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A.S.-H.
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.Ll. 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. Schwartz, H. Steinthal and F. Misteli, and even Aug. Schleier-
cher)2. Thirdly, my aim is to assess, on a broad canvas and with “minor”

1 F.Ll. 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 ep- 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 "Greekeness" 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 Oxyrhynchite. 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 focus 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. exclaims "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: ἐψεκότοι, ἡψεκότοι (135), ἡψεκώστω (164), άποκ άτομ (193), ἐνέκωστοι (257).
0.1.1 Basic structural-analytic procedure: methodological principles in brief\textsuperscript{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 paradigmatics, 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)\textsuperscript{6}. The former can

\textsuperscript{5} To some extent adapted from the methodological Introduction to Shisha-Halevy 1998.

\textsuperscript{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, juncture, recton (government), conditioning, compatibility or incompatibility, 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 punctured 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 coordination. This 'ID' names the entity, and distinguishes it from any possible 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 various allo-forms, or its cumulative profile, consisting of several categories.
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 praesentia 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: ‘discontinuous’) 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 nexal interdependency, between a thematic and a rhematic constituent; these two interdependencies are not mutually exclusive, that is, they are mutually combinable (as in an adnexual 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 nexal 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 ‘squeinting’, (Greco-)Latin-based — connotations, often compounded by diachronic-perspective ones. 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, Steinhall 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 syntactic⁹ — is reason enough to get acquainted with Coptic. Moreover, the diachronic dimension of the stratificational issue, namely the popular "syntax to morphology" evolitional 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 puremment 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 "illegitimations" 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 comprehension 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 scrip ta, where sociolinguistic correlates are extremely speculative to apply\textsuperscript{11}. 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.

\textsuperscript{11} Cf. Wahlgren 1995 (Hellenistic Greek), e.g. on final/consecutive 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. ὅσος and zero, different prepositions — e.g. αὐτό - ἐν- or ἴσωμεν/ἴσεσον/ἴσωμεν (frequent); ἀρ- and ναγ-, ἀρ- and εἰς-, Ἀη ἐτ-/πετ-, πετ-/ἐτ- in the Cleft Sentence (infrequent); ἐσπερὶ-τε and ἐσπερὶ-τε (rare). Lexical variae lectiones form a class of their own (ἐμι/κυκών, ταῦτα/κυκώπι, τασθο/ταθτότες, etc.), as do morphological variants (αἴνω-/εἶνα-, ἄτετειν-/ ἄτετειν-, τετε/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 subdivisible), NT Scripture, Nitrian (further subdivisible) 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 πετανεό), or alternatively belong to a parallel "technical-register" lexical system, so too Greek particles or conjunctions/adverbials, such as Φερεί, ΟΤI ἡ-, οίνα μηπος, γαρ οὖν, μητί γαρ, μενοντε, οὐτός οίνα 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 ἑκτω ἡ or φιλα νοτο, even ἡ - but not for Φιλιμπνε or ύπτορε, 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 hier-
archical in three ranks: the main running exposition; “Obs[ervations]” in-
terpolated in the main text, for discussion of implications, extra-corpus il-
stration, 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 macro-
copy — makes often for a “user-unfriendly” face and, I fear, tedious-
ness 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 de-
scription: the multifarious interconnectedness of features and phenom-
ena cannot be reflected in linear discourse\(^\text{12}\). 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 based on the unpub-
lished 14th-century MS Paris BN coptel (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)\(^\text{13}\), 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, 35f., 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 gram-
marian 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,

\(^{12}\) 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.

\(^{13}\) The Arabic text was added to the margin of the Rome Vat. copto 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 évolué (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” *tout 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 Thebaïdic 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 Thebaïdic”. 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, “мы нектес сефтас”).

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.10), "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. Bonjou'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: "Duxplex autem est linguae Aegyptiacae Dialectus Inferioris Aegypti, quae Coptica ple-rumque appellatur, sed potius Memphitica appellanda est; et Superioris Aegypti, quae Dialectus Sahidica, vel Thebaidica, sive Thebennitica, vocatur")\footnote{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).}. 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
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 fuisse 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’s15 (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 Graecisc 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,\textsuperscript{16} was the insightful information source of the typologists H. Steinhalt’s and F. Misteli’s Coptic information (in Steinhalt-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 Steinhalt 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”: “Memphiticam dialectum, olim toti Aegypto communem, tanquam antiquiorem et alienum matrem habendam esse”; here, “Memphitic” is still “Koptisch κατ’ ἔξοχήν”. For behind-the-scene reasons unknown to me, L. Stern (1880:ix) grumpily ignored the Schwartzte-Steinhalt grammar completely. He does mention Das Alte Ägypten critically and sarcastically, and says, quite unjustly: “…viel blättert und wenig früchte. Was sollen wir auch von einer linguistischen methode erwarten, die ihre argumente nur zu oft in der speculation sucht?”\textsuperscript{17} 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

\textsuperscript{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 Steinhalt. (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.

\textsuperscript{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. Steinhthal, referred to above (Steinhthal 1847:19, 44ff.). Still, Steinhthal 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 (19263, 19564), 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 Qūṣ’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. 1:303ff., 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-glossogetic 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. τωνομί (p. 45, 208B/11S) is perfectly correct Bohairic (των-τωνι-, 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-Samanûdî) 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, Battiscambe Gunn (1883-1950). Browsing in his unpublished papers (in the Griffith Institute archives, Oxford), one sees that Gunn18 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 **nte**-, **cie**-. 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), Pentateuch (copto 1, 9th-10th c.), Psalters (13th-14th c.), Gospels (13th to 18th c.); hagiographical and patristic texts — homilies, martyrlogies, 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, 82f., 1981:92ff., 121f., 1987:226f., 1989a, 1 1994b:124ff.; so also P. Kahle’s “semi-Bohairic” contrasting with Bohairic proper (1954:196, 231f., 377f.), with absence of combinatory aspiration and the grapheme iginal 5 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 different, non-descriptive school of linguistics. By definition, grammatically pertinent types of Bohairic are difficult to define pre-analytically and a priori, yet are impressionistically very striking (see SHISHA-HALEVY 1991a: esp. 57f.). More than for other dialects, the Bohairic linguistic 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?)
- Job/Psalms/Proverbs
- The Major Prophets
- Scripture hermeneutics (Lagarde’s Catena)

And then:

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

---

19 Preferred by Polotsky to OT Bohairic sources, the striking “Nitrian” features of NT texts notwithstanding.
20 PoLOTSKY 1944:5, on the Psalms: “un texte qui se distingue par la pureté de sa langue”.
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 idiometrically “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 (sty-
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 I 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: ἐπε-οὐν, ὄντα-, ἔπαντες-, τερα- future; final ταρε-; ἐ- and ἄ- for the focalizing (Second Present/Future); ἄν 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”: οὖχοτι Δε, μενοντε, οὐ-παντως, γαραοτι, παλινοτι, οὐπαρατοττο, ενοικ, verbal “particle” forms like ectω Δε or are or χαιρετε, ξινα “that”, ξιναμηπως, ἀνομεροτε, adverbial Φτσι, ξικ, vocative Φι-λιππε, στηνθε, 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 Tyxhen'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 original. 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, étranagement 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-textual — 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. Seth'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. Frösen 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\textsuperscript{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)\textsuperscript{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-

\textsuperscript{25} Cf. for instance VERBOOMEN 1992, on ἰν διδάσκων. 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).

\textsuperscript{26} It would for instance be most interesting to see whether the Bohairic opposition between ΝΑΚ- zero and ΝΑΚ- τε 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 (Seth 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; Simpson 1996 passim). It is therefore, I believe, rash to see a “tiefgreifende Divergenz zwischen Demotisch und Kopfisch” (Seth 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 scripta is not derived from the Demotic 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 diacritics, 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.

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 Vorlage, cf. Polotsky 1950:78ff., but later the opposite in 1962:417 n.1; Chainé 1933:xx (“la version de la Basse Égypte...moins grécisée que celle de la Haute Égypte”). Simpson 1996:170, and already Schwartz 1843:2033ff., presenting the bias

---

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”.

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).

29 An early verdict of “Grecization” of a Demotic text was reached by Spiegelberg
of the 'Grecized Bohairic' as a "Grundübel". This impression must yet be founded empirically, but it seems almost all Coptic/pre-Coptic diaglosses 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 diaglosses, 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 (Kwcwm is not a descendent of the LE Sequential), hr.f sdm, the causative conjugation; (293f.) p3-ddf nb (cf. Boh. Φήν Niben ετ-), Preterite/Perfect participial jr-; (294) Substantive + Adjective noun phrase; (295) an "early" Future tense (Boh.); (296) the μαν-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 πν" 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 overrule' feature — see Chapter Four; the discontinuous nexal negation occurs in ME too (306), as does the Circumstantial adnominal 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 pseudo-psycholinguistic 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 elusive — 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)\(^\text{30}\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coptic</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>\textit{naq- ts} vs. \textit{naq- pe} vs. \textit{aq-} \hspace{1cm} (§1.1.3)</td>
<td>Aorist vs. Imperfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quaternary \textit{agens} placement paradigm \hspace{1cm} (in narrative) (§1.1.5, 2.4.7 [f.])</td>
<td>Binary \textit{agens} placement paradigm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{mмон}, \textit{нфн} tensed negative pro-clause forms (§1.2.4)</td>
<td>\textit{oхi}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{еqе-} vs. \textit{qнн-} Futures \hspace{1cm} (§1.2.5.1)</td>
<td>Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present vs. Aorist \hspace{1cm} (§1.2.5.2)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{лв} vs. \textit{в} and \textit{в} \hspace{1cm} (§2.0.3)</td>
<td>\textit{lдi}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal Sentence(^\text{31}) vs. \textit{о}/\textit{ω} \hspace{1cm} (§§2.1-2.2)</td>
<td>(\textit{eфвaт} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

\(^{31}\) 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.
wos, xo, oI n-, n- noun predicates (§§2.2.1-2.2.2)

n- / e- ol-/ zero — Rheme
(§§2.3.3.2, 3.3-3.4)

Focalization patterns (Cleft Sentence, Augens, Particles) (§2.4)

π- (n-)/πι-/ ol-/ zero determiner set
(§§3.1-3.6)

(π-/ πι-) n- vs. nte- associative sphere-constituence noun expansion patterns
(§3.9)

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

ε+ infinitive / epeq-/ eπιν(epeq-) etc.
(§§3.13)

Δε- othi rap / rap
(§4.5.4)

(eIvat), noun apposition

Rhemes of eIvat

(zero det.; eIζ + vn.)

various focalization signalling

δ- / zero det. set

Genitive case

Sgl. vs. pl. morphology (binary category)

infinitive

γαρ
1.1 Narrative Tensing and Texturing

1.1.1 Narrative grammar: Narrative. Models, terminology and concepts
(a) Pre-Coptic and Coptic Egyptian Narrative Grammar: a note
(b) “Narrative”, Narrative Grammar, Narrative texteme and narrative texture
(c) The Narrative Texteme
(d) Traditional hierarchy models in Narrative grammatical analysis: Grounding

1.1.2 Narrative tensing and texture: general. The Coptic system in macroscopy, European and classical languages
(a) Tense and time
(b) The main tense oppositions
(c) Coptic tenses. Coptic and Greek
(d) Discussions: a classified report

1.1.3 The Coptic system in microscopy: specifics, details and documentation
(a) The opposition $\text{\textit{en}}$ + $\emptyset$ vs. $\text{\textit{en}}$ + $\text{\textit{pe}}$: Rich (Enhanced) Evolution Mode vs. mode switching
(b) $\text{\textit{en}}$/$\text{\textit{naq}}$ + $\emptyset$: functional specification
(c) $\text{\textit{en}}$/$\text{\textit{naq}}$ - $\text{\textit{pe}}$: functional specification
(d) Classified representative commented documentation. $\text{\textit{en}}$-$\text{\textit{aq}}$ - $\text{\textit{pe}}$
(e) Dream or Vision Narratives
(f) $\text{\textit{en}}$ - converted
(g) $\text{\textit{pe}}$ with other conjugation forms
(h) Micronarrative subtextemes and their systems

1.1.4 Atemporal / extratemporal / Present / non-verbal nexal forms in Narrative
(I) The Nominal Sentence
(II) The aorist $\text{\textit{aqcwtem}}$ in Narrative
(III) The Present tense in Narrative

1.1.5 Narrative texturing: juncture. “ordination” hierarchy. Information blocking and packaging
(a) Juncture signalling: Narrative cohesion and delimitation. Juncture environments
(b) Narrative slots (or paradigms) in Evolution Mode
(c) Connectors and disjunctors: adverbials: $\text{\textit{sox}, \textit{all}}$ etc.. Particles: $\text{\textit{gac}, \textit{xas}, \textit{xex}}, \text{\textit{an}}$. The Augens
(d) Narrative information structure
(e) Ordination hierarchy in Narrative
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 "Egyptianness" 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 praesens", 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!) 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 aspeccual Semitic associations of the term), along with the so-called pluperfect ne-aqcwtém.

¹ 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 χαχ vs. χι, undertaking the quest for the "lost perfect" (decended from χ nowadays) is surely worth while (see Richter 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 Sonnenaugue, the Petubastis Cycle — repays the effort by giving us an idea of the rich tapestry of its impressive grammatical and narratological sophistication and complexity\(^2\), 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\(^3\). Still, a careful microscopy of narrative grammar, both Coptic and pre-Coptic, reveals formal/functional matching and affinities\(^4\), 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\(^5\), 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 Völkerpsychologie, grammatical symbolism and glottogonic 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.Ll. 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 repre-
sentations. 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 Pheidias 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 po-
etic 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 sys-
tem, comprising numerous subsystems, of oppositions and neutraliza-
tions of elements in the syntagmatic scope of a whole text (not of a
“sentence”), with the paradigmatic dimension of all commutations ob-
servable 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 STIENTHAL and
MISTELI 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 spurts. 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. “Erzählttexte”, “Erzählen”; ADAMZIK 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: SCHIFFRIN 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 Unspeakeable 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 ‘hypertype’). 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". 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 descriptions; 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/reader-ship 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 Nuccacci 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); Wiéold 1983:421ff. (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: “résument” or condensed narrative (Ex. 5:1ff.); “chronicling narratives” (e.g. Gen. 5:31); etiological 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\textsuperscript{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 Schwindtalla (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.; \textsc{nak} \textsc{oi} \textsc{mbwq} \textsc{pe} 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 \textit{Problematik}, his main preoccupation is the opposition of the Perfect (\textit{perfectum praesens}, expressed by the \textit{passé composé}) and Preterite (\textit{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-past essence of the Greek \textsc{dpr} \textsc{stoc}, 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 \textit{passé simple} vs. \textit{passé composé} in mind, directly pertinent to our EM (\textsc{aq}— \textsc{ne}— \textsc{O})/CM (\textsc{ne}— \textsc{pe}), and the poetic tension between them (see below): (73) "Le temps fondamentale est l’aoriste, qui est le temps de l’événement \textit{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 \textit{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 \textit{passé composé} in Narrative (Pagnol: "un temps imprécis, médiocre, bête et mou"), with the secondary literature on the famous case of Camus’ \textit{L’étranger} (often discussed also elsewhere).

\textsuperscript{11} Cf. POLOTSKY 1985 for the formal distinction between Report and Narrative \textit{stricto sensu}, esp. in Demotic and Late Egyptian. Report in its turn is different from oral Narrative, \textit{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, BJÖRLUND 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 naïvely reductive conception
of “periphery” or expansion\(^{12}\); 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 \textsc{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., 24ff. etc.). One may have reservations regarding the exclusive association of foregrounding with plot progression (see \textsc{Couper-Kuhlen} 1989:9ff.) and change, also of background as “setting” (1990:175ff.; see also \textsc{Covet} 1991). But Fleischman also holds (loc.cit) that fore- and background are two extremes of a continuum, admitting of grading — see also \textsc{Givón} 1987, who stresses the non-binary nature of the grounding opposition, and the complexity of the correlation between backgrounding and syntactical subordination; \textsc{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 \textsc{Hopper} and \textsc{Thompson} 1980:280ff.) are loose and open to some objections of subjectivity and \textit{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 \textsc{background}. By contrast, that material which supplies the main points of the discourse is known as \textsc{foreground}... The foregrounded portions together comprise the backbone or skeleton of the text, form-

\(^{12}\) “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 \textit{P[resent] 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” (\textsc{Sicking} and \textsc{Stork} 1996:94). Consider Wallace’s definition of grounding, which I believe is problematic, simplistic and circular (\textit{apud} \textsc{Fanning} 1990:74ff.): “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 Depraetere 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., Matthiesen 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-analytical 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-phrase 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 Clifford 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 Acqwhin 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 nāq- zero and nāq- rē, 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 texts 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 back 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, overru ling and replacing “subordination” etc. by Narrative Grammar and even narratological parameters. (In Coptic narrative, indeed, ἔπε τέ is a fine case of text-grammatical “subordination”)\textsuperscript{15}. 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 passé, 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.

(12) For some instances of application of the grounding hierarchical model to modern and historical English Narrative, see WARVÍK 1990b; to French, WEINRICH 1982:171ff. (his own Tempusrelief, 157, 168ff.; “Auffälligkeit” approximating “salience”); to Russian, Chvany 1985 and Björklund 1993.

(e) A note on artistic, photographic and cinematographic terminol ogy 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\textsuperscript{16}. 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-

\textsuperscript{15} Cf. Weinrich 1977:146.

\textsuperscript{16} We find an early application of photographic/cinematographic terminology to the study of Greek Aktionsart 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\(^ {17} \).

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)

\(^ {17} \) 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-Romance 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 consitute 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 Ṽ, which is not a tense, properly speaking.
(3) Wilmot 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 Schiffrin 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 program-
ming". 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 con-
ventionally used for the tenses bear strong alien associations that poten-
tially and, in point of fact, bias our judgement of and blunt our sensitiv-
ity 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 intrigu-
ing diachronic phenomena of Egyptian. The first reaction, *viz.* that what
we have in Coptic is but a calque- replica of the Greek system, must im-
mediately 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" (*nqwwtm*) — to which I shall henceforth refer as "Preter-
te" - and *nqwwtm*, the "Imperfect", testifies to Latin/Greek termin-
ology 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 *nq* has "le sens de l'imparfait grec"; or STERN 1880
§373 "dauerzeit der vergangenheit in die beschreibung... entspricht als
solche dem griechischen imperfekt"). This aspectral 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*.\[^{18}\]
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 Sprach bund 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 (neqcowtem / naqcowtem, in its conventional associations and favourite traditional appellation, even going occasionally\(^{20}\) back to its probable Late Egyptian structural and probably formal predecessor wnf 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, JANSSSEN 1991, EGGS 1993:10ff. However, specificity, indefiniteness and genericity are difficult notions even when applied to nominalis; 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”.
The Coptic Preterite (-\(\lambda q\)) is compatible with adverbs of time extension that show its temporal-deixis compatibility-value to be neutral or unmarked: \(n\dot{\lambda}m\ n\dot{\epsilon}g\dot{\eta}t\) (Num. 20:29), \(n\dot{\kappa}e-\dot{\iota} n\dot{\epsilon}g\dot{\eta}t\) (Gen. 8:10), \(n\dot{\tau}m\ n\rho\dot{o}m\pi\) (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:
Septuagint Greek | Pentateuch Bohairic
--- | ---
Aorist | Preterite / (Imperfect)
Imperfect | Imperfect / (Preterite)
Present | Preterite / (Imperfect)

While a closer specimen check of the respective Greek correspondences of νε- Ø, νε- πε, αq-, γαq- and the Nominal Sentence (see in detail below) shows the following correlations:

Pentateuch Bohairic | Septuagint Greek
--- | ---
νε- Ø | Imperfect, Aorist, infinitive, Present, Perfect, (particleds)
νε- πε | Imperfect (also ηv-periphrases); (Aorist)
γαq- | Imperfect (also ηv-periphrases); present; (Aorist)
αq- | Aorist
Nom. Sentence | είναι constructions (also ηv-periphrases)

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 νε- 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 contextual; 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 tenses on Coptic. 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. Reville, RE 11 (1904) 111: "J'ai parmis les égyptiens de race de bons amis, dont la tournure d'esprit toute française m'étonne toujours", apud POLOTSKY 1985a: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-tenant 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 ne- 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 GRIESHAMMER 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 NICCACCI 1990; cf. also ROSEN 1969; POLOTSKY 1985, for a functional parallelism of wayyiqtol and Late Egyptian sequential jw.f hr sm. See also NICCACCI 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, lnh presentatives (Coptic q̣nitne ic 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 πε with πε-: 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” (λέγει, λέγουσι), “see” (δει) and (far more rarely) some verbs of motion (κατέβαινεν), that is to say in initial-boundary delimitative slots. It corresponds to Coptic πεπε-., πεπαπα (Ex. 5:3, 10:7:9:28:29, Num. 14:28, 20:19, 22:16:28:30 etc.; cεπαλο in Gen. 38:22 is not narrative, but reporting) the verb Δημαρ etc. (Gen. 29:2, Ex. 2:6:13, 3:2, 32:19, Num. 22:31 etc.); ἡμείς επεσήν (Num. 11:9). A rare instance of the Coptic (Sahebic) 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 raises 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 Schwarz. 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 oppositional 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’eternel imparfait”. Generally speaking, the Graeco-Roman 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 picture\(^{24}\); 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); Ruizérez 1982; Rijksbaron 1984; Ruigh 1991, with basic literature (presenting the the-

\(^{24}\) See Polotsky 1957:227 n. 1.

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 censoring 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, παρωχημένοις 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 *nḫq* with temporal adverbs indicative of “verbal plurality” (*nṯmw nḏḏwṯ, Gen. 21:20.f.:34, nḏḏwṯ nḏḏm Nibn Num. 9:16) means
lation, Goodwin’s “dwelling on the course of an event”, thus following Melzer 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.

De launois 1988:183f. introduces the concept of “durée psychologique”, which signals “l’importance que le locuteur attribue à l’action”: cf. Coptic Νας- (without τε, 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 reference 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”.

“Imperfeckt der lebhaften Darstellung” (Lerch 1930).

Fanning 1990:249: the Imperfect primarily descriptive.

“Imparfait pittoresque”: Brunetiére apud Pollak 1988:125 “tenant de composer et de fixer des tableaux... L’imparfait...sert à prolonger la compatibility, no more, and is not more indicative than its compatibility with ΤΝΟΣ (Ex. 3:9; Deut. 22:16) or ΕΤΩ (Ex. 36:3, Num. 11:33).

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 1879:103ff., 114), the former hierarchy is the most prevalent, indeed the default approach: TOGEBY 1955:390ff., BERTINETTO 1987 and many others.

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

(H.) ROSÉN 1980, RIJKSBARON 1988, LE GOFFIC 1995:134ff., and others see the Imperfect as thematic to its thematic environment, in particular the main-line event. This is interesting in view of the prominencing (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. SCHWYZER 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;
expllicative 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: GILDERSLIEVE “annalistic or note-book Present”
(1903: §201); KIECKERS 1915; THACKERAY 1978:24; 1923:20ff. and
*apud* OSBURN 1986:493f. (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,
um 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 of Coptic *(ne)quaq-).* 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 backgrounnding 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 1996:318ff. (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 FLEISCHMAN’s “anti-narrative”: “um der Wahrheit der Geschichte willen...schreckt Werfel von den Erzähltempora 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.).

COPPER 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.

FLUDEMK 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.)

Schiﬄin 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 άq- 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 ΚΑΓCΩΤΕΜ as a "præsens 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 Graeco-Romance category of the same name). As I have suggested regarding Demotic and Coptic (1989b:49f.), **nē-** 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 **nē-**,**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, **nē-** and **πε** may be considered the two constituents of an embracing discontinuous morpheme).

Obs.
(1) SHISHA-HALEVY 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 **nē-** both the traditional and the textual views of **nē-**, 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 **nē-** 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 (**nē-**,**πε** in our Bohairic) and EM-internal "gear-shift" (**nē-** Ø in our Bohairic; see below) are conflated.
(3) BIEDENKOPF-ZIEHNER (1999) assigns the "Reliefgebung" role to **πε**, "Sprechhaltung" — "Perspektive" to **nē-**. 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-HALEVY 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, **πι** a "backgrounding particle", "textual marker" (so Schenke in his index, p. 216). In this corpus, **πι** occurs as a real backgrounding exponent, also with **εξαλ-** and Temporalis **ετεξαλ-** (consider Mt. 9:2, 14:8); see also SHISHA-HALEVY 2003a.
latter, consider πε as an apodotic superordinator, especially with ἐπε- (apodotic ὠροκ ἐπε-...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 πεζαγ: 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 (αρ-) 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/delimitation in narrative, a true cut-away to offscreen or backdrop, much more highly delimitative than πε- alone (-αρ πε is a particularly delimitative compound signal, but, on the other hand, -Δε-, 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 nexally, 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-

31 Somewhat like “C’est” in the dialogic French “C’est maman qui me bat”, answering “Pourquoi pleures-tu”, πε- πε is essentially presentational, nexus-presenting (cf. Lambrecht 1988)
malized measure of what Damourette and Pichon called "réinvasion nynégozentrique" (1936 §§1604, 1722 etc.).

The absence of \textit{πε} is thus meaningful, i.e. structurally a \textit{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 \textit{νε- πε} and to \textit{αχ-} — 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 \textit{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 \textit{νε- Ο} and \textit{νε- πε} refine the narration beyond the original and introduce nuancing absent in the Greek. (Incidentally, P and Vat. copto 1, 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 \textit{νε- Ο} and \textit{νε- πε} with the main EM carrier \textit{αχ-} in simple terms of high-level thematicity and rhematicity, especially since \textit{νε- Ο} marks "Obtaining Situation" stretches (thematic?) as well as narrative focal points, and \textit{νε- πε} stands in opposition of rank to both \textit{νε- Ο} and \textit{αχ-}, 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 \textit{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, \textit{νε- Ο} is only thematic in certain configurations with a rhematic environment or segment; and so is \textit{νε- πε}, which is thematic in both \textit{αχ-} and \textit{νε- Ο} environments.

Obs.

(1) As said, it is the tension between the EM carrier \textit{αχ-} and the EM/CM exponents (respectively) \textit{νε- Ο} and \textit{νε- πε} that is the prime regulator of narrative pace and texture. Narrative stretches with "flat" EM \textit{αχ-} only acquire a special "ornamental" (Barthes) or lapidary chronicling character: consider Gen. 1:4f. \textit{στοιχ \textit{αφωπ\textepsilon\ \ βολα \ νε-πι}}
The opposition \textbf{ne-} Ø vs. \textbf{ne-} πε has a decidedly different value in Nitrian narratives; \textbf{ne-} πε is there apparently much less marked, judging by its relative frequency (\textbf{ne-} Ø 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, \textbf{ne-} Ø does concatenate in Acts; \textit{verba dicendi} occur with πε. The system of the early Bohairic B4 Twelve Prophets (P. Vat. coph. 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 οτὸρ \textit{παραστήσατε} \textbf{νε-} \textit{λογισθο}ν \textit{παραστίνω} \textit{εἰσίν} \textit{παραστήσατε} \textit{παραστήσατε} \textit{παραστήσατε} εἰσίν τοῖς παραστήσατε}). 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”\textsuperscript{12}, 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 \textbf{ne-} clauses (e.g. De Vis I 116f., II 79, AM I 81).

\textbf{(b) ne-} /naq- + Ø: 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) \textbf{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

\textsuperscript{32} \textit{Shisha-Halevy} 1986a:167f.
or highlighting. Narrative Peak; “freezing the moment”, visually vivid “freeze-frames”; “blow-up”. “Paintbrush narration”.

Following נע “see”: the perceived in dramatic close-up or slow-motion (“camera-eye” focus). Here is a unique opposition environment between נע- and נע- נך: the former occurs as focussing object of “see”, introduced by גְַמֵּּפּ (cf. Biblical Hebrew r’h w-hnh), the latter as second-object actant (נע + Obj. + נע- נך- נך).

(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 נע- Ø form seems to contrast with a singular-actor Preterite (“Perfect”, נג-), consider Ex. 18:13, Deut. 9:10 etc., would be symptomatic of this role.

(8) Verba dicendi, cognition verbs (affirmative)

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

The transition from נג- carried to נע- 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, נג- 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-n3w + durative Rheme (P. Spiegelberg 4/1.2, P. Krall 24/21).
(2) Some references to general or European-languages discussion of the above special roles or comparable ones: "episode amplification" within the foreground (our EM): cf. Chvany 1985:257ff.; 266f. (imperfective Present and imperfective Pasts); Fanning 1990:191 ("prominence"), Fleischman 1990:318ff. (amplification). Fuchs 1991:108f. in Hopper's model, this would probably be a background function (1979:215). "Narrative highlighting" or "narrative focussing": this is a much-debated term and issue. It overlaps S. Fleischman's "narrative peak" (1990:141ff.; see 193ff.), Baayen 1997: focal referential concern (Bibl. Hebrew yayiqtol), opposed to the basic narrative carrier (Bibl. Heb. wayyiqtol, our au-) which expresses disfocal referential concern.

Of the Greek Imperfect, cf. Gildersleeve'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 diverge on event focussing; also 1990:276 and Longacre apud Fleischman 1990:140; Mellen 2003, on the "inferred causality" of the impérfect. 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" (Mellen 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 ("piano-sequenza") and tableau effect in Narrative: Jespersen's lentolalegро pacing musical metaphors (e.g. apud Schwyzer II 277): Metz 1969:222ff.; Pollak 1988:124ff., 144 (the "time-lens" effect); Longacre apud Fleischman 1990:140, Fleischman 1990:397 n.193.


(7) The neo- marking of verba dicendi "say, speak" (אָנָּם, מִשְׁפֹּת) 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-quotatino 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 "remote" 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-
ing reported on is rather how the speaker feels about something”. Casparis 1975:108ff.
for *verba dicendi* in the English Present; so too Schiffri 1981:58ff. See also Dauses
1981:43ff. (French), Pollak 1988:133 (French) on the thematicity of *verba dicendi*.
Latin: Mellet 1988:132ff., 248ff. for the Imperfect tense of Latin *verba dicendi*; the early
Löfstedt 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 al-
ready Huftsch apud Hartmann 1918/20:40). Cf. also (H.) Rosén 1980; also, more gen-
generally, the opposition of a thematic tense (and tense segments) — the Imperfect — to a
rhythmic one (the Perfect).

Greek: Rukšbaron 1984:18 (the *verba dicendi* tense is thematic, since it is “intended
to obtain a reaction from the interlocutor”), much earlier, Mayser II/1:135 (the verb of
saying as thematic or incomplete); Kühner-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 1915:7ff. 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 Eriksson 1943:16, 21,
64ff., 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-to-
passé simple* with the effect of “discours dramatisé”; also Mellet 2003.

Typically, then, *νε-* 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 grad-
ing). It is affirmative only. It is very rarely concatenating; or rather
never really concatenating at all, but occurring in short series (unlike
*νε-* *πε*), and thus very different in its combinatorics from the narrative
Preterite *ακ-* (alias Perfect). It also has an otherwise differing syntax
(for instance, in its incompatibility with inclusion by *αι.-*). (Note again
that all above roles regard “linguistic eventing”, that is, staging deci-
sions and options of the narrator, and not attempts at the objective repro-
duction of real event [“change of situation”] features).

(c) *νε*-/*νακ*- + *πε*: functional specification.

Here (ana-)phoric association, even a general or vague one with the
information given in some foregoing narrative segment or stretch, is al-
mast de rigeur; *πε* is a hyper-clausal referent. Somewhat paradoxically,
ne- ne information is often more “important” for the plot, being of 
immediate relevance to main-line neighbouring events, than the evolu-
tive ne- Ǿ information; ne- ne information as it were supports the 
narrated plot as it is (being) (re-)considered by the narrator; but ne- Ǿ 
information is the plot, albeit in a privileged rank. The delimitative 
junctural value of ne- ne is strong. Negation is very common, even 
characteristic of certain functions (note for instance naqemim/cwotm 
an ne or naqememom an ne); ne- ne 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 
cotext 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, simultane-
ous and parallel one, the internal one of the narrator vis à vis his audi-
ence, in which the event or state are anchored by means of ne, 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 any-
thing, is even more complex.

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

(1) “psychological” information on internal mental/emotional/intel-
lectual/cognitive background states (and/or their physical mani-
festation) as motive or cause or as the reason why for Evolution 
Mode context.

Note the typical (albeit not constant) occurrence of rɔp, xε-, 
επιδι... in this kind of background.

(2) Explicatory-relevance background: the (physical or meta-
physical) 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 rɔp, 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 
itsel. Synoptic, panoramic or “bird’s-eye” view, zoom-out; “from 
then on...”. “Voiceover”-type telling of “what is happening”. Nar-

31 Casparis 1975:129.
ator'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 \textit{und zwar} (approx. “and that...”) rhematizing of additional information is in evidence. On the whole, \textit{ νέ - πέ} marks in this role \textit{Metanarrative}, rarely even \textit{meta-narration} (“as I told you earlier”, etc.) information. This is certainly the most subtle and finely nuanced functional category of \textit{ νέ - πέ}, to be considered with suspense-building and otherwise audience-oriented narrating tactics. Occasionally, the \textit{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 \textit{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 \textit{forward narrative spurt}, conveying the sense that “something is about to happen”. (Greek/Coptic \textit{μέν} [“μεν solitarie”] 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 \textit{αξ} to \textit{ναξ} - \textit{Ø}, 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 \textit{Δε} is here typical.

(5) Specification Content (second object actant) of seeing (\textit{ναξ}) — the scene or presented as external to narrative reality.

This category may be related to \textit{νέ - πέ} 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 \textit{Δε-} clause serving as object to \textit{ναξ} we find a rare slot of striking opposition between \textit{νέ - πέ} and \textit{νέ - Ø}, 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 wnn3w-. i.e. the Imperfect (e)n- (Setne 4/3 "I was referring to..."); see Quack 1991:199ff., also on Comment Mode resuming by the delimiting construction INFINITIVE + relative jrtf. 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 Llewelyn 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 (jfr.s hprjw-, e.g. 17/1, 19/1) and true ne- marked "backgrounding" Comment Mode, e.g. 5/14, 12/19 (delimited as jfr.s hpr wnn3w-, e.g. in 2/20, 11/9ff., 12/1).


(3) Mellot 1988:176ff., 259ff. for the explicative role of the Latin Imperfect. For Greek, Köhner-Gerth §383.2; Fanning 1990:248f.; Sicking and Stork 1996:47ff. ("offering the reader a dranatis persona's motivation for acting or speaking in a certain way... providing the background for something the reader has been told before"). For French, Pollak 1988:144ff., Abouda 2004 (see p. 66).

(4) "Detachment or removedness from reality"; cf. Gildersleeve 1903 §213ff., Goodwin §36ff., Mayser II/1:138f., 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 "éπει 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:§220 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 concision 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 “foregroundering with the syntactically independent, backgroundering with dependence”, e.g. p.87ff.; this last issue is investigated also by Mattiesen 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 ηει- πε (Stavinhořa 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, 84f.) — 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 ηει- + zero and ηει- πε in narrative:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters:</th>
<th>ηει- πε</th>
<th>ηει- zero</th>
<th>ηει- ηει- πε</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>γαρ, επιδιω</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∆ε</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οτογ -shift</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ζε-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further conversion</td>
<td>(*)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>topicalization + (∆ε)</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>Stative 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 GRIPPE IC presentative superordination:

Ex. 34:29 γως δε εις ηνην δεπειτετ ΝΣΕ-ΜΩΤΧΣ ΕΒΟΛ ΣΕΝΠΙΤΩΣ ΝΚΙΝΑ + οτορ ΓΡΙΠΠΗ ΝΑΡΕ-ΠΛΑΣΙ ΑΝΟΤΤ ΝΩΝΙ ΧΗ ΔΕΝΝΕΝΔΙΑ ΜΜΩΤΧΣ + ΕΙΝΗΝ ΔΕ ΔΕΠΕΙΤΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΓΡΙΠΠΗ + οτορ ΝΑΠΗΜΙ ΑΝ ΠΕ ΝΣΕ-ΜΩΤΧΣ ΔΕ-ΔΡΑΙΙΩΣ ΝΣΕ-ΠΓΟ ΜΠΑΝΟΜ ΝΤΕΠΕΙΓΟ — EM and CM in syntagmatic contrast: the first NE-Ø depicting a tableau, the subsequent NE-NE supplying background information for the action (see below), for negative cognition verbs. So too:

Gen. 29:2 ΓΡΙΠΠΗ IC ΟΤΩΝΗ ΝΑΣΧΝ ΔΕΝΤΚΟΙ ΝΑΣΧΝ ΔΕ ΜΜΑΤ ΝΣΕ-Γ ΝΟΓΙ ΝΕΣΙΟΝ SIM. GEN. 15:17.

Gen. 7:17f. ΟΤΟΡ ΑΖΑΛΑΙ ΝΣΕ-ΠΙΜΙΟΝ ΟΤΟΡ ΑΡΤΩΟΝ ΜΤΚΤΒΗΣΟΣ ΟΤΟΡ ΑΣΣΙΓΙ ΕΒΟΛ ΓΑΠΗΚΑΙ ΟΤΟΡ ΝΑΦΑΜΑΓΙ ΝΣΕ-ΠΙΜΙΟΝ ΟΤΟΡ ΝΑΦΗΝΟΤ ΝΑΖΑΙ ΕΜΑΥΖ ΓΙΖΕΝΠΙΚΑΙ ΟΤΟΡ ΝΑΣΚΑ ΝΑΖΗΝΟΤ ΝΣΕ-ΜΤΚΤΒΗΣΟΣ ΑΝΩΝΙ ΜΠΙΜΙΟΝ ΠΙΜΙΟΝ ΔΕ ΝΑΦΑΜΑΓΙ ΠΕ ΕΜΑΥΖ ΓΙΖΕΝΠΙΚΑΙ ΟΤΟΡ ΑΖΑΛΑΙ ΝΝΙΙΤΠΟΤ ΤΗΡΟΤ... — a striking instance of fast-to-slow-motion dynamic staging, with Mode shifting. For the Hebrew grammar of this passage, see NICCAI 1990:30f.

Gen. 25:25 ΑΖΙ ΔΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΣΕ-ΠΕΣΩΡΗ ΠΕΣΩΡΠ ΜΜΙΚΙ... ΜΕΝΕΝΕΣΑΦΙ ΔΖΙ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΣΕ-ΠΕΣΩΝ ΝΑΡΕ-ΤΕΠΛΙΞ ΑΜΟΝΙ ΜΠΙΕΤΜ ΝΗΚΑΤ.

Gen. 24:45 ΟΤΟΡ ΑΖΑΛΝΙ ΜΠΑΛΑΖΕΝΚΑΙΚΑΙ ΕΒΟΛ ΓΕΝ- ΝΑΓΗΤ ΚΑΤΟΤΕ ΙC ΡΕΒΕΚΚΑ ΝΑΖΗΝΟΤ ΕΒΟΛ ΕΡΕ-ΤΕΣΖΗΡΙΑ ΓΙΤΕΝΗΓΑΙ — dramatic Narrative: note again (GRIPPE) IC.

Gen. 47:11f. ΟΤΟΡ ΑΙΩΣΚΗΕ ΕΡΕΠΕΙΛΗΤ ΝΕΜ ΝΕΡΝΗΝΟΤ ΨΩΝΙ ΟΤΟΡ ΑΖΙ ΝΤΗΝΟΤ ΝΟΤΑΜΑΓΙ ... ΟΤΟΡ ΝΑΡΕ-ΙΩΣΚΗΕ ΦΙΣΟΤΟ ΜΠΙΕΣΙΝ ΝΕΜ ΝΕΡΝΗΝΟΤ ΝΕΜ ΠΗ ΤΗΡΝ ΤΕ- ΠΕΙΛΗΤ ΣΟΤΟ ΚΑΤΑΣΩΜΑ.

Ex. 14:22 ΟΤΟΡ ΑΖΙ ΕΚΩΤΝ ΝΣΕ-ΝΕΝΨΗΡΗ ΜΠΙΚΑ ΕΕΜΗΤ ΜΖΙΟΝ ΕΠΕΣΘΔΝΟΤ ΟΤΟΡ ΠΙΜΙΟΝ ΟΙ ΝΟΤΟΒΟΤ ΚΑΤΩ- ΝΑΜ ΝΕΜ ΚΑΖΑΗ ΜΜΩΣΟΤ — the dramatic-tableau effect here is striking, with the moment frozen: a fine instance of EM state.
Gen. 32:24 ἄρσωξιν δὲ ἡγε-ιακωβ μματατρ ὁος ἐπὶ

See below, for the “blurred-reality” (dream-quality) interpretation of

Ex. 5:10:19 

Num. 13:23 οὐχ Ἀργετοκαλὰναν ηὲ οὐκ ἄργας ἀλολί

(2) Verbs of cognition/perception — the perceived, in dramatic close-

Gen. 19:28 αὐνας ἐπιπο ἆρημνοι ἄπω ἡγε-οὐσίς

gen. 19:2 οὐχ ἄρας ἐπὶ 

Ex. 3:2 αὐνας ἡγε-νάρε-πιβατος μορ 

(3) Closeup zooming-in or “lingering camera” on an initial obtaining

Gen. 22:5ff. ἀρξι αὐς ἡγε-αβραμ ἀλπορκὴ ητεπίσια ἀρ-

Gen. 30:36 ιακωβ ἐπὶ ἑμονιν ἐνιεωςων ἄτελαβαν...

— 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’Orbieny 1.4ff., see Shisha-Halevy 1995a:301ff.).

Gen. 1:1-2 ενοσιάρχην αὐτῷ θεαμίον τούτες Ναρχών πκαζί δε νεοσίσναρν εροκ πε οσόρ νατιβτί ντόρ οτάκαοι Ναχών εξενθέσιν οτορ οσόν οσόν οσόν Ναρχών ειδεν- πιμοι... — the ultimate initial situation.

Gen. 42:6 ίωσιφ οτορ Ναρχών ενταφί οτόρ Φαί- Ναρτί βολ μπιμβιμπι τιρμ ντεθακί.

Gen. 39:2f. οτόρ ναρ-πτενος Χη Νεμ ίωσιφ οτόρ νεοσον-, οσοτοριον ει δε ει ρμαν ναγεμί νενε-πεφ Αναστον — (Vat om. ντόπο). Νε-πε marks CM that gives the reason for the subsequent text. Ντόπο is difficult, but existence is here well attested, and a Nominal Sentence would be lectio facilior.

Gen. 22:1 οτόρ άσωμπ ομενενανακάκι ναρε-φτί άσωμ Ναράαμ πεςακ ναγ ἄξε-

Gen. 37:3 ίακοβ δε ναγεμί νιωσιφ εφωλ οτσεθεψυθρί τηρον οτσεθεψυθρί πε ντεθεμιτέκλελο αρομίον δε ναγ ντοσεθρι οταστασον νενε-πεφ Βεντάμ ομον εβολ οτσεθεψυθρί τηρον άτεμεκτηρι...

Gen. 18:22 οτόρ οταστασον εβολ άματ... Ναρααμ δε ετ Ναγογι ερατι Μπεμεθο πτενος οτόρ εταφςωμ νενε-αβ- Ρααμ πεςακ — observe that ραρ is not exclusively explicative nor a sufficient correlate of the CM (that is, of νε-πε).

Gen. 27:23 ναρε-νεκάκι ραρ ου Μπωι — Esau’s hairiness is not staged here as explicative background in CM, but, I suggest, as an essential — indeed, crucial — descriptive part of the plot: the disguise that is central to the ruse of Rebecca and Jacob.

Deut. 9:24 οτόρ ετεθεμπτεσωτεμ νικατακάκι πτε- τενάρτι εροκ οτρε νικεμπτεσωτεμ κατεψθον + ναρετε- Νοι ραρ νατεσωτεμ νικατακάκι εκενπερογον εταφςων ερτεμ (= Vat) — again, not staged explicatively: “In fact, you have been disobedient...” — but as an essential obtaining situation. Recycled reminiscent narrative.

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

Deut. 9:9 Ναεκ Νραμι Γείτιπωον Νεμ Κεγοο γε Σμ νεκάκι ωίκ Γκπισθωμ οτόρ Μυοο ρπισθοι — the situation here is not part of the setting, but a basic component of the evolution.
Gen. 11:1f. οὖν ναρή-πκαὶ οἱ νοτσΦοτοὶ νοτσὴτ ἑμῶτ ἐκσημίν οὐσίμιν ἄξωμι εἰςάκιμ διημζαι ... ἅδημι

Num. 11:1 (and 4:2) οὖν πιλαος ναξηρεμημ νηαππετ-

Gen. 42:7 ετακπαὶ δὲ ναξ-εἰσχαν ἐπεθεύνη ἄξω-

Num. 25:6 οὖν ἵς αὐτῶμι ... ἄξινι μπεαθνη θαμα-

Deut. 9:15 (cf. also 5:23) ετακκτὶ ἑπεσθ ἐβολ εἰπ-

Gen. 23:10 εφρων δὲ αὐξημεμεὶ σεναμήθ αὐξενδροῦ ἄν

Deut. 25:17ff. πως ξαγοὶ οὐθήκ εἰπεσθ οὐσὶς άξιζωδι

Ex. 24:17f. πικαὶ δὲ μπισθ ντεπεθ ναξοὶ μφρηθ ἑπ-

Gen. 41:46 (and often sim.) ἰωςφ ι δὲ αὐξημεμεὶ ἀμ-

(5) Verba dicendi:

Deut. 1:25 ετακκτοῦκτ αὐτὶ σεννσαθι εβολ σεπου-

Ex. 12:33, 19:19 μμανής δὲ ναξημεὶ γὲ δὲ αὐξεθραν ἄ

Ex. 17:2 οὖν ναξηρουσῳ ναξ-ε-πλαος εμωσθς ἢος ἄν

CHAPTER ONE
(6) Verbs of cognition:
Ex. 20:18 οτὸς πιλαος θηρῇ νακωτεν εφεκμή νεμ
νιαμμακ νεμτεκμή ιντεκαλλανος.

(7) Essential narrative information: incidental statal-nominal predication:
Gen. 10:8-9 κως δε αχιδεεβρόδα φαι αθερετος οντα-
φων ειδεκπαρια ναπτι ναφωφ ναρηζ...
Cf. also Gen. 42:6, Ex. 14:22 etc.

(8) Essential narrative information: statal-adverbial predication:
Gen. 2:12 πινοῦς δε ντεπικαρι έτεμας νασεη οτογ
ναρε-πιωνι νασον ανεβος μνασ (= Vat).

(9) Cut-away, focus-shift and zooming-in:
Gen. 18:16 αντωστον αε εβολ μνασ ... αρπουτ εις
προ ανοιμοα ... αβραα δλ νακοσοι νεμωσον έφτφο
μνασοσ εβολ.

(10) Resultative-iterative Aktionsart action-amplifying role:
Gen. 30:38f. ...οτογ αχανινοβον ετακκοκον αρμη αε-
νιμα αετο ντεπιεκσων ανια αρσανη ανε-νιεκσων εκσ
νεσινανοβον ενινοβον ανε-νιεκσων οτογ ναρμιν
ανε-νιεκσων ανανονον ανοι θοποι νοτωνοι...

(11) Totalizing-iterative Aktionsart action-amplifying role:
Deut. 9:22 σεντιπρωκ σεντιπρασμοσ σεναεμγας ιντε-
πουκμα ναρπενταια ακουν απεκ μπαρνος — second-
person-plural recycled reminiscent narrative.

(12) Diffused-action “plurality” Aktionsart action-amplifying role: iterative:
Ex. 18:13 οτογ ανωπι μενεκαπερπατ αανεμει ανε-
ωσες ετεγαν επιλαος οτογ ναποι επαρη ανε-πιλαος
θηρη μπαρν μνασο.

(II) να-, ναρε-/νασ- + πε

(1) “Psychologistic” information on internal mental/emotional/intel-
lectual/cognitive background states (and/or their physical manifestation)
as motive or cause or as the reason why for Evolution Mode context:
Gen. 29:20 ἁγερὼς οὗτος ἐπὶ οὗτος ἀναστὰς ἐπὶ ἡμέραν ἡμέρας ἡμέρας ἡμέρας — the same information is presented as EM (Preterite) in verse 18: ἔφυγεν ἐκ οὗτος ἡμέραν ἡμέρας.

Gen. 37:4 εὐπλήθειτε οὕτως ἠμέραν ἡμέρας ἡμέρας ἡμέρας — the same information is presented as EM (Preterite) in verse 18: ἔφυγεν ἐκ οὗτος ἡμέραν ἡμέρας.

Ex. 1:21 ἐπιθησάτω ὁ θεός ἐπὶ σάρκα ἐπὶ... ἀρχαίοι οὗτοι ἀρχαίοι...

Ex. 2:15 ἄνθρωπος ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐπιστρέφεται ἐπὶ οὗτος ἄνθρωπος ἐπὶ οὗτος ἐπὶ... σάρκις ἡμέρας ἡμέρας — the same information is presented as EM (Preterite) in verse 18: ἔφυγεν ἐκ οὗτος ἡμέραν ἡμέρας.

Gen. 37:11 ἰσχυρὸς ἐρωτ... πέριστε ἐν τῇ πέριστε ἐπιστρέφεται ἐπὶ... σάρκις ἡμέρας — the same information is presented as EM (Preterite) in verse 18: ἔφυγεν ἐκ οὗτος ἡμέραν ἡμέρας.

Gen. 24:21 παρῆκας ἐν ὑμῖν ἐπὶ οὗτος ἐπὶ οὗτος ἐπὶ... σάρκις ἡμέρας — the same information is presented as EM (Preterite) in verse 18: ἔφυγεν ἐκ οὗτος ἡμέραν ἡμέρας.

Instances of “(he) did not know” — οὗτος ἐπὶ οὗτος ἐπὶ... σάρκις ἡμέρας — the same information is presented as EM (Preterite) in verse 18: ἔφυγεν ἐκ οὗτος ἡμέραν ἡμέρας.

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

Num. 22:3 ὁ θεός ἡμέρας ἡμέρας ἡμέρας — the same information is presented as EM (Preterite) in verse 18: ἔφυγεν ἐκ οὗτος ἡμέραν ἡμέρας.

Gen. 21:20 τῇ περιστρέφεται... σάρκις ἡμέρας — the same information is presented as EM (Preterite) in verse 18: ἔφυγεν ἐκ οὗτος ἡμέραν ἡμέρας.

Instances of “he wasn’t able/could not” — οὗτος ἐπὶ οὗτος ἐπὶ... σάρκις ἡμέρας — the same information is presented as EM (Preterite) in verse 18: ἔφυγεν ἐκ οὗτος ἡμέραν ἡμέρας.

Gen. 11:30 κατὰ... σάρκας... σάρκας... σάρκας... σάρκας — the same information is presented as EM (Preterite) in verse 18: ἔφυγεν ἐκ οὗτος ἡμέραν ἡμέρας.

(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 ζανίκι γαρ ἰερ ιερήν Μπατότι εὐδοτὶ ζαρχωρ ἅνε-νηπρομεσιο οὐορ ζανίκι πε — “and indeed they did (in this case)” — anaphorically reaffirming an atemporal “event” and applying this to a historical past event.

Num. 9:16 παρὶτ ναρψον πε νυχον νιβεν οτορ Ναρε-τσηντι ζωμος Μμος πε.

Deut. 2:14f. οτορ νιεγοστ ετλαίτοσ τμοσ Μμοί .. άε Νρομπι πε ζατεζγει εβολ Ναε-τσενα θρος Ντενίρμουιι Μπολε-μιντις εβολ Σεντ-παρεμβολ οτορ Ναρε-τσικζ Μβιξ ξι γιασοτ πε εποτοσ εβολ Σεντ-παρεμβολ ζατεζγει.. — 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 explicationary relevance. So too:

Gen. 37:25 ζηππει ιε ζανίκμαλιτις εμοςί ζιπιμωθ ετνος εβολ Ζανγιλαιιαα .. Τμοσι άπο ετνος εζρι ζθι μαμι — 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 Άρσιι Ναε-πιρμοι Ναμοσι εατι πε ζατεζγεντις άμασι — a rapid, condensed paraphrastic resumé of the plot.

Ex. 2:9 ("Δρεγ επαλλοτ οτορ μανιαη ΝΗ") .. άαζι άπο Ναε-τσικιι ηιπιοτ οτορ Ναςτγιαη ΝΕ (= Vat) — another clear case of “and so she did”.

Ex. 9:23f. Άρσοσι Ναε-ποζινο ναμιλ εζρι εζεντικαζι θρος ηνθαμμι Ναμοσι άπο Ναε-πιλα πε οτορ πικρομ Ναρψοσ εβολ Σεντιλα πιαλ άπο Ναμοσι άμασι πε άμασι (Vat Ναρψον άπο Ναε-πιλα πε .. Ναρψοσ εβολ Σεντιλα πιαλ άπο Ναμοσι άμασι άμασι) — a nice alternation of narrative back-stepping and slow, closeup progress.
Ex. 14:8 οσοι ἀπὸς ἔρε-προτ ἰπαρων οὐσον οὔμ οὐκ ἀλικτ οσοι ἀσφοξις καθος ονενεψήρι μπίκα οὐκ ἀλικτ οὐσον ἀσφοξις ἀναμοώς εὐβολ πε ζενοτάξις ἐσοκι +. — condensed, resulting, summing-up conclusion.

Gen. 8:3 οσοι ἀπαθεῖν άζε-πιμοθνως + οσοι ναφτ ἄντοτ ἰζε-πιμως οσοι ναμοως εὐβολ γαπαγι + ναφτ ἄντοτ πε + οσοι ναθνως ονσοκ πε άζε-πιμως μενενα-πι ηποσον + οσοι αςγεμει άζε-πηκβωτος... — 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 οσοι άλως άλωςν άζε-πηκβωτος καπυι μπιμως + πιμως αν άλωςας πε έμαςω ριζενπικας οσοι λαφως ενηνως τηρος έτοσι... 

Gen. 32:22 οσοι ηπερουσπι ημως πε άζε-νιταιο μπεμπεο θεος αν άλωςκου άηπειδωρε επεμμάθ άηπερεμπολλ άητουν αν ημπερωρ επεμμάθ... condensing of verses 17-21.

Several particularly difficult loci probably belong here:

Num. 21:6... οσοι ἀπὸς οσπρι ονιρος εξοτι εύηλος εὐσαρεσως οσοι νασιλαπι ονσαλος πε οσοι αυ-μωρο άζε-οτινωπ ημιε οντενεψήρι μπίκα — the non-narrative information is here anaphoric and thematic, a narrative pause making for suspense. Clearly similar are:

Gen. 44:12 άφωται φωταί οτων μπερκοκ... ηπειτσετ αν επερεποτες ιζενπινου ηπατείεσφου επικωγί οσοι λαξιμι νπηκαζη άηπεικοκ ήμενιαμι (= Vat).

Gen. 40:4 οσοι αμπονοτα ταρας μεμ ΰωςμιν αυκτιτος έτοτοι ηπειτζεον ερως οσοι άλως οσοι οσόν οσκον οσκν αν άν άππη ντεμονο ονηνηςον.

(4) “Parallel shots”: marked and significant simultaneity with narrative 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 αυερερεβσκι ἀ + σκ σιτη αν οντσήριον αν δε νεμεναλωτος γιπαγως ομως οσοι παξαλαθαμ ομ ΰωςμι επιδε θεος αν θαμ οσοι επερεποκ ήρως οσοι αυκτιτος ν-ξ νεον...
TENSING AND STRUCTURE IN NARRATIVE AND DIALOGUE

Ex. 10:22f. ὃτος ἀκουστὶ ἀνε-οὖχαι αἵ-δε-νὶκαὶ ἐνδευκημεν ἐνδεπαγὼν τὴρ ἄρη νεκύμι ... ὃτος ἰππεὺς ἀνα' ἐπετεύχθων σχέδει ἄρτα παραμονῆς κατὰ τὸν τόπον ἐννεαντίον ἐκ τοῦτος ναὸς ἤδεικνυσθαὶ ὑπὸ ναὸς ἔν τε ἄνθρωπος ἐνδεπαγὼν ἔνθισθων.

Ex. 2:3f. ὃτος ἀκουστὶ μπιαλοτ εἰρήνι εἰρος ὃτος αἰχαμ ἄντεπελος ἄνεντιππαρὸν δὲ ὃτος ναογικότ εἰροπ σὲ τίτοτε ἄνε-τεπεκων ἐκι ἔνατς ναὸς εἰμι ἰε-οῦ ἐπὶ ἐτακουστὶ μικρὸν.

Ex. 13:20f. ἀρξαὶ ἐν ἄνε-νενεφζηρι μπίσλ εβολ ζενοκκοχοῦ ἀναγων ἔσομον ἐναντιπωλαζε φι τῇ ἐκ ναῖψιμωτ ἀνρωπον πε ἄτη.

Ex. 1:12f. καταφρῆς ἔνενατεβίο μικρὸν μικρὸν ὃτος ἀνανήνων ναῦας νησίτω πε ἔνενατεβίο μικρὸν ὃτος ναυοῦ ἔνθισθαὶ μπιαλ μίκαλ ἕνα ἄρτα-περιμνημενής ἀπειδωποιμεν ᾠνενεφζηρι μπισά ... ὃτος νατζεμκό μποτυμανάτ πε (πε added super lin.). Vat has ἀνανήνων ναῦας νησίτω πε/ναυοῦ ἕνα ἄρτα-περιμνημενής ἀπειδωποιμεν ᾠνενεφζηρι/μπιαλ μίκαλ ἕνα ἄρτα-περιμνημενής — this is on the whole a difficult passage. Observe that ἀνανήνων ναῦας and ἀνανήνων ἕνα ἄρτα-περιμνημενής share one πε, being a binomial complex (and not a series or concatenation), while ναυοῦ πε is the Narrator’s parenthetic comment, and νατζεμκό μποτυμανάτ πε is a reprise.

Gen. 4:2 ὃτος ἁρμων ἄνε-ακελ οντομανεσων ἄνεσων καὶν ἐκ ναλρεβλε επκατί πε (= Vat) — an especially neat illustration of the rhetoric of να质押 πε.

Sometimes, we witness a clear simultaneous anaphoric scenic setting, or anaphoric narrative-situation closeup:

Num. 22:22 ὃτος ἁρμων ἄνε-φι τὸ ἀρμων αὐλαὶ ναυοὶ δὲ ὃτος ναγράγκελος τέσσαρας ἁμοὶ ἐπαρ προὶ εἰμιμεν ἠτεπεφεσὲν πε ὃτος ναυοὶ ναγράγκελε ἠτεπεφεσὲν πε.

Age specification seems to belong under this heading:

Gen. 25:25f. ἀγὶ ἐπὶ ἐξ ἄνε-πεσσῆρῃ πεσσωρῖ μμικ᾽ ... ἀκτρεπμερᾶν ἄν εὐστ ... μενενακαῖν ἀγὶ ἐπὶ ἄνε-πεσσῶν ἵνα ... ὃτος ἀκτρεπμερᾶν ἁκαικῶν ἀνακὲ ἐπὶ ναςπὲν ἀναμονῆς πε ἐταμελεσμέναις νας ἀνε-ρεβεκκᾶ.

Also (ναςπὲν- ἄχη ἄνε- πε) Gen. 16:16, 26:34, 25:20, 37:2 etc. Consider, however, the unmistakable pertinence for the plot in ἰε-less cases like:
Gen. 17:23ff. αἱρέω-ἀφραάμ ἀπὸ ἀρχῆς περὶ ἐμ ἐξερευνήσαν πολύτιμη ἐξερευνήσαν τὴν ἐπιφύλαξιν τῆς ἱεράς... οὕτω μεγαλύτερος εἶναι εἰς ἰδίαν ἐπιφύλαξιν... ἐφραάμ δὲ ναὴρ ἔγινεν πρῶτον εἰς ἰδίαν ἐπιφύλαξιν τὴν ἐπιφύλαξιν...— 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 ἀρνάτας ἄρνη-πάκτος μόρις νυκτίς οὕτω πάκτος ναῷρος γαίνει ἐν πε (= Vat).

(5) “Omniscient Narrator’s Channel” — information on goal, intention, significance of Evolution Mode context:

Gen. 37:34 ἵκωβ ἄφωνον ἴνα ἑξαπλώσῃ... ἴνα περερήψῃ 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 ἀντ ἄρνη-, without πε):

Gen. 6:12 οὕτω ἀρνάτας ἄρνη-άφωνον ἐπικαλέσαι τοῦ ὁ περερήψῃ πε.

Gen. 42:27 ἀρνάτας ἑφθότερον ἴνα τὴν ἁγιασμὸν ἐπισκόπῃ πε.

Gen. 31:2 ἀρνάτας ἄρνη-ἱκώβ ἐντόνα ναϊλόν + ἄρνη-ναῷοι μέρις ἴναι ναῷροι ἴναι ἐφοῦσαι ἑναῖ πε...

Consider the dialogic projection of the same text in verse 5, without πε: ἀνέκτας ἄρνην ἐντόον μετενρίωτ + ἄρνη-ναὐίς μέρις ἴναι ἐφοῦσαι ἑναῖ πε.

Compare also νε-α- πε in the actential-content slot:

Ex. 39:43 ἀρνάτας ἄρνη-μωχρίς ἐνιγμήνῳ ἀποκρίνεται ὁ περ ἐνεσεμάθωσι πε.

(7) Some instructive νε- πε cases of special interest:

(a) νακοὶ μυστικὸς πε διενεργήσει τοῖοι (etc.) (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 condensed 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 Liberation 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) νακοὶ ἄρνη-να.Glide}
οτός ΝΑΙΣΟΣ, which are truly narrative and amplified at that. Similarly, in Ex. 23:9 we have ΝΑΡΕΤΕΝΟΙ ΓΑΡ ΜΠΡΟΣΕΛΙΤΟΣ ΕΩΣ ΝΔΕΝΗΕ ΕΑΝΤΩΝ ΠΕ. Only in Ex. 22:21 ΝΑΡΕΤΕΝΟΙ ΓΑΡ ΝΩΜΗΝ ΕΩΣ ΝΔΕΝΗΕ ΕΑΝΤΩΝ ΠΕ we find Vat — not P — omitting ΠΕ.

(b) Equally dialogic, and equally causal, is Num. 31:15f. ΕΕΒΕΟΤ ΑΡΕΤΕΝΤΑΝΣΕΩΝ ΝΙΒΕΝ = ΝΑΙ ΓΑΡ ΝΑΤΩΝ ΠΕ ΝΟΤΡΙΚΙ ΝΕΝΣΗΡΗ ΜΠΙΧΑ...

(c) ΝΑΝΕΣ ΠΕ, ΝΕΝΣΕΣ ΠΕ: Gen. 24:16, 26:7 ΑΕΡΕΓΟΥ... ΖΕ-ΟΤΗ ΓΑΡ ΕΝΕΧΟΥΣ ΠΕ Π (Vat ΝΕΝΕΣΕΣ 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): ΛΑΙΤ ΔΕ ΓΙΩ ΦΙΝ ΚΟΝΤΩΙ ΝΜΗΑΒΡΑΜ ΝΑΤ-ΔΟΝ ΠΕ ΝΧΕ-ΓΑΝΕΧΟΥΣ ΝΕΑΓΕΡΕΟΤ ΝΕΜ ΧΑΝ-ΣΚΗΝΗ ΝΑΡΕ-ΝΙΚΑΓΙ ΔΕ ΕΤΕΜΝΗΤ ΕΤΜΠΙ (sic, for ΦΙΝΙ) ΜΜΗΝΟΤ ΑΝ ΠΕ ΕΠΡΟΤΕΒΟΥΣΙ ΚΡΙΟΤΖΑ ΔΕ-ΝΑΡΕ-ΠΕΤΕΝΤΩΟΤ ΠΩ ΝΑΤΟΛΔΕΤΙΟΝ ΑΝ ΠΕ ΕΛΟΤΙΝ ΚΡΙΟΤΖΑ Δ/ ΟΤΟΣ ΛΑΗΠΟΤΙ ΝΧΕ-ΟΤΖΟΤ ΝΤΕ-ΝΙΜΑΝΕΚΟΥΣ ΝΤΕΝΙΤΕΝΒΝΟΤ ΝΗΣΗΑΒΡΑΜ ΝΕΜ ΝΤΕ-ΝΙΜΑΝΕΚΟΥΣ ΝΤΕΝΙΤΕΝΒΝΟΤ ΝΤΕΛΩΤ ΝΙ-ΧΑΝΑΝΕΟΤ ΔΕ ΝΕΜ ΝΙΦΕΡΕΝΤΟΣ ΝΑΤΟΛΝ ΠΕ ΓΙΣΕΝΠΙΚΑΓΙ ΜΠΙΧΟΣ ΕΤΕΜΝΗΤ ΠΕΔΕΑΒΡΑΜ ΔΕ ΝΑΙΤ... (Vat ΝΑΤΩΝ ΠΕ/ΝΑΡΕ-ΝΙΚΑΓΙ ΔΕ ΕΤΕΜΝΗΤ ΕΤΜΠΙ ΜΜΗΝΟΤ ΑΝ ΠΕ / ΔΕ-ΝΑΡΕ-ΠΕΤΕΝΤΩΟΤ ΠΩ ΠΕ / ΝΑΤΟΛΔΕΤΙΟΝ ΑΝ ΠΕ ΕΛΟΤΙΝ ΚΡΙΟΤΖΑ / ΝΑΤΩΝ.

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

Deut. 5:4 ...ΟΤΟΣ ΑΝΟΙΚ ΝΑΙΟΙ ΓΙΑΡ ΠΕ ΟΤΕΤΕΝΣΕ ΝΕΜΝΗΕ ΤΕΝ ΕΤΑΛΩΤΕΝ ΕΝΙΚΑΚΙ ΝΤΕΝΣΕ Ε-ΑΡΕΤΕΝΕΡΡΓΟΤ ΔΑΣΗΗ ΜΠΙΟ ΜΠΙΧΡΨ Γ — reminiscent Narrative.

Deut. 5:24 ...ΟΤΟΣ ΝΑΡΕΤΕΝΘ ΜΜΟΣ ΠΕ ΖΕ-ΓΗΠΙΝΕ ΑΡΤΑ-ΜΟΝ ΝΧΕ-ΝΙΣΕ ΦΙΕ ΕΠΑΛΔΟΤΟΝ ΟΤΟΣ ΤΕΣΜΗ ΑΝΝΟΜΕΝΕΣ ΣΕΝΟΘΥΝΤ ΜΠΙΧΡΨ ΕΛΩΠΙ ΑΝΝΑΝΩΤΡΤΟΤΕΝ ΤΕΝΝΑ-ΜΟΣ (= Vat) — ΝΑΡΕΤΕΝΘ 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-Ο vs. ΝΕ-ΠΕ):
(See also above for paradigmatic opposition following ἀνα “see” and with age specification);

(a) ἔν — copula with adverbial Rhemes:

Gen. 41:56 ἀναπε-πρόκο γαρ ἔν ήγεςτεπο γνίκασι τῇρᾳ πε ἀγοين δὲ ἀφε-ἰσχύν ἄνιαςῳ τῇρᾳ όντο ότορ ἄναν εβολυ ἄνιεμενχμὴ τῇρᾳ.

(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 ἔν between incidental and plot-pertinent existential (and possessive) settings, the former Narrator’s “bonus” information, the latter of true “Obtaining Situation” status:

ἐν- ὑποντε- ὃ: obtaining possession-situation — plot-essential:

Gen. 16:1 σαρὰ δὲ τσιμῖ ναβραμ νασμικὶ ναμ ἀν ἐν ἑντοντεσ-οτσκῳ μματ νρεμνχμὶ ἐπεσραν πε ἀμαρ ἔνεδερα δὲ ναβραμ...

Ex. 2:16 πιοσὴ δὲ τσεμαδιμ ἑντοντα ὢ- νοσρ ἄματ ετομὶ ἁνιεσωὸν ὑτειοσφρ ροσιοτ.

Gen. 24:29 ῥεβεκκα δὲ ἑντοντες-οτσκὸ ἀματ ἐπεσραν πε ἀμαρ.

ἐν-μμον- ὃ (very rare) — dramatic obtaining situation:

Gen. 45:1 ὅτορ ἑνμον-γαὶ ὅπι ἐρατῃ ἀμ ἰσχὺ ὁτη ἐφνάσονγς ἐνεπκννοοτ.

As against

ἐν-στον-/μμον(τε-) ἐν: explicatory-relevance background, The Omniscient Narrator’s “inside information”:

Gen. 8:9 ἄταςοο ... ἐποτὶ ἐφκτβωτος ἀφ-ἐντονον-

μωσ πε ήγεςτεπο γνίκασι τῇρᾳ.

Ex. 12:30 ἄποιςτο ἄςρων ὕωπι ἄετικασι τῇρᾳ ντε-

χμὶ ἑνμον-νη γαρ πε ἑπετον-ς ὅτο νύῃςη.

Num. 20:2 ἑνμον-μωσ πε ἂετσςαγῳς ἂςωςοτ.

Num. 3:4 ὅτορ ἀμος ἀφε-ἀλαμ ἀμ αβιοτὶ ... ὅτορ

ἐνμοντοτ ὅορι ἄματ πε ὅτορ ἀφαοςή ναδε-ἐλαξαρ

ἀμ ἕιςαρ ἀμ ἄςρων ροσιοτ.

Gen. 41:8 ἀφαρῳ ἀφ οτερακωτι ἀςοτ ὅτορ ἑνμο-

μὴ ἐτταμο ἁφαρῳ ἐρος πε.

Cf. ἐν- ἐν in the environment of “being unable”.

Also Gen. 41:49, 43:32, 45:1.
(c) Some other striking instances of πe vs. zero opposition:

Gen. 8:3 οὗτος αὕτη εφημερίς ηνώσε ... οὗτος αὕτη ινι νοσ-
πνά εξεντικαί ... οὗτος αὕτος οἱ ζε-πιμωσ οὗτος
αὐλεμβε ζε-νημοσμοί ... οὗτος αὕτην ζε-πιμωσ—
πνοσ ἀν ζε-πιμωσ οὗτος ζε-πιμωσ οὗτος ζε-πιμωσ
εβολ διαπκαί ... ζε-πιμωσ ηνώσ πε ἀν ζε-πιμωσ
ινενεπαίρετε ηνεοσ ἀν ζε-πιμωσ ηνεοσ ἀν ζε-πιμωσ
ηε-πηκηβωτος...

Gen. 34:19 οὗτος κεμπιγκ ζε-πιδελαλίπι ... ζε-πηματ
gρα πε εξεντικερ πικεκβ κιακω θεορ δε καθηνοτε εροτε-
οσων ηεβεν εκπρζεπνηκι κεμπιγκτ.

Ex. 34:29 οὗτος γιππε ναρε-πηπαλ ενθωτ της
ζε-πενεπζι ηεμπαης εκπρζω τε επεζοτε εβολ Γιππιης
οὗτος ζε-μπεμπε ζε-λαξου ζοων ζε-πηκηο
μπανομ πτεπείζω.

Num. 20:2f. οὗτος ηεημον-πεπον ζε κεπζεπναζιρν οὗτος
ηεκεκη ζε-πεμπεζεκ ηεμη ηερων οὗτος ηερε-πηπαλ
επομε ηεμπαζζεης...

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

(1) αὐ- > θαυ- 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 αεκτωσην ζε-πηκηβωτος ἀν οὗτος 
εβολ διαπκαί ... οὗτος ζε-πηκηβωτος ἀν οὗτος
ινεν ζε-πηκηβωτος ινεν ζε-πηκηβωτος
ζε-πηκηβωτος σαπωζι ηνεοσ ...
(2) αχ- > ναχ- πε: Evolution-to-Comment Mode Shift (very common):

Gen. 25:21 ἰςακ ἐκ αχμενρηθας ... ῥεβεκκα ἐκ ναχ-μει νιακυβ πε.

Gen. 37:11 άξογ ἐκ ερον ναγ-νετςννος περιωτ ἐκ ναχρεγ επιακαζι πε.

Gen. 37:24 αγμηγ εχρι επιαλκκος πιαλκκος ἐκ ναχ-ψωσων πε.

Gen. 4:2 αχμικι νκαίν ... ακοναγτοτος = αχμικι μπεςκον ἀβελ ἐκ ὁτορ αχμωπι ναγ-ἀβελ ἀνταμενεκςων ἀνταγανες-κων ἐκ καίν ἐκ ναχρεγ μεπικει πε (= Vat).

(3) ναχ- πε > αχ- Comment-to-Evolution Mode shift (anticipatory or cataphoric Comment. Common)\(^{34}\):

Gen. 48:10 νεαγροω ςε πε ναγ-νενβαλ νιακυβ ὁτορ αχμωμεκομ νιατ ομβαλ αν πε ὁτορ αχωροτεύωντ ερον αχμηγις ερποτ.

Gen. 37:28 ὁτορ ναγκντος πε ναγ-νιρωμι μιλανεος ὁτορ αγκωκ αθενισχυφ επιωπι πεντιαλκκος ἐκ νισχυφ εβολ.

Gen. 21:20 ὁτορ ναρε-ψι χν ἐν πιλοτ ςε ακαία ὁτορ αχμωπι...

Num. 15:32 ὁτορ ναρε-νενςνπι μπικα χι γιππακε πε ὁτορ αχαμπι...

Ex. 14:10 ναχμαξων πε ναγ-φαραω ὁτορ αρκοντ...

(4) ναχ- Θ > αχ- : “gear-shift” — Focus change, reducing Narrative dimensions (zoom-out) (relatively uncommon):

Ex. 1:20 θς ἐκ ναχρεπενανεμ νιρεπεμεςι ὁτορ αχμαι ναγ-πιλλος.

Gen. 31:39 ναρλος ἑπεπκαρμα ... πιγλίνι ἀχμεναγ ἑβολ γαναβαλ.

(5) αχ- ναχ- Θ > ναχ- πε: Evolution to Rich (Enhanced) Evolution to Comment Mode (relatively uncommon):

Gen. 8:3 ὁτορ ναχ-μμτοτος ναγ-πιμως ὁτορ ναχμως ἑβολ γανκαζι ναχτ μμτοτ πε ὁτορ ναχμνς ἑνβοκ πε

\(^{34}\) Na. 2:9-10 (B4) νεμνον-πεφκοπτωτ πε ατρωλεμ मपιγत नेम पिनोस ओसोग नेमन अर्नेठ मप्ताॊसले पे अत्रोय... 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. ους αγαπαει nēe-πιμωσ ους αρτωον κτωτοις ους αεςι εβολ επικαις ους ναςαμαι nēe-πιμωσ ους ναςαμος ναςαι εμαυω γιζησηκαις ους ναςαμια ναςαμιας και πιμως πιμως με ναςαμαι πε εμαυω γιζησηκαις ους αχ-

gwbc nntως τηρω...

Obs.

(1) On tense switching and its functional correlates, see Weinrich 1977:164ff., 190ff., among the first to realize the primary 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-λρ/-mpeq- πε: high CM ("background") setting

Instances of ne-λρ- 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-λρ- πε constitutes a strong explication 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-λρ-, and the opposition with ne-λρ-Ø very weak) is also a striking case of "text-syntactic subordination" (which, in fact, H. Weinrich inspiredly reformulated as narrative "re-
lief"). The particle rαp too is here virtually a pattern constituent, a CM initial boundary signal in complementary distribution with ους.

(1) neaq- πε:

(a) physical or psychological "reason why" background (rαp an integral part of the λρ- > ne-λρ- πε configuration):

Gen. 28:11 ανκοτ ματ + neaq rh rαp ewtn πε.

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

36 Weinrich 1982:195ff. qualifies [+retrospectivity] (in addition to [+inconspicuousness] and [+narration]) as a distinct type of background. See also Fanning 1990:307f., 321.
Gen. 18:15 ἀκόμη δὲ εβαλ Ὁ ἦς-σαρμα εἰσὶν Μμός άρμ-νικωβί = νεακέργον γαρ πε. — “she had become frightened”, rather than “she was afraid”.

Ex. 9:11 οὗτος οὖργος δέν ἦν πε νέη-νιφαρμακος εὐρί επάτωσ ἦν πε νέη-νιφαρμακος.

Ex. 9:31 πικάρι δὲ νεμ πικότ τεμών = πικότ γαρ νεαρ-φόρ πε ὑπὸν πικάρι νεαρέραραξ πε.

Gen. 45:26 οὗτος αὐτόμωτ νεαρέσχης νέη-ιακωβ = νεμ-πετανγοτος γαρ πε.

Gen. 48:10 νεαρκρού δὲ πε νέη-νενβαλ νιακωβ οὗτος οὖργος οὐργόμενος καὶ μβολ ἦν πε οὗτος αὐτόρωστὲν ἐρὸν αὐτὸν ἐρὼν.

Cf. Ex. 17:12 νζίκα δὲ μμωτχσ νεαρκρού πε ... οὗτος αὐτόμων νεμ γορ άρταδροχ ννεκαξ.

Gen. 26:18 παλίν αἰεακ ψεκνώντων τητειμωσον ην ἐπετόκος νέη-νιαλωσον ἐτεαβραη πειετων οὐτος νεαρωσον πε νέη- (πε super lin.).

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

(b) Content — second object-actant — of seeing (cf. νε- Ο and νε- πε above, and νεαρ- below):

Ex. 39:43 άκναν νέη-μωτχσ ενιγβονοι τιροτ οὗτος νεαρωμωσον πε.

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

Lev. 10:16 οὗτος πιβαμππι έτέεβελωνοι ζηνογκύν άγκ-κων νεαρ νέη-μωτχσ = οὗτος Φαί νεαρπορκύν πε οὗτος αὐτώντ Νέη-μωτχσ.

Obs. νεαρ- Ο is extremely rare. I find only Deut. 9:24 άτ-γο μπεκθο τητειμ νέη-νευοτον νεμ γο χν νεαρως ενεαξικος γαρ νέη-πος εκτεδνοτ εβολ (Vat. νεαρ-, 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- Ο) and variously functional Comment Mode (νε- πε) collapses, by design, in Dream Narratives (DNs). Or, put structurally: the opposition between the two embracing complex morphemes νε- Ο and νε- πε is neutralized in the DN texteme as a poetic
contrivance, a special formal combination of the two being opposed to the Evolution Mode Preterite  لعبة. This means no less than the perfection of a new and even finer poetic device. Not the obliteration of "semantic" (signifié) differences between the two narrative modes, but that to the "flat", as it were chronicling or recording EM carrier لعبة, the DN texteme opposes a special blend of the egocentric or personal perspective (cf. the Narrator-sphere Comment Mode نأ- نق), the removed-from-reality (or blurring of reality: نأ- نق again), the précis-fraught-with-significance (نق, yet again) — all these with the dramatic closeup zooming-in effect of نق- 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 نأ- Ø / نق.

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 نأ- Ø and نأ- نق opposed to the Preterite; نق occurs almost always, though not with every نأ- form, but, applying to a نأ- grouping, it as it were characterizes the narrative carriers collectively. The blurring of reality expressed by the variation نأ- نق / 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 نق forms carry the basic tableau situation; لعبة 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" (αγνάς εοτρακοτί, άινας ερωτ ηνὰ λαλ ἦνατοι, ταπακοτί θαί εταίνας εροκ, νάρθι βενταπακοτί, άινας εοτρακοτί άινας... and so on; "see" only, in Moses's vision of the burning bush); (2) γηπετ Ἰε, (Μφορτ) ικεκ signalling the opening of the Dream Narrative itself\(^{37}\); (3) (optional) the final boundary or enframing signal closing the dream texteme and resuming the "real" Narrative: αγτων, αγτων ... οτογ νεοτρακοτι 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 multilayered 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 ακ- carries the culmination or dénouement and message of the dream, rhythmically to the basically thematic κε- and κε-κε. (The verbum dicendi used is πε dikhe).

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

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

3) Static tableau becoming dynamic ("coming alive" or animated): basic thematic situation (κε-) from which simple outline movement action (ακ- ακ- ακ-) starts (e.g. Gen. 37:6ff.): this latter action is rhythmic (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 
[\text{Noun Phrase} + \text{Circumstantial present/ne- existence + pe/description ne- pe}], across the foreground of which recurrent movement is in progress (ne- pe) (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- pe); new participants joining the dreamer in movement (ne- pe) 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 γνηπτε): 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- pe); new slow-motion or closeup plot development (ne-); [Narrator’s Channel interposition: μπι-]; culmination (αq-); Narrator’s final evaluation (ne- pe).

The second Dream (abridged): static *tableau* (Noun + Circumstantial); movement (ne- pe; 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 pe. 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. ανα τον αρακοτι ρηπη ις ομοιοκ εκτακ- ροτ οπηπικα ήρε- κους ι αγαθι ετη εοργ ναρ- ιαργελοκ ντεσ τατα έπανα επαγε ναν έμεντ γιωτε 
pe + πτε αν ακτακροτ έξους pe + εοργ πεζαq αε- ... αητων τι ανα-ικωβ ντουτι (P = Vat).

Gen. 31:10 άνα τι ερωτο ρναβλα αρακοτι ρηπη ις 
αηναρη ηε κελα ανα ερη έξελικεωσ ηε
nikaemi naxiosw pe otop naxoi naxioswta nem axoxan nkeymi esmodex (= Vat).

Gen. 37:6ff. cwtem etrapacoti + eia etainar epoc + icdei nanxh xenemh+ ntkoi enmoser nakanxan otop ap-
twny nxe-paxnaq apsoi eratq astaceo nxe-neten-
chnaq axoxwnt mopanxh (= Vat).

Gen. 37:9. khippe ainaq ekeraconi + mfrh+ icdei pirh
nem nipo nem iia naxios naxiosw mmoi pe (= 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. xfrh sntapacoti + neoston-osw naloai
xh mpano pe xfrh sntbw naloai nape-oson-(Vat
neoston-) t nxaq pe otop eia nafyri evoel pe eacen-
zanmah evoel etepor nxe-nicmah naloai otop nape-pia-
phot ntepopaw = xh sntadzai isii nnualoai = sionor
xfrh epafot etenendiax mfrapaw (= Vat).

Gen. 40:16f. ainaq esotracoti + ainaq icdek-naiqi nfr
nkanoen nkonaptihc xjenentafue + xfrh de xentipka-
novan etcanphui neoston nghtq pe + evoel sennh thtrw
ewape-potro xfrapw otopos nfrw nape-nigala+t
osw mmoi pe + evoel xentikanovan etxh xjenen-
tafue (= Vat).

Pharaoh’s Dreams — the official version:

Gen. 41:1ff. xfrapw de aqnaq esotracoti + icdek-naqori
eratq pe (Vat om. pe) xjenentiaro + khippe mfrh+ nee-
vol xenfiaro naxios epwi pe (Vat om. pe) nxe-
zi neqe enaniet sennosomt + naxomy pe xenpaxh keq
de neqe + naxios epwi+ menenca-nai evoel xen-
fiaro + eztalwot sennosomt otop eswom sennos-
raqori + naxomy xaten-niwpw xtenfiaro + otop
ztzi neqe etztalwot sennosomt otop eswom sennos-
carq + atwqw nzi neqe + enaniet sennosomt otop
eswati sennosraqori + atwqw de xde-xfrapw + otop
aqwenot eti + otop aqnaq ekeraconi mmari+ khippe
naxios epwi xde-xzi xsem sennolazem nowt +
etxont + otop enanet otop ic keq de xsem eswom +
etoi xnimfpu naxios epwi menewcsw + otop api
xsem eswom + etoi xnimfpu atwqw mpiz xsem et-
cotti otop etxont+ atwny xde-xfrapw otop neosra-
coti te.
Pharaoh’s slightly abridged and differently worded locutive version (square brackets enclose Pharaoh’s additions):

Gen. 41:17-24

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): ξῆπην ἐκ ἀναρίθ нихιωθ ἐν ἥνηι ἐνηριφθ... etc.
(2) Other dream reports in Coptic. In Bohairic, Daniel’s dream (ed. Bardelli, e.g. Ch. 7 Ὀποπάσις μαγῆ) which uses only ἐν-, ἐν-, εν- and αὐ-, but remarkably αἱνατ ἐν (most often), αἱνατ and αἰνατ in mid-dream: also 2:31.
In the Early Bohairic Twelve Prophets (B4, in the unedited P. Vat. copio 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 αὐτ-πε:
Zach. 5:9 αἰνατ ξῆπην ἐκ-επιμι κοτοτ ἐνηοτ ἐκβολ ἐκτον-οτινα ἦνοττεωτ ἐτοτ ια ἦνοτ-οταν τρεποντ-ερνωτ ἰντοτοποτο
Zach. 1:8 ἐκ οτρουμί εομαλί εέκεφτο ἦνοτ ια ἦνοτ οτοτ ια αㄡαριπθ...
past) generally introduce a dream or vision; outside Shenoute, we also find μετρείς, μετρείς and even κε- (with Circumstantial). Remarkably, we find ομοίωσις in *Apocalypse Sinaitici* (Leip. IV 198), see SHISHA-HALEVY, 2007b.

(3) Scholars have commented on the dreamlike quality of Jacob's strange night wrestling (Gen. 32:25): ομοίωσις—no πε in our corpus. (Vulg.) et ecce vir lucubatur cum eo usque mane, (Vetus Lat.) lucubatur/(con)luctatus est; Greek ἐπαλαίερ (v.l. ἐπαλαίεσθαι). (The variation an intertextual-paradigmatic indicant of the distinctness of the DN texteme?) Structural narratologists have viewed this episode as a specially instructive narrative "in nutshell": see Barthes in Barthes et al. (eds.), *Analyse structurelle 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 αὐτός / αὐτώς variant reading against the prevalence of ἐν ἡμείς / ἐν Εβραίος Θεό; 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 ομοίωσις ομοίωσις and μετρείς μετρείς insist on the textemic 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 rswy"); episodes/dreams introduced by jw.w dd; main carrier: perf. sdmf and wḥ.f sdm; Obtaining Situation: Present, 8/3, 9/5, 12f. ṭw j w ṭ3-ḥny 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. 100, p. 116), introduced by Second Tense or Emphatic, jḥfr pny-n rstwy; DEPUYDT 1994:60 (No.2, with n.29): — the Present (discussed in the context of Stern-Neurstedt's Law); Setne II 1/1 (Circumstantial opening and resume: rswy jw.w md...). See below, for notes on Egyptian narrative grammar. For Late Egyptian see the famous Chester Beatty dream-interpretation papyrus (GARDNER 1935:9ff.), where the dream itself is conditioned in the "adverbial paradigm": Stative, prepositional phrase, circumstantial sdm.f, the ḫr + infinitive convert.

(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, "oneirocrtical", 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 LAMBRRECHT 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 1986:368f. (Imperfect). A.L. Lepschy (1996:112f.) seems to misconstrue the transition from imperfetto to passato remoto in the following dream passage from Pulci’s Morgante (43.2ff.) — my italics:

Io ho fatta una strana visione: / Che m’assaliva un serpente feroce; / non mi valeva, per chiamar, Macone; / onde al tuo Iddio,... / Rivolsi... 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 fatto 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 tutt’e 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 robe 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 sveglio...Destinaccio maldetto!
L'avevo messo dret' 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 corroendo da una casa e si recava da un fabbro: un giovane ricciuto, coi 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 fermava, gli si inginocchiava davanti e gli diceva: “Benedetemi, 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”, 1975:79f., 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- te.


(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 277f., LOHMANNM-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 “prudelic” 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. 525f. on the prudelic role. EK 1996:122ff. (the scenic present in French); ANSCOMBRE 2004:81 (ex. 45) and 83 (ex. 56); LIMBS 1960:98 “un écart 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 prudelic 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): “Dychmygych eich hunain ar y daith, yn cerdded dwy’r mwd gan deimlo’r
tir yn gwewian oddi narch. Un cam seithug... a gallech gywmpo i ddyfroedd duon pwll diwaelod. Byddai'r gywnt yn mwmlai yn gwyfannus ym migau'r llwni bedw, a byddai rhaid gochel hag llihro ar y mwsgol... Codai tarch o'r ddyfroedd 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  **nirwmi enatq'enq'po.**

Gen. 21:17  **aq† cwtem etcmi miialo eboq qenpima enaqxh mmoq.**

Gen. 39:13  **nh enaccadi mmwot nemaq.**

Deut. 3:2  **niqamorpoq nh enatqop qimh mmiqordanhe.**

Deut. 4:46  **cwnq potoq qteniqamorpoq fiq enaqwop qeneceqwn.**

The only exception to this I am aware of is negative, predicating cwotn ("psychologistic" Omniscient Narrator's information):

Ex. 1:8  **aqtwuq nxe-keotpo qenqxmni fiq etenaq-cwotn an pe niwcf (= Vat).**

(Deut. 32:17 [Vat]  **qempx ati †notq nh enape-notio† cwotn mmwot an pe** has ne in our manuscript; emend to pe? but see below, Chapter Two, on the mysterious qenwq ne).

(g) **pe with other conjugation forms**

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

These forms appear to be the nearest in structural essence to the CM ne-/nea- 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  **pee mmawatq pe etaqenot mmoon-kenot† nqemmo nemqot pe (= Vat).**

No need to restore here ne- (pace Andersson 1904:143, Schenke 1987:548).
Lev. 4:22 εὑρὼν οὖν ητε-πιαρχών ερνοβε ... εγνατ αν
πε (πε super lin.) (= Vat).

Gen. 18:11 σαρπα δε ακοτεμ εκδατένη ητε-κενην
γιφαγοι μισοι αβραμ δε νεναι σαρπα εκερήβλο πε
εαναι σεννοτεγοι... (Vat neta-).

Gen. 29:17 αια δε νεοσαινης τε παρα δε νενανεκ
πε σεννεκσοτ ουσον ενεσως πε σεννεκσο εμαισω,
sim. Gen. 39:6 (both = Vat) — these are instances of the formal Circum-
stantial “carrying on” ne- as its conversion base.

Num. 15:34 ουσον ανεγιντη επεσετεκο μπατονεμι ΓΑΡ πε
#εναν πετεντενα νααιη παν. μπατον- is probably not Circum-
stantial, 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 “re-
dundant” or “pleonastic” πε (“verdächtig und darf gestrichen werden”) ³⁸. The phenom-
eron, 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 2η- 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 al-
ready 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 2εαρε- πε (AM
II 194), but 2η- 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. εγνουμυ πε (very com-
mon; e.g. AM I 34); generally speaking, 2ουμυ, 2ουην, εμι occur most frequently
accompanied by πε, in the Imperfect, Preterite and Circumstantial; other themes char-
acteristic of conjugation forms often coupled with πε are the thematic Statives 2ι, 2οι and
2ωπ. Obviously, this issue needs to be carefully studied in specific corpora. More im-
portant, however, is the narrative Comment Mode example 2η- πε in the early B4 John
(19:24) ητεσαι ατερναι πε (27:42) #εμηνυ μεν...ηνητ ηροτ 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 μεν (itself
ana/cataphoric, topologizing and forward-pointing); the B5 text has here οσν.

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 (?) Sin-
nesänderung”, adding exx. from the NT and Nitrian texts. Stern himself (1880 §375 on
ητα- πε) identifies cryptically “die copula πε, die als ursprünglich neutral zu fassen
ist...”.)
(2) ἡ φανάρι τοῦ ρητορικοῦ εἰσαγωγούμενον — ἐξηγητική θεωρία:
Gen. 35:18 ἄκουσα εἰς ἐκεῖνα τοὺς ἀπεικόπτοντας ἡ φανάρι τοῦ ἱερείου καταβαίνοντας Ἰερ.

(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 detaching-from-reality roles of (ἡ φανάρι) πε converge in irrealis apodoses:
Num. 22:33 εἰσεγέρεσθαι πε ἐν ἡ προσεχεῖσθαι πε ἡ ἡ οὐκ ἔνατος πε (ἡ φανάρι)
Not wholly clear to me, but apparently superordinative, is also
Num. 34:5 ὅταν εἴγοντας τοῦ τοῦ εὐχαριστοῦ εἰς τῷ θεῷ πε (= Vat) Greek ἐστιν ἡ δίδασκον ἡ ἄλλασσα

Obs.
(1) On πε with apodotic Future tenses99, cf. POLOTS 1939:110, quoting also εἰς 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 POLOTS 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 εἰς (see below), but rather superordinating πε and superordinated future.

(2) Mac. No. 20 p. 109 ἐνάκοιον ὑποτάσος πε resp. εἰς τὸ πε has πε in both Allocation and Response, both in Focalizing Conversion.

(3) The Preterite (ἡ φανάρι) occurs in Shenoutean Sahidic with πε in superordinating nexus-focussing function: ἐμμὸν ἔσχα πατὴρ πε γενικὸς Παντοκράτωρ (Shenoute Amél. II 341) “...otherwise, they would have been considered heretic”; εἰσεγέρθηκα...πετάσκοντας...οὐκ εἶπεν ἔσχα πε (Amél. 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 ἐναντίον τοῦ εἰσαγωγοῦσαν εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ ἦσαν πε (= Vat).
Num. 14:2 ἅμα εἰς ζήσαντας τὸν ἁγιασμόν τοῦ τέσσαρας ἡμέραν (Val ζήσαντας πε).
Num. 22:33 εἰσεγέρθηκα τοῦ πε ἐν ἡ προσεχεῖσθαι πε (ἡ φανάρι)

99 This construction is hardly the “functional heir” of Egyptian sdm.k3f (pace De-
puydt apud Loprieno 1995:261 n.199; and rightly Vernus 1990c:96f.): yet πε is not a
sequelling, but a superordinating-hyper-rhetorizing exponent, and at that rather the
“heir” of Egyptian #NEXUS + pw#.
(5) Focalizing Conversion (Second Tense) + πε:
Ex. 16:8 οσταρ μανων καρον αν πε (n super lin.; Vat naq-, no πε).
In Bohairic, outside the corpus:
επε-ναicαξι νεwν ντοτκ πε (AM II 238).

Obs.
(1) The construction is well attested in Sahidic: _nsec_επειμα 'αΡω ννας πε John
6:25 (not in Palau Ribes, Chester Beatty, Lycop. or Boh.); _nsec_ ας ζυοις πε John
(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 “mrw fpw” “It means that...” and even “c’est
que...” (Polotsky 1976 §26.4). We have as yet no attestation of πε following nexus in

(6) Lev. 8:31...ους πεξεμωτοις πε ιαρων (Vat om. πε)
This example is, I believe, unique. I cannot account for πε here.

(h) Micronarrative subtextemes and their systems
Chronicling narrative: carriers ας- vs. ιαρ- πε (age correspondence):

Gen. 5:31 ους αςωπι ιας-ειςμος θηρον ιτελαμεχ
ψηλ ιναμπι ους αμοια ους ιος ιαις ιαρξι ιεμπι
πε ους ανω ςες ςες-τιν μομπι.

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” ας- carrier, with πε- wholly absent.

“Recycled reminiscent condensed Narrative”: Deut. 1-3, 5:22-25,
9:8-10. Note the change of personal axis (3rd plur. to lst sgl./2nd plur.);
carriers ιτας- ας-; πε- rare: πε- γαρ without πε (9:24:25); πε- θ for concomitant (“obtaining situation”’, 5:23, 10:3) but also πε- θ for
Enhanced Evolution (9:9), in this special edited narrative sequence
which is in fact almost entirely made of highlights; very rarely πε-
πε, that is (2:15 [=Vat] is evidently a case of und zwar; in 5:24
ιαρτενξι υμοις πε [=Vat], the people’s declaration is presented
as cataphorically significant and even crucial). Cataloguing, not
sequencing ας- ας- ας- (e.g. 3:7f., 10:3), with a different ους vs.
zero ratio and function; also, a different dialogue / narrative ratio.
1st-person-centered "locutive" Narrative: Gen. 1:29, 27:2:6 ενηπνευσαίον — "nynegocentric" perfectum prae sens; Gen. 3:10 (Cleft Sentence); Gen. 24:34-37 (Report merging into Locutive Narrative)40. Report (historical or generic-hypothetical) reveals dialogic features:

Gen. 3:12f. ἔγεισθη ετακτική ἡν τὸ έπος ήσυχήν Σεπνιοῦθεν ἄιοτος ... πρὸς πεταφέργας μοι διοτόμω — topicalization, focussing (Cleft Sentence).

Deut. 26:13f. αἰτίανοι ὑπὸ ἑορτὸς ἐβόλο Σεπνιοῦθεν διήνυσαν αἰτίανοι σπείραν εἶπεν ἑορτὸς καὶ μπαραμία: εντοξιϊτη έκμετάλλωσεν ἡν τὸ έπος έξοδος καὶ έμμοιον έπεμπάσαν εμπροσθεν πρὸς έβόλο έμμοιον ... — 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 ταγεξουρηνίτι αἰθες (Greek. δεδομένων) μπαραμία εντοξιϊτη έκμετάλλωσεν ἡν τὸ έπος έκμετάλλωσεν επεμπάσαν εμπροσθεν — topicalization; compatibility with the Present tense.

Also Gen. 39:14ff. Σεπνιοῦθεν; - appositive έπι en- relative construction; interlocutory pronominal compatibility; Gen. 41:10-13; 42:30f.; Ex. 32:23 έμμοιον γαρ...

Rather surprisingly, we do not find the Focalizing Conversion in Report narratives (the FC occurs in Narrative included, as object of cognitive 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. οὕτως ἐκείστηκεν ἐκείστηκεν ἡμεῖς οὕτως εἰμὶ ἡμεῖς οὕτως ἡμεῖς οὕτως εἰμὶ ἡμεῖς διδάσκοντες διδάσκοντες διδάσκοντες διδάσκοντες διδάσκοντες διδάσκοντες...

40 The quintessential delocutivity of the written French "Preterite [passé simple] Narrative" 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 device 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 "1" (Benveniste apud BANFIELD 1985b:7), making the tension and alternation between the EM and Narrator/Audience-oriented CM so real and important as a poetic principle.
The generic hypothetical scenarios in Leviticus and elsewhere are instances of legal or preceptive narrative scenario, case-raising ("fall-setzend") that postulate complex possible event sequences akin to generic conditional protasis-apodosis complexes, even when not introduced by εὑσσείρι "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, thematic 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 εὑσσείρι δὲ ἡτεορφυρχὴ ερνοβι ὁτορ ἡτεορφυρχὴ ετεμήν ὑνταναῦ ὁτορ φαί οὕθερε πεί ἵ εὕσσει ὑεκεμὶ εἵ πρῶθεο εὕσσεσι ὑπὸ μνειμὸν.

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 ὁτορ φαί ἡτεομεν), may share in coordination or disjunction with the unconverted Nominal Sentence, or with the definitively generic verbal noun (cf. Lev. 5:21 ἵ εὕεοσμετουφύρπ ἵ εὕεοσμετουφύρπ ὑδούν). 

Lev. 5:17ff. ὅτερῳ τὴν ἕτεορφυρὶ ὁτορ ἡτεοκερνοβι ὁτορ ἡτεοκερνοβι νοτι
TENSING AND STRUCTURE IN NARRATIVE AND DIALOGUE

ννιεντολη λτεατνε ετεενυε βνιοτη αν οτογ Μπελεμι. οτογ Ντεεφση οτογ Ντεαλι Μπελνοβι οτογ Εεεινι εζότν Ντολνιλαι ... οτογ Εεεχω Ναν Εβολ.

Lev. 17:3ff. Φρωμι ... Φι ετνασοΛβελ Νομαλι ... Νεμ
Φι ετνασωτ Καβολ Νταναεμβολν οτογ Ντεεστεμενη
εφενυφο Ντικκνη ... οτονολ αφονοε Εβολ.

The Preterite may convey the significance of the events as explanation basis for the outcome, with Ραρ:

Lev. 20:12 εωσι ντενταλ νκοτ Νεμ οτεελετ Νταλ Μα-
ποτδοθοβον Μπβ + αεασεβνος Ραρ οτογ Ερωσ.

The “adulterous woman” episode (Num. 5:12-31) is especially sophisticated and rich in grammatical information. Starting off with Φτρωμι αρεσαντευζου ερπαβενιν οτογ Ντεεγπο
Μμοο Φενοισιγο, it has the Conjunctive as “case-raising” EM carrier and the Absolute Future for the “directions”, almost recalling scenic instructions and narrative EM. But it also features the Preterite and Circumstantial Present for Narrator’s Channel behind-the-scene CM, events and states (including cognition) respectively (13 + Εαι αε δε αε-
εωμε + Εαι Μπεσερβοκι, 14 Εαι αε εεεφο, 27 Νπεμι Αν [Cir-
cumstantial]), the Nominal Sentence with Ραρ for legal significance and definitions (15), dialogue with allocution (19ff.) 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 (εεε-, see Dialogue Tensing below), with an interplay of οτογ and zero for linkage: ειεσιτολ Γαρ εζότν επικαρι Νααιβον ... Εεεουμ
Εεεαθστολ οτογ Εεελ οτεεκοτογ Εγαννοτν
Νκεμμο εεεωμεϊ (Vat εεεσεμεϊ) Μμωον οτογ εεε-
Ακων Νλι οτογ εεεδμε εβολ Νταδιεθικ...

Obs.
It is of interest to note that the original Hebrew uses ki-yiqtol for initiating these legal narratives, and distinctively w-qataal both for the main carrier (contrast wa-yiqtol 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 Conjunctives following Εαν or δς Εαν 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 *yagcwtem* 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 *ne-*) 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 *ne*-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 *ne-*: included; metanarrative; extra-Narrative (chronicling); naming.

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

Gen. 25:3 *aqmou eougello pe eqxhke ebol.*

Gen. 25:21 *naytwry moq pe eobe-rebekka xe-otag-phin te — xe- introducing reason for action, in Comment Mode.*

Gen. 38:16 *mpqemi gap xe-teqwleet te — xe- conditioned by the verb.*

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

Deut. 33:1 *fai pe picmou etagcmon moq ne-mwvchc.*
Gen. 36 passim ΝΑΙ ΝΕ ΝΙΑΦΟ ΝΤΕ-ΗΣΑΥ ... ΝΑΙ ΝΕ ΝΕΝΨΗΡΙ ΝΑΔΑ ΤΟΠΗΙ ΝΗΣΑΥ ... ΝΑΙ ΝΕ ΝΙΗΓΕΜΜΩΝ ΝΤΕΝΕΝΨΗΡΙ ΝΗΣΑΥ.

(c) The Copular Pattern — naming:
Gen. 2:11-14 ΦΡΑΝ ΝΟΤΑΙ ΜΜΨΟΨ ΝΕ ΦΗΣΩΝ ΦΑΙ ΝΕ ΦΗ ΕΤΚΛΨ ΕΠΙΚΑΡΙ ΤΗΡΗ ΝΕΤΛΙΑΤ ... ΟΤΟΡ ΝΙΑΡΟ ΜΜΨ-Γ ΝΕ ΠΙΤΙΓΡΗΣ ... ΝΙΑΡΟ ΜΜΨ-Δ ΝΕ ΦΑΙ ΝΕ ΠΙΕΣΨΡΑΤΗΣ.

(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 ΠΚΑΙ ΔΕ ΝΕΟΣΤΑΤΝΑΣ ΕΡΟΨ ΝΕ ΟΤΟΡ ΝΑΣΟΒΓ.
Gen. 3:1 ΠΙΓΟΨ ΔΕ ΝΕΟΣΚΑΒΕ ΝΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΟΣΤΕ ΝΙΕΝΡΙΟΝ ΤΗΡΟΤ.
Gen. 6:9 ΝΨΕ ΔΕ ΝΕΟΣΡΨΜΙ ΝΕΜΗΙ ΝΕ.
Gen. 25:27 ΟΤΟΡ ΗΣΑΥ ΝΕΟΣΡΨΜΙ ΝΕ ΕΨΣΨΟΨ ΝΤΜΕΤ-ΔΕΡΗΣ ΝΡΕΜΝΚΟΙ.
Ex. 32:16 ΝΙΠΛΑΔ ΝΕΟΣΡΨΒ ΝΤΕΦΓ. ΝΕ.

(b) Comment Mode: anaphoric background situation
Gen. 11:30 ...ΟΤΟΡ ΑΡΨΡΑ ΝΕΟΣΤΑΤΨΡΗΝ ΝΕ ΟΤΟΡ ΝΑΝΨ-ΨΨΡΙ ΑΝ ΝΕ.

(c) Comment Mode: Narrator’s Channel: extra-narrative glossing.
Ex. 16:36 ΠΙΟΓΟΨΜΟΡ ΔΕ ΝΕΟΣΡΨΜΗΤ ΝΕ ΝΤΕ-ΠΙΓ ΝΨΓ.
Contrast, in a dialogic locutive report, no NE- conversion:
Gen. 46:32 ΝΙΡΨΜΙ ΔΕ ΣΑΝΜΑΝΕΣΨΟΨ ΝΕ ΣΑΝΨΨΜΙ ΓΑΡ ΝΡΕΨΨΑΝΕΨΨ-ΤΕΨΝΗ ΝΕ.

(d) NE-converted unexpanded Delocutive (rare) — anaphoric Comment Mode characterization:
Gen. 14:18 ΟΤΟΡ ΜΕΛΧΙΣΕΔΕΚ ΠΟΤΡΟ ΝΣΑΛΙΜ ΔΗΕΝΨΑΝΨΙΚ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΕΜ ΓΑΝΨΨΜ ΝΕΨΟΨΗΒ ΔΕ ΝΕ ΜΨΓ ΕΤΣΟΣΙ.

(e) NE-converted expanded Delocutive (rare) — explicative background Comment Mode:
Gen. 43:32 ΝΕΟΣΨΨΨ ΓΑΡ ΝΕ ΝΝΡΕΜΕΝΧΨΜΙ + ΝΕ ΝΑ ΝΕ-ΨΨΟΨ ΝΙΒΕΝ ΝΤΕΝΙΕΨΨΟΨ.
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 ἀχῶπτι δὲ ἐτατοὔτι γεννᾷ γηπῆ νελιά τε.
Gen. 15:17 επίαν δὲ νεφνατ ναώττι μφρή πε + ὀτσαρ ἀχῶπτι — the Greek has here ἐπεῖ δὲ ἐγινετο ὁ ἡλιος πρὸς ἀνομιὰς; Coptic seems to read the confirmative ἐπεῖ with δὴ "already", and not a subordinated clause.

Gen. 40:20 ἀχῶπτι δὲ ἑννιεγοοτ ἥμαρ-τί πε + νεγοοτ ἐμίς ἐμφαραί πε. This locus is somewhat problematic: the separator in πε + νεγοοτ is unique (Vat has here no separator until after πε), and raises doubt as to the converter status of πε- (the Hebrew has no verb or pronominal Theme).

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

Gen. 25:24 οὖτος ἀνομος εβολα νδε-νεσεγοογ εβεσεμικ οὖτος νεζαναθετες κνατ γενεκ 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 ομονοί α δε εἴσακ εποῦε εβολα δενεδέ α ονος ωαστεο μπρο μπκλε τηρή.
Gen. 2:10 οιαρο δε εἴσακι εβολα δενεδέ.

Obs.
See BIEDENKOPF-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 pragmatic situation.

(II) The Aorist ὑαργωτὲν in Narrative:

This is an especially interesting form for our examination from several points of view, both contrastively — Greek has no special correspondent for it — and internally, both synchronically and diachronically ὑαρ- (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 а{в}{й}ян- and superordinated. 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. а{в}г- differs from the Generic (or Non-actual) Present in ways that will be precised below. One is its very occurrence as a "habitual" narrative tense. It is extratemporal in narrative as well. It is not turned into a past tense by т{е}-, but rather given narrative compatibility and cohesion. Note that а{в}г- almost never occurs delimitatively, in Theme-switching (а{в}реп-), but always in personal linkage (а{в}г-).

Obs.
Sahidic narrative т{е}-а{в}г-, perhaps typically, corresponds often to unconverted а{в}г- in Bohairic: Ex. 33:8, Num. 9:17:18 — although Sahidic too occasionally documents the unmarked narrative Aorist⁴¹. See De Vis II 133 for the rare narrative м{т}а{в}г-

(1) Unconverted а{в}гсвтвм

(a) Comment Mode: Omniscient Narrator’s Channel, explicative extra-narrative information:

Gen. 50:4 παρηρ+ гап ωαρεπηνεργοσ нτενικωσ.

(b) Non-specific action in Evolution Mode Narrative: features of regularity, procedure and protocol. Typically, sequelling in apodosi to narrative eventual-temporal protases (а{в}ян-, м{е}ненкα-, н н{и}б{е}н et-, ег{у}н), i.e. superordinative. Affirmative and negative.

Ex. 18:26 а{в}го егπη еπιλαος пη н{ө}ννοι н{и}б{е}н д п{и}καξι ет{г}ροψ ωαρεπη еп{у}μι га-м{в}τρ{г}н д {к}а{г}и н{и}б{е}н ет{а}иων ωαρ{г}г{н} еρ{у}οι н{ө}νοι.

Ex. 33:7 о{т}о оγ{у}μι о{т}о н{и}б{е}н еτκω+ н{α}гπων еγ-в{μ}γαν еβολ е{г}κκην.

Num. 9:17 еγ{у}μι др{е}σαντε+{г}пι γενακ ... м{е}н{е}нκαναи ωαρωτεβ... (Greek Aorist).

Num. 9:23 еβολ γιτ{η}νπιοναγα{г}нι нτενπεц ωαροσωτεβ н{α}р{г}ας еν{е}οφερψи нτενπεц (= Greek Aorist).

Ex. 33:11 о{т}о а{г}п{д} ε{к}α{г}и οτ{е}μωτρ{г}н ег{у} о{т}εβερο... о{т}о а{в}г{к}αρ еβολ е{г}κκην еτ{п}αρεμβολ.

Ex. 40:37 еγ{у}μι д е{μ}πατεσ{ε}νακ еπ{у}μι н{з}{е}+{г}п{п}и м{π}αρ{μ}μωι ωαρεπηνεργοσ е{γ}α{σ}в{ε}νακ еπ{у}μι н{з}{е}+{г}п{п}и.

⁴¹ The conversion system of the Aorist is not straightforward, testifying to the intricate synchronic and diachronic profiles of this very special form. Cf. QUECKE 1979:441, SHISHA-HALEVY 2003a.
Gen. 30:42 ἐσωπὶ δὲ ἀρωμικὶ ὲδε-νιεσωτὸς ἡμᾶς.
Also Ex. 33:8f., Ex. 34:34, Ex. 40:36f.

Obs.

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

Num. 11:4-10 οὗτος ἀρχιμὶ ἄντιμοι οὗτος πεζονενεωρὶ μπέλα ἡνιμ επναβα δαν ενωμ ... ἐνβαλ σενατ εραὶ ἀν εψαλ ἐπιμανα παμανα δε καρητ ἄνωτερως δος οὗτος πεζομοτ νεμοτ νοσχρισταλος οὗτος ὑαβὶ ἐβαλ παζε-πιλας ἐσκαὶ μμο β ... οὗτος ἐσωπὶ ἀρωματοι ἔπειραν εραὶ επεντ επενταρημοι μπεζωρ ὑαβὶ επεντ ἐπεντ ἡνιμανα εἰπες οὗτος ὑαρκστεμ ερωτὶ ἀρχιμὶ ὲδε-ματς κατανοσαλμος πιοταί πιοταί γιρπεπερῳ οὗτος ἀρκατς ἱενοτιβόν ὲδε-πις ἐμαγω οὗτος ἀραπ-πετες ἐπεισεμο μματς (= Greek Aorist).

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 οὑμανι δὲ ἐσωπὶ ἐψαλ ἐβαλ θειεδεμ οὗτος ὑαστο μπρο μπας ἀρπη.
Gen. 2:10 οὑμαρ δὲ ἐσωπὶ ἐβαλ θειεδεμ.

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

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

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

Ex. 17:11 οὗτος ἀρωματοι ἀρωματοτας χαὶ ημνηστὶκ ὑαρκαστον ἡς-πῆς ἐσωπὶ δὲ ἀρωματω ημνηστὶκ εἰςην ὑαρκαστον ἡς-ἀμαλλ (in Greek, the Imperfect).
Num. 21:8f. God’s instructions to Moses: ὅποι ἔκεισεν ταῦτα Ἰακώβος ἀργεταὶ ἔφεσεν μὴ ἔμψυξεν ἐν αὐτῷ ὅποι ἔκεισεν. The narrative realization of the same program: ἔκεισεν ὅταν ἀρέστη Ἰακώβος ἐναπλασία ὅποι τεράστων ἔφεσεν μὴ ἔμψυξεν (= Greek Imperfect).

Ex. 16:21 ἀρχανγέλῳ Νέξη-Φρή ἡ ἄρμανδο εἶ θα μ εῦ (i.e. the manna).

Gen. 39:3 ἁγαμεῖν δε Νέξη-περικεφαλεῖ  ἔπειραν Νέξη-περικεφαλεῖν καὶ ἀνεμάζω Νέξη-περικεφαλεῖν γεωτικοί ἀνεματίματοι νείρας Νέξη-περικεφαλεῖν (= Vat). Properly a narrative scenario-in-allocution (Dialogue) form, ἀνεματίματοι here expresses regular (“natural”) inevitable procedure, and the same verb recurs, coordinated and marked by Νέξη-περικεφαλεῖ, Greek καὶ ἑτίκτον (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 Νέξη-converted: Νεῦργασὼ τῆς (Νέξη) (rare).

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

Gen. 13:10 οὐκ ἀρκεῖ Νέξη-περικεφαλεῖ ἐπηρμ. ἀρκεῖ Νέξη-περικεφαλεῖ ἐπηρμ. Τῆς Νέξη-περικεφαλεῖ (Νέξη-περικεφαλεῖ) (Greek ἦν ποτίζομεν).

Gen. 29:3 εἶ θαντὴ μετα τό νεῦργα τό περικεφαλεῖ οὐκ ἐντὸς τό Νέξη-περικεφαλεῖ οὐκ ἐντὸς τό μπερικεφαλεῖ (Vat ἐρος) τό μπερικεφαλεῖ (Vat Νέξη-περικεφαλεῖ) (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 ناق- 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 ϋατ-/νεγαθοτ etc., our ςταν-, cemot 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-3w- + Aorist in Demotic, attested from Ryl. IX on. Incidentally, the fact that ناق- is typically apodotic to ناون- 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 “antinarrative” device, for chronicling or cataloguing or for vivid, dramatic, focussed or highlighted narration, that is for episodal enhancing expressed in Coptic by نإ- without نإ). This absence is structurally important; I take it as yet another symptom of the independence of the Coptic translation of Vorlage 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) نإ-included or converted Present/Adjective Verbs, following نات “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 οτογ λγνατ نإ-Φ↑ εποτωιν نإ-نانإق
Gen. 28:8 οτογ λγνατ نإ-Ησατ نإ-Σεγωοτ نإ-نيوئ-πντε-νικανανοεοσ.
Gen. 29:3 εταγνατ نإ نإ-πυτ Φ↑ نإ-Σεμοστε ناια...

Also Gen. 42:1, Num. 24:1.

Obs.
Note that, following نات “see”, we encounter an actantial-content opposition paradigm of ناق- نإ vs. the present: in the latter case, نات is cognitive-perceptual (“perceive”) rather than visual, and evidently has a different valency: نإ- + verb-form is second actant.
(b) Converted: Relative
Gen. 15:11 ati de eπεσεν ναε-νιγαλαβ ἡξεννίκωμα ετφινῳ.

(c) Converted: adverbal, adclausal, adnexal, adnominal Circumstantial:
Gen. 21:22 πενε-αβιμελεξ ... εφετω τμος τε... 
Gen. 34:25 αςωμπι δε νεριν θενπιεςος μμαυ-ταπτενθ θενοσικαι... 
Gen. 27:34 αςωμεβαι εφαλ θενοσινιντι νεμην εσενωπι εμαυω.
Gen. 26:8 αναν ειςαλκ εφεωβι...

(d) The unincluded Present is rarer:
(1) Comment Mode ("Omniscient Narrator’s Channel"): general information; ethno-/geographics:
Gen. 2:12 πινος πε τεπικαρε ητεμματατ ναεμ.
Deut. 2:11 γεσπορα ερωα τε-νιομμιν.
Cf. also Deut. 2:20 (κεμοσπι τερωα).
Num. 13:21 οτοσ πικετεος νεμ πιετουςες νεμ πια-
κορπος οποσ θενπιαντωος.
(2) Comment Mode: Descriptive/backgrounding (+ πε)
A single instance: Gen. 26:7 θεν-οθη γαρ ενεκως πε θεν-
πεςο (= Vat, Greek + Ἡ).

Obs.
μπατεσ- in narrative is always Circumstantial (zero-converted: see below, Chapter Four), as a rule following the Preterite:
Gen. 41:50 τωςιφ τε αωθρι ε ωωμπι ναρ μπατοςι ναε-τις νπομπι νηκο
Num. 13:22 οτοσ ατκετεκβρυν ν-τις νπομπι μπατοσκετ-κανι...
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 νιουρως ετανεροπο θενεδωμ + μπατεσοπο
ωωμπι θενπια
CM, explicatively backgrounding, are also the rare instances of nemπατε-, with γαρ:
Gen. 2:5 nemπατεφ τε γαρ εφωμπι εξενπικαρι οτοσ nemφον-ρωμι πε
(also in the NT: John 3:24, 11:30).

1.1.5 Narrative Texturing: Juncture. "Ordination" Hierarchy. Information Blocking and Packaging.

Discussing the transition configuration of tenses, above, we were concerned 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, deli-
miters, is signifier of a textual contour or patterning of juncture. Junc-
ture 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 narra-
tive staging and information packaging); then, the high-level thematic-
ticity/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, GULICH, 1990; Irish, see VAN
HAMEL 1940:221+ n.1; MACCANA 1996) occur in pre-Coptic Egyptian, in Old Coptic
(SATZINGER 1994 217[a])42, and in Coptic NT parables, but not in our corpus. For general
discussions, see GULICH, HEGE and RABLE 1974; WENOLD 1983.
(2) Narrative juncture is of course just one set of juncture signals among numerous oth-
ers: 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, Introduct-
ion., 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. Junc-
ture Environments

(1) Zero vs. non-zero linked concatenation. The formal opposition
evident in contrasting combined events such as Num.26:10 ἀνκαὶ
ο啕 ς νρμχ ἄρομκοτ with Num. 11:31 ἄστιμα ἐβολ ὀτός
ἀρεξινοπ is familiar from many texts in various dialects. It has
been variously identified as carrying a junctural function, with zero a
link43, signifying, through inner cohesion, a certain grade of event
blocking; this is the marked term of the opposition (the narrative
asynthesis is very “Egyptian”, yet with a specific Coptic inversion of

42 ECENKATKE 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 (Sornicol 1985:15, with ref. to Hofmann’s Latinsche 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 Redewiege” 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 ἀνθρώπειν Ὄνομα ὢν ἔν ανακτεῖ Μητέρας ὢν πεντενήσεω ἔν ανακτεῖ, and Num. 12:11 Ἄπε-ου τι Αναπαρατεί Ανθρωποί.
(2) Sahidic, and rarely Nitrian Bohairic (cf. AM II 158 ἄρκα οὐσίος άρκημεν ἀρτοθβοῦντ ἀπὸ οὐσίος άρκημεν άρτοθθοῦν...) use also the Circumstantial ēq- 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 sdm.n.f in Middle Egyptian.
(3) Μεμ 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 μαρεζ, see Polotsky 1987b:161, and further below (Dialogue).
(5) Consider zero coordination also in the special resigné 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 ἄρτο in concatenating sequences.

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

(3) μαρεζ-: the negative Evolution Mode delimitation. In Comment Mode (μαιρο- ἢ πι), negation does not delimit per se, while it is

44 Kleeber 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. **αὐξι** ὀφιναὶ θηρός ὁφοῖοι ἀφερσεὶ ἀμαζοῦσιν ὅτι 

**Ex. 16:24** ὁφοὶ ἁμειᾳ ἀθανάτου κατὰ-

φρήν ἐπάθησαν ὅτι ναὴ ἀμφότερον ὑπὸ ὁφοῖο

**Num. 9:6** ὁφοὶ ἀναστορεῖ ὁφοὶ ἀναστορεῖ ὑπὸ ὁφοῖο

**Gen. 30:40** ὁφοὶ ἀμαζοῦσιν ἀμαζοῦσιν ὑπὸ ὁφοῖο

**Gen. 38:15** ᾠρίστα ἀμαζοῦσιν ἀμαζοῦσιν ἀμαζοῦσιν ὑπὸ ὁφοῖο

**Gen. 38:20** ἀμαζοῦσιν ἀμαζοῦσιν ἀμαζοῦσιν ἀμαζοῦσιν ὑπὸ ὁφοῖο

**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, si, jhr, jsk, jst), but also by zero as “absence of iw”. 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:172ff., 192f.); the Stative expresses the “obtaining situation” (Shipwrecked Sailor, 23ff.). The “narrative backbone”, or evolution carrier, is the **s$jm.n.f** form (Actor + Stative for verbs of movement and some other intransitives). Wn peripheral forms express i.a. enhanced evolution, also the past durative or habitative, while ‘h’ and lw/ln- hpr.n, wjn- etc. are Evolution Mode “foregrounding”, accelerating, chunking delimitations. Other important EM delimitations are hpr.n-, the specific narrative s$jm.n.f,⁴⁵ 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 s$jm.n.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 perfect46, the reasserted
Proper Name47 and so on) occur in Demotic, varying in role: hprf jw- /Temporal/adver-
bial , w't wwnw t3-jr hpr, (hpr) t3-wwnw n.jjr.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,
VOLKEN 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 "for-
ward spurt" configuration (3/8, 12/9f., 18/12.24, 19/12f., 20/4ff/24f. etc.). Especially
striking in Mythus is e-hwnn3w-wn - to introduce a story-within-a story (2/8, 16/15ff., 17/
9f., see SMITH 1992:83) and j.jr.w. hpr e-hwnn3w-wn for episode opening (18/21f.). The
Circumstantial converter too is a common delimiter, of a higher linkage value (Setne II 6/23ff.). On the important delimitation signal j.jr.s hpr , in Ryl. IX preceding the Circum-
stantial jw sdmf (cf. ácqwáthi eáq.), see VITTAMANN 1998:269ff.; "ein Stilmittel, nicht
durch grammatisch-syntaktische Erfordnisse bestimmt" (271) ignores macro-syntax;
"Für die Übersetzung bleibt es gleich, da i.ir.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 dis-
course signalling than Egyptian, seems ideal for this purpose. See also VITTAMANN
(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 where that paragraph represents a new section of a larger incident", see
MALONEY 1989.

(4) Deixis, Anaphora and Cataphora in Narrative. The deictic sys-
tem of Coptic is relatively simple, even when compared with pre-Coptic
Egyptian. In our Bohairic narrative, {Φαι}, actually the locutive ("I-
deixis") and interlocutive (I/you-deixis) deictic index, is generally used,
as for information supplied by the Narrator-Locator: menencáfaí (e.g. Gen. 38:30), menencá-náï-egóso ðe ëtòw ëtemmár
(Ex. 2:23), ðetówtev ebol ðai (Gen. 37:17; seemingly equivalent
here to ðmâs "there", e.g. Ex. 10:7), ðai ðe ñàçxn... (Gen. 38:5)
where the demonstrative is topical and cohesively marked alternant of
the personal pronoun; the same pronoun occurs in EM as well as
CM: (Gen. 38:10) ðqíwvb ðe ðwòpi ëgqòso ðmêmbo mûf ðe-áqíri ðnàïgwò òtòg ðqíwtev ðpàixet, náí ne-... (e.g.
Gen. 36 passim), ðái ðe ñéqsmòt ëtaçqtmòt mnoq ðçè-
mâxchc (Deut. 33:1), ebol ðënnaí ðqíwvb ðbol (Gen. 10:5),

(ERICSEN 1956 3/4), we have, not a concatenation but a "negative catalogue".


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, ΦΑΗ/ΦΗ et-: see SHISHA-HALEVY 1994:228ff. (with complex reference differences of phoricity and “deictic tone”).

(2) The Preterite, the main narrative carrier, is evidently compatible with the “hic and nunc” ΤΟΝΤ (“now”) only in strongly presentative locutive dialogue, where it is then resolved as a perfectum praesens (cf. Berschin’s review of H. Weinrich’s Tempus1, BERSCHN 1979:89): (Ex. 3:9) ΟΤΟΡ ΕΡΠΗν ΤΟΝΤ ΙΣ ΠΡΩΣΟΤ ΝΝΕΝΨΗΡΙ ΜΠΤΙΧ ΛΑΙ ΕΝΨΩΝ ΓΑΡΩΙ.

(3) The temporal/local deictics of the “then”/“there” type (German da, Welsh yna, Italian allora, Hebrew az and so on), Evolution-Mode onset (“foregrounding”), episode-de- marcation and narrative-hierarchy exponents, familiar from European and other narratives, do not occur in Coptic in a comparable role (ΤΟΤΕ “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 is in a similar role). For some discussions of general issues involved, cf. STAMMERJOHANN 1977, WÄRVEN 1987, 1990 (esp. 535ff.), BIRNTON 1989, SCHIFFER 1990: grammaticalized (co)text-deictics, typically with true context-deictic homonyms.

(4) EM onset and episodes, as defined by Van Dijk apud BINTON 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 ΑΓΥΜΠΙ (ΕΤΑΦ-) ΑΓ- (see below) and/or agents topicalization, usually with ΔΕ. See EHRICH 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-semantic-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 representation 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 οτοσ ἄγγελαις ΝΕ-ΜΩΤΗΣΕ εξοσν ... οτοσ ἄγ-
γελαις επετίωσν...

Gen. 20:4 ἄγγελαις ΝΕ-Δῇ θὰ εἰςβιμελέσε ... οτοσ πεϊα
尤其是在 ΔΕ ... άβιμελεσ ΔΕ ΜΠΕΙΣΟΙΡ ΕΡΟΣ...

Gen. 38:15 ΔΣΑΤ ΓΑΡ ΝΕ-ΔΑΧΛΩΜ ΠΕΡΙΒΗΕΡ ΕΡΝΙΩΤ
ΘΟΙΟ ΔΕ ΜΠΕΙΤΗΙΚ ΝΑΙ ΕΩΣΓΙΜΙ ΟΤΟΣ ΕΤΑΘΝΑΣ ΕΡΟΣ
ΝΕ-ΙΟΥΔΑΚ ΑΦΗΣΙ ΔΕ-ΟΣΠΟΡΝ ΤΕ ... ΟΤΟΣ ΜΠΕΙΣΟΤΟΝΕ.

Gen. 47:22 ...ἐπανεπίκαιροι ΝΝΙΟΥΘΒ ΜΗΣΑΤΒΙ ΜΠΕΙΟΙΚΗΒ
.Xna ΔΕΝΙΟΤΑΙΟ ΓΑΡ ΝΑΙΤΙΑΙΟ ΝΝΙΟΥΘΒ ΝΕ-ΦΑΡΑΒ
οτοσ ΝΑΣΟΥΜ ΜΠΙΤΑΙΟ ΕΤΑΘΝΙΓ ΝΝΟΥ ΝΕ-ΦΑΡΑΒ.

Obs.
(1) See Ross 1996 for the junctoral interplay of (repeated) Proper Names and appellatives with pronominals, especially in Latin (520ff. for the noun as delimitation); Shisha-

(6) “ΔΙΑΚΩΒ ΑΓ-ΓΕΝΑΣ”: 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 macrostructurally operative and fully valued (and
marked) in its paradigm, used superordinatively in the final part of a nar-
native EM chunk:

Gen. 25:33 ΔΗΣΑΤ ΔΕ ΔΥ ΝΝΙΜΕΤΕΩΡΠ ΜΜΙΚΙ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΙΑ-
ΚΩΒ.

Gen. 32:2 ΔΚΟΤΙΝ ΝΕ-ΑΒΑΝ ΑΓΓΕΛΑΣ οτοσ ΔΙΑΚΩΒ ΔΓ-
ΓΕΝΑΣ.

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

Obs.
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:182f.) sup-
ports the expectation that a nexal dependency may also be topicalized; see also
(7) The Narrative/Dialogue interface involves several striking inter-
textemc delimitations and boundary environments:

(a) Dialogue in Narrative is of course ubiquitous, with ἄε- an ob-
ligatory boundary signal for the "suspension of narrative" ("he said" —
πεξακ etc. — is fully on narrative ground). This is a theoretically dif-
cult issue, which I cannot address here: Dialogue is not merely inte-
grated into Narrative, but it is part thereof, and part of the main-line nar-
native development.

(b) The narrative projection of a dialogic texteme (in the configura-
tion 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 "ἀνιοτι νηι ητηατοσωμ" οτορ ανιιη ναι αγο-
τωμ.
Gen. 18:26 "γενκ εροι νια-οσφι ερωι" οτορ αγιεγινη
εροι αγφι-φι ερωι.
Gen. 27:21f. "γενκ εροι πασθρι νιαδηεμζεμ εροκ" αγ-
ιεγινη ιιε-ιακοβ βαικακ πειιντ αηζομζεμ εροι.
Ex. 10:21f. "κοστεπεκξιζ επωιι ετφε οτορ μαρεη-
ωνπι ιιε-οτκακ" — αμωτησ κοστεπεκξιζ επωιι
ετφε οτορ αηωοπι ιιε-οτκακ σιμ.14:26f. etc.
Gen. 29:27/8 "ζεκ-πι οση νηοι εβοι ντεθαιι οτορ ειετ ιπηε
νακ" — αζεκ-πι εβοι ντεθαιιι οτορ αλαβαν ἰ...

(c) Dialogic projection of Narrative (Narrative > Dialogue):
Gen. 31:2/5 ακηασ ιιε-ιακοβ επο ιιαβαν νιε-ηαποι
μφητν ιιαη νεμ η εφοω σηηαη ναν πε... "τιατ ανοκ
επο μπετενιωτ νιε-ηαποι μφητν ηιαη νεμ η εφοω
σηηαη ινηηιαν".

Note here the telling of dreams. Observe the persistence of the fuzzy-
reality signal πε in the telling:
Gen. 41:1ff/17ff. Φαραω ακηασ εοηρακοτι νιεαη-ηαποι
ετρη πε ιιζεν-φιαρ ηιηπηε μφηητν ιεηεβοι ιενφιαρο
ναη ηηοο επωιι πε ιιε-ξιε νεηε εηαηεο etc. ...ιπιωη
αε ιιηε-Φαραω οτορ ακηκοτ ετι οτορ ακηασ εκερακοτι
ιιαη ιτιοηπηε ηαζηνηο επωιι ιιε-ξιε ιιεηκ ιιεοιηο
ιεηνηο ηαζηνηο οτηωτ εηαηο εηαηεο οτορ ιιεηκ ιιεηκ

48 The astounding ζιηνκ (dd.n.f?) in the Schøyen Matthew (Oxyrhynchite dialect, ed.
Schenke 2000), 8:32, is certainly part and parcel of the plot.
εκψων εσώι ΝΑΙΜΦΕΓ ΝΑΣΝΗΟΣ ΕΨΩΙ (ετc.) — dialogized (reported) as:

ΝΑΙΡΗ ΣΕΝΤΑΡΑΚΟΥ ΙΚΕΚ-ΝΑΙΩΓΙ ΕΡΑΤ ΕΚΕΝ-ΝΕΝΟ- ΦΟΤΟΙ ΝΗΦΙΑΡΟ ΟΤΩΡ ΕΗΠΠΕ ΝΗΦΡΗ ΝΑΣΝΗΟΣ ΕΨΩΙ ΣΕΝΝΙΑΡΟ ΝΑΕ-Ζ ΝΕΓΕ ΕΝΑΝΕΣ ... ΝΑΣΝΟΙ ΝΕ ΣΕΝΝΙΑΧΙ ετc. ΑΙΤΩΝΤ ΔΕ ΟΤΩΡ ΔΙΕΝΚΟΤ ΔΙΑΣΕ ΟΝ ΣΕΝΝΙΑΧΙ ΝΗΦΡΗ ΣΕ ΚΕΧ ΝΕΔΕΜ ΝΑΣΝΗΟΣ ΕΨΩΙ ΣΕΝΝΟΤΛΑΣΜ ΝΟ- ΡΩΝΤ ΕΡΨΟΝΤ ΟΤΩΡ ΕΝΑΝΕΣ ΟΤΩΡ ΝΙΚΕΖ ΛΕ ΝΕΔΕΜ ΕΣΩΙ ΝΑΙΜΦΕΓ ΝΑΣΝΗΟΣ ΕΨΩΙ ΕΑΔΟΡΨΟΙ ΝΕ (ετc.).

(d) Narrative-in-Allocation: a compressed embryonic narrative subtexteme:

Deut. 24:18 ΟΤΩΡ ΕΚΕΕΡΦΜΕΤΙ ΔΕ-ΝΑΚΟΙ ΜΒΧΚ ΠΕ ΔΕΝΠ- ΚΑΡΙ ΝΧΗΜΙ ΟΤΩΡ ΑΚΣΤΚ ΝΑΕ-ΝΙΣΕ ΠΕΚΝΟΣΤΙ ΕΒΟΑ ΜΜΑΣ (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; FLEICHMAN 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 πεκνος, 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) ΕΤΑΚ-... ΑΚ-, in conjunction with ΑΚ- ΑΚ- ΑΚ- 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, e'taq- 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 e'taq-:

(a) Theme-agens maintained:

Gen. 24:16 e'taq i acmaq ntegepiapia.
Gen. 24:63 e'taq xoruny nneqbal aqnas.
Gen. 25:8 e'taqmotnq aqmoy.

(b) Theme-agens switched or asserted:

Ex. 32:1 e'taqnas nxe-pilaco xe-aqwoc nxe-mwhchc... aqmoy nxe-pilaco.
Gen. 37:4 e'taq nas de nxe-neqcnhoz xe-peqiwt me mnoq eboal osteneqwnpi throv qmectqw nxe-neq-

cnhoz — note here the dynamic nxe-construction of the Theme-

(3) No topicalization is present, but rather adverbial clause pre-mod-
ification:

Gen. 38:29 gwc de e'taqen-teqxiq naq catotq aqi eboal nxe-neqcon. — catotq resumes here the pre-modifying clause, while the temporal "protasis" is a form of high-level topicalization⁴⁹; the inverse sequence, aq- ... e'taq- is very different, the Temporal oc-

(3) (egwnt) aqhan- ... aq-. The so-called "Conditional" is not conditional in narrative. It is, like e'taq-, topical, but not to the tempo-
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(3) (egwnt) aqhan- ... aq-. The so-called "Conditional" is not conditional in narrative. It is, like e'taq-, topical, but not to the tempo-

Ex. 33:8 εὖμι δὲ ἐρχεῖμοι νἀ-μωτήρτῃ ωρογί 
ερατῇ νἀ-πιλοκ.

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

ἀκουστι [Adv.] ἀκ- Gen. 7:10, 8:6:13, 14:1, 19:34, 22:20, 30:41,
etc.

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

[ζενπανηρ] Gen. 19:29, 24:52 — see detailed dis-
cussion below, Chapter Three.


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

ἀκουστι [μπατ-] εἵπεκ εικ + noun. ἐκ (Gen. 24:15).

ετακ- ... εἵπεκ εικ ἄκ- (Gen. 18:2).

And the non-adverbial topicalization:


ἀκουστι itself is firmly anchored in the Hebrew-Greek ‘calque’
correspondent (ἦγερετο), yet continuing an Egyptian
narrative device using ἕπρ “become”from the oldest
phases on — is conjointly the formalized delimitier and
the Narrator’s cataphoric signalling of new develop-
ments to come.

Obs.

(1) Dialogic/locutive εκενουστι 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 in-
version or the “Arriva le général” construction, a verb-clause thematicization reintroducing
a Theme and signalling an “Evolution Onset”. Cf. BLINKENBERG 1928:88ff.; LERCH

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

(4) On superordinated temporal sequentiality as an action-propelling or foregrounding
device, see DECLERCK 1996:110ff.; DECLERCK 1997:188ff., 212ff.; TOMLIN 1985,
THOMPSON 1987:440ff. and MATTHEIEN and THOMPSON 1988, (on the correlation of
grounding and “ordination” in general); RYCHNER 1968, FLEISCHMAN 1990:176ff. (Old
French si superordination); GROSSMAN 2007 on Nitrian Bohairic.
The paradigm following ἄνω ΑΕ-/ΟΤΩΓ:

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

| ἄνω [Ø 1st OBJ. ACTANT] | ΑΕ- λαq- Gen. 8:13  
|                          | ΝΑΝΕΣ Gen. 1:10:12 etc.  
|                          | ΠΡΕΣΕΝΤ Gen. 28:8, 29:31  
| ΓΗΠΠΕ ις λαq- Gen. 33:1  
| ΑΕ- Nominal Sentence Ex. 2:2  
| λαq- Ex. 34:35  
| ΟΤΩΓ ΝΑQ- πε Gen. 6:12  
| ΟΤΩΓ ΓΗΠΠΕ ΝΑΝΕΣ Gen. 1:31  
| ΟΤΩΓ ΓΗΠΠΕ ις SUBST. λαq- Ex. 14:10  
| ΟΤΩΓ ΝΕΑQ- πε Ex. 39:43  
| ΓΗΠΠΕ (SUBST.) ΝΑQ- Gen. 19:28, 29:2  

(THEME) (RHEME)

This scheme is, I believe, of interest for the insight of a zero 1st object actant in the case of ΑΕ- 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) ΒΑΣΙΤΟΣ ις ΡΕΒΕΚΚΑ ΝΑΜΗΝΟΥ ΕΒΟΛ, or (Num. 25:6) ΟΤΩΓ ις ΟΤΡΩΜΗ ... ΛΩΝΙΝ ΜΕΡΕΜΟΝΩ, while certainly evolution onset or even peak delimitations, differ in the Presentative used (ις, not ΓΗΠΠΕ (ις)), which does not complement ΝΑQ “see”.
(2) In Dream Narratives, ΝΑQ ΕΟΤΡΙΑΓΟΥ “see a dream” is arguably also continued actorially by the specific narrative sequence (see above).

(c) Connectors and disjunctors: ΟΤΩΓ, ΔΑΔΔΑ etc. Particles: ταπ, ΑΕ, ΑΞΕ, ΟΥΝ. The Augens

ΑΕ and ταπ 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) ΑΕ 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 ΔΕ (νεοq) | ——, in EM, CM (background information) or locutive Narrative:

Gen. 4:2 οτιν άθωσιν νξε-αβελ νομιανεσων ν καιν ΔΕ ΝΑΨ ΕΡΨΒ ΕΠΙΚΑΓΙ ΠΕ.

Gen. 24:27 ζωμαρώσση τ νξε-νςε Φ Τ ΜΠΑΣΕ ΑΒΡΑΜ ΦΗ ΕΤΕΜΠΙΤΧΩ ΝΧΩΨ ΝΤΕΨΑΙΚΕΟΣΤΗΝ ... ΑΝΩΚ ΔΕ ΑΝΣΕ ΚΟΥΤΕΝ-ΝΑΨΗΤ ...

Gen. 27:32 οτιν Νξε-ιαακ πεψιτ ΝΑΨ ΔΕ ... ΝΕΟΨ ΔΕ Νξαξ Νξε- ...

Non-thematic high-level topicalization:

Gen. 29:31 εταχνας ΔΕ Νξε-νςε Φ Τ ΔΕ-ΣΕΜΟΤ ΝΛΙΑ ΑΨΟΨΩΝ ΝΤΕΣΟΤ.

Topicalization as episode-opening delimitation:

Gen. 41:50 ιωσφ ΔΕ ΑΨΗΡΙ ΙΨΩΝ ΝΑΨ.

Gen. 26:8 Νξαξ ΔΕ-ΤΑΨΩΝ ΤΕ ΑΨΕΡΓΟΤ ΓΑΨ ΕΔΟΣ ΔΕ-ΤΑΨΩΝΙ ΤΕ ... ΑΨΩΨΙΝ ΔΕ ΜΜΑΣ ΝΟΜΗΝ ΝΕΟΟΤ ΑΨΟΨΩΝ ΤΕ ΔΕ Νξε-ΑΒΙΜΕΛΕΧ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΕΨΗΨΨΩΝΤ ...

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

(2) γαψ (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 ναψ- πέ (it is certainly part of the pattern in νε-α- πέ cases). However, it is often coupled with Evolution Mode Preterites (true evolution) or νε- (obtaining/relevant situation, etc.) as well: but reason-giving may well not be restricted to the Comment Mode, and γαψ 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 γαψ — or some occurrences thereof — part of a metatextual utterance? I believe we are dealing with two distinct entities or two roles of γαψ: the first, delimiting, parenthetical, 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, explicable to the preceding segment.
(a) The case of γαρ linking within Enhanced Evolution or "Amplified Episode": ἃναγή.

Gen. 47:22 ὑστερ-πατὴ ρήματα παείωσις ὑστερφάτη γαρ ἃ ἃναγή "and this, since..."

Gen. 27:23 ναπέ-νερξία γαρ ωρ ἡφαι (see above, under νερ.)

Gen. 29:9 νοῶς γαρ νάσμοι ννιεσώτω υποκοιμήτω.

(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" rhythmic addition: "...and this he did/had he did so, since..."

Gen. 19:30 ἂγι ἀγ ἐπιβίωσι με-λωτ...ἀπερροθεμένο γαρ (sim. 20:2, 26:7): the message is his being afraid. This is a neat case of mode opposition, for ἃναγ-πε is of course usual for "psychologicist" 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 οπερκον ομοία ετεμματ ἔνθε-θεθα ομοία γαρ ετεμματ ἄφεν οτονγη ἐρον (cf. also Ex. 2:22, in dialogue).

Gen. 38:16 ("He said to her: let me come in unto thee") μπερεμεί γαρ ἔνθε-τερηθεκες τε.

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

Gen. 38:11 περε-ιοτας ἁγ νεήμαρ... αρξως γαρ τε-μηνπος ντεηκότω (sim. 21:16).

Ex. 13:17 μπερεσίμωτ οικωτο με-φή... αρξως γαρ νας-φή... τε... (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. ναπέ-πεγκο γαρ χν ζησενπερο μπικαρ τηρη

πε οφετων ἁγ νας-ιωσθη ηνιαγυπ τηρον νκοτο οτογ
naq† eboλ ... απικο γαρ άνεμωμ† εικενηκαιρι τηρη "and he did this, since...".

Deut. 34:9 αινοσω πνευρι ναση μος μπα ηκα† απα- 
νεκιλ Ραγ εμων πανε-μωτησσε.

Ex. 13:19 αμωτησσε ωαι ΝΝΙΚΑΣ ΝΤΕΙΨΚΟΦ ΝΕΜΑΡ 
αναλ γαρ αινοςφ ταρκενενσνηρι μπικα...

Locutive Narrative:

Gen. 37:17 ααρωτεσε εβολ ταί αρωτεμ γαρ ερωσω ευ- 
ωλ μμος άε-παρον εωωταίμ.

Deut. 2:10 πνευρι γαρ ντε-λωτ αι† ναρονρ νωοτ ... ΝΙΟ- 
ΜΜΩΝ ΓΑΡ ΝΙΩΡΠ ΝΑΤΩΡΝ ΓΙΩΤΑ ΠΕ.

(c) Delimiting γαρ with ΝΕ- ΠΕ (Comment Mode):

Gen. 31:32 (28:11, 29:9 and often) Ναζεμι γαρ άν ΠΕ.

Ex. 12:30 ΝΕΜΟΝ ΝΙ ΓΑΡ ΠΕ ΝΠΕΟΣΟΝ-ΜΟΤ ΝΣΗΤΩ.

Gen. 29:2 ΝΕΑΦΡΗ ΡΑΓ ΓΩΤΝ ΠΕ.

Gen. 45:26 ΝΕΜΠΕΠΤΑΝΣΟΤΟΣ ΓΑΡ ΠΕ.

Clearly parenthetic is

Gen. 35:18 ΑΣΨΩΠΙ ΆΕ ΕΚΝΑΤ† ΝΤΕΨΤΧΝ — ΝΑΣΝΑΜΟΤ 
γαρ ΠΕ...

Other particles are rare, or virtually excluded, from Narrative in our 
corpus (see Chapter Four). In Gen.22:7, άε corresponds to άε in Vat. 
The typically dialogic or expository οσων, 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 αιαε-ταρασοντι οσων ΝΝΙΝΕΨΡΑΝΩ... (= Vat).

And once in Delocutive Narrative:

Gen. 27:35 πεξακ οσων ΝΑΚ ΆΕ... (Vat ΆΕ), apparently similar to

Gen. 22:7 ΝΕΟΝ ΆΕ ΠΕΞΑΛ ΆΕ... (Vat ΆΕ)

Obs.

In Greek Narrative, ονων 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 Ophuizen 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.

\[ \text{ω} = \]
Gen. 22:20 ις ΜΕΛΧΑ ΓΩC ΑCΙ.
Gen. 30:42 άΓΩΨΙ ΑΕ ΝΔΗ-ΝΙΑΤΜΗΝΙ ΝΛΑΒΑΝ ΝΑΝΙΜΗΝΙ ΓΩΣ ΝΙΑΚΩΒ.
Gen. 27:31 άΡΩΜΙΟ ΓΩΨ...
Ex. 7:11 άΓΙΡΙ ΓΩΣ ΑΗ- ... ΜΠΑΙΡΗ.$.

\[ \text{θεο} = \]
(cf. Subst. ΔΕ ΝΕΟΨ-, above)
Num. 22:22 άΨΕΝΑΨ \text{θεο} \div ΟΨΟΓ ΟΨΑΡΓΕΛΟC ... ΑΨ-
Also Gen. 29:37, 30:1.

\[ \text{μαστ} = \]
Gen. 32:4 άΓΨΩΖΝ \DE ΝΔΗ-ΙΑΚΩΒ ΜΜΑΣΤΑΨ.

\[ \text{θρ} = \]
Ex. 4:19 \text{θρο} ΡΑΓ ΘΡΟΥ ΑΗ-
Gen. 24:36 ΑΨ ΝΝΗ ΓΝΑΤΝΤΑΨ ΘΡΟΥ.

(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 οψογ 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 οψογ 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 οψογ/άςω (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:

\[
\# \text{αψ} - ... \text{αψ} - ... \text{αψ} - \# \\
\# \text{αψ} - \# \text{οψογ} \text{αψ} - \# \text{οψογ} \text{αψ} - ...
\]
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 ḥōq, 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., 192f. 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. 27:14 [1+2] ἄρσελαν ἄρσιτος ἀρένος πνευματ ἄνθιστα ἐντεύματ θειοίον ννικότωσι


Gen. 25:1 [1] ἄορστιτος λδε-ἀβραάμ ἄρσι πνοςγιμι...

Ex. 32:20 [1+2] οὗτοι ἄρσι μπινικι εταέαμιοτος ἀροκρα λδεοτωρωμ οὗτοι ἄρσιτος λδενερομ ἀροτέμως ἀροτέρα ἐπιμινωτος οὗτοι ἄρτκο ννέννυρι μπιμά (narrated procedure).

Gen. 26:30f. [1+2] οὗτοι ἄριπι πνοσωπς έρωτος: ἄρσωμι. οὗτοι ἄρσων. οὗτοι διασωμοτος πνοσωτ τατττ + ἄρωρκ νωσο λδε-φρωμι μπερφυρ οὗτοι διατάφος λδε-ῦκακ + ἄρσενως ἐβολεν ἐραο... (cf. 24:54 etc. ἄρσωμι + ἄρσων).

(b) οὗτος-coordinated or punctuation-delimited single event or event blocks:


Ex. 4:31 [2+2+1] οὗτος ἄρνας λδε-πιλαος οὗτος ἄρωσι λδε-αράκσμπ οὗτοι λδε-φρωμι μπιμα λδε-άρεισ τος λδε-αρεορξεξ οὗτος διαριτι επεκτ οὗτος λδε-πιλαος ἄρωσωτ.

Num. 14: 45 [2] οὗτος δια επεκτ οὗτος λδε-πιλαολοκ λεμε πι-κανάμεος εττομ επιτωτ εττεματ + οὗτος τετιοι νωσοτ + οὗτος τατσκεετ νωσοτ υαξρηι εερμα + οὗτος αράρε βετενμαλπ...

(c) *Zero* coordination may narrate dramatically:

or else be the narrative projection of a post-imperatival Conjunctive:
Gen. 27:26f. [1] ("ζενκ εροι + ματσφι ερμω") ὀτογ
ἀψενάμ εροι τστιφι ερμω.
Gen. 27:21f. [2] ("ζενκ εροι παιμηρι + νταξομζεμ εροε")
ἀψενάμ ἀξε-ιακωβ ἐα-ιελακ πεζιωτ + ἀξαζομζεμ εροε.

(d) Opposites of single and double event blocking for the same verbs:
Gen. 30:14 [2] ἀψεναμ ἀξε-ρομννι ξενιεροον ντε-
πωσε-κτο τστιμι νταξομζεφεθ, vs. Gen. 30:10 [2] ἀψε-
ναμ ἀε-ιακωβ εδοτι ζαροε ωτον ἀξερβοκι ἀξε-
ζελη (and not Leah).
ἀελι ενιζματαλι ἀψεναντ... vs. Gen. 4:8 [2] ἀτωνκ
ἀξε-καιν εζεναβελ πεζιον ωτογ ἀψενεβεθ.

(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 junctional and information-structuring gram-
meme of high importance, a key exponent of a complex formal/func-
tional system\(^{51}\). 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 inform-
ation 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></td>
<td>Theme &gt; participle Rheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Base + Theme &gt; conjugation-form</td>
<td>(2), [(1)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Theme infixed in conjugation-form</td>
<td>(2), [(1)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Conjugation-form &gt; (αξέ-) 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 GALANDE 1964. We encounter a formal system complex as the
Coptic one: a triple placement paradigm, with important post-thematic “mutation” mark-
ing and concord, "inner-verbal" (Zakrzewska’s term, ZAKRZEWSKA 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 link-age, 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-
wining 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 ἀρκωτέμ and ναρκωτέμ 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] + conjuga-
tion-form #.

Gen. 4:1 ἀδαμ ἀν ἀρκωτένετα τεχερίμι.

Num. 14:6 ἵλος πυρὶ νναθ ἔνε ἅλεβ πυρὶ νιε-
φων ἐπολ δενην ἐτεκεπ-πικαῖ ἀνφυρ ὧνναγ-
βως... 

Gen. 16:1 σαρα ἀν τεκερίμι ναρβαμ ακμί... 

Gen. 15:12 ερε-φρι ναρωτι ὁστωμ ἀγι εξεναβραμ...

Gen. 4:2 ουσι αρκωτι ναγ-αβελ ὁτα ἀγι ᰟερβ 

Gen. 12:6 νικανανεον λαγων ἐξενιπικαῖ μπιχον 

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 con-
struction, 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?) de-
limitation — and forward action-propelling device. It signals a clean
break in the narrative chain (typically, accompanied by ἀν, 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 infor-
mation (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 com-
mon with ναρ- (πε) or νεαρ- 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 ἵππος Πυθρὶς Ἀρνᾶς Ἰερωμᾶς Χαλεβ Πυθρὶς Νικόφων Ἐβωλ δὲννην ἐταξητικάς Ἀρφὼν ἅπαξβοῦκας, 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 οὗτοι οἱ θεοί αὐτοὺς Ἀμώμαχ, Ex. 21:13 ὂς ἄνθρωπος εἰς ἔρθη ἐπερχόμεν. Gen. 21:6 οὗτοι ἐκαστὸς ἄνθρωπος. 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 ὥσικ ἰπτεντοῦμι οὗτος ὅποι ἰπτενενκὼ. Num. 8:26 γωβ ἔς ἱνεζεφεργυβ.

(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 preposed dative of articulated Proper Names with a passive verb: Gen. 2:2 ἅμα ἐς Ἰούδημον-Βοηθοῖς ἅρω, 10:20 οὗτος οὗτος ἅμα ἐκαστὲς ἅρω. Passivization does not serve in our corpus for FSP exopone 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 ἀνικατ δὲς ἀπὸ ΝΝΝΙΜΕΤΘΟΡΙΝ ΜΜΗΚΙΝ ἘΒΟΛ ΝΙΑΧΩΒ.

Gen. 32:2 ἀρκτός ΝΝΩ-ΣΑΒΑΝ ἈΨΕΝΑΡ ὅτος ΝΙΑΚΩΒ ἈΨΕΝΑΡ.

Gen. 33:17 ἄρταςαρ ΝΝΩ-ΧΑΤ ... EΧΕΙΡ ὅτος ΝΙΑΚΩΒ ἈΨΕΝΑΡ ἨΝΚΙΧΝΗ.

52 Andersson 1904:8 considers this ungrammatical. Note the indefinite Topics in Gen. 9:4 ὅταγ ΙΣΙΟΝΟΜΟΝ ἱπτεντοῦμος, also ὅταγ ἱπτεντοῦμος ὅτριν ἱνεζεκοὐ (De Vis 1 192).
Lev. 8:21 οτογ αμωσχεσ αφινιν πιμωια τηρη (cf. 24 οτογ  
αμωσχεσ αφινιν ιπνπυρι ναρπων...).

Gen. 28:12 ...οτογικι εκτεαρμοτ σενπικαρι  οτογ παρη-
νιαγελοι ντεφτντ ναρνα εγωμεν ναρνανος επεχη.

Gen. 41:4 οτογ ατγικι νεγε ετεαιωντ σενποτικοτ οτογ  
ετσωμ σενποτερα ρωμεκ ντιζι νεγε ετ εονανετ...
(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...οτογ αιπνεμτ ναριπω ωμεκ ιπνπωβοτ  
ντεμν which is, however, more dramatic and solemn.

Obs.
(1) The marked [base+Theme]-topicalizing construction (b) # 2- Theme αγκωτθεμ # —  
with its discontinuous Theme — is formally opposed to both (a) (topicalized) # Theme  
αγκωτθεμ # and to (c) # 2- Theme κωτθεμ #. In the case of (b:a), the formal distinc-
tive-feature opposition is of the respective presence vs. absence (zero) of the nuclear con-
jugation base; in (b:c), of the presence (delimiting) vs. absence (zero, linking) of 
pronominally repeated base. The (b) pattern is remarkably “right”, in the synchronic and 
synchronic “holographic” view of the base (and converter; whether a “verbum vica-
rium” or not) — as a nuclear constituent, not in need of a lexicem expansion; it is cer-
rainly not a case of anacoluthia.

(2) The formal-nexus topicalizing construction occurs sometimes in dialogue (Gen. 19:13  
...αμον τενατακοφ αε-ποτιπρωθ σεαγκικι ιππεμοι ππνε δογ 
ακατο ναε-ππε εκυμντ ντικακι εβολ (to be understood as “at last...”?), but 
is prevalent, even as a formalized (formulaic) Absolute Future form, in the Leviticus 
preceptive injunctions, again with a special tone focussing: επε-πιουηθ εκε-: 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. 
Apoc.), expressing solemn prophecy.

§330-333, esp. 332a: for Oxyrhynchite, SHISHA-HALEVY 1983:327. and now in detail, 
BOSSON 2006b.
(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: μενασαιω αν πε — μπορ ρω. See SHISHA-HALEVY 1986a:153, 161ff. for bases and converters in bracketing junctural status. Needless to say, the tensed Response-forms that look like stressed conjugation bases point in the same direction.

(c) Theme-agens infixed in conjugation-form: \#base + Theme + Verb Lexeme ("indefinite"): #

Gen. 1:5 ...οτόρ αθ† ἐντατμωνιν ζε-πιεγοοτ ... οτόρ αστονι μωστι ατσωδι μωστι μπιεγοοτ προσιν (contrast the preceding concatenating construction [d]: 1:2f. απωστι ζε-ουυωοινι οτορ άνατα εζε-φ†).

Gen. 4:26...οτόρ αθ† χαστμηνι νικαιν...

Gen. 30:22 αθ† δε ερ-φωμενι ναρανα οτορ αρσωτιν ερον ζε-φ† αστονι ντεστοτ.

Gen. 16:3 (Sarah did not bear children for Abraam. She told him to come to her handmaid Agar...) ἀθαρρα τσιμι ναβραμ + σι-αρα τσεβωκι...

Gen. 19:23f. οτόρ αθρυ ωτι ριζενπικαται αποε ρωοτ εζενοδωμα νεμ γομορρα οτόρ ωστι ωσηαι ... οτορ ατσιμι ναοτ εοτοτ εφαροτ...

Gen. 41:50ff ῥωουφ δε ασντρι β ωστι ιαο ... αθρεν-φοα μπισωμοη μμοι εζε-μανεοο ζε-αθ† οειρ-ποωο ηναμακαρ ηντ ηνθοτ ... αθρεν-φοα μπιμαθε ζε αθρ-φενο ζε-εφομ ζε-αθ† έρειαιι ... (Cf. also Gen. 4:26 οτορ σιο αστυνρι ωστι ιαο).

Gen. 30:18 πιεζε-αια ζε-αθ† τα μπαβεξε νηι ... οτορ αθρεν-φοα με-ιαχαρ.

Gen. 35:7 “He called the place ‘Beth-El’ (i.e. ‘House of God’)”, ζενπιμα γαρ ετεμματ αθ† οτονα ερολ.

Ex. 33:6 (“βεσ-ηνοτ ηνενεκτολιν ρεμ ηνενεκτολεα”)... οτορ απενσυντ επισλ εαουο σπερεοσεα...

Ex. 10:20 etc.... οτορ αποε εσεμεντ εσβραφ λωοτ.

Ex. 20:11 ασρι γαρ ν-ε νεγοοτ αποε ομιο υνφε νεμ πικατ.

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 agens53, where the noun is substituted for a per-

53 Although constructions (a) and (c) are well established and their opposition fully functional from the earliest Egyptian, and (d) from Late Egyptian on.
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 **καθ**-adjoined Theme: so for instance Gen. 12:7:36, 30:22 etc.). Also, super-ordinatively, in the narrative projection of an imperative (Ex.33:6) and with superordinating **οτός** (see below; consider Gen. 7:6, 17:1, 27:30 etc.). The construction also occurs, in a solemn, ceremonious 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 **ἀπέβη** **πρῶτοι επαύνας**; cf. also Ex. 13:3 **μὴ φιλή γερ** **ζένοντες εκαμάρι απὸ** **εν-θὸν ἐβολα** **μνᾶι**, 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 **Φιτ.**, **πάσα, ματσσε.**

(d) **# Conjugation-form **καθ- + Theme #

Gen. 1:3-4 **πέφθε καθ** ... **οτός απέβη καθ** καθ **αφφο** **εβολα καθ** καθ ...  
Gen. 4:15ff. **απὸ** **καθ** καθ **καθ** καθ **καθ** καθ **καθ** καθ **καθ** καθ ... 
Gen. 31:55, 32:3 **ἀπέβης καθ** καθ **καθ** καθ **καθ** καθ ... **καθ** καθ **καθ** καθ ...  
Gen. 21:2 **καθ** καθ **καθ** καθ **καθ** καθ ...  
Gen. 27:38 **καθ** καθ ... **καθ** καθ ... **καθ** καθ ... **καθ** καθ ...  

Non-specific quantified Themes occur here, including **οτός** (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 dynamity. The Theme-
exponence is also unmarked, with Theme persistence or Theme alternating, as it were Theme-selecting from a given, intratextual most immediately (and constantly) present repertory of potentially thematic nominals and pronominals (consider for instance the fact that "Φ†" occurs 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 (οττος or ΔΙ 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 construction is ubiquitous. (The fact that this is the Coptic Flexionsisolierung — lexeme/grammeme 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 υκελορμετρικός ΝΔΕ- 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 περιξίαρα with a nominal agens, the unmarked (“normal”) form is clearly περιξία, while the ΝΔΕ- construction is rare or excluded.

(3) Construction (d) is often used in and following ἐταξη- topicalization (e.g. Gen. 32:31, 37:4, 38:29).

(4) Combination and contrasts of Theme placements in a stretch of text are common. Some examples of (a) + (d):

Gen. 19:1ff. ΔΙΩ ΝΔΕ-παυκιαλος εν ερυθεν έκωμαι.

πωτ ΔΕ ΝΔΕΜΕΓΕΔΙ...

ἐταξεν ΔΕ ΝΔΕ-λωτ ἄμμων... οτος ἄμμων...οτος περιξία...

οτος ενεργειλε η ἐπερακτοι ΝΔΕΜΕΓΕΔΙ...

(5) ZAKRZEWSKA, in her important study of 1993 of Bohairic narrative grammar, based on Hymenaios. Acta Martyrum (an important corpus of Nitrian Bohairic), investigates, in the framework of T. Givon’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 topi-
cality and rheumaticity of the respectively placed Themes. In general, she finds the
preverbal placement correlates with forward and backward continuity, while “inner-ver-
bal” placement, according to Z. unmarked (which is certainly not the case in our corpus —
see above), and of a higher rheumaticity, 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 dif-
ferent.

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

(a) Protatic/Temporal Clause topicalized

For presetting, “constituting the temporal frame or ground for the fol-
lowing episode” (B R I N T O N 1993:84f.), narrative אֲֽעַֽוַּנְּ- and אֶתַּאֲֽוַּנְּ-
are topicalized, with the subsequent narrative stretch high-level rhe-
matic by that token. (See above, for אֶתַּאֲֽוַּנְּ-.... אֲֽוַּ- configurations). Some exx.
of אֲֽעַֽוַּנְּ-: 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 “context-
tualizing clauses” in Biblical narrative). While the familiar Coptic con-
figuration 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) אֲֽוַּ- אֶתַּאֲֽוַּ- or נַאֲֽוַּ- אֶתַּאֲֽוַּ- (as e.g. in Gen. 32:31, 25:20) are very different as re-
gards 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. S A T Z I N G E R 1976 on jr- segmentation; ROSS 1991 (Latin); R Y C H N E R
1968 (Old French); THOMPSON 1987, COUPER-KUHLEN 1989:12ff. (with further refer-
ences); D E C L E R C K 1996 (English). The Topic status or rheumatic importance are not ne-
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 אֶתַּאֲֽוַּ-,
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 circumstans (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\(^{54}\) does occur in Report, in special Narrative textemes (such as the aetiological, locutive “Naming Narrative”):

Deut. 22:16 ταιωρην ινθι αιθιοι μπλιρμι ετγιμι οτομ ετακμαιοε τυνοτ.

Ex. 2:10 οτομ απαρ-νεκραν Δε-μωσχς εκαω ημοι Δε-εταιεν επαιοι δενιμουτ.

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

Gen. 43:25 ηκωτεμ γαρ Δε-αρεισχρ ηεμι εοτωμ νε-μωσοτ μπιμα εμεμα.

Deut. 33:21 οτομ αρκατ ετεθαορκ αρ-εταφευτπικαγι ντε γακαρξουκ μματ.

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

Gen. 38:9 εταγεμι Δε-ασκοι Δε-αρε...ναυπι ναη αν.

Num. 13:22 οτομ αρκατ Δε-ακιματ ηεμ ιερι ηεμ άλων μνιαωο τεμακ.

Gen. 25:10 πιοιοτ ηεμ πιμιατ δ ϕη εταλλαυ ηαφο ντοτοτ ηνενροτ ηνεμετ εταθεμε αβραο μματ ηεμ ορατ τεгиμε.

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: έηακυλα ηε δενπεςγηη εκαω έβολ 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 甥- corresponding, in classic topicalizing configurations, to a Focalizing Conversion in Sahidic, or in clear CM cases: Gal. 2:1-2 οὐδεν εστο το ανεμονης..αυτος ας εστο κατοικους απο απαθομ ΕΒΟΛ (Sah. αυτος..νται απο...εις) — note the absence of ΝΗ in the thematized verb.

John 21:1 ΝΑΥΟΤΙΝΗΣ...ΑΤΟΜΟΝΗΣ δε ΜΠΑΡΗΣ — an instance of the Boh. 甥-Focalizing Preterite (cf. §2.4.2(b)).

John 6:6 ΦΑΙ δε ΑΤΟΓΟΝ ΕΟΡΠΙΡΙΑΖΕΝ ΜΜΟΥ (Narrator’s Channel, CM; Sah. νταν-). (B4 John εΥΚΩ ΜΜΟΥ)

John 21:23 ΑΠΑΙΔΩΣ δε ΕΒΟΛ ΞΕΝΙΝΗΝ ΛΕ.. (Sah. νταν-).

Acts 16:18 ΦΑΙ δε ΜΑΡΑ ΜΗΜΟΥ ΝΟΤΙΝΗ ΝΕΟΤΙΝ (Sah. ΕΝΕΚ- ΤΕ, a rare case of Foc. Imperfect in CM).

John 19:36 ΝΑΙ ΡΑΠ ΑΤΟΓΟΝ ΕΙΝΑ ΝΤΕΤΡΑΓΘΙ ΕΥΚ ΕΒΟΛ (Narrator’s Channel, CM; Sah. νταν-).

A FC does however occur in the Comment Mode and especially the meta-narrator’s Channel (with a Basic Preterite v.l.):

John 11:13 ΙΗΣ δε ΕΤΑΔΩΣ ΕΘΕ ΜΕΝΚΟΤ ΝΤΕΠΝΕΙΟΤ.

John 11:51 ΝΕΤΑΔΘΕ-ΦΑΙ δε ΕΙΝ ΕΒΟΛ ΠΙΓΩΤΩ ΜΗΝΑΤΑΤ..

John 21:19 ΦΑΙ δε ΕΤΑΔΩΣ ΕΟΡΠΙΡΙΝ..

(3) In Shenoutean Sahidic, the lexeme-focussing or nexus-focussing Focalizing Preterite in Narrative marks sharply the CM: (Leip. III 96) ΕΘΕ ΕΥΚΩ-ΝΤΑΙΝΘΟΥΣ ΝΗΗ - ΝΤΑΙΝΘΟΥΣ ΓΑΡ “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): (Amel. II 87) ΕΝΤΑ-ΝΕΤΑΚΕΕΡΕ ΕΡΕΑΙ ΕΡΟΙ ΚΑΤΕ ΜΗΤΣ ΝΕΕ ΝΕΝΡΙΡ ΧΑΝΤΕΤΙΝΩΡ ΑΝ ΧΑΝΤΕΡΘΡΟΣ Ν ΧΑΝΤΟΥ- ΚΟΥΡ ΑΝ ΧΑΝΤΕΡΘΡΟΣ ΑΛΛΑ ΧΑΝΤΟΥΤ(ΟΤ)ΙΝΩΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΕΤΑΠΟΜΕ ΑΤΟ ΕΥΚΩΛ ΝΗΓΤΩΝ ΙΝΙΕΒ ΝΡΑΤΟΥ ΧΑΝΤΟΥ ΝΤΕΤΑΤΕ “Those who have fallen down into it wallowed in it like swine, until they reached their thighs, and not until they sank up to their thighs, but even until they appeared fouled and smeared in it from the nails of their feet to the hair of their head”. See SHISHA-HALEVY 2007b.

(4) Pre-Coptic Egyptian. In the Old Kingdom autobiographical narrative, the Empathic 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.tw.f: — see Polotsky 1965:79ff.) are well attested in Lociutive/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 Empathic in Condensed Narrative (92ff.); also, in meta-narrative and meta-textual CM (see ex. 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 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 100523 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 / Emphatic thematic and cataphorically focussing verb-form is an important feature of Demotic Narrative, both as a special Enhanced or Rich Narrative form) our נָאֶף + zero) and as a Comment Mode (our נָאֶף - נְכֶה) 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.ir.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. 3/10f., P. Krall 17/22f., 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 macro syntactic 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 נָאֶף (above). (See Junge 1989:18ff., 63ff.).

(c) The “Tautological Infinitive” in Narrative

This is another special focussing construction, not of circumstantials 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 ἐσονώσθαμ μὴ ἔσαρκας καὶ πολλὰ τὸν ἱβέν ἐπεμνή ναβίμελεν ἐθείρα τοῖς ἐσθοῦν (συγκλέιων συγκλείσειν).

Ex. 13:19 οὐκ ἐμεττχεσ ἐλαὶ ὀνικα שכל ὑπεισέχης ἑνόσον τὸρ ἵσαμ αἱρεῖ τιρίκε τός ἑνωμένῳ μπελ ἐράω καὶ μιος ζέ... (ὁρκο γὰρ ὀρκίσεν).

55 It must be pointed out that gm hardly conditions an Emphatic form: cf. Ryl. IX 8/4, 9/1 etc.
Lev. 10:16 ΣΕΝΟΤΚΨΤ ἈΚΨΤ ΝΣΩΨ ΝΣΕ-ΜΩΤΧΣ (ζητών ἔξεζητησεν).

(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 superordinative highlighting by means of γνήπε (1c), which may, beyond its delimitative junctural role, be viewed as true narrative focussing.\(^{56}\)

Gen. 37:25 ἈΣΕΜΧΙ ΔΕ ΕΟΡΨΜ ... ΓΝΗΠΕ ΙC ΓΑΝΙΚΜΑΗΑΙ-
ΤΗΧΕ ΕΣΜΟΨΙ...

This Focus construction is often formalized as the “object of seeing” (here also ορός may mark the superordination); even here the characterization of “unexpectedness” or “counter-expectation”, or “suddenness” is striking:

Gen. 29:2 ...ορός ἀνατ γνήπε ιc ορός ΝΑΣΧΝ ΣΕΝ-
ΚΟΙ ΝΑΣΧΝ ΔΕ ΜΜΑΡ ΝΣΕ-Τ ΝΟΓΙ ΝΕΨΟΨ.

Ex. 14:10 ἈΞΑΩΨΤ ... ἈΝΑΤ ορός γνήπε ιc ΝΙΡΕΜΕ-
ΧΗΜΗ ΑΣΜΩΨΤ ΕΙΓΡΨΟΨ ΜΜΨΟΨ.


(e) Ordination Hierarchy in Narrative

In a text such as ours, which is by and large unarticulated, the isolation of narrative segments — blocks, chunks — by various means, including verbal and non-verbal signals such as particles and adverbials, links and delimitations, is essential. Formalized different-rank configurations of non-autonomous or lower-autonomy units, “included” or embedded 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 “sequential”, jw:f hr sdm\(^{58}\). The concatenated and concatenating narrative-

\(^{56}\) See SHISHA-HALEVY 1997, for presentative focalization in Celtic and Romance narrative.

\(^{57}\) “Main” is delusive, and always relative, on a scale of cotextual dependence, integration 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 Conjunction” ἐκκύτρης 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 DEPUNDT 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 dichotomy\textsuperscript{59}. 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”\textsuperscript{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)\textsuperscript{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 nexal form, while the inverse is not true: non-Clause-Conjugation nexal 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) etaq- ax- apyan- ax- 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:

\textit{Gen. 4:1}

\texttt{adam de aqcovenera tepcgimi}.

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 jawf hr sdjm 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 jawf hr sdjm is pretty vague; all that seems to matter is that it should not come at the beginning”.

\textsuperscript{59} Cf. Shisha-Halevy, 2006a.

\textsuperscript{60} Cf. Shisha-Halevy 1986a Chapter Seven; Fleishman 1990:205ff.

(3) The superordinating οτογ in apodosi (with the foregoing cotext 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 καταφρητὶς δὲ ενατοββίον μμωτὸν μμοι̣ τὸ οτογ

νατνηροτ ραμάι... (cf. ANDERSSON 1904:74 “etwas verdächtig”).

Gen. 17:1 αὐθωπί τὸ δὲ ημε-αβπαμ Ἁηνὴ νρομπὶ τὸ οτογ

απὶ οτογρὴ εαβραμ.

Gen. 27:30 αὐθωπί τὸ δὲ εταψὶ εβολ ημε-λακωβ... τὸ οτογ

ανατ-πεγκον ὅν εβολ Ἁηνηπορξές.

Gen. 7:6 Νωὲ δὲ Ναψχ-ηνὴ νρομπί τὸ οτογ απὶ μμωτο

νκατακαλτμος ὅν ενεπικαῖροι.

(4) Superordinate highlighting by means of ἅπιτε (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 ναγ- (πε) or νεαγ- πε are fuzzily superordinate (and anaphoric) to their preceding cotext.

Ohs,

(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 ναγ- 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 ταὶ τε οὲ “thus”, serving to focalize and delimit subsequent narrative events, see SHISHA-HALEVY 2007b (Shenoutean Sahidic; see for instance Leip. IV 26f.) Irish is amhlaithd a-, is é an chaoi 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 Allocation.

1.2.3.1 The interrogative Allocation. Questions. “Rhetorical Questions”.
   (a) General.
   (b) Nexal questions; unintroduced assertive-focal formal questions.
   (c) Specially introduced assertive-focal formal questions.
   (d) Rhetemic questions.
   (e) Inclusion/coordination of questions.

1.2.3.2 Allocation, exclamation, address. Imperatives.
   (a) Attention-forcing address.
   (b) Imperatives. \textit{màpeqcowtem}: the jussive / causative imperative. Sequeling \textit{màpeqcowtem}.
   (c) The imperatives — extended construction: the Post-Imperativial Allocutive slot.

1.2.4 The Response.

1.2.4.1 Response forms and constructions: “apocritics” and “reactives”.

1.2.4.2 Detailed contrastive Allocation/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 (\textit{eqecowtem, nneqcowtem}).
   (e) The Contingent-Indefinite Future (\textit{qnaqcowtem}): 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 \\textit{xn}.

1.2.5.4 The Imperfect in Dialogue.

1.2.5.5 The Preterite \textit{aqcowtem} 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 Wechselfrede, 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
Imperative 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 allocution/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. rap 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 (ek-nhot (Gen. 11:10, 25:18 etc.)); number neutralized: nnek-/nnetn- e.g. in Lev. 19.

1.2.3 The Allocation

1.2.3.1 The interrogative Allocation. Questions. “Rhetorical Questions”.

(a) General

The interrogative Allocation (“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 Allocations may be reacted to, yet as free complements, not governed and actantial).\(^{63}\) 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.\(^{64}\) 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 nexal or rhematic interrogative patterns. However, not only is it the case that no sharp boundaries

\(^{63}\) Arguably, by the very occurrence of a Response, an Allocation is retrospectively defined as elificitive and “incomplete”.

\(^{64}\) The two types are compatible in certain languages, e.g. Turkish, where rhematic elements can be followed by -\textit{ml}, which converts the whole to nexal 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 ΜΑΤΑ, 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 diasytem 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 allocation/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 signifique 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: knæw e*pok,... knæw e*pok 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 suaimhneach!” “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 (or ãw ãwn ãim), 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 ξε-αν + άπνοον προτρπ: 29:6 άν: ονός, Ex. 17:7 ξε-αν + πετ άοι νύντεν, Num. 16:22 ξε-ανιπωντ μπεξ ναι... 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) an-

(1) In quoted or indirect Questions — object actants of *verba dicendi, sentiendi* etc. (all Greek ει):

Gen. 8:7f. ενατ Ἴξα-αν-απιμωσ γροσρ (εβολ) (Greek ει).
Gen. 18:21 ενατ αν-καταποτρωσ ... Ἴξα-αν-σεξωκ μμος εβολ.

Ex. 4:18 ντανατ Ἴξα-αν-ετι εεονς (contrasted with the “direct” Gen. 43:27).

Num. 13:18ff. (νατ) Ἴξα-αν-καροπ ιε-αν-οτωσβ βε ιε-αν-οοσκοφξι βε ιε-αν οτνισφτ βε ... Ἴξα-αν-νανεκ ιε-αν-καροπ ιε-αν-οτωσβ κωπτ ερωσ βε-αν-πανατκοτ βε ... Ἴξα-αν-καροπ εεονς μμο-

Deut. 4:32ff. (νιν) Ἴξα-αν-εκσωπι καταπαίαξι ... Ἴξα-αν-αρκσωτ ερωβ μπαρβτ Ἴξα-αν-λεοννο εοτεμ ετσιμ μπτετ ετονος εقσαξι ... Ἴξα-αν-αρκσωπ ιε-αν-φφτ.

Gen. 27:21 ...ντανοιμαν εροκ Ἴξα-αν-νοικ ιε παπχρι λκατ (contrast Gen. 27:24 νοικ ιε παπχρι λκατ).

Gen. 42:16 (οσων εβολ, transitive) Ἴξα-αν-τετεν Ἴξα 

Num. 14:30 (χρεμρεμ) Ἴξα-αν-τετεναλσσεντεν ...

Ex. 17:7 αρσεν-πος εξαω μμος Ἴξα-αν-πος ωον ναχ-

Gen. 43:7 (The man asked us:) Ἴξα ετι πετενιστ ονς ει αν- 

Gen. 44:19ff. νοικ Ἴξα ακσεν-νεξαλσον εκάω μμος 

Gen. 24:23 νεσο-τυερπ ησιμ ματαμοι + αν-οτον-τοπος ...

NB: no Ἴξε-marking of the interrogative as actantial, but ματαμοι, while being delimited from its sequel, is both retrospective and prospective.

Obs.

(1) For the formal distinction and opposition of “quoted interrogation” vs. “direct interrogation”, cf. John (B4) 21:15ff.x3 κεμει μμοι but delocutively quoted 21:17 as άπ-κκεμει μμοι (not so in Homer’s κεπαραν μμοι/κεμει μμοι).

(2) The suprasegmental (probably intonational) markers of interrogation in spoken Bohairic — in correlation with zero or non-zero segmental markers — are, of course, entirely 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 ceremonial, affective, expressive, ironical or emphatic proclamatory interrogation. Often, Assertive-Focal Question (in the Greek, various markers):

Gen. 45:3 ἀνόκ πε ἰωχφ ἀν-ετι ζωνς άα-παιωτ (Greek zero).

Gen. 24:58 ἀν-τεπαγενε# (Response: ἡναψανθη) (Greek zero).

Num. 16:22 φτ φτ ητηπηη πεμαρη ηιβαη ιζε-πρωμι ηερνωμι ἀν-παιωτ μπε ηαι εζεντεσηηωθη ηθρε (Greek zero).

Num. 16:9:13 ἀν-οτκοςι ηωτεν πε (Φαί) δε ... (Greek μή).

Ex. 14:11 ἀν-εθεμον-μας ηεπκαγι ηεκαμι (Greek zero).

Num. 22:37 μη μπιοσωπη εμοτη ερωκ εεβεοσ μπεκι ηα-ροι ... οντος ἀν-ηναζζεμαζομ ηεπτημα ημοκ άν (Greek zero).

Ex. 14:12 ἀν-Φαί άν πε πιαζι ετανζοκ ηακ... (Greek οὗ).

Ohs.
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. ηωτεν-πανεβολ ηων — εβολ ηεναρπαν / ἀν-τετενεμωθον ηαβαμ ... τενεμωθον ημογ / ἀν-ζωνς ζωνς (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 εἱ + Fut.) ἀν-εεμικι..."will she really give birth?" (See below, on the unquestionability of the Absolute-Definite Future). This is in fact an Assertive-Focal Question.

Ohs.
Otherwise, ἀν- + allocutive Absolute Future is not interrogative, but used to express objuration: (again, Greek εἱ). Synchronously, we seem to have here a different homonymous ἀν entity:

Gen. 14:23 ἀν-εειεθι εβολ ηενετεντακ ηθρω.

Gen. 31:50 ἀν-ννεκεβιον ηηαγερι ἠε-ἀα-ννεκειςηι ηεπναγερι.

Deut. 1:35 άκωρκ εκαω ημογ ζε-ἀα-ερεωται ηιπρωμι ζατ ηεπικαζι.

(5) Gen. 33:15 ἀν-νταγων ηεμακ εβολ ηενιμνηγ ηεπημη (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 ταρεφ- (very marginal in Bohairic).

Obs.
In the context of deliberative “that”- Questions, Modern Greek ἕν- Questions come to mind: see ROUCHOTA 1993 for a pragmatic basis; seemingly a Mediterranean isogloss, it occurs also in Modern Hebrew (je-) and colloquial Arabic) — “shall I?”. Sahidic does not have ἕν- in this case.

(II) Zero (in the Greek, various interrogative markers) — also Assertive-Focal Questions:

Ex. 2:7 τεσσωψ ὅταμον ἢ... (Greek zero).
Gen. 43:27f. qοροδ ΝΔΣ-πητενιώτ ... ετι qονδ answered #qοροδ ΝΔΣ-πηκαλοτ πηνιώτ ετι qονδ (Greek ελ/zero) — observe that Gen. 46:30 ετι γαπ κονdio θοοκ is not a question (note γαπ).
Gen. 27:24 θοοκ πε παψηρπ υκαρ “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 οτκμωτ μματτε ετετακ παιωτ (Greek μή).
Ex. 2:14 ὡκ τεθωψ εσοτερ θοοκ... (“...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 τετενεψον άν ΝΔΣ... (Greek zero).

Obs.
“Intonation Questions” for zero-marked Questions (JUNGE 1983) characterizes a syntactical 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 ἅν-, 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 ἡ for μὴ, ἢ 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 grammeme borrowing, like (for some examples) καν and γοταν with the Conditional, or εἰμιθτι and γως (τε), μνποτε and μνπως with the Conjunctive, γοτε with the Circumstantial, Sentence Particles like ῥα, 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...”

ΜΗΙ similar?

ΜΗ (ίκ ...) an (discontinuous, self-cancelling negatives) “it is surely the case that...!”

Ξαρα (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.

ἀγω inferential (?) or amazed (?) question, reactive to a (pragmatic) situation (once, Greek ἥρα γε): see, however, Obs. below.

Gen. 30:2 ΜΗ ἀνοκ-τωβείω μἐθ (in Greek focalizing word-order).

Num. 11:12 ΜΗ ἀνοκ αἱερβωκ μπαιλαος θρπ ἢ ἀνοκ αἰμαςω.

Num. 12:2 ΜΗ μωτεςμη μητατη εταπςε μαι νεμαι ΜΗ μπερκαι μεναι ἀνων (Greek μῆ ... οὐχὶ ...).

Lev. 10:19 ΜΗ ηναυμπι εφαναμ μπςε “It will surely displease the Lord!”

Num. 11:22 ΜΗ ιεςωςως νεμ ιεςωςως δραμανξελδωλος ΜΗ σεναραως.

Deut. 20:19 ΜΗ οτρωμι νε πιωμη ετθεντκοι...

Deut. 29:17 ΜΗΙ οτων-οτρωμι εε-οτζεμι εε-οτπατρια εε-οτβειν εανομητ πικι καβαλ μπςε (= Vat) (Greek μῆ).

Num. 20:10 ΜΗΙ τενναινι νοσμωςως νωτεν εβολας εντατεπτα (Greek: adverbial-focalizing word-order; Sahidic: Focalizing Future) (= Vat) (Greek μῆ).

Gen. 29:25 ΜΗ νεταιερβωκ νακ αν ετβε-ραξα (Greek οὐ).
Num. 16:29 μη ποιεῖς αὐτὸν πεταλίμιον (= Vat) (Greek οὐχί; apodosis, not Question).

Ex. 4:11 Νῦν πεῖ ἐπαθῇ τὸν ἑρωματικὸν τοῦτον ἑρωματικὸν οὐκότως... μὴ ἀνοίξει τὸν πότερον (Greek οὐκ).

Num. 22:37 μη προσώπως εἰμι καὶ οὐκ εἰσέβεβληκεν πρὸς... οὐ περιφέρεσθε καὶ οὐκ εἰσέβεβληκεν (Greek οὐδὲ... οὐδὲ).

Num. 22:30 μη διέξεται τὸν οὐκ... μὴ καταλείψῃ ἠγέτην καὶ μὴν καταλείψῃ... (Greek οὐκ, μή).

Gen. 34:23 μη ἀνασώσωτε τὸν σου (Greek οὐχ; focalizing word-order).

Num. 23:12 μη οὖν μὴν ἀνασώσωτε εἰσέρχεσθε εἰς τὸν ἄγνωστον καὶ τὴν αἰετήτως (Greek οὐχί...).

Ex. 4:14 μη ἀρχήν πεκόν αὐτὸν πιλέσθην τοῦτον ἰστάσθη τοιαύτη τοιαύτῃ (Greek οὐκ).

Deut. 11:30 πῦρ καὶ πῦρ... πῦρ καὶ πῦρ (read with Vat) μη καὶ μὴν τὸν γῆν οὐκ ἁρπάζωτε... (read with Vat).

Deut. 32:34 μη καὶ καὶ τοῦτον τὸν θεσπόρον... (Greek οὐκ).

Gen. 37:13 μη καὶ καὶ νεκρονοῦσαν τὸν οὐκεκαθαρίσατε (Greek οὐκ).

Gen. 18:13 γὰρ τάξιν ἡμᾶς εἰκονεῖ (Greek ἀραγε).

Gen. 37:10 ταρακοῦν πάντως τὸν εἰκόνα εὐρέτερον γὰρ ἡμᾶς εἰκονεῖν τὴν εἰκόνα...

Gen. 27:36 εἰς-πεκεκαθαρίσατε οὐκ εἰκόνες μη πῶς τὸν οἶκον τῆς οἰκίσεως μη... (Greek οὐχ).

Gen. 26:9 αὐτὸς τεκμήριον τὸς “She is your wife then?” or “What! is she your wife?!” (Greek ἥρα γε).

Obs.

(1) Unlike Νῦν, μη 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 Allocutions 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 ἀνα- is not a conditioned (grammaticalized) form of μη--Assertive-Focal Questions.

(3) We do not find in the corpus an enclitic γὰρ (Greek ἥρα), a homonymy situation occurring e.g. in the NT: μη γὰρ τοῦtes Mt.18:1, μὴ τοῦtes γὰρ II Cor. 1:17.

would agree well with the LE etymology of this proclitic (Hannig, Handwörterbuch 21 “Gefühlsausbruch”): cf. j3 tH (Wb 1 25, 9 “Was soll?”, ERMAN 1933:§687, “was soll es heissen”, “was fällt euch ein?” “unwillige Redensart”. Compare Nitrian Bohairic impatient/indignant ʔəw, see below). However, the “reinforcing” roles in LE must yet be related to this; and the three main functions of Coptic eie/ie — interrogative marking, superordinating role in apodosis and (typically Bohairic, for Sahidic H) 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 eie- in L* (Kellis) cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 2002:308. (The interrogative/disjunctive/connective fuzziness certainly recalls the Greek “doubles” ἀρα ἢ ἢ ἢ and ἢ ἢ ἢ, and may have been influenced by them: see several studies in RIJKSARON [ed.] 1997).

(4) Question-initiating ʔəw (structurally different from the cataphoric pro-form interrogative Rheme ʔəw which, by the way, is more typically Sahidic than Bohairic, which often responds with nim and ow) is a colloquial Nitrian feature: see POLOTSKY 1934:64f., quoting several examples (ʔəw πιλοτοφ πε “Here then is the child!” or similar AM I 228 (and not “where is the child?” pace Crum, Dictionary s.v. ʔəw). Also Mac. No. 29 ftg. 5: ʔəw δε ον νεωτο επεται νοτξυδε νιγιήπι... “Nay, could one (on the contrary) detract from the marvel...?”. The inferential role is corroborated by the post-classic Greek ἀρα γε (so, not ἢ ἢ see BLOMQVIST 1969:128f.) in Gen. 26:9 and probably by Egyptian precedents. However, an alternative view, perhaps better suiting the respective contexts, would see ʔəw as expressing amazement: “What!...?” or, more moderately, “Why,...!”

65 Battiscombe Gunn compiled a brilliant diachronic and comparative profile of ʔəw (Egyptian ḥ), a study originally meant for his seminal Studies in Egyptian Syntax (Paris 1924), discussing 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 nexal pro-clausal Responses (“yes/no”) with the nexus in the Allocution. 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 ἡκ ήιννη, that is a Presentative, non-inferential element, which may indicate that ἢ ἢ is after all the proper reading.
(1) Rhematic Questions may be Assertive-Focal ("Rhetorical") Formal Questions:

Num. 16:11 ὅτοις ἵμ πε ἄρων ἰε-ἀρτένερπεμ ἐνωθ - Theme specific, therefore ἵμ "rhetorical" and the whole Assertive-Focal, not interrogative.

Ex. 10:7 οὐδένατ ἦ τον-σφόν ναῦων...
Deut. 1:12 πώς ἵνα ἔλθω ομών ἔσται εὐκλείμινι.
Gen. 18:13 εἴθε-ότι αὐχαρρα χωρὶς ἑρπι ἐσιτε.
Gen. 26:10 οτ πε θαί εἰτακαίq Ναν.
Gen. 4:10 οτ πετακαίq.
Also Gen. 21:26, 43:44, 44:4, Num. 31:15.

Obs.
(1) For οὐδένατ ἦ cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 1986a:85 and reff. For ἦ here, see §4.6.1 below.
(3) πώς is the only Greek-origin interrogative Rheme I find in the corpus.
(5) In οὐδένατ ἵμ εἰτακαίq 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) ἵμ 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 η καὶ ἄνοικται — ἵμ ἄνοικται: for the focal noun-initial construction, see Chapter Two below, and SHISHA-HALEVY 1986a:85f.). When the Theme in nexus with ἵμ 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 θεὸκ-ἵμ ποκ — ἄνοικται — περὶ μικοε ἰκάτ.
Gen. 32:27 ἵμ πε περκαν — ἰάκωβ.
Ex. 4:2 οτ πε θαί — ὅμωμ (πε super lin.).
Gen. 24:23f. θεὸ-ταμερί ννιμ... ἀν ὅτον-τοποκ... θερεμ-
τιόν μιμόν — ἄνοικται μιμώθα ἄνοικται... ὅτον ὅτον-
τοποκ... θερεκμίον μιμόκ.
Gen. 15:8ff. πώς θεὸ — θεὸ... — σί νην ἀνθήσασθε...

(3) ἀρτένερπος "How are you?" is an historically rooted but isolated idiomatic clause-form:

Gen. 43:27 ἄρωνος ἦ τον ἰε-ἀρτένερπος.
Obs.
This is a unique case of interrogative antact focalization with the Focalizing Present in Pentateuch Bohairic: cf. POLOTSKY 1940.

(4) ἐρωτάς ηα η ες another old, colloquial locutive (1st-person) affective idiom, expressing weary, despairing or agitated renunciation (Greek τι μοι + neutr./infinite, ἵνα τι ἡμῖν + infinitive):
Gen. 25:22 ἐρωτάς ηα η ες ηβαλιν.
Gen. 25:32 ἐρωτάς ηε ηονετώμειτοι.
Gen. 27:46 ἐρωτάς ηε ηπαώνε.
Num. 11:20 ἐρωτάς ηαν ες εβολ α ηενχμε.

Obs.
For this expression, also attested outside the Pentateuch (Job 30:2, I Cor. 5:12), cf. Late Egyptian n- ἰρυ-ἰθ ... n ἱρυ-ἰθ t3y ḫt nτf m-di-j. Černý-Gardiner, Hieratic Ostraca, Pl. XXXIII No. 2 (Ostr. Leipzig 16) ro 3 and Pl. LXIX No. 3 (Ostr. Staring) ro 3 n- ἰρυ-ἰθ nn - not distinctly infinitival forms. To my knowledge, there is no Demotic attestation. See SHISHA-HALEVY 1981:328, STERN 1880:124 ("elliptical"). The "accusative" n- is indeed difficult, and reminds one of n- following the Shenoutean τω ετω, also an "Egyptian" colloquialism (SHISHA-HALEVY 1978).

(e) Inclusion / Coordination of Questions.
(1) All Questions — indeed, the dialogue texteme itself — are includable as object actants in the valency matrix of verba dicendi by means of Αεε-, with the verb Αεε “say”, which is famously distinctive for a valency actantial slot filled by the formal “neutric” pronominal object -ε or -ο as cataphoric referent to Αεε- (Αοοε Αεε- etc.). It is interesting to observe the junctural delimitation by means of the “heavy” lemniscus delimiter + between Αεε- and its verb, clearly indicating the belonging of Αεε- 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, τον, ρω).

Obs.
"Inferential Questions", like Greek τι ου (PALMER 1995) and Egyptian interrogative + (j)3f (SHISHA-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 ιε respectively:
Ex. 4:11 ημι πε εταπτρο ερωμι ους ημι πε εταπτμιο-
εβο νεκνυτ.
Gen. 44:16 ου πετεννα ους 3μες κπεντε ιε ου πετεννα
καζι ημοι ιε ανναμαειον ηνοι.
For Nexal Questions, ὤνος seems excluded in favour of ιε or zero, with ἄν (unlike Sahidic ἅ) not connective but truly disjunctive:

Num. 11:12 ἴν ἄνος νερβωκ μπαλαος τηρφ ιε ἄνος αἰμακωτ.

Gen. 43:7 ἀν-ἐτί πετενιώτ ονδ ιε ἀν-οντετεν κον μματ.

Ex. 2:14 ὤν ἐκορωφ ἐσοτετ νοοκ... "... or is it that you wish..."

Num. 12:2 ἴν μπαλασ μματατ τατατσε καδι νεματ μι

Num. 13:18ff. (Νασ) ἄε-αν-κρσοπ ιε ἀν-σακωβ πε ιε ἀν-

οτκοτάδι πε ιε ἀν-ονιωφτ πε... ἄε-αν-νανεφ ιε ἀν-

κραουσ... ἄε-αν-ον-κοβτ κουφεν ἐρωφ ιε ἀν-γανατσοτ

πε... ἄε-αν-κηνιώττωτ ὤν μμον.

Deut. 4:32ff. (.IsAny) ἄε-αν-αρκωμπι καταπακαζί... ἄε-

αν-κακωτεμ ερωβ μπαρφτ... ἄε-αν-αενος κουτεμ ετευλη

μφτ... ετονδεν εκαςι... ιε ἄε-αν-αρκωμπτ νάε-φτ.

1.2.3.2 Alloction, Exclamation, Address. Imperatives

Formally marked Questions, both nexal and rhematic, 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 uter-
erance but exclude (or disregard, or not depend on) suprasegmental fea-
tures. Address is the prototypical allocutive signal:

(a) Attention-forcing address, an almost ideal dialogue-opening dis-
course signal, typically takes the form of an allocutive Proper Name or its equivalent, with no further alloction marker except for reiteration (also in the Greek original). Note the delimiters, indicating the relative prosodic autonomy of the addressed element:

Gen. 27:1 παντηρ ἐγήπει ἄνος.
Gen. 27:18 πανωτ ἐγήπει ἄνος.

Note the Coptic possessive, corresponding here and often to the Greek vocative of the “inalienable” kinship noun.
Gen. 22:7 πανωτ ὀυ πετωπο παντηρ.
Gen. 31:11 ιακωβ ὀυ πετωπο.
Gen. 46:2 ιακωβ ἵνακωβ ὀυ πετωπο.
Ex. 3:4 μπαλασ ὀυ μπαλασ ὀυ πε πετωπο.
(b) A complex, extensive address to a single addressee may constitute the entire allocution, in an acclamation:

Ex. 34:6f. ποσε ποσε θ' ἀνεπιστεύομεντες οὐκ ἄνεπιστεύομεντες οὐκ ἀνεπιστεύομεντες ἄνεπιστεύομεντες οὐκ ἀνεπιστεύομεντες οὐκ ἀνεπιστεύομεντες...

(c) Different is the address preceding or following an interrogative Allocation:

Num. 16:22 θ' θ' ἀνεπιστεύομεντες ἄνεπιστεύομεντες ἄνεπιστεύομεντες ἄνεπιστεύομεντες ἄνεπιστεύομεντες ἄνεπιστεύομεντες ἄνεπιστεύομεντες ἄνεπιστεύομεντες ἄνεπιστεύομεντες ἄνεπιστεύομεντες ἄνεπιστεύομεντες ἄνεπιστεύομεντες ἄνεπιστεύομεντες...

Gen. 15:2 πανεβ. ὁσ πε ἐτεκναθίω ἁν. ἅν. ὁσ πε ἐτεκναθίω ἁν. ἅν. ὁσ πε ἐτεκναθίω ἁν. ἅν. ὁσ πε ἐτεκναθίω ἁν. ἅν. ὁσ πε ἐτεκναθίω ἁν. ἅν. ὁσ πε ἐτεκναθίω ἁν. ἅν. ὁσ πε ἐτεκναθίω ἁν. ἅν. ὁσ πε ἐτεκναθίω ἁν. ἅν. ὁσ πε ἐτεκναθίω...

Gen. 16:8 ἀγαρ ὁσ ποκ ὁν ὁσ ποκ ὁν ὁν ὁν ὁν ὁν ὁν ὁν ὁν ὁν ὁν...

Gen. 21:7 ὁσ πε ἐτεκναθίω ἁν. ὁσ πε ἐτεκναθίω ἁν. ὁσ πε ἐτεκναθίω ἁν. ὁσ πε ἐτεκναθίω ἁν. ὁσ πε ἐτεκναθίω ἁν. ὁσ πε ἐτεκναθίω ἁν. ὁσ πε ἐτεκναθίω...

(d) A case of address appositive to allocative pronouns:

Gen. 19:18, Ex. 4:10 ὁσ ποκ ποκ.

(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 αδα μεν κελλα εστεκε ετακχι μενιομι μενιομι μενιομι μενιομι μενιομι μενιομι μενιομι μενιομι μενιομι μενιομι μενιομι μενιομι μενιομι...

Gen. 48:16 πιγγελος ετνογε μνοι εβολ βενιπετ-

Ex. 28:1 ὁσοι νοοτ ανοιτ...

Gen. 27:34 ὁσοι εροι εω παιωτ.

Ex. 28:3 ὁσοι νοοτ καζι...

(f) Address placed in final / intercolary position in the colon, as in the Greek (following the Hebrew):

Gen. 22:8 ερεφ ηνατηναι εστεκαμενες εστεκαμε

Gen. 23:11 θατ εγατο ποκ.

Gen. 23:15 μνον ποκ.

Gen. 27:13 πεκαοτο εορει εω εω...

Gen. 27:20 ὁσ πεθανεσμεν εκελε ηορεθη.

Gen. 48:19 ητιο πασιρι ητιο.

Ex. 4:10 ὁσοι εροπο ποκ.

Deut. 27:9 κατω εστεκε κατω ποκ.
The placement of the allocutive-augential accompaniment of Imperatives may differ from that of correspondents in the Greek:

Gen. 18:25 ἀγαλλάξεις (Greek μηδαμός σὺ ποιήσεις).

Obs.
(1) See SVENNUNG 1958; GÉRARD 1980; RENCHON 1967. For an instance of the fine or blurred boundary between interrogation, “Rhetorical Question” and exclamation in English, see HUDLESTON 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 κατάταξιν Θεοφίλε, πεπρε Luke 1:3, 22:35, Φιλιππε John 4:9, εὐγνώτερε Philipp. 4:3) and formalized imperatives (ἀρε James 4:13, χαίρε/χερέ/κερετε etc.).
(3) On the pragmatic specificity in address and vocative determination, in Bohairic τι or τί (see SHISHA-HALEVY 1989a:49ff.): πουρο; ἀγαλλάξεις AM II 295, ΦΗ ἔτ. 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: οὐ νεμ Mac. No. 6, SV 66; De Vis I 69, ω ΓΕ- AM II 322, ω βία (νεμωτεν) De Vis II 191, AM I 31; καίν κεφαλή AM I 19; χερε Luke I 27, χερετε AM II 276; πιβανα πιβανα AM I 229; τριφηνη νωτεν AM I 116 τριφηνη νακ Mac. No. 18; ἀβοκ μπαρψή SV 75, ἀβοκ νεμαγ SV 46, 59, AM II 323, ἀβοκ εκ- De Vis I 149, 163, ἀβοκ γωκ Cat. 9.

(g) οὐ, the familiar attention-forcing opening discourse signal is absent in the Pentateuch. Greek οὐ occurs only twice in the Septuagint: Gen.27:20, with no Coptic correspondent (πασκωρί); for the doubled ὡ ὡ — not Address but emotion signal — in Num. 24:23, Bohairic has one οὐ.

Obs.
Coptic ὡ is lexicographically considered a “native” element (Crum, Dictionary 517ff.), but the reflex of the Egyptian j3 (etc.) — if it is one — must no doubt have merged functionally with the Greek ὡ ὡ. 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. SCHWYZER II 600ff.); the early zeroing, or alternatively presence of ὡ may be due to “affect” or address tone: Cf. GILDESSLEEVER 1903 §20 (“the omission of ὡ in prose is passionate or late”); KÜHNER-GERTH II/1:48ff., 310ff.; MAYSER II/1 55: in the Greek Papyri, ὡ marks in “vocative” formulaic or solemn address. Needless to say, in Coptic, the distribution and value of the corresponding element are different.

(b) Imperatives. μαρέωςωτεμ

(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\textsuperscript{3}" — distinct from cwtem\textsuperscript{1} and cwtem\textsuperscript{2}, mainly on the basis of its commutation with m\textsuperscript{mep}- (the nuclear proclitic form of \textsuperscript{M}fe\textsuperscript{w}p "Don't!", expanded by the verb lexeme) and with the morphologically marked imperatives (\textsuperscript{A}p\textsuperscript{iosi}, \textsuperscript{M}a- etc.). In our corpus, the usual morphologically distinct Imperatives are:

\textsuperscript{A}p\textsuperscript{iosi}, \textsuperscript{A}pi- (\textsuperscript{i}pi) Gen. 20:16, 31:16, 34:9, Lev. 23:39.
\textsuperscript{A}pi\textsuperscript{em}\textsuperscript{i} Gen. 20:7, 38:25.
\textsuperscript{A}n\textsuperscript{it}= (\textsuperscript{i}ni) Gen. 38:24.
\textsuperscript{A}n\textsuperscript{at} (\textsuperscript{na}t) Gen. 20:7.
\textsuperscript{A}mos\textsuperscript{(i)} Gen. 24:33
\textsuperscript{M}a-, \textsuperscript{M}hi= (\textsuperscript{t}) Gen. 27:26, 34:8f., 42:37, Deut. 3:28, \textsuperscript{M}a-\textsuperscript{et}h\textsuperscript{=} Ex. 34:11f.
\textsuperscript{M}a-\textsuperscript{t}\-\textsuperscript{go} Deut. 3:28.
\textsuperscript{M}aw\textsuperscript{en}\textsuperscript{a} Gen. 7:1, 19:34.
\textsuperscript{M}a- imperatives of causative lexemes:
\textsuperscript{M}a-\textsuperscript{t\textsuperscript{aw}boq} Ex. 19:23.
\textsuperscript{M}a-\textsuperscript{t\textsuperscript{aco}} Ex. 32:27.
\textsuperscript{M}a-\textsuperscript{t\textsuperscript{co}} Gen. 24:17.
\textsuperscript{M}a-\textsuperscript{t\textsuperscript{fo}} Gen. 24:54.
\textsuperscript{M}a-\textsuperscript{t\textsuperscript{aw\textsuperscript{e}-\textsuperscript{tec\textsuperscript{cep}}\textsuperscript{h\textsuperscript{a}}}} Gen. 34:12.
\textsuperscript{M}a-\textsuperscript{t\textsuperscript{aw\textsuperscript{e}-\textsuperscript{pek\textsuperscript{im}\textsuperscript{w}}} Deut. 5:16.
\textsuperscript{M}fe\textsuperscript{w}p + Voc. + imp. Gen. 23:6.
(Voc.) + \textsuperscript{M}et\textsuperscript{p-}\textsuperscript{ip}\textsuperscript{i} Gen. 18:25, 19:7.

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: 118f.). 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 \textsuperscript{M}a\textsuperscript{peq}- (\textsuperscript{M}a\textsuperscript{pe}\textsuperscript{k}- 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. Zanutti 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?) ἱππρ ἐπε..., common in Shenoute and Besa (also in other dialects).

(2) ἑπερχῶτε: the Jussive / Causative Imperative. Sequelling ἑπερχῶτε

(a) Delocutive ἑπερ-/ἐποῦ-

(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 + ὁτοῦ ἑπερ- # constructions below). Negative Jussive not sequelling:

Gen. 1:3:6:9:11:15 (the creating Divine Command) “ἑπερχῶτι ἃς...” ὁτοῦ ἀπωφιν ἃς...

Ex. 10:11 μαροσκηνων αἰ ὅς-νηρμϊν ὅς-μαροσκηνων μὴ

Gen. 27:41 μαροσκηνων ἃς-νηροῦν τετειδοὶ μπάιωτ ἑνα νταςκωτε βιακωβ (= Greek) — impatient wish.

Lev. 24:16 εὐχαὶ ἀε μὴραν μπάεν ζενοτορ μαροσκηνων ζερβεκ βενανων μαροσκηνων εροῦ ... ζενζινορεφόενος αἰ ἑμπάεν μπάεν μαρεικων.

Gen. 30:24 ἑπερφτὶ ἀε μπωφιρι μμαρ-μ νη

Gen. 34:21 νηρμϊν γανιρχνικοκ αἱ μαροσκηνων νε-μαν γιαζενπικαιρι αἰ αοτομαερ-ιεβωυτ μνητυ.

Gen. 33:14 εὐχαὶ αἰ ωρασοδιν κωνοτ νηροῦν νοῷτ τεμαστομ τηροτ ἃς-νητεβνωτι μαρεαςεκ μοϊ δα-ἀςθ μπεραλοτ αἈκ αἰ εἰεζεμαηδομ γιαμιμωτ.

Deut. 20:5ff. ἐνα πρὡμι ντακκωτ νουτι μβερι ... ἑπερχωναὶ επεχι εἰς ἐλ.

Lev. 19:3 αἈκ αἰ πτςετεννοῦτ ὁτοῦ ωτοῦ ἑπερ-εργοῦτ ὁταίν νωιωτ ντακ νμαὶ ντακ.

Gen. 33:9 ὁτοῦ-οτμνῳ μμα ταςε ἑς ἀρανετενοσκ ὥστι νωκ

Ex. 36:6 ἐπωμι ὕβεν ἐνα εις ἐπωμι ἐπωμετερηςῳ ἃς.

Lev. 14:17 ὁτοῦ ωτοῦ ἑπερεφρωμι γοδγεξ ἑπερψφρ ὁτοῦ εκεεργοῦτ ὁταίν μπάεν πεκνοῦτ — a summing-up of the preceding verses. Note the allocutive Absolute Future sequelling the Jussive (see below).

(2) Polite wish:

Gen. 17:18 ἱκανὰ λοι ἑπερχῶς ἑπεκιμὼ.

Gen. 13:8 ἔπεσεν-οσώντε νιεπὶ οὐτω ἐνεμ οὕτωκ.
Gen. 45:5 ἔπεσεν-πετενήγητ οὐρά οὐεὶ ἔπεσενπι-
οσώντε νιεπῃ ντεπενή.

(3) Delocutive μάρετ-μάρον-: Absolute-Definite Future + μά-
ρετ-, μάρετ- 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 μάρετ-):
Gen. 2:18 μανες ἀν εὐρεπίρωμε νιεπὶ μματατπ = μα-
ρεπεναμῖο ναη νοσβονεος καθαρος.
Num. 35:28 ...μάρετσωμπι γαρ δεντβακι ντεπεσκα μδώτ.
Also Ex. 14:15:16, 19:10, 26:24.

(4) Locutive plural μαρην-: non-causative, textually sequelling hor-
tative “(and) let us...”, “let us then / therefore...”:
Gen. 19:34 ἑιππε δενκοτ καλα κκνηπιωτ μαρεντκοσ
νοσγρη δενπακεεδωρ...

(5) #μαρεν-, negative μεπορεν-: hortative “let us (not...?)”;
often pragmatically sequelling (“let us then....”):
Gen. 1:26 μαρενσαμιο νοσρωκ.
Gen. 24:57 μαρενσοντν ταλον ντεπεσκε εφαρπκ.
Ex. 15:1:21 μαρενγκε επςκ.
Deut. 13:13 μαρενσαν ντεπεσκυ μγκεκουντ.
Gen. 37:21 μεπορενοθεπεκ εοσψεκα.

(6) μαρον + “illative” local adverbial: hortative movement (Greek
verb of motion).
Gen. 4:8 μαρον ωτκοι.
Gen. 35:3 μαρον εγρη εεκαλ.

(7) Locutive Singular #μαρι- “May I....” — politely expressing
wish, in response to a pragmatic situation:
Gen. 25:30 μαμιζεμτπι εβολ δενπακι (Greek factitive:
γευσν με).
Gen. 46:30 μαμιοντ Δς ειζεμτνοντ Δς-ανασ επεκγο
(Greek ἀποθανοῦμαι).

Obs.
(1) μαρετ- is a specifically allocutive dialogic form, a synchronic effect and structural
implication of its μα- imperatival component. The Jussive is not used even in instruc-
tions, the legal code or injunctions or precepts, for which we have the Absolute-Definite
Future εἰρετ.: this is neutral or indifferent to the Locution/Allocution/Delocution perspectival distinction and the Allocution/Response systemic one. The synchronic issue is one of homonymy: Causative Imperative (μα- + ρε-ν-, like τ-ρε-ν and τα-ρε-ν-) vs. Jussive (μαρε- modal base). In our Bohairic, the causative reading is rare and probably affirmative only (unlike the affirmative μαρε-ν-. The Bohairic negative μπενορε-ν- is 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 correlateable with its syntactic and/or pragmatic environments. (The form is certainly not “optative”, pace Peust 1996:51; see Polotsky 1950:81ff., 1987:144f.; Layton 2004:268f.).

(2) ἑαρε for the only clause-form expressing movement without a verb of movement — the local adverb is an essential constituent of this pattern (in Middle Egyptian, ἱ with an illative prepositional phrase constituted a non-modal similar clause). ἑαρε 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) (ὁσογ) ὦν (ἀς) + Imperative (= Greek [= Heb.]):
Ex. 28:3 ὥσογ ὦν καλι...
Ex. 28:1 ὥσογ ὦν ἀνιοῦτ...
Ex. 14:14 ὥσογ νέωτεν χαρωτεν.
Gen. 9:7 νέωτεν ἀς διὰ ὥσογ μαγνικαγι ὥσογ ἀμαλεἴωτη.

(b) Imperative + ὦν ὦν (= Greek)
Gen. 7:1 μαγνικαγι ὦν ὦν πεκὴς ἥρς.
Gen. 8:16 ἄμος ἐβολ ... ὦν ὦν πεκὴς ἥρς τεκσιμι...

(c) Imperative + ὦν (rare): Gen. 18:25 μφωρ μπερῖπ ὦν ὦν μπαικαζι (Greek μηδαμως σο θουησει).

(d) Imperative + Address.
Gen. 27:26 γενκ ἐποϊ + μα-οσφι ἐρω πακὴς (= Greek).
Gen. 19:7 μφωρ ομπερ-παιπετσωσ (Greek μηδαμως μη πονηρευεσθε).
Ex. 8:25 μπεροταζτοτκ ἀς φαρω εεργαλ ... (= Greek).
Num. 23:18 τωνκ βαλλακ ὥσογ σωτεν (= 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 habebis") — a prospective "apodotic" reference. The post-imperative 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 εἰκεκνεύομα, against the propensity of the Contingent-Indefinite (να-) Future with the Allocution and especially Question (below). However, the post-imperative 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-imperative 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-imperative paradigm studied here (see also SHISHA-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 heterogenous in internal information structure. For instance, the grammaticalized or auxiliary ἁμαρτ., να... differ from full-value lexemic imperatives.
(2) The post-imperative paradigm must be kept carefully apart from the coordinated imperative (not μαρκατ-): see below.
(4) ταπεκνικωτε in 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 άμως ταπεκνατ (Homer άνα) and 21:12 άμως ταπεκ-
**tetēnōtωm** (Horner οτωμ imp.). However, ταρεξ- “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 μαρεξ:- consider John 11:44 καὶ εβολαὶ μαρεξουμεναὶ “and let him go...” as well as to the interestingly paratactic Contingent-Indefinite Future, consider John 16:24 B4 δριεξίν τετεναξί (Horner also ονοκ), in the very “guarantee apodosis” marked role typical of the Biblical Sahidic ταρεξουμεναὶ: “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:


Gen. 27:19 τωνκ γεμοὶ οτωμ ... (Greek ἀναστάζ καθισον καὶ φάγε) sim. Gen. 28:2, 19:14f.

Lev. 10:4 αμωνιν αλι-νετενκνησ εβολ (Greek καὶ).

Gen. 31:12 ξοντωτ ενωλί... ανας (Greek καὶ).

Gen. 38:24 ανιτς εβολ ροχκς (Greek Imperative + καὶ + Jussive).

Gen. 34:9 αρι-ωον ερο οτενκερπι ημιως καὶ ονοκ νενωερι σιτος...

Gen. 45:13 κωλεμ ανιπαωτ εσριτ... (Greek ταχυναντες καταγάγετε).


Gen. 18:6 ιγκ ιεοτοι οτωμεθ ν-η μεμνετοκελαίον (Greek καὶ).

Gen. 29:7 μαρεξοικτεν μονι (Greek απελθόντες βόσκετε).

Gen. 21:18 τωοτηεν σι ηπιαλοκ αμονι μμοκ (Greek Imper. Imperative καὶ + Imperative).

Gen. 27:43f. ινοτος οτοι μαρηπι εσωτεμ ετακμι τωνκ μα-

ωενακ... (Greek άκουσον...καὶ ἀναστάζ ἀπόδραθι).

Obs.

See Donhauser 1982 on Imperative coordination.

(2) Imperative + ονοκ / καὶ / zero + Imperative: catalogic listing (same-rank injunctions). The Coptic construction closely resembles the Greek one:

Deut. 12:28 δρεξ εσωτεμ ονοκ δριοτι νναικαξι ηητος (= Greek).

Gen. 14:21 μανιψωμι νηί σι καὶ νακ ννισεωρ (= Greek).

(3) IMPERATIVE + ὁποι + IMPERATIVE: same-rank (non-catalogic) successive-sequenced coordination of injunctions. The Coptic construction usually resembles the Greek one:
Gen. 1:22 αἰτά ὁποι ἄνθροπος ὁποι γαγ-νίμωσ (= Greek).
Gen. 45:13 ματαμεναίωτ επαγως θηρώ, εὐθενάθμη νέμαθω, ἡνετετενάτ ερώτω, ὁποι κυλεμεν ἀνι-παίωτ εὐθεία... (= Greek).
Ex. 17:5 μοισί ἄσωμι μπαίαλα σι νεμακ εβολ δεν-νιζελαλοι... ὁποι πιθαν... σι την θρήνι δεντέκκιξ ὁποι μοσι... (Greek δέ, καί).
Gen. 9:7 γαγ-πικαρ ὁποι ἄνθροπος ἡπτερα (= Greek).
Num. 3:6 σι νῆφτα λίθετα ὁποι ματαργοσ (Greek Imperative + Future).
Ex. 14:13 ἁμνομάτι σι ἐρατενεννωθ ὁποι ἁνατ... (= Greek).
Ex. 23:21 γαγθεκ εροχ ὁποι εκτενεμεν νκώμη μπερ-ερατ-εωτ νητ νεμαθ (Greek καί x3).
Ex. 25:2 ἄσω μεινηνηπρι μπισα ὁποι σι νηι νγανα-παρκη (= Greek).
Num. 20:26 μοισί νατρων ντερετολη ὁποι μηι εκσεν-ελεαςαρ (Greek).
Gen. 15:5 ἁθομάτι επάγω ὁποι σιηπι... (= Greek).
(3) IMPERATIVE + ὁποι + allocutive-sphere Absolute-Definite Future: sequelled main point of Divine Command. The Coptic construction usually resembles the Greek one:
Ex. 3:16 γαγθενακ ματατεννίζελαλοι... ὁποι εκκαςος νως... (Future = Greek)
Deut. 31:26 σι μπαίαδο κακ κανταφιρ νήκτβεωςκοσ... ὁποι ερεφωπι νακ μμασ ενεμεθέρε (Greek λαβόντες... θάνετε... καί έσται)
Num. 8:2 κακι νεμ αρπων ὁποι εκκαςος κακ δε-... (= Greek).
Gen. 44:4 των κακι εμενες ννηαρμι... εκταργωσ εκκαςος νως (Future = Greek).
(4) IMPERATIVE / γαγ- / ὁποι / zero + non-allocutive Absolute-Definite Future: assured sequel/result (see below). The Coptic construction usually resembles the Greek one:
Gen. 24:44 θεοκ σω + ειετος ΝΝΕΚΚΕΔΑΜΑΤΑΙ (Greek καὶ).
Ex. 8:12 συνσπ-πεκβωτ ... ουρος μασουαι μπιαταν
ντεπκαρι ουρος ετεκωπι ναζε-ζαλελομ ... (= Greek).
Num. 20:8 ...ουρος θαξι νεμπμετκα μπουμεθο ουρος εκετ
μπεκμωον (Greek λαβη... και λαλησετε... και δωσει...).
(5) IMPERATIVE + ουρος / zero + interlocutive-sphere Contingent-In
definite Future: locutive: undertaking, promise, assurance. The Coptic
construction resembles the Greek one:
Gen. 34:12 ματαωε-τεσσρφι εμαιω ουρος τενναθηνικ
(= Greek).
Ex. 24:12 ουρος επωωι ξαροι ειζεκπιτωον ουρος ωμπι
μμαι ουρος ηνατ νακ νεππαλαζ (= Greek).
Num. 22:19 οςι νεμπι ... ουρος ηναιμ ξε-ους πετεπςε
ναιζου νηι (= Greek).
Deut. 32:7 ωοεζεκιωτ ρηπαμοκ θεμελαοι θεμαξ-
δος νακ (= Vat) (= Greek).
(6) IMPERATIVE + ουρος / zero + locutive Conjunctive: successive-
sequenced willed result / consequence. The Coptic construction never
really resembles the Greek one:
Gen. 19:34 ραιεωε εξοςι ηνποτ ΝΕΠΗ αιν ουρος ΝΤΕ-
τουνονονοςραξ ... (Greek ειςελθουσα...κοιμηθητι... και εξανα-
στησωμεν).
Gen. 11:7 ομωνι ιμενωσε επεση ρηπεφεξπονολας
μμαι (Greek δευτε και καταβαντες συνξέωμεν).
Ex. 3:10 ουρος ιτεοτορικ (Greek δευρο άποστειλω).
Gen. 49:1 οωοτ ηνπαμωτεν (Greek συνάχθητε ίνα άναγ-
γειλο).
Gen. 31:44 ουρος ηντεσεμνι ροταιζεκκχ (Greek δεύρο
Gen. 27:21. γενκ εροι παξηρι νταξλομζεμ εροκ (Greek
ξηγισον ... και ηπλαφηςω).
Gen. 38:16 χατ νται ζαρο (Greek εισον με ειςελθειν) sim.
Deut. 9:14.
(7) IMPERATIVE / μαρεκ- + ουρος / zero + delocutive Conjunctive:
successive-sequenced unwilled result / consequence. The Coptic con-
struction does not resemble the Greek one:
Gen. 18:23 μπερτακο μπιεμε ΝΕΠΑΙ ΝΙΠΑΙ ΝΤΕΚΩΠΙ
ναζε-πιεμε μέφρη μπιασεβες (Greek interrogative Futures).
Gen. 1:6 μαρεκωπι ναζε-οταξρο ... ουρος ηντεκωπι
επεξωρε εβολ... (Greek two Jussives).
(8) IMPERATIVE / μαρεψ- + γινα + Conjunctive: purposed result/sequel (consecutivum or finalis). The Coptic construction resembles the Greek:

Deut. 31:28 θωστُ ννιαρξων ... γινα ιντακζι ενοτ-μαψ (= Greek).

Gen. 24:14 πεκτησταρια γινα ιντας (= Greek).
Gen. 27:41 μαροτζωντι ναε-νιεγοο ιντεψ κοτι μνιαοτ γινα ινταζωτε νιακωβ (= Greek).
Ex. 2:20 μοςτ* οτιν εσοσον εροψ γινα ιντεκσωμ οσοσικ (Greek ὅπως).
Ex. 20:12 ματαιεπεκιωτ κεμτεκματ γινα ντε-νιπενα-νεψ ωαποι μμοκ οτοσ γινα ντεκερ-οτινιοτ* ινςοτ γι-ζενενικαγι... (= Greek).
(9) IMPERATIVE + οτοσ / zero + μαρεψ- (delocutive).
(a) οτοσ / (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 κοστενεκκαζ επωσι ετψε οτοσ μαρεψ-κωσι... (= Greek).
Ex. 14:16 κοστων-τεκκαζ εβολ εζεν-ψιομ οτοσ φοραζ οτοσ μαροτι εσοτι ναε-νενωψι εμπια — temporal/logical sequelling (“and then make them go in...”) (= Greek) sim. Ex. 19:10.
Gen. 31:37 κεμμητοτι μπαια...οτοσ μαροτσογι ιντεν-μητ (= Greek).
Deut. 32:50 κοτι ερπι εζενπιτωτ... οτοσ μαροτσακ ζατενπεκαδος (= Greek Imperative + passive Imperative).
Gen. 41:33f. κοσι κακ οτρουμ ιναβε οτοσ ικαξητ... οτοσ μαρεψιν μαε-φαρω μαρεψω γεαντοπαρξει ει-ζενεκαγι οτοσ μαροτι ιπιρε-ε... οτοσ μαροτσοτε-νιφοτι ινθοτ... μαροτσοτε-πικοτο... οτοσ ετεψω-πι μαε-νιφοτι... (= Greek).
Also Gen. 18:3f., Deut. 10:11.
(b) οτοσ / zero contents of verbum dicendi: affirmative or negative. The Coptic resembles the Greek:

Num. 5:2 οταγκαζι ετοτοτ... οτοσ μαροτσιοτι εβολ (= Greek).
Ex. 14:2 καὶ οὐκ ἀνέσωρ ὡς ἀπεσταλμένος (= Greek).

Lev. 16:2 καὶ οὐκ ἀπέσταλεν οὐσῷ ομορφηθευμένη αὐτόν οὐκ οἴησεν (= Greek).

Lev. 24:2 ἡμείς ἐπονομάζομεν εἰς πᾶσαν νόησιν... (= Greek).

Num. 21:7 τωρίζειν καὶ κατημαργεῖ βολὴν γάρ (Greek καὶ) sim. Ex. 8:4 (οὐσὶ), 10:17 (οὐσῃ).

Deut. 15:9 μαρτυρία καταλόγου ομορφηθευμένη εἰς πᾶσαν νόησιν... (Greek μὴ γένηται) sim. Deut. 11:16.
(c) Zero - plural locutive, affirmative: grammaticalized (auxiliary) Imperative. The Coptic differs from the Greek:

Ex. 14:12 ἄνα ταρεν- (Greek πάρες ἡμῶς ὑπὸς + conj.).

Gen. 19:32 ἀνὴρ ἐπετειχεὶς γένος (Greek δεῦρο καὶ ποτίσμενον).

(d) The delimited negative Jussive is not in the post-imperatival slot. The Coptic resembles the Greek:

Ex. 19:24 ἐπετειχεὶς... ὄσος ἄνω ἀπαθεὶ... καὶ οὐσῷ ἐπετειχεὶς... (= Greek).

Deut. 4:9 ἡμείς τοὺς τοῖς καθαρεῖς τοὺς ἄνωτερος... (= Greek).

Obs.
(1) For the Imperative + ἡμείς- configuration POLOTSKY 1987:165ff. establishes two classes:
(I) IMP. + ἡμείς- Boh. (Sah. ταρεν-, ετρεκ-, e. Conative) — contentually weak Imperative, and ἡμείς- independent of the Greek;
(II) IMP. οὐσὶ ἡμείς- Sah. = Boh., Greek Jussive, thematic Imperative. The evidence above considerably refines this scheme.
(2) Some interesting post-imperatival cases in Nitrian: Luke 6:37f. (οὐσὶ ἰδιωτες- + οὐσὶ γενα- an); οὐσίων ἰδιωτες- is attested only in Nitrian: AM I 99 ἡμείς... ἐπετειχεὶς ironic "and then I will see", in AM II 86 οὐσὶ ἰδιωτες- of Deut. θεοτόκην ἄνω κατὰ τεκτῶν... ἡμεύς... expresses desired consequence.

1.2.4.1 Response Forms and Constructions: "apocritics" and "reactives"

(a) The Response, presupposing an Allogation, 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 constructions⁶⁸. 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 ἀ-, ΜΦΗ and ΜΠΕ-, ΝΝΟ and ΝΝΕ-, ωο and οβα—), 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 (ċe). While ĉe 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 ΜΦΗ (and of course ΝΝΟ and ωο) are always representative pro-forms, usually responsive to past Questions; ΜΜΟΝ, ἀγα and ĉe are also clause-initial asseverative Dialogue particles, responding as it were to an implicit denial or sceptical Nexal Question. Neither ΝΝΟ, ωο and ĉe are attested in the Pentateuch. The negatives ΜΜΟΝ and ΜΦΗ occur as pro-forms also in the second term of an alternative Question (…ομα-ΜΜΟΝ/ΜΦΗ “…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 1992:39f.).

(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 ĉe occurs also in cases of “si”, “doch”, cf. Mt. 15:27= Mark 7:28, Mt. 17:25.

(4) Terminology. “Negative-pronominal particles” (Schwartzze-Stenthal 1950:366) is more perceptive than Stem’s “adverbia der bejungung” (1880 §528) and Layton’s “interjections” (2004 §241, 245). These elements were studied in the 1930s and later by B. Gunn for Ntrian (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: ἡμὼν: προστατικὸς ὄνων-ἡμὼν AM 1125, ἡμῶν ἡμῶν AM 1102; ἡμὴ in ἡμῶν ἡμῶν ἡμὴ AM 118, ἡμὴ ἡμῶν ἡμὴ AM 1290 (in SV 46 it marks the past reference of the preceding). Coptic differs thus from languages which have in this case the naxial negation with the verb zeroed: consider German nicht (“Du kommst oder nicht?”), colloquial French pas (“tu viens ou pas?”), non in a higher register; Modern Welsh peidio or llai or ddim (again a difference of register?).

(6) ἡμὼν “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 ἢμων- (already in the earliest Demotic, Ryl. IX 17/3, and probably earlier). The affirmative counterpart of ἡμὼν, ὡτόν responds to ἴοτόν- in Jer. 44:17 Tattam; ὡτόν-ὁμόν ἡμὼν to ὡτόν-ὁμόν ὡμώτεν, Mt. 20:22, Mark 10:39.

(7) ἡμὸν (Ἀλλα...) responds as refusal form to an Imperative (Gen. 19:2). Pro-form ἡμὸν occurs often as a negative alternative in protases (“if not...”) and disjunctions (“or not...”, “otherwise”, “or else”). The Demotic protatic ἧν ἢν “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 ἰν (ἰν ἢν..., ERICHESEN 1956 1/8), we unfortunately want the preceding dialogue.

(8) ἡμὸν “no” is the only naxial pro-form to be substantivized by ὁ τῇ in Mt. 5:37, II Cor. 1:18 (in focus and Rhetus status, probably conditioned), ὁ τῇ in II Cor. 1:17 etc. (Cf. WUNDERLI 1976:214ff. for French oui, non substantivized). Consider also the famous ἑς ἑς ἡμὼν ἡμὸν, ὡτē-ἐς, ὡτē-ἡμὸν II Cor. 1:17ff.; ὡτωτὰ πετ., with ὡτ-conditioned by the focal status, II Cor. 1:19.

(9) In cases like Gen. 30:1 ἡμὸν ἡμὸν ἡμὸν ἡμὸν ἡμὸν. ἡμὸν is the Circumstantial adverbial protatic (“otherwise”, “or else”, νῦ (νῦ) μή, Lat. alioquin); so too in Gen. 42:16 (in Ntrian and the early “B4” we find the form ἐμὸν·, with the converter unzeroed, e.g. Mac. No. 95).

(10) J. Černy’s Etymological Dictionary 145 refers eże etymologically to Roman Demotic st (Ericheisen, Glossar 470), referring to Mag. 18, 31 (Griffith-Thompson I, 122 (1904)): Spiegelberg, Gramm. §138 Anm.: n st n·n-j m-p3-hrw? — St. “Will they inquire for me today?” — “They (will)” 

Frankly, I find it difficult to see a thematic plural pronoun in pro-clausal role (Černy does not mention ἐνο, and gives no etymology for ἔγο or ἐγε/ἐς). However, a neutric anaphoric pronoun is conceivable in this function and a distinctive Theme may well represent a nexus. While ἐς, ἐς, ἐς (Crum, Dictionary, 64f. — Crum chooses ἐς as the master form) may, formally speaking, all be tonic, non-proclitic unexpanded forms related to the Preterite base/pre-verb ἐς, ἐς, ἐς (the old auxiliary w3h), the e-vowel forms, esp. Sahidic, viz. ἐς, ἐς support the suspicion that we have here a merger of the responsive pro-forms with an assorting interjection; there is certainly a distinct affinity of responsive ἐς with the Preterite Allocution. ἐνο is synchronically and structurally a pro-verb, as early as Roman Demotic, where we have the finite responsive pro-clause #bn-jw.f# #bn-jw.w# “he/they shan’t” (Petubastis =

Cf. Modern Irish seu, neg. ni hea, which, however, contains a hematizing element (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: χάβαλα ετβήντρα...ΜΕΝΝΑΣΩ άν άν ΜΠΟΡ άώο "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, χάλα is both allocutive and reactive-to-situation. (11) χέ in "Old Coptic", SATZINGER 1994:214 line 101, is neither responsive, nor question-invoking, but something like "Yea,..." (cf. Luke 11:51 etc.). Both χάλα and χέ may serve, initially, to reinforce an asseveration (Boh. χέ corresponding in this role to Sah. χάλα),70 often following an argumentative question or another allocution: Luc. 7:26: 12:5 χάλα, with a reiterated injunction; Mt. 11:9, Luke 11:51, 18:8 χέ ΤΜΟ ΜΜΟC ΝΟΤΝ...(cf. the use of (ξ)ΑΜΗΝ); χέ ΤΤΟ ΜΡΟ ΕΡΟΚ Phil. 4:3. Consider also the solemn rhetorical addresses — "Yes, Father..." Luke 10:21, Mt. 11:26; Apos. 16:7 χέ ΝΟ C ΦΙΝ ΠΙΝΑΝΤΟΚΡΑΤΩΡ ΠΙΛΑΜΗΗ ΝΕΚΡΑΝ ΤΡΟΤ ΗΑΝΜΕΘΜΗΗ ΝΕ.
(12) χάλα and χέ may constitute the whole Response, and are then immediately followed by an addressed "Vocative" (e.g. ινότατεν); or they may precede a responsive clause (see below). The Question may indeed be evoked by χάλα, and may not be explicit at all: χότιτι χε ΕΕΜΗ χέ χάλα χέ ΝΕΝΝΕΠΑΡΡΟΞΟΝ ΤΡΟΤ...ΣΙΓΟ ΝΑΚ ΑΜ I 117.
(13) The admittedly impressionistic statement that Bohairic seems to prefer the Present to the Aorist agrees with the contrast between Boh. χέ and Sah. χό in Mt. 17:25.
(14) On ΜΦΗ, see ANDERSSON 1904:122f.; see STERN 1880 §528 on χάλα and χέ.
(15) In Gen. 17:17, God's χάλα responds remotely and fuzzily to Abraham's doubting ΑΝ ΕΕΣΩΨΗ... ΑΝ ΕΕΜΗΗ, which, however, is followed by ιχάλα ΦΗΗ ΜΑΡΕΨΗΝ... 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 repertory

(a) As will be seen from the tables below, the Pentateuch usage of the responsive elements is, compared with Nirtian and the NT, restricted and infrequent; except for a rare instance of ΜΦΗ, 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 Nirtian (specimen check) and NT (the exhaustive evidence) usage is conversational (and colloquial). Note the following restrictions and combinations:

χέ does not respond to an interrogative Nominal Sentence; χάλα does not respond to a Present Tense; χάλα responds to non-specific foregoing textual stretches containing various tenses; ΜΦΗ responds only to ΤΩΣ- (ΝΕ-ΛΩΣ-), 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-ΝΑΡΩΜ answers the polar question ΜΗΖΗΕ ΚΕΝΑΡΩΜ. Seeing that ΑΣ 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 ΜΗΟΝ responding to ΜΗΖΗ (i.e. ΜΗΤΗ) + ΝΑ-Future (Hag. 2:12).
MNON responds to the Present, Contingent-Indefinite Future, Nominal Sentence, Imperative; MNON ἄλλα to non-specific foregoing textual stretches.

The Pentateuch

Responsive responding to (clause):

 Aberdeen

- non-specific context/remote doubting ἃν εἰς...?/Jussive (ἄγα γίνεται ἰκ...) Gen. 17:19.

Ce

Not attested in the corpus.

MNON

ὤμοι-

- ἄν- + Contingent-Indefinite Future Num. 11:23; Deut. 8:2.
- Contingent-Indefinite Future Deut. 8:2.
- Nominal Sentence Gen. 42:9f.
- request/proposal (Imperative) Gen. 19:2.
- request/proposal (Imperative) Gen. 23:15.

MΦΗ


Nitrian, New Testament:

Responsive responding to (clause):

Arabic, Aram

- [pragmatic allocution — falling movement of idol] AM II 303.
- Imperfect (?) AM I 51.
- ἄν- + Nom. Sentence (“ἡδοκ πε X?”) AM I 96
- ὀτκότε + Nom. Sentence (“ἡδοτ ἡδαὶμών ἅπε?”) AM II 300.
zero + Nom. Sentence ("nοοκ πε X?") AM I 112.

gαρ- actual Present AM II 124, De Vis II 151.

gαρ + Existential Mac. No. 32.

Adjective Verboid (negative statement) Mt. 15:27 = Mark 7:28.

Mονον

Mονον άλλα Nom. Sentence (statement: "οτ- πε", "νοοκ πε" "Subst. πε") Joh. 7:12, 9:9, AM II 215f.

Mονον άλλα Jussive request/proposal (Imperative) Acts 16:37

Μι + Nom. Sentence ("νοοκ-οτ") John 18:17

Μι οτον- John 21:5

αν- + Present Mt. 13:29

zero + Nom. Sentence ("νοοκ πε X?") John 1:21

(χμετι ζε-) + Contingent-Indefinite Future AM I 243

(αρτενμετι ζε-) + Preterite Luke 12:51, 13:3

ΜφΗ

Μι + Preterite Luke 22:35

Μι- Pluperfect AM II 290

Μι- + Preterite AM I 18

(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 Pentateuch72. 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 # άνοκ πε # (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, άν, άρα; (negative) μή, οὐκορν, ιὲ, zero. Zeroed Responses occur with the Question markers μή, οὐκορν, zero. Non-zero Response markers occur with the following Question markers list: μμόν with zero; άρα with zero, άν, οὐκορν; ιὲ with zero.

(6) Pentateuch. Nexal Question markers occurring are: (affirmative) zero άν, μή(τι), άρα; (negative) μή, άν, ιὲ, zero. Zeroed Responses occur with: zero, άν, μή; Response markers occur — μμόν with άν; 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>Question marker</th>
<th>Question clause</th>
<th>Response pro-form</th>
<th>Response clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>ΝΟΟΚ ουρ-</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>echoed^ AM I 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>ΝΟΟΚ ουρ-</td>
<td>μμόν zero</td>
<td>AM II 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>ΝΟΟΚ ωυρ-</td>
<td>άρα</td>
<td>echoed^ AM II 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>νΟΟΚ πε Χ</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>νΟΟΚ πε AM II 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>νΟΟΚ πε Χ</td>
<td>άρα</td>
<td>νΟΟΚ 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>άγά</td>
<td>ονόμ πε AM I 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>any</td>
<td>ονόκ πε</td>
<td>άγά</td>
<td>ονόκ πε AM I 96, 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>any</td>
<td>ονόκ πε X</td>
<td>άγά</td>
<td>echoed* AM I 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mh</td>
<td>φαί πε X</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>ονόμ αν πε AM I 139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>otokth</td>
<td>Topic. Nom. Sent.</td>
<td>άγά</td>
<td>echoed* AM II 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>otokth</td>
<td>ονόκ-οτ- ονι</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>ονόκ-οτ- αν AM II 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Preterite</td>
<td>άγά + voc.</td>
<td>zero AM I 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>άγά + voc.</td>
<td>zero AM I 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>άγά + voc.</td>
<td>echoed, + [...] AM II 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>άγά + voc.</td>
<td>echoed* AM II 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Foc. Present</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>echoed* AM I 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Voc. + Present</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>ον πετωνι + Voc. AM II 318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>άγά</td>
<td>ονόκ πε φ̃ AM II 303</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>άγά</td>
<td>Topic + Imperative AM I 117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Voc. + Preterite</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>ονόκ-νιμ + 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>Contingent Future</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>neg. Contingent Future AM I 11, 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>ονόκ-νιμ</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Contingent Future AM I 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>ονόκ-νιμ</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>ονόκ-νιμ AM II 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Pluperfect +</td>
<td>[oblique Response] f</td>
<td>AM II 290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>ωον-</td>
<td>[dialogue-arresting Response] f</td>
<td>AM I 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>[dialogue-arresting Response] f</td>
<td>AM I 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>any</td>
<td>Foc. Present</td>
<td>[oblique Response] f</td>
<td>AM II 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Foc. Present</td>
<td>ωον-κ + Contingent Future</td>
<td>AM I 232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Contingent Future</td>
<td>[oblique Response] f</td>
<td>AM I 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Contingent Future</td>
<td>[dialogue-arresting Response] f</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] f</td>
<td>AM I 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Preterite + ονd</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>AM I 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Preterite + ονd</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>AM I 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Preterite</td>
<td>[oblique Response] f</td>
<td>AM II 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>Preterite + Voc.</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>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 + πω 4</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>AM II 318f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>νωτενι</td>
<td>άγα</td>
<td>άνων ηε De Vis II 265c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>Preterite</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>AM I 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΓΑΡΑ</td>
<td>Foc. Future</td>
<td>[zero] g</td>
<td>AM II 248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΓΑΡΑ</td>
<td>Contingent Future</td>
<td>[zero] g</td>
<td>AM II 212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΜΗ</td>
<td>Preterite +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΜΗ</td>
<td>Imperfect +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΜΗ</td>
<td>Preterite +</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>AM II 56f.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rhematic (selection):

| (وطن)            | νωκ-οτρεμ-         | άνωκ-οτρεμ-Χ        | AM II 76       |
| (νημ)            | ημ πε φαι        | φαι πε Χ m          | AM I 50        |
| (νημ)            | ημ ντακ τε      | ταμα ημαι-νοτ τε    | AM II 11f.     |
| (νημ)            | ημ πε           | Χ πε παραν          | AM I 66        |
| (νημ)            | νωκ-νημ         | άνωκ-Χ              | AM I 37, 111, 125 |
| (οτ)             | οτ πε ετωμη     | ΑΓΕΝΣ — πε ετ j      | AM II 105      |
| (οτηρ)           | οτηρ προντη       | ικ- Χ προντη          | AM II 290      |
| (Σεναυ η-)       | ερε- ηεων/        | ερε- Σεν-/χη         | AM II 76, 149  |
| (οτ, νημ)        | εκ /* ηεων/       | εκ-...ηεων/          | AM I 75, 229   |
| (وطن)            | οναυέ νακ        | οιγηα ερατη           | AM II 74       |
| (νημ)            | εκ- + νημ        | [self-supplied           | AM II 273      |
| (وطن)            | οναυων ηε τονο ηεη-φηζη ηηεωροιος... + | [zero]                | AM II 280f.    |
| (ηεων-οτ)        | ηεων-οτ ηπε- ηνε- |                    |                |

Combined — Rhematic / Nexal

(1) (وطن)            | νωτεν-γανρεμων +     | [Condensed Response] | AM II 122      |
| (νημ)            | X-νημ ετ- +         |                    |                |
| zero             | X πε + οιν-          | άγα ηνοπ πε          | AM II 124      |
| zero             | + κε-οταινε        |                    |                |
# Tensing and Structure in Narrative and Dialogue

## 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 Gen. 18:24, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>νοοκ πε</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>νοοκ πε* Gen. 27:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>ΦΑΙ πε</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Gen. 43:29</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>zero</td>
<td>+ Augens*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>οτ- ΜΗΛΑΤΑΤη</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Gen. 27:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΕΤ- + Address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>echoed* Gen. 29:5f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-</td>
<td>οτων-</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>echoed* Gen. 44:19f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-</td>
<td>Contingent Future</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Deut. 8:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-</td>
<td>ΜΜΟΝ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-</td>
<td>Contingent Future</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Num. 16:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-</td>
<td>Conjunctive</td>
<td>[dialogue-arresting</td>
<td>Gen. 33:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st sgl.*</td>
<td>Response]*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-</td>
<td>Absolute-Definite Future</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Gen. 17:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-</td>
<td>Foc. Conv.</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Ex. 14:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-</td>
<td>Existential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-</td>
<td>οτ- πε*</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Num. 16:9:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΦΑΙ ΔΕ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-</td>
<td>ΝΑΙ- πε πι-</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Ex. 14:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN-</td>
<td>Contingent Future</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Num. 22:37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔΕ-AN-</td>
<td>Nom. Sentence</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>Num. 13:18:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔΕ-AN-</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>Num. 13:19:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔΕ-AN-</td>
<td>Verboid</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>Num. 13:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>Preterite</td>
<td>ΜΦΗ</td>
<td>Num. 22:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHTI</td>
<td>Preterite</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Gen. 20:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>οτων-ουδην</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Num. 22:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>νοοκ ετνα-</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Num. 11:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>ΜΜΩΥΤΗΣ</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Num. 12:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>ΜΗΛΑΤΑΤη ΕΤΑ-</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Num. 11:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>άΝΟΚ ΑΙ-</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Gen. 18:14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

73 C super lin., with -q crossed out.
74 Vat άΝ 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><strong>MH</strong></td>
<td>Contingent Future [zero]</td>
<td>Gen. 37:8, 41:38, Lev. 10:19 etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MHTI</strong></td>
<td>Contingent Future [zero]</td>
<td>Num. 20:10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MHTI</strong></td>
<td>oτον- [zero]</td>
<td>Deut. 29:18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MHTI an</strong></td>
<td>Present +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MH</strong></td>
<td>Foc. Preterite + an [zero]</td>
<td>Gen. 31:14f,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MH</strong></td>
<td>ἀνοκ- Rheme [zero]</td>
<td>Gen. 4:9, 30:2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MH</strong></td>
<td>Rheme - πε-</td>
<td>Deut. 20:19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MH</strong></td>
<td>Theme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MH</strong></td>
<td>ἀνοκ-τεκεω [zero]</td>
<td>Num. 22:23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MH + an</strong></td>
<td>Contingent Future [zero]</td>
<td>Num. 11:22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Topic... MH**

| **MH**          | Preterite [zero] | Num. 23:26, 24:12 |
| **MH**          | Foc. Preterite [zero] | Gen. 31:15, 29:25 |
| **MH... an**    | Foc. Future [zero] | Gen. 34:23 |
| **MH... an**    | Focus - πεταχ- [zero] | Num. 16:29 |
| **MH... an**    | ἀνοκ + Rheme [zero] | Num. 22:30 |
| **MH... an**    | ἀνοκ πε | Ex. 4:11 |
| **MH... an**    | + Rheme's | |
| **MH... an**    | Topic + nai [zero] | Num. 23:12 |
| **MH... an**    | nετα | |

**Address**

| **IE**          | Preterite [zero] | Gen. 27:36 |
| **MHTI**        | Conditional (deliberative?) | |

**IE**

| ευκολος | neg. Absolute Future | Gen. 18:30:32 |
|         | + Conditional | |
| zero   | Address + Topic + Contingent Future + | |

**MH ΝΕΟΚ an + Preterite [Oblique Response] Gen. 20:4ff.**

**Rhematic (selection):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(ΝΗΗ)</th>
<th>ΝΕΟΚ-ΝΗΗ</th>
<th>ἀνοκ πε- Rheme</th>
<th>Gen. 27:32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(ΝΗΗ)</td>
<td>ΝΗΗ πεταχ-</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Gen. 21:26, Ex. 4:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ΝΗΗ)</td>
<td>ΝΗΗ πε δαρων [zero]</td>
<td>Num. 16:11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ΝΗΗ)</td>
<td>ΝΗΗ ΤΩΕΡΙ</td>
<td>ἀνοκ-τωριν- X</td>
<td>Gen. 24:23f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ΝΗΗ)</td>
<td>ΝΗΗ πε</td>
<td># X #</td>
<td>Gen. 32:27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TENSING AND STRUCTURE IN NARRATIVE AND DIALOGUE

<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>(ΝΗΜ)</td>
<td>ΝΑΙ-ΝΗΜ ΠΕ</td>
<td>ΝΑΙ ΠΕ —</td>
<td>Rheme Gen. 24:65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ΟΤ)</td>
<td>ΝΑΙ-ΝΗΛ ΠΕ</td>
<td>[zero]*</td>
<td>Ex. 16:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ΟΤ)</td>
<td>ΔΗΝΟΝ-ΟΤ…ΔΕ-</td>
<td>(zero)</td>
<td>Num. 22:28f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ΞΕ)</td>
<td>ΔΗΝΟΝ-ΟΤ…ΔΕ-</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Gen. 4:10, Num. 23:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ΞΕ)</td>
<td>ΠΕΤΕΚΝΑ-/</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ΞΕ)</td>
<td>ΟΤ ΠΕ ΦΑΙ</td>
<td>Rheme + ΠΕ</td>
<td>Ex. 4:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ΞΕ)</td>
<td>ΕΟΕΙ-ΟΤ</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Gen. 18:13, Num. 31:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ΟΤ)</td>
<td>ΤΟΠΙΚΟ + ΟΤ ΠΕ</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Gen. 37:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ΟΤ)</td>
<td>ΟΤ ΠΕ ΦΑΙ</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Gen. 26:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ΟΤ, ΣΕΝ-ΟΤ)</td>
<td>ΟΤ ΠΕΤΕΝΝΑ- +</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Gen. 44:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ΑΞ)</td>
<td>ΕΟΕΙ-ΟΤ/ΓΑΝΑΥ</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ΝΗΛ)</td>
<td>ΝΠΗΠΕ ΠΕ/ΝΕ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ΠΝΣ)</td>
<td>ΑΝΤΙΓΕΝΕΣ</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ΠΝΣ)</td>
<td>ΑΝΤΙΓΕΝΕΣ [zero]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ΑΤΕΟ-)</td>
<td>ΟΤΟΝ-ΝΑΙΡΩΜΙ</td>
<td>AGENS - ΑΡ-</td>
<td>Num. 22:9f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ΘΩΝ)</td>
<td>ΝΧΩΤΕΝ-ΓΑΝ-</td>
<td>EΒΟΛ ΣΕΝ-</td>
<td>Gen. 29:4, 42:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ΘΩΝ)</td>
<td>ΑΣΚΩΝ</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Gen. 18:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ΘΩΝ)</td>
<td>ΑΣΚΩΝ</td>
<td>[zero]</td>
<td>Num. 11:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ΘΩΝ)</td>
<td>ΣΕΝ-ΣΕΝ-ΑΚ</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 ΓΑΠΑ + Focalizing Future/Basic Contingent-Indefinite Future with pronoun+Augens focalized: will you send me there, too?”; so too the Contingent-Indefinite Future with preceding ΤΜΟΝ (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”: “Won’t 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 Allocution: “Don’t you know me? I am... ” “To whom do you make me sacrifice — Peter or Apollo?”

(h) ἠνών “now” marking an impatient Question? (impatience is perhaps also marked by the negative). In AM II 15 a preceding ἠνών 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 presentationalis nexus. This is the case of the apocritic (non-poletic) Cleft Sentence (cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 1987 and reff.)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 ἢ — 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 ἢ and ὃ.

(q) While ἢ is (not unlike ὅ) an anaphoric interclausal connector of the whole Allocution/Response complex, ἠνών 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 ἀνόκ πε, normally representing a Cleft Sentence, but here responding to a focalizing #Initial Pronoun, Second Verb#.

(s) ΧΡΙΣΤΙΑΝΟΣ ΜΗΝ άνόκ-ὁταί (“ich bin einer” “j’en suis un”) responds here to the opening Allocation άνόκ-ὄταν έφαγατιος. It is of interest to find ὁταί representing here a zero article, and, for that matter, to find a zero article in Topic status.

(t) Deliberative Question.

(u) The “ἀνόκ 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 ἢ- + 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 ἐκκυψών ΜΗΩΩΝ ΜΗΩΝ (?) ἐνωθών ΜΗΩΩΝ άΝ άΛΛΑ ΠΟΤΡΟ ἐταύτοπος ἐρω (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 ἁμαρτάμεναι ἀμαρτήματα (I 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):

1.2.4.3 Special responsive/allocutive clauses

(a) In Response status one encounters clauses which are adverbial Rhemes with their Themes zeroed:

1) #ΜΗΤΩΤΕ / ΜΗΤΩϹ + Conjunctive# constitutes an autonomous clause, following ᾧΤΩϹ, περὶ ἀκρό “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. #ΕΙΝΑ ΝΤΕ-# (Gen. 33:8) constitutes the “affirmative” (hidden purpose) term.

2) #ΜΠΕΙΡΗΤΑΝ# Ex. 10:11 (μη οὕτως) is both allocutive and responsive (note that negation is essentially dialogic).

3) #ΕΝΟΨΤΑΜΑ# “Fortunately”, Gen. 30:11.

Obs.
For the typically Bohairic dialogic predication #ΜΠΕΙΡΗΤΑΝ#, #ΜΦΡΗΤΑΝ # (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 # ΚΑΛΩϹ #, Job 39:24, Mt. 25:23.

(b) The Performative (Austin 1975: not however the “expositive” performative. See Shisha-Halevy 1995b:187ff.) is a par excellence allocutive allocation 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), εἰτωβευ + Conjunctive (AM II 273; ed.’s note “sic more sahidico. Lege ἐτωβευ” is uncalled for), εἰπετίν μημοκ (AM II 86f.), perhaps εἰκεϊ (AM II 270). In our corpus, the unmarked το γο ἔποκ in Gen. 44:18 is in function Performative proper.\(^{77}\)

\(^{77}\) 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-sensitve 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 or 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" εικεσωτι/εικεσωτεμ, of restricted convertibility and of certain familiar modalities, alongside the periphrastic ("go" να-) 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 sophistcation "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 εικε- "future tense definite", -να- "future tense indefinite", comparing proportionally αq- and ωαq- (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 syntags — to environment as well as to noun syntags. As I will attempt to show, this characterization and appellation is in principle acceptable.

Chaîne 1930:§625ff. understandably compares the να- 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 (I §106, p. 166), εικε- was "Futurum I" and the να- future was "Futurum II", the "Futurum Tertium vel Optativus" was μαπειq-, 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 (Aufrère and Bosson 2005), the terminology is "Futurum Primum" for both forms (see pp. 117f, 119 etc.).

Stern 1880 §§367f., 379ff.: [να-] "instans" but also "Futurum I": "der nächste ausdruck der zukünftige handlung...wechselt im gebrauche mit dem dritten [futurum] in beiden dialekten"; [εικε-] "das dritte futurum" — "bestimmter (whence Tattam’s "definite") und nachrücklicher" "...[at] oft die feierlichkeit einer versicherung" (so stressed by Stern himself). This Future is said to be more frequent in Bohairic; §381 documents B εικε- for S -να-. 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.): εικε- "simple Future"(while stressing its modal role!) and "(Tempus) Instans" for -να- (following Stern 1880 §367; see Marouzeau, *Lexique* 100).

Polotsky 1959, in his only special discussion of Bohairic grammar: "Fut III": -να- "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 editions)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): εικε- to be translated by "shall", ινανα- 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 ergeticum”, is currently taken to be a superordinating sequelling mark (occurring for instance in the El Amarna letters as apodotic): see Fasberg 1994 Ch. 2 (esp. 63ff.). Poitisky objects to “Energetic” in Coptic, as unwieldy. Athanasius of Qús (Bauer 1972:182ff.) is instructive on the Future, for he combines the affirmative εqε- and ṫ-Nα- 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 1982:310ff., 319f. On the semantics of the "Future" see Dahl 1985:105ff. "Future time reference" (i.e. prospectivity) is arguably the dominant, and perhaps the only constant semantic feature (Dahl 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 Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca 1994: definite/indefinite Futures: "expected", "prearranged", "scheduled", obligatory Futures; immediate future. On volitionality and telicity (endpoint view) in analysis of the Future, see Hopper and Thompson 1980:252ff., 270ff.

(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 syntax is today's morphology" (1982:126f.) rather begs the question of stratal syntax/morphology delimitation, and is ethnocentrically tailored for IE: Να is still synchronically operative as a lexeme (Stative of "go"), and the grammaticalization of the preposition r-"to" is arguably synchronous with the earliest ḫwfr ṣdm Future. Neither do we have here a clear case of "analytic ousting synthetic" (1982:32ff., Chapter 5), for ḫwfr (r) ṣdm has been synthetic since late ME, and qnacwtem is still analytic in Coptic, almost two millennia 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 certainly not paralleled in Egyptian. If anything, Egyptian ḫwfr ṣdm evolved in the long run from a locative-deictic Present-based type of temporality to a non-temporal, but not simply modal, futurity in Bohairic Coptic, and pronounced modality in Sahidic; the Να-
“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) — $jwfr sdjm$ was such a Present, and is so no more, while the $n\$ 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” $sdjmfr$ form, which disappeared in Coptic outside the purely grammatical $peq$-auxiliary following $\uparrow$, 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); HUDLESTON 1995 (pragmatic-semantic); ROTGÉ 1995 (the future as a "modalized time", an interpelay 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; 1964:52f., 235f. on its affinity with the Present and compatibility with "now" (cf. our $\uparrow$NOW, 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 BAHLLOUL 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 $\uparrow$αισαρεπετεκαρες $\alpha\psi\alpha$, Gen. 34:17 (fatidical) $\phi\alpha\iota$ $\alpha\nu\gamma\omega\mu\nu\nu$/$\epsilon\epsilon\gamma\omega\omega\nu\nu$. 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=S=O: BO ἐκεί-, S η- (7:16, 8:11:13, 12:27, 16:18 etc., modal / prophetic injunction; 24:9:14, 25:34 following τοτε, 10:12 BO ἐκεί-, S ἐπη-). 


(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. τερεμροκι...ὁτορ ἐρεμοῦτ... ἐκεί-... ὁτορ τερεμροκι... ὁτορ τερεμροκι... (v.l. ἐκείρορορο...) where the prophecy seems to be subdivided in three constituents, with η- marking the final peak; 

(d) Argumentative η- Future (Rom. 9:19); 

(e) η- Future in a "helpless" query (Rom. 6:1:2); 

(f) η- in a "prophetic scenario" or confident prediction (Mt. 20:18ff., 21:3:25, 24:47, 26:2:24, Mark 14:21); 


(h) Generally speaking, the η- Future seems in the NT to express the normal, ἐκεί- 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. 28:5:5, 29:13, 51:6, 68:36, 93:14, 118:15ff., 138:16ff., 145:9ff.); 

(b) no interlocutive/delocutive distinction (cf. 55:7ff., 68:36, 74:2, 118:15ff etc.). 

(c) Note (12:2) Ἑλορθαντ ΕΙ ΕΙ- ΕΙ-, inconceivable in our corpus; 

(d) In 134:16ff., the negative Future expresses an absolute negation rather than inability: "on no account will they..." ἘΙΟΤ ΝΗΟΤΟΤ ὁτος ἘΙΟΤΑΣΙ ΝΗΟΤΑΛ ΝΗΟΤΟΤ ὁτος ΝΗΟΤΑΤ... etc. 

(11) In Nitrian Bohairic, the ἐκεί-/η- relationship is yet again different, with the η-rage broader and encroaching on that of ἐκεί- (cf. η- vs. η- πε). 

(a) Assured or divine prediction, promise, assured result: η- Future (AM 1 3, 4, 8, 10, 66, 84 etc.);
(b) modal "optative" eeq-, ekke- nne- (AM I 6, 21, 59, 137 etc.);
(c) Injunctive, ekke-; Jussive, eqeq- (AM I 10, 12, 21, 45, 71).

(12) In the early B4 text of the Twelve Prophets (P. Vat.copto 9, as yet unpublished), there are instances of eeq- corresponding to the later (B5 or standard Boh.) version ṢNA-. Consider Hag. 2:9:19:23; however, in 2:2:12, the delocutive ṢA- Future (in an Assertive-Focal or "Rhetorical" Question) of B4 corresponds to B5 eeq-/qe-.

(13) The Future and the "Finalis"/Consecutive, (Sah.) Ze(kaac) eeq-/(e)enneq-, Ze-eqna-:

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 juncultural circumstances also enter other, intriguing constructions: hnhccc ntw- Deut. 9:28, gwcce ntek- Deut. 28:35, gina [gotan tswjan-] gaw- Ex. 40:32. Outside the corpus, consider Ze-eqna- (B4) Zach. 5:10; Nitrian: Ze-gina eqna- AM I 13, Ze-eqna- AM I 82, II 105, 298, Ze-eqna- AM I 24, 68, Ze-+ Conj. AM I 4, 7, 150 (content), Ze-gina+ Conj. AM I 4, 5, 14, 16, 207 (consec.), 89 (content) gina+ Conj. AM I 12, 16, 120, 121 (content), Zeexeq epeq- AM I 3, 246, II 123, Zeexeq eeq- AM I 7, 104, 2 (content). Obviously, the rich variety of constructions, conjunctions and adverbs (including eeqeq-, eneeneeq eqeq 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) eeq- (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 eeq- in no sense continues the prospective sdmf. This is yet another case of the obsfuscation brought about by seeing Sahidic as the typological representant of Coptic. -nA- 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 an eeq- NOUN e-cwtem # form.

(2) “Objective" is used of the ME r- Future by Vermus (VERMUS 1990c, e.g. 9ff.); also by Loprieno 1995 of LE) in a semantic spectrum ("threats, assurances, obligation, omen, 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 Vermus’ "subjective" Future (1990c:

81 It is certainly not the case that Latin amare habeo was "modally neutral" while the Romance (i')aimerai is modal (So LOPRIENO 1995:272 n.71).
(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*”, negatived as *hn.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 *sm* used as the auxiliary in a periphrastic Present-based Future, much like Coptic *now έ*ːː see Spiegelberg 1925 §139, Vittmann 1998:445f.

(d) The Absolute-Definite (“Specific”) Future (εεεεκοτέμ, κνεεεκοτέμ)

(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]
- [- Volitionality]
- [- Instigator/Speaker Orientation]
- [- Questionability]: incompatible with nexal (incl. Assertive-Focal (“Rhetorical”)) or rhamatic 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 πωκ, and so on
• Never responsive
• Incompatible with protatic environment (ιάξε) (in apodosi, un-marked by ιε)
• Rarely compatible with presetting temporal adverbials: typically un-modified (see Obs. below)
• Incompatible with particles: οσν, γαρ
• Typically and quintessentially sequelling, thus apodotic (οσοι ἐπι-)
• Not occurring in protasis; when apodotic, then unmarked by ιε
• Theme-agens specific in affirmative environment
• Non-disjoinable by ιε, yet coordinated by οσοι
• Conversion highly restricted
• Incompatible with Presentative (χιππει ιε, χιππει)
• Rarely compatible with Theme-agens topicalization
• 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 [εοβε] ια-).

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 rhematic sequel is of prime importance in Egyptian synchrony and diachrony: let me mention only σdm. hr., σdm.k.f, σdm.jn.f, the apodotic (prospective) σdm.f (in Old and Middle Egyptian); the Sequential ἰωση ʰr σdm, hr σdm.f (in Late Egyptian); the Conjunctive (Shisha-Haley 1995a). χαρακτηριστικ (see below and Shisha-Haley 2003a), the apodotic εγκορτημ (Shisha-Haley 1973) in Late Egyptian, Demotic and Coptic. (In Demotic, the important injunctive role of ἰωση σdm is arguably yet another facet of its superordinative nature). As is evident from the examples below, the sequelling role of εγκ-, 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 δαμαν. ἵνα νόταίο εναλ-κεν όροι κενητικωπ ιτεν ἵνα ἐφημεντίν παξί: the adverb here accentuates the consequential and apodotic-superordinating effect of εγκ-. An-

82 Not, however, with nexus topicalization (ερεπονθε εγκ…): see above and below.
other striking instance is Gen. 50:25 ὅτα ἄιων εἴπα ἡμέραι μην ἐκεῖ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ τῷ ἔφημεν ἐκεῖ ἡμῶν ἐρωτεῖ εἰς τὴν ἰσχυμάνακας εἰς ὅμεν ἰς ἀπεμποτικόν, which may perhaps also be understood as a causal "on the occasion of...", or "should God visit...".

(3) The unique ἡμερική 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 γνάθε πε- Ex. 6:1. Temporal post-modifiers (adjuncts) do occur, yet rarely: Gen. 15:13 εὐθερειβητῶν οὐ νεμοθειτί. Presentative instances are even rarer: Ex. 32:34 τὸν ζε μαγείακον ὅτα σιμπτι ἐκεῖνῳ και πλυν ἐαύτῃ ὁ τοι ζε παγελος εἰς ἐντικροπτέω μην. 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 1987:194).

(6) The unrepealability of the ἐκεί- 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 circumstances.

(2) Roles and documentation (classified by prime syntactic / semantic-pragmatic roles and associations)

(a) Affirmative

(1) Affirmative only: inevitable/ineluctable/inexorable sequel (with ὅτα or zero) apodotic/non-apodotic superordinating sequelling (affirmative 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 ὅτα, is as a rule separated from its "protasis" by the lemniscus delimiter + (Chapter Four), as in Gen. 30:15 or 42:34 and often: this is normally the case with "conditional" protasis/apodosis complexes.

(2) For the Absolute-Definite Future in the post-imperatival slot, see above.

(3) Note the important Future configuration ἡμα... (ὁτα) εἰς- (etc., for various persons) discussed below, which, I believe, strongly corroborates the sequelling role of the Absolute-Definite Future.

(4) Cf. ANDERSSON 1904:27 "so werde ich..." (ὁτα εἰς- Gen. 4:14), yet — wrongly, I believe — attributing this to ὅτα rather than the future form.

(5) Note below numerous cases of Sahidic and/or Greek "and" for the Bohairic asyndetic Future; comparison with a sensitive modern version (e.g. Luther's German one) is also instructive in these cases.

(6) DEPUYT 1993:244f. "The sequence ζνακωτο τε — as distinct from ζνακωτο without τε — typically occurs in the apodosis of conditional sentences" is factually correct. It is a marked superordinated construction of the ἡμα- Future, occurring in apodosi
Gen. 42:34 ἄνιοςὶ ἁπτενκοτζί οὐκ ἐποίη εἰεκέμι δε-νωτεν-γάναθὴ ἀν.
Gen. 30:20 ἄφτ τν ὥν ὅστα ἐνανεύθεν χρή σεππαις-χος ντετρυθοπ εἰεκνεμνριτ νἄε-πάγαι.
Gen. 4:14 ἰδὶ ἄνφεττ τζάφος εβόλο γάρ χο τοῦ ἐπισωπτε ἐικαρι οὐτο τοῦ ἐκεχερτερ γίζενπκαγι...
Gen. 18:5 τοῦ ἐπεί δι οὐσίωι ἑρτενεος τομ μενενσα-ναι ἑρτενεφωπτεν.
Gen. 24:46 κω νεοκ ἑιετσκ ενκεκκεσαϊαι (Arabic wa-; Greek καί), sim. 24:44.
Gen. 26:2ff. ωτπι δε σεππικαζι εναζον νακ οτος ἀρ-πεμάζωια γίζεπκαγι οτοσ εἰεκωπτι νεμακ εἰεκςουτ εροκ εἰετ ἐπακαζι τηρπ νακ.
Real concatenation: every εφε- form sequels the form preceding it.
Gen. 27:45 ωτπι νεμακ ιενασοου ωττέπεμβον νεμ πάωπιτ μπεκκον κοτγ εβόλο γαροκ ... τοῦ ἑιετατο νεωκ εβόλο μματ.
Gen. 29:27 δεκπι οτν εβόλο ντεβαι οτοσ εἰετ ητ δο νακ.
Gen. 30:15 μανεγαί νὴ δει εἰετ ἐν ννίζεμφες.
Gen. 31:3 μανεκο οικαζι ντεπεκιώτ νεμπέκαζον οτος εἰεκτστι νεκακ sim. 32:9.
Gen. 42:20 τοῦ ἁπτενκοτζί οὐκ ἄνιπτ γαροὶ τοῦ ἑρτενεζε-νετεςκαζί.
Ex. 8:25 ητ ἁσεβη εβόλο τιτοτκ τοῦ ἑιετωβε μφτ (cf. the narrativization of this Allocation [verse 26] ἄρι ... τοῦ ἁτ-ωβε...).
Ex. 14:4 ἁνοκ γαρ εἰεθε-πικτ μφαραω νουτ οτος εφε-δοξι γικάγοι μμωσ οτος εἰεκισοσ νςρη ρενφα-ραω...
Lev. 18:5 ναι ετεφρωμη ἅητετο εφέωνη.
Ex. 22:3 εφεσις δε μμονταν μματ εφεθηοι εβόλ...
Ex. 5:21 εφέτερο ερπτεν νᾶε-φτ εφεφγαί.
Num. 8:2 καζι νεμ ἀπων οτος εκαζος νας ἁε... sim. Lev. 17:2, Lev. 19:2.
TENSING AND STRUCTURE IN NARRATIVE AND DIALOGUE

Num. 20:8 ...οὐσὸς σαλίνες ἤπειρα ὑπόστασις ὅποις εἰσὶν ἡμῶν.
   Deut. 30:1ff. οὗτος εἰσελθεῖται ἐπὶ σάρκα ναζε-ναίακας ἐπὶ τρόπον ἑτεροκλή
tοιοῦ τετειμίσθω ... εὐεγέρτης-ἐνεκτωμι τρόπον ναζε-ποσ ὅποιος εἰκοσ ὅνακ...
   Deut. 2:28 εἰκόνες χάρι νῆρας εἰκοσοῦμα (Greek. καὶ, Sah. ἵσι).
   Deut. 5:27 εἰκοσάττρε ... ἐνεγοθησομεν οὗτος εἰκοσάττρε.
   Num. 16:30 εἰρέπεκαι ὥστη νῦν μνῆμα εἰκοσοῦμα.
   Gen. 28:15 εἶπεν ἄνωκ ἧμας οὗτος εἰκερές ἐρόκ ... ὅποιο εἰκετάκειν.
   Deut. 29:13 ἑνεκεν οἰκεσεμνητὶ παῖς οὐσαμεν οὗτος ἡμῶν εἰκοσ πιὸν ἑκοσ ἡμῶν ἄγα
   Not balanced or symmetrical — ἕπει is here resultative.
   Deut. 7:4 εὐεγερτημενοιρὶ γιὼν εβολεληρόι εἰκασμενωι ἄγακενενοιτὶ οὗτος εἰκόνες ἐκεδωμὴν ἔρωτεν ναζε-ποσ εἰκετ-ενεκτ οἰκειο εβολο εκεδωμεν — a real “narrative” future sce
cenario.
   Gen. 18:26 εἰς ἡμῶν ἡμῖν ἐκνήνων Ἄσκονα ἑκατάκτωμα τούτῳ εβολε λατον —

vine Intent” (often, but not necessarily, sequelling):
   Gen. 28:15 εἶπεν ἄνωκ ἧμας οὗτος εἰκερές ἐρόκ ... ὅποιο εἰκετάκειν — note the coordination of the Absolute-Definite Future to the Present, which is no less promissory.
   Gen. 46:4 ...οὗτος ἄνωκ εἰεὶ οὐσαμεν ἐξηρί εκνήν ἄνωκ ἐκεκήν εἰκοσ ὅποιον μαζεύε.
   Gen. 6:18 εἰκεσεμνη ηταῖηενκη ἡμῶν.
   Ex. 14:4 ἄνοκ γαρ εἰεθερ-πνητ ἑφαραμ νῦνοτ οὗτος εἰεθερ-πνητ ἑφαραμ μμωτ οὗτος εἰσελθοτ ἐξηρί ἡπεροφο ἐφαραμ... Contrast the “nynegocentric”-presented “I am going to...” in
   Ex. 14:17 εἶπεν ἄνωκ ἧμας ἐποιεῖνε ἐκεδο οὐσω ρος ἔνω ρος ήρ τηρί Σεθρασμὐ ἐρετε ἕναμον ἐτηρή κ τοῦτο.
   Ex. 9:5 οὗτος ἂστε ἁτὸς ἧμαι νους εὐεγερτησι μοι ἄσκονα ἐκετ-ενεκτ ἔρωτεν.
   Ex. 21:13 εἰεὶ ἧμας οὐσω θερεφοτ οὐσω ἅζε-φν ἐκεθετωτεν.
   Gen. 6:7 εἰκετηπερομαν εβολα ἢκεθαμοιο.
(3) Benediction, Maledition ("Divine Partner"): 

Lev. 26:5f ...οσον πικαρι εμενα ενεκοσταρ οσον Νεφων 
ntenimephων ετεη μπορουσα οσον ερεπισονων ταρο 


Gen. 3:19 εκεουωμ μπεκκικικι Νεϕων εμεκο ωτεκ-

taceo επικαρι ετασπικ εβολ Νάηντη.

Ex. 7:28 ...οσον ερεπισον θεβι επισυ νανξρων ... 

Gen. 9:25 ιεσορατ Ναη-καλαν εεισωπι νουβλον 


(4) Fatidical Prediction, Prophetic Word; “Prophetic Future Scen-

ario” ("Divine Partner"): 

Gen. 4:14 οσον εεισωπι ειριασον οσον εσεηερε ιε-


Gen. 18:10 κατανισχιον επανωνων εεεί ιονουμρι 


Gen. 15:13 Νενονοκο εκεεοι χε-ερεπικροξ ερ-εμπν-


Gen. 24:14 οσον εεισωπι ιπαρενος θε άνοικ εγι-


Gen. 41:30f. Νενονοκοι ετεη Ναη-κε-ζ ινομπι Νυρων 


Gen. 28:14 οσον εεπεκαροξ ερ-μιρρι επιομ Νυρων 


Num. 23:9 επεπι ιο ευλαοε εεισωπι χατατη.


Could this be a case of the adnominal Circumstantial converter zeroed 
before ιεεε;? See below, Chapter Four.

Deut. 31:20 ειςατο ήρ εξομ επικαρι Ναηαον.

Deut. 7:4 εεπεξεεικαρι ήρ εβολ ιερον εεισωπει 


Also: Deut. 28 passim, Num. 33:52f.

Obs.

Prophecy is, properly speaking, non- or extra-temporal: it is a case of the ineluctable “fu-
ture scenario”. Note the neutralizing (in the allocutive forms εεεε-, εεεεεε-) of direc-
tives or injunctions and the “Future Scenario”.
(5) Allocutive or delocutive statement of juridical / ritual / procedural obligation / injunction / instruction (as a rule addressed to minus habens; typically, "Divine Partner"): "you shall", "you are to...". Also, procedural ("scenic") instructions; name imposition:

Deut. 25:9 ὡς ἐκεῖ ἔρχεται καὶ λαμβάνεται ἡ κατασκευή ἡ κατασκευή τῆς πόλεως. ἄθανατή δύναμις ἡ κατασκευή τῆς πόλεως.

Gen. 6:18f. ἔκρυβεν πάντα τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ τοὺς κύκλους τῆς γῆς. Ὁ Κύριος θέλει νὰ φύγει ἡ γῆ και τὸ κατασκευασμένο.

Ex. 20:24 ὁ πατὴρ τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐκεῖ ἔτη καὶ πανταχοῦ πάντα ἀρκετά ἐκεῖ ἔτη πανταχοῦ πάντα ἀρκετά.

Gen. 2:16 ἐκεῖ ἔκρυβεν οὐδὲ ἔκρυβεν ἐκεῖ ἔκρυβεν τὴν κατασκευὴν τῆς γῆς. ἔκρυβεν τὴν κατασκευὴν τῆς γῆς.

Gen. 6:14ff. οἱ ἀνθρώποι πάντα ἐν τῇ γῇ καὶ τῇ γῇ καὶ τῇ γῇ καὶ τῇ γῇ καὶ τῇ γῇ καὶ τῇ γῇ καὶ τῇ γῇ καὶ τῇ γῇ καὶ τῇ γῇ καὶ τῇ γῇ καὶ τῇ γῇ καὶ τῇ γῇ καὶ τῇ γῇ καὶ τῇ γῇ καὶ τῇ γῇ καὶ τῇ γῇ καὶ τῇ γῇ καὶ τῇ γῇ καὶ τῇ γῇ καὶ τῇ γῇ καὶ τῇ γ Codable...
Obs.
(1) Note the difference between the Future and the Jussive μαρεθ - (above): the former is in reality not a Jussive, but a delocutive prospective constatation.

(2) I find of interest the coextensive combination of the negative Absolute Future with the statements of Non-Existence and the Preterite in De Vis II 119f. ουκετί ζε-μηνω-
ζαί νεκαρει ζαλαί ιαίρεικο οταλε νεκατί ζε οταλε νεκηκί οταλε μηνωζαίω ντεζερθυμι αλλα ζεμωνι εθοι ιαζαί γαμε νατιακε γωμ σο
παλτ... etc.; nneaq- appears here to be virtually aoristic.

(3) The discontinuous-Thème construction ἐπε- [nominal Theme-agens] ἐσεα-, 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 pronouncement: Lev. 4:6f. ὁτοι ἐπε-
ποιοθει ἐσεωμι ιαζηνθει βετπικοι... and so often in Leviticus; Num. 19:19 ὁτοι επαφη εοτας εκενοτσε εβοι... 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 topocalization of the whole nexus.

(3) 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/Diveine 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 SÜPPENSTEIN 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 μαρεθ- Jussive in these genres: in Bohairic, as we have seen, μαρεθ-, if not Post-Imperatival, is rather a rather circumlocutory request-form.

(6) Oath-taking, adjuration (interlocutive, delocutive) (Divine Oath or Divine Partner). αν homonym:

Gen. 50:25 ὁτοι διασθετο ταρκο ννεωμηρι μπια εγαω μμοκ δε νηφι βεπικωμι ετεθν ναωμι ερωτεν μμοκ ερεπεναεακε εβοι θαι νεμωτεν.
An other case of the Absolute-Definite Future pre-modified, by a causal “on the occasion of...”.

Gen. 14:22 ειεσεκταξη εφη εαν έτακθει.
Gen. 24:7 απομακ νηει εγαω μμοκ δε-ειε ιεπακα α ακ. Num. 32:11...δε-αι-επακα απακα... Gen. 31:49f. εεγαντ δε-φτ εσωτι νεμακ... δε-αι-ννεκ-
θεμπο νναωερι δε-αι-ννεκθεμι εεκαναωερι.

(7) Prayer and Request (addressed to plus habens, or to numinous authority) (uncommon):

Gen. 27:28 ὁτοι επεθι ται ναι εβοι βεπικωμι ντε-τφε.
Gen. 32:20 ειεσεκταμε ννεωμο... εεεαντ εεπεθο.
(8) Statement of Resolute Intent (rare)
Gen. 45:28 εἰευγήνηι ητανατ ἐροφ ἡπατήνωι.
Gen. 24:19 εἰετσίοι ηνεκκεδαμασαλι γιατοσω πηρνω.

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 ασνοτκ ηνεκλι ιν ιντεζδικ εξεμπαργι ηπρη
ηξημι.
Gen. 41:16 ασνεφή ηνοτερος μπιερζαλι θεαρα.
Gen. 32:32 εειζεθαλ ηνοτονημ ηνε-νεςθηρη μπιε-καρ
ηποτ ηιαζνοπημ.
Gen. 31:32 ellig ηεινθεζμ-νεκτορη ητοτη ηνεπζνε.
Ex. 12:43 ellig πε ηιμομοκ μπιπακαλ ιαλωεζμης ηιβεν
ηνεοτομημ εβολ μμοη.
Ex. 22:18 ηνετεσερ-θηρη ηωοη αημ ηθημαροζς.
Ex. 22:21 ηρα ηιβεν αμ ηφηζοκ ηιβεν ηνετεσερθμκαρ
ηιοτ.
Ex. 23:24 ηνεκουζμητ ηνοτονητ οηαλ ηνεκζθεμζι
ημμωθ.

Lev. 22:30 ηειζοτομη ηεπιμεζοσ ηεθμαα οηου ηνε-
tεθαζμπ ... ηεθθεζοη.
Gen. 9:4 οηαλ ηεθοτομοη μπιερη ηνετεσομη.
Deut. 17:15f. ηνεκζκμζιομ νεπ-οτρωμη ηωεμμο ναρ-κθη
εθημ εαζκ ... εεζε ηε-νεςθηερζηο αωει ηαπ οηου
ντεθαζμομ μπιαοο εαζημ ειαθη ηε-νεςθηερζηθκ-
θηνοτ εμαι επαμμυτ ηε — 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)
include by εεζε ηε- (rare as well), (c) included by ηε- in a final
construction (very rare).
The Decalogue: Deut. 5:18ff. ὡνεκερνωικ ὡνεκσωτεβ ὡνεκσιοτι ὡνεκερεμεοε ὁτοεκουφήρ ὡενομεοε ὡνοσά ὡνεκερεπηοεοιμ ετξειμι ὡσεκουφήρ ὡνεκερεπηοεοιμ επηιι ὡσεκουφήρ... — the Greek negated Future, and not μή οὐ, renders here the “Divine Negative Imperative” (and not an especially emphatic command / prohibition).

(2) Locutive: Divine Promise:
Gen. 19:22 ἵνα ὁς ὡμὸς ὡς ὡρεκναςμεκ ὡματ ὡναφκεο-δεο ὁτε ὡρηι ὡοτρωβ ὡτωκουεοακ ὡδοτοι ὡματ — this is a nicely paradoxical locus: declaration of Divine Inability!
Gen. 18:31 ὡννατακοσ ὡοβετο-κ.

(3) Oath-taking, adjuration (Divine Partner):
Gen. 31:49f. ὡεγενατ ὡδε-φή ὡοτωοι ὡνεμακ ... ὡε-αθ-ино-κεκκεβίο ὡναμερη ὡαθ-ἀ-ино-κεκκεκκίοι ὡεκακαμερη.
Gen. 42:15 ὡτε-ποοκαλ ὡμαραο ὡνατεκουεοωτον ὡβοτα 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 (να-, below) to be the “active” suppletive correspondent for the Absolute-Definite one, while the reduced convertibility of ὡεγε- 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: -ἡε ὡτεκε- or ὡτεκε-
Ex. 3:14:15 παρθή ὡτε ὡτεκεδοκ — adverbal Focus, sim. 26:17.
Ex. 20:9 ἰ ὡγοοτ ὡτε ὡτεκεερρω ὡμωοτ — nominal/adverbal Focus Ex. 19:3 ὡαι ὡτε ὡτεκεδοτοτ — pronominal Focus; sim. 20:22, Num. 23:16.
Ex. 22:30 παρθή ὡτε ὡτεκεαι — nominal focus; sim. 26:24.
Deut. 20:20 ὡνοο ὡτεκεορδρ.
Deut. 6:13 ἰ πεκγοτ ὡτεκεερροτ ὡατεκη ὡνοο ὡνατατ ὡτεκουεοομετοτ ὡοο ὡνοο ὡτεκεκοτοκ ὡρο ὡρο ὡἐκωρκ ὡμεραν — nominal/pronominal Foci; note the coordinated subcategorization by the unconverted Future.
(2) In expansion of Theme in Nominal Sentence:
Ex. 23:22 ΝΑΙ ΝΕ ΝΙΚΑΙ ΕΤΕΚΕΔΟΤΟΣ...
Deut. 19:4 ΦΩΣ ΠΕ ΠΙΟΤΑΡΚΑΡΝΙ ΕΤΕ-ΕΚΕΨΩΝΙ ΜΠΙΡΕΨΩ-ΤΕΒ.

(3) Negative: rare. Negative generic “cannot”, “does not by nature...” (cf. the negative Aorist, below). Appositive (the actual antecedent ΦΗ or ΦΩ).
Gen. 32:13 ΜΦΡΗΤ ΜΠΙΨΧ ΝΤΕΦΙΟΜ ΦΗ ΕΤΕ-ΝΝΕΨΩΜΠΗ.
Deut. 28:50 ΟΤΨΛΟΑ ΝΑΤΨΦΙΤ...ΦΩ ΕΤΕ-ΝΝΕΨΖΟΨΤ ΕΠΟ ΝΟΤΣΕΛΛΟ.

(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 ΕΚΕ- and negative ΝΝΕΨ-:
Gen. 1:6 ΜΑΡΕΨΨΩΝΙ ΝΞΕ-ΟΣΤΑΖΡΟ...ΟΤΟΡ ΝΤΕΨΨΨΙ 
ΕΚΕΨΨΡΑ ΕΒΟΛ... (Greek ΕΣΤΩ ΝΙΑΞΨΡΙΣΤΩ).
Ex. 34:7 ΦΑΠΙΝΙΨΤ ΝΝΑΙ ΟΤΟΡ ΠΙΑΛΤΕΝΝΟΣ ΟΤΟΡ ΕΚΑΡΕΞ 
ΕΟΤΗΕΜΝΗ ΟΤΟΡ ΕΠΙΡΙ ΝΟΤΝΑΙ ΨΑΓΑΝΨΟ ΕΨΒΑΙ ΝΝΙΑΝΟ- 
ΜΙΑ...ΟΤΟΡ ΝΝΕΨΤΟΤΒΟ ΜΦΗ ΕΤΟΙ ΝΕΝΟΧΟΕ.
(ANDERSSON 1903:62 “eigentlich ε + ΝΝΕΨ-, partizipial aufzufassen”; but the Greek has καὶ οὖ καθαρεῖ). 
Num. 23:9 ΖΗΝΠΕ ΙϹ ΟΥΛΑΟΕ ΕΚΕΨΨΨΙ ΜΝΑΡΟΤΨ (but Greek ΜΟΝΟΣ ΚΑΡΟΙΚΗΣΕΙ)
Lev. 25:6 ΟΤΟΡ ΕΕΨΨΨΙ ΝΞΕ-ΝΙΓΕΝΝΗΜΑ ΝΤΕΠΙΚΑΡΙ ΕΚΕ- 
ΟΤΟΜΟΤ ΝΕΟΚ ΝΕ ΠΕΚΒΑΚ (Greek ΕΣΤΑΙ ΒΡΩΜΑΤΑ ΣΟΙ).
Lev. 26:6 ΟΤΟΡ ΕΙΕΤ ΝΟΥΨΡΙΗΝΗ ΓΙΖΕΝΠΕΤΕΝΚΑΡ ΟΤΟΡ 
ΕΡΕΤΕΝΕΝΚΟΤ ΝΝΕΨΨΨΙ ΝΞΕ-ΦΗ ΕΤΝΟΨΨΨ (Greek καὶ οὖκ 
ΕΣΤΑΙ...).
Lev. 23:7 ΕΕΨΨΨΙ ΝΟΤΛΕΝ ΕΕΜΟΡΤΨ ΕΡΟΙ ΝΞΕ-ΨΟΤΑΒ 
(Greek ΚΛΗΤΗ ΆΓΙΑ ΕΣΤΑΙ ΧΜΙΝ).
Deut. 20:8 ΟΤΟΡ ΕΕΤΟΥΨ-ΤΟΤΟΤ ΝΞΕ-ΝΙΚΑΖ ΕΕΕΚΑΖΙ ΝΕ 
ΠΙΛΑΟΕ (Greek προσθήσουσι... λαλήσαι).
Ex. 28:35 ΕΕΨΨΨΙ ΝΞΕ-ΑΛΡΨ ΖΕΝΠΣΙΝΕΡΕΨΨΜΨΙ 
ΕΕΕΨΨΤΕΜ ΕΕΕΨΚΜΗ ΕΨΧΝΟΕ ΕΣΟΤΝ ΕΕΨΨΨΨΤΑΒ...ΝΕΜ 
ΕΨΧΝΟΕ ΕΒΟΛ (Greek ΆΚΟΥΣΤΗ ἢ φωνή αὐτοῦ).
Lev. 11:2 nai neb nitebniwos + epeteneoumouw 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 wupi ekectwv nwpiv otop ekei epwv ezenpitwos ntecinva otop ekeori epatv nni mma (Vat ek-; Greek γίνων ἔτοιμος) is different, for here we have a Stative Rheme with eke-. So too in:

Deut. 28:33...ekesbov nasonc ekosip... (Greek ἔστη ἀδικούμενο). 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 conjunctinal-final construction (very rare).

Ze-nne-

Lev. 10:7 netenenv cawol mpwo n’scknhn ... ze-nneten-

mow.

Deut. 17:15f. nnekwzemwom nerestraui nswemo narp-

xwn ephri zwk ... eboe ze-nneqefrego zwi nai otop

neteptaio mpialac ephri exhni ze-nnetenovagten-

onov enav epanmit ze.

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 (Ze- + Conjunctive, consecutive) Ex. 3:11, Deut. 30:13 and of course gina (not Zeacb).

gwte, gopwc/mhwc, hhnto + Conj. (e.g. 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 nne- De Vis I 76: Ze-nne- ibid. 32, 89, 90; "lest" De Vis II 206; Ze-exe- De Vis I 60, II 22; Zeacb is uncommon.

(e) The Contingent-Indefinite Future (qaqowtem): 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]. [- Apostoticity]
- [- 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 agens 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 otn, ἐστίν, έκ
• Freely compatible with specific time-indications
  • Freely compatible with modifiers
  • Freely included or embedded (e.g. by [ἐπιθύμε] ἐκ-
  • Compatible with Presentative ἔχειν (ἔχω)
  • Compatible with topicalization (esp. pronominal ἄνωκ)
  • Compatible with interrogation, Rhetorical Question, Modality Question πώς;
• Compatible with Focalization and focussing Presentation
• Compatible with Augens
• Compatible with explicative environment
• Compatible with protatic (ἔχει) and with apodotic environment (when apodotic, it is marked by ἔ; 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 ıe
• Junturally unmarked.

Obs.
(2) Contrary to general opinion, it is the ἔ- Future that lends itself to affects and modalities, whereas the Absolute-Definite one is "impassive" and detached; the Contingent-Indefinite 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 (oI ἔ- vs. Nominal Sentence, respectively; see below, Chapter Two), is entirely "value added" above the Future tensing in the Greek original.

(2) Compatibilities:
  temporal adverbials:
  ἐνόε (ραρ, ἐς, ὅσον): Gen. 47:4, 19:9, Ex. 9:15, Num. 24:17
  ἔναταοι ὁσοι ἐνόε ὅσον ἀν.
  ὅσον ἐνόε Gen. 24:50.
  ἃνθροι ἰεύσωι ἰεταιαδώφη Ex. 11:4.
  μπαίνατ ὧνάτ Gen. 29:18, Ex. 9:18, 10:4.
  ἄν ἔσοσοι μηθούι Ex. 5:3.
  ἐθαν μπαίνοι Deut. 32:29.
  ἐτί ραρ κε-ίς νέοσοι Gen. 7:4.
  μήσοσοι Deut. 20:3.
  ψάναστ ἐς- Focus Ex. 10:7.
  Interrogative/presentative/protatic environment:
  ἀν Ex. 16:4, Num. 14:30, Deut. 8:2.
  ἵν Gen. 18:17, 37:10, 41:38, Lev. 10:19.
  γάρa Gen. 37:10.
  zero interrogative marker Ex. 5:16.
  επιπε Ex. 7:17, 8:17:25, 10:4, 14:17, Num. 25:12.
  Explicative environment:
  ραρ Num. 22:17.
  ὦτ ραρ Deut. 2:5:19, 4:22, 18:12.
(εφέ) ε- inclusion, Gen. 44:34, Ex. 4:1, Deut. 5:25, 32:43.
Augens.
Gen. 31:5 ἄναναν ἀνόκ.

(3) Conversion: unrestricted.

(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” θή/πικάκι ετνα-, often and typically combined with “apodotic” εμ-ε-, which is after all
the “official” law-setting form (e.g. Gen. 6:21, 44:10, Ex. 12:10:15,
(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) ηε- (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 Fu-
ture 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:
“I’m going to…”
“I intend to (see to it that)”, “I mean to”.
“I’m willing/prepared/disposed to…”.
“I promise/undertake to…”
“I’m disposed to…”.

Background locutivity factor:
“I saw to it that…”, “I’ll see to it that…”
“I know/believe that…”

\cite{Andersson1903} suggests explicitly that ηα- serves suppletively to convert εμε- (cf. Deut. 17:16 εμενων ηε-θή ετναινων...).
“You’ll see that...”
“If I wish, then...”

(a) Affirmative — declared will, disposition, design or intention:

Gen. 7:4 eti gar ke-ξ negos τηναίνη νοσμών ηκατα-
κατομος εξεσπάρι — Divine instigator and intent, precisely

timed by temporal adverbial.

Ex. 11:4 ησσρι ςεντφαμι ςεντπαιδωρτυ ηναι...
Ex. 19:9 γηππε ανοκ ηναι ζαροκ...
Ex. 7:17 γηππε ηναμιγι ςενπιγωμτ...
Ex. 23:20 επηπε ηναοτωρπ μπαγγελος ξαζωκ.
Ex. 9:18 γηππε ανοκ ηναγων ητφρι ξαζωκ sim. Ex. 16:4.
Ex. 8:25 ηςπε απηπη αποκ ηνασενι ηβολ γιτοτκ sim. Ex.
3:13.

Ex. 16:4 γηππε ανοκ ηναγων ηντεν ηρανωι ηβολ
ςενφε.
Ex. 33:14 ανοκ επανομωι ξαζωκ οτο εγ ηνατ-εμτον

ηακ.

Ex. 2:9 ανοκ δε ηνατ ηνε μπεβεκε.
Num. 22:17 ηναταιοκ γαρ εμαξω οτο εη ητεκναξοτον

ηνηι ηναοττον ηακ.

Ex. 32:33 ηναταιτον οτον ηναναοτομον.
Ex. 33:19 ανοκ ηνακινι ξαζωκ.

Deut. 4:22 ανοκ γαρ ηνακων... — the Coptic for “I’m dying”
(“je meurs”)?

Ex. 33:1 ηκαζι εταιωρκ μμοι αβρααμ νεμικακ κη-

ηνακων ειξω μμοι δε-ηναθηνι μπετεναξοξ.

Num. 12:8 ηνακαζι νεμαξ προ οσβερο.
Num. 14:12 ηνακαρι ερωσ οτον ηνατακων.

Num. 14:19f. (xa-ξνοβι μπαλωκ ιαν ιβολ...) ηναξω

ηνωσ ιβολ καταπεκαζι.

(b) Assertive-Focal Formal Questions — affirmative:

Gen. 41:38 μη τηνακαμ-οτρωμι ημαηρι.
Gen. 37:10 γαρα ηενοτι τηναι ανοκ ηεμ τεκματ ηε

νεκνανοτ ηνεσοξωντ ημοι.

(c) In Response — affirmative and negative:

Gen. 19:2 μμον αλα ηεναμοτον μμον γιπιωτερ sim.
Num. 13:30.

Gen. 29:8 τηνακαμαμον αν δαμοτωσοτ ηνε-νημα-

ηνωσον ηθρον ητοτσκερκερ ημιωνι...

Gen. 38:16f. ηναοτωρπ νε νοσμας ηβαεμπι.
(d) *In apodosi*, including post-imperatival-slot apodosis — affirmative:

The opposition εἰπε- vs. -να- is here especially striking:
- -να- is not marked for sequelling;
- εἰπε- is absolute, impersonal, detached-objective, marked for sequelling;
- -να- expresses will, intention etc.

Ex. 8:17 εἰσώπη δε ακωτεμοσώμεν οὐθωρμι ταξιστριν ερπή εδώκ ... νοτακ νοτερόν.
Ex. 24:12 ἀνατ εἰποῦ σαροί εἰζενπιτων οτορ τίνα ἂν ἃναναπλάσει νώμι.
Num. 22:34 Τινατ ιδάε πιγωβ πανακ ἃν ἄνατασθο.  
Num. 20:18 ὧνεκσιν εβολα ζίτοτ εμνόν ἄναι εἰζοτεν ερξακ.

Deut. 12:20f. “Τινατεμ-αχ ακωτεμε-επισιμίνιν οὔτε-ταύτην εοστεμ-αχ”...εκοστεμ-αχ — an instructive example, sharply confronting and contrasting the personal with the impersonal-detached categories of Futurity.

Deut. 2:27f. ἄνακσιν εβολα ζίτενεπεκάζαί αἰναμούης εἰπι-μωτ ηναρίκη εοστιαμ οὔτε δαξὴς εκετέρες οὔθε δαξατ εἰεοστμ — 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 Φη εταφερνοβί εροὶ Τινατοτε νεβολα ζιπαζέων.

(e) Negative (+ affirmative) — refusal:

Ex. 21:5 Τινασινάνη αὖ εἰοὶ νρμεη.
Num. 23:20 Τινακστον σοτρ Τινατασθο ἃν.
Num. 16:14 τενναι ερπή ἃν.
Num. 13:31 τεννασε επισω ἃν.

(f) Focalization cases (not Focalizing Conversion).

Deut. 9:6 εκεειμί μφοοσ δε-οεβε-τεκκεομή αὖ οντε

(γ) Some striking or typical lexical compatibility environments:

Μοτ

Gen. 30:1 Μνωτηρι νηί ἡμοιν Τιναμοτ ανοκ (Greek Fut. τελευ-τήσω)

Gen. 50:24 ανοκ Τιναμοτ δενοτωμινι δε φιν Μνωτην ἐρωτεν (Greek Pres. ἀποθεοντικω).
Gen. 48:21 εὐπνε αὐτὸν ἐναμοῦ (Greek Fut. τελευτῆσιν).
Ex. 12:33 ἀνόν τὴρος ὑπὲρ τὴν ἔναμοος (= Vat; Greek Pres. ἀποθνήσκομεν).

Deut. 4:22 ἀνοκ ἄρτος ἐνεναίκανα οὐς ὑπὲρ ἀναμοὑς ἐν πρώτῃ ἀνας (Greek Pres. ἀποθνήσκω).

Allocutive cases: Gen. 20:3 εὐπνε νοεκ χρισμοῦ (Greek present).
Delocutive apodotic cases (see below): Gen. 33:13f. (If I rush them...)

Gen. 44:22 εὐωπαὶ ἄνοτεραν ἐπικριτικὰ χρισμοῦ (Greek future). Note the contrast with the resultative Absolute Future in Ex. 11:4-5 ἄναι...οὐος ἑνεμοῦ ναζε- (= Vat) (Greek Future).

ὡελα-: mostly 1st plural. Interrogative, responsive, Presentative.

Gen. 22:5 ἀνὸν ἄνοτεραν χαδαμαμαι.
Ex. 3:18 χαδαμαμαν ὁτν μὴ νεκνοῦ μμωψι sim. Ex. 5:3:8, 8:23.

Ex. 10:9 ἀνὸν χαδαμαμαν νεκνανσελαρπι νεκνενζέλωπι...

Ex. 3:13 εὐπνε αὐτὸν ἐναμοῦν οἰκος ἐνεκναμοῦν ἐμπώπαι.
Num. 13:30 μμων ἄλλα ἐνεκναμαν ἐπωψιν.
Num. 13:31 ἐνεκναμε ἐπωψιν.
Num. 14:40 εὐπνε αὐτὸν ἐνεκναμαν ἐπικριτικὴ.
Deut. 1:14 ἀνὸν τηραμαν ἐπωψιν.
Gen. 44:34 πως ἄρτος ἐπωψιν ὑπαναίτι...
Gen. 46:31 ἁναμοηνὶ νταταμε-φαραν.

Especially interesting in this connection is the differentiation of the Future χαναι and the actual-prospective reference of χνοῦν “he is coming”. It would appear that this verb stands outside the χνα- vs. χες- opposition, unlike the deictically different χωλα-, but the opposition between the two forms is unclear to me (the Greek fluctuates between Present and Future):

Locutive: ἁνοῦν, τηροῦν.
Num. 10:30 ἁνοῦν ἄλλα ἐπωψιν... (= Vat) “I’m not coming, but I shall go...” (Greek Fut.).
Num. 16:12 τήροῦν ἄν (= Vat) (Greek Pres.).
As against
Num. 20:18 ἁναϊ (Greek εξελεύσομαι).

84 Cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 1981:326.
Num. 16:14 τενναι εξερθήση = (Vat) (Greek Pres.).
Delocutive: qnhs + Adverbal.
Gen. 24:13:43 εννοεῖ εβολ εμαγνωση (Greek 13 Pres.; 43 Fut.).
Gen. 41:29 γνηπεί ic ζη πολεί σενανθον εναγνωση σενπκαζ τηρε νεκμεν (Greek Pres.) — not fatidical (which would be εφε-), but oneiromantical, a grammatical distinction as crucial as the one between Dream Narrative and "Reality Narrative" (see above).
Ex. 18:15 οσθι qnhs εαροι νξε-πιλασ (Greek παραγινεται).
γνηπε (IC) qnhs + Adverbal (γνηπε ic for true Speaker's here-and-now perspective):
Gen. 48:2 γνηπε ic ιουπεθε πεκωμη qnhs εαροκ (Greek Pres.).
Ex. 18:6 γνηπε ic ιουβορ πεκωμ qnhs εαροκ (Greek παραγινεται).
Ex. 9:3 γνηπε ic οξαζα ντεπσεν ηνσε εξερθη εθεννεκτενωσι ετθεντκοι (Greek επέσται) — note that the Presentative is here revealed to be of the same category as ονον-/Μνον, preceding the non-specific οξαζα.
Ex. 7:15, 8:16 γνηπε ονοκ qnhs εβολ νξε-πιλωσ (Greek εκπορευεται).
The periphrastic ονοκ e- expresses "be about to...", always in protasis (?):
Ex. 1:16 εψωπ ερεενωσιν ονοκ εθενεενε-νενεβρενεν ονων ετεεκιε... (Greek οταν μασευθε τας Εβραιας και οζιν προς τικετ).
Ex. 30:20 ονωνοςι ει εσωυν ετςκηιν...
While the verb in μωι e- is a lexically loaded descriptive (Aktionsart) auxiliary:
Gen. 25:32 μωι εμος (a calque of the Greek πορευομαι τελευταν?) and
Gen. 26:13 ζαμωι ειαί πέ (= Vat) (Greek προβαίνων μει-ζων εγίνετο).
Different still is the case of ζαμνος n- + INFINITIVE: gradual Aktionsart.
Gen. 7:17 οτσο ζαμνοσ (i.e. πιμωσ) ζαμλι εμαιω εη-δεν-πικαζ (Greek και έπληνθονῃ το θαιρ).
ζαμλικο (always formally or contextually-virtually negative):
Present reference.

Num. 13:31 τενναδεμζόμ αν οτρε-παιενοσ.
Ex. 1:9 ἐναδεμζόμ μμαστάν εν εμαι ημωτεν.
Gen. 29:8 τενναδεμζόμ αν ψαντοςεωσουτ' ηςε-νι-
μανεσων ηρους ντουςκερκερπιων.
Deut. 7:18 πως ἐναδεμζόμ ηρετος εβολ.
Assertive-Focal (“Rhetorical”) interrogation: “how can I?” = “I can-
not”:
Deut. 1:12 πως ἐναδεμζόμ μμασταε εμαι ημωτεν,
cf. 9 ἐναδεμζόμ μμασταε εν εμαι ημωτεν.

(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 σωλολ ηαθεμι οτος νεμθι έ κατακομ ("I can-
not believe that...").
Gen. 24:42 ικε έκανεοτσων-παμωτ ηα ηνον εμοιωι
gιωτη.
Gen. 37:8 ηη δενοπεμεπορο έκαερ-οτρο εςρην εκων
ιε δεσομετης έκαερης ερον.
Ex. 5:16 κναει ηπεκλαος οτω ηδονον.
Gen. 42:36 ιωθην ηςων αν εκμεεην ηςων αν τετεναθι
ηπεκβεηαμιν...
Num. 14:30 άν-τετεναθενωτεν έςον επικαη... —
God’s oath.
Deut. 8:2 εερεζεμι... ἦξ-αν-κηααερ έπεζεπηοολη έκαη-
μον.
Gen. 20:3 γηπηηε νεοκ έκααμον.
Gen. 42:15 δενθηι τετεναθεωνε εβολ.
Deut. 3:27 ιανη ηνεκβαλ ζε-κηαααερζηπιον αν ηπαιο-
δανης.
Deut. 31:29 ηεμι γαρ ζε-ετηαθ ηπαιον τετεναθεπα-
μιν.
Gen. 44:29 ηςων οτω αρετεηαθεωλι ηπαιεηε εβολ
γαπαμο... τετεναθελ-αμετηδελλο εμειεντ' δεσομεηκαη
νηη.
(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 circumstant; "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 ΔΕ-, ΡΑΠ; or as addressed (or deictically proximal, pragmatically allocutive); or as assertively "rhetorically", interrogative again, pragmatically allocutive; or as apodotic (also post-imperatival). Some delocutive cases express a possible ("might happen") or potential scenario:

Gen. 29:32 ΦΝΟΥΝ ΚΩΝΑΜΕΝΠΡΙΤ.
Gen. 49:29 ΑΝΟΚ ΚΕΝΑΧΑΤ.
Gen. 43:7 ΜΗ ΝΑΝΕΜΙ ΑΝΟΝ ΠΕ ΔΕ-ΚΩΝΑΔΟΣ ΝΑΝ... — sim. "I know that..." cases: Gen. 18:19, Ex. 3:19.
Ex. 8:22 ΕΥΨΩΝ ΓΑΡ ΑΝΨΑΝΨΕΤΝΙΒΟΤ ΝΤΕΝΙΡΕΜΝΧΗΜΙ ΜΠΟΤΜΕΟ ΚΕΝΑΓΙΩΝΙ ΕΞΩΝ.
Gen. 44:31 ΕΥΨΩΝ ΑΨΑΝΝΑΤ ΕΡΟΝ ΜΠΙΑΛΟΥ ΝΕΜΑΝ ΑΝ ΚΩΝΑΝΟΥ ΟΤΟΡ ΝΕΚΑΛΨΟΤΙ ΚΕΝΑΔΕΛΕΜΕΤΣΕΛΛΟ ΜΠΕΚΑ-ΑΛΟΥ... 
Gen. 3:5 ΚΕΝΑΔΟΤΩΜ ΝΔΕ-ΝΕΤΕΝΒΑΛ ΤΕΤΕΝΝΑΕΡΜΗΡΗΓΙΑ ΝΓΑΝΝΟΥ.
Ex. 5:10 ΚΕΝΑΤΤΩΓ ΝΩΤΝ.
Ex. 4:1 ΚΕΝΑΔΟΣ ΓΑΡ ΝΗΙ.
Ex. 4:14 ΑΨΑΝΝΑΤ ΕΡΟΝ ΚΝΑΡΨΨΙ ΝΗΡΗΙ ΝΗΠΤΗ ΚΕ-ΣΕΝΟΤΑΧΙ ΚΝΑΚΑΤΙ — apodotic.
Ex. 11:9 ΦΑΡΑΩ ΝΑΣΩΤΕΜ ΝΑΘΕΝΝΟΤ ΑΝ.
Ex. 19:13 ΚΕΝΑΣΕΤ-ΨΝΙ ΚΕΝΑΣΕΛΚ-ΚΟΕΝΕΚ.
Deut. 9:6 ΕΚΕΜΙ ΚΕΕΘΕ-ΤΕΨΜΕΘΗΙ ΑΝ ΠΣΧ ΝΑΤ ΜΠΑ-ΚΑΓΙ ΕΘΕΝΑΕΚ ΝΑΚ.
Ex. 10:7 ΚΩΝΑΝ ΔΕ ΟΤΟΝ-ΣΡΟΠ ΝΑΨΨΠΙ ΝΑΝ.
Lev. 9:4ff. (addressed) ΝΗΡΗΙ ΚΕΝΦΟΟΤ ΠΣΧ ΝΑΟΤΟΝΨ... ΟΤΟΡ ΚΝΑΩΤΩΝΓ ΚΕΝΘΕΝΝΟΤ ΔΕ-ΟΡΨΟΤ.
Num. 14:3 ΕΕΒΕΟΤ ΚΝΑΟΛΤΕΝ ΝΔΕ-ΠΣΧ ΕΣΩΝ ΕΠΙΚΑΓΙ... 
Num. 14:8 ΙΩΔΕ ΚΝΩΤΙ ΜΜΟΝ ΝΔΕ-ΠΣΧ ΚΝΑΟΛΤΕΝ ΕΣΩΝ ΕΠΙΚΑΓΙ... 
Deut. 32:7 ΨΕΝΠΕΚΙΨΙΤ ΟΤΟΡ ΚΝΑΤΑΜΟΚ ΝΕΚΣΕΛΛΟΙ ΟΤΟΡ ΚΕΝΑΔΟΣ ΝΑΚ.
Deut. 32:43 ὄσον ἔμωτεν ηεθνος ηπειραλος ὅτου μαροτπασ δων ην ηε-νησγελος τηρον τνετη τηνητη ηε-ηλαςηι μπεμωηου ηπιςονον ητενεηψηηπη.
Deut. 5:25 ὅτοις ἄνοσοι ηνητενος ηε-ηναμοκ-της ἐβολ ηε-ηαιηςηςης πειρηρη.
Gen. 33:13 (If I guide them...) ηεσαμος.
Num. 14:41 πετηνωτη τασωτη ηαν.
Ex. 4:8f. ευωπη δε ητοσωτεμπας ἕρωσ εητεςμη ηπιη-ηιηηι δηοςηε ηεσαμος ἕρωσ εητεςμη ηπιηηηιη ηηας-βη.
Num. 22:4 ἄνοσοι ταιητηςηςηη ηεσαςη-ης νηηος ητηρον ετκωτη ἑρον...
Ex. 1:10 ...ὅτοις ἀρτιανωτως ἑρον σεσασουςως ἐβολ ηεσηπεηκας.
Gen. 18:14 μη ὅτοις-οταςας ηαεπ-ατταος.
Ex. 33:16 πως ειαωπη ειουςην ἐβολ ταιημηα ηε-ηιηαηηιη ηνητημος ηνηαςακ...
Num. 23:19 μη ηηαρη ας...ηηαςαςας.
Ex.16:4 επησητασηςος ηε-ηα-ηεσαμοςηε ησα-ηαοςη.
Num.16:22 (if one has sinned, ) ηα-πασηςη τηπεςη ηαι εηε-ηηηεηηηςηη ηαρη.
For ηα-Future statements explicating, specifying and detailing preceding ἑςη- 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- > ἑςη-: ηα-: chain-opening; typically locutive. ἑςη-: sequelling, follow-up, dénouement, summing-up. also used to achieve a crescendo rhetorical effect.
Examples (selected from among many others):
Gen. 7:4 ετι γαρ κε-7-ἐγος ηναιηι ητασηα οτορ ειεη-ηεηψηηπη μπις.κ.
Gen. 4:14 ικαε χηπαρητη μποςτη ἐβολ γαγρο μπκαρι οτορ ειεηςηπ ἐβολ οτορ ειεηςηπ ειεηςηπ οτορ ειεηςηπ ειεηςηπ οτορ ειεηςηπ ειεηςηπ...
Gen. 40:13 ετι κε-7 κεγος ηπαιηπεηςη μαε-ηαιρας ητε-καρη κιοτ ηαςηεςακ ... οτοξ εκετ... οτοξ εκειπη ηαηητκ... οτοξ εκεεπ-ηπεηςηι ... οτοξ εκεενη...
Ex. 3:18 σενασωτεν νεανικορωσ αυτοι εκεισνακ αυτοι εκεισςον...

Ex. 4:14ff. ρηπει νοηοι αυλων εφακ αυτοι ανασιν παρικοι ναρθυι ναστη αυτοι εκειαοι νασιαοι ειδον ερωι.

Ex. 8:17ff. ρηπει ανοι ηνασωτρυ ερηι εαφκ... νοηαν νοτρυοι αυτοι ετεροι νανην ντενιερμανωμ εβολ ηνενηπ αυτοι... αυτοι ειετςων ανοι ηενπερσων ετεμαιαη νπικαιι νεκεμ...

Ex. 8:25 ηνασωτρυ εβολ αυτοι ειετςωε μη φ (Vat zero + ειετςωε).

Ex. 10:4f. ρηπει τηναιει νπαιηαι νπατ νοτρυαε εροι ερηι εενενεκιν ηηροι αυτοι εειεςωνς επον μπικαι.

Ex. 11:4 ναρθυι ηεντκαιεωρε ανοι τηναι εεοτοι ηενημην τηνημ ενοταν ετεροι ναεςωμει νινεν ετενηπι ηενπκαιι ηνκαιι.

Ex. 13:19 ηεντωτρυει πνε ηναιει ερωτεν αυτοι εερτενεσει νπακακ εβολ ται ηεμωτεν.

Ex. 14:17 αυτοι ρηπει ανοι ηναερεπσετι ηφαραθ νεοτ ηενηαερμανωμ ηηροι αυτοι εειενοτεν εεοτοι ειφαγομ ημωοι αυτοι εειεςιωοτ ναρθυι ηεντκαιεωρε...

Ex. 33:19 ανοι τηναιει εαφκ αυτοι εεικαιει ηενφραν μπνε ηεκκεμον.

Lev. 18:5 ναι εετφρωμι ναιηηοι εεεωνηη.

Lev. 10:3 ηνατωβο ηεηη εεεγεν εροι αυτοι εειεςιωοτ ηεκτενανωμι ηηρο.

Num. 10:30 τηνην αν αλλα εεεωνηηει (sim. 14:31).

Num. 14:31 τηνηοιοι εεοτοι επικαιιι αυτοι εεηερκαιηφονομει ηπικαιι...

Deut. 11:31 τετεναερξιοιο μπιοράνημ εεηερεηερκαιηφονομε κιοο (Greek Pres. + Fut).

Deut. 32:41 τηναερεπακηιι μβον... αυτοι εεε νοηηηοι ναηηηαηη... αυτοι εεεμειι... αυτοι εεοταηηαη ηενετφροπνουηι ενοταν εεεκακ αυτοι εεεκακ.

Deut. 31:29 τημεί γαρ ηε-ετδαη μπιοιο εεηερεηερξιο εερτεηηαη... αυτοι εεε ηεοτον εεηερηνηοι ηεναη ηεηηαηηηηνεο...

Also Gen. 18:19, Ex. 16:4.
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(2) εφε- > να- (> εφε-).

να- a “Micro-Future” explicating/specifying/detailing a preceding εφε- “Macro-Future” statement:

Gen. 41:40f. Νοκ εκεψωπι εξηπανι ... χηπις τναξω
μμοκ μφωοσ εξηπικαζη τθρι νκθκι.

Lev. 26:6 οτογ ειετ ποσερθην ειξηπιτενκαζ οτογ
ερετενεκοτ ηνεψωπι νκε-θην εητηπωπ οτογ εωθηρ
πιον ετρσω τνεκτακω.

Ex. 19:12f. Σενονθοτ εκεομ α θενγανωνι σεναςτεν-
πιον εροον ιε θενγανοεθενι σεναζεθ κ-οθενι εροο.

Ex. 7:3f. Ανοκ δε ειεπερε ιπθαι Νκο ωοτ οτογ
τναροτακαι νκε-θηνονι οτογ νκαπερι εζηπκαζ
νκθκι ντογ ηνεψωτεμ νκαθθονι νκε-θαραο οτογ
τναθι νταζικ εξενθκι οτογ ειεπηθακον (sic) πα-
λαθο θενψρι μπίελ ιβολ ... οτογ εεκμι τθρον νκε-
ηκεμζπκι ημε-ανοκ πε πτε εεκιοθτεν νταζιθ εξε-
θκι — this is a particularly instructive example, with a sophisticated
interplay of the two Futures, in a double ascending contour: the last Ab-
olute-Definite Future is certainly the culmination of a dramatic rhetori-
cal buildup. Consider also Ex. 3:20ff.

Obs.
(1) Cases like Ex. 32:34 τνοθ δε θεσεγανοτορ χηπων κακων ηπποθ ...
εηπις ειε σαγητον εχεηπορ ηπσοι θαζθκ θεσεγατον δε
εθηηκπηπονι τπατι νθηνον εεθπθ εδωοτ. or Ex.33:20 ηνεψωζε-
ζκομ ννατ ... οτ ηθρ ημον-ρωμι ννατ ... οτογ ηνεψωθκι are different
from the configuration just described, for here the Contingent-Indefinite Future really
belongs to a new syntactic unit or chunk, being a clear delimiter demarcating it from
the unit containing the Absolute-Definite Future. Zach. 3:8f. (B4, P Vat. copeto 9) χηπις
ανοκ τμανι ... χηπις ανοκ ειεπθθκ ... οτογ ειεπεκακον may be a case
of configuration (1): the Greek has here twice the Present tense following δοφ.
(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 re-
places the Absolute-Definite Future for modified and thematized prophetic predictions:
χηπις ανοκ τματακοκ ... ειεπεκκοκ δεθηηκακο ... οτογ εθεοὶ ... εκεαλι. Consider also the whole of Chapter Eleven.
(3) French “Écoute 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 liter-
arily striking and instructive, if difficult instance, bringing home con-
jointly (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: ΜΑΤΑΜΕΤΕΣΚΡΕΠΩ ΟΤΟΣ ΤΕΝΝΑΘΙΚ ... ΟΤΟΣ ΕΡΕ-
ΤΕΝΕΤ ΝΤΑΙΛΟΥ ΝΗΙ ΝΟΤΕΓΖΙΜΙ...

Jacob’s sons’ deceitful ruse: ΣΕΝΦΑΙ ΕΝΕΙΝΙ ΜΗΩΤΕΝ ΟΤΟΣ Ε-
ΕΝΔΥΜΠΙ ΣΕΝΘΝΟΥ ... ΟΤΟΣ ΤΕΝΝΑΙ ΝΝΕΝΩΠΗΡΙ ΝΩΤΕΝ +
ΤΕΝΝΑΣΙΣΓΖΙΜΙ ... ΟΤΟΣ ΕΕΝΔΥΜΠΙ ΣΕΝΘΝΟΥ ΕΝΕΕΡΜΦΡΗΠΤ+
ΝΟΤΕΓΕΝΟΓ ΝΟΤΩΤ.

Note Sichem’s recycled version (verses 22f.), reporting this conversation, emotionally involved(?) in the Contingent-Indefinite Future: ΜΟ-
ΝΟΝ ΣΕΝΦΑΙ ΚΕΝΑΝΙΝΙ ΜΜΟΝ ... ΜΟΝΟΝ ΣΕΝΦΑΙ ΜΑΡΕΝΙΝΙ
ΜΗΩΤΟΤ ΟΤΟΣ ΚΕΝΑΖΩΠΙ ΝΕΜΑΝ.

(4) Some cases of striking paradigmatic oppositions of the two Futures:

Gen. 29:32 Ε-ΤΝΟΥ ΚΝΑΜΗΝΠΙ
locutive, naming explication
Gen. 49:29 ΑΝΟΚ ΚΕΝΑΧΑΙ...ΘΟΜΧΤ
Gen. 13:17 Ε-ΤΝΑΘΗΙΩΝ ΝΑΚ
explicative and specifying
Gen. 46:31 ΤΝΑΖΗΝΙ ΝΤΑΤΑΜΕΣΚΡΑΩ
locutive, intention
Gen. 30:20 ΝΑΦΠΙ ΣΕΝΤΑΙΧΩΤ ΝΤΕΤΝΟΥ
explicative (sim. 29:34)
Gen. 50:5 ΕΡΕΣΗΝΟΜΧΤ
reported recycled instruction
Gen. 13:15 ΕΙΕΡΗΙΩΝ ΝΑΚ
solemn declaration
Gen. 45:28 ΕΙΕΖΗΝΗ ΝΤΑΝΑΤ ΕΡΟΗ ΜΝΑΓ-
ΜΟΤ
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 thematic *converb* either the Stative — Static Converb — or the “adverbial infinitive”, “gerund”: the Dynamic Converb, homonym of the verb lexeme (“substantival infinitive”)?
45, the adverbiality of which is synchronically immanent? The whole nexus is eminently comparable

45 For the term, its applications and related topics, see HASPELMATH and KÖNIG (eds.), esp. 1995.

46 Cf., for the immanence of adverbiality, the more marginal, but analogue case of ΤΗΡΩ, an adverb-slot pronominal-cohesion Augens (SMISHA-HALEVY 1986a:171ff.) which is historically traceable to a prepositional phrase (*r-drw*). 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 1990:216ff., despite the synonymity of "der Adverbialsetz" and "das Präsens"; 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-paradigmatic. (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 "relic" in Bohairic (B4) Coptic with Demotic documentation is the participial επσ (Shisha-Halevy 1983:315ff.).

(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: ενημοτειντι εποικ (e.g. Mt. 26:36, Luke 2:4, 9:10 etc.) alongside ευγενοτειντι εποικ (etc.) Mt. 27:33, Luke 19:29, 26:3:14 v.l. εταγ+, Acts 10:1; with ὑποθετ "translate, render" we invariably find the Aorist: (θα) ευγενοτεινεσε δε... etc. Acts 9:36, 13:8, 1 John 38:42 etc.

\[\text{An additional example, with a striking contrast between the actual and the generic for the same verb, is NHC III 139 ἡ νεῳ ἑν ὕμνος τοῦ σαμωτ.}\]
(6) Luke 7:8 is a nice example for the opposition of Present to sequelling Aorist within the [+ HUMAN] range: ἧς ἐμοὶ ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν ζε-μαγεύεις ὑμᾶς ἔνοικος οὗτος ὑμᾶς.

(b) The Aorist ὑάρκωτε / ἡμαρκωτε — 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. ὑάρκωτε and ἡμαρκωτε diverge sharply, and indeed constitute two autonomous formal-functional verbal entities. Like the Absolute-Definite Future ἐςεκωτε, the affirmative Aorist contains a sequelling syntactic component, probably associated with the diachronic conjunction or converter ἢς. As a matter of fact, I believe ἢς, 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 ὑακ- — not however in ἡμακ- — 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 LE88. The negative ἡμακ-, on the other hand, is extremely old, and goes back, formally and functionally, directly and exactly to the O/ME negative generic n sdm.n.f, well discussed by B. Gunn in his Studies in Egyptian Syntax (1924:110ff.). Functionally, the two could not be more dissimilar. Differently from ὑακ-, ἡμαρκωτε has a prominent "inability" and "impossibility" seme, with perhaps an "against nature" subseqe; an emphatically negative ("by no means") quality, not unlike that of ἡμεκ-, is also in evidence. Most significantly, ἡμακ- (exceedingly rare in Nitrian) is, as said, not sequelling or ensuing like ὑακ-, although it does (like many other unmarked forms) occur apodotically to ἑγεραι; unlike ὑακ-, ἡμακ- often occurs initially in its cotextual unit.

The convertibility of the Aorist is limited. The relative of ὑακ- occurs in a few formalized fixed phrases, while the adverbial Circumstantial conversion of ὑακ- is rare or non-occurring; this, possibly related to the inbuilt sequelling role, associates the form yet again with the ἐςε- Future. The adverbial Circumstantial of the Aorist is very rare, if at

88 The OE and ME j.w.f sdm.f is a complex periphrastic form, meaning "nexus in the Present" — the present occurrence and validity of a converb (Circumstantial sdm.f); it is non-sequelling.
all attested. The Focalizing Conversion εὐθύ- is well attested. ἀνέξα- is not Evolution Mode narrative (see above). The conversion of μὴ- is similarly rare: its Focalizing Conversion is not attested (a fact arguably associated with the historical “emphatic” component of the form). ἀν-μὴ- is rare in Bohairic, and seems to be attested in Nitrian only\(^9\). 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: DAHL 1995; cf. especially 417ff. Coptic, like Hindi and Turkish (among other languages)\(^0\), offers the opposition of a non-generic Present and a generic “Aorist”. The “Imperfect” tense is basically non-generic (DAHL 1995:419ff.; cf. RUPEEZ 1092 §275). See also DAHL 1995:420ff., 424 with reffs., on the relationship between generics and habituals, which are temporal generic sentences. The diachronic evolution or — in terms of primary/secondary functions — even diachronic “direction” is held to be “generic from habitual”; the “past of a general habitual” (our ἀνέξα-). KRIFKA 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 SMITH 1997:33f. “a pattern of events other than a specific situation [denoting] a state that holds consistently over an interval” for habitualls, 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): DECLERCK 1991:280ff. For French, KLEIBER 1987 on the semantics of habitualls. (Ch. I on habituality and genericity — both, according to Kleiber, subcategories of gnomicity, itself opposed to “episodicity”; Ch. IV on habitualls and “frequentatives”).


---

\(^9\) An instance is Mac., p. 160 No. 29 fgt. 3. 
\(^0\) Cf. PSICHARI 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 Aspectual Function of the Vedic 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 ('κατάφερω' 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. SHISHA-HALEVY 1995), The Absolute-Definite Future (above), Apodotic ἐχωτάτω (SHISHA-HALEVY 1973); in LE, the Sequential ἰερ ἁρ σήμ. 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 1985:22) 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)\textsuperscript{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 BtOr 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.

\textsuperscript{91} Incidentally, Depuydt's treatment (1989:23f.) of qncωτάτω πε (and τncωτάτω 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 apodosis.
(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: εὑσπ αὐχανδοκ ἔν-νιοτιαδοταν εγεσωμὶ ΝΑΚ ΜΒΕΧΕ ΨΑΡΕΝΙΕΣΩΤ ΤΗΡΟΤ ΜΕΣ-ΑΟΤΙΑ-ΤΑΝ.

Ex. 18:16 apodotic: εὑσπ ἈΕ ΝΤΕΟΤΑΝΙΟΤΙΑ ὑσπὶ ουτ-ΤΩΟΤ ΟΥΣΟΝ ΝΤΟΤΙ ΓΑΡΟΙ ΨΑΡΕΝΩ-ΨΙΟΤΑΙ ΨΙΟΤΑΙ ουσον ΝΤΑΣΑΒΩΤΟΤ...

Num. 12:6 apodotic: εὑσπ αὐχανσωμὶ ΝΑΕ-ΟΤΠΡΟΦΗ-ΤΗΣ ΝΤΩΤΕΝ ΣΕΝΟΤΓΟΡΗΜΑ-ΨΑΡΙΟΝΩΝΕΤ ΕΡΟΤ ΠΟΤΟΣ ΨΑΙ-ΣΑΖΙ ΝΕΜΑΧ.

Deut. 16:19 ΝΙΑΨΡΟΝ ΓΑΡ ΨΑΡΩΜ ΝΝΕΝΒΑΛ ΝΤΕΝΙΚΑ-ΒΕΤ ΨΑΡΤΑΚΟ ΝΝΙΚΑΖΙ ΝΕΜΧΙ (Greek καὶ ἔξαιρε...).

(2) Habitual

Deut. 5:24 ψαρεφυτ ι σαζι ΝΕΜ ΡΨΗΙ.

Negative: Impossibility

Gen. 18:12 ...ΕΣΩΜ ΜΜΟΣ ΔΕ-ΜΠΑΡΕΦΑΙ ΨΥΜΠΗ ΜΜΟΙ ΨΑΥ-ΝΟΣ ΠΑΣΤ ΔΕ ΑΧΕΡΙΕΑΛΟ (Greek Perfect: γέγονε).

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 πεζελαβαν ΔΕ ΔΕ-ΜΠΑΣΩΜΠΗ ΣΕΝΠΑΙΜΑ ΕΤ ΝΤΚΟΣΖΙ ΜΠΑΤΕΝΤΤ ΝΤΝΙΩΤ (Greek οὐκ ἔστιν οὗτος δοῦναι τὴν νεότεραν πρὶν ἢ τὴν πρεσβυτεραν — infinitive, expressing impossibility or rather formal negative obligation = prohibition).

Converted negative (Relative):

Lev. 11:47 ΣΕΝΘΗΤΤ ΝΗΝ ΕΤΤΑΝΘΟ ΝΕΜ ΝΗ ΕΤΕΝΠΑΤΗΜΟΣ (Greek τῶν ζωογονοῦντον).

Num. 20:5 ΠΙΜΑ ΕΤΕΝΠΑΤΣΙΤ ΜΜΟΠ ΟΥΔΕ ΜΜΟΝ-ΚΕΝΤΕ ΝΑΗΤΩ (Greek τόπος οδ οὐ σπειρεται).
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 ἔτηπωτ (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-Jernstedt 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 “ʔq6em-έq”, i.e. the Present with a rhematic transitive coverb 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 ʔσωω is even more interesting: this verb occurs rhematic 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 ε1, Ψωκ, Πωτ) where a Stative static coverb 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 έq- (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 1990:196ff.).

(4) JERNSTEDT 1927 does not explicitly mention zero article as a decisive factor in the alternation of object constructions. Cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 1986a:113ff.

(5) The full case of the "violation" of the Stern-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 ἀγων ἐμφαν ες ἔσολ "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 ὅσω are concentrated, in an impressive strength of documentation (kindly re-collated by the editor at my request): ἀγων ἐικάς 9:27; ἀγων ἐικής τα 19:22 (immediate object construction), and ἀγων ἐμφαν 19:33, ἀγων ἐκ 16:32 (infinitive, 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 grammemic (“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 Ἰωνί 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 N- MMOS) and durativity or “impefectivity” in Finnish and Estonian, cf. HOPPER and THOMPSON 1980:264ff.

(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 1996:106ff. (the shepherd with the sheep and rams). In the NT, the Present/Aorist opposition must yet be studied. An especially intriguing case is εἰσαγετήτοι/εἰσαγετήτ ΤΕΡΩ (e.g. Mt. 26:3:14:36, Luke 2:4, 9:10, 19:29 etc.).

Some examples:

Gen. 42:1f. στο-κεφαλ σεραλ.
Gen. 42:18 ἑρ-αρ ανοκ τοτο τεργοτ θατεργη.

Observe that the opposition of Actual vs. Non-actual Present is limited to the dynamic converbal Rhemes; the Stative (as also the non-verbal adverbal) Rheme occurs in actual and non-actual semantics:

Gen. 6:20 ἦγεραι ἐγχα (Greek πέτεινος) the generic Relative Present.

Gen. 34:10 πλιο γορεβεων μπετενθῳο.
Lev. 15:2 περετετελε δακεμ.
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" sdm.m.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 *τελι*, *τιτωτη*, *τινά*, *τότω*, 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. 24:5 ἐρωτόμενον τοῖς ἐν τῷ ἐθνὶ καθαρὸν ἐπίκεφαλον ἐκ τοῦ ἐθνοῦς τοῦτον. Presentative cases — ἐπιστείλατε τοῖς τοῖς ἐν τῷ ἐθνὶ καθαρὸν ἐπίκεφαλον ἐκ τοῦ ἐθνοῦς τοῦτον. 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 χή

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 οἱ ἐν-, annexing noun Rhemes, which is common to all Coptic dialects. All these considerations make a precise and extensive study of χή (with other copular elements, such as ων) truly indispensable — 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 χή in various environments and parameters:

Gen. 28:16 πάντως χή ἐπιστέπσαι (Greek ἔσται κύριος ἐν ...)
Gen. 47:1 ἐπιστείλατε τοῖς τοῖς τοῦ ἐθνοῦς τοῦτον (Greek εἶστιν ἐν...)
Gen. 47:6 τοῖς ἐπιστείλατε τοῖς τοῦ ἐθνοῦς τοῦτον (Greek ἐνατίόν σοῦ ἐστιν).

Gen. 26:24 τοῖς τοῦ γάρ μετὰ (Greek ἐπιστείλατε τοῖς τοῦ γάρ ἐμί).

92 Greek ἔστι is expressed in Copt, also by ων: Ex. 17:7 ἐν-πάντως ων, ἐστε ἐπιστέπσαι ων.
Gen. 26:28 ΕΝΟΤΝΑΤ ΑΝΝΑΤ ΑΞ-ΝΑΡΕ-ΦΙ ΧΗ ΝΕΜΑΚ (Greek ὁτι ἦν κύριος μετὰ σοῦ).
Ex. 33:21 ΟΤΩΝ-ΟΤΝΑ ΧΗ ΓΑΡΟΚ (Greek ἰδοὺ τόπος παρ’ ἐμοί).
Ex. 23:21 ΠΑΡΑΝ ΓΑΡ ΕΤΧΗ ΣΙΔΩΨ (Greek τὸ γὰρ ὄνομα μου ἐστὶν ἐπ’ αὐτῷ).
But may also occur unmediated:
Gen. 42:35 ΝΑΡΕ-ΦΙΩΠΡ ΜΠΑΤ ΜΠΙΩΤΑΙ ΠΙΟΤΑΙ ΣΕΝΠΠ-∆ΟΚ.
Gen. 18:9 ΙΣ ΓΗΠΝΕ ΣΕΝΤΟΤΝ ΣΕΝΤΣΚΗΝΗ.
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 χη (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 ψακ-, even in Narrative, is not concatenating. In fact, these questions touch the core of the theory of textemics, for we see that dialogic ψακ- is still relateable to narrative roles: 1st-person Locutive/Alloquotive Narrative, and Dream/Vision Narrative.

(a) ΝΑΙ/Ν ΕΜΙ ΓΑΡ (ΑΝ) ΠΕ: background:
Also Gen. 18:19 (God’s reason for blessing Abraham).
Gen. 28:16 πς εχ ΧΗ ΜΠΑΙΜΑ ΑΝΟΚ ΔΕ ΝΑΙΕΜΙ ΑΝ ΠΕ.
Gen. 43:7 ΜΗ ΝΑΝΕΜΙ ΑΝΟΝ ΠΕ ΔΕ-ΨΑΚΩΣ ΝΑΝ ΔΕ-...
Gen. 3:5 (the snake to Eve) ΝΑΨΕΜΙ 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 ΕΝΟΤΝΑΤ ΑΝΝΑΤ ΔΕ-ΝΑΡΕΦΙ ΧΗ ΝΕΜΑΚ.
Deut. 25:18 πως αρεψι ερατη οταν οπως αρ- 
ΑΛΩΣΙ ΜΠΕΚΚΑΤ ... ΝΩΚ ΔΕ ΝΑΚΙΚΟΡ ΟΤΟΡ ΝΑΚΓΟΣΙ.
Deut. 28:62 ΝΤΨΕΒΙΩ ΔΕ-ΝΑΡΕΝΟΙ ΜΠΡΗ ΝΝΙΚΙΟΤ 
ΝΤΕΣΙΕ ΕΤΕΕΞΠΗΝΝΟΤ... (Vat + πε):
(c) A special rhetorical topos:
ΝΑΡΕΝΟΙ ΓΑΡ ΝΨΕΜΜΟ ΞΩΤΕΝ ΠΕ ΣΕΝΠΚΑΡΙ ΝΧΗΜΙ Ex. 
22:21, Deut. 10:19.
Ex. 23:9 ἄρα οὖστοι γὰρ ὑποκλίτος εἴσεν ἐν ἤματιν καὶ ἡμιν ἡμῖν.
...
καὶ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ἡμέρας τῆς ἡμέρας ἡμῖν 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-aetiological ναί- (no πε), truly focalizing, in

Ex. 18:3 ("γεραν") ἐξω ἑμοὶ Ἰε ναὶ ἵπποι ἰπεμναξω ἵπποι σκοταί πτωχιμο (d) Ex. 1:10 ναὶ εἴσεν ναὶ τὸ τὸν νεμ ὑποκρίτων καὶ οὕτω πρὸς τοὺς ὑπεναντίους — this unique instance is interesting: The Imperfect seems to express here a hypothetical scenario.

Obs.
Ex. 16:3 ἄμοι εἰναν- πε is modal, and the Imperfect form conditioned.

1.2.5.5 The Preterite αἰχωτεμ in Dialogue: some problem highlights

Preterite or Perfect? It is easy to forget that αἰχωτεμ, 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 αἰ as Perfect (i.e. perfectum praesens), not Preterite; say, in locutive or presentative environment (Report being such a locutively marked sequence), or combined with τὸν. Can we contrast — and oppose — the two in Bohairic Coptic? Or else, in such a passage as

Gen. 20:6 ἀπο νω τειμιν γενοεντεγεντ εἰσοδεμ θερφαί εἰσθαι αἰσθανο εἰροκ μπισκ εἰρνοβί εἰροι εἰσθανο μπισκ εἰσι νεμακ

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 καὶ ὑποκρίτων (Nitrian) or (B4, Pent.) ὑποκρίτων with the Circumstantial Present converb has in my opinion not yet matured into fully developed Perfect tenses. (ὑποκρίτων is in all probability an allomorph of ὑποκρίτων, the Coptic form of ὑποκρίτων, 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:

\[ \text{γηππε ἧνοι ις ακ- / αι- Gen. 27:36, Ex. 3:9, 18:11.} \]
\[ \text{Num. 14:40 ἀνερνοβί.} \]

Gen. 27:36 αρσι-οιβε γαρ μνοι θαρ φαρσων-θαρ ὑπε.

Ex. 5:23 ἰκην-εταίῳ γαρ ἐβοταν γαφάραῳ εκακι νε-μαα... αργγεκο μπαίλαος (“he has been tormenting”).

On the other hand, real Preterite cases have time-specifying modification, or are part of lists:

Num. 20:24 ἀε-ἀτετηνηρίζωντ μαζείνοµου ντάντι-

Gen. 21:26 μπιεμι ... ὁταν θοκ μπεκταµοι ὁταν θοκ ἐπιστῇ.

Obs.
The basic question here, of course, is whether the perfectal reading of ακ-, 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-significant of “what the nexus is about”, and the Rheme the higher-significant 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 nexal 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”): ἀνοκνε, Ἐαὶ πε πινομος.
- The Adverbial-Rheme Pattern, for specific Themes, predicing the Dynamic and Static Converbs, in which case they are the “Bipartite Conjugation Pattern”; predicing the Contingent Future; predicing a class of adverbials: ἑγονεν, ἄναυ, τενναμος, τεννεψι γαρ 
  ἡννεννοβί.
- The Pro-Verbal Rheme (Verbal Nexus) Pattern predicing pro-verbal auxiliaries, expanded by and governing verb lexemes (“infinitives”), of nominal/pronominal Theme-actors: ἄτετενεροτω, εκε-
  σωτεμ.
- The Existential/Presentative Pre-nexal Clause, which introduces nominals into discourse so as to make them eligible for occurrence in the nexus patterns: 
  μμον-πορνη μπαίμα, γηπε ες γανικμα-
  λιθς εςμοψι.... This pattern serves to predice adverbials and verbal
  convers indirect, of non-specific nouns or pronouns. Non-specific
  (“indefinite”) existants and presentates may be expanded by adverbials,
  or by convers; the latter are by nature adnexal (rhetic), and supply
  an alternant to the Adverbial-Rheme Pattern, for non-specific themes.

Other nexus types (οτοντας, ἀνοντας, πεξας) are either deri-
  vatives 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-re-
  ferred or marked for discourse-“chunk”-scope roles, prominent land-
  marks 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
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 nasal 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) Themacity/rhemacity 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 nasal matrices. Existence, unlocated (absolute) or located, basically atemporal\(^2\), is in Coptic not verbal\(^3\), nor, in point of fact, at all nasal; it is marked by the prefixes οὐσιον- (affirmation of existence) and μμον- (affirmation of non-existence). Needless to say, the fact that οὐσιον-/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. οὐσιον- and μμον- form a pair of sui generis, asymmetrically associated atemporal clauses\(^4\) that, in

\(^2\) This accounts in part for such hybrid constructions (ουσιον + Nom. Sentence) as Gen. 39:2 νεοσιον-οτρωμι πε εηματ (Vat ne-).

\(^3\) Its synchronically non-verbal nature is also symptomized by peculiar actantial properties: consider Gen. 40:17 νεοσιον ναητγ πε εβολ δεν ηθος ευαπε-ποτρο ψαρω οτομοτ.

\(^4\) The Stative Converb ωοπ, expressing a verbal type of existence (qωοπ αν 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 — ὅτον does not predicate a noun — nor is ὅτον-/ΜΜΟΝ- 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 ΜΜΟΝ-_WAIT οἶς ἡ ὅτοσ.
Gen. 24:25 ὅτον-ΤΟΠΟΣ ἑΡΕΚΜΣΟΝ ΜΜΟΚ.

The existential locator slot (if any) — of restricted adverbial commutability: mainly ΜΜΩΣ and a few prepositional locatives, many of which mark possession — is as a rule adjunctal (occasionally, adnominal), not rhematic:

Num. 20:2 ΝΕΜΜΟΝ-ΜΗΣΟΤ ζΕ ΣΕΝ-ΤΣΑΝΑΡΒΙΝ.
Num. 22:24 ἀΕΤΟΝ-ΟΡΣΟΒΤ ΣΑΜΝΑΙ ΝΕΜ ΟΡΣΟΒΤ ΣΑΜΝΑΙ.
Deut. 32:12 ΜΜΟΝ-ΚΕΨΟΤΝ ΝΘΕΜΜΟ ΝΕΜΗΣΟΤ ΠΕ.
Lev. 11:21 ἀΕΤΟΝ-ΟΡΙΟΙ ΜΜΗΣΟΤ.
Lev. 11:23 ἀΕΤΟΝ-ΧΤΩ ΜΠΑΤ ΕΡΜΟΤ.
Deut. 21:18 ΕΨΩΝ ἀΕ ΕΣΟΝ-ΟΡΨΗΡΙ ΝΤΕΟΣΑΙ.
Gen. 24:22 ΣΑΝΛΕΨΝ ΝΝΟΣΒ ΕΣΟΝ-ΟΡΚΙΤ ΝΨΙ ΕΠΙΟΣΑΙ ΠΙΟΤΑΙ ΜΜΗΣΟΤ.

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 ὅτον-/ΜΜΟΝ-. 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, nexus 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 ΝΑ-):

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 ὅτον focusses its Existant, so as to render its thematicity (in nexus with a converse) lower than a regular definite Theme; where the definite Theme is anaphoric, the “existential Theme” is cataphoric.
Gen. 47:13 nemnon-cose de wop pe.
Ex. 10:4 oron-éron napwpi.
Gen. 23:6 mom-éla mom tæno mpeqmaq eboq 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 oron- and mom- is operative. Even here, we still face the impossibility of directly predicating 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 Ə̆̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̃̄
The opposition is thus in fact only between 1c and Ἐνηπει 1c. Generally, proclitic 1c- (rarely alone, usually as Ἐνηπει 1c-) introduces all kinds of noun-initial constructions; Ἐνηπει pronoun-initial ones, including nexus patterns with pronominal Themes. Sahidic, on the other hand, opposes εἰκ to εἰκ-Ἐνηπει εἰκ — both before nouns only —, while εἰκ-Ἐνηπει (no Ἐνηπει alone) occurs before pronouns or nexal constructions. Bohairic Ἐνηπει 1c is not bound in closest juncture (again, unlike Sahidic εἰκ-Ἐνηπει).

Functionally, the Presentatives, compatible with the Present, Future and Preterite tenses, occur mostly in hic-et-nunc allocutive environment, but are also encountered in narrative as highlighting (narrative focussing) exponents. In dialogue, the Presentative-marked Preterite (Ἐνηπει ἂν-) 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 backrounding; narrative tableau superordination; dramatic narrative highlighting\(^7\); superordinative narrative episode introduction; Narrative-Peak Focalization; Dream Narrative introduction; nexus focussing. Note the frequent Presentatives combined by ὅτως with νας and ἄνωτε.

Obs.


(2) LAYTON 2004 §476ff. is the only one to treat Sahidic εἰκ alongside the existentials. Bohairic differs from Sahidic in the relative order of the two Presentatives (Sah. εἰκ Ἐνηπει etc., unlike Bohairic, also concording - Ἐνηπει, Ἐνηπει) 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 ὅτως unless differently specified):

(1) Ἐνηπει + Pronoun: Response to Address:

\(^7\) For narrative presentation in Celtic and Romance, cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 1997, 1999b.
(2) ἰππε + Specific Noun: presentative Allocation:
Ex. 24:8 ἰππε ἰκ πείνομ.
Gen. 30:3 ἰππε ἰκ ταβωκι βάλλα.
Gen. 31:48 ἰππε ἰκ παῖται αἱ ὀηταῖα.
(3) μή ἰκ [...] αν + specific Noun/Pronoun + Present (Greek ουκ ιδού): focalization of nexus (by means of Assertive-Formal ("Rhetorical") Question):
Ex. 4:14 μή ἰκ ἀφων πεκκον αν πιεστίθεν ἤσοσται...
Gen. 13:9 μή ἰκ πκαγι τηρῇ χν ἁπεκκείω ἀν.
Deut. 11:30 Βατ μή ἰκ Ναὶ ἄν γίμηρ μπιορᾶνθης (ον).
(4) ἰππε ἰκ + Noun ἐκ - / ἐκ - / 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. 29:2 ακνας ἰππε ἰκ οσιωτα Νικχ Σεντκοι.
Gen. 37:25 ἄσεμε κ ά οσωμ ἰππε ἰκ ἰανικαλιθησ ἐτομών...
Gen. 18:2 ακνας ἰππε ἰκ ἂν πρωμι νατογι ερατος.
Gen. 28:12 ἰππε ἰκ οσμοτκι ἐσταγροντ δενπικαζι οτογ ναπειαγελος ατφής νασνα επιωι νασνης επεχτ ἰγωτε νε.
Gen. 15:17 επίδων δε νεῦνας πρωτι μφρε πι οσυας ἰγωτιν τι ἰππε ἰκ οσιριπ ειοι νχρεμτς νε μαλαμπς ἰχρωμε εατνιι κενεμητ Νικωμα ετήπω.
Gen. 31:10 ακνασ ονναβαλ νεπαοτιν ἰππε ἰκ νιβαριτ νε μιωιι νασνα ερήι εδενιευςον νε μιβαμπτι να-
νςοτοςπι ντογ νατοι νασιδοσαν νε μοταν νκερμι

(5) ἰππε + Να - (affirmative): superordinative Narrative-Peak Focalization (see Chapter One):
Ex. 34:29 ὡς αε ενήνοστ επεχτ με-μωτσχε εβολ

8 Fillmore’s term. The Circumstantial, adnexal, recalls in these cases the French rhetorical relative in presentative cases such as “La voila qui arrive”: see Lambrecht 2000. The Imperfect, a specific narrative focalization tense, alternates here with the thematic Circumstantial.
Gen. 19:28 ἀγνασ ὄπως ἰηππε ναγνησ επουι ναξ-οτυς — focalization through protagonist’s eyes.

(6) ἰηππε + εφ-: (affirmative): preceptive “scenario”:

Lev. 13:6 εηγενασ ερω ναξ-πισσεβ ... ὃτως ἰηππε εφοι χηλωλ ναξ-πισσε (= Vat).

(7) ἰηππε + εφε- Absolute Future: preceptive superordination (“at that point the priest shall observe...”):

Lev. 13:20 ἰηππε εηγενασ ναξ-πισσεβ...

(8) ἰηππε + {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 ἰηππε ἀνοκ ἱπουε εμος.
Gen. 28:15 ἰηππε ἀνοκ ἱχε νεμακ.
Ex. 7:15 ἰηππε νηον ρηνηος sim. 8:16.
Gen. 32:18 ἰηππε νηον εψη ρηαμενην.
Gen. 32:7 ἀνι γανκατ ἰηππε νηον ρηνηος.
Gen. 16:11 ἰηππε νηο τεερβωκι.
Also Ex. 6:30, Deut. 11:26.

(9) ἰηππε + {ἀνοκ} + να- Future (affirmative; see above, Chapter One): locutive/allocutive imminence (also in apodotic superordination).

Num. 25:12 ἰηππε ἀνοκ ἱνατ... sim. Ex. 16:4.
Num. 14:40 ἰηππε ἄνον τεεναμεναν επιπων...
Ex. 10:4 ἰηππε ἄνοκ ἱναινι μπιαινα νπαττ νοτωζε εφου sim. Ex. 8:17.

(10) ἰηππε + ἄνοκ + Preterite (rare): narrative background (?)

Gen. 27:6 ἰηππε ἄνοκ δηςωτεμ επεκιπτ εηςαξι νεμ ἱσατ... (Greek ἵθ + Aor.).

(11) ἰηππε + (Adv.) + Preterite, affirmative and negative: Allocution (perfection praesens); diagnostic observation; 1st-person Narrative.

Num. 24:10 ἰηππε δηνοτεις ἄκςμος ...
Num. 22:32 ὄπως ἰηππε αιι ...
Num. 23:20 ἰηππε διερρηνε νεμοτ ...
Deut. 26:17 ἰηππε μφοο τακςσπι μφ ... (no Greek correspondent).

Num. 17:27 ἰηππε ἄνοκτ εβολ ὄπως απακο.
Deut. 13:15 ἰηππε δηερμεεμμι ναξ-πασαξι.

(12) ἔγγινε ις + 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 ἔγγινε ις οσιεθε ρννυνθ ἀχτυνμ. Ex. 3:9 ἔγγινε ις ινιρνι ινιρνι ινιρνι ινιρνι ινιρνι — ἔγγινε ις not in close juncture.

Gen. 38:13 ἔγγινε ις πεομ άχηνα. Ex. 14:10 ἔγγινε ις ιρεμνχιμι ιςθοτωμ† (no Greek correspondent).

Num. 12:10 οτομ ιςπηπι θηνασ εβολ ιςηκβη οτομ ις ιςπηπι άσκωκ ιςερπι οτομ ιςπηπι άσκωκ ιςερπι. 
Num. 25:6 οτομ ις οτπμι ... άινι μπεςκνομ. 

Lev. 13:32 οτομ εγενατ ἀνεπιοτημ οτομ ἔγγινε μπεςκωμ εβολ ἀνεπιοτημ — note the negative nexus, exclusive to the diagnostic presentation.

Gen. 27:36 ιςοτι ις πακεσμοτ αγςιτη. (13) ἔγγινε + 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 ἔγγινε τετενοι μφοου μφριτ ονιτιον ιςτε-

Deut. 26:3 ἔγγινε ιςθωμ ουλ μφοου (no correspondent in the Greek).

Gen. 38:24 ἔγγινε σεμβοκι. 
Gen. 42:22 ἔγγινε σεκωτ νκαπτεςκνομ.
Ex. 17:9 ἀνόκ γηππε ἡναιή επατ εξενταφε μπίτωος
 (= Vat; Greek Perfect ἐστηκα as Synchronous Present:)
Gen. 34:21 πικαζι γηππε γουεεων μποθμεο.
Lev. 13:39 ὅσον εγενατ ναε-πιοση βοσο γηππε σε-
ζενπιεα ... ναε-γανα - diagnostic observation.
(14) γηππε + ὃτον-/μμων-: Allocation; diagnostic observation:
Ex. 33:21 γηππε ὅτον-ατνα αη γαροκ (Greek has here no ex-
istential, but a located Presentative).
Gen. 31:44 γηππε μμων-γα αειμεα.
Lev. 13:21 ἀπανανατ ... ὅσον ἰς γηππε μμων-κσι νυ-
obω ναήτς (= Vat).

This, with Gen. 18:9 (= Vat) and Ex. 8:25 (Vat ict), are the only in-
stances I am aware of the "Sahidic" sequence ἰς γηππε; note exactly
the same wording with γηππε alone in Lev. 13:26. (See no. [27] be-
low).

(15) γηππε + {ἀνόκ} εἰε- Absolute Future (see above, Chapter
One): Divine Promise (Greek Present — Performatives?):
Ex. 34:11 γηππε ἀνόκ εἰεγκοτι εβολ σακωτεν μπια-
morreoc...
Ex. 7:27 γηππε ἀνόκ εἰεκαπι ενεκσιν θροτ σεγαν-
σποτρ — apodotic.

(16) γηππε + Topic + εἰε- Absolute Future (see above, Chapter
One): Divine Promise:
Ex. 32:34 γηππε ἰς παγαελος εἰεερσορπ μμοοι σα-
ζωκ (Greek Present!).
Num. 23:9 γηππε ἰς οσλαος εἰενσαπι μματατι ὅσο 
nσοντοπ σενιεθνος.

(17) γηππε + εἰε- Absolute Future: Divine Promise:
Gen. 48:4 γηππε εἰεεπκαια.
(18) (γηππε) ἰς + Nominal Theme + αη (Present) — Allocation:
Gen. 20:15 γηππε ἰς πικαζι αη μπεκμεο.
Ex. 24:14 γηππε ἰς ααρων νεμ ραρ σεχι νεμωτεν.
Gen. 12:19 ἡνοτ ἰς τεκκζιμι αη μπεκμεο.
Gen. 16:6 ἰς τεβωκι αη σενεκζι.
Gen. 47:6 ἰς πικαζι νχομι αη μποθμεο.
Gen. 42:13 γηππε ἰς πικοτζι αη σακπενιπο.
(19) γηππε ἰς + Nominal Topic/Theme (Present, affirmative —
negative nexus only in cases of diagnostic presentation): Allocation:
prophecy; diagnostic observation:
Gen. 37:19 ἐνυπεο ἰε πυρεφερπασε ἐττύ ῥνηον.
Gen. 41:29 ἐνυπεο ἰε ἵ πυροτ ρνηον.


Ex. 9:3 ἐνυπεο ἰε ὅταχι ντε-ποτε ννοτ ἐγρηι ἐηεννεκτήβνωτι.

(20) ἰε + Specific Nominal Topic/Theme (Present, affirmative): allocution; diagnostic observation:
Gen. 45:12 ἰε νήενβαλ σενατ.
Gen. 34:10 ἰε πικαζι ποτεσωμ μπετενμυ (vs. 34:21 πικαζι ἐνυπεο ποτεσωμ μποτμυ).
Gen. 32:20 ἰε πεκαλωτ ιακωβ ῥνηον sim. 48:2, 27:42.
Lev. 13:56 ὄτορ ἄμαννατ νᾶε-πιοσωβ ὄτορ ἰε πισορ ἵοι νγαλ — diagnostic observation.

(21) ἰε + nominal Focus (Cleft Sentence): focussing (?)
Gen. 31:44 ἐνυπεο μμον-ἐλι νεμαν ἰε πυ τερμεθερε.

(22) ἐνυπεο + Nominal Sentence.
Deut. 10:14 ἐνυπεο γαρ να-ποτε πεκνοστν ἰε νᾶε-τφε νεμ τφε ντετφε πικαζι νεμ νη τθροτ ετενζηττ (= Vat ).

(23) ἐνυπεο ἰε + nominal Topic (Nominal Sentence Pattern III): expressive descriptive exposition (in Allocution).
Deut. 3:11 ἐνυπεο ἰε πεξδαοξ οτβενιπι πε ἰε πυ αί ἐκθ σεν...

(24) ἰε + Preterite (extremely rare — the only instance in the corpus): Divine Performative.
Deut. 1:21 ἀνατ ἰε ἄντε πετεννοστν ἰε επιασε ατεστ μπετενγο (Vat ic διτ).

(25) μφρντ ἰε + Noun + eq: sub-initial vision in Dream Narrative reporting.
Gen. 41:22 δινατ on ἵεσοτραςοί μφρντ ἰε κεζ νῆεμε εηλνοτ εποκοι... (Vat add. ὄτορ, om. ic).

The all-initial vision in Pharaoh's first dream is introduced by ἰαζκ ναο- πε (verse 2; see Chapter One); in the second dream by ἐνυπεο νασ- Report his dream, he starts with ἰαζκ ναι- (verse 17), going on to sub-episodic ἐνυπεο ic (verse 19).

(26) ἐνυπεο μφρντ νε: sub-episode in Dream Narrative.
Gen. 41:2 ἐνυπεο μφρντ νε-εβολ σενβιαρο νασννοτ εποκοι πε νᾶε-ζ νεξε ενανετ.

(27) ἰε ἐνυπεο + (Pron.) + nexus: apocritic (responsive) signal:
Gen. 18:9 Iç ḥayye genôśer xen†cshnan.
Ex. 8:25 Iç ḥayye anok Ṯnawëṇ nh... 

(b) Ṯxnh. 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 Ṯxnh; in Crum’s exx., Sah. has once Ṯntwc, once Ṯntwc. Sah. Ṯxnh is a hapax: Crum Dictionary 422a “advb showing consent”, Westendorf 268 “Partikel der Bekräftigung: ‘ja, gewiß’ which may be related. But Ṯxnh, for some no less mysterious reason, is always included by explicative ḥe-, 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 ṭαp, which is curious, firstly for the unusual occurrence of this particle in ḥe-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):

庶e-athon + Preterite in Narrative Comment Mode

Gen. 6:12 Ṯtōp qhnen зван-ṭē ḥe-ṃṭc Ṯ Ṯepikar Ṯtōp Ṯaq-
ṭakhmostat pe ḥe-athon Ṯcatəmp niben swq Ṯmpēqmuwit gišen-
pticari.

Gen. 26:7 ḥqeqgοt eδoc ḥe-taqṣimī te nmpote nce-
-goçeq... ebo-ṛeekkə teqṣimī ḥe-athon ṭar enećewc
pe ūnepcçqo — “she was lovely”

庶e-athon in Dialogue:

Gen. 29:15 nnekepçweh ni nāinabh ḥe-athon ṭar n洛克-
pacon — “you are my brother, after all”

Deut. 28:40 ṭaŋqoieit ṭeṣwɔmní Ṯak... nnekoqnoq eboal
mмоq ḥe-athon ṭeṣebɔpbeq nān-nekoqyoeit.

Also Gen. 6:13, Deut. 32:51x2, 33:19.

庶e-athon in preceptive Exposition:

Lev. 21:21 ḥe-athon ɔtɔn-ʌañi nĩḥtq.

Deut. 21:14 ḥe-athon ḥebebqoc “since you did humiliate her, af-
ter 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, junctured 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 ον. 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 paradigms 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 constituent 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 Grammar (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. Armbuster 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" Schwartz and Steinthal 1850:418ff., 472: not however Steinthal and Misteli 1893!) must have stemmed from an ethnocentric slip. Spiegelberg's laconic 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 1984:166ff.; 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 "articulate 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' definition. nec- does not indicate time but narrative linkage: see Chapter One.

2.1.1 The Delocutive Pattern Set

(a) Theme and Rheme

πε or {πε} - 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. determinator), demonstrative pronoun, or Proper Name. Its usual high enclitic 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 often turned Theme (high internal linkage: topical, fuzzy (non-formal) external 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 textual linkage, but pragmatic, not textual linkage). A pattern highly important, 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 Nexus 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 # - πε (“particule prédicative” — rather a nexusally 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 schematizing exponents for whole nexususes (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: nq- πε, eq- πε, eq- 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 categories or paradigms”, and the structural definition of identity (see the Introduction), this homonymy of patterns is immediately and sharply resolved by distinct and distinctive paradigmatic and syntagmatic specification.

The Rheme constituency consists of “nominals” only in a manner of speaking, for in Bohairic (unlike Sahidic, see SHISHA-HALEVY 1984a) really no zero-article or (alternatively) bare-lexeme Rhemes occur. Thus, pronominals (including and most prevalently, determinators) are predicated 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 indefinite article (JERNSTEDT 1949, JERNSTEDT [NAGEL] 1978: ος...πε with the Rheme of usual masculine compatibility).

- This pattern is very often — indeed, as a rule — included by Δε-, 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 reference by πε or by such links as Δε-, or by the Relative converter jointly with reference by πε. It is the absence of such linkage that distinguishes the Endophoric Pattern (see below).

- The pattern is but very rarely negated, almost only in its relative conversion: η-...Δι in converted, zero...Δι 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-}.


- Conversions: restricted. Circumstantial; Relative, only for possessive-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 interrogative-allocutive (e.g. Ex. 14:12, Num. 13:18, 16:13, 32:8), or presented by ους άγαρ or γήπε τι (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 αγίςερακην Δε-πεθον πμεσιωτ πε ους Δε-ποήρι νρεβεκκα πε — see the sensitive discussion in ANDERSSON 1904:59.
Gen. 30:29 θεοκ ετσωτυν ... οτοσ νεκτεβνωτι θροτ ενανεμηι ζε-οσηρ πε.
Deut. 23:7 Νεκκμεστε-οτρυκοσμεοσ ζε-πεκκον πε.
Num. 13:18 ...ιε ιν-οτζωβ πε ιε ιν οηκοσι ιε ιε ιν-ονιωτι πε.
Ex. 2:2...ετασναε εροι ζε-οταστιοε πε ινιμ. Num. 13:18.
Ex. 16:15 ου πε φαι ηανσωτν ημοε ιν πε ζε-ουτ πε.
Deut. 14:7f ...οτακαθαρτων ηωτεν πε.
Gen. 12:18 εθεβεον ... ηπεκταμοι ζε-τεκκωτι τε.
Gen. 28:17 ισηεκ παίμα ουροτι πε φαι ιε ιν πε αλλα πηι μητι πε οτοσ θαι τε ηπελη ηντετφε (= Vat) (Greek ως φοβερος δ η τόπος ουτος ουκ εστιν τοτο αλλα η οικος θεου... “nothing but...”) — note here the remarkable contrast of three Delocutive NS patterns: topological Delocutive Theme opening, Delocutive and Expanded Delocutive Theme carrying on. This is also a rare case of our pattern negated.
Deut. 32:28 ζε-οτεενοε πε ετατακο μπεκεοσνι — not a Cleft Sentence: if ετακ- isn’t Relative, following as it does the indefinite Rheme, then it must be either the Temporal or the Circumstantial Focalizer Preterite.
Lev. 27:28 ...πετοσαβ πε ηηενη εθοσαβ.
Gen. 38:15f. απετει ζε-οτοπορνι τε ... ηπεκεμι γαρ ζε-τεεκελετ τε.
Gen. 19:37 εβολ ζεππαιωτ πε — adverbal Rheme.
Also Deut. 24:15, 32:20.
Conversions:
Circumstantial:
Gen. 31:31 οησεει ... εονηιτι πε.
Lev. 4:21 ...εφα-οσεοι ηπεοςεεζενωγην πε.
Lev. 2:5 ευηπ αε εονσοσωμοσωι πε...
Relative:
Lev. 4:7 ετε-φη πε ετεζεκφκηνη — note (rather than a remarkable position of πε) that the converted NS is here φη πε, with the Rheme φη expanded by the Relative form.
Num. 17:5 γαι ηνεμμο ετε-εβολ αν πε δεννενζηπι ναπων (= Vat) — note here the non-specific Rheme expanded by the Relative, characterizing generic Relatives (see below, Chapter Four).
Deut. 32:21 φη ετε-ην-οτ-νοφτι αν πε ... φη ετε-ην-οτ-εεσονι αν πε.
Note the adnominal predicative pronominal-possessive system:

- nominal possessor — ἐτε-Φά-νε (Ex. 29:26, Lev. 7:20), negated as ἐτε-ὴ-Φά-ἀν ἃν ἃν (Gen. 47:26); pronominal possessor — ἐτε-φω-ν ἃν ἃν (Lev. 5:24), negated as ἐτε-ἰ-φω-ν ἃν ἃν (Gen. 15:13).

See below, for the zeroing of the Theme in similar cases.

Obs.

(1) Gen. 37:32 ἃν-ὡθην ἡμετέρῳ τῷ ἁγιῷ ἂν-μον is Endophoric (Vat τῷ ὡθην)
(2) In Gen. 20:3 ξημοτος ἐσε-ὑκινι ἔτακολος ὑιοι τῷ ἐσθοτον ἃν ὁσιῶν (Vat υιοι εὐωτον, Greek αὐτῇ δὲ ἐστι σωματικοῦ), is τὲ here a writing of ςε;?
(3) In Apoc. 2:2 ἤ ἐκώ ἄσσως ἄρωσος ἄε-ὑδανος στολος ὑς οὐκ ἐκάνοντο ἃν ἃν (sim. verse 9) we have a remarkable instance of Rheme and Theme anaphoric, in a special double linkage.

(4) For the adverb predicated by τὲ in the Nominal Sentence pattern, see Shisha-Halevy 1986a:38ff. This is not the adverb adnominally expanding the articles (ibid. 22ff.), but the adverb as adverb lexeme. The repertory of adverbial Rheemes is richer in Nitrian and OT texts outside the Pentateuch:

AM 1 47 χα-παίνα τὲ.
AM 1 57 παίρην τὲ (see below, the topicalized-Theme pattern).
Dan. 7:28 χα-μαναι τὲ.
Dan. 12:6 χα-οντα τὲ.
Dan. 11:36 ἐτε χα-ογιοτο τὲ.

(5) I would now like to suggest that the zero- determined Rheemes of the type σνε τὲ or σοτε τὲ (Shisha-Halevy 1984a) are really cases of “properization” — as “generic notion name” of the abstract or verb-noun (Shisha-Halevy 1989a §80.2.

(6) The famous 2 Cor. 10:7 κατὰ-φιλην τὲ-νοον-ψακτε ἃν ἃν ἃν is still unique (consider however John 21:21 νοο-οτ and Cat. 5 νοο-πιασιολοκ 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 ψακτε τὲ: 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 υπ-ИНFINITIVE + ADV. + {τὲ} (Funk 1991 §4.4.3), with Bohairic, Oxyrhynchite, Fayyemic Sahidic and Subakhmimic distribution, both interlocutive and delocutive (John 18:37, B4 and 9:34, B5, Gen.2:23 B4 ἦ-τινι έβολ δενετέργα τὲ; yet no instance in our corpus). For Oxyrhynchite, see Schenke 1997/8a:169f. has the fem. υπ- or pl. ἒν- as formal Rheme, and an expanding infinitive (of a closed group: 1, εις, 9 John 21:21 νοο-οτ (Greek οὕτος δὲ τί) is relevant here: the reading υπ τὲ (codd.) changes the meaning “What about him?” altogether (Bodmer III — B4 — has here ψακτε ηνοο δολαροτ). ηνοο πην ημιοτο (Shenoute, ed. Amel. II 257 uncollated) may be a companion example, evoking the Pauline one. Sahidic has here the mysterious interrogative ην (also found after άγιοντω, e.g. Ex. 2:20): παί δε τοιοτ
MICE, ΔΝΟ and εΒΒΕ 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 Infinitive...können wohl nicht einfach als “verbalsubstantive”... angesehen werden. Nicht der von ihnen benannte Vorgang wird prädiziert, sondern die wesentlich durch die Modifikatoren ausgedrückten Eigenschaften, zu deren nominaler 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 schematische 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 ΝΟΣΚ-ΟΤΩΞΡΟ ΤΗΡΚ ἙΝΩΒΙ John 9:35), rather than the indefinite infinitive “a case of”.

(8) Deut. 17:15 οΥΡΩΜΗ ΝΩΕΜΗ ... ΙΕ ΠΕΚΚΟΝ ΔΝ ΠΕ (Vat ΔΕ-ΟΤΗΙ ΠΕΚΚΟΝ ΔΝ ΠΕ) is perhaps to be seen as Circumstantial (haplography of ε- following τε), but the zero... ΔΝ negation speaks somewhat against this analysis (I cannot see the reading of Vat as the source of our text).

(9) οΤ- ΕΦΩΩΝ 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.

(1a) The Delocutive Pattern, Anaphoric Theme Zereoed

This is a rare and sporadic subpattern, yet one of considerable importance, in that it (alongside the Immutable-πε 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 “ΝΕΤΕ-ΝΟΣΚ” 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.
ΦΗ ετεφωμοι/πετεφωμοι (n-) (etc.) (vs. -Φωμ άν πε). 

netenovos θηρος (etc.) (Gen. 20:7, Num. 31:9): does θηρος here exclude ne?

netenov (Gen. 33:9), νη ϑενος (Num. 16:5).

ὁ η ετεωτεν μπατρια ... φωαί φωαί ετεωμι ΝΚΘΨ-

είς (Lev. 25:10, 27:2).

(b) Adverbial Rheme, substantivizing Relative Conversion:


(c) Hermeneutical syntax:

Num. 33:6 ανι εβοσεαν ετεοσμερος ντεσώμε (Vat + πε).

(2) Non-Relative cases:

(a) Gen. 13:13 νε-ζανρεςερνοβι (Vat + πε εμαωμ) (Greek οι δὲ νηροτοι ... ποητοι).

Gen. 25:24 νε-ζαναρεσ κατα δεντεςεκα (= Vat) (Greek τηςι δι διδυμα εν τηι Κολια αυτης) neoson- or nape- would have meant a rhematic σεν- cf. Polotsky 1960 §§35,54 + obs. 3, and contrast

Gen. 38:27 neoson-ζαναρεσ σεντεςεκα πε.

(b) (μ)παρητι άν (Gen. 4:15, 48:18, Ex. 10:11), also outside the corpus (Greek ουχι/μη ουτως)

(c) Gen. 23:15 οσ άςε φαι πασςε (Vat + πε; Greek ουχι κυριε) (οσ άςε v.l. οσ άςε πε Rom. 6:15, Act. 21:22.)

Obs.


(2) One cannot help recalling, when considering ε-/ετε-Φωμοι (πε), the syntactically per se very different Demotic possession-predicating pattern, basic in sales contracts etc. (nty-) mtωf, neg. bn-(jw)- mtωf- jn s (e.g. P. Berlin P 13633 10, see ed.’s note, p. 5, negative e.g. in P. Hauswaldt 2a ro 8 etc.; this last pattern, of great antiquity, seems to stand in complementary distribution with wn-mtωf, the former with anaphoric-pronominal and specific possessa (including p3-nty- and ... nb), the latter with indefinite and zero-determination ones, and in formulaic combination with possessive-article Rheimes (p3y,k... p3y). Incidentally, the form bn-jw-mtωf st jn “it is not yours (2nd fem.)”, P. Hauswaldt 3a ro 5, 7a ro 8 would seem to correspond to a Sahidic οςςταςς-ε “You (fem.) have it/them ” (see Layton 2000 §82 and p. 309ff.).
(3) Another possible case of Theme zeroing in Oxyrhynchite is ὡς 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 (binembral) Rheme — Theme construction.

(4) Cases of Theme-zeroing in the hermeneutical Relative conversion (of the Endophoric Theme?) in Nitrian Bohairic: ετε-κοι... AM II 90, ετε-περι ημιωτ... ibid. 104. Hermeneutical zeroing of Theme in Demotic: SIMPSON 1996:167 (R23 and 27) “nty-wp3yw whm X”.

(5) In Luke 20:20 εἰς ὁμος ἔρως Δε-πασχά (v.l. νέ) we have a different environment, historically attested, favouring the zeroing of the anaphoric Theme; cf. also Acts 24:14 Δε-ρεπεκ., Shenoute Chass. 63 Δοος Δε-νητενοτυν.

(6) Note a case of zeroed Theme in a Circumstantial conversion (v.l. πε) in 1 Cor. 6:11.

(7) ME jw mj shr ntr (Sinuhe B 43) is a special case of incidental Theme zeroed, although jw 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: hr jr p3-nty-jw.k jr n.j p3y.k jyt... See ČERNÝ-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 context-anchored, and often pragmatic-situation anchored. Whereas the unexpanded pattern (I, above) is closely linked to its preceding context, 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 topoicalized-Theme pattern is, through its Topic, anchored in the preceding context; 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 context-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 nexal 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 ni\(\Delta\)\(\epsilon\)-). 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 Chafe 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 an unmarked Rheme-Theme pattern. Is our expansion an "afterthought" (203) — note the prevalence of non-lexical anaphors (Φai etc.)? "Unaccented" (203): while the enclitic status of the thematic πε is fairly certain (Shisha-Halevy 1986a:34ff., 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 ni\(\Delta\)\(\epsilon\)-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 (Φai Deut. 9:3 etc., τοστι/τοστ Ex. 16:23:25, Proper Names), for non-specific Rhemes; possessive article, for personal-pronoun Rhemes. This implies specificity for ni\(\beta\)\(\epsilon\)n syntagms (probably "all", not quantifying "any", "every")10, as well as for ni\(\epsilon\)h

CT- (see Chapter Three). $\Phi_2^1 \Delta_\epsilon$, rarely $\Delta_\epsilon$, is the "that"-form Theme.

- Rheme constituency and specificity is broadest (thus different from the Delocutive Pattern [I]): all determinators occur except zero$^{11}$; $\pi$- 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 [I]). 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 $\eta_\epsilon$- (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 $\text{NAI NE NI\textit{PAH} / NI\textit{POMPI}}...$, 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 $\Phi_2^1$ 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 $\text{O\textit{TAI}O EQTOI NHI NE NAI}$ (cf. ...$\pi_\epsilon$ $\Phi_2^1$ in 8:16), unless we have $\Phi_2^1 \Delta_\epsilon$ or $\Phi_2^1$ CT-, 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 $\text{O\textit{TAI}O EQTOI NHI NE NAI}$ (cf. $\pi_\epsilon$ $\Phi_2^1$ in 8:16); see below, for some rare exceptions.

  (e) The foreshadowed $\pi_\epsilon$ — a structurally single $\pi_\epsilon$ 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 ΝΕΩΣΩΨ ΓΑΡ ΠΕ ΝΝΙΡΕΜΕΝΧΜΗ ΠΕ ΜΑΝΕΚΛΩΤ
ΝΙΒΕΝ (= Vat).

Gen. 46:34 ΟΣΩΡΕΒ ΓΑΡ ΠΕ ΝΝΙΡΕΜΕΝΧΜΗ ΠΕ ΜΑΝΕΚΛΩΤ
ΝΙΒΕΝ (Vat ΑΕ).

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 ὁμηλιώθης πε οὐαί Cat. 151) and ε+- infinitives (Mt. 20:23 ΦΩΙ ΓΑΡ ΠΕ ΕΘΙΙΧ).

The pattern is rare in Demotic (Spriegelberg 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 (Krael) 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


Ex. 16:23:25 ΓΑΝΚΑΒΒΑΤΩΝ ΠΕ ΕΤΟΤΑΒ ΕΠΣΟΣ ΠΕ ΤΟΟΤΙ...

ΝΕΝΚΑΒΒΑΤΩΝ ΜΠΣΟΣ ΠΕ ΠΟΟΤ — foreshadowed Theme.

Num. 13:19f. ΟΣ-ΑΨ ΝΡΗΙΠ ΠΕ ΠΙΚΑΖΙ...

Ex. 18:11 ΟΣΝΙΨΙΓ ΠΕ ΠΙΣ.

Num. 16:9 ΑΝ-ΟΣΚΟΤΑΙ ΝΩΤΝ ΠΕ ΦΑΙ ΑΕ- sim. Num. 16:13, Ex. 9:27; ΑΕ- Num. 16:12. — ΦΑΙ here is cata-, not anaphoric.

Deut. 22:5 ΟΣΩΡΕΒ ΝΤΕΠΣΙΓ ΠΕ ΟΣΟΝ ΝΙΒΕΝ...

Gen. 49:9 ΟΣΜΑΣ ΜΜΟΤΙ ΠΕ ΙΟΤΑΣ.

Deut. 32:33 ΟΤΜΑΘΟΤΙ ΝΑΡΑΚΨΝ ΠΕ ΠΟΣΗΡΠ ΝΕΜ ΟΤΜΑ-
ΘΟΤΙ ΝΓΟΨ ΝΑΤΤΑΚΟ.

In the Nitrian Martyrologies, the recurring "οὐσιν ή Φήν..." (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" Φήν merging. Compare also AM I 38 ταραν νημ Φωκ οὐσιν ή (not η).

**Interrogative-Pronoun Rheme**

Ex. 10:8 ΝΙΜ ΝΕΜ ΝΙΜ ΝΕ ΝΗ ΕΤΝΑΨΕΝΝΩΤ.

οτ η (ΝΙΜΕΤΜΕΘΕΤ) (Deut. 6:20).

οτ η (περαν) (Gen. 31:36, Ex. 3:13).

οτ / ΝΙΜ Η ΦΑΙ / ΝΙ- (Gen. 33:5:8, Ex. 5:2, 13:14, 16:15, Lev. 25:11, 45:28, Deut. 29:24 etc.).

Gen. 47:8 οιχρ νε νιτοποι.

ΝΙΜ η (Proper Name) (Num. 16:11), η- (Deut. 20:5ff.).

**Obs.**

A special case is οτ η ΦΑΙ έτα- (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 η (with an Immutable-Theme and the proclamatory / introductory ΑΝΟΚ η..."

Gen. 49:3 ΝΟΚ η ΣΑΖΟΜ.

Num. 18:20 ΑΝΟΚ η ΣΕΚΤΟ.

Deut. 10:9 ΝΟΟΙ η ΠΟΤΚΑΛΗΡΟΣ.

Deut. 18:2 ΝΟΟΙ η ΤΟΣΣΟΙ.

Deut. 10:21 ΝΟΟΙ η ΠΕΚΝΟΤ.""

**Rhematic (η-): rare**

Num. 24:20 ΤΑΡΧΗ ΝΤΕΝΙΕΘΝΟΣ η ΠΙΝΑΜΑΛΗΚ.

Gen. 37:33 ΤΟΘΗΝ ΜΠΑΨΗΡΙ τη ΘΑΙ.

Deut. 33:29 ΤΣΗΠ η ΠΕΚΨΩΣΨΟΤ — a gnostic generic sentence (see Chapter Three for the generic-name article).

NAI NE NH ΕΤΕΠΧΩ ΜΜΩΟΤ — 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:

Gen. 26:20 φων πε πιμωοτ.
Gen. 12:12 τερκιμε τε ΕΑΙ.
Ex. 4:22 παυροτ ΜΜΙΚΙ τε πικα.

Adverbiale RHEME:

Deut. 32:32 ΕΒΟΑ ΓΑΡ ΣΕΝΘΒΩ ΝΑΝΩΛΙ ΝΚΟΔΟΜΑ ΠΕ ΤΟΒΡΒΩ ΝΑΛΟΛΙ (= Vat) (vs. 32:32f., topicalized ΩΤΕΒΟΑ ΣΕΝ-) — a rare and punctually instructive case of discord between formal and non-formal Theme, probably due to the ungendered RHEME.

Lev. 23:28 ΕΒΕΒΟΤΧΩ ΕΒΟΑ ΝΗΤΕΝ ΠΕ ΝΑΙΤΩΒΡΕ ΕΒΕΒΟΘΝΟΤ.

Lev. 2:5 ΕΒΟΑ ΣΕΝΟΤΕΧΧΑΡΑ ΠΕ ΠΕΨΑΨΡΩΝ.

Ex. 1:19 ΜΦΡΗΠ ΔΑΝ ΝΝΙΓΙΟΙΜ ΝΤΕΧΧΗΜΙ ΠΕ ΝΙΓΙΟΙΜ ΝΤΕΝΙΓΕΒΡΕΟΣ — negated (rare). The placement of ΔΑΝ is remarkable, and may indicate a focalizing negation of the RHEME (cf. the Focus negation in Focalizing Conversion syntax, below).

Deut. 22:26 ΠΑΙΡΗΠ ΠΕ ΠΑΙΡΩΒ — as usual for ΠΑΙΡΗΠ, no marking of adverbiale status here. Note P. Vat. copto 9 (B4) Jon. 1:14 ΦΡΗΠ ΕΤΕΟΣΨ[Ψ] ΠΑΙΡΗΠ ΑΚΙΡΙ.

Obs.

(1) In (Ex. 3:14) ΠΑΙΡΗΠ ΠΕ ΕΤΕΚΕΧΧΟΣ..., 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 ΠΑΙΡΗΠ τε is old in Bohairic: cf. James 2:17 Quecke Or. 43 (1974) 388).

(2) Note ΜΦΡΗΠ as Theme: Gen. 32:4 ΦΑΙ ΠΕ ΜΦΡΗΠ ΕΤΕΠΧΩ ΜΜΟΣ; Num. 32:8 ΔΑΝ ΦΑΙ ΔΑΝ ΠΕ ΜΦΡΗΠ ΕΤΑΨΡΙ.

(3) The adverbiale RHEME in general is old in Bohairic: cf. ΜΗ ΙΚΕΝ-ΖΗ ΔΑΝ ΠΕ ΠΗΕ ΠΑΝΟΤΠ ΠΕ ΝΟΤΟΤ ΠΕ ΝΑΙ Hab. 1:12 Vat. copto 9 (B4).

Conversions

Relative: possessive-pronoun Rhemes only?

Gen. 38:25 ΠΙΡΩΜΙ ΕΤΕ-ΝΟΤΠ ΠΕ ΝΑΙ.
Lev. 27:24 ΦΑΙ ΕΤΕ-ΦΩΝ ΠΕ ΠΙΙΟΠΙ.

Lev. 6:8 ΩΤΕΟΤΟΝΟΤΠΙ ΕΤΕ-ΠΕΨΜΕΤΙ ΠΕ ΠΗΕ (= Vat; (Greek appositive: δσμη ευωδίας το μνημόσυνον αυτης το κυριω) — note the indefinite antecedent of the hermeneutical Relative.
NE-
Gen. 30:30 negankotzi gar ne nh throv enanttau.
Gen. 43:32 neorcwq gar ne nnipemenximi ne manecwox niven.

Obs.
The Relative NS pattern expands a non-specific nucleus in Nitrian and nt too:
De Vis II 55 ganhaw... ete- anok pe pirovit mmow; AM I 205 nireqer-
nobi throv ete-anok pe pirovit etenxhtov; Philipp. 3:19:19 nai ete-
tovtze pe ptako nai ete-potnov† pe tontewa 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-β.
(2) A unique example of nxe- apposition, properly belonging in the
verb clause system: I cannot account for it, but the Presentative is also
remarkable:
Deut. 10:14 ὑπὲρ γὰρ ὅτα πᾶς πεκνουτ σὲ nxe-tφε nem
τέχνη πικαί nem nh throv etenxhtq (= Vat)12.
(3) Gen. 32:4 φαι πε μφρη† eteçxaw mmoc — μφρη†, ad-
verbal, is here the Theme.
(4) The expanded Theme may be topicalized (see pattern III below)
in a rare solemn asserveration, where Topic and Theme are not only co-
present, but co-referent and almost synonymous: Deut. 7:9 πας
πεκνουτ φαι πε φ†.
(5) Ex. 16:23:25 gancabbaton ne etosab mpedc pe touts... 
neiccabbaton mpedc pe pou.
An especially nice instance of the "foreshadowed enclitic" (SHISHA-
Haleyv 1986a: 167f., and see Chapter Four) combined with pattern
switching (I to II or IV). It is clear that ne and πε belong here to the
same prosodic category.
(6) Ex. 1:19 μφρη† ἀν nniqiom mi nteqhmni ne nqiomi nte-
niebpeoc.
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 πε πιμαίν ἀν nteqimos nxe-pomari
nposed (Man. Ps. 22.6f.; cf. Wurst apud SCHENKE 1997/8b: 190), where nxe-
specifies the Theme ntaq, not the Copula πε, which is phorically inert.
(7) Deut. 33:17 γανταπ ντεφαοτταπ нωσωτ πε νεγταπ.  
Poetic language — homolexemic Rheme/Theme: note the singular formal Theme.

A unique case of the zero article as Rheme: however, in view of τωην 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 (τφαωι нτκιτ) ... κ ντεβι 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 Kiti").

(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 μπεφερνοβι with Sah. μπεπαιρνοβε. 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... αε... and other exponents of contrastive prominence (cf. Gen. 27:22 τσμη μεν τσμη νιακωβ τε νιαξα αε νενιαξ νιεσα τε). Or, by macrosyntactic linkage to the preceding context or content (consider the pragmatic Topic in Ex. 12:26 Φαιωμωι ουτοτε; 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 οσκλαλοτα πε 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 {ψα1} and possessive articles). {ψα1} ({πα1}-) 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 between 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 Sentence): Gen. 37:10 ταίρασεν οτ τε παρθηρι ετακνατ 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, homolexemic — are very rare, and favour balanced or correlative *Wechselsatz* reading: Gen. 25:28 άνε-νε-τεξικορας τεξκηρε τέ (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 characteristic of this pattern.

- Generally speaking, in cases of “real” prominent Topics (see above), this pattern *focalizes* the Rheme (Deut. 9:13 παλασον παναγώτενανάβινε) and is opposed to the expanding Theme (Pattern II) as typically allocutive, not reactive: Ex. 12:27 φαθεμεωι οτ τε — ορωσισμωσι κυνες τε παλασά. The Topicalized-Theme
Pattern, through its initial Thematization, is typically part of thematic progression, and is strikingly anaphorically-linked or cotext/context-referred: Deut. 1:17 πίστιν θαῦμα ἡ περίκομψη... μακαρόνι... ἐνιβάζει... μεγάλα... 

• 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 γεγονείτει... and is thus not straightforwardly topicalized:

   Lev. 13:31f. ἐρμήνευσεν... εἰσὶν οὖν γεγονος γεγονείτει τοιούτῳ... οὖν γεγονος γεγονος... ἐκείνοις εἰσιν... (exactly = Vat, even to the alternation of zero... ἀν and (non-Circumstantial?) η... ἀν — 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 juncture.

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 foolhardy 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 junctural 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 predecessors are considered in a Sahidic view of things, e.g. Seth 1916 §128ff. Ours is a pattern of importance in the diachrony of the Egyptian NS — indeed, Seth 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, 1 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 κακᾱ…φωκ πε παιωτ, AM I 38 παιων νεμ φωκ οται 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 κακᾱ τετια φωκ πε παιωτ, combining both topicalized and endophoric constructions.

(8) Is AM I 54 ANO5 τετια φωκ τετια φωκ 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 ANO5 τοντι τε τατμματος John 8:14 (B4). AM I 128 ANO5 ΓΑΝΜΗ ΝΡΩΜΗ ΝΕ resumes the topicalized plural personal pronoun lexically, as if it were a plural determinator — 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 antact, and is then resumed in the content-(Δε-) clause. It is thus topicalized:

Ex. 2:2 ετανατ ΔΕ ΕΡΟQ ΔΕ-ΟΤΑΙΣΤΙΟC ΝΕ.
Ex. 16:15 ΝΑΤΚΩΤΩΝ ΝΗΜΟQ ΔΝ ΝΕ ΔΕ-ΟΤ ΝΕ.
Ex. 21:36 ΑΓΩΝΣΟΝ-ΠΙΜΑΣ ΔΕ-ΟΤΡΕΠΣΑΒΑΛΕΞΑΝ ΝΕ.
Num. 11:16 ΝΝ ΕΤΕΚΚΩΤΩΝ ΝΜΟΛ ΔΕ-ΓΑΝΠΡΕΣΒΟΤΕΡΟC ΝΤΕΠΑΙΛΑΟΝ ΝΕ.

In Nitrian: ΔΕ-ΑΝΟ5 ΝΙΜ Μαc. No. 8 Β ΆΝΟ5 ΔΕ-...ΝΕ Μαc. No. 6; sim. ΑΝ Νε Vis I 168, II 165; ΝΑΤΚΩΤΩΝ ΔΝ ΝΕ ΔΕ-...ΝΕ De Vis I 69, II 172, Cat. 76 ΔΕ-ΑΓΩΝΣΟΝ ΔΕ-+ NS De Vis II 75; Cat. 96, 100 etc.

Selective representative documentation

Indefinite-Article Rheme: most common

Deut. 32:4 ΦΙΓ ΓΑΝΜΗ ΝΕ ΝΕΠΕΒΗΟΤΕ ΟΤΟΡ ΝΕΨΜΩΝΙ ΘΗ-ΡΟΤ ΓΑΝΑΓ ΝΕ.

Gen. 2:23 ΦΑΙ ΤΟΝΤ: ΟΤΚΑΣ ΝΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΣΕΝΝΑΚΑΣ ΝΕΜ ΟΡ-ΣΑΡΞ ΕΒΟΛ ΣΕΝΤΑΣΑΡΞ.

Note the colon prosodic unit following Topic + Particle separator.

Gen. 4:13 ΝΑΝΟΒΙ ΟΤΝΙΨΤ ΝΕ sim. 18:20.

Gen. 27:11 ΗΚΑΤ ΝΑΚΟΝ ΟΡΨΜΗ ΕΥΡΗΤ ΝΨΩΝ ΝΕ.

Ex. 12:42 ΦΑΙ ΟΤΟΤΕΡΨΙ ΝΤΕΠΣΣΕ ΤΕ — contrast this with the Immutable-Theme Ex. 12:42 ΟΤΟΤΕΡΨΙ ΝΤΕΠΣΣΕ ΤΕ).
Lev. 19:20 ὁτὸς θαί οὐσίωσι τε.
Gen. 28:17 ΙΣΧΕΚ ΝΑΙΜΑ ὁτῷ τε.
Gen. 46:32 ΝΙΡΩΜΙ ΔΕ ΓΑΝΜΑΝΕΣΩΤ ΝΕ ΓΑΝΡΨΙΜΙ ΓΑΡ ΝΡΕΨΔΑΝΕΩΤΕΒΝΗ ΝΕ — a rare unconverted narrative (Comment Mode) instance.
Deut. 12:23 περισσον ΟΥΣΙΧΝ ΝΕ.
Lev. 27:28 ΑΕ-ΠΕΘΩΤΑΒ ΝΕ ΝΤΕΝΕΘΩΤΑΒ ΜΠΤΕ.
Rheme: number, quantifier
Deut. 6:5 ΜΤΕ ΠΕΚΝΟΝΤ ΟΤΑΙ ΝΕ.
Gen. 41:25 ΕΡΑΣΟΥΙ ΜΦΑΡΑΩ ΟΤΙ ΤΕ.
Gen. 41:27 ΤΞ ΝΕΒΕ ΕΤΨΩΜ ΕΤΞΑΙΩΤΟΡ ΟΤΟΡ ΕΤΨΩΤΟΡ ΕΟΗΝΟΤ ΕΠΨΩΙ ΣΑΜΕΝΗΣΟΤ Τ ΝΡΟΜΠΙ ΝΕ.
Ex. 12:40 ΠΙΖΙΝΔΑΙΝΙ ΝΤΕΝΕΝΨΗΡΙ ΜΠΙΚΛA ... ΤΑ ΝΡΟΜΠΙ ΝΕ (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 ΝΑΙΡΨΜΙ ΝΙΜ ΝΕ ΕΤΤΗ — not Cleft Sentence, but Relative expansion of the Topic (not the Rheme!), which is pragmatically cohesive and syntactically final.
Gen. 37:10 ΤΑΙΡΑΣΟΥ ΟΤ ΤΕ ΝΑΨΗΡΙ ΕΤΑΚΝΑΨ ΕΡΟΣ.
Also Ex. 12:26, Deut. 7:1.
Specificity-indifferent Rhemes:
Deut. 33:7 ΦΑΙ ΦΑΙΟΤΑΔΑΣ ΝΕ.
Deut. 1:17 ΠΕΝ ΦΑΦΙ ΤΕ — the possessive pronoun is specificity-indifferent: see Chapter Three.
Ex. 13:2 ΙΣΧΕΚΡΨΜΙ ΩΑΠΤΕΒΝΗ ΝΟΤΙ ΝΕ SIM. Gen. 48:5 — adverbial Topic.
Num. 20:19 ΡΙΨΒ ΓΛΙ ΝΕ.
Also Ex. 9:29.
Specific Rheme: Π- Ν- /-ΝΤΕ- (rare)
Deut. 21:17 ΦΑΙ ΤΑΡΧΗ ΝΤΕΝΕΨΗΡΙ ΝΕ SIM. Ex. 12:2 — note that this article ({{Π-}}) is not specifying per se: see Chapter Three. However, in Deut. 21:17 we find a Relative clause coordinated to the Rheme: ΟΤΟΡ ΕΤΕΣΨΕ ΝΑΨ ΕΣΙ ΝΤΜΕΤΨΩΡ ΜΜΙΣΙ, a remarkable com-
patibility, which must mean a pronominal, not converter role of the Relative.

Ex. 13:6 περεσσει αν ναηορις πωλι νποτε επε — possibly a Topicalized Endophoric ("On the seventh day, it's/there is the Lord's Holiday").

Specific Rheme: Possessive Article (rare)

Gen. 25:28 νε-τεκσοράς τεκσει τε — almost Wechselsatz.

Gen. 31:43 ναηερι. ναηερι νε. νος ναηεννονι. ναηεννονι νε να θσο τεκσαν τσρον. νοσι νε νεν ναηερι — two instances of the Wechselsatz or correlative/balanced construction.

Adverbials as Rheme (uncommon)

Ex. 29:14 ϕαι εξενφνωβι γαρ νε (= Vat).

Num. 11:7 πιμαννα μφρην ινοτερφσνον νε.

Conversions
Relative:

The only instance has the converter bracketing the whole [Topic + core] complex:

Lev. 14:35 ϕη ετε-πηνη ϕωη νε.

Obs.
The same construction in Dan. 6:2 (Bardelli) ετεδανηλα νται νδυντον νε.

Circumstantial:

Gen. 11:3 νος ναοτωβι ϕωπι νων ντων ντορνον νορ-καη νενσρενι τε — πνοκαη stands here in symmetry to νοτα-ηωβι, and the Circumstantial is rhametic complement to ντωνι, and thus not properly topical.

νε— in Narrative, all instances of "Narrator's Channel", Comment Mode — see above.

Gen. 25:28 Δε-νε-τεκσορας τεκσει 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 predicking a quality or property, all coordinated, with a Proper-Name Topic, all background-supplying in narrative Comment Mode:

Num. 12:3 νος πιρωμι μωτnee neotrepμανυ νε εμα-ϕω.
Assorted Remarkable Cases

(1) Gen. 45:6 θαί ραπ ἐμαγρομπί Φτ" τε ετασωμπι...

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 ραπ: contrast Ex. 29:14, quoted above. (Vat has Pattern (II)). Note discord with ετασ-, in P and Vat.

(2) Gen. 41:26f. θξ νεθε εθανατε ξ γρομπι νε οθογ πι-ξ ηγεμε εθανατε ξ γρομπι 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 πιεροτ άρ μμαθ-ξ γανκαβατον ÷ ιε [οτμ] αμετον ευταβ μπακ (οτμ super lin.) (= Vat) we have the Topicalized Endophoric Pattern (below).

(4) Deut. 8:9 οτκαγι ενε-νεκσνι μβενιτι 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 επενεκσνι γανβενιτι νε, which is remarkable too, in the form επε- of the Circumstantial converting a NS.

(5) Lev. 11:41 σατι νεβ ... οσουκ νηθεν πε φαι (= 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 τακτναγωνη τηρε γανρωμι ετοσαβ νε (= Vat) — an instance of ad sensum reference to the Topic.
(7) Deut. 4:35 πεκνοστ ὁ θεόν πε Φι — 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 ἀρικι καβολ ἡμοί Φαί Φαγ νονπ 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 ἀε-πνεινον πε οὐογ τενκατζ τε.
Ex. 20:10 ἀε ἡπειεγοοτ ἀε Μμαστη ηπειεγοοτ Μπεκνοστ.

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 Shishahalevy 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 εὐφη εξεκ πιωνι ματιτνι ζπ ςπλας πε “There are seven eyes” or “Seven eyes are observable” (Greek existential ἐπτά δήθαλμοι εἰσίν). Evidently, there are two different kinds of existence or existentiality relation expressed here (ὁσι-ζπ ςπλας 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 ne- 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 άε- or ραρ 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 in 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. ne- narrativizes the pattern; most often in Comment Mode, but occasionally for the Narrative Peak (Gen. 29:15 γνηπε ne-αια τε).

Obs.
(1) I find in the corpus no instance of the type ταϊκαρξ ταϊκαρξιν 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, νοογ νοογ πε ναισκίκ νοὀτωτ ςπλας (Cat. 230) belongs rather to the Immutable-Theme or “ανοκ πε” pattern (below).
(2) A suppletive alterant of this NS is conjugated ἔσκοπο: οἷς τεφνας ἄρατι (Gen. 29:7)

(3) The Endophoric responsive to a Cleft Sentence, even without the formal Theme πι: #ον 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.) Knj nty-jw t3-wnm p3y, also Mag. verso 1/8. Negatived: P. Berlin 13619 line 10f. bn t3y.w prt-sht in t3y (ed. Zauzich, Papyri der Insel Elephante, 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: jsonwebtoken Ankhsh. 9/16 (pragmatic?), or Ryl. IX 17/5 (negativated): bn dntj jw-n3w-mtw.f jn t3y. P. Berlin P. 13549 12 (ed. Zauzich 1993) mdj 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 expression-slot contained in the lexeme itself, like the residual case of Coptic con/κωνι, ἐπ/ἐπω and such. In written language, one must consider this slot still fully operative (cf. French written language) — Ryl. IX 10/21 rmt-swq.w n3w, P. Berlin P. 15628 line 7f. mdj.t ‘3.t m-s8 t3y, also II Setne 2/17; Oracle 6/7 zero-determined but specific: hrw n3-nirw 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 Rhemes, 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 mdj: t3y r tm sbtj 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 οὐοι τεινὶ εἰσὶν εὐβολ ἀπολλωσυμώσες αἰ δεπιούσαι οὐ τοπταγ̄ ἕκφην μπότε πε.

Ex. 12:11 …οὐοι ερετενεοσωμε γενοισώς ε ὅσακα μπότε πε.

Lev. 6:10 αἰθιην νοτοο εὐβολ ἀπολλταγ̄ εὗρήπ μπότε νεβοτάβ ντεπενοταβ πε.

Lev. 18:17 νεκσι ντερεπε ντεπεσυρε πνε μνες εὐβολ δ ἄνεμφεσεν ἀραν ντακ πε + ὀνετακεσής τε σιμ. 18:12ff.

Gen. 37:27 Δεπνεοκεν ποσε σου τηνπάτε τε.

Lev. 16:4 οὐβος νίαε εαυτοβοε ἐρετιηγ πιωτην νεμ οὐβος νιάε ερενοτ ερηπι πναεκαλ εὔεσςπι πΓενεπεκωμα + ἄνεμφεσεν τε.
Lev. 20:14 ἐνασιν νοσείμειν ἰματιά νεκροκραξίας σενοφορίων.

Num. 15:26 ὁσοὶ εὐαγγελοῦν θηρίον ... ἰδέ-

Gen. 28:17 ὁ τε ἀν ἐν αὐτῇ ... ἔφαξεν οὐ-

Ex. 31:16 ὁσοὶ εὐθερίας νεκρωμένη ἀναπαυ-

Num. 18:19 ἐνασιανήν ἱππότης ... άιθιτος πατρὶ ... οὐ-

Gen. 28:17 ὁ τε ἐν αὐτῇ ἤπνοι οὐρανός ἰππό-

Ex. 32:5 ἀπὸ τῆς ἀποπτή τοῦ ἔθελον ... ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀν-

Lev. 23:5f. ἄνωθεν ἀναστάσεως ἀναπαυ-

Lev. 27:7 εὐχὴν ... ἐν ἀναπαυτῷ ... ἐνομίων ... ἐν-

Obs.

(1) Some Nitrian and NT documentation for the Endophoric Pattern:

Mac. 6 ἡμῶν τοὺς αὐτοὺς ἐκλέγειται ἐκ

Mt. 5:34 καθώς ἐν τῷ ἡμῶν ἱερατείᾳ ἐπὶ τῆς γυναῖκας ... ἐν τῇ ἐν τῃ
(2) Zered-Theme-Endophoric instances are found in Luke. This is instructive, being indicative of the highly formal slot-filling nature of this Theme: #ρωσι# Luke 24:29 (v.l. ρωσι πε); #γανομη# Luke 20:20.

Conversions:

**Relative:** hermeneutic, following Proper Name as formal antecedent:
   Gen. 35:6 λοσσα ... ετε-βεθαλ πε.
   Ex. 1:11 ιων ετε-θβακι μφρ Τε.

**Circumstantial:**
   Ex. 29:18 οθορ εκεινι μπιωλι θθη ξιζεΝιμα νερ-ωουμωισγ Μνησ ... εουωουμωοσκι μπις πε.
   **ne:** the most common conversion:
   Gen.29:25 Νελια Γαρ Τε.
   Gen.29:15 ζηππε Νε-λια Τε.
   **ne- + time-expression + πε** (Gen. 15:17 Φνατ ν-, 40:20 περοοτ μμιξι, Νεζgoo τνεγ Μπαλολι Num. 13:20 etc.).

**Obs.**

(1) Hermeneutical [...] ετε- + Rheme πε De Vis 1 43, 46, 48, 193, 194, II 23, 162, 34, 95, 106, 111, 118 (ετε-λοοκ 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 ρω 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-νηοο πε πις, De Vis II 29 Θαι ετε-πεζαλον πε πις.

(4) Narrativization of the pattern is quite frequent outside the corpus:
   AM II 299 Μεροτγι γαρ πε.
   SV 38 Μεπικνοτ γαρ μπιωγ πε.
   SV 54 νε-φρω γαρ τε.
   AM I 51 Λεοτρακοτι πε.
   John 13:30 νεκαωρε Αε 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 Ναικ Ντομι πε εικ Νεμακ is not a Cleft Sentence, but a kindred, Presentational pattern. Similarly:
(2) Deut. 2:14 ἂν προμπτὶ πε ωτεμαρθε...  
(3) Gen. 44:6 Ψαί γαρ ἐμαργρομπτὶ βτ πε ετασύμπνι.  
(4) Gen. 28:19 Ψαί αν πε “This/it isn’t so” may be Endophoric, but  
(5) Num. 32:8 αν-Ψαί αν πε μφρντ ετασαϊ ΝΣΕ-ΝΣΕΝΙΟΤ І is probably a case of Pattern (II), with thematic μφρντ.  
(6) Num. 11:19 νοεροος αν πε ερετεναωσωμ ωνητω ωναε αν πε ωναε ε νεγοο ων αν πε ωναε ι αν πε — this catalogue of negativated Endorphics represents the Focus of a foregoing Cleft Sentence (with Circumstantial Topic: see below).  
(7) Ex. 10:9 ανον τεντανεναν ... πςαί γαρ μπετε πεννοοτ (Vat πςαί γαρ... πε). A rare instance of zeroed Endophoric Theme (cf. Pattern Ia above for the zeroing of the anaphoric Theme).  
(8) Gen. 45:8 ινοο αε νεωτεν αν αρετενοτορπτ εμναι αλα Ψτ πε is interesting, combining the Endophoric or the Immutable Theme pattern — it is impossible to ascertain which — with a non-Cleft focalizing construction (focussing αν; see below).

Obs.  
(1) Contrast Mac. No. 29 κε-ι προμπτὶ πε ωτατ with Mac. No. 5 κε-εροοτ β ετ.. which has a zero-Theme Cleft Sentence.  
(2) Consider Nitrian and NT: Ψαί (ψψψ/ ρψ ων) πε μφρντ... Cat. 2, 38, 105, 194 etc. Rom. 5:15. Relevant are also Cat. 3, 4 ναΨ ωρτ πε, Cat. 4 παρρντ πε εμαη, Cleft Sentence, contrasted with παρρντ ... ετε-παβτ νααι Cat. 52, a zero-theme Cleft Sentence; Cat. 211 εμε-Ψαί 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 macrosyntactic linkage of the Endophoric (above):  

Ex. 31:15 περοοο αε μμαρ-Ψ ζανκαββατον + πε [οσμ] <μτον εφοταβ μπετ (οσμ super lin).  
Ex. 32:16 ινπαα ανοσεψτατ ντεφπ πε οτοτ γγραφε νεοστεφη ντεφτ τε (= Vat).  
Lev. 11:10 αδ ντρω ... οσωρεβ πε.  
Nicely contrasted with the clearly Endophoric case of ζανκρεβ ητεν νε (Lev. 11:10:12:13). See ANDERSSON 1904:103f.  
Ex. 12:42 οαι οοοερψιντ ντεφττ τε.  
Lev. 25:33 ινι ντενινακι ντενιατιθς οταμαμι ντυον πε (= Vat)  
Ex. 35:2 περοοο αε μμαρ-Ψ πεμτον πε (= Vat).
Φαι Φιμαγ-νκοπ πε (Gen. 27:36, Num. 22:28:32, 24:10) — adverbal status: “for the... time”.

Ex. 30:13 (τφαωι ντκιτ... κντεβι πε τκιτ — possibly a Topicalized Immutable-Theme (Pattern V) case. τκιτ is adverbal, not thematic: “per kiti”.

Obs.
(1) Nitrian and NT examples: Cat. 171 παϊάντοτ ταδιώκητι μπερι πε.
1 Cor. 15:56 ζυοτρίς γαρ μπνοτ Φνοβί πε ηνάμεν αε μπνοβί φνομος πε:
A sorites syllogism, in Bohairic not Copular (as in Sahidic) but Topicalized Endophoric.
Rom. 6:23 Νηψωνιον ... Φνοτ πε.
1 Cor. 11:3 ταφε νέον... Χ πε + ταφε νέον Χ.
(2) In Demotic: P. Berlin (ed. Zauzich) P. 15530 x+10f. Ητ ηντρ Υη ιρξύ’ 3 ρζύ: 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 predicating 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 νεωτεν πε εταρετεννατ.
Num. 23:16 Ναί πε ητεκεκαζι Μμως (Vat Ναί ητεκεκε-).
Ex. 23:12, 35:2 ζε νεροοτ πε ητεκιρη Ννεκεβοτι.
Gen. 43:11 ιζε ναιρντ πε αρτιοτι μθαι.

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 predicating 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: πὲ only.
• Rheme constituency: interlocutive pronouns (common); delocutive (very rare); indefinite noun; παριφ.
• Conversion: Relative only, in hermeneutical glossing.
• Negation: attested only responsively.

Obs.
(1) See POLOTSKY 1987:117ff. on the “starres πὲ” 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 hû-/hî-/pl. hêm- 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 πὲ # - interlocutive and (very rarely) delocutive. ἀνόκ πὲ, {νοο=} πὲ. Dialogic. Not negativized 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 πὲ as thematic, functional evidence contradicts this, and speaks for an a-nexal structure, somewhat similarly to Existential or Presentative υπηπτε ic statements which is not to say that ἀνόκ πὲ expresses the same notion as υπηπτε ἀνόκ (e.g. Gen. 27:18).

(1) Proclamatory (in “Divine Self-Assertion”) or acclamatory — presentational-existential: interlocutive persons only

Deut. 32:39 ἀνόκ πὲ ὁτοις ἰμον-κεοται ἐβηλα ἐροί.

Obs.
(3) Outside the corpus: Is. 47:10; De Vis 1 195. John 8:58 μητα-αβραὰμ ωμπι ἀνόκ πὲ “I am in existence”; Acts 5:36, AM I 28, 42, 112, 126; ἀυτὸν πὲ “we're (something)” Gal. 2:6:7; Soph. 2:15 (fem. locutor) ἀνόκ πὲ ὁτοις ἰμον-κεοται ζε μενενεκε (B4).
(4) ἀνόκ πὲ in John 8:24 and 13:19 (“believe that...”) expresses the mystical “theological-existential identity”. Interestingly, negativized in Acts 13:25 ἀτενημετῳ ζε-ἀνόκ ἀνόκ γαπ ἀν πὲ, ἀλλα υπηπτε εγνηστ ἰμενενεκε 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 ἐναι οὐκ ἐμὶ ἐγὼ — may ῥα be the Coptic answer to the focalizing inversion of ἐγὼ in the Greek? (5) How is Gen. 44:18 ΝΕΟΚ ΠΕ ΜΕΝЕНΣΙΑ-ΦΑΡΑΩ (Greek σὺ ἐστί μετὰ Φαραώ) to be analyzed, and what does it actually mean? Is the adverserial constituent here thematic? or is it thematic? or an adjunctual modification of ΝΕΟΚ ΠΕ?
(6) A kindred construction to the one studied here, is Heb. 1:12 ΝΕΟΚ ΔΕ ΝΕΟΚ ΠΕ "you are you" = "you are immutable" (cf. SHISHA–Haleyv 1984a), Ps.101:28 ΝΕΟΚ ΔΕ ΝΕΟΚ ΠΕ ὅτορ ΜΕΡΗΜΠΙ ΚΕΝΑΜΟΤΝΚ ΑΝ, Heb.13:8 ΝΕΟΚ ΝΕΟΚ ΠΕ ΝΕΜ ΨΑΕΝΕΓ: I do not find in the corpus an attestation for this construction.
(7) Deut. 24:10 ἀγωνιζεῖ τὸ ὑποταμιαναι ἑπεκτύβριος Φῦς ἐτέ-ΝΕΟΚ ΠΕ ἐγεροπί — approx. "Whatever it be that he owes" is syntactically mysterious (=Vat; Greek δὲφέλλημι οἵτιον). See Polotsky 1987:67; cf. Sah. Ruth 3:10 (ed. Shier — not in the Greek) ΠΕΤΕΝΤΟΨΙ ΠΕ ΝΗΤΟΨ "whoever he be".

Conversions:

Relative: in hermeneutical glossing only. The Relative converter ete- 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, pe in our NS pattern does not refer to the nucleus:

Gen. 44:15 πηρομι ἐτέ-ΑΝΟΚ ΠΕ.
Deut. 10:15 ἀγωτίπ μποτάρθρα ΜΕΝΕΝΚΑΩΤ ΕΤΕ-ΝΕΩ-ΤΕΝ ΠΕ.

Obs.
(1) See Polotsky 1987:86 on ΦΥ ΕΤΕΟΤΡ- 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-Haleyv 1981:329 and Chapter Three below) ΕΤΕ-ΑΝΟΝ ΠΕ Rom. 9:24, ΕΤΕ-ΝΕΩΤΟΡ ΠΕ Cat. 64 etc. The special character of this conversion is proven by the occurrence of non-specific antecedents: Cat. 118, SV 32 ΟΤΡΕΓΕΡΝΟΒΙ ΕΤΕ-ΑΝΟΚ ΠΕ.

(2) Responsive, reactive or otherwise text-anaphoric, in cohesion to rhematic 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 rhematic 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 οὐδὲν, οὐδὲ 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 ΝΕΟΚ ΠΕ ΠΑΨΗΡΗ ΗΚΑΣ — ΑΝΟΚ ΠΕ.

Ex. 4:11 ΝΙΜ ΠΕΤΑΨΕΛΜΙΟ-ΕΒΩ ΝΕΜ ΚΩΤΡ ... ΜΗ ΑΝΟΚ ΑΝ ΠΕ.

Obs. (1) Outside the corpus: ΑΝΟΚ ΠΕ responsive to "ΝΕΟΚ ΠΕ ...?", Mark 14:61f. ΝΕΟΚ ΠΕ ΠΧΕ ΠΑΨΗΡΗ ΜΗ ΕΤΣΜΑΡΨΩΣΤ — ΑΝΟΚ ΠΕ: ΑΝΟΧ ΠΕ responsive to the expanded ΝΙΜ ΝΕ... in Cat. 36, 40, 60, 69. AM I 55 ΝΕΟΚ ΠΕ ΠΑΨΗΡΗ ΑΡΑ ΑΝΟΚ ΠΕ. ΑΝΟΧ ΠΕ responsive to initial-position focalization, DV II 265.

(2) Anaphoric ΑΝΟΚ ΠΕ: John 11:10 (B4) ΠΙΡΕΨΤΕΒΩ ΟΨΟΓ ΠΙΣΧ ΑΝΟΚ 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: ΑΝΟΚ ΠΕ Φ† Ex. 3:6, 6:2f. [+ ΟΣΟΓ ΑΙΩΝΟΝΤ...], 6:6 [ΟΣΟΓ ΕΙΕΝΕΝΘΝΟΣ] 14:4 [ΟΣΟΓ ΑΙΡΙ ΜΠΑΡΗΓ†] or ΑΝΟΚ ΠΕ ΠΣΕ ΠΕΤ- (Lev. 22:16, Ex. 6:2:7 etc.).

Gen. 41:44 ΑΝΟΚ ΠΕ ΦΑΡΩW.

ΑΝΟΚ ΠΕ Φ† (+ EXPANSION) Gen. 28:13, 35:11, 46:2.

Gen. 31:13 ΑΝΟΚ ΠΕ Φ† ΕΤΑΨΟΣΟΥΝΗ ΕΡΩΚ.

Ex. 3:14 ΑΝΟΚ ΠΕ ΦΗ ΕΤΨΩΝ.

Ex. 20:5 ΑΝΟΚ ΓΑΡ ΠΕ ΠΣΕ ΠΕΚΝΟΣ†.


Gen. 45:3 ΑΝΟΚ ΠΕ ΙΩΣΗΦ.

Gen. 24:34 ΑΝΟΚ ΠΕ ΠΑΛΟΣ ΝΑΒΡΑΑΜ ΑΝΟΚ ΠΣΕ ΔΕ ΑΨΗΡΟΥ ΕΝΑΣΤΕ ΕΜΑΨΩW... — 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 "ἈΝOX ἐς + 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 ἈΝOX ἐς ἘΡΩΤΗΜΑ ἈΝOX ἐς ὉΣ ἈΝOX-ΒΩΚ (v.l. ὍΣ ἈΝOX-ΒΩΚ) ἩΣΙΑΝ or Hos.11:9 (B4) ἈΝOX ἐς ὉΣ ὉΣ ὉΣ ἘΡΩΤΗΜΑ ἈΝOX, 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 ἈΝOX ἐς πΕΣΕΝΣΕ. ἈΝOX ἐς πΕΣΕΝΩΤ; royal "diatagmatic" pronouncements, decrees and edicts: De Vis I 193 ἈΝOX ἐς ἈΝΩΝΥΜΟΝΟΝΟΠ ΠΩΡΟ ΤΣΟΤΟ ΠΩΡΟ ἩΣΙΙΟ ΠΩΡΟ ΤΣΩΤΟ... AM I 122 ἈΝOX ἐς πΙΝΙΑΝΝΟΣ; Mac. No. 16 ἈΝOX ἐς πΙΟΣΤΟΣ ΠΙΕΒΙΝ; AM I 14 ἈΝOX ἐς πς ΠΕΣ ΠΕΣΕ; De Vis II 266 ἈΝOX ἐς ΓΑΒΡΙΗΛ. Also incantatory, in magical texts, e.g. Kropp Zauberexte (G) ἈΝOX ἐς ΜΑΡΙΑ ἈΝOX ἐς ΜΑΡΙΓΑΜ ἈΝOX ἐς ΜΠΑΣ ΜΠΑΣ ΜΠΑΣ ΜΠΑΣ ἘΡΩΤΗΜΑ. ἘΡΩΤΗΜΑ.

(4) Our pattern (and ἈΝOX ἐς 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 ἈΝOX ἐς ΠΕΣΕΝ ΠΕΣΕΝ... ἈΝOX ἐς Χ... ἘΙΣΚΑΙΝ Ν - SV 29, 33 etc.

(5) The prosody of the pattern is not clear. A case such as (NHC II 93) ἈΝOX ΠΕΣΑΛΑ ΠΕΣΕΝΤ- is at least an indication that {ἐς} 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 Sethe 1916 §143ff. For ME ḟι Ṛ, see Schenkel 1984:168 "be (there)"; it may be effectively negated in LE (cf. Vernus 1985) as ḟι Ṛ "not be there, be deficient, not disponible". On the OE/ME pattern ḟι + PN and ḟι + PRONOUN, see Gilula 1976 and again Schenkel 1984:168. (With an adnexal extension — ḟι + converters: Circumstantial or Static 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 ἡς ἀπὸ πῆς "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. ḟι + PN, only twice, at the very beginning of the text (1/21.28), against numerous ḟι + PN (2/8.22, 5/9 etc.); Ṛ + PN 2/21: ḟι + PN responsive to Ṛ-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 apocritic (responsive) identification-by-name to the interlocutive ἈΝOX-ΝΙΜ (ἈΝOX)

Gen. 27:24 ἈΝOX ἐς ΠΕΣΕΝ ΠΕΣΕΝ — ἈΝOX ἐς.

Two possible analyses and interpretations are "Is it you, my son Esau?" (see [a] above), or "Are you my son Esau"? The Greek σὺ οὖν ὣς μου Ἡσαυ does not resolve this dilemma. On the other hand, Gen.
27:21 ΞΕ-ΑΝ-ΝΘΟΚ ΠΕ ΠΑΨΗΡΙ ΧΕΑΤ ΨΑΝ-ΜΜΟΝ (the Greek has the same), being included by ΞΕ- seems to be "whether you are my son Esau, or not".

Gen. 27:32 ΝΘΟΚ-ΝΙΜ ΝΘΟΚ ΑΝΟΚ ΠΕ ΠΕΚΨΗΡΙ ΠΕΚΨΟΡΠ ΜΜΙΓΙ ΧΕΑΤ.

(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 ΧΑΝΨΡΕΒ 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 ΟΤΟΣΕΡΨΙΥ ΝΤΕΠΣΕΤ ΠΕ strikingly contrasted with the Topicalized Endophoric ΨΑΙ ΟΤΟΣΕΡΨΙΥ ΝΤΕΠΣΕΤ ΤΕ ibid.

Lev. 13:23 ΟΤΟΣΑΗ ΝΤΕΠΙΕΡΨΟΤ ΠΕ (= Vat).

Lev. 13:28 ΟΤΟΣΑΗ ΝΤΕ-ΟΤΚΨΚΨ 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: ΟΤΩΒΟΤΕ ΠΕ, ΟΤΨΙΨΕ ΠΕ, ΧΑΝΨΡΕΒ ΠΕ, ΟΤΧΑΝΕ ΠΕ, ΟΤΧΕΣςΤ ΠΕ.

Obs.

(1) In Num. 14:22 ΦΗΑΨ-10 ΝΚΟΠ ΠΕ ΦΑΙ it is ΦΑΙ 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 ΡΨ 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 ΡΨ in prosodic view.

There is much material on ME ΡΨ and constructions in OE and ME (“Non-Verbal Sentences in ΡΨ”) — 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 ΡΨ 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 ΡΨ constitutes practically a reason for, or a justification of, what has just been said….”. Cf. narrative ΝΑΨ- ΠΕ in our Comment Mode, a narrative correspondent to the expositive ΣΔΜΨ ΡΨ. (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-
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. Gun MSS V A 1.14), in which *pw* 
therematizing 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, con-
sider Pỳr. 577a Jst tw ḥn"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 (₇st *pw nn ṭh s b₃k, 18th Dyn.).
(6) LE: SATZINGER 1981:481ff., 491f. — this seems to be yet another diaphragm between 
Bohairic and LE (cf. Pỳr. 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 9/2.11ff. 3st *t3y. Con-
sider 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-smtt 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: *ṣm 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 1996:166ff.

(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 ᾱξιν-, ἥν-, ἄβαλ 
γν-, ἄβαλ γἰν-:- see THOMASSEN 1990:428ff.

(9) I do not find the Immutable Theme topicalized in our corpus. Note John 13:26 ΨΗ 
ἈΝΟΚ έΓΝΑΣΕΝ-ΠΙΑΩΜ ΝΑΤΗΘΙQ ΝΑQ ΝΕΟQ πε (Pal. Ribles πεΤΜΑΤ πε) or 
the lemmatic Topic in 1 Cor. 11:3 ἡφισαίε ... ΝΕΩΤΕΝ πΕ.

(d) # NOUN SYNTAGM (specific) + πε #: resumptive/responsive (ana-
phoric) to focalization constructions (incl. Cleft Sentence)

Gen. 45:8 ἸΝΟΥ ἰΕ ΝΕΩΤΕΝ ἸΝ ΑΡΕΤΕΝΟΤΟΡΠΤ ἜΜΝΑΙ 
ἀλλα ΦΠ πΕ.

This may well be a case of the Endophoric Theme pattern.

(e) # Adverbial (παὶρητ) + πε #

Gen. 43:11 ἗ΣΕ ΠΑΙΩΝΤ ΠΕ ΑΡΙΟΤΙ ΜΠΑΙ - "if this is so,...": 
see above, for παὶρητ 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 PE ETEKEXOTOV (= Vat), extending pe beyond the personal pronoun, also to the plural demonstrative;

NEWTON NETAPEYNNAV is remarkable not only for its Topic form (which would be rare even in Sahidic), but for its non-contrastive focussing function.

Obs.
A negated case from the Psalms, the pattern anaphoric to a non-Cleft focussing construction: Ps. 99:3 NEWQ LQEMION OTQ ANON AN PE “HE created us, and not we”; see below, for initial-position foci. Also De Vis II 265 NEWTON ATETEN-... APQ ANON PE. Also, ANOK AN PE responding to an indefinite Rheme (as would be “Je ne le suis pas” for “Je n’en suis pas un”): Luke 22:58 NEWQ OTEBOA MMOWT — ANOK AN PE.

(VI) The Copular Pattern: # Theme — copular pe — 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-HALEVI 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; Φραν n- or {πεκ-}παν or Proper Name; perhaps also delocutive personal pronoun (νοσοι).
- Rheme Constituency: Proper Names (highly specific); {τι-} (rare). Note the Theme/Rheme equispecificity.
- Copula: πε, τε (for demonstrative Themes).
- This, often (not always) a classic Thematic Progression, low-Communicative-Dynamism construction (‘ascending nexus’


(a) Basic naming:

Gen. 29:16:16 Φραν ντινιντι πε • λια οτος Φραν ντικονσί πε ραξνα.

Gen. 36:32 Φραν ντενβακι πε • αναναβα.

Gen. 35:10 πεκραν πε ιακωβ.

Φραν (n-. . .) πε + Proper Name · (Gen. 11:29, 16:1, 25:1, Ex. 1:15, 18:3f., Lev. 24:11, Num. 25:15, 26:59).

Obs.

(1) Contrast πεκραν here, initial Theme, with its equally thematic correspondent in Ex. 3:13 οτ πε πεκραν, or Ex. 3:15, 6:3 φαι πε παραν ντε- . . . , or Gen. 28:18,
Ex. 15:3... ἐν περὶδῷ, or Cat. 123 ἀνατολὴν εἰς περὶδῷ, 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/alllocutivity/delocutivity and focality: see SHISHA-HALEVY 1989a:87ff. (2) The Copula is always ἐν: 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 - .rnn#, prevalent in Demotic, is not attested in our corpus, but occurs residually in Sahidic as #X πιντύ #; see WESTENDORF 1981/3:81ff., and below, on binominal patterns in the corpus.

(4) In Mal. 1:2 ΜΗ ΝΙΚΑΤ ΑΝ ΠΕΙ ΤΑΚΩΘΑΦ ΕΠΕΠΙΚΡΟΤΟΜΕΝ ΕΙΑΚΩΘΑΝ we have the nearest case to a Wechselsatz (with ΜΗ...ΑΝ a discontinuous Assertive Question marker).

(b) Responsive to an interrogative Expanded-Theme Pattern:

Ex. 16:15 οὖν ἐν ταῖς — ΦΑΙ ἐν πισίκε εταθηθι ὑμεῖς.

(c) Hermeneutical — Proper-Name equivalence; name glossing:


Gen. 36:1:8 ἡκατ ἀν τοιοῦ ἐν τοιού ἐλασμ... — a rare case of Topicalized Theme preceding the Copula, and a Delocutive Theme.

Gen. 15:2 ΠΟΗΡΙ ἀν ΜΜΑΣΚΕΚ... + ΦΑΙ ἐν ΔΑΜΑΣΚΟΣ ΕΛΙΕΖΕΡ (Greek αὐτοσ...).

Gen. 23:2 ἦβακ ἑαρβοκ θεὲ ετχὴ σενπίδξον ... θαὶ τε κεβρων (Greek αὐτὴ ἐστίν κεβρῶν).

Gen. 23:19 ἠπεμθο ΜΜΑΡΜΡ ... θαὶ τε κεβρων (Greek αὐτὴ ἐστίν κεβρῶν).


Assorted remarkable cases:

Lev. 17:11:14 ἐπιθὲ γὰρ ΝΤΕΚΑΡΑΣ ΝΙΒΕΝ ἐπὶ πεκκνοὐ (= 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 πεκκνοὐ as compared with ἐπιθὲ. This seems to conflict with the Greek rendering (11 τὸ γὰρ αἶμα αὐτοῦ ἀντὶ τῆς ψυχῆς ἐξελάστει, 14 ἡ γὰρ ψυχὴ πάσης σαρκός αἶμα αὐτοῦ ἐστίν). 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-proverbal Wechselsatz or balanced construction, predi-
cating the equivalence of “soul” and “blood”.

Conversions:

Relative:

Gen. 22:24 οὐ ετε-πεσκαν πε ρεμά.

Circumstantial — always adnominal:

Gen. 16:1 οὐσβωκι επεσκαν πε αγάρ.
Gen. 25:1 ...νουςμίε επεσκαν πε ήπεττοτρα.
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. πιθοτι/πιθακ-β πε + P. The glossing hermeneutical Copular Pattern (no comme) selects and thematizes individual lemmata: Cat. 9, 1, 66, 72, 84 etc.

(2) The Copular as a responsive pattern: Cat. 214 οτε τε ἤπειρον μερη... θαί τε

(3) Note the naming topicalized Copular SV 55 ΝΑΙ- ... ΦΑΙ πε Χ. The Relative Copular is typically Nitrian: De Vis II 15 ΦΗ ετε-ΝΟΟΡ πε πιωνς, 29 ΘΑΙ ετε-πεσκαλον πε πιως.

(4) Copular πε is invariable: Cat. 102 τοβ ἡκενε οτν πε πιωτικν πρεκ-
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(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 είναι in the Greek) — specifying name-identity or quantity or constitutuence: # N — [number or quantity “name”]#. Note the frequent lemniscus between Theme and Rheme.
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παρχων... + [X ] (Num. 2:10 etc.).
N (material) + [quant.] (Ex. 38:29, Lev. 23:13, Num. 2:26:31ff., 7:85ff.,
28:20ff., 29:9, 31:38ff. etc.).

εβωλ [X] (Num. 1:6ff.).
Φα- [X] + παλμος [X] (Num. 26 passim).
νεωμπι [X] + [Y] (Gen. 10:1, Num. 26 passim).

προσημων + [number] (Num. 31:39).

δαυαστι... θα (Num. 17:14; cf. also Gen. 25:3, 31:36ff., 47:28,
Num. 26:62): no rhyme-introducing ν-.

πεδαυον + [X] (Num. 7:37:43 etc.).

Note also:

Deut. 5:14 πιεγουσ [X] [Μαγ-
γαναβατον Νεμτον Μπες
πεκνος] (= Vat).

Deut. 16:8 πιεγουσ [X] [Μαγ-
ογίνι Εβωλ Πωλ Μπες
(= Vat) — where πιεγουσ seems to be adverbial, but may well be the-

matic-topical.

Obs.

(1) I suggest that, instead of speculating on whether what is zeroed here is a Copula or a
formal Theme anaphoric to the Topic, these well-attested constructions should not be
seen as a case of zeroing at all, but as true binominals; certainly, triggered by Biblical
Greek constructions (in their turn triggered by the Hebrew), yet firmly rooted in the
Egyptian past and grammatically viable. True, this special specifying pattern sometimes
resembles appositive-listing constructions (such as the budal apposition in Arabic), and is
never negated or converted; yet the interdependence of its two constituents is arguably,
often clearly nal.

(2) These patterns are contrasted, as stylistically special, “Biblically marked” variants,
to — and occasionally combined with — the “regular” Delocutive NS patterns; occasion-
ally, these regular patterns, initial or nal, serve as frame to the special ones:

Num. 25:14 Φαν ΔΕ [X]. 25:15 Φαν ΔΕ Ντιραοι... Πε [X].
Num. 34:19ff. Ναι Νε Νιπον... Τεσαν Ν... [X].

(3) We have an exactly parallel pattern in Demotic, predicking terms in spatial/temporal
closed systems: Hawara Uk. XVIII (= P. Hamburg dem. 4) lines 17, 18ff., LÜDDECKENS
1998:172 (ed.’s note, with further references, p. 182): ntj-ww-ww-tw: j h’ j k t
1/2 + 1/10 “What I myself own is the other 1/2+1/10 part...”. In Ryl. IX 3/7ff.
we have the infini-
tive as RHEME of a binominal construction, again with a quantitative-specification: djt
śp w st n św 50 “to have them receive 50 blows of the whip” (see VITTAMANN 1998:
344ff.). The infinitive is rhematic in the oracular inquiry form p3y j’ś-shn nfr śm r p3-tś,
P. Berlin P 15637+15803 line x+2f. Also, compare in Demotic the formulaic construc-
tion in sale or lease contracts of real estate properties, in the clause identifying the property in
question by specifying the boundaries or neighbouring properties: n3yf hynw... p3yf
rsy... p3yf j3bt..., n3yf hyn w rsy... (“Its neighbours — its south:...”, “its east:...”,
its southern neighbours: ...”) and the like.
2.1.1.1 Some assorted configurations: transitions between delocutive Nominal-Sentence patterns / macrosyntactic patternings; paradigmatic oppositions

Lev. 13:21 ις ευππε μμον-κωι νοτβαυ νσθυ ϵοςφ θε- 
νιοντι ις ετενπψωρ ντεπεκαοσαν νοςφ ϕαι οσγολ 
πε — descriptive Present and non-descriptive (diagnostic) NS.

Deut. 21:20 πενεωρι ϕαι ϕοι νατπαι ωτος οσρερσνιθ 
πε νοι νατωτεμ.

(a) Expanded-Theme ⇒ Binominal (below) (Question ⇒ Response).

Gen. 47:8f. οσιρ πε νιρμπι νεγον ντεπεκωνζ — νι-
ρμπι ντενιρμπι ντεπαιωνζ NH εςψων νοθων ɾɐ 
νρμπι.

(b) Expanded-Theme ⇒ Copular (Question ⇒ Response).

Ex. 16:15 ος πε ϕαι — ϕαι πε πιωικ εταφτφικ νωτεν.

(c) Anaphoric-Theme ⇒ Expanded-Theme (shared or bracketing ap-
positive Theme).

Lev. 10:13 ος νομιμον νακ πε νοςφ ντο νομιμον 
ννεκωρι πε ϕαι.

(d) Topicalized-Theme ⇒ Anaphoric-Theme

Gen. 46:32 νιρμμι δε γαν μανεκων νε γανρμμι γαρ 
νρεφυανευ-τεβνΗ νε.

(e) Topicalized-Theme ⇒ Topicalized Interlocutive (below).

Gen. 27:11 ἰκατ πακον οσρμμι εφρητ νοςφ πε ανωκ δε 
ανωκ-οσρμμι εφσθη.

Two cases of tensed environment for the Nominal Sentence:
(f) Present ⇒ Nominal Sentence (⇒ Present).

Deut. 14:7f. κεερμμι ναε-ναι κεφωρφ δε αν ... ναι 
γανακαορτον νωτεν νε — descriptive Present Tense in contrast 
with non-descriptive (preceptive) NS.

Ex. 5:17 τετενερψφγν νοςφ νωτεν-γανρεφψρψφν (vs. 
κεερμμην ν. 8) - allocutive incidental description vs. essential char-
acterization (vs. delocutive description); Greek σχολάζετε σχολασται 
έστε (σχολάζουσιν ...).

(g) Nominal Sentence ⇒ Present.

Lev. 14:21 ευςπ δε οσγκι πε νοςφ τεξαξ ζιμι αν...

Inherent-characterizing NS and incidental correlative Present.

(h) Absolute-Definite Future (εφε- ) ⇒ Nominal Sentence.

Deut. 33:29 εφεερνατφ ϕοκ ναε-πεκβόθεος τεχνι πε 
πεκυσονου — 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 εὐοι δήκι νυς Lev. 25:35 — no difference in the Greek, which is verbal in both cases (πένηται).

Lev. 13:34 εὐοι οὐκ ἡστὶν κοῖλη νυς Lev. 13:31 (Greek οὐχ ἡ δώις ἕγκοιλοτέρα) — description vs. negativized diagnostic characterization.

Deut. 20:21 πενήρι φαί νοί νατματ οοσ ουρεψηνυν σε οοί ναπωτεμ — 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 1 50 ΝΙΜ ΠΕ ΦΑΙ ⇒ ΦΑΙ ΠΕ ...; but

Expanded-Theme ⇒ Expanded-Theme:
AM 1 66 ΝΙΜ ΠΕ ΠΕΚΡΑΝ — ... ΠΕ ΠΑΡΑΝ, and

Expanded-Theme ⇒ Expanded-Theme ⇒ Copular:
AM 1 2 ΝΙΜ ΠΕ ΠΕΚΡΑΝ — ... ΠΕ ΠΑΡΑΝ — ΠΑΡΑΝ ΠΕ...

Copular ⇒ Topicalized:
1 Cor. 11:3 τάφε [ ... ] ΠΕ ΠΕΧΤ ΤΑΦΕ ΔΕ Ν[ ... ] ΠΕΧΑΙ ΠΕ

Topicalized ⇒ Relative Endophoric:
Cat. 40 τεχνίτι τεχνίτι τε έτε-κοπου πο πε πεχτ.

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. τεότζεμεν τε θαί ... άξογ ούν άξε-ανοκτεομνί 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:

  \( \text{\textsc{anok}} \) - Ex. 3:11  
  \( \text{\textsc{anon}} \) - Ex. 16:7, Gen.42:10
  \( \text{\textsc{n\textsc{eo}}k} \) - Gen. 29:14  
  \( \text{\textsc{n\textsc{eo}}} \) - Gen. 24:60, 39:9  
  \( \text{\textsc{n\textsc{owten}}k} \) - Gen. 42:34
- Substantival apposition to the Theme is marked by \( \text{\textsc{se}} \) (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:

  \{\text{\textsc{pi}-}\} Gen. 4:9, 30:2
  \{\text{\textsc{pi\textsc{ne}-}}\} Gen. 12:13, 29:15, 39:9, Num. 22:30,
  \( \text{\textsc{se}} \) - Gen. 32:17, 50:19 (specificity-indifferent)
  \( \text{\textsc{ov}} \) - Ex. 33:3, Deut. 7:6  
  \( \text{\textsc{gan}} \) - Ex. 5:17

- \text{\textsc{nim}} “who?” Ex.3:11 (+ sequelling \( \text{\textsc{se}+-} \) Conjunctive, which marks the question as assertive [“rhetorical”])
- \( \text{\textsc{ov}} \) “what?” Ex.16:7 (+ sequelling \( \text{\textsc{se}+-} \) 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 \{\text{\textsc{pi}-}\} (?), \text{\textsc{ot\textsc{ai}, — niben}}\(^{17}\). This is the only pattern to exclude the specificity extremes from rhematic status. The exclusion of zero implies a different “sense” assigned to \( \text{\textsc{ov}} \)-; however, the exclusion of the Proper Names does not mean that the equally interlocutive \( \text{\textsc{anok} \pi\textsc{ne} + PN} \) 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  \( \text{\textsc{anok-\textsc{se}o\textsc{p}}} \)  
  Is. 43:1 (Tattam)  \( \text{\textsc{n\textsc{eo}k-\textsc{se}o\textsc{wi n\textsc{eo}k}}}, \) Oxyrh. 
  Ps. 118:94  \( \text{\textsc{an-k-pok}} \): confirming the specificity-indifference of \( \text{\textsc{se}} \).

\(^{15}\) 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, 143f., 146ff.)
Conversion: none attested in the corpus, except for a single possibly circumstantial negated instance (Gen. 42:24 δε-νωτην-ζανη-πινικος νωτην-ζαναπιν ον). This too indicates the distinctiveness of the pattern.

Negation by postpositive αν is well attested.

Prosody: closest (?) internal juncture. Bohairic orthography — as is the norm outside the “pure Sahidic” domain — does not reflect the thematic nature of the interlocutive pronominal Themes by a special reduced morphophonological homonym. This prosodic feature is symptomatic by the placement of enclitics after the Rheme syntagm (Γαι 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 (ἀνον-/?ωτην-ζαν-, ἄνοκ-/?οκ-?ω-) seems to be the rule. In the topicalized subpattern, the Topic is exactly echoed in the Theme, yet these two are homonyms: “lexemic” personal pronoun and pronominal Theme, respectively. Note that the topicalized subpattern (locutive [1st] persons only?) is found as

18 See Funk 1991:4ff., 13ff. The prosodically unmarked variant in Shenoutean Sahidic (ἄνοκ- Amël. II 70, ΝΤΩΤΗ- Leip. IV 100 etc.) may perhaps be considered an Akkumism.

a rule with particle or Augens\textsuperscript{20}, which adds to the segmentation and topicalization marking, beside their rhetoricity 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{jnк-}na\textit{нъ} 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 1967:99ff., GILULA 1976:167ff. SCHENKEI 1984:162ff. sees \textit{jnк-}, 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 mтwk-rm jn}, in Ryl. IX 1/18 with its LE antecedent (VITTMANN 1998:310ff.)
(3) The well-known instance of \textit{нндк}- (Sah. \textit{ntq}-)\textit{ф}a-(\textit{пa}-), II Cor. 10:7, apparently cast in the Interlocutive NS matrix, is still unique: see above.
(5) ROSEI 1975b applies the Coptic \textit{ан}-/\textit{анок} paradigm to resolving the Biblical Hebrew \textit{anи} — \textit{анк} dilemma, purely typologically, it seems, without considering the Greek intermediate stage: both \textit{анок} and \textit{анк} are rhematic as well as unmarked.

Selective representative Documentation

Gen. 47:3 \textit{анн-}\textit{анмананесвоп \дxa-}\textit{nekалвопи \анн \ннпнйтп}\textsuperscript{†}.

Ex. 33:3 \textit{бнок-}\textit{отпдсп ннанпнтвпбн}.
Ex. 3:11 \textit{анок-}\textit{ннм \дxe-}\textit{нтамвнхн гтгп}ap\textit{н}ap\textit{w}.

Gen. 24:24 \textit{анок-}\textit{твепи мвдптапл} \textbf{\pmнхрп \мнэ-}\textit{лхп} — the Augens \{\textit{ннпн=} only?) is here \textit{topicalizing} rather than a signal of rhetoricity.

Gen. 23:6 \textit{бнок-}\textit{отпдсп \бнок евлa гтпнпфт}\textsuperscript{†}.

Gen. 50:19 \textit{анок-}\textit{фкф}п\textsuperscript{†} \textit{гап \анок} — 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{бнок-}\textit{ннм \бнок} is rhetorical and sarcastic.

\textsuperscript{20} Cf. FUNK 1991:8ff., 25ff.
\textsuperscript{21} SHISHA-HALEVY 1986a:166f.
Conversion

Circumstantial?

Gen. 42:24 δε-νωτεν-γανχριψνικος νωτεν-γανχρπ
ἀν — the second sentence is probably Circumstantial, zeroed before
syllabic nasal in negation (see Chapter Four).

Obs.
Conversion, out of corpus — Relative: Acts 27:23 ὁ ἐτε-ἀνοκ-φων, Cat. 220
μπαρμ ον ἐτε-ἀνοκ-οτεβολ...ἀν; ἑν- Hag. 2:16 (B4) νε-νετεν-νημ
γαρ. Obd. 1:11 οὐγον νε-νοθοκ οταλ γυκ εβολ μήντον ην. Job 4:19 μὴ δὲ
ἐτωπι ἑγανηθι ημι ἑτε-ἀνοκ γυμ ἀνον-γανεμον ἑκεαμι
νοσβτ is a striking topicalized and converted example, irregular both in the expansion
form of the indefinite antecedent-nucleus and in the anacolouthic resumption. No less re-
markable is John 17:14 (B4) καταφρτ οτε-ἀνοκ γυ νανοκ-εβολ ἑκπι-
κομοκ αν with an adverbial Rheme, undetermined.

Negation:

Deut. 11:2 νωτεν-γαναλωτι αν.
Gen. 42:10 ἀνον-γανχρπ αν ἀν-καναλωτι.
Gen. 42:24 δε-νωτεν-γανχριψνικος νωτεν-γανχρπ
ἀν — probably Circumstantial, zeroed before syllabic nasal in negation
(see Chapter Four).

Num. 22:30 μὴ ἀνοκ-τεκεω αν — discontinuous μὴ...ἀν.
Deut. 32:6 νωτεν-οταλοκ ννοχ γοθ οτορ νοαε αν — coo-
dinated Rheme negation.

Topicalized subpattern — locutive only

Gen. 27:11 ηκαν ναον οτρωμε εφρτητ νηωι νε ἀνοκ δὲ
ἀνοκ-οτρωμε εφεθν.
Ex. 6:12 ἀνοκ γαρ ἀνοκ-οτατκαι.
Ex. 22:27 ἀνοκ γαρ ἀνοκ-οτρεφωντ.
Gen. 42:11 ἀνον ηθεν ἀνον-νενυθρπ οτρωμει νοσντ.
Ex. 16:7f. ἀνον δὲ ἀνον-οτ.

2.2.1 Verbal copular elements in Bohairic: οι ἦ / επ-: incidental
(circumstance-referred, non-inherent) noun predication

(a) A familiar, historically rooted and typologically important con-
struction employs the Stative converb of τι "do" with the rheme-mark-
ing η- in a complex copula οι η-, 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 η-) in the adverbial-Rheme
(“Bipartite”) matrix. Structurally, the primary opposition #qoi n-Rheme# vs. #Rheme — nē# 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 εqoi n- is a suppletive alternate of the NS. As a matter of fact, it is not easy to find lexemes for which the full opposition exists (one such is xo “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 nexcel 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); nē- (in narrative and narrativel 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 ἐμε ἐμι “εἰμι ὃ εἰμι” is contrasted to the Divine Proclamatory (Ex. 3:14) ἄνω πε φη ετώπο “εἰμι ὃ δὲν”; “I am what I am” does not precisely convey the sense of the former.

Selective representative Documentation
Ex. 21:8 qoi nēc an ethic naq eboλ — an uncommon negative instance.
Gen. 23:4 ἑαυτοὶ οἱ πρεσβεύσαι ὁτὸς ἑαυτοὶ νῳκέμον.

Gen. 10:9 ναχοί ναφσφα νἄρης μπεμποὶ μπῆς φῦ εὐ-


— observe that the nominal expansion of the
determinator is not characterized in any formal way for inheritance or
incidentiality.

Ex. 19:16 νακοὶ νονιῶτος ὁ οἰκεῖον.
Ex. 22:21 σάρκεσινοί γὰρ νῳκέμον ἡστὸν πε (above, Chapter One).

Gen. 14:10 ἡμέρα οὖν ἐκ τῶν ἀειλάρ νῃωτὸς ὑμᾶς ὑμῖν


Ex. 25:33 νὸν ἀράσηρ εὐστὸι μπῆς ὁ παρὸκ παρὰ.
Ex. 26:8 μαραθεϊστι εὐστὸι οὐ-μᾶρ μμαρί.
Ex. 26:24 εὐφυσοὶ εὐσήμως νἄρε-νίκεθιπολείς εὐστὸι νοῦτα.
Ex. 26:32 νομικεθιπολείς εὐστὸι νοῦτα ... ὁτὸς τῶν-ᾶ μμαρί


Ex. 30:23 ὅτι οὐκαινομόρον εὐστὸι οὐστοτῷ.
Ex. 21:5 νῷα ναζηνήν ἀ κτὸι νῳκέμε.
Lev. 20:20 εὐφυσοὶ εὐστὸι νόνοιοκο.

Lev. 26:13 οὐ οὐ καθοπονότα πειος διδακτοῖ ναχμε εὐ-


Gen. 17:14 πιστῶτε οὐτοὶ νατσεβί.

Deut. 1:19, 8:15 πυρά χρῆς εὐκατάει στῶτοι χτὸς ἑφιν-


“frightening” (ἐπ-γοτ “fear” Gen. 28:17 etc.) Ex. 3:6, Deut. 2:4:8.

Gen. 31:47 “πιῶτα στῶτοι τίμεθε” — the name of the “Witness


Cairn” : contrast Gen. 31:46 πιῶτα εὐτοπ-τίμεθε ωτῶι νεμακ


“It is this cairn that testifies (or: “is witness”) between me and you”.

(b) Copular ἐπ- + Noun Syntagm (same determination profile)
provides the non-durative (or better non-statal), alternant for ὅνοι ὑω-.

By the same token, copular ἐπ- /οἱ ὑω- is characterized as intransitive22.

In this syntagm set, ἐπ- is thematic, the noun syntagm rhematic. Within the
opposition indicated here in-conjugation, ἐπ- signals non-durativity:

Ex. 7:15 ἀσφ-οτρομ “it turned into a snake”.

Num. 7:87...ἐςφρ-οτρομπι.

Gen. 48:19 ἐρεπ-οτρομωτ ἐρῶ — ὅτι probably conditioned here
by the comparative expansion ἐρώ.

Ex. 16:20 ἀσφ-ὑντ.
Ex. 7:19 ἀσφ-ὑντ.
Ex. 38:23 νῦν πετασμέν-αρχιτεκτων.
Num. 12:11 οὖν ἀνέφ-ατεμί.

Some striking pairings of the ϵρ / όι ι- alternation and, where ex-
tant, their NS opposita:
-ϵρ-άτοσεμ Deut. 9:24.
-όι χάτοσεμ Deut. 9:24.

ϵρ-μεσερ- ϵερομεσερ νοῦι Ex. 23:1.
-οί μμεσερ Gen. 31:47.

However, ςερμεσερ, ςερμεσερ Gen. 31:48, Deut. 19:18 may
be a case of the rarer “play the role of”, “act as” (see Obs. below, dis-
scussion of Shenoute Chass. 20ff.).

ϵρ-ατο Gen. 28:13 "fear": μπερεργοτ.
Gen. 28:17 ἱεροκ πάιμα σφοτον (= Vat) “awe-inspiring”,
“terrible”. Cf. (De Vis I 76) σφοτον πο εώρκ μμή μαιλίτα
εώρκ μμεθνοτ.
-οί νγοτ Deut. 6:22 “frightful, terrible” γαλομόχορτ ενασερ
σφοτο ετοί νγοτ — possibly supplying the Circumstantial con-
version of the NS σφοτο πο? Similarly the Relative in (De Vis I 201)
τοσνοτ ετεμματ ντέσμοτ οὐ ετοι νγοτ ναρενρωμί
νίβεν.

ϵρ-νκικ Lev. 20:10.
-οί κκκικ Lev. 20:10 ἓν ετοί κκκικ νέμ το ετοώοι
κκκικ ἐρος.

ϵρ-φρηθ Gen. 34:15 εώμπ κτενερ-πενρηθή 23.
παρηθ πο is common, outside of the -οί ι- / ϵρ- alternation.

ϵρ-σε Ex. 15:9 ...ντετασικ ϵρ-σε, Gen.1:28 αρ-σε εάωη
(i.e. πίκαπ).
Ex. 21:8 όοι κσε κα τηθ ναν εβολ.

23 Note the difference between the noun-predicating ϵρ-{...}ρηθ and παρηθ
παρηθ Ex. 7:10, where we have the lexicem, not grammemic ιπ with παρηθ its
object. It is of interest that it is ι- in the mediate-object construction that carries the
junctural differentiatiation in this case (cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 1986a Chapter Three).


ep-νιωτ, ep-ονιωτ (Num. 15:8, Gen. 43:34) “be big, great”. ονιωτ pe (Num. 13:18) “it is strong”.

Lev. 25:25 εψοι νηηκι vs. οσηηκι pe Lev. 25:35.

Lev. 13:34 εψοι ναιαν αν (Greek ουκ εστιν κοιλη) vs. ναιαν αν pe Lev. 13:31.

Deut. 20:21 πενψηρι φξι ροι ιατματ ρογ οηρηθχηθηθηθ pe ροι ιατμωτεμ.

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 (“οσηε pe”):

Human status, role, class, institution, relationship, state, age, quality:
+ κοηαι Deut. 7:7.
+ νιωτ Gen. 21:8, 43:34 ηερηνιωτ αε ντε-ττοι ωμενια-
+ μην, Num. 15:8 ερηθεοηθ ερηνιωτ.

Gen. 48:19 εεεηρσνιωτ ρεοq, with ρε- probably conditioned by the expansion ρεοq.
+ δωκ Gen. 44:9 εεηερβωκ κκενσκε, 30:26 αεηερβωκ
+ κε ηεβηητον (vs. μεηθωκ εηαιεικ, presupposing *ερ-
+ μεηθωκ), Gen. 25:23, 29:32.

+ ρεμεη Ex. 21:5.
+ παμαο Gen. 30:43.
+ ηηκι Lev. 25:25.
+ οηρψηιηη ηεθεθκοι Gen. 16:12.

+ σσεη Ex. 15:9 ηεηαηιηζε ερηθσ, Gen. 1:28 αρισεη εξωη (i.e.
+ πικαζη), Ex. 21:8 ροι οηση αθη εθηθηθ εβελ.

+ γηηοθεθζηηο εζεθπιαλοο Deut. 20:9.
+ οηρο Gen. 37:8 κηθεθοθρο εερθη εξωη.
+ αζωιη Gen. 10:9.
+ οσηβ Deut. 10:6, Ex. 30:30.
+ πεμνεῶια Gen. 21:23.
+ ωομ Deut. 7:3.
+ ωοπτ Gen. 48:20.
+ δαε Deut. 2:7.
+ νωικ Lev. 20:10.
+ νεεπε Deut. 19:8.
+ δομεοσ Ex. 2:22.
+ ναυτ† Gen. 15:1.

Non-human constituency or attribute: material, shape, form, modality, emotion, language and speech, colour:
+ ρην† (+ Ν- or possessive): (Gen. 27:12:14:27).
+ εοτ† Deut. 6:22, 8:14.
+ ωαε Deut. 7:2.
+ σνοq Ex. 7:17.
+ γεντ Ex. 16:20.
+ γοq Ex. 7:15 (οσ-).
+ δακων Ex. 7:9:10:12 (οσ-, Γαν-).
+ ωβωτ Ex. 4:4 (οσ-).
+ δανε Lev. 13:34.
+ σερβενι Num. 33:55.
+ δοτιαοταν νεμ δοταν ηκερμι Gen. 31:10f.
+ ωωτ† ωωτ† νεμ βρεγι Gen. 14:10
+ ουκφοτον νοτμτ, ουκμην νοτμτ Gen. 11:1 — the only case in the corpus of οσ- determination following οΙ Ν-: not indefinite article, but a focussed quantifier: discontinuous οσ νοτμτ.

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-φων.
Ex. 13:12 εεερ-ναπτε.
Ex. 4:16 εεερ-ρωκ.

(c) Several other ερ- entities, structurally distinct from the copular ερ- that alternates with οΙ Ν-:
(1) *ep-* + Adverbial (see Polotsky 1959:459) in non-durative environment, alternating with the rhematic adverbial in the Present; rare in the corpus, but well attested elsewhere:

Gen. 44:4 *etαερσαβαλ αυ τρακι...*  
Gen. 3:5 τετενναερμφρην ιγκαννος.  

(2) Non-copular *ep-* + zero article + NOUN: marking ("deriving") the denominal stem of verb lexemes, in durative and non-durative environments:

+ *nobi* Gen. 40:1 (note the degree modification in Ex. 32:31 *erpobi σενωνιηυν* ι *nobi*).

+ *γωβ* Gen. 31:29, Ex. 31:4.
+ *καλτινιν* Num. 10:10.
+ *οσω* Num. 11:28, 32:31.
+ *οσωνινι* Gen. 1:15:17.

Gen. 31:46 παιδαλ ετερμεθε οτωιι νεμακ — here, however, we may have an instance of the rare *ep-* "constitute, play role of", "act as" (see below).

(3) *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 *ep-* + Greek -ν-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 "κωτεμ" "native" infinitives.

Ex. 34:16 *ετερεπενεκυρι* ερ-πορνετιν.
Ex. 5:16 *ετερα-ματιγροιν ημων*.

Also Gen. 21:10, 29:18:20, Ex. 16:30, Lev. 26:34, Num. 27:14, 11:25, Ex. 32:4 and passim.

(4) *ep-* + Egyptian verb lexeme. Extremely rare:

*αρι-εμι* (imperative only? e.g. Deut. 2:7). Perhaps *ερ-ζινιοπ* (Num. 32:5).

CHAPTER TWO

(6) **επ-** -/-ε-: **επ-** "render", "verb of incomplete predication" (Curme) — trivalent **επ-/-αι-.** The Rheme with *zero* or indefinite determination.

Ex. 5:21 ἀρετεινὲπ-πενχωοι μβοῦ.  
Gen. 42:36 ἀτετεναιτ νατωῆηπι.  
Gen. 14:23 ιερ-αβρα μναμαο.  
Ex. 8:10 αὐατιτο νσωνωσ σηνωσι.  
Gen. 34:31 αἰπι ανενωνι μφρηνη νσουρην.

(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:

+ πεοναιεξ Num. 10:32.  
+ μεομηι Gen. 20:16, 41:32.  
+ μκαξ νήητ Gen. 27:38.  
+ Φμεηι ν-, πεημετι Gen. 41:9.  
+ πωτωπι Gen. 43:9.  
+ ξηηιοπ Gen. 32:10:23, Num. 32:5:7, perhaps "execute crossing" vs. ξηηιοπ *ibid.* "cross".

+ οηηαξι Gen. 24:12.  
+ οηηιοηνη ν- Gen. 21:8.  
+ οηηαξη Lev. 5:22.  
+ μβκ Ex. 14:5.  
+ Φμεηι, πεημετι Gen. 8:1, 40:14, Num. 10:9.  
+ Φρωμη Deut. 32:10.
+ ἐφάν Gen. 12:18.
+ age Gen. 35:28, Num. 28:3.

(7) ἐπβοκὶ, ἐβοκὶ “conceive, be/become pregnant” — alternation between non-durative and durative environments.

(a) ἐπβοκὶ vs. ἐβοκὶ “conceive” vs. “[be] pregnant” (ἐπβοκὶ non-durative)

Gen. 38:24 ἐγννέε ἐβοκὶ.
Num. 11:12 θε ἐτεμβοκὶ.
Gen. 16:5 ζητεννᾷ ἐν ἰε-ἐσμβοκὶ — Focalizing Present.
Gen. 38:25 ἐβολὰ ἐνπιρβομ ἐτεννοτ ἐναι αἰμβοκὶ ἀνοκ (v.l. ἀεπβοκὶ).

Focalizing Present “It is by the man whose these are, that I am pregnant” (v.l. Basic Preterite “... I have conceived”).

Gen. 38:18 ασεβοκὶ ἐβολὰ μμοτ (Preterite).
Gen. 16:4 ασεβοκὶ (Preterite).

(b) But performatively (“Divine-Intervention Performative”), ἐπβοκὶ occurs even in the (non-actual?) Present:

Gen. 16:11 ἐγννέε ννο ντετερβοκὶ.
Gen. 25:23 Ἠλὸν ἐν αἰρετεβοκὶ 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 ἐ- + zero article, not alternating with ο ν- 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) ἡγlatlong ἐν οτα κεῖμεν ἡγ-μακε ἐν οτα εῖτο κεῖμεν ἡγ-τον ἐν ἐν γίνοοε ἄνω μᾶθε ντι ... ἡγ-θαλακα ἐν οττε κοοτκ κοοτκ ἡγ-κοον ἐν οτα καὶ ἐγ.every ἡγ-κοτ ... καὶ γαρ μπεέε νναι μμεντνυωντ κεναι ταῦτ ἡγ-τον ἐν οτα μμωτ πεκτοβ πεκτοβ ὑπ ην ταῦτ ἄν (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-/οι ν-alternation.
the final Nominal Sentences, see SHISHA-HALEVY 1984a: 186). (It may well be that similar cases of “act as” hide among the επ- occurrences in Bohairic, consider Deut. 10:6 ἀπεροθήκας τρομοκράτης. Thus the Demotic ḫr. ṳ jr ḫw. ḫ mousemove{m} hmr 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, Giry-Schneider 1987, Spence 1988).

(2) ωστι εσοι η- is non-durative — either Future (Greek ἔσται): Num. 29:13, also Ex. 27:1, 30:1, Deut. 6:8, 33:5; or else Jussive/Imperative: Ex. 26:8 μαρεμωστι εσοι αν ἐμμερεσι, also Gen. 27:29.

(3) It is possible to see επ- as suppletive to the Nominal Sentence (Funk 1991: 29 n. 54), since οἰ η- is in partial opposition to the latter; however, since this opposition is neutralizable, επ- and the NS do find themselves often alternants.

### 2.2.2 χή, ωσι

So far as I know and my documentation goes, the distinctly and peculiarly Bohairic Copula χή — occurring only with prepositional Rhemes in the Present — is not a trait of pre-Coptic Egyptian; Demotic or even LE may yet yield attestation of the grammaticalized, auxiliary Stative of ḫr3’, for the first radical of which Coptic ρ 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. χή corresponds to Sahidic κή, 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 χή “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 exoponence 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 χή is the correspondent, or even alternant of non-inherent οἰ η- 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 χή vs. zero opposition in the corpus (with no correspondence in the Greek). The only real working hypothesis, I believe, is that χή 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 *membe no* or *esotn 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*, *etemmat* 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 Senkiposmos* (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 *gmpne oron orma xh garok.*
Gen. 47:6 *ic pka ... xh mpocmno*.
Gen. 42:28 *ic fra qxh Senpacok.*
Gen. 42:13 *gmpne ic picy *qxh Etenpeqwt.*
Gen. 16:6 *ic tevoki xh Sennedix.*


Gen. 42:32 *qxh nem penivt.*
*Ph etxh eg CHE Edenenpcqni.* Gen. 43:16, 44:1.
Gen. 27:15 *th enacxh esoth Senpechi.*
Gen. 7:22 *nxai niben etxh EJdenpiwori.*
Gen. 37:22 *naiakkoc etxh enpwaqe.*
Gen. 25:9 *Ph etxh membe moampe.*
Gen. 17:23 *Nh etxh Senphi nebpaam.*
Gen. 35:9 *afj ae orongq eiakovw epxh Senlouga.*
Compare instances, frankly disconcerting, of zero copula opposita:
Gen. 42:21 *aga tenepphi gar Sennennobi.*
Gen. 42:35 *naep-mnorr npat npiozai piozai Senpeq-cox.*
Gen. 38:21 ἡμον-πόρνη πναίμα — located Non-existential.
Gen. 19:11 ΝΙΡΩΜΙ ΑΕ ΕΝΑΤΙΠΡΕΠΡΟ ΜΠΗΙ... 
Gen. 23:8 ΙΔΕ ΕΣΕΝΤΕΤΕΝΨΥΧΗ...
Gen. 24:62 ΝΙΚΑΓΙ ΕΤΚΑΝΕΜΕΝ.
Gen. 18:9 ΙΕ ΖΗΝΠΕ ΕΝΣΩΤΝ ΣΕΝΤΣΚΗΝΗ.
Also, zero is usual in age specification: Gen. 17:1 etc.
(b) The Copular Stative Converb ϊπων, much rarer than χή, seems to
be lexically active, and express real human (or Divine) Existence-in-Loca-
tion; ϊπων 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 ΝΗ ΕΤΙΨΩΝ ΝΣΗΝΩΣ.
Gen. 24:62 ΝΑΨΨΩΝ ΝΕ ΣΕΝΗΤΙΚΑΓΙ ΕΤΚΑΝΕΜΕΝ.
Gen. 25:27 ΕΨΨΩΝ ΣΕΝΟΤΗΙ.
Gen. 20:3 ΕΠΨΨΩΝ ΝΕΜ ΟΡΖΑΙ.
Gen. 21:20 ΑΨΨΨΩΝ ΓΙΝΨΨΑΙΕ illustrates the dynamic counterpart
of Copular ϊπων.

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, ΟΙ 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- (ΜΜΟΣ) and the adnominal attributive
nota relationsis 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
adverbial object-actant / predicative / adverbial slot is certainly remark-
able:

Lev. 6:9 ΕΨΕΩΤΟΜΨ ΝΑΤΚΩΒ.
Ex. 39:1 ΑΨΕΑΜΙΨΟΨ ΝΓΑΝΣΤΟΛΗ.
Ex. 7:1 ΑΙΤΗΙΚ ΝΝΟΤΨ.
Ex. 5:21 ΑΡΕΤΕΝΕΡ-ΠΕΝΣΕΟΙ ΜΒΟΨ.

26 See BARRI 1978:263 (Theme — Rheme structure inside the phrase).
Ex. 7:1 ἑσεύσωπι νακ νοσπροφήτης (contrast Ex. 30:2 ἑσεύσωπι εἰοι ιετεραφωνοι).
Deut. 28:44 θεοι εσεύσωπι νοταφε νεοκ δε εσεύσωπι
νοταφε.
Gen. 38:11 ξεμι νιξμα.
Gen. 14:14 άτελ-άλτε πεκον ναίξμαλωτος.

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 converse or adverbial-privilege finite verb-form) signalling this adnexal expansion status (see also in detail below, Chapter Four, on the junctural final-delimitation role):
Gen. 15:2 ἀνοκ ξεναχατ εβόλ εἰοι ιατυρί.
Deut. 22:4 ακωννατ εφίω Μπεκον ιε πεμακι εαρει εἱκμωιτ.
Ex. 1:18 παῖςμ οτ πε εταρετηναιφ ερετενςανξο
ννιγωρν.
Gen. 16:1 οτεβοι επεκπαν πε ααρ.
Ex. 26:24 εσεύσωπι ετοημ ναε-νίκεφαλικ ετοι νοται.

The Conjunctive, still most enigmatic of Coptic verb-forms and hitherto almost neglected in Bohairic linguistics, is another adnexal converse. (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 ΔΕ- in Ex. 3:11 ἀνοκ ιίμ ΔΕ-, Ex. 5:2 ιίμ πε ναι ΔΕ-, Ex. 16:7 ἀνον-οτ γαρ ΔΕ-, or following ξια, γοπως, ἑωςφε, μνποτε/μπνως passim, or in protasi after εγωπ: 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-adjoining higher-level rhematic sequel.

Obs.
(1) In Welsh, leniting yr-, but for the lenition homonymous with the preposition yr- “in”, is both rhematicity marker and denominal adverbal-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, adverbal 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 Rotherenberg 1975. Such scanning of adjectival slots reveals interesting parallels and differences between Coptic η- 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 satellital. 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 *converb* (Shisha-Halevy 1986a Chapter Seven) in paradigmatic opposition to the equally rhematic adnexit Circumstantial one; both occur adnominally or adverbially.

(6) Gen. 32:27 ερεπεκραν υμωπι ξε-πικά has *ξε-* commuting with *n-* as rhematicity marker.

(7) The familiar morphological puzzle of the two 3rd-plural forms of the Conjunctive, *viz.* *nτως*- ("regular" in its paradigm) and *νκε-* (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: *nτως-* "wirkliche folge" — "die form des objektiven modus der vorstellung", *νκε-* "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 rhematic 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-
orical 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 Coptic27. 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; LAMBRECHT 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 court28), 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 παράφορον is the Focus, while the second, a nexus (verbal or adverbial Rheme) marked by ετ-; πε- ετ- (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 reduction29, 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 pragmatics). In fact, this is the major difference between the Bohairic and Sahidic Cleft constructions: the latter uses the Endophoric-Theme pattern, where πε is determinator-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 rheematicity of the segment preceding; it is neither 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 τετενδίξει ἑς οἰκι ὀφθεὶ πνεύμ τι νέον νεόντων ςαβωτ. (zero Theme excluded for a negatived 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 aporphor 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!) 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): TUAUILLON 1975 on adverb CS focalization in French; ROTHENBERG 1971b, THUN 1975, LAMBRECHT 1988, 2000 on the Presentative (or nexus-presenting, nexus-rhematizing) CS in French; SORNICOLA 1988, DELIN and OBERLANDER 1995 on English (I find of interest the discussion of the CS in Narrative, e.g. 477ff., 483ff., 488ff.) on English; KAPELIUK 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 componatory resumptive pattern for the CS (e.g. in responses or in otherwise anaphoric negation/interrogation):
Ex. 4:11 ΝΗΜ ΠΕ ΕΤΑΨΗΝΙΟ-ΕΒΟ ΝΕΜ ΚΟΤΡ ΠΕΘΩΝΑΤ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΕΜ ΒΕΛΛΕ ΜΗ ΑΝΟΚ ΑΝ ΠΕ ΠΕΝΣΙ (ΠΕΝΣΙ appositive to ΑΝΟΚ). Corroborative of the Endophoric NS — CS affinity even in Bohairic are also such cases as Num. 11:19 ΝΟΤΕΣΟΟΤ ΑΝ ΠΕ ΕΡΕΤΕΝΝΑΟΤΟΥΜ ΝΗΣΗΧ ΡΟΤΑΔΕ ΕΛ ΑΝ Ξ ΡΟΤΑΔΕ Ε ΝΕΣΟΓΟΤ ΑΝ Ξ ΡΟΤΑΔΕ ΚΑΙ ΑΝ Ξ... (Circumstantial Topic; Vat has ΕΤΕΝΝΑΟΤΟΥΜ). Contextual support for the affinity of the Endophoric to the Cleft Sentence is also the etiologic Ex. 32:18 (= Vat): ΟΤΘΗΜ ΑΝ ΠΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΑΝΓΚΑΡΑΚΛΝ ΕΨΟΡ ΑΛΑΛ ΟΤΘΗΜ ΕΒΟΛ ΑΝΓΚΑΡΑ- ΖΧΝ ΝΤΕ-ΟΤΗΡΗ ΕΤΣΩΤΕΝ ΕΡΟΣ ΑΝΟΚ, or Gen. 45:8 ΗΝΟΤ ΓΕ ΝΟΓΘΕΝ ΑΝ ΑΡΕΤΕΝΝΟΤΟΠΤΙ ΕΜΝΑΙ ΑΛΛΑ ΦΙ ΠΕ, which has the Endophoric- or Immutable-Theme contrastively linked to a sequence-marked focalization; also Am. 7:8 B4, B5 ΟΤΡΑΣΜΑΣ ΠΕ responding to ΟΤ ΝΟΘΚ ΕΤΑΚΝΑΤ ΕΡΟΣ.

(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 pre-
cludes 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 cri-
tique 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 con-
sider such elements (and diachrony in general) entirely unsystemically and in detach-
ment 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 un-
necessary than unfounded. A third error is to treat Coptic as monolithic, ignoring the con-
siderable 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 De-
monic) “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 preposi-
tional 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.

(7) For a contrastive study of Coptic/Greek focalization, See POLOTSKY 1944:29ff. and
passim, SHISHA-HALEV 2002.

(8) A possible instance of “that”-form τηλ- following πε: De Vis II 118 ουγοη
πετανωηρι μήτ σιεκαρ κε ουγοη ηα on πε τηλ- γιοτη νταικρα3
(τηλ- could well be the so-called Temporalis).

(9) Notes from Chronology. SATZINGER 1981:491, 505 n. 83: as in Bohairic, we have in
the Topic an expansion of the “N pw” core. Arguably, the # Focus + πε- # 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 VERNUS 1990:188f. For LE, see RITTER 1994 (pw. “subject” in the “syntactic di-
dimension”, as against pragmatic and semantic ones).

(10) The Demotic CS points to an Endophoric pattern as core: P. Berlin P13633 (El-
phantine) line x+25 τηλ h mdt τηλ-nty-tw. ṛh s “It’s the exact state of things that you
know". Ryl. IX 2/5 ss shb.w n3-jjr hpr, I Setne 4/8 w't wnnwt t3-jjr hpr etc. etc.; even with pronominal Focus: mtnw n3 nty- Ryl. IX 13/6, mtnw t3 nty- Ryl. XI 7, mtws t3-wnt. P. Spiegelberg 1/16. As in Coptic, we do find mtws 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 εp- 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, εp-., where not substantivized as περ-, περεβ εp- 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. Shishahalev 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 ε- as a Focalizing Conversion form): notegooq an πε επετενναταςαμ nσητq ouvε b αν εν ouvα ε nετεν tαι αν ne... (Vat etetenna-)

Obs.
Outside the corpus, cf. De Vis II 49 nιμ nσητας ερεφιω mερεσωρ ετεπτηq, etc. Clearly, in Nitriotic Bohairic the status of the Circumstantial Conversion is very different, in adnominal and other slots as well: AM II 129 ou ει Φια εκκω mνοq, and especially as Topic with adverbial Foci (concurring with the Focalizing Conversion, see below), an historically established role (Shishahalev 1978).

(c) Focalization — Morphologically Unmarked Topic (I)
The interrogative pronoun nιμ combines with the unconverted Preterite to form a peculiar subpattern with unmarked Topic, in a construction typical of Nitriotic texts but attested in all types of Bohairic, viz. nιμ (οτη) αq- (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 nιμ αq- icxe kcalon ει nιμ πε εταq-
Rom. 11:34f. (consensus) nιμ πεταq- ει nιμ αq- ει nιμ αq-
Cat. 194f. αυ νιτρις ανατοτε ερος αε-ωηηικ nτεπωηης ...
(3) Unlike other interrogative adverbials, notηπ and (sometimes) oτη enter for some reason unmarked-Topic constructions:
Mark 15:4 ανατ ζε-σειρκατεροπιν εροκ νοσηρ (cons.).
AM I 235...ζε-ατσιει ετααψε νοσηρ.
AM II 112 ζε-ασσωκ εσων.
Cal. 227 ζε-ατσαγ οβιν (John 20:2;13:15).
The Relative-Topic CS is not triggered by οσηρ either:
SV 20 ζε-οτον-οτρ οσωπ ηματ.
De Vis I 190 ατενανατ...ζε-οτον-οτρ ιαοι εοιι ιεντικανια.

(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 ὑλον ἐ δρεερβοκι μμων.
Gen. 21:6 οτσωβι αψα ιηπη ηπι.
Lev. 25:5 οτρομπι ινεοτμιν εεωωπι ιεπικαη.
Deut. 16:15 ἡ νεροον εκειοτιν.
Gen. 44:27 ιηπι ἐ δαεικιμι μαπο ιηπη.
Deut. 28:38 ζακοκαηι εκειολον.
Gen. 37:20 οτεηριον εφεσου ανασομη — 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 τανομτερν ρεπαρζει ντεταξη ηπι νηπι νται-

Gen. 45:8 ινον αν δεωτεν αν αρετινοτορπ εμνα
αλλα ρη ιε — the Focus is here triply marked: by its initial placement, by αν and, retrospectively, by the conjunct Nominal Sentence with the formal or situational #Theme πε (see above).
In a case of an initial non-anaphoric adverbial, like Deut. 9:6 εο-
βετεκμεομι αν πε ιητε μπιλαξαπι ναο, both sequence and
αν signal focalization.

Obs.
(1) Outside the corpus:
Mt. 16:17 καρπε ρερ κονι αν αρηωρι κηπ αλλα παιωτ
πετσηενηποτι...
Mt. 13:27 μη οσηρον ενανεσ αν ακατη ιενπεκιοηι.
(e) The adverbial Focus. In the corpus, it is rather restricted:

Ex. 3:14f. παίρητον ετεκεᾶο (Vat -ξομ -: not necessarily adverbial).

Ex. 22:30 παίρητον ὑποκεῖq (not necessarily adverbial).

παίρητον ετός 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 ζενον πε ετεκιρε ννεκβήωνι, 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) ομοία ετεκότον ημών ετχν ημνίατι ημώνεωτεμ.
John 15:27 (B4) ημιν εικασήν ετεκάσων ημήν (the Circumstantial
would in this text probably be επετέν-).
John 14:27 μήπερ πε ετεπίκοςαο τοιοο ετνατ.
Cat. 4 παίρητον εν ενακωσι.

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: δεν-, ην-, ιδαλ ην-, ιδαλ ην-: see Thomassen
1990:428f.), presuppose an Adverbial + πε core.

(2) παίρητον πε is old in Bohairic: cf. Gen. 43:11, James 2:17 Quecke Or. 43 (1974)
388. The interrogative alternant occurs in CS in Nitrian: Ναώ ταρ Νρήτον ηπαβηνα-
De Vis II 3, 4. Cat. 4 Ναώ εσε-οτν Νρήτον ηπαβηνατεβ οε Ννιαλωσον.

(f) A major descriptive question concerns the functional difference —
or else allotagmic complementarity — between the Topic forms ετός (no
formal Theme) and πε(ε)ετό-, 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 πεταβηβαναν επνων ιετοε...

Νιμ ετενερπανιοι..., 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 prefer-
ence 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 ετ- 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 ετ- as the Topic form. But quantifier Foci (including indefinite determinators), also combine with ετ-. On the other hand, middle-range determinators tend to combine with πε(ε)τ- (details below). Thus, interlocutive pronouns combine more usually with ετ- rather than π(ε)ετ-; delocutives with πετ-; π- and πι- with πετ-; demonstratives usually with ετ-; indefinites and interrogatives with ψετ-. The 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 ετ- or π(ε)ετ- with a degree of confidence. But no more than that: a tendency, not conditioning or selection.

1) Focus listing for the ετ- Topic in the corpus:
Focus: high- and low-specificity is typical; middle-specificity is rare.
{πι-} is extremely rare.

- Indefinite articles; quantifiers.
  \(\sigma\) (Gen. 27:38, 49:1, Ex. 32:17f., Num. 6:7, Deut. 24:6).
  \(\gamma\lambda\nu\) (Lev. 22:25).
  Ex. 11:1 ετι κερεστ δημαρτυρ ετινανηq. [number name] (Ex. 23:10).
  Gen. 23:15 \(\tau\) Νκιτ\(\uparrow\) Νγατ ετοττωι Νεμακ (= Vat.)

- Interrogative Pronouns (also πετ- below).
  \(\sigma\) (Gen. 49:1).
  \(\nu\) (Gen. 49:9, Ex. 32:24, Num. 11:4:18:29, 24:9:23, Deut. 5:29, 30:12f.).
  \(\lambda\omega\) (Deut. 4:7:8).

- Personal Pronouns, interlocutive:
  \(\alpha\nu\) (Gen. 42:37, Ex. 4:12:15, Deut. 32:39).
  Gen. 31:39 \(\alpha\nu\) εναι\(\uparrow\) εβωλιτωτ (note the conditioned theme-pronoun in interlocutive personal linkage; also \(\nu\)εκ \(\alpha\)εκ- Num. 22:34) — the possibility of a Focalizing ("Second") Imperfect must not be entirely dismissed.

\(\nu\varepsilon\theta\nu\), \(\nu\varepsilon\theta\tau\varepsilon\) (Ex. 20:22, Num. 11:29, Deut. 9:1, 20:20).
Ex. 32:22 \(\nu\varepsilon\theta\nu\) ετεκωτωτ.

\textsuperscript{32} Gardiner 1957 §§227, 373; Groll 1967:47ff.
\textsuperscript{33} Unless it be before the quantifier κε-.
• Personal Pronouns, delocutive (rare):
  Gen. 44:20 νεος μματατα ετων.
• Demonstratives:
  φαι (παι-) (Gen. 5:29, 25:22).
  Deut. 3:28 φαι ετναρωροπμως.
  Gen. 31:46 παισαλ ετερμεορε οντωι νεμακ.
• Proper Names34:
  Num. 12:2 μν μωσχς μματατα εταπςε σαξι νεμακ.
  Ex. 2:22 φαρ μπαιωτ ετοι μβονθος νη.
  {πι-}: extremely rare; not anaphoric.
  Num. 7:9 νιωμωι ινπεθοταβ ετεντοτα (= Vat).
• Possessive article {πεκ-}, rare:
  Gen. 3:10 τεκσμθ ετα[ι]κοθεμεq is formally deviant, and, functionally, clearly Presentational (that is, τεκσμθ 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 πετακοθεμεq. Formally, both the Relative Preterite and the Topic, not co-referent with Focus, are remarkable too. (See below, [g]).
  Ex. 23:21 παραν γαρ ετκιν γιαωq.

Obs.
(1) Three rare, apparently negative instances in the NT call for observation:
  Mt. 7:21 οτον ηβην αν ετκω δμος νη δε-πάνε κτε εναλ εσοντν
  ιαμενθορον ηνειφορνοι νει εανος εσοντ γν. 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 beside nexal and topic
  negation (this is, I believe, a real term in the negation paradigm for the Focalizing Con-
  version, see below). (Luke 12:6, Cat. 146) μν ηεακ αν ετεον ημθων εσολ... is
  not really negative, but marked by μν...αν as enhanced “Rhetorical” Assertion (see
  above). Zach. 3:2 (B4) μν αν φαι αν πε μκρηθηνη βουβε...
  Greek οδοι τοτο δε δαλας έξεσπαρμενος — a very rare Theme-initial, Adverbial-Rheme, Copular
  NS pattern: αν, part of the μν...αν Assertive Question, is here repeated as a “fore-
  shadowed enclitic”.

(2) The specifically Oxyrhynchite pattern # ητακ ετε- + Proper Name/PN-equivalent is
  and still not quite understood (SCHENKE 1978:*55f. (101f.), 1996:106; SHISA-HALEVY
  45:11, 141:6; a few similar instances from Nag Hammadi are discussed in SCHENKE

34 It is worth noting that this construction is attested in early Bohairic epistolography,
  in the presentative CS as opening formula “PN ετειδει”: see Worrell, Coptic Texts
  175ff.
pronoun here is by no means focal or always rheumatic; 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 ἅλκ ητε-περοτατ μπαρτ 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 ἀκαοι “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 ἅλκ ηπ (etc.) recalls, but does not exactly match our corpus: see SCHENKE 1996:107ff. (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.

- Interrogative pronouns (var. πε ετ-):
  ॰ο, ΝΙΜ (Gen. 21:26, 27:18, Ex. 17:4, 10:26, 15:24, Num. 9:8, 16:30 etc.).
  Deut. 3:24 ΝΙΜ ΓΑΡ ΝΟΟΤ ΠΕΤΝΑΙΡΙ...
  Ex. 4:1 οτ πετναξοι ΝΟΟΤ.
  Gen. 46:3 οτ πετνοι (so always; οτ πε ετ- a common variant, Ex. 3:4, Gen. 21:29, 27:37, 44:15).

- Demonstratives (less typical?):
  Num. 23:2 ΦΑΙ ΠΕΤΝΑΛΙΓ.
  The πε ετ- variant seems to be here especially significant (Ex. 30:13, Num. 22:38).
  Ex. 19:3 ΝΑΙ ΠΕ ΕΤΕΚΝΑΖΟΤΟΥ and similar 20:22, 23:16 etc.
  Delocutive personal pronouns (πε ετ-):
  Deut. 6:13 ΝΟΟΤ ΠΕΤΕΚΕΤΟΜΚ ΕΡΟΩ.
  Deut. 1:38 ΝΟΟΤ ΠΕ ΕΝΑΘΗΙΩ (= Vat)
  Ex. 38:23 ΕΛΙΑΒ ΦΗ ΠΕΤ-ΑΧΙΚΑΜΑΧ... ΝΟΟΤ ΠΕ ΕΤΑΡΕΦΑΡΣΧΙΣΧΟΤΩΝ.

- Interlocutive personal pronouns (rare) (πε ετ-):
  Ex. 19:4 ΝΟΩΤΗΝ ΠΕ ΕΤΑΡΕΥΕΝΝΑΤ.
  Note the interlocutive reference linkage.
Determinators: \{\pi\}:
Gen. 3:13 \pi\rho\iota\varphi\iota\pi\theta\varepsilon\varphi\gamma\alpha\ \mu\mu\omega\iota\iota\ — presentational, not focussing.

• Proper Names:
Gen. 31:32 \pi\rho\alpha\chi\alpha\ \tau\epsilon\gamma\zeta\gamma\iota\iota\ \pi\epsilon\tau\alpha\kappa\kappa\omega\lambda\pi\eta\omega\tau\iota\sigma\eta\.
Deut. 6:13 \pi\sigma\tau\varepsilon\ \pi\kappa\varepsilon\nu\nu\o\iota\tau\t
\tau\epsilon\kappa\varepsilon\iota\varphi\rho\sigma\iota\ \gamma\alpha\tau\epsilon\varphi\gamma\iota\h, also \pi\epsilon\tau.-
Deut. 32:12, Ex. 14:14:25, 15:3.
Ex. 16:6 \pi\sigma\tau\varepsilon\ \pi\tau\alpha\kappa\gamma\iota\eta\nu\eta\nu\o\iota\tau\o\ \epsilon\beta\o\alpha\ \lambda\zeta\nu\kappa\alpha\iota\iota\ \nu\nu\h.
Gen. 31:44 \phi\tau\iota\ \pi\tau\epsilon\rho\mu\iota\epsilon\iota\epsilon\rho\iota\ \o\tau\tau\iota\iota\ \nu\epsilon\mu\alpha\kappa.

• Possessed Focus:
Gen. 45:12 \rho\iota\iota\ \pi\tau\iota\kappa\zeta\iota\ \nu\epsilon\mu\o\tau\iota\nu.

• Indefinite article (Sgl.) (very rare: only Preterite?):
Gen. 43:12 \o\tau\mu\eta\tau\alpha\t\tau\e\mu\eta\mu\iota\iota\ \pi\tau\alpha\kappa\omega\iota\iota\iota.
Ex. 15:15 \o\tau\sigma\o\e\r\e\r\e\t\tau\e\p\ \\a\ \pi\tau\alpha\kappa\delta\iota\o\t\eta\o.

Arguably, \o\tau\mu\eta\tau\alpha\t\tau\e\mu\eta\mu\iota\iota\ and \o\tau\sigma\o\e\r\e\r\e\t\tau\e\p\ are here not focal: this is in all probability a Presentational pattern, with \pi\ emphatizing both noun and verb in nexus (see below).

Deut. 32:28 \o\tau\e\o\n\o\o\c\o\ \pi\ \e\t\t\a\t\k\a\o\o\ \m\p\e\q\c\o\o\s\i\i\ (= Vat). This is not a CS, but a NS with expanded Rheme.

• Adverbials; \pi\alpha\i\r\h\tau\i\o\ — \pi\epsilon\(e)\t- only.
Gen. 39:19 \pi\alpha\i\r\h\tau\i\o\ \pi\tau\a\q\a\q\ also Ex. 23:11.

\pi\alpha\i\r\h\tau\i\o\ \pi\epsilon\(e)\t- 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 \pi\alpha\i\r\h\tau\i\o\ \pi\ “That is how it is”.
Ex. 23:12 \xi\ \nu\e\g\o\o\o\o\ \pi\ \e\t\e\k\i\i\r\i\ \n\e\k\g\h\b\o\o\i\i\, also Ex. 20:8, 34:21, 35:2.

Obs.
(1) In Ex. 4:2 \o\t\ \pi\ \phi\\iota\i\i\ \e\t\k\e\t\k\e\k\i\i\ 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 (N \pi\ \n\e\ \phi\h\ / \n\e\ \phi\h\ / \n\h\ \epsilon\t-) 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 to be a typically Bohairic rendering of certain Greek phrases. Also POLOTSKY 1990:426ff., quoting e.g. Gen. 24:14, Ex. 3:14, 10:8, 29:1; for the copular “N \pi\ \pi\epsilon\(e)\t-” (#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\textsuperscript{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; juncturally 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 }\textit{\lambda \rho }- is not really opposed to \textit{nim }\textit{\pi \tau \alpha \rho }-). 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{\pi \alpha \rho \beta \eta }\textsuperscript{†}, 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 expository noun/pronoun-focussing CS), and in apocritic (responsive) and explicative slots (with no special formal marking in the Greek). The formal theme \textit{\tau \chi e}, where present, is situational; the relative is Rhematic or adnexal:

\textsuperscript{35} The present writer is engaged on a comprehensive study of rhetorical focalization in Shenoutean Sahidic.
Gen. 3:10 τεκσιη απαλος ζηνπιαπαλι
coc αιεροτ (consensus of all codd.), answering “Where are you?”

Ex. 2:18-19 ομωμι νρεμενχμι πε εταπανγεμ εβολ
ντοτοτ, answering “Why did you hurry back?”

Probable cases are:
Gen. 43:12 ομητατεμι πεταγυμεν.
Ex. 15:15 οτσερτερ πεταγματο.
Gen. 3:13 πηροη πεταμεργαλ μμοι.

Obs.
(1) Outside the corpus, consider:
John 9:15 (“How did you come to see?”) ομωμι πεταγμα εξεπαναλ ομω
αιεροτ εβολ αιερ σεβολ (B4 ομεμμιο ννοτομι αρθηρ εναλαλ αιερι
μμων εβολ αιερ σεβολ).
John 12:29 (B4) (φε)ταπαλαλ πεταγυμεν...
(φετα)εγεροεσ πεταγμαζε
νεραγ (explaining the voice from heaven).
Luke 9:7ff. Three explanations: ισαννιος πεταγμαν εβολ σεβολ εομωοτ...
νηαες πεταγμαννε εβολ...
οηιροβλης ηνειαρξεος πεταγμα.
Luke 19:31 πνη πετερνγαλ μμογ (answering “Why do you untie the colt?”).
De Vis 11 168 ον πε ετωγο ζηνπιαολιε ετεραγμεν τηρν ηερι
ζανωμι γεν ηετατι-ερατω εβερνμω.
(Welsh); THUN 1975. KRÖTSCHE 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?” — “entièremment 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 Polotskyan “orthodoxy” and the communis opinio: I
shall treat those in more detail.

The FC, by and large the core of Polotskyan 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: άη /άη.  

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 1990:136f., 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 constituency 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, circumstants (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 constituent38 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, correlative 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 gwneud “do”) in Modern Welsh, with reference to Herodotean Greek (see ROSEN 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 postponed adverbial 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 Nitrerie): “...Ann. Serv. XL 244, ou il aurait fallu dire que l’état du bohaïrique à l’égard du normal égyptien est déjà celui du démotique”. But early Bohairic is here less conservative: see Quecke, Or. 43 (1974) 388 James 2:18, or Δεύτηρη- Zach. 5:10, in P. Vat. copto 9 (B4); see further below.

(4) Is the FC substantival (see discussion in Shisha-Halevy 1986a:63f., 99f.)? 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 Satzsinhaltes 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 adverbial-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\textsuperscript{39}. Sahidic ζιντακ-, past alternant of ζιν εικ-, may be a prepositional governance of “that” (ενε-ντακ- is more difficult by far); ηντακ- ... πε (John 11:13 Sah. codd. AB, Palau Ribes and Thompson, not Boh.), which STERN 1880:217 translates “das/was...; das ist...” recalls ME “mrw f pw,” which predicates a “that” form of the situational pw: “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 σιν-ασπερος, 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 σινε)\textsuperscript{40}. The instances of injunctive αναθ- (e.g. Hos. 2:9, John 14:17 B4), or the final ἥε-αναθ-, 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-HALEVI 1972) occurs twice in protatic roles. First, the αγ- of αγωτε-, the Bohairic negative Conditional, a form by now best established in Oxyrhynchite; second, the ηαπ- Temporal, topicalizing 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\textsuperscript{41}:

Gen. 6:1-2 οτορ αγουπτοι ετανιρωμε ερριτη ναουα γεινεπικαρι οτορ ανειμιγει νωοτ νιασιερενι ετανατα δε ναε-νιαγενος νεβιγ ενισερι ετανιρωμε γενανέτε αυςειρι νωοτ εβολ δενην ηποτ ετασκοτ-νοτ.

Gen. 6:5 ετανατα δε ναε-νικ φτε ενικακι ετανιρωμε γεινεπικαρι οτορ οτορ νιβεν ερρικι δενποτε εμαυ ενινπετευεοτ ηποτ ετανατα μυκεμε καε-φτе. Ex. 2:10 εταερνιγιντε δε ναε-νιλος γενε γοτον (absence of adverbial adjunct).

For the Focalizing Preterite, consider (see more examples below):

Ex. 20:23 λωτεν εταπετενατ γε-ετιειακε νεμωτε εβολ δεντεφ γενεθαμιο γωτεν ηγανοτηντ νιτατ γενανοτοτ νωοτ.

\textsuperscript{39} Interestingly and perhaps aptly (pace BAUER 1972:45), Athanasius of Qus assigns to the converter ζιν the substantival value of Arabic ‘an’ (208/14).

\textsuperscript{40} Consider Man. Ps. 151.27 μαϊςε-ειατνγων ηκιμ, 156.9 μποςεν-ης τε πε πνοτε etc.

\textsuperscript{41} ετε-νπε- is extremely rare in the corpus. The mysterious Num. 2:33 λαε-νιθεσ ετεμποτ [space] ωινε ερρικω ησιφι ησινοτ ραχερηντ εταπεντε εσφεγ ευτογ εμνυχς εοτογ οτργ ατιρι... (= Vat) is non-conclusive. Of course, this is the form of the FC for negative Topic, interrogative Focus and affirmative nexus: Jer. 3:2 ετεμπεσωθεν ησαυον ημα, Na. 3:19 (B4) ετεμπη-ετακια ατα ετεμπεσοφοι ηκιμ νησιον ηνιβε, with the subnexus ηπε- and ηκιακα itself topicalized. 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.
In fact, the difference between the FC construction and the Temporal + apodotic-clause construction is one of information level, since in both cases ेताि - is either thematic or topical.

(6) GROSSMAN 2007 offers a fresh perspective on ेताि - in Nitrian Bohairic, viz. as a Circumstantial conversion form, more or less replacing ेा - . 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” ĵrr-f-sdm may exist alongside the focalizing Converter ĵrr-f- prefixed 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 ेञ्मiiii as a case of “verb omitted” (169 + n.16) is wholly unacceptable.

(8) The ‘iīnnamā 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, discernable 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-explicitation 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.

42 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 die 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 1989:49ff., 2006a).

(2) The Problem of focalizing ε-: Circumstantial, FC, non-conversion: identity and homonymy.

(a) While in Pentateuch MSS ε-/λ- 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 ιπι ένοσνωντι Ναω Νρη ιπι (Vat ἠρε-).

Gen. 18:14 Μητι οτον-καζε Ναερτενος Σατενη ιπι εινα ταιεθο εαροκ καταπαιχοθ ερανοτνωοτι (= 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 οττοτι Δε ερετενου μμησε (= Vat).

Ex. 15:18 πόε εκοι νοτρο ωαενε τε ερετενου μετει
νερ οτοπ ετη.

Deut. 31:29 ετγαν μπανος ερετεναερααομιν (Vat τε-
tετε).

Gen. 18:9 εριναοτ (responsive to ἀκωπιν) (Vat κεναοτ).

Ex. 12:18 ετνερερητι κεοτ-ια μπακοτ Νγοτ
Lev. 3:7 ευναένη εὐστήν μεμεθο μπότ (= Vat).
Ex. 18:14 εὐθείον νεόκ μασάκ εκσεμί (= Vat et-
, i.e. CS. This may mean that νεόκ μασάκ is focussed in P too).
Lev. 13:6 ὁσῷ γίνεται εὐοῖ νεῖλο (Gk καὶ ἵδι καὶ μιαὶ ἡ
ἀφῆ...).
Ex. 2:14 νιμ πε ἑταμάκ μαρχων ... ών εκσωσ εὐσο-
βετ = νεόκ μπίρητ ἑτακάκωτε μπιρεμνήμει νεὰ (= Vat
ακ-).
(b) Rarer instances of focalizing ε-, not in opposition to α-, are even
more baffling:
Gen. 44:15 δενορσήμη εὐσωσήμη.
Deut. 29:19 ά-ειμωγι δεντσορμες μπαράτ (= Vat).
Gen. 26:8 άε-οση γαρ ενεωςες πε δενακος (Vat νε-) —
ε- before νεωςα is not conclusively a converter. Also Gen. 29:17.
Deut. 9:25 νενεκάσω (Vat νεαν-) — the case of ενε- is again
different: ενε- 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 παϊώμι ονορσώμι μμος αν πε αλλα εφώ εκαναμωσ ντεθύτ.:
4:11 ευάντοτκ ὅταν εβόλ αν μαν νε-πλύωτ ετόνε.
15:27 εικάνεμυ ετετενων νεμή.
4:51 άε-εφώμε νε-πεκωμπρι (B5 ωνή).
Also 12:6:26 (no conversion in B5). John 14:7 άε-αφι ανακωμπι νεμώτεν
εκαναμώτι δεσεμήνι (B5 άε-αφώμι νεμώτεν οσο εκσωμι νε-
ακωμπ, but two 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) ουτα μμον-κερεν γαπή εκαστόν μπομε εκακαμώτι
μνήτα.
(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-ταμιμ.
13:18:22 ναδερώτεν ας ακαμιμ and 16:13 ακακαζί γαρ αν εβολ
ετοτης (as in Nitrian, α- seems preferred for negative constructions): αν(να)-
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 ειναμω εγώμι γαρκ ποζε πανοτ:
Mich. 6:8 ενανιακοκ φρωμι άε... also Hos. 2:9 coll. This is an old role of the

^43 I believe this Topic form has venerable ancestors from Late Egyptian on (SHISHA-
Haley 1978). A striking Demotic example is Petubastis 2/16 jw-bn-p.k jj n sf r-dib3 jh
"Why didn’t you come yesterday?".

Focus-initial, interrogative Focus: Mich. 6:6 ἧς ἄνατα ἐπαρε-μακέ.

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 ἄρων (as always!) Hos. 13:10, Zach. 1:5 ἄρων ἐν and Hos. 11:9 ἄρων φησίν ἄντικι, Zach. 2:12 ἄρων οὐκ ἐν and Hab. 3:8 ἄρων πεκμβον ἄρων φησίν. Another favourite environment for ἄ- is the "Rhetorical" μν...ἀν (Joel 3:4, Hab. 2:6). Zach. 5:10 ἄρων ἄνω λαοῦ ... ἐφών and Zach. 2:4 ἄρων οὐδέ καὶ οὐδερεν.

(3) The ε/-ἀ- 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) ἄρων De Vis I 30, II 140, Cat. 4, 13, 107, 205 (!). AM I 24, 98, 214 — ἄρων is much less usual, but does occur.

ἐφών ἄφοτ πδαιμων De Vis II 231.

ἐφών ἄφοτ De Vis I 102.

ἐφών De Vis II 195.

ἐφών SV 21, 23, 28.

ἐφών De Vis II 172.

ἐκκλην ἐφών De Vis I 181, II 137.

(b) εἰσώμω ἐ (ἐρέ). De Vis II 168, 246ff., 250, AM I 15, 66, 126, εἰσώμω ε- SV 11, 14, 22, 34, 50.

ἐκωσμω Rhet. AM I 11, 112.

εἰσεπεθημίν SV 18.

AM I 64 ἐκωσμω ἄνω λαοῦ ἄνω (otherwise ε-).

ἄρων ἄνω λαοῦ - / ἐφών ἄνω λαοῦ De Vis I 39f.

ἀνωθώρητον AM I 64, 69.

(c) εἰςεπεθημίν AM I 27.

εἰςεπεθημίν AM I 191.

(d) Negative constructions have usually α-, not ε-.

(e) Cases of apparently real variation:

Δε-ἀνάω οὔθ De Vis I 84.

Δε-ἐπαρα-ἀνάω οὔθ De Vis I 143.

Δε-ἀνάω De Vis I 124.

Δε-ἐπαρα-ἀνάω v.l. De Vis II 171.

ἐναρετή De Vis I 65.

ἐναρετή De Vis I 156.

Δε-ἀναρακος Δε-οὐ De Vis II 195.

ἐκάω ημος Δε-οὐ (common phrase) Mac. 6.

ἀπετεγαν ημος Δε-ανοικ-νημ Cat. 45 = Mt. 16:15

ἐκαναντυτε Δε-ανοικ-νημ Νε Cat. 94.

ἐκατερότατ ἐοβέ-οτ;? answered ἐκατερότατ ἐοβέ- De Vis I 59.

ἀν-επακομον ἐποκ μπεκμον Job 1:12.

(4) Focalizing εαρ-, well established in Sahidic (especially in Shenoute), is rare in Bohairic and absent in our corpus:

Cat. 134 οὐταρ ἐοβητι ἀν εαρεφαί μαε-...
(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” j.jr.f sdm, past tense or atemporal, ousted almost completely by the analytic, converter jrr and its allomorphs? While Gen. 43:27 ἀρετενερος is, somewhat surprisingly, the Focalizing Present in Bohairic and Late Egyptian (Polotsky 1940), and it is Sahidic that responds here in the unconverted τετνερος, the following loci — past tense — are difficult out of corpus:

AM I 214 ἀρετενξω ητετενπολις ηκαθνοτ εθεεοτ.
AM I 19 ἀρετεννατ εον εωτεν ἰε-ἀρετενςιν’ ηνετεν-
σωκ εβολ.
Cat. 208 ἀρετενξω ηλαζαρος εθων.
John 11:3 ἀρετενξαψ ηθων (B4).

(4) Second-power conversion. In Bohairic, we find only ενε- as a possible instance of synchronic double FC conversion: not attested in the studied corpus.

Obs.
(1) Consider Mac. No. 6 p.45 ενακωλα πε σενπερβετ εκωμ εβολ ηαν, Mac.
No. 20 ενακωλω μαφοσ πε resp. ειβέν 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 ηα- is De Vis II 151 ηαο φι ηαο ηρηφ.
(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 ηεοκ μματατκ εκεμεει.
Gen. 38:25 εβολ ηενπιρωμι ετενοτοι πε ηαι διμβοκι
ηαοκ.

Topic unmarked (usual):
Neg.: Ex. 5:14, Num. 11:11, 22:37.

See Shisha-Halevy 1986a Chapter Two for FC patterning in Shenoutean Sahidic; 2002 for Oxyrhynchite.
RHEMES AND RHEMATICITY

نان بل-ود Gen. 18:13, 26:9, 29:5.
+ Pres. Deut. 32:30.

Focus Constituency

Interrogative adverbials: (نان) بل-ود “why”, “for what reason”, πως “how”, χαμαρ “until when”.
Non-interrogative adverbial: έβολα χε-.

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 χε-βαί αρναιεί B4 (B5 χε-).
ελε-έτ α- έκ- Mark 5:35 (v.l. Basic).
άρψι χε-ας ... αρτενιρι άρπα Acts 4:7 (cons.).
χε-ναω άρα ατα έταν- Μας. No. 33.
χαω όφι τε- έα- Μας. Cat. 100.
χε-ναω άρς άνα- Μας. No. 31.
χαω όφι τέ ανα- έα χαω όφι τέ ένα- Cat. 9.
χαω όφι τέ ένα- Cat. 48, 67 etc.
Mark 3:22 χε-βορχ ύν ενεδον άρη ητιον όνων άρων εβολ.
Cat. 134 ύταρ έβνά αν εαρ-φαί χε-...
εφεβαί εταν- Cat. 228.
CHAPTER TWO

ετεβηται ερε- Cat. 162.
εβολ α οών ερνα- Cat. 85.
εεβε- ερε- De Vis I 154.
εεβε-οτ εκ- / ερε- Cat. 129, AM I 15, 116, 122 etc.
Cat. 98 πως οών αινα- η γιτεν-αυ ινθωβ.
The formulaic "Φαι ετε-εβολ γιτοττι ερε-ωτοτ ινβεν ερ-πεπι ιναπ νεμ-πεικιτ", e.g. AM I 109.
(2) No FC follows ωλαοτ (Αε-) “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: ... ιναοτ Gen. 37:15f., ... ύεν-οτ Ex. 22:27, ... ωλαοτ Gen. 30:30, ... ιναπ ινρηι 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 πως and εεβεοτ, invariably final:

Num. 11:13 αιναειμαι α οών.
Gen. 37:16 αρμοι ινθων.
Gen. 37:30 αιναγεμνενι ινθων.
Gen. 37:15 ακκωτ ιναοτ.
Gen. 42:7 εταπετειν εβολ α οών.
Gen. 16:8 απεννοτ οών οτογ αρενα εεθων.
Gen. 30:30 ινοτ ζε αιναεμαιο νει νοθι ονωα.
Gen. 44:16 αλλαοθαιον ονοτ.
Deut. 28:67 αρε-τοοτι ινωοτι ονωα ... αρε-ροτι να-ωοτι ιναο ινρηι.

(b) Non-interrogative Focus. For the Topic, verbs-of-movement45 or verbs-of-incomplete-predication lexemes are typical. The Focus is as a rule final. Note that (a) Αε- and Αα- 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 μφοοτ “today”, may follow the Focus as final adverbial “Antitopics”. Note that, of two successive adverbials, either the last is focal or both are, as a coordinative or compound group:

Deut. 24:15 αρεεθων ικ εροτ.

45 An old Egyptian feature: POLOTSKY 1944:83f.
Gen. 44:30 τευτρυχ άπασι δεντρυχ κπιαλον.
Gen. 43:25 άρσωτεμ γαρ άε-αρε-ώπονθε μετε εοσωμ υπιαλα ετμματ.
Gen. 34:31 αλλα δεναιρι δενεσωνι κπιρθη κπιορπην.
Num. 20:17 ανναμωσι εμπιμωτ κπιορ.
Gen. 30:16 ακνησος ειοσον άροι κπιοοτ.
Gen. 44:30 ούν άξε απασωνι δεοσον γαπεκαλον ετε-
πενιωτ πε κπιαλον χ πεμηι αν — Circumstantial negatived
nexus as Focus.
Gen. 45:7 εταφ γαρ τασοι δαμωτεν εεαπο-οτριωγη
νωτεν γηαπικαρι οτωρ εσανεσωνιωνι ηονω δωγη ρω-
ten...
Gen. 24:50 εται α ενολ εηενποκε άξε-παιρκβ +
Gen. 47:4 εται επωωι δενπικαγι.
Gen. 42:9 ετατετενε εη ρ-ιατενθνοσ ηδετατε ητε-
exωρα.
Gen. 42:10 εται εηενπανηρωτοι ηον δα-ηεκαλωτοι.
Gen. 42:12 μμων αλλα ετατετενε ενατ ετατει μπικαγι.
Gen. 45:5 μπενθηρεπετενηθ μκαρ ουδε μπενθηρεπηρη
ννωτ ητενθνοσ άξε-ετατετενθτ ηναι + εταφ γαρ
τασοι δαμωτεν εεωνι νωτεν.
Num. 22:20 ιξην ετατι άξε-ναιρκπι εμοτε + εροκ...
Gen. 49:31f. ετακεκαμεκαμ ηματ: ηεμ εαρε τεμ-
ξιμι + ετακεκακει μματ: ηεμ μεβεκακ τεμξιμι +
etεθεκα ηια μματ.
Deut. 10:6 εταξμουτ ηματ άξε-αρπων.
Deut. 22:27 ετακεκαμε ηεκωι.
Ex. 2:10 εταηεν επωωι δενπιμωτ.
Ex. 20:22 άξε-ετακαξι ηεμωτεν ενολ δεντε ∧

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:

Num. 22:29 ἀπεκώβη μμοί.
Gen. 16:5 ἐτακνήτι θε ἡ θε-ἀκμβοκί — object of verb of perception: in fact, a type of Free Indirect Discourse.
Gen. 44:5 δεσοσσιωμ ἑφισιωμ (Focalizing Present or Preterite?) — co-focussing with the Tautological Infinitive; more clearly still in Gen. 44:15 δεσοσσιωμ ἐνεδρισιωμ.
(b) Responsive [lexeme + adverbial] focussing:
Gen. 16:8 (“Whence and whither are you going?”) αἱφήτ ανοκ ἐβολ σακρεῖ μπρο χαπα ταστ.
Gen. 37:16 (“What are you looking for?”) αἰκωντι νκανακνησιν.

Obs.
(1) Nothing like the quintessentially allocutive ἀκλοβι “It is crazy you are” occurs in the corpus. The delocutive Basic Tense ἀκλοβι John 10:20 (B4) is neatly opposed to the allocutive “ἀκλοβι”: Acts 12:15 ἀπεκώβι; but also the delocutive ἀρε-ναι ἀλοβι 1 Cor. 14:23 cons. (Acts 26:24 v.l.); ἐπετελοβι AM I 114, also in Shenoutean Sahidic (ἐκλοβε Shenoute BLOr 8664 A (6) f.6 ro with parallels in BLOr 3581A). Perhaps similar is ἀρε-ναι τασι 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) τὸνεν αν...ἀλα ἐιστωμ... AM II 11: Performative or contrast-induced focalization? ὁσωμ occurs often in the FC.
(b) διειροκ “I mean you!”. SV 17, 37, 67 (vs. εἰσικ ορο- SV 42); εκσε- 
          πειμ...εἰσερε... AM I 128.
          εκσερε- almost always e- in Cat. 46, 6, 17, 32, 54, 133 etc... ιεκσερε-νιμ Cat. 214
          (John 13:22-24). This is not a late feature: consider John 13:22 (B4) ιεκσενιμ. or
          κανικεροτεν θητον αν John 13:1; διειρο v.l. ει- Mark 5:41. Somewhat similar is εἰκασι ε-
          Cat. 1, 36, 128, 214 etc.
(c) Crum & Bell, Jews and Christians: 97.4 αἴνητ εήτ “I am coming north”.
(d) John 8:11 εἴηγεν (αν).
(c) In Dialogue, Exposition or poetic passages, we find focussed the adverbial Rheme of the adverb-theme nexal pattern:

Gen. 3:9, 4:9 ἀλάμ ἀκοίμων.
Deut. 33:13 αἰθανόμορος ὑπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας.
Num. 36:7 ἡ ἀρετὴ τοῖς πιστοῖς ἡ μισθοκατάνομαία.
Num. 13:22 ἀπορρίματος ἡμερῶν ἡμέρα ἡμερῶν ἡμέρα ἡμέρα ἡμέρα ἡμέρα ἡμέρα
ἀμφίπου ὁ... Deut. 33:25, 32:31.
Deut. 33:13 αἰθανόμορος ὑπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας.

Obs.
For Ex. 2:20 ἀοιόμων ἡ ὑπὸ (= Vat), compare Zach. 1:5 ὑπότικοι ἡ ἀοιόμων
ἡ, and perhaps Oxyrh. Ps. 88:50 (Schenke 1996:105 compares Ps. 103:8). I do not un-
derstand this construction: is ἡ an interrogative enclitic particle? Can ἡ be related to
the mysterious interrogative we find in Sah. John 21:21 παῖ ἡ ὑπὸ ἡ ὑπὸ (Boh.

(4) Actant focussing with the FC is extremely rare in the corpus, actu-
ally found only in the very old phrasal construction for “how are you?”
Gen. 43:27 αἰθανόμορος (cons.) (Polotsky 1940). This means, of
course, that the Relative-Topic CS is the only actant-focussing construc-
tion in the described system.

(5) So-called Rhetorical Questions, a typical focalization environ-
ment, 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 ἢ (also with a negative nexus: ἢ + ἢ...ἀν) and
ᾗ...αν. In a sense, these are cases of layered, double — for ἢ...αν,
triple — focalization, higher on the focality scale. In the following in-
stances, the adverbial Focus of the FC, always final, is underlined:

Gen. 34:23 ὡς ὅτε κρπόνωτι ἡμὲν κρπότε-φατ ἡμὲν

Gen. 40:8 ἢ ἁρπαξάνω ἡ ἀβαίλεις ἡ ἃ ἁμαρτία ἀν ἢ ἠμαρτία
Gen. 29:25 ἡ ἁμαρτία ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ ἡ μου.
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 ἔσοβετ νηὸκ μὴρ η ἐτακχω-τεβ...μπιεμνξημι νκαχ

Ex. 14:11 άν-ετεμμον γμάτ ζενπκαρνι ηξημι.

The unconverted basic tense — unmarked Topic — may occur with a “Rhetorical Question” marked assertion (unlike normal Sahidic):

Num. 23:19 μη ηψαρπί αν ηψακαζι μη ηψαρκι αν ηψε-ψη ετακχωμ.

Num. 20:10 μητί ηνηνκηιη ηνοηθησοι γντεν άπολ γεν-ηληνπηρα.

And, for actant focussing, the Relative-Topic CS is used:

Num. 16:29 μη πνητέ αν πε ητακητατοί.

Obs.

(1) Note the following cases of “Rhetorical” focalization outside the corpus:

Cat. 107 μην άψμη ηνεχικημιν Δε-αψωϊν.

Cat. 79 άντκηντι εταφη ήξα ρκκω-ιη νκω-ι - nexus of or lexeme focussing.

John 8:22 (B5) μην αόηνεξοήεις μηηθατη.

Mal. 2:10 (B4) μην άντκηντι ηνοτι άν ηψεεηνηθησοι άν.

Joel 3:4 (B4) μην ητακηηαλ μπεηθηερα ηνοτ ηζηιοη άν.

Job 1:9 μην άψε-ιοβ άηεμι μηηθε ηνζηιζη.

Jer. 8:22 μην άν-ετεμμον-κοντ ηζελλλαλ μα άν-άνηον-χινη μηηθ.

Mt. 26:53 ηε άηκηετι Δε-ετεμμον-ώζομ μηοι ετωβη ηναιωτ... — content clause focalized, in which Non-Existence is focalized in its turn.

Ps. 61:2 μην άηε-ηαζηυνιη ηαζηεζωζ άν.

Ps. 87:11 μην άναηπι ηηεκηευθηρη ηηερεμηνωοη.

Hab. 2:6 (B4) μηθι ηθροτ άν ηηακηιηθοτ ηαρου — Augens or object actant or both focalized.

Zach. 3:2 (B4, collated) μηθ ηα θαι άν ηε - Foreshadowed negator Enclitic?

(2) A nice unrecognized Demotic example (P. Berlin P. 13549 verso 14f). bn-jw ι.η j.ρ hpr n Υb 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 ηδ-ηρ ήb n j.η j.m.f jn “Hasn’t Teos written to me about it?” makes better sense than Zauzich’s “Darüber hat mir Teos nicht geschrieben”. The actantial j.m.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 Ryil. 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 negated): μ...μ, μ following the Topic or enclosing the whole nexus;

(b) Focus (nexus affirmative, Topic affirmative): μ following the Focus;

(c) Topic (nexus affirmative, Focus affirmative): Topic variously negated.

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. ΝΑΣΝΗΡΗΙ ΣΕΝΤΦΕ ΑΝ ΟΤΑΕ ΝΑΣΓΙΜΗΡ...

Gen. 3:4 ΝΑΡΕ-ΤΕΝΝΑΜΟΥ ΑΝ ΣΕΝΟΤΜΟΥ, also 16:8.
Deut. 8:3 ΝΑΡΕ-ΠΙΡΩΜΙ ΝΑΝΙΣ ΕΨΙΚ ΜΜΑΤΑΤΩ ΑΝ.
Num. 20:17 ΝΑΝΝΑΚΙΝΙ ΑΝ ΕΒΟΛ ΓΙΤΕΝΝΙΚΟΙ ΟΤΑΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΓΙΤΕΝΝΙΑΓΑΛΟΛΙ ΟΤΑΕ ΤΕΝΝΑΚΕΜΜΟΤ ΑΝ ΕΒΟΛ ΣΕΝΟΤ-
ΛΑΚΚΟΣ ΝΤΑΚ ΑΛΑ ΑΝΝΑΜΟΩΙ ΓΙΤΜΨΙΤ ΝΟΣΡΟ (= Vat).
Ex. 16:8 ΟΣΤΑΡ "ΑΠΨΟΙ ΣΑΡΟΝ ΑΝ ΠΕ = ΝΑΕ-ΠΕΤΕΝΧΡΕΜ-
ΡΕΜ.
Deut. 29:14 ΝΑΙΧΨ ΝΤΑΙΙΑΙΑΕΘΚΗ ΑΝΟΚ ΝΕΜΩΤΕΝ ΜΜΑΤΑ-
ΤΕΝ-ΘΗΝΟΤ ΑΝ ΜΦΟΟΤ ΑΛΑ ΝΗ ΕΤΕΜΠΑΙΜΑ ΝΕΜΩΤΕΝ
ΜΦΟΟΤ (= Vat).
Num. 23:19 ΝΑΡΕ-ΦΙ ΟΙ ΑΝ ΜΦΡΗΤ ΜΦΡΩΜΙ ΕΨΑΡΤΓΑΠ
ΕΡΟΥ ΟΤΑΕ ΜΦΡΗΤ ΑΝ ΝΟΤΨΗΡΙ ΝΡΩΜΙ (= Vat).
Deut. 11:10 ΝΑΨΟΙ ΓΑΡ ΑΝ ΜΦΡΗΤ ΜΨΙΚΑΓΙ ΝΤΕΧΗΜΙ.
Deut. 30:13 ΝΑΣΝΗΡΗΙ ΣΕΝΤΦΕ ΑΝ ΟΤΑΕ ΝΑΣΓΙΜΗΡ ΜΦΙΟΜ
ΑΝ.
(b) Deut. 5:3 ἔταψεν σεμνεταίδιαθενήν ἵνα νενετνιόταν (add. supra. lin. P) ἀλλὰ νεμώτεν — cf. the famous Ryl. IX 13/11 f. bn-jfr(j) i:w n ntn-jt:w 3n...

Num. 16:29 μφρνι ἵνα εὐαγγελοῦ... ἀρε-ναὶ νάμος ἰε Ἰε-μφρνι ἐφανερωθηνί νρωμι νιβεν ἀρε-πονερωθηνί ναυσιπι (= Vat).

Gen. 38:9 (he knew) Ἰε-ἀρε-πικρωθναυσιπιναυμιναν.

Deut. 32:31 νοσνοῦταμφρνιμπεννοῦταν (= Vat)

(c) Not conclusively attested in the corpus.

Obs.
(1) Num. 2:33 μπενετικα εἰμηπὸσυμηνι εἰρων μφρνι νακτοσ καταμφρνι ἔταψεν ἐντοπο μπορησ οὐρα ἦστι Ἰε-νενευρι μπικά makes better sense as a case of negative “Temporal” (ἐταπ-) and superordinative-apodotic οὐρα ἦστι than as Relative. For a negative Topic, consider εἰμηπὸσυμηνι γὰρ εἰμηπὸσυμηνι ἐναι-νιμ νηνοτ νιβεν Na. 3:19 (B4).

(2) In Gen. 44:30 ἰνατ Ιε-ἰδαιγοινετομενενομενεπενιωτ σε μπιαλοτο ἂν νεκχην ἰαν, 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 ἵνα-ἐτεμμον μάρτ Σενηπαρικη νυχαμι, 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) Infini-
tive. 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 dia-
chronic 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 com-
mon pattern, like other cases of “native” Coptic syntax triggered and statistically enhanced by Greek correspondents), must have been de-
coded 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 “Di-
vine Grammar” nature of the Definite-Absolute Future εἰκε-, Chapter One).

47 It is OT-Scriptural when we find the Tautological Infinitive in the NT: John 3:29 Σενοτριαῖς ἱπαϊ, or in homiletic texts: De Vis II 118 Σενοτριαὶ ἱπαϊ.
The pattern consists usually of the repetition (including equivalence repetition), in resonance of a ἰη- 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 Ἰη- 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 ἱαρ or Ἰη to its context.

The construction occurs in Dialogue:
Gen. 26:28 ἰηοντων αναντ Ιη-... in Response.
Gen. 19:17 ἰηοντογεμ νογεμ, imperative Allocation.
Gen. 44:5 Ἰη- ἰηοντοσιωμ ἄγασιωμ — probably Focalizing Present — which would co-focalize the lexeme; the Greek has here the Present. Also, less ambiguously, Gen. 44:15 ἰηοντοσιωμ εὐαγασιωμ. (In Gen. 3:4 (B4) (= Vat) θαρετοναμοτ ον ἰηοτοσιοτ we even have explicit FC with nexus negation, focussing adjunctal ἰη-+ infinitive, which, despite the inverse internal information structure, results in the same macrosyntactic effect.

In preceptive generic-legal exposition:
Lev. 20:2 ἰηοτοσιοτ ηαροτοσεβεμ, focussing injunctions.
Ex. 15:26 ἰηοτοσετεμ ητεκσωτεμ ηκατομιν μπητ.
Lev. 7:24 εοτωμ Ἰη ἰηοτοσιοτ — a less formalized topicalization.

Lev. 14:48 ἰηοτοσιωμ ρατομ ον — a rare Stative, a rarer negative instance: “by no means”, not focussing an injunction: “spread it has not”.
Ex. 22:17 εοπν Ἰη ἰηοτοσιοτ νητ ητεκσωτεμωτ νητ.

Two formally remarkable variations on the pattern:
Ex. 21:28 ἰηγανωμ ερεςετ-ωμ consider also Lev. 20:27 ἰηπωμ... ANDERSSON 119f. (unnecessarily) suggests emending to ἰηπωμ; Num. 14:10 ειωμ εροτ ην-πωμ or Num. 15:35 εεκιωμ εποι ἰηπωμ may be different.

Num. 8:26 εωβ Ἰη ἰηετεπεβομ — here the bare lexeme, not zerdetermined one, serves as action abstract (otherwise, we should find εωβ Ἰη ἰηετεπει). 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 ΣΕΝΟΤΜΟΤ ΕΙΕΜΟΤ ΕΡΟΚ.
Num. 22:30 ΣΕΝΟΤΨΙΝΩ ΑΙΩΝΙΟ ΜΜΟΚ — interrogative Allo-
cution.

Gen. 37:8 μν ΣΕΝΟΤΜΕΤΟΡΟ ΧΑΕΡΟΤΡΟ — Allocation —
Rhetorical Question (see below, comment on Gen. 43:3). Compound
verb focalized (different ερ- auxiliary from Num. 8:26 above).

Gen. 43:3 ΣΕΝΟΤΜΕΤΜΕΕΡΕ ΑΚΕΡΜΕΕΡΕ ΝΑΝ — compound
(auxiliary + abstract) verb focalized (different ερ- auxiliary from Num.
8:26 above).

Gen. 20:18 ΣΕΝΟΤΨΕΑΜ ΑΡ ΨΕΑΜ ΝΚΑΒΟΛ...
Gen. 43:7 ΣΕΝΟΤΨΙΝΙ ΑΚΨΕΝΤΕΝ.

Gen. 31:30 ΣΕΝΟΤΠΙΕΡΜΙΑ ΓΑΡ ΑΚΕΡΠΙΕΡΜΙΝ — com-
-pound (auxiliary + abstract) verb focalized (different ερ- auxiliary from Num.
8:26 above).

Gen. 47:22 ΣΕΝΟΤΣΑΙΟ ΓΑΡ ΝΑΨΤΑΙΟ ΝΝΙΟΤΗΒ — compound
(auxiliary + abstract) verb focalized.

Ex. 15:1 ΜΑΡΕΝΓΩΣ ΕΠΣΕΣ ΣΕΝΟΤΨΟΣ ΓΑΡ ΑΨΙΩΣΟΣ — com-
pound (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 ιε μπεκκεξπορεμοτ νη πω ανοκ παιωτ.
Deut. 21:14 ΞΕΟΘΗ ΑΚΘΕΒΙΟΣ “for you did humiliate her, after
all”.

Deut. 29:14 ΝΑΙΧΩ ΝΤΑΙΑΙΑΘΗΚΗ ΑΝΟΚ ΝΕΜΩΤΕΝ ΜΜΑΤΑ-
ΤΕΝ-ΘΗΝΟΤ ΑΝ ΜΦΟΟΤ ΑΛΛΑ ΝΗ ΕΤΕΜΠΑΙΜΑ ΝΕΜΩΤΕΝ
ΜΦΟΟΤ.

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 nexal 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 predicing 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 coincid-
ing 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 ἀν and n-...αν, for the negative conjunction bases
are not negators, and ωτεμ- is a negator of the verb lexeme or infini-
tive.

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 an-
other formal difference between the two patterns, and is significant for the issue of nega-
tive 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 nw r-rf, 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 (WEINRICHT 1982:710ff.), but the carrier of negativity, and ἀν (not
zero...αν), in clause-final placement, a true negation focuser, compatible with non-
nelx negative elements such as πNηΟQ-, μηολ and μπηQ-. The case of ἀα 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:
μηολ...ἀα: De Vis I 65.3, 145.1, AM II 208, Mac. No. 9, emphatic “by no means”;
AM I 29, 128, 165, 207, 46; gnomic 73.
AM I 120 μηολ ὠτρο ἀκερονοτά ἀα.
De Vis II 109 μηολ- ὐμιον τημεθοτ Σως ἔσομα ἀα.
De Vis II 266 μηολ- γαί νταν μπαμφτ ἀα.
μπηQ- ἀα appears to be an emphatic, expressive, affective-tone negation (+ ἐπιθηπηq)
“by no means”; SV 19. 28, AM I 8 (same verb repeated), 163, (!) 216, De Vis II 178,
149 (+ ἐπιθιηπηq; without ἀα rather weak and phraseological: “don’t say...” “don’t be
angry”), De Vis II 216, 224), I 123, II 149 (ἀα marking final boundary in Nitrian, unlike
Sahidic). Note in the Pentateuch Ex.12:13 πΝηQ...ἀα codd. (not P: condemned by
ANDERSSON 1904:80), NT Bohairic ντοτωτημ...ἀα 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 grammatical-
ization process is complete in Coptic (232). And yet, we find in LE similar cases to
Nitrian /NT Bohairic μηολ...ἀα, πΝηQ- ἀα (227: still focussing “particle”), 226.
There seems to be no attestation of sw ήπ σδι with bn... jwn3, 229, which means that the
Present is not negated nexally.

(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 n-Xal 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, N alone is the unmarked negative, N-... N 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 “Aqcwth 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-...N vs. N distribution — opposition, alternation and variation — is an issue never seriously tackled on corpus basis. As often, M.G. Schwartze in his “white elephant”, Das alte Ägypten (1843), makes some insightful statements on the Bohairic dialect: he believes (1460ff.) N — N to be a “stronger” (our focussed) negation, and attempts to formulate distribution and frequency patterning. He associates zero-... N with Bohairic. Somewhat later, in the posthumous Schwartze-Stenithal 1850:436, N-... N is clearly associated with the Circumstantial. See also STERN 1880 §431: “E- N — ...N, with E- usually lost” (STERN 1880 §§388ff. too seems to associate the full N-... N form with Sahidic, as against Bohairic); cf. ANDERSSON 1904:110 on Lev. 7:10: almost always N-... N; 115f. ad Num. 6:12 NCEHTI N “also eigentlich ENCENHTI”, with further exx. See FUNK 1987 on the dialectal spread of the two negation-forms.

N-... N alternates in the corpus with zero... N (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 E- N constitute a third oppositum)49:

Gen. 44:26 ΜΠΕΝΚΟΤΑΙ NCON XH NEMAN N.

49 It may be no coincidence that the ME negators n- and nn, in being incompatible with lw, neutralize Circumstantial/autonomous opposition. GUNN 1924:105, 114f., 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 ἐγείρωμι ηνεκείν ἃν.
Deut. 8:9 ὥστε τι ηνικατοστήμαται ἡπεκκώικ ἃν...
Deut. 28:36 οὐκενοκε Δρῷμη ηνεκεστήροι ηνήοψθαι ἃν (= Vat).
Lev. 22:14 Ἐπιμεθε αὐθαυτών ἐπολο γέννησ εὐθαυτα κημελ ἃν.
Lev. 19:27 δυνατόν ἃν πε is in Coptic circumstantially construed (Greek affirmative: ἄθωτόν ἐστίν).
Deut. 22:2 εὐφαίνετε ἐρόκον ἃν (= Vat); also, with the same Stative — a mere coincidence? — Deut. 25:4 ὥστε τι οὐκενοκε δεκτῇ ἐροπό ἃν (note disparity of the two 3rd person sgl. pronouns) — frankly, I do not see the connection between this specific lexical convert verb and its deviant construction.
Lev. 11:26 ὁτοῦ γέννηστα τινός ἄν λιβνεν ετε-νίσσα τηταρας φοράτο ὁτοῦ εὐκελεί ἁνεκαβε ὁτοῦ οτο- καμελ εὐκαμελ ἁν ἃν — the nom. extraposition seems significant.

Obs.
Nitrian texts have εὐ- ἃν very frequently: De Vis I 90, 133, 134, 161, II 17, 190, 210, 211 — but also Circumstantial -...ἀν De Vis I 101, 25, κημελ ἃν De Vis II 176, 278, ἐνάκεμ (εμί) ἃν II 195, 238 ἃ-...ἀν unconverted De Vis II 16, 172.

Unmarked (rather than “independent”) syntactical status is signalled by zero-...ἀν:

γορυσσι ἃν Deut. 25:7 ἑνοψθα ἃν Deut. 25:8, also 30:11, 31:2, Num. 11:6, 14:41:43.

Gen. 31:29 ὁτοῦ ταξικ ἄεμαξομ εἰρ-πετρῳτο ἄν — note the final placement of nential-negation, non-focalizing ἃν.
Both zero- ἃν and -ἀν follow Relative Conversion in the corpus:

Lev. 7:10 γορυσσοτοι λιβνεν εὐοτυσσεμ ἃν.
Two rare exceptions are
Deut. 31:13 γορυσσή ἄετε-νεκεστήρον ἃν: rhythmic factor?
Deut. 32:21 φάλεν τοῦ δενοτοῦ ἃν πε ... φάλεν τοῦ δενοτον ἃν ἃν πε — Relative Nominal Sentence.

For the FC, -...ἀν negates the nexus between Theme-Topic and Focus, while ἃν is Focus-referred: see above. However, it is probably a postfixed form — ἃν, not zero... ἃν, that signals “local” focalizing negation in the corpus:
Deut. 32:6 οτασσοκ νοτοκ ὁτοῦ οναβε ἃν.
Gen. 30:15 καὶ ἀν ζε-.  
Deut. 9:5 εἰσεβετεκμεθαμῖ ἂν πῦς ητοι ἡμαῖρας ἂν — this preposition seems to be especially prone to focalization; this is true from the earliest Egyptian phase on. Also  
Num. 35:22 Σενοτεράνια εἰσεβοσμεταξαί ἂν — here, and often, ἂν marks a delimitation (Chapter Four).  
Lev. 15:25 Σεντχοῦ ἂν ητε τεκμερι.  
Num. 16:28 ἑνεβολ πιττ ἂν (= Vat) — protasis.  
Gen. 27:12 Νοτσαγοτ ὁτοι Νοτςμοτ ἂν.  
Deut. 28:13 εὐελικ...Νοτςκε ὁτοι Νοτςκτ ἂν.  
Num. 12:8 Σενοτνατ ὁτοι Σενοτσμοτ ἂν.  
Num. 24:17 ἁνταμος ὁτοι ἁτον ἂν.  
Gen. 45:8 Νοωτν ἂν ἁρτενοτορπτ ἐμναι ἄλλα δρ ἂν. Focal negation by -ἀν seems neatly opposed to nexal negation by ν—ἀν, for FC constructions: see above.  
In ἁη... ἂν, the high-focality term in paradigm with either ἁη or ἁη... zero alone (see above), we have ἂν signalling highest co-focalization (in this sense, ἂν here is anything but “expletive”50):  
Gen. 31:15 ἁη νεταςοτεν ἄν ἂν ἁρφτ ἁγναγομοὶ ἂν also Gen. 20:5, Deut. 32:34, Ex. 4:14 ἁη ιε ζαρω ἃρκον ἂν πιλετιθς ...  
The placement of ἂν in these cases is environmentally conditioned, while ἁη is initial (see above for more examples).

Obs.  
(1) Some instances of focalizing ἂν in the NT:  
Imperative + ADV. - ἂν John 6:27.  
Preterite — ADV. - ἂν John 7:10.  
John 14:22 ιοτας ἁπικαριωθς ἂν B4 (B5 ἁς alone): a nice instance of delimiting negation.  
John 6:32 ἁρωτας ἂν ἂτ ἁκτν ἁμϊκικ B4 (B5 ἂς alone), also 7:19, 15:16, 1 Cor. 15:10, Eph. 6:77.  
ἈΝ- ἂς ἄλλα ἑμ- Rom. 4:12.  
II Cor. 10:8 ΠΕΡΨΚΙΤ ἐταπдумать θιμ ην ἄρκω ὁτοι ἂς ἀπετεντυργατ ἂν.  
Rom. 8:12 οτοι επον Σενταρθαν.  
(2) FUNK 1986:103f. n.3, 31 points out the need to distinguish (for Akhmimic) between zero and nil, with en “alone”, the Relative ἐτε-ɛɛ... en has zero. The same obtains for Oxyrhynchite (SHISHA-EMAILY 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 OPOH 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 AQ- John 6:32.
N- ADV AN AQ- John 6:58.


(5) ne-etaq-... AN seems to be an established form in Cat. of the Preterite FC construction, negatived nexus (e.g. Cat. 97, 137, 8, 33, 184, 208 etc.). Cf. (?) the Demotic pre-negator bn-jw- (Spiegelberg 1925 §472ff., exx. 213ff., even for j.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, extrapoled 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). Extrapoletion is often focalizing, a function signalled by non-specific or determination-indifferent noun syntagms 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 puncturally a delimitation, whereas Topicalization is a strong linkage (Chapter Four).

Gen. 25:23 wloa b areepboke mwhwot.
Gen. 21:6 oosewbi apoq nhi.
Lev. 25:5 otrotei nteotonon ecewoppi mpikapi.
Deut. 16:15 x negoeto ekeaitov.
Gen. 44:27 ὑπὲ ἐνταίμιμι μακων οἱ.
Deut. 28:38 γανκουξι εκελούν.
Ex. 12:46 οὕτως οὐκετικαύῳ ἐβολ ΜΜΟῤ “even a bone”.
Deut. 1:28 ἀλλὰ νεμ γανκεψῃ οὐκ ἔρως (nem focussing: “even”).
Gen. 44:5 γανπεθοῦσ ἀπετένσκοσ.
Gen. 35:10 ἀλλὰ πίς εἰςεψῃ ναιε-πεκράν focalized Rheme.
Deut. 27:6 γανώνι εστονοξ εκεκότων.
Deut. 4:12 οὕτως μπετένσαν ἐρού ἀλλὰ ... οὕτως ἀπε-
τενσοἐμε.
Gen. 45:8 νωστεν αἰ ἀπετενοέρπητ εμναι ἀλλὰ Φἴ πε — a rare instance of pronominal focussing, resumed, like a Cleft Sen-
tence, by the Immutable-Theme or Endophoric Nominal Sentence.

(b) Topicalization is signalled by specific extraposited nouns, cotext-
tually cohesive, and no restriction of the verb lexeme.
Gen. 22:5 γεμσει μπαίμα ... ἀνοκ δε νεμ πιάλος τεννα-
ϊϊ\.καν.
Gen. 27:37 θοκ δε οὐ πε εἵναις νακ.
Ex. 6:12 ἄνοκ γαρ ἀνοκ-οτατάκι.
Ex. 5:16 πιτογ γαρ στ ἐσὶ μμοῤ ἀν ννεκεβιαικ ὁτογ σεξὼ
μμοῤ ναι ἄε-τηςι ττέντι ττηντιτωβι μαθαιιμωτ.
Gen. 42:18 Φἴ γαρ ἄνοκ Τεργός τταττεβ.
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 ὁτογ σεννιτεβνωτι θρων Φή εηβεν ετεν-
σοπ ντεραμο Φορζ ὁτογ εἰςειλ μνεμεβ ὁτογ οὐκατι
επταβι μμοῤ αν.
The non-specific extraposited Topic\footnote{See Lotscher 1992.} is less common by far, and never
cotextually anchored:
Lev. 10:9 οὔτῃς ἄπο δεικερας οὐκετενχωτ.
Deut. 8:13 οὕτως ἄπο τταλ ντους ἄτειας νακ...
Gen. 31:39 οὗτι επεθρίον ὁτομι μπιεννα νακ.
Deut. 29:6 μικ Μπετενοτωμ ὁτογ οὐπ νεμ σικερα
Μπετενχω — zero-determined generic Topic, resumed by zero.
(c) In poetic language, a third construction is encountered:

Ex. 15:2 ἀστονομεῖ εἰσελθεῖ εἰ πρὸ τῷ ἐπὶ πρὸς τὸν πόλιν ἐφεξῆς ἀναμνήστηκαν

Ex. 15:4 γανειτί παναιπαθής περιποίητης ἀφελικής ἀφελικοῦ σημείωσα.

Ex. 21:8 κεκοσκότων νεμέιμο οὑν οὐκ ἐν ἐθνικ πλεύρῃ.

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 ἵνα- (rarely ἐ-) is a grammaticalized preposition marking the topicalization:

Gen. 22:17 ἵνα νομος εἰς κόσμον εἰρήνην.

Gen. 43:7 ἤτοι ἵνα Ἀφροδίτη.

Gen. 43:3 Ἰερομπομενοῦ ὄνομα ἐλεημονεῖ ἀποκρημμοῦν — topicalizing a compound verb.

Num. 8:26 γὰρ ἄνεγερθήσα — topicalizing a compound verb.

(d) The Presentatives ἐπέπε, ἐπέπε εἰ, εἰ are devices enabling one type of topicalization, not focalization (see above):

Ex. 6:30 ἐπεπε ἅνοικον ἐπερετήμα — note that ἅνοικον does not signal topicality, but is simultaneously a “Flexionsisolierung” (cf. Polotsky 1990:171 n.5) and a Theme-recall device:

Ex. 4:14 ἢ εἰ ὅπως πεκκῶν ἀνάμεθα ἁπλῶς ἀναλάβας ἵνα ἵνα καὶ ἀκολουθήσω.

Gen. 42:13 ἐπέρεω εἰ πικορίζῃ χξὴν ἑθενπεινῳτ.

Lev. 13:31f. ἀφωνοντος ... οἰσοφοι αὐτοῖς ἐπέπε εἰ περιο ὀργάνας εἰν ἐς.

(e) The preposition ἐπερε- is a rare topicalization signal: so is ε- for infinitives (cf. LE ἐρ):

Gen. 17:20 ἐπερε-ἐκμανα ἀφετρεῖ εἰς ἐκστήμεν ἐποκ ἐπέπε εἰς κόσμον ἐποκ.

Lev. 7:24 ἐνωμ ἀπό ἄνονοιστονοτ.

(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 ṅaše-marked Theme, the Theme in commutation with the delocutive suffix-pronoun) a nexus-topicalizing term:

Gen. 17:24 ṣaṣṣagam ḏe ṅaṣṣxḥ ṣēŋqē ṅrômπi...

Gen. 25:33 ḏḥcat ḏe ḏq† ṅnīmētṣwōrn ṅmóci eḇol ńi-qwē ḏub.

Obs.

(1) On # Noun + sdm.f # thematization in ME, with the subsequent nexus rhetic as a whole, adverbial-converbal, “Circumstantial sdm.f”: see Westendorf 1953, Doret 1980, Junge 1978 (1979); Loprieno 1995:187ff. The feature of Topic specificity is heuristically useful in a languageless 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 ḏf nḥt “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 Zaузich 1993: t3y- jht ty 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 ḏn “The request you sent me, I will take care of them (sic) too”.

(3) On topicalized adverbs (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).


(6) Initial-position focalization is common outside the corpus: DV II 265 nōwten ätētēnēmō nniēprathē nπtωt äqā ńnōn πe.

53 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.
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 Exponent, "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 (ȝh tep) ic-
   (d) Determination in inherent and non-inherent rhematic status
   (e) Theme determination following ŋxe-
   (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. ǭ̪sāI, ǭ̪hOn and ǭ̪sāI

3.5 n-. and ǭ-. "two definite articles"?

3.5.1 {n-.} the deictic, cohesive specifying article
3.5.2 {ǭ-.} — 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 determined 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 converses. 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, rhetoricity, 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 hithero been on Sahidic. TILL 1927, while simplistic and undiscerning, 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 ROSEN (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); GIVON 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 Germanic), 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” (HODLER 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 gewesen”; 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-indexsis grammaticalization is acceptable (although this is an imponderable, and in a sense a *petitio principii*), 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 SCHWARTZE 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. {\textit{în}-}, 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 (\textit{qua} 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 \textit{prius dictum} or in cohesion with a coreferent), paradigmatic (the extent of commutability in inverse proportion to specificity) and intertextual or pragmatic (\textit{prius nota} playing a role as consequential as that of \textit{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 \textit{pωq} "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 (نبي- / 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 ممكن- /ممكن- + َُ- /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 {Φλα-}, 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.; Thrane 1980, esp. 77f., 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 Mumm 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
{τι-}

uniques (τεις), genus name (τεχνις)

"naming" metalinguistic actualizator

lexeme representant for inalienable
association (τι- N-)

ΟΤι-

"a certain..."

specific-indefinite

NON-SPECIFIC

GENERIC

{τι-}

genus name

zero

abstract, extensional
unstructured
(genus-representing
genus member)

ΟΤι-

"a quantity unit"

"instance genericity"

τιι-

intensional

genericity

NON GENERIC OR PARTICULAR

ΟΤι-, ΠΑΙ-

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

definite

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 combinatorial 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: Ḟ - N O B I is thus eminently comparable with Ḥ Q - CアウTEM (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 ḠḤON “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) ḤE-, also combinable with adverbials (see Chapter Two); or rhematic status in the Nominal Sentence (i.e. predicability by ṖE, see Chapter Two), or compatibility with the nota relationis ḠN-, 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 M.G. SCHWARTZE (in BUNSEN 1845:641ff.) explicitly states the nuclearity of the bases-with-Theme as an auxiliary verbal nexus; see also STEINTHAL-MISTELI 1893:293, probably Schwartze’s teaching. (Also SHISHA-HALEVY 2000:83ff.).

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
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: Ṭ-ḎE, Ḥ-NØBI, ṴI-ṮØW and even Ṣ-CØM (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 it. 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 ʿaw- singular indefinite articles). Sahidic examples for this are ʾI-ME “the true one (masc.)”, or ʾI-C₉₉₉₉₉ “the syllabary” (Shenoutean Sahidic), or ʾI-ʾI-XE (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-determinated “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. CWN)1: ʿABH vs. ʿABE, ʾE₉₉₉₉₉ 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 ʾI-ʾG₃₂₂ and ʾI-ʾG₃₂₂ (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]w\}

or \{LEXEME\} + suffix \{-i\}

or \{LEXEME\} + suffix \{-ωρι\}, \{-ωρι\}, \{-νοτι\}

or \{LEXEME\} + infix \{no breaking in Bohairic\}: εβιδιαίκ, εγωρ π

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 Σποτ, which may be suppletive to the singulars ωμπ ι/ ωμπι, and Σποτοτον). 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 nτε-. Not contained in these classes are εβιδιάιοι Gen. 39:11, εποτοτον Lev. 25:37 (both inalienable), the magical staves (νιωβο τ Gen. 30:37), and the ensemble of Egyptian waterways (νηπω τον 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 reorganized 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-**，**an-**，**n-en-** 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 **n-**{+ no article} their *outil 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.

**οτιμηδ νιεφωτι** Gen. 26:14.

**γαντεβνωτι** νεγωτι Gen. 26:14 — a peculiar case (two plurals, nuclear and satellital).


30 **ναναταει** Gen. 32:14.

**νισεμμωσι** Ex. 12:19.

**νικαλωτι** Ex. 50:7:23.

**νεναλωτι** η- Gen. 21:25.


**νιεβιακ** Gen. 33:6.

**νεκεβιακ** Ex. 5:15f., 32:13.

**νικεοτι** Ex. 5:14:19.

**νικαβετ** Ex. 28:3.

**νιεδελοι** Ex. 3:16.

**νιμετμερετ** Num. 17:25 **νιμετμερετ**.

**νιειομι** Ex. 1:19.

**νοττιομι** Deut. 3:6f., Num. 32:26, 31:17.

**γαντιομι** Gen. 34:9.


**νεκσιμων** Gen. 19:14.

**νενδελλοι** Ex. 10:9.

**νενειρο** η- Gen. 23:3.

**νοτιοτ** Ex. 6:17, 4:5, 10:6.

**νεκφιρωτι** Ex. 26:13.

**νεκφιρωτι** Ex. 30:4.

**νεκσκοτοσ** Gen. 22:17.

**νιεδαλτακ** Gen. 24:32.

**νιεφωτι** Ex. 29:34.

**νεκφωτι** Ex. 21:28, Lev. 6:20, Num. 12:12, Gen. 40:19.
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.

**NIWQ** Ex. 29:31, Lev. 7:15.

**Ebol SENNIAQ (tōn kρeōn) — EBOL SENNIAQOSI (tōn kρeōn) — NNEQHOSI (tā kρēa)** Gen. 12:4ff.

**NB:** ΠΑΛΟΣ- Ν-, ΝΑΛΩΣI ΝΙCAAK, ΠΔΛΟΣ ΝΤΕ- Gen. 24:59, 26:25.

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 e[pwq][wq] nτuciones  Gen. 29:2, varying with e[pwq] nτuciones  Gen. 29:3:10; psaq nτchgi Luc. 21:24 (v.l. psaq), or kẹnq nτeq- (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 περα[pwq] (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 ḫnwi 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 cnwot and ṣbẖwē accounting for most of those) 28 lexemes with morphematic plural, of which exactly half are attested with "syntactical" plural (mën, ṭmḥ, ḡāḇ, ṭnsn, ḡhay, ṣw, ṭw, ṭw, ṭw, ṭw, ṭw, ṭw, ṭw, ṭw, ṭw, ṭw, ṭw, ṭw, ṭw, ṭw, ṭw, ṭw, ṭw, ṭw, ṭw, ṭw, ṭw, ṭw, ṭw, ṭw, ṭw, ṭw, ṭw), 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 qan-). 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: ḡin-, masculine in the grammaticalized action noun -n̓eḏiniz- (see below), is opposed to a feminine verbal abstract (t̓n̓iniz-); perhaps even cases like the variation in ov[n]epwmi n̓e[n̓]iz nhq/nhnc 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 ἄτ- or the grammaticalized ρεμ-, πεύ-.

It seems that statements of the nuclearity 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 nuclearity 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 οὐπαρηθή (AM II 72 — not in our corpus; Sah. οὐ-τει-μινε: Jernstedt 1978, §14f.; the substitute status of οὐ- and ἕαν-; 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 ὅταί/ὁτα. ἕαν- does not have in Bohairic a non-proclitic counterpart, ἕανον corresponding to ἕοίνε etc. Consider the following representative loci, all indicative of a nuclear determinator:

Num. 6:7 θυρηθεῖς οἶδει εὐκλής (= Vat).
Num. 7:1 ἐνειδεὶς εἰκέρ ὀστομπί (Vat έατ-).
Num. 14:18 µαιούτ όναὶ ὅτοι νομὴν ἡμῆς.
Ex. 23:7 πεττοῖχθοι ὅτοι νομὴν.
Deut. 28:64 λακκοῦντος τὸ αὐτοὔνει νομὴν ναώνοι.
Deut. 33:25 ὦτεινι ὅτοι νομὴν πε πευκήνοι.
Gen. 34:7 λικῖοῦτ ὅτοι παλαινὸς ὅτοι εὐαρέξ...
Deut. 25:15 οὐκ ἀληθινὸν ὅτοι νομὴν.
Deut. 9:9:18 άκιι µπιοτὸντα µῶοτ µπίος, sim. Deut. 29:5,
Ex. 34:28.
Ex. 10:10 ὅτειντςος (cf. οὐκανάτσατ Mt. 11:30 Oxyrhynchite: see Schenke 1996:11ff.).

Cat. 57 ...εἰκανοκ-στρουτ ὅτοι νομὴν πιοτὴν.
Ps. 85:10 λεοκ-στρουτ ὅτοι εἰκίρι ...
AM I 164 ό πιοτξ ὅτοι ναβεὶ.
Ps. 68:30 ὅτρικι ὅτοι εὐκλής.
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 ("ονήμε πε").

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, NoCenTnI 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 morfematico" — 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 1989:47lf. 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 ονήμε, ποιητή 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 ΠΕΠΑΙΛΕΒΗ 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 τ-ΝΕ or τ-ΛΑΣΕ (Luke 5:36 Palau Ribes, like the τ-ΓΕΝ-ΤΕΙ-MINE construction, may be a case of hyperdetermination — specific determinator + generic zero: zero does indeed have a "positive Zählwert", but that may and typically does signify the "genus" (See Browne

---

\(^5\) At least in Bohairic: consider the ονήμε πε 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 ΝΕΟΝΟΤΩ | πε ΠΙΛΑΞΙ | John 1:1, corresponding to the Greek rhematic zero-determinated θεός. It may well be that "the Word was God" would be rendered as ΝΑΡΕ-ΠΙΛΑΞΙ | ΝΝΟΤΩ and not by a Nominal Sentence.
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-para-
digm; 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, examin-
ing the specific category and participation role of determination in the
given environments. Many of these may (as in Givón 1978) be pre-
sented as parametrical properties (Rhematicity, Topicality etc.). The fol-
lowing 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, Foc-
us of Relative-Topic Cleft Sentence: [+/− specific, + particular, +/−
quantified].**

This is an especially privileged slot, not least since the tension be-
tween specificity of RHEME and THEME is in a sense copular, that is, ex-
cercises a naxal 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.

(2) **Incidental, Contingent non-Inherent RHEME marked by ₢-,
(0i, 1) n-, (.waitKey) e- [− specific, – particular, +/- quantified].**

See above. Chapter Two; and see below.

Gen. 17:8 εἰσεχωπὶ ΝΝΩΣ ΝΝΩΣ† — never ΝΝΩΣ."†

Gen. 28:3 εκεισωπὶ ἐγάπωσὸτος ἄνενος.

Gen. 34:9 σῖτος ΝΝΕΤΣΗΨΙ ἐγάπωσὶ.

Gen. 34:4 σί ΝΤΑΙΛΟΤ ΝΗΙ ΕΟΣΓΙΜΙ.

Gen. 28:22 ζωτις ε[ɴɪ ἐπῖστορ]† — counter-intuitively, π- 
— not specific *quā* determinator: see below (§3.9) for the Personal-
Sphere (“inalienable”) Association.

Ex. 12:14 εἰσεχωπὶ ΝΟΣΕΡΦΗΜΕΤΙ.
Ex. 21:5 ἴνα ἀφεινθήναι δὲν εἰς οἱ τρόποι — cannot in Coptic
be a non-rhetic adverbial adjunct.
(3a) EXISTANT ὄτον— [- specific, +/- particular, +/- quantified].
(3b) NON-EXISTANT ἰμμον— [- specific, – particular, – quantified]:
lowest determination profile.
See SHISHA-HALEVY 1984b for Sahidic.

(4a) POSSESSUM ὄτοντα= ἰμμοντα= [+/- specific, +/- particular,
+/- quantified].
This seems to be one of the slots characterized by a maximal determi-
nation category.
(4b) POSSESSOR [+/- specific, + particular, – quantified].

(5a) Segmentation (extraposition) — cotext-anchored TOPIC [+ spe-
cific, +/- particular, – quantified]:
Deut. 29:5 ἰενεγβῶς μπορεπάς ἰενεγωβοῦς ἰμπορ-
σι[+ ἐβόλ.
(5b) Segmentation (extraposition) — cataphoric FOCUS (§2.4.7)
[- specific, – particular, –/+ quantified]:
Deut. 23:25 ὅλος ἰνεκεθίτι (cf. ANDERSSON 1904:8f.).
Deut. 9:18 ὦ ἵκ ἰμπορῶν ἰμtório ἰπικῶ.
Lev. 10:9 ὄσιρπ ἰνεμοτσικεῖα ἰνενεκμῶν.
Deut. 8:13 ὅρατ ἰνεμοτσιοῦ ἰσαβάναι ἰακ ...

(6) ἰφ-Theme [+/- specific, + particular, +/- quantified].
In poetic language, we find: Gen. 27:29 ὁτοῦ τρόπηρβωκ ἦ σα
ἰφ-γανεθνου ὁτοῦ τρόπηρτος ἦ σα ἰφ-μαναπρων.
Outside the corpus we find the rare zero determination in negative
environment:
Jer. 30:33 ἰνεφωπτί ἰφ-ρωμὶ/ἰφεψὶ ἰνεμπακαῖ ἰαττί (collated).
Jer. 28:43 ἰνεφτάκεῳ ἐρω ἰφ-ψἐψι ἰρωμὶ ἰαττί (collated).
Deut. 21:5 ἰεφωπι ἰενπρωτὸς ἰφ-ἐκ ἐβόλ ἰβεν ἰνε-
ἀντιλογία ἰβεν is probably not a case of zero determination (and
quantification: “every case of...”), but of totality (“all forgiveness”)
with ἰβεν 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 (ROUSSO and TSIMPLI 1994). In Coptic, the \textit{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 combinatorily 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\(^7\). In fact, the attributive clause expansion is (co-)specifying, while the adnexual one is non-specifying\(^8\).

(9a) **Nucleus of Adnominal Clause** (II) + Circumstantial Conversion: \textit{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 \textit{n\textsc{a}t} + Circumstantial, a clear adnexual construction). See ROTHENBERG 1972 ("propositions relatives adjointes").

\(^8\) The adnexual adnominal role of Circumstantial converbal forms is well established in early Egyptian (Amenemope X 12 \textit{p3-jn jw.f wbn}, exactly corresponding to the Coptic \textit{\textalpha\varphi\rho\varphi \textepsilon\nu\nu\nu\textalpha\gamma\varsigma\iota} construction, e.g. in \textit{\textgamma\textmit\nu\nu\nu\textmit\nu\nu\nu\textmit\nu\nu\nu\textmile\nu\nu\nu\textmile\nu\nu\nu\textmile\nu\nu\nu\textmile} Shenoute Leip. III 87, and its variants): DAUMAS 1962:30.
Deut. 22:4 ἀκολούθοντες ἐ-Φιω μπεκόνι τέρατει εἰς ἔντομον ἔως τοῦτον. 
Ex. 23:4 ἀκολούθοντες ἐ-τέρα ἐπεκάλαξε τέρατει εἰς ἔντο 

Lev. 14:52 νεμ-πικοκκίνος εὐσκατ' (ἐν τῷ κεκλωσμένῳ κοκ 
κίνῳ).

Gen. 15:2 Ἀνοίς σεισάξει ἐβολ αἰοι κατ' ἀθωῆρι.

Gen. 20:3 ἡμι τε εὐγγοι νεμοτρεῖ.

Occasionally, and often in Nitrian, the difference between the Circumstantial and the Relative is to our sensibilities elusive; the former is typical of place-and-time characterizations, as if it were a grammaticalized conjunctival conversion. Formally speaking, εἰς- is doubtlessly predominant. All in all, this is still one of the riddles of Nitrian Bohairic9:

Deut. 14:14 Νν τε Νιτεβνωτι εἰρεθενεοτομος (Anderson 1903:334f.).

Gen. 2:4 πιστος εαυτ' θανιετε ημεπκαζε ναητν (B4).

SV 27f. πιστος επεπραγματευθες ταθοντ ερον (vs. Νινε 
ετριακων).

Cat. 112 πιστος ξε-ον ερεπτικτασιεν τοι θανθωτ.

{Φι} ερε- De Vis II 76, Cat. 106, 108, 115, 134 etc., {Θαι} ερε- Cat. 94.

(9b) NUCLEUS OF ADNOMINAL CLAUSE (I) + Relative CONVERSION: attributive 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 = attributive, Circumstantial = adnexal".

Num. 15:30 όρισθης ενα- (= Vat). Also Lev. 5:4, cf. 5:17 (ορισθης ηρε ενα-).

Lev. 27:12 ορει ενανενερ...ορει ερσκωσ (= Vat) — see Andersson 1903:108.

Outside the corpus, the construction, well established, has a broader range:

9 A Demotic example: τά dnyt jw.s ph r-ηρν Parker, JARCE 3 (1964) 95 (A, line 6. Parker emends to nij-jw.s).

Zach. 2:8 (B4) ἐγὼ νρωμὶν εὐμενὴν ετελεσθήσατε (collated).
De Vis II 108 ὁσιόν νρωμὶ εἰσεβοτ ἐπε.
De Vis I 77 γανρωμὶ εἰσεβα.
zero + ἐταὐ- De Vis I 75 μὴ μμον-ρωμὶ μματ ἁφοῦντ ἐταυρημμὸν μποτμανμίς (alongside ἐφευρὴν ἐφτασὶ and, for σγὶμὶ, ἐφαρπιγοῦτ-νρπ ἀρετίς). De Vis II 217 παρενοε ἐταερμοναθ ἐτακταεοου εφαγο...
De Vis I 100 οταγ ἐενανεγ.
De Vis II 45 μφρὴν† νοται ἐταγνεγκι...
De Vis I 158 ἰτε-γκκι ἰτε-πεμαο ἰτε βωκ ἰτε πεμκη ἰτε- ἐγνωτ ἰτε σγίμι εεναμοτ.
Cat. 175 μὲ εελικ may be different, resuming the foregoing πισε εελικ.
Also De Vis I 76, 77, 147, 201 etc.: apparently, for the Present the construction is most common with Statives.
Is. 65:20 ἐνεφωσπὶ νἀ-οτο ἐεναμοτ (Tattam, collated: consensus).

(9c) (Nucleus of Adnominal Clause (III): Negative Environment + Δε- + Negative Environment: the adnominal paradigm to a generic zero-determinated 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) νεμμον-βακί... Δε μπενζίτη.
Exx. in the Bohairic NT: Luke 8:17:25, 12:2, Mt. 10:26 μμον-πεττοβε γαρ Δε-κνασώρπ εβολ ἀν μμον-πεττηπ Δε-κε- βακεμί εροκ ἀν. 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 (paraphrastic or rhetorical equivalent)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 mn-mdl=ntfri (Mntnoqpe) jw-bn-p-Pr c3 dt 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):


Paris 1304 28 p. 42 ἰν-τοπος οὐδε καὶ Ἰε-νενανοιεν ἀν.

Leip. III 215 οὐ Γάρ ἡναδ ζηνενταργωβ ... ἡπτοιο ... Ἰε-ζενεβολ ἀν ἦν ζηνκαρ θροτ ... οὐ ἡναδ Πετοτργωβ ... ἡπτοι ... Ἰε ζενεβολ ἀν ἦν ζητεε θροτ ἀν.

Orientalia 44 (1975; p. 156, BL Or. 8664 f. 2 p. Ἐφ) ἩΤΣΟΣΟΝ ἀσ Ἰε-κνασνοτρώμε εβολ γνάρα εφο ομοεύκ εθίμε ἡπειτοσώμε ἃων περσέθρ Ιε-μποτείρε Ντοκ ετωκ ἃω εφανωβ ζαικεερ Κ ινχεε Νοτρώμε Ἰε-μποτσώμε Ντωμ Ντοκ.

Chass. 97. οὐ πετοοοπ Ἰε-νοτάρ ἀν ἦν.

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 of its determined 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 εε-ψωμι, Ex. 4:12 οτος ητατςαβοκ, or following the auxiliary ηα- in the Future: Ex. 4:12 άνωκ ετηα-οσων, or in the causative infinitive or other following cases:
Ex. 7:3 eἰεθερεπνήθη τῷ ἁραμῷ νῶτος ὀσοὶ τῷ ναόρατοι οἱ Ναζε-ναμήνην.

Ex. 2:4 εἰς τῷ Νιατς εἰς μιᾷ Χει... Ex. 2:18 εὐθεσθ ἀρτενωκλημ εἰ.

Deut. 23:6 ταλ-νοταρ.

Deut. 19:3 καὶ μὴ φάντ.

Note that in the discontinuous construction of ὁπο, ε- + infinitive has nil, not zero determination:

Deut. 18:10f. Νῃστήμι ναθτην ἐκεῖρο μηθευρὴν εἰ τευκ-

(2) The singular indefinite determinator with the infinitive is grammaticalized, typically rhematic or thematic (including topicalization):

Lev. 20:2 Σενοσμοῦς νεποῦτοςοβεβεπ (see Chapter Two for the Tautological Infinitive).

Num. 27:7 Σενοτοῦνταρ εἰς τὸ νῶτον.

Lev. 23:37 ΝΗ ἐτετναμοῦντ ἐρυθον Σενοσμοῦντ.

Gen. 34:14 οὗμιπι πε.

Ex. 30:32 εὐεσφωπι νωτεν νοτοτοβο — εὐεσφωπι νοτο-

τοτοβο μπετ (see below, and above, Chapter Two).

Num. 17:25... οὐαρεξη οὐομ οὐμηνιν.

The indefinite article is no less grammaticalized when following other prepositions, adverbializing the infinitive:

ἀπομοι νοσινιτὸν ἐπὶ Gen. 46:29, 37:10; also Lev. 16:32 (ἐβεβε).

Obs.


(3) The plural indefinite γαν- is very rare with the infinitive, fully concretizing it:

Gen. 49:26 (in poetic language) γακμοῦ δτεπεκιουτ Νέμ-
tεκμαο νικμοῦ ντεγκαλαμφο νενεγ νικμοῦ ντενι-

τωτον μμαμονι.

(4) η-, The non-phoric, actualizing, notion name generic determinator is typical of infinitive determination. The isolated form ην- serves
suppletively as its plural only in associative expansions with n- and nτε-, and is a case apart — plural only\(^{13}\).

(a) ε-π- + infinitive is an idiomatic concurrent of ε- + 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 = τό + infinitive in Greek). This grammaticalized role is strikingly generic:

Ex. 16:33 ἐκεχαρὶ μπεμβο ἀφι ἐπαρεν ἐρομ.
ἐπαίτοσ Ἰοῦθ. 27:26.
ἐπισοβει Ἰοῦθ. 17:7.
ἐφοσομευ Ἰοῦθ. 19:23.
ἐπικ Ἐξ. 16:8, Ἰοῦθ. 25:19.
ἐπισομεμ Ἐξ. 12:13.
ἐπιτ Ἡμ. 31:4:5.
ἐφιομεν Ἐγερ. 32:8.
ἐπικμεμὶ n- Ἐξ. 10:26.
ἐφιμετὶ ἐρομ Ἐξ. 17:11.

ἐπιφωῇ Num. 8:24 contrasted with ἐφω,” Num. 8:22.

(b) The concretization and semantic focussing of the infinitive is signalled combinatorily, by π- with n- or nτε-. In this construction, n- (which in non-infinitival lexemes signals special “inalienable” or Personal-Sphere constituency association: see below) marks actantial, nτε-appurtenative dependence. The plural nεπ…n- is especially rare with infinitives, and, as usual, higher in individualizing-concretizing-specializing value than the singular.

Gen. 32:30 ‘Φ πασ μφ’ as Place Name: “the occasion of …”.
Gen. 21:16 Φμοσ μπιψει “the event of …”.
Num. 20:3 πτακο nενεκνασ “the occasion of …”.
Gen. 23:1 πνωσ ncapp “the length of life”.
Ἐξ. 25:26 πωπ ννιπομπ “the number”.
Deut. 33:13 πκμοσ μπει “the blessing” (vs. 14 πκμοσ nτε-
ἐας…, cataphoric).

Ex. 4:25 πεβει nτεπιαλο “the foreskin”.
Ἐξ. 18:8 πωπι nτετζιμ μπεκιωτ “the shameful parts”.
Deut. 8:17 παμαρὶ nτεταζι “the grasping power”.
Deut. 5:25 ἐνεκαζι μπαίλαο “the speech-words”.

\(^{13}\) Cf. Silverman 1981 for the origins of this form.
(c) **πι-** + infinitive: generic — concept/notion name:

Gen. 35:2 πεμτόν πε.
Lev. 8:14 and passim πνω εβολ.
Deut. 28:48 πικό νεμ πιιβι νεμ φβωφ γεμ φμοτ.
(d) **πι/πι-** infinitive: variation? some difficult cases of apparent variation:

πιφωφεν ντε- varying with πιφωφεν ντε- Num. 4:28:33 etc.

Ex. 34:21 θεπσιτ αν πιωσ.
Deut. 28:48 πικό νεμ πιιβι νεμ φβωφ γεμ φμοτ — all apparently generic.

(5) **πι-** + infinitive is usually cataphoric:

Num. 1:44 πιδεμπφυινι εταθαιη.
Ex. 3:17 πιεμκο ντεπιπεμνκαι.
Gen. 49:26 (in poetic language) γανκμοτ ντεπεκηφτ νεμ-
  τεκματ νικμοτ ντεγανκαλαπφο νενεφ νικμοτ ντενι-
  τωτοτ μμαμμονι

Gen. 49:18 πινογεμ ντεπσ.
Gen. 49:25 πικμοτ ντετβε.
Num. 3:35, 4:41:45 πιδεμπφυινι ντε-.

Much more rarely, anaphoric:
Gen. 34:27 πισωτεβ “the corpses”, “partitive” or rather assosia-
tive: “the... of slaying”.

Obs.
(1) Hermeneutical syntax supplies numerous instances of anaphoric reference for **πι-** +
infinite:

πιωτεμκοτωνινι Cat. 3
πιοκο ζε- Cat.3.21, 155
πιοφονγι 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) infinitive\(^\text{14}\)) and cataphoric.

(6) Deictic characterization of the infinitive:

Deut. 31:26 ναικαξι θροτ ντεταιρσαν.
Deut. 29:24 ναιμβον ντεπαινιψτ ναωντ.
Deut. 13:14 ναικαξι.
Gen. 42:21 ναιροκαξα.

\(^{14}\) 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: πετελνοιeκενε for the fine distinctions of πιν ... ρελκοιι ... τετετεκενε and πι ... тетелене:
(a) Valency and actance opposition indifferent or neutralized:
Deut. 10:22 πονετακλα
Lev. 8:33 πετεβωκρελλ.
Deut. 26:7 πετεκηπιο νεμην πετελκεκεκερι νεμην πετεκλεκεκεκε.
Lev. 9:7 πεκκωελλ (possessive of πκωελλ — ritual name and concept, Lev. 8:14 and passim).
Num. 4:47f. πετελκεκεκεπι, πετελκεκεκεπι.
Lev. 25:26 πετελελнελ.
(b) Actantial status — as agens or object actant — resolved by subsequent resumption in a Relative construction:
Ex. 16:8 πετεκλεκεκεκεπεμ Ρη θωετεν ετεκεκεκεκεκεπεμ
Lev. 25:26 πετελελнελ.
Deut. 28:57 πεκκκηαντην πετελκεκεκερι ετεκεκεκεκεκει
Lev. 25:50:51 πετελκεκ
Gen. 45:11 οὐσίαν-κε-ξί ηπομπή.
Lev. 25:26 εὐσπν ἐξ οὐσίαν-σαλί μμον-πετάξιη σαροχ.
Ex. 2:1 νεοσον-οσαὶ ἐξ οἴσσολεν ἱνατί.
Deut. 25:11 εὐσπν ἐξ οὐσίαν-ρωμῆ ἐν εὐσομὲν ἐκκοπ.
Gen. 38:27 νεοσον-κακόπετ τεντεκνεδί ἐπε.
Gen. 39:2 νεοσον-οτρωμῆ ἐκ οὐκαὶ ἔρει αὐτό — not located.
Gen. 24:23 ἀν-οὐσίαν-τόπος ζατενπειότεν ἱπερενμτόν
μμον.
Gen. 24:25 οὐσίαν-τόπος ἐκωστέν ταρόν εὐσομῶν
ἐνοφ οὐσίαν-τόπος ἱπερεκτόν μμοκ.
Gen. 24:22 γανελών ννοσάμ οὐσίαν-οσκί ἄναπ εἰποῦσα
πιοταὶ μμοῦ.
Gen. 18:24 εὐσπν οὐσίαν-πὰ ννομὴν ἵπεντμακι.

* Note: zero Existant?
Perhaps also Gen. 40:17 νεοσον ηπητ ἐπε οὐβ έπενη
τήποτε εὐσομποστο ταραύ ντομοτ

(2) μμον-, 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 μμον-ωικ οτάδε μμοῦ.
Num. 20:5 μμον-μμοῦ εκσ.
Gen. 38:21 μμον-πορνη μπάιμα.
Gen. 39:9 μμον-ζαί εὐσοςεί εροὶ ηπεμενή οτάδε μμον-


nemmon-ρωμη ηπητος Num. 26:64 σιμ. Gen. 41:39.
Deut. 32:12 μμον-κενοτ ἄνεμμο νμωοτ πε.
Ex. 9:14 μμον-κενοται μπαρτ ηπητες 
ποικίλη 
Deut. 4:35.
Num. 20:5 μμον-κεντε ηπητος οτάδε ἄλοι ποτα οτάδε ερπαν
οτάδε μμον-μμοῦ εκσ.


μμον-μαθον Gen. 43:32, 44:22, 19:19 etc.
Deut. 8:15 μμον-μμοῦ μματ sim. Num. 20:5.
Num. 23:22 μμον-σιωμ 
γαρ ηπηκωβ οτάδε 
σεντεπ.

Deut. 32:28 μμον-πικτθεθη 
ληπητος.
Lev. 13:31 μμον-καί 
ανοταν μφηρη
Ex. 12:30 
πε 
μπεοσον-
ληπητος.
Special to μμον-, affirming Non-Existence and mostly Circumstancial, are the substantival Relative forms πετ- (Stative Converbs) and ἕν ετ- (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-άν ἑττάμον μἐθαρα ρος πε.
Lev. 25:26 εἰσιν δὲ εοτον-οταὶ μμον-πετὰνα Ἀρορ.
Lev. 26:17 ...μμον-πετᾶσσα καθὶ ἀπὸν 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 (οτοντε- / οτοντα-, 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 enfanning “whole” — predicative Personal-Sphere Constituence Association (§3.9), opposed to the unmarked οτοντα/=μμοντα= possessive verbs:

οτον-
κεταὶ εοτον-ωρασ θμοι Gen. 41:38, Ex. 4:13 etc.
Deut. 14:9:10 ...ετετουν-τεν τοι θμοει. sim. Lev. 11:9f.:12.
Deut. 1:15 γανρομι καθὲ εοτον-ἐπίστασθαι θμοει.
Deut. 29:18 ἡτὶ οτον-ντοτις καταθνοτ.
Lev. 22:21 οτον-ανιθ νςητοτ — contrast the non-grammaticalized preposition in Num. 5:2 οτον νιβεν ετετουν-ανιθ νσητ.

Lev. 11:21 ...ετετουν-χθαί θμοει.
Lev. 11:23 ...ετετουν-κτο μματ εραθο.
Gen. 6:17 καφζ νιβεν ετετουν-τπα κωνζ νςητα sim. Gen.
41:38 ορωμι καταρθελ ἐοτον-ουτπα ντεθελ νςητ.

μμον- is much rarer in this construction.
Deut. 32:20f. μμον-κατ θμοι ... μμον-ναζ τ θμοι.
See §3.9 for a discussion of Personal-Sphere Constituence 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 ὄτον- or μμὸν-, which would *prima facie* seem to conflict with the thematic status of the Existential Statement when it is followed by adverbial locutions 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 Existant, 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):

**ότον-**
Gen. 40:9:10 *νεότον-οὐμων Ναόλοι Χὴ μπάμβο πε.*
Gen. 31:14 *μὴτι ἂν οτόν-κετοι σῶμι Ναὸν ἐκ κεκαληπονομα.*

Ex. 10:7 *ότον-σπον νακωπι.*
Ex. 10:10 *ότον-οὐπητῳ σῶμι ἡ ἦσσωτεν.*

**μμον-**
Gen. 47:4 *μμον-μαμμον ῥαφ ὑοπ.*
Gen. 20:9 *οὐρωβ μμον-γλι νααικ.*
Lev. 25:31 *νὴ ετεμμον-κοβτ τακτιοιστ ἐρσώς.*
Gen. 41:54 *νεμμον-ῳκ ὕοπ πε σιμ. 47:13.*
Gen. 16:16 *ὑωπι μμον-ἀρικι σὶ ἐροκ σιμ. Num. 35:27.*
Gen. 23:6 *μμον-γλι μμον-ταγνο.*

Obs.

(1) Polotsky explicitly, even emphatically considered ὄτον-/μμον- to be predicative, even if not verbal: 1960 §33 “existence and non-existence are predicated by ὄτον ‘there is’ and (μ)μὸν ‘there is not’...the predicates of existence and non-existence”...§34 “That ὄτον and μμὸν 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 addude 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).

(3) On ὀν-νητ- cf. Quecke 1985:263f. Both Existence and Non-Existence with the Relative Existent have early pre-Coptic precursors. Cf. the generic Existent in LE mn-p3-nty- (by "morphologically definite", he must mean "formally"; not "subject", pace Vernus 1985:155), and Demotic mn-ln p3-nty-, familiar from gnomic didactic literature (P. Insinger) and well attested elsewhere (note the plural substantivized relative in mn-n3-nty-ph n-δ-τ "There are no things that reached...", Zauzich, Papyri aus Elephantine [1978] P.15519 line 9f.).

(4) ἡμον-περφ Job 2:3 is, I believe, a strong argument for the non-specificity of ἰωπ and πε,- (below, §3.5.3). De Vis 11 212 ἡμον εθε- is remarkable: a "that"-form Existent.


(5) ὀντ(α)q / ημοντ(α)q. The possession verboid locates existence or non-existence with the possessor, by means of the grammaticalized preposition ντε-/ντα-, neutralizing appurtenance, belonging and possession. The possessum is presented, not as Existent, 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 nominal (or Proper Name, which shares many nominal properties).

• Two prosodically different allomorphs are encountered:

A "full" form (ὄνον/ημοντα-, ονον/ημοντθ-) which is prosodically unmarked ("absolute"), occurring with indefinite and number-name possessa, introduced and marked as possessed object by n-;

A reduced marked form (ὄνον/ημοντ-, realized before the pronominal constituents as -τ-, -τε-, -τκ-, -τετθ-) that is prosodically linked to an immediately following possessum ("construct") — occurring with a zero-article possessum (including ναει ριβεν and "two", which are constructed as zero- with postpositive "β"), as well as with zero possessum.

For a nominal possessor, the pre-nominal form is ὀνοντε- (in which case, the "two" possessum is constructed as non-zero, introduced by n-).

Interestingly, we find in the corpus several instances of ὀνον-nte- and ημον-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 ημαρ 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 con-
struction, or following the verboids and preceding the verboid in the n-
mediated construction. It cannot be argued that *MMAW* is a discontinuous 
part of the existence component of *OVTAD*, 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 εὐθὺς δὲ εὐσκόπυρη πετούσα εὐοί νατιω-
τεμ ὁτος ἐπεκύρην (Greek ἐὰν δὲ τινὶ ἦ ὁτὸς ἀπειθής) — 
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 
*OVTAD* (not *MMONTAQ*) verboid is replaced by an allotactic con-
struction — 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 *OVTAD* 
here as an *outil grammatical*.

Gen. 39:4 ἔμμην εἴρεν εἰρένα.
Gen. 45:10 ΝΕΤΕΝΔΑΚ.
Gen. 46:32 ΝΗ ΕΤΕΝΤΩΝ.
Gen. 30:30 ΝΗ ΘΡΟΣ ΕΝΑΥΝΤΑΚ.
Deut. 19:15 ΤΕΚΘΕΡΙ ΒΕΤΕΝΤΑΚ.

Contrast Bohairic and Sahidic in cases such as

I John 4:16 ἡγοῦν εὐτεοκτακ-πνοιε ΝΙΗΤΗ “the love God has in 
us”, corresponding to Bohairic ἡγοῦν ΝΤΕΘΝ ΕΤΕΝΔΗΤΕΝ, illustrating 
the role of adnominal *NTE*-, further grammaticalized into a *nota relationis* in-
roducing the *possessor*.

Job 2:4 ΝΙΗ ΝΙΗ ΕΤΕΟΓΚΑΤΑΚ-ΜΠΡΩΜΕ has both pronominal and 
nominal possessors, the latter marked by the preposition ΝΗ-.

*NTE*- occurs also adnominally, following low- and high-specificity 
nuclei:

Deut. 15:7 ΟΤΙ ΝΤΕΝΕΚΒΑΚΙ.
Lev. 11:32 ΟΤΑΙ ΝΤΕΝΑΙ.
Gen. 43:34 ΝΙΤΟΙ ΘΡΟΣ ΝΤΩΣ “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 οὐρωνθή εκάση “I must needs speak”.
(2) Probable instances of zero possessum (cf. the zero Existant in Lev. 20:13:16:27).
Deut. 25:5 μμοντεq μματ (note the proclitic allomorph!)

Representative examples:
Num. 31:4 οτροντοτ-τεβνη μματ.
Gen. 44:20 answered by: οτρονταν νοτζελλα νιωτ μματ.
Deut. 3:19 οτροντωτεν μματ νοτμηπι ντεβνη.
Deut. 4:7 ...ετεοτονταq μματ νοτονοντνστ.
Deut. 4:8 ...ετεοτονταq ιγανμεαμη.
Ex. 33:12 οτροντακ νοτγομοτ ναγρα.
Ex. 32:24 ηνμ ετεοτοντεq-νοτβ μματ.
Gen. 19:12 οτροντακ νοτζαι μπαιμα.
Ex. 2:16 οεοτονταq ν-ζ νουερι μματ.
Gen. 33:11 οτρον↑-νξαι νιβεν.
Num. 27:8 cir. μμοντεq-ωπρι ινωοτ μματ.
Deut. 25:5 μμοντεq-ζρος μματ.
Num. 5:8 ευωπ δε μμοντε-πιρωμι ιναζηκητ μματ εωτε ε↑ is remarkable, for the rare compatibility of ι- with zero determination of the possessum, and the apparently different syntax of the nominal possessor.

Difficult is
Gen. 33:9 οτρον↑-οτμηπι μματ - a rare case of non-zero determination with the proclitic allomorph (but οτμηπι “much, a lot” may not really be a case of non-zero, bare or zero ινωοτ not being admissible).

(c) Presentative clauses introduced by (κατηε) ιε 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 ἔγνησε ἵππον.  
Gen. 30:3 ἐγνησε ἵππον βαλλα.  
Gen. 31:48 ἔγνησε ἵππον παίρει ταίταν ἔννομ ταίτυλαν.  
When the Presentative presents a clause Theme, the latter is specific:  
Gen. 16:6 ἵππον βαλλα ἴν ἰνέκεια.  
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 definiteness 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  
Num. 13:18:20  
--- the indefinite determinator does not determine αὐτό, but [αὐτό] 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 {πι-} - determined Rhemes, while demonstratives are relatively common (even the unusual non-phoric {πι-} is here better
attested than \{πι-\}). In fact, the phoric \{πε\} has a textural representing specificity that is higher than the deictic one. This imbalance, which is so essential for the nexal dependence 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 \{ἀνοκ\-\} 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 \(n\- + zero\)/indefinite; \(e\- + indefinite: Here the generic zero is opposed to the equally non-specific and generic (non-particular, albeit quantified: see below) \(ο\-\), the instantial metaphor of genericity, 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 ἄρσογ νήρπ.

Ex. 7:1 εὴππε αἰθικ ννοσφ ἑφαρα ντογ αἰρων πεκ-γον εψεψωτι νακ ντοπροφητνς (Vai μπροφητνς).

Gen. 14:14 ἀελλωτ πεκγον ναίκμαλωτος — note here the striking “adverbial Rheme” role.

Deut. 26:19 μφρητ ταπακικ νονομαςτος.

Num. 22:18 ...ιαικ νκοσζι ιε νιωτι.

Ex. 6:5 Φη ετενιρεγκνχι ιρι μμωσ μβωκ νζεντζ.

as against

Deut. 28:9 εχετοσνοκ ναγ νοσλαςο εχοτσαβ.

Lev. 19:32 τωνκ δαξων νοσεμένχιμ.

Gen. 22:2 ανιτη νηι μματ νοσζιλα.

Gen. 23:9 μαετιθιη νηι νοσζζφο.

Ex. 29:2 εκεθακιωτ νωσ νοσζεμεδαιλιον — οτ- 100 marks the noun as non-adverbial, but predicative and actantial.
Gen. 22:13 ἀφενη ἐφρήνι νοσελαος.
Gen. 28:22 παίωνι εταῖταροφ ἐπατη νοσεκταν.
Gen. 44:33 ἁνοογι ἄροκ νοσελαος.
Deut. 22:21 ἐερηνι ἑπεικιιτ νοτηι μπορηή.

But most often, and typically, in the case of lexically thematic verbs, like οἱ and ὑμι. 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 ης=

Lev. 26:12 εἰςεμωνι νωτεν ννοοτον οτογ ... ἑρετενεμωνι

ηηιη νοσελαος.

Ex. 7:1 ἤτηποι αἰειθικ ννοοτον μεταραφ οτογ ἄροφ νεοφεμωπι

νακ ηνοποφιητης (Vat μπροφιντης).
Deut. 29:12 εἰςεμητη ναοι νοσελαος οτογ νεοφ εκεμωνι

νακ ηνοοτον.

— νοοτον in these passages is hardly generic, nor can it be instantial:

Gen. 17:7 εορισεμοι νακ ηνοοτον.
Deut. 26:18 ... μωνι ναοι νοσελαος εφονε νοσελαος sim. 7:6, 14:2.
26:19 Deut.

Gen. 44:10 ... μωνι νηι νοσελαος.
Lev. 16:29 ερεξει αμωνι νωτεν νοονιμον νενεπ (the modal alterant of ibid. 34 ἀηι οονιμον νενεπ νωτεν νε).
Ex. 30:32 εκεμωνι νωτεν νοοτοτοβο.
Ex. 14:22 ναρε-τιμωτον οι νοονοτοτε καιτιναμ νεμ κα-

αςηή μμως.

Gen. 29:24 αλαγαν δετ νηζεξπτα τερηβκι ναλι εναιβκι

ηηα.

The distinctive role of ε- (always with οο- or γαν-), while well established historically, is elusive. For one thing, the verb lexeme repertoary is here more restricted than in the case of ν-; plural cases are truly quantifying; the nominal Rheme is often expanded and qualified; narrative, actual-history and prospective (promised) sequences and scenarios are typical; ενοφ-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-

οφ-. 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 αμωνι ναο ενεφτιμι.
Gen. 34:9 στιτν ννετενωφηπι εξαντιμι.
Gen. 34:4 ὃι Ναυλατον οἱ εὐσχεμι.  
Deut. 21:11 ἔτσικτε Ναχ εὐσχεμι.  
Gen. 38:14 μπετθίκα Ναχ εὐσχεμι sim. (affirmative) Gen. 16:3.  
Gen. 28:9 χριστα πειθελε εὐσχεμι (contrasted with non-narrative, non-factive Deut. 24:4 εὐσχι Ναχ νεχεμι, corresponding in both instances to the Greek γυναῖκα).

Gen. 22:3 αὐτὰρνιροξ εὐσχεμι.  
Other narrative or scenario cases: Gen. 20:12, 29:24, 38:14 (neg.), Deut. 21:11, 25:5.

Gen. 24:60 ζωπτι εὐανωβα.  
Gen. 28:3 ὑστημπι εὐανωστυτ νεχνοκ.  
Ex. 22:30 ἐρετεμεντυπι νην εὐανρωμι εὐτυβ.  
Gen. 28:22 ... ἐστιν ε[νί Μπνοσ †] - a remarkably specific (even particular?) instance.

Gen. 17:6 ἀνακαλ εἵνωτ νοτμηω νεχνοκ ... εἰεκακ εὐανω-

Gen. 9:3 ἔστεμπι νωτεν εὐσχεμι.  
Gen. 9:13 ἐστεμπι εὑρχει.  
Ex. 12:14 ἐστεμπι νοτετγεμε.  
Gen. 21:30 ἔνυα ντοτσομπι νην εὐμεθεμοπε σιμ. Gen.  
31:44.

Also Gen. 12:2, 21:13, 46:3, 47:4, Ex. 32:10.

Obs.
(1) In Gen. 34:22 εὐστε εὐστι νοταλλοκ νοτωτ “a single people” we are, I believe, still in the generic range: οὐ- νοτωτ is not necessarily more concrete than the “exemplary” οὐ-. See also Gen. 11:1.
(2) In Deut. 21:15 ἐστεμπινιομι εὐρτ ὑστι νοτρωμι we have a nice instance of a ο- homonym: this is the possessive ὑστι ο-/νας.
(3) Mt. 5:37 ἀπεπεπετεναι αἐτ οὐταμ ήμων ήμων 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 -οι combines in the Present tense with ο- 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 οὔ- is extremely uncommon:

Ex. 19:16 Νακοι Νοτητινντ Ωενεκεν.  
Gen. 11:1 οι νοτυχοτοτ νοτώτ νεμ οτυμη νοτώτ — not the indefinite article.
However, the non-durative or unmarked alternant of -οι ν-, namely εηρ-, does combine frequently with concretizing / individualizing ου- and γαν-: a non-specific, quantified, particular Rheme:

Ex. 7:12 αηερ-γαναρακων.
— ουαρακων Ex. 7:9:10.
— ουγον Ex. 7:15.
εηρ-ουλοοε Deut. 4:20.
Or with an anaphoric "substitute" ου- ("one"):
Gen. 15:1 πεκβε Xml εηεηρ-ουνιωιν.
(3) The unique Gen. 5:2 ηαηακιοοτ οηγοοο νεμ οηεζιιιιι (= Vat) has a rhematic "Third Actant" in an instantal generic determination and no segmental mark of rhematicity.

(e) Theme determination following ναε-. While the actant-Theme slot following the Conjugation Bases allows for maximal determination, ναε- introducing the postpositive Theme coreferent with the grammemic 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 ηεηεροοοτ ητηνοη ηεζιιιιιι ηιωηηη.
Deut. 3:3 ιατεζηετε ηαοζ ιηαη ιεηη.

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 signifiant 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 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 “Artikellosigkeit”, “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 \( ωτ\) als “Nulltempus” oder “zero-conjugated verb” bezeichnen wollte”. Now the “bareness” of \( ωτ\) in nexus — or better as governed by the conjugation bases - is indeed very different from the absence of an article in a paradigm with πτ and ωτ-., 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., YOTSUURA 1970:68 (English), GUILLAUME 1919; ANSCOMBRE 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 ‘SNØ’): is structurally unclear and under-resolved.

(3) BORGHTOUTS 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 \textbf{ΜΗΟΝ-ΚΕΟΤΑΙ}.

Num. 32:4 \textbf{ΟΡΟΝΤΟΤ-ΤΕΒΝΗ ΜΜΑΤ}.

Deut. 24:20 \textbf{ϹΕϹ-ϹΩΙΤ}: 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 άξε-μήμμι: not compound?
Deut. 11:11 εγε-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 ἁσερζελύω: ερ- auxiliary verb (Chapter Two)17.
Ex. 16:20 ἁσερβεντ.
Deut. 10:6 ἁσεροστηβ.
Ex. 4:27 αὐτῆς ερωθ.
Deut. 32:6 οὐλαος νοῦς οὐρ ναβε αν.
Deut. 2:28 εκετιφε/μωσ ηνι εβολ ζαγατ.
Deut. 19:3 μα μηωτ.
Num. 5:20 ουγκίμη ζαγατ.
Num. 1:44 ουρωμι καταφίλη.
Num. 14:18 ποει μιρως νην θανινίωτ ηναι ...
Num. 12:7 πνο ουβερο.
Ex. 19:13 ηνεξία σι νεμα.
Num. 31:18 μποστοσενταπι μωσοτ.

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 ἄτζη ηνην εαμον (= Vat).
Num. 7:71 ε ν-γιεβι εαμοστρομπι (Vat ιασ-).18
Gen. 6:17 καρζ ηνην ετεοτον-πην ηνουδον ανηπ.
Gen. 31:10 δαζ πεκρομε ετνοεζ.
Gen. 43:31f. (κακικ εισφι) ἄτζην ιαρον μματατη ονηον ἄτζην ιαρωσ ηματατον ἄτζην ιαρωσ ηνιηεμηκια ηματατον.
Ex. 15:22 λατζεμμωσ ην πε εκω.
Deut. 9:9:18 οικ μποστωμ μωοτ μπιοω.
NB: Ex. 12:16 γωβ ηνην ... ηνετενατοσ: not zero determined: “all works”, with ηνην determinator, not quantifier.
NB: Num. 8:26 γωβ ηνεεεργωβ — a nice illustration of the difference between the ερ- homonyms: here we apparently have the derived ερωσ “work”, not the compound ερωβ “do a job”.

phy”. Some cases in English of word-formational nil determination rather than zero in composition: talk shop — hair-raising — sand-piper — turn-coat.

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 ως-, to {πι-} and{π-}, 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-referentiality
19, non-particularity (genericity) — this is in fact the only determinator to express genericity as a primary seme
20, 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 {π-}, 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 γαν-, as in the case of the Existant, zero signifies extensional genericity; similarly in a ternary opposition, with {πι-} and ως-/γαν- (e.g. as object actant); in opposition to {π-} in naming, as a notion (genus) name (see below, dis-
cussing generics); again in opposition to ως-/γαν-, in rhematic 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 {π-} 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 ἄνεγώμεν or τρεγὼμεν or ἄτεγώμεν with the infinitive in ἔγώμεν; 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 ὅσιγον τὸ μὴν, Ex. 4:8 πιμήνιν μμαγ-β, Ex. 10:22 ὁ ὅ τε φαινον, Gen. 32:14± ὁ μακάνθι το αρφίτο ὅ λοτος τὸ κανόνον... 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 ὅ- {+ no article} their outil grammatical, apparently do not count as true zero article: Gen. 26:14 ὅσιγον νιέψομεν (ibid. ἄντεβνομεν νιέψομεν is difficult), Gen. 42:2, 43:2:4 ὅγκοτονι αὐρήσον, Gen. 32:14 κακάμαται. 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 ὅσιπον υμῖς ῥετ, that is, ῥετ ὅσιπον υμῖς ῥετ. On the other hand, following the in initioc ompositi ("paricipial") pre-object verb-lexeme (as in Deut. 23:25 ἄγ κοτο, Gen. 46:32 ἄρχανεγ-κεφνην, Ex. 14:9 ἁκι-θεο, Ex. 30:25 Φασ-κοδε), where determination commutation is not attested in the corpus, the situation is not entirely clear. Sahidic construc-
tions such as the Shenoutean "GEN-MAI-PENMTON MATAAN" may indicate elsewhere a zero article following the i.i.c. component (the specificity of πεφ- is occasionally low; see below); this is probably supported by such compounds as


— all with a medial conditioned grammeme selected (conditioned) by the initial lexeme; not so in the case of

ΩΤΕ-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-ΣΕΛΛΟ Gen. 21:2, ΜΕΤ-ΜΕΒΡΕ 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 lexeme21 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: TOΣΙ, ΜΕΡΙ, ΡΟΒΙ.

3) No determination commutation before certain pronominal grammemes, in any environment: ΟΤΩΝ, ΝΘΟΩ, 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 ΝΙΜ or ΟΤΗΡ 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) Ï²α- "one/he of-"\(^{22}\), preceding the determinator slot, is by that
token not a determinator, but inert or indifferent to determination (the
same applies to {Ï²ως}) and even, in certain environments, to περι-
(which, however, gets its specifying effect from its contact with the
lexeme).

(6) Ï²Η ετ-, the formal nucleus of substantivized Relatives is indif-
ferent to determination: see below.

Obs.
(1) γαι and οτ 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
(2) The Focalizing Present αερπατω (John 19:24 B4 ) proves that {Ï²α-} — not as-
pirated here! — is not a determinator (it is compatible with most determinators: see be-
low).
(3) The Non-Existant following μμων-, 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-μμων- 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 fre-
quently cataphoric) and is always to some extent quantified — in all
these respects unlike zero. Both are non-specific, but their main associa-
tion is in that the indefinite is the next grade on the individualizing or
concretizing scale, after and above the zero — which makes for a fre-
quen rhetorical figure of various contextual contrast:

Deut. 8:8 οτικαπε γνησοτον εμι ευτ γανιαγαλολι γανβω γα-
νερμαν.

Gen. 44:19f. άν-αντατετε-ιωτ ηματ ιε ιον, answered
ατονταν οτικαπε οιωτ ηματ ημεταιλοτ...

Ex. 12:15 οσεμ-ατσεμορ ⇒ τακε-οσεμορ.

Ex. 19:13 Ξεγανωνι...κενακε-ωνι and similar phrases.

Moreover, zero Non-Existant (μμων- + zero) contrasts neatly with
indefinite Existant (οτικα- + οτ-/γαν- , e.g. Lev. 13:21:30:31).

Deut. 22:5 ηνε-κκεσοε νγωντοι υοπι αιοτεσιμι (= Vat) —
observed the zero / indefinite alternation.

In Lev. 26:12 ειεσωπι νωτεν ννοτι οτογ... επεσαι-
ωπι ννι νσαλαον, the opposition is motivated by the thematic

\(^{22}\) And not the specific "he of", as translated in SHISHA-HALEVY 1985.

(f) Special affinity of zero with negative environment\textsuperscript{23}. In actantial, existential and possession status in negative nexus, zero as expressing the "nulligeneric" seems to exclude the indefinite (not the definite!) altogether: negativity and indefiniteness are incompatible:

\begin{verbatim}
Deut. 15:11 ΝΝΕΡΧΗΚΙ ΓΑΡ ΜΟΤΝΚ ...
Deut. 18:1 ΝΝΕΤΟΙ ΒΩΠΙ ...
Num. 21:5 ΜΜΟΝ-ΒΙΚ ΟΤΑΕ ΜΒΩΤ.
Gen. 38:21 ΜΜΟΝ-ΠΟΡΝΗ ΜΠΑΙΜΑ.
Deut. 12:13 ΜΜΟΝΤΕΨΤΟΙ ΟΤΑΕ ΚΑΗΡΟΣ.
\end{verbatim}

A case like Deut. 25:13f ΝΝΕ-ΟΤΩΙ ΝΕΜ ΟΤΩΙ ΒΩΠΙ ΔΑΚ (= Vat) with the [ος- νεμ ος-] constituent unity bracketed by ΝΝΕ- apparently does not constitute an exception: ος- here is not an indefinite article, but ος- νεμ ος- a discontinuous correlative phrase meaning something like "one... another... [on different occasions]."

(g) 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: 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 zero and indefinite determination stand in a fine opposition, as specified above.

(h) Zero article in coordination: bracketing

In noun-syntagm coordination, primarily a case of determinator connection, the lexemes "make themselves felt", that is, interfere in the grammemic mechanism, more than in any other construction (note again the effect of the resemblance of zero and nil). The existence, in Coptic as in pre-Coptic Egyptian\textsuperscript{24}, of special connectors for zero-determinated coordinates, has in our Bohairic a special significance, for, while νεμ is

\textsuperscript{23} Indeed, 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).

\textsuperscript{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{gi}".
the normal coordinator for this determination, γι is also used (alongside
νεμ) as a closer link — almost as of a coordinative compound — in the
phrases “(flowing/oozing with [ν-]) milk-and-honey” and (much more
rarerly) “(full of) silver-and-gold”:

ερωτι νεμ εβιω Ex. 3:8, Num. 14:8 (Vat γι).
Deut. 27:3 ερωτι εβιω (Vat + [εβολ] γι).
ωοτο ερωτι εβολ γιεβιω Deut. 26:15, 31:20.

Here γι-, which is in Sahidic the normal inter-zero connector, is re-
stricted to a few closely-knit phrases, bracketed by ν-; however, it is not
the bracketing that is accountable for γι-: witness Gen. 45:8 οτ[ιωτ
νεμ θε] or Deut. 8:8 οσκαγι νονο νεμ ιωτ γανιαγαλοι
gαιο εγαρμαν.

Other groups are as a rule coordinated with νεμ, which is in
Bohairic considerably more extended in function:

Deut. 14:15 ειοια νεμ σαγι νεμ ωοτι.
Deut. 10:18 ιωκ νεμ εβοσ.
Ex. 4:11 εβο νεμ κοτρ πεοναε εβολ νεμ δελαε.
Lev. 26:1 ννετενεαμιο νωτεν νγαμοτιν κανια οταε
Φωτι.

Ex. 36:6 πωμι νεμ σεμι — in Topic.
Ex. 35:31 οτια νκατι νεμ κοφι.
Deut. 26:19 μερητι οτακικ νονομακτοε νεμ ωοτουο
νεμ ωοτ.

πεαμιοκ νγωοτ νεμ σεμι Gen. 1:27, 5:2.
Deut. 11:11 οσκαγι ντωοτ νε νεμ μεςοωτ (Vat οτισμες-
ωοτ)

Gen. 37:25 οτ τι νεοηννογι νεμ κοντι νεμ ετακτη.
Disjunctors occur in commutation with νεμ:
Deut. 12:13 ομονειτοι οταε καηροε.
Num. 22:18 εαιε νκονκι ει ιωτι.
Num. 20:5 οοον-κεντε νιεητγ οταε καλοι οταε ερμαν
οταε κεοο-κωο εεω.

Lev. 12:7 ΦΗ εοηαμινε ιτε γωοτ ιτε σεμι.

Gen. 1:6 ...ντεεισει εεελέρε εβολ οττε μωον νεμ
οφωοοτ (Vat; Greek ανα μεσον ιδατος και ιδατος) — we would
expect here an indefinite after οττε, unless the asymmetry is based on
a distinctive interpretation of this locus.
3.4 The indefinite articles. Particular vs. non-particular indefiniteness. \textit{οὐδὲν}, \textit{οὐδὲν} and \textit{γα}. 

(a) The indefinite articles or determinators, \textit{οὐς}- and \textit{γαν}-, 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 isinstantial and metaphoric (“an instance of” = “any conceivable individual case of”). The said individualization subsumes and is informed by a basic quantification and it is probable that \textit{οὐς}- and \textit{γαν}- are operative as homonyms in two distinct paradigms, one determining, the other quantifying. In the singular, gender differentiation (that is, \textit{οὐς}_masc- and \textit{οὐς}_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 εἴπησεν ἀνὸς ἀναστήσεται εἰρήνη εἰς ἔκκλησι... οὐδὲν νοταῖον.

Ex. 9:18 εἴπησεν ἀνὸς ἀναστήσεται εἰρήνη εἰς ἔκκλησι οὐδὲν μὴν ἐπιταγεῖ

Perhaps also:

Deut. 17:8 οὐκ ἐστὶν ὁ ὄνομα, ὁ ὄγκος ἐστὶν ὁ ὄγκος.

Deut. 17:11 εἰσίν τινι (i.e. εἰσίν σωματικῶν;?) οὐκ ἐστίν ἑαυτός.

Ex. 21:24f. ὅταν ἐπάλληλα ἐπιλέξει ἐπιλέξει ἐπιλέξει ἐπιλέξει ἑαυτός ἑαυτός ἑαυτός.

and, I believe, the rhematic slots following \textit{n-} and \textit{e-}, discussed above (statistically certainly most numerous), even with the Rheme specified and concretized:

Gen. 9:3 ἐπένεκαν ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς ἐπένεκαν.
Gen. 9:20 εὐρωτὶ οὐνρωτὶ οὐτωί.
Gen. 12:19 αἰολὸς νήλ ἐτρεῖμι.
Ex. 14:22 ἡπε-πιμωτ οἱ οὐντοῦτοι κατιναν ςι με-κα-
δαφει μμωτ.

Noteworthy is the unique
Gen. 5:2 ἀπαμινσσ νιγκινιτ οὐντοῦτ οὐτεξιμ (consensus),
where the absence of segmental rhematicy 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 instantial 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 οὖπὰλα ἄτεφτ.
Gen. 32:30 αἱνατ Ὠᾳ εοὺνορτ νγο οὐπεγο.
Num. 5:20 ὦτεξιμ μᾶλα.

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-
tous:
Ex. 3:22 ἀλλα εἰςεπετιν ξα-οτεξιμ ιντοτε ντεοῦεπε
ςι τέκυφερι νγακκτεςι νγατ ςι μεγαςνςβ, sim. Ex. 11:2.
Ex. 4:25 ετσεύει δε ςα-τεπιφρα νοῦαλ...

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
(στ-ιαλ 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 ιι-) but as pro-form, substitute or representant, represent-
ing descriptively a preceding indefinite syntagm:
Ex. 3:22 ἀλλα εἰςεπετιν ξα-οτεξιμ ιντοτε ντεοῦεπε
ςι τέκυφερι νγακκτεςι νγατ ςι μεγας νςςβ.
Deut. 28:36 γανκενορτ γανε ςι γανωνι.
(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 Ὺοη-ΔΑΝ-. 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"), ΓΩΝ- "she with/characterized by [a] face of..." (and ΠΙΓΟ Ν-: "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 ἄνοκ γὰρ ἄνοκ-οτατεβαζι.
Num. 13:18 ...ιε ἄν-οτακαβε ιε ιε ἄν-οταιντιντι ιε.
Gen. 29:31 παχελα δε ΝΟΟΜ ΝΕΟΤΑΣΡΗΝ ιε.

(g) The indefinite article covers the entire lowest-specificity range and is grammatically indispensable also with abstract lexemes after the preposition ΣΕΝ-, and for all lexemes in some constructions. In these cases, its semantic opposition to zero is of course neutralized:

Ex. 4:18 μαχελακ ΣΕΝΟΤΩΤΑΙ.
Ex. 12:9 ευφοει ΣΕΝΟΤΜΟΤ.
Ex. 7:11 ΣΕΝΟΤΜΕΤΦΑΡΜΑΚΟΣ.
Ex. 15:21 ΣΕΝΟΤΜΟΤ ΓΑΡ ΑΧΙΩΤΟ.
Ex. 13:19 ΣΕΝΟΤΩΝΙ ΠΟΕ ΝΑΒΙΝΙ — the Tautological-Infinitive construction (Chapter Two).

Deut. 12:6 ΜΦΡΗΤ ΝΟΤΜΟΤ.
Ex. 16:14 ΜΦΡΗΤ ΝΟΤΙΩΤ.
Ex. 3:22 αλλα εεεεεετειν ΝΕΟΤΑΣΡΙΝ...
(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 αὐτῶν ὄστρωμὶ ἐν νεμβρεσί ἐστὶν οὐβενοτέρνον (Vat ρωμὶ). (ὄστρωμὶ ἐν (“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 νεγαναθρην κατὰ σεντεκνηξὶ (= Vat). Not commonly, ὁ- acts as quantifier (“one”):

**Deut. 1:23 ἐν ὄστρωμὶ ὄστρωμὶ κατάφθαν.**

**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 Wenamün 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 ὅμοιος (ονόμα) and ὅνομα (γόνιμο). But in the third part of his essay, discussing τειμίνη n- 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 definites is not ad-hoc but structurally unavoidable, as is implied in the Bohairic τι- ότοι n-: Num. 14:18 παντι-ζεντις ότοι νομος; Deut. 8:9 ἡμετηρι pred. of NS (Greek στιγμος) (Vat GABANENI).
(7) Polotsky 1989:468ff. (and 1991) suggests a "shift of subst. to adjectival meaning" in the non-specific (indefinite) rhematic noun. This is begging the question. In fact, he conceives of the "definite adjectivals" πνευμ (ουκ) or ἀκο (κε) as derived from a deep-structure nexal ὅσο-... πε, ἀκον... κε by conjoint transposition and condensation. I believe the partitive or associative relation is here perfectly applicable: as in τι{σωμ ον-}, τι{γον-} so too in the case of πνεω. This relationship is thus distinct from that of {φα-}, pace Polotsky 1989:471ff.

(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 extrapolated 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 ὁταυ εντοπιον ὁτομη μπεινη νακ - a case of "not even" focalization.

Ex. 12:46 ὁτκας νητενκαωμε έβολ μμομ — a case of "not even" focalization.

Ex. 15:2 ὁταμονοεσ νεμ ὁτρεμπλεμε έβολ έμωι αρκωμι νηι.

Differently prominent, and equally non-thematic, are the initial nouns in:
Lev. 10:9 οὐθρπ ομοτοσκικα ημετενκωστ.
Deut. 8:13 οὐγατ ημοτοσοτμ ασώμαται ηακ.
Different still is
Ex. 15:4 γαςωτμ ναμαβαθμ ντρικταθμ αςοκακιοτ ηεν-
Φιομ.
Deut. 1:28 αλλα ηεμ γακενμημι νακωπ ανματ ερμωτ
(ηεμ focussing “even”).

Obs.
Topicality and high or higher specificity are two aspects of one and the same phenomenon. 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,” construction (see Westendorf 1953, Junde 1978 [1979], Doret 1980) and the “s3j ‘fhnt” construction, with an inalienable possessed Theme following the extraposed possessor; the Topic placement here is conditioned.

**Actantial and non-actantial apposition to specific nucleus; nucleus to specific apposition:**
Ex. 15:14 οσωτεμ ηε-γαγενοκ.
Ex. 14:20 οτομ αγηωπι ηε-οτροφομοσ ηεμοτακαι —
note the coordinated phrase appositively to a singular agent pronoun.
Gen. 33:18 καλμ οτβακι.
Num. 32:36 αμπαμ ηεμ βεαμαπ εαπολοικ.
Gen. 39:1 πετεφρ οτρωμη ηεμεμπομι.

**Distributive-quantifier reiteration:**
οτρεμμιον οτρεμμη ε/ημηηιν Num. 29:10:15.

**Excurs: οταλι, οτον, ηαλ**
(a) οταλι. The indefinite article’s synchronic-systemic relation to a prosodic allomorph οταλι / οτι (in Bohairic, obtaining only for the singular) sets it apart from the definite determinant. οταλι/οτι, the full prosodic alterant, is compatible with πι- or zero determinators (and by this token lexemic rather than grammemic — or at least not fully grammemic) and has several clear-cut grammatical roles and several structural entities; unless anaphoric (i.e. syntagmatically grammemic), it refers to animates only. Note that οταλι, οτι is not compatible with ηιβεν (οτον replaces οταλι in this slot: see below):

(1) οταλι ηι- /ντε- (either πι- or zero determinated) is junctorially and functionally opposed in-paradigm to οτι; οταλι ηιμο of is its pro-
nominal form. Unlike ὀτόν (below), the environment of ὀταί is primarily affirmative:

“One/first of two”:

Ex. 37:8 ὀταί νερότοιμ εἰς ἐννευτόταί νάλκες ντεπιλα-
stηριον ὦτος πικετσαί νερότοιμ εἰς ἐννευτόταί μμαγ-β
ntεπιλαστήριον.

Deut. 21:15 (εἰςι μνεώνν τοῦ μήνων εἰμηέ μμομοὶ τοῦ
μήνων εἴμοιτό μμοός).

“One” (number):

Lev. 23:28 ζ Νηήθ Νατασί...οταί μμας.
Deut. 12:14, 17:2 χενοτάι Νεκβάκι (for οταί Ντενεκβάκι
Deut. 15:7 see below, 3.9 [f]).

(2) ὀταί formal nucleus, whether anaphoric or not:

Lev. 27:11 οτεβνην εὐφαξέμ...οταί εβωλ δενήν ετε
τεύξε αν εϊνε εβωλ Νήντος.

Lev. 27:33 οταί ενάνετε δανταί εὐγωτο.
Lev. 5:22 οταί εβωλ δενοσβ νιβέ.
Lev. 21:14 οτεκρα νέμο τού εὐγωτι εβωλ νέμο τού εκ
εαοι.

(3) Human indefinite or generic pronoun: “one”, in actancial status:

Lev. 15:24 εὐσαν ᾧσανοτάι κκότο γεμάτ.
Deut. 22:28 εὐσαν ᾧσανοτάι δίμη νοτάλοτ.
Deut. 24:5 εὐσαν ᾧσανοτάι δί νοτάυμι...
Deut. 21:22 εὐσαν ᾧσανοτονοβι ρμπι δενοτάι.

For the plural of ὀταί, χανωτόν, morphologically the indefinite plural of ὀτόν as a lexeme, stands structurally as the pro-enclitic alternant of χαν—; χανωτόν too is often anaphoric, by dint of χαν—.

Gen. 30:39 χανωτόν ετοί νεοίετοι νοτωβυ νεμ χαν
οταί Νκέρμι.

(4) Correlative ὀταί...ὀταί (“one...another”) configuration (al
ways anaphoric)\

Ex. 28:7 ὀταί ὀτεβ ὀταί.
Ex. 21:12 ᾧσανοταί τού νοτωβυ νοταί.

(5) πισταί πισταί and ϕοταί ϕοταί. The difference in form of
these very common phrases, often combined, for the adverbial-distribu-
tive “each”, less usually “one by one” (not really concurring with
ὀτόν νιβέν; both forms are resumed by the singular), is frankly baf-

26 AM II 165 εβωλ δενοτάι ετάι...εβωλ δενοσβάκι εβάκι is remark-
able in the zero determination of the second term of the correlation.
fling: the functional difference between πισταί and φυλαί escapes me. While it is on the whole clear that πισταί is anaphoric and specific, and πισταί πισταί usually opens the sequence that is carried on appositively and adverbially by φυλαί φυλαί (as in Ex. 12:3f., Num. 16:17f. and often), φυλαί φυλαί, non-specific, non-phoric, often following in status adverbiai 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 α πισταί πισταί εσκι ναχ...
Ex. 12:3f. μαρεπισταί πισταί σ' ι ναχ νονεκωντ... εψεσι
...φυλαί φυλαί μπερμψι.
Ex. 12:22 ννετενε υβολ φυλαί φυλαί μπρο ντεπεψι.
Ex. 32:29 απετεναψκ ννετενζακ... φυλαί φυλαί σεν-
πεψυψχπι νεμ πεψκον.
Num. 2:34 χαροψτετεβ μπισταί πισταί.
Consider also the following adverbial (or predicative, or appositive) instances:

πισταί πισταί Num. 4:19, 6:54, 7:5, 33:54, etc.
πι... πισταί Num. 29:9.
eφυλαί Ex. 16:22 (but: εφοτα Εx. 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, γανοτόν, the plural correspondent of οταί, and is famously compatible with νιβέν — a syntagm more important in Sahidic27, with zero and (in Bohairic, outside the corpus) ni(κε)- and nai-. οτόν alone has zero-determination status. Like οταί, οτόν, much more important, refers to animates (incl. human and animal; etymologically, probably a participle of wn(n) “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-Άεμήπ Μμου, Deut. 33:26 Μμον-οτόν Μφρτ Μφ†). The singular does not enter partitive constructions as οταί does.

Zero-determined singular οτόν, like a lexeme, favours, and indeed is practically conditioned by, negative environment, as an alternant to affirmative οταί:

27 οτόν νιβέν is in the corpus expanded by the Relative, νιβέν being the determinator, not quantifier.
**THE NOUN SYNTAGM AND THE DETERMINATION SYNDROME**

**NNEOTON εἰςαε vs. ερων-οταν εἰςαε** Deut. 15:4:7.
Ex. 13:7 NNEQOTONGQ NAK EBOL NΔE-ΟΤΟΝ ΕΟΤΟΝ-ΣΕΜΗΡ ΜΜΟQ.
Ex. 23:26 NNEOTON ENQNAMICI AN ΟΤΑΝ ΔΕΡΠΗΝ ΨΩΠΙ.
Deut. 23:17 ΝΝΕΟΡΝΗ vs. ΟΤΟΝ ΕΕΡΡΝΟΡΝΕΝΙΝ ΨΨΠΙ —
ΟΤΟΝ supplying here a masculine term.
**NNEOTON-** also Ex. 10:14, 11:6, 23:26, Num. 8:19, 17:5, 18:5.
Ex. 10:6 ΜΠΙΝΑΝ ΕΟΤΟΝ ΜΠΕΨΡΗΥ, cf. also Gen. 41:19.
Non-animates are rare: (“any”, always anaphoric, almost only in
negative environment):
Ex. 9:24 ΜΠΕΟΤΟΝ ΨΨΠΙ ΜΠΕΨΡΗΥ (i.e. hail)
Ex. 13:7 NNEQOTONGQ NAK EBOL ΝΔΕ-ΟΤΟΝ (scilicet “food”)
ΕΟΤΟΝΣΕΜΗΡ ΜΜΟQ.
Non-negative occurrences are very rare, and as a rule correlative (be-
side the ubiquitous ΟΤΟΝ ΝΙΒΕΝ):
ΟΤΟΝ ΚΑ-ΟΤΟΝ “one after the other” Ex. 10:1 (Greek ἑξῆς), Deut.
2:34.
Ex. 35:5 ΜΑΡΕΟΤΟΝ ΣΙ ΝΤΕΝΟΤΟΝ ΜΜΩΤΕΝ.

The plural ΓΑΝΟΤΟΝ is very different, and its syntax closer to that of
ΟΤΑΝ (above). Semantically, it is not restricted to animates, and often
lexically fuzzy (even absent in the original):
Gen. 30:39: (anaphoric) ΓΑΝΟΤΟΝ ΕΤΟΙ ΝΘΟΙΘΟΙ ΝΕΜ ΓΑΝ-
ΛΟΤΙΑΟΤΑΝ ΝΙΜ ΓΑΝ-ΛΟΤΑΝ ΝΚΕΡΜΙ.
Ex. 16:20 ΔΙΚΩΠ ΝΓΑΝΟΤΟΝ ΕΒΟΛ ΜΜΟQ sim. 19:22, 29:34.
Ex. 16:27 ΓΑΝΟΤΟΝ ΣΕΝΠΙΑΣΩ.
Ex. 29:34 ΨΨΠΙ ΔΕ ΔΡΕΨΑΝ-ΓΑΝΟΤΟΝ ΜΔΩΠ ΕΒΟΛ ΣΕΝ-
ΝΙΑΥ.

ΓΑΝΟΤΟΝ corresponds in Bohairic to Sah. (etc.) ΖΟΙΝΕ, not attested
in Boh. but presupposed by ΓΑΝ-.

Obs.
(1) ΟΤΑΝ in negative environment means “not (even) a single one”: ΜΠΕΟΤΑΝ ΜΜΑ-
ΤΡΥ ΜΔΩΠ Ex. 8:27, 14:28, 24:11.
(2) Phraseological ΝΙΩΤΟΝ ΜΠΑΙΡΗΥ Luke 18:16, Cat. 7 ΝΑΙΟΤΟΝ ΜΠΑΙΡΗΥ Cat.
58; 1 Cor. 16:18, Cat. 189: see Crum. Dictionary, 482a.

(c) ΓΑΙ, corresponding in many ways to Sahidic ΛΑΛΑΣ, is usually in-
animate in reference (thus sometimes contrasted with ΟΤΑΝ for ani-
mates. In fact, non-anaphoric ΓΑΙ may be seen as the inanimate alternant
of ΟΤΟΝ in negative environment). Unlike ΟΤΟΝ, ΓΑΙ is combined, by
the *notae relationis* η-, ντε-, pronominally ητας, with other noun lexemes (“any...”) while it is not compatible in the corpus, unlike Nitrian Bohairic, with any determinator (i.e. a true grammernic pronoun). This is the prime difference between οτον/οται and χια:

Deut. 24:5 χια ισωβ.
Deut. 28:55 χια ινξαι.
Gen. 37:24 χια ιμωφοτ.
Num. 17:5 χια ινεμμο.
Ex. 19:12 χια ιταγ (i.e. any part of the mountain).
χια occurs often in negative environment (“nothing/no-one”; it sometimes even acquires negative semantics of its own):

Num. 16:15 ιμιεχιλαί ιντοτον οταε ιμιεχεμκο ινταλ ιμωφοτ.
μπεγαί μοτ Ex. 9:6:7.
Ex. 16:19 μπεγεγαί ιςαινιπ.
Gen. 37:24 ιμιον-χια ιμωφοτ ινεχτ.
Deut. 16:18 ινεκετργι αισωβ.
Ex. 19:12 ...ιεχεμσοι ιεμ χια ιταγ.

Rhematic, χια is inherently negative — “nothing”, “a trifle” (Greek οὐδέν):

Num. 20:19 ιφωβ χια ιςε.
Ex. 22:9 φι οτον ιξε-ινταγαί (v.l. ΒΓΙ χια ιςαι ινταγαί ιςε) is still mysterious: οτον, ιξε-, ι-οτ- (?) are wholly enigmatic, while the Theme ιςε may be zeroed in our MS.

Obs.
(1) In the Interlocutive NS as well as the Delocutive pattern, χια (and οτ; cf. Ex. 16:7, 16:15) occur without the indefinite article only in Bohairic: FUNK 1991:28; however, οτ-χια does occur in Bohairic (e.g. v.l. John 8:54, often in Nitrian), almost always rhematic in the NS.
(2) ηταί “at all” Luke 19:8 does not occur in the corpus.

Human animate χια is somewhat less usual. Apparently occurring only in negative environment, this raises the question of the opposition of χια with οτον; the frequent combination of χια with ιμιον- may be significant, although Deut. 33:26 ιμιον-οτον ιμπητ ιμφι still points to some distinction between οτον and χια.

Ex. 10:23 μπεγαί ιατ επεχοιν οταε μπεγαί ιωνι...
Ex. 22:10 οτον ινεχτσαι-ιαί εμι.
Ex. 34:24 ινεχες μπεικκαί ιερεπισθιν.
Gen. 39:11 ιμιον-ιαί εισοτην ιεμπηι — εισοτην is here remarkable for “inside”.


Gen. 31:50 ΜΜΟΝ-ΓΛΑΙ ΝΕΜΑΝ.
Gen. 39:9 ΜΜΟΝ-ΓΛΑΙ ΕΨΟΓΙ ΕΡΟΙ ΕΜΠΕΨΗΙ ΟΥΔΕ ΜΜΟΝ-
ΓΛΑΙ ΕΨΗΠΙ ΕΡΟΙ has both animate and inanimate ΓΛΑΙ.
Gen. 20:9 ΩΤΕΨΒ ΜΜΟΝ-ΓΛΑΙ ΝΑΛΙΨ.
Also Ex. 34:24, Lev. 27:26, Deut. 11:25.

3.5 {ν-} and {πι-} — “Two definite articles”?

Bohairic has a four-term articular system, with separate and asym-
metrical 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>ΝΕΝ- (ν-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{πι-}</td>
<td>ΝΙ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΟΨ-</td>
<td>ΠΑΝ-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

zero-

The prevailing consensus concerning the two “weak and strong” art-
icles 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 παλ- 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 op-
position and especially the functional range of {π-}. This is not to deny
the obvious morphological relatedness of {π-} and {πι-}, synchroni-
cally 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 Bohairic28,
escapes me. To my knowledge, no Demotic (let alone LE) data are indicative of a similar

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 ΝΙ- at all, and if something other than ΝΙ-, 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” πι- from πι-, through what he lighty calls “a loss of the vowel”. This is meaningless — is it a feature of diachronic evolution? What does “derivation” mean in this context? Synchronously, πι- and πιξ- are not prosodically related alternants29; both are proclitic, and postulating a prosodic derivation dependence between them is tantamount to derive Sah. article πι- from the demonstratives πιει-/πιξ-.

(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 Referents”: (a) obligatory in (“cumulative”) non-specific reference; also for unica: “water”, “the sun”; “the door” — situationally unique, with no further specification: cf. our πι-; (b) deictic, specified by preceding or following context: Bohairic πιξ-. See also D. Hartmann 1982 (NHG dialects), Marky 1985b, Eroms 1988: 269ff. (one article stressed, the other proclitic); Harweg 1989 (spoken NHG, dialectal, but also standard).

(3) The πιξ-/πι- distribution issue is closely associated with the alteration πιν-/πιειε, 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 πιν, not πιειε, and if the regens has the definite article this must be of the πιξ-series, not the πι-series” (Gunn mentions “nouns which can take the πι-series” — he has obviously identified here a specific lexical group — ASH)... “Rule: nouns which can take πι-articles take πιξ-articles (a) in the vocative... [but:... Φιέτε...], when followed by a relative expression (including etenмατ and et- + qual.), (b) often before nτε + determined noun (the question still is why nτε 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 Chaîne 1933 we find the most detailed — indeed, the most serious — discussion of this difficult issue (see pp. 125-132, §§267-285). True, Chaîne falls for the red herring of the “fort vs. faible” approach; yet such formulations as (§275) “noms communs de sens

vided between πι- and πιν...almost all such cases are “pre-genetival” (pre-πι-, avoiding the πιειε-convention valid for πιξ-), resemble very much the conditions and rarity of Bohairic πειε, whereas πιξ- is the only plural article occurring in a relative-clause expanded NP. In the singular, however, the situation is clearly different from Bohairic: πι- 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 πι- πι- πιξ-series, on a ternary scale of tonicity; however, one misses ΦιΗ / ιΗ and πι- (Sah. or Boh.), and thus we gain little insight into the functional and structural value of either, in relation respectively to ΦιΗ / ιΗ and πι- . Viewing πι- as “strong” (trad. terminology) with relation to πιξ- is unfounded, for while the former is a zero-grade of ιΗ, the latter does not really have a “guna” grade correspondence (unless it be the πιειε of πιειε-ι-, as Kasser maintains).

30 It is possible, of course, that the complicated and still controversial story of the pre-Romanic 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 stem-
ming from syntagmatic and/or paradigmatic dependence on another
noun syntagm, specific or non-specific, co-textual, intertextual or con-
textual. This, in a nutshell, is what distinguishes it from \π-.

In Bohairic, the association of \{πι\-\} with the demonstrative deter-
minator \(Φ\) is severed (while \(Φ\) is still directly opposed to \(Θ\), albeit
not as distal to proximal, as in most other dialects: witness the pre-Rela-
tive slot, this is not the case between \πι- and \πιαι-. This ensues in a dif-
ferent value to \πιαι-, as is evident, e.g., in \{πιαι\-\} \(νοσωτ\), I Thessal.
2:14): \{πι\-\} is an article — the in some senses unmarked definite arti-
cle 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 unterscheidend bestimmende bedeutung” is still unexcep-
tionable. Indeed, \{πι\-\} — and only \{πι\-\} amongst articles — character-
izes 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 famil-
iar from the text:

(1) Representing:

Ex. 8:12-13 ὀταγνωστος ... πιαγνωστος.
Ex. 9:22-25 οταλ ... πιαλ (cf. 9:24 ἀρθρωσον ἔγε-πες τον αλαλ ... ναζωμον τε πιαλ πε).
Deut. 10:1-3 πλαξ ενοτ ... ἕπλαξ ... ἕπλαξ ενοτ.
Num. 25:6ff. ἵκ οὐρώμι εβολ ἕπετερπε λπιαλ ἐνιν ... πιρώμι πιραελίτης.
Gen. 30:32 εκωτον ὑμεν ναταν ... νεμ νιαοτιαοταν.
Gen. 30:35 ηὴ τὴν αὐτὴν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἔστω... ΝΙΟ-
τῷ ὑπὸ.

(2) Fuzzily anaphoric — recalling from a cumulative database or
folder:
Gen. 32:22 ἀψι ντεζιμί βτ νεμ ἄβωκι βτ νεμ πε-ιά
νουρπι...
Gen. 41:56 ἀσώσων... ΝΝΙΑΖΩΡ θηρον ΝΣΟΟΟ οσο ΝΑΤ-
ΕΒΟΛ ΝΝΙΡΕΜΝΧΗΜΙ θήρων.

(3) In specificity concord — anaphorically cohesive in apposition:
Gen. 41:45 ουν ἄβακι.
Ex. 3:1 χωρῆσεν πιτώσι.
Gen. 21:33 Φτ πιελενεγ.
Gen. 22:21 ως πισσορπμμίς.
Gen. 3:22 λαβάν πισσρος.

(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 πιπτας ετοι ΝΑΙΠΑΟΤΗ.
Gen. 20:3 τζζιμι ετακολας.
Gen. 26:2 νικαρι ετζνάδος ΝΑΚ.
Gen. 25:6 ΝΙΣΡΟΤ ΝΤΕΝΙΠΑΛΑΚΗ ΝΤΕΑΒΡΑΔ.
Ex. 22:5 ΝΙΣΩΤΠ ΝΤΕΝΙΠΙΑΓΑΛΟΛΩΙ.
Gen. 28:12 ΝΙΑΓΕΛΟΣ ΝΤΕΩΤ.
Gen. 28:20 ΠΙΜΣΙΤ ΦΙΑΙ ΑΝΟΚ ΕΤΜΟΜΙ ΓΙΩΤΩΠ.
Gen. 26:18 ΝΙΣΩΤΠ ΝΤΕΝΙΜΙΝΩΤ ΝΗ ΕΤΑΤΣΟΚΟΤ Νκε-Νια-
λωτι Ντεαβραδ.
Gen. 17:13 τυτυχ ξετιμματ.
Deut. 1:17 πικαζι ετζαζι εττένηθοτ.
Ex. 16:2 τζτζαζογι θηρς Ντενενψηρι μπιζα.
Gen. 32:22 ΠΙΖΙΝΙΟΝΙ ΝΤΕΑΒΡΩΚ.
Num. 34:6 ΠΙΟΙΨΙ ΝΙΟΜ.

(2) In specificity concord — cataphorically cohesive in apposition:
Gen. 23:2 ἄβακι ερβοκ.
Gen. 19:9 πιρωμι ζε-αωτ.

(c) A third type of reference is non- or extra- (inter-) textual (“exo-
phoric”). It is typically dialogic-situational, but not really restricted tex-
temically. Here we find singulars as well as plurals, as prius nota, not
prius dicta; or simply as familiar in the world of current discourse:
Gen. 22:5 γεμιστι μελαια λαμ Θεω.
Gen. 24:55 μαρεθπαρεενος υφινι Νεμαι.
Gen. 42:9 νιατατι ντεζωρα.
Gen. 26:1 ποτρο Ννιφτιλθιτ.
Gen. 42:33, 43:6 πεζε-πιρωμι δε ναν πθες οπακαγι... αφ- 
θεντεν Νζε-πιρωμι...
Gen. 43:8 οσωρι Μπιαλον Νεμι.
Deut. 19:18 ετεζωνι νζε-νιφτραπ...
Deut. 20:5 ετεζακι νζε-νικαγ νεμ πιλαοκ.
Deut. 9:28 μπιοκε ντοτζον Νζε-νν ετζον ζεππικαγι.

(d) {πι-} 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 paradigm-
atic specificity: a structured and finely delimited lexical system of sys-
tems, in which every term is “definite” in the Saussurean sense of ex-
pressing “that which all others do not express”.
Deut. 24:19 πιμκι νεμ πιλεζμο νεμ πιοφθανοις νεμ 
τζωρα.

νικαβέντι Νιομη, Νιαζωριν Deut. 15:19.
πινιωτι, πιωκοζι Gen. 25:23.
πικοζαι... πικεκοται Gen. 42:13.
Gen. 32:19 πιμαζ-8 νεμπιμαζ-ι.
An extensive technical-terminology case — catalogue of Temple 
utensils: Ex. Chs. 25, 36ff.
πιλεζμο, πιρεμναζωινι Num. 35:15.
πιρη, πιιογ Gen. 37:9, Deut. 17:3.
Deut. 7:1 πιξηττεοες νεμ πιερεζςεοες νεμ πιαμορρεος 
νεμ πιαζανανος νεμ Φερεζςεος νεμ πιεςεος (Vat 
πιφερεζςεος) — the zero article here is a mystery for me; the 
Greek has here only definite generic nouns.
Deut. 2:12 πιξορρεοες Ναζωοπ ζενεπιρ.
Deut. 2:20 κεταρ νιπαθαιν Ναζωοπ ριωτι.
Checklists of animal species: Deut. 14:12-18 πιλεζωμ πινοτρι 
πινουζερ πιαζεθον πιερε πιαβωκ νεμ λαρον αροδιον 
κανον ει... The switch to zero-article generic terms is remarkable.

It is here that {πι-} (metaphorically generic) and {πι-} (quintessentially 
generic) are closest to one another, even up to the syntagmatic ad-
jacency of both articles — as a rule, not in haphazard admixture but in 
separate groups:
Deut. 28:48 πιγκο πεμπτιβι πεμ δβων πεμ δμων.
Deut. 30:15 πωνε γεμ δμων πιπενανεγ γεμ πιπετ-
γων.
Deut. 1:17 πιγαν δλ-δλ’ πε.

Or in paradigmatic adjacency — {πι-} for a term in a structured
closed term system (typically in syntagmatic compatibility), {π-} for an iso-
lated term as unicum:
πικαγι Gen. 7:23, 8:11.

πιρη, πιιογ Gen. 37:9, Deut. 17:3.

πιστι Ex. 21:4 “the master” (of a slave).
πιστι (passim) “the Lord”.

(e) High-to-highest specificity is a prominent trait in the name para-
digm, following Δε- of the naming one. Here {πι-} commutes with
Proper Names and with {π-} genus and notion names (see below, 3.8):

†-περνον/πεπραν Δε-
μον† επερπαν Δε-
τεραν ερων Δε-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>πι-</th>
<th>Gen. 1:5:10, 2:23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Φι-</td>
<td>Deut. 2:11:21, Gen. 32:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πι-</td>
<td>Δνε- 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>π-</td>
<td>(genus) Gen. 32:30, 35:18, 50:11, 21:31 (see below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proper Name</td>
<td>Gen. 16:11, 3:20, 17:19 etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Νιμ</td>
<td>Gen. 2:19 (pro-PN).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clause in PN status Gen. 22:14, Num. 28:18.

Obs.
Gen. 30:13 ασχρ Δε-οτμετρασαο 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 {π-} — 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 {π-} 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, \textit{naming} article — a special determinator definitely absent in the Greek system. It is singular only. \textit{nēn-} (and the residual \textit{n-}: \textsc{Polotsky} 1968; see also Chapter Four), conventionally assigned as its plural form, are in fact very different: they occur only in the discontinuous \textit{nēn-} \textit{n-}. The article \textit{n-} does not occur in apposition to a proper Name, unless in the discontinuous Constituence Personal-Sphere Association construction \textit{n-} \textit{n-} described below. Here, in fact, is the hub of the problem of \{\textit{n-}\}. What is the common ground of, say, the \textit{unicum} \textsc{φιομ} and the first term in Ex. 21:22 \textsc{παλ}_ {\textit{nēc}}\textsc{γίμι} and in Num. 20:24 \textit{φωσισ} \textit{παπαντιαλογία}? Since, generally speaking, outside these constructions, \{\textit{n-}\} is syntactically inert, relatively speaking: it itself is non-phoric, and is but rarely expanded attributively or even resumed (even the article + \textit{οτός} \textit{n-} construction, testifying to partitivity, is excluded for \{\textit{n-}\}; and so is the combination of \textit{φωσισ} and \textit{n-}, while \textit{παπαν} \textit{n-} is well attested). This type of generic is but rarely expanded:

\begin{itemize}
  \item Unique: Deut. 34:12, 11:24 \textsc{φιομ} \textit{nēlē}.
  \item Unique: Num. 34:12 \textsc{φιομ} \textit{εμολαε}.
  \item Unique: Deut. 8:15 \textit{τωσκ} \textit{πινιω} \textit{ετεμματ} \textit{οτός} \textit{ετοι} \textit{nēto} \textsuperscript{+} (expressive).
  \item Generic: Num. 31:50 \textsc{φωσισ} \textit{εταπ} \textit{σι} \textit{νοτκετος} \textit{κνοτωβ}.
  \item Generic: Num. 21:5 \textit{πωικ} \textit{ετωσυειη} (expressive; Arabic demonstrative!).
  \item Generic: Num. 23:19 \textit{ναρεθ} \textit{οι} \textit{αι} \textit{μαφη} \textit{η} \textit{μαφωσισ} \textit{ευαρη} \textit{ερον} — not conclusively relative; most probably adnexal circumstantial, as often following \textit{φη} \textit{η} \textit{n-}.
  \item Generic: Gen. 27:27 \textit{κτοι} \textit{ετάνηκ} \textit{εβολ} (poetic-expressive).
\end{itemize}

Address Status: (extra-corpus): Mark 10:17f. \textsc{φρεκ} \textsc{tcbw} \textsc{ηαθωος}.

I suggest that \{\textit{n-}\} \textit{n-} (almost only specific nouns or PNs follow here) does not constitute an expansion of a nuclear \{\textit{n-}\}, but is a complex frame or matrix of discontinuous elements, in which the article is an initial constituent (details below). In this case \{\textit{n-}\} is not nuclear, and does not specify its lexeme alone, but combinatorily, by induction — it is the element following the \textit{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, \{\textit{n-}\} + \textit{nē-}

\textsuperscript{31} Cf. \textsc{Rosén} (H.) 1999:41f. for the use of Latin \textit{ille} and \textit{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 \(\pi\)- does occur in the corpus as a morphophonemic alternant (\(\text{\textit{n}ae\omega\nu\nu} \text{\textit{n}icaak}\) Gen. 26:25 (= Vat); see POLOTSKY 1968) before unstressed vowel — arguably, a case of "signalling of preservation of initial lexeme-boundaries", ASH; cf. OLZ 59:253 n. 1 1964, omitted in Collected Papers 438. The "\(n<\nu\)" rule is valid only for Egyptian lexemes. The fact that \(\text{\textit{ne\nu}-}\) is not attested alone does not mean, I think, that \(\pi\)- and \(\pi\)- are neutralized in the plural, but only that generic-name \(\pi\)- is singular only. The genericity of \{\(\pi\)-\} is stated, following STERN 1880:227, also by DEPUYDT 1985a (\(\pi\)- "Element-genus", ZERO "genus"; D. uses Mallon-Malinine's examples and is not corpus-based).

3.5.2.1 Different roles of \{\(\pi\)-\}:

(a) The article \{\(\pi\)-\} actualizes-by-naming unique geographical and cosmic notions — a closed lexical list — such as

\(\pi\kappa\gamma\iota\) Gen. 8:1:9:11.
\(\tau\Phi\epsilon\) Gen. 8:2.
\(\Phi\nu\sigma\nu\nu\) Gen. 1:2.
\(\Phi\iota\rho\sigma\) Gen. 41:1.
\(\Phi\iota\omicron\mu\) Gen. 22:17.
\(\Phi\rho\mu\) Lev. 22:7.

The four cardinal points: Gen. 28:14, 24:62.

\(\pi\sigma\tau\), \(\Phi\uparrow\) \textit{passim}, which have the status of highest-specificity Proper Names.

(b) \{\(\pi\)-\} in the name slot:

Gen. 16:14 ...\(\uparrow\rho\alpha\nu\) \(\Delta\epsilon-\tau\omega\omega\uparrow\) \(\epsilon\tau\alpha\nu\alpha\nu\) (= Vat).
Gen. 1:8 \(\Phi\uparrow\) \(\mu\omicron\nu\uparrow\) \(\epsilon\pi\iota\alpha\alpha\rho\sigma\) \(\Delta\epsilon-\tau\Phi\epsilon\).
Num. 11:3 \(\alpha\tau\rho\rho\nu-\Phi\rho\alpha\nu\) \(\mu\nu\nu\mu\alpha\) \(\epsilon\tau\epsilon\mu\mu\mu\alpha\) \(\Delta\epsilon-\Phi\rho\omega\kappa\).
Gen. 21:33 \(\Phi\uparrow\) \(\pi\nu\gamma\lambda\epsilon\epsilon\).
Gen. 30:18 \(\Delta\epsilon-\Phi\nu\beta\epsilon\).
De Vis I 181 \(\alpha\rho\omega\nu\nu\nu\) \(\epsilon\nu\epsilon\rho\rho\nu\) \(\pi\nu\Phi\nu\nu\nu\).
Ez. 13:10 (Tattam, collated) \(\epsilon\tau\alpha\Delta\omega\) \(\mu\nu\nu\nu\nu\) \(\Delta\epsilon-\tau\iota\rho\iota\nu\nu\nu\) \(\tau\iota\rho\iota\nu\nu\nu\) \(\omicron\omicron\omicron\) \(\mu\nu\nu\nu\nu\) \(\Delta\epsilon-\tau\iota\rho\iota\nu\nu\nu\) \(\tau\iota\rho\iota\nu\nu\nu\)

\(\omicron\omicron\omicron\) \(\mu\nu\nu\nu\nu\) \(\Delta\epsilon-\tau\iota\rho\iota\nu\nu\nu\) \(\tau\iota\rho\iota\nu\nu\nu\) 3.5.2.1

(c) \{\(\pi\)-\} with lexemes in general (open-listed), which it designates by forming their Notion Names and actualizes metalinguistically. This role coincides with \{\(\pi\)-\} forming genus names, often in enumeration. (BALLY 1950 §115 ["l'emploi générique des substantives] présente à l'imagination des entités existant à un seul exemplaire et échappant à toute quantification"): 
ποριον Gen. 31:39.

Φυσων Ex. 1:22.


πγνον Deut. 15:23.

Φμνιν Gen. 9:12.

τερων Gen. 21:8.

Φρωμι + πεβνη Num. 31:11, 8:17.

ικην-Φρωμι ωα-πεβνη Ex. 9:25, 12:12 etc.

εκην-Φνοπ Num. 29:25.

απ-πγνον Num. 35:25 (subsequently — but generically still —

απνον in Num. 35:27; alway definite in Greek).

ε-πν Num. 31:4.

ε-Φοτομι Lev. 19:23.

ε-πολεμομι Num. 32:6.

π- in grammaticalized noun phrases:

εφα δε- Gen. 26:5 etc.

μφρην N-, ετ-, θνη N- passim.

Φνε μ- premodiﬁer (see below).

πκε- "also", with Proper Names or personal pronouns.

Obs.
(1) Ex. 7:15 πγθων εταφωνυμ θαιροντον - non-generic — is diﬃcult: Vat has here π-. εταφ- is not relative but Temporal. Is this article due here to the mystical uniqueness of a magic wand?

(2) π- in the rare, if not (in the corpus) unique Ex. 2:14 μπιρην ετακατωτε μπερυνηνη νελαφ (Vat Φρην) is either marked as aﬀective, or else is cataphoric: “in the very manner in which ...”.

(d) π- + quantiﬁer: non-phoric article, combinatory speciﬁcity:

ομαξ [num.] νιστον Num. 33:38.


πκεβηνιμιν Gen. 42:36 (cf. παικειορδαννε, 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):

πνεπτων Deut. 24:7.


γανπεθωναντ Num. 10:30 (= Vat).
πκε is distinctively common in the NT and Ntirion sources with Proper Names and their commutables, personal pronouns: *νεμ πκενθον γων* Cat. 31, 47, Mac. No. 6; πκενθον γων 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 γίνα νεκρωτές μπιλισάρος; also Gal. 2:1, Acts 12:25, 19:15, Philipp. 4:3, έντηκριμίνιν Acts 23:11.

(f) π- n- (almost only specific\(^{33}\)): discontinuous close ("inalienable" or Personal-Sphere Constituence Association) non-possessive association, see in detail below: combinatory high specificity. The article itself is of neutral specificity (which is why it occurs here):

Φμαγι μπεκκον Deut. 22:1.
Θνατ μπιλακοτ Ex. 2:8.
Πκον μπαγι Deut. 25:7f.
Τφια βλετι Num. 17:2.
Θσετις μπιλαξδ πικκωβ Gen. 32:24.
Νενμασι μπιλαξδ ντεπικαγι Gen. 23:13.

Obs.
(1) Φνατ n- is grammaticalized in Φνατ ντροτι, Φνατ νγανατοτι Ex. 16:6:12 as an adverbial pre-modifier, contrasted with: — μφνατ νγανατοτ, μφνατ νγανατοτι, post-modifier, Ex. 16:8:13. Ex. 16:13 μφνατ δε νπωρπ ακωμπ... is not in conflict with the above statement, since this is in contrastive focus; nor is Num. 28:16, where μφνατ is coordinated to μπιλακοτ.

(2) Num. 21:29 ω Φαλαξ ναζας (= Val) in address may be a case of "pragmatic Proper-Name", cf. ShishA: HALEVY 1989a:49ff., but is possibly another instance of π- n-.

(3) Note instances of appositive {π-} n- (following Proper Names, delimitative in contrast to π - πτε-):
Ex. 3:1 ηοθορ πενθοσ # φοσις μπαγιν.
Gen. 24:10 εφεμετοπαμι # εεβακι νναξωρ.
Gen. 41:46 Φαραω # πνπρο νχρι.
Deut. 33:1 μετεχε # Φρωμι μφι.

(g) π- πτε- (specific\(^{34}\)): an especially intriguing environment for {π-}, here singular only (no ιεν-). Probably not another discontinuous construction, yet still not entirely clear to me: it is strongly suggestive of being an opposition construction for the π- n- one, reducing or annulling the Personal-Sphere Constituence Association (see below):

Τσερμεσ ιεπαγιντ Deut. 29:19.

\(^{33}\) Unless in poetic language.

\(^{34}\) Unless in poetic language.
(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) ἐρωμι ἐρωμι totalizing: “each and every man”, Lev. 20:9, 22:18 (+ etna-); 17:13, 18:6 (resumed by ἰνεξ- Sgl! Greek αὐθρω-πος ἰνθρωπος):

(2) Φροθαί Φροθαί, opposed to πιοταί πιοταί: adverbial “each”, “one by one” — see above, under οταί. Πιοταί seems to be anaphoric and specific, Πιοταί Πιοταί usually opening the sequence carried on by Φοραί Φοραί, and Φοραί Φοραί non-specific, nonphoric; Φοραί Φοραί is typically appositive. However, this is no more than an impression, with numerous contradictory examples, and the opposition in the actancial slot (always agent actant) escapes me altogether (Greek always έκαστος):

Gen. 44:11 ἀπιοτσαί πιοταί ὅσος μπεκςκόκ γιάζενπικαγί ὅσος ΙΦοραί Φοραί οτσαί μπεκςκόκ.

Num. 16:17 μαρεπιοτσαί πιοταί σφι ιντεκςσόρφρ ὅσος ερε-Φοραί Φοραί ἰν σεσφισσόρφρ.

Ex. 16:16 Φοραί Φοραί μαρεπέκσκι (cf. Ex. 32:27 μαρε-Φοραί Φοραί Εωτεξ).

Ex. 16:29...Φοραί Φοραί Σενπέκμα — appositive, adverbial and rhematic.

Ex. 36:4...Φοραί Φοραί καταπεκέςβ.

(3) Φα-πιεκοσ πιεκοσ Ex. 16:4f. proves the compound nature of the reiteration phrase: “each day’s (ration)”.

(4) Zero determination reiterated, following Rheme-introducing Ν-, expresses focussed fragmentation:

-οι νωμι ↑ υμι ↑ Gen. 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 πκαγι νΧΗΜι, nor τερωτ ΝΤΕΤΕΚΜΑΤ, nor πξερεμεμ ΝΤΕΝΕΝΨΗΡΗ ΜΠΙΧΑ, 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 ‘pronoun — noun lexeme’ and ‘noun 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 ΝΤΕ-, 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.

νη... Gen. 44:34.

πι-... Gen. 50:19, Ex. 13:12 only Φ†, περοτ.
περοτ-... Deut. 12:17, Gen. 32:18 — compatibility of kindred.


νημ Gen. 32:17, 38:25.

οιρ-...ορωτ Deut. 12:8: also indefinite article?

ρωσ Gen. 24:57.

 Appropriately, Φα- has non-specific or rather specificity-indifferent syntax; it is an anaphoric-substitute “pro-form”, gender-number cohesive (never cataphoric; non-deictic).

Deut. 12:17 νιωτων μμιςιι ντενεκερφων νεμ νανέκε-


κων.

Deut. 18:15 νεκκνυσ... ναπαρτ†.


Deut. 33:7 Φαι Φα-ιοσαλατ πε.
Ex. 16:4f. Φα-περθού νιεφοην.

(b) {Φωω} 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 πηρωμι ετᴇ-νοτυ νε ναι.


Lev. 22:22:24 Φη ετλατ νηεναλ... Φη εταφδεξηκ ηνοτυ.
Deut. 20:18 πηντ ηπεκον ... Φων...
Ex. 21:34 εφεερΦων.


Noteworthy — and in my opinion indicative of specificity-indifference — is the construction:

Gen. 49:25 Φ† Φων (Greek ὃ θεός ὃ ἔμοι), 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 \(Φ\omega=q\) 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 \{Φ\ω=\}, very common outside the corpus, is \{πετε\Φ\ωq\} / \{Φ\η ετε\Φ\ωq\} (πe), or lexeme-specifying \{πετε\Φ\ωq\} n- (Φ\ω= 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 ze-roing):

\[
\text{\textit{πετε\Φ\ωq n\π\τ\σ\ς (etc.) \textit{Gen. 20:7, Num. 31:9,}}}
\]
\[
\text{\textit{πετε\Φ\ωq \textit{Gen. 33:9, η\ε\τε-}\\textit{π\ν\κ\ν\κ\v N\u{1}m. 16:5,}}}
\]
\[
\text{\textit{L\v{e}v. 5:24 Φ\η ετε\Φ\ωq π\v{e} ε\v{e}θη\v{e}ηq ναq.}}
\]
\[
\text{Φ\v{o}s\v{a}i Φ\v{o}s\v{a}i ετε\v{e}θωq \textit{π\kappa η\nu\i{1}c\i{i}} \ldots Φ\v{o}s\v{a}i Φ\v{o}s\v{a}i \ldots \v{e}n\textit{e\v{t}e\v{e}ωt\v{e}n m\pi\tau\pi\i{1}s \ldots \tau\tau\i{i}m\v{e} n\v{e}n \v{e}t\v{e}θωq \mu\f{\mu}\tau\v{x}h \ldots \textit{L\v{e}v. 25:10, 27:2})} \textit{- special reference to Φ\v{o}s\v{a}i Φ\v{o}s\v{a}i?}}
\]

(e) \textit{NT\v{a}q} is used to introduce the \textit{attributive} pronominal possessor for a quantified or low-specificity (indefinite, zero-determination) or \textit{markedly specific} (including high-specificity) nominal \textit{possessum}:

\[
\text{\textit{ο\tau\v{c}\o{n}i NT\v{a}q \textit{μ\pi\rho\e\v{e}n\o\c{n}c \textit{L\v{e}v. 21:3,}}}
\]
\[
\text{\textit{[number] n\ldots NT\v{a}q \textit{Ex. 36:38, 38:10ff.}}}
\]
\[
\text{\textit{\alpha\w{p}\o{n} \textit{NI\v{e}n NT\v{a}t\v{w}ten \textit{L\v{e}v. 2:13, Deut. 5:14, 28:42,}}}
\]
\[
\text{\textit{\sigma\r{p}o\sigma\v{e} NT\v{a}q \textit{Deut. 3:3,}}}
\]
\[
\text{\textit{\tau\i{n}\\v{e}p\i{n} \textit{N\i{t}hi \textit{Deut. 22:16.}}}
\]

Obs.

(1) In the unedited B4 Twelve Prophets (P.Vat. copto 9) Zacharias we find four intriguing examples of \textit{πι- NT\v{a}q} (Zach. 9:17 Π\u{1}α\r{a}θε\v{o}n NT\v{a}q, 11:6 Π\u{1}ο\v{r}η\v{e} NT\v{a}q, 11:10 Π\u{1}ω\v{b}ο\v{t} N\i{t}hi, 11:5 Ν\i{m\a{c}e\v{c}w\o{t} NT\u{2}w\o{t})} — 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 \textit{hendrowsus 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 \textit{Palermo 1998}.

(2) Luke 5:3 \textit{\alpha\o{q}o\a{q} e\o{t}a\i{n} \textit{\nu\i{1}t\o{k}\o{d}i N\i{t}hi \textit{πe hints at the possible nominal-possessor alternant of the NT\v{a}q 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 syntagms (not zero-determined?) is effected by the complex means of n - following a cataphoric de lective 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 KENK.
Lev. 13:12 ICXEN-ΔWQ WJ-PATQ.
Num. 32:24 PWTEN.
Num. 4:27 PWW NAQPN.
Deut. 28:64 ΔWQ MPKAGI.
Ex. 12:28 ETOTQ MMWCHC NEM QAQWN.
Lev. 14:17 QHTC NTEQΔIK NOTINAM.

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-designating ΔWQ / ΔWQ and the proclitic lexeme-expanded alternant of the latter, namely the specifying possessive article {πEQ-}. H.J. Polotsky’s explanation is essentially dynamic and indeed generative: progressive pronominialization (of possessor — πEQ- of possession — ΔWQ — of both — ΔWQ); the aspiration of Boh. ΔWQ- is explained (Polotsky 1985:91f.) by “[die] Ellipse des Substantivs, zu dem das anlauteende ΔWQ- gehört; das Substantiv, an das ΔWQ- 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 Unterteilung eines Substantivs (des Besitzers) unter ein andres (ein Besitz) als Ausgangspunkt einer progressiven Pronominalisierung, die mit dem beiderseits pronomenlichen πWQ ihr Ende erreicht”. As often in his later work, Polotsky mixes here linguistic-systematic analysis and metalinguistic-dynamic synthesis. DEPUYDT 1985b sees πWQ as “substantival”, πEQ- 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 ΔWQ- is indeed remarkable and telling. R. Kasser attributes this to its being half-stressed (1994: 289f., 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) πATWEXELT “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,38, 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) NETENOΣI θΠΟΣ ΝΟΤΚ ΝΕ ΟΤΟΓ ΝΟΤΚ ΝΕΤΙ: 17:10, also 8:44, 16:14ff., 17:17:18:35. Contrast John (B4) 14:27 ΤΕΤΕΘΙ ΝΠΙΡΗΝΝ (Greek ειρήνη την ἑλιγν), 17:17 ΠΕΤΕΦΩΚ ΝΚΑΛΙ with ΤΕΠΙΡΗΝΝ 14:10 (αὐτοῖ); does the former focus the possession? John 19:24 (B4; B5 ΔΝΑ- ) ΔΕΡ-ΤΑΝΗ in the Present proves by the waiving of the Stern-Jemstedt Rule that τα- (ελα-) is not specific.

(4) Note also the following representative instructive exx. outside the corpus: characterizing possessum specificity AM II 202 ΟΤΣΟΙ ΕΦΩΙ ΝΕ “a boat of mine”; cases illustrating the focusability of φω-, De Vis II 232 ΑΝΟΝ-ΝΟΤΚ ΝΠΕΡΜΑΘΗ: its pro-form nature, Luke 22:42 ΠΕΤΕΘΗ ΑΝ ΑΛΑ ΦΩΚ ΜΑΡΕΡΨΩΝΗ.

(5) Appositively attributive (colloquial?) Nitrian παιβοι Φωι Μαρ. No. 4 fgt 3, ΝΕΤΡΕΗ 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 -jnk (cf. Gilula 1968)39, also allowing for specificity marking of the possessum, and — mutatis mutandis — comparable to attributive-rheticum “mine” in earlier English (and Germanic), as in “father mine”? The πετε-φωνο 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: Poseener 1988), Togeby 1982: 1 475ff., Weinrich 1982:310ff., Jacobs 1990:67ff.; Cf. also, French celui de Substvoc, see Veland 1996 esp. 127ff., 136ff.

(7) In LE, a special attributive postpositive pronoun set (jnк, tw, sw) expresses the possessor after low- or high-specificity nominal possessum, under almost the exact conditions of our attributive nτα- ([e] above): Ehrman 1933 §107ff.

(8) Cases like ερωτείρων τοποι τοποί Gen. 29:2, varying with ειρων τοποί Gen. 29:3:10; που που τοποί Luke 21:24 (v.i. pουκ), кенк нτερμάτ (De Vis II 7, Polotsky 1930:84), and, even more cogently, the lexemized possessive in περηφωνι.

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 nτκ + POSSESSUM, nк-jmτ + POSSSESSUM, and the late (but not Coptic) nσ-sw + POSSSESSUM, historically an adjective-Rheme pattern.
περσῳ, πίρῳ (AM I 129, Polotsky 1934:66) or εἴρων μνείβο (De Vis II 247 — note the immediate direct-object indicating specificity-indifference of ρων). All point to the 3rd-sgl.-masculine possessed lexeme being an active motivating lexeme, not a syntagm form.

3.6 Generics: a retrospect and synthesis

Ποτόμος Νοστή Νεμπότομος Νατ Νεμνίων Ετται-
νοτ Νεμνιμαργαρίθμης Νεμνισκήνες Νεμ Φης Νεμο-
ςικόν Νεμκοκκίνων ... Νεμψέ Νιβέν Νοτίνον Νεμψωτ
Νεμβενιτή Νεμμάρμαρον Νεμκτανμων Νεμκεθοινο-
τη Νεμκοζέν Νεμλίβανος Νεμχρίπ Νεμνέορ Νεμςτκεδ-
αλιόν Νκοτο Νεμτεβή Νεμεσωτ Νεμθρό Νεμςωμα
Νεμψακ Νρωμί Νεμςπορά Ντέτεπισκημιά Ντέτεττραχ
Ασφενσώτ Εβολ Γαρο (Αρος. 18:12-14)

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 {∅-} 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, \{π1\} and \{σσ\}, 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 \{π\}, zero, \{π1\}, \{σσ\}. All determinators, perhaps even \(\varepsilon\bar{n}\)-, are susceptible of generic decoding. The Bohairic system of generic marking is thus considerably more sophisticated than the Sahidic one\(^{40}\). 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: π1-masked, σσ- (\(\varepsilon\bar{n}\)-) masked. (Zero too may be considered as masking “as a bare lexeme”). Except for a certain grammatically alternant overlap between σσ- 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-

\(^{40}\) See SHISHA-HALEVY 1994:233ff. for a tentative first formulation of the issue at hand.
coding, for genericity has no single absolute synthetic meaning. (The following detailing observations will occasionally review statements made above on the respective determinators).

(a) \(\pi\)-, 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 \(\pi_1\)-, 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 \(\pi_1\)-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 \(\{\pi\}\), which I believe to be symptomatic and telling:

- Prevalently determinating abstracts, especially verbal nouns of all kind (infinitives, \(\epsilon\pi\) + infinitives, \(\epsilon\pi\alpha\iota\nu\eta\rho\epsilon\eta\epsilon\), \(\epsilon\pi\iota\nu\iota\nu\eta\epsilon\tau\epsilon\nu\epsilon\), lexical abstracts)
- Rarely occurring with Greek loans ( unlike \(\pi_1\)-); 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.

- \(\{\pi\}\) is the determinator occurring in real naming and as quote form:
  
  Gen. 16:14 ...\(\uparrow\)\(\tau\alpha\nu\ \chi\epsilon\-\tau\omega\omega\uparrow\)\(\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\alpha\varsigma\) (\(P = \text{Vat}\)).
  Gen. 1:8 \(\alpha\phi\uparrow\)\(\mu\omicron\omicron\uparrow\)\(\epsilon\pi\iota\alpha\kappa\gamma\rho\rho\omega\).
  Num. 11:3 \(\alpha\tau\uparrow\rho\epsilon\nu\phi\rho\)\(\tau\alpha\nu\ \mu\omicron\iota\alpha\nu\)\(\epsilon\tau\epsilon\mu\eta\mu\alpha\)\(\chi\epsilon\-\phi\rho\omega\kappa\epsilon\).

- \(\{\pi\}\) is the determinator used in grammaticalized (adverbial, conjunctival) noun phrases:
  
  \(\epsilon\nu\omega\iota\), \(\epsilon\pi\epsilon\varsigma\nu\tau\iota\), \(\epsilon\phi\omega\iota\nu\) \(\text{Gen. 37:18}.
  \epsilon\phi\mu\alpha\ \chi\epsilon\-, \ \mu\phi\rho\uparrow\)\(\epsilon\tau\-\)\(\nu\iota\)-, \(\nu\epsilon\theta\mu\iota\uparrow\)\(\nu\iota\)-, \(\pi\kappa\epsilon\-\).

- For the important role of \(\{\pi\}\) as main constituent part of the discontinuous \(\pi\-\) \(\nu\)- and \(\pi\-\) \(\nu\tau\epsilon\)-, see below. This is still the named genus,
representing it here almost iconically as non-referent ‘token’, in an associative (“inalienable” [for τη-], or [for τητε-] non-possessive) dependence with a specific noun, which lends the whole phrase its specificity. τη- itself is again specific only in the “external” meta-lexical sense suggested above; the absence of phoricity and the total non-informative-ness 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 {τη-}.

Obs.

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.): ἄπις, διωντα, κτοιξιον, ἀποδεικτικόν, ἴπικα, ἴπι, ἔπων — then often articulated in the Arabic gloss. Usually, however, the Arabic article glosses the definites in Bohairic (ηπωμι, ηπωμι, ηριομι; less usually ηπαν, τημ). 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, 233ff., 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.). τητε- corresponds to the Greek definite article with participle or agent noun (221ff., 381ff.): “zero-antecedent” eq.: ληγατουνεκμιν 344. A few exceptions: 195 κύδος σιξ τιθε τινε (275-8, 294ff., 296ff., 299. Greek words 350ff., 191).

Generic:

πεχιπιον Gen. 31:39.

Φηωτον Ex. 1:22.

Φηωτον Ονοματικον Gen. 9:12.

Φηωτον Βευς Lev. 19:12.

Πανονια Deut. 15:23.

Φηωτον Ονοματικον Gen. 9:12.

Φηωτον Ονοματικον Num. 29:31.

Φηωτον πετεβονθ Ex. 9:25, Num. 18:15, 31:11, 8:17.

Τινε Gen. 21:8.

Φοσωνιον 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 món- the "nulli-generic" is closely associated with non-existence: CHRISTOPHERSEN apud JESPERSEN 1949 (1961): 438ff.; less typically, it follows orón as existant; in derived verbs (e-r-nóbi, σi-cwó); in attribution (n- áγαρω), zero as non-essential i.e. incidental Rheme (following n-), 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-mwst Ex. 7:21.
  osew-wik, sas-emwmp Ex. 12:19.
  si-mwst Ex. 2:19.
  ep- (“do”) Gen. 41:9 (Chapter Two).
  ep- (“be”) Gen. 25:23, 29:32 (Chapter Two).
  ἐπ- ἐπ Ex. 5:10.
  osew-στρεμνή Num. 32:4.
  ωνεν-ελιποι ἐπωτ Num. 31:18.
  ἐς-επεμμή 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):
  ὀσατσεβί ἐνωμί Gen. 34:14.
  χείμε νἰβεν ὁκαβ Ex. 35:25.
  ὀμη ὀμηθείνον ἐμ ὀμεμή Deut. 25:15.
  ἐχείμι ἀθεώμω Num. 12:1.

(3) Incidental rhematic generic — rhematic second or third actant (see above, and Chapter Two):
  Ex. 16:20 ἐπερ-κεντ.
  Ex. 7:19 ἐπερ-κνοσ.
  Ex. 26:32 ὅσιςφαλις ἐτοι ὅνομ βοὶ ὅτος ἐτοι ἁναβικ ἐτοι νησ.
  Ex. 30:23 ὀτκαναμώμων ἐκοι ὅκανοστί.
  Gen. 42:36 ἀτετενάιτ ὁλφηπί.
  Gen. 44:23 ἀπερπάμα ὁκαμό.

(4) Zero as negative-environment generic. Zero represents the low-specificity (with the indefinite instantial generic excluded) in negative environment:
  Deut. 24:16 ὅνειστ μοῦ ἐνεπεμμή ὅτα ὅνεσμεν μοῦ ἐεπεμιστ.
  Deut. 12:13 ἁμοντεν-τοι ὅτα ἁκης.
  Gen. 38:21 ἁμον-πορὴν ἀπαίμα.
  Deut. 17:16 ὅνεπερεπετο ἀμη ἀη σιμ.17.
  Deut. 15:11 ἁνεθί ἁγα ἁοῦνκ.
Ex. 19:15 μπερτομί εςψιμί.
Gen. 36:31 μπατευρό ψωπί.
Ex. 16:24 μπεγεντ ψωπί.
Deut. 8:3 ναρεπιρψμι ναψςε εψψκι μματατψ αν.

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 πιτεβτ ηψηγ ντηψιομ.
Ex. 17:7 “πισψωντ νεμ πιχρεμψεμ” (in naming).
Num. 35:15 ψημ μπφεμμο χνεμ μπρεμνάψώιλι.
Deut. 7:1 πιχέττεος ψημ πιψεψεςος ψημ πιμφψερος ψημ πιψάναψος ψημ ψέρεςεος ψημ πιεψης, also Deut. 20:17 etc.

πιγκα μψημμο ψημ πιοψφανος ψημ ἡχπα Deut. 24:19f., 26:12.
Deut. 26:12 πιληψθς.
Gen. 31:40 πινίνμ αψψεναψ εψα λγαναβαλ.

(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 εψαλ δεψππενμυψτι νεμ εψαλ δεψπψψψτοψ
νεμ εψαλ δεψπψψψτοψ.
Gen. 30:32 ἡννὶγιβ ἡννὶβαἰμπὶ (Greek definite plural).
Num. 21:6 νηγὸν ... εὐχαστωτῆ (ANDERSSON 1904:104, Greek definite plural)
Gen. 15:11 νηγαλατ (ANDERSSON 1904:41 attributes this to a “slip of the Coptic translator”: Greek ὅρπεα).
Gen. 31:35 μῆρπῆν νηγιομὶ — μῆρπῆν νη — 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 οτὸν-Ἀἀοὶ μμὸκ ἡννὶρῳμὶ (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 ππαος, τεχοτονη, παρετηκος, παλαιν, παγενεβω; πεξπίτιανος, καταλετο; παρετηκος, πεξπιτιανος, παλαινων, παγεμε, παγελεος. 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 ὁ- 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 (e, 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 μῆρπῆν νη-1, on p. 116 of Crum’s copy of Stem’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 νη-, is merely implied: Jon. 3:7 B4 νηῳμὶ νῃεβνητὶ νῃεγὼτ (sic) νῃεγὼτ (“those in the city of Nineve”).
(6) Generic abstracts, to my knowledge not occurring in our corpus, are attested elsewhere: Ταίνη, Ταφία Luke 2:52; Mac. passim (e.g. 35B): Ταφάθ, Τελαγικ. Τηθαϊ-πεννο/κον/προμ/πεμπατω; plurals ibid. 35C Νηὶωτῆς, Νηὶορ- Νηὶοτη, Νηὶογνωτ.

(e) ὁ- (παν-) (3.3) — the instantual 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 *nxe-*, 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 *nem othaw nem εξενοτιωτη* *nem ganweiri εξενοτιωτ... Deut. 8:18* μαθη φι ετεψιασ *nxe-στοφο* εφιλανει *nem othαh nem othi.*

Deut. 22:22 *εψενκοτ nem othinsi ecsemci nem ηα.*
Deut. 10:18 *οτρφανος othεμμο othαρα* (Sah. π-, τ-).


Consider also the following grammatically conditioned cases: *ecsemci senotcnoq ntac Lev. 12:5, othinsi ntetcwni mpεkiwt* (Topic) *Lev. 18:12, *&*enoctai Gen. 28:21, othik Gen. 28:20 obj. (*ganwic Ex. 16:4), otheto othrap Gen. 27:28,*

*οθσνοq naenobi Deut. 21:8.*

Two instances of the plural *gan-* , 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* κεωτεμ εγανπακοτι othog κβωλ αμωονη.*

*Ex. 16:4* γηπνε ανοκ τιναγοντι νωτεν nganoeik.

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 *gan-* occurs following *θφρή* in B4: Soph. 1:17 ετεψοι *θφρή* νγανβαλετ, Soph. 2:3 *θφρή* νγαναθοι, *θφρή* νγανοθωνώ *ntetα-παβία.*
(f) Oppositions, alternations and combinations: classified striking examples

(1) The case of οὐ- 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 circumstants, the junctural exploitation of the zero vs. indefinite opposition and the frequent οὐ- following initial zero.

(a) Deut. 22:5 ΝΝΕ-ΚΕΣΤΟC ΝΓΩΣΟT ΥΨΩΝΙ ΓΙΟΤΣΙΜI - zero and οὐ- generic, in alternation (actant vs. circumstantial).
Ex. 12:15 neg. οΤΕΜΑΤΩΜΗΡ vs. affirm. ΤΑΚΕΣΤΩΜΗΡ
(b) Deut. 25:14 ΝΝΕΟΡΝΙΨI ΜΜΕΝΤ ΝΕΜΟΡΚΟΤΖΙ ΥΨΩΝI.
Deut. 25:13 ΝΝΕΟΡΨI ΝΕΜ ΟΨΨI ΥΨΩΝI — correlative framework.

(c) Deut. 22:22 ΕΥΕΝΚΟΤ ΝΕΜ ΟΤΣΙΜΙ ΕΥΕΜΕΙ ΝΕΜ ΠΑI — casual generics vs. compound verb.

ΕΚΕΛΛΑΨΟΤ ΝΝΟΤΒ ΣΕΝΟΣΝΟΤΒ Ex. 30:5, 36:38 etc.
Ex. 30:6 ΕΥΕΝΕΣΤΟΝΟΤI ΕΒΟΛ ΣΕΝΟΣΝΟΤΟΤI.
ΕΥΕΙ ΕΒΟΛ ΣΗΤΣ ΝΔΕ-ΟΤΜΩΟΤ vs. ΑΨΙΒI ΝΔΕ-ΠΙΔΑΟC ΝΚΑ-
ΜΜΩΟΤ Ex. 17:3:6 — syntactically conditioned alternation.

Ex. 19:13 ...ΣΕΤ-ΨΗΝI ΣΕΝΓΑΝΨI.

(d) zero for the interrogation, οὐ- in the response: Gen. 44:19f. ΑΝ-
ΟΡΝΗΣΕΝΕΝ-ΙΨΤ ΜΜΑΤ ΙΕ ΣΟΝ — ΣΟΝΝΤΑΝ ΝΟΥΣΕΛΛΟ
ΝΙΨΤ ΜΜΑΤ ΝΕΜ ΟΤΑΛΟΣ...

(e) Lev. 26:1 ΝΝΕΤΕΝΘΑΜΙΟ ΝΩΤΕΝ ΝΓΑΝΗΝΟΤΚ ΝΔΙΑΞ
ΟΤΔΕ ΦΨΤΡ — zero inside non-generic indefinite bracketing (a more complex hierarchy is signalled by bracketing)
Ex. 35:3 ΟΤΙΝΑΝ ΝΚΑI ΝΕΜ ΣΟΦΙΑ ΝΕΜ ΟΤΚΑI ΝΕΜ ΟΤΕΠΙ-
ΣΤΗΜΗ.

(2) Π- vs. Π-, for specific lexemes:
παζI Gen. 1:2, 8:1:9:11 — usually in collocations, e.g. with τΦε, “the earth”, vs. πικαζI “the land, the world” Gen. 7:23, 19:31.

ΦΡΗ Lev. 22:7 ΟΤΟΣ ΝΤΕΦΡΗ ΖΩΤΠ vs. ΠΙΟΝ, ΠΙΡΗ Deut.

ΦΜΩΟΤ Ex. 1:22 vs. ΠΙΜΩΟΤ Gen. 8:1 (water of the Deluge),
ΠΙΜΟΤΝΓΩΟΤ Gen. 8:2.

ΡΨC ΝΤΧΨI Deut. 20:13 (Vat ΝΤΧΨI = ἐν φόνῳ μαχαίρας).
περιγραφής οὐσίας πε Deut. 12:23 = Vat (Greek v.l. αἰμα/τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ)

(3) πι- vs. π- vs. zero in lists.

Catalogic-list generics may be a case apart\(^{41}\). The variation π- / πι- is still baffling. We do have some cases of evident grammatical constraint (that is, of alternation):

Deut. 30:15 πωνᾶς οὐ εἴμων πιπεμνανεψ οὐ εἴμων πιπε-

εῦνοιν.

Gen. 7:23 ἰκζενήφρωμι ῶπτεβνη οὐ εἴμων σατη ινίεν οὐ εἴμων

νικαμφάν ντεσφη.

Deut. 11:24 ποιμα — πιαταλιβανος — φιαρο — φιομ

ετ- — πιπεμνανεψ: generics vs. Proper Names?

Deut. 16:19 ννοσίδωρον νιδαύρων γαρ ῶπασσεμ

ννενβαλ ντεσικαεσ.

Or of various hierarchical arrangements, also combined with grammatical factors:

Deut. 28:48 πικό νομιμοτετέρων τετελεστε —

Note the recurrent ἰκζενήφρωμι ῶπτεβνη Ex. 9:25, Num.

8:15:17, 31:11, never differently.

Gen. 31:40 ναῖροκε σαπακάμα μπιεγοοτ οὐ εἴμων πι

ηπιεσδωρ.

Deut. 10:18 ζεμετ μπιεμμον ετωκικ οὐ εἴμων ουφος —

three different generic types combined.

Deut. 8:3 ναπε-πιφρωμι ναωνε εθνικ ομαστατητικ αν.

Deut. 4:19 φορομ οὐ εἴμων πισοσ οὐ εἴμων νιοσιτ (+ τσφη).

Still, in the longer lists the semantic ground for shifting from one gen-

cus 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:

οτ-μασι, ριουβ, ραφριτ

zero — εισαλ, σακι, ωου, ραμπολπαραλικ / σεροπ-

θος, ελκουβ, λαρον, ρωδιαν, κινον, ειπ etc.

τ-πασελαροκ.

πι- — ρασοποροντα, ζαμοντα, ραφιο, χιρογιαλια, περ.

ασωμ, νοσρι, νουερ, αλετον, θερ.

αβωκ 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 ΦΗ or Π- 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 ΦΗ εΤ - /ΦΑΙ εΤ- and of Π- εΤ-?
(d) What (if any) are the deictic properties of the Relative Forms in point?

Excurse: 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, ΦΑΙ (παι-) and ΦΗ are in Bohairic asymmetrical (to a far greater degree than in Sahidic): ΦΑΙ is a broad-range, ΦΗ a narrow-range deictic. Their opposition is mostly neutralized: ΦΗ does not accr at all as focus or Rheme (cf. STERN §245): what is more, ΦΑΙ is the only text-phoric representant of the two. The functional assignation of Π- to ΦΗ (following Sahidic) must be reviewed, for ΦΑΙ takes on in Bohairic certain expressive roles associated in Sahidic with Π- (POLOTSKY 1957:229f.), cf. παι- nɔtŋw (De Vis I 123, Cat. 225), Num.14:18 παι-niŋw† nnaI, and ω παι- (De Vis I
196), consider De Vis I 175 ταίνιον ἡ φήμη σοφται ἐν τῷ ἑαυτῷ ἔργῳ ἕν τῷ ἑαυτῷ ἐκατογράφῳ ἐν τῷ ἑαυτῷ ἐκατογράφῳ... 

(b) The typical textual phoricity of Φαί is not shared by Φην. {Φαί} has a double mobility. First, the neuter Φαί/ναί, or Φαί/θαϊ for grammatical gender, which are always text- phoric, and mostly anaphoric; second, the masculine as opposed to the feminine and plural: Φαί/θαϊ/ναί, rarer and of different referentiality, and typically carrying sex-marking function. In the first case, Φαί and ναί, in Narrative or Exposition, are often fuzzily anaphoric (note ἐν θεοφαί, μενενεκαφαί, παρηθή, less usually cataphoric: consider Ex. 13:15, 16:15, 13:14, 34:32, Lev. 11:9:28f., Num. 8:15, Lev. 14:19, 21:14, Deut. 3:21, 5:15, Gen. 10:9, 16:14, 19:22, 20:6, 15:10:14, 18:5, 10:18 etc.; cataphoric reference Gen. 20:13, 25:16, 34:15, 45:17, Ex. 15:1 αὐγεσ νταιων, Num. 15:22, 26:51 θαϊ τε τεπίκοπον ντενεφούρι ντικά... Lev. 11:13 οὐσον ναί ὀρβον ἐβολ σεννιγαλα...; Lev.11:21 ναί ερετενοσομοσ...; Num. 16:9 Φαί ζε-). In Nominal 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 Φαί αυ-, Gen. 37:22). It is always anaphoric in the case of θαϊ-Φαί/ναί (Ex. 14:3, Lev. 11:6, 13:37 etc.). Note Φαί for cohesive summing-up (Num. 7:17:35:41), Φαί 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, Φαί/θαϊ may replace the personal pronouns as a highly cohesive alterant of θεον / θεος:

Gen. 17:18 Ἰχαμα Φαί ναρεφων — a remarkable locus: Φαί either resumes the topical Ἰχαμα, or characterizes it for deixis (περι- would mark it as anaphoric, not as situationally prominent).

Gen. 16:12 Φαί εχεεροτρωμι νπεμηκοι.

Deut. 3:11 ἑκατε ις περος ὀβελωτι πε Φαί χας σεν-

τακρα...

Gen. 42:6 ἱεχφ δε ναρχοι ναρχων επικαζι οὐσον Φαι

ηρι θεολ...

Or it may refer to contextually (pragmatically) familiar specific entities, situation or background:

Gen. 12:12 τεκεζιμι τε θαϊ.

Gen. 12:18 θεοφαί ἀκερδαϊ ναν.

Gen. 37:32 ανδεμθαϊ.
παίλασι Num. 11:11f. and passim.
Num. 32:5 πασίκοδάνσες.
Gen. 20:10 ὁτί πετάκνατ ἐρωθ ἔλκερφᾶι.
Gen. 42:14 Ἐνὶ πετάδοιο ὅπετε ἔλκερὶ μμος ἰε-.
Num. 22:33 ἄρικι καβαλ μμοι Ἐπὶ ὕπαρ τὸ σοπ πε.
Gen. 19:34 ἐνπαίκεθείωρ (also Ex. 11:4).
Expressive deixis (see [d] below) (cf. Sahidic πι-):
Num. 14:18 παύνεςτ ἡναι.
It is Ἐπὶ that is focussed:
Gen. 26:24 κατὰ Ἐπὶ Ἐπί.
Ex. 30:37 παἰσκεμνὶ Ἐπὶ.
Ex. 12:2 παῖδεατ Ἐπὶ.
(d) The above notwithstanding, there are still two slots of opposition
between Ἐπὶ and Ἐν (and, unlike Sahidic, παϊ- and πι-; the former a
diectic demonstrative, the latter article), of which the most conspicuous
is the slot preceding the Relative, Ἐν / Ἐπὶ ἐτ-, where, inversely, it is
Ἐν that is unmarked (see below). In this slot, Ἐπὶ is clearly marked for
locutivity or allocutivity (the I-you-deixis), and is often affectively
expressive (SHISHA-HALEVY 1994:228ff.). In this environment, Ἐπὶ sig-
nals the "situation-at-hand deixis" and more generally the interlocutive
sphere (HARWEG 1968, 1990:167f.). Note that the selection of Ἐπὶ and
Ἐν is not triggered here by the Greek Vorlage — indeed, the Coptic is
considerably more sophisticated in this point than the Greek; also, that,
unlike Ἐν ἐτ-, Ἐπὶ ἐτ- is always anaphoric:
Gen. 11:4 (Let us build) ὁποτρος Ἐπὶ ἐτετέαςε ναωμπι
ἐερπι ἐτός "a tower such as has a peak reaching the sky" (Greek
 où ἢ κεφαλῆ...).
Gen. 39:17 πεκαλοτ νγεβρεος Ἐπὶ ἐτακεν... pejorative,
disparaging: affective.
Gen. 3:11 πιγεν Ἐπὶ ἐταεγεγκων ἐρωθ ἰε-Ἐπὶ μμα-
τπὶ μπερτοτμ ἐβοι μμος: focussing.
Ex. 10:11 μαρτουμσί μοτ Ἐπὶ ἐρ οωτ ἔτετε-
κωτ ἡνωτ: affective, disparaging.
Ἐπὶ ἐτ- occurs also in concord to {παϊ-} determination of the nu-
cleus:
Deut. 4:8 παἰνομος τηρῷ Ἐπὶ ἀνοκ ἐτό μμος... also Ex.
4:17. Deut. 20:16 etc.
Different perhaps is Gen. 27:20 οὐ περὶ Φαί + ἐτακτίσμα (Isaac to Esau, who has just invited him to eat of his game (Greek τί τοῦτο 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) θεὸς οὐκ ἔχει λαῖσσον ἔπος θύμα (the she-ass) λαῖσσον (sic) πε.
In Narrative, in contrast to another delocutive:
Ex. 7:12 Αὐλοῖοι νααῆν ωμκ ΝΝ ᾿Ωλοῖον + Ντεν (of the Pharaoh’s magicians).
Ex. 24:2 κοσμήσεις ἐκείνου ἐρχομένος γὰρ [Ν] θύμα (but the Children of Israel) ΝΝ ἐρχομένος — marking for inferiority.
(f) The local adverb τὴ — always rhematic in Relative Conversion) seems to have in our Bohairic a markedly pejorative value similar to that of ΦΗ (stronger than ετεμμαύ; ταί is purely local):
Gen. 37:19 πιείται πεπραγότος ετθ (said contemptfully by Joseph’s brothers).
Num. 16:14 ΝΗ ετθ (said disparagingly of Korah and his followers).
Deut. 13:5 πιείται δε ετθ pejorative, contemptful.
Gen. 24:65 πιείται ΝΗ περὶ ετθ ετούκ εγοτθ ϑεράν — uniquely non-pejorative, but distal? Greek τίς ἔστιν ὁ ἀνθρώπος ἐκεῖνος ὁ πορεύόμενος; ἐκεῖνος is not usually rendered by ετθ.
Contrast ταί in εβολ ταί (locutive narrative) Deut. 9:12; Gen. 37:17 Αὐτοῦτες εβολ ταί.

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-, η-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-):
  - γαππεονανεψ Num. 10:30.
  - γαππετγωσ Num. 11:1.
  - οππετγωσ Num. 11:10.

Probably also
  - Gen. 37:26 ου πιπεονανεψ ετενναλι (zero article!).


In coordination and parallelism with zero-determinated lexemes:
  - Ex. 4:11 εβο νεμ κορς, πεονας Μνοι α νεμ βελα.
  - As Existent or Non-Existent (zero / ου-):
    - Lev. 25:26 ἄμον-πετκν α ζαροκ (Circumstantial).
    - Ex. 10:10 οτον-οππετγωσ χόν ζακωτολ.
  - As object of derivational επ-, Δε- (lexeme iconic simulation):
    - Num. 10:29 εππεονανεψ.
    - Lev. 19:14 ηνεκαζεπετγωσ.
  - In discontinuous combination with ηνευ (zero):
    - Lev. 7:19 πετομνησοτ νυν ερεοτομ.

3 Non-specific, non-particular: generic “genus-name” type (cf. {πι-} above). Non-restricted lexical constituency? Morphologically restricted (Present tense: Statives only):
  - Num. 23:3 επετκοστων (cf. είπεαπε...).
  - Lev. 11:39 πετμωστ 秣 ν εμ πεπερπιον οτομ.
Lev. 13:10 ἵππς ἵππας.
Lev. 27:10 πτερυγία πτερύγων, different from the particular and specific Lev. 27:14 ὡστε θνητός ἓττανερ ὅστε θνητό ἓττανερ (= Vat).

(4) Non-specific, appositive-neutric (a unique instance):
Gen. 19:19 ἀκροτεκμεθήμενη ἑρπνίῳ πετεκναίῃ νεμήν ἑρέπταζυχῆ ὅνὴ (= Vat) (Greek ...τὴν δικαιοσύνην σου ὅ ποιεῖς...).

(5) Particular, specific by reference: anaphoric. Morphologically restricted (Present tense: Statives only):
Deut. 21:1ff. οὐδὲ ἐρμασὶ ... ἐκτὼ ἐπεθμασὶ ... ἐφεθμασὶ.

(6) Particular, specific by combination: appositive to highly specific nucleus. Non-restricted lexical constituency? Morphologically restricted (Present tense):
Deut. 28:58 ...εἰπὶ θνατικαῖ τῆς τοῦ τεπαίνομος πετεκναίῃ.
Lev. 22:16:32 ἀνόκ πε πῆς περτοροῦλλο μμών (not Cleft Sentence!)

(7) Particular, specific by combination (see above) — “πετε-phiaq”.

(8) Particular, specific: named as unique — cf. the article {ν-} above. Morphologically restricted (Present Tense):

πεθοσα “the Holy (usually: “of Holies”, Greek ἁγία (τῶν) ἁγίων and some variants, with no apparent correspondence in the Coptic). This is a technical term, a concept both architectural and ritual⁴² — which appears to have caused some difficulty and ensuing variation in rendering. Note that nēt- is attested only here:

πεθοσα διδηθοσα διδηθοσα Num. 4:4, Ex. 30:36, Lev. 27:28.

πεθοσα πεθωσα Num. 4:16.

Προ νπεθοσα Lev. 22:32 — a case of “inalienable” association (below), incidentally proving the non-zero and specific nature of πεθοσα.

τστονθ πνεθοσα Ex. 29:29.

Compare the following plural phrases:

νν θθοσα ντεπεθοσα Lev. 10:12.

⁴² θθοσα is early as a concept in Egyptian: see VITTMANN 1996:466ff. (Ryl. 9 11/8).
(II) (ΦΗ ΕΤ-)  

(1) Non-specific but hypothetically particular, a special, paradoxical and very rare determination characteristic, carried, outside conjugation, by the indefinite article (see above).

(a) Thematic protatic-generic agens actant (case-raising: initializing a hypothetic “generic scenario”, carried on by the Conjunctive) in legal, medical and ritual textemes. Tenses: Future (ΦΗ ΕΤΝΑ-):

Ex. 21:15 ΦΗ ΕΤΝΑ† ΝΟΤΩΝ ΜΠΕΙΩΤΕ ΤΕ ΕΤΜΑΝ ΣΕΝΟΤΜΟΥ ΜΑΡΕΨΜΟΥ.

Ex. 21:16 ΦΗ ΕΤΝΑΛΙ ΝΟΤΑΙ ΝΣΙΟΤΙ ΟΤΟΡ ΝΤΕΨΕΝΔΩΡΙ ΕΔΩΝ ΝΤΕΨΘΙΗΕ ΕΒΟΛ ... ΣΕΝΟΤΜΟΥ ΜΑΡΕΨΜΟ\(\)U.

Ex. 22:20 ΦΗ ΕΤΝΑΕΡΨΩΥΜΩΙ ΝΙΑΝΚΕΝΟΤ† ... ΕΤΕΨΟΤΥΕ ΕΒΟΛ.

Num. 19:11 ΦΗ ΕΤΝΑΣΙΝΕ ΜΦΗ ΕΘΜΩΟΤ ...  

Also, title-wise, without a scenario:

Lev. 12:7 ΦΗΝΟΜΟΟΤ ΝΣΕΗ ΕΤΝΑΜΙΚΙ.  

Lev. 11:36 ΦΗ ΔΕ ΕΤΝΑΣΙ ΝΕΜ ΝΗ ΕΘΜΩΟΤ ΝΤΕΝΑΙ.

(b) “Any (particular) one who…”:  

ΦΗ ΝΙΒΕΝ ΕΤ-, e.g. Lev. 15:32, 17:4. Mostly masculine singular. A special construction, rooted in the Egyptian past.

Gen. 41:24 ΝΕΜΜΟΝ-ΦΗ ΕΤΤΑΜΟ ΜΜΟΙ ΕΡΟΣ (Greek ὁ ἀπαγγέλων): proves non-specificity — this is not ΦΗ, but ΦΗ ΕΤ-.


ΦΗ ΕΤΣΙΜΝΟΤ (Sah. οτα έq- Deut. 32:25, functionally identical? see POLOTSKY 1987:78f.)
Lev. 27:14 ὀστε ΦΗ ετνανεφ ημ εοστε ΦΗ ετγωφοτ.
Lev. 11:36 ΦΗ ετνασι ημ ην εομωφοτ ηνεναι.

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 1987:84f. In fact, niben behaves here prosodically like an Augens (Ex. 16:23 ΦΗ θηρι ημα- etc.). However, niben does not always occupy the colon-second position: Deut. 21:5 ΧΩ εβολ λημ, possibly Num. 18:13 ζωφοι νοτταγ niben (Greek τα πρωτογενεματα παντα). 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 νοφοι μησι niben (Num. 8:17 Lag.) is Lagarde’s own Coptic, and similarly fictive is νοφοι... niben ντη (Lev. 21:19, 22:18; see Crum Dictionary sub nih), probably Wilkins’ own translation into Coptic from the Greek (Brooke 1902:262), we do have a few genuine instances in Bohairic and Sahidic: ζωφοι μησι niben Num. 3:13 (Vat ωφον), nemenAssot niben (letter of H. Quecke 2/7/80), Choiak-Psalmody, ed. Labib 1955 p.333; def. plural in Sahidic Ruth (ed. Shier) 4:7 ἐμαικει nih; παρος nih in nhc 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 i3-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 εκαλωσι νη ετενεκεωσι νη (Greek δοσι ουκ οιδασι) — the negative is unusual.

Lev. 27:14 ΕΡΩΜΙ ... ΦΗ ετναεραιαζιν (Greek ανθρωπος δς άν ...).

Lev. 15:2 οτρομι ΦΗ ετεοτον-οτετετελ ναουμι ηπεςεκωμα (Greek ανδρι, ανδρι θ εάν...).

(2) Specific and particular: “the (particular one) that...” — comprehensive, unrestricted tense and gender/number repertory:

Ex. 39:13 ΦΗ εταεκεπι.
Ex. 21:19 ΦΗ εταφτ μπιερβοτ.
Lev. 24:14 ΦΗ εταεκαγοτι.
Lev. 25:30 ΦΗ ετακωφοτ.
Lev. 5:24 ΦΗ ετεφωη λε ενθηινη λεη.

---

43 It is in cohesion with the quantifier niben combined with zero determination that we encounter the masculine/feminine neuter neutralization: Num. 6:7 ζυχ ημ niben εακηοτ, Lev. 17:12 ζυχ ημ ninen ηπεοτουμ-σνοη.
Ex. 21:22 ἐπετοικαὶ κατὰ βῆς ετέθης η ἐπετοικαὶ οὐκ ἔτον της ἡ βῆς.
Num. 16:13 sim. Num. 16:5.

οὐ ἔτεθης καὶ οὐκ ἔπετοικαὶ διὸ η ἔτεθης ἐτέθης οὐκ ἔτον της
Lev. 25:10, 27:2.

Num. 17:13 η ἔτον ἕκτος ... η ἔτον ἕκτος.
Ex. 16:23 η ἔτον ἕκτος ἕκτος.

(3) Specific and particular: in appositive-anaphoric linkage with a
specific and particular nucleus:

Deut. 21:1 πικαζί η ἔτεθης πεκνοττ ὁ πνεύμα ἡ ἐκκλησία.
Num. 14:31 πικαζί η ναότεν εταρεθενγενενοντα σάβαον μμοο.

Lev. 4:5 πικαζί η ἔτεθης.
Deut. 9:12 πεκλαος ἡ ἐτακενος ἐβολα η ἐκκλησία.

(4) Specific and particular: ἐπετοικαὶ ἔτον ἔπετοικαὶ (ritual term:
name and type of a specific sacrifice).

ἐπετοικαὶ ἔπετοικαὶ ... Lev. 9:15, 14:13:19.
A zero-conversion variant is

Lev. 7:7 η ἔπετοικαὶ (= Vat) (Greek το περι της ἀμαρτίας),
cf. Lev. 8:14 πικαζί ἔπετοικαὶ.

Another variant is

Lev. 14:17 η ἐπετοικαὶ ἐπετοικαὶ-: the morphemic-orthographic merging
of ἐπετοικαὶ- and ἐπετοικαὶ- may have Demotic precedents, and even LE ones, as
ἐπετοικαὶ- Adv. Compare Lev. 8:2 πικαζί ἐπετοικαὶ- (= Vat),
Lev. 7:7 η ἐπετοικαὶ-μετεμεταγμένη (Vat ἐπετοικαὶ-), and cases of ἐπετοικαὶ- + ad-
verb like πως ὅπως ὁ ἔπετοικαὶ-μμοο Num. 4:16. However,
{ἡ} occurs as nucleus of ἐπετοικαὶ- especially in affiliation: Proper Name
+ {ἡ} ἐπετοικαὶ- + Proper Name (Ex. 35:34, 37:20), cf. also ἐπετο-
λαρμαν Ex. 29:29.

(5) Two special cases in poetic language:
(a) Specific and particular.

Num. 23:8 ἐπετοικαὶ ἐπετοικαὶ ερωταν — peculiar on two
counts: the negative — unique in my files — and the object actant nu-
cleus.
(b) Non-specific, non-particular — institional generic (above):

Deut. 32:25 ὁ ἐπετοικαὶ ἐπετοικαὶ ἐπετοικαὶ ἐπετοικαὶ ἐπετοικαὶ ἐπετοικαὶ.
Observation to Question (b):

The following isomorphic correlation between the generic determination-signals before lemmes and before converters of verbal nexus, as exponents of agens actantial genericity, cannot, in my opinion, be dismissed as coincidental (in order of ascending genericity):

\{πι\} \{Φη- ετ-\} — agens hypothetically particular in a case-raising hypothetic “generic scenario”

\{π-\} π-ετ- — “named” genericity of agens: “type name”

οὐ- οὐ-ἔνανοτα, οὐ-ποτεναινοτα (Oxyrh.) — casual instantial genericity of agens (also Φη ετ-: Deut. 32:25)

ζερο — ζη-ευ- — zero-grade genericity of agens.

οὐ-ἔνανοτα (Oxyrhynchite) Mt. 11:30, see Schenke 1996:111ff., οὐ-ποτεναινοτα (Oxyrhynchite) Ps. 85:5.

ευ- “(any) one who” (Shisha-Halevy 1976), is a case of zero determination grade, and like it is typical — indeed the alternant of other actantial-generices — of negative environment:

Deut. 18:10f. Ννοσκίμη Νήντκ εὐθορο μπεκψηρι ετεψερι εκειν δενοτρομ — ρετηφαρι — Ασυβεν — ευ-νοτα — έβολ δενονεξι — ευτονετ εραχμηνι — ευσινι Ννιερομωττ.

45 Greek “potentiality” ὀσ 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-ερε- and Νετντοσ- in the Palau Ribes Luke (2:5, 18:24 ed. Quecke), appositive to Proper Names or substantival, are in juncture analogous to οὐ-ἔνανοτα.
Deut. 12:9 ἰνετενοῦτος εὐβολ ὡς ἡμῶν εὐγώστω ὀτὲ ὑπ ἔφος ἀλλά εὐτέλεστώ (= 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 παρθ ἡς ὁτοντάκ μιᾶς εἰμαντός ντέκω ννικολαίων.

(2) The probably related adverbial and adverbial role of ἐς - 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 ἐς -:

Ex. 30:32 ἰνετενοῖμι μπαρθ ἐς γοβᾶ.

Mark 7:10 ἡρμηνοῦ ὅρθως ὅν ἐσχατὴ ἐργῶν ἑναπεσιῶτ ἐμ ἐπεματ (v.l. ὄτατα).

Mark 7:35 δανκαί ἐς εἰκοστίων (consensus).

(3) Note the zero-generic coordinated to the thematic indefinite article: Ps. 68:30 ὅρη-κι ὅτο ἡμῶν ὅτο σφ. Ps. 85:10 ὅτο ὅτι ὅτο ἐπιπ....

Observations to Questions (c) and (d)

(1) Contrasting such cases as

Ex. 39:13 ἐταύπετι.

Ex. 21:19 ἐταύτ ἡμπέρσωτ.

Gen. 41:24 ἰεδον-ἵν ἐττάμο μμοὶ εἰρος.

Lev. 12:7 ἰνομος ντέθω ἐταμικί.

with

Deut. 21:1 πικαρί ἐταπαὶς πεκνοῦ ὅ νατην νακ.

Deut. 11:2 ἀναλωτοὶ ἑν ἐταις ἐκωτων ἀν.

Lev. 15:2 ὀτρωμὶ ἐχ ἐτετοτο-οττετελα ἐπίωμι ἡν-πεοκωμα,

we conclude that {ἵν ἐτ-}, which may be considered a kind of analytic Relative pronoun, 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-ἔτ- is not backwards cohesive. The rare appositive πετ-, as in:

Deut. 28:58 ἱπ ὅνοι δάκατα θροτ ὅτεναμος πετ-σοῦτ...

Lev. 22:16:32 ἀνοκ πε ποῦτεῦσε μῶιος, is, I suggest, not linked anaphorically at all, but a case of an apposed highly specific

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 ΝΙΒΕΝ following ΦΗ and Augentia (τθρωτ, ἄνωκ, νηκ, νωτεν) following ΝΗ⁴⁸. 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 η-, 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 Φαι, elsewhere an undifferentiated phoric representative, forms in Φαι 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 1985:262ff. (corrective to Nagel); Polotsky 1987:80, 85 (on πετ- and ΦΗ ετ-). On Bohairic, we find Quecke 1985:266. On the πεταιανομια type, Quecke 1985:273ff. Quecke explicitly states the leximization 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 “parathetic” (our “appositive”) ΦΗ ετ- (“a looser link”: Φαι ετ-even looser) Polotsky 1987:89ff.

(4) Diachronic. Already Demotic poses some intriguing questions in this context, especially concerning the relationship between “adjective” lexemization and types of genericity — p-nty-n3-km.ν vs. km “black” (Quack 1999 A4); in Ryl. IX, p-nty-w’b the

⁴⁸ Like other Augentia, τθρωτ may occur at a later, colon-final position: Gen. 31:18 ΝΗ ετενταξ τθρωτ, Gen. 27:45 ΝΗ ετακατωτ ΝΑΟΤ τθρωτ. However, the placement following NH is usual (Gen. 34:28, 35:2, 41:17 etc.). Exx. for ΝΗοκ etc.: Ex. 23:27, 24:21, Lev. 22:15, Deut. 4:2:8 etc.
specific “the Holy of Holies”, VITTMAN 1998:466ff., beside p3-wb b, n3-wbw. 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 “hypothetical particular” generic), and must, like our ἀποδοτικός, structurally be considered a cluster of homonyms: (1) existant (19/1, 20/8f. etc.; rarely negative; cf. also jw-mn-nty-sw y re-p3-nty P. Berlin 13548 (ed. Zauzich 1993) Ptol. — no det.: “...dass es nichts darin 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 SHIISHA-HALEVY 1989a). French and German are especially prominent among the languages treated: SLOAT 1969 (English), LE BIHAN 1978, TOGEBY 1978 (40ff on the articled, 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 articled 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 articled 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 rhematically the well-demarcated name paradigm itself:

†παν ἐρο= Δε- Lev. 23:2, Deut. 2:11:21.
†πεν= Δε- Num. 32:42.
Μοτ† ερο Δε- Lev. 23:3:4.
Μοτ† επεκραν Δε- Gen. 16:11, 17:5:19, 32:28.
...πεκραν ζωπτι Δε- Gen. 17:15, 32:28.
Gen. 17:5 Νοτησμοτ† επεκραν Δε-αβραμ αλλα ερεπεκ-
παν ζωπτι 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.

π( ) (genus/notion name) Gen. 1:8:10, 26:20ff., 30:18, etc.

π- 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 π- (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 ελωμ πιετεος, βεηρ πικεττεος.

PN πιτωσ Num. 20:22, Ex. 3:11.

49 The actual name in Φπαν ν-, 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 ἄρωμν ποτιωτ.
Ex. 14:31 μωτσχε σεσαλοτ.
Ex. 3:1 ιοθορ πεσωμ φοσνβ μμαδιαν.
PN νεμ PN γανοπολικ ετξορ Num. 32:36.
Gen. 39:1 πετεθφρ ... οσρωνι νρεμινχονι.
Δε- following a PN introduces “translation naming” (SHISHA-HALEVY 1989a:2.3.1.3f.)
Gen. 30:18 ιαχαρ Δε-Φβεχε.
Gen. 30:13 ιασερ Δε-στραμαο.
The expanding or satellital PN following Δε- as a special rhematic naming apposition is the adenominal packaging of naming, adjoined to a higher- or lower-specificity nucleus. In Dialogue, with human reference and when it follows παι- or πι-, this apposition is as a rule disparaging:
Φαι Δε-μωτσχε Ex. 32:1:23 — disparaging.
πετζορι εακωβ Gen. 49:24 — this (in poetic language) is different (Greek δυνατου Ιακωβ).

Obs.
Outside the corpus:
ταξιμι Δε-ΡΠΝ Apoc. 2:20.
παι Δε-γρωμαν De Vis I 37 disparaging; so too
οσρωμι/περωμι Δε-ῖς Mac. No. 6.
παιξετ Δε-λοσκας Mac. No. 6.
παισκολ Δε-ξριςφανος AM I 218.
παιραν Δε-ῖςα AM I 122, 125.
οσαι Δε-ΡΠΝ AM I 51.
οσπολικ Δε-κεντωπί AM I 110, 202.
περωμι επτρωπος 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 Allocation:
†βακι ερβοκ Gen. 23:2.
πασιπι ιαστ Gen. 27:21.

50 Hermeneutical PN translation has distinct constructions: Act. 13:9 σαλος Δε
eτε-πασλος πε (SHISHA-HALEVY 1989a 2.3.1.3)
(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 τονι, πονει, ωφρπ (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-} (Φ†, πΣΤ, etc., in a range of grades: see above, §3.5.1). And PNs are compatible with determinators, for deictic characterization and without deproperization:

παλλακαννες Deut. 3:27.
πκεβενιαμιν Gen. 43:14, 42:36.

Obs.

πκενεογ γων, 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 Ο Φλαον ρχαιωες.
Num. 20:10 ερωι ιατεσωτεμ.
(Mt. 22:16 Φρεψιβωδ.
Mark 10:17f. Φρεψιβω ταγηαοως.)

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 πασμπρι + ΕΗΠΠΕ ΑΝΟΚ.
Gen. 27:18 παυστ ÷ ενπε ανοκ.
Gen. 31:11 ἰακωβ ÷ οὐ πετων.
Gen. 46:2 ἰακωβ ÷ ἰακωβ ÷ οὐ πετων.
• Complex, extensive address to a single addressee may constitute the entire Allocution, in a Divine Acclamation:
  Ex. 34:6f. πρὸς πρὸς Φ.Name ντενιμεπενγκ ηθον εἰδοκωνεψ ηθον Ἐλλ.νινιψ ηθον οὗτος πιλεκανος οὗτος ειρηνεψ εστιμενήι
• The Address preceding or following an interrogative Allocution:
  Num. 16:22 Φ.Name Φ.Name ντενιμπναι ναι καρπα ηθον εἰδοκωνεψ αχερνοβί αν. παώντα ηθον ηθον ναι εξεντεπτανγκωθ θηρ.
Gen. 15:2 πανθβ ÷ οὐ πε ετεκναθηθ ηθον.
Gen. 16:8 ἀγαρ : ἑβωκι ηκαρα : αρηνθοψ εβολ οψ.

(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 information structuring were pointed out. PNs are reasserted as strong delimitations (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 και άνε ηε-εοτρωμι ηεμθηθ ηηε.
  Gen. 25:27 οτορ ηκατ ηεοτρωμι πε ενσωθοψ ητμε-ερνθ ητεμνκοι.
Ex. 24:18 οτορ αρηνασκ ηηε-μωτθης εβοθη...οτορ αρηνασκ επισθω επιτωθο
Gen. 20:4 αρηνασκ ηηε-Φ.Name γαβιμελεξ ... οτορ πεδαθ
Nam θε... γαβιμελεξ δε μπειφηο ερον...
Gen. 25:33 ηκατ δε αρ.Name ηνημετωρπ ημίιη εβολ ηηα-
kouβ.
Gen. 32:2 αρκοτη ηηε-λαβλαν αρηνασκ οτορ ηιακυβ ἀρ-
θενασκ.

3.9 The noun syntagm expanded: the notae relationis. Associative relationships. Constituence Personal-Sphere ("Inalienable") Association

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 π- Ν-, π- Ντε- and πι- Ντε-. In structural terms, what we find at first sight is a double opposition of Ν- with Ντε- and πι with π-, 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 Ν- and Ντε- constructions goes back to L. Stern’s grammar, if not earlier. Stern (1880: 183ff.) first made the distinction between possession and appurtenance; in π- Ντε , 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 Chaîne 1933, somewhat frantically convoluted statements such as the following (§§203ff.) testify to the difficulty of the descriptive task: “Ν- introit le complément déterminatif après un nom de sens générique qui est alors pris dans son acception première marquée par l’article faible...la particule Ντε- introit 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 πι- vs. π- Ντε, 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 "πικοι νεκεμ", "τυθνη λαετη" "πινατ προνι", "πινομοι 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 ({πεντ}-, — {νταντ}).

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. Steinhall's brilliant 1847 dissertation on the nota relationis: (one would like to have some information on contacts — if any — between Stern and the typologist Steinhall, who had made these elements, patterns and dependencies of Coptic his own). Consider STEINHAL 1847:47f. ὅτι δὲ καὶ ἀναφέρθη: "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, εν is not a "determinative pronoun" (56), and πρωμενοσ is about the worst "synthetic" illustrative construction conceivable for the nota relationis in Coptic.
ent today\textsuperscript{31}, Steinthal says: "Præterea quum id, profecto verum sit, Coptis, qui omnes casus η denotarent, denotasse nullum: nos quoque, quem sentiantias Aegyptias ad verba vertamus in nostros sermones, casus omnino evitare debemus, ac ne supplere quidem quois Copti non supplerevertint". However, Stern kept to the "genitival" terminology: 1880 §293: "genitiv der relation", §294: πι-ιντε- "der bestimmte genitiv", which faults the many insights in "die Relation".

(2) Steinthal and Misteli 1893:277f. "Das koptische v ist, wie neupers. i, ein auschließlich 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 (277ff.) the junctural gradation of association ("Angehörigkeit"), from the compositional ἕν-η-νοτε to 'πιγιηφι ιντε-ϕφωμι' (actually not attested?) — calling for mid-grade πι-ιντε-. 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 η, not ιντε, and if the regens has the definite article this must be of the πι-series, not the η-series" (Gunn mentions "nouns which can take the πι-series", having identified here a lexical group). "Rule: nouns which can take πι-articles take πι-articules (a) in the vocative... [but... Φ† ετομασ...], when followed by a relative expression (including ετομασ and ετ- + qual.), (b) often before ιντε + determined noun (the question still is why ιντε is employed in some cases and not in others) (are exceptions incorrect?)."

(4) Diachrony is here greatly neglected. See Borgouts 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-/ιντε- (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 (1): \{πι\-\} η-, ηεν- η- two noun syntagms connected by η-, the first determined by \{πι\-\}, 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 literature 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
inherence vs. incidence, which we find in nominal predication (Chapter
Two). I would quote here my tentative definition of "inalienable essen-
tial 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 componential and representational: "N¹ represents
N²" (compare Gen. 41:46 ΠΚΑΓΙ 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 ΝΤΑ=)
normalizes 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, ΝΕΝ-
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, ΝΕΝ⁻ (rarely N⁻) really belongs only only in the associative
phrase, while π⁻ is the number-neutral (morphologically singular) "not-
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 appellative: 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 ΦΒΕΕΞΕ ΝΟΥΙΠΟΡΝΗ (instantial generic) and
the remarkable, equally generic, ...ΨΥΝΙ ΕΠΗΙ ΜΠΝΟΤ 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- n-" 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 valent 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 ματρι "[one’s own] silver [money]" and ματρι2 "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 μοι and ροι, instead of (n)τα with ματι for the existential predication of possession by means of the special verboid:

Deut. 1:15 εισόδον-επίστημη μμωτ (opposed to non-grammaticalized Deut. 32:28 μοι-επίστημη οσιτο τον "in them").
Lev. 11:9f.; 12 ετεοτον-τενι μμωτ also Deut.14:9:10.
Ex. 13:7 οτον εισόδον-κεκαλμηρ μμοιμ.
Lev. 11:21 ετεοτον-κα−μμωτ.
Lev. 11:23 ετε-οτον-κτο μεθετ ερωσ.  
Deut. 32:20f. μμον-κα† μμον.  
Deut. 32:20f. μμον-ντε† μμον.

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-, πι- 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 assignment 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 πι- ντε- patterns.
Singular:
(a) πτωσευνναρμων Deut. 3:8.
πτωσευνκινα Lev. 25:1 and often.
πκαγινεσεμ Gen. 47:4, 23:2, 41:46, 48:7 and often.
νιρομπιντε-πωνςναβραμ Gen. 25:7(!).
τφισαληλετι Num. 17:2.
φιναςποτι, φιναςνανατοοτι Ex. 16:6f.
φιναςνεπωτιμφιρ Gen. 15:17.
τηπιννηγοοσ Num. 14:34.
νιηγοοσντεγινβιμφιριιμωτιευς Deut. 34:8.
*πκαγιννενωψηριινςτ Gen. 23:7.
φλαοςμπκαγιννενωψηρισκετ Gen. 23:7.
φινομοςμπιπακχα Num. 19:14. 
εραδοιμπιεζωρε Gen. 20:3.
μφιρτμπιπσοντεψιομ Gen. 32:12.
τφιγιντφισαλημπαναχ Deut. 3:13.
τωστμπινασευ Gen. 21:14.
*‘φιναςμφι†' Gen. 32:30 in naming; not actiantal association (Greek ειδοςθεοι); contrast the anaphorically marked πιναςντε-φ† Gen. 32:31.

Num. 33:8 φμωιτν-φνεγοοσ may belong here, but is probably different: non-specific, quantified second noun.
(b) τσγιμιλαυτ Gen. 19:26.
θματμπιπλοσ Ex. 2:8 .
*πνοιομπκαγι Deut. 25:7f..
*τσγιμιμπενκον Deut. 25:7 (πεν- does not condition ντε-) .
φονεμμφι† Gen. 14:18.
μωτισμεβκμπιευ Deut. 34:5.
Φινιμπινηιι Ex. 22:8.
...γωτιεπιθιμπνοσ† Gen. 28:22 — in rhematic status, generic — unique among zero and indefinite articles.
(c) τσαραννντρωμι Ex. 30:32.
πνοιομππεεβι Ex. 4:25f.
*ταφενιωσφφ Deut. 33:16.
παλοξνιακωβ Gen. 32:24.
θονουσιμπαλοξνιακωβ Gen. 32:24.
*τσηνιακωβ Gen. 27:22.
*φποντσκητν (vs. νιπβιοτιντε†σληνη) Num. 4:30.
τεο†νιαακ Gen. 31:42.
Plural — note the drastic reduction in constituency:
(b) * nενυχρι n- Num. 27:1 sim. Gen. 23:7 (Num. 10:8 νιοσθε διαρρφνι is not CA, but genealogical status attribution).

(c) nενοθος τοιος εις Ex. 14:30 — here, and usually in this class, metaphorical (not for n-).

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 nominatur, intellegitur et seruuus: 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 SPANOCH 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 (MSG 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 distinguishe 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 VELAZQUEZ-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 personelle”), 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 lexico-syntactic 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 “s3 jcf nht”, see EDEL 1955/64:412, GARDINER 1957:163. Another may be the occurrence as the in fine compositi 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 adnominal 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 μιστή.
Ex. 17:13 οταντες ντεχάη.
εν... μπιαβότ... Num. 29:7:12.
Deut. 27:2 εμπρ νπιοράλλης.

(7) τσκριμι n-: the singular γιμέ, shown by Young 1971 to be a specific and specialized form for inalienable "wife" in the Sahidic πι- n- construction, is not attested in Bohairic.

(8) Remarkably, θρακοι n- has CA both with the night and with the dreamer: πκςλι 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 ντεχάη Gen. 34:26.
εγολθ εμπάμ Gen. 14:17.
πκες ντεςδίκις ηονινάμ Lev. 14:36.
ατρηςδις μπκας Deut. 28:64.

(b) Pattern (II) {π- } + nτε-. Probably the most intriguing of all in this set of constructions. 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 "τσκη nτεπτής" or "νεντάπι nτεπιμανεπ-μοτυμοτυμά" as metaphors, but especially — for the core lexemic "Χ" repertory referred to above as typical or even

54 Depuydt's statements (1985a:53) "π- requires n- to follow it ", "π- nτε- is almost entirely absent" are untenable.
valential in Pattern I — when the first term is further specified, or when the expanding noun has the possessive article, i.e. is marked as possessed: 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)σεβί, μορτ, ἄφε. In this pattern, {πι} stands in opposition to {πι-} (construction III), which is phoric and specific/specifying on its own, with its whole construction signifying unmarked association; π- ντε-, on the other hand, signifies and expresses the suppression or reduction of Constituence Association:

τσαρξ Νοτρωμι Ex. 30:32.
is in opposition with
πκαρι Ντεπεκιωτ Gen. 31:3.
τσαρξ Ντεπεκατσεβι Gen. 17:24f.
πγο Ντενεκμορτ Lev. 19:27.

Φτ παραδιπ and Φτ Ντενεκιοτ in the same verse (Acts 7:32).

Otherwise, ντε- characterizes the nucleus as associated to its expansion in a non-possessive relationship — appurtenance, in the broadest sense.

ντε- is incompatible with zero determination (cases like ντε-παςτ, ντε-ωρπη are PNs, 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 ταξιξ ντεπετξορι.
Gen. 17:24f. τσαρξ Ντεπεκατσεβι.
Num. 12:12 τοντεκματ.
Lev. 18:8 Νομπι ντεπεκιμι Νπεκιωτ.
Num. 27:21 Νκαρι ντερωρ.
Gen. 37:3 Νομπρι Ντεπεκμετσέλλο.

Deut. 5:28 τὸν θνητὸν καὶ “sound”.
Deut. 28:45 τὸν θνητὸν πεκνοῦτ “voice”.
Gen. 18:1 φρονοθητηκήνη.
Lev. 19:27 προς θνητοποιήσε.
Gen. 34:33 προς μπακομ ντεπεργο.
Lev. 19:27 προς θνητοποιήσε.
Deut. 33:15 ταφεν ἄρκην καλαμφο (poetic).
Deut. 8:17 παμαξα θοτάξει.
Ex. 4:25f. πεοετιαλοτ.
Gen. 31:3 παξαξ θεπεκιώτ.
Ex. 12:22 φρον θεπεχίνι (vs. the unexpanded, anaphorically specific προ πιδ).

Deut. 31:29 επάδε θνητεγοτ.
The nuclear noun is an abstract or verbal noun:
Deut. 29:19 τερμεσ θεπακή.
Deut. 31:16 τερωτ θεπεχαφε.
Gen. 27:28 παμαξα θετοτοτο νεμ οθηριπ.
Num. 14:27 πκρεμεμ θνηθεγηρι ιπικα.
Num. 20:24 φωςον θεταναηιοία.
Deut. 31:10 παμαξα θετηκνοπαία.
Ex. 26:8 τωιν θετιοτοια θερών.
Plural (rare):
Ex. 29:2 νετηπ θετηπανερωσωτθωσωτ.
Gen. 49:6 νεκκοβγ θετομασι (= Vat; poetic).
Num. 27:1 νεμπερι θεηεαπααα ποηρι νοφερ.

(c) Pattern (III): {πι-} + θε-. This very common construction is (semantically) unmarked for precise manner of association, in the broadest sense of appurtenance (in Sahidic, θε- seems to be marked as against the unmarked θ-: 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 νίκηνος ντεποτιωτ.
Num. 4:41 πιδεμπώινι ντεπαμοιο ντενενψηρι ντεδων — verbal nouns with actant.
Num. 4:45 ιομή ντεπατέ- metaphoric?
Num. 4:44 νιιν ντενοτιο — metaphoric.
Deut. 31:14 ιπρωω ντεϊκνηλη.
Num. 19:18 νικας ντενιπειφομων — no longer “inalienable”.
Gen. 49:18 πινογεμ ντεπατε — actantial.
Gen. 49:25 πικμοι ντεπατε — actantial.
Gen. 32:22 πιδινικινι ντειαβοκ — actantial.
Lev. 14:28 πιμα ντεπιεινοντε-Φη ντειμετωαντε.

When the nucleus is of higher or lower specificity, that is, on either side of πι- in the specificity scale\(^\text{56}\) ντε- is conditioned i.e. is non-pertinent. However, ντε- enables the individual determination of individual constituents: Patterns IIIa-b-c.

(d) Pattern (IIIa) πιι- / Φη + ντε-: deictic (high specificity) nucleus. Here, for the first time, we find a pronoun eligible to follow ντε-; the expansion is of the here-and-now locutive deictic range. ντε- itself is non-pertinent, and expresses the most general kind of association.

Gen. 30:20 παίχοινος ντειμτνοτ.
Deut. 31:26 νιακαζι θηρον ντεταιφων.
Deut. 29:24 παίμβον ντεπαινιγτν ναωντ.
Deut. 22:16 ταιψεπι νθηι — a deictic correspondent to “τα-ψεπι” or to ταψεπι νθηι? See Obs. below.
Deut. 29:24 παίμβον ντεπαινιγτν ναωντ.
Lev. 4:29 Φη ντεΦοβι — we have here a rare case of a generic rectum of ντε-.

PN Φη ντε- PN Ex. 35:34, 37:20.

(e) Pattern (IIIb): {πεκ-} + ντε- is significant also for the compatibility of the possessive article with ντε-, which is thus revealed as non-posessive. The possessive article is higher than πι- on the specificity scale, and has a personal-deictic component

Gen. 31:6 παβεκε ντειματην νειεβι.

\(^{56}\) I must disagree with BORGHOUTS 1980:66, who attributes the selection of ντε- following ου- or πεκ- 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 ντε- just as the lower-specificity grades do (cf. this/a friend of mine): πιι- ντε- etc.
Num. 8:16 τετόρυντενεισώμποιμίαν.
Num. 5:29 ...ερηπεκεάδιντακ — ντε- here is not expanding-adnominal, but rhematic (in the Stative-Durative Nexus Pattern).

(f) (IIIc): οτ- / zero — + ντε-: non-specific nucleus, specific or non-specific expansion; broadest/unmarked association (non-pertinent ντε-).
Deut. 3:2 ἀχέρετανομενντενεινηνηπομπησαὶ.
Lev. 2:14 Σεβην☰呙ντε ντενεκταρα.
Num. 30:10 οὐτεύξηντεσιαοῖδε.
Ex. 3:15 οὐτεύξηντεσιαοῖδεπάνωοςνᾶωος.
Lev. 11:32 οὐαὶντεναὶ.
Deut. 15:7 οὐαὶντενεκβακί.
Gen. 19:12 κεισαὶντακ.
Ex. 38:10ff. κντεδαοεις
κντεδαοείς
κντεντενος.
Num. 21:28 οτακαὶντενεδων.
Deut. 4:25 γανοψίαντενεκκακί.
Deut. 23:19 ΜΗΣΗΝΑΠΑΤΝΜΗΣΗΝΑΠΑΤΝΜΗΣΗΝΑΠΑΤΑΝ
ΝΙΒΕΝ.

Num. 30:14 ετυχοτεβε νιβέννεμαναψνιβενντεοτνατ.
Note also (specificity-indifferent nucleus):
Deut. 32:14 οτωτοψινοεςεμοτενανώμιϊλι — poetic languages.

Note the alternation η-Zero / nτε-γαν-.
Lev. 17:13 Φρωμιντενεινηνηπομπησαὶ.
Lev. 10:12 ΝΗΕΘΟΤΑΒ数控ηεθοταβ.
Lev. 19:30 ΝΗΕΘΟΤΑΒΝΤΗ.
ΠεθοταβντενήεθοταβEx. 30:36, Lev. 27:28.
Gen. 33:5:8 οτοτακονεναι.
Gen. 48:8 ΝΙΜοτακονεφαί.

Obs.
In the unedited B4 Twelve Prophets (P.Vat. coppto 9) Zacharias, we find four examples of πι- ...ντακ, concentrated in Chapter 9 and 11: Zach. 9:17 πνασσοονντακ, 11:5 ΝΙΜΑΝΕΔψωτντωο11:6πνισροντακ, 11:10 πνισροτωντακ. With no apparent trigger in the original Greek, this construction must be opposed to πεν-, 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 {πεν-}; or a special rhetorical-emotive and focussing deixis, in Constituence 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 παραθετών ντασ is indeed clearly rhetorical-exclamatory: εἰ τι αγαθόν
αύτο; 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 differ-
ences between CA and non-CA relationship, and the reduction and gra-
dation of CA: (a) the weakening or annulment of the CA in the case of
possessed or associated expansion nouns, occasionally in long associa-
tion chains, (b) the generally associative, non-marked syntax of (1) non-
CA with the same lexemes (which in effect are not the same), (2) plural-
ity of the first and especially second terms, as reduced or annuled 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 nu-
cleus; (c) “variation” — frankly baffling, even if (I believe) provision-
ally so; by no means rare.

Gen. 26:25 Φραν μΦρ.
Gen. 25:13 Νιραν ντενενυχρι Νιςμανα.

Gen. 23:13 Νένμαως Μπιλαος Ντεπικαρι.
Ex. 5:3 ...ἐνενμαως ντενενυχρι.

Ex. 2:8 τωρι μφαραω.
Gen. 26:34 Ιωταίν τωρι μβειρ.
Gen. 9:19 νωρι Να ναι Ντενε.
Ex. 5:3 ...ἐνενμαως ντενενυχρι νεμνινυχρι ντενε-
νυχρι.

Gen. 27:46 Νενωρι ντενενυχρι ροτι νξετ.
Gen. 27:46 Νενωρι ντεπακαρι — not (or reduced) CA: meta-
phor.

Gen. 28:1 Νιωρι ντεσιναναυος — removed affiliation, re-
duced CA.

Deut. 9:2 Νιωρι ντενακ — not CA?
Gen. 25:6 Νιςροτι ντενιπαλακ Ντεαβρααμ.

Gen. 28:21 πιι μπαιωτ.
Gen. 24:67 πιι Μκαρα.

Gen. 46:31 πιι ντεπαιωτ — metaphor: not real house, but
“paternal family”, πιι ντεπεκυφρι Deut. 5:21.
Num. 3:35 παρχων ντεπνι ὃτε αναμωπην ντεπάνμος μμέραπι — Merari belongs to his tribe no less than his tribe belongs to him! a nice instance of "Personal-Sphere".

Lev. 25:33 νινι ντεboldaki ντεποταμαγι.
Num. 1:2 νινι ντενοσιοτ — not CA?

Lev. 25:15 θπι ννιρομπι.
Num. 4:40 θπι ντενοτράν.


Ex. 14:30 τσις ννιρεμνικμι.
Lev. 26:25 νενςις ντενετενξαζι.

Ex. 6:3 ϕτ ναβραμ, ϕτ νιανακ, ϕτ νιακωβ, ϕτ ννεκιοτ. Ex. 5:3 ϕτ ντεμι-νιςιδεμρσ.
Num. 16:22 ϕτ ϕτ ντενιππα in address — not CA.

Deut. 1:4 πτρο νθεβακαν.
Deut. 9:26 πτρο ντενιεθνος — not CA.
πτρο ντενιαμοπρες Deut. 1:4, Num. 21:21 — not CA.

Num. 25:15 παρχων μμαδιαμ.
παρχων ντεφτέν ανακαρ Num. 7:18:24:30 etc. — not CA?
Num. 3:35 παρχων ντεπνι ὃτε αναμωπην ντεπάνμος μμέραπι

Ex. 24:6 τφαωι μπιςνον.
Num. 31:30 τφαωι ντενενψρπι μπιςλ.
Ex. 24:6 ϊκεφαωι ντενιςνονον — ke reducing CA.

Deut. 31:29 ετθαν μπαμοτ “after my death”.
Deut. 31:29 επςαε ντενιεγον “the last day”, not CA.

Deut. 1:2 πτωοτ νχιρ.
πτωοτ νχινα Ex. 34:32 etc.
Deut. 1:9 πτωοτ ντενιαμοπρες — not CA.
Ex. 34:29 πτωοτ νχινα- very remarkable, even strange; extremely rare.
Deut. 4:48 πτωοτ ντεκανιωρ.
Gen. 14:24 ττοι ννιρωμι.
Gen. 43:34 ηπτοι θηρον ητωον — grammatically conditioned (pronominal expansion); not ἡπτοι probably to disambiguate the assignment of the Augens θηρον.

Gen. 36:8 ἔμαυ μμονι ντερεβεκκα.
Ex. 2:8 ἔμαυ μπιαλοτ.

Wholly mysterious is the following variation:
Gen. 26:25 ναιλωτι νιαακ.
Gen. 26:19 νιαλωτι ντειαακ.
Gen. 24:59 πιαλοτ ντεαβρααμ.

Ex. 23:16 πωλι μπιωςζ ντενεκωορπ νονταζ.
Ex. 23:15 πωλι ντενιατζεμζρ.

Lev. 16:18 έβολ αζενπξονον ητεπιαζ κεμ έβολ αζενπξονον μπιαμπι (no differentiation in the Greek).

πκαζι νξεζμι passim.
πκαζι νξααζαζ passim.
πκαζι ντεξααζαζ Gen. 11:32, Num. 27:12 (την γην χανααν).
Out of over 30 cases in Genesis, only two instances of η- following καζι correspond to the definite την γην χανααν (the other is the remarkable, almost unique 17:8 πικαζι θηροκ νξααζαζ). 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- η-, which would support the constituent nature of “inalienability”.

Deut. 5:25 τζμπ ηπζε.
Deut. 28:45 τζμπ ητεπζε πεκνοζ (no difference in the Greek form).
Deut. 33:7 τζμπ νιοτααζ.
τζμπ ντενενεζαζ Deut. 1:34, 5:28.

Deut. 9:5 ομεταζεβζσ ντεναζεζνοζ.
Deut. 9:4 ημεταζεβζσ ντεναζεζνοζ (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 ἄγων λέγων or Lev. 4:28 ὁμοιόμορφῳ ὄνομα is essentially the same as Lev. 4:28 ὑβαζομι ὑγίμι, or Lev. 4:23 ὁρμωτὶ χασαμ. 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 *n-* morph, and *nte-* 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 explicable.

And yet, the Adjective as a word-class, syntactically and structurally conceived\(^57\), might be postulated for Bohairic Coptic too. In *Coptic Grammatical Categories* (1986a, Chapter Four)\(^58\), 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. Malaize and Winand 1999:79).

\(^58\) On the famous Romance (especially French) problem of adjective placement, Wilmet 1993 is a very readable, loaded homoerotic (a relatively late study in a long tradition, including Wilmet’s own in *RLR* 45 (1981), and others, partly enumerated in Shasha-Halevy 1986b:132 n. 15). Cf. also Toegby 1984 IV §1537, 1539f. for the expressive (often pejorative) “frippon de valet” type; Rotenberg 1970 includes “un fripon d’enfant” (II, 86f.) 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 — κο-φος ἄρωμα and ἄρωμα κο-φος — 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 παίτωνα ναγαθων.
Deut. 28:47 ητ ονα γαθων.
Deut. 20:11 γανάξια ηγηρθίκηνον.
Gen. 37:4 ηγηρθίκηνον.
Lev. 21:20 οτικώρα ναγριόν.
εθριόν ναγριόν Deut. 7:22, Lev. 26:22.
Num. 16:2 γανρωμε νονομαστος.
Ex. 28:39 οτιμβι μποικίατον.
Deut. 25:15 οτιμα ναλεθηονον νεμο νομη — ομη is one of the very few lexicem Egyptian adjectives in this slot.
Ex. 2:13 οτιρωμει β νεβρεος.
Gen. 38:2 οτιρωμει ηονολονεος.

In our corpus, however, νιώτι and κοταξι do occur exclusively in the nuclear position, and for them no real opposition of placement obtains; this may be seen as an extension of the usual nuclear position of quantifiers — Ex. 23:13 γανκενοντι, Lev. 26:26 μητ ογιμι — which in turn form a sub-class of nuclear grammemes:

Deut. 25:14 νιώτι μμεντ νεμο νοτοκοταξι: no “one” — the determinator nucleus is sufficient.
Deut. 9:1 γανιώτι μβακι.
Num. 14:23 κοταξι ναλνον νιβν νατεμι.
Gen. 42:15 πενενκοταξι νονο.
(Deut. 8:15 πωάχε πινιώτι ετεμματ hints at another constructional possibility, but here the primary nucleus is name-generic).

However, ordinals (μαξ- from two on) do have a double placement:
Gen. 8:13 πιαβοτ ηγοτιτ.
Gen. 8:4 πιαβοτ μμαξ-7.
Gen. 10:2 οτιηρι μμαξ-2.
As against:
Gen. 15:16 πιμαξ-4 ναξωτ, which may be marked as focussed (“only the fourth generation”).
And we also find isolated cases like
Gen. 34:14 οτατεβι μπωμ — 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: ἀνθρώπῳ δὲ ἔχει ἀκροβυ-
στίαν),
in opposition to
Gen. 16:3 τεσσερίς ηδύμιν.
Gen. 20:4 οὐξαλα ηδήμι οὐξ ηδήμι.
Lev. 4:23 οὔκεροτ ηδήμι,
in contrast to the functional charge of placement opposition in “non-
adjectival” cases like
Num. 12:1 ἡγεμίς ηδήμι.
Ex. 2:7 οὐχεμίς ἡγεμίζω (“a woman”).
Compared with Lev. 4:28 ἤταεμπί ηδίμι (“female”), this may point to traces of a semantically distinctive, tagmemic role 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 concord linkage (animate -ος, inanimate -έν), a mechanism not always active also in non-attributive status:
Ex. 27:1 εὐοί ητετράγωνον.
Num. 4:6 εὐοί ἡτακινέων.
Deut. 25:16 γάναδικοκ (deeds).
Cases of marked feminines are arguably non-adjectival, but substanti-
val, with no necessary feminine concord even for movables:
Lev. 21:7 οὐχεμίς μηροπή.
Num. 12:1 ἡγεμίς ηδήμι.
Ex. 21:8 ηδεθόνος ἐς ηδήμμο.
Gen. 41:33 οὖσμι ηδίμι.
Ex. 35:25 ηδίμι νίδεν ηδίμε (cf. ηδήμι ηδίμι Prov. 14:1,
which may be focussing as well).
Deut. 32:6 οὐλαος ηδίμος οὗτος ηδίμε άν.

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 η- 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 Steinthal 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-
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 n-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 apposítum) and direct expansion. Note that the Greek triggers the relative and rhematicity of the apposítum in two different Coptic ways:

πηρωμι ετε ανοκ πε Gen. 44:15 (Greek ἄνθρωπος οἶος ἐγώ).
πηρωμι ετε-πενιωτ πε Gen. 44:24:30:31 (Greek τὸν παῖδά σου πατέρα δὲ ἡμῶν, τοῦ παίδος σου πατρός δὲ ἡμῶν).
πηρωμι πενιωτ Gen. 44:27 Greek ὁ παῖς σου ὁ πατήρ ἡμῶς.

(b) ἃ-: 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 νέκαλωτι 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 τένναςωμι ἃ-νεκαλωτι σεππαρι ηγεσε.  
Gen. 42:13 τενερ-ιβ νον ἃ-νεκαλωτι.  
Gen. 47:3 ανον γανμανεκεωτ ἃ-νεκαλωτι sim. Gen. 46:34.

Gen. 42:10 etαι εσεπανεσροτι ναι ἃ-νεκαλωτι.
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 ἔσεθεν δὲ οὗ νομὸν γινώσκεινς πεννοῦς τετένοις τὸ Ἰσραήλ ἡγοῦτ.

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 junctional linkage and delimitation environment.

Obs.

(1) Needless to say, δι- 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 δι- is uncommon enough to make its occurrence almost predictable (see Jelanskaia 1962:95f.). This is a strikingly Nitrian and Nitrian-component (NT and OT) construction. The element δι- introduces PNs, specific nouns, τι- in associative syntagms, that is with ν- or τι-; and, ην-ετ-, and that is, not indefinites and zero-generics. Cf. AM II 199, 211, De Vis I 31, II 88, 109.; Cat. 79 ἔσεθεν δὲ γινώσκεινς δι-νομῖνς τὴν νήματι τὸ Ἰσραήλ ἡγοῦτ... ἔσεθεν γινώσκεινς δι-νήματι. In Biblical texts: Ps. 113:26 ἄνοι γινώσκεινς δι-νήματι; Dan. 1:12, 3:4, 9:8. Early exx. in Kellia I 104 No. 28 (early: 6-8 centuries; ed. Daumas and Guillaumont, 1969) ἄνοι δι-νήματι, ed. Bosson 2003 — in a slightly different construction (and broader distribution?): ἄριστος ἀνώμοιος δι-πρεποστῆκεν No. 91; probably also ἀριστομετρός δι-πραγματίκος No. 10, ἄνοι δι-πραγματίκος No. 98. (2) This construction is compatible with the Augens, which it follows: ἀνώμοιος ἀνοικτά τοι ἃνοι δι-πραγματίκος (AM I 49). In Nitrian, the construction may also (albeit rarely) be delocutive: Cat. 154 ἔσεθεν δὲ ὕλον ντενοῦς ἢγοστον ἒν οὖν διαλεγομένης οὐτοὶ; also Cat. 106 ἑαυτοκτονίασιν ἡμῶν ἐφὶ ἤγοστον... δι-πραγματίκος οὐτοπερεποστῆς. Note that δι- does not always occur with PNs (which, again, are by this token marked as essentially different from “appellatives”) and never with number names: AM I 155 ἔρωστ ἄνοι, 105. ἄριστος τοι ἀνωτατοιος, AM I 65 ἔσεθεν ἡγοστῶ.

(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 γι-, γι-). 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 Shenoutean Sahidic, Shisha-Halevy 1986a:§1.3.3; to the references there add Bol-

59 In fact, ΝΗ ἔτ- in Deut. 4:4 means “you who...”, i.e. is allocutive.
LEE 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 πιοραί πιοραί, φιοραί φιοραί, see above.

Gen. 32:16 αυθιτιος νεκαλωτί πιογι πιογι κασαρα

(b) πι- πι- totalizing:

φρωμι φρωμι....(φι) ετνα- Lev. 20:9, 22:18, 26:2.

(c) οτ- οτ- quantifying “one (in each case)”.

οτρεμνητ οτρεμνητ ε/μπαίβ Num. 29:10:15.

(d) Reiterated zero determination seems to occur only following the Rheme-introducing η-, expressing focussed fragmentation:

Ex. 8:10 αταιτος νςνωσ ινωσ.

See above (3.3).

(e) Miscellaneous, distributive or focussing, following κατα- or η-.

καταφαι φαι “exactly thus” Ex. 26:24, Gen. 26:24.

Lev. 6:5 ηγανατοοτι γανατοοτι.

Obs.

Outside the corpus, cf. κεωβ κεωβ “any other thing (of the kind)”, in disjunctions with ite and iε Cat. 143, 220; Rhematically, I Cor. 15:39 καρν ιπεν ταγκρα ταγκρα τετε (cf. Shisha-Halevy 1984a).

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 converbal 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
substantiation 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 conversbs, 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 adverbial status: examples are certain conversbs (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 adverbial or (pro)nominal focus in a role typically substantival. As a matter of fact, it is an extreme grammaticalization of a lexically frozen converse, namely r-dd "saying", that gives us the one and only native Coptic substantivizing (and general-subordinating) "conjunction", namely Ξε-.

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" dichotomic 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 registers; 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, ἄν final occurs only five or six times while ἰνα occurs 999 times (see his Appendix III).
of *signifiés* for the various *signifants*, 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 scarcity, almost total absence of variant readings of “that”-forms and final constructions between manuscripts (e.g. ours and Vat) must add confidence to the pursuit of their individual semantics.

A second, theoretically important and structurally unsurprising realization is that forms are valued also by combination, i.e. by syntagmatic contrast. In a passage featuring, say, ε- + infinitive, ἔθεσ- and γίνα + 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 Steiñhal and Misteli 1893:298f.; Frandsen 1975 is a privately 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 category: see Rosén (H.) 1981 for a structural account. For Modern Welsh “i- cum infinitivo” and the substantivizing converter *y(r)-, mai-* (with some Modern Irish correspondents), see Shishia-Halevy 1995, 1998:56f., 162, 183.

(3) The Circumstantial converber as appositive “that”-form (in Nitrian) mostly occurs in a single phraseologically specific NS pattern (note the interlocutivity, and the constant presence of ΝΑΩ):

AM II 115 οτωπίνα ΝΑΩ ΑΝ ΠΕ ΕΚΘΗΝΟΤ ΕΒΩΛ.  
AM II 97 οτρωνότ ΝΑΩ ΠΕ ΕΚΑΜΟΝΙ ΝΗΙΒΑΕΜΠΙ.

AM II 97 οτρωπίνα ΝΗΙ ΑΝ ΠΕ ... ΕΚΜΟΤΘ ΕΠΑΙΩΤ ΔΕ-ΠΙΡΕΜΕΝΧΗΜΙ.

AM II 96 οτακέζεον ΝΑΚ ΑΝ ΠΕ ΕΚΨΨΨΨ ΝΤΧΨΡΑ ΝΧΨΜΙ.

But also rather frequently in: AM II 113 οτρ αΠ ΠΕ ΕΤΑΨΨΨΨ ΕΡΟΚ ΕΚΡΙΜΙ.

(4) ὑατεκψωτεν, another converb, is used in Nitrian as a prospective or sequelling “that” form, in some cases renderable as final:

AM II 145f. ΑΝΟΚ-ΝΗΙΝ ΑΝΟΚ ΧΑΤΑΧΑΖΙ ΝΕΜ-ΦΑΙ sim. De Vis II 127.

AM II 147 ΑΚΧΑΤ ΧΑΤΑΧΑΖΙ ΝΕΜΑΚ.

De Vis II 127 ΝΑΙ ΠΕ ΝΗ ΕΤΑΣΙΤΤΟΤΟΤ ΝΕΜΑΚ ... ΧΑΤΕΚΨΨΗ ΝΠΟΤΜΑΡΤΡΨΙΟΝ.

De Vis II 183 ΤΝΑΩΛΨ ΤΡΨΨ ΧΑΤΝΑΨ...

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) Δε- “that”-form: a grammaticalized and fossilized verb of Δω “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 (reception) and its contentual object (as a rule second or third) actant; introducing contents of speech (verba dicendi, loquendi, cogitandi, sentiendi, etc., with Δω and other lexemes, Δε- is incorporated in the verb, proleptically represented by the neutric -с (see [2]).

Gen. 1:4 αγνας εμε-Φ† εφοσώμει θε-νανεκ.  
Ex. 16:15 νατσώμεν ἔμοι στ θε-οτ πο.  
Gen. 42:24 (οσωμε ἐβολ), 49:15 (νασ), Deut. 2:7 (ἐμι).

Ex. 8:1 δεος ναρπυν πεκκόν θε-οττενπεκκυβωτ.  
Ex. 8:5 εσμύντσε νεμνί δε-ντατωβγ… (Greek πότε εὖζωμαι).

(2) Variously appositive to neutric pronouns and pronominals; appositive Theme in Nominal Sentence:

Num. 16:13 αν-οτκοτζι πε δε-ακετζν εβολ δενπκαρι…  
Num. 16:9 αν-οτκοτζι νωτεν πε φαί δε-αθ† μπίκλα 
οτετ-θνος εβολ δεν-μταναςχν.  
Num. 16:3 χας νωτεν δε-ταίνταςχν θνρπ δανρωμι 
ετορμε βε.

Gen. 45:5 μπενθερη-πίκμβ νωοτ ντεν-θνος δε-εταρε-
τενθι εμναι.

(3) Explicative or causal Δε- grounds (metaphrastically, much like γαρ, but less finely nuanced) the actual existence of the preceding text:

Gen. 33:11 σι γανακιςοτ εταιοντος νακ Δε-αγναί ννι ναδ- 
Φ†.

Deut. 12:12 ετετενοτνος μπεμεο μπιτε νεμ ντεν-
σιρπ νεμπετεσερι νεμ ντενβωκ νεμ ντενβωκι 
νεμ πιλετιςει ετεντεστοσσαν δε-μοντεστοι μμα 
ντας καθροι νεμωτε.

It is especially striking following questions, giving the basis for asking the question (“seeing that …”):

Num. 11:11 εβεεσοτ ακθεμκο μπεκβωκ ότοσ εβεεσοτ μπι-
ξιμι νοτγμοτ μπεκμεο δε-ακελαπζωτ μπαιαδος 
εροι.
Num. 11:12 μη ἀνοκ διερβωκι μπαλαος θηρκ ιε ἀνοκ διμακον Με-κακω μμος νηι Με-σιτη εσφη εκεντ.

Num. 11:13 αναζεμακ εσν ετ Μπαλαος θηρκ Με-σεριμι εσρη εξωι...

(4) Με-: 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 ἄνοκ-νιμ Με-νταυηνη ηαφαραω (Greek οτι + Fut.).

Ex. 5:2 μ ηε φαι Με-ντακωτεμ ηεατεοκμη (Greek οτι + Fut.).

Ex. 16:7 άνο-οτ γαρ Με-ντατηνκρεμεμ ηαρον (Greek οτι + Pres.).

Gen. 20:9 μητι δενρνοβι εροκ Με-ακινι εσρη εξωι...

(Greek οτι + Perf.).

Deut. 30:12f. μαενρηφι Μεντφε αν Με-ντεκκωθ Με-...

οτα μαεκιμηρ μφιομ αν Με-ντεκκωθ (Greek και + Fut., και + Conj. Aor.).

Non-rhetorical consecution “so that I may ...”:

Ex. 8:5 οεμνητθν οεμνι Με-νταταβηθ ...

Lev. 22:33 ...εαιενονκον εβολ Μεπακαζι ηνκμι Με-

νταποπι ηντεθν ηνοτ] (Greek οστε + infinitive).

A unique, to me unexplicable case of seemingly real purpose-clause, is also the only delocutive instance on my files:

Ex. 22:7 εσνπ Με ηαγανοται ] νοτογατ μπεκφηρ ιε

γανκεκκωθ Με-ντεκηρηθ ερσθ (= Vat) (simple infinitive in the Greek).

Με- 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:

Με- + Conjunctive.

Conjunctive.

Με- (Clause).

(5) Με- as universal subordinator:

ἐσθε-Με-: Deut. 9:28 etc. — apparently a case (the only one) of a prepositional rectum.

**ουχοτι Δαι -** Deut. 7:7.

Obs.
Not attested in our corpus, but in NT or/and Nitrian:
εωκ Δαι “as if” De Vis II 54, 89 etc. (ζωκ εωκ Δαι - εωκ Δαι - in Sahidic etc.)
εωκ Δαι - (†εικ/ακνα-) final, De Vis I 123, II 39.

**μφρητ Αλε -** De Vis II 33 (cf. μφρητ 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 conjunctional 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 n- and nτε- — 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 adnexal 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 ζινα, (ζινα) μηπωκ, (ζινα) γοπωκ, εωκτ/Δαι, μηπωκ, 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 ζινα γαρ nτε-τερπιπαζε αη μηπωκ γαρωτε γοπωκ nτε-τερποτε ωπι ζενωθοτ Δαι-
τενερνοβε εροq (Greek ἐνεκεν... τοῦ πειράσαι... ὤπως ἀν γένηται... ἵνα μη ἀμαρτάνετε).

Deut. 8:2-3 εκεερφμενει μήμωι τηρη φη ετακενκ
giωτγ nξε-πςξε πεκνουρ γιπωαε γοπως ∅ευπεκεμκοκ... ουρα
αηεμκοκ αηερεγκρο οουρ αηετεμκοκ απιαννα... για nτεκταμοκ αηε...
(Greek ὤπως ἀν... ἵνα...).

Ex. 9:16 εεεε-φαι ααεερ εροq ιηαηαυηθη ηηαζωη εβολ
νηηηθη οουρ ηηηθηηερ επαρραν ειηεεηκαηηι τηρη
(Greek ἐνεκεν τοῦτο... ἵνα ἐνδείξωμαι... καὶ ὦπως διαγγελῇ).

Ex. 5:3 Φη nτενεεβρεος αηεαεμεν εροq τερακηεαα
οςη η-ηεςεη ιηηη ιηρη ιηερη ιηηαηηε για nτενεηε-
γκουηωεηι μπηςη πεκνουηηη ηηηηςς ηηε-εηθηηηη ηαρον
(Greek ὥπως θύσωμεν...μη ποτε συναντήσῃ).

Ex. 10:1f. Δνοκ γαρ ειεερε-περηη ηηωοt ηεμηεηαμωοι
για nτεηαμηηιηι αιιι εερη ηηωοι...ηηη (sic) nτεηηε-
τενκαξι εερη εεεηαηηαηηη nτεηεηεηωηηιηι nεμηηηηιηι
nτεηεηεηωηηι (Greek ἑνα ἤξης ἐπέλθη... ὦπως διηηγήσηθε).

Ex. 12:42 ονηεηερηι nτεπςη pε γωςςε εεηνωt εβολ
ηεπκαξι νηηηι ονηεηερηι nτεπςη pε γωςςε nτεc
γωηηι nνεηηηηιηι μπιαλ γαηναδως (Greek ὥστε + iνιn-
tινηvε, twice).

Gen. 34:22 Σεpςξι cεcαηι ιηηνη ηηερηεηωηηι ηεμαη
γωςτε εωηωηι ηνλανυ ηοξωτ ηηυξοξ tηροξ ιηαηηoξη
cηεηωςη (Greek τοῦ κατοικεῖν... ὥστε εἶναι... ἐν τῷ περι-
τεμένεσθαι — note the surprising Greek correspondent for the Coptic ιηαη + Conj.).


για and ηηηπηε with the Conjunctive may constitute complete
superordinate clauses on their own:

Gen. 18:21 ιζε δε ιηηη ιηαηηζιηι — apodotic.
Gen. 24:5 ηηηπηε nτεcώηεηοξηζη ιζε-ιζειηι εηνωηι
nεμηι — responsive.

για- with the negative Conjunctive differs from ηηηπηε + af-
firmative Conjunctive, as Greek ἵνα μη- is opposed to μη-:

Ex. 28:35 οουρ εεεηωηι ιζε-ζαιυηη ζεpξεηεηερη-
γωηηι εεεηεηεμ εεεεμμη ... για nτεcώηεηοξηζ...
(Greek ἵνα μη...).

(2) ιηηην-ωζηομ nτε- Gen. 44:22, Ex. 8:22, 19:23 etc. is a fami-
iliar landmark of Bohairic: only Non-Existence?
(3) "That"-form Conjunctives may occur appositively to neutric pronoun + ὃς ὁ: Gen. 44:7 ἡπετρία ἰγκαλοτοτί ἰττοτι ῥπαίκας.

(4) Following εὐθύτι (historically containing a neutric pronoun, and the precursor of ὅς ὁ 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 ὁρῶμοι or interrogative marker, corresponds analytically to the deliberative τά- of Sahidic (see Polotsky 1944:17f., §9)⁶²:

Ex. 2:7 τεσσαρά in ἰαιτοτί ῥε...
Gen. 24:5 χωρῶμοι ἰττατέο.
Gen. 33:1 ἰαν-ἀντοτί (Vat ἰαν-τά-).

(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 εὐθύτι ἰγτεμεσι τεροτι γεροκ ἰττατόρι ῥπε...
Gen. 44:7 ἡπετρία ἰγκαλοτοτί ἰττοτι ῥπαίκας.

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) ἐπιτι- alone is in our corpus not a "personal" (that is, finitized), but a causative infinitive: Ex. 7:3 εἰς ἐπιτι ἰγκαρα τῳ ἰττατόρι ῥιναὶ ἰαν-ἐπιτι ῥιναὶ ἰαν-ἐπιτι.
However, it is the basis of two formalized converbs, namely ἐπεξέρχονται and ἐπικεφαλήσσονται.

Obs.
(1) See Polotsky 1987:157ff. τρέφη- 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 que 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, Sardic, 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 υα-).

(2) Ζιν- + Lexeme does not derive a generic notion name, but a true lexicalized verbal substantive. Unlike the infinitive itself, to which Ζιν- 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- n- association. 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 agens of the verbal action), quantifiers, Νιβεν etc. The form renders Greek verbal nouns and verbal abstracts, infinitives and subordinate clauses. Apparently, Ζιν- (+ Lexeme) subsumes two homonyms. The masculine is highly grammaticalized and hardly variable; the less common feminine πόζιν-, τόζιν- (ο/ντε-) 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 εἰναὶ ζινεπιβαθοκτονοῦσα Νινεπ (Greek infinitive).
Gen. 3:16 επεξώπι ζανειναι Νινεπιζινταζού (Greek η ἀποστροφῆ).
Gen. 4:7 πεζινταζού επεξώπι γαρωκ (Greek η ἀποστροφῆ).
Gen. 11:10 Ναι Νζινιμίζι (Greek αλ γενέσεις).

63 Athanasius of Qōs presents Bohairic Ζιν- + INF in correspondence to the Sahidic infinitive: see Bauer 1972:176f.
Gen. 30:30 ἱπταμένη ἐσώτερον ἐρωκ (Greek ἐπὶ τῷ ποδὶ μου).

καταπαίζωνιν Gen. 25:12.

καταπαίζωνιν Gen. 43:7.

σενοτοντωνοσ Num. 10:6 (= Vat).

ἐνεργῶς NIBEN Lev. 16:29.

σεντεκάξινι Ex. 34:24 (vs. πᾶς εῖλαν ὁτε- Num. 33:38).

πεκαζανμωί εβολ Deut. 28:5, 33:18 (vs. πιςιμωσι Ex. 33:8, Gen. 33:14).

πεκαζανμωίτι Lev. 2:9.

νοταζωμπωγεν τῆρον Num. 4:27 (vs. νοταζωμπωγεν 4:32, π/πιζωμπωγεν ὁτε- 4:28, 33).


πιςιμωσι λτε- Ex. 12:40.


NB: τεκαζανμωί Deut. 28:49 (= Vat) = “his manner of speaking”, “language”; τεκαζανμωί De Vis II 10 “the manner of your becoming human”.

(d) Converbs: Prospectives (non-factive) and Scenario Eventives.

The sheer number and variety of converbial 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:

ερεω-.

ε- INFinitive.

επ- INFinitive.

επαζιν- INFinitive.

επαζιντεω-.

επαζιντεω-.

επαζιντεω-.

(επτεω- is yet another form attested outside the corpus: Rom. 15:13, I Cor. 10:13, Ez. 16:26).

Sahidic:

ετεω-.

ε- INFinitive.

επ- INFinitive.

(1) ε- + (αὐτεμ) + 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
εὐλογ/αῖ ε- INFINITIVE does usually, but not always have ὠστε + in-
infinite as its original. In more detail:

(a) Valential (second or third actant) or semi-valential. Governing
verbs (selection):

γογγον, ἡνιατ, ἠνα-, ἓνο, ἡνό, ταῦτο, νότι, ἠ, ἴω-
λεμ, οὐράττω, ἴω, οὐρω, μετε, κατ, σωτεὶ (nca-), ἰω, ἰω-
ῥκ, ἰωβελομοι/μοιο-μοῖο, οὐράττως, οὐρωπ. Negativized
infinite: ἵωπ, ἰωα, ὀπι, ἴπι, ἐπαλα, ἰωτο, ταῦτο, ἰωκ.

Ex. 8:25  ἤπεροταττοκ ἰε επαλα εὐσιμοτωρπ Μπι-
λαος εβολ.

Deut. 5:1 επετενεαρεγ εαίτος (Greek infinitive).

(b) Appositive, also to a cataphoric neutric pronoun (rarer than in

(c) εὐλογ/αῖ e- INFINITIVE (as a rule = Greek; also rarely Greek τοῦ +
infinite) Gen. 5:7, 23:8, Ex. 6:13:27, 30:18:38, 29:36, 12:42, 36:2,

Specific function: often “to the extent of”, “even up to...”:

Gen. 34:22 Ἴελαία επανειν υμιν ὑμην
εὐλογε εὐπωνι νοσακος νονώτε τηροτ (Greek ὠστε εἶναι)
ἐλατοτενοπο-νεοτωρτ.

Num. 7:1 ἵωπι πεπιρος τεταρκωκ ἆρε-μωτος
εὔκατε ετάρω ιπτκίνη ερατος (Greek ὠστε + infinitive).

Deut. 28:54f. ἵεερπβακανος ἱππιροβαλ ἁπικον ἅν
τερκεμί... εὔκατε ἐωστειν ιπται αμοτος (Greek ὠστε +
infinite).

Deut. 12:20 ἵωανερπιότενιν ἆτα-ταυτη σε εὐστε-
μας (Greek ὠστε + infinitive).

(d) Adnominal (also valential): Deut. 29:4 γανβαλ εναν... γα-
σαλαξ εὐστεμ.

Ex. 35:25 οτος εκιμι νιβαν νκαβ οσεοετη εεπιον.

(e) Acantial: Num. 5:8 εὐστο αμοτεπιρωμι αμο-
σατ εὔκατε ετ (Greek ὠστε + infinitive).

(f) Scope of an action (“with the effect of...”, consequential, some-
times verging on purpose or goal); action plan; import of action etc.

Ex. 7:14 ἵαορος ἅρα-πντ εφαρκ ἐωσιμοτωρπ μπι-
lαος εβολ.

Num. 25:1 ἵαορα νἄ-πλαος εεπορνεσιν.

Deut. 4:25 οτος ντετενηρί μπιπετρως μπεμβος μπε-
σετοννος ετ-ἐωντ ναχ (Greek infinitive).

Ex. 35:1 ...τεταρκωτο εκατον (ους εκατον Deut. 27:26).
Deut. 18:9 ονεκςικβω ειπι κατανικων.
Ex. 32:12 αγενος εβολ ... εξωθεον νερει ζινιτων.
Ex. 9:17 ετι οτι ενιοεκ κερι μπαλαοε εσεμενοτορποσ εβολ.

Gen. 43:18 ...ειτεν ναονες οτον ε†ωκαν ναν ενδικαετεν μμωκ (Greek infinitive... του + infinitive).
Deut. 9:1 νεοκ ετεαρεξυπερ μπιορδανης μυοτ ειεν εςονεν εερκληρονομε εγανελυντ νεονοες (Greek infinitive + infinitive).
Deut. 30:10 εςων ηε οκανεκωτεν ηεσα τεμη μπεξενοντεν εαρεν οτον ειπε νεεενεντοκεν ηθροτ.
Deut. 34:11 ηεκεκι ηε μεπεκερ ηθροε εταρεμενον μεε-πεξε ηειτοε ηεηπεκη νεκεκι.

(2) επ+ infinitive: not negated, 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:

ευρεκ εροκ Ex. 16:33 (Greek ες διαθηρησυν) vs. ευρεκ Deut. 28:45 (Greek infinitive).
εηαιτοεν Deut. 27:26 (Greek του + infinitive) vs. the valential εταρεκοτοεν εηαιτοε Ex. 35:1 (Greek infinitive).
εευσομενεκ Deut. 13:9 (Greek infinitive) vs. Ex. 16:3, 17:3 εεωε-τελε κταεκαταευν, εςοτεν.

(3) ενδικ+ infinitive: not negated, 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 ...ειτεν ναονες οτον ε†ωκαν ναν ενδικαετεν μμωκ (Greek infinitive + infinitive... του + infinitive).
Ex. 35:35 αεμηκετο εηεει νεκεια ηενδικαει ηεαμιο ηενιαεοντεν ηθροτ (Greek infinitive).
εεκεκιλει Lev. 8:15.
εεκεκιλει- Gen. 3:22.
Num. 10:2 οτον εεκεκεπε νακ εεκεκεοεοντι ντεκεκνεγυε ηεμε εηερκεμενοτονο ενε-πεκαβελον (Greek infinitive + infinitive).

Lev. 17:11 εεκεκιλε, επεκεκιενο (not in the Greek).
Lev. 16:27 ηαi εναντονονον εςθν εναντωβγ.
Lev. 24:7 ελεκε ενθε εναντερφμενι.

(4) εναντερ + infinitive: pronominal agens only. Not negatived. Not valential.

A rare, stylistically marked form (P in constant consensus with Vat), the etymology of which is obscure, unless we have here the morphological apparatus of the Conjunctive (the syntagm of ζι-ν- with the Conjunctive 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 significance of an action, which may be part of a Divine Plan or Purpose.

1st sgl. Ex. 16:4 ετερωκι μφανιεγοσ πιεγοσ εναντα- σοντον... (= Vat) (Greek δοκετ).
Lev. 26:45 ενανταψωμι ηθοσ ηνοσ† (= Vat) (Greek τον + infinitive).

2nd pl. Lev. 26:1 εναντετονωμωτ μμοσ (= Vat) (Greek infinitive).

Lev. 20:26 εναντετονωμι ηνί (= Vat) (Greek infinitive).

3rd sgl. Num. 19:13 ζεβαζεμ εναντεφεωσεμ ηνηθο (= Vat) (Greek different).

3rd pl. Gen. 1:15 ετεροψωμι ζενπιαζρο ητεψε επ- αντοτεροψωμι εζενπικαι (= Vat) (Greek έστε + 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.
εν + INF.
De Vis I 109 etc.
ε(οτεμ)ορε- De Vis II 147, SV 41.
Conjunctive
De Vis II 276, SV 74.
εναν- + LEXEME
De Vis II 140.
εναντε- De Vis II 177.
εντωσ + Conjunctive
Cat. 95.


**CHAPTER THREE**

mnote + Conjunctive
De Vis I 134, 139.

*ina + Conjunctive
Cat. 4, 18, De Vis II 68.

gote + Conjunctive
De Vis II 82.

*exac + Conjunctive
De Vis I 125, II 100.

*exac eqe-
De Vis II 247, SV 61.

*ina eqe-
SV 17.

mperac + Conjunctive
De Vis II 100.

gaca/ta/*eq-
Cat. 25, De Vis I 123.

gaca aqna-
De Vis I 24.

gac*ac eqeq-
Cat. 95.

*ina e(omega)eq-
Cat. 26.

*ac + eqe-
SV 32.

*ac-nqe-
De Vis II 137.

*ac + Conjunctive
De Vis II 146.

*ac-eqna-
De Vis II 257.

*ac-aqna-
De Vis II 171, 212, SV 60.

*ac-in eqep-
Cat. 84, 90.

*ac-in nqe-
Cat. 74, De Vis I 124.

*ac-in eqe-
Cat. 149.

*ac-in eqna-
Cat. 75.

*ac-in + Conjunctive
Cat. 7, 26.

*ac-in mntac + Conjunctive
Cat. 27.

*ac-eqpe-
Cat. 26, 28.

*ate- as sequelling or final “that” form
De Vis I 26, II 136.
(5) εθαε/- εθαε: negativable (but rarely negativ?)

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 concurring (linkage) or discording (delimitation) with its preceding nominal or pronominal environment.

For Coptic έθε-, the Greek text has as a rule an infinitive or ελε + verbal noun; but the former is after all also the Greek correspondent of the simple ε- + infinitive in Coptic. The differentiation of (κωδε) ε+ INFINITIVE and (κωδε) έθεθη- 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 έθε- 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 -θεθη- 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 ετεθαμι νωτεν έθεθηθυμετ εματ “so that he can/may flee there” (Greek infinitives).

Gen. 19:20 ταιβακι εθεθηθε εματ “so as to enable me to flee”.

Gen. 1:14 μαρτοθαμι νακε-ηθεθηκεροτωμιν δηπιτα-κρονητε έθεθηκεροτωμιν επικαρη “that they may...”.

Lev. 19:29 ηνεκθωμ ινεκθωμ έθεθηκερπορπετηθ “so as to make her a fornicator” (Greek εκπορνευσαι αυτην).

Num. 21:29 ιντηθη κεσιωμεμ έθεθηκα ημαται (Greek infinitive) “so that they may be saved”.

Gen. 36:7 ναρκη-πετεθηθωθαρ ου οη έθεθηκερμοο σιοσμα (Greek τοθ + infinitive) “to permit their living in the same place”.

Ex. 15:1 οσθρ θξςιο έθεθηκαος (Greek τοθ λεγειν v.l. λεγον-τες) “to make them say”.

Deut. 4:14 ηκβω νωτεν εγαλγαπ... έθεθηκεραιο... contrast with πικαρη Φη ητεθηκαοε σοσμη ορο έθεθηκα ηηρο-νομες... “to bring you to observe them” (Greek infinitives).
Lev. 4:3 ΝΤΕΕΡΝΟΒΙ ΕΩΡΕΟΣΛΑΟΣ ΕΡΝΟΒΙ “to make a people sin” (Greek τοῦ τῶν λαῶν ἄμαρτείν).

Gen. 3:23 ἈΠΤΕ ΦΙ ΟΤΩΡΝΗ ΕΒΟΛ ΣΕΝΝΙΠΑΡΑΘΙΟΝ ΜΠΟΤΝΟΨ ΕΩΡΕΡΨΒΩ ΕΠΙΚΑΡΙ (Greek infinitive) “to make him work the land”, sim. Gen. 2:15.

Deut. 20:19 ΕΩΨΝ ΔΕ ΑΚΩΝΖΕΜΙ ΣΑΒΟΛ ΝΟΤΒΑΚΙ... ΕΒΩΤΣ ΕΡΟΣ ΕΩΡΕΚΖΗΣ “that you may take it” — final goal.

Deut. 4:20 ΑΠΕΝΘΝΟΥ... ΕΒΟΛ ΣΕΝΧΗΜΙ ΕΩΡΕΤΕΝΕΡΟΤΛΑΟΣ ΝΑΨ “that you may make a people unto Him” — final goal.

Deut. 8:16...ΖΙΝΑ ΝΤΕΕΡΝΗΜΚΟΚ ΟΤΟΡ ΝΤΕΕΡΝΠΙΡΑΖΙΝ ΜΜΟΚ ΕΩΡΕΠΙΝΕΤΝΑΝΕΨ ΩΨΝΜΙ ΜΜΟΚ ΕΠΡΨΕ ΝΤΕΝΙΕΓΟΟΤ (Greek... καὶ εὖ σε ποιήσῃ) “so that good may/can befall you” — final goal.

Lev. 22:13 ΑΚΩΝΖΕΡΝΗΡΑ ΕΑΣΨΙΤΣ ΕΒΟΛ ΕΩΣΤΕΜΕΡΕΣΡΟΣ ΩΨΝΙ ΝΑΣ (so: Vat εωστεμερε-) “so that she can have no progeny” — a rare negative instance.

Num. 14:3 ΕΒΕΕΟΤ ΤΝΑΟΤΕΝ ΝΔΕ-ΠΤΣ ΕΞΟΤΝ ΕΠΙΚΑΡΙ ΕΩΡΕΝΓΕΙ ΣΕΝΠΒΩΤΣ “so as to make us fall”.

Adnominal, appositive, contentual, expanding cataphoric neuter. Not causative:

Gen. 47:29 ΑΤΣΨΝΤ ΔΕ ΝΔΕ-ΝΙΕΓΟΟΤ ΕΩΡΕΨΜΟΤ.


Lev. 11:39 ΕΨΝΠ ΔΕ ΝΤΕΟΤΟΝ ΜΟΤ ΕΒΟΛ ΣΕΝΝΙΤΕΒΝΨΩΤΙ ΕΩΡΕΤΕΝΟΤΟΜΟΤ — adnominal! (Greek ὅ ἐστί ὑμῖν τοῦτο φαγείν) “that are edible for you”.

Gen. 18:25 ΜΦΨΡ ΜΠΕΡΙΡΙ ΝΓΟΚ ΜΠΑΙΑΚΙ ΕΩΡΕΚΨΨΤΕΒ ΝΟΤΘΜΙ ΝΕΜ ΩΤΑΣΒΗΣ.

Gen. 24:23:25 ΑΝ-ΟΤΟΝ-ΤΟΠΟΣ ΣΑΤΕΝΝΠΕΙΨΤ ΕΩΡΕΝΜΤΟΝ ΜΜΟΝ “so to enable us to...”?

Gen. 16:3 ΜΕΝΕΝΣΑ-Ι ΝΡΟΜΠΙ ΕΩΡΕΑΒΡΑΜ ΑΙΤΟΤ — a unique alternant of ΜΕΝΕΝΣΑΕΡΕ- (= Vat) (Greek τοῦ + infinitive).

Lev. 4:27 ΟΝ ΕΤΣΨΕ ΑΝ ΕΩΡΕΣΨΨΨΙ.

Deut. 4:42 (Ὣ ΜΒΑΚΙ) ΕΩΡΕΨΨΨΤ ΕΜΑΣ ΝΔΕ-ΠΡΕΨΨΨΤΕΒ.

Deut. 30:20 ΦΑΙ ΠΕ ΠΕΚΨΝΣ ΝΕΜ ΠΆΨΑΙ ΝΤΕΝΕΚΓΟΟΤ ΕΩΡΕΚΨΨΨΙ ΖΙΖΕΝΠΙΚΑΡΙ - not purpose, but specification of ΦΑΙ (evident in the articulated Greek τὸ κατοικεῖν σε).

Gen. 2:18 ΝΑΝΕΣ ΑΝ ΕΩΡΕΠΙΨΨΜΙ ΩΨΝΙ ΜΜΑΣΑΤΨ.
Gen. 34:22 ἡμῶν εἰσελθεῖτε εἰς τὴν πόλιν της Ψαλιὲς καὶ ἔφυγεν μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ ἤλθεν τῇ πόλει ταῦτα ἀκούσας τῶν λακωνίων τῶν Ἰωάννου καὶ τῶν οἴκων τοῦ ιεροῦ τῶν Ἰσραήλ.

Gen. 17:19 εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἐπιστρέφεσθαι τοῦ τάφου τῶν αδελφῶν τοῦ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ τῶν φίλων τουτέστατα, καὶ εἰς τὴν πόλιν τῆς Παλαιστίνης εἰσελθεῖν τὴν κόπον καὶ τὸ σοφίαν καὶ τὴν πόλιν ταῦτα.


Valential, actantial (rare, in contrast to ε- + infinitive).

Ex. 9:28 μαρτυρεῖ τοῦ Καίσαρα ἀνεθεμένην κοίτην καὶ ἔπεσέν τις εἰς τὴν πόλιν τῆς Παλαιστίνης.

Ex. 31:16 ἀρχαῖος καὶ ἐπόθηκεν τῷ τοῦ Μωσής τοῦ τῆς Παλαιστίνης.

Restrictive specification of respect, import, force etc. (rare, compared with ε- + infinitive):


Goal — specific purpose? also γωστὶ εἰποῦ:

Lev. 11:45 καὶ ἐδραμαίσαντο ἐβολὴν ἑπελήφθη πρὸς τὴν πόλιν τῆς Παλαιστίνης καὶ ἔφυγεν μετὰ τῶν Ἰσραήλ (Greek infinitive).

Ex. 30:4 ἐδραμαίσαντο ἐπὶ ταῦτα τοῦ Καίσαρα τῆς Παλαιστίνης γωστὶ εἰποῦ καὶ ἐπηρεάσθη μετὰ τοῦ τῶν Ἰσραήλ.

Lev. 20:5 εἰς τὰς ὑπαρχόντας ἐπὶ τῶν Ἰσραήλ ἐπηρεάσθην εἰς ἑαυτοῦ, ὡς καὶ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ ἐπήρεθεν εἰς τῆς πόλεως τῆς Παλαιστίνης.

In cases of Theme-switching, or any Theme clarification, εἰποῦ may have allomorphic conditioned status, in complementary distribution with ε- + infinitive (this also applies to several of the exx. above):

Gen. 4:15 ἧλθεν ἐκ τῶν ἱερών καὶ ἐπηρεάσθη συνεχῶς ἀνωτέρως ἐκ τῆς Παλαιστίνης ἡμᾶς εἰποῦ ἐπηρεάσθην εἰς της πόλεως τῆς Ἰσραήλ
dor, "so as not to let him be killed".


Gen. 2:18 ἡμῶν ἐπηρεάσθη εἰς τῆς πόλεως τῆς Ἰσραήλ.

Ex. 32:13 ἐθνικός καὶ ψυχικός καὶ ἐπηρεάσθη εἰς τῆς πόλεως τῆς Παλαιστίνης.
Gen. 30:41 αἰακὼς καὶ ἡ αὐτοὶ ἢ ζῳονοῦσα τοῦ καιροῦ τίς ἔστιν ἡ αἴκαμα σοῦ ἐνίκωσον ἦ τερονσίωσον.

Excursus: causatives

As said, the auxiliary infinitive -ερεκν̄- 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 -ερεκν̄- 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 -ερεκν̄- + lexeme. This difference is more pronounced in Bohairic than in Sahidic:

ἔρ- Gen. 12:2, 13:16, 19:19 (ἔρνιςής), 34:16 (ἐρπορνέστιν), Deut. 28:29 (ἔρσφήρι), 41:51 (ἐρψωβυ), Deut. 28:21 (ἐρψε), Ex. 23:33 (ἐρνονάθ), Num. 33:54 (ἐρκοτι). This case is of special interest, since the -ερ- segment in ἐρεκν̄ is after all the allo-form of ἰπι/ἐρ- governed by the proclitic τ- (i.e. †); ἐροε- is not concurrent here — this is a conditioned case. Quality verbs are prevalent.

†- Deut. 22:19 ἠκαί (ττο not attested in Bohairic).


ἐσκο Lev. 25:16 (τεσκό not attested).


μνον Deut. 5:33.


64 According to Polotsky, Bohairic “prefers [ερεκν̄-] 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) θεῖον, τεκέο, τάχο, θεμέλιο, θαμίο, τότε, ταρκό, ταμό, ταμό, ταμό, τακό, ταμό, ταμό, ταμό, τασείο, τεκέο, ταμό, τακό, ταμό.

6. **Sennazin-** + Lexeme. Rare

Ex. 30:15 ... Sennazin ✡ nτις φορα μπεσ

Lev. 4:27 εχων ντετσα νλις τε αρνοι ... Sennazini noiti NNienstoi ... ον ετεσαε αν εφεασωπι.

Num. 1:51 Sennazinyi ... Sennazinykot.

Num. 7:89 Sennazini εσοτι ντεμωσης εφικνη ... ονοφ ραγωτεμ εφικι ντεπεσ...

7. **Sennazinte- / παντες** pronominal or nominal *agens*

Very rare (see above, for εναντες). Like εναντες, the form seems to express the inner significance or more important aspects of an action:

Lev. 15:23 εφεσωμι εφασημ Sennazinteysi nemac (= Vat) — remarkably, a rare case of anaphoric μι- determination.

Lev. 15:31 ονοφ ννονμον εβεπωσωσωμ Sennazintosωσωμ.

Lev. 23:22 νετεναεκμπωσι μπεσι ντετενιψι Sennazintekwsi.

Num. 5:21 ερεπες ✡ νοναζωνι νσι ✡ Sennazintepes ρωςτ μπεδος.

8. **Sennazinope**- pronominal or nominal *agens*: an eventive scenario: “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 αὐτόν. 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 Ναζημιάν πε Σεππαξινερεσενκότ οτόρ Ντεκ-τουν.

Ex. 34:29 Αφρισωτ... Σεππαξινερεψτι σάκι Νημα.

Lev. 26:25f. Ετέσηνοτ εφρι ενεναι Ντενετενεκκι Σεππαξινερεψτέζεθνοτ...

Gen. 32:20 Ερετεςενκι νεμ Νεα Σεππαξινερετεν-κεμ.

Lev. 18:28 Ζηνα Ντενεκτικαγι ερως εξενενοτ οτόρ Ντενεκτεςεθνοτ Σεππαξινερετετενκογ.

Lev. 22:16 Οτόρ ετεινι εδωτ νοτανομία... Σεππαξ-ινεροτογκκ Νην Εοταβ.

Ex. 16:7 Οτόρ Φινατ Νπανατογι ερετενατ επιωσον Μπιτζ Σεππαξινερεψκωτεν Ναξ-ητζ ενετενερεμπεμ...

Num. 25:11 Φιννεος... Αμτμον μπαεμβον... Σεππαξ-ινερεψκογ επαχογ.

Num. 26:61 Αμμον Ναξ-ηαααγ νεμ αβιοτα Σεππαξ-ινεροτινι εφρι Νοταρπθ Νηεμμ.

Deut. 16:13 Πιλε εκαλι... Σεππαξινερεκωστι εξοτον...

Deut. 9:14 Μπερζος Σενπεκνής Σεππαξινερεσζ Πεκ-νοντι τακε-ναεεονι εβωλ Γατζ Μπεκζο...

Lev. 20:4... Ντοτωλ Ννοτβαλ εβωλ Ζαπιρμι Σεππαξ-ινερεψτ εβωλ Σενπεξαρι Νοταρκων εσετεμζοεβεϕ.

Ex. 28:35 Οτόρ εεεωσпи Ναξ-ηαρτ Σεππαξινερεψκηε-μπι εεεωτεκεν ετεςμι... Ζηνα Ντενεκτεμμοτ...

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 ασωμπι, 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. Σεππαξινερετετεντε Μπιτζ επικαγι εφ-ναεεοτον Αςοκ εξοτον ερως οτόρ εεεωσпи αρετε-ενενοτομ... Ερετεζεινι Νοταμεμεια...

Lev. 24:16 Σεππαξινερεψκεοα εφραν Μπιτζ Μαεεκμοβ.
THE NOUN SYNTAGM AND THE DETERMINATION SYNDROME


Num. 26:26 Ἕπηνάθροτρηξεξέκοθεν τοῦ Ἕπηνακο τοῦ ἰπώικ τοῦ ἐνεμήτ Νξιμί Νετήτ Ννιώκ τωτον Ἕπηνακο.

Gen. 19:29 Ασύπι τοῦ Ἕπηνακοπος Ἐνάθωεζτι τιρος... ἄφτ, ερφιμενι, καβραμ.

(9) ΜΕΝΕΝΑΘΡΕΡΕΡΟΠΟΙΟΝ OR NOMINAL AGENS: post-eventive scenario convert. It too may be topical (this role is of course typical of ἐκατωτεμ, the so-called “Temporal” conjugation form), but adjuvantly gives relative temporal information (as a rule, the Greek has μετά τοῦ + (αὐτῶν) + infinitive).

Ex. 7:25 ἀνομοι ἐβολλ Νξε-ξι Νξεγουον Μενεναθρεπερος ωρι εφιαρο.

Ex. 18:2 Αξι αε Νξε-ιοθορ... Νκεφιωτα Μενεναθρερηχας...

Deut. 24:4 Νεπφυγζηζομ εσικ Ναξι Νξιμι Μενεναθρεπες..

Lev. 13:7 επωπη τον αθονσωτεβ Νξε-πιμνιτι Νηπηναθρεπνας ερον Νξε-πιοτηθ επιζηνοτ-βοι....

Lev. 14:48 Ωτος ζηππε Νηναθραψω ψάλμον Νηπηνι Νξε-πισζωρ Μενεναθροτεσζ-πις.

Deut. 12:30 Μπερκς, ηνσαωοι νκωοοτ Μενεναθροτο-φοτοτ εβολ.

Gen. 5:4 Ασύπι Νξε-νιεγουοτ Ναιάμ Μενεναθρη-ζνιο νκεο...

Topical, in real Narrative only (?), following ασύπι, which is a “dummy” formal Narrative Carrier enabling the initial position of με-νεναθρεπ-. This position of the converb makes it a full constituent of the clause’s information structure, in the Narrator’s staging or “packaging” choice:

Gen. 25:11 Ασύπι τον Μενεναθρεφεμοτ Νξε-αβραάμ ἄφτ, σμοτ είσακ.

Gen. 27:1 Ασύπι τον Μενεναθρεφερηζηλο Νξε-εισκηκ Ωτος Νεβαλ Ανερζλαολ εφνατ Μβολ αυμοτ... ...

Gen. 39:5 Ασύπι τον Μενεναθρεφηχαο Εζηνεπνι... Ωτος ἄφτ, σμοτ επνι Μπερεμενχτι.
Our converb is thus opposed to the equally topical εταγ-, which, its conventional name notwithstanding, is not temporal and does not convey relative chronology\textsuperscript{66}:

Gen. 50:14-15 ὁτι ἀπάσεο Νάε-ιωσὴ φεύρι εὐξήμι νέον ἡμέρας ΝΗ ὑποτ Εταγγείων ἡμέρας Νέονετειμεῖτε μενένεπετεθεῖσθομες μπερίωτ ## Τατάνα νέον Νάε-νενενήνον νιώσης Νάε-apolloιωτ μοντ νεδώνον ...

See above, for an instance, unique in the corpus, of μενένε — Time Expression — εἴπε- (Gen. 16:3).

\textsuperscript{66} See Grossman 2007, for an “adverbial conversion”-view of εταγ-.
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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 junctorially 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, combinatorial syllabicitry;

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, allocation-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 ROSÉN 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. ROSÉN 1964:164) "exponents of the dependence between segments or anullment 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 Allocutions 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 lexemics 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, Δκωτεμ and Απιρωμι # εωτεμ, ΔΝΟΚ-ΟΤΡΩΜΙ and ΟΤΡΩΜΙ 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 Angehcirigkeit und Verbindung”): ρεν-νοστε — ωγρενπρωμε — ωβρεμπρωμε — πυβριντε-φρωμι; 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 Steinthal-Misteli, Erman 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-ων-; ε-ων-: (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, Braquel 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\} + \{ö — e\} in cwtēm. (We note that morphs and syllable are incommensurable — cō 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: cōnt but cōṭēm (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 cētēm, \{e-\} + \{shan\} + \{f\} for eqwān, \{n-\} + \{an\} + \{anok\} for nanok ān, \{t- ů — o\} + \{Ain + m\} + \{Glottal Stop\} for tāmo “tell you” (sgl. fem.), the complex linkages of verb lexemes with their object (cōṭēm, coēmēq and cōṭēm, cētēm, niōn; 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 (pīpām and pētcwēm, dō- and ōn, dōn, dōn and dōn, dāwā and dēntēx̂ē mīlōn), between Topic and Clause (between pīpām and dācōtm). 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, dē- inclusion and so on.
• **High Text-level complex syntagmatic juncture** obtains between Allocation/Response; Evolution/Comment Modes, narrative chunks or blocks (see for these Chapter One above); protasis/apodosis (and more generally superordinative sequelling forms, like οικ - and εφε - 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 pronominal or pronominal or prosodically reduced allomorph of a lexeme or grammeme (a *delimiter* in close juncture is the maintenance of aspiration for ΦΑ-). 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 junctural 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 praesentia* representatives in the text. Incidentally, midway grades of grammemicity or lexemicity are not given but ensue *inter alia* from junctural 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 ξq-, and ξq-, needless to say, closer than απιρωμεν [ευτεμ]). 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 n exal 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.

\[\text{cwn} \neq 1, \text{wp} \neq 1\]
\[\text{pw} \neq \text{mi}, \text{pwm} \neq 1\]
\[\text{gb} \neq \text{ho} \text{t}, \text{tebn} \neq 0 \text{o}\text{ri}\]
\[\text{tam} \neq \text{ho} \text{t}\]
\[\text{x} \neq \text{a} \text{om}, \text{xa} \neq 0 \text{m},\]
\[\text{se} \neq \text{op}\]
\[\text{m} \text{e} \text{e} \text{o} \neq \text{m} \text{h} \text{i} \text{— closer juncture than}\]
\[\text{m} \text{e} \text{t} \neq \text{m} \text{e} \text{o} \text{e} \text{p}\]
\[\theta \neq \text{m} \text{e} \text{c} \text{i} \text{o} \text{— closer juncture than}\]
\[\tau \neq 0 \text{m} \text{o}\]
\[\text{cw} \neq 0 \text{t} \text{e} \text{m}\]
\[0 \text{w} \neq 0 \text{t} \text{p}\]
\[\text{ca} \neq 0 \text{i}, \text{wa} \neq 0 \text{w}\]
\[\varepsilon \neq 0 \text{t} \text{w} \text{o} \text{t} \text{e}\]

(B) In-phrase boundaries.

(b1) Compound - Constituent \neq Compound - Constituent.

In composition, the link, if morphophonemic, resides as a rule in the first (i.e.,) constituent, but at- and similar “semi-lexical” word-formation constituents\(^4\), which are nuclear, are also linked by the paradigmatic inertia (e.g. nil, not zero determination) of the expanding second constituents\(^5\). In case of multiple boundaries, the pre-grammemic one is closer than the pre-lexemic one.

\[\text{ep} \neq 0 \text{cnoq}\]
\[\Phi \text{e} \text{p} \neq 0 \text{pacoq}\]
\[\phi \neq \Phi\]
\[\text{man} \neq 0 \text{apeq}\]
\[\text{peq} \neq 0 \text{emecio}\]
\[\text{pem} \neq 0 \text{m}\]
\[\text{pem} \neq 0 \text{senhi}\]
\[\text{met} \neq 0 \text{a} \text{lo}\]
\[\text{m} \text{e} \text{e} \text{o} \neq \text{m} \text{h} \text{i}\]
\[\text{m} \text{e} \text{t} \neq 0 \text{m} \text{e} \text{o} \text{e} \text{p}\]
\[\text{at} \neq 0 \text{w} \text{emh} \text{p}\]

\(^3\) Cf. Polotsky 1933.

\(^4\) Cf. Oerter 1999 for general and terminological information.


\(^6\) The combinatory aspiration, or absence thereof, possibly defining two met- entities.
JUNCTURE FEATURES

\( \omega \epsilon \neq N \neq \iota \tau, \ \omega \epsilon \neq N \neq \mu \tau \)

\( \theta \epsilon \theta \neq \rho \epsilon c \)

\( \mu \alpha \epsilon e w \neq \tau e \nu b n h \)

\( \phi c \epsilon \zeta o h e n \)

\( q t e \neq \phi a t, c e \epsilon \neq n o \nu \eta i \)

\( \omega w n \neq \xi a g a t \)

Pre-lexemes, alias Lexeme Pre-modifiers or Conjugation Mediators, a very limited \( i.i.c. \) list for an open \( i.f.c. \) one. Rare in the corpus.\(^7\)

Acts 23:3 \( k r e n i k e \neq \xi e m c i \).

Gal. 3:15 \( m p a t o t a g e m \neq \theta e a \nu c . \)

II Tim. 1:6 \( \xi e - n t e k e r e n i g m o t \ n t e \xi \uparrow o t a g e m \neq w n s \)

(b2) VERB Lexeme \( \neq \) Morphological Pre-ACTANT MECHANISM

(lexico-morphemic patterning, in discontinuous-segment juncture):

\( c o t e n / c e t n / - / c o t n \neq \), i.e. \{s \(-\) t \(-\) p\} \( \neq \{\delta \neq \emptyset / e \neq \emptyset / \delta \neq \emptyset \} \).

(b3) VERB Lexeme \( \neq \) PRONOMINAL Object ACTANT.

\( \chi a \neq t \) following consonant, including laryngeal zero.

\( \phi o \theta e b e \neq t \)

\( \phi o \theta e b e \neq q \)

\( \phi o \theta b \neq o \theta \)

\( t w o r n \neq i^8 \) — less close than

\( t w n \neq k \)

\( c o t n \neq q \)

(b4) PREPOSITIONAL Base \( \neq \) PRONOUN or NOUN\(^9\).

\( n c w \neq q \) closer than

\( n c a \neq \pi r w m i \)

\( n c a \neq \theta h n o s \)

\(^7\) 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 \( \xi e - \) “any longer” (STERN 1880 §454, POLOTSKY 1930:875 ad De Vis II 9; also De Vis II 174, 177) and \( o t a g e m - \) “again, re-, in reply, in addition” etc. (Greek mostly \( \alpha w a - \) and \( \xi e i n - \): Crum, Dictionary 509b: rarely in Sahidic) to the Sahidic repertory. (I believe \( t h m - [\xi e t e m -]\) does not belong to this category, formally or functionally, pace FUNK 1978a:97ff.). 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 (\( n e w y d d - \) “recently”, \( h e n - \) “formerly, of old”, \( a i l - \) “again”, \( m a w r - \) “greatly” etc.).

\(^8\) Cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 1977a.

\(^9\) 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.
\[\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon \mp \pi\rho\rho\mu\mu - \text{closer than}\]
\[\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon\nu\nu \mp \kappa\]
\[\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon\nu\nu \mp \emptyset\]
\[\varepsilon \mp \sigma\tau\rho\rho\mu\mu\]
\[\varepsilon\rho\nu \mp \eta\]
\[\varepsilon\rho\nu \mp \tau\nu\]
\[\varepsilon\rho\nu \mp \emptyset\]

(b5) "INALIENABLE" NOUN LEXEME \(\mp\) PERSONAL POSSESSOR.

\[\varpi \mp c\]
\[\varpi \mp \eta\]
\[\Delta\nu \mp \tau\nu\]

(b6) "INALIENABLE" NOUN LEXEME/PREPOSITIONAL BASE \(\mp\) NOMINAL POSSSESSOR.

\[\varepsilon\omega\vartheta\nu \mp \eta \mp \eta \varepsilon\sigma\sigma\varepsilon\beta\text{ (Lev. 21:10)}^{10}.\]
\[\tau\omicron\omicron \nu \mp \lambda\alpha\rho\nu\nu \varepsilon\mu\varepsilon\eta\nu\nu \hrho (\text{Deut. 19:5}).\]
\[\varepsilon\rho\nu\nu/\varepsilon\nu\pi\rho\nu \mp \eta \mp \tau\nu\nu\nu (\text{Gen. 29:2}).\]
\[\varepsilon\nu\pi\rho\nu\nu \mp \eta \mp \tau\nu\nu\nu (\text{Gen. 29:3:10}).\]

(b7) DETERMINATOR (sgl.) \(\mp\) NOUN LEXEME: \(\pi/\Phi\)-, \(\pi\)-, \(\sigma\)-

LEXEME.

\[\eta \mp \sigma\mu\nu\hnu - \text{more open than}\]
\[\pi\mp \iota\nu\ \\
\Phi \mp \rho\nu\ \\
\Phi \mp \mu\hnu\nu\ \\
\Phi \mp \iota\omicron\mu\ \\
\pi \mp \iota\nu\ \\
\sigma\mp \epsilon\ c\omega\nu\]

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": \(\tau \mp \tau\iota\mu\nu\hnu\text{ (Lev. 5:15)}; \tau\nu\nu \mp \eta\alpha\nu\text{ (Gen. 19:3).}\)

(b8) Constituence Personal-Sphere Association: DETERMINATOR (singular-only \(\pi\)- and plural-only \(\nu\nu\)- + \(\nu\)-) \(\mp\) LEXEME. Determinator + \(\nu\)- 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 \(\nu\)-, cf. \(\kappa\nu\nu\ k\tau\epsilon\mu\nu\nu\nu\text{ De Vis II 7, \pi\rho\nu\nu, \nu\epsilon\rho\nu\nu\nu\ De Vis I 28).\) \(\text{POLOTS\KYY 1934:61.}\) The invariable pronoun is here an "inalienable-possession" slot-filler as well as an actualizator and perhaps also specifier (cf. Amharic -\(\alpha\), def. article as well as 3rd sgl. masc. possessive suffix). This is a reduction in linkage grading.
Φمالك μπεκο
nen-[μαγξ] μ+ πιλαος.11

(α9) possessive pronoun + determinator (noun syntagm).
φα + πιεγοοτ πιεγοοτ.13
φα + φι

(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-14

(b12) determinator (+ noun lexeme) + movable lexeme.
ξανκακίοι β + ξιφήνηκον
οτρισμίοι β + ξανανεος

(b13) determinator (+ noun lexeme) νι + determinator (noun syntagm).

(a) Constituence Personal-Sphere Association (= b8).
nenμαγξ μ+ πιλαον.15
nenθροιτο β + ξετ
τωρι μ + φαραω
ενενμαγξ ρετ- + κετενηρπι

11 nen- - n-, and π- - n-, are discontinuous (see below on juncture across discontinuous boundaries); see Chapter Three on Constituence Association (n.15 below).

12 See Polotsky 1964:253 n.1 (not included in CP), 1968 (Boh.), Shisha-Halevy 1983:316 (Oxyrh.).

13 While both determinators and possessive pronouns are nuclear, expanded by their respective subsequent segments, or segment strings, πι-, πι-, πες- stand in the pre-lexeme 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 πες-: the non-aspiration of the possessive article is prosodically and morphophonemically clear, and the need to distinguish πα- ("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).

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.

15 A veritable juncture paradigm, the significant 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.
νεμώεπι nte- ἡ παίκαγι
νιψερι ἡ nte-νιχανανεος
πιλαος ἡ nte-πικαγι
νιψιρι ἡ nte-νετενψηρι

(b) Apposition
Φή ἡ πινιγώντ

(c) Naming specification
πιρωμί ἡ ἄε-μωτσερ

(b14) DETERMINATOR ἡ RELATIVE CONVERTER.
π ἡ ετ- — closer linkage.

{Φή}/Φαι ἡ ετ-/ετακα-/εταή — more open linkage. Deut. 12:25

πινενανεγ νεμ πεθαναν.
Gen. 19:7 παινετγων.
Num. 10:30 γανενανετ.
Ex. 22:20 Φή ετακαρψωτψωπ νακενενοντ.
Lev. 12:7 Φνομος ntaxον εταμινει.
Gen. 41:24 Νεμμον-Φή εταμο υμοι επος.
Ex. 21:19 Φή εταή ἡ μπιεργών.

(b15) PRONOMINAL NUCLEUS ἡ NOMINAL EXPANSION.

(a) Interlocutive personal pronoun
Gen. 47:3 άνον-γανμανεςψων ἡ σα-νεκααψων.
Deut. 4:4 Νεωτεν ἄε ἡ σα-μή εσονε υγ ναπες πεννοντ ἡ
tετενοντ δηρον μψον.

(b) Delocative personal pronoun
Gen. 30:41 ζεννιχοτε ευακεψωπσων ... άε- ὑ

Gen. 7:13 αψενανα άε- ὑ ναε.

(b16) SPECIFIC ANTECEDENT ἡ EXPANDING CLAUSE.

(a) Relative Conversion (+ anaphora) linkage: attributive expansion
Ex. 12:40 πιξινακωιλι ντενεψηρπι μπιεκα ἡ ετ-ἀτερ-πεμ-

ιαλι μμοψ.

Ex. 10:6 Φαι ἡ ετε-μπενεκιοτ ἡ ναε εοςον μπηψήντ.

16 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.

17 This difference is symptomized by relative extent of flanking commutation and (in)separability.
(b) Circumstantial Conversion linkage (+ anaphora): rhematic (adnential, predicative expansion)\(^{18}\)

Gen. 33:1 θηππε ει δεηα άειγον δ + ε-ννηνος.
Deut. 14:4, Lev.11:2 ναι ηε νηηενωοτι + ερε-τενηεοτομοτ.
Deut. 22:27 τειειπι δ + ε-εηωπη νενεη (Vat; P τη- έταη-).  
(b17) LOW-SPECIFICITY ANTECEDENT + EXPANDING CLAUSE.
Circumstantial Conversion linkage\(^{19}\).
Deut. 5:9f. οννοτ+ ηηεηνηο δ + ε-ηήηεηνη.
Gen. 22:13 θηππε ει οτεεκωοτ δ + ε-ηήεηνο μηοη ηεενηε-

Deut. 23:16 ηηεκ+ ηοτβωκ εεοηεη ηνεηηνε δ + ε-ηήηεη εραηχ.
Lev. 21:7 οτεειπι μηοηηνη οτοπ δ + ε-κκοηq.
(b18) SPECIFIC/NON-SPECIFIC ANTECEDENT + EXPANDING CLAUSE.
Relative conversion in hermeneutical glossing\(^{20}\):
Gen. 44:24 πηεαλαοτ δ + ετε-πενεηητ ηε.
Ex. 1:11 ιων δ + ετε-ηεβακι μηρη ηε.

---

\(^{18}\) In Nitrian Bohairic (and to a lesser extent in the NT), the status of this construction is evidently different, but still unclear: Cat. 25 τεειπι εεεεηνηον πατ εβολ έαροο, caption; Cat. 35 εεοε ηηε εεεεηηζηα κοτοηοεη caption — so often, e.g. 35, 42, 51, 86; De Vis II 153 πακωμ εεεεηω ηεηεκ + επηοοη. Also ηαι ετε-. Φη ετε- De Vis I 101, II 56, Cat. 106, 108, 115 etc. Note the combination of relative and Circumstantial in: καζηηηε νεηοηητ εεεεηηωη ηεηεοτ 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 precursor of the Coptic one in point.

\(^{19}\) Lev. 27:12 οται εεολαηνεγ ορ Num. 17:5 ηαι ηεηεμηο ετε-εβολ αη ηε ηεενεηεπι ηεηπ (= 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 witnesses, inc. M 569 ed. Aranda, collated: Hans Quecke by letter, 15/11/88). Consider also the following, especially generic instances: AM I 2 εεοε-οηνηηνοε εηαη-

---

\(^{20}\) See Polotsky 1987:104f. on the “Hermeneutischer Relativsatz” and the preference of Bohairic for ετε-...πε and the Endophoric NS pattern over ετε-παι πε... In this construction, the internal juncture of the expanding clause is closer, the external (expansion) juncture more open.
Gen. 50:1 πὴβηι ναχμι + ἐτε-ῤής πε ἐτ ‡ γιμήρ μπιτόρ-
δανής.
(b19) ZERO-DETERMINATION ANTECEDENT in negative environment ‡
EXPANDING CLAUSE (negative environment). Δε- linkage21:
Deut. 3:4 νεμμων-βακι ‡ δε-μπενδιτικ Vat (Paris Δε, prob-
ably to be emended or at least to be referred back to an original Δε-
there is no particle here in the Greek that would trigger Coptic Δε).

(b20) VERB LEXEME ("INFINITIVE") or CONVERB ‡ DETERMINATOR +
NOUN EXPANSION (object actant); VERB LEXEME ("INFINITIVE") or CON-
VERB ‡ PRONOUN EXPANSION (object actant).

The valency-pattern matrix is an important, closely-knit junctural do-
main and scope, containing important links. Typologically, it is of sig-
nificance 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. Com-
pletion 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 them-
soles, linked both to the verb and through the verb. The primary link-
age, to the verb, is effected either (1) by a prosodic and/or morphe-
phonemic mechanism in the lexeme, with inseparability and closest
juncture, or (2) by a smallish list of rectional grammatic prepositions
(mainly η-, ε-, νκα-), in looser juncture with the verb. (In the case of
reflexive diathesis, an appropriate anaphor is added).

The difference between actants and circumstnats, 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 (νασ, κω-
τεμ, δομδεμ...), also:

21 See Chapter Three for Δε- in the paradigm adnominal to a generic nucleus, in a
doubly negative environment: see above, Chapter Three (SHISHA-HALEVY 1986a:148.
213). Exx. in the Boh. NT: Luke 8:17:25, 12:2, Mt. 10:26 νεμμων-νετζιν Δε-κε-
ναεμι επομ Δν (Cat. 28).
cωβι n- Num. 22:29.
σι nεμ- Ex. 19:12.
†φι ερν- “kiss” Ex. 4:27.
κιμ n- “move” Lev. 14:44.
ωνι ε- “visit, call on” Num. 26:64.
εργωβ n- “work (at)” Ex. 31:4.
Deut. 28:44 θνυθ ενεσωπι ινωφε θνυκ δε εκεσωπι
nοττατ.
Gen. 43:9 ειεσωπι ειοι ινερηνοβι.
Lev. 11:36 εσωπι οτην εκασεμ.
Lev. 25:44 θν ηνθρω ετνασωπι ιακ.
Deut. 1:22 πιμωτ φι ετεθηναωεν αν ερπί γιωτι
(which Funk 1992:19 emends, with Vat, into ετεθηναωε).
Also μπενζίτε, Σοθεπ, ενκ, γενγκωνκ, τωστι (see
below).

Obs.
(1) Cases like πινοβι εταφερνοβι ιμνοθ Lev. 4:28:35 and the structurally different
πικομον εταφςμοτ ιμνοθ Deut. 33:1 etc. have ιμνοθ as a conditioned anaphoric
formal object — making ερνοβι formally and potentially bivalent, μονε 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 πιζεμπυμι εταιηαq Num. 1:44, which is old in Egyptian.
(2) It may be that the adverb in γεμι ιπιαμια Gen. 22:5 is also a formal valency slot
filler: is γεμи 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 μπιτζεμκο-σται ιμνοθ (but Vat ιτοτ).
Lev. 17:12 ιμνερθυμ-στοιρ (= Vat); sim. Lev. 7:27.
Gen. 38:8 τονος-οτζροξ.
Ex. 4:11 ινιε εταφθανιο-εβολ ινιε κοτρε πεζατε ιμολ ινιε βελα (=
Vat).
Gen. 42:16 οτωριο-στιοι οτιν εβολ.
Ex. 11:1 οτωριο-οινοσ (Vat οτερην-).

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 οτ τετεπτενεκνοτς ερετιν μμον ωτοτκ.  
Ex. 16:33 επαρεξ εροκ — possibly a case of zero third actant.  
Ex. 25:11 εκεους ννοςβ.  
Deut. 27:1 ...ευργελεν μμωτεν ερων (distinct from γον-  
γεν ντεν- Deut. 1:18).  
Gen. 44:1 μεγ-νενκοκ νναιρωμι ννοκο ννορι — quadrivalent?  
Gen. 19:32-35 μαρεντεπενιωτ νοθηπ ... μαρεντκοφ  
νοθηπ.  
Deut. 18:10f. εγερο μπεκωτζει ετετερι εκεινο με-  
νοτρχωμ (also Num. 14:11 μανασ με βαλλοε ερο μμοι  
εμβον).

μπερερζινιοπ μμον ε- Num. 32:5 (cf. also ερζινιοπ zero  
nεμ — Num. 32:29, ερζινιοπ N- Num. 33:51).

ταρκοφ N- Gen. 22:16 — this causative-diathesis matrix helps us to  
interpret αιωρκ μμοι Gen. 22:16, which has the first slot zeroed.

Deut. 21:14 εκεκας εβολ εκοι νρεμε.  
Gen. 12:2 ειεαικ εοτνιωγ νμιμα.  
Ex. 32:4 αγεδινιιοφ ννοναςι ννωτζ.  
Ex. 7:1 εξεωμπ τακ νοτρποφητς.  
Gen. 5:2 αγεδινισοιο φτσωρετ νεμ νοταμι... (= Vat).  
Ex. 35:35 αγεδισοφ εμετι νκοβια.

(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 — \{\text{πε}\} internal copular linkage, marked in the highly enclitic delocutive Theme, which (externally) carries also an anaphoric or cataphoric referential cotext or context link; when \{\text{πε}\} 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.

\(\times \neq \text{σωμ} - \) "aspiration" of pronominal Theme is a link. So too \(\times \neq \text{ναβωκ}, \) before grammeme.

\(\text{νασ} \neq \text{σεντεχμή.}\)

\(\text{νκ} \neq \text{νασωμ αν Deut.8:9 (Circumstantial).}\)

\(\text{C} \neq \text{ενσοτν Gen. 18:9} - \) 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/-μον-} + existant) followed in low linkage (open juncture) by a rhematic dynamic or Stative converb:

Gen. 20:9 \text{σωμβ \ μον-ξαί \ νααι.}

Ex. 33:21 \text{γηπε \ οτον-οτμα κη γαροκ.}

Gen. 23:6 \text{μον-ξαί \ μον ταγνο.}

(c4-c5) Verbal-Rheme nexus.

\(\text{αξ} \neq \text{εωτεμ, \ ι-πρωμι} \neq \text{εωτεμ}: \) structurally, it is the closely linked [base+Theme] \(\text{α-ξ} \) (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{σδμf} 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\textsuperscript{23}. 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 \& n\textsuperscript{2}xe-Theme, Base + Theme \& Verb Clause juncture features.

Anaphoric or cataphoric linkage of a core pronominally-linked unit ("\textit{αγεωτεμ}") to an extrapolated Theme makes for three distinctive "Flexionisierung" juncture contours; in the case of an extrapolated [base+Theme] unit, nexus-topicalization, the linkage is complex (both anaphora and base repetition) and the cohesion consequently high\textsuperscript{24}.

(a) Gen. 25:21 \textit{ιαπακ δε αγμενε-νεκαυ}. 
(b) Num. 3:4 \textit{αγμοσ νεκε-νααβ νεμ άβισα}. 
(c) Gen. 25:33 \textit{ανκαυ δε αυ† ναιμετωρπ ναιμικε ενολ νιακωβ}. 
\textit{ερεδορθυ εγεναυ} (Lev. passim).

(c9-c12) Some special Base + Theme-Agent links\textsuperscript{25}:

(c9-c10) Base \& Second-Person-Feminine zero and Second Person Plural Pronominal Themes\textsuperscript{26}. The conditioned base allomorph indicates higher cohesion: conditioning is a link.

\textit{αρε † Ο-κωνι, αρε † Ο-κωβι} (Preterite: Num. 5:20, 22:29 etc.). As contrasted with:
\textit{α † q-ωρκ, α † i-τωντ} etc.
Gen. 50:5 \textit{ερε † τεν-τομετ} (Absolute Future).
Cat. 208 \textit{αρε † τεν-κω ναςαροκ εθων} (Preterite).
(c11) Base \& Nominal Theme boundary:
Gen. 27:28 \textit{οτως ερε-φι† † ιακ}.

\textsuperscript{23} The [base + Theme] unit is encountered alone, apocritically: "\textit{νεκεσην ων} \& \textit{τε"... μποτ ρω} ("...we wouldn’t have stayed" — Indeed, they \textit{did not}). Shenoute ed. Leip. IV 97.
\textsuperscript{24} Cf. GALAND 1964, esp. 38ff., 48ff. for the intricate reference patterns in Berber verb clauses.
\textsuperscript{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 grammemic signals (cf., on the "pronominality" of the bases. SCHLEICHER 1859:21, SCHWARTZE-STEINTHAL 1850:423ff.). See note 23.
\textsuperscript{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 ἐωπιν ἄμανδων ἐνηαοτιαοταν ἑτεγωτι

(nak ἰβεξε ὦηε-νιεωυν θῃοτ ηεκαοτιαοταν.

(c12) [Base + Theme] core unit linkage: discontinuous-segment juncture across pronominal Theme-agens. 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 ἑ- [Theme] ε-, ἑτενεν-ε-). Note the syllabication εq-ε-.

α-[-]q[+]ωαν- (Conditional, affirmative; consider α- [Theme] ωαν-).

(c13) CONVERTER ☠ Base, CONVERTER ☠ Determinator, CONVERTER ☠ Nexus: Boundaries and Linkage.

(c14) CONVERTER ☠ ὁ τον- + 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 ὁ τον- , indicating a junctural contact-situation between converter (conditioned) and Theme (conditioning): ὁ τον- is here junctorially absent, in the sense that ἑ- etc. is conditioned by an element following ὁ τον-: ὁ ἑ-ὁ τον- is as “prenominal” as ἑ-.

The junctural “transparency” of ὁ τον- correlates with the morphosyntactical circumstance of its being purely formal, not a form of Existential Statement. The difference between these still enigmatic forms and the normal converters is not yet clear.

Ex. 39:23 ἐως ἐς ὑων ὄςεντεςμητ ἐχς... ἑ-ὁ τον-ὁ τοσβι ναττοσῳ κωτ ἐτος (= Vat!).

(c15) CONVERTER (Relative) ☠ Base (Absolute Future).

ἐτε ☠ ἑεγωτι Deut. 19:4 (= Vat), with exx. like Ex. 3:14:15 παρθι ἐτεκεδων (= 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.

28 Bohairic normally has ἑτε-, not ἑ-ὁ τον- with a non-specific actor expression (Polotsky 1960:411), but consider ἑ-ὁ τον-ὁ ταί Να- Lev. 11:32 or ἑ-ὁ τον-...

...Νυτ τε Lev. 21:21.
Gen. 1:6 ...οὐχομενεκαψι ἢ εἰφηψωρκ εβολ... (Greek ἐστὶν διακωρίζον) is a well-established construction and form; more exx. in Chapter One; taken with the zeroed Circumstantial allomorph before the negator n-...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 junctural 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 partially.29 In precise structural terms, we have to do with its two homonyms, one a true converter, one (still) a pronoun, each with distinctive juncture properties.30


Lev. 14:32 Φη ἐτέ ἢ Θ-κώμι ἢ (see also below, on non-zero resumption of antecedent in affirmative clauses).

Deut. 25:9 παρώμι ἐτέ ἢ Θ-κώμω ἢ Μηθί θεσκον.

(c18) Relative Converter ἢ Adverbial RHEME. Allomorphic έτε-, joining a boundary less close than έτ-; no “liaison étroit” (Poletsky 1949, Kasser 1994b).

Φη ἐτέ ἢ εἰθεφομοι Lev. 6:23, 9:15 etc.32

29 Consider the case of the έτ- Και- 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. έτ-Και- (e.g. in Oxyrhynchite Mt. 5:5:7-9. 12:36, 15:32, also in Acts, (mostly with ΝΕ- future). Historically regarded, έτει- would correspond, and be diachronically related to the second of two Relative markers in LE (and Demotic?) - ntj- and ntj-jw.f.; see Schenke 1978:*48ff. Funk 1981 describes έτ-ΟΥ as “synthetic”; έτ-Και- as “analytic”, which, unless meant as a junctural statement, would be tautological and but begg the question. I would also suggest comparing the second syntagm with the Sahidic (and Oxyrhynchite) conjunctive Ν-Και- (Shisha-Halevy 1986a Chapter Seven): Ν- functionally kindred to έτ- (a relationship already observed by Steinhall 1847) is apparently not restricted to nouns. The most inspired and detailed study of the opposition έτ-Και- v.s. έτοι- 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 Steinhall 1850:359 vs. 490 (“declinierte Conjunction”).

31 Cf. Rosén 1964:182

32 Cf. Andersson 1904:101; see Poletsky 1949:31f. Note also (Lev. 7:7) Μηθφη ἢ Φη έτεθεμέτωντ, for which latter merging of έτε- and ΝΤΕ-, see also Chapter Three.
etē διὰ ἁμαρ Gen. 19:25.
etē διὰ ἀνακτήτωμεν επεκρπν εἰσεβορ-τέρ

(c19-c20) RELATIVE CONVERTER διὰ TOPICALIZATION/PREMODIFICATION CLAUSE. Allomorphic etē- , joining a boundary less close than for etē-. The premodifying or presetting adverbials and adverbal clauses, of a restricted paradigm, are also topical. These constructions are typically Bohairic.33

Lev. 14:35 Φη etē διὰ πνει Φων οῶ.
Deut. 2:25 νη etē διὰ αὐσανακτήμεν επεκρπν εἰσεβορ-τέρ

(c21) PRE-NEGATOR διὰ FOCALIZING CONVERTER.

Whereas the placement of the post-negator ἀν is apparently pertinent, that is, carries a functional load (see Chapter Two), the pre-negator η- adjoins the initial segment of the focalization construction, namely the converter, in closest juncture, as witnessed by the non-syllabic nature of the nasal.35 Unlike this embracing negation in unconverted nexus, ν-…ἀν is in this case not Circumstantial:

Gen. 3:4 ζαρητενημανοῦν ἀν Σενουμοῦν.
Num. 20:17 ζαναγειν ἀν Εβολ γιτεννηιαγαλοἰ.
Deut. 29:14 Ναίκω νταλιάδενκη ἀνόκ Νεμώτεν μματα-
θεν-όηνοῦν ἀν μφοοτ.
Deut. 11:10 Ναηοὶ γαρ ἀν μφρήτ μπίκαρι Ντεχοήμι.
Gen. 31:15 Μη νετατοπτεν νακ ἀν μφρήτ Νηγανσεμ-
μων.

(c22) PRE-NEGATOR διὰ PERSONAL-PRONOUN THEME (sec. person masc.).

Deut. 8:9 Νηκνασωμοῦν ἀν (Vat νηκα-) Circumstantial (see below). Both pre-negator and Theme are delimited by syllabicity (below), the latter also by non-aspiration.

33 Φη etē- + [ADV, AUGENS] άη-, άαη-, έηε-, Present, ηα- Future, οντοται, Nominal Sentence: Polotsky’s “split adjective clause” (POLOTSKY 1987:93ff.) is rare in the corpus (Polotsky’s exx. are from the NT — very common — and Proverbs). While Polotsky considers this the “transposition” of an entire clause, I take it to be a conversion of a topicalized-premodifier one. The feature is North-Middle Egyptian, shared by Fayumic and Oxyrhynchite (QUECKE 1974:108 + n.212) — e.g. Acts 2:32 (ed. Schenke) ete-ἀναν θηρν θα νεα ημνερ. Instances of Φη etē- + adverbial / topicalization (NT) have, besides the NS, also the present, Preterite, Circumstantial Present, Conjunctive, even Imperative (attested in LE!): II Tim. 4:15 Φη etē-νοοκ γαωκ αρεγ
ερκ οιβολ νμου.

34 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).

35 See SHISHA-HALEVY 2002:317ff., 321ff. for the delimitation of η- from τ- 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) οὐσι- /μοιν- Existant.

Close juncture. Linkage for μοιν-: exclusion of all but zero determination. By this token, οὐσι- enters looser juncture than μοιν- (see Chapter Three).

Num. 23:23 μοιν-σιώμι γαρ.
Gen. 47:13 νεμοιν-στα ἔστε πε.
Ex. 33:21 ρήματε οὐσι-ο硫α καὶ γαροκ.
Lev. 21:21 ἦς-ορθι οὐσι-ἀνε ἀρτικ.

(D) Textural (ultraclausal, hypernexusal) juncture boundaries.36

(d1) Verb Clause 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 εὐσπ οὐσμεναρipsis ἐροί οὐδε ητοσμεσω-

τεμ νεκασημ...

Ex. 5:7 μαρονθενυοτ νεοτον οτογ νεοθενεττοχ νωοτ.
Gen. 19:34 μασενε έσοτν ένκοτ νέμαι οτογ ντεντογ-

νος-οβαος...

Ex. 3:10 ἕνος ἄμοτο νταοτορπκ...

Gen. 27:41 μαρονθσντ νξε-νιεγον ντεφίμον μπαϊτ γίνα νταδωτεβ νικαμμ μαρεφσπι νξε-οτασρο...
οτογ ντεφρμπι εφεφιμα (so, correctly) εβολ...

Ex. 14:2 σικι νεμ νενουηπι μπύκλ οτογ μαροντοτμετβ.

The extended paradigms includes other conjugation forms, with their own junctural profile, which, however, is related to that of the Conjunctive:

Num. 21:7 τωβς ουν μπετ μαρεφγιλ νναιγοοπ εβολ

γαρο.

Num. 22:19 ογι νεμικ ὀτογ τναεμί δε-οτ πετεπητ

ναζον όι (= Greek).

Ex. 33:14 ανόκ εθανομοι δάρωκ ὀτογ τναβτέμτον

νακ.

Num. 22:17 τναταοκτ γαρ εμασμ οτογ όι ετεκναδοτοβ

νακ τναλιτοτ 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 (ὡς-, εἰς-), but delimitation is in evidence, signalled by rupture of personal concord and syntax:

Num. 12:6 εὐσφι χωμανώσιν ἥς-οπροφύτης δετώσεν ἦνοικορομα δ ὑμιῶντοντε ἑρόμ ὀσσον ὄματι θείοι νεμαν.

Ex. 4:1 εὐσφι ἄσωτενηνατ ‡ ἑροι ὀσε ἄτωτενεμοτ-τεμ ἔκατασμην κεναδοτοι ἑροι νην ἢς-μπεροντοςον ἑροκ νής-φ ‡ οτ πετασμον νωσ.

The *irrealis* complex is more formalized, with κε- and πε- linking protasis and apodosis, and tense-shifting delimiting the latter:

Num. 22:33 ἐνεμπερίκι πε τοσονοτ νεόκ κεν μεν ειναν-ζοθεκι πε οθ ἤς-μεν θανατασον θας.

(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 ἄπεναιρψιν αρα ναοτόμοι νοτώκ ‡ κεν μεν ἁμεπε.

Gen. 43:25 ἄσωτεμα γαρ ἢς-αιρ-ώσονθη κεντι εινατον ‡ μπίαα ετεκματ.

Num. 11:13 αιναζεμ-ας ‡ θων.

Gen. 37:16 αςμον ‡ θων.

Gen. 37:30 άκαθενθη ‡ θων.

Gen. 37:15 ακκωτ ‡ ντα ‡ οτ.

Lev. 3:7 εναενήν εξοτον μπεμεο μπεντ. Ex. 2:14 ἄν εκοτους εξοθετ.

Gen. 44:30 τεπτυσθη ακαωί σεπτυσθη μπιαλοτ.

Gen. 34:31 ἀλα αϊναπη κενςκοτοι μπρτ ‡ νοσπορήν.


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:

ας ‡ θων passim.

Gen. 18:9 ες ‡ νοσον (responsive to ας θων).
Gen. 16:5 ετακναστ ΧΕ ΧΕ-άς ἡ λβοκί.
Num. 22:29 ἀρε ὡς κωβί μμοι.

In the case of Focus-initial construction, the main Focus ἡ Topic boundary always immediately precedes the Focalizing converter, with secondary boundaries in the Topic:

Ex. 18:14 εἰσε-οτ οὐκ ἡμᾶτατ ἡ εἰκεμεν.
Gen. 38:25 εβολ Χεσπηρῶμε ετενοτν η ηαι ἡ ΑἸΒΟΧΙ ἀνοικ.
Deut. 31:29 εταν ἡμαςμο Ͽ ἡ ετενηναπερανομιν (Vat te-
ten-).
Gen. 44:5 Σενονιτωμ Ͽ ἡ άσιστωμ.
(d6) VERB CLAUSE ἡ SEQUELLING FORMS: εηε-, ϊακ- (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 coor-dinated to their foregoing cotext but sequelling have built-in links with it. What is juncturally remarkable is, on one hand, the absence of con-nectors, and, on the other hand, the presence of superordinating expo-nents, that are juncturally delimiters, since the sequel is rhematic.

Gen. 42:34 Ανιοτι Μπετενκούζι ΝΚΩΝ ΓΑΡΟΙ ἡ ΕΙΕΕΜΙ ΧΕ-
ΝΩΤΕΝ-ΓΑΝΖΗΡ ΑΝ.
Gen. 30:20 ἀρτ ἡ ἄη ΝΟΣΤΑΙΟ ΕΝΑΝΕΨ ΝΡΗΙ ΣΕΝΝΑΪ-
ΧΟΥ ΝΤΕΝΤΟΣ ΕΙΚΕΜΕΝΠΙΤ ΝΧΕ-ΠΑΓΑΙ.
Gen. 18:5 άρωχ ΕΙΕΣΙ ΝΟΤΧΙΚ ΕΡΕΤΕΝΕΟΥΜ ΜΕΝΕΝΚΑ-
ΝΑΙ ΕΡΕΤΕΝΕΓΕΝΕΤΙΝ.
Gen. 24:46 ἡ ΝΟΟΚ ΕΙΕΤΧΟ ΝΝΕΚΚΕΣΑΜΑΤΛΙ (Arabic ηα-;
Greek και), sim. 24:44.
Gen. 4:14 ιεΧΕ ΧΑΡΙΤΤ ΜΠΟΟΤ ΕΒΟΛ ΓΑΡΓΟ ΜΠΚΑΡΙ άΡΟΧ
ΕΙΕΒΩΜΠΙ ΕΙΕΙΑΓΟΜ άΡΟΧ ΕΙΕΧΕΡΤΕΡ ΧΕΣΧΠΚΑΡΙ...
Num. 12:6 άρωπι ΑΧΤΗΝΩΜΠ ΧΕ-ΟΤΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ ΝΤΩΤΕΝ
ΣΕΝΟΤΓΟΡΟΜΑ ἡ ΧΑΙΟΤΟΝΤΙΕΡΟΧ άΡΟΧ άΡΟΧ ΧΑΙΑΖΙ ΝΕΜΑΙ.
Deut. 16:19 ΝΙΑΠΡΟΝ ΓΑΡ ΧΑΡΧΗΣΗ ΝΝΕΝΒΑΛ ΝΤΕΝΙΚΑ-
ΒΕΤ ΧΑΤΑΚΟ ΝΝΙΚΑΖΙ ΝΕΜΗΙ (Greek και Σιαπει...).
(d7) Dialogue-internal juncture: ALLOCUTION ἡ 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 ὃν εἰκοσὶν εἴδοθεν ἦν ὅποι μὴ πρῆτ ἐτακτPrototypeOf τεβ ΜΠΙΡΜΧΜΗΝ ὅποι μη.

Ex. 3:16 μακενὰκ μακεντῆτ-νηξίαιοι ... ὅτος ἑκδος ὅνωστ...

Ex. 24:12 ἀμοῦ ἐπονὶ γαροὶ ἡμῖνὶ ποτῶν ὅτος ὑπὶ μπατ ὅτος ἠτὰ ὅνατ νὲκ ἦναμπλα.

Gen. 49:1 ἐκᾶτετ ἡταμῶτεν (Greek σύναπθε ἵνα ἄναγγελο).

Ex. 14:11 γίνεται θαυματουργοῦ ἡ ἐκκοπὴ ἐβολ ζηνικὰρο καιῆμη.

Ex. 4:2 γίνεται ζηνικὰρο καιῆμη, answered ὅτι βατὶ (πε super lin.).

Gen. 43:7 ἦν-ετι πετεϊνωτ ἐν ἦν ἦν-οντετεν-κον μμᾶτ. θαυματουργοῦ ἡ ἐκκοπὴ ἐβολ ζηνικὰρο καιῆμη.

Gen. 43:27f. θοτὸν ἦν-πετεϊνωτ ... ἦτι κοντ, answered ὅτι βατὶ (πε super lin.).

Gen. 27:32 θαυματουργοῦ ἡ ἐκκοπὴ ἐβολ ζῆνωτ ἦτι κοντ.

Gen. 32:27 κατὲ θεκτήμενον μέκατ.

Gen. 18:9 ἦν-ετι πεκκατὰ γαρρα τεκτῆμε, answered ἦν-ετι κοντ... 

(d8) NARRATIVE JUNCTURE (see Chapter One, esp. §1.1.5).

Another sophisticated paradigmatic set features combinations, in various order, of the Preterite ἅγ-, main Narrative Evolution Mode tense;
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 ἀρτων ἄκε-μωρχς ἀπναγμος.

Ex. 3:6 Ἀκροτιατ ρινατ ὁτο τρωτεμ επεμαρ ἁπα-

Gen. 25:25 αἐτ ἐευν νὰκ-περμπρι περσωρπ μμίςι...

Menencaφαι αἐτ ἐευν νὰκ-περσκε νὰτε-εφκιάκ ἄμοι

Gen. 22:6ff. αἐτ αευν νὰκ-ἀφραμ μνίρορφ ἆταπίλα ἀφ-

tαλοτ εζεικακ ... ὁτο ἄτενωτον νὰκ-μπφ ετος

πεζεικακ δε ἀφραμ [...] πεζε αφραμ δε [...] ἄστ-

Gen. 37:4 ἐτασματ ζε-περγιωτ μει μμορ ατμεστυη

Gen. 37:4 ἐτασεμνίκαν μετ κεμοτ ατμεστυη

Ex. 1:21 ἐπικια τε νατερηστ ἄτγη μφτ πε ... ἄτεαμπο

Ex. 2:15 αρσωτεμ δε νὰκ-φαραφ επαειςξι ὁτο φαραφ

Gen. 21:20 ὁτο ναρε-φτ χ νεμ πίατον πε ακαιαί ὁτο

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 element 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 αγωνητεμ (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 nexal 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 ανοκ-φαφ † γαρ ανοκ to Ex.1:19 μφρη† αν ννιγιομι ντεχμι πε ννιγιομι ντενιγεβρεος, from Gen. 37:28 οτογ νασνοπ πε ιε-πιρωμι μμαδινεος ... ανενιωσψφ επω ψηι ανεπιλακκος ατ† νιωσψφ εβολ to Gen. 13:5ff. ναρεπικαρι δε ιεημασι ιωπι (sic, for ιωπι) μμωναν πε, 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 οὐσιώμεν is in Bohairic differently related to οὐς compared to the ἀσωμ vs. οὐς 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 οὐς, which proportionately reduces that of οὐσιώμεν. The much more restricted range of οὐ- also considerably broadens that of οὐς. Hierarchically, οὐσιώμεν is still of a higher order than οὐς, which in the corpus coordinates internally and, as a rule, symmetrically, infra-clausal unities (nominal — any determination but {πι-}? — or adverbial phrases) as subnescal constituents, while οὐσιώμεν superordinates or adds clausal or ultra-clausal ones; οὐσιώμεν is initial (and prefixed in close juncture) to the added unity, οὐς infixed in the coordinative one.

(a) οὐς

Ex. 9:31 πιμαζι δε οὐς πιιωτ αθμιτι.
Gen. 14:10 ἰμελλοτ δε ετμοιαζ ναοι ουωτι ωπι τι οὐς.

Deut. 6:15 ητετε ταωτ οὐς ημε έμβον (= Vat) — coordinating verb lexemes in close juncture after bracketing conjugation base.
Deut. 25:13 νεοστιρι νημ οτι τα οτι.
Ex. 15:18 πς εκοι ντοπο ναιενεξ οης οηενεξ ητετιε-

Ex. 28:35 ετεκεωτεμ ετεκεσμη έγνωτε εδοτην επεθεο-

Deut. 9:24 διης ηπεςμο ηπες ταοι οηονο οης ηομ έ

Gen. 31:10 αινατ ερςοτ ηναοια ηναοιτο ζηηπι ιε

Deut. 26:5ff. άγιετεν έβολ έκπιαμ έγονετι οηομ

Gen. 31:2/5 αηςτ ηκρακιβ επρον ηλαπαν δ ηε-νηοιη

Note the punctuation signals (discussed in detail below) in the following:

Ex. 35:5 ηνοςη δε οηναη αν: οην : οηγομτ δ.
Gen. 25:2 acmici naq n’embram • nem • iexan • nem • madan • nem • madiam • nem • iecbok • nem • ʒwte.

e • 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 orot • nem • orot seems to be the rule; the raised point is both a separating and isolating mark; see below, on punctuation in detail).


epaxin- nem eropv- Num. 10:2.

Ex. 8:4 eboł zaroi nem eboł gannalac. 

qinimic i nte- ... nem qinimac nte- ... Deut. 28:11.

Deut. 28:37 senow ncazi nem gannparabonh nem er-Φiri eparok.

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 necok vs. nemak opposed in juncture) to other pronouns or nouns:

Num. 18:3 nai nem nọwten — typical of interlocutives?

But Num. 16:16 neok nemvot nem darpwn.

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 nem pie etaqemiiu-ebo + nem koπρ (= Vat).

Ex. 2:14 nem pie etaqxak narpwn + nem peqτgap (= Vat).

Deut. 29:6 nep nem ciqerα (= Vat).

Ex. 35:31 magi mπneta nkat + nem coφia + nem otka + nem oteπicṭhm (= Vat ncoφia).

Presented hierarchically: Gen. 45:8 mp∞rh + nsm-[iωt + nem ʒe].

Ex. 3:8 eqζat + nepw† + nem ebiw + (= Vat).

Contrasted (no punctuation!) with:

Deut. 6:3 otkaqi eqζat + nepw† gi-ebiω (= Vat).

Deut. 26:15 otkaqi eqωsvo nepw† eboł gi-ebiω (= Vat).

(nem...) nemax seems to signal coordination-unit closing, a final boundary signal (note there is remarkably no punctuation before the fi-
nal nemai, in contrast to the lemniscus + before practically every nem term of the coordination):³⁸:

Ex. 19:24 never nem aarrw nemak.

Num. 18:19 nak nem nekwhri nem nekwhri nemak.

Gen. 24:10 ebol Wennisamazli ntepeqfèc nem ebol Wennisamazli ntepeqfèc nemak.

Gen. 7:7 nem teqçimi nem neqwhri nem nigioni nte-

teqwhri nemak.

Gen. 7:13 aρwηnaw ḳje-nwe nem peq- iwhri cin cham aψηw iwhri ntenwe nem teqçimi nem ḳiτη nemigi nteqwhri nemak.

Gen. 8:16 amot ebol ... never nem nekwhri nem tekçimi nem nigioni ntenekwahri nemak

(b) otos

Gen. 1:4f. otos aψwηp ebol ḳje-ẑità oṣetnqηglwini nem oṣetpixaki otos ẑità moti epηgqini ḳepigqoou otos pixaki amos tł epeqåzm aw otos aρwaw aψwηp ḳje-pieiawq otos amos¢ ḳepigqo pηqs¢ ṡηpηgq pηqs¢ oṣetqoti.

Ex. 34:29 ゞς¢ de eσnşot oṣetqot ḳje-mwηshσ ebol Wennisawot nçina + otos ḳηpηpe nare-ẑitlax snoti ˌ nwni xh Wenniṣīxj mwmɔxσ.

Gen. 7:17f. otos aρawaw ḳje-çimwaw otos aρtqot ṇṭqawtaw oṣọ aqcici ebol Gawkapçu otos naqamaw ḳje-çimwaw otos naqinσ aw naqaw aqamaw Liβennipckaw oṣọ naqna naqinσ строитель ḳje-ẑitqawtaw oṣọami mπimwaw.

Ex. 17:12 Wenniṣìj de mwmɔxσ neqywq pe ... otos aρwaw nem կաή aρtaŋqοq ննվիչ.

Gen. 41:1ff. ṭαpaw de aq̣naw eτρawawa + ṭαq̣ek-qaq̣aw einaq̣ pe (Vat - pe) ẓίq̣enf̣iaro + q̣ηp̣ηpe ṃf̣ṛṭ σ̣eε̣bol ẓẹṇf̣iaro σ̣ạṇṇḥọọ σ̣p̣ẉẉị pe (Vat om. pe) ṇ̃ẹ-ẓ̂ neq̣ẹ ẹṇα̣ṇẹṭ q̣ẹṇṇq̣ọṃṭ + ṇạṭṃọṇ pẹ q̣ẹṇṇq̣ạx̣ị ḳẹ ẓ̂ dẹ neq̣ẹ + σ̣ạṇṇḥọọ σ̣p̣ẉẉị + ṃẹṇẹç̣ạṇị ẹḅọl ẓẹṇf̣iaro + eτ̣ téṛaẉoṭ q̣ẹṇṇq̣ọṃṭ oṣọ oτ̣ẉọṃ q̣ẹṇṇq̣ọṃị.

Lev. 5:1 eψwaw de ṇṭẹ-oτ̣p̣ẉṭṇ ḥ ẹṛṇọḅị oṣọ oτ̣ẹc̣c̣cẉṭṃ ẹṭṃḥ oτ̣ṇạẉ oṣọ q̣ḥṇ oṭṃẹṛẹ pe ịẹ-aq̣ṇaw ịẹ-̣x̣ẹ̣ṃị ẹp̣iṛẉṭq̣ ạq̣ẉṭẹṃq̣ẉṭ ọẹψ̣ị ṃp̣ịṇọḅị.

³⁸ The fact that the original Greek has here invariably καί...μετ(ά)... does not, I believe, detract from the interest of the construction and the final-boundary signalling value of this nemak. If it is a calque, the fact that this is a typically Bohairic/LE turn of phrase (see Shisha-Halevy 1981:326f.) indicates that it does have Egyptian roots.
(c) A true opposition of nem and ὥσος is encountered only before Circumstantial (not Relatives):

Ex. 28:35 εἰσεχώρειν ετερικὴν ἐτυχόντως ἐπεθωρα-ἀβ ... nem εὑρήσως ἐβολ — coordinating the actential predicative clauses as paired adverb phrases.

Deut. 28:37 Σενοτω ἐκαζί nem ἑντάραβον nem ἑντειρί ἐροκ... — the Circumstantial here is really coordinated to the adverb phrase.

Gen. 41:1ff. Νατνης ἐψωι menēncanai ἐβολ Σε-φιαρα ἐταλιωτον Σενπορχνοτ ὃτος ἐσσωμ Σεννοτα-φοτι — added description.

Ex. 34:7 πινιουτ ἡμαὶ ὁτος πιαλεπηνος (sic) ὁτος ἐψηπε... Deut. 2:21 ...ἐναλη ὁτος ἐναψη.

nem does not coordinate clauses as such, but as adverbial or nominal commutables, as word-class paradigms. This is a key factor of its functional nature. In Ex. 10:25 ἀλα nem θεοκ ἐκεftime φανσαια ὃν we seem to have yet another juncturally definable, homonymous, third nem entity, a focussing morph — proclitic like ὥσος, 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-/nem≠, 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 ἑαρε-πητ εκ nem ἰσχηφ, Gen. 37:4 ετακατα εκ-πεκειωτ Μει μμοξ ἀκμετωμοντ αντικαζί nemαι, Gen. 40:4 ὁτος απιννοστ ταζωτ nem ἰσχηφ, Gen. 45:1 ὁτος nemμον-γαὶ ὁγι εράη nem ἰσχηφ. 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 (104f.) about the lexical charge of ἁρω, which is far from expressing "simple coordination" ("simple coordination" is a phantom anyway). The relationship of ΜΝ- and ἁρω is still not entirely clear (96ff.); generally speaking, ΜΝ-/γι- are unmarked, ἁρω marked coordination.

(3) Kasser 1995 examines the possibility that ἁρω (in Sahidic as well as in other dialects?) is proclitic, on the basis of suprasegmental-prosodic arguments. I believe Boh. ὥσος 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) ἐςςεςτ ἀπς ἐρμεστ ὡςκ nem ὡςτετεκεξίμε.
(d) **ιε-** as disjunctive coordinator:

The Greek-origin (or Egyptian/Greek merger?) **ν** (ἡ), important in Sahidic as it is in other dialects (e.g. Oxyrhynchite), does not occur in our Bohairic corpus; but the proclitic element **ιε-**, which has at least two other homonyms, one interrogative — see Chapter One above — and one apodotic-superordinating, links disjunctively like **ν**; **ιε** is very versatile, even more than most coordinators, in its application:

All determinators are disjoinable by **ιε**:  
**zero** — **νννννν** **ιε-** **zero** — **νννν** Ex. 35:29.  
**πι-** **ιε-** **πι-** Ex. 22:5.  
**Φι-** **ιε-** **Φι-** Ex. 21:26.  
**ος-** **ιε-** **ος-** Gen. 44:8.  
**κε-** **ιε-** **κε-** Gen. 31:14.  
**zero** — **ιε-** **zero** — Gen. 44:19.  
Gen. 31:14 **ΜΗΤΙ ΔΑΝ ΟΡΟΝ-ΚΕΤΟΙ ΣΩΞΝ ΝΑΝ ΙΕ-ΚΕΚΛΗΡΟΝΟΜΙΑ.**

Gen. 31:43 **σε ιετναλιιν ηναλερι μυος ιε-νοσεληρι εταμακοτ.**  
Lev. 13:30 **σαλομιειε πε οτσεγτ ιεταμακοτ ιε-οτσεγτ ιε-οτσεγτ πε ιεταμοτ.**  
Lev. 5:1 **ιε- αθαρ ιε-αθεμι επιρωβ.**  
Ex. 28:43 **εναι εδομ πε ιε-κκινη ... ιε-εναι εδομ επιρωβ.**  
Lev. 5:2 **ετσαλεμ ιε-ετμοτ.**  
Lev. 13:24 **ετσαλεμ ιε-ετςαλευσερνεβυ επερευρεβυ.**  
Non-Rhetorical interrogative clauses are often disjoined by **ιε-**:  
Gen. 32:17 **νυοκ Φι-νιμ ιε-ακα έων.**  
Also Gen. 37:8, 43:7, 44:16.  
Conjunctive **ιε-** Conjunctive Ex.22:10, Lev.25:14, 5:3, 13:19, Deut. 24:3  
Disjoined protases: **εωμι αρωμ- ιε-εωμι αρωμ-** Ex. 30:21.  
Like **οσον** and perhaps unlike **νεμ**, **ιε-** 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 **νεμ**) 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 *nuclearity 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 πινιωτυ νναι ους πιστηνος (sic, sic) ους εχαρε.

Ex. 23:7 πεττοτηνος ους νημιη.

Deut. 8:15 πυαε πινιωτυ ετεμματ ους ετοι ηνοτ.

Following the indefinite article, the basic tense replaces rarely the Circumstantial, and zero article the *nota relationis* + zero:

Num. 14:12 οσιωτυ νεονος ους ναωη(υ) (Vat ηναωη). Lev. 26:1 γαμνοτην ναδω ουδε φωτε.

Obs.

(1) Cases like Ex. 3:22 γανκετος νγατ νεμ γαννοτην are not instances of bracketing linkage (by lexeme), but of delimiting repeated determinator as a referential pro-form representing the noun phrase.

(2) οτ- οους n-, οτ- οους eq-: Ps. 68:30, 69:6, 85:10, apparently always rhematic in NS.

(b) Bracketing possessive pronoun (see Chapter Three):

Gen. 31:43 νοτι ... νεμ ναωηρι.

Ex. 10:1 πεφητ νεμ νεπαλωτι.

(c) Bracketing n-, nτε-:

Num. 22:18 εαιν ικοτζι ε νιωτυ.

Num. 13:31 ντωτεν νεμ νετνωηπι “yours and your children’s”.

Non-coordinative *nota relationis* bracketing — note the *lemniscus*:

Ex. 8:10 αιτοτ νηςνωτ + σνωτ.

Ex. 3:8 εψιατν νερωτ + νεμ εβιω + (= Vat).

Ex. 35:31 μαργ μπετσνα κατ + νεμ σοψια + νεμ ορκατ + νεμ οψπιτθνη.

Gen. 25:2 ρκμι ιν αν σρωρματ + νεμ + ιεζαν + νεμ + μαςαν + νεμ + μαριςαν + νεμ + ιεζεκ + νεμ + ιωπε.

(d) Bracketing prepositions (the most common case of bracketing juncture); apparently, only in cases of matching determination of the bracketed terms.
N-/MMO=
ΝΩΩ οτε η Gen. 32:30.
ΝΩΓΙ ΝΕΜ ΟΓΙ Gen. 32:16.
ΜΠΙΕΣΘΟΥ ιε- πιεζωρψ Num. 9:21.
ΜΠΕΜΘΟ Ν- ΝΕΜ ΠΕΜΘΟ Ν- Gen. 34:18, 41:37.
Ν-/ΝΑ=
ΝΑΩ ΝΕΜ ΝΕΨΓΕΝΑ Ex. 30:21.
ΝΑΚ ΝΕΜ ΠΕΚΔΡΟΞ Gen. 17:7.
ΝΚΑ-/ΝΚΩ=
ΝΚΑΦ/ΝΕΜ ΜΨΣΧΣ Num. 21:5.
Ε-/ΕΡΟ=
ΕΡΑΤ ΟΤΑΕ ΝΟΤΒ Deut 7:25.
ΟΣΤΕ-/ΟΣΤΨΕ "between... and...".

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; "ΟΣΤΨΗ ΝΕΜ...", in opposition to "ΟΣΤΕ-ΝΕΜ ΟΣΤΕ-". 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).

ΟΣΤΨΗ ΝΕΜΑΚ + Gen. 16:5, 23:15, 31:44 (Greek ἀνὰ μέσον ἕμοι καὶ σοῦ).

ΟΣΤΨΟΟΤ ΝΕΜ ΙΑΚΨΒ Gen. 30:36 (Greek ἀνὰ μέσον αὐτῶν καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον Ἰακώβ).

ΟΣΤΨΨΙ ἄ ΓΡΑΜ + ΝΕΜ ΙΑΚΑΚ ΝΕΜ ΙΑΚΨΒ Ex. 2:24 (Greek τῆς διαθήκης αὐτοῦ πρὸς...).

ΟΣΤΨΗ - ΝΕΜΨΤΕΝ + ΝΕΜ ΟΣΤΕ-ΨΥΣΧΗ ΝΙΒΕΝ Gen. 9:12:15 (Greek ἀνὰ μέσον ἕμοι καὶ ὑμῶν καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον πάσης ψυχῆς...).

As opposed to

ΟΣΤΨΗ + ΝΕΜ + ΟΣΤΕ + ΣΑΡΨ ΝΙΒΕΝ... Gen. 9:17.

ΟΣΤΨΨΝ ΝΕΜ ΟΣΤΨΚ Gen. 26:28 (Greek ἀνὰ μέσον ὑμῶν καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον σοῦ).

ΟΣΤΨΗ ΝΕΜ ΟΣΤΨΨΝ ΝΕΜ ΟΣΤΕ-ΠΕΚΔΡΟΞ Gen. 17:10 (Greek ἀνὰ μέσον ἕμοι καὶ ὑμῶν καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ σπέρματος...): 11 (Greek ἀνὰ μέσον ἕμοι καὶ ὑμῶν).

ΟΣΤΨΗ: ΝΕΜ: ΟΣΤΨΚ Gen. 17:2 (Greek ἀνὰ μέσον ἕμοι καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον σοῦ).


ΟΤΤΕ-ΝΙΜΑΝΕΝΣΩΤ... + ΝΕΜ: ΟΤΤΕ: ΝΙΜΑΕΝΕΝΣΩΤ... Gen. 13:7
ΟΤΤΕ ΟΤΡΨΜΗ ΝΕΜ ΟΤΤΕΟΤΡΓΧΙΜΗ + ΝΕΜ ΟΤΤΕ-ΟΤΡΙΩΤ ΝΕΜ ΟΤΤΕΟΤΡΧΕΡΙ Num. 30:17 etc. ΟΤΡΨΙ: ΝΕΜ ΟΤΡΨΚ + ΝΕΜ: ΟΤΤΕ: ΝΙΜΑΝΕΝΣΩΤ ΝΕΜ • ΟΤΤΕ • ΝΙΚΜΑΝΕΝΣΩΤ Gen. 13:8.
Note here the pertinent absence of bracketing for looser juncture as *oppositum* (token exx.):
ΕΠΑΜΑ ΝΕΜ ΕΠΑΚΑΓΙ Gen. 30:25.
ΣΕΝ- ΝΕΜ ΣΕΝ- Gen. 31:33, Deut. 11:18.
ΝΧΑΦ + ΝΕΜ ΝΧΩΚ Num. 21:7.
ΕΒΟΛ ΣΕΝ- ΝΕΜ ΕΒΟΛ ΣΕΝ- Deut. 11:13.
Examples for non-pertinent (asymmetrical) cases:
Ex. 10:16 ΜΠΕΜΒΟ ΜΠΣΕ ΝΕΜ ΕΡΨΤΕΝ.
Num. 10:8 ΥΛΕΝΕΓ ΝΕΜ ΥΛΑΝΕΤΕΝΣΨΩΣ.

(e) Bracketing converter: rare in Bohairic.
(1) Relative ("the Relative carried on") — bracketing ΟΤΡΩΣ-coordination of affirmative or negative, identical or non-identical conjugation forms:
ΕΤ-[ΑΨ- ΟΤΡΩΣ ΑΨ-] 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-[ΜΠΑΣ- ΟΤΨΕ ΜΠΑΣ- ΟΤΨΕ ΜΠΑΣ-] Deut. 4:28.
ΕΤΕ-[ΝΑΚ- ΑΝ ΟΤΨΕ ΝΑΣ-...ΑΝ] Deut. 8:16.
Ε-ΝΑΠΕΤΕΝ- ΟΤΡΩΣ ΝΑΠΕΤΕΝ-) Deut. 32:38.
ΕΤΕ-[ΜΠΑΣ- ΟΤΡΨ ΜΜΩΝ-] Num. 20:5.
ΕΤΕ-[ΝΚΕ- ...ΑΝ ΟΤΨΕ ΜΨΟΣ-] Deut. 11:2.
The case of ΕΤ- (1Ε/ΟΤΡΩΣ/ΝΕΜ — / 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 ΤΖΕ ΝΕΓΕ ΕΤΖΙΩΤΟΣ ΣΕΝΝΟΤΣΜΟΤ ΟΤΡΩΣ ΕΡΨΟΜ ΣΕΝΝΟΤΣΑΨ.
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 ΕΝΑΜΟΨΙ ΢ΑΖΨΚ ΟΤΡΩΣ ΤΝΑΤΕΜΤΟΝ ΝΑΚ (Vat ΑΝΟΚ ΤΝΑΜΟΨΙ). Compare also:
Ex. 2:22 Φ† γραμμένως οτι οι Μποντος Νης ους απναγμένη...

Deut. 21:17 Φαι ταρχη Ντενιεψηρι πε ους ετεςε πανα
εσι Ντεμετωρποτ Μμισι (Greek και τοτω καθικι, i.e. focal arrangement) (= Vat), where ετ- is topical to the Focus Φαι in a coordinated Cleft Sentence.

In Deut. 8:15 πωάε πινίωφ τ ητεμματ ους ετοι Νης the second relative, which may arguably be a case of repeated (delimiting) converter following ητεμματ, is in all probability coordinated to πινίωφ.

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: "ετερ- here makes an environment in which coordination of infinitive lexemes is compatible". Bentley Layton, letter of 197/98 à propos Shenoute ed. Leip. IV 43 νεε ετερεσεινε σωμ ι ιωεγ
(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 ετωαθεο τοις απω γαρεγ; or nominal actor + Contingent Future auxiliary: ibid. τειμντακε ετεμματ Ναράγε Νοοιν απω γαρεγ. 

(2) Circumstantial
Converter repeated: this is the normal construction, hence not a delimitation:
εναλα ους εναλωθ Deut. 2:21.
εκ- Νεε εκ- Νεε εκαι- Deut. 6:7.
ετ- νεε ετνα- Deut. 11:19.

In Gen. 6:5 ετανατ Νσε-πσε Φ† ηνικακια Ντενιρωμι 
ζενασι ηζενεπικαζι ους οτοι ονοι Νιβεν ευρακι 
ζενποτητ (Vat qρακι), οτοι Νιβεν + Circumstantial is the nexal actant of Νασ ε- , coordinated to ηνικακια ζε-ζασι.

(f) Bracketing conjunction-base (a unique instance: cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 1986a:161f. for Shenoute):

Μηπως Ντενπσ επεκνοτ Ζωντ νεε εμβον εροκ Deut.
6:15 (= Vat) — the close juncture between the action expressions in the Greek μη...δργισθείς θυμοθη is possibly the trigger for the Coptic construction.
(g) Bracketing mh (Assertive Focal Question), bracketed clauses: mh anok ai- iε anok ai- 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, μπερ- neg. imperative (Deut. 31:6) and so on.
(4) ε- before infinitive (which thus proves to be distinct from the preposition ε-): 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 ({νθοη}, {ιγ}, {πε}, etc.), deictic (the case of {νι-} or {παι}), or pro-formal (οτον, οται, ιλι γαν- 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 (Lambrecht 1996:36ff.) is that only in the former case we are concerned with linkage proper: not all reference is junctorially significant. The very multifariousness of phoric devices implies the variety of linkage types.
4.2.4.1 Anaphoric reference: a miscellany

(a) Anaphoric reference to determinators in noun syntagms: hyperphrasal, hypemetal scope (see also above, and Chapter Three).

(1) The reference to non-zero determinators neutralizes specificity/particularity grading:

Deut. 2:12 πίθορροος ναψωπ ἀσεχιπ.
Gen. 20:3 ἰγειμί ετακολοῦ.
Num. 31:50 θρωμί εταφεί οσκεκοτος ονοτβ — reference to the metaphoristic "naming" determinator is uncommon.
Gen. 39:2 οσρωμί ... εφτματ.
Ex. 3:22 αλλα εκεεπετιν ναε-οτεγιμι ντοτε ντεκεεεε νεμ τεκεφεπι...

The postulation of two, masculine and feminine, oυ- homonyms is probably unavoidable, in view of the divergence of oυαι and oυι, of which oυ masc and oυ fem are proclitic allomorphs:

Lev. 27:33 ουαι ενανεπ ψαος εφωσο.
Deut. 21:15 (εγιμι ενοτι) ουι μμωοτ εφει μμοε ουι μμωοτ εφμοετι μμοε.

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 κεπμι ετνοιξο.
Gen. 6:12:17 ακπζ νιβεν ευν μπεκμωτ.
Gen. 6:15 καπζ νιβεν ετεοτον-πνα νωνς νεητμ.
Num. 6:7 ψοκν νιβεν εκμοτ.
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 Jeremst (see his posthumously edited Isoledovanija, pp. 553-9).
(2) The resumption of nīben is a difficult issue. Ex. 12:16 γωθ nīben ... nnēτεναιτοσ (see already Schwartz and Steinthal 1850:478) certainly differs from Gen. 6:15 κατ nīben eτεοτον-πηα nwnθ nσθηq or Num. 6:7 ζσθ nīben eακμοτ in Juncture Domain Frame, but probably also in the status of nīben itself — “all” or “any”, the latter quantifier with zero determination of the lexeme. Consider - nīben + sgl. Deut. 11:24, Num. 31:51, Lev. 16:17, 18:23; nīben + pl. Gen. 7:15, Lev. 7:26ff., 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-wik eẖpri) ḥxw ṣaprw mivatq ṣwq ḥxw ṣaprw mivatq ṣwq ṣaprw nnnēpnnxhmī mivatq.
Num. 11:13 mā ṣaq ṣnē eotw.
Num. 20:5 mmon- ṣwot ecw.
Deut. 9:9:18 wik mπiσωm mswt mπicw, sim. Ex. 16:8, Deut. 9:1, 29:6 (!)
Deut. 2:6 ṣpe de eptenewp...
NB: Gen. 3:2 eboal sēn pottaq nteniśwηn nteṇipa-dicc tetnaσw (Bodmer III + eboal nθtov, resumption to topicalized adverb).
Some slots simply do not allow zero as a commutable:
Deut. 8:3 narepiśwìmī nawsē ewik mivatq άn — Augens.
Deut. 16:4 nne- ṣewmhr ṣwq eboal — reflexive object actant.
Deut. 1:16 pmī ... peqcon — possessive article.
Ex. 23:7 pettoshtwst ṣwq nënmi nnekqoqebq — representative resumption of pet·.

Obs.
See Andersson 1904:8ff.; contrast the resumption of indefinite determination in De Vis 1 192 ṣaq mpeqotomq othpi 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 ꝏbdb -opacity NNEQEPGW

Outside the corpus, cf. (AM I 113 ꝏbcdwówyn ꝏw ꝏbcdwówyn ꝏNNEQEPGW: the placement of ꝏw 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 ᾳNOK PE ТаПАТТЯ ЕРОК.
Ex. 19:4 ᾳNOK ПЕ TAPEПЕTAП.
Gen. 31:39 ᾳNOK ЕНАI ЕBOA GРОT.

(Outside the corpus: De Vis II 266, 267 ᾳNOK ΡЕ ΕTAППЯ ОTOPIT).

(2) Neutralization of locutive/delocutive: expansion of interlocutive Nominal-Sentence Rheme:

Gen. 27:11 ᾳNOK ΔE ᾳNOK-ОТРВМΙ ЕЯВХН.
(3) The scope of θΡΟΣ: overrule of person by number, person-neutralizing plural Augens:

Ex. 12: 33 ᾳON θΡΟΣ ΤΕΝΝΑΜΟΤ (Vat add. θΡΗΝ).
Deut. 5:3 ΝΕMΩTEN ΝΟwΤEN θΡΟΣ.

Obs.


(3) Textual transition from interlocutive to delocutive characterizes the “narrative projection of Allocution”: Ex. 4:6 ΝΕПГСΙК ΔE ΝΑQ ΡΟN ΔE ГИТЕКΠΙЗ ЭПΟT ΝΕBΟTУK ΟΤΟС ΛΨΙТЕКΠIЗ ЭПΟT ΝΕBΟTУ ...
(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. actancial, as in Num. 5:8 ΜΜΟΝΤΕΠΙΡΨΨΜ... έψΨΕΔΕ ΤΨ).

(a) Zero resumption with zero marking adverbial status — an eminent instance of junctural significance: adnominal vs. conjunctival constructions (εΤψ- “wh-”, vs. ΕΤψ- “that?”). The grammaticalization of the lexeme is both cause and effect of the “conjunctivalization” of the construction.

ΦΡΗΓ, (ΠΑΙ)ΡΗΓ (see also special discussion below):
Deut. 7:19 μΦΡΗΓ ΕΤΑΨΕΝΚ ΕΒΟΛ...

Beside ΦΡΗΓ, 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. 30:41 ΑΣΨΨΜΙ ΔΕ ΣΕΝΠΙΧΟΤ ΕΨΑΣΣΨΨΜΟΤ ... ΝΞΕ-ΝΙΕΨΜΟΤ.
Ex. 10:6 ΙΔΞΕΝΨΙΕΓΟΣ ΕΤΑΨΨΜΙ ΠΙΞΕΝΨΙΚΑΓΙ sim. Deut. 4:32
Ex. 9:24 ...ΣΕΝΨΙΚΑΓΙ ΝΤΕΧΜΙ ΙΔΞΕΝΨΙΕΓΟΣ ΕΤΑΕΨΝΟΣ ΨΨΜΙ ΓΨΨΤΨ.

Lev. 14:57 ΣΕΝΨΙΕΓΟΣ ΕΤΕΨΝΑΨΨΜΕΝ ΝΕΜ ΠΙΕΓΟΤ ΕΤΕΨΝΑΤΟΨΒΟ, sim. Num. 30:15 — bracketing by ΣΕΝ- or of adverbial status.

Num. 9:1 ΣΕΝΨΜΑΨΡΜΟΤ ΨΝΟΤΓ ΕΤΑΣΤΙ ΕΒΟΛ ΣΕΝΨΚΑΓΙ ΝΧΨΜΙ.

Lev. 7:35 ΣΕΝΨΙΕΓΟΤ ΕΤΑΕΨΝΟΣ ΕΓΔΟΝ.
Lev. 19:6 ΣΕΝΨΙΕΓΟΤ ΕΤΕΨΝΑΨΨΜΤ ΕΨΕΨΟΤΜΨ.
Gen. 3:5 πιεγος ετετεναιουσι δειλα μμοου γεναιοτων
ναε-νετενβαλ — a case of casus adverbialis.

Non-zero (MMOO:) resumption:
Gen. 5:2 μπιεγος εταπομιωσε μμου.
Deut. 4:10 πιεγος ετετεννοι ερατου θενου μμου.
Gen. 21:8 ξεπιεγος εταφτομε ισαη πεθυρπι μμου.
Num. 30:16 μενεκανπιεγον ετακσωτεμ μμου.
Num. 14:40 πιτων εταπεν ζοκ ην ηε-ανερνωβη.
Num. 33:54 πιονα λιονα εφμα εταπερθαν ηαη εξω.
Gen. 16:14 Name of well: "τωμωτ εταιανε μπαμεο".
πιτοπος/πιμα ... μματ Deut. 12:21, 26:2 etc.

Two examples are, I believe, especially instructive in this context:

In Gen. 39:6 εωβ νιβεν ευμακητος ϊαρεπελε θοτεν-νεπ-
δικ it is the zero resumption of the Topic alone that signals the adverbial status of εωβ νιβεν: "in every thing"; while in

Gen. 50:5 ηπηξ ηεπιμενετε εταιωκα κη ... ερετε-
θομετ μματ, the topical adverbial ηπηξ ηεπιμενετε... is re-
sumed by the focal anaphoric pro-adverb μματ, 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 conjuncti-
tional/general subordinator prevailing in Romance does not obtain in Coptic.

(d) Allocation — Response referential linkage and cohesion: MMON, ΜΦΗ, ηε, etc. — anaphoric marked Response forms: see above, Chapter One, 1.2.4.

Note: Gen. 44:19f. zero article (question) to ου- (answer): an-
οντοτετεν-ιωτ μματ ιε- con # ονταν νοεελλο
ηωτ μματ ηεμ οταλοτ...

(e) Delocutive reference may be disrupted by a noun, at the turning-
point between cata- and anaphoric reference:

Ex. 32:1 αρογωτ ηαε-πιλαοι εξεν-αρων οτογ πε-
ξωτ ηαη.

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 ουρος εσεωσι εκς της εως εοι ιερεις — cataphoric, contrasted with anaphoric feminine.

Ex 33:16 πως σησυσι εκς ους εως ινα ταφμε ζεινι ιοντομοτ ναπρακ — cataphoric.

Gen. 15:6 ανατ Ναγε αβαρρ εφ αυτος πας εοικεμε ομηι — anaphoric to a specific segment or, fuzzily, to foregoing information.

Deut. 18:14 μεεθι εικ ιερηι — anaphoric.

Lev. 5:1 εσωπι ινεασωσι ερνωπι ... ονος φι τι ουμε ορε πε ει-ανατ ιε ακεμι επισωλ ας τεικονι εσειι

μπινωι — anaphoric.

Ex. 35:5 Μαρεοσι οι ινεασωσι νοσαφερεια μποτι ους

νιβεν ετεακεμνιτε ζειεφικτ εεινι επιτιν ... (Greek πας ο δεκομενος...) — anaphoric?

Ex. 25:2 οι ινα ιναπαρκι ειτοτοτ νιβιο ετεακ

ερφι εεκ(εεκ)ποφε — phoric?

Num. 21:16 τωπι οι εινειος ζεις οι ινα εοτετ

πιλως κ ιοαν — anaphoric feminine merges with cataphoric neuter reference.

Cataphoric are cases like:

_Thic_ εθερη — Num. 21:23.

_Thic_ ... επιροφιτετιν Num. 11:29.

(φι) ευθεσεις ιακ ιαι ... Deut. 21:17.

_Νανεκ_ + Conjunctive Ex. 14:12.

_Νανεκ_ + _e_ - Infinitive Gen. 29:19.

_Νανεκ_ ιαν _εακ_ — Num. 11:8.

_Σεντεντεινικι_ εωτιε + Infinitive Gen. 23:8.

_Νανεκο_ + Conjunctive Gen. 44:7.

Ex. 10:10 θαεκοσι _ιαωοι _ιαυρηι_.

Deut. 16:9 εικεριτεις _κιοκε_.

_Επεξ_ ζε- Num. 5:19 etc. — the systemic absence of _Επεξ_ -

or _Επεξ_ ζε- 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 _signifiant_ for the neuter may usually be accounted for:
Num. 9:15:16 οὖσαν ηγαροτγί ηαχθ ξιζεντεςκήνην 
μφήτη κ νοννεοι ηαρωμ ... παρητή ηαρων πε νηοτον ηι-
βεν (- q- = πιμανα?)

Gen. 1:18 οὖσαν αναθη ξιζε-ξή ξε-ηανεν (= Vat) (no ana-
phora in the Greek οτι καλον)

Gen. 15:4 ...οὖσαν σατοτη οσμη ητεπθε ....

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-: mrrt.f, mrt.n.f). This formal 
feminine varies or alternates with the masculine. Consider the following examples (see 
1993)]29 136633 x+11 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.
VITTMAANN 1996:409, 454) n3-ntj-jw NN ḏd n-jm.s “know what NN says”, and even,
fully grammaticalized, Dem. P. Berlin 13634+23681 a/b x+2 n3-ntj-jw.f r j j n-jm.s 
j j r-hr.tn “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 ḏd j j r-s “whatever he will say, do it”. J. Fr. Quack draws my atten-
tion to several others, including Setne I 4/18 ḏh p3-ntj-jw.(r) ḏdl.s n.f. Berlin 15619 is 
inconclusive, since the pron. object is not the suffix-pronoun, but the “dependent” pronoun,
indifferent to gender (J. Fr. Quack). The masculine is found as NS-Theme (πετε- πε): 
Dem. P. Berlin 13633 verso 18 p3-ntj-mtr ḏr.w p3.y. and Dem. P. Berlin 13634+23681 a/b 
x+5 r-h-n p3-hb.w n.tn n-jm.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 οσωμυ απαιη ηνη ξιζε-πσε — a distinctive Junc-
ture Domain Frame: cf. Chapter Two for this focalization pattern. See 
also Gen. 34:7.

Ex. 32:32 ιξε ξαξαξαποηνοβι ηνωμ εβολ α ε χαη.

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 ...ντεηπη κ νοτωηκ κη ηνοτομ κεμ οηγθε 
ξαζοαντ ημοη (= Vat).

39 Cf. editor’s note, p. 4 “Ungenauigkeit bei den neutrich gemeinten Suffixen”.


Deut. 24:12 οὐκεῖον ΝΝΕΚΕΝΚΟΤ ΣΕΝΠΕΓΓΒΟΤ — 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 οὗτοι τις ἡμετέρῳ ΝΕΜΕΤ ΟΤΚΟΤΑΙ.

Ex. 3:22 ΓΑΝΚΕΒΡΑΙΟΤ ΝΓΑΤ ΝΕΜΕΥΝΟΒ.

Deut. 28:36:64 ΓΑΝΚΕΒΡΑΙΟΤ ΓΑΝΕΥΕ ΝΕΜΕΥΝΙ.

(a) οὐκεῖον / ΓΑΝΟΤΟΝ (outside the corpus) represent an indefinite noun syntagm or a lexeme as Rheme in a Nominal Sentence:

Apos. 2:2:9 ΓΑΝΑΠΟΙΟΤΟΛΟΤ ΝΕ ... ΓΑΝΟΤΟΝ ΑΝ ΝΕ.

But in II Cor. 11:22 ΓΑΝΕΒΡΑΙΟΤ ΝΕ ... ΑΝΟΚ ΓΩ — the reference, anaphoric to the entire nexus, is zeroed.

Obs.

Job (ed. Porcher) 4:19 ΝΟΗΜΙ ΝΟΗΜΙ ΕΤΕ Σ ΑΝΟΝ ΓΩΝ ΑΝΟΝ-ΓΑΝΕΒΡΑΙΟΤ ΣΕΝΠΑΙΟΜΙ ΝΟΤΑΤ seems an awkward resumptive construction, but is in fact the only one systemically available — note the delimitation ΕΤΕ Σ 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 ΜΦΡΗΤ, ΠΑΙΡΗΤ reveals a sophisticated set of representative constructions:

(a) Linkage: masculine “regular” anaphoric actantial representation in relative clause of Φ/ΠΑΙΡΗΤ as antecedent:

ΠΑΙΡΗΤ ΝΕ ΕΤΕΚΕΑΙΩ and similar, Gen. 21:1, 27:9, 26:29, Ex. 23:1.

Gen. 27:8 ΜΦΡΗΤ ΕΤΝΑΓΕΝΓΩΝΚ ΕΡΟΥ.

Gen. 27:19 ΜΦΡΗΤ ΕΤΑΚΚΑΞΙ ΝΕΜΗΙ ΜΜΟΥ.

(a’) replaces the masculine by what must be a fuzzily text-resumptive neutric feminine, yet may simultaneously mark the grammaticalization (“conjuncturalization”) of ΦΡΗΤ:

ΚΑΤΑ/Μ-ΦΡΗΤ ΕΤΑΙΑΙΩC Gen. 8:21, 19:8, Lev. 24:19, Deut. 2:29 etc.

Ex. 8:9 ΚΑΤΑΦΡΗΤ ΕΤΑΚΚΑΧΟΤ Ν∆Ε-ΜΨΗΧΕ sim. Num. 23:30, Ex. 7:22.

Gen. 19:31 ΜΦΡΗΤ ΕΤΕΚΤΗΨ.

Ex. 8:8 ΚΑΤΑΦΡΗΤ ΕΤΑΚΚΕΜΝΗΤC.

Num. 33:56 ΜΦΡΗТ ΝΝΑΙΑΙΑΙΣ ΝΨΟΤ ΕΙΕΑΙΨ ΝΨΤΕΝ (= Vat!) is remarkable: Ν as Relative converter of ΝΑΨ-.
Obs.
(1) W.-P. Funk (tentatively, in a letter of 22/5/98) "the reference to ΜΗΡΗ, 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 ΔΟΧ". Funk compares the "Crypto-Bohairic MS of Nag Hammadi VIII, 1 (Zostrianus), where the Sahidicized ΜΗΡΗΤΕ is regularly followed by ΜΗΟΣ"... "You can easily say that only the first pronoun (ΑΙC) is really a reference to ΜΗΡΗ, while the second (ΑΙQ) 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.

(2) Note AM I 81 ΜΗΡΗ ΕΤΕΧΑΝΑΣ ΕΡΟΙ ΕΙΡΙ ΜΗΟΣ ΑΡΙΤΕ (cf. the neutric feminine overrule, below); B4 (Bodmer III) John 15:12 ΚΑΤΑΦΡΗ ΕΤΑΙΜΗΝΕΡΕΘΗΝΟΣ ΜΗΟΣ sim. 14:31, 15:9, 17:23.

(b) Delimitation: delimitative zero clearly marking adverbial status:
Ex. 39:22 ἈΠΡΗ ἈΙΡΙ...
Num. 8:6 ΠΑΙΡΗ ΕΚΕΙΡΙ ΝΩΟΤ.
(b') zero "casus adverbialis" + fuzzily text-resumptive neutric feminine linkage: Num. 36:10 ΠΑΙΡΗ ΑΣΑΙC.
Deut. 21:3 ΠΑΙΡΗ ΕΚΕΑΙC.
Num. 25:12 ΠΑΙΡΗ ΑΙΔΟC.
(c) Zero resumption — uncommon in our corpus:
Deut. 7:19 ΜΗΡΗ ΕΤΑΨΕΝΚ ΕΒΟΛ...

4.2.4.5 The "neutric feminine overrule" seems to account for some striking constructions of ΔΟΧ "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 ΠΙΦΡΗ).
Gen. 22:3 ΑΤΙ ΕΠΙΜΑ ΕΤΑΦΡΗ ΔΟΧ ΝΑQ.
Gen. 43:2 ΠΙΘΕΛΟ ΕΤΑΡΕΤΕΝΔΟC.
Ex. 8:9 ΚΑΤΑΦΡΗ ΕΤΑΨΔΟC ΝΑE-ΜΩΤΗC (see above for ΦΡΗ).

4.2.4.6 The {ΦΑΙ} 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. {ΦΑΙ} either
(a) reflects a demonstrative of the Greek original:
Gen. 42:6 ΙΩΣΗΦ ΝΑQΟΙ ΝΑΡΧΩΝ ΕΠΙΚΑΡΙ ΟΥΡΟΓ ΦΑΙ ΝΑQ ΕΒΟΛ... (Greek οὐτος), contrast 42:7 ΝΕΩΣΟΥ ΑΕ ΠΕΔΩΣΟΤ (Greek οί δέ...).
Num. 5:13:14 ...ΟΥΡΟΓ ΝΤΕΚΕΟΤΑΙ ΝΚΟΤ ΝΕΜΑΣ ... ΟΥΡΟΓ ΝΤΕ-ΨΤΕΜΠΙΨΩΒ ΟΤΩΝΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΑΓΡΕΝΝΕΝΒΑΛ ΜΠΕΣΓΑΙ ... ΘΑΙ
JUNCTURE FEATURES

(α) The four-term linkage Relative expansion paradigm: ετ- vs. {Φαι ετ-} vs. {Φη ετ-} vs. η-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 ου-, γιαν-. 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 hwn, 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 concurring operator, seeing that the nuclear article replaces the pronominal-nuclear gender/number-exponent slot of the Semitic-type Egyptian adjective (ΦΗ in ΦΗ ετ- is indeed an "article", according to the junctural evaluation in ERMAN 1915:185):

\[ nfr-Ø > πι-αγαθος \]
\[ nfr-τ > η έταναι- ος \]

Num. 35:23 οίνη νίβεν ΦΗ έτεργάμως ΝΙΔΤΡ ΝΕΜΙ ΑΝ (Greek Rel. pronoun).

Lev. 25:44 οσβωκ ε- οσβωκι ιν θυρον έταναιωπι οικ (Greek zero determination ... οικ οικ).

Lev. 5:4 οσπωχ άν έταναρκες (Greek zero det. ... άν άν...).

Lev. 15:2 οσρωμι ΦΗ έτετοσων-οστετελ οικωπι ζεν- πεκωμα (Greek άνδρι άνδρι ιο έν...) — seemingly semantically identical with:

Lev. 27:14 ΦΡΩΜΙ ... ΦΗ έταναργαζη (Greek άνθρωπος ος άν...).

Deut. 11:2 γάναλωσι ιν έτενεσωσι ΑΝ (Greek οικ οικ οιδασι) — the negative is unusual.

Deut. 6:11 γάννιμπ ΜΒΑΚΙ ένανες ιν έτεμπεκκοτου γάναλεκος έσυχκ ιν έτεμπεκκοτου γάναλεκολοι ΝΕΜ 

γάναλεκεκατι ιν έτεμπεκσωσι (Greek Relative pronouns).

Lev. 4:16 πιστήβ ΦΗ ετολίκ ΦΗ έτερερβίξ ΔΗΚ ΕΒΟΛ (Greek ό + participle ό + participle).

Deut. 21:1 πικαρι ΦΗ έτερερβις πεκνοτι ΝΑΘΙΙΨ ΝΑΚ.

Num. 14:31 πικαρι ΦΗ νοστεν ετερενεγκολοσ ΑΛ 

ΒΟΛ ΜΜΟΨ — the position of the Augens accords with ΦΗ ... ΜΜΟΨ as JDF.

Deut. 10:2:4 ΝΙΚΑΡΙ ιν έναντινιπλαξ (Greek Relative pronoun).

Lev. 4:5 πιστηβ ΦΗ ετολίκ ...

Deut. 9:12 πεκλος ιν έτακενος εβολ ζεντκαρι ΝΧΗΜΙ.

(2) ΦΑΙ ΕΤ- (cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 1994:228ff.).

While ΦΑΙ is obviously different from ΦΗ deictically, with a locutive/allocutive semantic here-and-now basis, and — formally — is a tighter
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 φai is either affective in rhetorical tone, or else cataphoric-characterizing ("such as...." — see Chapter Three):

Gen. 11:4 ὁσπὸργος Φαὶ ἐτετεκῆφε ναυσὶ περὶ ἑτερα ἐτεῖ.

Deut. 21:3 ὁσβαγί Φαὶ ἐτεμπεσεργὼβ.

Num. 14:8 πικαὶ Φαὶ ἐτὰμαντ ἑρῶταν ἐμεχώβ.

Following a highest-specificity primary deictic παὶ-nucleus, {Φαὶ ἐτ-} is conditioned, as a deixis concord index:

Ex. 4:17 παἰσῴωτ Φαὶ ἐτεκναρχαίμης ἐρῆπι νήσῃ πρὶς σιμ. Deut. 4:8, 19:1 etc.

Finally, {Φαὶ ἐτ-} may itself mark the interlocutive here-and-now point of reference:

Gen. 24:42 πιμωτ Φαὶ ἓτον ἐτμομοι ἑἰσὶν also Gen. 3:11, Ex. 10:11, 23:22 etc.

Ex. 32:7 ἀρφανομνίν θαύ-πεκλαος παὶ ἐτακανοὺ... (Greek oūs ἐξηγαγε) — contrast the unmarked

Deut. 9:29 πεκλαος θν ἐτακανοῦ ἐβαλ (Greek Rel. pronoun -plural); θν concords ("ad-sensum") with the whole phrase and not just with the determinator of πεκλαος, but this may be motivated by the Greek oūs.

(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 ἄρρε-τεκκεθομή ερνὶῳ ἐτεκαναίιν θεμὶ εὑρατιφχων ὄρεσ (= Vatz) (Greek ...τήν δικαιοσύνην σου ὑπὸ ποιεῖ... with a "fuzzy" neutric concord).

Or it may be particular, specific by combination, appositive to a highly specific nucleus.

Deut. 28:58 εἰπὶ ἀνακαχι τῆς τιτα τεπανομος πετσή-νοτ.

Lev. 22:16:32 ἀνοκ πε ποτε πεττοτεβο μμωτ (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 adnominial status of the nexus.

Deut. 20:19 μη οὕτωμι πε πισθην ετ-ζειντικοι...

Gen. 48:16 πιανελοις ετ-νομεν μμοι.

(2) Affirmative nexus: pronominal anaphor following the converter ετ- (very rare):

Ex. 22:11 οὐρανῷ ηνεφ' πε ετερνασθοι οττωσι μὴ (Vat ετερνασθοι).

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 ετ-, the last vestige of the historical Relative pronoun (in the specific-pronominal actor [Theme] slot) to assume full converter functioning. 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 ετ- is most pronounced. In fact, their difference is primarily junctural: the former links appositively with the antecedent and nexeally with its Rheme (the να- auxiliary Stative in our example: -ετ+να-), while the latter is doubly and analytically linked to the antecedent, by converter morph and by anaphor, while being sharply delimited from the nexus: ετεβ[ν+να-].

Obs.
(2) A second analytic possibility for the "absent actor expression" (Funk 1978:112ff.) postulates a zero anaphoric element following ετ- (Funk 1978:114 suggests a generative "deletion transformation" here).
(3) This construction is familiar from Demotic (cf. Frandsen 1991:30ff.), and is not a Coptic innovation, but (in Coptic at least) a feature of colloquial language: Theban Graf- fiti (ed. Jasnow, Gramm. Demotica 93, 97) 3446/7f. p3-ntj-jw.f m-tw.k (which would be Boh. φη ετερντακ) 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.
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 diasystems, 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 convervive, 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 ἡ ετεκναζίμι ἄν.
Deut. 1:39 ἡ ετεπκωσθν ἄν μᾶοτ νοταγαθον ε-ο-ν-

peo0θ.

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 jucturally evident as a boundary by the persistence of the prefix-pronoun series following the converters: e-Ø-ce- ....en, ete-Ø-ce-

...en, ne-Ø-ce ...en: see Nagel 1969:36b, 37; Funk 1987. The same boundary is revealed by the Bohairic anaphoric pronominal Theme pronoun in ete- Ø-q-...\an.

(c) In the case of lexical identity of antecedent with the Relative clause — a figura etymologica with an infinitival antecedent or a deriving auxiliary as Relative verb — the JDF is concluded and marked for its final boundary by a formal conditioned “pro-lexemic” object-actant anaphor, viz. mmo= or epo=, which does not belong to the valency matrix of the Relative verb but is extraneous to it:

Deut. 28:67 τγοτ ητεπκηγὴτ ην ετεκναςπογοτ mmoq.
Deut. 28:53 πεκγοζεθετ ετεκναςγεδγωζκ mmoq.
Lev. 5:6 φνοβι εταγερνοβι mmoq.
Lev. 5:18 τεγμετατεμι εταγερμετατεμι mmoq.
Deut. 28:67 ηνασ ην ετεκναζ ερποτ.

(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 ΠΙΜΑ ΕΤΑΨ¹ ΚΑΣΙ ΝΕΜΑΨ² ΜΜΟΨ³: 1, 2 — refers outside the juncture domain frame; 3 — inside the JDF.

Gen. 39:19 # ΝΙΚΑΣΙ ΝΤΕΨ¹ ΚΕΙΜΙ # ΝΗ ΕΝΑΣ¹ ΚΑΣΙ ΜΜΩΨ² ΝΕΜΑΨ³: 1, 2 — inside the larger JDF; 3 — outside it; ΝΗ — deictic link of the smaller domain with preceding referate context.

Ex. 6:5 # ΠΝΙΑΓΟΜ ΝΤΕΝΕΝΨΗΡΙ ΜΠΙΣΧ...# ΦΗ ΕΤΕΝΙΡΕΜ- ΝΧΗΜΙ ΙΡΙ ΜΜΩΤ¹ ΜΒΩΚ ΝΣΗΤΨ² 1, 2 — inside the larger JDF; 1 — linking the JDF to preceding referate context; ΦΗ — initial delimitation/boundary signal for the JDF, deictic link of the whole domain with preceding referate context; 2 — conditioned formal link with ΦΗ.

Lev. 4:27 ...ΟΤΙ ΝΝΙΕΝΣΟΛΗ# ΕΗ ΕΤΕΨ¹ ΥΕ ΑΝ ΕΘΡΕΨ² ΩΨΝΓ: 1 — both exophoric (altogether outside textual domain frame) and cataphoric, inside it, in either case strongly delimited from ΕΗ; 2-outside the JDF; ΕΗ — initial delimitation/boundary signal for the JDF deictic link of the whole domain with preceding referate context.

Lev. 7:8f. ΝΙΟΤΗΒ # ΦΗ ΕΤΕΨ¹ ΝΑΕΨ² ΕΣΟΨΝ ... ΦΗ ΕΤΟΨ- ΝΑΤΑΜΟΨ¹...: 1 — linking outside the smaller JDF, inside the larger one; 2 — conditioned link inside the JDF, linking to ΦΗ, initial delimitation/boundary signal for the JDF, not linking it with the preceding referate context; -ΩΨ- — non-phoric.

4.2.4.7.2 [Topic to clause]

This syntagmatic environment⁴² 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 ΦΑΙ ΤΑΨΧ ΝΤΕΝΕΨΗΡΙ ΝΕ - 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 ΝΠΡΩΜΙ ΔΕ ΠΑΝΜΑΝΕΝΧΩΤ ΝΕ ΠΑΝΡΩΜΙ ΓΑΡ ΝΠΕΚΛΩΜΕΝΗΣΤΕΒΝΗ ΝΕ.

Ex. 5:16 ΠΙΤΟΓ ΓΑΡ ΚΕΤ ΜΜΟΨ ΑΝ ΝΝΕΚΕΒΙΑΙΚ.

Gen. 8:22 ΝΝΙΕΡΟΟΤ ΤΗΡΟΤ ΝΤΕΠΚΑΙ + ΟΤΩΡΩΝ ΔΕΝ ΟΤΖΩΣ + ΟΤΑΡΨΥ + ΟΤΚΑΤΜΑ + ΠΙΨΥΜ ΔΕΝ ΠΙΖΗ ΝΥΨΙΜ ΠΙΕΡΟΟΤ ΔΕΝ ΠΙΕΖΨΡΨ ΝΝΟΤΨΤΟΝ ΜΜΩΣΟΤ.

Deut. 24:12 ΟΨΗΛΚΙ ΝΝΕΚΕΝΚΟΤ ΣΕΝΝΕΨΓΒΟΣ.

(b) Resumption of zero article + lexeme — alternation of allo-anaphors:
Zero anaphora: ΩΙΚ ΜΝΕΨΟΨΨΜ... Ex. 16:8, Deut. 9:1, etc.

Homolexemic linkage (noun lexeme Topic, compound auxiliary + lexeme derived verb): Num. 8:26 ΕΨΒ ΔΕ ΝΝΕΨΕΡΓΨΒ (not *ΕΨΒ ΔΕ ΝΝΕΨΙΠΙ).

Homolexemic linkage (infinitive Topic, conjugated verb):
Lev. 7:24 ΕΟΤΨΜ ΔΕ ΝΝΟΤΟΤΟΜΟΤ (= 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 delimitation and boundary between Topic and core pattern, one symptomized by discord or absence of concord (see §4.2.4.7.3 below):

Gen. 41:26f. Π-Ξ ΝΕΓΕ ΕΟΝΑΝΕΨ Ξ ΝΡΟΜΠΙ ΝΕ ΟΤΩΓ ΠΙ-Ξ ΝΨΕΜΣ ΕΟΝΑΝΕΨ Ξ ΝΡΟΜΠΙ ΝΕ.
Gen. 44:6 ΦΑΙ ΓΑΡ ΕΜΑΡΨΟΜΠΙ Β-ΤΕ ΕΤΑΤΨΨΠΙ.

(d) Topicalized formal nexus: CONJUGATION BASE + [Conjugation Base + Nominal Theme]: a double — homogrammemic 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- ΑΨ - (see above, Chapter One, §1.1.5 [d] 1): Lev. 8:24 ΟΤΩΓ ΑΜΩΤΨΧΕ ΑΨΙΝΙ ΝΝΕΨΨΗΡΙ ΝΑΡΨΨΝ...

In a formulaic superordinative constituent clause of the preceptual texteme: ΕΡΕ- ΕΨΕ- e.g. Lev. 13:31, 14:16 etc. ΟΤΩΓ ΕΡΕΠΙΟΤΨΗΒ ΕΨΕΨΨΡΨ ΕΒΟΛ...

(e) The so-called Tautological Infinitive topicalizing construction (Chapter Two, §2.4.4), having a formalized adverbial verb (indeed, an
analytical convert verb) in Topic status, and a repeated conjugated verb, is homolexemically linked to its clause:

Ex. 15:26 ἰδονωςκωτεν θεεκωτεν ναετκυν πανειεν ναετκυν ημπιτεν.

(f) Conversion of topicalized constructions may in isolated instances be a link between Topic and clause:

Num. 12:14 ἐνεπεκιώτα αρβιοτι ναεκαν- αν πε (Vat ἐνε-
πεκιώτα αρ- νακαν-…. αν πε is difficult; Greek ελ + Aor.).
Gen. 25:28 ἔνε-τεεξδορικ τεκεβρο πε (= Vat) — this is a special Wechselsatz-type Topicalized Delocutive NS (see above, Chapter Two).

Lev. 14:35 ὁν ετε-πιτι φων πε.

However, more often than not, conversion is a delimitative index of this very boundary:

Num. 12:3 ορογ πιρωμί μωρες κανονεπεμλαυ πε εμαυω.
Gen. 29:31 ραχη άε νοοκ κανονεπερκήν 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 (άε-) 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 εταεκνατ άε επογ άε-οτακτιοτ πε.
Ex. 16:15 οτεκκωτν ημοι αν πε άε-οτ πε.
Ex. 21:36 αρεανκωτν-πιματι άε-οτπεξβαλελ πε.
Num. 11:16 NH … έτεκκωτν ημωοτ άε-γανπεεββεττε-
πος ητεπαλλααοτ πε.

(h) άαε- is a postpositive morph adjoining noun syntagms and demonstratives to a personal-pronoun antical 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. LAMBRECHT 2000, characterizing the special construction of the “relatif de perception".
core. *n*ē- 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 ἀρωμπὶ ἐδή η*η*ε-πωνιη *ναρκα* ... ἀκμωτ *η*ηε-καρπα...

Gen. 23:8 ἀρακαὶ νεμ ως η*η*ε-αιρααμ.
Ex. 7:21 ναρχη πε η*η*ε-νικνοπ ηηηηκαηη θηρη ηκημη.
Non-specific Theme-actants — one of the few non-Existential ways of having indefinite Themes:

Gen. 29:2 ναρχη ηηαη η*η*ε-ι ηοηι ηεκεωω...
Ex. 10:22 ἀρωμπὶ η*η*ε-οηηκαη.
· Ex. 19:16 ἀρωμπὶ η*η*ε-γανεμη ηεμ γανετεβημη ηεμ οσηηηηη ηηηνοδοκ.

The concord link between Theme-actant and the *η*ηε- noun syntagm is *sui generis*, and does not prejudice any subsequent linkage to the latter:

Ex. 32:7 ἀρεπανομην η*η*ε-πεκλαος ηαι ετκηένωη ...(οης ἰηηγης).

(But Deut. 27:1 εσεκνο η*η*ε-πηλαος θηρη).

Num. 3:4 οθογ ηακωτ η*η*ε-αιααμ ηεμ αβιζηα ... οθογ ηεμμοντοη ηηηρη ηηαη ηε.

Num. 19:18 εσεκνοη ηηοτομηος η*η*ε-οτρωμι εηοταβ (= Vat). Note here the instance of cataphoric discord or absence of concord, which is in fact a case of *specification*.

Gen. 1:14 ηαρουμπιη η*η*ε-γανηηεηερωηιη (= 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 etotq mmyothuc nēm ἀπρων.
Deut. 19:5 totq nāprwn nēm nερwhpI.
Deut. 30:4 αρμαψq nτψε (= Vat).
Gen. 29:2 ερψq/εηψq nτψwτ (Vat epwc, εηψwc).
Gen. 29:3:10 εηψwc nτψwτ.
Deut. 20:13 ρwc nτcηqI.
Lev. 21:10 ειωτq nnh εθοστ.

Obs.
(1) A nice Demotic instance of (c): Dem. P. Berlin (ed. Zauich 1993) 15530 x+10f. ht-ntr Ybh jpy '3 p3y “the Temple of Elephantine, it’s a great shrine”.
(2) Construction (d) too is attested in Demotic: cf. STRICKER 1962 p. 39 jw s nb jw:f hk n.f; discussed by the present writer in the forthcoming sequel to 1989b.
(3) In the Bohairic NT, we find the nexus-topicalizing construction usually as a varia lectio: 1 list α- (Preterite), nα-, the Circumstantial Present, the Focalizing Converter (not the relative converter!). It is particularly common in B4 (Vat. copto 9: Mich. 3:12, Joel 2:4:10, Soph. 3:8; epe- εηε-, nnc- nncq-; Mich. 5:4 αρεωα- αρουαν-; α- αq- Jon. 1:2:5:7, Na. 2:3, Hab. 3:10; mαpe- mαpec- Jon. 2:8, Hag. 2:18; nαpe- nαq- Zach. 3:1; eτεμπε- eτεμπεc- (Focalizing Preterite) Na. 3:19; also attested in Nitrian.
(4) Note (ad [b]): Cat. 58 εεμεc εη ... Φωι αν pe εθηq, where the masculine resumption of the ε- + infinitive Topic is remarkable.
(6) Lev. 20:13 ατεωq ραρ αταiq and similar are cases of focussing, not topicalization: see Chapter Two, §2.4.7.
(7) (ad [g]): Nitrian: αρεοτωνt εηε-ανοκ nιm Mac. No. 8B; αcopq εη-...; nι Mac. No. 6 sim. ωτp De Vis 1 168, II 165; nαρεοτωνt αν pe εηε-...; nε De Vis 1 69, II 172, Cat. 76; ατεμησεt εη- + NS De Vis II 75; ...ειωωq α- εη- + NS Cat. 96; nετi ε- + NS Cat. 100.

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 rhematic 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 rheumatizing — is neither commutable with, nor referent to any lexeme, and is thus paradigmatically as well as macro-syntactically inert, so is its no less formal referential, linking operation. This strong linkage even overrules the topicalization reference should the pattern be topicalized, creating a distinctive delimitation between Topic and tightly knit core pattern, where only the Rheme really "exists" in the structural sense:

Gen. 37:27 ζα-πενον πε οτωρ τενεκαρξι τε.
Ex. 20:10 δενπιεγοος δε μμαγ-ζι νεκαββατον μπε-πεκνοντι πε.
Ex. 32:16 πιερδξ νεοτεμβ ντεφς πε οτωρ γραφη νεοτεμ-γραφη ντεφς τε (= Vat).
Lev. 11:10 ην τηρον ... οτωρεβ πε.
Lev. 25:33 νικι γνενικακι γνενιλετιθς γνεκαλι γνατωρ 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 πιξελλα εταιρετενδοκ ζε-....
Deut. 9:28 ...εσιτον εδουν επικαρι εταφδοκ ωνω.

Obs.
(1) See Kešik 1989 on "anacataphore"; also De Mulder 1998.
(2) The remarkable case of Mt. 11:10: Φην γαρ πε Φην ετσονοτ εωνητυ ζε..
Sah. παι γαρ πετζεγ ετμινητυ ζε., Oxyrh. πει γαρ πετζονοτ ετμινητυ ζε- has no explicit referent, either anaphoric to Φην or cataphoric to ζε-.. However, the personal pronoun q in the resumptive prepositional phrase suffices for the anaphoric cohesion, while it may not be a coincidence that the first consonant of ετσονοτ 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 (jrrw n.f r3 pn "(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 unpredictability and unexpectedness, thus high thematicity and super ordination, of sequel.
(a) Person/number disruption.

Deut. 17:14 εὐσωπ ἀεὶ ητετενθε ματὶν εὐπικαρίς ϕη ετεπέσε ναθικ νακ εκεκραληρονομίν μμον ητεκαϊμπι 
είωτη... (= Vat; Greek sgl.). Singular and plural allocutives are evidently in the same cohesive continuity scope, with a fine difference, elusive 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 individualizing and more intimate singular — generally constitutes a striking rhetorical device in Deuteronomy.

Deut. 31:26f. σι μπαϊϊωμ ητεπαινομος χαρ σαπεφιρ 
ητκαβωτος ητεβαιαοηκη νητεπεσε πετεννοςτι οτος εκε- 
ωνμπι νακ ματο ετεμεμετρε αηε-ζωνμι ανοκ ητεκ- 
μετρεντωμπι ηνοκ νεμ τεκαρβι ενωμτ ετι γαρ ανοκ 
ειονς νεμωτον μποοτ ναρετενζωντι μπτι πε...

Deut. 1:22 πεζωτεν αεεμαρονεωρπι νγαρυμι ζα- 
βωμ μαρονμεωτπικαρι ναν οτος μαροτταμον εοτταλι 
πιμωτ ϕη ητετεναγκαν ενρι ειωτη νεμ νιβακι (FUNK 1992:19 emends, with Vat, into ετενναγε — unnecessarily, I believe).

Deut. 28:25 εκεωμπι ετάξωρ εβολ ζενοιμετωρσσωτ 

Deut. 17:7 τάξη ζνιμεθρετ ετελωμπι ζιίςως (Vat εκε- 
ωμπι).

An intervening noun is a boundary marker, signalling a discontinuity of reference that is not anacoluthic:

Ex. 32:1 αηοωοςτι μαε-πιλαοε εζεηαρωιν οτος πε- 
ζωντι μαχ.

Obs.
Cf., in Shenoutean Sahidic: ξαϊςονε ενταιατ ηναι εηαω μμος ζε- 
ενναβος εβοι ετβιηντ ανοκ (Leip. 111 144); (address) πετοτονε εβοι θρο 
ζενοιμετωρσσος θρου αωε ερενεζβοσσος θρου οτος εβοι νηθκ (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 “instead of” feminine/plural neutralization in favour of the masculine:

Gen. 16:3 ακάρα ... σι-αγαρ τεςβωκι οτος αεθικ ναβρα ραμ (Vat αεθικ).
Lev. 5:24 ἡκῶν εταξίζεμσ (Vat Δεμς).
Num. 36:5 παίρνων υπερήφανον ητένενυμίην ινωχόν εὐκῶν...
(= Vat).
Gen. 3:10 τοκεμ ητάικομεν (Vat ηταίκομεν).
Gen. 19:19 τοκεμομίην ... ητεκναίην ημ ηι (Vat. fem.).
Num. 6:2 οτρήμι ιε οτρίμι ηταρζων ημ ησσάη ... ηφε-
τοσφο (= 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 ατρίζε ητφε (= Vat).
Gen. 29:2:3:10 ηρωγ/ηρως ητωμ (=
Obs.
Cases like Gen.41:4 ατις ης ... ατρομάκ ... 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 ινικ κπετενοτωμ ορωγ ηρπ ηημ σεκηη κπε-
tεςω.
(3) Zero object actant — fuzzy cotextual representative:
Ex. 22:3 ηρωπ ιε κπόηνταρ κπαρ...
(4) Zero representing post-verb and specific pronominal object actant
across a [protasis — apodosis] JDF:
Ex. 32:32 ικαξε κνακαπογσβι ηρωτ εβολ ιε αμ (Ηρωτ
εβολ zeroed).
(5) Zero representing nominal expansion in the coordination JDF:
Num. 16:14 κη νωο ηημ ηβ.
(6) Zered formal Theme of Nominal Sentence, see Chapter Two
above, §4.1.1 pattern la — cases of Relative Conversion: ηαη ετεηφωη
ν-, κπετενοτκ etc. (Num. 16:5, 31:9, Lev. 25:10 etc.), all apparently
periphrastic of the pronominal-possessor possessive pronoun (κπωκ, 
κπωκ, ηωη ν-); this may point to the development of a specific pos-
s sessive. Also Lev. 9:15 ηαη ετε-επε-κποβι κπιλαος; also, in
hermeneutical syntax: Num. 33:6 απι εβοηθαν ετεοημερος 
κπε-πωηε (Vat + πε). In junctural terms, this can only mean the 
cancelling of anaphora following upon grammaticalization, that is, loos-
ening of linkage or delimitation.
(7) Zero resumption of temporal antecedents after relative: conjunctival construction?

Num. 9:1 ἵνα ἀναγγέλλω τι εστιν εβολα ἐνπικαρι

Gen. 30:41 ἵνα ἀναγγέλλω εἰς ἐνπικαριν ἵνα ἀναγγέλλω...

The absence of anaphoric reference here shifts in one sense the construction to conjunctival 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-...ἀν) negating the Relative Present, delimiting the converter from the conjugation form, a boundary symptomized by the delocutive pronominal anaphor to the antecedent; zero-... ἀν delimits, while ἀν-... ἀν (Circumstantial) links (see more above). Both define a JDF, within which some cohesion obtains, and an initial and final boundary.

Deut. 1:39 ΦΗ ἤτελκοῦσαν ἀν μηκοῦσαν ἔναραθον ἰε-οὐ

— that is, ἤτε-ο-κοῦσαν ἀν.

(9) Zero is the allomorph (morphonemic alternant) of the Circumstantial converter before syllabic nasal — a link:

Gen. 20:9 ὁπως γιον-ζαὶ ναλικ.

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 ἐπ- and ἐκ-, auxiliary verbs (ἐπ- 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:

```plaintext
##α=q-cwtem##, or ##α-ሞƿ互利 cwtem##
```

(b) In the Interlocutive Nominal Sentence pattern set (§2.1.2), the proclitic {ἄνοικ-} Theme, non-phoric, effects prosodic copular high linkage with its Rheme. Unlike its Sahidic correspondent {ἄντ-}, the Theme is not marked orthographically as proclitic, but is in Bohairic nonetheless
opposed to a tonic (or prosodically unmarked) homonym {ἀνόκ}, 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 — πε, 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, §2.1.1). Similarly the Immutable Theme (πε), including
the case of #ἀνόκ πε# (§2.1.1 [V]). See §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”)
lexeme morph + discontinuous vocalic morphs: noun lexemes — lexical
consonants + full/zero-reduced degree vowels (ρωμί πεμ [ρ-μ / ω vs.
zero]; ɛοι ɛοτ-, [ɛο / ɔι vs. ι]); verb lexemes (ɕωτπ ɕετπ-
cottπ = [ɕ-τ-π / ω vs. ɛ- vs. ɔ etc.]).

(b) In-lexeme linkage by allophonic procedure, e.g.
- “no long /ɔ/ before /h/” (νογ)
- “no long /ɔ/ following nasal” (νογεμ, μογ)
- “in-lexeme glottal-stop realization” (see below)
- “μανεψ”- type sibilant assimilation; ɕαξι-type absence of as-
similation
- tone/aspiration correlation (see below): χω, ɓαλ; other symptoms
and implications of the tonal unit. Observe that so-called combinatorial
aspiration is valid in lexemic and phrasal scopes: ɛεβε, μαρο-
θετετ-, μετμεθεπ (POLOTSKY 1957a:224 n.3 on the delimitation in
μετ-με-θεπ), ɸρωμί, νεθοταβ.

See also above, §4.2 under A, for prevailing delimitations.

Obs.
For juncture features obtaining within word boundary, cf. ROSEN 1964:160ff.

4.3.2 The phrasal (subnexal) scope of validity: selected instances

(a) Determinator ({π-}) + noun lexeme.
(1) Obtaining: combinatory aspiration link: ɸρωμί, өмɛ (below).
(2) Obtaining: nasal desyllabification link: ɦτον but немтοн (be-
low).
(3) Obtaining: gender selection-dependence between lexeme and deteminator: Φ-ρωμι, τ-Φε (see Chapter Three).

(b) Apposition nucleus (nominal, pronominal, Proper Name) + apposition.

Obtaining: gender compatibility interdependence link:
PN †baki Gen. 10:11, 1:45, 46:28.
Num. 3:4 ἀρπων ποτιωτ.

(c) Verb lexeme + pronominal object.
Obtaining: pre-nominal allomorph selection link.
Obtaining: pre-pronoun allomorph selection link.
Obtaining: object-pronoun and lexeme morphonemic allomorph selection, e.g. glottal-stop environment (see below).

τωστ- n but των-κ (SHISHA-HALEVY 1977a).
εκεσθ-εθνότ.
ςοφέ-ς (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 dependence 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 deteminator):
Obtaining: labial assimilation link of nasal (for syllabic nasals only).
Deut. 31:18 εἰςφωνὴ ὕπαγο σενπιεγσοτ ετεμματ.
Obtaining: pre-nominal allomorph selection link.

(g) preposition + suffix pronoun:
Obtaining: stem-ultimate-syllable stress link.
Obtaining: pre-pronoun allomorph selection link.
(g) [Noun/pronoun + Augens + …] colon unit.
Obtaining: placement rules (see below).
Num. 14:31 πικαζι ΦΝ ΝΩΤΕΝ ΕΤΑΡΕΤΕΝΕΓΕΝΘΝΟΤ ΚΑ-

(h) The coordination/disjunction scope:
Obtaining: coordinator/disjunctor 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).
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: \{\text{аноκ+}\} 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 thematic 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=variants), and close juncture between formal verb-nexus and lexicem actant (α=variants of ετεμ).

The Base-Conjugation, (pro)nominial Theme
Obtaining: partial junctural closure; closer between formal (grammemic) verb-stem and Theme (α-πρωμι, α-ϕαλ) and open between formal verb-nexus and lexicem actant (α-πρωμι#ετεμ).

Converter + personal-pronoun Theme (affirmative and an-negated durative and adverb-Rheme nexus)
Obtaining: suffix-pronoun link alternant of prefix pronoun (†- but ε-1- etc.).

Obtaining: (adnominal and adverbal negative Circumstantial) \(\text{n-..an}\) negation, zero converter (SHISHA-HALEVY 1994:226ff.).

Converter + nominal / pronominal Theme
Obtaining: selection link of prenominal allomorphs αε-, naρε-, ερε- (not relative converter).
Topicalized nexus by discontinuous base+theme formal "pro-verbal" or grammemic verbal nexus: ερε-πιοθθε ερηνατ.

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:

nek-όσα Ex. 36:6: the aspiration link.
ετ-εμμαξ: the nasal desyllabication link.
nek-να-ωμι Ex. 36:7: the non-aspiration delimiter.

4.3.4 The hypernexal scope of validity: textual juncture (selected instances)

(a) Dialogic Allocution + Response.
Obtaining: Response-marked-form links (αγα, μφη, μμον etc.; see above, Chapter One).

(b) Protasis + apodosis ("removed from reality").
Obtaining: ne- concord linkage.

(c) Topic/proleptic pronoun + clause.
Obtaining: anaphora rules, prolepsis rules (see above).
Ex. 16:15 νατσωσην μμον αν πε δε-οσ πε.

(d) The Narrative chain (see above, Chapter One).
Obtaining:
Theme continuity as link.

οποιο vs. zero as linkage exponents.
Mode continuity (maintenance) as link (αq- αq- ναq-).
Mode switching as delimitation (αq- αq- ναq- ⇒ ναq- 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 scripta 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 junctorial 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 οτ vs. τ for /u/ — "graphematic crasis". The typically Sahidic graphemic near-symmetry of (ε)ι and (ο)τ is not found in Bohairic in our corpus; ει m Bohairic is bivocalic, while οτ is univocalic; ει is either diphthongal as in ειεξακ, Ex. 33:23; disyllabic (επει, Lev. 14:36) or belongs, delimitatively, to two segments, as in οτβελεει... Lev. 22:22. ει is probably bivocalic in οτει “get far” (Gen. 44:4) as in “one” (fem.), for which usual Bohairic forms are οτι and οτει. Postvocically, οτ has two juncctorial significant occurrences, which vary, albeit to a limited extent (only following the preposition ε-). The ε-οτ-/ετ- variation (preposition with indefinite article) notwithstanding, one could suggest that οτ is vocalic (and syllabic/syllable peak), τ consonantal (and syllable coda):

- ε-οτ-
  (a) crossing grammeme ἢ lexemic boundary.
  ἐτε-οτητοτοτοτ Deut. 20:8.
  (b) Crossing converter ἢ determinant (noun phrase) boundary.
  Gen. 43:32 ζε-νε-οτω κω ρ γε.
  (c) Crossing some intergrammemic boundaries.
  ε-οτ- μεμμη Num. 35:29.
  ε-οτιοτιοτ ιε Gen. 31:31 (Circumstantial converter ἢ 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 combinatory 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.
ete-otron-, e-otron-, ne-otron Num. 22:24, Lev. 11:21-23,
Gen. 39:2f. syll. onset.
Eke-otronm Gen. 2:16 in syllabic onset.
Ebe-or passim.
Nae-or passim.
* e- ( - ) :  v linking
(a) Crossing some (other) intergrammemic boundaries (in the case of
the preposition e- varying with e-or -).
E-cre Gen. 20:12.
E-cre metmeoepe Gen. 21:30.
E-cre-wns Gen. 45:5.
(b) 3rd pl. pronoun following base or converter; always -v - linking.
Evre- passim.
Ere- Circumstantial, passim: Circ. converter † 3rd person pl.
(c) In final (noun-syntagm) position:
Ean “asses”.
(d) 400 number “400”.
(e) reduced prosodic grade of [oi]: eor-norpi (/y/, cf. Kasser

• ơv following consonant and vowel other than e-; lexeme-initially,
lexemically or mono-morphically; ơv delimitative:
(a) 3rd pl., following consonant (pov-, wacr-tov-, ma-pov-,
tovv-nov, eprov),
ơv w (mmw-ot, erw-ot, takw-ot, nh-ot),
as against 2-ơv (never 2-ơv) — v- linking:
awapan, etav- mmat, nat.
Non-final, intralexemically, internal link: œwœ Ex. 32:1.)
(b) ov-a, ov-כ, ov-ח, ov-ונג, nna-שותות Gen. 8:21.
Cena-otronm passim: syllabic onset: initial boundary.
2-orwpi ơwpi Gen. 4:26.
(c) “What?” {ơv}.
(d) In-lexeme: апри瑷 Gen. 31:10:12 (five syllables?).

46 Note ceworpi in B4 Hab. 1:16, Zach. 9:17. In northern dialects, ơ occurs also
stressed (B4 ơwbc “heel”, or Oxyrhynchite, ơv “belly”, kahr, gar [before nasal]:
W.P. Funk, by letter). On the other hand, ơơ ( = ơơ). 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:

\textit{Mαθoυσcλα}.

\textit{Oτρ}.

But \textit{γτ} - in initial position of Greek-origin words (e.g. \textit{γρακίνην} — aspirated Upsilon).

Obs.

(1) Note our \textit{Δε-σθι} (e.g. Lev. 20:23), against the consistent \textit{Δε-θι} 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: \textit{Νε-τ} (e.g. John 9:4), \textit{Νε-τ} (e.g. John 11:13), \textit{Ετε-τ} (e.g. John 6:46), \textit{ιΔε-τ} (John 9:25), \textit{εθε-τ} (John 8:46), \textit{Νε-τ} (e.g. John 19:23 \textit{νετογιν ηνηματι νετατωµη τε} etc. One wonders whether the writing \textit{μον(τε)} of the neg. Existential/possessive, so typical of this text, and apparently occurring mostly after e-morphs (\textit{Δε-μον, Ετε-μον, Νε-μον, Εμον}) 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 \textit{ον}-initial lexeme: John 12:15 \textit{πετρο}.


(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 priori — 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 1987:1XIII 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" - ἀνόκ' πε, ἁνοκθείρα: 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 (λημυσκός), Garthausen (1913) II 414f., role not clear. The paragraphos (of various shapes), II 402f. for "Sinnabschnitt"; "Lesezeichen — Interpunktion für Silben-. Wort- und Satzz trennung" (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 νηοξ δε πεξαζ... / οτοξ πεξαζ... / οτοξ ναξω 

mocc...): 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: ἡνανόκ Gen. 18:17, επ' αρχων 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.
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, of 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):
(when present, a particle or an adverbial is concomitantly unit-demarcating)

\[\text{εἰρηνοβίτω} \text{§ Ex. 9:27.}\]
\[\text{εἰσιωμαρ} \text{§ Gen. 30:27 sim. 20:11.}\]
\[\text{μμονοπω} \text{§ Gen. 24:8.}\]
\[\text{ναξ... πε} \text{§ passim.}\]
\[\text{ννομοτεπερβανζε} \text{§ θειακωβ Gen. 32:28.}\]
\[\text{ωανατζε} \text{§ τετενοτωμα} \text{Ex. 16:28.}\]
§ closing augential sequence units (as a rule)

Gen 29:14.

... ἐ ε β ο ιτικώ μινιν ιναπαράννοικ 
Gen 32:29.

...πετεττεμεροναν 
Gen 32:18.

§ demarcating cola (as symptomized e.g. by repeated “foreshadowed” enclitics: see below).

Gen 43:32.

Antecedent § adnominal clause (as a rule).

Gen 42:21 ... § ζείλα 
§ τεννρφιαρβεννενοβι

§ between terms of coordination (as a rule).

Gen. 7:13 σμ σ χαμ σ ιαφθη 
Gen. 9:18, 24:54.

§ between iteration terms (as a rule), the lemniscus signalling their unity.

Gen 6:5.

Gen 8:10.

§ enclosing terms of address (as a rule).

Gen 46:2.

Gen 22:1.

§ signalling paragraph-end (as a rule).

Ex. 9:12:21, 13:22, 14:4 etc.

§ between terms of apposition (typically).

Gen 39:1.

Gen 3:11.


Gen 35:25f.

Num. 16:9.

Num. 16:13.

Lev. 20:7.
§ enclosing tabular enumeration terms (as a rule).

ηρεμων § θεμαν §
ηρεμων § ωμαρ §
ηρεμων § κωφαρ etc. (Gen. 36:15ff.).

§ signalling the end of topical or thematic unit(s) (as a rule).

νευτάκτηρηστατατικάμεικρωξεσπιεκμι § νητατι
εβωλεννεψίαλωα § κωρικηνιομινενemspρινιακωβ §
νευτάκτηρηστατικάμεικρωξεσπιεκμι § νητατι

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-imperatival slot (see above, Chapter
Between Temporal (εταq-) and main clause: Gen. 4:1, 38:3.
Following (base/converter +) nominal Theme in nexus: Gen. 2:22,

Theme πε (Copula) § Rheme: Gen. 24:29, 38:2.
Theme § Rheme: Gen. 46:9ff. (cf. the colon in this role, Gen. 46:23).

ηασυπηδενβαλα § ηβωκηλραξανα § ανανπεμνεπθα-
λιμ Gen. 35:25f.

απωπινανειγοποθηροτντειαρεα § παινπορμπν etc.

Topicalized nexus (in Narrative) §1.1.5, ερε-NOUN § ερε-
(also other tenses): Lev. 1:5, 2:2, 4:5, 8:25 etc.
Rheme § αν 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).

ακωων § αδαμ Gen. 3:9.

§ delimiting well-defined units in Dialogue.

§ ηεπαρηθηαναωτ § Gen. 48:18.
§ ηεπιαωθηρητεμι § Gen. 48:19.
§ ηερηππηεανοκ § Gen. 22:11.
§ ηεμμοννατσε § Gen. 22:15.
The *lemniscus* is exceptional where a *colon* is expected that is, in close-juncture boundaries.

§ ΞΕΡΞΣΟΥΣΡΕ ΝΗΙ Gen. 27:3.
ΞΕΡΞΙΑΡΕΔ Gen. 5:16.

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, ΟΤΟΓ, ΞΕ, prepositions, the *nota relationis* Ν;
- 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 Augens⁴⁷;

*Observe the following cases of distinctive punctuation:*

ΝΝΟΤΜΟΤΠΕΠΡΑΝ ΞΕ § ΞΕΙΑΚΩΒ Gen. 32:28 (two ΞΕ-homonyms)

ΝΗΕΤΟΤΠΙΜΜΘΟΤ § ΝΕΟΣΟΤΑΤ- Num. 4:49 (ΝΕΟΣΟΤ pronoun — as against the Augens) vs. ΞΕΝΘΟΚΟΤΕΒΟΛΞΕΝΠΑΚΑΣΝΘΟΥΚ § ΝΕΜΕΒΟΛΞΕΝΤΑΚΑΡΞ Gen. 29:14. Also:

ΕΒΕΕΤΚΨΩΝΙΝΚΑΡΑΝΝΘΟΥΚ § Gen. 32:29.

... ΠΕΤΣΛΕΤΕΡΩΡΟΚΑΝΟΚ § 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 ΞΕΕΜΠΕΚΣΣΗΠΟΤΜΟΤΝΗΡΨ • ΑΝΟΚΠΑΙΩΤ Gen. 27:36.
The *colon* is second on the quaternary scale and paradigm of demarcation (highest demarcation first):

\[
\text{lemniscus} \\
\text{colon} \\
\text{raised point} \\
\text{(no punctuation)}
\]

After the *lemniscus*, the most prevalent demarcator, we find the *colon* (Greek *dikolon*), probably the most elusive and the most difficult to assess functionally. It is best characterized contrastively: it demarcates smaller units than the *lemniscus*; it isolates or *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 *lemniscus* concludes syntactic or discourse chunks. It is interesting to note that the distribution of the *colon* in P is not uniform, but evolving: the incidence of *colon* increases as the text advances, at the expense of the raised point, which eventually all but disappears, while the incidence of the *lemniscus* remains more or less constant or even diminishes in some slots. The *colon* occurs between constituents of larger units, especially within bound-morph sequences or within closer-juncture environment such as enclitics. The *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:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ΝΝΟΣΜΟΤ} & : \text{ΕΠΕΚΡΑΝ} & \text{Gen. 17:15 (sim. 9:11)}.
\text{ΕΤΤΟΜΙΝΟΤ} & : \text{ΕΟΤΙ} & \text{Ex. 26:3}.
\text{ΝΕΜ} & : \text{ΠΗΡΠ} & \text{Gen. 27:37}.
\text{ΝΑΟΙΝΩΥ} & : \text{ΩΩ} & \text{Gen. 14:10}.
\text{ΦΗΕΤΑ} & : \text{ΑΓΑΡ} & \text{ΜΑΣΚ} & \text{Gen. 16:15}.
\text{ΙΚΕΝ} & : \text{ΚΙΩΝ} & \text{Gen. 10:19}.
\text{ΜΠΕΡΕΝ} & : \text{ΤΕΚΩΝ} & \text{Gen. 22:12 sim. 43:23.f., 39:14}.
\text{ΝΕΤΕΝ} & : \text{ΝΟΠ} & \text{Gen. 47:24}.
\text{ΝΤΕ} & : \text{ΕΨΡΩΝ} & \text{Gen. 49:29}.
\text{ΝΕ} & : \text{ΜΑΛΕΛΗΛ} & \text{Gen. 5:16, sim. 35:8}.
\text{Ν} & : \text{ΚΟΝ-} & \text{Gen. 11:19 (vs. ΝΚΟ: Ν- 11:17) sim. 10:4}.
\text{ΕΣΩΤΕΝΔΑ} & : \text{ΑΓΑΡ} & \text{Gen. 16:4 sim. 17:22}.
\text{ΣΕΝ} & : \text{ΟΤΜΚΑΡΝΗΤ} & \text{Gen. 42:38}.
\text{ΟΤΒΕ} & : \text{ΑΒΡΑΑΜ} & \text{Gen. 17:9}.
\text{ΜΕΝΕΝΚΑ} & : \text{ΡΝΝΕΓΟΝ} & \text{Gen. 8:3}.
\text{ΟΤΤΕ} & : \text{ΝΙΘΡΙΟΝ} & \text{Gen. 3:1}.
\end{align*}
\]
Especially striking and recurring constellations:
nεμποσρο : nγομπρα Gen. 13:10 sim. Gen. 12:5 before the
nota relationis and direct-object marking n-, an especially important
slot.
αρ:θαμιοq : καταθηκων Gen. 5:1.
30:14.
Theme : πε : Rheme Gen. 11:29.

Obs.
I find remarkable εβες : ηα Gen. 35:1:7 with ουθ: ηα 35:3:8, ουθ:ηα 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, com-
bined and contrasted with the looser lemniscus are especially telling: the
colon internal — as it were inside brackets — the lemniscus final and
phrase-external:
The **colon** overlapping the raised point: in this case embracing:

**α νερε: Ex. 9:11, 15:23 (cf. the point • αν • πε Gen. 39:6).**

**ντεμι: αν: Gen. 4:9.**

**ακτρενεπερανζε: ραα Gen. 30:11, sim. 30:6 — a slot where no lemniscus is found to occur.**

**γαν:ανζε=νεμγαν=ανζο 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: **ναζε: ηρ Gen. 46:12, sim. 35:8.**

**ε: ε Lev. 13:56.**

**ε: ε Lev. 13:30.**

**ι: ε Lev. 10:16, Num. 6:14.**

(NB: space between identical ε vowels in Lev. 2:2, 6:8).**

**νωε: επωσοιτ 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.

**Γεν. 29:6** — note enveloping punctuation.

**Μητανώσιμοι Gen. 31:14.**

**οὖσαν Gen. 6:20 (vs. 19 lemniscus).**

**Φημινινταιαδανηκι Gen. 9:12:18.**

**ἀρισμελικάρα: ἀρενθωβοβολωθων Gen. 16:8; sim. Gen. 49:26, 26:26.**

**ἀερπενηπεραν: ἄεθεοcludes Gen. 4:25, 6:2:13.**

**οὐσητακατονθικ Gen. 25:8.**

**ερεβιτ: μασαμ Gen. 22:8.**

**αποσαι ερμοπι Gen. 38:28.**

*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.

**ἐνεβολεντιογοι • ἀν • περικεφκαλαι ... Lev. 27:22.**

**τετενωτωυ • ἀν • εκοινεμπεγε Ex. 21:5.**

**κοινοτε • ἀν • εθικ Ex. 21:8.**

• ἀν • ἰε Ex. 5:10.

• ἀν • πε Gen. 37:4.

• ἀν πε • Gen. 45:3.

• ἀν • οὖντα οὐ • Gen. 24:5.

**The raised point in environments of closer and closest juncture, typically enveloping short morphs and components:**

ἀν • παλακιοὴννται Num. 16:22.

**Νατ • εργολι Ex. 30:1.**
ΔΕΑΜΟΙ • ΕΝΕ • ΆΜΟΤ • ΝΕΔΕΝ Ex. 16:3.
ΜΑ • AQ • ΝΑΝΕΟΣΨΜ Num. 11:13.
ΝΟΤΜ • AQ • Num. 11:18:20.
†ΝΑΟΤΝΜ • AQ • Deut. 12:20.
ΔΙΝΑΖΕΝ • AQ • ΘΩΝ Num. 11:13.
ΝΝΕΚ • ΕΡΑΔΙΚΙΝ Lev. 19:13.
ΦΑ • ΡΨΕ Gen. 24:57.
ΠΙ • ΙΩΤ • Ex. 9:31.
ΠΙ • ΑΛ • Ex. 10:15.
ΠΑ • ΗΙ • Gen. 19:8.
ΠΕ • ΗΙ • Gen. 17:12.
ΔΙ • ΔΙΜΙ • Gen. 18:3.
ΕΤΑΛΛΑΜ • ΜΟΤ† Gen. 2:19.
• AQ • ΤΩΝΨ Gen. 25:34.
ΓΑΝ • ΑΛ • Lev. 13:38:39.
ΝΝΕΝ • ΕΝ • ΝΕΝΒΑΛ Deut. 14:1.
ΕΡΕΤΕΝΕ • ΕΛ • ΝΑΚΑΣ • ΕΒΩΛ Gen. 50:25, sim. 42:36.
ΑΛΑΒΑΝ • ΕΛ • ΛΙΑΤΕΨΕΡΙ Gen. 29:23.
ΟΤΡΟΠΟΣ • ΕΝΨ • Gen. 45:27.
ΝΑΡΕΝΙΑΓΨΛΟΣ • ΗΙΣ • ΗΝΑΛΨΤ Gen. 19:15.
ΠΑ • ΗΙ • Gen. 19:8.
ΠΕΚ • ΗΙ • Gen. 17:12.
ΝΕΜΜΟΝ • ΗΙ • ΓΑΡΨΕ Ex. 12:30.
ΑΡΕΨΤΕΜΝΕΤΝΚΟΤΨΧΙΝΚ Ι • ΕΜΝΑΙ Gen. 42:15.
ΝΝΕΝΑΨΗΡΙ • Ι • ΝΕΨΝΤΕΝ Gen. 42:38.
ΑΠΙΜΨΩΤΝΚΑΤΑΚΑΤΨΜΟΣ • Ι • ΕΔΕΝ- Gen. 7:6.
ΓΑΡΨΖΕΝΟΨ • Ι • ΤΕΝΝΑ • Ι • Gen. 37:10.
ΑΦΤΩΡΕΨΨΨΨΝΝΨΒΕΝ • Ι • ΕΨΨΨΙ Gen. 2:9
ΜΨ • Β • Gen. 3:7.
ΠΙ • Ν • ΝΕΜΗΙ • Gen. 18:24.
ΔΕΜ • Α • ΜΜΑΨ • Gen. 18:30:32.
• Β • Β • Gen. 6:20, 7:2:3:15 etc.
ΣΩΒΕ • ΠΙΚ • Gen. 18:31.
ΑΠΙΛΑΨΙΩΝ • Ν • Π • ΝΑΜΟΣΨΑ Gen. 24:10.
ΠΙΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ • Β • Gen. 19:1.
Isolating Proper-Name segments:
ΣΕΝ • ΚΑΙΝ • ΑΤΒΕΛ• Gen. 4:24.
ΑΨΨΦΕ (sic) • Ν • ΙΑΡΕ • Gen. 5:15.
ΑΝΕΤΑ • ΑΓΑΡ • ΘΒΨΚΙΝΣΑΡΡΑ Gen. 25:12.
ἀλαβάνει· ἐλατείερι Gen. 29:23.
ἀχμενηραξιλαδεεργοτε· λια· Gen. 29:30.
ἐδε· σχο Gen. 5:3.
ἀγμονναξε· ἥρ· νεμασγαν Num. 26:19.
ἀκτρενεπερανξε· τίνα· Gen. 30:21.

λενεννοτν· δινα· Gen. 34:25.
δινα· τούσωνι Gen. 34:27.
δινα· τωέρινακωβ Gen. 34:3 (vs. δινα: τερεφερι Gen. 34:5)

ἀλαβάνει· ἧ· νζελάχα· τερβωκιν· λια· τερεφερι Gen. 29:24

ἐνεκαπαντε· αγρ Gen. 16:1, 38:1.

φραννήνιωθνπε· λια· οτορφραν· ντκοκζι· περακαν
Gen. 29:16

Separating identical segments (incl. graphemes)
ἀσωε· ἐπωμι Ex. 12:38.
ἀβρααμαε· ετιαναογι Gen. 18:22.
εθεβεπι· Ἰ Gen. 18:32.

ῳτ· ῥωτ· Gen. 14:10.

ζαμπισαοί· ποσαί· Gen. 42:35.

· γοτε· ετινοσεβολ Gen. 24:11.
· νεμ· ... · νεμ· ... · νεμ· ... · νεμ· ... · νεμ· ... Gen. 25:2
(x5):3:4

Varia — alerting for danger of metanalysis?

ετ· ἦπ· ετεφεραζ Lev. 18:6.

ὅτε· ορτε· ελιμ· νεμ· ορτε· σινα· Ex. 16:1.


περκεκον· οχμοσ Gen. 42:38.

· ἀζεν· εφόνε Gen. 25:6.

ἀκοσ· ον· ἠ Gen. 12:13.

· ἐπωμι Gen. 2:9.

All three punctuation marks occasionally occur in syntagmatic proximity, which testifies to the meaningfulness of their contrast:

νοσοσπνεκοσφρηπετεσφωπινακεχκεθχιμιν· νοσίνε·
ἐφρεμ· νεμμαναςχι· μφροπνπσβνν· νεμμφροπνξσ-
μεων· ετεσωμοτακι· Gen. 48:5.

δειμπεκεκεδιπ· ουσμοσσηρω· άνοκπατ Gen. 27:36.


θασφερι· θασφεριν· οτονατεβνωσι· θατεβνω-
σιν· θαθοσςετεκαντ ερσωσσσι· νε· νεμναθι έ·
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>
</tbody>
</table>

units demarcated:

| bound morphs: lexemes       | —         | +     | (-)          |
| short lexemes / morphs      | —         | (+)   | +            |
| bound morphs: PNs           | —         | +     | +            |
| bound morphs: grammemes     | —         | (-)   | +            |
| bound morphs: converters     | —         | —     | +            |
| bound morphs: enclitics: άν  | —         | (-)   | +            |
| bound morphs: determinators  | —         | —     | +            |
| unbound morphs: number names | —         | —     | +            |
| bound morphs: identical segments | —     | (+)   | +            |
| averting metanalysis        | —         | —     | +            |

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 copie 1 avoids end-of-line breaks in mid-morph in Egyptian-Coptic elements:

αρε/-, ναρε/-, ετ/αυ/-, άτ/-, γαν/-, οτ/-, πι/-, π/-, ΝΕΝ/-, ΠΕΨ/-, 
Δε/-, ΝΤΕΤ/ΑΡΑΒΙΑ, ε/ΔΟΤΝ, ΜΑ/ΨΕΝΑΚ, εΘ/ΝΑΝΕΨ, Ν/-, ΝΙΝ/, ΕΡΩΣ, ΙΚΕΝ/ΤΕΝΜΕΤΑΛΟΣ, ΙΑ/ΙΩΨ, ΙΕ-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:

\textit{na/neq} Gen. 1:8.
\textit{na/peq} Gen. 1:9 (imperative + auxiliary).
\textit{nie/biaik} Gen. 50:17 (e- part of the plural morphology).
\textit{epetnen/ezoc passim} (4th e- historical and synchronic morph).
\textit{mh/note passim}.
\textit{coer/terp} Gen. 4:12 (morphematic doubling).
\textit{be/ap} Gen. 49:3.
\textit{n/neksehp} Deut. 28:39.
\textit{pie/goos} Deut. 27:11.
\textit{tebn/wothi} 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:

\textit{mpc/tho} Gen. 50:13.
\textit{epetnepos/om} Gen. 45:18.
\textit{xy/soi} Gen. 41:42.
\textit{coz/nos} Gen. 50:8.
\textit{xa/la} Gen. 7:21.
\textit{zet/teq} Gen. 4:15.
\textit{tha/mio} Gen. 6:15, Deut. 27:15.
\textit{me/ncna} Gen. 5:4.
\textit{mab/bot} Gen. 8:14.
\textit{ov/epi} Deut. 9:23.
\textit{eqwos/it} Deut. 32:49.

Proper Names are even less subject to the rule here advanced, yet even they largely preserve the syllabic cut:

\textit{ai/akewb}
\textit{ab/pam}
\textit{a/adam}
\textit{xo/anolomor}
\textit{dek/la}
\textit{nimi/aim}
\textit{iw/schf}
Similarly Greek loans\textsuperscript{48}:  
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{κατακ/λασμος}
  \item \textit{κατακ/λασμος}
  \item \textit{πα/παδικος}
  \item \textit{πα/παδικος}
\end{itemize}

\textit{Obs.}

(1) Some pages seem to manifest a concentrated (distracted?) deviation from this consistency: e.g. Lev. 5:16:17 \textit{τοσ/γο, κατ/κοτ, νε/θορεβ} — 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):

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{ρο/μηπι}
  \item \textit{ρο/μηπι}
  \item \textit{ω/μπι}
  \item \textit{ω/μπι}
  \item \textit{σω/μα}
  \item \textit{σω/μα}
  \item \textit{κα/και}
  \item \textit{κα/και}
  \item \textit{ειευενηι}
  \item \textit{ειευενηι}
  \item \textit{πο\textsuperscript{ε}\chi}\textsuperscript{ν}
  \item \textit{πο\textsuperscript{ε}\chi}\textsuperscript{ν}
  \item \textit{νθω\textsuperscript{ε}\tau\textsuperscript{ε}}
  \item \textit{νθω\textsuperscript{ε}\tau\textsuperscript{ε}}
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{48} The phonology of loan-words in Coptic deserves special study: they are characterized, \textit{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):

\[ \varepsilon \beta o^{\infty} 2:1 \]
\[ \varepsilon \rho^{\infty} 2:14 \]
\[ \nu^{\lambda} \alpha t^{\infty} 3:6 \]
\[ \omicron \tau \omega \nu^{\infty} 1:9 \]
\[ \gamma m \omega^{\infty} 27:19 \]
\[ \nu e n m a^{\infty} 3:6 \]
\[ \Delta \rho o^{\infty} 3:15 \]
\[ \varsigma^{\infty} 3:18 \]
\[ \kappa o^{\infty} 4:14 \]
\[ \pi^{\infty} 4:20 \]
\[ \omicron \eta r^{\infty} 4:26 \]
\[ \epsilon n \omega^{\infty} 4:17 \]
\[ \nu r^{\infty} 9:24 \]
\[ \kappa \alpha \kappa i^{\infty} 6:5 \]
\[ \chi^{\infty} 24:46 \]
\[ \omicron \sigma o^{\infty} 4:18 \]
\[ \lambda o \beta o^{\infty} 8:4 \]
\[ \mu m a^{\infty} 24:60 \]

Rarely, more than a single letter is added in this position:

\[ \rho m h^{\infty} 4:1 \]
\[ \omicron \varepsilon^{\infty} 5:16 \]
\[ \rho^{\infty} 6:6 \]
\[ \kappa a^{\infty} 12:6 \]

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:

\[ \epsilon o / \beta h^{\uparrow} \text{Gen. 12:13.} \]
\[ \tau a c / \theta o q \text{Gen. 14:16.} \]
\[ \epsilon t e m \varphi a \varphi a r a / \alpha n n e \text{Gen. 47:2.} \]
\[ \epsilon / t e m m a t \text{Gen. 19:33.} \]
\[ \epsilon b o l / m m a t \text{Gen. 19:9, 24:4.} \]

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 ωσ (with σ stacked above ω), 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 syllability, 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, ơ 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” - άνόκ’πε, νεγ’ωθε (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 syntagmatics, or the textual sequence of linguistic unities (pace Kasser 1994b:110), just as it concerns morphology — 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 πετότον), pronominal Theme and Rheme (κεμματικά as against αμματικά), Relative converter and Rheme (e.g. ετεκματικά, 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 combinatorial 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 be-
yond 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 supra-
segmentals 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 suprasegmental 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 Silben-
grenze” . 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 ein-
system zur Bezeichnung von Silbengrenzen aus keinen phonetisch-theoretischen Beweg-
gründen 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 (170f. 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 contemporane-
ously 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, Ox-
ford), 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: “silisch im Sinne der Silbeneranalyse des Schreibers...” “die Gewiß an der
phonetischen Realisation orientierte Silbenanalyse”, which follows a statement of “nicht
diäphrenz Zineipien” (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 Apophthegmata 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 Problematik 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: πεψιρ, πξρεμπεμ; double clusters have rising or steady sonoricity: ϕρο, ττιμη), 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 obstruct + sonant clusters.49

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; ένκ or τωνκ with a final cluster as coda).

Coda (zeroable)50: Sonority Sequencing Principle: coda clusters fall in sonority from the nucleus (ένκ, τωντ, αίτ — 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 οσα, οσι concur with disyllabics.
50 A zeroed coda is of course not the same as a zero segment as coda: ηνο “to you” (fem.), πε- “your-” (fem.). Vocalic lengthening in coda: ημωιοτ, 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):

\[\text{̱έβεξε} \text{ Gen. 30:32.}\]
\[\text{̱έμωφι} \text{ Gen. 31:23.}\]
\[\text{̱έφισα} \text{ Gen. 31:21.}\]

Marked syllabic in adjoining vocalic or consonantal environment is always a delimitation. The Jinkim is deployed to mark morphematic and lexematic boundaries (the tension between syllabic/phonosyllabic and morphematic boundaries is of interest):

\[\text{̱ή} - \text{ as a rule maintains its syllabic} — \text{this constitutes a delimitation} \]
(cf. Lev. 8:33, 13:28, 2:5, 3:2, 4:18:23 etc.):

\[\text{μα-̱ή-έκωφ} \text{ Gen. 43:32.}\]
\[\text{ετε-̱ήσητq} \text{ Lev. 1:9} — \text{clearly not "liaison étroite".}\]
\[\text{ἄπνανκοτ} \text{ Ex. 22:27.}\]
\[\text{οτ-̱έξωρq} \text{ Gen. 41:11.}\]
\[\text{ῳε-̱ιάκωβ} \text{ Gen. 31:17.}\]
\[\text{νε-̱έβολ} \text{ Gen. 41:2.}\]
\[\text{ε̱μμον} \text{ Num. 20:18: delimitation following the Circumstantial:} (Vat \text{μμον}).}\]
\[\text{εκέεν=} \text{ Ex. 18:19, 34:29.}\]
\[\text{εφέ-εφ-} \text{ Lev. 16:19}^{51}.\]
\[\text{νε-̱ήπενq-} \text{ Ex. 12:39, νε-̱ήπατε-, νε-̱μμον} \text{ Gen. 2:5.}\]
\[\text{ετε-̱ήφη} \text{ Ex. 11:5.}\]
\[\text{ετε-̱ήπεύμοθo} \text{ Ex. 14:9.}\]
\[\text{ετε-̱ήταξq} \text{ Gen. 12:20.}\]
\[\text{ῳα-̱ήναι} \text{ Gen. 22:5.}\]
\[\text{ῳα̱τοπεωτωt} \text{ Gen. 29:8 (!).}\]
\[\text{ν-̱ένοσοc} \text{ Lev. 20:10.}\]
\[\text{ν-̱εράλιτhεc} \text{ Lev. 24:10.}\]
\[\text{ν-̱ιάκωβ} \text{ Gen. 27:6.}\]
\[\text{ἀq-ιπι ν-οτωμοc} \text{ Gen. 26:30.}\]
\[\text{ν̱έξωρq} \text{ Deut. 9:25.}\]
\[\text{ν-̱ονομακτοc} \text{ Num. 15:2.}\]
\[\text{οτ-̱άνομια} \text{ Lev. 20:14.}\]

\[^{51}\text{The Oxyrhynchite Codex Glazier (the Acts) has for the Absolute-Definite Future a consistent syllabication contrast of ε̱φ-ε- as against the other persons, ε-κε-, ε-κέ-, ε-κε-}.\]
ἀρι-ἐμι Gen. 20:7.
ἀ-ἰακωβ Gen. 29:11.
ἀ-ι Gen. 32:7.
ἡπάθο Gen. 41:1:2 — syllabication conflicting with aspiration (phjaro vs. pi-a-ro).

νκναωτωμ ἃν Deut. 8:9 Circumstantial; Vat νκνα-: x- non-syllabic, in onset cluster.

ἀρε- P (= Vat) generally.

c-ἐθεφεφοβι Lev. 6:23. e-te- or et-e-? Probably the former.

NB: φιν εθεφεφοβι, φι ετεμετωματ (nte-) Lev. 7:7 — no Jinkim on e-.

c-ἀκο.

παικε-ἐλαβρε.

μα-νεσωτ (unetymological metanalysis).


c-ἀθε Gen. 40:19.

The opposition is junctural in a case like:

νη ἐτε-ντακ Gen. 31:18 (= Vat) against νετεντακ Gen. 24:2.

ἐτε-μπαίμα 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")?

c-νοσων Gen. 18:9.

c-τεμματ (vs. ἡμματ).

(but: c-τε-νάσττq Gen. 49:32, see above);

νατ-... ἃν, ύτα-... ἃν as a rule, for negating the nexus with Focalizing Present/Future/Preterite.

Deut. 8:3 ἀρε-πιρωμι ναώς εωικ μματατq ἃν

(c) Cases of syllabic initial radical nasal (looser morphematic juncture) in variation with e + nasal: (closer juncture) — some examples are given above and below. The three forms encountered for each instance are the lexemic one (στον, ἴβον), the marked close-juncture one, with the lexeme "melting" into a preceding unity (ἐμτον, ἐμβον —
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 (ἐήτον). The variation between the first two (a variation not occurring with any of the ἐ 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.

ἐήτον:
ἐκ-ἐήτον Ex. 34:21 (ἐ at end of line) vs. ἐκ-ἐ-ἐήτον ibid.
πεήτον Ex. 35:2 (= Vat).
πιεήτον Num. 10:36 (Vat πιήτον).
ἐνεήτον Ex. 35:2 (= Vat), 16:23 (= Vat), Deut. 5:14 (= Vat), 12:9.
†εήτον Deut. 25:19.
(ἐτ)αγεήτον Num. 11:25 (ἐτόν Vat), Deut. 33:2.
θρεκεήτον Deut. 5:33.

Obs.
See Funk 1992:26f. on the variation αγεήτον/αγεήτον; ἅξαι is rarer in the corpus than εηκαι.

ὁμβον
ἀμοτεμβον Num. 11:10, 32:9, 11:1 (Vat ὁμβον) vs. ὀτμβον Deut. 29:23.
αγεμβον Num. 11:33 (αγμβον Vat), Deut. 1:37 vs. αγμβον Deut. 32:19, 9:8 ντεμβον Deut. 11:17.
ἀπετετευμβον Deut. 4:21 vs. ὁμβον Deut. 32:16.
πεμβον Num. 12:9.
ἐνεμβον Deut. 31:17, Num. 16:15 (= Vat).
παιμβον Deut. 29:24.
ἀωντ νεμὁμβον Deut. 6:15.
†<i>náøepetachi</i> ὢβον Deut. 32:39.
<i>ὤρο ἡμοὶ ἔβον</i> Num. 14:11 (Vat ὤρο ἡμοὶ ἔβον).

ἐπισμεναὶ
Lev. 16:8.
ἐκσεμπῷα
Lev. 5:10.

ἐκεῖναι
ἐκεῖναι Νιβὴν Ex. 35:32, Lev. 18:6.
ἐκεῖναι Ex. 10:15, Gen. 34:29, Deut. 28:55 (= Vat).
καέκεναι Deut. 15:2.

Νδαέκεναι Νιβὴν Deut. 29:23.

Νεμ ἦκει Νιβὴν Ex. 20:11, 40:9, Num. 16:13, Gen. 36:6 varying with Νεμ ἔκειναι Νιβὴν Gen. 34:2, οὐκ ἔκειναι Νιβὴν Deut. 8:14 (Vat ἦκει), Num. 18:14.

οἰκείναι Gen. 31:31.
ποιεῖναι Num. 24:11.

ὀτε ἔκεναι Deut. 28:57.

ἐκεῖνο
πεκέμκαι (etc.) Ex. 32:5, Num. 19:3.
πεκέμο Νιβὴν 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.

ἐκαρ
πεκέμκαι Deut. 28:57.

Μνότ

Μθασ
οτεμθασ Num. 19:16 (Vat Μθασ).
οτακθιο νεμθασ, οτακθιο νεμθάσ Gen. 23:20, 50:13 Vat.

Ενκοτ: Ενκοτ usual form in the MS.

Εκεικοτ Deut. 22:22.

Κεκοτ Deut. 31:16.

Εκκοτ Deut. 24:12.

(d) Instances of distinctive or significant syllabication:
(1) In the Absolute-Definite Future.
ειέ-, εκέ-, εκέ- (but εκε- in Vat!). Kasser 1994:129 believes that εκ/ε- is "orthographiquement plus avancé" than ε/εκε-. Why, and in what sense? The former is certainly better founded historically.

ερέ- sec. sgl. fem. Gen. 16:11, distinguished from
έρε- + sec. person plural/nominal Theme (e.g. Gen. 17:5, 18:14, 22:8 etc., Ex. 10:2, 11:6).
έ-ι Gen. 24:8.

(2) ἀρε-ωλι sec. sgl. fem. Preterite Gen. 30:15: the core morph is syllabic.


(4) Most interesting: π- article + syllabic vowel, with the Jinkim signalling the morphematic boundary: π+άλωτ, π+άλοξ (Gen. 24:34, 32:25) — still syllabic, although syllable covers more than one grapheme: ἀ- here is a syllabic realization of a zero laryngeal 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 ἀλωτ dans π-άλωτ, graphie occultant la division syllabique du mot" (R. Kasser by letter, 25/3/98); ΝΑΛΩΤΙ Ν- Gen.26:25, ΝΑΛΟΞ Ν- Gen. 50:23, both = Vat (ΝΕΝ- in Gen. 21:25); see Polotsky 1968:244f. Compare, however, πινι in Quecke 1984:302. On the other hand, ΝΞΕ-Ν-ΑΛΩΤΙ ΝΙΚΑΑΚ Gen. 26:25 (= Vat) has close juncture with the preceding vocalic environment (contrast ΝΞΕ-ΙΚΑΑΚ Gen. 26:31, ΑΕ-ΝΟΤΩΨΥ Gen. 37:2). Somewhat similar is ἐτ-έγε Gen. 24:34 = Vat, 24:9, 32:25:32, Ex. 23:4.

(5) ἐκάκινθινον Num. Ch. 4 passim: ξ — the Greek rough breathing is not considered consonantal for syllabication purposes (Vat ἐκάκινθινον).

4.4.5 "Aspirate" consonants (θ, χ, φ, 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 obstruct consonant.
Combinatory (allophonic) aspiration (a)

Aspiration of the surd consonant immediately preceding a sonorant in syllable-onset clusters:
\(\pi \rho \epsilon \rho \epsilon \mu \epsilon\) (triple cluster) Ex. 16:12.
\(\Phi \rho \omega \mu i\).
\(\Phi i \alpha \rho o\) (the boundary between article and lexeme is here enough to maintain the syllabicility of \(\alpha\)).
\(\mu e t \mu e \theta e\) (illustrating junctural contrast between two boundaries): \(\mu e t-m e-\theta e\).

Combinatory (allophonic) aspiration (b)

Aspiration of consonantal onset, or last consonant in cluster onset, immediately preceding the stress:
\(\Phi h \theta h\)
\(m \Phi \omega r\)
\(x \omega \kappa \alpha-\)
\(\pi c \Phi 1 p\) (triple cluster) Ex. 27:7
\(\omega e e g\)

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 \(\Phi i \alpha p o\) (phja-ro would account for \(\Phi\) -, while the Jinkim, if exclusively marking syllabic autonomy, would indicate pi-a-ro). Similarly, cases like \(\alpha w t e b\), Num. 31:17 \(\delta o b b o t\) or \(\alpha w t e n\) Deut. 4:36 \(\alpha o m o t\) do not, I think, pose the short-open-syllable question, but illustrate the same dynamicity.

Non-combinatory (phonematic and “etymological”; or else pertinent) aspiration is 1 believe questionable, and the phonematic load of the opposition marginal: \(x o g\) Num. 11:9 vs. \(k o g\) Deut. 8:15, \(\pi a-\) vs. \(\Phi a-\); cf. also \(n o w t e n\) pron. as against \(n t o w t e n\) (\(n t e-\)) etc. Lev. 26:31, Num. 16:33 (the latter \(t < d\) — this “\(t_2\)” “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 \(t w o t n, t, k w t\), the dental or velar not
subject to combinatorial aspiration (b), devoid of written (graphematic) allophones.

Obs.
(1) On the nature of Bohairic ꢑ x (راتيج). Surd [h] sequences are in Bohairic written in subsequent separate graphemes: ꢑꢟꢑ ꢝꢟ ꢘꢕꢔ (ображен is exceptional); ꢑ x is not a digraph for ꢝꢟ/k ꢛ (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 grapheme, 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 (< ı) and non-aspirating ones (< d: cf. ꢑꢑꢑ, ꢑ) — see Worrell 1934: 187ff., Vyčičl 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 ꢑ/ and ꢑ/, 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 ꢑ- (STRESS) vs. ꢑ- (STRESS), that we have a synchronic phonological differentiation, corresponding to a diachronic source difference: elsewhere, both Egyptian ꢛ/ and ꢛ/ merged into Bohairic ꢛ/; ꢛ/ > ꢛ/, ꢛ/ > ꢛ/, ꢛ/ — 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 ꢝꢟꢟꢟꢟ (Kellia 1, 1969, edd. Daumas-Guillaumont, No. 23 p. 105, which, like the "pre-Old Coptic" ꢑ ꢑ ꢑ ꢑ 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); ꢑ x are not spirants, while ꢑ probably is. Arabic ꢛ transcribes both ꢛ and ꢛ. 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. ꢟꢟꢟꢟ ꢟꢟ ꢟꢟ 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. (Somewhere, I cannot conceive of the third segment in the monosyllabic τηφω φοτοτ firmware 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 - ρ and ph, θ - t and th.

(4) The allophonic distribution described of aspirates and non-aspirates excludes loanwords from Greek: σικέρα, σπαλαξ Lev. 11:30, κασακών 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 phonemic: πα- vs. φα-, not ceteris paribus Φε vs. πε, κετ- “build” vs. κετ (“other”, Crum 507b), θ “there” vs. θη “that” (sgl. fem.), less neatly νωτος vs. ντωτος (n- + “theirs” [fem.] vs. “with them”); usually, θ x 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 θαμιο (unaccented, from διτ!), θεληα - or θεπιο, 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, καγι, opening a stressed syllable?

4.4.6 Juncture and aspiration: aspiration as link / delimitation

(a) Tone/aspiration correlation within lexeme boundaries:

ωτερωρ, ομαρτερ — a unit-valid morphemic alternation link (primarily, one-stress linkage).

Φοτιφετ, Φετιφωτ — 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-vrddhi 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) seam — delimiter of two different segments:

“an aspirate is syllable and/or morph-initial, not -medial- or -final”53

“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. ROSEN 1964 §3.1 ex. 1 (Attic Greek).
ἀρεπ-ὁνος Gen. 19:2.
Ἐν-ὁνος Gen. 50:24.
Σατεν-φρο Gen. 18:10.
Ντε-χμὶ Ex. 8:2.
Πιμωτίντε- Deut. 1:19.
Νεχωτοῦρο Deut. 1:21.
Φῶς vs. π-ῶς Num. 24:8.
Π-ῶς Num. 17:7 vs. Φῶς "theirs".

Nαρεφθωτιμωισωπ#ννως Ex. 10:23. In a case like this, or like Num. 18:17 Αραγόνως, aspiration defines rightward linkage in the lexemic scope and a leftward boundary over an internal seam in the nexal 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 nξnα-): κ here is the deaspirated x.

(d) Morphemic juncture overruling syllabication (and resulting aspiration).

Μετημωρε 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.

Μεθωμι cuts across morphemic boundary (the existence of Θωμι may be a factor here) Deut. 6:20:24 (me-thméi) (οτ-Θωμι Deut. 32:4).

Μετ- always:
Μετίωτ Num. 17:17.
Μετοτωβ Num. 18:1.
Μετνατ Deut. 6:25.
Μετβωκ Deut. 7:8.
Τενμετάλωσ Gen. 47:3.
Μετνίωτ† Gen. 43:33.
Μετρεψεργα Deut. 28:57.
Οτμετρεμεγε 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 ἐθές-, ἐθήκε, the
definite articles or the θ- of causatives (διδακτάς Gen. 35:17). In fact,
the actual morphs given to this fluctuation are practically only the Rela-
tive converter ετ-/εθ- and the sec. sgl. masc. κ-/κ-:

ἐθοσώπι Ex. 3:12.

ἐμαίο (secondary aspiration: from djit!).

Φίον Ex. 26:27 ἐμῆτ Ex. 26:28 Φλάκε Ex. 26:23 Φβέξε Lev.

χοσωγ Gen. 24:5 so always?

χναμὸν Gen. 20:7, 24:42.

ἀννασωμ ἀν (Vat χξανα-) Deut. 8:9 Circumstantial — remark-
able: κ deaspirated, completing a syllable with θ?.

ἐθακότι Gen. 31:10:24 but (rare) τ-πακότι Gen. 20:6 (Vat θ-).

εκ-πανθί Gen. 17:1 so almost always, but ευνόων Gen. 48:7.

νεκ-μανεκωσι Gen. 13:8 so always.

ἐτεκ-να- Gen. 15:2 but ἐτε-χξα- Ex. 4:13.

ἐτ-μωσιν twice Lev. 5:2 (Vat θ-) but ευμωσιν Num. 19:11
(= Vat).

κξα-/χξα- Gen. 37:8 in the same verse, in near-identical environ-
ment. True variation.

n.2).

ἐθνα εθον Χ Gen. 23:18, but:

ἐτ-πανακ Gen. 20:15.

ἐτ-νοσα Gen. 30:32.

ἐτ-νοσον Deut. 32:29.

Obs.

(1) Combinatory aspiration / non-aspiration variation is a prominent feature of B4 MSS.
In Bodmer III B4 John: ἐτνα- 5:24, ἐτροτεθ 6:11, ἐτοσθεθ 5:18, alongside
Hab. 2:6, ἐτρεθ- Jon. 4:6, but εἰσερθε- Na. 2:14, ἐτρα- Hab. 3:16, ἐπηντροθ-
Hab. 3:2, ἐτρηθ Mich. 5:13 vs. ἐθνα-, ἐθνασηθ, ἐθοσαθ: ἐσθοθ Hab. 2:6;
ἡμρήτ Zech. 9:15, but ἡμρήθ Zech. 9:7, 12:2; χξα- Hab. 1:14, ΠΝΟΝΜΠΝ Na.
1:3 but Φίθα Na. 2:12; ἐτμωσιι Hab. 1:6, ἐθεμεγ Hab. 1:6, ἐτθνωθ Am. 2:16,
ἐθαλαθί 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: τκκάρα, θοναος, θηριον, ενωξ,
ἐκμαηθικάλα, ικθθεθ, θκθικθικ, κετ, σκθφθ, ποθοθθεθ, δαραθ (final aspirates
only in PNs of this kind); Κραεγρα Ex. 27:3, Χαθπιρος Ex. 24:10,
ἀνθοφοθον Ex. 25:28; Ψονδωθομπάνθξ Gen. 41:45 violates several privilege and
compatibility rules. Sursds 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 allmorphs 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:

\[\text{mpiacebhs Gen. 18:23.}\]
\[\text{pexenipresigm onto m\={e}araaw Ex. 8:15.}\]
\[\text{nepesos mnic m\={e}araaw pe Gen. 40:20.}\]
\[\text{etem\={e}araaw an pe Gen. 47:2.}\]
\[\text{m\={e}rhi Gen. 18:11.}\]
\[\text{otmac m\={e}aempi Gen. 38:17.}\]
\[\text{-osmoi Gen. 27:23.}\]
\[\text{anok t\={w}ri m\={m}aepo\={n}a \div anok : p\={w}ri m\={m}eixa Gen. 24:24.}\]
\[\text{act m\={b}alla tecb\=wki naq eotegimi Gen. 30:4, sim. Gen. 20:14, 35:25 m\={b}alla n. relationis (= Vat).}\]

As against
\[\text{ganniu\={w} n\={b}aki Deut. 6:10 (= Vat).}\]

As against
(b) Delimitation.
\[\text{\={n}embon Deut. 31:17, \={n}emt\={o}n Ex. 35:2, 16:23 (=Vat),}\]

Non-syllabics never assimilate:
\[\text{s\={e}npk\={a}ri Lev. 22:33.}\]
\[\text{s\={a}tenf\={p}ro Gen. 18:10.}\]
\[\text{esph\={i} e\={s}ennonklaoc Ex. 7:29.}\]

Obs.
A nasal and a labial consonant in contact “will not be of contrasting localization” (cf. Rosén 1964:160ff.): 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. Τοιμίη έτακτική την θεός ακτήνη σενπιω- 

ους ... προι πετακεράλ μμοι αιστώμ.

Deut. 26:13f. Αιτοσβο ννη έθοταβ εβολ σενπανί ... μπι-

κω νεωι ιτεκεντολ οτορ μπιερεσωνω οτορ μπι-

οτώμ σεντοσκάγ.

Gen. 24:45 οτορ αμωπνη μπαζέκναιαζι.

Ex. 33:12 θεός δε μπεκταμοι εφη ετεκναοτρπντ νεμθι.

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.

• ετ — joining final consonant+sonant radical segmental sequence.

• zero — joining radical τ.

χατ Gen. 15:2.
ατ Gen. 34:30.
τωντ Gen. 31:35.
δεμτ Gen. 4:14, 12:13.
σοβετ Gen. 20:11.
ναμετ Gen. 32:11.
θομτ Gen. 47:29.
δολτ Gen. 28:20.
κολτ Gen. 31:26.

εοβετ Gen. 39:8 (Vat εοβήτ)- the shortening of a closed syllable?

Interesting cases where the morphematic vowel resolves structure and
distinguishes between zero and nil:

κοτ 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 Χ (laryngeal sonorant).

ερο-Ø Gen. 12:12.

ἐρο- Ø Gen. 38:16.

κενατανζο- Ø Gen. 12:12.

θεβιο-Ø Gen. 6:9.

πε-Ø: τεβωκι, νεζια, νεβαλ, πεζροζ, τεζταρια, πεαλοζ, νει καξ Gen. 3:16, 16:6:10, 24:17, Num. 5:21 etc.

μπε-Ø: μπεσωκι, μπεερ- Num. 5:19.


ἀρε-Ø: Pret. ἀρεερ-, ἀρεσωκι, ἀρεωβι 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:

ερε-Ø: Abs. Fut. ερεμικι, ερεμοτ† Gen. 16:11.

ἐρε-Ø: Circumst. ἐρετοβνοττ Num. 5:19.

νε-Ø prep. Gen. 30:15, Ex. 2:7.

τεραθενε-Ø Gen. 24:58 — special future morph, also Sahidic.

νεμε-Ø Gen. 20:10.


μματα† Gen. 39:9.

εοβη† Gen. 12:13.

ντοτ† Gen. 18:.6.

σελασωλι Num. 22:29 (Vat gefσωλ†).

(extra-corpus) θεο γωι Cat. 33.

Obs.

(1) Two other junctorially significant unit-final archimorphemes 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, pen-; sooben.

nści e7aXemn Num. 20:14 (= Vat).
Nentaton Ten Gen. 31:15.

nqenten Num. 20:5.

omkten 2wn Num. 16:34.

Kotten 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 qen-), but the allomorph -ehnot joins the prenominal state of verb lexemes and “inalienably possessed” nouns, including those grammaticalized in compound prepositions as a “noun grammeme”:


Matotbe-ehnot Gen. 34:2.

en-ehnot Gen. 50:24.

Aer-ehnot Lev. 26:33.

Mecte-ehnot Lev. 6:30.

Cotbe-ehnot Gen. 34:17.

etet-ehnot Lev. 26:25.

eti-ehnot Lev. 26:33.


Ezen-ehnot Lev. 26:9


On epeten(e) as the 2nd pl. base form for the Absolute-Definite Future e.g. Deut. 2:1, 6:9; Deut. 14:4 P epeten- (Vai epeten-), see Quecke 1986:353f., Funk 1992:20; on the “nominality” of enot54, see Steinhall and Misteli 1893:293.

(2) The three allomorphs — better: “allo-lexemic bases” of the dictionary entry twotn (“arise, get up”), in Bohairic of reflexive diathesis, are joined by a transitive homonym twotn “raise”, and an intransitive twotn + actantial 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: tun= by non-syllabic pronouns, twotn= by syllabic ones (Shisha-Haley 1977a):

Ten-ehnot Gen. 34:3.

Etwn Gen. 31:35.

Twnk Gen. 19:15.

Twni Gen. 21:18 (outside the corpus: Dan. (Bardelli) 7:5, Is. 51:9, 52:1, 51:17 Tattam).

Xtwotnot Gen. 18:16, Num. 2:9, 10:2, 26:9.

The exact semantic and formal spectrum of non-reflexive twotn 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 PAINTWOTN 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 **τωστον** much more broadly used, as yet another, inanalysable lexemic form. It represents a plural Imperative — uniquely marked! — in Athanasius of Qôs (BAUER 1972:186, 3); In the Bohairic Job and Psalms, **τωστον** and **τωστη εγίναμ** e- “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 **τωστον** 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. **κωστον** Dan. 1:4): Job 6:16:27, 16:5, 27:7.

4.4.7.1 The laryngal (Glottal Stop, ‘Ayin) 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.


(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 rigourously 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. KAHELE 1954:240ff., n.2).

(3) Compare the synchronic laryngal 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 syllabicity. The similarity to Coptic is striking: cf. (ROSEN 1962:50) “synchron-analytische feststellbare und sich ihrerseits in ein Phonem gruppierende Lauterscheinung...die historisch-komparativ einen Laryngal entschprechenden”. In fact, H.B. Rosen’s studies of the Greek and IE laryngals in the late nineteen-

---

55 ERMAN’s preference for Sahidic in 1915:181, an essay on juncture, stems from this dialect’s “having” the glottal stop, although it is, as a matter of fact, a dialect with relatively speaking rather poor reflexes of this dia-phoneme.
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 — ὠτάσσ-νε or τήμε-τε — 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: ἀλοξ, ἀλοσ (cf. ἡμόν, ἀρώμα), τάκο (cf. τόσσο), κανγ — within lexeme boundary, in lexemic scope. Note the form ὀ of the plural “definite” article adjoining this ἀ- (Polotsky 1968:245).

(b) Vocalization of ‘Ayin as [a]—colouring in median (pre-nominal and pronominal) final — lexeme-boundary status (pregrammemic): χα-, χασ.

(c) Realization as zero in final post-consonantal status (‘Ayin): μνηγ, τιάβ, ξωρ “scatter”, Φων “(over)turn”.

Obs.

(1) Φων (Sah. πων) has two sporadic by-forms, viz. Φων Deut. 31:18 Φένσ Deut. 7:4, 22:1, ετφονσ Deut. 32:5, Φων Ex. 32:25 corrected super lin. to Φων, ληφόνσ Num. 18:17 — and Φων Ἀ φόνσ Gen. 19:29 (Crum Dictionary 514f.). These may point to a final consonantal reflex of the ‘Ayin (Egyptian prf.: cf. ψων [sn'] and Νακι Sah. Νακε) — 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 πον, πων, Φων “flow, be poured” (pnn+pn) and πώνκ, πώνοκ, πωνογ “empty out, draw, bail water” (pk) is not entirely clear, although an Egyptian “Verschärfung” is not out of the question.

(2) ε 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): νεη (equivalent of Sah. να-管理和 Boh. ναι), μήε “love”, μεη “truth”, κοε “hair”, κοσε (sm3), κεε (q'h), περνηε “temple”, ωεη “shine” (vs. οε-Ω “go”), ραεηε “east” vs. ραεη “joy”, ζηε “fall”, εεη- τη-, ειε- of τοε “wash”.

(d) Vocalization of ‘Ayin as [i] in syllabic peak, in final lexemic boundary, in lexemic scope: ιωι “wash”; μωι “walk” qωι “hair”, ναι “(have) mercy” etc.

(e) Zero realization of the Glottal Stop in median final-lexeme-boundary status: ce-, co (cf. κετ-, κοτες).

(f) Vocalization of the morphematic Glottal Stop, second-person-feminine pronoun, as [i], following a lexeme- or grammeme-final consonant: τωον-ι (Gen. 21:18) Μματι (Gen. 39:9) Σελαω-ι (Num. 22:29, Vat Σελαωι, cf. Stern 1880 §342).

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 nexal 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 επ- 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; ἀβαδαν alone is as enigmatic in Bohairic as ἄβαν is in Sahidic, and the question of its precise nature is still pending.

Obs.
(2) ἀπεμι Deut. 8:5 and επξηνιοπ Num. 32:5:29 are two rare cases where native Egyptian infinitives are integrated by means of ἰπ, 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 παρθη, discussed above, privileged to occur in two disparate slots; or εξαπίνα as in Num. 4:20, 6:9 Ννοτι εξοντ εξαπίνα, or Deut. 17:4 ταξιμμί, which are wholly non-committal or indifferent as regards their form (unlike clause-initial καλως... vs. adjunctual ...νκαλως56, for which abundant formal information co-sig-

56 N- signalling the triply pertinent slot of adjunctal adverbiality, rhetoricity 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 γανάτοοςι... Deut. 28:67, adver-
bial form of the noun τοοςι.

As unambiguously adverbial as the banal Num. 6:10 ἁενπιε-
γοος... ἐχεινι, the case of Deut. 16:8 ἐνεγοος εκεοσωμ μτ-
εμιπ, and, even more strikingly, ἐνχοσ ρομπι 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 ϕιαγ-ι νοον πε ϕαι (= Vat), with
the whole clause presentationally or rather superordinatively57 adverbial,
by token of ϕαι (“for the 10th time”, “ten times”).

As pointed out above (Chapter Two, §2.2.1), the deriving auxiliary
ἐπ- also serves to accommodate adverbials in non-durative conjugation
environment:

Gen. 44:4 εταερεσβοι τε ντβακι...
Gen. 3:5 τετεναερμερφιντ νπαννοοτ.

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. Con-
version (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 anecdotically,
orally and in classroom discussion — from a technical morphosyntactic
shifter of the Durative Conjugation (“Bipartite”) agens 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 mecha-
nism 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 im-
plied in 1960. The part-of-speech approach is an application of the origi-
nal 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” (*ne* - *næ*) 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 juncutral gradience and type. The converters, and conversion, are primary exponents of subtextual unities and juncutral 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, adjectivischer, 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 *ne* - (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 verb, which, in a way strikingly similar to the Greek participle (member of a nominal rather than adverbial word-class), is always rhematically associated with another textual segment — noun, nexus or a more complex stretch of text — forming with it a predicative link union (cf. μετοχήν). It is thus a feature with extraordinarily important junctural implications. Its converbal 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 Praesens Indicativi saepissime exprimitur, adeo ut Praesens Indicativi 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 Aegyptiacae), in the Bibliotheca Angelica, Rome, now edited by Aufrère and Bossong (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 ἐρωτ- into the English Present Progressive). Peyron 1841:85 "Praesens et Participium Praesentis", with ἐτ- (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. I, 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) εψαγ-: no clear example in our corpus (with μπαγ- 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:

\[\text{ΜΜΟΝ- (Gen. 20:9, 30:1, Lev. 22:21, Num. 22:26, Deut. 8:15 etc.),}

neatly contrasted with the grammaticalized-formalized Circumstantial \[\text{ΕΜΜΟΝ “or else, otherwise” (e.g. Num. 20:18).}

A case like Gen. 47:4 ΜΜΟΝ-ΜΑΜΟΝΙ ΡΑΡ \[\text{ΨΟΠ} is instructive as to the role of \[\text{ΡΑΡ} in signalling a non-Circumstantial (thus non-zero, unconverted) homonym of zero conversion. \[\text{ΡΑΡ} is thus here a delimiter.

Circumstantial \[\text{Ν-...ΑΝ: Gen. 38:8, Num. 35:23 etc. etc. However, note the following extremely rare instances of \[\text{ΕΨ- ΑΝ}, all remarkable in one sense or another: Deut. 25:5 \[\text{ΝΝΕΤΧΩΜΙ ΜΗ ΕΤΑΨΜΟΤ \[\text{ΨΩΝΙ ΝΟΤΡΨΜΙ ΕΨΞΕΝΤ ΕΡΟΨ ΑΝ} (= Vat), which neutralizes adverbal-adjunctal and adnominal statuses (the Greek has here \[\text{ΔΝΩΡΙ ΜΗ \[\text{ΕΓΓΙΩΝΤΙ); similarly, Num. 9:13 \[\text{ΠΙΡΨΜΙ ΕΤΑΨΨΨΙ ΕΨΤΟΤ-ΨΗΝΟΤ ΟΤΡΨ ΕΨΞΕΝΤΨΨΨΨΙ ΕΝΑΨΟΤΗΡΩ ΑΝ} (\[\text{ΑΝ supra lin.; ΕΨΑ-} may be the adnominal circumstantial of the Focalizing Present; Vat \[\text{ΞΕΝΟΤΗΡΩ ΑΝ \[\text{ΕΨΤΟΤΗΡΩ}}; Deut. 22:2 \[\text{ΕΨΨΨΨΕΨ ΕΨΞΕΝΤ ΕΡΟΚ ΑΝ ΟΤΡΑΕ ΝΚΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΨPsi
Obs.
(1) Cf. Shisha-Halevy 1994:226ff. In ME, the negators n-, n- are often Circumstantial, especially in statements of non-existence: Sh.S. 148 t3 w3 n rh sw rmt, Sin. B 47 nfr...nn snnwf. This neutralization is almost coextensive with that of the opposition zero vs. jw.
(2) Non-zero Circumstantial before nasals, in B4 Bodmer III John ęmon, ęntate-
(John 9:4, 13:19:22) ęntate- (4:49), ence...an (13:38, 6:64): In the B4 (P. Vat.
copto 9) Twelve Prophets: ęmmonteq adnom. Zach. 9:11, ęmmon Hab. 2:19, 3:4
adnom., ęntateq Soph. 2:2, ęntator- Hag. 2:15, ęntator- Obd. 17 adnom.,
ęntiq- Hag. 2:3 adnom.
(3) Note in Exodus an instance of textual zeroing: 16:3 ęgontęmci (e and an added
supra lin., but Vat too has ęgontęmci).
(4) Note Ex. 10:11 ęmpəři= an as a relatively autonomous dialogic utterance: negative-adverb "not so".

(d) ępe-ọson- is rare in the corpus, but usual in Nitrian and common in NT and OT. This is a juncturally fascinating prenominal alternant of the Circumstantial of the adverb-Rheme Durative pattern, with a typically prenominal allomorph of the converter selected across the ọson 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 ọson, as a "phantom partition". All Themes and Existants are indefinite (ọ-., ęan-., ę):

Ex. 39:23 ęhec de nęwənn načəntęcmtę ęq少年 ęnəəə nəwənt ępeọson-ọscəbi nətəsov kətę ęqec (= Vat). The next exx. are all adnominal, with prepositional Rhemes:

Lev. 21:19 ọtraq ępeọson-ọtəəəm ęlətq (= Vat).
Lev. 21:20 ọtraq ępeọson-ọtəəəra ęnəpəion ęlətq (= Vat).

Deut. 10:7 ọtqasi ępeọson-ęanəọntəəəem ęlətq (Vat ęọson).

These are opposed to ę-ọson-, which appears to be rare in Nitrian outside existential statements:

Lev. 23:17 ętəəətət ęọsonəmepənt ęməmət.

The existential nape-ọson in Gen. 40:10 nape-ọson-ę nəmaq
pe (Vat ne-ọson), vs. Gen. 40:9 nape-ọson-ọtəəə ęnəloəi əx ęmpəmətən pe, is an analogue construction with ne- conversion (to my knowledge, neither Focalizing Conversion nor Relative conversion occur in this construction). ępe-əmən- 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, aducing NT examples; the Themes
attested are ọ-, ęnotętęt only. In Nitrian, where this form must yet be studied, there cer-
tainty 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 ὅσον-, or with the negative ἡμον- in any function (yet another point of affirmative/negative asymmetry!). The Themes are indefinite (not zero-determined?). ὅσον- is attested, but is rarer in Nitrian (e.g. AM I 134, Cat. 104).

(2) For the possible diachronic precedent of ἐρε-ὁσον, namely LE ἸΡ-᾿, see SHISHAHALEVY 1981:326; cf. Spiegelberg, ᾄΖ 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 ωμι + rhematic Circumstantial, since, in view of the formal/functional sequelling effect of the Absolute-Definite Future (see Chapter One above). “Circumstantial (adnexual) dependence” semantics alone cannot suffice to establish a formal Circumstantial marking:

Ex. 28:35 οὗτος ἐρεδωμί νὰ-ἀρῳ ξένηνερεφεμε-μωί ἐτεκωτεμ ἐτεκυμή ἐφηνοτε ἐξοτν... (= Vat; Greek ἑσται Αρων... ἀκουσθῇ ἢ φωνῇ αὐτοῦ).

Lev. 23:7 ἐφηνοτεμ ἐστεμοτν ἐρον θε-ξονατ (= Vat; Greek ἡ ημέρα ἢ πρώτη κλητῇ ἀγία ἑσται ὑμῖν).

Lev. 25:6 οὗτος ἐφηνοτεμ νὰ-νιγένημα ντεπικαρι εκε-τομοτ... (= Vat; Greek ἑσται... βρώματά σοι).

Gen. 1:6 οὗτος ντεφωμί εφεβωρά εβολ ὅστε μωτο νεμ οτμοτ (= Vat; Greek ἑστω διαχωρίζον).

Two instances of the periphrastic ωμι eke- + Stative, hitherto considered agrammatical in Coptic (cf. however WINAND 1996 for LE):

Deut. 28:29 εκεφωμί εκκαμμεμ... οὗτος εκεφωμί εκεσ-

hοτ (Vat ek-; Greek ἑση + Pres. Part.).

Ex. 34:2 ωμι εκεεβτωτ (Vat. ek-; P emended by FUNK 1992).

⁵⁹ In this corpus, the graphematic distinction is found of ἸΚ- vs. Ἰ- for respectively the pertinent vs. formal or conditioned Circumstantial (e.g. following ἦπρ).
Probable instances:
Lev. 25:46 ὦσον εἰρέμων ἐν τῷ ἐρετεναιμίῳ τοῦ ἱματι[ο]ν... (cf. Andersson 1904:64f.; Greek ἤσονται ὑμῖν κατόχους).
Deut. 20:8 ὦσον εἰρεταιιτωσ τὸ ὧδε-νικάττεν εἰρεταιιτι διπλακός (Greek infinitive).
Deut. 8:9 ὦσκάρι εἰνεψτωνι μηνηππί νεφε δικάζει νοσςοτε εβολ γενέτων.
Num. 9:22 εἰρεταιιτ ὧδε-ιερουσ εἰερεταίνι εδωκεν ὧδε-ἀριππί (Greek πλεοναζούσης σκιαζούσης).

4.5.1.2 Syntactic slotting: the adnomal Circumstantial — adnominal, adverbial, adclausal

(a) Adnominal

Nucleus specificity. The crux of the adnominal Circumstantial is no doubt the conventional view of the Circumstantial as essentially compatible only with non-specific ("indefinite") nuclei (Gen. 21:19 μωσεν εφονι; Ex. 30:7 ωρεθνονις εφοικτ, Ex. 18:21 γανρωμι νεμνιε εφοικτ εντετρεγιπ), 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 γράμμη εις ησάτα περιον εφοικτ.
Lev. 14:52 νεμ πικοκκινον εφεκτ (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 Particp mitunter seine attributive Bedeutung aufgiebt und dann nur die Rolle eines erklärenden Nebensatzes spielt".

Deut. 14:4, Lev. 11:2 ΝΑΙ ΝΕ ΝΙΤΕΒΝΜΩΝΙ ΕΡΕΤΕΝΕΟΥΜΟΝ (Andersson 1904:134f. emends to ετετεν-).
Lev. 18:9 ννεκσωμεν εβολ μπωπτι ντετεκκωνι νωνιστε ιε νωνιστε εταμακοτ νόσον ιε εταμακοτ μβολ.
Deut. 22:27 τεσιμπο ειροπε νεωκ Vat (P has here τ- ετατ-; 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-
clexus 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 ἀκώναντι εἶναι μπεκον ιε πεμάκι εισεχεί γειμωτ.

Num. 22:23 άκναν τάξι-τελω επιαγμελος ... εφοργι ερατη γηπεμωτ οτοι τεχφοι επεκκαμένον σεντεξιά.

Gen. 6:16 εκεβαμίο ιπτκβωτοσ εκσοτητ εκσοτη.

Ex. 19:9 γινα ντεπιαλσος εωτεμ εροι εικαζι 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 one60.

However, demonstrative-nucleus cases like

Lev. 26:36 νη εκεβωαδν μεφρήν σοτπολεμος μμον-πετ-

σοι χικυμωτ Vat (P έτατ-, 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 πίμα or Φ-

ρήν61.

The Circumstantial alternates with η- (an equally looser link, an

adnexal nota relationis), following the indefinite article:

Lev. 21:7 οτσεμι μπορνη οτογ επκοσ.

Obs.

(1) The conventional confusion of the functional “attributive” with the formal “adnominal” (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 “adnexital” status is sharply demarcated, and generally clear. “Satznachtrag” (see MÜLLER-LANCE 1994:110ff. on absolute constructions — “between coordination and subordination”, 72ff.) is not entirely satisfactory, since it wants the predicativity (rhematistic) 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 SELBER 1997:130ff., as does in this regard Celtic and in particular Irish syntax (HAMP 1973): agus typically converts in Modern Irish statal-existential nexus adnexally, in adnominal, adverbial or adclausal status, very differently from temporal or other “conjunctional” adverbial clauses.

60 Consider (Cat 37) καζι ηιβεν ετωοειτ ερενιφμι κακοτον.
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 restrictedly, as “nicht adnominal” — I believe both adnominal, adverbal and adclausal statuses are compatible with the special adjoined “shared” rhematicity (the μετοχή-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 ἀνά- (see Chapter One for narrative focussing, and cf. the rhematic Relative in Lambrécht 2000); see Chapter Two for ἀνά- and εἰς-following Presentatives. The Circumstantial enters paradigmatic opposition with another rhematic converse, namely the Conjunctive (see Stern 1880 §440 and Shisha-Halevy 1986a Chapter Seven).

(3) Along with οἵνανος (once in Oxyrhynchite, Mt. 11:30 ed. Schenke) and οἰ- εἰς- (see Schenke 1996:100ff.) we encounter the no less instructive Sahidic πε- and τε- εἰς- 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 οἰς- οἴσος εἰς- (Ps. 69:6) which alternates with οἰς- οἴσος εἰς- (Ps. 68:30, 85:10), always Rheme of Nominal Sentence.

(b) Adverbal, ad-clausal or “ad-textual” cases. The Circumstantial rhematically adjoins 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-nexal complex, in which two rhemes coalesce to form a union of predicates: this is the real sense of the Greek μετοχή (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 context — the adjunction of action or state — that this converse 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:

εἰς- (Greek Pres. part., καὶ + Pres.).

εἰς-ω μοι “saying” following verba dicendi in the broadest sense: Ex. 18:6, Num. 24:12 and passim (always Greek-induced: λέγον etc.).

⁶² Cf. Lohmann 1965:224f.; the Coptic Circumstantial is a finite, analytic converse.
Deut. 4:34 ὡβ νῖβεν ἑταχαίτωτ ... ἡπεκμεθο εκνατ. 
Ex. 28:35 εὐεκστείμεν εὐεκσμη εὐνύον εὐστιν επεθυγ- 
αβ ... ἡμε εὐνύον εὐβαλ...

Lev. 26:13 ὕμ εὐαρένην ἅν ἐβολ ... ἐτετενοί μβωκ.
Ex. 1:18 παρῳβ οὐ πε εταρετεναιρ ερετεναιρ ἡν- 
γῶστ.

 Neck- an: adjunctal only (Greek οὐκ + part.).
Num. 35:23 ὅνι νῖβεν ὕμ εὐεκναμοσ χιότι χεκει ἁποτ.

ε- + Nominal Sentence or Cleft Sentence: relatively uncommon (only delocutive and naming NS):

Lev. 4:21 μἡρήτ ἐταξρωκὴ μπιμαί κτευορὰ ἐθαορ-
νοβὶ κτευτστασγῳ νέα.
Gen. 35:29 αἴμοσ αἱκα χεκενεκεγενος εοτζελλο νέα
ἐβολ ἃνγανεκοφ.
Gen. 38:2 αἴματ ᾠκὰ ... ἐτσερ πολτρομι ἥντανεγονο
ἐπεκαν πε νάνα.

eωσον-/μμον-, εωσονταγ/μμονταγ (Greek Relative, con-
journal -τὸς participle, main clause).

Lev. 2:11 χεκενεκαμιῶνοτ εοσον εωσον-κεκεμνχ ννωτ.
Lev. 22:21 ἐβολ ῥεπ νείγῳ ντε ἐβολ ἃνεικεκωτο
μμον-αἰτι νείγτον.
Num. 22:26 ὅρα με εὐεκδβα μμον-ρήτ ἐρικε εοτοῖα
ἐκπαρ.

eακ- (Greek part. Aor. or Perf.; less usually, finite Aorist with par-
ticiple corresonding to a Coptic unconverted verb). No narrative sequential
eακ- in the corpus.
Gen. 34:7 αὐρωβ ναιπι αἄιιρ πέε-κειστ ἁπεπτελ
κτοτ νεῖγο νικποβ.
Gen. 15:15 ἐκαθενακ χακενιοτ ἁδοταρπνμην εὐα-
νωτσικ χεκενεκεστελλο ἁνανε.
Lev. 6:10 ἁννακακτρεκ εαοδισμενχ — ἁακ- object actant
or "adverbal" of ἁοδισεκ (SHISHA HALLEY 1975, 1976).
Lev. 22:32f. ἁνοκ πε πκτοτβο κκωτεν εἰκε-
νηην οτ ἐβολ ἁπεπταρι ηνημι...
Ex. 16:3 ἁμοι ενεκαμοτ πε ἁεκενμι εαντεργοτ ἐβολ
ἂτεπτστ.
Num. 22:30 μη ἁδοταρπνο αὐτοπο κκοκ εαπτι ηνα
μπάρητ.


**CHAPTER FOUR**

**μπατεφ-** (mostly narrative) (Greek προ του + inf.; forms of χρο-

**νιζεν + inf.).**

Gen. 19:3f. άτοστωμ μπατονκοτ + οτοσ...

Gen. 13:10 νεωώστεω πε μπατεφ† ρωότ νεωόσα τε

Gen. 13:10 νεωώστεω πε μπατεφ† ρωότ νεωόσα τε

Gen. 50:16 πεινώτ απαρκον μπατεφμοτ εχώω μικο

Gen. 41:50 ίσωντι δε αφηρι ө ωμε ματονι νάε-†-ί

Νεομπι ιγκο...

Ex. 12:34 αφι δε νάε-πιλασπε μπατονσίωσε-

ΜΗΡ νάε-νοσοσωσε.  

Deut. 23:22 ΝΝΕΚΩΣΚ ΜΠΑΤΕΚΤΗΣ.

εχνα- (Greek δτί + pres., ἡνίκα (όν + pres., ἢν το + inf., ώ ον +  

Gen. 31:20 ...εψτεμταμοε χναχωνας.

Gen. 35:1 γη ετασιοσνηρ εροκ εκναψωτ εβολ...

Ex. 28:43 εψεωστον νάε-λαρων τε

Nεωρι τενκρηι;

Lev. 10:9 οσρι τε με νοσεξερνε νηνενωσον ... ερετε-

νασε εχοτν τενκρη...

Num. 28:8 εκειαν ερεοσοι νασωπι — cf. Num. 9:11  
ερεοσοι νασωπι εχειν, with a different information structure.

(c) A juncturally interesting slot: the Circumstantial adnexal to the  
Nominal Sentence or Cleft Sentence. This does not imply overlap of the  
adnominal/adverbial status opposition:

Gen. 24:1 άρασαμ νεοσίζελλο πε εαγχαι ζεννεοφροσυ

Deut. 5:9f. ανοκ πε ... οτνοτ† νεχροφ εχφεβιω ννι-

νοβι τεννιοτ† εζεννισρι ... εχοφ ειρι νοσαι φα-

ζανψο νάωςο... — note the different standing of the two Circum-

stantialstials, both adnominal, a difference carried by the distinction in  
linkage.

Gen. 20:10 οτ πε εακνατ εροφ εακεφχαι — the first Circum-

stantial is topical in the CS; the second adnexal.

Gen. 20:3 θατ τε εχωπν τε νοσαι.

Gen. 31:38 ναικ ΝΟΜΠΙ ΝΕ ΕΙΧΗ ΝΕΜΑΚ — the Circumstantial  
adnexal to “these twenty years”.

Deut. 14:21 ΝΕΟΚ ΩΛΑΣΟΕ ΕΨΟΤΑΒ — Circumstantial adnominal  
to Rheme.
(d) Adnominal / adverbal status truly overlapping (indefinite nucleus) — uncommon:

Deut. 25:5 ἐσφαὶ εἰσον-γανενός ψωπ γιοταὶ ὀροφ ἥτεοτα μος ἄμοντεψξροξ μμας (Greek στέρμα δὲ μὴ ἢν αὐτῶ).

Deut. 23:16 ννεκτ ὅνεβσκ ετοτα μπεψβε εαψβετ ερακ (Greek Relative).

(e) The Circumstantial as a special rhematic-actant form ("predicative complement").

(1) The grammaticalized ὁμαὶ with the no-less grammaticalized Circumstantial Present, always affirmative, periphrastically and suppletively enables the Stative or the Dynamic Converb in certain tense categories (the narrative Preterite, the imperative, the Jussive, the Present-based ἃ- 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 actor expression or another pronominal segment of the Circumstantial may be either a conditioned link (e.g. ἐρεψωμπι ἔρ-), or a pertinent delimiter accompanied by a referential anaphoric link (e.g. Gen. 17:1 ὁμαὶ ἦμον-ἀρικι σι ἔροκ). 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 nota relationis introducing and marking a rhematic determinator phrase: Gen. 44:10 ἐρεψωμπι ἅτι ννα ὅνεβᾶς (sim. Ex. 30:21).

Note, in the following illustration, cases of the 3rd plural actor, Dynamic Converb and object as suppletive Statives (thus in fact double suppletion); also the use of the copular ὁι ὅ-, where the Circumstantial ὅ Stative is opposed to zero (i.e. to ὁμαὶ ὅ-).

Gen. 21:11 ἄπιακαὶ ὁε ὁμαὶ ἐριαῶτ μπεμβο ὅνβαςαμ.
Num. 16:16 ὁμαὶ ἐρετενςετωτ.

Gen. 17:1 ὁμαὶ ἦμον-ἀρικι σι ἔροκ.

Lev. 11:36 σεσαςίμ ετογ ἕρεψωμπι ὅντα ἕτσαςίμ.
Num. 14:33 ἑτσενῳπι ἕρεψωμπι εβομονι ἁμωσ ὅπ-

ωμηε...
Gen. 41:36 οτι τι πνευματι νανειρυνοι ελεγχει ερμοτ — here and in the next example, τι = τι, the latter replacing the non-existent morphological Stative.

Num. 14:33 ενευματι επομον ημωτι ζιπωαε.

Ex. 25:20 ενευματι ηπειρηστικ εφονστενης ηφω υβολ ... οτι ερεπονδρ ζωοντ εδοσ εφουννουρφων — a noteworthy case of “inalienable-possession” dependence of the Circumstantial actants with the actant of the auxiliary (and nucleus base): discontinuous -παντα- and -παντα-

Gen. 43:9 οτι ενευματι εινι πρεπερνοπί.

Deut. 28:29 εγκευματι εκαζομεθεμ μμερι.

Gen. 4:12 εγκευματι εκμισομ.

Ex. 33:16 πωκ ενευματι εκονγον ηβολ ιντανμη ηδαι- γιμι πονγιοντι ναππακ.

Lev. 10:19 ημι πνευματι επαγαναθ μπατ.

Cases of the Circumstantial Absolute-Definite Future complementing υμπτι (see above, 4.5.1.1 [ε]). This υμπτι εγκ- _CSR_grammatical occurs almost only with an Absolute Future nucleus, which makes it a regular, if not predictable combinatorial pattern:

Gen. 1:6 οτι κατευματι κατευμπρα αιμοντι οτι αιμωτ = (Vat).

Ex. 28:35 οτι κατευματι ηπειρηστι ηππαζινεπεργωμωμωι κατευωεμ ετερκμεν εφηνοε ζωον ... (Vat εκαζωεμ).

Lev. 23:7 κατευματι ημεντ ετεμοντι κατορι ερομ απονοε (= Vat).

Lev. 25:6 οτι κατευματι ηπειρησκαμ ντεπικρακ εκα- 

ομοντομ ... (= Vat).

The following two remarkable cases are not properly speaking suppletive, but still periphrastic constructions for complex verbal categories:

Ex. 33:13 ποπωκ καταματι εδαιγιμι πονγιοντι ναππακ combines the Conjunctive with the rhematic Preterite, for a “Future Perfect” complex tense.

Ex. 19:19 καταματι γε ηπειρησκαμ ἀνθεγιοιφιοκες εκ- 

αμωμωι ετημ (Greek εγίνετο ...προσπάντος) - a special augmentative Aktionsart in Narrative Evolution Mode (Chapter One).

(2) The grammaticalized “descriptive verbs of incomplete predication” (Curme), are illustrated here by οτι:
In Dialogue: ὡς + 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 ἔφορος εἰκώς ἡμεριάζῃ “have done”: (Greek ἔως τοῦ λαλῆσαι με).

Gen. 43:23 ἔφορος εἰς μοὺ (Greek ἀπέχω).

Num. 32:19 ἄνασσα εν ἡμέρα οἰνοκλαθρος (Greek ἀπέχομεν).

In Narrative: ὡς + Circumstantial Present: “finish, cease”: Greek (κατὰ πάυσιν + participle.


Narrative κὴν + Circumstantial Present is semantically distinct from ὡς (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 ἁκὺν ἃ εἴασα ἡμέρα (Greek συνε-

τελέσεν λαλῶν).

All other attestations of this verb in the corpus are of a different — valency construction (and render different Greek verbs):

Gen. 30:15 κὴν ἃν + ἐε-ἀρεὶλα μπαζα... (Greek οὐχ ἵκανὸν σοι).

Ex. 31:17 ἀντιπρόσωπος μμαζ-ε ἁκὐν ὀσοφ ἁκμέτον μμοψ (Greek ἐπαύσατο).

Deut. 3:26 κὴν ἔροκ μπερ- (Greek ἰκανούσθω σοι).

(3) The Circumstantial adnexal to the object actant — a third, rhematic, verbal actant. Juncturally, beside sharing in the usual close valency-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 Circumstantial in nexus Theme-Rheme juncture — the second nexus juncture in this complex JDF. Some representative instances:

.swapem: Num. 11:10 ὰτοφ ὡς ὄσωτος ἐρωτὺς εὐρίμι.

Ex. 19:9 γίνα ντεπιλαςσος σωτέρμ εποι εἰς ἡμέρα σεμακ.

ΝΑΣ: Deut. 22:4 ἀκωάνατο ΕΦΙΩ ΜΠΕΚΩΝ ΙΕ-ΠΕΡΜΑΣΙ εἰς ἡμέρα εἰς ἡμέρα.
Gen. 26:8 ἀφισθητ ... ἀνάπει εἰςακ ἐνεῳ ΝΕ-ΒΕΚΚΑ.
24:2, 44:31.
Num. 22:23 αἰνάν ΝΔΕ-†ΕΩ εἰπαγελος ... έφωρι ερατι
γίμιμοι τοῖς τεχνηι ἐκεῖκεμ ΣΕΝΤΕΓΧΙΖ.
†-ΜΑ† Ex. 23:4 ΑΚΛΑΝΤΜΑ† ετεγε μπέκεξαί ΙΕ-ΠΕΙΙΩ
ΕΥΣΟΡΕΜ...
ΧΩ Gen. 15:2 ΑΝΟΚ ΕΣΕΗΑΤ ΕΒΟΛ ΕΙΟΙ ΝΑΣΗΠΙ — Bo-
hairic seems to prefer the copular verbal periphrase to the direct immediate
(N-)-rhetorical adjunct.
ΘΑΜΙΟ Gen. 6:16 ΕΚΕΘΑΜΙΟ ΝΕΚΤΑΒΩΤΟΣ ΕΣΕΟΤΗΤ ΕΣΟΤΩN.
Of course, cases of third N-/E-actant are structurally similar in junc-
ture (see Chapter Three, §3.2(d)):
Gen. 12:2 ΕΙΕΙΑΚ ΕΟΣΝΙΨΤ ΝΕΛΟΛ.
Ex. 32:4 ΑΡΕΑΜΙΟΥ ΝΟΜΜΑΙ ΝΟΧΩΤΕ.
Note the absence of N- when the rhetorical complement is preposed:
Gen. 6:16 ΓΑΝΗΠΙ ΝΔΕ Β ΝΕΜ Η ΝΔΕ ΕΚΕΘΑΜΙΟC.

(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
adnaxal or rhetorical, but a topical premodifier to subsequent text, defin-
ing (as initial constituent) a pattern in which a clause or clausal complex
is high-level rhetorical, in naxal 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 ΕΨΤΩΒΕ ΕΔΩΚ ΕΚΕΨΝΗ.
Num. 16:13 ΕΚΟΙ ΝΑΡΧΨΝ ΕΡΩΝ ΝΕΟΚ-ΟΤΑΡΧΨΝ.
Gen. 15:12 ΕΡΕΦΡΗ ΝΑΓΩΤΠ ΟΣΤΩΜΤ ΑΙΙ ΕΔΝΑΒΡΑΝ.
Ex. 33:22 ΕΨΝΑΙΝΙ ΝΔΕ-ΠΑΨΟΥΕ ΕΪΕΙΑΚ ΣΕΝΟΥΧΟΛ ΝΤΕ†-
ΠΕΤΡΑ.
Num. 9:11 ΕΡΕΡΟΤΖΙ ΝΑΣΩΝΙ ΕΣΕΛΙΩ.
Gen. 48:7 ΑΝΟΚ ΑΕ ΕΙΝΗΟΤ ΕΒΟΛ ΣΕΝΤΗΜΕΟΝΤΟΜΙΑ...
ΑΣΜΟΥ ΝΔΕ-ΡΑΧΗΛ...
Lev. 20:12 ΕΣΑΡΕΡΣΕΒΗΣ ΓΑΡ ΟΤΟΝ ΕΡΨΟΤ.
Gen. 44:4 ΕΣΑΡΕΡΣΑΒΟΛ ΑΕ ΝΕΒΑΚΙ ΜΠΑΤΟΤΟΤΕΙ ΕΒΟΛ
ΝΕΔΕ-ΙΩΝΗΦ...
(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:

\[ \text{εὐωπ} + \]
\[ \text{επ-} \text{ Ex. 12:14.} \]
\[ \text{ἐκα-} \text{ Lev. 1:14, 2:4:14, 7:12.} \]
\[ \text{ἐξ-} \text{ Lev. 3:1, 7:18 — } \text{ἐξωτερικός} \text{ ἑπετερικός} \text{ here constitutes a closely-linked Tautological-Infinitive-type focalizing construction; Lev. 13:9.} \]
\[ \text{εὐκς/ετι} \text{ επ-} \text{ Gen. 29:6:9, 44:14, Deut. 31:27, Ex. 34:29.} \]
\[ \text{ετοε} \text{ επ-} \text{ Gen. 24:11, 42:21, 45:1, Num. 33:40.} \]
\[ [\text{εταε} \text{ Gen. 24:29, Num. 33:39, Deut. 9:23].} \]
\[ \text{ιελο} \text{ μποτο-} \text{ Ex. 1:19.} \]

(h) Likewise, the Circumstantial, "vested" and partitioned off, features in the adverbial paradigm following foregrounding-delimiting \text{εὐωπ} in Narrative Evolution Mode (see above, Chapter One, §1.1.5 [b]):

\[ \text{εὐωπ} \text{ επ-} \text{ Gen. 39:10} \]
\[ \text{ἐκα-} \text{ Gen. 35:17f., 38:27} \]

\[ \text{ετα- e.g.} \text{ Gen. 12:11, 20:3} \]

\[ \text{ιελο} \text{ μποτο-} \text{ a-} \text{ Gen. 7:10, 8:6:13, 12:14, 14:1} \]

(i) The adverbial-adjunct Circumstantial is juncturally 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:

\[ \text{ἐκωκφ} \text{ "round about" (Gen. 23:17, Ex. 19:12, 25:11:24, Lev. 8:15, Num. 14:12, 35:2 etc.).} \]
\[ \text{επρακι} \text{ Lev. 26:24 ειεμοωι} \text{ nemωτε} \text{ ζενοτων} \text{ επ-} \text{ρακι.} \]
Obs.

(1) See Shisha-Halevy 1975, Layton 2004 §425. Additional Bohairic exx.: eq-
γολάκ “sweetly”, Prov. 3:24, Mark 7:10:35 ἦν ετναξαί eqρωτ, Ναξαί... eq-
cοττών; also 9:39.

(2) This feature may be as early as Late Egyptian (Circumstantial sdm.f): D’Orb. 8,1 ...
h r nβύτ n b 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 adverbial. 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
advverbial-adjunct Circumstantial is not clear, but one factor common to
both is the adverbial 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 ηνετοντων εβολ ηντων εφοτωτ οτα έι-
φοι ηνετοντων.

Deut. 18:10f. ηνοταζίμιοι ηντακ.

εφορο μπερκυρι ε ε τεψερε εκιν ηνετοντω
ιε εφωνι ηνίωθεν
εφκακονιζεθε εφχεματσ
οτα εφήφαζει ηνικ
οτα εφεβεν
οτα εφοτω σεβολ ηνεθενς
οτα εφθωτ ηζαμμηνι
οτα εφωνι ηλιήφιμων.

Obs.

(1) See Shisha-Halevy 1976. Add Pistis Sophia 235.4 έι εφεσικλ, NHC VII 74., in
Proper-Name status. For Bohairic, cf. also Apoc. 2:15 οτον-ντακ μια έκφαμοι.
(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 έκιμην glossing
ληγατον. The Scala Magna (BM Or. 8780 f. 73vo) reads έρων εβολ σαριν; in other
Scalae such as BM Or. 8775 we find the feminine έκριμι bακια “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 Νηγκογι εθονωτ.
Ex. 12:4 ΝΗ εουενηπη.

And perhaps also the rare cases of substantival ετ- (Present or Fu-
ture), not πετ- or ΦΗ ετ-:

Deut. 21:17 Φαι ταρκη ητεεπωηηπι πε οηηρ ετεηςε ναη
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 οθαλω ητεεφι πε ετεηςαπωηοι οτηθοτ Μπε
(Vat. ετεηςατωηη — 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 ...αν): Deut. 1:39 ΦΗ ετεηςαωοθον αυ ητοοτ
νοηαθον εε οτηεεθοοτ: 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 rheumatic 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 Circumsantsial 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” Circumsstantial 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 Φαίγωμεν ουτος εταρκετάνως calls for special observation; the Greek τι το πράγμα τούτο δ ἐποίησενε 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 ετ-: see above (cf. Andersson 1904:1f.).

(b) The Preterite or generic-tense Relative-pronoun base (not converter?) ερ-, attested in older MSS (B4) as well as in many other dialects, does not occur in our corpus.

(c) The converter form in ετε-ναςτητξ or ετε-εναςτητξ 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 ντα-, in a Cleft Sentence: πτόειν/εταρκετάνων Ex. 16:6 (ν crossed out, ε above line). Cf. (?) γαντότι- for the normal γαντοτι- 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 αρ-ε ("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 Φη ετε-πινη φων πε.
Deut. 2:25 Νή ετε-αρκετωμεν επεκραν ετεωροπερεφ64.


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-τετεσποράς τετεσπέ τε.

Obs.
The Bohairic Relative converter is famous for its extraordinary open juncture with its conjugation form, allowing the interpolation of premodifying topical adverbials, topicalizing extrapolation and the (essentially and prosodically different) Augens. However, for a reason not clear to me, this occurs almost only with substantivized (Φην έτ-, Φαι έτ-) Relative clauses, see POLOTSKY 1987:93ff. and above, §4.2 (boundaries c19-c20):
I Cor. 8:10 Φην έτε οὐ οὕτως πιστεύως Τετεν-ερμοπη φύτευν εἰκονεῖ, ἀλλὰ πιστεύως Τετεν-ερμοπη φύτευν εἰκονεῖ, ἀλλὰ πιστεύως Τετεν-ερμοπη φύτευν εἰκονεῖ.
Eph. 3:12 Φαι έτε-ναρίας ήνθας άνσι μπορώντως εβολ...
Eph. 2:3 ΝΗ έτε-ανόν θρόνον πανομοί πάνην έν ζοντένον.
Heb. 5:11 Φαι έτε-εβοβητώ οπνώς αναν πε πισκαί.
II Thess. 2:9 Φην έτε-πεδίναν εψε θανατικά μεσονεργεία Τετεν-ερμοπη πατανάκ — 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 ΦΗ έτε καλως τετεν-
It would indeed seem that the juncture contour of substantivized Relatives is distinctive (cf. Φην ΝΙΒΕΝ έτ-). 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: Φην εοβε- (Lev. 4:34 etc.) may be associated with the adverbial-Rheme Nominal-Sentence conversion of έτε-εοβε- άν, έτε-εβολ άν ΝΗ έσεν- (Lev. 9:10, Num. 17:5, Deut. 20:15).

(h) έτε-νάκ- (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 νακ- 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 νακ-, for its part, resembles νακ- as regards Relative conversion. Both έτε-νακ- [Lev. 4:35] and ε-νακ- [Num. 31:23] are attested; diachronically, both have formal and/or functional affinities with the Emphatic, the ancestor of the Focalizing Conversion; even the a-vo-calization is here significant.

(i) Conversion of the negative Durative Conjugation forms shows three constructions, differing in their junctural profile:
(1) Φην έτεκνα- άν (on the zero ... άν negator basis, i.e. έτε-Θ-κνα-... άν, Gen. 17:14, Deut. 1:39, 18:19, 25:9).
(2) εταυη(να)- ἄν (the n-... ἄν negator basis — Lev. 23:29, Deut. 27:26, 29:15, 31:13).

(3) ετ- ἄν (the ... ἄν negator basis): Stative Rheme only. Less common? (Deut. 28:61).

(j) The case of εταη-: a brief observation. This unique instance of multiple homonymy is typically Bohairic. Its resolution is entirely structural-syntactic — indeed, it is mainly junctural, for the Temporal εταη- 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 εταη- that exceed this simple distribution:

(1) Cases of syntagmatic compatibility like Deut. 29:25 ἁδαιδηνη κνεπσε ... ηθ εταηγεμνηθε νεμ νονηοτ']+ εταηγενοτ εβολ βενπκαζι νχημι hint at the categorial disparity of the adverbial-adjunctual εταη-, which is adjoined to the Relative in close narrative linkage. (Incidentally, εταη- does not express temporal anteriority or contemporaneousness, but only the narrative juxtaposition of actions).

(2) A case like Deut. 22:16 αιθηιτι μπαιρωμι εζηκιι εταημεστως ἄνοι (= Vat) can hardly have relative εταη- 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 μδ μωτηθιε μμαιατη εταπσε εαξι νεμαq μη μπεηκαζι νεμαν άνον 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 εταη- group concludes and juncturally closes the pattern.

(4) In a case like Gen. 6:7 ειεκετ-πιρωμι εβολ εταηθαμιοιq εβολ εα πνο μπκαζι (which closely follows the Greek sequencing: the Greek has here a Relative clause), we actually have a neutralization of adnominal/adjunctal status, and εταη- may well be an adverbial "(after) having creating him"; it must be remembered that adverbial or adclausal εαq- is here extremely rare, so rare as to render its opposition with εταη- (so important in Sahidic) virtually void.

(5) Similarly, an adverbial slot is clearly indicated in a case with no initial nominal constituent, such as Gen. 21:5 οτογ αβραμ ναξηθ κενπ ιπομμη πε εταημασιαακ πεκωηη ι ναq. Again, this is
not an "after" clause, but the overlay of narrative eventing. It is the converses — μενενεκαθορεψ-, ἰηνακτινοθορεψ- — 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 (ἐ-νταγ-, ηταγ-: cf. POLOTSKY 1960:398, §11 Obs., and POLOTSKY 1957:232, 1964:252; SHISHA-HALEVY 1986a:66f. §2.1.1.2). I expect a sensitive sifting of ηταγ- examples, Nitrian and Scriptural, will yield instances, adnominal and adverbial, of this old Egyptian combination (actually a conversion of the whole focalizing construction), attested also in the Present and ηα- Future. (See above, number [2]).

(7) Unambiguously Temporal — that is, quintessentially adverbial — is ηταγ- in the following narrative configurations. Here, the exact relative temporality is expressed by the elements in combination with ηταγ-:

άρωμι (ας) ηταγ- Gen. 6:1, 11:2, etc.
μενενεκα- ηταγ- Ex. 34:33.
γοτε/γως (ας) ηταγ- Gen. 38:5:29, 24:30, 2:4, etc.
(ὁτογ) ηταγ- (ας) ... ας-/ηα- Gen. 9:22, 18:2, 24:48, 35:29, etc.

ηα-/ας- ηταγ- (ας) Gen. 16:16, 21:5, 25:20 etc.
Negative ετε-μπε- ... ας- Gen. 8:9, Ex. 2:3, Num. 14:16 etc.

(k) The Hermeneutical Relative Nominal Sentence ετε-... πε is of juncture 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 πε 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 πιειλιε ντεπίαξωκ εβαλ ετεφαϊαρπων πε.
Deut. 10:15 θοταρακ ... ετεψωτεν πε.
Gen. 44:15 ξενοτσισιωμ εσαπσισιωμ ηα-πιρψμι ετε-

ανοκ πε.
Gen. 50:1 πηβιιηεξημε ετεφη πε ετγιμιηρ ηππιοράζεις.
Num. 15:7 ηεηηε θ ... ετεφη-Γ ηοτγιιν πε.
Ex. 1:11 ιων ετεθβακε μηφη πε.
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 pronominals only: determinators in noun syntagms, or on their own (proclitic, in the latter case) and demonstratives (sometimes proclitic). Attributive juncture is closer than adnexit, which is similar to non-grammatical nexal juncture. (Attributive has syntagmatic precedence over adnexital 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 rhematic expansions, namely by means of the *notae relationis* (Chapter Three) or their *n*- homonyms. 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]</th>
<th>nexus as Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Circumstantial+ [NEXUS]</td>
<td>nexus as Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[TEXT] + Circumstantial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[NEXUS] + Circumstantial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOUN SYNTAGM/PRONOUN +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circumstantial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n1-NOUN SYNTAGM + nte- + [non-zero])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circumstantial as rhematic actant:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-αγώ ε(η) etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ετεμεν ερο(η) ε(η)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ωπη ε(η)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-αι(ζ) ε(η)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-θαμίο(ε) n-oy- etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOUN SYNTAGM ((n1-n2n)) + Relative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n1-NOUN SYNTAGM + n- + [zero])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φαι/φη + Relative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n-NOUN SYNTAGM + nte- + [non-zero]) — reduced or annulled Constituence Personal-Sphere Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n- + Relative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n-NOUN SYNTAGM + n- + [non-zero])</td>
<td></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) ουσογ in apodosis; generally superordinating (= Greek):

Num. 21:8 ουσογ εεεωσσων αρεβαλπιεσον σιλανει εορ-ρωμι ουσογ εεεωσσων επιολο ηομοτ ουσογ εεεωσσων.

Ex. 1:12 κατανηπσι αε ηεβαεβιο ηεμοο ηεμο ουσο  

νασνηο καοϊ... (cf. Anderson 1904:74).

Gen. 9:14 ουσογ εεεωσσων  

σεεηνταλεπιιεοε ηεσνηο αι- 

ζεηπικαι εοσογ εεεοοςος  

ναε-ταφι...

Obs.

This construction of ουσογ is not exclusively Biblical, nor can it always be seen as a device for Biblical rhetorical-stylistic effect, motivated by the Greek original καθί; 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 1962:29-74 and passim; Kühner-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 αςω still features in the idiomatic “Egyptian” syntax of Shenoute (Shisha-Halevy 1986a:51f. §1.3.10).

(b) Superordinator ιε. In Bohairic, this morph — to my knowledge, without an accepted Egyptian etymon — conflates the disjunctive homonym (Sah. ιε), the pre-clausal superordinating signal, opening the apodosis after topicalizing ιεθς (Sah. ιεθς) and the interrogation signal (Sah. ιεθς, see above, Chapter One, §1.2.3.1). In this case, we find no trigger in the Greek:

Gen. 43:5 [ιεθς αε ηθσθυρπ ηπενοκον ηαη ιαη] ιε 

τεναηςκη ιαν (Vat omits ιε).

Num. 11:15 [ιεθς ηθαιπι ηηιη ιπαηφι] ιε ιθθεθ ιε- 

νοκοθοφ (= Vat).

Superordinating ιε is a non-proclitic homonym of the disjunctor ιε-.

(c) Sequelling, apodoticity 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 Conjoinctive is thus a su-
perordinative tense, in pre-Coptic Egyptian⁶⁵ 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 ωγν, ραφ, Χε₂ 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, juncrtured 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 Χε- hardly affects this structure. See SHISHA-HALEVY 2000 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 converses 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-

⁶⁵ The LE “sequential” "jw.f hr sdm" too 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 glotioagonically, 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 “syntaxic”) parameters. However: ὑν (Boh. ὑν-) 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; ἡσ ( initialise) 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 Ἰε ἁγιαὶ ἡμεῖς ἐνισχύω τὴν ἑλέαν ἀρξόμενον ἂν = Greek word order; but note lemniscus, signalling topicalization of the adverbial?
• Adverbial — colon-second delimiter:
  Gen. 24:42 ἀνάμισεν ἐν Ἰακοῦ ἡμῶι ἡμῶι ἡμῶι ἡμῶι ἡμῶι ἡμῶι ἡμῶι ἡμῶι ἡμῶι ἡμῶι.
• ἡσ actant following the “object of giving” (always specific), and often finally placed (with no triggering correspondence in the Greek original):
Deut. 9:6 ποῦ ἐνατικαίᾳ νὰκ.
Gen. 20:7 Ματσείμι μπιρωμί νακ.
Gen. 20:7 μα-[τεσείμι μπιρωμί] νακ.
Gen. 34:4 σι πναλαον νηι.
Gen. 31:12 ΝΗ έταλαβαν ίπι μμωτ νακ.
Gen. 30:4 ας[τ] μιλλα τεκβωκι νακ εοτσείμι.
Gen. 44:1 μας-νενοκι μναιρωμι νοσο μωσ.
Contrast νακ immediately following the verb and preceding the object (both highly specific and non-specific):
σι νηι νοσ- Gen. 15:9, 21:30.
Num. 23:1 ιωτ νηι μπαιμα ν-ξ νουνοι.
Gen. 15:10 αςι νε νακ νναι θροσ.
Ex. 16:29 άναω Φι ταν ας[τ] νωτεν μπαιεγοντ ντενι-
cαβατον.

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 εξοι μηρητ νακ νεμ ἕ
μποστ νεμήι αν. Gen. 31:29 μποτε τακια μενομ ευπητσως νακ
αν. Gen. 2:19 Φαι ιε ροθραν ρο (Φαι focalized!) (all B4); Ps. 48:18 πεκως
νωκεματ επεντ ημεντ νεμακ αν. De Vis II 116 ειονως ενατ ερωτον
γω. (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 juncntural idiosyncrasy is in the tension between the
prosodic and the syntactic units in which they “exist” (colon and pattern re-
spectively), between their anaphoric cohesiveness, their adverbiality and
their encliticity, which conditions their actual position in the said pro-
sodic and syntactic units. (Generally speaking, Bohairic is far less
enclisis-prone than Sahidic — again, it is in this closer to Late Egy-
pian). 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 combinatoric aspiration reflects tension between the syllable and morphemic-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 τρε 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 ετεθεμιου.
  Ex. 8:27 μπεοται μματατη σωνη.
  Ex. 22:27 Φαι γαρ πε πεγγος νίκοι μματατη.
  Deut. 8:3 ... εωικ μματατη αν.
  Also Gen. 39:9, 41:40, 42:38 etc. etc.
- Adverbial-rhematic (adclausal or neutral) placement:
  Ex. 18:18 μμον-υζομ μμοι εεφει μματατη.
  Gen. 32:16 πιογη πιογη ψοτοσα μματατη.
  Num. 11:14 μμον-υζομ μμοι ανοι εωι μπαλοσ μματατ (cf. Deut. 1:12 πως τηναυζημομ μματατ εωι...).
  Also Gen. 21:28, 32:24, Num. 23:9 etc.
(2) μμιμμον= is very rare — barely attested — in the corpus:
  Lev. 25:49-50 ειωιπ αε αοζιμη ... εοωμ μμομ μμιμμονμ
(3) τηρ= “all (of-)”; τηροσ a generalized plural form (see above, §4.2.4.1):
- Post-nucleus (adnominal or post-referate-phrase) placement:
  νη τηροσ ετη- Gen. 35:2, 34:28, 41:7, 46:6, Ex. 12:16, 13:12, 20:4 etc., but:
  νη ετεντωσοσ τηροσ Gen. 46:32, 31:18, 47:1, probably following.
  νετενταψ τηροσ, πετενταψ τηρη, νετενοσκ τηροσ
  Gen. 35:6 πιλαοσ τηρη ετνεμαψ.
Gen. 36:6 ΝΙΚΩΜΑ ΘΡΟΥ ΝΤΕΝΕΨΗ, but:
Ex. 29:12 ΝΚΩΜΑ ΔΕ ΝΤΕΝΙΣΙΝΟΥ ΘΡΨ.
Gen. 42:11 ΑΝΩΝ ΘΡΕΝ ΑΝΩΝ-ΝΕΝΨΗΡΙ ΝΟΤΡΨΗ.
Gen. 42:36 ΑΝΩΝ ΘΡΟΥ Ι — the Augens, part of the Theme phrasal
Domain Frame, is sharply delimited from the lexeme Ι.
Also Gen. 24:40, 31:37, 33:8, 47:11.
• Adverbal — Rhematic or neutral placement:
Gen. 33:13 ΣΕΝΑΜΟΣ ΘΡΟΥ.
Ex. 4:19 ΑΡΜΟΣ ΓΑΡ ΘΡΟΥ.
Gen. 24:14 ΨΑΤΟΤΕΨΩ ΘΡΟΥ.
Gen. 25:25 ΕΨΕΡΕΨΨΨΨΨ ΘΡΨ.
Deut. 4:4 ΝΕΩΤΕΝ ΔΕ ... ΤΕΤΕΝΟΝΣ ΘΡΟΥ ΜΦΟΥΩ.
• Conditioned colon-second pre-referate placement:
Deut. 3:5 ΓΑΝΒΑΚΙ ΕΣΤΑΙΡΨΨΨΨ ΘΡΟΨ ΝΕ.
Gen. 25:4 ΝΑΙ ΘΡΟΨ ΝΕ ΝΕΝΨΗΡΙ ΝΧΕΤ.
• Final placement:
Gen. 11:6 ΓΗΝΠΕ ΙΚ ΟΥΓΕΝΟΣ ΝΟΤΨΤ ΝΕΜ ΟΤΣΝΟΤΟΤ
ΝΟΤΨΤ ΘΡΟΨ (= Vat).

(4) ω= “{he}+.too”, “{he}for {his} part...”, even “{he} on the
other hand...”; often topicalizing.
• Post-referate immediate placement (adnominal):
Gen. 27:34:38 ΣΜΟΤ ΕΡΟΙ ω ΝΑΙΨΤ.
ΑΝΟΚ ω ΕΙΕ... Lev. 26:16:24:41, Gen. 20:6 ΑΝΟΚ ω ΑΙΕΜΙ..., Deut. 10:10 ΑΝΟΚ ΔΕ ω ΑΙΟΓΙ ΕΡΑΤ ΖΙΠΙΤΨΨΨΩ, Deut. 4:14 etc.: not “too”.
Gen. 21:23 ΚΑΤΑΨΜΕΨΜΗΙ ΕΤΑΙΑΙΚ ΝΕΜΑΚ ΕΚΕΙΨΙ ωΨ ΝΕΜ
ΗΙ.
Ex. 19:13 ΝΗ ωΨΟΤ ΜΑΡΟΤΙ ΕΨΨΨΩΙ.
Gen. 30:14:30:42 ΑΨΨΨΨΙ ΔΕ ΝΞΕ-ΝΙΑΤΨΗΡΙΙ ΝΑΛΑΒΑΝ ΝΑΝΙ-
ΜΗΝΙ ΓΨΟΨ ΝΙΑΚΨΒ.
• Adverbal (or ad-clausal) rhematic placement:
Ex. 7:11 ΑΤΙΨΙ ΕΨΟΤ ΝΞΕ-ΝΙΡΕΨΨΨΨΗΜ ΜΠΑΙΡΨ, sim. 8:3: 14.
Ex. 22:21, 23:9 ΝΑΡΕΤΕΝΟΙ ΓΑΡ ΝΨΕΜΜΟ ωΤΕΝ ΠΕ ΣΕΝΨ-
ΚΑΓΙ ΝΧΗΜΙ.
Colon-enclitic (colon-final, colon-closing) placement:
Num. 18:28 παιρὴ τ ἐβολα Σενρεμήτ Νιβεν Ἕωτεν + ἀνι-
οτι... Note the lemniscus, delimiting the JDF.

(5) {ανοκ}, the pronominal prominence marker, combinatory homono-
ym of the lexicemic personal pronoun, accompanies Topics and Foci, and (unlike Ἕωτι) 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 sub-
tle (usually not triggered by any Greek feature).

- Post-referate placement following pronouns (mostly interlocutive)
  and Proper Names, focussing or topicalizing:
  Gen. 29:31 ῥαχὴ λ ἐν θοκ νεοτασφῆν τ ι.
  Gen. 27:36 ιε μπεκεκαξινοτσμοτ ΝΗΙ + ρω ΆΝΟΚ ΠΑΙΩΤ —
  note punctuation.
  Num. 12:2 μν μωσην ΜΜΑΤΑΤΗ ΕΤΑΝΤΗ ΚΑΖΙ ΝΕΜΑἘ ΝΗΜ ΜΗ
  ΜΠΕΚΑΣΙΙ ΝΕΜΑΝ ΆΝΟΝ.
  Ex. 4:10 ζκαιωστ ἰ ἀν ΝΑΣΕ-ΠΑΛΑΣ ΆΝΟΚ.

- Adverbal or adclausal, focussing or topicalizing the personal the-
thematic constituent (mostly interlocutive) of verb clauses. Following the
Interlocutive NS, it topicalizes the Theme. Its placement is as immedi-
ately following its referate as prosodically possible:
  Gen. 18:25 ΗΦῳΡ ΜΠΕΡΙΠΙ ΝΈΟΚ ΜΠΑΙΚΑΣΙΙ.
  Gen. 30:1 ΜΠΕΣΜΙΚΙ ΝΈΟΚ ΝΙΑΚΒ.
  Gen. 30:2 ΜΜΟΝ + ΝΑΜΟΝ ΆΝΟΚ.
  Gen. 23:12 ΚΕΡΓΟΤ ΝΈΟΚ ΓΑΖΗΝ ΜΦἸ.
  Gen. 15:14 ΠΙΕΝΟΝΙ ΔΕ ΕΤΟΤΕΡΒΩΚ ΝΑἘ ΕΙΕΠΓΑΝ ΕΡΟΘ
  ΆΝΟΚ.
  Gen. 3:14 ΑΚΕΡΦΑΙ ΚΖΟΤΡΤ ΝΈΟΚ ΕΒΟΛ ΟΤΕΝΙΤΕΒΝΩΤΟΤ
  ΣΗΡΟΤ sim Gen. 4:11.
  Gen. 50:19 ΆΝΟΚ-ΦΑΦΙ ΓΑΡ ΆΝΟΚ.
  Gen. 22:6 ΝΈΟΚ-ΟΤΟΤΡΟ ΝΈΟΚ.

- 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:
Φιλοκ ετακ-/ετεκ- Gen. 21:23, Num. 11:16.
Deut. 4:2 ναίκαςι ανοκ εὖγονεν μμον ετενηνοτ.
Contrast with the post-referate placement:
Gen. 24:3 νικανανοεον ην εὖγων ημήτοτον ανοκ.
Gen. 13:15 πικαγι τηρη ςτακνατ ερον ανοκ.
Gen. 24:49 icxe ςυν νεωτεν τετεναιρι.
Num. 15:18 . . . επικαγι εὖναελ-ενθον ανοκ εὖσον ερον.
Deut. 30:18 Φιλ εὐτετεναερξινορ μπιιορξανεθ νεωτεν εὖσον ερον.
• Final placement: here I suspect an appositive construction of the
lexemic personal pronoun, not the Augens:
(1) {νοοκ} NEM — (all persons):
Deut. 29:14 ναίκων νταιλαιονεθ κ Greek ναίκαςοτι ανοκ
nekwten.
Gen. 24:54 διοῦωμ δακω νοοκ νεμιρψμί ετνεμακ.
28:64, Ex. 12:31.
(2) ανοκ + Proper Name — the pronoun mediating between locutive
pronoun and PN:
(3) {νοοκ} paradigmatically commuting with Νξε- + NOUN?
Deut. 28:2ff. κκαμααατ νοοκ ʔεννιβακι.
οτογ κκαμααατ νοοκ ʔεντκοι.
(κκαμααατ Νξε-νιμικι τετεκνεκι . . .
κκαμααατ Νξε-νεκανοεθκ).
Also Num. 14:21.

Obs.
Cases (infrequent in the corpus) of the invariable particle νοοκ, always combined with
αε, are isolable by the lack of personal concord, which is a junctural delimitation fea-
ture: the combination appears to lend αε full contrastive force (Greek αε only):
Ex. 9:6 άννοοο νξε-νιτεβουωτι τηρουν τετενιρεννυκα μεβολ αε νοοκ
ʔεννιτεβουωτι τετενεγκυρι μπικα μπελα μοτ.

(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 open⁶⁶ juncture in evidence:

⁶⁶ Relatively, within the scale proposed.
Gen. 24:49 ἰδε οὗτ νεωτέρον τετεναιπὶ...
Gen. 44:8 ἰδε μεν πιστεύτε ἐτανδεμῇ ἱεννενοκ ποντακτευῇ.
(2) Less open juncture in evidence:
Gen. 24:42 ναμωτὶ ὑπερ τετοιοῦ εἰσῳ τοιοῦτω πίσω.
Deut. 4:2 οἰκαζῇ άνοικ ἐπιγώγεν μμοτ ετενενοτευ.
Lev. 18:7 τεκμαρ γαρ τε.
Deut. 1:27 εμβευον ἵνε ποτε μος εμον ἕχετεν εβολ.
Ex. 34:14 οὐκα γαρ ννητενοτουῖτ νκενοτευ.
Deut. 10:14 ἰχνεπε γαρ ναποτε πεκνοτευ ἐσ.
(3) Closer juncture signalled:
Num. 14:19 θα-μοβομ θοιαλαος ναρ εβολ.
Ex. 5:16 καθὰ πθελαος οὗν νοτακε.
Deut. 15:2 κεκαεανξαν νιβεν εβολ ετενακ.
NB: NIVEN appears to be enclitic only in ὑπερ ἃνεν ετ-; it is however the only element occurring in this slot, which is thus structurally of close juncture.
Gen. 35:10 μνωτομοτε εροκ ἰνε ἰακωβ.
νὴ τθροτ ετ- Gen. 35:2 etc.
Gen. 33:13 εμσων οὗν αισανσογι.
Ex. 34:24 εμσων γαρ αισανσιοτευ.
Deut. 3:25 τελαναπεναν οὗν ν-ε νεγοτ.
(4) Closest juncture in evidence:
Num. 22:17 τεταιοκ γαρ εμαυω.
Ex. 16:7 άνοικ ἰνε ἱανοτο-ω γαρ ἰα-ντετενακρεμπεμ
ἀρπον.
Gen. 47:4 μμον-μαμμονι γαρ ωπ.
Gen. 23:6 θοκ-οτοτρο θοκ εβολ ετενῃτ.
Deut. 26:10:15 εμσωτο-ερωτευ εβολ ειεβιῳ.
(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. εγείρε-, which is prefixed in close juncture.
68 Cf. also Oxyrhynchite Mt. 26:54 (Cod. Scheide) οτ-ον οὗν.
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 \( \text{νεωσω} \ \text{γαρ} \ \text{πε} \ \text{νηρεμνυμι} \ \div \ \text{πε} \ \text{μανε-} \\
\text{κωστ} \ \text{niben} \ \text{ντενιεσκωσ} (= \text{Vat}), \text{also:} \\
\text{Gen. 46:34 οτερεβ γαρ} \ \text{πε} \ \text{νηρεμνυμι} \ \div \ \text{πε} \ \text{μανεκωστ} \\
\text{niben} \ \text{ντενιεσκωσ} (\text{Vat} \ \text{Δε} \ \text{for} \ \text{the second} \ \text{πε}). \\
\text{Lev. 2:5 ευωτι} \ \text{δε} \ \text{ειωσωμουσωτι} \ \text{πε} \ \text{εβολ} \ \text{δεν-οτες-} \\
\text{καρα} \ \text{πε} \ \text{πεκαρον} (= \text{Vat}). \\
\text{Ex. 16:23 γανκαβατον} \ \text{πε} \ \text{ετωσαμ} \ \text{μποτε} \ \text{πε} \ \\text{(Vat} \ \text{γανκαβα} \\
\text{τατον} \ \text{νεμτον} \ \text{μποτε} \ \text{πε}). \\
\text{γαρ} \ \text{in a problematic instance:} \\
\text{Ex. 32:1 ψαι} \ \text{γαρ} \ \text{Δε-μώτης} \ \text{...} \ \text{τενεμι} \ \text{γαρ} \ \text{(Vat} \ \text{τενεμι} \\
\text{ἀν} \ \text{Δε-οτ} \ \text{πεταςωμι} \ \text{μμοq}. \\

Obs.

(1) This intriguing phenomenon, famously discussed by E. Fraenkel for Greek and Latin, is common in Nitrian (esp. the Martyrdoms) e.g. AM I 143 οηποςον ηδωπθη νεμ \\
oταληειος πε νεμ ηδωπθη ηδιεβ πε ηδεφον. B4 John 19:23 ηεποθην \\
etεεας ηεπατουρη πε ετεωοι εβολ μπωι τηρυ τε. \\
αρ (not occurring in our corpus) in Assertive-Focal-Formal ("Rhetorical") Questions: \\
μα αρ ψαι αρ πε - Zach. 2:3, 3:20 (B4); also μα ονονυετο οτυματ αρ \\
αΡεροτ-οηνοτ αρ Mal. 2:10.

(2) εβολ in Gen. 6:7 ειεετπηρομι εβολ εταεραμιοιε εβολ εα προ μπαρι: \\
here, however, we have two compatible εβολ elements — the first post-verbal (corre-
responding to the Greek ἀπο- in ἀπαλειψω), the second an adjunctual circumstantial εβολ 
εα-.

(3) At least two prosodically distinct homonomous πε entities, both constituents of NS, 

(f) Proclisis is important for Coptic junctural typography, 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; δεν-, η-, ε-; α-κ- / 
α-πιρωμι-. 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 ex-
pansion 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-φρωμι) stands in opposition to a junctorially more 
complex nexus-topicalizing construction α-φρωμι ακ-, often com-
mented upon above. Closest and near-closest juncture.
(2) Word-formational, derivational, compositional, lexemic: pem-(n)-, peq-, qeb-, weh- “son of”, met-, ep-, otem- and so on: prosodically reduced first (“in initio compo siti”) term, nuclear, morphologically marked by opposition with the full, unmarked lexeme. The expansion sequel, unmarked, is either nominal or adverbial (Lev. 18:17 pemānī). Closer-to-closest juncture.

(3) {ānok-} 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, analogic 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 1847:19f., 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; pēw is a particle that, if not post-focal, tends to final position; ān 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.

\[ \Delta e_2 | rāp/otn/Δe | nā | pēw | qw= | thp= | nēo= | ān | Δe_1 | pē. \]

\[ Δe_1 = \text{“anymore”, “any longer”} \]

\[ Δe_2 = \text{“then”: see below.} \]

\[ Δe nē/pē Gen. 9:18, 14:18. \]

\[ Δe ān pē Gen. 28:17. \]

\[ 69 \text{ An analogue to the prosodic shift in later Egyptian from sentence-final to sentence-initial, a shift not completed in Bohairic (see Shisha-Haleyv 1981) is supplied by French (Old to Modern French): Lerch 1930:85f.} \]
RAP AN PE Gen. 31:32.
ΔΕ ΝΑ= Gen. 20:12.
RAP NAN PE Gen. 34:14.
ΤΗΡΩ ΝΕ Deut. 3:5.
ΤΗΡΩΤ ΑΝ ΜΜΑΤΑΤΟΣ Num. 23:13.
RAP ΤΗΡ= Gen. 45:20, Ex. 4:19, 9:19, Lev. 18:27.
RAP ΝΩΤΕΝ ΑΝ Deut. 2:9.
ΑΝΩΚ ΔΕ ΓΩ Deut. 10:10.
RAP ΑΝΩΚ Gen. 50:19.
RAP ΤΗΡΩT Ex. 4:19.
ΟΤΝ ΝΩΤΕΝ Gen. 24:49.
ΝΩΤΕΝ ΑΝΩΚ Lev. 26:28.
ΡΩ ΝΕΟQ Gen. 24:8.
ΠΩC ΝΕΟQ ΑΝ Deut. 31:27.
ΝΗI ΡΩ • ΑΝΩΚ Gen. 27:36.
ΑΠΩΕΝ ΔΕ NE Ex. 2:20 (= Vat; NE enclitic? see above, Chapter Two).
ΔΕ RAP Gen. 16:13.
ΑΝ ΔΕ Ex. 5:10 (cf. FUNK 1991:10 n.23).
ΟΤΝ ΔΕ (?) Ex. 22:9 ΦΗ ΟΤΝ ΔΕ ΝΟΤΙΛΙ (v.l. ΕΛΙ): the structure is obscure.
Ex. 29:14 ΦΑΙ EΞΕΝ-ΦΝΟΒΙ RAP PE (!), contrast e.g. 29:22:28 ΦΑΙ RAP ΟΤΑΝΚ PE .

Obs.
(1) For Sahidic, KASSER 1993, 1994e, 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 πΕΩ -, πΕΙ- as well as the pronoun πΑ- (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 prosodic-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-text 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’ Zur Technik der Wortstellung in den Eddalieder (1909, Leipzig:Teubner). See also DIK 1995, esp. 34f., 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 Abtönungspartikel)... “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 timing too). Note especially the Problematis of the “peninal 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 Oppuelsen 1993:71ff. 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 Rose (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 Burkhardt 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 (1972:268f.), “... da ihre Wiedergabe unzuverlässig ist und anscheinend die koptischen Texte bald eine griechische Parikel auslassen, bald nach eigenen Gütldücken zufügen oder Vorhandenes verändern...” reveals manifest incomprehension. 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 οὖν/οὖν is familiar from the B4 Bodmer John (see Kasser’s introduction, p. 63f.), but the version also adds (with respect to the Greek) Ράπ and Δέ (p. 78). Note the following variation in the Bohairic NT: οὖν/όν particle John 5:16:18, Mt. 7:19, 3:10 and often; οὖν/Δέ John 5:6:11, 6:61, 6:5:12, Luke 4:7, 13:18; Ράπ/όν
(7) Discourse signalling is the essential datum of discourse analysis. See Stammer-Johann 1977 on Spoken Italian discourse; Güllich 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 bridgers”, “discourse commentaries” and “Vertextung” (21ff., 108ff., 129ff.), also the thematic-structuring function (121ff.).

(a) 
(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. γάρ, οὕτως) 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. ἀκουστὶ δε ἐταφάνων ἐκαβραθ ... ἀσμίς τὸν ἀρχηγὸν ἄκουστι δε ἐκεναθοτ μμίς δε πεζετρεφομεσίο ... ἀκουστὶ δε ἐκαθ Δησίτσιν ... ἀσφεν-περπαρ ... ἀσμις δε τὸν ἀρχηγὸν ἄσεομες...

Gen. 19:1 ἄρι τὸν ἐν τῆς-πατρελοι ἐς ἑρρήν ἐκοτόμα μβιατ ἑρότι λυτ δε ναπγεμις จำกετπατλ ἑκτεοδόμα.

Gen. 21:9 ἐτακνασ δε κε-καρα επισφρι παρα...

Gen. 21:6 πεζεκαρα δε κεονσεβοι ἀδειη νηι ντε-πσε.

Gen. 2:6:10 ωτιοτι δε εωαε επισφι εβολ δεοδεμ ... ωτιοτ δε εωαε εβολ εβολ δεοδεμ ... πινοτ δε ντεπικαι ητεμματ νανε...

Gen. 35:23ff. ...νεπσφρι δε νλια πτορτι μμίς νιακφβ δε ὀτβην δε κεμολ δε λετ δι ιοτακ δε κακαρ δε ζαβουλων δε νεπσφρι δε νραχα τεγκι μιακφβ δι ιωκεφ δι νεμ βενιαμι δ.

Ex. 33:12 χππε νοεο κιω μμος με-αλιοι μπαλας επυβι δε νοεο δε κπεκαμοι εφι ετεκατοτορντε νεμει νοεο δε ακκος νηι με-τσων μμοκ...

Gen. 27:29 ψν ετεκα δερω φτοςτοτο ψν δε-ετεμου ερων ομαματ.

(2) The fully antithetic particle of Bohairic seems to be δε νοοι, which is also highly delimitative:
Ex. 9:6 ᾣτνοιξ ἄξε-νίτεβνωσόι ντε-νίρεμνξκξμί εβολά
ἀε νθοῦκ ἄξενιτεβνσότι ντενενψγγρί ἀπίςλα ἄμεξελ
μοι.

(3) ἄε is typical of topicalization70, Theme-switching or narrative-
block-initial position. Here contrast is often discernible:

Gen. 24:27 ζχμαρψωτ νξε-πξε ... ἀνοκ ἄε ἄνες τερ-
τωντ...
Gen. 24:31 εἶπεςον κοπί επάτε ... ἀνοκ ἄε αἰσεβέτε...
Gen. 4:1 ἀπαμ ἄε ἀγκονενετα τερςγίμι...
Gen. 4:2 ἄξσγγην νξε-ἄβελ νομάναπςοσ ντεγανε-
cσον κακν ἄε ναπερτσω ἐπικαγι πε.

(4) As in Greek, [μεν... ἄε...] 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 αἰονσψρπ μπίμας μβαεμπι νθοκ ἄε
μπεκξεμσ.
NB: Gen. 41:13 ἀνοκ μεν ακχατ ἐκενταρψη ΨΗ μεν
ἀκαψ (Vat. ΨΗ ἄε).

Obs.
See SICKING and VAN OPHUISEN 1993:12ff. on ἄε used for text articulation.

(b) ραψ

(1) This is no doubt the most common particle, after ἄε. Contrary to
common opinion, its rich semantics do not so much concern causality,
but grounding, founding-in-givenness, or the presentation "ensuing
before basis". ραψ grounds the foregoing co-text, or its situation, or even
(meta-textually!) its very existence, in an association of inevitability,
naturalness or ensuing-ness, validating the foregoing information.
Moreover, ραψ 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 ζέονσψεβ ντεςνσε πε οτον νιβεν ετιπ
ναι + εὐβεναισψεβ ραψ ναι πνεσ ιναψον εβολ.

70 On the topicalizing role of "but" particles in German, cf. ALTMANN 1976.
Gen. 42:23 νωσος ει δε νατεμι αν πε δε-ιωσεφ αυτος ερως ταρε-πιερμενετης γαρ και οτως πε.

(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 μαροτοβοβοτ # εατερασεβεης γαρ οτω τον ερως.

Num. 32:1 μνωωςδεμδον ενατ επικαρι # μπορωσω γαρ νωσι...

Thus too, γαρ 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, οτι, 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.);

γαρ is a mode-switching delimiter in Narrative, a Comment-Mode initializing signal (esp. with [αν] + 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 exclamative in Dialogue.

Obs.

Some outstanding discussions. The Greek γαρ seems to have attracted early attention: see for instance the excellent MISNER 1904. (γαρ 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 that 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 γαρ would approximately correspond to German denn + doch. Cf. ROMBOETS 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. KUPER 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 ῥαρ- comparable particles in German.

(4) Stern 1880 §607: "die conjunction ῥαρ", relating it to ἀκι (but it is "nachdrückerlich 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 δὲ (e.g. Deut. 11:14, 14:4), or to Greek καὶ (Gen. 41:56, 31:32, Ex.5:23).

(5) For Bohairic ῥαρ, 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 ἀκι (Ex. 20:25, Lev. 10:17), or, normally, ῥαρ (Gen. 7:4, 18:15:19, 22:12 etc.). Bohairic ῥαρ corresponds (more or less in that order) to Greek γὰρ, δὲ or καὶ, διὶ or δἰ δἰ — or to the absence of any particle: this last is significantly correlative with the well-defined functional group, especially the delimiting and non-expllicative ῥαρ. This seems to indicate an independent Coptic ῥαρ entity, extending and only partly overlapping the original functional range of the Greek particle. (Observe that for the fixed combinations of γὰρ — ὀνταρ, ἐγρα, ἐναρ — the correspondence with Greek is almost exact, while for the uncombined particle Coptic diverges — I say this impressionistically — by more than 10%).

(3) ῥαρ occurs in narrative Comment Mode frequently with Focalizing Conversion and other focalization constructions:

Gen. 43:16 ἀρεναὶρῳμι ῥαρ καὶ ῥαρ μοναςικ νεμὴ μερι.

Ex. 13:19 ἁεοταραψ ῥαρ αἰςὶνφ ταρκενεγημὶ μπία.
Also Gen. 47:22, Lev. 10:14, Deut. 11:10, 31:7:21, etc.

(4) Like ἀκι, ῥαρ very commonly accompanies topicalization (incl. presetting adverbial Topics). This, I believe, is an epiphenomenon; ῥαρ does not, like ἀκι, (co)signal topicalization:

Ex. 5:16 πιτορ ῥαρ σετ ἁμορ ἁν...

Gen. 50:20 νεωτεν ῥαρ ἀρεντεκοσι τὶ... ὁ ἀκι...

Lev. 20:12 ἀσερασβε τρα ὀτιν ἐρωσ.
Also Lev. 14:2, 20:6, 18:27.

(5) ῥαρ delimits, and co-marks with νακ πε mode-switching to Comment Mode in Narrative; is in this environment explicative (see in detail above, Chapter One,):

Gen. 45:3 νακσῳρτερ ῥαρ πε.
Gen. 45:26 νεμ πεκταναττοσ ῥαρ πε.
Gen. 31:32 νακεμι ῥαρ αν πε.
Also Gen. 36:7, 35:18 etc.

(6) On the other hand, ῥαρ is rare, but still attested, in Narrative Evolution Mode (see above, Chapter One). ῥαρ 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 ὄτος διηνοτον πρῶτον θητόν ἡμὸς, ὡς ἁμαρτήματα ἄσκανε-νεκρίζει γαρ ἐξωθί πρὸς-ἐμμετρίω — a possible alternative is “we know this, since...”.

This particle features most typically in exposition and in the Allo-cution and Response substructures of Dialogue.

(7) In exposition, precising identification:

Num. 21:26 Ἀρναδακαί τῆρος ἄντιαμορφος ἕμεν ἐκεῖνων ἕκαρος ἦτοι ἄνθρωπος ἐρού ἐκ θαμ ἕνα γαρ τε ἐκεῖνων ἠρκαίτε ἄντομον ποτρον ἄντιαμορφος.

(8) In Assertive Questions (see above, Chapter One), γαρ is not explicative:

Ex. 16:7 ἀνεκ δέ αἰόν-ος γαρ δέ-ἐντετεκτερᾶμ ἄρον — note the compatibility of topicalizing δέ 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 μοήν πασεὶ αἰκωτείν γαρ... opening subsections of response (no particle here in the Greek).

Ex. 14:4 ἀνοκ γαρ εἰσερεπτήτ μὴ ἁραώ νωτο... opening declaration of Divine Intent (δέ in the Greek).

Gen. 30:30 νεραγκοςκαί γαρ ἦν τρόπος ἐναντώντας μπαμ-θο... opening main point of argumentation (Greek γάρ); so too in:

Gen. 48:18 παριήτητ άν... θαυμα γαρ πε πιστηρή.
Gen. 48:19 ἀκαίρηπαν παρωρήπ ἀκαίρηπα γαρ ἐξωθώτι... “It is because...”, “the point is, that...”.

Gen. 20:11 περιεφράμε αἰθείος γαρ δέ... opening Response (Greek γάρ).

(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 αὰρ ἐριφράν-παν ἁμὴμα ετεμματ ἄβεβηλα δια-πίμα γαρ ετεμματ ἁρὰ ὁσογοντ ροπ — aetiological naming: sim. Ex. 2:22 etc.
Ex. 20:20 δεμνομεν για γαρ τετερμπιαζεν μμωτεν νξε-φι αφι μμαι γαρωτεν.
Ex. 19:23 μμων-γξομ ντεπιαλος ι επωι ... νοεκ γαρ ακερμεθρε ναν εκαω μμος ζε ουτεπιτωσ εβολ ουογ ματοσβογ.
Ex. 12:30 αονιωψ νξρςογ γυπινι δεσπιαρΙ τηρη ντε-κανι μεμοννι • γαρ • πε μπεσον μορ νξντη.
Ex. 32:22 τ. μπερμβον πας • νοεκ γαρ ετκωσων μπε-κανυοι μπαλαλος • πειζωσ γαρ ναν ζε-μακαμιο νξα-κανον παν...
Lev. 18:7 ...νεμ οςωπι ντετεκμαζ ηνεκσφρπ εβολ τεκμαζ γαρ τε ηνεκσφρπ μπεσωπι εβολ — γαρ here also focusses the Rheme “τεκμαζ”.
Ex. 19:12 (the first and second γαρ) μακεντεν ερωτε ν εστε-μι επωι εδενπιτωσ ... οτων γαρ νιενεν ετουασι νεμ πιτωσ βενοτσον εγμον • νενζα • σι νεμαγ ν νξα-γανωνι γαρ σενακετωνι ερογ.
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 ουογ νινοω νπωρι ηνναγκ μμγ μινα νκα • 
αξιανεκξια γαρ εξωπ ηνξε-μπανβος.
(c) Cases of # IMPERATIVE... + ... γαρ... # are striking instances of the particle meta-textually grounding the very allocation, not its content — “this I enjoin you, for...”
Ex. 16:9 αμωινι ... αεσωτεμ γαρ...
Also Ex. 32:1:23, Gen. 29:21.
(d) In perceptive textemes, γαρ bases or justifies the preceding instruction, injunction or prohibition, categorically or contingently also, metatextually, the actual injunction/prohibition and not its content:
Lev. 18:7 ...νεμ οςωπι ντετεκμαζ ηνεκσφρπ εβολ τεκμαζ γαρ τε ηνεκσφρπ μπεσωπι εβολ.
Lev. 13:6 ερετοσβογ ηνξε-πιοταν + οσμινι γαρ πε.
Ex. 23:8 ηνεκσιαωρον ηιαωρον γαρ χατωομ ηννεβαλ 
ηνετναγ μμολ — gnomic grounding.
Ex. 22:21f. οὐκ ἐμμοί ἡμέναν ἄρας ἂν ἃς τής ὁμώς καὶ ἡμέρας.
Lev. 18:24 μπερσών τένναλ τήρεσιν ἄνευ τένναλ τήρεσιν ἄνευ.
Deut. 12:31 μὴ ἐκεῖρει τετελεσμένος ἄνευ τετελεσμένος.
Deut. 10:19 ἐρετεμνὲς ἀπὸ ἡμέρας ἀρπαγμένοι ἑς ἡμέρας ἡμέρας.

(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 ἀξιωτήρας ἑς ἡμέρας ἀκριβώς ἑς ἁμαρτίας ἁμαρτίας ἁμαρτίας ἁμαρτίας...
Deut. 32:32 εὐολός ἑς ἠμοίων ἐνήμεροι πε τοῦ ἔστω ἡμοίων...
Deut. 32:35 ἐλλησθεν ἡμᾶς ἑς ἠμοίων ἐνημεσθής πε τοῦ ἔστω τοῦ...

(f) ἐς ἑς ὁ ἡμέρας: the rare compatibility of causal ἐς with ἡμέρας is illustrated by a unique (?) instance:

Deut. 10:17 ἀκμαῖος τοῦ ἡμέρας ἅπαντος ἡμέρας ἡμέρας ἡμέρας ἡμέρας...

(g) In the correlative configuration: ἡμέρας... θεὸς ἠμοίων... cataphoric ἡμέρας (cf. Denniston’s “anticipatory use”, 1954:68ff.) is resumed by a prepositional expression of explicit causality: ἡμέρας itself marks the commencement of a new topic:

Gen. 42:21... ἀκριβώς ἡμέρας ἡμέρας ἡμέρας...
Deut. 2:7 τοῦ ἡμερίας ἡμερίας ἡμερίας ἡμερίας...
Deut. 15:11 ἤνεργα ἡμέρας ἡμερίας ἡμερίας...
Ex. 16:29 ἄνω θεὸς ἡμέρας... θεὸς ἡμέρας... θεὸς ἡμέρας... θεὸς ἡμέρας... θεὸς ἡμέρας...

(h) Non-explicative ἡμέρας in geographical-topographical identification, a special case of the Narrator’s Channel:

Num. 21:25f. ἡμέρας... ἡμέρας... ἡμέρας... ἡμέρας... ἡμέρας... ἡμέρας... ἡμέρας... ἡμέρας...

(i) ἡμέρας in a chinese-box-like hierarchical complex of grounding:

Gen. 47:4 ἐντείνεται ἡμερίας ἡμερίας... ἡμερίας... ἡμερίας... ἡμερίας...
Gen. 47:20 ὥσον διωσκφ χεππικαγι τηρη ντενιρεμν-κηνι μφαραω ἀνιρεμνκηι γαρ ἔρμπο ντεκαγι μφαραω ἀπικο γαρ δεμνοντ ἐξων.

(j) The embarassingly mysterious ἄε-οσνι γαρ complex (see also Chapter Two), with no special Greek correpodent — (δι)ότι (γὰρ) — occurs (rarely) in Narrative Comment Mode, and (typically) draws attention to background facts in Dialogue. As obscure is ὥστι itself (not occurring in the corpus without γαρ, unlike the NT, OT other than the Pentateuch, and Nitrian).

Lev. 25:42 ...ἀεστι γαρ γανεβίαικ νωθι νε sim. 25:55.
Lev. 22:20 ...ἀεστι γαρ σερηων νωτεν αν.
Gen. 29:15 ...ἀεστι γαρ νεοκ-ναον.
Gen. 26:7 ...ἀεστι γαρ ενεσων πε δεννεςγο.

(k) Two remarkable cases:

Ex. 34:14 ωςε γαρ ηνετενονωμτ ηενοντι 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 οὗ γὰρ μη...).

Deut. 10:14 γνηπε γαρ νποςε πεκνοντι νε ηςε-τφε νεμ τφε ηντετφε... (= Vat) is the only case I am aware of, of the particle in a presentative clause. (νςε- too is here exceptional as marker of thematic apposition to the formal Theme νε).

Obs.
(1) ἄεστι (see above for the orthography) is common in Bodmer III B4 John, but also in P. Vat copto 9 (especially in Osee).
(2) οστα ρ is inseparable (and thus comparable to ωςε): Ex. 33:3:20 Greek οὗ γὰρ. So is καταρ ην 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) ὡςν

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, rhematizing and discourse-articulating. Both are so-called “implicative particles”. Junctorially, both are also (relative) initiality-signals (this is especially striking in the case of ἄνω ὡςν). But ὡςν is distinctively anaphoric, returning to and resuming the run of discourse while leaving and marking the foregoing text as a concluded digression, while γαρ is both ana- and cataphoric. In Dialogue, ὡςν links anaphorically, as marking reactivity.
Obs.

(1) οὖν is extremely rare in the Sahidic NT (only Luke 16:27 and Heb. 4:6), with εἰ there the usual correspondent to Greek οὖν. This must mean that the particular Bohairic opposition of οὖν (of Greek origin) with ἧν (very old Egyptian) is virtually neutralized in Sahidic. For the Sahidic Pentateuch, we have (for Greek οὖν) instances of the omission of a particle altogether, e.g. Gen. 29:27, Ex. 16:28, Lev. 14:11 etc., or ἧν (the "general particular connector"), Gen. 12:12, 50:5, Lev. 11:6; or οὖν (Gen. 6:14, 12:13, Ex. 22:24, 33:5 — the latter no doubt the normal correspondent. Bohairic οὖν normally corresponds to Greek οὖν. 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 οὖν is common in NT (e.g., John) and Nitrian Bohairic; cf., with πεζάq, John 4:48, 6:67, Luke 19:12 etc. άε-οὖν in narrative topicalization: AM I91 ΝΑΙ άε-οὖν άενδάγεναροσίτωτ, also 180, 158, 194.

(3) Greek οὖν in narrative is attested already in Herodotus (e.g., I 85, 95, 110 etc.), in the Narrator’s Channel: see also Poythress 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 οὐν has been vastly expanded so that it absorbs nearly all the territory normally occupied by δέ”.

(4) οὖν is extremely common in the hermeneutical Catena, alongside άε-οὖν (see below), and special ready-made Greek particle amalgams like άγάνον (107), άγανοντε (145), άγάνοντεν (107), άγάνονταρ (198), άγάνονταρ (92, 198), άγάνονταρ (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 οὖν in protasi: Luke 11:13, 12:26, 16:11.

(5) Greek οὖν occurs in questions, in compound particles (naxal questions) or, for thematic questions, alone: ἐροῦν, οὐκοῦν, τί οὖν. In Coptic interrogatives (Oxyrhynchite) we find -οὖν άν, and ὅς οὖν...ής άε... in Rom. 10:14).

(6) οὖν: outside narrative, Poythress 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 Opheuwen 1993:25ff., 89ff. on Attic (Lysias, Plato etc.) Greek οὖν: “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) οὖν occurs exceptionally in a Circumstantial Nominal Sentence in Acts 2:30 (cons.) (άμορος οὔς ἀκούει) εὐπροφήτης οὖν πε οὔς εὐκλεον άε- ...

(a) Allocutive/locutive Dialogue:

(1) Imperative/Lussive + οὖν; ΠΝΟΤ οὖν + imperative, the most prevalent occurrence:

Gen. 12:13 ΚΕΝΑΞΟΒΕΒΕΤ ΝΕΟ άΕ ΚΕΝΑΤΑΝΣΟ άΑΟΣ οὖν άε-ανοκ-τεμων.

Gen. 27:8 ΠΝΟΤ οὖν ΠΛΥΠΗΙ ΚΩΤΕΜ ΝΚΩΙ sim. 27:43.

(2) The *hic-et-nunc*, non-inferential initial-boundary-marking ἀντὶ *οὖν* precedes various locutive (1st person, sgl. and plur.) and locutive-sphere clause types:

Num. 14:3 ἀντὶ *οὖν* ἄνακοκ κακοῦ εἰρηκοκτόν...  
Gen. 50:5 ἀντὶ *οὖν* ἀπεκεφαλήσασθαι.  
Gen. 48:5 ἀντὶ *οὖν* Πεκύρημι ἢ...νοτι ἄν.  
Also Gen. 19:9. Contrast:

Gen. 24:50 τεννακτωμένων ἂν *οὖν* ἀντὶ, where ἀντὶ is a true temporal adverbial (“now”) rather than an atonic particle.

(3) Future + *οὖν* — note the prevalence of verbs of motion:

Ex. 3:18 τεντακτωμαν *οὖν* ένεοθεστ. sim. Deut. 3:25.  
Ex. 5:16 χ/κακί μπεκάλος *οὖν* ηνίοντες — interrogative? note the rare non-colon-second placement (Vat κακί *οὖν*...), which means a link between ένεοθεστ. and μπεκάλος.  
Gen. 18:21...οτόρ εἰεκεθη *οὖν* επεκεθ.  
Deut. 3:25 ἀντίκινιορ *οὖν*...

(4) In reactive Questions (rheumatic and nexal):

Gen. 27:33 ομ οὖν ἄκερκτοςτοικοκτόν ηνί...  
Ex. 5:16 χ/κακί μπεκάλος *οὖν* ηνίοντες (observe the placement of the particle; Vat κακί *οὖν*...).

(5) *οὖν* in protasi (Greek οὐ, δέ): “coming to the point”, i.e. high-level rheematizing:

Gen. 33:13 ευπό *οὖν* αιμαγοδικη ηοτο...η... sim. 44:29, 46:33, Ex. 22:27, Lev. 4:22.

(6) *οὖν* in Narrative (rare). In our corpus, this usually corresponds to Greek οὐ. Always “say” or “tell”, that is, the Narrative/Dialogue seam:

Gen. 41:24 αἰματάρακοςι *οὖν*...(Greek οὐ).  
Gen. 27:35 πέκατη *οὖν* ηα (Greek δέ).  
Ex. 8:6 πέκατη *οὖν* δε...(Greek οὐ).  
Ex. 8:15 πέκατηνερεσιωμη *οὖν* ηφαραμ (Greek οὐ).

(7) The particle seems to be a summing-up exponent and a final delimiter in

Ex. 22:8 κακι ηιβέν ηςιντονς... εχεοτομακε ηε ηουυγον ηε ενεκωστ... + φη *οὖν* δε ηοταλ (Vat *φη* *οὖν* δε-γαλ). The construction is obscure (Greek δ τι οὐ παν η; the Ara-
bic translates negatively, *wa-lā ʿayʿan 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. *πεντε-ντοχ πε*, Ruth 3:10 Sah. [Shier]).

(d) Ξε

This is the only one of the old "Egyptian" enclitic particles left in Coptic (*gr*/*tr*). Of the Greek particles, it is compatible only with *ὄσν* (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 Ξε with *ὄσν* — cf. Gen. 41:33 †νοθ-ὁσν GJ, †νοθ-Ξε others). Ξε is well established in Bohairic, and the correspondence "Boh. ὅσν, Sah. ἕξε", 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 ἕξ).

Obs.

(1) LE and Demotic final *gr* (≈ our Ξε, ?) are already distinctive (Černý-Groll 1975:134 “adverb”. Ermann 1933 §682 “enklitische Kojunktion” 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 Battiscombre 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 ΤΑΦ. 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 ΠΑΡΘ as a connective ("conjunction": "then, thus, 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) *όσν* and *σΗ* are compatible, hence categorically discrete, in Oxyrhynchite: Acts 6:3 *ο γαν ἕξ ε;* *όσν* is considerably rarer than *σΗ in the Oxyrh. Psalms, but elsewhere both are well attested in the same texts.

Ξε 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).
κε1 - 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, ετι. It occurs in prevalently plural-delocutive/generic environment:

Deut. 17:13 νννετεραςεβης ζε.
Deut. 17:16 νννετενοταγτενθνος ενας εναμωτι ζε.
Gen. 35:10 νννομος δι ζε sim. Gen. 17:15.
Num. 8:25 νννοτεργωβ ζε.
Num. 18:22 ννντι ζε.
Num. 9:12 ννννσωκιν ζε.
Ex. 9:30 νννεκωμπι ζε.
Ex. 5:10 κεναντος κουτεν αν ζε.

νννετενοτσο ζε ενας... Deut. 28:68, sim. Ex. 10:28, 8:25, Deut. 3:26.

Obs.
(1) Andersson 1904:37, Stern 1880 §518ff.: “adverb”.
(2) A syntactically distinct, nexus-referred homonym of this element reoccurs as a specifically (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) κε1 occurs rarely in affirmative environment (Nitrian): AM I 1108 ννακωτνετε
εβολα μεκνωστ τεκνων ζε.
(4) The two ζε morphs are neatly combined in Rom. 6:9 ζε κοπτον αν ζε φιοτ ζε
ναεςε εροω αν: two different, compatible JDFs.

κε2 - clause-enclitic, clause-initial signalling in partial opposition to ουν (see above)

In Dialogue:

(1) With Imperative/Jussive: (also Τνου ζε + Imperative; cf. ουν above); superordinating:
Gen. 45:9 ιε ζε ντεθνον μαγενωτεν... (Greek ουν).
Gen. 31:13 Τνου ζε τινκ ανος εβολα (Greek νυν νουν or ουν), also Gen. 41:33, Ex. 10:17, Num. 24:11.
Gen. 46:30 ναεποτον ζε ιεζεντνοτ (no particle in the Greek).

Note that, while ουν is truly a consequential inferential, κε is not, but, virtually opening allocutive discourse, adds an “impatience” or “urging” component to the injunction. Except for the doubtful Ex.22:8
ΦH οΥN ΔE ΝΟΥΣΩΛI (see above), we do not find in the corpus any instance of ΔE compatible with οΥN, a combination attested in Vat and its apographs (only οΥN in the other sources):

Ex. 5:18 ΤΗΝΟΥ οΥN ΜΑΒΕΝΩΤΕΝ ΒΑΤ ΤΗΝΟΥ οΥN ΔΕ (cf. perhaps also Ex. 22:8)

The Greek often has no particle for Coptic ΑΣΕ2 (so e.g. in Gen. 23:15, 31:43, Ex. 10:3, 18:28, Num. 14:11:27 etc.).

Obs.
ΔΕ-ΟΥN — that is, οΥN following ΑΣΕ2 — is of importance in Nitrian: De Vis I 13, II 23, 47 in questions. It is especially prevalent in Catenae, where (like οΥN and ρΩ οΥN) it seems to be characteristic of hermeneutical style, and occurs almost on every page. A striking instance (203) πΙΡΟ οΥN ΠΕ ΠΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ ΤΑΤΗ ΔΕ ΤΕ ΤΓΡΑΦΗ ΕΒΟΤΑΒ ΦΗ ΔΕ-ΟΥΝ ΕΤΕΝΩΝΗΤΩΝ ΕΒΟΤΑΝ ΑΝ... contrasts οΥN — marking the explication of allegory — with ΔΕ οΥΝ, the latter seemingly being a rhetorically peaking term. In AM, ΔΕ-ΟΥN occurs rhetorically at the very beginning of a royal epistle (I 169) and, narratively, alongside οΥN 91, 98, 158, 180, 194).

(2) Marking reactive questions (almost no οΥN); superordinating:
Deut. 1:27 ΕΒΕΕΟΥ ΑΣΕ ΠΟΓΕ ΜΟΟΤ ΜΜΟΝ ΑΠΕΝΤΕΝ ΕΒΟΛ (Greek non-interrogative, no particle).

Gen. 31:43 οΥΔΕ ΠΕΤΗΝΑΛΙΨ no particle in the Greek.
Gen. 23:15 οΥΔΕ ΦΑΙ ΠΑΣΩΕ (Vat add. ΠΕ) (Greek τι ην ειν τουτο).

Ex. 2:20 ΑΡΕΩΝ ΔΕ ΝΕ (= Vat) — see above, §2.4.2, for this mysterious but well-documented ΝΕ.
Gen. 30:30 ΤΗΝΟΥ ΔΕ ΑΙΝΑΘΑΜΙΟ ΝΗ ΝΟΤΗΝ ΝΕΝΑΤ (Greek τουν ουν).

(3) ΛΑΘΑΡΑ ΔΕ ... ("usque tamen") + Present; no particle in the Greek. We may have here ΔΕ1, but the placement weighs against this; is this a case of ΔΕ3 "still", "yet"?
Ex. 16:28 ΛΑΘΑΡΑ ΔΕ ΤΕΤΕΝΟΤΟΥΗ ΑΝ ΕΚΩΤΕΜ.
Num. 14:11 ΛΑΘΑΡΑ ΔΕ ΠΑΙΑΑΟΕ ΘΡΟ ΜΜΟΙ ΕΜΒΟΝ.
Num. 14:27 ΛΑΘΑΡΑ ΔΕ ΤΑΙΤΗΝΑΓΨΗΝ ΕΤΡΨΟΤ ΝΗ ΕΤΟΤΧ-ΡΕΠΡΕΜ ΜΜΨΟΤ ΝΈΨΟΤ ΜΠΑΜΡΟ — the Greek has here the accusative την συναγωγην την πονηραν ταυτην, as the marked case (cf. "Why me?").

Obs.
ΛΑΘΑΡΑ ΔΕ is generally very well attested: Ps. 6:4, 12:2f., 73:10, 78:5, 81:2 etc. (only 79:5 without ΔΕ); ΔΕ clearly belongs in the pattern, as does ΣΕ in the Shenoutean (Akhmimoid) Sahidic ΛΑΘΕΟΤ ΣΕ ΣΨΠΕ, see SHISHA-HALEVY 1986a:85.
(4) δέ in non-interrogative Allocution (†νοσ δέ):
Num. 11:6 †νοσ δέ-ατηςψτεχ υωοτι (Greek νυχὶ δέ).

(5) δέ in Narrative (very rare):
Gen. 22:7 θνοό ς δέ πειςλαγ (Vat δέ) Greek δέ (Arabic 'ammâ)
Cf. οςιν above in a similar role. May we assume, here and in cases like
De Vis II 167 ἢςγωοπι δέ..., a misreading of δέ?

δέ- 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 — actential 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
δέ- 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) ρω
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 punc-
tuation delimiter placed immediately following ρω, 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 1990:120ff.):
Gen. 27:36 ιε μπεκεδπνςκμοτ νηι ρω • άνοκ παιωτ.
Ex. 36:9 παιρκι † ρω • πετςωοι ηνιαται τηςτ (παιωι ρω
supra lin. P) (= Vat).
Ex. 28:33 οςορ γαςερμαν ννοοβ μπαεκμοτ ρω (= Vat).
Gen. 24:8 θμονον ρω • θνοο κπεπταςεο μπαςωρπι εματ
(= Vat) — note here a remarkable adverbial marking of monon; re-
markable separation of ρω and θνοο; remarkable focussing of the
imperative negation with θμονον.

Obs.
(1) For the probable etymon of ρω, see Erm 1933 §683 on LE m-r3-c, of colon-final
placement.
(2) DEPUYDT 2001, in characterizing ἔριθυ (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 ἔριθυ, and there is no need for "negation" or even "contrast" to describe its effect.

(3) A supporting argument for focussing ἔριθυ is the prevalent Φαί (παί-) ἔριθυ "just this": see STERN 1880 §249. This particle focalizes the deixis of the Φαί series in Bohairic generally: B4 John 9:30 (ΣΕΝΦΑΙ). In Nitrian: Φαί etc. Cat. 5; ἔοβεφαί De Vis II 11, Cat. 1, 9, 18, 20, 26, 68 — this is especially striking in hermeneutical style. παίρνει ἔριθυ on ετε- Cat. 16, παί- notωρ ἔριθυ on (πε) Cat. 12, 46, 148, παίρων ἔφαὶ ἔριθυ AM I 137. We find ἔριθυ also focussing πι- (De Vis II 26), Φω- (SV 64), ἔριθυ on is especially typical of Nitrian (De Vis, Cat.), often with negation (ἀν ἔριθυ), "(not) at all", e.g. AM I 128, 129.

(4) The conditioned, colon-second "clause-enclitic" position of ἔριθυ occurs less often, in advert-focussing conversion (Focalizing Preterite): B4 John 9:29 ἀρετήσφη παί ἔφαῖ (Cat. 185) εταχὶ ἔριθυ εἴθε. Significantly, we also find ἔριθυ in this placement in Rhetorical Questions, where the whole nexus is assertively focussed: μὴ ἔριθυ, ἑκὼ ἔριθυ: consider also ἄμοι ἔριθυ, ἀρνώσ ἔριθυ, ἀολῶς ἔριθυ, τεώς ἔριθυ, μὴπως ἔριθυ (De Vis 141, II 162f., AM 1 117 etc., John 7:26). The clause-final placement in B4 Gen. 2:19 παν ἔριθυ εἴθαδαν θότερ ἐρωτ... Φαί θεον θόταν ἔριθυ (interestingly not in P or Vat) is probably an old Egyptian placement (SHISHA-HALEVY 1981:319).

(5) ἔριθυ recalls Greek γέ in functional and formal regards: see MOORHOUSE 1959:138ff., 149; SEILER 1977; DÍK 1995:38ff., 44 ("counterpresuppositional focus").


(f) MÉN

This, an essentially cataphoric discourse-organizing particle, is probably the "most Greek", idiomatically speaking, of Greek loan-particles in Coptic.

(1) Discourse-structuring: MÉN... ΔΕ... occurs in contrastive/correlative topicalization in dialogue:

Gen. 27:22 ἤςιν ἘΣΙΝ ἘΗΣΙΝ ΝΙΚΩΒ ΤΕ ΝΙΚΙΩΔΤΕ ΝΕΝΙΚΩΔΤΕ (Greek μὰν... δὲ...).

Gen. 38:23 ΑΝΟΚ ΜΕΝ ΑΙΘΩΡΙΠ ΜΠΗΗΑΘΙ ΜΒΑΜΠΙ ΝΟΘΕΚ ΑΕ ΜΠΕΚΑΙΗΜΟΣ (Greek μὰν... δὲ...).

Gen. 41:13 ΑΝΟΚ ΜΕΝ ΑΧΧΑΤ ΕΞΕΝΤΑΡΧΗ ΦΗ ΔΕ ΑΚΑΨΩ (Greek... τέ... δὲ...).

71 The Greek has εὐρήκας, with no explicit object; Coptic, in which an object is essential for the construction of high-transitivity ΣΙΜΙ, 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 μέν marks the first term of a potential correlation, with the other term realized or unrealized; μέν also defines the hierarchy:

Deut. 20:11f. εὐωπ ὁ ἄκωπον ἐκ οὐβάκι ἐβῶτες ἔρωτ ... εὐωπ ὁ μέν ἄκωπον ὅλην ἐβολήν ἐπετε[μ]ένωσεν ... εὐωπ ὁ μέν ἄκωπον ἐπετε[μ]ένωσεν ... (Greek δὲ ... μὲν ... δὲ ...).

Lev. 3:1-6 εὐωπ ὁ μέν ὁ ὀπτώπωσεν ἐν ὁμοίῳ περὶ ταῖοι μετέξει περὶ περὶ ταῖοι μετέξει εὐωπ ὁ μέν ἄκωπον ἐβολήν ἐπετε[μ]ένωσεν ... εὐωπ ὁ μέν ἄκωπον ἐπετε[μ]ένωσεν ... (Greek δὲ ... μὲν ... δὲ ...).

Lev. 27:7 εὐωπ ὁ μέν ἰς ἐρωτήσει εὐωπ ὁ μέν ὁ ὀπτώπωσεν περὶ περὶ περὶ περὶ περὶ ... ὁ ὀπτώπωσεν ἐπετε[μ]ένωσεν ... (Greek δὲ ... μὲν ... [δὲ ...]).

(3) "Solitary μέν" segments a protatic topicalized clause, heralding the thematic apodosis:

Gen. 44:8 ἰς μέν πιθανὴ εταναζέμενη Σέννενκοκ άνταζερ σάρκα ... πωε τενακώλπ ἐβολήν Σέννην μπεντέ (Greek μὲν ...).

(4) μέν γὰρ is interesting, being an amalgam of anaphoric and cataphoric (Rheme-heralding) signals:

Gen. 43:14 άνοξ μέν γὰρ μὴρ ἀπεγράφη ἐπεναρτήματος ἀπεγράφη (Greek μὲν γὰρ ...: a remarkable reflection of the original on the Coptic).

Obs.
1. μέν γὰρ 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 γὰρ μέν still answering to μὲν γὰρ ... (I Cor. 14:17, Job 9:19, 12:11, 28:2).
2. μέν γὰρ Cat. 190, very common narratively in the Acts, where we even find ὁ ἄστι ὁ κυρίος (Acts 28:5 one cod.), is not attested in our corpus. μέν γὰρ: De Vis II 39.

(g) γὰρ "thus, then"

Enclitic, non-interrogative γὰρ (Denniston 1954: ἀρά 93) is very rare in the corpus; I find only:

Gen. 26:28 μαρεθεσσιν γὰρ ὁ ἄστι τοι ὁμοίως ὃς τοι (Greek γενέσθω ἀρά).
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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'origine¹.

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 époque². 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'origine³. 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 vergeurs (35-38 mm) et observer que les fils de chaîne sont groupés par deux, ce qui semble caractéristique des manuscrits égyptiens (copistes et arabes) de cette période.

**Composition des cahiers et pagination**

Selon la foliation 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 7 au début du 3e 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 bohairiques 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 feuilles 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 feuilles perdus étaient les trois premiers du manuscrit. Ils ne comportaient pas de texte, puisque la Genèse commence bien au f°1 (= Α dans la numérotation copie d’origine), mais probablement au moins une grande croix ornementale comme on en trouve souvent à cette place.

- Le 10e cahier (f° 88-93) est constitué 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 foliotation 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 bohaïriques de cette période. La foliotation re-commence 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 numéroteur indépendamment les pages des différents textes contenus dans un codex. La foliotation est indiquée de deux manières: en chiffres coptes traditionnels (hérités du grec), peut-être portés de la main du copiste, et en “chiffres coptes” cursifs7, probablement ajoutés plus tard, peut-être à l’occasion d’une nouvelle reliure.

Régule

Les feuillets ont été préparés, probablement grâce à l’utilisation d’une mastara, ou planche à régler8. La surface à écrire est divisée en trois colonnes égales, ce qui permet d’utiliser les deux premières pour le copte 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 copte la


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 جسد et de la queue inférieure du ١١١، et la taille importante de certaines lettres dont l’intérieur est rempli de rouge: ١١١١١١٠١١١١٠١٠. Il y a deux formes pour le “hay” : ١٠١٠١٠١٠١٠١٠١٠ et ١٠١٠١٠١٠١٠١٠. 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 -س en rouge, jusqu’au f° 328R; ensuite les espaces destinés à ces signes continuent à être ménagés, mais ne sont plus remplis.

- Diacritiques: ١٠١
de l’Exode (f° 94R) a trois lignes de lettres monumentales noires, puis quelques lignes en onciale dite “nitriote”\(^{11}\), 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. À la première page des Nombres (f° 231R), les trois premières lettres du texte sont seules très agrandies: \(\text{œ} \text{γ} \text{ο}(2)\), chaque \(\text{o}\) 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.

*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: \(\text{ɔ̃z} (167)\) a été résolu en marge \(\text{γενεκεκαυφ}\) (cent soixante-sept).

- Dans la Genèse et le Deutéronome une main (occidentale?) a introduit une division du texte en chiffrs 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 Choikai 1073 (année écrite en chiffres coptes cursifs: \(\text{ғ owē'}\)), soit 15 décembre 1356.

- À 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 (\(\text{ғ o g}\)), soit 1357/1358, tandis qu’à la fin du texte se trouve la souscription: \(\text{eγo} \text{δοc} \text{en h} \text{p} \text{n} \text{n} \text{ɑ} \text{m} \text{n}\)

\(^{11}\) 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\(^{e}\) au 14\(^{e}\) 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 ἀμνη.

- 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:

ἀκάωκ ἐβολ ναε ἱσεωρία ἐθογαβ ην οὐγιρθην ὑτε φή ἀμνη ἐχεν ταχ ὑμιπηκ έφενε παѡλα ὑτε νεγνωβι πιγγενε ετμες ἱάβνη νιβεν φη ετε ἱγεμπνω αν εερημουγ ἐροθ έχε ρημη μαλιτα ηνοξος ηεν ηραν μιαηνα πιγηρι ναβραμ πιεμπεμαχ ἵμαυνογ ἵμβακι [...]  

κε ογον νιβεν ετναχημι νιγεβαϊ ις ἱμετανοια μαρεπηρι νογαγανη ογος ήτεναις κατα πετερπηπτ έρε πνχ τ ναγ ιμπινηabıτ νιγεβαϊ εφε νεγαγανη άμνην

ηπομπη ηνιμαρτηρπος αἰω ηνογιρθην ὑτε φή ἀμμην

“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 Pemdjè14 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’Ézéchiel 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 γεννη. Il pourrait s’agir d’un dérivé de γεννη « être malade », ou de γεννη, « 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 θεορία, 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): ἄριστος πίπαρ ιεβολ ἤπει θεωρία εὐογάς (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 Bábah, 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 copistes 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.\footnote{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 numérotation 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 déchiffrée 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.
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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 فيه 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 ‘ل ... of the command’ (لم الأمر); cf. W. Wright, A Grammar of the Arabic Language [Cambridge, 1933], vol. 1, p. 291; vol. 2, p. 35) in Exod. 5:7, 9: 9 ‘... وليمضوا ... فلتنتقل أعمال ... فليهتموا بها ...' '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 هذى 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 القرابف 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. 1, 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 ‘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 احدثهما (instead of احدثهما) 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 ايش (اي شيء) instead of the interrogative pronoun يام ‘what’. Both ايش 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 ... ‘(either) or’, in interrogative sentences: Num. 13:18 ‘are they strong or weak’?; cf. Wright, Grammar, vol. 2, p. 306 (although اقوى has اقويما seems to have been a better choice: see ibid., p. 308).

die’.

8. Hyper-corrections: Exod. 4:2 ‘فقال له الرب ما هذه التي في يدك اما هو اما هي’ ‘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) نذقا ناو نذئه ناذ مك اتحج نذوزعو ده نذقا مك اتحج ود. It might be an attraction or a ‘scholarly hyper-correction’ in the Arabic, where there is such an adaptation of the demonstrative pronoun and the relative pronoun (which should have been used 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’, iپ is translated as ابر ابر; proper
names in Exod. I follow the Coptic (cf. verse 3 نذخالايم); 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 אלזא מודא). See also Gen. 32:2, the Arabic فسار بعقوب في طريقه ورفع طرفه فرأى عساكر الله... ‘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 כריסה ‘shins’ translated as אקורע (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-Fara'id, Arabic-English Dictionary [Beirut, 1986], p. 651); ושה ‘soul’ translated as רוח נרפה in Gen. 2:7; 7:22 (cf. Blau, Dictionary, p. 693); or evenروح נרפה in Deut. 20:16; מְשַׁחַת ‘ointment’ is translated as משחה (see e.g. Lev. 7:35, or משחה in Exod. 29:7); מַחָּה ‘a camping place’ as מַחָּה in Exod. 29:7; מַחָּה ‘a lamp’ as מַחָּה in Exod. 35:14; מַחָּה, ‘anything devoted to God’ is translated as משחה and there is even a pl. form (Lev. 27:28-29. For the meaning in Classical Arabic, cf. Lane, Lexicon, vol. 2, pp. 553 ff.). In Lev. 25:24, יבֹכֵל אַרְיֵא אָמום ‘and in the whole land you hold’, the Arabic is وفي جميع الأرض التي في حوزكم (cf. حوز ‘in J. Blau, Dictionary, p. 151) apparently caused this translation choice (cf. the same word translated as מיראת ‘inheritance’ in Gen. 47:11 or Num. 32:29, 32). In Deut. 8:9 is translated as מסכנתה (both mean ‘poverty, destitution’). מסכנתה is the Classical use in Arabic; see Hava, Al-Fara'id, p. 329). According to Blau, in Judaeo-Arabic texts כֹּכָּבָה plur-al כֹּכָּבָה is a literal translation of the Hebrew כֹּכָּבָה ‘burnt-offering’ (Blau, Emergence, p. 156; cf. Blau, Dictionary, p. 372). This word appears in several places, such as Gen. 8:21, but this does not translate the Hebrew parallel. The word כֹּכָּבָה in the Hebrew version of Gen. 8:20 is translated as כֹּכָּבָה in the same sense as כֹּכָּבָה (‘burnt-offerings’). כֹּכָּבָה is translated as כֹּכָּבָה in Exod. 29:25; and in Exod. 30:20 it translates
כַּשַׁת, a sacrifice burnt completely (or partly). In Lev. 1:3 כַּשַׁת is translated as וֹכֶדֶת כַּשַׁת and in Lev. 4:34 כַּשַׁת is translated by מִזְבֵּחַ. Sometimes apparently translates מִזְבֵּחַ 'the altar of the burnt-offering' when it is understood not merely as a 'burnt-offering' but 'burnt-offering related to the incense and the good smell coming from it. In Num. 33:48-50 'the plains of Moab' מְזַחֲתָה מֹאָב is translated as מֵהַמֶּרֶב מֹאָב 'the west of Moab', but this is in fact a reflection of the Septuagint, where מֵהַמֶּרֶב מֹאָב is translated as 'the west of Moab' (cf. Deut. 1:1 'in the Araba, within the reach of the west').

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 הֵסֵתָה סַנָּה (or סַנָּה הֵסֵתָה) 'each one, every one' (cf. W.E. Crum, A Coptic Dictionary [Oxford, 1979], p. 469). Although the classical phrase כל אחד is also in use (cf. Wright, Grammar, Vol. 2, p. 204) such as in Exod. 5:4 כִּי נָשֶׁתָה וְחֵילָה חוֹדְשָׁה: ‘let each one of you [note the preservation of the dual] go to his work’, we find more often translations of הֵסֵתָה סַנָּה in phrases like (Exod. 1:1; כל אחד واحد; Num. 7:5; 11:10) and even (Num. 5:10; Lev. 7:10; cf. the feminine, ibid., 5:26). The phrase כל אחד translating in one place סַנָּה הֵסֵתָה 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 הֵסֵתָה סַנָּה 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
ordinance; in Lev. 24:22 ‘the alien, لِدَمَ’ is translated by al-dhimmi (of a non-Muslim community protected by Islam); in Gen. 8:20 ‘the clean birds’ الطير الخالل al-tayr al-al-ḥalāl; Lev. 10:10 ‘the unclean and the clean’ الخالل والحرام al-ḥalāl wa-l-ḥarām (lawful and unlawful in terms of Muslim jurisprudence (cf. Blau, Dictionary, pp. 120, 142).

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 وقتم 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’) is a translation from the Coptic...περὶ τὸν οὗτον ἔναν πικασί τῆς ἐτακασί ἰμοῖο ἦν. Note the influence of the Coptic word order, more especially the possible influence of the adjective verb ἔναν- (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'ul 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 علم أعلم ‘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’ ḫynt an nt’q 3:16 ‘I have surely remembered you’ ḫynt nwmn ḫyn ṣmṭy τ ṣmtyn.

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 reinforcer (see the definition in Shisha-Halevy, p. 273). See, e.g. Gen. 4:9 حْقَالَلَّلَهَّلَّلَهَّلَهَّلَّلَهَّلَّلَهَّلَّلَهَّلَّلَهَّلَّلَّلَهَّلَّлَّلَّلَّلَّلَّلَّلَّلَّلَّلَّلَّلَّلَّلَّلَّلَّلَّلَّلَّلَّلَّلَّلَّلَّلَّلَّلَّلَّلَّلَّلَّلَّлَّلَь
as... دعاه... قايلًا... 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 اني ذكرًا قد ذكرتكم...

8. Exod. 2:2 ἐτανοντε ἢ ἑρυκ ταστικὸς ην... The Arabic is a literal translation:... ولا نظروه أنه جميل هو (‘... when they saw him that he is beautiful...’). The pronominal suffix in نظروه does not match the Classical Arabic (cf. Gen. 37:4: فلما نظر اخوته 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 ην (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 ἡσενοτεν θοταί θοταί ησεντ ενεψις ‘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 ‘لى of the command’ (لى الامر), and not by the Arabic imperative. Cf. above, section Classical elements, 2: the example given there is Exod. 5:7:לים ותטיל את עמל... ו.hours... let them... Let them go... let the works [of these people] be heavy... let them take care of them [the works]’. Here ‘لى of the command’ is used to translate the Coptic causative imperative (مار الق- let him-): ماروسونيس... ماروس)... מארוס... מארוס... מארוס... מארוס... מארוס... מארוס... מארוס... מארוס...

10. Another result of a literal translation is seen in ἑφμα: in Deut. 8:20 ἑφμα ην... ἡτεθεν κωτε... ‘because you did not listen...’, the Arabic version is لوضع لموضوع عدم سماعكم, and it translates the Coptic literally (لى موضوع like ما means ‘place’). In Gen. 22:16 ‘because you have done...’; ما انك فعلت... It might be that ما was chosen here because of the similarity to the sounding of ἑφμα. But cf. Gen. 22:18: ἑφμα ‘because’ is translated by في (cf. Wright, Grammar, vol. 2, p. 78); in Gen. 22:13 ‘instead of his son’ عرض اسحاق ابنه ἑφμα is translated by a parallel Arabic usage.

11. ‘To sport, play with a woman’ in Gen. 26:8... נוק נמצת לא רבקה... The Arabic version, following the Coptic ἐσκοβιν κεμبي نم بรกكا سيق سيغيمي is (‘Isaac is sporting with Rebekah his wife’; note the similarity of the Arabic root ض ح.ك to the Hebrew root בק). Cf. Gen. 39:17: נק אל אֶנֶבֶּה הָעִבְרִי אַשְׁר הָעַבְרָה לָע ל The Hebrew slave... came to me to make sport on me’. The Coptic is κοβι ‘to laugh, play’, but the Arabic here is ليفضحي ‘to disgrace me’.

12. In Exod. 5:8 ἑφμα... وثابت... ‘to work on...’; Cf. above, section Classical elements, 2: the example given there is Exod. 5:7:럼... Let them... Let them go... let the works [of these people] be heavy... let them take care of them [the works]’. Here ‘لى of the command’ is used to translate the Coptic causative imperative (مار الق- let him-): ماروسونيس... ماروس)... מארוס... מארוס... מארוס... מארוס... מארוס... מארוס... מארוס... מארוס...

Examples:

Exod. 5:7 Arabic فلا تعودون تعطون (‘you shall not give again’) translates the negative optative nneten osagetnenosnems et...; عاذ serves here as an auxiliary verb (Cf. Blau, Grammar, p. 188, no. 295-296; idem, Christian Arabic, p. 442). In Gen. 9:11 the imperfect فلا يكون translates the Coptic optative nne... wopan (‘it shall [never] be’) in the promise of God to Noah (cf. Blau, 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, Exod. 31:14 eqemose mphos (‘he shall surely be put to death’) and it is translated by the Arabic maf′ul mušlaq فليمتص موتا; verse 15 يموت موتا. There is also a usage of the Coptic causative imperative in similar cases (Lev. 20:9). Cf. the use of the Arabic imperative in Deut. 4:40 ‘Keep his decrees and commands...’, where واحفظ سنته ووصاياه is a translation of osoy ekēpeq... In Deut. 7:18 ‘you shall not be afraid’, nnekaypget 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 Gen. 27:41. In 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 (Deut. 5:6-18), the negative optative nnek is generally translated by the Arabic negative imperative. In verse 12 (‘Keep the Sabbath day’), the Arabic positive imperative ياحفظ translates the Coptic imperative ḫeq, while in verse 15 the Coptic optative (‘you shall remember’) is translated also by the Arabic imperative. In Exod. 7:4 ‘Pharaoh shall not listen to you...’; the Arabic وليس يسمع translates the Coptic optative nneqcowem (in connection with the imperfect, ليس expresses a strongly denied present or future; cf. Wright, 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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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
Flexionisolierung, 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 (€φε-), 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 (qānāt), 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 (τιεογια) of Holies" 419-420, 425-426
Homolexemicity, 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, Coptic (nāq-), 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
εrr- + Infinitive, 464
Narrative Infinitive, 121
Thematic, 240
See also "Tautological Infinitive"

Injunctive, 460
Injunctive-Hortative Focalizing Conversion, 312-313

Interlocutive 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 εp-, 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
Jinkim, 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-Morphemic Juncture, 1, 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, 4.1.1, 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, Adverbal/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, Morphophonematics as Juncture Features, Negation, Neutric Feminine, In-Nexus Concord Link, Nexus Scope of Juncture, Nominal Sentence/Juncture Characterization of NS, Ordination, Paradigm and Juncture, Particles, Prosody, Punctuation, Relative Conversion, Relative Conversion/Relative Constructions, Juncture of, Superordination.
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-Allocution, 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
Narrative Texteme, 34-41
Pacing in Narrative, 60
Placement of Theme-agens in Narrative, 123-131
Presentatives in Narrative, 226-229, 231
Recycled (Revisited) Narrative, 70, 73, 94
Responsive Set Narrative, 95
Slow Motion in Narrative, 59-62, 68, 83
Thematicity/Rhematicity in Narrative, 58
Zoom-in, in Narrative, 59-62, 67-71
Zoom-out, in Narrative, 63
See also Focalization, Scenario
Nasal, Lexeme with Initial Syllabic, 564-566
Negation, 143, 169, 177, 2.4.6, 352, 497, 527, 536, 583-584
Negation of Nominal Sentence Patterns, 237, 244, 251, 257, 263, 277, 279
Embracing Negation, 325-326
Focalizing Negation, 247, 261
and Generics, 407-409
Negation Focussed, 325
Negative Environment, 368, 375, 385-386, 408, 411, 423, 490
Nexal Negation, 166, 323, 324-325, 327-328
Neutralization, Conditioning, De-Pertinentization, 30, 41, 82-83, 177, 190, 208, 213, 218, 219, 296, 306, 357, 414, 421, 440, 469, 486, 495, 514, 516, 519, 567, 601
Neutric Feminine Anaphor/Cataphor, 456, 4.2.4.2, 4.2.4.5
Neutric Gender (Pronoun), 151, 166, 415, 419, 421, 456, 460, 467, 518-520
Nexus, 222, 325, 580
Focussed, in Narrative, 93, 128, 132
Focussed, in Allocation, 146-147, 176, 227, 232
Focussed, 133, 167, 232, 293, 320, 322-324, 324-325
Mediate/Discontinuous, 499-500
Negatived, 375, 564
Nexal Scope of Juncture, 4.2.6, 539-540
Nexus Patterns in Coptic, 2.0.1
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
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 (Interlocutive) + πε, 263-265
Personal-Pronoun (Interlocutive) + πε + Proper Name, 265-267
Indefinite Noun-Syntagm + πε, 267-268
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Rhematicizing n- as Rheme in Nominal Sentence, 255
Theme Zeroed in Delocutive Nominal Sentence, 240-242, 302
Topicalized-Theme Pattern, 126, 249-256, 269, 528-529, 599, 600
"Divine Acclamation" Pattern, 256 in Egyptian Diachrony, 235, 245, 251-252, 266, 267, 269, 278, 402
General and Preliminary Issues, 233-235
Interlocutive Pattern Set, 2.1.2, 265, 266, 386, 516, 536-537, 610
Suppletivity with the Delocutive Pattern Set, 275-276
Topicalized Subpattern, 279
Juncture Characterization of the NS, 492-493, 539
See also specific NS Patterns
Nominal Sentence in Cleft-Sentence Topic, 302
Oppositions of and Suppletion for, 2.2.1 passim
Nominality, Nounhood in Coptic, 340
Non-Specificity, 441, 447
Non-Specific Nucleus Expanded by Relative, 238, 247, 260
Non-Specific Rhemes with e-p-, 280-284, 286, 287-288
Non-Specific Theme, 224
See also Specificity
Noun Predication, Incidental-Contingent, 198, 279-281, 348-349, 365-368, 375, 405, 434
Noun Predication, Inherent, 198, 405, 434
See also Nominal Sentence
Nubian, 24, 582
(Non-)Nuclearity, 3.0.4, 340, 451, 484, 487, 494, 520, 523, 524
Nucleus and Expansion, 6, 291, 399, 536
See also (Non-)Nuclearity
Oath, 192
Object Actant, see Actant/Object Actant
Object Pronoun, 538
Obtaining Situation, in Narrative, 38, 58, 59-62, 69-70, 77, 100, 108, 125
Omniscient Narrator's Channel, 63-64, 70, 73-74, 76, 78, 91, 97, 102, 108, 117-119, 132, 214, 624
Ordination, 4.5
Ordination in Narrative, 39, 135-137
Paradigm and Juncture, 479, 482-483, 487, 488, 595
Parataxis, 107
Parenthesis, 620
Parenthetic Comment in Narrative, 66, 75
Particles, 116-119, 140, 151, 176, 1.2.4.3, 186, 545, 548, 606, 611-613, 4.6.1
Parts-of-Speech model, 8-9
Pattern, (def.) 4, 480, 605
Perfect (Egyptian, Coptic), 30, 219-220, 226
Performative, 177, 217, 226, 228, 229, 230, 287, 318-319, 338
Divine-Intervention Performative, 226, 228, 230, 287, 319
See also Synchronous Present
Person, Generic, 140
"Personal Infinitive", 461
Persons, Interlocutive, 140
(Non-)Phoricity, 62, 354, 364-365, 406, 415,
Circumstantial Focalizing Preterite 238, 601
Focalizing Preterite, 87, 132, 309-310, 311, 314, 329, 489, 567
Negative Preterite (\(\text{\`miteq}\)) 107
Relative Preterite, 311, 567
Pro-Form, 165, 1.2.4.1, 378-379, 518
Pro-Nexus, 158
Pro-Verb, 340, 605
in Response, 166, 167-177, 378, 399, 402
Proclamation, Divine, 263, 280
Proclisis, Procliticity, 276, 346, 425, 536-537, 613-614, 631
Prolepsis, 252
Pronoun Expanded, 3.11
Proper Names, 150, 262, 265-267, 270, 276, 277, 297, 301, 361, 392, 396, 422, 423, 3.8, 441, 452, 482, 611
Identifying-by-Name, 266
Name-hood, 427
Naming Apposition, 428
Naming Forms, 191, 270-271, 427, 437
Proper Name in Allocution, 429-430
Proper Name Expanded/Expanding, 427-429, 3.11
Proper Names in Narrative, 99, 110-111, 430
See also Generics/General Notion Name
Prophecy, 190
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
Prospective Conjunctive (\(\text{\`axf\`eq}\)), 158, 159-160, 164

426, 441, 442, 4.2.4, 4.2.4.7.5 and
\textit{passim}
See also Anaphora, Cataphora, Exophora, Phoricization
Phoneme, Covert Laryngal, 4.4.7.1
Phoricization, 523
Phorics, 4.2.4
Plural (Coptic)
  Morpholexical, 28, 342-345
  Syntagmatic, 28
Poetical Rhetorics, 624
Polotsky, H.-J., 1, 4, 16, 17, 19, 20, 57, 132, 295, 296, 305-308, 310, 311, 347-348, 369, 381, 401, 581-582
Portuguese, 461
Possession, 78, 239, 240-241, 345, 362, 431, 434
  and Determination, 3.5.3
Possession Verboïd, 357, 361-363
Possessive Article, 254, 345, 353, 357, 398-400, 434, 443-444, 461, 482, 515
Possessive Pronoun (Coptic \(\varphi\alpha\-\)), 254, 276, 338, 373-374, 398-399, 401-403, 451, 482, 487, 538
Possessor, 349, 361-362, 400, 486
Possessum, 349, 361-362, 400
See also Zero Possessum
Post-Imperatival Allocutive Slot, 112, 158-164, 501, 547
Pragmatic Theme, 262
Pre-Negator, 597
See also Legal-Generic Case-Raising
Prepositions, 485, 538
Present, Narrative, 43, 47, 48, 49, 53-55, 104, 134
Present forms in Narrative, 1.1.4
Present Tense (Coptic), 168, 169, 170-177, 209-211, 274, 275, 287
  in Narrative, 104-105
  Focalizing Present, 170-177, 287, 318, 323, 374
  Circumstantial Conversion of, 583
  Generic (Non-Actual), 165, 209-211, 215-217, 287, 350
Presentational Constructions, 257, 260-261, 263-266, 301, 303, 304-305, 580
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
   Nexus 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
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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
Schwartz, 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
Sichem 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 Definutive 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 (eταξις), 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/Agent 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
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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 Juncture/Topicalization Juncture
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 Existant, 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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ΔΛΟΥ, ΔΛΟΧ 567
ο- (interr.) 143, 144-146, 168-169, 170-177
ον (neg.), ο-ον 261, 325-329, 527, 552, 600-601
(ΔΟΚ) 120, 610-611
ΞΑΡΑ 147-148, 175, 633
ἈΣ 147-148, 149
ἈΑΣ  ἈΗΗ ἙΓΕ 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
ΕΒΕ- 331
ΕΝΕ- 312
ΕΡ- 2.2.1
ΕΡ- (Topic in Cleft Sentence) 297
ΕΡΒΟΚΙ, ΒΟΚΙ 287
ΕΡΟΥ ΝΑ- Ν- 151
ΕΤ- 511, 526
ΕΣΑ- 113, 114, 115, 131, 309-310
ΕΫΣΕ- 603
ΕΡΕ- 460-474
ΙΕ 147-149, 170-177, 186, 197-198, 604
ΚΕ-, ΠΚΕ- 395, 396, 429
ΚΗΝ 219, 593
ΜΕΝ ... (ΔΕ) ... 64, 92, 249, 461
ΜΕΝ-ΓΑΡ 633
ΜΗ-ΟΥΝ 633
ΜΗ 147-148, 170-177, 513
ΜΗΝΟΤΕ, ΜΗΝΩC 177
ΜΗΤΙ 147-148, 170-177
ΜΗΝΙΜΗΟ= 608
ΜΗΟΝ (resp.) 27, 165, 166, 167-177
ΜΗΟΝ- (exist.) 2.0.2, 349, 374, 407, 495, 498
ΕΡΕ-ΜΗΟΝ 495, 584
ΜΗΑΥ 361-362
ΜΗΑΥΑΤ= 120, 608
ΜΠΑΤΕΓ- 105
ΜΦΗ (resp.) 27, 165, 167-177
ΜΑΡΟΝ 157, 158
Ν- (rhematizing, nota relationis) 255, 273, 2.3, 365-368, 440, 448-449, 451, 603
Ν- (object marking) 550
ΝΑΥ “see” 60, 64, 104, 116
ΝΕ (interr.?) 239, 319
ΝΕ- 91, 99, 100, 103, 104, 136, 199, 254, 255, 260, 540
ΝΕ-/ΝΑ= 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
ΝΕΑΣ- Ø 82
ΝΕΑΣ- ΝΕ 81-82, 125
ΝΕΜ 330, 375-377, 504-506
ΝΕΝ- (pl. art.) 394, 434
ΝΟΟΥ- in Nominal Sentence 239
ΝΙ- 409-410
ΝΙΒΕΝ 349, 418, 421, 515, 612
ΝΙΜ (interr.) 150
ΝΝΟ 165
INDEX OF COPTIC ELEMENTS AND PHRASES

ηξε- 243, 248, 316, 331-332, 349, 368, 530-532, 625
-οι η- 27, 28, 2.2.1, 367-368
ον 175

{n-} 246, 354-355, 3.5, 3.5.1
π-ετ- 395
πεξας 113, 130
{πι-} 3.5, 3.5.1
πως 150

(ΡΗΤ) (ΜΠΑΙΡΗΤ). ΜΦΡΗΤ 177, 247, 261, 263, 277, 282, 303, 410, 517, 4.2.4.4, 584, 587, 628
ρω 176, 293, 631, 632, 4.6.1

ςέ (resp.) 165, 167-177

τθρ= 120, 516, 608-609
τω ετως η- 151
τωουν 538, 576-577

ογ (interp.) 374
ογαι, ογι 265, 276, 277, 382-384
ογια (ΓΑΡ) 28, 232, 543
ογκουν 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

ογτε (“between”) 510-511
ογω 592-593
ογογ, άγω 116-120, 151-152, 160-164, 187, 507, 511

χη 28, 1.2.5.3, 2.2.2

φια, φη 414-417, 522-523

ω 154

ψο 165
ψον 223, 2.2.2
ψωπι 585, 591
αςωπι 115

υτεμ 325, 485

θανατ 317

ζα- 264, 276, 451-452, 488

ζη- 375-377
ζω= 120, 609-610
ζη 374, 385-387

θηππε, ιε, θηππε ιε 60, 61, 67, 84, 135, 137, 186, 189, 197, 202-203, 217, 219-220, 2.0.3, 248, 260, 263

Δε- 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
Δη 151, 522-523
Διν- (vnl.) 345, 461-462, 464

Τηνυ 110, 176, 219, 627
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**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
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Gen. 9:6 - 193
Gen. 9:7 - 158, 161, 161, 550
Gen. 9:10 - 551
Gen. 9:11 - 549
Gen. 9:12 - 395, 406, 406, 510, 552
Gen. 9:13 - 367, 510, 550
Gen. 9:14 - 604
Gen. 9:14f. - 115
Gen. 9:15 - 510
Gen. 9:16 - 461
Gen. 9:17 - 510
Gen. 9:18 - 546, 552, 614
Gen. 9:20 - 286, 378
Gen. 9:22 - 602
Gen. 9:23 - 79, 556
Gen. 9:24 - 558
Gen. 9:25 - 190
Gen. 9:28 - 45
Gen. Ch. 10 - 272
Gen. 10:1 - 273
Gen. 10:2 - 449, 551
Gen. 10:4 - 549
Gen. 10:5 - 109
Gen. 10:8-9 - 71
Gen. 10:9 - 110, 191, 281, 283, 415, 550
Gen. 10:11 - 428
Gen. 10:18 - 415
Gen. 10:19 - 549
Gen. 10:20 - 126
Gen. 10:24 - 511
Gen. 10:26 - 550
Gen. 11:1 - 284, 367, 367
Gen. 11:1f. - 70
Gen. 11:2 - 602
Gen. 11:3 - 254
Gen. 11:4 - 416, 525
Gen. 11:6 - 609
Gen. 11:7 - 162
Gen. 11:9 - 94
Gen. 11:10 - 140, 461
Gen. 11:19 - 549
Gen. 11:29 - 270, 270, 550, 550
Gen. 11:30 - 72, 99
Gen. 11:32 - 447
Gen. 12:2 - 367, 470, 492, 594
Gen. 12:4 - 289
Gen. 12:4ff. - 344
Gen. 12:5 - 550

Gen. 12:6 - 125, 558
Gen. 12:7 - 129
Gen. 12:11 - 115, 217, 595
Gen. 12:12 - 247, 415
Gen. 12:12f. - 275
Gen. 12:13 - 196, 276, 558, 554, 626
Gen. 12:14 - 595
Gen. 12:18 - 238, 287, 314, 415
Gen. 12:19 - 160, 230, 364, 378
Gen. 12:20 - 563
Gen. 12:36 - 129
Gen. 13:2 - 407
Gen. 13:3 - 505
Gen. 13:4 - 511
Gen. 13:5 - 550
Gen. 13:5ff. - 73, 77, 503
Gen. 13:6 - 552, 554
Gen. 13:7 - 511
Gen. 13:8 - 157, 511, 572
Gen. 13:9 - 227
Gen. 13:10 - 103, 550, 590
Gen. 13:13 - 241
Gen. 13:15 - 209, 611
Gen. 13:16 - 282, 470
Gen. 13:17 - 209
Gen. 14:1 - 115, 595
Gen. 14:2 - 415
Gen. 14:8 - 415
Gen. 14:10 - 281, 284, 397, 504, 549, 554
Gen. 14:13 - 129, 284
Gen. 14:14 - 291, 365
Gen. 14:15 - 343, 611
Gen. 14:16 - 558
Gen. 14:17 - 440
Gen. 14:18 - 99, 437, 614
Gen. 14:21 - 160
Gen. 14:22 - 192
Gen. 14:23 - 145, 286, 408, 444
Gen. 14:24 - 447
Gen. 15:1 - 284, 368
Gen. 15:2 - 153, 271, 291, 351, 430, 594
Gen. 15:3 - 415
Gen. 15:5 - 161
Gen. 15:6 - 519
Gen. 15:8f. - 175
Gen. 15:8ff. - 150
Gen. 15:9 - 607
Gen. 15:10 - 415, 607
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. 16:2 – 246, 510
Gen. 16:2 – 237, 373, 553, 553
Gen. 17:13 – 390
Gen. 17:14 – 281, 527, 600
Gen. 17:15 – 191, 427, 549
Gen. 17:16 – 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
Gen. 18:26 – 112, 189
Gen. 18:27 – 116, 286
Gen. 18:28 – 173
Gen. 18:30 – 174, 553
Gen. 18:31 – 194, 363, 551, 553
Gen. 18:32 – 174, 553, 554
Gen. 18:33 – 593
Gen. 19:1 – 553, 618
Gen. 19:1ff. – 130
Gen. 19:2 – 166, 168, 200, 458
Gen. 19:3 – 105, 486
Gen. 19:3f. – 590
Gen. 19:5 – 319
Gen. 19:7 – 155, 158, 395, 418, 488
Gen. 19:8 – 363, 458, 521, 553, 553
Gen. 19:9 – 198, 390, 428, 558, 627
Gen. 19:11 – 91, 290
Gen. 19:12 – 344, 363, 416, 444, 567
Gen. 19:13 – 127
Gen. 19:14 – 68, 343
Gen. 19:14f. – 160
Gen. 19:15 – 553
Gen. 19:17 – 323
| Gen. 19:23f. – 124, 128 | Gen. 21:14 – 73, 437 |
| Gen. 19:30 – 118, 611 | Gen. 21:20f. – 50 |
| Gen. 19:32 – 164 | Gen. 21:23 – 284, 626 |
| Gen. 20:1 – 590 | Gen. 21:34 – 50 |
| Gen. 20:3 – 202, 204, 228, 239, 290, 351, 390, 437, 514, 590, 595 | Gen. 22:2 – 365 |
| Gen. 20:12 – 259, 367, 552, 615, 624 | Gen. 22:12 – 549, 610 |
| | Gen. 22:24 – 272 |
| | Gen. 23:1 – 355, 531 |
| | Gen. 23:2 – 271, 390, 428, 437, 531 |
| | Gen. 23:3 – 343 |
| | Gen. 23:4 – 281 |
| | Gen. 23:6 – 155, 225, 277, 278, 360, 493, 610, 612 |
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Gen. 23:7 – 437, 437, 438, 441
Gen. 23:8 – 290, 463, 519, 531
Gen. 23:9 – 365, 390
Gen. 23:10 – 70, 572
Gen. 23:11 – 153, 217
Gen. 23:13 – 396, 438, 445
Gen. 23:17 – 566, 595
Gen. 23:18 – 572
Gen. 23:19 – 271, 397, 442
Gen. 23:20 – 566
Gen. 24:1 – 255, 590
Gen. 24:2 – 564, 564
Gen. 24:3 – 290, 459, 611
Gen. 24:4 – 191, 558
Gen. 24:5 – 173, 177, 217, 459, 460, 552, 555, 572
Gen. 24:6 – 160
Gen. 24:7 – 192
Gen. 24:8 – 545, 567, 615, 631
Gen. 24:9 – 567
Gen. 24:10 – 396, 506, 553, 564
Gen. 24:11 – 554
Gen. 24:12 – 286, 428
Gen. 24:13 – 203, 217, 228, 416
Gen. 24:14 – 115, 163, 190, 246, 247, 303, 344, 609, 610
Gen. 24:15 – 115
Gen. 24:16 – 77, 114
Gen. 24:17 – 155
Gen. 24:19 – 193, 344, 593
Gen. 24:20 – 344
Gen. 24:21 – 72, 168
Gen. 24:22 – 224, 358, 593
Gen. 24:23 – 144, 358, 359, 468, 469, 548, 564
Gen. 24:23f. – 150, 174
Gen. 24:24 – 277, 278, 551, 573
Gen. 24:25 – 224, 358, 468, 469
Gen. 24:27 – 117, 619
Gen. 24:29 – 78, 168, 546, 547
Gen. 24:30 – 550, 602
Gen. 24:31 – 116, 315, 619
Gen. 24:32 – 343
Gen. 24:33 – 155, 593
Gen. 24:34 – 265, 411, 567
Gen. 24:34-37 – 95
Gen. 24:34ff. – 36
Gen. 24:35 – 344
Gen. 24:36 – 120
Gen. 24:40 – 547, 609
Gen. 24:42 – 198, 204, 525, 572, 606, 612
Gen. 24:42ff. – 36
Gen. 24:43 – 190, 203, 228
Gen. 24:44 – 162, 188, 246
Gen. 24:45 – 67, 105, 116, 547, 574
Gen. 24:46 – 188, 500, 558
Gen. 24:48 – 602
Gen. 24:49 – 611, 612, 615, 627
Gen. 24:50 – 198, 317, 627
Gen. 24:51 – 547
Gen. 24:52 – 115
Gen. 24:53 – 411
Gen. 24:54 – 122, 155, 546, 551, 611
Gen. 24:55 – 391
Gen. 24:56 – 623
Gen. 24:57 – 157, 399, 553
Gen. 24:58 – 145, 416
Gen. 24:59 – 344, 447
Gen. 24:60 – 276, 367, 550, 558
Gen. 24:61 – 123
Gen. 24:63 – 114
Gen. 24:63f. – 594
Gen. 24:65 – 175, 253, 417
Gen. 25:1 – 122, 270, 272
Gen. 25:2 – 505, 509, 554
Gen. 25:3 – 98, 273, 554
Gen. 25:3ff. – 438
Gen. 25:4 – 272, 554, 609
Gen. 25:6 – 125, 390, 445, 554
Gen. 25:7 – 244, 246, 287, 437, 438
Gen. 25:8 – 114, 238, 552
Gen. 25:9 – 289
Gen. 25:10 – 95, 132, 567
Gen. 25:11 – 473
Gen. 25:12 – 462, 553
Gen. 25:13 – 244, 445
Gen. 25:16 – 415
Gen. 25:17 – 244, 246
Gen. 25:18 – 140
Gen. 25:20 – 75, 131, 602
Gen. 25:21 – 80, 98, 494, 541
Gen. 25:22 – 151, 301, 572
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Gen. 28:15 – 189, 189, 228
Gen. 28:16 – 217, 218
Gen. 28:17 – 84, 238, 253, 259, 281, 282, 614
Gen. 28:18 – 270
Gen. 28:19 – 260, 261
Gen. 28:20 – 390, 411, 520, 610
Gen. 28:21 – 411, 445
Gen. 28:22 – 348, 366, 367, 434, 437
Gen. 29:3 – 103, 104, 345, 402, 486, 532, 535
Gen. 29:4 – 175
Gen. 29:5 – 315, 548
Gen. 29:5f. – 145, 173
Gen. 29:6 – 143, 552
Gen. 29:7 – 160, 258, 344
Gen. 29:7f. – 548
Gen. 29:8 – 200, 204, 552, 563, 599
Gen. 29:9 – 68, 118, 119, 547
Gen. 29:10 – 345, 402, 486, 532, 535
Gen. 29:11 – 122, 564
Gen. 29:12 – 237, 513
Gen. 29:14 – 276, 546, 548
Gen. 29:15 – 232, 253, 257, 260, 276, 625
Gen. 29:16 – 270, 270, 363, 554
Gen. 29:17 – 77, 92, 255, 312
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 21:23 (Sah.)</td>
<td>Rom. 3:12 - 423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 27:42 - 92</td>
<td>Rom. 3:29 - 168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 27:42 (Bodmer III ed. Kasser)</td>
<td>Rom. 4:12 - 328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 27:42 (Sah.)</td>
<td>Rom. 4:13 - 328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 2:30 - 626</td>
<td>Rom. 6:2 - 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 2:32 (Oxyrh.) - 497</td>
<td>Rom. 6:9 - 629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 4:7 - 315</td>
<td>Rom. 6:15 - 241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 4:12 (Oxyrh.) - 312</td>
<td>Rom. 6:19 - 345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 4:14 (Oxyrh.) - 309</td>
<td>Rom. 6:23 - 262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 5:8 - 168</td>
<td>Rom. 8:12 - 328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 5:36 - 263, 428</td>
<td>Rom. 9:19 - 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 6:3 (Oxyrh.) - 628</td>
<td>Rom. 9:24 - 264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 7:32 - 301, 441</td>
<td>Rom. 11:34f. - 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 9:20 - 301, 302</td>
<td>Rom. 13:5 - 259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 9:36 - 210</td>
<td>Rom. 14:15 - 315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 12:15 - 177, 318</td>
<td>1 Cor. 5:12 - 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 12:18 - 329</td>
<td>1 Cor. 6:11 - 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 12:25 - 396</td>
<td>1 Cor. 7:4 - 259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 13:8 - 210</td>
<td>1 Cor. 10:13 - 462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 13:25 - 263</td>
<td>1 Cor. 10:17 - 516</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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I Cor. 15:56 - 262
I Cor. 16:18 - 385

II Cor. 1:12 - 328
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Apost. 2:20 - 428
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Apost. 6:16 - 88
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Acta Martyrum (CSCO, edd. Balestri and Hyvernat)

AM I 1 – 171
AM I 2 – 184, 275, 489
AM I 3 – 183, 184
AM I 4 – 183, 184, 184, 266
AM I 5 – 184
AM I 6 – 184, 246
AM I 7 – 184, 184
AM I 8 – 183, 325, 489
AM I 10 – 183, 184
AM I 11 – 313
AM I 12 – 184, 184
AM I 13 – 184
AM I 14 – 184
AM I 15 – 313, 316
AM I 16 – 184, 184
AM I 18 – 166, 169, 176
AM I 19 – 154, 314
AM I 20 – 170
AM I 21 – 184, 184
AM I 24 – 184, 313
AM I 25 – 171
AM I 28 – 171, 263
AM I 29 – 148, 171, 172, 325
AM I 30 – 154
AM I 31 – 154
AM I 34 – 92
AM I 36f. – 171
AM I 37 – 92, 172
AM I 38 – 246, 252
AM I 42 – 263
AM I 44 – 168, 171
AM I 45 – 184
AM I 46-51 – 87
AM I 46 – 325
AM I 47 – 171, 239
AM I 49 – 452
AM I 50 – 172, 272, 275
AM I 51 – 168, 260, 428
AM I 53 – 171
AM I 54 – 252
AM I 55 – 171, 265
AM I 57 – 239
AM I 59 – 171, 184
AM I 60 – 169, 171
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 1 – 272, 318, 632</td>
<td>Cat. 63 – 260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 2 – 261</td>
<td>Cat. 64 – 260, 264</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 3 – 261, 356, 356</td>
<td>Cat. 66 – 260, 272</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 4 – 260, 261, 261, 299, 299, 313, 356, 466</td>
<td>Cat. 67 – 315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 5 – 239, 239, 314, 632</td>
<td>Cat. 68 – 632</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 6 – 318</td>
<td>Cat. 69 – 265, 532</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 7 – 260, 385, 466</td>
<td>Cat. 72 – 272</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 8 – 329</td>
<td>Cat. 74 – 466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 9 – 154, 272, 315, 632</td>
<td>Cat. 75 – 466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 10 – 252</td>
<td>Cat. 76 – 252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 12 – 632</td>
<td>Cat. 77 – 314</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 13 – 313</td>
<td>Cat. 79 – 320, 452</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 14 – 260</td>
<td>Cat. 84 – 272, 466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 16 – 632</td>
<td>Cat. 85 – 316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 17 – 318</td>
<td>Cat. 86 – 314, 489</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 18 – 466, 632</td>
<td>Cat. 89 – 260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 20 – 632</td>
<td>Cat. 90 – 466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 21 – 314</td>
<td>Cat. 94 – 313, 351</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 25 – 466, 489</td>
<td>Cat. 95 – 465, 466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 26 – 466, 466, 466, 632</td>
<td>Cat. 96 – 252, 532</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 27 – 466</td>
<td>Cat. 97 – 329</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 28 – 260, 314, 466</td>
<td>Cat. 98 – 316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 31 – 396, 429</td>
<td>Cat. 100 – 252, 315, 532</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 32 – 258, 318</td>
<td>Cat. 102 – 272</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 33 – 258, 329</td>
<td>Cat. 105 – 261</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 34 – 260</td>
<td>Cat. 106 – 351, 452, 489</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 35 – 489</td>
<td>Cat. 107 – 313, 320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 36 – 258, 265, 318</td>
<td>Cat. 108 – 351, 489</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 37 – 314, 489, 587</td>
<td>Cat. 112 – 351</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 38 – 261</td>
<td>Cat. 115 – 351, 489</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 40 – 252, 258, 265, 275</td>
<td>Cat. 118 – 264</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 41 – 260</td>
<td>Cat. 123 – 271</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 42 – 489</td>
<td>Cat. 128 – 318</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 45 – 313</td>
<td>Cat. 129 – 316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 46 – 318, 632</td>
<td>Cat. 132 – 260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 47 – 314, 396, 429</td>
<td>Cat. 133 – 318</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 48 – 315</td>
<td>Cat. 134 – 313, 315, 351</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 49 – 259, 259, 489</td>
<td>Cat. 137 – 329</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 51 – 489</td>
<td>Cat. 143 – 453</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 52 – 261</td>
<td>Cat. 146 – 301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 54 – 318</td>
<td>Cat. 148 – 632</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 56 – 314</td>
<td>Cat. 149 – 466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 57 – 346</td>
<td>Cat. 151 – 245</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 58 – 258, 385, 532</td>
<td>Cat. 154 – 272, 452</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 60 – 260, 265</td>
<td>Cat. 155 – 298, 356, 516</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cat. 157 – 272</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cat. 158 – 272</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cat. 162 – 316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coptic</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 169 - 260</td>
<td>De Vis I 87 - 259, 259</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 171 - 262</td>
<td>De Vis I 89 - 196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 175 - 352</td>
<td>De Vis I 90 - 196, 327</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 184 - 329</td>
<td>De Vis I 98 - 252, 630</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 185 - 632</td>
<td>De Vis I 100 - 259, 352</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 187 - 260, 377</td>
<td>De Vis I 101 - 327, 489</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 189 - 385</td>
<td>De Vis I 102 - 313</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 194 - 261, 458</td>
<td>De Vis I 109 - 465</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 194f. - 297</td>
<td>De Vis I 116f. - 59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 204 - 377</td>
<td>De Vis I 123 - 325, 414, 458, 466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 205 - 313</td>
<td>De Vis I 124 - 466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 208 - 314, 329, 494</td>
<td>De Vis I 125 - 466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 211 - 260, 261</td>
<td>De Vis I 130 - 604</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 213 - 265</td>
<td>De Vis I 133 - 327</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 214 - 272, 318, 318</td>
<td>De Vis I 134 - 327, 466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 220 - 279, 453</td>
<td>De Vis I 139 - 466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 221 - 265</td>
<td>De Vis I 141 - 632</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 225 - 414</td>
<td>De Vis I 142 - 410</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 227 - 298</td>
<td>De Vis I 143 - 313</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 228 - 315</td>
<td>De Vis I 145 - 325</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 229 - 258</td>
<td>De Vis I 146 - 604</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. 230 - 257</td>
<td>De Vis I 147 - 352</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Homélies coptes de la Vaticane (ed. De Vis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coptic</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De Vis I 13 - 630</td>
<td>De Vis I 154 - 316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis I 24 - 313, 466</td>
<td>De Vis I 156 - 313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis I 25 - 327</td>
<td>De Vis I 158 - 352, 630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis I 26 - 466</td>
<td>De Vis I 161 - 327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis I 27 - 313</td>
<td>De Vis I 163 - 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis I 28 - 486</td>
<td>De Vis I 168 - 252, 460, 532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis I 30 - 313</td>
<td>De Vis I 169 - 630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis I 31 - 452</td>
<td>De Vis I 171 - 604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis I 32 - 196</td>
<td>De Vis I 172 - 377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis I 37 - 428</td>
<td>De Vis I 175 - 415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis I 39f. - 313</td>
<td>De Vis I 180 - 630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis I 43 - 260</td>
<td>De Vis I 181 - 313, 394, 423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis I 46 - 260</td>
<td>De Vis I 190 - 298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis I 48 - 260</td>
<td>De Vis I 191f. - 410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis I 59 - 313</td>
<td>De Vis I 193 - 260, 266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis I 60 - 196</td>
<td>De Vis I 194 - 260, 630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis I 65 - 313, 325</td>
<td>De Vis I 195 - 263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis I 67 - 102</td>
<td>De Vis I 196 - 414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis I 69 - 154, 252, 532</td>
<td>De Vis I 201 - 282, 352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis I 75 - 352</td>
<td>De Vis I 3 - 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis I 76 - 196, 282, 352, 465</td>
<td>De Vis I 4 - 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis I 77 - 352</td>
<td>De Vis I 7 - 402, 486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis I 83 - 460</td>
<td>De Vis II 9 - 629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis I 84 - 313</td>
<td>De Vis II 10 - 462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vis I 84 - 313</td>
<td>De Vis II 11 - 632</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX OF COPTIC PASSAGES QUOTED OR CITED

De Vis II 15 – 260, 272
De Vis II 16 – 327
De Vis II 17 – 327
De Vis II 22 – 196
De Vis II 23 – 260, 630
De Vis II 26 – 632
De Vis II 29 – 260
De Vis II 33 – 458, 516
De Vis II 34 – 260
De Vis II 36 – 59
De Vis II 38 – 423
De Vis II 39 – 458
De Vis II 45 – 352
De Vis II 47 – 458, 471, 630
De Vis II 49 – 297
De Vis II 54 – 458
De Vis II 55 – 248
De Vis II 56 – 489
De Vis II 68 – 466
De Vis II 75 – 252, 532
De Vis II 76 – 351
De Vis II 79 – 59
De Vis II 82 – 466
De Vis II 88 – 452
De Vis II 89 – 458
De Vis II 90f. – 272
De Vis II 92 – 258
De Vis II 95 – 260
De Vis II 100 – 466, 466
De Vis II 106 – 252, 260, 272
De Vis II 107 – 252, 272, 516
De Vis II 108 – 352
De Vis II 109 – 325, 452
De Vis II 111 – 260
De Vis II 118 – 260, 296, 322
De Vis II 119f. – 192
De Vis II 127 – 455, 455
De Vis II 130 – 460
De Vis II 133 – 101
De Vis II 136 – 466
De Vis II 137 – 313, 466
De Vis II 140 – 313, 465
De Vis II 146 – 466
De Vis II 147 – 465
De Vis II 149 – 325, 325
De Vis II 151 – 169, 314
De Vis II 162 – 260
De Vis II 162f. – 632
De Vis II 165 – 252, 532
De Vis II 167 – 631
De Vis II 168 – 305, 313, 607
De Vis II 169 – 272
De Vis II 171 – 313, 460, 466
De Vis II 172 – 252, 313, 327, 532
De Vis II 174 – 629
De Vis II 176 – 327
De Vis II 177 – 465, 629
De Vis II 178 – 325
De Vis II 183 – 455
De Vis II 190 – 327
De Vis II 191 – 154
De Vis II 195 – 313, 313, 327
De Vis II 206 – 196
De Vis II 210 – 327
De Vis II 211 – 327
De Vis II 212 – 361, 466
De Vis II 216 – 325
De Vis II 224 – 325
De Vis II 231 – 313
De Vis II 232 – 402
De Vis II 238 – 327
De Vis II 246f. – 313
De Vis II 247 – 403, 466
De Vis II 250 – 313
De Vis II 257 – 466
De Vis II 263 – 428
De Vis II 265 – 172, 269
De Vis II 266 – 266, 325
De Vis II 276 – 465
De Vis II 278 – 327

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
INDEX OF COPTIC PASSAGES QUOTED OR CITED

Mac. No. 32 – 169
Mac. No. 33 – 315
Mac. No. 35B – 410
Mac. No. 35C – 410
Mac. No. 95 – 166

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

Sahidic: Shenoute

ed. Amélineau
Amél. I 95 – 93
Amél. I 113 – 94
Amél. I 276 – 215

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

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