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1. This paper ponders analytically the Circumstantial and Relative Conversions in Coptic (CC,¹ RC), seen especially as satellital, in the [nucleus — satellite (expansion)] dependences. I wish to present here some progressions of thought about central topics and vexed questions concerning the CC, which is arguably among the “most Egyptian” of Coptic grammatical features, familiar as they may be, as a basis for a typological profile.² The issues considered are presented in sequences which, I believe, are pertinent, with connections that appear to me instructive. The examples given are usually minimal and representative only. The hidden agenda of this paper aims, inter alia, at demonstrating the descriptive effectiveness of structural syntactic analysis.

I submit that we do not yet properly understand the CC, and contest the conventional way of approaching it. The CC differs interestingly from the other conversion. Not only is it the earliest of converters in Egyptian diachrony — it is the earliest “completely formed” converter. Its structural tension with the RC is an informing feature of Coptic syntax. (The RC is but half-way to converterhood, ṉe- is arguably not a converter at all, deposed by Polotsky in the 1987 Grundlagen from converterhood, and the Focalizing Conversion is of restricted distribution, morphologically overlapping the RC and the CC and (in Bohairic at least), giving sometimes (in the Preterite) impression of a base-conjugation form.

¹ Also for “‘Circumstantial’ Converb”: see below.
² One awaits a Coptic equivalent of Hugo Schuchardt’s masterly Das Baskische und die Sprachwissenschaft; the present paper may provide a part-sketch for such endeavor.
2. H. J. Polotsky’s late account of the CC in the *Grundlagen* (1990:225-260, VII: “Grundzügen der adverbialen Transposition”) is based on an *a priori* triple Parts-of-Speech model, with “transposition” approximating conversion/converter, while “adverbial” is clearly open to objection, as a problematic and even dubious entity or category — if a category — and at least begging the question. What Coptic linguistics knows as “converters” come on the grammatical stage (Polotsky 1960a) in a rather laconic manner and morphosyntactic, not in a syntactic (certainly not a macrosyntactic) scope. The converter was never defined or theoretically established; the conception of “adverb” is synthetic and again aprioristic, a parts-of-speech non-analytic abstraction — in fact a conglomerate of dozens of word-classes presented as a unitary category — indeed a part of speech. (Indeed, this seems a classic case where a term, self-explanatory as it were, leads our conception “by the nose”, and conditions our comprehension).

The functional statement made for the CC by Bentley Layton in his grammar (Layton 2011 §§ 403-409, 411, 421, 430 etc.) distinguishes “adverbial clause” from “attributive clause”. I believe this dichotomic, more or less common opinion is simplistic, when compared with the actual rich functioning of the form. This is again based on Polotsky (1990 VII); but this dichotomy goes further back, to Stern’s grammar (§ 400ff.). In fact, we have a spectrum of functions, with rhematicity always present to some degree, and “circumstance” usually doubtful.

(Note that pre-Coptic Egyptian converbal syntax is relevant to Coptic, where we find it enriched and more complex).

3. To anticipate. Three basic errors are, I believe, observable here, two terminological-conceptual, one descriptive. The prime or original error lies, I think, in positing an alternation RC/CC. regulated by nucleus specificity (consider, for instance, Layton 2011 §§ 403, 430: “circumstantial and relative alternate and vary according to syntactical environment” — the sense of “vary” here is not clear). Similarly Polotsky 1990: 248. Another, terminological weakness is the application of “attributive” to the CC (Polotsky 1990: 241ff.), presumably in the sense of our “adnominal” (which, however, if purely formal-syntactic), yet obliterating the essential opposition between attributive and predicative (our “rhematic” function). Another terminological-conceptual slip pertains to the alleged adverbiality of the CC: first (a query obtaining for the converb as such — cf. Haspelmath and König (eds.) 1995, Shisha-Halevy 2009): what does “adverb”, the most problematic, obscure, even dubious Part of Speech, actually mean
in this context? (The distinction of “canonical” and “non-canonical” is here surely but a tell-tale sign of descriptive embarrassment). The CC, like other converbs, hardly matches the syntactic-behavioural picture of the conventional adverb. What are we to understand by “the CC is adverbial”, as a piece of syntactical information? (Incidentally, what is a Coptic verb, and how is the CC of relevance to the Coptic verb?).

4. Forty-odd years ago, when I submitted my doctoral dissertation on Shenoute’s Circumstantial, Polotsky’s then recent conversion model (introduced for the first and practically last time\(^3\) in the Coptic Conjugation System of 1960) was taken unquestioningly, as an unproblematic, simple and simplifying, model, informing the Coptic verbal system, alongside, and hierarchically above, the Conjugation Forms. (Conversion of the Nominal Sentence has never been especially addressed, although in fact, conversion applies beyond verb clauses, to nexal constructions in general, and even further, to pro-forms like \(\text{ⲉⲙⲙⲟⲛ}\) and even \(\text{ⲉⲙⲟⲅⲓⲥ}\). However, as said, the Coptic converters were not used subsequently in Coptic studies, have never been defined or properly described by Polotsky or by others, and require fresh theoretical consideration, historical as well as synchronic, not least as the consequence of their assignment or reduction to three Parts of Speech — noun, adjective, adverb — in Polotsky’s Grundlagen of 1987 and 1990.\(^4\)

Now the old or “classic” converter system is structurally questionable, or at least does not constitute a single category, since these prefixed elements rarely if at all commute, their environmental distribution being drastically disparate. Indeed, the converters are often mutually compatible, which structurally means allo-categorial value. In fact, the four converters are representants, signals of the main syntactical statuses: adnexality, (Circumstantial), Comment Mode in narrative (so-called Preterite Conversion),\(^5\) adnominal or rather seemingly adnominal status (Relative Conversion) and, finally, Focalizing Conversion, signaling a specific information structure, marking various verb-clause constituents, including nexus itself, as

---

\(^3\) See below for the “transposition exponent” of 1987-1990. Polotsky’s “conversion” was adapted and applied in Jerusalem School linguistic description, but not by Polotsky himself after 1960.

\(^4\) The original use of “conversion” in Prague School terminology and in word-formation linguistics is indeed associated with Parts of Speech models, not with word-class or paradigmatics, but in the Coptic Conjugation System Polotsky (1960a) transcends this restrictive association, to return to it in the Grundlagen (1990).

\(^5\) Shisha-Halevy 2007a, Chapter One.
focal or topical. The converters’ connection with the Parts of Speech is questionable: the RC is not adjectival in any conception of the (hardly straightforward) Indo-European/Semitic ethnocentric adjective — and, in Coptic, “adjective” is all the more incongruous; synchronically, the FC is not substantival; the present observation will attempt to show cumulatively that the CC is not simply adverbial.

All this means that this group of elements is not uni-categorial, a dispersion significant only in the framework of structural analysis; still, the heterogeneity of these elements and functions — roughly subdivisible into macrosyntactic discourse markers and syntactic phrasal ones — is instructive, diachronically, dialectally and synchronically.

5. Dependences (the stuff languages are made of) are few in Coptic. Three major overhead patterns are observable:

(a) nexal: no nucleus, but two interdependent informational constituents, namely theme (“what the clause is about”) and rheme (“what is being predicated of the theme”); a nexus (short for “predicative nexus”) may itself be nuclear or satellital;

(b) phrasal (nucleus + expansion or satellite);

Remarkably, (a) and (b) are compatible and may be syntagmatically combined:

{[ⲁ- ⲏⲥⲱⲧⲙ]}  
nexus + satellital infinitive

which, however, is not precise enough, for it will lead to the paradoxical conclusion that this syntagm is phrasal. The correct scheme must take into account Immediate Constituents hierarchy:

{[ⲁ- ⲏⲥⲱⲧⲙ] + -ⲡ-}  
phrase

The infinitive is here governed (as “object”) by the nuclear Conjugation Base (here ⲁ-), and both together are rhematic to the theme-actor (here -ⲡ-). The Rheme-to-Theme sequence is somehow satisfying, for it accords with the Delocutive Nominal Sentence and the so-called Adjective Verbs.

A paradigmatic combination of (a) and (b) is the focus of the present exposition, viz. adnominal-satellital merged with rhematic — phrasal merged with nexal — conveniently “adnexal”: see below, § 8.
(c) – (d) are difficult dependence patterns, respectively resembling (a) and (b) yet very different from them:

(c₁) pre-nexal: existential/non-existential $\text{ἀὖ-/μὲ-}$ + (non-specific, usually unquantified) noun-phrase

(c₂) pre-nexal: presentative $\text{ἐἰκ} (\text{ἐἴῃ⧦ε, etc.})$

(d) phrasal: prepositional phrase: preposition + noun phrase/personal pronoun (the pseudo-nuclear preposition is governed by the (pro)noun).

6. **Nucleus to Satellite** is the invariable phrasal-pattern sequence (“constituent order”) in Coptic. The nucleus, definable as *that constituent that is grammatically representative of the whole phrasal syntagm*, is primarily grammemic, or rather more grammemic than its less grammemic, or more lexemic satellite. As said, a nexus can be nuclear or satellital; I repeat this, since it may be thought counter-intuitive; and it is after all the satellital nexus that is the adnexital element which concerns us here. The implications of this are primarily junctural: higher-linkage, closer-juncture boundary between nucleus and satellite than between theme and rheme; and constituent-paradigm size, inversely proportional to grammemicality grading, inversely proportional to linkage grading.⁶ Nuclearity⁷ is most typically substantival, but also lexemic or nexal. The [nucleus+satellite] phrasal unit usually precedes the junctural boundary; inside the phrase, the nucleus is more grammemic, unless it contains a lexeme.

7. The **Adverb** is a brutally synthesized categorial cluster, an heterogeneous grouping of virtually dozens of paradigms — word-classes — the individual “fragments” probably better seen as “adverbials”, since “adverb” is almost worn out. It is worth pointing out again that the adverb has no special relationship to the verb (“adnominal adverb” is not an oxymoron). Accordingly, we observe types and degrees of the dependence of adverbials on their environmental patterns — all non-hierarchical (“canonical” is uncalled-for in this connection, and rather begs the question).

8. **In adnexal status** stands a satellital rheme adjoining a nuclear substantive (noun phrase), pronoun (including determinators), lexeme, verb clause or a Nominal Sentence, or any nexus, or a textual stretch. The adnex

---

⁷ See Shisha-Halevy 2007a, Index s.v. “nuclearity”.
contracts a new nexus with the said nuclear element(s). In English or French, the rheme is usually nominal (mostly adjectival), and typically participial. Alternatively, the rheme is arguably “the rhematic word-class”,8 part-of-speech-neutral, with “adverbial” perhaps semantically prominent (possibly in an ethnocentric associative reflex). Note:

“Do not go gentle into that good night” (Dylan Thomas)
“They’ll roost nice and tender” (placement here essential?)
“It struck him speechless”
“Give it to him good”
“Hold tight”
“Weep me not dead” (John Donne; see Empson 1947: 163f. “I, who am not dead”).
“Both the Earnshaws smelt sour”
“She had kept his office clean and tidy”
“Prometheus Unbound”
“H.J. Polotsky Structuralist”
“A Nation Divided”.

Compare French “travailler dur”, “parler haut”, “sentir bon” “dire vrai”.

In Coptic, it is the CC, a finite converb, that is the particular form for adnexal expansion. This (typically in the Present, predicating the Stative) often corresponds to the adjectives and participles of modern European languages).

(Man.Ps. 88) ⲡⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲫⲱⲣⲕⲟⲥ ⲫⲓⲃⲓⲧⲱⲣⲟⲥ — an instructive example:

ⲫⲓⲃⲓⲧⲱⲣⲟⲥ is both adnominal to “the world”, and topical to the Preterite: “The world (it being) evil, I have hated”.

The adnexal form blends formal syntax (“adnominal”) with information structure, combining patterns (a) and (b), phrasal and nexal patterns. We see in English that the syntactically marked adnexal stands in opposition, in the adverbal paradigm, with the morphologically marked, functionally unmarked, non-predicative adjunct (*“Do not go gently…”

I find that the difficulty of comprehending the adnexal in languages without a specific adnexal form is revealed by such quantificative-hierarchical and downright wrong terms like “halbprädikativ” or “secondary predicate”, constantly associating the adnexal with “basic” predicates.

9. The present collection of “vignettes”, ruminative, almost anecdotal, often repetitive, by no means exhausts the formal or functional gamut of the Circumstantial. One prominent subsystem unheeded here is that of “verbs of incomplete predication” — the syntax of ὠ̓, ὠ̓, ὠ̓.

and many more. Another is the “topical” CC, preceding its “main” (in the sense of “unconverted”) clause, and of interest also for historical reasons and the possible interference of Greek: this is a distinctly un-Egyptian feature and of historical interest for this very reason. Yet another is the macrosyntax of the CC, and CC semantics in microscopy (to an extent discussed in Polotsky 1990): distinct profiles for different forms converted, notably the Circumstantial Aorist (ⲉⲥⲣⲓⲚ-), the Circumstantial Preterite (ⲉⲧⲱⲕⲩⲩ-), the Circumstantial Future (ⲉⲧⲱⲕⲩⲩ-), converted Nominal Sentence (with “whereas” a typical but not exclusive reading):

Jos. 22:22 χε-πνοὺτε Ντος ον πε πνούτε Εντος πε πνοεῖκ πνούτε

Prov. 27:2 A, S (Z 24) ἑπεκεοῦχε ταῖακ εὐκταπρο ἐν ἔτε/κεταπρο...ἐντωκ αν τε

Sap. Salom. 8:10 ὅλοι-εοοὐ ...ἀλῳ ταὶο ἔντωνταλῳ εἰς- ὀυῳρῷ ὧν ἔν

Gal. 6: 3 εὐξε-ογνοῦα γὰρ ἄρῳ ἰνοε κε-ἀνοκ πε εὐλαγ πε

10. Adnexality is highly operative in Coptic. While the nota relationis - is striking, introducing a lexemic rhematic term, it is the adnexal nexus — or adnexal clause, signaled by the CC — the Circumstantial Converb that is of central interest in the present study. A special point of interest here is the seam or boundary between the thematic and the rhematic constituents of this hyper-nexus; the theme may be a considerable textual block. We are by no means dealing with a “secondary predication” (e.g. Himmelmann and Schultzze-Berndt 2005, and earlier S. R. Driver, see Polotsky 1990: 226). The hierarchical term is misleading, for often enough the CC carries the main predication (and it is this very tension between rhemes that makes the CC so effective rhetorically).

11. I suggest we distinguish five basic roles for the CC, the interrelations of which being the intriguing aspect and partly the riddle of the CC:

(a) Adnexal, rhematic;
(b) Topical, thematic;
(c) Conjunctional (formal);
(d1) Non-combinatory endocentric (“endonuclear”) roles: ἐκριμ “(one [fem.]) crying”; ἐκκρῶτε “it turning around”; “round about”;
(d2) Conversion-base, determination-base roles.
12. The term (Umstandsatz, Zustandssatz: Polotsky 1990: 225) is, I believe, all wrong, as it implies a role in the “conjunctional world” of Indo-European and Semitic syntax. The CC does not express any particular circumstance, in any sense of the word; it is no more circumstantial than, say, the Greek participle (below). But even “vagueness or ambiguity in adjuncture” as the prime role of the CC would still be inaccurate. We witness in the CC a striking case of clause — i.e. nexus — in rheumatic status, no more, no less, and the specific semantics of adjuncture, so to speak “pure” predicative adjuncture: this is the essential converb of Coptic.

13. There is cogency and clear advantage in considering the CC a finite converb, that is, in an approximative and “average” broad definition, an adverbial-word-class finite verb-form; in a narrower definition, a copredicative form.9 This is far beyond a question of mere terminology. It makes us face the conceptual, typological-contrastive and terminological issues of the converb in relation to the Indo-European participle. The “partaking” in the abstract Greek concept of μετοχή — Latin participium — refers, not to any morphological part-of-speech merging feature, but to a predication of union of a verb and a preceding (or following, neighbouring) entity. Ludwig Stern’s idea of the Coptic Circumstantial as “indefinite participle,“ (1880) is thus not infelicitous.10 (However, the “indefinite” here, which apparently reflects the antecedent in the case of the adnominal role (the role seemingly highest-ranking in the functional spectrum of the form), and the use of “definite participle” for the Relative, are both off the mark: see below.11 However, Stern’s term is no less than a stroke of genius, anticipating by nearly a century Lohmann’s insight (see Polotsky 1990:228f.). Lohmann 1965: 225 (quoting Poppe 1951, but for some reason not Ramstedt 1902!) even speaks of “Konverbal-fungierendes

---

9 Ramstedt 1902 coined the term (“Konverb”) as a meaningful alternative to the “meaningless” “gerund” (“Gerundium”). In fact, it is the idea of participation or union, evident in the μετοχή, that is reflected in Ramstedt’s converb. It is still in general use in Altai and Turkic linguistics, and in sporadic isolated application to Ethiopian linguistics (by H.J. Polotsky, G. Goldenberg and others), in Egyptian-Coptic (H. Satzinger, F. Kammerzell, Shisha-Halevy 2009), in Celtic (Shisha-Halevy 2010), as well as in typological studies (Haspelmath and König 1995).


11 While “definite” may well apply to the RC, which arguably “contains” a specific determinator nucleus (below), this is not the case of the CC.
Partizipium” (1965: 226), of “Teilhabe” (“sharing” — the Platonic methexis). Indeed, “laetus hausit venenum” (1965:227) exceeds the verbal μετοχη category, and seems to apply to any nexus. Lohmann points out the functional affinity of the Indo-European participle and the Altai-Turkic convert which, in contradistinction to the participle, is, as said above, an adverbial cluster of word-classes: the Coptic Circumstantial is no doubt a converbal form, rather than a participial one, let alone a conjunctional element.

The typological significance of the Greek participles as adnemal and/or converbal is an issue on its own, not discussed here but certainly relevant to the issue in point.

14. The adnominal status and slot, satellital in its phrasal pattern, are prominent in Coptic, but by no means simple. First of all, we encounter a satellital paradigm, where attributive is often opposed to rhematic (predicative); here the nucleus contracts a nexus with the satellite — for the predicative status is compatible with the nuclear status (cf. Barri 1978). The blending of adnominal and rhematic in a formal element is certainly remarkable and not to be taken for granted. Neutralizations of rhematic and attributive do occur, but do not imply a universal absence of opposition. Secondly and understandably, there obtains a correlation between nucleus form and satellital opposition or neutralization, paradigmatic pertinence or total reduction.

The famous absence — diachronic “loss” — of the adjective, gradually (and never totally) replaced in Egyptian, has its consequences. Noun syntagms (different from high-specificity pronominals, which usually enter appositional constructions) can show expansion by the nota relationis, or by specific adverbials — by no means all — or by conversion forms (CC, RC) or, under certain circumstances, by unconverted clauses.

12 In fact, Ramstedt’s Konverb does not refer to adverbiality at all, but to union or sharing or participation (hence kon-), which indeed brings us not far from nexus and adnexality.

13 See Lohmann 1965 (referred to above); Bakker 1988:108ff., on circumstantial participles: “participles, unlike adverbial subclauses, simply have no means to express a given relation lexically and overtly. The crucial feature of participles is precisely that they are unspecified as to their relation with the main clause (as well as their dependence on the main clause”); (130) not adjectival but eventual. [On attributive roles: rhetorics. as a matter of fact, neutralizes the adjective vs. adverb opposition]. Rhetorical importance: — relational vagueness or fuzziness, intercategorial vagueness or fuzziness.

14 The use of “attributive” approximating our “adnominal”, as opposed to “adverbial”, (Layton 2011 §§ 403-409, 430 etc.) constitutes a high-cost imprecision, for it obliterates the adnominal-rhematic satellite.
The exact syntactical conditions for these satellites, and correlations to specific nuclei, have not yet been entirely worked out. In fact, every noun syntagm is in Coptic an instance of adnominality to a pronominal determinator nucleus (ⲡⲥⲣⲓⲩⲉ, ⲟⲩⲃⲣⲓⲩⲩ). Cases like ⲟⲩⲃⲣⲓⲩⲩ (Mt 11:30, Ps 118:68, both Oxyrhynchite, both rhemes of delocutive Nom. Sentences) are rare:

\[
\text{NUCLEUS + adverbials}
\]

\[
\text{n- (nota relationis: Steinthal 1847)}
\]

\[
\text{nominals (e.g. ⲉⲧⲣⲟⲩ)}^{15}
\]

\[
\text{CC}
\]

\[
\text{RC}
\]

\[
\text{BASIC (no conversion)}
\]

Now the adnominal CC is generally conceived of as alterant of the Relative, in a symmetrical configuration:\(^{16}\)

Definite Antecedent — Relative Conversion

Indefinite Antecedent — Circumstantial Conversion

This, I believe, is a false symmetry.

15. In linguistic description, \textit{symmetries are suspect}, being symptomatic of an extrinsic systematization. Here is a persistent, systemic yet false symmetry model, namely W. Till’s “unechter/uneigentlicher Relativsatz” (note the negative characterization)\(^{17}\). Much earlier, we find Ludwig Stern’s definite/indefinite participles (Stern’s “participium adiectivum” complicates the issue further, as does Polotsky’s “adjektivische Transposition”, since the adjective as a Part of Speech is uncalled-for in this context, which demands \textit{syntactical features}). This neat — too neat! — strongly traditional model is, I believe, wrong and seriously misleading, born of the original sin of unstructural analysis, compounded by \textit{a priori}

\[^{15}\text{Arguably, these are not residual adjectives but cases of composition (in fine compositi).}\]

\[^{16}\text{Layton 2011 §403, 430. This consensus has spread to general typology: e.g. Lehmann 1984: 103 “(im Ägyptischen) ist der RS postnominal und wird mit einem Pronomen begonnen, nur wenn das höhere Nominal definit is; sonst gibt es keinen Subordinator” — often comparing Arabic (see n. 17). However, the Egyptian RC is not really postnominal; it rather combines with the determinator, with the noun lexeme infixed in this discontinuous syntagm.}\]

\[^{17}\text{In parenthesis, one may say that the implied comparison with the Classical Arabic alternation of \textit{aladi} vs. \textit{zero} relative marking is not entirely far-fetched, for there are synchronic and diachronic morphosyntactic indications to the Circumstantial being a “conversion basis” for the relative — in that sense, a “zero conversion” form (see below).}\]
interpretation, and the still pervasive opinion concerning the hierarchy of a “select club” of “superior sources”, and others, considered “bad” or even “corrupt”, and of little or no heuristic value. There is a minute grain of statistical descriptive cogency in this model; but it flies in the face of all evidence. It is didactically felicitous, and still informs, I fear, all thinking on the subject.

16. There are several immediate arguments against this model:

(a) the CC does occur often adnominally to specific nuclei. (In fact, specificity is environmental, not necessarily localized as a feature of a substantive antecedent.)

(b) The Relative Conversion does occur, albeit rarely, in non-specific (generic or hermeneutical) environment.

(c) The CC, an adnexal (not conjunctival Indo-European-style) clause, does not “mean” the same as the Relative; their signifieds are different. The CC is a rheumatic expansion, converbial (converbalt?), adverbial (in the approximative sense) even when adnominal. The Relative is attributive. Admittedly, the semantic opposition of the two is not always clear-cut, may under circumstances be neutralized, and is often not \textit{ceteris paribus}, but obtains nevertheless.

(d) The converterhood of the Relative Conversion, youngest of all converters in Coptic, is in fact incomplete. There are syntactic functions in which the Relative is still clearly \textit{pronominal} (as in earlier Egyptian), not converter. So it is, most notably, in the actor position in the Bipartite and Adjective Verbs: \textit{ⲡϣⲱⲥ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ⫱ ᵙᒡ那一.rmtree

20 Compare the difference of the two English -ing homonyms, \textit{a dancing girl} (attributive, adjective-participial) \textit{vs. a girl dancing} (thematic, adnexal, converbal). In this case, the functional differentiation appears to be carried by the significance of position, but this is apparent only, since we don’t really have here a \textit{ceteris paribus} condition. Comparison with the said English element is still instructive: although morphologically non-finite, it often occurs in-syntagm with an actor expression. Functionally, “adverbial subordination” (Kortmann1995, 1998) may also aptly describe the Coptic element examined here.
construed on its own, but is a discontinuous component, always combined with a preceding specific determinator ([\(\text{ⲡ-} \, \text{ⲗⲓ-}\)], [\(\text{ⲡ-} \, \text{ⲃⲓ-}\)]), that is, not in compatibility with a high-specificity noun syntagm or its determinator, but in constituent combination with one. (After all, one might wonder, why should an adjectival expansion-form be restricted to specific nuclei?) Moreover, specificity is a component of an environmental syndrome, not a localized feature.\(^{21}\) The noun lexeme (if any) is inserted, so to speak, in the determinator + RC template.

(e) Probably the most decisive argument against this alleged symmetry is paradigmatic.\(^{22}\) The CC paradigm is comprehensively structured, with noun syntagms of all specificity grades, verb clauses, Nominal Sentences and more, including non-specific textual stretches, whereas the RC clause is restricted to a slot following noun syntagms and some pronominals.

17. I do not contemplate here diachrony. The Circumstantial nexus forms are in OE/ME the basic rhematic verb-forms, according to Polotsky’s model — adnexit and adjunctal (and then also potentially focal), but, unlike Coptic, prominently rhematic in periphrastic patterns. (In Coptic, the Dynamic and Stative Converbs are rhematic and may be focal; the Stative may very rarely be adjunctal).\(^{23}\) The Coptic Present, the only template for these two converbs, carries on the Egyptian “Bipartite” pattern, which is in ME opened by a noun, pronoun or thematic (nominal) verb-form, closed by a rhematic adverbial one. Egyptian diachrony — perhaps any long-term linguistic diachrony — is instructive panoramically, in low resolution; when we look at details, real continuity becomes problematic. The converter \(\text{jw}\) (OE to Demotic) is still enigmatic — it is the earliest, arguably most important converter of Egyptian. The co-existence of two almost polarly different \(\text{jw}\) homonyms — one non-deictic, probably converbal, probably the ancestor of the Coptic CC, the other nominal, formally rhematic, superordinative and deictically nynegocentric — is still a conundrum.

\(^{21}\) Shisha-Halevy 2007b.

\(^{22}\) An instructive, and somehow satisfying, near-insight is provided by comparing the converb with the Augens (as described in Shisha-Halevy 1986, Chapter Six). Both categories are “adverbial”, both as it were hover about a core or nucleus — they relate to it, but in varying roles; both are junctorially linked to it pronominally; both are in fact adnexit. The difference between them, other than trivially morphological, lies solely in the verbality of the converb. In a sense, Polotsky is here vindicated. Without need for transformations, the Circumstantial-converb is adverbial: “The quintessential meaning of adverbiality is rhematicity, without anything to do with verbality”; and \(\text{ad-}\) is indeed apt.

\(^{23}\) See Boud’hors & Shisha-Halevy 2012.
18. On the evolution “Relative pronoun-to-converter” see Lehmann 1984: 103 (“das Relativum entwickelt sich im Neuägyptischen, wie im Akkadischen und Umgangsarabischen, zu einer invariablen Konjunktion”). It has never been complete: note for instance the Cleft- Sentence topic, appositive to the pronominal theme, or the opposition of πρωμε ετςωτμ to the rare, but well attested by now with more than a dozen exx., “abundans” (Polotsky 1987: 55ff., following Bakker 1988 for Greek), τεςιμε ετςμοος μναί Shenoute ed. Leipoldt IV 28. This scenario (not rare: found in Celtic, Romance, Greek) results in the synchronic existence of two ετ- homonyms — converter and pronoun — bringing home the triviality of morphology and all-importance of syntactic distribution.

19. **Relative vs. Circumstantial.** This limited opposition is environment-related. It may be weakened, or reduced, down to being cancelled — that is, neutralized: in the case of the non-specific nucleus, the relative is extremely rare. Does this mean, in effect, that other components carry the oppositional load? Note that this is not an opposition of restrictive vs. amplificative expansion, but one of attributive vs. rhematic (appositive?) one. This is an interesting and uncommon opposition: the satellite forming a nexus with its nucleus (noun syntagm and certain pronouns), a nucleus which is thematic.

20. **CC/nota relationis; the rhematicity paradigm** (e.g. and typically, expanding a Nominal Sentence theme):

CC

N-

(Athan. ed. Lefort 84) ογελεγθερος πε ναγτεξουγιος
(Prov. 28:15) ομοιοι επε εφρθαειτ αγω ογνω εφοβε πε

Another striking environment is following ωπε:

(Apophth. 61,4 ) άγωπε εγκτωφ τας τπολις τής ευρίμε
(1 Cor.14:11) Τιανωπε νβαρβαρος αγω εγναβαρβος πε

πετωλε νμαι

See further below; and consider Steintosh 1847: 52 on N- “duas notions inter se refert” “cum linea mathematica, qua duo puncta coniugantur aut inter se referantur apte comparari posse mihi videtur” — the next thing to our “nexus”. Steintosh establishes a pattern with the RC, not the CC, in-paradigm with the nota relationis, but it is the very issue of the predicativity
or attributivity of $n$- that (I believe) occupies Steinthal’s attention, not the opposition (as we would put it) of CC and RC. Another complex factor in the functioning of the nota relationis is nucleus and satellite specificity — a difficult issue, still in need of study.

21. Differential **Immediate-Constituence and juncture**: CC and RC.
   - The nucleus and CC are in separate Immediate Constituents.
   - Difference (of position and constituency) in the nexal seam (boundary) between the two constituents (CC rhematic as high-level rheme).
   - Junctural principle difference between CC and RC.
   - The CC may be topicalized as preset.
   - The CC may be vested (preceded by conjunctions or adverbials), unlike the RC; then it is no longer rhematic or adnexal.
   - The Relative is not “adnominal” in the sense of “ad-noun phrase”, nor satellital or expanding, but stands in a closer-juncture discontinuous complex, with higher-specificity elements — the determinators or other pronominal nuclei.
   - The CC is not specifically adnominal, or expanding, in the sense of potentially filling an existing slot (as e.g. in a valency matrix), but it is quintessentially satellital. The CC is often grammaticalized or of low thematicity (again, unlike the RC).
   - The CC’s nucleus may be a highly complex and/or extensive unit, unlike the RC’s nucleus.

22. The role of **the specificity parameter** in nuclear syntax is blurred, nuanced and fleeting, also since it is often observed indirectly, through the filter of another language.

   (Shenoute Canon 8, *passim* ed. Boud’hors 2013) $\text{ϩⲉⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲏⲡⲛ ⲫⲉⲣⲁⲓ}$ $\text{ⲛϩⲏⲧⲛ vs. ⲏⲡⲛ ⲫⲉⲣⲁⲓ ϩⲉⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ}$

   Some features:

   (a) indefinite nucleus: RC practically excluded, CC compatible
   (b) indefinite nucleus: adnominal adverbial
   (c) specific nucleus: RC + adnominal adverbial
   (d) zero article, feminine lexeme nucleus: CC [masc. representant]
   (e) zero article, generic nucleus: CC, RC (rare) compatible
   (f) specific nucleus: CC, RC compatible
   (g) $\theta\epsilon$ nucleus: CC (conjunctional, below)
   (h) time/place nucleus (specificity-indifferent): CC (conjunctional, below).
23. A brief word on **converbs**. Coptic, Ethiopian and Turkish (generally, Altai and Turkic) share in the highly operative converb system a basic typological affinity (see Steinthal 1847, 99ff. — Polotsky 1960). Within Egyptian diachronic typology, Coptic represents a “returned” peak of converbal *Leistung*, reflecting the early peak of ME. In passing, let me point out that the criticism of Polotsky’s Middle Egyptian model of grammar (by Collier, Vernus and others) on the argument of “typological *invraisemblance*” does not hold, with the converb a central trait of affinity (along with focalization patterns, periphrastics, conversions and other features). Converbs characterize Semitic and non-Semitic East African languages, and are paramount in Coptic: especially formal-grammaticalized auxiliary converbs, so typical of ME. Significant in Coptic are also the Clause Conjugations and the Eventives (\(\text{ⲙⲡϣⲧⲣⲉⲥⲙ-}, \text{ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉⲥⲙ-} \) and so on). More impressionistically, one may even speak of a typological “converbal profile” in language comparison and typological grouping.

24. The CC a **determination base** (A), a **conversion base** (B)?

These familiar if obscure, and probably telling functions (to my knowledge rare or absent in pre-Demotic Egyptian) are associated primarily with coordination (and disjunction), but also with some other syntactic constructions. Note the exclusion of unconverted coordination (in the Present/Future — i.e. no attestation of \(*\text{ⲧⲓ-…ⲧⲟⲩ-ॢ-} \) or \(*\text{ⲧⲃⲧ-} \); note also the rareness of negative forms coordinated. In the case of coordinated RC (the most frequent), does this mean the circumstantial is a zero conversion form, or conversion base? Is the CC here expanding (satellital), more or less as usual, with the coordinator \(*\text{ⲧⲃⲧ-} \) or the disjunctors \(*\text{ⲧⲃⲧ-} \), \(*\text{ⲧⲃⲧ-} \) that are remarkably adverbial, not conjunctional, introducing the CC as preset-modifier: “also, adding, additionally” — with no symmetry between the two flanks. It seems obvious that in both (A) and (B) constructions, the CC indicates the **nuclear status of the grammemic first element** — determinator, converters, Relative pronoun.

The main significance of the (A) constructions lies in the striking corroboration of Jernstedt’s insight in his seminal 1949 article on the partitive nature of determination syntax, *viz.* the nuclearity of the determinators, and their partitive relation to the satellital lexemes. Note the switch to RC in coordination with specific nuclei (exx. below). An alternative analysis for the determination-coordinated CC is the endo-nuclear Circumstantial (see below): “one/any who…”.

Construction (B) is a favourite in Shenoute, where we find a whole system of juncture features in coordinative and disjunctive conversion constructions.25

Frankly, these are obscure (even if well-known) constructions — constructions in which the exact nature and roles of the CC, and especially their relationship to expansion and adnexality, still escapes us.

Some assorted exx. (of all registers, and various dialects).

Construction (A):

(Pist. 80) ὀγαθαος αγω επσουτών πε
(Worrell Freer 280) ὀγαθαος πε ἅρῳ βη αγω εφογαλβ
(Jos. 23:9) ζηννος ζηννος αγω εγταξρνυ
(Sap. Salom. 8:19f.) ξε-ανγ-ογυηρε αημε νεγψυαν εγνται
μμαυ νουψγυαν ενανους αγω εαλυ-ογαθαος...
(Ps. 24:8 Budge) ὄγρυρντος αγω επχούτων πε
(II Reg 1:23) ομερατε αγω ενεισων — noteworthy, for the CC here coordinated to an (apparently) specific nucleus.

(Besa ed. Kuhn 80) πενεπουοον αη η ϊτοψ εφσοοεπ — the first element is probably revealed by the CC as non-specific! So too:

(Drescher Leg. 49) πενεπουοων αη... αγω εφογαλβ... — coordination basis generic? See Haspelmath 2004.

vs. (relative coordinates with specific nucleus grammemes)

(Luc. 9:41) τενεα ναπιςτος αγω ετοομε
(Ps. 3:3) υτκ-παεοου αγω ετχιαε ιτααπε (Gk δόξα μου και υγόν την κεφαλήν μου)
(Phil 4:1) νασψην μμεριν αγω εφογασωγ
(Besa ed. Kuhn 77) νεψβυηε ετεανοους αγω ναικαλουνη has an inverse sequence.

Construction (B):

(Shenoute L III 46) ντόq μαγάτq πετςότq αψ ω χατίνγγ
(Shenoute Chass. 108) πενταπρθγεωήμαν εβεβίας αψ
εκραθγογοηταλιος εράκοτε
(Pist. 356) ναε ετεμπογρίψβ ςαμνισθήριον μπογείν
αλλα εαγμογν εβολ ...εγρψβ

25. The endocentric (endo-nuclear) CC — with no nucleus preceding or following it — is a special CC construction, probably more significant of the nature of this conversion than is apparent in its distribution, and is suggested in the early discussions.26 I shall not enlarge here on the relevant constructions, but it is surely telling that there are no actantial marking — object or actor markings — in these constructions, in object or actor status; also that the two main constructions differ primarily in their pronominal paradigms: 3rd sgl. masc. (εκκατε “round about”, adverb) and 3rd sgl. masc./fem. (ενανογq “any good one”, εκρίμε “any crying one [fem.]”). The adverbal slot points to a connection with the satellital CC: the adnexal expansion, junctorially different — looser — from the morphological object construction, which also explains the absence of actantial marking:

(P.Mon.Epiph. 313) μπίειν ενανογq
(Lev.6:10 Boh. Paris BNF Copte 1) ννογχόνμχεμ εκφί-ψεμχρ
(Gen.31:8) ...άπο εψο ψτο το
(Judith 12:3) ενναιείν των εχείνε μμογγ ετέ

These are all cases of (“object”) actantial status, but not formally rectional — not formally governed by the verb lexeme. Or, on second thoughts, not objective but adverbal, that is, occupant of a specific verb-expanding slot.

We find other actantial adverbal slots too.

Actor, existant:

(Jos.9:29) ννεψψχεψ ςβολ ννηττθγχν εψο ννςψαλ αψ
ννψψψψψψ ψαν αψ μπανογτε
(Heb.12:16) ωγ-ογψφρνος κ εφσον (Boh. ωγψφρνος κε
ογαψψ)

Adverbials:

(Prov. 3:24) εκμοτν = ἡδέως

Generic person, also neutric feminine:

(Rom. 5:9 Thompson) \( \text{nawoc} = \text{pollo} \)

And (Budge Misc.168) \( \text{aqei eqwte} \)

26. **Adnominal CC: hyperspecific nucleus, CC expansion**

I would not rule out the possibility that high- to highest-specificity nucleus conditions the CC, not RC as expansion:

(P.Mon.Epiph. 283) \( \text{eic peirwme enw pe itnnooyq} \) — a distinct possessive construction for high-specificity possessa: “this… of mine”

(Pist. 338,10f.) \( \text{acwane ge nterepewthr watm eneixaxe } \)

(Pist. 384) \( \text{xe-eneouxdae eneikolacic mnnneikricic eycbtwt npreqnowe} \)

27. **Adnominal CC: \text{nim}-determined nucleus, CC and RC expansion.**

Structurally, two \text{nim} homonyms have been suggested (Shisha-Halevy 1986: 143 f., 146), viz. a \text{determinator}, commutable (not compatible) with \text{zero}, indefinite and definite determinators (totalizing “all”), specifying, hence with the familiar symptoms of specificity: expansion by RC, plural anaphoric reference, Stern-Jernstedt \text{n}-compatibility, coordination by \text{mn}--; another entity combined with \text{zero} — a \text{quantifier} “any, every”, hence: CC expansion, singular anaphoric reference, coordinated by \text{qi}, \text{nte-}/\text{nta=} (spec.) as possessive expansion — **discontinuous component with zero determinator.** This alternation would have been elegant — if I say so myself — and perhaps true, but for one inescapable difficulty: I can see no consistent way to distinguish between the finely differentiated two, in the absence of any unambiguous co-signal. Besides, the two elements are subject to variation (including \text{variae lectiones}) and their environment are not consistently valid (so the sgl./pl. statement), except perhaps as a statistical tendency. \text{2wbnim, oyon nim, oyoew nim, pome nim} are certainly a case apart, neutralizing the opposition that is limited to cases like \text{qice nim}. (Is this a blurring of opposition? Or the stark reality of (free) variation, so painful for structuralists? Or is it the special condition of the “vague paradigm”, which is still a category,
but difficult to define in structuralist terms?) At any rate, the precise distribution of the parameters,\(^{27}\) in terms of dialect, register and textual type, has not yet been described.

Consider the following:

(Act. 9:36) ϭⲱⲃ ⲡⲓⲙ ⲯⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩϥ
(Deut. 14:11) ⲭⲣⲱⲃ ⲡⲓⲙ Ⲫⲟⲩⲧⲱⲃⲁⲃ
(Jos. 10:40) ⲗⲰⲓ ⲡⲓⲙ Ⲩⲧⲣⲱⲃ Ⲫⲝⲏⲩⲗ Ⲫⲣⲓⲣⲩⲏⲙ
as against:

(Jos. 11:11) ⲗⲰⲓ ⲡⲓⲙ ⲧⲕⲺⲅ ⲩⲦⲧⲱⲃ ⲩⲦⲧⲱⲟⲩ Ⲩⲧⲣⲱⲃ Ⲫⲝⲏⲩⲗ Ⲫⲣⲓⲙ ⲧⲤⲉ ⲧⲩⲧⲱⲃ ⲧⲤⲉ Ⲩⲧⲣⲱⲟⲟ ⲪⲧⲪⲧⲱⲃ ⲧⲤⲉ ⲧⲤⲍⲱⲩ ⲧⲠⲓ ⲧⲤⲉ ⲧⲧⲕⲟⲩ ⲧⲤⲉ ⲧⲧⲤⲟⲩ ⲧⲤⲉ

and:


28. The CC expanding specific nuclei is very well established, in various registers and dialects,\(^{28}\) in a rich syntactic typology. Here is just a token presentation of constructions I consider to be of special interest (it is truly a pity that not all attestations can be presented here and discussed, since most loci have their grammatical distinction and interest). This is probably the most instructive slot of the CC — the enigma, the core interest of the adnominal CC, still in need of microscopic description. The compatibility of this specificity grade with the expanding Circumstantial may well be

\(^{27}\) Incommensurate parameters: (coord.) Ⲯⲧⲧⲩⲧⲱⲃ ⲡⲓⲙ ⲧⲧⲧⲱⲟⲩϥ - ⲧⲧⲧⲱⲃ ⲡⲓⲙ ⲧⲧⲧⲱⲟⲟ ⲧⲧⲧⲱⲟⲟ. This compounds the difficulty. Contrary to expectation, I do not find the existential ⲧⲧⲧⲱⲟⲩ- and ⲧⲧⲧⲱⲃ- preceding the quantifying ⲡⲓⲙ. Generally, it seems the quantifier is much weaker statistically than the determinator ⲡⲓⲙ.

\(^{28}\) See Richter 2008: 103ff. “circ instead of rel” in legal texts. The feature is apparently more widespread in late and non-literary Sahidic as well as Nitrian Bohairic, but is by no means restricted to these varieties.
the “blind spot” which, I believe, has been hopelessly obscuring the structure of this category.

Three factors seem to join in the neglect of these numerous passages and cases. First, the fact this is apparently not considered a problem in need of explanation, even though the textual validity is beyond doubt; second, the unacceptable ease of condemning a source as grammatically defective; third, the apparent total absence of a “don’t know”, “don’t understand”, even “don’t feel” component in scholars’ heuristic world. Prominent and especially well-attested is appositive {παί eq-} which, at least in Shenoute, and with non-specific preceding nuclei, has typically the sense of “such (as)”, “qualis” (see a special discussion by Polotsky 1990: 245ff.):

(Shenoute L III 206) γεννοεις μπεθοου εναυψωυ...ναι ερεειρ\(\) ενοου τενογ ερεεοογ — a possible interpretation of the first ερε- is as a Focalizing Conversion, with the second as focalized CC.

(Shenoute Wessely IX 177) ογν-ζεναικαιος ναι εφναταζοογ nῃ-πψοβ ναιαεβης

(Worrell Freer 292) αξαμαρτε ητποε νυε εκνυτοογ

(Crum Papyruscodex 18,13) πρατ εϕποε ιε

(Jos.12:2) νερψου ετωοο χιη-κιωη ναι εγο ιποειει χιη-αρηοον

(Judith 10:19) ηυμ πετνακαταφρονι μπειλαος ναι εουνταρ ραι ιεηηαπ ιη-

29. The relationship of the CC to existential syntax is interesting, mainly due to doubt regarding the thematicity of ογν-/μη-, and the existential conundrum: # ογν-νοου (non-spec.) eq- # as against # ογν-νοου (non-spec.) — Rheme # may be viewed as the paradigmatic array and opposition of an analytic vs. synthetic (“morphological”) dynamic or static converb. I do not see the existential constructions as nexal, but as sui generis, pre-nexal.

Consider a few of the relevant constructions:

(Man.Hom. 21,5ff.) ογναμαεις ερουρμε νοημερσεουν εραινωρς

(Man.Hom. 10,6-9) ογνογαν αρωπε ογνογαν μπερωπε

(Man.Ps. 172,21ff.) ογνογεσαε εμηρ απην

(Man.Hom. 23,7) ογνογαν αγαρην 30,10 ογνογαν αρωπε ογνογαν μπερωπε

(Shenoute L IV 108) ογνας γαρ μεεηε χε-...
(Shenoute Wessely IX 91) οὖν-γεννος ένας ψοων...
(Shenoute Chass. 116) εὐχε-οὖν-Ρωμε εὐγεω-θη...
(Shenoute L IV 41) οὖν-γοινε εγό Νάτνπογτε ν.λ. ομ. εγο
(Shenoute Wessely IX 141) εὐχε-οὖν-ογά δε εὐκά Νάττπετθογεῖτ...
(Prov.26:11) οὖν-ογώπη εὐαξάγη-νοβε
(Đud. 3:19) οὖν-ογώξαξε εὐρήπ Ντέπνπογτε Ντοοτ.

30. **Presentate + CC: presented nexus**

In these constructions, to a degree kindred to existentials, typically signaling narrative focus (specific presentate), or a state for narrative build-up (non-specific presentate), the CC seems to be adnexal to the presentate:

(Apophth. 225) εἰς-οὖξηρα εκκριτ ζίπαρο γνον εκπίνε
(Apophth. 180) εἰς-ωσιςμόν γνώναξος εγγερατογ ζίπεκρο

(Đud. 3:25) εἰς-πεγχοείς ε跞νχ
(Jud. 4:22) άγω εἰς-σικαρα ε跞νχ.

31. **Koinzidenzfall** (performatives)

These constructions or forms, syntactically much more complex and implicative than Austin’s English-based “herewith/hereby” concept, have not yet been studied for Coptic. They are essentially locutive (1st-person, usually singular) and, pragmatically “synchronous present” (Koschmieder’s [1965] “Koinzidenzfall”, preferably to Austin’s narrow and non-grammatical “performative”), raise a preliminary question of morphological identity. It is conceivable that these are special “pure-nexus” cases of the CC, and, arguing from dialectal morphology, not Focalizing Conversion; but this may be gainsaid within Sahidic.

Some possible categoric instances (the actual occurrences are numerous, and, in fact, many letter-opening cases may arguably be Synchronous Present ones):

(P.Mon.Epiph. 131) ηαϊ εἰςγαί γνοογ
(O.CrumST 37) προ παντος εἰακπάξε
(O.Vind.Copt. 243, 289, 303) εἰαράκαλει
(CPR IV 177) εἰτάγο γνώξαξε αγω εἰκμίνε
(Pleyte-Boeser 486) εἰακπάξε.

29 Cf. Shisha-Halevy 2007a: 225ff and Index, s.v., p.706. Further study is here called for.
Some letter-opening CC forms (see below in detail) may be Koinzidenz-fall cases, but there are other interpretations, more probable.

32. CC in the delocutive Nominal Sentence: tagmemic issues

This pattern set achieves macrosyntactic linkage by Nominal-Sentence reference of the formal pronominal themes ρε, ηε, εε, enclitic to the rheme and potentially cataphoric to a thematic (antitopic?) noun syntagm or demonstrative pronoun. (As a rule, interlocutive [1st/2nd persons] themes overrule delocutive rhemes. A question raised in the context of CC satellital position, and a non-specific rheme, concerns the placement of the CC. Is there an adclausal slot, occupiable by the CC? Is the CC placement conditioned prosodically, or is it pertinent, i.e. oppositional? Is the position of the pronominal theme ρε, enclitic to a degree, motivated (e.g. by an extensive CC clause) and motivating? Consider:

# Rheme ες- ρε #

(Athan. ed. Lefort 20) ογρωβ εψψοψετ ρε
(Man.Ps. 22ff.) ογρημα εψψοψε ρε
(Ev.Verit. 23,11) ογρε εψψηκ ρε “a true one” (rheme),

vs. # Rheme ρε ες-ι/ι- #

(Till Mart. I 146, 2) ογρηπ ρε ες ρε επρςα (Ev.Phil. 56,3ff.) ογραν ρε εςρπ ογραν ρε εψψοψε εςο
(Apophth. 241) ογραςε ρε εςοψος...

(Munier, Manuscripts 9227) γενμαενης γαρ ρε γαραρη ηονγας ηαταρκε γενμαογι ρε εςγαρατη ηονγας εςςεβω καλως γενμαω γαρ εςεβτωτ εψκε εςο ηποψψ ρεςψοεις (εκτη)

(Pist. 267) ογςθς ρε εςψψγψψκρψε ρα λαλα εςψψω- ρψψγψε

Consider also cases of neutralization or indifference:

(O.CrumST 265) δανκ-ςοψψκε ες ιπαοεις ας
(Budge Misc. 42,3f., Apa Mena ed. Drescher 30) ησκ-σιμ (ιτειςε) ες-

(Apa Mena ed. Drescher 176)31 ηςς ρςς ος ης ρςςοςο...

30 Shisha-Halevy 1987, 2007a, Chapter Two.
31 Shisha-Halevy 1984:186, a special pattern, favoured by Shenoute.
Rather than consider the two constructions free variants (a possibility not to be ruled out), thus non-pertinent, it may be worth our while to try and understand a possible opposition, tenuous as it might be. Evidently, it is the position of the theme νε that makes the first formal difference—whether the CC is in the same prosodic colon as the Nominal-Sentence rheme, or forms its own colon, following the Nominal Sentence, beyond its boundaries. Unless conditioned, such tagmemic formal-prosodic distinction must entail a functional one, which would primarily involve the **predicative value** of the CC clause: higher for the post-pattern clause than for the post-rheme one.

This hypothesis is not easy to prove, but I advance it nevertheless.

33. **Letter-opening syntax: thematic CC? Koinzidenzfall?**

The rich variety of letter- and document (e.g. edict)-opening constructions present questions involving the CC. The analysis of these is anything but simple or transparent. Conceiving of them as “formulaic” (even beyond the problems this presents in itself, for “formulaic grammar” is not self-evident: the concept is often circular and begs the question) hardly resolves the complexity. The constructions found under this heading (and “letter” here must be taken broadly) are familiar, but the exact functions and syntax are difficult to be confident about. We find mainly probable CC cases, thematic in special Cleft Sentences and Presentational Sentences, and possible Koinzidenzfall (performative) cases. The distribution and specific roles of the individual constructions are as yet uncharted, beyond dialectal tendencies (e.g. Fayumic). The following issues are basic:

- defining formulaic syntax;
- ωιε, αγναζε ηολμα, etc. are intrinsically thematic and carry little or minimal information;
- χομολογει, ωρκ, and others raise the possibility of a performative reading;
- tensing: synchronous present?
- focalization, rhematization, presentation, signature, performative are all possible signifieds and semantic components of the patterns;

---

32 Biedenkopf-Ziehner 1983 is the sole detailed discussion of this important set of patterns. This study, which presents the various constructions, is essentially philological, does not come to terms with the syntactic problematik, and is simplistic in its grammatical discussion.
– (macro)syntactic and text-linguistic peculiarities of textual initiality (where initial), in the epistolary subtexteme of the dialogue;
– an intriguing clash — formal, not pragmatic — between locutivity and delocutivity (see [a] below).
– the various patterns include a constant Proper Name or PN-equivalent (hyper-specific, and in itself of descriptive interest) as integral part. This means we have here an instance of PN syntax and a case of PN peculiarity.

Although we are typically dealing with a non-literary corpuses of texts, the features in point — but not all forms — also occur as literary devices: this is yet another riddle.

In all, three overhead “master patterns” are observable: basic predication or performative (a), signature-presentational (b) and identificational (c). (The illustration and reference are not exhaustive, and the classification not exclusive). In all three patterns, the locutive pronoun ḤROWAN is optional.

(a) Thematic CC, or alternatively Koinzidenzfall CC:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#PN masc./fem.plur.</td>
<td>ḤONOWE ḤENENNEIOTE ḤETOYWA ḤENECEBHC ḤETOYH2 2NOYHT (Drescher Leg. 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#PN</td>
<td>ḤOCEWAI (CPR IV 12, 85, Acta Pauli 46, 48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#ḤOAK PN</td>
<td>EIWIHNI# (Fay.) (O.CrumVC 92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#ḤOANOK PN</td>
<td>BWPK# (O.Vind.Copt. 47, O.CrumST 110) — not initial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Signature-Presentational, not Cleft Sentence\textsuperscript{33}. Attested from OE on (especially in ME) as jnk pw + converbal paradigm. The formal element πe is here not enclitic, but proclitic: witness the constituent πeq-, and even frequently πq-. Kindred to the Biblical divine proclamatory “I am the Lord your God, who…”\textsuperscript{34} The CC is here clearly thematic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#ḤOAK PN</td>
<td>WECWAI# (Fay.), #ḤOANOK πe PN WECWAI# (O.CrumST 383)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#PN πeqcwai#, #PN πpqcwai# (O.CrumVC 48, 60)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#PN f.</td>
<td>TECEWA1# (CPR IV 145).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{33} See Biedenkopf-Ziehner 1983: 45, 180.

\textsuperscript{34} Cf. Ferretti Cuomo 1998, on the theological-literary application of this Biblical syntax to the divine Beatrice in the Commedia (Inferno): “I’son Beatrice che ti faccio andare.”
(c) Cleft Sentence homonym. Not focalizing, but identifying. Note the commutability of \( \varepsilon \tau \)- here — not RC but Relative Pronoun — with CC in (a).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{#PN } & \text{ⲡⲉⲧⲥϩⲁⲓ} \quad \text{(O.CrumVC 46)} \\
\text{#PN } & \text{ⲉⲧⲥϩⲁⲓ} \quad \text{(O.Vind.Copt. 173, 208)} \\
\text{#ⲧⲕⲙⲧⲡⲕⲇⲛⲉ} & \text{ⲉⲧϫⲡⲟ} \quad \text{ⲛⲛⲉⲥϣⲏⲣⲉ} \quad \text{ⲭⲣⲓⲥⲧⲓⲁⲛⲟⲥ} \quad \text{ⲉⲩⲉⲓⲛⲉ} \quad \text{ⲙⲙⲟⲥ} \\
\text{(Shenoute L III 117)} \\
\text{ⲧⲉⲕⲗⲏⲥⲓⲁ} & \text{ⲉⲧϫⲡⲟ} \quad \text{ⲛⲟⲥ} \\
\text{(Shenoute L III 52)} \\
\text{ⲧⲙⲁ} & \text{ⲏ} \quad \text{ⲡⲉϩⲛⲁⲁⲩ} \\
\text{(Shenoute L III 94)} \\
\text{ⲧⲛⲁⲕⲟⲧϥ} & \text{ⲉϥⲫϩⲁⲩⲣⲟⲥ} \\
\text{(Shenoute L III 21)} \\
\text{ⲉⲛⲧⲁⲛ} & \text{ⲙⲡⲉ} \\
\text{(Shenoute BM Cat. 206)} \\
\end{align*}
\]

34. Adnexal CC: rhematic actant, nexus actant.

This is probably the clearest and most striking case of adnexality. In fact, the CC in this construction is so unambiguously adnominal-rhematic, adnexal, that one should think it would conclusively settle the question of the alleged Relative/Circumstantial alternation once and for all. Thus, the Immediate-Constituent analysis

\[
\text{VERB (LEXEME) + [ noun/pronoun + CC] [ n e x u s ]}
\]

is here requisite, and \textit{not}

\[
\text{VERB (LEXEME) + noun/pronoun (object) + CC (expansion)}.
\]

This figured construction is rhetorically effective, favoured by Shenoute, in a rich lexical spectrum, from verbs of perception like \( \nu \nu \) or \( \text{ⲥⲱⲧⲙ} \) to verbs “of incomplete predication” (Curme) or, which is almost the rule, incomplete-predication homonyms of semantically full lexemes (so \( \text{ⲟⲓⲥⲏ} \)). In fact, this is a \textit{distinct transitive valency matrix}. In Shenoute, the CC rheme is mostly the \( \varepsilon \)-converb, less often \( \varepsilon \)-, rarely \( \varepsilon \)- and \( \varepsilon \)-.

(Shenoute L III 52) \text{ⲡⲉϯⲓⲁⲣⲉⲇⲉ} \text{ⲡⲉⲧⲓⲧⲇⲉ} \text{ⲡⲉⲧⲇⲓⲧⲇⲉ} \text{ⲡⲉⲧⲇⲓⲧⲇⲉ} \text{ⲡⲉⲧⲇⲓⲧⲇⲉ} 

(Shenoute L III 117) \text{ⲧⲉⲕⲗⲏⲥⲓⲁ} \text{ⲉⲧϫⲡⲟ} \text{ⲛⲟⲥ} 

(Shenoute L III 94) \text{ⲧⲉⲕⲗⲏ interpolated phrase} 

(Shenoute L III 22) \text{ⲧⲉⲕⲗⲏ interpolated phrase} 

(Shenoute III 21) \text{ⲧⲉⲕⲗⲏ interpolated phrase} 

(Shenoute L IV 16) \text{ⲧⲉⲕⲗⲏ interpolated phrase} 

(Shenoute BM Cat. 206) \text{ⲧⲉⲕⲗⲏ interpolated phrase}
A remarkable case like:

(Pist. 338,10f.) ἄσωπται ὑπὲρἐπαυκὰ ἐγὼ ἐνείσαξε ἐκὼ μμοαν ὑπὶ-μαιρία
(sim. 75,1f., 124,12, 136,13f., Budge Misc.192., etc.)

is peculiar, for while it may belong here, it may equally be non-actantial, but expand the hyper-specific nucleus with no reference to the verb.

Contrast:

(Shenoute Chass. 189) μαρεσωτὰν ἐπεπροφθῆς εὑρὼ μμοἰ.

A proleptic idiomatic construction with “know”:

(Wess. XV 140) ἤκούουν ἑπτὰμην εὑρὼν ἄρτημπενεῳτ (P.Mon.Epiph. App. I 36f.) ενεκούουν μὲν μμοε ἐκο νογεὶ οὐωτ 2ητμηντνουτε

35. (a) Nexus adjoined by nota relationis or by object marker (the same entity?). The main point of interest here lies in the behaviour of nexus as element, in interdependence with — that is, governable by — the nota relationis. The nota relationis itself as a pre-rhematic signal is another striking feature in this construction type:

(Ps. 28:5-9) τεσμὴ μπξοεὶς εὑρώσῃς ννκερος (Schleifer; Budge ec., possibly Focalizing Conversion, focusing the object)

(IV Reg.11:13 Maspero) περιοοον ννλντον εγνπυ

(Act. 23:18) εεῖνε νακ εὑρόν νπεὶρῳπρε εὐγντῃ-οὐγαξε εὐροον

(Joh. 2:9 Quecke) τῶπε μμοογν εὐαρὴρπ
35 (b). CC Adnexal: \textit{nota relationis} + [nexus]:
\[
\text{nœœ m[p- eq-].}
\]
\[n e x u s\]
and related constructions. This is again a familiar, idiomatic case of pre-
dicative nexus included and adjoined by the \textit{nota relationis}, with the CC
the nexus rheme.

Note here the neat opposition:

CC (rhematic) vs. RC (attributive):

(Epist.Jer. 15) \(\text{nœœ rαρ mπερναγ nουρςωμε εψανοψωπ εμερψωαγ ελανγ}\)
(Ecclesiasticus 34:29) \(\text{ταί τε θε mπρπ εώαδοκιμαζε μφντ}
\text{μπαςιαγ ΢ΜΙΜΙΓΕ}\)
(Is.55:11 Kasser) \(\text{ταί τε θε mπσακεετνχ εβόλ γνρωει}
\text{eκένσεκότα επαζωγ}\)
(Joh. 17:22 Boh. Horner) \(\text{οψος ανκ πιωού ετακθιή nη}
\text{αιθιη nνωο γία nνωςωπι γςωο ηενομετογαι}
\text{μπεμπήτ Ρων εψωο ηενομετογαι}\)
(Apophth. 201) \(\text{ταί τε θε ηεψψψχ εςψόλε}\)
Also Prov.6:29, 25:13, 1John 3:12, James 2:26 etc.

36. Captions

# PN + \textit{εψψψχ} #

(Wess. XVIII 83) \(\text{απα βεσιαιοε εψψψχ mνουρςωμε χε-}
\text{λαλαλιοε εψψψψψψνωε ηας εψψψχαι ηεψψψψψχ.}\)

37. Conjunctional syntax — CC a formal signal

A nice dilemma here is to decide between the substantivized nexus
— “that-” form, general subordinator, neutralizing all casual relations —
and an adverbial-locative Relative “in which”.\textsuperscript{36}

\textsuperscript{35} Rather comparable to the Egyptian Circumstantial \textit{sdm.f} in its used as caption to
explain and comment on pictorial representations.

\textsuperscript{36} A laconic note on understanding a grammatical feature. Surely not by test of trans-
lation into the linguist’s own language(s), but solely analytically, by considering its formal /
functional features (i.e. by oppositions and neutralizations) — that is, by the conception
of partial systems. No less requisite is the synthetic procedure of scanning these partial
systems involved, for which diachrony also is essential, as one dimension of its hologram-
ic picture, as well as the other diasystemic insights (dialectal, registerial or textematic).
For semantically evaluating “that-”-forms, CC joins in many substantival slots, in opposition
to adverbials; slots most of which are still problematic: χε-, (ε)τε-, Conjunctive,
(a) **Location (in time/space).** (Is this a lexical or a semantic feature?)

\[\text{ⲡⲓⲙⲁ ⲩⲣⲉ- ... ⲡⲧⲟⲩ} \quad (DV \text{ II Boh. 89,136,147,187, so common, in fact,}
\text{that it can be considered a typical feature of Nitrian Bohairic).}
\]

\[\text{ⲡⲓⲙⲁ ⲩⲣⲉⲛⲉϥⲕⲓⲧⲏⲧⲏⲥ ⲡⲟⲟⲩϩ ⲩⲩⲟⲩⲛ ⲛϩⲥⲧ} \quad \text{(Mt. 22:13, so quoted by Shenoute, Pleyte-Boeser 335, Ins. 69)} \]
\[\text{ⲡⲕⲁⲉ ⲩⲧⲓⲃⲟⲗ ⲡⲙⲁ ⲩⲣⲉⲡⲣⲓⲙⲉ ⲛⲧⲱⲡⲉ ⲡⲙⲁϫⲫⲫ ⲙⲛⲟⲃϩⲉ ⲡⲓⲉϩⲟⲟⲩ ⲩⲣⲉ- (DV \text{ II 150.3 (vs. 8 rel.)}}
\]
\[\text{ⲡⲓⲙⲱⲧ ⲩⲣⲉ- (DV \text{ II 207.6) \quad ⲡⲓⲏⲓ ⲩⲣⲉ- (DV \text{ II 211.)}}
\]
\[\text{ϯⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩ ⲩⲣⲉ- (DV \text{ II 238) \quad ⲡⲓⲛⲁⲩ ⲩⲣⲉ- (DV \text{ II 232) \quad ⲡⲓⲥⲏⲩ ⲩⲣⲉ- (DV \text{ II 233)}}
\]
\[\text{ⲉⲛⲧⲉⲩⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲕⲛⲁϫⲓ ⲛⲧⲓⲡⲥⲧⲟⲗⲏ (P. Bal. 396) \quad ⲡⲛⲉϩⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲛϩⲛⲧⲥⲁⲣⲝ (Rom. 7:5) \quad ⱀⲉ ⲛⲧⲉⲣⲉⲧⲙⲉϩⲙⲧⲁϥⲧⲉ ⲛⲟⲩϣⲏ ⲛⲧⲱⲡⲉ ⲉⲛⲣϩⲱⲧ (Act. 27:27) \quad ⲙⲛⲉ υϣⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲩⲣⲟϥ ⲩⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲙⲦⲉ ⲡⲙⲡⲁⲓ (1Tim. 3:2) ⲙⲦⲉ Ⲇⲩⲡⲉⲡⲓⲥⲕⲟⲡⲟⲥ ⲙⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛϩⲱⲃ ⱀⲉ-}\]

\[\text{ⲉⲣⲉ ⲡⲧⲟⲩ ⲡⲚⲟ ⲝⲓⲉ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝⲓ ⲝ蜈.}

(b) \[\epsilon \omega Ϫⲗⲓⲣⲓⲛε \text{ + CC is of theoretical interest for the evolution of historical lexical non-pertinence (hpr/jw-), turning into synchronic grammaticalized non-pertinence of the self-same element.}\]

(c) \[\nuⲟⲧ \text{(etc.) + CC\textsuperscript{37}} \quad \text{(Achm. \textit{Muséon} 52, 1ff. Lefort) \text{ ⲉⲧⲓ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲉⲧⲛⲉ ⲇⲉⲧⲟ ⲡⲟⲩ ⲇⲉⲕⲛⲁϫⲓ ⲛⲧⲓⲡⲥⲧⲟⲗⲏ (P. Bal. 102,30, 114,15, etc.)}}
\]
\[\text{Drescher Leg. 24) \text{ ⲉⲧⲓ ⲝⲟ \textit{mmoc.}}
\]

(d) **Various “that” readings**

\[\text{ⲉⲧⲓⲁ ϕⲃⲏ ⱀⲉϣϣⲉ ⲇⲉ ϕⲃⲏ ⱀⲉⲣⲟϥ ⱀⲉⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲙⲦⲉ ⱀⲉ-}\]
\[\text{ⲉⲧⲓⲉ ⲛⲧⲉⲩⲛⲟⲩ ⲇⲉⲕⲛⲁϫⲓ ⲛⲧⲓⲡⲥⲧⲟⲗⲏ (Pist. 309) ⲉⲧⲓⲁ ϕⲃⲏ ⱀⲉϣϣⲉ ⲇⲉ ϕⲃⲏ ⱀⲉⲡⲓⲥⲕⲟⲡⲟⲥ ⲛⲧⲉⲩⲛⲟⲩ ⲇⲉⲕⲛⲁϫⲓ ⲛⲧⲓⲡⲥⲧⲟⲗⲏ (1Tim. 3:2) ⲉⲧⲓⲁ ϕⲃⲏ ⱀⲉⲡⲓⲥⲕⲟⲡⲟⲥ ⲛⲧⲉⲩⲛⲟⲩ ⲇⲉⲕⲛⲁϫⲓ ⲛⲧⲓⲡⲥⲧⲟⲗⲏ}\]

\[\text{(e)-infinitive and others. As for the nuancing of “that”, say in English reading of the Coptic, these can be useful only when a specific equivalent recurs in correlation with an environment of a formal configuration.}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{37} Cf. Polotsky 1990: 249ff.}\]
(Act. 24:19, sim. 1Tim. 3:2ff.) ηαι εισε εγχαιναι
(P.Mon.Epiph. 258) τενού εισε-τετνουγμ της ορετειρηνν
ζητημετε — no verb in the CC rHEME.
(Drescher Leg. 24) (a vision) ωστε ειναι εροι εισε ερουργμε

38. Briefly, *en passant*. Like the obstinate association of CC/RC, the mys-
tery of the familiar *varia lectio “paradigm”* CC/RC is not easy to unlock. As said, these are not two eligible attributive forms, but very different adnominal satellites — the RC adnominal only and, as said, determinator- oriented; the CC universally, essentially satellital. One explanation seems to be the conjunctional CC, not unlike some functions of the Conjunctive, not adnexal, indeed arguably a distinct entity.

Almost every instance of CC/RC *v.l.* is a complicated tale unto itself. And, obviously, we are here up against the structural meaning of variant reading in general: by no means synonymy (which seems to be the com-
mon opinion), but, somewhat paradoxically, often rather the opposite: a meaningful tension of signifieds, coexisting in a close range of a semantic subsystem. A precise typology of variant-reading types is certainly called for, one that will include environmental details: this would entail a grammatically sensitive philology.

Returning to our conversions. It may be recalled (for instance) that in certain “converter language”, such as Egyptian-Coptic, Celtic and Romance, we encounter, throughout their history, Relative Pronouns alongside Relative-Conversion; here is a striking case for a variant reading where, against structuralist principles, the readings are (only) formally differenti-
ated (consider Shenoute Leipoldt IV 28 ῦεκταιε ετεκταιον ριιαν αι). Other instances, of CC/RC — it is noteworthy, and probably significant, that they are not more prominent statistically:
39. **CC in Thematic/Topical slots of Nominal Sentence patterns**

An array of constructions, with CC as *theme* or theme part. This is the intriguing second basic role of the CC; the almost paradoxical opposite status of the circumstantial across the nexal rift may still be related to the rhematic role. It is satellital; not adnexal, but still a nexus-constituent. *All instances seem rhetorical* to some degree (?). Structurally, this conversion is an entity on its own: this may be the conjunctional “that” form (above).

(It is interesting to note, that the CC is comparable, in its polar double functioning, to the Focalizing Conversion: this too alternates between focality, rhematicity, thematicity and topicality).

**Classified representative illustration:**

(a) Delocutive interrogatives, rhetorical. Topical CC, expanding the NS theme:

(Mich. 7:18 A) ΝΙΜ ΠΕ ΠΚΕΝΟΥΤΕ ΝΒΛΕΚ ΕΨΗΙ ΜΜΟ ΝΝΑΝΟΜ ΑΟΥ 
ΕΨΟΒ ΜΜΑΩ ΛΝΜΤΡΕΨΤ ... ΑΟΥ ΕΜΠΚΕΜΑΡΤΕ ΝΤΨΟΡΗ... 
(Deut. 3:24 Kasser) ΝΙΜ ΓΑΡ ΠΕ ΠΚΕΝΟΥΤΕ ΖΝΤΠΕ Λ ΓΙΧΝΠΚΑ 
ΕΨΗΛΩΕΙΡΕ ΚΑΤΑΝΕΝΤΑΚΑΛΥ 
(Deut. 4:8) ΑΨ ΠΕ ΠΚΕΛΛΟΣ ΕΨΝΤΑΨ... 
(Isidore ed. Munier, 155,1) ΟΥ ΝΕ ΝΕΙΨΒΥΗΕ ΕΚΕΙΡΕ ΜΜΟΥ (Part 
of theme; see “theme CC” § 33). 
(BKU III 338,8) ΟΥ ΠΕ ΕΨΡΝΟΨΡΕ ΝΗΤΝ 
(Budge Misc. 51) ΝΙΜ ΤΕ ΤΑΙ ΕΡΕ- 
(Budge Misc. 538) ΟΥ ΠΕ ΠΕΙΕΡΟ ΕΡΕΤΕΙΡΕ ΤΑΧΡΥΗ ΕΨΚΨ 
(Apophth. p. 55,21) ΑΨ ΠΕ ΠΒΙΟΣ ΕΙΝΑΚΟΤΠΙΨ ΝΑΙ 
(Budge Misc. 444,12f.) ΝΙΜ ΠΕ ΠΡΜΗΨΤΕ ΕΨΤΝΤΨΝΙΕ ΕΡΟΚ 
(Wess. XVIII 116) ΟΥ ΠΕ ΠΑΙ ΕΚΤΔΑΥ ΜΜΟ 

(b) Interlocutive interrogatives, all rhetorical: 

(Budge Misc. 42) ΝΤΚ-ΝΙΜ ΕΚ- 
(Rom. 14:4) ΝΤΚ-ΝΙΜ ΕΚΚΡΙΝΕ 
(note the variant reading, ΕΤ-/ΕΚ- etc. Joh.9:34, 10:18)

---

38 This apparently drastic functional difference may correlate with a formal junctural one — a distinction of Juncture Domain Frame. See Shisha-Halevy 2004.
(c) Cleft/Nominal Sentence: #FOCUS/RHEME + CC topic/theme# (Typical, even symptomatic of Shenoutean Sahidic, but attested also elsewhere).

(d) Word-class-neutralization focal paradigm (partial listing): ωγ, ογηρ, ηαγ χε, δην-ογ, δηγ η-, δενον, -ωο (Shisha-Halevy 1986 §2.5)

   All exx. are from Shenoute:

(P.Ryl.Copt. 70)39 ογηρ ητυπος μπονηρον εαγχοκου εβολ (Amél. II 155) ηαγ ηε ηενου εενοι ηαγ ηαν (Wess. XVIII 140) ηηναι ον κορο επεηγηντ εν-ηρικε εροογ αν (P.Lond.Copt. I 211) δικαιωκ εαγρωμο ερο

(e) CC in time-unit syntax

(1) #εεικ- TIME-UNIT + CC# “It’s [time-unit] that…”
(2) #γαντε-ογ (εε) ωπε / γαναγ + CC# “Until when…? ”
   “How long…?”

(Shenoute L III 36) γαντεογ ωπε εεεερε ηεηεβηε εηηεμα ετογαο (Shenoute P 1314 144) γαντεογ εε ωπε ανον ηεηεπωνε ηεηεηηνε γαο (Shenoute P.Ryl.Copt. 70) γαναγ εηηπηεταγετ-πηνογε (Worrell Freer 237) εεικ-ωμετε ηρομετε εεοερε εροκ (Shenoute Amél. I 71) εεικ-αογηρ ηνορειε χιντα-παι ηαζογ

40. “Time-setting” CC constructions: narrative temporal reference to sunrise/sunset, in sophisticated syntax (note adnominal-adnexal CC; preposition governing nexus). (The translations below are approximate and flat, almost entirely devoid of the semantic nuancing of the Coptic).

   (a) preposition + [“the sun/time-term + CC]

   nεxus

(Pachom ed. Lefort 92) δαην ηνομητ ηνοογ επηανκοτκ “Three days before he was to die”

39 Note that εαγ- topics seem to differ, in that the focality seems to be low, or to be rheumaticity, rather than focality. This pattern set, first proposed three decades ago, has not yet been fully studied and understood. It has Egyptian antecedents — at least in Demotic and Late Egyptian (see Shisha-Halevy 1978).
(b) “before/at sunrise/sunset”: πρὸ ἡλίου ἀνιόντος. Here Greek interference is conceivable.

(Till Mart. I 193) γὰρ ὑπογόειν εἰπνᾶν “before the sun rose/would rise”

(Budge Misc. 142) οὖν τῆς εἰπνᾶσσαν “when the sun set/would set”

(lit. approx. ‘at for the sun to set’)  

(De Morte Iosephi [Lagarde] 23:9) μναγ μπρε εἰπνᾶν “when the sun was about to rise”

(Gen. 15:12) μναγ μπρε εἰπνᾶσσαν “when the sun was about to set”.

(c) “not yet” form, CC (even though the converter is often zeroed):

(Worrell Freer 232,12) μνατ-πρε νωτπ “before the sun set” (“when the sun had not yet set”)

(Jud. 14:18) εμπατε-πρε νωτπ “before the sun set” (“when the sun had not yet set”)

(d) Clause Conjugation:

(Isidore ed. Munier, 159) ιτερε-πογοείν ὡς “after the sun had risen”

(Isidore ed. Munier, 122) παντε-πογοείν ὡς “until the sun had risen”

(e) temporal νεε (still to be studied):

(Apocr. Joh. NHC II 59,35f.) νεε μπρε εἰπνᾶν “when the sun was about to rise”.

(f) adverbial CC:

(Jos. 8:29) πρε εἰπνάτε εἰςωτπ (Gk genitive absolute: interference?)

“as the sun was about to set”

(Jud. 9:33, Isidore ed. Munier, 174) ερεπρη ναωά “as the sun was about to rise”

(Jon. 4:8 Boh.) ακουωτπ εἰπναωάι κατοτγ νξε-φρη “it came to pass, as soon as the sun had risen…” (from Alexis Mallon, Grammaire copte, Beyrouth 1956, Chrestomathie).

(Till Mart. I 281) ερεπρη ναωτπ “as the sun was about to set”

(Gen. 15:17) ερεπρη ναβεκ εἰςωτπ “just as the sun was about to set” — periphrastic (?).

(Apophth. 218) απρε εἰ εἰπνασσωτπ narrativized “the sun was about to set” — periphrastic (auxiliary εἰ).

(g) Non-verbal:

(Sap. Salom. Lagarde 16:28) γὰρ νακα μπρε “before sunrise” — “sunrise” has a proper-name status.
41. A question of identity: the Generic Present — more real than hypothetical.

I wish to consider once again the significance of this form, seemingly Circumstantial Present, yet with the Stern-Jernstedt Object Exclusion, and the intransitive-infinitive exclusion suspended, conjointly with (or consequently of) durativity disabling. This residual $\text{ⲉϥ}$-form is, I believe, a homonym of the familiar CC, the Present Converb (see Shisha-Halevy 2007a with further references, also to Demotic attestation) — a distinct generic, non-actual ‘Present’ tense.

Like some other special verb-forms, this form seems to be more frequent in post-classic Sahidic (colloquial preserving of old morphology and categories?), and in B4 John (Bodmer III) Boh.

This tense-form occurs as carrier of the lexical core, following (satellital and adnexal to) the highly grammaticalized auxiliary $\text{ⲟⲩⲱ}$: ($\text{ⲛⲧ}$)$\text{ⲁϥⲟⲩⲱ}$ $\text{ⲉϥ}$—“he has [already …]”, the periphrastic perfect tense of Coptic (Grossman 2009).

Non-Biblical exx.:

(Budge Misc. 24,34, 28,9) $\text{ⲧϥⲏⲓⲓⲓ}$
(P.HermitageCopt. 41,8) $\text{ⲧⲓⲓⲓ}$
(P.HermitageCopt. 113 n.8 $\text{ⲧⲓⲓ}$ $\text{ⲧⲓⲓ}$)
(Till Mart. II 127,13) $\text{ⲧⲓⲓ}$ $\text{ⲧⲓⲓ}$
(Till Mart. II 55,4, 56, 5, Drescher Leg. 21,14 etc.) $\text{ⲟⲩⲱ}$ $\text{ⲟⲩⲱ}$

42. CC and auxiliation. $\text{ⲧⲓⲓ}$

Unlike other auxiliaries, e.g. $\text{ⲟⲩⲱ}$, “cease, have done”, in narrative also forming the periphrastic perfect, the old Egyptian-Coptic auxiliary $\text{ⲟⲩⲱ}$ is a “pure” grammeme, with (a) suppletive function, (b) the role of signalling inalienable association.

For (a), we have a rich suppletive system: the CC converb carries adnexally the theme — dynamic or stative converbs (alias the Stern-Jernstedt/durative infinitive,40 and the Stative) — while expanding the nuclear, non-durative tense-form; moreover, $\text{ⲟⲩⲱ}$ makes adverbial verb-forms, existentials, Nominal Sentences compatible with tense-forms (usually Base Conjugation or imperatives):

(Apophth. 59) $\text{ⲧⲓⲓ}$ $\text{ⲧⲓⲓ}$ $\text{ⲧⲓⲓ}$ $\text{ⲧⲓⲓ}$ $\text{ⲧⲓⲓ}$
(Ps.72:14) $\text{ⲧⲓⲓ}$ $\text{ⲧⲓⲓ}$ $\text{ⲧⲓⲓ}$ $\text{ⲧⲓⲓ}$ $\text{ⲧⲓⲓ}$

— suppletion for the Stative: in fact, double suppletion, with the Greek-origin infinitive homonymous and suppletive for the Stative.

40 Admittedly a jarring term, a contradiction in terms. “Dynamic” or “Present Converb” is preferable.
(Gen. 39:10 Boh. BNF Copte 1) ἁςϣⲱⲡⲓ εκκαχίας νεώςαυνιν ἁςⲉⲩⲩ νεدواυ
(Ex.33:13 Maspero) εἰεψωπέ ελες εγςνιν — remarkably, a Circumstantial Preterite as rheme of ὁψων. So too Jos.5:7 ἁςψων εμψυγ-.

(b) Less well-known is ὁψων + CC to signify part/whole of body-part inalienability:
(Apophth. 59) ἁςψων ερεπνυρω ρογνειν
(Deut 33:28 Boh. BNF Copte 1) εφεψων ερεπνυρος χορ.

The inalienability features or system in Coptic are far from clear. We are familiar with certain syntactic exponents of personal-sphere relationship: suffixal possessives (พอ=ς as against πεκ-ρο, not a distinctive opposition for this lexeme); in Bohairic, the construction [π- η-] in opposition to [φ- π- ητε-] (with [π- ητε]- a reduced categorial form), see Shisha-Halevy 2007a §3.9; φο/φυ= and εφο= with the existentials: μο υγν-θυ δπτυοηε, υγν-/θυ-θυ φομ-φυ=, as the inalienable alternants for the possessive verboids.

In our rather complex ὁψων construction we have another sophisticated case of Part-Whole suppletion, triggered by the inalienably-related “Constituent-Actor” (“their face”) of the converb, and consisting of this and the high-ranking “Whole Actor” (“they”) for the enframing verb-clause. This reminds one of the familiar Whole + Part theme construction in Middle Egyptian: sꜢ.j/φ.ο fɲh “my son, his hand is strong” = “my son’s hand is strong” (=”my son is of age”). The function of the construction in point appears to be solely that of characterizing the inalienable (Charles Bally’s “Personal-Sphere”) association, and the suppletive factor is the “requirement” to start with the Whole.

The inalienability phenomenon, still unresearched for Coptic, may be scalar, with a core of lexemes for which the marked syntax obtains, and a periphery less marked. It is difficult to integrate all constructions, but our suppletive pattern seems to signal higher or highest inalienability.

References of the Coptic texts


Others:


Judith: *ibidem*.
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