Conjunctive, so prominent in Sahidic that it has come to oust or marginalize other roles in the pan-Coptic picture, is, I suggest, secondary and derived by alternative analysis from the sequelling “that”-role in cases like:

Gen. 44:32 εὑρι αἱστεμενψ ἦροκ νταταγοψ ἡπε-
Gen. 44:7 ὥνεσινοι ννεκαλωςι ὁτοιρι μπαίκαζι.

Obs.
(1) In Oxyrhynchite, the Conjunctive is even found as a post-prepositional rectum form (Schenke 1996:115f.). This exceeds even the Bohairic “that” distribution range.

(2) In Nitrian Bohairic, we find the (conjunctive in injunctive and jussive roles (e.g. De Vis I 83, II 130); the apodotic role, also attested in non-literary sources, e.g. the Epiphanius letters; also Demetrius, (De Vis I 168), a superordinative role attested from Late Egyptian onward; and the typically Bohairic sequelling “so that” role (e.g. De Vis II 171).

(3) The Conjunctive in Demotic (Spiegelberg 1922/1925 §140-153, Johnson 1976: 282ff.); protatic roles, Spiegelberg §495), final (§149); following prepositions — attested early, but fully established by Roman Demotic (§148); rarely adnominal (§151; see Johnson 1976:294f.); Injunctive §152 — this is hardly a “modal” role in the Indo-European sense, pace Loprieno 1995:95, 229). All these are definitely compatible with a “that”-form core function.

(c) Verbal nominalization bases.

(1) ἑπέκ- alone in our corpus not a “personal” (that is, finitized), but a causative infinitive: Ex. 7:3 εἰς ἑπέκ ἑπέκ ἐπ τὸν ναοτ ρατ ἀρτατοςαμψ ἡνε-ναμην.65

65 The Conjunctive “carrying on” in protasi is familiar in all Coptic dialects (Ex. 21:18, Lev. 7:18, 25:26, Deut. 17:2 etc.). Cf. a que- form carrying on the conditional protasis in French (Togeby 1982 §651, following Tobler).

66 Cf. the prospective “that”-deliberative questions in Modern Greek (Rouchota 1993), Arabic, Modern Hebrew: a mediterranean isogloss?
However, it is the basis of two formalized converbs, namely ἔρεμω and ἐπὶκινερεμω.

Obs.
(1) See Polotsky 1987:157ff. τρεμω- has in Sahidic a broad syntactic range: as Rheme of NS e.g. (Shenoute ed. Young 1993, 129), as Non-Existant (Sirach 40:29), as immediate object (Mt. 20:32, Luc. 6:31), and, of course, following determinators including demonstratives (II Cor. 7:11 etc.).
(2) The Portuguese infinito pessoal e.g. (o) folares: a “syntactic substantive”, homonym of the fut. subjunctive, is register-marked “assim indica che és mal educado” (see Brakel 1981:199). It recalls the Coptic finitized infinitive in many respects: it occurs following prepositions, the definite article, and generally as a versatile “that”-form: see Flasche 1947, Brakel 1981:210 on its junctural properties; see Ledgeway 1998, on the history of the form (which is an isogloss extending to Old Neapolitan, Sardin, Calabrian and more). The total replacement of the infinitive by a “that”-clause, which however is not “morphologized” into a new, finitized infinitive, is familiar from the Balkanic Sprachbund (Modern Greek væ-).

(2) Σιαν- + Lexeme does not derive a generic notion name, but a true lexicalized verbal substantive. Unlike the infinitive itself, to which Σιαν- adds a feature of concreteness (“act of”, “instance of”), it is not usually determined as a generic by π-, unless in the converbal syntagms with prepositions (below) or in the π- η- association63. It has a full determination range, singular and plural numbers, deixis, possessive articles (this is perhaps its most striking concretization feature, with the possessor the agents of the verbal action), quantifiers, niben etc. The form renders Greek verbal nouns and verbal abstracts, infinitives and subordinate clauses. Apparently, Σιαν- (+ Lexeme) subsumes two homonyms. The masculine is highly grammaticalized and hardly variable; the less common feminine ἡ Σιαν-, τά Σιαν- (n-/nte-) is as a rule a more concrete (“manner of…”), a true lexical verbal noun. Plurals, possessives, even zero determination signal a third case, of de-grammaticalization:

Gen. 9:16 εἰενατ επὶκινερεμωτι ὧν ταία ὠθήκη γνες (Greek infinitive).

Gen. 3:16 εκευωμι γανεγαὶ ηγε-πικιντασεο (Greek η ἄποστροφῃ).

Gen. 4:7 περκιντασεο εκευωμι γαροκ (Greek η ἄποστροφῃ).

Gen. 11:10 Ναι ς ηγίκινμις (Greek αἰ γενέσεις).

63 Athanasius of Qūṣ presents Bohairic πις- + INF in correspondence to the Sahidic infinitive: see Bauer 1972:176f.
Gen. 30:30 Σένταξιν καταιποτικ εξοτερικ εροκ (Greek ἐπὶ τῷ ποδὶ μου).
καταπαίαξινι Gen. 25:12.
καταπαίαξινι Gen. 43:7.
Σένταξινπολτωπουνον Num. 10:6 (= Vat).
Σεινέρωβς Νιβέν Lev. 16:29.
Σέντεκξινι Ex. 34:24 (vs. πιξίνι εβολα λτε- Num. 33:38).
Πεκξίνομοι εβολ Деут. 28:5, 33:18 (vs. πιξινμοι Ex. 33:8, Gen. 33:14).
Πεκξίνερφμετι Lev. 2:9.
Νοτάξινφωμεν θρον Num. 4:27 (vs. νοτψωμεν 4:32, π/πιψωμεν λτε- 4:28, 33).
Πιξίναξωιν λτε- Ex. 12:40.
Ταλωσ...Ναξινταλο δ Lev. 24:6.
NB: Τεκξίνωξινi Deut. 28:49 (= Vat) = "his manner of speaking", "language"; Τεκξίνερφωμi De Vis II 10 "the manner of your becoming human".

(d) Converbs: Prospectives (non-factive) and Scenario Eventives.
The sheer number and variety of converbal forms in the continuum of consecutive, final (intention, purpose and goal), generally prospective and sequelling "that" in our corpus and in all types of Bohairic is amazing, and greater than in Sahidic. The converses are:

Bohairic:
ετερετικ.
ε- INFINITIVE.
επ- INFINITIVE.
επάξιν- INFINITIVE.
επάξιντετετικ.
επάξινετετετικ.
(επτρετικ- is yet another form attested outside the corpus: Rom. 15:13, 1 Cor. 10:13, Ez. 16:26).

Sahidic:
ετετετετικ.
ε- INFINITIVE.
επ- INFINITIVE.

(1) ε- + (ουτετικ) + infinitive: often conditioned, i.e. valential; appositive; adnominal. Expresses something like lowest-rank finality — specifying the import, purport, force, effect; the non-factive scope and/or implication of an action. Usually corresponds to Greek infinitives, but
γωςτ/ας ε- INFINITIVE does usually, but not always have ὀστε + infinive as its original. In more detail:

(a) Valential (second or third actant) or semi-valential. Governing verbs (selection):

γωστον, θυματο, ἐμα, μοι, τασο, νοτι, 1, κυλας, οὐγρατο, κω, οὐκω, μετι, καρ, εὐγρατον (νεα), δω, οὐρκ, οὐκεμον/μμον-οὐδον, οὐγρατον, οὐγρατον. Negativated infinitive: οὐπ, δω, οὐ, οἶ, ιπ, εὖαλ, νοτον, ταγό, οὐρκ.

Ex. 8:25 ἀπεροστατοκεν ἔε εὐγρατο εὐγρατοφωρπι ἠπιλαος ἐβολ.

Deut. 5:1 ἐπητενεαρεφι εἰατον (Greek infinitive).

(b) Appositional, also to a cataphoric neutric pronoun (rarer than in Sahidic): νανες ε- infinitive etc. Gen. 29:26, 44:17, 31:7.


Specific function: often "to the extent of", "even up to...":

Gen. 34:22 Σενθαί ηναιν ημον ... ηπορογωνι ηνεαν γωςτε ευσωνι νοταλος νοτωτ θροτ (Greek ὀστε εἴναι) ηναντενου-ηκοσων.

Num. 7:1 αγωνι Σενπεροοτ αταξωκ ἄγραμ αγραμε αταγο ντακάνη επατο (Greek ὀστε + infinitive).

Deut. 28:54f. εὔερπάκκανος Σενπεραλ επεσεκον νεμεπανι ... γωςαδε εὐγρατεν† νοται ἡμωτ (Greek ὀστε + infinitive).

Deut. 12:20 αγωνεπησημονι Σα-τακάνα γωςτε εοτε-μακ (Greek ὀστε + infinitive).

(d) Adnominal (also valential): Deut. 29:4 γανβαλ εναν ... γαν-μαδε εὐγρατσ.

Ex. 35:25 οτογ στίμι νιθεν νεαβν Σενκεκετι εἰπιοπη.

(e) Aciational: Num. 5:8 ευσων δε μμοντεπιρωμι Σα-αυγήτ ημαρ γωςαδε ε† (Greek ὀστε + infinitive).

(f) Scope of an action ("with the effect of...", consequential, sometimes verging on purpose or goal); action plan; import of action etc.

Ex. 7:14 αιριγδρω Σα-πντη μβαρας εὐσεμοτωρπι ἠπιλαος ἐβολ.

Num. 25:1 αγωνι Σα-πναλος εἰπορπνετι.

Deut. 4:25 οτογ ντετεμπι μμπετρωσι σμεμεο μπεσ ητενννοτ† ε†-ἄωντι μακ (Greek infinitive).

Ex. 35:1 ...αταξβαντδ ειατον (vs. ειατον Deut. 27:26).
Deut. 18:9 ννεκείσεβω εἰπὶ κατανικωῦ.
Ex. 32:12 αἴγενος εβολ... εἰσοθεοῦν οὐραὶ ζηιτων.
Ex. 9:17 ετί οὖν ννεκ κιρὶ μπάλας εὐθεμοτορποῦ εβολ.
Gen. 43:18 ...εἰσίτεν ννοκς ότος εrdfικαγ ναν ενδια
ten μβωκ (Greek infinitive... τοῦ + infinitive).
Deut. 9:1 ννεκ εταφαξινοπρ μπιορδανκ μημον εὑε
eβολν εἰπκανρονομεν εγανηπία ννεκος (Greek infinitive +
infinite).
Deut. 30:10 εὐωπε δε ἀκαγενωτεμ νκα τκην μπε
cηκνοτεν εαρεγ ότος εἰπρ ννεκεντολθ τθροτ.
Deut. 34:11 νιμηπιν νε μνωφεήν τθροτ εταφοτοπτ
ναε-ποε εαιτον βεππκαρί νχημι.

(2) επ+ infinitive: not negativated, no agens expressed. Not valential
(this seems to be distinctive).
Probably indicates marked intended and desired purpose: “for/with
the express purpose of”: see above, §3.2 (a), for documentation. Note
the following contrasting pairs:
εναρεγ εροκ Ex. 16:33 (Greek εἰς διαθήρησιν) vs. εαρεγ Deut.
28:45 (Greek infinitive).
εναιτον Deut. 27:26 (Greek τοῦ + infinitive) vs. the valential
eταφαξοτον εαιτον Ex. 35:1 (Greek infinitive).
εσοθεμε Deut. 13:9 (Greek infinitive) vs. Ex. 16:3, 17:3 εὐω-
tεβ ντακτναγων, εσοβεν.

(3) ενδια+ infinitive: not negativated, no agens expressed. Not
valential. “For the purpose of”. When following ε- + infinitive, then
sequelling and/or higher-rank goal: “and so...”.
Gen. 43:18 ...εἰσιτεν θνοκς ότος εrdfικαγ ναν ενδια
ten μβωκ (Greek infinitive + infinitive... τοῦ + infinitive).
Ex. 35:35 αρματον εμετί νκοφια ενδιακατ ηαμίο
θνιγνβοντι τθροτ (Greek infinitive).
ενδιανινι Lev. 8:15.
ενδιανκογεν- Gen. 3:22.
Num. 10:2 ότος εναχωπιτι νακ ενδιανκωντεν τνσναγων
νεμ ερποτωονοτο ναε-παραβολαν (Greek infinitive + in-
finitive).
Lev. 17:11 ενδιαντοβφε, ενδιαντοβο (not in the Greek).
Lev. 14:23 ενεφονο... ενδιαντοβο — also Lev. 17:11, Lev.
Lev. 16:27 ηαὶ εὐανεπορανον εἰσον εὐαντωθεν.
Lev. 24:7 εὐχαὶ εὐλογεὶ εὐανερφεμεν.


A rare, stylistically marked form (P in constant consensus with Vat), the etymology of which is obscure, unless we have here the morphologi-
cal apparatus of the Conjunctive (the syntagm of ζή-ν- with the Con-
junctive would be historically embarrassing, but well in accord with the
substantival role of the latter). It usually seems to express, in a solemn
tone (usually a Divine Locutor), not so much purpose as the inner sig-
nificance of an action, which may be part of a Divine Plan or Purpose.

1st sgl. Ex. 16:4 ευεκεκι μηπαιεξεβν πειξεον εὐαντα-
σοντος... (= Vat) (Greek ὅπως).

Lev. 26:45 εὐανταξωμπι ηνοξ ηνοξ† (= Vat) (Greek τοῦ +
infinite).

2nd pl. Lev. 26:1 εὐαντενεορωξτ μμοξ (= Vat) (Greek
infinite).

Lev. 20:26 εὐαντεθενυμπι ηνι (= Vat) (Greek infinitive).

3rd sgl. Num. 19:13 θεαθμ εὐανθεφεξωζεμ ηνητθ (=
Vat) (Greek different).

3rd pl. Gen. 1:15 ετεροεξωμι ηενππαξρο ντεξφε επ-
αντονεροξωμι εἰξενπκαζ (= Vat) (Greek ὅστε + infinitive).

Obs.

Note the following catalogue (still in need of structuring and collating) of broadly final,
sequelling constructions in Nitrian Bohairic, on the narrow basis of De Vis, Cat. and
Sinuthii Vita. Obviously, corpus-specific study is de rigeur. The system hinted at here is
even richer than that of the Pentateuch: we find no less than twenty-six affirmative, seven
negative forms, with often surprising compatibilities:

ε- + INF
De Vis I 76 etc.
επ + INF.
De Vis I 109 etc.
ε(ὡτεμ)θε-De Vis II 147, SV 41.
Conjunctive
De Vis II 276, SV 74.
ευανι- + LEXEME
De Vis II 140.
ευαντε-
De Vis II 177.
εοπως + Conjunctive
Cat. 95.
ΜΠΟΤΕ + Conjunctive
De Vis I 134, 139.
ΓΙΝΑ + Conjunctive
Cat. 4, 18, De Vis II 68.
ΓΩΤΕ + Conjunctive
De Vis II 82.
ἈΕΧΑΚ + Conjunctive
De Vis I 125, 1100.
ἈΕΧΑΚ ΕΚΕ-
De Vis II 247, SV 61.
ΓΙΝΑ ΕΚΕ-
SV 17.
ΜΠΕΧΑΚ + Conjunctive
De Vis II 100.
ΓΩΚΑΤ/ἈΕ ΕΚΝΑ-
Cat. 25, De Vis I 123.
ΓΩΚΑΕ ΑΚΝΑ-
De Vis I 124.
ΓΩΚΤ/ἈΕ ΕΡΕΠΕ-
Cat. 95.
ΓΙΝΑ Ε(ΨΤΕΗ)ΕΡΕ-
Cat. 26.
ἈΕ- + ΕΚΕ-
SV 32.
ἈΕ-ΝΝΕΠ-
De Vis II 137.
ἈΕ- + Conjunctive
De Vis II 146.
ἈΕ-ΕΚΝΑ-
De Vis II 257.
ἈΕ- ΑΚΝΑ-
De Vis II 171, 212, SV 60.
ἈΕ-ΓΙΝΑ ΕΡΕ-
Cat. 84, 90.
ἈΕ-ΓΙΝΑ ΝΝΕΠ-
Cat. 74, De Vis I 124.
ἈΕ-ΓΙΝΑ ΕΚΕ-
Cat. 149.
ἈΕ-ΓΙΝΑ ΕΚΝΑ-
Cat. 75.
ἈΕ-ΓΙΝΑ + Conjunctive
Cat. 7, 26.
ἈΕ-ΓΙΝΑ ΜΠΠΟΚ + Conjunctive
Cat. 27.
ἈΕ-ΕΡΕ-
Cat. 26, 28.
ΨΑΤΕ- as sequelling or final "that" form
De Vis I 26, II 136.
(5) οηρε-/οηρε: negativable (but rarely negatived?)

This form is especially difficult to evaluate functionally. It has a subtly articulated semantic spectrum — not primarily final or consecutive — and syntactic roles similar to those of ε- + infinitive, with the essentially junctural difference of either concording (linkage) or discording (delimitation) with its preceding nominal or pronominal environment.

For Coptic εηρε-, the Greek text has as a rule an infinitive or είς + verbal noun; but the former is after all also the Greek correspondent of the simple ε- + infinitive in Coptic. The differentiation of (εωτετε) ε+ INFINITIVE and (εωτετε) εηρεη- is thus an internal Coptic question. In general, and in superficial view, we find: restrictive “for the purpose of” specification; “with respect to...” “in that...” — contents, object actant; apposition to cataphoric neutric -ε-; appositive “namely, that”; “that” as first target/goal or sub-goal, not main final purpose; often caused or enabled consequence (“with the effect, that...”).

However, I suggest for εηρε- a typical and distinctive “causative” sequel reading, in a broad spectrum ranging from downright factivity through various grades of causation to “may” / “can” modalities; the mainframe actor enabling, occasioning, bringing about, inducing or contributing to the action by the -ηρεη- one. In this interpretation, the Coptic text introduces the causative semantic category in divergence from the Greek text, which is enriched by the translation (which is also, and primarily, an interpretation):

Num. 35:6:11:15 εηρεζωπι ηντεν εηρεηφυτ εματ “so that he can/may flee there” (Greek infinitives).

Gen. 19:20 ταηβακε ιζεντ εηρεηφυτ εματ “so as to enable me to flee”.

Gen. 1:14 μαροηζωπι ιντε-εηρεηπεροποσιν εζεπητα-κρο ηντετφε εηρεηπεροποσιν επικαρει “that they may...”.

Lev. 19:29 ηνεκκυμη ηνεκκαρει εηρεηερεπορνητεον “so as to make her a fornicator” (Greek οικονομεςαι αυτην).

Num. 21:29 αυτη ηνορομπι εηρεηοξαι (Greek infinitive) “so that they may be saved”.

Gen. 36:7 ηνε-πετεντοηοτ ραρ ου πε εηρεηομοοε εησιμα (Greek του + infinitive) “to permit their living in the same place”.

Ex. 15:1 οτοο ραςο οερεηοε οερεηοε (Greek τού λεγειν v.l. λεγον-τες) “to make them say”.

Deut. 4:14 δεκηβη ηντεν απαηγαη... εηρεηεηηηεηπη... contrast with πικαρει φη ετεπεηηηαηε εζοση ηρου εηρεηκηρη-νομει... “to bring you to observe them” (Greek infinitives).
Lev. 4:3 ΝΤΕΞΕΡΝΟΒΙ ΕΗΡΕΞΩΧΛΙΟΣ ΕΡΝΟΒΙ “to make a people sin” (Greek τοῦ τῶν λαῶν ἀμαρτεῖν).

Gen. 3:23 ΑΠΤΕ ΦΠ ΟΤΡΝΗ ΕΒΟΛ ΣΕΝΝΙΠΑΡΔΙΙΟΣ ΜΠΟΤΝΟ ΕΗΡΕΞΕΡΦΒΕ ΕΠΙΚΑΓΙ (Greek infinitive) “to make him work the land”, sim. Gen. 2:15.

Deut. 20:19 ΕΗΨΗΝ ΔΕ ΑΚΨΑΝΓΕΜΣΙ ΕΑΒΟΛ ΝΟΤΒΑΚΙ... ΕΒΩΤΣ ΕΡΟΣ ΕΗΡΕΚΩΙΣ “that you may take it” — final goal.

Deut. 4:20 ΑΡΕΝΘΗΝΟΣ ... ΕΒΟΛ ΣΕΝΧΜΗΙ ΕΗΡΕΤΕΝΕΡΟΤΛΙΟΣ ΝΑΨ “that you may make a people unto Him” — final goal.

Deut. 8:16...ΖΙΝΑ ΝΤΕΨΤΡΕΜΚΟΚ ΟΤΟΡ ΝΤΕΨΕΡΠΙΡΑΖΙΝ ΜΜΟΚ ΕΗΡΕΠΙΝΕΤΝΑΝΕΨ ΥΨΨΗΝ ΜΜΟΚ ΕΨΔΑΕ ΝΤΕΝΙΕΓΟΟΤ (Greek... καὶ εὖ σε ποιῆση) “so that good may/can befall you” — final goal.

Lev. 22:13 ΑΚΨΑΝΓΕΡΧΗΡΑ ΕΑΤΩΓΤΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΕΨΤΕΜΕΡΕΣΡΩΣ ΥΨΨΗΝ ΝΑΣ (so: Vat εψτεμερε-) “so that she can have no progeny” — a rare negative instance.

Num. 14:3 ΕΕΒΕΟΤ ΨΝΑΟΛΤΕΝ ΝΑΞΕ-ΠΨΕ ΕΣΟΤΝ ΕΠΙΚΑΓΙ ΕΕΡΕΝΓΕΙ ΣΕΝΠΒΩΤΣ “so as to make us fall”.

Adnominal, appositive, contentual, expanding cataphoric neuter. Not causative:

Gen. 47:29 ΑΤΣΨΩΝΤ ΔΕ ΝΑΞΕ-ΝΙΕΓΟΟΤ ΕΗΡΕΨΜΟΤ.

Lev. 11:39 ΕΨΨΗΝ ΔΕ ΝΤΕΟΤΟΝ ΜΟΤ ΕΒΟΛ ΣΕΝΝΙΤΕΒΨΝΟΤΙ ΕΗΡΕΤΕΝΟΤΟΜΟΤ — adnominal! (Greek ὁ ἔστι ὑμῖν τούτου φαγεῖν) “that are edible for you”.

Gen. 18:25 ΜΦΨΡ ΜΠΕΡΙΡΙ ΝΣΟΚ ΜΠΑΙΚΑΙΙ ΕΗΡΕΚΨΩΤΕΒ ΝΟΤΨΜΗΙ ΝΕΜ ΟΤΑΣΕΒΗΣ.
Gen. 24:23:25 ΑΝ-ΟΤΟΝ-ΤΟΠΟΣ ΣΑΤΕΝΝΕΙΨΤ ΕΕΡΕΝΜΤΟΝ ΜΜΟΝ “so to enable us to...”?

Gen. 16:3 ΜΕΝΕΝΣΑ-Ι ΝΡΟΜΠΙ ΕΕΡΕΑΒΡΑΜ ΑΙΤΟΤ — a unique alternant of ΜΕΝΕΝΣΑΕΡΕ- (= Vat) (Greek τοῦ + infinitive).

Lev. 4:27 ΕΗ ΕΤΣΨΕ ΑΝ ΕΕΡΕΣΨΨΨΙ.

Deut. 4:42 (Ρ ΜΒΑΚΙ) ΕΕΡΕΨΨΨΤ ΕΜΑΤ ΝΑΞΕ-ΠΙΡΕΨΨΨΤΕΒ.
Deut. 30:20 ΦΑΙ ΜΕ ΠΕΚΨΝΤΙ ΝΕΜ ΠΑΨΑΙ ΝΤΕΝΕΚΕΓΟΟΤ ΕΕΡΕΚΨΨΨΤΙ ΕΠΖΕΝΨΙΚΑΓΙ - not purpose, but specification of ΦΑΙ (evident in the articulated Greek τὸ κατοικεῖν σε).

Gen. 2:18 ΝΑΝΕΣ ΑΝ ΕΕΡΕΠΙΡΨΜΙ ΥΨΨΗΝ ΜΜΑΡΤΑΣ.
Gen. 34:22 ἡσσαὶ εἰςαὶ βοῖον ... ἑφοροῦσοι νεμάν ἐστε ἑφοῖ φιλακοδος νοστὶ τῆρος γίνα ντενικόβι-

Gen. 17:19 εἰςεκενν νταναθήκη νεμαβ εοςααθήκη νενεξ εοριῳσον νάολ νννοτ sim. 26:29 (negative).

Valential, actantial (rare, in contrast to ε- + infinitive).
Ex. 9:28 μαρεγωόξπ εορούσοπ νξενιμε ντενια (Greek τοῦ + infinitive).
Ex. 31:16 ενεαρεπ ... ενακαββάτων νθι εοροτάιτον τοιον final goal.

Restrictive specification of respect, import, force etc. (rare, compared with ε- + infinitive):
Deut. 12:4 πίμα εταςοτηντ νξεπινε εοροντοτ τεπε-

Goal — specific purpose? also γωδαι εορειν:
Lev. 11:45 πνη εταςονοντ εβολ ἡσπκαζι νηνθι εορι-

Ex. 30:4 ενεωπντ νξεγακαλα γιηνεγοντ γωδαι εοροτιτη νεπι οσοθοτοτ also 37:5, 37:14 — specific purpose; thus, different from γωδαι ε- + infinitive.
Lev. 20:5 ειετακον νεμ οτον νιβεν εταςτοτ μματ νεμαβ γωδαι εορενπορνετον εναρχων...

In cases of Theme-switching, or any Theme clarification, εορει—

Gen. 4:15 ἀνκεν χα-ομήνι ηκαιν εστεμεροτοσκεβεγ

Gen. 24:23:25 αν-οτον-τοπος βατενειοτ εορενμτο

Gen. 2:18 μανεκ αν εορενιφιν γωπια μματτη.
Ex. 32:13 παεκαζι τηρη ακασε εθηικ νποταξοτ οσο

Excursus: causatives

As said, the auxiliary infinitive -ορειq- is in our corpus broadly causative (ranging from causative proper, through factitive to a “let” permissive and “may” or “can” modality), in approximate opposition to the lexemic morphological causatives. We find the following lexemes more commonly predicated by -ορειq- in the corpus. It will be observed that, even in the unusual case of the attestation of a “lexical” (i.e. morphological) causative for the same root, no real synchronic concurrence exists between the two, since the lexical items are valued within the sublexical (including non-causative) systemic frames — their meanings are different from -ορειq- + lexeme. This difference is more pronounced in Bohairic than in Sahidic:

ερ- Gen. 12:2, 13:16, 19:19 (ερνιωτ), 34:16 (ερνορνεττιν), Deut. 28:29 (ερυφηρηπι), 41:51 (ερνωβιημ), Deut. 28:21 (εροτι), Ex. 23:33 (ερνομπι), Num. 33:54 (ερκοτι). This case is of special interest, since the -ερ- segment in ορειq- is after all the allo-form of ιπι/ερ- governed by the proclitic τ- (i.e. †); οροε- is not concurrent here — this is a conditioned case. Quality verbs are prevalent.

†- Deut. 22:19 †οκι (ττο not attested in Bohairic).


σβοκ Lev. 25:16 (τσβκο not attested).


μτνυt Deut. 5:33.


According to Polotsky, Bohairic “prefers [ορειq-] to the lexical causatives” (Polotsky 1987:146); but it is difficult to see how one can quantify this choice, given the basic difference of the two incommensurables — a syntactical construction, by definition productive, and a restricted lexical class. To my knowledge, we hardly ever find variant reading of the two “causatives”. It is of course true that many lexical causatives, familiar in Sahidic, are not or not yet attested in our Bohairic sources. I list in the corpus (the most common) θεντ, Τεθντ, Τακο, Τεθεθίο, Θαμιο, Τοτπο, Ταρκο, Ταπο, Ταγο, Τεμθο, Τοφο, Ταγο, Ταθο, Τεφο, Ταμο, Ταθρο, Ταγο, Τεθεθο. Rarely in the Present: Num. 14:11 υληνατ δε παλιος ορο καιοι Μβον.
\[\text{σωμα} \text{Lev. 23:43, Gen. 47:11:21 (αύτο).}\]
\[\text{σωστι} \text{Ex. 11:21.}\]
\[\text{τις} \text{Deut. 32:42.}\]
\[\text{ανακεν} \text{Ex. 34:24.}\]
\[\text{ονος} \text{Deut. 24:5.}\]
\[\text{μτων} \text{Deut. 12:10.}\]
\[\text{φωτ} \text{Ex. 23:27.}\]
\[\text{i ενω} \text{Gen. 2:9.}\]
\[\text{να-ρωκ} \text{Num. 13:30.}\]
\[\text{τωμ} \text{Ex. 23:27.}\]
\[\text{σωντ} \text{Gen. 28:10:13, Lev. 2:8.}\]

Obs.
Polotsky 1930:876 considers De Vis II 47 μφρητ εθε- a "Sahidicism" for the properly Nitrian μφρητ + Conj., as in Ez.18:23.; however, I see no reason to assume here a Bohairic calque of ινε εθε-.

(6) **ΣΕΝΝΑΙΝ-** + Lexeme. Rare

Ex. 30:15 ...ΣΕΝΝΑΙΝ\(\uparrow\) ηνικφορα ΜΠΔ\(\uparrow\)

Lev. 4:27 εψωπ ινεοστηχν μματςε ιρνοβι ... ΣΕΝΝΑΙ-\(\uparrow\)ΗΙΠΙ ινοντι ινιεντολν ... ιν ιειεσης ιαι ιειεςωπι.

Num. 1:51 ΣΕΝΝΑΙΝΙΑΙ ... ΣΕΝΝΑΙΝΙΚΙΟΤ.

Num. 7:89 ΣΕΝΝΑΙΝΙ ινοντ ινεωστχε ιςεκ\(\uparrow\)ΗΙΝ ... οτογ ιμωτεμ ε\(\uparrow\)κμη ινε\(\uparrow\)ιοτ...

(7) **ΣΕΝΝΑΙΝΙΤΕ-** / ΠΑΙΝΙΤΕ= pronominal or nominal *agens*

Very rare (see above, for ΕΝΑΙΝΙΤΕ=). Like ΕΝΑΙΝΙΤΕ=, the form seems to express the inner significance or more important aspects of an action:

Lev. 15:23 εψωωπι εψαςεμ ΣΕΝΝΑΙΝΙΤΕ\(\uparrow\)ΙΣΗΙ ινιεμάτ (Vat) — remarkably, a rare case of anaphoric ιι- determination.

Lev. 15:31 οτογ ινοντομ ιειεποιςωβεμ ΣΕΝΝΑΙ-\(\uparrow\)ΙΤΕ\(\uparrow\)ΙΣΗΙ.

Lev. 23:22 ινετεν\(\uparrow\)ΕΚΜΠΩΣ\(\uparrow\)ΙΝ ΜΠΩΣ\(\uparrow\)Ι ινε\(\uparrow\)ΙΕΠΕΝΙΙΩ\(\uparrow\)Ι ΣΕΝΝΑΙΝΙΤΕ\(\uparrow\)ΙΣΗΙ.

Num. 5:21 ιεπ\(\uparrow\)ιοτ ινοντομ ινιε: ΣΕΝΝΑΙΝΙΤΕ\(\uparrow\)Ι ινιιτεμίοτ.

(8) **ΣΕΝΝΑΙΝΙΕΡΕ-** pronominal or nominal *agens*: an eventive scenario copverb: “in the event of”, “on the occasion of” — usually calamitous happenings (“scenario” including Narrative proper but also
preceptual instruction, prophecy and so on). Continued by the Preterite αὐτ.- As a rule, the corresponding Greek form is ἐν τῷ + (αὐτὸν...) + infinitive.

Usually, following the plot-carrying verb, as adjunctal circumstance (on a broad semantic range, most typically explicative):

Gen. 19:33 ἐγέμισαν περὶ σεπταίνεσενκώτος οὖσις ντεκτονά.

Ex. 34:29 αἵσιως ... σεπταίνεσε τὰς κακὶ νεκρά.

Lev. 26:25f. εὐπάθηναι εὐπρεπεῖς καταλήψαντοι σεπταίνεσεν οὖσις τετελεσθήσειμονοτ...

Gen. 32:20 επετενεσκάταςιν οὖσις εὐπρεπετενεσκατήμονα.

Lev. 18:28 γίνα ντεσθενταπικαί γρόσω εὐπριενονοτ οὖσις ντετίμεστενονοτ σεπταίνεσετενεκοπαγ.

Lev. 22:16 οὖσις εὐετίνι εὐαγωνοτ νοτανομία ... σεπταίνεσπεθοτούμ νην ένοταβ.

Ex. 16:7 οὖσις οὐνατοσσότι επετενανεί εὐιωσοτ ημίς ἕνεκα σεπταίνεσεκατωτεμεταν ἢς-ποτε επετενεκραμπεμ...

Num. 25:11 φιννεος ... αὑτότον μπαέμβον ... σεπταίνεσπεθεξροτ επαχογ.

Num. 26:61 αἵματο ναζε-ναδαν λειμ αἴβοτα σεπταίνεσπεθοτούμ εὐρρί νοταξρωμ ναζεμμο.

Deut. 16:13 πολύ εκλαίο ... σεπταίνεσεκατωτεμετα εὐσῶτν...

Deut. 9:14 μπερδας σεπταίνεσθε σεπταίνεσεκατον τακε-ναίεσενοτ εβολ εταγμ ἐπεκζο...

Lev. 20:4 ... ντοτσκαλ ννοτβαλ εβολ γαπέρωμι σεπταίνεσπεθεφτ εβολ σεπεκατραν νοταρχων εστέμπαςοβεσ.

Ex. 28:35 οὖσις εὐεστοι ναζε-αραν σεπταίνεσεκατωτεμεταν ετεσετωτ ετεσγκα ... γίνα ντεσθεντομοτ...

Far less usually, the verb is clause-initial, a topical circumstance “preset” (in a drastically restricted semantic range). This position of the verb (preceded by the formal αἵματο, in true Narrative) makes it a full constituent of the clause’s information structure, a staging and “packaging” decision of the speaker/narrator-translator:

Num. 15:18f. σεπταίνεσετενεσκατε εὐσῶτν επικαίγετε τα-ναεπονοτ ανοκ εὐσῶτν εροπ οὖσις εὐεστοι αρετεμπαγωνοτ ... επετεενεινι νοταξρέσαμα...

Lev. 24:16 σεπταίνεσεκαταν εὐφαν μπαεμ μαρεκμοτ.
Gen. 39:15 ἡπειρεσσωτείτε δε Ἰς-λιςκει ISTRIBUTION οτορ ηλικη εβολ αριστη εμεπεβεσ ηχοτ — report, not narrative.

Num. 26:26 ἡπειρεσσοτρεξεκεκοντ ζεντοικο ήμε πιωκ οτορ ερεμήνη ηχοτ έετη ηλικη  nowrap ζεν-

Gen. 19:29 ασωπι δε ἡπειρεσσος ηενηιβακι τηρού ... αφτ <ερφμενι ναβρασ.

(9) MENENCAERE- pronominal or nominal agens: post-eventive scenario converb. It too may be topical (this role is of course typical of εταρχωτείτε, the so-called “Temporal” conjugation form), but adjunctly gives relative temporal information (as a rule, the Greek has μετά τοῦ + (αὐτόν) + infinitive).

Ex. 7:25 αναρ εβολ ηςε-ψη νερου τον ηενηερεσσος ωρι εφαρο.

Ex. 18:2 αστι δε ηςε-ιοθορ ... κεαπφμαρ ηενηερεχας...

Deut. 24:4 κεαπφκεδικομ εκικ ηακ ηχοτο ηενηερεσσω.

Lev. 13:7 ευσπι δε αρσανοτωτεβ ηςε-πιμινι ηεπι-

Lev. 14:48 οτορ επιπη ηενορλκω χινη αν ηεπι

Deut. 12:30 <περκωτις ηκαμω κεωτον τον ηενηερεω-

Gen. 5:4 ασωπι ηςε-νερου τακαμ ηενηερε-

Topical, in real Narrative only (?), following ασωπι, which is a “dummy” formal Narrative Carrier enabling the initial position of ME-

Gen. 25:11 ασωπι δε ηενηερεχοτο ηςε-αβρακ αφτ <εισακ.

Gen. 27:1 ασωπι δε ηενηερεχερσελο ηςε-ιςακ οτορ νεγβαλ ατεραλ έφνα εμολ αμοτιτ ... 

Gen. 39:5 ασωπι δε ηενηερεχακ εζενηπηνι ... 

οτορ αφτ <εισ πτηιι μπιρεμενχμι.
Our converb is thus opposed to the equally topical etq-, which, its conventional name notwithstanding, is not temporal and does not convey relative chronology66:

Gen. 50:14-15 ὅτε πρέπει οὗτος οὐκ εὐρίσκῃ εἴρητα ἐξελήξατο οὖν τὸν τόπον τιθεμένον τοῖς εὐνέκταις μενενεκαθορεφθεῖσας μπείσατέ μοι αὐτῶναν τούτον ἐπὶ πολλὰ μὴν παρατηρήσομεν ἐπὶ παρευριζόμενον τοῦτον περισσότερον τὴν χρήσεως τοῦ συνελήθεως τοιαύτης...

See above, for an instance, unique in the corpus, of μενενε — Time Expression — εἰρή- (Gen. 16:3).

66 See Grossman 2007, for an “adverbial conversion”-view of etq-.
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4.2.4.4 The case of Ἐφίπτω, παιρπνό
4.2.4.5 The “neutric feminine overrule”
4.2.4.6 The Φαμ link
4.2.4.7 Reference juncture: examination of selected Juncture Domain Frames and scopes
4.2.4.7.1 [Antecedent to Relative clause]
4.2.4.7.2 [Topic to clause]
4.2.4.7.3 In-nexus concord linkage
4.2.4.7.4 Ana-cataphoric reference
4.2.4.7.5 Anacoluthia

4.2.5 Zero as link or delimiter
4.2.6 Prosodic linkage

4.3 Scopes of junctural validity (a selective repertory)

4.4 Graphemato-morphematic juncture: graphemic and graphotactic epiphenomena of juncture
4.4.1 οό vs. ο for /u/ — “graphemetic crasis”
4.4.2 Punctuation features: the lemniscus, the colon, the raised point
4.4.3 The end-of-line break. Consonantal writing?
4.4.4 (Morpho-)syllabic boundaries: the Jinkim
4.4.5 “Aspirate” consonants (Θ, Φ, Χ) and “aspiration”
4.4.6 Juncture and aspirants: aspiration as link / delimitation
4.4.7 Striking environments and features of allomorphic juncture.
4.4.7.1 The laryngal (Glottal Stop, 'Ayin) phonemes (“X₁, X₂”): the Bohairic reflexes as juncture features
4.1 Juncture in general. Linkage and Delimitation. Levels and Gradience.

(a) **Juncture.** In this last chapter, I wish to dwell on matters that concern the very texture of the text and its constituents — to specify, map and try to understand, classify and perhaps quantify (at least in a relative way), the means Coptic has for signalling grading of "togetherness" and "apartness" of segments, from the graphemic level to longer stretches of text, and in fact, to present textural and prosodic features and phenomena as preliminaries to an account of juncture and cohesion in Bohairic Coptic.

We use junctural concepts and terms unconsciously, as a matter of fact, without giving much thought to their significance, or even their actual meaning: affixation, position and sequence, slot and syntagm, commutation in a slot, "ordination" (as in "subordination") and inversion, pattern and construction, narrative concatenation and allocution/response syntagmatics, are all junctural or juncturally significant concepts or assume junctural information. Indeed, **analyzability** — the very quintessence of the text, *la parole*, language itself — is a junctural notion and, as is well known, a relative one.

Juncture phenomenology consists of the intricate interplay of links (formal cohesion signals) and **delimiters**, the exponents of their reduction or negation. Both classes signal boundaries or "seams", and, therein, a grading or opposition of formal signalling of some degree of "togetherness". (I find it heuristically advisable to see cohesion between **continuous** or **discontinuous segments** as the basic positive signifiant and often signifié property, the reduction or enhancement of which, to a minimal or maximal degree, would constitute and signal a
grading of delimitation or linkage). Of course, all linkage and delimitation is relative, and linkage of some grade obtains across all boundaries.

Juncture features are, analytically speaking, of different orders, in correspondence to the traditional levels of analysis: graphemic, phonemic, morphophonemic (including lexematic-phonemic), morphemic and morphosyntactic, syntactic (and text-syntactic), but this stratification is non-hierarchical, partly overlapping, continuous and fuzzy, and best replaced by the determination of junctural unit, scope and domain.

In a comprehensive study of juncture features, the text is first scanned for boundaries or seams, and then we examine the obtaining paradigms or commutation classes for the structure of juncturally resolvable units, and (when possible) the quantified gradience of linkage and delimitation. We thus have in the present study three procedurally related analytical goals:

(1) **Listing of boundaries**: formulating statements on boundaries that delimit segments in a syntactical inter-dependence, with linkage and/or delimitation features across them, in a paradigmatic statement of complexity (and, where feasible, also scalar gradience), from text-level downwards — for instance, narrative sequencing, concord, reference, assimilation, combinatory syllabicity;

(2) **Presentation of linkage / delimitation symptoms**, from the graphemic to the macro-syntactic.

(3) **Resolution of scopes and units**: formulating statements concerning the validity of obtaining formal linkage or delimitation features: determining and correlating these links and delimiters with the scopes or extents within which they obtain — for instance, "word", "lexeme", nexal and hyper-nexal narrative block, allocution-response complex.

The present essay (see pilot studies in Shisha-Halevy 1986a Chapter Six, 2003c and 2004) attempts to scan the Coptic text for boundaries or seams, and then to judge the nature of obtaining linkage/delimitation and (when possible) their relative grading. This is not a systematic and exhaustive attempt at a comprehensive uniform theory of Coptic juncture (such as is Rosén 1964 for Biblical Hebrew, Attic Greek and Sanskrit), but means to present materials for such a study, and address the issues it involves.

(b) Let me begin by introducing **working definitions for basic terms and concepts** germane to juncture phenomena and essential in formulating statements concerning the validity of formal linkage or delimitation features.
Cohesion, cohesivity: degree of mutual formal association of continuous or discontinuous segments in a text.

Linkage: marking of higher-grade cohesion or of cohesion in general.

Delimitation: marking of annullment, negation or reduction of linkage.

Seams or boundaries (here coded by "‡") are higher-delimitation (lower-linkage) slots or points of contact of segments (typically, where several delimiters converge), flanked on either side by lower-delimitation (higher-linkage) areas. We are also concerned with a structure of paradigms obtaining in these slots and flanking them.

Link: index, signal or exponent of linkage or cohesion. Links are definable (here slightly modifying ROSEN 1964:160) as "exponents of dependence obtaining between segments or unit in a higher unit not exceeding their arrangement". Every link is by the same token also a delimiter, since it defines, concomitantly with the relevant delimiter, the segment units which it links. A delimiter, on the other hand, is a boundary signal only, and an exponent of negative linkage.

Delimiter: index, signal or exponent of delimitation. Delimiters signal the reduction and/or annulation (cancelling) of links: they are by definition inter-segment boundary signals; the more delimitaters obtaining across a boundary, the more open the juncture across it. Inversely, the more links obtaining across a boundary, the closer the juncture across it. Delimiters are (cf. ROSEN 1964:164) "exponents of the dependence between segments or annullment units across a boundary".

Juncture grading: a juncture slot is characterized for gradience by the number of links/delimiters obtaining and converging in it.

Juncture Scope (JS): formal extent of validity for links or delimiters. The scope is the range within which links/delimiters obtain or apply ("are true"). In fact, scope is defined by juncture conjointly with syntagmatic structure.

A Juncture Domain Frame (JDF) consists of the elements enframing a Juncture Scope; overall syntagmatic environment — for instance: embraced by N-...AN; including a topicalization and its resumption or representation; antecedent and its relative nexal expansion. Sometimes, the JDF consists of very segments flanking and constituting a boundary. The JDF may coincide or be coextensive with the scope.

Juncture contour: distinctive linkage and delimitation profile over boundaries inside a specific domain frame.

Units in juncture: constituent elements in a boundary or in a cohesive complex.
(c) Some reflections on structure and unit. To what degree is the conventional model of a priori "building-blocks" ("word, clause, sentence") at all valid for a given text? A narrative, for instance, is arguably not constituted by clauses at all, but a complex texture built around a concatenation of the expression of linguistic events. The most important factor to realize here is that the unities are neither absolute, nor rigid. This is not surprising, for the decoding analysis (by the reader or listener), which starts at text-level, is linear and cumulative; all structuration is dynamic and ever changing as further signals are transmitted, and cumulatively received, identified and valued. Moreover, any element simultaneously "belongs" — stands in association with — to several others, and may indeed be associated in several kinds of relationship and several grades simultaneously (for a typical instance, internally inside a group and externally with elements outside it, or even outside the text). The textual and subtextual structure is multidimensional. Units do not exist absolutely and praeter-analytically, which is why "sentences" and "clauses" as well as "words", not to mention the "levels" such as morphology and syntax, are not empirically valid grammatical (as distinct from logical) notions. Valid are instead, say, "linked units of commutation in Dialogue" (such as Allocations and Responses), or "concatenation units in Narrative" such as narrative Evolution Mode events, or the layering of Evolution Mode (linear) and Comment Mode (non-linear), and so on.

Inter-element associatedness is continually signalled and reported in real textual time, as a textual base for retrospection and anaphora is accumulated, whereas for the prospective cotext, yet to come, expectations are manipulated, modified, satisfied or disappointed, and the already realized text reappraised accordingly. The text itself is also delimited, articulated and "chunked" dynamically. All this is the first lesson of the cohesive view of textual reality.

A final word on "familiar" or pre-analytic units. While the word unit may be describable for Indo-European and Semitic by its familiar fusion of lexemes and grammemics, or by morphological and morphophonemic structure, and its boundaries may be generally definable (initially and finally, e.g. by allowed clusters — list size, constituency — or even phonemes — inventory and exclusion), this would hardly suit Coptic, where lexemes are the operative unity, and formal structure multifarious. Coptic, in Schleicher's verdict (1859) — is "wortlos", which shows that Schleicher identified the special status of Coptic lexemes. (In Egyptian, we have, of course, the determinatives, a potential final-
boundary marker for the written lexemes in their consonantal root manifestation, which was always fused with grammemic, mostly vocalic infixation and suffixification. All other units are compound, really syntagms and patterns, and need to be defined in terms of their constituent categories, order, boundaries and juncture within them. In this respect, ἄγωτεμ and ἀπιρωμι # εκτεμ, ἀνοκ-οτρωμι and ὀτρωμι πε are different patterns or subpatterns. Coptic uses scriptio continua, of course, with some separation and, of course, punctuation marks — according to traditional grammar, notorious for their opacity, and certainly given to variation in occurrence and role. Their polyfunctionality, a confusing and sometimes misleading factor, must not obscure their pertinence; they are a matter of scribal practice and school, and are best studied codex-wise (see discussion at some length below).

Obs.
(1) Junctural discussion and statements in preceding chapters (selection):
(a) Negation as delimitation (Chapter One, Narrative).
(b) Narrative juncture and information structure (Chapter One, Narrative and Dialogue).
(c) Allocution and Response linkage and delimitation, see above (Chapter One, Dialogue).
(d) Juncture profiles of Nominal Sentence patterns (Chapter Two).
(e) The junctural aspect of the opposition between associative phrases, opposition carried by π- Ν-, π- Ντε- and πι- Ντε- (Chapter Three).
(f) Reference to zero article and neutric gender (Chapter Three).

(2) An alternative view, oriented to the articulatedness and analyzability of the text, would see delimitation as primary and linkage as its negation or reduction.

(3) FUNK 2006 is an extremely important paper, offering invaluable observations on aspects of the interface of graphemic/phonetics/phonemics in Coptic and in general, especially in a dead language. See SHISHA-HALEVY 1986a, Chapter Six, 2003c on juncture in literary modern Welsh and 2004, a pilot study of juncture features in Shenoutean Sahidic.

(4) A set of junctural studies may be found almost avant la lettre in STEINTHAL and MISTELI 1893:272ff. (in fact, the main topic of this excellent typological sketch): gradience of noun/noun interdependence (276ff. “verschiedene Grade der Angehörigkeit und Verbindung”): ρεμνότε — ψερε μπωμε — ψερε μπρωμε — πισιρι ντε-ρωμι; then, four grades of verb and object (279ff.): insights on the nuclearity of the conjugation “auxiliaries” or bases, and their affinity to pronominals (293); the referential-junctural role of grammatical gender (287f.), the Conjunctive (“Adjunktiv”, 297ff.), and more.

(5) Following Steintal-Misteli, EMAN 1915 is the earliest study of Coptic juncture, which unfortunately did not get the appreciation it deserved. Consider the following selection of highlights, many of which are included in the discussion below. Generally, Bohairic is found to be of “looser” juncture than Sahidic: particle placement permits us a glimpse into open and close groups (183f.); the absence of assimilation as a symptom of looseness (our delimiter; 184f). The spelling α-οντ-, ε-οντ-: (preposition before the indefinite article (185). α-vocalism looser than ε-vocalism (185). Aspiration vs. non-aspiration as indicative of stress (186); cases of unreduced pre-object forms of the infinitive as indicative of juncture (187).
(6) I acknowledge my debt in formulating my thoughts in the present chapter above all to H.B. Rosén (1964), a brilliant essay on general, Indo-European and Semitic juncture. There are to my knowledge few systematic descriptive accounts of juncture; see, for instance, Brakel 1981 for morphemic juncture in Portuguese.

(d) Juncture levels. Levels of junctural analysis are purely analytic models (cf. Rosén 1964:164 n.33). In the reality of the text they are almost always blended, and always non-hierarchical, although at the extreme locations — say, at grapheme and text-level — they are more clearly distinct. Here are some striking points in the order continuum of juncture.

- **Graphemato-phonemic juncture** obtains between successive graphemes, and may often be deduced for inter-phonetic and inter-phonemic boundaries;

- **Lexemato-morphemic juncture** obtains within the noun and verb lexeme and the stative: for instance \{s-t-m\} + \{ð — e\} in **cowem**. (We note that morphs and syllable are incommensurable — **cow** contains elements of more than a single unit: cf. Rosén 1964:158; we note the initial and final boundary marking of lexemes, especially cases of final clusters: **cowañ** but **cowem** (cf. Polotsky 1933)

  Initial boundary: #CS (SC syllabic) [C=consonant, S=sonorant]

  Final boundary: SC# (CS syllabic, vocalized)

- **Morphematic and inter-morphemic juncture** obtains within grammemes and grammemic complexes, and between lexemes and grammemes. Here belong the discontinuous linkages of discontinuous morphemes — \{-e\} + \{s-t-p\} for **ceṭṭi**, \{e\} + \{san\} + \{f\} for **eṇyaṇa\-**, \{n\} + \{an\} + \{anok\} for **naṇok an**, \{t- Ø — o\} + \{Ajin + m\} + \{Glottal Stop\} for **tamo** "tell you" (sgl. fem.), the complex linkages of verb lexemes with their object (**cowem**, **coṭṭem** and **cowpi, ceṭṭi-piṇjwa**) and so on.

- **Nexal/clausal pattern syntagmatic juncture** obtains between constituents of a clause or a hyper-clause: thus, between Theme and Rheme (rather, Theme Phrase and Rheme Phrase), between Focus and nexal Topic (**piṇwij** and **piṇcwem**, **aṇ-** and **aṇn**, **aṇṇaṇoc** and **aṇov**, **aṇawij** and **seṇṭyvixh mpilov**), between Topic and Clause (between **piṇwij** and **aṇcwem**). Obviously, these (inter-) dependences are combinable, which makes for complicated juncture contours.

- **Inter-clausal pattern syntagmatic juncture** obtains between clauses. Consider narrative concatenation and narrative tense-shifting, clause coordination and disjunction, the Conjunctive "carrying on" a clause, **aṇ-e-** inclusion and so on.
• High Text-level complex syntagmatic juncture obtains between Allocution/Response; Evolution/Comment Modes, narrative chunks or blocks (see for these Chapter One above); protasis/apodosis (and more generally superordinative sequelling forms, like ωάq- and εqε- with preceding cotext: Chapter One); noun syntagm, pronoun or Proper Name/subsequent reference (anaphoric/cataphoric reference; text-deictic exponence).

(d) Juncture gradience. Scarity or gradience of juncture, while theoretically evident, is difficult to establish empirically. It is obvious that every environment has its own paradigm and paradigmatic structure; there are environments where all we can establish are open/close properties. But there are others where “closeness” or “openness” are accompanied by other formal symptoms, such as (for close juncture) assimilation or doubling of a vowel realizing a glottal stop\(^1\), or a prenominal or pronominal or prosodically reduced allomorph of a lexeme or grammmeme (a delimiter in close juncture is the maintenance of aspiration for Ḟά-). Or (for open juncture) differences in the class or extent of the elements that may occupy the boundary slot. However, there is correlation of paradigm extent and juncture grading: the more restricted the paradigm (such as a paradigm of grammemes) the closer the juncture, and the other way around, with lexeme paradigms: the drastically different juctural properties of pronouns and nouns are a striking case in point. Indeed, since inter-paradigm tension (i.e. between similar or kindred paradigms in different slots) and indeed opposition is an important, if usually ignored, structural feature, paradigmatic reduction — even up to paradigm cancelling — is a dynamic link\(^2\), and paradigm expansion a dynamic delimitation. Juncture is of course a consequence of segmental compatibility, but the paradigmatic dimension of juncture is as evident as it is essential for comprehending this factor of linguistic structure, and it emerges from the syntagmatic axis, and the circumstance of compatibility and sequencing being but a linear projection of a multi-dimensional structure: linkage, delimitation, boundaries of varying juncture, continuity and discontinuity, sequencing, all obtain between paradigms, and not just between their in praeessentia representatives in the text. Incidentally, midway grades of grammemicity or lexemicity are not given but ensue inter alia from juctural factors. Thus, both separability and

---

\(^1\) POLOTSKY 1957a:231.

\(^2\) In fact, totally reduced paradigms flank closest juncture; so ατ-, μετ- followed by nil, not zero determination are closer than close-juncture slots where zero and other articles commute (e.g. following the pronominal construct cases of the infinitive).
inseparability are graded; and when two "close" or "open" boundaries do not reveal any discriminating traits, it is their commutation extent that indirectly indicates their junctural grade (α= entering closer juncture than αq-, and αq-, needless to say, closer than ατρπωμι ἂ [εττεμ]). Linkage is thus often cumulative. It is often non-segmental — prosodic and/or relational: manifested in rection (government, conditioning), in special compatibilities (as in the case of specific determinator and relative conversion, see below), and discontinuity in complex marking. Generally speaking, juncture grading across a boundary is determined by the number of links and/or delimiters obtaining for that boundary. Juncture gradience informs all, in the textual and textural aspect of grammatical features, which is after all their prime aspect. Juncture, and juncture gradience, is also essential for comprehending diachronic processes and the diachronic career of specific entities and categories, not only in the "syntax to morphology" evolution and in grammaticalization, but also in deciphering the track and trace of diachrony left in the junctural profile of synchronic elements.

4.2 Juncture seams/boundaries: a brief scan in expanding Scope.

The following summary and selective repertory of in- and inter-segment/unit boundaries also constitutes a listing of syntagmatic compatibilities. The idea is not only to catalogue patterns, boundaries and links across them, but also to demonstrate the descriptive advantage of the junctural view of the constructions in point (selected boundaries will be discussed at length below). The juncture levels — inter-graphemic, inter-phonemic, inter-syllabic juncture, inter-syntagm and so on — cut across lexemic, morphemic and even nexal scopes. It is evident that phonemic (including syllabic) boundaries do not coincide with morphemic ones. Very often, in scopes A and B, the left-hand flank of the boundaries includes the delimited constituent + link; the right-hand flank, just the constituent; in more extended scopes, the linkage is predominantly packaged with the second constituent (brief comments are presented in footnotes):

(A) In-lexeme, lexico-morphemic boundaries.
(B) In-phrase boundaries. Word-formation and composition boundaries.
(C) In-clause (in-nexus) boundaries.
(D) Ultra-clausal boundaries.
(E) Text-level boundaries.
(A) In-lexeme, inter-syllable, lexico-morphemic boundaries, including synchronic gender-number morphs: morphemic analyzability is a delimiter.

\[ \text{cwn} \not \not \not i, \text{wep} \not \not \not i \]
\[ \text{pω} \not \not \not \text{mi}, \text{pwm} \not \not \not i \]
\[ \text{εb} \not \not \not \text{hori}, \text{tebn} \not \not \not \text{wori} \]
\[ \text{tam} \not \not \not \text{horts} \]
\[ \text{x} \not \not \not \text{λom}, \text{xl} \not \not \not \text{om}, \]
\[ \text{εθ} \not \not \not \text{op} \]
\[ \text{meθ} \not \not \not \text{mhi} — \text{closer juncture than} \]
\[ \text{met} \not \not \not \text{meθpe} \]
\[ \text{θ} \not \not \not \text{meceio} — \text{closer juncture than} \]
\[ \text{t} \not \not \not \text{amo} \]
\[ \text{cw} \not \not \not \text{teo} \]
\[ \text{osw} \not \not \not \text{pt}^3 \]
\[ \text{ca} \not \not \not \text{xi}, \text{wa} \not \not \not \text{new} \]
\[ \text{ε} \not \not \not \text{cwor} \]

(B) In-phrase boundaries.

(b1) \text{COMPound - CONSTITuent} \not \not \not \text{COMPound - CONSTITuent.}

In composition, the link, if morphophonemic, resides as a rule in the first \textit{(i.e.)} constituent, but \textit{at}- and similar "semi-lexical" word-formation constituents\(^4\), which are nuclear, are also linked by the paradigmatic inertia (e.g. \textit{nil}, not \textit{zero} determination) of the expanding second constituents\(^5\). In case of multiple boundaries, the pre-grammemic one is closer than the pre-lexemic one.

\[ \text{ep} \not \not \not \text{cnoq} \]
\[ \Phi\text{p} \not \not \not \text{pacori} \]
\[ \text{t} \not \not \not \Phi \]
\[ \text{man} \not \not \not \text{arpeg} \]
\[ \text{peq} \not \not \not \text{οmeceio} \]
\[ \text{pemn} \not \not \not \text{θmi} \]
\[ \text{pem} \not \not \not \text{θenhi} \]
\[ \text{met} \not \not \not \text{θello} \]
\[ \text{meθ} \not \not \not \text{mhi} \]
\[ \text{met} \not \not \not \text{meθpe}^6 \]
\[ \text{at} \not \not \not \text{θemhr} \]

\(^3\) Cf. Polotsky 1933.

\(^4\) Cf. Oerter 1999 for general and terminological information.


\(^6\) The combinatory aspiration, or absence thereof, possibly defining two \textit{met}- entities.
The document contains a paragraph discussing juncture features in grammar, mentioning pre-lexemes, alias lexeme pre-modifiers or conjugation mediators, and their role in an i.e. list for an open i.f.c. one. It mentions a feature likely limited i.c. list for an open i.f.c. one, rare in the corpus. Acts 23:3 κρηπήκε δὲ γεμικ. Gal. 3:15 ἡποταμεῖα δὲ θαυμ. II Tim. 1:6 ζέ-ντεκερεπήμοτοτ ντε랍εταμεῖα δὲ ὁμας (b2) Verb lexeme δὲ Morphological Pre-Actant Mechanism (lexico-morphemic patterning, in discontinuous-segment juncture): χωτεπ/κεττι-/κατπ, i.e. {s — t — p} δ {δ — ο/ε — ο/δ — ο). (b3) Verb lexeme δὲ Pronominal Object Actant. Χά δὲ τ following consonant, including laryngeal zero. θοτεθε δὲ τ θοτεθε δὲ q θοθβ δ οτ Εωσθ δ i — less close than ΦΩΝ δ Κ ΚΩΠ δ q (b4) Prepositional Base δὲ Pronoun or Noun. Ντω δ q closer than Νια δ πιρεμ Νια δ ονασ

7 This feature is junctorially fascinating, for the overall inner-matrix cohesion is not disrupted by it (the pre-lexemes are in that sense “phantom elements”). See Funk 1978a:99, 101, 104 (“Präverbal”), 95 n.10, 104 n.59; Shisha-Halevy 1986a §3.3 (“Conjugation Mediators”, since they occupy a “zero slot” in the nexus), with further literature; Layton 2004 §183. Bohairic (not our corpus) adds ζε- “any longer” (Stern 1880 §454, Polotsky 1930:875 ad De Vis II 9; also De Vis II 174, 177) and οταμει- “again, re-”, in reply, in addition” etc. (Greek mostly άνα- and επι-: Crum, Dictionary 509b: rarely in Sahidic) to the Sahidic repertory. (I believe το–[γυτεμ–] does not belong to this category, formally or functionally, pace Funk 1978a:97f.). These elements are not, I believe, due to a calque interference of Greek preverbs, although the Greek feature, also junctorially interesting, may account for their importance in Coptic; Welsh has a similar category (newydd- “recently”, hen- “formerly, of old”, ail –“again”, mawr- “greatly” etc.).


9 Linkage here is probably also effected prosodically by stress; the non-commutability of noun syntagm and personal pronoun, which is the very essence of “inflecting prepositions”, also in Celtic (Shisha-Halevy 2003b:285f.) is indicative of difference in boundary juncture.
εωβε ‡ πιρωμι — closer than
eωβντ ‡ κ
εωβντ ‡ ά
ε ‡ οτρωμι
εφο ‡ ρ
εφω ‡ τεν
εφο ‡ ά
(b5) “INALIENABLE” NOUN LEXEME ‡ PERSONAL POSSESSOR.
ρω ‡ c
πατ ‡ q
Δω ‡ τεν
(b6) “INALIENABLE” NOUN LEXEME/PREPOSITIONAL BASE ‡ NOMINAL POSSESSOR.
γιωταρ ‡ n ‡ nh εωσαβ (Lev. 21:10).10
τοτα ‡ n ‡ αρπων neu neκρωπι (Deut. 19:5).
ερωυ/ειρωυ ‡ n ‡ τωωτ (Gen. 29:2).
ειρωμε ‡ n ‡ τωωτ (Gen. 29:3:10).
(b7) DETERMINATOR (sgl.) ‡ NOUN LEXEME: τ/Φ-, πι-, οτ- +
LEXEME.

ni ‡ cmh — more open than
πι ‡ ιωτ
Φ ‡ ρh
Φ ‡ mhini
Φ ‡ ιομ
π ‡ ini
οτ ‡ ε cωωτ

Generally speaking, with some exceptions, gemination in native, not Proper-Name elements is a signal of two units, that is, a delimitation for a morphemic boundary: “two identical consonants belong to two syllables/morphs”: τ ‡ τιμη (Lev. 5:15); τεν ‡ οα- (Gen. 19:3).

(b8) Constituence Personal-Sphere Association: DETERMINATOR (singular-only ι- and plural-only neu- + n-) ‡ + LEXEME. Determinator + n- constitute a discontinuous nucleus constituent, with its own internal boundaries, delimiting determinators from the nuclear lexeme (see [b13]).

10 Note the tendency to gender/number neutralization before n-, cf. κενq neκματ De Vis II 7, πιρωq, neκρωq De Vis I 28, Polotsky 1934:61. The invariable pronoun is here an “inalienable-possession” slot-filler as well as an actualizer and perhaps also specifier (cf. Amharic -u, def. article as well as 3rd sgl. masc. possessive suffix). This is a reduction in linkage grading.
ΦΜΑΣ + ΜΠΕΚΣΟ
ΝΕΝ-[ΜΑΥΔ] Μ + ΠΙΛΑΟΣ\textsuperscript{11}.
ΝΑΛΨΟΤΙ ΝΙΚΑΛΚ\textsuperscript{12}.
(b9) POSSESSIVE PRONOUN + DETERMINATOR (NOUN SYNTAGM).
ΦΑ + ΠΙΕΓΟΟΤ ΠΙΕΓΟΟΤ\textsuperscript{13}
ΦΑ + Φ\textsuperscript{14}
(b10) POSSESSIVE PRONOUN + PERSONAL (SUFFIX) PRONOUN.
ΦΩ + Ι
(b11) PRONOMINAL NUCLEUS + VERBAL (relative-conversion) EXPANSION (see [b14]).
Π + ΕΤ- — closer than
ΦΗ + ΕΤ-
ΦΑΙ + ΕΤ-
(b12) DETERMINATOR (+ NOUN LEXEME) + MOVABLE LEXEME.
ΞΑΜΑΔΙ Ν + ΞΙΡΗΝΙΚΟΝ
ΟΤΡΩΜΙ Ν + ΞΑΝΑΝΕΟΚ
(b13) DETERMINATOR (+ NOUN LEXEME) Ν- + DETERMINATOR (NOUN SYNTAGM).
(a) Constituence Personal-Sphere Association (= b8).
ΝΕΝΜΑΨΔ Μ + ΠΙΛΑΟΣ\textsuperscript{15}
ΝΕΝΣΡΟΤ Ν + ΧΕΤ
ΤΩΕΡΙ Μ + ΦΑΡΑΩ
ΕΝΕΝΜΑΨΔ ΝΤΕ- + ΝΕΝΕΨΗΡΙ

\textsuperscript{11} ΝΕΝ- Ν-, and Π- Ν-, are discontinuous (see below on juncture across discontinuous boundaries); see Chapter Three on Constituence Association (n.15 below).
\textsuperscript{12} See POLOTSKY 1964:253 n.1 (not included in CP), 1968 (Boh.), SHISHA-HALEVY 1983:316 (Oxyrh.).

\textsuperscript{13} While both determinators and possessive pronouns are nuclear, expanded by their respective subsequent segments, or segment strings, πι-, πι-, πεε- stand in the prelexeme slot, but ΦΑ in the pre-determinator slot. This is a crucial junctural difference, which accounts for ΦΑ- being non-specifying, specificity-neutral albeit anaphoric (see above, Chapter Three), and is formally symptomized by its aspiration being constant (cf. POLOTSKY 1985:91). Incidentally, I believe that KASSER 1993:53f. n.13 is wrong about the association of ΦΑ- and πεε-: the non-aspiration of the possessive article is prosodically and morphophonemically clear, and the need to distinguish πια- ("my-") from ΦΑ- "he of" cannot be invoked, since they inhabit altogether different slots: see Chapter Three. As far as juncture is concerned, the maintenance of the aspiration is a delimitation (within close juncture).

\textsuperscript{14} A striking case for the correlation of extent of flanking paradigms and looseness of linkage: Π-ΕΤ- close, ΦΗ ΕΤ- (etc.) open, ΦΑΙ ΕΤ- (etc.) opener juncture; see Chapter Three.

\textsuperscript{15} A veritable juncture paradigm, the signifiant for a sophisticated signifié category of association, from Constituence Association (less optly "inalienable possession") — tightest juncture — to unmarked appurtenance — loosest juncture — through a complicated gradation: see Chapter Three, §3.9.
nenwepi nte-‡ naikagi

nenwepi‡ nte-nixananeoc

piadooc‡ nte-pikagi

nenyhi‡ nte-netenwepi

(b) Apposition

Φ †‡ ππιγιομ†

(c) Naming specification

πιρωμι‡ δε-mwetc

(b14) Determinator‡ Relative Converter.

t‡ et- — closer linkage.

{ΦΗ}/Φαι‡ et-/etna-/etaq- — more open linkage†

Deut. 12:25 πεπενανεψπ νεμ πεθαναψ.

Gen. 19:7 πανετγψων.

Num. 10:30 γανεπενανετ.

Ex. 22:20 ΦΗ ετναερψωτψψι νγανκενοτ†

Lev. 12:7 Φνομος ντεθ ετναμιη.

Gen. 41:24 νεμμον-ΦΗ ετταμο μμοι ερος.

Ex. 21:19 ΦΗ εταψ† μπιερψοτ.

(b15) Pronominal Nucleus‡ Nominal Expansion.

(a) Interlocutive personal pronoun

Gen. 47:3 anon-γανμανεψων‡ δα-νεκαλψοτι.

Deut. 4:4 νεωτεν δε‡ δα-νη εβοτγη νκαψεψ πεννοτ†

tetenonδ τθοτ μψοτ.

(b) Delocutive personal pronoun

Gen. 30:41 δεπινιχοτ εμαρσιψψψοτ ... ηδε-‡ νε-ψοτ.

Gen. 7:13 αψψηηψ νδε-‡ нве.

(b16) Specific Antecedent‡ Expanding Clause.

(a) Relative Conversion (+ anaphora) linkage: attributive expansion

Ex. 12:40 πιζινδζιαι ntenenwepi mpical‡ et-ατερ-πεμ-

ζιαι μμο.

Ex. 10:6 Φαι‡ ete-μπενεκιοτ† νατ εοτον μπεψρΗ†.

† πι- is here the concording operator and link in appositione, occupying a slot arguably corresponding to the pre-Coptic nuclear gender/number-exponence slot in the adjective: Old/Middle Egyptian nfr.t ‘the/a fem. one qualifiable by beauty’, hm.t nfr.t ‘the/a woman — the/a fem. one qualifiable by beauty’. From Late Egyptian on, the prefixed nuclear articles carry the gender/number signalling, first in apposition with the suffixed built-in ones, then in diachronic replacement thereof. The partitive dependence between determinator and lexeme is part of the later-Egyptian analytic structure.

‡ This difference is symptomized by relative extent of flanking commutation and (in)separability.
(b) Circumstantial Conversion linkage (+ anaphora): rhematic (adnexital, predicative expansion)\(^{18}\)

Gen. 33:1 ἡνπει ις ἡκαὶ περιοσ + ἐ-κνησοτ.  
Deut. 14:4, Lev.11:2 ηλει νετεβνοτι + ἐρε-τενεοτομοτ.  
Deut. 22:27 ἵσελοςιπι + ἐ-κατο νεκε (Vat; P ἵ- ετατ-).  
(b17) Low-Specificity Antecedent + Expanding Clause.  
Circumstantial Conversion linkage\(^{19}\).

Deut. 5:9f. οτνοτ + νεποχο + ἐ-κπωειω.  
Gen. 22:13 ἡνπει ις οτεκωτι + ἐ-κτάνοινο μμοι σενεν- 
ταπ.  
Deut. 23:16 νἐκτ + νοτβωκ ετοτι μπεστ + ἐ-κφωτ 
ἐρατκ.  
Lev. 21:7 οτκεσιμι μπορνη ὀτορ + ἐ-κκοσ.  
(b18) Specific/Non-Specific Antecedent + Expanding Clause.  
Relative conversion in hermeneutical glossing\(^{20}\):  
Gen. 44:24 πεκαλοτ + ἑτε-πενειίωτ πε.  
Ex. 1:11 ἰων + ἑτε-θβακι μφρ τε.  

\(^{18}\) In Nitrian Bohairic (and to a lesser extent in the NT), the status of this construction is evidently different, but still unclear: Cat. 25 ἵκεσιμι ερέπισον ὦτ εβολ 
σαρος, caption; Cat. 35 ἰδοε ἤν ερετεκταζ μοτοσ caption — so often, e.g.  
35, 42, 51, 86; De Vis II 153 πνανε ερεσκεβ νιενε κατοττ εροκ. Also ἅπα 
ερε-, ἤν ερε- De Vis I 101, II 56, Cat. 106, 108, 115 etc. Note the combination of 
relative and Circumstantial in: καζαε νιενε ετοσοτι ερεσοποιοιταξοτοσ Cat.  
37, with the Circumstantial of looser juncture. In a posthumously published study, one of 
his rare Coptic essays, B. Gunn examined a ME construction that may be an early precu- 
isor of the Coptic one in point.

\(^{19}\) Lev. 27:12 ἤται εισανεξ or Num. 17:5 ςαι νπεμο ετε-εβολ αν νε 
σενενεσφης Ναρπον (= Vat) in our corpus illustrate the compatibility of the relative 
converter with non-specific nuclei, contrary to received grammatical opinion, which 
is well established esp. in Nitrian Bohairic. This indicates the relative is not a mark of 
higher specificity — or a specifying exponent — but one term in an expansion paradigm. 
On the relative converter expanding non-specific nuclei, see Stern 1880 §424: Nic. 1:14 
is wrongly interpreted (we have here an autofocal Focalizing Preterite). However, Mt. 
19:12 is a good example (Stern’s doubts notwithstanding: we have here several wit- 
the following, especially generic instances: AM 1 2 εποτε-κταπάνοιε έτας- 
τωνοπ... 8: AM I 131. 141 ἄται εταί εβολ σενεσταποτον... εβολ 
νωταξα ανακεμα; AM I 189 οτα ίτεθμος-ται ιβόμει κωτοι μμοι αν; 
Cat. 49 ςαι νπιείειεταζ μμει νετακκακι; Benjamin, Hom. on the 
αλατ ετ- Shenoute ed. Leip. IV 158.

\(^{20}\) See Polotsky 1987:104f. on the “Hermeneutischer Relativsatz” and the prefer- 
ence of Bohairic for ἑτε-...πε and the Endophoric NS pattern over ἑτε-παι πε... In 
this construction, the internal juncture of the expanding clause is closer, the external (ex- 
pansion) juncture more open.
Gen. 50:1 πηβινυ νχνμι 绀ε-Φι πν ετ 绀σιμιρ μπιορ-δανης.

(b19) ZERO-DETERMINATION ANTECEDENT in negative environment 绀 EXPANDING CLAUSE (negative environment). 绀e- linkage21:

Deut. 3:4 νημιμον-βακι 绀ε-μπενξιτκ Vat (Paris 绀e, probably to be emended or at least to be referred back to an original 绀e-; there is no particle here in the Greek that would trigger Coptic 绀e).

(b20) VERB LEXEME ("INFINITIVE") OR CONVERB 绀 DETERMINATOR + NOUN EXPANSION (object actant); VERB LEXEME ("INFINITIVE") OR CONVERB 绀 PRONOUN EXPANSION (object actant).

The valency-pattern matrix is an important, closely-knit junctural domain and scope, containing important links. Typologically, it is of significance that the object actant always follows the verb lexeme, and that the agens actant always precedes it. The lexeme itself follows the initial boundary; the last actant, wherever it occurs, marks the final one. Completion of the valency matrix is a final-boundary signal; there are two main internal boundaries in the matrix: first and primary, between the verb lexeme and its actants; secondarily, between the actants themselves, linked both to the verb and through the verb. The primary linkage, to the verb, is effected either (1) by a prosodic and/or morphophonemic mechanism in the lexeme, with inseparability and closest juncture, or (2) by a smallish list of rectional grammatical prepositions (mainly ν-, ε-, ναυ-), in looser juncture with the verb. (In the case of reflexive diathesis, an appropriate anaphor is added).

The difference between actants and circumstances, the most vexed point of valency dependence grammar, is thus, if not practically solved, at least theoretically comprehended, as associated with juncture structure of the verb phrase. A special junctural case is the zero object actant, identified as such by the very matrix; location of the zero object in the matrix is immaterial: it is its presence that is decisive.

Consider the following range of constructions:

The Bivalence Matrix, of so to speak minimal transitives: agens and object actants (including rhematic actant). Note, beside the "normal" ones and the ε- rection verbs of cognition and perception (ναυ, κω-τεμ, δομενεμ...), also:

cωβι n- Num. 22:29.
σι νεμ- Ex. 19:12.
‡θι ερν- “kiss” Ex. 4:27.
κιμ ν- “move” Lev. 14:44.
ουντι ε- “visit, call on” Num. 26:64.
εργων n- “work (at)” Ex. 31:4.
Deut. 28:44 νηοκ ερκωπιτι νοηφε νηοκ δε εκεσωπι
νοτετ.
Gen. 43:9 ειεσωπι ειοι νηεφεπονβι.
Lev. 11:36 εενωπιτι νητν εεφαζεμ.
Lev. 25:44 νη τηνοτ ετναωπιτι νακ.
Deut. 1:22 πινωφιτ ην εεεεηηεψεναε εερπι εειπε
(which FUNK 1992:19 emends, with Vat, into εεεεηηεψε).
Also μπεζηιτικ, ζοθεηε, εηκ, εεεεσεκ, τωσιι (see be-
below).

Obs.
(1) Cases like πινοβι εταεφεπονβι μηοι Lev. 4:28:35 and the structurally different
πιενομ εταεφεομ μηοι Deut. 33:1 etc. have μηοι as a conditioned anaphoric
formal object — making ερνομi formally and potentially bivalent, εμομ trivalent —
which “rounds up” and closes the construction and also marks a “saturating” matrix-fi-
nal boundary: the resumption or repetition of the lexeme within the derived denominal
verb, effects double linkage with the antecedent. This is distinct from the case of the non-
derived μηεμπυιιιι ετααιι Νυμ. 1:44, which is old in Egyptian.
(2) It may be that the adverb in εεεει εμειηα Gen. 22:5 is also a formal valency slot
filler: is εεεει alone at all attested?
(3) Note the cases of orthographically unmarked linkage mechanism, well attested in the
valency matrix. Interesting is here the ambiguity between n- and morphophonemic link-
age for non-zero objects (the orthographic zeroing of n- is prevalent in Demotic):
Num. 16:15 μππεζεκο-οηα μηοοτ (but Vat νοτα).
Lev. 17:12 γηηουοηη-σηο = Vat); sim. Lev. 7:27.
Gen. 38:8 τοενοσ-οεραζ.
Ex. 4:11 ηιι πε εταεφεομο-εηο ηεη κοτπ ρεεηατ ηεολ ηεη βελε (= Vat).
Gen. 42:16 οερπι-οηα οηο ηεοα.
Ex. 11:1 οορπι-οηηο (Vat οερπι-).

The Trivalent Matrix: third actant, rhematic or non-rhematic. The third actant is more restricted than the second, and by that token of a higher linkage with the verb and verb + first actant units of the matrix domain:

Deut. 10:12 ὅτε πετενώσεν ἥμουρόν ἐρετίν μμοῦν ντότκ.  
Ex. 16:33 ἐπάρεξ ἐροῦ — possibly a case of zero third actant.  
Ex. 25:11 ἐκεώς μννοῦβ.  
Deut. 27:1 ...ἐξογγέν μμωτέν ἐρωσ — (distinct from ἡγγέν μνεν- Deut. 1:18).  
Gen. 44:1 μαγ-νενκοκ μμαίρωμι μκοῦσ νωσ — quadrivalent?  
Gen. 19:32-35 μαρεντεπενίωστ μνοῦρπ ... μαρεντκορ μνοῦρπ.  
Deut. 18:10f. ἐνερο μπεκυμπρι ιε τεκυμρι εκινι με- 
νοτέρπωμ (also Num. 14:11 μιανατ ἴε παλανσ ἐρο μμοι 
ἐμβον).  
μπερεπεμποιού μμο ν— Num. 32:5 (cf. also ερπεμπιορ zero 

ταρκομ ν— Gen. 22:16 — this causative-diathesis matrix helps us to 
interpret τιμωρ μμοι Gen. 22:16, which has the first slot zeroed.  
Deut. 21:14 ἐκεξεκ ἐβολ ἐκοι νρεμε.  
Gen. 12:2 εἰειάκ εοτινώ ἐνιαλ.  
Ex. 32:4 αρκαμίοιο μνοματι νοσιτυ.  
Ex. 7:1 εψεκομπι νακ νοσπροφήτης.  
Gen. 5:2 αρκαμιόου στραυτ ὑμε οτριμι... (= Vat).  
Ex. 35:35 αρκαμοο υμεσι νοκοία.

(C) In-nexus Boundaries: Theme  Rheme.  
The inner juncture contour across the sharp Theme  Rheme boundary, external juncture and other specifics are distinctive of nexus type — nominal-Rheme, adverbial-Rheme, verbal-Rheme nexus. (In fact, juncture contour is distinctive and definitional of any pattern).

(c1) Juncture in the nominal-Rheme nexus (“Nominal Sentence”) is pattern-specific: the NS pattern set of sets (Chapter Two above) is in this respect considerably heterogenous. Generally speaking, we observe closer to closest linkage of pronominal-thematic and rhematic grammemes, the latter covering practically all Rhemes, since it is the determinator nucleus of the noun syntagm that is usually predicated. Note the respective main distinctive features of juncture (details in Chapter Two):
Interlocutive: \{$\text{anok}$-\} proclitic Theme, non-phoric, carries the copular link of close juncture. The pattern has no extra-clausal linkage (although it may occur as Response), and is textually delimitative.

Delocutive: Rheme — \{$\pi\epsilon$\} internal copular linkage, marked in the highly enclitic delocutive Theme, which (externally) carries also an anaphoric or cataphoric referential cotext or context link; when \{$\pi\epsilon$\} links internally, the pattern is delimitative. Note the juncturally special Topicalized-Theme, Expanded-Theme, Endophoric-Theme, Immutable-Theme and copular patterns (details in Chapter Two).

(c2-c3) Adverbial-Rheme nexus (Chapter Two).

- Specific Themes: high linkage of Theme and Rheme (grammeme/lexeme close juncture) for personal-pronoun Themes; low linkage of Theme and Rheme (lexeme/lexeme open juncture) for other Themes. External linkage with cotext or context is effected by and through the Theme.

\[ x \neq \text{σωφωρ} \] "aspiration" of pronominal Theme is a link. So too \[ x \neq \text{ναβωκ}, \] before grammeme.

\[ \text{nac} \neq \text{σεντεκμή} \].

\[ \text{ŋk} \neq \text{νασωμ} \] an Deut.8:9 (Circumstantial).

\[ c \neq \text{ενσοτν} \] Gen. 18:9 — closest juncture ("liaison étroite" Polotsky 1949, Kasser 1994b), symptomized by vocalic realization of syllabic nasal morphs.

- Non-specific Themes. Here the juncture contour is entirely different, for the pattern is not dichotomic, but basically consists of a close-juncture statement of (Non-) Existence (\text{οτον}/\text{μμον} + existant) followed in low linkage (open juncture) by a rhematic dynamic or Stative converb:

\[ \text{Gen. 20:9 οτσωβ μμον-ξαι νααιq}. \]
\[ \text{Ex. 33:21 σκμμε οτον-ότμα χν γαρ} \text{θωκ}. \]
\[ \text{Gen. 23:6 μμον-ξαι μμον ραννο}. \]

(c4-c5) Verbal-Rheme nexus.

\[ \text{ἀq} \neq \text{σωτεμ, a- πρωμι} \neq \text{σωτεμ}: \] structurally, it is the closely linked [base+Theme] \text{a-q} (formal nexus) unit that is the formal cataphoric Rheme ("the verb") — indeed, it is not in structural principle and reality different from the pre-Coptic \text{sdm.f} verbal system — with the verb lexeme (infinitive) an actantial and appositive expansion of the formal Rheme. The pronominal and nominal Themes are accordingly closely linked to the base, with the [base+Theme] unit (less closely)
linked to the expanding infinitive. In this precise junctural sense, the Theme is not infixed at all. The two combined internal juncture contours of these conjugation forms are thus distinctive, differing in the familiar grammeme/lexeme (closer) vs. lexeme/lexeme (opener) interface parameter.

(c6-c8) Theme ✧ Verb Clause, Verb Clause ✧ nxe-Theme, Base + Theme ✧ Verb Clause juncture features.

Anaphoric or cataphoric linkage of a core pronominally-linked unit ("aqqwatem") to an extrapoosed Theme makes for three distinctive "Flexionisolierung" juncture contours; in the case of an extrapoosed [base+Theme] unit, nexus-topicalization, the linkage is complex (both anaphora and base repetition) and the cohesion consequently high.

(a) Gen. 25:21 iaak de aqmenpe-hcaw.
(b) Num. 3:4 aqmoa nxe-naaab nem abiota.
(c) Gen. 25:33 nhcaw de aq znimetwpom mmici eboa niajakw.

erefothb egeat (Lev. passim).

(c9-c12) Some special base + Theme-Agens [...] links:

(c9-c10) Base ✧ Second-Person-Feminine zero and Second Person Plural Pronominal Themes. The conditioned base allomorph indicates higher cohesion: conditioning is a link.

 appears ✧ 0-cwq, appears ✧ 0-cwbi (Preterite: Num. 5:20, 22:29 etc.).

As contrasted with:

a ✧ q-wrk, a ✧ i-twnt etc.

Gen. 50:5 ere ✧ ten-thomct (Absolute Future).

Cat. 208 are ✧ ten-xw nlaagapoc tenw (Preterite).

(c11) Base ✧ Nominal Theme boundary:
Gen. 27:28 otog ere-ep ✧ naik.

23 The [base + Theme] unit is encountered alone, apocritically: "επανελασω αντε... η πως πω ("...we wouldn't have stayed" — Indeed, they did not") Shenoute ed. Leip. IV 97.

24 Cf. GALAND 1964, esp. 38ff., 48ff. for the intricate reference patterns in Berber verb clauses.

25 There is similarity between base- and converter-juncture, which makes for the resemblance of some base-initial and converter-initial contours. Bases are nuclear pro-verb auxiliaries governing the infinitive; like pronouns, they are actualizers of the verb, prime grammeme signals (cf., on the "pronominality" of the bases, SCHLEICHER 1859:21, SCHWARTZE-STEINTHAL 1850:423ff.). See note 23.

26 Cf. ROSEN 1964:182 on the juncture around a zero segment. Another case in point is the zeroed pre-negator following converters in Akhmimic and Lycopolitan (cf. FUNK 1987), and, in Bohairic, in the Relative conversion (see below). In Coptic, the affinity of zero and noun syntagm or Proper Name in this specific slot and environment is junctural.
Gen. 31:8 εὐγνω 

(c12) [Base + Theme] core unit linkage: discontinuous-segment juncture across pronominal Theme-agens²⁷. Here again the left flank of the boundary is more closely linked to the Theme than the right flank — this is evident mainly by allomorphic conditioning of the first base constituent, but also indicated by the unstable distribution of the second:

ε [‡]q[‡] ε- (Absolute-Definite Future, affirmative: consider ἔπε- [Theme] ε-, ἔπετεν-ε-). Note the syllabication ἑq-ē-.

ἀ-[‡]q[‡] ὃαν- (Conditional, affirmative; consider ἀπε- [Theme] ὃαν-).

(c13) Converter + Base, Converter + Determinator, Converter + Nexus: Boundaries and Linkage.

(c14) Converter + ὅτον- + Theme + Rheme.

Rare in the corpus, but common in Nitrian and (less frequently) NT/OT Bohairic, is the pre-nominal (pre-determinator) allomorph of converters preceding ὅτον-, indicating a junctural contact-situation between converter (conditioned) and Theme (conditioning): ὅτον- is here junctorially absent, in the sense that ἔπε- etc. is conditioned by an element following ὅτον-: ἔπε-ὅτον- is as “prenominal” as ἔπε-²⁸. The junctural “transparence” of ὅτον- correlates with the morphosyntactical circumstance of its being purely formal, not a form of Existent Statement. The difference between these still enigmatic forms and the normal converters is not yet clear.

Ex. 39:23 ἡνεκ ἰν ὧν ὄντων ὅσον ὅσον ἃκτησθή... ἔπε-ὅτον-ὅτοψ ὅτος ὅτος ὃτος (= Vat!).

(c15) Converter (Relative) + Base (Absolute Future).

ἔτε + ἐσκριμπον Deut. 19:4 (= Vat), with exx. like Ex. 3:14:15 παρθήν ἐπε ἐπεκδοκο (= Vat) — (see Chapter One) indicate a fuzzy interface between converter and base, with a non-specific affiliation of the second epsilon, which may be indicative of closer juncture. On the other hand, the case of zeroed converter allomorph in:

(c16) Converter (Circumstantial) + Base (Absolute Future).

²⁷ Rosén 1964:180ff. “mediate juncture”-: links or delimitations “prevailing between segments that are not immediately adjacent”. The non-initial or second segments are diachronically weak, and synchronically “unstable”, absent in certain environments (notably, for the Bohairic Conditional, in negation, and (as a rule) in the Absolute Future for all dialects, prenominally.

Gen. 1:6 ...οσον ντεψωπι ‡ εφεψωρξ εβολ... (Greek ἔστω διαχωρίζων) is a well-established construction and form; more exx. in Chapter One; taken with the zeroed Circumstantial allomorph before the negator ν-...ἀν (below), while morphophonemically conditioned, it is junctorially significant as arguably more delimiting — less closely linked, since iconically paratactic — than the actual non-zero converter.

(c17-c19) The numerous junctorial peculiarities of the Relative-Conversion forms (see also [b17] and [c14] above) are surely also associated with this element’s peculiar standing as an “incomplete converter”, that is, what is still one of the mysteries of Coptic dialectal morphotactics, namely the fact that the Relative converter seems not always to convert, or to convert only partially²⁹. In precise structural terms, we have to do with its two homonyms, one a true converter, one (still) a pronoun, each with distinctive juncture properties³₀.

(c17) RELATIVE CONVERTER ‡ [zero]- — ἄν: discontinuous-segment juncture across a zero segment³¹. Allomorphic ἓτε- (zero delimiter).

Lev. 14:32 ΦΗ ἓτε ‡ Ω-κνακιμί ἄν (see also below, on non-zero resumption of antecedent in affirmative clauses).

Deut. 25:9 παρωμί ἓτε ‡ Ω-κνακωτ ἄν μὴνι μπεχκον.

(c18) RELATIVE CONVERTER ‡ ADVERBIAL RHEME. Allomorphic ἓτε-, joining a boundary less close than ἓτ-; no “liaison étroit” (POLOTSKY 1949, KASSER 1994b).

ΦΗ ἓτε ‡ εβεβεψοβι Λεβ. 6:23, 9:15 etc.³².

²⁹ Consider the case of the ἓτ- - ἓτ- isogloss (incidentally, not by-passing Demotic, pace QUECKE 1979:439f. — Coptic does not after all “carry on” Demotic any more than Demotic does LE; dialectology cannot be well integrated with written diachrony in Egyptian. ἓτ- - ἓτ- (e.g. in Oxyrhynchite Mt. 5:5:7:9; 12:36; 15:32, also in Acts, (mostly with ne- future). Historically regarded, ἓτεψ- would correspond, and be diachronically related to the second of two Relative markers in LE (and Demotic)? - ntj- and ntj-μστ-; see SCHENKE 1978:*48ff. FUNK 1981 describes ἓτ- - ἓτ- as “synthetic”, ἓτ- - ἓτ- as “analytic”, which, unless meant as a junctural statement, would be tautological and but begging the question. I would also suggest comparing the second syntagm with the Sahidic (and Oxyrhynchite) conjunctive ἓν- - ἓτ- (SHISHA-HALEVY 1986a Chapter Seven): ἓν-, functionally kindred to ἓτ- (a relationship already observed by STEINTHAL 1847) is apparently not restricted to nouns. The most inspired and detailed study of the opposition ἓτ- - ἓτ- v.s. ἓτος- is BOSSON 2006a:49-59, pointing to two conjoint synchronic factors, namely the internal syntagmatics of the Coptic Relative construction and the translated segment in the Greek original.

³₀ Cf. already SCHWARTZE and STEINTHAL 1850:359 vs. 490 (“declinierte Conjunctio”).

³¹ Cf. ROSEN 1964:182.

³² Cf. ANDERSSON 1904:101; see POLOTSKY 1949:31f. Note also (Lev. 7:7) ΦΗ ἓτε† ΦΗ ἓτεβονι ΠΑΙΡΗΤ ΩΝ ΠΕ ΦΗ ἓτε† ΜΕΤΑΧΑΡΤ, for which latter merging of ἓτε- and ἓτ- see also Chapter Three.
**JUNCTURE FEATURES**

**ete** ἥματ Gen. 19:25.
**ete** ἰνήμε τιq Lev. 1:9.

(c19-c20) **RELATIVE CONVERTER** ἢ **TOPICALIZATION/PREMODIFICATION CLAUSE.** Allomorphic **ete-**, joining a boundary less close than for **et-**. The premodifying or presetting adverbials and adverbial clauses, of a restricted paradigm, are also topical. These constructions are typically Bohairic.

Lev. 14:35 ὥν **ete** ἵνι **πιε** ἕω τε.
Deut. 2:25 **Νη** **etε** ἀτωλιτωτες ἐπεκαν ἐτειερτερ.

(c21) **PRE-NEGATOR** ἢ **FOCALIZING CONVERTER.**

Whereas the placement of the post-negator **αν** is apparently pertinent, that is, carries a functional load (see Chapter Two), the pre-negator **ν-** adjoins the initial segment of the focalization construction, namely the converter, in closest juncture, as witnessed by the non-syllabic variety of the nasal. Unlike this embracing negation in unconverted nexus, **ν-…αν** is in this case not Circumstantial:

Gen. 3:4 **ναπετηναγοτα αν** **σεναρμοτα.**
Num. 20:17 **νανακινι αυ σολα γιτεννικοι οτα εβα εβα γιτεννιααλαλι.**
Deut. 29:14 **ναϊκ** **νταλαδακη μανοκ **νεμωτεν** **ματατεν-αννοτα αν** **μφουτ.**
Deut. 11:10 **ναηοτ** γαρ **αν** **μφρητ** Μπικαγι Ντεχεμι Ντεχεμι.
Gen. 31:15 **νη ετατοπτεν** **νακ** **αν** **μφρητ** **νανωμεμωτα.

(c22) **PRE-NEGATOR** ἢ **PERSONAL-PRONOUN THEME** (sec. person masc.).
Deut. 8:9 **νκναοσομ αν** (Vat νκνα-). Circumstantial (see below). Both pre-negator and Theme are delimited by syllability (below), the latter also by non-aspiration.

---

33 See Andersson 1904:63. This is Polotsky’s only example (1987:93ff) from the Pentateuch (he quotes in all 19 others, of which 18 are NT ones, one from Proverbs).

34 See Shisha-Halevy 2002:317ff., 321ff. for the delimitation of **να**- from **α-** in certain Oxyrhynchite texts. The significance of this juncture property can be evaluated in the context of a general study of the juncture of negation.
(c23) oτων- /μμων- δι Existant.

Close juncture. Linkage for μμων-: exclusion of all but zero determination. By this token, oτων- enters looser juncture than μμων- (see Chapter Three).

Num. 23:23 μμων-δισπνμ γαρ.
Gen. 47:13 αμμων-οτο δε υπο πε.
Ex. 33:21 γιαν αυτον-οταί αν γαροκ.
Lev. 21:21 δε-οτηι oτων-ασηι ανητηι.

(D) Textural (ultraclausal, hypernexual) juncture boundaries36.

(d1) Verb Clause δι Conjunctive.

A complicated junctural paradigm set, with links/delimiters ranging from connectors (or their zeroing), through personal Theme maintenance (or Theme switching), to negation maintenance (or re-assertion): see Shisha-Halevy 1986a Chapter Seven (and above, Chapter One, §1.2.3.2).

Ex. 4:1 εσηηα αρστενατόν έροι ουλε ντοσωτεμεω-

τεμ νεκατασιμ...

Ex. 5:7 μαρουένσων νέων οτος νεσένενεττον νεων.
Gen. 19:34 μασένε εσότην εκκοτ νεβάη οτος ντεντον-

νος-οράροδ...

Ex. 3:10 τνοια αονα ντατοπρκ...

Gen. 27:41 μαρπόνσωντ μξε-νιεροου ντεφμουν μπαιχ

για ντανκωτεμ νιακωβ μαρεκμποι μξε-οτακρο...

οτοσ ντεφμποι εφεβμρά (so, correctly) εβολ...

Ex. 14:2 σαξι αεμε νεβεμπι οπικα οτος μαρουτωτεμ.

The extended paradigmatics includes other conjugation forms, with their own junctural profile, which, however, is related to that of the Conjunctive:

Num. 21:7 τωβς ουν μπετε μαρεκμλι νιαριοο ϵεβο

γαρον.

Num. 22:19 όζι αεμη ... οτοσ τναεμι μξε-οτ πετεπετ

καγο ης (= Greek).

Ex. 33:14 ανοκ εναμωοι ετάβκ οτοσ τναεμητον

νακ.

Num. 22:17 τνατανκ γαρ εμασών οτος ην ετεκνακστον

ης τναστστον νακ.

36 See also the discussion of Sentence Particles below.
(d2-d3) PROTASIS ♢ APODOSIS (factual, counterfactual, topicalizing etc.). Linkage here may be effected by a special sequelling form (ὥπ-, ἔκα-) , but delimitation is in evidence, signalled by rupture of personal concord and syntax:

Num. 12:6 ἐσώπτρον ἀφάντωστι νε-οντροφήτθεις ἁπτωτὲν ἀναγροπὸμα ὅπτομοτρὸς εροκ ὀσμὸς ἀλακᾶξι νεμαρ.

Ex. 4:1 ἐσώπτρον ἀκτημναρὶ ἐροὶ όταν ἄτοπτομοτεμὼ-

τεμ χατακμὴ σελαδόρα γὰρ ἔνα ἐμπεραγομένῃ εροκ ἀκτημανρὶ ὠτ πεταμοτρὸς νμερ.

The irrealis complex is more formalized, with νε- and πε linking protasis and apodosis, and tense-shifting delimiting the latter:

Num. 22:33 ενεμπρικὶ πε ντομοτρὸσ νεοκ μεν ναινα-

ποθεκ πε νὴ ἔμ ναινατανδοκ νε.

(d4-d5) [FOCALIZING CONVERSION + NEXUS] ♢ FOCUS.

For Topic-initial constructions — the great majority of cases — it is as a rule the valency matrix that serves as delimiter, that is, when the valency matrix is concluded, the Focus commences:

Gen. 43:16 αρηναρποῖμι γὰρ ζνατόμμον νοτωκ ♢ νεμῆ

μμερὲ.

Gen. 43:25 ακτὴμνοτομοτρὸσ γὰρ ἀκε-αἶρε-ἰμχήφ μετὶ εὑρωμ ♢ Μπιμα ετεμματ.

Num. 11:13 αίνασαμ-ἀρ ♢ θωμ.

Gen. 37:16 αρμος ♢ νωμ.

Gen. 37:30 αναμεθενὶ ♢ εὑρωμ.

Gen. 37:15 ακκωτ ♢ νκα ♢ ντ.

Lev. 3:7 ἐγνανηφ εὔορν Μπνεμον Μπνε.

Ex. 2:14 ὑαν εκορωμ ἐξνοβετ.

Gen. 44:30 τεφυβαχ ἀκαύχ δεντύβαχ ἀπαλλόθ.

Gen. 34:31 ἄλλος αρναιρὸι ντενγκάλοι Μβρήν ♢ νςωπορνη.

Num. 20:17 αναμώμοι γιπιμιωτ ότρο.

Gen. 30:16 Ακνόσε εὐσορν εαροί μφοος.

Gen. 44:30 νὸστ ἄμ αναμεθενὶ εὐσορν γαπεκαλοῦν ετε-

πενιωτ πε μπιαλοῦν ην νεμῆθον — Circumstantial negated

νεσυς as Focus.

An exception to this is the case of Rheme focalization ("auto-focal") construction, in the Present, where the focalization boundary coincides with the nexus boundary and there is no ambiguity as to the incidence of the focalization. The pattern juncture is here closer:

ἀρ ♢ θωμ passim.

Gen. 18:9 εκ ♢ νικοτρ (responsive to ακαρωμ).
Gen. 16:5 ἐτανασαῖ τῷ θεῷ ἰδα-αὶ καὶ μβοκύ.
Num. 22:29 τῷ εὐθεὶᾳ καὶ κωβί μμοι.

In the case of Focus-initial construction, the main Focus + Topic boundary always immediately precedes the Focalizing converter, with secondary boundaries in the Topic:

Ex. 18:14 εἴθε-οτ νοοκ μματάτκ + εκγέμει.
Gen. 38:25 εβολ εγεπήρωμι ετενοτῇ νε ἱα + αἰμβοκί ἀνοκ.

Deut. 31:29 ετσάν μπαμοτ + ερετενιαπανομίν (Vat te-
ten-).
Gen. 44:5 οσοπτερίσωμί + αφηθήμ.
(d6) VERB CLAUSE + SEQUELLING FORMS: επε-, ἤπα- (see Chapter One).

This set of sequelling clause forms, as a general category old in and typical of Egyptian-Coptic, constitutes an intriguing junctural feature that is hard to match in Indo-European (but are found in Semitic): a category of superordinative, in a sense “apodotic” tenses that are not coordinated to their foregoing cotext but sequelling have built-in links with it. What is junctorially remarkable is, on one hand, the absence of connectors, and, on the other hand, the presence of superordinating exponents, that are junctorially delimiters, since the sequel is rhematic.

Gen. 42:34 ἀνιντι μπετενκοτζα ννοκ γαροί + εἰειμί θε-
νωτέν-γανζερπάν.
Gen. 30:20 ἀφτ + ἄνοι ὡτσαίο ενανεγ νᾶρπι θεπαί-
κοτ ουμενοπετ νᾶε-παία.
Gen. 18:5 ὁρος εἰεῖςι νοτωικ ερετενεοτοῦμ μενενκα-
νάι ερετενεγενένων.
Gen. 24:46 εν οὐκ εἰετκο ἱνκεκέναματλ (Arabic wa-;
Greek καὶ), sim. 24:44.
Gen. 4:14 ἰκάθε καταίττ μποοοτ εβολ γαργο ἱπκαρ ὁτογ
εἰεσωμί εἰικαγο ὁτογ εἰεσερτερ ἱδενπκαγι...

Num. 12:6 εὐωπι αὐγανωμπι νᾶε-κτροφήντες λτωτέν
θεντγρομα + ωιοτοτονγτ ἐρογ ὁτογ ωαίαζα κεμα.
Deut. 16:19 Νιαώρον γαρ υστεχαμ ονένβαλ ονένια-
κατο Νάτακο Νάιαζα νώμη (Greek καὶ ἀγιαπε...).
(d7) Dialogue-internal juncture: ALLOCUTION + RESPONSE.

The rich variety of Allocation/Response interface and combinatorics has been studied above in detail (see Chapter One, esp. §1.2.3-4)\(^{37}\). The

\(^{37}\) See also SHISHA-HALEVY 1981b, on the junctural evidence regarding LE dialogue as attested in texts presented as oracular queries.
formal nature of linkage and delimitation between these two sub-systems of dialogue is complex and multifarious. I will limit myself here to repeating germane observations, and point out that (a) while both allocutive and reactive-responsive subsystems of Dialogue carry signals of inter-dependence and mutual linkage, it is the Response that is most typically marked for this linkage, indeed often defining the type of Allocution (even by its zeroing); and yet, the Response is (superficially) the constituent of dialogue that appears most autonomous; (b) thematic questions not only anticipate, but distinctively open a (thematic) fillable slot in the Response, while nexal questions prejudice the Response seriously — in fact, practically restrict it to confirmation or repudiation; (c) the post-imperatival sequel is different in juncture properties from the Response; (d) Allocutions, esp. interrogative ones, are characterized as such by the very sequel of a Response (as against e.g. "indirect questions"), but may still be Response-less; the difference is mainly junctural.

Some examples:

Ex. 2:14 ἦν εὐστοχώς εὐσθεστ ἦν οὐκ μπιρήτει τακάκως τε οὐρίσιν ἱλαρίνης Νάνα.

Ex. 3:16 ἀρχικὴ ἱστορία ἵνα ἥξεσθον τεταμένη ἰσόχρον ἀλλοι ... οὐκ εκδεξος ἰσόχρονος...

Ex. 24:12 αμον εὐπρόντητον οὖν ἵνα ἀναπλασθῇ ὡς τοῖς Μηταζ.

Gen. 49:1 ἔνωσαν Ἐπταταμώτεν (Greek συνάχθητε ἵνα ἀναγείλω).

Ex. 14:11 ὡς ἵνα εἰκαῖ τάκατο ἦν εὔκατος εὐβολ ἰπαταμώτεν ἰμπαταμώτεν.

Ex. 4:2 ὡς κατὰ τὸ Κέρατον ἐκεῖος αὐτῷ ἵνα ἀκούσῃ (ἡπερὶ ἦν).

Gen. 43:7 ἵνα εἰκάτωτ οὐκ ἵνα εἰκάτωτ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἰμπαταμώτεν-κον ματα.

Gen. 43:27λ. ζοτοξ θεομορφιτετικότιοτι ἵνα ἀκούσῃ τὸν ἰμπαταμώτεν ἤτοι τὸν ἰμπαταμώτεν.

Gen. 27:32 θεοκ-καταθεοκ, answered ἰπερὶ πεκωμπομίε ἰμπερικ."
naq-, Narrative Evolution Mode focussing tense; and naq- pe, Comment Mode (Narrator’s Channel) tense. The two latter forms are delimiting, the last an especially high delimitation. The former is closely linked by zero. Note that we are not dealing with coordination, but with sequentiality, a sui generis type of linkage. Some examples (see Chapter One).

Ex. 2:17 άγτωνα παρε-μωρςκαρ απαναρμοτ.
Ex. 3:6 Τανδοσα αίνατ οτώρ αικωτιμ επεμαγη καπα-λαοσ...

Gen. 25:25 αρι δε εβολ νάε-νεςγρι ρεςορν λμιγι... μενεναφαν αρι εβολ νάε-νεςγριον ναρέ-τεξαξ αμονι μποιβς ηνκατ.

Gen. 22:6ff. αρι δε νάε-αβρααμ ηνρογκ ητεπιδιλια αγ-ταλον εξενικακ ... οτωρ αρεκνωον νάε-μπι ετκοπ πεζεικακ δε ναβρααμ [...] πεζε αβρααμ δε [...] νασ-μωι δε μπι ετκοπ ατι εφια εταφ τ ηοκ ναρ.

Gen. 37:4 ητασκα νάε-νερειωτ μει ρμοο αμεστωη ναζεμοκο αν πε εκαζι ηηναρ.

Ex. 1:21 επιν δε νατερκοτ τατην κμη τε ... ατεμιο ναρ νενενι...

Ex. 2:15 αρκωτεμ δε νάε-φαραω επαικαξι ατωρ φαραω ναφκωτ τ ηντακο μμωσκαρ πε (πε super lin.).

Gen. 21:20 ατωρ ναρε-φι τη νη εμ πιαλοι τε αραζι τοτορ απωσπι...

4.2.1 The word as a junctural entity in Coptic: a brief note.

The issue of word-division in reproducing a Coptic manuscript text is in fact a pseudo-problem, an issue extrinsic to Coptic and essentially motivated by a Western-squinting editorial perspective. As a technical issue, it is not trivial; but it ought not to be given a scientific descriptive significance. However, the question of whether any “basic (relatively) free form” unity, a non-orthographical (non-typographical) recurrent subtextual segment of relative autonomy, can consistently be defined, resolved and analytically tagged as “word” — is a legitimate and meaningful one in Coptic, as it is in any language. While the general-linguistic consensus as to the incommensurability of specific definitions (semasiological, morphological or prosodic), and the non-universality of composite definitions of the word (along with the concomitant realization of the precedence of syntax over morphology), crystallized in the
heyday of structural linguistics in the mid-twentieth century, does not seem to inform current usage in grammatical description, one may muse on the feasibility of a workable working definition of the Coptic word.

In a typological treatise on language morphology, of which Coptic data (Bohairic and Sahidic, intermingled) constitute the major part, August Schleicher of Stammbaum fame reports (1859:20ff.) on M.G. Schwartzte’s studies. (Generally speaking, the intellectual affinity and empathy of Schwartzte with the typologist H. Steinthal, whom he taught Coptic, and the syntactical descriptive interest and acumen of both scholars, were more striking than those of the genealogist and historicist August Schleicher; this may be hinted at by the tone of the report, cf. p. 21). Yet here we have what is the only special discussion of this issue for Coptic (later taken up by Steinthal and Misteli, 1893). Schleicher draws attention to the “root” as a scope for “phonetic changes”, and to “uncertainty about the demarcation of the word” and the general orientation of the problem to orthography: elements separated or not separated in writing. S. does not commit himself to answering the question “where do we draw the word boundary?” — “Nur die einsicht in den bau der sprache kann hier entscheiden” (1859:21), but it is this very insight that consistently contradicts the general establishment of such a unity.

From the junctural and structural perspectives, it is evident that the lexeme is, for its part, a real, consistently perceptible unity, the internal cohesion of which is higher than that across its flanking boundaries. This is also true of its syntagm with grammemes, as a rule prefixed to the lexeme, as in άρξωτεμ (verb clause) or πιρωμι (noun phrase) — and this syntagm tempts comparison with the typical familiar “word” of Indo-European or Semitic. However, verb clauses, and generally nexus syntagms, differ sharply from the conventional word unit in that they include forms that are juncturally widely divergent, with linkage peaks and valleys and open-juncture “islands” — from Gen. 50:19 άνοικ-φαντ ιαρ άνοικ to Ex.1:19 μφρητ άν ινιγιομι ιντεχμι ιε ινιγιομι ιντειγεβρεος, from Gen. 37:28 οτογ νατνοτ ιε νάε-πιρωμι ιμμαδινεος ... ιανισιωσφ επι-ψιλ ιεπιπιλακκος ιτι ινισιωσφ εβολ to Gen. 13:5ff. ιαρ-πικαρι να ετεμματ ωμπι (sic, for ωμπι) ιμμωτ ιαν ιε, and so on. If this consideration is conceded, one could assign some morphological characteristics to a Coptic “word”; but then, and by the same token, this unity would have absolutely no junctural or prosodic correlates, or be utterly trivialized. I doubt the descriptive gain in perpetuating the “word” unity at such a high price.
4.2.2 Coordination and disjunction linkage

The connective ὠς ὁς is in Bohairic differently related to νὲμ compared to the ἀσ ὄς vs. ἐν ὄς opposition familiar from Sahidic. This means a different functional structure in the two dialects. The main characteristic is here the considerably broader functional range of the connector νὲμ, which proportionately reduces that of ὠς ὁς. The much more restricted range of ἐν- also considerably broadens that of νὲμ. Hierarchically, ὠς ὁς is still of a higher order than νὲμ, which in the corpus coordinates internally and, as a rule, symmetrically, infra-clausal unities (nominal — any determination but {τ-}? — or adverbial phrases) as subnexal constituents, while ὠς ὁς superordinates or adds clausal or ultra-clausal ones; ὠς ὁς is initial (and prefixed in close juncture) to the added unity, νὲμ infixed in the coordinating one.

(a) νὲμ

Ex. 9:31 πιμαγε δὲ νὲμ πιστ ἁτνίας.
Gen. 14:10 ἀνέλαοτ δὲ ετμολαγ νακοκ νᾶσωτ άωτ νὲμ βρεαὶ.
Deut. 6:15 ντενίντ ἁ wnd νὲμ εμφον (= Vat) — coordinating verb lexemes in close juncture after bracketing conjugation base.
Deut. 25:13 ννενιας νὲμ οττυ άωπι.
Ex. 15:18 πὁν εκον νοτρο χ λενες νὲμ χ λενες ντενιενες ὠς ὁς ετι.
Ex. 28:35 ετεσωτεμ ετεςκμν ευκνην εοινε επεθο-
ταβ ... νὲμ ευκνην εβολ.
Deut. 9:24 αἰςον μπιμεομ μποντ ν-προ νεγοσον νὲμ ἐμ νεκωργ.
Gen. 31:10 αϊνατ ερωσον νναβαλ νερακοι ρηπρε εσ νι-
βαρην νὲμ νιδωια ναταν ερρι εξεκνιεκων νὲμ νι-
βαμπι νοεσοβυ πε υσον ναοι ναοινσον νὲμ
δοταν νκερμι ετοδς (= Vat).
Deut. 26:5ff. αγετεν εβολ ηηευαρ ηενρηινιουτ ναομ
νὲμ ηενρηιαε εκαμαγι νὲμ ηενρηαφοε εφκοει νὲμ
ηεγανηιουτ ννατ νὲμ ηεγανμηιιε νὲμ χανυφηπι
ὀσογ ἀγετεν εβολα απαιμα.
Gen. 31:2/5 αγανο νδε-ιακωβ επρο νλαβαν ν ἐν-ναροι
μφρητ νκαρ νὲμ ἐεφουτ αν πε.

Note the punctuation signals (discussed in detail below) in the following:

Ex. 35:5 αυνοσον νὲμ οερα: νὲμ : οερομτ ν.
Gen. 25:2 acmici naq ẓembram • nem • iezan • nem • madan • nem • madiam • nem • iebok • nem • ẓwte.

Nem coordinates adverbials, including converses. Note that here, unlike nominal-term coordination, nem itself is usually not demarcated by the dot and colon punctuators. Here and in clause coordination, nem coordination by and large resembles orog coordination in punctuation; (an exception are orite terms: orite • nem • orite seems to be the rule; the raised point is both a separating and isolating mark; see below, on punctuation in detail).

ẹpānin- nem epro- Num. 10:2.
Ex. 8:4 ebol ẓaroi nem ebol ẓanālaac.
qinimici nte- ... nem qinimac nte- ... Deut. 28:11.
Deut. 28:37 senow ncāzi nem ẓananabāl nem ev-φiri eprok.
ek- nem ek- nem ekna- Deut. 6:7.
Also Gen. 1:11:12, 3:15, 4:4, 5:29, 13:3, 19:28, Deut. 11:19 etc.
Nem coordinates an independent pronoun (nem neok vs. nemak opposed in juncture) to other pronouns or nouns:
Num. 18:3 nai nem nōwtan — typical of interlocutives?
But Num. 16:16 neok nemwot nem ẓarwn.
Nem coordinates zero determinators, also after a bracketing indefinite. Here nem seems to alternate, at least in the “milk-and-honey” context, with gi. Bracketing n- nota relationis is common; indeed, bracketing seems to be typical of coordinated zero — it is the zero article that effects bracketing, not nem or gi-

Ex. 4:11 nim pe etaqeāmiio-ebo + nem koqry (= Vat).
Ex. 2:14 nim pe etaqxak narpwn + nem req‡gaπ (= Vat).
Deut. 29:6 hrp nem sikep = (Vat).
Ex. 35:31 mazq mπnetma nkατ + nem soφia + nem ẓọkατ + nem otepīcθṃ (Vat nsoφia).
Presented hierarchically: Gen. 45:8 mφρπ + nsw-[iow + nem ẓe].
Ex. 3:8 eφ̣a† nem † + nem ebiw + (= Vat).
Contrasted (no punctuation!) with:
Deut. 6:3 ẓọkαgi eφ̣a† nem † gi-ebiw (= Vat).
Deut. 26:15 ẓọkαgi ephịo nem † ebọl gi-ebiw (= Vat).
(nem...) nemaz seems to signal coordination-unit closing, a final boundary signal (note there is remarkably no punctuation before the fi-
nai nemαs, in contrast to the *lemniscus* + before practically every nem term of the coordination\(^{38}\):

Ex. 19:24 θεοκ nem αρσαν nemακ.

Num. 18:19 νακ nem nekpweπi nem nekweπi nemακ.

Gen. 24:10 εβολ σεννιασατλι ντεπεφεεσε εβολ σεννιασαθον τηςου ντεπεφεεσε nemακ.

Gen. 7:7 nem τεπαειμι nem nekweπi nem nιζιοιιιι nτε- nεκpweπi nemακ.

Gen. 7:13 αρσεναπ naxe-νωε nem peq-?key νωπri cιm хаm iαφεθ νωπi nτενwe nem τεθαειμι nem ȠȠ nιζιοιιιι nτεπεφεπi nemακ.

Gen. 8:16 αμον εβολ ... θεοκ nem nekweπi nem τεκpειμι nem nιζιοιιιι nτενεκpweπi nemακ

(b) oτογ

Gen. 1:4f. oτογ αρσωξε εβολ naxe-ȠȠ oτεπηοτλινι nem oτεpιξακι oτογ αη ηotrosi niεπια sοπη oτογ πιξακι αμοντέ erοθ naxe-πιεξωξε oτογ αρσηι υw- πι ατοοιιιι ιωπηι piepοth nγοτιt.

Ex. 34:29 εwс de eπηνoυ eπeεεη naxe-μπατθςε εβολ σεπηιτoυ oδιnа + oτογ ηπηπe παρε-ηπλαξ sνoυτ nωνιι χη σελεπηξιγιθ ριμπατθςε.

Gen. 7:17f. oτογ αρσαη πaxe-πιμωυ oτογ αρτωπoμ nτκαβσιοc oτογ αcεcιи oβολ ριπκαζι oτογ παξαμαζi naxe-πιμωυ oτογ nαρnηπ oδιnα eμαυw ριζεpηηpxακι oτογ nαcηα nαcηηπ oδιnα πaxe-ητκαβσιοc επιwζi ηηπιμιμωυ.

Ex. 17:12 ηεζιγιθ de ριμπατθςε ηεζγρη δε ... oτογ αρρωη nem εwp αρηαξροq πηπηηξιγιθ.

Gen. 41:1ff. Φαραω de αqηνατ εξοτακοτι + ιζεκ-παροζι εpατη δε (Vat - πε) πιζεθιαπο + εηππε ηερπη ηεeβολ πιζεθιαρο πατηποι επιwζι δε (Vat om. πε) naxe-$ξ$ nepe εnαπεη πιεpηeμεζοt + παημοιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιιи

Lev. 5:1 ετωπι de nτe-οπeτηθ enoβι oτοη ηετεζεηθ ετεcηι nοταλαw oτοη Φαι oτεθερε de iε-αqηaθ iε- λεμει εηπιeη ερηeη ερηeη ηεζηοβι.
(c) A true opposition of nem and ὁρογ is encountered only before Circumstantial adjectives (not Relatives):

Ex. 28:35 ἐσεκύτον εἰτεύχμη εὐνήστα ἐστόν επεθορ- 

ἀβ ... nem εὐνήστα ἐβολ — coordinating the actational predicative clauses as paired adverb phrases.

Deut. 28:37 ἡσυγκαβεῖ nam nem ταπάπαλον nem εὐθυρι 

ηροκ... — the Circumstantial here is really coordinated to the adverb phrase.

Gen. 41:1ff. ἅταννοε εἰσωμι menencais εβόλ Ἴν-

ειαρο εἰδαίωον ἱενποικοτ ὁρογ εἰσωμ ἱεννοτα-

UIViewController — added description.

Ex. 34:7 πινιῖς τι ναὶ ὁρογ πιατεθήνος (sic) ὁρογ εὑρετε... 

Deut. 2:21 ἐνάλη ὁρογ εὐράυω.

nem does not coordinate clauses as such, but as adverbal or nominal commutables, as word-class paradigms. This is a key factor of its functional nature. In Ex. 10:25 ἀλλα nem ἡθοκ ἕκεν ἔκεν 

ηγανείλα ναν we seem to have yet another juncturally definable, homonymous, third nem entity, a focussing morph — proclitic like ὁρογ, but not clause-oriented, here prefixed to the whole pronoun + verb clause complex, focussing the pronoun.

Obs.

(1) The prenominal alternant of the preposition nem-/ nemα-, e.g. as part of a valency matrix of a verb, is a structurally distinct homonym of the connector; this is, in fact, an application of a junctural-profile criteria to establish identity. Gen. 39:2 ἡσαρ-πᾶτ 

εὴ nem ἰωκτ, Gen. 37:4 εὐπερατὶ ἐκενειὼν ὡμον ἅμετοστο 

νάτανδομ ἀτ ν έ ειασζι νημαγ, Gen. 40:4 ὁρογ αἰνίνοστ ταγωτ nem 

ἰωκτ, Gen. 45:1 ὁρογ νεμον-ταὶ ὡγ ἑράτη nem ἰωκτ. See Andersson 1904:94.

(2) Ernst 1994 is a cogent discussion of the junctural significance of coordination in Sahidic Coptic and in LE: the distinction between lexemic and determinator coordination is crucial, and of considerable theoretical significance. I readily agree with what Ernst’s words (104ff.) about the lexical charge of ἀρσω, which is far from expressing “simple coordination” (“simple coordination” is a phantom anyway). The relationship of mn- and ἀρσω is still not entirely clear (96ff.): generally speaking, mn-/εἰ- are unmarked, ἀρσω 

marked coordination.

(3) Kasser 1995 examines the possibility that ἀρσω (in Sahidic as well as in other dialects?) is proclitic, on the basis of suprasegmental-prosodic arguments. I believe Boh. ὁρογ is of closer juncture with its following segment than the connector (not the preposition) nem.

(4) Outside the corpus, Bohairic nem is used disjunctively between interrogative clauses: Mal. 2:14 (B4) ἐθυριστι κατὰ εὐρετε ὀττὼκ nem ὀστετεκζιμι.
(d) *ie-* as disjunctive coordinator:

The Greek-origin (or Egyptian/Greek merger?) ἦ (ἡ), important in Sahidic as it is in other dialects (e.g. Oxyrhynchite), does not occur in our Bohairic corpus; but the proclitic element *ie-*, which has at least two other homonyms, one interrogative — see Chapter One above — and one apodotic-superordinating, links disjunctively like ἦ; *ie* is very versatile, even more than most coordinators, in its application:

All determinators are disjoovable by *ie*:

zero — *niben* *ie*- zero — *niben* Ex. 35:29.

πι- *ie*- πι- Ex. 22:5.

Φ- *ie*- Φ- Ex. 21:26.

ου- *ie*- ου- Gen. 44:8.

κε- *ie*- κε- Gen. 31:14.

zero — *ie*- zero — Gen. 44:19.

Gen. 31:14 ἡνί οὐν-κετοι κοζίν ναν *ie*-κεκληρο-νομία.

Gen. 31:43 οὐ *κε* περιναίιι ηνασερί μφοιν *ie*-νοσώμπρι ετάρμακεν.

Lev. 13:30 οὐδομαίεμεν οὐν ονεογετ *ntε*τάψει *ie*-ονεογετ οὐν ονεογορή.

Lev. 5:1 *ie*- ἄναν *ie*-άγεμι επιγαβ.

Ex. 28:43 ενναί εζον κεκλην ... *ie*-ενναί εζον εσεμωί.

Lev. 5:2 ... ετσαζέμεν *ie*-ετμωορτ.

Lev. 13:24 ...ετήμοροε *ie*-ετημάσετολομε εφερεσήμως.

Non-Rhetorical interrogative clauses are often disjoined by *ie-:*

Gen. 32:17 λα ο Φα-νίν *ie*-αγκα εθών.

Also Gen. 37:8, 43:7, 44:16.

Conjunctive *ie*- Conjunctive Ex.22:10, Lev.25:14, 5:3, 13:19, Deut. 24:3


Like οσος and perhaps unlike οίμ, *ie-* enters close juncture with the added/disjoined segment, which is thus marked for disjunction.

4.2.3 The bracketing link

A segment governing a unit of more than one segment (e.g., in coordination by κέμ) is defined as initial in a domain frame of bracketed juncture prevailing in its scope. Evidently, it is opposed as closer juncture in a binary paradigm to the looser-juncture repetition of the same segment. Bracketing by a segment reveals, not its autonomy or relative
importance, but its *nulearity within its bracketing scope*. The bracketing element establishes juncture hierarchy, scope and Domain Frame, for a specific “island” of close or closer juncture. Some striking instances of bracketing:

(a) Bracketing determinators. Here, the *nota relationis* *n*- and the relative or Circumstantial converters are typical exponents of bracketed juncture linkage:

Ex. 34:7 πινιωτ ἃ τ ὁ ο ὅ ὁς πιαλτεννος (sic, sic) ὁς ὁς ἐκαρε.

Ex. 23:7 πεττοτβννοτ ὁς ὁς ηνμνι.

Deut. 8:15 πυλαε πινιωτ ἄ τεθμναι ετοι ετοι νγοτ.

Following the indefinite article, the basic tense replaces rarely the Circumstantial, and *zero* article the *nota relationis* + *zero*:

Num. 14:12 ονσιωτ νένονος ὁς ὁς ναβωει (Vat enασωηι). Lev. 26:1 γαμνοτνκ νΔιος ορε θυθε.

Obs.
(1) Cases like Ex. 3:22 γανκενος νγοτ νεμ γαμνοτ are not instances of bracketing linkage (by lexeme), but of delimiting repeated determinator as a referential pro-form representing the noun phrase.
(2) *σκ* ὁς *σκ* *σκ* *σκ* *σκ* *σκ* *σκ* *σκ*. Ps. 68:30, 69:6, 85:10, apparently always thematic in NS.

(b) Bracketing possessive pronoun (see Chapter Three):

Gen. 31:43 νοτι ... νεμ ναωει.
Ex. 10:1 πεφγτ νεμ νεφαλωσι.

(c) Bracketing *ν* *ν* *ν* *ν* *ν* *ν*:

Num. 22:18 ειαν ηνονιει νιωτ.
Num. 13:31 ντωτεν νεμ νεναυηπι "yours and your children’s”.

Non-coordinative *nota relationis* bracketing — note the *lemniscus*:

Ex. 8:10 αίτω ηνωνοτ + ηννοτ.
Ex. 3:8 εφζατ νερωτ + νεμ εβιω + (= Vat).
Ex. 35:31 μαρι μπνενμα νκατ + νεμ κοφια + νεμ οσκατ + νεμ οσπικθημ.
Gen. 25:2 ακμίκι νακ νηεμπαν *νεμ* *ιεζαν* *νεμ* *μααν* *νεμ* *μααιαν* *νεμ* *ιεκβοκ* *νεμ* *ζωτε*.

(d) Bracketing prepositions (the most common case of bracketing juncture); apparently, only in cases of matching determination of the bracketed terms.
This, continuing early pre-Coptic Egyptian syntax, is a special idiomatic phrasal case (as also revealed by the punctuation: see here some typical cases, and more below); seemingly occurring only with pronouns/Proper Names; "οστῳ ἡμ...", in opposition to "οστε-ἡμ ὁστε-". It is used to mark hierarchical structure in group coordination (the latter construction often, but not invariably, responding to the repetition of the preposition in Greek).

οστῳ ἡμ ἐκακ = Gen. 16:5, 23:15, 31:44 (Greek ἄνα μέσον ἐμοῦ καὶ σοῦ).

οστῳο στοι ἢκωβ Gen. 30:36 (Greek ἄνα μέσον αὐτῶν καὶ ἄνα μέσον Ἐκακ).

οστῳ ἡμ ἢκωβ = Gen. 30:36 (Greek τῆς διαθήκης αὐτοῦ προς...).

οστῳ • ἡμ ἐκακ = Gen. 9:12:15 (Greek ἄνα μέσον ἐμοῦ καὶ ὑμῶν καὶ ἄνα μέσον πάσης ψυχῆς...).

As opposed to

οστῳ = Gen. 9:17.

οστῳν = Gen. 26:28 (Greek ἄνα μέσον ὑμῶν καὶ ἄνα μέσον σου).

οστῳ ἡμ ἐκακ ἡμ ἐκακ = Gen. 17:10 (Greek ἄνα μέσον ἐμοῦ καὶ ὑμῶν καὶ ἄνα μέσον τοῦ σπέρματος...): 11 (Greek ἄνα μέσον ἐμοῦ καὶ ὑμῶν).

οστῳ: ἡμ: οστῳκ = Gen. 17:2 (Greek ἄνα μέσον ἐμοῦ καὶ ἄνα μέσον σοῦ).


JUNCTURE FEATURES

οττε-νιμανενεωσ... = nem: οττε: νιμανενεωσ... Gen. 13:7

Note here the pertinent absence of bracketing for looser juncture as oppositum (token exx.):

επαμα nem επακαπι Gen. 30:25.
ζεν- nem ζεν- Gen. 31:33, Deut. 11:18.
νκαφη nem νκωκ Num. 21:7.
εβολ ζεν- nem εβολ ζεν- Deut. 11:13.

Examples for non-pertinent (asymmetrical) cases:

Ex. 10:16 μπεμβο μπετε nem ερωτεν.
Num. 10:8 χανερ nem χανετεναζωσ.

(e) Bracketing converter: rare in Bohairic.

(1) Relative ("the Relative carried on") — bracketing οτρογ-coordination of affirmative or negative, identical or non-identical conjugation forms:

ετ-[αρ- οτρογ αρ-] Gen. 13:4, 31:13, Deut. 32:6 — the boundary of ετ ≠ α- (BASE) is very different from the one of ετ ≠ Theme (PRESENT/FUTURE), where no bracketing is attested.

ετε-[μπατ- οτάε μπατ- οταε μπατ-] Deut. 4:28.
ετε-[νακ- αν οταε νατ-...αν] Deut. 8:16.
ετε-[ναπετεν- οτρογ ναπετεν-] Deut. 32:38.
ετε-[μπατ- οτρογ μμον-] Num. 20:5.
ετε-[νεε- ...αν οταε μπορ-] Deut. 11:2.

The case of ετ- (1ε/οτρογ/nem — / Ø) ετ- converting the Present or Να- Future (e.g. Gen. 2:9, 41:7:27, Ex. 4:18, Lev. 5:2, 11:3:4, Num. 24:15f., Deut. 10:17, 14:6, 32:5) is non-pertinent — this is a conditioned delimitation, since ετ- does not bracket the unconverted durative pattern. However, we do rarely find the Circumstantial as conversion-base in such cases:

Gen. 41:4 τγε εταίωσον σεννοτσμοτ οτρογ ερσομ σεννοτσαπ.

Note also the cases of coordinated basic, unconverted tense following the relative (in coordination to a Cleft Sentence as a whole, not to the Relative form):

Ex. 33:14 Ανοκ εναμοωι δαμωκ οτρογ ταμετον Νακ (Vat Ανοκ ταμοωι). Compare also:
Ex. 2:22 ὑπὸ γράμματες ἐτοι οἱ οὐσιοί ἐν ἀναγμετ...

Deut. 21:17 φαί ταρχή τοῦ δὲ οὗτος επεκέφαλος ἐνεγκλήματα (Greek καὶ τοῦτο καθήκει, i.e. focal arrangement) (= Vat), where ετ- is topical to the Focus φαί in a coordinated Cleft Sentence.

In Deut. 8:15 πώλησε πνιωτῇ ετέμματα, οὗτος ετοί νεοτ Throwable relative, which may arguably be a case of repeated (delimiting) converter following ετέμματα, is in all probability coordinated to πνιωτῇ.

Obs.
(1) Here is, I believe, an important junctural issue — again, not matched by any formal distinction in the Greek original — which really concerns the boundary of converters with their converted tense-forms, no less than any subsequent boundaries within its scope: “ετερεφε—here makes an environment in which coordination of infinitive lexemes is compatible” (Bentley Layton, letter of 19/7/98 to propos Shenoute ed. Leip. IV 43 ος ετερεφεῦ σωμής τους). (2) Bracketing by base, well attested in Sahidic (Cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 1986a:161f., 2004) is rare in the corpus: consider in Sahidic even bracketing by base + negative (pron. actor): Shenoute (ed. Young 1993) 50 ερμανθμως τους αὐτούς ἀποzą; or nominal actor + Contingent Future auxiliary: ibid. τειμεντᾶκε ετέμματα ἀπομένει τοις αὐτούς ενθρ.

(2) Circumstantial
Converter repeated: this is the normal construction, hence not a delimitation:

ἐνακτὶ ἐντος ἐνακτὶ Deut. 2:21.
ἐκ- ἐν ψως ἐκ- ἐνας- Deut. 6:7.
ἐν- ἐτος- Deut. 11:19.

In Gen. 6:5 εταθνὰς οὖς-πος φίνικας τοῦ πτερωματικοῦ ξεσαλωσία εἰςεπικαρές, ὁτος ὁτος ὁμοιος εφρακίς θεοποιήθη (Vat ἔρακι), ὁτος ὁμοιος + Circumstantial is the nexal actant of ἐν- , coordinated to enikakia ἡ- α-σαλωσία.

(f) Bracketing conjunction-base (a unique instance: cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 1986a:161f. for Shenoute):

μὴπως πτερως πεκνοτῇ ἀμπτὶ ἐνημίος ἐποκ Deut. 6:15 (= Vat) — the close juncture between the action expressions in the Greek μὴ...δργισθείς θυμώθη is possibly the trigger for the Coptic construction.
(g) Bracketing מָה (Assertive Focal Question), bracketed clauses:

מָה תָּנְוִק מַיְהַמָּה תָּנְוִק מַיְהַ- Num. 11:12.

(h) Not bracketing, i.e., always delimiting by repeated segments: conditioned no-opposition cases. This is as significant and instructive as the bracketing construction:

3. Converters with Durative Pattern: Ex. 28:35, Deut. 11:19 etc.; also, practically speaking, all bases, יָטָפָ- neg. imperative (Deut. 31:6) and so on.
4. יָ- before infinitive (which thus proves to be distinct from the preposition יָ-): Ex. 32:6, Num. 21:11, Deut. 10:12.

4.2.4 Referential linkage and cohesion: phorics

This is the prime and major grouping of linkage and cohesion phenomena, seemingly perhaps the most banal, where linkage seems iconic. It is often conceived of as cohesion tout court, and yet, it is complicated, sophisticated, high-ranking and rich in implications, and not at all adequately charted.

Cohesion linkage is often effected by pronominal — representative (יהוּדָא), כְּ, כְּנָה, etc.), deictic (the case of יָ- or יָּדַי), or pro-formal (הָוָן, הֶזְזָי, הֶזְזָי הָוָן - etc.) — phoricity.

The difference between the deictic anaphors and the representative ones is considerable. The latter include an echo signal of the referate’s constitutive properties — gender, number, specificity — which is essential for identifying the referate, omitting its lexemic content, while the former may concord with the indicated element, but this agreement is not rigorous.

Linkage is the functional essence of these elements. Gender and number, and to a great extent specificity, are in Coptic the main categorial parameters of all cohesive operators within the scope of cohesion. The difference between the “text-internal discourse world” and the “text-external” one (LAMBERCHT 1996:36ff.) is that only in the former case we are concerned with linkage proper: not all reference is juncturally significant. The very multifariousness of phoric devices implies the variety of linkage types.
Obs.
(1) Cf. Harweg 1979, Ehlich 1983, Schiffrin 1990; Kleiber 1992; Morel and Danon-Boileau (eds.) 1992, Cornish 1996 — all on the distinction and mutual relationship of deixis and anaphora, a controversial central issue. Generally speaking, deixis is hierarchically higher; anaphora/cataphora — relationships obtaining between elements co-occurring in the text — a textual and textural application of deixis. (A striking case of sophisticated text-deictic application is näq- nē, a normal Comment Mode carrier in narrative, in its basically anaphoric and delocutive linkage to the Evolution Mode carriers näq- and näq-, see Chapter One).
(2) Nominal, lexical, Proper-Name cohesion is common in the corpus, but is not studied here; cf. Harweg 1979:263ff., 286ff., Shisha-Halevy 1989a: §§2.4, 2.4.2.

4.2.4.1 Anaphoric reference: a miscellany

(a) Anaphoric reference to determinators in noun syntags: hyperphrasal, hypernexual scope (see also above, and Chapter Three).

(1) The reference to non-zero determinators neutralizes specificity/particularity grading:

Deut. 2:12 πιθορρηγος näqʊn ēnchιp.
Gen. 20:3 ἕτρωμι ētakolac.
Num. 31:50 φρωμι ētaqši noqκekoc nnoτb — reference to the metaphoristic “naming” determinator is uncommon.
Gen. 39:2 ουτρωμι ... eq†mατ.
Ex. 3:22 ἀλλα ēcεeεeτιn nδε-οτρωμι nοτc nτεeεeεe nēm τεcεφeπi...

The postulation of two, masculine and feminine, oτ- homonyms is probably unavoidable, in view of the divergence of oται and oτι, of which oτ masc and oτ fem are proclitic allomorphs:

Lev. 27:33 oται eνανεq δανοται epqwοτ.
Deut. 21:15 (qωμι χnοτ†) oτi mμwοτ epqmei mμoc oτi mμwοτ epqmoτ† mμoc.

And especially in view of the gender-characterized anaphoric reference, which, here too, is formally to the nuclear determinator (Chapter Three, see esp. 3.0.1-4).

(2) Especially striking is the fluctuating feminine/masculine/plural reference to the nuclear zero article, even with “feminine” (i.e. feminine-determinator-compatibility) lexemes, of Egyptian or Greek extraction: this is a true syntactical “neuter” in the neutralization sense, and proves [Nucleus to Expansion] to be a distinct Juncture Domain Frame (see [2]):

Gen. 31:19 κερμi eτνοης.
Gen. 6:12:17 καρπ ηνibεn εeψηq mpeqwmwit.
Gen. 6:15 καρπ ηνibεn eτeθoτon-πna nwnς nςhtq.
Num. 6:7 υψηq ηνibεn eαqmoτ.
Obs.
(1) See Shisha-Halevy 1986a:145ff. with further references; for Demotic, Shisha-Halevy 1989b:38ff. Apparently, the first to observe on this extraordinary feature of Coptic was Jernstedt (see his posthumously edited Isole dovani a, pp. 553-9).
(2) The resumption of naben is a difficult issue. Ex. 12:16 qwb niben ... nntenaitos (see already Schwartz and Steinthal 1850:478) certainly differs from Gen. 6:15 cap niben eteoton-pia nnwn6 nshytq or Num. 6:7 ptxh niben eaqmot in Juncture Domain Frame, but probably also in the status of niben itself — "all" or "any", the latter quantifier with zero determination of the lexeme. Consider -niben + sgl. Deut. 11:24, Num. 31:51, Lev. 16:17, 18:23; niben + pl. Gen. 7:15, Lev. 7:26f., Num. 31:17.

(3) Nil (not zero, since conditioned) actantial reference to non-nuclear zero determination, proving cases of [Noun to Actantial Resumption], in particular Topic representation in the Rheme, to be distinct Juncture Domain Frames (see [1]):

Gen. 43:31f. (xa-wiq ejphi) atxw 'apaq mmatatq orog atxw 'aprov mmatatot atxw 'aprov nnpemnuxmi mmatatot.
Num. 11:13 m6 • aq • nan eotwm.
Num. 20:5 mmon-mwoq ecw.
Deut. 9:9:18 wiq mposowm mwoq mpicw, sim. Ex. 16:8, Deut. 9:1, 29:6 (!)
Deut. 2:6 3pe de epecenewyp...
NB: Gen. 3:2 eboal xen pottaq nteniwyn nteppearacic tenaoqwm (Bodmer III + eboal nqhtot, resumption to topicalized adverb).

Some slots simply do not allow zero as a commutable:
Deut. 8:3 naperipwmi nawnds eqiq mmatatq an — Augens.
Deut. 16:4 nne-temhr oronq eboal — reflexive object actant.
Deut. 1:16 podmi ... pofcon — possessive article.
Ex. 23:7 pettobnwoq orog nomq nnekdgeboeq — representative resumption of pet-.

Obs.
See Andersson 1904:8f.; contrast the resumption of indefinite determination in De Vis I 192 otq mpoqotomq othpq mpeqcoq.

The representation of, and linkage to, topical zero-determined lexemes that are constituents of compound verbs, in the alternant to the Tautological Infinitive construction (Chapter Two), are different:
Num. 8:26 gb db neqepgw..

Outside the corpus, cf. (AM I 113 woswoswe pw ṭnaepwoswe še neqepgw; the placement of pw is here conditioned, and the focussing is probably of the nexus itself).

(b) Interlocutive cohesion: anaphoric reference to interlocutive pronouns.

(1) In Cleft Sentence: *interlocutive overrules delocutive*. The issue is of general interest because of the interlocutive/delocutive referential tension and the associated non-phoricity of the interlocutives: repeating an interlocutive pronoun is much like repeating a lexeme, or rather a Proper Name, as a cohesive device; it is of lower cohesion:

Gen. 7:1 nəok petainat epok.
Ex. 19:4 nwotən petəpetennat.
Gen. 31:39 anok enai ḫ eboal qitot.

(Outside the corpus: De Vis II 266, 267 anok pe etapqət otorpit).

(2) Neutralization of locutive/delocutive: expansion of interlocutive Nominal-Sentence Rheme:

Gen. 27:11 anok de anok-otrəwe eqəhn.

(3) The scope of thros: overrule of person by number, person-neuralizing plural Augens:

Ex. 12: 33 anon thros tennamos (Vat add. thren).
Deut. 5:3 nemwotən nwotən thros.

Obs.


(3) Textual transition from interlocutive to delocutive characterizes the "narrative projection of Allocation": Ex. 4:6 neqəpəq de naq on de gitekəq eleqtn dqəwtk otoq aqqiteqəq eleqtn dqəwtk...
(c) Antecedent resumption: zero vs. non-zero resumption of nucleus in adnominal clause (attributive Relative or adnexal Circumstantial). This is a basic junctural environment, paradigmatically revealing two different links, looser and closer respectively.

(1) Generally speaking, zero resumptions, of high importance in Coptic, constitute a complicated variety: referential zero (e.g. zero actants, to zero determinator); conditioned zero; conjunctival construction with antecedent grammaticalization vs. lexical antecedent; or non-referential zero (e.g. actantial, as in Num. 5:8 μμοντεπιρωμι... γεωδε ετ).

(a) Zero resumption with zero marking adverbial status — an eminent instance of junctural significance: adnominal vs. conjunctival constructions (ετι- "wh-", vs. ετι- "that")?. The grammaticalization of the lexeme is both cause and effect of the "conjunctivalization" of the construction.

ΦΡΗ‡, (παι)ΡΗ‡ (see also special discussion below):
Deut. 7:19 μΦΡΗ‡ εταθενκ εβολ...

Beside ΦΡΗ‡, temporal and local lexemes are found, all in formally marked adverbial status themselves, with no resumption, but a casual adverbial marking of the Relative pronoun, in the Greek, unless the relative is overruled by external syntax ("attraction"). In Coptic, we find two constructions:

Zero anaphor:
Gen. 2:4 ...μπιεγοσ εταθεν Φ οαιιο ινθε... - non-initial-position temporal noun, ι- marked for adverbial status. Sim. Gen. 5:1.
Gen. 30:41 αρωμι δε σεπικοθ εμαρθιρωσ ... Νεε-νιεωσ.
Ex. 10:6 ιεζεπιεγοσ εταθωμι γιζεπικαθι sim. Deut. 4:32
Ex. 9:24 ...σεπικαθι ινεχμι ιεζεπιεγοσ εταθωνος ωμι γιωτ.
Num. 9:1 σενεμπρομπι κνοιρετ εταθ εβολ σεπικαθ ινχμι.
Lev. 7:35 σεπιεγοσ εταθενος εκοτ.
Lev. 19:6 σεπιεγοσ ετεθνασωτ εζεκομυ.
Gen. 3:5 πιεγος ετετεναισωμ εβολ γμοη γενασωμν
νεω-νετενβαλ — a case of casus adversialis.
Non-zero (γμοη=) resumption:
Gen. 5:2 μπιεγος ετανκισιωσε γμοη.
Deut. 4:10 πιεγος ετετεννοπι ερατεν θηνοτ γμοη.
Gen. 21:8 δεπιεγος εταττοτιε ιεακ πευψρι γμοη.
Num. 30:16 μενενκαπιεγος ετασκωτεμ γμοη.
Num. 14:40 πιτουο εταπεκι δοκ ναν ιε-αηερνοβι.
Num. 33:54 πιοται πιοται ειφμα ετεπερπαν ναε εζωπ.
Gen. 16:14 Name of well: "τωπω τ εταινατ γμαμεολ".
πιτποπς/πιμα ... γμας Deut. 12:21, 26:2 etc.

Two examples are, I believe, especially instructive in this context:
In Gen. 39:6 γωβ νιβεν εμακιτοσ γαρεπεκεγ κοτεν-νεψ-
διακ it is the zero resumption of the Topic alone that signals the adver-
bial status of γωβ νιβεν: “in every thing”; while in
Gen. 50:5 νεψρι ςενπιμιγατ ετασκοκι νεν ... ερετε-
θομετ γμας, the topical adverbial νεψρι ςενπιμιγατ ... is
sumed by the focal anaphoric pro-adverb γμας, instructing us as to the
potential resumption paradigm of topical preset adverbials, as well as
their very topicality.

Obs.
See Larsson 1990 passim. esp. 187ff. on zero anaphor with temporal-quantitative nuclei
in Italian. However, the homonymy of the relative-with-zero-anaphora and the conjun-
tional/general subordinator prevailing in Romance does not obtain in Coptic.

(d) Allocated — Response referential linkage and cohesion: γμον, 
μφη, γε, etc. — anaphoric marked Response forms: see above, Chapter
One, 1.2.4.

Note: Gen. 44:19f. zero article (question) to ον- (answer): αν-
οντοντετεν-ιωτ γμας ιε- 
γονταν ιορρελλο
νις γμας γραμ
οταλογ...

(e) Delocutive reference may be disrupted by a noun, at the turning-
point between cata- and anaphoric reference:
Ex. 32:1 αποβατ ιενηπιλλαο εζεν-ιαπον οτογ πε-
ζων γαν.

4.2.4.2 The “neuter gender” signifié, in an overruling morpho-syntac-
tical signification — grammatical gender has primarily cohesion func-
tion — and a signifiant homonymous with the feminine singular. (This
is different from the masculine/feminine/plural fluctuation signifié observed above for the anaphora to a zero article). Its phoricity vector is neutralized; indeed, its very phoricity and link nature is problematic at times, when it seems a mere slot filler. Note the following examples:

Deut. 21:14 ὥσος εἰσήμω πι ἀπόστολοι, εἰσῆκα εἶναι εἶσθαι — cataphoric, contrasted with anaphoric feminine.

Ex 33:16 πᾶς εἰσήμων τοῦ ἄνθρωπον ἐντολής ἡ ἰδιωτικὴ προσοχὴν τοῦ ἄνθρωπον — cataphoric.

Gen. 15:6 αὐνά ἐν ξενοδότῳ ἐφ’ ἀλόγων νὰ ἔσον ἑσόμην — anaphoric to a specific segment or, fuzzily, to foregoing information.

Deut. 18:14 ἱππότης ὁ μαθητής — anaphoric.

Lev. 5:1 εὕρω ὁ ἐντολή ἐποιήσαντί ἐστιν ... ὥσος ὁ ὑπάρχων ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ ἐδείκτη ποιήσαντι εἰς ἑσόμην ἑπισκόπου ἀπόστολος ἐπισκόπου — anaphoric.

Ex. 35:5 ἀποστολὴν στὸν ἀποστόλα ὑπάρχων ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ ἐντολής ἐστὶν ἐντολής ... (Greek πᾶς ὁ ἐξαρμούμενος...) — anaphoric?

Ex. 25:2 στὸν ἄνθρωπον τοῦ ὄντος ἐποιήσαντι ἐστὶν ἐποιήσαντι — phoric?

Num. 21:16 ἑταὶ ἐν ἀποστόλῳ ἔκκαθιστός ἐν ἀποστόλῳ ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ οὗ ἐντευξάμενος ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ ἐντευξάμενος — anaphoric feminine merges with cataphoric neuter reference.

Cataphoric are cases like:

thic εἰρήκη- Num. 21:23.

thic ... ἑπροφήτευσα Num. 11:29.

(Θαῦ) εἰνὲκε ἐν ἱστάει ... Deut. 21:17.

nanec + Conjunctive Ex. 14:12.

nanec + ε- Ininitive Gen. 29:19.

nanec nan εαν- Num. 11:8.

cεκατεύχεται ἐστὶν + Ininitive Gen. 23:8.

cνεκατεύχεται + Conjunctive Gen. 44:7.

Ex. 10:10 μαρεσκατεύχεται μπαίρητα.

Deut. 16:9 ενεκεράθης ἐν Γενέσει.

εξακτοπολογήσαμεν τῷ ἔπαι ε- Num. 5:19 etc. — the systemic absence of *εξακτοπολογήσαμεν τῷ ἔπαι ε- or *εξακτοπολογήσαμεν τῷ ἔπαι ε- brings home the linking role and nature of this formal pronoun, which mediates between the verb lexeme and quoted text, in a typologically significant cataphoric buffer between lexeme and clause.

Rare instances of the masculine significant for the neuter may usually be accounted for:
Num. 9:15:16 οσον ηγαναρωτει ναψχη γίζεντεςκεννη 
μφηθενοσκμοτηναρωμ…παρεθηναψωπονενχοσ

(-γ=πιναννα?)

Gen. 1:18 οσον ηγανατηνςε-φενε-νανεφ (= Vat) (no ana-
phora in the Greek ὃτι καλὸν)

Gen. 15:4 ...οσον κατωτη ασμη ητεπςε ....

Obs.

Demotic, from Ryl. IX on, has also the formal feminine signifying neuter gender, not only
pronominally and phorically but also as the gender of a Relative form (t3-ntj- as the con-
tinuation of the early Egyptian relative-stem-suffixed -t-: merr.f, mrt.n.f). This formal
feminine varies or alternates with the masculine. Consider the following examples (see
1993)99 136633 x+14 t3-ntj-jw.w r-hn-s “what they will instruct”. 15530 x+6f. t3-ntj-jw.w
r- jr.: s n f jw.w r jr- s n j “what they will do to him, they will do to me”, Ryl. IX 10/16 (cf.
Vittmann 1996:409, 454) rh t3-ntj-jw NN dd n-jmn.s “know what NN says”, and even,
fully grammaticalized, Dem. P. Berlin 13634+23681 a/b x+2 n-t3-ntj-jw.f r jj n-jmn.s
j jr.hrt.in “the moment he comes to you” lit. “in that he will come”. Note the feminine
overrule (see below, for the Coptic correspondents) in Topic status, Dem. P. Berlin 15619
verso 1 p3-ntj-jw.f r dd j j jr- s “whatever he will say, do it”’. J. Fr. Quack draws my at-
tention to several others, including Setne I 4/18 jh p3-ntj-jw.j(r) ddj.s n.f. Berlin 15619 is
inconclusive, since the pron. object is not the suffix-pronoun, but the “dependenl” pronoun,
indifferent to gender (J. Fr. Quack). The masculine is found as NS-Theme (πετεν- πε):
Dem. P. Berlin 13633 verso 18 p3-ntj-mtr hr.w p3y. and Dem. P. Berlin 13634+23681 a/b
x+5 r-h-n p3-hb.w n t n n-jmn.f “according to what has been sent to you”.

4.2.4.3 Anaphoric linkage to the indefinite article: three junctures.

(a) In non-nuclear slots (especially actantial or prepositional), pro-
nominal linkage is always specific, by delocutive personal or demonstra-
tive pronoun. Anaphoric reference to the particular indefinite article (“a
particular instance of...”) is thus specific, exactly like the link to a defi-
nite article:

Gen. 21:6 οσον ονεβι αναιοη νηο νανε-πςε — a distinctive Junc-
ture Domain Frame: cf. Chapter Two for this focalization pattern. See
also Gen. 34:7.

Ex. 32:32 ινεκ λωκαποτνυβι νωον οβολ ιε χαο.

When the indefinite article is non-particular i.e. generic, an object
actant has zero anaphor, but slots not allowing zero still show the same
specific pronoun:

Gen. 28:20 ...ντεπη λοτωκ νηο εοιοομ νεο ονιο
νακλοατ ημον (= Vat).

39 Cf. editor's note, p. 4 "Ungenauigkeit bei den neutrich gemeinten Suffixen".
Deut. 24:12 ὁσῇκῃ ἀνεκεκοτος σένπεκβος — topicalization Juncture Domain Frame. Cf. also Gen. 31:38f.

(b) An anaphoric indefinite article represents as nucleus an entire foregoing indefinite noun syntagm:

Deut. 25:14 οὐνιῶτι μμεντ ἵν ὁ τοῖ ὅτοι.
Ex. 3:22 γὰνκεποκ νγατ ἵν γάννοιβ.
Deut. 28:36:64 γάνκενοιτ ἵν τακε ἵν γάνωνι.

(a) οὐτὶ / γανοτον (outside the corpus) represent an indefinite noun syntagm or a lexeme as Rheme in a Nominal Sentence:

Apoc. 2:2:9 γαναποκτολοκ νε ... γανοτον ἀν νε.
But in II Cor. 11:22 γανεβπαλο νε ... ἀνοκ ἵν — the reference, anaphoric to the entire nexus, is zeroed.

Obs.

Job (ed. Porcher) 4:19 γανή νομι ετε ἵν ανον γων ἀνον-γανεβολ σέν-

παὶμι νοτοτ seems an awkward resumptive construction, but is in fact the only one systemically available — note the delimitation ετε ἵν ανον γων... marking this relative as distinct; this is also manifest in the very compatibility of zero-determination ομι and ετε-

4.2.4.4 The case of μφρτ, παηρτ reveals a sophisticated set of representative constructions:

(a) Linkage: masculine “regular” anaphoric actantial representation in relative clause of ἰη/παη-ρτ as antecedent:

παηρτ πε ετεκελικ and similar, Gen. 21:11, 27:9, 26:29, Ex. 23:1.

Gen. 27:8 μφρτ ετεγένντων εροκ.
Gen. 27:19 μφρτ ετξεκαζὶ πνεμι Μμοκ.

(a’) replaces the masculine by what must be a fuzzily text-resumptive neutric feminine, yet may simultaneously mark the grammaticalization (“conjuncturalization”) of μφρτ:

κατα/μ-μφρτ εταιικ Gen. 8:21, 19:8, Lev. 24:19, Deut. 2:29 etc.

Ex. 8:9 καταμφρτ εταθαυ ναε-μωτχε sim. Num. 23:30, Ex. 7:22.

Gen. 19:31 μφρτ ετεκτηκ.
Ex. 8:8 καταμφρτ εταγεμνητ.
Num. 33:56 μφρτ ἅναιαικ νωοτ εἰεαικ νωτεν (= Vat!) is remarkable: n as Relative converter of νατ-.
Obs.
(1) W.-P. Funk (tentatively, in a letter of 22/5/98) "the reference to ἡβρήτι, if any, is regularly made by -c, not -q. The normal case is no resumptive pronoun at all, or at best something resembling the -c of ἄροι". Funk compares the "Crypto-Bohairic MS of Nag Hammadi VIII, 1 (Zostrianus), where the Sahidicized μπρογτε is regularly followed by μμος"... "You can easily say that only the first pronoun (αις) is really a reference to ἡβρήτι, while the second (αις) has a more general antecedent, a more lofty one ("things to be done", "do it" = "handeln"). Funk refers also to Deut. 1:22, 31:26. "at any rate, -c cannot refer to the article". I readily concur with this distinction of two grades of anaphora.

(b) Delimitation: delimitative zero clearly marking adverbial status:
Ex. 39:22 παρθήνα αἰμπρεν...
Num. 8:6 παρθήνα εκείρι̣ νωστὸν.
(b') zero "casus adverbialis" + fuzzily text-resumptive neutric feminine linkage: Num. 36:10 παρθήνα ἀσκαίκ.
Deut. 21:3 παρθήνα εκεκαίκ.
Num. 25:12 παρθήνα αἰμος.
(c) Zero resumption — uncommon in our corpus:
Deut. 7:19 μφρην εταφενκ ἐβολ...

4.2.4.5 The "neutric feminine overrule" seems to account for some striking constructions of ἀλα "say" and probably other verbs (see above, §4.2.4.2 Obs. for Demotic antecedents, and §4.2.4.4 Obs. 1, for the feminine anaphor following πιἀρήνι).

Gen. 22:3 ἀντι ἐπίμα ς ταφήν άροι ναυ.
Gen. 43:2 πίσσελον εταπετενδος.
Ex. 8:9 καταφήνι εταφήν άροι ναυ-μωσχε (see above for ἡβρήν).

4.2.4.6 The {φαϊ} link is opposed to the delocutive personal pronoun. The former occurs in the corpus in the role of a deictic anaphoric exponent, while the latter is a non-deictic representant. {φαϊ} either
(a) reflects a demonstrative of the Greek original:
Gen. 42:6 ἰωσθφ ναφον ναμκαν επικαρι οτιφ φαι ναφτ ἐβολ... (Greek οὕτος), contrast 42:7 νωστὸν λε πεδος (Greek ο性价).
Num. 5:13:14 οτιφ ντεκεοτοι νκοτ νεμακ... οτιφ ντε- ντεμπιγωβ οσων εβολ ναγρεννινβαλ μπεκαι... ί αι
JUNCTURE FEATURES

In accwq θαι Μπεκερβοκί οσον ἡτεορίνα νθογ 1 εξον ἑπεζα αοσον ἡτεξοξον ἐτεχθηκπι = θαι δε εκκον... (Greek αὖτις δὲ...).

Ex. 31:14 ἀργ ἐπανασβατον ἁε-Φαι ὑπαβ μπέε (Greek τοῦτο).

Num. 22:5 γνπνε ἰς ὀσολος αἡ εβολ δενχμη εοσον άνπωβε μηρο μπικαρι = οσον Φαι ἁοσοξ ζανζανλ (Greek και οὔτος...).

οσον Φαι ἡτεη - Lev. 5:4 (Greek και οὔτος...), sim. Lev. 5:1 and Chapter 11 passim (clean and unclean animals; Φαι... q- (τοῦτο); Ex. Chapters 37-38 passim Φαι ἁοθεμιο...etc. (Greek οὔτος ἑποίησεν...), or else, {Φαι}

(b) is an exponent of strongly delimitative Theme-switching; phoricizing (through gender/number cohesion) an adnominal relationship, calquing the gender/number linkage of the Greek Relative pronouns:

Ex. 8:18 Φαι ηνξεαθ νοςρόν ηωπ ηεζηηη (Greek ἐφ’ ής).

Ex. 21:8 εγωπ δε αξωτερπανη μπεκεε = οσον θαι ητεξημενοσας... (Greek ἧν).

Obs.
Ross 1996 suggests a scalar grading of discourse anaphors according to “referencing strength” for Latin qui hic ille, as symptomized by intervening current and non-current entities. Although Φαι is highly phoric, it is still delimitative, compared with the personal pronoun; νθογ δε is a still higher delimitation or lower linkage.

4.2.4.7 Reference juncture: examination of selected Juncture Domain Frames (JDFs)

4.2.4.7.1 [Antecedent to Relative clause]

(a) The four-term linkage Relative expansion paradigm: ετ- vs. {Φαι ετ-} vs. {Φη ετ-} vs. π-ετ- calls for some observations:

(1) adnominal {Φη ετ-} (only a sector of the functional spectrum of {Φη ετ-}): see here, Chapter Three, §3.7) constitutes an important delimitation — in fact, it is sometimes so regular and predictable that one may argue it is a zero-formal-nucleus link — gender-number-marking the Relative converter: as it were, formally speaking, a makeshift movable Relative pronoun, by means of a formal deictic nucleus. 40 The nuclear determinators to {Φη ετ-} are specific-phoric {πι-}, generic {π-} or indefinite-generic ος-, ζαν-. No zero determination is attested; the

40 Cf. (for Middle Welsh translated texts, where the Vorlage is Latin or Old French), the Relative converter a- and its phoric nucleus the gender number marked demonstratives yr lhwn, yr hon; see Shisha-Halevy 1995:142ff., esp. 145.
extent of antecedent phrase is unrestricted; the Relative-tenses paradigm is apparently unrestricted. Functionally, this delimitation corresponds to a higher rhematic independence of the Relative ("appositive"). The expansion is heavy in characterizing information: a rhematic amplification is "packaged" as adnominal. Diachronically, it is instructive to reflect that, again on the formal level, the ΦΗ component is here also the Coptic concording operator, seeing that the nuclear article replaces the pronominal-nuclear gender/number-exponent slot of the Semitic-type Egyptian adjective (ΦΗ in ΦΗ η to is indeed an "article", according to the junctural evaluation in ERMAN 1915:185):

\[ nfr-\emptyset > \pi\-\lambda\\lambda\\theta\\omicron\omicron\omicron \]
\[ nfr-\iota > \theta\omicron \ \epsilon\tau\n
link or rather looser delimitation, it is not easy to formulate its precise reference semantics in a sweeping general way. Note the following cases, where Φαι is either affective in rhetorical tone, or else cataphoric-characterizing (“such as...” — see Chapter Three):

Gen. 11:4 οτσπρος Φαι ετετεαφε ναωμπι ωσερπι ετφε.
Deut. 21:3 ουβαγι Φαι ετεμπεσεγρωβ.
Num. 14:8 πικαι Φαι ετζαν ιερωτ ιεμεβιω.

Following a highest-specificity primary deictic nai-nucleus, {Φαι et-} is conditioned, as a deixis concord index:

Ex. 4:17 ιαωβωτ Φαι ετεκναερναιμιηι ιερπι ινητη sim. Deut. 4:8, 19:1 etc.

Finally, {Φαι et-} may itself mark the interlocutive here-and-now point of reference:

Gen. 24:42 ιπωιτ Φαι τσνοτ ετμωηι ειωτη also Gen. 3:11, Ex. 10:11, 23:22 etc.

Ex. 32:7 ακεραιομιν ιαε-πεκαλονι Φαι ετακενοσ...
(Greek ους εξηγαγες) — contrast the unmarked

Deut. 9:29 πεκαλονι ινι ετακενοσ εβολ (Greek Rel. pronoun -plural); ινι concords (“ad-sensum”) with the whole phrase and not just with the determinator of πεκαλονι, but this may be motivated by the Greek ους.

(3) Adnominal πετ- is rare in the corpus, and is rather loosely linked to its nucleus. It is either non-neutric-appositive (a unique instance):

Gen. 19:19 ακερε-τεκμεθομι ερνιωτ ιπετεκκαιηι ιεμι
εορεταψηχι ωνσ (= Vat) (Greek ...την δικαίοσύνην ου ο ποιεις... with a “fuzzy” neutric concord).

Or it may be particular, specific by combination, appositive to a highly specific nucleus.

Deut. 28:58 ειπι ια Nico ιηροτ ιντεπαιεμοι ιετες-

Lev. 22:16:32 ανοκ πε πωκ πεπτερωπο μμωσ (not a Cleft Sentence!)

(b) Actor (Theme) actant in Relative clause, coreferent with antecedent (or, in the case of Cleft Sentence, with Focus + formal Theme) — anaphora to antecedent in the durative nexus pattern Relative clause.

(1) Affirmative nexus: no separate anaphora is the normal construction — the reference is in the “portmanteau” Relative morph, which is by the same token, properly speaking, a pronoun, not converter: both ac-
tor expression (Theme) and exponent of adnominal status of the nexus.

Deut. 20:19 ἔντεκοι ἐν ἑτὲρῳ...
Gen. 48:16 πιστεύεισ ἐν δομή ἡμῶν.

(2) Affirmative nexus: pronominal anaphor following the converter ἐτ- (very rare):

Ex. 22:11 ὁμαδερ ἄνθτ ἐν ἑταναῳ ὁτῶν ἔν ἡμῖ (Vat ἑτερκεψῳ).

This by now familiar case of non-zero anaphoric reference to the agens-coreferent antecedent in the Durative Conjugation is significant, inasmuch as it indicates and proves a synchronic non-pronominal (converter) status of ἐτ-, the last vestige of the historical Relative pronoun (in the specific-pronominal actor [Theme] slot) to assume full converter functioning\(^{41}\). Indeed, this completes — very late in the day — the converter status of the relative. However, it is from the junctural angle that the difference between the pronominal and converter constructions of ἐτ- is most pronounced. In fact, their difference is primarily junctural: the former links appositively with the antecedent and nexally with its Rheme (the ἐν- auxiliary Static in our example: -ἐτ+ἐν-,), while the latter is doubly and analytically linked to the antecedent, by converter morph and by anaphor, while being sharply delimited from the nexus: ἐτε[ς][q+ἐν-].

Obs.


(3) This construction is familiar from Demotic (cf. FRANDESEN 1991:30ff.), and is not a Coptic innovation, but (in Coptic at least) a feature of colloquial language: Theban Graffiti (ed. Jasnow, Gramm. Demotica 93, 97) 3446/7f. p3-ntj-jw.f m-tw.k (which would be Boh. φη ἐτεκντακ), alongside cases of Relative Future (p3-ntj-jw.f + infinitive).

(4) The synchronic variation of Relative pronoun and Relative converter would seem to correspond, diachronically, to a transition (often postulated in numerous languages, e.g.

\(^{41}\) The Relative, the youngest converter to evolve and indeed never entirely evolved, is also notable juncturally for being the most closely linked to its antecedent determinator — unlike all other converters, it is never initial, but always linked to a nominal or pronominal “prop”.
in Romance, Greek, Celtic and Semitic) from pronoun to converter. However, upon a closer look, it turns out to be almost always a case of coexistence — sometimes in different linguistic diastems, such as spoken and written varieties, different registers etc. — of the two very different function elements. This may well have been the case in Egyptian, as is suggested by the Demotic and attestation. For Romance, see Sornicola 1985:10ff. on the diachrony of the two types, especially in terms of spoken vs. formal-written language; Fiorentino 1997.

(3) Negative nexus: the \{zero...\an\} embracing negator includes a #zero# boundary that is reflected in the pronominal anaphor. Here the relative exponent is clearly converive, not pronominal (indeed, the negative construction may well have been one of the starting points or triggers of conversion syntax for \ntj\). We have here delimiting zero and a clear boundary:

Lev. 14:32 ΦΗ ἐτεχναζίμι αν.
Deut. 1:39 ΦΗ ἐτεκεσώταν αν ἀθόοτι πολαραθον ἱε-ορ-πεθοοτ.
Also Gen. 17:14, Deut. 18:19, 25:9 etc.

Obs. The case of Akhmimic and Lycopolitan zero -...\an\ (embracing) negation is especially striking, for the zero pre-negator is here junctorially evident as a boundary by the persistence of the prefix-pronoun series following the converters: ε-Ό-će-...\en\, ετε-Ό-će-...\en\, νε-Ό-će...\en\; see Nagel 1969:36b, 37; Funk 1987. The same boundary is revealed by the Bohairic anaphoric pronominal Theme pronoun in ετε-Ό-ｑ-...\an\.

(c) In the case of lexical identity of antecedent with the Relative clause — a figura etymologica with an infinitival antecedent or a deriv ing auxiliary as Relative verb — the JDF is concluded and marked for its final boundary by a formal conditioned “pro-lexemic” object-actant anaphor, viz. \mno\ or \e\, which does not belong to the valency matrix of the Relative verb but is extraneous to it:

Deut. 28:67 τγόντι ντεπεκρήν θή ετεκναεργοτ \mno\.
Deut. 28:53 πεκροξεξεξ ετεάναεξεξωξκ \mnoq\.
Lev. 5:6 Φνοβι εταξερνοβι \mnoq\.
Lev. 5:18 τεκμετατεμι εταξερμετατεμι \mnoq\.
Deut. 28:67 νικάν τή ετεκνασ ερωτοτ.

(d) The question of identity of referents is inevitable in delocutive pronominal reference. Here are a few selected but typical cases of interest; it will be seen that, out of the maximal three heterophoric referents, only one or two are found contained within the JDF:
Gen. 35:13 πίμα ἑταπ' καξίων ὄνεμα τ' ἡμοιώματι: 1, 2 — refers outside the juncture domain frame; 3 — inside the JDF.

Gen. 39:19 πιεκτέστομι τ' θηνα ένακ' καξίων ἡμοιώματι: 1, 2 — inside the larger JDF; 3 — outside it; θην — deictic link of the smaller domain with preceding referent context.

Ex. 6:5 προογονον τ' ἕξει τ' σπάζουσι τ' θην ἐνεπεμ-πίπτοντες ὄνεμα τ' μεσίον: 1, 2 — inside the larger JDF; 1 — linking the JDF to preceding referent context; θην — initial delimitation/boundary signal for the JDF, deictic link of the whole domain with preceding referent context; 2 — conditioned formal link with θην.

Lev. 4:27 ὡς στ' θην ἐνετ' ὡς ἐνεπεμ-πίπτοντες ὃντελέστατο τ' σπάζουσι: 1 — both exophoric (altogether outside textual domain frame) and cataphoric, inside it, in either case strongly delimited from θην; 2 — outside the JDF; θην — initial delimitation/boundary signal for the JDF deictic link of the whole domain with preceding referent context.

Lev. 7:8f. πιοθν' πιοθθν' πιοθθθ' ἐνομίζων τ' θην ἐνεπεμ-πίπτοντες ὃντελέστατο τ' σπάζουσι: 1 — linking outside the smaller JDF, inside the larger one; 2 — conditioned link inside the JDF, linking to θην, initial delimitation/boundary signal for the JDF, not linking it with the preceding referent context; -οντελέστατο — non-phonetic.

4.2.4.7.2 [Topic to clause]

This syntagmatic environment is of special importance in a Topic-prominent language such as Coptic (and has been of central interest from Middle Egyptian on, with a heightened significance from Late Egyptian on). Topic resumption is not simple anaphora, but a special case of coreference: one discontinuous thematic complex, in which the Theme represents the Topic in the core clause. Structurally, the Topic and anaphor-representant define a clear JDF. However, we find different, distinctive internal forms of anaphora and linkage-arrangements for this complex, which are correlated with Topic-forms nexus patterns and/or Theme specificity.

(a) Topic — clause cohesion: some types:

(b) Delocutive concording linkage.

Deut. 21:17 θαί ταρχθν τ' ἕξει τ' σπάζουσι ὃντελέστατο τ' σπάζουσι: Topicalized-Theme Nominal Sentence pattern (see Chapter Two, Pattern III): the Topic often grammaticalized into Theme. So too:

42 Externally, the Topic construction is a link, while the initial-placement Focus is a delimitation: see above, Chapter Two.
Gen. 46:32 "πηρμί δὲ γανμανεσωτι νε γανρμι γαρ
ηρεσμανεστεβνι νε"

Ex. 5:16 πητογ γαρ σε† μμοψ άν ννεκεβιακ.

Gen. 8:22 "ννευροσι θηροσι ντεπκαρι + οτρηρι

νεμ οτωκι + οταρωψι νεμ οτεκαμα + πισωψι

νεμ πιερωψι νεμ πιερωψι οννοσμον ρμμωτι.

Deut. 24:12 οσιικι ννεκενκοτ δεννπερψγος.

(b) Resumption of zero article + lexeme — alternation of allo-anaphors:
Zero anaphora: ωικ μπερ.OutputStream... Ex. 16:8, Deut. 9:1, etc.

Homolexemic linkage (noun lexeme Topic, compound auxiliary + lexeme derived verb): Num. 8:26 εωβ δε οννεπερψγοβ (not *εωβ
dε οννεπιπι).,

Homolexemic linkage (infinitive Topic, conjugated verb):
Lev. 7:24 εοσωμι δε οννοσονοσον (= Vat).

(c) Topicalized Endophoric Nominal Sentence (Chapter Two, pattern
IVA): the strong internal Rheme — formal Theme linkage, carried by
concord, overrules the Topic — Theme one, effecting a remarkable de-
limitation and boundary between Topic and core pattern, one sympto-
mized by discord or absence of concord (see §4.2.4.7.3 below):
Gen. 41:26f. †-† ης ενεε ννενεναζ ης ννομπι νε οτογ γι-γι

νηντοε ενενεναζ ης ννομπι νε.

Gen. 44:6 θαι γαρ ομαρομπι νη† τε ετανοςμπι.

(d) Topicalized formal nexus: CONJUGATION BASE + [Conjugation
Base + Nominal Theme]: a double — homограммемic and pronominal
— resumption linkage; indeed, the internal juncture contour here is
striking for its strong linkage.

This construction (of a broad dialectal distribution) is yet another case
of grammaticalized (and devalued) topicalization, macrosyntactically
superordinative. Two textemic cases are especially common:

In Narrative: α- αγ- (see above, Chapter One, §1.1.5 [d] 1): Lev.
8:24 οτογ αμωτηςε αηινι οννενψηρπι ιαμρψν...

In a formulaic superordinative constituent clause of the preceptual
texteme: ερε- ερε- ε. g. Lev. 13:31, 14:16 etc. οτογ εριπιοτηθβ
εμεφωρε εβολ...

(e) The so-called Tautological Infinitive topicalizing construction
(Chapter Two, §2.4.4), having a formalized adverbial verb (indeed, an
analytical converb) in Topic status, and a repeated conjugated verb, is homolexematically linked to its clause:

Ex. 15:26 ἀνοσούσθημεν τεκνώσθημεν ηετκνώσθημεν κατανημὴν μπότ. 

(f) Conversion of topicalized constructions may in isolated instances be a link between Topic and clause:

Num. 12:14 ανεπεξεργαζόμενοι ναζενα-αν πε (Vat οπ̣ε- 

εξεργαζόμενοι ναζενα-.... αν πε is difficult; Greek ει + Aor.).

Gen. 25:28 ἀε-νε-τεταρκαφτε εκφράζε τε (= Vat) — this is a special Wechselsatz-type Topicalized Delocutive NS (see above, Chapter Two).

Lev. 14:35 ΦΗ ετε-πινι φωπ πε.

However, more often than not, conversion is a delimitative index of this very boundary:

Num. 12:3 οτογ πιρωμι μυσγκε νεορηπεμραψ πε εμαυς. 

Gen. 29:31 πανφιαλ δε νοοκ νεονταόδην τε.

(g) The Proleptic Pronoun JDF: verbs of cognition contract in Bohairic a special idiomatic “that”-object-clause construction for Nominal Sentence clauses, in which the actual Theme of the clause joins the lexeme as object actant, and is then resumed in the content (ἀν-) clause by the formal NS Theme. It is thus topicalized in its domain frame (in a special included-Topic construction), with the same or similar linkage as in the topicalized Nominal Sentence pattern43:

Ex. 2:2 εταρναγ δε εροκ ἀν ορατιος πε. 

Ex. 16:15 ηντεκωστηλ ημοσ αν πε ἄν-οτ πε. 

Ex. 21:36 ημανκτοντη-πιματι ἀν-τρεπαδελ πε.

Num. 11:16 ἰν... ετεκωστηλ νμωσ ἀν-τανπερεβετ- 

τρός ντεπαίλλος πε.

(h) ἀν- is a postpositive morph adjoining noun syntagms and demonstratives to a personal-pronoun anticial delocutive Theme, following conjugation forms. This is hardly a case of simple anaphora to a topicalized element, nor an “Antitopic” (Chafe and Lambrecht), nor again an epexegetical apposition heralded by a cataphoric pronoun, but a discontinuous complex actor expression, where the personal pronoun is an “incorporation” of the noun, and, in that sense, cataphoric to it. The peculiar formal and junctural nature of this construction is in its marking a boundary between the lexical periphery of a grammemic verb-clause

43 Cf. LAMBRICHT 2000, characterizing the special construction of the “relatif de perception".
core. *nē* itself has no meaning or function, other than the linkage between a noun and a grammemic pronoun in *nexus*, and, by the same token, the delimitation between the nexus in *Flexionsisolierung* or incorporation with its representant thematic and rhematic constituents and its lexical-specification periphery. It is noteworthy that this is one of the rare cases where a personal-pronoun (formally always specific) is linked to a non-specific (but never generic — never *zero*-determined) referent. This construction — predominantly narrative in the corpus — is yet in need of special study (see above, Chapter One, §1.1.5 [d] 1, for tentative suggestions as to its specific information-structuring function in narrative).

Specific Theme-*agens*-actants — the most typical (protagonist PNs are especially usual; this being an unmarked term in the quaternary Theme-placement paradigm, in itself a junctural operator — an initial boundary signal, starting narrative chainlets):

Gen. 23:1:2 ἀργωπί η τῇ *nē*-πως *ncappa* ... ἄμος *nē*-cappa...

Gen. 23:8 ἀρχαίοι οὐ κω *nē*-αβράαμ.

Ex. 7:21 ναρχὴ πε *nē*-πιγνον άπεκαγι τρπ ακαμ.

Non-specific Theme-actants — one of the few non-Existential ways of having indefinite Themes:

Gen. 29:2 νατχ ματ *nē*-η νοτι νεκως...

Ex. 10:22 ἀργωπι η *nē*-ορθακι.

Ex. 19:16 ἀργωπι *nē*-γανκη μεν γανετέβραξ μεν ουκηνη πνοεκα.

The concord link between Theme-actant and the *nē*- noun syntagm is *sui generis*, and does not prejudice any subsequent linkage to the latter:

Ex. 32:7 ἀφεπανομην *nē*-πεκλαοκ ναὶ ετακεννοῦ ...*(οὔς ἐκηγαγε). *(But Deut. 27:1 επεδηθ οὐκ *nē*-πιλλαοκ ηρπα).*

Num. 3:4 οτογ ἄμος *nē*-αλλακ μεν αβίονα ... οτογ

_numc_ *nē*-μειωτον ωρμ ιμματ πε.

Num. 19:18 επεδηθ άποστραμοι *nē*-οτρωμι εγοταβ (= Vat). Note here the instance of cataphoric discord or absence of concord, which is in fact a case of specification.

Gen. 1:14 μαρεγωπι ναὶ *nē*-γανεπερεσωτη (= Vat) — the same syntax in the Hebrew, but not the Greek, which has a plural verb.
The pronoun—noun discontinuous complex recalls to a degree the n-mediated nominal possession following a delocutive pronoun (the JDF here is that of the closed list of old "inalienables"), where the pronoun is equally idotypical, but tends to masculine-singular neutralization and paradigmatic freezing. Here too, the pronoun — noun juncture, n-notwithstanding, involves an incorporation boundary and delimitation:

Ex. 12:28 ἕτοι τὸ ἄνω οὖς τὸν ἐν ἀρών.
Deut. 19:5 τὸ τὸν ἐ

4.2.4.7.3 In-nexus concord linkage. The junctural distinction of the Endophoric Nominal Sentence (Chapter Two, patterns IV and IVa) is in its unique linkage of thematic anaphora to rematic determinator, which is functional only as a suprasegmental signifiant of copula. (This juncture is also of interest as an uncommon link across the quintessential
nexal delimitation — the sharp boundary between Theme and Rheme that is "bridged" by the act of predication). Just as the Theme — here a formal slot-filler and thus rhematizing — is neither commutable with, nor referent to any lexeme, and is thus paradigmatically as well as macrosyntactically inert, so is its no less formal referential, linking operation. This strong linkage even overrules the topicalization reference should the pattern be topocalized, creating a distinctive delimitation between Topic and tightly knit core pattern, where only the Rheme really "exists" in the structural sense:

Gen. 37:27 ΞΕ-ΠΕΝΔΥΟΝ ΠΕ ΟΤΟΡ ΤΕΝΓΑΡ ΤΕ.
Ex. 20:10 ΞΕΝΝΙΕΓΟΟΥ ΞΕ ΜΜΑΓ-Ξ ΝΕΝΣΑΒΒΑΤΩΝ ΜΠΕΝ-ΠΕΚΝΟΥΤ ΠΕ.

Ex. 32:16 ΝΙΠΑΛΑ ΝΕΟΥΡΒ ΝΤΕΦΠ ΠΕ ΟΤΟΡ ΤΙΓΡΑΦΗ ΝΕΟΥΡΓΡΑΦΗ ΝΤΕΦΠ ΤΕ (= Vat).
Lev. 11:10 ΝΗ ΤΗΡΟΥ ... ΟΤΡΑΒΕ ΠΕ.
Lev. 25:33 ΝΙΗ ΝΤΕΝΙΒΑΚΙ ΝΤΕΝΙΛΕΘΙΤΗΣ ΟΤΑΜΑΖΙ ΝΤΩΟΥ ΠΕ (= Vat).

4.2.4.7.4 Ana-cataphoric reference. The cataphoric vector is important as a linkage direction in Coptic, especially in the case of the neutric "feminine" pronoun. Indeed, some interesting cases of "double-faced", two-vector reference may indicate a neuter overrule of anaphoric reference:

Gen. 43:27 ΠΙΓΕΛΛΟ ΕΤΑΡΕΤΕΝΔΟΙ ΞΕ-....
Deut. 9:28 ...ΕΣΙΤΟΥ ΕΣΟΥΝ ΕΠΙΚΑΡΙ ΕΤΑΨΧΟ ΝΝΟΥ.

Obs.
(1) See KESIK 1989 on "anacathaphe"; also DE MULDER 1998.
(2) The remarkable case of Mt. 11:10: ΨΑΙ ΓΑΡ ΠΕ ΨΗ ΕΤΣΧΟΤΤ ΕΘΒΗΤΠ ΞΕ-.
Sah. ΨΑΙ ΓΑΡ ΠΕΤΣΗΕ ΕΤΒΗΤΠ ΞΕ-. Oxyrh. ΨΕΙ ΓΑΡ ΠΕΤΣΧΟΤΤ ΕΤΒΗΤΠ ΞΕ- has no explicit referent, either anaphoric to ΨΗ or cataphoric to ΞΕ-. However, the personal pronoun η in the resumptive prepositional phrase suffices for the anaphoric cohesion, while it may not be a coincidence that the first consonant of εΤΣΧΟΤΤ falls together with the neutric feminine. As it stands, the construction resembles the venerable Egyptian adnominal passive-with-precising-prepositional-anaphora treated in POLOTSKY 1976 §2.2.7 (ηρπο ϊν φρ 3 πν "(he) who is made for-him this spell" = "for whom this spell is made").

4.2.4.7.5 "Anacoluthia", a stylistic-rhetorical reduction or disruption of cohesion, is formally a junctural phenomenon — featuring not merely looseness or a boundary, but the unpredicatability and unexpectedness, thus high thematicity and super ordination, of sequel.
(a) Person/number disruption.

Deut. 17:14 εὐσπερὶ δὲ ητέτενσε εὖσπερὶ εὐπλὰρι φη 
ετεπὸν δὲ ναθινὶ νὰκ εἰκερκάνονομι μμὸν ητεκυψὶ 
γίωτ̄η... (= Vat; Greek sgl.). Singular and plural allocutives are 
evidently in the same cohesive continuity scope, with a fine difference, elu-
sive to me, between the individual allocutor (also used in Coptic as a 
generic person!) and the communal one. It is difficult to tell which of 
the two is more personalized, but it is quite clear to me that the interplay 
between them — the transition from congregational plural to individual-
izing and more intimate singular — generally constitutes a striking rhe-
torical device in Deuteronomy.

Deut. 31:26f. σὲ μὴν δὲ ητεπανομὸκ χαὶ καπεφὶ 
πεῖκεβωτὸς ητεπαλογῆνη ητεπὸν πετεννὸσιν ητορ 
εὐκυψὶ νὰκ μὴν εἰμὲμετερεῖ δε-γκεροὶ ηνὸκ ητεκ-
μετρεσῆνην νὲμ ητεκαρῇ εὐναυτὴ εἰ 
γαρ ηνὸκ 
enὸστ ἡνωτὴν ἡπὶον ἡπετεντὰςων ἡβῖν 
πὲ...

Deut. 1:22 πεῖκωτὲν δὲ-μαρηνουτρὶ 
σαλὰν 
μαροτμεσῆπικαρὶ 
νὰκ ητορ 
μαροτμαίο 
εὐταςὲ 
πιμωτὶ 
φη 
ετεπαναρὲ

ηρῆι 
γίωτ̄η 
πὲ

(FUNK 1992:19 emends, with Vat, into ητεπαναρὲ — unnecessarily, I 
believe).

Deut. 28:25 εὐκυψὶ εὐακρὶ 
εβωλ 
δεκαμετετρὼ 

Deut. 17:7 
εὐακρὶ 
νομεθρὲ 
εὐκυψὶ 
γίω 
(Vat 
εὐκυψὶ).

An intervening noun is a boundary marker, signalling a discontinuity 
of reference that is not anacoluthic:

Ex. 32:1 
αὐθωνῖν 
δὲπιλακ 
δὲ 
πο

αὐθὼν 
σὲ.

Obs.

Cf., in Shenoutean Sahidic: 
δὲ 
ποτ 
εὐακρὶ 
εβωλ 
ετβης 
δὲ 
πο 
εὐακρὶ 
πο 
εὐακρὶ 
εβωλ 
ετβης 
δὲ (Leip. III 144); (address) 
πο 
εὐακρὶ 
εβωλ 
ετβης 
δὲ (ed. 
Guérin, RE 10 161a). The remarkable rhetorical “disruption of personal consistence” 
which is often due to the overrule by the interlocutive sphere of reference, goes at least 
back to Late Egyptian (COURROYER 1977).

(b) Disruption of gender/number reference — always masculine “in-
stead of” feminine/plural neutralization in favour of the masculine:

Gen. 16:3 
ἀκαρ 
... 
σὲ-ἀγαρ 
τεσβωκὶ 
οτὸς 
ἀκτῆσι 
νἀβραμ 
(Vat ἀκτῆσι).
Lev. 5:24 τακω ετακήμευ (Vat άκυμε).
Num. 36:5 παρητι τοιαν οντενενωμπο οιωνηφε εμέκω (Vat).
Gen. 3:10 τεκάμη ετακήμευ (Vat πετακήμευ).  
Gen. 19:19 τεκένωμι ... πετέκαλικ ἐμ ἢ (Vat. fem.).  
Num. 6:2 οτρωμι ... οτριγιμι οπωλαμαγω οοτεμα ... ἐετοθβο (Vat Greek is here not the motivation). Also Deut. 17:2.
Here, in a different sense, belong the cataphoric cases of discord (see above):
Deut. 30:4 αρπάξα ποτε (Vat).
Gen. 29:2:3:10 ερωη/ειρως ην ἰωμε.
OBS.
Cases like Gen.41:4 ατζε οτε ... αστωκ ... show anaphoric juncture, not with article but with noun syntagm as a whole.

4.2.5 Zero as link / delimiter: a summary typology

(1) Bracketing zero determinator: see above, §§3.3, 4.2.3.
(2) Zero representative anaphor to zero article (as e.g. in Topic) (see above):
Deut. 29:6 ωικ οντεσοτωμ οηογ άρ άπ οκεα οπετενω.
(3) Zero object actant — fuzzy cotextual representative:
Ex. 22:3 εωη αε μμονταμ μματ...
(4) Zero representing post-verb and specific pronominal object actant across a [protasis — apodosis] JDF:
Ex. 32:32 ιακεν καποτονοβι νοςβ εβολ οε ηνα (νοσβ εβολ zeroed).
(5) Zero representing nominal expansion in the coordination JDF:
Num. 16:14 κβ νοο νομ ε.
(6) Zeroid formal Theme of Nominal Sentence, see Chapter Two above, §4.1.1 pattern la — cases of Relative Conversion: Φη ετεφωκ ν-, οντεσοτκ etc. (Num. 16:5, 31:9, Lev. 25:10 etc.), all apparently periphrastic of the pronominal-possessor possessive pronoun (νοσκ, νοσκ, οωκ ν-); this may point to the development of a specific possesive. Also Lev. 9:15 Φη ετε-εβε-Φονοι μπιλος; also, in hermeneutical syntax: Num. 33:6 ατι εβοτοα οντομερος οντε-πομε (Vat + πε). In junctural terms, this can only mean the cancelling of anaphora following upon grammaticalization, that is, loosening of linkage or delimitation.
(7) Zero resumption of temporal antecedents after relative: conjunctural construction?

Num. 9:1 Σεπομαγρομπι ονωσε ητατι εβολ Σεπικαρι

Gen. 30:41 Αγωνι ηδε Σεπικιχοτ εματσικμοτ ... Νξενικεσου.

The absence of anaphoric reference here shifts in one sense the construction to conjunctural instead of Relative; but, in another sense, it forms a casus adverbialis status, zero-marking the adverbial relationship of noun and expansion (cf. English paratactic “the day the sky fell down”, once regarded as “konjunktionslose Hypotaxe”). In this latter analysis, we have a delimitation, with a delimiting zero where an anaphoric resumption would be a link.

(8) Zero pre-negator (zero—...αν) negating the Relative Present, delimiting the converter from the conjugation form, a boundary symptomized by the delocutive pronominal anaphor to the antecedent; zero—... αν delimits, while η—... αν (Circumstantial) links (see more above). Both define a JDF, within which some cohesion obtains, and an initial and final boundary.

Deut. 1:39 Φη ητεμικσωτν αν μψουν νοτααθον ιε-ομεθοοτ — that is, ητε-∅-τεμικσωτν αν.

(9) Zero is the allomorph (morphonemic alternant) of the Circumstantial converter before syllabic nasal — a link:

Gen. 20:9 οργωβ μον-γαι νααι.

4.2.6 Prosodic linkage

Proclisis is of course the most important word-formational and indeed formational means in Coptic: prepositions, derivational prefixes such as ρεμ- and μετ-, auxiliary verbs (επ- etc.), determinators, conjugation bases — all form prosodically linked nuclei of their various syntagms, which are clearly delimited from others. Enclisis is not involved in nucleus-expansion syntax. Let me here mention three cases of nexal prosodic linkage:

(a) In verbal-nexus patterns, the bases, the real verbal component, albeit grammemic and “pro-verbal”, contract with their Theme a tightly linked core verb-clause, nuclear in its syntagm, which is perforce expanded by a lexical periphery:

```
#a=q-cωtem##, or #a-∅pwmi#cωtem##
```

(b) In the Interlocutive Nominal Sentence pattern set (§2.1.2), the proclitic {ανοκ-} Theme, non-phoric, effects prosodic copular high linkage with its Rheme. Unlike its Sahidic correspondent {αντ-}, the Theme is not marked orthographically as proclitic, but is in Bohairic nonetheless
opposed to a tonic (or prosodically unmarked) homonym \{\text{\textit{anok}}\}, on the
evidence of the placement of variously enclitic elements.

(c) In the Delocutive (basic, expanded- or Topicalized-Theme and
Endophoric patterns), the formal delocutive Theme — \pi\varepsilon\ , which has a
relatively high (but not highest, i.e. close-juncture-contracting) encliticity
grading, effects a complex linking action, both pattern-internal and
macrosyntactic, which is distinctive of the individual patterns (see details
in Chapter Two, \S 2.1.1). Similarly the Immutable Theme (\pi\varepsilon), including
the case of #\text{\textit{anok}} \pi\varepsilon# (\S 2.1.1 [V]). See \S 4.6.1 for enclitic particles.

4.3 Scopes of junctural validity (a selective repertory)

4.3.1 The lexemic scope of validity; the “lexical word”: obtaining
links/delimiters (selected instances):

(a) Morpholexemic discontinuous linkage: consonantal (“skeleton")
exeme morph + discontinuous vocalic morphs: noun lexemes — lexical
consonants + full/zero-reduced degree vowels (\text{\textit{pomi}} \text{\textit{pem}} [\text{\textit{p-m}} / \omega \text{ vs.}
zero]; \text{\textit{ceoi}} \text{\textit{cet}-}, [\text{\textit{ce} / \text{\textit{o1}} \text{ vs. \textit{t}}]); verb lexemes (\text{\textit{cwt\pi}} \text{\textit{ce\pi}}-
cott\pi[\text{\textit{c-t-p}} / \omega \text{ vs. \textit{e-} vs. \textit{o} etc.}).

(b) In-lexeme linkage by allophonic procedure, e.g.

- “no long /o/ before /h/” (\text{\textit{pog}})
- “no long /o/ following nasal” (\text{\textit{noz\varepsilonm, moz}})
- “in-lexeme glottal-stop realization” (see below)
- “\text{\textit{wanew}}”- type sibilant assimilation; \text{\textit{caxi}}-type absence of
assimilation
- tone/aspiration correlation (see below): \text{\textit{c\omega, e\alpha\lambda}}; other symptoms
and implications of the tonal unit. Observe that so-called combinatorial
aspiration is valid in lexemic and phrasal scopes: \text{\textit{e\theta\varepsilon}}, \text{\textit{ma\rhoo\varepsilon-
thet\varepsilont-}}, \text{\textit{me\thetao\varepsilonp}} (Polotsky 1957a:224 n.3 on the delimitation in
\text{\textit{me-\thetao\varepsilonp}}), \text{\textit{\varphi p\omega m}}, \text{\textit{ne\thetao\varepsilonb}}.

See also above, \S 4.2 under A, for prevailing delimitations.

Obs.

4.3.2 The phrasal (subnexal) scope of validity: selected instances

(a) Determinator (\{\pi\-\}) + noun lexeme.

(1) Obtaining: combinatory aspiration link: \text{\textit{\varphi p\omega m}}, \text{\textit{\varepsilon m\varepsilon}} (below).
(2) Obtaining: nasal desyllabification link: \text{\textit{\u\text{\textit{ton}} but \textit{pemton}} (be-
low).
(3) Obtaining: gender selection-dependence between lexeme and
determinator: Φ-ρωμι, τ-Φε (see Chapter Three).

(b) Apposition nucleus (nominal, pronominal, Proper Name) + apposi-
tum.

Obtaining: gender compatibility interdependence link:
PN †baki Gen. 10:11, 1:45, 46:28.
Num. 3:4 αἰρων ποτιωτ.
(c) Verb lexeme + pronominal object.
Obtaining: pre-nominal allomorphic selection link.
Obtaining: pre-pronoun allomorphic selection link.
Obtaining: object-pronoun and lexeme morphonemic allomorph se-
lection, e.g. glottal-stop environment (see below).

ξα-τ.
τωσαν-ι but των-κ (Shisha-Halevy 1977a).
ecotbe-θhnot.
ςοβε-κ (cf. Polotsky 1933).
(d) Possessive associative pronoun + determinator + lexeme scope.
Φα:- its aspiration is a delimiter: out of contact with the lexeme
(therein unlike the determinators), but in contact with determinators (see
Chapter Three above). Another delimitation: no gender selection de-
pendence between noun syntagm and Φα:-
(e) Nucleus (antecedent) — verbal expansion (Relative clause) scope.
Obtaining: links of anaphoric reference (above).
(f) preposition + noun syntagm (singular specific determinator):
Obtaining: labial assimilation link of nasal (for syllabic nasals only).
Deut. 31:18 εἰεθωνι υπάρχο σενπιεγοοτ ετεμματ.
Obtaining: pre-nominal allomorphic selection link.
(g) preposition + suffix pronoun:
Obtaining: stem-ultimate-syllable stress link.
Obtaining: pre-pronoun allomorphic selection link.
(g) [Noun/pronoun + Augens + …] colon unit.
Obtaining: placement rules (see below).
Num. 14:31 πικαζί ΦΗ νωτεν εταπετενγενθνοτ σα-
βολα μμοκ.
(h) The coordination/disjunction scope:
Obtaining: coordinator/disjunctors link (as by definition).
Obtaining: bracketing link (one possibility).
(i) The valency matrix scope:
Obtaining: actant sequencing and dependency complex of lexeme +
specifically conditioned actant forms (as by definition).
Num. 5:26 εφετερον τε γεμισθήσας μνήμων.
Ex. 1:21 επίδνω πε ναυτιναρρον χαλαρά μφθυ με ... αφανίων περι περι... 
Ex. 2:15 αρχιστείμεν δε νακε-φαραώ επισταμών ουτος φαραώ
ναπκωταντε κατάκο μμωτείσης με.

4.3.3 The nexal scope of validity: selected instances

(a) "Nominal Sentence": noun-Rheme nexus (see above, Chapter Two):

The Interlocutive-Theme pattern
Obtaining: {ανοκτό+} procliticity link (Theme to Rheme JDF).

The Delocutive-Theme pattern (general)
Obtaining: {+ πε} relative-encliticity link; {πε} final boundary
(Rheme to Theme JDF).

The Delocutive-Theme Pattern (topicalized Theme)
Obtaining: Topic resumption in thematic anaphora link: gender-
number concord — {πε} final boundary (Topic to Theme JDF).

The Endophoric Pattern
Obtaining: in-nexus reference to article — thematic anaphora link to
rhematic determinator — {πε} final boundary (Rheme to Theme JDF).

(b) Verbal nexus:

The Base-Conjugation, personal-pronoun Theme
Obtaining: total junctural closure within formal (grammemic) nexus:
verb-stem and Theme (α=q), and close juncture between formal verb-
nexus and lexicemic actant (α=q-κωτεμ).

The Base-Conjugation, (pro)nominatal Theme
Obtaining: partial junctural closure; closer between formal (gram-
memic) verb-stem and Theme (α-πιρωμι, φα-φαν) and open between
formal verb-nexus and lexicemic actant (α-πιρωμι#κωτεμ).

Converter + personal-pronoun Theme (affirmative and αν-nega-
tive durative and adverb-Rheme nexus)
Obtaining: suffix-pronoun link alternant of prefix pronoun (†- but ε-
t- etc.).

Obtaining: (adnominal and adverbal negative Circumstantial) n-...αν
negation, zero converter (SHISHA-HALEVY 1994:226ff.).

Converter + nominal / pronominal Theme
Obtaining: selection link of prenominal allomorphs αρε-, naρε-,
ερε- (not relative converter).
Topicalized nexus by discontinuous base+theme formal "pro-verbal" or grammemetic verbal nexus: \textit{επε-πιονθς επενατ}. Obtaining: double linkage between Topic and Comment (i.e. thematic clause).

Obs.
The construction is in our corpus common in the Absolute Future and in narrative (see above, Chapter One). It is generally prevalent in B4: John 1:2:5, 2:8, 3:8, Na. 1:8, 3:19, Soph. 3:8:16, Zach. 11:1 etc.

Relative-pronoun Theme (not converter!) + Rheme (Statal Nexus):

Obtaining: the following links/delimiters:
\textit{νε-οςαβ} Ex. 36:6: the aspiration link.
\textit{ετ-εμματ}: the nasal desyllabication link.
\textit{νετ-να-ωμπ} Ex. 36:7: the non-aspiration delimiter.

4.3.4 The hypernexital scope of validity: textual juncture (selected instances)

(a) Dialogic Allocution + Response.
Obtaining: Response-marked-form links (ἀξα, ἡφη, ἡμον etc.; see above, Chapter One).

(b) Protasis + apodosis ("removed from reality").
Obtaining: \textit{νε-} concord linkage.

(c) Topic/proleptic pronoun + clause.
Obtaining: anaphora rules, prolepsis rules (see above).
Ex. 16:15 \textit{νατσωσν μμον άν πε ζε-ος πε}.

(d) The Narrative chain (see above, Chapter One).
Obtaining:
Theme continuity as link.
\textit{οσογ} vs. zero as linkage exponents.
Mode continuity (maintenance) as link (αγ- αγ- ναγ-).
Mode switching as delimitation (αγ- αγ- ναγ- \Rightarrow ναγ- πε).

(e) Verb + subcategorizing Conjunctive (cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 1986a Chapter Seven).
Obtaining: person/number categorization non-pertinence as link.
Obtaining: negation subcategorization non-pertinence as link.

4.4 Graphemato-morphematic juncture: graphemic and graphotactic epiphenomena of juncture. Here is a whole world of scrippta data, in which the mysterious and phantom-like apparent outdoes by far the evident, real (in the sense of formal/functional reality) and clear: ortho-
graphic filtering and scrambling of the emic and etic code. And yet, this "Buchstabenlehre", as the nineteenth-century scholars would describe the pursuit, is perforce our main or only gate to such crucial systems of linguistic reality — first la parole, then la langue — as phonetics/phonemics (morpho)phonotactics, as well as native metalinguistics generally: we know little about the scribal tradition(s) and schools with which to associate them, or their junction with Greek ones. We are certainly in need of an updated dependable Coptic Gardthausen; such statements as we find on Coptic punctuation are dismissive or evasive. Here I shall but hint at some central junctural features and roles of the written text (note that Bibl. Vat. copto 1, the manuscript probably most germane to ours, is still sharply different from it in many graphematic respects).

4.4.1 ου vs. υ for /u/ — "graphematic crasis". The typically Sahidic graphemic near-symmetry of (ε)ι and (ο)υ is not found in Bohairic in our corpus; ει in Bohairic is bivocalic, while ου is univocalic; ηι is either diphthongal as in ειεξακ, Ex. 33:23; disyllabic (Εψει, Lev. 14:36) or belongs, delimitatively, to two segments, as in ουβελε γε... Lev. 22:22. ηι is probably bivocalic in ουει "get far" (Gen. 44:4) as in "one" (fem.), for which usual Bohairic forms are ουι and ουει. Postvocally, ου has two juncturally significant occurrences, which vary, albeit to a limited extent (only following the preposition ε-). The ε-ου-/ευ- variation (preposition with indefinite article) notwithstanding, one could suggest that ου is vocalic (and syllabic/syllable peak), υ consonantal (and syllable coda):

- ε-ου-
  (a) crossing grammeme ‡ lexemic boundary.
εηε-ουετοτου Deut. 20:8.
(b) Crossing converter ‡ determinator (noun phrase) boundary.
Gen. 43:32 Ξε-νε-ουουγ ραπ πε.
(c) Crossing some intergrammemic boundaries.
ε-ου-μεμυν Num. 35:29.
ε-ουετοι πε Gen. 31:31 (Circumstantial converter ‡ indef. article).

44 See Funk 2006, e.g. 70ff., for a brilliant exposé on the problems and the solutions: a sober and penetrating discussion of the structural way out of this grave difficulty.

45 The 4th-century, (B4 Bodmer III) Gospel of John and Genesis differs in the notation of combinatoric aspiration; it also has no Jinkim notation (see Kasser’s Introduction). The unedited B4 Twelve Prophets (Vat. P. copto 9) is again very different: it has a type of short syllabic stroke, restricted to nasals, and an idiosyncratic, sophisticated system of punctuation.
Syll. onset.

Gen. 39:2f.

Gen. 2:16 in syllabic onset.

passim.

passim.

- linking

(a) Crossing some (other) intergrammemic boundaries (in the case of the preposition - varying with -).

Gen. 20:12.

Gen. 21:30.

Gen. 45:5.


(b) 3rd pl. pronoun following base or converter; always - linking.

Circumstantial, passim: Circ. converter 3rd person pl.

(c) In final (noun-syntagm) position:


“asses”.

(d) number “400”.


- following consonant and vowel other than -; lexeme-initially, lexemically or mono-morphically; delimitative:

(a) 3rd pl., following consonant ( , , , , )

(as against - (never) — - linking:

Non-final, intralexemically, internal link: Ex. 32:1.)

(b) passim: syllabic onset: initial boundary.

passim Gen. 4:26.

(c) “What?”

(d) In-lexeme: Gen. 31:10:12 (five syllables?).

Note in B4 Hab. 1:16, Zach. 9:17. In northern dialects, occurs also stressed (B4 "heel", or Oxrynchite, "belly", [before nasal]: W.P. Funk, by letter). On the other hand, (= TST). Oxyrh. Ps. 104:29, is apparently a syllabic bilabial sonorant. It would certainly seem that this grapheme has various phonetic and phonematic values.
(e) In alien words: reproducing original graphemics: 

\[ \text{Μᾶθοςκαλα.} \]

Observation.

But \( \gamma \) - in initial position of Greek-origin words (e.g. \( \gamma \text{τάκινον} \) — aspirated Upsilon).

Obs.

(1) Note our \( \Delta e-\sigma θ i \) (e.g. Lev. 20:23), against the consistent \( \Delta e θ i \) in B4 John (e.g. 12:29) and P. Vat. copto 9, e.g. Hag. 2:4:8:18, Zach. 9:1; esp. common in Hos., e.g. 8:7:13, 9:4:7:10:12f.:16f. Generally: \( n \Delta e-\tau \) (e.g. John 9:4), \( n e-\tau \) (e.g. John 11:13), \( e-\tau \) (e.g. John 6:46), \( i \Delta e-\tau \) (John 9:25), \( e \Theta e-\tau \) (John 8:46), \( n e \) (e.g. John 19:23 \( \text{νέ} \text{ψων} \) \( \text{ετεματ} \) \( \text{νε} \text{τατωρτ} \) \( \tau e \) etc. One wonders whether the writing \( \text{mon(τε)q} \) of the neg. Existential/possessive, so typical of this text, and apparently occurring mostly after c-morphs (\( \Delta e-\text{mon} \), \( \text{et} \text{e-} \text{mon} \), \( \text{ne-} \text{mon} \), \( \text{em} \text{on} \)) is a related phenomenon; but this form occurs also initially (John 13:16:36f., 14:6 etc.). Observe that the second sg. fem. allomorph of the possessive article too is closely linked graphically to an \( \alpha \gamma \)-initial lexeme: John 12:15 \( \text{πεσρο} \).

(2) For \( e-\tau \) - the rule in Oxyrhynchite? — see Bosson 1994:189. See Bosson 2006a:21ff., 30ff. for the i. e. i graphemes in Codex Schøyen (Oxyrhynchite Matthew).

(3) For the issue in point, cf. Funk 2006:77, on the pertinence of this orthographic differentiation in Fayumic.

4.4.2 Punctuation features: the Lemniscus, the Colon, the Raised Point

In our text, these are in red ink, a prominent set of graphematic features distributed unevenly throughout the text. While variance is more in evidence here than in other cases of grammatical signifiers, and although we can only speculate on the pragmatic purpose of the punctuation marks, it is certainly not the case — even \( a \) \( p \) \( r \) \( i \) \( t \) \( i \) \( o \) \( r \) — that these are random or meaningless and their distribution chaotic. We know little about Coptic MS punctuation systems and their relation to systems of other languages, especially Egyptian, Greek and Syriac; yet we may speculate that they may have satisfied the need for maintaining the transparency of the text and its articulation, its analyzability, in both senses — a need in all probability associated with the \textit{scriptio continua} (which, in turn, may have signified a reading aloud of the text at some stage of the copying). Coptic needs palaeographical description in broad scope and in detail, and punctuation needs to be studied on a text-specific basis and then by scribal habits and “schools” (it is remarkable that punctuation systems often vary even within a single manuscript, from one part or component to another; this is the case in our MS too). Eventually, we should aim at
the reconstruction of a native conception, or conceptions, of junctural structure and even of a native theory of syntax.

Obs.
(1) The traditional attitude to Coptic punctuation is characterized by exasperation and even irritation. So Lagarde, in his introduction to the Pentateuch Koptisch (p. xi) describes it as “nicht des Redens darüber wert”, and even Stern 1880 §635 as “nicht eben wichtig oder nothwendig”, (§9) punctuation being “meist ganz sinnlos gesetzt”.
(2) W.P. Funk (letter, 22/5/98) suggests that “phonetics and syllables as opposed to morphology [are] the underlying principle for graphic issues (...line breaks, separators, glide spelling, sonorant handling)...[in] relatively EARLY manuscripts...in Bohairic...Paris copte 1 is clearly late enough to be fully in the “morphological” way”.
(3) Layton 1987:1LXIII f. broadly distinguishes two groups of signs: “apostrophes” — “dividers between morphemes or other very small units” and “logical punctuation marks”, “separating clauses or major rhetorical units”; see also ibid. 8f.
(4) In the “Hypostasis of the Archons” Nag Hammadi text, we encounter the hooklet indicating “morphemic boundary following a syllable of two or more letters” - ἀνὸκ’ ἡμε, ἀνὸκ’ ἡμε: see Layton 1973:190ff. on the functions and association with Greek and Egyptian systems. (It is important to note that, whereas the divider forms probably derive from Greek, the role system does not).
(5) For division marks in Oxyrhynchite, cf. Schenke 1981:18ff., Bosson 1994:168ff. apostrophe for syllable final boundary; 173 on the “Komma” and the middle-height point, the latter to separate clauses (“entre deux phrases bien distinctes et formant une idée, une entité sémantique en soi”), the former for “l’articulation d’une phrase comportant deux ou plusieurs concepts, déductions ou autres”. The double point “accroît la valeur de séparation par rapport au ‘point simple’” (Bosson 1994:167 n.2).
(6) Punctuation highlights in Greek MSS (from the 4th century on): the lemniscus (λημνισκός), Garthausen2 (1913) II 414f., role not clear. The paragraphos (of various shapes), II 402f. for “Sinnabschnitt”; “Lesezeichen — Interpunktion für Silben-., Wort- und Satztrennung” (II 394ff.). The raised point system, maintained right into the Middle Ages (the higher the point, the longer/greater the pause), II 400f., 404f. For the colon, as old as the 3rd century B.C., see II 396ff., also Thomson 1912:58ff.; see also Rapp 1991.
(7) The punctuation marks in Egyptian were discussed by Erman 1925:9f. and Černý 1977[1947]:24f.: “to facilitate reading and comprehension”, but have never been properly studied. The Coptic systems occasionally seem to allot Egyptian roles to Greek signs.
(8) Vat. copto 1 is in this respect very different from our MS. The text as a whole is much more spaced. There is little or no upper-register letter writing (see below). Punctuation marks include the point in line height; the colon (two points) occasionally at verse end; the lemniscus is less common than in P, apparently following particularly long discourse (rather than sub-clausal) units. Note especially its use (as in early Greek MSS) to indicate role-switching (our cases of nūq de nēlāq... / otēg nēlāq... / otēg nātāw mēnc...): but we also find a three-dot complex mark (•••) as an universal demarcator, not unlike the lemniscus in P.
(9) Very rare cases of a post-morph apostrophe or hooklet-like raised punctuation are encountered in P: ἡμ’ἀνοκ Gen. 18:17, ep’ ἰρξων Gen. 1:18. This is not frequent enough to formulate functional statements.
(10) Large “capital” letters, generally with preceding spaces, constitute in our MS clear section-initial or sub-paragraph-initial, or passage-initial boundary signals e.g.
Gen. 31:52 ἀνάμ μον- zipfile neman. Gen. 31:49 Τροπάς εταξίως Εγένον νεκ-Φ. This mark is extremely frequent, averaging 5-6 to a page.

4.4.2.1 Preliminary note. A ternary or three-grade system is broadly discernible in our MS: the lemniscus for loosest, the colon (or double dot) for closer, the raised point for closest juncture demarcation. However, there is some fluctuation, especially between the first two and the last two demarcators. Although the following distribution statements do not amount to confident predictability of occurrence, they come sometimes rather close to this. In general, we observe distinctive functional cores, with overlapping peripheries; when all or some markers are present together, these core roles are in effect simultaneous and conjoint.

(A) A final syntactic delimiter and demarcator: the lemniscus

§

This final and boundary signal is a syntactical-unit isolating, defining and delimiting element, sometimes close to a modern "colon"-type element (signalling constructional-syntaxic and prosodic unity): it is often found with a {small space} as co-delimiter. It does not usually occur in closest or close-juncture slots (this is where the colon and the raised point are at their most typical). There is a considerable predictability of its occurrence, in the relative-quantitative classification into instances of prevalence, or exclusion or of fluctuation. The lemniscus is generally combined with spacing, at the end of verses, paragraphs and chapters. (Note that verses may begin by opening a new line, yet this is by no means the rule). The units demarcated by the lemniscus are not necessarily extensive; not all environments are equally prevalent, nor its distribution consistent in all components of the corpus.

Clause/colon + particle/adverbial § (as a rule):
(w when present, a particle or an adverbial is concomitantly unit-demarcating)

ἀιερνοβίτηνον § Ex. 9:27.
ἀδιωναμαρ § Gen. 30:27 sim. 20:11.
μμονονρω § Gen. 24:8.

νας-... ης § passim.

ννντομτητέπερπάνκες § ζεικωβ Gen. 32:28.

ωαηνατζε § τετενοτωων·αν· Ex. 16:28.
§ closing augential sequence units (as a rule)

Gen. 29:14.

εὐθεῖον κωμίνακαράνοθον § Gen. 32:29.

...πετετεμεροκανοκ § Ex. 32:18.

§ demarcating cola (as symptomized e.g. by repeated “foreshadowed” enclitics; see below).

Gen. 43:32.

Antecedent § adnominal clause (as a rule).


ναινεινεθονοτοι § ερετενεονοτονοτ Lev. 11:2.

νεοντονεοντοκονματ § επευρανατ § λαβαν Gen. 24:29.


Verba dicendi (etc.) § ζε (as a rule):

Gen. 42:21 ... § ζεανα § τενεπφιαρθηναινοβι

§ between terms of coordination (as a rule).

(οτον, nεμ as a rule, incl. zero-marked terms; between concatenated or coordinated clauses, etc.).

Gen. 7:13 χμ § χαι § ιαφεθ, 9:18, 24:54.

§ between iteration terms (as a rule), the lemniscus signalling their unity.

Gen. 6:5.

εμαωε § εμαωε §

αιτονεσνωτοι § σνωτο Ex. 8:10.

§ enclosing terms of address (as a rule).

ζειακωβ § ιακωβ § Gen. 46:2.

αβρααμ § αβρααμ § Gen. 22:1.

§ signalling paragraph-end (as a rule).

Ex. 9:12:21, 13:22, 14:4 etc.

§ between terms of apposition (typically).

πετεφρη § πικιοτρντεφαραω Gen. 39:1.

πιθωνη § φαιεται- Gen. 3:11.


Gen. 35:25f.

πεφαι § ζε- Num. 16:9.

οκονζιπε § ζε- Num. 16:13.

Φοσαβ § ανοκπηεκπετεννοτ Lev. 20:7.
§ enclosing tabular enumeration terms (as a rule).

§ ἡγημων § θεμαν §
§ ἡγημων § ωμαρ §
§ ἡγημων § κωφαρ etc. (Gen. 36:15ff.).

§ signalling the end of topical or thematic unit(s) (as a rule).

§ Νιηταρι εβαλεννενεκαλακ § ξωποειομιοενεκαλακ §

Corollaries of the above:

Between protasis and apodosis ("closing the protasis"): Gen. 2:17, 16:42.
Between premodifier and clause: Gen. 3:16, 24:45, 3:17.
Between imperative and post-imperative slot (see above, Chapter One): Gen. 24:40:51.
Between Temporal (εταφ-) and main clause: Gen. 4:1, 38:3.

Theme πε (Copula) § Rheme: Gen. 24:29, 38:2.
Theme § Rheme: Gen. 46:9ff. (cf. the colon in this role, Gen. 46:23).

§ Νενηπιδεννελακ § θωβκιπακακ § Δαμενενεθελακ
§ Δαμενενεθελακ Gen. 35:25f.

§ Δαμενενεθελακ § Νυποτητειακε § Ρεκρομπλι etc.

Topicalized nexus (in Narrative) §1.1.5, ερε-Noun § eρε- (also other tenses): Lev. 1:5, 2:2, 4:5, 8:25 etc.
Rheme § an πε Theme: Ex. 14:12.
Clause § modifying clause (as a rule).

In Dialogue: allocutive clause § addressed noun/name, allocutive clause § allocutive clause (not as a rule).

§ Ακοουν § Αδαμ Gen. 3:9.
§ Αγα § Τενηρηκιαρκεννενοβι Gen. 42:21.
§ delimiting well-defined units in Dialogue.

§ Δεναπηρτανναοωτ § Gen. 48:18.
§ Δενηπωρητεμι § Gen. 48:19.
§ Δεγηππεανοκ § Gen. 22:11.
§ Δεομοννατε § Gen. 22:15.
The *lemniscus* is exceptional where a *colon* is expected that is, in close-juncture boundaries.

§ ΞΕΡΨΟΤΣΡΕ ΝΗΙ Gen. 27:3.
ΞΕΨΙΑΡΕΑ Gen. 5:16.
ΞΕΝΣ (question) Gen. 27:21, 29:5:7f., Ex. 4:18 vs. § ΞΕ-
ΑΝΝΕΚ- (Gen. 31:50, oath), Gen. 24:23 (questions, no ΞΕ-) and
ΑΝΕΤΙ § ΠΕΤΕΝΙΨΤΟΝΣ Gen. 43:5.

The absence of the *lemniscus* within units which are often, typically or as a rule *demarcated by lemnisci* is significant. Rather than close juncture, this implies the prosodic cohesion of cola. Note the following cases of distinctive absence:

* within conjunction forms with pronominal actor;
* after *νεμ*, *οτος*, *ξε*, prepositions, the *nota relationis* η;
* between Focus and Topic in Cleft Sentence (both Focalizing Conversion and Relative-Topic Cleft Sentence patterns);
* within determinator + lexeme noun — phrases and ΦΗ + Relative phrases;
* within Nominal Sentence patterns: pronominal Theme and Rheme.
* between clause and particle, before Augens

Observe the following cases of distinctive punctuation:

ΝΝΟΤΜΟΤΤΕΝΣΟΡΑΝ ΞΕ § ΞΕΙΑΚΨΒ Gen. 32:28 (two ΞΕ-
homonyms)

ΝΗΕΤΟΤΨΙΜΜΨΟΤ § ΝΙΩΟΤΑΨ- Num. 4:49 (ΝΙΩΟΤ pronoun — as against the Augens) vs. ΞΕΝΘΟΚΟΤΕΒΟΛΣΕΝΠΑΚΑΣΝΘΟΚ §
ΝΕΜΕΒΟΛΣΕΝΤΑΚΨ Gen. 29:14. Also:
ΕΒΕΘΟΤΨΙΝΙΝΑΠΑΝΝΘΟΚ § Gen. 32:29.
... ΠΕΤΨΩΤΕΜΕΡΡΟΣΑΝΘΟΚ § Ex. 32:18 (ΝΘΟΚ, ΑΝΟΚ Augens).

(B) The *colon* [:] closer-juncture medial separator

The *colon* is found as a closer-juncture boundary signal between syntagm terms, and in some cases between syntagms: inter-clausal, inter-word, inter-morph, inter-colon. There is some apparent overlapping with the *lemniscus* — mostly, cases of *lemniscus* for colon — yet distinctive cases point to a basically different specific role. Here, as elsewhere, it is best to isolate the exclusive roles where only (or virtually only) the colon occurs, and the *lemniscus* does not.

47 Note ΞΕΙΕΜΠΕΚΣΕΞΗ:ΟΤΣΜΟΤΝΗΡΨ • ΑΝΟΚΨΑΙΨΤ Gen. 27:36.
The colon is second on the quaternary scale and paradigm of demarcation (highest demarcation first):

\textit{lemniscus}

\textit{colon}

raised point

(no punctuation)

After the \textit{lemniscus}, the most prevalent demarcator, we find the \textit{colon} (Greek \textit{dikolon}), probably the most elusive and the most difficult to assess functionally. It is best characterized contrastively: it demarcates smaller units than the \textit{lemniscus}; it isolates or \textit{separates} (rather than marking final boundary). The colon seems typically to separate morphs, including closest-juncture and lexemic ones, in well-demarcated morph sequences (syntagms) — formal units, while the \textit{lemniscus} concludes syntactic or discourse chunks. It is interesting to note that the distribution of the \textit{colon} in P is not uniform, but evolving: the incidence of \textit{colon} increases as the text advances, at the expense of the raised point, which eventually all but disappears, while the incidence of the \textit{lemniscus} remains more or less constant or even diminishes in some slots. The \textit{colon} occurs between constituents of larger units, especially within bound-morph sequences or within closer-juncture environment such as enclitics. The \textit{colon} is also found (albeit far less typically) in a set of two, as an embracing or enveloping (discontinuous) demarcator. In the following, I usually do not separate units where the text has no punctuation signal:

\textsc{Nnothmow}: \textsc{epespan} Gen. 17:15 (sim. 9:11).
\textsc{etomoinov}: \textsc{eov} Ex. 26:3.
\textsc{neim}: \textsc{phipt} Gen. 27:37.
\textsc{nacoino}: \textsc{ow} Gen. 14:10.
\textsc{pheta}: \textsc{agap}: \textsc{macq} Gen. 16:15.
\textsc{icen}: \textsc{ciown} Gen. 10:19.
\textsc{miperen}: \textsc{tekai} Gen. 22:12 sim. 43:23f., 39:14.
\textsc{neten}: \textsc{hot} Gen. 47:24.
\textsc{nte}: \textsc{eowwn} Gen. 49:29.
\textsc{nexe}: \textsc{maleela} Gen. 5:16, sim. 35:8.
\textsc{n}: \textsc{con}- Gen. 11:19 (vs. \textsc{nco}: \textsc{n}- 11:17) sim. 10:4.
\textsc{esotna}: \textsc{agap} Gen. 16:4 sim. 17:22.
\textsc{sen}: \textsc{otmkapht} Gen. 42:38.
\textsc{othe}: \textsc{abram} Gen. 17:9.
\textsc{menenca}: \textsc{punegoov} Gen. 8:3.
\textsc{othe}: \textsc{nophion} Gen. 3:1.
οστωκ : νεμοστε : τεγίμι Gen. 3:15.

αψελ : νεψαπαρκοντα Gen. 31:18 sim. 45:23.
επανονεξ : οπανενανεq Gen. 3:22.
οσονει : ηναμικι • αν Ex. 23:26.
νεοτεκωνι : υσπιενανανωβα : Gen. 24:60.

Especially striking and recurring constellations:

νεωτεναε : αιαι Gen. 9:7.


νεμποσρο : νγομορα Gen. 13:10 sim. Gen. 12:5 before the nota relationis and direct-object marking η-, an especially important slot.

αρμικι : νενσελ : οσονq Gen. 4:22.
μπεγοου : εταπτεαμιο Gen. 5:1:2.
αρομιοq : κατατικων Gen. 5:1.
αρφεναξηερονηεν : ηενεγοοτεντενωεξετο Gen. 30:14.


ατρενεξε : ιακωb Gen. 27:36.

Theme : πε : Rheme Gen. 11:29.

Obs.

I find remarkable εβεδ : ηα Gen. 35:1:7 with ηεδ • ηα 35:3:8, ηθε#ια 35:6 — the toponym is treated as a compound (Arabic too has here two words, with the second "properly" in the genitive case).

The frequent, even normal cases of colon, the finer demarcator, combined and contrasted with the looser lemniscus are especially telling: the colon internal — as it were inside brackets — the lemniscus final and phrase-external:

 anak twepi mbaqothea ÷ anak : twepi melxa ÷ ph

 ÷ otoo atsouw ÷ atcw noq nem nipwmi : etnemaf ÷
Gen. 24:54 (sim. 9:10).

 ada ÷ nem : celaa ÷ Gen. 4:23, sim. 10:2 etc. etc.

 nnaotapto : ze ÷ ecqoqep- Gen. 8:21.


 atai : otoo awai : ganwolo ÷ nem ganwomt nteganw-
loa etewwpi Gen. 35:11.

 ÷ nem bacemalo : twepi nelwm : piqecoc ÷ Gen. 26:34.

 newten ze atetemecwii : atetemotopq ebol ebol
gapwten ÷ Gen. 26:27.

 : ancat andaq etkoi : avaxwpq novxorqce mpewiqm ÷
Gen. 27:5.

 The colon overlapping the raised point: in this case embracing:
 : anpe : Ex. 9:11, 15:23 (cf. the point • an • pe Gen. 39:6).

 tsem : an : Gen. 4:9.

 actrepqpanxe : rad Gen. 30:11, sim. 30:6 — a slot where
no lemniscus is found to occur.

 gan:ase+nemgan:anwq Ex. 18:25

 In some cases we seem to have the colon between non-identical or
identical vowels, possibly to avert elision or diphthongization (crasis),
and to isolate the vowel, but this role is by no means typical or frequent:

 zae : hpe ÷ Gen. 46:12, sim. 35:8.

 e : e Lev. 13:56.

 e : 1 Lev. 13:30.


 (NB: space between identical e vowels in Lev. 2:2, 6:8).

 awe : epwotw ÷ Gen. 8:6.
Seeming cases of the *colon* in *lemniscus* role are misleading. While the slots may match, the units and the *raison d'être* differ.

*ἀργαλοκόμα* : *κουσί* : Gen. 29:6 — note enveloping punctuation.

*ὁμιλητής* : *ὄντος* Gen. 31:14.

*ὑπερβάλλω* : *ἀγείρω* : Gen. 6:20 (vs. 19 *lemniscus*).

*ἰμινινθεραίασθή* : *ὁ* *ἐνυν*... Gen. 9:12:18.


*ὑπερβάλλω* : *ἀγείρω* : Gen. 25:8.


*Colon* after Topic: Gen. 5:21, 6:9.

(C) The raised point [•]: closer- and closest-juncture separator

Typically occurring within bound morphs (closer/closest juncture environment), or isolating the post-negator *ἀν* — a short-segment separator, enveloping or embracing the segment (discontinuously: [••••]); also separating two identical vowels or, occasionally, consonants belonging to two units. In general, this seems to serve for component-segment or morph clarification, marking analyzability (especially with low-familiarity elements, such as Proper Names) and averting metanalysis:

The raised point enveloping the (post) negator *ἀν*.

(especially striking) • *ἀν* • Gen. 20:12, 2:18, 13:6, 24:5, 27:12, 42:11:36, 29:8, 30:33, 43:5 etc.

*ἐνεχεχολογηνιογι* • *ἀν* • *πεντενεγαμαγι*... Lev. 27:22.

*ἀναφερό* • *ἀν* • *ειοινπεμεγ* Ex. 21:5.

*τετελοσωμοϋ* • *ἀν* • *εκσωτεμ* Ex. 16:28.

*κοιντε* • *ἀν* • *εθηκ* Ex. 21:8.

• *ἀν* • *ἐκ* • Ex. 5:10.

• *ἀν* • *πε* Gen. 37:4.

• *ἀν* *πε* • Gen. 45:3.

• *ἀν* • *οντε* • Gen. 24:5.

The raised point in environments of closer and closest juncture, typically enveloping short morphs and components:

*ἀν* • *παντεκοιτά* • Num. 16:22.

*νατ* • *εργοι* Ex. 30:1.
Isolating Proper-Name segments:

- Gen • kain • atbele • Gen. 4:24.
- ἀρδάφε (sic) • ἰαρέ • Gen. 5:15.
- ἀνετα • ἀγαρ • ἐβσκινκάρρα • Gen. 25:12.
αλαβαν • ελ • λιατεψωρι Gen. 29:23.
αμνενρεπαχηλαεεσοτε • λια • Gen. 29:30.
ξε • σω Gen. 5:3.
αμοσουζε • ηρ • νεμαναν Num. 26:19.
αστρεπνεπαγενε • ηνα • Gen. 30:21.
νενενοτν • ανα • Gen. 34:25.
ανα • τουσωνι Gen. 34:27.
ανα • τουρηνιακωβ Gen. 34:3 (vs. ανα : τεψωρι Gen. 34:5)
αλαβαναε • ἔφ • σελφα • τεψβωκι ÷ ναια • τεψωρι Gen. 29:24
ἐπεσεραπ • ἁρ Gen. 16:1, 38:1.
Φραντνιωτπε • λια ÷ ουορφραν • ηνκοσι • περαχα ÷ Gen. 29:16
Separating identical segments (incl. graphemes)
αςυε • επωηι Ex. 12:38.
αβρααμαε • ετιναψοι Gen. 18:22.
εθεπε • ι • Gen. 18:32.
ωτφ • ωτφ Gen. 14:10.
ζατνπνοσαι • ποσαι • Gen. 42:35.
• golte • etnотεσβολ Gen. 24:11.
• nem • ... • nem • ... • nem • ... • nem • ... • nem • ... Gen. 25:2
(x5):3:4
Varia — alerting for danger of metanalysis?
et • ηπ • ετεψαρβ Lev. 18:6.
φηετ • οστε • ελια • nem • οστε • cina ÷ Ex. 16:1.
πεκεεσον • αμοσ • Gen. 42:38.
αδοε • οση • ξε Gen. 12:13.
• i • επωηι Gen. 2:9.

All three punctuation marks occasionally occur in syntagmatic proximity, which testifies to the meaningfulness of their contrast:
†νοσονπεκψρηβεταρψσωσενακξενκημι ÷ nosine :
eφρεμ • nemmanacch • μφρηνραοσβι ÷ nemμφρηνραοσβι
µεων ÷ ετεψωσινη ÷ Gen. 48:5.
÷ δειεμπεκεζνπ : ουσονσρηρω • ανοκπαιωτ Gen. 27:36.

ναιωρι • ναωωριν : ωτοναιετεβωνσι • νατεβνωνσι
νιν : ναιθροτετεκνασ ερωσσοσι • ηε • nemnαωρι ÷ Gen. 31:43.
schematic functional overview of demarcator slotting

+ typical or exclusive role
(+) occasional, atypical, also other demarcators occurring
(-) uncommon
— virtually no occurrence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>lemniscus</th>
<th>colon</th>
<th>raised point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unit-enveloping incidence</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unit-final incidence</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inter-units demarcating incidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dialogue units</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prosodic units</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>topical/thematic units</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nucleus — satellite</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coordination terms</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iterated terms</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apposition terms</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terms of address</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tabular enumeration terms</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>units demarcated:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bound morphs: lexemes</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>short lexemes / morphs</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bound morphs: PNs</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bound morphs: grammemes</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bound morphs: converters</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bound morphs: enclitics: Άν</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bound morphs: determinators</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unbound morphs: number names</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bound morphs: identical segments</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>averting metanalysis</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.3 The End-of-Line Break; Consonantal Writing?

The end of the line, a graphematic and orthographic boundary, may be associated more readily than others with syntactic theory; therein lies its general impression of flexibility. As a striking rule, with surprisingly few exceptions, Paris Copte I avoids end-of-line breaks in mid-morph in Egyptian-Coptic elements:

ΔΡΕ/-, ΝΑΡΕ/-, ΕΤ/ΑΪΚ- , ΑΤ/-, ΚΑΝ/-, ΟΤ/-, ΠΙ/-, ΝΕΝ/-, ΠΕΩ/-, ΑΣ/-, ΝΤΕΤ/ΑΡΑΒΙΑ, Ε/ΣΟΤΝ, ΜΑ/ΨΕΝΑΚ, ΕΘ/ΝΑΝΕΩ, Ν/, ΧΙΝ/, ΕΘΟΤΕ, ΙΚΕΝ/ΝΕΜΕΛΑΟΥ, ΣΑ/ΣΩΨ, ΧΕ-ΑΝ/Α-.

The syllabic cut (see in detail below) is here all-important, and in fact hierarchically primary. Indeed, the association of syllabication and writing principles is so essential, that it brings the “orthographical syllable”
to the fore as a possible basis for the syllable itself (dictating, as in the case of pre-Coptic Egyptian, and proofreading by actual reading aloud may be a possible factor: in fact, I guess the synchronic transmission of the text, i.e. the way it reaches the scribe’s decoding cognition, is a key factor).

Perhaps not to be seen as exceptions, but rather as indicative of “hidden seams” for the Coptic encoder/decoder, are:

\( \text{να/νεχ} \) Gen. 1:8.
\( \text{μα/πεχ} \) Gen. 1:9 (imperative + auxiliary).
\( \text{με/βιακ} \) Gen. 50:17 (ε- part of the plural morphology).
\( \text{επετεν/εξος} \text{ passim} \) (4th ε- historical and synchronic morph).
\( \text{μν/νοτε} \text{ passim}. \)
\( \text{κοερ/τερ} \) Gen. 4:12 (morphematic doubling).
\( \text{βερ/βερ} \) Gen. 49:3.
\( \text{ν/νεκσερπ} \) Deut. 28:39.
\( \text{πει/γοσ} \) Deut. 27:11.
\( \text{τεβη/ωσι} \) Gen. 47:14, 8:20 (base + plural ending).

Exceptions to the inter-morphemic cut do occur, but are relatively rare; some seem to conflict with our syllabication, but are quite viable:

\( \text{μπεχ/θο} \) Gen. 50:13.
\( \text{επετενεσ/ως} \) Gen. 45:18.
\( \text{ω/φοτ} \) Gen. 41:42.
\( \text{πκα/φι} \) Gen. 47:4.
\( \text{εφα/γος} \) Gen. 49:17, 9:23.
\( \text{κοξ/νος} \) Gen. 50:8.
\( \text{α/αμ} \) Gen. 7:21.
\( \text{οτ/πεχ} \) Gen. 4:15.
\( \text{οε/μιο} \) Gen. 6:15, Deut. 27:15.
\( \text{με/νενεα} \) Gen. 5:4.
\( \text{πια/βότ} \) Gen. 8:14.
\( \text{οσ/ερπ} \) Deut. 9:23.
\( \text{εκωσ/ιτ} \) Deut. 32:49.

Proper Names are even less subject to the rule here advanced, yet even they largely preserve the syllabic cut:

\( \text{αλ/ακωβ} \)
\( \text{αβ/ραμ} \)
\( \text{α/αναμ} \)
\( \text{ξο/δολογομορ} \)
\( \text{αεκ/λα} \)
\( \text{νιμι/αιαμ} \)
\( \text{ιω/σφ} \)
Similarly Greek loans:

\( \text{ phí / σαι} \)

\( \text{ ρε / χη} \)

\( \text{ κεβω / τοս, κτ / βωτος} \)

\( \text{ κατακ / χτσμος} \)

\( \text{ πα / ραδιος} \)

\( \text{ ωσι / πια} \)

Obs.
(1) Some pages seem to manifest a concentrated (distracted?) deviation from this consistency: e.g. Lev. 5:16:17 τοτ / ξο, ναι / τοο, νέ / θοσαβ — all within the same ten lines.
(2) In Vat. copto 1, with much longer lines, the scribe breaks almost 50% of the lines in mid-element.

In the last 10%-15% of the line, we often find vowels written in the high register (above the line), leaving the consonantal skeleton in the line. This is apparently a space-saving “shorthand”, preparing for the end of the line, and seems to be at least a hint of the realization of the morphematic status of the consonantal skeleton. I doubt that it is the case of forgetful or negligent writing, in view of the general high quality of the scribal practice in our manuscript and the prevalence of the use of the high register.

Some prevalent exx. from Genesis (excluding the omicron-upsilon combination monogramme):

\( \text{ ρυθπι} \)

\( \text{ ρωμι} \)

\( \text{ ωπι} \)

\( \text{ ωμα} \)

\( \text{ ωαι} \)

\( \text{ ωρ', ωρι, ωπι} \)

\( \text{ ωβι} \)

\( \text{ καε} \)

\( \text{ ειεωνηι} \)

\( \text{ χ'ν} \)

\( \text{ νωτεν} \)

\( \text{ άφνη} \)

48 The phonology of loan-words in Coptic deserves special study: they are characterized, inter alia, by special phonemes or graphemes, idiosyncratic syllabication, end-of-line-cut rules and so on.
Very different is, I think, the case of a single high-register vowel or consonant at the very end of the line, to avoid breaking a word (here including Proper Names and loans), or a morph at its very end, before its last element (exx. from Genesis):

\[\text{Ex.} 2:1\]
\[\text{Phc.} 2:14\]
\[\text{N'atc.} 3:6\]
\[\text{Otwnc} 1:9\]
\[\text{Cmoc} 27:19\]
\[\text{Nemac} 3:6\]
\[\text{Alprox} 3:15\]
\[\text{Cimn} 3:18\]
\[\text{Agon} 4:14\]
\[\text{Pne} 4:20\]
\[\text{Ohip} 4:26\]
\[\text{Enwoc} 4:17\]
\[\text{Hpn} 9:24\]
\[\text{Kakix} 6:5\]
\[\text{Cw} 24:46\]
\[\text{Oteox} 4:18\]
\[\text{Altor} 8:4\]
\[\text{Mar} 24:60\]

Rarely, more than a single letter is added in this position:

\[\text{Pomn} 4:1\]
\[\text{Oemp} 5:16\]
\[\text{Pomn} 6:6\]
\[\text{Kal} 12:6\]

Another special break location is at the very bottom of the page: this, it seems, is a truly final break. Here as much is added as is necessary, and mid-breaks are normal:

\[\text{Ew/hn} \uparrow \text{Gen.} 12:13.\]
\[\text{Tac/woq} \text{Gen.} 14:16.\]
\[\text{Etem}F\alpha\beta\gamma\alpha\rho\alpha\omega/\alpha\nu\pi\varepsilon \text{Gen.} 47:2.\]
\[\text{E/temmat} \text{Gen.} 19:33.\]
\[\text{Ebol/mm} \varepsilon \text{Gen.} 19:9, 24:4.\]

Obs.

(1) The end-of-line challenge is met differently in various scribal traditions in different languages and scripts, and calls for creative and individualistic scribal solutions, being an occasion to display competence and professional flair. While mid-word break is common
in Greek and Latin MSS (with abbreviations as common), in Hebrew 9th to 15th century MSS both are rare, with an average of only 9% mid-word break encountered (only 5% if one deduces basic morph separation (information by M. Beit-Arié). In Syriac MSS, mid-word break is as a rule altogether avoided by various means, such as letter broadening (in Scripture texts), or commencing and recommencing of the next line. See also Beit-Arié 2003:39 on upper-register lettering near the end of the line in medieval Hebrew MSS of the 13th-15th century (ours is 13th-14th): “placing exceeding letters above the word segment written within the justification” — at least 30% of the cases, with different rates for different locations. This is but one of the tactics in “line management” — “filling up the line with the first letters of the next word (repeated in the next line)”, with graphic fillers, slanting words too long to be accommodated within the line, dilating or constricting last letters, and more.

(2) B. Layton comments on our high-register consonantal writing (letter of 20/3/98): “[The phenomenon] is not so usual in fact...I think this phenomenon, which I call compressed writing, is a function of the page layout and has to do with the regulation of the right margin. Naturally, it is implicated with scribal aesthetic habits, too. In the present case, we have a bilingual manuscript laid out, no doubt, with a mastara (writing board). I would guess that the Arabic column was written first, presenting certain practical limits on the length of the Coptic lines. In any case, there would be the vertical ruling of the mastara pattern, signalling to the Coptic scribe that he’d better bring things to a close. In the heart of the problem in a bilingual, is that Arabic takes so much less room than Coptic; i.e., the Coptic is almost bound to exceed, or threaten to exceed. The solution is for the scribe to compress if necessary at the end of the line...in the case of writings such as ρωμί, where ω is stacked above μ, it’s tempting to see the position of Arabic vocalic signs as an influence. But two things speak against this. First, consonants are also stacked. Second, in pre-Arabic Sahidic MSS, we find stacked vowels, especially ωε (with ε stacked above ο), so the practice/aesthetic predates Islam. I must say, that looking at copt. 1. I see nothing unusual or amiss. I certainly would NOT have guessed that the scribe first wrote the consonants (generally, as in Arabic) and then filled in the vowels (generally, as in Arabic)

What I tentatively suggest — especially in view of the considerable flexibility of the end-of-line cut — is that it is the Egyptian consonantal “skeleton” structure of the word (still synchronically paramount in Coptic), rather than Arabic structure, that is behind this practice; this is especially striking when the vowels are morphemic.

(3) Cases of superlinear correction in mid-line do occur in our MS, but are very rare (e.g. Gen. 20:18).

4.4.4 (Morpho-)syllabic boundaries. The “Jinkim”.

(a) The syllable boundary or “cut” (“limite de syllabe” Kasser 1995: 187ff., 190ff.) is a vital issue in Coptic orthography, morphophonemics and even grammar, but here too the obscure and enigmatic outweighs the clear. I shall not touch here on the Sahidic superlinear-stroke system, and shall generally limit myself to the junctural implications and associations of the phenomenon. In Bohairic, we have a distinct formal exponence and functional system for marking syllabicity, namely the Jinkim (“movement” — the origin of the term, which has Arabic asso-
ciations, and evidently indicates some native grammatical terminological and conceptual tradition, is still obscure). The superlinear “point” (in actual graphic reality often extended to a short dash or apostrophe-like slanting or hooked line), which broadly indicates the syllabic autonomy of the vocalic or (con)sonantal pointed segment, is an exponent of the syllabic jointing, and of potentially morpho-syllabic, phonematic, morphophonemic and morphematic juncture. However, we encounter differences and even conflict between morphophonemic and purely phonematic juncture. (As Stern early noted, 1880 §7, this has grammatical significance too). The said autonomy is relative, and dynamic, i.e. flexible; moreover, every segment may simultaneously enter several divisions, relating to several structures; the attempt to see all of them, flattened, as it were, may account for the apparent variation and contradiction.

Obs.
(1) A short overview of history of the feature and possible connections. This term and concept, to my knowledge the only Coptic grammatical term that must presuppose a grammatical tradition, recalls the Arabic (harakat) for “vocalization”, cf. Stern 1880 §§6, 371, yet its function is quite different. In Classical Syriac, the “vowel-point” indicates a higher vocalic grading (diphthong rather than monophthong, ḍ rather than a, a rather than e — interestingly, a relative function). In a second century B.C. Greek papyrus, a similar device is used for word-division, which may be an antecedent of the Coptic “syllabic stroke”. In the “Hypostasis of the Archons” Nag Hammadi text we encounter the hooklet indicating “morphemic boundary following a syllable of two or more letters” - ἀνοκлежа, ἐνεψῳλῃ (Layton 1973:189ff., 198f.).

(2) Of course, we have only an orthographic reality to deduce from about phonetic, phonological, prosodic ones: see Funk 2006. Kasser’s consternation (1993:52) is well justified; but, here too, and as a principle of sound method, it is scribal variance, not negligence in scribal practice, that must be contemplated (pace Kasser 1994b:109f. with n.2). In fact, this variance provides us with a differential criterion — cases or slots or environments of non-variance are firmly distinct from the “unstable” ones. The Jinkim does not concern words, but syntagmas, or the textual sequence of linguistic unities (pace Kasser 1994b:110), just as it concerns morphonology — or morphography — rather than phonology pure and simple (Funk 2006).

(3) Polotsky 1949 is the seminal discussion of the Jinkim, marking a “son formant syllabe à lui seul”, rather than the syllabic peak. Evidently, the syllabication bears on the allophonic aspiration (1949:34). The main junctural significance of the Jinkim lies in its absence and segmental replacement in cases of close juncture (“liaison étroite”), e.g. between determinator and lexeme (as in πέντων), pronominal Theme and Rheme (κείμενα as against αἰκίμανα). Relative converter and Rheme (e.g. ετέριμαν), see Polotsky 1949:29ff., Kasser 1994b:114. Our text evidently has the classic, “earlier” system, although this familiar characterization and classification of Jinkim usage must be further precised. In Polotsky’s post-classic or late system, we find such cases of combinatory aspiration like χνατ as, rather than constituting a contradiction in terms (independ-
ent syllable yet part of cluster), conflict with the morphematic boundary, but may also be taken diachronically as extension of the allophonic and/or allomorphic mechanism beyond the syllable.

(4) Kasser 1994b treats Vat, on the borderline between the classical and postclassical phases, with the Jinkim roles “plus sobres, moins nombreux”. But our MS, later by far, too has early as well as late characteristics. Generally speaking, Kasser distinguishes two forms of syllabifications, a rapid one and a dictation-speed (occasionally “euphonic”) one, that are vindicated by the Jinkim (e.g. 1982, 1994b:115).

(5) The general controversy, or dilemma, about whether the separators and related supersegmentals indicate syllabic or morphemic boundaries: Rosén’s important paper of 1976 (I quote by the pagination in his Collected Papers, East and West) on a 13th-century Greek MS of Herodotus, marking syllable-final boundaries by an apostrophe (similar in shape to a spiritus lenis), relies heavily on Coptic structural and supersegmental features: see p. 417ff. on the Sahidic system. Note that “in Coptic there is no conflict between morph and syllable extent” (418 n.42) is certainly inexact as it stands; but it is true that [in Coptic] “befindet sich zumindest an einer der Grenzen jedes Morphems ein Silbengrenze”. Rosén suggests that the apostrophe may be in Coptic a forerunner of the apices in the superlinear stroke of early Sahidic MSS (418ff.) He is certainly right when he says (420) that the Coptic system is based on a good understanding of syllabic phonological structure; yet, most importantly (415) “Es darf keinem Zweifel unterliegen, das ein system zur Bezeichnung von Silbengrenzen aus keinen phonetisch-theoretischen Beweggründen erwachsen ist, sondern ursprünglich den rein funktionalen Zweck verfolgt haben muss, d.h. hauptsächlich bei Fehlen eines phonologischen Grenzsignals, adäquat in einer der Erleichterung des Verständnisses dienenden Weise zum Ausdruck zu bringen” — a practical device for isolating and identifying morpho-semantic segments and boundaries. Rosén’s information on the “hooklet” serving to delimit morphemes in certain Nag Hammadi MSS (420) is based on Funk 1976:58ff. — NHC V, perhaps also Budge’s Sahidic Deuteronomy and the Apocalypse of Elias: “am Wortende bzw vor bestimmten starken Morphemfugen”, but Funk himself retracted this later: see 1982:65; 1995a:15ff. (convergence of morphemic and syllabic boundaries), 1995b:32ff. (syllabic division). See also Bosson 1994:168ff. on the apostrophe for syllable-final boundary (170ff. and n.64 for other discussions).

(6) In 1994b, R. Kasser characterizes systematically, but rather summarily, the usage of Jinkim (“autosyllabicity”) and related graphemic phenomena (see also Kasser 1991b). Kasser does not specifically refer to a morphematic factor (yet see p. 128 n.41, and p. 129). Battiscombe Gunn compiled notes on the Jinkim (more or less contemporaneously with, or earlier than Polotsky’s BSAC article of 1949); unpublished notes, attached to his letter to A.H. Gardiner of 2/3/41 (AHG 142.124.77 at the Griffith Institute, Oxford), with eight points on Bohairic syllable structure; he too points to the existence of several systems, expounding “the most widespread” to his friend and patron.

(7) The Jinkim is not restricted to Bohairic — it is functional in Oxyrhynchite: see the introduction to Bosson 1997:xi f.. Mink in Gabra 1995:63 is question-begging and self-contradictory: “silbisch im Sinne der Silbenanalyse des Schreibers...” “die Gewiß an der phonetischen Realisation orientierte Silbenanalyse”, which follows a statement of “nicht kohärente Prinzipien” (see Schenke 1996:90ff. for a just criticism of Mink’s linguistic introduction to Gabra’s Oxyrhynchite Psalms). In 2006, B. Layton discusses a Sahidic manuscript with a sui generis system of Jinkim points: the Apophethegmate Patrum in MS IB 17 (484) of the Biblioteca Nazionale di Napoli.
(8) Frankly, the syllable is a difficult if not problematic notion. For one thing, where does it “exist” — where is it a meaningful, as against pragmatically useful, entity? Renouncing the traditional stratificational view of language, as Coptic consistently teaches us to do — the syllabic unit conflicts with most other unities. Somewhat like the word, syllabication is well established in some, but by no means all written systems, but even in spoken language its status and integration in phonetic and phonological structure is generally questionable. In written language, syllabic division seems out of place and all but a contradiction in terms, unless it be a device for vocalizing a written text. (See Hjelmslev’s definitions, “a chain of expression containing no more than a single accent” or “a minimal syntagm on the expression plane”, bring home the difficulty of accommodating this concept in a structural framework, even on the phonematic level: see Malmberg 1967:69ff., 98ff., 128ff.). In Coptic, it is also intermeshed inter alia with the consonantal quality known as aspiration (below).

(9) Fort 2000 is an outstanding study of the phenomena examined here (in the verbal system, especially the Sahidic one) and of the Problematic involved. The author, stressing the significance of “engrammation” — the graphematic environment — arrives at not dissimilar conclusions to those of the present discussion: see especially p. 334ff., for the dynamicity and pluridimensionality of the boundary marking; also p. 326 for the end-of-line boundary; and generally, for a cogent evaluation of the notion of the syllable for Coptic.

(b) Syllable-structure constituents — in mutual linkage to form one syllabic unit — are in Bohairic:

Onset (zeroable): consonants or sonorants; clusters, even triple ones (all with a morphemic boundary running within them: πηφιρ, πξρεμψεμ; double clusters have rising or steady sonority: Φρο, ττίμη), counting as a single segment. According to the Sonority Sequencing Principle: onsets rise in sonority towards the nucleus (cf. de Saussure’s convenient if “unprofessional” “chaînon explosif rompu”), as evident in obstruent + sonant clusters⁴⁹.

Nucleus or peak: vowels, sonorants (rarely and only in specific positions; disyllabic Σοθεκ with aspiration linking coda of the first and onset of the second; ενκ or τώνκ with a final cluster as coda).

Coda (zeroable)⁵⁰: Sonority Sequencing Principle: coda clusters fall in sonority from the nucleus (ενκ, τώντ, αιτ — all cases of morphemic boundary running within the cluster).

Syllabic juncture can be tentatively described in terms of sonority contour:
“if three adjoined segments fall and rise in sonority, they belong to two different syllables”;

⁴⁹ Monosyllabic rising diphongs like οτα, οτι concur with disyllabics.
⁵⁰ A zeroed coda is of course not the same as a zero segment as coda: ήμο “to you” (fem.), πε- “your-” (fem.). Vocalic lengthening in coda: ήμωδοτ, Φη.
“if three adjoined segments rise and fall in sonority — they belong to a single syllable”.

Two syllables are delimited (in consonantal environment, nasals preceding):

\[ \text{\textit{λβεξε Gen. 30:32.}} \]
\[ \text{\textit{μμωωι Gen. 31:23.}} \]
\[ \text{\textit{μφιτερο Gen. 31:21.}} \]

Marked syllabicity in adjoining vocalic or consonantal environment is always a delimitation. The Jinkim is deployed to mark morphemic and lexematic boundaries (the tension between syllabic/phonosyllabic and morphemic boundaries is of interest):

\[ \text{\textit{ν-} as a rule maintains its syllabicity — this constitutes a delimitation (cf. Lev. 8:33, 13:28, 2:5, 3:2, 4:18:23 etc.).} \]

\[ \text{\textit{μα-ν-εκωοι Gen. 43:32.}} \]
\[ \text{\textit{ετε-νδηθηq Lev. 1:9} — clearly not “liaison étroite”.
\]
\[ \text{\textit{αψαινκοτ Ex. 22:27.}} \]
\[ \text{\textit{οσ-εξωρp Gen. 41:11.}} \]
\[ \text{\textit{ναε-ιακωβ Gen. 31:17.}} \]
\[ \text{\textit{νε-εβολ Gen. 41:2.}} \]
\[ \text{\textit{εμμον Num. 20:18:} delimitation following the Circumstantial: (Vat \textit{μμον}).} \]

\[ \text{\textit{εκεεν= Ex. 18:19, 34:29.}} \]
\[ \text{\textit{εξ-ερ- Lev. 16:19\textsuperscript{51}.}} \]
\[ \text{\textit{νε-μπευq Ex. 12:39, νε-μπατε-, νε-μμον Gen. 2:5.}} \]
\[ \text{\textit{ετε-νδηπηι Ex. 11:5.}} \]
\[ \text{\textit{ετε-μπευμθο Ex. 14:9.}} \]
\[ \text{\textit{ετε-νταηq Gen. 12:20.}} \]
\[ \text{\textit{ψα-νιαι Gen. 22:5.}} \]
\[ \text{\textit{ψαντοτεωωοτ} Gen. 29:8 (!).} \]
\[ \text{\textit{ν-ενοξωc Lev. 20:10.}} \]
\[ \text{\textit{ν-εραθωθις Lev. 24:10.}} \]
\[ \text{\textit{ν-ιακωβ Gen. 27:6.}} \]
\[ \text{\textit{αψ-ιηρ ν-οτωθονc Gen. 26:30.}} \]
\[ \text{\textit{νεξωρp Deut. 9:25.}} \]
\[ \text{\textit{ν-ονοματος Num. 15:2.}} \]
\[ \text{\textit{οσ-ανομια Lev. 20:14.}} \]

\textsuperscript{51} The Oxyrhynchite Codex Glazier (the Acts) has for the Absolute-Definite Future a consistent syllabication contrast of \textit{ες-ε-} as against the other persons, \textit{ε-κε-, ε-κε-, ε-κε-}.
ἐτνα-ὠκτ Lev. 20:13.
πε-ἰῶτ Gen. 24:23.
ἔ-ibName Gen. 24:10.
ἀπι-ἐμι Gen. 20:7.
ἀ-ἰὰκωβ Gen. 29:11.
ἀν-ι Gen. 32:7.
Φιάρο Gen. 41:1:2 — syllabication conflicting with aspiration (phjarο vs. pi-a-ro).

 nackte an Deut. 8:9 Circumstantial; Vat naken-: x- non-syllabic, in onset cluster.

ἀρε- P (= Vat) generally.

ετε-ἐθβεφνοβί Lev. 6:23. e-τε- or et-e-? Probably the former.
NB: Φη εθβεφνοβί, Φη ετερμεθωμ (nte-) Lev. 7:7 — no Jinkim on e-.

ἐ-ἀσς.

παίκε-ἐξωφ σ.

μα-νενοσ (unetymological metanalysis).


τεκ-ἀφε Gen. 40:19.

The opposition is junctural in a case like:

η ἐτε-ίντακ Gen. 31:18 (= Vat) against πεπεντακ Gen. 24:2.

ετε-ἵπαιμα Deut. 29:15, not ""unseriöse’ Punktierung” (Funk 1992:26), but the overrule of morphematic over phonosyllabic demarcation.

Absence of syllabicity of nasals in adjoining vocalic environment is always a basic-grade link (cases of “liaison étroite”?):

cενδόταν Gen. 18:9.

ἐτεμματ (vs. ἴματ).

(but: ἐτε-ίνακτιq Gen. 49:312, see above);

νακ-... an, νετα-... an as a rule, for negating the nexus with Focalizing Present/Future/Preterite.

Deut. 8:3 ναρε-πιρωμί ναων σ εωικ ἴματατq an

(c) Cases of syllabic initial radical nasal (looser morphematic juncture) in variation with ε + nasal: (closer juncture) — some examples are given above and below. The three forms encountered for each instance are the lexicem one (μτον, μβον), the marked close-juncture one, with the lexeme “melting” into a preceding unity (εμτον, εμβον —
it is almost a paradox, that this close-juncture alternant serves to delimit), and the rare "hybrid" and most interesting one, where close juncture does not cancel the lexemic delimitation (ἐμτόν). The variation between the first two (a variation not occurring with any of the ἱ grammemes) means that the form may be marked for close juncture or not, in which case the original lexemic form is maintained; the third form, which looks a contradiction in terms, is a syllabication that would both show close linkage and lexemic identity. A distributional trend or relative regularity is evident even within the seeming flottement, and indeed serves to restrict and structure it: for instance, the preposition ε- takes the lexemic form; the π- article (and several other grammemes) the combinatory one; the lexemic one occurs in conjugation after a nominal actor; and so on. Variance in juncture, written or spoken, is of the essence, where sonantal and sometimes vocalic boundaries of lexemes are concerned. Indeed, this variance correlates with the permeability — the essential nature — of such boundaries.

ἐμτόν:

ἐκ-ἐ-ἐμτόν Ex. 34:21 (Μ at end of line) vs. ἐκ-ἐ-ἐμτόν ibid.

πεμτόν Ex. 35:2 (= Vat).

πιεμτόν Num. 10:36 (Vat πιέμτον).

ἐμτόν Ex. 35:2 (= Vat), 16:23 (= Vat), Deut. 5:14 (= Vat), 12:9.

ἀπ εμτόν Deut. 25:19.

(ἐτ)ἀγιεμτόν Num. 11:25 (Μτόν Vat), Deut. 33:2.

οριεμτόν Deut. 5:33.

Obs.

See Funk 1992:26f. on the variation ἀγιεμτόν/ἀγιεμτόν: ἰκαί is rarer in the corpus than ἰκαί.

ἐμβόν

ἀγιοτεμβόν Num. 11:10, 32:9, 11:1 (Vat ὠτιμβόν) vs. ὠτιμβόν Deut. 29:23.

ἀγιεμβόν Num. 11:33 (ἀγιμβόν Vat), Deut. 1:37 vs. ἀγιμβόν Deut. 32:19, 9:8 ιτεμβόν Deut. 11:17.

ἀπ εμβόν Deut. 4:21 vs. ὠτιμβόν Deut. 32:16.

πεμβόν Num. 12:9.

ἐμβόν Deut. 31:17, Num. 16:15 (= Vat).

πτιμβόν Deut. 29:24.

Ἀ ὄλτεμμεν ἰμβόν Deut. 6:15.
†Naøρεταχηι ᾑβον Deut. 32:39.
ερό μμοι εύμβον Num. 14:11 (Vat ερο μμοι ᾑβον).

Μπα
πετεμπα Lev. 16:8.
ετεμπα Lev. 5:10.

Δαι
ἐεναι ηβιν Ex. 35:32, Lev. 18:6.

Ναι Ex. 10:15, Gen. 34:29, Deut. 28:55 (= Vat).
Καιναι Deut. 15:2.
Αεναι ηβιν Deut. 29:23.
Nεμ Ναι ηβιν Ex. 20:11, 40:9, Num. 16:13, Gen. 36:6 varying with Nεμ Εναι ηβιν Gen. 34:2, οτομ Εναι ηβιν Deut. 8:14 (Vat Ναι), Num. 18:14.

Οται Gen. 31:31.
Πεναι Num. 24:11.
Ηεναι Deut. 28:57.

Θεο
περμο (etc.) Ex. 32:5, Num. 19:3.
πεμο Num. 20:10, Gen. 50:13.

Here, and in the next lexeme, we observe a neat alternation in linkage — closest vs. close, of obstruent or obstruent-final morph and spirant-final morph, respectively.

Καρ
πεκεμκαρ Deut. 28:57.

Νοστ

Γαρ
πιμγαρ Num. 19:18 (Vat γαρ) vs. πιμγαρ Gen. 23:17, 50:13.
οτεμγαρ Num. 19:16 (Vat γαρ).

Ωλφ Νεμαρ, οτκθησις Νεμαρ Gen. 23:20, 50:13 Vat.

Νκοτ: ένκοτ usual form in the MS.

Εενκοτ Gen. 39:10.
Εενκοτ Deut. 22:22.
Καινκοτ Deut. 31:16.
Ννεεκοτ Deut. 24:12.
Ακαεκοτ Gen. 19:33.

(d) Instances of distinctive or significant syllabication:

(1) In the Absolute-Definite Future.
eié-, eké-, eqé- (but éqé- in Vat!). Kasser 1994:129 believes that ek/e- is "orthographiquement plus avancé" than e/ke-. Why, and in what sense? The former is certainly better founded historically.

epê- sec. sgl. fem. Gen. 16:11, distinguished from
èpê- + sec. person plural/nominal Theme (e.g. Gen. 17:5, 18:14, 22:8 etc., Ex. 10:2, 11:6).

e-i Gen. 24:8.

(2) ãpe-oai sec. sgl. fem. Preterite Gen. 30:15: the core morph is syllabic.

(3) Rel. / Focalizing Preterite et-ā-NOUN (Gen. 6:1, 25:10, 20:13), å-f tat- Gen. 30:18:23, but pronominally always etai- etc.; et-â-

(4) Most interesting: ð- article + syllabic vowel, with the Jinkim signalling the morphmatic boundary: ð+âlôt, ð+âlôz (Gen. 24:34, 32:25) — still syllabic, although syllable covers more than one grapheme: å- here is a syllabic realization of a zero laryngal consonant. This is a delimitation, and certainly not a case of "liaison étroite": "il leur arrive aussi, par dérogation due à la distraction, de pratiquer un usage non phonologique et justifié par l'analyse des ensemble d'éléments grammaticaux, en isolant ainsi âlôt dans ð-âlôt, graphie occultant la division syllabique du mot" (R. Kasser by letter, 25/3/98); nalwotí n- Gen.26:25, nalôz n- Gen. 50:23, both = Vat (nen-
å- in Gen. 21:25); see Polotsky 1968:244f. Compare, however, ðiñ in Quecke 1984:302. On the other hand, ñde-n-alwotí ñicaak

(5) ëiâkineinon Num. Ch. 4 passim: ë — the Greek rough breathing is not considered consonantal for syllabication purposes (Vat ëiâkineinon).

4.4.5 "Aspirate" consonants (θ, χ, ð, ς) and "aspiration"

"Aspiration" is in Bohairic grammar a conventional name for a weakly phonematic, mostly motivated (conditioned) consonantal property, expressed by special graphemes, which is closely interrelated with syllabication: syllabication-related combinatory aspiration is evidently a junctural link. "Aspiration" in Bohairic has nothing to do with /h/ or the aspirate phonetics of an obstruent consonant.
Combinatory (allophonic) aspiration (a)

Aspiration of the surd consonant immediately preceding a sonorant in syllable-onset clusters:

πξερέπεμ (triple cluster) Ex. 16:12.

Φρωμι.

Φιάρο (the boundary between article and lexeme is here enough to maintain the syllabicity of α).

μετμεθηπε (illustrating junctural contrast between two boundaries): μετ-με-θηπε.

Combinatory (allophonic) aspiration (b)

Aspiration of consonantal onset, or last consonant in cluster onset, immediately preceding the stress:

Φη οη

μφωρ

χω χα-

πιτρ (triple cluster) Ex. 27:7

ωεες

The stress suprasegmental phone is thus structurally equivalent to a sonorant glide, as a conditioning factor, unless the stress preserves an original aspiration.

Obs.


Aspiration according to (a) only apparently conflicts with syllabication: Gen. 41:1:2 Φιάρο (phja-ro would account for Φ-, while the Jin-kim, if exclusively marking syllabic autonomy, would indicate pi-a-ro). Similarly, cases like ἡστεβ, Num. 31:17 σοβοσ or σωτεμ Deut. 4:36 σομος do not, I think, pose the short-open-syllable question, but illustrate the same dynamism.

Non-combinatory (phonematic and "etymological"; or else pertinent) aspiration is 1 believe questionable, and the phonematic load of the opposition marginal: χος Num. 11:9 vs. κος Deut. 8:15, πα- vs. Φα-; cf. also νωτεν pron. as against ντωτεν (ντε-) etc. Lev. 26:31, Num. 16:33 (the latter t < d — this "t₂" "diachronic phoneme" shows the inevitability of a hologrammic diachronic/synchronic view of systemic identity); here the ceteris paribus stipulation is often not maintained; consider cases like τωστν, ῃ, κωτ, the dental or velar not
subject to combinatory aspiration (b), devoid of written (graphematic) allophones.

Obs.
(1) On the nature of Bohairic $\Phi \times \varepsilon (\sigma)$. Surd+ [h] sequences are in Bohairic written in subsequent separate graphemes: πετεφων, πχο, πτικων, πτεμκο (θέβιο is exceptional); $\Phi \times \varepsilon$ is not a digraph for π/τ/κ + 2- (except for "foreign" Proper Names, which are not a cogent argument anyway). This alone would indicate that the said graphemes are "free" for different functions.

WORRELL 1934:18ff. — the only special study of Coptic phonetics and phonology to date — simply assumes phonetic aspiration for these graphemes, which is still a kind of implicit consensus. But this view was challenged from early on (Stern 1880:17: "emphatic as in Arabic"; De Zwaan 1905:419 n.1 "Aspiration is here a doubtful term, for the real value of the Coptic symbol x is at least as difficult to determine as the exact historical character of the sound represented by the Greek sign χ"). Incidentally, the two desiderata mentioned by De Zwaan as urgent for Coptic studies are still far from being realized, one century hence) to recent discussion (Kasser 1993:50 n. 4, 1994c:288 n.1, 292 "enforcement", Loprieno 1995:42f. "ejective"), the "pre-stress/pre-sonant quality", which is in Bohairic mostly conditioned, has been identified as the fortis type, although true aspiration may well be a phonetic-realization epiphenomenon thereof, and is relative anyway (cf. Clark and Yalop 1990:89ff. on initial voiceless plosives in onset); see De Groot and Winteler apud Jakobson and Halle 1963 (Swiss German) 155f. + n. 3 "Les fortes s’opposent aux douces par une pression de l’aire plus élevée...et par une durée plus longue...".

(2) The different treatment of pre-tone aspirating dentals (< 1) and non-aspirating ones (< 2: cf. τωϊφξ, Τι — see Worrell 1934: 187ff., Vycichl 1960, Kasser 1994c:291 nn.21, 23 — poses a nice theoretical-structural problem in the combined perspective of synchrony and diachrony, the definition of the phoneme and the nature of allophony; we must, as said, conclude the synchronic existence of /l/ and /\l/, which, however, have really only a diachronic contrast. Of course, in Bohairic, unlike Sahidic, the "aspirate" vs. "non-aspirate" contrast is phonematic, albeit weakly so (cf. also Loprieno 1995:42f.): it is only in cases of Θ- (stressed) vs. Τ- (stressed), that we have a synchronic phonological differentiation, corresponding to a diachronic source difference: elsewhere, both Egyptian /l/ and /\l/ merged into Bohairic /l/: /l/ > /l/, /\l/ > /l/, /\l/ — a classic synchronic merger.

(3) Peripheral auxiliary information, which reflects contemporary phonetics, is not conclusive, but does not point to aspiration. In Greek words, we find in Kellia (7-8 cent.) spellings like καλακτος (Kellia 1, 1969, edd. Daumas-Guillaume, No. 23 p. 105, which, like the "pre-Old Coptic" κϕι in Quecke 1997, must be seen in the context of the respective contemporary Greek graphemes and their value. The aid of Arabic pronunciation of Coptic "aspirate graphemes" and the use of Coptic AGs to render Arabic for establishing any synchronic value of Scripture Bohairic is very doubtful (Blau 1979, Satzinger 1991b); θ x are not spirants, while $\Phi$ probably is. Arabic $\breve{t}$ transcribes both $\tau$ and θ. The Arabic grammatical tradition identifies the "aspirate" quality with the Arabic emphatic one of "strong explosives" (Stern 1880:17 n.1): see now Satzinger 2003: 203ff. In fact, there aren’t any conclusive arguments in favour of Bohairic graphemes be-

52 Cases like Oxyrh. μετεξεββιοστ recall Egyptian phonetic complementation in enclosing biliteral hieroglyphs — preceding and following them — with their alphabetic values.
ing aspirates in any sense, while counter-arguments abound. (Somehow, I cannot conceive of the third segment in the monosyllabic τριφωτος Joel 1:3 as phonetically aspirate). The transcription in Demotic of aspirate graphemes in Greek PNs and other words (3rd century BC to 1st century AD), generally by surd stops corroborates their emphatic nature (especially that of χ): see Clarysse 1987: χ — q, kh, gh (frontal), g (frontal); ϕ - p and ph, θ - t and th.

(4) The allophonic distribution described of aspirates and non-aspirates excludes loanwords from Greek: σικερα, σπαλλας Lev. 11:30, κλαρκων Lev. 11:16 — yet another phonological distinction of this lexical sub-inventory.

(5) The synchronic status of the aspirate/non-aspirate distinction is very weakly phonematic: πα- vs. Φα-, not ceteris paribus Φε vs. πε, κετ- “build” vs. κετ (“other”, Crum 507b), θε “there” vs. οθ “that” (sgl. fem.), less neatly νθωτ vs. ντθωτ (ν- “theirs” [fem.] vs. “with them”); usually, θ × Φ occur as allophones of τ κ π in clusters before sonants, or prevocally in tonic syllables.

(6) The constant aspiration in the first consonant of θαμίο (unaccented, from δι!), θελή - or θεβιο, which, I believe, is not accounted for by the hori in the simplex verb (pace Crum 457b)? Why the absence of “aspiration” in the velar in κωτ, κωτ, κατ, opening a stressed syllable?

4.4.6 Juncture and aspiration: aspiration as link / delimitation

(a) Tone/aspiration correlation within lexeme boundaries:

ωτεροπρ, ωτορτερ — a unit-valid morphemic alternation link (primarily, one-stress linkage).

Φοτοφετ, Φετφωτ — aspiration assimilation linkage (the second and first aspirates are secondary).

Obs.

Kasser 1994c suggests a “half-tone” middle degree of tonicity, between zero tone and full tone; this reminds one of zero-guna-vyddhi verb tonicity gradation in Indo-European. Cases of half-tone are παι- and esp. prenominal (construct) and presuffixal (pronominal) allomorphs of the verb lexemes. See there, 290ff. generally on the correlation of aspiration and tonicity (n. 24 for the repertory and deviations). Kasser attributes practically all to epiphenomena of tonal features, and ignores (a) juncture (which I believe ranks highest as gradient factor); this includes of course inner-lexemic juncture, (b) lexemic Systemzwang, which, being synchronic, is not analogy, but a junctural pattern property.

(b) Aspiration before (across) scam — link within a unit, and

(c) Absence of aspiration before (across) scam — delimiter of two different segments:

“an aspirate is syllable and/or morph-initial, not -medial- or -final”[

“a morphemic/morpholexemic inter-segment boundary is present between a non-aspirate and a tonic vowel”:

53 There is in Coptic no instance, in native Egyptian lexemes, of a single syllable having aspirates in both onset and coda — a Coptic Grassmann’s Law: cf. Rosén 1964 §3.1 ex. 1 (Attic Greek).
ὩΕΡΠ-ΕΗΝΟΣ Gen. 19:2.
ἘΝ-ἘΗΝΟΣ Gen. 50:24.
ΣΑΤΕΝ-ΦΡΟ Gen. 18:10.
ΝΤΕ-ΧΗΜΙ Ex. 8:2.
ΠΙΜΩΤ#ΝΤΕ- Deut. 1:19.
ΝΩΗΤ#ΟΤΟΡ Deut. 1:21.
ΦΩΤ vs. Π-ΩΤ Num. 24:8.
Π-ὩΟΣ Num. 17:7 vs. ΦΩΟΣ "theirs".
ΝΑΡΕΦΩΤΩΝΙΩΝ#ΝΜΟΣ Ex. 10:23. In a case like this, or like Num. 18:17 ΔΡΗΟΝΩΣ, aspiration defines rightward linkage in the lexemic scope and a leftward boundary over an internal seam in the naxal scope. This boundary counteracts the strong rightward linkage of a pre-posed grammemic segment, reducing from the overall closure of the seam. It is always at the junction of leftward and rightward junctures, the interface of grammemic and lexemic hyper-paradigms, that this peculiar junctural turbulence is encountered.
ΧΝΑ-, ΕΤΕ-ΧΝΑ-, Ε-ΧΝΑ- vs. ΠΕΚ-ΙΩΤ, ΑΚ-ΟΤΩΥ.
ΝΚΝΑΟΤΩΜ ΑΝ Deut. 8:9 Circumstantial (Vat NΧΝΑ-): Κ here is the deaspirated χ.
(d) Morphemic juncture overruling syllabication (and resulting aspiration).
ΜΕΤΜΕΘΕΡΕ Gen. 31:48, Num. 17:9 — thus always. Inside-lexeme validity, with two different boundaries (PoloTSKY "given syllabication", 1957a:224 n. 3), the first less close, the second closer.
ΜΕΘΗΜΗ cuts across morphemic boundary (the existence of ΘΗΗΗ may be a factor here) Deut. 6:20:24 (me-thmēi) (ΟΤ-ΘΗΗΗ Deut. 32:4). ΜΕΤ- always:
ΜΕΤΙΩΤ Num. 17:17.
ΜΕΤΟΘΒ Num. 18:1.
ΜΕΤΝΑΗΤ Deut. 6:25.
ΜΕΤΒΩΚ Deut. 7:8.
ΤΕΝΜΕΤΑΛΟΣ Gen. 47:3.
ΜΕΤΝΙΩΤ Gen. 43:33.
ΜΕΤΡΕΨΕΡΡΑΕ Deut. 28:57.
ΟΤΜΕΤΡΕΨΕΙ Lev. 19:20.
(e) Aspirate/non-aspirate variation — not indicating "unstable juncture", but "telescoped" alternative divisions, see above — is far less widespread than is apparent at first sight, and evidently restricted: Τ-/Θ- seems especially prevalent. It never occurs in pre-stress aspiration, nor,
in pre-sonorant status, in most slots, e.g. always εορε-, εοβε, the
definite articles or the ο- of causatives (ομειχον Gen. 35:17). In fact,
the actual morphs given to this fluctuation are practically only the Rela-
tive converter et-/εο- and the sec. sgl. masc. κ-/κ-:

εοσωριπ Ex. 3:12.
ομαίο (secondary aspiration: from διτ!).
φιομ Ex. 26:27 ομήντ Ex. 26:28 ψλακξ Ex. 26:23 ϒβεξε Lev.
χοσωμ Gen. 24:5 so always?
χαμους Gen. 20:7, 24:42.
νκναοτωμ αν (Vat νκνα-) Deut. 8:9 Circumstantial — remark-
able: κ deaspirated, completing a syllable with η?.
ομακοτι Gen. 31:10:24 but (rare) τ-ομακοτι Gen. 20:6 (Vat ο-).
εκ-πανη Gen. 17:1 so almost always, but εκνους Gen. 48:7.
νεκ-μανεκως Gen. 13:8 so always.
ετεκ-να Gen. 15:2 but ετε-χνα- Ex. 4:13.
ετ-μωοτ twice Lev. 5:2 (Vat εο-) but ετμωοτ Num. 19:11
(= Vat).
κνα-/χνα- Gen. 37:8 in the same verse, in near-identical environ-
ment. True variation.
n.2).
εονα εοσον Gen. 23:18, but:
ετ-πανακ Gen. 20:15.
ετ-νοσκ Gen. 30:32.
ετ-νους Deut. 32:29.

Obs.
(1) Combinatory aspiration / non-aspiration variation is a prominent feature of B4 MSS.
In Bodmer III B4 John: ετνα- 5:24, ετροτες 6:11, δοσβεψ 5:18, alongside
Hab. 2:6, ετρεψ- Jon. 4:6, but εεορε- Na. 2:16, ετρα- Hab. 3:16, επτιντρπ-
Hab. 3:2, ετρῆς Mich. 5:13 vs. εονα-, εοναετ, εοταβ: εορο Hob. 2:6;
μερητ_Zach. 9:15, but μερητ_Zach. 9:7, 12:2; χνα- Hob. 1:14, ππονμες Na.
1:3 but χμα Na. 2:12; ετμωμι Hab. 1:6, εομεγ Hab. 1:6, ετβνωυ Am. 2:16,
εολαιμ Mi. 3:5 and so on.
(2) “Alien” rules: aspirate graphemes in Greek loans and PNs have a different value, and
are outside the distribution observed above: τξορα, βονοςος, ονριον, ενωδ,
χακ, μεοτεκκακ, ακεθ, φωλικτημ, κετ, κωφ, ροβωθ, βαρα (final as-
pirates only in PNs of this kind); κρεαγρα Ex. 27:3, σαμφιρος Ex. 24:10,
αμαφορον Ex. 25:28; ψονζωμφανχ Gen. 41:45 violates several privilege and
compatibility rules. Surds preceding sonorants are not aspirated in these loan-words, even
in syntagm with “native” morphs.
4.4.7 Striking environments and features of allomorphic juncture.

The very notion of complementary distribution and environmental conditioning / selection of allomorphs implies linkage, between (a) motivating and (a) motivated segment(s). Above, I have pointed to the junctural correlation of the respective commutability extents of two given segments; the case of one segment being conditioned — governed — by another, is surely an extreme instance of this. The pronominal elements following and delimiting lexemes (as object actants) and some grammemes are instructive. From a different angle and inversely, the formal sensitivity of the environment (especially verb lexemes) to the effect of linkage or delimitation is for us a precious junctural index.

(a) Link: labial assimilation of nasals. Only syllabic nasal morphs assimilate to non-syllabic labials. Assimilation defines here both Juncture Scope and Domain Frame:

\[ \text{Μπιασεως Gen. 18:23.} \]
\[ \text{Πεζενιρεψιωςν ον Μφαραγ Ex. 8:15.} \]
\[ \text{Νεπέγοοσ Μνικί Μφαραγ Πε Gen. 40:20.} \]
\[ \text{Ετεμφαφαραγ αν Πε Gen. 47:2.} \]
\[ \text{ΜφρηGen. 18:11.} \]
\[ \text{Οφμας Μβαέμπ Gen. 38:17.} \]
\[ \text{-οφμωι Gen. 27:23.} \]
\[ \text{Ανοκ τωνρι Μβαέσινα + Ανοκ : πωνρι Μμελαχ Gen. 24:24.} \]
\[ \text{Αστ Μβαλλα Τεθεωκί Νατ Εοσώγιμ Gen. 30:4, sim. Gen. 20:14, 35:25 Μβαλλα n. relationis (= Vat).} \]

As against
\[ \text{Σανίνυτ Νβακι Deut. 6:10 (= Vat).} \]
As against
(b) Delimitation.
\[ \text{Νεμβον Deut. 31:17, Νεμτον Ex. 35:2, 16:23 (=Vat),} \]

Non-syllabics never assimilate:
\[ \text{Σένπκαρι Lev. 22:33.} \]
\[ \text{Σατενφρο Gen. 18:10.} \]
\[ \text{Εγρηε Εδένπεκλαος Ex. 7:29.} \]

Obs.
A nasal and a labial consonant in contact “will not be of contrasting localization” (cf. Rosén 1964:160f.): syllabicity is here a necessary condition in Bohairic Coptic.
(b) The 1st-person-singular pronoun morphematic set: allomorphs defining JDFs and unit-final boundaries, and, by their very selection, acting also as links.

- i — following vowel, or consonant, final delimiter for the [base + actor] core formal nexus JDF; following vowel, final delimiter for the causative verb lexeme + object actant JDF and for the prepositional JDF:

  Gen. 3:12f. ἔχειμι ετάκτης ηνὶ νέος αὐτῷ Σεππιοῦ
  ὡνὶ διοῦμ ... πιγω πεταφέργαλ μμοὶ διοῦμ.

  Deut. 26:13f. λιτσαμ βοο εἴροε αὐλα Σεππάθὶ ... ἔπι-
  χῶ νεω ιντεκέντολν ὡτορ ἕπιερπεσίων ὅτορ ὅπι-
  ὡμ δεππάκαν.

  Gen. 24:45 ὅτορ αὐσωπὶ ἡπαῖζεκναιαξί.

  Ex. 33:12 νεοκ δε μπέκταιμοι εφί ετέκναοτρπνη
  νεμνη.

  Final delimiter for the verb lexeme + object actant JDF, for the prepo-
  sitional JDF:

- τ — following consonant radical, sonant radical, X (orthographi-
  cally, but not phonologically zeroed laryngal) radical.

- et — joining final consonant+sonant radical segmental sequence.

- zero — joining radical τ.

  xat Gen. 15:2.
  ait Gen. 34:30.
  twnt Gen. 31:35.
  ẓemt Gen. 4:14, 12:13.
  ὅουβετ Gen. 20:11.
  ἅουμετ Gen. 32:11.
  ἅομετ Gen. 47:29.
  ἅολοτ Gen. 28:20.
  κολιτ Gen. 31:26.
  ὅουβετ Gen. 39:8 (Vat ὅουβντ)- the shortening of a closed syllable?
  ntot Gen. 31:31.

  Interesting cases where the morphematic vowel resolves structure and
distinguishes between zero and nil:

  kōt Gen. 24:49.
  σετσωτ Gen. 34:30.

(c) The second person feminine suffix pronoun: allomorphs defining
JDFs and unit-final boundaries, and, by their very selection, acting also
as links:
A famous case of synchronic morphological zero (probably corresponding, not to a diachronic phonological loss, but to a phonetic element with no corresponding grapheme — a glottal stop?). Final boundary of: possessive article; conjugation base; converter; prepositional phrase; verb-lexeme; causative verb lexeme; Augens:

• zero — in syllable coda.
• zero + e- colouring in syllable coda — joining a-vowel prepositional phrase.
• i — in syllabic peak joining consonant, including X (laryngal sonorant).

έρο-Ø Gen. 12:12.
εάρο- Ø Gen. 38:16.
ενατάνσο- Ø Gen. 12:12.
εεβίο-Ø Gen. 6:9.
πε-Øː: τεβωκί, νεξία, νεβάλ, πεζρόξ, τερταρία, πεάλοξ, νέι καρ Gen. 3:16, 16:6:10, 24:17, Num. 5:21 etc.
επε-Ø: επεςωκύ, επεερ- Num. 5:19.
αρε-Ø: Pret. αρεερ-, αρεςωκύ, αρεςωβι Num. 5:20, 22:29 here not prenominal, but a special pre-zero base allomorph.

Note the following syllabication difference, resolving a homonymous morphemic one. The Jinkim does not preclude the coda status of the morphematic zero:

έρε-Ø: Circumst. έρετοβνος Num. 5:19.
νέ-Ø prep. Gen. 30:15, Ex. 2:7.
τεραγένε-Ø Gen. 24:58 — special future morph, also Sahidic.
νεμε-Ø Gen. 20:10.

ντοτ̱ Talent 18:.6.
σερωλι Num. 22:29 (Vat γελωλι̱).
(extra-corpus) νεο εωι Cat. 33.

Obs.
(1) Two other juncturally significant unit-final archeimorphemes with their allomorphs, the general distributional picture of which in Bohairic is still pretty confused (STERN 1880 §342), but in our corpus the trend is clear:
(a) 1st person plural pronoun — apparently conditioned morphonologically: — (e)n joining vowels and sonorants (all but n, and including the laryngal phonemes; -ten joining consonants and -n:
Vowel- n: epon, nan, ten-; sòa®en.
πσικε έταξαμεν Num. 20:14 (= Vat).
ženatopten Gen. 31:15.
qënten Num. 20:5.
ómken eGN Num. 16:34.
køttén Gen. 43:10, Deut. 2:1.
(b) The 2nd person plural pronoun. Here the allomorph -ten joins conjugation bases, converters, simple (i.e. not compound) prepositions (all except Žen-), but the allomorph òbnot joins the prenominal state of verb lexemes and “inalienably possessed” nouns, including those grammaticalized in compound prepositions as a “noun grammeme”:
wep-òbnot Gen. 19:2.
natòbte-òbnot Gen. 34:2.
Ebihnot Gen. 50:24.
âp-òbnot Lev. 26:33.
mete-òbnot Lev. 6:30.
còtte-òbnot Gen. 34:17.
edÈ-òbnot Lev. 26:25.
èi-òbnot Lev. 26:33.
Ebi-òbnot Lev. 26:9.
On épëte(n(e)- as the 2nd pl. base form for the Absolute-Definite Future e.g. Deut. 2:1, 6:9; Deut. 14:4 P épetene- (Vai épeten-), see QUECKE 1986:353f., FUNK 1992:20; on the “nominality” of òbnot54, see STEINHAL and MISTELI 1893:293.
(2) The three allomorphs — better: “allo-lexemic bases” of the dictionary entry òwótn (“arise, get up”), in Bohairic of reflexive diathesis, are joined by a transitive homonym òwótn “raise”, and an intransitive òwótn + actancial preposition (e.g. Deut. 1:19 “set out, move from”). The three allomorphic bases (historically merging suppletively two distinct verbs) are selected by the pronouns: — ten- for the second plural; for the other persons: twon= by non-syllabic pronouns, twon= by syllabic ones (SHISHA-HALEVY 1977a):
Tën-òbnot Gen. 34:3.
ëtwnt Gen. 31:35.
Townik Gen. 19:15.
Tëwotni Gen. 21:18 (outside the corpus: Dan. (Bardelli) 7:5, 1s. 51:9, 52:1, 51:17 (Tattam).
âtwotnot Gen. 18:16, Num. 2:9, 10:2, 26:9.
The exact semantic and formal spectrum of non-reflexive òwótn is not clear to me: consider Gen. 7:17, 22:19, Num. 16:3 (the Present tense), 20:11; I find interesting the nominalizations (see our Chapter Three), like ðàëntwotn Num. 4:15 =Vat;

54 Incidentally, this is the second pronoun to select a pre-nominal allomorph; the other is the zero second person singular feminine, conditioning pre-nominal base and converter allomorphs.
Outside the corpus, we find **τωτον** much more broadly used, as yet another, inanalyzable lexicem form. It represents a plural Imperative — uniquely marked! — in Athanasius of Qūṣ (BAUER 1972:186, 3); In the Bohairic Job and Psalms, **τωτον** and **τωτον** εξήπτυ: "raise up"/"rise up", Job 6:21, 30:21, 58:2, 91:12, Ps. 19:19, 74:6, 77:52 etc., alongside the reflexive **των** , Job 7:4, Ps. 3:6:8; typical of NT variant readings, Nitrian Bohairic and Porcher’s Job, we have **τωτον** in all persons, and in the Present too (proving this is not to be a pronominal object extension, but an inert slot-filler, become part of the lexeme; cf. **κωτον** Dan. 1:4): Job 6:16:27, 16:5, 27:7.

### 4.4.7.1 The laryngeal (Glottal Stop, 'Ayn) phonemes ("X₁, X₂"): the Bohairic reflexes as juncture features.

This is a striking juncture-sensitive environment, in which diachrony meets synchrony in a multi-dimensional hologrammic reflex. Its value is in the effect that different junctural gradings have environmentally on allophone motivation or selection. We are dealing with an allophonic ensemble — all allophones of some overt phoneme or other — that is cumulatively definable as a covert (sonorant) phoneme.

**Obs.**

(1) On the synchronic laryngeal phoneme(s)


(2) SATZINGER 1979 is a good structural treatment (for the Sahidic verbal environment) of these phonemes, postulating "X" (no vowel colouring) and "X'" (vowel colouring), with an /X/ archiphoneme. Its distinctive allophonic property is here defined as "tendency to vocalic reduplication" (347), and indeed, can hardly be characterized more rigorously for Sahidic. Other realizations (see esp. p. 347ff.) — [a] before tonic syllable: [zero] at onset of tonic syllable and at absolute coda of tonic syllable. The vocalic doubling — in unstressed word-final and following the tone before consonant(s) — is irrelevant for Bohairic (cf. KAHLE 1954:240ff., n.2).

(3) Compare the synchronic laryngeal sonant in Herodotean Ionic Greek, structurally established (ROSEN 1962:48ff., esp. §§12.1, 15.27 ), with the following allophone set: vocalic length, zero, hiatus; no vocalic syllability. The similarity to Coptic is striking: cf. (ROSEN 1962:50) “synchron-analytische feststellbare und sich ihrerseits in ein Phonem gruppiere Lauterscheinung...die historisch-komparativ einen Laryngeal entschreiben”. In fact, H.B. Rosen’s studies of the Greek and IE laryngals in the late nineteen-
fifties and sixties owe much to H.J. Polotsky's classroom exposition of the Coptic facts. (4) The syllabic realization of the laryngeal phonemes as vocalic doubling before the enclitic pronominal Theme — ḏwq-a-ne or ṭmēq-e-te — which is especially significant for our study as junctural link (cf. Polotsky 1957a:231, 1957b:348f.; see now Roquet 2006) is absent in Bohairic, as is in general doubling as laryngeal reflex.

Note the following significant realizations of the laryngeal phonemes:

(a) Vocalization of 'Ayin as [a] in syllabic peak: ḏwq-a, ḏwq-e (cf. ḏwq-a, ḏwq-e, taka (cf. tōsqo), ḏwq-a — within lexeme boundary, in lexemic scope. Note the form ả of the plural "definite" article adjoining this ả- (Polotsky 1968:245).

(b) Vocalization of 'Ayin as [a]-colouring in median (pre-nominal and pronominal) final — lexeme-boundary status (pregrammatic): ɔa-, ɔạ.

(c) Realization as zero in final post-consonantal status ('Ayin): ṭwq, ṭwq, ṭwq “scatter”, ṭwq “(over)turn”.

Obs.
(1) ṭwq (Sah. ṭwq-ke) has two sporadic by-forms, viz. ṭwq Deut. 31:18 ṭwq-Deut. 7:4, 22:1, ṭwq Deut. 32:5, ṭwq Ex. 32:25 corrected super lin. to ṭwq, ṭwq-ke Num. 18:17 — and ṭwq ṭwq- Gen. 19:29 (Crum Dictionary 514f.). These may point to a final consonantal reflex of the 'Ayin (Egyptian pr.: cf. ṭwq [ə'ə'] and ṭwq (Sah. ṭwq) — with a non-specific consonantal articulation, familiar from the Indo-European laryngals in certain cases. However, the etymological assignation of these and of the lexically distinct ṭwq, ṭwq, ṭwq “flow, be poured” (pron+pron) and ṭwq, ṭwq, ṭwq “empty out, draw, bail water” (pron) is not entirely clear, although an Egyptian “Vorschäfung” is not out of the question.

(2) ṭ following hiatus is familiar from Oxyrhynchite, as syllabic reflex realization of the 'Ajin and, less commonly, Glottal Stop. This is probably the most striking dialect for the synchronic presence of this phoneme (initially and intervocally zeroed): ňeə (equivalent of Sah. əə- and Boh. əə), m̄eə “love”, m̄eə “truth”, q̄eə “hair”, c̄oə (sm3'), kęe (q'h), p̄eə “temple”, w̄eə “shine” (vs. əə- “go”), p̄waə “east” vs. p̄wa “joy”, ə̄eə “fall”, ə̄eə- īə, ə̄eə- of ə̄eə “wash”.

(d) Vocalization of 'Ayin as [i] in syllabic peak, in final lexemic boundary, in lexemic scope: īw “wash”; ə̄w “walk” q̄w “hair”, ə̄w “(have) mercy” etc.

(e) Zero realization of the Glottal Stop in median final-lexeme-boundary status: ce-, co≡ (cf. kete-, kot≡).

(f) Vocalization of the morphematic Glottal Stop, second-person-feminine pronoun, as [i], following a lexeme- or grammeme-final consonant: ŏwq-n-i (Gen. 21:18) mm̄aət (Gen. 39:9) s̄eəl̄w̄a-i (Num. 22:29, Vat s̄eəl̄w̄a, cf. Stern 1880 §342).
4.5 Integration in texture. "Ordination": "syntactic-role status". Converters. Discourse signalling: some prominent cases.

By "integration in discourse" I mean a specific type of linkage — of course, all textual elements cohere, by definition of a text; but what I have in mind is the role of special morphs that exist for the very purpose of integrating a unit — most notably, a nexus one, or even an information block — as well as delimiting it by syntactic-role status isolation, qualifying it for a given junctural slot in texture. Some instances are presented below in detail.

(a) Integration of Greek-origin verbs.

What επ- does for Greek-origin verb lexemes is "lexemization" or "infinitivization", with nuclear εp- the formal infinitive, and the Greek element — morphologically the nominal Greek infinitive, where Sahidic has a "lexical zero stem" form — is marked as derivate verb. This is a significant typological trait, for, unlike Sahidic, Bohairic does not accommodate the Greek element in the infinitive slot at all: the επ-+ infinitive complex is thus only semi-analyzable; ἀγαπάω alone is as enigmatic in Bohairic as ἀγαπάω is in Sahidic, and the question of its precise nature is still pending.

Obs.
(2) apieh Deut. 8:5 and ephio Num. 32:5:29 are two rare cases where native Egyptian infinitives are integrated by means of 1p1, although the former is exclusively an imperative (i.e. no επ-εμι is present).

(b) "Adverbial Status"

The all-important if elusive adverbial word-class is not an absolutely definable "part of speech", but a syntactic-role status cluster, syntactically defined (actually, the role at the focus of Shisha-Halevy 1986a), and juncturally meaningful; adverbiality is not necessarily marked otherwise. Consider παρθή, discussed above, privileged to occur in two disparate slots; or εξαπίναι as in Num. 4:20, 6:9 ΝΝΟΤΙ ΕΘΟΥΝ εξαπίναι, or Deut. 17:4 ταγμή, which are wholly non-committal or indifferent as regards their form (unlike clause-initial καλως... vs. adjunctual ...ΝΚΑΛΩΣ 56, for which abundant formal information co-sig-

56 N- signalling the triply pertinent slot of adjunctal adverbiality, rhematicity and object-hood that is marked in Arabic by the accusative and in Welsh by lenition (Shisha-Halevy 1995 §3.4).
nals the function); also the case of ἀπαντοῦσα... Deut. 28:67, adverbal form of the noun τοῦσα.

As unambiguously adverbial as the banal Num. 6:10 ἀπεκτάντωσα... εἰς τοὺς, the case of Deut. 16:8 ἄνεγορτ ἐκεῖσθαι ἀπὸ τῆς εἰμι, and, even more strikingly, ἄνεγορτ ὁρὸς ἰθορὲς ποιμνὶ Deut. 16:16, are different still, for here adverbiality is not a function of position, nor of any specific marking, but of purpose-built syntactic patterning. This is also the case of Num. 14:22 θαμάζω τὸ κοπιῶν περὶ θαλάσσα (= Vat), with the whole clause presentationally or rather superordinately adverbial, by token of θαλάσσα ("for the 10th time", "ten times").

As pointed out above (Chapter Two, §2.2.1), the deriving auxiliary επ- also serves to accommodate adverbials in non-durative conjugation environment:

Gen. 44:4 ετασεπάβαλα νὴθ τωκάτι...
Gen. 3:5 τετεναερμεφρητ ἑγέροντα.

Adverbial status is also signalled by a structurally precedent Focalizing Conversion (see Chapter Two). This JDF statement is valid in Bohairic more than in any other dialect of Coptic.

(c) Conversion. This is no doubt the most striking instance of nexus integration in Coptic syntax, and a show-piece of Coptic and Egyptian grammar. Some special theoretical consideration is here called for. Conversion (as first applied to the Coptic verbal system by H.J. Polotsky in 1960, but practically nowhere since in his published work, and indeed not for Egyptian or for other languages — see below, Obs.) has ever been a vague and multilayered concept, never unequivocally defined. Polotsky himself explained the term variously, mostly anecdotally, orally and in classroom discussion — from a technical morphosyntactic shifter of the Durative Conjugation ("Bipartite") agent from prefixal to suffixal; to full part-of-speech transference (POLOTSKY 1960 §28 and, more ideologically, later, in 1987-1990 for the idealistic and a priori substantive/adverb/adjective triad, with the formal conversion mechanism explicitly presented as a part-of-speech transformative device; cf. 1976 for an early non-morphological conversion scheme in Middle Egyptian); through a less rigorous and more moderate conception, of any syntactic-status formal exponence of the verb, simultaneously implied in 1960. The part-of-speech approach is an application of the original and most conventional connotation (in word-formation context) and

57 Cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 1995:165f. for some cases of superordination overlapping adverbialization.
association of the term, going back at least to Sweet's *New English Grammar* of of 1900 (§105) and cultivated in Prague School linguistics, while the macro-syntactic, syntactic-status one, which I endorse here, was more or less "in the air" of Polotsky's teaching in the nineteen-sixties, but has really only been followed up by his disciples.

I wish to propose here again a somewhat novel view of the Coptic converters (tentatively presented in my "Demotic Work-Notes", 1989b:49ff.). Divide them into two groups (mutually compatible, in second-power conversion) — (a) exponents of ad-clausal and adnominal linkage, in clausal scope and nucleus-to-expansion Domain Frame: the Circumstantial and Relative (adnominal) conversions, carrying the opposition of adnexal and attributive expansion respectively; (b) discourse signals, concerned with message and information structuring: the Focalizing and the so-called "Preterite" (ನೇ- *nē*) Conversions. Subordination is not a notion that applies easily to Egyptian-Coptic (Shisha-Halevy 2006a). The exceedingly old, logic-based, European-ethnocentric, originally prescriptive dichotomy of "subordinate" vs. "main" (clause) — the latter also coinciding with "formally unmarked" (in fact, macrosyntactically marked!) — can and must, I believe, be replaced by statements of junctural gradience and type. The converters, and conversion, are primary exponents of subtextual unities and junctural structuring of discourse.

Obs.
(1) See Shisha-Halevy 1995 §1.0.1, on subordination and conversion; 2006a, on Polotsky's use of the conversion terminology and his heritage in this context. See Dokulil 1968 on conversion in Prague School word-formation terminology — the formal changing of a word's status/role (generally a-priori and non-analytic, in the part-of-speech class range).
(2) "Konversion oder Transposition"..."dass Sätze aller Typen durch verschiedene grammatische Mittel in eine der drei nicht-verbalen Wortklassen: Substantiv, Adjektiv, Adverb überführt werden"..."der ursprüngliche Satz wird so zu einem eingegliederten Satzteil, einem Satzglied substantivischer, adjektivischer, adverbialer Bedeutung". Polotsky 1987. "Word classes" in this formulation depend on an essential reduced scheme of the *partes orationis*: the Circumstantial is the "adverbiale Transposition" (Umstandssatz, Zustandssatz); "substantivische Transposition" applies to the Second Tense (which as a matter of fact has no conclusively substantival slotting since Late Egyptian). The odd one out is here *nē* (1987 p. 3), which is not assignable to any Part of Speech, and Polotsky of necessity retracts the 1960 system: "Die Präteritale Transposition betrifft weder Wortklassen noch Gliedsätze, sondern verschiebt Vollsätze in die relative Vergangenheit... Es war ein Fehler meines "Conjugation System" §18, ihr die erste Stelle unter den Transpositionen anzuweisen". Conversion has reached its final phase: converters must coincide with specific a priori Parts of Speech in order to qualify, and must be "transposed" from a basic tense — the ideal "verbal" verb clause that is primary and — it must be said — "original". The "Preterite" converter, be it first or last of the
set, contradicts itself: it converts, but is no converter. The description must reject facts: the generative model is, typically, forced on grammatical reality.

(3) "Subordination", implicit in the very title of DEPUYDT 2000 and in "main", in the title and in the second constituent of the peculiarly Egyptological term, coined by S. Groll, "Non-initial Main Clause", leads us further to such symptoms of descriptive unease as "hybrids" (134) or such descriptively meaningless concepts as "independence". "Working definitions" won't help (pace DEPUYDT 2000:131) unless part of a consistent and uniform general theory. In fact, this difficulty is no less than a blessing, for Egyptian teaches us to break free of this non-analytic dichotomy, viz.: "main" vs. "subordinate", also in European and Semitic languages and indeed in general linguistics.

(4) See BARRI 1981, for converters in Modern Greek: the basic concept is that of "a verbal preparticle causing transposition (subordination) of the whole clause into a clause-part", yet in an expanded, broadly conceived system (Circumstantial, conditional, Relative, substantivizers, various subordinators, even temporal markers). See also SHISHA-HALEVY 1995 for converters in Middle Welsh in a narrowly conceived system: clause-oriented (Relative) and discourse-oriented (e.g. negative, interrogative, responsive, focussing). Following Polotsky, the term was extended into pre-Coptic Egyptian and even used by Gerald Browne for Old Nubian.

4.5.1 The Circumstantial conversion: junctural syntactic-role status scanning

Linkage of a special kind is the quintessential function of the Circumstantial converb, which, in a way strikingly similar to the Greek participle (member of a nominal rather than adverbial word-class), is always rhythmically associated with another textual segment — noun, nexus or a more complex stretch of text — forming with it a predicative link union (cf. μετοχή). It is thus a feature with extraordinarily important junctural implications. Its converbial status too has specific junctural implications.

Obs.
The history of the terminological and descriptive association of the Circumstantial with the "participle" is very old, much older than Stern's usage, going back to 17th and 18th Latin Coptic grammars. See SCHOLTZ-WOIDE 1778:101 §103 ("Participium Praesens Graecorum Aegyptiace per Praens Indicatixi saepissime exprimitur, adeo ut Praesens Indicativa a Praesenti Participii in utraque dialecto non differat"). In the seventeenth century we find the term in Père Bonjour's manuscript grammar of 1698 (Elementa linguae Copticae sive Aegyptiae), in the Bibliotheca Angelica, Rome, now edited by AUFRÈRE and BOSSON (2005), a valuable work much plagiarized and even copied by Tuki. Bonjour may have had in mind the periphrastic "dicens est" as the structural essence of the Coptic form (still echoing in Homer's translation of εἴρη- into the English Present Progressive). PEYRON 1841:85 "Praesens et Participium Praesentis", with εἰρη- (129f.) a participle too,

58 The Egyptian-Coptic converb systems are treated by the present writer in a forthcoming article.
thus preceding STERN 1880 §400ff. However, Stern seems to use the term advisedly, whereas the tradition was ethnocentric and Greek/Latin-inspired (notably by the Greek textual correspondents of the Coptic). The terminological association, functional but hardly formal, was renewed in Chaîne 1933:300ff., Préface p. ixf. ("Construction participe" [of Pres. t. Pres. III "à raison de son rôle dans la phrase qui est celui de la forme verbale de ce nom dans nos langues"]). Polotsky seems to object to the term, although he notes that it is not inapt, functionally (1959:459ff.).

4.5.1.1 Notes on morphology, morphophonemics and morphotactics.

(a) εὐας-: no clear example in our corpus (with μπας- Ex. 33:11 a case of the converter zeroed before syllabic nasal).

(b) Zeroing of the converter in the negative subsystem. Converter zeroing and negativity are closely associated in our Bohairic, by reason of pre-syllabic nasal zeroing:

ΜΜΟΝ- (Gen. 20:9, 30:1, Lev. 22:21, Num. 22:26, Deut. 8:15 etc.), neatly contrasted with the grammaticalized-formalized Circumstantial ΕΜΜΟΝ "or else, otherwise" (e.g. Num. 20:18).

A case like Gen. 47:4 ΜΜΟΝ-ΜΑΠΜΟΝΙ ΡΑΡ ΨΟΝ is instructive as to the role of ΡΑΡ in signalling a non-Circumstantial (thus non-zero, unconverted) homonym of zero conversion. ΡΑΡ is thus here a delimitter.

Circumstantial Ν-...ΑΝ: Gen. 38:8, Num. 35:23 etc. etc. However, note the following extremely rare instances of ΕΨ- ΑΝ, all remarkable in one sense or another: Deut. 25:5 ΝΝΕΤΣΙΜΙ ΜΗ ΕΤΑΧΜΟΤ ΨΩΠΙ ΝΟΡΨΜΙ ΕΨΕΝΤ ΕΡΟΨ ΑΝ (= Vat), which neutralizes adverbal-adjunctal and adnominal statuses (the Greek has here άνδρι μη ἐγγίζοντι); similarly, Num. 9:13 ΠΙΡΨΜΙ ΕΤΝΑΨΨΙ ΕΨΟΤΗΒΟΣΤ ΟΤΟ΢ ΕΨΕΝΟΣΨΜΙΕΤ ΕΝΑΨΟΣΗΟΣ ΑΝ (ΑΝ supra lin.; ΕΝΑΨ- may be the adnominal circumstantial of the Focalizing Present; ΒΑΤ ΕΝΑΨΟΣΗΟΣ ΑΝ ΕΨΟΤΗΒΟΣΣ; Deut. 22:2 ΕΨΨΠΙ ΕΨΕΝΤ ΕΡΟΚ ΑΝ ΟΤΑΣΚΨΨΜΙ ΜΜΟΨ ΑΝ (= Vat) — again, for some reason the Stative ΕΨΕΝΤ. Unique is the full Circumstantial converter, Sahidic-wise before Ν- ΑΝ: Ex. 23:26 ΟΤΟΝ ΕΝ:ΨΝΑΜΙΚΙ ΑΝ (Note punctuation. ΒΑΤ ΝΨ- ΑΝ).


ΜΨΑΣ- Ex. 33:11 ΟΤΑΛΟΨ ΠΕ ΜΨΑΨΚΕΝ-ΓΣΚΗΝΗ ΕΒΟΛ.


(c) Zeroing of the converter before inter allocutive Nominal Sentences:

(d) ερε-οτον- is rare in the corpus, but usual in Nitrian and common in NT and OT. This is a juncturally fascinating pronominal alternant of the Circumstantial of the adverb-Rheme Durative pattern, with a typically pronominal allomorph of the converter selected across the οτον boundary, without actual contact of the motivating and motivated segments. This alone is of considerable junctural interest. But this also implies the inertness and formal nature of οτον, as a "phantom partition". All Themes and Exsistants are indefinite (οτ-, γαν-, ἂν):

Ex. 39:23 γενε τε δε ντωδην οκιμεντεςμην τε εισαγει νυμ β σκαλις ερεοτον-οτοκωβι νατνοω κατ τε εγενε (= Vat). The next exx. are all adnominal, with prepositional Rhemes:

Lev. 21:19 οτρωμι ερεοτον-οτοκωμει ναιητη (= Vat).
Lev. 21:20 οτρωμι ερεοτον-οτρουβα ναρπιον γιωτη (= Vat).
Deut. 10:7 οτκαγι ερεοτον-γανμοτνεκωρμ εν ναιητη (Vat εοτον).

These are opposed to ε-οτον-, which appears to be rare in Nitrian outside existential statements:

Lev. 23:17 ετεςοδοτ εοτονωμεηρ ημωτω.

The existential ναρε-οτον in Gen. 40:10 ναρε-οτον-γ ναρη πε (Vat νε-οτον), vs. Gen. 40:9 ναρε-οτον-οτρω ναλωλι χη ἧπαμο πε, is an analogue construction with νε- conversion (to my knowledge, neither Focalizing Conversion nor Relative conversion occur in this construction). ερε-μμον- is not attested in the corpus.

Obs.

(1) Stem alone has a special statement concerning this mysterious construction (1880 §413), correlating it with prepositional predicates, adusting NT examples; the Themes attested are οτ-, σνοτ[F] only. In Nitrian, where this form must yet be studied, there cer-
tainly seems to be preference for adverbial and Stative Rhemes (this is an impression based on *Acta Martyrum* and *Catena*); this form hardly occurs, in any case, with truly existential ὁσον-, or with the negative ἡμοι- in any function (yet another point of affirmative/negative asymmetry!). The Themes are indefinite (not zero-determinated?). ὁσον- is attested, but is rarer in Nitrian (e.g. AM I 134, Cat. 104).

(2) For the possible diachronic precedent of ἐπε-ὁσον, namely LE jr-wn, see Shisha-Halevy 1981:326; cf. Spiegelberg, AZ 53 p. 8, 62 p. 43 n.6).

(e) Circumstantial conversion of the Absolute-Definite Future: zero. This historically established feature, attested in Late Egyptian and Demotic, although in earlier Egyptian, as in Coptic, the converter is sporadically zeroed: see Johnson 1976:157ff.; J.F. Quack, *Enchoria* 24:176 (1977/8); consider e.g. P. Berlin 15622+23668 line 6 (ed. Zauzich 1993)\(^59\).


(2) For the affirmative Future, we may, with fair structural certainty, postulate a zeroed Circumstantial converter on the paradigmatic basis of ωπι + rhematic Circumstantial, since, in view of the formal/functional sequelling effect of the Absolute-Definite Future (see Chapter One above). “Circumstantial (adnexit) dependence” semantics alone cannot suffice to establish a formal Circumstantial marking:

Ex. 28:35 ὅσο τε ἐν ωπι ἡμε-ἀρων Ἑμμαθιεροφευ-μωι ἐτεκμίτε ἐτεκσμίθ εἰμινος εἰςοτη (= Vat; Greek ἐσται Αρων... ἀκοινή ἢ φωνή αὐτοῦ).

Lev. 23:7 ἐν Ἐξωτερικὴ ἐροὶ ἦ τε-ἀρων (= Vat; Greek ἢ καὶ ἢ πρώτη κλητὴ ἢγία ἐσται ὑμῖν).

Lev. 25:6 ὅσο τε ἐπειλαται ἡμε-νιγερνω λτεπικαρι ἐκε-τοὶ (= Vat; Greek ἐσται... βρώματα σοι).

Gen. 1:6 ὅσο ἐπειλαται ἐπειλαται ἐβολ στε πρώτα μωτιν ὑμειωτ (= Vat; Greek ἐστώ διαχωπίζον).

Two instances of the periphrastic ωπι ἐκ- + Stative, hitherto considered agrammatical in Coptic (cf. however Winand 1996 for LE):

Deut. 28:29 ἐκείσαται ἐκκαθομμεν... ὅσο ἐκείσαται ἐκείσοτ (Vat ek-, Greek ἐστι + Pres. Part.).

Ex. 34:2 ἔσοτι ἐκκαθομμεν (Vat. ek-; P emended by Funk 1992).

\(^{59}\) In this corpus, the graphematic distinction is found of ἱε- vs. ἱ for respectively the pertinent vs. formal or conditioned Circumstantial (e.g. following ἱπρ).
Probable instances:

Lev. 25:46 ὅσοι εἰσεβμιν ϛλτεεναι ἑτεεναιᾳ ἤημωσ... (cf. ANDERSSON 1904:64f.; Greek ἔσονται ὑμῖν κατόχων).

Deut. 20:8 ὅσοι ἐκεεστοτογ ἱλη-νικάτε ἐκεεστο γιππα λας (Greek infinitive).

Deut. 8:9 ὅσοι γιππα εἰνεεμι ημενιπι νε ἐκεεστο γιοσ-γομτ ἕβολ γιεεετογ.

Num. 9:22 εἰσεβμι ηλη-νιερον εἰεερήης εἰδικ ηλη-ἀθηπ (Greek πλεοναζόουης σκιαζόουης).

4.5.1.2 Syntactic slotting: the adnomal Circumstantial — adnominal, adverbal, adclausal

(a) Adnominal

Nucleus specificity. The crux of the adnomal Circumstantial is no doubt the conventional view of the Circumstantial as essentially compatible only with non-specific ("indefinite") nuclei (Gen. 21:19 μωσ εροτιν; Ex. 30:7 ορεενοορι εροοουτ, Ex. 18:21 γανρωμι ημεμι εροοοτ ημεμερεφηγηνο), the Relative with specific ("definite") ones. However, this old model of a Circumstantial/Relative alternation, conditioned or selected by nucleus specificity, while statistically certainly convincing (it goes back at least to STERN 1880 §§407, 409f., 412, 415, 439 etc., with a very insistent and persistent statement) is, I believe, misleading and inexact (see above, Chapter Three §3.1 (9a-b) and here, §4.2 link b16; also below, on the Relative); specific noun syntags and even personal and demonstrative pronouns are certainly expandable by the Circumstantial:

Gen. 33:1 ζηππε ει ηαιες περιον εοηνοτ.

Lev. 14:52 ἴηι πικοκκινον εύκατ (vs. 51 ετ-). ANDERSSON 1904:108 is here discerning, with a unique and cogent statement: "Meiner Meinung nach hängt dieser Gebrauch davon ab, dass das Partizip mitunter seine attributive Bedeutung aufgiebt und dann nur die Rolle eines erklärenden Nebensatzes spielt".

Deut. 14:4, Lev. 11:2 ηαι ηε ηειτεκμωοτ εητεενεοοοοτ (ANDERSSON 1904:134f. emends ιο ετεε-).

Lev. 18:9 νηνεκοπηπ εβολ μπωιην ντεεκοεΗηνη νηενωη ιε ηεικοηε εαεκοην νδουην ιε εαεκοη νδολ.

Deut. 22:27 ἱεεληπη εαεηη νκωο Vat (P has here ἱ- ετα-; cf. ANDERSSON 1904:136f.).

The Circumstantial is specifically rhematic — adnomal — when in opposition to the attributive relative. This is at its clearest when its nu-
culus is the object of a "verb of incomplete predication", in which case a striking "union" or "sharing" (cf. the Greek μετοχή) of predication is observable:

Deut. 22:4 ἀκουνάντες ἐφίστων μπέκασι ιε πεφματι εκερεί ἐφιμωτ.

Num. 22:23 ακνάντες ἔδε-τέων επιγεγρελοκ ... εφορά εράθη

ζιτινιμωτ οτοσ τεγκχι εστουκεμ δεντεψία.

Gen. 6:16 εκεθαμίον μὴ ξεμπτωτοκ εκσοτητ εκογν.

Ex. 19:9 γίνα ντεπιλακολ εκτεμ εποι είκαξε νεμακ.

The junctural status of the Circumstantial is here delimitative, even disruptive, for, unlike the Relative, it carries the information core: the Theme — Rheme interdependence linkage is looser than the nucleus — satellite one, the nucleus — Relative link is tighter than the nucleus — Circumstantial one 60.

However, demonstrative-nucleus cases like

Lev. 26:36 νη εκακωμάν μήρυς ἐντοπολημος μμον-μετ-

σοξι νατος Vat (P ετασ-, cf. ANDERSSON 1904:112), which are, of course, characteristic of Nitrian Bohairic, are for me still a mystery. Likewise, the Circumstantial as a conjunctival form, following grammaticalized (or "pronominalized"?) substantives like πιμα or Φ-

ητιό 61.

The Circumstantial alternates with η- (an equally looser link, an adnexal nota relationis), following the indefinite article:

Lev. 21:7 οτασκύλιι μπόρνη οτοσ εκκογ.

Obs.

(1) The conventional confusion of the functional "attributive" with the formal "ad-

nominal" (as in POLOTSKY 1990:241ff. "attributiver Umstandssatz") helps to obscure the special role of the Circumstantial, which is elusive anyway, and can be patent only in opposition to the attributive interdependence. And yet, the "adnexal" status is sharply de-

marcated, and generally clear. "Satznachtrag" (see MÜLLER-LANCÉ 1994:110ff. on absolute constructions — "between coordination and subordination", 72ff.) is not entirely sat-

isfactory, since it wants the predicativity (rhematicity) factor, and makes use of the misguided notion of "subordination"; indeed, it brings home the inadequacy of the "sub/

coordination" model as aprioristic and syntactical, strange as this may sound. The Egyptian "non-initial main clause" notion, basically flawed, has a similar didactic value, see FELBER 1997:130ff., as does in this regard Celtic and in particular Irish syntax (HAMP 1973): agus typically converts in Modern Irish statal-existential nexus adnally, in adnominal, adverbal or adclausal status, very differently from temporal or other "con-

junctival" adverbial clauses.

60 Consider (Cat 37) καζι νιβεν ετωονειτ ερενιρωμι ναξοτοη.

61 For the latter cf. also B4 (P. Vat. copto 9) Zach. 2:12.
Stern speaks of "attribut eines verbs" — "verbales attribut" (e.g. 1880 §418, pp. 251, 260, 266f., 272 etc.) Funk 1991:53 adopts "adnexal", but then restrictively, as "nicht adnominal" — I believe both adnominal, adverbal and adclausal statuses are compatible with the special adjoined "shared" rhematicity (the \(\mu\varepsilon\tau\omicron\chi\acute{\eta}\)-type role) that is expressed by the Circumstantial. Indeed, it is always the rhematic core of its complex.

(2) As a higher-level rhematic form, the Circumstantial has affinities with \(\lambda\alpha\nu\gamma\)- (see Chapter One for narrative focussing, and cf. the rhematic Relative in Lambrecht 2000); see Chapter Two for \(\lambda\alpha\nu\gamma\)- and \(\epsilon\varphi\)- following Presentatives. The Circumstantial enters paradigmatic opposition with another rhematic convertible, namely the Conjunctive (see Stern 1880 §440 and Shisha-Halevy 1986a Chapter Seven).

(3) Along with \(\sigma\tau\epsilon\nu\alpha\nu\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\nu\xi\nu\tau\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\nu\xi\) (once in Oxyrhynchite, Mt. 11:30 ed. Schenke) and \(\sigma\tau\epsilon\varphi\)- (see Schenke 1996:100ff.) we encounter the no less instructive Sahidic \(\pi\epsilon\rho\epsilon\)- and \(\tau\epsilon\rho\epsilon\)- in the Palau Ribes Luke (2:4, 18:24, cf. Quecke's Introduction, p. 75): the Circumstantial expands non-specific and specific formal pronominal nuclei.

(4) Consider \(\sigma\tau\epsilon\varphi\)- \(\sigma\tau\omicron\rho\lambda\nu\varphi\)- (Ps. 69:6) which alternates with \(\sigma\tau\epsilon\varphi\)- \(\sigma\tau\omicron\rho\lambda\nu\varphi\)- (Ps. 68:30, 85:10), always Rheme of Nominal Sentence.

(b) Adverbal, ad-clausal or "ad-textual" cases. The Circumstantial rhematically adjoining its nexus to a foregoing verb clause or any other nexus complex or, fuzzily, the preceding text. What this effects is not subordination, but the demarcation of the last and final component of a hyper-nexus complex, in which two rhemes coalesce to form a union of predicates: this is the real sense of the Greek \(\mu\varepsilon\tau\omicron\chi\acute{\eta}\) (Latinized as participium)\(^{62}\). Evidently, the term "circumstantial" is basically off the mark, functionally speaking: for it is not circumstance, but the actual rapprochment, link, and its interface with the preceding cotext — the conjunction of action or state — that this verb signifies. Its relative rhematicity is a corollary of the said conjunction or adjunction, a role which makes this conversion so very important from the junctural angle. However, in this union the Circumstantial is rhematic — and as such, a final-boundary marker — within a much more extensive JDF, which may contain a sizable chunk of the preceding text: the Circumstantial in that case rounds off a truly macrosyntactic pattern. The following illustration is selective:

\[
\epsilon\varphi\-\; (\text{Greek Pres. part., }\kappa\alpha\iota\; +\; \text{Pres.}).
\]

\[
\epsilon\varphi\zeta\omega\; \mu\mu\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\; \text{"saying" following } \text{verba dicendi} \text{ in the broadest sense: Ex. 18:6, Num. 24:12 and } \text{passim} \text{ (always Greek-induced: } \lambda\acute{\varepsilon}\gamma\omega\nu\text{ etc.)}.\]

\(^{62}\) Cf. Lohmann 1965:224f.; the Coptic Circumstantial is a finite, analytic convertible.
Deut. 4:34 ἡβ δι'βεν εἰκαίτοτ… ἐπεκμεθο εκτασ.
Ex. 28:35 εὐετεὶτεμ εὐετείμαν εὐνήνει ἐθνὶν ἐπεθειτὰρ… ἐνε ἐξήνην εὐβολ…
Lev. 26:13 Ἄν ἐπεκαίτοτ εὐβολ… ἐτετενοὶ μβωκ.
Ex. 1:18 πασῦν ὦν πε τεταπενϊαὶ ἐπετεντανδο νηνιγὼτ.

ηγ- ἀν: adjunctal only (Greek οὐκ + part.).
Num. 35:23 οἰν δι'βεν φίν ἐπεκαίτοτ νῆστήν ηγεμίνη.

e- + Nominal Sentence or Cleft Sentence: relatively uncommon (only delocutive and naming NS):
Lev. 4:21 μφρητ ἐταρπώκεν μπίμασι τεσωρπ ἐβασονοι τεσωτεναγώγην με.
Gen. 35:29 αγμοσ ἀχαν ζατενηνεκςνος εοτζέλλο πε εξάκεν εὐβολ ἰἐνγανεγοτ.
Gen. 38:2 αγνατ μματ… ἐτασερπ νοτρωμι νθανανεος ἐπεςπαν πε αξα.

εοσον-/μμον-, εοτονταγ/μμονταγ (Greek Relative, conjunct -τός participle, main clause).
Lev. 2:11 ζατενηνεκςμως εοσον εοσον-μμεμνρ μμωσον.
Lev. 22:21 εὐβολ ἰἐνγενος νεενιγσοτ ει εὐβολ ἰἐννιεκσωτ μμον-αῖνι νῆστοτ.
Num. 22:26 ορμα εψεξεδυγξ μμον-ρητ ἐρικι ειοτιναμ εῖ ἀξαν.

εα- (Greek part. Aor. or Perf.; less usually, finite Aorist with participle corresonding to a Coptic unconverted verb). No narrative sequential εα- in the corpus.
Gen. 34:7 οταςβ δι'νιπτ ιαριμ ναε-ειχεμ ἰἐνπτελα νεενικοτ νεμ τεερπ νικαβ.
Gen. 15:15 εκεσενακ ἰανεκιοτ ἰἐνοτοριβαν ἐκεσενανωτεμζέλλο ενανες.
Lev. 6:10 μνπαουζεοεν εαξιεμνερ — εα- object actant or “adverbal” of ιοξεάζεν (Shisha Haley 1975, 1976).
Lev. 22:32f. ανοκ πε πδζ επτετενο μμωτεν εαιενοτν ευβολ ἰἐνπκαζη νκακμι…
Ex. 16:3 αμοι ενεανμος πε ἰἐνκκμι εανσιερροτ εὐβολ ἱτεπνιζζε.
Num. 22:30 μη ἰἐνοτςινγξ αἰνινγξ μμον εαιριπ νακ μπαριντ.
μπατετ- (mostly narrative) (Greek προ του + inf.; forms of χρονιζειν + inf.).
Gen. 19:3f. ἀσωτῶμ μπατοτνκότ ἢ σοσ... Gen. 13:10 νεωδεστοκ πε μπατετήρ ροϊτ νεοδομανα ἰεμνομπα μερή... NB: the μπατε- clause is parenthetical here.
Gen. 50:16 πενιςω αγαρκον μπατετμοτ ενάω μμοκ ἰε...
Gen. 41:50 ιωσκήδι με αβιηρι τ εωτι να τ μπατονι νάδε-τ-τ νρομπι νγκο...
Ex. 12:34 αβσι δε νάδε-πιλαοκ μπιςωτ μπατοτσισεμηρ νάδε-νντσοσωκεμ.
Deut. 23:22 ννεκωποκ μπατεκτης.

Gen. 31:20 ...εὔτεμπταμοφ εγκανσεμαγ.
Gen. 35:1 κη εηατοκοτογκ εροκ εκακφστ εβαλ...
Ex. 28:43 εκεοστο ινάδε-αρεον νεμ νεποωηρ εεναι εβονι εττκκανν;
Lev. 10:9 οτηρπι νεμ νεκιερα νντενκεοσοτ ... εετεην

nadve εβονι εττκκανν...
Num. 28:8 εκελιχ εεεροοσι ηαωπι — cf. Num. 9:11 εεεροοσι ηαωπι εεελιχ, with a different information structure.

(c) A junctorially interesting slot: the Circumstantial adnexal to the Nominal Sentence or Cleft Sentence. This does not imply overlap of the adnominal/adverbal status opposition:
Gen. 24:1 αριαμ νεοτζελκο πε εακαλιαν ηεννεκεροοσ
Deut. 5:9f. ανοκ πε ... ωτνοτήρ νρεοχογεφεηβιω ννι

νοβι ρεντιοντήρ εκεννιιχηρι ... ωτοπ εηρι νοσραν ζα-

ρανφο νάωορ... — note the different standing of the two Circum-

stantialts, both adnomenal, a difference carried by the distinction in linkage.
Gen. 20:10 οτ πε εεκανατ ερογ εακερφαί — the first Circum-

stantial is topical in the CS; the second adnexal.
Gen. 20:3 ραι τε εεςωοπ νεμ ντραι.
Gen. 31:38 ραικ νρομπι νε εειχη νεμακ — the Circumstantial

adnexal to “these twenty years”.
Deut. 14:21 νθοκ οσλαοο εονταβ — Circumstantial adnominal

to Rheme.
(d) Adnominal / adverbal status truly overlapping (indefinite nucleus) — uncommon:

Deut. 25:5 εὕτω εὐστὸν-γὰρναός ὣς τὸ γύρνα αὐτοῦ ντεοσά μοὸς ἡμοντερ])(ἡ μᾶς (Greek στέρμα δὲ μὴ ἢν αὐτῷ).

Deut. 23:16 ννεκτὴς νοσταί ετοτῃ μνεηθὲς εὐαγγελὲν ερατι (Greek Relative).

(e) The Circumstantial as a special rhematic-actant form (“predicative complement”).

(1) The grammaticalized ωντι with the no-less grammaticalized Circumstantial Present, always affirmative, periphrastically and suppletively enables the Static or the Dynamic Converb in certain tense categories (the narrative Preterite, the imperative, the Jussive, the Present-based τὰ- Future, the Conjunctive and, frequently in the corpus, the Absolute-Definite Future). The auxiliary supplies the nuclear tense categories in a thematic environment, the Circumstantial the Rheme. Juncturally, the personal reference in the act expression or another pronominal segment of the Circumstantial may be either a conditioned link (e.g. επερεωντι ἐπ.), or a pertinent delimiter accompanied by a referential anaphoric link (e.g. Gen. 17:1 ωντι μνον-ἀρικὸι ὦ εροκ). The juncture contour within this JDF is peculiar: the linkage of the rhematic actant is looser than that of all other actants being both expanding and information-carrying — overmapping, as it were, a nexal kind of juncture onto a nucleus — satellite one. Here, as usually, the Circumstantial alternates with a rhematic notar relationis introducing and marking a rhematic determinator phrase: Gen. 44:10 επερεωντι ηνὶ νοσαλος (sim. Ex. 30:21).

Note, in the following illustration, cases of the 3rd plural actor, Dynamic Converb and object as suppletive Statics (thus in fact double suppletion); also the use of the copular τοι ἣ-, where the Circumstantial + Static is opposed to zero (i.e. το ὅτι ἢ-).

Gen. 17:1 ωντι μνον-ἀρικὸι σι εροκ.
Ex. 27:16 κρηκουσὶν ἄρες-πεκαλαμμα εὐπρὶ ἄρκ μμαγι νσιὸς neg. Gen. 21:12.
Lev. 11:36 κατὰς ὅς ἐνευσωντὶ ηνὶ ηνὶ εὐσὼς.
Num. 14:33 κατευνωρὶ εὐνωντὶ εύμοις μμωσο ἐπι-

ωατε...
Gen. 41:36 ὀτρόγ εὐσεβῶι νῆε-νικρϳροι εὐαρέξ ερπωτ — here and in the next example, ἤτα = ὥτα, the latter replacing the nonexistent morphological Stative.

Num. 14:33 εὐσεβῶι εὔσμονι μμωοτ εἰνπαγε.

Ex. 25:20 εὐσεβῶι νῆε-νικρ万美元 εὐερωτενεγ Φορμ εβολ ... ὀτρ odio εὐερωτενεγ δοστ μεστ εὐσμοτ εὐερωτενοσ — a noteworthy case of “inalienable-possession” dependence of the Circumstantial actants with the actant of the auxiliary (and nucleus base): discontinuous -τα + οὐς- and -τα + οὖς-

Gen. 43:9 εἰεσβῶι εἰοι ντεπερνοβί.
Deut. 28:29 εἰεσβῶι εικνοχεμ μνερι.
Gen. 4:12 εἰεσβῶι εκκασομ.

Ex. 33:16 πος εναγῶι εκτοτονε εβολ νταφμην χει-ξιμε νομγοτ ναγρακ.

Lev. 10:19 μη γναγῶι ευραναξ μπερε.

Cases of the Circumstantial Absolute-Definite Future complementing γουπτι (see above, 4.5.1.1 [e]). This γουπτι επι- outil grammatical occurs almost only with an Absolute Future nucleus, which makes it a regular, if not predictable combinatorial pattern:

Gen. 1:6 ὀτργ ντεεσβωι εὐεφώρα εβολ οὕτο εμωοτ

Ex. 28:35 ὀτργ εὐσεβωι νῆε-λαραν δεπαξινερεψ-γουμι ευεσρε οὕτοςμ εφονυοτ εὐσόταν... (Vat εσσετεμ).

Lev. 23:7 εὐσεβῶι νωτεν εσεμοντα ερογ δεφωταβ (= Vat).

Lev. 25:6 ὀτργ εὐσεβωι νῆε-νιγεθμά ντεπικαρε εκ-οτομοσ... (= Vat).

The following two remarkable cases are not properly speaking suppletive, but still periphrastic constructions for complex verbal categories:

Ex. 33:13 γοπος ντασβωι εαξίμε νοσγοτ ναγρακ combines the Conjunctive with the rhematic Preterite, for a “Future Perfect” complex tense.

Ex. 19:19 νασβων αε νῆε-νικμή ντεεξανπιγγος ασμωι ετη (Greek έγινοντο ...προβαίνουσαι) - a special augmentative Aktionsart in Narrative Evolution Mode (Chapter One).

(2) The grammaticalized “descriptive verbs of incomplete predication” (Curme), are illustrated here by ὀσω:
In Dialogue: οὕτω + Circumstantial Present: “have (already) done” (in the Clause Conjugation or Preterite) — periphrastic Perfect; no special descriptive verb is found in the Greek original, which typically has the Present.

Gen. 24:33 ζητοσσω ειςω νναιακαι “have done”: (Greek εως τοι λαλησαι με).

Gen. 43:23 ιοσσω ειςοι μνοι (Greek απεχω).
Num. 32:19 ιοσσω ενσι ννενκληρος (Greek απεχομεν).

In Narrative: οὗτω + Circumstantial Present: “finish, cease”: Greek (κατα)πάω + participle.

Preterite: Gen. 49:33 αποσσω νζε-ιακωβ εσοναςγανι ννεπ- ωρι.

Gen. 24:19 ωτεποσσω εεκω.
Deut. 20:9 αζωνασω εςκαζ αει ηεπιδιαοικ.

Narrative κνυν + Circumstantial Present is semantically distinct from αιμω (rare in the corpus, it is a Bohairic lexeme, typically Nitrian, but well attested in the NT and OT outside the Pentateuch): “finish”

Preterite: Gen. 17:22 ακκνυν αε εςκαζ αειμαν (Greek συνε-

τέλεσεν λαλῶν).

All other attestations of this verb in the corpus are of a different —
valency construction (and render different Greek verbs):

Gen. 30:15 καν αν + ζε-αρεωλι μπαγαι... (Greek ουχ ικανον

σοι).

Ex. 31:17 ζεπιεγωου μμαγ-ξ ακκνυν οτογ αεμτον

μνοι (Greek ἐπαύσατο).

Deut. 3:26 καν εροκ μπερ- (Greek ικανούσθω σοι).

(3) The Circumstantial adnexal to the object actant — a third, rhematic, verbal actant. Juncturally, beside sharing in the usual close va-
lenacy-matrix linkage (cohesion), the Circumstantial marks here the final boundary for the specific valency-matrix JDF, that has the transitive verb lexeme (which is simultaneously resolved as being of reduced rhematicity) as initial boundary. But the distinctive junctural aspect of the construction is the linkage of the second (object) actant to the Cir-
cumstantial in nexal Theme+Rheme juncture — the second nexal junc-
ture in this complex JDF. Some representative instances:

εωστν: Num. 11:10 οτογ ωαςοτστεμ ερωστ ετριμι.
Ex. 19:9 κινα υτεπιλαοος εωστεμ εροι ειςκαζι νεμακ.

νασ: Deut. 22:4 ακωναναζ εφιω μπεκον ιε-περματι

εςιει ειφωνι.
Gen. 26:8 ἀναταφάτ... ἀναστειλε ἐκσωβι ἦν πε- 

べκκά.
Num. 22:23 ἀναστειλε νδε-τεω ἐπιαγγελος... ἐφορε ἐρατη 

gινομιτ ουρο τεϊσθη ἐσωκεμ ἕντεξαμε.
τ-πατ Ex. 23:4 ἀκωντματ ἐτερε ἐπεκακαὶ ἰε-πεινω 

ἐτερομε...

χω Gen. 15:2 ἀνοκ γεναχατ ἐβολ ἐιοι νατωηρι — Bo-

hairic seems to prefer the copular verbal periphrase to the direct immedi-

ate (n-) rhematic adjunct.

θαιοι Gen. 6:16 εκεθαμιο ντκαβωτος εκεοντητ ειςον.

Of course, cases of third n- /e- actant are structurally similar in junct-

ture (see Chapter Three, §3.2[d]):

Gen. 12:2 εἰεικ εουνιωτ ἵναλα.
Ex. 32:4 αγεαμιονι λοσμας λοστωτ.

Note the absence of n- when the rhematic complement is preposed:
Gen. 6:16 γαντιπι νδε ῃ νημ ῃ νδε εκεθαμιοσ.

(f) The initial Circumstantial has premodifier status, marking initial 

boundary. This distinctive slot is essentially, inversely different from the 

ones hitherto examined, for here the converbal converted nexus, is not 

adnexal or rhematic, but a topical premodifier to subsequent text, defin-

ing (as initial constituent) a pattern in which a clause or clausal complex 

is high-level rhematic, in nexual interdependence with it. Note that the 

Focalizing converter, in Bohairic also morphologically distinct from the 

Circumstantial (in Sahidic they merge morphologically, and are kept 

distinct by their junctural status), is also an initial boundary signal — a 

thematic or topical one:

Gen. 20:7 εςτωνε εεωκ εκεωνσ.

Num. 16:13 εκοι ναρχων ερον νθοκ-νηαρχων.

Gen. 15:12 ερεθρι ναγωτπον στωττ ακι εεωκναρμ.

Ex. 33:22 εκνακι νδε-ναωος ειεακ θενουχοι λτετ-

πετα.

Num. 9:11 ερεποτε νασωνι ετεαικ.

Gen. 48:7 ἀνοκ δε εινηντ εβολ θεντμεκοποταια...

ακμοτ νδε-ναρχα... 

Lev. 20:12 εταερασενς γαρ οτον ερωτ.

Gen. 44:4 εταερασολ δε ντβακι μπατοτοτει εβολ 

πεδε-ιωσεφ...
(g) The Circumstantial enclosed or "vested". The Circumstantial converter is the only one combinable with a loosely prefixed element that serves to resolve, determine or restrict its semantic reference spectrum; this is common in initial status. The existence of this slot is remarkable, as is also the fact that the said element acts also as a junctural partition delimiting the Circumstantial, partitioning it off — as it were "insulating" it and rendering it inert, in its interdependence with its environment: this Circumstantial no longer defines a sub-textual pattern, but occupies the slot of a "mere" adverbial:

\[
\text{εω̃ωπ + εq- } \text{Ex. 12:14.}
\]

\[
\text{εqna- } \text{Lev. 1:14, 2:4:14, 7:12.}
\]

\[
\text{εq- } \text{Lev. 3:1, 7:18 — εqωστωμ ητεqτωμ here constitutes a closely-linked Tautological-Infinitive-type focalizing construction; Lev. 13:9.}
\]

\[
\text{εωκ/ετι εq- } \text{Gen. 29:6:9, 44:14, Deut. 31:27, Ex. 34:29.}
\]

\[
\text{εοτε εq- } \text{Gen. 24:11, 42:21, 45:1, Num. 33:40.}
\]

\[
\text{[εταq- Gen. 24:29, Num. 33:39, Deut. 9:23].}
\]

\[
\text{ικαν επατωσ- Ex. 1:19.}
\]

(h) Likewise, the Circumstantial, "vested" and partitioned off, features in the adverbial paradigm following foregrounding-delimiting \text{αςωστι} in Narrative Evolution Mode (see above, Chapter One, §1.1.5 [b]):

\[
\text{αςωστι εq- Gen. 39:10}
\]

\[
\text{εqna- Gen. 35:17f., 38:27}
\]

\[
\text{ετα- e.g. Gen. 12:11, 20:3}
\]

\[
\text{ικαν ανεα- Gen. 7:10, 8:6:13, 12:14, 14:1}
\]

(i) The adverbial-adjunct Circumstantial is junctorially interesting as a case of a non-referential delocutive pronoun, which is not actantial either; in fact, the only definition of this peculiarly idiomatic and old usage is junctural: the cancelling ("freezing") of an endoparadigm constitutes a delimitation. In the corpus, I find:

\[
\text{εqκωτ् "round about" (Gen. 23:17, Ex. 19:12, 25:11:24, Lev. 8:15, Num. 14:12, 35:2 etc.).}
\]

\[
\text{εqρακι Lev. 26:24 ειμωωι nemοτεν Ικωττωμεν εq- γακι.}
\]
Obs.

(1) See Shisha-Halevy 1975, Layton 2004 §425. Additional Bohairic exx.: eq-
γολακ “sweetly”, Prov. 3:24, Mark 7:10:35 Φιλ ετνακάκι εργοστ, ηνακακι... 
εργοστών; also 9:39.

(2) This feature may be as early as Late Egyptian (Circumstantial sdm.f): D’Orb. 8,1
...hr rmyt n f q f “... weeping for him loudly”, unnecessarily emended by Gardiner.

(j) “The antecedentless” or better “endonuclear” Circumstantial is a
generic, nomen agentis nexus-form: the Circumstantial here recalls a 
participle, although no other sign of nominality is observable. Its syntac-
tical status is adverbal. The pronoun — masculine only in the corpus,
also feminine outside it, evidently referential (in contradistinction to [i]
above) — is actor-actant (only the Dynamic Converb is predicated; I
find no Stative example in the corpus). The exact relationship with the
adverbial-adjunct Circumstantial is not clear, but one factor common to
both is the adverbal status which, on a higher analytic level, merges ob-
ject actant and adverbial circumstant. The distinction is then purely
junctural, for it is the referentiality of the pronoun — 3rd sgl. masculine
in both cases; effectively nuclear in the nomen agentis case: “he/one
who...”, but entirely formal and non-referential slot-filler in the
adjunctal case — that resolves the actual difference. Note the alternation
with analytic or synthetic derived nomina agentis:

Ex. 12:9 Ννετενοσωμ εβολ νγητοτ εγωσωμ οταε εγ-
φοςζ ζενοσωμωτ.

Deut. 18:10f. Ννοτζιμι νητκ.

εγερο μνεκσω πι ε τεκσερ εκει νενοσκρωμ
ιε-εγοσιμ ζενισωγι
εγερκαλνονιεσι
εγεμετατ
οταε παξεραζι
οταε αεβε
οταε εγωσωμ εβολ ζενθεζζι
οταε εγωσωμ εζανμινι
οταε εγοσι μνπεξμωμωτ.

Obs.

(1) See Shisha-Halevy 1976. Add Pistis Sophia 235.4 η εγοσκωκ, NHC VII 74., in
Proper-Name status. For Bohairic, cf. also Apoc. 2:15 οτον-ντακ μνκει εγομονι.
(2) This is a common gloss and lemma form. No.344 in the 6th cent. Boh. Greek-Boh.
glossary published by Crum and Bell in Aegyptus 6 (1925) has εγομον glossing
ληγατον. The Scala Magna (BM Or. 8780 f. 73vo) reads εγοσι εβολ σαριη; in other
Scalae such as BM Or. 8775 we find the feminine εγομι κακια “one (fem.) who
cries”, “a crying female”, among numerous ετ- lemmata, some of them evidently adver-
bial, to judge by the Arabic glosses (the lemmata are always singular).

4.5.2 The Relative: some reflections

Diachronically, this element, structurally closest to the oldest con-
verter, the Circumstantial, was the last to reach full converter-hood; in
fact, even in Coptic it still shows some characteristics of a nexus con-
stituent. This synchronic distinction and tension has a distinct junctural
character, namely in the representation of an antecedent in the Relative
clause by ετ- itself:

Ex. 6:9 ΝΗΒΗΟΤΗ ΕΘΝΑΥΤΗ.
Ex. 12:4 ΝΗ ΕΤΩΕΝΠΙΗ.

And perhaps also the rare cases of substantival ετ- (Present or Fu-
ture), not πετ- or ΦΗ ετ-:

Deut. 21:17 ΦΗ ΤΑΡΧΗ ΝΤΕΝΕΨΞΗΡΙ ΠΕ ΟΤΟΡ ΕΤΕΙΣΕ ΝΑΡ
ΕΣΙ... (= Vat).

There are, to accentuate the distinction of this converter/pronominal
entity, well-documented indications of a synchronic competing con-
struction, namely, the unusual case of a separate delocutive actor re-
sumption/representation of the antecedent in the affirmative Durative
Conjugation, with a converter homonym (see detailed discussion and il-
lustration, above, §4.2.4.7.1(b1)):

Ex. 22:11 ΟΤΑΝΑΥ ΝΤΕΦΠΙ ΠΕ ΕΤΕΙΝΛΑΨΩΠΙ ΟΤΤΙΟΤ ΜΠΗ
(Vat. ετεψεψωπι — in the Base Conjugation, ετ- is of course full
converter). Note that the case of the negative ετ-q-(να-) with the pro-
noun resuming an antecedent is quite different — we have here a zeroed
pre-negation (i.e. zero ...ΔΑ): Deut. 1:39 ΦΗ ΕΤΕΨΙΨΘΩΝ ΔΑ ΝΠΟΟΤ
ΝΟΣΑΓΑΘΟΝ ΠΕ ΟΤΠΕΘΘΟΤ: the zero is here the junctural partition
between the Relative and the Theme.

The postulation of a zero anaphoric morph, resumptive of the anteced-
ent (so Layton 2004 §405: “nothing (Ø) is suffixed to the converter
ετ= (ετ= + Ø). This significant absence...expresses resumption + sub-
ject function”) is, as I now see it, but begging the question, tautological
for seeing ετ- as converter, and has no actual ground in reference syn-
tax — all the more so, seeing that it is in contrast to the real converter
construction with an explicit resumption. (The co-existence of homony-
mous Relative pronoun and converter is not rare: witness English that,
or Italian che).
The cohesion between antecedent determinator (non-specific, of low specificity, specific, highly specific) and its nexal expansion is as crucial as it is complex: anaphoric reference in many cases, but primarily the special combination of specific determination and the relative converter, a combination which (in view of its statistical predictability quotient) borders on a discontinuous-mark complex. Associated, though not symmetrical with this are the non-specific determinators and Circumstantial expansion. These two types stand in junctural (and functional) opposition — of the most fundamental in Coptic — as attributive satellites, to a looser and marked type of cohesion, that between specific nuclei and the Circumstantial: the adnexal or rhematic satellite, discussed above. (Also loose and marked is the “Hermeneutical Relative”, with the Relative expanding a non-specific nucleus). Finally, in a rare construction which must nevertheless be included in the picture, non-specific, as a rule generic nuclei combine with the Relative conversion. Let me stress again, that, while the compatibility of the specific nucleus with the relative and the non-specific one with the Circumstantial are established beyond doubt, the two conversion forms are alternants only in a statistical (“normalcy”) approximative synthetic model: this is a considerable sector of the formal and functional spectra, but there are others, as yet only partly understood. The current classroom formulation, of a relative “proper” with definite antecedent alternating with the “improper” Circumstantial following indefinite ones, is incorrect.

Obs.
(1) Instances of non-specific antecedents of the Relative are as a rule generic, not particular. See Stern §424: his example Nic. 1:14 has, not the relative but Focalizing Preterite, but Mt. 19:12 is a valid instance, Stern’s doubts notwithstanding (several witnesses, incl. M 569 ed. Aranda, collated: H. Quecke by letter, 15/11/88); add Benjamin, Hom. on the Nuptials of Cana ed. Müller (Abh. Heidelberg Akad. 1968, 1, 132). See also above, Chapter Three. §3.1 9b.

(2) The distinction — logic-oriented, universalistic, praeter-analytic and not intrinsically grammatical — of restrictive vs. non-restrictive (appositive, amplificative, predicative etc.) Relative clauses is by no means correlatable with the formal opposition of Relative vs. Circumstantial, esp. following a specific nucleus. This is (Kleiber 1967:77) “une opposition introuvable”. Two different pluridimensional semantic oppositions are here active: — specific vs. generic interpretation or reading (34f.), and the restriction, gradual and not dichotomically opposed to non-restriction, of the nucleus. Kleiber’s suggestion (e.g. 119ff.) is interesting in the present context: opposing, “semantic-juncturally”, integration to detachment of the Relative and nucleus (cf. the “looseness” pointed out above of the rhematic expansion). The specificity grading of the antecedent, which is by definition scalar, is a crucial factor in the semantic reading of the Relative: another is the contribution of the expansion to the said specificity and their junctural interdependence.
(3) The Relative converter is juncturally unique in its usual contingency with its antecedent phrase. This is so constant that such a deviation as Gen. 44:15 Φαίγωβ ὅτι οὐ κατατέθεται calls for special observation; the Greek τι τὸ πράγμα τούτο ὃ ἐποίησεν is clearly not at the basis of the Coptic, but decisive is the Topicalized-Theme Pattern (Chapter Two, §2.1.1 III), which is in Bohairic so formalized as to constitute a juncturally compact group, and may be triggered by the Greek Copula-less construction.

4.5.2.1 Notes on morphology, morphophonemics, morphotactics

(a) In our corpus, we find a structured ("trendy") fluctuation of aspirated and unaspirated morphophonemic (junctural) alternant of the allomorph εν-: see above (cf. ANDERSSON 1904:1f.).

(b) The Preterite or generic-tense Relative-pronoun base (not converter?) επ-, attested in older MSS (B4) as well as in many other dialects, does not occur in our corpus.

(c) The converter form in ετε-νασθτι or ετε-ἐνασθτι is problematic: the latter analysis is based on the close juncture statement in POLOTSKY 1949 (and cf. STERN 1880:247).

(d) For ετε- as allomorph with the Absolute-Definite Future, e.g. Ex. 3:14, 23:22, Deut. 6:13 etc. neg. Deut. 28:50: see above, Chapter One.

(e) We have in the corpus at least one instance of οντο-, in a Cleft Sentence: ποιεῖ πεν/ετακεμένον οντό Ex. 16:6 (n crossed out, e above line). Cf. (?) ὑμνοτο- for the normal ὑμνοτο- in Gen. 29:8 (without claiming any Sahidic factor in the corpus).

(f) The basic fact that Bohairic does not have a special prenominal alternant of the Relative in the durative conjugation, like the Circumstantial ε-ρε-, the Focalizing Conversion α-ρε and ηα-ρε ("Preterite conversion") may be seen as an archaic feature: see QUECKE 1979:439f. Before non-specific Themes in the durative conjugation, ετε-, not ετε-οτον-, is the conversion alternant: POLOTSKY 1960:411. Both peculiarities have a junctural implication, namely looser linkage with the nominal-Theme conjugation form. This is confirmed by the following remarkable cases of open-juncture (or less-close-juncture) Relative Conversion, which indicate a relative autonomy of the converter, at least in substantivized Relative clauses:

Lev. 14:35 Φω ἑτε-πηθι Φω αν πε.
Deut. 2:25 η πε-διάνασθωτεν επεκραν ετεωροτερπαι


64 See ANDERSSON 1904:63. This is Polotsky's only example (1987:93ff) from the Pentateuch (he quotes in all 19 others, of which 18 are NT ones, one from Proverbs).
However, the first example may point rather to the grammaticalized and devalued status of the Topic in this NS pattern; consider, similarly, Gen. 25:28 ne-teq hence teq hence te.

Obs.
The Bohairic Relative converter is famous for its extraordinary open juncture with its conjugation form, allowing the interpolation of premodifying topical adverbials, topicalizing extraposition and the (essentially and prosodically different) Augens. However, for a reason not clear to me, this occurs almost only with substantivized (Φη ητ-, Φαι ητ-) Relative clauses, see POLOTSKY 1987:93ff. and above, §4.2 (boundaries c19-c20):
II Cor. 8:10 ΝΗ έΤΕ ΟΥ ΜΟΝΟΝ ΠΙΩΒ ΕΑΙΚ, ΑΛΑ ΠΙΚΟΣΤΟΥ ΑΤΕΤΕΝ-
ΕΡΩΠΙ ΝΩΤΕΝ-ΟΝΝΟΒ ΕΡΟ.
Eph. 3:12 Φαι έΤΕ-ΝΑΡΠΗ ΝΗΤΗΤ ΑΝΣΙ ΝΠΙΟΥΝΤΕ ΕΒΟΛ...
Eph. 2:3 ΝΗ έΤΕ-ΑΝΟΝ ΤΗΡΟΤ ΝΑΝΜΟΥΙ ΝΑΡΠΗ ΝΗΤΟΤ.
Heb. 5:11 Φαι έΤΕ-ΕΘΒΗΤΩ ΟΤΝΙΤΩ ΝΑΝ ΠΕ ΠΙΚΑΩΙ.
II Thess. 2:9 ΦΗ έΤΕ-ΝΕΞΗΝΙΕ ΕΓΧΗ ΚΑΤΑΘΕΝΕΡΦΙΑ ΝΤΕ-ΠΚΑΤΑΝΑΚ — the
Relative converts a topicalized Circumstantial Focalizing Conversion.
I Tim. 5:3:5 ΝΗ έΤΕ-ΟΝΤΩΣ + NS.
Acts 27:4 Φαι έΤΕ-ΜΕΝΕΝΑ ... ΜΠΕ...
II Pet.1:19 ΝΗ έΤΕ ΚΑΛΝΟΣ ΤΕΤΕΝ-
It would indeed seem that the juncture contour of substantivized Relatives is distinctive (cf. Φη ΝΙΒΕΝ ητ-). Although I have no textual basis for this as yet, I believe this feature is Egyptian, and that Late Egyptian and/or Demotic evidence of it will eventually come to light.

(g) Zero actualization of the Relative converter before adverbials: Φη ΕΘΒΗ- (Lev. 4:34 etc.) may be associated with the adverbial-Rheme Nominal-Sentence conversion of έΤΕ-ΕΘΒΗ- ΝΕ, έΤΕ-ΕΒΟΛ ΑΝ ΝΕ
ΣΕΝ- (Lev. 9:10, Num. 17:5, Deut. 20:15).

(h) έΤΕ-ΝΑQ- (Deut. 8:16) is the only case we find of Relative Second-Power conversion. We have no Relative Focalizing Conversion (cf. POLOTSKY 1960:405 n.3), despite the affinities of the ΝΑQ- and Focalizing conversions (cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 1989b:49ff.; see also the Oxyrhynchite Acts 4:12 [Schenke] for a rare example of the historically well-established Circumstantial + Focalizing Conversion Cleft). The Aorist ΝΑQ-, for its part, resembles ΝΑQ- as regards Relative conversion. Both έΤΕ-ΝΑQ- [Lev. 4:35] and Ε-ΝΑQ- [Num. 31:23] are attested; diachronically, both have formal and/or functional affinities with the Emphatic, the ancestor of the Focalizing Conversion; even the Α-vo-
calization is here significant.

(i) Conversion of the negative Durative Conjugation forms shows three constructions, differing in their junctural profile:

(1) ΦΗ έΤΕQΝΑ- ΑΝ (on the zero ... ΑΝ negator basis, i.e. έΤΕ-ΘΡ-
(2) eîtēq(να)- δν (the ν-... δν negator basis — Lev. 23:29, Deut. 27:26, 29:15, 31:13).

(3) eî- δν (the ... δν negator basis): Stative Rheme only. Less common? (Deut. 28:61).

(j) The case of eîtēq-: a brief observation. This unique instance of multiple homonymy is typically Bohairic. Its resolution is entirely structural-syntaxic — indeed, it is mainly junctural, for the Temporal eîtēq- is typically an initial-boundary delimiter — a narrative converbal topicalization form (see Chapter One, §1.1.5 and Grossman 2007) — whereas the Relative is a phrase-final delimiter. However, there are examples which complicate the issue, hinting at the existence of special roles and slots of eîtēq- that exceed this simple distribution:

(1) Cases of syntagmatic compatibility like Deut. 29:25 Τδιαθεκή ρεπεστ ... θν eîtēqγεμνήτε ης νομιοτ eîtēqηνος εβολ λεπκαζι εξήμι hint at the categorial disparity of the adverbial-adjectival eîtēq-, which is adjoined to the Relative in close narrative linkage. (Incidentally, eîtēq- does not express temporal anteriority or contemporaneouness, but only the narrative juxtaposition of actions).

(2) A case like Deut. 22:16 αιθης μπαιρωμι εγκινι εταq- μεκτως Τνος (= Vat) can hardly have relative eîtēq- as a phrase-final delimiting mark, but may probably be a case of close Evolution Mode Narrative linkage (“and now he has come to hate her”). A Focalizing Preterite (“...and it is only now that...”) and even an adnominal-Circumstantial Cleft Sentence are not ruled out.

(3) Num. 12:2 μυ μωσχε εκαρπος εταπεστ εαζι νεματ μπεςκαζι νεμαν ανον represents a case of unambiguous Relative, yet not as expansion — Proper Names, being over-specific, are not usually expanded directly by the Relative conversion — but of Topic of Cleft Sentence: here too, the eîtēq- group concludes and juncturally closes the pattern.

(4) In a case like Gen. 6:7 ειεκετ-πιρωμι εβολ εταθαμιοq εβολ εα προ μπικαζι (which closely follows the Greek sequencing: the Greek has here a Relative clause), we actually have a neutralization of adnominal/adjunctal status, and eîtai- may well be an adverbal “(after) having creating him”; it must be remembered that adverbal or adclausal eαq- is here extremely rare, so rare as to render its opposition with eîtai- (so important in Sahidic) virtually void.

(5) Similarly, an adverbal slot is clearly indicated in a case with no initial nominal constituent, such as Gen. 21:5 οτογ αβρααμ ναqξη δενπ νρομπι πε ετατεμισιακ πεφωηρι ναq. Again, this is
not an “after” clause, but the overlay of narrative eventing. It is the
converbs — menencaθepeq-, ἕνεκθινθεπεq- — that relate acts
on the temporal axis (see Chapter Three).

(6) We have in Bohairic to my knowledge no clear instance of the
second-power Circumstantial Conversion of the Focalizing Preterite, an
important complex conversion in Sahidic (e-nτq-, nτq-: cf.
SHISHA-HALEVY 1986a:66f. §2.1.1.2). I expect a sensitive sifting of
eτq- examples, Nitrian and Scriptural, will yield instances, adnominal
and adverbal, of this old Egyptian combination (actually a conversion of
the whole focalizing construction), attested also in the Present and nα-
Future. (See above, number [2]).

(7) Unambiguously Temporal — that is, quintessentially adverbal —
is eτq- in the following narrative configurations. Here, the exact
relative temporality is expressed by the elements in combination with
eτq-:

ἀκωμπι (Δε) eτq- Gen. 6:1, 11:2, etc.
menenca- eτq- Ex. 34:33.

γοτε/γυc (Δε) eτq- Gen. 38:5:29, 24:30, 2:4, etc.
(ονογ) eτq- (Δε) ... αq-/nαq- Gen. 9:22, 18:2, 24:48, 35:29,
etc.

nαq-/αq- eτq- (αq-) Gen. 16:16, 21:5, 25:20 etc.

Negative eτe-μπe- ... αq- Gen. 8:9, Ex. 2:3, Num. 14:16 etc.

(k) The Hermeneutical Relative Nominal Sentence eτe-... nε is of
junctural interest, for its internal and external linkage mechanism. The
NS concerned is either the Endophoric or the Immutable-Theme
(“c’est”) one — see Chapter Two; in either case the referentiality of nε
is merely formal and non-pertinent. It is questionable whether the lemma
is at all the antecedent of the Relative — consider several examples
quoted here:

Ex. 29:26 πινλαι nτεπιδωκ εβολ ετεφαιδαρφn nε.
Deut. 10:15 ποτδροκ ... ετενωτεν nε.
Gen. 44:15 σενοτσισφημ εσαιφισιμη nαε-πιρωμι ετε-
δακ nε.

Gen. 50:1 πρβπι nχμηι ετεφη nε ετβιμηρ μπηορδανηc.
Num. 15:7 ρεμηt τ ... ετεφε-ι nτζι πε.
Ex. 1:11 ιωn ετεθβακι μφρη τε.

Expansion syntax and juncture gradience
The Circumstantial, adnexally expanding, has nexal linkage with its nucleus (either a pronoun/noun syntagm, a nexus or textual stretch), while the Relative — as a rule preceding the circumstantial syntagmatically — has attributive linkage with proninals only: determinators in noun syntagms, or on their own (proclitic, in the latter case) and demonstratives (sometimes proclitic). Attributive juncture is closer than adnexal, which is similar to non-grammemic nexal juncture. (Attributive has syntagmatic precedence over adnexal juncture, when both occur together). This gradience may be correlated, especially in the case of noun-syntagm or pronoun nuclei, with non-nexal but possibly rhemtic expansions, namely by means of the notae relationis (Chapter Three) or their n- homonymys. The following is a tentative approximation for such correlation; each row is of closer juncture than the one immediately above it, the grades merging into one another.

(rising linkage scale)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Circumstantial+ [TEXT] – nexus as Topic</th>
<th>Circumstantial+ [NEXUS] – nexus as Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[TEXT] + Circumstantial</td>
<td>[NEXUS] + Circumstantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOUN SYNTAGM/PRONOUN + Circumstantial</td>
<td>(n1-NOUN SYNTAGM + nτε- + [non-zero])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circumstantial as rhematic actant:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ογω ε(ν)- etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-εωτεμ ερο(ν) ε(ν)-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ωωτι ε(ν)-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-οι n-, ωωτι (ε(ν)οι) n-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-λε(ν) n-, -οιοι(ν) n-ογ- etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOUN SYNTAGM ((π1-παί)) + Relative</td>
<td>(π1-NOUN SYNTAGM + n- + [zero])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φαι/φη + Relative</td>
<td>(π-NOUN SYNTAGM + nτε- + [non-zero]) – reduced or annulled Constituence Personal-Sphere Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>π- + Relative</td>
<td>(π-NOUN SYNTAGM + n- + [non-zero]) – Constituence Personal-Sphere Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.4 Superordination

This is a syntactic status all too readily overlooked in syntactic scanning. It is a sharp delimitation, marking a clause as of higher informa-
tional rank — as high-level rhematic — than its preceding environment. It is peculiar in that, paradoxically, its very delimitative essence is anaphorically referential: condensing its preceding context into a single point, it as it were uses this for leverage into highlight: “in view of all this”, “(only / just...) at this point” and numerous other references to discourse accumulation, down to “therefore” and even “then”, familiar in its Narrative formalization in many languages as the Evolution-Mode plot development signal *par excellence*.

(a) ὅσος *in apodosi*; generally superordinating (= Greek):

Num. 21:8 ὅσος εὐεργησίας ἀρα εὐεργησίας ἀρα εὐεργησίας ἀρα εὐεργησίας εὐεργησίας εὐεργησίας εὐεργησίας.

Ex. 1:12 καταφθέντα δέ ενασθενίον μιμομον μιμομον μιμομον μιμομον μιμομον...

Gen. 9:14 ὅσος εὐεργησίας ἐνασθενίον ἐνασθενίον ἐνασθενίον ἐνασθενίον ἐνασθενίον...

Obs. This construction of ὅσος is not exclusively Biblical, nor can it always be seen as a device for Biblical rhetorical-stylistic effect, motivated by the Greek original καί; consider De Vis I 130 n.3, 146, 171 etc. As a matter of fact, this syntax has Greek roots of long before the Septuagint and cannot be dismissed as Hebraism or Semitism; cf. Beyer 1962:9-74 and passim; Kübler-Gerth §255 n.2 (it is attested from Homer on): as pointed out, this is “the adverb, not the conjunction” (Blass-Debrunner §442.7). It must moreover be borne in mind that the coordinating clause-connector “and” in Egyptian is a newcomer: “adverbial” non-coordinative ἀκος still features in the idiomatic “Egyptian” syntax of Shenoute (Shisha-Halevy 1986a:51f. §1.3.10).

(b) Superordinator *ie*. In Bohairic, this morph — to my knowledge, without an accepted Egyptian etymon — conflates the disjunctive homonym (Sah. *h*), the pre-clausal superordinating signal, opening the apodosis after topicalizing *icaxe* (Sah. *ie*ie) and the interrogation signal (Sah. *ie*ie, see above, Chapter One, §1.2.3.1). In this case, we find no trigger in the Greek:

Gen. 43:5 [icaxe de ενασθενίον ἐνασθενίον ἐνασθενίον ἐνασθενίον] *ie* τεννάσχε αν (Vat omits *ie*).

Num. 11:15 [icaxe κναίρι νηι μπαίρφ] *ie* δοθετ *εν-

Superordinating *ie* is a non-proclitic homonym of the disjunctor *ie*-

(c) Sequelling, apodoticy and and superordination. These syntactic features overlap, I believe, the last being broader than the first two; sequelling appears to be one of the innermost, most persistent traits of Egyptian in synchrony and diachrony. The Conjunctive is thus a su-
perordinative tense, in pre-Coptic Egyptian\textsuperscript{65} and non-literary Coptic (see Shisha-Halevy 1995a); so are the Absolute-Definite Future (above, Chapter One, §1.2.5.1 [d]) and the affirmative Aorist (Chapter One, §1.2.5.2 [b]).

(d) The particles ointment, rap, axe\textsubscript{2} are often superordinative. See below, §4.6.1.

4.6 Sequencing, placement and prosody features

(a) General comments

Constituent sequencing (loosely, "word order") is a sub-issue of juncture that apparently cannot be approached head-on because of its formidable complexity. First of all, distinction must be made between constituent ordering or sequencing and component placement: the former is a tagmemic factor of relativity; the latter, a matter of the syntagmatic/paradigmatic identity of the said component. Second, the realization is essential that constituent ordering is not a property or feature detached — a phenomenon existing and analyzable separately from, and, as it were, mapped onto the actual segment combination that is the subtextual unit under consideration, but a distinctive, yet not privileged, pattern constituent feature (the pattern being defined as "bounded, juncatured and ordered sequence of categories"). What is in fact an ultra-pattern, inter-pattern or hyper-pattern, is the placement of certain "floating" elements, which either stand outside patterns, or are superimposed on patterns in an overhead textual network.

Coptic would qualify as a "VS" language, when we recognize "V" as represented in the core formal nexus that is the conjugation base + Theme/actor syntagm: the verbal nexus pattern (Chapter Two). (The Flexionsisolierung device that is the marginalizing of lexical information by means of \texttt{\textasciitilde}noun- hardly affects this structure. See Shisha-Halevy 2000 \textit{passim}, esp. 81ff.: the stability of constituent sequencing over the millennia of Egyptian diachrony is impressive). However, the durative conjugation — diachronically and synchronically an essential part of the verbal system — predicating conversbs of initial Themes, is most definitely "SV". Yet the verb-forms here "make use" of an essentially non-verbal nexus pattern, as they have done for millennia. This formulation of sequencing as such is on its own meaningless or trivial, begging the question of the multidimensional formal definition of con-

\textsuperscript{65} The LE "sequential" jw.f hr sm to is, I believe, essentially superordinating: it is apodotic, in the relevant environment (see Shisha-Halevy 1973).
struction — except for the purpose of driving home the realization that there is no “dominant word-order”; consider also the Rheme-to-Theme and Theme-to-Rheme constituent sequencing of Nominal Sentence patterns (Chapter Two above).

The adaptation of “native” Coptic (rather rigid) sequencing to that of the original Greek is, I believe, minimal; the only instance of interference I can point to with some confidence, but not with certainty, is prosodic, namely the relative weightiness of the initial component(s) of the prosodic clause, as evident in enclitics placement; a corollary is perhaps the focalizing initial position (Chapter Two).

Obs.
(1) STERN 1880 §635 is an early discussion of word order, basic sequence and typical structure.
(2) The Bohairic clause-final tendency, which decidely harks back to LE and perhaps Demotic (SHISHA-HALEVY 1981:319, FUNK 1991:7 n.18) does not extend to Greek-origin sentence particles (see below), as if these are “imported” together with a prosodic profile.
(3) A manifest weakness, at least in Coptic, of the by now conventional distinction of “pragmatic” (Topic-to-Comment) and “syntactic” (“Predicate to Subject”, presumably Rheme-to-Theme) sequencing — e.g. in LOPRIENO 1988, 2000 — lies in the fact that both Nominal Sentence and Cleft Sentence syntagmatics exhibit both sequences. Thus, Bohairic has Theme-to-Rheme, Rheme-to-formal-Theme-to-non-formal-Theme, Topic-to-Rheme-to-Theme, Topic-to-Focus and Focus-to-Topic for adverb and nominal Foci respectively. Unless we are talking glotiotongically, these differences had better be expressed in terms of cohesion and phoricity, nexus patterning, various sequence conditioning and real, meaningful paradigmatic oppositions.
(4) LOPRIENO 2000 operates within an entirely different approach to linguistic system and structure, an approach I reject as essentially non-empirical, even beyond the per se innocuous, by now conventional separation of “pragmatic” from “syntactic” (or rather “syntactic”) parameters. However: ὅρν (Boh. ὅρν-ί-) is not a verb, and can hardly be presented as a (main) instance of “VS” ordering; the relationship between the sole case of “SV” (the Durative or Statal Conjugation - which, incidentally, turns “VS” non-specific Themes!) and the Egyptian “VS”, cannot in any way be considered diachronic; ἀγαθός (ἀγαθός-) hardly “rhematizes informationally heavy subjects”.

(b) Some instances of striking or special placement phenomena — initial, medial and final boundary signalling:
- Adverbial — clause modifier:
  Gen. 31:29 Ἰύπ οἶκοι μὴ ἔχεις ἔτι ζύζησοι νῦν = Greek word order; but note lemniscus, signalling topicalization of the adverbial?
- Adverbial — colon-second delimiter:
  Gen. 24:42 μᾶχιτ ὁ θανάτος ἐστὶ μοι ὕψων.
- Ἀγαθός actant following the “object of giving” (always specific), and often finally placed (with no triggering correspondence in the Greek original):
Deut. 9:6 πορε νατ μπαικαγι νακ.
Gen. 20:7 μαςεμι μπιριωμι ναρ.
Gen. 34:4 σι ινταιαλον νηι.
Gen. 31:12 νη εταλλαν ιπι μμωθ νακ.
Gen. 30:4 απ ι σαιαλα τεσβωκι ναρ εοςεμι.
Gen. 44:1 μας-νενεκκ νναιρωμι ννοσο ννου.
Contrast να= immediately following the verb and preceding the object (both highly specific and non-specific):
σι ινι νοσ- Gen. 15:9, 21:30.
Num. 23:1 ικτι νηι μπαιμα ι-ι νουοσι.
Gen. 15:10 αεσι δε ναρ νναι θρου.
Ex. 16:29 ανατ φι γαρ απ νουτ ινταιεγοντ ιντεν-
cαββατον.

Obs.
(1) This placement seems to conflict with the tendency of “Wackernagel’s Coptic corollary “ (cf. Polotsky 1961) — and Wackernagel’s Law is associated with a high-initial prosodic contour; yet the final or near-final placement of some weakly stressed or prosodically dependent elements is very probably “Egyptian” (Shisha-Halevy 1981:319). Other final-position enclitics: Gen. 31:2:5 ξεροι μφρι ιςαρ νεμ ι
μπου νεμηι ιν. Gen. 31:29 ιςηοτε τακαμ ιςεομ εερπετουθ νακ
ιν. Gen. 2:19 φαι ιπι ποσπάν ρου (φαι focalized!) (all B4); Ps. 48:18 πεθουθ
ναιναξ επεηθ εαμει ιςαρι νεμαλ ιν. De Vis II 168 ειοτουθ εινατ ερπουθ
ρου. (See below, for examples from the corpus itself). Polotsky’s treatment of the issue does not include Bohairic specifically, and is Sahidic-oriented (such Bohairic material as is mentioned is NT): we have no Bohairic attestation for his categories Ib (Presentatives),
Ic (extraposition). II and III: we have Bohairic attestation only for Ia (initial adverbials).
See however Polotsky’s n.1 on 1961:298.

(c) Augentia are special adverbial-status pronoun-containing cohesive elements. In our Bohairic, their referate nucleus is always specific, mostly highly specific (personal pronouns, Proper Names, demonstratives). Their junctural idiosyncrasy is in the tension between the prosodic and the syntactic units in which they “exist” (colon and pattern respectively), between their anaphoric cohesiveness, their adverbiality and their encliticity, which conditions their actual position in the said prosodic and syntactic units. (Generally speaking, Bohairic is far less enclisis-prone than Sahidic — again, it is in this closer to Late Egyptian). These are real “floating segments”, that is, elements the placement of which is not pattern-integral. The variation in placement illustrated
below stems from this tension, and reflects it in the actual text, somewhat as the often irregular combinatory aspiration reflects tension between the syllable and morphematic-segment demarcation systems; but it also serves as link, within the respective Domain Frames, which are often defined by the Augens.

Obs.
(2) See Stricker 1962 §58ff. for the special appositive-adverbial syntax of tr= in Roman Demotic: the category has yet not been studied for pre-Coptic Egyptian.

(1) μματατ= “alone”, “only” (also focussing) has a double pertinent placement (a placement opposition):
- The Augens follows its referate noun/pronoun phrase, in an immediate expansion:

Ex. 12:16 Φαι μματατη εεεεμιοι.
Ex. 8:27 μμεοται μματατη σωζη.
Ex. 22:27 Φαι γαρ πε πεγβος μματατη.
Deut. 8:3 ... εωικ μματατη αν.
Also Gen. 39:9, 41:40, 42:38 etc. etc.
- Adverbal-rhematic (adclusual or neutral) placement:

Ex. 18:18 μμον-ωζομ μμοκ εερΦαι μματατη.
Gen. 32:16 ιπογι ιπογι οαοια μματατη.
Num. 11:14 μμον-ωζομ μμοι άνοκ εξαι μπαιλος μματη (cf. Deut. 1:12 πως ιναωζεμιο μματατ εξαι...).
Also Gen. 21:28, 32:24, Num. 23:9 etc.
(2) μμηνμμο= is very rare — barely attested — in the corpus:

Lev. 25:49-50 εωοι αε λαζιμι ... εεωι μμομ μμηνμμομ

(3) τηρ= “all (of-)”; τηρου a generalized plural form (see above, §4.2.4.1):
- Post-nucleus (adnominal or post-referate-phrase) placement:

νη τηρου ετ- Gen. 35:2, 34:28, 41:7, 46:6, Ex. 12:16, 13:12, 20:4 etc., but:

νη εεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεεε
Gen. 36:6 ΝΙΚΩΜΑ ΘΡΟΣ ΝΤΕΝΕΨΗ, but:
Ex. 29:12 ΝΚΩΧΝ ΝΤΕΝΙΚΝΟΥ ΘΡΨ.
Gen. 42:11 ΑΝΟΝ ΤΗΡΕΝ ΑΝΟΝ-ΝΕΝΨΗΡΙ ΝΟΤΡΨΗ.
Gen. 42:36 ΑΝΑΙ ΘΡΟΣ Α — the Augens, part of the Theme phrasal
Domain Frame, is sharply delimited from the lexeme Α.
Also Gen. 24:40, 31:37, 33:8, 47:11.
• Adverbal — Rhematic or neutral placement:
Gen. 33:13 ΣΕΝΑΜΟΣ ΘΡΟΣ.
Ex. 4:19 ΑΜΟΣ ΓΑΡ ΘΡΟΣ.
Gen. 24:14 ΖΑΤΟΡΣΩ ΘΡΟΣ.
Gen. 25:25 ΕΙΣΟΡΕΨΡΨΥ ΘΡΨ.
Deut. 4:4 ΝΕΩΤΕΝ ΔΕ ... ΤΕΤΕΝΟΝΤΙ ΘΡΟΣ ΜΒΟΥΡ.
• Conditioned colon-second pre-referate placement:
Deut. 3:5 ΓΑΝΒΑΚΙ ΕΙΣΑΚΡΙΟΤ ΘΡΟΣ ΝΕ.
Gen. 25:4 ΝΑΙ ΘΡΟΣ ΝΕ ΝΕΝΨΗΡΙ ΝΧΕΤ.
• Final placement:
Gen. 11:6 ΕΙΣ ΟΥΓΕΝΟΣ ΝΟΤΨΤ ΝΕΜ ΟΤΣΠΟΤΟΣ
ΝΟΤΨΤ ΘΡΟΣ (= Vat).

(4) ΓΨ = “{he}...too”, “{he}for {his} part...”, even “{he} on
the other hand...”; often topicalizing.
• Post-referate immediate placement (adnominal):
Gen. 27:34:38 ΣΜΟΣ ΕΡΟΙ ΓΨ ΝΑΙΨΤ.
ΔΑΝΟΚ ΓΨ ΕΙΕ... Lev. 26:16:24:41, Gen. 20:6 ΔΑΝΟΚ ΓΨ ΑΙΕΜI...,
Deut. 10:10 ΔΑΝΟΚ ΔΕ ΓΨ ΑΙΟΙ ΕΡΑΤ ΖΙΨΙΤΨΟΥΡ , Deut. 4:14 etc.:
not “too”.
26:43.
Gen. 21:23 ΚΑΤΑΨΜΕΨΜΗΙ ΕΤΑΙΑΙΣ ΝΕΝΑΚ ΕΚΕΙΡΙ ΓΨΚ ΝΕΜ
ΗΙ.
Ex. 19:13 ΝΗ ΓΨΟΤ ΜΑΡΟΤΙ ΕΠΨΨΙ.
Gen. 30:14:30:42 ΑΨΨΨΠΙ ΔΕ ΝΞΕ-ΝΙΑΥΜΗΙ ΝΑΛΒΑΝ ΝΑΝ-
ΨΜΗΙ ΓΨΟΤ ΝΙΑΚΨΒ.
• Adverbal (or ad-clausal) rhematic placement:
Ex. 7:11 ΑΤΙΡΙ ΓΨΟΤ ΝΞΕ-ΝΙΡΕΨΙΨΨΗΜ ΜΠΑΙΡΨ̣ sim. 8:3:
14.
Ex. 22:21, 23:9 ΝΑΡΕΤΕΝΟΙ ΓΑΡ ΝΨΕΜΜΟ ΓΨΤΕΝ ΝΕ ΣΕΝΨ-
ΚΑΖΙ ΝΧΗΜΗ.
• Colon-enclitic (colon-final, colon-closing) placement:
  Num. 18:28 Παρηθεῖ ὄβλα διπατέρια ὑβεῖν ἐὰν ὄτι... Note the lemniscus, delimiting the JDF.

(5) {ἈΝΩΚ}, the pronominal prominence marker, combinatorial homonym of the lexemic personal pronoun, accompanies Topics and Foci, and (unlike ἐκβ.) is not contrastive or confrontative. It is probably the most common of Augentia, and also the most interesting as regards placement properties. Functionally speaking, it is often elusive and subtle (usually not triggered by any Greek feature).

• Post-refereate placement following pronouns (mostly interlocutive) and Proper Names, focussing or topicalizing:
  Gen. 29:31 ἐναχεὶ ἂν ὅν τοῦ πτωσθῆν τε.
  Gen. 27:36 ἐν ἐπεκκεκακόντοσμος ὃς ἄνοκ παίωτ — note punctuation.
  Num. 12:2 μὴ μωτσής μμαιετα τε ἐταπόκες καὶ νεμαν μὴ μπείδαζη νεμαν ἄνον.
  Ex. 4:10 ὄκλωσαν ἂν παιε-παλας ἄνοκ.

• Adverbial or adclausal, focussing or topicalizing the personal thematic constituent (mostly interlocutive) of verb clauses. Following the Interlocutive NS, it topicalizes the Theme. Its placement is as immediately following its referate as prosodically possible:
  Gen. 18:25 μφωρ μπεριπό νοϕκ ἁτακαζὶ.  
  Gen. 30:1 μπεκίμει νοϕκ νιακῳβ.  
  Gen. 30:2 μμον ἀνομοτ ἄνοκ.  
  Gen. 23:12 κεβγοτό νοϕκ γαταί νηφ.  
  Gen. 15:14 πιενος ἂν ἀτοσπὶς ὕπαι ἐιειγαπ ἐροcry ἄνοκ.  
  Gen. 3:14 ακεπφαὶ κεβγοτότ νοϕκ ὄβλα ὀττενιτεκκνοτ ςκοτο sim Gen. 4:11.  
  Gen. 50:19 ἄνοκ-μναфор γαρ ἄνοκ.  

• Colon-second ("colon-enclitic") placement, always in the prosodic slot between antecedent and relative converter. The colon consists of antecedent + Relative; this is the Domain Frame — made up of two separate sub-cola — within which this placement signals linkage. The Augens also defines the initial boundary:
JUNCTURE FEATURES


- Final placement: here I suspect an appositive construction of the lexemic personal pronoun, not the Augens:

(1) \{ΝΕΟΚ\} ΝΈΜ — (all persons):
Deut. 29:14 ΝΑΙΧΩ ΝΤΑΙΛΙΑΘΗΚΗ ΝΈΜ ΝΑΙΚΑΖΟΤΙ ΑΝΟΚ ΝΕΜΩΤΕΝ.
Gen. 24:54 ΔΡΟΣΩΜ ΔΡΣΩ ΝΕΟΚ ΝΕΜΙΡΩΜΙ ΕΤΝΕΜΑΩ.

(2) ΑΝΟΚ + Proper Name — the pronoun mediating between locutive pronoun and PN:

(3) \{ΝΕΟΚ\} paradigmatically commuting with ΝΔΕ- + NOUN?
Deut. 28:2ff. ΚΣΜΑΜΑΑΤ ΝΕΟΚ ΣΕΝΝΙΒΑΙΚΙ.
ΟΤΟΓ ΚΣΜΑΜΑΑΤ ΝΕΟΚ ΣΕΝΤΚΟΙ.
(ΚΣΜΑΜΑΑΤ ΝΔΕ-ΝΙΜΙΚΙ ΝΤΕΤΕΚΝΕΔΙ... ΚΣΜΑΜΑΑΤ ΝΔΕ-ΝΕΚΑΝΟΘΗΚΗ).
Also Num. 14:21.

Obs.
Cases (infrequent in the corpus) of the invariable particle ΝΕΟΚ, always combined with ΔΕ, are isolable by the lack of personal concord, which is a junctural delimitation feature: the combination appears to lend ΔΕ full contrastive force (Greek δε only):
Ex. 9:6 ΔΗΝΟΣ ΝΔΕ-ΝΙΤΕΒΝΩΤΙ ΗΘΡΩΤ ΝΤΕΝΙΡΕΜΝΧΗΜΙ + ΕΒΟΛ ΔΕ ΝΈΟΚ ΣΕΝΝΙΤΕΒΝΩΤΙ ΝΤΕΝΕΝΓΗΡΙ ΡΙ ΜΠΙΣΑ ΜΠΕΖΛΙ ΜΟΥ.

(d) Particles and other prosodically sensitive elements as indices of boundary juncture: a tentative suggestion for a basic relative four-grade scale. The grades merge into one another. This is especially true for (2) and (3), which are therefore most interesting and least trivial:

(1) most open\(^{66}\) juncture in evidence:

\(^{66}\) Relatively, within the scale proposed.
Gen. 24:49 ἵκε ὁτν ὑπώτεν τέτεναιρι...
Gen. 44:8 ἵκε μεν πιγάτ εταναζέμη θεννενκοκ αντακετοῦ.
Gen. 31:43 οὗ ἰε πετναλικ.
Gen. 27:33 νῦν ὁτν: αἰκήρωσεδορὼσε νη.
Gen. 32:26 οὐσετι αὐωρτι γαρ ᾐστι.
(2) Less open juncture in evidence:
Gen. 24:42 παμώιεὐ ταῖς τοῖς εἰςμοι γίωτα.
Deut. 4:2 παίςαςι ἀνοκ εἰςγογενείς μοιοι ετενεπνοου.
Lev. 18:7 τεκμαρ γαρ τε.
Deut. 1:27 θεοιντα τε ποτε μοισι ἡμοιτι θεον τεντεντενεβολ.
Ex. 34:14 οταε γαρ νεπτεντοσωπτι νκεηνοι.
Deut. 10:14 θηπη γαρ ναποτε πεκνοςι νε.
(3) Closer juncture signalled:
Num. 14:19 ξα-θνοβι μπαλαος ναπ εβολ.
Ex. 5:16 κνακι μπεκλαος ὁτν νκονε.
Deut. 15:2 κεκαλακαι νιβεν εβολ ετεντακ.
NB: νιβεν appears to be enclitic only in ἰε νιβεν ετ-; it is however the only element occurring in this slot, which is thus structurally of close juncture.
Gen. 35:10 ννοσθοντι εροκ ἰε ἰε-ιακυβ.
νη τηθοτ ετ- Gen. 35:2 etc.
Gen. 33:13 εὐωπ ὁτν αἰσανσογι.
Ex. 34:24 εὐωπ γαρ αἰσανσιοτι...
Deut. 3:25 τενασεναν ὁτν ν-ν πεγοσοτ.
(4) Closest juncture in evidence:
Num. 22:17 ταναταικ γαρ εμασω.
Ex. 16:7 ἀνον ἰε ανον-οτ γαρ ἰε-ντεντενεμπεμ
ἀραν.
Gen. 47:4 μμον-μαμμονι γαρ ᾐστι.
Gen. 33:6 θεοκ-οσοτρο θεοκ εβολ εἰτεπντ.
Deut. 26:10:15 εὐφοτο-εροτε εβολ ἱεβιω.

(e) The "Foreshadowed Enclitic" — cases of double simultaneous occurrence of enclitic or less-stressed elements, once in colon-second, again in pattern-proper position (Cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 1986a:168). This

67 As contrasted with Sah. εὐβα-, which is prefixed in close juncture.
68 Cf. also Oxyrhynchite Mt. 26:54 (Cod. Scheide) ὁτ-ἐν ὁτν.
is a phenomenon more revealing than others about the tension between prosodic and pattern-distinctive placement of enclitics, as well as about Juncture Scope and Domain Frame:

Gen. 43:32 νεοςωσι γαρ πε ννιρεμνιχιμι = πε μανε-

Gen. 46:34 οσωρεβ γαρ πε ννιρεμνιχιμι = πε μανεσωτ

Lev. 2:5 ευωπι δε εοσomegaωωοι πε εβολ σεν-οτες-

Ex. 16:23 γανκαβατων πε ετοσαβ μποτε πε (Vat γανκα-

γαρ in a problematic instance:

Ex. 32:1 Φαι γαρ ΔΕ-ΜΩΣΗΣ ... τενεμι γαρ (Vat τενεμι

Obs.

(1) This intriguing phenomenon, famously discussed by E. Fraenkel for Greek and Latin, is common in Nitrian (esp. the Martyrods) e.g. AM I 143 οσεφοσ ησωμ ρεμ οσωτυςις πε νεμ μονελεχιμι πε παθεφοσ. B4 John 19:23 ηψων ετεματησωτρπ πε ετοσκι εβολ μπωμε ιηρε πε.

(2) eβολ in Gen. 6:7 ειεψετπιρωμι εβολ εταωδαμιου εβολ γα προ μπκαρι: here, however, we have two compatible eβολ elements — the first post-verbal (corresponding to the Greek ἀπο- in ἀπαλείψω), the second an adjunctual circumstantial eβολ γα-

(3) At least two prosodically distinct homonymous πε entities, both constituents of NS, are isolable for Shenoutean Sahidic: Shisha-Halevy 1986a:34f., 161f. (n.36).

(f) Proclisis is important for Coptic junctural typology, as a class of high-to-highest prosodic linkage, initially delimitative (marking initial boundaries), and instructive on the junctural correlates of syntactic nuclearity: most proclitics are nuclear in their immediate syntagms.

(1) Grammemic: πι-, παι-, πε-κ-, τ-πε-κ-, σεν-, ν-, ε-; α-κ- / α-περκωμι-. Note that determinators are not only initial, but typically contract or motivate subsequent anaphoric-reference linkage; all nuclear proclitics enter a “determination”-type dependence, in which their expansion is nominal or pronominal (this includes the verb lexeme). The nuclear core nexus of the Base Conjugation (α-κ- etc.) with a nominal actor-Theme (i.e. α-φιρκωμι) stands in opposition to a juncturally more complex nexus-topicalizing construction α-φιρκωμι ακ-, often commented upon above. Closest and near-closest juncture.
(2) Word-formational, derivational, compositional, lexemic: ρεμ-(N)-, ρεκ-, κερ-, ωεν- "son of-", μετ-, επ-, οτεμ- and so on: prosodically reduced first ("in initio compositi") term, nuclear, morphologically marked by opposition with the full, unmarked lexeme. The expansion sequel, unmarked, is either nominal or adverbial (Lev. 18:17 ρεμμένη). Closer-to-closest juncture.

(3) {άνοκ-} Theme in the interlocutive Nominal Sentence pattern: not nuclear, but including both Theme and copula, thus in fact rhematizing its sequel.

(g) A concluding note.

(1) The relationship between prosody and juncture is a prime question to be pondered: is it hierarchical, analytic or even tautological? I see juncture as the primary factor, of the highest rank in a hierarchical structure (cf. POLOTSKY 1949:29f., 34; KASSER 1993:51). The importance of this hierarchy cannot be overstressed. We use prosodic properties as symptomatic, to determine juncture contours. Scarcity of tonicity is exactly what we would expect, in view of the gradation of linkage, which was pointed out early for Coptic (STEINTHAL-MISTELI 1893; earlier still, STEINTHAL 1847:19ff., 33).

Combination of less-stressed elements is the basis for establishing a precedence scheme (in which any of the slots can be vacant, and most are, at any given occurrence). Unfortunately, we are not in the position of establishing "inverse precedence", for the clause-final-tendency placement (see above; ρω is a particle that, if not post-focal, tends to final position; άν is another). The following scheme applies to the clause-initial and colon-second tendency, which, although arguably influenced and confirmed by the interference of Greek prosody, is still entirely "native", and was in evidence in the Middle Egyptian phase.

\[ Δε₂ | ίαρ/ουν/Δε | να- | ρω | ωσ/θρο/νεο- | άν | Δε₁ | πε. \]

Δε₁ = "anymore", "any longer".
Δε₂ = "then": see below.

Δε νε/πε Gen. 9:18, 14:18.
Δε άν πε Gen. 28:17.

An analogue to the prosodic shift in later Egyptian from sentence-final to sentence-initial, a shift not completed in Bohairic (see SHISHA-HALEVY 1981) is supplied by French (Old to Modern French): LERCH 1930:85f.
RAP AN PE Gen. 31:32.
DE NA= Gen. 20:12.
RAP NUN PE Gen. 34:14.
THROT NE Deut. 3:5.
THROT AN MMATATOS Num. 23:13.
RAP TIP= Gen. 45:20, Ex. 4:19, 9:19, Lev. 18:27.
RAP NWTEN AN Deut. 2:9.
ANOK DE ΓΨ Deut. 10:10.
RAP ANOK Gen. 50:19.
RAP TIPOR Ex. 4:19.
ΟΨΝ NWTEN Gen. 24:49.
NWTEN ANOK Lev. 26:28.
ΨΨ NEQ Gen. 24:8.
ΠΨC NEQ AN Deut. 31:27.
ΝΗΙ ΨΨ • ANOK Gen. 27:36.
ΑΨΨΩΝ ΩΕ NE Ex. 2:20 (= Vat; NE enclitic? see above, Chapter Two).
ΩΕ RAP Gen. 16:13.
AN ΩΕ Ex. 5:10 (cf. FUNK 1991:10 n.23).
ΟΨΝ ΩΕ(?) Ex. 22:9 ΨΗ ΩΨΝ ΩΕ ΝΟΤΕΛΙ (v.l. ΕΛΙ): the structure is obscure.
Ex. 29:14 ΨΑΙ EΞΞEN-FNOBI RAP PE (!), contrast e.g. 29:22:28 ΨΑΙ RAP ΟΨΨΨΚ PE .

Obs.
(1) For Sahidic, KASSER 1993, 1994c, 1995a suggests a scale of tonicity, on which the demonstrative, definite and possessive determinators and possessive pronoun are grouped in three locations: tonic, vowel-less/atonic (zero, ASH) and semi-tonic: the latter grade is the most elusive, applying according to Kasser to the determinators NEQ-, NEI- as well as the pronoun ΝΑ- (B. ΦΑ-), see 293ff. This is a specific application of a more general tripartition of the tonicity scale as a ternary category.
(2) On enclitic placement see SHISHA-HALEVY 1986a, Chapter Six and quoted literature. The colon, the prosodie-syntactic unit, conceived of as an “expiratory complex” (so Slupsky apud Fraenkel’s seminal Kolon und Satz), may not seem very useful for our written purposes, but prosody — like syllabication, like rhythmical prose and the rhythm factor in a written text — is a set of phenomena of language that transcends the difference between spoken and written language. Or perhaps, this is one of those spoken-language features that exist, in some difficult-to-explain way, in the written text.
(3) Two seminal pioneering Germanistic studies on the phenomenon of “weak word leaning on a strong one” (or on a strong combination of words) are J. Ries, Wortstellung in Beowulf (1907, Halle a.S.:Niemeyer) 72ff. and E. Sievers’s Zur Technik der Wortstellung in den Eddalieder (1909, Leipzig:Teubner). See also DIT 1995, esp. 34ff., for the prosodic prominence quality of the initial element which supports the peninitial Greek enclitic particles.
4.6.1 "Sentence Particles" and the JDF defined by them: some highlights of Discourse Signalling

The Coptic particles have never been seriously studied for any dialect, individually or as a group. Juncturally speaking, these elements are not simple delimiters but boundary + scope and colon markers. In fact, they are part of complex signals that "provide an illocutionary template for the utterance" (BOLINGER 1983, on prosodic features). They are also, of course, discourse signals that define and signal intratextual types of limits and connections.

A nice structural-analytical point in Coptic is the relationship of the SPs of Greek origin to the corresponding item in Greek. In this, the category is not unlike all loans, but their elusive discourse-referred, abstract signifié makes for especially difficult evaluation. Like other loans, occurrences of the "Greek Particles" in Coptic do not necessarily match an occurrence in the Greek Vorlage (see below); when grammatical semasiology is concerned (cf. the Preterite vs. Imperfect opposition in Coptic), the implication of a distinct value system is daunting. Sentence Particles are grammemes; and whereas a Greek lexeme, once it leaves its home system and is integrated in the Coptic lexicon, changes its value accordingly, the case of loan-grammemes is different. Be that as it may, we must view the elements in Coptic as separate linguistic signs; and we are not even on the threshold of a detailed account of the Graecitas Copta, especially in terms of lexico-grammatical systems (unfortunately, we don't even have a serious dictionary — let alone a series of structurally analytic, profiling lexical studies, which obviously must differentiate dialects and genres — of the Greek element in Coptic).

Seeing that this category is not monolithic, we cannot as yet do much better than aim at a broad definition. Denniston's mentalistic approach — "a word expressing a mode of thought, considered either in isolation or in relation to another thought, or a mood of emotion", with E. Fraenkel's "expressing emotion directly and laying emphasis and illustrating context", or [elements marking] "a tone of speech" (cf. the German term Abtönungsartikel)... "a word without a meaning which...is able to discharge emotion, to make known intentions, to connect related clauses", all eventually focus on the particles as pragmatic-function markers. A different, discourse-analytical approach is taken by POLANYI and SCHA 1983, one that I prefer, as being oriented to juncture functions (1983:264ff): "...discourse structure signalling devices used to mark movement from one discourse unit to another PUSH to an embedded unit, or a POP back to a temporarily displaced controlling unit... [They] force
an interpretation of a clause in a ‘frame of reference’ other than the one appropriate to the immediately preceding clause. Some signal initialization of a unit (‘well’), completion (‘OK’) or resumption (‘so’). Others may explicitly state the termination, initiation or resumption of a unit”. See Dik 1995:38ff.; Schiffrin 1985 suggests “conversational coherence” as a specific role of particles: “help[ing] speakers locate themselves and their utterances in the on-going construction of discourse”.

Probably the most telling hint about the construction of Coptic particles is their incompatibility with certain converters — namely, those of the “first group”, the Circumstantial and Relative. Similarly to Sentence Particles, discourse-oriented converters (of the “second group”) also regulate the information flow; but it is the syntactic-status ones that exclude the particles, as, in fact, do Δε inclusion and even coordination.

Obs.

(1) The juncture-relevant quandaries and potential insights of particle placement are cogently pondered by Dik 1995 for Herodotean Greek, see Chapter Three (p. 31ff.). (Herodotus seems to be the single most popular Classical Greek author in the field of corpus-based particle study, and perhaps of tensing too). Note especially the Problematik of the “peninitial position”. where “second can mean third or fourth”, “word can mean constituent”, “sentence can mean clause or phrase, or, in short, domain”. Indeed, I find the notion of “domain” is Dik’s most valuable contribution.

(2) Hellwig 1974 is an extremely important paper on aspects of Greek particles, including the prosodic (see p. 164ff.); Sicking and Van Ophuijsen 1993:1ff. is a general essay on Attic Greek particles — relevant scope, interchangability and overlap, paraphrasability, context. Slings 1997 on the discourse roles of Herodotean particles.

(3) See Kroon 1995 and Hilton 1997/8 for Latin particles and their discourse function. See Rosen (H.) 1999:161 + n.4 for cohesion by means of Latin particles “translated” from the Greek. This is very different from the Coptic state of things: it is not a reduced Greek-origin system, as in Coptic (see Burkhart 1995 on particle translation). I wonder to what extent, if any, Greek (always present in the background of Coptic, be it only intertextually) is essential for understanding the Coptic elements.

(4) See Shisha-Halevy 1986a:166f. for Shenoutean Sahidic, with its rhetorically operative Greek loan-particles. Even in translated Coptic, it is nevertheless not the case of “reproducing” in Coptic the particles of the Greek Vorlage; thus, Mink’s formulation (1972:268ff.), “… da ihre Wiedergabe unzuverlässig ist und anscheinend die koptischen Texte bald eine griechische Parikel auslassen, bald nach eigenen Gutdünken zufügen oder Vorhandenes verändern…” reveals manifest misconprehension. In fact, Coptic returns to the particle-rich O/ME phase, which is yet another instance of the cyclical-periodic evolution of Egyptian. In their rich functional variety, Coptic particles match the Greek ones.

(5) Funk’s discussion of 1984, one of the rare general essays on the subject of the Greek/Coptic interface, does not treat the particles at all in its lexical or grammatical sections.

(6) The variant reading οὐν/ον is familiar from the B4 Bodmer John (see Kasser’s introduction, p. 63f.), but the version also adds (with respect to the Greek) ῥαπ and Δε (p. 78). Note the following variation in the Bohairic NT: οὐν/νο particle John 5:16:18, Mt. 7:19, 3:10 and often; οὐν/Δε John 5:6:11, 6:61, 6:5:12, Luke 4:7, 13:18; ῥαπ/νο

(7) Discourse signalling is the essential datum of discourse analysis. See STAMMER-JOHANN 1977 on Spoken Italian discourse; Gülch 1990 for French, Gil 1995, for Romance in general. Note, in this last important study, beyond the distinction of “text adverbials” from sentence particles (esp. 30ff.) the useful concepts of “discourse bridges”, “discourse commentaries” and “Vertextung” (21ff., 108ff., 129ff.), also the thematic-structuring function (121ff.).

(a) δε

(1) δε is very common; indeed, it is the general additive connector of narrative clauses and clause-blocks, the basic link-and-delimiter: it establishes a prospective (forward-looking) boundary — hence its role in topicalization, see below — while marking non-initiality, i.e. relating all prospective text to the foregoing stretch. We find δε often corresponding to other particles (e.g. γὰρ, οὐ) in the Greek Vorlage. In narrative (and geographical-descriptive or chronicling exposition, etc.), δε is not at all, or only very weakly, contrastive, except for special configurations; but it is often contrastive in Dialogue:

Gen. 35:16ff. ἀγωνι δε εταψκωντ εκαπεῖα ... ἀκμίσι νῦν-παρήλ ἀγωνι δε εκνασιοτ μμίσι δὲ νῦν-περηκ-μεσίο ... ἀγωνι δε εκατ' ητεσκυτηθ ... ἀκτρεπ-περπαν ... ἀκμοῦ δε νῦν-παρήλ ἀθεομισί...

Gen. 19:1 αυ τα νῦν-πιγκελος θερη εκοδομα μήνατ ντοτα λωτ δε ναψκεμι ηταντπλαν ητεκωδομα.

Gen. 21:9 ετασκα δε νῦν-καρα επωνι μεγαρ ...


Gen. 2:6:10 ομοτα δε εσασι επωνι εβολ βενεδεμ ... οτιαρ δε εσααρ εβολ εβολ βενεδεμ ... πινωβ δε ντεπικαρ ετεμματ νανε...

Gen. 35:23ff. ...επωνι δε ναια πωροπ μμίσι νιακωβ + πονβην + οτμεων + ιετα + ιονας + ικαρα + ηανναλων + επωνι δε ντραχ τεριμι νιακωβ + ιωκεφ + νεμ βενιαμίν +.

Ex. 33:12 ἡνττε ηνοκ καδω μμος δε-αλισι μπαλας επωωι δε ηνοκ δε μπιεταμοι εφη ετικατατοπη νεμη ηνοκ δε ακας νη δε-τεσων μμοκ...

Gen. 27:29 Φη ετεκας εροκ ηεκοτοτ Φη δε-ετεκουτ εροκ ηεκαματ.

(2) The fully antithetic particle of Bohairic seems to be δε ηνοκ, which is also highly delimitative:
Ex. 9:6 ἄνωθεν ΝΔΕ-ΝΙΤΕΒΝΩΣΟΙ ΝΤΕ-ΝΙΡΕΜΧΗΜΙ ΕΒΟΛ
ΔΕ ΝΔΟΨ ΑΕΝΙΤΕΒΝΩΣΟΙ ΝΤΕΝΕΝΨΗΡΙ ΜΠΙΧΑ ΜΠΕΓΛΙ
ΜΟΤ.

(3) ΔΕ is typical of topicalization⁷⁰, Theme-switching or narrative-
block-initial position. Here contrast is often discernible:
Gen. 24:27 ζεμάρωστ ΔΕ-ΠΣΕ ... ἀνοκ ΔΕ άνψε θο-
τωντ...
Gen. 24:31 ΕΕΒΕΟΣ ΚΟΡΙ ΕΡΑΤΚ ... ἀνοκ ΔΕ ΔΙΕΒΤΕ...
Gen. 4:1 ΆΔΑΜ ΔΕ ΑΙΣΧΟΤΕΝΕΑ ΤΕΨΕΙΜΙ...
Gen. 4:2 ΑΙΨΨΙΝΙ ΔΕ-ΑΒΕΛ ΝΟΤΜΑΝΕΛΟΣΟΤ ΝΤΕΓΑΝΕ-
ΕΛΩΣΟΤ ΚΑΙΝ ΔΕ ΝΑΨΕΡΨΩΒ ΕΠΚΑΙΓΙ ΠΕ.

(4) As in Greek, [ΜΕΝ... ΔΕ...] discontinuously define the template
for an antithetic rhetorical configuration; this is a complex particle. In-
terestingly, both examples I find illustrate locutive (1st-person) recount-
ing:
Gen. 38:23 ἀνοκ μεν διοφωρπ μπιμας μβαεμπι ννοκ δε
μπεκζεμς.
NB: Gen. 41:13 ἀνοκ μεν ακγατ έζενταρψι ϕΝ μεν
ακγυ (Vat. ϕΗ δΕ).

Obs.
See SICKING and VAN OPHEUSEN 1993:12ff. on ΔΕ used for text articulation.

(b) ΓΑΡ

(1) This is no doubt the most common particle, after ΔΕ. Contrary to
common opinion, its rich semantics do not so much concern causality,
but grounding, founding-in-givenness, or the presentation “ensuing
before basis”. ΓΑΡ grounds the foregoing cotext, or its situation, or even
(meta-textually!) its very existence, in an association of inevitability,
naturalness or ensuing-ness, validating the foregoing information.
Moreover, ΓΑΡ is anaphorically superordinating — presenting a pre-
supposition, not thematically but rhematically: “and that [“und zwar”]
is to be considered in view of the fact (which is to be taken as given),
that...” (see §4.5.4):
Deut. 18:12 ΔΕΟΨΨΡΕΒ ΝΤΕΝΣΕ ΠΕ ΟΤΟΝ ΝΙΒΕΝ ΕΤΙΡΙ
ΝΝΑΙ + ΕΕΒΕΝΑΙΨΡΕΒ ΓΑΡ ΝΑΙ ΠΣΕ ΝΑΨΟΤΟΥ ΕΒΟΛ.

⁷⁰ On the topicalizing role of “but” particles in German, cf. ALTMANN 1976.
Gen. 42:23 ἐσώτειραντελεῖνῃπεβισεικώσακεγιοτεμενονερώσῃγαρηνοτσώτειρανε.

(2) Concomitantly, γαρ is often discourse-articulating, for in its superordinating role, it is a signal of (relative) initiality, owing to its peninitial placement:

Lev. 20:12 γαρανησώτικμεθανήςεκειμέναςεποτονερώσῃ.

Num. 32:1 μποροῦσαιδιμόνεκαπεικάςεναποτομωσί
gar neωi...

Thus too, gar opens, and delimits, Allocation and Response (Gen. 48:18, 20:11, 23:15, Deut. 11:13); it does not occur in true questions — in this it is unlike its mirror counterpart, ὅτι, opening appositive (e.g. Ex. 5:16, Deut. 11:10) and parenthetic segments (Gen. 30:27; note also the grounding of aetiological naming, Gen. 32:30, 35:7, 27:36 etc.); gar is a mode-switching delimiter in Narrative, a Comment-Mode initializing signal (esp. with [Ἀν] + πε, as a complex signal e.g. Gen. 41:49, 45:3:26, Ex. 12:30:33:39 — see above, Chapter One). Arguably, it is also exclamatory in Dialogue.

Obs.

Some outstanding discussions. The Greek γάρ seems to have attracted early attention: see for instance the excellent Misener 1904. (γάρ in questions; confirmatory; motivating a word or phrase; explanatory; justifying an attitude of objection or reproof, or some emotion, surprise, indignation, grief; transitional “then”; anticipatory). Note also the following discussions and statements, on roles relevant to the Coptic particle:


(2) Comparable perhaps to a merged range of Latin enim and nam (the excellent study in Kroon 1995. cf. Chapters 6-8.); at for “emphatic direction of attention to a new thematic unit”, “transition to a new thematic unit” (1995:152ff., 333ff.), for “meta-communicative comment” (195ff.). For the Latin enim and especially nam, note especially 195ff. ( enim for “metacommunicative comment”), 144ff. (nam “marks discourse units that provide subsidiary information....”, “confirmative” nam for “evidence, justification, elaboration, explanation, background exemplification”), 152ff. (“transition to a new thematic unit”).

(3) Greek γάρ would approximately correspond to German denn + doch. Cf. Rombouts 1982:69, 109 “I have taken cognizance of the fact, that...”. See Kosaka 1989:160 on denn in questions — the clause presupposed as given: generally, on act-of-speech referability of the German particles. Küper 1989:492ff., Burkhardt 1982 on denn for marking a presupposition (“I suppose you'll agree with me that...”); 68ff. in questions. The interrogative environment of SPs is especially interesting, not least because of the
special range of dialogic cohesive features: see ICKLER 1994, esp. 381ff. and 399ff. for rap-comparable particles in German.

(4) STERN 1880 §607: “die conjunction rap”, relating it to ση (but it is “nachdrücklicher und selbständiger”, and “gewöhnlich aus dem griechischen texte herübergenommen wird”). As a matter of fact, Coptic does not always correspond here to any single Greek particle (e.g. Gen. 50:20); or it corresponds to Greek δέ (e.g. Deut. 11:14, 14:4), or to Greek καί (Gen. 41:56, 31:32, Ex.5:23).

(5) For Bohairic rap, the Sahidic Pentateuch has either no particle or any other formal sign (Gen. 19:22, 32:1:4:26, Ex. 22:23 etc.), or causal ση (Ex. 20:25, Lev. 10:17), or, normally, rap (Gen. 7:4, 18:15:19, 22:12 etc.). Bohairic rap corresponds (more or less in that order) to Greek γάρ, δέ or καί, διτι or διοτι — or to the absence of any particle: this last is significantly correlatable with the well-defined functional group, especially the delimiting and non-expllicative rap. This seems to indicate an independent Coptic rap entity, extending and only partly overlapping the original functional range of the Greek particle. (Observe that for the fixed combinations of γάρ — οτραπ, κεραπ, ονα-rap — the correspondence with Greek is almost exact, while for the uncombined particle Coptic diverges — I say this impressionistically — by more than 10%).

(3) rap occurs in narrative Comment Mode frequently with Focalizing Conversion and other focalization constructions:

Gen. 43:16 ἀρενάρῳμι rap νᾶοσωμ νότωικ νεμῆι μμερὶ.
Ex. 13:19 σενοταναγι rap αἰσχῆαφ ταρκενεγηρὶ μπίλα.
Also Gen. 47:22, Lev. 10:14, Deut. 11:10, 31:7:21, etc.

(4) Like ση, rap very commonly accompanies topicalization (incl. presetting adverbial Topics). This, I believe, is an epiphenomenon; rap does not, like ση, (co)signal topicalization:

Ex. 5:16 πιτορζ rap σετή μμος άν...
Gen. 50:20 νεωτεν rap αρεντενοςνι ... Φτά ση...
Lev. 20:12 εαπερασεσμεναραπ οτον ερωτ.
Also Lev. 14:2, 20:6, 18:27.

(5) rap delimits, and co-marks with ολοιο πε mode-switching to Comment Mode in Narrative; it is in this environment explicative (see in detail above, Chapter One,:)

Gen. 45:3 ναζαρεστερ rap πε.
Gen. 45:26 νεμ περτανγοστον rap πε.
Gen. 31:32 ναζεμι rap αν πε.
Also Gen. 36:7, 35:18 etc.

(6) On the other hand, rap is rare, but still attested, in Narrative Evolution Mode (see above, Chapter One). rap is here not explicative, but
apparently expresses logical consequence “and therefore”, “which is why...”: in fact, it constitutes an intrusion of CM into EM.

Deut. 34:9 οτιγ άνηκετ πώληπ ινάτηρ ομηό μπάη ικανή ιάκα-νεράξα γαρ εξώθη ισε-μουσήνε — a possible alternative is “we know this, since...”.

This particle features most typically in exposition and in the Allocution and Response substructures of Dialogue.

(7) In exposition,precising identification:

Num. 21:26 ...ένναβακι θρότ ιντιμαννόρπεος νεμ εσεβών νεμ ἔν θροτ ετοι ηνομ ερος ἔν ηλια γαρ τε εσεβών έβακι ιντεμχων οτρο ιντιμαννόρπεος.

(8) In Assertive Questions (see above, Chapter One), γαρ is not explicative:

Ex. 16:7 ανοκ δε ανον-ος γαρ ιςε-ιντετεμχρεμπέμ ηα-πον — note the compatibility of topicalizing ιςε and γαρ in the same extended clause, though not in the same colon but in two different JDFs.

(9) Initiality-marking γαρ in Dialogue:

Gen. 23:15 μμον παση αίκωτεμ γαρ... opening subsections of response (no particle here in the Greek).

Ex. 14:4 ανοκ γαρ ειερεπγητ λφαράω νσοτ... opening declaration of Divine Intent (δε in the Greek).

Gen. 30:30 νεγανκοταξι γαρ νε θροτ εναττακη μπαμ-θό... opening main point of argumentation (Greek γαρ); so too in:

Gen. 48:18 παρηταν... Φαϊ γαρ τε πισώρη.

Gen. 48:19 τεμι παοήρι τεμι Φαϊ γαρ εεςωπι... “It is because...”, “the point is, that...”.

Gen. 20:11 πεδεαβραμ Δε αιδος γαρ Δε... opening Response (Greek γαρ).

(10) Nuances of causality:

(a) A selection of passages illustrating the run-of-the-mill explicatory situation (see also above, under focalization and mode-switching roles):

Gen. 35:7 αυτρεφάρνα μπίμα ετεμματ Δεβεσαλα αςέ-πίμα γαρ ετεμματ αυτρ εορηφ ηρο φ — aetiological naming: sim. Ex. 2:22 etc.
Ex. 20:20 ΑΧΗΝΟΜ ἢν ζερεφόπιρας ἐν μμωτεν ἉΞΕ-Φ ἵ ζί μπαί ψαρωτεν.
Ex. 19:23 μμών-ψέκμ ζτεπιλλος ε ἐψωνι ... θεοκ γαρ ἄκερμεορε ναο εκάω μμοι θε οτετπιτων εβολ οτογ ματοςβογ.
Ex. 12:30 άοινιων ζνπρως ψωπι ζηνπικαρ αθρη ζτεχωμ θεμον ἵοι θεοκ θεος μμοι ζνποτοι μμπαίλος παις ψωνι γαρ νη θεος-μαθαμιο ζγαν-

ΝΟΤ θαν...

Lev. 18:7 ...νεμ ορσυπι ιτετεκμασ θνεκσορπι εβολ τεκμασ γαρ τε θνεκσωρπ μπεσωπι εβολ — γαρ here also focuses the Rheme "τεκμασ".

Ex. 19:12 (the first and second γαρ) μαρκετεν ερωτεν εςτε-

μι ενσωπι εδενπιτωτ ... οτον γαρ νιβεν ετνασι ι θεοκ ι 

πιτωσ θενοτοσ εμεοσ ω θνεκαι ι θεομι μπαις γαρ 

ζε-

γανωνι γαρ σεναςετωνι εροφ.

Consider also Gen. 31:32, 36:7 (explaining the preceding clause), Deut. 4:22, 7:7, 12:9 (explaining the very location preceding).

(b) Non-explicative, but logically consequent relationship ("and thus/ therefore..."):

Deut. 34:9 οτογ γινομ πυρι θναθι θογ μπα μπαθ

ι άρσανερξιζ γαρ εξωπ θε-ματηςχς.

(c) Cases of # IMPERATIVE... + ... γαρ... # are striking instances of the 

particle meta-textually grounding the very allocation, not its con-

tent — "this I enjoin you, for..."

Ex. 16:9 άμωνι ... άρσωτεμ γαρ...

Gen. 24:56 μπερταζμο μμοι αποκ γαρ κοουτ-παμωτ. 

Gen. 32:26 οτορπι άμωρπι γαρ ψωπι. 

Also Ex. 32:1:23, Gen. 29:21.

(d) In preceptive textemes, γαρ bases or justifies the preceding in-

struction, injunction or prohibition, categorically or contingently — also, 

metatextually, the actual injunction/prohibition and not its content:

Lev. 18:7 ...εμ ορσυπι ιτετεκμασ θνεκσορπι εβολ τεκμασ γαρ τε θνεκσωρπ μπεσωπι εβολ.

Lev. 13:6 εχετοςβογ Ήνε-πιυοθνις ω οτμινι γαρ πε.

Ex. 23:8 θνεκσιδωρον οίδωρον γαρ ωατωμ θνενβαλ 

θνετατ θμολ — gnomic grounding.
Ex. 22:21ff. ὁσκεμμον ννετεν'μακρ ἀνα ὀ τετενεωτων ῥαρ ντπουχα μπισκεμμον.
Lev. 18:24 μπερσων ἑνναι τθρων ἀρσωγ ῥαρ ἑνναι τθρων ναι-
Deut. 12:31 ηνεκιρι ... κηνοτ ῥαρ εταχμεςτων δαταιτων.
Deut. 10:19 ερετενμενε-πισκεμμον ναρετενοι γραμ νσκε-
μο γωτεν νε.
(e) The particle contributes to the effect of poetical (Deut. 32:36, Ex. 15:9) or poetical-prophetic rhetorics (Gen. 41:31) in the general vague dependency it establishes between verses, and mainly as a signal of commencing a poetic unit:
Ex. 15:9 αρξοσ γραν ναι-παξαξα νη-νασωξ ηνταταγο
νταφωσ νηςωσων...
Deut. 32:32 εβολ γραν νιεωνα ναλοια πε τοσωνα ναλοια...
Deut. 32:35 ηνηπνοτ γραν γοταν ακωνωσωρν ναι-
tετοτατ...
(f) ναι- + γρα: the rare compatibility of causal ναι with γρα is illust-
trated by a unique (?) instance:
Deut. 10:17 αρσωτι μποταξοζ σενενειωτων ετανω-
τεν νε ... ναι-νοσυ γρα σενεννοτν νηου πε φυν ντεν-
νοτν (=} Vat). 
(g) In the correlative configuration: γρα ... εηε ηαι ..., cataphoric γρα (cf. Denniston’s “anticipatory use”, 1954:68ff.) is resumed by a prepositional expression of explicit causality: γρα itself marks the com-
mencement of a new topic:
Gen. 42:21 ... αξι τενηρηθι γρα σενενοβι ... ειεδαι
αξι εγρηθι εαυν ναι-παιζωδες.
Deut. 2:7 νοσυ γραν σενεννοτν αρςμοσ εροκ σενιη-
bνοτι τθρων ντενεκζιξ ειεδαι αριεμο ναι.
Deut. 15:11 ννερηθι γραν κοτνκ εβολ γουενηπικαζι εε-
δαι ννω μποσ ναι...
Ex. 16:29 αναν φυν γραν αην νωτεν μπιεγουν ντεν-
cαββατον εεπενται νηου αην νωτεν μπιεγουν μμα-6
μπουκ μπιεγουν β...
(h) Non-explicative γρα in geographical-topographical identification, a special case of the Narrator’s Channel:
Num. 21:25f. ...νεμ εεχων ...∥ εηε γρα τε εεχων.
(i) γρα in a chinese-box-like hierarchical complex of grounding:
Gen. 47:4 εταν επωηι σενπικαζι = μμον-μαμονι γρα
τοπ ... απικο γραν δεμνοντνε σενπικαζι νξανααν.
Gen. 47:20 διωχὴς ξενικαίγι τηρηη ντενιρεμν- 
χμί μηραρω + ανιρεμνχμί γαρ ἀποσκαίγι μηραρω 
ἀπιγκο γαρ δεμνοντ ἐξωνον.

(j) The embarassingly mysterious ἄε-ονὴ γαρ complex (see also 
Chapter Two), with no special Greek correpondent — (δι)ότι (γὰρ) — 
occurs (rarely) in Narrative Comment Mode, and (typically) draws atten-
tion to background facts in Dialogue. As obscure is ονὴ itself (not oc-
curring in the corpus without γαρ, unlike the NT, OT other than the 
Pentateuch, and Nitrian).

Lev. 25:42 ...ἄεονη γαρ γανεβιαικ νυθη νε sim. 25:55.
Lev. 22:20 ...ἄεονη γαρ εσητην νυτεν αν.
Gen. 29:15 ...ἄεονη γαρ νεοκ-πακον.
Gen. 26:7 ...ἄεονη γαρ ενεεςε αν νενπεςο.

(k) Two remarkable cases:

Ex. 34:14 οὐδε γαρ ννετενοσωνςον νκεσοντι is of interest,
both semantically and formally, since this is to my knowledge the only 
instance of the particle in a coordinated clause (Greek uncoordinated οὐ
γὰρ μη...).

Deut. 10:14 ἡππε γαρ θαπτε πεκνοςτι νε ηύε-τηε νεμ 
τετεντεφε... (= Vat) is the only case I am aware of, of the particle 
in a presentative clause. (νύε- too is here exceptional as marker of them-
atic apposition to the formal Theme νε).

Obs.

(1) ἄεονη (see above for the orthography) is common in Bodmer III B4 John, but also 
in P. Vat copito 9 (especially in Osee).

(2) οτρω γαρ is inseparable (and thus comparable to οτρω): Ex. 33:3:20 Greek οὐ γὰρ.
So is ιεραγ Gen. 9:5, 20:12, Deut. 2:20 etc., Greek καὶ γὰρ. In both amalgamated or 
fused cases, the first element is not recognizable on its own as a Coptic entity, and the 
particular status in the original Greek is apparently irrelevant to the Coptic.

(c) οτόν

This important particle is in one respect the mirror image of γαρ, 
marking the "ensuing... after basis/ground in logical sequence", validating 
a textual unit in view of a preceding one ("in view of the above...").
Like γαρ, it is conjointly superordinating, rheumatizing and discourse-arti-
ticulating. Both are so-called "implicative particles". Juncturally, both are also (relative) initiality-signals (this is especially striking in the case of 
νος οτόν). But οτόν is distinctively anaphoric, returning to and 
resuming the run of discourse while leaving and marking the forego-
ing text as a concluded digression, while γαρ is both ana- and 
cataphoric. In Dialogue, οτόν links anaphorically, as marking reactivity.
Obs.

(1) ὃς is extremely rare in the Sahidic NT (only Luke 16:27 and Heb. 4:6), with δὲ there the usual correspondent to Greek οὐ. This must mean that the particular Bohairic opposition of ὃς (of Greek origin) with δὲ (very old Egyptian) is virtually neutralized in Sahidic. For the Sahidic Pentateuch, we have (for Greek οὐν) instances of the omission of a particle altogether, e.g. Gen. 29:27, Ex. 16:28, Lev. 14:11 etc., or δὲ (the "general particular connector"), Gen. 12:12, 50:5, Lev. 11:6; or δὲ (Gen. 6:14, 12:13, Ex. 22:24, 33:5 — the latter no doubt the normal correspondent. Bohairic ὃς normally corresponds to Greek οὐν. Only relatively rarely do we find no particle in what sources we have of the Greek original (e.g. Ex. 5:9, Num. 14:9).

(2) Narrative ὃς is common in NT (e.g., John) and Nitrian Bohairic; cf., with περὶδρασις, John 4:48, 6:67, Luke 19:12 etc. δὲ-ὁς in narrative topicalization: AM I 91 ΝΑΙ δὲ-ὁς ἄγιος ἀνὴρ ὁ προσκυνήσας, also 180, 158, 194.

(3) Greek οὐν in narrative is attested already in Herodotus (e.g., I 85, 95, 110 etc.), in the Narrator’s Channel: see also POTHRESE 1984:327ff. (on NT Greek): “returning to the main line of events after a digression, a parenthesis, or the supplying of background information”; 336 “the range of οὐ has been vastly expanded so that it absorbs nearly all the territory normally occupied by δὲ”.

(4) ὃς is extremely common in the hermeneutical Catena, alongside δὲ-ὁς (see below), and special ready-made Greek particle amalgams like μὴ-ὁς (107), μὴ-ὁς-τοις (145), ὁμολογεῖ (107), ὁμολογεῖ (198), κεννεῖ (92, 198), ὁμολογεῖ (45) etc. It is of course also found in expositive and argumentative textemes (De Vis II 70, 73, 74, 79, 80, 95, 107, 133 etc.). Argumentative ὃς in protasi: Luke 11:13, 12:26; 16:11.

(5) Greek οὐν occurs in questions, in compound particles (naxal questions) or, for thematic questions, alone: ἢδρον, οὐκοῦν, τί οὐν. In Coptic interrogatives (Oxyrhynchite) we find -ὁς ἂν, and πώς ὃς...πώς δὲ... in Rom. 10:14).

(6) οὐν: outside narrative, POTHRESE 1984:323 (NT Greek) observes on the roles of “logical inference...a relationship of reason-result or grounds-implication”. However, as with γάρ, I believe a more syntactic, less semantic approach to this information-structuring element is called for. SICKING and VAN OPHEIJSN 1993:25ff., 89ff. on Attic (Lysias, Plato etc.) Greek οὐν: “back to main line after a digression therefrom”; (27) “a difference in what may be called status between what precedes and what follows”, which is equally suited to γάρ.

(7) ὃς occurs exceptionally in a Circumstantial Nominal Sentence in Acts 2:30 (cons.) ἀρμόν οὐσία αὐτοκρατορία εὐπροφήτης ὃς πε οὐσία ἑσχεων ἄρ... ...

(a) Allocutive/locutive Dialogue:

(1) Imperative/Jussive + ὃς; ἃς ὃς ὃς + imperative, the most prevalent occurrence:

Gen. 12:13 σεασομετρετε νεό ας σενατανσο ας ομη ὃς ἄρου-ντο-κεουνι.

Gen. 27:8 ἃς ὃς ομη πασμπηι εωτεμ ινωμι ημι 27:43.

(2) The *hic-et-nunc*, non-inferential initial-boundary-marking \(\uparrow\)not over precedes various locutive (1st person, sgl. and plur.) and locutive-sphere clause types:

- **Num. 14:3** \(\uparrow\)not over nan nanec nan eΦenkotten...
- **Gen. 50:5** \(\uparrow\)not over \(\uparrow\)nawenhi epwsi.
- **Gen. 48:5** \(\uparrow\)not over pekwri \(\uparrow\)...noti ne.
- **Also Gen. 19:9. Contrast:**
- **Gen. 24:50** tenawwemzom an over \(\uparrow\)not, where \(\uparrow\)not is a true temporal adverbial ("now") rather than an atonic particle.

(3) Future + over — note the prevalence of verbs of motion:

- **Ex. 3:18** tenawwenan over n-\(\uparrow\)negou sim. Deut. 3:25.
- **Ex. 5:16** χ/κασι mpeklac over n\(\uparrow\)onc — interrogative? note the rare non-colon-second placement (Vat κασι over ...), which means a link between σι and mpeklac.
- **Gen. 18:21...οτοκ ειεουενιι over epecht.**
- **Deut. 3:25** \(\uparrow\)nepδιnιoρ over...

4. In reactive Questions (rhematic and nexal):

- **Gen. 27:33** οι over αμεραξσεσδερκε οιι
- **Ex. 5:16** χ/κασι mpeklac over n\(\uparrow\)onc (observe the placement of the particle; Vat κασι over ...).

5. over *in protasi* (Greek ου, δέ): “coming to the point”, i.e. high-level rhematizing:


6. over *in Narrative* (rare). In our corpus, this usually corresponds to Greek ου. Always "say" or "tell", that is, the Narrative/Dialogue seam:

- **Gen. 41:24** aiwetaracosti over ...(Greek ου).
- **Gen. 27:35** pεξαq over naq (Greek δέ).
- **Ex. 8:6** pεξαq over δέ...(Greek ου).
- **Ex. 8:15** pεξε-nηρεϕεσιwηm over mφαραw (Greek ο\(\uparrow\)v).

7. The particle seems to be a summing-up exponent and a final delimiter in

- **Ex. 22:8** caξι niben s\(\uparrow\)in\(\uparrow\)onc ... εβεβεωμακι nem over nem otεcwot ... + Φ over δε not\(\uparrow\)lai (Vat • Φ over δε-\(\uparrow\)lai •). The construction is obscure (Greek δ τι ουν αύv η; the Ara-
bic translates negatively, *wa-là šay'an minha* “and there isn’t anything from it”). All I can say about this is that this seems to relate in some way to the obscurity (for us) of the Coptic idiom for “whoever he be” (cf. *πετε-ντον πε*). *Ruth* 3:10 Sah. [Shier]).

(d) *κέ*

This is the only one of the old “Egyptian” enclitic particles left in Coptic (gr[fl]). Of the Greek particles, it is compatible only with *ὁρν* (not in our corpus, though), which means that it cannot be synonymous with it. Indeed, it is probably the most interesting, the truly “Egyptian” particle (there are almost no *variae lectionis* of *κέ* with *ὁρν* — cf. *Gen. 41:33 †νοσ-ὁρν* GJ, †νοσ-κέ others). *κέ* is well established in Bohairic, and the correspondence “Boh. *ὁρν*, Sah. *κέ*”, while statistically not far wrong, does not give the whole picture (*pace* *Funk* 1991:7, or 10 n.23, there also on the placement of Sahidic *κέ*).

Obs.

(1) LE and Demotic final *gr* (⇒ our *κέ* ?) are already distinctive (ČERNÝ-GROLL 1975:134 “adverb”. *Ermann* 1933 §682 “enklitische Kojunktton” is felicitous, highlighting its textual effect. Stern extends this terminology to all Coptic particles, see 1880 §610); *Erichsen Glossar* 582f., *Spiegelberg* §417ff.
(2) As so often, we find Battiscombe Gunn way ahead in his functional evaluation: (V 73 p. 9f., *ad* Gardiner EG §255, at the Griffith Institute, Oxford) “it seems to me that gr is mostly used to introduce a change of Topic” (recently recognized in *El-Hamrawi* 2000); incidentally, this is also a functional feature of *ραφ*. Gunn’s papers (also VI 66) contain much material on Old and Middle Egyptian particles, including their placement and constructions in which they occur and do not occur. Incidentally, in 1, 9 (with a letter to Crum of the late 1930s, VII 60) we find an extensive study (published in part in *Festschrift* Crum, 1950) of Nitrian, patristic, hagiographical *παρη†* as a connective (“conjunction”: “then, puis, tum…”), a role not occurring in Bible versions, nor in texts with an extant Greek source. Gunn included Bohairic, especially Nitrian observations in many of his Egyptian studies, as for instance in V A 1.4, an unpublished Chapter XXXI for his *Studies in Egyptian Syntax*, on Eg. *mry, my*, “likewise, similarly”).
(3) *ὁρν* and *σίμ* are compatible, hence categorically discrete, in Oxyrhynchite: Acts 6:3 *ὄρ ὁρν σίμ πι*; *ὁρν* is considerably rarer than *σί* in the Oxyrh. Psalms, but elsewhere both are well attested in the same texts.

*κέ* supplies a striking instance of two- or even threefold synchronic homonymy (cf. *Funk* 1991:10 n.23), rather than grammaticalization (which is in fact a diachronic and causal aspect of the phenomenon: cf. *Abraham* 1991).
\( \varepsilon_1 \) - clause-final adverb, in negative environment: "(not) again, (not) any more"

This is a final boundary signal; post-verbal, almost invariably with the Future (mostly 3rd plural Absolute-Definite Future): the Greek has as a rule an adverb, \( \varepsilon \). It occurs in prevalently plural-delocutive/ge-
neric environment:

Deut. 17:13 \( \varepsilon \).  
Deut. 17:16 \( \varepsilon \).  
Gen. 35:10 \( \varepsilon \).  
Num. 8:25 \( \varepsilon \).  
Num. 18:22 \( \varepsilon \).  
Num. 9:12 \( \varepsilon \).  
Ex. 9:30 \( \varepsilon \).  
Ex. 5:10 \( \varepsilon \).  

Obs.
(1) Anderson 1904:37, Stern 1880 §518ff.: "adverb".

(2) A syntactically distinct, nexus-referred homonym of this element reoccurs as a spe-
cifically (Nitrian?) Bohairic "mediator", "lexeme premodifier" or "verbal preextension": Stern 1880 §454, Shisha-Halevy 1986a:124ff., §3.3, Layton 2004 §183; Polotsky 1930:875 ad De Vis II 9; also De Vis II 174, 177.

(3) \( \varepsilon_1 \) occurs rarely in affirmative environment (Nitrian): AM 1 108 \( \varepsilon \).

(4) The two \( \varepsilon \) morphs are neatly combined in Rom. 6:9 \( \varepsilon \).

\( \varepsilon_2 \) - clause-enclitic, clause-initial signalling in partial opposition
to \( \sigma \) (see above)

In Dialogue:
(1) With Imperative/Jussive: (also \( \sigma \) + Imperative; cf. \( \sigma \) above); superordinating:

Gen. 45:9 \( \varepsilon \).  
Gen. 31:13 \( \varepsilon \).  
Gen. 46:30 \( \varepsilon \).  
Gen. 41:17, Num. 24:11.

Note that, while \( \sigma \) is truly a consequential inferential, \( \varepsilon \) is not, but, virtually opening allocutive discourse, adds an "impatience" or "urging" component to the injunction. Except for the doubtful Ex.22:8
ΦH οΤN ΔE ΝΟΥΓΑИ (see above), we do not find in the corpus any instance of ΔE compatible with οΤN, a combination attested in Vat and its apographs (only οΤN in the other sources):

Ex. 5:18 †ΝΟУ οΤN ΜΑΥΕΝΩΤΕΝ Vat †ΝΟУ οΤN ΔE (cf. perhaps also Ex. 22:8)
The Greek often has no particle for Coptic ΔE₂ (so e.g. in Gen. 23:15, 31:43, Ex. 10:3, 18:28, Num. 14:11:27 etc.).

Obs.
ΔE-ΟΤN — that is, οΤN following ΔE₂ — is of importance in Nitrian: De Vis I 13, II 23, 47 in questions. It is especially prevalent in Catenae, where (like οΤN and ρΩ οΤN) it seems to be characteristic of hermeneutical style, and occurs almost on every page. A striking instance (203) πιρο οΤN ρε πιριστος †νατη ΔE τε †γραφη εποταυ Φη ΕΔ-ΟΤN ΕΤΕΝΚΗΝΟΤ ΕΔΟΤN ΑΝ... contrasts οΤN — marking the explication of allegory — with ΔE οΤN, the latter seemingly being a rhetorically peaking term. In AM, ΔΕ-ΟΤN occurs rhetorically at the very beginning of a royal epistle (I 169) and, narratively, alongside οΤN 91, 98, 158, 180, 194).

(2) Marking reactive questions (almost no οΤN); superordinating:
Deut. 1:27 εξειον ΔE ΝΟΥ ΜΟΥ ΜΟΝ ΑΓΕΝΤΕΝ ΕΒΟΑ (Greek non-interrogative, no particle).
Gen. 31:43 οΤN ΔΕ ΝΟΥΝΑΙΡ no particle in the Greek.
Gen. 23:15 οΤN ΔE ΦΑΙ ΝΑΤΕ (Vat add. πε) (Greek τι ὧν εἰν τοῦτο).
Ex. 2:20 ΑΚΕΩΝ ΔE ΝΕ (= Vat) — see above, §2.4.2, for this mysterious but well-documented NE.
Gen. 30:30 †ΝΟΤ ΔE ΑΙΝΑΣΑΜΙΟ ΝΗ ΝΟΤΗΙ ΝΗΟΝΤ (Greek νῦν οὐν).

(3) ωΑΕΝΑΤ ΔE ... ("usque tamen") + Present; no particle in the Greek. We may have here ΔE₁, but the placement weighs against this; is this a case of ΔE₃ "still", "yet"?
Ex. 16:28 ωΑΕΝΑΤ ΔE ΤΕΤΕΝΟΤΩΥ ΑΝ ΕΚΩΤΕΜ.
Num. 14:11 ωΑΕΝΑΤ ΔE ΠΑΙΛΑΟΣ ΕΡΟ ΜΜΟΙ ΕΜΒΟΝ.
Num. 14:27 ωΑΕΝΑΤ ΔE ΤΑΙΩΝΑΓΩΝΗ ΕΤΡΩΟΤ ΝΗ ΕΤΟΤΧΗΡΕΜ ΜΜΟΤ ΝΘΟΤ ΜΠΑΜΘΟ — the Greek has here the accusative τὴν συναγωγὴν τὴν πονηρὰν ταύτην, as the marked case (cf. "Why me?").

Obs.
ωΑΕΝΑΤ ΔE is generally very well attested: Ps. 6:4, 12:2f., 73:10, 78:5, 81:2 etc. (only 79:5 without ΔE); ΔE clearly belongs in the pattern, as does ΣΕ in the Shenoutean (Akhmimoid) Sahidic ωΑΕΝΕΟΤ ΣΕ ΨΩΝΕ, see SHISHA-HALEVY 1986a:85.
(4) Δε in non-interrogative Allocution (†νοσ Δε):
Num. 11:6 †νοσ Δε-ατενψυχη γυωσι (Greek νυψί δὲ).

(5) Δε in Narrative (very rare):
Gen. 22:7 νοου Δε πεξαropic (Vat Δε) Greek δὲ (Arabic 'ammâ)
Cf. οτιν above in a similar role. May we assume, here and in cases like
De Vis II 167 ευγγυμπι Δε..., a misreading of Δε?

Δε- clause-proclitic grammaticalized verb “saying”
There is surely no need to illustrate this ubiquitous grammaticalized
converbal element, arguably the only conjunction in Coptic, an element
— in a group of elements — actantial with verba dicendi etc., closely
associated with explicative clauses and with nexus substantivation. It is
of an entirely different syntactic and junctural properties than Δε₁ and
Δε₂, and is mentioned here for completeness’ sake. Clause-proclitic
Δε- falls syntactically into two subclasses, the first valential and thus
discontinuously componental of certain lexemes, the second non-
valential and essentially a substantivator of all types of nexus, indeed a
substantivizing converter.

(e) πω
This particle (old, yet first attested as a particle later than the Egyptian
ancestor of Δε₂, from LE on) is relatively rare in the studied corpus.
Unlike the others, it is not discourse- but information-structuring: a
focussing signal. It is often placed immediately following (closing) the
focussed segment (in that sense, it is “word-enclitic”); note the punctua-
tion delimiter placed immediately following πω, defining the Focus
unit and the scope prosodically (in this not unlike Greek γε). The particle
occurs either “redundantly” with or in focussing patterns, or as a
sole focussing signal. (See Shisha-Halevy 1990:120f.):
Gen. 27:36 ει μπεκεξποστὸς ηνι πω • Δηνοκ παιωτ.
Ex. 36:9 παρητρπ πω • πετωμον ηνιατην θρον (παιωι πω
supra lin. P) (= Vat).
Ex. 28:33 οτοι γανερμαν ηνοτι Μπαικμοτ πω • (= Vat).
Gen. 24:8 Μμονον πω • νοου Μπερτακεο Μπαικρι εματ
(= Vat) — note here a remarkable adverbial marking of μμονον; re-
markable separation of πω and νοου: remarkable focussing of the
imperative negation with μμονον.

Obs.
(1) For the probable etymon of πω, see E rman 1933 §683 on LE m-r3- contestant placement.
(2) Depuydt 2001, in characterizing ρω (118) as "contrast[ing] a thought as expressed by a sentence or clause, with its negation" trivializes, I think, the point of the flexible focussing incidence of this particle, which can be referred to any focalizable element in the text. Not "sentence" or "clause" but "information block" is the "logical" scope of ρω, and there is no need for "negation" or even "contrast" to describe its effect.

(3) A supporting argument for focussing ρω is the prevalent Φαί (παί-) ρω "just this": see Sern 1880 §249. This particle focalizes the deixis of the Φαί series in Bohairic generally: B4 John 9:30 (ένοφαί). In Nitrian: Φαί etc. Cat. 5; εοθεφαί De Vis II 11, Cat. 1, 9, 18, 20, 26, 68 — this is especially striking in hermeneutical style. παίρην* ρω on ete- Cat. 16, παί- -νωτρ ρω on (πε) Cat. 12, 46, 148, παιρω δορ Φαί ρω AM I 137. We find ρω also focussing πι- (De Vis II 26), Φω= (SV 64), ρω on is especially typical of Nitrian (De Vis, Cat.), often with negation (αν ρω), "(not) at all", e.g. AM I 128, 129.

(4) The conditioned, colon-second "clause-enclitic" position of ρω occurs less often, in adverb-focussing conversion (Focalizing Preterite): B4 John 9:29 αρετοφαίρη ρω άνοφαί, (Cat. 185) εταψι ρω εοθε:. Significantly, we also find ρω in this placement in Rhetorical Questions, where the whole nexus is assertively focussed: μη ρω, γὰρ ρω; consider also αμοί ρω, άρηστω ρω, γολω ρω, τεές ρω, μηνως ρω (De Vis I 141, II 162f., AM I 117 etc., John 7:26). The clause-final placement in B4 Gen. 2:19 παν οιην εν εμνάμοντερ ρω... Φαί πε πλαταν ρω (interestingly not in P or Vat) is probably an old Egyptian placement (Shisha-Halevy 1981:319).

(5) ρω recalls Greek γε in functional and formal regards: see Moorhouse 1959:138ff., 149; Seiler 1977; Dik 1995:38ff., 44 ("counterpresuppositional focus").


(f) .MESSAGE

This, an essentially cataphoric discourse-organizing particle, is probably the "most Greek", idiomatically speaking, of Greek loan-particles in Coptic.

(1) Discourse-structuring: setMessage... δε... occurs in contrastive/correlative topicalization in dialogue:

Gen. 27:22 Τσμχ setMessage Τσμχ Νιακωβ τε Νιαξίξ δε Νενξίξ Νχατ λε (Greek μεν... δε...).
Gen. 38:23 Άνοκ setMessage Άιοσερπι Μπιναζι Μβαιμπι Νθοκ δε Μπεκζεμες71 (Greek μεν... δε...).
Gen. 41:13 Άνοκ setMessage Αμχατ εζενταρχι Φη δε Ακαυγ (Greek... τε... δε...).

71 The Greek has εισριαζε, with no explicit object; Coptic, in which an object is essential for the construction of high-transitivity Ζιμί, returns here to the syntax of the original Hebrew. In Greek, the object status may (formally, not pragmatically) be referred to the kid sent by Judas.
(2) A non-correlative, more complicated hierarchical structure, in which \textit{men} marks the first term of a potential correlation, with the other term realized or unrealized; \textit{men} also defines the hierarchy:

Deut. 20:11f. εὐσπὸς ἂς ἀκωμῆςαν ἑοσμαὶ ἐβωτε εἰροκ ... εὐσπὸς ἂς ἁτωμὲρον ῥω νάκ ἑενπακαζι μνι-ρηνηκον ... εὐσπὸς ἂς ἁτωμεκωτεμ νακ... (Greek δὲ... μὲν... δὲ...).

Lev. 3:1-6 εὐσπὸς ἂς οὐσωσῳςωτῳ ννογεμ πε πε-ταῖο μπτε + εὐσπὸς ἂς ἁεηνῃ ἑσοτν εβολ ἑενειγωστ ... ἐεηενῃ ἑσοτν ἑοι ναταζι ... εὐσπὸς ἂς εβολ ἑεν-ηνειγωστ πε πεκαδρον... (Greek δὲ... μὲν... δὲ...).

Lev. 27:7 εὐσπὸς ἂς ἱκταζ ἐντρομπτ ἑουξι + εὐσπὸς ἂς οὐσωσοττ πε ... δ εὐσπὸς ἂς εὐσεβινουτ ... (Greek δὲ... μὲν... [δὲ...]).

(3) “Solitary \textit{men}” segments a protatic topicalized clause, heralding the thematic apodosis:

Gen. 44:8 ἱκταζ ἂς πιατ ετανξεμῃ ἑενεενουκ αν-ταζεαος γαρκ ... πνε τενακαλπ εβολ ἑεννι μπενετ (Greek μὲν...).

(4) \textit{men} γαρ is interesting, being an amalgam of anaphoric and cataphoric (Rheme-heralding) signals:

Gen. 43:14 ανοκ ἂς γαρ μὴρῃ † εταερατῳῃ + αἰε-ρατῳῃ (Greek μὲν γὰρ...: a remarkable reflection of the original on the Coptic).

Obs.

(1) \textit{men}γαρ is very well attested in the NT and Nitrian, e.g. De Vis II 24, 56f., I Cor. 11:7:14:18 (cons. all), with a rare minority variant γαρ \textit{men} still answering to μὲν γὰρ... (I Cor. 14:17, Job 9:19, 12:11, 28:2).

(2) \textit{men}σον Cat. 190, very common narratively in the Acts, where we even find \textit{d}ε \textit{men} σον (Acts 28:5 one cod.), is not attested in our corpus. \textit{men}τοι: De Vis II 39.

(g) γαρα “thus, then”

Enclitic, non-interrogative γαρα (Denniston 1954: ἀρα 93) is very rare in the corpus; I find only:

Gen. 26:28 μαρεκασω τι γαρα οςτῳ νεμ οςτωκ (Greek γενέσθω ἀρά).
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APPENDIX I

ANNE BOUD'HORS
(IRHT/CNRS. Paris)

Le manuscrit est sommairement décrit dans les trois catalogues, désormais anciens, d'Amélineau, Chabot et Delaporte (voir les indications bibliographiques à la fin de cet appendice). L'attention portée aux aspects matériels et à l'histoire du livre y est assez limitée, ce qui est normal pour l'époque. Les progrès effectués par la codicologie permettent désormais de connaître davantage les détails de fabrication du manuscrit et, même s'il subsiste des incertitudes, de le situer dans son milieu d'origine.

Identification du texte
Pentateuque copte (bohaïrique)-arabe.

Dimensions d'une page
398 mm de hauteur sur 283 mm de largeur.

Support
Papier non filigrané caractéristique des manuscrits du Moyen-Orient à cette époque. Les traces laissées par la forme ayant servi à fabriquer les feuilles sont visibles en transparence: fils de chaîne verticaux et verges horizontales, ce qui implique un pliage en deux (in F°) de la feuille d'origine. Les dimensions de cette dernière étaient donc d'au

1 De nombreuses observations, habituellement très difficiles à effectuer en raison de la fragilité des manuscrits, ont pu être faites pour celui-ci en 2000, à la faveur d'une restauration qui a entraîné le démontage provisoire de la reliure. Je suis très reconnaissante au service de restauration de la BnF de m'avoir autorisée à examiner le manuscrit pendant cette période, et particulièrement à Fabrice Belliot, en charge des travaux, qui m'a aimablement donné les explications techniques dont j'avais besoin et communiqué la copie de son compte rendu de restauration.


3 Les fils de chaîne correspondent en effet aux traverses disposées dans le sens de la
moins 566 x 398 mm. En réalité elles devaient être plus importantes et correspondre à un grand format oriental (660/720 x 490/560 mm), car le manuscrit semble avoir été fortement rogné, probablement par plusieurs reliures successives (voir plus loin). Plus précisément encore, on peut mesurer l'épaisseur d'un groupe de vingt vergeures (35-38 mm) et observer que les fils de chaîne sont groupés par deux, ce qui semble caractéristique des manuscrits égyptiens (coptes et arabes) de cette période.

**Composition des cahiers et pagination**

Selon la foliotation moderne, le manuscrit comporte 372 folios, numérotés A-B-C et 1-368, le dernier étant sans numéro. Les signatures des cahiers ont presque toutes disparu à cause de l'usure des pages qui a nécessité des restaurations (anciennes) dans les angles (la signature 1 au début du 3ème cahier confirme cependant qu'elles existaient). On compte 38 cahiers, dont 34 sont des quinions (cahiers formés de cinq feuilles pliée en deux ou bifolios), unité la plus courante dans les manuscrits médiévaux bohaïriques sur papier.

Cahiers "anormaux":

- Le 1er cahier est composé des deux bifolios internes du cahier d'origine (f°1/f°4 et f°2/f°3) et de trois folios simples (f° 5-7) dont les pendants ont été perdus et ont été remplacés par trois feuillets de papier plus récent (f° A-B-C), qui portent un filigrane "à l'ancre" caractéristique des papiers fabriqués pour le Levant du 16e au 18e siècles. Les trois feuillets perdus étaient les trois premiers du manuscrit. Ils ne comportaient pas de texte, puisque la Genèse commence bien au f°1 (= X dans la numérotation copie d'origine), mais probablement au moins une grande croix ornamentale comme on en trouve souvent à cette place.

- Le 10e cahier (f° 88-93) est constituté de trois bifolios seulement. La Genèse se termine au f° 91, les f° 92 et 93 sont blancs.


5 C'est toujours à elle que je fais référence quand j'emploie les chiffres dits "arabes".

- Le 19e cahier (f° 174-177) ne comporte que deux bifolios. L’Exode se termine au f° 175V, les f° 176 et 177 sont blancs.
- Le 38e cahier (f° 358-368) se compose de cinq bifolios et d’un folio supplémentaire sur lequel est écrite une note arabe à l’encre bleue (ce folio a pu être ajouté plus tard).

Le dernier folio du manuscrit (sans numéro) est de même nature que les folios A-B-C.

Il semble donc que le codex soit constitué de trois parties copiées indépendamment et regroupées dans une même reliure (Genèse, Exode, puis les trois autres livres), ce que confirment les dates indiquées à la fin de la Genèse et de l’Exode (voir plus loin), ainsi que la foliation d’origine, qui recommence au début de chaque partie.

Le manuscrit est en effet folioté, et non paginé. Les numéros sont inscrits au verso dans le coin supérieur gauche, selon la pratique la plus courante des manuscrits bohāiris de cette période. La foliation recommence au début de l’Exode et du Lévitique (cf. ci-dessus), mais aussi au début des Nombres, ce qui correspond à une autre tendance, déjà observable dans un grand nombre de manuscrits antérieurs, de numéroté indépendamment les pages des différents textes contenus dans un codex. La foliation est indiquée de deux manières : en chiffres copistes traditionnels (hérités du grec), peut-être portés de la main du copiste, et en “chiffres copistes” cursifs, probablement ajoutés plus tard, peut-être à l’occasion d’une nouvelle reliure.

Récupère
Les feuillots ont été préparés, probablement grâce à l’utilisation d’une mastara, ou planche à régler. La surface à écrire est divisée en trois colonnes égales, ce qui permet d’utiliser les deux premières pour le copiste et la troisième pour l’arabe, plus concis, tandis que sont tracées 33 lignes horizontales séparées de 8/9 mm. On observe que l’arabe ne sort que rarement de la colonne qui lui est réservée, alors que le copiste la

8 Cf. Denis MUZERELLE, Vocabulaire codicologie, Paris, 1985, p. 70: “Instrument composé d’une planchette sur laquelle sont tendues des cordelettes correspondant aux lignes à tracer, de sorte qu’il suffit d’appliquer la feuille sur l’instrument et de la presser le long des cordelettes pour en obtenir l’empreinte sur la feuille”.
dépasse fréquemment et semble plutôt éviter la coupure de mots en fin de ligne. La calligraphie de l’arabe semble s’être adaptée à l’espace restant; il est donc probable que la traduction arabe a été copiée après le texte copte. Dans le même sens pourrait aller le fait que l’encre de l’arabe semble plus noire.

**Paléographie**

- Ecriture: c’est le même copiste qui a copié tout le manuscrit, mais en plusieurs parties indépendantes, ce qui se reflète dans des variations quant à l’aspect d’ensemble: plus aéré au début de l’Exode, plus dense au début du Lévitique. En l’absence de paléographie bohémienne, il est assez difficile de caractériser cette écriture, dont on peut dire cependant qu’elle n’est plus aussi droite et dense que celle de manuscrits un peu plus anciens: on remarquera particulièrement la longueur de la queue supérieure du imestamp de la queue inférieure du ő, et la taille importante de certaines lettres dont l’intérieur est rempli de rouge: ą̄, ō, φ̄, ū̄. Il y a deux formes pour le “hay”: ū̄ et ū̄. L’encre du texte est noire, mais dans l’Exode certaines lignes sont en rouge, ainsi que le titre courant. Les séparations entre segments de phrases (il peut s’agir de pauses logiques, mais peut-être aussi de respirations à observer dans une lecture à voix haute) sont indiquées par des signes -S- en rouge, jusqu’au f° 328R; ensuite les espaces destinés à ces signes continuent à être ménagés, mais ne sont plus remplis.

- Diacritiques: djinkim (= point, ou plutôt ici tiret très court et légèrement incliné de gauche à droite) sur m et n centres de syllabe et voyelles autosyllabiques. C’est l’usage “classique” en usage jusqu’au 14e s., défini par H.-J. Polotsky10.

- Mise en page et décoration: en tête de chaque livre se trouve un frontispice constitué d’entrelacs tracés à l’encre noire, qui n’ont été coloriés que pour le Lévitique (vert-jaune-rouge) et le Deutéronome (rouge et noir). La première page de la Genèse est en lettres qu’on pourrait qualifier de monumentales (de 1,5 à 3,5 cm de haut) avec alternance de deux lignes noires/ deux lignes rouges. La première page

det”.

de l’Exode (f° 94R) a trois lignes de lettres monumentales noires, puis quelques lignes en onciale dite “nitriote”\(^\text{11}\), avec ponctuation par points d’or, tandis que dans la marge un rinceau a été tracé à l’encre, mais non colorié. La première page du Lévitique commence en lettres monumentales avec alternance de deux lignes noires/ deux lignes rouges, l’arabe étant lui aussi monumental. A la première page des Nombres (f° 231R), les trois premières lettres du texte sont seules très agrandies: ογο(2), chaque ο étant constitué de deux cercles tracés au compas, mais sans couleur. La première page du Deutéronome, sous un frontispice étroit, commence par une initiale à entrelacs, rouge et noire, puis le texte est en module normal.

L’impression d’ensemble est celle de non achèvement, et pourtant d’une utilisation assidue dont témoignent à la fois l’usure, déjà évoquée, et les nombreuses notes.

\textit{Notes et colophons}

Un peu partout dans les marges, les corrections et ajouts de tous ordres ont été très nombreux. Je relève ici les plus remarquables.

- Dans les marges et en rouge, les nombres contenus dans le texte biblique ont été écrits en toutes lettres jusqu’au f°18. Exemple au f° 9: \(\text{槃} (167)\) a été résolu en marge \(\text{グエネクショ}\) (cent soixante-sept).

- Dans la Genèse et le Deutéronome une main (occidentale?) a introduit une division du texte en chiffres romains, qui correspond plus ou moins à celle des chapitres actuels. À partir de l’Exode et jusqu’à la fin du Deutéronome, des divisions du texte en lettres coptes rouges sont portées dans la marge, soit 186 sections qui ne correspondent pas aux chapitres actuels.

- Au f° 91R, à la fin de la Genèse, une petite note en arabe écrite dans le sens vertical contient une date: 19 Choïak 1073 (année écrite en chiffres coptes cursifs: \(\text{고}\)), soit 15 décembre 1356.

- A la fin de l’Exode (f° 175V), une petite note arabe est écrite à l’encre rouge en biais dans la marge, avec une date dont l’année, en chiffres coptes cursifs, doit être 1074 (\(\text{고}\)), soit 1357/1358, tandis qu’à la fin du texte se trouve la souscription: \(\text{EXOΔOC EN ΗΡΗΝΗ ΑΜΗΝ}\).

\(^{11}\) Cette écriture, qui est celle des manuscrits de parchemin du Ouadi-Natroun (mais aussi celle du BnF Copte 13, dont la provenance précise n’est pas connue), se retrouve dans de nombreux manuscrits de papier du 11\(\text{e}\) au 14\(\text{e}\) s., utilisée comme écriture ornementale dans les premières lignes d’un texte ou d’une section. Je ne pense pas qu’elle suffise à elle seule à attribuer au Ouadi-Natroun un manuscrit qui l’emploie de cette façon, car cet emploi a pu se répandre ailleurs.

- Les deux folios suivants, qui sont vides de texte, portent des notes en arabe et des cachets de possesseur ou de lecteur qui sont encore à identifier.

- A la fin du Lévitique (f° 236V) se trouve une petite note en arabe, sans date. En rouge: λεγιτικον αμην.

- A la fin des Nombres (f° 309R) se trouve une autre petite note arabe en rouge, sans date.

- Le colophon (f° 367V):
  A l’origine il comptait dix-huit lignes, mais à partir de la seconde moitié de la ligne 4 et jusqu’à la ligne 15, il a été raturé de telle façon qu’il est illisible. On peut lire encore:

  ἀκάω τοῦσι τοῦ σαραγετάου μεταστράφη αμήν ἄραν έρετι υπογραμμήν ἄραν ἀμήν ἔχει ταξίν υπορκι εὑρε εποιαν ἄραν νεφονοί πιγηνην εμέρις ἃδηνι νιβεν φι ετε ἄνεμπως αν εερογμονοτ ἁροτ χε ρωμί παριστατα μοναχος μεν φράν μιχαλ πιγηρι ναμφαμ πεμπεμαν ἄμαινυ τυμαιοτ ἁιδακι [...]

  κε ωγον νιβεν εταναχί πογεβμι ις τμετανοια μαρεμπι πογάγαμι ογος ιτεμπας κατα πετερπεπι ἐρε πνευ τη αμην ἄμην μπινιωτ ἁνεβιω εὑρε τεμάχαμη ἄμην περομπι νινιμαρτυροκ ἁνόξ μενογιραμπην ἄραν ἀμην

  “Achevée la sainte Torah, dans la paix de Dieu, amen. Par la main de ce malheureux sous le nombre de ses péchés, ce misérable (?)13 plein de toute souillure, celui qui n’est pas digne d’être appelé “homme”, encore moins “moine”, qui a nom Michel, fils d’Abraham, originaire de Pemdjé13 la pieuse cité [...]

12 La même note, datée de la même année 1460/1461, se retrouve dans le manuscrit BnF Copite 2A (f°186R): c’est une copie du livre d’Ezéchiel datée de 1375, qui a un certain nombre de ressemblances avec Copite 1, mais n’est pas du même copiste.
13 Je n’ai pas identifié le mot ωγηνη. Il pourrait s’agir d’un dérivé de ωγων « être malade », ou de ωγωνη, « être démuni ».
14 Ancienne Oxyrhynchos, actuelle Bahnasa.
Et quiconque trouvera l'oubli ou le repentir, qu'il fasse une aumône et qu'il la fasse comme il convient. Le Christ lui donnera grande récompense à cause de son aumône. Amen.


La copie est donc achevée l'année 1359/1360. Il se pourrait que θεωρία soit une mauvaise compréhension du mot hébreu Torah, et non pas le mot grec θεωρία, qui n'est pas employé dans ce sens. C'est probablement par influence de l'arabe que ce mot apparaît ici en copte, comme l'indique le titre porté au début des Nombres (f° 237R): Ἰπιεοκ πίνακ ἄ νεκμ έβολ ἑν ἱθεωρία εγγον (avec le mot arabe correspondant التوراة).

En marge du colophon se trouve une note en arabe qu'Amélineau reproduit dans sa notice avec le commentaire: "On voit ainsi que le manuscrit a été écrit à Gizeh au mois de Bâbah, au moment où le Nil avait atteint 20 coudées et était resté sans décroître jusqu'à la moitié (?) de Baba, ce qui avait fait grand plaisir aux Égyptiens." Au folio suivant (f° 368) se trouvent cinq lignes en arabe élegamment tracées à l'encre bleue. C'est sans doute à ces lignes qu'Amélineau fait allusion quand il dit qu'une autre note en arabe "nous apprend que la copie a été collationnée".

Date
La copie de ce Pentateuque s'est donc étalée entre 1356 et 1360.

Reliure
La reliure actuelle est trop petite pour le manuscrit. C'est probablement une reliure de récupération, qui n'a pas dû être mise en place avant le 16e siècle (cf. les f° A-B-C et leur filigrane). Il s'agit d'une reliure en cuir marron de type oriental assez banal, à dos plat, sans rabat, avec des motifs estampés à froid (losanges et écoinçons). Lors de la restauration effectuée en 2000, le démontage de la reliure a permis d'en sortir divers fragments coptes et surtout arabes qui servaient de garnissage. Aucun de ces fragments n'est datable avec précision. Cependant plusieurs d'entre eux sont manifestement plus tardifs que le manuscrit Copte 1, au vu de la qualité du papier et de l'écriture. L'un des fragments est en syriaque. La reliure actuelle pourrait avoir été mise en place à la fin du 16e ou au début du 17e siècle.15

15 On notera une remarque intéressante d'Hugh EVELYN-WHITE concernant les
Histoire du manuscrit
Les différentes mentions, signatures et chiffres apposés sur les premières pages du manuscrit permettent de remonter le fil de ses déplacements. La cote actuelle, Copte 1, a été attribuée au manuscrit dans le premier catalogue imprimé de la Bibliothèque royale (1739), où les manuscrits étaient classés par langue, et à l’intérieur de chaque langue selon les types de texte. En 1682, dans l’inventaire manuscrit de Nicolas Clément, où la numération des manuscrits ne recommençait pas pour chaque langue, le manuscrit portait la cote Regius 326 (cette indication n’est pas visible dans le manuscrit, mais elle se retrouve grâce aux concordances). Il avait appartenu au collectionneur Gilbert Gaulmin et portait le numéro “trois cent quarante-deux” lors de la vente des manuscrits de ce dernier à la Bibliothèque royale en 1667, où son premier numéro d’inventaire était “520”. Gaulmin avait obtenu ce manuscrit vers 1645, par l’intermédiaire de François Daniel et Jean Magy, marchands provençaux établis en Égypte: le cachet de F. Daniel, à ses initiales, se trouve au f°A, accompagné d’une note probablement de la main de Magy: “Ce sont les Cinq libvres de Mouyse en arabe et gofetin/”16.

Où F. Daniel avait-il acquis ce manuscrit? Probablement au Caire ou dans un des monastères du Ouadi-Natroun. La note arabe déchiffée par Amélineau dit que le manuscrit a été copié à Gizeh, vraisemblablement dans un monastère puisque le copiste est un moine. Le manuscrit a pu ensuite être donné à un autre établissement, peut-être le “monastère des Syriens”. La langue et les particularités textuelles pourraient aider à progresser dans cette question.

Bibliographie
AMÉLINEAU (Emile), Catalogue des manuscrits copistes de la Bibliothèque nationale, s.l., 1890-1896 [catalogue manuscrit].

manuscrits de Saint-Macaire: “It was in 1626 that the Barberini Psalter was rebound: this may indicate some general effort to put the library in order”: The Monasteries in the Wadi n’Natrun, New York, 1926, vol. 1, p. XXIII, n. 2.


Dans PETERS (Melvin K.H.), *A Critical edition of the Coptic (Bohairic) Pentateuch*, Atlanta (Septuaginta and Cognate Studies), 1983-1986, le BnF Copte 1 porte le sigle A.

Les chapitres 39 à 45 de la Genèse ont été publiés par MALLON (Alexis), *Grammaire Copte*, Beyrouth, 19564, d'après le Copte 1 de Paris, avec les variantes du Copte 1 du Vatican.
APPENDIX II

OFER LIVNE-KAFRY

Some Notes concerning the Arabic Version*

The bilingual Coptic-Arabic versions of the Pentateuch of MS Paris. Copt. 1, reflect the Copts’ need, at a time of lingual transition, of an Arabic translation besides the traditional Coptic text; this is a preliminary study of the Arabic text. The language of the Arabic version belongs to the so-called Christian-Arabic, which, like the medieval Judaeo-Arabic is less committed to the ideal of Classical Arabic (J. Blau, *A Grammar of Christian Arabic* [Louvain, 1966-1967], vol. 1, p. 19); among Blau’s numerous works in this field see, e.g. *The Emergence and Linguistic Background of Judaeo-Arabic* (Oxford, 1965); *A Grammar of Mediaeval Judaeo-Arabic*, second enlarged edition (Jerusalem, 1980; in Hebrew); *A Dictionary of Mediaeval Judaeo-Arabic Texts* (Jerusalem, 2006). As part of Middle Arabic it includes elements of the Classical language, as well as other features, akin to those reflecting the influence of ‘conquered languages’, the penetration of the dialects into the literary language, hyper corrections, etc. (For a general introduction see Blau, *Christian Arabic*, vol. 1, pp. 42-58.) The Arabic text is discussed here in light of these characteristics, while some questions concerning the relations between the two versions might be posed. For example, was the Arabic translated from the Coptic version, and if so, was it the only source? In most cases where the text exceeds the lines it is Arabic text; this implies that the Coptic text was most probably written first. Is it possible that the Arabic was influenced by the Coptic? Are there signs of the Coptic in the Arabic in terms of grammar, style, or vocabulary? Is there a reflection of the Hebrew version of the Pentateuch? The Septuagint? The answers might be important for the study of Arabic (and Coptic), especially from the linguistic point of view, though other

* The full reference of the manuscript is B.N. Paris. Copt. 1. See its description in J.F. Rhode, *The Arabic Versions of the Pentateuch in the Church of Egypt*, Washington D.C.; The Catholic University of America, 1921 (Ph.D. Dissertation), pp. 46-52. In the framework of this study we will not discuss the scribe’s notes in the margins of the manuscript (ibid., pp. 46-52); see also A.E. Brooke, ‘The Bohairic Version of the Pentateuch’, *Journal of Theological Studies* 3 (1902), pp. 258-278. I wish to thank A. Shisha-Halevy who introduced me to this field, for the text that he made available to me, and for his warm encouragement.
fields might benefit too, such as biblical studies or the history of the area (e.g. cultural evidence of relations among the different Arabic-speaking communities, especially in Egypt). At the present stage of research it is impossible to make a comparison with other Arabic translations of the Bible (Egyptian and others) or to treat exegetical traditions of the text; instead we prefer to show some general trends through selected examples.

**Classical elements**

These are an important component in all forms of Middle Arabic (see e.g. Blau, *Grammar*, p. 5). It seems that the translator of the Arabic text was acquainted with the grammar of Classical Arabic and wished to produce a translation of 'high language'. This is generally reflected through the impact of Classical Arabic in many ways, such as the preservation of orthographic marks, in the morphology, and mainly through the syntax, where many other Christian texts are far less strict (the preservation of the moods; the cases: nominative, accusative, and genitive of the noun, with the vowels added in many instances; pronouns; numerals, and more). Although he is not always consistent, the translator makes a great effort to adhere to Classical forms.

Some examples which demonstrate Classical usages (sometimes including features of Middle Arabic):

1. In *Num.* 13:23, 25: ... وقطعوا غصنًا في عنقود عنب ... من بعد أربعين يوماً ... and they cut a branch in which (there was) a bunch of grapes ... after forty days'; the cases are marked in the manuscript according to the rules of Classical Arabic.

2. Correct use of ‘لَل of the command’ (لَام الامَر); cf. W. Wright, *A Grammar of the Arabic Language* [Cambridge, 1933], vol. 1, p. 291; vol. 2, p. 35) in *Exod.* 5:7, 9: ‘let them go... let the works [of these people] be heavy... let them take care of them [the works]'. Cf. below, the section *The relation of the Coptic to the language of the Arabic version*, 9.

3. The subjunctive of the imperfect (cf. Wright, *Grammar*, vol 2, pp. 22, 28) in *Num.* 13:16 هذه أسماء الرجال الذين ارسلهم موسى ليجسوا الأرض ‘These are the names of the men whom Moses sent in order that they investigate the land’. Note also the agreement of the different components of the sentence according to the rules of Classical Arabic (cf. Blau, *Christian Arabic*, vol. 2, pp. 275ff.).

4. Special attention should be paid to the Classical use of the dual in the Arabic translation (see *Gen.* 4:23; 40:5; *Exod.* 1:15-16; 5:4; but cf. *Exod.* 1:21 in the plural), because a special morphological dual category
does not exist in the Coptic text and because the grammatical rules of the
dual are not always kept in Middle Arabic in general (see Blau, op. cit.,
vol. I, p. 47; pp. 209-223); generally the dual is replaced by the plural
(like the القابل، above) as an aspect of the analytic trend (cf. ibid., p. 209).
See also, e.g. Exod. 1:15
وقال... ملك مصر للقابلين للتيين للعبرانيين واسم... احمدهما...’And the king of Egypt said to the two midwives whom the
Hebrews had; the name of one of them...’. The use of the dual for the
noun, the relative pronoun, and the pronominal suffix is according to Class-
cical Arabic rules, but the combination احمدهما (instead of اخدها) is
probably a reflection of the spoken language (ibid., p. 237; cf. J. Blau, Gram-
mar, p. 113).
5. On the penetration of the spoken language see also َوَيْلُ شَيْءٌ (اي
شيء) instead of the interrogative pronoun ما ‘what’. Both ما and ايش appear in
Num. 13:18-20 in the sense of ‘what, of what sort, how?’; cf. Blau, Dic-
tionary, p. 27.
6. Classical use of ... ام ... ‘(either) or’, in interrogative sentences:
Num. 13:18 اقويهم ام ضعفاء 18 ‘are they strong or weak’; cf. Wright,
Grammar, vol. 2, p. 306 (although اقويهم seems to have been a better choice:
see ibid., p. 308).
7. Classical style and ways of expression: Gen. 25:32 قد أشرف على
الموت ‘...I am at the point of death’ (literally: ‘I overlooked death’; cf.
1537). The Coptic text says simply [like the Hebrew] ‘...I am going to
die’.
8. Hyper-corrections: Exod. 4:2 فقال له النبي ما هذه التى في يدك اما هو
‘and the Lord said: What is it which is in your hand? As for him,
he said: a staff’. This is a translation from the Coptic (which is basically a
reflection of the Septuagint) ΠΕΑΣΑΚ ΝΑΨ ΝΕΣ ΠΟΤ ΑΕ ΟΥ ΠΕ ΦΑΙ
ΕΤΣΕΝ ΤΕΚΣΙΑ ΝΒΟΨ ΑΕ ΠΕΑΣΑΚ ΑΕ ΟΤΨΒΨΤ. It might be an
attraction or a ‘scholarly hyper-correction’ in the Arabic, where there is an
adaptation of the demonstrative pronoun and the relative pronoun (which
should have been in the masculine) to عصا, a feminine noun.

Reflection of the Septuagint
The last example is one of many in which the Septuagint is reflected in
the Arabic text through the Coptic. This is clearly seen in the preservation
of proper names: Gen. 38:1 ‘Hirah’, يراص is translated as ايراس; proper
names in Exod. 1 follow the Coptic (cf. verse 3 نبفلئيم); even
Abraham is written ابرام, ابرام in Gen. 17:5, although in other cases the Arabic word is preferred (like موسى Moses). The
Septuagint’s version is also reflected in Gen. 12:6 ‘the high tree’ through the Coptic (for the Hebrew version אלחא מורת). See also Gen. 32:2, the Arabic ‘and Jacob went in his way and he looked up and he saw the troops of God…’ translates the Coptic version, which is a direct translation of the Septuagint. These might hint also at the presence of the Septuagint’s unique (sometimes exegetical) tradition in the Arabic translation.

Reflection of the Hebrew versions of the Pentateuch (or Arabic versions translated from Hebrew).

1. The Coptic version was apparently not the only source on which the Arabic text relied. Differences between the versions are sometimes evident, and there seems also to be a reflection of the Hebrew version of the Pentateuch (or, more probably, of Arabic translations from the Hebrew). The choice of Arabic words sounding similar to Hebrew words in the same verses is not always a proof of a deliberate act by the translator, but it should be taken into consideration. For example, the Hebrew כדריסים ‘shins’ translated as (Exod. 12:9; 29:17; Lev. 1:9; 4:11; 8:21) might be related to a similar use in Classical Arabic (see J.G. Hava, Al-Faraid, Arabic-English Dictionary [Beirut, 1986], p. 651); תושה ‘soul’ translated as (Exod. 2:7; 7:22 (cf. Blau, Dictionary, p. 693); or even in Deut. 20:16; משל ‘ointment’ is translated as (see e.g. Lev. 7:35, or in Exod. 29:7); משל ‘a camping place’ as משל in Exod. 33:7; משל ‘a lamp’ as מחלת in Exod. 35:14; מחל ‘anything devoted to God’ is translated as (Lev. 27:28-29. For the meaning in Classical Arabic, cf. Lane, Lexicon, vol. 2, pp. 553 ff.). In Lev. 25:24, ללכי אור לאוחותכם and Lev. 25:24, ‘and in the whole land you hold’, the Arabic is وفي جميع الأرض التي في حوزكم (cf. J. Blau, Dictionary, p. 151) apparently caused this translation choice (cf. the same word translated as ميراث ‘inheritance’ in Gen. 47:11 or Num. 32:29, 32). In Deut. 8:9 is translated as بالمسكنة (both mean ‘poverty, destitution’. السكنة is the Classical use in Arabic; see Hava, Al-Faraid, p. 329). According to Blau, in Judaeo-Arabic texts white marble is a literal translation of the Hebrew שלח ‘burnt-offering’ (Blau. Emergence, p. 156; cf. Blau, Dictionary, p. 372). This word appears in several places, such as Gen. 8:21 ‘burnt-offerings’, but this does not translate the Hebrew parallel. The word שלח in the Hebrew version of Gen. 8:20 is translated as מḤראות (‘burnt-offerings’). שלח is translated as סמיה in Exod. 29:25; and in Exod. 30:20 it translates
2. It seems, albeit in rare cases, that (conversely) the Christian-Arabic of the Copts might have influenced the Judaeo-Arabic of Egypt. One case is the adverbial phrase זהבך ו�습니다 (or פְּסֵגַה פְּסֵגַה) ‘each one, every one’ (cf. W.E. Crum, A Coptic Dictionary [Oxford, 1979], p. 469). Although the classical phrase כל واحد is also in use (cf. Wright, Grammar, Vol. 2, p. 204) such as in Exod. 5:4 מָעֵשׂ נַעַטֵן פְּסֵגַה פְּסֵגַה מָעֵשׂ נַעַטֵן פְּסֵגַה פְּסֵגַה ‘let each one of you [note the preservation of the dual] go to his work’, we find more often translations of זהבך ו предост in phrases like� (Exod. 1:1; Num. 7:5; 11:10) and even (Num. 5:10; Lev. 7:10; cf. the feminine, ibid., 5:26). The phrase واحد probably tries to place special emphasis on reciprocity (Gen. 32:27 ‘... each killing his brother and friend and neighbor’). A rare instance of a similar use of what the Arabic is attested in an Egyptian Judaeo-Arabic text (Blau, Grammar, p. 113, no. 9; idem, Dictionary, p. 754). This expression may be a loan translation from the Coptic, into both the Christian Arabic and the Judaeo-Arabic of Egypt (probably through Christian-Arabic), and it might represent a spoken language as well. If so, this is important cultural evidence. The findings of Blau in the above-mentioned Dictionary may be extremely helpful in any future research on the subject. So far I have not found a direct connection of our text with the Arabic translations of the Torah by Saadia Gaon.

The cultural influence of Muslim society

The cultural influence of Muslim society is expressed in the use of Muslim terminology in non-Muslim texts, even concerning religious matters (cf. Blau, Emergence, pp.159-160). Examples: سنة (sunna, pl. سنن sunan) ‘religious conduct, generally of those who follow the way of the Prophet Muhammad; Muslim tradition; Muslim law’ appears in many places in biblical connotation. See e.g. Exod. 27:21 'a lasting
The relation of the Coptic to the language of the Arabic version

Still, what makes the Arabic version so different from other Christian-Arabic (non-Egyptian) texts seems to be the relation of the Coptic to the language of the Arabic version of the Pentateuch (sometimes, as mentioned, reflecting the Septuagint). The Coptic version may have been the most important source for the Arabic translation. The results are sometimes contrary to what is deemed to match the norm in Classical Arabic, both grammatically and in style, despite the translator’s knowledge of Classical grammar. It is difficult to know whether the translator’s choices were a result merely of his insufficient knowledge of Classical Arabic or of his wish to produce a more verbal translation of a sacred text; or if there was an attempt to create a literary style understood by the intended readership at a time of linguistic transition (or as the continuation of an already existing version). Also, he might have acquired the knowledge of Arabic grammatical rules, but was not well aquainted with Classical literature. The variation may also hint at what comes instinctively to the translator’s mind in his specific linguistic environment. The examples given here are selective; at this stage of the research they point to tendencies rather than giving a full and detailed presentation of the subject.

1. Deut. 1:14 The Arabic وقلتم حسنًا هو هذا القول الذي قلته ان تفعل ‘...and you said: What you propose to do is good’ (literally: ‘Good is this thing [cf. Blau, Dictionary, p. 570, entry قول in the sense of ‘matter, thing’] which you have said, that you would do’) is a translation from the Coptic...πεξωτεν ζη νανε πιαζί ΦΗ ητακαζι νυνοι λαϊκ. Note the influence of the Coptic word order, more especially the possible influence of the adjective verb νανε- (cf. A. Shisha-Halevy, Coptic Grammatical Chrestomathy [Leuven, 1988], pp. 196; 261).

2. As in the first example, the word order of the Arabic version frequently follows that of the Coptic text. One interesting case is that of maf'ūl muqlaq (the absolute object; cf. e.g. Wright, Grammar, vol. 2, p. 54). In Classical Arabic the internal object follows the verb and very rarely precedes it (cf. Blau, Christian Arabic, vol. 3, pp. 604-605). In Gen. 15:13 أعلما ‘you will surely know’ the usual word order of Classical Arabic is preserved, but there are examples where the internal object is prefixed
to the verb. According to Blau this construction is mainly limited to biblical translations (from Aramaic or Greek; cf. ibid., p. 604). The internal object sometimes translates prepositional phrases in the Coptic (a kind of cleft sentences?). See e.g. Exod. 3:7 'I have surely seen' γεν οσιανα ανινα 3:16 'I have surely remembered you' γεν οσυιανι ανυινη ερωτεν.

3. The combination ... 'as for him...' is common in Classical Arabic (see Wright, Grammar, vol. 1, p. 292). In the Arabic version there are many examples with an obvious influence of the Coptic reinfencer (see the definition in Shisha-Halevy, p. 273). See, e.g. Gen. 4:9 وقال الرب الأله... 'and God the Lord said to Cain: Where is your brother Abel? As for him, he said...’ (γεν οσιαν ανη πεθαγ...).

There are many other examples (see e.g. Gen. 18:9; 20:4; 22:7; 27:18; 39:7-8; Exod 2:13; 4:2).

4. 'All...' is generally translated according to the rules of Classical Arabic by genitive phrases (cf. Wright, Grammar, vol. 2, p. 204), such as in Exod. 1:5 ηυειον ην τηρον... 'the souls, all of them...' is translated as... وكل النفوس 'the souls, all of them' in Exod. 5:12 ορειν ην ουλω ην ην τηρον... the Arabic version is فتفرق الشعب في مصر... 'the people scattered in Egypt, all of it (in the whole of Egypt)'. This is a verbal translation, retaining the structure of the reinfencer τηρ- ('all...', 'the whole of...'). See also Gen. 37:4.

5. The description of 'Age': following the Coptic, it is generally described through كن فق 'he was (at [a certain age])'. See e.g. Gen. 50:26 ορογ αμοσιν ην ειωσθη εφκεν πι νομομ 'Wheat was lost in Egypt, and Joseph died being in 110 years (at the age of 110)' (see also Gen. 7:6; 17:24-25; but cf. 37:2; Deut. 31:2).

6. Exod. 1:5 'And Joseph was in Egypt'; the Arabic وقان يوسف موجودا is 'and Joseph "was existing" in Egypt' seems to follow the Coptic ιωσθη αε ναχη ην κημη πε. Such a usage is not regular in Arabic; it should have been simply وقان يوسف مصع. The Coptic preterite (cf. Shisha-Halevy, p. 75) used here belongs to the durative conjugation. The translator seemingly wanted to express somehow 'duration (-ing)' in the Arabic, and he chose to do so by using an expression of 'existence' (but it might also have been a wish to emphasize a Coptic meaning: see W.E. Crum, A Coptic Dictionary [Oxford, 1979], p. 95, k.).

7. In Exod. 1:15 وقال ملك مصر للقابتنين... قلما... 'And the king of Egypt said to the two midwives... saying...’ translates the Coptic ορογ πεζαν ποτρο... ορογ πεζαν αε... Cf. Exod. 3:4... αμοσιν ερον... εφιων αμοσ αε... 'He called him... saying...' is translated
as... دعاه... قايلا... The translator probably wanted to reflect in the Arabic the circumstantial durative infinitive by using the Arabic الحال (state of condition). Note that in Classical Arabic قال إن is required before a direct speech as in Exod. 3:16: ... وقال انني ذكرًا قد ذكرتمكم...。

8. Exod. 2:2 ἔταξομαι ἐκ ἑπόκε ἐκ οὐκατοικος πε... The Arabic is a literal translation:... والمنظره إنه جميل هو (‘... when they saw him that he is beautiful...’). The pronominal suffix in نظره does not match the Classical Arabic (cf. Gen. 37:4: فلما نظر أخوته ان اباه...). The هو (it might be a late addition, because it is written in smaller letters; but that is not certain) is not required here in Classical Arabic and it seems to be enclitic, following the sg. masc. enclitic subject πε (Cf. Blau, Christian Arabic, vol. 2, p. 402, no. 290.1: a possible reflection of Syriac in the feature of enclitic emphasizing the preceding word).

9. In Exod. 5:4 ἡεῖποντες οὑοι οὑοι ἡείποντες ἐνεμορισιτι ‘let each one of you (two) go to his work’: the Coptic imperative is translated by the Arabic jussive connected with the imperative in the use of ‘ل of the command’ (ل الم الأمر, and not by the Arabic imperative. Cf. above, section Classical elements, 2: the example given there is Exod. 5:7: وليمضوا... فنتقن أعمال... ‘let them go... let the works [of these people] be heavy... let them take care of them [the works]’. Here ‘ل of the command’ is used to translate the Coptic causative imperative (مـئـق- let him-): مارسوسين و... مارسوسن و... مارسوسن و... مارسوسن و...

10. Another result of a literal translation is seen in ἡφα: in Deut. 8:20 ἡφα ἐκ... ἡποτεν εωτει... ‘because you did not listen...’, the Arabic version is موضوع عدم سماعكم is not an Arabic expression, and it translates the Coptic literally ( موضوع like مـا means ‘place’). In Gen. 22:16 ‘because you have done...’; βα انك فعلت... It might be that كـ was chosen here because of the similarity to the sounding of ἡφα. But cf. Gen. 22:18: ἡφα ‘because’ is translated by لان (cf. Wright, Grammar, vol. 2, p. 78); in Gen. 22:13 ‘instead of his son’ ἡφα is translated by a parallel Arabic usage.

11. ‘To sport, play with a woman’ in Gen. 26:8... The Arabic version, following the Coptic ἦσος ἐκσβύνι ἐνεβέκκα ὑπεχόμινι is اسمح بضاحتك رفقة زوجته (‘Isaac is sporting with Rebekah his wife’; note the similarity of the Arabic root ض.ح.ك to the Hebrew root נ.ש.ג). Cf. Gen. 39:17: كل الاسلام العبري اسمه للجا في ‘The Hebrew slave... came to me to make sport on me’. The Coptic is سـبـي to laugh, play’, but the Arabic here is ليضحني ‘to disgrace me’.
12. The Arabic text offers several translation choices for the Coptic optative (‘third future’): ‘eqe-\textit{cwtem}', ‘\textit{nee-q cwtem}' (Shisha-Halevy, pp. 177-178).

Examples:

\textit{Exod. 5:7} Arabic فلا تعودون تعطون (‘you shall not give again’) translates the negative optative \textit{nne\textit{ten or\textit{gw\textit{en unh\textit{no\textit{en et}}}}... عاد serves here as an auxiliary verb (Cf. Blau, \textit{Grammar}, p. 188, no. 295-296; idem, \textit{Christian Arabic}, p. 442). In \textit{Gen. 9:11} the imperfect فلا يكون translates the Coptic optative \textit{nee... yw\textit{yn}} (‘it shall [never] be’) in the promise of God to Noah (cf. Blau, \textit{Christian Arabic}, vol. 1, p. 271 on the third person of the imperfect denoting command). The Coptic optative in some commandments is strengthened by an infinitive prepositional phrase, for example, \textit{Exod. 31:14 eqem\textit{os m\textit{ho\textit{so}}}} (‘he shall surely be put to death’) and it is translated by the Arabic \textit{maf\textit{ul mu\textit{f\textit{laq}}} قليمت موتا verse15 يموت 15 فلما تتو موتا. There is also a usage of the Coptic causative imperative in similar cases (\textit{Lev. 20:9}). Cf. the use of the Arabic imperative in \textit{Deut. 4:40} ‘Keep his decrees and commands...’, where is a translation of \textit{or\textit{q ek\textit{e\textit{lg}}}... In \textit{Deut. 7:18} ‘you shall not be afraid’، \textit{n\textit{ne\textit{k\textit{ek\textit{op\textit{og}}}... is translated by an Arabic energetic imperfect فلا تخافن probably to increase its force. Note a rare use of an Arabic energetic form of the imperfect to translate the Coptic conjunctive in \textit{Gen. 27:41}. In \textit{Deut. 1:11} the Coptic optative in the sense of ‘may’ (‘May the Lord, the God of your fathers, increase you a thousand times and bless you’) is translated by the Arabic imperfect indicative. In the Ten Commandments (\textit{Deut. 5:6-18}), the negative optative \textit{nee\textit{k}} is generally translated by the Arabic negative imperative. In verse 12 (‘Keep the Sabbath day’), the Arabic positive imperative احفظ translates the Coptic imperative /ros, while in verse 15 the Coptic optative (‘you shall remember’) is translated also by the Arabic imperative. In \textit{Exod. 7:4} ‘Pharaoh shall not listen to you...’; the Arabic وليس يسمع translates the Coptic optative \textit{n\textit{ne\textit{q\textit{c\textit{wtem}}} (in connection with the imperfect, ليس expresses a strongly denied present or future; cf. Wright, \textit{Grammar}, vol. 2, p. 302).

Conclusions

The Arabic version of the Pentateuch of MS Paris. Copt.1 (written by Christians for the use of the Christian community) is an interesting example of Christian Arabic. There is an attempt to create a version based on Classical Arabic, but it also reflects various features typical of Middle Arabic in general. The text also reveals some linguistic influence of
Hebrew versions of the Pentateuch and of the culture of Muslim society, and is closely related to the Coptic version from which, for the most part, it was probably translated. Even if we see it as a somewhat artificial combination, it is still quite consistent, and the study of its features in grammar, syntax, and vocabulary might be extremely valuable.
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 Determinators, see Determination/Articles

Diachrony and Synchrony, 372, 568, 569,
4.4.7.1

Diagnostic Grammar, 220, 226-231, 257,
267-268, 274, 275
Dialogue, 1.2.1-1.2.5.5, 500-502, 618,
626
 Dialogue Discourse Signalling, 4.6.1
 Narrative/Discourse Interface, 112-113
See also Allocation, Response
 Discontinuous-Segment Complex, 56, 81,
127, 147-148, 192, 396, 433-435, 448,
456, 499, 500, 532, 631
See also Juncture/Discontinuous-Segment

Juncture
Discord, 247, 255, 261-262, 459, 467, 531,
535
Discourse Signalling, 4.5, 4.6.1
 Disparaging Affect, 416, 417, 425, 428, 449-
450
 “Divine Acclamation/Proclamation” Nominal-
Sentence Pattern, 256, 263-265, 430
Divine Intent, 622
Divine-Intervention Performative, 226, 228,
231
Divine Locutor or Partner, 218, 289, 465
Divine Negative Imperative, 194
“Divine Partner”, 189-192, 194
Divine/Royal Signature, 263-265
Divine-Word Grammar, 161, 187, 189-194,
199, 226, 228, 230, 231, 263-265, 322,
465
Doubling, of Vowel in Laryngal Environment,
578, 580-582

Dream or Vision Narrative, 64, 68, 76, 82-
91, 113, 116, 127, 203, 218, 226, 227,
231
Penelope’s Second Dream (the Odyssey), 88-89

Egyptian, Diachrony of, 24-26, 218, 433,
605, 606, 607
See also Cleft Sentence, Determination Syndrome,
Narrative Grammar, Nominal Sentence, Relative Conversion

Egyptian, Late, 48, 69, 88, 94, 122, 131, 132-
133, 133-134, 135, 148-149, 151, 211,
213, 242, 245, 252, 266, 268, 269, 300,
306, 312, 313, 314, 325, 332, 361, 380,
402, 433, 460, 488, 496, 500, 506, 507,
585, 596, 605, 606, 628, 631

Egyptian, Old/Middle, 50, 81, 93, 95, 107,
108, 110, 122, 125, 132, 133, 151, 185,
211, 217, 234, 242, 243, 266, 267, 268,
309, 326, 329, 332, 334, 338, 345, 382,
402, 439, 455, 488, 520, 533, 584, 614,
617, 628

Egyptian, Pre-Coptic, 90, 132, 133, 135, 145,
154-155, 181-182, 184-185, 186, 188,
211, 216, 234, 271, 288, 294, 308, 312,
314, 316, 326, 334, 335, 347, 371, 380,
387-388, 402, 433, 439-440, 448, 479-
480, 453, 493, 510, 524, 526-527, 544,
582, 600, 604, 614, 628, 631
Enclisis, Encliticity, 266, 277, 278, 536-537,
539, 606-607, 607-613, 613-615
 Foreshadowed Enclitics, 59, 99-100,
 244-245, 248, 301, 320, 612
End-of-Line Break, 4.4.3

English, 444-445
Erman, A., 17, 480
Eventives, 471-474

- Evolution Onset, 115
- Narrator's Comment on Narrative Evolution, see Comment Mode
- "Reason Why" for Evolution, 62-66, 71-73, 81-82
- Unexpected Dramatic Development in Evolution Mode, 100
- (Non-)Existant, 2.0.2, 349, 352, 359, 498, 584

See also Zero Existant
- (Non-)Existence, 78, 2.0.2, 349, 352, 359
- (Non-)Existence, Statement of, 169, 170-177, 2.0.2, 357-363, 498
- Existential, see (Non-)Existence, Statement of; Non-Existence, Statement of
- Existential/Presentative Pre-Nexal Pattern, 222
- Exclamation, 152-154
- Exclusion Features, 276
- Exophoric, Pragmatic or Situational Theme, 57, 249, 252, 257, 261, 262-269, 294, 390-391
- Expansion Syntax, 4.5.1-2, 602-603
- Extraposition, see Topic, Topicalization

Figures, Rhetorical-Stylistic, 206-209
- Final Clauses, Finality, 3.13, 454
- Final-Consecutive Sequel, 291
- Final Goal, 468

See also Purpose
- Flexionsisolierung, 130, 331, 494, 530-531
- Focality, 271, 292-294

Focalization, Focussing, 131-132, 133, 146, 176, 186, 197, 294, 307, 355, 423, 439, 453, 532, 608-609
- Actant Focussing, 319, 320, 2.4.7
- Adverbial Rheme Focussed, 319
- Envelope Focussing, 293, 307, 318, 320

Focalization in Dialogue, 140
- Focalization and Negation, 2.4.3, 2.4.6
- Focalization Patterns, 28, 261, 269-270, 2.4, 2.4.1-7
- Focalization in Topic Position, 2.4.7
- Focalizing e- in Bohairic, 311-313
- Focussing of Negation, 325
- Focussing Particles, 176, 631-632
- Focussing Signal, 631-632
- Lexeme (+ Adverbal) Focussed, 318, 320
- Narratological 'Viewpoint Focalization', 226-228
- Responsive Focussing, 318

See also Assertive-Focal Formal ("Rhetorical") Questions, Circumstantial Conversion, Focalizing Conversion, Focus, Negation, Nexus

Focalizing Conversion (FC), 88, 94, 95, 132-134, 170-177, 199, 212, 240, 270, 280, 296, 304, 2.4.2-3, 499-500, 532, 548, 564, 580, 593, 621
- Circumstantial Topic, 311-312
- FC Converted (Circumstantial), 312, 600
- FC Injunctive-Hortative, 312-313
- FC substantival? 308-309
- Negatived, 2.4.3, 2.4.6
- Focus, 6, 132, 194, 295, 306-308, 381-382, 499-500, 528, 610-611
- Initial Actantial Focus, with Unmarked Topic, 298-299
- Focus, in Narrative, see Narrative Focus

See also Cleft Sentence, Focalization
- Focussing, see Focalization
- French, 36, 47, 55, 57, 95, 115, 165, 182, 263, 267, 288, 291-292, 304, 345 and passim
- Dream Tensing in French, 90
- Funk, W.-P., 278, 480, 522, 541, 561
- Future, 178-179, 181-184
- Future (Coptic), 1.2.5.1
- Absolute-Definite Future (εφε-), 127, 145, 156, 157-158, 159, 161-162, 169, 170,
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185-196, 201, 202, 206-209, 211, 213, 230, 274, 284, 495-496, 563, 566-567, 576, 592, 605, 627, 629

Absolute-Definite Future Converted, 194-196

Absolute-Definite Future, Narrative Scenario in, 188, 189, 190

Absolute-Definite Future, Narrativized, 188

Contingent-Indefinite Future (qna-), 27, 159, 162, 168, 169, 170-177, 196-206, 206-209
   In Allocutive Sphere, 204
   Delocutive Reference, 205-206
   Futures Shift, 206-209
   Lexical selection/compatibility with, 201-204
   In Locutive Sphere, 199-204

Gardiner, A. H., 2, 18, 31-32, 310
See also Gunn, B.G.

Gemination, 486

Gender (Coptic), 340-341, 345, 461, 514, 538

Gender/Number Category (Coptic), Residence of, 340-345, 347-348

Generics, 368, 378, 391-392, 393, 3.6.418, 420, 422, 423
   Discriminative Generic, 409-410
   Generic Notion Name, 239, 276, 365, 3.5.2, 405-407, 434
   Instantial Generic, 377-378, 408, 410-411, 422, 434
   Named Generic, 419, 420, 423, 424-425, 434

See also Legal-Generic Case-Raising, Scenario/Generic-Hypothetical, Zero-Generic

Glossing/Lemmatic Syntax, 99, 405-407, 424, 596-597

See also Hermeneutical Syntax

Glottal Stop, see Laryngals

Gnomic Grounding, 623

Gnomic Proverbial Sentence, 246, 271-272

Goal, Final, 366, 467-469

See also Purpose

(De-)Grammaticalization, 8, 178-180, 249-252, 352, 380, 401, 405, 461, 517, 521, 535, 583, 600, 631

Grammeme, Grammemicity, 123, 130, 147, 155, 158, 165, 216, 270, 286, 382, 435, 482, 493, 494, 529, 530-531, 536, 541, 542, 576, 613 and passim


Dream Tensing in Greek, 88-89

Greek, Modern, 142, 146, 212, 460, 582


Greek: Coptic, Contrastive Statements, 0.6-0.7, 45-48, 123, 296, 310, 339, 380, 406, 414, 416, 582, 606, 616, 617, 619, 621

Greek-Origin Elements, 146-147, 448-450, 458, 579

Greek-Origin Nouns, 448-450

Greek-Origin Verbs, 285, 579

Gunn, B.G. 1, 18-19, 59, 92, 136, 149, 166, 213, 216, 217, 234, 243, 267, 268, 310, 326, 375, 380, 388, 433, 439-440, 448-449, 489, 545, 561, 628

Hebrew, Biblical, 47-48, 60, 88, 97, 103, 121, 131, 149, 163, 278

Hebrew, Modern, 51, 90, 460


See also Glossing Syntax

High-Register Writing, 556-559

"Holy (πρεσβυτέρος) of Holies" 419-420, 425-426

Homolexemia, Syntax of, 176, 249, 250, 527, 529, 530

Homogrammemicity, Syntax of, 529

Honorific Syntax, 516
Hyperevent in Narrative, 121
Hypothetical Particularity, 420, 423, 426
See also Case-Raising

Iconicity, 131, 371-373, 399, 407, 418
Imminence, 226, 228
Imperative, 154-164, 168, 169, 626, 629, 631
Imperfect, 43, 44, 47, 48-53, 55, and Chapter One passim

“Preludic” Imperfect, 51, 86, 90

Imperfect, Coptics (nax-), 27, 39, 40, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 51, 55-59, 64, 67-71, 77-82, 83, 85, 104, 125, 126, 132, 169, 170, 217-218

Focalizing Imperfect, 132, 133

“Inalienable Possession”, see Constituence
Personal-Sphere Association

Incorporation, 530-532

Infinitives, 331, 340, 3.13, 490

Determination of Infinitives, 353-357
ε- + Infinitive, 316, 462-464
ετο- + Infinitive, 464

Narrative Infinitive, 121

Thematic, 240

See also “Tautological Infinitive”

Injunctive, 460

Injunctive-Hortative Focalizing Conversion, 312-313

Interlocutie Personal Perspective, Syntax of, 1.2.1-5 passim, 262, 263-267, 265, 266, 275-279, 386, 416, 451-452, 488, 516

Interrogative Pronouns, 304

See also Cleft Sentence, Nominal Sentence

Intransitive Copular ε-p., 280-284

Irish, 137, 143, 166, 234, 280, 455, 587

Irrealis, 93, 499, 540

Italian, 347

Dream Tensing in Italian, 88-89

Jacob wrestling with the Angel (Gen. 32:24-25), 88

Jernstedt, P. V., 346, 381

Jinkin, 4.4.4, 575


Allomorphic Juncture, 4.4.7

Delimitation, 4.1, 4.2.3, 4.2.4, 7.5, 4.2.5, 4.2.7 and passim

Discontinuous-Segment Juncture, 485, 487

Graphemato-Morphematic Juncture, 481, 4.4, 4.4.1, 4.4.7.1 and passim

Gradience of Juncture, 425, 482-483, 4.2.3, 516, 522, 564, 566, 599, 602-603, 611-612 and passim

Juncture Domain Frame (JDF), (def.) 478, 4.1, 509, 4.2.4.7.1-4, 530, 532, 535, 539, 574, 576, 580, 588, 593, 608, 610, 613, 622, 4.6.1 and passim, Chapter Four

Juncture Scope, (def.) 478, 4.1, 4.3, 509, 613, and passim, Chapter Four

Levels of Juncture, 481-482 and passim, Chapter Four

Linkage, 390, 4.1, 4.2, 3.6 and passim

Linkage/Delimitation in Narrative, 57, 62-66, 68, 79-81, 101, 105-120, 120-123, 127

Linkage/Delimitation in and around Nominal Sentence Patterns, 237, 240, 242, 244, 247, 254, 256, 257, 261, 264, 265, 270, 277-278

Narrative Juncture, 1.1.5, 501

Morpho-Syllabic Juncture, 4.4.4.5

Topicalization Juncture, 497, 4.2.4.7.2

See also Adverb, Adverbial/Premodifying Adverbials/Premodification Juncture, Allomorphic Juncture, Anaphora, Aspiration, Aspiration and Morphemic Juncture, Base Conjugation Juncture, Bracketing, Cataphora, Circumstantial Conversion, Conversion/Conversion Juncture, Coordination/Disjunction, End-of-Line Break, Glottal Stop, Lexemic Scope, Juncture Validity in, Morphophonemics as Juncture Features, Negation, Neuritic Feminine, In-Nexus Concord Link, Nexus Scope of Juncture, Nominal Sentence/Contribution Characterization of NS, Ordination, Paradigm and Juncture, Particles, Prosody, Punctuation, Relative Conversion, Relative Conversion/Relative Constructions, Juncture of, Superordination,
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Syllabic Juncture, Theme/Juncture of Theme in Nexus, Zero Link, Delimiter, Zero Segment, Juncture across.

Jussive (Coptic), 156-158, 169, 192, 460, 626, 629

Koinzidenzfall, see Synchronous Present

Laryngals, 485, 574, 576, 4.4.7.1
Latin, 47, 49

Dream Tensing in Latin, 88, 89

Layton, B., 559

Legal-Generic Case-Raising, 199, 351, 420
See also Preceptive-Legal Syntax

Lemniscus, 85, 121, 151, 187, 257, 545-548, 550, 551, 554, 555, 549, 610


“Lexeme Premodifiers”, 285-286, 485, 629

Lexemic Scope, Juncture Validity in, 483-484, 4.3.1 and Chapter Four, passim

Lexemicity, 454, 482, 564

Lexemization, 402-403, 425, 579

Loan-Words in Coptic, 557-558

See also Greek-Origin Adjectives, Greek-Origin Verbs

Locution, Locutive Personal Perspective, Syntax of, 1.2.1-5 passim, 228, 266, 279, 443, 460, 626

Lycopolitan, 527

Micronarrative Subtextemes, 94-95
See also Narrative Fragments

Morphophonemics as Juncture Features, 537 and Chapter Four, passim

Morpho-Syllabic Boundaries, 4.4.4

Naming, 488

Naming, Aetiological, 20, 622

Naming Apposition, 428

Naming in Narrative, 99, 129

See also Proper Name

Narrative Grammar, 1.1.1-5

Aetiological Naming Narrative, 94, 129, 132

Chronicle Narrative, 94

Condensed Narrative, 35, 36, 82, 96, 129, 219

Counterexpectation in Narrative, 135

Dramatic Narrative Highlighting, 226, 229

Eventive Converbs in Narrative, 471-474

Generic Narrative, 96-97

Grounding in Narrative, 37-40

High Background in Narrative, 81-82

Locutive Narrative, 95, 119

Narrative-in-Allocation, 113

Narrative Bounding Slots, 113-116

Narrative Delimitation, 55, 57, 107-109, 1.1.5 and Chapter One, passim

See also Juncture

Narrative dénouement, 127

Narrative/Dialogue interface, 112-113, 627

Narrative Discourse Signalling, 116-120, 618-619, 620, 621, 622

Narrative in Egyptian diachrony, 30-32

Narrative Focus, 59-62, 131-135

Narrative Fragments, 35, 76, 94

Narrative Gear-Shift, 57, 59-62, 79-81

Narrative Information-Structure, 120-137

Narrative Juncture, see under Juncture

Narrative Linkage, 55, 57, 106-110, 1.1.5 and Chapter One passim

See also Juncture

Narrative Modes 34-35

Narrative Mode Shift/Switch, 55, 64, 79-81, 107

Narrative Pacing, 58

Narrative Peak Focalization, 60-62, 87, 100, 129, 226, 227

Narrative Projection of Dialogue, 112-113, 516

Narrative Relief, 39, 40, 52, 108

Narrative Tensing (Coptic), 43-48

Narrative Tensing (general), 41-43, 48-55
Nexus Patterns in Coptic, 20.1
In-Nexus Concord Link, 4.2.4.7.3
as Predicative Actant, 291
of (Pro)noun with (Pro)noun, see
Nominal Sentence
Topicalized, 186, 192, 494, 529, 540,
547
Topicalized, in Narrative, 111, 126-
128, 332
Verbal Nexus, 222-223, 536
See also Adnexal
Nil element, 170, 323, 327, 328, 515
Nil vs. Zero, 371-374
Nominal Sentence (Coptic), 27, 69, 98-100,
168, 169, 170-177, 195, 222, 223, 231,
233-279, 347, 348, 364-365, 379, 548,
589, 590, 606
in Adverbial Status, 256, 262
Binominal Theme-Initial Patterns, 272-
273
Configurations and Patterning of
Patterns, 274-275
Copular Pattern, 250, 251, 252, 255,
260, 269-272, 550, 613
Delocutive Pattern Set, 99, 2.1.1, 386,
613
Adverbials predicated in, 237,
239, 244
Cataphoric Expanded Formal
Theme Pattern, 242-249, 303
Endophoric-Theme Pattern Set,
100, 237, 242, 253, 254, 255,
256-262, 268, 269, 294, 295,
330, 489, 602
Narrativized, 260
Topicalized, 261-262, 267,
529
with Zeroed Theme, 261, 302
Immutable-Theme Pattern, 100,
249, 252, 257, 261, 262-269,
294, 295, 303, 330, 602
Personal-Pronoun (Inter-
locutive) + πε, 263-265
Personal-Pronoun (Inter-
locutive) + πε + Proper
Name, 265-267
Indefinite Noun-Syntagm +
πε, 267-268
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rhematizing n- as Rheme in Nominal Sentence</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme Zeroed in Delocutive Nominal Sentence</td>
<td>240-242, 302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topicalized-Theme Pattern</td>
<td>126, 249-256, 269, 528-529, 599, 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Divine Acclamation” Pattern</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Egyptian Diachrony</td>
<td>235, 245, 251-252, 266, 267, 269, 278, 402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General and Preliminary Issues</td>
<td>233-235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlocutive Pattern Set</td>
<td>2.1.2, 265, 266, 386, 516, 536-537, 610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppletivity with the Delocutive Pattern Set</td>
<td>275-276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topicalized Subpattern</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juncture Characterization of the NS</td>
<td>492-493, 539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See also specific NS Patterns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal Sentence in Cleft-Sentence Topic</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppositions of and Suppletion for</td>
<td>2.2.1 passim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominality, Nounhood in Coptic</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Specificity</td>
<td>441, 447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Specific Nucleus Expanded by Relative</td>
<td>238, 247, 260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Specific Rhemes with μ-</td>
<td>280-284, 286, 287-288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Specific Theme</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See also Specificity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notae Relationis</td>
<td>290, 353, 355, 362, 385-386, 388, 393-394, 396-397, 433, 3.9, 450, 480, 509, 548, 550, 591, 603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun Predication, Incidental-Contingent</td>
<td>198, 279-281, 348-349, 365-368, 375, 405, 434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun Predication, Inherent</td>
<td>198, 405, 434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See also Nominal Sentence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nubian</td>
<td>24, 582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Non-)Nuclearity</td>
<td>3.0.4, 340, 451, 484, 487, 494, 520, 523, 524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nucleus and Expansion, 6, 291, 399, 536</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See also (Non-)Nuclearity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oath, 192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object Actant, see Actant/Object Actant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object Pronoun</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining Situation, in Narrative</td>
<td>38, 58, 59-62, 69-70, 77, 100, 108, 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omniscient Narrator’s Channel</td>
<td>63-64, 70, 73-74, 76, 78, 91, 97, 102, 108, 117-119, 132, 214, 624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordination</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordination in Narrative</td>
<td>39, 135-137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradigm and Juncture</td>
<td>479, 482-483, 487, 488, 595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parataxis, 107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenthesis</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenthetic Comment in Narrative</td>
<td>66, 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particles, 116-119, 140, 151, 176, 1.2.4.3, 186, 545, 548, 606, 611-613, 4.6.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parts-of-Speech model</td>
<td>8-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern, (def.) 4, 480, 605</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect (Egyptian, Coptic)</td>
<td>30, 219-220, 226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performative</td>
<td>177, 217, 226, 228, 229, 230, 287, 318-319, 338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divine-Intervention Performative</td>
<td>226, 228, 230, 287, 319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See also Synchronous Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person, Generic</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Personal Infinitive”, 461</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons, Interlocutive</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Non-)Phoricity</td>
<td>62, 354, 364-365, 406, 415,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page Numbers</td>
<td>Subjects, Concepts, and Names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426, 441, 442, 4.2.4, 4.2.4.7.5 and passim</td>
<td>Presentatives, 60, 61, 67, 84, 87, 135, 137, 186, 187, 189, 197, 202-203, 217, 219-220, 2.0.3, 248, 260, 263, 331, 363-364, 588, 625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoneme, Covert Laryngal, 4.4.7.1</td>
<td>Circumstantial Focalizing Preterite 238, 601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoricization, 523</td>
<td>Focalizing Preterite, 87, 132, 309-310, 311, 314, 329, 489, 567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phorics, 4.2.4</td>
<td>Negative Preterite (Μπεργ-) 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural (Coptic)</td>
<td>Relative Preterite, 311, 567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morpholexical, 28, 342-345</td>
<td>Pro-Form, 165, 1.2.4.1, 378-379, 518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntagmatic, 28</td>
<td>Pro-Nexus, 158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetical Rhetorics, 624</td>
<td>Pro-Verb, 340, 605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polotsky, H.-J., 1, 4, 16, 17, 19, 20, 57, 132, 295, 296, 305-308, 310, 311, 347-348, 369, 381, 401, 581-582</td>
<td>in Response, 166, 167-177, 378, 399, 402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese, 461</td>
<td>Proclamation, Divine, 263, 280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Determination, 3.5.3</td>
<td>Prolepsis, 252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession Verboid, 357, 361-363</td>
<td>Pronoun Expanded, 3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessive Article, 254, 345, 353, 357, 398-400, 434, 443-444, 461, 482, 515</td>
<td>Proper Names, 150, 262, 265-267, 270, 276, 277, 297, 301, 361, 392, 396, 422, 423, 3.8, 441, 452, 482, 611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessive Pronoun (Coptic {φα-}), 254, 276, 338, 373-374, 398-399, 401-403, 451, 482, 487, 538</td>
<td>Identifying-by-Name, 266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessor, 349, 361-362, 400, 486</td>
<td>Name-hood, 427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessum, 349, 361-362, 400</td>
<td>Naming Apposition, 428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See also Zero Possessum</td>
<td>Naming Forms, 191, 270-271, 427, 437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Imperatival Allocutive Slot, 112, 158-164, 501, 547</td>
<td>Proper Name in Allocation, 429-430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatic Theme, 262</td>
<td>Proper Name Expanded/Expanding, 427-429, 3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Negator, 597</td>
<td>Proper Names in Narrative, 99, 110-111, 430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preceptive-Legal Syntax, 96, 127, 157-158, 191, 226, 228, 232, 323, 529, 623-624</td>
<td>See also Generics/Generic Notion Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prophecy, 190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prosody, 59, 233, 243, 244, 248, 252, 266, 269, 270, 277, 346, 361, 373, 387-388, 401-402, 425, 490, 538, 542, 548, 570, 631, 4.2.6, 4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prospective Conjunctive (ταπερ), 158, 159-160, 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protasis, Protaticity, in protasi, 93, 114, 131-132, 159, 165, 186, 187, 197, 199, 291, 309, 310, 328, 426, 460, 482, 499, 535, 547, 627, 632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepositions, 485, 538</td>
<td>Present forms in Narrative, 1.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present, Narrative, 43, 47, 48, 49, 53-55, 104, 134</td>
<td>Present Tense (Coptic), 168, 169, 170-177, 209-211, 274, 275, 287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Narrative, 104-105</td>
<td>in Narrative, 104-105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focalizing Present, 170-177, 287, 318, 323, 374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Circumstantial Conversion of, 583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generic (Non-Actual), 165, 209-211, 215-217, 287, 350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentational Constructions, 257, 260-261, 263-266, 301, 303, 304-305, 580</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Pro-verbs (Coptic), 340
Psychologistic explanation in Narrative, 63, 71-72, 91
Punctuation in Coptic, 106, 270, 4.4.2, 583, 631 and passim
See also: Colon, Lemniscus, Raised Point Purpose, 355

Questions, 1.2.3.1, 274, 620, 622
Coordinated Questions, 151-152
Deliberative Questions, 145-146
Included Questions, 151-152
Nexal Questions, 141-143, 143-146, 151-152
Reactive Questions, 627
Rhematic Questions, 141-143, 149-151, 151-152, 169, 501
Zero-Marked Questions, 1.2.3.1, 170
See also: Allocation

Raised Point, 515, 545, 552-554, 555, 610
Reality, Fuzzy, Blurred or Alternative, 50-51, 68, 83, 112
Reference, 4.2.4.1-7 and passim
Referential zero, see Zero Resumption in Relative Construction
Reiteration, 382, 397-398, 3.12
as Nominal-Sentence Rheme, 257, 264
Coordinated to Nominal Sentence Rheme, 253
Expanding Non-Specific Nucleus, 238, 247, 260, 351-352
Relative Conversion of Nominal Sentence, 237-238, 254, 260, 270, 272, 279, 302
Relative Converter and Relative Pronoun, 424, 425
Open Juncture of Relative Conversion with Conjugation Form, 599-600
See also: Relative Constructions, Zero Allomorph of Relative Converter
Relative Constructions, Juncture of, 496-497, 511, 517-518, 538, 4.5.2-4.5.2.1, 4.2.4.7.1
Actor Expression in, 525-528

Antecedent Construction, 3.1, 597
Non-Specific Antecedent, 489
Relative Converter vs. Pronoun, 526-527
Relative Forms, Determination of, 395, 3.7
Relative Forms, Diachrony of, 526-527
Relative Forms, Substantivized, 395, 3.7, 600
See also: Relative Conversion
Report, 34-36, 85-86, 95, 132, 226, 228, 318
Rhematization in Narrative, 131-135
Rheme, Rhematicity, 378, 521, 533
Adverbial Rheme, 222
Determination in Rhematic Status, 364-368
Negative Adverbial Rheme, 248
(Pro-)Verbal Rheme, 222
Rhematizing e-, 365-367
Rhematizing n-, 255, 273, 2.3, 349, 365-366, 440, 448-449, 451, 594
Rheme Focalized, 250-251, 499-500
(Pro)nominial Rheme, see: Nominal Sentence
See also: Theme
Rhetorical Questions, see: Assertive-Focal Formal Questions
Rhetoricity, 276, 278
See also: Affective Syntax

594, 612, 613, 615, 617, 621, 626, 627-628, 630
Scenario, 471-474
(Ineluctable Prophetic) Future, 97, 189, 190
Generic Hypothetical, 96-97, 420, 423
Hypothetical, 219
Preceptive, 226, 228
Schleicher, Aug., 479, 503
Schwartzé, M.G., 15-16, 48, 198, 326, 340, 503, 532
Second Tenses, see Focalizing Conversion
Self-Assertion, Self-Introduction, Self-Presentation, Divine/Royal, 264-265
Sequelling Functions, 93, 100-103, 129, 156-158, 161, 163, 180, 184, 185-196, 201, 211-215, 276, 457-460, 464, 482, 499-500, 501, 604-605
Sequencing, 4.6
Síchem and Jacob's sons (Gen. 34:11-16), 208-209
Specificity, 337-338, 345, 364-365, 400, 3.7, 520
Equispecificity, in Nominal Sentence, 250
Fuzzy Specificity Divide, 350
Higher Specificity, of Focus in Cleft Sentence, 300-301
Indifference (Vagueness) to Specificity, 250, 276, 277, 284, 338, 372, 373-374, 398-400, 403, 444
Inequispecificity, in Nominal Sentence, 364
Lower Specificity, of Focus in Cleft Sentence, 300-301
Paradigmatic Specificity, 391
Specificity Grading, 357, 366, 417, 418
Specificity of Rheme in Delocutive Nominal Sentence, 236, 244, 260, 270
Specificity of Theme in Nominal Sentence, 243-244
Specificity of Theme and Rheme, 348
See also Determination, Non-Specificity
Steinthal, H., 16, 432-433, 503
Steinthal, H. and Misteli, F., 433, 480
Stern, L. (Chr.), 15, 16, 23, 433
Stern-Jernstedt Rule, 215-216, 381
Structural-analytic procedure, 0.1.1
Subordination, 581, 587
Subordination in Narrative, 39, 40, 226
Fuzzy Superordination, 137
Syllable, Syllabication, 575, 578
Syllabic Cut, 555, 556, 4.4.4
Synchronous Present ("Koinzidenzfall"), 177, 217, 226, 228, 229, 230
See also Performative
Syntagmatics, in structural analysis, 5-6, 308
Synthesis and Analysis, 4, 11, 401
Tableau, static/dynamic, 67, 83-85
"Tautological Infinitive", 134-135, 293, 318, 2.4.4, 595
Temporal (etq.), 113-114, 115, 131, 238, 309-310, 322, 474, 601-602
Tensing, 1.1.2-4, 1.2.5
"That"-Forms, 291, 296, 308-309, 310, 361, 3.13, 530
Thematization, in Nominal Sentence, 249-256
Theme, Thematicity, 110, 123-131, 195, 2.1.1-2 passim, 331-332, 360, 368, 469 and passim
Juncture of Theme in Nexus and Relative Construction, 493-494, 495, 526, 528, 529, 530, 531, 533, 535, 536, 539, 540, 547, 584, 597, 609 and Chapter Four, passim
Pragmatic Theme, 262
Theme and Rheme, 6, 58, 126, 2.0.1, 233-234, 291, 307, 532-533, 547, 560, 605-606 and Chapter Two, passim
See also Actant/Agens Actant
Time expressions, 260, 287
Tobler, A., 410
Topic, 6, 110, 114-115, 125, 126, 131, 142, 243, 249-256, 294-305, 2.4.7, 349, 381-382, 473, 474, 515, 518, 528-530, 540, 551, 552, 600, 610-611
Adverbial Topic, 515
Topic expanded, 253
Topic-turned-Theme, 249-256
Topic Morphologically Unmarked, 297-299
Topicalization, 114, 130, 131-132, 186, 197, 248, 249-256, 262, 277-278, 279, 2.4.7, 528-530, 540, 547, 609, 610, 619, 621, 622, 633
Topicalization in Narrative, 114, 117, 125-126, 131-135, 331-332
Topicalization of Nexus, 111, 126-128, 186
See also Tuncture/Topicalization Tuncture
Turkish, 334, 335, 350, 381
“Und zwar”, in Narrative, 64, 73, 94, 111, 118, 246
Variation, grammatical, 9-10
Vedic, 212-213
Verba dicendi, 59, 60, 61-62, 70, 144, 151, 163, 323, 456, 631
Verbal Noun, 461-462
See also “That”-form
Verbal-Rheme Nexus, 493-494
Verbality, Verb-hood in Coptic, 340
Verbs of Cognition/Perception, 71, 91, 92, 105, 132, 144, 252, 318, 490
Vision Narrative, see Dream or Vision Narrative
Wechselsatz, 250, 254, 271, 272, 530
Weinrich, H., 40, 54, 82
Welsh, 61, 90-91, 165, 166, 234, 259, 280, 291, 293, 295, 307, 326, 373, 399, 400, 424, 455, 480, 485, 515, 523, 579, 582
Welsh, Dream Tensing in, 90-91
Word, in Coptic, 4.4.1, 502-503
Zero Actant, 517-518
Zero Allomorph of Circumstantial Conversion, 536, 539, 583-584, 585
Zero Allomorph of Relative Converter, 600
Zero Conversion, 422
Zero Coordination, see Coordination
Zero Delimitation, 522
Zero Existent, 358, 363
See also Determination/Zero Article, Zero Morph, and specific entries above and below
Zero-Generic Circumstantial, 348
Zero Link/Delimiter, 106, 540, 4.2.5
Zero Morph, 574-575, 576
See also Zero Element, and specific entries above and below
Zero Morphophoneme, 537
Zero vs. Nil, 3.3, 353-354, 371-374
Zero Nucleus, 523
Zero Possessum, 363
Zero Pre-negator, 496, 527, 597, 600
Zero Realization of Phoneme, 485, 4.4.7.1
Zero Reflex, 4.4.7.1
Zero Resumption in Relative Construction, 517-518
Zero Segment, Juncture across, 494, 496
Zero Theme in Nominal Sentence, 261, 302, 535
See also Anaphora, Zero, Coordination
Zero, Determination/Zero Article.
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**Δλογ, Δλος** 567  
**Δν-** (interr.) 143, 144-146, 168-169, 170-177  
**Δν** (neg.), **N-...Δν** 261, 325-329, 527, 552, 600-601  
**{λνοκ}-** 120, 610-611  
**ἐγαρ** 147-148, 175, 633  
**ἐω** 147-148, 149  
**ἀγάρ, ἀγάρ, ἐκείνα 165, 166, 167-177**  
**γαρ** 57, 69, 81, 97, 105, 117-119, 177, 197, 232, 255, 257, 264, 4.6.1  
**γαρ μεν 633**  
**Δε** 57, 64, 116-117, 4.6.1  
**ε-** (rhematizing) 290, 365-368  
**ε-** (focalizing) 311, 313  
**ε+** INFINITIVE 28  
**ἐβεβε-** 331  
**ἐνε-** 312  
**ἐπ-** 2.2.1  
**ἐπ-** (Topic in Cleft Sentence) 297  
**ἐρβοκι, ἐβοκι** 287  
**ἐρογ, ἐρογ** N- 151  
**ἐτ-** 511, 526  
**ἐταχ-** 113, 114, 115, 131, 309-310  
**ἐγικε-** 603  
**θρε-** 460-474  
**ιε** 147-149, 170-177, 186, 197-198, 604  
**κε-, πκε-** 395, 396, 429  
**κν** 219, 593  
**μεν ... (Δε) ...** 64, 92, 249, 461  
**μεν-γαρ 633**  
**μεν-ογν 633**  
**μν 147-148, 170-177, 513**  
**μνοτε, μνωι 177**  
**μνιτ 147-148, 170-177**  
**μμινμμο 608**  
**μμοθ (resp.) 27, 165, 166, 167-177**  
**μμον-** (exist.) 2.0.2, 349, 374, 407, 495, 498  
**ἐρμο-μμοθ 495, 584**  
**μμαι 361-362**  
**μμαιατ- 120, 608**  
**μπατερ- 105**  
**μφη (resp.) 27, 165, 167-177**  
**μπαρον 157, 158**  
**ν-** (rhematizing, nota relationis) 255, 273, 2.3, 365-368, 440, 448-449, 451, 603  
**ν-** (object marking) 550  
**ναγ "see" 60, 64, 104, 116**  
**νε (interr.?) 239, 319**  
**νε- 91, 99, 100, 103, 104, 136, 199, 254, 255, 260, 540**  
**νε-/ναχ- Ø 27, 39, 40, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 51, 55-59, 64, 67-71, 77-82, 83, 85, 104, 125, 227, 502, 514, 588**  
**νεαχ- Ø 82**  
**νεαχ- πε 81-82, 125**  
**νεμ 330, 375-377, 504-506**  
**νεν- (pl. art.) 394, 434**  
**νηοχ- in Nominal Sentence 239**  
**νι- 409-410**  
**νιβεν 349, 418, 421, 515, 612**  
**νιμ (interr.) 150**  
**ννο 165**
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νΔε- 243, 248, 316, 331-332, 349, 368, 530-532, 625
ογτε ("between") 510-511
ογω 592-593
ογωγ, Αγω 116-120, 151-152, 160-164, 187, 507, 511

ον 175

χν 28, 1.2.5.3, 2.2.2


π-ετ- 395
πεξια 113, 130

πι- 3.5, 3.5.1
πωε 150

(ΡΗ) (Μ)παίρητο. Ἡβρης 177, 247, 261, 263, 277, 282, 303, 410, 517, 4.2.4.4, 584, 587, 628

πω 176, 293, 631, 632, 4.6.1

κε (resp.) 165, 167-177

τηρ= 120, 516, 608-609
τω ετω ν= 151
τωογν 538, 576-577

ογ (inten.) 374
ογαι, ογι 265, 276, 277, 382-384
ογην (γαρ) 28, 232, 543
ογκογν 170-177
ογν 92, 119, 197, 4.6.1
ογον- (exist.) 69, 2.0.2, 349, 495, 498
επε-ογον- 495, 584
ογον (pron.) 384-385

Δέ- 104, 151, 257, 276, 290, 352, 409, 427, 454, 456-458, 490, 513, 530, 631
Δε-ογν 630

-Δε 119, 150, 176, 605, 4.6.1

Δω 151, 522-523

ΞI- (vbl.) 345, 461-462, 464

†ινα 110, 176, 219, 627
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Unless otherwise specified, the references are to the standard Bohairic sources ("B5"). Particular dialects and/or editions are specified in parentheses. Pentateuch readings marked (Vat) refer to the MS Vat. copto 1.

The index excludes references given merely to register morphological, phonological or morphophonological, lexical or lexicophonological attestation, and a few special sources (e.g. Kellia graffiti or the Scala Magna).

Old Testament: Genesis

Gen. 1:1-2 – 69
Gen. 1:2 – 99, 378, 394, 412
Gen. 1:2f. – 128, 130
Gen. 1:3 – 156
Gen. 1:3f. – 129
Gen. 1:3ff. – 130
Gen. 1:4 – 104, 456
Gen. 1:4f. – 58, 506
Gen. 1:5 – 128, 392, 427, 429
Gen. 1:6 – 156, 162, 195, 376, 585, 592
Gen. 1:8 – 394, 405, 427, 556
Gen. 1:9 – 156, 556, 558
Gen. 1:10 – 116, 392, 427, 427
Gen. 1:11 – 156, 505
Gen. 1:12 – 116, 505
Gen. 1:14 – 467, 531
Gen. 1:15 – 156, 285, 465
Gen. 1:16 – 423
Gen. 1:16 (Bodmer III ed. Kasser) – 423
Gen. 1:17 – 285
Gen. 1:18 – 520, 544
Gen. 1:22 – 161, 161
Gen. 1:26 – 157, 283
Gen. 1:27 – 376
Gen. 1:28 – 161, 282, 283
Gen. 1:29 – 95
Gen. 1:31 – 116
Gen. 1:45 – 428
Gen. 2:1 – 558
Gen. 2:2 – 126
Gen. 2:4 – 517, 602
Gen. 2:4 (Bodmer III ed. Kasser) – 351
Gen. 2:5 – 72, 105, 107, 602
Gen. 2:6 – 100, 102, 618
Gen. 2:9 – 471, 511, 553, 554
Gen. 2:10 – 100, 102, 618
Gen. 2:11-14 – 99
Gen. 2:12 – 71, 105, 547
Gen. 2:14 – 558
Gen. 2:15 – 468
Gen. 2:16 – 191, 542, 547
Gen. 2:17 – 547
Gen. 2:18 – 157, 468, 469, 552
Gen. 2:19 – 392, 427, 553, 607
Gen. 2:19 (Bodmer III ed. Kasser) – 632
Gen. 2:22 – 547
Gen. 2:23 – 191, 252, 392, 427, 547
Gen. 2:23 (Bodmer III ed. Kasser) – 239, 277, 354
Gen. 3:1 – 99, 549
Gen. 3:2 – 191, 515
Gen. 3:4 – 199, 321, 497
Gen. 3:4 (Bodmer III ed. Kasser) – 323
Gen. 3:5 – 205, 218, 285, 518, 580
Gen. 3:6 – 558, 558
Gen. 3:7 – 553
Gen. 3:9 – 319, 547
Gen. 3:10 – 36, 95, 301, 305, 535
Gen. 3:11 – 416, 546
Gen. 3:12 – 547
Gen. 3:12f. – 95, 574
Gen. 3:13 – 303, 305
Gen. 3:14 – 610
Gen. 3:14-18 – 193, 550
Gen. 3:15 – 505, 550, 558
Gen. 3:16 – 461, 470, 547
Gen. 3:17 – 547
Gen. 3:18 – 558
Gen. 3:19 – 190, 193
Gen. 3:20 – 392, 427
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Gen. 3:23 – 468
Gen. 4:1 – 125, 136, 547, 558, 619
Gen. 4:2 – 75, 80, 117, 125, 125, 137, 193, 619
Gen. 4:4 – 505
Gen. 4:6 – 314
Gen. 4:7 – 461
Gen. 4:8 – 123, 157
Gen. 4:9 – 174, 276, 319, 551
Gen. 4:10 – 150, 175, 547
Gen. 4:12 – 556
Gen. 4:13 – 252, 253
Gen. 4:14 – 187, 188, 190, 206, 500, 558
Gen. 4:15 – 241, 469, 556
Gen. 4:15ff. – 129
Gen. 4:17 – 547, 558
Gen. 4:18 – 558
Gen. 4:20 – 558
Gen. 4:22 – 550
Gen. 4:23 – 153, 541, 551, 626
Gen. 4:24 – 553
Gen. 4:25 – 552
Gen. 4:26 – 128, 128, 542, 558
Gen. 5:1 – 550
Gen. 5:2 – 368, 376, 378, 492, 518, 550
Gen. 5:3 – 554
Gen. 5:4 – 473, 556
Gen. 5:5 – 217, 626
Gen. 5:7 – 463
Gen. 5:9 – 626
Gen. 5:15 – 553
Gen. 5:16 – 548, 549, 558
Gen. 5:18 – 626
Gen. 5:20 – 547
Gen. 5:21 – 550, 552
Gen. 5:23 – 547
Gen. 5:24 – 125
Gen. 5:27 – 547
Gen. 5:28 – 547
Gen. 5:29 – 301, 505
Gen. 5:31 – 35, 94
Gen. 6:1 – 286, 567, 602
Gen. 6:1-2 – 309
Gen. 6:2 – 552
Gen. 6:4 – 361
Gen. 6:5 – 309, 512, 558
Gen. 6:6 – 558
Gen. 6:7 – 189, 601, 613
Gen. 6:9 – 99, 430, 550, 552
Gen. 6:12 – 76, 116, 232, 514
Gen. 6:13 – 232, 552
Gen. 6:14ff. – 191
Gen. 6:15 – 514, 515, 556
Gen. 6:16 – 587, 594
Gen. 6:17 – 359, 370, 514
Gen. 6:18 – 189
Gen. 6:18f. – 191
Gen. 6:19 – 552
Gen. 6:20– 216, 551, 552, 553
Gen. 6:21 – 199
Gen. 6:30 – 217
Gen. 7:1 – 155, 158, 516, 594
Gen. 7:2 – 553
Gen. 7:3 – 553
Gen. 7:4 – 198, 200, 206
Gen. 7:6 – 129, 137, 553
Gen. 7:7 – 506
Gen. 7:10 – 115, 595
Gen. 7:13 – 488, 506, 546
Gen. 7:15 – 359, 515, 553
Gen. 7:17 – 203, 359
Gen. 7:17f. – 67, 79, 81, 506
Gen. 7:18 – 74
Gen. 7:21 – 556
Gen. 7:22 – 289
Gen. 7:23 – 392, 412, 413
Gen. 8:1 – 286, 394, 407, 412, 412
Gen. 8:2 – 394, 407, 412
Gen. 8:3 – 74, 79, 80, 549
Gen. 8:4 – 449, 558
Gen. 8:6 – 115, 551, 595
Gen. 8:7 – 143
Gen. 8:7f. – 144
Gen. 8:9 – 78, 394, 407, 412, 602
Gen. 8:10 – 45
Gen. 8:11 – 392, 394, 407, 412
Gen. 8:13 – 115, 116, 449, 595
Gen. 8:14 – 556
Gen. 8:16 – 158, 506
Gen. 8:20 – 556
Gen. 8:21 – 521, 542, 551
Gen. 8:22 – 193, 529
Gen. 9:1 – 161
Gen. 9:3 – 367, 377
Gen. 9:4 – 126, 193
Gen. 9:5 – 624
| Gen. 9:6 – 193 | Gen. 12:6 – 125, 558 |
| Gen. 9:10 – 551 | Gen. 12:11 – 115, 217, 595 |
| Gen. 9:11 – 549 | Gen. 12:12 – 247, 415 |
| Gen. 9:16 – 461 | Gen. 12:20 – 563 |
| Gen. 9:17 – 510 | Gen. 12:36 – 129 |
| Gen. 9:22 – 602 | Gen. 13:4 – 511 |
| Gen. 9:23 – 79, 556 | Gen. 13:5 – 550 |
| Gen. 9:24 – 558 | Gen. 13:5ff. – 73, 77, 503 |
| Gen. 9:25 – 190 | Gen. 13:6 – 552, 554 |
| Gen. 9:28 – 45 | Gen. 13:7 – 511 |
| Gen. Ch. 10 – 272 | Gen. 13:8 – 157, 511, 572 |
| Gen. 10:11 – 428 | Gen. 14:1 – 115, 595 |
| Gen. 10:18 – 415 | Gen. 14:2 – 415 |
| Gen. 10:19 – 549 | Gen. 14:8 – 415 |
| Gen. 10:20 – 126 | Gen. 14:10 – 281, 284, 397, 504, 549, 554 |
| Gen. 11:1f. – 70 | Gen. 14:16 – 558 |
| Gen. 11:2 – 602 | Gen. 14:17 – 440 |
| Gen. 11:7 – 162 | Gen. 14:23 – 145, 286, 408, 444 |
| Gen. 11:10 – 140, 461 | Gen. 15:1 – 284, 368 |
| Gen. 11:30 – 72, 99 | Gen. 15:5 – 161 |
| Gen. 11:32 – 447 | Gen. 15:6 – 519 |
| Gen. 12:2 – 367, 470, 492, 594 | Gen. 15:8f. – 175 |
| Gen. 12:4 – 289 | Gen. 15:8ff. – 150 |
| Gen. 12:4ff. – 344 | Gen. 15:9 – 607 |
| Gen. 12:5 – 550 | Gen. 15:10 – 415, 607 |
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Gen. 15:10f. - 108
Gen. 15:11 - 105, 410
Gen. 15:12 - 125, 125, 126, 137, 594
Gen. 15:13 - 187, 190, 239
Gen. 15:14 - 415, 610
Gen. 15:15 - 589
Gen. 15:16 - 449, 547
Gen. 15:17 - 67, 100, 227, 260, 437
Gen. 15:20 - 126
Gen. 16:1 - 72, 78, 125, 270, 272, 291, 554
Gen. 16:3 - 128, 367, 450, 468, 474, 534
Gen. 16:4 - 287, 549
Gen. 16:5 - 287, 318, 500, 510
Gen. 16:6 - 230, 289, 364, 550
Gen. 16:8 - 153, 318, 321, 430, 552
Gen. 16:10 - 470
Gen. 16:11 - 228, 287, 319, 392, 427, 427, 567
Gen. 16:12 - 283, 415
Gen. 16:13 - 343, 594, 615
Gen. 16:14 - 94, 394, 405, 415, 510, 518
Gen. 16:15 - 549
Gen. 16:16 - 75, 289, 360, 602
Gen. 16:18 - 316
Gen. 16:19 - 547
Gen. 17:1 - 129, 137, 290, 572, 591, 591
Gen. 17:2 - 470, 510, 550
Gen. 17:5 - 427, 427, 567
Gen. 17:6 - 367, 470
Gen. 17:8 - 348, 447
Gen. 17:9 - 549
Gen. 17:10 - 246, 510
Gen. 17:12 - 237, 373, 553, 553
Gen. 17:13 - 390
Gen. 17:14 - 281, 527, 600
Gen. 17:15 - 191, 427, 549
Gen. 17:17 - 145, 167, 173, 187
Gen. 17:18 - 156, 415
Gen. 17:19 - 168, 392, 427, 427, 469
Gen. 17:20 - 331, 470, 470
Gen. 17:22 - 549, 593
Gen. 17:23 - 289
Gen. 17:23ff. - 76
Gen. 17:24 - 332
Gen. 17:24f. - 397, 441, 441
Gen. 17:26 - 373, 373
Gen. 18:1 - 442
Gen. 18:2 - 115, 135, 227, 602
Gen. 18:3 - 553
Gen. 18:3f. - 163
Gen. 18:5 - 188, 415, 458, 500
Gen. 18:6 - 160
Gen. 18:9 - 175, 218, 230, 232, 290, 311, 319, 499, 501, 564
Gen. 18:10 - 190, 573
Gen. 18:11 - 82, 92, 283, 370, 573
Gen. 18:12 - 214
Gen. 18:13 - 148, 150, 174, 175, 283, 315, 370
Gen. 18:14 - 173, 206, 311, 567
Gen. 18:15 - 82, 168
Gen. 18:16 - 71
Gen. 18:17 - 198, 199, 544
Gen. 18:19 - 205, 207, 218
Gen. 18:20 - 252, 253
Gen. 18:21 - 144, 168, 459, 627
Gen. 18:22 - 69, 554
Gen. 18:23 - 162, 551, 573
Gen. 18:24 - 173, 358, 553
Gen. 18:25 - 112, 154, 155, 158, 416, 468, 610
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<td>De Vis II 183 - 455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis II 38 - 423</td>
<td>De Vis II 190 - 327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis II 39 - 458</td>
<td>De Vis II 191 - 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis II 45 - 352</td>
<td>De Vis II 195 - 313, 313, 327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis II 47 - 458, 471, 630</td>
<td>De Vis II 206 - 196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis II 49 - 297</td>
<td>De Vis II 210 - 327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis II 54 - 458</td>
<td>De Vis II 211 - 327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis II 55 - 248</td>
<td>De Vis II 212 - 361, 466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis II 56 - 489</td>
<td>De Vis II 216 - 325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis II 68 - 466</td>
<td>De Vis II 224 - 325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis II 75 - 252, 532</td>
<td>De Vis II 231 - 313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis II 76 - 351</td>
<td>De Vis II 232 - 402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis II 79 - 59</td>
<td>De Vis II 238 - 327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis II 82 - 466</td>
<td>De Vis II 246f. - 313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis II 88 - 452</td>
<td>De Vis II 247 - 403, 466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis II 89 - 458</td>
<td>De Vis II 250 - 313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis II 90f. - 272</td>
<td>De Vis II 257 - 466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis II 92 - 258</td>
<td>De Vis II 263 - 428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis II 95 - 260</td>
<td>De Vis II 265 - 172, 269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis II 100 - 466, 466</td>
<td>De Vis II 266 - 266, 325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis II 106 - 252, 260, 272</td>
<td>De Vis II 276 - 465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis II 107 - 252, 272, 516</td>
<td>De Vis II 278 - 327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis II 108 - 352</td>
<td>De Vis II 109 - 325, 452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis II 111 - 260</td>
<td>De Vis II 118 - 260, 296, 322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis II 119f. - 192</td>
<td>De Vis II 127 - 455, 455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis II 127 - 455, 455</td>
<td>De Vis II 130 - 460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis II 130 - 460</td>
<td>De Vis II 133 - 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis II 136 - 466</td>
<td>De Vis II 137 - 313, 466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis II 140 - 313, 465</td>
<td>De Vis II 146 - 466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis II 146 - 466</td>
<td>De Vis II 147 - 465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis II 149 - 325, 325</td>
<td>De Vis II 151 - 169, 314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis II 151 - 169, 314</td>
<td>De Vis II 162 - 260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis II 162 - 260</td>
<td>De Vis II 162f. - 632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis II 162f. - 632</td>
<td>De Vis II 165 - 252, 532</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New Coptic Texts from the Monastery of St. Macarius (ed. Evelyn-White)**

- Mac. No. 4 fgt 3 - 402
- Mac. No. 5 - 261
- Mac. No. 6 - 154, 252, 259, 313, 314, 396, 428, 428, 532
- Mac. No. 8B - 252, 532
- Mac. No. 8B fgt 1 - 87
- Mac. No. 9 - 325
- Mac. No. 16 - 266
- Mac. No. 18 - 154
- Mac. No. 18-20 - 451
- Mac. No. 20 - 93, 314
- Mac. No. 29 - 261
- Mac. No. 29 fgt. 3 - 212
- Mac. No. 30 - 168
- Mac. No. 31 - 315
Mac. No. 32 — 169
Mac. No. 33 — 315
Mac. No. 35B — 410
Mac. No. 35C — 410
Mac. No. 95 — 166
Amél. II 33 — 215, 353
Amél. II 70 — 277
Amél. II 87 — 133
Amél. II 257 — 239
Amél. II 341 — 93

Sinuthii Vita Bohairice (ed. Leipoldt)
SV 11 — 313
SV 14 — 313
SV 17 — 318, 466
SV 18 — 313
SV 19 — 325
SV 20 — 298
SV 21 — 313
SV 22 — 313
SV 23 — 313
SV 27f. — 351
SV 28 — 313, 325
SV 29 — 266
SV 30 — 240
SV 32 — 264, 466
SV 33 — 266
SV 34 — 313
SV 37 — 318
SV 38 — 260
SV 41 — 465
SV 42 — 318
SV 46 — 154, 166
SV 47 — 526
SV 50 — 313
SV 54 — 260
SV 55 — 272
SV 59 — 154
SV 60 — 466
SV 61 — 466
SV 64 — 632
SV 65 — 277
SV 66 — 154
SV 67 — 277, 318
SV 74 — 465
SV 75 — 154

ed. Chassinat
Chass. 18 — 241
Chass. 20ff. — 287
Chass. 63 — 242
Chass. 97 — 353

ed. Guérin
Guérin, RE 10 p. 161a — 534

ed. Leipoldt
Leip. III 69 — 241
Leip. III 87 — 350
Leip. III 96 — 133
Leip. III 116 — 526
Leip. III 144 — 534
Leip. III 146f. — 410
Leip. III 215 — 353

Leip. IV 22 — 48
Leip. IV 26f. — 137
Leip. IV 28 — 526
Leip. IV 43 — 512
Leip. IV 96f. — 128
Leip. IV 97 — 167, 494
Leip. IV 100 — 277
Leip. IV 125 — 87
Leip. IV 158 — 489
Leip. IV 198 — 88

ed. Shisha-Halevy
Orientalia 44 (1975; BL Or. 8664 f. 2)
Or. p. 155 — 241
Or. p. 156 — 241, 353

ed. Wessely
Wess. 9 — 241

Sahidic: Shenoute

ed. Amélineau
Amél. I 95 — 93
Amél. I 113 — 94
Amél. I 276 — 215

ed. Young (Coptic Manuscripts from the White Monastery, 1993)
Young 50 — 512
Young 69 — 216
Young 129 — 461
Other Texts:

*Benjamin, Homily on the Nuptials of Cana* (ed. C.D.G Müller)
Benjamin, Hom. 132 – 489

*The Monastery of Epiphanius at Thebes* (ed. Crum)
Epiph. 105 – 276

*Manichaean Psalms* (ed. Allberry)
Man. Ps. 22.6f. – 248
Man. Ps. 151.27 – 309
Man. Ps. 156.9 – 309

*Nag Hammadi Codices* (Facsimile ed.)
NHC II 93 – 266
NHC III 139 – 210
NHC V 23 – 94
NHC VII 11 – 421
NHC VII 74 – 596