BOHAIRIC—LATE EGYPTIAN DIAGLOSSES:
A CONTRIBUTION TO THE TYPOLOGY OF EGYPTIAN

By ARIEL SHISHA-HALEVY

0. More than fifty years have elapsed since Sethe's invaluable treatise (Sethë 1925) laid the foundations of the modern conception of Egyptian diachrony (his monumental Verbum [1899] had been more of a diachronic inventory or grammar). Therein he collected and appraised many correspondences and oppositions between "Coptic" and "Demotic" (the latter really meaning "pre-Coptic Egyptian"),¹ which are as valid and significant today as they were then, when our knowledge of both Coptic and pre-Coptic grammar was still very imperfect. Twenty years later when B. H. Stricker presented his own view of the development of Egyptian (Stricker 1945), adding to and considerably rearranging the inventory of typological comparabilia, "Coptic" was still being compared with preceding phases as a homogenous entity, or at least in macroscopic view (the same is true for Hintze 1947). However, as there is really no justification, either synchronic or diachronic, descriptive or comparative, for tackling Coptic en bloc as a monolithic phenomenon, previous to examining its components, let us here engage in a brief typological-comparative study, confronting the Bohairic dialect of Coptic with the pre-Coptic, pre-Demotic phase known as Late Egyptian (LE). May it be accepted as a modest tribute to our master, who more than anybody else has managed to harmonize the synchronic, diachronic and typological quests into the mysteries of Egyptian.

Before proceeding to the comparison itself, we might be called upon to clarify as well as justify our aims and methods, choosing the comparanda and the compared stages of the language.

0.1.1 In the following pages, we shall be attempting no more than to set up a contrastive checklist of grammatical details, not all by any means "characteristics" in the sense of "typological princi-
ples," a list which consequently cannot claim to be exhaustive. In adding to such a list a comparative dimension, one is not necessarily comparing categories — an indispensable precondition to validity in a total typological comparison. All we can reasonably expect to establish by this approach is an unspecified degree of affinity ("Sameness" or complete similarity is excluded by definition in distinct systems of language. Under the mutatis mutandis conditions imposed upon this kind of comparison, one must primarily include differences in the moyens d'expression, from phonemes to morphemes to syntagmes, insofar as the categorial properties, i.e., the isolability or "opposedness" and valeur of the phenomenon in point are comparable).

What are the following comparative lists meant to establish? Or, to put it differently, what are the claim and ratio of the present study? In the first place, such a comparison is its own primary justification, in drawing attention to descriptive similarities of grammatical entities, put in more or less systemic formulation. Secondly, the very fact that equipollent Sahidic—LE lists cannot (to the best of my knowledge) be posited, must point to both a Sah.—Boh. disparity and a Boh.—LE affinity, two not unimportant typological statements, ones, moreover, that must be elaborated and supported beyond impressionistic apprehension. Thirdly, it is of consequence especially in the case of the tardily documented Bohairic dialect to "legitimize" synchronic features, which might otherwise be condemned as symptoms of linguistic decadence, by relating them to pre-Coptic equivalents (consider, for instance, the relative construction with an indefinite antecedent; see § 2.5 below).

0.1.2 The Bohairic dialect is here discussed in the sense of "as opposed to Sahidic." Thus it is the two major Coptic dialects that constitute the Coptic comparatum. Bohairic has somehow gained a reputation for innovation or progressiveness (see Sethe 1923:162), which, as a matter of fact, turns out on examination to be quite unfounded. It may be due to the joint effect of a late documentation and a frequent
impression, not yet systematically supported by any research, of dependent, unidiomatic following of the Greek original in Scripture translation. First to point out the fallacy of this prejudice was Erman (Erman 1915; see also Stern, ZÄS 23 [1885] 153); the present study is in fact a further illustration of the same argument.  

0.1.3 Why compare Bohairic with LE rather than with the immediately preceding phase, Demotic? The reason for this choice is twofold: (a) it is in LE that we witness the inception of the most drastic, deep-reaching typological divergence in Egyptian diachrony, the language acquiring at this point of documentation the marked analytic character still fully evident in Coptic; (b) by skipping and excluding the Demotic stage from our discussion we can keep the diachronic, dynamic factor and its import out of consideration and thus manage to obtain a static, contrastive, purely typological picture. Were we to include the Demotic evidence, we should then have to tackle such obscuring issues as degrees of archaism and the evolutional perspective, issues by no means negligible yet not properly the concerns of a typological study, which has no reference to the developmental or time-axis. Consequently, it is with diasystems (rather than "chronosystems") - with diamorphs and diatagmes - we shall concern ourselves. 

0.1.3.1 The LE corpus in this discussion is comprehensively defined to include both literary and nonliterary subcorpora, the distinction between which is here mostly irrelevant.

0.1.3.2 Pre-Coptic dialects have no more bearing on this study than has the evolutional dimension. Both issues are of course related, and on both there cannot be conclusive statements without prior categoric comparative examination.

0.1.4 The following types of correspondence will be demonstrated below: 1. Prosodica and Juncturalia

2. Syntactica

3. Morphologica

4. Idiomatica
1. Prosodic/junctural equivalence

1.1 Perhaps the most striking orthographic feature of Bohairic as opposed to standard classical Sahidic is the absence of morphophonemic reduced-vowel alternants. This phenomenon was amply discussed by Erman (Erman 1915:182 ff.), who, however, did not sufficiently stress the orthographic relevance of this: 10 ḫmon-/oyon- are as proclitic (forming a close-juncture group with the following morph) as S (m)mn-/oyn-; mnt-, ẓnt- as proclitic as mnt-, ẓnt-; ḫnok-, ḫnof- (etc.) syntactically and, as far as can be judged by syntactic criteria, prosodically equivalent to mnt-, ḫnk-; and so on. The vollstufe/nullstufe opposition is in Bohairic orthographically cancelled in favor of the unmarked morph, yet well-established syntactically; 11 thus it is not really a proof, as Erman would have it, of the "archaic nature" of this dialect.

1.1.1 Still, in one of Erman's cases, viz., oyontap "he has-" (p. 183 f.), we do recognize a formally-and-functionally equivalent LE syntactic paradigm:

A. Independent verboid syntagm; N, the possessum - direct object:
   (a) oyon/ḫmon- N (often oyon ḫtāq-)
      (a') wn/mm m-di.f- N

B. Independent open-juncture existential syntagm; N, the indefinite possessum - subject of the existential predicate:
   (b) oyon/ḫmon N ḫtāq/ḥtōq
      (b') wn/mm N (im) m-di.f

C. Independent adverbial-predicate syntagm; a pronominal possessum:
   (c) (m)ḥentōq (versus S oynta'q)
      (c') sw m-di.f (circumstantial: iw.f m-di.f)

D. The relative alternant, the nominal/pronominal possessum the antecedent:
   (d) -etentap (vs. S -etegoyn'q)
      (d') -nty m-di.f
EVIDENCE: (a) Gen 16:1, Mt 9:6, Jo 10:18 etc.
Balestri-Hyvernat) I 59.19, 64.25.
(c) Dt 4:38, Job 42:10, Lk 8:18, 42.
(d) Gen 36:7, Ex 20:17, Mk 12:44, 2 Cor 8:12.
(a') LRL 3.6, 7.1, HO XLVII ro 6 ff., LES 67.3 f. etc.
(b') LRL 19.15, 51.8.
(c') LRL 15.6, BM 10054 3 ro 17, JEA 11 (1925) Pl. 38 13, 19.
(d') LRL 73.3, DM 119 ro 3.

1.2 A striking syntagmatic opposition of Boh. open vs. Sah.
close juncture\textsuperscript{12} occurs between the relative converter \textit{et} and the con-
verted form or syntagm. The following paradigms of disjoining elements
may be suggested (a selection):

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
(noun & adverb, & \textit{άπ}, \textit{επι}, \textit{πρ} (sec.pres., circ.pres.),\textsuperscript{13} \\
-\textit{et} & or & (\textit{λαν}) \\
pronoun & conditional, & \textit{ναπ}, \textit{πνα}, \textit{ογον/μον}, \\
 & augens & pres., conjunct. etc. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note that this construction occurs only with the relative substantivized
by the formal demonstrative antecedent \textit{φη/φα}, and (rarely) after the
semi-conjunctional \textit{φην} (e.g., 1 Cor 15:22), i.e., not with a freely
commutable lexical antecedent.

REPRESENTATIVE EVIDENCE: Dt 2:25, Lk 12:5, 43, 2 Cor 8:10, Col 3:7, Heb
7:16, 2 Pet 3:10, De Vis, \textit{Homélies coptes de la Vaticane II} 19.9 f.

Now, the same junctural openness is indicated in a LE construc-
tion parallel to a Boh. one (quotable, e.g., from De Vis, \textit{Homélies:}
\textit{ολι \ ετε έκολ 21οτος εθαναομεν ήμεν \ ήσε τσουρ ίψου ήμοι "that through which
the thorn of death shall be trampled"}, Horus and Seth 2.13 (LES 39.13
f.) \textit{ρσ \ρμτ 2 ιντ 40 n \ρμπ \ς τσι \ιω. \σε ιm \ς ζ κνβt}, word by word, "the
two who it is now 40 years that they have been in the tribunal." Com-
pare also the ubiquitous \textit{ρσ ιντ \νβ} . . . "all that . . .," also a case
of substantivized relative, where \textit{νβ} appears to be colon-enclitic (e.g.,
LRL 14.16, LEM 4.10, 70.10, HO XV 1 vo., etc.), with the present, future
or an adjectival predication as the subordinated pattern.\textsuperscript{14}

1.3.1 Boh.-LE affinity in the position of weakly stressed (a relative term, see n. 12) members of the sentence,\textsuperscript{15} or, more specifically, the post-negation \textit{an}, the particles \textit{on}, \textit{pwo},\textsuperscript{16} the \textit{augentia}\textsuperscript{17} \textit{thp}, \textit{2\omega\eta}, \textit{νοος}. I adopt this cautious formulation since the problem of word order in general is not one that can be treated selectively, for one class of words alone; it is by definition a question of relative definition. Nonetheless, one can quote an impressive bulk of examples as evidence for the sentence (colon-) posterior or trailing position of this class (which is probably its primary, pertinent position) in Bohairic, versus a sentence-anterior, secondary position in the Sahidic parallels; and here again we find Bohairic tallying with LE. Some of this evidence is here offered,\textsuperscript{18} all cases in which the \textit{differentia specifica} between Sahidic and Bohairic is the position of the unstressed elements:

(a) \textit{an}: Mt 23:4 \textit{εγὼ \εἰμι \εἴρων \an}: \textit{εγὼ \an \εἰμι \εἴρω}, Mt 13:56, 15:2 \textit{ἐννεκώπι} \textit{γὰρ \ιδιοχια \εἴρω}: \textit{ἐννεκώπι \γὰρ \an \πηγεσια}, Mk 14:7 \textit{νεμωτε υν \νοος \νικεν \an}: \textit{νεμωτε \an \ημειν \ποιοειο\an}, Jo 14:30, 19:4, Acts 26:26.

(b) \textit{xe} "any more":\textsuperscript{19} Jo 14:30 \textit{ηναξαομοιο\an \ηκαξι \νοτεν \an \xe}: \textit{ηναξαομοιο\an \xe}: \textit{ηναξαομο\an \ηγαξε \νηνθα}, Gal 4:7 \textit{οικοικη\an \νεξ}: \textit{οικο\an \νεξ}: \textit{οικο\an \ηκαξε\an \α\an}, Apoc 21:4.

(c) \textit{ρω}: the final position with the meaning "even, too, also" and "the same" is restricted to Bohairic, e.g., Mt 26:44, 2 Pet 3:7 \textit{ηνλυοι \αι \νεμπακα21 \ηπρι \ημπαπα\an \ρω} (S \textit{πωωτ}), \textit{Acta Martyrum} (CSCO) I 128.21; the colon-enclitic position, in other senses, occurs only in Sahidic (e.g., 1 Cor 5:1, 6:3, 15:29). Consequently no actual S : B opposition can be shown here. Nevertheless, the affinity of Boh. with LE \textit{m\tau\alpha\nu\tau} (below) would justify including this particle here.

(d) the \textit{augens \νοος} etc.: Jo 5:30, 6:30 \textit{ου \ιμηνια \ετεκιπι \ιμοι \νοοκ}: \textit{ου \νηγ ηποκ ιηκαιρε ιμοι}, De Vis, \textit{Homélies} I 182.10 \textit{ουνολοι \εγ\an \αι \νοο\an \xe} . . . .


(g) The presuffixal preposition κατ' ἐν: Lk 16:2 (v. 1.) καισαρι

(h) ON: Rom 8:17 δικαίος καισαρι ON : χριστού ON καισαρι. De Vis, Homélies I 125.5 f. . . . ΝΕΜΠΕΧΔΙΟΤΩΝ ἑβολαὶ ἐν νῇ ἔφησαν ἔφησαν ON.

1.3.2 LE parallels: 21

(a') (bn) - ινως: 22 Μ 10052 15.6 f. ινο i.ι.ο.ο. in ρητο ινο f m ρητο.ι pr ινως, P. Leopold (JEA 22 [1936] Pls. xiii-xvi) 2.6 f. . . . ινο bn sw mi-η ινο n3 maw mοτωτ n n3 maw nty tum 5m r ιτς im.w m-ων ινως "it not being at all like the pyramids and tombs of the nobles which we constantly went to rob," LEM 71.9 f. bn ntk wr ινο in.k m kt st r ιτς k r mi-η ινως, Turin 1978 208 vo (ed. Allam, Hier. Ostraka u. Papyri, 1973).

(b') -gr "(further)more": 23 DM 626 vo.3, Mayer A 6.25, BM 10052 4.1, 5.8.16 etc. (bw-pw.ι ptr nty nb gr), etc.

(c') -m ῶ-ο-ο "also, too": 24 Horus and Seth 7.14, 15.8 (LES 58.11 f.) hr ir hr-ο-ο nty, ινο pCt rhyw htrw m p3 nty τυκ im m ῶ-ο-ο, Wenamun 2.5.13.37 (LES 67.12 f., 68.7 f., 70.12 f.), LRL 47.10.

(d') The augens nτf (etc.): BM 10052 3.7 f. ινο f dτ n.n 4 δντ μ p3 4 gr inm, 0. Michaelides LIX 87.4 ινο hr dτ nτf pzy.τ (i.e., φωγ) nty m-ο.ι gr nτf, Mayer A 9.1 m-ιρ dδ n.i "wh.k im" ink.

(e') The augens ᾳρη: 25 see examples below in § 4.1.

(f') The augens (r-)νστη: DM 121 ro.4 hr pzy.ι cκ νάμ n.i ν-νστ.ι, 207 3, 4, RAD 56.5.

(g') n.τf: JEA 41 (1955) 102 (Neskhons, ed. Edwards, 1.26; see Gunn, ibid., p. 92, n. 20) ινο p3 nty ς ιν ις "she shall have what is benefi-

(h') ον "again, too" LRL 20.15; cf. too Doomed Prince 6.11 (LES 5.8),
d'Orbney 4.1 (LES 13.1): "verb + n.f Cn."

2. Syntactic (Pattern) Equivalence

2.1 οὔτακα/οὐδ' οὔν ὡτα/μεντοῦτα (ὡτα)/ἐτεντακα ≈ wn m-ḍi.f/ wn N m-ḍi.f/sw m-ḍi.f/nty m-ḍi.f: see § 1.1.1.

2.2 The Nominal-Sentence pattern with anteposed nominal (lexical) and anaphoric pronominal ("grammatical") subjects: S P S, N1 N2 NE, is typical of Bohairic,26 with the Sahidic parallel texts usually showing the pattern with a postposed nominal subject (P S S, N1 NE N2, NE being the formal or grammatical subject cataphoric to the lexical one). For example: Mt 10:2 ΦΡΑΝ ΑΣ ΜΟΙΓΕ ΝΑΟΚΤΟΛΟΣ ΝΑΙ ΝΕ (S ΝΑΙ ΑΣ ΝΕ ΦΡΑΝ . . .), Rom 7:7 ΦΝΟΜΟΙ ΦΝΟΒΗ ΝΕ (S ΦΝΟΜΟΙ ΝΕ ΦΝΟΒΗ), Acts 16:3 ΝΕΡΚΙΟΤ ΟΥΟΕΙΝΙΝ ΝΕ (S ΟΥΕΙΝΙΝ ΝΕ ΝΕΡΚΙΟΤ), also Gen 24:65, 29:15, Lev 24:10, Lk 24:16, 1 Cor 15:5, 6, Eph 5:23, Acts 17:19 etc.

Now this is in fact a formal mutation of a time-honored pre-Demotic Egyptian pattern of nominal predication, schematically presentable as: extraposed nom. subject (topic) - nom. predicate - formal pron. subject (realizable as zero). In LE the topic is segmented and marked by ṦRN-, the pattern being almost invariably represented as ṢRN-N1 N2,27 e.g., Redesieh Inscr. C 3 ṢRN nb, ḫC ṢRN, "Gold, (it is) the body of the gods."

On the other hand, the pattern with the enclitic nominal subject, common in Sahidic, is not to the best of my knowledge attested in LE (it is in Old and Middle Egyptian and in Demotic).28

2.3 Second Tense Constructions and Functions:

2.3.1 Generally speaking, the Boh. constructions are here much more "orthodox" from the diachronic point of view: the extensions of the diachronic situation to include nonadverbial predicates to the Second Tense subject, so common in Sahidic (indeed, in some cases - such as interrogative pronominal objects - as common as the historically "correct" construction), are extremely rare in the kind of Bohairic here treated.29 Contrast the two dialects, e.g., in Mt 12:3, Jo 4:33, Ps 29:10, 49:13, Job 18:4 etc. In this respect Bohairic conforms to
LE usage.\textsuperscript{30}

2.3.2 Just as we encounter in Bohairic a verb-topicalization form (viz., the Second Perfect \textit{Δειγωτεσ}, \textit{Δειγωστεσ}) regularly used as a temporal protasis,\textsuperscript{31} so we find in LE a typical "temporialis" (\textit{m-\textasciitilde{d}r \textasciitilde{s}m.f}) occasionally functioning as a topicalization form before an adverbial predicate, in a special Cleft Sentence pattern,\textsuperscript{32} e.g., 

\textit{HO Pl. 66 2 vo 2 ff. m-\textasciitilde{d}r p\textasciitilde{f} i\textasciitilde{m} t\textasciitilde{s}y.w m\textasciitilde{w}t, i\textasciitilde{w} t\textasciitilde{s}y.s p\textasciitilde{d}t m-\textasciitilde{d}i.s h\textasciitilde{t}t.s} 

"It was when her own share was (already)\textsuperscript{33} in her possession that he divided with their mother." In other words, the temporialis : topicalization functional opposition is neutralized both in Boh. and in LE, in each case in favor of a different member of the said opposition.

2.3.3 See § 3.5 for instances pointing to the possible existence of a preterit Second Tense \textit{\textasciitilde{A}pten-} (\textit{i.ir.\textasciitilde{t}n}, tripartite base, not converter) in Bohairic.

2.4 THE BOHAIRIC NOMINAL CLEFT SENTENCE AND THE LE PARTICIPIAL STATEMENT: it is remarkable that the distribution of the irregular (though common enough) \textit{glose}-form \textit{\textasciitilde{E}r} - after a nominal/pronominal \textit{vedette} (instead of the usual \textit{\textasciitilde{N}et-}),\textsuperscript{34} which as a rule occurs in Sahidic after pronominal predicates - and personal pronouns at that\textsuperscript{35} - is in Bohairic much more extensive. The details are not entirely clear, but the general picture points to the following \textit{vedette} categories before \textit{\textasciitilde{E}r}-: (a) personal pronouns (e.g., Mt 3:14, Rom 7:17); (b) proper names, including "God" (e.g., Mt 2:22, 1 Cor 3:7, Ex 2:22); (c) interrogative pronouns: \textit{\textasciitilde{\textasciitilde{H}}n, \textasciitilde{\textasciitilde{H}n}},\textsuperscript{36} \textit{\textasciitilde{Oy}} (e.g., Mt 9:5, 19:25, Mk 14:63 f., Gen 49:9, Dt 4:7); (d) demonstratives: \textit{\textasciitilde{Pai}, \textasciitilde{Pai}-, \textasciitilde{Pai}} (e.g., Mk 8:37, 13:1, Acts 11:14, Apoc 14:12, Gen 31:46); (e) numerals, including \textit{\textasciitilde{Oy\textasciitilde{P}}} and the indefinite article (e.g., Mt 10:29, Lk 18:22, Gen 27:38).

The LE Cleft Sentence construction immediately called to mind as typologically equivalent is the so-called Participial Statement, in which the \textit{glose} is the bare participle/relative form,\textsuperscript{37} as opposed to the "Nominal" Cleft Sentence, which has a determined \textit{glose}, \textit{ps + participle/relative form}. Moreover, the \textit{vedette} category completely tallies
with the Bohairic one specified above. Some parallel examples: (a')
personal pronouns: Mayer A 1.19, 4.3, HO Pl. 46 2 ro (thrice: "bn ink
i.its św), vo 1, LRL 58.9, 70.14 ntk ıptr . . . , etc.; (b') proper names
(or special appellations, including nb ntw "Lord of the gods" and pây.n
nb "our lord"): LRL 45.10, 67.12, BIFAO 72 (1972) 65 'Imn-hît nty m
ntwr, BM 10052 1.15, BM 10403 1.23; (c') interrogative pronouns (iḥ,
nym): HO Pl. 79 4, d'Orbiney 4.10 (LES 14.1 f.), Blinding of Truth 6.5
(LES 33.11); (d') demonstratives: LRL 17.16 in tṣy nty b-w-pw.w in.s
n.i; (e') numerals: LRL 69.3 f. hr ir wç mç c i.ir mr.

2.5 RELATIVE WITH INDEFINITE ANTECEDENT: the incompatibility of
the relative (adnominal attributive) sentence and an indefinite ante-
cedent, one of the fundamental syntagmatic phenomena of Coptic, is
somewhat qualified in Bohairic; the following indefinites do occur as
nuclei of a relative construction:39 OYA (Lev 27:12, ονάνη; Acta
Martyrum, ed. Hyvernat, I 37.20, ἔταγε); OYRIM (De Vis, Homélies I
147.6, ἔταγε); RONI (Mt 7:9, 12:11, ἔτε; De Vis, Homélies I 101.4,
ονάνη); OY- (1 Pet 1:23, some codd., ονά-). In LE I know of the
following parallel examples of an indefinite antecedent with the rela-
tive nty-:40 Ṱ말 (O. Cairo 25644 ro 6), s (DM 1059 vo 2), both corre-
sponding to (OYA) RONI; hÎč "things" (HO Pl. 57 1 ro 1).

3. Morphological-Functional Equivalence

3.1 The so-called Third Future (εψέ-/ίνηγ-), which in Sahidic
may be considered a modal rather than temporal category has lost
most of its convertibility, the mark of a sentence "tense" conjugation
form, is in Bohairic a full category of tense, coexisting with and
apparently opposed to the "tempus instans" ζνεαçωτεθ, the Sahidic sole
future tense.43 Instances of the S future corresponding to B εψέ- are
ubiquitous (e.g., Mt 5:19, 6:22,34, 10:21, Ps 22:24 etc.). Moreover,
the B "Third Future" occurs with the circumstantial (realized as zero
before εψέ-) and relative converters, e.g., (circ.) Lev 25:6,46, Num
9:22; (rel.) Lk 4:8, Gen 32:12, Ex 20:9,22, 23:12, Dt 6:13 etc.
In LE, of course, Ꝍ Ꝍ Ꝍ Ꝍ Ꝍ is the only independent future tense form, occurring in the circumstantial and the relative; e.g., (circ.) BM 10403 3.14-15 Ꝍ Ꝍ Ꝍ Ꝍ Ꝍ (r) Ꝍ Ꝍ Ꝍ. i, (neg.) LEM 82.10 f.; (rel.) P. Berlin 10628 8 f. Ꝍ Ꝍ Ꝍ Ꝍ Ꝍ; see further examples in the discussions referred to above.

3.2 As is well-known, Ꝍ Ꝍ Ꝍ, the presuffixal base of the B conjunctive, corresponds to the LE base Ꝍ Ꝍ Ꝍ, whereas the S Ꝍ Ꝍ Ꝍ (only pre-nominally and pre-zero Ꝍ Ꝍ Ꝍ) must be considered secondary. Admittedly, the 3rd pers. plur. has in B a by-form Ꝍ Ꝍ Ꝍ Ꝍ Ꝍ alongside the regular Ꝍ Ꝍ Ꝍ; the general impression (which is, however, far from conclusive) is that Ꝍ Ꝍ Ꝍ is used in the continuative (subcategorizing) function, e.g., Mt 3:10, 5:11, Mk 5:4, 9:45, while Ꝍ Ꝍ Ꝍ occurs most frequently in the "subjunctive," "that"-function, as governed by verbs (including "impersonalia") and conjunctions, e.g., Mk 2:12, 10:14, Lk 8:55, Phil 1:13, 1 Tim 2:2 etc.

3.3 The status of the post-negation Ꝍ Ꝍ Ꝍ appears to be different in Bohairic from its Sahidic counterpart; it seems to be a considerably freer, less mechanically obligatory (and thus more pertinent) element in B; in S it is the central part of a discontinuous negation complex. On the one hand, we encounter it in Bohairic accompanying "tautologically" other, self-sufficient negations; on the other hand, and more significantly still, we find in the New Testament impressive evidence for the omission of Ꝍ Ꝍ Ꝍ when the negation is marked otherwise. Some examples (but part of the evidence) are: (a) Ꝍ Ꝍ Ꝍ (especially striking in negated Second Tense constructions, Ꝍ Ꝍ Ꝍ and Ꝍ Ꝍ Ꝍ): Lk 12:15, 21 (得天独 Ꝍ Ꝍ versus Ꝍ Ꝍ Ꝍ) Mt 10:14, 13:13, 15:20, 24:2, Mk 2:17, 13:2, 33, Rom 8:15, 1 Cor 9:20, 14:22, 2 Cor 2:11, 5:19, Gal 3:16, Col 2:19 (v. 1. Ꝍ Ꝍ Ꝍ Ꝍ; often so), 2 Th 2:5, Heb 5:13, 13:17, 1 Tim 3:3, 6:3, 2 Tim 3:3, Tit 3:2, Ja 2:21, 1 Pet 3:9, 1 Jo 4:8, Acts 22:25 etc.; (b) Ꝑ Ꝑ Ꝑ, Ꝑ Ꝑ Ꝑ, Ꝑ Ꝑ Ꝑ: Lk 18:13, Rom 2:28, 4:13, 9:6, 1 Cor 8:8, 2 Cor 7:12, Acts 2:7, 15.

Now this state of things is again similar to that obtaining in
LE: there too ḫnw3, the ancestor and correspondent of AN, is but a
reinforcing complement to an independent negation (bn) rather than a
component of a discontinuous negation morpheme.54

3.4 Some remarkable (though isolated) examples of the Bohairic
2nd pers. plur. Perfect ᾠτενενωτεραθ55 give the impression of being
used as a Second Tense (i.e., nonpredicatively), thus constituting a
possible equivalent in form and function to the LE "emphatic" i.ιη.ἐν
σχ. It goes without saying that I have in mind instances where the
interpretation as Second Present is excluded.56 (a) adverb + ᾠτεν-
(note the Greek word order): 1 Cor 15:2, Gal 4:14, Phil 4:14, Ja 5:13;
here also belong the numerous examples of ετεθεοι ᾠτεν-, e.g., Gen
43:6, 44:4,5, Ex 2:18,20, Hos 10:13, Amos 4:4 etc.; (b) B ᾠτεν-
corresponding to S ΨΥΤΕΤΡ-: 1 Cor 1:13, Heb 12:22; (c) oppositions of
膑νεν- : ᾠτεν- in the same immediate context: Gen 43:6 ετεθεοι
膑ενερπαλωρ ννι οτετεναμε πιρομι (so Lagarde; Vat. Copto 1 has
膑εν- - οτεν), 1 Cor 4:8 ιεξιν οτεν-ιεξιν οτενερφαμιν, οτενοιν
膑ενερφυρονο; (d) assorted cases: Lk 19:46 (S v. 1. perf./pres.)
膑ενεραλικ μεωι ιοκανι, Acta Martyrum (CSGO) I 213.29 - 214.1 f. πως
膑ενι επειμα οτενεκιοι οτετενηποιις ιοκαλοινου ετεθεοι; (e) the syntagms:

However, the ᾠτεν- : οτετεν- opposition ought to be further
studied, on the basis of manuscript norm (any statement made must be
valid at least for a one-MS corpus), before such a conclusion can be
admitted.

3.5 VARIA

3.5.1 Elementary and categorical morphologic correspondences:
the prenominal relative ὑτε- ~ nty (S ὑτερε-); the morphologic oppo-
tion circumstantial : Second Tense, mostly cancelled in S, is maintained
both in B (6- : λ- ) and LE (iω- : i.ιr-);57 the morphologic opposition
Second : relative positive Perfect, maintained in classical S (ΨΤΑ- :
ΕΝΤΑ- ), is neutralized both in B (ΨΤΑΝΟΤΕΡΑ) and LE (i.ιr-); the ink/
ΑΝΟΚ pronominal paradigm has neither in B nor in LE a morphologically
marked nonpredicative allomorph such as S ληφ- (etc.); the opposition of two plural definite articles, B "ṇ̃- (LE n3 n-)" and "ṇ- (n3-)") does not exist in S.58

3.5.2 Bohairic λροντ "why do you . . .?" (S ἀγορ) is implied in the LE common phonetic spelling ἰῆρ (e.g., BM 10052 10.17, 11.2, 12.25, 13.9, Mayer A 3.23.25, 4.16.18 etc.; cf. LEM 82.16 ἰῆρηρ, k, delete ἵρ), occurring alongside the etymological approximation ἰῆρα, in BM 10052 only for the 2nd pers. sgl. fem. (11.5, 13.15, 15.5), in Mayer A for the masc. (9.22, 10.10.25).

3.5.3 The still mysterious Bohairic converted form επεογον-59 has its LE counterpart in two instances of the no less obscure ἰρ (in- ) -ων-: LRL 15.8 f. ἰρ-ς ἵρ ἰρ κ ῃ ο ̂ μ, where it is apparently circumstantial,60 and P. Strasb. 33 8 (ed. Spiegelberg, ZAS 53, 1917) ἰρ-ς ἰρ ἰτρ, certainly circumstantial; see ZAS 62 (1927) 43.

4. Correspondence of Idiomatic Syntax

4.1 Sporadic neutralization of the category of person in the plural paradigm in favor of the 3rd pers. plur., in the augens TΗΡ̣: ΤΗΡΟΥ used as representative of the whole plural paradigm:61


This phenomenon is well-attested in LE (yet, to the best of my knowledge, not discussed in any grammar), e.g., LRL 29.14 f. ἐς η ρ = r ἰρ ο τ, HO Pl. 80 vo 15 ἰω. n m-ς τ ἰρ ο τ;62 the magical formula "ἰμ hr. τ ῃ n ἦς ἱθ ἰτρ ἰρ ἰτρ," P. Cairo 58002-3-4-5 (also nb. n ἰτρ, ibid.).

4.2 "ΝΕΜ-Χ ΝΕΜΑΨ" and "ΝΕΜ ΝΗ ΕΘΕΝΜΑΨ": these seemingly pleonastic expressions for "together with"63 are extremely common in Bohairic (e.g., Lk 6:3, 22:14, Mk 5:40, Acts 17:34 ΝΑΙ ἔτενάψ ἄιονις ος ΝΗΠΤΙΤ ΠΙΑΡΙΟΠΑΙΤΗΣ ΝΕΜΟΥΟΓΣΙΜΗΙ ἐπεεράν πε ΑΜΑΡΙΧ ΝΕΜΑΝΚΕΧΔΟΥΝΗ
NEWMWOY, Gen 6:18 ἹΝΟΚ ΝΕΜΝΕΚΨΗΠΗ ΝΕΜΤΕΚΣΙΜΗ ΝΕΜΝΙΣΙΜΗ ΝΤΕΝΕΚΨΗΠΗ ΝΕΜΑΚ, 7:13, 8:18 etc. (note that since they correspond as a rule to a simple σῶν in the Greek, it may be safely assumed that this is indeed an authentic Coptic idiom).

In fact, we find some comparable LE expressions: "irm-X wn irm.k" Mayer A 1.9, 2.11, BM 10052 1.18, 8.3 f., 10.3, and the present tense counterpart "irm-X nty irm.k," LRL 19.4; other pleonastic turns of expression, like the epistolary (DM 326 1 f.) iḥ ḫay.k ḫab n.i n₃ mdt mnty twk ḫr ḫab n.i ḫr.sn, "what means your writing me those bitter matters regarding which you write me?"; LRL 28.1 i.ir.i ḫab n.₂ t₃ ṣiːt iḥab.i n.₃ ḫr . . . , "it is regarding . . . that I have written you the letter which I wrote you"; cf. the formulary "sḏw mdt nb iḥab.k n.i ḫr.w, ṣm ḫab i.ir.k r-ḏḏ," "all the matters concerning which you have written to me have been noted - your having written:" (LRL 34.9 f., 37.5 f., 44.16, 45.1, 47.2 f.) and BM 10052 1.6 wn.k m n₃ ṣm ʿwn.k ʿm.w "you were in the business in which you were."

4.3 The anaphoric adverbial in the very common noun clause rendering "the place he is in" is in Bohairic usually ṭMOervatives, whereas Sahidic prefers ṡWHT, e.g., (among numerous examples) Mt 2:9, Mk 5:40, 14:9, Jo 6:62, 12:1, Col 3:11 etc. Now this is a striking case where we are able to set up a pair (at least) of "dia-sentences" with little or no observable difference, for in LE too we find ṣm t₃ nty twk ʿmov (LRL 30.7, 48.13), t₃ st nty twtn ʿmov (O. Michaelides 66 vo, LEM 121.16), st nb nty sw ʿmov (P. Cairo 58033 37, Mayer A 2.13, 6.12, LRL 58.1 etc.) and ṣm nty sw ʿmov(.f) (LRL 8.1, HO Pl. 80 vo 16 etc.). Most frequently we find the anaphoric adverb m-ʿmov, corresponding to ṭMOAY in Bohairic (Mk 4:5, Ja 3:16).

4.4 The so-called "ethical dative" construction, occurring (except for ṭM) in nondurative patterns, usually complementing intransitive verbs, does occur in Sahidic but is incomparably more frequent, and its distribution more extensive, in Bohairic: e.g., Lk 9:57 (ṭM), Ja 2:3, De Vis, Ḥomélies I 63.7 (ẓMçı), ibid. 104.2, 181.4 (ṇAY).
132.6 (αὼμι), *Acta Martyrum* (CSCO) I 3.5, II 29.18 f. (μεγί), I 144.17 (φανι), 164.25 (εμί) — most Nitrian examples listed here are imperative or jussive ones.

This construction is as typical of LE, with the same lexical and morphosyntactic distributions:⁶⁹ **LRL** 58.7 (gr "be silent"), **LEM** 49.15 (.ptr), 61.15 (sm), **RđE** 8 (1951) 185 (pr), Amenemope 22.7 (hms) etc.

4.5 **VARIA**

4.5.1 **εροφ** (+ infinitive) = *irt ih*, *iry ih* etc., "for what purpose?"; Bohairic:⁷⁰ 1 Cor 5:12, Gen 25:32, Num 11:20, Hos 14:9, all translating (κα) τς. LE: (hr) *irt ih*, **LEM** 61:14; (?) n *iry ih*, followed by noun/pronoun, **HO** Pl. 33 2 ro 3, 69 3 ro 3; *ir.tw.f ih*, followed by *hr* + infinitive: this is peculiar to the Tomb-Robbery series of texts;⁷¹ the suffix of neuter gender? Mayer A 3.26, 4.1, 6.15 f., 9.2.4, BM 10052 4.17, BM 10383 1.5.

4.5.2 "αμη!" — an interjection of surprise ("what!"): *Acta Martyrum* (CSCO) I 228.4 αμη πιλλονι νε;⁷² may be compared with LE *is ih*, an interjection of displeased surprise,⁷³ **LRL** 1.9, **LEM** 9.16, 44.8, 61.10 etc.

5. Some suggested equivalences or at least correspondences which may be established by further study

5.1 The use of the determined nominalized verb (infinitive or other *nomen actionis*) in Bohairic versus a nonverbal or unnominalized verbal mode of expression in Sahidic: instances are Mt 26:8 (*παίτακο*), Lk 2:47 (*πεμι*), Rom 3:20 (*πνοείνθυνοι*), Gal 5:14 (*φίλεπνοκτορφφ*), Col 3:14 (*πινούρ ἰτεπίδεκ εβολ*), Acts 5:18 (*παρες εροφογ*); this is also a basic typological trait in LE.⁷⁴

5.2 Is there a preference in Bohairic for the Cleft Sentence type "It is to you that I come" over the type "It is you to whom I come"?⁷⁵ This is apparently the case in LE.

5.3 Worthy of comparative consideration also is the pattern of nominal predication with a *zeroed* pronominal subject after an extraposed
topic (see § 2.2) in LE, and πετεφωι,77 in which the topic is the pronominal antecedent of an attributive nom. predication (e.g., Mk 3:21, Lk 6:30, 16:12 – versus -ne in the negative! Note that the LE pattern too is exclusively affirmative: Jo 17:10 ἡ ἑτενογιαν οὐκ ὥστε etc.).78 Consider also the following instances of a zeroed subject in Bohairic: Lk 24:29 ἐφη (πρὸς ἐσπέραν ἐστίν); 1 Cor 5:11 (v. 1., in four important MSS) ἐσπέραν ἑγγονοιαν ἐγγάμα τεκτόν τεκτόν (ἐὰν τις . . . ἢ πόρνος); Lev 13:46 (Lagarde and Vat. Copto 1 in consensus) . . . ἐσπερακαθαρτος (ἀκάθαρτος ὦν); Lev 14:13 etc. (Lagarde with Vat. Copto 1) ἥ ἑτεβεμφωνοι (τὰ περὶ ἀμαρτίας), cf. Rom 2:8 ἑτεβεμφων οὐδορμῶσην ὥστε; De Vis, Homélies I 43.8 (cod.) ὤγαναν γὰρ ἑσωτ . . . ὥστε 2ημωλικ.

5.4 The appositive numeral construction, extended in Bohairic to ἡ μή (Num 12:4; in S we have only ἡ μήσια), is a well-known feature of LE; consider τὸ πρὸ 3 (DM 46 vo 4), τὸ πρὸ 4 (BM 10052 3.8), τὸ πρὸ 5 rmt (ibid. 5.8.14), τὸ πρὸ 9 βάκυω (P. Turin 2021 3.7) and of course τὸ πρὸ 2 (Horus and Seth 8.11 etc.). In this connection, the whole issue of postpositional, adpronominal apposition (marked in LE by το-, in Bohairic by μα- [interlocutive persons] and ἡμες- [delocutive persons]) must be taken up.

5.5 Among phraseological notabilia is the analogue use of the adverbs μαρτηρι in Bohairic and μα-νς in LE79 (the latter corresponds etymologically to B ἡμα "here"); Bohairic-LE lexical (semantic) structuring is still an entirely unresearched field.

NOTES

1 It is only in a brief note on p. 298 that Sethe confronts Coptic ("especially Bohairic") with Late Egyptian. See, however, Sethe, 1923:160 f., for some relevant statements on Coptic dialectal differentiation.

2 See Sethe, 1925 passim, Stricker, 1945:25, 33 ff.

3 Not only have Sahidic : Bohairic differences never been highlighted or adequately and systematically presented (in Stern's Grammatik - of which incidentally 1980 is a centenary - the two dialects are
intermingled); it is difficult to point out competent monographic treatment of Bohairic grammatical issues, this dialect being usually overshadowed by discussion of Sahidic.


5 The corpus from which our examples are drawn is primarily that of Scripture Bohairic and not "Nitrian" texts, although reference to the latter will occasionally be made. Note that all references are selective and representative, not exhaustive.

6 Pace Grapow, 1938:5.


8 The source abbreviations used here throughout are the conventional ones, both for Late Egyptian texts (see those used in Groll, 1975 or Frandsen, 1974) and for Bohairic ones.


10 We are here perforce studying a "Buchstabenlehre," to use J. Grimm's superscription for comparative phonology in his Germanische Grammatik.

11 This seems to have escaped Grapow, 1938:30, n. 1.

12 "Open" and "close" are to be taken here in a broad, approximative application. Our knowledge of Egyptian sentence prosody and other relevant data is too meagre to allow of more precise grading and more committed statements.

13 The relative conversion of a Second Tense is not attested in Sahidic, nor, for that matter, in Bohairic outside the quoted construction; indeed, both converters give the impression of being mutually exclusive (as members of a single paradigm or in syntactic alternation; historically they may be taken to constitute a single morphologic entity). It is perhaps preferable to view our construction and probably its whole paradigm as ἔτει- converting a sentence, complete with adverbial and other adjuncts, rather than a conjugation form. A case like 2 Tim 4:15, ἡ ἔτει δοκεῖ τοῖς ἀγίοις ἑ βοηθεῖν τοῦ ἀγίου ἔτοιμον, would suggest a much extended range of conversion for the relative in Bohairic, at least in the construction here discussed. On this phenomenon see Polotsky, BSAC 12 (1949) 31 f. (CP 384 f.); also Quecke, Untersuchungen z. kopt. Stundengebet (1970) 382-86,
especially on the Sahidic syntactic equivalents.

14 See Erman, 1933:$ 838, Sethe, 1925:293, Groll, 1975:498 f. The Bohairic correspondent is ϕΗ ΝΙΒΕΝ ΕΤ- (e.g., Lev 11:25), pointing to yet another open juncture position (I have no data regarding the junctural properties of LE powment before relative forms and constructions – the article powment enters close juncture with the following word); consider too Acts 21:23 ΦΑΙ ΟΥΝ ΑΡΙΤΗ ΕΤΕΝΝΑΧΟΥ ΝΑΚ.


16 See Fecht, 1960:$ 179.

17 Polotsky's "Verstärker" (Polotsky, 1961:298, n. 1); see also Cermak, 1931:$ 258 f.

18 Admittedly, precise statistics are here indispensable; still, both random and extensive checks bear out this impression. There are naturally numerous instances where Sahidic = Bohairic in this respect, e.g., Jo 4:32, 8:21, Rom 3:18; this often occurs among Horners variae lectiones.

19 We find this position and function reported as early as La Croce's Lexicon Aegyptiacum-Latinum (1775): "in fine positum significat ετο"; see Le Monde Oriental 4 (1910) 39 ff.


21 On LE word order see Hintze, 1950:131 ff.


23 See Černý, JEA 31 (1945) 35, n. ee, with more examples.


25 Many Demotic examples are quoted by Stricker, "Het demotische Adjectief," OMRO 43 (1962) 26-49; also Spiegelberg, Demotische Grammatik, § 74.

26 It would prove worth our while to check in this context the status and frequency in Bohairic of frontal extraposition beyond this pattern. My impression is that its occurrence in instances like Acta Martyrum (CSCO) II 5.5 f., ΜΑΤΑ ΓΕΡ ΧΩΥΝ ΝΩΛΙ ΑΗ, is more common in Bohairic, and rather similar to LE (ΜΡ) IR- constructions.


See Polotsky, 1944:31 C with n. 2, and earlier the typological comparison of B with LE in Polotsky, 1940 (especially p. 244 f.). Nevertheless, the Cleft Sentence pattern with the Second Tense/circumstantial following an adverbial vedette is as common in Scripture Bohairic as it evidently is in Sahidic. Consider Mt 22:40, Jo 18:32 (Bodmer), Gen 44:15, Ex 18:14, Num 16:29, Mic 6:6. So also is the "ΘΑΛÓΘΕ" construction, parallel in structure to the "legitimate" ἄγματι one: Lk 8:52, 1 Cor 14:23, Acts 2:15, 12:15.


Stern, 1880:§ 425, Mallon, 1956:§ 245 3).


Ibid., 425 n. 1.

The Bohairic (and Bohairicized S) construction ΝΗΜ άη- (e.g., Mt 21:31, Lk 3:7, Hag 2:4; see Polotsky, GGA [1934] 64) has its own LE equivalent in cases such as BM 10052 3.17 ἵω νυμ χγ3.κ "Who will look for you?"

See Groll, 1967:47-57, Groll, 1975:525-30. The specific LE moyens d'expression for this pattern may include a prefixed m- marking the vedette.

Stern, 1880:§ 439 f., with a structurally more adequate formulation in Praetorius' review, ZDMG 35 (1881) 758. The circumstantial is the sole adnominal sentence form compatible with an indefinite noun or pronoun, the opposition attributive (relative): adpredicative (circumst.) being neutralized in this environment.

This occurs also in Late (Bohairicized S): Crum, Papyruscodex 34.18, 35.18.28; Budge, Miscellaneous Texts 153.3; Till, Märtyrerlegenden I 58.1, 78.18 f.23, II 35.25 etc., with the same antecedents as in B. In the remarkable idiom of P. Bodmer VI we find ἥρ(ε)- (Prov 7:5, 10:26) after indefinite antecedents (cf. Polot-
sky, 1962:425 n. 1?

Similarly for "antecedents" of the participles, Groll, 1975:§§ 48. 5.2, 50.4.1.


Except for (a) the circumstantial of Ṣneq-, see Polotsky, 1957:232 f., and (b) some scattered examples of the relative (affirmative, 2nd pers. plur.) in such late (Bohairicized?) texts as Ciasca's Leviticus (e.g., 11:3,9).

The functional difference between the two eludes me. Often, though by no means always, Mallon's term "futur énergique" for Ṣeq- seems very apt; sometimes the opposition correlates with a difference of person, with the nṣ- future used for the interlocutive, Ṣeq- for the delocutive persons. Often the variation appears inexplicable (consider, e.g., Lk 6:37, 21:24 ff. versus 26).

See Stern, 1880:§§ 381, 397.

See Andersson, 1904:62 ff.

Stern, 1880:§ 419, Andersson, ibid. and p. 134 f.


See Stern, 1880:282 and § 441, Andersson, 1904:93. Some examples conflicting with this theory: Mk 3:9,10,14, Col 3:21, Heb 9:15,23. mtw. Ṣ and n.ṣ- are in variation already in the Demotic Magical Papyrus (see Janet H. Johnson, The Demotic Verbal System, p. 282; see also n. 170).

Thus Andersson, 1904:80 (ad Ex 12:13 Ṣneq- (fut. III) Ḣ; cf. LE bn ḫṣr Ṣm Ṣm, e.g., O. Cairo 25752); so too often the editors of the CSCO Acta Martyrum ("dele Ḣ"). This is very striking in Nitrian Bohairic. Some examples: Ṣmon- Ḣ Acta Martyrum I 9.8, II 229.17; Ṣnep- Ḣ ibid. I 216.3, II 121.3 f., Lk 6:37 (v. 1. cod. E); neg. conjunctive n Ḣ Mk 6:11 (v. 1.).
Kicksola, 1975 (especially p. 268 ff.) records no comparable state of things for the Sahidic NT. The sixty-odd instances of AN omitted (p. 270 ff.) he considers either scribal error (about two-thirds) – it goes without saying that this category may, perhaps must, exist in the Bohairic NT as well, although as a matter of policy it ought not to be overused – or due to affirmative interpretation: this must be contextually motivated (some such examples in Bohairic are Lk 12:57, 13:15; a case apart is the omission in Bohairic of AN after the rhetoric NH = norme, e.g., Lk 23:39, 24:26). The case is different for Bohairic, where the environment for omission is well-determinable, where moreover AN occurs outside the N – AN morphemic complex. Note that the omissions in Bohairic are attested in various MSS, occasionally in "respectable" ones such as B (e.g., 1 Cor 14:22, 1 Pet 3:9); I noted omissions also in A, C, D, F, H, J, K, L, M, N – the last two being especially prone – O, T and some others. A full research must follow upon a careful evaluation of the MSS by modern linguistic (including orthographic) criteria, rather than by those of age or palaeography.

See Andersson, 1904:83 ff.


See Polotsky, 1960:§ 46 for other morphemes with a similar allo-morph; see also Stern, 1880:261, Mallon, 1956:§ 244.

Cf. Andersson, 1904:47 ff. "Second Present to express the past."

The possible objection that LE oppositions and neutralizations are – for us – on the graphemic level is irrelevant, since in Bohairic too we can do no more than study a "Buchstabenlehre," albeit considerably more differentiated.

Sethe, 1915:298; see Polotsky, JEA 54 (1968) 243-45.

See Stern, 1880:§ 413. The form is very common in Nitrian Bohairic, but is fairly frequent also in the Scripture idiom, e.g., Ex 28:32, Mt 13:12, 25:29, Mk 5:25, Acts 27:39, 28:11 etc., sometimes as a variant reading. The predicate is either an adverb or a stative.

Wente, Late Ramesside Letters, p. 36, n. m, suggests some ways of accounting for this, among them as a peculiar Second Tense form.

Schwarze-Steinthal, Kopt. Grammatik (Berlin 1850) 470; Stern 1880:...

Note the colon-final position in this and the next examples (the colon marked by points); see §§ 1.3.1-2 (e).

Stern, 1880:$ 253.

See Andersson, 1904:12 ff., 31 f.

Here in fact we are able to extend the documentation to Middle Egyptian, "bw nty ntw im" (Cairo 20485), "bw nty st išm" (Westcar 9/3 f.) and the bizarre "bw ntf im" (Meríkare 91; see Gardiner, Egyptian Grammar § 200.2), as well as Demotic, ps ġy nty ps . . . m-im.f Ryl. IX 2.4, 19.12, ḫs s ūw. ṣ m-im.s ibid. 2.8 f. Two other striking Coptic-LE "diachronic sentences" are (a) twin dy ḫms.ti ḫr ḫnt ḫḥ (Horus and Seth 8.3 = LES 47.9), lit. "You are sitting here doing what?", with (B) Acta Martyrum (CSCO) I 191.25 f. ēkēmci ēkēpou (see also Polotsky, 1940:243); (b) sw mwst iwj.f ġnh (HO Pl. 39 2 vo 3 = LEM 108.6) "He is dead being alive," also iw mwst.k ġnh.k (0. Cairo 25761.2), with (S) Shenoute ed. Chassinat 69.22 ff. δικούων ὁμοῦ εὖμνοῦτ (cf. ibid. 207.17 ff. πέτων ὡς εὖμνοῦτ).

One example of this type, HO Pl. 88.14 ps nty iw ṣ m-im, is a remarkable and perhaps unique instance of nty syntactically functioning as a converter, conditioning the shift st ṣ w in the pronominal "agens"; see Polotsky, 1960:$ 12.

See, e.g., Shenoute ed. Leipoldt III 192.1 (μοώε), IV 104.1 f. (枉ω⽗), 121.27 (-pagination) etc.

See Hintze, 1950:81-91, with many LE examples (all from LES).

See Polotsky, JEA 25 (1939) 112.

See Peet, The Mayer Papyri A and B, p. 12, n. 5 ("an indignant rhetorical question"); idem, The Great Tomb-Robberies, p. 126, n. 4 ("an indignant denial").

See Polotsky, GGA 196 (1934) 65.


So Polotsky, 1944:64.


Stern, 1880:§ 251, Andersson, 1904:23, Mallon, 1956:43. The LE equivalent of πετέρων is ρε κέου (e.g., Adoption P. ro 4).

Other possibilities of topicalization: ΜΗ ἔΤΕΝῳς (Acts 4:23 etc.), ΟΥΣΙῊ θεογ (Gal 6:9).

See Gunn, Studies in Honor of W. E. Crow, pp. 61-63; Godron, BIFAO 63 (1965) 131-33, quotes Sahidic instances, which, however, are late and could well be Bohairicisms.
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