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>A</td>
<td>pronominal suffix</td>
<td>cuwtaa</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 (γεγραμμενος, εγγεγραμμενος) 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Basic Tenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td>acwouta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;not yet&quot;</td>
<td>(i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aorist</td>
<td>mawacwouta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Future</td>
<td>cewacwouta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Imperatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simple</th>
<th>cuwta</th>
<th>nqiwacwouta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Causative</td>
<td>mawacwouta</td>
<td>mawacwouta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causative</td>
<td>nqiwacwouta</td>
<td>nqiwacwouta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(i) The affirmative counterpart of nqiwacwouta may originally have been cewacwouta, which in most dialects was levelled under acwouta.

(1) In Bohairic this form is pointed either cewacwouta or eew-. The syllabication e/-e is also well attested by early Sahidic MSS.

(1) The Simple Imperative does not belong to any conjugation pattern, but it behaves syntactically like the conjugations of the Tripartite...
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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 expression, either by a noun or by a special set of pronominal preformatives (some of which, namely κ-, υ-, ε-, 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 ταῖ "here" or ἶκαλα "there", or a prepositional phrase like Ἰάνουφτ "with you" or ἔν θροικ "in the city":

6. The Bipartite Conjugation Pattern is what Gardiner (Ep. 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 (!). 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 Bipartite 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-

(!) Vergote Chr. d’Ég. 31 (1956) 218; Polotsky OLZ 1957, 227.
nary nouns, especially its pronominal and presufixal forms, it is rather substantial 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 “nn m.” In its capacity as “nn 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 ἀγαπᾶτε τὰ λαλῆτε ἐκούστειν “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 πέμψαναι “they were happening (ἔγινε, ἔβανε)” alongside of πέμπον “they were (ἔγινα, ἐβανόν).” 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 λυτός “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 (λυτός) daily”; 1Cor. xv.22 “just as all men die (ἵνα ζῇ ἐν ζώον) in Adam”; Ps. Lxi.10 “if he sees the wise men dying (ἐνμπόν)”; an actual and particular occurrence of “dying” is expressed by the “Future” ἐπίλυτον “going to die,” while the Qualitative λυτοῦτι means “being dead.” With many intransitive verbs, like γυνὴ “to hunger” and ἐσθή “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 ἔφυγε as against Ps. Lxiv.22 πάρει: Deut. xxviii.56 τετείχον... ἐκτείνομαι “she who is soft and smooth” as against ἐσθήτως ἡ σπείρα ἡ ἁπάντως “the softness of her smoothness.”
main sentence into a subordinate clause: (2) Circumstantial ε-, (3) Relative ητε-, ητε- ε- etc. - (cf. § 18).

Obs. 1. The Third Future does not take ηηε, 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 me is often, apparently optionally, followed by me.

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 and the converted tenses can be grouped together as Satellitees 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 ηειαζωητια 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. xi.12 ουν ηειαζωητια εαν α ειμι δι' αγαθαι τελειε "there are eunuchs who were born like that from the womb of their mother "; (2) it is negated by (ηε)+, etc. (§§ 28, 30, 31), e. g. Mt. xx.28 ηειαζωητια ειρεσθαι αν ετεραγιακε ηαι αεα ειλακινε ιε "just as the Son of Man came not in order to be served but to serve ... " (for the construction ηει- definite noun plus Circumstantial cf. e. g. 1Cor. xi.12; Sir. xix.15 "ουν ηειαζωητια εαν ου "there is he who stumbles (cf. § 33) without having done so in his heart ". Other examples in OLZ 1887, 222.

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 ετ- steps into the first position of the Conjugation Pattern.

Obs. The correctness of analysing, e. g., the relative 1st pl. ετε- into ετε- plus suffix -ηηε, rather than into ετε- plus preformative ηει- (L. Eg. πηηε ιεη ιηε) is borne out by the 3rd pl. form ετε- (contrast L. Eg. εηηε ιεη ιηε); cf. Demotic πηηε ιεη ιηε ιεη ιηε ιηε.  

13. Before nominal subject the Sentence Converters assume the lengthened forms πειε (Imperfect, § 16) επε, επε. This lengthening does not, however, take place in all dialects to the same extent. Cf. §§ 52-55.

14. επε (prenominal), εηε are also the forms of the Second Present in Sahidic and Subakhmic; in the other dialects the forms are ηπε (Akhmimic also ηλε), εηε.

15. In these dialects the forms of the Imperfect are similarly ηπε, εηε. 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

πειε ι (πειε) correspond to
ne ηειαζωητια, ne εηεηε, ερειαζωητια, etειαζωητια, etc.

πειε ι is the Preterit Present ("praesens in praeterito") = Imperfect, just as ηειαζωητια is the Preterit Perfect ("perfectum in praeterito") = Pluperfect, etc. However, πειε ι sometimes seems to exhibit certain properties of a basic, rather than of a converted, tense, cf. § 28; its primitive converted character is evident in πειε(ηι)πη § 35.

17. The Imperfect can be further preceded by the Relative Converters ε- and (ηε)ε- etc. It is noteworthy that Thompson's Subakhmic St. John uses πειε πειε πηηε "he who was formerly (non-simultaneously) blind" ix.13, but consistently avoids the forms
with ε-, replacing them mostly by the Relative Present, cf. ii.22, 23, vii.62, viii.42, x.40, xii.6, 32, xiii.5, xviii.1.

The ability to be further preceded by the Relative Converter ε- belongs to the Preterit Converter νε as such, not to the Preterit Present (Imperfect) specifically, cf. evryttae § 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 ε- to express the protasis of an unfulfilled condition ("supposition contrary to fact") (1).

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

| Basic | Preterit | Circumstantial | Relative | "Second"
|-------|----------|----------------|----------|---------|
| qe- (εe-) | neq (νεν-εν-) | eq- (εν-) | eteq- (ετον-) | eq- (εν-)
| ae- | ne ae- | eaq- | enteq- | enteq-
| μν- | ne μν- | εμν- (2) | ετε μν- | ετε μν-
| μνατq- | ne μνατq- | εμνατq- | ετε μνατq-a | ετε μνατq-
| μναq- | ne μναq- | εμναq- | ετε μναq- | εμναq-
| μεq- | ne μεq- | εμεq- | ετε μεq- | εμεq-
| eq- | neq- (eq- b) | eqe- | ετε eqe- | ετε eq-
| μνεq- | ne eq- | eneq- (d) | ετε μνεq- | ετε μνεq- c |

Satellites in the second degree:

| nqtaq- | enteq- | eneq- | ρενq- | (eqeq- ?) f |

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

(2) εμνq- without a stroke over α: in the superlineation system here accepted as standard, word-initial syllabic sonorants become non-syllabic when preceded by one-vowel morphemes.
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f) A likely instance is Acts xxii.24.

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 ov ("there is") , the negation being effected by uθ ("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 latest. For details see § 35.

21. Neither in Akhmimic nor in Sahidic does the rule apply to the Second Present; cf., for both dialects, Prov. xi.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 Αρ ον (2Δ) is known to me; the usual construction is ον-

22. Neither in Bohairic nor in Sahidic does the rule apply to the Third Future: both dialects use invariably εθα before an indefinite actor expression. Cf. for Bohairic, Ps. xxvii.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. xxii.19, Job v.15, 16, xviii.11, 14, 19, xx.15, 16, 24, 26, 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-
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 ɛq-t-ɛwta and ɛq-t-wa-
ɛwta (§ 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 the auxiliary, 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 (Infinite) alternate ɲov (Bohai-
ric novi) e-. Cf. examples where Bohairic novi e- corresponds to
Sahidic na- (Lk. xxii.7 ḫrãj na jnov ɪ̆t ĭmij: ɛp ɲã ḫrãj ĭmij
"when these things are about to happen"), or Sahidic nov e- corre-
responds to Bohairic na- (Acts xxviii.10 ḫtɪ̆pɪ̆nov ĕw jnov: ʊwɔh
ɪ̆mij ĕw na ɪ̆mij  "when we were about to take off"), or
Sahidic nov e- and na- occur alongside of one another (Lev. x.9
ɪ̆t tɪ̆ ḫrãj ɪ̆mij ĕw ɪ̆nu ɪ̆nu ĕw ĭnu ɪ̆nu  "they were
slaughtering" ... ḫ ḫtɪ̆ pɪ̆nov ĕw). The true nature of the relation-
ship between na- and nov e- was first recognized by Jernstedt Dok-
lady Academiae Nauk SSSR 1927, 38; nov e- occurs not only with ḫrãj and ḫtɪ̆p, but also with
ɪ̆mij (Mk. xiii.7, Jo. vii.8) and with ɪ̆pɪ̆nov (Ex. iii.27), and
outside the Bible with the affirmative Perfect (Crum Dict. 219 a-b).

Obs. 1. The fact that the only function of nov 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
nov e- is really an old Infinitive form; it may very well be a late back-for-
ward 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
(1899) 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 sentence
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 negated by the morpheme τὰ (Bohairic and Fayyumic 𓅅); outside conjugation the function of τὰ is to negative the Infinitive. It is placed after the pronominal suffix:

Conjunctive πονηρώτωται.
Future Conjunctive: only one example (in independent use, § 1) is on record (Lefort Le Musée 60, 1947, 12) Mk. xii.14 τὰρκίτης Χεν Ῥαποτίτης "shall we give or shall we not give? " (7)
Temporal ιπτερετίσωται (Mk. ii.4. Lk. ii.45, Acts xvii.6, xxi.14).
" until " γιαντρινοίσωται (Num. xxi.35, Josh. viii.22, Bohairic Gen. xli.49).
Conditional εφιπαίνωται (Sir. xxvii.3, Mt. xviii.16).
With nominal actor, so far as the evidence goes, τὰ is normally placed after the conjugation base:
Conjunctive ἵπτεται πρῶς ὑστοται. Exceptionally τὰ is found after the nominal actor before the Infinitive: Prov. ii.5 = iii.6.
Future Conjunctive: no example.
Temporal ιπτερετίσωται (Crum Papyruscodex 30, 7).
" until " no Sahidic example is known to me; a Bohairic example is quoted by Stern § 449: μαθετείμεν πᾶν κοιν θελτα γιαντρινοίσωται.
Conditional ερεματίσωται πρῶς ὑστοται (2 Thess. ii.3).

Obs.: The γιανθι of the Conditional can be omitted before τὰ. In Bohairic and Fayyumic this omission is the rule. In Sahidic εφιπαίνωται and εφιπαίνωται, ερεματίσωται and ερεματίσωται are equally common.

28. The Bipartite Pattern containing a definite actor expression and all " Second Tenses " are negated by (π-) . . . ἀπ, 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).

(7) This exceptional case runs counter to the old rule, still fully valid in Coptic, that in combinations of the verb " to give " with a σφος (προκομά) it is only the former which can be negated.
But with the Preterite \textit{ne} we have
\begin{align*}
\text{περιθαυ\textit{\small{δ}}} (\textit{ne}) & \quad \text{περιθαυ\textit{\small{δ}} AN (\textit{ne})} \\
\text{περι πρω\textit{\small{δ}} θαυ\textit{\small{δ}}} (\textit{ne}) & \quad \text{περι πρω\textit{\small{δ}} θαυ\textit{\small{δ}} AN (\textit{ne})}
\end{align*}
The construction \textit{ne} \textit{επιθαυ... AN}, which we might expect on the analogy of the other Converters and which actually occurs in Demotic (Spiegelberg \textit{Dem. Gr.} \textsection 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 \textit{επι τι χαίρε ο\textit{\small{δ}}} \textit{παλαιν AN} "if this one were not doing evil (εί μην ο\textit{\small{δ}} ο\textit{\small{δ}} κακόν ποιών)".

\textit{Obs.} The Circumstantial Converter \textit{ε-} precedes the negative \textit{παρα...}, \textit{επεριθαυ AN}, but the negative \textit{ε-} (prevocally often \textit{θαυ...}) precedes the morphem \textit{ε-} of the Second Present and the Second Aorist: \textit{θαυ\textit{\small{δ}}} \textit{παρε-} \textit{επεριθαυ AN}, \textit{θαυ\textit{\small{δ}}} \textit{παρε-} \textit{επεριθαυ AN} (e.g., Isa. xxviii.7; Lefort \textit{Pères apost.} 35.9).

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

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Basic Tenses} & \textbf{"Second Tenses"} & \\
\hline
\textbf{Negatived by (\textit{πа...}) AN} & \textbf{επεριθαυ...} & \\
\hline
\textbf{Affirmative} & \textbf{Negative} & \\
\textbf{αε-} & \textbf{δαε-} & \textbf{παε-}
\hline
\textbf{Imperatives} & & \\
\hline
\textbf{εαε-} & \textbf{δαε-} & \textbf{παε-}
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\textbf{Clause Conjugations}

Negatived by \textit{θαυ...

\begin{align*}
\textit{θαυ...} & \quad \textit{ταρεθαυ...} \\
\textit{θαυ...} & \quad \textit{παρεθαυ...} \\
\textit{θαυ...} & \quad \textit{εγκαθαυ...} \\
\end{align*}

\(^{(1)}\) Woide's text is confirmed by the Chester Beatty Ms. A (coll. Thompson), Delporte (whose \textit{V = Horner's 20}), Morgan IV (kindly collated by Mr A. F. Shore). The Chester Beatty Ms. B omits the \textit{αε-}, and Horner's 14 (coll. Shore) does the same and spells \textit{παε} instead of \textit{επεριθαυ...}.

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.

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{1} & \textbf{2} & \\
\hline
\textbf{(a) Second Present} & \textbf{επεριθαυ...} & \textbf{βαθθκ} & \textbf{}\textit{επεριθαυ...} & \textbf{βαθθκ} \\
\hline
\textbf{(b) Second Perfect} & \textbf{θαυ...} & \textbf{βαθθκ} & \textbf{θαυ...} & \textbf{βαθθκ} \\
\hline
\textbf{(c) Second Present} & \textbf{επεριθαυ...} & \textbf{βαθθκ} & \textbf{επεριθαυ...} & \textbf{βαθθκ} \\
\hline
\textbf{(d) Second Future} & \textbf{επεριθαυ...} & \textbf{βαθθκ} & \textbf{επεριθαυ...} & \textbf{βαθθκ} \\
\hline
\textbf{(e) Second Present} & \textbf{επεριθαυ...} & \textbf{βαθθκ} & \textbf{επεριθαυ...} & \textbf{βαθθκ} \\
\hline
\textbf{(f) do. (negated)} & \textbf{επεριθαυ...} & \textbf{βαθθκ} & \textbf{επεριθαυ...} & \textbf{βαθθκ} \\
\hline
\textbf{(g) Second Perfect} & \textbf{επεριθαυ...} & \textbf{βαθθκ} & \textbf{επεριθαυ...} & \textbf{βαθθκ} \\
\hline
\textbf{(h) Second Aorist} & \textbf{επεριθαυ...} & \textbf{βαθθκ} & \textbf{επεριθαυ...} & \textbf{βαθθκ} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

(a) Ps. lxvii.28 "ibi est"; (b) Ps. xxxv.13 "ibi ceciderunt";
(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 (\textit{πα...}) AN 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" morpheme; cf. *Études de synaxe copte* 88-9.

Ob. It should be noted that in Sahidic the position of AN 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. (â) ... AN is often used to negative a non-verbal part of the sentence having predicative force, especially all kinds of adverbial adjuncts.

This construction is likewise used with "Second Tenses", if they follow, instead of preceding, the adverbial predicate. In this case AN follows the predicate (contrast § 31 Ob.); while the "Second Tense" is affirmative. Cf. Deut. i.6, Lk. xii.15, quoted *Études* 39; Deut. vii.7 οὐκ ὠφη ἢ ἐκτετήριον ἄν έπαθε παρα ἀπεστάρην τιρρων ἢ τα πρόκες ἰσχνα ἄνω τῷ θνώτητι τῶν ἱεροθείων άλα ... άλα ... "it was not because you are more numerous than all nations that the Lord preferred you and chose you ... but ... "; *Le Mission 42* (1929) 222 εἰσὶν ἐπ' ἄν ή ἐκ τοῦ πυρὸς ἡ τήν ἡμέρα πάντα πολὺ χρήσιμον ἀρχαίον εἰσιν, well translated by Lefort (p. 250) "ce n'est pas, en effet, parce que censt est plus grand, que cinquante [les soixante] ne vaut rien"; Schenoute ed. *Chassinat* 38, 35 εἰσιν ἀντιπτομάκες εἰσὶν ἄν (the all-important άν (') is missing in Leipoldt's text III 79, 4) ... εἰς πνεύμα τερή "it is not if the fox barks that the lion is afraid".

Ob. 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 (â) ... AN alone, even if it were not amply demonstrated by actual Coptic usage. At the same time it is true that "there are many examples in which II Tenses are used, where no Adverbial extension is present" (Plumley *Introduct. Coptic Gr.* p. 81). Such "exceptions", which are relatively 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 ("employs abusifs"), but it is not in the least suggested that they should "be dismissed as improper uses". They can be "dismissed" only in the sense that they do not invalidate the definition of the basic function.

(*) Foxes flee before lions: Schenoute 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 "employs 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 Inuitive) and as actors (following the conjugation base). In Bohairic, as was first pointed out by Chaline *Élements* § 802, this "improper" extension is unknown (with the exception of the idiom ἀρ罕见 εὗρον "how are you?" *Gen.* xiii.27, cf. *Ann. Soc. 40*, 245).

IX. Existential Sentence

33. Existence and non-existence are predicated by *ον* (') "there is" and (ι) *άλλη "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; *ονο*, *ονοι*, *ονιμη*: numerals; *άλλοι "many", *άλλα "anybody, anything", *άλλα "another", *ονθό "how much?" The definite article is admitted in two cases: (1) in substantivized relative expressions (Spiegelberg *Dem. Gr.* § 441 Ann.), and (2) in the phrases *ονθοι* (*Sit. xxvii.21), *άλλη έν* (*1Sam. xxv.17, Isa. i.6, xl.28, Wisd. v.10*) "there is a way", "there is no way" (of doing) (').

The combination with the preposition *άρτε*, *άρτα* with "yields the expressions ονθώτε, ονθώτας, άλλετε, άλλατας "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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ονθοι</td>
<td>πε(α)θη</td>
<td>ε(α)θη</td>
<td>ετε(α)θη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>άλλη</td>
<td>πειλθη</td>
<td>είλθη</td>
<td>ετε άλθη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ονθοι</td>
<td>πειλθη</td>
<td>είλθη</td>
<td>ετε άλθη</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Satellite in the second degree:

| ονθοι(α)θη | -- | -- | ένθοι(α)θη d |

(*) The best MSS. are inconsistent as regards the superlineation of the ά in *ονθοι*: the earlier MSS. tend to omit the stroke.

(1) In Ps. lxxxi.12 άλθη πειλθη ήτε άλθη τοεοεο (Till *Kopt. Gr.* § 480) άλθη means "and".
34. The negative form ἄι, with its built-in negative element, is reminiscent of the negative conjugation bases of the Tripartite Pattern. In fact, ὁν and ἄι probably are, like most conjugation bases, remnants of the old σμ. conjunction. That ὁν and ἄι cannot take personal suffixes, results from the definiteness of the latter. That ὁν and ἄι 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. L. Eg. is a phonetic writing of ὅν ὑ. Sethe Verbum I § 203; Spiegelberg Rec. tr. 21 (1899) 41-2. On the existential sentence in M. Eg. (ὁν ὑ, neg. ὁν ὑ ὑ) cf. Gardiner Eg. Gr. §§ 107-8.

Obs. 2. The fact that ὑ was a verb-form, does not make "verbs" of ὁν and ἄι. 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 (ὄρωμα πεν- ταχ' and sim.) in the opening sentence of other parables, Mt. xxii.35, Mk. xii.1, Lk. x.30, xii.16, xiv.16, xviii.10, xx.9.
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 ὅμοιος, however, this is not true, and ὅμοιος and πάθῳ 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. Sethë ᾅ 64 (1929) 63-4; however, the nature of the prefix πρ-, 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 (ἀ)... ἀν.

Basic Preterit Circumstantial Relative "Second"

πανόης πε πανόης ἐπανόης (1) ἐπανόης ἐπανόης b)
(2) ἔτε πανόης a)

a) ἔτε- is used when the subject of the Adjective Verb is = the antecedent, and ἔτε when the subject is distinct from the antecedent. Cf., for the latter case, Shenouët ap. Rossi Pap. copti II i13 ποι ἔτε πάθῳ ποι ἐπάθῃ παθὴ ἐρῳο市县 "just as those over whom he will rule are numerous"; with the negation, Brit. Mus. Cat. No. 981 (p. 480 b) (-)οι ἔτε (π)πανόης ἀν ἔτε- "the way it is not good for... to...". A nominal subject (Till Kopt. Gr. § 462) is necessarily distinct from the antecedent.

b) Etudes 51. Add Shenouët ed. Chassiniat 135,44-5 ἔτε πε πανόης ἐπανόης "whereby are they greater than one another?".

Obs. The subject may be definite as well as indefinite (pace Till Kopt. Gr. § 284). Cf. πανόης ἔτε- Ps. lxxxiii.11, Prov. xi.23, xii.9, xv.16, 17, xvi.19, 32, xvii.1, xix.22, xx.23, xxi.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 (§ 50), 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. Sahidic

39. We have to distinguish the pronominal and the presuffixial forms of the conjugation bases.

Pronominally all bases end in a vowel, either Α or 

Presuffixially the bases end either in Α, or in stable ε, or in unstable ε (alternating with zero).

Unstable ε behaves differently, according as it is preceded either by one of the stops η or τ (§ 44), or by the sonorant ρ (§ 45).

40. The pronominal actor suffixes fall into four groups:

(1) Single Surds: (2nd m. sg.) -κ
(3rd m. sg.) -γ
(3rd f. sg.) -ε

(2) Single Sonorants, appearing in two alternant shapes:
non-syllabic (postvocalic) syllabic (postconsonantal)
(1st sg.) -ι (-α), that is [i] -ι, that is [ι]
(1st pl.) -η -η, that is [η]
(3rd pl.) -οτ -οτ, that is [οτ]

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

(4) The suffix 2nd pl. has two alternants: short -τη, long -τητη. 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 pronominal base.

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

(1) 2nd f. sg. forms ending in -ε are considered as having zero when the base has stable ε, and as having -ε when the base has unstable ε.
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41. First Group.
The base consists pretonymically and presufxally of the single vowel \( \upalpha \):

Perfect: \( \upalpha - \).
- 1st sg., 1st pl., 3rd pl.: non-syllabic; 2nd f. sg.: zero, var. -\( p(\upalpha) \);
- 2nd pl.: long.

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

42. Second Group.
The base consists presufxally either of a single vowel (\( \varepsilon \)) or a vowel (\( \upalpha \), stable \( \varepsilon \)) preceded by a single consonant:

Circumstantial Present, Second Present, Third Future, Conditional \( \upvarepsilon - \); Imperfect \( \upvarepsilon \); Aorist \( \upvarphi \); Neg. Aorist \( \upvarepsilon \); (\( \upvarphi \)).
- 1st sg., 1st pl., 3rd pl.: non-syllabic; 2nd f. sg.: -\( p(\upvarepsilon) \); thus also, as variant, in the Relative Present (§ 59); 2nd pl.: long.

Prenominal: lengthened by -\( p(\upvarepsilon) \); thus also the Relative Present (§ 59).

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

43. Third Group.
The base ends prenominally and presufxally in \( \varepsilon \), preceded either by stop plus sonorant or by double sonorant:

Causative Infinitive \( \upvarepsilon \), Neg. Third Future \( \upvarphi - \).
- 1st sg., 1st pl., 3rd pl.: non-syllabic, but 1st sg. -\( \varepsilon \) is normally replaced by -\( \upalpha - \): \( \tau \); \( \upvarphi \); 2nd f. sg.: zero; 2nd pl.: short.

Obs. In Sahidic the 2nd pl. variant \( \tau \) is non-standard, though old; cf. § 56 Obs.

44. Fourth Group.
The base ends in a stop (\( \eta \), \( \tau \)) plus unstable \( \varepsilon \):

Neg. Perfect. \( \upvarphi \); "not yet" \( \upvarphi \); "until" \( \upvarphi \).

[Relative Present \( \eta \); except for the prenominal form \( \tau \) and the 2nd f. sg. variant \( \eta \).]

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

Obs. The disappearance of \( \varepsilon \) before the single-consonant suffixes is the norm in the classical orthography (Rahlf's *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 \( \varepsilon \):

Causative Imperative \( \upvarphi \); Future Conjunctive \( \tau \); Temporal \( \tau \).

B. Other dialects

46. (Cf. § 41). In the Perfect the 2nd f. sg. form \( \upalpha - \) is also found in Akhmimic (Prov. xxxi.29) alongside of \( \upalpha - \) (Mic. iv.9, Nah. iii.18; relative \( \eta \) Zeph. iii.11, Clem. ed. Schmidt p. 16,12) and in Subakhmimic (Jo. iv.18 relative \( \tau \), but neither in Bohairic \( \upalpha - \) nor in Fayyumic \( \upalpha - \).

In the 2nd pl. Bohairic has very frequently \( \upalpha - \) (as in the Second Present, § 48) alongside of \( \upalpha - \); and thus regularly in the Relative (and Second) Perfect \( \upalpha - \).

47. (Cf. § 42). In Akhmimic the Aorist belongs to the Fifth Group (§ 58). For the other bases of the Second Group Akhmimic uses prenominal both the enlarged and the unenlarged forms, apparently without distinction (§ 55): Circumstantial \( \varepsilon \) alongside of \( \upalpha - \), Second Present \( \upalpha - \) alongside of \( \upalpha - \), Neg. Aorist \( \upalpha - \) alongside of \( \upalpha - \).

Whether the Imperfect has \( \upalpha - \) alongside of \( \upalpha - \) (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) \( \upalpha - \) is often mistaken for the Imperfect. [Imperfect \( \upalpha - \) Jo. xii.2 (Rösch).]

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

Circumstantial \( \tau \) and Third Future \( \tau \)-
Second Present \( \tau \)

Imperfect \( \tau \)
Aorist \( \tau \)
Neg. Aorist \( \tau \)

(1) Add Mt. xi.26 ap. Amundsen *Symbolae Olsentiae* 24 (1945) 123.
Second Present ἐρετῖ- and Imperfect περετῖ- occur as variants also in Subakhmimic; an isolated instance of Second Future ἐρετνα- even in classical Sahidic: Sir. ii.15 Lagarde.

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

- Bohairic ὑπον-, ἐπον-
- Fayyumic τρον-, ἐπον- Mk. viii.30, Jo. iii.20, but ἐπεν- Ep. Jer. 66 bis
- Akhmimic τον-, ἐπον-
- Subakhm. τρον-, -νον-

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

- Bohairic ὑπι-, ἐπι-
- Fayyumic τρι-, -νι-
- Akhmimic κα-, -να-
- Subakhm. τρι-, -πα- -νι-

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

50. The anomalous 1st sg. suffix -α (§ 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 -άε goes together with stable έ in the rest of the paradigm (except the 2nd f. sg.):

1st pl. ἑν- τέν- ἑν-
3rd pl. ἑτε- τέν- ἑτε-

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

51. In Bohairic syllabic έ 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 -ί and -όν, while -έ joins the consonant suffixes. So far as the conjugations of Groups III-IV are concerned, the distinction between stable and unstable έ is irrelevant to Bohairic, stable έ occurring only in the Circumstantial Present and the Third Future: on the one hand έ appears before all consonantal suffixes in all these conjugations, on the other hand it disappears in all these conjugations before the vocalic suffixes -ί and -όν. The anomalous 1st sg. suffix -άε of the Neg. Third Future can no longer be related to stable έ 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 έπέε and έπε (the two lone instances of 2nd pl. τάπετεμ, 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 -άε, but otherwise behaves exactly like the conjugations of the Bohairic Group III (however, a peculiarity of the Conjunctive is the 3rd pl. by-form έυς- alongside of έυν-)

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

52. The element -πέ 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 -πέ. Yet apart from its initial πά- (Bohairic πά-), 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 τίρά̣ with the Bipartite Conjugation Pattern.

53. Of all the forms enlarged by -πέ the Relative Present έπέε has the smallest distribution in terms of dialects. The only dialect in which it is firmly established is Sahidic.

Obs. Occasionally έπε occurs in classical Sahidic, e.g. Str. 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>επέ</td>
<td>ἐπε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect</td>
<td>ἐπέ</td>
<td>παπέ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Present</td>
<td>επέ</td>
<td>άπε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg. Aorist</td>
<td>λεπέ (λαπέ)</td>
<td>λαπέ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

| Circumstantial | ε 13 | [ἐπε nil] |
| Second Present | ά 29 | άπε 42 |
| Second Future | ά... πά- 13 | άπε... πα- 9 | 51 |
| Neg. Aorist | λα 4 | λαπε 12 |

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 -πέ appears consistently throughout the paradigm, presuffixally as well as prenominally, in the group λαπέ- (Causative Imperative), τάπε- (Future
Conjunctive), (ii)τατοπ- (Temporal), γαρε- (Aorist). The consistency of -pe in the last-named conjugation is especially noteworthy, since Akhmimic stands alone in this respect (§ 58).

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

Future Conjunctive τατοπη- (Till Osterbri A 2)
Temporal τατοπη- (Gasp. 33, 7)
Aorist γαρεπη- (Hagg. ii.16).

In the Minor Prophets the Causative Infinitive has likewise τατοπη- alongside of τετοπη- (Till’s note on Mal. i.7); contrast Prov. xxiv.23 τετοπη-.

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

58. On the other hand the testimony of Akhmimic for γαρεπη- is supported by a piece of historical evidence. In Demotic the non-relative sdm. of the verb "to come", lw. (Rylands IX i.11.6, cf. Griffith III p. 223 n. 21; 326) occurs, apart from its "progressive" use after an Imperative (thus Rylands IX 12, 16), only after "to give" (l and my), after m-dri "when" (Lexa Gr. dém. V 3 p. 824 ex. 6) and after hr, i.e. precisely in the prototypes of our Fifth Group, μαρη, τατοπη, ἐτερη and Akhmimic γαρε- ἐπικ. This would seem to suggest that γαρεπη- is genuine, being compounded of ἐπικ- (hr) and, like the other bases of this group, the prospective sdm./-pep. The γαρη- of the other dialects may well be due to the analogy of the negative counterpart μαρη-μεπη-.

59. A similar element occurs as 2nd f. sg. suffix in the four Satellites of the Bipartite Conjugation Pattern (in the Relative ἐτερη- alongside of ἐτερη-), see below), in the Aorist and the Negative Aorist — i.e. the same conjugations as have prenominal -pe; and in the Perfect ἄρε- as variant of ἀ- (§ 41). Cf. Sottas Rev. ég. N. S. 3 [no 2, fasc. 3-4] (1924) 14-5; Edgerton JAO S 55 (1935) 266-7.

We may disregard the Aorist (§ 58), the Negative Aorist (§ 52) and
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the Perfect (where Sottas had already recognized the -pe(e) as secondary), and limit ourselves to the Satellites, to which we add the forms with the Future auxiliary μαρη-:

Imperfect μαρη- μαρη- var. μαρη(μερη)-
Circumstantial μαρη- μαρη- var. μαρη(μερη)-
Relative ἐτερη- μαρη- μαρη- var. μαρη- μαρη(μερη)-
Second μαρη- μαρη- var. μαρη(μερη)-

The Future forms in -μαρη- have the testimony of our best MSS, in their favour, while the fuller ones in -μαρη(μερη)- are rather characteristic of late MSS.

The best evidence is available for the Relative μαρη-, which occurs, e.g., throughout the excellent Michigan MS. of Ruth, i.16 (bis), 17 3.4, 5, 11. For the contrast Relative Present ἐτερη- vs. Relative Future μαρη- cf. especially Mk. vii.22-3 according to Horner’s 8 (collated) and 74 and Wessely No. 119 b: μαρητακαρη “what you want” βασίλευτε μαρητερη “what you will ask me” (Horner’s 114 has μαρητε- and μαρητερη-, Wessely No. 120 a μαρητε- and μαρητερη-). In Mt. xv.28 μαρη- is supported by Wessely No. 100 3. In spite of the strong evidence for ἐτερη- the testimony of Thompson’s MS. for μαρη- 1Cor. vii.16 cannot be rejected: while ἐτερη- is presumably the primitive form, μαρη- (e.g. Le Muséon 42, 237 u; Rossi Pap. copii I ii 59a common in later Sahidic) is easily understood as due to the analogy of the other Satellites.

The Future Imperfect μαρη- 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 μαρη-).

For Second Future μαρη- 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 μαρη- Clement ed. Schmidt xx.7 (= Job xxxviii.11, where Ciaccia’s late Sahidic has μαρη-) agrees with the classical Sahidic form.

Because of the dearth of Akhmimic evidence it is impossible to say whether in this dialect the -pe(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.

Orientalia — 28
Obs. 1. In post-classical Sahidic an occasional 2nd f. sg. -p can be met with in practically all conjugations, e.g. First Present Tephy (Sethe Az 58, 55 n. 1; Worrell Coptic MSS. in the Freer Collection 122), First Future Tephy (Piehl Sphinx 4, 33; Sethe l.c.; cf. Fayyumic Tephy; l Cor. xii.16 ap. Zoega 151); Neg. Perfect Tephy and Temporal Tephy (Wessely XV No. 198 d), etc.

Obs. 2. In Bohairic the 2nd f. sg. of the First Future is Tephy (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 -p. In Sahidic Tephy occurs in the P. Soph. (Scholtz-Wolde Gr. aeg. 97; Sethe l.c.) and occasionally elsewhere, e.g. Jdg. xiii.5, 7 (Thompson; but in verse 3 Tephy).

Obs. 3. The Sahidic forms in -p have probably nothing to do with the paradigm Tephy discussed by Kahle Balaizah 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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