The Coptic Conjugation System

H. J. POLOTSKY – Jerusalem

I. Conjugation. Conjugations. Conjugation Patterns

1. For the purpose of this outline (*) Conjugation means the various ways in which a Coptic verb can enter into grammatical construction with actor expressions in such a way as to function either as a main sentence or as a dependent clause. Any such construction is a conjugation. We thus have Sentence Conjugations and Clause Conjugations. The former comprise seven Tenses (properly so called) — three pairs of affirmative and negative forms and one lone negative form — and the Imperatives (only the Causative Imperative is properly speaking a conjugation). The five Clause Conjugations comprise 1° three subordinate clause equivalents (two of them compounded with prepositions), which occur in company with a Sentence Conjugation, and 2° two "Conjunctives", which normally continue either a Sentence or a Clause Conjugation; an exception to this rule is the independent (probably elliptic) use of the 1st sg. of the Conjunctive and of the 1st pl. of the Future Conjunctive, Stern §§ 446, 450. All Clause Conjugations are formally set apart from the Sentence Conjugations by a mode of negation of their own (§ 27).

2. Coptic has two distinct Conjugation Patterns, 1° Tripartite and 2° Bipartite. Within each pattern the function of grammatical distinctiveness is vested in a different constituent element.

(*) This paper was written and tried out in class while I was Visiting Professor of Egyptology at Brown University (Providence, Rhode Island) in 1959-60 (σοφία γραμματίως ἐν ἐκκαθήμενῳ σχολήσ Ἰτ. xxxviii 24). I owe a special debt of gratitude to my friend and academic host at Brown, Professor Richard A. Parker, for going over my successive drafts and saving me from many a loose statement.
II. The Tripartite Conjugation Pattern

3. The distinctive element of any conjugation of the Tripartite Pattern is the conjugation base, which occupies the first position in the pattern. It is followed by (2) the actor expression (noun or pronominal suffix) and (3) the verb in the Infinitive. A Verb in Coptic is a word which is capable of filling the last position in the Tripartite Conjugation Pattern:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>α</td>
<td>προμε</td>
<td>ωτιη</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nominal and suffixal actor expressions differ in regard to their juncture with the verb: particles requiring the second place in the sentence (γαρ, λε, ουν, βε, χωνη) come after the nominal actor, but after the whole complex if the second position is filled by a suffix.

4. The following are the conjugations of the Tripartite Pattern:

A. Sentence Conjugations

Affirmative          Negative

a. Basic Tenses

Perfect          αεκσωτιη           ινεκσωτιη
("not yet")            —— (1)          —— (1)
Aorist          εασωτιη            ιεσωτιη (μαυ)
Third Future     εεκσωτιη        ιπεκσωτιη (2)

b. Imperatives

[Simple]         ωτιη               ιπρωτιη (3)
Causative        μαρεκσωτιη         μπρεκσωτιη (3)

(1) The affirmative counterpart of ινεκσωτιη may originally have been γακσωτιη, which in most dialects was levelled under αεκσωτιη.

(2) In Bohairic this form is pointed either εεκσωτιη or εεκ.-. The syllabication ε/ε- is also well attested by early Sahidic MSS.

(3) The Simple Imperative does not belong to any conjugation pattern, but it behaves syntactically like the conjugations of the Tripartite
B. Clause Conjugations

Conjunctive  
Future Conjunctive  
Temporal  
"until"  
Conditional

Obs. 1. In two of these conjugations, \( e-q-e-\text{cwt} \text{m} \) and \( e-q-\text{yan-cw} \text{t} \text{m} \), there is an additional morpheme between the suffix and the verb. It has not been thought necessary to take these additional morphemes into account, because with nominal actor \( \text{yan} \) precedes the latter, i.e. is treated as part of the conjugation base: \( \text{epyan prxmtf cwt} \text{t} \text{m} \). As regards \( \text{-e} \), it disappears altogether with nominal actor \(^{(1)}\): \( \text{ep} \text{e prxmtf cwt} \text{t} \text{m} \), superficially coinciding with the Circumstantial and the Second Present (cf. § 23, Obs. 4); since it is unlikely that so distinctive a morpheme should have been really omitted, the analogy of \( \text{yan} \) would seem to encourage the belief that the \( \text{-e} \) likewise preceded the nominal actor, but coalesced with the final \( \text{-e} \) of \( \text{ep} \); cf. (Sethe ap.) Gardiner JEA 16 (1930) 226. However, the \( \text{ep} \) itself presents an unsolved problem, cf. Gardiner JEA 32 (1946) 101.

A further reason for disregarding the morpheme \( \text{yan} \) in setting up the Tripartite Pattern is the fact that it can be omitted before the negative \( \text{t} \text{m} \) (§ 27, Obs. 3).

Obs. 2. The \( \text{eq-} \) of \( \text{eqeqcw} \text{t} \text{m} \) coincides superficially with the Circumstantial Present in Sahidic, Bohairic, Fayyumic and Subakh-mimic, but in Aklimimic the \( \text{aq-} \) of \( \text{aqaqcw} \text{t} \text{m} \) coincides superficially with the Second Present; the \( \text{eq-} \) of \( \text{eqyancwt} \text{t} \text{m} \) coincides superficially with the Second Present in those dialects which distinguish the Second Present from the Circumstantial Present (§ 14).

III. The Bipartite Conjugation Pattern

5. The Bipartite Conjugation Pattern is represented by only one (basic) conjugation, the so-called "First Present". It has no conjugation base at all. The first position is filled by the actor ex-
pression, either by a noun or by a special set of pronominal preformatives (some of which, namely κ-, q-, χ-, resemble — or, historically speaking, have come to resemble — the pronominal suffixes). So far as the Bipartite Pattern as such is concerned, the second (predicate) position is by no means restricted to the verb: it can be filled not only by the Infinitive as well as the Qualitative (whose only function is to fill the second position in the Bipartite Conjugation Pattern), but also by any adverbial expression, i.e. either a real adverb like ταί "here" or παρατη "there", or a prepositional phrase like τιμί άπαθε "with you" or τάπα της της "in the city":

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>πρωμέ</td>
<td>ταί</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χικ</td>
<td>παρατη</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. The Bipartite Conjugation Pattern is what Gardiner (Eg. Gr. § 319) calls the "Pseudo-verbal construction", i.e. a special variety of the sentence with adverbial predicate, in which the adverb shares its privilege of position with certain verb-forms. Historical grammar is able to explain the presence of the Infinitive in this sentence type, and to offer a sort of excuse for the presence of the Qualitative. For a synchronic description of Coptic, however, this historical explanation is irrelevant. Within the framework of Coptic there is nothing "adverbial" about the predicative Infinitive and the Qualitative (1). On the other hand this sentence type can, of course, be spoken of as a "conjugation pattern" only if its second position is filled by a verb-form.

The distinctive element of the Bipartite Conjugation Pattern is the verb-form.

IV. Infinitive and Qualitative

7. The only verb-form capable of filling the third position of the Tripartite Conjugation Pattern is the Infinitive. Now the Infinitive is not a typically verbal form. Although it often possesses morphological features of its own, by which it is set apart from ordi-

(1) Vergote Chr. d'Eg. 31 (1956) 218; Polotsky OLZ 1957, 227.
nary nouns, especially its prenominal and presuffixal forms, it is rather substantival in character and therefore shares several syntactic properties with the noun substantive. Cf. Stern §§ 451, 453, 467, 468, 473. In Crum’s *Dictionary* there is under practically every “vb” a special entry headed “an m”. In its capacity as “an m” an Infinitive can even fill the second position of the Tripartite Conjugation Pattern, i.e. it can function as the actor of another Infinitive, e.g. Sir. xxix.20 *συντωπε τακε μιoιες ιεγούτων* “guaranteeing has ruined many upright men”.

8. The following paradox should be noted: the Infinitive, not a typically verbal form, is the only verb-form allowed in the typically verbal Tripartite Conjugation Pattern, whereas the Qualitative, a typically verbal form, occurs only in the Bipartite Conjugation Pattern, in which the privilege of position belongs properly to the adverb.

9. In so far as the Infinitive and the Qualitative of the same verb can both be used in the Bipartite Conjugation Pattern, they form a contrast: the Infinitive expresses an action in progress, while the Qualitative expresses a state. Cf. Acts v.12 *μετέχων* “they were happening (ἐπινέκτω, κτάβαντ)” alongside of *μετεγγον* “they were (ἠσταυρών, εραντ)”. The possibility of having the same actor for the Infinitive as well as for the Qualitative is limited to intransitive verbs, but the number of such verbs actually admitting both forms in the Bipartite Pattern is none too great. E.g., the Infinitive *μοιν “to die” is used in the Bipartite Pattern, when the act of “dying” is spoken of in a general way, as in 1Cor. xv.31 “I die (τῷ ἀνεμε̣) daily”; 1Cor. xv.22 “just as all men die (πάντες ἀρπαγούμοι) in Adam”; Ps. xlviii.10 “if he sees the wise men dying (εὐμοι)”; an actual and particular occurrence of “dying” is expressed by the “Future” *παρ-μοιν “going to die”, while the Qualitative *μοιν means “being dead”. With many intransitive verbs, like *δικο “to hunger” and *εἰδε “to be thirsty” the Infinitive is hardly found in the Bipartite Pattern (1). This is espe-

(1) Outside conjugation the contrast of Qualitative vs. Infinitive does not exist. The state *predicated* by the Qualitative is *named* by the Infinitive. Cf. Jo. xix.28 *σοφε* as against Ps. lxviii.22 *πληθεί*; Deut. xxviii.56 *ητέσσιν . . . ετελεσθαν* “she who is soft and smooth” as against *πεσόντων ιππεσθανδάτι* “the softness of her smoothness”.

cially true of verbs of motion. As a general rule they require the Qualitative, while the Infinitive is mainly used in certain phraseological construction (Obs. 1).

On the other hand, with transitive verbs the contrast of Infinitive vs. Qualitative within the Bipartite Conjugation Pattern is accompanied by a shift between actor and undergoer. The subject of the state expressed by the Qualitative would be the undergoer of the action expressed by the Infinitive in any conjugation: the actions αἰκοτόπη “I chose him” or ἔκωτῇ ἱμαμα “I choose him” result in the state έκοτόπη “he is chosen”. Cf. Zoega 308 (Ἀρφῆ.κ.) ἀπόκ λή ἔκωτῇ ἱμαμα δεύτερα ἐμίσολα “I too am excommunicating you, and you are excommunicated”; 1Sam. xxx.1, 3 ἀποκρε... αἰει ἑσπάσασκε ἐκεὶνε ἐκεῖνε ἐμίσολα ἐροκα “(the Amalekites) burnt it... (David and his men) came up to the city and behold, it was burnt”; Deut. vii.11 γενναί ἐκείνα παί ἐτε ἰμνόμαν θο “dug wells which you did not dig”; Mt. xiii.44 ὁμοί ἐροκα παί ἐπά ὁμοί ἔροκα ἐροκα “a hidden treasure which a man found and hid”. In other words, the Qualitative of transitive verbs has the meaning of a statal passive (1).

Obs. 1. So far as the Sahidic Bible is concerned, the constructions in question, all involving the Circumstantial of εἰ “to come”, are (1) εἰεὶ εἰσῆ— “when he was about to...” Mt. vi.5, Jo. xvi.21, Rom. xv.24, 2Cor. iii.16; note especially ἤπειρος εἰ εἰσῆ “when P. was about to come” Acts v.15; (2) ἀλγυῖο εἰεἰ “he has already come” Mt. xvii.12; (3) εἰεὶ εἴτρε— “should it become necessary that...” Mk. xiv.31.

V. Basic Tenses and Satellites

10. Like other sentence types, the Basic Tenses, affirmative as well as negative, can be preceded by one — in certain cases (§ 17, cf. also § 11 Obs.) by two — of three Sentence Converters: (1) τὸ converts the tense into the corresponding preterit; it does not affect its status as a main sentence, but produces a “relative tense” in the sense in which, e.g., the Latin Imperfect and Pluperfect are “relative tenses” (“Nebentempora” of the Present and the Perfect respectively) (2). The other two convert the tense from a

(1) The term “statal passive” is borrowed from Curme Grammar of the German Language (1922) § 194.4.
(2) Cf. W. Gardner Hale The cum-Constructions (1887) 18-20, 21 n. 1.
main sentence into a subordinate clause: (2) Circumstantial ε-, (3) Relative ετ-, ετε, ε-, επτ- (cf. § 18).

Obs. 1. The Third Future does not take ne, and it is only a matter of inference that its affirmative form can take the Circumstantial ε- (coalescing with the initial ε-).

Obs. 2. The Preterit Converter ne is often, apparently optionally, followed by ne.

11. "Second Tenses" are formed by morphemes which offer a certain resemblance to the Sentence Converters, especially to the Relative. Although this resemblance, so far as it goes, is probably not accidental (cf. § 31), the Second Tenses are on syntactic grounds (§§ 21, 28 Obs.) better kept apart from the converted tenses. However, the Second Tenses and the converted tenses can be grouped together as Satellites of the basic tenses.

The syntactic function of the Second Tenses is, as a rule, to turn the tense into a noun-equivalent, capable of filling the first (actor) position of the Bipartite Pattern, and thereby to throw emphasis on the adverbial predicate (§ 30). English achieves the same effect in a similar way by the use of the Cleft Sentence ("it was ... that ... ").

Obs. The Second Perfect which, in Sahidic at least, is the only Second Tense the characteristic morpheme of which is other than ε-, is capable of being preceded by the Circumstantial Converter ε-. The resulting form επταγωνίσσει coincides superficially with the Relative Perfect, but differs from it syntactically: (1) it can be used as "virtual relative" after an indefinite noun, e.g. Mt. xix.12 ὄν χεπιστορ ζερ επταγωνίσσει εδολ ἡ ἐντεῦχαι πειτείει "there are eunuchs who were born like that from the womb of their mother"; (2) it is negated by (η-) .... άν (§§ 28, 30, 31), e.g. Mt. xx.28 ἴπει μή χτυπήσας επταγείν ἀν επτευδιακονεί παῖς ἀλα ἐλιακονεί "just as the Son of Man came not in order to be served but to serve ... " (for the construction ἴπει η- definite noun plus Circumstantial cf., e.g., 1Cor. xi.12); Sir. xix.15 ὄν χεπισκολατε επταγαλα ἀν γὰ τις περρητ "there is he who stumbles (cf. § 33) without having done so in his heart ". Other examples in OLZ 1957, 232.

12. When the Bipartite Conjugation Pattern is preceded by the Sentence Converters, the pronominal preformatives are replaced by the pronominal suffixes. With the Relative, however, this is true only when the pronominal actor of the relative clause is distinct from the antecedent; when the antecedent is the actor of
the relative clause, the *et*- steps into the first position of the Conjugation Pattern.

*Obs.* The correctness of analysing, *e.g.*, the relative 1st pl. *et*- into *et*- plus suffix *-n*, rather than into *et*- plus preformative *tn*- (L. Eg. *nty lw.n*) is borne out by the 3rd pl. form *etot*- (contrast L. Eg. *nty st*); cf. Demotic *nty lw.n*, *nty lw.w*.

13. Before nominal subject the Sentence Converters assume the lengthened forms *nepe* (Imperfect, § 16) *ep*<sub>e</sub>, *etep*<sub>e</sub>. This lengthening does not, however, take place in all dialects to the same extent. Cf. §§ 52-55.

14. *ep*<sub>e</sub> (prenominal), *eq*- are also the forms of the Second Present in Sahidic and Subakhmimic; in the other dialects the forms are *ape* (Akhmimic also *a*), *aep*<sub>e</sub>.

15. In these dialects the forms of the Imperfect are similarly *nap*<sub>e</sub>, *napq*-. Syntactically, however, the Imperfect goes with the Circumstantial and the Relative, this entire group being in certain respects treated differently from the Second Present. Cf. § 21.

16. The converted forms of the Bipartite Conjugation Pattern thus resemble superficially the basic forms of the Tripartite Pattern. Structurally and functionally the three morphemes of

*neqout<sub>α</sub>* correspond to

*ne eqout<sub>α</sub>, ne imq-*

*etaqout<sub>α</sub>, et eq<sub>α</sub>imq-*

*etaqout<sub>α</sub>, et eq<sub>α</sub>imq-* etc.

*neqout<sub>α</sub>* is the Preterit Present ("praesens in praeterito") = Imperfect, just as *ne eqout<sub>α</sub>* is the Preterit Perfect ("perfectum in praeterito") = Pluperfect, etc. However, *neqout<sub>α</sub>* sometimes seems to exhibit certain properties of a basic, rather than of a converted, tense, cf. § 28; its primitive converted character is evident in *ne(o)yn* § 35.

17. The Imperfect can be further preceded by the Relative Converters *e*- and (*n*)*ete*. It is noteworthy that Thompson’s Subakhmimic St. John uses *ne*<sub>e</sub> *neqo* *nby<sub>e</sub>* "he who was formerly (non-simultaneously) blind" ix.13, but consistently avoids the forms
with e-, replacing them mostly by the Relative Present, cf. ii.22, 23, vi.62, vii.42, x.40, xi.6, 32 xii.1, xvii.5, xviii.1.

The ability to be further preceded by the Relative Converter e- belongs to the Preterit Converter as such, not to the Preterit Present (Imperfect) specifically, cf. eηeύητας § 33. It provides therefore no argument for regarding the Imperfect as a basic tense.

The Imperfect can also be further preceded by the Circumstantial Converter e- to express the protasis of an unfulfilled condition ("supposition contrary to fact") (1).

18. The following table shows the Basic Tenses with their Satellites:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Preterit</th>
<th>Circumstantial</th>
<th>Relative</th>
<th>&quot;Second&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eη-</td>
<td>neq-</td>
<td>eq- (ey- )</td>
<td>eteq-</td>
<td>eq- (ey- )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dη-</td>
<td>ne dη-</td>
<td>eq- (ey- )</td>
<td>eteqa-</td>
<td>ηetaq-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mηq-</td>
<td>ne mηq-</td>
<td>eq- (ey- )</td>
<td>ete mηq-</td>
<td>ete mηq-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mπηq-</td>
<td>ne mπηq-</td>
<td>eq- (ey- )</td>
<td>ete mπηq-</td>
<td>mπηq-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yηq-</td>
<td>ne yηq-</td>
<td>eq- (ey- )</td>
<td>ete yηq-</td>
<td>yηq-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meq-</td>
<td>ne meq-</td>
<td>eq- (ey- )</td>
<td>ete meq-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eeq-</td>
<td></td>
<td>(eq- )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nneq-</td>
<td></td>
<td>enneq-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Satellites in the second degree:

| netaq- | enetaq- |         |
| neq-   | eneq-   | (eneq- ) |


b) Inferred on the analogy of enneq- as used after zekαac (OLZ 1957, 233).

c) Probably non-existent in Sahidic. For Bohairic see Stern § 419, Mallon § 382.

(1) Stern § 630. However, combinations of Basic Tenses with eηe will not be listed as "Satellites in the second degree".

(2) ηηηπηq- without a stroke over ηη: in the superlineation system here accepted as standard, word-initial syllabic sonorants become non-syllabic when preceded by one-vowel morphemes.
VI. Syntactic Peculiarities of the Bipartite Conjugation Pattern

19. The construction of the Bipartite Conjugation Pattern is profoundly altered by the indefiniteness of the actor expression. An indefinite actor expression must in all dialects be preceded by $\textit{ovyn}$ "there is", the negation being effected by $\textit{ssin}$ "there is not". Especially the negation differs entirely from the characteristic negation of the Bipartite Conjugation Pattern (§ 28). The Bipartite Conjugation Pattern with indefinite actor expression must therefore be treated under the Existential Sentence (§ 33).

20. After the Sentence Converters the special status of the indefinite actor expression is maintained by different dialects with different degrees of strictness, Akhmimic (with Bohairic as a close second) being the strictest and Sahidic the laxest. For details see § 35.

21. Neither in Akhmimic nor in Sahidic does the rule apply to the Second Present; cf., for both dialects, Prov. x.i,17, xii.2, xiii.1, xviii.19. This is one of the reasons for suspecting that the association of the Second Present with the Bipartite Conjugation Pattern is secondary (§ 52 Obs.).

No Bohairic example of $\textit{ep} \textit{ovyn}$ is known to me; the usual construction is $\textit{ovyn}$– $\textit{ep}$–.

22. Neither in Bohairic nor in Sahidic does the rule apply to the Third Future: both dialects use invariably $\textit{ep}$ before an indefinite actor expression. Cf. for Bohairic, Ps. cxxvii.2, Prov. iii.8, 22a, Mt. x.21, xxiv.5, 7, 10, 21, Mk xiii.12, Lk. i.14. ii.35, xiv.10; for Sahidic, Lev. xxv.5, Deut. xxix.19(18), Jdg. ix.20, Prov. xxi.6, xxi.19, Jo. xi.50, 2Cor. viii.13, 14.

23. A severe restriction is imposed upon the direct complement expressions by which the Infinitive can be followed immediately in the Bipartite Conjugation Pattern. Only bare nouns, i.e. nouns with zero article (Stern § 332 sub fin.), numerals, and indefinite expres-
sions like ἀνάπ “something”, ἀρχ “many”, οὐ “what?” are allowed in this position. Object suffixes, being by nature definite, are excluded. Nouns with an article, even the indefinite article, as well as personal pronouns (suffixes) must be connected by the preposition ἐν, ἐνόμ (Stern § 494). The rule and the exceptions therefrom (especially ὀνειδ-, ὀναγμ= “to wish, love”) have been worked out by Jernstedt Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR 1927, 69-74.


Obs. 2. ἐπαν= “to please” is used in all conjugations: First Present, Acts xii.3, Rom. xiv.18; Imperfect, Ps. xxxiv.14; Circumstantial, 2 Cor. v.9, Heb. xii.28; Relative Present, Dent. vi.18, Heb. xiii.16, and often.

Obs. 3. On the other hand ἐπάν (with reflexive suffix) “to be willing, consent” is only used in the conjugations of the Tripartite Pattern and in the Imperative (Ps. xxxiv.14 ἐπανακ).

Obs. 4. As Jernstedt p. 72 has pointed out, this rule often allows to distinguish the prenominal base and the 2nd fem. sg. (Jernstedt Doklady 1925, 25-6) of the Third Future from those of the Circumstantial and the Second Present. Additional criteria are provided by the rule concerning verbs of motion (§ 9); for Bohairic, by the use of ἐπε (as against ἐοτ) before indefinite noun (§ 22); and by the fact that the Conjunctive continues neither the Circumstantial Present nor the Second Present. E. g., Ps. xxxvi.15 ἐπε τευκχε ἐπωκ ἐπομν ἐπομβυ ΑΥ ἐπε νευντο ενωμ “may their sword enter their heart and their arrows break” can be identified as Third Future (1) by the Infinitive ἐπωκ and (2) by the use of the Conjunctive.

24. The terms “dauerzeiten” and “ereigniszeiten” (Stern) are, on the semantic level, coextensive with “Bipartite” and “Tripartite Conjugation Pattern” respectively. The term “dauerzeiten” (“durative tenses”) is adequate, but “ereigniszeiten” (“point tenses”, “limitative tenses”, “non-durative tenses”) has the disadvantage of including the Clause Conjugations, which are not “tenses” at all.

25. In a survey of the Coptic conjugation system the “Futures” with ἀνα- require no separate mention, since they are merely expansions of the Bipartite Conjugation Pattern. The fact that ἀνα- can only
be followed by an Infinitive, not by a Qualitative, and that such an
Infinitive can be freely followed by nouns and suffixes denoting the
undergoer of the action constitutes no violation of the Stern-Jernstedt
rule and does not justify the conclusion that the “Futures” with
\( na- \) are not durative tenses (1). In characteristic contrast with the
post-suffixal additional morphemes in \( eq-e-cωμ\bar{\alpha} \) and \( eq-\gammaαμ-cωμ\bar{\alpha} \) (§ 4 Obs. 1) the \( na- \) belongs to the second part of the Bi-
partite Conjugation Pattern. The grammatically operative element of
the predicate, the one to which the rules concerning the durative tenses
apply, is not the “main verb”. The durative character of the “future” auxiliary \( na- \) is borne out by the fact that as soon as a “Future” is formed from a conjugation of the Tripartite Pattern,
\( na- \) is replaced by its non-durative (Infinitive) alternant \( noy \) (Bohairic \( pουι \) e-). Cf. examples where Bohairic \( pουι \) e- corresponds to
Sahidic \( na- \) (Lk. xxi.7 ἀρξασαν παί pουι ἐγγούν; ἐρε παῖ πάσαμον
“When these things are about to happen”), or Sahidic \( noy \) e- corres-
dents to Bohairic \( na- \) (Acts xxviii.10 ἰτετῆποντο εκω ἐβολά; ὅτος,
ἐπιασθεν ἐβολά μιματ “when we were about to take off”), or
Sahidic \( noy \) e- and \( na- \) occur alongside of one another (Lev. x.9
ετετηγαμμίστω εὐθὲς ἐγγού ε-... ἡ ετετηματί οἱ πεπιότοι ἐγγού ε-
ηρίκα ἄν εἰσπορεύηθε... ἡ προσπορευμένοι ὑμῶν).

The true nature of the relationship between \( na- \) and \( noy \) e- was
first recognized by Jernstedt Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR 1927,
35; \( noy \) e- occurs not only with \( εργαν \) and ἰτετε, but also with
\( μιματε \) (Mk. xiii.7, Jo. vii.8) and with \( χαπτε \) (Ez. iii.27), and
outside the Bible with the affirmative Perfect (Crum Dict. 219 a-b).

Obs. 1. The fact that the only function of \( noy \) e- is that of a
“Future” auxiliary with non-durative conjugations, while \( na- \) is also
a full verb “to go” (cf. OLZ 1959, 458), raises grave doubts as to whether
\( noy \) is really an old Infinitive form; it may very well be a late back-for-
mation from \( na- \).

Obs. 2. There is no satisfactory explanation for the absence of the
expected preposition e- after \( na- \); cf., however, Spiegelberg Rec. tr. 14
(1893) 39-40.

VII. Negations

The various groups of conjugations are correlated to specific
modes of negation.

(1) I must formally retract the statement contained in the last sen-
tence of OLZ 1959, 458 n. 3.
26. The basic tenses of the Tripartite Pattern have ready-made negative counterparts with built-in negative elements, § 4.

27. The Clause Conjugations are negatived by the morpheme ται (Bohairic and Fayyumic γυτεμι); outside conjugation the function of ται is to negative the Infinitive. It is placed after the pronominal suffix:

Conjunctive πεταιωται.
Future Conjunctive: only one example (in independent use, § 1) is on record (Lefort Le Musée 60, 1947, 12) Mk. xii.14 ταρπιδι η η η η η η "shall we give or shall we not give?" (4)
Temporal πεταιταισωται (Mk. ii.4, Lk. ii.45, Acts xvii.6, xxi.14).
"until" γαντρταισωται (Num. xxi.35, Josh. viii.22, Bohairic Gen. xli.49).
Conditional επεγανταισωται (Sir. xxvii.3, Mt. xviii.16).
With nominal actor, so far as the evidence goes, ται is normally placed after the conjugation base:
Conjunctive πηταιται πρωμε σωται. Exceptionally ται is found after the nominal actor before the Infinitive: Prov. ii.5 = iii.6.
Future Conjunctive: no example.
Temporal πηταιται πρωμε σωται (Crum Papyrus codex 30, 7).
"until": no Sahidic example is known to me; a Bohairic example is quoted by Stern § 449: γαντεταται ται ται ται ται.
Conditional επεγανταιται πρωμε σωται (2 Thess. ii.3).

Obs. The γατν of the Conditional can be omitted before ται. In Bohairic and Fayyumic this omission is the rule. In Sahidic επεγανταισωται and επεγανταισωται, επεγανταιται and επεταιται πρωμε σωται are equally common.

28. The Bipartite Pattern containing a definite actor expression and all "Second Tenses" are negatived by (η) ... αν, cf. §§ 31-32.
As regards the converted forms of the Bipartite Pattern, there is a characteristic difference between the Circumstantial and the Relative on the one hand, and the Preterit on the other (§ 16).

(4) This exceptional case runs counter to the old rule, still fully valid in Coptic, that in combinations of the verb "to give" with a sdm. (iry.) sdm -πεταισωται it is only the former which can be negatived.
In the type of Sahidic here described (1) it is rather uncommon for Circumstantial and Relative constructions of the Bipartite Pattern to be negated, which can be done by an alone. The normal method, which is the rule in other sentence-types, is the conversion of negative constructions into Circumstantial and Relative constructions, e. g.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tripartite Pattern</th>
<th>Nominal Sentence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic (\text{\textpi\textcu\textcj\textnu\textcu})</td>
<td>(\text{\textpi\textcu\textcj\textnu\textcu})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic (\text{\textpi\texthu\textcu})</td>
<td>(\text{\textpi\texthu\textcu})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circumst. (\text{\textpi\texthu\textcu})</td>
<td>(\text{\textpi\texthu\textcu})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative (\text{\textpi\texthu\textcu}) *</td>
<td>(\text{\textpi\texthu\textcu})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative (\text{\textpi\texthu\textcu}) *</td>
<td>(\text{\textpi\texthu\textcu})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and correspondingly in the Bipartite Pattern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic (\text{\textpi\texthu\textcu})</td>
<td>(\text{\textpi\texthu\textcu})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic (\text{\textpi\texthu\textcu})</td>
<td>(\text{\textpi\texthu\textcu})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circumst. (\text{\textpi\texthu\textcu})</td>
<td>(\text{\textpi\texthu\textcu})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative (\text{\textpi\texthu\textcu}) *</td>
<td>(\text{\textpi\texthu\textcu})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative (\text{\textpi\texthu\textcu}) *</td>
<td>(\text{\textpi\texthu\textcu})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The constructions marked by * require, as a rule, a resumptive pronoun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) But not, e. g., in Shenoute.

(2) In Akhmimic the construction \(\text{\textpi\texthu\textcu}\) is the norm, e. g. Prov. ix.13, x.12, xi.29, xv.22, xvii.9, xix.23(20), xxiv.22. The Sahidic in all these places has \(\text{\textpi\texthu\textcu}\).

(3) In Rom. ii.29 \(\text{\textpi\texthu\textcu}\) " whose honour is not from men, but from God " it would be tempting to see a Relative Second Present; in Prov. xxvii.19 \(\text{\textpi\texthu\textcu}\) " even as the faces do not resemble each other " this would seem less likely, though not impossible.

Orientalia — 27
But with the Preterite ne we have

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{neycwotxx} & \quad \text{neycwotxx AN} \\
\text{pere neycwotxx} & \quad \text{pere neycwotxx AN}
\end{align*}
\]

The construction \( \text{ne minrmo... AN} \), which we might expect on the analogy of the other Converters and which actually occurs in Demotic (Spiegelberg \textit{Dem. Gr.} § 175 under 11), is preserved in the protasis of an unfulfilled condition: Jo. xviii.30, where the true reading (already quoted, presumably from Woide's \textit{Appendix} \(^1\), by Stern p. 413) is \( \text{ene mnai p neyovu AN} \) "if this one were not doing evil \( (\varepsilon\,\mu\eta\,\eta\nu\,\sigma\theta\alpha\tau\varsigma\,\varkappa\alpha\varsigma\nu\pi\omega\nu) \) ".

\text{Obs.} The Circumstantial Converter \( \varepsilon \) precedes the negative \( \text{ne} \), \( \text{enyovu AN} \), but the negative \( \text{ne} \) (prevocally often \( \text{ne} \)) precedes the morpheme \( \varepsilon \) of the Second Present and the Second Aorist: \( \text{nneq-} \text{cwoott AN} \), \( \text{nneqacwotxx AN} \) (e.g., Isa. xxviii.27; Lefort \textit{Pères apost.} 35, 9).

29. Using the negations as principle of classification, we obtain the following schematic representation of the conjugations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Tenses</th>
<th>Second Tenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negativzied by ( \text{ne} ) \ldots \text{AN}</td>
<td>eq-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>eq-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>æq-</td>
<td>ænq-</td>
<td>æeq-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imperatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \text{màreq} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clause Conjugations

Negativized by \( \text{ta} \)

\( \text{teq}, \text{taeq}, \text{téteq}, \text{swan}, \text{eqw} \).

\(^1\) Woide's text is confirmed by the Chester Beatty Ms. A (coll. Thompson), Delaporte (whose V = Horner's 20), Morgan IV (kindly collated by Mr A. F. Shore). The Chester Beatty Ms. B omits the \( \text{me} \), and Horner's 14 (coll. Shore) does the same and spells \( \text{me} \) instead of \( \text{ene} \), but neither has \( \text{ene} \).
VIII. The Syntactic Status of the "Second Tenses"

30. The identical treatment, in respect of negation, of the Bipartite Conjugation Pattern and the "Second Tenses" arises from the structure of sentences containing a "Second Tense": such a sentence is a true sentence with adverbial predicate, in which the "Second Tense" fills the first position (§ 5). Structurally, therefore, such a sentence is not a "conjugation pattern" at all (§ 6 end).

The Second Present need have no verb at all, i.e. the Second Tense morpheme plus the actor expression is by itself sufficient to fill the first position; if it has a verb (Infinitive or Qualitative), the latter is included in the first position. All other Second Tenses must necessarily be followed by an Infinitive within the first position. Cf.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eq</td>
<td>ἐγέλθη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀναστήσει</td>
<td>ἐγέλθη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>epe τινὸς ἐνίωσθη</td>
<td>ἐγέλθη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eīnāp ἰπακχα</td>
<td>ἐγέλθη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Second Present</td>
<td>(b) Second Perfect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

as against

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>epe περρωτον ο προ</td>
<td>ἐβολαὶ γίτοοτ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πειξι οοου αν</td>
<td>ἐβολαὶ γίτοοτ ρωμε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πτα πτηρφ ἵμωνε</td>
<td>ἐβολαὶ γίτοοτυ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐμαρε ἰεπχαξε ἱωτῆ</td>
<td>ἐβολαὶ γίτοοτου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Second Present</td>
<td>(d) do. (negativated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Second Perfect</td>
<td>(h) Second Aorist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Ps. lxvii.28 "ibi est"; (b) Ps. xxxv.13 "ibi eccliderunt"; (c) Ps. xxxv.10 "apud te est fons vitae"; (d) Mt. xxvi.18 "apud te faciam Pascha"; (e) Prov. viii.15 "per me regnant reges"; (f) Jo. v.41 "non ab homine accipio gloriam"; (g) Jo. i.3 "per ipsum omnia facta sunt"; (h) Prov. xv.28 "per ipsas reconciliantur inimici".

31. The function of (ἵ-) ... ἀν is to negate the nexus between subject and non-verbal predicate. With "Second Tenses", accordingly, it negates the nexus between the noun-equivalent "Second Tense" and the adverbial predicate, not the "Second Tense" itself: "it is not ... that ...". If the "Second Tense" itself, not its nexus with
the adverbial predicate, is to be negated ("it is ... that ... not ..."),
this is done by converting the negative Basic Tense into the Relative
§ 28), the Relative Converter functioning as "Second Tense" mor-
pheme; cf. Études de syntaxe copte 88-9.

Obs. It should be noted that in Sahidic the position of ἂν does
not indicate the predicate. It does so often, but far from regularly, in
Bohairic, e. g., Mt. x.34, Lk. iv.4, Jo. v.34.

32. (ῠ--) . . . ἂν is often used to negative a non-verbal part
of the sentence having predicative force, especially all kinds of adver-
bial adjuncts.

This construction is likewise used with "Second Tenses", if
they follow, instead of preceding, the adverbial predicate. In this
case ἂν follows the predicate (contrast § 31 Obs.), while the "Second
Tense" is affirmative. Cf. Deut. ix.6, Lk. xii.15, quoted Études 39;
Deut. vii.7 ὁτάτι ἐδείξαι καὶ ἔδραμεν ἄφετο ἐπάσης τυρφού
πτα πνεομα ἐνεβα θοττίπ ἄνω ἀρετὶν θοττίπ ... ἄλλα ...";
"it was not because you are more numerous than all nations that
the Lord preferred you and chose you ... but ..."; Le Muséon 42
(1929) 222 ἐβόλε δια ἂν ἐτρογοῦ ὅσι θαμε ἐκνυς ἄφετο ἐγώνε
ἐργοῦτε, well translated by Lefort (p. 250) "ce n'est pas, en effet,
pare que cent est plus grand, que cinquante [leg. soixante] ne vaut
rien"; Shenoute ed. Chassinat 38, 35 ἐργαν τῆς ἀγωγὸς ἀγγακ ἐβόλε ἂν
(the all-important ἂν (1) is missing in Leipoldt's text III 79, 4)
... ἐπε πληθύνυ τρέπε "it is not if the fox barks ... that the lion is
afraid ".

Obs. That the basic and essential function of the "Second Tenses"
is to nominalize Basic Tenses and to render them capable of becoming
subjects of adverbial predicates, could be inferred from the negation
(ῠ--) . . . ἂν alone, even if it were not amply demonstrated by actual
Coptic usage. At the same time it is true that "there are many exa-
mples in which II Tenses are used, where no Adverbial extension is present"
(Plumley Introd. Coptic Gr. p. 81). Such "exceptions", which are re-
latively not at all numerous, can be brought under a limited number of
heads and understood as extensions of the basic function; cf. Études 51-3.
Inasmuch as such uses deviate from the structure of the "Second Tenses"
they are secondary ("emplois abusifs"), but it is not in the least suggested
that they should "be dismissed as improper uses". They can be "dis-
mised" only in the sense that they do not invalidate the definition of
the basic function.

(1) Foxes flee before lions: Shenoute ed. Leipoldt III 87, 23.
It is noteworthy that "exceptions" are especially uncommon with the negation, and it may be mentioned, for the record, that the specific meaning of the negated Second Perfect was correctly defined before this definition was found to be valid for the "Second Tenses" in general (GGA 1934, 60).

It is further noteworthy that not all "emplois abusifs" occur in all dialects. Sahidic, e.g., uses the "Second Tenses" not only "properly" with interrogative adverbs (including prepositions with interrogative pronouns) but also with interrogative pronouns as direct complements (following the prenominal Infinitive) and as actors (following the conjugation base). In Bohairic, as was first pointed out by Chaîne Éléments § 802, this "improper" extension is unknown (with the exception of the idiom λρετενεψιν των ἄριστων "how are you?" Gen. xliii.27, cf. Ann. Serv. 40, 245).

IX. Existential Sentence

33. Existence and non-existence are predicated by οὐν (1) "there is" and (μ)μην "there is not" respectively, followed by the subject. The subject is never a personal pronoun. As a rule it is one of the following: nouns with indefinite or zero article; οὐα, οὐον, δοείνα; numerals; γάρ, "many", πάντα "anything", δε "another", οὐχ "how much?" The definite article is admitted in two cases: (1) in substantivized relative expressions (Spiegelberg Dem. Gr. § 441 Anm.), and (2) in the phrases οὐν οε ον- (Sir. xxvii.21), μην οε ον- (1Sam. xxi.17, Isa. i.6, xlv.28, Wisd. v.10) "there is a way", "there is no way" (of doing) (2).

The combination with the preposition μητε-, μητας "with" yields the expressions ουρπητε-, ουρπητας; μητε-, μητας "have", see Till Kopt. Gr. §§ 289-94.

The predicates of existence and non-existence have all the Satellites:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Preterit</th>
<th>Circumstantial</th>
<th>Relative</th>
<th>&quot;Second&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ουν</td>
<td>οε(ο)νη</td>
<td>οε(ο)νη</td>
<td>ετε(ο)νη</td>
<td>οε(ο)νητας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μην</td>
<td>μημην</td>
<td>εμην</td>
<td>ετε μην</td>
<td>ετε μην</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Satellite in the second degree:

| οε(ο)νη   |   |   |   |

(1) The best MSS. are inconsistent as regards the superlineation of the ο in ουν; the earlier MSS. tend to omit the stroke.

(2) In Ps. lxvi.12 μην περινην ετε μητας ρονοοε (Till Kopt. Gr. § 480) μην means "and".
a) Études 50. Add Shenoute ed. Leipoldt III 85, 14 ἐγὼ ἔστη τὸν ταπαδὸν ἐναπτασεὶ ηττα καὶ χαίρειν ὑποτευ τὸν "if he still has power, it is in those who allow him place in them that he has it"; perhaps also Rom. i.14 εὑρίσκω εἰρήν "it is I who owe a debt to them".

b) Études 50; OLZ 1957, 233.

c) Only ἐνέπληθεν εἰς τὴν μείωσιν τῆς ἐντασιάς in the protasis of an unfulfilled condition.

d) Job xxxi.35, Mt. xviii.28, Jo. xvii.5, Rom. vi.21, 1Jo. ii.7. In the Cleft Sentence, Acts xiv.12 ἦτοι πεπεφθανει οἴομε πέμπτην περὶ τοῦ γνῶσα "it was he who was powerful in speech"; Mt. xxi.28, Lk. xv.11 ὄρωμεν πεπεφθανει ἤγατι ποιητὸς χρόνος "it was a man who had two sons", which is the Coptic way of expressing "there was a man who had two sons" (!); var. πεπεθανει τῷ τιτατῇ; and thus Shenoute ed. Chassinat 103, 11.

34. The negative form μὴ, with its built-in negative element, is reminiscent of the negative conjugation bases of the Tripartite Pattern. In fact, ὁμίλιο and μὴ probably are, like most conjugation bases, remnants of the old σαμ. conjugation. That ὁμίλιο and μὴ cannot take personal suffixes, results from the definiteness of the latter. That ὁμίλιο and μὴ can be self-sufficient predicates, results from their being intransitive, while the conjugation bases of the Perfect and the Aorist go back to transitive auxiliary verbs, requiring an Infinitive as their necessary complement.

Obs. 1. b- Bg. is a phonetic writing of ἵνα ἔγνω: Sethe Verbum I § 203; Spiegelberg Rec. tr. 21 (1899) 41-2. On the existential sentence in M. Eg. (ἵνα ἔγνω, neg. ἵνα ἔγνω) cf. Gardiner Eg. Gr. §§ 107-8.

Obs. 2. The fact that ἔγνω was a verb-form, does not make "verbs" of ὁμίλιο and μὴ. From the point of view of Coptic they can only be described as predicative expressions of existence and non-existence.

35. "Absolute existence is but rarely asserted; usually there is some qualification in the form of [...] an adverbial phrase [...]. When such a qualification occurs, there is a tendency for it, rather than the notion of existence, to become the real predicate" (Gardiner). The importance of the Existential Sentence for the conjugation system

(1) Cf. the Cleft Sentence with the Relative Perfect (ὀρωμουμενε πεπεφθανει ... and sim.) in the opening sentence of other parables, Mt. xxi.33, Mk. xii.1, Lk. x.30, xii.16, xiv.16, xviii.10, xx.9.
lies in the fact that it is likewise used with the verbal partners of the adverbial predicate, i.e. the Bipartite Conjugation Pattern (§ 19).

After the Sentence Converters the rule requiring the use of the Existential Sentence for the Bipartite Conjugation Pattern with indefinite actor expression is fully valid in Akhmimic and predominantly in Bohairic (see Obs. 1) and probably in Fayyumic. In Sahidic, so far as the affirmative sentence is concerned, the rule has no absolute validity: we find both the Converters plus οὐν and the ordinary prenominal forms of the Converters, ἐπε, ἐπε, ἐτερε (§ 13); ἐτε οὐν seems to be limited to the case where the actor has zero article and the predicate is a prepositional phrase; Shenoute, however, uses it also in the Akhmimic manner with verbal predicate (Obs. 2). Before zero article actor and verbal predicate Bohairic uses ἐτε (without οὐν) and Sahidic ἐτερε (Obs. 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Akhmimic</th>
<th>Bohairic</th>
<th>Fayyumic</th>
<th>Sahidic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>οὐν</td>
<td>οὐν</td>
<td>οὐν</td>
<td>οὐν/οὐν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐτερε</td>
<td>ἐτε ὑπ</td>
<td>ἐτερε/ἐπε</td>
<td>ἐτερε</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Obs. 1.** Bohairic ἐπε ἀπο. Lk. xxi.5, 20, Mk. vi.9; ἀπο οὐ- Mk. x.22, xiv.4, 56, Jo. xii.11; ἀπο ἀπο- Mk. i.6, iii.10, iv.36, xiv.4.

Obs. 2. Sahidic ἐτε ὑπ, e.g. Ps. xxiii.8, Lk. i.49, Eph. iii.20

Pete οὐν δομὶ ἀμοι, Jer. v.5, Acts xxv.5, Rom. xv.1 Pete οὐν δομὶ ἀμοιο “who has (have) power”; Ex. xxxiv.7 Pete οὐν ποδῃ ἐρω “who has a sin to his charge”; Lev. xxii.17 Pete οὐν Χαίπ οἰων ἐν οἷον “in whom there is a blemish”; Prov. xiv.4 ΠΙ ΠΡΕ οὐν ΓΑΣ ΠΡΩΤΩΤ ΠΡΕΝΗΜΑ “where there is much produce”; Rev. viii.9 Pete οὐν ἘΠΩΤ ἘΠΩΤ “in whom there is a soul”; Mk. vii.16 Pete οὐν ΜΑΔΙΚ ΒΕ ἌΜΟΙ “who has an ear” (cf. Mt. xiii.43 = Mk. iv.9 Pete οὐν ἘΠΩΤ ΜΑΔΙΚ ἘΠΩΤ).

Shenoute ed. Chassinat 85, 41 προῳ ἐτε οὐν ἀπο ὑπ ΜΟΥ ΣΕ ἀμοι ἐπαροτ ἀμοιο ἘΤΕ ἘΤΕ “the thing which many neglect for the sake of money”; ibid. 159, 30 ΠΙΑ ΠΡΕ οὐν ὑπ ΟΤΗΜΗΒΕ ΠΟΙΟΥΣ ἐρω “the place whither a multitude is gathered” (cf. and contrast Acts xii.12).

Obs. 3. Bohairic, Ps. iv.5 οὐ πετε ΣΑΡΤ ΠΑΛΙΟΙ ΝΗ “what is it that flesh will do to me?”; Ps. iv.12, cxvii.6 (= Heb. xiii.6) οὐ πετε ΡΩΜΠ ΠΑΛΙΟΙ ΝΗ “what is it that man will do to me?”; Sahidic, Lev. xv.32 πετερε επερμα ΠΑΕΙ ΕΒΟΛΗ ΑΜΟΙ “from whom sperm will issue”.

Obs. 4. Sahidic examples for οὐν οὐν- in the protasis of an unfulfilled condition (§ 17): Mk. ix.42, Lk. xvii.2 (var. ἐπερε), Heb. vii.11. Negative, Shenoute ap. Zoega 461 ΠΕΝΗΜΗΒΟΙ Π ΠΗΜΗΒΟΙ . . . ΠΕΝΗΜΗΒΟΙ ΑΠ ΠΕΖΕ . . . “if a thunderbolt were not pursuing him . . . they would not say: . . .”
36. The so-called Adjective Verbs belong to the conjugation system inasmuch as they may be said to replace the Qualitative of the verbs to which they are related. With most of those verbs the Qualitative is either extremely rare or altogether non-existent. Of *ōyy*, however, this is not true, and *ōyy* and *nāyywe* seem to be practically equivalent.

The structure of the Adjective Verbs is still problematic. In all likelihood the stem is the Infinitive, followed by a possessor expression; cf. Sethe ÄZ 64 (1929) 63-4; however, the nature of the prefix *nē-* , which seems to turn this nominal expression into a predicative one, is quite obscure.

37. The Adjective Verbs have all the Satellites. They are negated by (*ṇ*)... *an*.

Basic Preterit Circumstantial Relative "Second"

| *nāνοντ* | *nē nāνοντ* | *éνανοντ* | (1) *éτιπανοντ* | *éπανοντ* | b) (2) *éτε nανοντ* |

a) *ēτ* - is used when the subject of the Adjective Verb is = the antecedent, and *ēτε* when the subject is distinct from the antecedent. Cf., for the latter case, Shenoute ap. Rossi *Pap. copti* Π i ii 13 *nēe etē nāyywov nēsī nēτēnαρξοεις εροο* "just as those over whom he will rule are numerous"; with the negation, *Brit. Mus. Cat.* No. 981 (p. 480 b) (*ṇ*)*ēe etē (ṇ)nāνονc αν etēr* - "the way it is not good for ... to ..."). A nominal subject (Till *Kopt. Gr.* § 462) is necessarily distinct from the antecedent.

b) *Études 51*. Add Shenoute ed. Chassinat 135,44-5 *gītī oy eπαλατ eπεψερνυ* "whereby are they greater than one another?".

*Obs.* The subject may be definite as well as indefinite (*pace* Till *Kopt. Gr.* § 284). Cf. *πανο* *oy* - Ps. lxxiii.11, Prov. xi.23, xii.9, xv.16, 17, xvi.19, 32, xvii.1, xix.22, xx.23, xxii.1, xxiv.5, Wisd. iv.1.

XI. Formal Analysis of the Conjugation Bases

38. A classification of the conjugation bases by purely formal criteria must leave out of account not only the preformatives of the First Present, but, so far as Sahidic is concerned, also the Conjunctive, which has become closely assimilated to the First Present (for Bohairic
see § 51). On the other hand, it is useful to include the Satellites of the First Present and, for certain forms (§ 59), of the First Future. Although the Relative Present does not quite fit into any of the groups to be set up (§§ 42, 44), its very recalcitrance will prove illuminating.

A. S a h i d i c

39. We have to distinguish the prenominal and the presuffixal forms of the conjugation bases.

Prenominally all bases end in a vowel, either $\lambda$ or $\varepsilon$.

Presuffixally the bases end either in $\lambda$, or in stable $\varepsilon$, or in unstable $\varepsilon$ (alternating with zero).

Unstable $\varepsilon$ behaves differently, according as it is preceded either by one of the stops $n$ or $r$ (§ 44), or by the sonorant $p$ (§ 45).

40. The pronominal actor suffixes fall into four groups:

1. Single Surds: (2nd m. sg.) $-\kappa$
   (3rd m. sg.) $-\epsilon$
   (3rd f. sg.) $-\epsilon$

2. Single Sonorants, appearing in two alternant shapes:

   non-syllabic (postvocalic)          syllabic (postconsonantal)
   (1st sg.) $-\tilde{\tau}$ ($-\epsilon\tilde{\iota}$), that is $[\text{i}]$ $-\iota$, that is $[\text{i}]$
   (1st pl.) $-\tilde{n}$ $-\tilde{n}$, that is $[\text{n}]$
   (3rd. pl.) $-\nu$, that is $[\text{u}]$ $-\nu$, that is $[\text{u}]$

3. The suffix 2nd f. sg. has three alternants: zero, $-\epsilon$, $-p(\epsilon)$. The distribution of zero and $\epsilon$ is analogous to that of the non-syllabic and syllabic alternants described under (2) (1). In one case the alternants zero and $-p(\epsilon)$ appear as variants (§ 41).

4. The suffix 2nd pl. has two alternants: short $-\text{th} \tilde{\nu}$, long $-\text{th} \nu$. In certain cases these alternants appear as variants (§§ 43 Obs., 45 Obs. 1, 56 Obs.). The short form is perhaps best regarded as added to the prenominal base.

By applying the criteria listed in §§ 39 and 40 we obtain five groups. See the synoptic table on p. 416.

(*) 2nd f. sg. forms ending in $-\epsilon$ are considered as having zero when the base has stable $\epsilon$, and as having $-\epsilon$ when the base has unstable $\epsilon$. 
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41. **First Group.**
The base consists prenominally and presuffixally of the single vowel $\alpha$:
- Perfect $\alpha$-
- Ist sg., Ist pl., 3rd pl.: non-syllabic; 2nd f. sg.: zero, var. $-\rho(e)$;
- 2nd pl.: long.

*Obs.* The zero form of the 2nd f. sg., first explicitly pointed out by Spiegelberg *Rec. tr.* 30 (1908) 141-2, is the one found in the best MSS.

42. **Second Group.**
The base consists presuffixally either of a single vowel ($\varepsilon$) or a vowel ($\delta$, stable $\epsilon$) preceded by a single consonant:
- Circumstantial Present, Second Present, Third Future, Conditional $\epsilon$-;
- Imperfect $\nu\varepsilon$-; Aorist $\gamma\alpha$-; Neg. Aorist $\mu\varepsilon$- ($\lambda\lambda\alpha$-).
- Ist sg., 1st pl., 3rd pl.: non-syllabic; 2nd f. sg.: $-\rho(e)$; thus also, as variant, in the Relative Present (§ 59); 2nd pl.: long.

Prenominally: lengthened by $-\rho(e)$; thus also the Relative Present (§ 53).

*Obs.* In the Conditional the prenominal and the 2nd f. sg. (e.g. Ruth ii.9, Jo. xi.40) is normally $\epsilon\rho\gamma\alpha$-; $\epsilon\rho\gamma\alpha$- is archaic. The 2nd f. sg. of the Third Future is $\epsilon\varepsilon$- (Gen. iii.16 ap. *Brit. Mus. Cat.* No. 932; Jdg. iv.20, Ruth ii.9).

43. **Third Group.**
The base ends prenominally and presuffixally in stable $\epsilon$, preceded either by stop plus sonorant or by double sonorant:
- Causative Infinitive $\tau\rho\epsilon$-, Neg. Third Future $\overline{\nu}\mu\varepsilon$-.
- Ist sg., 1st pl., 3rd pl.: non-syllabic, but Ist sg. $-\epsilon \iota$ is normally replaced by $-\alpha$: $\tau\rho\alpha$-, $\overline{\nu}\mu\alpha$-; 2nd f. sg.: zero; 2nd pl.: short.

*Obs.* In Sahidic the 2nd pl. variant $\tau\rho\epsilon\tau\iota\overline{\mu}$- is non-standard, though old; cf. § 56 Obs.

44. **Fourth Group.**
The base ends in a stop ($\mu$, $\tau$) plus unstable $\epsilon$:
- Neg. Perfect $\overline{\beta}\mu(\epsilon)$-; "not yet" $\overline{\rho}\mu\alpha\tau(\epsilon)$-; "until" $\gamma\alpha\tau(\epsilon)$-.

[Relative Present $\epsilon\tau(\epsilon)$-, except for the prenominal form $\epsilon\tau\varepsilon$ and the 2nd f. sg. variant $\epsilon\tau\varepsilon$-].

The $\epsilon$ appears prenominally and before the suffix 2nd pl.; it disappears before all other suffixes.
- Ist sg., 1st pl., 3rd pl.: syllabic; 2nd f. sg.: $-\epsilon$; 2nd pl.: short.

*Obs.* The disappearance of $\epsilon$ before the single-consonant suffixes is the norm in the classical orthography (Rahlfs *Die Berliner Hs. des sahid. Psalters* 28 n. 4). Exceptions occur, however, even in old and otherwise careful MSS.

45. **Fifth Group.**
The base ends in a vowel plus $\rho$ plus unstable $\epsilon$:
- Causative Imperative $\mu\lambda\rho(\epsilon)$-, Future Conjunctive $\tau\lambda\rho(\epsilon)$-, Temporal $\overline{\iota}\tau\rho(\epsilon)$-.
The e appears prenominally, before the single surd suffixes and before the suffix 2nd pl.; it disappears before the sonorant suffixes.

1st sg., 1st pl., 3rd pl.: syllabic; 2nd f. sg.: -e; 2nd pl.: short.

**Obs. 1.** Alongside of \(\tau\alpha\rho\varepsilon\tau\eta\pi\iota\) there exists a non-standard variant \(\tau\alpha\rho\varepsilon\tau\eta\pi\iota\nu\). Cf. § 56 Obs.

**Obs. 2.** The spellings \(\nu\tau\tau\nu\iota\pi\iota\) etc. are those of the classical orthography; \(\nu\tau\tau\eta\rho\pi\nu\) is, however, found in otherwise reliable MSS.

### B. Other dialects

#### 46. (Cf. § 41). In the Perfect the 2nd f. sg. form \(\alpha\) is also found in Akhmimic (Prov. xxxi.29) alongside of \(\alpha\rho\) (Mic. iv.9, Nah. iii.16; relative \(\varepsilon\tau\alpha\rho\) Zeph. iii.11, Clem. ed. Schmidt p. 16.12) and in Subakhmimic (Jo. iv.18 relative \(\nu\tau\alpha\nu\)).

In the 2nd pl. Bohairic has very frequently \(\alpha\rho\varepsilon\tau\eta\rho\nu\) (as in the Second Present, § 48) alongside of \(\alpha\tau\tau\eta\rho\nu\) and thus regularly in the Relative (and Second) Perfect \(\varepsilon\tau\alpha\rho\varepsilon\tau\eta\nu\).

#### 47. (Cf. § 42). In Akhmimic the Aorist belongs to the Fifth Group (§ 58). For the other bases of the Second Group Akhmimic uses prenominally both the enlarged and the unenlarged forms, apparently without distinction (§ 55): Circumstantial e alongside of \(e\rho\nu\), Second Present A alongside of \(\alpha\rho\nu\), Neg. Aorist \(\nu\alpha\nu\) alongside of \(\nu\alpha\nu\). Whether the Imperfect has \(\nu\alpha\nu\) alongside of \(\nu\alpha\nu\) (the latter e.g. Jon. ii.1) must be left open for the moment; in books of reference the Second Perfect (cf. OLZ 1960, 25 n. 1) (1) is often mistaken for the Imperfect. [Imperfetc \(\nu\alpha\nu\) Jo. xiii.2 (Rösch)].

#### 48. (Cf. § 42). For the 2nd pl. of the Second Group Bohairic adds the short suffix -\(\tau\eta\nu\) to the enlarged prenominal base:

- Circumstantial \(\varepsilon\rho\varepsilon\tau\nu\nu\) and Third Future \(\varepsilon\rho\varepsilon\tau\nu\nu\)
- Second Present \(\alpha\rho\varepsilon\tau\nu\nu\)
- Imperfect \(\nu\alpha\rho\varepsilon\tau\nu\nu\)
- Aorist \(\gamma\alpha\rho\varepsilon\tau\nu\nu\)
- Neg. Aorist \(\nu\gamma\alpha\rho\varepsilon\tau\nu\nu\)

(1) Add Mt. xi.26 ap. Amundsen *Symbolae Osloenses* 24 (1945) 123.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Bases</th>
<th>1st sg., 1st pl., 3rd pl.</th>
<th>2nd f. sg.</th>
<th>2nd pl.</th>
<th>prenominal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>non-syllabic</td>
<td>syllabic</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>-ε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>ά-</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>(x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>ε- ιη- ιατ- ιε-</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>τρε- τιπε-</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>μπ(ε)- μματ(ε)- ματ(ε)- μετ(ε)-</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>μαρ(ε)- ταρ(ε)- πτερ(ε)-</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Second Present ὑπὲρτὶ and Imperfect ὑπὲρτᾶ—occur as variants also in Subakhmimic; an isolated instance of Second Future ὑπὲρτὰ—even in classical Sahidic: Sir. ii.15 Lagarde.

49. (Cf. § 43). In all other dialects the 3rd pl. forms of the Third Group have -ογα- against Sahidic -ἐγα-:

- Bohairic ερογ-
- Fayyumic τρογ-
- Akhmimic τογ- (ὑ)νογ-
- Subakhmim. τρογ- πογ-

For the 1st sg. the picture is more diversified:

- Bohairic ἐρι-
- Fayyumic τρι- τη-
- Akhmimic τα- ὑνα-
- Subakhmim. τρι- τρα- ἵ-

The Subakhmimic forms τρι- and τρογ- are matched by 1st pl. τρὶ- (Jo. vi.52, with a long stroke over all three letters), as against Sahidic τρεπτ-.

50. The anomalous 1st sg. suffix. -ἀ (§ 49), not being correlated to stable ε in the rest of the paradigm, as it is in Sahidic (§43), hardly justifies the setting up of a special group. If we disregard it, the Akhmimic and Subakhmimic forms of the Neg. Third Future and the Subakhmimic forms of the Causative Infinitive would join the Fifth Group, while the Akhmimic forms of the Causative Infinitive, the base of which is τε- prenominally and before the suffix 2nd pl., and τ- before all other suffixes, would join the Fourth Group.

Obs. Note that in Akhmimic the paradigm of the Causative Infinitive coincides with that of the fem. sg. Possessive Article, and the paradigm of the Negative Third Future, so far as it is known (I have no reference for the 1st pl.), coincides with that of the pl. Possessive Article.
In the Sahidic Possessive Article the anomalous 1st sg. suffix -<e> goes together with stable e in the rest of the paradigm (except the 2nd f. sg.):

1st pl.  | ten-  | ten-  | ten-
3rd pl.  | ney-  | tey-  | ney-

In Akhmimic an e appears normally only in the pl. Possessive Article, and only before surd suffixes (contrast 1st pl. ti<e>— ): it is obviously called forth by the phonetic properties of the sonorant t- with special reference to its position in the syllable.

51. In Bohairic syllabic i occurs only in word-initial position. For the conjugations of Groups III-V the number of sonorant suffixes is therefore reduced from three to two, viz. the two vocalic suffixes -e and -oy<e>, while -i joins the consonant suffixes. So far as the conjugations of Groups III-IV are concerned, the distinction between stable and unstable e is irrelevant to Bohairic, stable e occurring only in the Circumstantial Present and the Third Future: on the one hand e appears before all consonantal suffixes in all these conjugations, on the other hand it disappears in all these conjugations before the vocalic suffixes -e and -oy<e>. The anomalous 1st sg. suffix -<e> of the Neg. Third Future can no longer be related to stable e in the rest of the paradigm, but hardly requires the setting up of a special group. All conjugations of Groups III-V can therefore be lumped together in one single group, III. The non-occurrence of ιτερε and ταρε (the two lone instances of 2nd pl. ιταρετεν— ), Stern § 450, notwithstanding) in Bohairic can be made up for by including the Conjunctive, which shares with the Neg. Third Future the anomalous 1st sg. suffix -<e>, but otherwise behaves exactly like the conjugations of the Bohairic Group III (however, a peculiarity of the Conjunctive is the 3rd pl. by-form nις<e> alongside of nτου— ).

C. The prenominal and 2nd f. sg. ending -pe

52. The element -pe which distinguishes certain prenominal bases from their presuffixal forms does not possess the same status in all dialects. The bases in question are the four Satellites of the Bipartite Conjugation Pattern (§§ 13, 14), the Aorist and the Neg. Aorist. As the evidence of Akhmimic suggests (§ 58), the Aorist does not originally belong to this group, and may therefore be disregarded. Within the framework of Coptic syntax the Negative Aorist has nothing in common with the bases with which it shares
the prenominal \(-pe\). Yet apart from its initial \(\mu-\) (Bohairic \(\mu\nu\-\)) it closely resembles the Second Present, and in the light of historical grammar there can be little doubt that it is in fact compounded with the Second Present; cf. Gardiner *JEA* 16 (1930) 227; Edgerton *JAOS* 55 (1935) 262, 265.

*Obs.* The Second Present is durative, while the Neg. Aorist is non-durative. In all likelihood the Second Present has acquired its durative character secondarily through the association of \(\textit{fwrj}\) with the Bipartite Conjugation Pattern.

53. Of all the forms enlarged by \(-pe\) the Relative Present \(\textit{epe}\) has the smallest distribution in terms of dialects. The only dialect in which it is firmly established is Sahidic.

*Obs.* Occasionally \(\textit{epe}\) occurs in classical Sahidic, e.g. Sir. xiv.2 Lagarde (collated).

54. The other forms (disregarding the Aorist, on which see §§ 56, 58) are firmly established in Sahidic, Bohairic and Fayyumic:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sahidic</th>
<th>Bohairic</th>
<th>Fayyumic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Circumstantial</td>
<td>(\textit{epe})</td>
<td>(\dot{\textit{epe}})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect</td>
<td>(\textit{pepe})</td>
<td>(\pi\textit{ape})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Present</td>
<td>(\textit{epe})</td>
<td>(\dot{\textit{\lambda pe}})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg. Aorist</td>
<td>(\textit{mepe} (\mu\textit{\lambda pe}))</td>
<td>(\textit{\lambda\textit{mpe}})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

55. Akhmimic, on the other hand, shows considerable fluctuation (§ 47). A count for the Proverbs gives the following results:

| Circumstantial | 13 | [\(\textit{epe} \text{ nil}\)] |
| Second Present | 29 | \(\dot{\textit{\lambda pe}}\) |
| Second Future | \(\lambda\ldots \pi\lambda\ldots 13\) | \(\dot{\textit{\lambda pe}}\ldots \pi\lambda\ldots 9\) |
| Neg. Aorist | 4 | \(\lambda\textit{\lambda pe}\) |

The prenominal Imperfect does not occur at all in the Proverbs. The large number of Second Presents is characteristic of sapiential style.

56. In sharp contrast with this fluctuation the \(-pe\) appears consistently throughout the paradigm, presuffixally as well as pre-nominally, in the group \(\mu\textit{\lambda pe}-\) (Causative Imperative), \(\tau\textit{\lambda pe}-\) (Future
Conjunctive), (n)\textit{Ta}pe- (Temporal), \textit{gApe}- (Aorist). The consistency of -\textit{pe} in the last-named conjugation is especially noteworthy, since Akhmimic stands alone in this respect (§ 58).

\textit{Obs.} In this group (except \textit{mApe}-, which has no 2nd persons) the long suffix 2nd pl. seems to be normal in Akhmimic:

\begin{tabular}{ll}
Future Conjunctive & \textit{Tapetetn}\textsuperscript{-} \hspace{1cm} \textit{Till Osterbrief} A 2 \\
Temporal & \textit{Tapetetn}\textsuperscript{-} \hspace{1cm} \textit{Gespr. 33, 7} \\
Aorist & \textit{gApetetn}\textsuperscript{-} \hspace{1cm} \textit{Hagg. ii.16.}
\end{tabular}

In the Minor Prophets the Causative Infinitive has likewise \textit{tapetetn}\textsuperscript{-}- alongside of \textit{tetetn}\textsuperscript{-} (\textit{Till’s note on Mal. i.7}); contrast Prov. xxiv.23 \textit{tetn}\textsuperscript{-}.

57. Historical grammar shows that the -\textit{pe} is secondary in the Relative Present (Demotic \textit{ny} \textit{iw}) and in the Circumstantial (\textit{iw}), but it looks to Coptic for an indication as to whether the Second Present (\textit{ihr}) really contained a spoken \textit{r} and might therefore have been the source of -\textit{pe} in the other forms. In itself this is not unlikely, but the evidence of Akhmimic hardly suggests that the -\textit{pe} is more legitimate in the Second Present than elsewhere.

58. On the other hand the testimony of Akhmimic for \textit{gApeq}- is supported by a piece of historical evidence. In Demotic the non-relative \textit{sdm.f} of the verb “to come”, \textit{iw.f} (Rylands IX \textit{i.iw.f}, cf. Griffith III p. 223 n. 21; 326) occurs, apart from its “prospective” use after an Imperative (thus Rylands IX 12, 16), only after “to give” (\textit{di} and \textit{my}), after \textit{m-drt “when”} (Lexa Gr. dém. V 3 p. 824 ex. 6) and after \textit{by}, \textit{i.e.} precisely in the prototypes of our Fifth Group, \textit{Aape}, \textit{Ta}pe, \textit{fitepe} and Akhmimic \textit{gApe}. This would seem to suggest that \textit{gApeq}- is genuine, being compounded of \textit{gA-} (\textit{by}) and, like the other bases of this group, the prospective \textit{sdm.f} -\textit{peq}. The \textit{gAeq}- of the other dialects may well be due to the analogy of the negative counterpart \textit{maeq-}/\textit{meeq}.

59. A similar element occurs as 2nd f. sg. suffix in the four Satellites of the Bipartite Conjugation Pattern (in the Relative \textit{etepe}- alongside of \textit{ete}-, see below), in the Aorist and the Negative Aorist — \textit{i.e.} the same conjugations as have prenominal -\textit{pe}; and in the Perfect \textit{Ap(e)}- as variant of \textit{A-} (§ 41). Cf. Sottas Rev. ég. N. S. 3 [= 2, fasc. 3-4] (1924) 14-5; Edgerton JAOS 55 (1935) 266-7. We may disregard the Aorist (§ 58), the Negative Aorist (§ 52) and
the Perfect (where Sottas had already recognized the -p(e) as secondary), and limit ourselves to the Satellites, to which we add the forms with the Future auxiliary \(\text{nax}^-\):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Variant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect</td>
<td>(\text{nepe}^-)</td>
<td>(\text{nepa}^-) var. (\text{pepe}\text{nax}^-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circumstantial</td>
<td>(\text{per}^-)</td>
<td>(\text{pera}^-) var. (\text{pepe}\text{nax}^-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative</td>
<td>(\text{ete}^-) var. (\text{etep}^-) (\text{etepa}^-) var. (\text{etena}^-), (\text{etep}\text{na}^-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>(\text{erpe}^-)</td>
<td>(\text{epa}^-) var. (\text{pepe}\text{nax}^-)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Future forms in \(\text{-epa}^-\) have the testimony of our best MSS. in their favour, while the fuller ones in \(\text{-ep(e)na}^-\) are rather characteristic of late MSS.

The best evidence is available for the Relative \(\text{etepa}^-\), which occurs, e.g., throughout the excellent Michigan MS. of Ruth, i.16 (bis), 17 iii.4, 5, 11. For the contrast Relative Present \(\text{ete}^-\) vs. Relative Future \(\text{etepa}^-\) cf. especially Mk. vii.22-3 according to Horner's 8 (collated) and 74 and Wessely No. 119 b: \(\text{πετογαγη} \) "what you want" ... \(\text{πετοπαντει} \text{μίποι} \text{μίποι} \) "what you will ask me" (Horner's 114 has \(\text{πετε}^-\) and \(\text{πετεπα}^-\), Wessely No. 120 a \(\text{πετε}^-\) and \(\text{πετεπα}^-\)). In Mt. xv.28 \(\text{ete}^-\) is supported by Wessely No. 100'd. In spite of the strong evidence for \(\text{ete}^-\) the testimony of Thompson's MS. for \(\text{etepes}^-\) 1Cor. vii.16 cannot be rejected: while \(\text{ete}^-\) is presumably the primitive form, \(\text{etepa}^-\) (e.g. \(\text{Le Muséon} \text{42, 237 u; Rossi \text{Pap. copti I iii 59a; common, in later Sahidic)}\) is easily understood as due to the analogy of the other Satellites.

The Future Imperfect \(\text{nepe}^-\) is attested in Jo. iv.10 by Horner's 91 (= Delaporte's E) and P. Soph. 368, 17, as well as by Thompson's Subakhmimic (the late Morgan MS. has \(\text{pepe}\text{nax}^-\)).

For Second Future \(\text{epa}^-\) I have only non-Biblical references, e.g. Shenoute ed. Leipoldt III 201, 9; Cairo Cat. (Munier) No. 9292 recto, 46.

Unfortunately these forms, hard enough to come by in classical Sahidic, are even rarer in Akhmimic. However, Second Future \(\text{epa}^-\) Clement ed. Schmidt xx.7 (= Job xxxviii.11, where Ciasca's late Sahidic has \(\text{epa}^-\)) agrees with the classical Sahidic form.

Because of the dearth of Akhmimic evidence it is impossible to say whether in this dialect the -p(e) of the 2nd f. sg. was treated similarly to the prenominal -pe (§ 45). Sottas's and Edgerton's conclusion that it originated in the Second Present is plausible but receives no support from Coptic.
Obs. 1. In post-classical Sahidic an occasional 2nd f. sg. -p can be met with in practically all conjugations, e.g. First Present τp- (Sethe ἌΣ 58, 55 n. 1; Worrell Coptic MSS, in the Freer Collection 122), First Future τερπα- (Pielil Sphinx 4, 33; Sethe l. c.; cf. Fayyumic τελπα- 1 Cor. xii.16 ap. Zoega 151); Neg. Perfect μμπ- and Temporal ππτερεψ- (Wessely XV No. 198 d), etc.

Obs. 2. In Bohairic the 2nd f. sg. of the First Future is τερα- (first recognized to belong to this paradigm by Stern), which is the more remarkable as the Satellites, with the partial exception of the Relative, have no forms in -pα-. In Sahidic τερα- occurs in the P. Soph. (Scholtz-Woide Gr. aeg. 97; Sethe l. c.) and occasionally elsewhere, e.g. Jdg. xiii.5, 7 (Thompson; but in verse 3 τεπα-).

Obs. 3. The Sahidic forms in (-)επα- have probably nothing to do with the paradigm εια- discussed by Kahle Bala'izah p. 157.

D. Conclusion

60. The formal analysis confirms that the Satellites of the Bipartite Conjugation Pattern make up a morphological group by themselves. While the Neg. Aorist joins this group from historical causes, Akhmimic helps us to recognize that the affirmative Aorist originally belonged to an entirely different group.

Purely formal criteria lead to different groupings for different dialects (§§ 50-51) and afford no practical alternative to the classification set forth in §§ 4, 18, 29.
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NUNTII PERSONARUM ET RERUM

Ist die B-L Schrift im wesentlichen entziffert?

H. Th. Bossert – Istanbul

Nach der Liste von Fr. Steinherr (BO VIII 1951 S. 134 ff) entfallen von 2306 Zeichen der B-L, Bleibriefe aus Assur 450 auf den Worttrenner. Es bleiben demnach 1856 zu lesende Silbenzeichen einschließlich der Ideogramme und Determinative übrig. Sechs Silbenzeichen (210 ya, 155 ä, 146 a und ä, 118 i, 113 i und ä) nehmen hinsichtlich ihrer Häufigkeit (zusammen 742) die ersten Stellen ein. Nehmen wir an, die beiden i-Zeichen seien bisher zum grössten Teil falsch gelesen worden, so errechnet sich etwa sechs Prozent irriger Lesungen. Der prozentuale Anteil der Falschlesungen erhöht sich noch, da Ideogramme und Determinative hätten abgesetzt, die nicht wenigen Zeichen aber, die ebenfalls "i" oder "i" gelesen wurden, hätten hinzugefügt werden müssen.
