THE CIRCUMSTANTIAL PRESENT AS AN ANTECEDENT-LESS (i.e. SUBSTANTIVAL) RELATIVE IN COPTIC

By ARIEL SHISHA-HALEVY

1. COPTIC disposes of two procedures to express the substantival relative clause ('he who . . .', 'that which . . .' etc.), namely, either by substituting a *substantivator* morpheme (of the ⲡ-/ⲧ-/ⲛ- paradigm)[1] for the antecedent, yet in close juncture with the relative-converted[2] form: ⲡⲉⲧ-, ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁϥ-, ⲡⲉϣⲁϥ-, etc.; or by having an indefinite pronoun or pronominal (ⲟⲩⲁ, ⲣⲱⲙⲉ, ϩⲟⲉⲓⲛⲉ: 'one', 'any', 'some') as antecedent to a circumstantially converted form, as the relative : circumstantial opposition is neutralized, in favour of the latter, when adnominal to a non-ⲡ-determined substantival kernel.[3]

A third, rarer and obviously idiomatic procedure is that using the *bare circumstantial present form* as an antecedent-less relative, mostly equivalent to an ⲟⲩ-determined, ⲡ-substantivated relative form (ⲟⲩⲡⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ, ⲟⲩⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩϥ, etc.); or, alternatively, a ⲟⲩⲁ-antecedent before the adnominal circumstantial. The Sahidic and Bohairic examples offered below (all of them either definitely or very probably translated from the Greek) represent most of the possible syntactical functions of a substantival relative.

(a) as *direct object*, though *without governing the prenominal morphoponemic alternant* (status constructus) of the infinitive:[4]

---

[1] Not the definite article (although homonymic and certainly related to it), but belonging to a different category (paradigm): the substantivated relative may be, in many cases, further determined by ⲡ-, ⲟⲩ-/ϩⲉⲛ- or ⲟ-(zero), and the relative form (ⲉⲧ-) itself is not otherwise commutable with a noun. ⲡⲉⲧ- on its own is in some respects treated as a zero-determined substantive: consider the following (among many other examples): Job 11 : 8 (ⲡⲉⲧ- as antecedent of the adnominal circumstantial, see n. 3); Shenoute, ed. Chassinat, 117. 32, ed. Leipoldt, III, 126. 13 etc. (ⲟⲩⲛ̄-/ⲙⲛ̄-ⲡⲉⲧ-); Shenoute, ed. Leipoldt, IV, 71. 20 (ⲡⲉⲧ- ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ-); Shenoute, ed. Amélineau, I, 133. 10 (ⲡⲉⲧ- ⲛⲓⲙ); Shenoute, ed. Chassinat, 63. 9, ed. Leipoldt, IV, 128. 27 (ⲡⲉⲧ- as direct and immediate object of a Bipartite Pattern predicate, in defiance of the Stern–Jernstedt rule); Mich. 3. 11 (Akhm.: 'ⲙ̄ⲡ̄-ⲡⲉⲑⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲉⲓ ⲁϫⲱⲛ'), see Polotsky, 'The Coptic Conjugation System' (in *Orientalia* 29 [1960], §§ 19, 35).

[2] Polotsky's conversion terminology, op. cit. §§ 10–18.

[3] The so-called 'pseudo' ('unecht' or 'uneigentlich') relative clause (Till, *Kopt. Gr.*² § 475: an unfortunate appellation, signifying, from the structural-descriptive point of view, precisely nothing), already commented upon by Prätorius (his review of Stern's *Gr.*, *ZDMG* 35 [181], 758). The present writer has tried, in an unpublished doctoral thesis (1972) to formulate structurally the distributional details, as well as the functioning, of the circumstantial and relative conversion-forms in the Sahidic corpus of Shenoute's works, arriving at the conclusion that there actually exists a *circumstantial : relative* opposition (*predicative* vs. *attributive* junction), which is neutralizable in certain environments.

[4] Unlike the Second Future when object of ϭⲙ̄ⲉ in a negative predication (see Spiegelberg, *ZÄS* 58. 157). See in Shenoute, ed. Leipoldt, III, 13. 9, ed. Chassinat, 33. 14, 36.9, 73. 20. In Subakhmîmic, see *Manichaean Psalmbook* 151. 27, 156. 9 (ⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲩϭⲛ-ⲉⲩ ⲡⲉ ⲡϩⲟⲧⲉ), 203. 25, 207. 23. This idiom is attested also in Late Coptic: Budge, *Miscellaneous Texts* 168. 19, Drescher, *Coptic Legends*, 55. 19.

(1) Gen. 31:8 (Sah., ed. Ciasca) . . . ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲛⲉⲥⲟⲟⲩ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ϫⲡⲟ ⲉϥⲟ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲧⲟ ʻ. . . and all the sheep bear flecked (ones).' Boh.: ϣⲁⲣⲉ ⲛⲓⲉⲥⲱⲟⲩ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲙⲉⲥⲁⲟⲩⲓⲁⲟⲩⲁⲛ: τέξεται πάντα τὰ πρόβατα ποικίλα.

(2) Ex. 12:9 (Sah., ed. Kasser) ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲱⲙ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ϩⲏⲧⲟⲩ ⲉϥⲟⲩⲱⲧ ⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉϥⲡⲟⲥⲉ ϩⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲉϥϭⲏⲥ ϩⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲥⲁⲧⲉ 'You shall not eat of them what is raw, nor cooked in water, but roasted in fire' (Ciasca . . . ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲉⲩϭⲏⲥ sic(?) ϩⲛ̄ⲥⲁⲧⲉ); Boh.: ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲱⲙ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ϧⲏⲧⲟⲩ ⲉϥⲟⲩⲱⲧ ⲟⲩϫⲉ ⲉϥⲫⲟⲥⲓ ϧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲙⲱⲟⲩ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲉϥϫⲉϥϫⲱϥ ϧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲭⲣⲱⲙ: οὐκ ἔδεσθε ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὠμὸν οὐδὲ ἡψημένον ἐν ὕδατι ἀλλὰ ἢ ὀπτὰ πυρί.

(3) Deut. 18:10, 11 (Boh., ed. Lagarde) ⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲩϫⲓⲙⲓ ⲛ̄ϧⲏⲧⲕ ⲉϥⲟⲣⲟ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉϥϣⲏⲣⲓ ⲓⲉ ⲧⲉϥϣⲉⲣⲓ ⲉⲥⲓⲛⲓ ϧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲭⲣⲱⲙ, ⲓⲉ ⲉϥϣⲓⲛⲓ ϧⲉⲛⲛⲓϣⲉⲛϩⲟⲓ . . . ⲟⲩϫⲉ ⲉϥⲙⲟⲩϯ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉϫⲓ ⲟⲩϫⲉ ⲉϥϫⲟⲩϣⲧ ⲉϧⲁⲛⲙⲙⲏⲓⲛⲓ ⲟⲩϫⲉ ⲉϥϣⲓⲛⲓ ⲛ̄ⲛⲓⲣⲉϥⲙⲱⲟⲩⲧ 'Let not be found among you (one) who makes his son or his daughter pass through fire, or (one) who inquires of the diviners . . . nor (one) who ventriloquizes, nor (one) who looks for omens, nor (one) who is a necromancer'. Greek: all participles (in the nominative).

(4) Judith 12:3 ⲉⲛⲛⲁⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲧⲱⲛ ⲉϥⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲉϯ ⲛⲉ 'Whence shall we bring (one) resembling them to give thee?' πόθεν ἐξοίσομέν σοι δοῦναι ὅμοια αὐτοῖς;

(5) Epiphanius (ed. Crum, *Monastery of Epiph.* II. 313.4 f.) ⲙ̄ⲡⲓϭⲓⲛⲉ ⲉⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩϥ ⲉϥⲣⲁⲛⲁⲕ 'I have not found (one) which is good which (will) please you'. Crum completes '(corn)'. A post-classic, non-literary, untranslated (i.e. native Coptic) instance.

(b) as postposed actor (or grammatical subject), *unintroduced by* ⲛ̄ϭⲓ-:

(6) Josh. 9:29 (ed. Kasser) ⲛ̄ⲛⲉϥⲱϫⲛ̄ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ϧⲏⲧⲧⲏⲩⲧⲛ̄ ⲉϥⲟ ⲛ̄ϩⲙ̄ϩⲁⲗ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉϥⲟ ⲛ̄ⲣⲉϥⲡⲉϩ-ϣⲉ: οὐ μὴ ἐκλίπῃ ἐξ ὑμῶν δοῦλος οὐδὲ ξυλοκόπος 'There shall not cease amongst you (one) who is a slave and (one) who is a wood-cutter'.

(7) 2 Kings 3:29 (ed. Drescher) ⲛ̄ϥⲧⲙ̄ⲱϫⲛ̄ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲓⲡⲏⲓ ⲛ̄ⲓⲱⲁⲃ ⲉϥϫⲁϩⲙ̄ (v.l. ⲛ̄ϭⲓ-ⲟⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛ̄ⲡⲟⲛⲟⲣⲉⲩⲥ) ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉϥⲥⲟⲃϩ̄ ⲉϥⲁⲙⲁϩⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲟⲩⲣⲁⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉϥϩⲏⲩ ϩⲛ̄ⲧⲥⲏϥⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉϥⲣ̄ϭⲣⲱϩ ⲛ̄ⲟⲉⲓⲕ: . . . καὶ μὴ ἐκλίποι ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου Ἰωὰβ γονορρυὴς καὶ λεπρὸς καὶ κρατῶν σκυτάλης καὶ πίπτων ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ καὶ ἐλασσούμενος ἄρτοις ʻ. . . and there shall not cease in the house of Joab (one) who is impure and (one) who is leprous, (one) who grasps a crutch and (one) who falls by the sword and (one) who is in want of bread'. There seems no justification for Drescher's *sic*-ing of ⲉϥϫⲁϩⲙ̄, see *Corpus Script. Christ. Orient.* 314/Copt. 36, p. 86 n. 1; the circumstantial after ⲱϫⲛ̄ does, however, seem suspiciously like a predicative complementation of this verb.

(8) (?) John 1:27 (Thompson's collation, Chester Beatty MSS. A, B) ϥⲁϩⲉ ϫⲉ ⲉⲣⲁⲧϥ . . . ⲡⲁⲓ ⲉⲛⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲁⲛ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟϥ, ⲉϥⲛⲏⲩ (ⲙⲛ̄)ⲛ̄ⲥⲱⲓ (Horner: ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲏⲩ ⲙ̄ⲛ̄ⲛ̄ⲥⲱⲓ with ⲉϥ- *variae lectiones*): ὁ . . . ἐρχόμενος; 'Stands . . . He, whom you know not, (one) who is to come after me'.

(c) Co-ordinated (by ⲁⲩⲱ) to, or disjoined (by ⲏ, ⲁⲗⲗⲁ) from a noun *signifying a quality*, this being either the predicate of a Nominal Sentence (ⲉϥ- this expressing *an additional predication*)[5] or in any other syntactical status:

(9) Num. 14:12 (Boh., ed. Lagarde) ⲟⲩⲛⲓϣϯ ⲛ̄ⲉⲑⲛⲟⲥ ⲟⲩⲟϩ ⲉⲛⲁϣⲱϥ 'A great and multitudinous people': ἔθνος μέγα καὶ πολύ.

---

[5] *Nominal* additional predication is effected by the *nota relationis* ⲛ̄, e.g. 1 Cor. 5:11; Joel 2:13 (ed. Malinine); Clemens 45.1 (ed. Schmidt); Shenoute, ed. Leipoldt, III, 135. 10 f., ed. Chassinat, 108. 15 ff. In Bohairic this use is extended to non-predicative status, e.g. *Acta Martyrum* (edd. Balestri-Hyvernat), I, 158. 18; 164. 11; 175. 10 f.; 179. 15; 207. 3 etc.

(10) Psalms (Sah., ed. Budge) 24: 8 ⲟⲩⲭⲣⲏⲥⲧⲟⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉϥⲥⲟⲩⲧⲱⲛ ⲡⲉ ⲡϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ 'Good and (one) who is upright is the Lord' (cf. *Pistis Sophia* 80. 1 ⲟⲩⲁⲅⲁⲑⲟⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉϥⲥⲟⲩⲧⲱⲛ ⲡⲉ). Boh.: ⲟⲩⲭⲣⲏⲥⲧⲟⲥ ⲉϥⲥⲟⲩⲧⲱⲛ ⲡⲉ: χρηστὸς καὶ εὐθής.

(11) Psalms (Boh., ed. Burmester-Dévaud) 68: 30 ϯϣⲟⲡ ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲟⲩϩⲏⲕⲓ ⲟⲩⲟϩ ⲉϥⲙⲟⲕϩ 'I am poor and (one) who is miserable'; Sah.: ⲁⲛⲅⲟⲩϩⲏⲕⲉ ⲉϥⲣⲡⲕⲉⲙⲟⲕϩ: πτωχὸς καὶ ἀλγῶν.

(12) Heb. 12 : 16 (Sah.) ⲙⲏⲡⲱⲥ ⲟⲩⲛ-ⲟⲩⲡⲟⲣⲛⲟⲥ ⲏ ⲉϥⲥⲟⲟϥ ⲛ̄ⲑⲉ ⲛ̄ⲏⲥⲁⲩ πόρνος ἢ βέβηλος (Boh. ⲟⲩⲥⲁϥϩⲏⲧ) 'a fornicator or (one) who is impure'.

(13) *Evangelium Philippi* (ed. Ménard) 108.6 f. ⲟⲩⲥⲁⲣⲕⲓⲕⲟⲛ ⲁⲛ ⲡⲉ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲉϥⲟⲩⲃⲃⲏⲩ 'He is not a thing of the flesh, but (one) who is pure'; a Second Present (conditioned by ⲁⲗⲗⲁ)[6] interpretation is not excluded.

(14) *Nag Hammadi Codex VII* (Facsimile Edition, 1972) 125.6 ⲛ̄ⲧⲕ̄-ⲟ[ⲩⲡⲛⲉⲩⲙⲁ] ⲟⲩⲁⲁϥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉϥⲟⲛϩ (cf. ibid. 25 f. ⲛ̄ⲧⲕ̄-ⲟⲩⲡⲛⲉⲩⲙⲁ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲱⲧ ⲉϥⲟⲛϩ) 'Thou art a Spirit alone and (one) who is living'.

(15) Worrell, *Freer MSS.* 280.3 ff. ⲟⲩⲇⲓⲕⲁⲓⲟⲥ ⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ϩⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉϥⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ 'He is righteous in all things and (one) who is holy'.

(16) *Patres Apostolici* (ed. Lefort) 37.6 f. ⲟⲩⲃⲟⲧⲉ ⲡⲉ . . . ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉϥϣⲟⲩⲉⲓⲧ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛ̄ϫⲟⲟⲩⲧ. 'It is an abomination . . . and (a thing) which is vain and base'. Note the contextual association with the ⲛ̄- (*nota relationis*) introduced attribute.[7]

(17) Ibid. 71.20 ϩⲱⲥ ⲁⲧϣⲡ̄-ϩⲙⲟⲧ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉϥⲁⲛⲧⲓⲗⲉⲅⲉ 'as ingrate and (one) who dissents'.

(18) *Acta Pilati* (ed. Revillout) 75.1 ⲟⲩⲙⲁⲓ-ⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲧⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲥⲥⲏⲕ ⲉⲡⲥⲁ ⲛ̄ⲛ̄ⲓⲟⲩⲇⲁⲓ: θεοσεβής ἐστι καὶ μᾶλλον ἰουδαΐζει 'She is God-loving and (one) who tends towards the Jews'. A Second Present interpretation is possible.

(19) Drescher, *Coptic Legends* 14.5 ϩⲉⲛⲛⲟϭ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲩϫⲟⲥⲉ ⲛⲉ, 'They are great and exalted'.

(d) After the gloss-introducing ⲉⲧⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ ⲡⲉ,[8] glossing Greek terms; as *gloss* in Greek-Coptic (-Arabic), as *lemma* in Coptic-Arabic *scalae*:

(20) Baynes, *Gnostic Treatise* (Cod. Brucianus) L. 13 . . . ⲙ̄ⲡⲁⲛⲧⲉⲗⲏⲥ, ⲉⲧⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ ⲡⲉ ⲉϥϫⲏⲕ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ: παντελής, i.e. '(one) who is perfect'.

(21) Ibid. XIV. 1 ⲟⲩⲡⲁⲛⲧⲟⲕⲣⲁⲧⲱⲣ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲁⲩⲧⲟⲡⲁⲧⲱⲣ, ⲉⲧⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ ⲡⲉ ⲉⲣⲉ ⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲛ̄ϩⲏⲧϥ 'He is παντοκράτωρ and αὐτοπάτωρ, i.e. (one) in whom every Fatherhood is'; a Second Present interpretation ('It is in him that every Fatherhood is') is possible.

(22) *Rylands MS. 113* (Catalogue, p. 62) ϯⲱⲟⲥⲙⲉⲛⲟⲥ· ⲉϥϯ ⲙ̄ⲡⲱⲛϩ '(one) who gives life'.

(23-4) *Brit. Mus. Oriental 1242(1)* (Catalogue, No. 491) ⲉⲥⲧⲓⲛⲁⲣⲟⲥ(?)· ⲉϥϭⲙϭⲟⲙ 'mighty' and ⲁⲥⲫⲁⲗⲏⲥⲉ· ⲉϥⲧⲁϫⲣⲏⲩ 'firm', beside ⲁⲅⲁⲑⲟⲥ· ⲡⲉⲧⲣ̄ϣⲁⲩ, ⲁⲅⲓⲟⲥ· ⲡⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ and strangely ⲁⲅⲓⲟⲧⲏⲥ· ⲉϥⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ. [sic]

(25-41) *Paris Copte 43, 44* (The Paris Scalae, *Vat. copt. 71*; ed. Kircher in *Lingua Aegyptiaca Restituta*, 1643):[9] seventeen Bohairic examples in Chapter 25 (pp. 231-4), with occasional variants and parallels quoted by Crum in the *Dictionary* under the relevant headings. Note especially ⲉϥϩⲉⲗⲟⲗⲓ 'light' (adj.) (طائش), ⲉϥⲧⲁⲧϩⲟⲩⲧ (مجتمع) (Crum 439 b or 447 b), 'congregated' or

[6] Polotsky, *Études de syntaxe copte* (Cairo, 1944), 52 f., ('C').
[7] Cf. also *Pistis Sophia* (ed. Schmidt) 275. 19; *Patres Apostolici* (ed. Lefort) 91. 7; *Athanasius* (ed. Lefort) 66. 15 f.
[8] See Prätorius, op. cit. 757, and Jelanskaja in *Palestinskij Sbornyk* 5. 68 (1960), 40 f.
[9] See Mallon, *Mélanges de la Faculté Orientale de l'Université St. Josef (Beyrouth)*, II (1907), 213-64.

'restrained'; ⲉϥϣⲧⲁⲙⲏⲟⲩⲧ 'closed' (مفلوق), ⲉϥⲣⲉⲕⲣⲱⲕ 'putrid, scorched' (عفن, مقمّر), ⲉϥⲕⲏⲕ 'peeled' (مقشّر) ⲉϥⲗⲱⲃϣ 'glowing' (مروق, مشوط) etc.

(e) A co-ordinated substantival unit.

(42) Josh. 11: 17 ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉϥⲃⲏⲕ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲉⲥⲛⲉⲓⲣ '. . . and that which goes up to . . .'.

2. This phenomenon recalls the use, in classic and post-classic sources, of ⲉϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄, ⲛⲉⲉϥ-, ⲡⲉϥ- as the *glose* (logical subject) component in a 'Cleft Sentence' ('It is . . . who/that . . .').[10] This is probably the case of the epistolary opening-formula X ⲡⲉϥⲥϩⲁⲓ ⲛ̄-Y', a collateral variant of (the also more literary) X ⲡⲉⲧⲥϩⲁⲓ and X -ⲉϥⲥϩⲁⲓ,[11] as well as other epistolary and legal formulas. The circumstantial *glose*-form has a highly interesting distribution also in the literary idiom, and can be traced back to pre-Coptic Egyptian.[12]

3. Not to be overlooked in this context is the *adverbial* use of the self-same circumstantial present,[13] which may be related to its substantival function, although the exact connection is to me as yet obscure (*the Greek participle* may be a clue). Cases like our ex. (2) make a translation-transference from the so-called adverbial accusative very plausible, as do also (a) the fact that this function-form is limited to the 3rd person masc. sing. and (b) the lack of any formal means of syntactical inclusion in the two first groups exemplified above.

4. The *adnominal* circumstantial (see n. 3) which is the only verb-form adnominal to a non-determined substantival kernel, is in my opinion not directly connected with the function here discussed; it is rather a case of localized neutralization of the *relative*: *circumstantial* opposition, and cannot account for the substantival function, unless we assume an ellipsis of an indefinite antecedent (ⲟⲩⲁ, (ⲟⲩ) ⲣⲱⲙⲉ or sim.): for this there is neither any ground nor any parallel, and it would be but a restatement, not a solution, of the problem.[14] Nevertheless, the very existence of the above category (c), together with its statistical preponderance, seem to imply some connection with the adnominal circumstantial.

5. Functionally, this construction seems to stand on a still lower level of definition than that of ⲡⲉⲧ-, which is, after all, in many syntactical regards treated not as a zero-determined noun. In our ⲉϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ we really have a case of zero determination: in the syntagmatics of Coptic relative constructions, this means a zero antecedent.

---

[10] For the terminology of the Cleft Sentence ('phrase coupée') analysis see Polotsky, op. cit. 57 ff., *idem, Orientalia* 31 (1962), 413 n. 1, 414 ff., and the references there.

[11] A listing of the variant formulas, with extensive documentation, in Kahle, *Bala'izah* 183 ff.

[12] The circumstantial *glose*-form (after nominal and adverbial '*vedettes*', or logical predicates) has been extensively discussed by the present writer in the aforementioned doctoral thesis, *The Circumstantial Sentence in Shenoute's Coptic* (Jerusalem, 1972). An interesting parallel to the non-predicative function of a participial verb-form may be found in Greek; see Rosén, 'Die "zweiten" Tempora des Griechischen. Zum Prädikatsausdruck beim griechischen Verbum', *Mus. Helvet.* 14 (1957), 133–54.

[13] Cf. my remarks in *JEA* 61 (1975), 256–7.

[14] This seems to be Stern's explanation, at least of (c): *Grammatik* § 406 (our example (11)).