CIRCUMSTANTIAL VIGNETTES: REFLECTIONS ON ADNOMINAL, ADVERBIAL, ADNEXAL: THE COPTIC "CIRCUMSTANTIAL" CONVERB

By Ariel Shisha-Halevy

For Helmut Satzinger

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, ⲛⲉ- 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 ε-ⲙⲙⲟⲛ and even ε-ⲙⲟⲅⲓⲥ). 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 ϥ-]   ⲥⲱⲧⲙ}

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-   ⲥⲱⲧⲙ] + -ϥ-}

p h r a s e

n   e   x   u   s

The infinitive is here governed (as "object") by the nuclear Conjugation Base (here ⲁ-), and both together are rhematic to the theme-actor (here -ϥ-). 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:

(c$_1$) pre-nexal: **existential/non-existential** ⲟⲩⲛ-/ⲙⲛ- + (non-specific, usually unquantified) noun-phrase

(c$_2$) pre-nexal: **presentative** ⲉⲓⲥ (ⲉⲓⲥ ϩⲏⲏⲧⲉ, 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 adnexal 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 constituential-paradigm size, inversely proportional to grammemicality grading, inversely proportional to linkage grading.[6] Nuclearity[7] 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 heterogenous 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

---

[6] See Shisha-Halevy 2004.
[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 ⲉϥϩⲁⲩ ⲁⲓⲙⲉⲥⲧⲱϥ — an instructive example: ⲉϥϩⲁⲩ 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 adverbial 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 ⲱⲱⲡⲉ, ⲟⲩⲱ,

---

[8] Cf. Shisha-Halevy 1998:157ff.

ϭⲓⲛⲉ, 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 (ⲉϣⲁϥ-, ⲉⲙⲉϥ-), the Circumstantial Preterite (ⲉⲁϥ-), the Circumstantial Future (ⲉϥⲛⲁ-), converted Nominal Sentence (with "whereas" a typical but not exclusive reading):

Jos. 22:22 ϫⲉ-ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲛⲧⲟϥ ⲟⲛ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲛⲧⲟϥ ⲡⲉ ⲡϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ
    ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ

Prov. 27:2 A, S (Z 24) ⲙⲁⲣⲉⲕⲉⲟⲩⲉ ⲧⲁⲓⲁⲕ ⲉⲧⲕⲧⲁⲡⲣⲟ ⲉⲛ ⲧⲉ/
    ⲕⲉⲧⲁⲡⲣⲟ…ⲉⲛⲧⲱⲕ ⲁⲛ ⲧⲉ

Sap. Salom. 8:10 ϯⲛⲁϫⲓ-ⲉⲟⲟⲩ …ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲁⲓⲟ ϩⲛⲧⲙⲛⲧϩⲗⲗⲟ ⲉⲁⲛⲅ-
    ⲟⲩϣⲏⲣⲉ ϣⲏⲙ

Gal. 6: 3 ⲉϣϫⲉ-ⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲁ ⲅⲁⲣ ϫⲱ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ ϫⲉ-ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲡⲉ ⲉⲩⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲡⲉ

10. *Adnexality* is highly operative in Coptic. While the *nota relationis* ⲛ- 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 Schultze-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);**
(d_1) **Non-combinatory endocentric ("endonuclear") roles:**
    ⲉⲥⲣⲓⲙⲉ **"(one [fem.]) crying"; ⲉϥⲕⲱⲧⲉ "it turning around",**
    "round about";
(d_2) **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 rhematic 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 co-predicative 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 μετοχη — 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 μετοχη, 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).

[10] See Bakker 1988: 108ff. ("circumstantial participle). Stern (1880: 242) describes the non-attributive "participium" as "Tempus des umständlichen Nebensatzes aus den Schranken seiner adjektivischen Bedeutung".

[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.[12] Lohmann points out the functional affinity of the Indo-European participle and the Altai-Turkic *converb* 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 adnexal and/or converbal[13] 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.[14] 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 (ⲡⲱⲁⲉⲛⲉⳅ, ⲟⲩⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⳅⲛ-). Cases like ⲟⲩ-ⲉⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩⳅ (Mt 11:30, Ps 118:68, both Oxyrhynchite, both rhemes of delocutive Nom. Sentences) are rare:

    NUCLEUS + adverbials
                   ⲛ- (*nota relationis*: Steinthal 1847)
                   nominals (e.g. ⲱⲏⲙ)[15]
                   CC
                   RC
                   BASIC (no conversion)

Now the adnominal CC is generally conceived of as *alternant 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, **symmetries are suspect,** being symptomatic of an extrinsic systematization. Here is a persistent, systemic yet false symmetry model, namely W. Till's "unechter/uneigentlicher Relativ-satz" (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 Transpo-sition", since the adjective as a Part of Speech is uncalled-for in this context, which demands *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 *a priori*

---

[15] Arguably, these are not residual adjectives but cases of composition (*in fine compositi).*

[16] 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 ist; sonst gibt es keinen Subordinator" — often comparing Arabic (see n. 17). However, the Egyptian RC is not really post-nominal; it rather combines with the determinator, with the noun lexeme infixed in this discontinuous syntagm.

[17] In parenthesis, one may say that the implied comparison with the Classical Arabic alternation of *alladi* vs. *zero* relative marking is not entirely far-fetched, for there are synchronic and diachronic morphosyntactic indications to the Circumstantial being a "con-version 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.)[18]

(b) The Relative Conversion does occur, albeit rarely, in non-specific (generic or hermeneutical) environment.[19]

(c) The CC, an adnexal (not conjunctional Indo-European-style) clause, does not "mean" the same as the Relative; their signifieds are different. The CC is a rhematic expansion, converbial (converbal?), 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 *ceteris paribus*,[20] but obtains nevertheless.

(d) The converter-hood 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 *pronominal* (as in earlier Egyptian), not converter. So it is, most notably, in the actor position in the Bipartite and Adjective Verbs: ⲡⲱⲱⲥ ⲉⲧ-ⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩϥ, ⲛⲓⲡⲁⲑⲟⲥ ⲉⲧ-ⲥⲏⲱ; but also as topic (not satellite), in the last-position slot of the Cleft Sentence (FOCUS ⲡ(ⲉ) ⲉⲧ-, FOCUS ⲉⲧ-).

The RC is thus hardly an "adjectival converter". First, it is not always converter (above). Second, it occurs in-paradigm with Circumstantials (e.g. ⲡⲁⲓ ⲉϥ-/ⲡⲁⲓ ⲉⲧ-)/ Third, even as converter, the Relative is not be

---

[18] Shisha-Halevy 2007b.

[19] Shisha-Halevy 1981: 323 §2.5; 2007a: 266, 351f.

[20] Compare the difference of the two English *-ing* homonyms, *a dancing girl* (attributive, adjectival-participial) *vs*. *a girl dancing* (rhematic, adnexal, converbial). 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 *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 ([ⲡ- ⲉⲧ-], [ⲡⲁⲓ ⲉⲧ-]), that is, not *in compatibility* with a high-specificity noun syntagm or its determinator, but *in constituental 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 — adnexal 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; tha 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 *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 *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 juncturally linked to it pronominally; *both are in fact adnexal*. 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 *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 ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲧⲥⲱⲧⲙ to the rare, but well attested by now with more than a dozen exx., "*abundans*" (Polotsky 1987: 55ff., following Bakker 1988 for Greek), ⲧⲉⲥϩⲓⲙⲉ ⲉⲧⲥϩⲙⲟⲟⲥ ⲙⲛϩⲁⲓ Shenoute ed. Leipoldt IV 28. This scenario (not rare: found in Celtic, Romance, Greek) results in the synchronic existence of two ⲉⲧ- 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 oppositive 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 rheme):

CC

ⲛ-

(Athan. ed. Lefort 84) ⲟⲩⲉⲗⲉⲩⲑⲉⲣⲟⲥ ⲡⲉ ⲛⲁⲩⲧⲉϩⲟⲩⲥⲓⲟⲥ
(Prov. 28:15) ⲟⲩⲙⲟⲩⲓ ⲡⲉ ⲉϥϩⲕⲁⲉⲓⲧ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲟⲩⲱⲛϣ ⲉϥϩⲟⲃⲉ ⲡⲉ

Another striking environment is following ϣⲱⲡⲉ:

(Apophth. 61,4) ⲁⲩϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲉⲩⲥⲃⲧⲱⲧ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲡⲟⲗⲓⲥ ⲧⲏⲣⲥ ⲉⲩⲣⲓⲙⲉ
(1 Cor.14:11) †ⲛⲁϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲛⲃⲁⲣⲃⲁⲣⲟⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲩⲃⲁⲣⲃⲁⲣⲟⲥ ⲡⲉ
       ⲡⲉⲧϣⲁϫⲉ ⲛⲙⲙⲁⲓ

See further below; and consider Steinthal 1847: 52 on ⲛ- "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". Steinthal 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 ⲛ- 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 constituence) 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) ϩⲉⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ ϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲛϩⲏⲧⲛ *vs.* ⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲧⲉ-ϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲛϩⲏⲧⲛ

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) ⲑⲉ nucleus: CC (conjunctional, below)
(h) time/place nucleus (specificity-indifferent): CC (conjunctional, below).

23. A brief word on **converbs**.[24] Coptic, Ethiopian and Turkish (gener-
ally, 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 con-
verbal *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 *invraisem-
blance*" 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 auxil-
iary converbs, so typical of ME. Significant in Coptic are also the Clause
Conjugations and the Eventives (ϩⲙⲡⲧⲣⲉϥ-, ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲁⲧⲣⲉϥ- 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 knowl-
edge 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 *ⲉⲧ-… ⲁⲩⲱ/ⲏ ϥ-); 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* conver-
sion form, or conversion base? Is the CC here expanding (satellital),
more or less as usual, with the coordinator ⲁⲩⲱ or the disjunctors ⲁⲗⲗⲁ,
ⲏ 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) con-
structions, 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 cor-
roboration 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…".

---

[24] Haspelmath and König 1995, Shisha-Halevy 2009 and 2010.

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) ⲟⲩⲁⲅⲁⲑⲟⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉϥⲥⲟⲩⲧⲱⲛ ⲡⲉ

(Worrell *Freer* 280) ⲟⲩⲇⲓⲕⲁⲓⲟⲥ ⲡⲉ ⲛϩⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉϥⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ

(Jos. 23:9) ϩⲉⲛⲛⲟϭ ⲛϩⲉⲑⲛⲟⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲩⲧⲁϫⲣⲏⲩ

(Sap. Salom. 8:19f.) ϫⲉ-ⲁⲛⲅ-ⲟⲩϣⲏⲣⲉ ϣⲏⲙ ⲛⲉⲩⲫⲩⲏⲥ ⲉⲩⲛⲧⲁⲓ
        ⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲛⲟⲩⲯⲩⲭⲏ ⲉⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲁⲛⲅ-ⲟⲩⲁⲅⲁⲑⲟⲥ…

(Ps. 24:8 Budge) ⲟⲩⲭⲣⲏⲥⲧⲟⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉϥⲥⲟⲩⲧⲱⲛ ⲡⲉ

(II Reg 1:23) ⲛⲁⲙⲉⲣⲁⲧⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲛⲉⲥⲱⲟⲩ — noteworthy, for the CC
        here coordinated to an (apparently) specific nucleus.

(Sap. Salom. 7:22-3) ⲟⲩⲛ-ⲟⲩⲡⲛⲉⲩⲙⲁ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛϩⲏⲧⲥ ⲉϥⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲛⲣⲉϥⲛⲟⲓ
        ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲙⲟⲧ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ ⲛⲁⲧⲉⲥⲙⲟⲧ ⲉϥⲁⲥϣⲟⲩ ⲣⲣⲉϥⲣϩⲱⲃ
        ⲉϥϭⲙϭⲟⲙ ⲉϥⲟ ⲛⲁⲧⲧⲱⲗⲙ ⲛⲥⲁⲃⲉ ⲛⲁⲧⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲙⲙⲁⲓⲁⲅⲁⲑⲟⲛ
        ⲉϥⲧⲟⲣϩ ⲉⲙⲉⲩϣⲁⲙⲁϩⲧⲉ ⲙⲙⲟϥ ⲣⲣⲉϥⲣⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩϥ
        ⲙⲙⲁⲓⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉϥⲧⲁϫⲣⲏⲩ ⲉϥⲟⲣϫ ⲉϥⲟ ⲛⲁⲧⲣⲟⲟⲩϣ ⲉϥϭⲙϭⲟⲙ
        ⲉϩⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉϥϫⲱϣⲧ ⲉⲭⲙ-ⲡⲧⲏⲣϥ ⲉϥϫⲱⲧⲉ ϩⲓⲧⲛⲛⲉⲡⲛⲉⲩⲙⲁ
        ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲣⲣⲉϥⲛⲟⲓ ⲉⲧϣⲟⲟⲙⲉ — a nice array of alter-
        nating *notae relationis*, Circumstantials and Relatives.

(Besa ed. Kuhn 80) ⲡⲉⲧⲉⲛϥϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲁⲛ ⲏ ⲛⲧⲟϥ ⲉϥϣⲟⲟⲡ — the
        first element is probably revealed by the CC as non-specific! So
        too:

(Drescher Leg. 49) ⲡⲉⲧⲉⲛϥⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲁⲛ… ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉϥⲟⲩⲱϣ… — coor-
        dination basis generic? See Haspelmath 2004.

vs. (relative coordinates with specific nucleus grammemes)

(Luc. 9:41) ⲧⲅⲉⲛⲉⲁ ⲛⲁⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲧϭⲟⲟⲙⲉ

(Ps. 3:3) ⲛⲧⲕ-ⲡⲁⲉⲟⲟⲩ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲧϫⲓⲥⲉ ⲛⲧⲁⲁⲡⲉ (Gk δόξα μου καὶ
        ὑψῶν τὴν κεφαλήν μου)

(Phil 4:1) ⲛⲁⲥⲛⲏⲩ ⲙⲙⲉⲣⲓⲧ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉϯⲟⲩⲁϣⲟⲩ

(Besa ed. Kuhn 77) ⲛⲉϩⲃⲏⲩⲉ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲇⲓⲕⲁⲓⲟⲥⲩⲛⲏ has
        an inverse sequence.

---

[25] See Shisha-Halevy 1986, Chapter Six; 2004; 2007a, Chapter Four.

Construction (B):

(Shenoute L III 46) ⲛⲧⲟϥ ⲙⲁⲩⲁⲧϥ ⲡⲉⲧⲥⲟⲧⲡ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉϥⲧⲁⲓⲏⲩ

(Shenoute Chass. 108) ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁϥⲣϩⲏⲅⲉⲙⲱⲛ ⲉⲑⲉⲃⲁⲓⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ
       ⲉⲁϥⲣⲁⲑⲟⲩⲥⲧⲁⲗⲓⲟⲥ ⲉⲣⲁⲕⲟⲧⲉ

(Pist. 356) ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲉⲙⲡⲟⲩⲣϩⲱⲃ ϩⲛⲙⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ ⲙⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ
       ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲉⲁⲩⲙⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ …ⲉⲩⲣϩⲱⲃ

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 pro-
nominal paradigms: 3rd sgl. masc. (ⲉϥⲕⲱⲧⲉ "round about", adverb) and
3rd sgl. masc./fem. (ⲉⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩϥ "any good one", ⲉⲥⲣⲓⲙⲉ "any crying one
[fem.])". The adverbal slot points to a connection with the satellital CC:
the **adnexal expansion,** juncturally different — looser — from the mor-
phological object construction, which also explains the absence of actan-
tial marking:

(P.Mon.Epiph. 313) ⲙⲡⲓϭⲓⲛⲉ ⲉⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩϥ

(Lev.6:10 Boh. Paris BNF Copte 1) ⲛⲛⲟⲩϫⲟⲙϫⲉⲙ ⲉⲁϥϭⲓ-ϣⲉⲙⲏⲣ

(Gen.31:8) …ϫⲡⲟ ⲉϥⲟ ⲛⲧⲟ ⲧⲟ

(Judith 12:3) ⲉⲛⲛⲁⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲧⲱⲛ ⲉϥⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲉϯ ⲛⲉ

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) ⲛⲛⲉϥⲱϫⲛ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛϩⲏⲧⲧⲏⲩⲧⲛ ⲉϥⲟ ⲛϩⲙϩⲁⲗ ⲁⲩⲱ
       ⲛⲛⲣⲉϥⲡⲉϩϣⲉ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙⲡⲁⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ

(Heb.12:16) ⲟⲩⲛ-ⲟⲩⲡⲟⲣⲛⲟⲥ ⲏ ⲉϥⲥⲟⲟϥ (Boh. ⲟⲩⲡⲟⲣⲛⲟⲥ ⲓⲉ
       ⲟⲩⲥⲁϥϩⲏⲧ)

Adverbials:

(Prov. 3:24) ⲉⲕⲙⲟⲧⲛ = ἡδέως

---

[26] Shisha-Halevy 1975 and 1976, 2007a: 586 ff., §§4.5.1.2, 4.5.2). A newly suggested
analysis is forthcoming.

Generic person, also neutric feminine:

(Rom. 5:9 Thompson) ⲛⲁϣⲱⲥ = πολλῷ
And (Budge Misc.168) ⲁϥⲉⲓ ⲉϥⲕⲱⲧⲉ

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) ⲉⲓⲥ ⲡⲉⲓⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲡⲱⲓ ⲡⲉ ⲁⲓⲧⲛⲛⲟⲟⲩϥ — a distinct possessive construction for high-specificity *possessa*: "this… of mine")

(Pist. 338,10f.) ⲁⲥϣⲱⲡⲉ ϭⲉ ⲛⲧⲉⲣⲉⲡⲥⲱⲧⲏⲣ ⲥⲱⲧⲙ ⲉⲛⲉⲓϣⲁϫⲉ ⲉⲥϫⲱ ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲛϭⲓ-ⲙⲁⲣⲓⲁ

(sim. 75,1f.; 124,12; 136,13f.; Budge Misc.192., etc.)

(Acta Pilati 79) ⲉⲧⲃⲉⲡⲉⲓϩⲱⲃ ϭⲉ ⲉⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩϥ

(Worrell *Freer* 292) ⲧⲱⲟⲩⲛ ϩⲁⲡⲁⲓ ⲉⲣⲉϯⲡⲟϭⲉ ⲛϣⲉ ⲙⲡⲉⲥⲏⲧ ⲙⲙⲟϥ

(Pist. 384) ϫⲉ-ⲉⲛⲉⲟⲩϫⲁⲓ ⲉⲛⲉⲓⲕⲟⲗⲁⲥⲓⲥ ⲙⲛⲛⲉⲓⲕⲣⲓⲥⲓⲥ ⲉⲩⲥⲃⲧⲱⲧ ⲛⲣⲣⲉϥⲣⲛⲟⲃⲉ

27. **Adnominal CC: ⲛⲓⲙ-determinated nucleus, CC and RC expansion.**

Structurally, two ⲛⲓⲙ homonyms have been suggested (Shisha-Halevy 1986: 143 f., 146), *viz.* a **determinator**, commutable (not compatible) with *zero*, indefinite and definite determinators (totalizing "all"), specifying, hence with the familiar symptoms of specificity: expansion by RC, plural anaphoric reference, Stern-Jernstedt ⲛ- compatibility, coordination by ⲙⲛ-; another entity combined with *zero* — a **quantifier** "any, every", hence: CC expansion, singular anaphoric reference, coordinated by ϩⲓ-, ⲛⲧⲉ-/ⲛⲧⲁ= (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 *variae lectiones*) and their environment are not consistently valid (so the sgl./pl. statement), except perhaps as a statistical tendency. ϩⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲙ, ⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲙ, ⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓϣ ⲛⲓⲙ, ⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛⲓⲙ are certainly a case apart, neutralizing the opposition that is limited to cases like ϩⲓⲥⲉ ⲛⲓⲙ. (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) ϩⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩϥ

(Deut. 14:11) ϩⲁⲗⲏⲧ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉϥⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ

(Jos. 10:40) ⲛⲕⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲟⲩⲛ-ⲛⲓϥⲉ ⲛⲱⲛϩ ⲛϩⲏⲧⲟⲩ,

as against:

(Jos. 11:11) ⲛⲕⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲧⲉⲟⲩⲛ-ⲛⲓϥⲉ ⲛⲱⲛϩ ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ

and:

(Jos. 10:39) ⲛⲕⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲧⲱⲛϩ

(Ez. 28:13) ⲱⲛⲉ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩ

(Num. 16:26) ⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲛⲧⲁⲩ

(Num. 17:2) ⲁⲣⲭⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲛⲧⲁⲩ

(P.Lond.Copt. I 1029, CPR IV 49, 75, BKU III 400 etc.) ϩⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉ- ⲡⲉ

(Pist. 283) ⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉϥ-

(Keph. 160) ⲥⲁⲡ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉϥ-

(Keph. 139) ⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉϥ-

(Keph. 157) ϭⲁⲙ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉϥ-

(Acta Pauli 36,9f.) ⲥⲱⲱϥ ⲛⲓⲙ ϩⲓ-ⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲩϩⲁⲩ

(Athan. Lefort 49 b 15f. uncollated) ϩⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉϥϩⲟⲟⲩ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲧⲭⲁϩⲙ

(Besa ed. Kuhn 2,27, 16,24f., 17,16, 51,18, 96,5f.) ϩⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉϥϩⲟⲟⲩ

(Besa ed. Kuhn 32,20, 33,23, 57,25) ϩⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲧϩⲟⲟⲩ

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.) ⲙⲛϩⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩϥ - ⲙⲛϩⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉϥϩⲟⲟⲩ. This compounds the difficulty. Contrary to expectation, I do not find the existential ⲟⲩⲛ- and ⲙⲛ- preceding the quantifying ⲛⲓⲙ. Generally, it seems the quantifier is much weaker statistically than the determinator ⲛⲓⲙ.

[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 {ⲡⲁⲓ ⲉϥ-} 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) ⲅⲉⲛⲛⲟϭ ⲙⲡⲉⲑⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲛⲁϣⲱⲟⲩ…ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲣⲉⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲣⲉⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ — a possible interpretation of the first ⲉⲣⲉ- is as a Focalizing Conversion, with the second as focalized CC.

(Shenoute Wessely IX 177) ⲟⲩⲛ-ⲅⲉⲛⲇⲓⲕⲁⲓⲟⲥ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉϥⲛⲁⲧⲁⲅⲟⲟⲩ ⲛϭⲓ-ⲡⲅⲱⲃ ⲛⲛⲁⲥⲉⲃⲏⲥ

(Worrell *Freer* 292) ⲁϥⲁⲙⲁⲅⲧⲉ ⲛⲧⲡⲟϭⲉ ⲛϣⲉ ⲉⲥⲛⲧⲟⲟⲧⲟⲩ

(Crum *Papyruscodex* 18,13) ⲡⲅⲁⲧ ⲉϥⲡⲟⲥⲉ ⲡⲉ

(Jos.12:2) ⲛⲉⲣⲣⲱⲟⲩ ⲉⲧϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲭⲓⲛ-ⲥⲓⲇⲱⲛ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲩⲟ ⲛⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲭⲓⲛ-ⲁⲣⲛⲱⲛ

(Judith 10:19) ⲛⲓⲙ ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲕⲁⲧⲁⲫⲣⲟⲛⲓ ⲙⲡⲉⲓⲗⲁⲟⲥ ⲡⲁⲓ ⲉⲟⲩⲛⲧⲁϥ ⲅⲣⲁⲓ ⲛⲅⲏⲧϥ ⲛ-

29. The relationship of the CC to **existential syntax** is interesting, mainly due to doubt regarding the thematicity of ⲟⲩⲛ-/ⲙⲛ-, and the existential conundrum: # ⲟⲩⲛ-NOUN (non-spec.) ⲉϥ- # as against # ⲟⲩⲛ-NOUN (non-spec.) — Rheme # may be viewed as the paradigmatic array and opposition of an analytic *vs*. synthetic ("morphological") dynamic or stative 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.) ⲟⲩⲛⲭⲁⲉⲓⲥ ⲉϥⲥⲱⲣⲙⲉ ⲟⲩⲛⲣⲙⲣⲉⲟⲩⲏ ⲉϥⲁⲡⲱϣⲥ

(Man.Hom. 10,6-9) ⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲁⲛ ⲁϥϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲁⲛ ⲙⲡⲉϥϣⲱⲡⲉ

(Man.Ps. 172,21f.) ⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲉⲥⲁⲩ ⲉϥⲙⲏⲣ ⲁⲡϣⲏⲛ

(Man.Hom. 23,7) ⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲁⲛ ⲁⲩⲣⲁⲣⲛⲏ 30,10 ⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲁⲛ ⲁϥϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲁⲛ ⲙⲡⲉϥϣⲱⲡⲉ

(Shenoute L IV 108) ⲟⲩⲛⲅⲁⲅ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲙⲉⲉⲅⲉ ⲭⲉ-…

(Shenoute Wessely IX 91) ⲟⲩⲛ-ⲅⲉⲛⲟⲥ ⲥⲛⲁⲩ ϣⲟⲟⲡ…
(Shenoute Chass. 116) ⲉϣϫⲉ-ⲟⲩⲛ-ⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉϥⲟⲩⲉϣ-ⲧⲙⲉ…
(Shenoute L IV 41) ⲟⲩⲛ-ϩⲟⲓⲛⲉ ⲉⲩⲟ ⲛⲁⲧⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ v.l. om. ⲉⲩⲟ
(Shenoute Wessely IX 141) ⲉϣϫⲉ-ⲟⲩⲛ-ⲟⲩⲁ ⲇⲉ ⲉϥϫⲱ ⲛⲛⲓⲡⲉⲧϣⲟⲩⲉⲓⲧ…
(Prov.26:11) ⲟⲩⲛ-ⲟⲩϣⲓⲡⲉ ⲉϣⲁϥϫⲡⲉ-ⲛⲟⲃⲉ
(Jud. 3:19) ⲟⲩⲛ-ⲟⲩϣⲁϫⲉ ⲉϥϩⲏⲡ ⲛⲧⲉⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲛⲧⲟⲟⲧ.

30. **Presentate + CC: presented nexus**[29]

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) ⲉⲓⲥ-ⲟⲩⲭⲏⲣⲁ ⲉⲥⲥⲣⲓⲧ ϩⲓⲡⲁϩⲟⲩ ⲙⲙⲟⲛ ⲉⲥⲣⲓⲙⲉ
(Apophth. 180) ⲉⲓⲥ-ϣⲟⲙⲛⲧ ⲙⲙⲟⲛⲁⲭⲟⲥ ⲉⲩⲁϩⲉⲣⲁⲧⲟⲩ ϩⲓⲡⲉⲕⲣⲟ
      ⲛⲑⲁⲗⲁⲥⲥⲁ
(Jud. 3:25) ⲉⲓⲥ-ⲡⲉⲩϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲉϥⲛⲏϫ
(Jud. 4:22) ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲥ-ⲥⲓⲥⲁⲣⲁ ⲉϥⲛⲏϫ.

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) ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ
(O.CrumST 37) ⲡⲣⲟ ⲡⲁⲛⲧⲟⲥ ⲉⲓⲁⲥⲡⲁⲍⲉ
(O.Vind.Copt. 243, 289, 303) ⲉⲓⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉⲓ
(CPR IV 177) ⲉⲓⲧⲁⲅⲟ ⲙⲡⲁϣⲁϫⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲥⲙⲓⲛⲉ
(Pleyte-Boeser 486) ⲉⲓⲁⲥⲡⲁⲍⲉ.

---

[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.[30]

This pattern set achieves macrosyntactic linkage by Nominal-Sentence reference of the formal pronominal themes ⲡⲉ, ⲧⲉ, ⲛⲉ, 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. oppositive? Is the position of the pronominal theme ⲡⲉ, enclitic to a degree, motivated (e.g. by an extensive CC clause) and motivating? Consider:

> # Rheme ⲉϥ- ⲡⲉ #

(Athan. ed. Lefort 20) ⲟⲩϩⲱⲃ ⲉϥϣⲟⲩⲉⲓⲧ ⲡⲉ
(Man.Ps. 22ff.) ⲟⲩⲃⲏⲙⲁ ⲉϥⲟⲩⲁⲃⲉ ⲡⲉ
(Ev.Verit. 23,11) ⲟⲩⲙⲉ ⲉϥϫⲏⲕ ⲡⲉ "a true one" (rheme),

> *vs.* # Rheme ⲡⲉ ⲉϥ-/ⲛ- #

(Till Mart. I 146, 2) ⲟⲩⲏⲣⲡ ⲡⲉ ⲉϥϯ ⲉⲡϩⲙⲭ
(Ev.Phil. 56,3ff.) ⲟⲩⲣⲁⲛ ⲡⲉ ⲉϥϩⲏⲡ ⲟⲩⲣⲁⲛ ⲡⲉ ⲉϥⲟⲩⲟⲛϩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ
(Apophth. 241) ⲟⲩϣⲱⲥ ⲡⲉ ⲉϥⲙⲟⲟⲛⲉ…
(Munier, Manuscrits 9227) ϩⲉⲛⲙⲁⲑⲏⲧⲏⲥ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛⲉ ϩⲁⲣⲁⲧϥ ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲁϩ
ⲛⲁⲧⲁⲣⲓⲕⲉ ϩⲉⲛⲥⲃⲟⲩⲓ ⲛⲉ ⲉⲩϩⲁⲣⲁⲧϥ ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲁϩ ⲉϥϯⲥⲃⲱ
ⲕⲁⲗⲱⲥ ϩⲉⲛϩⲙϩⲁⲗ ⲛⲉ ⲉⲩⲥⲃⲧⲱⲧ ⲉϫⲱⲕ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲙⲡⲟⲩⲱϣ
ⲙⲡⲉⲩϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ (etc.)
(Pist. 267) ⲟⲩⲥⲟⲛ ⲡⲉ ⲉⲛϥϩⲩⲡⲟⲕⲣⲓⲛⲉ ⲁⲛ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲉϥⲟⲩⲉϣ-
ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ

Consider also cases of neutralization or indifference:

(O.CrumST 265) ⲁⲛⲟⲕ-ⲟⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲓⲟ ⲙⲡⲁⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲁⲛ
(Budge Misc. 42,3f., Apa Mena ed. Drescher 30) ⲛⲧⲕ-ⲛⲓⲙ (ⲛⲧⲉⲓϩⲉ)
ⲉⲕ-
(Apa Mena ed. Drescher 176)[31] ⲛⲧⲟϥ ⲛⲧⲟϥ ⲟⲛ ⲡⲉ ⲉϥϯϭⲟⲙ…

---

[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 ⲡⲉ 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:[32]

- defining formulaic syntax;
- ⲥϩⲁⲓ and related lexical categories (some differently ranking) like ⲱⲓⲛⲉ, ⲁⲥⲡⲁⲍⲉ ⲧⲟⲗⲙⲁ, etc. are intrinsically thematic and carry little or minimal information;
- ϩⲟⲙⲟⲗⲟⲅⲉⲓ, ⲱⲣⲕ, 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 ⲁⲛⲟⲕ/ⲁⲛⲟⲛ
is optional.

(a) Thematic CC, or alternatively *Koinzidenzfall* CC:

ⲍⲏⲛⲱⲛ ⲉϥⲥϩⲁⲓ ⲛⲛⲉⲛⲛⲉⲓⲟⲧⲉ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲛⲉⲩⲥⲉⲃⲏⲥ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲏϩ
      ϩⲛϣⲓⲛⲧ (Drescher Leg. 10)
#PN masc./fem.plur. ⲉϥⲥϩⲁⲓ/ⲉⲥⲥϩⲁⲓ/ⲉⲩⲥϩⲁⲓ# (O.Vind.Copt. 49, 62,
      181)
#PN ⲉⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ (CPR IV 12, 85, Acta Pauli 46, 48)
#ⲁⲛⲁⲕ PN ⲉⲓϣⲓⲛⲓ# (Fay.) (O.CrumVC 92)
#ⲁⲛⲟⲕ PN ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ# (O.Vind.Copt. 47, O.CrumST 110) — not initial
#ⲁⲛⲟⲕ/ⲁⲛⲟⲛ PN f./masc./plur. ⲉⲥⲥϩⲁⲓ / ⲉϥⲥϩⲁⲓ / ⲉⲩⲥϩⲁⲓ# (CPR
      IV 145, O.CrumVC 43, O.CrumST 41, O.Vind.Copt. 104, 105).

(b) Signature-Presentational, not Cleft Sentence[33]. Attested from OE on
(especially in ME) as *jnk pw* + **converbal paradigm**. The formal element
ⲡⲉ is here not enclitic, but proclitic: witness the constituent ⲡⲉϥ-, and
even frequently ⲡϥ-. Kindred to the Biblical divine proclamatory "I am
the Lord your God, who…"[34] The CC is here clearly thematic.

#ⲁⲛⲁⲕ ⲡⲉ PN ⲉⲓⲥϩⲉⲉⲓ# (Fay.), #ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲡⲉ PN ⲉϥⲥϩⲁⲓ# (O.CrumST 383)
#PN ⲡⲉϥⲥϩⲁⲓ#, #PN ⲡϥⲥϩⲁⲓ# (O.CrumVC 48, 60)
#PN f. ⲧⲉⲥⲥϩⲁⲓ# (CPR IV 145).

---

   [33] See Biedenkopf-Ziehner 1983: 45, 180.
   [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 єт- here — not RC but Relative Pronoun — with CC in (a).

#PN пєтсгаι# (O.CrumVC 46)

#PN єтсгаι# (O.Vind.Copt. 173, 208)

#аΝοκ PN єтсгаι єтϣιΝє# (O.CrumVC 17, O.CrumST 237, 287, 246).

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

> VERB (LEXEME) + [noun/pronoun + CC]
>   [n   e   x   u   s]

is here requisite, and *not*

> 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 ΝаΥ or сωтм to verbs "of incomplete predication" (Curme) or, which is almost the rule, incomplete-predication homonyms of semantically full lexemes (so бιΝє). In fact, this is a **distinct transitive valency matrix**. In Shenoute, the CC rheme is mostly the єq- converb, less often єаq-, rarely ємєq- and єϣаq-.

(Shenoute L III 52) тєккΛнсια єтχπο ΝΝєсϣнρє ΝχριστιаΝος
     єΥєιΝє ммос…

(Shenoute L III 117) аqтаат єιмокг Νгнт

(Shenoute L III 94) ОΥΝтаΝ ммаΥ мпϣє мпωΝг мпєстаΥρос
     єqΛамπєΥє мпєгооΥ мΝтєΥϣн

(Shenoute L III 22) тΝΝакотq єρєχωq πєг ϣагραι єтπє

(Shenoute III 21) аΝбΝтq єqсΝг χє- — a familiar and largely idiomatic array of "find" constructions, with some sophisticated reference contours. (гє є- is a quasi-synonym, less typical of Shenoute).

(Shenoute L IV 16) пма н πєгΝааΥ єтєqΝабΝтq єаΥсмΝтq Νє

(Shenoute BM Cat. 206) …єгαρєг єπнι мпΝοΥтє мΝπєqχριστος
     єqοΥааβ

(Shenoute L III 21) ⲁⲛⲥⲱⲧⲙ ⲏ ⲁⲛϭⲛⲧϥ ⲉϥⲥⲏϩ ⲭⲉ-ⲁⲩⲕⲧⲟⲟⲩ
        ⲟⲛ
(Shenoute L IV 36) ⲁⲩⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲙⲡⲉⲟⲟⲩ ⲓⲏⲥ ⲉⲁϥϫⲓ ⲛⲟⲩⲙⲟⲣⲫⲏ
        ⲛϩⲙϩⲁⲗ
(Abd. 2) (A) ⲁⲩⲧⲁⲁⲩ ⲉⲩⲡⲏⲧ ⲁⲓⲧⲉⲉⲕ ⲉⲕⲥⲁⲃⲕ
(Esther E 15 (XVI)) ⲧⲛϭⲓⲛⲉ ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲛϩⲉⲛⲣⲉϥⲣⲡⲉⲑⲟⲟⲩ ⲁⲛ ⲛⲉ.

A remarkable case like:

(Pist. 338,10f.) ⲁⲥϣⲱⲡⲉ ϭⲉ ⲛⲧⲉⲣⲉⲡⲥⲱⲧⲏⲣ ⲥⲱⲧⲙ ⲉⲛⲉⲓϣⲁⲭⲉ
        ⲉⲥϫⲱ ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲛϭⲓ-ⲙⲁⲣⲓⲁ
(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) ⲙⲁⲣⲉϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ ⲉⲡⲉⲡⲣⲟⲫⲏⲧⲏⲥ ⲉϥϫⲱ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ.

A proleptic idiomatic construction with "know":

(Wess. XV 140) ϯⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲉϥϣⲟⲟⲡ ϩⲁϩⲧⲙⲡⲉⲛⲉⲓⲱⲧ
(P.Mon.Epiph. App. I 36f.) ⲉⲛⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲙⲉⲛ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ ⲉⲥⲟ ⲛⲟⲩⲉⲓ
        ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ ϩⲛⲧⲙⲛⲧⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ

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) ⲧⲉⲥⲙⲏ ⲙⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲉϥⲟⲩⲱϣϥ ⲛⲛⲕⲉⲇⲣⲟⲥ (Schleifer;
        Budge ⲉⲥ-, possibly Focalizing Conversion, focusing the object)
ⲧⲉⲥⲙⲏ ⲙⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲉϥⲟⲩⲱϣϥ ⲛⲟⲩϣⲁϩ
ⲧⲉⲥⲙⲏ ⲙⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲉϥⲕⲓⲙ ⲉⲧⲉⲣⲏⲙⲟⲥ
ⲧⲉⲥⲙⲏ ⲙⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲉϥⲥⲟⲃⲧⲉ ⲛⲛⲉⲓⲟⲩⲗ
(Pleyte-Boeser 467.3ff.) ⲡⲁⲛⲧⲓⲅⲣⲁⲫⲟⲛ ⲛⲧⲉⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲗⲏ ⲛ-ⲓⲥ ⲉϥⲥϩⲁⲓ…
(IV Reg.11:13 Maspero) ⲡⲉϩⲣⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲛⲗⲁⲟⲥ ⲉⲩⲛⲏⲩ
(DV I 87 Boh.) ⲛⲓⲣⲉϥϭⲓⲟⲩⲓ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛⲉⲙ ⲛⲓⲡⲟⲣⲛⲟⲥ ⲛⲉⲙ ⲡⲕⲉⲥⲉⲡⲓ
        ⲛⲛⲓⲛⲟⲃⲓ ⲉⲩⲓⲣⲓ ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲛϫⲉ-ⲣⲱⲙⲓ ⲛⲓⲃⲉⲛ…
(Act. 23:18) ⲉⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲙⲡⲉⲓϩⲣϣⲓⲣⲉ ⲉⲟⲩⲛⲧϥ-ⲟⲩϣⲁⲭⲉ
        ⲉϫⲟⲟϥ
(Joh. 2:9 Quecke) ⲧⲱⲡⲉ ⲙⲡⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲁϥⲣⲏⲣⲡ

35 (b). **CC Adnexal**: *nota relationis* +[nexus]:

ⲛⲐⲉ ⲙ[ⲡ-   ⲉϥ-].
    [n e x u s]

and related constructions. This is again a familiar, idiomatic case of pre-dicative nexus included and adjoined by the *nota relationis,* with the CC the nexus rheme.

Note here the neat opposition:

CC (rhematic) *vs.* **RC (attributive):**

(Epist.Jer. 15) ⲛⲐⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲙⲡⲉ2ⲛⲁⲩ ⲛⲟⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉϥϣⲁⲛⲟⲩϭⲱⲡ
    ⲉⲙⲉϥⲣϣⲁⲩ ⲉⲗⲁⲁⲩ

(Ecclesiasticus 34:29) ⲧⲁⲓ ⲧⲉ Ⲑⲉ ⲙⲡⲏⲣⲡ ⲉϣⲁϥⲇⲟⲕⲓⲙⲁⲍⲉ ⲙⲫⲏⲧ
    ⲙⲡⲭⲁⲥⲓ2ⲏⲧ 2ⲙⲡⲙⲓϣⲉ

(Is.55:11 Kasser) ⲧⲁⲓ ⲧⲉ Ⲑⲉ ⲙⲡϣⲁⲭⲉⲉⲧⲛⲏⲩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ 2ⲛⲣⲱⲉⲓ
    ⲉⲛⲛⲉϥⲕⲟⲧϥ ⲉⲡⲁ2ⲟⲩ

(Joh. 17:22 Boh. Horner) ⲟⲩⲟ2 ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲡⲓⲱⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲁⲕⲧⲏⲓϥ ⲛⲏⲓ
    ⲁⲓⲧⲏⲓϥ ⲛⲱⲟⲩ 2ⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲟⲩϣⲱⲡⲓ 2ⲱⲟⲩ ⳹ⲉⲛⲟⲩⲙⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲓ
    ⲙⲡⲉⲛⲣⲏⲧ 2ⲱⲛ ⲉⲛϣⲟⲡ ⳹ⲉⲛⲟⲩⲙⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲓ

(Apophth. 201) ⲧⲁⲓ ⲧⲉ Ⲑⲉ ⲛⲧⲉⲯⲩⲭⲏ ⲉⲥ2ⲟⲗϭ

Also Prov.6:29, 25:13, 1John 3:12, James 2:26 etc.

36. Captions
PN + ⲉϥϣⲁⲭⲉ
(Wess. XVIII 83)[35] ⲁⲡⲁ ⲃⲁⲥⲓⲗⲓⲟⲥ ⲉϥϣⲁⲭⲉ ⲙⲛⲟⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲭⲉ-
    2ⲗⲗⲁⲇⲓⲟⲥ ⲉϥ⳹ⲥⲃⲱ ⲛⲁϥ ⲉⲡⲟⲩⲭⲁⲓ ⲛⲧⲉϥⲯⲩⲭⲏ.

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".[36]

---

[35] Rather comparable to the Egyptian Circumstantial *sḏm.f* in its used as caption to explain and comment on pictorial representations.

[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-mic picture, as well as the other diasystemic insights (dialectal, registerial or textematic). For semantically evaluating "that"-forms, CC joins in many substantival slots, in opposi-tion to adverbials; slots most of which are still problematic: ⲭⲉ-, (ⲉ)ⲧⲣⲉ-, Conjunctive,

(a) **Location (in time/space).** (Is this a lexical or a semantic feature?)

ⲡⲓⲙⲁ ⲉⲣⲉ- … ⲙⲙⲟϥ (DV II Boh. 89,136,147,187, so common, in fact, that it can be considered a typical feature of Nitrian Bohairic).
(Joh. 20:19 Quecke) ⲡⲙⲁ ⲉⲣⲉⲛⲉϥⲙⲁⲑⲏⲧⲏⲥ ⲥⲟⲟⲩϩ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ
(Mt. 22:13, so quoted by Shenoute, Pleyte-Boeser 335, Ins. 69) ⲡⲕⲁⲕⲉ
      ⲉⲧϩⲓⲃⲟⲗ ⲡⲙⲁ ⲉⲣⲉⲡⲣⲓⲙⲉ ⲛⲁϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲙⲛⲡⲭⲁϩϫϩ
      ⲛⲛⲟⲃϩⲉ
ⲡⲓⲉϩⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲣⲉ- (DV II 150.3 (*vs.* 8 rel.))
ⲡⲓⲙⲱⲓⲧ ⲉⲣⲉ- (DV II 207.6)
ⲡⲓⲏⲓ ⲉⲣⲉ- (DV II 211.)
ϯⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲣⲉ- (DV II 238)
ⲡⲓⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲣⲉ- (DV II 232)
ⲡⲓⲥⲏⲩ ⲉⲣⲉ- (DV II 233)
ⲉⲛⲧⲉⲩⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲕⲛⲁϫⲓ ⲛⲧⲓⲉⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲗⲏ (P. Bal. 396)
ⲛⲛⲉϩⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲛϩⲛⲧⲥⲁⲣϫ (Rom. 7:5)
ⲛⲧⲉⲣⲉⲧⲙⲉϩⲙⲛⲧⲁϥⲧⲉ ⲛⲟⲩϣⲏ ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲉⲛⲣϩⲱⲧ (Act. 27:27)
ϩⲙⲡϩⲁⲡ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲉⲕⲕⲣⲓⲛⲉ ⲛⲕⲉⲟⲩⲁ ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ ⲕϭⲁⲓⲟ ⲙⲙⲟⲕ ⲟⲩⲁⲁⲕ
      (Rom. 2:1 v.l. ⲉⲕⲛⲁ-) — not local, but localizing nucleus.

(b) **ⲉϣⲱⲡⲉ + CC** is of theoretical interest for the evolution of histori-
cal lexical non-pertinence (*hpr jw*-), turning into synchronic grammatical-
ized non-pertinence of the self-same element.

(c) **ⲛⲑⲉ (etc.) + CC**[37]

(Achm. *Muséon* 52, 1ff. Lefort) ⲧⲉⲓ ⲉⲛ ⲧⲉ ⲧϩⲉ ⲉⲁⲓⲧⲁⲙⲓⲁⲕ ⲙⲙⲁⲥ
(Apophth.158) ⲛⲑⲉ ϩⲱⲱⲛ ⲉⲛⲕⲱ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ…
ⲛⲑⲉ ⲉⲥⲥⲏϩ (ⲙⲙⲟⲥ)… (BKU III 422; CPR IV 9, 24, 77, 103; P. Bal.
      102,30, 114,15, etc.)
(Drescher Leg. 24) ⲑⲉ ⲉϥⲟ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ.

(d) **Various "that" readings**

(Pist. 309) ⲉϣϣⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲉⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲡⲉ ⲛⲧⲉⲡⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲉⲁϥⲉⲓⲣⲉ
      ⲙⲡⲁⲓ
(1Tim. 3:2) ϣϣⲉ ϭⲉ ⲉⲡⲉⲡⲓⲥⲕⲟⲡⲟⲥ ⲉⲙⲡⲟⲩⲧⲁϩⲟϥ ϩⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛϩⲱⲃ

(ⲉ)-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.
      [37] Cf. Polotsky 1990: 249ff.

(Act. 24:19, sim. 1Tim. 3:2ff.) ⲚⲀⲒ ⲈⲰⲰⲈ ⲈⲨⲒⲘⲠⲈⲒⲘⲀ

(P.Mon.Epiph. 258) ⲦⲈⲚⲞⲨ ⲈⲰⲬⲈ-ⲦⲈⲦⲚⲞⲨⲰⲰ ⲚⲀⲘⲈ ⲈⲢⲈⲦⲈⲒⲢⲎⲚⲎ
    ⲐⲚⲦⲈⲚⲘⲎⲦⲈ — no verb in the CC rheme.

(Drescher Leg. 24) (a vision) �ꙄⲰⲤⲦⲈ ⲈⲒⲚⲀⲨ ⲈⲢⲞⲒ ⲈⲰⲬⲈ ⲈⲢⲈⲞⲨⲢⲰⲘⲈ
    ⲀꙄⲈⲢⲀⲦϤ ꙄⲒⲬⲰⲒ (sim. Pist. 254,7. Pach. 14,27).

(e) Miscellaneous **content CC** (translatable e.g. "in that", "that" —
'pseudo-"that"'). Adnexal?

(Till Mart. I 203,16) … ⲈⲦⲦⲞⲖⲘⲀ ⲈϤⲬⲰ ⲚⲚⲀⲒ sim.

(O.Vind.Copt. 324,4f) ⲦⲞⲖⲘⲀ ⲈϤⲤⲒⲀⲒ passim.

(P.Mon.Epiph. 455) ⲞⲨⲆⲒⲔⲀⲒⲞⲚ ⲀⲚ ⲠⲈ ⲠⲀⲒ ⲈⲔⲞ ⲚⲬⲀⲤⲒꙄⲎⲦ

(Consider also P.Lond.Copt. I 306, sim. Budge Misc.159) ⲚⲦⲀⲞⲨ
    ⲰⲰⲠⲈ ⲘⲘⲞⲔ ⲈⲔⲞⲨⲰⲰ …

(Budge Misc. 76) ⲞⲨ ⲠⲈⲦⲰⲞⲞⲠ ⲘⲘⲞⲔ ⲈⲔⲘⲞⲔꙄ — this "that" is
    semantically complicated: "I ask this in view of the fact that…"
    is one possible reading.

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 seman-
tic 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 ⲦⲈⲤꙄⲒⲘⲈ ⲈⲦⲤꙄⲘⲞⲞⲤ ⲘⲚꙄⲀⲒ).
Other instances, of CC/RC — it is noteworthy, and probably significant,
that they are not more prominent statistically:

(Joh.7:3 Quecke) ϫⲉⲕⲁⲥ ⲉⲣⲉⲛⲉⲕⲙⲁⲑⲏⲧⲏⲥ ⳉⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲛⲉⲕⳉⲃⲏⲩⲉ
       ⲉⲕⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ (v.l. ⲉⲧⲕ-).
(Mc. 3:3 Quecke) ⲉⲣⲉⲧⲉϥϭⲓϫ ⲙⲟⲟⲩⲧ (v.l. ⲉⲧⲉⲣⲉⲧⲉϥϭⲓϫ ϣⲟⲩⲱⲟⲩ)
(Luc. 22:11 Quecke) ⲡⲙⲁ ⲉϯⲛⲁⲟⲩⲱⲙ… (v.l. ⲡⲙⲁ ⲉⲓⲛⲁⲟⲩⲱⲙ…)

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.[38] 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) ⲛⲓⲙ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲕⲉⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲛⲃⲁⲗⲉⲕ ⲉϥϥⲓ ⲙⲙⲟ ⲛⲛⲁⲛⲟⲙ ⲁⲟⲩ
       ⲉϥⲱⲃⳉ ⲙⲙⲁϥ ⲁⲛⲙⲛⲧⳉⲉϥⲧ … ⲁⲟⲩ ⲉⲙⲡϥⲉⲙⲁⳉⲧⲉ ⲛⲧϥⲟⲣⲅⲏ…
(Deut. 3:24 Kasser) ⲛⲓⲙ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲕⲉⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⳉⲛⲧⲡⲉ ⲏ ⳉⲓϫⲛⲡⲕⲁ
       ⲉϥⲛⲁϣⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲕⲁⲧⲁⲛⲉⲛⲧⲁⲕⲁⲁⲩ
(Deut. 4:8) ⲁϣ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲕⲉⲗⲁⲟⲥ ⲉⲩⲛⲧⲁϥ…
(Isidore ed. Munier, 155,1) ⲟⲩ ⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲓⳉⲃⲏⲩⲉ ⲉⲕⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ (Part
       of theme; see " thematic CC" § 33).
(BKU III 338,8) ⲟⲩ ⲡⲉ ⲉϥⲣⲛⲟϥⲣⲉ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ
(Budge Misc. 51) ⲛⲓⲙ ⲧⲉ ⲧⲁⲓ ⲉⲣⲉ-
(Budge Misc. 538) ⲟⲩ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲉⲓⲉⲣⲟ ⲉⲣⲉⲧⲉⲓⲡⲉ ⲧⲁϫⲣⲏⲩ ⲉϫⲱϥ
(Apophth. p. 55,21) ⲁϣ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲃⲓⲟⲥ ⲉⲓⲛⲁⲥⲟⲧⲡϥ ⲛⲁⲓ
(Budge Misc. 444,12f.) ⲛⲓⲙ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲣⲙⲛⳉⲏⲧ ⲉϥⲧⲛⲧⲱⲛ ⲉⲣⲟⲕ
(Wess. XVIII 116) ⲟⲩ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ ⲉⲕⲧⲁⲟ ⲙⲙⲟ

(b) Interlocutive interrogatives, all rhetorical:

(Budge Misc. 42) ⲛⲧⲕ-ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲕ-
(Rom. 14:4) ⲛⲧⲕ-ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲕⲕⲣⲓⲛⲉ
(note the variant reading. ⲉⲧ-/ⲉⲕ- 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):** ⲁϣ, ⲟⲩⲏⲣ, ⲛⲁϣ ⲛⲍⲉ, ⲍⲓⲧⲛ-ⲟⲩ, ⲍⲁⲍ ⲛ-, ⲍⲉⲛⲥⲟⲡ, -ⲱⲥ (Shisha-Halevy 1986 §2.5)

   All exx. are from Shenoute:

(P.Ryl.Copt. 70)[39] ⲟⲩⲏⲣ ⲛⲧⲩⲡⲟⲥ ⲙⲡⲟⲛⲏⲣⲟⲛ ⲉⲁⲩϫⲟⲕⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ
(Amél. II 155) ⲛⲁϣ ⲛⲍⲉ ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲟⲩⲟⲓ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲁⲛ
(Wess. XVIII 140) ⲍⲛⲛⲁⲓ ⲟⲛ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲉⲙⲡⲉⲩⲍⲏⲧ ϭⲛ-ⲁⲣⲓⲕⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ ⲁⲛ
(P.Lond.Copt. I 211) ⲇⲓⲕⲁⲓⲱⲥ ⲉⲁϥⲣⲱⲙⲙⲟ ⲉⲣⲟ

(e) **CC in time-unit syntax**

(1) #ⲉⲓⲥ- TIME-UNIT + CC# "It's [*time-unit*] that…"
(2) #ϣⲁⲛⲧⲉ-ⲟⲩ (ϭⲉ) ϣⲱⲡⲉ / ϣⲁⲧⲛⲁⲩ + CC# "Until when…? " "How long…?"
(Shenoute L III 36) ϣⲁⲛⲧⲉⲟⲩ ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲉⲩⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲛⲛⲉⲓⲃⲟⲧⲉ ⲍⲛⲙⲙⲁ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ
(Shenoute P 131⁴ 144) ϣⲁⲛⲧⲉⲟⲩ ϭⲉ ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲁⲛⲟⲛ ⲙⲡⲉⲛⲡⲱⲛⲍ ⲛⲛⲉⲛⲍⲏⲧ
(Shenoute P.Ryl.Copt. 70) ϣⲁⲧⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲙⲡϥⲧⲁⲛⲍⲉⲧ-ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ
(Worrell Freer 237) ⲉⲓⲥ-ϣⲟⲙⲧⲉ ⲛⲣⲟⲙⲡⲉ ⲉⲓϭⲟⲣϭ ⲉⲣⲟⲕ
(Shenoute Amél. I 71) ⲉⲓⲥ-ⲁⲟⲩⲏⲣ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓϣ ϫⲓⲛⲧⲁ-ⲡⲁⲓ ⲧⲁⲍⲟϥ

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]

                             n e x u s
(Pachom ed. Lefort 92) ⲍⲁⲑⲏ ⲛϣⲟⲙⲛⲧ ⲛⲍⲟⲟⲩ ⲉϥⲛⲁⲛⲕⲟⲧⲕ "Three days before he was to die"

---

[39] Note that ⲉⲁϥ- topics seem to differ, in that the focality seems to be low, or to be rhematicity, 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) ⲍⲁⲑⲏ ⲙⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲉϥⲛⲁϣⲁ "before the sun rose/ would rise"

(Budge Misc. 142) ⲍⲙⲡⲣⲏ ⲉϥⲛⲁⲍⲱⲧⲡ "when the sun set/would set" (lit. approx. 'at for the sun to set')

(De Morte Iosephi [Lagarde] 23:9) ⲙⲡⲛⲁⲩ ⲙⲡⲣⲏ ⲉϥⲛⲁϣⲁ "when the sun was about to rise"

(Gen. 15:12) ⲙⲡⲛⲁⲩ ⲙⲡⲣⲏ ⲉϥⲛⲁⲍⲱⲧⲡ "when the sun was about to set".

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

(Worrell Freer 232,12) ⲙⲡⲁⲧⲉ-ⲡⲣⲏ ⲍⲱⲧⲡ "before the sun set" ("when the sun had not yet set")

(Jud. 14:18) ⲉⲙⲡⲁⲧⲉ-ⲡⲣⲏ ⲍⲱⲧⲡ "before the sun set" ("when the sun had not yet set")

(d) Clause Conjugation:

(Isidore ed. Munier, 159) ⲛⲧⲉⲣⲉ-ⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ϣⲁ "after the sun had risen"

(Isidore ed. Munier, 122) ϣⲁⲛⲧⲉ-ⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ϣⲁ "until the sun had risen"

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

(Apocr. Joh. NHC II 59,35f.) ⲛⲑⲉ ⲙⲡⲣⲏ ⲉϥⲛⲁϣⲁ "when the sun was about to rise".

(f) adverbial CC:

(Jos. 8:29) ⲡⲣⲏ ⲉϥⲛⲁϯ ⲉⲍⲱⲧⲡ (Gk genitive absolute: interference?) "as the sun was about to set"

(Jud. 9:33, Isidore ed. Munier, 174) ⲉⲣⲉⲡⲣⲏ ⲛⲁϣⲁ "as the sun was about to rise"

(Jon. 4:8 Boh.) ⲁⲥϣⲱⲡⲓ ⲉϥⲛⲁϣⲁⲓ ⲥⲁⲧⲟⲧϥ ⲛϫⲉ-ⲫⲣⲏ "it came to pass, as soon as the sun had risen…" (from Alexis Mallon, *Grammaire copte*[4], Beyrouth 1956, Chrestomathie).

(Till Mart. I 281) ⲉⲣⲉⲡⲣⲏ ⲛⲁⲍⲱⲧⲡ "as the sun was about to set"

(Gen. 15:17) ⲉⲣⲉⲡⲣⲏ ⲛⲁⲃⲱⲕ ⲉⲡⲍⲱⲧⲡ "just as the sun was about to set" — periphrastic (?).

(Apophth. 218) ⲁⲡⲣⲏ ⲉⲓ ⲉϥⲛⲁⲍⲱⲧⲡ narrativized "the sun was about to set" — periphrastic (auxiliary ⲉⲓ).

(g) Non-verbal:

(Sap. Salom. Lagarde 16:28) ⲍⲁⲑⲏ ⲛϣⲁ ⲙⲡⲣⲏ "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 ϥ- 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 ογω: (ⲛⲧ)ⲁϥογω ⲉϥ- "he has [already …]", the periphrastic perfect tense of Coptic (Grossman 2009).

Non-Biblical exx.:

(Budge Misc. 24,34, 28,9) ⲁιογω ⲉιϫοοϲ
(P.HermitageCopt. 41,8) ⲁιογω ⲉιⲧⲁⲁϥ
(P.HermitageCopt. 113 n.8 ⲛⲧⲁιογω ⲉιϲⲙⲛⲧϥ
(Till Mart. II 127,13) ⲁϥογω ⲉϥϥιⲧϥ ⲛϫιογⲉ
(Till Mart. II 55,4, 56, 5, Drescher Leg. 21,14 etc.) ⲁϥογω ⲉϥⲙογ.

42. **CC and auxiliation. ϣωⲡⲉ**

Unlike other auxiliaries, e.g. ογω, "cease, have done", in narrative also forming the periphrastic perfect, the old Egyptian-Coptic auxiliary ϣωⲡⲉ 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 rheme — dynamic or stative converbs (*alias* the Stern-Jernstedt/durative infinitive,[40] and the Stative) — while expanding the nuclear, non-durative tense-form; moreover, ϣωⲡⲉ makes adverbial verb-forms, existentials, Nominal Sentences compatible with tense-forms (usually Base Conjugation or imperatives):

(Apophth. 59) ϣωⲡⲉ 6ⲉ ⲛⲧⲉιⲍⲉ ⲉⲕϲⲟⲟγⲛ ϫⲉ-
(Ps.72:14) ⲁιϣωⲡⲉ ⲉγⲙⲁϲⲧιⲅογ ⲙⲙⲟι — 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) ⲁⲥϣⲱⲡⲓ ⲉⲥⲥⲁϫⲓ ⲛⲉⲙ-ⲓⲱⲥⲏϥ
    ⲛⲉϩⲟⲟⲩ ϧⲁⲧⲏⲛ ⲛⲉϩⲟⲟⲩ

(Ex.33:13 Maspero) ⲉⲓⲉϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲉⲁⲓϩⲉ ⲉⲩϩⲙⲟⲧ — remarkably, a Cir-
    cumstantial Preterite as rheme of ϣⲱⲡⲉ. So too Jos.5:7
    ⲁⲩϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲉⲙⲡⲟⲩ-.

(b) Less well-known is ϣⲱⲡⲉ + CC to signify **part/whole of body-part inalienability**:

(Apophth. 59) ⲁⲩϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲉⲣⲉⲡⲉⲩϩⲟ ⲣⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ
(Deut 33:28 Boh. BNF Copte 1) ⲉϥⲉϣⲱⲡⲓ ⲉⲣⲉⲡⲉϥϩⲏⲧ ϫⲟⲣ.

The inalienability features or system in Coptic are far from clear. We are familiar with certain syntactic exponents of personal-sphere relationship: suffixal possessives (ⲣⲱ=ϥ as against ⲡⲉϥ-ⲣⲟ, not a distinctive opposition for this lexeme); in Bohairic, the construction [ⲡ- ⲛ-] in opposition to [ⲡⲓ- ⲛⲧⲉ-] (with [ⲡ- ⲛⲧⲉ]- a reduced categorial form), see Shisha-Halevy 2007a §3.9; ⲛ-/ⲙⲙⲟ= and ⲉⲣⲟ= with the existentials: ⲙⲏ ⲟⲩⲛ-ⲧⲛϩ ⲙⲡⲉⲧϫⲟⲥⲉ, ⲟⲩⲛ-/ⲙⲛ-ϭⲟⲙ ⲛ-/ⲙⲙⲟ=, as the inalienable alternants for the possessive verboids.

In our rather complex ϣⲱⲡⲉ construction we have another sophisti-cated 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: *s3.j ᶜ·f nḥt* "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

Old Testament (Gen., Deut., Num., Ez., when not otherwise specified): Ciasca,
    Agostino. 1883-1885. *Sacrorum Bibliorum fragmenta copto-sahidica* I-II.
    Rome.
New Testament (when not otherwise specified): Horner, George. 1911-1924. *The
    Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Southern Dialect*. London.

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

Others:

Abd. A : Till, Walter C. 1927. *Die achmîmische Version der zwölf kleinen Propheten: Codex Rainerianus.* Vienna.

Achm. *Muséon* 52, 1ff. Lefort : Lefort, Louis-Théophile. 1939. "Fragments d'apocryphes en copte-akhmimique." *Le Muséon* 52, 1-10.

Acta Pauli : Schmidt, Carl. 1905. *Acta Pauli, Übersetzung, Untersuchungen und kopt.Text*. Leipzig.

Acta Pilati : Revillout, Eugène. 1913. *Les apocryphes coptes II (Acta Pilati)*. Paris.

Apa Mena ed. Drescher : Drescher, James. 1946. *Apa Mena : a selection of Coptic texts relating to St. Menas*. Cairo.

Apocr. Joh. NHC II : Waldstein, Michael & Wisse, Frederik (eds.). 1995. *The Apocryphon of John. Synopsis of Nag Hammadi Codices II, 1; III, 1; and IV, 1 with BG 8502,2*. NHMS 33. Leiden.

Apophth. : Chaîne, Marius. 1960. *Le manuscrit de la version copte en dialecte sahidique des Apophthegmata Patrum»*. Cairo.

Athan. : Lefort, Louis-Théophile. 1955. *Lettres festales et pastorales en copte*. Louvain.

Besa : Kuhn, K. 1956. *Letters and Sermons of Besa*. Louvain.

Budge Misc. : Budge, E.A. Wallis. 1915. *Miscellaneous Coptic Texts in the dialect of Upper Egypt*. London.

Crum *Papyruscodex:* Crum, Walter E. 1915. *Der Papyruscodex saec. VI-VII der Phillippsbibliothek in Cheltenham. Koptische theologische Schriften*. Strasbourg.

De Morte Iosephi [Lagarde] : De Lagarde, Paul. 1883. *Aegyptiaca*. Göttingen.

Deut. Kasser : Kasser, Rodolphe. 1962. *Papyrus Bodmer XVIII. Deutéronome I-X, 7, en sahidique*. Cologny-Genève.

Drescher Leg. : Drescher, James. 1947. *Three Coptic Legends*, Cairo.

DV I et II : De Vis, Henri. 1922 et 1929. *Homélies coptes de la Vaticane*. 2 vol. Copenhague.

Ecclesiasticus : De Lagarde, Paul. 1883. *Aegyptiaca*. Göttingen.

Epist.Jer. : Kasser, Rodolphe. 1964. *Papyrus Bodmer XII et Mississipi Coptic Codex II. Jérémie XL, 3- LII, 34. Lamentations. Epître de Jérémie. Baruch I, 1- V, 5 en sahidique*. Cologny-Genève.

Esther E 15 (XVI) : Thompson, Herbert. 1911. *A Coptic Palimpsest Containing Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Judith and Esther in the Sahidic Dialect*. London,

Ev.Phil. : Layton, Bentley (ed.). 1989. *Nag Hammadi Codex II, 2-7, together with XIII, 2*, Brit. Lib. Or. 4926(1) and P. Oxy. 1*. NHS 20. Leiden.

Ev.Verit. : Attridge, Harold W (ed.). 1985. *Nag Hammadi Codex I (The Jung Codex)*. NHS 22. Leiden

Is.55:11 Kasser: Kasser, Rodolphe. 1965. *Papyrus Bodmer XXIII. Ésaïe XLVII, 1-LXVI 24, en sahidique*. Cologny-Genève.

Isidore ed. Munier: Munier, Henri. 1918. "Les actes du martyre de Saint Isidore,". *BIFAO* 14, 97-190.

Jos.: Shore, A. F. 1964. *Joshua, I-VI, and Other Passages in Coptic*. Dublin.

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

Judith: *ibidem*.

Keph.: Polotsky, Hans Jakob & Böhlig, Alexander. 1940. *Kephalaia. 1. Hälfte*. Stuttgart.

Man.Hom.: Polotsky, Hans Jakob. 1934. *Manichäische Homilien* Bd I. Stuttgart.

Man.Ps.: Allberry, Charles R.C. 1938. *A Manichaean Psalmbook*. Stuttgart.

Maspero: Maspero, Gaston. 1892. "Fragments de la version thébaine de l'Ancien Testament." *MMAF* 6, 1-296.

Mich. A: Till, Walter C. 1927. *Die achmîmische Version der zwölf kleinen Propheten: Codex Rainerianus*. Vienna.

Munier, Manuscrits: Munier, Henri. 1916. *Manuscrits coptes. (Catalogue général des antiquités du musée égyptien du Caire, n°s 9201-9304)*. Cairo.

Pachom ed. Lefort: Lefort, Louis-Théophile. 1956. Œuvres de S. Pachôme et de ses disciples. Louvain.

Pist.: Schmidt, Carl. 1905. *Koptisch-gnostische Schriften. Bd. I. Die Pistis Sophia. Die beiden Bücher des Jeû. Unbekanntes altgnostisches Werk*. Leipzig

Pleyte-Boeser: Pleyte, Willem and Boeser, Pieter. 1897. *Manuscrits coptes du Musée d'antiquités des Pays-Bas à Leide*. Leiden.

Prov.: Worrell, William H. 1931. *The Proverbs Of Solomon In Sahidic Coptic: According To The Chicago Manuscript*. Chicago.

Ps.: Budge, E. A. Wallis. 1898. *The Earliest Known Coptic Psalter*. London.

Quecke (Joh.): Quecke, Hans. 1984. *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*. Barcelone.

Quecke (Luc.): Quecke, Hans. 1978. *Das Lukasevangelium saïdisch Text der Handschrift PPalau Rib. Inv.-Nr. 181 mit den Varianten der Handschrift M 569*. Barcelone.

Quecke (Mc.): Quecke, Hans. 1972. *Das Markusevangelium saïdisch Text der Handschrift PPalau Rib. Inv.-Nr. 182 mit den Varianten der der Handschrift M 569*. Barcelone.

II Reg: Drescher, James. 1970. *The Coptic (Sahidic) Version of Kingdoms I, II (Samuel I, II)*. Louvain.

Sap. Salom.: De Lagarde, Paul. 1883. *Aegyptiaca*. Göttingen.

Schleifer: Schleifer, J. 1914. *Sahidische Bibel-Fragmente Aus Dem British Museum Zu London: III Psalmenfragmente*. Vienne.

Shenoute Amél. I-II. Amélineau, Émile. 1907-1914, *Œuvres de Schenoudi. Texte copte et traduction française*, 2 vol. Paris.

Shenoute BM Cat. 206: Crum Walter E. 1905. *Catalogue of the Coptic Manu-scripts in the British Museum*. London, n° 206.

Shenoute L III: Leipoldt, Johannes. 1908. *Sinuthii Archimandritae Vita et Opera omnia* III, Louvain.

Shenoute L IV: Leipoldt, Johannes. 1913. *Sinuthii Archimandritae Vita et Opera omnia* IV, Louvain.

Shenoute Chass.: Chassinat, Émile. 1911, *Le quatrième livre des entretiens et épîtres de Shenouti*, Cairo.

Shenoute P 131^4 144: Paris, manuscript BnF Copte 131^4, f.144

Shenoute Wessely IX: Wessely, Carl. 1909. *Griechische und Koptische Texte theologischen Inhalts I.*, *SPP* IX, Leipzig.

Till Mart.: Till Walter C. 1935-1936. *Koptische Heiglien-und-Martyrerlegenden*. 2 vol. Rome.

Wess. XV: Wessely, Carl. 1914. *Griechische und Koptische Texte theologischen Inhalts IV (SPP XV)*. Leipzig.

Wess. XVIII: Wessely, Carl. 1917. *Griechische und Koptische Texte theologischen Inhalts V (SPP XVIII)*. Leipzig.

Worrell Freer: Worrell, William H. 1923. *Coptic MSS from the Freer Collection*, Ann Arbor.

Bibliographical References

NB: I didn't specify publication of the following four illustrious masters, whose significant and seminal work is not limited to a single publication:

John Austin, George Curme, Charles Bally, John Donne (English poet).

Bakker, Egbert J. 1988. *Linguistics and Formulas in Homer: Scalarity and the Description of the Particle per*. Amsterdam.

Barri, N. 1978. "Theme and Rheme as Immediate Constituents." *Folia Linguis-tica* 12, 253-265.

Biedenkopf-Ziehner, Anneliese. 1983. *Untersuchungen zum koptischen Brieffor-mular unter Berücksichtigung ägyptischer und griechischer Parallelen*. Würzburg.

Boud'hors, Anne. 2013. *Le Canon 8 de Chénouté. Intoduction, édition critique, traduction*. BEC 21. Cairo.

Boud'hors, Anne and Shisha-Halevy. Ariel, 2012. "Two Remarkable Features of Coptic Syntax." *ZÄS* 139, 105-112.

Empson, William. 1947. *Seven Types of Ambiguity*, New York.

Ferretti Cuomo, Luisa. 1998. "L'acclamazione e la proclamazione del nome: su due formule interlocutive nella Commedia." In: *Atti del XXI. Congresso Internazionale di Linguistica e Filologia Romanza (Univ. di Palermo, 18-24 settembre 1995),* vol. 6: *Edizione e analisi linguistica dei testi lette-rari e documentari delMedioevo. Paradigmi interpretativi della cultura medievale*. Tübingen, 599-612.

Grossman, Eitan. 2009. "Periphrastic Perfects in the Coptic Dialects: a Case Study in Grammaticalization." *Lingua Aegyptiaca* 17, 81-118.

Haspelmath, M., 2004. "Coordinating Constructions: an Overview." In: Haspelmath, M. (ed.), *Coordinating Constructions*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 3-39.

Haspelmath Martin and König Ekkehard (eds.). 1995. *The Converb as a Cross-Linguistically Valid Category*. Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 13. Berlin/New York.

Himmelmann, Nikolaus and Schultze-Berndt, Eva, 2005. *Secondary Predication and Adverbial Modification*. Oxford.

Kortmann, Bernd. 1995. "Adverbial Participial Clauses in English." In: Haspelmath M. and König E. (eds.), 189-237.

—. 1998, "Adverbial Subordination in the Languages of Europe." In: van der Auwera Johan (ed.), *Adverbial Constructions in the Languages of Europe*. Berlin-New York, 457-561.

Koschmieder, Erwin. 1965. "Zur Bestimmung der Funktionnen grammatischer Kategorien." In: *Beiträge zur allgemeinen Syntax*. Heidelberg, 9-69.

Layton, Bentley. 2011. *A Coptic Grammar*[3]. Wiesbaden.

Lehmann, Christian. 1984. *Der Relativsatz*: *Typologie seiner Strukturen, Theorie seiner Funktionen, Kompendium seiner Grammatik*. Tübingen.

Lohmann, Johannes. 1965. *Philosophie der Sprachwissenschaft*. Berlin.

Polotsky, Hans Jakob. 1960a. "The Coptic Conjugation System". *Orientalia* 29, 392-422 (= *Collected Papers*. Jerusalem 1971, 238-268).

—. 1960b. "Syntaxe amharique et syntaxe turque." In: *Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi Etiopici*. Rome, 117-121.

—. 1987, 1990. *Grundlagen des koptischen Satzbaus*, I — II. ASP 27, 29. Decatur Ga.

Poppe, Nikolai Nikolaevich, 1951. *Khalkha-Mongolian Grammar with Bibliography, texts, Glossary*. Wiesbaden.

Ramstedt, Gustav John. 1902. *Über der Konjugation der Khalkha-Mongolischen*. Helsinki.

Richter, Tonio Sebastian. 2008. *Rechtssemantik und forensischer Rhetorik: Untersuchungen zu Wortschatz, Stil und Grammatik der Sprache koptischer Rechtsurkunden* (2nd ed.). Wiesbaden.

Schuchardt Hugo. 1925. *Das Baskische und die Sprachwissenschaft*. Vienna.

Shisha-Halevy, Ariel. 1975. "The Coptic Circumstantial Present with an Empty (Impersonal) Actor Suffix." *JEA* 61, 256-257.

—. 1976. "The Coptic Circumstantial Present as a Substantival Relative." *JEA*62, 134-137.

—. 1978. "Quelques thématisations marginales du verbe en néo-égyptien." *OLP* 9, 51-67.

—. 1981. "Bohairic-Late Egyptian Diaglosses: a Contribution to the Typology of Egyptian." In: Dwight W.Young (ed*.), Studies Presented to H.J. Polotsky*. Beacon Hill, 413-438.

—. 1984. "Notes on Some Coptic Nominal Sentence Patterns." In: *Studien zur Sprache und Religion Ägyptens (Festschrift Westendorf)*. Göttingen, 175-189.

—. 1986. *Coptic Grammatical Categories: Structural Studies in the Syntax of Shenoutean Coptic*. Analecta Orientalia 53. Rome.

—. 1987. "Grammatical Discovery Procedure and the Nominal Sentence in Egyptian and Coptic." *Orientalia* 56, 147-175

—. 1998. *Structural Studies in Modern Welsh Syntax: Aspects of the Grammar of Kate Roberts*. Studien und Texte zur Keltologie 2. Münster.

—. 2004. "Juncture Features in Shenoutean Coptic: Linkage and Delimitation". In: *ICCoptS* 7, 155-175.

—. 2007a. *Topics in Coptic Syntax: Structural Studies in the Bohairic Dialect*. OLA 160. Leuven.

—. 2007b. "Determination-Signalling Environment in Old and Middle Egyptian: Work-Notes and Reflections." In: Taly Bar and Eran Cohen (eds.), *Festschrift Gideon Goldenber*g. Münster, 223-254.

—. 2009. "A Note on Converbs in Egyptian and Coptic." In: Charles G. Häberl (ed.). *Afroasiatic Studies in Memory of Robert Hetzron*. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, UK, 95-105.

—. 2010. "Converbs in Welsh and Irish: a Note." In: *Kelten am Rhein. Akten des dreizehnten Internationalen Keltologiekongresses von LVR Landesmuseum Bonn*. Mainz, 270-277.

Steinthal, Hermann Heymann. 1847. *De Pronomine Relativo Commentatio philosophico-philologica*. In: Waltraud Bumann (ed.), *Steinthal. Kleine Sprachtheoretische Schriften*, Hildesheim 1970, 3-113.

Stern, Ludwig. 1880. *Koptische Grammatik*. Leipzig.

Ariel Shisha-Halevy
shisha@mail.huji.ac.il