Journal of Coptic Studies 1 (1990) 99–127

THE "TAUTOLOGICAL INFINITIVE" IN COPTIC: A STRUCTURAL EXAMINATION

1. In the following pages, I wish to scan a neglected, if familiar, construction of Coptic for some of its most striking formal and functional, paradigmatic and syntagmatic aspects of significance and implication. I refer to the construction sometimes called the "tautological," "absolute," or paronomastic infinitive, in which an infinitive is followed by a homolexemic (or otherwise related) finite verbal form, the two constituting together a single clause pattern: e.g., ϩⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲱⲁⲏⲗ ⲁⲫⲱⲁⲏⲗ (Jas 5:17). This is a construction of considerable significance in the grammar of most Semitic and certain non-Semitic languages,[1] and, more pertinently to our investigation, of great interest to students of Septuagint Greek and its relation to Biblical Hebrew.[2] I shall attempt to show that what is generally (if implicitly) considered to be a case of *calque* or "replica function,"[3] the "footprint"—so to speak—in Coptic of a Greek idiom, in internal non-historical terms, is in fact a signal integrated in a system of syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations contracted by definition by a grammatical element. I am convinced we

NOTE: The sources of the examples are listed at the end of this article.

[1] Gideon Goldenberg ("Tautological Infinitive," *IsOrS* 1 [1971] 36–85) offers a penetrating treatment of the Semitic construction, with illuminating observations on comparable Turkish and Berber constructions; see pars. 26–35 on the Biblical Hebrew patterns.

[2] See H. St. J. Thackeray's classic discussion, "Renderings of the Infinitive Absolute in the LXX," *JThS* 9 (1908) 597–601. Note the Greek/Coptic equivalence in the OT, schematically presented:

GREEK	infinitive	action noun oblique case	instrument noun dative	other idioms	pres. participle (conjunct)
COPTIC	ϩⲛ̄-ⲟⲩ- + INFINITIVE "Tautological Infinitive"				circumst. present (preceding)

The Greek action nouns include radical abstracts (such as ἀκοή), derived abstracts (-ία) and suppletives (ἔξοδος, θάνατος). Note that Coptic tautological infinitives corresponding to the Greek conjunct participle are very well attested (Gen 3:16 [*SB*], 15:13 [*SB*]; Exod 3:7 [*SB*]; Deut 15:10 [*SB*]; Judg 1:28; 1 Sam 25:28, 27:12, 28:1; 2 Sam 18:25, 20:18; Ru 2:16; Isa 48:8; Jer 46:18; Ps 117:18; etc.); this supports the view of the Coptic construction as non-mechanical and meaningful on its own terms.

[3] Uriel Weinreich, *Languages in Contact* (PLCNY 1; New York 1953) 39–42 (par. 2.34: "Replica Functions for Equivalent Morphemes"). The term "calque" is generally used in the context of lexical borrowing or "loan translation" (see, for example, Theodora Bynon, *Historical Linguistics* [Cambridge 1977] 232–237).

cannot accept the limitation of "translation grammar" without first appreciating the phenomena involved on their own terms. I shall therefore not consider here the comparable phenomenon in the Greek *Vorlage* of most of my sources, even though it must be clear that it is in some way or another at the root of many of the features of the Coptic construction.[4] As I hope to show, this underappreciated syntagm not only is important from a specific functional point of view, but also illuminates several general systemic issues. This paper is also meant to vindicate the view that formal borrowings or calques, far from being of mere interlingual and diachronic interest, are synchronically and internally important, let alone systemically significant. The central issue here is of course the specific paradigmatic value of this construction as a *signifiant*, or signal, for the Coptic decoder (listener-reader)—e.g., the value of the fourth member in the following (partial) paradigm:

["ϯⲛⲁⲛⲁϩⲙⲉⲕ"]
["ϯⲛⲁⲛⲁϩⲙⲉⲕ ⲣⲱ"]
["ⲉⲓⲛⲁⲛⲁϩⲙⲉⲕ"]
[ϩⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩϩⲙ̄ ϯⲛⲁⲛⲁϩⲙⲉⲕ (Jer 46:18)]

[4] Some remarks on "grammatical calques" generally, and on Greek calques in Coptic. First, postulating "formal similarity or a similarity in preëxisting functions" (Weinreich, *Languages in Contact* 39) assumes that these functions are clearly stated, and that "interlingual equivalence of the morphemes or categories" has been established by contrastive-grammatical study. This is not the case either in Greek (the "prototype" in our case) or in Coptic. Second, the contact between Greek and Coptic is here of a special kind not discussed in Weinreich's classic treatment, viz., translation. This kind of contact is peculiar in that it constitutes a distinct type of bilinguality: not a matter of double linguistic competence, but the contact of two texts. One text is an authoritative source, given, ever-present, decoded (but also interpreted and often imitated) by the author of the target text; the other text is created on the basis of the source text. This is a situation of "texts in contact" (encoded with decoded) as well as "languages in contact." Moreover, these are not ordinary texts: we know that the Coptic translation of the Scriptures, as well as its Greek source, exerted a pervasive influence on the literary idiom, the style of certain of its genres, and thus on its idiomatic syntax. Third, in Greek itself the feature in point is secondary, i.e., borrowed, a calque: the ultimate and real prototype is of course Biblical Hebrew. And fourth, and I believe most important, are the native roots of the induced feature, Coptic and Greek: Weinreich does not dwell on the native receptivity factor. In Coptic, a comparison is called for with another famous case of calque with respectable precedents in Egyptian, namely, the Coptic causative infinitive after prepositions as well as in certain verbal functions, describable as replicas of Greek morphological, syntactic, and modal-semantic features (H. J. Polotsky, "Modes grecs en copte?" in: Michel Malinine, ed., *Coptic Studies in Honor of Walter Ewing Crum* [BByzI 2; Boston 1950] 73–90 [= Polotsky, *Collected Papers* (Jerusalem 1971) 208–225]). Incidentally, the Septuagint Greek tautological infinitive too is not without its internal roots (see Raphael Kühner, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache* [3d ed., by Friedrich Blass and Bernhard Gerth; 2 vols.; Hannover/Leipzig 1890–1904] 2.1:308; Eduard Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik* [3 vols. (vol. 2 ed. Albert Debrunner; vol. 3 by Demetrius Georgacas); HAW II.1.1–3; Munich 1939–1953] 2:166).

This investigation, a pan-Coptic study with evidence drawn mostly from the Sahidic and Bohairic dialects, also aims to contribute to the understanding of infinitive syntax in Coptic (a study still to be undertaken in extenso in the context of verb nominalization, determination, and noun syntax) and of derivational systems in this language.

2. On first analysis, the tautological infinitive (TI) in Coptic (called "adverbialer infinitiv" by Stern, "Komplements-Infinitiv" by Till;[5] Stern's term is, as usual, the more felicitous) consists of two immediate constituents. First, a prepositional phrase in which the preposition ϩⲛ̄– "in" governs the indefinite article ⲟⲩ–, which is in turn expanded by the verb lexeme (vaguely, "infinitive"); second and following, a verb clause ("conjugation form") predicating the same lexeme or one related to the first in some precisable way.

3. FORMAL DATA: THE FIRST CONSTITUENT. (**a**) *Determination*: It is remarkable that we encounter in our construction not the zero article (which might a priori seem to be the very form to express the abstract "verbal notion"), but the indefinite determinator, usually denoting "a specimen/an instance of...."[6] Indeed, this is the most striking case of indefinite determination of the infinitive. However, the determination system for verb lexemes ("infinitives," of double compatibility: as satellites of both main kinds of actualizator, viz., determinators and pro-verbs, alias "conjugation bases") is radically different from that of the single-compatibility noun lexemes. The commutation following the nuclear determinators ("articles": see Ariel Shisha-Halevy, *Coptic Grammatical Categories* [AnOr 53; Rome 1986] chap. 5) is only deceptively straightforward as regards its *valeur*. Note the following summary table of functions (which applies to the Egyptian infinitive class in Sahidic Coptic, not to Greek loan "infinitives" [see below], nor to infinitives of various kinds in other dialects).

[5] Ludwig Stern, *Koptische Grammatik* (Leipzig 1880) par. 473; Walter C. Till, *Koptische Grammatik (Saïdischer Dialekt)* (2d ed.; LSOAS 1; Leipzig 1961) par. 350; unlike Stern, Till confuses our construction with other cases of *figura etymologica*, e.g., the cognate object (see below); cf. Georg Steindorff, *Lehrbuch der koptischen Grammatik* (Chicago 1951) par. 381.

[6] Petr V. Ernštedt, "Zur Determination im Koptischen," *WZHalle* 27.3 (1978) 95–106 (translated by Peter Nagel from "K determinacii v koptskom jazyke," *Sovetskoe vostokovedenie* 6 [1949] 52–62); see esp. pars. 2–3, 14, 18–19.

Verb Lexeme	Noun Lexeme
DEFINITE π–cωτm̄ (sing. masc.) Nucleus of *nota relationis* satellite or relative expansion;[7] rheme or topic of delocutive or endophoric ("impersonal") Nominal Sentence;[8] as actor-expression conjugation form;[9] with ε–, in adverb phrase ("επcωτm̄");[10] in address;[11] quantified,[12] possessed;[13] concretized (πϣⲁϫε, πμεεγε) and/or individualized (πμογ): in either case, deverbalized[14] ("event," "occasion," rather than "act"). Paradigmatically phoric ("exophoric"). Inert in reference chain. Negatived by τm̄– (e.g., Amél. 2:233).	π–ρωμε (sing./pl., masc./fem.) Syntagmatically and paradigmatically specific; the genus as a monolithic entity; in address (situational specificity or of freezing of determination opposition). Both syntagmatically and paradigmatically phoric: non-initial (link) in reference chain.
INDEFINITE ογ–cωτm̄ (sing./pl.) Individuation ("an instance of..."): with ϩn̄– in adverb phrase ("ϩn̄ογϩωπ");[15] "something that is/consists in.../is characterized by.../is an instance of"; concretized (ογϣⲁϫε, ογϣι, ογcμογ)—deverbalized. Inert in reference chain. Negatived as –μn̄τ–ⲁτ–.	ογ–ρωμε (sing./pl.) "Specimen of a kind"; (with abstracts) "something that is/consists in.../is characterized by..."; (with matter names) "a measured quantity of." Initial (delimitative) in reference chain.
ZERO I ∅–cωτm̄ Rheme/theme of Nominal Sentence;[16] following prepositions; following *nota relationis*;[17] immediate direct object (governed actant) of modal verbs (ογωϣ, ϣ–). Negatived by τm̄– (L 3:67).	∅–ρωμε The genus name; the genus quality: abstraction. Proper-name equivalent (in some respects).
ZERO II ε–∅–cωτm̄ Second object (governed actant) of trivalent verbs; adjunct (circumstant) of verb; topic of verb clause, non-resumed topic of endophoric Nominal Sentence;[18] coordinated to another infinitive; following a cataphoric pronoun.[19] Negatived by τm̄–.	
NIL cωτm̄ Derivation base: following the deriving nuclei ϭιν–, ρεϥ–, ⲁτ¹–, pro-verbs (conjugation bases, τρεϥ–). Negatived as μn̄τ–ⲁτ–.	ρωμε Derivation base: e.g., following the deriving nuclei μn̄τ–, ρm̄n̄–, ⲁτ²–. Following determinators.

[7] E.g., πⲁϣⲁι μπτⲁλϭο (Amél. 2:113), πϣωϥ ντεψγχη (Amél. 2:76), πcωογϩ εϩογν εντⲁνενειοτε cοογϩϥ εϩογν (Amél. 2:93), πcωντ τηρϥ (Amél. 1:304). Note that it is probably the determinator, not the infinitive, that is expanded.

Note the difference between the two types of noun phrase in the value structuring of the individual degrees (indefinite and plural much rarer, i.e., more specialized, for infinitives) and especially the difference in the value of zero, which is in a sense the unmarked member of the category for the infinitive. (**b**) *Negation* (a single example): derivational (ⲙⲛ̄ⲧ–ⲁⲧ–: type X below). (**c**) *Expansion*, restricted: direct object, the preposition ϵ– (componental modifier: types II and III below).

4. FORMAL DATA: THE SECOND CONSTITUENT (conjugated verb). (**a**) *Tense*: see par. 5.b below. (**b**) *Negation*, non-derivational, is markedly rare and usually characterized by contrast (Judg 1:28, 15:13; Josh 17:13). (**c**) *Conversion* is uncommon; the rare exceptions are all cases of the Second Tense (i.e., still main clause): 2 Sam 24:24; John 3:29 (codd.); ⲉⲧⲉⲧ̄ⲛⲛⲁ– in Exod 22:19 is jussive. (**d**) *Expansion* is

[8] E.g., ⲡⲉϫⲡⲟ ⲇⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ̄ⲧⲣⲙ̄ⲙⲉϩ ⲟⲩⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲓⲧⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲣⲏⲧ ⲡⲉ (Gal 4:23), ⲡⲧⲃⲃⲟ ⲡⲁⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲡⲉ (Amél. 2:152).

[9] E.g., ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲣⲉⲡϩⲉ ⲟⲩϩⲓ ⲛⲥⲱⲟⲩ (Amél. 2:49), ⲛⲓϩⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲧⲁⲡⲧⲁⲗⲃⲟ ⲏ ⲡⲉⲙⲧⲟⲛ ⲁⲣⲭⲉⲓ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲛϩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ (Amél. 2:113).

[10] Shisha-Halevy, *Categories* par. 1.3.7.

[11] E.g., ⲡⲙⲟⲩ (1 Cor 15:55).

[12] E.g., ⲡⲓⲯⲱⲛⲉ ... ⲥⲛⲁⲩ (Amél. 2:97), ⲡⲓⲕⲉⲯⲁϫⲉ (Amél. 2:100).

[13] E.g., ⲡⲉⲩⲯⲓⲡⲉ (Amél. 1:119), ⲡⲉⲩⲟⲩⲱⲯ (Amél. 2:96).

[14] M. G. Schwartze, *Koptische Grammatik*, ed. H. Steinthal (Berlin 1850) 455: "Der nackte Verbalstamm ward durch die Vorsetzung des bestimmten Artikels ... in ein Nomen verbale verwandelt."

[15] Ernštedt, "Determination" par. 24 ("stereotypical complex," "instrumental ϩⲛ̄–"), pars. 20–23 (ⲟⲩ– with abstract nouns). E.g., ϩⲛⲟⲩϩⲱⲡ (Amél. 2:107), ϩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲟⲟⲩⲧⲛ (Amél. 2:90), ϩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲟⲗⲥⲗ ... ϩⲛⲟⲩϫⲡⲓⲟ (Amél. 2:89). Note that the negativing element here is ⲁⲧ–, with ⲙⲛ̄ⲧ– representing the abstract after ⲟⲩ– ("ϩⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲧ–": e.g., Amél. 2:108).

[16] E.g., ⲟⲩϩⲟⲧⲉ ⲡⲉ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲣⲟⲥ (L 4:14), ⲧⲉⲫⲩⲥⲓⲥ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲥⲟⲟⲩ ⲡⲉ ⲟⲩⲁϩⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁⲡⲱⲱⲥ (Chass. 65), ⲙⲡⲁⲓ ⲁⲛ ⲡⲉ ⲛⲟⲓ ⲛⲛⲉⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ ⲕⲁⲗⲱⲥ (L 4:157), ϩⲉ ⲙⲉⲛ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁⲡⲁϩⲟⲩ ⲡⲉ ϫⲉ ... (Chass. 122), ⲟⲩ ⲉⲣⲟⲓ ⲡⲉ ⲣⲱϩⲧ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ (Amél. 2:303), ⲏ ⲁⲣⲛⲁ ⲁⲛ ⲛⲧⲟϥ ⲡⲉ ϫⲱ ... (Amél. 2:127).

[17] ⲡⲛⲁⲩ ⲛⲕⲁⲡϫⲟⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ (L 4:174), ϩⲛⲟ ⲛⲉⲓⲁ–ⲃⲓϫ (Amél. 1:218). Such examples as ⲟⲩⲱⲙ ϩⲓⲥⲱ "food and drink" (Amél. 1:205) indicate that this is a true *zero* rather than a nil or "nothing."

[18] Amél. 1:199–200: ⲉⲃⲱⲕ ... ⲉⲯⲁⲗⲏ ⲉⲱⲯ ⲉⲯⲁⲗⲗⲉⲓ ⲉⲧⲃⲃⲟⲕ ⲉϥⲓⲧⲉⲡⲣⲟⲥ-ⲫⲟⲣⲁ ... ⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩϥ ... ⲉϫⲱ ⲇⲉ ⲉⲟⲩⲱⲙ ⲉⲥⲱ ⲉⲥⲱⲃⲉ ... ⲟⲩⲁⲛⲟⲙⲓⲁ ⲧⲉ (note the masc. resumption of the infinitive, the fem. resumption of the fem. rhematic indef. article in the endophoric Nominal Sentence). Compare also the Bohairic Lev 7:24 (for the Sahidic TI) ⲉⲟⲩⲱⲙ ⲇⲉ ⲛ̀ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲟⲙϥ "but eat it they shall not" (εἰς βρῶσιν οὐ βρωθήσεται). It is remarkable that in a "topic-prominent" language such as Coptic, with striking historical precedents (*ir-* "segmentation" or topic prominencing in Old, Middle, and Late Egyptian) for widespread regular topicalization, the infinitive is rare in that role, and prepositional (ϵ–) marking is very doubtful, if at all attested outside the infinitive (one possible example is Chass. 34:34–45).

[19] E.g., ⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩⲥ ⲉϩⲱ (Amél. 1:55), ⲉⲥⲛⲥⲱⲛ ⲉⲧⲙⲣⲛⲟⲃⲉ (L 4:24).

non-restricted: modifiers, direct object (governed), complement (non-governed).[20] (**e**) *Person*: all persons are attested; nominal actor (rare, always definite). The differences in compatibility options between the first and second constituent are striking.

5. FORMAL DATA: DISTRIBUTION. (**a**) *Macro (generic) distribution*: almost only in the Scripture genre (Bible, Bible quotation, reminiscence, and emulation; see J. M. Solá-Solé, *L'infinitif sémitique* [BEHE 315; Paris 1961] app. 2, construction *a*; NT occurrences seem to apply OT loci). (**b**) *Micro (textemic) distribution.* First and foremost, the address substructure of the DIALOGUE: the future (the present-based future, Future III); imperative and jussive. Rarely, the present (Judg 11:25; Jer 47:14; never passive stative) and aorist (Gen 44:5 *B*). Note especially the following dialogic subtextemes: *prophetic assertion* or *proclamation of divine intent* (Gen 3:16; Jer 45:3; Zech 12:3 *B*; etc.); *rhetorical question* (Gen 37:10 *B*; etc.); *preceptual instruction*, with the conditional the most typical conjugation form (Exod 22:17 *B*; Lev 19:7; Deut 11:13; etc.). The TI is much rarer in NARRATIVE textemes (perfect tense: Gen 43:7, Judg 1:28), and even in this case typically in first-person report and similar cases of non-chronicling narrative, unless the conjugated verb is negatived, when it is usually contrastive emphasis that is signalled.

6. FORMAL OBSERVATIONS: COHESION INSIDE THE CONSTRUCTION: "TRANSPARENCE"; THE DEVERBAL ADVERB, (**a**) *The junctural features* (no new actor is asserted: the actor of the conjugation-form is common to both verbal elements; no interposition between the TI constituents, save the enclitics ⲁⲉ and ⲅⲁⲣ [2 Sam 18:25; Num 25:31 *B*], and the augens ⲁⲛⲟⲕ [2 Sam 18:2], all of conditioned placement) point to the TI constituting a single colon.[21]

(**b**) *The word-formational interdependence between the TI constituents.* The postulation of direction and process to relate base-word and "transparent" word[22] is a traditional, peculiarly Indo-European

[20] Cf. Shisha-Halevy, *Categories* par. 3.0.1.

[21] Shisha-Halevy, *Categories* pars. 6.0.2–3 (note that the first component may include the ϵ– modifier in type III below).

[22] On the notion of transparence in word-formation, see Hans-Martin Gauger, *Durchsichtige Wörter: Zur Theorie der Wortbildung* (Heidelberg 1971). This study is a Eurocentric examination of regular formal interrelation between the affixally derived word and its "base": the assumption of synchronic "motivation"—direction—is another component of Gauger's theory that is certainly not of universal validity and contestable also

approach, although the definition of "transparence" might, with some modification, apply to "alien" types of derivational interdependence. "Durchsichtige Wörter sind solche, die an andere Wörter bewußtseinsmässig gelehnt sind. Sie lehnen sich an das Wort an, das in ihnen selbst enthalten ist: auf dieses Wort hin sind sie durchsichtig.... Die undurchsichtige Wörter sind—als Wörter—unabhängig.... Hinsichtlich der Seinsweise des durchsichtigen Wortes in der Sprache ist nun dies der entscheidende Zug: es ruht nicht in sich selbst, sondern es weist von sich selbst weg auf andere Wörter hin."[23] In the case under study, "transparence," a word-formational quality, would match the syntactic-junctural issue of COHESION of the constituents of the construction. In Coptic—and indeed in many Indo-European-type languages—I would prefer to see this relation rather as a matter of oppositions and application ("use"), e.g., as in the case of such compatibility as in the construction under discussion here. Incidentally, the so-called "conversion" interdependence, i.e., derivational transition from one word-class to another,[24] statically to be seen as a relationship, cannot simply apply in Coptic: ⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ following ϩⲛ̄–ⲟⲩ– is environmentally kept distinct from ⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ in ⲡ–ⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ and ⲁⲩ–ⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄, with part-of-speech assignment purely a matter of definitively tagging one slot in one pattern; none of these ⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ elements is a verb or, for that matter, a noun in its own right, any more than ⲙⲉ in ⲟⲩ–ⲙⲉ or ⲡ–ⲙⲉ ("a/the true [one]") is an "adjective"; ⲁ– + ⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ is a VERB PHRASE (with an actor-theme, a verb clause) and ⲡ– + ⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ a NOUN PHRASE; see more below, in par. 8.f.

It is obvious that a new conception of "word-formation" is here called for (Wolf-Peter Funk's "Toward a Synchronic Morphology of Coptic" [in: *ICCoptS 1* 104–124] is the only attempt to date to come to grips with the problems involved). In Coptic, the grammatical nucleus—the marker of grammatical state, of grammatical integration, the actualizer—is as a rule prefixed (the "pro-verb," alias conjugation

on a point of method, as conflicting with the stasis implied in "transparence" and synchronic-structural analysis.

[23] Hans-Martin Gauger, "Determinatum und Determinans im abgeleiteten Wort?" in: Leonhard Lipka and Hartmut Günther, eds., *Wortbildung* (WF 564; Darmstadt 1981) 299–300. Replacing "motivation" by "transparence," Gauger satisfies not only the essentially static descriptive notion of relationship, but also the gradient nature of this particularly fine interdependence between related words. See also Hans Marchand, "Expansion, Transposition, and Derivation," in: Dieter Kastovsky, ed., *Studies in Syntax and Word-Formation* (IBAL/IGLG 18; Munich 1974) 324, 331–332.

[24] Gauger, "Determinatum und Determinans."

base; the determinators; ⲧⲣⲉϥ–; in word-formation, ⲙⲛ̄ⲧ–, ⲁⲧ–, ⲣⲉϥ–; the denominal-deriving ⲣ̄–, ϯ–, ⲭⲓ–, etc.): grammatical class markers are prefixed, not suffixed, to the "base word" (in Greek, by contrast, the deriving morphs, while equally nuclear, are typically suffixed: the syntagmatic *Grundrichtung* is "satellite to nucleus"). Denominal nominal (adjectival or substantival) derivation is in Coptic primarily effected by the use of the *determinators*: ⲟⲩⲙⲉ, ⲡⲙⲉ "a/the true (one)" (ἀληθινός); and it is especially striking in cases of gender disparity between the derivate and basis (non-derivate) determinators (both nuclear): ⲧⲥⲩⲗⲗⲁⲃⲏ "the syllable" vs. ⲡⲥⲩⲗⲗⲁⲃⲏ "the syllabary." Obviously, the dependence between the two components of the noun syntagms is not the same in the two cases: in ⲧ–ⲙⲉ we have an endocentric selection-determination construction ("the lexeme selects the variable"), whereas ⲡ– in ⲡ–ⲙⲉ is exophoric or externally selected, a combination-constellation; the former is an appositive, the latter a subordinative junction.

Similarly, deadverbial derivation uses the determinator for prepositional phrases, and (definite) determinator + relative converter for adverbs: ⲡⲱⲁⲉⲛⲉϩ "the eternal (one)," ⲡⲉⲧ–ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ "ὁ ἐκεῖνος." This use of the determinators—quite apart from the fact that these are the exponents of gender and number—is undoubtedly a prime symptom of the analytic nature of Coptic.

The deverbal nominal derivation system in Coptic (as distinct from the grammatical means of clause nominalization, mainly ⲭⲉ–, ⲧⲣⲉϥ–, and the conjunctive) is fairly simple, in comparison to other languages with agglutinative word-formation features:

	ϭⲓⲛ–	cⲱⲧⲙ̄ (manner, factive nominalization)

and

(ⲙⲛ̄ⲧ–)	ⲣⲉϥ–	cⲱⲧⲙ̄ (agent nominalization)
	ⲁⲧ–	cⲱⲧⲙ̄ (negative agent nominalization)

Obs. 1. (**a**) This deverbal ⲁⲧ– is really ⲁⲧ[1]– ("who does not..."), with a homonymous ⲁⲧ[2]– ("-less") which derives denominally and is formally defined as distinct by its commutation, not with ⲣⲉϥ–, but with ⲣⲙ̄ⲛ̄– (ⲣⲙ̄ⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ, negative ⲁⲧⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ); the deverbal ⲁⲧ– negates also the residual instances of suffixal agent nominalizations (ⲛⲁϩⲧ, negative ⲁⲧⲛⲁ). (**b**) ⲣ̄–ⲁⲧ[1]– constitutes a special word-formational negativer of the verb lexeme, distinct from the nexal one: ⲁⲛⲧⲓⲧⲣⲉⲩⲥⲟⲩⲛⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ ... ⲁⲩⲣⲁⲧⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲙⲙⲟϥ (L 4:7). (**c**) ⲙⲛ̄ⲧ–, with ⲁⲧ–, returns the derivation to the abstract level, forming the derivational negation of ϭⲓⲛ– (see type X below). ⲙⲛ̄ⲧ– seems to be the denominal alternant of ϭⲓⲛ– (at least in Sahidic; the value of the more grammaticalized, predominantly

masc. ϫIN- in Bohairic seems different), but curiously it occurs also as a deadverbial abstract, and even before the adverbial-verbal *stative* (Crum 176*b*). (**d**) I ignore here the deverbal concretizing derivation "by suffix pronoun" (ⲟⲩⲟⲙ-ⲥ, ⲥⲟⲟⲩϩ-ⲥ: Funk, "Synchronic Morphology" 118–119) and synthetic derivates like ⲏⲡⲉ "from" ⲱⲡ); their distribution, value, and relation to the analytic derivates to which they stand in opposition are as yet obscure, and the intriguing formal question of whether the suffixed pronouns are nuclear (against the *Grundrichtung*) or satellital is tied up with questions of function.

Questions of predictability, relative productivity, or degree of lexicalization, which are vital parameters for examining and evaluating word-formational patterns in the Indo-European and similar linguistic types, are difficult to answer in Coptic, or at least need special reformulation; the more specific preoccupations of modern word-formation study—derivation vs. composition, "conversion" (i.e., derivation by zero morpheme), combinability, sequencing, placement and juncture, as well as the semantic resolution of oppositions—are still largely unresearched. (However, even though "Bildungsweisen," "Wortbildungsverfahren," or "word-formation rules" are language-specific, we are still faced with the duality of related words that are either "gestaltbezogen" or "inhaltbezogen."[25])

7. The following table is a representative inventory and consequent typology of eleven main observable kinds of formal sequence and relationship in the TI construction.

(a) INVENTORY

	ϩN̄-ⲟⲩ-	Finite Verb Form	Examples
I	ⲯⲁϩⲁ	ⲯⲁϩⲁ	Jas 5:17
II	ⲧ-ⲧⲱⲛ	ⲧ-ⲧⲱⲛ	L 4:121
	ϫⲁ-ⲣⲱ-	ϫⲁ-ⲣⲱ-	Num 30:15 *B*
	ϭⲓ-ⲯⲏⲙ	ϭⲓ-ⲯⲏⲙ	Gen 44:5 *B*
	ϭN̄-ⲡⲉ-ⲯⲓⲛⲉ	ϭN̄-ⲡⲉ-ⲯⲓⲛⲉ	Exod 3:16
III	ⲕⲱ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ	ⲕⲱ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ	Deut 22:7
	ⲃⲱⲕ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ	ⲃⲱⲕ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ	Num 13:30
	ⲧ ⲉ-(ⲙⲏⲥⲉ)	ⲧ ⲉ-(ⲙⲏⲥⲉ)	Deut 15:10

[25] Leo Weisgerber, "Vierstufige Wortbildungslehre," in: Lipka and Günther, eds., *Wortbildung* 36–54. Hans Marchand ("A Set of Criteria for the Establishing of Derivational Relationship between Words Unmarked by Derivational Morphemes," *IF* 69 [1965] 10–19 [= Kastovsky, ed., *Studies* 242–252]) refers to derivational *relevance*, productivity, and direction, all not easy to establish in the present case.

	ϩN̄–OY–	Finite Verb Form	Examples
IVa	ϫωρ	ϫωρ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ	Lev 13:27 *B*
	ϫογⲱⲧ	ϫογⲱⲧ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ	Ps 39:2 *B*
	cωτM̄	cωτM̄ ϵ–	Exod 15:26
	ⲱιnϵ	ⲱιnϵ nc̄ω=	Lev 10:16
	ϫω	ϫω ṅcω=	Lev 5:21 *B*
	†	† ϵϩρⲁϊ	Jer 39:4
	ⲧⲁϩο	ⲧⲁϩο ⲉⲣⲁⲧ=	Deut 22:4 *B*
IVb	ⲧⲁⲕο	ⲧⲁⲕο n̄–	Deut 12:2
	ϥωⲧϵ	ϥοⲧ=	Josh 17:13
V	ⲡωⲧ	ⲡнⲧ	2 Sam 18:25
	ϵι	ⲛнγ	2 Sam 18:2; Jer. 43:29
VI	ⲱϵ	ⲱϵ–ⲛⲁ=	Num 13:30 *B*
VII	ϵⲡιθγⲙια	ϵⲡιθγⲙϵι	Luke 22:15
	ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲅⲅϵλια	ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲅⲅιλϵ	Acts 5:28
	ⲡορⲛια	p̄–ⲡορⲛϵγϵ	Hos 4:18 *A*
	ϩγⲡομονη	ϩγⲡομϵιnϵ	Ps 39:2
	κληρος	ϵρ–κληρονομιn	Deut 15:4 *B*
	ⲡολϵμος	ⲡολϵⲙι	Judg 11:25
VIII	ⲙn̄ⲧ–(p̄ρο, ⲙn̄ⲧρϵ, ⲃλ̄λϵ)	p̄–(p̄ρο, ⲙn̄ⲧρϵ, ⲃλ̄λϵ)	Gen 37:8 *B*, 43:3; 1 Sam 8:9; Zech 11:17 *A*
	ⲙϵγⲓ	ϵρ–ⲫⲙϵγⲓ	Deut 7:18 *B*
	ⲟⲥι	†–ⲟⲥι	Exod 21:22 *B*
	ⲃο†	ⲃιⲧ= ṁⲃο†	Deut 7:26 *B*
	ⲃιογⲓ	ολ= ṅⲃιογⲓ	Gen 40:15 *B*
	ϫομ	ϫϵⲙ–ϫομ	Num 13:30 *B*
	ⲁnⲁⲱ	ⲱρκ	Acts 2:30
	ⲡϵⲧnⲁnογϥ	nⲁnογ=	Judg 11:25
IX	ⲃωnⲧ	†–nογⲃc	2 Sam 12:24
	ⲱⲓⲡϵ	ϫι–ⲱⲓⲡϵ	1 Sam 27:12
	ϵοογ	ϫι–ϵοογ	Exod 15:21
	ⲱⲓnϵ	ϫnογ	2 Sam 20:18
	ⲁⲱⲁι	ⲑρϵ– ⲁⲱⲁι	Gen 3:16 *B*
	ⲙογ	ⲙογογⲧ	Exod 22:19; Judg 15:13
	ⲙογ	ϸοⲑⲃϵ=	Lev 20:15 *B*
	ⲁnⲁⲱ	ⲧⲁρκο	Exod 13:19; 1 Sam 14:28
	ϩⲃⲁ	ⲁⲁ= n̄ϩⲃⲁ	L 3:188
	ⲁnⲁⲑϵⲙⲁ	ⲁⲓ= ṅⲁnⲁⲑϵⲙⲁ	Deut 20:17 *B*
X	ⲙϵⲧ–ⲁⲧ–{INF}	ⲱⲧϵⲙ–{INF}	Exod 22:17 *B* (codd.)
XI	ϵιρϵ	cⲙinϵ (n–oγhι)	1 Sam 25:28
	oγωⲱ	ⲁϫιoγ	1 Sam 20:6
	oγωρⲡ	ϫω ⲉⲃⲟⲗ	Deut 22:7 *B*
	κακια	ϵρ–nοⲃϵ	1 Sam 12:25

(b) TYPOLOGY

I. Full lexical and grammatical congruence: simple verb lexeme repeated (no expansion).
II. Full lexical and grammatical congruence: compound verb (deriving auxiliary verb + nominal base) repeated (note, however, the junctural distinction indicated by the differentiation of ⲟⲙ̄–ⲡⲱⲓⲛⲉ [assimilated nasal] and ⲟⲛ̄–ⲡⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲱⲓⲛⲉ [no assimilation]).
III. Lexical and grammatical congruence: compound verb (*verb* + *post-verb*, defining individual lexical identity) repeated.
IVa. Lexical congruence, grammatical divergence: an unexpanded verb lexeme resumed by an expanded conjugated verb (verb + circumstant).
IVb. Lexical congruence, grammatical divergence: an unexpanded verb lexeme resumed by an expanded conjugated verb (verb + object actant).
V. Lexical congruence, grammatical alternation: infinitive verb lexeme resumed by a conditioned stative.[26]
VI. Lexical congruence with alternation: "go on one's way"—verb lexeme resumed by its extended form.[27]
VII. Lexical congruence, grammatical divergence: a radical nominal abstract resumed by a denominal verb derivate: the suppletive alternant, for Greek-origin verbs, of both types I and IX.
VIII. Lexical congruence, grammatical divergence: a nominal derivation base resumed by a denominal verb derivate: either an abstract noun or a noun derivate (syntagm) in correspondence to a verb syntagm, in which the deriving nucleus is (a) the copular auxiliary ⲣ̄– "be, constitute" (ⲣ̄– alternating in durative conjugation with ⲟ ⲛ̄–), or (b) the denominal deriving verbs ⲣ̄– "make," ϫⲓ– "take," ϯ– "give," ϫⲉⲙ– (ⲟⲛ̄–) "find"; the denominal derivation in this case may be direct (lexemic), or indirect, through a pronominal object actant with the lexeme adverbially marked ("stealth..., take [him] by stealth"). I find remarkable here the complementary distribution between derivational and predicative syntagms, the latter corresponding to ⲙⲛ̄ⲧ– derivates, the former to lexemic abstracts. Alternatively, the abstract-verb relationship may be opaque[28] or formally more complex (ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩϥ,

[26] H. J. Polotsky, "The Coptic Conjugation System," *Orientalia* 29 (1960) 396–397 (= Polotsky, *Collected Papers* 242–243), par. 9.
[27] H. J. Polotsky, "Zur Neugestaltung der koptischen Grammatik," *OLZ* 54 (1959) 459 (= Polotsky, *Collected Papers* 237).
[28] Gauger, *Durchsichtige Wörter* 167–169, on degrees of formal divergence or (the other face of the coin) of transparence—*cœur* : *cardiaque, mûr* : *maturité, lecture* : *lire, boire* : *potable, lettre* : *épistolaire*). Gauger relegates such cases as these to the diachronic

the lexeme-equivalent nominal relative, resumed by the adjective verb—which goes to show that the first constituent may well be more complex than, but not an expanded form of, the second).

IX. Lexical, grammatical-semantic divergence: a simple verb/base noun resumed by a causative or factitive verb moneme/syntagm in its active or its passive form, constituting an increase in diathesis/valency characterization, by various means (monematic, lexematic, syntagmatic: morphological or syntactic[29]); note cases of neat diathetic oppositions (e.g., ϣⲓⲛⲉ + ϣⲓⲛⲉ : ϣⲓⲛⲉ + ϫⲛⲟⲩ- 2 Sam 20:18).

X. Lexical congruence, grammatical divergence: negative abstract noun derivate (syntagm) resumed by a negatived conjugated verb lexeme: this is the only form in which the non-conjugated verb is negatived (by ⲁⲧ-, the derivational negation, and not ⲧⲙ̄-, the infinitival one; ⲟⲩ- and ⲧⲙ̄- incompatible?). I know of a single example for this pattern (Bohairic consensus, with a pattern III *varia lectio* in P copte 1; in Sahidic a different construction).

XI. Miscellaneous cases of no lexical and merely approximative semantic congruence.

8. WORD-FORMATIONAL/JUNCTURAL DIFFERENTIAL ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION. (**a**) In the TI combination, the initial component is not a form indifferent to diathesis/valency or negation characterization, nor is it incompatible with expansion; obviously, it is the characterization contour that is here significant, not component properties; a contour that is typically either constant or increasing, never decreasing—a distinct non-referential, non-substitutive one: non-modified/modified to modified, non-compound/compound to compound. Note the difference in expansion constituency between the first (unconjugated) and second (conjugated) constituents: the first is restricted to ⲉ- satellites and virtually to zero-determination direct objects; the second is unrestricted.

(**b**) Types I–VI vs. VII–VIII: the basic syntactic dichotomy, between those types in which the verb lexeme is nuclear and the development is in its expansion, and those types in which the lexeme is satellital.

(**c**) Type III vs. IVa: defining a valential opposition between post-

perspective (i.e., the effect of sound laws) alone, not to the crucial and, I believe, primary one of synchronic suppletive assignation.

[29] "Analytic" and "synthetic" marks of causativity: Lucien Tesnière, *Éléments de syntaxe structurale* (2d ed.; Paris 1965) 266–270.

verbs (componential, "empty" in Tesnière's system) and non-componential adjuncts.

(**d**) Type I vs. VII, type VII vs. VIII. The formal relation of the Greek abstracts to their derivates isolates the suffixed deriving nuclei (–ϵγ–, –ϵ–, –∅–, –ⲛⲟⲙϵ– [suppletively, with ⲕⲗⲏⲣⲟ–]) in a Greek derivational subsystem, corresponding to the native Coptic one of lexical or ⲙⲛ̄ⲧ– abstracts and prefixed nuclear deriving verbs expanded by zero-determinated base nouns. "Infinitives" of Greek origin have distinct (more restricted) nominal features, especially those symptomized by compatibility with non-zero determinators (witness the suppletion I/VII, one that is not simply attributable to any property of the Greek infinitive itself, but may be connected both with the fact that the Coptic verb-lexeme and the Greek-origin one are not coextensively "lexemic," as well as with the frequent availability of Greek-origin nominal deverbal derivates, i.e., a distinct word-formational system for Greek verbs, operative within Coptic [cf. the Greek-origin adverbs in –ⲱⲥ related *in Coptic* to "adjectives" in –ⲟⲥ; Shisha-Halevy, *Categories* chap. 4]). Zero-determination is common with Greek-origin verbs (as existant following ⲙ̄ⲙⲛ̄–: 1 Pet 1:22, Chass. 13; following the rectional ⲛ̄–, and ⲁⲭⲛ̄– "without": Matt 3:14, Rom 12:9; following the *nota relationis*: Acts 4:21; nil article, following ⲣϵⲫ–: L 3:150), but indefinite and definite determinators are extremely rare (in the *S* NT, definite determination is restricted to ⲡϵⲓⲑϵ, which is not opposed to a special derivate abstract: Mark 15:15 and Gal 5:8 only, also in Shenoute [ⲡϵⲓ̈ⲡⲓⲑϵ: Orl. 56 = Ariel Shisha-Halevy, "Unpublished Shenoutiana in the British Library," *Enchoria* 5 (1975) 79]; indefinite determination is restricted to the deverbal derivate ϩⲛ̄ⲟγ–: with ⲡϵⲓⲑϵ again in 1 Cor 2:4–5 and 2 Cor 12:15; all evidently idiomatic phraseological imports, replaced in *B* by "Egyptian" equivalents). The special status of Greek verbs in non-Sahidic Coptic, especially scriptural Bohairic, is of course made evident by the obligatory ϵⲣ– "do," prefixed as a verbal marker or "infinitivizer" to the Greek infinitive, lending it true infinitive privileges. It is remarkable that while this prefix is the carrier of grammatical categories (e.g., imperative ⲁⲣⲓ–: not, for Greek verbs, the "naked stem"—pace Stern, *Grammatik* par. 384—but the infinitive in a morphologically marked form), it is fully compatible with another grammemic ⲓⲣⲓ, viz., the one in such "bases" as ⲙ̀ⲡϵⲣ–, ⲟⲣϵⲫ–, ⲙ̀ⲡϵⲛⲟⲣϵⲫ– (e.g., Rom 12:2, Gal 6:9, 2 Thess 3:13).

(**e**) Type VIII vs. IX: non-causative vs. causative denominal derivation (by means of the same auxiliaries).

(f) Verb lexeme, "naked verb stem," infinitive, "abstract," "action noun": these terms have been used so far more or less indiscriminately and without definition. I would now suggest their distribution in Coptic along the following lines. The VERB LEXEME, an element of *la langue*, is distinguished from the noun lexeme by compatibilities and often by form (morphophonemic alternation, no "plural," in fact no countability/individuation marking): ⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄, Gk ⲫⲟⲣⲓⲛ (*B*), ⲫⲟⲣⲉⲓ (*S*). It is actualized in *la parole* as either (1) the INFINITIVE or (2) the VERBAL ABSTRACTS (derivates). The INFINITIVE is the actualization form of the lexeme in a verb phrase by the pro-verbs (the bases in the base-conjugation: ⲁⲭ–,[30] ⲙ̄ⲡⲣ̄–, ⲧⲣⲉⲭ–, etc.; the affirmative imperative is not an infinitive, but a form sometimes homonymous with it): ⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄, Gk ⲉⲣ–ⲫⲟⲣⲓⲛ (*B*), ⲫⲟⲣⲉⲓ (*S*). The VERBAL ABSTRACT (of which the action noun is but one case) is a different kind of lexeme actualization, marked by other actualizers: determinators, (ⲙⲛ̄ⲧ–)ⲣⲉⲭ– and its negativer ⲁⲧ[1]–, ⲟⲓⲛ–, for Egyptian lexemes; derivational or nominal suffixes for Greek-origin lexemes (in this case, the absence of direction—i.e., the fact that only lexeme:derivate opposition is significant—is very striking). Consider the combination of all possible derivation types in nine definite abstracts occurring in one passage (Shenoute, Leid. 331–332):

Determinators	ⲙⲛ̄ⲧ–( )–	Greek Derivation
ⲡⲉⲟⲃⲃⲓⲟ	ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲙⲁⲓⲥⲟⲛ	ⲧⲁⲅⲁⲡⲏ
ⲡϩⲁⲣⲉϩ	ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲣ̄ⲙⲣⲁⲱ	ⲧⲙⲉⲗⲉⲧⲏ
ⲡⲧⲃⲃⲟ	ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲣⲉⲭⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄	ⲧⲡⲁⲣⲑⲉⲛⲓⲁ

While there is no hierarchy or derivational direction between verb (here "infinitive") and derivate noun ("neither noun nor verb can be termed semantically primary or semantically secondary" [Bohumil Trnka, "Conversion in English," in: Vilém Fried, ed., *Selected Papers in Structural Linguistics* (JanLing, Series Maior 88; Berlin/New York/Amsterdam 1982) 354]; in Coptic, both are but actualizations in *la parole* of the lexeme which is a feature of *la langue*), the opposition structure of ⲟⲓⲛ– and determinator abstraction calls for further study, and is markedly different for different lexemes: for some lexemes, the

[30] The rhematic "infinitive" in the Bipartite pattern is different: it stands outside derivation dependences, being only in opposition with the stative (Shisha-Halevy, *Categories* par. 3.1.2.1.1). Incidentally, the alternations ϩⲛⲁ– : ⲣ̄ϩⲛⲁ– and [*prep. phrase*] : ⲣ̄– [*prep. phrase*]—NON-DURATIVE (or unmarked) vs. DURATIVE environment, respectively—is indicative not only of the verbalizing actualization effect of ⲣ̄–, but also of the different status of the durative verbal rheme.

latter hardly exists (e.g., ϩⲙⲟⲟⲥ), while for others it is much more important than the former (e.g., ϩⲓⲥⲉ "trouble"). By and large, ⲃⲓⲛ– abstracts, feminine in Sahidic (i.e., of marked gender), are similarly marked and specialized in their semantics ("form, manner of," "product, instrument of"), while the determinatorial abstract, unmarked (masculine), is of a broad comprehensive semantic spectrum. In Bohairic, the ϫⲓⲛ– abstract, usually masculine in gender, is accordingly less specialized and much more grammaticalized ("Nominal Infinitive" [Stern, *Grammatik* pars. 180, 470]), with the determinatorial one of relatively restricted *valeur*.

It is worth noting that the Coptic facts certainly seem to corroborate the so-called lexicalist hypothesis,[31] postulating the neutrality of the lexicon regarding the verb:verbal noun distinction, one which in Coptic is purely syntactic, not morphological as we know it in the "nostratic" range of languages. Which brings us to the question, whether there is any structural descriptive gain in postulating a zero deriving morpheme for the verbal abstract, deriving an "action noun" from a verb lexeme (so Funk, "Synchronic Morphology" 119–120). I believe there is not, unless it be a zero article, e.g., following the *nota relationis* (ⲡⲙⲁ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲱⲙ "the eating-place") or the assertion of non-existence (ⲙⲛ̄ⲕⲱ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ "there is no forgiving"). Nominalization, here as in principle elsewhere, is primarily signalled by non-zero environmental patterning which may be (syntagmatically) compatible with a paradigmatically defined zero, such as the zero article: ⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄, as noun, is a noun *syntagm*. That is why I believe it is preferable to highlight the abstracting-deriving role of the determinators, not the nominalizing one: when it comes to definition, even a noun lexeme is in Coptic nominalized (i.e., signalled as noun) by the determinators, which is strictly speaking tautological; ⲟⲩⲯⲁⲉⲛⲉϩ is no less "nominal," analytically speaking, than ⲟⲩⲕⲗⲟⲟⲗⲉ. However, the question of conversion (derivational word-class shifting by zero,[32] postulated by Sweet for English as early as 1909) is certainly intriguing in Coptic, especially from the theoretical aspect of identity vs. homonymy, rather than from the dynamic transpositional aspect: is (for instance) the element following ϩⲛ̄–ⲟⲩ– the same entity as that following the pro-verb ⲁ–ⲫ–? I think not: the former is an abstract, the latter an infinitive.

[31] Dieter Kastovsky, "Zur Analyse von Nomina Actionis," in: Lipka and Günther, eds., *Wortbildung* 383–384.

[32] Dieter Kastovsky, "Wortbildung und Nullmorphem," in: Lipka and Günther, eds., *Wortbildung* 306–323.

(**g**) "Deverbal adverb." There is, I believe, a case for considering the opening constituent of the TI construction to be a derived "deverbal adverb," in view of its free productivity, its "grammaticalness" (the semantic weakening of its non-verbal components: ϩⲛ̄–, ⲟⲩ–), its occurrence also outside the construction here under study (i.e., following the conjugation form or in non-paronomastic syntax). Since it also as a rule shares one actor, one negation exponent, and all temporal and aspectual categories with the conjugated verb, even the terms "converb" or "gerund" seem appropriate.[33]

(**h**) *Cohesion contours.* Sequence types II, III, IVa, VIII, IX, X, taken conjointly with the absence of the sequences "ⲕⲱ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ... ⲕⲱ" and "†ⲧⲱⲛ ... †" (Shisha-Halevy, *Categories* par. 3.1.1.1.0.1 [3]) reveal the junctural pattern of our construction, essentially different from the common one of resumption: not a referential representation contour, but one of iterative compilation or accumulation.[34]

9. EXCURSUS: THE OLD/MIDDLE EGYPTIAN PRECEDENT. (**a**) In the prevalent OE/ME construction, the unconjugated constituent of the TI syntagm is focalized by the *sḏm.f* (present), *sḏmw.f* ("prospective") or *sḏm.n.f* (preterite) emphatic forms of transitive or intransitive verbs, i.e., in a Cleft Sentence, affirmative or nexus-negative (never verb- [*glose*-] negative). Some representative examples follow.
rmm.i rmyt (Edel par. 728) "It is (in) crying that I cry."
wnn.i wnnt (CT V 108b) "It is (in) existing that I (shall) exist."
ʿnḫ.i ʿnḫt (CT IV 180f) "It is (in) living that I shall live."
irr.k iryt (CT VI 392q) "It is (in) acting that you (shall) act."
msy P. mswt (Pyr. 353c) "It is (in) being born that P. shall be born."
n mt.f, ʿnḫ ʿnḫt P. pn ḏt (Pyr. 1477b) "He shall not die; it is (in) living that this P. shall live, for ever." The arrangement (placement of the nominal actor) indicates that the conjugated and non-conjugated verb forms combine in a closely linked unity; similarly in *ḏ3.tw ḏ3wt T pn* (Pyr. 344a).
wrš.n.t wršt (CT I 287c) "It is (in) being vigilant that you (fem.) have been vigilant."
n mwt.n is T. mtwt (Pyr. 350a–b) "It is not (in) dying T. has died."

[33] See a fine discussion of these terms by Gideon Goldenberg, "The Semitic Languages of Ethiopia and their Classification," *BSO(A)S* 40 (1977) 489–494.

[34] Non-verbal noun iteration is not used in Coptic in this role (see Shisha-Halevy, *Categories* par. 1.3.3; for iterative cohesion, see also M. A. K. Halliday and Ruqaiya Hasan, *Cohesion in English* [London 1976] 277–282).

Rarely, the unconjugated constituent is not focalized but adjunctal to a "subjunctive" ("prospective") *sḏm.f* form:
rdì.ì mwt.t mwtt (CT I 287a–b) "I have caused you (fem.) to die in dying."
Note that in either case, the construction is dialogic or at least modal; both the construction and the generic as well as textemic distributions are remarkably similar to the OT Hebrew (and translated Coptic) ones;[35] it is somehow satisfying to observe the convergence of the grammatical and textual roots for the Coptic construction.

(**b**) The unconjugated element, known in the grammatical literature as a "Komplementsinfinitiv,"[36] simply "infinitive," or "nomen actionis" (Sethe, Edel, Schenkel), syntactically seen as "object" (in the case of transitives; "cognate accusative" [Gardiner]) or "subject" (intransitives), turns out, upon a closer syntagmatic/paradigmatic scanning, to be adverbial in syntactic status. The Semitic "adverbial case" ending *-wt*[37] comes to mind. A "casus adverbialis" status of a real infinitive, i.e., a

[35] Mutatis mutandis, and allowance always made for the fact that the Scripture evidence in Coptic goes by and large back to the Biblical Hebrew phenomenon.

[36] Kurt Sethe, *Das ägyptische Verbum* (Leipzig 1899–1902) pars. 720-736, esp. 720, 723, 724, for the syntactic status; Sethe, *Übersetzung und Kommentar zu den altägyptischen Pyramidentexten* (6 vols.; Glückstadt/Hamburg/New York [1935]-1962) 4:43 (*ad* 810a): "zu der weiblichen Form des Inf. absol."; Elmar Edel, *Altägyptische Grammatik* (AnOr 34, 39; Rome 1955–1964) pars. 723–729. The rare attestation of a suffix-pronoun with *mswt, msy P. mswt.f* (Pyr. 353c; Edel par. 729) is hardly conclusive enough to establish the nominal nature of this form. Alan Gardiner, *Egyptian Grammar* (3d ed.; London 1957) par. 298 obs. ("cognate accusative"; "being to all intents and purposes mere nouns they do not concern us further"); Wolfgang Schenkel, *Die altägyptische Suffixkonjugation* (ÄA 32; Wiesbaden 1975) 37–38, 47 (a kind of *nomen actionis*). Cases like *ʿnḫ* (imperative) *ʿnḫ.k* (with a possessive suffix) are hardly on a par with the usual TI (pace Sethe, *Verbum* par. 724). Sethe does not draw the essential conclusions from the adverbiality of the Late Egyptian and Coptic correspondents. For LE, see Adolf Erman, *Neuaegyptische Grammatik* (2d ed.; Leipzig 1933) pars. 415 (Anm. 3), 421. The type relevant and comparable to the Coptic TI is the conjugated or otherwise finitized infinitive followed by *m-* with a colexemic infinitive: *ì.ir.ì ḥ3b n.k m ḥ3b* (Sall. I 4, 2); *m-s3 p3-tm dìt ir.f ʿm.ì m ʿm* (Anast. V 21, 7); *p3-nty nb twk iry.f m iry* (Leyd. 348 verso 9, 8); *p3-wn i3.t t3-ir.k n.ì m t3wt* (Ostr. DM 251): not "since your action was stealing" (Jaroslav Černý, Sarah Israelit Groll, and Christopher Eyre, *A Late Egyptian Grammar* [StudPohl, series Maior 4; Rome 1975] 182 [ex. 513]), but "since you *did* steal." The second construction adduced by Erman has a modified adjunctal infinitive, and is comparable to the Coptic construction illustrated here in appendix II: *m-ir ʿḥʿ m ʿḥʿ nb* (Anast. V 22, 3); *iw.ì r mḥ.w mḥ (sp 2)* (Anast. VIII 2, 15); *iw.f rḫ.s m rḫ n ʿḥʿwty* (Truth 4, 4); *iw.ì dìt šsp st n3-nty m ḫrt-nṯr m šsp nfr* (Neschons 3, 14).

[37] See Carl Brockelmann, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen* (2 vols.; Berlin 1908–1913) 1: par. 251.b (adverbially used abstracts); Sabatino Moscati et al., *An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages* (PLO n.s. 6; Wiesbaden 1969) par. 15.2.

nominal form of the verb, of course is conceivable, except that such a word-class statement would be almost meaningless, seeing that this form is hardly ever observable outside this adverbial status. While pleading full innocence of glottogonic intent, I would still point out that there is in Semitic too hardly any conclusive evidence to prove this form nominal.[38] While syntactic considerations are in this case much clearer than morphological ones, neither aspect really warrants seeing this element in Egyptian (in synthetic word-class resolution) as an infinitive or *nomen actionis*, or (in analytic syntactic resolution) as an object or "accusative," but as an adverbial rhematic componential extension (not modification!) of the verbal stem. Needless to say, the emphatic form unambiguously points to the adverbiality of the complement,[39] and intransitive verbs (such as *wnn* "be") have no direct object valency. In fact, the slot occupied by this element is not actantial; it is a "ghost" slot open after any verb in a certain adverbial paradigm, "shadowing" it while representing its lexemic "name." Functionally, this is a self-focussing ("autofocalization") of the verb (Shisha-Halevy, *Categories* par. 2.1). This form is privileged to occur in the "adverbial paradigm,"[40] which it shares with the infinitival prepositional phrase, the stative, circumstantial *sḏm.f*, *sḏm.n.f*, passive *sḏmw.f*, and to an extent the prospective *sḏm.f*, all (by the structural test of identity) "adverbial": it thus ought by right to be included in accounts of this pivotal "Bipartite" pattern in Old and Middle Egyptian.

[38] T. W. Thacker (*The Relationship of the Semitic and Egyptian Verbal Systems* [Oxford 1954] 129, 131, 153) characterizes the Hebrew form as a "universal form ... having both nominal and purely verbal functions," "a verb-form of universal application," and he admits it is "preclude[d] ... from being classified as a noun," since it does not in fact have peculiarly nominal syntactic properties. Cf. Solá-Solé, *Infinitif sémitique* 84–87 (formal considerations), 87–96 (functional: "une action concomitante," "modalité concomitante," "détermination adverbiale à une action principale exprimée par une forme verbale personnelle"); Goldenberg, "Tautological Infinitive" par. 37. Note that one of the two main LXX Greek renderings of the Hebrew construction is adverbial: an adverbially marked verbal noun or a straightforward non-verbal adverb (Thackeray, "Infinitive Absolute" 597, 600), while the other (conjunct participle) is syntactically a "sentence modifier" (premodifier status).

[39] Mordechai Gilula, "Enclitic Particles in Middle Egyptian" (Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, 1968 [in Hebrew, with an English summary]) 84–85; Gilula, review of Helmut Satzinger, *Die negativen Konstruktionen im Alt- und Mittelägyptischen* (MÄS 12; Berlin 1968), *JEA* 56 (1970) 210.

[40] H. J. Polotsky, "Egyptian Tenses," *ProcIASH* 2 (1968) 93–97 (= Polotsky, *Collected Papers* 89–93), pars. 41–46; Polotsky, "Les transpositions du verbe en égyptien classique," *IsOrS* 6 (1976) 3–4 (par. 1.3). Polotsky does not include this form among the "formes adverbiales" ("Transpositions" 26–32 [pars. 3.1–3.7]). Cf. also Friedrich Junge, *Syntax der mittelägyptischen Literatursprache: Grundlagen einer Strukturtheorie* (Mainz 1978) 25, 80–81.

(c) The differences in construction between Egyptian and Coptic are as illuminating as the points of agreement. The answer to the question of why the focussing of the verb in Egyptian uses a marked thematic ("emphatic") finite verb as against the invariably rhematic conjugation form in Coptic lies, I believe, in a cluster of interdependent syntactic points of dissimilarity of deep typological significance. First, there is the more cotextual nature of focus-marking in Coptic (itself a symptom of the less rigid word order, available for marking purposes, and the higher analytic index of the later phases of the language), which adds non-morphological means for marking thematicity/topicality and/or focality. Second, and ensuing, is the pre-verbal as well as post-verbal placement of the focus in Coptic (Shisha-Halevy, *Categories* chap. 2) as against the exclusively post-theme placement in OE/ME. Third, and consequent, is the existence of the self-focalizing "emphatic" (Second Tense) in Coptic, to my knowledge non-occurring in the oldest phases of Egyptian. However, we do find the Coptic reflecting the old construction: a Cleft Sentence in Gen 3:4 (significantly, the conservative Bohairic), ⲛⲁⲣⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲁⲙⲟⲩ ⲁⲛ ϧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲙⲟⲩ, almost exactly matches Pyr. 350a–b (quoted above); unfocalized more often (see appendix II below).

10. SYNTACTIC STATUS: COLEXEMIC PREMODIFIER. On the one hand, we have seen in our examination of the construction that the TI is not a nominal-extrapositional (or "nominativus pendens," or "absolute nominative") pattern. On the other hand, two observations are relevant here. (a) The "deverbal adverb," being grammaticalized, regularly (predictably) and more closely related to the conjugated verb than any premodifier, does in a sense constitute an adverbial "projection" (Tesnière's term). This is perhaps corroborated by the fact that this construction is virtually the only way a topicalizing extraposition is effected in Coptic for a verb: cases like ⲁⲛⲁϣ ⲙⲉⲛ ⲙⲡⲟⲩⲉⲓⲣⲉ (L 3:18) are rare, and they illustrate cotextual (cotext-bound) topicalization; similarly ⲉⲃⲱⲕ ... ⲉϣⲗⲏⲗ ... ⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩⲫ ... (Amél. 1:199–200; see n. 18 above), which is cotextual-antithetic, and does not predicate the same verb that is topicalized; in *B* ϩⲱⲃ ⲇⲉ ⲛ̀ⲛⲉⲫⲉⲣϩⲱⲃ (Num 8:26) and ⲉⲫⲱϣⲉⲛ ⲙ̀ⲡⲟⲩⲫⲱϣⲉⲛ (Num 8:22), we have a topicalizing construction very similar to a TI. (b) The junctural parameters examined above (non referential contour, lexemic equivalence) are joined by two others, non-junctural: first, the obvious substitutional one of syntactic status—*adverbiality* (the first constituent of the TI is a prepositional phrase); second, the basic oppositive one of placement—*initial position.*

In fact, we witness in the TI a "syncretistic" convergence of two or three roles of adverbial pre-position. First is *premodification*, circumstance- and manner-presetting (Shisha-Halevy, *Categories* par. 1.1.2.2; "the effect of [modifier] pre-position is that the adverb colors everything that follows"[41]). Contrast cases like L 4:2 ϩⲣⲁⲓ ϩⲙⲡⲉⲕⲣⲁⲛ ⲁⲛⲡⲣⲟⲫⲏⲧⲉⲩⲉ. (Incidentally, while it would seem that ϩⲣⲁⲓ is essential with premodifying ϩⲛ̄– in most functions, it is absent in the TI construction.) Second is *focussing* (Shisha-Halevy, *Categories* par. 2.6.2). And a probable third is *topicalizing pre-position*, in one sense diametrically opposed to focussing, in another sense (that of prominence ["Hervorhebung"] marking) kindred to it. This very special convergence of grammatical signalling, together with the internal junctural contour mentioned above and the external junctural one of cotextual unboundness (delimitation), defines the specific role of this construction.

11. FUNCTIONAL. The grammarian's consensus on the role of the TI is "strengthening" or "stressing" of the verb (Stern, *Grammatik* par. 473: "Dem hebräischen infinitivus absolutus, welcher das hauptverb desselben stammes verstärkt, entspricht in gleicher bedeutung ein adverbialer infinitiv im koptischen."; Steindorff, *Lehrbuch* par. 381: "zur Verstärkung des Verbum finitum, entsprechend einem Komplement-infinitiv in der alten Sprache"; Till, *Grammatik* par. 350: "zur besonderen ... Betonung des Verbalbegriffes"). I believe this is indeed correct, but must be rephrased in the structural terms of a verb focussing paradigm. The mystery of verb focussing,[42] in a sense the most intriguing part of focus-marking grammar, lies in part in the different structuring of the focality paradigm for verb and noun, quite apart from the complexity of the focality syndrome itself (which, for a start, constitutes a gradual rather than binary category[43]) and its

[41] Dwight L. Bolinger, "Linear Modification," in: Fred W. Householder, ed., *Syntactic Theory 1: Structuralist* (Harmondsworth/Baltimore/Ringwood 1972) 37.

[42] Jan Firbas, "On Defining the Theme in Functional Sentence Analysis," *TLP* 1 (1964) 268; Petr Sgall, "Focus and Contextual Boundness," in: Östen Dahl, ed., *Topic and Comment, Contextual Boundness and Focus* (PTL 6; Hamburg 1974) 25–51.

[43] Shisha-Halevy, *Categories* pars. 2.0.2.0–2.0.2.4. Friedrich Junge, "A Study in Sentential Meaning and the Notion of 'Emphasis' in Middle Egyptian," in: Gertie Englund and Paul John Frandsen, eds., *Crossroad: Chaos or the Beginning of a New Paradigm; Papers from the Conference on Egyptian Grammar, Helsingor 28–30 May 1986* (Copenhagen 1986) 191–205. The main criticism here called for (in view of the fact that this is the most elaborate treatment to date of the theoretical issue for Coptic-Egyptian) is that Junge oversimplifies, even for a general (i.e., English-based) study of the subtle issues involved,

peculiarly complicated semantics.[44] Apparently, the verb must be marked as nominal (e.g., by a determinator), or adverbialized, or especially converted, to be topicalized or focalized; otherwise, it is signalled as rhematic. Generally speaking, the noun in Coptic is thematic when in nexus with an unmarked verb, focalized when in nexus with a verb marked by a relative or Second Tense conversion, topicalized when preposed to (and represented in) a nexus.

12. THE VERB FOCUSSING PARADIGM. **(a)** ⲉⲫⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄, the autofocal Second Tense (Shisha-Halevy, *Categories* par. 2.1). Its macrodistribution is nearly complementary to that of the TI. This type of verb focussing is not cotextually bound; indeed, it constitutes a delimitation: it does not build on a preceding rheme as its theme, and is accordingly of relatively high Communicative Dynamism. This construction features in special cotextual configurations.

ϩⲱⲥ ⲉⲫⲭⲉ-ⲛⲧⲁⲩⲡⲱⲫⲥ ⲛϩⲏⲧ ⲛⲧⲁⲩⲡⲱⲫⲥ ⲅⲁⲣ (L 3:96) "... as if they became dazed—which they in fact did."

ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲁⲛ ⲭⲉ-ⲉⲫⲣϩⲟⲧⲉ (Amél. 1:131–132) "... not because he is *afraid*."

ignoring, for instance, the existence and significance of "John *did* see the play" (negatived "John did *not* see the play," as against "John *didn't* see the play"), "John saw the play, didn't he?" "See it John did" or "John saw the play indeed," with "He saw the play, John did" as in opposition to (i.e., in paradigm with) both "*John* saw the play" and "John *saw* the play" (p. 197). Junge achieves his generalizations at the cost of overlooking crucial particulars. Evidently, the binary notion of "markedness" (pp. 192–193) is ill suited as a model to do justice to this complex characterization syndrome, just as the old praeter-linguistic, universalist question-answer "logic" test is inadequate or patently inaccurate (thus "John *saw* the play" does not specify "What did John do?"). It is clearly not a case of "emphase ou non" (p. 204), just as "given" and "non-given" are but two extreme poles on a multi-node gradient scale, marked by a broad range of formal means, segmental and suprasegmental, grammatical, lexical-phraseological, prosodic and cotextual (consider for example "I'll say," "believe me," "frankly," alone or conjointly, as grammatical markers; Dwight L. Bolinger, *Degree Words* [JanLing, Series Maior 53; The Hague/Paris 1972] 93–110). Admittedly, the focalities we have to diagnose are of different kinds (witness the compatibility of the two foci in such sentences as "*What is* the matter?" with actant and nexus focalizations); but it is for that very reason essential to define and correlate them, for, as a matter of fact, all clause constituents are always marked for Functional Sentence Perspective in some way or another. Moreover, we are not concerned with the predictability of a (not given) context (p. 197), but with the value of elements *in context*, i.e., accommodated and integrated in a cotext that is an integral part of the data.

[44] Erich Hofmann, *Ausdrucksverstärkung* (*EZVS* 9; Göttingen 1930) chap. 3: contrastive emphasis (par. 25), intensive Aktionsart (par. 27), durative Aktionsart (par. 26), hyperbolic reference mark ("as it were": pars. 29–30); in par. 30 Hofmann attempts to relate the different roles. For the focal verb outside contrast or intensification, see also Haiim B. Rosén, "Die 'zweiten' Tempora des Griechischen: Zum Prädikatsausdruck beim griechischen Verbum," *MH* 14 (1957) 147 (III.b.7: "Satzinhalt als Prädikat").

(**b**) The focussing particle –ⲣⲱ (cf. English "indeed," or Greek γέ[45]), in part of its functional range (affirmative clauses): cotextual link, prosodemic marker. The particle immediately follows the focus (if a verb, this is often a repeated lexeme occuring as rheme earlier in the cotext), or occurs in conditioned colon-second placement, in such combinations as ⲟⲩⲁⲉ ⲣⲱ, ⲏ ⲣⲱ, ⲙⲏ ⲣⲱ, ϩⲟⲗⲱⲥ ⲣⲱ, ⲙⲉⲱⲁⲕ ⲣⲱ. Verb focus, tense-mark focus:

ⲧⲃⲁⲉⲓⲟⲉⲓ ⲃⲉ ϩⲓⲟⲩⲥⲟⲡ ... ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲭⲉ–ⲧⲧⲃⲁⲉⲓⲏⲩ ⲣⲱ ϩⲛⲛⲁϩⲃⲏⲩⲉ (Amél. 1:70) "Condemn me, then, all together ..., because I *am* condemned, in my works."

ⲡⲉⲓⲏⲓ ⲉⲫⲉⲱⲱⲡⲉ ⲉⲡⲱⲱϥ ⲏ ⲛⲭⲁⲓⲉ ⲥⲉⲟ ⲣⲱ ⲛⲭⲁⲓⲉ (Amél. 2:8) "This house will become a desolation, a waste (Jer 49:13)—and they (really) *are* desolate."

ⲉⲧⲃⲉⲟ̀ⲩ ⲁⲡⲟⲩⲁ̀ ⲙⲟⲩ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁϥⲣ̄ⲕⲁⲕⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲭⲉ–ϥⲙⲟⲟⲩⲧ ⲣⲱ̀ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲟⲩⲕⲁⲕⲉ ⲡⲉ (Chass. 69) "Why did one die and become darkened? Because he (really) *is* dead and dark."

... ⲭⲉ–ⲉⲩⲉⲙⲟⲩ ⲏ ⲣⲱ ⲁⲩⲙⲟⲩ (Amél. 1:132) "... that they may die—or they *have* (indeed) died."

ϥⲛⲁⲥⲓ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲏ ⲁϥⲥⲓ ⲣⲱ (Amél. 1:135:6) "For he will be sated, or *has* been sated."

ⲁⲡⲁⲓ ⲁⲥⲁⲓ ⲏ ϥⲛⲁⲁⲥⲁⲓ ⲣⲱ (Amél. 1:150) "He has been relieved, or *will* be relieved."

Compare the focussing effect of ⲣⲱ on pronouns/nouns and adverbials (note especially the additional marking by ⲣⲱ of Nominal Sentence and even Cleft Sentence rhemes/foci, to which the particle supplies the segmental prosodic and cotextual characterization):

ⲁⲩⲣⲡⲇⲓⲁⲃⲟⲗⲟⲥ ⲛⲃⲗⲗⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲟⲩⲃⲗⲗⲉ ⲣⲱ ⲡⲉ ⲛⲛⲁϩⲣⲛ–ⲛⲉⲧⲉ-ⲣⲉⲓ̄ⲥ̄ ⲱⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲙⲙⲁⲩ (Amél. 1:176–177) "They blinded Satan—and he (really) *is* blind, before them with whom Jesus is."

ⲙⲏ ⲁⲛⲙⲉⲩⲉⲧ–ⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲣⲱ (Amél. 1:283) "Did we kill *a man*?" ("Was it a man we killed?").

ⲱⲁⲣⲉⲧⲃⲛⲏ ⲣⲱ ⲣⲛⲟⲃⲉ (Amél. 1:283) "Does *an animal* sin?"

Note especially: ⲛⲧⲟϥ ⲣⲱ ⲡⲉⲧⲥⲩⲙⲃⲟⲩⲗⲉⲩⲉ ⲛⲁⲩ (Amél. 1:281) "It is *he* that counsels them"; (day 20 of the month Epēp), ⲉ̀ⲧⲉⲡⲁⲓⲉ̀-ϩⲟⲟⲩ ⲛ̀ⲟⲩⲱⲧ ⲣⲱ ⲟⲛ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲓⲁ́ⲅⲓⲁⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲛ̀ⲧⲉⲡⲧⲟⲡⲟⲥ ⲙ̀ⲡⲓⲁ́ⲅⲓⲟⲥ ⲑⲉⲟⲇⲁ́ⲣⲟⲥ (Eric O. Windstedt, *Coptic Texts on Saint Theodore the General* ... [London/Oxford 1910] 1) "that is the *very same day* of the consecration of the shrine of St. Theodore." Cf. also ⲫⲁⲓ ⲣⲱ ⲟⲛ ⲡⲉ

[45] J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles* (2d ed.; Oxford 1954) 114–140.

ⲉⲧⲁⲣⲫⲱⲡⲓ ... (Paul de Lagarde, *Catenae in Evangelia Aegyptiacae Quae Supersunt* [Göttingen 1886] 201).

ⲛⲉⲧⲧⲥⲃⲱ ⲛϩⲁϩ ⲛⲧⲛⲧ ⲛⲁⲛ ⲣⲱ ⲁⲛ ⲁⲛⲟⲛ (Amél. 2:38) "We that give instruction to many, while not giving instruction *to ourselves.*"

ⲉⲧⲃⲉⲡⲁⲓ ⲣⲱ ⲁⲓϫⲟⲟⲥ (Amél. 2:94) "*That* is why I said...." Cf. also ⲉⲧⲃⲉⲟⲩ ⲣⲱ ⲙⲡⲉⲡϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲛⲓⲉⲥⲥⲁⲓ ⲉⲓ (1 Sam 20:27): ⲣⲱ in this instance supplies the prosodemic-cotextual characterization to the adverb which is rhematic by virtue of pattern.

(**c**) The Cleft Sentence.[46] In Coptic, zero-determinated infinitives are but rarely contrastively focussed in the Cleft Sentence (nominal focus, relative verbal theme-topic); the infinitive is in this case always an *actor actant*: ⲱⲙⲥ ⲁⲉ ⲡⲉⲧϩⲟⲟⲩ (L 4:174) "... however, it is sinking that is bad"; ⲏ ϩⲓⲥⲉ ⲁⲛ ϩⲓ-ⲙⲟⲕϩⲥ ⲡⲉⲧⲥⲏϩ (Amél. 1:1) "... or is it not tribulation and suffering that is written ...?" Infinitives (zero-determinated) are of course found as rhemes of the copular Nominal Sentence (Ariel Shisha-Halevy, "Notes on Some Coptic Nominal Sentence Patterns," in: Friedrich Junge et al., eds., *Studien zu Sprache und Religion Ägyptens* [2 vols.; Göttingen 1984] 1:180 [c]). This is in fact the normal construction of predicating an infinitive of a nominal theme.

(**d**) The "tautological infinitive" construction. The TI focus is of a high grade of Communicative Dynamism; in other words, it is of very low context-boundness and may in fact be taken as a subtextual

[46] The Cleft Sentence focalization of the infinitive in Middle Egyptian, restricted to verbs of motion in narrative, is a delimitative paragraph-initial boundary signal (*ḫ pw ir.n.f* "# # then he set out ..."; literally, "It is going-in that he did") and not polemic-assertive (pace Junge, "Sentential Meaning" 199). For the typological interest in this double duality (textemic: narrative vs. dialogue; junctural: delimitative vs. linking assertion), a comparison with Celtic (e.g., Mabinogion Middle Welsh) is instructive (Pwyll = R. L. Thomson, *Pwyll Pendeuic Dyuet* [Dublin 1957]; Branwen = Derick S. Thomson, *Branwen Uerch Lyr* [Dublin 1961]). (**a**) NARRATIVE. (1) New episode-onset marking: # *Sef* ("it is") + (rel.)VERB (*a wnaeth*, "that he did") + INFINITIVE # : *Sef a wnaeth y gwraged, kyscu* (Pwyll 463) "Now the women slept ..." (literally, "This was what the women did: sleep"). (2) Context-bound resumptive-cohesive predication, thematic progression: # *Sef* ("it is") + INFINITIVE + (rel.)VERB (*a wnaeth*, "that he did") + INFINITIVE # : ... *y phenyt a gymerth. Sef penyt a dodet erni, bot yn y llys honno* ... (Pwyll 501–502) "She accepted the punishment; and the punishment put upon her was to be in this court...." (3) Paragraph demarcation/episode delimitation (by "information dips," i.e., low-Communicative-Dynamism seams, flanked by relative highlights): # INFINITIVE (rel.)VERB (*a oruc/wnaeth*, "that he did") # : *a dechreu ymdidan a wnaeth Matholwch a Bendigeituran* (Branwen 130) "And then M. conversed with B." (**b**) DIALOGUE. (4) Verb focalization: # INFINITIVE (rel.)VERB (*a wnaeth* "that he did") # : *dy-waradwydaw a-wnaethpwyt* (Branwen 80–81) "They did really insult you"; in dialogue-narrative seam (narrative resumption): *"Mi a af," heb ynteu, "y'r orssed y eisted." Eisted a wnaeth ar yr orssed* (Pwyll 200–202) "'I am going,' he said, 'to the hillock to sit down.' And in fact, sit down he did on the hillock."

delimitation signal. Although it is clearly part of a distinctive stylistic mannerism of a specific corpus (and as such used for rhetorical effect, e.g., by Shenoute for achieving a biblical-archaic note of gravity or elevation, of prophetic assertiveness or preceptive severity), the TI does have a marking role, one of information modulation, which may be perceived through semantic resolution of its main distributive components. One recalls Marchand's definition of the role of "emphasizing" *do* in English[47] as "die affektische Betonung der Wirklichkeit eines Geschehens," with its twin components of affect or heightened assertive value (often overlooked or underplayed as a constituent of focussing semantics) and metaphrastic claim of eventual or nexal reality. Both account for the essentially dialogic quality of this construction: (1) in prospective pronouncements: prophetic assurance, turning the imminent present-based "future" (ϥⲛⲁⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄) into a proclaimed future ("You *shall indeed* ..."); (2) in imperative pronouncement: vehemence, asseveration; (3) in conditional-temporal, eventual "protases," usually formalistic and formulaic in preceptive texts and partly devalued ("Should it indeed be the case, that ..."); (4) in narrative, as a partly devalued formulaic idiom, or in dialogic past assertions, fully valued, e.g., Acts 7:34, 23:14 ("It *did* happen, that ..."), ϩⲛ̄-ⲟⲩϩⲃⲁ ⲁⲧⲉⲧⲛⲁⲁⲧ ⲛϩⲃⲁ (L 3:188) "You *have* embarassed me indeed." Observe that, while the narrative TI seems to be in Biblical Hebrew a paragraph-initial boundary signal (consider Judg 9:8; the nominal-focus Cleft Sentence has this role in Egyptian-Coptic: *s pw wn*; ⲟⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲡⲉⲧⲉⲟⲩⲛ̄ⲧⲁϥ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ⲱⲏⲣⲉ ⲥⲛⲁⲩ; verb focussing for verbs of motion in Egyptian: *prt pw ir.n.f*), this is not the case with the Coptic TI. There are two facts which would seem to corroborate further the special affective value of TI focussing. The first is the compatibility of our construction with non-affective focussing (of modifiers: Second Tense/circumstantial): ϩⲛⲟⲩⲱⲡ ⲉⲓ-ⲛⲁⲱⲟⲡⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲟⲧⲕ̄ ϩⲁϩⲟⲙⲛ̄ⲧ (2 Sam 24:24); ϩⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲣⲁⲱⲉ ⲁϥⲣⲁⲱⲉ (John 3:29). And second, the different semantics (and relative rarity) of the TI for *negative* nexus, where contrast replaces affect:[48] ϩⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲙⲟⲩ

[47] Hans Marchand, "Syntaktische Homonymie: Das umschreibende *do*," in: Kastovsky, ed., *Studies* 61–63, 75–76 n. 25. Significant is the rarity of negative instances, applying also to the TI (the relatively few negative examples are characterized by a contrastive, not affective, focus). For the Hebrew "prototype," Solá-Solé (*Infinitif sémitique* 98–100) observes several "modalités subjectives": imperative, exhortative, necessitative, permissive, exclamative, admirative, etc.; without noting, however, the contribution of the finite verb construction to marking these modalities. (Cf. Goldenberg's type C ["Tautological Infinitive" pars. 32–34].)

[48] Cf. Hansjakob Seiler, "Negation, den Begriff des Praedikats betonend," *SL* 6 (1952) 79–91.

ⲁⲉ ⲛ̅ⲧⲛ̅ⲁⲙⲟⲟⲩⲧⲕ̅ ⲁⲛ (Judg 15:13); ϩⲛ̅ⲟⲩⲫⲱⲧⲉ ⲁⲉ ⲙ̅ⲡⲟⲩⲫⲟⲧⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ (Josh 17:13). Note also that the TI, rare in the present and not attested for a passive stative predicate, is replaced by other means of verb focussing for these circumstances.

Appendix I: Documentation (representative examples): The "tautological infinitive"

(a) Scriptural

Gen 3:16 *B* ϸⲉⲛⲟⲩⲁ̀ϣⲁⲓ ⲉⲓⲉ̀ⲑⲣⲉⲛⲉⲙ̀ⲕⲁϩ ⲛ̀ϩⲏⲧ ⲁ̀ϣⲁⲓ

Gen 20:18 *B* ϸⲉⲛⲟⲩϣⲑⲁⲙ ⲁ̀ⲫ† ϣⲑⲁⲙ / *S* ϩⲛ̅ⲟⲩϣⲧⲁⲙ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲁⲡϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ϣⲧⲁⲙ

Gen 37:8 *B* ⲙⲏ ϸⲉⲛⲟⲩⲙⲉⲧⲟⲩⲣⲟ ϫⲛⲁⲉⲣⲟⲩⲣⲟ ⲉ̀ϩⲣⲏⲓ ⲉ̀ϫⲱⲛ ⲓⲉ ϸⲉⲛⲟⲩⲙⲉⲧⲃ̅ⲥ̅ ϫⲛⲁⲉⲣⲃ̅ⲥ̅ ⲉ̀ⲣⲟⲛ

Gen 37:10 *B* ϩⲁⲣⲁ ϸⲉⲛⲟⲩⲓ̀ ⲧⲉⲛⲛⲁⲓ

Gen 40:15 *B* ϸⲉⲛⲟⲩⲃⲓⲟⲩⲓ̀ ⲁⲩⲟⲗⲧ ⲛ̀ⲃⲓⲟⲩⲓ̀

Gen 43:3 *B* ϸⲉⲛⲟⲩⲙⲉⲧⲙⲉⲑⲣⲉ ⲁⲫⲉⲣⲙⲉⲑⲣⲉ ⲛⲁⲛ

Gen 43:7 *S* ϩⲛ̅ⲟⲩϣⲓ̈ⲛⲉ ⲁⲫϫⲛⲟⲩⲛ

Exod 3:16 *S* ϩⲛ̅ⲟⲩⲃ̅ⲙ̅ⲡϣⲓⲛⲉ ⲁⲓ̈ⲃ̅ⲛ̅–ⲡⲉⲧⲛ̅ϣⲓⲛⲉ

Exod 13:19 *B* ϸⲉⲛⲟⲩⲁ̀ⲛⲁϣ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲁⲓⲱⲥⲛϥ ⲧⲁⲣⲕⲉ–ⲛⲉⲛϣⲏⲣⲓ ⲙ̀ⲡⲓⲥ̅ⲗ̅

Exod 15:1 *S* ϩⲛ̅ⲟⲩⲉⲟⲟⲩ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲁⲫϫⲓⲉⲟⲟⲩ

Exod 21:22 *B* ϸⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟ́ⲥⲓ ⲉⲫⲉ̀†ⲟ́ⲥⲓ

Exod 22:17 *B* ⲉ̀ϣⲱⲡ ⲁⲉ ϸⲉⲛⲟⲩⲙⲉⲧⲁⲧⲑⲱⲧ ⲛ̀ϩⲏⲧ ⲛ̀ⲧⲉⲫϣⲧⲉⲙⲑⲱⲧ ⲛ̀ϩⲏⲧ

Exod 22:19 *S* ϩⲛ̅ⲟⲩⲙⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛ̅ⲛⲁⲙⲟⲟⲩⲧⲟⲩ

Lev 5:21 *B* ϸⲉⲛⲟⲩϫⲱ ⲛ̀ⲧⲉⲫϫⲱ ⲛ̀ⲥⲱϥ ⲛ̀–

Lev 13:27 *B* ⲉ̀ϣⲱⲡ ⲁⲉ ϸⲉⲛⲟⲩϫⲱⲣ ⲛ̀ⲧⲉⲫϫⲱⲣ ⲉ̀ⲃⲟⲗ

Lev 13:35 *B* ⲉ̀ϣⲱⲡ ⲁⲉ ϸⲉⲛⲟⲩϫⲱⲣ ⲉ̀ⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̀ⲧⲉⲫϫⲱⲣ ⲉ̀ⲃⲟⲗ

Lev 20:9 *B* ϸⲉⲛⲟⲩⲙⲟⲩ ⲙⲁⲣⲟⲩϸⲟⲃⲃⲟⲩ / *S* ϩⲛ̅ⲟⲩⲙⲟⲩ ⲙⲁⲣⲉⲫⲙⲟⲩ

Num 13:30 *B* ϸⲉⲛⲟⲩϣⲉ ⲧⲉⲛⲛⲁϣⲉⲛⲁⲛ

Num 14:18 *B* ϸⲉⲛⲟⲩⲧⲟⲩⲃⲟ ⲫⲧⲟⲩⲃⲟ ⲁⲛ ⲙ̀ⲡⲓⲣⲉⲫⲉⲣⲛⲟⲃⲓ

Num 30:15 *B* ϸⲉⲛⲟⲩϫⲁⲣⲱⲫ ⲛ̀ⲧⲉⲫϫⲁⲣⲱⲫ ⲉ̀ⲣⲟⲥ

Deut 2:31 *B* ϸⲉⲛⲟⲩⲕⲗⲏⲣⲟⲥ ⲉ̀ⲉⲣⲕⲗⲏⲣⲟⲛⲟⲙⲓⲛ ⲙ̀ⲡⲉⲫⲕⲁϩⲓ

Deut 4:26 *S* ϩⲛ̅ⲟⲩⲧⲁⲕⲟ ⲧⲉⲧⲛⲁⲧⲁⲕⲟ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲓϫⲙ̅–

Deut 7:18 *B* ϸⲉⲛⲟⲩⲙⲉⲩⲓ̀ ⲉⲕⲉ̀ⲉⲣⲫⲙⲉⲩⲓ̀

Deut 7:26 *B* ϸⲉⲛⲟⲩⲃⲟ† ⲉⲕⲉ̀ⲃⲓⲧⲟⲩ ⲙ̀ⲃⲟ†

Deut 15:10 *S* ϩⲛ̅ⲟⲩ† ⲉⲙⲏⲥⲉ ⲉⲕⲉ† ⲛⲁϥ ⲉⲙⲏⲥⲉ

Deut 17:15 *S* ϩⲛ̅ⲟⲩⲕⲱ ⲉⲕⲉⲕⲱ ϩⲓϫⲱⲕ ⲛ̅ⲟⲩⲁⲣⲭⲱⲛ

Deut 22:1 *B* ϸⲉⲛⲟⲩⲧⲁⲥⲑⲟ ⲉⲕⲉ̀ⲧⲁⲥⲑⲱⲟⲩ

Josh 17:13 *S* ϩⲛⲟⲩⲫⲱⲧⲉ ⲁⲉ ⲙⲡⲟⲩⲫⲟⲧⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ

1 Sam 12:25 *S* ϩⲛ̅ⲟⲩⲕⲁⲕⲓⲁ ⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛ̅ϣⲁⲛⲉⲣⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲛⲧⲱⲧⲛ̅

1 Sam 20:6 *S* ϩⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲁⲫⲁⲓⲟⲩ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲓ
1 Sam 25:28 *S* ϩⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲡϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲛⲁⲥⲙⲓⲛⲉ ⲛⲟⲩϩⲓ
1 Sam 28:1 *S* ϩⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲉⲓⲙⲉ ⲉⲓⲙⲉ
2 Sam 1:6 *S* ϩⲛⲟⲩϩⲉ ⲁⲩϩⲉ ϩⲙ̄ⲡⲧⲟⲟⲩ
2 Sam 12:14 *S* ϩⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲃⲱⲛⲧ ⲁⲕ†ⲛⲟⲩⲃⲥ
2 Sam 18:2 *S* ϩⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲉⲓ ⲁⲛⲟⲕ †ⲛⲏⲩ
2 Sam 18:25 *S* ϩⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲡⲱⲧ ⲇⲉ ⲛⲉϥⲡⲏⲧ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ
2 Sam 24:24 *S* ϩⲛⲟⲩϣⲱⲡ ⲉⲓⲛⲁϣⲟⲡⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲟⲧⲕ̄ ϩⲁϩⲟⲙⲛ̄ⲧ
Judg 11:25 *S* ϩⲛⲟⲩⲡⲟⲗⲉⲙⲟⲥ ⲁϥⲡⲟⲗⲉⲙⲓ
Jer 14:19 *S* ⲙⲏ̄ ϩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲧⲟ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲁⲕⲧⲥⲧⲟ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̈ⲓⲟⲩⲇⲁ
Jer 47:14 *S* ϩⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲉⲓⲙⲉ ⲕⲉⲓⲙⲉ
Lam 5:22 *S* ϩⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲕⲱ ⲛ̄ⲥⲱⲕ ⲁⲕⲕⲁⲁⲛ ⲛ̄ⲥⲱⲕ
Zech 11:17 *A* ϩⲛⲟⲩⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲃ̄ⲗ̄ⲉ ϥⲛⲁⲣ̄ⲃⲗ̄ⲉ
Ezek 28:9 *S* ϩⲛ̄ⲟⲩϫⲟⲟⲥ ⲕ̄ⲛⲁϣϫⲟⲟⲥ
Ps 39:2 *S* ϩⲛ̄ⲟⲩϩⲩⲡⲟⲙⲟⲛⲏ ⲁ̈ϩⲩⲡⲟⲙⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲉⲡϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ
Ps 117:18 *S* ϩⲛ̄ⲟⲩ†ⲥⲃⲱ ⲁⲡϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ †ⲥⲃⲱ ⲛⲁ̈ⲓ
Luke 22:15 *S* ϩⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲉⲡⲓⲑⲩⲙⲓⲁ ⲁ̈ⲉⲡⲓⲑⲩⲙⲉⲓ
John 3:29 *S* ϩⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲣⲁϣⲉ ⲉϥⲣⲁϣⲉ/ϥⲣⲁϣⲉ
Jas 5:17 *S* ϩⲛ̄ⲟⲩϣⲗⲏⲗ ⲁϥϣⲗⲏⲗ
Acts 2:30 *S* ϩⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲁⲛⲁϣ ⲁⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲱⲣⲕ̄ ⲛⲁϥ

(**b**) Non-scriptural (Shenoute; all *S*)
P copte 130²42 (V) ⲙⲏ ϩⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲣⲁϣⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲣⲁϣⲉ ⲁⲛ
Amél. 2:380 ϩⲛⲟⲩⲉⲓ ⲕⲛⲏⲩ
P copte 130⁴110 (V) ϩⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲭⲡⲓⲟ̄ ⲙⲁⲣⲛ̄ⲭⲡⲓⲟ̄ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲣⲏⲩ
L 3:183:11 ϩⲛⲟⲩⲧⲁⲕⲟ ⲧⲛⲛⲁⲧⲁⲕⲟ (Deut 4:26, 12:2; etc.)
L 3:188:6 ϩⲛⲟⲩϩⲃⲁ ⲁⲧⲉⲧⲛⲁⲁⲧ ⲛϩⲃⲁ ϩⲁⲧⲏⲛ
L 4:121:4–5 ⲉϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲇⲉ ϩⲛⲟⲩ†ⲧⲱⲛ ⲉϥϣⲁⲛ†ⲧⲱⲛ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲛ

Appendix II: Some related constructions: Paronomastic noun-verb combinations not especially discussed

(**a**) ADJUNCTAL Verbal Adverb
Exod 32:10 *B* ⲉⲓⲉⲙⲃⲟⲛ ϸⲉⲛⲟⲩϫⲱⲛⲧ / *S* ⲃⲱⲛ̄ⲧ ... ϩⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲟⲣⲅⲏ (Exod 22:24 *S* †ⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩⲃ̄ⲥ̄ ϩⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲃⲱⲛ̄ⲧ)
Num 30:13 *B* ⲉ̀ϣⲱⲡ ⲇⲉ ⲁϥϣⲁⲛⲫⲱⲛϩ ϸⲉⲛⲟⲩⲫⲱⲛϩ
Gen 3:4 *B* ⲛⲁⲣⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲁⲙⲟⲩ ⲁⲛ ϸⲉⲛⲟⲩⲙⲟⲩ
Num 5:12 *B* ⲛ̀ⲧⲉⲥϩⲓⲡϩⲟ ⲙ̀ⲙⲟϥ ϸⲉⲛⲟⲩϩⲓⲡϩⲟ
Num 11:10 *B* ⲁϥⲭⲱⲛⲧ ϸⲉⲛⲟⲩⲙ̀ⲃⲟⲛ
Num 11:15 *B* ϸⲟⲃⲃⲉⲧ ϸⲉⲛⲟⲩⲙⲟⲩ / *S* ⲙⲟⲩⲟⲩⲧ ⲙⲙⲟⲓ ϩⲛⲟⲩϩⲱⲧⲫ̄
Deut 31:29 *B* ⲧⲉⲧⲉⲛⲛⲁⲉⲣⲁⲛⲟⲙⲓⲛ ϸⲉⲛⲟⲩⲁⲛⲟⲙⲓⲁ
Bar 4:12 *S* ⲙ̄ⲡⲣ̄ⲧⲣⲉⲗⲗⲁⲩ ... ⲣⲁϣⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲓ ϩⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲣⲁϣⲉ

Amél. 1:211 *S* ϣιπε ϩnoγϣιπε
Also Gen 2:17 *B* (inverse order in Greek). Consider also:
Lev 19:9 *S* ωϩc̄ m̄πωϩc̄ ("cognate object")
Exod 31:14 *B* eqėmoγ ṁφmoγ / *S* ϩn̄oγmoγ eγemoγoγt m̄moq
Lev 19:20 *S* mπoγ†cωte mmoc ϩnϩencωte (λύτροις οὐ λελύτρωται); cf. Num. 23:25 *B* ϸenϩancaϩoγi ṁπepcϩoγopq oγae ϸenϩancmoγ ṁπepcmoγ ėroq / *S* ϩn̄oγ- m̄m̄p̄- oγae ek- m̄m̄p̄-; Num 24:10 *B* ϸenoγcmoγ akcmoγ ėroq
Deut 13:10 *SB*, 21:21 *B*; Num 15:35 *B*

(**b**) PRESENT CIRCUMSTANTIAL (presetting premodifier) + main clause
Heb 6:14 *S* eïcmoγ †nacmoγ epok aγω eeitaϣo †nataϣok (cf. Gen 22:17; Gk preceding participle; *B* ϸenoγcmoγ †nacmoγ epok)
Joel 1:7 *A* eqϩatϩt̄ aqϩtϩωtc̄
Nah 2:3 *A* eγxoγoγpe aγxaaroγ
Ps 125:6 *S* eγnhγ ae cenhγ

(**c**) DEGREE MODALITY ADJUNCT: paronomastic infinitive or noun modified; clause "enhanced-degree" modification ("greatly," "very much")
Gen 48:16 *B* eγėàϣai eγniϣ† ṅàϣai
2 Sam 13:15 *S* aamnωn mectωc ϩn̄oγnoϭ m̄moste
Dan 11:3 *B* eqėerϭc̄ ėxenoγmetϭc̄ ėnaϣωc
Jonah 4:6 *S* aqraϣe ... ϩn̄oγnoϭ n̄raϣe
Berl. Gnost. 46:14–15 *S* acpime ϩnoγpime enaϣωq
Wess. 1:90 *S* ... eγp̄nobe ϩn̄oγnobe eqkhb
Amél. 1:204 *S* ... aγω ncmoγ ϩnoγmoγ nϣaenϩ
Wess. 1:156 *S* ... xekac ... eqecmoγ erωtn̄ ϩn̄cmoγ nim
(cf. Amél. 2:49 *S* ... xekac ϩωωn ϩnϩarϩ nim ennaϩarϩ epen-ϩht)

(**d**) ANTECEDENT-RELATIVE paronomastic noun-verb juxtaposition
Deut 28:57 *B* pekϩoxϩex ėtenekxaxi naϩexϩωxk ṁmoq
Deut 28:67 *B* tϩo† ... ϑh ėtekmaerϩo† ṁmoc
Rom 6:10 *S* pmoγ gar n̄taqmoγ m̄moq ... pωnϩ̄ ae etq̄onϩ̄ m̄moq (ὃ γὰρ ἀπέθανεν ... ὃ δὲ ζῇ)
Note the obligatory (n̄-/m̄mo-) resumption, proving the adverbial relation of the infinitive with the conjugated verb.

(e) TOPICALIZING paronomasy
Lev 7:24 *B* ⲉⲟⲩⲱⲙ ⲁⲉ ⲛ̀ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲟ̀ⲙⲟⲩ
Num 8:26 *B* ϩⲱⲃ ⲁⲉ ⲛ̀ⲛⲉϥⲉⲣϩⲱⲃ

SOURCES

(a) Non-scriptural

Amél. = Amélineau, É. *Œuvres de Schenoudi: Texte copte et traduction française.* 2 vols. Paris 1907–1914.

Berl. Gnost. = Till, Walter C. *Die gnostischen Schriften des koptischen Papyrus Berolinensis 8502.* 2d ed., by Hans-Martin Schenke. TU 60.2. Berlin 1972. Cited by codex page number.

Chass. = Chassinat, Émile. *Le quatrième livre des entretiens et épîtres de Shenouti.* MIFAO 23. Cairo 1911.

CT = de Buck, Adriaan, and Gardiner, Alan H. *The Egyptian Coffin Texts.* 6 vols. OIP 34, 49, 64, 67, 73, 81. Chicago 1935–1956.

Edel = Edel, Elmar. *Altägyptische Grammatik.* AnOr 34, 39. Rome 1955–1964.

L = Leipoldt, Johannes. *Sinuthii Archimandritae Vita et Opera Omnia.* 3 vols. (numbered 1, 3, and 4). CSCO 41, 42, 73 (Copt. 1 [= II.2.T], 2 [= II.4.T], 5 [= II.5.T]). Paris 1906–1913.

Leid. = Pleyte, W., and Boeser, P. A. A. *Manuscrits coptes du musée d'Antiquités des Pays-Bas à Leide.* Leiden 1897.

Orl. = Orlandi, Tito. *Shenute contra Origenistas: Testo con introduzione e traduzione.* Rome 1985.

P copte = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, fonds copte, unpublished MSS.

Pyr. = Sethe, Kurt. *Die altaegyptischen Pyramidentexte.* 4 vols. Leipzig 1908–1922.

Wess. = Wessely, Carl. *Griechische und koptische Texte theologischen Inhalts.* 5 vols. Stud.Pal. 9, 11, 12, 15, 18. Leipzig 1909–1917.

(b) Scriptural (OT references follow the LXX numbering of Rahlfs)

Old Testament (Bohairic)

Bardelli, Joseph. *Daniel Copto-Memphitice.* Pisa 1849.

Burmester, Oswald Hugh Ewart, and Dévaud, Eugène. *Psalterii Versio Memphitica e Recognitione Pauli de Lagarde: Réédition avec le texte copte en caractères coptes.* Louvain 1925.

de Lagarde, Paul. *Der Pentateuch koptisch.* Leipzig 1867. Collated with the unpublished MSS P copte 1 and Vatican copto 1.

Tattam, Henry. *Duodecim Prophetarum Minorum Libros in Lingua Aegyptiaca Vulgo Coptica seu Memphitica ex Manuscripto Parisiensi Descriptos et cum Manuscripto Johannis Lee, J. C. D. Collatos.* Oxford 1836.

Old Testament (Sahidic)

Budge, E. A. Wallis. *The Earliest Known Coptic Psalter: The Text, in the Dialect of Upper Egypt, Edited from the Unique Papyrus Codex Oriental 5000 in the British Museum.* London 1898.

———. *Coptic Biblical Texts in the Dialect of Upper Egypt.* London 1912.

Ciasca, Agostino. *Sacrorum Bibliorum Fragmenta Copto-Sahidica Musei Borgiani.* 2 vols. Rome 1885–1889.

Drescher, James. *The Coptic (Sahidic) Version of Kingdoms I, II (Samuel I, II).* CSCO 313 (Copt. 35). Louvain 1970.

Kasser, Rodolphe. *Papyrus Bodmer XVI: Exode I–XV, 21 en sahidique.* Cologny-Geneva 1961.

———. *Papyrus Bodmer XVIII: Deutéronome I–X, 7 en sahidique.* Cologny-Geneva 1962.

———. *Papyrus Bodmer XXII et Mississippi Coptic Codex II: Jérémie XL, 3–LII, 34, Lamentations, Epître de Jérémie, Baruch I, 1–V, 5 en sahidique.* Cologny-Geneva 1964.

Maspero, G. *Fragments de la version thébaine de l'Ancien Testament.* MMAF 6. Paris 1892.

Thompson, Herbert. *A Coptic Palimpsest Containing Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Judith and Esther in the Sahidic Dialect.* London etc. 1911.

Wess. 4.

Old Testament (Akhmimic)

Till, Walter C. *Die achmîmische Version der zwölf kleinen Propheten (Codex Rainerianus, Wien).* Coptica 4. Copenhagen 1927.

New Testament (Bohairic)

Horner, George. *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Northern Dialect Otherwise Called Memphitic and Bohairic.* 4 vols. Oxford 1898–1905.

New Testament (Sahidic)

Horner, George. *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Southern Dialect Otherwise Called Sahidic and Thebaic.* 7 vols. Oxford 1911–1924.

Quecke, Hans. *Das Markusevangelium saïdisch: Text der Handschrift PPalau Rib. Inv.-Nr. 182 mit den Varianten der Handschrift M 569.* PapyCast 4. Barcelona 1972.

———. *Das Lukasevangelium saïdisch: Text der Handschrift PPalau Rib. Inv.-Nr. 181 mit den Varianten der Handschrift M 569.* PapyCast 6. Barcelona 1977.

———. *Das Johannesevangelium saïdisch: Text der Handschrift PPalau Rib. Inv.-Nr. 183 mit den Varianten der Handschriften 813 und 814 der Chester Beatty Library und der Handschrift M 569.* PapyCast 11. Rome/Barcelona 1984.

Thompson, Herbert. *The Coptic Version of the Acts of the Apostles and the Pauline Epistles in the Sahidic Dialect.* Cambridge 1932.

Department of Linguistics
Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Jerusalem
Israel

ARIEL SHISHA-HALEVY