ORIENTALIA

VOLUMEN 29
NOVA SERIES



1960

PONTIFICIUM INSTITUTUM BIBLICUM ROMA 204 PIAZZA PILOTTA 35

H. J. Polotsky – Jerusalem

I. Conjugation. Conjugations. Conjugation Patterns

- 1. For the purpose of this outline (*) Conjugation means the various ways in which a Coptic verb can enter into grammatical construction with actor expressions in such a way as to function either as a main sentence or as a dependent clause. Any such construction is a conjugation. We thus have Sentence Conjugations and Clause Conjugations. The former comprise seven Tenses (properly so called) — three pairs of affirmative and negative forms and one lone negative form — and the I mperatives (only the Causative Imperative is properly speaking a conjugation). The five Clause Conjugations comprise 1º three subordinate clause equivalents (two of them compounded with prepositions), which occur in company with a Sentence Conjugation, and 20 two "Conjunctives", which normally continue either a Sentence or a Clause Conjugation; an exception to this rule is the independent (probably elliptic) use of the 1st sg. of the Conjunctive and of the 1st pl. of the Future Conjunctive, Stern §§ 446, 450. All Clause Conjugations are formally set apart from the Sentence Conjugations by a mode of negation of their own (§ 27).
- 2. Coptic has two distinct Conjugation Patterns, 1º Tripartite and 2º Bipartite. Within each pattern the function of grammatical distinctiveness is vested in a different constituent element.
- (*) This paper was written and tried out in class while I was Visiting Professor of Egyptology at Brown University (Providence, Rhode Island) in 1959-60 (σοφία γραμματέως ἐν εὐκαιρία σχολῆς Sir. xxxviii.24). I owe a special debt of gratitude to my friend and academic host at Brown, Professor Richard A. Parker, for going over my successive drafts and saving me from many a loose statement.

II. The Tripartite Conjugation Pattern

3. The distinctive element of any conjugation of the Tripartite Pattern is the conjugation base, which occupies the first position in the pattern. It is followed by (2) the actor expression (noun or pronominal suffix) and (3) the verb in the Infinitive. A Verb in Coptic is a word which is capable of filling the last position in the Tripartite Conjugation Pattern:

1	2	3
Å	d ubmre	cwti

Nominal and suffixal actor expressions differ in regard to their juncture with the verb: particles requiring the second place in the sentence (vap, de, own, se, gwwq) come after the nominal actor, but after the whole complex if the second position is filled by a suffix.

4. The following are the conjugations of the Tripartite Pattern:

Negative

A. SENTENCE CONJUGATIONS

Affirmative

	12 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	110840110
	a. Basic Tenses	
Perfect "not yet" Aorist	ачсшт <u>и</u> —— (¹) <u>ш</u> ачсшт <u>и</u>	ипфсшти ипатфсшти исфсшти (иаф-)
Third Future	eqecwta (2)	пиедсшти
	b. Imperatives	
[SIMPLE CAUSATIVE	сшти марецсшти	wnpcwrw] (3)

- (1) The affirmative counterpart of unarecourse may originally have been paqcors, which in most dialects was levelled under accors.
- (2) In Bohairie this form is pointed either executes or exect. The syllabication e/fe— is also well attested by early Sahidic MSS.
- (3) The Simple Imperative does not belong to any conjugation pattern, but it behaves syntactically like the conjugations of the Tripartite

B. CLAUSE CONJUGATIONS

Conjunctive	ngcwta
Future Conjunctive	TAPECOUTE
Temporal	птередсшти
" until "	шортпаш
Conditional	ттоопащрэ

A further reason for disregarding the morpheme $\omega \kappa n$ in setting up the Tripartite Pattern is the fact that it can be omitted before the negative $\tau \overline{\kappa}$ (§ 27, Obs. 3).

Obs. 2. The eq- of eqecuta coincides superficially with the Circumstantial Present in Sahidic, Bohairic, Fayyumic and Subakhmimic, but in Akhmimic the aq- of aqacutae coincides superficially with the Second Present; the eq- of equancutae coincides superficially with the Second Present in those dialects which distinguish the Second Present from the Circumstantial Present (§ 14).

III. The Bipartite Conjugation Pattern

5. The Bipartite Conjugation Pattern is represented by only one (basic) conjugation, the so-called "First Present". It has no conjugation base at all. The first position is filled by the actor ex-

Pattern in the sense that it is not subject to the restrictions of the Bipartite Pattern (§ 23). It is here listed mainly in order to provide the necessary frame for the Negative Causative Imperative. The bare Causative Infinitive is not a conjugation.

pression, either by a noun or by a special set of pronominal preformatives (some of which, namely k-, q-, c-, resemble — or, historically speaking, have come to resemble — the pronominal suffixes). So far as the Bipartite Pattern as such is concerned, the second (predicate) position is by no means restricted to the verb: it can be filled not only by the Infinitive as well as the Qualitative (whose only function is to fill the second position in the Bipartite Conjugation Pattern), but also by any adverbial expression, i.e. either a real adverb like TAI "here" or THOAIC "in the city":

1	2
пршме	сштя Внк Таї

6. The Bipartite Conjugation Pattern is what Gardiner (Eg. Gr. § 319) calls the "Pseudo-verbal construction", i. e. a special variety of the sentence with adverbal predicate, in which the adverb shares its privilege of position with certain verb-forms. Historical grammar is able to explain the presence of the Infinitive in this sentence type, and to offer a sort of excuse for the presence of the Qualitative. For a synchronic description of Coptic, however, this historical explanation is irrelevant. Within the framework of Coptic there is nothing "adverbial" about the predicative Infinitive and the Qualitative (1). On the other hand this sentence type can, of course, be spoken of as a "conjugation pattern" only if its second position is filled by a verb-form.

The distinctive element of the Bipartite Conjugation Pattern is the verb-form.

IV. Infinitive and Qualitative

- 7. The only verb-form capable of filling the third position of the Tripartite Conjugation Pattern is the Infinitive. Now the Infinitive is not a typically verbal form. Although it often possesses morphological features of its own, by which it is set apart from ordi-
 - (1) Vergote Chr. d'Ég. 31 (1956) 218; Polotsky OLZ 1957, 227.

⁽¹⁾ The only example known to me of the ϵ - appearing before the Infinitive is Sir. XXVIII.24 (Lagarde) $\epsilon p \epsilon$ netkw \overline{n} cwoy \overline{n} xnoeic $\epsilon \epsilon i$ etoot \overline{q} "those who abandon the Lord will fall into his hand". For ϵi etoot ϵi ϵi etoot ϵi ϵi etoot ϵi in Sir. XXXVIII.14 the same idiom occurs in the same tense and the same construction without ϵ -.

nary nouns, especially its prenominal and presuffixal forms, it is rather substantival in character and therefore shares several syntactic properties with the noun substantive. Cf. Stern §§ 451, 453, 467, 468, 473. In Crum's Dictionary there is under practically every "vb" a special entry headed "nn m". In its capacity as "nn m" an Infinitive can even fill the second position of the Tripartite Conjugation Pattern, i. e. it can function as the actor of another Infinitive, e. g. Sir. xxix.20 agntupe take annue excortun "guaranteeing has ruined many upright men".

- 8. The following paradox should be noted: the Infinitive, not a typically verbal form, is the only verb-form allowed in the typically verbal Tripartite Conjugation Pattern, whereas the Qualitative, a typically verbal form, occurs only in the Bipartite Conjugation Pattern, in which the privilege of position belongs properly to the adverb.
- 9. In so far as the Infinitive and the Qualitative of the same verb can both be used in the Bipartite Conjugation Pattern, they form a contrast: the Infinitive expresses an action in progress, while the Qualitative expresses a state. Cf. Acts v.12 nergone "they were happening (ἐγίνετο, fiebant) " alongside of nerwoon " they were $(\tilde{\eta}\sigma\alpha v, erant)$ ". The possibility of having the same actor for the Infinitive as well as for the Qualitative is limited to intransitive verbs, but the number of such verbs actually admitting both forms in the Bipartite Pattern is none too great. E.g., the Infinitive wor "to die" is used in the Bipartite Pattern, when the act of "dying" is spoken of in a general way, as in 1Cor. xv.31 "I die (twor) daily "; 1Cor. xv.22 "just as all men die (noe rap erormor) in Adam"; Ps. xlviii.10 "if he sees the wise men dying (every)"; an actual and particular occurrence of "dying" is expressed by the "Future" na-uor "going to die", while the Qualitative Moort means "being dead". With many intransitive verbs, like 2000 "to hunger" and EIBE "to be thirsty" the Infinitive is hardly found in the Bipartite Pattern (1). This is espe-

cially true of verbs of motion. As a general rule they require the Qualitative, while the Infinitive is mainly used in certain phraseological construction (Obs. 1).

On the other hand, with transitive verbs the contrast of Infinitive vs. Qualitative within the Bipartite Conjugation Pattern is accompanied by a shift between actor and undergoer. The subject of the state expressed by the Qualitative would be the undergoer of the action expressed by the Infinitive in any conjugation: the actions αισοτης "I chose him" or τοωτη παιος "I choose him" result in the state $q_{COT\Pi}$ "he is chosen". Cf. Zoega 308 (Apophth.) anok 2w 4kw wwwth 21802 arw tethkh 21802 "I too am excommunicating you, and you are excommunicated"; 1Sam. xxx.1, 3 AYPOKEC... AYEI EZPAÏ ETNOZIC AYW EICZHHTE CPOKE " (the Amalekites) burnt it ... (David and his men) came up to the city and behold, it was burnt"; Deut. vi.11 genghei eyбнх пай ете μηκόοχος "dug wells which you did not dig"; Mt. xiii.44 ογα 20 едени пай ента отроше де врод адгонд "a hidden treasure which a man found and hid". In other words, the Qualitative of transitive verbs has the meaning of a statal passive (1).

Obs. 1. So far as the Sahidic Bible is concerned, the constructions in question, all involving the Circumstantial of $\epsilon_{\mathbf{i}}$ "to come", are (1) $\epsilon_{\mathbf{q}\epsilon\mathbf{r}}$ $\epsilon_{\mathbf{q}\epsilon\mathbf{r}}$ "when he was about to ..." Mt. vi.5, Jo. xvi.21, Rom. xv.24, 2Cor. iii.16; note especially $\epsilon_{\mathbf{p}\epsilon}$ $\epsilon_{\mathbf{r}\epsilon\mathbf{r}}$ $\epsilon_{\mathbf{p}\epsilon\mathbf{r}}$ "when P. was about to come" Acts v.15; (2) $\epsilon_{\mathbf{q}\epsilon\mathbf{r}}$ $\epsilon_{\mathbf{q}\epsilon\mathbf{r}}$ "he has already come" Mt. xvii.12; (3) $\epsilon_{\mathbf{q}\epsilon\mathbf{r}}$ "should it become necessary that ..." Mk. xiv.31.

V. Basic Tenses and Satellites

10. Like other sentence types, the Basic Tenses, affirmative as well as negative, can be preceded by one — in certain cases (§ 17, cf. also § 11 Obs.) by two — of three Sentence Converters:

(1) ne converts the tense into the corresponding preterit; it does not affect its status as a main sentence, but produces a "relative tense" in the sense in which, e. g., the Latin Imperfect and Pluperfect are "relative tenses" ("Nebentempora" of the Present and the Perfect respectively) (2). The other two convert the tense from a

⁽¹⁾ Outside conjugation the contrast of Qualitative vs. Infinitive does not exist. The state predicated by the Qualitative is named by the Infinitive. Cf. Jo. xix.28 †οβε as against. Ps. Ixviii.22 πλειβε; Deut. xxviii.56 τετσημ... εταλεσλωσ "she who is soft and smooth" as against πεσποη ππεαλοσλεσ "the softness of her smoothness".

⁽¹⁾ The term "statal passive" is borrowed from Curme Grammar of the German Language (1922) § 194.4.

⁽²⁾ Cf. W. Gardner Hale The cum-Constructions (1887) 18-20, 21 n. 1.

main sentence into a subordinate clause: (2) Circumstantial ϵ -, (3) Relative ϵ --, ϵ --,

Obs. 1. The Third Future does not take $n\varepsilon$, and it is only a matter of inference that its affirmative form can take the Circumstantial ε -(coalescing with the initial ε -).

Obs. 2. The Preterit Converter $m\varepsilon$ is often, apparently optionally, followed by $m\varepsilon$

11. "Second Tenses" are formed by morphemes which offer a certain resemblance to the Sentence Converters, especially to the Relative. Although this resemblance, so far as it goes, is probably not accidental (cf. § 31), the Second Tenses are on syntactic grounds (§§ 21, 28 Obs.) better kept apart from the converted tenses. However, the Second Tenses and the converted tenses can be grouped together as Satellites of the basic tenses.

The syntactic function of the Second Tenses is, as a rule, to turn the tense into a noun-equivalent, capable of filling the first (actor) position of the Bipartite Pattern, and thereby to throw emphasis on the adverbial predicate (§ 30). English achieves the same effect in a similar way by the use of the Cleft Sentence (" it was . . . that . . . ").

12. When the Bipartite Conjugation Pattern is preceded by the Sentence Converters, the pronominal preformatives are replaced by the pronominal suffixes. With the Relative, however, this is true only when the pronominal actor of the relative clause is distinct from the antecedent; when the antecedent is the actor of the relative clause, the er- steps into the first position of the Conjugation Pattern.

Obs. The correctness of analysing, e.g., the relative 1st pl. $\epsilon \tau \bar{n}$ into $\epsilon \tau$ - plus suffix $-\bar{n}$, rather than into $\epsilon \tau$ - plus preformative $\tau \bar{n}$ (I. Eg. nty tw.n) is borne out by the 3rd pl. form $\epsilon \tau o \tau$ - (contrast I. Eg.
nty st); cf. Demotic nty iw.n, nty iw.w.

- 13. Before nominal subject the Sentence Converters assume the lengthened forms mepe (Imperfect, § 16) epe, etepe. This lengthening does not, however, take place in all dialects to the same extent. Cf. §§ 52-55.
- 14. $\epsilon p \epsilon$ (prenominal), $\epsilon q -$ are also the forms of the Second Present in Sahidic and Subakhmimic; in the other dialects the forms are $\epsilon p \epsilon$ (Akhmimic also ϵ), $\epsilon q -$.
- 15. In these dialects the forms of the Imperfect are similarly nape, naq. Syntactically, however, the Imperfect goes with the Circumstantial and the Relative, this entire group being in certain respects treated differently from the Second Present. Cf. § 21.
- 16. The converted forms of the Bipartite Conjugation Pattern thus resemble superficially the basic forms of the Tripartite Pattern. Structurally and functionally the three morphemes of

meqcωτω is the Preterit Present ("praesens in praeterito") = Imperfect, just as me aqcωτω is the Preterit Perfect ("perfectum in praeterito") = Pluperfect, etc. However, meqcωτω sometimes seems to exhibit certain properties of a basic, rather than of a converted, tense, cf. § 28; its primitive converted character is evident in me(o)γm § 35.

17. The Imperfect can be further preceded by the Relative Converters ϵ - and $(n)\epsilon$ - ϵ . It is noteworthy that Thompson's Subakhminic St. John uses $n\epsilon$ - ϵ $n\epsilon$ - ϵ $n\epsilon$ - ϵ 0 $n\epsilon$ 2 "he who was formerly (non-simultaneously) blind" ix.13, but consistently avoids the forms

401

with ϵ -, replacing them mostly by the Relative Present, cf. ii.22, 23, vi.62, vii.42, x.40, xi.6, 32 xii.1, xvii.5, xviii.1.

The ability to be further preceded by the Relative Converter e-belongs to the Preterit Converter me as such, not to the Preterit Present (Imperfect) specifically, cf. enerminas § 33. It provides therefore no argument for regarding the Imperfect as a basic tense.

The Imperfect can also be further preceded by the Circumstantial Converter ϵ - to express the protasis of an unfulfilled condition ("supposition contrary to fact") (1).

18. The following table shows the Basic Tenses with their Satellites:

Basic	Preterit	Circumstantial	Relative	"Second"
d- (ce-)	ue vd- ued (uel-)	ev d− (ev −)	entaq- (etoy-)	пта q - (е r -)
mud-	ue mud-	E227 (2)	ete unq-	ete unq-
unatq-	ne wnatg-	EMILATG-	ete unatq-a)	- confirmed to
myd-	ue myd-	emyd-	ешач- ете шач-	emyd-
wed-	ue wed-	erred-	ete ned-	
ede-	*· ·	(ecle-) b)	c)	
uued-		enneq- d)	Ete $(\underline{\mathbf{u}})$ neg- \mathbf{e})	, american

Satellites in the second degree:

ntag-	 entaq-		WOFE AMERICA
ued-	eued-	ened-	(eneq- ?) f)

- a) Crum Papyruscodex 18, 17; Shenoute (?) ap. Brit. Mus. Cat. No. 212 (p. 93 b 3).
- b) Inferred on the analogy of enneq- as used after xekaac (OLZ 1957, 233).
- c) Probably non-existent in Sahidic. For Bohairic see Stern \S 419, Mallon \S 382.
- (1) Stern \S 630. However, combinations of Basic Tenses with $\epsilon n \epsilon$ will not be listed as "Satellites in the second degree".
- (2) **EMNQ** without a stroke over **M**: in the superlineation system here accepted as standard, word-initial syllabic sonorants become non-syllabic when preceded by one-vowel morphemes.

- d) References in OLZ 1957, 232; add Mk. ix.3 (Horner's 73).
- e) Rom. xi.33. For Bohairic cf. Ps. xx.12 and references in Andersson Ausgewählte Bemerkungen 62.
 - f) A likely instance is Acts xxii.24.

VI. Syntactic Peculiarities of the Bipartite Conjugation Pattern

- 19. The construction of the Bipartite Conjugation Pattern is profoundly altered by the indefiniteness of the actor expression. An indefinite actor expression must in all dialects be preceded by own "there is", the negation being effected by wn" there is not". Especially the negation differs entirely from the characteristic negation of the Bipartite Conjugation Pattern (§ 28). The Bipartite Conjugation Pattern with indefinite actor expression must therefore be treated under the Existential Sentence (§ 33).
- 20. After the Sentence Converters the special status of the indefinite actor expression is maintained by different dialects with different degrees of strictness, Akhmimic (with Bohairic as a close second) being the strictest and Sahidic the laxest. For details see § 35.
- 21. Neither in Akhmimic nor in Sahidic does the rule apply to the Second Present; cf., for both dialects, Prov. xi,17, xii.2, xiii.1, xviii.19. This is one of the reasons for suspecting that the association of the Second Present with the Bipartite Conjugation Pattern is secondary (§ 52 Obs.).

No Bohairic example of * ape or- (gan-) is known to me; the usual construction is or-... aq-.

- 22. Neither in Bohairic nor in Sahidic does the rule apply to the Third Future: both dialects use invariably **epe** before an indefinite actor expression. Cf. for Bohairic, Ps. cxxvii.2, Prov. iii.8, 22a, Mt. x.21, xxiv.5, 7, 10, 21, Mk xiii.12, Lk. i.14, ii.35, xiv.10; for Sahidic, Lev. xxv.5, Deut. xxix.19(18), Jdg. ix.20, Prov. xxii.19, Job v.15, 16, xviii.11, 14, 19, xx.15, 16, 24, 26, Jo. xi.50, 2Cor. viii.13, 14.
- 23. A severe restriction is imposed upon the direct complement expressions by which the Infinitive can be followed immediately in the Bipartite Conjugation Pattern. Only bare nouns, i.e. nouns with zero article (Stern \S 332 sub fin.), numerals, and indefinite expres-

sions like war "something", gaz "many", or "what?" are allowed in this position. Object suffixes, being by nature definite, are excluded. Nouns with an article, even the indefinite article, as well as personal pronouns (suffixes) must be connected by the preposition \overline{n} , \overline{n} (Stern § 494). The rule and the exceptions therefrom (especially orego, orage "to wish, love") have been worked out by Jernstedt Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR 1927, 69-74.

Obs. 1. Verbs compounded with nouns denoting parts of the body and taking possessive suffixes are mostly subject to the rule, cf. xi-zpa=: xi πzpa= "be occupied" Ps. cxviii.23; κα-zth=: κω πzth= "trust" Ps. ii.12, Prov. xxi.22, Sir. xxxviii.40; κα-pω=: κω πpω= "be silent" Sir. xxxv.8, Mt. xxvi.63, Lk. i.20; κα-τοοτ= εβολ: κω πτοοτ= εβολ "despair" Lk. xxi.26. Exceptions: p-zth= "repent" Prov. xiii.12; ωπ-zth= "commiserate" Prov. xxi.26; but † πzth= "pay attention" Prov. xii.13.

Obs. 2. Pana="to please" is used in all conjugations: First Present, Acts Xii.3, Rom. xiv.18; Imperfect, Ps. xxxiv.14; Circumstantial, 2 Cor. v.9, Heb. xii.28; Relative Present, Deut. vi.18, Heb. xiii.16, and often.

Obs. 3. On the other hand pena= (with reflexive suffix) "to be willing, consent" is only used in the conjugations of the Tripartite Pattern and in the Imperative (Ps. XXXiV.14 APIRMAK).

Obs. 4. As Jernstedt p. 72 has pointed out, this rule often allows to distinguish the prenominal base and the 2nd fem. sg. (Jernstedt Doklady 1925, 25-6) of the Third Puture from those of the Circumstantial and the Second Present. Additional criteria are provided by the rule concerning verbs of motion (§ 9); for Bohairic, by the use of ερε (as against εογοη) before indefinite noun (§ 22); and by the fact that the Conjunctive continues neither the Circumstantial Present nor the Second Present. E. g., Ps. xxxvi.15 ερε τεγchqε βωκ ερογη επεγρητ αγω ητε μεγοτε ογωωση "may their sword enter their heart and their arrows break" can be identified as Third Future (1) by the Infinitive βωκ and (2) by the use of the Conjunctive.

24. The terms "dauerzeiten" and "ereigniszeiten" (Stern) are, on the semantic level, coextensive with "Bipartite" and "Tripartite Conjugation Pattern" respectively. The term "dauerzeiten" ("durative tenses") is adequate, but "ereigniszeiten" ("point tenses", "limitative tenses", "non-durative tenses") has the disadvantage of including the Clause Conjugations, which are not "tenses" at all.

25. In a survey of the Coptic conjugation system the "Futures" with **na**-require no separate mention, since they are merely expansions of the Bipartite Conjugation Pattern. The fact that **na**- can only

be followed by an Infinitive, not by a Qualitative, and that such an Infinitive can be freely followed by nouns and suffixes denoting the undergoer of the action constitutes no violation of the Stern-Jernstedt rule and does not justify the conclusion that the "Futures" with na- are not durative tenses (1). In characteristic contrast with the post-suffixal additional morphemes in eq-e-cwia and eq-wancorting (§ 4 Obs. 1) the ma- belongs to the second part of the Bipartite Conjugation Pattern. The grammatically operative element of the predicate, the one to which the rules concerning the durative tenses apply, is the auxiliary, not the "main verb". The durative character of the "future" auxiliary na- is borne out by the fact that as soon as a "Future" is formed from a conjugation of the Tripartite Pattern, na- is replaced by its non-durative (Infinitive) alternant nor (Bohairic novi) e-. Cf. examples where Bohairic novi e- corresponds to Sahidic na- (Lk. xxi.7 apewan nai noyi ewwni: epe nai nawwne "when these things are about to happen"), or Sahidic nor e- corresponds to Bohairic na- (Acts xxviii.10 πτερπηον εκω εκολ: ονοχ eynaenten eRox way "when we were about to take off"), or Sahidic nor e- and na- occur alongside of one another (Lev. x.9 ететпуанном евшк егоми е-... и ететпат петпомої егоми еήνίκα ἄν εἰσπορεύησθε ... ἡ προσπορευομένων ύμῶν).

The true nature of the relationship between na- and nor e- was first recognized by Jernstedt *Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR* 1927, 35; nor e- occurs not only with epwan and ntepe, but also with unate (Mk. xiii.7, Jo. vii.8) and with empty (Ez. iii.27), and outside the Bible with the affirmative Perfect (Crum *Dict.* 219 a-b).

Obs. 1. The fact that the only function of nor e- is that of a "Future" auxiliary with non-durative conjugations, while na is also a full verb "to go" (cf. OLZ 1959, 458), raises grave doubts as to whether nor is really an old Infinitive form; it may very well be a late back-formation from na-

Obs. 2. There is no satisfactory explanation for the absence of the expected preposition e- after na-; cf., however, Spiegelberg Rec. tr. 14 (1893) 39-40.

VII. Negations

The various groups of conjugations are correlated to specific modes of negation.

 $(^{1})$ I must formally retract the statement contained in the last sentence of OLZ 1959, 458 n. 3.

- 26. The basic tenses of the Tripartite Pattern have ready-made negative counterparts with built-in negative elements, § 4.
- 27. The Clause Conjugations are negatived by the morpheme $\tau \overline{\mathbf{u}}$ (Bohairic and Fayyumic $\omega \tau \epsilon \mathbf{u}$); outside conjugation the function of $\tau \overline{\mathbf{u}}$ is to negative the Infinitive. It is placed after the pronominal suffix:

Conjunctive nerrecore.

Future Conjunctive: only one example (in independent use, § 1) is on record (Lefort *Le Muséon* 60, 1947, 12) Mk. xii.14 TAPNT XIII TAPNT XIII we give or shall we not give? "(1)

Temporal Tepequecuta (Mk. ii.4, Lk. ii.45, Acts xvii.6, xxi.14).

"until" wantetucwta (Num. xxi.35, Josh. viii.22, Bohairic Gen. xli.49).

Conditional equantucutu (Sir. xxvii.3, Mt. xviii.16).

With nominal actor, so far as the evidence goes, $\tau \overline{\mathbf{a}}$ is normally placed after the conjugation base:

Conjunctive nterm npwee cwte. Exceptionally to is found after the nominal actor before the Infinitive: Prov. ii.5 = iii.6.

Future Conjunctive: no example.

Temporal птерета приме сшта (Crum Papyruscodex 30, 7). "until": no Sahidic example is known to me; a Bohairic example is quoted by Stern § 449: шатештен ппа сшхи прите.

Conditional epwante npwee cwte (2 Thess. ii.3).

- Obs. The wan of the Conditional can be omitted before Tw. In Bohairic and Fayyumic this omission is the rule. In Sahidic equantucota and equality common.
- 28. The Bipartite Pattern containing a definite actor expression and all "Second Tenses" are negatived by $(\bar{n}-)$... αn , cf. §§ 31-32.

As regards the converted forms of the Bipartite Pattern, there is a characteristic difference between the Circumstantial and the Relative on the one hand, and the Preterit on the other (§ 16).

In the type of Sahidic here described (¹) it is rather uncommon for Circumstantial and Relative constructions of the Bipartite Pattern to be negatived, which can be done by $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{n}$ alone. The normal method, which is the rule in other sentence-types, is the conversion of negative constructions into Circumstantial and Relative constructions, e.g.

Tripartite Pattern

Nominal Sentence

Basic Aqcwta anqcwta nwq ne anwq an ne
Circumst. eaqcwta eanqcwta enwq ne eanwq an ne
Relative entaqcwta ete anqcwta ete nwq ne ete anwq an ne

and correspondingly in the Bipartite Pattern

Basic	(3rd pl.) сесшт и пршие сшт и	ncecwtm an mpwme cwtm an
Circumst.	eycwtie	encecwta an (rarely eycwta an)
	ере пршие сшти	емприме сити ап
Relative	etoycwta * etcwta	ete noecwta an * ete noecwta an (rarely etcwta an) (2)
	етере приме сштм *	ете мпршме сштм ап * (rarely етере пршме сштм ап *) (3)

The constructions marked by * require, as a rule, a resumptive pronoun

(1) But not, e.g., in Shenoute.

(2) In Akhmimic the construction excurred en is the norm, e.g. Prov. ix.13, x.12, xi.29, xv.22, xviii.9, xix.23(20), xxiv.22. The Sahidic in all these places has exe negowing an

(3) In Rom. ii.29 παϊ ετερε πεσταειο woon an εβολ επ πρωμε· αλλα εβολ ειτα πηοντε "whose honour is not from men, but from God" it would be tempting to see a Relative Second Present; in Prov. xxvii.19 ποε ετερε πεο είπε απ επεγερην" even as the faces do not resemble each other" this would seem less likely, though not impossible.

⁽¹⁾ This exceptional case runs counter to the old rule, still fully valid in Coptic, that in combinations of the verb "to give" with a sdm.f (lry.f sdm -peqcwTxx) it is only the former which can be negatived.

But with the Preterite ne we have

neycwta (ne)

neycwta an (ne)

пере приме ситы (пе)

пере проме соты ап (пе)

The construction **ne πηρωσε... αn**, which we might expect on the analogy of the other Converters and which actually occurs in Demotic (Spiegelberg *Dem. Gr.* § 175 under 11), is preserved in the protasis of an unfulfilled condition: Jo. xviii.30, where the true reading (already quoted, presumably from Woide's *Appendix* (¹), by Stern p. 413) is **ene πηαϊ p neoooy αn** "if this one were not doing evil (εἰ μὴ ἦν οὖτος κακὸν ποιῶν)".

Obs. The Circumstantial Converter ϵ - precedes the negative $\overline{\mathbf{n}}$ -, ϵ nqcwta an, but the negative \mathbf{n} - (prevocalically often $\overline{\mathbf{n}}\mathbf{n}$ -) precedes the morpheme ϵ - of the Second Present and the Second Aorist: $(\overline{\mathbf{n}})$ neq-cwta an (e.g., Isa. xxviii.27; Lefort <math>Pères apost. 35, 9).

29. Using the negations as principle of classification, we obtain the following schematic representation of the conjugations:

Basic Tense	"Second Tenses"	
Negatived by (n-)an		The second secon
	q -	€d−
Affirmative	Negative	
aq-	mud-	птач-
	unatq-	
നമർ-	rred-	ewad-
ede-	uued-	
Imperatives		Control (Control (Con
	шпр-	,
my bed-	MIPT peq-	

Clause Conjugations

Negatived by TR

по-, тарео-, птерео-, шапто-, еошап.

(1) Woide's text is confirmed by the Chester Beatty Ms. A (coll. Thompson), Delaporte (whose V = Horner's 20), Morgan IV (kindly collated by Mr A. F. Shore). The Chester Beatty Ms. B omits the α -, and Horner's 14 (coll. Shore) does the same and spells \overline{n} ne instead of ene, but neither has \overline{n} ne.

VIII. The Syntactic Status of the "Second Tenses"

30. The identical treatment, in respect of negation, of the Bipartite Conjugation Pattern and the "Second Tenses" arises from the structure of sentences containing a "Second Tense": such a sentence is a true sentence with adverbial predicate, in which the "Second Tense" fills the first position (§ 5). Structurally, therefore, such a sentence is not a "conjugation pattern" at all (§ 6 end).

The Second Present need have no verb at all, i.e. the Second Tense morpheme plus the actor expression is by itself sufficient to fill the first position; if it has a verb (Infinitive or Qualitative), the latter is included in the first position. All other Second Tenses must necessarily be followed by an Infinitive within the first position. Cf.

	1	2
(a) Second Present	ed =	Yall
(b) Second Perfect	A SYATTI	HAY
(c) Second Present	ере тпнун	шпшпг гатнк
(d) Second Future	еїнар ппас	жа гатнк
as a	ngainst 1	2
(e) Second Present (f) do. (negatived)	ueixi eoox vu ebe uebbmox o <u>ub</u>	TOOTIS COAS
(g) Second Perfect	пта птнре шоле	PTOOTIS SOA3
(h) Second Aorist	ns əxaxnəs əqaqə	TOTOOTIS SOA3

- (a) Ps. 1xvii.28 "ibi est"; (b) Ps. xxxv.13 "ibi ceciderunt"; (c) Ps. xxxv.10 "apud te est fons vitae"; (d) Mt. xxvi.18 "apud te faciam Pascha"; (e) Prov. viii.15 "per me regnant reges"; (f) Jo. v.41 "non ab homine accipio gloriam"; (g) Jo. i.3 "per ipsum omnia facta sunt"; (h) Prov. xv.28 "per ipsas reconciliantur inimici".
- 31. The function of $(\overline{n}-)$... An is to negate the nexus between subject and non-verbal predicate. With "Second Tenses", accordingly, it negates the nexus between the noun-equivalent "Second Tense" and the adverbial predicate, not the "Second Tense" itself: "it is not ... that ...". If the "Second Tense" itself, not its nexus with

the adverbial predicate, is to be negated ("it is ... that ... not ..."), this is done by converting the negative Basic Tense into the Relative (§ 28), the Relative Converter functioning as "Second Tense" morpheme; cf. Études de syntaxe copte 88-9.

Obs. It should be noted that in Sahidic the position of an does not indicate the predicate. It does so often, but far from regularly, in Bohairic, e.g., Mt. x.34, I.k. iv.4, Jo. v.34.

32. $(\overline{n}-)$... Δn is often used to negative a non-verbal part of the sentence having predicative force, especially all kinds of adverbial adjuncts.

This construction is likewise used with "Second Tenses", if they follow, instead of preceding, the adverbial predicate. In this case an follows the predicate (contrast § 31 Obs.), while the "Second Tense" is affirmative. Cf. Deut. ix.6, Lk. xii.15, quoted Études 39; Deut. vii.7 orx ot: xe etethow an enate hapa herocothror hat have of thorth arm agreence through the Lord preferred you are more numerous than all nations that the Lord preferred you and chose you ... but ..."; Le Muséon 42 (1929) 222 ebox fap an xe coronno three anwe hat he egoor, well translated by Lefort (p. 250) "ce n'est pas, en effet, parce que cent est plus grand, que cinquante [leg. soixante] ne vaut rien"; Shenoute ed. Chassinat 38, 35 epwan trawop awkak ebox an (the all-important an (1) is missing in Leipoldt's text III 79, 4) ... epe haovi tope "it is not if the fox barks ... that the lion is afraid".

Obs. That the basic and essential function of the "Second Tenses" is to nominalize Basic Tenses and to render them capable of becoming subjects of adverbial predicates, could be inferred from the negation $(\overline{n}-)\dots$ an alone, even if it were not amply demonstrated by actual Coptic usage. At the same time it is true that "there are many examples in which II Tenses are used, where no Adverbial extension is present" (Plumley Introd. Coptic Gr. p. 81). Such "exceptions", which are relatively not at all numerous, can be brought under a limited number of heads and understood as extensions of the basic function; cf. Études 51-3. Inasmuch as such uses deviate from the structure of the "Second Tenses" they are secondary ("emplois abusifs"), but it is not in the least suggested that they should "be dismissed as improper uses". They can be "dismissed" only in the sense that they do not invalidate the definition of the basic function.

It is noteworthy that "exceptions" are especially uncommon with the negation, and it may be mentioned, for the record, that the specific meaning of the negatived Second Perfect was correctly defined before this definition was found to be valid for the "Second Tenses" in general (GGA 1934, 60).

It is further noteworthy that not all "emplois abusifs" occur in all dialects. Sahidic, e.g., uses the "Second Tenses" not only "properly" with interrogative adverbs (including prepositions with interrogative pronouns) but also with interrogative pronouns as direct complements (following the prenominal Infinitive) and as actors (following the conjugation base). In Bohairic, as was first pointed out by Chaîne Éléments § 802, this "improper" extension is unknown (with the exception of the idiom APETENEP OY "how are you?" Gen. xliii.27, cf. Ann. Serv. 40, 245).

IX. Existential Sentence

33. Existence and non-existence are predicated by own (1) "there is " and (\$\overline{\pi}\$) u\$\overline{\pi}\$ "there is not" respectively, followed by the subject. The subject is never a personal pronoun. As a rule it is one of the following: nouns with indefinite or zero article; owa, owon, goeine; numerals; gaz " many", xaar " anybody, anything", 6e " another", owhp " how much? " The definite article is admitted in two cases: (1) in substantivized relative expressions (Spiegelberg Dem. Gr. § 441 Anm.), and (2) in the phrases own of \$\overline{\pi}\$-(Sir. xxvii.21), and of \$\overline{\pi}\$- (1Sam. xxv.17, Isa. i.6, xl.28, Wisd. v.10) " there is a way", " there is no way" (of doing) (2).

The combination with the preposition $\overline{\mathbf{n}}\mathbf{T}\mathbf{e}$, $\overline{\mathbf{n}}\mathbf{T}\mathbf{a}$ "with" yields the expressions $\mathbf{o}\mathbf{v}\mathbf{n}\mathbf{T}\mathbf{e}$, $\mathbf{o}\mathbf{v}\mathbf{n}\mathbf{T}\mathbf{a}$ "have", see Till Kopt. Gr. §§ 289-94.

The predicates of existence and non-existence have all the Satellites:

Basic	Preterit	Circumstantial	Relative	"Second"
ovn	$\overline{\mathbf{n}} \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{o}) \mathbf{a} \underline{\mathbf{u}}$	$\epsilon(\mathbf{o})\mathbf{v}\overline{n}$	$\epsilon \Delta \epsilon(0) \Delta \underline{u}$	$\epsilon(0)$ $\gamma \overline{\mathbf{n}} \tau \mathbf{a} = \mathbf{a})$
12.0	กระเทีย	em <u>u</u>	ete mi	(d nu sts

Satellite in the second degree:

$$\mathbf{n} \epsilon(\mathbf{o}) \mathbf{v} \mathbf{u}$$
 \mathbf{c} \mathbf{c} $\mathbf{e} \mathbf{u} \epsilon(\mathbf{o}) \mathbf{v} \mathbf{u} \mathbf{d}$

⁽¹⁾ Foxes flee before lions: Shenoute ed. Leipoldt III 87, 23.

⁽¹⁾ The best MSS, are inconsistent as regards the superlineation of the n in own; the earlier MSS, tend to omit the stroke.

⁽²⁾ In Ps. lxxi.12 ип певин ете ипта воноос (Till Kopt. Gr. § 480) ип means "and".

- a) Études 50. Add Shenoute ed. Leipoldt III 85, 14 EUXE OYÑTŒ OYGOU YAP ON EOYÑTAÇË ZÑ NETKA UA NAÇ ÑZHTOY "if he still has power, it is in those who allow him place in them that he has it"; perhaps also Rom. i.14 EYÑTAY EPOÏ "it is I who owe a debt to them".
 - b) Études 50; OLZ 1957, 233.
 - c) Only ene(0) $\gamma \vec{n}(\tau a =)$ in the protasis of an unfulfilled condition.
- d) Job xxxi.35, Mt. xviii.28, Jo. xvii.5, Rom. vi.21, 1Jo. ii.7. In the Cleft Sentence, Acts xiv.12 ntoq nenern som who preserved it was he who was powerful in speech"; Mt. xxi.28, Lk. xv.11 orpower nenerntag waar number cnar "it was a man who had two sons", which is the Coptic way of expressing "there was a man who had two sons" (1); var. nete(0) rntag; and thus Shenoute ed. Chassinat 103, 11.
- 34. The negative form $\underline{n}\overline{n}$, with its built-in negative element, is reminiscent of the negative conjugation bases of the Tripartite Pattern. In fact, own and $\underline{n}\overline{n}$ probably are, like most conjugation bases, remnants of the old $\underline{s}\underline{d}m.f$ conjugation. That own and $\underline{n}\overline{n}$ cannot take personal suffixes, results from the definiteness of the latter. That own and $\underline{n}\overline{n}$ can be self-sufficient predicates, results from their being intransitive, while the conjugation bases of the Perfect and the Aorist go back to transitive auxiliary verbs, requiring an Infinitive as their necessary complement.
- Obs. 1. L. Eg. is a phonetic writing of nn wn: Sethe Verbum I § 203; Spiegelberg Rec. tr. 21 (1899) 41-2. On the existential sentence in M. Eg. (iw wn, neg. nn wn) cf. Gardiner Eg. Gr. §§ 107-8.
- Obs. 2. The fact that wn was a verb-form, does not make "verbs" of **own** and \overline{wn} . From the point of view of Coptic they can only be described as predicative expressions of existence and non-existence.
- **35.** "Absolute existence is but rarely asserted; usually there is some qualification in the form of [...] an adverbial phrase [...]. When such a qualification occurs, there is a tendency for it, rather than the notion of existence, to become the real predicate" (Gardiner). The importance of the Existential Sentence for the conjugation system
- (1) Cf. the Cleft Sentence with the Relative Perfect (OYPOWER TENTAGE and sim.) in the opening sentence of other parables, Mt. xxi.33, Mk. xii.1, I,k. x.30, xii.16, xiv.16, xviii.10, xx.9.

lies in the fact that it is likewise used with the verbal partners of the adverbial predicate, *i. e.* the Bipartite Conjugation Pattern (§ 19).

After the Sentence Converters the rule requiring the use of the Existential Sentence for the Bipartite Conjugation Pattern with indefinite actor expression is fully valid in Akhmimic and predominantly in Bohairic (see Obs. 1) and probably in Fayyumic. In Sahidic, so far as the affirmative sentence is concerned, the rule has no absolute validity: we find both the Converters plus own and the ordinary prenominal forms of the Converters, nepe, epe, etcepe (§ 13); etc own seems to be limited to the case where the actor has zero article and the predicate is a prepositional phrase; Shenoute, however, uses it also in the Akhmimic manner with verbal predicate (Obs. 2). Before zero article actor and verbal predicate Bohairic uses etc (without owon) and Sahidic etcepe (Obs. 3).

Akhmimic	Bohairic	Fayyumic	Sahidie
ue o <u>u</u> u	ne ovon/nape	ne oxan	uev <u>u</u> /uebe
$\epsilon(\mathbf{o}) \lambda \underline{u}$	eoron/epe		$\epsilon(o)$ % $\overline{n}/\epsilon p\epsilon$
ete oyn	ete ovon		етере

Obs. 1. Bohairic epe gan- Lk. xxi.5, 20, Mk. vi.9; mape or-Mk. x.22, xiv.4, 56, Jo. xii.11; mape gan- Mk. i.6, iii.10, iv.36, xiv.4.

Obs. 2. Sahidic ete(0) yn, e. g. Ps. xxiii.8, I.k. i.49, Eph. iii.20 nete oyn fou amoq, Jer. v.5, Acts xxv.5, Rom. xv.1 nete oyn fou amooy "who has (have) power"; Ex. xxxiv.7 nete oyn noße epoq "who has a sin to his charge"; Lev. xxi.17 nete oyn xßin giwwq "in whom there is a blemish"; Prov. xiv.4 nea ete oyn zaz nehtq nyenhaa "where there is much produce"; Rev. viii.9 eteyn фухн лентоу "in whom there is a soul"; Mk. vii.16 nete oyn maxe fe amoq "who has an ear" (cf. Mt. xiii.43 = Mk. iv.9 neteyntq maxe may).

Shenoute ed. Chassinat 85, 41 ngwß ete orn gaz norre anoq enagor amoor etse gout "the thing which many neglect for the sake of money"; *ibid*. 159, 30 nma ete orn ormhume coors epoq "the place whither a multitude is gathered." (cf. and contrast Acts xii.12).

Obs. 3. Bohairic, Ps. lv.5 or nete capz naaig nei "what is it that flesh will do to me?"; Ps. lv.12, cxvii.6 (= Heb. xiii.6) or nete poul naaig nei "what is it that man will do to me?"; Sahidic, Lev. xv.32 netepe crepus naei ebor arog "from whom sperm will issue".

Obs. 4. Sahidic examples for ene orn or in the protasis of an unfulfilled condition (§ 17): Mk. ix.42, Lk. xvii.2 (var. enepe), Heb. vii.11. Negative, Shenoute ap. Zoega 461 ene an orkeparnoc nht newq... nernaxooc an ne xe... "if a thunderbolt were not pursuing him ... they would not say: ...".

X. Adjective Verbs

36. The so-called Adjective Verbs belong to the conjugation system inasmuch as they may be said to replace the Qualitative of the verbs to which they are related. With most of those verbs the Qualitative is either extremely rare or altogether non-existent. Of ow, however, this is not true, and ow and names seem to be practically equivalent.

The structure of the Adjective Verbs is still problematic. In all likelihood the stem is the Infinitive, followed by a possessor expression; cf. Sethe $\ddot{A}Z$ 64 (1929) 63-4; however, the nature of the prefix me-, which seems to turn this nominal expression into a predicative one, is quite obscure.

37. The Adjective Verbs have all the Satellites. They are negatived by $(\overline{n}-) \dots \times n$.

Basic Preterit Circumstantial Relative "Second"

nanory ne nanory enanory (1) et nanory enanory b)

(2) ete nanory a)

- a) et- is used when the subject of the Adjective Verb is = the antecedent, and ete when the subject is distinct from the antecedent. Cf., for the latter case, Shenoute ap. Rossi Pap. copti II iii 13 noe ete naywor noi netenapxoeic epoor "just as those over whom he will rule are numerous"; with the negation, Brit. Mus. Cat. No. 981 (p. 480 b) (-)oe ete (n)nanove an etpe-"the way it is not good for ... to ...". A nominal subject (Till Kopt. Gr. § 462) is necessarily distinct from the antecedent.
- b) Études 51. Add Shenoute ed. Chassinat 135,44-5 gitn or enazar enerephr "whereby are they greater than one another?".

Obs. The subject may be definite as well as indefinite (pace Till Kopt. Gr. § 284). Cf. nanoy oy- Ps. lxxxiii.11, Prov. xi.25, xii.9, xv.16, 17, xvi.19, 32, xvii.1, xix.22, xx.23, xxii.1, xxiv.5, Wisd. iv.1.

XI. Formal Analysis of the Conjugation Bases

38. A classification of the conjugation bases by purely formal criteria must leave out of account not only the preformatives of the First Present, but, so far as Sahidic is concerned, also the Conjunctive, which has become closely assimilated to the First Present (for Bohairic

see § 51). On the other hand, it is useful to include the Satellites of the First Present and, for certain forms (§ 59), of the First Future. Although the Relative Present does not quite fit into any of the groups to be set up (§§ 42, 44), its very recalcitrance will prove illuminating.

A. Sahidic

39. We have to distinguish the prenominal and the presuffixal forms of the conjugation bases.

Prenominally all bases end in a vowel, either α or ε .

Presuffixally the bases end either in α , or in stable ε , or in unstable ε (alternating with zero).

Unstable ε behaves differently, according as it is preceded either by one of the stops π or τ (§ 44), or by the sonorant p (§ 45).

- 40. The pronominal actor suffixes fall into four groups:
 - (1) Single Surds: (2nd m. sg.) -**k** (3rd m. sg.) -**q** (3rd f. sg.) -**c**
 - (2) Single Sonorants, appearing in two alternant shapes:

non-syllabic (postvocalic) syllabic (postconsonantal)

(1st sg.) $-\ddot{\imath}$ (- ε_{i}), that is $[\dot{\imath}]$ - ι , that is $[\ddot{\imath}]$ - \ddot{n} . that is $[\ddot{\imath}]$ - σ_{i} . that is $[\ddot{\imath}]$ - σ_{i} . that is $[\ddot{\imath}]$ - σ_{i} . that is $[\ddot{\imath}]$

- (3) The suffix 2nd f. sg. has three alternants: zero, $-\varepsilon$, $-p(\varepsilon)$. The distribution of zero and ε is analogous to that of the non-syllabic and syllabic alternants described under (2) (1). In one case the alternants zero and $-p(\varepsilon)$ appear as variants (§ 41).
- (4) The suffix 2nd pl. has two alternants: short $-\tau \overline{n}$, long $-\tau \epsilon \tau \overline{n}$. In certain cases these alternants appear as variants (§§ 43 Obs., 45 Obs. 1, 56 Obs.). The short form is perhaps best regarded as added to the prenominal base.

By applying the criteria listed in §§ 39 and 40 we obtain five groups. See the synoptic table on p. 416.

^{(1) 2}nd f. sg. forms ending in $-\epsilon$ are considered as having zero when the base has stable ϵ , and as having $-\epsilon$ when the base has unstable ϵ .

415

41. First Group.

The base consists prenominally and presufixally of the single vowel \mathbf{A} : Perfect \mathbf{A} -.

1st sg., 1st pl., 3rd pl.: non-syllabic; 2nd f. sg.: zero, var. $-\rho(\varepsilon)$ 2nd pl.: long.

Obs. The zero form of the 2nd f. sg., first explicitly pointed out by Spiegelberg Rec. tr. 30 (1908) 141-2, is the one found in the best MSS.

42. Second Group.

The base consists presuffixally either of a single vowel (ε) or a vowel $(x, stable \varepsilon)$ preceded by a single consonant:

Circumstantial Present, Second Present, Third Future, Conditional e-; Imperfect ne-; Aorist wa-; Neg. Aorist ue- (ua-).

lst sg., 1st pl., 3rd pl.: non-syllabic; 2nd f. sg.: $-p\varepsilon$; thus also, as variant, in the Relative Present (§ 59); 2nd pl.: long.

Prenominally: lengthened by -pe; thus also the Relative Present (§ 53).

Obs. In the Conditional the prenominal and the 2nd f. sg. (e. g. Ruth ii.9, Jo. xi.40) is normally epwan-; epewan- is archaic. The 2nd f. sg. of the Third Future is epe- (Gen. iii.16 ap. Brit. Mus. Cat. No. 932; Jdg. iv.20, Ruth ii.9).

43. Third Group.

The base ends prenominally and presufixally in stable ϵ , preceded either by stop plus sonorant or by double sonorant:

Causative Infinitive TPE-, Neg. Third Future mne-.

1st sg., 1st pl., 3rd pl.: non-syllabic, but 1st sg. -eï is normally replaced by -a: Tpa-, nna-; 2nd f. sg.: zero; 2nd pl.: short.

Obs. In Sahidic the 2nd pl. variant $\tau_{perer\overline{n}}$ — is non-standard, though old; cf. § 56 Obs.

44. Fourth Group.

The base ends in a stop (π, τ) plus unstable ϵ :

Neg. Perfect. $\overline{\mathbf{an}}(\mathbf{e})$ -, "not yet" $\overline{\mathbf{anat}}(\mathbf{e})$ -, "until" $\mathbf{want}(\mathbf{e})$ -, [Relative Present $\mathbf{er}(\mathbf{e})$ -, except for the prenominal form \mathbf{erepe} and the 2nd f. sg. variant \mathbf{erepe} -].

The ε appears prenominally and before the suffix 2nd pl.; it disappears before all other suffixes.

1st sg., 1st pl., 3rd pl.: syllabic; 2nd f. sg.: -€; 2nd pl.: short.

Obs. The disppearance of ϵ before the single-consonant suffixes is the norm in the classical orthography (Rahlfs Die Berliner Hs. des sahid. Psalters 28 n. 4). Exceptions occur, however, even in old and otherwise careful MSS.

45. Fifth Group.

The base ends in a vowel plus \mathbf{p} plus unstable $\mathbf{\epsilon}$:

Causative Imperative $\exp(\varepsilon)$ -, Future Conjunctive $\operatorname{Tap}(\varepsilon)$ -, Temporal $\operatorname{\overline{nTep}}(\varepsilon)$ -.

The ε appears prenominally, before the single surd suffixes and before the suffix 2nd pl.; it disappears before the sonorant suffixes.

1st sg., 1st pl., 3rd pl.: syllabic; 2nd f. sg.: -€; 2nd pl.: short.

- Obs. 1. Alongside of Tapet \vec{n} there exists a non-standard variant Tapetet \vec{n} —. Cf. § 56 Obs.
- Obs. 2. The spellings $\vec{n} \tau \epsilon p \vec{n}$ etc. are those of the classical orthography; $\vec{n} \tau \epsilon p \epsilon n$ is, however, found in otherwise reliable MSS.

B. Other dialects

46. (Cf. § 41). In the Perfect the 2nd f. sg. form a- is also found in Akhmimic (Prov. xxxi.29) alongside of ap- (Mic. iv.9, Nah. iii.16; relative etap- Zeph. iii.11, Clem. ed. Schmidt p. 16,12) and in Subakhmimic (Jo. iv.18 relative nta-), but neither in Bohairic (ape-) nor in Fayyumic (ap-).

In the 2nd pl. Bohairic has very frequently aperen- (as in the Second Present, § 48) alongside of ateren-; and thus regularly in the Relative (and Second) Perfect exaperen-.

- 47. (Cf. § 42). In Akhmimic the Aorist belongs to the Fifth Group (§ 58). For the other bases of the Second Group Akhmimic uses prenominally both the enlarged and the unenlarged forms, apparently without distinction (§ 55): Circumstantial e alongside of epe, Second Present a alongside of ape, Neg. Aorist as alongside of mape. Whether the Imperfect has ma alongside of mape (the latter e.g. Jon. ii.1) must be left open for the moment; in books of reference the Second Perfect (cf. OLZ 1960, 25 n. 1) (1) is often mistaken for the Imperfect. [Imperfect ma Jo. xii.2 (Rösch)].
- 48. (Cf. § 42). For the 2nd pl. of the Second Group Bohairic adds the short suffix -ren to the enlarged prenominal base:

Circumstantial eperen- and Third Future eperene-

Second Present aperen-

Imperfect

napeten-

Aorist

мпаретеп-

Neg. Aorist

(1) Add Mt. xi.26 ap. Amundsen Symbolae Osloenses 24 (1945) 123.

I	11. J. Foliotsky					
prenominal		= base	base plus -pe	= base		= base
2nd pl.	long	×	×			
2nd	short			×	×	× ×
'n	-pe	\times	×			
2nd f. sg.	ÿ				Annual representation of the second second	×
21	zero	×		×		
ol., 3rd pl.	syllabic				×	×
1st sg., 1st pl., 3rd pl.	non-syllabic	×	×	×		
w		4	42	43	4.	45
Bases		Α-	e- ne- 1984- 1986-	тре- ппе-	<u>π</u> π(ε)- <u>π</u> πατ(ε)- <u>ω</u> απτ(ε)- [ετ(ε)-]	мλρ(ε)- Τλρ(ε)- πτερ(ε)-
Group)	Ħ	<u> </u>	IV	<u> </u>

Second Present epern- and Imperfect nepern- occur as variants also in Subakhmimic; an isolated instance of Second Future eperna- even in classical Sahidic: Sir. ii.15 Lagarde.

49. (Cf. § 43). In all other dialects the 3rd pl. forms of the Third Group have $-o_{\mathbf{Y}}$ as against Sahidic $-e_{\mathbf{Y}}$:

Bohairic oporFayyumic TporMk. viii.30, Jo. iii.20, but
mner- Ep. Jer. 66 bis

Akhmimic TorSubakhm. Tpornor-

For the 1st sg. the picture is more diversified:

Bohairic	0 b1–	-ann
Fayyumic	Tpı-	uui-
Akhmimic	TA-	-ann
Subakhm.	трі-,	тра- пі-

The Subakhmimic forms τ_{Pl} —and τ_{Pov} —are matched by 1st pl. $\tau_{P\bar{n}}$ — (Jo. vi.52, with a long stroke over all three letters), as against Sahidic τ_{Pen} —.

50. The anomalous 1st sg. suffix. -A (§ 49), not being correlated to stable e in the rest of the paradigm, as it is in Sahidic (§ 43), hardly justifies the setting up of a special group. If we disregard it, the Akhmimic and Subakhmimic forms of the Neg. Third Future and the Subakhmimic forms of the Causative Infinitive would join the Fifth Group, while the Akhmimic forms of the Causative Infinitive, the base of which is Te- prenominally and before the suffix 2nd pl., and T- before all other suffixes, would join the Fourth Group.

Obs. Note that in Akhmimic the paradigm of the Causative Infinitive coincides with that of the fem. sg. Possessive Article, and the paradigm of the Negative Third Future, so far as it is known (I have no reference for the 1st pl.), coincides with that of the pl. Possessive Article.

In the Sahidic Possessive Article the anomalous 1st sg. suffix -x goes together with stable ε in the rest of the paradigm (except the 2nd f. sg.):

1st pl. nen- ren- nen-3rd pl. ner- rer- ner-

In Akhmimic an ϵ appears normally only in the pl. Possessive Article, and only before surd suffixes (contrast 1st pl. $n\overline{n}$ -): it is obviously called forth by the phonetic properties of the sonorant n- with special reference to its position in the syllable.

51. In Bohairic syllabic \dot{n} occurs only in word-initial position. For the conjugations of Groups III-V the number of sonorant suffixes is therefore reduced from three to two, viz. the two vocalic suffixes -1 and -or, while -n joins the consonant suffixes. So far as the conjugations of Groups III-IV are concerned, the distinction between stable and unstable e is irrelevant to Bohairic, stable e occurring only in the Circumstantial Present and the Third Future: on the one hand ϵ appears before all consonantal suffixes in all these conjugations, on the other hand it disappears in all these conjugations before the vocalic suffixes -1 and -ox. The anomalous 1st sg. suffix -x of the Neg. Third Future can no longer be related to stable e in the rest of the paradigm, but hardly requires the setting up of a special group. All conjugations of Groups III-V can therefore be lumped together in one single group, III. The non-occurrence of ntepe and Tape (the two lone instances of 2nd pl. nTapeTen-, Stern § 450, notwithstanding) in Bohairic can be made up for by including the Conjunctive, which shares with the Neg. Third Future the anomalous 1st sg. suffix -x, but otherwise behaves exactly like the conjugations of the Bohairic Group III (however, a peculiarity of the Conjunctive is the 3rd pl. by-form nce- alongside of nrov-).

C. The prenominal and 2nd f. sg. ending $-p\epsilon$

52. The element -pe which distinguishes certain prenominal bases from their presuffixal forms does not possess the same status in all dialects. The bases in question are the four Satellites of the Bipartite Conjugation Pattern (§§ 13, 14), the Aorist and the Neg. Aorist. As the evidence of Akhmimic suggests (§ 58), the Aorist does not originally belong to this group, and may therefore be disregarded. Within the framework of Coptic syntax the Negative Aorist has nothing in common with the bases with which it shares

the prenominal -pe. Yet apart from its initial \mathfrak{L} - (Bohairic $\mathfrak{L}\mathfrak{R}$ -) it closely resembles the Second Present, and in the light of historical grammar there can be little doubt that it is in fact compounded with the Second Present; cf. Gardiner JEA 16 (1930) 227; Edgerton JAOS 55 (1935) 262, 265.

- Obs. The Second Present is durative, while the Neg. Aorist is non-durative. In all likelihood the Second Present has acquired its durative character secondarily through the association of *iir.f* with the Bipartite Conjugation Pattern.
- 53. Of all the forms enlarged by $-p\varepsilon$ the Relative Present $\varepsilon \tau \varepsilon p\varepsilon$ has the smallest distribution in terms of dialects. The only dialect in which it is firmly established is Sahidic.
- Obs. Occasionally $\epsilon \tau \epsilon$ occurs in classical Sahidic, e.g. Sir. xlv.2 Lagarde (collated).
- 54. The other forms (disregarding the Aorist, on which see §§ 56, 58) are firmly established in Sahidic, Bohairic and Favyumic:

	Sahidie	Bohairic	Fayyumic
Circumstantial	ере	éре	€2 \ €
Imperfect Second Present	ере иере	ape nape	ase (n)
Neg. Aorist	мере (маре)	мпаре	WES/E

55. Akhmimic, on the other hand, shows considerable fluctuation (§ 47). A count for the Proverbs gives the following results:

Circumstantial	e 13	[epe nil]
Second Present	a 29	жре 42°)
Second Future	$\begin{bmatrix} a & 29 \\ a \dots & na-13 \end{bmatrix} 42$	аре 42° аре па-9 51
Neg. Aorist	eea 4	маре 12

The prenominal Imperfect does not occur at all in the Proverbs. The large number of Second Presents is characteristic of sapiential style.

56. In sharp contrast with this fluctuation the $-p_{\varepsilon}$ appears consistently throughout the paradigm, presuffixally as well as prenominally, in the group wape- (Causative Imperative), tape- (Future

Conjunctive), $(\overline{n}) \tau \times p \epsilon - (\text{Temporal})$, $\varepsilon \times p \epsilon - (\text{Aorist})$. The consistency of $-p \epsilon$ in the last-named conjugation is especially noteworthy, since Akhmimic stands alone in this respect (§ 58).

Obs. In this group (except маре-, which has no 2nd persons) the long suffix 2nd pl. seems to be normal in Akhmimic:

Future Conjunctive	тарететп-	Till Osterbrief A 2
Temporal	тарететп-	Gespr. 33, 7
Aorist	-ntetagas	Hagg. ii.16.

In the Minor Prophets the Causative Infinitive has likewise TPETETN-alongside of TETETN- (Till's note on Mal. i.7); contrast Prov. xxiv.23 TETN-.

- 57. Historical grammar shows that the $-p\varepsilon$ is secondary in the Relative Present (Demotic nty iw) and in the Circumstantial (iw), but it looks to Coptic for an indication as to whether the Second Present (iir) really contained a spoken r and might therefore have been the source of $-p\varepsilon$ in the other forms. In itself this is not unlikely, but the evidence of Akhmimic hardly suggests that the $-p\varepsilon$ is more legitimate in the Second Present than elsewhere.
- 58. On the other hand the testimony of Akhmimic for <code>&apeq-</code> is supported by a piece of historical evidence. In Demotic the non-relative <code>sdm.f</code> of the verb "to come", <code>iw.f</code> (Rylands IX <code>i.iw.f</code>, cf. Griffith III p. 223 n. 21; 326) occurs, apart from its "prospective" use after an Imperative (thus Rylands IX 12, 16), only after "to give" (<code>di</code> and <code>my</code>), after <code>m-drt</code> "when" (Lexa <code>Gr. dém. V 3 p. 824 ex. 6)</code> and after <code>hr</code>, <code>i. e.</code> precisely in the prototypes of our Fifth Group, <code>mape</code>, <code>Tape</code>, <code>mtepe</code> and Akhmimic <code>@ape</code>. This would seem to suggest that <code>@apeq-</code> is genuine, being compounded of <code>@a-(hr)</code> and, like the other bases of this group, the prospective <code>sdm.f-peq</code>. The <code>gaq-</code> of the other dialects may well be due to the analogy of the negative counterpart <code>waq-/weq-</code>.
- 59. A similar element occurs as 2nd f. sg. suffix in the four Satellites of the Bipartite Conjugation Pattern (in the Relative etepe- alongside of ete-, see below), in the Aorist and the Negative Aorist $i.\ e.$ the same conjugations as have prenominal -pe; and in the Perfect $\mathbf{Ap(e)}$ as variant of \mathbf{A} (§ 41). Cf. Sottas $Rev.\ ég.$ N. S. 3 [= 2, fasc. 3-4] (1924) 14-5; Edgerton JAOS 55 (1935) 266-7. We may disregard the Aorist (§ 58), the Negative Aorist (§ 52) and

the Perfect (where Sottas had already recognized the $-p(\varepsilon)$ as secondary), and limit ourselves to the Satellites, to which we add the forms with the Future auxiliary nx:

Imperfect	uebe-	ueby-	var. nep(e)na-
Circumstantial	ере-	*ера-	var. * $\epsilon p(\epsilon)n\lambda$ -
Relative	ете- var. етере-	етера-	var. etena-, etep(e)na-
Second	ере-	ера	yar. ep(e)na-

The Future forms in $(-)\epsilon p x$ - have the testimony of our best MSS. in their favour, while the fuller ones in $(-)\epsilon p(\epsilon)n x$ - are rather characteristic of late MSS.

The best evidence is available for the Relative etepa-, which occurs, e.g., throughout the excellent Michigan MS. of Ruth, i.16 (bis), 17 iii.4, 5, 11. For the contrast Relative Present ete-vs. Relative Future etepa- cf. especially Mk. vi.22-3 according to Horner's 8 (collated) and 74 and Wessely No. 119 b: neteorage "what you want" ...netepaaltei and autoq "what you will ask me" (Horner's 114 has netep- and netepna-, Wessely No. 120 a nete- and netepena-). In Mt. xv.28 ete- is supported by Wessely No. 100'd. In spite of the strong evidence for ete- the testimony of Thompson's MS. for etepe- 1Cor. vii.16 cannot be rejected: while ete- is presumably the primitive form, etepe- (e.g. Le Muséon 42, 237 u; Rossi Pap. copti I iii 59a; common in later Sahidic) is easily understood as due to the analogy of the other Satellites.

The Future Imperfect nepa- is attested in Jo. iv.10 by Horner's 91 (= Delaporte's E) and P. Soph. 368, 17, as well as by Thompson's Subakhmimic (the late Morgan MS. has nepna-).

For Second Future epa— I have only non-Biblical references, e. g. Shenoute ed. Leipoldt III 201, 9; Cairo Cat. (Munier) No. 9292 recto, 46.

Unfortunately these forms, hard enough to come by in classical Sahidic, are even rarer in Akhmimic. However, Second Future **apa**— Clement ed. Schmidt xx.7 (= Job xxxviii.11, where Ciasca's late Sahidic has **epna**—) agrees with the classical Sahidic form.

Because of the dearth of Akhmimic evidence it is impossible to say whether in this dialect the $-p(\varepsilon)$ of the 2nd f. sg. was treated similarly to the prenominal $-p\varepsilon$ (§ 45). Sottas's and Edgerton's conclusion that it originated in the Second Present is plausible but receives no support from Coptic.

- Obs. 1. In post-classical Sahidic an occasional 2nd f. sg. -p can be met with in practically all conjugations, e. g. First Present τρ- (Sethe AZ 58, 55 n. 1; Worrell Coptic MSS. in the Freer Collection 122), First Future τερπα- (Piehl Sphinx 4, 33; Sethe l. c.; cf. Fayyumic τελπα-1 Cor. xii.16 ap. Zoega 151); Neg. Perfect $\overline{\alpha}$ πρ- and Temporal \overline{n} τερερ- (Wessely XV No. 198 d), etc.
- Obs. 2. In Bohairic the 2nd f. sg. of the First Future is TEPA- (first recognized to belong to this paradigm by Stern), which is the more remarkable as the Satellites, with the partial exception of the Relative, have no forms in -pa-. In Sahidic TEPA- occurs in the P. Soph. (Scholtz-Woide Gr. aeg. 97; Sethe l. c.) and occasionally elsewhere, e.g. Jdg. xiii.5, 7 (Thompson; but in verse 3 TENA-).
- Obs. 3. The Sahidic forms in $(-)\epsilon px$ have probably nothing to do with the paradigm ϵqx discussed by Kahle Bala'izah p. 157.

D. Conclusion

60. The formal analysis confirms that the Satellites of the Bipartite Conjugation Pattern make up a morphological group by themselves. While the Neg. Aorist joins this group from historical causes, Akhmimic helps us to recognize that the affirmative Aorist originally belonged to an entirely different group.

Purely formal criteria lead to different groupings for different dialects (§§ 50-51) and afford no practical alternative to the classification set forth in §§ 4, 18, 29.

XII. Bibliography

- W. Till, "Die Satzarten im Koptischen", Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung 2 (1954) 378-402. Review by Vergote, Chronique d'Égypte 31 (1956) 218-9.
- id., Koptische Grammatik (Leipzig 1955). Reviews by Vergote, Chronique d'Égypte 31 (1956) 403-9; Polotsky, OLZ 1957, 219-34 (esp. 225-8).

NUNTII PERSONARUM ET RERUM

Ist die B-L Schrift im wesentlichen entziffert?

H. Th. Bossert - Istanbul

Nach der Liste von Fr. Steinherr (BO VIII 1951 S. 134 ff) entfallen von 2306 Zeichen der B-L Bleibriefe aus Assur 450 auf den Worttrenner. Es bleiben demnach 1856 zu lesende Silbenzeichen einschliesslich der Ideogramme und Determinative übrig. Sechs Silbenzeichen (210 u.a., 155 ă, 146 a und ā, 118 ha, 113 i und ī) nehmen hinsichtlich ihrer Häufigkeit (zusammen 742) die ersten Stellen ein. Nehmen wir an, die beiden i-Zeichen seien bisher zum grössten Teil falsch gelesen worden, so errechnet sich etwa sechs Prozent irriger Lesungen. Der prozentuale Anteil der Falschlesungen erhöht sich noch, da Ideogramme und Determinative hätten abgesetzt, die nicht wenigen Zeichen aber, die ebenfalls "i" oder "ī" gelesen wurden, hätten hinzugefügt werden müssen.

Schopenhauer hat Recht, wenn er sagt: "Jede falsche Entzifferung wird, wenn sie auch zu einigen Erscheinungen passt, den übrigen desto greller widersprechen". Widerspruchsvolle Lesungen ergaben sich für jeden, der die bisherige Entzifferung nicht ungeprüft übernehmen wollte, etwa beim B-L. Demonstrativpronomen. Es wurde bis jetzt "i" gelesen, wird aber in Zukunft "za" zu lesen sein. Auch der nom. und acc. Tarhuis, Tarhuin (auch Tarhuis, Tarhuin) musste befremden, weil er wirklichkeitsfern war. Wer allerdings von der von mir immer bekämpften Theorie ausging, jedes B-L Silbenzeichen habe nur einen einzigen Lesewert, fand seine i- oder i-Lesung im B-L Verb aia- "machen" schon in der Grossreichszeit bestätigt (vgl. Abb. 1). Für die Lesung "i" wurde dagegen kein überzeugendes Argument beigebracht. Für "ia" hätte man sich auf den Namen der Göttin Aia (1) in Fıraktin berufen müssen (vgl. Abb. 1), in dem zum ersten Male das zweigestrichene "i" fassbar

⁽¹) Auf dem Felsrelief von Fıraktin (M XXX sowie Bossert, Altanatolien, Abb. 550-552) opfert links Ḥatusili III. dem Saruma, in der Mitte Putuhepa der Ḥepat. In der Beischrift rechts wird als Landesgöttin die DĀ-ja genannt, zu der vorläufig E. Laroche, Recherches sur les noms des dieux hittites (RHA VII [1946-47]) S. 43 f u. 119 zu vergleichen ist. Nach KUB X 92 I 14 hatten Ḥepat und Aja einen gemeinsamen Tempel.