

A. SHISHA-HALEVY

«Middle Egyptian» Gleanings:
Grammatical Notes on the
«Middle Egyptian» Text of Matthew

Extrait de la *Chronique d'Égypte*
Tome LVIII, No 115-116, 1983

IMPRIMERIE CULTURA • WETTEREN • BELGIQUE

BRUXELLES
1983

SOMMAIRE — INHOUD

FONDATION ÉGYPTOLOGIQUE REINE ÉLISABETH EGYPTOLOGISCHE STICHTING KONINGIN ELISABETH

Comité de Patronage - Berscherkmomitee. Conseil d'Administration -
Beheerraad. Personnel - Personeel. Nouveaux membres - Nieuwe
leden. Membres décédés - Overleden leden 3

ÉGYPTE PHARAONIQUE — FARAONISCH EGYPT

Études — Artikelen

N. WEEKS, « Care » of Officials in the Egyptian Old Kingdom	5
Abdel Monem A. H. SAYED, New Light on the Recently Discovered Port on the Red Sea Shore	23
M. GREEN, The Syrian and Lebanese Topographical Data in the Story of Sinuhe	38
Amin A. M. A. AMER, Hori: the Worried Scribe of Pharaoh	60
J. MÁLEK, Who Was the First to Identify the Saqqara Serapeum?	65
S. GUARNORI - J.-L. CHAPPAZ, Deux tables d'offrandes et un bassin à li- bations du Musée d'Art et d'Histoire à Genève	73
J. B. CALLENDER, Sentence Initial Position in Egyptian	83
S. P. VLEEMING, Two Unrecognized Greek Concepts in Demotic P. B.M. 10597	97

Livres — Recensies 100

ÉGYPTE GRÉCO-ROMAINE — GRIEKS-ROMEINS EGYPT

Études — Artikelen

Jean LENAERTS, Deux papyrus des <i>Sortes Astrampsychi</i> : P. Iand. 5, 71 et P. Rain. I, 33	187
Hermann HARRAUER, Ein Papyrusfragment aus 243 v. Chr.	200
Pieter J. SIJPESTEIJN, Letter of Eponymos to his Mother	206
Pieter J. SIJPESTEIJN, Three More First-Century Penthemeros-Cer- tificates	208
Raymond BOGAERT, Note sur l'emploi du chèque dans l'Égypte ptolé- maïque	212

Voir suite couverture p. 3
Vervolg omslag p. 3

CHRONIQUE

« Middle Egyptian » Gleanings: Grammatical Notes on the « Middle Egyptian » Text of Matthew

The book before us ⁽¹⁾ is by no means yet another text edition: it is difficult to overstate its importance — comparable, in my opinion, to that of Thompson's Subakhmlmic John — or over-praise the editor for a perfect execution of his task. This edition will, I believe, prove a veritable milestone in the story of Coptic grammatical and dialectological research. For here we are offered the first extensive *testo di lingua* for this « new » dialect, for which we have hitherto had the evidence of lacunary or very short fragments; it is difficult to predict what impact it will have on our view of grammatical phenomena and dialectological conception, esp. the metalinguistic « stasis » or balance between the northern and southern dialects of Coptic ⁽²⁾. Obviously one cannot any longer be content with haphazard collection of facts: a *Spezialgrammatik* approach and precise internal portraiture are now called for. One may say that this edition opens the « Middle Egyptian » era of linguistic Coptology — the ME story is in its very beginning, and the present edition makes sure that it shall indeed be told. In the following pages I shall first report on this first-class work, then follow with some « *notes de voyage* », by which I hope to add to my colleagues' pioneering studies (OSING 1978, SCHENKE 1978, QUECKE 1974, FUNK 1981) of this intriguing dialect. My observations, often laconic, are meant as worknotes for a

(1) Hans-Martin SCHENKE, ed., *Das Matthäus-Evangelium im mittellägyptischen Dialekt des Koptischen (Codex Scheide)*. Berlin, Akademie-Verlag, 1981. 1 vol. in-8°, XII-202 pp., frontisp., 17 figs. (TEXTE UND UNTERSUCHUNGEN ZUR GESCHICHTE DER ALTCHRISTLICHEN LITERATUR, Bd. 127). DM 42, —. The dialect or grammatical system of this text is referred to in the present paper as « M », while the « Middle Egyptian » dialect of Coptic is abbreviated « ME ».

(2) M cannot be rightly appraised without taking Fayumic into account; but the Fayumic *système de grammaire* is still largely uncharted, esp. for its morphological and syntactic components (see the account — the best there is to date — in ASMUS 1904; CHAÎNE 1933 is based for Fay. on the evidence of a single edition, of three medium-sized fragments).

preliminary structural-distributional draft, esp. of morpho-syntactic issues, which have been neglected or sketchily treated in earlier accounts. Let it be stressed that such critical remarks as are called for are all marginal, and in no way detract from one's pleasure in this solid, neat piece of scholarship.

* * *

Schenke's *Introduction* (pp. 1-50) maintains the high standard of editorial introduction set by H. Quecke in his editions. We find here discussions of *codicology*, *orthography* (incl. punctuation, letter formation, and — surprisingly yet realistically — phonetic and phonology, « *Buchstabenlehre* »). Here (26 ff.) is a thorough study of the ME systems of syllabicity markers, superpunctuation and superlineation). Under « *language* » (34-46) we have a characterization of the dialect, first morpho-phonemic (with Fayumic as *point de repère*) and then, cumulatively, by morphological and lexical traits. This is followed by more leisurely treatment of selected issues, among which we find (in somewhat haphazard order): the relationship of *o* and *ou* (33 f.); the organization of the morphological system, the relative and *temporalis* (35 f.); the pattern « *ntak etc-* » (36); the preterite relative marker *er-* (36 f.); *er-* (prenom. of *eire*) vs. a *n-* (38); the durative: non-dur. alternation might have been pointed out here); *pei- pai* (38; surely not a « tautological figure » but a distinct determination syntagm — witness the Greek); orthography-phonetics again (38 ff.), lexicology and similar (40 f.) and finally a selection of problematic *loci*. Some of these issues will be studied below. Schenke's remarks on the *version* (46-50) close the introduction. The text presents no problems, owing to the excellent state of the manuscript; it is a boon to earn the gratitude of very Coptologist, for a trustworthy basis for future research. The very few instances where the editor had to emend the text are straightforward (a rare exception is 21: 45, where the perfect is admissible, although the Second Present may be preferable). One might pick a bone with the editor's word-division policy. Elements are separated as a rule, except for presuffixal morphs, articles, some (two-grapheme) pronominal prepositions (ⲉⲓ, ⲉⲛ, ⲁⲛ, not ⲉ-, ⲛ-) and assorted cases of composition (ⲙⲁⲛⲉⲩⲧⲁⲛ, ⲙⲟⲩⲛⲑⲟⲃ, etc.). This rather obscures the finer syntagmatic distinctions (*šene* = vs. *šē* « go », *ountef* vs. *ountf-*, on which more below) that have junctural symptoms.

Following the text and plates (54-150) we come to the invaluable *index* (151-202) which, as a research instrument, is almost of equal value to the text itself. Truly exhaustive, it lists even elements like the articles, *auō*, *n...an*, exciting hungry, wistful thoughts on the part of the linguist regarding other editions... It separates the lexical and verb-grammatical, although the distinction between « *grammar* » and « *lexicon* » is inevitably leaky (converters, proclitic pronouns, determinators, negators are included in the lexical list). The traditional « *part of speech* » classification

(« *n. vb. praep. adv....* ») leaves, inevitably again, some elements out in the cold (determinators, « *particles* », *augentia*, predicatives such as *oun-*, *mmn-*). Greek loans are presented separately (in Greek, with a Coptic form wherever this deviates from the Greek). A few objections and reservations regarding terminology, definitions or delimitation (really nit-picking, considering the immense value of the index): *enne-* the irrealis protasis, « *praet. circumst.* » (153): this is not incontrovertible (see below). The functional definition (154) of *ete-* in the « *abbreviated Cleft Sentence* » (itself infelicitous) is objectionable and obscuring (see below). The distinction of a « *demonstrative article* » from the corresponding « *demonstr. pronoun* » takes some theoretical founding. *hi-* « *copula* » (179): « *coordinator* » seems preferable. « *Adj(ective)* » (e.g. *nouj*, *nafre*, *hbour*): this too presupposes a theoretical background, as does also the entry for *n-*, painstakingly subdivided (« *part. gen.* », « *part. attrib.* », « *part. ident.* »), not entirely satisfactorily from a structural viewpoint. So too « *adv.* », e.g. *rō* « *auch* » (169), but *cl* « *also, nun, wiederum* » (185) with no part-of-speech assignment. Gender is as a rule determined on the basis of Crum's dictionary, not internally in our corpus: *pehou* « *m.* », *rouhe* « *m.* » — on what grounds?, *spatou* « *m.pl.dual* (!) », and sometimes (*hre* « *needle* » 182) no gender is indicated. Some entries are separated (*touba* and **tbba* — qual. only! - 172), while others are united (*thebia* + *thbbia* 174, *šebiout* + *šbbia* 177 f.). I would treat *ouae* = and *ouaet* = in a single entry; also *jō* in its various references.

The conjugation forms are presented on p. 186 ff., in two columns: for the Bipartite — the present (1) and future; for the Tripartite, Sentence Conjugation — affirmative and negative; for the Clause Conjugation — conjunctive and « *future conjunctive* » (see below), conditional and negated conditional (the negator of the Bipartite Pattern, *n...an*, is included in the « *lexical* » index, p. 152 f.).

* * *

I. MORPHOLOGICAL SYSTEM. CONVERTER MORPHOLOGY. DEFINITE-ARTICLE MORPHOLOGY.

(a) The overpowering impression in M is of a morphological situation unique in Coptic, with maximal resolution and almost no homonymy: perfect (*ha-*): Sec. Present (*a-*): circumstantial (*e-*) (2); the relative always *et-*, never *e-*; the circumstantial never zeroed before a syllabic nasal; *ene* (interrog. marker) opposed to *enne-* (irrealis-protasis marker).

(1) One notes the absence of the Basic Present with a nominal actor. This may be a case of significant non-attestation, with some other construction (nominal apposition to the 3rd person prefix?) suppletively replacing the missing one.

(2) See SCHENKE 1978: 45 (91) ff., also p. 35 in the present work; FUNK 1981: § 1.2.3-4. (Schenke's use of the diachronic « *shift* » concept is here out of place; likewise « *enfällt* » for the absence of *nteref-*).

True, the prenominal Third Future *ere-* does coincide with the prenominal circumstantial — but even here we find an occasional variant *ere-e* (2: 6, 20: 33, 23: 35) for the Future, *-e* carrying the formal opposition.

(b) **The circumstantial**: (1) M supplies us with one of the rare examples of affirmative *adverbal* circumstantial aorist: (11: 18 f.) *hafi gar ncl-iðhannēs emefjoum-aeik oude emefse-ērp ... hafi ncl-pšēre mprome ešafjoum ešafsō*.

(2) *eman* (6: 1, 9: 17) « else » (« *ešōpe mmon* ») ⁽¹⁾, opp. to *man* « no » (5: 37, 13: 29), is clearly circumstantial and can thus shed light on Sah. (e)*mmon*.

(3) The circumstantial complement syntax of *šatnau* « till when, how long? », hitherto based (for the affirmative) on Akhmimic evidence ⁽²⁾, is now corroborated by M (17: 17).

(4) In our corpus, the relationship between the circ. converter and the marker of the irrealis protasis (*enne-*, *enna-*, *ennare-*, *enne-ha-*) is not beyond doubt (Schenke connects them still, pp. 153, 189, 192). Although a Fayumic-like *nnaf-* preterite may be postulated as basis for this form (see below, III (e)), this is for M sheer speculation; the last word on this question has obviously not yet been said ⁽³⁾ (a reflex of Dem. *n-njw-* cannot be ruled out).

(c) **The relative**: (1) *etse(ne)-* vs. *etou(ne)-*: for this opposition Schenke has a diachronic explanation ⁽⁴⁾ (*nty.tw.f-* vs. *nty.lw.f-*) which may be faultless but cannot satisfy the need for a descriptive allocation of this mystifying case of a « syntactic » converter which fails to convert morpho-syntactically ⁽⁵⁾. Funk's ⁽⁶⁾ characterization of *etse-* as « analytic » vs. the « synthetic » *etou-* is no more of an explanation, unless he means this in a *conjunctural* sense. It is the *conjunctural* approach that I believe will reward us here with an answer: an intervening zero could here mark the opener of two grades of *rel. converter-Bipartite conj.-form* juncture ⁽⁷⁾.

(1) CRUM, *Dictionary* 178b; cf. *aliouin*, *ēnei* (BLASS-DEBRUNNER: §§ 360.2 Anh., 456.3 Anh.).

(2) POLOTSKY 1960: 25 f. (= CP 396).

(3) Cf. QUECKE 1979: 445 f.

(4) 1978: 48 (94) f.

(5) Schenke's distinction in the Bipartite (188) between a « relative pronoun » *et-* (no overt actor) and a « relative converter » *et* + (pro)nominal actor is questionable in the extreme, and ought to be based on a synchronic theory.

(6) 1981: 184. « Mechanische Verbindung » does little to clarify the issue, which is after all the very mechanism of this conversion. Since we have no example for the 1st pers. plur., one may say that, but for the rare exx. for *etou(ne)-*, the whole paradigm is « unconverted », *eli-* being a writing of *et-ti-*. I find it difficult to overlook in this context the relation of the conjunctive base *n-* with the following nexus *se-sōtm*, and rule out a similar relation between *et-* and *se-ne-* (in certain respects, *et-* and the modifier marker *n-* are allomorphs).

(7) Cf. *ne'se-*, *e'se-an* in NHC II (NAGEL 1969: §§ 36b, 37).

(Incidentally, the statistics in M of the two constructions are: (fut.) *et-sene-* (12 occurrences): *etoune*-(2), (pres.) *etse*-(1), *etou*-(2). In all instances, *se-* does not resume the antecedent. The relative takes part in all usual syntactic environments). A similar conjunctural looseness may be manifested in the baffling construction, for which the evidence is increasing, of a pronominal expression in the Bipartite of an actor *correferent with the antecedent*, e.g. *Prov.* 24: 55 *oushime tai etsnar-petsnaaaf*, *Mt.* 5: 8 (Sah. cod., not M) *ntouu netounanau epnoule*, *Apocal.* 1: 4 (*Mus.* 54: 109, 1941) *petfšoop* (kindly brought to my knowledge by H. Quecke), Shenoute ed. Leipoldt III 116.3 *petfna an nhēlou*, IV 28.14 *teshime etshmoos mnouhai*, NHC VI 9.15f. *tihbsō etstoe hiððf*. Here is indeed an analytic procedure — separating the actor-expression from the syntactic-status mark as against the synthesizing « *prōme etstōtm* » with *et-ø*-signalling status and antecedent actor correference ⁽¹⁾. (The diachronic transition from pronoun to converter would agree with the common synthesis-to-analysis cyclic development).

(2) The famous *er-* (Schenke's « Relativpartikel », 1978: 51 [97] f., here [36, 153] « perf. Relativpräfix », Funk's « perf. Relativpronomen », Haardt's « präteritales Relativum ») is supposed to mark the adnominal status of the perfect and the correference of its actor with the antecedent. Following several studies ⁽²⁾, neither its dialectological status nor its internal paradigmatic assignment have been conclusively established. The evidence in M calls for several observations: (a) At first sight, correferent *ethaf-* and *er-* appear to be variants ⁽³⁾. Let us however qualify this impression by detailed classification:

{p}etha{f}-, masc. & fem. sgl. & pl. (23: 20 ff. 37, 26: 57)	<i>per-</i> masc. sgl. only (10: 40, 20: 12 etc.)	expanding the def. determinator: <i>partial opposition</i>
{pai} etha- (1: 16, 7: 24: 26, etc.)	* <i>pai er-</i> not attested	« appositive relative »: <i>no opposition</i>
* <i>hob nim ethaf/u-</i> not attested	{ <i>hob nim</i> } <i>er-</i> (14: 20: 36, 28: 11 etc.)	« generically » adnominal: <i>no opposition</i>
N ^{pl.} <i>ethau-</i> (10: 6, 11: 21 f., 27: 52)	N ^{sgl.-pl.} <i>er-</i> (13: 39, 15: 24)	adnominal to a definite noun: <i>partial opposition</i> (15)
- <i>pethaf-</i> only 13: 28	- <i>er-</i> , - <i>per-</i> , - <i>ner-</i> common (see II (b) (1) below): 3: 7, 14: 2 etc.	<i>glose-form</i> of « Nominal » Cleft Sentence: <i>virtually no opposition</i>

(1) FUNK 1978: 112 ff. offers a transformational account, introducing a different type of « zero » (« deletion transformation », not carried out in these deviant cases).

(2) HAARDT 1961, 1969; FUNK 1977: 35 n. 57, 1981: 183, § 1.2.2.3.; SCHENKE 1978: § 2.4.

(3) (n)*etelehu-* stands outside this system, occurring only with antecedent / actor (13: 9, 20: 16, 22: 10); *etelehu-* in general is not in opposition to *er-* for this reason.

(b) Striking is the relatively high incidence of *er-* (usually *per-*) corresponding to a Greek *present* (10 : 40, 12 : 48, 13 : 23 : 37, 14 : 20, 15 : 24 : 37, 18 : 12 — all BS[F] rel. present). This could of course be attributed to interpretation, but in view of the Demotic evidence for a generic/ gnomic present and 'present-perfect' value of *l.ir-* (LICHTHEIM 1981) may point to a possibility that *er-* does not completely overlap in function with the perfect.

(c) *šope* appears to be a lexeme with a preference for *er-* (e.g. 18 : 31, 26 : 20, 27 : 54 etc.); it is difficult to appraise the situation with other lexemes (*ersoip* is possibly another case in point (14 : 20, 15 : 37, not in SB); *tou perhitn* 'what does it concern us?' (27 : 14) seems no less idiomatic and/or fossilized). With many verbs we find *flottement* (*sotm*, 13.23 : 20 : *ji*, 25.2.16 : 25.18.20.24, *hotb* 23.31 : 37, *ei* 20.8 f. : 1, *šope* 18.31 : 11.21.23, *sorm* 18.12 : 10.6). In view of this distributional picture it is difficult to be confident about *er-* being characteristic of ME, let alone being a ME trait in other dialects (SCHENKE 1978 : 51 [97] ff.).

(d) **The morphophonology of the definite articles :** (1) The vocalized morphophonemic alternant *pe-* occurs consistently before : *initial clusters*, including *consonant + h* ⁽¹⁾, geminated consonant, (*pejja* 'the sower'), consonant + non-syllabic semi-vowel (*tehiē*, *pesoua* ⁽²⁾, *pehiēb*, *nehame* ⁽³⁾) etc. and 'pseudo-clusters' of syllabic *m/w* + consonant (*pemta*, *nemheu* ⁽⁴⁾, *pemtan*, *neuhar*, *peušep*, *teunou*, *teuše*, etc.); also before the word for 'day' (*pe-hau*).

(2) The syllabic/non-syllabic morphophonemic alternants of the plural def. article are conditioned by the stressing of the lexeme, with Egyptian as well as Greek-origin words ⁽⁵⁾ : *Ḥ - Ṽ...* (ΝΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ, ἡ-ΑΡΧΩΝ, ἡ-ΕΛΛΕ, ἡ-ΑΕΙΤ- 'less', ἡ-ΑΒΖ, ἡ-ΑΕΙΚ, ἡ-ΙΟΥΔΑΙΕΙ) vs. *N-...Ṽ* (Ν-ΑΡΧΙΕΡΕΥΣ, Ν-ΑΡΧΑΙΟΣ, Ν-ΕΡΓΑΤΗΣ, Ν-ΑΚΚΟΣ, Ν-ΕΝΤΟΛΑΧΕ, ΝΕΨΕΥ, ΝΕΚΑΥ ⁽⁶⁾, Ν-ΑΝΗΥ).

(1) One must take here into consideration the frequent instances of *ethaf-* recurring for a single given lexeme (cotextual conditioning?), e.g. 7 : 24 : 26, 11 : 21 : 23, 13 : 20 : 22, 23 : 20 ff., 25 : 18 ff., which rather reduce the statistical weight of *ethaf-* in this case.

(2) The only variation occurs here, with *ne-/m-pharisaïos* (Schenke p. 29), *p-phoros* (22 : 19), *p-thusiastērion* (23 : 18).

(3) The non-syllabic status of *[w]*, *[j]* conflicts here with the superpunctuation of the following vowel (ΠΕΚΟΥΑ, ΠΕΖΟΥΑ, ΠΕΖΙΔΕΕ) and occasionally with the line-final seam (ΠΕΖΙ/ΗΒ Dox. 16). ΤΙΣΕΡΙΧΩ, ΠΙΣΕΡΟΝ, ΝΙΟΥ etc. must have syllabic *[j]*.

(4) Vs. *n-mheu* 'as (a) tomb' (21 : 13), with a homonymic *n-* of a different junctural standing.

(5) POLOTSKY 1964 : 253 n. 1 (= CP 438) — according to Polotsky, the rule applies consistently only to native lexemes.

(6) Vs. ἡ-ΕΚΑΥ — a different-juncture homonymic *n-* (18 : 12).

II. THE NOUN : PATTERNS & SYNTAGMATICS.

(a) **Noun determination. Coordination. Reference.** (1) The determination system (esp. the definite grade(s)) in M differs from that of Sah. and Boh. (the Fayumic situation is not clear); naturally, this requires special structural investigation. However, a few impressions are especially striking : *pi-* (no fem. in M)/*ni-* : {*pi-*} is neither 'affective' as in Sah. ⁽¹⁾, nor a higher-deixis article, as in Bohairic, nor is it as a rule text-anaphoric. It is mainly encountered in 3 roles : as a *categorical-notional or generic determinator* (here often plural), e.g. 5 : 45, 7 : 15, 6 : 32, 11 : 25, 15 : 31, 19 : 21 — note the plural after *thē n-* ⁽²⁾ (e.g. 6 : 2 : 5 : 7 : 16, 22 : 30, 23 : 27 etc.); as a *cataphoric* determinator, of a noun expanded by *n-θ-* or *et-* (in the latter case, opp. to *p-*), e.g. 10 : 1, 11 : 8, 12 : 35, 24 : 28 : 30, 27 : 19 etc.); thirdly, as a 'paradigmatic' determinator, i.e. indicating an item in a closed set of several, e.g. 18 : 12 f., 20 : 24, 25 : 16 ff.). Note that the interplay of ' *pi- nte-* ' and ' *p- n-* ', so characteristic of Bohairic is absent here (indeed, only *p- nte-* occurs in M — a typically Fayumic construction). On the other hand, {*p-*} occurs with nouns expanded by *n-def-* and *nte-* (3 : 5, 10 : 6, 15 : 29, 23 : 35, 27 : 56, etc.); after *thē n-*, not notionally or generically but in individual comparison (12 : 13, 13 : 40, 24 : 27 : 37, 18 : 43) — rarely the sgl. *p-* corresponds to a plural *ni-* (18 : 17, 23 : 37, 25 : 32). It occurs with 'vocatives' (*ne-*, 23 : 23 : 26 f.), with unexpanded nouns (of unique reference or appositive to proper names : 13 : 6, 8 : 24, 3 : 17, 23 : 35, 26 : 5), toponyms (12 : 41, 20 : 29, 21 : 1 : 11) ethnic names (10 : 4, 2 : 23, 27 : 56), and other specific appellations (*ppas-kha* 27 : 15, *narkhiereus* 2 : 4).

The indefinite *ou-* : remarkable is *ouenanouf* (χρηστός 11 : 30), where an atonic form of *oue* 'one' is expanded by the adnominal circumstantial (cf. *tere-*, *neuntou* Luc. 2 : 5, 18 : 24 Quecke).

θ- (significant absence of determinator), commutable with *pi/p-* and *ou-*, must be distinguished from the zero not commutable with *ou-* : unlike the former, the latter zero is compatible with the direct-object marker *n-*, consider (18 : 8 f.) *eountek ncij nte ... eountek nbel sneu*.

(2) **Expansion of the noun syntagm :** (*p-/ou-/θ-/...nim*) *nte-* signifies *ap-purtenance* and *affiliation* rather than possession (some striking exx. : *pasnaf nte-ttiathēkē* 26 : 28, *nzizanian nte-tsoše* 13 : 36, also agentive *nte-* in 23 : 15, 24 : 14, 25 : 34 ; *nte-* expressing affiliation, location, consistence, 2 : 1 : 5, 3 : 5, 10 : 6, 21 : 11, 19 : 28, 27 : 15). After *ou-*, *θ-* and ... *nim* this is non-pertinent, since *nte-* is conditioned (11 : 20, 12 : 28, 23 : 35) — this opposition with *n-* is maintained only after a *p-*-determined noun.

(1) POLOTSKY 1957 : 229 f. (= CP 231).

(2) *Ibid.* 230 (= 231).

(In 27 : 15 we have a unique case of possessive *nle-*, perhaps even « inalienable » possession : *ne- tsunéthia te nle-phégeman*, due to the intervening pronoun ? In 27 : 65 *nle-* is predicative : *hi-nrefhareh nle-lénou*).

(3) *Coordination* : note *mn-* used to coordinate adverbs (9 : 11), *aud mn-* (25 : 4, Dox. 29), both recalling Boh. and Fayumic usage (for the latter, cf. Dan. 1 : 3, Jer. 27 : 8 Till). The disjunctive *é* used before ... *nim* (12 : 25) seems equally un-Sahidic.

(4) *Reference* : (a) note the neat difference between M and Sah. in (26.59 f.) (M) *naukote nsa-metré nnouj ... mpoucine* (with zero-reference to a zero-determinator), (Sah.) ... *oumntre ... mpouhe eouon* (whereas *cine* can have a zero-object, *he e-* cannot, and thus *ouon* resumes *ou-*). Not so, however, in 12 : 43 : (M) (*šine nsa-*) *oumanemtān ... mefcine*, (Boh.) *ma nemton ... cine*, (Sah.) *oumanmtān ... he eouon*.

(b) Another source of mystification is the well-known *locus*, 11 : 10 *pei gar petshéout etbétf je-*, translating *οὗτός ἐστιν περὶ οὗ γέγραπται*, agreeing with the Sah. and Boh. texts in the absence of cataphoric pronoun. Schenke's tentative conjecture (p. 46 f.) « *petsshéout* » is hardly acceptable, seeing that the cataphoric norm with *shei* is in M the masculine (21 : 13, cf. Mil. 13 ro). This construction could, I believe, be described in any of three approaches : (1) the absence of pronominal cataphora-marking ⁽¹⁾, as in cases like (Sah.) *kata-the etséh je-* (e.g. Shenoute ed. Leip. III 155.19, cf. our Mt. 17 : 11) ; in both cases, *et-* is a « conjunctive » formal syntactic marker rather than a true relative (in our construction, *p-* is not deictic — it is a focus- or nexus- marker in the Cleft Sentence — and *et-* the *glose*-marker). (2) A possible « systemic bald patch » for *pei petf-* (cataphor) ... *je-*, which is to my knowledge unattested, perhaps owing to a phoric ambivalence of the 3rd sgl. pronoun. (3) The somewhat fantastic possibility that we have here no less than a case of the « indirect attribute » (« *nart sababiy* »), so typical of the earlier stages of Egyptian ⁽²⁾. Obviously, we need more examples.

(b) *The Predication of a Noun ; the Cleft Sentence*. (1) *Glose-form/vedette* correlation : *pet-* vs. *et-* ⁽³⁾ : *pet-* with a nominal focus variously determinated ; indefinite and interrogative pronouns, numbers, proper name, personal pronoun — usually *delocutive* (3rd person) — a sole exception is 26 : 64 *ntak pet-* ; *et-*, on the other hand, only with *interlocutive* persons. Similarly with (*p*)*etne-* (the only interlocutive case is without *p-*, 10 : 20). For the imperfect we find only *petena-* (*pei* the

(1) Cf. *nanagnôsis etprepei nošou* (Quecke, *Mus.* 85 : 7 + n. 6).

(2) See POLORSKY 1976 : §§ 2.2.3, 2.2.5-8.

(3) It is a pity Schenke does not indicate in the index the occurrence of a relative form in a *p*-marked *glose*, but only in an unmarked (his « abbreviated » — assuming a process of reduction !) one (e.g. in pp. 153, 188).

focus) ; so too for the perfect, *pethaf-*. With (*p*)*er-* — affirmative Cleft Sentence only — the picture is significantly different. The unmarked form *er-*, by far the more common, occurs after nouns, interrogative pronouns and *delocutive* pers. pronouns (14 : 2), whereas the rare *per-* is attested only in (archaic?) fossilized idioms : (27 : 4) *tou perhitn anan* « What/how/where ⁽¹⁾ does it concern us ? », (26 : 20) *rouhe peršope*. Note also the *pe ef-* *glose* following *nim* « who » (6 : 27) ⁽²⁾.

(2) Functionally « unorthodox » — non-polemic — roles of the Cleft Sentence are prevalent in M. (a) *Vivid immediate reporting* (26 : 18, BS *peje-*, Gk. present) ; (b) *narrative boundary-signalling* (26 : 20) ⁽³⁾ ; (c) *explicating* (14 : 2). Consider also 8 : 7, 9 : 22, 27 : 44, where a Cleft Sentence in M corresponds to a *construction plane* in other versions. This may agree with the « devaluation » and non-polemic use of the Second Tenses in M (see below).

(3) Schenke has twice treated the special ME pattern which resembles a Cleft Sentence with a *p-less glose* containing a zero-subject Nominal Sentence : (16 : 16) *ntak ete-pekhristos pšère mpnoute* — see SCHENKE 1978 : §4 and the present book p. 36 f., with an index entry and listing on p. 154. The pattern is in itself as difficult in its syntagmatic and thematic-functional analysis as in its paradigmatic assignation (Schenke's « *ete-* occupies the copula position » is objectionable on both these counts). Moreover, it calls for a reconsideration of some fundamental syntactic issues. (a) *The pattern itself* — affirmative only, not converted — is divisible in two constituent paradigms, of which the first is a personal pronoun, the second a proper name or one approaching a proper name in its specificity grading ⁽⁴⁾ : *išous, pekhristos, petros, pnoute, pera nnioudaiei, pšère mpnoute, petoueb, petjose* (in Dox.). Examination of its functional articulation leads us to conclude, rather surprisingly, that it does not agree with the rheme-theme contour of the polemic Cleft Sentence with its focal *vedette*. In one case (16 : 16) it is just conceivable that the *noun* is rhematic ; in others (16 : 18 *ntak ete-petros* — « it is Petros you are » — perh. also Dox. 32 ff.) this is acceptable ; in no instance is the *pronoun alone* unquestion-

(1) *lou-*, the mysterious interrogative, may be proclitic in *tneut/tau* « till when, how long ? ». The connection with *atou* « whither » (in dial. P), proposed by Schenke here (p. 37), may tie in with my analysis of the Shenoutean *tô etô* (1977).

(2) - *pe et-* is in M not a *glose*-form, but the junction of the pronominal subject and adnominal relative (23 : 17 : 19).

(3) Incidentally, parable opening in M is not marked by a Cleft Sentence construction but by an unmarked imperfect (21 : 28 : 33).

(4) Note that the *ang-/ntk-* paradigm is incompatible with a proper name predicate (this is at least the case in Sahidic ; a Fayumic instance is *Marc. 8 : 28* [Chassinat] *ntekiôhannês*) ; the suppletive pattern in this case is « *anok pe + proper name* », which is in fact invariably the SB correspondent to our pattern.

ably rhematic, and in some (e.g. 24:5 *anak ete-pekhristos*) the pattern does not seem at all prone to a binary theme/rheme analysis. Indeed, in all instances it would accord with the conception of a special solemn « anacletic », pro-/acclamatory sentence, at once presentative, existential and identifying, specifically « theological » (cf. the *ἐγὼ εἰμι* type ⁽¹⁾). Observe that the specificity grading is about equal in both terms of the nexus, making for its special informational balance (this is striking in the 1st person *exx.*, such as 22:32 *anak ete-pnoue nabraham* or *Act. 7:32 anak ete-pnoue mpekiot*) ⁽²⁾. Formally — taking into consideration the lack of suprasegmental distinctive features, which renders any formal definition imperfect and distorted — the relative conversion must be in some way analogue to the Second Tense in its *autofocal* role (see below), focalizing not an adjunctal element but itself (*efmmau* opp. to *fmmau*, *esnkotk* « it is asleep she is » vs. *snkotk* « she is asleep »): in our case too we have an enhancement or promotion to a higher grade of focality, probably extending to both terms of the nexus (pronoun-noun) ⁽³⁾.

(b) I know of no other case of Nominal Sentence of any form in the *glose* of a Cleft Sentence with a (pro)nominal *vedette* ⁽⁴⁾ — this is not surprising, as it would amount to a double pronoun-noun nexus, and indeed corroborates what is suggested above, that *ete-* marks the whole pattern as focal, not just one of its terms.

(c) The absence of *p-* in the *glose* concurs in Sahidic with a personal-pronoun focus ⁽⁵⁾, in Bohairic (and M) with other types of *vedette*. In this

(1) See i.a. NORDEN 1956: 177-239 (esp. 177 ff., 183 ff., 214 ff.), SCHWEIZER 1965.

(2) In other dialects (and pre-Coptic Egyptian, cf. SETHE 1916: § 143-4), the pattern « *anok pe N* » (formally and functionally distinct from the « *predicative-pron. subject-nom.subject* » pattern) serves this purpose. Consider Kropp, *Zaubertexte G* (Sah.) *anok te maria anok te mariham anok te tmaau mpônē mpkosmos tērf*. The ternary Nominal Sentence pattern is the weak link in the current theory of the Coptic Nominal Sentence: POLOTSKY 1962: 426ff. (= CP 431ff.). In the proclamatory series in NHC VI (KRAUSE - LABIB, *Gnost. u. herm. Schriften* ... 122 ff.) we find the instructive alternation of *anok-ou-*, *anok pet-/tet-* and *anok pe/te p-t-*; to this triad M adds a fourth member, *anak ete-N*.

(3) This is not the place to enlarge on the non-polemic values (or types) of formal Cleft Sentence constructions — presentative, narrative-opening and narrative, descriptive, exclamative-rhetoric, explicative — encountered in certain languages (e.g. Egyptian, Celtic). In some of these the pattern is only superficially coincident with the polemic Cleft Sentence, and differs from it in suprasegmentals and immediate-constituents analysis (in some types, noun/pronoun and relative constitute a single nexus member).

(4) For a Nominal Sentence in the *glose*, circumstantial in form, of a Cleft Sentence with an adverbial focus, consider (Shenoute ed. Leip. III 71.19 f.) *naš nhe eoujpjo an pe*.

(5) POLOTSKY 1962: 425 + n. 1 (= CP 430).

Cleft Sentence generally, this *p-* is not phoric or referent — its non-phoricity symptomised by invariability (sporadically in Sah., as a rule in Bohairic ⁽¹⁾) — but a post-focus nexus marker distinguishing a *clause* from a noun+relative *phrase*, and thus may be dispensed with where this analytic ambivalence (adnominal vs. topical-thematic relative) is otherwise resolved or does not arise (e.g. after a pronoun, proper name or indefinite noun).

(d) The zeroing of the subject {*pe*} in Nominal Sentences, encountered in various dialects, is relatable to the relative conversion — topicalizing or conjunctive ⁽²⁾, not straightforwardly adnominal — and perhaps also to the absence of *p-* (the reference of *pe* would be problematic). Another, better known case of zeroable {*pe*} is in the possessive *petepōf* « his » (*pe* zeroable only in the affirmative, usually in Bohairic and sporadically in Sahidic ⁽³⁾, and (in Boh.) following an extraposed noun (e.g. *Num. 7:25:31:37*): in both cases the (zeroed) reference would have been merely formal and non-pertinent; indeed, the non-pertinence of the anaphora seems to be the key to its zeroability, and this very obviously applies to our « pseudo-Cleft » pattern.

III. THE VERB: PATTERNS & SYNTAGMATICS. « TEMPUSLEHRE ».

(a) **The Second Tense.** (1) A *morphological note*: on the face of it, the « Second Perfect » *ehaf-* constitutes a case of neutralization — unique among converters in M — of circumstantial and Second Tense (in *Mil.* and the « Fayumicised-ME » John publ. by Husselman, *aha-* is the Sec. Perfect, with *a-*, the Sec. Tense converter, generalized). This may however mean no more than the generalization in M of the circumstantial topic ⁽⁴⁾ to serve as a sole topic-form for the Tripartite conjugation (*nšare-* 6:32 stands alone against seven *exx.* for *eša-*). *elha-*, used in M as a temporal protasis, could then be understood as a specialization of the Second Perfect converter. FUNK (1981: §§1.1.2, 1.2.2, 2.2) and SCHENKE (p. 35) suggest this is a « secondary function » of the relative (so at one time believed POLOTSKY — 1964: 252 = CP 437 — for the ME^F John; there too *a-ha-* and *et-ha-* could be two Sec. Tense

(1) *Ibid.* 419 f. (= CP 424 f.).

(2) The « hermeneutic » « *ete pai pe N* » and « *ete N pe* » is another case of the « proforma » mediating relative, occurring even without an explicit antecedent (e.g. DE VIS, *Homelies* II 79.2 f.) and after indefinite lemmata (cf. ELANSKAJA 1960: 40 ff.); here too *pe* is sporadically zeroed (e.g. NHC III 42.3, 55.12).

(3) *Acta Martyrum* (edd. Balestri - Hyvernati) II 90.13, 104.20 f., 158.2 f. (Boh., Shenoute ed. Leipoldt III 69.17, ed. Chassinat 18.19 f., 63.4; NHC II 87.6, etc.; see SHISHA-HALEVY 1981: 328 f.).

(4) Cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 1975: 475 f., 1976: 36 f.

allomorphs in different roles, as could also be *et-nafe-*, « temporal » in ME, quoted by Schenke (Act. 12:6). This question obviously needs further deliberation. *Synchronically*, the question at issue is whether we can make a statement of *homonymy* for the two elements, or of *complementary distribution* of two allomorphs: « secondary » and « primary » functions have little synchronic meaning.

(2) *Function*: internal and contrastive examination reveals the high incidence — high even compared with Sahidic — of the Sec. Tense used to focalize non-adverbial element; occasionally a BS(F) Basic Tense answers to a Sec. Tense in M. This confirms the « devaluation of emphasis » tendency observed above for the nominal Cleft Sentence: M carries this favouring of marked topicalization further than any other dialect. Note: (pro)nominal object focalized⁽¹⁾: 10:29, 12:3, 13:23 (F: Basic Aor.), 20:21, 21:16, 22:30; (pro)nominal actor focalized: 5:32, 6:32; *autofocal roles of the Sec. Tense* (usually corresponding to a SB Basic Tense), expressing *imminence* in dialogue, with exclamation despondent overtones (Sec. Future), 8:25:31, 20:30, 25:8; *apodotic Sec. Future*, 5:32, 16:25: *dramatic, synchronous* (exclamatory?)⁽²⁾ Sec. Present, 25:6, perh. 9:3; *rhetorical questions* with the Sec. Present, 13:56, 26:53; *the verb lexeme focalized*, 9:24 (*nehas- en-SB mps-*, cf. POLITSKY 1944: 52 f. = CP 156 f.), 22:16 (neg. present); the *protatic « that »-form* role⁽³⁾: at least in the affirmative⁽⁴⁾ we have a synchronic neutralization of the conditional with the Sec. Present (e.g. 5:47, 19:17:21).

(3) *The topic form in focus-initial patterns*: we must distinguish between a *non-interrogative* adverbial focus, for which the marking of the topic is indispensable (Bip. 6:7, 7:20, 25:26, Trip. 11:13, 12:33) and an *interrogative* adv. focus (*etbe-ou*, *neš nhē*, *pōs*, *hn-eš n-*), for which the focality is inherent and the topic-marking optional: Basic Tense (aff., neg. present, perfect, Nom. Sent.), usually after *etbe-ou*, 8:26, 14:31, 19:7, 22:45 (but 7:4, 22:45 with other foci); Sec. Tense (Bipartite only!) usually with *neš n-*, 12:26:29, 24:42:43 (*etbe-ou* 27:46 only)⁽⁵⁾.

(1) Note 26:17, 27:22, where objective *tef-* (the caus. infinitive), expanded by an interrogative adverb, conditions a Second Tense.

(2) Cf. *Jews & Christians* 97 line 4 *aknēou ehēt*, also 98 line 5. Incidentally, in Husselman's ME² John these uses are very rare (perhaps 9:9), which must be taken into account in the dialectological definition of this text.

(3) FUNK 1981: 197 ft., Schenke p. 194 « simple conditional ».

(4) The *tm*-negated form (e.g. 6:20, 6:15, 18:16 f.) could arguably be taken for a Clause-Conjugation infinitival negating of a Second Present; likewise *aki ekne-*, with the infinitive construed as a suppression of the durativity of the Bipartite under certain conditions.

(5) 12:29 (*neš nhē* + Sec. Present — the only instance of this combination) is

(4) *Prominent topicalization*: (7:2) *hmphep gar etetnetef auneti-hep erotn nhēlf* — topicalizing prolepsis of the adverbial (cf. 6:21, 24:28) with a resumptive focus. For the affinity (or « shiftability ») of prominent noun topicalization and focalization, contrast M (13:11) *ntotn hautes nētn es-noun-mmusterion* with (S) *ntautas nētn* (focal indirect obj.) and (B) *nthōten elesoi nōten ...* (personal pron. focalized).

(5) *ou-thē* (πῶς) in (26:54) *ou-thē oun arenegraphaeoue nejok ebal* is obscure (the placement of *oun* indicates its junctural closure. Schenke identifies *ou* as the interr. pronoun).

(b) *The conjunctive; post-imperative forms.* (1) The favoured coordination (often asyndetic) of imperatives is shared by M with Boh. ⁽¹⁾, opposed to the Sah. « imperative + conjunctive » coordinative sub-/syncategorization (cf. POLITSKY 1944: 5 = CP 110), consider 5:24:29:43, 6:6:13:17, 9:5:6:13:18, 11:4:29, 19:21, 26:26 f. etc. etc. This ties in with other cases of independent clauses in M answering to sub-/coordination in Sah. (24:7:13:30:32, 26:2). The post-imperative conjunctive in M, attested only for the 1st pers. sgl. (*nta-*), once for the 1st plur., and for the 3rd plur. (*nse-*) is not coordinative, but expresses *purpose/result* (esp. *promised or guaranteed result*; 1st pers. only: 11:28 f., 4:19, 8:21, 21:38 etc.) or *content* (following *keleue*, *kō*, *mai*; 1st pers., 14:28; 3rd pers. plur. 8:22, 13:30, 14:16). It is likely that in the former case — the 1st pers. — we have in fact a member of the special « causative conjunctive » post-imperative paradigm (*ntare-*, see below).

(2) *nta-* is in M the post-imperative and coordinative 1st pers. sgl. allomorph, as against *ta-* in initial ⁽²⁾ self-exhortative function (2:8, 8:7 vs. 18:19:21).

(3) Typical non-coordinative roles of the conjunctive in M are shared with Boh. and Fay. as against Sah.: « subjunctive » (better « contentualizing » — complementing impersonal predications, appositive to the cataphoric neutric fem.) after *nanous*, *srnafre*, *jekes*, *hne* =, *anankē*, *ešope* (?) (5:29, 13:28, 17:4, 18:6 f.); « that »-form role, after *mnnsa-* (26:32, 27:53); governed by (or complementing?) « conjunctive » adverbs, *hinas*, *hōste*, *mēpōs*, *mēpote* (4:6, 7:6, 8:24, 12:14, 21:21); *hathē* + conjunctive (26:34).

strangely continued by the conjunctive and renders the Greek *δύναται* + infinitive: may this be emended into a Sec. Future?

(1) The Fayumic evidence is inconclusive (cf. Jes. 32:9:11, 34:1 Chassinat).

(2) FUNK 1981: 181 and Schenke p. 193 report a *ta-nta-* variation. Schenke's « elliptisch » is unfortunate; he must have in mind a *sous-entendu* presence of **kel* « let me », which has no basis in the corpus. Observe that *-ta-* is in M also an expanding bound allomorph of the causative infinitive for the 1st person sgl. (FUNK 1981: 186 f.).

(4) The specific post-imperative « causative conjunctive » *ntare-* ⁽¹⁾ in M:

sgl.		plur.	
1st pers. <i>nta-</i>	see (1)	<i>ntarn-</i>	guaranteed result (27 : 40 : 42); content/purpose ⁽²⁾ (27 : 49)
2nd pers. <i>ntarek-</i>	guaranteed result (19 : 21)	<i>ntaretn-</i>	guaranteed result (7 : 7, 11 : 29)
3rd pers. <i>ntare</i> + noun	guaranteed result (23 : 26)	<i>ntarou-</i>	guaranteed result (7 : 7, 5 : 28)

(5) Notes on individual loci : (a) 12 : 29 : see footnote 5, p. 322 (b) 5 : 28, 13 : 19 (so in Fayumic) : the conjunctive continues a protatic-generic relative present. (c) 21 : 21 : the conjunctive continues a protatic present (*ešope oun-*). (d) 17 : 11 : the conjunctive follows the predication of *nnēou*. (e) 13 : 13 is difficult (Schenke p. 47) : *jekes eune nsetmne auð eusotm ensesotm en nneunoei*; cf. the Fay. *je-eueneu nseneu en* (circ.) *auð euesōtem nsesōtm en oude nseimi en* : *jekes* is probably resumed by the conjunctive, premodified by the affirm. circumstantial; the two last circumstantial forms (affirm., neg.) premodify *oude nneunoei*, likewise governed by *jekes*. Emending *eusotm* into a Third Future (cf. the Fay., Sah. & Boh.) is obviously simpler, but Schenke's conjecture (which he himself rejects) seems to me perfectly acceptable.

(c) The predication of possession is effected in M by a complementary combination of a verboid (*ountef/mmntef*) and the predication (in the Bipartite) of the preposition *nte=*. In this respect, M stands mid-way between Sahidic and Bohairic-Fayumic. The distributional facts are as follows (NB : « *mme* », the formal pronominal-deictic adverb, does not feature in the ME construction. It does in Fayumic, e.g. Joh. 4 : 17 Chass.) :

(1) « Future Conjunctive » (Funk, Schenke after Stern) is not satisfactory, since this form is hardly more « futuristic » than the simple conjunctive; « causative conjunctive » seems more apt, although the morphological relationship within the causative system is rather obscured in M. On the formal and functional details, see POLOTSKY 1944 : 1 ff. (= CP 106 ff.), 3 ff. (108 ff.) for the post-imperative status, 9 ff. (114 ff.) for the form *ntare-*.

(2) I can find no example in M for the « deliberative » 1st plur. (POLOTSKY 1944 : 17 f. = CP 122 f.). The final-consecutive function of *taref-*, in Sah., typically post-classic (POLOTSKY *ibid.* : 6 f., 2 n. 1 = CP 111 f., 107), is perhaps attested in (27 : 49) *cō ntarnne je-* (ἀφες ἰδωμεν, v.l. ἀφετε) which however allows also an exhortative or contentual interpretation. (Cf. in Fay. Joh. 4 : 29 Crum *amoini taletenneu*, v.l. [Zoega] *talētetēn-*).

POSSESSUM : <i>p-(et-),</i> personal pronoun <i>nke nim</i>	POSSESSUM : non-personal pronoun, noun syntagm		POSSESSUM : zero
		POSSESSOR : nominal	POSSESSOR : pronominal
POSSESSOR : pronominal			
<i>petntef</i> (13 : 44 ff., 25 : 14)	prosodically unmarked forms : <i>ountei, ountek, ountef, ounten</i> ; construction : MEDIATE (<i>ounte= n-N</i>) ; determination : definite, numeralia (3 : 4 : 9, 7 : 29, 8 : 9, 18 : 8 f. : 28, 19 : 22)	<i>ounte-N-ø-N</i> (9 : 6)	<i>ountef, ounten</i> (6 : 12, 13 : 12, 25 : 29)
<i>fnfef</i> (13 : 12, 25 : 29)		<i>ounte-N-ø-num.</i> (21 : 28)	<i>mmntef</i> (13 : 12, 18 : 25, 25 : 29)
<i>nke nim etntef</i> (18 : 25)			
	proclitic forms : <i>ountf-, ountk-, ountētn-, mmnti-, mmntf-, mmntou-</i> ; construction : IM-MEDIATE ; determination : <i>ø-</i> , indefinite, <i>pet-</i> , definite (5 : 23, 6 : 1, 8 : 20, 9 : 36, 13 : 21, 15 : 32, 17 : 20, 20 : 15, 22 : 24)		

(d) The non-verbal nexal negation in M is *n...en*, without an *n-less* variant/alternant : yet another manifestation of the constructional perspicuity of our dialect — the incidence of the negation is unambiguous and resolute ⁽⁴⁾. *n...en* is used even for rhetorical-interrogative negation (12 : 11, 18 : 12 : 33 etc.) ; rhetorical-local/focal negation (7 : 22, 13 : 27 : 55), non-rhetorical local negation (26 : 5) ; negating of the imperfect (*nnaf-en*, 1 : 19, 12 : 7, 23 : 30, 26 : 15, 27 : 12) ⁽⁵⁾.

(e) A structural Tempuslehre is still an urgent desideratum for all Coptic dialects. I would touch here only upon the use in M of three tenses : future, imperfect, aorist.

(1) The role assignment of the future tenses is especially intriguing, since the Third Future (Funk, Schenke « energetic future » after Mallon) is in M not straightforwardly modal, and shares in the temporal function of the future (not that the boundary between the two is clear-cut) ; it appears that in this respect too M stands midway between Sah. and Boh. (Fay. ?). A few classificatory notes towards a future special study of this

(1) This is unique to M ; it is difficult to judge whether it applies to *Mil.* as well (but 41 vo = I Thess. 2 : 19 *mē nntoten en pe* seems to indicate this). This is the usual negation in Husselman's John (e.g. 6 : 26 f.), but does not extend to the negated imperfect (see below).

(2) This negation is rare ; *nef-...an* (*naf-en* in Husselman's John, 6 : 66, 7 : 5) is the usual negation (POLOTSKY 1960a : § 28, p. 408 = CP 252). The Fayumic variant of the imperfect (both affirm. and negated) *nnaf-* comes to mind (e.g. *Mc.* 9 : 6 Chass., *Act.* 16 : 4 : 7 Till, *Mt.* 14 : 4, *Jes.* 31 : 1 Chass. etc., see CHAINE 1933 : § 577 ; cf. FUNK 1981 : n. 14 with reffs.), yet the affirmative in M is *naf-*.

question (4): *Fut. III: nne-* « shall not », « shall by no means », absolute negation, also in the rel. conversion, usually in the 3rd person (5:20, 7:19, 11:6, 12:39, 16:4:22 etc.). Much rarer *peteke-*, *petefe-* (Schenke p. 35), usually extraposed (12:50, 15:5, 16:19, SB - Fut. I). Bene-/maledictory, prophetic, apocalyptic tone (10:41, 12:27:36, 16:18, 24:29, 25:46 etc., B - Fut. I). *Fut.I/II*: in conversion, suppletive — neutralizing the opposition *Fut III: -ne-* future? — relative affirmative (19:19, 23:18, 26:21:23:25:28 etc., very common), circumstantial (10:1:26, 15:1, 25:14 etc.), Second Tense (7:20, 10:41, 11:16, 16:25 f. etc.). Expressing imminence, (certain) eventuality (= SB, 7:4:9 f.:13:12:22, 10:17:19, 20:4:18 etc.); corresponding to S and/or B *present* (7:24:26, 9:5:28, 10:16, 13:3, 19:25, 20:22, 21:31:43, 22:14); apodotic, following *tote* (SB Fut. III, 6:14 f.:33 f., 16:27, 25:31, 26:75), here in opposition with *Fut. III* (SB Fut. I, 24:9:14, 25:34:37:41:44); « *tine-* » (23:34, 26:61, 27:64); consecutive (with *hōste*, 23:31).

(2) *The imperfect as a narrative tense* (2): (a) M uses the imperfect more consistently in the sense of a narrative-part « *consecutio temporum* » in the relative conversion (3) where Sah. answers with a rel. *present* (8:33, 15:38, 26:52 etc.), circ. *present* (14:21, 26:73, 27:42:44:54, 28:6:11) or rel. *perfect*.

(b) The imperfect and *pe*: insofar as there exists opposition between + *pe* and its absence — i.e. not in dialogue, relative conversion and the irrealis protasis (4) — it appears that this opposition corresponds to a difference between a *background*, *behind-the-scene*, *situational*, *auxiliary* or *parenthetical* information that does not advance the plot (+ *pe*), information *contributing to the development of the plot*, with a durative/iterative/habitative/descriptive/stative *Aktionsart* characterization (*pe* absent). Contrast (+ *pe*) 9:36, 13:34, 14:4 f.:8, 16:1, 22:23, 26:55 (*gar*):69, 27:18 (*gar*):12 (« all this time »):39:55 etc. with (- *pe*) 2:18, 21:9:11 (*naujō* etc.), 24:38, 25:35 f.:42 f., 26:27:58 ff.:63, 27:11:30:36:61, 28:3 etc. Now this agrees on the whole with the conception

(1) Internal/contrastive and multidimensional (polyparametric) classification is here *de rigueur* (by person/affirm.-neg./contextual parameters); also contrastive functional range determination (B=S=M, B=M≠S, S=M≠B and so on).

(2) The imperfect in *dialogue* is paradigmatically distinct (e.g. 25:21:23, 26:69:71, 28:3), being opposed primarily to the unconverted present as well as to the perfect tense.

(3) Cf. FUNK 1978: n. 20 (*ad* 26:21).

(4) Schenke pp. 189, 192. In (26:35) *enne-šantimou* (S *kan esšanšope etramou*, B *kan asšanphoh ntamou*) Funk and Schenke (p. 46) assume a contamination or corruption; could this be a case of *enne* (« were it », « even if ») before an *adverb-ø* ≠ predicative pattern? (cf. the Shenoutean *ene etbe-an* etc. e.g. Leip. IV 94.23, 156.26, Amélineau I 158, II 514, etc.).

of *pe* (with the imperfect as well as with other non-nominal verb forms) as a macrosyntactic thematic « backgrounding » signal (4).

(3) M uses the *aorist* differently and, by impression, more extensively than Sahidic or even Bohairic. Note instances where *mef-* corresponds to SB *mmcom* (7:18), *šaf-* to a SB present (27:17:22), the Second Aorist to Basic Future (in a rhet. question, 12:11), and, most significantly, the adverbial circumstantial of the affirm. and neg. aorist (11:18 f.). Consider also 6:28, 15:27 (rel. aor.:rel. pres.), 5:45, 6:2 (aor.:pres.).

IV. THREE NOTES ON ARRANGEMENT.

(a) A phenomenon well-known in various dialects (2), namely the resumption of a « *conjugation-base/converter* + *nominal actor* » proleptic syntagm by a full conjugation form with a 3rd pers. pronominal actor. This construction (apparently one of the procedures of « *Flexionsisolierung* », removing the lexemic component to the periphery of the nuclear pronominal pattern) is very common in M, yet its distribution is unbalanced: it occurs most frequently in the case of a narrative perfect, rather rarely with Third Future (6:4, 24:14) and conjunctive (12:45, 13:32), and very rarely with the preterite (14:24) and Sec. Present (9:3) conversions — not the circumstantial or relative — yet another corroboration of the subdivision of the converters into macrosyntactic (preterite and Sec. Tense) and intraclausal (relative, circumstantial). It is affirmative only, and has nothing to do with the extent of the extraposed noun (which is a rule definite). In the case of the perfect (*ha...haf-*), it seems that this is not a mere stylistic quirk, but amounts to a *superordinating* construction, a macrosyntactic apparatus for « foregrounding », marking *événement* highlights by setting foregoing stages of the narrative as background (particularly clear exx.: 14:32, 17:1, 25:10, 27:19).

(b) Observe a marked tendency of M for proleptic extraposition, often with Boh. against Sahidic: this is yet again a marking of topical status which ties in with the topicalisation patterns discussed above. Consider 10:10:30, 11:5, 12:5, 16:18, 17:11:26.

(c) A characteristic relative order in M of the verb, mediate direct object and « postverb » *ebal* is: « verb — *n-N* — *ebal* » (e.g. 5:31, 7:4 f., 12:13, 13:44:46, 21:12), contrasted with the Sahidic « verb — *ebol* — *n-N* » (3); Bohairic usually agrees with M. although with occasional secondary conditioning of the Sah. arrangement (21:12) (4).

(1) Cf. GRIMES 1975: 55 ff., Chs. 21-2; JONES 1977 *passim* (e.g. 4 ff., Ch. 6). Two isolated exceptions, with + *pe* in the mainstream of the plot: 8:34, 27:39, unless these too must be judged and interpreted by the bulk of the evidence.

(2) This construction is common in Fayumic: *a-af-* Act. 9:38 (Gaselee), *Dan.* 2:49, *Sus.* 63, *Mc.* 15:44 (Till); *nale-naf-* Joh. 3:23 (Chass.).

(3) See CHAÏNE 1933: § 828 (p. 381 f.).

(4) The Fayumic evidence is again inconclusive (*Jes.* 32:7, *Mt.* 13:36 Chass.).

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

« Middle Egyptian » Texts:

- M The Middle Egyptian text of Matthew (ed. Schenke).
- Jews & Christians *Jews and Christians in Egypt* (ed. H. I. Bell, 1924), pp. 91-99: three Coptic letters ed. by W. E. Crum.
- Mil. *Lettere di San Paolo in Copto-Ossirinichita* (ed. T. Orlandi, 1974, = *Papiri della Università degli Studi di Milano*, V).
- ***
- ASMUS, H. 1904 *Über Fragmente in mittellägyptischen Dialekte*, Göttingen.
- CHÂINE, M. 1933 *Éléments de grammaire dialectale copte*, Paris.
- ELANSKAJA, A. I. 1960 « Sintaksiceskaja rol' opredelitel'nyx predloženij v koptskom jazyke », *Palestinskij Sbornik* 5 (68): 32-44.
- FUNK, W. P. 1977 « Zur Syntax des koptischen Qualitativs », *ZÄS* 104: 25-39.
- 1978 « Towards a Synchronic Morphology of Coptic », in: *The Future of Coptic Studies* (ed. R. McL. Wilson), 104-124.
- 1981 « Beiträge des mittellägyptischen Dialekts zum koptischen Konjugationssystem », in: *Studies Presented to Hans Jakob Polotsky* (ed. D. W. Young), 177-210.
- GRIMES, J. E. 1975 *The Thread of Discourse*, the Hague (= *Jannua Linguarum*, s. minor 207).
- HAARDT, R. 1961 « Zum Gebrauch des präteritalen Relativums '-ir() im Altkoptischen und Koptischen », *WZKM* 57: 90-96.
- 1969 « Weitere Bemerkungen zum präteritalen Relativum '-ir im Koptischen », *WZKM* 62: 30-31.
- JONES, L. K. 1977 *Theme in English Expository Discourse*, Lake Bluff.
- LICHTHEIM, M. 1981 « On the Participle *iir* in Demotic », in: *Studies Presented to Hans Jakob Polotsky* (ed. D. W. Young), 463-471.
- NAGEL, P. 1969 « Grammatische Untersuchungen, zu Nag Hammadi Codex II », in: *Die Araber in der alten Welt* (edd. Altheim - Stiehl), V/2, 393-469.

- NORDEN, E. 1956 *Agnostos Theos*⁴, Stuttgart.
- OSING, J. 1978 « The Dialect of Oxyrhynchus », *Enchoria* 8 (Sonderband): 29 (75)-36 (82).
- POLOTSKY, H. J. 1944 *Études de syntaxe copte*, Le Caire (= CP 102-207).
- 1957 Review of TILL, *Koptische Grammatik*, *OLZ* 52: 219-234 (= CP 226-233).
- 1960a « The Coptic Conjugation System », *Orientalia* 29: 392-422 (= CP 238-268).
- 1960b Review of BÖHLIG, *Der achmimische Proverbientext*, *OLZ* 55: 23-28 (= CP 395-397).
- 1962 « Nominalsatz und Cleft Sentence im Koptischen », *Orientalia* 31: 413-430 (= CP 418-435).
- 1964 Review of HUSSELMAN, *The Gospel of John in Fayumic Coptic*, *OLZ* 59: 250-253 (= CP 436-438).
- 1976 « Les transpositions du verbe en égyptien classique », *Israel Oriental Studies* 5: 1-50.
- QUECKE, H. 1974 « Il dialetto », in: *Lettere di San Paolo in Copto-Ossirinichita* (ed. T. Orlandi), 87-102.
- 1979 Review of J. H. JOHNSON, *The Demotic Verbal System*, *Orientalia* 48: 435-447.
- SCHENKE, H. M. 1978 « On the Middle Egyptian Dialect of the Coptic Language », *Enchoria* 8 (Sonderband): 43 (89) - 58 (104).
- SCHWEIZER, E. 1965 *Ego Eimi. Die religionsgeschichtliche Herkunft und theologische Bedeutung d. johanneischen Bildreden*², Göttingen.
- SHISHA-HALEVY, A. 1975 « Two New Shenoute-Texts from the British Library (Commentary) », *Orientalia* 44: 469-484.
- 1976 « Unpublished Shenoutiana in the British Library: Commentary », *Enchoria* 6: 29-60.
- 1981 « Bohairic - Late Egyptian Diaglosses: A Contribution to the Typology of Egyptian », in: *Studies Presented to Hans Jakob Polotsky* (ed. D. W. Young), 314-338.

Ariel SHISHA-HALEVY

Sergio DARIS, <i>P. Thead. 17.15 : μέτριοι καὶ μονήρεις</i>	222
Jean GASCOU, Notes de papyrologie byzantine	226
Alain MARTIN, Un proscynème inédit d'Edfou	235

Chronique — Kroniek

Hans HAUBEN, « Naoclères classiques » et « Naoclères du Nil »	237
---	-----

Papyrus littéraires et documents — Literaire papyri en dokumenten	248
---	-----

Livres — Recensies	269
------------------------------	-----

ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONALE DE PAPYROLOGUES

Statuts	277
Liste des membres	279
XVIII ^e Congrès international. Athènes, mai 1986	296

ÉGYPTE CHRÉTIENNE — CHRISTELIJK EGYPTE

Étude — Artikel

William M. BRASHEAR, The Coptic Three Wise Men	297
--	-----

Chronique — Kroniek

Arie SHISHA-HALEVY, « Middle Egyptian » Gleanings : Grammatical Notes on the « Middle Egyptian » Text of Matthew	311
--	-----

TABLE DES MATIÈRES	330
------------------------------	-----