

LINGUA AEGYPTIA
Studia Monographica 26

Transitivity and Aspect
in Sahidic Coptic

Nina Speransky

Widmaier Verlag
Hamburg

Nina Speransky

Transitivity and Aspect in Sahidic Coptic:
Studies in the Morphosyntax
of Native and Greek-Origin Verbs

Lingua Aegyptia
Studia Monographica

Herausgegeben von
Frank Kammerzell, Gerald Moers und Kai Widmaier

Band 26

Institut für Archäologie
Humboldt Universität
Berlin

Widmaier Verlag
Hamburg

Institut für Ägyptologie
Universität Wien
Wien

Transitivity and Aspect in Sahidic Coptic:
Studies in the Morphosyntax
of Native and Greek-Origin Verbs

DDGLC Working Papers 2

Nina Speransky

Widmaier Verlag · Hamburg
2022

Die Publikation wurde ermöglicht durch eine Ko-Finanzierung
für Open-Access-Monografien und -Sammelbände
der Freien Universität Berlin.

Titelaufnahme:
Nina Speransky,
Transitivity and Aspect in Sahidic Coptic.
Studies in the Morphosyntax
of Native and Greek-Origin Verbs
Hamburg: Widmaier Verlag, 2022
(Lingua Aegyptia – Studia Monographica; Bd. 26)
ISSN 0946-8641
ISBN (paperback): 978-3-943955-26-2
ISBN (PDF): 978-3-943955-91-0
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.37011/studmon.26>

© Nina Speransky 2022
This book is published by Widmaier Verlag, Hamburg,
with open access at www.widmaier-verlag.de



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.
To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Druck und Verarbeitung: Hubert & Co., Göttingen
Printed in Germany

In loving memory of Brakha (Beatrice) Avigad

Contents

Editorial.....	xi
Acknowledgements.....	xiii
Abstract / Zusammenfassung.....	xv
Tables.....	xvii
Abbreviations.....	xviii
Quoted sources.....	xix
0 Introduction.....	1
0.1 Research objectives.....	1
0.2 Coptic language: an outline of the verbal system.....	3
0.3 Argument structure; transitive clause type.....	5
1 Transitivity and aspect in native Sahidic verbal system.....	9
1.1 Transitivity: towards a working definition.....	9
1.1.1 Transitivity: a lexical property or a grammatical cluster category?.....	9
1.1.2 Prototypical transitive construction: definitions and problems.....	12
1.1.3 What does transitivity stand for?.....	14
1.1.4 Transitivity alternations; anticausatives; resultatives.....	19
1.2 Transitivity in Coptic: previous research.....	24
1.2.1 Semantic equivalents to Indo-European transitive verbs use different valency patterns in Coptic.....	25
1.2.2 No uniform morphosyntactic passive in Coptic.....	27
1.2.3 Verbal lexemes of the mutable class have both transitive and non-causative meaning.....	30
1.2.4 <i>n-/m̄m̄=</i> : question of identity.....	31
1.2.5 No transitivity in Coptic?.....	33
1.3 Transitivity in Coptic: Systemic view.....	34
1.3.1 Redefining the transitive pattern.....	34
1.3.2 Transitivity as a parameter of the conjugation patterns.....	35
1.3.2.1 Aspect-Diathesis Grid.....	35
1.3.2.2 Durative intransitive infinitive: a ghost form.....	36
1.3.3 Tense-base / Morphology / Diathesis distribution: sample statistic from Sahidic.....	39
1.3.3.1 Unaccusatives: aspect / form distribution.....	40
1.3.3.2 Labile verbs: aspect / diathesis / form distribution.....	41
1.3.4 Analysis of statistical data and comments.....	43
1.3.4.1 Reduced use of intransitive infinitive in the Bipartite.....	43
1.3.4.2 Eventive infinitive: an anticausative form.....	44
1.3.4.3 Eventive paradigm: transitive infinitive replacing <i>status constructus</i> ?.....	46

1.3.4.4	Eventive non-causative infinitive: a member of two transitivity oppositions	48
1.3.4.5	Conjugation bases as a mechanism of valency alternation	49
1.3.4.6	Classes of mutable verbs: strong transitives, labile verbs, monadic verbs	54
1.3.4.7	The opposition <infinitive: stative> in the Bipartite conjugation	58
1.3.5	Diachrony	63
1.3.5.1	Attestations of causative split in pre-Coptic Egyptian	63
1.3.5.2	Excursus: Simpson-Depuydt Rule	68
1.3.6	Miscellaneous consequences of the asymmetrical diathesis	72
1.3.6.1	Discrepancies between absolute and construct forms	72
1.3.6.2	Suppletive forms across the conjugation patterns: case of εΙΜΕ vs. COΟΥΝ	76
1.3.7	Conclusion	81
2	Periphrastic construction <ϣϣνε + circumstantial clause>	83
2.1	Problem description	83
2.2	Previous research	85
2.3	Distributional properties of periphrasis	89
2.4	Periphrasis: future tenses / moods	90
2.5	Periphrasis: perfect	97
2.6	Types of periphrastic predicates and the lexical inventory of the pattern	98
2.7	The issue of inchoativity	100
2.8	The issue of iterativity	102
2.9	Conclusion	103
2.10	Appendix: periphrasis in Demotic	104
3	Greek loan verbs in Coptic: diathesis and grammatical voice marking	107
3.1	Defining research object and research objectives	107
3.2	Koine: summary of changes to verbal system (after Lavidas 2009)	110
3.3	Borrowing of grammar: theoretical preliminaries	114
3.4	Voice in Greek and in Coptic: categorial clash	120
3.5	Analysis of morphological-diathetic classes of verbs	125
3.5.1	Class A: two forms, two diatheses	125
3.5.1.1	Class A: overview	125
3.5.1.2	Functions of the middle-passive voice morpheme	127
3.5.1.3	Class A: syntactic properties of short forms	130
3.5.1.4	Class A: Summary	131

3.5.2 Class B: two forms, one diathesis	132
3.5.2.1 Class B: overview.....	132
3.5.2.2 Treatment of Greek deponents in Sahidic	136
3.5.2.3 Class B: Intra-Sahidic deponentialization	141
3.5.2.4 Class B: Summary	147
3.5.3 Class C: one form, two diatheses (labile verbs).....	149
3.5.3.1 Class C: general remarks.....	149
3.5.3.2 Looking for lability triggers: frequency, semantics, diathesis in the source language	153
3.5.3.3 Aspect and causativity.....	159
3.5.3.4 Class C: Summary	165
3.6 Greek verbs in Sahidic: voice and aspect system (summary)	170
Appendix 1. Morphology ~ diathesis correlation in Greek loan verbs.....	173
Appendix 2. Non-alternating Greek loan verbs	175
Bibliography	193
Text sources	201
Index of Greek Verbs	205
Index of Coptic Greek-origin verbs	211
Index of Coptic native verbs	217

Editorial

It is a great pleasure for the undersigned to present, as a second installment of *DDGLC Working Papers*, the volume “Transitivity and Aspect in Sahidic Coptic – Studies in the Morphosyntax of Native and Greek-Origin Verbs”. Its author Nina Speransky studied linguistics at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem with Haim Baruch Rosen and Ariel Shisha-Halevy. Proselytized by the latter, her MA supervisor, she became an ardent devotee of Coptic whose glow has not stopped sparking her curiosity ever since. A PhD fellowship of the *German Israeli Foundation* project “Transitivity and Valency in Language Contact: The Case of Coptic” (2016-2019)¹ brought her in touch with the DFG long-term project *Database and Dictionary of Greek Loanwords in Coptic (DDGLC)* at Freie Universität Berlin where she received her PhD in 2021.

“Transitivity and Aspect in Sahidic Coptic” is a landmark in the linguistic description, interpretation, and typological comparison of Coptic language data. The main thread of its first part “Transitivity and aspect in native Sahidic verbal system” goes along, and eventually beyond previous observations and thoughts by Ludwig Stern, Petr Ernsted, and Wolf-Peter Funk and results in a revised model of the Coptic conjugation system, supplemented by what the author calls, the Aspect-Diathesis Grid. A bit (though not exceedingly) complicated than the one we know, it displays a neat structural equilibrium, explains some hitherto poorly understood observations and helps disambiguating what had until now looked like homonymies. A crucial point is the discovery of the regular function of the difference between the Coptic bipartite and tripartite pattern for voice marking. While parts of the rediscovered system, such as the compatibility rules of the stative, were already known, and others, such as the passive semantics of objectless transitive verbs in the tripartite pattern, had already been observed but not fully understood, the overall compatibility limitations of intransitive infinitives have thus far been partly overlooked, partly mistaken as a peculiarity of the verbs of motion. The Aspect-Diathesis Grid model now provides a fuller account of the entanglement of all these phenomena and shows the fundamentally templatic character of voice marking in Coptic.

The posterior part of the book, “Greek loan verbs in Coptic: diathesis and grammatical voice marking”, is a major contribution to the study of Greek-Egyptian language contact and an expedition into still uncharted territory. Research in borrowability and borrowing strategies of Greek verbs in Coptic has until now mostly concentrated on the morphology of Greek input forms and their syntactic integration with or without light verb. The issue of the adaptation of loaned verbs to recipient language patterns of valency and transitivity and the question how Greek verbs were marked for voice within the Coptic matrix system have barely been raised so far.² Based on thorough analysis of the data accessible in the

-
- 1 Conceived by Eitan Grossman, this project (*GIF* Grant No. I-1343-110.4/2016) was conducted at Jerusalem and Berlin with professor Grossman and the undersigned as principal investigators.
 - 2 The question was explored by aforesaid *GIF* project, see E. Grossman, “Language-Specific Transitivity in Contact: The Case of Coptic,” *Journal of Language Contact* 12, 89-115; see also W.-P. Funk, “Differential Loan across the Coptic Literary Dialects”, in E. Grossman, P. Dils, T.S. Richter & W. Schenkel (eds), *Greek Influence on Egyptian-Coptic: Contact-Induced Change in an Ancient*

DDGLC database and on a sophisticated differentiation of loan verbs along their morphological and diathesis variation, the author has discovered a transition from (relics of) the donor language system of morphological voice marking, including evidence for parallel system borrowing, towards the recipient-language system of templatic voice marking. Her conclusions help profoundly to brighten up the twilight of this transitory situation and lead to new findings, such as the hitherto unnoticed productivity of the Greek middle-passive suffix in Coptic as a means of valency reduction of loan verbs.

“Transitivity and Aspect in Sahidic Coptic” was granted the *Award for Academic Excellence* of the *International Association for Coptic Studies* on its congress at Brussels in July 2022. It is delightful to see the lexicographical data of the *DDGLC* project bear rich fruit already before their public release. I am particularly grateful to the Freie Universität Berlin for funding the *Gold Open Access* publication of this book.

Berlin, 31 October 2022

Tonio Sebastian Richter

African Language (DDGLC Working Papers I), *LingAegStudMon* 17, Hamburg: Widmaier, 369-397, and E.D. Zakrzewska, “Complex verbs in Bohairic Coptic: language contact and valency,” in: B. Nolan & E. Diedrichsen (eds), *Argument Realisation in Complex Predicates and Complex Events: Verb-Verb Constructions at the Syntax-Semantic Interface*, *Studies in Language Companion Series* 180, Amsterdam: Benjamins, 213-243.

Acknowledgements

Completing this work, I find myself hardly able to express all the gratitude I owe the people who by their concern, patience, and support enabled me to conduct the research. From the very hatching of the idea developed here, my supervisor, Professor Sebastian Richter was the person who inspired and guarded my every step, being the most generous and open-minded listener and critic, I ever had the good chance to meet. I am deeply grateful for every one of our stimulating conversations, as well as for his brilliant seminars that imbued the Coptic history and culture with such a lively shine.

I am very thankful to my second advisor, Dr. Alexander Letuchiy, whose papers served to me as a long-desired textbook on verbal typology.

I shall always gratefully remember my teachers at the Hebrew University, Hannah and Haim Baruch Rosen. And of course, my heartfelt thanks go to my teacher of general and Coptic linguistics, Ariel Shisha-Halevy.

I owe special thanks to Prof. Heike Behlmer who practically ordered me to start my PhD study. I am extremely grateful to my fantastic colleagues, Dr. Diliانا Atanassova, Dr. Frank Feder, Theresa Kohl, Julien Delhez and So Miyagawa, without whom I could never cope with the many difficulties the process involves. I sincerely thank the whole team of the DDGLC project for assisting me with their expertise, as well as for providing the actual material the study is based upon. I am also deeply grateful to all my colleagues at the Digital Edition of the Coptic Old Testament project of the Göttingen Academy of Sciences and Humanities. Special thanks are due to Prof. Andréas Stauder. The present research could be not conceived without the existence of the digital databases of the Coptic Scriptorium (<http://copticcriptorium.org>), <http://coptot.manuscriptroom.com>, and DDGLC (<https://refubium.fu-berlin.de/handle/fub188/27813>).

I really cannot thank enough my dear friend and colleague Sina Becker, who has always been there for me in every little need. The present work owes much to her expertise in the world of Coptic literature. I am also deeply grateful for the privilege of using her still unpublished dissertation.

With deep love and gratitude, I name my friends whose kindness and patience supported me all this time through: Natacha Descombes, Anna Sergeeva, Julia Braverman. My dear parents, my husband, my children, Sarah, Seva, Yasha, Joseph, and Leah, and my nieces and nephew, Julia, Galia, Vadim were the support team I could not do without.

The work was supported by German Israeli Foundation [I-1343-110.4/2016 “Valency and Transitivity in Contact: The Case of Coptic” and Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft [DFG-Langzeitprojekt Database and Dictionary of Greek Loanwords in Coptic].

Abstract

Despite the relatively long history of grammatical descriptions, certain details of the Coptic verbal system have not yet been sufficiently clarified. Diathetic classes of labile verbs, semantic classes of non-labile mutable verbs, *stative: infinitive* opposition, the functional range of the periphrastic construction, integration of Greek loan verbs into Coptic valency alternation system and the role of the loaned morphology in that system are some of the pressing problems the present study aims to investigate. In Coptic, all these problems belong to the domain of the interaction between two grammatical categories, transitivity and aspect.

Apart from the introductory chapter that briefly states the research objectives and gives a general overview of the linguistic material and theory employed, the present study consists of three chapters. The first chapter studies major regularities in the transitivity alternations of native Egyptian verbs. Defining the Coptic conjugation system by two parameters, those of aspect and transitivity, I examine the functions of the absolute infinitive as the only unmarked form opposed, on the one hand, to transitive eventive construct forms, and on the other hand, to intransitive stative. The system of conjugation patterns is analyzed as a templatic system where a specific conjugation pattern ascribes not only tense, aspect, and modus, but also voice to an unmarked verbal form. Finally, the native verbs are classified into four groups based on the formal criteria of mutability and lability, and this classification is found to correlate with the semantic one based on the agentivity and telicity of verbal lexemes. I also look into the diachrony of the aspect-transitivity cluster and use the two-parameter model to explain various synchronic anomalies of Coptic verbal valency.

The second chapter looks into semantic and grammatical factors triggering the use of the periphrastic pattern <ⲱⲟⲛⲉ + circumstantial clause> which is shown to fulfil the whole range of functions, from punctual passive to resultative, depending on the lexical properties of the verb.

The third chapter explores the diathesis of Greek loan verbs in Sahidic. Valency-changing devices for Greek verbs are examined and compared with those operating on native verbs. The occasional use of Greek middle-passive suffix is analyzed as the vestige of parallel system borrowing.

Zusammenfassung

Trotz der relativ langen Geschichte der grammatikalischen Beschreibungen sind bestimmte Details des koptischen verbalen Systems noch nicht ausreichend geklärt. Diathetische Klassen labiler Verben, semantische Klassen nicht labiler veränderlicher Verben, die Opposition <Stativ: Infinitiv>, Funktionsbereich der periphrastischen Konstruktion, Integration griechischer Lehnverben in das koptische Valenzalternationsystem und die Rolle der entlehnten Morphologie in diesem System sind einige von den dringenden Problemen, die die vorliegende Studie untersuchen soll. In der koptischen Sprache gehören alle die-

se Probleme zum Bereich der Interaktion zwischen zwei grammatikalischen Kategorien, Transitivität und Aspekt.

Neben dem Einführungskapitel, in dem die Forschungsschwerpunkte kurz dargestellt und ein allgemeiner Überblick über das verwendete sprachliche Material und die Theorie gegeben werden, besteht die vorliegende Studie aus drei Kapiteln. Das erste Kapitel befasst sich mit wichtigen Regelmäßigkeiten bei den Transitivitätswechseln von ägyptischen Verben. Indem ich das koptische Konjugationssystem durch zwei Parameter definiere, nämlich Aspekt und Transitivität, untersuche ich die Funktionen des absoluten Infinitivs als der einzigen unmarkierten Form, die auf der einen Seite transitiven eventiven Konstruktformen und auf der anderen Seite intransitiven Stativen entgegengesetzt ist. Das System der Konjugationsmuster wird als ein templatisches System analysiert, bei dem ein bestimmtes Konjugationsmuster nicht nur Zeitform, Aspekt und Modus, sondern auch Diathese einer unmarkierten verbalen Form zuschreibt. Schließlich werden die nativen Verben aufgrund der formalen Kriterien der Veränderlichkeit und Labilität in vier Gruppen eingeteilt, und es wird festgestellt, dass diese Klassifizierung mit der semantischen korreliert, die auf der Agentivität und Telizität verbaler Lexeme basiert. Ich untersuche auch die Diachronie des Aspekt-Transitivitäts-Clusters und verwende das Zwei-Parameter-Modell, um verschiedene synchrone Anomalien der koptischen verbalen Valenz zu erklären.

Das zweite Kapitel befasst sich mit semantischen und grammatikalischen Faktoren, die die Verwendung des periphrastischen Musters <ⲱⲣⲏⲉ + Umstandssatz> auslösen, von dem gezeigt wird, dass es den gesamten Funktionsumfang erfüllt, von punktuelltem Passiv bis Resultativ, je nach den lexikalischen Eigenschaften des verbalen Lexems.

Das dritte Kapitel befasst sich mit der Diathese der griechischen Lehnverben im Sahidischen. Die Mechanismen der Valenzalternation für griechische Verben werden untersucht und mit denen verglichen, die mit nativen Verben fungieren. Die gelegentliche Verwendung des griechischen medial-passiven Suffix wird als ein Rudiment von „parallel system borrowing“ analysiert.

Tables

Table 1 Aspectual-diathetic distribution of verbal morphs.

Table 2. Aspect / diathesis / form of unaccusatives: instances

Table 2a. ⲟⲛⲉ ‘to live’

Table 2b. ⲡⲟⲗ ‘to reach’

Table 2c. ⲥⲣⲉ ‘to be at leisure’

Table 2d. ⲣⲟⲩ ‘to grow, sprout’

Table 2e. ⲕⲓⲛⲉ ‘to grow fat’

Table 2f. ⲁⲓⲁⲓ ‘to multiply’

Table 2g. ⲛⲟⲓⲛ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ‘to remain’

Table 3. Aspect / diathesis / form of labile verbs: instances

Table 3a. ⲛⲟⲓⲗ ‘to fill / be filled’

Table 3b. ⲡⲟⲣⲱ ‘to spread’

Table 3c. ⲡⲟⲗ ‘to divide / be divided, burst out’

Table 3d. ⲣⲟⲕⲉ ‘to incinerate / burn’

Table 3e. ⲧⲁⲕⲟ ‘to destroy / perish’

Table 3f. ⲧⲁⲗⲗⲟ ‘to heal, make calm / be healed, calm down’

Table 3g. ⲟⲓⲱⲛⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ‘to show / appear’

Table 3h. ⲟⲣⲓ ‘to count / to be counted, belong to’

Table 4. Diathesis of absolute infinitive: specific instances

Table 4a. ⲃⲟⲗ (ⲉⲃⲟⲗ)

Table 4b. ⲛⲟⲓⲗⲛ

Table 4c. ⲱⲱⲟⲃⲉ

Table 4d. ⲥⲟⲓⲗ

Table 5. Syntactic-semantic classification of native Coptic verbs

Table 6. ⲥⲟⲓⲛ and ⲉⲛⲉ in the Old Testament (sample)

Table 7. Form-meaning distribution of the verbs of class A

Table 8. Middle-passive morpheme in the detransitivized predicate

Table 9. Deponent morphology dating

Table 10. Greek-Coptic correlates for ‘witness’

Table 11. Non-causative token ratio for labile and non-labile Greek loan verbs

Table 12. Diathetic patterns of Koine verbs.

Abbreviations

Abbreviations of documentary texts follow those listed in the *Checklist of Editions of Greek, Latin, Demotic and Coptic papyri, ostraca and tablets*. This resource can be currently found at <https://library.duke.edu/rubenstein/scriptorium/papyrus/texts/clist.html>.

Amel. 1 = Amélineau (1914), vol. 1

Amel. 2 = Amélineau (1914), vol. 2

BASP = Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists

BCNH.T = Bibliothèque copte de Nag Hammadi, Section “Textes”

CSCO / CS = Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium / Scriptorum Coptici

DDGLC = Database and Dictionary of Greek Loanwords in Coptic (<https://www.geschkult.fu-berlin.de/en/e/ddglc/index.html>)

LBG = Lexikon zur byzantinischen Gräzität

MONB. = Monasterio Bianco (White Monastery)

NHC = Nag Hammadi Codices

NHMS = Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies

NHS = Nag Hammadi Studies

Pier.Morg. = Pierpont Morgan Library

Shen. Can. = Shenoute Canon

TLA = Thesaurus Linguae Aegyptiae (<https://aaw.bbaw.de/tla/servlet/TlaLogin>)

Quoted sources

The Greek texts of the Old Testament are quoted according to Rahlfs-Hanhart (2006), those of the New Testament follow Nestle-Aland (2012). Unless otherwise specified, I use the English Standard Version (ESV) for the English translation. The standard abbreviations for the Bible books can be found at <https://www.esv.org/resources/esv-global-study-bible/list-of-abbreviations/>. The Sahidic text of the Old and the New Testament is quoted according to the Coptic Scriptorium database (Caroline T. Schroeder, Amir Zeldes, et al., Coptic SCRIPTORIUM, 2013-2021, <http://copticcriptorium.org>).

Greek and Egyptian papyri

Canopus Kom el-Hisn, CG 22186	Simpson (1996)
Canopus Tanis, CG 22187	Simpson (1996)
HGV BASP	BASP 48 (2011)
HGV O.Frange 188	Boud'hors/ Heurtel (2016)
HGV PSI	Vitelli / Norsa (1917)
HGV SB	Ruprecht / Hengstl (1997)
P Carlsberg	Smith (2002)
P. Berlin P 15530	Zauzich (1993)
P. Boulaq	Töpfer (2013)
P. Cair. Masp. 1	Maspero (1911)
P. Cair. Masp. 2	Maspero (1913)
P. Cair. Masp. 3	Maspero (1916)
P. Harkness	Smith (2005)
P. Insinger	Lexa (1926)
P. Leiden I 348,	
Vso. 9,6-10,8, Bakenptah's letter	Caminos (1954)
P. Leiden I 384	Spiegelberg (1917)
P. Lond. 4	Crum (1910)
P. London BM EA 10477 (P.Nu)	Lapp (1997)
P. London-Leiden	Griffith-Thompson (1921)
P. Oxy 54	Coles, Maehler, Parsons (1987)
P. Petese Tebt. A, The Story of Petese	Ryholt (1999)
P. Rylands	Vittmann (1998)
P. Spiegelberg	Spiegelberg (1910)
P.Ant	Barns / Ziliacus (1960)
P.Berlin P 13548	Zauzich (1993)
P.Berlin P 3022, Sinuhe	Gardiner (1909)
P.Bodl.	Salomons (1996)
P.Flor.	Vitelli (1906)
P.Heid.	Duttenhöfer (1994)
P.Kairo CG 51189 (P.Juja)	Munro (1994)
P.Oxy. 8	Grenfell, Hunt (1898)
pMMA Heqanakht II	Allen (2002)
Sakkara Necropole	
The Tomb of Tjy the ship convoy lord	Steindorf (1913)
Stela of Hor (Kairo JE 71901)	Landgrafova / Dils, TLA
Stela of Nesmontu (Louvre C 1 = N 155)	Landgrafova / Dils, TLA
Tomb of Si-renpowet I	Gardiner (1908)

Coptic texts

Abbaton

Timothy, Archbishop of Alexandria,
Discourse on Abbaton, BL Or. 7025 Budge (1914)

Abraham of Farshut

First Panegyric on Abraham of Farshut,
White Monastery codex CG Goehring (2012)

Ad Phil. Gent.

Shenoute, Ad Philosophum Gentilem Leipoldt (1955)

Amazed

MONB. HB 28 b:24-29 (“I am amazed”) Cristea (2011)

Antiphonary

Pier.Morg. M575, Antiphonary Cramer/Krause (2008)

Apocalypse of Adam

NHC V, The Apocalypse of Adam MacRae (1979)

Apocalypse of James

NHC V, The (Second) Apocalypse of James Hedrick/Parrott (1979)

Apocr.John

NHC II, The Apocryphon of John Waldstein/Wisse (1995)

Apologia de in crudelitate

Fondation Bodmer 58, Apologia de in crudelitate Crum (1915)

Asclepius

NHC VI, Asclepius 21-29 Dirkse/Parrott (1979)

Berliner “Koptisches Buch”

Berlin, Ägyptisches Museum P.20915,
Berliner „Koptisches Buch“ Schenke Robinson (2004)

Besa on Theft

Besa Codex A: On Theft and Deceitful Behaviour Kuhn (1956)

Colluthus

Encomium on St. Colluthus, Pier.Morg. M.591 Chapman/Depuydt (1993), Schenke (2013)

Concept of Power

NHC V, The Concept of our Great Power Wisse/Parrott (1979)

Cyprianus

Legend of Cyprianus, Pier.Morg. M.609 Bilabel (1934)

Encomium on John the Baptist

British Library Or. 7024,

Encomium on John the Baptist

Budge (1913)

Epima

Martyrdom of Apa Epima, Pier.Morg. M.580

Mina (1937)

Evod.rossi

Homily on the Passion and the Resurrection

Attributed to Evodius of Rome

Rossi (1892)

Exegesis on the Soul

NHC II, The Exegesis on the Soul

Lundhaug (2010)

Festal Letter 16

Vienna Nationalbibliothek K 9241, K 9242, MONB.DS Cristea (2011)

Four Creatures

John Chrysostom, Encomium on the

Four Bodiless Creatures, Pier.Morg. M.612

Wansink(1991)

Gabriel

Installation of Gabriel, Pier.Morg. M.593

Great Mysterious

Book of the Great Mysterious Discourse,

Bodleian Library MS Bruce 96

Crégheur (2013)

Historia Ecclesiastica

MONB.FY - Historia Ecclesiastica Coptica

FY 158 Volume II

FY 49 Volume I

Orlandi (1968-1970)

Hochzeit zu Kana

Benjamin of Alexandria, Hochzeit zu Kana

Müller (1968)

Hom. Pass. Res. (M.595)

Homily on the Passion and the Resurrection

Attributed to Evodius of Rome, P.Morgan M.595

Chapman (1993)

Matthew/Scheide

Princeton, Private collection Scheide MS 144

Gospel of Matthew

Schenke (1981)

Michael

Installation of Michael, Pier.Morg. M.593

Müller (1962)

O.Crum 22

Cairo, Egyptian Museum CG 8138 - O.Crum 22

Crum (1902)

On the Punishment

MONB.BB, Fr. 3 On the punishment of sinners Kuhn (1956)

P.Budge

Columbia University P.600, SB Kopt. 1 036,
papyrus Budge Schiller (1968)

P.CLT

New York, Metropolitan Museum of Arts,
Accession 24.2.7 Schiller (1932)

P.KRU

HGV P.RKU, Koptische Rechtsurkunden aus Djeme Crum/Steindorf (1912)

P.Méd.Copt. IFAO

Cairo IFAO, Coptic Medical Papyrus Chassinat (1921)

P.Mon.Epiph.

Papyri of the Monastery of Epiphanius at Thebes Crum/Evelyn-White (1926)

P.MoscowCopt.

Coptic texts of Pushkin Museum, Moscow Jernstedt (1959)

ParShem

NHC VII, Paraphrase of Shem Wisse/Pearson (1996)

Pepper Receipt

London, British Museum Or. 8903, 20-26 Crum (1925)

Pistis Sophia

Pistis Sophia, British Library Add MS 5114 Schmidt/MacDermot (1978)

Protennoia

NHC XIII, Trimorphic Protennoia Poirier (2006)

Rufus

Rufus of Shotep Homilies on Luke and Matthew Sheridan (1998)

Shen.Can. 1

Shenoute, Canon 1 Emmel (2021)

Shen.Can. 2

Shenoute, Canon 2 Kuhn (1956)

Shen.Can. 3 YA

Shenoute, Canon 3 MS. YA Layton (2014)

Shen.Can. 3

Shenoute, Canon 3 Leipoldt (1954)

Shen.Can. 4 Shenoute, Canon 4	Wessely (1909), Leipoldt (1955)
Shen.Can. 6 Shenoute, Canon 6 (1914)	Leipoldt (1954, 1955), Amelineau 1,2
Shen.Can. 7 Shenoute, Canon 7	Leipoldt (1954); Crum Cat. 194 f.3
Shen.Can. 8 Shenoute, Canon 8	Boud'hors (2013)
Shen.Can. 9 Shenoute, Canon 9	Pleyte / Boeser (1897)
Spiteful Monk Catechesis against a spiteful monk, British Museum Or. 7024	Lefort (1956)
St. Antony New York, Pier.Morg. M.579, Encomium on St. Antony	Garitte (1943)
Teachings of Silvanus NHC VII, Teachings of Silvanus	Peel (1996)
Theodore Martyrdom of Theodore the Anatolian, Leontios the Arab, and Panigeros the Persian, Pier.Morg. M.583	Müller/Uljas (2019)
Thomas NHC II, The Gospel of Thomas	Layton (1989)
To Herai MONB.BA, Fr. 30 To Herai	Kuhn (1956)
White Mon. Great Prayerbook of White Monastery	Lanne (1958)
Wisdom of Jesus Christ Berlin, Ägyptisches Museum 8502, Wisdom of Jesus Christ	Till /Schenke (1972)
Zostrianos NHC VIII, Zostrianos	Barry, et al. (2000)

0 Introduction

0.1 Research objectives

The present work includes three papers that deal, from different angles, with one and the same vast issue of transitivity and diathetic alternation in Sahidic Coptic. Although one of the central questions of the present-day typological studies, this issue is also – quite surprisingly, – one of the weakest points in the modern Coptic linguistics. Not that it has always been so. Transitive, intransitive, and passive forms and patterns received much attention in the works by Stern and Jernstedt who formulated, with an admirable mixture of accuracy and inspiration, the basic rules governing the syntax of direct object in Coptic. In doing so, they boldly crossed the border between two syntactic domains that were, since the days of antique grammarians and almost up to the present, strictly divided, the domains of *genus verbi* (voice) and verbal aspect. Indeed, for a mind trained on Greek and Latin conjugation tables, Coptic with its Moebius strip of grammatical categories opens an entirely new and wonderful perspective. However, the line of research laid down by these scientists has not been continued. Despite much meticulous work of the masters of today’s Egyptian and Coptic philology, such as Shisha-Halevy, Depuydt, Emmel, Funk, Layton, Engsheden, Reintges, Grossman, we have not grown much wiser regarding the Coptic *active: non-active* opposition, as a whole, nor regarding the relation between this opposition and the opposition of *eventive: durative* aspect. As long back as in 1978, Funk called the attention of Coptologists to the pertinent problem with the treatment of “those Coptic verbs that are Active in meaning when they have a direct complement but are approximately “Passive” or “Middle” when used in the tripartite pattern without a direct complement”.¹ Yet, that very problem is hardly even stated, not to mention systematically treated or explained in the newest Sahidic grammars, Layton (2000) and Reintges (2004). Transitive or intransitive use of the absolute infinitive form, alternations of infinitive and stative, a holistic understanding of stative, grammatical distinctions between passive and anticausative, the opposition of simple and periphrastic constructions are the topics very much in need of a caring hand. Many phenomena that we take at face value, as mere stylistic or rhetorical variations, could turn to be essential for the language structure, if correctly analyzed.

Our current state of knowledge concerning the morphosyntax of Greek loan verbs in Coptic is in no way more advanced than that of native verbs. Several studies discussing the integration of Greek verbs into Coptic, such as Böhlig (1953, 1955, 1995), Girgis (1955), are mainly interested in the morphophonetic changes occurring to the loan verbs, others (e.g., Almond 2010, Grossman & Richter 2017) consider insertion strategies of Greek infinitives which oscillate between light-verb insertion and direct insertion. Finally, one recent contribution (Grossman 2019) briefly sketches the integration of Greek verbs into Coptic transitivity and valency patterns comparing the most general morphosyntactic properties of native Coptic and Greek verbs. The issue that remains completely unaddressed

1 Funk (1978b:120).

is the interplay of diathesis and aspect, as reflected in the semantic and syntactic behavior of loan verbs. This issue, however, is of primary importance for our understanding of the loan verb integration in Coptic. Whether the aspectual split that is so crucial for the native verb paradigm does or does not play the same role for loan verbs, is the question to be answered before we can make any meaningful comparison between the transitivity models of loan and native verbs.

This study addresses the following questions: 1) the distribution of native verb forms in terms of diathesis and aspect; 2) semantic and syntactic properties of the periphrastic circumstantial construction; 3) transitivity alternations in Greek loan verbs and their connection to aspect realization. In the first part, the Coptic conjugation system is defined as a diathesis-aspect grid where some verbal forms (*status constructus*, *status pronominalis*, stative) are marked for both diathesis and aspect, whereas the absolute infinitive is unmarked for either and thus functions as a contrastive opposition to the marked form in each conjugation pattern. This approach allows to specify the functional load of several oppositions: eventive absolute infinitive vs. durative infinitive; durative infinitive vs. stative; eventive absolute infinitive vs. construct forms. An interesting corollary is the conclusion that the non-causative / intransitive use of absolute infinitives was, in fact, far more reduced and semantically specific than commonly assumed now. Further on, I try to pursue the development of the aspect-diathesis system throughout the course of the attested history of Egyptian, in order to verify the hypothesis of a causative split that could have shaped the system, as we see it in Coptic. Another diachronic excursus deals with the history of the durative transitive pattern. In particular, I examine and try to explain the exceptions to the Stern-Jernstedt rule discussed in Simpson (1996) and Depuydt (2009). The last section describes various syntactic and lexical phenomena that might arise as a result of the causative split in Coptic, most of them previously disregarded.

The second chapter focuses on the periphrastic circumstantial construction specifying the place of periphrasis in the verb paradigm, the semantic values associated with it, and the classes of verbs participating in that construction.

The third chapter is dedicated to the syntactic integration of Greek loan verbs into the diathesis-aspect grid. I explore the use of Greek voice morphology concluding that the integration of the Greek middle-passive voice marker into Sahidic represents a specific case of parallel system borrowing. Further on, I delimit the group of loan verbs capable of labile alternation and examine various factors that could be responsible for this behavior.

However tempting it was to conduct the intended research on the material of all the attested dialects of Coptic, in the end to choose Sahidic as the sole object of examination looked like the only reasonable option. Attested infinitely better than the minor dialects, Sahidic offers a singularly diverse body of corpora including literary texts of different times and genres and a rich collection of documentaries. Some of these corpora, such as the Biblical corpus or Shenoute's Canons, are large enough to gather even some kind of (very thin and tentative) statistics, which seems to be impossible to do in any other dialect, perhaps except Bohairic. However, Bohairic is so different from Sahidic in many aspects of valency patterning, not to mention the treatment of the loan verbs, that it obviously calls for a separate study.

At the same time, I did not deem it sensible to confine the research to a single text corpus of Sahidic. The variance we find inside this dialect does not prevent us from conceiving a holistic idea of the verbal system. Rather, it demonstrates the potential of that system.

Far from being in any way exhaustive, this study is an attempt to make the Coptic verbal grammar more adequate for a typological comparison and the semantic categories behind it more palpable for the readers of Coptic.

0.2 Coptic language: an outline of the verbal system

Coptic² is the last language phase of the Egyptian language, the native language of the population of the Northern Nile valley, which constitutes an autonomous branch of Afro-Asiatic language family. The first written attestations of Egyptian come from ca. 3000 BC. The onset of Coptic is marked with the transfer of written Egyptian to an alphabet based on the Greek script, with an addition of some six or seven Demotic consonantal signs. The lifetime of Coptic encompasses the period from ca. the 4th CE to ca. 14th CE,³ when the last Coptic speakers shifted to Arabic, as a result of the Arabic conquest of Egypt in the 7th CE.

The standardization of the Coptic script coincided with (and possibly resulted from) the spread of Christianity in Egypt when the Bible and other important Christian literary texts were translated into the native language. Containing a large corpus of religious literature, such as homilies, monastic rules, vitae of holy fathers etc., Coptic belongs to the main languages of the Christian East. Alongside Christian writings, Coptic contains Gnostic and Manichean texts, as well as a large number of documentary texts — private letters, legal documents, medical prescriptions, and ritual or magical spells. All that makes Coptic a medium of precious information on the early Christian history and the everyday life in Late Antique Egypt.

The pre-Coptic data gives pretty little opportunity to trace regional language varieties, but in Coptic one already discerns more than ten standardized written dialects. The best attested are Sahidic, a southern dialect that for a certain period served as a literary standard for Coptic, Bohairic, originally spoken in the western part of Lower Egypt, Fayyumic, Akhmimic, Oxyrhynchitic (otherwise called Mesokemic or Middle Egyptian), and Lycopolitan. Less standardized texts may show local linguistic traits. Thus, the Hermopolitan Sahidic is relatively easily recognizable by the lenition of final plosives. The most conspicuous differences between the dialects lie on the phonetic and lexical level, but it is possible to observe also minor morphosyntactic and word order variations, such as changes in valency patterns, different distribution of conjugation bases or placement of clitic elements.⁴

2 A detailed linguistic description of Egyptian in its continuity may be found in Grossman & Richter (2015), a grammatical overview is presented in Haspelmath (2015b). Richter (2015) gives a profound account on the early history of Egyptian-Coptic linguistics.

3 Different sources give various dates, from the 11th to the 14th CE. Here I follow the data presented in Grossman & Richter (2015).

4 For a selective list of Bohairic isoglosses, see, e.g., Shisha-Halevy (1981).

Due to the close and prolonged contact with Koine Greek, the *lingua franca* of a multiethnic population of Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt, Coptic language became enriched with Greek vocabulary to such a degree, as to allow some researchers call it a ‘bilingual language variety’.⁵ The estimated percentage of Greek loan words in Coptic varies from 20% to 40%, comprising ca. 3000 nouns (among them nominalized adjectives), ca. 600-700 verbs, and remarkably many functional elements, viz., prepositions, conjunctions, discourse markers.

There is, however, a slight inaccuracy in saying that Coptic borrowed the Greek parts of speech. As distinct from Greek, Coptic is not an inflectional language and has almost no part-of-speech morphology. The structural elements of Coptic are sequences of morphs, in all probability, bound by a common stress, some of them bearing a grammatical meaning, and the others a lexical one.⁶ The order of constituents in a group is fixed and determined by their dependency classes. The order of clause constituents is also fixed, which allows to distinguish several models of predication called *conjugation patterns*. Since Polotsky (1960), two major conjugation patterns are recognized in Coptic, the *Tripartite / Non-durative* (eventive) pattern and the *Bipartite / Durative* pattern. The distinctive element of the Tripartite conjugation is the tense-aspect-modus-polarity marker occupying the first position in the predicate base. It is followed by a nominal subject and a verbal lexeme in form of *absolute infinitive* or else in one of the two pre-object forms, *status constructus* that is immediately followed by a substantival object, or *status pronominalis* that is immediately followed by a pronominal object.

Tripartite (eventive) conjugation

ⲁϥⲥⲟⲩⲏ / ⲁⲓⲣⲟⲩⲙⲉ ⲥⲟⲩⲏ	ϥⲗⲁϥⲟϥⲟⲩⲏⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ / ϥⲗⲁⲓⲡⲏⲟϥⲧⲉ ⲟϥⲟⲩⲏⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ
a-f-sôtm / a-p-rôme sôtm	ša-u-ouônh ebol / ša-p-noute ouônh ebol
pret-3sgm-hear /	
pret-Art.MSG-man-hear	hab-3pl-show outside / hab-Art.MSG-God-show outside
‘He / The man heard’	‘They appear (habitually) / The God appears’

ⲙⲡⲟϥⲥⲉⲧⲙⲗⲁⲁϥ (verb in form of *status constructus*)

mp-ou-setm-laau

pret.neg-3pl-hear-anyone

‘They did not hear anyone.’

ϥⲗⲁⲓⲥⲟⲩⲏⲥ (verb in form of *status pronominalis*)

ša-i-sotm-f

hab-1sgl-hear-3sgm

‘I hear him (habitually)’

Some of the categories marked by the TAM markers of the Tripartite are tense (past), relative tense (‘not yet’, ‘after’, ‘until’), modus (jussive, optative).

5 Reintges (2001:233). See Zakrzewska (2017) for a discussion.

6 See Layton (2011:22, §27), Haspelmath (2015b).

The Bipartite conjugation has no conjugation base. The first position is filled by a pronominal prefix or, much less often, by a nominal subject. The second position is filled either by an adverb, or by a verb in one of the two forms, absolute infinitive or *stative*. Stative (formerly also termed qualitative) is a verbal form that predicates a state in some way related to the action or event named by the verb.

Bipartite (durative) conjugation

π-χοεις ταχρο η-πεφ-σβοι

p-choeis tačro η-pef-cboi

DEF.M.-lord strengthen.INF ACC.-POSS.3S-arm

'The Lord strengthens his arm'

σε-ταχροη ην ηενειφτ

se-tačrêu hn hen-eift

3P-strengthen.STAT with IDF.P-nails

'They are strengthened with nails'

The Bipartite pattern is associated with one tense (general or actual present) and one aspect (durative).

Not every verbal root can occur in each of the four above-mentioned forms (absolute infinitive, *status constructus* & *pronominalis*, and stative). A significant number of verbs are attested only in infinitive. Such verbs are called *immutable*, as opposed to *mutable* verbs that possess, at least, two forms distinguished by different vocalization. ρωετ 'strike / fall' is an example of a mutable verb, εαρεε 'guard' represents the immutable class.

Absolute infinitive	ρωετ	εαρεε
<i>Status constructus</i>	ρεετ-	—
<i>Status pronominalis</i>	ραετ=	—
Stative	ραετ	—

0.3 Argument structure; transitive clause type

The major clause type in every language consists of a predicate and a number of dependent noun phrases called predicate arguments. Each argument is associated with a distinct semantic role, such as agent, patient, experiencer, goal, recipient etc. The semantic roles in a clause satisfy the condition of uniqueness: every argument is assigned one and only one semantic role. The set of semantic (or thematic) roles developed in comparative linguistics⁷ proves to be more or less finite, which makes it possible to base further analysis on some general definitions. The most common are:

Agent: The 'doer' of the action denoted by the predicate.

Patient: The 'undergoer' of the change denoted by the predicate.

Experiencer: The living entity that experiences the event denoted by the predicate.

Goal: The location or entity indicating the end of the movement denoted by the predicate.

⁷ The system of semantic valency was first outlined in the works of J.Gruber (1965), Ch. Fillmore (1969), Ju. Apresjan (1974).

Source: The location or entity indicating the origin of the movement denoted by the predicate.

Recipient /Benefactive: The entity that benefits from the action or event denoted by the predicate.

Every semantic role tends to correlate with some consistent syntactic coding type.

Not all roles are equally important for a sentence to be complete and understandable. The arguments that bear the essential semantic roles are called *core arguments*. They must either be overtly stated, or be retrievable from the context. Their omission makes the clause ungrammatical. Other arguments are called peripheral. A specific configuration of core and peripheral arguments is called an argument structure, or, in more venerable, but still used terms, a *valency pattern*.

Depending on the number of core arguments, verbs are divided into univalent or monadic, bivalent, and ditransitive. A *monadic* verb has a single core argument, which may bear the semantic role of an agent (as, e.g., ‘dance’, ‘work’), or of a patient (‘sleep’, ‘fall’). A *bivalent* verb has two arguments, most often an agent and a patient (‘bite’, ‘take’), a *ditransitive* verb has three arguments, the third mostly a recipient (‘give’, ‘pay’).

Introducing the notion of *transitivity*, a recent authoritative study, Dixon & Aikhenvald (2000), recognizes two universal clause types:

- *intransitive* clause, with an intransitive predicate and a single core argument which is in S (intransitive subject) function
- *transitive* clause, with a transitive predicate and two core arguments which are in A (transitive subject) and O (transitive object) functions

Transitivity is understood as a property of a bivalent clause whose arguments have the following specific semantic traits:

A - the argument whose referent “does (or potentially could) initiate or control the activity”⁸ (i.e., has the semantic role of agent)

O - the argument whose referent is affected by the activity (i.e., has the semantic role of patient)

Whereas monadic clauses are unambiguously defined as intransitive, bivalent clauses present something more of a problem. There is a more or less general consensus among the linguists that there are two-argument clauses that are intransitive. However, the above definition offers no clear criteria that would help to distinguish between these two types of clauses.⁹ In fact, it gives no cross-linguistically applicable criteria of transitivity,¹⁰ nor does it explicitly state that transitivity is a linguistic universal to be found in any specific language.

8 Dixon & Aikhenvald (2000:3).

9 Affectedness of the second argument’s referent cannot be considered a clear criterion, since most non-agentive referents are in this or the other way affected.

10 The most widely accepted recent approaches to transitivity are discussed in Haspelmath (2011).

Now, in many cases, the ambiguity surrounding the category of transitivity is no great impediment. As observed in Haspelmath (2011), in most languages transitive clauses are such a prominent type that they can easily be selected intuitively.¹¹ However, Coptic, with its rather unconventional (for a European eye) valency and voice system, prepares many traps for anyone who would like to replace a strict grammatical analysis with his intuitions. Therefore, it appears necessary, at the very outset, to explore the deep semantic content of the notion of transitivity in order to prove it indispensable for a reasonable analysis of the Coptic verbal system, and to establish connections between transitivity and other domains of verbal grammar, most importantly, with aspect.

11 Haspelmath (2011:545).

1 Transitivity and aspect in native Sahidic verbal system

1.1 Transitivity: towards a working definition

1.1.1 Transitivity: a lexical property or a grammatical cluster category?

In Shisha-Halevy's "Coptic Grammatical Categories", the chapter dealing with different models of argument expansion bears the eloquent title of "The **so-called** direct object" (emphasis mine). This reserved term is not accidental. An amazing fact about Coptic linguistics is that the applicability of the notion of transitivity to the Coptic verbal system is far from being an established fact. The source of this ambiguity is not only our insufficient knowledge of the intricate grammatical mechanisms of Coptic, but also the somewhat dubious nature of the notion itself. For, despite multiple elaborate treatments of various parameters of transitivity in the works by authors such as Aikhenvald, Borer, Comrie, Dixon, Dowty, Fillmore, Givón, Kittilä, Kulikov, Lakoff, Lazard, Levin and Rappaport Hovav, Letuchiy, Mal'chukov, Mel'čuk, Næss, Nedjalkov, Polinsky, Testelec, Tsunoda, to name just the most authoritative ones, it is difficult to find a comprehensive description of the phenomenon that would have universal validity. Indeed, it is not even claimed that transitivity in the sense of encoding specific semantic relations by a specific syntactic pattern is a universally valid phenomenon. Consequently, as a researcher of a particular language, you have full freedom to incorporate or not this category in your grammatical descriptions. To quote G.Lazard,

"Within the limits of the description of an individual language, the question of transitivity is not so difficult, and not so interesting. 'Transitive' is a label the descriptive linguist gives to a certain class of verbs which, for some reason, he sets apart from other kinds of verbs, because he deems them worthy of special treatment. He is always free to choose a certain verb class and to decide that this shall be the transitive class. He is also free to make no use of the notion of transitivity and only to classify verbs according to whatever criteria he finds relevant. Both choices are licit.¹²"

Is then transitivity a language-specific descriptive category or a cross-linguistic comparative concept?¹³ Though Lazard's definition sounds more like the first option, it is obvious that transitivity is based on some fundamental semantic distinctions and should therefore be represented in that or other form all across the languages. In order to provide a working definition of transitivity that might be used in the analysis of Coptic data, and also to try to gain a more precise understanding of the phenomenon as a whole, it might be helpful to re-examine the origins of the notion and to track down possible misapprehensions that might have distorted our view of it.

12 Lazard (2002:150).

13 The distinction is proposed and discussed in Haspelmath (2010).

Excursus. The history of the concept of transitivity

The concept of transitivity has entered the Indo-European grammar in the second century C.E., in the works of the Alexandrian school. In his treatise on Greek verbal voice system, the alleged author of the term, Apollonios Dyscolos has set aside the class of verbs taking prepositionless accusative objects as the one capable of regular voice alternation. Hierarchizing the basic bivalent patterns, Apollonios regards the accusative pattern as the basic one, from which all others deviate, both in form and in meaning. His logic can be captured from the fragment below where Apollonios discusses the semantic and the syntactic divergence between the two verbs denoting ‘love’: φιλέω and ἐράω:

φαίνεται δ' ὅτι καὶ τὸ φιλεῖν τοῦ ἐρᾶν διοίσει, καθότι ἢ μὲν ἐκ τοῦ φιλεῖν ἐγγινομένη διάθεσις ἐνεργείας ὄνομα σημαίνει· οἱ γοῦν φιλοῦντες παιδεύουσιν, πάλιν τῆς διαθέσεως κοινῆς τοῖς προκειμένοις ἐπ' αἰτιατικὴν συντεινούσης...2.2.419 τὸ γε μὴν ἐρᾶν ὁμολογεῖ τὸ προσδιατίθεσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐρωμένου... καὶ σαφές ἐστιν ὡς συνετοῦ μὲν ἐστι καὶ ἀγαθοῦ τὸ φιλεῖν, καθάπερ καὶ πατέρες παῖδας φιλοῦσιν, οὐ μὴν συνετοῦ τὸ ἐρᾶν, ἀλλ' ἤδη παρεφθορότος τὸ λογιστικόν. Οὐ χρὴ ἄρα ἀπορεῖν ἔνεκα τίνος τὸ μὲν φιλω ἐπ' αἰτιατικὴν φέρεται, τὸ δὲ ἐρῶ ἐπὶ γενικῆν.¹⁴

The basic sense conveyed in the accusative pattern is defined by Apollonios as ‘transitive’ (διαβιβαστικόν), featuring a transfer of the active force (ἐνέργεια) from the referent of the nominative to the referent of the accusative argument.¹⁵ Thus, starting from Apollonios, transitivity has been understood as a linguistic sign with a very specific signifier and a very imprecise meaning. Accusative object (termed *direct object*) and double voice morphology were signs of a transitive verb for classical grammarians who understood transitivity as a property of a verbal lexeme. Yet, with the flourishing of non-Indo-European linguistics, it has become pretty clear that, whereas the notion of transitivity seems to be efficient for the description of manifold grammatical phenomena, the formal properties alone do not suffice to identify the domain of transitivity in languages with essentially different Case and Voice systems. On the other hand, traditional semantically based definitions largely following the one given by Apollonios do not provide criteria for any meaningful grammatical distinction.¹⁶ Starting from late 1970s, these definitions became essentially

14 “Es scheint sich aber auch ‘φιλεῖν’ von ‘ἐρᾶν’ in der Weise zu unterscheiden, dass das dem ‘φιλεῖν’ entspringende Verhalten (des Subjekts) vorzugsweise eine Thätigkeit in sich schliesst; denn die ‘φιλοῦντες’ erziehen, und beide Thätigkeiten (sowohl die des ‘φιλεῖν’ wie die des ‘παιδεύειν’) erstrecken sich gleicherweise auf einen (Objekts)Akkusativ... Das ‘ἐρᾶν’ aber setzt zugleich ein von dem Geliebten verursachtes Affiziertsein (der Seele) voraus... Es ist einleuchtend, dass das ‘φιλεῖν’ das Zeichen eines Guten und Verständigen ist, welcher liebt wie Väter ihre Kinder lieben, dass ‘ἐρᾶν’ aber das Zeichen eines nicht verständigen Mannes, dessen Vernunft bereits Schaden gelitten. Man darf also nicht in Zweifel sein und fragen, warum φιλω den Akkusativ, ἐρῶ den Genitiv regiert.” (Transl. Buttman 1877).

15 “χρὴ γὰρ νοεῖν ὅτι ἡ ἐνέργεια ὡς πρὸς ὑποκειμένον τι διαβιβάζεται, ὡς τὸ τέμνει, τύπτει, τὰ τούτοις παραπλήσια· ἥς καὶ τὸ παθητικόν ἐκ προϋφεστῶσης ἐνεργητικῆς διαθέσεως ἀνάγεται, δέρεται, τύπτεται.” (Ap.Disc. III 148).

16 Cf. Kittilä (2002:26-27).

refined in typological studies. The far-reaching similarities in the semantics of transitive verb classes between various languages made it possible to eventually grasp the main semantic components of transitivity. It has been observed, for example, that verbs of an immediate effect ('break', 'shoot', 'boil' etc.), as well as verbs denoting solicitation ('ask', 'threaten') or pursuit ('follow', 'search') tend to be encoded by transitive structures, while verbs of symmetric actions ('fight with', 'talk to') mostly take indirect objects. Verbs of perception ('hear', 'smell') and emotion ('love', 'like', 'hate') may participate in the transitive pattern, or else take indirect objects. Moreover, it became clear that transitivity is not simply a lexical feature, but rather the property of the whole clause, influenced, *inter alia*, by factors outside the verbal lexeme as such. That opened a new perspective: the opposition 'transitive vs. intransitive' was no longer analyzed as a clear-cut dichotomy, but rather as a scalar property that can be more or less expressed in a clause, depending on the values of certain semantic parameters. Various proposals were made regarding the exact nature of these parameters, such as the very extensive list presented in Lakoff (1977):

- 1) There is an agent who does something
- 2) There is a patient who undergoes a change to a new state
- 3) The change in the patient results from the action by the agent
- 4) The agent's action is volitional
- 5) The agent is in control of what he does
- 6) The agent is primarily responsible for what happens
- 7) The agent is the energy source in the action
- 8) There is a spacio-temporal overlap between the agent's action and the change in the patient
- 9) There is a single definite agent
- 10) There is a single definite patient
- 11) The agent uses his hands, body or some instrument
- 12) The change in the patient is perceptible
- 13) The agent perceives the change
and even
- 14) The agent is looking at the patient.¹⁷

The somewhat excessive granularity of this list blurs the general idea. A more targeted list of parameters is provided in the fundamental study of Hopper and Thompson (Hopper & Thompson 1980). Here, the cluster of features includes: the number of participants; kinesis (action); aspect (telicity vs. atelicity); punctuality; volitionality; polarity (affirmative or negative nexus); mode (realis vs. irrealis); agency; affectedness and individuation of the

17 Lakoff (1977:244).

object. Each parameter yields a scale on which clauses may rank higher or lower; the combinations of these parameters characterize clauses as more or less transitive.

There is a cardinal difference between this approach and the one in Lakoff (1977). Hopper and Thompson extend the repertory of the verbal features relevant for transitivity to include non-lexical ones, such as telicity, punctuality, mode and polarity. In doing so, they combine two lines of research that are usually separated. The first one (Verkuyl, 1972, 1993, 1999, Comrie, 1981, Tenny, 1987, 1994, Paduceva and Pentus 2008, Rothstein 2008, Borer 2005 and others) considers transitivity, along with other types of argument structuring, as a tool of grammatical (mainly, aspectual) construal of a clause.

The other line of research, on the contrary, explores transitivity as a lexical property. The arguments of a verb are ascribed semantic proto-roles of agent, patient, experiencer¹⁸ etc. which are characterized in terms of volition, control and affectedness. It is studied, in what way specific configurations of these features determine the argument structure of a verb. Thus, Testelec (1998) argues that different combinations of control and affectedness in the two arguments yield a semantic classification of verbs closely corresponding to the formal *intransitive* : *middle* : *transitive* classification.¹⁹ Along the same lines, Naess suggests that maximal distinction of participants with respect to the features of volition, control (in Naess' terms, instigation) and affectedness is the semantic trigger of syntactic transitivity.²⁰ Control and volition of the agent, affectedness of the patient together with the real mood and affirmative polarity of the verb are taken to constitute a prototype of transitivity, a limiting case which has the highest chances to be encoded by a syntactically transitive construction, if it exists in the language. (As was mentioned before, the universality of transitivity is hypothesized, but not yet proven.)

1.1.2 Prototypical transitive construction: definitions and problems

A notion of prototypical transitive construction (PTC) is a convenient instrument for identifying transitive patterns in languages of different morphosyntactic profile and / or different types of argument linking (ergative or nominative-accusative). The definitions of PTC can be either more empirical, or more generalized, but their application yields identical results. The empirical approach proposed – seemingly independently, – by Kozinsky in 1980 and Tsunoda in 1985 defines prototypically transitive verbs based on a specific class of meanings that assume transitive case frames in all languages. These are the verbs “which describe an action that not only impinges on the patient, but necessarily creates a change in it”²¹, i.e., verbs of destruction, such as ‘kill’, ‘destroy’, ‘break’, ‘bend’²². Recently, the same idea was advocated in Haspelmath (2015):

18 See the discussion in Dowty (1991).

19 Testelec (1998:44).

20 Naess (2007).

21 Tsunoda (1985:387).

22 Cf. Kozinsky: “... A small semantic class of verbs, viz. verbs of destruction and creation, is assumed to be transitive in its basic voice in all languages. Further, any verb which requires the same construction(s) as the verbs in the core class do, may be called transitive.” (Quoted from Testelec 1998:29).

“A verb is considered transitive if it contains an A and a P argument. A and P are defined as the arguments of a verb with at least two arguments that are coded like the ‘breaker’ and the ‘broken thing’ micro-roles of the ‘break’”.²³

Once the transitive core class is thus identified, all the verbs using the same valency pattern are pronounced transitive.

In a generalized way, the same identification pattern is presented in Lazard (2002):

“A PROTOTYPICAL ACTION is an effective volitional discrete action performed by a controlling agent and actually affecting a well individuated patient. The MAJOR BIACANT CONSTRUCTION, in any language, is the construction used to express a prototypical action.”²⁴

Givón (1995) provides a list of basic features of any PTC, which, besides the lexical properties of volitionality and control, include grammatical parameters of aspect and modus.

“a. **Agent:** The prototypical transitive clause involves a volitional, controlling, actively initiating

agent who is responsible for the event, thus its **salient cause**.

b. **Patient:** The prototypical transitive event involves a non-volitional, inactive noncontrolling

patient who registers the event’s changes-of-state, thus it has **salient effect**.

c. **Verbal modality:** The verb of the prototypical transitive clause codes an event that is *compact* (non-durative), *bounded* (non-lingering), *sequential* (non-perfect) and *realis* (non-hypothetical). The prototype transitive event is thus fast-paced, completed, real, and **perceptually and/or cognitively salient**.”²⁵

The concept of the transitive prototype makes it possible to match syntactic alternations of a bivalent clause with their semantic proximity to the prototype or deviation from it, as with partitive case of direct objects in the imperfective aspect in Finnish (1) or genitive of negated transitive clauses in Russian (2).

(1) a. Liikemies kirjotti kirjeen valiokunnalle.
Businessman wrote letter-ACC. committee-to
‘The businessman wrote a letter to a committee.’

b. Liikemies kirjotti kirjettä valiokunnalle.
Businessman wrote letter-PART. committee-to
‘The businessman was writing a letter to a committee.’
(Hopper and Thompson 1980:262)

23 Haspelmath (2015:5).

24 Lazard 2002:152

25 Givón 1995:76

- (2) a. Ja chital vashu knigu.
 I read-PST your-ACC book-ACC
 ‘I have read your book.’
- b. Ja vashej knigi ne chital.
 I your-GEN book-GEN not read-PST
 ‘I have not read your book.’

Conversely, it is somewhat more difficult to use the prototype theory to account for multiple verb classes that are compatible with transitive case frames, but do not match the semantic prototype. The claim is that all the non-prototypical transitive clauses are formed by analogy or, in Givón’s wording, **metaphorical extension** of the transitive sense²⁶. Metaphorical extension, according to Givón, covers verbs with a locative direct object (‘enter the house’), locative direct object and implied patient (‘feed the cows’ = ‘give food to the cows’, ‘they robbed her’ = ‘took something from her’), with a moving part of the subject (‘kick’), with a dative-experiencer subject (verbs of cognition, sensation, volition), verbs with a reciprocal/ associative object (‘He met Sylvia.’ – ‘He met with Sylvia.’), the verb ‘have’, verbs with cognate objects (‘sing a song’). However, the concept of metaphorical extension does not suffice to account for crosslinguistic systemic similarities and distinctions outside the core class, such as, e.g., invariably transitive alignment of possession-transfer verbs (‘sell’, ‘lose’ etc.).²⁷ Yet another weakness of the prototype theory is its inability to grasp the formal distinction between different surface-syntactic (active and passive) representations of a transitive event.

1.1.3 What does transitivity stand for?

Finally, it is easy to notice that the transitive prototype is a descriptive model, without any explanatory force.²⁸ Neither the list of transitivity parameters, nor the prototype theory provide any conceptual frame for the grammaticalization of the prototypical action. There is, as yet, no general agreement concerning the factors that could be responsible for the phenomenon of transitivity. Hopper and Thompson suggest that transitivity may be one of the strategies used for information structuring²⁹, perfective / transitive clauses being usually more rhematic (or foregrounding), than imperfective / intransitive ones. For Kittilä, morphosyntactic or structural transitivity is an iconic reflection of the ontological transitivity of events.³⁰ Næss, as has been mentioned above, takes the principle of the

26 Givón (1984:98).

27 See Testelefs (1998:30).

28 Cf. Naess (2007:16).

29 Hopper & Thompson (1980:283 ff.).

30 Kittilä (2002:44 ff.): “Ontological transitivity (as for linguistic manifestation of transitivity) is best defined as our idea about different events in the non-linguistic world. Based on the recurrence of events, we are able to make generalizations about their relevant properties. Only the bare nature of events is relevant in this respect. This information is employed in the description of events and in the interpretation of constructions. The features of ontological transitivity are usually absolute in nature and the ontological information about the nature of events is common for all language users

maximum role distinction between the agent and the patient to be the superordinate semantic idea of transitivity.³¹ Comparing valency alternations with TAM-splits, Tsunoda concludes that both phenomena belong to the domain of transitivity and are operated by the superordinate notion of effectiveness of the action.³² For all their outward difference, the ideas of Næss and Tsunoda seem to point to one and the same thing: transitive structure serves to distinguish the agent as an effective performer of an action from the undergoer (patient) or experiencer.

A more profound version of the same idea has been suggested in DeLancey (1987). According to DeLancey, “the cluster of attributes associated with transitivity define a semantic construct which approximates the notion of EVENT as opposed to STATE”.³³ Assuming now that the opposition is not binary, but scalar, it can be most closely defined as STATE vs. NON-STATE opposition. Indeed, the most salient semantic feature of an effective action is that it is not a state. To make my point, I shall briefly return to the list of transitivity parameters in Hopper & Thompson (1980).³⁴ As was first observed by Tsunoda, the ten parameters constituting this list are not equally relevant in triggering the transitive encoding³⁵, and what is more, none of them seems to be crucial for it.³⁶ One obvious exception from this principle seems to be the number of participants. Indeed, the point on which the parameter theory is most often criticized consists precisely in that it effectively includes the one-participant clauses into the scope of transitivity.³⁷ Moreover, Hopper and Thompson’s hypothesis licences the view that one-argument constructions might be ascribed some degree of transitivity or even surpass in transitivity some less lucky bivalent constructions, given the univalents possessed more transitivity features. Lazard illustrates the awkwardness of such an analysis with the following examples:

(regardless of the language they speak). The absolute nature of these features means that we all are able to distinguish ‘killing’ from ‘hearing’ and we all agree on this distinction (provided that we behave rationally).” The idea seems to be unwarranted. The nature of events is not structured, it is our analysis that structures them, and the analysis is performed through linguistic means. Thus, we cannot witness anything like “a pure event of beating”, we rather witness a sequence of situations that we can analyze as an event of beating. Saying ‘John beat Harry’ is only a specific way of reflecting the situation that could possibly be expressed in a series of intransitive clauses, such as ‘John pushed hard’, ‘Harry fell to the ground’ and so on. Kittilä’s logic, therefore, seems to pull linguistic categories on the extra-linguistic reality. This shows, however, how deeply is the notion of transitivity rooted in our consciousness.

31 Næss (2007:22).

32 Tsunoda (1981:392 ff.).

33 DeLancey (1987:58).

34 To this list of parameters, one probably has to add that of tense. The past tense must be considered more transitive, than the non-past tense. This would explain such phenomena as the split causativity described in Kulikov (1999) or the Coptic data that shall be discussed below.

35 See Tsunoda (1985:386).

36 As stated, e.g., by DeLancey (1987:58) for Lhasa.

37 See, e.g., Tsunoda, Lazard (2002), Kittilä (2007).

- (3) Susan left.
 (4) John likes beer.³⁸

Whereas the second clause has only one feature of transitivity (2 participants), the first clause has four: it is active, telic, punctual and volitional. If one understands Hopper and Thompson's theory literally, it must follow that the first clause will enjoy transitive encoding with much more probability than the second one, which looks quite contrary to linguistic facts, at least, in the limits of the English grammar³⁹. Lazard offers a solution for this problem suggesting that the two-participancy should rather be regarded as a basic condition of transitivity.⁴⁰

Let us, however, assume that the analysis in Hopper & Thompson is more correct and that one-argument stative predicates belong to the domain of transitivity forming the negative pole of the transitivity scale. On the other pole, there would stand two-argument predicates denoting a causation of a certain change in the patient.⁴¹ The patient-like argument can be regarded as the measure of the non-stativity of the predication. Under such view, transitivity is one of the instruments that are used to denote the temporary, non-permanent character of the nexus.

Unlike the prototype theory, this view is clearly based on a grammatical constant, the difference between states and non-states being a universal one. Moreover, it does not prescribe any *a priori* features to the transitive model, but it can explain some features of the prototype, such as volitionality or control. As observed by Vendler, states are treated in the language as non-volitional predicates, or to put it more precisely, the semantic component of volition is neutralized for states:

“When I say that I could run if my legs were not tied, I do not imply that I would run if my legs were not tied. On the other hand, there is a sense of “can” in which “He could know the answer if he had read Kant” does mean that in that case he would know the answer. Similarly, in an obvious sense, to say that I could like her if she were not selfish is to say that I would like her if she were not selfish. One feels something strange in “Even if I could like her, I would not like her”. It appears, therefore, that in conditionals “could” is often interchangeable with “would” in connection with states. For the same reason, “can” might become redundant in indicative sentences of this kind. Hence the airy feeling about “I can know”, “I can love”, “I can like” and so forth.”⁴²

Thus, the feature of volitionality is a contrastive feature in the opposition of a stative and a non-stative predicate. Such conclusion is but a paraphrase of DeLancey's idea

38 Lazard (2002:178).

39 As shown in Hopper and Thompson (1980:268 ff.), the data of ergative languages confirm their analysis.

40 Lazard (2002:180).

41 Cf. Testelefs (1998:33): “The purest case of an Agent with no characteristics of a Patient is probably that participant of many-place predicates which is linked to them via the causative relation and bears no other relation of a more specific kind.”

42 Vendler (1957:148).

that volitionality is an inalienable part of the causative semantics and as such enters the cognitive scheme of CAUSE and EFFECT expressed in transitive constructions.⁴³

At the level of parts of speech, the scale STATE-> ACTION would probably equal the spontaneity scale of verbs (3), from passives (or, in Haspelmath's term, agentful) and unaccusatives through unergatives and transitives to causatives.

The spontaneity scale (from Haspelmath 2016)

transitive	>	unergative	>	automatic	>	costly	>	agentful
('cut')		('talk')		('freeze (intr.))		('break (intr.))		('be cut')
<— more causatives				more anticausatives —>				

But one might as well suggest a broader view which would include in this stativity-activity scale also nominal, adjectival and adverbial predicates as denoting qualities and permanent, stable and temporary states.⁴⁴ A continuum leading from the most stable nexus to the least stable one could look as follows: he is a doctor -> he is young -> he is in denial -> he is sleeping -> he is reading a book -> he broke the glass.

An example from Chukchee (Mel'čuk 1993) may serve as an illustration of the link between intransitivity and stativization.

- (5) a. Γəm-nan tə-ret-ərəkən-ø kimitʔ- ə n (tom-etə).
 I-INSTR 1SG.SUB-transport-PRES-3SG.OBJ load-SG.NOM friend-SG/PL.DAT
 'I [= I] transport a-load [= II] (to-friend(s) [= III]): I actually do this.
- b. Γəm-ø t-ine-ret-ərəkən (kimitʔ-e) (tom-etə).
 I-NOM 1SG.SUB-'antipassive'-transport-PRES load-SG.INSTR friend-SG/
 PL.DAT
 'I [= I] transport (a-load [= II]) (to-friend(s) [= III]): I am a transporter (this is my occupation).

(5a) is a transitive / ergative clause with the nominative direct object. The antipassive marker in the example (5b) lowers the syntactic rank of the second argument, it becomes an indirect object, whereas the initial ergative subject ('I') changes the case to nominative / absolutive. The change in the surface structure brings about the change in the meaning. The initially active predicate ("I am transporting") is reinterpreted as a permanent state ("I am a transporter of loads").⁴⁵

Understanding transitivity as a mechanism of the (non-)stative characterization of the predicate, it is easy to see why aspect is one of its crucial components and is taken by

43 DeLancey (1987:61 ff.).

44 Cf. Nedjalkov & Jaxontov (1988:3): "It is assumed here that actions (e.g., 'to build', 'to break'), states (e.g., 'to stand', 'to be broken'), and qualities (e.g., 'to be long', 'to be kind') are the basic types of predicated properties irrespective of the formal means of their expression in individual languages." See also Wunderlich (2006).

45 Mel'čuk (1993:35).

some researchers (e.g., Tenny 1994) to be the decisive factor in (in)transitive encoding. Indeed, various alternations of transitivity are directly bound to the aspectual properties of the predicate. So, as has been suggested by Verkuyl (1972 et al.), for some groups of verbs, a specific object may characterize the clause as telic (6a), whereas a bare plural noun determines the atelic interpretation (6b):

(6a) Joan ate an apple.

(6b) Joan ate apples.

Another case of interdependence between the aspect and the form of the object may be illustrated by (7a,b):

(7a) Taylor ate the apricot.

(7b) Taylor ate at the apricot.

The above examples display homomorphism from the spatial extent of the second participant to the temporal progress of the event it participates in. The terms ‘incremental theme’⁴⁶ and ‘incremental theme verbs’ are applied to objects and verbs that allow for such homomorphism, respectively. As the above examples show, the contrast between the transitive and the intransitive structure corresponds to the difference in semantics: the transitive pattern denotes an accomplished action, whereas the intransitive pattern denotes an action with an unspecified outcome.

In both situations of (6) and in (7a), the object appears to be a quantifier of the event (in Borer’s term, “subject-of-quantity”⁴⁷). This provides us with the important characteristics of a transitive pattern. To put it quite simply, transitive pattern does not tell us HOW the object is affected, but about HOW MUCH it is affected. While different semantic roles of non-patient participants, e.g., benefactive, instrument, source and so on, are signaled by cases and/or prepositions with their own range of meanings, the patient-valency tends to be the least morphologically marked (at times being coded just by immediate adjacency, as in Nivkh, Hebrew or Coptic) and semantically charged.⁴⁸

This ‘orthogonal to semantics’ role of the non-agent participant in a transitive clause is probably the factor ensuring this pattern’s overwhelming frequency and productivity throughout languages. It would not seem improbable, - though I am not aware of any statistical study to that purpose, - if transitive verbs would prove to constitute the majority of the verbal lexicon in most languages. The productivity of the transitive pattern also depends on its property to form a causative counterpart to non-causatives, sometimes by morphological derivation (e.g., German ‘be’-prefix word formation), sometimes by

46 See Dowty (1991) etc.

47 See Borer (2005).

48 Cf. Testelec (1998:32): “Much work has been done to characterize the role of Agent explicitly... By contrast, I am aware of no convincing semantic definition of the role of Patient, i.e., of the most affected argument of a verb... Agent, or Instrument, or Benefactive are semantic roles which are the same or similar with different verb predicates, whereas Patient semantics cannot be generalized but is rather a role installed individually by every particular verb.”

creating a labile use for a previously non-causative verb (e.g., spoken Russian “гулять собаку” ‘walk the dog’, “меня улыбнуло” ‘it has smiled me’, Spanish “lo desapareció el Estado” ‘The State has ‘disappeared’ him’). Frequency, productivity, transparency, autonomy, and naturalness are the properties often invoked for defining prototypical syntactic transitivity.⁴⁹

Thus, there is every reason to treat transitivity as a universal grammatical category understanding it as a manifestation of the STATE vs. NON-STATE character of the predicate through the argument linking pattern. Crucially, transitive diagnostics is not confined to the morphologically marked passive voice or the differential flagging of agents and patients, the factors that are irrelevant for an analytic language, such as Coptic. Rather, a valency pattern with two core arguments demonstrating some correlation with the individuation features of the non-agentive argument, correlation with tense-aspect-mood categories of the verb, semantic transparency, frequency, and productivity should be regarded as *bona fide* transitive.

1.1.4 Transitivity alternations; anticausatives; resultatives

Whereas the above-mentioned secondary symptoms help in identifying a transitive pattern, an even more important feature, in fact, the hallmark of a transitive verb is that it can undergo diathesis alternations. The term ‘**diathesis**’, introduced in Xolodovič (1970), refers to the possible patterns of mapping the semantic arguments of the verb (agent, patient, goal etc.) onto syntactic functions (subject, object etc.).⁵⁰ Different diathetic patterns are represented, for instance, in

(8a) He cooked soup for the homeless.

(8b) He cooked for the homeless.

(9a) The blast of wind broke the window.

(9b) The window broke.

(10a) You rub the body with mud.

(10b) You rub mud on the body.

Diathetic distinctions may or may not be morphologically marked on the verb. Grammatical voice, such as Ancient Greek middle-passive τέμνει ~ τέμνεται ‘cuts ~ is being cut’ can be defined as diathetic distinctions marked in verbal morphology.⁵¹ As our examples show, in the absence of morphological marking, diathesis may be expressed through syntactic means, such as word order.

49 Cf. Winters (1990).

50 Xolodovič (1970:13), cf. Mel’čuk (1993).

51 Mel’čuk, I., Xolodovič, A. (1970:117).

One salient feature of the transitive class is a specific diathesis alternation that involves the syntactic promotion of the patient and the demotion or elimination of the agent.⁵² The ensuing intransitive clause may belong to one of the four following types:

Passive *stricto sensu*: the original agent becomes a peripheral argument and may be either realized as an oblique object, or omitted:

- (11) Η δήλωση υπογράφηκε από όλους τους συμμετέχοντες
 i dhlōsi ipoghrafike apo olus tus simetexondes
 the.NOM statement.NOM sign.NACT.PAST.PRFV.3SG by all the participants
 ‘The statement was signed by all the participants’

Middle (Dixon & Aikhenvald’s ‘agentless passive’): the original agent is implied, but not specified:

- (12) Αυτό το βιβλίο διαβάζεται πολύ ευχάριστα
 afto to vivlio dhiavazete poli efcharista
 this.NOM the.NOM book.NOM read.NACT.PRES.3SG very pleasantly
 ‘This book reads very pleasantly’

Noncausal (Anticausative): there is no agent stated or implied, the event is conceived as spontaneous:⁵³

- (13) Η πόρτα άνοιξε ξαφνικά
 i porta anikse ksafnika
 the.NOM door.NOM open.ACT.PAST.PRFV.3SG suddenly
 ‘The door opened suddenly’⁵⁴

Statal passive / objective resultative: the state reached by the patient as a result of the core event, irrespective of there being an agent implied, or not.

- (14) Окно разбито
 okno razbito
 window.NOM break.PAST.PRFV.PRTCP.NOM
 ‘The window is broken’

The above diathesis types share a number of common features: each type relates to the corresponding transitive structure as effect to cause; all of them involve valency reduction, with Agent suppressed and Patient promoted to the subject position.⁵⁵ The functional overlap between these categories results in them often sharing the same morphological

52 The list does not include the reflexive and the reciprocal diathesis, since they are not agent-suppressive. The term ‘middle’ is not unproblematic, but it will not play any role in the subsequent discussion concerning Coptic and is mentioned here for the sake of exhaustiveness only.

53 Cf. Dixon & Aikhenvald (2000:7).

54 The exx. (11) through (13) are taken from Lavidas (2009:19).

55 This formula captures prototypical traits of passive; as shown in Abraham (2006), languages vary with respect to specific parameters of passive structures.

marking⁵⁶ which is why they remained undetected for a long time, subsumed under the cover notion of passive. In particular, anticausative and resultative were not recognized by grammarians until the recent works of Leningrad / St. Petersburg typological school (Nedjalkov & Sil'nickij 1969, Nedjalkov & Jaxontov 1988 and others). The grammatical and semantic properties of these categories, as well as the distinctions between them and passive, are far from being clearly grasped, let alone finalized, but since both notions are indispensable for the correct grammatical analysis, I shall try to briefly summarize the most essential properties of each.

The term '**anticausative**' can be employed in a narrower sense based on semantics and morphology, or in a broader, purely semantic sense.⁵⁷ As a morphological term, it refers to intransitive verbal forms that are derived from the corresponding causatives by means of a decausativizing morpheme, as *aç-**il**-di* in (15):

- (15) Turkish Annem kapi-yi aç-ti
 Mother door-ACC open-PAST
 "My mother opened the door"
 Kapi aç-**il**-di
 Door open-ANTICAUS-PAST
 "The door opened" (Haspelmath 1987)

In this sense, the term is conceived as a structural counterpart to **causative verbs** where the valency increase is marked by a causativizing affix, e.g., Estonian *-ta-* (*õppida* 'learn' / *õpetama* 'teach', *kasvama* 'grow (intr.)', *kasvatama* 'grow (tr.)').

Understood semantically, anticausative denotes any verb (or verbal form) which fulfills three conditions:

- 1) the anticausative verb X has a synthetic counterpart X₁, such that the meaning of X₁ is [to CAUSE X];
- 2) X denotes an event that occurs spontaneously, without an agent implied;⁵⁸
- 3) the subject of X has the semantic role of *patient*.

It is evident that the semantic definition of anticausatives comprises a larger number of verb classes, than just morphological anticausatives. In fact, the [CAUSE – EFFECT] relation between the members of *anticausative~causative* pairs may have different morphological realizations across the languages. Following the classification introduced in Nedjalkov & Sil'nickij (1969), typologists distinguish between directed and non-directed causativity

56 Cf. Haspelmath (1987:30): "... there are quite a number of languages in which one and the same morpheme has reflexive, anticausative and passive meaning. In other language, the morpheme has only reflexive and anticausative meaning (German, Qechua, Nivkh...), and yet in other languages it has only anticausative and passive meaning... There do not seem to be any languages in which one morpheme has reflexive and passive meaning, but no anticausative meaning."

57 On the necessary differentiation of the two meanings see Haspelmath (1987), 2.2.

58 See Comrie (1985:326): "Passive and anticausative differ in that, even where the former has no agentive phrase, the existence of some person or thing bringing about the situation is implied, whereas the anti causative is consistent with the situation coming about spontaneously."

alternations. Directed alternations are further divided into causative and anticausative alternations, where one of the alternants is morphologically derived from the other one by means of a causativizing or decausativizing morpheme. Both causative and anticausative types of alternation have been instantiated above.

The non-directed alternations fall into three different types, equipollent, suppletive and labile. According to Haspelmath (1993), “in **equipollent** alternations, both are derived from the same stem which expresses the basic situation, by means of different affixes (16a), different auxiliary verbs (16b), or different stem modifications (16c).”⁵⁹

- (16) a. Japanese *atum-aruu* ‘gather (intr.)’
atum-eru ‘gather (tr.)’
 b. Hindi-Urdu *šuruu honaa* ‘begin (intr.)’
šuruu karnaa ‘begin (tr.)’
 c. Lithuanian *lūžti* ‘break (intr.)’
laužti ‘break (tr.)’

Further on, in **suppletive** alternations, the causal opposition is represented by different stems, as in:

- (17) Russian *goret* ‘burn’ (intr.) ~ *žeč* ‘burn’ (trans.)

Finally, in **labile** alternations, one and the same verbal lexeme can be used in both causal and noncausal sense, without any formal change. That type of causative alternation is characteristic of Coptic verbal grammar.

Finding a common semantic denominator of the whole anticausative class and proposing strict criteria for distinguishing morphologically marked anticausatives from passives is as yet an unsolved problem.⁶⁰ The crucial distinction is that anticausative verbs denote processes that are spontaneous (Comrie, Haspelmath), occur without a volitional intervention of an agent (Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1995:102), tend to increase the entropy (Kulikov 1998:147 ff.). The absence of an ‘agent-oriented meaning component’⁶¹ rules out the use of an agentive prepositional phrase or agent-oriented adverbs (e.g., “on purpose”) with anticausative predicates. On the contrary, an intransitive predicate modified by an adverb with the sense of ‘*sua sponte*’ is usually anticausative.

The above criteria, however, are not universally applicable, neither do they always yield unambiguous results. The adverbial modifiers are so infrequent that one cannot possibly use them for anticausative diagnostics in dead languages. Further on, the prepositional phrase introducing agent in passive can cover other meanings, as well, often instrumental. Thus, if present, it does not always denote an agent; yet the absence of such phrase does not necessarily mean that no agent has been implied. Morphological marking is not decisive, either. As stated in Kulikov (1998:141), some languages use the same marking for both categories, and in languages with different marking, the distinction is not carried out in a systematic way. Finally, the semantic definitions are too vague to rely upon.

59 Haspelmath (1993:91 ff.).

60 See Kulikov (1998:140 ff.).

61 Haspelmath (1993:92 ff.).

Nevertheless, the two categories must be set apart in an accurate grammatical analysis. One reason for that is their unequal distribution: whereas every transitive verb can be passivized, the causative / anticausative alternation is available for a subset of the transitive class only.⁶² Even more importantly, the TAM behavior of anticausative verbs may differ from that of passive forms. Though this topic is as yet largely unexplored, it seems that, at least in some languages, anticausatives behave as an eventive form, whereas passives are aspect-neutral. This issue will be addressed in some detail in the section 3.5.3.3 of the present work.

In order to avoid terminological confusion, I shall henceforth follow M. Haspelmath's proposal in using the terms '**causal**' and '**noncausal**' for the respective members of a semantic causativity alternation.⁶³ This definition of 'noncausal' applies to any semantic entity that has a causal correlate. Thus, our notion of 'noncausal' comprises also passive meanings. Where it will be necessary to maintain the distinction between the anticausative and passive semantics, I shall use the respective terms.

Anticausatives form a subset of the **unaccusative**⁶⁴ class of intransitive verbs. An unaccusative verb (e.g., 'fall', 'burn', 'languish', 'trip', 'collapse') is a univalent verb whose syntactic subject is semantically a patient. Unaccusatives are contrasted to **unergative** verbs ('dance', 'work', 'call') that predicate volitional actions of an agent subject. In Coptic, as in many other languages, this semantic difference has far-reaching syntactic implications.

It is easy to see that unaccusatives share two properties of anticausative verbs, namely, they denote a spontaneous action affecting the patient subject. However, the notion of unaccusative is broader since it does not imply the existence of a causative counterpart. Thus, Levin & Rappaport Hovav (1995, section 3.3) have convincingly shown that languages usually do not have any synthetic causative for the unaccusative verbs of existence and appearance.⁶⁵ The term 'anticausative' is convenient to use when discussing valency alternations of a causative verb, whereas 'unaccusative' usually applies to lexical classes.

The term '**resultative**' refers to a verbal form used to denote a state resulting from a previous action or implying a previous event.⁶⁶ The subject of resultative may be co-referential with various participants of the core event, yielding different diathetic types of resultative. The two basic types are subjective and objective resultative, where the subject of resultative corresponds to the subject or the object of the underlying clause, respectively. The objective resultative is only derived from transitive verbs and involves the change in diathesis identical to that of passive: the agent is demoted, the patient subjectivized. This results in the partial intersection of functions between resultative and passive: statal passive is frequently combined with resultative, being used to express the

62 I refer the reader to the thorough discussion in Haspelmath (1987:13 ff.).

63 Haspelmath (2016:37).

64 For details, see Perlmutter (1978).

65 Interestingly, Coptic might be an example to the contrary: the labile verb ⲟⲩⲱⲛⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ has both the anticausative reading 'appear' and the causative reading 'reveal'.

66 Nedjalkov & Jaxontov (1988:6).

result of a previous action, or is interchangeable with it, with a very slight change in meaning.⁶⁷ Further on, both are contrasted to actional passive: referring to one and the same situation, actional and statal passive stress different temporal planes of that situation. Actional passive emphasizes the action that preceded and caused the observed state, statal passive / resultative is focused on the resulting state itself. Accordingly, objective resultative / statal passive may formally differ from actional passive, as in German (18a), or may be identical with it, as in English (18b).

- (18) a. Der Brief war bereits versiegelt, aber ich kann nicht sagen, von wem er versiegelt wurde.
 b. The letter was already sealed, but I cannot say by whom it was sealed.

It is suggested that there may exist a genetic relation between resultative and passive, resultative being an older category.⁶⁸ Thus, Arkadiev (2018) suggests a gradual transition from resultative through statal passive to actional passive by means of adverbial extensions with temporal or instrumental meaning, or alternatively by intercalation of an inceptive verb, such as English ‘get’ or German ‘werden’. Such path of “dynamicization” (to use Arkadiev’s term) of resultative is instantiated in German, Baltic, and Slavic languages.

- (19) a. Gestern noch war dort ein Schild angebracht. (resultative)
 ‘Yesterday, a signboard was still attached there.’
 b. Gestern noch wurde dort ein Schild angebracht. (actional passive)
 ‘Only yesterday someone attached a signboard there.’

In the grammar of Coptic, the term ‘resultative’ is sometimes applied to the form known as ‘stative’.⁶⁹ The two notions are very close, indeed, yet with a difference between them which is most accurately described in Nedjalkov & Jaxontov (1988): “...The stative expresses a state of a thing without any implication of its origin, while the resultative expresses both a state and the preceding action it has resulted from.”⁷⁰

1.2 Transitivity in Coptic: previous research

The necessity to revise the notion of transitivity before applying it to the Coptic grammar is due to the remarkable lack of agreement on that issue among the linguists of Coptic. The disagreement stems not so much from different understanding of the observable linguistic data, as from the barely comparable ways of systematizing this data. Depending on the method of defining transitivity, the attempted approaches can be loosely divided into pure lexico-semantic (Steindorff, Till, Spiegelberg, recently Layton), formal syntactical (Crum, Jernstedt, Polotsky, Shisha-Halevy, Engsheden), diachronic-syntactical (Stern, recently Reintges), and formalized semantic ones (Grossmann). An important methodological distinction (not always explicitly stated) is whether transitivity is regarded as a property

67 Nedjalkov & Jaxontov (1988:45 ff.).

68 Nedjalkov & Jaxontov (1988:49).

69 See Reintges (2011), Haspelmath (2015b).

70 Nedjalkov & Jaxontov (1988:6).

of a verbal lexeme (as in Till, Layton, partly Polotsky) or as a property of a specific valency construction (Jernstedt 1986, Crum). Since none of the approaches has proven to be convincing enough, the valid definition of Coptic transitive pattern still remains a matter of personal preference, though in nearly all the recent work on the topic (Layton's Grammar excepted), the label of 'transitive' refers to the alternation of immediate object attachment and <N-/MMO=>-pattern. Below I shall briefly address the main difficulties that arise from applying the transitivity theory to Coptic.

1.2.1 Semantic equivalents to Indo-European transitive verbs use different valency patterns in Coptic

The lexico-semantic approach is characterized by the initial presupposition that transitivity is an inherent property of a verbal lexeme as a semantic unit. For the first authors of Coptic grammars, this idea was so self-evident that the usefulness of the notions 'direct object' or 'accusative' for Coptic was never questioned; moreover, these authors obviously did not see any need to theoretically justify the grammatical choices they made. The procedure of selecting transitive valency patterns thus consisted in determining semantically transitive verb classes and listing their valences. In this selection, the Coptologists seem to have been guided by their sense of language which was based on the transitive pattern distribution in their native European language, i.e., German or French.⁷¹ Since there is no one-to-one match between the inventory of the European transitives and the inventory of Coptic mutable or, broader, n-governing verbs (the most obvious difference being the verbs of perception which are mostly transitive in European languages, but immutable and e-governing in Coptic), the result of this selection was a set of 'accusative' prepositions, slightly different for each author. Thus, Steindorff relates the notion of the direct object (or 'accusative object') to the following three valency options:

- 1) Immediate object attachment pattern (henceforth IP) with the object immediately following one of the construct forms of the infinitive (*status constructus* or *status pronominalis*, respectively)
- 2) n- (MMO=) valency pattern
- 3) e- (εPO=) valency pattern⁷²

The last subgroup is further specified by Steindorff as containing verbs of sensual perception (ⲛⲁϣ 'see', ⲫⲱϣⲧ 'watch', Ⲭⲱⲧⲛ 'hear, listen', ⲩⲱⲗⲛ 'smell' etc.), verbs of speech (ⲙⲟϣⲧⲉ 'call', ⲫⲙⲟϣ 'bless', Ⲭⲁϣⲟϣ 'curse') and a group without any common semantic denominator (ⲕⲓⲙ 'move', ⲉⲓⲟϣⲉ 'hit', Ⲭⲣⲟ 'win', equivalent to German 'besiegen'). It is pretty obvious that this selection of transitive lexemes is conditioned not so much by Coptic grammatical facts, as by aligning Coptic verbal inventory to the grammar of German.

Till, in his 'Koptische Grammatik', applies the same method even more generously:

71 Cf. Jernstedt (1986:399).

72 Steindorff 1904:165-167

“Bei bestimmten Verben wird das direkte Objekt mittelst der Präposition ε-, ερο= bezeichnet. ... Manche Verba können das Objekt mit η- oder mit ε- bezeichnen... Seltener werden die Präpositionen ηα-/ ηαω= (wörtl. ‘nach’) und εα-/ εαρο= (wörtl. ‘unter’) verwendet, wo wir ein direktes Objekt haben.”⁷³

More recent treatises on transitivity, such as Layton’s grammar, abandon this intuitive method of grammatical assortment, but not the idea that transitivity is a semantic property of a verbal lexeme and goes beyond any specific valency pattern in Coptic. In particular, Layton suggests the following definition of a transitive lexeme:

“‘Transitive’ infinitives are those which at the speaker’s choice can be constructed so as to express action directed at a ‘direct object’, i.e., at a receiver or goal of action.”⁷⁴

Based on meaning alone, this definition clearly is not meant to make any distinctions between various two-argument valency patterns: there are few types of the second core argument that cannot be interpreted as a receiver or a goal of an action.⁷⁵ To illustrate his point, Layton provides examples of ‘transitive constructions’ with the prepositions η-, ε-, ηα-:

- (20) Matt. 2:11 ε-Υ-ηαΥ **ε-ΠΩΗΡΕ** ΩΗΗ... εΥ-ΟΥΩΝ **η-ηεγασωωρ**
 ‘They saw **the child**... They opened **their treasures**’
- (21) Matt. 2:13 εΗΡΩΔΗΣ ΓΑΡ ηα-ΩΗΗ **ηα-Π-ΩΗΡΕ** ΩΗΗ
 ‘Herod is about to search **for the child**’

Layton further states that “each transitive infinitive has its own particular preposition(s) that mark objects”, setting apart the sub-class of mutable infinitives that “under certain conditions” allow the direct object to be immediately suffixed to the infinitive instead of being mediated by a preposition. But equating in such a way transitivity with bivalency, Layton does not only deprive the notion of transitivity of any sense. He also commits a huge ‘oversmoothing’ of the Coptic valency and diathesis grammar ignoring such significant properties of η-governing verbs as the capacity for differential object marking and valency reduction.⁷⁶ (For instance, whereas ουονε εβολ can mean both ‘show’ and ‘appear’ and μοεε both ‘fill’ and ‘be filled’, it is impossible to find the verb εαρεε with the ‘guarded’ patient encoded as a subject, or ηαΥ as a predicate to something ‘seen’.) Hence, this method fully merits the reproach addressed by Jernstedt to its predecessors, namely

73 Till 1955:129-130

74 Layton (2004:127).

75 Eventually, such a broad definition would include even a recipient, which makes it *a priori* rather infelicitous.

76 On DOM in Coptic see Engsheden (2006), (2008), (2017). According to my observation (yet to be tested), the IP /η- (ηηω=)- valency pattern is the only valency pattern compatible with the zero-article of the *nomen rectum*.

that being useful for didactic purposes, they still should be discarded as blurring important grammatical distinctions and preventing any meaningful systematization of data.⁷⁷

Condemning the purely semantic view on the issue of transitive valency as dysfunctional in terms of grammatical description, Jernstedt, in his ‘Study on Verbal Government’, advocates a more formal approach⁷⁸. He supports his choice of the pattern with the following criteria: the syntactic parallelism between the <N-/MMO=>-pattern and Indo-European accusative patterns, the relative frequency of this pattern compared to other argument structure patterns of Coptic and, finally, its analogy to the direct object pattern in Semitic languages where one observes a similar alternation between the immediate and the prepositional object attachment through the ‘*nota accusativi*’.⁷⁹ Probably for reasons related to scientific communication problems, Jernstedt’s arguments never became widely known or followed.

1.2.2 No uniform morphosyntactic passive in Coptic

As mentioned in 1.1, a significant trait of transitive verb usually is its markedness for voice. Voice is usually defined as an inflectional category that changes the diathesis of a verb without changing its propositional meaning⁸⁰. More specifically, by means of a morphological alternation, passive voice allows to change the syntactic representation of semantic actants, so that *patiens* acquires grammatical characteristics of the subject, while *agens* is demoted to the position of an oblique object. Thus, logically, passivization should not bring any changes to such properties of the denoted action, as its aspect or tense:

- (22) a. The mourners have brought Mugabe’s body home.
 b. Mugabe’s body has been brought home by the mourners.
 c. The parents are beating the child.
 d. The child is being beaten by the parents.

In Coptic, as stated by Shisha-Halevy,⁸¹ there exists no single, unambiguous, and regular passive construction. The closest equivalent is the impersonal passive construction with a non-referential 3rd plural subject $\lambda\text{-}\gamma\text{-}\text{c}\text{o}\text{t}\text{t}\text{i}=\text{q}$ ‘he was chosen’ (lit., “they have chosen

77 Cf Jernstedt (1986:399): “Obviously, this kind of terminology is possible only as long, as the author aims at writing a practical grammar, not having the least intention of undertaking a thorough investigation which would most probably free him from the elementary biases and change his whole approach to the issue.” (Translation- N.S.)

78 Jernstedt (1986: 398-399): “When defining the notion of the direct complement (object) in Coptic, I think it advisable to be guided almost exclusively by purely formal criteria, since the semantic criterion is too broad to define any such specific content of the term, as could be conveniently used in research. Judging by semantics alone, it would be equally justified to apply the term “direct object” not only to the above-mentioned <N-/MMO=>, but also to the <e-/epo=> and several other prepositional phrases. For both MMO= and epo= imply a similar mode of the object’s affectedness by the action” (translation – N.S.).

79 Jernstedt (1986:400).

80 As, e.g., in Geniušienė (2006:31).

81 Shisha-Halevy (1986:107, § 3.0.1.1).

him”), with or without the prepositional phrase εβολ ζιτην-, introducing the agent. But whereas semantically this construction resembles the canonical European passive clauses (the agent can be demoted, and the patient topicalized), the surface structure of the verbal phrase is identical to that of a regular active predicate in the respective tense / modus. Moreover, being syntactically active, the impersonal construction is not distinctive of the transitive pattern, but can be used with any non-monadic verb, e.g.,

(23) Shen.Can. 6, Leipoldt (1954:43, 5)

εΥΡ ΜΗΤΡΕ ΖΑΡΟΥ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΙΤΗ ΝΕΤΟΥΗΖ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΖΗ ΝΕΙΣΥΝΑΓΩΓΗ
 ‘Him being witnessed by all who gathered in these synagogues...’

Finally, neither the use of the agentive complement, which otherwise may denote a source or an instrument, nor obviously the use of 3rd plural subject is confined to the impersonal passive construction. On the above grounds, Shisha-Halevy claims the impersonal construction to be “a passive-surrogate” or translation equivalent, not a true passive transform”.⁸² Largely the same view is held by Layton⁸³ and Reintges⁸⁴. Importantly, the semantic bleaching of the formal pronominal subject shows that the construction underwent a certain degree of grammaticalization, which is all the more obvious, when the clause contains both the subject and the agentive prepositional phrase. Yet, it principally differs from the canonical passive in that it does not change the diathesis of the core verb.

Another Coptic passive equivalent is stative, a verbal form confined to the durative conjugation. As observed in Reintges (2004), this form is close in meaning to English adjectival passives which name a state or condition without necessarily implying an agent,⁸⁵ as in ‘*the air in the room was stuffed*’. In Nedjalkov’s terms, this state can be either primary, or secondary, i.e., conceived as a result of a previous event. The first meaning is typical for the statives of intransitive verbs, such as *cpqe* ‘be at leisure’⁸⁶:

82 Shisha-Halevy 1986:106, footnote 6.

83 Layton (2011:135-136, §175).

84 Reintges (2004:226).

85 Reintges (2004:228).

86 Such primary states (and not resultatives) are also the statives of the verbs of motion. This is explicitly stated in Polotsky (1957: 230): “... bei den Verben der Bewegung bezeichnet das Qualitativ keineswegs den erreichten Zustand, sondern die im Vollzug, im Fortgang, befindliche Bewegung. Es bedeutet also ‘ἴβηκ’ ‘ich gehe’, nicht etwa ‘ich bin weggegangen und (schon) fort’; ἴβηγ ‘ich falle, πίπτω’... nicht ‘ich bin gefallen und liege da, πέπτωκα’”. Common for primary and secondary states, i.e., for statives and resultatives is the non-terminative time schema (in Vendler’s terms). The difference is that resultative implies an already terminated action, while stative presents the action itself as non-terminative: 2Sam 3:29 *αγω ερε και ναι ερραι εζη ταπε νιαβ ... ηφτενωζην εβολ ζη πηι νιαβ εφχαρη αγω εφσβε εφμαρητε νογογρας αγω εφρηγ ζη τσηε αγω εφρρωρ νοεικ*
κατατησάτωσαν ἐπὶ κεφαλὴν Ἰωαβ ... καὶ μὴ ἐκλίποι ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου Ἰωαβ γονορρυῆς καὶ λεπρὸς καὶ κρατῶν σκυτάλης καὶ πίπτων ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ καὶ ἐλασσούμενος ἄρτοις
 “May it fall upon the head of Joab ..., and may the house of Joab never be without one who has a discharge or who is leprous or who holds a spindle or **who falls** by the sword or who lacks bread!”

(24) Exod 5:8

αγω ταπς ντωβε ετηπ εβαγταμιος εβαγταμιος μμηνε εκενοχς ερραι εκωου
 ννεκφι λααγ εβολ νρητογ **σβσροϣτ** γαρ
 και την σύνταξιν της πλινθείας, ἥς αὐτοὶ ποιοῦσιν καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν, ἐπιβαλεῖς
 αὐτοῖς, οὐκ ἀφελεῖς οὐδέν· **σχολλάζουσιν** γάρ·
*'But the number of bricks that they made in the past you shall impose on them, you
 shall by no means reduce it, for **they are idle**.'*

Transitive verbs, such as τάλσο 'heal', on the contrary, often yield a resultative reading in stative:

(25) Matt. 15:31

εγναγ ενσαλε εγμοουε μη νσαναζ εγταλσηγ
'When they saw the mute speaking, the crippled healthy (lit.: healed)'

In 1.1.4, it has been shown that the functions of objective resultative and stative passive partly overlap. Yet, the question whether the Coptic stative must be termed a passive form, is not uncontroversial for Coptologists. For Till, the aspectual limitation of this form was an argument against equating it with passive, since in his opinion, only eventive forms are passive. In his review of Till's Coptic grammar, Polotsky considers this argument invalid and claims that the stative of transitive verbs is to be regarded as a passive form on account of the diathetic shift between this form and the corresponding infinitive:

"Bei transitiven Verben... hat das Qualitativ regelmäßig das reale Patiens, also das
 Objekt des Infinitivs, zum Subjekt, und bezeichnet den Zustand, in dem sich das reale
 Patiens nach Erleidung (*passio*) der durch den Infinitiv bezeichneten Handlung befin-
 det. In solchen Fällen von "Passiv" zu reden, entspricht herkömmlichem Sprachge-
 brauch..."⁸⁷

We should, however, stand up for Till here. Since the set of verbal participants does not change with the change in diathesis, one basic symptom of passive is the principal compatibility with an agentive phrase. However, a stative predicate with an agentive phrase <εβολ ριτῖ + Noun / Pronoun> are rather an exception. There are two such examples in the Old Testament (Psalm 37:13, Isaiah 51:20), and three (two of them identical) in the New Testament (Luke 6:18 = Acts 5:16, Romans 13:3). I managed to find only one clause of this type in the corpus of Shenoute's Canons:

(26) Shen.Can. 1, 21(1), YG 129:1⁸⁸

ται τε θε ετῆναραμε εχ **νητconε** ἵτοοτῆ εβολ ριτοτογ ἡμιν ἡμογγ
*'... thus will she rejoice on behalf of those **who are bound** to her through their own
 effort...'*

Moreover, even in this unique example, the sense of the prepositional phrase hovers on the border between agent, instrument, and source, so that the passive reading is not mandatory.

87 Polotsky (1957:230).

88 Funk (unpublished).

In other cases, Shenoute avoids using <stative + agentive PP> structure altogether; instead, in order to de-topicalize the agent of a durative predicate, he resorts to the impersonal passive pattern discussed above:

- (27) Shen.Can. 9, Leipoldt (1954:94, 18)
 πετωροϣρ δε **νηετογκωτ ημοου εβολ ζιτη ιϥ** εφωροϣρ ητεφϣϣη
 ‘*He who destroys **what has been built by Jesus**, destroys his soul*’
- (28) Shen.Can. 4, Leipoldt (1955:171, 11)
εγμε ημοου εβολ ζιτη ηρωμε ναττωτη
 ‘...*it is by disobedient people that **they are loved***’

Thus, passive stative constructions with animate agents seem to be barely acceptable in the biblical language and even less so in Shenoutean Coptic.

Finally, Till’s idea of the overall function of stative does not deserve to be discarded lightly. Establishing a state-to-process relation between a stative and its infinitive, instead of a passive-to-active one,⁸⁹ Till creates a holistic concept of the morphological class of statives, a concept that accounts for the fact that the set of verbs with attested stative forms comprises intransitive monadic verbs, unaccusative, as well as unergative (κιννε ‘become fat’, αϣαλ ‘be multiplied’, πωζ ‘reach’, ωνζ ‘live’, βωκ ‘go’), and transitive verbs with alternating diathesis, i.e., verbs whose infinitive may have a causative, as well as a non-causative meaning (οϣωνζ ‘show / appear’, μογζ ‘fill / be filled’). At the same time, for many, if not for most of non-alternating transitive verbs, e.g., ϣι ‘bear’, κοϣην ‘know’, τωμε ‘bury’, a stative form is not attested, or is attested very poorly. So, even though the transitive infinitive of an alternating verb is diathetically opposed to its stative, it would be hardly justified to regard stative as a regular passive formation.

1.2.3 Verbal lexemes of the mutable class have both transitive and non-causative meaning

The most serious difficulty in establishing the category of transitivity in Coptic arises from the fact that the most part of the Coptic absolute infinitives are neutral in terms of *causative: non-causative* opposition, which means that one and the same <C¹ōC²C³>-form can code both transitive and intransitive meaning. This property, though not covering the whole of the mutable class (so, for instance, μηϣε ‘to fight’ will never be used non-causatively as ‘to be fought against’ or κοβτε ‘to prepare’ as ‘to be prepared’) is typical for roughly 70% of the Coptic verbal inventory. Steindorff attributes this feature to the originally nominal character of the absolute infinitive:

“Als Nominalform bezeichnet der Infinitiv kein bestimmtes Genus des Verbums, weder Aktivum, noch Passivum. οϣωνζ bedeutet z.B. “öffnen” und “geöffnet sein”, μηϣε “schlagen” und “geschlagen werden”. In dieser Weise wird der Infinitiv bei den meisten transitiven Verben in aktivischer und passivischer Bedeutung gebraucht.”⁹⁰

⁸⁹ Till (1955:257).

⁹⁰ Steindorff 1904:92

The same observation (though without the reference to the nominal character of the infinitive) may be found in the works of Till, Polotsky, Grossman.⁹¹ The diathetic neutrality of Coptic infinitives led Till to claim that the distinction between transitive and intransitive is “completely foreign to Egyptian affecting only the translation”.⁹² However, Funk in his survey of Coptic diathesis points out that Coptic grammatical mechanisms are perfectly able to perform the universal diathetic distinctions, such as the distinction between anticausative (ⲁⲓⲣⲟⲡⲓ ⲉⲛ ⲟⲩⲕⲗⲟⲟⲗⲉ ‘he hid in a cloud’), passive (ⲁⲓⲣⲟⲡⲓ ⲉⲛ ⲟⲩⲕⲗⲟⲟⲗⲉ ‘he was hidden in a cloud’), reflexive (ⲁⲓⲣⲟⲡⲓ ⲉⲛ ⲟⲩⲕⲗⲟⲟⲗⲉ ‘he hid himself in a cloud’) and resultative (ⲡⲉⲛⲓⲡⲓ ⲉⲛ ⲟⲩⲕⲗⲟⲟⲗⲉ ‘he is hidden in a cloud’) usages⁹³ which indicates a developed morphosyntactic diathesis-marking system. To combine the premise that each verbal lexeme is a bearer of an inherent (in)transitivity with the diathetic flexibility of most Coptic verbal lexemes, Funk suggests that in each pair of *non-causative*: *causative* homonyms, the causative counterpart is derived from the non-causative one by means of a zero causative element.⁹⁴ Thus, ‘*pōrč*’ in *a-f pōrč mmo* = ‘he divided (something)’ or *a-u porč-f* ‘he was divided’ stands in derivational relationship to ‘*pōrč*’ in *a-f pōrč* ‘he was divided’. This zero-derivation, according to Funk, would be parallel to overtly formed contrastive patterns of denominal verbs derived by means of ⲧ and ⲗⲓ, respectively.

In the more recent research, the above-discussed diathetic flexibility of Coptic absolute infinitives is ascribed to the phenomenon of *lability*⁹⁵ defined as the property of a verb to show valency alternation without any formal change.⁹⁶ The relative merits of both explanatory models, the derivational one and the monolexemic one, will be discussed below.

1.2.4 ⲛ-/ⲙⲙⲟ=: question of identity

The prepositional phrase <ⲛ-/ⲙⲙⲟ=> stands apart from the rest of prepositional verb expansions being the only prepositional phrase to regularly alternate with the immediate object attachment pattern (IP). But whereas it is most often considered to be a functional equivalent of the IP, the distributional differences between these two constructions suggest that they are not necessarily to be subsumed under the same valency pattern. The distributional properties of the two constructions can be briefly sketched as follows:

91 Till (1955:122-123): “der Infinitiv im Koptischen ... einfach die Handlung als solche bezeichnet ohne Rücksicht darauf, ob sie vom Standpunkt des Handelnden (Subjekt) = aktiv, oder vom Standpunkt des Behandelnden (Objekt) = passiv betrachtet wird”. Polotsky (1960:230): “... richtige Wahrnehmung, dass die Transitivität nicht am Infinitiv-Schema C¹ⲟC²C³ haftet”. Grossman 2019:108: “Valency-reduction in Coptic is mostly marked via labile verbs, verbs that participate in alternations in which “the same verb is used both in the inchoative and in the causative sense” [without any formal change]... Coptic allows both A-preserving and P-preserving lability.”

92 Till (1955:123-124): “diese Unterscheidung ist dem Ägyptischen vollkommen fremd; sie wirkt sich nur in der Übersetzung aus.”

93 Funk (1978b:121).

94 Ibid.

95 Emmel (2006), Grossman (2019).

96 See 1.1.4.

- a) The immediate pattern is usually the one more frequent in the non-durative conjugation;⁹⁷ my (not yet statistically verified) impression is that IP is also the prevailing construction for the imperative of the native Coptic verbs;
- b) together, the immediate and the mediated constructions constitute a mechanism of *differential object marking* inside the non-durative conjugation which in some way correlates with the information packaging in the clause. According to Engsheden, high referentiality and thematicity of the object promotes the use of the mediated construction.⁹⁸ This (not too strict) interdependence is realized only in the non-durative conjugation, and only with native verbs: Greek verbal lexemes lack construct forms and cannot participate in the mediated / immediate alternation;⁹⁹
- c) On the contrary, in the durative conjugation, <N-/MMO=> is almost the only possible allomorph for a direct object construction. The only exception¹⁰⁰ is a zero-determined object without a possessive suffix, i.e., the lowest specificity-grade object. This compatibility restriction is known in Coptology as ‘Stern-Jernstedt rule’.

In the linguistic treatment of the prepositional pattern, one can often observe a mixture of synchronic and diachronic considerations. Thus, for Shisha-Halevy, this pattern is “on the one hand, a direct-object marker after transitives under given conditions, yet on the other hand an “adverbial”, i.e. modifier signal... and is thus in fact an ‘onset’ of the ‘indirect’ object as rection of transitives.”¹⁰¹ According to Stern (who calls it a ‘verbal genitive construction’¹⁰²), Schenkel¹⁰³ and Reintges¹⁰⁴, the use of the genitive preposition is conditioned by the originally nominal or adverbial (for Schenkel) character of the durative infinitive. Both Schenkel and Reintges attempt to demonstrate that the use of the prepositional DO-pattern implies also slight semantic deviations from the sense coded by the IP. According to Schenkel,

“[a]ls charakteristisch für Verbaladverbien ist anzusehen, daß sie keine verbale Rektion besitzen... Die mit N-/MMO= eingeleiteten Ersatzkonstruktionen sind nicht als Präpositionalobjekte einzuschätzen, vielmehr als “freie” adverbiale Bestimmungen, die

97 The respective numbers of IP: PrepP for several test verbs in the biblical text are: $\mu\omicron\gamma\zeta$ ‘fill’: 70:16; $\pi\omega\rho\omega$ ‘spread’: 23:23; $\omega\pi\tau$ ‘count’: 69:10; $\omicron\gamma\omega\mu\zeta$ $\epsilon\beta\omicron\lambda$ ‘show’: 68: 44; $\tau\alpha\kappa\omicron$ ‘corrupt, destroy’: 169:101. Appreciating these figures, one has to consider that according to Jernstedt, the use of <N-/MMO=> in the non-durative conjugation is more widespread in the Bible translations, than elsewhere in Sahidic, which suggests a Greek influence (Jernstedt 1986:441).

98 Engsheden (2008:34).

99 See Engsheden (2008:24) for other exceptions.

100 Apart from some very specific lexical cases, such as indefinite and interrogative pronomina ($\omicron\gamma$ ‘what’, $\zeta\alpha\zeta$ ‘many’ etc.), complements of the verb $\omicron\gamma\omega\mu\zeta$ ‘to wish’ and a few other cases.

101 Shisha-Halevy (1986:107).

102 Stern (1880:312).

103 Schenkel (1978).

104 E.g., in Reintges (1995:195).

nicht in der Rektion des Verbs gesetzt sind. Ein † ⲭⲟ ⲙⲙⲟϥ ist nicht als “ich sage es” zu analysieren, sondern, approximativ paraphrasiert, als “ich sage – mit dem Inhalt Es.”¹⁰⁵

This interpretation looks arbitrary. Seeing that ⲭⲟ ⲙⲙⲟϥ is a mandatory durative equivalent of the non-durative ⲭⲟⲟϥ, it is hardly reasonable to analyze the first verbal expansion as an adverbial modifier, and the second one as a direct object. Moreover, since this ‘free adverbial modifier’ cannot, in fact, be omitted without turning the clause unfinished or ungrammatical, it is simply wrong to call it a ‘free modifier’. It is clearly a part of the argument structure of the verbal lexeme, which corroborates Polotsky’s statement that “within the framework of Coptic, there is nothing ‘adverbial’ about the predicative Infinitive and the Qualitative”.¹⁰⁶

Reintges, in his turn, draws an analogy between the opposition <IP: ⲛ-/ⲙⲙⲟ=phrase> in Coptic and that of <accusative: partitive case> in Finnish:

“In Finnish as well as in Coptic, a verb phrase with an accusative Case-marked object imposes a bound event reading on the entire clause, while an unbound event reading is obtained when the direct object is assigned oblique Case.”¹⁰⁷

Now, applied to Coptic, this precise wording suggests that in a contrastive environment which can only be the non-durative conjugation, the two different valency patterns yield the above difference in meaning. That contradicts Coptic data, since the boundedness / unboundedness of the verbal event is coded in the conjugation base, and not imposed by the object; the choice of this or the other object attachment construction has no impact on the aspectual characteristics of a non-durative clause. But it is nevertheless true that the oblique pattern being obligatory in the durative conjugation and the IP basically excluded of it, one may speak of a high correlation between the valency pattern and the aspectual type of the event. This, and the almost 100%-coinciding lexemic distribution¹⁰⁸ between the two patterns is a strong argument in favor of regarding them as allomorphs of one direct object supermorpheme, as Jernstedt does.

1.2.5 No transitivity in Coptic?

In view of all the above difficulties, it is easy to understand that for Coptic, the notion of transitivity remains, if possible, even more problematic than for the general theoretical linguistics. In two of the more recent studies, Shisha-Halevy and Emmel opt for abandoning this notion altogether, when dealing with the Coptic verbal system. An alternative approach proposed by Shisha-Halevy in his ‘Coptic Grammatical Categories’ suggests describing each verbal lexeme in terms of its obligatory valency to obtain classes of uni-, bi- and trivalent verbs. Under such approach, a lexeme compatible with various valency

105 Schenkel (1978:15).

106 Polotsky (1960:395).

107 Reintges (2001: 185).

108 Except in very few cases where the absolute form of a mutable verb has other valency (kōmš nsa-). Cf. Jernstedt 459.

patterns (e.g., εἶπε Ν- ‘make’ vs. εἶπε Ν- Ν- ‘make into’) is treated as a conglomerate of homonyms, and the task of elaborating the verbal system is basically reduced to making out an exhaustive list of all such homonyms with all the possible valency patterns.¹⁰⁹

In a similar fashion, the analysis of various valency patterns of the verb ⲥⲟⲩⲧⲙ and its allomorphs brings Emmel to the conclusion that “the phenomena that fall under the heading ‘transitivity’ are far too complex...to warrant using the traditional transitive/intransitive dichotomy as a category for dividing all Coptic verbs into two large groups.”¹¹⁰ According to Emmel, the transitivity terminology should not be applied to Coptic, except for the purpose of making cross-references to other languages¹¹¹. At the same time, he remarks that if Coptologists had to resort to making an “extensive and precise valency listing of all verb lexemes” instead of categorizing and describing valency as a system, such a list would not prove either descriptively adequate, or very elegant.¹¹² It would actually obfuscate verbal system regularities that are crucial for our understanding of Coptic.

1.3 Transitivity in Coptic: Systemic view

1.3.1 Redefining the transitive pattern

On theoretical grounds whose validity I tried to demonstrate in the section 1.1, a transitive pattern in a language is the one characterized by all or most of the following properties:

- 1) It denotes no specific semantic relation of the second argument to the verb (such as recipient, goal, benefactive, source etc.)
- 2) It correlates with the second argument’s individuation features (such as definiteness, specificity, personal reference)
- 3) It correlates with the tense-aspect-modus categories
- 4) It may be subject to valency reduction, where either the first, or the second argument is demoted; this alternation may or may not be morphologically marked
- 5) It is particularly frequent and productive compared to other bivalent patterns
- 6) It most probably coincides with the valency pattern of the verb ‘break’ in its active diathesis

Such configuration of symptoms permits us: a) to establish beyond doubt that transitivity is a working grammatical category in Coptic; b) to unequivocally define the transitive valency pattern as the alternation of the immediate pattern with the Ν-/ΜΜΟ=prepositional phrase. The relevance of (2), (3), (4) and (6) for this pattern needs no further comment. As for its frequency, a rough count based on the examination of the entire verb inventory in Crum’s Dictionary reveals that the class of verbs employing the IP/ Ν-/ΜΜΟ=alternation

109 Cf. Shisha-Halevy 1986:108

110 Emmel 2006:52

111 Ibid.

112 Ibid.

comprises some 70% of the verbs of Egyptian origin.¹¹³ For Greek loan verbs, this percentage is much lower, only about 30%, but still significant. Finally, as far as the semantics of the pattern is concerned, the data allows two ways of interpretation. In Shisha-Halevy's opinion, obligatory (or rectional) expansions of the verb have no proper meaning, but contribute to the overall meaning of the verbal syntagm. For instance, "the preposition ϵ - when non-commutable – i.e. after $\kappa\alpha\gamma$ or $\rho\alpha\rho\epsilon\zeta$ – is as rectional, as devoid of meaning, as $\eta/\mu\mu\omega=$ or the immediate object-construction $\sigma\epsilon\tau\tau\eta/-\sigma\omicron\tau\tau\eta=$ ".¹¹⁴ On the other hand, the verbs compatible with ϵ -/ $\epsilon\rho\omega=$ belong to a limited number of semantic classes compared to those compatible with $\eta/\mu\mu\omega=$. According to Zakrzewska, the marker ϵ -/ $\epsilon\rho\omega=$ "is preferably employed for the second argument... with the verbs of perception and cognition, characterized by low agency of the referent of the first argument, verbs denoting performative acts which demand a certain amount of instigation on the part of the referent of the second argument and verbs denoting either superficial affectedness or affectedness pertaining to that referent's sphere of influence."¹¹⁵ The possibility of such delineation for ϵ -/ $\epsilon\rho\omega=$ means that $\eta/\mu\mu\omega=$ (expanding, as previously mentioned, the most part of the verbal lexicon) imposes fewer restrictions on the semantics of its verbal head (or, in Borer's view which seems to be exceptionally appropriate for Coptic, its verbal modifier¹¹⁶) than ϵ -/ $\epsilon\rho\omega=$, i.e. is basically far more semantically loose.

1.3.2 Transitivity as a parameter of the conjugation patterns

1.3.2.1 Aspect-Diathesis Grid

The inner mechanism of direct object attachment in Coptic is defined by two rules, the Stern-Jernstedt rule (briefly referred to in 1.2.4) and the rule of the distribution of stative forms. Though the Stern-Jernstedt rule is sometimes taken to relate solely to the definiteness / animacy / specificity of the object¹¹⁷, Jernstedt's own phrasing emphasizes not only the individuation features of the object, but also the distributional properties of verbal forms:

113 According to my calculations, the exact numbers are 590 transitive verbs to 266 intransitives or reflexives, i.e. 68,9 %. The examination included only such lexemes whose meaning is not marked by Crum as unknown. This is, of course, a very rough evaluation mixing up the data of different dialects, periods and genres. Thus, impressionistically, Bohairic seems to have gone furthest in the direction of replacing the transitive pattern with other valency patterns, predominantly with the prepositional phrase ϵ -/ $\epsilon\rho\omega=$ (the issue of ϵ - gradually superseding η - as a DO-marker is explored in Lincke 2018). For simplicity's sake, I disregard the fact that Coptic valency patterns are not completely rigid (e.g., $\sigma\omega\tau\eta$ 'to hear, listen' can use both the IP and the ϵ -/ $\epsilon\rho\omega=$ -pattern, $\sigma\omega\beta\epsilon$ 'to laugh at' uses ϵ -/ $\epsilon\rho\omega=$, $\langle\epsilon\chi\eta- / \epsilon\chi\omega=\rangle$ and $\langle\kappa\alpha\lambda- / \kappa\omega=\rangle$ -patterns with no observable difference in the meaning). The statistics here thus shows only the percentage of verbs that are compatible with the transitive pattern.

114 Shisha-Halevy (1986:108).

115 Zakrzewska (2017b: 230).

116 Borer (2005: 9).

117 So, e.g., in Winand (2015:534).

“... In the system of present tenses, the verb is never used in *status pronominalis*, while *status constructus* is permitted only with undetermined common nouns and undetermined pronouns (among them the demonstratives).”¹¹⁸

With some approximation, one can state that both construct forms are reserved for the eventive conjugation. Stative, on the other hand, is acceptable only in the durative pattern¹¹⁹. That means that of the four verbal morphs, three are marked for aspect: the construct forms are punctual/ eventive¹²⁰, whereas the stative is durative.

Another characteristic trait of these forms, also so trivial that it has been never to my knowledge taken into account, is their diathetic markedness. Indeed, both forms marked for non-durative aspect (*status constructus* and *status pronominalis*) are also necessarily transitive. Moreover, since one of them is reserved for substantival and the other for pronominal arguments, together they would suffice to exhaust the transitive valency of the verb covering the whole field of possible nominal arguments. Vice versa, the durative form (stative) is always intransitive.

This aspect-diathesis clustering is crucial for the Coptic verbal system, since it reveals an additional dimension in the grammatical opposition of *non-durative: durative* conjugation, the dimension of diathesis. Indeed, the absolute infinitive in the Tripartite conjugation is opposed to (and possibly stands in a complimentary distribution with) the transitive verbal forms. On the other hand, in the Bipartite, it contrasts with a characteristically intransitive form. It therefore stands to reason that the two absolute infinitives – that of the non-durative and that of the durative conjugation – do not have an identical function in the system. Even if liable to labile usage, an absolute form will primarily occupy the empty niche in the diathetic lattice. Thus, the present analysis of the properties of marked verbal forms predicts that in the Tripartite conjugation base, an absolute infinitive will mostly have a non-causative meaning, whereas in the Bipartite, it will rather be used causatively.

Table 1 | Aspectual-diathetic distribution of verbal morphs

Diathesis	Eventive (Tripartite) Conjugation	Durative (Bipartite) Conjugation
TRANSITIVE	STATUS CONSTRUCTUS STATUS PRONOMINALIS	STATUS ABSOLUTUS
INTRANSITIVE	STATUS ABSOLUTUS	STATIVE

1.3.2.2 Durative intransitive infinitive: a ghost form

As already discussed in 1.2.3, the majority of verbal lexemes in the transitive class can code the transitive-causative, as well as the non-causative meaning, seemingly just depending on the physical presence of the object. However, at least, as regards the inventory of native Coptic verbs, this general statement can be accepted as true with two caveats: of

118 Jernstedt (1986:390, translation – N.S.).

119 See Funk (1978a) for the explanations of possible exceptions.

120 With the exception of the *status constructus* combined with \emptyset -object which is aspectually neutral.

However, Polotsky admits that verbs of motion may not be the only class displaying such idiosyncrasy:

“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... With many intransitive verbs, like $\xi\kappa\omicron$ “to be hungry” and $\epsilon\iota\beta\epsilon$ “to be thirsty” the Infinitive is hardly found in the Bipartite Pattern.¹²⁵”

As for the verbs of motion, this verb class constitutes, indeed, the most conspicuous instance of the principle discovered by Stern and Jernstedt, because the stative form in this case denotes an action in progress,¹²⁶ the meaning supposed to be rendered by infinitive:

“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.”¹²⁷

Rather surprisingly, the key words in this formula are “in so far”. Although some verbs do, indeed, display the contrast in aspect (progressive vs. stative) indicated by Polotsky, such cases are too infrequent to form a notion of a consistent grammatical opposition. Stative may effectively capture the meaning of an ongoing process, as can be seen in the verbs of motion, as well as in many others:

(29) Ps 24:15

$\epsilon\pi\epsilon\lambda\alpha\beta\alpha\lambda\ \epsilon\iota\omicron\rho\mu\ \eta\omicron\gamma\omicron\epsilon\iota\alpha\ \eta\eta\mu\ \epsilon\pi\chi\omicron\epsilon\iota\varsigma$

οἱ ὀφθαλμοί μου διὰ παντὸς πρὸς τὸν κύριον

‘My eyes are ever toward the Lord’ (Coptic, lit.: *‘my eyes are forever looking at the Lord’*)

Specific semantic conditions triggering the use of both forms for a non-causative durative meaning will be explored in 1.3.3.1. We should observe, however, that the notion ‘action in progress’ can be rather misleading, making one look at Coptic through the tenets of the European grammar. As far as it means nothing other than a continuing process, it will be treated in the Coptic verbal system not as an action, but as a state of being engaged in an action, i.e., will be expressed by a stative. The above misapprehension is the possible source of fallacy one finds in Layton’s definition of the opposition between intransitive infinitive and stative in the durative conjugation. Layton claims that apart from some five verbs of motion, “the stative describes the enduring state of the subject after some process has come to an end or some quality has been acquired, $\sigma\epsilon\text{-}\omega\gamma\omega\omega\gamma$ “They are dry”, and the infinitive expresses enduring, ongoing, or general process or entry into a state, $\sigma\epsilon\text{-}\omega\sigma\omega\gamma\epsilon$ “They are becoming dry, they dry out”.¹²⁸ Thus, according to Layton, Coptic stative

125 Polotsky (1960: 396-397).

126 Ibid.

127 Polotsky (1960: 396, §9).

128 Layton (2011:236-237).

has predominantly a resultative reading, which is too rough an approximation. On the other hand, an ‘enduring, ongoing, or general process’, from the point of view of Coptic grammar, is a state. So, the semantic distinction denoted by Layton seems to be illusory.

To sum up, the observations made by Stern, Jernstedt and Polotsky suggest the following restrictions on the use of the absolute form in the durative tenses: with alternating verbs, apart from a relatively small number of exceptions, this form has a causative meaning and stands in a transitive construction. With non-alternating intransitive verbs, the absolute form is nearly always¹²⁹ excluded, making stative the only verbal form compatible with the durative tenses. Thus, for transitive verbs, the opposition <infinitive : stative> is in the first place an opposition of diathesis, while with intransitives, this opposition is most often suppressed,¹³⁰ or at least, does not have a consistent grammatical meaning.

1.3.3 Tense-base / Morphology / Diathesis distribution: sample statistic from Sahidic

I shall now proceed to check the above statements against the data of two large text corpora, namely, Shenoute’s Canons as represented in Funk (unpublished) and the Bible. The test is conducted on a small sample of verbs, all meeting one basic requirement: the verb must appear in the corpora, at least, in the forms of absolute infinitive and stative. Now, based on the criteria of valency and transitivity, the Coptic verbal inventory can be divided into four groups: ‘strong transitive’ verbs which do not have any form with a non-causative meaning (e.g., $\chi\iota$ ‘take’); unergative verbs with non-transitive valency (e.g., $\epsilon\alpha\pi\epsilon\zeta$ ‘guard, preserve’); unaccusatives (e.g., $\mu\omicron\gamma\eta\iota$ $\epsilon\beta\omicron\lambda$ ‘remain’)¹³¹; finally, verbs displaying labile alternation pattern (e.g., $\tau\alpha\kappa\omicron$ ‘destroy / be destroyed’). Being semantically unalterable and having either a functionally limited stative or no stative at all¹³², the verbs of the first two groups turn out to be irrelevant for the study of interdependencies between tense patterns and diathesis. The mechanisms of valency reduction for these verbs seem to be impersonal passive or reflexive construction. On the other hand, unaccusative verbs possess statives; therefore, a contrastive analysis of their stative vs. durative infinitive should reveal the aspectual distinction suggested in Layton (2000), if indeed such distinction is manifested grammatically. The group of unaccusatives is represented in the sample by the following

129 The exceptions are discussed in detail in 1.3.4.6 and 1.3.4.7.

130 See Shisha-Halevy (1986:106, fn.4).

131 Interestingly, my classification does not match the similar one presented in Reintges (2004:228-230). In particular, the class of verbs that I take to be unaccusatives is called ‘variable behavior verbs’ by Reintges who comments that “in the absolute state, they behave semantically as unergative verbs with agentive subjects. In the corresponding stative, variable behavior verbs behave more like unaccusatives, because the subject receives a non-agentive interpretation as the holder of some state or condition.” (Reintges 2004:229-230). Now, to estimate the contrast between eventive and stative forms as a contrast between unergative and unaccusative subject linking seems to be an interpretation profoundly influenced by the desire to explain the formal opposition at whatever price. It is difficult to agree, e.g., that a referent that remained or will remain has some other semantic role than the one that remains.

132 Thus, for instance, the stative of $\chi\iota$ ($\chi\eta\gamma$) occurs in the Bible only as a part of fixed lexical units, $\chi\eta\gamma$ $\eta\beta\omicron\upsilon\iota\varsigma$ ‘the oppressed ones’ and $\chi\eta\gamma$ $\eta\kappa\omicron\tau\iota\varsigma$ ‘perverse’ (Psalms 102:6, 145:7, Proverbs 2:15, 8:8, Sirach 32:12). In Shenoute’s Canons this form is not used, at all.

verbs: $\omega\eta\zeta$ ‘live’, $\pi\omega\zeta$ ‘reach’, $\epsilon\rho\eta\epsilon$ ‘be at leisure’, $\rho\omega\tau$ ‘grow, sprout’, $\kappa\eta\eta\epsilon$ ‘grow fat’, $\lambda\alpha\delta\alpha\iota$ ‘multiply’, $\mu\omicron\gamma\eta\iota$ $\epsilon\beta\omicron\lambda$ ‘remain’. The group of labile verbs allows for multiple comparisons: non-durative vs. durative absolute infinitive, non-durative transitive vs. non-durative intransitive infinitive, durative intransitive infinitive vs. stative. Included in the sample are labile verbs with a relatively high degree of frequency, such as $\mu\omicron\gamma\zeta$ ‘fill out / be filled out’, $\pi\omega\rho\omega$ ‘spread’, $\pi\omega\zeta$ ‘divide / be divided, burst out’, $\omega\pi\iota$ ‘count / to be counted’, $\omicron\gamma\omega\eta\zeta$ $\epsilon\beta\omicron\lambda$ ‘show / appear’, $\tau\alpha\kappa\omicron$ ‘destroy / be destroyed’, $\rho\omega\kappa\zeta$ ‘incinerate / burn’, $\tau\alpha\lambda\omicron\sigma$ ‘heal, make calm / be healed, calm down’.

1.3.3.1 Unaccusatives: aspect / form distribution

Table 2a | $\omega\eta\zeta$ ‘to live’

Conjugation	Form	Bible	Shenoute - Canons
Eventive Tenses	non-causative infinitive	138	11
Durative Tenses	stative	231	31
	non-causative infinitive	–	–

Table 2b | $\pi\omega\zeta$ ‘to reach’

Conjugation	Form	Bible	Shenoute - Canons
Eventive Tenses	non-causative infinitive	62	5
Durative Tenses	stative	5	2
	non-causative infinitive	–	–

Table 2c | $\epsilon\rho\eta\epsilon$ ‘to be at leisure’

Conjugation	Form	Bible	Shenoute - Canons
Eventive Tenses	non-causative infinitive	7	4
Durative Tenses	stative	3	2
	non-causative infinitive	–	–

Table 2d | $\rho\omega\tau$ ‘to grow, sprout’

Conjugation	Form	Bible	Shenoute - Canons
Eventive Tenses	non-causative infinitive	11	3
Durative Tenses	stative	12	3
	non-causative infinitive	1	2

Table 2e | κηνε ‘to grow fat’

Conjugation	Form	Bible	Shenoute - Canons
Eventive Tenses	non-causative infinitive	5	–
Durative Tenses	stative	9	2
	non-causative infinitive	1	–

Table 2f | αφαι ‘to multiply’

Conjugation	Form	Bible	Shenoute - Canons
Eventive Tenses	non-causative infinitive	81	9
Durative Tenses	stative	63	14
	non-causative infinitive	4	–

Table 2g | μογν εβολ ‘to remain’

Conjugation	Form	Bible	Shenoute - Canons
Eventive Tenses	non-causative infinitive	26	7
Durative Tenses	stative	12	5
	non-causative infinitive	–	–

1.3.3.2 Labile verbs: aspect / diathesis / form distribution

Table 3a | μογρ ‘to fill / be filled’

Conjugation	Form	Bible	Shenoute - Canons
Eventive tenses	non-causative infinitive	73	7
	causative infinitive	16	1
	construct forms	70	16
Durative tenses	stative	78	32
	non-causative infinitive	1 (?)	1 (?)
	causative infinitive	5	3

Table 3b | πωρα ‘to spread’

Conjugation	Form	Bible	Shenoute - Canons
Eventive tenses	non-causative infinitive	18	–
	causative infinitive	23	4
	construct forms	23	8
Durative tenses	stative	13	3
	non-causative infinitive	1	–
	causative infinitive	1	1

Table 3c | πωξ 'to divide / be divided, burst out'

Conjugation	Form	Bible	Shenoute - Canons
Eventive tenses	non-causative infinitive	16	5
	causative infinitive	17	14
	construct forms	8	9
Durative tenses	stative	6	6
	non-causative infinitive	–	1
	causative infinitive	1	2

Table 3d | ρωκξ 'to incinerate / burn'

Conjugation	Form	Bible	Shenoute - Canons
Eventive tenses	non-causative infinitive	10	3
	causative infinitive	36	3
	construct forms	73	8
Durative tenses	stative	9	7
	non-causative infinitive	2	–
	causative infinitive	6	3

Table 3e | τακο 'to destroy / perish'

Conjugation	Form	Bible	Shenoute - Canons
Eventive tenses	non-causative infinitive	195	22
	causative infinitive	101	19
	construct forms	169	29
Durative tenses	stative	10	4
	non-causative infinitive	5 (of them 4 in the NT)	–
	causative infinitive	12	20

Table 3f | ταλοο 'to heal, make calm / be healed, calm down'

Conjugation	Form	Bible	Shenoute - Canons
Eventive tenses	non-causative infinitive	4	1
	causative infinitive	14	–
	construct forms	57	2
Durative tenses	stative	1	–
	non-causative infinitive	–	–
	causative infinitive	5	2

Table 3g | ογώνε εβολ¹³³ ‘to show / appear’

Conjugation	Form	Bible	Shenoute - Canons
Eventive tenses	non-causative infinitive	170	21
	causative infinitive	44	4
	construct forms	68	10
Durative tenses	stative	56	54
	non-causative infinitive	6	–
	causative infinitive	17	8

Table 3h | ὀν ‘to count / to be counted, belong to’

Conjugation	Form	Bible	Shenoute - Canons
Eventive tenses	non-causative infinitive	16	2
	causative infinitive	10	5
	construct forms	69	8
Durative tenses	stative	39	39
	non-causative infinitive	–	–
	causative infinitive	16	5

1.3.4 Analysis of statistical data and comments

1.3.4.1 Reduced use of intransitive infinitive in the Bipartite

The first rough estimate of the data not only confirms the above cited observations by Stern, Jernstedt and Polotsky, but also allows to rephrase them more precisely. Thus, it must first be stated that both corpora make very little (and with unaccusatives, almost none at all) use of intransitive infinitives in the durative tenses, so little indeed that it would be difficult to ascribe this form any single and permanent grammatical function. At the same time, transitive infinitives in the Bipartite are perfectly regular, if not numerous. Consequently, a zero-argument infinitive in the Bipartite must with high probability be interpreted as a case of agent-preserving valency reduction, as in

(30) Rev. 9:11

επεφραν μνητρεβραιος πε βαττων μνητογυειεινι δε δε πεττακο
 ὄνομα αὐτῷ Ἑβραϊστί Ἀβαδδὼν καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἑλληνικῇ ὄνομα ἔχει Ἀπολλύων
 ‘His name in Hebrew is Abaddon, and in Greek he is called Apollyon’ (lit., ‘he who destroys’)

133 Excluded from the present statistics are all the occurrences of the verb in the sense of ἐξομολογέομαι ‘to sing praises, confess’. The semantic divergence between the two senses is wide enough to treat the verbs as homonyms.

- (31) Shen.Can. 7, Leipoldt (1954:16, 6)
 εβολ δε πατασσε σταλσο δε ον
 ‘for it strikes, and then it heals’

For Shenoute’s texts, where we do not have any non-Coptic source text and have to rely on our philological feeling for interpretation, the almost total absence of durative intransitive infinitives is sometimes a decisive argument in favor of a causative interpretation of an object-less infinitive, as in:

- (32) Shen.Can. 6, Amel. 2 (286:11)
 τωοην πχοις ηπρτρειρωμε ηκατανας βμβοη ηπρτρε τεκβονθεια ουε ημην
 ηηποτε ηφτωρηπ ητενϣχη ηθε ηοημογι **εμν πετωτε ουτε ην πετωρημ**
 ‘Arise, oh Lord, do not let the man of Satan overcome, do not let your help go
 away from us, lest he seizes our soul, like a lion, with nobody to redeem (us), nor
 anybody to save (us)...’

The alternative interpretation of the phrase in bold, which is “while nobody will be redeemed, nor nobody saved”, is perfectly possible from the point of view of the content, but must be rejected on the above grammatical grounds.

In view of these data, we can re-examine Polotsky’s statement cited in 1.3.2.2 reproduced here for the reader’s convenience:

“The possibility of having the same actor for the Infinitive as well as for the Qualitative is limited to intransitive verbs.”

As becomes clear from Polotsky’s examples (αωρη, μογ, ρκο, ειβε), the term ‘intransitive’ comprises here the set of monadic / unaccusative verbs. It follows, therefore, that according to Polotsky, bivalent infinitives can only have transitive meaning in the Bipartite which is close enough to what we observe in our statistics. However, sporadic intransitive durative infinitives occur with monadic, as well as with bivalent verbs.¹³⁴ In 1.3.4.6 and 1.3.4.7, I shall endeavor to specify the semantic load of these forms.

1.3.4.2 Eventive infinitive: an anticausative form

An intransitive eventive infinitive constitutes an anticausative counterpart to the transitive form, since they are used to “express the same basic situation... and differ only in that the causative verb meaning involves an agent participant who causes the situation, whereas the inchoative (i.e., anticausative – N.S.) verb meaning excludes a causing agent and presents the situation as occurring spontaneously.”¹³⁵ Thus, the Coptic lability can be classified as anticausative, which is the most frequent lability type cross-linguistically, according to

¹³⁴ I shall refrain from passing any judgement concerning the diachrony of these occurrences. It is, however, curious that the two researched corpora differ in their tolerance to intransitive durative infinitives of various verbs. Moreover, the language of the New Testament seems to differ in this respect from that of the Old Testament. A diachronic study of this phenomenon might perhaps be useful for approximative text-dating.

¹³⁵ Haspelmath 1993:90

Letuchiy (2009). Based on this understanding of the mechanism of Coptic lability, we can correctly predict that verbs that denote human activity in a strict sense will not exhibit the property of lability, i.e., will usually belong to the ‘strong transitive’ class. Indeed, the property of lability is not displayed in any of the synonyms with the meaning ‘cut’ (ογωωδε, ωωλε, ωωωτ, ωτωτ, εωλε, εωεεε, εωωδε), as well as in the Coptic verbs for ‘building’ (κωτ), ‘spinning’ (ειρε), ‘stealing’ (κωλπ, εωφτ), ‘ploughing’ (εκα). Whenever any of these and similar verbs have a note ‘intr.’ in Crum’s dictionary, this refers to the instances of agent-preserving (i.e., patient-dropping) valency reduction.¹³⁶

We can now address the problem posed in Funk (1978): how do we define the distinction between different forms of a Coptic verb with a roughly ‘passive’ function, i.e., the forms displaying this or the other kind of valency reduction as compared to their transitive counterpart.¹³⁷ The specific instances Funk mentions to illustrate his question are:

- (33) εφωπ εη ογκλωοε
PST-3SGM-hide in-a-cloud
‘He hid in a cloud’
- εεεωπ εη ογκλωοε
PST-3PL-hide-3SGM in-a-cloud
‘He became hidden in a cloud’
- εφωπ εη ογκλωοε
PST-3SGM-hide-3SGM in-a-cloud
‘He hid himself in a cloud’

We are now in position to state a clear semantic distinction between all three constructions. The first one is anticausative, so denoting rather a spontaneously occurring event than a volitional action. This explains why the intransitive infinitive of εωπ most often predicates inanimate nouns, as can be seen in Crum’s examples. The second construction refer to the same situation as the corresponding transitive, but the agent is semantically (not syntactically) demoted. Thus, it serves as an exact equivalent of passive model, where this model is morphologically marked. Finally, the third example instantiates a reflexive construction, an action volitionally performed by the agent on himself. As mentioned elsewhere, the stative of the same verb can denote a secondary, as well as a primary state, i.e., can either mean that an entity has been hidden, or else that an entity has not yet been uncovered.

How strictly were the functions of anticausative, resultative, and passive differentiated in Coptic? In other words, how often could an eventive infinitive or a stative be used in the passive function? According to my data, almost never: the agent expression introduced, e.g., by εωλ εηη is very infrequent with intransitive infinitives, and even more so with statives. Among the rare examples that can be interpreted as passive constructions are:

136 The ambiguity of the note ‘intransitive’ in Crum (1939) which may refer to anticausative semantics or to intransitive syntax of the verb is addressed in Emmel (2006).

137 See Funk (1978:121).

(34) Deut 22:3

ΔΥΣΩΡΗ ΤΗΡΧ ΝΤΟΥΤΥ ΗΠΕΚΣΟΝ ΗΝΕΤΝΔΩΡΗ ΝΤΟΥΤΥ ΔΥΩ ΗΓΞΕ ΕΡΟΥΥ ΗΝΕΚΜΟΩΥΕ
ΕΚΑΔΥ

ὅσα ἐὰν ἀπόληται παρ' αὐτοῦ καὶ εὔρησ' οὐ δυνήσῃ ὑπεριδεῖν;

'... with any lost thing of your brother's, which he loses and you find; you may not ignore it.'

(35) Shenoute, Ad Phil. Gent. 264, Leipoldt (1955:46):

ΝΘΕ ΗΠΡΡΟ ΕΤΗΜΑΥ ΝΑΠΙΣΤΟΣ, ΝΤΑΥΚΑΖΤΗΥ ΕΠΑΥ, ΠΗΟΥΤΕ ΝΑΚΚΑΡΩΝ, **ΕΤΡΕΥΤΑΛΩ**
ΕΒΟΛ ΖΗΤΟΥΤΥ ΖΗ ΠΕΥΩΩΝΕ

'... Like that faithless monarch who trusted in the fly, the god of the Accaronites, that **he might be cured (through him? by him? – N.S.)** of his sickness.'¹³⁸

(36) Shen.Can. 2 (Kuhn 1956:120, 12)

ΝΤΕΤΝΞΕ ΕΞΡΑΙ ΔΥΩ ΝΤΕΤΝΡΩΞΤ ΕΠΕΣΗΤ **ΕΒΟΛ ΖΗΤΟΥΤΟΥ ΝΝΔΔΑΙΜΩΝ** ΕΤΑΠΑΤΑ
ΝΗΩΤΝ ΔΥΩ ΕΤΣΩΒΕ ΝΣΩΤΝ

'And you will collapse and **be cast to the ground by the demons** who deceive and mock you'

(37) Shen.Can. 8 XO 100:40-42

ΝΤΑΥΦΩΟΘΟΥ Η ΝΤΑΥΦΩΩΩΕ **ΕΒΟΛ ΖΗΤΟΥΤΥ**

'Whom he smote, or who have been smitten by him (became smitten through him? – N.S.)'

The incompatibility of stative with such constructions invalidates Polotsky's opinion of stative as a passive form, at least, in terms of modern typological linguistics.¹³⁹

1.3.4.3 Eventive paradigm: transitive infinitive replacing *status constructus*?

In the non-durative tenses, the ratio of transitive / causative and intransitive / anticausative use of the absolute infinitive depends, as it seems, on the lexical meaning of each specific verb. Importantly, the paradigm of verbal arguments occurring with transitive eventive infinitives in our sample does not seem to be unbiased: nominal arguments tend to occur more frequently than pronominal ones. On the other hand, forms of *status constructus* (pre-substantival forms), on average, are represented poorly, compared to *status pronominalis*. With some verbs, e.g., ΟΥΩΝΞ ΕΒΟΛ 'show / appear', the mutual ratio of the three forms, as attested in the biblical text, is such as to almost speak about complementary distribution between transitive absolute form and *status pronominalis*.

Transitive absolute infinitive with nominal arguments	42
Transitive absolute infinitive with pronominal arguments	0
<i>Status constructus</i>	14
<i>Status pronominalis</i>	54

138 Translation by A.Alcock (with agens omitted).

139 Polotsky 1957:228-229

It would be reasonable to suggest that the semantic factor underlying such distribution is not even definiteness¹⁴⁰ or specificity of the object – for substantival objects of infinitives are often definite and specific, too, – but the respective informational weight of the object. In this respect, pronouns differ from most nominal objects. By their very nature, they are anaphoric, which means that they refer to a previously mentioned entity and thus have smaller communicative importance. As such, they tend to not be prosodically prominent and usually form a single prosodic unit with their verbal head.¹⁴¹ This idea may be further extended to explain the choice between *status absolutus* vs. *status constructus* with nominal arguments. Hence, by way of diachronic reconstruction, one could assume that the absolute form that had been initially reserved for the non-causative usage in the Tripartite at some point started to supplant the construct forms under specific conditions which demanded an accentual separation between the verb and its object, due to the informational importance of the latter.¹⁴²

This explanation would be at variance with Jernstedt's suggestion that the use of the absolute form with pronominal objects in the non-durative tenses had been standard in the previous stages of Egyptian and that the remnants of this practice are preserved in the Scripture Coptic.¹⁴³ However, the Demotic data, as attested in the TLA database, rather support our theory: the examples of verbs governing *n-imz* in non-durative tenses are far less frequent than those with pronominal suffixes. There is, therefore, every reason to consider the transitive absolute infinitive an innovation. Whether it had been introduced into the language by analogy with the unchangeable loaned Greek infinitives, as Quack supposes¹⁴⁴, or by an intra-Coptic analogy (with the durative infinitive or with the

140 Cf. Engsheden “Verbal semantics and differential object marking in Lycopolitan Coptic” 2018:156: “It would thus seem as if Coptic DOM conforms to the definiteness hierarchy: personal pronoun > proper noun > definite NP > indefinite specific NP > nonspecific NP (e.g. Aissen 2003: 437). The cut-off point along this scale differs between the main two TAM categories (imperfective vs. non-imperfective), but the lowest ranked category (non-specific NPs) is excluded in both. As definiteness is an all-pervasive feature (irrespective of TAM), it can be said to be the single most important factor for the selection of *n*-marking in Coptic...”. The author would like to express her deepest gratitude to Dr. Åke Engsheden for bringing his paper to her attention.

141 My impression, though not yet verified statistically, is that in imperative, native transitive verbs will mostly occur in their construct forms, most frequently *status pronominalis*. If true, this might give an additional weight to the hypothesis of respective communicative importance of the verb and the object as the decisive factor for the choice of form, because by its very essence, imperative tends to emphasize the action which is to be conducted.

142 Such representation would comply, e.g., with J.Haiman's thesis that the distance between morphemes is economically motivated: “X#Y is replaced by X+Y where Y is predictable” (Haiman 1983:782 ff.).

143 Jernstedt (1986: 403): “During the period of the compilation of the Coptic Bible, the use of *status absolutus* with personal pronouns-objects outside the present conjugation still existed in the language, but was on the verge of disappearance. The principle of word-by-word translation applied by the translators of the Bible did not therefore introduce anything new to Coptic syntax, but had just succeeded to take advantage of the vanishing rule reflecting it in such way that totally distorted its ratio compared to the spoken language.” (Translation – N.S.)

144 Quack (2020: 70): “... durchgängige Verwendung der indirekten Objektanknüpfung [mit griechischen Verben – N.S.] vielleicht der Auslöser dafür ist, dass sie im Koptischen auch ausserhalb der Dauerzeiten fakultativ gebraucht wird.”

intransitive infinitive of the non-durative conjugations), can hardly be established. But in all cases, its use seems to be secondary compared to that of the non-causative forms.

1.3.4.4 Eventive non-causative infinitive: a member of two transitivity oppositions

Let us now consider the two transitivity oppositions: the *eventive* intransitive vs. *eventive* transitive and the *eventive* intransitive vs. *durative* transitive infinitive. If, as assumed above, the transitive use of the eventive infinitive has been a later development, we might expect that these two oppositions will not always have identical semantics. And such, indeed, is the case of the verb $\omega\rho\mu$. The eventive anticausative $\omega\rho\mu$ may denote either ‘to get lost’ or ‘to go astray’. Its transitive counterparts do not share this double meaning. In all attestations I could find, the eventive transitive $\omega\rho\mu$ invariably means ‘lose’, while the durative transitive infinitive stands for ‘lead astray’. In Crum’s opinion, the meaning ‘lose’ is derived from the general sense of ‘send astray’,¹⁴⁵ but such semantic derivation does not look plausible. A more probable scenario is that the two oppositions developed independently of each other. Thus, if the original meaning of the verb had been ‘lose / be lost’, then there would be nothing unexpected about its non-causative component gradually acquiring the synonymic meaning of ‘to go astray’. This, in its turn, could later have produced a transitive allomorph with the sense ‘to lead astray’ in the durative conjugation pattern, which would result in the mentioned divergence of the two transitive forms.

(38) Wis 12:24

καὶ γὰρ **ἀγχοῦμ** ἴπογοι ἐρραὶ ῥηνεῖοογε ἡτεπλανῆ ἐγμεεγε χε ῥηνογτε νε ναὶ
ετσηα ἡνζωδον ἡνκεξεθνος

καὶ γὰρ τῶν πλάνης ὁδῶν μακρότερον **ἐπλανήθησαν** θεοῦς ὑπολαμβάνοντες τὰ
καὶ ἐν ζώοις τῶν αἰσχυρῶν ἄτιμα

‘*They **wandered** far even from the normal ways in which people err! They took
horrible things to be gods, the worst forms of animal life.*’¹⁴⁶

(39) 1Sam 9:3

ἀγω νεοογ ἡσιε πειωτ ἡσαογλ **ἀγχοῦμ**

καὶ **ἀπόλοντο** αἱ ὄνοι Κις πατὴρ Σαουλ,

‘*Now the donkeys of Kish, Saul’s father, **were lost.***’

¹⁴⁵ Crum (1939:355a).

¹⁴⁶ Translation: Common English Bible.

(40) 2Tim. 3:13

ⲛⲣⲟⲙⲉ ⲁⲉ ⲛⲡⲟⲛⲏⲣⲟⲥ ⲁⲗⲟⲩ ⲛⲡⲓⲗⲁⲛⲟⲥ ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲡⲣⲟⲕⲟⲓⲛⲧⲉ ⲉⲡⲓⲡⲉⲧⲣⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲗⲥⲟⲣⲏ ⲁⲗⲟⲩ **ⲉⲗⲥⲟⲣⲏ ⲛⲣⲉⲛⲕⲟⲟⲩⲉ**

πονηροὶ δὲ ἄνθρωποι καὶ γόητες προκόψουσιν ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον, **πλανῶντες** καὶ πλανώμενοι.

‘...while evil people and impostors will go on from bad to worse, being deceived and **deceiving** others.’¹⁴⁷

(41) Matt. 10:39

ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁⲗⲣⲉ ⲉⲧⲉⲗⲗⲓⲕⲏ ⲕⲏⲁⲥⲟⲣⲏⲙⲉⲥ ⲁⲗⲟⲩ ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁⲗⲥⲟⲣⲏ ⲛⲧⲉⲗⲗⲓⲕⲏ ⲉⲧⲃⲏⲏⲧ ⲕⲏⲁⲣⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲥ
ὁ εὐρῶν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπολέσει αὐτήν, καὶ ὁ **ἀπολέσας** τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ
ἔνεκεν ἔμοῦ εὐρήσει αὐτήν.

‘Whoever finds his life will lose it, and whoever **loses** his life for my sake will find it.’

The interesting thing about these examples is that they instantiate the mixed, morphological-templatic, nature of the verbal derivation in Coptic. The meaning of the verbal lexeme depends not only on the verbal root involved, but also on the specific aspectual pattern it is used in.

1.3.4.5 Conjugation bases as a mechanism of valency alternation

By using the term ‘morphological-templatic derivation’ I mean that for the infinitives of alternating verbs, the Coptic two-conjugation system constitutes a seemingly productive mechanism of valency alternation where the non-durative objectless matrix serves as an operator of valency reduction, and vice versa, the durative matrix is used for causativization. (The presence of an overtly expressed **n**-object in the non-durative matrix overrules its voice characteristics.) The conjugation base may therefore be regarded not only as the tense-aspect-mode-head of the infinitival form expanded by the indexes of person and number, but also as its voice head. The tables below illustrate the diathetic distribution across the conjugation patterns for the verbs **ⲃⲟⲗ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ** ‘be loosened / loosen’, **ⲛⲟⲩⲣⲏⲙ** ‘be saved / save’, **ⲡⲣⲟⲟⲥⲉ** ‘be wounded / wound’ and **ⲥⲟⲟⲩⲗ** ‘gather (intr.) / gather (tr.)’. The examples which are taken from Shenoute’s Canons cover all the tokens of the above verbs in the concordance.¹⁴⁸

147 In Sahidic version, the order of the two epithets differs from that in the Septuagint. The ESV translation has been changed by me accordingly.

148 For lack of published editions, I supplied my own translations. These are approximative and only serve the purpose of intelligibility of the examples. – N.S.

Table 4a. βΩΛ (εβολ)

	be loosened, released	loosen; interpret
Eventive	C1 ηπεπογα πογα ημον βωλ εβολ ρη ρηδονη <i>none of us has been released from pleasures</i>	C6 αγω πεφαστ ηβωλ εβολ ημηρη <i>his tail will release the chains</i>
	C1 τεωρη μμο ρη πσολ ετηβωλ εβολ <i>you strengthen yourself through the lie that will be dissolved</i>	C9 πετηβωλ εβολ ητεϊεντολη <i>whoever will dissolve this order...</i>
	C1 φαρετσιο ηποεικ ηηπμοου ερωανβωλ εβολ <i>You feed yourself on bread and water; when you stop fasting (lit.: "you are absolved")</i>	C9 εφεβωλ εβολ ητεγγχη ηηετρνοβε <i>so that he releases the souls of the sinners</i>
	C4 εαγβωλ εβολ ρραι ηρητογ ημηρη ηηη ηηη κακια ηηη <i>while they were released from all chains and all evils</i>	
	C6 ηθε ηταφβωλ εβολ αφογωγ τηρη <i>the way he broke down, was crushed altogether</i>	
	C6 ετβε ογ αφπωρ ηηεφροεττε η αρηρογ αφβωλ εβολ <i>why did he tear his clothes or why did he break down?</i>	
	C6 εηπατφβωλ εβολ ηηηηηη <i>when he did not yet come to terms with us</i>	
	C6 φαρηνεικεηελος βωλ εβολ <i>the other members get weak (lit., dissolved)</i>	
	C7 σεηβωλ εβολ ησεφι ηηηαγ <i>they will be dissolved and carried away</i>	
	C8 ηπατφβωλ η ηπατφφι ηηηαγ ριχων ηβι πσωντ <i>until the wrath is released and comes upon us</i>	
	Durative	C7 σοπ εηβωλ εβολ ηθε ηοηομη <i>sometimes we get dissolved like clay</i>
		C3 ετερεηιατςβω βωλ ηπεφωαχε εχη πεγωγωφ <i>while the unlearned interpret his words at will</i>
		C4 τηβωλ ημοφ εβολ εχωτηη <i>we disclaim it on your behalf</i>
		C4 αγω τηβωλ ηπετηρηαη εβολ ριχων <i>and we disclaim your opinion on us</i>
		C7 φβωλ εβολ ηηερβηγε ηησαδανασ <i>he destroys the deeds of Satan</i>
		C8 εγβωλ εροογ ηρηηρασογ <i>while they interpret their dreams for them</i>

Table 4b | $\eta\omicron\gamma\epsilon\mu$

	be saved	save
Eventive	<p>C6 $\mu\eta\tau$ $\eta\epsilon\pi\tau\alpha\gamma\eta\omicron\gamma\epsilon\mu$ $\gamma\eta$ $\psi\epsilon$ <i>ten will be saved out of a hundred</i></p> <p>C6 $\eta\tau\eta\eta\eta\omicron\gamma\epsilon\mu$ $\epsilon\eta\epsilon\iota\chi$ $\mu\eta\pi\eta\omicron\gamma\tau\epsilon$ <i>and we shall be saved to the hand of God</i></p> <p>C6 $\lambda\gamma\eta\omicron\gamma\epsilon\mu$ η $\lambda\gamma\pi\omega\tau$ $\epsilon\beta\omicron\lambda$ $\eta\mu\pi\epsilon\theta\omicron\omicron\gamma$ <i>they were saved or they eloped from the evil</i></p> <p>C6 $\eta\epsilon\pi\tau\alpha\gamma\eta\omicron\gamma\epsilon\mu$ η $\eta\epsilon\pi\tau\alpha\gamma\eta\lambda\alpha\gamma\eta\mu\omicron\gamma$ $\epsilon\beta\omicron\lambda$ $\gamma\eta$ $\pi\omega\eta$ <i>those who saved or were saved from the pit</i></p> <p>XR $\epsilon\tau\tau\epsilon\eta\eta\eta\omicron\gamma\epsilon\mu$ $\epsilon\tau\epsilon\gamma\tau\omega$ $\eta\kappa\omega\gamma\tau$ <i>so that we shall be saved from the flame of fire</i></p>	<p>C1 $\pi\eta\omicron\gamma\tau\epsilon$ $\eta\lambda\eta\eta\omicron\gamma\epsilon\mu$ $\eta\tau\epsilon\gamma\gamma\chi\eta$ <i>God will save their soul</i></p> <p>C1 $\eta\eta\lambda\eta\eta\omicron\gamma\epsilon\mu$ $\eta\pi\epsilon\gamma\theta\beta\beta\iota\omicron$ <i>and he will save their humility</i></p>
Durative		C6 $\epsilon\mu\eta$ $\pi\epsilon\tau\omega\tau\epsilon$ $\omicron\gamma\tau\epsilon$ $\mu\eta$ $\pi\epsilon\tau\eta\omicron\gamma\epsilon\mu$ <i>while there will be no one who rescues or who saves</i>

Table 4c | $\omega\psi\omega\beta\epsilon$

	be wounded	wound
Eventive	<p>C6 $\lambda\gamma\psi\omega\beta\epsilon$ η $\epsilon\lambda\tau\alpha\pi\epsilon$ $\omega\psi\omega\beta\epsilon$ <i>they were wounded, or the head was wounded</i></p> <p>C6 η $\epsilon\tau\beta\epsilon$ $\omicron\gamma$ $\eta\pi\psi\omega\beta\omega\beta\epsilon$ <i>why was he not wounded?</i></p> <p>C8 $\eta\epsilon\pi\tau\alpha\gamma\psi\omega\beta\omega\beta\epsilon$ η $\eta\epsilon\pi\tau\alpha\tau\epsilon\tau\eta\psi\omega\beta\omega\beta\omicron\omicron\gamma$ <i>those who were wounded or whom you have wounded</i></p> <p>C8 η $\eta\tau\alpha\tau\epsilon\tau\eta\psi\omega\beta\omega\beta\epsilon$ <i>or who are (2Pl.) wounded</i></p> <p>C8 $\eta\tau\alpha\psi\omega\beta\omega\beta\omicron\omicron\gamma$ η $\eta\tau\alpha\gamma\psi\omega\beta\omega\beta\epsilon$ $\epsilon\beta\omicron\lambda$ $\gamma\eta\tau\omicron\omicron\tau\psi$ <i>whom he wounded or who were wounded by him</i></p> <p>C9 η $\epsilon\lambda\gamma\psi\omega\beta\omega\beta\epsilon$ <i>who were wounded</i></p> <p>C9 $\epsilon\psi\lambda\gamma\psi\omega\beta\omega\beta\epsilon$ $\eta\tau\omicron\omicron\gamma$ $\epsilon\beta\omicron\lambda$ $\gamma\eta\tau\omicron\omicron\tau\psi$ <i>who were wounded by him</i></p>	<p>C6 $\mu\eta\pi\omicron\tau\epsilon$ $\eta\tau\alpha\psi\omega\beta\omega\beta\epsilon$ η $\tau\alpha\beta\lambda\alpha\pi\tau\epsilon\iota$ $\eta\pi\alpha\iota$ <i>lest I shall hurt or harm this one</i></p> <p>C9 $\epsilon\psi\lambda\gamma\psi\omega\beta\omega\beta\epsilon$ $\eta\pi\omega\eta\epsilon$ $\lambda\eta$ <i>(those who stumble upon a stone), they do not hurt the stone</i></p>
Durative	C8 $\epsilon\tau\beta\epsilon$ $\eta\epsilon\tau\psi\omega\beta\omega\beta\epsilon$ η $\eta\epsilon\tau\psi\omega\beta\omega\beta\epsilon$ $\eta\omicron\gamma\omicron\epsilon\iota\psi$ $\eta\eta\mu$	C7 $\psi\omega\beta\omega\beta\epsilon$ $\epsilon\tau$ $\pi\alpha\gamma\tau\epsilon$ $\epsilon\eta\epsilon\tau\psi\lambda\eta\gamma\eta$ $\eta\eta\omicron\omicron\gamma$ <i>she wounds, (but) she heals those whom she hurts</i>

Table 4d | $\omega\omega\omicron\gamma\epsilon$

	be gathered	gather (trans.)
Eventive	C3 $\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\omega\omega\gamma\epsilon$ $\rho\omega\omega\gamma$ $\omicron\omicron$ $\epsilon\gamma\omicron\gamma\omicron$ $\mu\omicron$ $\eta\epsilon\sigma\eta\eta\gamma$ <i>they will gather together with the brothers</i>	C3 $\omicron\gamma\omicron$ $\eta\epsilon\tau\omega\omega\gamma\epsilon$ $\rho\omega\omega\gamma$ $\epsilon\gamma\omicron\gamma\omicron$ $\lambda\gamma\omega$ $\epsilon\gamma\omega\lambda\alpha\tau$ <i>there are those who hoard for themselves</i>
	C3 $\epsilon\eta\alpha\sigma\omega\omega\gamma\epsilon$ $\eta\tau\eta\beta\omega\kappa$ <i>we shall gather and go</i>	<i>(lit.: inside), but are still in need</i>
	C4 $\eta\tau\alpha\tau\epsilon\tau\eta\sigma\omega\omega\gamma\epsilon$ $\epsilon\gamma\omicron\gamma\omicron$ $\rho\lambda\tau\epsilon\tau\eta\gamma\tau\eta$ <i>you have gathered among yourselves</i>	C4 $\epsilon\tau\epsilon\tau\eta\sigma\omega\omega\gamma\epsilon$ $\eta\alpha\iota$ $\epsilon\gamma\omicron\gamma\omicron$ $\eta\eta\alpha\sigma\omega\omega\epsilon$ <i>that you harvest my fields for me</i>
	C6 $\eta\pi\omicron\gamma\omega\omega\gamma\epsilon$ $\epsilon\gamma\omicron\gamma\omicron$ $\gamma\iota$ $\omicron\gamma\sigma\omicron\pi$ <i>They did not gather all at once</i>	C4 $\eta\tau\eta\sigma\omega\omega\gamma\epsilon$ $\eta\alpha\eta$ $\epsilon\gamma\omicron\gamma\omicron$ $\eta\omicron\gamma\eta\alpha$ <i>and let us seek mercy for us</i>
	C6 $\omega\omega\gamma\epsilon$ $\epsilon\gamma\omicron\gamma\omicron$ $\eta\tau\epsilon\kappa\tau\eta\eta\epsilon$ $\eta\eta\omicron\omicron\gamma$ <i>come together and judge them</i>	C4 $\lambda\tau\epsilon\tau\eta\sigma\omega\omega\gamma\epsilon$ $\omicron\omicron$ $\epsilon\gamma\omicron\gamma\omicron$ $\eta\gamma\epsilon\eta\omega\lambda\alpha\epsilon$ $\bar{\eta}\pi\lambda\alpha\eta\eta$ <i>you collect deceitful words</i>
	C6 $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\eta\epsilon\sigma\eta\eta\gamma$ $\tau\eta\pi\omicron\gamma$ $\eta\alpha\sigma\omega\omega\gamma\epsilon$ $\epsilon\eta\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\pi\eta\gamma$ <i>when all the brothers will come together</i>	C6 $\eta\pi\eta\tau$ $\omega\omega$ $\epsilon\omega\omega\gamma\epsilon$ $\eta\alpha\eta$ $\epsilon\gamma\omicron\gamma\omicron$ $\eta\omicron\gamma\lambda\alpha\tau$ $\gamma\eta$ $\eta\epsilon\eta\eta\eta\tau\omega\lambda\alpha\tau\epsilon$ $\tau\eta\pi\omicron\gamma$ <i>I willingly collected sentences for all our</i>
	C6 $\epsilon\eta\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\eta\epsilon\sigma\eta\eta\gamma$ $\tau\eta\pi\omicron\gamma$ $\omega\omega\gamma\epsilon$ <i>while not all the brothers are gathered</i>	<i>evil deeds</i>
	C7 $\epsilon\lambda\gamma\omega\omega\gamma\epsilon$ $\epsilon\chi\omega\gamma$ $\omega\lambda\eta\tau\gamma\mu\omicron\gamma$ <i>gathering upon him until he died</i>	
	C7 $\eta\tau\alpha\eta\alpha\iota$ $\tau\eta\pi\omicron\gamma$ $\omega\omega\gamma\epsilon$ $\epsilon\pi\omicron\sigma$ <i>into which they all assemble</i>	
	C7 $\eta\tau\alpha\gamma\omega\omega\gamma\epsilon$ $\epsilon\eta\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\pi\eta\gamma$ $\gamma\eta$ $\tau\alpha\phi\omicron\pi\eta\eta$ <i>which are gathered in the depository</i>	
	C8 $\epsilon\tau\epsilon\eta\pi\epsilon\iota\sigma\omega\omega\gamma\epsilon$ $\epsilon\gamma\omicron\gamma\omicron$ $\eta\eta\mu\eta\tau\eta$ <i>I did not gather with you</i>	
	C8 $\tau\eta\alpha\sigma\omega\omega\gamma\epsilon$ $\lambda\eta$ $\omicron\omicron$ $\tau\epsilon\eta\omicron\gamma$ <i>I shall not gather now</i>	
	C9 $\epsilon\omega\lambda\alpha\sigma\omega\omega\gamma\epsilon$ $\epsilon\gamma\omicron\gamma\omicron$ $\eta\gamma\eta\tau\omicron\gamma$ <i>if you are gathered on them (sci., on Sabbaths)</i>	
	C9 $\eta\tau\alpha\eta\sigma\omega\omega\gamma\epsilon$ $\lambda\eta$ $\epsilon\gamma\omicron\gamma\omicron$ $\epsilon\eta\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\pi\omicron\sigma$ <i>it is not in those places that we gather</i>	
	C9 $\epsilon\gamma\omega\lambda\alpha\sigma\omega\omega\gamma\epsilon$ $\epsilon\pi\eta\alpha$ $\epsilon\tau\omicron\gamma\pi$ $\rho\omega\beta$ $\eta\gamma\eta\tau\gamma$ <i>if they are gathered in their working place</i>	
	C9 $\omega\lambda\eta\tau\omicron\gamma\omega\omega\gamma\epsilon$ $\tau\eta\pi\omicron\gamma$ <i>until they are all gathered</i>	

be gathered	gather (trans.)
Durative	<p>C5 ενϥωϥϩ ϩαν εϩοϥν νοϩϩοϩο <i>as we gather a surplus for us</i></p> <p>C5 εϩϥωϥϩ ηηοοϩ ϩαϩ εϩοϥν ενεϩεϩααϩ <i>as they keep amassing their property</i></p> <p>C6 εϩϥωϥϩ εϩοϥν εϩοϥ νϩεϩαωη ηϩητ <i>as he gathers lots of worms inside it</i></p> <p>C6 εϩϥωϥϩ εϩοϥν ετοοτε ντηηητατϥ <i>while they gather (property) driven by the insatiability</i></p> <p>C6 εϩϥωϥϩ ϩαϩ εϩοϥν νοϩωαωϩε <i>as they pile up poverty for themselves</i></p> <p>C8 εϩϥωϥϩ εϩοϥν εϩοϩ ηπεϩτακο <i>Preparing (lit.: collecting) his own ruin</i></p> <p>C8 ενϥωϥϩ ητεϩρια τηϩε νϥωηατικον <i>as we collect every corporeal need</i></p>

The above tables show that the interpretation of a verb in infinitive emerges as a result of the interplay of the two following factors:

- 1) the overall meaning of the lexeme proper
- 2) the morphosyntactic framework the lexeme is incorporated into.

Thus, similarly to Semitic languages,¹⁴⁹ the Coptic verbal system is based on inflectional patterns, the difference being that Semitic templates are discontinuous morphemes consisting of specific vowel sequences the lexical component (verbal root) is combined with, whereas in Coptic the cluster of grammatical elements precedes the lexical component. It therefore has little sense to analyze one specific (transitive or intransitive) facet of a Coptic labile verb as basic, and the other one as derived from it, which is the analysis suggested in Funk (1978). Rather, each conjugation constitutes a derivation pattern in its own right, and infinitival stems serve as derivation bases. Thus, the pair like ϩωϩϩ ‘be divided’ vs. ϩωϩϩ ‘divide’ are not “two separate lexemes, one of which stands in derivational relationship to the other”¹⁵⁰, but rather two realizations of a single macrolexeme with the general meaning of division. A description presenting such a pair as a pair of homonyms would be uneconomical.

Interestingly, lability is not a permanent property of a verbal lexeme throughout a dialect. So, in Shenoute’s lexicon, ϩων is a non-causative monadic verb with the sense of ‘approach’:

149 See, e.g., Doron (2003) for Modern Hebrew, Arkhipov, Kalinin & Loesov (2021) for Accadian.

150 Funk (1978b:121)

- (42) Shen.Can. 6, Leipoldt (1955:190, 13)
 ΠΕΣΜΟΥ ΕΦΟΥΩΝΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΗΠΡΩΜΕ ΝΔΙΚΑΙΟΣ ΗΠΠΩΔ ΕΤΡΕΦ**ΖΩΝ** ΕΞΟΥΝ ΕΠΧΟΕΙC
*'The blessing reveals a virtuous man as worthy to **come closer** to the Lord.'*
 For the causative counterpart, Shenoute uses the synthetic form ΤΡΗΝΟ 'make approach', which is also strictly non-labile, at least, in the corpus of the Canons.
- (43) Shen.Can. 1, 14.5
 ΜΗ ΜΠΧΟΕΙC ΔΗ ΠΕΝΤΑΦCΟΤΠΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΟΥΤΕΝΕΤΡΗΤΟΥΩ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΕΑΦ**ΘΝΟ** ΕΞΟΥΝ ΕΡΟΥ
'War es etwa nicht der Herr, der dich von all deinen Nächsten auserwählt und sich dir genähert hat' (lit.: 'made you come closer to him')
 In the Bible, however, the same simplex lexeme may be found in the causative sense of 'make closer' (although 3 times out of 4 occur in one and the same book, Isaiah):
- (44) Isa 5:8
 ΟΥΟΙ ΝΝΕΤΤΩCΕ ΝΟΥΗΙ ΕΥΗΙ ΕΤ**ΖΩΝ** ΝΟΥCΩCΕ ΕΥCΩCΕ
 Οὐαὶ οἱ συνάπτοντες οἰκίαν πρὸς οἰκίαν καὶ ἀγρὸν πρὸς ἀγρὸν **ἐγγίζοντες**
*'Woe to those who join house to house, who **add** field to field'*
- (45) Isa 5:19
 ΜΑΡΕΠΡΕΦCΕΠΗ ΖΩΝ ΕΞΟΥΝ ΝΝΕΤΦΝΑΔΔΥ ΔΕ ΕΝΕΝΑΥ ΕΡΟΥ
 Τὸ τάχος ἐγγισάτω ἃ ποιήσει, ἵνα ἴδωμεν
'Let him be quick, let him speed his work that we may see it'
- (46) Isa 46:13
 ΛΙΖΩΝ ΕΞΟΥΝ ΝΤΑΔΙΚΑΙΟΥCΥΗΗ
 ἤγγισα τὴν δικαιοσύνην μου
'I bring near my righteousness'

On the other hand, ΤΡΗΝΟ is almost entirely unattested in the Bible. In the case of this verb, the two corpora display alternative ways of causativization. The biblical Coptic causativizes by means of the conjugation pattern, in Shenoute morphological causativization is applied.

1.3.4.6 Classes of mutable verbs: strong transitives, labile verbs, monadic verbs

Cases of unstable lability like the above-described case of ΖΩΝ should be kept in mind when dividing Coptic morphologically mutable verbs into diathetic classes. Yet, such cases are rather exceptional. Upon the whole, it is possible to establish one labile and two unalterable classes of Coptic verbs based on the criteria of agency and lexical aspect.¹⁵¹

151 The same criteria are used for the classification of Akkadian verbs in Arkhipov, Kalinin & Loesov (2021).

Table 5 | Syntactic-semantic classification of native Coptic verbs

	Strong transitive verbs	Labile verbs	Non-labile intransitive verbs
Obligatory agent	+	-	-
Telic aspect ^a	+	+	-

- a This term is used here as a property of an aspectual pair combined in a labile verb, in the sense explained in Paducheva & Pentus (2008:192).

The class of agentive monodiathetic verbs has been identified in Stern (1880). Stern refers to this class as ‘verbs of strong active meaning’¹⁵² observing that these verbs never have the anticausative (in Stern’s terms, passive) reading. Stern’s list of these verbs comprises † ‘give’, ϫΙ ‘take’, εΙΡΕ ‘do’, ϺΙ ‘throw’, ΕΙΝΕ ‘bring’, ΚΙΝΕ ‘cross’, ΣΙΝΕ ‘find’, ϸϺΑΙ ‘write’, ϨΩΠ ‘receive’, ΟΥΩΜ ‘eat’, ΚΩΤ ‘build’, ΚΩ ‘put, let, leave’, ϫΩ ‘say’, and several others. The verb ϸΩΠΤΕ ‘prepare’ most often displays the behavior of a strong transitive verb, although isolated cases of labile use are attested, too. Importantly, this class also includes verbs of perception (ϸΩΤΗ ‘hear, listen’, ΤΩΠΕ ‘taste’, ΣΩΩΤ ‘look, see’) and a verb of cognition (ϸΟΟΥΝ ‘know’).¹⁵³ Some specific morphosyntactic features of these verbs which are here termed ‘strong transitives’ are discussed in the chapter 2 of the present work.

At the other extreme we find one-argument unaccusative verbs that do not undergo labile causativization. Semantically, this class consists of verbs predicating a state (ϸΡΡΕ ‘be at leisure’, ΜΟΥΝ ΕΒΟΛ ‘remain’), verbs predicating a feature (ΚΜΟΜ ‘be black’, ϺΩΡΟΥ ‘be heavy’, ϺΩΩΜΕ ‘be thin, lean’, ΛΩΜΣ ‘be foul, stink’, ΚΡΟΜΡΜ ‘be dark’ etc.), certain verbs of emotional state (ΡΟΕΙΣ ‘care’) and verbs whose core event¹⁵⁴ is a change of state (ΑΩΑΙ, ΡΩΤ ‘grow’, ΔΛΕ ‘rise’ ϨΩΠΕ ‘become’).¹⁵⁵ The mechanisms of valency increase for such verbs are morphological and morphosyntactic. Thus, some of them (ΔΛΕ, ΣΒΟΚ, ΑΩΑΙ) form τ-causatives (ΤΑΛΟ, ΤΣΒΚΟ, ΤΑΩΟ), which, in their turn, are liable to the “standard”, conjugation-based valency alternations. Another, productive and therefore more regular mechanism of causativization for the group of univalent verbs is the use of the causative construction with ΤΡΕ-.

152 “verba von stark activer bedeutung”, see Stern (1880:302-303).

153 Several other verbs of perception and cognition (ΝΑΥ ‘see’, ΜΟΥϺ ‘look, watch’, ΕΙΜΕ ‘learn’) are not only monodiathetic, but also morphologically immutable.

154 In Haspelmath et al.(2014:590), the term ‘core event’ is defined as “the meaning component that is shared by both verbs of a causal - noncausal pair”. Defined in this way, the term is, of course, inapplicable to the group of monadic verbs that do not have any causative counterpart. Yet, I would like to preserve it to denote the single most important component of the verbal semantics. Of course, the component of change is present in the semantics of all eventive (i.e., non-stative) verbs. For instance, the intransitive ‘break’ roughly means ‘to pass from the state of wholeness to the state of non-wholeness’. But for such verbs as ‘to grow’, change is the key semantic component, for the verb does not include any understanding of previous smallness or ensuing greatness. It only states that a change in this direction occurs. The etalon verb with the change as core event is ‘to become’.

155 In the more specific analysis in Reintges (2004:230), the following lexical groups are mentioned: verbs of smell emission, verbs of light emission, verbs of inherently directed motion, internally caused verbs of change of state, verbs of existence, occurrence and (dis)appearance.

(47) Gen 48:4

εις ρηητε †νατρεκαϳαι ηγαιαι

Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀύξανῶ σε καὶ πληθυνῶ σε

‘Behold, I will make you fruitful and multiply you’

The multiple mechanisms of valency alternation generate two oppositions (monadic simplex vs. τ-causative in its non-causative usage and τ-causative vs. the causative τρε-construction). The semantic or perhaps extra-linguistic factors influencing these oppositions are as yet an open question in the Coptic linguistics; their clarification lies outside the scope of the present work.

As can be seen in the statistical tables, almost all verbs of the mutable monodiathetic class have a TAM-complementary distribution of forms: infinitive for the non-durative tenses and stative for present and imperfect. A notable exception is the subgroup of verbs whose core event includes the semantic component of change. This subgroup uses infinitive in the Bipartite to express various kinds of **non-stative** meaning, which might be:

a) iterative meaning

(48) Shen.Can. 8 (XO 286:21-25)

εϳαϳε εϳρηβε η̄νετϳοιβε ϳη̄τεγϳυπομηη κατα καιρος

‘s’il convient de s’affliger pour ceux d’entre nous dont la constance varie au gré des circonstances...’¹⁵⁶

as opposed to the stative meaning in:

(49) Shen.Can. 1, 10.3 (XC 16-17)

εϳαϳε καταπετρη η̄ταει εβολ ϳη̄ρενπεθοοϳ ερενπεθοοϳ ε̄ιερεϳοιβε η̄οϳ η̄το ερεϳη̄νοβε τηροϳ

*‘Wenn, gemäß der Schrift, du hervorgegangen bist aus Schlechtigkeiten hinein in Schlechtigkeiten, was unterscheidet dich dann von allen (anderen) Sündern?’*b) dynamic (progressive) meaning

(50) Ezek 17:8

ρη οϳαϳε ε̄νανοϳ ϳιϳη οϳηνοϳ η̄μοοϳ η̄τοϳ κ̄ηηε ε̄τρεταϳο εβολ η̄ρεη̄τοϳ

εις πεδιον καλον̄ ε̄φ’ ῡδατι πολλῶ̄ ᾱυτη πᾱῑνε̄ται τοῡ ποιειν̄ βλαστοϳ

‘It had been planted (lit.: ‘grows fat’ – N.S.) on good soil by abundant waters, that it might produce branches’

vs. the stative

(51) Num 13:21

αϳω αε οϳ πε η̄καϳ αε η̄εϳκ̄ιωοϳ αε η̄εϳαααω

Num 13:20 καὶ τίς ἡ γῆ, εἰ π̄ιων ἢ παρειμένη

‘and whether the land is rich (lit.: is fat) or poor’

156 A. Boud’hors (2013).

(52) Exod 1:12

ΚΑΤΑ ΘΕ ΔΕ ΕΤΟΥΘΒΒΙΟ ΜΗΘΟΥΓ ΤΑΙ ΤΕ ΘΕ ΕΝΕΥΑΦΑΙ ΝΗΟΥΟ
καθότι δὲ αὐτοὺς ἐταπείνουν, τοσούτω **πλείους ἐγίνοντο**

'But the more they were oppressed, the more they multiplied...'

vs. stative

(53) Num 22:3

ΑΜΩΑΒ ΕΡΣΟΤΕ ΖΗΤΗ ΜΠΛΑΟΣ ΜΠΧΘΕΙΣ ΝΕΦΟΘ ΓΑΡ ΜΗΑΤΕ ΠΕ
καὶ ἐφοβήθη Μωαβ τὸν λαὸν σφόδρα, ὅτι **πολλοὶ** ἦσαν

'And Moab was in great dread of the people because they were many.'

The past progressive meaning of these verbs could obviously be expressed by the absolute infinitive with the perfect or imperfect base, without any pronounced difference between them.

(54) Acts 9:31

ΑΓΩ ΖΗ ΠΟΠΙΣ ΜΠΕΠΝΑ ΕΤΟΥΑΑΒ **ΝΕΑΦΑΙ**
καὶ τῇ παρακλήσει τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος **ἐπληθύνετο**

'... and in the comfort of the Holy Spirit, it multiplied'

(55) Acts 12:24

ΠΩΑΧΕ ΔΕ ΜΠΠΟΥΓΤΕ ΑΦΑΓΖΑΝΕ ΑΓΩ **ΑΦΑΦΑΙ**
Ὁ δὲ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἠύξανε καὶ **ἐπληθύνετο**.

'but the word of God increased and multiplied'

The distinctions between infinitive and stative forms in the durative conjugation will be further discussed in section 1.3.4.7.

The nucleus of the class of labile verbs consists of telic lexemes with a non-obligatory agent actant in the event scheme, such as ΠΩΖ 'break, burst, tear', ΩΦΡ 'freeze', ΣΩΚ 'draw, flow', ΣΟΥΓΤΝ 'stretch', ΣΩΟΥΖ 'gather', ΠΩΩΝΕ 'turn', ΠΩΩ 'divide', ΟΥΩΝ 'open', etc. Occasionally, however, the verbs that do not comply with one of the two criteria may nevertheless demonstrate lability. So, ΜΟΘΝΕ 'graze, pasture' is labile and atelic, ΣΩΝΤ 'create / be created', ΩΩΩΣΕ 'wound / be wounded' have an obligatory agent but can be used in a clause with a patient subject. Yet, such cases are presumably rather infrequent.

Apart from these three classes of mutable verbs, Coptic verbal vocabulary includes the immutable class consisting of unergative verbs, such as verbs of movement and posture, verbs of sound emission (ΟΥΕΛΟΥΕΛΕ 'howl', ΚΑΚΚΕ 'whisper', ΖΗΖΗ 'neigh', ΖΩΣ 'sing'), communication (ΟΥΛΗΛ 'pray', ΟΥΟΧΝΕ 'take counsel', ΜΟΥΓΤΕ 'call', ΣΜΜΕ 'appeal' and others).¹⁵⁷

157 A very similar classification of unergatives can be found in Reintges (2004:229). The semantic groups mentioned by Reintges are: sound emission, bodily activity or expression, manner of motion.

1.3.4.7 The opposition <infinitive: stative> in the Bipartite conjugation

Let us now come back to the issue of the respective status of infinitive and stative forms in the durative tenses. As a start, I shall try to summarize the conditions bringing about the use of the Bipartite intransitive infinitive.

In 1.3.4.6, it has been demonstrated that a specific lexical group of unaccusatives (verbs lexicalizing change of state) use durative infinitive to express the meaning of a progressive non-causative present. Such meaning combining the semantics of process and of change of state is, on the ontological grounds, rather rare.

Beside the sporadic occurrences with non-labile monadic verbs, intransitive infinitives may also surface with labile verbs. Thus, in Shenoute's Canons, a Bipartite intransitive infinitive appears to be bound to the idea of *iterativity*, which can be dictated by the context or else constitute a part of the proper lexical meaning of a verb. The context-bound iterativity may be illustrated by the following examples:

- (56) Shen.Can. 7 GN381, Crum (1905, frag.194 f.3)¹⁵⁸

ΔΝΟΝ ΔΕ ΔΝΟΝ ΖΕΝΚΑΖ · ΣΟΠ ΕΝΒΩΛ **ΕΒΟΛ** ΝΘΕ ΝΟΥΟΜΕ · ΣΟΠ ΕΝ**ΖΩΣΒ** ΝΘΕ ΝΟΥΧΟΡΤΟC
ΕΜΝ̄ ΜΟΟΥ ΖΑΡΟΦ

'As for us, we are but earth. Sometimes we **dissolve** like clay, sometimes we **wither** like grass devoid of water.'

- (57) Shen.Can 6, Amel. 2 (317:2)

ΖΕΝCΥΝΑΓΩΓΗ ΕΑΥΡΩΜΕ ΠΩΖ ΝΝΕΦΖΟΕΙΤΕ ΖΡΑΙ ΝΖΗΤΟΥ ΝΖΑΖ ΝΣΟΠ ΕΜΑΤΕ ΕΦΖΙΟΥC
ΕΖΟΥΝ ΖΗ ΠΕΦΖΟ ΖΗ ΤΕΦΣΟΜ ΑΥΩ ΕΦΖΕ Ε**ΦΡΩΞΤ** ΕΖΡΑΙ ΕΧΜ ΠΙΚΑΖ ΔΕ ΗΝ ΣΟΜ ΗΜΟΥ
ΕΔΖΕΡΑΤΥ

'...monastic communities where one would often tear his clothes hitting himself on the face with all his might, and fall, **collapsing** to the ground, because he does not have strength enough to stand'

The infinitives in bold represent unique occurrences of their lexemes in a non-stative form in the Bipartite. Besides the form of the verb as such, iterativity is signaled by characteristic adverbials, such as ΣΟΠ Ε-... ΣΟΠ Ε- 'at times, now... again', ΖΑΖ ΝΣΟΠ 'many times'.

On the other hand, for the lexically coded iteration, this durative form would be a standard one. This can be observed on such verbs as ΖΙΤΕ 'move to and fro' or ΠΩΩΝΕ 'toss and turn'.

- (58) Shen.Can. 9 DF 113:16-17, Pleyte & Boeser (1897)

ΟΥΝ̄ ΟΥΑ ΜΕΝ ΖΟCΕ ΕΦΤΑΛΛΙΠΟΡΕΙ ΧΙΝ ΖΤΟΟΥC ΟΥΑ ΡΟΥΖΕ ΖΗ ΠΕΡΖΩΒ ΚΕΟΥΑ ΔΕ Ε**ΦΖΙΤΕ**
ΧΙΝ ΖΤΟΟΥC ΟΥΑ ΡΟΥΖΕ

'There is one who toileth miserably from dawn till evening, while some other loiters (lit.: '**walks hither and thither**') from dawn till evening.'

158 Crum's translation ("we are but earth and wither as grass") deviates slightly from the Coptic text. Translation – N.S.

(59) Shen.Can. 6, Amel. 2 (322:7-8)

†ΠΩΩΝΕ ΝΗΤΟΥ ΖΗ ΟΥΜΑ ΕΥΜΑ ΕΥΜΑ ΕΙΣΟΝΤ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΤΕΥΩΗ ΤΗΡΣ ΕΙΕΠΘΥΜΕΙ
ΕΤΡΕΠΟΥΘΕΙΝ ΕΙ ΕΖΡΑΙ

'I toss and turn inside it (i.e., my bed – N.S.) from side to side waiting the whole night through for the light to come out'

As a matter of fact, the infinitive form of these verbs is not opposed to any stative. For ζιττε, there is no stative attested in Crum's dictionary. The entry for πωωνε does include the stative ποωνε, but it is not used in the Canons. Since both verbs have construct allomorphs, they can still be considered mutable; but there is a reason to suppose that their stative form was gradually supplanted by infinitive precisely because of the iterative character of the lexeme as such.¹⁵⁹

Funnily enough, such is also the case of the verb of movement *par excellence*, κιμ 'move, make movements'. Being a mutable verb, in as much as its construct allomorphs are attested in the Bible, it is used as infinitive in the Bipartite and for all we know, does not possess any stative form, which probably must be explained by the idea of the repetition of movement contributing to its semantics.

An intransitive use of a causative morpheme to denote iteration is not unusual, from the typological point of view. In Nedyalkov & Sil'nickij (1973), the meaning of intensity or iterativity is claimed to be one of the cross-linguistically attested outcomes of a causative derivation that does not increase original valency. Thus, in Zulu, the form *enz-isa* derived from *enza* 'work' by means of a causative suffix has the meaning of 'work persistently', if there is no direct object present. Further on, according to Nedyalkov, "it is apparently no coincidence that in some languages synchronically primary V^{tr} (and even Vⁱⁿ) designating actions which are *iterative by nature* and seemingly composed of a set of similar actions contain a causative morpheme, e.g., Abkhazian *a-r-x-ra* 'mow'... Georgian *i-c-in-i* 'laugh'".¹⁶⁰ Of course, the similarity between Zulu and Coptic does not immediately strike the eye, Coptic having no derivational causative morpheme. If, however, we take into account that in the Bipartite infinitive itself is a marked transitive form, then its location in an objectless paradigm equals to the non-valency increasing causative derivation.¹⁶¹ Again, the observed cases of lexical iteratives with the same alternation pattern echo the instances mentioned by Nedyalkov for Abkhazian and Georgian.

In all other cases, except the two discussed above (dynamic interpretation with the change-of-state verbs and iterative interpretation with labile verbs), the use of an intransitive infinitive form where one would rather expect a stative must, in all likelihood,

159 Neither is the stative of πωωνε attested in the Bible. Durative intransitive infinitive occurs in Sir. 18:25 and Gal. 1:6.

160 Nedjalkov & Sil'nickij (1973:20).

161 Interestingly, what looks like an exactly opposite phenomenon, namely, iterative sense conveyed through a reflexive form, may be a slightly different reflexion of the same underlying factor: non-valency changing, i.e., non-directed transitivity interpreted as an enhancement of the action, multiplying its objects or its occurrences. Examples of that may be found in Doron (2003).

be considered a formal variation without any functional meaning. Consider, e.g., the total semantic, even textual identity of the Greek *Vorlage* for the following examples:

(60) Joel 2:31

εμπατφει νσι πινος ηροογ ηπιχοεις ετογωνη εβολ

Joel 3:4 πρην ελθειν ημεραν κυριου την μεγαλην και επιφανη

and

Acts 2:20

ηπατφει νσι περοογ ηπιχοεις πινος ετογωνη εβολ

πρην ελθειν ημεραν Κυριου την μεγαλην και επιφανη

'before the day of the Lord comes, the great and magnificent'

Another example of the free variation between stative and infinitive is the treatment of the verb ζων 'approach'. In Luke 15:1, it translates the same Greek form (auxiliary ειμι + present participle of εγγιζω), as in Jer 23:23.

(61) Luke 15:1

νερεντελωνης δε τηρογ ηη ρρεφρνοβε ζων ερογν ερογ εσατω ερογ

Ἦσαν δὲ αὐτῷ ἐγγιζοντες πάντες οἱ τελῶναι καὶ οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἀκούειν αὐτοῦ.

'Now the tax collectors and sinners were all drawing near to hear him'

(62) Jer. 23:23

ανοκ πε πινογτε ετζηη ερογν

θεδς εγγιζων εγω ειμι

'I am a God at hand'

In both cases, the stative ηη is to be expected. Indeed, as is expected for a verb of movement, ηη occurs 101 times in the Bible, as opposed to 4 tokens of the durative intransitive ζων, without any aspectual difference traceable. Both forms can translate the periphrastic participle construction, as in (61) and (62) above, and the adjectival phrase εγγύς ειμι, as in (63) and (64):

(63) Rev. 22:10

ηηρωωβε ηηααδε ηηειπροφητια ηηειαωαμε δε πεογοεια γαρ ζων ερογν

Μη σφραγίσῃς τοὺς λόγους τῆς προφητείας τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου· ὁ καιρὸς γὰρ

ἐγγύς ἐστιν

'Do not seal up the words of the prophecy of this book, for the time is near'

(64) Rom. 10:8

πααδε ηηη ερογν εροκ ηη τεκταπρο αγω ηηαι ηη πεκρητ

Ἐγγύς σου τὸ ῥῆμά ἐστιν, ἐν τῷ στόματί σου καὶ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου·

'The message is very close at hand; it is on your lips and in your heart'

Besides, stative is also used to convey the dynamic meaning expressed in Greek by a finite verb:

(65) Isa 41:21

ΠΕΤΗΡΑΠ **ΞΗΝ** ΕΞΟΥΝ ΠΕΧΕ ΠΧΟΕΙΣ ΝΟΥΤΕ ΔΑΝΕΤΝΩΔΑΧΝΕ¹⁶² ΖΩΝ ΕΞΟΥΝ ΠΕΧΕ ΠΡΡΟ
ΝΙΑΚΩΒ

Ἐγγίζει ἡ κρίσις ὑμῶν, λέγει κύριος ὁ θεός· ἤγγισαν αἱ βουλαὶ ὑμῶν, λέγει ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἰακωβ.

*‘Your judgement comes close, says the Lord God. Your arguments have come, says the King Jacob’*¹⁶³

The free variation or competition of semantically equal forms would usually result in one form superseding the other, and indeed, various dialects of Coptic yield examples of stative and infinitive replacing each other, as, for instance, in the case of the verb ‘sit’, represented in both conjugations by the infinitive **ἕμεσι** in Bohairic and the stative **ἕμοο** in Sahidic and other dialects.¹⁶⁴ The prevalence of that or the other form is individual for each specific verb. So, for example, the stative **τακηγ(τ)** of the verb **τακο** ‘destroy’ seems to have acquired adjectival character and is mostly used as an epithet (‘spoilt, κατεφθαρμένος) in Shenoute and in the Bible; the infinitive of this verb comes in not only for iterative / habitual (2Cor. 4:9, 2Cor. 4:16, Jude 1:10), but also for resultative (Job 5:11) usage which is characteristic of statives.

At the same time, the cases of stative used for dynamic meanings are evidently less frequent than the reverse situation. In the biblical sample, there is at best one instance that allows such an interpretation of stative.

(66) Luke 2:40

ΠΑΗΡΕ ΔΕ ΑΗΜ ΝΕΑΡΑΙΔΕΙ ΔΥΩ ΝΕΦΘΗΘΟΝ ΕΦ**ΗΜΕΞ** ΝΤΣΟΦΙΑ
τὸ δὲ παιδίον ἠύξανεν καὶ ἐκραταιοῦτο **πληρούμενον** σοφίᾳ
And the child grew and became strong, **filled** with wisdom.

The use of the imperfective participle in Greek presents the action as progressive, as opposed to the resultative sense conveyed in the English translation. But the uniqueness of such an example in Coptic makes one think that the aspectual difference in this case is neutralized, rather than expressed in an alternative way. In all other cases, stative is reserved – both in Scriptures and in Shenoute – for resultative or stative meanings, as in

(67) EpJer 16

ΝΕΓΒΑΛ **ΣΗΜΕΞ** ΝΦΟΡΕΙΩ
οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν **πλήρεις** εἰσὶν κονιορτοῦ
‘Their eyes are full of the dust’

162 Read **ΦΟΧΝΕ**. Orthography according to Coptic Old Testament edition (<http://data.copticscriptorium.org/texts/old-testament/>).

163 My translation deviates from the one in the ESV, so that it may more closely resemble the Coptic text.

164 A detailed discussion of the functional neutralization between infinitive and stative can be found in Funk (1978a:27 ff.).

- (68) Job 41:19
 ερε νβακωνε **ηπ** ντοοτγ ντρε νογχορτος
 Job 41:20 **ηγηται** μεν πετροβόλον χόρτον·
 Job 41:28 *'for him, sling stones are turned to (lit.: count as) stubble'*
- (69) 2Sam 11:11
 πα.χοεις ιωαβ μη νεζημαλ μη.χοεις σεπορα εβολ ρι ρρας ντσωφε
 ó κύριός μου Ιωαβ και οι δοῦλοι τοῦ κυρίου μου ἐπὶ πρόσωπον τοῦ ἀγροῦ
παρεμβάλλουσιν
'my lord Joab and the servants of my lord are camping (lit: spread) in the open field'
- (70) Num 14:14
 αγω ντοκ π.χοεις **κογονε** εβολ ερογ νβαλ ριβαλ
 ὅστις ὀφθαλμοῖς κατ' ὀφθαλμοῦς **ὀπτάζει** κύριε
'For you, O Lord, are seen face to face'

The incompatibility of non-causative infinitives and infinitives of verbs of movement with the durative pattern, unless in the iterative sense, may occasionally be of use as an analytic tool for elucidation of homonyms. This logic can be applied to the lexeme **μογζ** in:

- (71) P. Morgan Library M.593 Installation of Michael (Müller 1962:58,9-12)
 η̄π̄ερενκοτ̄κ̄ ογ̄δε η̄π̄ερ̄ζ̄ῑνηβ̄, ᾱλλα ω̄ω̄πε̄ ε̄ρενετ̄νη̄πε̄ μηρ̄ **ε̄ρενετ̄ενη̄ε̄ς̄ μογ̄ζ̄**
 Theoretically, two out of the three homonyms for **μογζ** ('take a look', 'fill / be filled', 'burn') would fit in well as a predicate for **νετενηε̄ς̄** 'your lamps': 'be filled' as well as 'burn'. However, 'be filled' as a non-causative verb must be excluded from consideration. The correct translation, consequently, is 'burn':
*'Do not lie down nor do you fall asleep, but keep your loins girdled and your lamps burning.'*¹⁶⁵

The data gathered in the above discussion make it possible to revise the scope of aspectual meanings the Coptic present tense can assume. According to Layton (2000), the present tense pattern expresses an enduring, ongoing or general action, process, state or situation.¹⁶⁶ Reintges (2004) distinguishes between the perceptive, performative, epistemic, habitual and generic types of present, whereas the aorist, in his opinion, can have multiple, iterative, frequentative, distributive, habitual or extensive reading. Our examples show that besides denoting primary or secondary states, the present can also have iterative or dynamic meaning that can be morphologically signaled through the infinitive of a mutable intransitive verb. Thus, the area of semantic intersection between aorist and present is greater than one can infer from grammars and calls for a further and more detailed research.

165 Of course, since the passage is a quotation from Luke 12:35, we do not have to recur to grammar analysis in order to understand the text. Yet, it is important to know that such analytic tool exists.

166 Layton (2011:233).

1.3.5 Diachrony

1.3.5.1 Attestations of causative split in pre-Coptic Egyptian

Although the huge life span of the documented Egyptian language¹⁶⁷ makes it possible to engage in the adventurous enterprise of ‘linguistic archeology’ speculating how different parts of the system changed over enormous periods of time, the sheer complexity of the pre-Coptic conjugation, not to mention limitations of the Egyptian writing system, work against all attempts at creating a concise and transparent diachronic survey. What follows should therefore be taken rather as a tentative sketch of such a survey, than as a final statement on “how everything has really happened”. With that proviso, I shall venture the following analysis of the observable data.

As specified in 1.3.2.1, one can discern in the Coptic conjugation system two layers, that of morphologically marked forms (construct forms, stative) and that of the unmarked absolute infinitives. Let us imagine that the unmarked layer is a secondary one, that it has emerged in the process of paradigm readjustment after some categorial shift in the system. What we are left with is a paradigmatic system where the binary oppositions of tense (past vs. present), aspect (perfective vs. imperfective) and diathesis (transitive vs. intransitive) are not yet shaped in separate morphosyntactic paradigms, but rather merged in two categorial clusters: <transitive perfective past> and <imperfective intransitive present>. These two clusters may be thought of as the nucleus of the verbal system, while secondary forms expanding this nucleus filled the gaps where the category of tense disengaged itself from aspect and transitivity, such gaps as the intransitive past tense, the transitive present tense, the imperfective past tense. (Thus, our model, explains, inter alia, also the secondary derivation of the imperfective past tense by means of the preterite converter.)

The nucleus hypothesis conforms with Hopper & Thompson’s generalizations regarding transitivity, since the perfective aspect is supposed to correlate with high degree of transitivity. Moreover, the clusterization of the three above categories as such is also not unheard of in linguistic typology. In this connection, one can recall the phenomenon of split ergativity which consists in the interdependence between different alignment patterns (ergative-absolutive or nominative-accusative) and tense-aspect (perfective / imperfective) characteristics of the clause. Even closer is the phenomenon of **split causativity** (predominant intransitivity of perfective forms for some verbs) described by Kulikov for Vedic Sanskrit and Ancient Greek. According to Kulikov,

“...the hypothesis of a genetic relatedness of these three categories appears quite plausible, notwithstanding the fact that they belong to three different classes: the perfect is a tense, the stative is usually considered an aspectual category, and the middle participates in the voice, or diathesis, opposition. In contemporary Indo-European studies these three categories are taken as associated with each other so intimately that some scholars even treat the perfect as one of the members of the diathesis opposition (active vs. perfect[-

167 See, e.g., Grossman and Richter (2015:70).

middle]), although, at first glance, the expression ‘perfect diathesis’ makes no more sense than, say, ‘nominative number’ or ‘feminine case’.”¹⁶⁸

Split causativity is manifested in the older Indo-European languages, — Ancient Greek and Vedic Sanskrit, — through the phenomenon of the morphological tense-diathesis split. So, in Ancient Greek, active perfects of many verbs are intransitive non-causatives, whereas the corresponding present forms are transitive causative.

- a. εἰ καὶ μιν Ὀλύμπιος αὐτὸς ἐγείρει (Iliad, N 58)
if and him Olympian.Nom.SG self.Nom.SG awake.Pres-3SG.ACT
‘and if the Olympian himself awakes him ... ’
- b. οἱ δ’ ἐγρηγοῦσσι (Iliad, K 419)
they awake.PF-3pL.ACT
‘They awoke.’ (Example from Kulikov 1999:29)

Since perfectivity is supposed to be linked to a higher degree of transitivity, the anticausative perfects of Ancient Greek may seem puzzling. The unexpected combination can be explained by the semantic proximity between perfect and resultative stative. It is assumed that the intransitive form had originally functioned as a stative and later became reinterpreted as a past tense form.¹⁶⁹ If our interpretation of the Coptic data is correct, then Coptic represents an even more elegant instance of split causativity, where the three categories are clustered in a non-contradictory way.

At first sight, our model has an important drawback, because it seems to suggest that the above-described unfolding of the categories and emergence of the secondary forms has been a rather late, partly intra-Coptic phenomenon, which obviously cannot be true. However, one should take into account another possibility, namely, that some fundamental parts of the verbal mechanism, such as stative / transitive past patterns, were inherited through all the stages of the language, whereas the rest were configured around and adapted to this fundamental part in different ways.

Indeed, the Egyptian verbal system, the way it is represented in Old, Middle, Late Egyptian and Demotic grammars, has always had a tendency for a complementary distribution of transitive and intransitive verbs by various tense-aspect patterns with a following lifting of restrictions and reorganization of patterns. According to Edel (1955), the Old Egyptian perfect *sdm=f* can be found solely with transitive verbs¹⁷⁰. In Middle

168 Kulikov (1999:30 ff.).

169 Kulikov (1999:31).

170 Edel (1955:213). The description of the *sdm=f* pattern in Malaise & Winand (1999) differs significantly from that given in Edel (1955). According to Malaise & Winand, this pattern underwent the change from Old Egyptian intransitive perfect tense to Middle Egyptian punctual past, which was compatible with transitive and intransitive verbs alike, though lexically restricted: “*En ancien égyptien*, dans les Textes des Pyramides, régulièrement dote d’un sujet nominale, il est attesté avec les verbes intransitifs, comme contrepartie de la *sdm.n.f* des verbes transitifs... *En Égyptien classique*, le perfectif *sdm.f* est un accompli ponctuel... On trouve le perfectif *sdm.f* aussi bien avec des verbes transitifs qu’avec des verbes intransitifs.” Interestingly, both contradicting descriptions mention diathesis restrictions in the distribution of the pattern.

Egyptian, the ‘division of labor’ between the two patterns — the *sḏm.n.f* and the stative pattern — is described as transitivity / intransitivity opposition¹⁷¹, because both patterns are supposed to be identical in the denotation of tense and aspect. In Late Egyptian, the form *sḏm.n.f* becomes obsolete and falls out of use, but the same transitivity opposition resurfaces in the opposition of patterns *sḏm.f* and stative. So, according to Junge’s Late Egyptian Grammar, “the Late Egyptian preterite *sḏm=f* ... (is) used exclusively with transitive verbs. Intransitive verbs, especially verbs of motion, use the First Present with the Old Perfective¹⁷²”. And again, in Demotic, the restriction on the compatibility of *sḏm=f* with intransitive verbs had slackened. Thus, according to Quack:

“Im Unterschied zum Neuägyptischen können auch intransitive Verben im *sḏm=f* der Vergangenheit konstruiert werden, speziell auch Bewegungsverben, bei denen das Vergangenheitstempus *sḏm=f* die ältere Vergangenheitsbildung mit dem Pseudopartizip im Präsens I ablöst.¹⁷³”

At the same time, the form itself becomes slowly marginalized¹⁷⁴, replaced by the periphrastic form with the auxiliary *jrj* ‘to do’.

Thus, it seems that in the whole course of Egyptian language, its verbal system tried to keep apart some kind of telic transitive and atelic intransitive structure, both given to an interpretation as a reference to a past action or to a present state resulting from that action. Thus, *ph.n.j 3bw* can be both “I have travelled as far as to Elephantine” and “I am in Elephantine”. The link between resultative forms and transitivity is explained by Kulikov as follows:

“In fact, the semantics of the PERFECT has two facets. One of them relates to an event in the past resulting in a certain state in the present. This part of the perfect semantics (‘actional perfect’) implies high effectiveness of an action and therefore must correspond to a high transitivity degree... The other facet is the meaning of an achieved state of affairs (resulting from some action in the past)¹⁷⁵, which belongs to the sphere of the present.”

However, in order to avoid the danger of oversimplification, we have to bear in mind also the following. No Old or Middle Egyptian grammar describes the *sḏm=f* pattern as a transitive *structure*. Quite the contrary, it is underlined that this pattern is compatible with transitive *lexemes*, quite independently of whether they have an object. Thus, according to Edel (1955), “die Verwendung des *sḏmf* als historisches Perfekt... begegnet allerdings nur bei transitiven Verben (**mit oder ohne Objekt**).”¹⁷⁶The important prerequisite for this

171 So, e.g., in Allen 2014: 247 with some examples, such as:

Xnt.kw ph.n.j Abw (Hatnub 14, 6) ‘I have gone upstream and reached Elephantine.’

172 Junge-Warburton, Late Egyptian Grammar 3.5.1

173 Quack (2020: 78, § 12.4.1).

174 See *ibid.*, p.73: “Im Spätägyptischen wird zunehmend das *sḏm=f* durch *irD=f sḏm* ersetzt.”

175 Curiously, this resultative semantics of present rooted in the past was precisely the feature discerned by Young in Shenoute’s use of present (Young 1961:116).

176 Edel (1955:213, § 467). Cf. Satzinger (1976:132), “unter den Verben, die im perfektischen *sḏm.f* belegt sind, sind nun auch solche, die zwar in gleicher oder ähnlicher Bedeutung transitiv

and the like statements is that the Egyptian finite forms, like the construct forms and the stative in Coptic, have a fixed diathesis. Hence, for transitive verbs, the opposition <*sdm.f* : stative> pattern is valid and has the above-described sense (telic transitive vs. atelic intransitive):

- (72) Papyrus Nu, Tb 124, 2
kd.n b3 = j hnr; t m dd, w
'My Ba has built a fortress in Busiris'

vs.

- (73) P.Kairo CG 51189 (P.Juja), Tb 149, 860
mn, w kd(.w)¹⁷⁷
'Min is created'

Or:

- (74) P. London BM EA 10477 (P.Nu), Tb 083, [2]
sd.n = (j) wj m štw
'I have dressed / concealed myself as a turtle'

vs.

- (75) P.Berlin P 3022, Sinuhe, 293-294
sd.kw m p3k, t gs.kw m tp, t sdr.kw hr hnk, yt
'I was dressed in finest linen, anointed with oil, I lay on a bed'

But for most intransitive verbs, this opposition is simply invalid. For them, the *sdm=f* pattern is inaccessible, in much the same way, as the transitive part of the Coptic paradigm is inaccessible for monadic verbs. As follows from this analogy, this lexical constraint does not compromise the general model of tense-aspect-diathesis split.

Trying to reconstruct the details of the shift that transformed the earlier Egyptian diathetic system into the Coptic one, you inevitably stumble upon one more difficulty. As mentioned above, in the pre-Coptic stages of the language, the finite forms of the verb tended to have one diathesis. Incidentally, this was the reason for the remarkably frequent use of the causativizing *dj*-construction with monadic verbs, e.g., in Demotic. E.g., for a verb such as *wj* 'be (make) far', I have been able to find just one transitive example in the TLA database:

- (76) P.Berlin P 15530, x+13
iw=f-hpr r rwh = f hD mj wj = w s r.r = f
'Wenn er Anstoß nimmt, soll man ihn von ihm (dem Heiligum?!) entfernen!'

gebraucht werden können, im speziellen Fall jedoch objektlos sind ("Objektilgung")."

177 In the equivalent passage of Papyrus Nu, Tb 149, the identical phrase is interpreted as active: 'Min creates' (<https://aew.bbaw.de/tla/servlet/GetCtxt?u=guest&f=0&l=0&db=0&tc=25757&ws=101&mv=3>, as of 07.03.2021). However, the passive reading seems to be more appropriate in the context.

On the other hand, the database contains about 150 instances of the *dj(.t) wj* construction, such as:

- (77) P. Spiegelberg, XI,20
bw-ir =w dj,t wj 3h mhl hl,2l iwḥ p3 mšc n kmj
‘Sie pflegen nicht Kampf und Streit fernzuhalten unter dem Heer von Ägypten’
- (78) P. Petese Tebt. A, V 2
[bn]-iw =j dj,t w3j md,t p3j = (j) sn
‘Ich werde nicht zulassen, daß etwas fern ist (or: fehlt), mein Bruder!’

What were the factors influencing the transition from this European-like, fixed-diathesis verbal system to the more Semitic-like labile one which we observe in Coptic, where the voice is a property not of the lexeme, but of the template? Should we look for these factors outside the native grammar – in other words, could the transition occur under the influence of the Greek voice grammar? I do not think such an explanation necessary or even likely. Instead, one could propose something like the following scenario.

In all the earlier stages of the language, from Old Egyptian through Demotic, tense-aspect templates, though not directly ascribing voice to a lexeme, demonstrate selective compatibility with the diathesis of the verb. This selective compatibility reaches the Coptic stage in form of the phenomenon captured by the Stern-Jernstedt rule and by the Stern’s rule of the selective compatibility of stative. In Coptic, on the other hand, eventive patterns become re-structured so that the first argument is invariably indexed on the auxiliary verb, and the main verb expands the auxiliary in its construct or infinitival form. Now, the Egyptian infinitive is a form unmarked for voice. Edel reports this to be the case already in Old Egyptian, so it can hardly be viewed as a Coptic innovation caused by the language contact.¹⁷⁸ Once the objectless infinitive enters the Tripartite paradigm, the tense-aspect markers of the Tripartite become also its voice markers, in as much as they set the frame where it is opposed to construct forms and thus liable to a non-causative reading. Instances of this reading may be found already in Demotic, e.g., in negative periphrastic templates (which, one could suppose, served as a trigger for the switch of the whole of eventive conjugation to the periphrastic-tripartite structure)¹⁷⁹:

- (79) P. London-Leiden, 17, 30, Griffith-Thompson (1921:118-119)
*iw =j r šš =k n3j-ḥr p3 ntj ḥr p3 bḥd ntj-iw **bw-ir =f htm***
*‘I will glorify thee before him who is on the throne, who **does not perish**’*
- (80) P. Leiden I 384, [XV,16]
bw-ir p3j =w mtm[e] jf m-s3 =w cn sp-2
*“Ihr Schandfleck (o.ä., wörtl. “ihre Spur”) kann nie wieder von ihnen **abgewaschen werden.**”*

178 Edel (1955:351, § 695).

179 The diachronical table of verb forms in Quack (2020.:113) provides an excellent visualization of how the periphrasis enters the verbal paradigm in negations by the time of Late Egyptian and how it later becomes spread through the affirmative forms in the process of paradigm leveling.

Cross-linguistically, labile patterning can emerge or spread in different ways. Sometimes it is attained through the phonological merger of causative and anticausative counterparts (e.g., Old English *bærnan* ‘kindle’ and *biernan* ‘burn (intr.)’ melt into Modern English *burn*) or through the deletion of the reflexive pronoun, as in Germanic languages or Latin, or else through the multi-functionality of the middle voice, as in Classical Greek¹⁸⁰. Among the mechanisms responsible for the rise of lability, the one suggested here, namely, the transfer of voice marking to the TAM-template by means of periphrasis manifests a singular and rather sophisticated linguistic phenomenon.

1.3.5.2 Excursus: Simpson-Depuydt Rule

Whereas it does not seem at all impossible to figure out the circumstances that have brought about the use of non-causative infinitive in the Tripartite conjugation, the dominance of the causative absolute infinitive in the Bipartite is much more difficult to account for. Ideally, two issues have to be clarified: what kind of ‘natural selection’ has left transitive infinitives, suppressing intransitive ones; and how did the original presuffixal *sdm=f* form become supplanted in the Bipartite by the absolute infinitive with the prepositional phrase object. The second problem is by no means new; its answer would equal the explanation of the Stern-Jernstedt rule, a thing many Coptologists have made a try at. The first problem has, to my knowledge, never yet been posited, let alone answered.

It is an established fact in Egyptian linguistics that the Coptic First Present is the descendant of the Middle Egyptian *iw=f hr sdm*¹⁸¹, a form initially denoting progressive present. This construction is compatible with both intransitive (exx. 81 & 82) and transitive (exx. 83-86) verbs:

- (81) Tomb of Si-renpowet I. , [14-15]
n³.t=j m hb d3m. =j hr nhm sdm.t(w) hbb=(j) jm
 ‘My city was in festival, my recruits rejoiced, when one heard (me) dancing there’
- (82) Stela of Hor, Kairo JE 71901 [7]
h3s.t. <hr> hnk dw. hr jm3 s,t nb.t di.n =s sdh =s
 ‘the foreign countries present gifts, the mountains are friendly, every place has given its secret’
- (83) pMMA Heqanakht II, [rto30])
dd =tn p3 k,w n r(m)t.(Pl.) =j jw =sn hr jri.t k3,t
 ‘Ihr sollt diese Einkünfte meinen Leuten geben, wenn sie beim Verrichten der Arbeit sind’
- (84) Stela of Nesmontu, (Louvre C 1 = N 155) [A.14])
wr. hr hzi.t =j
 ‘The great ones praised me’

180 Kulikov (2014), Gianollo (2014) etc.

181 Polotsky (1960:395).

- (85) Sakkara Necropole, the tomb of Tjy the ship convoy lord, [1]
 ...*sms,w-w**hr,t hr wd*^r = *sn*
 ‘Ein Ältester der Werft bei ihrem (= Schiffe/Klauentiere) Zuweisen/Entladen’
- (86) P. Boulaq 3, x+7,5
jnp,w hr,w hr snfr wt = *k*
 ‘Anubis und Horus verschönern deine Umwicklung’

A cursory look at the tokens in the TLA database gives the impression that in this pattern, transitive verbs with overt direct objects are far more frequent than intransitive ones. However, this statement requires statistical verification which hopefully will be carried out through further research.¹⁸² If this impression is correct, the opposition <stative : infinitive> in the present tense pattern must be interpreted as the opposition of diathesis, in the first place, in pre-Coptic Egyptian as well as in Coptic. In view of the above discussed interconnection between transitivity and aspect, it is not particularly difficult to reconcile this concept with Gardiner’s treatment of the opposition as an aspectual one.¹⁸³

In its further development, the <*hr*+ infinitive> pattern undergoes both formal and semantic changes. By the time of Late Egyptian or even earlier, it acquires the meaning of generic present, or aorist.¹⁸⁴ Starting from ca. 12th century B.C., the preposition *hr* is regularly omitted in writing,¹⁸⁵ and in Demotic texts, the pattern exhibits a new feature: in the overwhelming majority of cases, the direct object is not indexed on the verb in form of a personal suffix, but is attached (or flagged) by the preposition *n / n.im*. This has enabled Egyptologists to argue that the Stern-Jernstedt rule applies to Demotic grammar, as well.¹⁸⁶

The attempts to explain the sudden flourishing of the prepositional phrase *n / n.im* in the transitive present initially focused on the adverbial status of the infinitive in the Bipartite. Thus, Elanskaya¹⁸⁷ claimed that as a member of the prepositional phrase, infinitive was necessarily indefinite and for that reason could not attach a suffix pronoun that would act as a determiner. This explanation looks confusing enough, since at the period when the bipartite predicate included the full prepositional phrase, direct objects were still coded by suffix pronouns.

182 For the sake of accuracy, one must add that the two examples without an overt DO cited here (81 and 82) do not contain non-causative verbs, either; *nhm* is not exactly ‘rejoice’ in the sense of ‘be glad’, but rather ‘emit loud sounds of joy’, which is unergative; *jm*³ has the sense of ‘honour somebody’ and appears here exactly in that sense (as opposed to the passive ‘be honoured’).

183 Gardiner (1957:245), see above 1.3.3.7.

184 Satzinger (online:38), Depuydt (2002). However, there are reasons to believe that the functions of the bipartite pattern were not exhausted by the said two meanings, since it was also used, e.g., in the apodictical narrative perfect clauses, see Satzinger (1976:36 ff.).

185 Satzinger (online:27).

186 Parker (1961), Johnson (1976).

187 Elanskaya (2010:142).

- (87) P. Leiden I 348, Vso. 9,6-10,8, Bakenptah's letter, [9,9]¹⁸⁸
ptrj pʒy = k [DD] n šhny.t n,tj tw=k hr jrt =f
 'Siehe (?) dein [---] des Auftrags, das du ausführst'
 (See also the examples 83-86.)

These examples suffice to demonstrate the futility of the part-of-speech approach to the Stern-Jernstedt rule attempted by Elanskaya and later by Schenkel¹⁸⁹. Another, more promising path has been taken by Simpson and Depuydt. Their approach is based on the observation that in Demotic, the discussed pattern appears to sometimes violate the rule, yielding exceptions that would never hold in Coptic. In particular, Simpson claims that the language of Ptolemaic decrees contains very few examples conforming to Jernstedt's rule and that the choice between the immediate and the mediated (i.e., prepositional) object construction is affected by aspectual distinctions¹⁹⁰.

"[The object-suffixed] type of punctual durative infinitive has atemporal or 'aoristic' rather than simultaneous sense. A... parallel is provided by the 'gnomic' statements characteristic of wisdom texts. In relative clauses, these often imply conditions and can similarly combine atemporality with completed action, as in 'Ankhsheshonqy 21:19 *pA nt nq s-ħm.t jw wn mtw=s hy* "he who lies with a married woman..."¹⁹¹

To illustrate the aspectual contrast, Simpson cites such examples as:

- (88) Canopus Tanis, CG 22187, 7/ 24 *nʒ grt.w nt-jw=w fy=w*
 'the rings they wear'
 (89) Canopus Tanis, CG 22187, 8/ 29 (the 25 priests) *nt-jw=w stp=w hr rnp.t*
 'who are chosen each year'

as opposed to

- (90) Canopus Kom el-Hisn, CG 22186, 10 (the festival of Sothis) *nt-jw=w jr n-im=f n hʒ,t-sp 9.t ibd-2 šmw sw 1*
 'which is being held' (the current year, on a particular date)

Depuydt explains the correspondence between the use of the prepositional model and the imperfective meaning it conveys by referring to the partitive character of direct objects with imperfective verbs:

"The preposition *n/-n-jm=* (from earlier *m*) in origin had partitive meaning ("from, from among"). This partitive meaning is associated as follows with the continuous present. In the immediate present, an action only applies to *part* of a direct object. Thus, if one drinks a cup, one drinks only part of it right now. It does not surprise that, in the continuous present as expressed by the bipartite conjugation, a direct object is preceded by the preposition *n...* meaning "from". [...] In sum, a difference in tense is expressed by a difference in attachment of the direct object. This may seem unusual. But the bipartite

188 Translation: L.Popko.

189 Schenkel (1976), discussed above in 1.2.4.

190 Simpson (1996:152).

191 Simpson (1996:150).

conjugation does not leave room for distinctions elsewhere. The bipartite conjugation does not have auxiliaries.¹⁹²

We encounter here, as it seems, a sound explanation of the split in the object flagging with an ensuing preservation of the mediated form in the present tense. In this scenario, the prepositional phrase has germinated inside the Bipartite as a signal of progressive aspect. It is important to notice, however, that the split observed by Simpson and Depuydt is mainly restricted to one specific syntactic subtype of the bipartite pattern, viz., to its relative conversion. This might mean that in Demotic relative sub-pattern serves as a neutralization environment merging forms of relative aorist with those of relative present. This point of view seems not ungrounded, since the ‘proper’ aorist relative conversion <*ntj hr sdm.f s*> is extremely rare in Demotic. Thus, according to Quack (2020):

“Aorist: Entweder *ntj hr sdm=f s*, so *ʒhj nb ntj hr ʕnh ntr n.jm=w* „alle Dinge, von denen ein Gott lebt“ pRhind I 9, 10, oder (meist) durch *ntj sdm=f* „der es hört“ bzw. *ntj.jw=f sdm=f* „den er hört“ ersetzt; so *pʒ ntj bʒk=s* „derjenige, der sie bearbeitet“ Chascheschonqi 24, 20; *ibid 4 šmw ʕrky ntj jw=w jr pʒ hrw-ms pr-ʕʒ n.jm=f* „der 30. Mesore, an dem man den Geburtstag des Königs begeht“ Rosettana 27f.¹⁹³” etc.

The merger of aorist and present forms in the relative conversion is quite transparent in the following example, where the tense characteristics of the relative clause can be derived from its parallelism to aorist in the main clause.

- (91) P. Insinger, IV,23, TM55918
pʒ ntj swn hʒtj =f hr-ir pʒ šj swn =f
 ‘Wer sein Herz kennt, den kennt das Schicksal’

The example of *swn* is illustrative, since in the durative conjugation this verb invariably combines with the prepositional phrase *n.im=*:

- (92) P. Spiegelberg (line VIII,20)
tw =j swn n.im =k pʒ mr-mšʕ wr-ḥp-imm-nw,t
 ‘Ich kenne dich, General Ur-di-imen-niut!’

Consequently, one could assume that the prepositional object first emerged inside the relative frame as a contrastive signal of imperfective aspect and then spread throughout the present tense pattern. Or, the other way round, the relative present was the last environment to resist the change by virtue of its overlapping with the aorist paradigm. While the exact order of grammatical events remains as yet unclear, the result is known: the older construct form is retained in the Bipartite in one case only, that of zero-determined nominal object or indefinite pronoun. Like other cross-linguistically attested cases of noun incorporation, this phenomenon is associated with non-specificity of the noun and therefore with genericity. That is evident from examples such as:

192 Depuydt (2009: 107).

193 Quack (2020: 95).

(93) Shen.Can. 8 XO 235:22

ΕΝΚΕΤΗ ΝΝΙΗ ΕΝΩΚΕΩΗ ΝΝΙΗ

‘Whom do we build houses for? Whom do we dig wells for?’ (Lit.: “For whom are we house-building / well-digging”)

And yet, the use of *status constructus* in the present pattern is triggered by purely formal factors (i.e., noun determination) and not by semantic genericity of the clause. Generic statements not bearing the necessary formal feature are coded in exactly the same way as progressive ones:

(94) Shen.Can. 6, Amel. 1 (110:11)

ΠΒΑΛ ΖΩΩΥ ΝΒΛΛΕ ΜΕΦΩΠ ΕΡΟΥ ΜΠΟΥΘΕΙΝ ΕΤΒΕ ΠΑΩΔΙ ΜΠΚΑΚΕ ΕΤΝΖΗΤΥ ΠΒΑΛ Η ΝΒΑΛ ΕΤΜΕΖ ΝΟΥΘΕΙΝ ΝΕΤΝΑΥ ΕΠΟΥΘΕΙΝ Η ΕΤΩΠ ΕΡΟΥ ΜΠΟΥΘΕΙΝ

‘As for the blind eye, it does not receive the light because of the abundance of darkness; the eye or eyes that are full of light, they are those that see the light and take the light into themselves.’

As already mentioned in 1.3.4.7, aspectual values of the present tense and, inter alia, its use for generic present are a relatively virgin topic in Coptic linguistics. It is an established fact that both aorist and first present can code the generic meaning.¹⁹⁴ Moreover, Young has demonstrated that, at least, for Shenoute’s Coptic, they are interchangeable in this meaning.¹⁹⁵ There is as yet no certainty as to the factors influencing the choice of either construction, but there can be no doubt that they go far beyond stylistic considerations suggested by Young for Shenoute’s texts. So, for instance, the total absence of prenominal, pre-1 Pl. and pre-2 Pl. negative aorist in Shenoute must, in all probability, trigger (or at least signal) the use of negative present for generic tense with the subjects expressed by substantives or 1st and 2nd person plural pronouns. An additional factor could be the diathetic difference between present and aorist: it is possible that aorist was chosen for non-causative generic predicates, whereas present was preferred for causative ones. The issue of diathesis in Coptic generic statements is, at any rate, worth further examination.

1.3.6 Miscellaneous consequences of the asymmetrical diathesis

1.3.6.1 Discrepancies between absolute and construct forms

The principal dichotomy inside the Coptic verbal system, its split into eventive and durative paradigm, each one with its own set of forms and compatibilities, is most pronounced in the Stern-Jernstedt rule, as well as in the rule concerning the distribution of stative.

194 Layton (2011: 261-262, §337): “αρε- expresses nexus between actor and verbal action without reference to any particular range of time. It is a tenseless (generic, atemporal, extratemporal, omnitemporal) reference point next to the Coptic tense system. Sare- often co-occurs with the discourse perspective of timeless truth (gnomic/wisdom literature theology) so as to express generalizations and gnomic assertions about habitual actions or propensities, and about what does or does not, will or will not, can or cannot, did or did not, happen by nature... The Coptic durative present tense ϣ-ωρη also occurs in this kind of discourse.” See also Layton (2011:436-437, §527).

195 Young (1961).

However, once this dichotomy is grasped as the opposition of diathesis, many more minor and intricate facts of Coptic verbal form distribution come into view and receive explanation. Among these, the least conspicuous problem is that of the missing infinitive. Indeed, according to the data from Crum's Dictionary, there exists a body of verbs attested solely in construct forms or in stative throughout the whole corpus of preserved Coptic texts (in all the dialects). Their absolute form is lacking and can be reconstructed on the basis of the common morphophonemic rules of Coptic. Computerized check of the verbal inventory in the Dictionary reveals that this is true for some 25 out of 590 native transitive verbs, such as (ⲛⲟⲗⲛⲉ) 'shake', (ϥⲟⲣϥ) 'spread', (ϥⲟⲓⲟⲗⲟⲓⲗ) 'wrap' etc. Now, the functions of an absolute infinitive are to provide an anticausative reading in the eventive conjugation and a causative / transitive progressive reading in the durative conjugation, and also to copy the eventive causative sense of construct forms. The last function is clearly supplementary. The causative progressive meaning tends to be statistically infrequent. So, if an anticausative reading is not applicable to the semantics of a particular lexeme, the chances to find that lexeme attested in the absolute form are significantly lower, and its total absence must not come as a surprise.

The same principle can have a milder consequence, when the absolute form is found in the durative, but not in the eventive conjugation. Such is the case of the verbs ⲙⲉ 'to love' and ⲙⲟⲩⲧⲉ 'to hate'. Both verbs do not have non-causative, 'spontaneous' semantic counterparts. In our terminology they are strong transitives, which means that they are practically never used without an overt direct object. In the Tripartite conjugation, these verbs appear solely in their construct forms. That is valid for the biblical corpus, as well as for Shenoute's Canons.

(95) Gen. 27:46

ⲛⲉⲗⲉ ϣⲣⲉⲃⲉⲕⲕⲁ ⲁⲉ ⲛⲓϥⲁⲁⲕ ⲗⲉ ⲁⲓⲙⲉⲗⲧⲉ ⲛⲁⲁⲗⲉ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲛⲟⲩⲉⲣⲉ ⲛⲛⲟⲩⲛⲣⲉ ⲛⲕⲉⲧ
'Then Rebekah said to Isaac, "I loathe my life because of the Hittite women'

(96) Deut. 22:12

ⲉⲣⲉⲩⲁⲛⲟⲩⲁ ⲁⲉ ⲗⲓ ⲛⲟⲩϥⲓⲙⲉ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲙⲁϥ ⲁⲓⲱ ⲛⲟⲩⲙⲉⲗⲧⲟϥ
'If any man takes a wife and goes in to her and then hates her...'

(97) 2Sam 13:22

ⲁⲓⲱ ⲛⲉⲣⲉ ⲁⲃⲛⲉⲁⲗⲟⲙ ⲙⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲛⲁⲙⲛⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲛⲟⲩⲁⲗⲉ ⲛⲧⲁⲩⲟⲃⲃⲓⲟ ⲛⲟⲩⲁⲙⲁⲣ ⲧⲉⲩϥⲟⲛⲉ
ⲛⲗⲛⲧⲓ
'Absalom hated Amnon, because he had violated his sister Tamar' (lit.: 'because of the word with which he humiliated Tamar, his sister')

(98) Shen.Can. 1 9:3

ⲗⲉⲕⲁⲁϥ ⲉⲓⲙⲉⲗⲧⲟ¹⁹⁶ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϣⲓⲧⲛ̅ ⲓⲥ ⲙ̅ⲛ̅ⲛⲉⲩⲁⲓⲧⲉⲗⲟϥ ⲛ̅ⲟⲉ ⲛ̅ⲛ̅ⲣⲓⲣ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲉⲙⲁⲕⲁⲟⲁⲣϥⲁ
ⲉⲓⲙⲉⲗⲧⲉ ⲛ̅ⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϣⲓⲧⲛ̅ⲛⲉⲧⲛⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ
'so dass du von Jesus und seinen Engeln gehasst wirst, wie die Schweine, die Unrat fressen, von denen gehasst werden, die sie sehen'

196 Strictly speaking, this example is not illustrative, since (at least, in Shenoute) the 2-Sgl-fem. direct object cannot be coded with the prepositional phrase ⲙⲙⲟ=, unless after Greek loaned verbs. In

- (99) 2Sam 19:6
 ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲕⲛⲉⲣⲓ ⲛⲉⲧⲙⲟⲥⲧⲉ ⲛⲛⲟⲕ ⲁⲗⲟ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲥⲧⲉ ⲛⲉⲧⲙⲉ ⲛⲛⲟⲕ
 ‘because (lit.: so that) you love those who hate you and hate those who love you’
- (100) Shen.Can. 3, Leipoldt 1954 128:26
 ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲡⲣⲟⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲣⲉⲛⲉϥⲭⲓⲁⲉⲉϥ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲛⲟϥⲧⲉ
 ‘so that the man loves his enemies for God’s sake’
- (101) Shen.Can. 4 GH 33:60-34:2
 ⲁⲗⲟ ⲧⲛⲛⲁⲛⲉⲣⲉ ⲛⲉⲧⲭⲓ ⲥⲃⲟ ⲛⲧⲟⲟⲧⲟϥ ⲛⲛⲉⲧⲧⲓ ⲥⲃⲟ ⲛⲁϥ
 ‘And we shall love those who learn from those who teach them...’
- (102) Shen.Can. 6 Amelinau 1 57:9
 ⲛⲏ ⲛⲧⲟⲧⲛ ⲧⲉⲛⲟϥ ⲛⲉⲧⲙⲉ ⲛⲛⲉⲧⲓⲧⲟϥⲟⲧⲛ ⲏ ⲛⲉⲧⲛⲕⲁⲧⲁⲥⲁⲣⲗ
 ‘Are you those who love their neighbors or their relatives’

The discussed phenomena prove that construct forms are not morphological adaptations of the absolute infinitive, but independent forms with their own paradigmatic properties. The same principle is manifested in the verbs whose valency pattern varies according to the specific verb form employed. A textbook example of such verbs is ⲥⲟⲧⲙ ‘hear, listen’, but it is not at all unique in this respect, though the full list of verbs belonging to this type is yet to be made out. Attempts are made to explain the formal valency discrepancies at the semantic level, but the results obtained from semantic examinations are usually unsatisfying. Thus, in case of ⲥⲟⲧⲙ, Emmel deems it necessary to reject Shisha-Halevy’s representation of ⲥⲟⲧⲙ as a set of homonymous verbs distinguished by their valency patterns:

“... I must take issue with Shisha-Halevy’s gloss of *sōtm e-* as “listen to”, whereby he sought to distinguish it from *sōtm n-/mmo=*, *setm-*, *sotm=/sotme=*, which he glossed instead as “hear”. But also in construction with the preposition *e-*, *sōtm* certainly can mean “hear”, at least when the object of *e-* is a thing (such as a voice) rather than a person: for example, *mpou-sōtm e-tesmē* “they did not hear the voice” (Acts 22:9). I think it necessary... to admit – provisionally – that the distinction represented in English by “hear” versus “listen (to)” is not marked in Coptic by the opposition *sōtm* *-/n-* : *sōtm e-...*”¹⁹⁷

In Emmel’s opinion, consequently, the opposition between *sōtm*₁ and *sōtm*₂ cannot be reduced to the semantics of the verbal lexeme itself. An alternative explanation offered in Emmel (2006) is semantic, too, and focuses on the referentiality and semantic prominence of the object. It is claimed that the transitive allomorphs of *sōtm* are in most cases employed with a specific type of objects which is semantically void and not directly definable in terms of any other semantic case-role, such as SOURCE (sound emitter, typically a

all other cases, the meaning of this phrase is ablative. However, with *ⲙⲟⲥⲧⲉ* and *ⲛⲉ*, coding of any pronominal object with prepositional phrase is equally excluded.

197 Emmel (2006: 38).

person), AUDITIVE (sound or voice), FORM (text-type) or SPEECH (word). Emmel calls this type of object NEUTRAL. In the corpus of the Sahidic New Testament, this type of object is most frequently realized through the resumptive pronoun of a relative clause.¹⁹⁸ However, neutral objects are not confined to the transitive valency pattern; according to the statistics in Emmel (2006), they are, at least, as frequent with the prepositional phrase ϵ - / ϵpo -. Thus, the semantic type of object does not unambiguously define the valency pattern.

Since neutral objects are usually expressed by pronouns, one could imagine that *status pronominalis* of this verb stands in complementary distribution to *status absolutus* with respect to the type of object (direct pronominal vs. ϵ + nominal object). This, however, is not quite true, because pronominal objects are also compatible, even frequent with the *sōtm* ϵ -construction. A significant fact is that the absolute form of *sōtm* almost never comes with the prepositional phrase $\eta\mu\text{o}$ -. Not a single example can be found in Shenoute's Canons, and there is only one such example in the Biblical corpus:

(103) Luke 16:2

πεχλαϣ ναϣ δε ου πε παι εϋρωτμ ημοϣ ετβητκ

Τί τοῦτο ἀκούω περὶ σοῦ

'(He) said to him 'What is this that I hear about you?'

Nor is \langle status absolutus + η + Noun \rangle a frequent combination. Again, Shenoute consistently abstains from using it, and the biblical Coptic provides not more than 4 examples: Job 9:16 ($\eta\text{p}\omega\text{t}\mu$ $\eta\text{ne}\eta\text{tan}\eta\text{o}\gamma\text{t}\varsigma$), Jer 8:6 ($\eta\text{t}\epsilon\text{t}\eta\text{c}\omega\text{t}\mu$ $\eta\text{ne}\gamma\omega\lambda\alpha\chi\epsilon$ $\lambda\eta$), Dan 3:29 ($\eta\text{pe}\eta\text{c}\omega\text{t}\mu$ $\eta\text{ne}\kappa\eta\text{t}\text{o}\lambda\eta$), Luke 9:9 ($\epsilon\text{t}\omega\text{t}\mu$ $\eta\text{na}\iota$ $\epsilon\text{t}\beta\eta\text{t}\eta\text{t}\eta$). By way of comparison, the number of \langle $\epsilon\text{c}\omega\text{t}\mu$ ϵ - \rangle -tokens in the Bible amounts to some 600. Clearly, the absolute form of $\epsilon\text{c}\omega\text{t}\mu$ is as good as incompatible with the transitive pattern, which means that the two valency patterns are found in complementary sets of environments. These are also unevenly distributed. The construction of infinitive with the prepositional phrase seems to be unmarked, whereas the use of the transitive minority of construct forms is, in all probability, semantically conditioned by a specific type of object, namely, a resumptive or other pronoun. Thus, the functions of the two constructions partly overlap. This development can be construed as the gradual replacement of the transitive forms through the non-transitive infinitive in the process of paradigm levelling. Such diachronic model would mean that historically, the absolute infinitive of *sōtm* appeared in the eventive conjugation later than the transitive forms. Whether or not this pattern had originated in the durative conjugation and later spread on to the eventive one, could be clarified in the course of some further research.

Among the verbs with similar valency alternation pattern are, e.g., $\eta\text{i}\text{o}\gamma\epsilon$ 'strike', $\kappa\omega\text{p}\omega$ 'request, persuade', $\eta\text{o}\lambda$ 'reach', $\kappa\omega\text{m}\omega$ 'mock, deride'.¹⁹⁹ Using $\kappa\omega\text{m}\omega$ as an example, we can once more verify that differences in valency are morphosyntactically conditioned and do not entail semantic differences. The absolute form of $\kappa\omega\text{m}\omega$ is expanded by the prepositional phrase ηca - 'after', which is compatible with both nominal and pronominal

198 Emmel (2006:49).

199 Emmel (2006) observes similar behavior in the verb $\eta\text{o}\omega$ 'bid, order' (Emmel 2006:51).

objects and alternates with construct forms of the verb. Both the object of *nc̣a-* and the pronominal suffix object denote a person or an entity which is being derided.

(104) Shen.Can. 8 XO 51:10-16²⁰⁰

η κ̣η̣κ̣ω̣κ̣ω̣ *nc̣a* ι̣ω̣ν̣α̣ς̣ π̣ε̣π̣ρ̣ο̣φ̣η̣τ̣η̣ς̣ ε̣τ̣ς̣μ̣α̣μ̣α̣δ̣α̣τ̣ π̣ρ̣ω̣μ̣ε̣ ε̣τ̣ξ̣α̣ρ̣η̣μ̣ α̣γ̣ω̣ ε̣τ̣β̣η̣τ̣ ρ̣η̣
π̣η̣μ̣α̣

‘Va-tu te moquer de Jonas, le prophète béni, ô homme souillé et abominé dans ce lieu?’

(105) Shen.Can. 8 XO 68:14

η̣τ̣α̣ρ̣κ̣ω̣μ̣ω̣γ̣ α̣η̣ ε̣τ̣β̣ε̣ η̣τ̣ω̣α̣τ̣ε̣ η̣η̣ρ̣ο̣ι̣τ̣ε̣ η̣ η̣ η̣ε̣ρ̣ω̣α̣(η̣)

‘*Ce n’est pas à cause des franges des vêtements ou des manteaux qu’il les a raillés...*’

Both *κ̣ω̣μ̣ω̣ *nc̣a-** and *κ̣ω̣μ̣ω̣=* are used to render identical or closely synonymous Greek verbs in the Bible: *μυκτηρίζω* ‘turn up the nose, sneer at’, *ἐξουθενώ* ‘set at naught’, *ἀτιμάω* ‘disdain’.

(106) Psalm 2:4 α̣γ̣ω̣ π̣ι̣χ̣ο̣ι̣ς̣ η̣κ̣κ̣ω̣μ̣ω̣γ̣

καὶ ὁ κύριος ἐκμυκτηριεῖ αὐτούς

(107) Isa 37:22 α̣ρ̣ς̣ω̣μ̣ε̣ α̣γ̣ω̣ α̣ρ̣κ̣ω̣μ̣ω̣ς̣ τ̣π̣α̣ρ̣θ̣ε̣ν̣ο̣ς̣ τ̣ω̣ε̣ε̣ρ̣ε̣ η̣κ̣ι̣ω̣η̣

Ἐφάλλισέν σε καὶ ἐμυκτήρισέν σε παρθένος θυγάτηρ Σιών

(108) 2Sam 6:16 α̣κ̣κ̣ω̣μ̣ω̣ η̣κ̣ω̣α̣ ρ̣η̣ π̣ε̣ρ̣ε̣ρ̣η̣τ̣

καὶ ἐξουθένωσεν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς

(109) Ps 21:7 ο̣γ̣ο̣η̣ η̣η̣μ̣ ε̣τ̣η̣α̣γ̣ ε̣ρ̣ο̣ι̣ α̣γ̣κ̣ω̣μ̣ω̣ η̣κ̣ω̣ι̣

Ps 21:8 πάντες οἱ θεωροῦντές με ἐξεμυκτήρισάν με

(110) Ps 34:16 α̣γ̣π̣ε̣ι̣ρα̣ζε̣ η̣η̣ο̣ι̣ α̣γ̣κ̣ω̣μ̣ω̣ η̣κ̣ω̣ι̣ ρ̣η̣ ο̣γ̣κ̣ω̣μ̣ω̣

ἐπείρασάν με, ἐξεμυκτήρισάν με μυκτηρισμόν

The valency split of *κ̣ω̣μ̣ω̣* looks therefore very similar to the previously discussed case of *ω̣τ̣η̣* and can possibly be explained in the same vein, except that with *κ̣ω̣μ̣ω̣*, the referentiality of the object does not seem to make any difference for the choice of the absolute or the construct form.

1.3.6.2 Suppletive forms across the conjugation patterns: case of *ει̣μ̣ε* vs. *σο̣ο̣γ̣η̣*

The two Coptic verbs for ‘know’ – *ει̣μ̣ε* and *σο̣ο̣γ̣η̣* – have never as yet been regarded as suppletive forms. Moreover, the lexicologists of Coptic distinguish both verbs semantically. So, Crum translates *σο̣ο̣γ̣η̣* simply as ‘know’, whereas *ει̣μ̣ε* is both ‘know’ and ‘understand’; similarly, Funk in his concordance to Shenoute translates them as “connaître” and “percevoir, comprendre”, respectively. If I nevertheless suggest a relationship of suppletion between these two verbs, it is due to the fact that their distribution in the conjugation patterns is not identical. *ει̣μ̣ε* is almost without exception used in the non-

²⁰⁰ Translation of this and the next example: A. Boud’hors.

durative pattern, while the infinitive of σοοϣν seems to be compatible with the durative pattern only. In the table below, the first 50 occurrences of each verb in the Old Testament are listed with their conjugation base.

Table 6 | σοοϣν and εινε in the Old Testament (sample)

σοοϣν	εινε
1) Gen 3:5 $\epsilon\rho\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\iota\upsilon\tau\epsilon$ γαρ σοοϣν $\chi\epsilon$	1) Gen 3:7 $\lambda\gamma\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon$ $\chi\epsilon$
2) Gen 18:19 νεισοοϣν γαρ $\chi\epsilon$	2) Gen 8:11 $\lambda\chi\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon$ δε νοι νωρε $\chi\epsilon$
3) Gen 19:35 μνεψσοοϣν αν πε $\epsilon\tau\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota\epsilon\text{ν}\epsilon\kappa\omicron\tau\kappa$	3) Gen 21:26 μπειμε $\chi\epsilon$
4) Gen 27:2 $\text{ν}\tau\text{σοοϣν}$ αν μπεροοϣ μπανοϣ	4) Gen 24:14 $\rho\eta\text{παι}$ $\text{τ}\text{ναειμε}$ $\chi\epsilon$
5) Gen 30:29 ντοκ πετσοοϣν $\epsilon\tau\eta\eta\tau\epsilon\eta\mu\epsilon\lambda\lambda$	5) Gen 24:44 $\rho\eta\text{παι}$ $\text{τ}\text{ναειμε}$ $\chi\epsilon$
6) Gen 31:6 ντωτν δε $\rho\omega\tau\eta\tau\eta\tau\eta\text{ν}$ τετνσοοϣν $\chi\epsilon$	6) Exod 2:4 $\epsilon\sigma\omega\omega\tau$ μποϥε εινε $\epsilon\text{νετ}\text{να}\omega\omega\text{πε}$ μμοϣ
7) Gen 31:32 $\text{νερει}\alpha\kappa\omega\beta$ δε σοοϣν αν πε $\chi\epsilon$	7) Exod 6:7 ντετνειμε $\chi\epsilon$ (conj.)
8) Gen 48:19 τσοοϣν $\rho\omega$ + clause	8) Exod 7:5 νσειεμε νοι $\text{νρη}\eta\kappa\eta\mu\epsilon$ τηροϣ $\chi\epsilon$
9) Exod 1:8 παι $\epsilon\eta\psi\text{σοοϣν}$ αν $\epsilon\iota\omega\sigma\eta\phi$	9) Exod 7:17 $\rho\eta$ παι $\text{κ}\text{ναειμε}$ $\chi\epsilon$
10) Exod 3:7 τσοοϣν γαρ $\text{μπεϥρ}\iota\sigma\epsilon$	10) Exod 8:6 $\chi\epsilon\kappa\alpha\sigma$ $\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon$ $\chi\epsilon$
11) Exod 3:19 $\alpha\text{νοκ}$ νδε τσοοϣν $\chi\epsilon$	11) Exod 8:18 $\chi\epsilon\kappa\alpha\sigma$ $\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon$ $\chi\epsilon$
12) Exod 4:14 τσοοϣν $\chi\epsilon$	12) Exod 9:29 $\chi\epsilon\kappa\alpha\sigma$ $\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon$ $\chi\epsilon$
13) Exod 5:2 $\text{ν}\tau\text{σοοϣν}$ αν $\text{μ}\pi\chi\omicron\epsilon\iota\varsigma$	13) Exod 10:2 $\rho\eta\text{αι}$ $\text{νρη}\tau\omicron\upsilon$ ντετνειμε $\chi\epsilon$
14) Exod 6:12 $\alpha\text{νοκ}$ νδε $\text{ν}\tau\text{σοοϣν}$ αν $\text{ν}\omega\alpha\chi\epsilon$	14) Exod 10:7 $\text{κοϣ}\omega\upsilon$ εινε $\chi\epsilon$
15) Exod 9:30 τσοοϣν $\chi\epsilon$	15) Exod 14:4 νσειεμε τηροϣ νοι $\text{νρη}\eta\kappa\eta\mu\epsilon$ $\chi\epsilon$
16) Exod 10:26 $\alpha\text{νον}$ νδε $\text{ν}\tau\text{νσοοϣν}$ αν $\chi\epsilon$	16) Exod 14:18 νσειεμε τηροϣ νοι $\text{νρη}\eta\kappa\eta\mu\epsilon$ $\chi\epsilon$
17) Num 11:16 ντοκ $\epsilon\tau\epsilon\kappa\text{σοοϣν}$ μμοοϣ $\chi\epsilon$	17) Num 11:23 $\epsilon\pi\lambda\eta$ $\text{κ}\text{ναειμε}$ $\chi\epsilon$
18) Num 14:23 παι $\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ νσεισοοϣν αν $\text{μ}\pi\pi\epsilon\tau\text{να}\omicron\upsilon\psi$ μν $\text{ππε}\theta\omicron\omicron\upsilon$	18) Num 14:34 $\lambda\gamma\omega$ $\text{τετ}\text{ναειμε}$ $\epsilon\pi\omega\omega\text{ν}\tau$ $\text{νταορη}\eta$
19) Num 20:14 ντοκ κσοοϣν $\epsilon\pi\rho\iota\sigma\epsilon$ $\text{τηρ}\psi$	19) Num 16:5 $\lambda\chi\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon$ νοι $\text{π}\text{ποϥτε}$ $\epsilon\text{νετ}\text{ε}\text{νοϣ}\psi$ νε
20) Num 22:6 τσοοϣν $\alpha\text{νοκ}$ $\chi\epsilon$	20) Num 16:28 $\rho\eta$ παι $\text{τετ}\text{ναειμε}$ $\chi\epsilon$
21) Num 22:34 νεισοοϣν γαρ αν $\chi\epsilon$	21) Num 16:30 ντετνειμε $\chi\epsilon$
22) Num 32:11 παι $\epsilon\tau\text{σοοϣν}$ $\text{μ}\pi\pi\epsilon\theta\omicron\omicron\upsilon$ μν $\text{ππετ}\text{να}\omicron\upsilon\psi$	22) Num 22:19 ταειμε $\chi\epsilon$
23) Num 35:23 παι $\epsilon\eta\text{να}\omicron\upsilon$ $\text{νρη}\tau\psi$ $\text{ν}\psi\text{σοοϣν}$ αν	23) Deut 4:35 $\rho\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon$ $\epsilon\tau\text{ρεκειμε}$ $\chi\epsilon$
24) Deut 1:39 $\epsilon\tau\epsilon\eta\psi\text{σοοϣν}$ αν $\text{μ}\text{ποοϣ}$ $\text{μ}\pi\pi\epsilon\tau\text{να}\omicron\upsilon\psi$ η $\text{μ}\pi\pi\epsilon\theta\omicron\omicron\upsilon$	24) Deut 4:39 $\lambda\gamma\omega$ $\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon$ $\text{μ}\text{ποοϣ}$ $\text{ν}\eta\kappa\omicron\tau\kappa$ $\rho\eta$ $\text{πε}\kappa\eta\tau$ $\chi\epsilon$
25) Deut 3:19 τσοοϣν $\chi\epsilon$	25) Deut 7:9 $\lambda\gamma\omega$ $\text{κ}\text{ναειμε}$ $\chi\epsilon$
	26) Deut 8:5 $\lambda\gamma\omega$ $\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon$ $\rho\eta$ $\text{πε}\kappa\eta\tau$ $\chi\epsilon$
	27) Deut 9:3 $\lambda\gamma\omega$ $\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon$ $\text{μ}\text{ποοϣ}$ $\chi\epsilon$
	28) Deut 9:6 $\lambda\gamma\omega$ $\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon$ $\text{μ}\text{ποοϣ}$ $\chi\epsilon$
	29) Deut 11:2 $\lambda\gamma\omega$ $\epsilon\tau\text{ετνειμε}$ $\text{μ}\text{ποοϣ}$
	30) Deut 11:2 παι $\epsilon\tau\epsilon\text{νσειεμε}$ αν $\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon$ $\text{μ}\text{ποϥ}\text{να}\psi$ $\epsilon\tau\epsilon\sigma\omega\omega$ $\text{μ}\pi\chi\omicron\epsilon\iota\varsigma$
	31) Deut 29:5 $\chi\epsilon\kappa\alpha\sigma$ $\epsilon\tau\text{ετνειμε}$ $\chi\epsilon$
	32) Deut 29:8 $\chi\epsilon\kappa\alpha\sigma$ $\epsilon\tau\text{ετνειμε}$ $\chi\epsilon$
	33) Josh 1:7 $\chi\epsilon\kappa\alpha\sigma$ $\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon$ $\epsilon\zeta\omega\beta$ $\text{ν}\eta\mu$

COOYN	EIME
26) Deut 8:3 ενσεσουν μνοφ αν νσι νεκειοτε	34) Josh 1:8 δεκαε εκεειμε εειρε νρωβ νιν
27) Deut 8:16 ετε νεσεσουν μνοφ αν νσι νεκειοτε	35) Josh 3:7 δεκαε εγεειμε δε
28) Deut 9:2 ναι ντοκ ετκσουν μνοογ	36) Josh 3:10 ρηπαι τετναειμε δε
29) Deut 11:28 εντετνσουν μνοογ αν	37) Josh 4:24 δε εγεειμε νσι νρεθνοε τηρογ μπκαρ δε
30) Deut 13:3 εντετνσουν μνοογ αν	38) Josh 22:22 ντοφ ρωωφ φναειμε δε
31) Deut 13:7 ενγσουν μνοογ αν	39) Josh 22:31 νποογ ανειμε δε
32) Deut 13:14 ενγσουν μνοογ αν	40) Josh 23:13 ειμε δε
33) Deut 14:21 νπετε νγσουν μνοφ αν	41) Josh 23:14 τετναειμε ρηπετηρητ νητετηγγχη δε
34) Deut 19:4 νπετηρογωφ ενφσουν αν	42) Judg 3:2 δεκαε εγεειμε νσινγενεα ννωρη νπισρανλ ετσαβοογ
35) Deut 28:33 κερεθνοε ενφσουν μνοφ αν	43) Judg 3:2 νπογειμε εροογ
36) Deut 28:64 ναι νγσουν μνοογ αν	44) Judg 3:4 αγω ασωωπε εκααγ επαρογ επιραζε νπισρανλ νρητογ ειμε δε
37) Deut 29:15 ντωτη τετνσουν νεε...	45) Judg 4:9 πλην ειμε δε
38) Deut 29:25 ναι ετεενσεσουν μνοογ αν	46) Judg 6:22 αγω γελεων αφειμε δε
39) Deut 31:21 ανοκ γαρ τσουν ννεγπονηρια	47) Judg 6:29 αγειμε δε
40) Deut 31:27 δε ανοκ τσουν ντεκντηναωτ νακρ	48) Judg 6:37 τναειμε δε
41) Deut 31:29 τσουν γαρ δε	49) Judg 13:16 νφειμε δε
42) Deut 32:17 ενσεσουν μνοογ αν	50) Judg 13:21 τοτε αμανωε ειμε δε
43) Deut 32:17 εννεγειοτε σουν μνοογ αν	
44) Deut 34:6 νν λααγ σουν ντεφκαϊσε	
45) Josh 2:5 ντσουν αν δε	
46) Josh 2:9 τσουν δε	
47) Josh 8:14 πρρο δε νεφσουν αν δε	
48) Josh 10:2 νεφσουν γαρ δε	
49) Josh 14:6 ντοκ κσουν νπωαδε	
50) Josh 22:22 αγω ντοφ ννογτε φσουν	

This small sample providing a true-to-life picture of the distribution of the two verbs proves that the preference of each one towards a specific conjugation pattern is not accidental. It also shows that the choice of this or that verb is not conditioned by the type of the object, whether nominal phrase or clause, although ειμε may occur more frequently with a clause, than with a (pro)noun. The relationship between the two infinitives may thus be identified as suppletion in tense and aspect.

By way of illustration, let us consider the following example:

(111) Joshua 22:22

ΠΝΟΥΓΤΕ ΝΤΟΥ ΟΝ ΠΕ ΠΝΟΥΓΤΕ ΕΝΤΟΥ ΠΕ ΠΧΘΕΙC ΠΝΟΥΓΤΕ ΑΓΩ ΝΤΟΥ ΠΝΟΥΓΤΕ **ϣCΟΟΥΓΝ**
 ΑΓΩ ΠΙCΡΑΗΛ ΝΤΟΥ ΖΩΩΩ **ϣΝΑΕΙΜΕ**

‘Ο θεός θεός ἐστὶν κύριος, καὶ ὁ θεός θεός κύριος αὐτὸς **οἶδεν**, καὶ Ἰσραηλ αὐτὸς **γινώσεται**·

‘The Mighty One, God, the Lord! He knows; and let Israel itself know!’

Despite their being expressed by different lexemes in Coptic and in Greek, the two signs for ‘know’ contain no difference in notion, but that of tense and aspect. This follows not only from the parallelism of these two occurrences, but also from the fact that both translate one and the same Hebrew verb יָדַע / יָדָע ‘know’²⁰¹:

עֲדַי הוּא יְדָע, הוּא יָדָע, הוּא יָדָע, הוּא יָדָע, הוּא יָדָע, הוּא יָדָע

El-Elohim-JHWH-El-Elohim-JHWH hu - **yodefa** - ve - Israel - hu - **yedaʿ**

‘God’(6) – ‘he’ – ‘know’ - 3 Sgl Pr – ‘and’ – ‘Israel’ – ‘he’ – ‘know’ - 3Sgl Fut

One could argue that the feature <± telic> is an intrinsic property of each lexeme and defines their respective compatibility with the conjugation patterns. Thus, in 1 John each lexeme has a constant Greek counterpart, οἶδα for **ϣOΟΥΓΝ** and γινώσκω for **εΙΜΕ**, the second pair used with the telic sense even at the expense of the distribution regularity (in the case of **ΤΕΝΕΙΜΕ**):

(112) 1John 2:3

ΑΓΩ ΖΗ ΠΑΙ **ΤΕΝΕΙΜΕ** ΧΕ ΔΑΝΟΥΩΝΩ

καὶ ἐν τούτῳ **γινώσκομεν** ὅτι ἐγνώκαμεν αὐτόν

‘And by this we know that we have come to know him’

(113) 1John 5:19-20

ΤΕΝCΟΟΥΓΝ ΧΕ ΔΑΝΟΝ ΖΕΝΒΟΛ ΖΗ ΠΝΟΥΓΤΕ ΑΓΩ ΠΚΟCΜΟC ΤΗΡΩ ΕΚΚΗ ΖΗ ΠΟΝΗΡΟC ΑΓΩ
ΤΕΝCΟΟΥΓΝ ΧΕ ΑΠΩΗΡΕ ΜΠΝΟΥΓΤΕ ΕΙ

οἶδαμεν ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐσμἐν, καὶ ὁ κόσμος ὅλος ἐν τῷ πονηρῷ κεῖται. **οἶδαμεν**
 δὲ ὅτι ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἦκει

‘We know that we are from God, and the whole world lies in the power of the evil one. And we know that the Son of God has come’

Interestingly, however, the feature <- telic> is characteristic of the absolute form of **ϣOΟΥΓΝ**, but not of its construct forms which can render γινώσκω as can be seen from the example 112 (where ΔΑΝΟΥΩΝΩ translates ἐγνώκαμεν). We may conclude that **εΙΜΕ** plays a role of a suppletive infinitive for construct forms of **ϣOΟΥΓΝ**. As also in the above discussed case of **ΩΤΩ**, this suppletive infinitive has lost the direct valency pattern in favor of the prepositional phrase with **ε-**. Since **εΙΜΕ** is also capable of tackling (pro)nominal objects, these types of objects form a contrastive environment where the difference between the two ‘know’-verbs becomes meaningful. To find out exact nuances of this difference is not the task of the present paper, but the first impression is that the construct form of **ϣOΟΥΓΝ**

201 **ϣOΟΥΓΝ** translates γινώσκω, e.g., in Matt. 12:33 ΕΒΟΛ ΓΑΡ ΖΗ ΠΚΑΡΠΟC ΝΩΔΑΓCΟΥΓΝΠΩΗΝ ΕΚ ΓΑΡ ΤΟΥ ΚΑΡΠΟΥ Τὸ δένδρον γινώσκεται “For the tree is known by its fruit”.

is preferred with pronominal objects over the εἰμε εἶπο-construction. The ratio of σοοῦν to εἰμε occurrences with pronominal objects in the Bible is 99 / 35.

Aspect-bound stem suppletion with the verbs of knowing is a phenomenon that has parallels in Indo-European languages; in Classical Greek, as is well known, the verb οἶδα ‘know’ is morphologically related to εἶδον ‘see’, or more precisely, constitutes its morphological perfect / resultative. One could suspect a fundamental analogy in the way the notion of ‘knowing’ interacts with the category of aspect in both Greek and Demotic/Coptic. In a most naïve way, that can be formulated as follows: some languages tend not to treat the resultative state of knowing something as a result of a process of acquiring knowledge. If you are sitting down, you will end up seated, but if you learn something, you will not necessarily end up knowing it. The process and the result lie, as it were, on different planes which is reflected in different lexemes being used for one and the other. Further, acquiring knowledge, either as a process or as a result, may be associated not with the idea of knowledge as such, but rather with the idea of experience gained by acts of perception or, in the case of Demotic, possibly even consumption.²⁰² In Greek, as already said, the consequence of this aspectual and notional split is that the resultative verb bears a genealogical similarity to the verb of perception, and not to the verb meaning ‘learn, gain knowledge’ - γιγνώσκω; in Demotic or in Coptic, on the contrary, the eventive forms for the resultative σοοῦν are supplied by the verb that originally denoted a type of consumption (swallowing) and that came to denote the process of gaining knowledge, i.e. εἰμε.

It is difficult to imagine in details the process by which this suppletion took place. The predecessors of the two lexemes are not abundant in Demotic. The TLA database contains 6 tokens of *ʕm*-‘eime’ and about 25 of *swn*-‘sooun’. This evidence is, of course, too scarce for any trustworthy reconstruction of events. One can at best try to mark some minor regularities in the usage of both forms. Thus, *ʕm* participates in *sdm=f*s constructions (4 tokens out of 6), whereas *swn* always comes in periphrastic patterns (3 tokens of aorist) or in present tense. *ʕm* governs a clause (3 tokens), a noun introduced by the preposition *n*- (2 tokens) and once a pronoun introduced by *r-r*//. *swn*, on the other hand, strongly prefers nominal objects: nouns (8 tokens, no preposition), pronouns (4 tokens of pronominal suffix, 3 of *n.im*= with pronominal suffix 1 token of *r-r*=), as opposed to a single attestation with a clause as an object (Rosettana, line 31). It is not unthinkable that *ʕm* and *swn* became fixed in the non-durative conjugation in their absolute and construct forms, respectively, in accordance with the type of object preferred in each case. It seems that later, this selectivity towards a specific object type became smoothed out, though it did not vanish altogether.

Whatever happened, it manifested a drastic conceptional change compared to the older stages of Egyptian that employed one and the same root *rh* for both the process of learning and the state of knowing something.

202 On the use of the verbs of tasting as metaphors for the process of cognition in Egyptian, see Steinbach-Eicke (2017).

1.3.7 Conclusion

The approach proposed in this chapter explores the association between transitivity and aspect in the Coptic conjugation system. Traditionally, this system is considered to be based on the binary aspectual distinction (eventive vs. durative tenses). I argue that the introduction of a new parameter, that of causativity /transitivity provides a more correct account of Coptic verbal grammar. My analysis is based on the fact that inherently transitive (construct) forms of the Coptic mutable verb are confined to the eventive conjugation, whereas the inherently intransitive stative is only compatible with the durative pattern. It is therefore reasonable to consider these forms aspectually marked. Thus, in conformity with the generalizations in Hopper & Thompson (1980), Coptic transitive forms are primarily associated with the telic (eventive) aspect, and vice versa, atelicity is linked to intransitivity, a phenomenon resembling the causative split described in Kulikov (1999) for Ancient Greek and Vedic Sanskrit. This model correctly predicts that the diathetically unmarked verbal form, the absolute infinitive, will be in the first place employed as the diathetic counterpart to the marked form in each conjugation. Indeed, in the eventive conjugation the free infinitive most often (with some verbs, in the vast majority of occurrences) has a non-causative reading. In the durative conjugation, on the other hand, the infinitive mainly serves as a transitive counterpart of stative. A durative intransitive infinitive occurs extremely infrequently, denoting an iterative event in present, or else a dynamic process with the verbs whose semantics includes the component of change, such as ⲁⲔⲁⲓ ‘grow’. Many, if not most of the monadic unaccusative verbs do not allow the free infinitive form in the durative conjugation. The infinitive of such verbs is employed in the Tripartite conjugation only and thus stands in a complementary distribution to the stative.

The transitive use of the eventive infinitive is easy to construe as a secondary development. In fact, the statistically obvious tendency to use this form for nominal arguments suggests that the absolute infinitive gradually supplants *status constructus* as a prenominal transitive form, in course of the evolution of differential object marking in the Tripartite conjugation. The fact that infinitive supplanted *status constructus*, but not *status pronominalis* corroborates the idea that the differential object marking in Coptic is triggered by the information status of the object. The object with more informative value, e.g., referring to a newly introduced entity, is marked with a morphologically more elaborate construction of infinitive with the prepositional phrase *n-*.

Revising the traditional idea of the two construct forms as “mutated forms of infinitive” gives room for a better understanding of minor morphosyntactic facts of Coptic verbal grammar, such as a “valency split” shown by some lexemes having (transitive) construct forms along with an intransitive infinitive (Ⲙⲟⲩⲏ, Ⲓⲓⲟⲩⲉ etc.). It also explains the absence of an absolute form with some lexemes, or suppletion of the missing absolute form with the form based on another verbal root, as in the case of ⲉⲓⲙⲉ / Ⲙⲟⲟⲩⲏ ‘know’.

Based on the features of morphological mutability, transitivity and lability, the inventory of Coptic native verbs can be divided into four classes: mutable transitive non-labile verbs (here labelled “strong transitives”), mutable labile verbs, mutable intransitive non-labile verbs, and immutable verbs. The members of each class have a common

semantic denominator. Immutable verbs are unergative, mutable non-labile verbs are atelic unaccusatives, labile verbs are combinations of telic unaccusatives and their causatives. Finally, strong transitives are agentive telic verbs. Thus, a specific combination of two factors, agentivity and lexical (a)telicity, defines the morphosyntactic character of a native Coptic verb.

2 Periphrastic construction <ϣωπε + circumstantial clause>

2.1 Problem description

As observed by Haspelmath, the concept of periphrasis has never belonged to central issues in either descriptive, or typological linguistics.²⁰³ Though forming an essential part in the process of grammaticalization which repeats itself in cycles, each time using fresh periphrastic material for synthesizing new grammatical forms, periphrasis is perceived by grammarians as a marginal and haphazard phenomenon. The term is applied intuitively to designate multi-word expressions with some kind of grammatical meaning, either a basic one which is regularly signaled through morphological markers (e.g., Russian imperfective future, Latin present subjunctive), or a finer and more complex one (e.g., the Classical Greek periphrasis with *τυγχάνω* + participle ‘I happen to do’). In the first case, the periphrastic form in question often fills a paradigmatic gap, usually marking the place of some categorial clash.²⁰⁴ It is then opposed to synthetic members of the same inflectional paradigm (e.g., the Latin passive perfect is opposed to active perfect and present / imperfect passive). The second type of periphrasis has no synthetic grammatical counterparts and is consequently difficult to identify as a grammatical structure, rather than a coincidental co-occurrence of lexemes.²⁰⁵ However, periphrastic constructions, as a rule, have specific features that help recognize them as such. Among these features, Haspelmath mentions idiomaticity (or, in Haspelmath’s terms, ‘semantic non-compositionality’) and a limited range of grammatical contexts the auxiliary member is compatible with. This last feature is of special importance, since it provides a formal, not subjective and observer-dependent, criterion of grammatical function of the construction in question. To use Haspelmath’s example, “in the German *werden*-future only present indicative (and perhaps subjunctive) forms of *werden* are allowed, but not past tense forms (e.g. *wird kommen* [becomes come] ‘will come’, but not **wurde kommen* [became come]).”²⁰⁶

Sharing the common fate of periphrastic constructions, the Coptic periphrastic pattern <ϣωπε εϕωπττ / εϕωπττ> has received very little attention until now. Being rather infrequent, it hovers in the eyes of a Coptologist halfway between a rhetorical device and a grammatical mechanism of an obscure function. As concerns the formal side, neither the distributional properties of its auxiliary, nor the commutation properties of the core verb have been adequately described. To my knowledge, no contrastive study compares this pattern with synthetic forms of a similar meaning. Consequently, our idea of its semantics may be but rough approximation.

Furthermore, it is unclear whether the criterion of semantic non-compositionality is at all applicable in this case: grammatical interpretations of the pattern usually focus on either one of its two parts, sometimes ignoring ϣωπε and sometimes stressing it

203 Haspelmath (2000:654 ff.).

204 Haspelmath (2000:655): “...this kind of gap can only arise in inflectional systems in which more than one morphological category is combined”.

205 Cf. the discussion in Bentein (2011).

206 Haspelmath (2000:661).

as the aspect-bearing element of the pattern, without any explicitly stated reason. This uncertainty is reflected in different ways periphrastic structures are translated. At times, they are rendered by a mere indicative passive, as in (114), or anticausative, as in (115):

(114) Shen.Can. 1 §6

εὔρωε εὔρωητ ἐρραῖ ἐξῆπεθῶσιαστηριον ἡτεκκλησια ἡῆωρῆμῖσε
 ‘Sie werden am Altar der Gemeinde der Erstgeborenen ... empfangen’

(115) Abbaton (Budge 1914:241, 30-31).

εκεῶρωε εκάωε εῖν τῆνητε εκρῆμοος ἐρραῖ ἐξῆ οὔρωρονος ἡκωετ̄
 ‘You shall hang in the middle sitting upon a throne of fire’

In other cases, translators may choose to accentuate the durativity of the action suggested by the subordinate clause, e.g., with an adverb of duration as in:

(116) Benjamin of Alexandria, Hochzeit zu Kana 252:14

αἰῶωπ εἰτ̄ σῶοινοὔφι ἐρρη
 ‘Ich liess den Weihrauch **fortdauernd** aufsteigen’

Most frequently, however, periphrastic structures are rendered by an analytic construction with a verb denoting inchoativity, entry into a state:

(117) Hebrews 5:12²⁰⁷

αὔω ἀτετηῶρωε ετετηρῆρεια νοὔρωτε νοὔρρε ἀη ἐκῶορ
 ‘You have come to need (**you-have-become you-needing**) milk, not the solid food’

(118) Benjamin of Alexandria, Hochzeit zu Kana 248:3-4

οὔος ἀῶωωπ εφῆητ̄ ἐπαῖα νημ φαῖ εῶωεεῶωρ
 ‘Und er begann zu fliehen nach dieser und jener Seite, indem er in Erregung geriet’

In cases like these, the translator must have relied upon the inchoative (i.e., change-of-state) component in the semantics of the auxiliary verb as the last resort for distinguishing the given sentence from its semantic *doppelganger* with a synthetic form (here, ἀτετηρῆρεια and ἀῶωωτ, respectively).

Having no idea of either semantic, or formal triggers for the use of periphrasis, we are even less equipped to explain the absence of periphrasis in syntactic and semantic environment apparently suitable for it.²⁰⁸

207 Translation: B.Layton (Layton 2000:343).

208 So, e.g., we cannot validate Jernstedt’s emendation of Sethe’s ‘misapplied stative’ examples (see Sethe 1922, Jernstedt 1925). Jernstedt proposes obligatory use of periphrastic construction wherever the infinitive “would not fit due to its meaning” (“Wo der Infinitiv wegen seiner Bedeutung nicht hinpasste, da wurde allerdings das Qualitativ gesetzt, aber nie und nimmer in der Weise, dass man es dann einfach mit dem betreffenden nichtpräsentischen Hilfsverbalpräfix zusammengab... Man bediente sich eben der Umschreibung durch das Verb ‘sein, werden’ im betreffendenfalls erforderlichen Tempus mit daran angeschlossenen präsentischen Umstandssatz, welcher das zum Ausdruck der Zustandsaktionsart unumgängliche Qualitativ selber enthielt”). Jernstedt obviously has in mind the use of the periphrastic construction as a suppletive form

Our uncertainty stems from a basic logical fault in the general approach to the periphrastic pattern. Strangely enough, it is usually regarded not as an autonomous grammatical form, but rather as a concatenation of forms, one of which (the auxiliary) is used to adapt the other (the core verb form) to the otherwise inaccessible grammatical environment. Thus, it is implied that grammatical means are the speaker's objectives. Under this interpretation, the speaker does not intend to find a proper linguistic form for the desired content, but rather wishes, for some obscure reason, to find whatever way there is to use the pre-conceived form where he should not use it. This approach is obviously fruitless as an instrument of linguistic analysis. Indeed, what would we learn of the English periphrastic form 'he will go', if the grammar would only tell us, it is used to combine the infinitive 'go' with the 3rd Sgl. personal pronoun?

Instead, I propose to apply the standard procedure that consists in:

- a) verifying the categorial values suggested for the pattern by means of contrasting it with other entities with similar or identical values;
- b) finding the formal restrictions imposed on each of its parts;
- c) fine-tuning the definition of the pattern's grammatical functions to match its distributional properties.

2.2 Previous research

The most standard up-to-date description of Coptic periphrasis is provided in Layton (2011). In Layton's opinion, the periphrasis with ⲱⲟⲛⲉ, as well as the periphrastic future with the auxiliary ⲉⲓ, serves to enlarge the range of tenses compatible with the verbal form used in the circumstantial clause.²⁰⁹ For some reason, Layton does not extend this definition to include also the periphrastic *modi* of imperative and jussive which receive a separate brief mention. But even in this abridged version, Layton's explanation is problematic, since it cannot account for a substantial number of circumstantially converted infinitives occurring in the periphrastic construction, as in (119):

(119) Four Creatures, f.4v b (Wansink 1991: 29).

ⲁⲪⲈⲒⲘⲒⲘⲒⲘⲉⲓ ⲉⲛ ⲧⲈⲒⲘⲒⲧⲘⲁⲓⲣⲟⲘⲉ ⲉⲧⲣⲉ ⲛⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲁ ⲉⲛ ⲛⲈⲒⲧⲟⲩⲱⲛ ⲱⲟⲛⲉ ⲉⲩⲉⲓⲛⲉ
ⲛⲈⲒⲧⲟⲩⲱⲛ ⲛⲈⲒⲧⲟⲩⲱⲛ ⲛⲛⲉⲧⲟⲛⲉ

“(God) arranged in his benevolence that each of the four creatures would resemble four classes of the living”

Obviously aware of the problem, Layton adds to his formal explanation another one based on semantics. He claims that periphrastic conjugation may at times express an incipient meaning denoting “subject beginning to act, entering a state, beginning to participate in a process, acquiring a quality.”²¹⁰ Given the extensive parallelism between Coptic periphrastic predications and Greek <γίγνομαι + adjective / participle> constructions

for a non-causal meaning, but he does not sufficiently clearly specify the conditions when this suppletion should be obligatory.

209 Layton (2011:342ff.).

210 Layton (2011:343)

in the Biblical corpus, such an idea certainly does not look ungrounded. However, the combination of formal and semantic factors in Layton's description of the pattern creates notional havoc reflected in the table of Coptic tenses where Layton summarizes his conclusions as follows (I reproduce here only the fragments that have a bearing on periphrasis):

Future:

- (120) ⲡ-ⲛⲁ-ⲕⲱⲧ 'he is going to build'
 ⲡ-ⲛⲁ-ⲱⲟⲛⲉ ⲉ-ⲡ-ⲕⲱⲧ 'he will be building, he will build (*or* he will start building, he will get to building); *rare*
- (121) ⲡ-ⲛⲁ-ⲱⲟⲛⲉ ⲉ-ⲡ-ⲕⲛⲧ 'it is going to be/ become built' (describing a state)
 ⲕⲉ-ⲛⲁ-ⲕⲟⲧ-ⲡ 'it is going to be built' (process)

Past:

- (122) ⲁ-ⲡ-ⲕⲱⲧ 'he built / has built; it became built / got built'
- (123) ⲁ-ⲡ-ⲱⲟⲛⲉ ⲉ-ⲡ-ⲕⲱⲧ 'he built, he started building, he got to building; *rare*
- (124) ⲁ-ⲡ-ⲱⲟⲛⲉ ⲉ-ⲡ-ⲕⲛⲧ 'it was built (describing a state) (*or* it came to be built)²¹¹

Aspectual values this table assigns to different members of the verbal paradigm seem to be impressionistic and not too clearly distinguished (for example, it is utterly incomprehensible how the process of going to be built can possibly differ from the state of going to become built).²¹² That makes difficult rendering them through palpable comparative concepts. Thus, the translation of the future tense periphrasis (ex.121) suggests the notion of a pre-resultative state, which would be a rare bird in typology. On the other hand, the past tense periphrasis (ex. 124) seems to refer to past progressive, past resultative or past inchoative, without any discrimination criteria suggested. So, for the moment, we can only cautiously state that according to Layton, the periphrastic pattern appears in predicates with conflicting tense / aspect / diathesis properties. This echoes the definition in Funk (1978a):

“Ein wesentlicher Zusatz zu dieser Regel (i.e., the rule of the incompatibility of stative with the Tripartite conjugation, -- N.S.) betrifft das Verfahren, das die koptische Sprache für den Fall bereithält, dass die beiden inkompatiblen Bedingungen aufeinander treffen, d.h., wenn auf Grund semasiologischer Merkmale (Zustand und/oder Passiv)

211 Layton (2011:437-438).

212 Generally speaking, the given method of finding out aspects of verbal forms seems contrary to the usual procedures applied by linguists for this purpose. Whereas a standard aspectual test consists in finding out what aspect-marking elements, e.g., time adverbs, are compatible with the verbal form in question, the aspectual values represented in the above table seem to be derived from the meaning of different constituents of the patterns. So, for example, the translation 'he will start building' constitutes a word-for-word rendering of the Coptic phrase which does in no way guarantee the equivalence of grammatical meaning. Of course, the material of an extinct (and not abundantly documented) language does not yield enough opportunities to conduct all the necessary tests with precision.

einerseits für das Verb die Qualitativform gefordert ist, andererseits aber der syntaktische Kontext eine Konjugation des Dreiteiligen Schemas vorschreibt. In diesem Fall tritt normalerweise eine auf analytischem Wege gebildete Ersatzkonstruktion ein, die sogenannte *Coniugatio periphrastica* mit $\omega\omega\pi\epsilon$.²¹³

Quack (2020) provides a similar explanation for the Demotic precursor of the pattern, however, without any reference to the diathesis factor.

“Das Verb *hpr* „sein, werden“ wird in verschiedenen Fällen als Hilfsverb gebraucht, um Konstruktionen zu ermöglichen, die andernfalls ausgeschlossen wären. Sofern man die Nuance des Qualitativs im Sinne des abgeschlossenen Zustandes einer Verbalhandlung außerhalb des Systems der Dauerzeiten verwenden will, kann man das Verb *hpr* im jeweiligen Tempus verwenden und daran einen Umstandssatz mit dem Qualitativ des Hauptverbes anschließen...²¹⁴

The not too obvious common semantic denominator of the three definitions is that the periphrastic pattern has some kind of bound stative or bound resultative reading. Now, boundedness of a state can theoretically mean that this state is presented as having a starting point or an end-point (if it has both, then it is punctual and therefore cannot be regarded as a state). The second option must be excluded from consideration, because there is no evidence of a periphrastic construction with $\omega\omega\pi\epsilon$ ever having a terminative meaning analogical, e.g., to Russian derivatives with the prefix *do-*: *do-smotrel* “finished watching”.²¹⁵ Thus, the general meaning of periphrasis is assumed to be start-defined stative, i.e., inchoative.

Two additional descriptions of the pattern, one in Demotic and one in Coptic, do not refer to the feature of inchoativity or boundedness, but stress the ultimately imperfective character of the pattern. Simpson (1999) claims that “the durative clauses in these passages all express continuous or progressive actions, and the periphrastic construction is presumably employed in order to link them with verbal bases which do not normally have this sense.”²¹⁶ In the same vein, contrasting forms like ‘κ-να-ογοπ’ with ‘κ-να-ωωπε ε-κ-ογϱαβ’ and ‘ε-κ-ε-κα-ρωκ’ with ‘ε-κ-ε-ωωπε ε-κ-κω η-ρωκ’, Lambdin suggests that the periphrastic circumstantial is employed, “when it is necessary to express a durative or continuous process or state in the future”.²¹⁷ Yet, he abstains from extending the validity of his hypothesis to tenses other than the future.

Finally, Funk is the only author to explicitly propose passive diathesis for a possible trigger of the periphrastic construction. His definition, however, is somewhat evasive and does not specify the conditions under which diathesis could be considered the sole or main

213 Funk (1978a:25).

214 Quack (2018: 68).

215 For the terminative meaning, Coptic employs the periphrastic structure with the auxiliary $\omega\omega\pi$; but even that, strictly speaking, does not always have the meaning of termination of a state, but rather that of a state after the termination of an action, i.e., a resultative state, see Grossmann (2009).

216 Simpson (1996: 129).

217 Lambdin (1983: 30.9).

factor responsible for the use of periphrasis. Taken at face value, the idea that periphrasis serves to combine non-active forms with the tense base conjugation is not satisfactory. After all, a large number of verbs have a synthetic form (that of the absolute infinitive) which functions as a punctual passive or anticausative of the Tripartite conjugation. As can be seen from the following Biblical examples, neither an anticausative meaning, nor even a parallel periphrastic construction with the change-of-state meaning in the Greek original do necessarily bring about the use of periphrastic pattern in the Coptic translation:

(125) Matt. 17:2

πεφρο αφατατε ντρε ηπηρ αγω νεφροτε **αγογβαω** ντρε ηπογοειν
καὶ ἔλαμψεν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος, τὰ δὲ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ **ἐγένετο λευκά** ὡς
τὸ φῶς
'and his face shone like the sun, and his clothes became as white as the light'

(126) John 5:9

αγω η̄τεγνογ **αφογχα** η̄σι πρωμε
καὶ εὐθέως **ἐγένετο ὑγιής** ὁ ἄνθρωπος
'and the man was immediately healed'

(127) Acts 1:19

αγω **απειρωβ σωλη̄ εβολ** η̄ογον η̄ιμ
καὶ **γνωστὸν ἐγένετο** πᾶσιν
'and it was revealed to everyone'

(128) Acts 8:1

ογον δε η̄ιμ **αγχωωρε** εβολ ενεχωρα η̄τογδαλια η̄ν τσαηαρια
πάντες δὲ **διεσπάρησαν** κατὰ τὰς χώρας τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ Σαμαρίας
'and they were all scattered throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria'

It is therefore to be expected that the diathetically conditioned periphrasis, if indeed it exists, marks such cases where the use of a synthetic form is for some reason impossible, i.e., functions as a suppletive form filling an inflectional gap. Alternatively, one could perhaps argue that passive / non-causative is nowhere a single factor contributing to the use of periphrasis, but that it is invariably entwined with some other grammatical feature, e.g., with stative aspect, and it is precisely this combination that needs to be expressed analytically.

The sum total of our present-day ideas about the Coptic periphrasis looks as follows: this pattern must in most, if not all, cases have an imperfective value; it may, at least sometimes, convey the sense of change-of-state; it is often employed in future tenses, though not confined to them; finally, in some cases it might fill paradigmatic gaps created by collision of anticausative or passive sense with certain, as yet undefined, aspect-tense features of the Tripartite conjugation. In the following parts of the study, I shall try to elucidate this description.

2.3 Distributional properties of periphrasis

From the present-day descriptions of the pattern, one might conclude that no restrictions are imposed on the tense base of the auxiliary; indeed, Layton's above-cited wording suggests that the periphrastic pattern is aimed at employing as many tense bases, as possible, to enlarge the scope of stative. However, an examination of the distribution of periphrasis proves such ideas to be somewhat too loose. It turns out that some tense bases are involved in periphrasis much more often, than the others, some do not participate in the pattern, at all.

Unfortunately, the only text corpus allowing for exhaustive and significant statistics is a translated one, i.e., that of the Bible. The count below reflects the respective number of circumstantially converted infinitive or stative clauses expanding a Tripartite $\alpha\omega\pi\tau\epsilon$ -clause in the biblical corpus. It does not include circumstantial clauses with nominal predicates, with the predicates expressed by possessive verboid or adjectival verbs.

Tense base	Number of tokens
Optative	77
Future	76
Perfect	48
Conjunctive (mostly following future tense)	47
Imperative	19
Inflected Infinitive	14
Jussive	8
Conditional (future sense)	4
Aorist	1
All tokens	294

For reference, one can compare it with numbers obtained from Shenoute's Canon 1 and Canon 6:

<u>Canon 1</u>	
Perfect	4
Imperative	4
Optative	3
Conjunctive (following future)	2
Future	1
Inflected Infinitive	1
All tokens	15
<u>Canon 6</u>	
Perfect	4
Inflected Infinitive	3
Future	3
Conjunctive (following future)	2
Conjunctive (following present)	2
All tokens	14

Although there is a surprising variation in the data as to the ratio of perfect forms (in the biblical text, the tokens of periphrastic perfect constitute some 16% of the array, while in Shenoute's corpus they amount to some 30+%), in other respects, the statistics show much affinity. Thus, aorist forms are vanishingly rare in the Bible and virtually non-existent in the two selected canons. Importantly, in both corpora, there is no single occurrence of either limitative 'empat-f-sotm', or temporal 'ntere-f-sotm' with periphrasis. Later I shall try to account for the absence of these tense bases; suffice it here to observe that if the main semantic content of periphrasis would be to stress inchoative aspect of an action, its non-occurrence with the limitative base would be striking and rather unexplainable. At the same time, the majority of the overall occurrences of periphrasis are represented by tenses and moods with various shades of future meaning. The Demotic evidence, though extremely scarce, reveals roughly the same ratio of periphrastic future to past tense, as the biblical texts.²¹⁸ Thus, the temporal value of periphrasis may be either future or past, the modal meanings include indicative, optative and imperative.

In the next two sections, I intend to examine the opposition between periphrastic and synthetic temporal forms, to be able later to compare the results and find possible differences between them.

2.4 Periphrasis: future tenses / moods

In a most parsimonious way, the meaning of future periphrasis as a complex morpheme may be described as future resultative. In Nedjalkov (1988), one of the basic works on verbal resultative constructions, the term 'resultative' is defined as follows:

"The term resultative is applied to those verb forms that express a state implying a previous event. The difference between the stative and the resultative is as follows: the stative expresses the state of a thing without any implication of its origin, while the resultative expresses both a state and the preceding action it has resulted from."

One has to bear in mind, though, that the distinction between the resultative and the stative pointed out by Nedjalkov is not unambiguous. This is reflected in the fact that both categories are oftentimes encoded by the same polysemous morpheme, which can also serve to denote the passive:

The division was immediately surrounded by their opposite number. – Passive
 I saw Frank Sinatra surrounded by fans. – Resultative
 The village was surrounded by woods. – Stative²¹⁹

In Coptic, too, these three categories are not strictly differentiated. Especially in the case of periphrasis, it is convenient to think of them as a continuum with fuzzy boundaries. With some lexemes (including complex ones, such as ⲧ-ⲗⲁⲛ 'judge'), the exact meaning of periphrasis may be closer to the 'pure', i.e., punctual passive, as in:

²¹⁸ The Demotic data is discussed in 2.10.

²¹⁹ This example is taken from Nedjalkov (1988).

(129) Shen.Can. 2 (Kuhn 1956:124, 24-25)

αιωαδε νμημητη εἰπ ταταπρο **μαριωωπε ετετι† ελπ εροι** εἰπ πμα ετιμαγ
 ‘(I have come to you once, or two or three times), having spoken to you by word of
 mouth, let me be judged by you in that place.’

In this sentence, the adverbial expansion εἰπ πμα ετιμαγ meaning roughly ‘here and now’, point rather to the punctual, than the statal interpretation (“let me be in the state of being judged by you”). From the structural point of view, the predicate here is opposed to the imperative pattern † ελπ εροι ‘let you judge me’. Thus, the periphrastic structure serves to form a passive of a formally intransitive verbal phrase.

However, it is much more common for the analytic construction with future tenses to express a future resultative or stative meaning.²²⁰ Contrastive analysis of synthetic and analytic future forms, when possible, points to the opposition between a punctual event and the resultant state of its non-agentive argument (‘to get fulfilled’ vs. ‘to stay fulfilled’, ‘to sit down’ vs. ‘to remain seated’). The presence of this semantic trait in periphrastic predicates is formally proven by their compatibility with adverbial expansions denoting time intervals, such as **νηεροογ τηρογ** ‘all days’ or **ωα-** ‘until’. Since the adverbs expand the predicate as a whole, and not just the subordinate clause, the property of durativity must also be taken as pertaining to the predicate as a whole, as in:

(130) Num 6:8

νηεροογ τηρογ ντε πεφερητ εφεωωπε εφογααβ μηλχοειε
πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς εὐχῆς αὐτοῦ ἅγιος ἔσται κυρίῳ
 ‘All the days of his vow **he is holy** to the Lord’²²¹

(131) Luke 1:20

εις εἰητε **εκεωωπε εκκω ρωκ** εμηνησοη μηοκ εωαδε **ωαπεροογ** ετερεναι ναωωπε
 και ιδου **εση σιωπων** και μη δυναμενος λαλησαι **αχρι ης ημερας** γενηται ταυτα
 ‘And behold, **you will be silent and unable to speak until the day** that these things
 take place’

(132) O.Crum 22

αγω διαισσα τεκπολιε **ναωωπε εεεμαμαατ ωα ενεε**
 ‘and Edessa your city **shall be blessed for all time**’

(133) Lev 11:24

αγω ετετηααωωμη εἰν ναι ογοη νηη ετηααωε ενετημοογ† νηητογ **φναωωπε**
εφλαρη ωα πναγ νρογρε
 και εν τούτοις μιανθήσεσθε πας ὁ ἀπτόμενος τῶν θνησιμαίων αὐτῶν **ἀκάθαρτος**
ἔσται ἕως ἑσπέρας
 ‘By these you will make yourselves unclean, whoever touches their carcasses **will**
be unclean till evening’

220 My definition coincides with Lambdin’s “durative or continuous process or state in the future”.

221 Translation mine – N.S.

The two tokens of $\chi\omega\zeta\mu$ ‘be(come) unclean, polluted’ in the last quotation constitute a minimal syntactic pair not only with respect to their tense, but also with respect to their diathesis. The use of the periphrastic construction cannot, therefore, be attributed to the passive genus of the verb, but reflects the aspectual difference between the two predicates. I could not find in the biblical corpus a single instance of the infinitive $\chi\omega\zeta\mu$ with a non-punctual meaning; my guess is that the clause * $\varphi\eta\lambda\chi\omega\zeta\mu$ $\varphi\alpha$ $\pi\eta\lambda\alpha\gamma$ $\nu\rho\omicron\gamma\zeta\epsilon$ ‘he will become unclean till evening’ would be ungrammatical.

The case of $\chi\omega\zeta\mu$ does not, however, rule out the possibility of a synthetic form with the future stative meaning:

(134) Num 35:28

μαρφεογωζ ζη τπολις ημμα ηπωτ φαντεφμογ ησι ηπος ηοηηηβ
 ἐν γὰρ τῇ πόλει τῆς καταφυγῆς **κατοικεῖτω**, ἕως ἂν ἀποθάνῃ ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ μέγας
 ‘For he **must remain** in his city of refuge until the death of the high priest’

(135) Deut 28:24

ερεπχοεις † ηογφοειω ηηεκαζ ητε ογκαζ **φωγο** εζωκ εβολ ζη ηπτε φαντητακοκ
 ζγω φαντηφοτκ εβολ
 δόφη κύριος τὸν ὑετὸν τῇ γῆ σου κονιορτόν, καὶ χοῦς ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ **καταβήσεται**
 ἐπὶ σέ, ἕως ἂν ἐκτρίψῃ σε καὶ ἕως ἂν ἀπολέσῃ σε
 ‘The Lord will make the rain of your land powder. From heaven dust **shall come**
down on you until you are destroyed (lit.: until it destroys you and until it wipes
 you out)’

Evidently, the degree of obligatoriness of the periphrastic construction varies with different verbal lexemes. This variation does not come at random but is regulated by the lexical aspect of the verb. The main operative distinction is the distinction between telic and atelic / durative verbs. Telic or terminative verbs are defined in Nedjalkov & Jaxontov (1988) as the verbs that denote a transition from one state to another or acquiring a quality (‘sit down’, ‘fall’, ‘forget’, etc.), while durative verbs do not imply a definite purpose (‘sing’, ‘run’, ‘look’) or else they express a state (sit, know).²²² For the Coptic periphrasis, the crucial distinction seems to be the following: with telic verbs, the resultant state comes at the final point of the event, whereas for an atelic verb, the ‘result’, or the eventive facet, basically coincides with the entry into the state denoted by the verb. An extreme case of the telic class are strong transitive verbs;²²³ statal verbs and the verbs of motion constitute the opposite extreme. In a most general form, the rule sounds as follows: telicity of the verb correlates with the obligatoriness of the periphrastic construction as a future atelic non-causative form. The scheme below gives a graphic representation of the semantic/syntactic/lexical range of the periphrastic pattern with future tenses / modi:

222 Nedjalkov (1988:5). This semantic category and its application to Coptic verbal system is also discussed in 1.3.4.6.

223 See the definition in 1.3.4.6.

Meaning of periphrasis	Passive (?)	Resultative	Stative	Iterative (?)	
Paradigmatic function	Suppletive		Contrastive	Facultative	
Verb classes	Strong transitive	Labile telic	Atelic / Statal	Motion	
Examples	καρῶν ‘curse’	ἔσται ‘fulfil’	μοῦρ ‘burn’	ἔσται ‘be sweet’	ἔσται ‘walk’

The following two examples illustrate the facultativity of the analytic construction with the verbs of motion:

(136) Genesis 3:14

ἐκεμοῦσε ἔσται τεκμεσῶντ ἀγῶ ἔσται ζητῆ
 ἐπὶ τῷ στῆθει σου καὶ τῇ κοιλίᾳ πορεύσῃ
 ‘on your belly (lit.: on your breast and your belly) you shall go’

(137) Abbaton (Budge 1914:238, 19-21)

ἐκεῶπις ἐκμοῦσε ἔσται ζητῆ • ἡμέρας τῆρου ἡπεκῶντ •
 ‘You shall be walking upon your belly all the days of your life’

The difference between the two expressions marked in bold lies on the margin of grammar, since it cannot be represented in terms of binary opposition of any grammatical feature, aspect included. Both predicates denoting identical events, the adverbial expansion ἡμέρας τῆρου ἡπεκῶντ ‘all the days of your life’ is the only overt distinction between them, and it would be reasonable to suppose that this expansion has triggered or at least motivated the change in the form of the verb. In such cases, as this, the grammatical opposition is not that of punctual synthetic vs. durative analytic form, but rather that of an aspectually unmarked synthetic vs. marked durative analytic form. The periphrastic pattern in the last example supposedly might have iterative, rather than durative reading. However, this is a matter of interpretation and cannot be directly proven.

Periphrasis occurs more frequently with the class of durative and statal verbs. However, I could not find a context that would help to detect the semantic difference between the simple and the complex form in such cases. Extrapolating the previous findings onto these cases, we might suspect that the longer form stresses the stative aspect of the verb, but it is difficult to determine, whether a native speaker would find a significant difference in sense between

(138) Ps 103:34

παῦλας **ἡμεῖς** ἐξῶπις ἐξῶπις ἡμεῖς
 ἡδυνθείη αὐτῷ ἡ διαλογὴ μου
 ‘May my meditation be pleasing to him’

and

(139) Sir 49:2

φιναρλος ντρε νογεβιω ρν τταπρο τηρς
 ἐν παντί στόματι ὡς μέλι γλυκανθήσεται
 ‘it is (lit.: will be) as sweet as honey to every mouth’²²⁴

This non-obligatory kind of periphrasis cannot be accounted for by any theory that treats it as a strictly suppletive structure. It does not fill any paradigmatic void, either as a passive / intransitive, or as a stative form. Rather, it constitutes a device of categorial refinement, which would be quite common for such structures, as pointed out in Bybee (1994).²²⁵ Structurally, it seems to be a secondary development; one can imagine that the pattern has been initially used as a suppletive form with various classes of telic verbs, and then, having become associated with the stative meaning, has spread to the durative class.

In quantitative terms, at least, telic verbs constitute the nucleus of the lexical repertory of periphrasis. This class consists of two subgroups, specified above as the labile (e.g., **ἔωκ** ‘fulfil / be fulfilled’, **ἔωξμ** ‘make (yourself) unclean’) and the strong transitive (**ἔαρογ** ‘curse’, etc.) verbs. With the verbs of the first group, the opposition <infinitive : periphrastic form> is the opposition of aspects, punctual vs. stative:

(140) John 15:25

ἀλλα **ἔεκας ἐφἔἔωκ ἐβωλ** νοσι παρὰ.ε εττηρ ρμ πεγνομος
 ἀλλ’ ἵνα πληρωθῆ ὁ λόγος ὁ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ αὐτῶν γεγραμμένος
 ‘But the word that is written in their Law must be fulfilled’

(141) John 16:24

ἔεκας ἐρεπετηραῶε αἴτια ἐφἔἔηκ ἐβωλ
 ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ὑμῶν ᾗ πεπληρωμένη
 ‘that your joy may be full’

(142) 1Cor. 14:25

νετρηπ ἠπεφρητ **ἠα.ογῶνηρ ἐβωλ**
 τὰ κρυπτά τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ φανερά γίνεται
 ‘the secrets of his heart are disclosed’

(143) Isa 2:2

πτοογ ἠπχῶεις **ἠα.αἴτια ἐφἔἔονηρ ἐβωλ** ρν τρηρ ἠνεροογ
 ἔσται ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις ἐμφανὲς τὸ ὄρος κυρίου
 ‘The mountain of the Lord will be visible in the latter days’²²⁶

Here the periphrastic structure obviously supplies the stative future.

224 English translation: New Revised Standard Version.

225 “New periphrases develop to express meanings that are more specific than the meanings already expressed grammatically in the language at the time.” Bybee et al. (1994:133).

226 Translation – N.S. The ESV translation (“It shall come to pass in the latter days that the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established as the highest of the mountains”) deviates strongly from the Coptic text.

The verbs belonging to the second group have an animate agent, are active and mono-diathetic: their infinitive has a causative reading only. Here, the opposition <infinitive : periphrastic form> is the opposition of both aspect and diathesis. This group constitutes the biggest source of periphrastic constructions in Sahidic. Here belong, e.g., *καρογ* ‘curse’, *ωπ* ‘count’, *σωπε* ‘prepare’²²⁷, *σωπε* ‘seize, take’, *τοπτι* ‘make alike’, *ταειο* ‘honor’, as well as *σμογ* ‘bless’, which has developed a stative form, despite not being historically a transitive verb.

- (144) Pierpont Morgan Library M.593 (Installation of Gabriel), 77:25

τενογ σε νεσνηγ **ωωπε ετεπνσβτωτ** πτεπνωερεπεπτηγτπ ενεγναζις πνεκκλησια
ετογδαβ

‘Now then, brethren, be prepared and go early to the services of the holy churches’

- (145) Shen.Can. 8, XO 78:57-60

μαρογωωπε εγσεγορπ πναεππνογτε

‘Let them be cursed before God’

- (146) Shen.Can. 3, YA 309-10

εγεωωπε εγμηπ ερογν ενκανων ετκη εεραπ πνεσνηγ τηρογ

*‘(And all who dwell next to us) shall be bound by the canons that are laid down for all the siblings’*²²⁸

- (147) Shen.Can. 1, 6, XC 13-14

εγεωωπε εγωππ εεραπ εχη πεωγσιαεστηριον πτεκκλησια

‘Sie sind am Altar der Gemeinde der Erstgeborenen, die in den Himmeln angeschrieben sind, empfangen’ (lit.: *‘they shall be received at the altar of the church’*)

Of course, the above schema of verbal classes represents only the most basic correlations between forms and grammatical categories. Individual lexemes may develop an idiosyncratic behavior which would lie beyond the scope of this rough approximation. So, for example, the grammatical marking of the aspectual split by periphrasis may overlap with a lexical and semantic split. Such is, e.g., the case of the verb *ογοπ* ‘be(come) clean, holy’. Whereas its periphrastic stative is used 13 times in the Bible to translate *ἅγιος ἔσται*, the corresponding punctual mediopassive *ἀγιαζομαι* ‘become holy’ is usually rendered by *τββο* (e.g., 1Cor. 6:11, 1Cor. 7:14, 1Tim. 4:5, Heb. 10:29) and only twice by the infinitive *ογοπ*, in the identical phrases of Matt. 6:9 and Luke 11:2 (*μαρεπεκραν ογοπ* ‘hallowed be your name’). In other cases, *ογοπ* conveys the sense of ‘become pure, unblemished’ (Psalms 118:80, Job 11:15, Sirach 16:12). So, periphrastic predicates with *ογααβ*, seemingly, do not have any synthetic counterpart of the same root.

227 Crum (1939) treats *σωπε* as a labile verb. However, most attestations marked as intransitive are in Bohairic, or else have the causative reading ‘prepare (something)’ with an omitted DO. Although Luke 10:10 proves that sporadic anticausative/passive use was not altogether excluded, it still seems rather a marginal option in Sahidic.

228 Text according to Leipoldt (1954: 120). Translation according to Layton (2014:118-119).

In much the same way, the infinitive of ὡσο ‘pour down, empty’ is used mainly or, perhaps, exclusively with the meaning ‘pour down’, while the stative form ὡσεν means ‘empty’; thus, for ὡσο, the synthetic form cannot under any conditions serve as a syntactic alternative for the analytic construction:

(148) 1Cor. 1:17

κεκασ **εννεκῶσπε εφῶσεν** νβι πεσταγρος μπεχ
 ἵνα μὴ κενωθῆ ὁ σταυρὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ
‘lest the cross of Christ be emptied of its power’

Finally, periphrasis can supply missing tenses or modi for stative verbs incompatible with the eventive conjugation. In my opinion, this can explain the use of periphrastic constructions with the verb εἶνε ‘be like’ whose infinitive is not attested in the Tripartite. The periphrastic construction is employed, when there is a need to express the idea of ‘being alike’ in tenses or modi other than present indicative:

(149) Shen.Can. 4, GI 98:37 (Wessely 1909)

ἢνελλᾶγ ἡραὶ ἢρητῆ εἶτε ῥοογτ εἶτε ςῆμε **ὡσπε εγείνε** ἡνιρεφῆνοβε τηρογ
 ετῆμαγ
“so that none of you, man or woman, would resemble all those sinners”

(150) 1John 3:2

τετνσοογν κε εφῶανογῶνῆ εβολ **τενναῶσπε εἶνε** ἡμογ
 οἶδαμεν ὅτι ἐὰν φανερωθῆ, ὅμοιοι αὐτῷ ἐσόμεθα
‘but we know that when he appears, we shall be like him’

A less rigorous, but similar behavior is demonstrated by the verb ὥσῳτ ‘look, watch’, whose infinitive is not, strictly speaking, incompatible with the non-durative tenses, but strongly prefers the durative pattern.

Cases, as these, provide an ideal illustration to Funk’s concept of periphrasis as a medium for combining the stative aspect with the non-present tenses. One should, however, keep in mind that the variable here is not the aspect, which is an inherent part of the lexeme, but the tense. Periphrastic forms of these verbs complete the paradigm not only in future tenses, but in perfect, as well:

(151) Shen.Can. 9 DF 261:24, Funk (unpublished)

εαγῶσπε εγείνε ἡμογ
‘It was him they started to resemble’

(152) Exodus 2:4

ατεφῶσπε ὡσπε εσῶσῳτ ἡπογε εἶνε εἰετναῶσπε ἡμογ²²⁹
 καὶ κατεσκόπευεν ἡ ἀδελφὴ αὐτοῦ μακρόθεν μαθεῖν, τί τὸ ἀποβησόμενον αὐτῷ
‘His sister was looking from afar to know what would happen to him’

2.5 Periphrasis: perfect

The difference between the synthetic and the analytic form is much less obvious with perfect, than it is with future tenses. As will be shown in 2.7, the periphrastic perfect in most cases conveys the meaning of the change of state. At the same time, as also with future tenses, it clearly serves to represent the predicated event as interminate. This leads to one of the two possible ways of interpretation: 1) the event is represented as begun in the past but taking place at the time of speech or for an indefinite length of time; 2) the event as such pertains to the past, but its result is valid at the time of speech or for an indefinite length of time. As far as my examples go, the first interpretation is associated with the absolute and the second one with the stative form of the subordinate predicate.

(153) Shenoute, Canon 6

ΜΠΙΕΩΘΗΘΩΜ Η ΤΗΝΑΘΗΘΩΜ ΑΝ ΕΣΩ ΧΕ ΤΖΗΩ ΖΩ ΕΜΗΡΩΜΕ ΟΟΟΥΝ ΕΒΟΛ ΧΕ
ΑΦΩΩΠΕ ΕΥΧΕΡΟ ΖΡΑΙ ΖΗ ΠΑΖΗΤ ΝΟΙ ΠΩΩΝΕ ΕΤΗΜΑΥ ΝΛΟΙΜΟΟ ΝΘΕ ΝΟΥΚΩΖΤ ΖΙΤΝ
 ΝΕΤΝΙΦΕ ΝΩΩΦ ΝΘΕ ΝΖΕΝΔΒΒΕΟ ΕΥΧΕΡΟ ΖΝ ΟΥΖΡΩ ΖΙΤΝ ΝΕΤΝΙΦΕ ΕΡΟΟΥ ΑΥΩ **ΑΦΩΩΠΕ**
ΕΦΒΡΒΡ ΖΡΑΙ ΖΗ ΠΑΩΩΜΑ ΝΘΕ ΝΟΥΜΟΟΥ ΕΥΟΑΖΤΕ ΖΑΡΟΥ ΝΟΙ ΝΕΤΝΕΩΩΕ ΖΙ ΟΑΑΟΕ
 ΕΠΚΩΖΤ ΕΤΗΜΑΥ

*‘I could not and will not be able to stay, for I am hurt, and no one knows it, because this filthy illness **has come to burn** in my heart, like a fire under (the breath of) those who breath on it, like the coals that burn in the oven, when one fans them. And it **has become boiling** in my body, like water being heated by those who throw wood and logs to the fire (underneath it).’*

A frequent Greek equivalent of the first type of this pattern is the phrase: γίγνομαι εἰς + Acc., as in

(154) Ruth 4:16

ΑΥΩ ΝΘΕΜΙΝ ΔΟΑΙ ΜΠΩΗΡΕ ΚΟΥΙ ΔΟΑΑΑΦ ΖΝ ΚΟΥΗΟ **ΑΦΩΩΠΕ ΕΟΖΛΟΟΛΕ** ΜΗΟΦ
 ΚΑΙ ἔλαβεν Νωεμιν τὸ παιδίον καὶ ἔθηκεν εἰς τὸν κόλπον αὐτῆς καὶ **ἐγενήθη** αὐτῷ
εἰς τήνην.

*‘Then Naomi took the child and laid him on her lap and **became his nurse.**’*

(155) Shen.Can. 6, MONB.XV, 98, Amel. 1, 37

ΠΠΟΥΟΥ ΕΝΤΑΠΠΟΥΟΥΤΕ ΟΟΥΟΥΟΥ **ΑΦΩΩΠΕ ΕΦΡΟΚΕ ΕΦΟ ΝΚΑΚΕ ΕΦΤΑΚΗΥ** ΤΗΡΦ ΜΗ ΝΕΦΩΝΕ
*‘the mountain that God has cursed **became burnt out, dark and destroyed, all of it with its stones**’*

(156) Apocr. John 29:18-19

ΑΦΕΤῪΤῪ ΠΟΥΟΕΙΝ ΑΥΩ ΜΠΩΩΠΕ ΝΟΥΟΕΙΝ ΟΥΤΕ ΝΚΑΚΕ ΑΛΛΑ **ΑΦΩΩΠΕ ΕΦΩΩΠΕ**
*‘it darkened the light. So, it did not become light, nor darkness, but rather **it became weak**’*

The above examples show that periphrastic perfect constructions denote events consisting of two parts, the change of state and the new state, of which the second has no tense value of its own, but is assigned a tense depending on the context. Thus, the present reading is appropriate for (153), but not for (154)-(156), which refer to narrative past.

The first type of perfect periphrasis may be termed ‘antiperfect’ based on its time schema: essentially, it denotes an event that is NOT completed at any known reference time-point. On the other hand, the second type has the same two facets, as the usual perfect: a prior event and a resultant state. Hence, no great semantic change would possibly ensue, if we rephrase (155) in the following way:

ΠΤΟΥΘΥ ΕΝΤΑΠΝΟΥΓΤΕ ΣΖΟΥΩΡΗ ΔΑΦΩΚΕ ΔΑΡ ΚΑΚΕ ΔΑΓΤΑΚΟ

However, the use of the analytic construction clearly shifts the accent from the event itself to the resulting state. Taking this shift to be the main function of periphrasis, we can extend this idea to cases where such semantic nuances cannot be obtained from the context, such as:

(157) Shen.Can. 1, 17.5

ΔΥΚΑΔΣ ΕΣΑΧΗΜΟΝΕΙ ΔΥΩ ΔΑΦΩΠΕ ΕΣΣΟΛΠ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΒΙ ΤΑΧΗΜΟΣΥΝΗ ΝΤΕΣΠΟΡΝΕΙΑ
‘indem man sie entkleidete und beschämte und die Schamlosigkeit ihrer Unzucht wurde aufgedeckt’

The biblical passage quoted by Shenoute uses a synthetic form, a non-causative infinitive, to render the same meaning (the difference in tenses does not seem to play any role here):

(158) Ezek 23:29

ΝΣΣΩΛΠ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΒΙ ΤΑΧΗΜΟΣΥΝΗ ΝΤΟΥΠΟΡΝΙΑ
 και ἀποκαλυφθήσεται αἰσχύνη πορνείας σου
‘and the nakedness of your whoring shall be uncovered’

2.6 Types of periphrastic predicates and the lexical inventory of the pattern

Seemingly at variance with the definition of periphrasis as resultative-stative form is the fact that the periphrastic predicate is not confined to formally intransitive forms, i.e., statives and intransitive infinitives, but includes verbs with direct objects, as well, as, for instance, in

(159) Gen 3:14

ΕΚΕΩΠΕ ΕΚΟΓΕΜ ΚΑΖ ΝΝΕΖΟΥ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΜΠΕΚΩΝΖ
 γῆν φάγη πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ζωῆς σου
‘dust you shall eat all the days of your life’

However, examples such as this last one show that ‘staging’ the event as atelic involves a change in the agentivity properties of its subject, such as volitionality and non-affectedness. Indeed, here, as also in the example from Luke 1:20 (εκεῶπε εκκω ρρωκ ‘you will be silent’), the core event of the predicate is forced on the subject referent as a punishment. Another detransitivizing feature of such constructions is the low individuation of the object. Thus, generally, even if the actant A performs an action on the actant B, the imperfective aspect of periphrasis represents this event as the state of A, and not of B. In Vendler’s schema, this corresponds to states and activities, but not achievements or accomplishments. This semantic content may appear in three different syntactic shapes:

- (a) intransitive infinitive (e.g., $\mu\omega\omega\upsilon\epsilon$ ‘walk’) or – mostly – stative predicate:
- (160) Shen.Can. 6, Amel. 2 (299:6)
 $\omega\alpha\lambda\tau\omega\gamma\eta\tau\upsilon\epsilon\ \epsilon\pi\sigma\alpha\ \eta\nu\omega\lambda\ \mathbf{\eta\psi\omega\omega\pi\epsilon\ \epsilon\psi\sigma\kappa\epsilon\kappa\omega\pi}$ $\epsilon\psi\pi\iota\mu\epsilon\ \xi\eta\ \nu\omega\gamma\epsilon\iota\pi\ \mu\mu\omega\omega\upsilon\epsilon$
 ‘till they bring him outside and **he turns over** (or perhaps: **lies upside down**)
 crying in the street’
- (b) transitive infinitive with a non-specific (most often, zero-articled) object:
- (161) Shen.Can. 3 YA 552:39
 $\mathbf{\eta\tau\bar{\eta}\omega\omega\pi\epsilon\ \epsilon\eta\tau\sigma\omega}$ $\bar{\eta}\eta\epsilon\eta\epsilon\pi\eta\gamma\upsilon$
 ‘And **we shall teach** each other’ (lit: ‘**we shall give learning** to each other’)
- (162) Deut 19:11
 $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\omega\lambda\lambda\omega\gamma\omega\mu\epsilon\ \delta\epsilon\ \omega\omega\pi\epsilon\ \epsilon\psi\mu\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon\ \eta\pi\epsilon\tau\epsilon\iota\tau\omega\gamma\omega\psi$
 $\epsilon\grave{\alpha}\nu\ \delta\grave{\epsilon}\ \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\tau\alpha\iota\ \grave{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma\ \mu\iota\sigma\acute{\omega}\nu\ \tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \pi\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$
 ‘if anyone **hates his neighbor**’
- (c) ‘impersonal passive’ construction; in this case, the deep structure patient corresponds to two surface-syntactic actants: the object of the core verb and the subject of the auxiliary. At the semantic level, it manifests the split between its status as the topic of the speech (corresponding to syntactic subject) and its non-agentivity (corresponding to syntactic object). At the syntactic level, it is obviously a mechanism for expressing intransitive imperfective future / perfect with such verbs that do not have intransitive forms (i.e., with stative-less verbs), in this sense an allotagm of (a):
- (163) Nag Hammadi Codex V, The Apocalypse of Adam, f.85
 $\mu\grave{\alpha}\rho\epsilon\pi\epsilon\gamma\omega\gamma\tau\alpha\zeta\ \lambda\omega\omega\mu\bullet\ \alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\ \mathbf{\sigma\epsilon\eta\alpha\omega\omega\pi\epsilon\ \epsilon\psi\sigma\omega\sigma\upsilon\eta\ \bar{\eta}\mu\omega\sigma\upsilon}$ $\omega\alpha\ \eta\eta\mu\omega\sigma\ \bar{\eta}\eta\epsilon\omega\delta\eta\bullet$
 ‘Their fruit does not wither. But they will be known up to the great aeons’
- (164) On the Punishment of Sinners, 77,26-78,2, Kuhn (1956:8, 28-30)
 $\pi\epsilon\gamma\psi\eta\tau\ \eta\alpha\mu\omega\gamma\ \delta\eta\ \lambda\gamma\omega\ \pi\epsilon\gamma\kappa\omega\zeta\tau\ / \eta\alpha\chi\epsilon\eta\alpha\ \delta\eta.\ \bar{\eta}\sigma\omega\omega\pi\epsilon\ \epsilon\pi\epsilon\sigma\alpha\pi\bar{\zeta}\ \eta\eta\mu\ \eta\alpha\gamma\ \epsilon\pi\omega\omega\gamma:$
 ‘Their worm shall not die, and their fire shall not be quenched and they shall be for all flesh to see them’

Each of the three constructions is available for the Greek loan verbs:

- a) Periphrasis with intransitive infinitive:
- (165) NHC II Gospel of Thomas, 70, Layton (1989)
 $\pi\epsilon\chi\epsilon\ \bar{\iota}\sigma\ \chi\epsilon\ \omega\omega\pi\epsilon\ \epsilon\tau\epsilon\tau\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\gamma\epsilon$
 ‘Jesus said, “Become such who pass by.”’
- (166) Pepper Receipt (Crum 1925:106-7)
 $\mathbf{\sigma\epsilon\eta\alpha\omega\omega\pi\epsilon}$ $\epsilon\sigma\omega\pi\bar{\chi}$ $\lambda\gamma\omega\ \mathbf{\sigma\epsilon\sigma\epsilon\beta\alpha\iota\omega\gamma}$ $\zeta\bar{\eta}\ \eta\alpha\ \eta\eta\mu$
 ‘It shall be valid and guaranteed wherever it may be produced’

b) Periphrasis with transitive infinitive and non-specific object

(167) Abbaton (Budge 1914:241,32-33).

εἴρενεκβαλ ἡαῶωνε εὔθεωρει ἡνετσαπεσнт ἡπκαρῖ αῶαρραῖ ενετρηῖ ἡμοῦνηιοογε •
‘Your eyes shall be looking at the things below the earth, up to (and including) the things that are in the waters’

c) Periphrasis with ‘impersonal passive’ structure:

(168) Nag Hammadi Cod. VI, Asclepius 21-29

ἡτοῦ δε **φναῶωνε εὔρ ἀποστερι ἡμοῦ** ἡτεφρελιπс εφῶοοῖ ῥῆ οὔνοσ ἡλγπῆ•
‘And he will be deprived of his hope, since he will be in great pain’

(169) Nag Hammadi Cod. VI, The Concept of our great power

τοτε φηνοῦ εφοτοῦ τηροῦ εβολ• αῶ **σβναῶωνε εὔρκολαζε ἡμοῦ** αῶαντοῦτῶβο•
‘Then he shall come to destroy them all, and they shall be punished until they become pure’

Inside the class of verbs used in the periphrastic pattern, there appears to be a striking percentage of synonymy, both among the native vocabulary and between the native and the loaned Greek lexemes. The noteworthy micro-groups are: ‘remain’ (μοῦνι εβολ, προσκαρτηρει), ‘watch’ (ἡαῦ, σῶαῦτ, ἠεωρει), ‘believe’ (ἡαρτε, πιστεγε), ‘walk, be engaged in the act of walking’ (μοοῶε, ει, παραγε), ‘govern’ (αῡαρτε εχῆ, αρχεσῶαι), ‘resemble’ (εῖνε, τοντην), ‘be small, empty’ (свок, αῶαχρ, οῦῶσῶ), ‘be insignificant / despised / distressed’ (ρῶα, сῶα, сῶαῶ, мкаρ), ‘be/ make firm, strong’ (ωρх, тахро, βεβαῖογ). This can hardly come as a surprise, seeing that all these lexical groups belong to the atelic class and that the use of periphrasis is heavily influenced by the aspectual features of the verbal lexeme.

2.7 The issue of inchoativity

As previously mentioned, periphrasis is now generally understood as a form characterized by both imperfective (atelic) and bounded aspect, which means that the event in question is represented as a temporally unlimited change of a previous state. Moreover, this change-of-state nuance of meaning is thought by some researchers (e.g., Layton) to be the sole trigger of analytic constructions with a subordinate infinitive. However, the very first example used by Layton to illustrate this statement makes one question its veracity.

(170) Luke 7:38

αααρεπατс ριπαροῦ ἡμοῦ ραρατῶ εсрime αααρχи ηρηπνεογερητε ηνεсрμιοογε
 εαсῶτοῦῦ ἡπῶα ητεсаπε **αῶῶωνε εс-ῖπi** ενεῶογερητε εсῶαρεс ἡμοῦῦ ἡπсῶбн
 καὶ σταῶα ὀπίσω παρὰ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ κλαίουσα, τοῖс δάκρυσιν ἡρξато βρέχειν
 τοὺс πόδας αὐτοῦ, καὶ ταῖс θριζῖν τῆс κεφαλῆс αὐτῆс ἐξέμασεν, καὶ **κατεφῖλει** τοὺс
 πόδας αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡλειφεν τῶ μύρφ.

*‘And standing behind him at his feet, weeping, she began to wet his feet with her tears and wiped them with the hair of her head and **kissed his feet** and anointed them with the ointment.’*

For the periphrastic phrase $\alpha\sigma\omega\pi\epsilon\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\eta\ \epsilon\pi\epsilon\phi\omega\gamma\epsilon\rho\eta\tau\epsilon$, Layton suggests a translation containing the marker of inchoativity ('she began kissing his feet'), based on his word-for-word reading of the phrase as "she-became she kissing". The Greek original, however, does not warrant such reading. The inchoative meaning in this verse is associated with another verb ($\beta\rho\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota\nu$ - $\lambda\omega\rho\eta$ 'wet'). Following the original, the Coptic translator marks it by $\lambda\rho\chi\iota$. On the contrary, the event of kissing is coded by the simple narrative imperfect. The text gives no reason for a change-of-state interpretation in this case ("she stopped whatever she was doing and began kissing his feet"). Thus, paradoxically, Layton attempts to prove his point with one of the very few instances of perfect periphrasis that does not hold with the inchoativity hypothesis.

However, most occurrences of perfect periphrasis in the biblical corpus, with very few exceptions, entail the change-of-state meaning, being the usual translation equivalent of Greek $\gamma\acute{\iota}\gamma\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ -phrases, as in:

(171) Joshua 9:18 (9:12)

$\tau\epsilon\nu\omicron\gamma\ \sigma\epsilon\ \lambda\gamma\omega\sigma\omega\gamma\epsilon\ \lambda\gamma\omega\ \lambda\gamma\omega\pi\epsilon\ \epsilon\gamma\omega\eta\chi\ \epsilon\beta\omicron\lambda\ \mu\eta\omega\sigma\kappa\ \eta\tau\epsilon\zeta\eta\eta$
 $\nu\ddot{u}\nu\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \acute{\epsilon}\xi\eta\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \gamma\epsilon\gamma\omicron\nu\alpha\sigma\iota\nu\ \beta\epsilon\beta\rho\omega\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\iota$
'but now, behold, it is dry and crumbly (lit.: has become dry and crumbly)'

(172) Lamentations 1:16

$\lambda\eta\lambda\omega\eta\rho\epsilon\ \omega\omega\pi\epsilon\ \epsilon\gamma\tau\alpha\kappa\eta\chi$
 $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\ \omicron\iota\ \nu\iota\omicron\iota\ \mu\omicron\upsilon\ \eta\phi\alpha\nu\iota\sigma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\iota$
'my children are desolate (lit.: 'have become desolate)'

(173) Joel 2:2

$\mu\eta\pi\epsilon\ \omicron\gamma\omicron\nu\ \eta\mu\eta\ \omega\omega\pi\epsilon\ \epsilon\psi\epsilon\iota\eta\epsilon\ \mu\eta\mu\omicron\chi\ \chi\iota\eta\ \eta\omega\sigma\eta\ \lambda\gamma\omega\ \mu\eta\eta\kappa\alpha\ \eta\alpha\iota$
 $\acute{\omicron}\mu\omicron\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\ \omicron\upsilon\ \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omicron\nu\epsilon\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\iota\omega\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \mu\epsilon\tau\ \acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\omega\nu$
'their like has never been before, nor will be again after them'

If the inchoative sense can hardly be termed the main trigger of periphrasis in these cases, it is at least not altogether excluded from the semantics of the phrase. The situation is different with future tenses. Here, the Coptic analytic pattern almost always corresponds to Greek $< \epsilon\iota\mu\acute{\iota} + \text{participle}>$:

(174) Deut 28:34

$\eta\gamma\omega\pi\epsilon\ \epsilon\kappa\sigma\omega\mu\ \zeta\eta\ \eta\epsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\epsilon\eta\epsilon\kappa\beta\alpha\lambda\ \eta\lambda\gamma\ \epsilon\rho\omicron\gamma$
 $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\eta\ \pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\pi\lambda\eta\kappa\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \delta\iota\acute{\alpha}\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\ \acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\tau\alpha\ \tau\omega\nu\ \acute{\omicron}\phi\theta\alpha\lambda\mu\omega\nu\ \sigma\omicron\upsilon$
'so that you are driven mad by the sights that your eyes see'

(175) Mark 13:13

$\eta\tau\epsilon\tau\eta\omega\pi\epsilon\ \epsilon\rho\epsilon\omicron\gamma\omicron\nu\ \eta\mu\eta\ \mu\omicron\sigma\tau\epsilon\ \mu\eta\omega\tau\eta\ \epsilon\tau\beta\epsilon\ \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\eta$
 $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon\ \mu\iota\sigma\omicron\upsilon\mu\epsilon\mu\omicron\iota\ \acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\nu\ \delta\iota\acute{\alpha}\ \tau\omicron\ \acute{\omicron}\nu\omicron\mu\acute{\alpha}\ \mu\omicron\upsilon$
'And you will be hated by all for my name's sake'

Interestingly, the observable neutralization of the change-of-state meaning of the auxiliary in future tense is not unparalleled among modern languages. In this connection, one can

recall the German change-of-state verb *werden*, which is used as an auxiliary for inchoative past passive, but has no inchoative sense as a future auxiliary.

The syntactic and semantic problem behind these observations is, of course, far too complicated to try to treat it in the present work, but the first naive explanation could be as follows: the meaning of change does not require a specific morphological marker in future tenses, because it immanently pertains to the future tense as such. For Coptic, this means that the periphrastic construction generally depicts the event as a change from some previous state, though this component of meaning is never the central or the single one.

The absence of periphrastic predicates in temporal subordinate clauses can be sufficiently well explained and comprehended, if one takes into account that the temporal pattern $\eta\tau\epsilon\rho\epsilon\text{-}\rho\text{-}\omega\tau\tau\mu$ ‘after he heard’ denotes a point of time understood as the starting point of the event denoted by the main clause, hence it is bound to contain a terminative verb; the interminativity of periphrasis must be what makes it incompatible with this conjugation pattern. Slightly less intuitive seems the fact that the limitative clause, as well as the temporal one, requires its predicate to be terminative-punctual and not just start-punctual, in which case periphrasis would have a chance to occur with that pattern.

2.8 The issue of iterativity

An open question is the interrelationship between periphrasis and the semantic category of iterativity. As shown in Khrakovsky (1989), this category pertains to the domain of quantifiability of events. Since punctual events are singular, iterative (multiple) events tend to take a morphological shape that expresses non-punctuality. As a consequence, iterativity is often expressed by the same means as imperfectivity; not infrequently, inside the class of verbal markers used to express imperfectivity, there may be a subclass “specializing” on iterative Aktionsart. Thus, there would be nothing strange about one and the same periphrastic structure employed as a marker of both durativity and iterativity.

However, the evidence of an iterative use of periphrasis is scarce and remains dubious to me. I have managed to find no more than four or five instances of iterative periphrastic predicate, one of them being the above cited example from Luke 7:38. In three further instances, the core verb is a verb of movement ($\epsilon\iota$ ‘come’, $\rho\omega\tau$ ‘run’, $\beta\omega\kappa$ ‘go’); iteration is overtly expressed by temporal or spatial adverbials ($\rho\lambda\lambda$ $\eta\sigma\iota\tau$ ‘many times’, $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\alpha$ $\mu\eta$ $\eta\mu\iota$ ‘here and there, to this and other side’) or implicitly suggested by the context.

(176) Besa On Theft, frag. 23: II,3 (Kuhn 1956:63)

$\epsilon\tau\beta\epsilon$ $\eta\alpha\iota$ $\omicron\gamma\omicron\iota$ $\eta\eta\tau\bar{\eta}$ $\chi\epsilon$ $\lambda\omicron\gamma\kappa\rho\iota\tau\eta\varsigma$ $\epsilon\varphi\bar{\rho}\zeta\omicron\tau\epsilon$ $\lambda\eta$ $\rho\eta\tau\bar{\eta}$ $\eta\pi\eta\omicron\gamma\tau\epsilon$, $\lambda\gamma\omega$ $\epsilon\eta\bar{\eta}\omega\mu\epsilon$ $\lambda\eta$ $\rho\eta\tau\bar{\eta}$ $\bar{\eta}\rho\omega\mu\epsilon$ $\bar{\rho}$ $\rho\lambda\lambda$ $\eta\sigma\iota\tau$ $\bar{\eta}\omicron\gamma\chi\eta\tau\alpha$ $\chi\epsilon$ $\bar{\eta}\eta\epsilon\sigma\omega\mu\epsilon$ $\epsilon\sigma\eta\eta\gamma$ $\omega\alpha\rho\omicron\lambda$ $\bar{\eta}\rho\lambda\lambda$ $\bar{\eta}\sigma\iota\tau$ • $\epsilon\sigma\tau$ $\rho\iota\sigma\epsilon$ $\eta\lambda\alpha\varphi$ •
*‘Therefore, woe to you, because a judge who neither feared God nor respected man, gave judgment for a widow that she should not be coming to him so often and troubling him.’*²³⁰

230 (This instance is an almost exact quotation of Luke 18:5 with a different time adverb, but an identical sense: $\tau\eta\eta\alpha\rho$ $\rho\epsilon\sigma\lambda\eta\pi$ $\chi\epsilon$ $\eta\eta\epsilon\sigma\omega\mu\epsilon$ $\epsilon\sigma\eta\eta\omicron\gamma$ $\omega\alpha\beta\omicron\lambda$ $\eta\sigma\tau$ $\rho\iota\sigma\epsilon$ $\eta\alpha\iota$ / $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\delta\iota\kappa\eta\sigma\omega$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\eta\nu$, $\bar{\iota}\nu\alpha$ $\mu\eta$ $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\chi\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$ $\upsilon\pi\omega\pi\iota\acute{\alpha}\zeta\eta$ $\mu\epsilon$ / “...I will give her justice, so that she will not beat me down

(177) Hochzeit zu Kana, 248:3-5

ΟΥΟΣ ΑΥΦΩΠΙ ΕΦΗΤ ΕΠΑΙΣΑ ΝΕΜ ΦΑΙ ΕΦΩΕΡΘΩΡ

‘Und er begann zu fliehen nach dieser und jener Seite, indem er in Erregung geriet’²³¹

(178) Shen.Can. 1 17.7

ἸΠΡΩΩΠΕ ΕΡΕΒΗΚ ΕΞΟΥΝ ΕΠΝΑ ΕΤΕΣΥΝΑΓΕ ἸΡΗΤῸ ΕΡΕΩΟΟΠ ῶΝΟΥΚΡΟϞ

‘Gehe nicht hinein zu dem Ort, an dem du dich zum Gottesdienst versammelst wenn du etwas Schlimmes planst’

The iterative perfect in (179) and (180) proves that, even if the analytic form bears any relation to the iterative meaning whatsoever, it is, at least, not obligatory in perfect:

(179) Pistis Sophia, Book 1 23b 24,19-22

ἸΤΕΡΟΥΝΑϞ ΕΠΝΟΣ ἸΟΥΟΕΙΝ ΕΝΕΦΩΟΟΠ ἸΜΟΙ΄ ΑΥΦΩΤΟΡῸ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΕΞἸ ΝΕΥΕΡΗϞ ΑϞΩ
ΑΥΠΩΤ ΕΠΙΣΑ ἸΝ ΠΑἸ ῶΡΑἸ ῶΝ ἸΑΙΩΝ

‘when all those saw the great light which I had, they were all together (lit.: over each other) troubled and flew from side to side in the aeons’

(180) Ps 77:40

ῶΔῶ ΝΟΟΠ ΑΥῸ ῶΩΝΤ ΝΑϞ ϞΙ ΠΧΑΙΕ

ΠΟΣΑΚΙΣ ΠΑΡΕΠῖΚΡΑΝΑΝ ΑΥΤὸΝ ἘΝ Τῆ ἘΡῆΜῶ

‘How often they rebelled against him in the wilderness’

Yet, the periphrasis of the unspecific-object infinitive might arguably highlight the iterative semantics in:

(181) Nag Hammadi Codex VII, Teachings of Silvanus f. 87 (Peel 1996:286)

ΑϞΩ ΕϞΩΔΑΝΠΑΔΕϞΕ ἸΜΟΚ ῶΝ ῶΩΒ ΝΙΜ ΩΩΠΕ ΕΚῸ ΠΕΤΝΑΟΥϞ

‘And should you be educated in any matter, be doing what is good.’

2.9 Conclusion

The Coptic circumstantial periphrasis is compatible with the tenses and modes of future meaning (future, optative, imperative, future conjunctive, jussive and future conditional) and with perfect. Occurrences with aorist are extremely infrequent, periphrastic subordinate clauses, if they exist, seem to be very rare.

Depending on the form of the core verb, the predicate in the circumstantial clause most often belongs to one of the three formal types: a stative or an intransitive infinitive (mostly with Greek verbs); transitive infinitive with a non-specific object; two-argument infinitive with a non-specific subject, i.e. the ‘impersonal passive’ construction. The impersonal

by her continual coming.” Here, of course, the parallel with the Greek participle suggests itself as another possible trigger of the periphrastic construction in Coptic. However, such structural nuances would not be supported in quotations.)

231 Mueller (Heidelberg 1968:248). Though aware of committing a methodological transgression in using instances from a non-related corpus and, still worse, from a different dialect, I cannot give up on this token of iterative periphrasis: the instances are altogether so rare, that losing a single one, you are in danger of missing a grammatical nuance.

passive type serves as an equivalent of the stative predicate for stative-lacking verbs. Predicates consisting of an infinitive with a specific subject and a specific object, such as Ruth 4:16 ἀσώπει ἐξλοοε μιοφ ἐγενήθη αὐτῷ εἰς τιθηνόν ‘(she) became his nurse’, are rather an exception.

The specific semantic interpretation of a periphrastic construction depends on the employed form and the lexical aspect of the core verb. With the statives of telic verbs, including strong transitives, periphrastic pattern denotes, respectively, future or past objective resultative. The periphrastic resultative past theoretically could be opposed to the stative past expressed by the imperfect converter with stative, as, e.g., in Luke 9:45 μεζροβς ερωογ / ἦν παρακεκαλυμμένον ἀπ’ αὐτῶν ‘it was concealed from them’; however, I was not able to find any actual minimal pair of periphrastic perfect vs. stative imperfect with the same core verb. Further on, with the statives or infinitives of atelic / statal verbs, the periphrastic form has the respective reading as future stative or past interminate (“anti-perfect”). Finally, with unspecific-object infinitives and with statives of motion verbs, it presumably can also denote a multiple, iterating situation.

As to the structural place of the pattern, with telic verbs it is a suppletive, i.e., paradigmme-filling form. With atelic / statal / motion verbs, it seems to be facultative, highlighting the durative, or possibly sometimes iterative aspect.

Interestingly, whereas the past resultative periphrasis has the semantic component of inchoativity (hence the parallelism with the Greek copular pattern γίγνομαι + noun / adjective / participle), the same construction referring to future does not usually denote a change of state. Possibly, this shade of meaning is neutralized in future tenses by the general sense of future as a change of the preceding state.

2.10 Appendix: periphrasis in Demotic

The tokens of the periphrastic *hpr(=f) jw(=f)* pattern in the Demotic corpus of the Thesaurus Linguae Aegyptiae are very few, hardly more than 10. All the more remarkable is that most of them occur within the tense bases that can be largely defined as future-type tenses. Among them are:

a) *Future and negative future*

(182) TM47388, P.Rylands 9, X, 18

*mtw =f p3 ntj-jw =f r hpr tw =f shn n.im =n ʿn*²³²

“It is him who will be responsible for us”

(183) TM54058, P.Harkness, II, line 2, Smith (2005)²³³

...dd bn-tw-n3.w t3j fʿm hpr tw =s dʿj D.t

“...saying: This little girl should not be in want of anything”

232 The verb ‘shn’ in this example can be understood as either transitive (“he will command us”) or intransitive. In my interpretation of this clause as intransitive, I follow G. Vittmann’s translation.

233 Translation mine, based on the translation in the Thesaurus Linguae Aegyptiae data base.

b) *Conjunctive with future meaning*

(184) TM6378, Canopus decree, CG 22186 /18, Simpson (1996:238-239)

[mtw] [p3] [sd] [n] [t3j] [r^c][j],t hpr iw =f grmr r:r =f

“[and the tail of the Uraeus-snake] should be twined round it (i.e., papyrus stalk)”

(185) TM6378, Canopus decree, CG 22186 / 61, Simpson (1996:238-239)

*p3 shn n nb ntj-iw =w dj,t h^c p3j =s stm-(n-)ntr n.im =f mtw =f hpr iw =f šb{,t} r p3**ntj-iw =w dj,t h^c t3 rpj.t n [t3] pr-^c3,t brng3 n^h-wd3-snb t3j =s mw,t n.im =f*

“...the gold diadem with which her cult image is crowned should be different from the one with which is crowned the statue of Queen Berenice her mother.”

(186) TM55955, P. London-Leiden III, line 10, Griffith-Thompson (1921:34-35)

*mtw =k dj,t <st> r t3 b^ct^cne,t hm sp-2 n-wš-n dj,t hpr h^cjse mtw =f hpr iw =f stf m-šs**sp-2*

“... and (you should) add (it) to the dish gradually without producing perturbation, so that it becomes clear exceedingly...”

c) *Optative*(187) TM55955, P. London-Leiden X, line 3, Griffith-Thompson (1921:74)²³⁴*mj-ir =w hpr jw =w šs sp-2 jw =w smn D.h jw =w swtn iw =w phr*

“Let them be proved (bis), established, correct, enchanted...”

All the examples above share three grammatical characteristics: they refer to **future** events from the speaker’s time perspective, they have **imperfective** aspect and they are all univalent clauses with the verbal lexeme used in an **intransitive** structure, whatever guess we could make regarding its actual morphological shape. However, the aspectual characteristics may vary, as can be seen from the following perfective example:

(188) TM46443, P.Berlin P 13548²³⁵*iw=f-hpr iw rh p3-šr-p3-mr-ih p3 (r:)kd r ij r-hrj mtw =f ir p3 hrw 2 kd mj iw =f mtw**=<šf?> hpr iw =f tj r-hrj p3 hrw thb r dj,t w^cb n h,t-ntr*“If the architect Psenpelaïas can come and make 2 days of building job, let him come. And **let him come** on the day of watering, so that he cleans the temple.”

As for the tense characteristics, it is unclear, whether the few occurrences of the seemingly identical construction in non-future tenses (exx. 10 and 11) can be interpreted as periphrasis, at all:

234 My translation is based on that of Griffith-Thompson who however translate the periphrasis analytically (“let them come into being, proved”).

235 My translation is based on that in the Thesaurus Linguae Aegyptiae data base.

- (189) TM56179, P.Carlsberg 302(8), frag. 13, II, lines 2-3
- ²³⁶

ḥpr p3 mwt tw = fhl r [m]3 nb ntj [hr] t3 p,t tw = fšnb irm p3 [ʿnh] [i.ir?] pr n p3 nwn
 “The Death flew (flew out? was flying?) to every place which is under the sky uniting
 with the [life which] came forth from the Primaeval Ocean”

(or: “There appeared the Death, flying in every place under the sky...” etc.)

- (190) P. Insinger XX, 18, TM55918

ḥpr hr tw = fke h3 p3 dwf ir = fhrj {r} <n> p3 t3 m whm3

“Though Horus hid himself (was hidden?) behind the papyrus, he ruled the land
 again.”

The Demotic data at our disposal are really too scarce to safely determine what grammatical factors (imperfective aspect? intransitive diathesis?) were the primary triggers of the periphrastic construction. One can easily imagine that in some cases the pattern was used to avoid an agent-preserving intransitive interpretation:

* *mj-ir = w smn mj-ir = w swtn mj-ir = w phr*

“Let them establish, let them set upright, let them charm (?)...” (cf. example (8)).

In any case, imperfectivity and intransitivity are just complementary ways of atelic representation of an event. Thus, we can claim that the Demotic periphrasis, in all probability, served as an atelic future construction.

236 My translation is based on that by M. Smith, with the altered periphrastic phrase. Smith’s translation goes as follows: “Death came into existence, flying...” etc.

3 Greek loan verbs in Coptic: diathesis and grammatical voice marking

3.1 Defining research object and research objectives

As the substrate language in the bilingual society of the Ptolemaic, Roman and Byzantine Egypt, Egyptian language was subjected to a heavy influence of Greek which has replaced Demotic as the language of administration. The extent of the interaction between the two cultures and the two languages in the everyday life of different social strata is as yet difficult to measure, as can be seen, e.g., from the careful evaluation of the bilingual situation in the Ptolemaic Egypt in Bagnall and Criore (2006):

“The last two decades have gradually made it clear that Greek and Egyptian documentation does not correspond in any simple fashion to underlying realities. The same individuals in some cases operated in both spheres for different purposes: Greek in royal service, often Egyptian in religion, but much more mixed in law and private relations. Long before the end of the Ptolemaic period, Greek was overtaking Egyptian as a means of communication in practically every sphere except the religious, and yet, at least until the late second century BC, private legal instruments in Demotic remained common. What seems clear is that society contained a considerable spectrum of individual positions in the use of language, ranging from Greek settlers whose Egyptian was limited to a few words for talking to servants or tradesmen, to numerous Egyptian peasants who encountered Greek almost exclusively in the person of bureaucrats and even there used intermediaries as far as possible. Between these extremes were many more or less bilingual persons... <Moreover,> generation of Greek documentation <...> extended by proxy much farther in society than did actual competence in Greek.”²³⁷

The linguistic influence originating in multiple social contacts between the Hellenic and the gradually hellenized native community certainly could not be unilateral. However, it is obvious that the mutual impact of Greek and Egyptian was asymmetrical, mostly taking the form of linguistic borrowing from Greek as a dominant language to Coptic as a socially subordinate one.²³⁸ Now, according to Sakel (2007), the character of borrowing tends to correlate with the type of the sociolinguistic contact between the donor and the recipient languages; the borrowing of grammatical patterns / categories often results from the influence of a substrate language, whereas a dominant language provokes code switching with the ensuing borrowing of the ‘physical’ linguistic matter, mostly vocabulary²³⁹. It is, therefore, not surprising that in case of Greek borrowings into Coptic, the borrowed stuff consisted mainly or exclusively of what Muysken calls the ‘fabric’ of language, namely, of lexical items, whereas the borrowing of grammatical patterns or categories, if any

237 Bagnall & Criore 2006:58.

238 See Muysken (2017:6). For the reverse side, namely, the impact of Coptic on Greek, see Torallas Tovar (2017).

239 See Sakel (2007:15-16).

such occurred, has yet to be demonstrated.²⁴⁰ Among these borrowings, according to the estimates of the DDGLC project, roughly 50% are represented by nouns and about 20% more by verbs. The ratio of actual occurrences of nouns and verbs is different: here, verbs account only for some 10% (or less) of all the loans. At present, the data base includes ca. 600 Greek loan verbs. This number may slightly change with the arrival of new documents and new attestations, but hardly significantly.

A substantial part of studies treating the accommodation of Greek verbs in Coptic concentrate on verb integration strategies. This issue comprises two questions: what exactly was the form loaned, infinitive, imperative or the bare verbal stem; and what strategy, — a direct insertion of the verbal lexeme or the light verb construction, — had the temporal and the structural priority. The first topic has been investigated by Böhlig (1995), Funk (2017); the second one is treated, *inter alia*, in Reintges (2001), Egedi (2017), Grossman & Richter (2017). The ‘input’ part of the borrowing process has thus attracted a sufficient amount of attention among the linguists of Coptic.

Compared to that, the ‘output’ part, namely, the diathesis and valency of a newly minted Graeco-Coptic verb, is as yet a rather uncharted territory. The studies in this field include Zakrzewska (2017a, 2017b) and Grossman (2019). Following Reintges (2001) in his interpretation of the absolute infinitive as a morphosyntactic noun introduced by a covert or overt light verb²⁴¹, Zakrzewska (2017a) suggests a number of questions as the desiderata for future investigations, among them: what is the valency of the verbs obtained by the light verb derivation; are there regularities in the number and morphological marking of arguments of the derived verbs; is the valency pattern of a derived verb influenced by the valency of the incorporated Greek form, or in other words, are there correspondences between the valency of the original lexeme in Greek and its replica in Coptic; and how precisely occurred the phonetic attrition of the light verb to reach its final stage of zero representation in Sahidic. The question of a possible correspondence between the valency patterns employed by a lexeme in Greek and in Coptic is addressed in Zakrzewska (2017b), with the conclusion that the verbs of Greek origin in Coptic pattern rather with the semantically close native verbs, than with their Greek prototypes, although both languages use a case-marking system, *i.a.*, to mark the patient’s non-prototypical affectedness.²⁴²

Whereas the main point of Zakrzewska’s research lies in various non-default (*i.e.*, non-transitive) valency patterns, Grossman (2019) focuses on the integration of Greek-origin loan verbs into the Coptic transitivity patterns. Under a somewhat narrow definition of transitivity as the property of a two-argument construction with A- and P-arguments, Grossman concludes that Greek origin verbs have properties similar to those of native

240 Zakrzewska (2017a). Still, the grammatical influence of Greek is immediately evident in the domain of discourse structuring, cf. Zakrzewska (2017b:218): “As for grammatical borrowings, the strongest degree of Greek influence can be observed in the adoption of discourse strategies and clause combining strategies, including the use of function words such as conjunctions and discourse markers.”

241 Reintges (2001:184).

242 Zakrzewska (2017b:230-231).

verbs in the domain of A/S-coding, but differ from them in the coding of P in that the Greek morphs do not allow P-incorporation or indexing of P on the verb. According to Grossman, this deficiency cannot be explained by mere phonological reasons²⁴³, since both indexing and incorporation of an object are possible for native verbs with the same final segments (e.g., ‘krine’ and ‘Cine’, ‘staurou’ and ‘čooou’). Without pronouncing any final judgement on the matter, Grossman admits that the inability of Greek-origin verbs to incorporate a nominal or a pronominal object might be related to diachronic factors, assuming that Greek verbs entered the Coptic language system after the mechanism of argument incorporation and indexing had stopped being productive.

The present study continues exploring the accommodation of Greek loan verbs into the Coptic valency and diathesis patterns, with a special focus on causativity alternations. In the most general way, the problem can be phrased as follows: is the category of voice marked on loaned Greek verbs in Coptic? And if yes, what grammatical mechanisms participate in this marking?

The topic being vast, an exhaustive description would take far more than a single study. My intention is therefore to delineate the observable tendencies. Even this modest task stumbles upon many methodological difficulties which heavily impact the validity of any conclusions and which I would like to register here as ‘limited liability’ signs.

The first of these impediments consists in the definition of the object of research. One has to bear in mind that the original Greek lexeme and its Coptic reflection cannot be equated for the simple reason that the Graeco-Coptic morph is a member of a totally different system of signs. This idea is advocated by Shisha-Halevy who stresses the importance of “viewing Greek-origin elements as special ‘Graecitas Coptica’ linguistic signs, with all this implies, and mainly Listener’s Model decoding analytical function”. He argues that once a Greek morph starts its career in Coptic, it becomes “rather a special Coptic sign, and as such is caught in an oppositive tension within C(optic), between C(optic)-G(reek) and C(optic)-E(gyptian) signs... Any “memories” or rhetorical aura it might have of its Greek career are in principle only marginally, if at all, relevant for the Coptic *état de langue*, and for us in practice rather elusive and subjective.”²⁴⁴ The distance between a Greco-Coptic morph and its Greek origin is immediately expressed through semantic differences between them which can sometimes go so far, as to make the question of grammatical similarity irrelevant. Thus, ἀλλάσσει ‘exchange’, as it seems, has preserved only one specific facet of the meaning of ἀλλάσσω ‘change’ and therefore cannot denote a spontaneous process; if the Greek verb in the Hellenistic period acquires an anticausative usage based on this semantic trait of spontaneity, we obviously cannot expect the Coptic replica to demonstrate the same behavior. A certain degree of discrepancy between the source lexeme and the loaned one is also observable in such cases where a Coptic translator uses one ‘Greek’ word to translate another, as, e.g., in

243 Grossman (2019:106).

244 Shisha-Halevy (2017:442).

(191) Acts 28:26

Ἀκοῆ ἀκούσετε καὶ οὐ μὴ **συνῆτε**
 ʒN OƐƐWṬM ƧṬNΔƐWṬM NṬṬNṬMṬMṬOṬ
 ‘You will indeed hear but never understand’

(192) Acts 18:17

καὶ οὐδὲν τούτων τῷ Γαλλίῳι **ἔμελεν**
 ΔƐW MΠEΓΔΛΛIΩN ΠPOCΞΞS EPPOY
 ‘But Gallio paid no attention to any of this’

These considerations do not compromise the idea of comparison between the grammatical properties of the borrowed item and those of its replica in the source language but call for greater exactitude in our treatment of the compared items.

Another limitation encountered in the present type of research is so self-evident to any linguist of a dead language that it makes almost no sense to mention it anew. This is the limitation in the number and the quality of accessible attestations. In terms of statistics, the situation is as follows: At present, the medium number of attestations per verb in the DDGLC database is approximately 31. However, they are very unequally distributed between such giants as βαπτίζει ‘baptize’ (117 attestations), λυπεί ‘be sad, grieve’ (161 attestations), on the one hand, and far less frequent, and therefore all the more interesting, κομιά ‘whitewash’ (2 attestations), ταρασσε ‘bother’ (6 attestations), ῥαρμοζε ‘join together’ (7 attestations). In some cases, a diathetic variant of a verb is attested only once, or else the context is so unclear, as to put any conclusive interpretation beyond our reach. Furthermore, the data may vary across the dialects, but the poor numbers in all the dialects do not prove anything about the actual use of the lexeme in question. And, needless to say, some usages or morphological shapes seem to be an idiosyncratic property of a specific corpus of texts. This is often the case with the corpus of Nag Hammadi which accounts for a large part of middle-passive forms in Sahidic. Therefore, in this study, a meticulous description merits much more than a hasty conclusion. But even this target is barely attainable, where the data is so scarce, that it is often impossible to distinguish between accidental usage occurrences, and regular, but underrepresented phenomena.

3.2 Koine: summary of changes to verbal system (after Lavidas 2009)

The variety of Greek to be used for the comparison of a source lemma with its Coptic offshoot presents an additional problem. At the first glance, the most natural candidate for this comparison seems to be the language of the New Testament, a strain of post-Classical Greek best described in grammars and dictionaries. E.g., in Zakrzewska (2017b), the author advocates her choice of a source idiom as follows:

“...As information about the valency patterns of the Greek verbs quoted is not included in Crum’s dictionary, I excerpted the necessary data from Bauer’s 1988 [1979])

dictionary of New Testament Greek, the standard dictionary of the variety of Greek with which the Coptic writers were most likely to be familiar.”²⁴⁵

According to Bortone, the choice of the Biblical Greek as the source of information on the grammar of Hellenistic Greek in general is warranted by the following factors:

- i) Septuagint and the New Testament together constitute the longest extant text written in Koine;
- ii) Uninfluenced by the literary conventions of the Atticist prose²⁴⁶, the language of the Greek Bible must be closer to the vernacular Koine, than the contemporary literary works.²⁴⁷

However, the choice of New Testament Greek as the best representative of Koine is not unproblematic for several reasons. For one, it is not uniform in itself: some gospels reveal more archaic linguistic traits, than the others, the gospel of Mark appearing as the most innovative one.²⁴⁸ More importantly, even if the influence of Semitic original, and possibly Semitic mother tongue of the writers has been overestimated by the earlier scholars of the Biblical language²⁴⁹, it was nevertheless significant enough to not embrace this idiom as the purest sample of Hellenistic Greek. What is still more relevant for the Graeco-Coptic contact research, the idea that “the Greek spoken from the south of Italy through Asia Minor, Syria, Egypt, and the erstwhile Persian Empire and as far as the plains of the Punjab, was basically uniform”²⁵⁰ and that the variety documented in the Bible may as well stand for the one spoken in Egypt looks highly improbable. On the contrary, though the New Testament (as also the Septuagint) Greek could possibly serve as a literary standard for Coptic writers, we can hardly be sure that this was the source language of Coptic borrowings, at least not in the areas other than Christian theology. Certainly, in their everyday life, Egyptian population was rather exposed to the Greek vernacular whose closest approximation we find in non-literary papyri. The language of papyri is known to be significantly different from the language of New Testament, especially in its syntactical mechanisms.²⁵¹

Moreover, even the papyri do not do full justice to the linguistic reality of the vernacular Koine, since writing as medium calls for a certain degree of formalizing and ‘smoothing out’ of speech and thereby gives a distorted representation of the living language.²⁵²

245 Zakrzewska (2017b:230).

246 Cf. Bortone (2010:172): “A bigger problem is the prestige that Classical Attic had, and the influence it therefore exerted on Hellenistic Greek prose as represented, for example, by the works of Polybius, Diodorus Siculus, Epictetus, or Strabo. Most literary authors wrote in a language that appears to differ from Attic only on close inspection <...>, although the effects of Atticism at this stage are not as far-reaching as in the following centuries.”

247 Bortone (2010:172).

248 Ibid.

249 Bortone (2010:174-175).

250 Bortone (2010:172).

251 Cf. Wallace, D.B. (1996:23).

252 Cf., e.g., Torallas Tovar (2010:254), Koester (2012/I:107), Brixhe (2010:231).

Not only official documents written in Egyptian Koine, but also private letters often use technical language with fixed formulaic expressions²⁵³ that tend to ignore or hide grammatical changes. All that does not make the comparative work desperate, but yields it a certain degree of approximation.

Finally, tracking down the changes occurring to a borrowed lexeme suggests that the source language is a pure idiom, untainted by any previous contact with the target language. Would this approach prove accurate in case of Koine, in particular with regard to its verbal system? On the one hand, the Egyptian influence on Greek in the area of verb grammar has never yet, to my knowledge, been a topic of discussion among the researchers of either Coptic, or Koine Greek.²⁵⁴ Multiple changes in the morphology and syntax of Koine verbs are attributed to internal Greek factors.²⁵⁵ On the other hand, it is hard to imagine that such crucial part of language usage, as the tense-aspect-modus-voice system, remained intact for the linguistic habits of many non-Greek speakers. And indeed, there is an indirect evidence suggesting that the speech of Egyptian Greek-speaking community deviated from the classical canon, i.a., in the way they applied the Greek voice morphology:

“[Den aktiv-transitiven Verben] sind nicht gleich die Verba ζῶ, ὑπάρχω, εἰμί, πνέω, φρονῶ und ähnliche. Von diesen wird keine analoge Passivbildung vorhanden sein, weil sie nicht einmal im Indikativ Personen darstellen können, die von der Handlung affiziert werden, so dass sie von sich ein leidendes Verhalten aussagen könnten... Daher müssen **diejenigen, welche solche Wörter durch das ganze Passiv durchflektieren** (emphasis mine – N.S.), eingestehen müssen, dass sie solches bloss um der formellen Übung willen thun, nicht aber dass eine solche Flexion naturgemäss oder auch nur denkbar wäre. Es ist gerade so, wie wenn jemand eine Maskulinform verzeichnen wollte von Wörtern wie γαλουχέσασα (‘breastfeeding’), ἐκτρώσασα (‘having a miscarriage’)”²⁵⁶ [Apollonius Dyscolus, Syntax, A.D. II]

‘aito:’ and ‘aitoumai’ are different; as the first one means that I ask for something in order to take it once and not to give it back, the other I ask for something to use it and return it’ (Ammonius, 7; A.D. V).²⁵⁷

In these explanations, one can distinctly hear an irritated note of a language expert observing the decline of a former linguistic norm. Both authors being the citizens of Alexandria, though with an interval of some 300 years, their descriptions must refer to the same geographical variety of Koine, the Egyptian one, and might theoretically point to some interaction between Greek and its Egyptian substrate.

253 Torallas Tovar (2010:254).

254 E.g., Torallas Tovar, in her brief review of Egyptian grammatical traits in Egyptian Greek, points out several phenomena connected with the use of prepositions (ὀπό and ἐν as analogous to Egyptian *hn*), adverbs (ἐπάνω as a possible equivalent of εχην), conjunctions (ὅτι in front of a direct speech in the manner of the Egyptian *xe*), with the reference system in relative clauses, but does not mention any phenomenon in the domain of the verb. (Torallas Tovar 2010:262-264).

255 See Lavidas 2009:119-120.

256 A. Buttmann (1877:227).

257 Quoted from Lavidas (2009:109).

In short, a comparative study of Greek and Coptic grammatical categories has to recur to several gross approximations: it has to take the relationship between Koine and Coptic as a unilateral <donor – recipient> one; further on, it has to assume that Koine of the written sources renders the spoken language with sufficient accuracy; finally, different written sources, such as documentary papyri, private letters and literary and sacral texts, must be regarded as largely representing one and the same language variety.

With this in mind, let us review the basic grammatical innovations of Koine in the domain of the voice system, as they are represented in the exhaustive study by Lavidas (Lavidas 2009).

1) Causativisation and Transitivity of intransitive verbs

- *New causative interpretation of formerly intransitive verbs*

(Septuagint; II-I BC) βασιλεύω ‘to cause someone to rule’, ἐξαμαρτάνω ‘to cause someone to make a mistake’; (New Testament; AD I) ἀνατέλλω ‘to make someone stand up’, ἀναφαίνω ‘to make someone appear’, μαθητεύω ‘to make someone a pupil elsewhere’, κατακληρονομῶ ‘to cause someone to inherit.ACT’, etc.

- *Emergence of active forms with causative meaning corresponding to the existing anticausative medio-passive forms*

Classical Greek: ἡδομαι ‘to enjoy oneself/take one’s-pleasure’ → Koine: ἴδω ‘give pleasure’

Classical Greek: μαίνομαι ‘to rage/be furious’ → Koine: (ἐκ)μαίνω ‘drive mad’

- *Innovative causative use of former active and middle anticausatives*

Classical Greek: λευκαίνω, λευκαίνομαι ‘become white’ → Koine: λευκαίνω ‘make white / become white’, λευκαίνομαι ‘become white’

- *Addition of a direct object to former intransitives with the ensuing specification of meaning*

New Testament Koine: ἱερουργῶ: ‘to sacrifice/minister the gospel’
 ὑβρίζω: ‘to run riot (in the use of superior strength or power)’
 ἐνεδρεύω: ‘to lie in wait for/lay snares for’
 μένω: ‘to stay/wait for’

2) Changes towards the expansion of active morphology

- *Loss of non-active morphology in marking of benefactive meaning and increase in the use of reflexive pronouns*

ψηφίζει τὴν δαπάνην ‘he counts the cost’ (New Testament, Luke, 14, 28, with the meaning of the Classical Greek transitive ψηφίζομαι)

- *Decline of medio-passive future forms and leveling of the verbal paradigm towards active morphology*

ἀκούσω: hear.ACT.FUT [instead of ἀκούσομαι hear.MED-PASS.FUT]

ἀμαρτήσω: fail.ACT.FUT (Matthew, 18, 21)

ἄρπάσω: snatch-away.ACT.FUT (John, 10, 28)

βλέψω: see.ACT.FUT (Matthew, 13, 14)

ἐμπαίζω: mock.ACT.FUT (Mark, 10, 34)

- *Extension of active forms to the majority of the anticausative class*

ἀλλάσω: ‘to undergo a change’

ἐκτοπιζω: ‘to take oneself from a place/go abroad’

ἀναζευγνύω: ‘to yoke or harness again/withdraw’

κινῶ: ‘to move forward’

The use of medio-passive morphology with active verbs implied by the above quotations from Apollonius and Ammonius does not belong to the main grammatical phenomena of Koine; on the contrary, it rather goes against the mainstream. Lavidas attributes its very occurrence to the instability of the voice system,²⁵⁸ but this anomaly is also worth discussing in the context of intra-Coptic grammatical innovations.

3.3 Borrowing of grammar: theoretical preliminaries

Focusing this study on voice and voice marking of the loaned Greek-origin verbs in Coptic means examining a set of related issues: the function of the Greek voice morphology in Coptic, alternative mechanisms of voice marking for Greek verbs in Coptic, and the extent of semantic field covered by all these mechanisms. Obviously, to clarify the first issue, the study should consider not the verbal lexeme as a whole, but rather the distribution of the voice markers. This part of the study has to define, whether these markers are borrowed into Coptic ‘wholesale’ with the marked lexeme, or function as autonomous morphemes. That being the objective, I shall first sketch the typological perspective of borrowing, so that very diversified facts of Coptic borrowing from Greek could be categorized and compared to other cross-linguistic data.

Borrowing as a result of language contact has attracted much attention on the side of historical linguists and typologists, since it is regarded, along with phonemic change and analogical re-analysis, one of the major factors of linguistic change. Yet, whereas the borrowing of lexical material is clearly observable and statistically quantifiable and thereby gives an immediate ‘feel’ of the degree of language contact, the borrowing of grammatical entities was until relatively recently denied by many linguists even as a possibility. The first work to systematically treat the question of non-lexical borrowing was provided by

258 Lavidas (2009:109): “In many instances, active voice instead of non-active was used, but also vice versa. These changes comprise evidence of changes in the voice system of the Hellenistic period, resulting in instability in the voice system (as we can see from the tendencies observed in the ongoing changes).”

Weinreich (1953). Since then, the topic was discussed and elaborated on in many treatises, such as Sakel (2007), Heine and Kuteva (2003, 2005), Gardani (2018, 2020), Seifart (2015), Gardani, Arkadiev and Amiridze (2015), Muysken (2000, 2010), Matras and Sakel (2007), Matras (2011), Mithun (2012), Wichmann & Wohlgemuth (2008), Wohlgemuth (2009), to name just the most cited ones. So, by now it is well established that, in terms of M. Mithun, structure can be borrowed as well, as substance. This basic distinction between the lexical and the grammatical borrowed material is captured in the terminology proposed in Matras and Sakel (2007). The authors use the term ‘MAT borrowing’ to denote morphological material and its phonological shape from a donor language replicated in a recipient language. The contrasted term ‘PAT borrowing’ is defined in Sakel (2007) in the following way:

“PAT describes the case where only the patterns of the other language are replicated, i.e. the organisation, distribution and mapping of grammatical or semantic meaning, while the form itself is not borrowed.”

The terms MAT and PAT thus refer to the most specific (lexical and morphological) and most abstract (syntactic and semantic) language elements, respectively. Obviously, the diverse material of interlingual borrowing cannot be divided dichotomously into MAT and PAT; rather, these terms denote the two extremities of what can migrate from one language to another. Heine & Kuteva (2005) propose the following classification of transferrable linguistic material:

- a. Form, that is, sounds or combinations of sounds
- b. Meanings (including grammatical meanings or functions) or combinations of meanings
- c. Form–meaning units or combinations of form–meaning units
- d. Syntactic relations, that is, the order of meaningful elements
- e. Any combination of (a) through (d)²⁵⁹

Now, this list is the result of a typological work aiming at the generalization of very diverse data gathered from the description of individual languages. In the present study, I would like to do the reverse and to try to apply typological generalizations to the description of Greek-Coptic contact phenomena, namely, to classify the Greek loans in Coptic as loans of forms, or meanings, or else of combinations of forms and meanings. To this end, I had to devise my own scale, a kind of ‘borrowing thermometer’, matching the grammatical depth, or the level of abstraction, of a borrowed element with a specific kind of transfer. Theoretical and descriptive studies on contact borrowing, most importantly Gardani (2018) and Gardani (2020), suggest the following scale of the elements of linguistic transfer:

Borrowing classification scale

- (1) “content words”: a specific combination of phonetic material and meaning is transferred from the source language (SL) to the recipient language (RL)

259 Heine & Kuteva (2005:2).

- (2) morpheme of the SL transferred as a ‘frozen’, non-analyzable part of a borrowed lexeme (e.g., English plural morpheme -s in Russian English-loaned nouns *chips-y* ‘chips’, *baks-y* ‘bucks’, where -y is the Russian plural morpheme)
- (3) morpheme of the SL retaining or modifying its grammatical meaning in the RL, but used only on the stock of loaned lexemes, thus establishing a paradigm parallel to an existing native paradigm, e.g., the parallel native and Arabic-loaned verbal paradigms in Ghomara Berber²⁶⁰. This phenomenon is labelled *parallel system borrowing* (PSB) in Kossman (2010);
- (4) morpheme borrowed from the SL replacing a native morpheme in an existing paradigm, e.g., Spanish plural morpheme replacing native plural in Quechua²⁶¹;
- (5) morpheme borrowed from the SL spreads to the native vocabulary giving rise to a previously absent category or categorial paradigm;
- (6) a new dimension for an already existing paradigm, which is copied from the SL; the morphological material filling out the new paradigmatic dimension is supplied by the RL, e.g., ‘hot news perfect’ in Irish English tense paradigm²⁶², or development of dual number in Tayo possibly after the model of Melanesian languages Drubéa and Cèmuhi²⁶³;
- (7) the RL develops a grammatical category attested in the SL, but totally new in the RL, e.g., the rise of category of noun-adjective agreement in Yucatec possibly due to the contact with Indo-European languages²⁶⁴, or ‘nominal past’ category in Mawayana (used to express former possession, deceased persons, etc.) born from the contact with Cariban languages²⁶⁵. In that case, one can speak of complete linguistic subsystems transferred as a result of language contact.

(1) to (5) represent MAT-borrowing or a combination of MAT and PAT; (6) and (7) illustrates pure instances of PAT-borrowing.

The differentiation between (6) and (7) is somewhat alien to the concepts and terminology used in authoritative studies on PAT-borrowing, such as Heine & Kuteva (2005) who regard borrowing, or replication from the perspective of the types of changes produced in the original system of the recipient language. Thus, Heine and Kuteva treat the rise of the category of evidentiality in Portuguese used by native speakers of Tariana²⁶⁶ similarly to the development of dual number in Tayo or the reflexive use of the possessive pronoun *oma* in Estonian²⁶⁷, since all these developments “fill a categorial gap”, in other words, are signs of a newly acquired linguistic subsystem previously absent from the recipient language. For the sake of the present work, however, it seemed important to be more precise about the nature of grammatical entities presumably replicated from Greek to

260 Gardani (2020).

261 Gardani (2018).

262 Gast & van der Auwera (2012:8).

263 Heine & Kuteva (2005:125).

264 Stolz (2015:286-288).

265 Gardani, Arkadiev, Amiridze (2015:3)

266 Aikhenvald (2002: 315–16), Heine & Kuteva (2005:74).

267 See Heine & Kuteva (2005: 124 ff).

Coptic. Let us define a category as a basic semantic property whose various manifestations have grammatical relevance, and a categorial facet as one such individual manifestation of a category.²⁶⁸ From this point of view, ‘dual’ is a facet of the category of number, whereas evidentiality is a basic category, whose facets are, e.g., ‘visual’, ‘non-visual’, ‘inferred’, ‘reported’.²⁶⁹

Clearly, the above borrowing classification scale is very rough and cannot claim to be in any way exhaustive. It may only serve for an approximate orientation, when a specific borrowing phenomenon is to be evaluated with respect to its place in the target grammatical system. Importantly, it suggests that borrowing a morpheme from the source language does not automatically import the category originally marked by that morpheme into the recipient language. This idea sounds trivial on the theoretical level, but in practical research, it is not always easy to realize how exactly a borrowed sign changes its signifié to become accommodated to the new system.

As follows from the above principle, the **degree of matching** between an original element of the SL and its replica in the RL is an essential property of a borrowed morpheme. This degree is known to vary greatly depending on the complexity of functions the morpheme has in the source language. As stated in Gardani et al.(2015),

“There is... no reason to assume that mat-borrowed grammatical morphemes in a RL take over the full gamut of functions of their sources, as is implied, e.g., in <the> notion of global copying. As has been repeatedly shown by different scholars... if interlinguistic transfer of morphemes occurs at all, it is the morphemes with a higher degree of functional transparency that are borrowed more frequently. From this, it follows that morphemes that are polyfunctional in the SL, are borrowed into the RL primarily with their more concrete and transparent functions.”²⁷⁰

The most general claim to this sense made in Heine (2012) states that, “in contact-induced grammaticalization, the replica element or construction in the RL almost invariably occupies a less advanced stage of functional-semantic development than its model in the SL.”²⁷¹ Thus, borrowing of inflectional morphemes does not warrant their membership in

268 The notion of ‘category’ applied here is strictly defined in Mel’čuk (1993:5-6): “An inflectional category of class $\{K_i\}$ of signs of language L is a set of mutually exclusive significations $\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_n\}$ such that:

1. with any K_i , one of σ_j is obligatorily expressed and every σ_j is obligatorily expressed at least with some K_i ;
2. All σ_j -s are expressed regularly, i.e.:
 - (a) an σ_j is strictly compositional—in the sense that it is joined to the meaning ‘ K_i ’ without any unpredictable effect;
 - (b) an σ_j has a small set of markers distributed according to general rules of L ;
 - (c) an σ_j is applicable to (nearly) all K_i -s.”

What is here called a facet, is Mel’čuk’s grammeme defined as follows: “A grammeme is an element of an inflectional category. Thus, a specific voice (e.g., the passive) is a grammeme.”

269 Heine & Kuteva (2005:74).

270 Gardani, Arkadiev, Amiridze (2015:6).

271 Gardani, Arkadiev, Amiridze (2015:6).

a full-fledged inflectional paradigm in the target language. For instance, Greek feminine adjective endings in Coptic are subject to several constraints: occurring solely on loaned adjectives, they also restrict the set of possible syntactic heads to loaned feminine nouns. This led Böhlig to regard respective nominal phrases as “gelehrte Überreste”, frozen and obsolete expressions, which might not be quite true, since sporadic exceptions are possible: e.g., in the late text of Commentary to the gospel of Matthew, written by Rufus of Shotep, a Greek feminine adjective modifies a Coptic feminine noun: τεισαρωδικη ν̄σβω²⁷²; a few further isolated examples can be found in the Bible. Such examples prove that the feminine ending morpheme probably remained analyzable within the tenets of Coptic grammar, but constituted a small subsystem in the general Coptic system of adnominal modification. From typological point of view, it constitutes an instance of *parallel system borrowing*.

Another pivotal trait of a borrowed morpheme is the **degree of its integration** in the target language, as specified in (2) through (4). The stage (4), where a borrowed formative applies to the native vocabulary of the recipient language, marking a class of elements with some common semantic property, and becomes productive there is termed ‘borrowing proper’ in Gardani (2020)²⁷³. However, the same author recurs to a weaker version of this so-called ‘nativization constraint’, admitting that if a borrowed morpheme applies to (and possibly becomes productive on) the loan vocabulary, this is enough to consider the phenomenon as morphemic borrowing. Different kinds of morphemes are claimed to have different degrees of propensity for borrowing. Supposedly, derivational morphemes have greater chances to be transferred to a language-in-contact, compared to inflectional morphemes. This claim has been first made in Weinreich (1953) and is mostly corroborated by later studies. For example, on Thomason and Kaufman’s borrowability scale, adpositions and derivational affixes are situated one level higher than inflectional morphology. Neither is the class of inflectional morphemes uniform with respect to borrowability. Gardani (2008, 2012) claims that the borrowing potential of an inflectional morpheme correlates with its appurtenance to either ‘inherent’, or ‘contextual’ morphemes, in Booij’s terminology²⁷⁴. The borrowing of inherent morphemes statistically largely outweighs that of agreement and structural case markers.

The way morphological borrowing is influenced by the respective types of languages involved, is an issue still in need of a thorough investigation. On the one hand, typological changes are not altogether excluded, as shown by multiple examples, e.g., case syncretism, transformation of goal adverbials into direct objects etc., in Heine & Kuteva (2005:148 ff.). On the other hand, situations of a contact between two languages belonging to completely different structural types were never, to my knowledge, systematically stud-

272 Sheridan (1998:92). Rufus of Shotep Homilies on Luke and Matthew.

273 Gardani (2020:4.3)

274 Booij (1994, 1996 Inherent versus contextual inflection and the split morphology hypothesis) distinguishes two types of inflection; inherent inflection does not depend on syntactic content, though it may define it. Basically, it is a set of morphemes with pragmatic semantics, such as plural endings, or TAM morphemes, negation, mood, evidentiality morphemes. On the other hand, contextual morphemes are syntactically dependent; here belong, in the first line, all morphemes that mark agreement or structural case.

ied. In particular, there seems to be no proof that a language of an analytic type is likely to loan morphemic paradigms or develop a system of affixes replicating that of a synthetic donor. As stated in Haspelmath (2008), “structural incompatibility has often been invoked as explaining resistance to borrowing, although in recent years it has come under attack. For grammatical borrowing, it seems undeniable that it plays a role (e.g. it seems very unlikely that an isolating language like Vietnamese would borrow a case suffix)...”²⁷⁵

To sum up, the diagnostics of morphological borrowing consists basically in two procedures: a) defining whether a morpheme X' in the recipient language has a function, at least, partly identical to that of the original morpheme X in the source language; b) defining whether it is confined to the loan vocabulary or it can form regular combinations with native elements. Presumably, the second option is naturally confined to contact between languages of the same typological class, although no definitive data on that issue is currently available.

Now, a borrowed morpheme participating in regular alternations in the recipient language necessarily denotes some grammatical category. The thing to be assessed is, whether the category marked in this way has formerly been present in the recipient language, or else it is innovative, and then possibly loaned as PAT. In the first case, the change consists in loaned markers replacing the native ones, as it happens with Spanish-origin plural marker in Quechua (see borrowing classification scale (4)). The second type of change, the rise of a new category or categorial facet loaned together with its markers, represents “a type of morphological transfer that lies in between” MAT- and PAT-borrowing²⁷⁶ and seems to occur even less frequently. However, it is not altogether unattested. Such process, for instance, is taking place in Western Neo-Aramaic where, according to Coghill, Arabic-origin passive derivation has spread to the native lexicon forming a new passive.²⁷⁷

Whereas the presence of the non-native lexical material usually makes it relatively easy to establish that a combination of MAT- and PAT-borrowing has taken place, there is no secure way to trace down the possible transfer of a pure grammatical meaning.²⁷⁸ In any case, it seems relatively clear that a new (or, in Heine & Kuteva's terms, “incipient”) grammatical category is not “installed” in the recipient language in its entirety, but rather evolves gradually from recurrent patterns of discourse that bear some structural-semantic likeness to the category markers in the source language.²⁷⁹ The resulting incipient category has a few cross-linguistically recurrent properties, the most salient of which are:

275 Haspelmath, M. (2008:53). For the opposite view, see Thomason & Kaufman (1988:53).

276 Gardani et al. (2015:7).

277 Coghill (2014:100): “The morphology, which first appeared in WNA as an integral part of the Arabic verbs with which it had been borrowed, has since taken on a life of its own: the borrowed derivations are now used productively to form passives of derivation I verbs, including inherited ones.”

278 For the detailed discussion on the matter see Heine & Kuteva (2015:21ff.).

279 Cf. Heine & Kuteva (2005:70): “Grammatical change in general and grammaticalization in particular start out with pragmatically motivated patterns of discourse that may crystallize in new, conventionalized forms of grammatical structure. Use patterns are discourse pragmatic units that need not, and frequently do not, affect the structure of grammatical categorization. However, once language contact gives rise to major use patterns, this may lead to a transition from pragmatically

- a. Incipient categories are ambiguous between their earlier (= source) and their present (= target) meanings, that is, an interpretation in terms of the source meaning is generally possible.
- b. Their use is optional in that they may but need not be used. This means that the grammatical meaning expressed by the category is not obligatorily marked.
- c. They are phonetically and morphosyntactically largely indistinguishable from the source category and their use is confined to the context in which they arose.²⁸⁰

This brief survey will enable us to consider the Coptic borrowing data in the wide typological context and to match them with a specific type of linguistic matter transfer. But such comparison needs correct ‘settings’ that will be discussed in the next chapter.

3.4 Voice in Greek and in Coptic: categorial clash

There is an illusory ease in tracing down the ways of linguistic transfer from a synthetic to an analytic language. The only simple task, it would seem, is to investigate, if the morphs $c_1, c_2 \dots c_n$ of a grammatical category C of the source language comply with the same rules of alternation / distribution in the recipient language. If they do, this may result in a parallel system borrowing (if only the loan part of the vocabulary is affected), or else in the rise of a new grammatical category (if the new morph / morphs extend onto the native vocabulary and on the condition that the category C was not a functional grammatical category of the RL before the contact). An intermediary borrowing situation of a loan morpheme replacing a native morpheme in an existing paradigm is less probable, when the recipient language in question is an analytic one, with few or no bound morphemes to express syntactic meanings. If, however, the distribution of c_1, c_2 etc. differs from that of the source language, one states that the category C has not been borrowed and that the c -morphs are to be regarded simply as phonetic strings, borrowed as “frozen” parts of lexemes that contain them.

Whereas the positive results yielded by this approach must be quite reliable, there appears to exist not a little probability of a ‘false negative’, since it reduces C to its morphological markers in the source language and by doing that, disregards the possible interference of the native grammatical system.

The analysis of the Graeco-Coptic verbal morphology borrowing in Funk (2017) follows the logic I have briefly sketched above. Since valency-reducing morphology in Coptic is confined to the present tense,²⁸¹ the category of voice is generally understood to be unmarked for native Coptic verbs; Greek verbs, on the other hand, have overt voice morphology, partly borrowed into Coptic, albeit attested mostly in Bohairic and Fayumic dialects. Thus, the question to answer appears to be relatively simple: given a pair of alter-

motivated to morphosyntactic templates, in particular to the emergence of new grammatical (functional) categories. <...> transition is gradual. There is no straightforward replacement of major use patterns by full-fledged grammatical categories; rather, use patterns gradually acquire properties of grammatical categories”.

280 Heine & Kuteva (2005:71).

281 Cf. Stern (1880), Funk (1978a), Layton (2011), Grossman (2019).

nating (causative / non-causative) verbs, does the Greek medio-passive morph regularly mark the non-causative member, and the absence of this morph, the causative member of the pair, at least, in these dialects? Funk answers this question in the negative:

“The frequent usage of verb forms ending in –cœ (= Greek -σθα) in Bohairic clearly suggests a certain degree of functioning of the Greek category of “voice” with the verbs borrowed into Coptic, and yet this functioning is rather limited or fragmented. At best, it can be seen to be “lexicalized” in some verbs at the time of the borrowing process itself. This may be largely the case of the deponent verbs: some of the more common ones, such as ⲁⲛⲉⲗⲉⲥⲉⲟⲉ, appear to be firmly established in their long form. But if we look at transitive Greek verbs with a variable active vs. passive usage, the forms we find to be used in the most carefully edited Bohairic manuscripts are not too often the ones we would expect.”²⁸²

So, even Bohairic, of all Coptic dialects the one most conservative with regard to the Greek verbal morphology²⁸³, does not unambiguously display the morpheme-category ‘package borrowing’. For all the dialects that did not borrow the Greek passive morph, in other words, for all the dialects other than Bohairic and Fayyumic, Funk suggests a perfect congruence between the borrowed verbal form and the native *status absolutus*:

“All other dialects – that is, those that import most verbs in an almost “naked stem”, imperative-like form – use these forms in the same way as many “transitive” native verbs are used in their *status absolutus*. This is to say, whether they are meant to cover an active or a medio-passive meaning in a given case is determined not by their form but by the syntactic and semantic context”.²⁸⁴

The above diagnosis is generally accepted in today’s Coptic linguistics and can be supported by numerous examples, such as those cited in Grossman (2019):

ešče pek-bal=de n-ounam skandalize mmo-k
 ‘If your right eye offends you...’ (Sahidic, Matthew 5:29)

(The Pharisees who heard this word) a-u-skandalize
 ‘They were offended’ (Sahidic, Matthew 15:12)²⁸⁵

or the even more extreme case where the causative and the non-causative meaning can be distinguished neither by form, nor by construction, to make one wonder if they were discerned, at all, by the Coptic audience:

282 Funk (2017:378).

283 This concerns both the mediopassive and the active infinitive suffix / ending.

284 Funk (2017:378).

285 Grossman (2019:109).

(193) James 1:13

ΠΙΝΟΥΤΕ ΓΑΡ **ΜΕΓΠΕΙΡΑΖΕ** ΝΛΑΔΥ ΕΠΙΠΕΘΟΥΓ **ΜΕΓΠΕΙΡΑΖΕ** ΝΤΟΥ ΝΛΑΔΥ
 ό γάρ Θεός **άπειραστός έστιν** κακών, **πειράζει** δέ αὐτός οὐδένα.

‘for God cannot **be tempted** with evil, and he himself **tempts** no one.’

Yet, such description does not cover all the phenomena pertaining to the loan verb voice and possibly does not do justice to the essential ones: e.g., the data of the DDGLC database demonstrate that the property of lability ascribed to all Greek-origin verbs by default is manifested in only about 10% of such verbs (some 60–65 out of ~600). Moreover, the free infinitive of native transitive verbs is not used as freely, as can be deduced from the above description. As shown in chapter 1 of the present work, for many, if not most Egyptian verbal roots, the infinitival form does not have a non-causative reading in present. An intransitive present infinitive of a loan verb is, therefore, a structural equivalent of a native Egyptian stative. Besides, the correlation between the Greek active / mediopassive form and causative / non-causative meaning can be described with more precision. While there certainly is no universally valid formula for assessing the form / meaning distribution of all Greek loan verbs, some tendencies of this distribution can be detected. The prerequisite for the more detailed view is the analysis that would take into account the native voice grammar and semantics. In what follows, I discuss the respective features of Coptic and Greek voice categories that might influence the loan verb accommodation in Coptic.

As explained above in chapter 1, the Coptic system of voice is inherently connected to that of aspect: eventive anticausative / passive (*status absolutus*) is morphologically different from stative anticausative / passive (*qualitative / stative*) and, as follows from the dichotomy of the Coptic TAM system, is incompatible with the TAM pattern of the stative. In short, each Coptic verb form codes two categories simultaneously: aspect AND voice.²⁸⁶

Interestingly, the Greek three-voice morphological system largely based on the affectedness of the subject actant was not an ‘inborn’ trait of the language, but the result of a historical development. In the older stages of Greek, semantics of affectedness must have interacted with aspect, Aktionsart and tense semantics, in a way somewhat recalling the Egyptian tense-aspect-patterns system. Thus, at least, in Homeric Greek, a verbal paradigm often comprised two stems differing both in aspect and in diathesis. The imperfective stem served as a transitive base, the perfective one as an intransitive. Such is, e.g., the case of the verb ἀράρισκω / ἤραρα ‘join, fit together’:

a. αὐτός δ’ ἀμφὶ πόδεσσιν έοῖς ἀράρισκε πέδιλα

‘but he himself was fitting sandals about his feet’ (Homer, *Odyssey*, 14, 23; 8 BC)

286 More precisely, stative is marked for aspect and diathesis, while *status absolutus* has a default anticausative meaning in eventive tenses and a default causative meaning in the durative tenses. The important thing is, however, that aspectual and diathetic meanings of Coptic verb forms are coordinated.

- b. ὁ δὴ καὶ πᾶσιν ἐνὶ φρεσὶν ἤραρεν ἡμῖν
 ‘(our decision) that suited all of us just now in our minds’ (Homer, *Odyssey*, 4, 777; 8 BC)²⁸⁷

However, this aspect-diathe-sis split was hardly systematic and, at any rate, non-productive by the time of Koine where different tense forms became eventually aligned with respect to their voice morphology.²⁸⁸ Besides, seeing that the overwhelming majority of Greek-origin verbs in Coptic were borrowed in their imperfective stem²⁸⁹, this split could not possibly influence the use of the verbs in any way.

In short, the contact of Greek and Coptic voice systems was the contact of one-dimensional (voice) and multi-dimensional (voice-aspect/tense) categories, similar in that respect, e.g., to the contact between the category of number in Spanish (number) and Nahuatl (number-animacy).²⁹⁰ This means that the migration of Greek verbs into Coptic was bound to raise a certain tension, especially in such contexts where the semantic field of the two categories did not overlap, e.g., with a non-eventive anticausative/ passive, which by the Coptic criteria corresponded to a stative / passive form, whereas a stative Greek verb could well be morphologically active. The seemingly chaotic distribution of morphological passive markings observed by Funk in various Bohairic corpora²⁹¹ might have roots in that tension.

One should add that in contrast to the regularity of the plural morpheme with Spanish inanimate nouns that has triggered the change in Nahuatl number marking, the mediopassive morphology of Koine was far from being semantically consistent, due to multiple changes to the verbal morphology (see 3.2 above for details). Besides the group of verbs with the regular morphological alternation, there were also lexemes displaying mediopassive morphology with an active sense (deponents) and labile verbs where the active morphology could denote both the causative and the anticausative meaning. The complexity of the source system may be responsible for the diversity of the response observable in the way Coptic treats the voice of loaned verbs. Indeed, even within Sahidic alone, Greek-origin verbs can function as labile or monodiathetic, may have or have not the mediopassive suffix which, in its turn, usually, but not always, corresponds to an anticausative meaning; further on, these verbs may prefer one certain tense base or be freely used in both.

287 These examples are taken from Lavidas (2009:56-57). For the discussion of ‘split causativity’ phenomenon in Ancient Greek, see Kulikov (1999).

288 Lavidas (2009:111).

289 About 10 aorist forms are attested in the DDGLC database. No perfect stem seems to have been borrowed into Coptic. The rest (~590 verbal lexemes) are represented by their imperfective stems.

290 Canger & Jensen (2007:404).

291 Commenting on the distribution of morphologically marked verbs in Bohairic and Fayyumic, Funk remarks that the active and medial forms, “instead of being used in a clear-cut way as members of oppositional pairs (active vs. passive voice) are chosen at random or according to a scribe’s inexplicable personal preference”. Of course, an alternative explanation is always possible, which would attribute the random usage of forms to their actual obsolescence at the time of writing / copying / editing of a specific text.

To find, quoting Polonius, if there is a method to this madness, I thought it useful to regard the grammar of Greek loan verbs in Coptic as a multi-dimensional system built on some interplay of one formal and two semantic oppositions:

- 1) active vs. non-active (medio-passive) verb morphology
- 2) causative vs. anticausative meaning
- 3) eventive vs. durative aspect

Between the members of these oppositions there can theoretically exist multiple dependencies. Greek medio-passive morphology may reflect the difference in causativity or may do so, e.g., with stative aspect, but not with the eventive one. It is also not unthinkable that stative aspect is marked by non-active morphology regardless of whether or not the form is anticausative. The morphologically unmarked (=active) forms may be labile in any environment, as suggested by Funk, or may be influenced by the same syntactic mechanisms (tense-aspect alternation) that define the diathesis of native verbs, imitating the syntactic behavior of the native marked forms, i.e., stative and transitive eventive infinitive. Finally, there might be no difference whatsoever in the functioning of both active and medio-passive forms, the latter being used as a kind of stylistic ornament or a vague allusion to a never really acquired norm.

To systematically examine these interdependencies, I divide all the loaned verbs into classes defined by: a) voice morphology, b) diathesis. Four classes obtained in such way are:

- A) 2 forms, 2 diatheses: verbs with attested active and middle-passive forms and two diathetic variants, causative and anticausative.
- B) 2 forms, 1 diathesis: verbs with attested active and middle-passive forms, both corresponding to a single diathesis, whether causative or anticausative; it seemed proper to include here also such verbs that are attested only in their middle-passive form, because retaining this form is a marked feature in Sahidic.
- C) 1 form, 2 diatheses: labile verbs with active morphology denoting both causative and anticausative meaning; this class is used in the way similar to the native *status absolutus* of transitive verbs and therefore displays what Funk regards as a typical behavior of a loaned verbal lexeme.
- D) 1 form, 1 diathesis: verbs with active morphology corresponding to either causative, or anticausative meaning.

This classification is made for utilitarian purposes only. The appurtenance to one or another class is seemingly not directly conditioned by any semantic or morphological properties of the verb in the source language; moreover, it is not permanent, but depends, i.a., on the actual attestations of the verb found in Sahidic documents. Thus, each class represents nothing more than an observable array of verbs with similar overt parameters used to track down repeating patterns of morphosyntactic behavior. The investigation has to find: 1) the relation between the Greek voice morphology and the causative / non-causative meaning; 2) the relation between the Greek voice morphology and the tense / aspect meaning; 3) the

correlation of tense / aspect values and the causative / non-causative diathesis (if there is any) in Sahidic.

However scarce and valuable all the attestations of alternative morphology or meaning throughout the dialects are, I thought it necessary to limit this study to those belonging to Sahidic dialect, so that our notion of the interplay between different grammatical factors would not be distorted by peculiar usages in different dialects. On the other hand, the research makes use of every Sahidic text found in the DDGLC database, without exceptions. The consequence of such formal approach is that Sahidic texts bearing the marks of heavy influence on the part of other dialects, e.g. Bohairic or Akhmimic (such as some texts from the Nag Hammadi corpus), are necessarily subsumed in the overall analysis. However, excluding the influenced forms from consideration would, in my opinion, be even less justified than taking the risk of ascribing them to the dialect where they were not deeply rooted.

3.5 Analysis of morphological-diathetic classes of verbs

3.5.1 Class A: two forms, two diatheses

3.5.1.1 Class A: overview

At present, the group of bidiathetic verbs with attested suffixed forms comprises the following Graeco-Sahidic lexemes:²⁹² ἀναπαυε ‘give rest / have rest’, βαρει ‘weigh down, oppress / be heavy’, βλαπτει ‘harm / be harmed’, κολαζε ‘punish, torture / be punished’, παρακαλει ‘beseech, entreat / be urged’, πειθε ‘convince / be convinced’, πλανα ‘mislead / err’, πληροφορει ‘satisfy / be satisfied’, τρεφε ‘feed, nourish / be fed’, ωφελει ‘help / profit’. βαρει and ωφελει deviate from the canonical causative alternation scheme, one member of each pair being a stative;²⁹³ nevertheless, since each pair stands for two mean-

292 Here and below, the Greek prototypes are cited in the form they appear in the DDGLC database. The Coptic variants have a standardized form following the corresponding Greek morphology. This form must not, and indeed often does not, match those actually attested. This list, needless to say, is not closed or final, since new attestations might show new forms or new diathesis variants for these and other verbal lexemes. It is best regarded as a representative group exhibiting some observable tendencies.

293 Causative βαρει: ‘weigh down’ is opposed to stative ‘be heavy’. In the pair ωφελει: ‘be helpful, profitable for : profit’, the second member of the pair codes the core event, whereas the state expressed by the first member is interpreted as its causative counterpart; the semantic role of the core actant, the ‘profittee’, is not unambiguous: it can be interpreted as the entity most affected by the event, i.e., the patient, or the ‘receiver’ or goal of the event, i.e., the recipient. This ambiguity is resolved in the causative predication where the ‘profittee’ can be coded as a direct or an oblique object (the first option being evidently preferable):

ε̅κ̅ρω̅φ̅ε̅λ̅ε̅ι̅ ἱ̅ν̅ο̅κ̅ ο̅γ̅α̅α̅κ̅ ‘... *helping yourself only*’ (Nag Hammadi, Teachings of Silvanus, 117, 22-23)

α̅γ̅ω̅ ε̅ι̅τ̅ς̅ω̅ ἡ̅ι̅α̅[κ̅ω̅β̅ (...)]ε̅τ̅ω̅φ̅ε̅λ̅ε̅ι̅ ἡ̅α̅γ̅ ‘*teaching Ja[cob ...] that will profit him*’ (P.Mon. Epiph. 140, 25)

Moreover, the causative tokens of this verb in Sahidic never code the eventive (‘to help’) meaning which is expressed by another lexeme (βοηθει). The causative ωφελει, therefore, has only the stative (‘to be helpful, profitable’) interpretation.

ings roughly correlating as cause and result, it seemed convenient to consider them together with the cases of the usual causative alternation.

Table 7 | Form-meaning distribution of the verbs of class A²⁹⁴

Verb	Short form		Long form	
	Causal reading	Non-causal reading	Causal reading	Non-causal reading
ἀναπαύε	6	4	-	3
βαρει	12	1	1(?)	2
βλαπτει	31	2	-	1
κολαζε	79	1	-	1
παρακαλει	490	-	-	1
πειθε	101	138	-	3
πλανα	65	56	-	11
πληροφορει	21	5	-	6
τρεφε	1	-	-	1
ωφελει	26	34	-	7

The short forms of ἀναπαύε, πλανα, πειθε and ωφελει are just about equally represented in both diatheses, i.e., they display labile valency alternation with occasional vestiges of a morphological passive. On the other hand, βαρει, βλαπτει, κολαζε, παρακαλει, πληροφορει are predominantly causative verbs. For some of them (βαρει, βλαπτει, κολαζε, παρακαλει), the non-causative reading is attested only or almost only in the suffixed form. The tokens of τρεφε are extremely scarce (one occurrence in the Codex Tchacos, and one in NHC II); the short form is transitive, whereas the long form stands for passive. Importantly, there is hardly any token of a long form of any verb in a causative reading, except for one rather dubious attestation of βαρεισθαι as ‘weigh down’ in NHC VII.

For a grammatical opposition to be established between the two forms of a verb, they have, at minimum, to be found inside one and the same corpus. Such instances, although rare, are not unavailable. Both πλανα and πλανασθαι are attested in the Gospel of Philipp (NHC II,3), On the Origin of the World (NHC II,5) and the Paraphrase of Shem (NHC VII,1). παρακαλει / παρακαλεισθαι and πληροφορει / πληροφορεισθαι occur in P. Budge. Both ωφελει and ωφελεισθαι are attested within the documentary corpus of P.Kru. Yet, the co-occurrence of two different forms in one corpus does not necessarily amount to a voice opposition. Thus, ωφελει and ωφελεισθαι are both used for ‘get profit’ in the documentary texts; NHC II employs πλανα and πλανασθαι indifferently for ‘err, be misled’. The cases where the morphological voice opposition seems to function (παρακαλει, πληροφορει in P.Budge and πλανα in the Paraphrase of Shem) are isolated. Thus, no systematic voice distinction is realized through the use of the suffix morpheme.

Besides, since the main (albeit not the only) source of the suffixed forms for these verbs are the Nag Hammadi manuscripts, one cannot claim with certainty, whether the suffixed forms used there belong to Sahidic, or are vestiges of other Southern dialects.²⁹⁵

294 The statistics is calculated based on the data in the DDGLC data base, as of 12.12.2020.

295 The discussed forms are attested in the central corpus of Codex II and in Codex VII, described in Funk (1995: 129 ff.) as ‘distinctly southern’ and not bearing any traces of northern Coptic.

The mere suggestion that suffixed forms could have Sahidic ‘citizenship’, may appear unlikely to anyone familiar with the classical Sahidic literature. Yet, it must not be refuted too rapidly. The sporadic occurrence of the suffixed forms in later Sahidic texts could mean that these forms were not always alien to this dialect, even more so since their use does not appear to be random: they are consistently used to denote non-causative meanings. The semantic functions of the middle-passive voice morpheme in class A verbs are discussed in the next section.

3.5.1.2 Functions of the middle-passive voice morpheme

Whether constituting the sole attested form of a verb, or standing in an opposition to the short form, the suffixed form almost invariably has a non-causative meaning. The present work cannot aim at precisely determining the genesis of this regularity. It might well be, and indeed it would be only logical, that the suffixed form of a verb was borrowed coupled to its non-causative meaning. Alternatively, what we find in the manuscripts could be the result of an erudite editorial work. Finally, there is a chance that the use of the middle-passive suffix was an intra-Coptic development. This suggests not a little degree of linguistic competence in Greek on the side of Coptic speakers, but such competence is not at all improbable, seeing that, at least, in order to omit the suffix and to obtain the short form, the ‘borrower’ ought to recognize it as a separate morpheme. Whatever its origin, in most cases, the suffixed form co-occurs with the promotion of a patient actant to the subject position, as in:

(194) P.Budge, 243-244, Schiller (1968:106)

ⲁϣⲱ ⲧⲁⲣⲉⲧⲉⲧⲏⲛⲓⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉⲓⲥⲉⲟⲓ ⲛⲧⲉⲧⲏⲁⲁⲥ ϣⲁ ⲡⲛⲟϥⲧⲉ ⲛⲧⲉⲧⲏⲉⲗⲉⲅⲭⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲓⲙⲟⲟϥ ⲛⲓⲗⲓ
 ⲥⲉⲗⲟⲛⲉ ⲉϥⲙⲏⲏ ⲉⲅⲟⲗ ϣⲏⲛⲧⲉϥⲙⲏⲓⲧⲁϣⲣⲟⲙⲱⲥ
 ‘and so that you (the arbiters) **may be urged** to act for God’s sake and examine them, so that they cease persevering in their shamelessness...’

(195) Exegesis on the Soul, 137, 9

ⲧⲟⲧⲉ ⲥⲛⲁⲣⲃⲗⲁⲓⲡⲧⲉⲥⲟⲓ
 ‘she then will **be hurt**’

(196) BL Pap 82, P.KRU 83, 12-15

ⲡⲣⲟⲧⲓⲟⲛⲓ ⲛⲉⲛ ⲛⲛⲉϥⲟⲩⲟⲩⲉⲗⲓⲥⲟⲓ ⲛⲗⲁⲁϥ ⲁⲉϥⲧⲉⲣⲟⲛ ⲁⲉ ⲉϥⲛⲁⲥⲱⲕ ⲉⲣⲣⲁⲓ ϣⲁ ⲡⲉⲕⲣⲓⲛⲁ
 ⲙⲡⲛⲟϥⲧⲉ ⲛⲟϥⲱⲡⲉ ⲉϥⲕⲟⲗⲁⲥⲉⲥⲟⲓ ⲛⲛⲁⲣⲣⲏ ⲡⲃⲏⲛⲁ ⲉⲧⲣⲁⲣⲟⲧⲉ
 ‘first of all, he shall not benefit at all, and second, he shall draw upon himself the judgment of God, and he **shall be punished** before the fearful tribunal’

Interestingly, in this last example the **suffixed** form is used in a periphrastic conjunctive with a future meaning, i.e., in the environment where a native verb would be expected to appear in its **stative** form.

According to Funk, “the large number of peculiarities that distinguish the language of each tractate from the standard Sahidic are all found to be in agreement with one or several known southern dialects”, presumably either Akhmimic or L6. It is not improbable that the suffixed passive forms of several Greek loan verbs belong to the non-Sahidic traits of the language of the codices.

The obscurity of the text in the Paraphrase of Shem turns it nearly impossible to determine the precise functional load of the suffixed form (p-)βαρεισθαῖ which is consistently used there in intransitive present clauses. In two out of three occurrences, the translators render this form as (objectless) causative stative:

(197) NHC VII, ParShem 7, 24-27:

αγω μετνουμε ἡτφγσις εἰτῆπσα ἡπιτῆν σοογσ• εσῖρβαρεισθαῖ αγω εσῖρβλαπτεῖ
*'And the root of Nature, which was below, was crooked, since it is **burdensome** and harmful.'*

(198) NHC VII, ParShem, 48, 8-11

θενμακαριος νε μεταρεζ εροογ ετπαραθηκη ἡπιμογ• ετε παῖ νε πιμοογ ἡκακε
 εἰτῖρβαρεισθαῖ•
*'Blessed are they who guard themselves against the heritage of death, which is the **burdensome** water of darkness'*

Yet, the same form is translated with the non-causative stative expression in ParShem 15, 32:

(199) ετραβωκ επιτῆν επιταρταρον ψα πογοειν ἡπιπῆα εἰτῖρβαρισθαῖ ψινα εἰναζαρεζ ερογ
 ετκακια ἡπβαρος•
*'...that I might get an opportunity to go down to the nether world, to the light of the Spirit which **was burdened**, that I might protect him from the evil of the burden.'*

Assuming that one and the same form could acquire diathetically opposed meanings, one has to arrive at the conclusion that in that case the suffix signals the stative aspect, with the voice distinction neutralized. However, such an assumption does not look convincing. It seems more plausible that in each of these cases, the form has the non-causative sense 'be heavy' (as opposed to 'burden, be cumbersome'), otherwise regularly expressed in Coptic with the stative ζορω. Since only two verbs of class A, βαρει and πλανα, consistently use -σθαῖ in present tense predicates, it is unlikely that the suffixed form is in any way associated with the stative aspect.

Excursus. Middle-passive suffix in P.Budge (P.Col.600)

The so-called Papyrus Budge containing a transcript of a court hearing that took place in Apollonopolis Magna (Edfu, Upper Egypt) in the 7th century CE, provides unique tokens of the suffixed form for two verbs of class A (παρακαλεισθαῖ, πληροφορεισθαῖ). Both forms accurately render the respective non-causative meaning ("be urged", "be satisfied").

(200) P.Budge, 235-236, Schiller (1968:104)

εγπροσδοκει' ναγ δε εγψανσω' εγσχολαζε [[ἡ]]ε νιωαχε ἡτῆμινε ψασαπαντα
 ναγ εῖρ πετεπων ἡ[[ω]]πποογ οπερ ακριβως τῆπληροφ<ορ>εισθαῖ' ε[[.]]παῖ δε
 νασαπαντα ναγ

'...whereas they expect that if they continue busying themselves with these aforesaid words, it would be of avail for them to make what is ours theirs, which—we are completely convinced that it will be of no avail to them...'

Taken for granted that Sahidic borrowed verbal lexemes in their abridged form and that the sporadic occurrences of the suffix are due to the influence of other dialects in such early and abstruse corpora as the one of Nag Hammadi, the fact that the long forms surface in a relatively late Sahidic text is surprising. Not less surprising is the fact that these forms pertain to the discourse of a peasant (Philemon) and are hardly a result of a post-factum editorial work, since Philemon's language in all other respects seems to bear the marks of an unpolished oral speech, such as a very fuzzy syntax. Could it be possible that in its treatment of Greek verbal morphology, the spoken Sahidic differed from the literary norm familiar to us from the Biblical translations and the Shenoute corpus? If the lack of documents recording the spoken language will never allow us to clear up this question, we can nevertheless venture an explanation as to why these forms do appear in Philemon's speech. As can be seen in the example of the verb $\omega\phi\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota(\sigma\alpha\iota)$ 'get profit', and moreover in several instances of the verbs of class B that will be discussed below, the use of the suffixed form can often be a mark of the legal language in Sahidic. Philemon delivers his speech in the trial; moreover, he endeavors to make it sound as competent as possible by an informed use of specific legal terms, like $\kappa\omicron\mu\pi\lambda\epsilon\gamma\sigma\iota\varsigma$ $\eta\eta\omicron\mu\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ 'notarial completion' (P.Budge 86 & 105) etc. Perhaps, the unexpected suffixed forms of the above-named verbs are but an additional sign of the imitation of the learned 'legal' language.

Excursus. The middle-passive suffix of $\eta\kappa\epsilon\sigma\alpha\iota$

The sole attestation of the verb $\eta\kappa\epsilon\sigma\alpha\iota$ 'win' merits a separate discussion, not only because being a *hapax legomenon*, it cannot be properly assigned to any class of loan verbs, but also because the use of the middle suffix in this one attestation is quite peculiar in that it occurs on a causative member of the pair 'win / lose, be vanquished':

(201) Evod.rossi, Homily on the Passion f.27v b, 86

$\epsilon\rho\omega\lambda\eta\pi\rho\rho$ $\eta\kappa\epsilon\sigma\alpha\iota$ $\omega\alpha\rho\epsilon\mu\eta\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\iota$ $\phi\omicron\rho\epsilon\iota$ $\eta[\eta]\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\eta\tau\omicron\mu\alpha$ $\epsilon\tau\pi\rho\epsilon\iota\omega\upsilon$

'When the king is victorious, (his) soldiers wear their radiant white garments.'

It is not necessary, however, to resort to the explanation by 'random usage' to account for such morphology. True, according to the data in Liddell-Scott dictionary, the Greek $\nu\iota\kappa\acute{\alpha}\omega$ has two diatheses, the active and the passive one, and the form used in Sahidic could read only in the sense of 'be vanquished, lose'. Yet, it is not implausible that the Coptic writer in this case consciously uses the middle-passive morphology in some sense that would be closer to the Greek middle voice, even though such usage deviates from the way this verb is used in the source language. The parallel place in another version of the same text, pMorgan M595, lends credence to this conjecture. Here, instead of the verb 'to win', the compound 'to take victory' ($\chi\iota$ - $\eta\kappa\eta$) is used:

(202) Hom. Pass. Res. (M.595), 48r b,34-48v a,3, 86, Chapman (1993:103)

$\epsilon\rho\omega\lambda\eta\pi\rho\rho$ $\gamma\alpha\rho$ $\chi\iota$ $\eta\kappa\eta$ $\omega\alpha\rho\epsilon\mu\eta\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\iota$ $\phi\omicron\rho\epsilon\iota$ $\eta\eta\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\eta\tau\omicron\mu\alpha$ $\epsilon\tau\pi\rho\epsilon\iota\omega\upsilon$

'So, if the king is victorious (lit.: takes victory), the soldiers wear their radiant garments.'

According to the observation made by L.Stern, ⲭⲓ ‘take’ is often found in compounds that constitute the passive counterpart to the compounds with † ‘give’ and the same core verb²⁹⁶. Obviously, the semantics of ‘winning’ in Coptic lacks some components that make up for agentivity, perhaps such as volitionality. The victory is ‘taken’, not ‘realized’. In the verbal lexeme of Evod.rossi, this might trigger the use of the formative that is usually associated with involitionality and affectedness of the passive, quite like the native formative of the same function in pMorgan M595.

3.5.1.3 Class A: syntactic properties of short forms

In 3.4, we surmised that Greek-origin verbs might theoretically display some kind of correlation between their diathesis / voice and the tense-aspect base they are used with, in analogy to native verbs. The combination of intransitive non-causative use with durative conjugation would align Greek infinitives with Egyptian statives. The attestations of the class A verbs collected in the DDGLC database suggest no such correlation, with active, as well as with middle-passive morphology. For the four verbs whose short forms are unmarked for voice, this dissociation between aspect and causativity signifies the degree of lability surpassing anything available for native verbs. Thus, ‘ofelei’ can mean ‘get profit’ and ‘bring profit’ both in the present and in the optative tense, ‘peithe’ as ‘be persuaded, agree’ is employed in the formulae ⲁⲛⲡⲉⲓⲟⲩⲉ [PST] ‘we have agreed’ and †ⲡⲉⲓⲟⲩⲉ [PRES] ‘I agree’.

(203) P.Mon. Epiph. 253, 8-10

ⲉϣⲟⲡⲉ **ϣⲡⲉⲓⲟⲩⲉ** ⲛ̄ⲧ̄ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲗⲗ̄ ⲉⲗ̄ⲛ̄ ⲡⲟⲩⲁⲣ, ⲉⲧⲛⲏⲩ̄ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲡⲟⲩ̄ⲣ̄ⲗ̄ ⲕⲁⲛ̄ Ⲓⲓⲧⲟⲟⲧ̄ϣ̄ ⲕⲁⲛ̄ Ⲓⲓⲧⲟⲟⲧ̄ϣ̄
ⲛ̄ⲕⲉⲟⲩⲁ ⲛ̄ⲧ̄ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲗⲗ̄•

*‘If he **agrees**, and we sell them at the value that is going to be fixed, whether by him or by someone else, and we (then) sell them...’*

(204) BL Pap 104, P.KRU 39, 18-21

ⲛⲧⲟϥ ⲕⲟⲙⲉⲥ ⲡⲁⲓⲟⲓⲕ(ⲏⲧⲏⲥ) ⲁⲓⲕⲉⲗⲉⲓⲩⲉ ⲛⲁⲛ̄ ⲡⲣⲟⲥ ⲟⲩⲉ ⲛⲧⲁ**ⲛⲡⲉⲓⲟⲩⲉ**

*‘Komes the administrator; he commanded us in the way to which we **agreed**’*

In many cases, the voice distinction is marked by different valency patterns. So, ‘*a=s-peithe na=f*’ means ‘she obeyed / listened to him’, whereas ‘*a=s-peithe mmo=f*’ means ‘she convinced him’. However, in case of a zero or nominal object, any possible syntactic difference is neutralized, in the same way as we have seen in (193) above. So, probably, the context was the only means to retrieve the meaning of the subordinate clause in the following sentence:

(205) Abraham of Farshut, 104, 24

ⲉⲧⲩⲉ ⲟⲩ̄ ⲛ̄ⲡⲉⲕⲡⲓⲟⲩⲉ ⲛ̄ⲡⲁⲣⲏⲏⲁⲛⲁⲣ̄ⲓⲧⲏⲥ ⲉⲧⲣⲉϥⲡⲓⲟⲩⲉ ⲛ̄ⲡⲣⲟ

*‘Why did you not **convince** the archimandrite to **agree** with the emperor?’*

296 Stern (1880:316).

This subsystem of ‘total lability’ is peculiar in two respects. First, it is difficult to understand how a system of signs with identical forms, but mutually opposite content could ever be functional, which is an old objection to the very idea of lability.²⁹⁷ Admitting, however, that due to the factor of linguistic adaptability it probably worked in Coptic, it is yet to be grasped how such subsystem has developed alongside the somewhat different native one, whether it happened by direct indiscriminate insertion of the short form, or else gradually, through the decline of the suffixed form as a marker of non-causativity.

One of the verbs in class A, ἀναπαυε, displays an alternative mechanism of decausativization by means of an object pronoun coreferential with the subject.

(206) Coptic Museum EG-c Ms 3811, Panegyric on Macarios of Tkow, VIII, 11

τῶϣν δμνητῖ ἡτετῖδωπε ἡνεζῖομε ἡτετῖδαναπευε ἡμωτῖ ἡμναγ

‘*Arise, come and seize the women and rest with them.*’

Formally, this construction is reflexive, but it cannot be interpreted as a self-directed causative action, since the causative meaning of this verb, ‘give rest in the afterlife’, is meaningful only with one specific actor, God, and cannot denote a self-directed action. Thus, reflexivization in this case must be understood as a purely grammatical device which was for some reason preferred to the non-causative use of the short form. Except for the two reflexive attestations of ἀναπαυε, this type of non-causative derivation is not attested among the class A verbs.

3.5.1.4 Class A: Summary

The class consists of 4 labile and 6 transitive verbs with the vestiges of a middle-passive form attested for each of them. Almost every middle-passive form (every form, if we accept βαρεῖσθαι as a non-causative predicate) corresponds to the non-causative meaning of the respective alternation pair. Thus, the distribution of the suffix in this class can by no means be called random or accidental.

Most of the suffixed forms belong to the Nag Hammadi codices II (the so-called “central corpus”) and VII (Paraphrase of Shem), the tractates that, according to Funk, display several “distinctly southern” features. The sporadic tokens of the middle-passive morphology may, therefore, be traces of the influence of some other southern dialect, such as Akhmimic. Yet, the occurrence of such forms in later Sahidic texts, such as P.KRU 83 (8th century C.E.) or P.Budge, suggests that these forms could be employed in Sahidic proper, in non-literary texts. That these late tokens are found in the texts of the legal genre can be accidental, seeing that besides literary texts, the documentary Sahidic is the only register

²⁹⁷ See, e.g., the quotation from V.Henry in Kulikov (2014:1141). Obviously, one has to undertake a more sober approach to the functionality of languages, agreeing with Labov that though “...it is often asserted that speakers take the information state of their addressee into account as they speak, and that given a choice of two alternatives, they favor the one that will put across their meaning in the most efficient and effective way, <...> quantitative studies of the use of language fail to confirm this assertion.” (Labov:1994:549).

sufficiently well documented for any linguistic analysis. Otherwise, these forms could be a mark of legal discourse.

Neither the long, nor the short forms of the verbs belonging to class A display any link between the tense-aspect features of the predicate and its causative / non-causative semantics. In contrast to native verbs, the category of voice for this class is separated from aspect. On the other hand, since the suffix morpheme does not seem to be linked to the durative conjugation, clearly it had not been reinterpreted as an aspect marker. The way this morpheme is employed in the discussed verb class can be tentatively described as the vestiges of parallel system borrowing.

3.5.2 Class B: two forms, one diathesis

3.5.2.1 Class B: overview

In Sahidic, the inventory of this class includes the following verbs:

a) Verbs with both active and middle-passive morphology attested (22 lexemes):

αισθανε / αισθανεσθαι	αίσθάνομαι	‘feel’
ανηκει / ανηκεσθαι	ἀνήκω	‘belong’
ανεχε / ανεχεσθαι	ἀνέχω	‘endure, put up with’
απολαγε / απολαγεσθαι	ἀπολαύω	‘enjoy, partake of’
αρνα / αρνεισθαι	ἀρνέομαι	‘reject, deny’
διαλεγει / διαλεγεισθαι	διαλέγω	‘discourse, preach’
διαστελλε / διαστελλεσθαι	διαστέλλω	‘specify’
διαφερι / διαφεριεσθαι	διαφέρω	‘pertain, belong’
εζηγι / εζηγιεσθαι	ἐξηγέομαι	‘expound, preach’
εμφανιζε / εμφανιζεσθαι	ἐμφανίζω	‘show, produce (a document)’
επιχειρει / επιχειρειεσθαι	ἐπιχειρέω	‘attempt, try’
κυριεγε / κυριεγεσθαι	κυριεύω	‘be the owner of, possess’
μαρτυρει / μαρτυρειεσθαι	μαρτυρέω	‘be witness, testify to’
νεμει / νεμεσθαι	νέμω	‘hold sway over, manage’
πολιτεγε / πολιτεγεσθαι	πολιτεύω	‘conduct one’s life’
πραγματεγε / πραγματεγεσθαι	πραγματεύομαι	‘do business, trade in’
πραссе / πραττεσθαι	πράσσω	‘act’
προσεχε / προσεχεσθαι	προσεύχομαι	‘pray’
σιχανε / σιχανεσθαι	σικχαίνω	‘loathe, despise /be nauseated’
σκεπτει / σκεπτειεσθαι	σκέπτομαι	‘consider, examine’
τερπει / терπειεσθαι	τέρπω	‘enjoy, delight in’
εγποργει / εγποργειεσθαι	ὕπουργέω	‘assist, serve’

b) Verbs attested only in middle-passive form (9 lexemes):

ἀντιποιεῖσθαι	ἀντιποιέω	‘oppose to’
ἀρασθῆαι	ἀράομαι	‘pray to’
διατιθεσθῆαι	διατίθημι	‘dispose by will’
ἐπερείδεσθαι	ἐπερίδω	‘lean, rest on’
κτάσθαι	κτάομαι	‘acquire’
οικειοῦσθαι	οικειόω	‘claim as one’s own, appropriate’
σεβεσθῆαι	σέβομαι	‘worship’
ῥυποκείσθαι	ὑπόκειμαι	‘be liable, subjected, available’
φαίνεσθαι	φαίνω	‘be clear, obvious’

Semantically, most of these verbs belong to the class of unergatives. The large share of deponents among the Greek prototypes (10 of 31 lexemes) is obvious even in this primary synopsis. This share appears to be even more significant, if one checks the borrowed lexemes against the data in Greek papyri of comparable time period, i.e., first centuries C.E. The necessary adjustments concern the following verbs:

ἀνέχω: Between the active and the medium form of this verb in Greek, there is a significant semantic difference: ἀνέχω means ‘hold up, raise, maintain’, while the medium ἀνέχομαι means ‘hold oneself up, be patient, suffer’.²⁹⁸ The semantics of the lexeme adopted in Coptic suggests that in this case, as in several others discussed below, the middle form served as a prototype for the borrowing.

(207) P.Cair. Masp. 3 67290, TM 18422 (VI C.E.)

[οὐδὲν γὰρ] **ἀνέχομαι** τῷ κυρίῳ Εὐδοξίῳ περὶ τούτου
‘I will not **tolerate** lord Eudoxios with regard to this matter’

(208) HGV SB 20 14241, TM 23699 (VI C.E.)

τὰ νῦν καταξιοῦτω μὴ **ἀνέχεσθαι** συναρπαγῆναι παρὰ τινος
‘please do not **suffer** them to be snatched away by somebody’

ἀντιποιέω: again, the divergence of senses between the active ‘do in return’ and the middle ‘oppose, resist’ in Greek qualifies the middle form as the predecessor of the Coptic lexeme. Multiple examples from documentary papyri support this conclusion:

(209) P.Bodl. 1 45, TM 22584 (~ VII C.E.)

καὶ βεβαιώσομεν ὑμῖν τήνδε τὴν πρᾶσιν καὶ τὴν νομὴν πάσῃ βεβαιώσει διὰ παντὸς ἀπὸ παντὸς τοῦ ἐπελευσομένου ἢ ἀντιποιησομένου, τὸν δὲ ἐπελευσόμενον ἢ ἀντιποιησόμενον παραχρῆμα ἡμεῖς οἱ πεπρακότες ἐκστήσομε[ν] καὶ ἐκδικήσομεν
‘And we confirm this sale and the possession with every warranty through everything and against everything that will happen or befall, and everything that will come or befall, we the sellers will immediately replace and repay.’²⁹⁹

298 Liddell-Scott.

299 Here and below, the translation of the quotations from papyri is mine. – N.S.

διαλέγω: Whereas the active form of this verb has the meaning ‘pick out, choose’, the medium form διαλέγομαι has developed the meaning “converse, discourse”, which is the meaning adopted by Coptic. This statement from LSJ is supported by the data from papyri, e.g.:

(210) P.Ant. 2 92, TM 32722

ὥστε **διαλέγ[ε]σθαι** καὶ τῷ κυρίῳ Θεοφείλῳ περὶ τοῦ Λείλο[υ] καὶ παρα[δοῦν]αι αὐτῷ τὰ δ νομίματα

‘in order to **talk** with the lord Theophilos concerning Lilos and to give him 4 solidi’

διατίθωμι: The rare tokens of this verb in the preserved papyri display the middle form διατίθεμαι (HGV P.Heid. 6 376, TM 3073 ὅπως κομισάμενοι τὸ φορτίον διατιθώμεθα ‘so that having received the load, we distribute it’).

ἐμφανίζω: the active form is found in the earlier papyri,³⁰⁰ the middle-passive ἐμφανίζομαι in the later ones:

(211) P.Cair. Masp. 1 67032, TM 18996 (VI C.E.)

παρακ[λήσ]εις ... λαβεῖν τὴν εἰρημένην θείαν κέλευσιν ... καὶ **ἐμφανίσασθαι** τοῖς κατὰ χάραν δικαστηρίοις

‘demand... to take the above-mentioned divine order ... and **produce** it before the local courts’

(212) P.Cair. Masp. 2 67151, TM 18905 (VI C.E.)

...ἐξεῖνα δὲ μόνον αὐτῇ τὰ αὐτῆς γονικὰ πράγματ[α] συλλαβεῖν ἐξερχομένη τοῦ οἴκου μου, ἅπερ ἔναποδείκτω[ς] **ἐμφανήσεται** ὡς ἦσαν ἐκεῖνα συνεισηγέμενά μοι παρ’ αὐτῆς γονικόθεν

‘She is only allowed, when leaving my home, to take the things she inherited from her parents, which she can ostensibly **prove** to be brought by her to me by inheritance.’

ἐπερείδω: the meaning ‘lean on’ is rendered by the middle form (LSJ); in Greek papyri, the lexeme occurs very infrequently, always in the form of present passive participle, as in:

(213) HGV PSI 5 452, TM 33127 (IV C.E.)

οἱ δὲ οἰκέται **ἐπεριδόμενοι** τῇ δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ, ὡς φα[σι], ἀπαρνοῦνται(?) τῆν ἡμετέραν ὑπηρεσίαν

‘and the house slaves **guided** by his promise, as they say, refuse to serve us’

(214) P.Cair. Masp. 1 67087, TM 19016 (VI C.E.)

ἀπῆλθεν τυραννίδι **ἐπεριδόμενος**

‘he went forth **supporting himself** by the tyranny’

οἰκειόω: in Coptic documents this lexeme is used in the meaning ‘dispose of, claim as one’s own’ which in Greek is rendered by the middle form (LSJ). This form is found in Antinoopolis VI C.E. papyri, e.g.:

300 E.g., in HGV P.Eleph. 8 TM 5842 (III B.C.), HGV P.Köln 5 216 TM 2482 (III B.C.), BGU 4 1209 TM 18659 (I B.C.).

(215) P.Cair. Masp. 2 67167, TM 18923

...προσήγεγές μοι τὰ εἰρημένα ἐνέχυρα ἀντὶ τοῦ προσημανθέντος χρέους καὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ παραμυθείας ἔχειν καὶ κατέχειν καὶ **οἰκειοῦσθαι** ἐμαυτῶ δεσποτικῶ δικαίῳ
 ‘*You have brought me the afore-said pledges in lieu of the above-mentioned debt and its interest, to own, to possess and to **dispose of** by my own exclusive right*’

The active form of this verb seems to be attested in earlier texts only, such as Thucydides (IV B.C.), or Herculaneum papyri of III-I B.C. containing philosophical texts attributed to Philodemus and Epicurus.

πολιτεύω: Classical Attic prose (Thucydides, Xenophon etc.) makes use of the active form, whereas the IV-VI C.E. Greek papyri from Egypt invariably use the middle-passive participle to designate the residence of persons involved, e.g.:

(216) P.Flor. 1 43, TM 23558 (Hermopolis, 370 C.E.)

Αὐρήλιος Κῦρος Ἐρμείου **πολιτευόμενος** Ἐρμοῦ πόλεως
 ‘*Aurelius Kyros, son of Hermias, **citizen** of Hermopolis*’

σικχαίνω: Though this verb is used in active form in late Greek prose (Polybios, Marcus Aurelius etc.), a case can be made for medium σικχαίνομαι as a competing form. This is, e.g., the form Aquila, a Jewish translator of the Old Testament, uses in Exodus 1:12 as a gloss to the LXX βδελύσσομαι ‘feel a loathing’: καὶ ἐσικχαίνοντο τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραηλ³⁰¹ and καὶ ἐβδελύσσοντο (οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι) ἀπὸ τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραηλ, respectively. The lexeme is too poorly documented to make confident claims about the form it could be loaned in, but the possibility of a deponent (medium equivalent to active) usage cannot be excluded.

τέρπω: According to Liddell-Scott (1996), this verb whose active form meant ‘make glad, joyful’ was more frequently used in the middle-passive form τέρπομαι corresponding to the anticausative meaning ‘enjoy, be glad’. Coptic seems to have adopted only the anticausative facet. Unfortunately, I could not find this lexeme attested in any of the published Greek documentary papyri. It is possible, though, that the use of the middle-passive morphology in Coptic is triggered by the frequency of the anticausative usage in the spoken or, more probably, the literary Greek.

Thus, not being deponents *stricto sensu*, the above 9 verbs probably functioned as ones in Koine, namely, their medium form had no active counterpart with a corresponding causative meaning. If we consider them as deponents, the total number of deponent prototypes in class B will amount to 19 out of 31. In the next section, I shall discuss some properties of this subgroup in a broader context of the marking of Greek deponents in Sahidic. In section 3.5.2.3, I shall return to the rest of the members of this class and try to account for their occurrence.

301 Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt (1875:81, fn.25), where also a gloss from Cod.85: “σικχαίνομαι τοῦτον τὸν ἄνθρωπον taedet me huius hominis”.

3.5.2.2 Treatment of Greek deponents in Sahidic

Since Greek deponents make up about two thirds of the class, it seems reasonable to expect that the split into two forms is a standard development for a borrowed deponent verb. This assumption proves to be wrong. In the course of their transfer to Sahidic, the majority of monodiathetic middle verbs lose the middle-passive morphology and receive the stem-like form common for most borrowed lexemes. The switch from middle-passive to active morphology occurs with:

a)	λογίζομαι	λογιζε ⁺	‘consider, recite’ and its derivatives:
	ἀπολογίζομαι	απολογιζε ⁺	‘pay back, reimburse’
	συλλογίζομαι	συνλογιζε	‘make sense, discuss’
b)	δέχομαι	δεχι ⁺	‘receive’ and its derivatives:
	διαδέχομαι	διαδεχε ⁺	‘follow someone as a successor’
	ἀποδέχομαι	αποδεχε ⁺	‘accept, welcome’
	παραδέχομαι	παρδεχε ⁺	‘receive’
c)	χαρίζομαι	χαριζε ⁺	‘give, grant’ and its derivatives:
	ἀποχαρίζομαι	αποχαριζε ⁺	‘give as a gift’
	προσχαρίζομαι	προσχαριζε	‘gratify’

and many other deponents, such as:

ἀγωνίζομαι αγωνιζε ‘fight’, ἀπαρνέομαι απαρνα⁺ ‘deny’, ἀσπάζομαι ασπαζε⁺ ‘embrace, greet’, δαιμονίζομαι δαιμονιζε ‘be possessed by a demon’, ἐγκρατεύομαι εγκρατεγε ‘practice self-control’, ἐνθυμέομαι ενθυμει ‘meditate, contemplate’, εὐαγγελίζομαι ευαγγελιζε ‘proclaim’, καθηγέομαι καθηγει⁺ ‘instruct, teach’, μέμφομαι μεμφει⁺ ‘reproach, blame’, ὀρχέομαι ορχει⁺ ‘dance’, παρρησιάζομαι παρρησιαζε ‘speak freely’, ὑπισχνέομαι γηπισχογ⁺ ‘promise’.

The derivatives of the verb ἔρχομαι ‘come, go, walk’ (the base verb itself has obviously not been borrowed) constitute a special case in that only their suppletive (active) aorist is borrowed in Coptic:

παρέρχομαι	παρελε	‘pass over’
προσέρχομαι	προσελε	‘approach’
συνέρχομαι	συνηλοι	‘join, work together’

The noteworthy feature of the truncated group of deponents is that most of them are transitive (these are marked by ⁺).³⁰² Conversely, relatively few deponents of class B (ανεχε, εμφανιζε, επεπειδεσθαι, κτασθαι, οικειογσθαι) are confined to the transitive valency pattern. Most other verbs either have a single argument (πολιτεγε, τερπε), or employ a non-transitive valency pattern, e.g., the PP with e- (δικωνε, σεβεσθαι), n- (αρσθαι, γηποκεισθαι) etc. It may be inferred that Sahidic tends to treat the middle passive suffix and the transitive valency pattern as mutually exclusive morphosyntactic patterns. This

302 One should also notice that this group includes verbs of movement (compounds of ελε and ορει), i.e., active non-ergative verbs.

idea gains further support from the fact that in a subclass of B, the use of valency patterns may vary in accordance with the morphological shape of the verb, as is illustrated by the table below.

Table 8 | Middle-passive morpheme in the detransitivized predicate³⁰³

Meaning	Active form	Valency pattern	Meaning	Middle form	Valency pattern
‘reject, deny’	αρνα	n-/nmo=	‘reject, deny’	αρνισθε	n-/nmo= n-/na=
‘exactly describe, specify’	διαστειλλε	n-/nmo=	‘dispose of, see about’	διαστειλλεσθαι	ετβε
‘partake in, enjoy’	απολαγε	n-/nmo=	‘partake in, enjoy’	απολαγεσθαι	εβολ ρ̄n
‘bear witness’	μαρτυρει	n-/nmo= ∅	‘testify to, bear witness’	μαρτυρεσθαι	ε-/ερο= εα- / εαρο=
‘enact, carry out; be in charge’	πρασσε	n-/nmo= ∅	‘be in charge’	πραττεσθαι	∅
‘feel loathing towards’	σιχανε	nmo= ερο=	‘be indisposed’	σιχανεσθαι	∅

While omitting the Greek middle-passive morphology, Coptic may sometimes recur to the native mechanism of reflexivization to mark the affectedness of the subject in the borrowed intransitive deponents. In section 3.5.1.3, we have already seen an instance of the reflexive morpheme used to mark valency reduction of the verb *αναπαγε* ‘lay to rest / take repose’. There, the semantic affinity of the reflexive construction with the non-causative alternant justified regarding it as a voice-changing grammatical device: replacing the reflexive object pronoun by any other nominal object would radically change the meaning of the predicate. The syntax of the deponent verbs is different. Here, as it seems, both replacing of the pronominal object by any other noun and omitting it altogether would make the sentence ungrammatical. In Geniūšienė’s terms, such constructions are called ‘*reflexive tantum*’.³⁰⁴ Thus, *παρρησιαζε* (*παρρησιάζομαι*) ‘speak boldly, act boldly, encourage oneself to act / speak’ invariably appears with a direct object coreferential with the subject of the clause:

(217) Cyprianus, f. 73r b, 1-8

ετβε παι **μη̄ται** προσοπον̄ η̄η̄η̄αγ̄ **επαρρησιαζε** η̄η̄ο̄ῑ νρη̄τοϋ
‘because of that I do not have the countenance to speak freely with them.’

(218) Festal Letter 16, DS 191 b 26-DS 192 a 10

αλλα *μαρεπω*αχε *η̄περοφη̄της* εῑ ε̄τμη̄τε **ε̄παρρησιαζε** η̄η̄μοϋ
‘But may the word of the prophet come forth in the middle, speaking freely’

303 For examples, see Appendix 1.

304 Geniūšienė (1987).

The same analysis may be proposed for ἀνακτα (ἀνακτάομαι) ‘refresh oneself’, ἀνεχε (ἀνέχομαι) ‘wait’³⁰⁵, ἐγκρατεγε (ἐγκρατεύομαι) ‘control oneself’, σκυλλει (σκύλλομαι) ‘take the trouble’, στρατεγε (στρατεύομαι) ‘serve in someone’s army, be a soldier for someone’:

(219) Pistis Sophia, Book 2, 231b-232a

αγω μη̄πρανακτε μη̄μω̄τ̄ν \ φαντε̄τ̄νη̄βινε̄ μη̄μη̄γστηριον̄ η̄ρεφω̄τ̄ϥ
 ‘And do not refresh yourselves until you find the purifying mysteries’

(220) Epima, f. 26v

αγω τακεριμε. εις σαωφε \ η̄ρονπε. χινταικαας η̄σωι. **εισηγρατεγε μη̄μοι** ε̄τβε
 πεκραν ε̄τογααβ.
 ‘And my wife, too, it has been seven years since I have left her behind, exercising self-control because of your holy name.’

(221) Colluthus, f. 94r-121v Chapman / Depuydt (1993:47)

απεκειω̄τ̄ η̄εν **στρατεγε μη̄μοι** η̄η̄ρο η̄η̄καρ̄ η̄η̄η̄σω̄ς ᾱφρ̄ πογω̄ω̄ η̄η̄ρο η̄η̄πε η̄η̄
 η̄η̄καρ̄ η̄η̄ πε̄χ̄
 ‘For your father has served as a soldier for the king of the earth. Afterwards he did the will of the king of heaven and earth, Jesus Christ.’

Thus, the borrowed middle suffix and the native reflexive direct object constitute two alternative ways for marking anticausative or durative (e.g., in the case of στρατεγε) meaning. Both morphs may alternate with one and the same lexeme, as in the case of απολαγε ‘take pleasure, partake of, enjoy’:

(222) Spiteful Monk, 55

η̄η̄τοκ̄ δε, ω̄ παω̄η̄ρε, πο̄τ̄ ε̄βολ̄ η̄η̄η̄μο̄τ̄η̄ς η̄η̄πεῑᾱῑων̄ δε **ε̄κεαπολαγε μη̄μοκ̄** η̄η̄
 η̄η̄πεῑᾱῑων̄ ε̄τη̄η̄η̄.
 ‘But you, O my son, flee the satisfaction of this era, so that you will enjoy yourself in the future era.’³⁰⁶

(223) BL Pap 78, P. KRU 65

ε̄γ(ογ)οη̄ε̄ ε̄βολ̄ η̄η̄σπογ̄λη̄ η̄η̄μ̄ ε̄η̄η̄ε̄ ε̄ογ̄βᾱχ̄η̄ς η̄η̄η̄ᾱ η̄η̄ ογ̄ειω̄τε̄ η̄η̄μο̄σ̄γ̄ ε̄ε̄ω̄η̄
 η̄η̄πεγ̄ειβε̄ αγω̄ **ε̄γαπολαγεσθαι** ε̄βολ̄ η̄η̄ η̄η̄ᾱγᾱθο̄[η̄] η̄η̄ᾱτ̄ω̄ᾱχε̄ ε̄ροογ̄
 ‘they exhibit every zeal to find a handful of mercy and a drop of water to quench their thirst and enjoy the good things which words cannot describe.’

Quite exceptionally, the middle suffix and the reflexive object overlap, as can be illustrated by σκεπτε̄ι / σκεπτῑσθαι ‘consider’: in most cases, this verb is used with the pronominal object η̄μο= co-referential with the subject:

305 Strictly speaking, this meaning is not registered for the Greek verb and must have developed inside Coptic, but possibly on the basis of the medial form with the sense of ‘suffer, endure’.

306 Translation: A.Grons.

(224) Colluthus, f. 89v b, Schenke (2013:45)

μηπως κ̄ουωω̄ ε̄σκη̄ιτ̄ταῑ ἦ̄μο̄κ
‘Perhaps you want to think it over’

(225) Ms. Gr. fol. 21, P.KRU 74, 42-44

λο̄ιπον̄ δ̄ῑσκε̄ιτ̄ταῑ ἦ̄μο̄[ι]̄ ἔ̄ν̄ ο̄γ̄λο̄γῑσ̄μο̄ς̄ ε̄φ̄σο̄γ̄τω̄ν̄ ἄ̄ε̄ ο̄γ̄δ̄ῑκᾱῑον̄ πε̄ δ̄ᾱω̄
 ο̄ῡπ̄τε̄ω̄δε̄ πε̄
‘Furthermore, I considered in straight reasoning that it is just and fitting’

The combination of both detransitivizing devices in one verbal phrase is a sign of the decreased functionality of one or both of them in the later period:

(226) Hom. Pass. Res. (M.595), 39v b, 27-33, Chapman (1993:93); 9th C.E.

π̄νο̄ῡτε̄ γ̄ᾱρ̄ ἀ̄ρε̄ρᾱτ̄ῑ γ̄ᾱ τ̄κᾱτ̄ᾱδ̄ῑκ̄η̄ ε̄ρε̄ ἠ̄ρω̄με̄ ἔ̄ω̄ω̄ῑ κ̄κᾱρ̄ ἔ̄ικ̄ε̄ρ̄η̄με̄ς̄ ἔ̄μο̄ο̄ς̄
ε̄τ̄ρ̄ε̄ῡσ̄κε̄ῑτ̄τ̄ῑσ̄θ̄αῑ ἦ̄μο̄ο̄ῡ
‘Verily, God is standing to be sentenced, while people of earth and dust sit to give judgement’

The reflexivization by means of the PP with ἦμο= tends to occur fairly regularly with one and the same lexeme, as it does with native lexemes like κ̄ω̄τ̄ε̄. Conversely, the occurrences of the Greek middle suffix are sporadic and mostly look like lexicalized relics of the borrowed form.

Thus, in Sahidic, Greek intransitive deponents can appear in three different shapes: in a short stem-like form, bearing no marking altogether (ἀγωνίζομαι ἀγωνίζε ‘fight’, δαίμονίζομαι δαίμονιζε ‘be possessed by a demon’ and a few other verbs), with a reflexive object PP and with the Greek middle-passive suffix morpheme. We could expect that the morphological variant which is closest to the morphology of the source language would also have temporal precedence. However, the chronological evidence does not unequivocally prove the mediopassive form to be the most ancient one. Moreover, this form can appear in texts as late, as IX C.E. Yet, whether early, or late, its use seems to be corpus-specific. The table below displays comparative attestation dates for a set of verbs mainly attested in literary sources (αἰσθάνε ‘feel’, ἀνεχε ‘endure’, ἀπολαύε ‘take pleasure, partake of’, ἀρασθε and προσεχε ‘pray’, ἀρνα ‘deny’, διαλεγει ‘converse’, ἐζηγι ‘preach’, πολιτεύε ‘conduct one’s life’, πραγματεύε ‘trade in’, σεβασθαι ‘worship’, σιχάνε ‘feel loathing against’, σκεπτε ‘consider’, τερπε ‘enjoy’, φαίνεσθαι ‘seem’).

Table 9 | Deponent morphology dating

Long form	Short form
ἀνεχεσθε : Nag Hammadi Codex IX (4 C.E.), O.Crum 171 (6-8 C.E.)	ἀνεχε : multiple attestations (4 C.E. to 10 C.E.), inter alia Nag Hammadi Codex II, VII
ἀρνισθε : Nag Hammadi Codex V, VII (4 C.E.); P.Mich. 3520 (4 C.E.)	ἀρνα : multiple attestations (3- 11 C.E.)
ἀρασθε : Nag Hammadi Codex V (4 C.E.)	

Long form	Short form
ΔΙΑΛΕΓΙΘΑΙ: Pierpont Morgan M.595 and GIOV.AM (9 C.E.)	ΔΙΑΛΕΓΕΙ: Historia Ecclesiastica Coptica (date unknown)
ΕΞΗΓΙΘΕ: Pierpont Morgan Library M.580 (9 C.E.), Pierpont Morgan Library M.583 (9 C.E.), Bibl. Nat. Copte 129.16.76 (9 C.E.), Bodleian Library 42b.4.1 (?)	ΕΞΗΓΙ: Coptic Museum EG-c Ms 3811 (early 10 C.E.)
ΠΟΛΙΤΕΥΕΘΑΙ: Nag Hammadi Codex II, VI (4 C.E.); Pierpont Morgan M.595 and GIOV.AM Homily on the Passion (9 C.E.)	ΠΟΛΙΤΕΥΕ: different mss. ranging from 4 to 11 C.E.
ΠΡΑΓΜΑΤΕΥΕΘΑΙ: Nag Hammadi Codex VI (4 C.E.)	ΠΡΑΓΜΑΤΕΥΕ: Pierpont Morgan Library M.583, M.591 (9 C.E.)
ΠΡΟΣΕΥΧΕΘΑΙ: Nag Hammadi Codex II (4 C.E.)	ΠΡΟΣΕΥΧΕ: BL Add MS 5114 Pistis Sophia (4-5 C.E.)
ΟΨΕΘΑΙ: Nag Hammadi Codex II, VI, VII (4 C.E.)	
ΣΙΧΑΝΕΘΑΙ: Nag Hammadi Codex VII (4 C.E.)	ΣΙΧΑΝΕ: Nag Hammadi Codex II, VII (4 C.E.)
ΣΚΕΠΤΙΘΑΙ: Pierpont Morgan M.595 and GIOV. AM Homily on the Passion (9 C.E.)	ΣΚΕΠΤΕΙ: various sources of 6-11 C.E. , inter alia in Pierpont Morgan M.595 and GIOV.AM Homily on the Passion
ΤΕΡΠΕΘΑΙ: Nag Hammadi Codex III (4 C.E.)	ΤΕΡΠΕ: BG 8502 (4 C.E.)
ΦΕΝΕΘΑΙ: Nag Hammadi Codex VI (4 C.E.)	

Most of the longer forms occur in the corpus of Nag Hammadi codices. Still, some presumably later texts can contain the suffixed forms, too. In that case, one could surmise the existence of an earlier text variant, although it is also possible that the longer form, hardly of everyday use, served to create a patina of antiquity. A text particularly prominent in this respect is the “Homily on the Passion and the Resurrection Attributed to Evodius of Rome”, both in the p.Morgan M595 and Giov.AM manuscripts dating from ca. IX C.E.³⁰⁷ Some lexemes may be represented in both forms inside one and the same corpus (ΣΙΧΑΝΕ ‘feel loathing’ in NHC VII, ΣΚΕΠΤΕΙ ‘consider, examine’ in both mss. of the Homily of the Passion), though such situation is evidently extremely unusual. One possible explanation can be found in the beginning of this section.

307 M.Sheridan suggests VI-VII C.E., the time of an increased pressure exercised on the Egyptian church, as the most likely period for the composition of this homily (Sheridan 2012:146). Thus, the text could stem from much earlier epoche, than the manuscript. Its attribution, however, goes even further back, ascribing the authorship to a certain Evodius, traditionally held to be Peter’s successor in the See of Rome. It is, therefore, unclear whether the linguistic trait referred to here genuinely reflects the contemporaneous usage, or is to be taken as an imitation of the more sober antiquated style.

3.5.2.3 Class B: Intra-Sahidic deponentialization

The phenomenon of the productive middle-passive suffix in Sahidic, unwarranted by the morphological properties of the source verbs, has hitherto attracted little attention. This is quite understandable considering the altogether negligible number of such tokens. Almost all the verbs with the unexpected middle form are found in the corpus of Sahidic legal papyri dating from 8th C.E.³⁰⁸ The idiosyncrasy of this corpus merits a separate discussion and must probably be ascribed to conservativeness of legal idiom, in general, an inevitable consequence of the idea of immutability and continuity of the law. In the language of legal documents, formulae obtain the force of validating the content allowing to trace down a unique occurrence to its model event or historic precedent. That is why people mastering this specific language register are taught to escape linguistic innovations.³⁰⁹ This policy might occasionally result in intentional archaization and hypercorrection, in pursuit of a linguistic standard that had either long ago become obsolete or else never really existed. It is hard to think of any other explanation for the sudden occurrence of the suffix morpheme in a dialect notorious for omitting it.

Yet, if we want to account for the unexpected morphological changes, it is not enough to refer to a specific register that prompted them to happen. These novel forms are not random monstrosities, but appear to be to a certain degree grammatically rooted, even by virtue of their regular use with the verbs in question, namely, ἀνήκει / ἀνήκεσθαι, διαστelle / διαστelleσθαι, διαφέρει / διαφείρεσθαι, κύριεγε / κύριεγεσθαι, μαρτυρεῖ / μαρτυρεῖσθαι, πράσσει / πρᾶττεσθαι. As to my knowledge, the first and only researcher to take a notice of this phenomenon was P.V. Jernstedt. In his opinion, the emergence of these forms is due to an incorrectly applied analogy to the true deponents:

“ἀνήκεισθαι is based on ἀνήκειν ‘belong to’. The medium form of an indefinite mood can in no way compel us to hypothesize that a corresponding form was used in Greek. Other Greek transitive verbs may likewise exhibit a medium voice indefinite mood form in Coptic. So, BM 1703 πετ.διαφέρει⁹ εῖρεκ undoubtedly reproduces τὸ διαφέρον σοι ... ἔγχοκεισθαι and other medium forms, such as ἐνεχέσθαι, have probably served as a source for the use of the medium ending in the verbs that have originally had an active form.”³¹⁰

Now, linguistic analogy works as regularization of forms under the assumption of some grammatical or semantic relation common for the compared entities.³¹¹ Therefore, even if we accept the explanation by analogy proposed in Jernstedt (1959), it would still need a clarification: why exactly did the analogy work towards lengthening the form in those rather anomalous cases? Is it possible to single out a specific syntactic or semantic parameter responsible for what looks like a redundant marking of the verb? Interestingly, there seems to be not one, but three or four such parameters, not all of them coinciding in each case.

308 This, of course, may be a sheer coincidence caused by the unequal representation of various genres in surviving Sahidic corpus, as explained in 3.5.1.4.

309 Cf., e.g., Abramova (2019).

310 Jernstedt (1959:13). Translation mine – N.S.

311 In Dinneen (1968), this is termed “the positive side of analogy”.

a) Stative aspect of an unaccusative verb

obviously triggers the use of the middle-passive suffix with $\Delta\eta\eta\kappa\epsilon\iota$ and $\Delta\iota\alpha\phi\epsilon\rho\epsilon\iota$, both of them meaning ‘belong’.

(227) BL Pap 100 - P. KRU 36

$\lambda\gamma\omega\ \tau\eta\zeta\omicron\mu\omicron\lambda\omicron\gamma\epsilon\iota\ \epsilon\tau\eta\epsilon\iota\ \epsilon\beta\omicron\lambda\ \epsilon\rho\omega\tau\eta\ \tau\omicron\gamma\ \lambda\omicron\iota\pi\omicron\gamma\ \xi\alpha\ \beta\epsilon\lambda\alpha\alpha\gamma\ \eta\zeta\omega\beta\ \epsilon\varphi\Delta\eta\eta\kappa\epsilon\iota\theta\alpha\iota$
 $\epsilon\tau\epsilon\iota\kappa\lambda\eta\rho\omicron\mu\iota\alpha\ \eta\eta\mu\alpha\kappa\alpha\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\pi\iota\phi\alpha\eta\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \eta\eta\ \mu\alpha\rho\iota\alpha$

*‘...and we declare that we shall not henceforth sue you on account of anything **pertaining** to this inheritance of the late Epiphanius and Mary...’*

(228) BL Or. 4868 - P.KRU 14

$\lambda\gamma\omega\ \eta\gamma\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\theta\alpha\iota\ \lambda\gamma\omega\ \eta\gamma\rho\ \pi\lambda\theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \eta\pi\eta\iota\ \tau\eta\rho\varphi\ \xi\iota\ \tau\tau\alpha\iota\lambda\alpha\kappa\iota\eta\ \pi\rho\omicron\varsigma\ \eta\varphi\tau\omicron\omega$
 $\eta\tau\alpha\iota\omicron\gamma\omicron\eta\zeta\omicron\gamma\ \eta\alpha\kappa\ \epsilon\pi\eta\iota\ \tau\eta\rho\varphi\ \epsilon\kappa\ \tau\epsilon\tau\rho\alpha\gamma\omega\eta\omicron\eta\omicron\ \chi\iota\eta\ \eta\varphi\kappa\eta\tau\epsilon\ \varphi\alpha\ \rho\alpha\tau\eta\gamma\ \eta\eta$
 $\eta\kappa\epsilon\chi\rho\eta\sigma\tau\eta\rho\iota\omicron\eta\ \epsilon\tau\Delta\eta\eta\kappa\epsilon\iota\theta\epsilon\theta\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\rho\omicron\varphi$

*‘and you may become lord and take possession of the entire house on Pailakine street according to its borders which I have indicated to you for the entire house on four sides from its foundations to the air, along with the furniture that **belongs** to it’*

This form has a free alternant $\Delta\eta\eta\kappa\epsilon\iota$ attested about two times less frequently:

(229) BL Or. 4881 - P.KRU 8

$\eta\tau\omicron\omega\ \tau\epsilon\ \eta\alpha\iota\ \eta\mu\epsilon\eta\eta\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma\ <\eta\ >\pi\alpha\eta\zeta\ \tau\eta\rho\varphi\ \chi\iota\eta\ \eta\epsilon\varphi\kappa\eta\tau\epsilon\ \varphi\alpha\ \rho\alpha\tau\eta\gamma\ \eta\eta\ \eta\epsilon\varphi\chi\rho\eta\sigma\tau\eta\rho\iota\omicron\eta$
 $\tau\eta\rho\gamma\ \epsilon\tau\Delta\eta\eta\kappa\epsilon\iota\ \epsilon\rho\omicron\varphi$

*‘These are the boundaries of our entire share of (the) courtyard, from its foundations to the airspace, together with all the utensils **belonging** to it’*

$\Delta\iota\alpha\phi\epsilon\rho\epsilon\iota\theta\alpha\iota$, in turn, is attested only in the suffixed form.

(230) Vienna Nationalbibliothek K 10993 - P.KRU 23

$\omicron\gamma\Delta\epsilon\ \epsilon\rho\omicron\kappa\ \eta\eta\ \eta\epsilon\kappa\omega\eta\rho\epsilon\ \eta\eta\ \eta\omega\eta\rho\epsilon\ \eta\eta\epsilon\kappa\omega\eta\rho\epsilon\ \omicron\gamma\Delta\epsilon\ \varsigma\omicron\eta\ \omicron\gamma\Delta\epsilon\ \varsigma\omega\eta\epsilon\ \omicron\gamma\Delta\epsilon\ \omega\eta\eta\omicron\gamma\alpha$
 $\omicron\gamma\Delta\epsilon\ \omega\eta\eta\varsigma\eta\gamma\ \omicron\gamma\Delta\epsilon\ \eta\epsilon\kappa\chi\omega\zeta\ \omicron\gamma\Delta\epsilon\ \eta\epsilon\kappa\chi\omega\zeta\ \eta\chi\omega\zeta\ \omicron\gamma\Delta\epsilon\ \lambda\alpha\alpha\gamma\ \eta\rho\omega\eta\epsilon\ \epsilon\varphi\Delta\iota\alpha\phi\epsilon\rho\epsilon\iota\theta\alpha\iota$
 $\epsilon\rho\omicron\kappa\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\ \lambda\alpha\alpha\gamma\ \eta\varsigma\mu\omicron\tau\ \Delta\pi\lambda\omega\varsigma$

*‘neither against you, your children, or your children’s children, nor a brother or sister, nor a first- or second-degree relative, nor your kin or your kin of kin, nor anyone **belonging** to you in any way at all’*

(231) BL Or. 4884 - P. KRU 44

$\chi\iota\eta\ \tau\epsilon\eta\omicron\gamma\ \epsilon\eta\epsilon\iota\omega\ \beta\eta\mu\omicron\sigma\eta\ \epsilon\epsilon\iota\ \epsilon\beta\omicron\lambda\ \epsilon\rho\omega\tau\eta\ (\dots)\ \omicron\gamma\Delta\epsilon\ \xi\alpha\ \lambda\alpha\alpha\gamma\ \eta\zeta\omega\beta\ \epsilon\varphi\Delta\iota\alpha\phi\epsilon\rho\epsilon\iota\theta\alpha\iota$
 $\epsilon\pi\eta\eta\alpha\kappa/\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\Delta\omega\bar{\rho}\omicron\varsigma\ \omicron\gamma\Delta\epsilon\ \xi\alpha\ \eta\eta\omicron\gamma\beta\ \omicron\gamma\Delta\epsilon\ \xi\alpha\ \xi\alpha\Delta\tau\ \omicron\gamma\Delta\epsilon\ \xi\alpha\ \varsigma\chi\alpha\Delta\tau\ \omicron\gamma\Delta\epsilon\ \xi\alpha\ \varphi\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\epsilon\tau$
 $\omicron\gamma\Delta\epsilon\ \xi\alpha\ \rho\omicron\eta\pi\epsilon\ \eta\omicron\gamma\omega\eta$

*‘From now on, I shall not be able to proceed against you, (...) neither for anything **pertaining** to the late Theodore, nor for gold, nor for silver, nor for dower, nor for dowry, nor for year’s eating’*

d) Affected (involved) subject participant

The effect of this factor can be seen in the morphological shape of the term $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\epsilon\gamma\epsilon(\sigma\alpha\iota)$ ‘be owner’ in Sahidic documents³¹². The Coptic lexeme must have acquired its shape quite independently from Greek, since contemporary (in the broad sense) Greek legal documents make use only of the active form (the object is in accusative, if it immediately follows the verb, as follows from BGU 1 241, BGU 3 805, BGU 3 917 and others):

(237) HGV BASP 48, TM 132139 (VI C.E.)

[- ca.5 - μετὰ τήν] ἐμήν τελευτήν κρατεῖν καὶ **κυριεύειν** καὶ δεσπόζειν διὰ παντός τοῦ αὐτοῦ τρίτου μέρους μοναστηρίου ὀλοκλήρου

*‘(I agree ... that after) my death you possess, **have authority** and are master forever over the same third part of the whole monastery’³¹³*

(238) P.Cair. Masp. 1 67097 V D, TM 19026 (VI C.E.)

εὐδοκῶ καὶ πύθωμαι πρὸς τῷ σὲ ἀπεντεῦθεν κρατεῖν καὶ **κυριεύειν** καὶ δεσπόζειν το(ῦ) προδηλωθέντος ὀλοκλήρου πατρῶου κτήμ[ατος μετὰ πα]γτός αὐτο(ῦ) το(ῦ) δικαίου καὶ χρηστηρίων ἀπάντων

*‘I consent and agree that from now on you possess, **have authority** and are master over the whole above-defined property inherited from (my) father, including all the rights on it and all the utensils’³¹⁴*

In Coptic, sporadic tokens of the active form (e.g., in p. CLT 7, p. KRU 28) are by far less frequent than the suffixed form, as in:

(239) Vienna Nationalbibliothek K 10993, P.KRU 23

(...) νγραμαρτε αγω νερ χοεις νγκυριεγεςσαι νπραωμονντ νπηι τηρρ ετημααγ

*‘(...) and take possession, and **have authority** and be the master over the third of the whole said house’*

(Similar formulae are found in p.KRU 8, 14, 25, 39, 46, 71 etc.)

Remarkably, this ‘passive’ form can be expanded by a direct object phrase, as in:

(240) P. KRU 77

ντετηρ̄ [χοεις] εροογ ρ̄ν̄ νντχοεις ννν̄ πρὸς θε̄ ν̄τᾱῑρορ̄ῑζε̄ ν̄μοος νν̄τ̄ν̄ ν̄τ̄τε [ν̄τε] τ̄[ν̄]κ̄υρ̄ῑε̄γ̄ε̄σ̄αῑ ν̄ν̄μο̄ο̄γ̄ ν̄τε̄τ̄ν̄χ̄ποο̄γ̄ ν̄ν̄τ̄ν̄

*‘(...) and you shall be their [owners] in all ownership as I have bestowed it on you above, [and] you **have authority over them**, and acquire them for you’*

Outside of the possession formula, the long form of $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\epsilon\gamma\epsilon$ is attested once in the sense ‘be valid, authoritative’, in an objectless present clause:

312 Often erroneously written as $\kappa\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\sigma\alpha\iota$ (observation of F.Krueger, DDGLC database.) Since, however, the meaning of the verb and the formula it appears in are exactly identical to those of $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\sigma\alpha\iota$, I take ‘keleuesthai’ to be an orthographic variant and not a form of ‘keleue’ in need of a special consideration.

313 Translation: J.Combs & J. Miller (2011:85).

314 Translation mine. – N.S.

(241) P.CLT 4, mss 24-25

εφνααωαπε εφσμοσφ εφκ**κ**ριεγ**α**ῖ ρῖ ηα νη εγναεμφανιζε ῖμοφ νρητῖ ριτη
 ογιογραφη ῖφγιογραφος νταφρζαιφ ῖν ναζιοπιςτος ῖηαρτυρος
*'It shall be valid and **authoritative** wherever it may be produced, by the signature
 of the subscriber who has written it, as well as the trustworthy witnesses.'*

The shorter form is not attested in this meaning, at all.

Since the legal formula uses conjunctive, i.e. a tense of the eventive paradigm, it is hardly justified to ascribe to the predicate the stative aspect. The verb must possibly be interpreted as 'gain, acquire control', rather than 'have control'. Therefore, the affectedness or the involvement of the subject ('you shall gain for yourself the control') remains the most plausible candidate for setting off the morphological change.

e) Involved subject participant and detransitivized predicate: the case of **μαρτυραι(σθα)**

The Liddell-Scott dictionary contains two separate verbal entries based on the stem μαρτυρ-. One of them, μαρτυρέω 'bear witness to' is inflected in the active in the present tense, but takes the middle morpheme in the future tense and in the aorist. The other one, μαρτύρομαι (in later texts μαρτυροῦμαι) means 'call to witness' or 'declare'. The middle suffix in the present tense obviously functions as a causative or intensifying morpheme.³¹⁵ The active form is far more frequent; it is used either with dative of an entity witnessed (CPR 1 30 μαρτυρῶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς γαμικοῖς συμβολαίοις 'I bear witness to the wedding contract', HGV BGU 3 900 μαρτυρῶ τῇ μισθῶσι 'I bear witness to the lease', HGV BGU 2 404 μαρτυρῶ τῆδε τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ 'I bear witness to the agreement' etc.), or else in objectless testimonial statements after a personal name (HGV BGU 2 668 Φλ(άτιος) Δίος Ἀβραμίου στρ(ατιώτης) μαρτυρῶ 'I, the soldier Flavius Dios, son of Abramios, bear witness' etc.).

The middle-passive form is usually expanded by an accusative object or by a content clause:

(242) P.Oxy. 8 1120, TM 31719 (III C.E.)

κατὰ τοῦτο **μαρτύρομαι τὴν βίαν** γυνὴ χήρα καὶ ἀσθενής.
*'I accordingly **testify to his violence**, being a feeble widow woman'*

(243) P.Oxy. 54 3759, TM 15268 (IV C.E.)

μαρτύρομαι ὅτι κατὰ τινων ἀνήνεγκεν ἐπὶ τὸν κύριόν μου τὸν ἑπαρχὸν καὶ κάτ
 ἐτέρων εἰσάγει νῦν...
*'...I **declare that** he has brought forward (a complaint) against some persons to my
 lord the eparch and that he is suing the others...'*

To complete the picture, one should mention that in Koine, this stem has produced various more or less synonymous compounds (ἐκμαρτυρέω, διαμαρτυρέω, προμαρτυρέω),

315 Such parallelism of valency changing functions in the same morpheme is cross-linguistically not uncommon. See, e.g., Lyutikova & Bonch-Osmolovskaya (2006) for Balkar data.

which as a rule combine the middle-passive form with the active semantics, i.e. function as deponents.

Interestingly, the Coptic loan verb does not reproduce the form–meaning split observed in Greek. Both μαρτυρεῖ and μαρτυρεῖσθαι have the meaning ‘bear witness’; the short form is mainly attested in literary sources (Paraphrase of Shem NH VII, Berliner Koptisches Buch), the suffixed form invariably occurs in legal documents. The short / active form is often used with a cognate object:

(244) NHC VII, ParShem, 29,19-22

Ἰσοδομιτῆς δε κατὰ ποῦωϣ Ἰπμεγεῦθος σεναρ̄μαρτυρι ἡτ̄ μαρτυρια ἡκαθολικη
 ‘...but the Sodomites, according to the will of the Majesty, shall **bear witness** to the universal testimony...’³¹⁶

The long form can be expanded by a prepositional phrase with ε- (seemingly reserved for inanimate objects) and / or ελ- (mostly for animate objects)³¹⁷, both meaning ‘for, on account of’:

(245) BL Or. 4885 Ro - P. KRU 59

εϣωρϣ ηακ ρισμη τειεπιτροπη εσο ητγπος ηασφαλεια εϣω εηπαρακαλει ηρενηρωμε
 ηαζιοπιστος εϣμαρτυρεσθαι ερος
 ‘...As a security for you I have drawn up this commissioning in the form of a declaration of indebtedness, and I have asked trustworthy men who have **testified** to it...’

(246) BL Or 1061 C + Or 1062 - P. KRU 68

εηπαρακαλε ηρενη[αρ]τγ[ρος ετρ]εϣμαρτυριεσ ελαρι εηαινηγραφον ηβοϣλεγμα
 ηαδιαθηκη [η]ϣαϣηε ηελη ετχη
 ‘...I beseech w[*it*]ne[*sses that*] they might **testify** on my behalf to this document that is a will, testament, [*and*] written last decision...’

Let us also consider the following. In Coptic documentary texts, μαρτυρεῖσθαι can alternate with its native equivalent η ἡντηρε which takes the stative form ο ἡντηρε in the present tense formulae “I am the witness” and “I bear witness to...”: P.Lond. 4 1494, TM 19924 ισακ ηρωη ηϣκωου **ηιο ἡντηρε** εηηρομολογ[ια] ‘Isaak of Tjkoou, I **bear witness** to this agreement’; P.Lond. 4 1511, TM 39814 ε[ηοκ -ca.?-] **ηιο ἡντηρε** εηιεγηη προσ τεσσοη ‘I... **bear witness** to this contract of pledge in its full force’. Needless to say, only infinitive is compatible with the non-present tenses: P.KRU 67, TM 85968 εηρ **ηντηρε** εηεδιαθηκ(η) προσ τεφαηηης ‘I have testified to this testament by his request...’; P.KRU 75, TM 85976 ηη ἡντηρε εηηροτ **εηηαρ ἡντηρε** κατὰ τεηαιηης ‘...and the trustworthy witnesses who shall subsequently testify by our request...’. On the other hand, the Sahidic Bible has multiple tokens of the form ηη ἡντηρε ‘I witness by something, call to witness, solemnly declare’ which almost always translates the Septuagint διαμαρτύρομαι. In the documentary texts, this form is attested just once in HGV O.Frange 188:

316 Translation: D.Burns.

317 Due to the limitation in the number of attested tokens, it is impossible to give stricter definitions.

(247) ⲧⲣ ⲙⲏⲧⲣⲉ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲁⲛⲓⲁⲗⲏⲧⲏⲧⲏⲧ ⲧⲉⲧ ⲉⲗⲟⲕ ⲉⲙⲁⲧⲉ
 I profess that my heart is very content with you

Syntactically (it takes sentential actants) and semantically, this second *ⲣ ⲙⲏⲧⲣⲉ* looks analogous to Greek *μαρτύρομαι*. The following table summarizes the form / meaning distribution of the original Greek verb, its Egyptian counterpart and the loaned lexeme.

Table 10 | Greek-Coptic correlates for ‘witness’

	Greek	Coptic (present)	Graeco-Coptic
‘bear witness’	μαρτυρέω	ⲟ ⲙⲏⲧⲣⲉ	ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲉⲓ ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲉⲥⲟⲗⲓ
‘call to witness, declare’ (intensified)	μαρτύρομαι	ⲣ ⲙⲏⲧⲣⲉ	

The function of the middle-passive morph, as it seems, does not copy the Greek one, but rather follows the Coptic pattern, where the affectedness or involvement of the subject actant is marked by a valency-reduced form of stative.

As a post-scriptum to this complicated story, one should add that in the documentary Sahidic there are actually attested two cognate verbal lexemes with the identical sense of ‘bearing witness’: *ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲉⲓ* and *ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲗⲉ*. Though both of them, at the first sight, look genuinely ‘Greek’ from the point of view of their morphology, the second one, *ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲗⲉ*, might well constitute an intra-Coptic derivate: no such lexeme is registered for Greek either in the Liddell-Scott dictionary, or among the documents published on the *papyri.info* online resource.³¹⁸ However, as witnessed by the preserved Sahidic documents, this variant was the one more frequently used: it yields approximately 7 times as much attestations in legal texts as the real borrowed verb. This neologism had possibly been coined and accepted by way of standardizing the opaque original lexeme.

Thus, if the loan verb deponentialization found in Sahidic documents is not considered completely incidental, it must originate in semantic (affectedness / involvement of the subject actant, less sure the stative aspect of the predicate) and syntactic (valency reduction, detransitivization) properties of the clause. Importantly, the role of the suffix as the marker of valency reduction and subject affectedness copies its function in the source language.

3.5.2.4 Class B: Summary

Greek deponents make up the bulk of the class of monodiathetic verbs with two forms attested. This does not mean, however, that the middle-passive suffix morpheme was automatically preserved in Sahidic. The attestations show that: 1) with most verbs, the suffixed form occurs far less frequently and is generally corpus-conditioned; 2) an intransitive deponent has much more chances to keep up the suffix, than a transitive deponent, although exceptions, such as *ⲕⲧⲁⲥⲟⲗⲓ* or *ⲉⲙⲑⲁⲛⲓⲥⲟⲗⲓ*, do occur. All in all, a clear correlation exists between the use of the suffix and the intransitive diathesis of the predicate, which

³¹⁸ LBG cites a single instance of *ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲗⲟⲙⲓ* with the meaning ‘zum Zeugen anrufen’ (“call to witness”) in a 12th century text of *Analecta Manassea*.

is conspicuous in the cases where the split of forms is associated with the split in valency patterns (Table 8). The majority of Greek deponent verbs with transitive valency were borrowed in their stem form.³¹⁹

A remarkable subgroup of class B consists of those verbs whose middle-passive morphology is at variance with what is attested for their counterparts in the source language. Besides the six verbs discussed in 3.5.2.3, it might also include $\epsilon\chi\pi\omicron\gamma\rho\epsilon\iota$ ‘render service’, once found in the suffixed form $\epsilon\chi\pi\omicron\gamma\rho\epsilon\iota\sigma\epsilon$ which is not warranted by its Greek usage:

- (248) Four Creatures, f. 14v a, 7-16 (Wansink 1991: 38, 16-18); 9th century C.E.
 ἀληθῶς ὀνόσ πε πρῶυ ηνι πταιο ντα πνογτε χαριζε ημοϋ ηνειασδηατος
 ετογααβ εχχιπογρισε εθιπερεσια ηπεγχοεισ καλος αχεν ρισε
 ‘truly, great is the honor and the glory which God has granted to these holy
 incorporeal ones; they perform the service of their lord well, without weariness’

Even if this subgroup constitutes not more than one percent of all the borrowed Graeco-Coptic verbs, the described morphological re-shaping points to a certain productivity of the Greek bound morph inside Coptic, albeit only on the stock of borrowed lexemes. Its grammatical functions mainly mirror those in the source language since it is used to mark intransitive constructions with an affected subject. This type of grammatical behavior of a borrowed element is defined as *parallel system borrowing* in 3.3.

The productivity of a borrowed morpheme is a phenomenon not yet, to my knowledge, described for Coptic. (By way of comparison, the productivity of the Coptic plural ending on borrowed nouns, e.g., $\Upsilon\chi\omicron\omicron\upsilon\epsilon$ ‘souls’, is a well-established Coptic grammatical trait³²⁰). However, the Greek middle-passive suffix is not the only Greek-origin morph to be used in Coptic word-formation. A set of Graeco-Coptic verbal lexemes display combinations of stem and suffix that do not have prototypes in genuine Greek texts. In such cases, the derivation must probably have taken place inside Coptic itself. The suffixes most frequently found in such derivations are *-eue* and *-ize*. Thus, the stem of $\sigma\kappa\omicron\tau\omicron\omega$ ‘become dizzy’ in Coptic is represented by $\sigma\kappa\omicron\theta\omicron\gamma$ and $\sigma\kappa\omicron\tau\epsilon\gamma\epsilon$, $\phi\theta\omicron\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ ‘envy’ has cognates $\phi\theta\omicron\nu\epsilon\iota$ and $\phi\theta\omicron\nu\epsilon\gamma\epsilon$, for $\delta\alpha\pi\alpha\nu\acute{\alpha}\omega$ ‘spend’ there are attested the variants $\Delta\alpha\pi\alpha\eta\eta$, $\Delta\alpha\pi\alpha\eta\epsilon\gamma\epsilon$, $\Delta\alpha\pi\alpha\eta\iota\sigma\epsilon$, the Greek deponent verb $\delta\omega\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ ‘grant, give as a gift’ is entirely replaced by $\Delta\omega\rho\iota\sigma\epsilon$ which is not attested in genuine Greek texts, etc. We encountered an additional instance of the same phenomenon in our discussion of $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\gamma\rho\epsilon\iota$, with its cognate $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\gamma\rho\iota\sigma\epsilon$, seemingly also an intra-Coptic development.

Almost all the tokens of the newly-coined suffixed forms occur in the corpus of documentary texts.

The ‘true’ deponents with preserved middle suffixes occur mainly in the Nag Hammadi codices II, III, V, VI, VII and IX. However, some late texts, such as pMorgan 595, also show sporadic use of the deponent forms.

319 The difference between the stem and the middle imperative form suggests that, in case of deponentia, at least, it was stem that was borrowed.

320 See, e.g., Egedi (2015:1339).

3.5.3 Class C: one form, two diatheses (labile verbs)

3.5.3.1 Class C: general remarks

The mechanism of morphological voice marking by means of the Greek middle-passive suffix morpheme discussed in sections 3.5.1 and 3.5.2 was clearly very limited in terms of its lexemic distribution; it is attested in marginal corpora, and its use appears to be irregular and ambiguous. Conversely, a sufficient number of verbs in standard literary Sahidic display regular labile alternation. Thus, contrasted to the rudimentary morphological voice marking, lability appears to be the default valency alternation device for loan verbs in Sahidic and is treated as such in Funk (2017) and Grossman (2019)³²¹. Accordingly, there seems to be no need in specifying the verbal classes it applies to. Meanwhile, the notion that every Graeco-Coptic verb allowing for valency alternation can be used in both senses indiscriminately is not correct. True, lability must have been productive, seeing that apart from the core of ~8-9 verbs that demonstrate lability throughout the whole Sahidic corpus, there are about 40 more lexemes which occasionally display an unmarked valency switch in specific texts. Yet, generally, lability of Graeco-Coptic verbs is lexically conditioned, whereas two other mechanisms of valency alternation, the valency increasing prefix $\tau\pi\epsilon$ - and the detransitivizing ‘impersonal passive’ construction, do not seem to be confined to any specific set of lexemes. Semantic and grammatical properties of the labile class must therefore be weighed out against the majority of Graeco-Coptic verbal lexemes that either do not form causal pairs, or form them by means of the above mentioned morphosyntactic devices.

It was already said that the number and the inventory of labile verbs is fluctuating depending on the corpus in the question. Apart from the occasional absence of a certain verb in the corpus (e.g., the corpus of Shenoute’s Canons seemingly does not contain a single token of $\beta\alpha\pi\tau\tau\iota\zeta\epsilon$ ‘baptize’), this is often due to many verbal lexemes being used asymmetrically, with one (causative or non-causative) facet far more frequent than the other. As a rule, some alternative marking of valency change is preferred with these verbs. Such is the case of the predominantly intransitive $\gamma\gamma\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\kappa\epsilon$ ‘be subdued’ which for the most part demonstrates causative alternation by means of suppletion or morphological causativization. Both suppletion (by means of the native verb $\kappa\omega$ ‘put’) and morphological causativization (by means of the causative infix $\tau\pi\epsilon$ -) are illustrated in the following example:

321 See Funk (2017:378), Grossman (2019:109).

(249) 1Cor. 15:27

πάντα γὰρ ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ. ὅταν δὲ εἴπῃ ὅτι πάντα ὑποτέτακται,
 δῆλον ὅτι ἐκτὸς τοῦ ὑποτάξαντος αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα.

ⲁⲓⲕⲁ ⲛⲕⲁ ⲓⲁⲣ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲓⲁ ⲛⲉⲓⲟⲩⲉⲣⲏⲧⲉ ⲓⲟⲩⲁⲛ ⲁⲉ ⲉⲓⲩⲁⲛⲁⲓⲟⲟⲥ ⲁⲉ ⲛⲕⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲁⲓⲓⲩⲓⲟⲩⲁⲓⲟⲟⲥ
 ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲓⲉ ⲛⲃⲟⲗ ⲛⲓⲛⲧⲁⲓⲩⲁⲓⲟⲩⲉ ⲛⲕⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲓⲩⲓⲟⲩⲁⲓⲟⲟⲥ ⲛⲁⲓ

*‘For “God has put all things in **subjection** under his feet.” But when it says, “all things **are put in subjection**,” it is plain that he is excepted who put all things in **subjection** under him.’*

At times, the decision on the lability of a specific verb must be made on the basis of a single contrastive usage, as, for instance, in the case of ἀναγκάζε ‘compel’ that is once attested in the sense ‘be compelled, urged’ (pMoscow Copt 69). The verbs with strongly unequal frequency of transitive and intransitive tokens are called ‘partially labile’ in Letuchiy (online). The partially labile lexemes differ significantly from lexemes like ἀγζανε ‘make grow / grow’ which has an almost equal proportion of causative and non-causative tokens. Certain lexemes are monodiathetic in one corpus, but behave as labile in another one. For instance, the NT knows only transitive use of ἔλιβε, whereas Shenoute understands it as both ‘suffer, be distressed’ and ‘make suffer, torture’:

(250) Shen.Can. 6, Amel. 2 (322:10)

†ⲈⲒⲒⲒⲒⲒⲒ ⲁⲓⲩⲟⲩ ⲛⲓⲩⲉⲕⲣⲟⲩⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲣⲟⲩⲟ ⲛⲁⲣⲁ ⲧⲁⲓⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲁⲉ †ⲓⲩⲁⲣⲧ ⲛⲓⲟⲩⲉⲓⲕ ⲉⲟⲩⲟⲩⲛⲓ ⲛⲧⲟⲟⲩⲟⲩ
 ⲛⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓⲛⲏⲩⲩⲩ

‘I suffer and I am distressed much over my endurance, for I lack the bread to eat from the hands of my brothers’

(251) Shen.Can. 6, Amel. 1 (70:7)

ⲉⲛⲈⲒⲒⲒⲒⲒⲒ ⲛⲛⲉⲛⲉⲣⲏⲩⲩ ⲉⲓⲓⲩⲓⲛⲁⲓⲩⲩⲩ

‘Whereas we torture each other in vain’

The New Testament, on the other hand, treats βασανίζε as both a transitive (252) and an intransitive (253) verb:

(252) Mark 5:7

†ⲓⲩⲟⲩⲕ ⲉⲣⲟⲕ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲁⲉ ⲛⲛⲉⲕⲃⲁⲓⲛⲓⲩⲉ ⲛⲛⲟⲓ
 ὀρκίζω σε τὸν Θεόν, μή με βασανίσῃς.

‘I adjure you by God, do not torment me.’

(253) Matthew 8:6

ⲛⲁⲩⲟⲩⲛⲉ ⲛⲏⲩⲩ ⲓⲣⲁⲓ ⲓⲙ ⲛⲁⲛⲓ ⲉⲓⲕⲏⲓⲟⲥ ⲁⲓⲩⲟⲩ ⲉⲓⲃⲁⲓⲛⲓⲩⲉ ⲉⲛⲁⲧⲉ

ὁ παῖς μου βέβληται ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ παραλυτικός, δεινῶς βασανιζόμενος.

‘...my servant is lying paralyzed at home, suffering terribly’

The complementary distribution of the two verbs for ‘suffering’ between the corpora signals a variation, worth further study, between the idiom of the New Testament translation and the original literary Sahidic.

In view of the above considerations, the list of Greek labile lexemes in Sahidic cannot claim to represent the ultimate reference base. Rather, it must be regarded as a broad

enough sample serving analytical purposes. At present, it includes 51 verbal lexemes: ἀναγλισκε ‘be consumed / consume’, ἀναγκάζε ‘be compelled / compel’, ἀπορεῖ ‘be in doubt, confused / confuse’, ἀγζανε ‘grow / make grow’, βαπτίζει ‘be baptized / baptize’, βασανίζει ‘be tormented / torment’, βεβαίον ‘be confirmed / confirm’, γυμνάζε ‘be trained / train (someone)’, δογματίζει ‘subject oneself / teach someone, affirm something’, ἐνεργεῖ ‘be active / put to action’, εὐφρανε ‘rejoice, be glad / please’, ζωγραφεῖ ‘be painted / depict’, ὁωρεῖ ‘look, be like / watch, behold’, ὀλιβε ‘be afflicted, oppressed / oppress’, καθαρῖ, καθαρίζει ‘be purified, cleansed / purify’, καθίστα ‘be appointed / appoint’, καλωπιζει ‘be beautiful/ perform, make beautiful’, καταξίον ‘be deemed worthy / deem worthy’, καταργεῖ ‘be abolished / abolish’, καταφρονεῖ ‘be neglected / despise, neglect’, κατεχε ‘be delayed, wait / delay’, κατορθοῦ ‘be erect / rectify’, κερα ‘be mixed / mix’, κολλα ‘cling, stick to / join (something together)’, κοσμεῖ ‘be put in order, adorned / adorn’, κοψίζει ‘be diminished / relieve, lessen’, λυπει ‘suffer / cause suffer’, μαθητεγε ‘be a disciple / make a disciple’, νηφε ‘be sober / make sober’, παιδεγε ‘learn / educate’, παραβα ‘transgress / mislead’, παραγε ‘pass by / lead astray, pervert’, παραμυθίζει ‘enjoy / comfort, console’, πειραζε ‘be tempted / tempt’, πληρογ ‘be full / fulfill, satisfy’, σαλεγε ‘be shaken / shake’, σκανδαλιζε ‘be offended / offend’, σκυλλει ‘take the trouble / give the trouble’, στεφανογ ‘be crowned / crown’, στολιζε ‘be dressed / dress’, συναγε ‘receive communion / give communion’, συναλλαζε ‘be changed / change’, συριστα ‘consist / assemble’, συρε ‘crawl, drag’, σχηματίζει ‘be arranged / arrange’, ταραζε ‘be troubled / upset, trouble’, ταζε ‘be assigned / assign’, τρυφα ‘delight in / put at ease, make delight’, φανερογ ‘appear / reveal’, ραρμοζε ‘be put together / join’, ρηλανη ‘be pleased / please’³²².

This extensive list gathered from multiple corpora of various ages, genres and authors represents the maximum number of presently known Graeco-Sahidic labile verbs. To assess the number of invariably labile verbs, we can consider two specific corpora, that of Shenoute’s Canons and the Sahidic New Testament. As far as could be ascertained, Shenoute’s Canons contain only nine labile verbs: ἀγζανε, ὀλιβε, κοσμεῖ, λυπει, παιδεγε, παραγε, πειθε, πλανα, σκανδαλιζε. The labile set of the New Testament is somewhat more extensive: it includes 16 verbs (ἀγζανε, βαπτίζει, βασανίζει, γυμνάζε, ἐνεργεῖ, εὐφρανε, ὀλιβε, καταργεῖ, κατεχε, κερα, κοσμεῖ, λυπει, παραγε, πειθε, πλανα, σκανδαλιζε, σκυλλει). The intersection of the two sets consists of 8 verbs and must, in all probability, represent the core of the labile class used similarly in all Sahidic texts.

Further on, let us remember that verbs in Classical Greek and (to a lesser degree) in Koine are diathetically flexible by which I mean that they are generally capable of promoting any argument to the subject position.³²³ In other words, passive constructions

322 Labile interpretation is somewhat dubious with ἐπιρε ‘be urged, hasten / press, urge (?)’, λαθηδανε ‘be confused, ignore / confuse, let ignore’, στασιαζε ‘rise up, rebel / make rebellious (?)’.

323 “Bei der Umwandlung des Aktivs mit einem Objekte in das Passiv geht nicht nur, wie in anderen Sprachen, der Objekts-Akkusativ in den Subjekts-Nominativ über, z. B. Ἐκτωρ ὑπ’ Ἀχιλλέως ἐφονεύθη (akt. Ἀχιλλεύς ἐφόνευσεν Ἐκτορα), sondern auch Verba mit Objekts-Genetiv oder Dativ können ein persönliches Passiv bilden, so dass also der Genetiv oder Dativ in den NSubjektso-minativ übergeht. So sagt der Grieche: φθονοῦμαι, ἐφθονήθη, φθονήσομαι ὑπό τινος (v. φθονεῖν τι, invidere alicui), d. h. ich empfangе, empfing, werde empfangen Neid von einem, der Lateiner

are not restricted to transitive verbs, but can be formed with intransitive verbs having more than one argument, such as διακονέω or πιστεύω:

(254) Matthew 8:15

καὶ ἠγέρθη καὶ διηκόνει αὐτῷ.
'and she rose and began to serve him'

Matthew 20:28

ὡσπερ ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἤλθεν διακονηθῆναι, ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν.
'... even as the Son of Man came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many.'

(255) John 5:46

εἰ γὰρ ἐπιστεύετε Μωϋσεῖ, ἐπιστεύετε ἂν ἐμοί·
'For if you believed Moses, you would believe me'

2 Thessalonians 1:10

...ὅτι ἐπιστεύθη τὸ μαρτύριον ἡμῶν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ.
'... because our testimony to you was believed.'

Thus, we might expect that labile alternation in Graeco-Sahidic verbal system would not be restricted to transitive verbs but would also include at least some verbs with other valency patterns. As it is, no verbs with non-transitive valency are attested in labile alternation, with one possible exception of κοινῶναι 'be shared / share, partake in':

(256) Shen.Can. 8, XO 167a, Boud'hors (2013:217)

ⲬⲈ ⲀⲦⲉⲧⲚ̅ⲘⲘⲘⲘⲛⲉⲓ ⲈⲛⲈⲢⲬⲬⲈ ⲈⲧⲈⲘⲈⲠⲁⲈ ·
'...because you **have participated in** forbidden actions'

(257) NHC VIII, Zostrianos, 22

ⲀⲠⲠⲟⲩ ⲘⲘⲘⲘⲘⲘⲛⲉⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲟⲈⲣⲟⲥ ⲛ̅ⲕⲁⲑⲟⲘⲘⲘⲘⲛⲉⲓ ⲈⲠⲀⲠⲘⲘⲘⲘⲛⲉⲓ ⲈⲠⲟⲘⲟⲩ ⲛ̅ⲠⲁⲘⲟⲩⲛⲉⲓ·
'The universal intelligence **is shared** when the self-begotten water is completed'

However, the only non-causal attestation of this verb belongs to an obscure text and must be received with caution. Generally, Graeco-Coptic intransitive verbs use other devices of valency alternation, most often the 'impersonal passive' construction:

(258) Matt. 20:28 ⲛⲟⲈ ⲛⲠⲟⲩⲛⲉ ⲛⲠⲟⲩⲛⲉ ⲛⲧⲁⲒⲉⲓ Ⲁⲛ ⲈⲧⲠⲉⲒⲘⲘⲘⲘⲛⲉⲓ ⲛⲀⲠⲘ ⲈⲠⲘⲘⲘⲘⲛⲉⲓ ⲀⲠⲠⲟⲩ Ⲉⲧ ⲛⲧⲉⲒⲠⲠⲘⲘⲘⲘⲛⲉⲓ ⲛⲀⲠⲧⲉ ⲒⲀⲒⲒⲒ (cf. the example 254).

Thus, lability of Graeco-Sahidic verbs is of the patient-prominent type and in that respect resembles rather the valency alternation system of target language (Sahidic), than that of the source language (Greek).

dagegen: invidetur mihi ab aliquo; πιστεύομαι u. ἀπιστοῦμαι ὑπό τινος (v. πιστεύειν u. ἀπιστεῖν τι), ich empfangе Glauben, keinen Glauben." (Raphael Kühner, Bernhard Gerth, Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache, §378). See also Luraghi (2010).

Even the most cursory comparison of Sahidic and Bohairic data suggests that labile alternation has been far less productive in Bohairic. Only a small part of the Bohairic counterparts of the labile set can be found in the digitalized and searchable corpora. It seems that in many cases, Bohairic prefers the native equivalents (αἰῶνι / τρε-αἰῶνι for ἀγζάνε ‘grow’, χι / † ωμε for βαπτίζει ‘baptize’). As is well known, loan verbs in Bohairic bear Greek morphological markers of voice. Interestingly (and somewhat at variance with the observations published in Funk 2017), those marked with the active infinitive morpheme -ιν (e.g., ἀναγκάζιν, βασανίζιν, παιδεύιν, πειράζιν, σκανδαλίζιν) appear to function almost invariably as monodiathetic causatives. If confirmed by further research, this lack of flexibility in the active form might correlate with the more rigorous preservation of the middle-passive form in Bohairic. Presumably, the reduced use of labile alternation in Bohairic is compensated for by other valency changing strategies. E.g., the causative *οπε-* will possibly occur in Bohairic with far greater frequency than in Sahidic.

3.5.3.2 Looking for lability triggers: frequency, semantics, diathesis in the source language

The small percentage of labile verbs indicates that lability was not the dominant strategy of voice alternation for loan verbs in Sahidic, or else that loan verbs were generally less liable to valency alternations than the native vocabulary. If this strategy was nevertheless preferred in some cases, this could theoretically result from multiple reasons, such as the influence of the source language or certain semantic properties of the verbs in the labile set. Alternatively, one could assume that lability as a less marked and more versatile alternation model resulted from equally frequent use of a lexeme in both causative and non-causative senses.³²⁴ Let us examine the respective influence of each factor on the choice of labile type of alternation.

1) ‘Spin’ frequency

The choice of a lighter pattern of valency change marking may correlate with the frequency of this change or can even be triggered by this frequency. The following procedure has been devised in order to test this conjecture. For 15 randomly picked verbs of the labile class, we count the ratio of non-causative tokens to the overall number of tokens.³²⁵ For 15 randomly picked transitive verbs of the non-labile class, we count the ratio of the impersonal passive tokens to the overall number of tokens.³²⁶ This ratio which may

324 On the relation between frequency and markedness, see Haspelmath (2008b), Greenberg (1966).

325 All the numbers correspond to the DDGLC data, as of 11.11.2020.

326 Thus, we ignore the impersonal passive tokens of the labile verbs. However, this does not influence the results, since adding these tokens could only strengthen our conjecture. We also do not examine the non-labile verbs with non-transitive valency patterns, since it has been observed that the labile class does not include verbs with non-transitive valency of the causal alternant. Finally, labile verbs are not juxtaposed to non-labile intransitive verbs that use the morpheme *τρε-* as a causativization marker. This procedure is considered superfluous for our purposes and is left for some further study.

be dubbed ‘spin frequency’ will show the average inclination of each group to passive diathesis. We predict that this ratio will be significantly higher in the labile group. The table below displays the labile and the non-labile verbs with their respective number of occurrences and of non-causative tokens.

Table 11 | Non-causative token ratio for labile and non-labile Greek loan verbs

Class of verbs	Verbal lexeme	Non-causative / impersonal passive tokens	Overall occurrences
Labile	αγζανε	38	65
	βαπτιζε	10	88
	βασανιζε	16	67
	εγφρανε	80	98
	ζωγραφει	5	20
	θλιβε	32	90
	κερα	7	22
	κολλα	4	11
	κοσνει	19	60
	κογφιζε	2	7
	νηφε	73	84
	πληρογ	9	26
	σαλεγε	2	5
	τασσε	2	15
	ζαρνοζε	5	6
Non-labile	αθετει	2	49
	επαينوγ	1	30
	θαλπει	1	8
	θγσιαζε	0	119
	καταλλαλει	2	45
	κωλγε	8	131
	οικονομει	1	64
	παραδιδογ	8	68
	πατασσε	0	58
	σκεπαζε	5	52
	σταγρογ	39	142
	σφραγιζε	3	171
	φορει	1	191
	ζερμηνεγε	19	43
ζυπονηιζε	0	3	

The average ratio of the labile group is ~ 0.415 . The average ratio of the non-labile group is ~ 0.085 . The number of passive occurrences for labile verbs is thus about 5 times as great as that for the non-labile sample which confirms our initial suggestion. However, the sheer frequency of diathetic switches does not guarantee that the verb in question becomes labile. Labile usage is not attested, e.g., for $\sigma\tau\alpha\upsilon\pi\omicron\upsilon$ ‘crucify’ and $\rho\epsilon\rho\mu\eta\eta\eta\epsilon\gamma\epsilon$ ‘interpret’ (19 non-causal to 43 overall attestations and 39 to 142 attestations, respectively). The fact that both of them belong to the literary variety of Sahidic suggests that the spoken language might have been more prone to introduce labile usages.

2) Source diathesis pattern

Now, let us check the assumption that the diathetic properties of a Graeco-Coptic verb are derived from or, at least, influenced by its Greek correlate. Broadly taken, this hypothesis predicts that the prototypes of the labile group will generally have more diathetic flexibility, than those of the Graeco-Coptic monodiathetic class. A necessary prerequisite for testing this idea would be a full diathetic chart of all Greek verbs that were borrowed into Coptic. The chart, moreover, should be tailored to include all voice alterations that were attested in the era of Koine, and only such alternations. At present, such reference base is but a desideratum. The data in the dictionaries, such as Liddell-Scott (1996), cannot be relied upon, first because morphological variants are not time-classified, and secondly, because the presence of a morphological variant in the dictionary does not tell anything about its mode of use. The most exhaustive study of diachronic voice alternations in Greek, Lavidas (2009), marks important tendencies, but does not offer any sort of ‘voice vocabulary’ our test requires. The following analysis is therefore confined to very uncertain preliminary observations that can at best propose some questions to be answered by future studies. For each prototype of the labile group and for a random sample of the prototypes of the monodiathetic class, we provide a form-diathesis distribution pattern based on the data from the Strong’s New Testament Concordance and the digitalized documentary papyri. The two lists, the ‘labile’ and the ‘monodiathetic’ one, are then compared to each other and to their Coptic parallels, respectively.

Table 12 | Diathetic patterns of Koine verbs

Pattern number	Morphological shape	Diathetic pattern	Examples
1	active / active and middle ~ passive	causative ~ non-causative	$\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omega$ delay – wait, be delayed
2	mostly active	causative	$\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\phi\rho\omicron\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ despise, neglect
3	active	non-causative	$\delta\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$ hesitate
4	active ~ active and middle-passive	causative ~ non-causative	$\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omega$ lead astray – pass by
5	active and middle-passive	non-causative	$\alpha\tilde{\upsilon}\xi\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$ grow

One thing that leaps to the eye is the absence of the purely labile model where the active form would correspond to both causative and non-causative diatheses. Labile usage is ‘embedded’ in model 4, where the active form stands for both meanings, but even here the middle-passive can regularly express the non-causative meaning. Thus, the assumption that lability of a verb in Coptic is caused by the lability of its prototype in Greek must be rejected.

Of the verbs belonging to the labile class in Sahidic, pattern 1 adequately describes 32 lexemes (ἀναλίσκω, ἀναγκάζω, ἀρμόζω, βαπτίζω, βασανίζω, βεβαιώω, δογματίζω, εὐφραίνω, θλίβω, καθαιρέω + καθαρίζω, καθίστημι, καταξιώω, καταργέω, κατέχω, κολλάω, κοσμέω, κουφίζω, λυπέω, μαθητεύω³²⁷, παιδεύω, πειράζω, πληρώω, σαλεύω, σκανδαλίζω, σκύλλω, στεφανόω, στολίζω, συναλλάσσω, συνίστημι, τaráσσω, φανερώω, ὑποτάσσω), pattern 2 describes 3 lexemes (καταφρονέω, κοινώνω, τάσσω), pattern 3 describes 3–4 lexemes (νήφω, παραβαίνω, τρυφάω, less certainly σχηματίζω³²⁸), pattern 4 describes παράγω, pattern 5 describes αὐξάνω. Four verbs, γυμνάζω, ζωγραφέω, κατορθόω and κεράννυμι, by and large seem to follow pattern 1, but mostly with finite active and non-finite (participle) passive forms. Finally, for two verbs, ἡδάνω and παραμυθίζω, no unambiguous Greek equivalents were found.³²⁹ Consequently, the verbs of pattern 1 constitute about 68% of the labile group. I hypothesize that the share of this type of verbs in the non-labile class may be significantly smaller, as opposed to the pattern 2 and pattern 3 verbs (causative and non-causative verbs with active morphology). A random sample of the prototypes of the Sahidic monodiathetic class, indeed, yields a much larger percentage (50% or more) of these two types of verbs. A full statistical analysis of the non-labile prototypes lies beyond the scope of the present paper. Still, it is evident that this class also contains many pattern-1 verbs which means that Greek bidiathetic verbs were often borrowed in one diathesis only.

Interestingly, however, the set of labile prototypes proves that the reverse situation was also possible, and Greek monodiathetic verbs could acquire a second diathesis in Coptic. It cannot be claimed with certainty regarding the pattern 2 verbs: after all, the visible absence of the non-causative diathesis in Greek may well be an observer-based fault. But for νήφω ‘be sober’, παραβαίνω ‘pass beside / over, transgress’ and τρυφάω ‘live luxuriously, be licentious’, no causative meaning is attested in the whole corpus of the Greek language. Their causative interpretation illustrated in (259–261) must, therefore, have developed within Coptic itself.

327 Κουφίζω and μαθητεύω are represented as labile verbs in Liddell-Scott (1996).

328 Due to very poor attestation in our sources, the diathetic model can be only hypothesized. Moreover, it might well be that any association with the Coptic σχηματίζει is erroneous, since in Coptic, this verb allegedly has a quite different semantics (“bind as a prisoner” according to DDGLC database, as of 26.10.2020).

329 Lefort (1950) derives ρηλαδνη from ἀνδάνω ‘be pleased / please, gratify’. However, ἀνδάνω seems to be attested only in the Classical Ionian prose and poetry (Homerus, Euripides, Hipponax, Herodotus); it is absent from LBG. It is, therefore, an open question if ἀνδάνω can be taken as the source form for ρηλαδνη. The Greek New Testament correlate of ρηλαδνη is συνήδομαι (Romans, 7:22). In its turn, παραμυθίζω seems to be an intra-Coptic formation based on the stem of the Greek παραμυθέομαι, which is not attested in Coptic.

- (259) Pistis Sophia, Book 1, 49b
 αγω **αφνηφε ημοι** ηβι πεκπιν(εγν)α ετνημαϊ
‘And as for your spirit which is with me, it made me sober.’
- (260) White Mon. - Unknown Anaphora 3, part 1, 115, 2-3
 αςχι εβολ ημ πωην ασογωη **ασπαρβα μπκεαδδμ** ημμας
‘She took from the tree, she ate, she made Adam too transgress with her.’
- (261) Hom. Pass. Res. (M.595), 36ν b, 30-37γ a, 1, Chapman (1993:89)
 εωδαμακαριζε αν ηπρωμε ετωοοη ην ταρχη ηπαριστον δε **αφτρυφα**
ηνετααταρμου
‘Someone who is at the beginning of the banquet-speech is not praised because he has delighted his guests.’

The potential ability of a borrowed Greek verb to develop a causative reading in Coptic must probably be considered also for cases outside Sahidic. Thus, it is tempting to give causative interpretation to the otherwise syntactically quite confusing instances of the verb ανεχε ‘endure, suffer’ in the Mesokemic dialect, such as:

- (262) Matthew / Scheide 11:22, ms. 145,13-146,4
 πλην ηχω ημας ηητην δε σενεανεχε ηττυροσ ην τειδων ημ περδλ ητεκρισι
 ηρογαιεστε εροτην
 πλην λεγω υμιν, Τύρω και Σιδωνι ανεκτοτερον εσται εν ημερα κρισεωσ η υμιν.
‘But I tell you, it will be more bearable on the day of judgment for Tyre and Sidon than for you.’

Under the usual (non-causative) interpretation of the predicate, the two cities are represented as the stimulus, and not as the patient, in other words, as the thing to be endured rather than the entity that endures. The causative reading of the verb (“they will make Tyre and Sidon endure... rather than you”) would better correspond to the original sense.

The above analysis leads to the following conclusions: since Greek monodiathetic verbs constitute, at best, less than 15% of the Graeco-Sahidic labile class, there is an evident correlation between lability in Sahidic and the double, causative and non-causative, diathesis of the source verb. However, there is no evidence that lability in Greek triggered lability in Sahidic. Moreover, there is the principal possibility that a monodiathetic (at least, a non-causative) Greek verb can be reinterpreted as a bidiathetic verb in Sahidic which results in its labile usage.

3) Semantic classes of labile verbs

The previous sections have established that lability of the loan verbs is linked to the frequency of the valency change, but presumably is not directly connected to the diathesis of the source verb. Both phenomena are in themselves not decisive and must therefore be side-effects of some semantic selection that defines the grammar of valency increase / reduction for a specific verb. Here I shall try to find the underlying principle of this

selection. Undoubtedly, labile use correlates with *affectedness of the patient* which is manifest in the following groups of labile verbs:

- a) Verbs of feeling or causing an emotion (ἀπορεί ‘be at a loss, confused / confuse’, βασανίζει ‘be tormented / torment’, εὐφρανε ‘be / make glad’, ὀλιβε ‘suffer / make suffer’, λυπεί ‘be / make sad’, παραμυθίζει ‘enjoy / comfort, console’, ταρασσε ‘be disturbed, worried / disturb’, τρυφά ‘delight in / put at ease, make delight’, ἡδανῆ ‘be pleased / please’);
- b) Verbs denoting some change in physical parameters (ἀγζανε ‘grow (intr.) / grow (trans.)’, ἀηραλικκε ‘be consumed, destroyed / consume’, σὴναλλασσε ‘be changed / change’); here also belong the Greek deadjectival verbs βεβαιου ‘be confirmed / confirm’, καθαρι / καθαριζε ‘be clean / clean, purify’, κουφιζε ‘be lightened, reduced / reduce’, πληροϋ ‘be fulfilled, satisfied / fill, satisfy’);
- c) Verbs denoting change in external properties (κονια ‘be whitewashed / whitewash’, κοσμει ‘be decorated / ornate’, στολιζε ‘be dressed / dress’, στεφανου ‘be crowned / crown’);
- d) Verbs with the general meaning of joining or uniting different elements: κολλα ‘glue’, ζαρμοζε ‘unite, join’, σὴνριστα ‘be assembled / assemble’, κερα ‘mix’.

Affectedness of the patient, however, cannot be the decisive criterion, since among the verbs that are not attested in the labile use, there are transitives with affected patient, such as παραδιδου ‘betray’, πατασσε ‘smite’, σταγρου ‘crucify’, αρνα ‘reject, deny’, διωκει ‘pursue, chase’, δοκιμαζε ‘examine, test, ὀλπει ‘care for’, ὀεραπειγε ‘heal’, καταλαλει and διαβαλλε ‘slander’, κατηγορει ‘accuse’, κρινε ‘judge’, κατακρινε ‘condemn’ κωλυε ‘hinder’, αιχμαλωτιζε ‘take captive’, εζωριζε ‘banish, exile’, χειροτονει ‘ordain, elect’, ζομολογει ‘acknowledge, confess’, and many others. Neither does **animacy / inanimacy of the patient** directly determine the mechanism of valency reduction, although a random sample taken from the non-labile group shows that the ratio of the verbs with an inanimate patient to those with an animate one is higher in the labile group (~0.6 in the labile group vs. ~0.3 in the non-labile).³³⁰ A far more essential semantic factor seems to be the necessary presence of an **animate actor** in the semantics of the event, as opposed to a possible spontaneous interpretation. By way of illustration, let us compare two sets of the non-causative correlates of verbs with inanimate patients. The first set consists of verbs attested in the labile alternation; the verbs of the second set belong to the monodiathetic group.

Labile verbs with inanimate patients: ἀηραλικκε ‘vanish, be consumed’, ἀγζανε ‘grow’, βεβαιου ‘be confirmed’, κολλα ‘glue together’, κουφιζε ‘become light’, σαλεγε ‘shake’, σὴνριστα ‘combine’, κερα ‘mix’, ζωγραφει ‘be painted’, σχηματιζε ‘be arranged, bound’;

330 All in all, the verbs with animate, or more precisely human, referents of the second argument constitute the majority in the loan Greek verbal vocabulary, which is indeed a remarkable sociolinguistic fact. One can hypothesize that the restructuring of social relations in the Late Antique Egypt triggered a significant renewal in the corresponding part of the vocabulary.

Monodiathetic verbs with inanimate patients: *ἁγιαζε* ‘consecrate’, *ἀποδιδου* ‘give away’, *ἀποσῆτιζε* ‘learn by heart’, *μισθοῦ* ‘give in lease’, *διοικεῖ* ‘manage’, *ἐμφανιζε* ‘show, produce’, *ἑρμηνεῖ* ‘translate’, *εὑπορεῖ* ‘supply, provide’.

With a few exceptions, the verbs of the first set have two possibilities of interpretation, namely, as a result of a volitional action (of an animate actor) or a spontaneously occurring event. The second interpretation is not available for the verbs of the monodiathetic group. Consequently, spontaneity must be singled out as a factor setting off labile alternation.

In some cases, spontaneity is gained as a result of a specific ‘staging’ of an otherwise agentful verb; this untypical use is the source of the partial lability we mentioned above in 3.5.3.1.

(263) P.MoscowCopt. 55, TM 87164

ἀρι ταγαπῆ ἡβωκ πεσκγλμος ἡτετῆει ερης χε ἡεκκλησια **καταφρονῆ**

‘Please take the trouble to come south, because the churches are neglected.’

(264) White Mon. - Bread-breaking prayer of Patriarch Severus, 182, 12-15

πεινε αγω πεχαρακτηρ ἡτε πῖογτε πῖωτ πρῆνε ἡταϣτ ματε αγω **αφ{α}καταξιοῦ**

‘The image and the representation of God, the Father, incense that has pleased and has proved itself worthy...’

The link between lability and spontaneity forms a remarkable contrast in the way Graeco-Sahidic verbs are marked for voice compared to their Koine prototypes. Greek passive form can mark the non-active voice, whether the verb has a non-causative (spontaneous) meaning, as in (265), or a volitional actor is implied, as in (266). Sahidic prefers a labile form in the first case, and an impersonal passive construction in the second.

(265) Matt. 26:33

Εἰ καὶ πάντες σκανδαλισθήσονται ἐν σοὶ ἐγὼ οὐδέποτε σκανδαλισθήσομαι

εϣχε σενασκανδαλιζε ἡρητκ τηροϣ ἀνοκ δε ἡτηασκανδαλιζε (sic!) ἀν ενεϣ

‘Though they all fall away because of you, I will never fall away.’

(266) 2Cor. 4:9

διωκόμενοι ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἐγκαταλειπόμενοι

εγδιωκε ἡμον ἀλλα εηκκω ἡμον ἀν ἡσωϣ

‘(We are...) persecuted, but not forsaken’

Now, the majority of native lexemes form labile pairs of causative and anticausative counterparts (see 1.3.4.2, 1.3.4.6). In that respect, the valency alternation model of loan verbs aligns with that of the native vocabulary.

The feature of spontaneity has some implications on the aspectual distribution of labile verbs. These implications will be discussed at some length in the next section.

3.5.3.3 Aspect and causativity

Whereas the native Egyptian verbal system displays the morphologically marked opposition between the (non-causative) stative / resultative, the causative eventive,

and the non-causative eventive form, the body of loaned labile verbs does not bear any morphological marking of either aspect, or diathesis. That does not rule out the possibility that the subsystem of loan verbs is sensitive to the interplay of the two categories, but this dependence, if it exists, can only be manifested at the syntactic level. Whether or not a given verb shows the link between aspect and diathesis, can be measured by the respective number of the non-causal tokens of this verb in the durative and the eventive tense patterns. In particular, a high incidence of non-causal tokens of a specific lexeme in durative environment and the absence of such tokens in the eventive pattern would signal aspectual-diathetic patterning similar to the one observed with native verbs.

When applied to the class of labile Greek loan verbs, the above test shows that the verbs of the labile class can be divided in two groups. Slightly more than a half of these verbs (25 lexemes) prove to be aspect- and voice-neutral, similarly to the verbs of class A discussed in 3.5.1.3. This group includes: ἀνηραλικκε, ἀναγκαζε, ἀγζανε, βαπτιζε, καθαρι(ζε), καθιστα, καταζιογ, καταργει, κατεχε, κατορθογ, κολλα, κογφιζε, ληπει, ηηφε, παιδεγε, παραβα, παραγε, πειραζε, πληρογ, σαλεγε, σκανδαλιζε, ταρασσε, φανερογ, ραρμοζε, ρηδανη. In the other group, there are verbs that have very few or no attestations of eventive non-causal usage (βασανιζε, βεβαιογ, ζωγραφει, κερα, κοσμηι, στεφανογ, σχηματιζε) or seem to strongly prefer durative non-causal use over the eventive non-causal one (απορει, γυμναζε, δογματιζε, ενεργει, εγφρανε, ολιβε, καταφρονει, μαθητεγε, παραμυθιζε, σκυλλει, στολιζε, συνριστα, τασσε, τρυφα).

The observed divergence seems to correlate with two semantic features: the possibility of a spontaneous interpretation for the core event and the lexical (a)telicity of the verb. The aspect-neutral non-causatives are telic unergatives (e.g., παιδεγε, παραβα, παραγε) and unaccusatives (e.g., κολλα, κογφιζε, ληπει, ηηφε). Contrastingly, atelic (απορει, βασανιζε, ενεργει) and agentful (ζωγραφει, κοσμηι, στεφανογ) non-causatives show strong preference for durative use. The last type of constraint is far from being self-evident and needs a brief grammatical commentary.

For the purposes of the present research, agentful verbs are non-causative verbs with a necessary volitional, i.e., agentive component in their semantics, although this component may be (and, in the existing attestations, is) never overtly marked. The assessment whether or not a specific verb is agentful, is based solely on its general lexical meaning and is accordingly very rough.³³¹ However, it proves effective for the ensuing analysis. The notion of agentful verbs is based on the following definition provided in Haspelmath (2016):

“*AGENTFUL* is an ad hoc term used here for (potential) verb meanings that refer to processes such as ‘be cut’, ‘be washed’, ‘be beaten’, ‘be thrown’ which are quite difficult to construe as occurring on their own, without an agent, because of agent-oriented manner components in their meaning (i.e. they seem to require reference to an agent in their definition). In this regard, these verb meanings are quite different from unaccusatives such as ‘melt’, ‘sink’, ‘break (intr.)’ and ‘change (intr.)’. We can easily

331 The precise distinction between non-causative and passive predicates is notoriously difficult. See, e.g., the discussion in Kulikov (1998:140 ff.).

talk about wax melting, a boat sinking, a stick breaking, and a person changing without thinking of an agent, but when we talk about cutting, washing and throwing, we seem to necessarily have an agent in mind³³².

According to this definition, the absence of the feature of spontaneity in their semantics distinguishes agentful verbs from unaccusatives and may have a bearing on their respective coding.³³³ If, for instance, a language employs a morphological marking for passive predicates, this marking is more likely to appear on agentful verbs, than on spontaneous non-causatives, although the differences in marking are seldom or never clear-cut in any known language.³³⁴ Perhaps, it would be wrong even to regard spontaneity or its absence as a permanent property of a verbal lexeme; to a greater or lesser degree it is a matter of the overt realization of syntactic arguments and, as a consequence, of a specific reading in every single occurrence. Thus, in Russian, (267) has a spontaneous predicate and is perfectly grammatical, while (268) with the same verb forming a passive predicate violates the norm.

(267) *kniga napisala-s' sama soboj*
 book (NOM) write. PFV:PAST-PASS / ANTICAUS by itself
 'The book was written all by itself'

(268) **kniga napisala-s' Pushkinym*
 book (NOM) write. PFV:PAST-PASS / ANTICAUS Pushkin (INS)
 'The book has been written by Pushkin'

The last example shows that telic past is incompatible with a passive meaning in Russian. However, the sentence turns perfectly grammatical in either of two cases: 1) the finite verbal form is replaced by a **resultative** passive participle with the past auxiliary:

(269) *kniga byla napisana Pushkinym*
 book be:PAST write.PASS.PRT Pushkin (INS)
 'The book has been written by Pushkin'

or 2) the perfective verb is replaced by its **imperfective** (i.e., atelic) counterpart:

(270) *kniga pisala-s' Pushkinym shest' let*
 book (NOM) write.IPFV:PAST-PASS / ANTICAUS Pushkin (INS) six years
 'Pushkin has been writing this book for six years' (lit.: 'The book was being written by Pushkin for six years')

As can be seen from the above examples, Russian verbal grammar makes a link between two semantic parameters, aspect and 'spontaneity' (this last one amounting possibly to the necessary presence of an animate agent in the sememe of the verb). At least, in the past tense, agentful verbs, or agentful-passive counterparts of transitive verbs can be either atelic, or resultative, but never eventive telic (in the common terminology of Russian

332 Haspelmath (2016:36).

333 Haspelmath (2016:40).

334 See Kulikov (1998) for a thorough discussion.

linguistics, *perfective*). Such constellation of features does not look accidental.³³⁵ Indeed, as indicated in Hopper and Thompson (1980), punctuality and telicity of the verb are associated with transitivity and may resist passive interpretation.

If the Graeco-Coptic agentful verbs avoid the eventive conjugation, this may be ascribed to similar reasons. Like Coptic statives, they have the **passive-resultative** reading in the durative conjugation, as in (271-273):

- (271) Great Mysterious, B28, 23-25 (Crégheur 2013:256)

ⲧⲢ ΔⲈ ⲁⲢⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲛⲡⲉⲓⲣⲓⲛⲓ (ΥⲤⲦⲦⲚⲚⲚⲚ) ⲉⲣⲉⲛⲉϣⲏⲁⲑⲏⲦⲏⲤⲢⲤ ⲧⲏⲧⲣⲟϥ ⲃⲟⲟⲗⲉ ⲛⲉϣⲉⲛⲁⲗⲃⲟⲟⲤ
 ⲛⲉⲓⲁⲁϥ **ϩϥⲤⲉⲑⲁⲛⲟϥ** ⲛⲓⲟⲣⲥϥⲛⲏ
 ‘But Jesus performed this mystery while all his disciples were clothed in linen garments and **crowned** with myrtle’

- (272) Theodore, f. 68v a, 13-16 (Müller/Uljas 2019:231)

ⲁϥⲱ ⲛⲉⲣⲉⲡⲓⲁⲃⲟⲗⲟⲤ ϩⲓⲡⲉⲤⲤⲏⲧ ⲛⲧⲡⲉⲛⲛⲏ **ϩϥⲤⲉⲑⲁⲛⲟϥ** ⲛⲟⲉ ⲛⲟϥⲉϣⲏⲁⲗⲟⲤⲟⲤ
 ‘And the devil was underneath the step, **bound** like a prisoner.’

- (273) BL Or. 4868, P.Kru 14

ⲕⲁⲧⲁ ⲧⲉⲓⲡⲣⲁⲥⲓⲤ ⲧⲁⲓ ⲉⲤⲤⲏϩ ⲉⲤⲃⲉⲃⲁⲓⲟϥ ⲉⲤⲟⲩⲏⲱ ϩⲏ ⲟϥϩⲱⲃ ⲛⲟϥⲱⲧ ϩⲓⲧⲟⲟⲧⲏ
 ‘...according to this deed of sale, this one, which is written, **confirmed**, and evened in every single matter by us’

In the eventive conjugation, the same verbs invariably have the causative reading:

- (274) Four Creatures, f. 11v a, 29 - b, 3 (Wansink 1991: 35)

ⲁⲡⲉⲛⲔⲟⲉⲓⲤ ⲕⲉⲗⲉϥⲉ ⲛⲁⲛ ⲉⲤⲣⲉⲛⲧ ⲛⲧⲟⲟⲧⲕ ⲁϥⲱ ⲁⲛⲤⲉⲑⲁⲛⲟϥ ⲛⲓⲟⲕ
 ‘Our lord commanded us that we should help you and we **crowned** you...’

- (275) Theodore, f. 64v a, 6-9 (Müller/Uljas 2019:226)

ⲑⲉⲱⲁⲱⲣⲟⲤ ΔⲈ ⲛⲏ ⲡⲉϥⲕⲉⲱⲃⲏⲣ ⲗⲉⲟⲛⲧⲓⲟⲤ ⲁϥⲤⲏⲏⲏⲁⲧⲓⲥⲉ ⲛⲓⲟϥ
 ‘Then Theodore and his friend Leontios **arranged** him’

- (276) P.Mon.Epiph., Appendix I 7

ⲁⲛⲃⲉⲃⲁⲓⲟϥ ΔⲈ ⲛⲧⲉⲡⲣⲁⲥⲓⲤ ⲛⲧⲁⲡⲉⲛⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲛⲁⲣϣⲓⲉⲡⲓⲕⲟⲛⲟⲤ ⲁⲓⲟⲤⲕⲟⲣⲟⲤ ⲧⲁϩⲟ[ⲥ ⲉ]ⲣⲁⲧⲤ
 ‘...we **confirmed** the act that our father, the archbishop Dioscorus, upheld.’

335 In Latin, as well as in Russian, morphological passives are only compatible with imperfective aspect (‘dicitur’), whereas perfective stems build passives based on resultative participles (‘dictum est’). Spontaneous non-causatives, on the other hand, form regular morphological perfect (‘cado – cecidi ‘fall’). Of course, such data are too scarce to build theories on. Moreover, they get various explanations in terms of each separate language. So, Gerritsen (1988: 132-136, 163-168) argues that the discussed aspectual constraint in Russian is due to that only ‘non-actual’ readings are possible with passives in *-sja*, which cannot cover the peculiarity of Latin verbal paradigm. Interestingly, the cognate Bulgarian *se*-passive form is not aspectually constrained, as opposed to invariably telic periphrastic passive with a resultative participle (see Dimitrova-Vulchanova 2012:950). Clearly, the issue of passive-telicity link is in need of further research; the present parallel of Russian and Graeco-Coptic systems is intended as an illustration only and in itself does not explain the complex phenomenon in question.

On the other hand, the non-causal verbs compatible with eventive conjugation mainly denote spontaneous occurrences.

(277) Amazed, MONB. HB 28 b:24-29 (Cristea 2011:150)

μη ερωσαν πρωμε ει αν εβολ ρη οη **νηαυζανε** ρμη πειμα νρωπιε · η νρη ευσεβης η
νηρ ασεβης ‘Pray tell, if the person were not to exit the womb and **grow up** in this
dwelling place, would he be acting piously or impiously?’

(278) CG 8737 - P.KRU 97, 7-10

απλαβολος ρεϋτ πνωηρε ετημαγ ερωην επκωϋτ αφρωκε νσавηλ δε ανρ πνεγε
νημα ετογααβ ανσπωπιϋ νμον **αφανηαλικε**
‘The devil cast our son into the fire, and he would have burned up, had we not
remembered the holy place, we beseeched him, lest **he would have perished.**’

(279) NHC VII, ParShem 6,23-29

πθαγμα δε ηπ{θαγμα}ογοειν αφνογοϋρ ηπβαρος **αφρκολλα** ετκλοολε ηφγημη
‘And the Astonishment (of the) light cast off the burden. It **stuck** to the cloud of the
Hymen.’

(280) Pistis Sophia, Book 1, 96b

αϋτι παογοϊν ηη ταβον · αϋω αταβον **σαλεγε** ριρωην ημοι ·
‘They took my light and my power. My power **was shaken** inside me.’

The only two exceptions seem to be βαπτιζε ‘be baptized’ and πληροϋ ‘be satisfied’, both of them agentul verbs.

(281) Antiphony, 6, 24-25

νηντα**βαπτιζε** επεϋτ · αϋτ ηπεϋτ ριωοϋ ·
‘Those who **have been baptized** to Christ, they have taken Christ upon them.’

(282) Pushkin Museum I.1.b.682, P.MoscowCopt. 1

αιχι **απληροϋ ητοοτκ** ρα πεφο[ρ]οϋ ητσε[ρειωρε]
‘I have received and I **have been satisfied by you** for the rent of the aroura of
land...’

If a verb allows for both a passive and a spontaneous interpretation, these may eventually become quite dissimilar, as in the case of **εϋϋριστα** which means ‘be constituted’ as a (non-spontaneous) resultative and ‘thicken’ as (spontaneous) eventive verb:

(283) Berliner “Koptisches Buch”, 69 (Schenke Robinson 2004:139)

εϋϋρ[η]ριστα εβολ [ρμη πεσν]αϋ τεϋϋϋ[η] ηη πωμα
‘...**being constituted** out of both the soul and the body...’

(284) P.Méd.Copt. IFAO, 246-247, Chassinat (1921:238)

οϋηπλαστρον ετβε νεωω αλοϋ αμημονιακοϋ (δραχηη) η λϋθαλγηρον (δραχηη) δ
στεππεριαϋ (δραχηη) ηε οϋλακ ηνεϋ (η)ηε πεστοϋ καλωϋ **ϋαντεϋϋνηριστα**
‘A plaster against psora: desert salt: (drachm) 8, litharge: (drachm) 4, alum:
(drachm) 15, a small bowl of olive oil: Boil them well, until they **thicken.**’

The second category of aspect-sensitive labiles are the verbs whose non-causative counterpart is atelic. Depending on the lexeme, this feature can be less or more persistent. Thus, rather unpredictably, ἀπορεῖ ‘be confused’ may at times read as ‘become confused’, whereas βασανίζε ‘be in pains’ is attested in the atelic reading only.

(285) Hom. Pass. Res. (M.595), 34v a,21-25, Chapman (1993:87)

ΝΤΕΡΕΠΙΛΑΤΟΣ ΔΕ ΑΠΟΡΕΙ ΝΗΤΗΜΕΝ ΑΠΟΛΟΓΙΑ ΕΧΩ ΑΦΝΕΧ ΤΛΟΙΘΕ ΕΧΝ ΝΙΟΥΓΔΑΙ
 ‘And when Pilate **was dumbstruck** and was unable to find any response to speak,
 he cast blame on the Jews...’

(286) NHC XIII, Protенnoia, 43, 27-29

ΤΟΤΕ ΔΥΟΥΩΩΒ̄ Ν̄ΒΙ Ν̄ΔΥΝΑΜΙΣ ΕΥΧΩ Μ̄ΜΟΣ ΔΕ ΔΝΟΝ ΖΩΩΝ Τ̄Ν̄ΡΑΠΟΡΙ ΕΤΒΗΤΥ` ΔΕ
 ἸΠ̄ἸΜΕ ΔΕ ΠΑ ΝΙΜ ΠΕ
 ‘Then, the powers responded, saying, “**we, too, are puzzled** about this, for we did
 not know to whom it belongs.’

(287) P.Méd.Copt. IFAO 362, Chassinat (1921:297)

ΟΥΒΑΛ ΕΥΒΑΣΑΝΙΖΕ ΚΑΛΟΣ ΕΦΟ Ν̄ΖΡΕΥΝΑ
 ‘An eye that **hurts** very much while it suffers from flux...’

The causatives of atelic labiles are not aspectually restricted and occur in both eventive and durative conjugations.

The constraints on the conjugation pattern apply not only to atelic labile verbs, but also to several atelic monodiathetics, such as κινδυνεύε ‘be in danger, be liable’, νηστεύε ‘fast’, κατοικί ‘dwell’, χρεώσται ‘be indebted, owe’ and some others. Being compatible with durative pattern only, these verbs are structurally equivalent to Egyptian stative verbs, e.g., прѣсрѣст ‘be stiff’, λούφε ‘be prone to fall, decadent’.

(288) Hom. Pass. Res. (M.595), 28v a,32-28v b,2, Chapman (1993:80)

ΤΠΟΛΙΣ ΕΤΕΜΝ ΡΩΜΕ ΝΗΤΙΣ ΠΡΟ ΕΤΑΡΧΕΙ ΕΧΩΣ ΚΥΝΔΥΝΕΥΕ ΔΕ ΝΝΕΝΒΑΡΒΑΡΟΣ
 ΤΟΡΠΙΣ ΝΤΟΟΥΤΥ
 ‘The king who rules over the city with nobody in it **is in danger**, lest the barbarians
 capture it from him.’

(289) Encomium on John the Baptist, Budge (1913:131)

ΕΩΩΠΕ ΕΥΩΔΑΝΒΩΚ ΝΑΥ ΕΥΝΗΣΤΕΥΕ ἸΤΕΙΞΕ • ΣΕΝΑΣΩΩΜ̄ Ἰ ΤΕΞ̄ἸΗ •
 ‘If they go while **fasting** like this, they shall faint on the road’

(290) Pistis Sophia, Book 2, 233b³³⁶

ΑΥΩ ΝΕΤ̄ΠΩΔ ἸΝ̄ΜΥΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ ΕΤΚΑΤΟΙΚΙ ἸΜ̄ ΠΑΤΩΔΔΕ ΕΡΟΥ • ΕΤΕἸΤΟΟΥ <Ν>Ε
 ΕΤΕἸΠΟΥΠΡΟΕΛΘΕ ΕΒΟΛ •
 ‘And those who are worthy of mysteries which **dwell** in the Ineffable which did not
 come forth’

336 The verb ‘dwell’ is attested from one source only, Pistis Sophia; the aspectual restrictions on this lexeme are in need of further clarification.

(291) BL Or. 4879 - P.KRU 16

αΚΗ ρΕΝΑϢΦΑΛΙΑ ΔΒΟΛ ΕΡΟΙ ΕΡΕΞΡΑΧΗΛ ΤΑϢϢΙΜΕ **ΧΡΕΟϢΤΕ** ΝΗΚ ΝΩΜΟΥΝ ΝΤΡΜΗϢΙΟΝ
 ‘You have brought forth certain declarations of indebtedness against me (showing)
 that Rachel my wife **owes** you eight trimesia.’

We can now summarize the aspectual properties of Greek-origin verbs and compare them with those of native verbs. As we remember, Coptic has one labile verb form, absolute infinitive, that has three functions:

intransitive eventive infinitive	α-ϣ-ΟΥΩΝ	‘he / it opened’ (anticausative)
transitive eventive infinitive	α-ϣ-ΟΥΩΝ Μ-Π-ΡΟ	‘he opened the door’
transitive durative infinitive	ϣ-ΟΥΩΝ Μ-Π-ΡΟ	‘he opens the door’

This form can never function as resultative.

The distribution of Graeco-Coptic labiles looks different. Depending on whether the verb is interpreted as spontaneous or agentive, it includes the following functions.

Spontaneous verbs:

intransitive eventive infinitive	α-ϣ-ΔΝΖΔΛΙΚΕ	‘he / it was consumed’
transitive eventive infinitive	α-ϣ-ΔΝΖΔΛΙΚΕ ΜΜΟ=ϣ	‘he consumed it’
intransitive durative infinitive (often with resultative reading)	ϣ-ΔΝΖΔΛΙΚΕ	‘he is (being) consumed’
transitive durative infinitive	ϣ-ΔΝΖΔΛΙΚΕ ΜΜΟ=ϣ	‘he consumes it’

Agentive verbs:

transitive eventive infinitive	α-ϣ-ϢΤΕΦΔΝΟΥ ΜΜΟ=ϣ	‘he crowned him’
intransitive durative infinitive (resultative)	ϣ-ϢΤΕΦΔΝΟΥ	‘he is crowned’
transitive durative infinitive	ϣ-ϢΤΕΦΔΝΟΥ ΜΜΟ=ϣ	‘he crowns him’

The functional patterns of native Egyptian and Greek forms do not coincide. Rather, Coptic conjugation patterns function as derivational templates that modify the general meaning of a Greek lexeme, as they do with native stems. Whether a certain lexeme is compatible with either conjugation pattern, is defined by the semantic properties of the lexeme, namely, agentivity / spontaneity and telicity / atelicity.

3.5.3.4 Class C: Summary

Loan verb lability: general parameters

The class of labile verbs constitutes a minority among all attested Greek verbal lexemes in Sahidic. The core of this class are some 8-9 verbs that are equally often used as causatives and non-causatives, irrespective of the corpus. The rest are mostly partially labile verbs,

i.e., causatives with sporadic non-causative usages in specific corpora, or vice versa. At present, there are altogether 54 lexemes attested in labile use in Sahidic. However, new data might expand this list, since the very irregularity of labile usages proves the mechanism of lability to be productive in this dialect.

The non-active alternants in the labile pairs belong to two diathetic classes: non-causatives and passives. Passive lability is not unusual in African languages³³⁷, occasional labile pairs of active-passive meaning are also attested in the native vocabulary of Coptic. Yet, the majority of the labile class, for loan verbs, as well as for native ones, consists of causative-anticausative pairs.

Only syntactically transitive verbs (with one possible exception of $\kappa\omicron\iota\kappa\omega\upsilon\eta\iota$ ‘be shared / partake in’) participate in labile alternation. The rest of bi- and trivalent verbs employ morphosyntactic instruments of valency change. These alternative instruments are the so-called ‘impersonal passive construction’ and the causative prefix $\tau\pi\epsilon-$. The first one is used to demote the agent by inserting an impersonal 3rd person plural pronoun in subject position. Thus, it does not reduce the syntactic valency of the verb, but effectively reduces the semantic one, yielding a passive reading. The causative prefix increases the valency adding a causer. Any of the two mechanisms can be used alternatively to lability, as can possibly also suppletion, which is however rather difficult to trace down. Some lexemes allow for several valency-changing tools. Such is the case of $\chi\eta\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\kappa\epsilon$ ‘submit to’.

There is no evident correlation between the membership in the labile class and the morphosyntactic properties of the prototype lexeme in the source language. Rather, lability correlates with the possibility of spontaneous interpretation of the event coded by the verbal lexeme. In other words, for a loan verb to be labile, the core event must be construable with, as well as without an animate actor. The animacy of the second actant does not seem to play any role, although primary tests show that inanimate patients are more likely to form labile pairs, than monodiathetic ones. In some cases, such as $\eta\eta\phi\epsilon$ ‘to make / become sober’, Sahidic creates a causative doublet to an originally monodiathetic non-causative Greek verb. One side effect of lability is an approximately equal number of causative and non-causative tokens of the same lexeme.

Semantic classes of labile verbs

Some of labile verbs can be sorted into various semantic classes, such as verbs of causing / experiencing an emotion, verbs of change in physical parameters or external properties, verbs with general meaning of joining. This classification must be considered tentative, due to semantic diversity of the class; yet, it has cross-linguistic parallels. So, according to Gianollo (2014), verbs meaning ‘to join’ and its opposite, and verbs meaning ‘to change’, ‘to become different’, among them deadjectival verbs, constitute a large part of the labile inventory in Late Latin³³⁸. There are also some intersections with the semantic classes of labiles listed in Letuchiy (2010:248). On the other hand, the absence of motion and spatial

337 See Cobbinah & Lüpke (2009) for Mande languages, Letuchiy (2006) for typological analysis and some specific examples.

338 Gianollo (2014:971 ff.).

configuration verbs in Graeco-Coptic labile inventory is not very meaningful, since such verbs are generally underrepresented among the loan verbal forms.

αρχει: issue of phasal verb lability

Similarly, almost no phasal verbs were loaned to Coptic from Greek. The only instance of a phasal verb seems to be αρχει / αρχεσθαι ‘begin’. A unique morphosyntactic behavior of this verb has earned it a separate section in W.-P. Funk’s survey of the diathesis of Greek loan verbs in Coptic.³³⁹ According to Funk, the Southern dialects have adopted the form~meaning dichotomy between the active and the passive voice: ἄρχειν ‘rule’ vs. ἄρχεσθαι ‘begin’ that had developed in Koine. Later on, however, the suffixed form has eventually been replaced by the shorter one even in the phasal meaning, which, as Funk claims, was rather the result of “scrupulous editing”, rather than of a natural linguistic process.

To this account, a few details concerning the diathesis of both verbs must be added. In Sahidic, αρχει ‘rule’ and αρχει / αρχεσθαι ‘begin’ function as homonyms. αρχει as ‘rule’ is monodiathetic active, whereas αρχει and αρχεσθαι as phasal verbs are bidiathetic, mostly reading as ‘start doing something’, but also possible in the spontaneous meaning ‘have a beginning, start being’.

Spontaneous:

- (292) Nag Hammadi Codex V, (Second) Apocalypse of James, 58, 11-13

αυω παλιν εφετ [ἰνογ]αωκ εβολ ἡτε ηη [ετ]αγρ̄αρχει ἡἰν ογαρχη ἡτε ηη ετνααωκ εβολ•

*‘And furthermore, he shall furnish an ending of the things which **have begun**, and a beginning of the things which are to end.’*

- (293) Wisdom of Jesus Christ, 96, 5-8, Till/Schenke (1972:232)

εβολ γαρ εἰ πἰνουτε ααρχεσθαι ἡβι τἡἡτνουτε ηἡ τἡἡττρο

*‘For with this god, the godliness and dominion **began**...’*

Active:

- (294) To Herai, 385 (Kuhn 1956:102, 34)

απρωμε αρχει ἡκωτ. ἡπἡεωσἡσომ εαοκἡ εβολ•

*‘This man **started** building but was not able to complete it.’*

- (295) Apologia de incrudelitate, Crum (195:38)

ἡἡτε[ρ]επαγριος αυω πκἡνηγος ουβε [η]ααιμων αββα εγαγριος αρ[χ]εσθαι εταγε νεεβηγε ἡπογα πογα ἡἡααιμων εἡ νεφεφαλλιον αααοος αε

*‘...when the saint and the huntsman of the demons, Abba Evagrius, **began** narrating the works of each and everyone of the demons in his Kephalaia, he said...’*

339 Funk (2017:380-381).

- (296)
- Historia Ecclesiastica*
- , Orlandi (1968:42)

ⲁϤⲣⲁⲛⲉ ⲁϤⲱ ⲁϤϤⲁⲓ ⲉⲁϤⲁⲣⲭⲉⲓ ⲉⲛϤϤⲛⲧⲁⲒⲛⲁ ⲉⲧⲟϤⲁⲁⲃ
 ‘he rejoiced and wrote, **starting** with holy treatises...’

- (297) Colluthus, f. 96v, Chapman / Depuydt (1993:39)

ⲧⲓⲛⲁⲁⲣⲭⲓϤⲟⲉ ⲉⲓⲛⲉⲕⲉⲕⲱⲙⲓⲟⲛ ⲕⲁⲧⲁ ⲑⲉ ⲛⲧⲁⲓⲉϤⲧⲥ ⲭⲟⲣⲛⲉⲓ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲗⲁϤ ⲉⲧⲟⲁⲗⲃ
 ‘...I will **begin** your encomium according as Christ has provided me with my
 humble tongue.’

As can be seen from the above examples, the relation between the active and the spontaneous meaning of $\alpha\rho\chi\epsilon\iota$ is not the canonical causative one. Letuchiy (2013) shows that agentivity is neither necessarily present in the sememe of the active verb ‘to begin (something)’, nor necessarily absent from the sememe of the spontaneous ‘to start’. Thus, the phrase ‘the sermon started’ does not mean that the sermon started all by itself, whereas ‘the city began its growth by 200 B.C.’ or ‘the union began to fall apart’ lacks an agent. However, in many languages, such as Russian, phasal verbs are coded as transitives, due to a certain semantic affinity between the phasal and the causative type of diathetic variation.³⁴⁰ Not so in Sahidic. Here, apart from two occurrences, both of them in the Discourse of the Eighth and the Ninth (Nag Hammadi Codex VI), $\alpha\rho\chi\epsilon\iota$ / $\alpha\rho\chi\epsilon\iota\theta\alpha\iota$ is not attested within the transitive valency pattern. It mostly takes ϵ - with nominal arguments, ϵ - or η - with sentential actants.³⁴¹ Consequently, the diathetic variance shown by this verb differs from the labile one.

Aktionsart of loan verbs

The idea that the native Egyptian verbal vocabulary is not uniform with respect to its aspectual properties is advocated in Reintges (2015). Based on the morphological distinctions observed in the j -radical stems in the durative and the eventive environment, verbal stems are divided into *aspect-neutral* and *bi-aspectual*.³⁴² The bi-aspectual verbs have morphologically distinct perfective and imperfective stems, whereas the aspect-neutral verbs use the same stem in various TAM patterns. A similar distinction, with some modifications, applies to Coptic, where the aspect-neutral verbs like $\rho\alpha\rho\epsilon\zeta$ ‘guard’ can be used indifferently in both conjugation patterns, whereas the bi-aspectual verbs like $\sigma\gamma\omega\omega\zeta$ ‘reveal / appear’ have restrictions in aspect and diathesis. Thus, morphology has been instrumental in tracing down aspectual distinctions in native verbs. There exists, however, the danger of a logical fallacy that we commit, if we consider morphology to be not an important symptom, but rather the trigger of aspectual asymmetries. In fact, the aspect value of a verb is defined by its specific semantic traits that become manifest, inter alia, through the compatibility properties of the verb. The morphological immutability

340 For a profound discussion, see Letuchiy (2013:170 ff.).

341 The choice of a preposition appears to be related to the morphological shape of the verb. $\alpha\rho\chi\epsilon\iota$ is more frequent with η -, and $\alpha\rho\chi\epsilon\theta\alpha\iota$, with ϵ -. In Coptic, η - typically marks the infinitival part of modal predicates, whereas phasal verbs usually take circumstantial clauses as complements.

342 Reintges (2015:417).

of Greek loan verbs does not mean that they are all aspect-neutral. If a certain lexeme is predominantly used within the durative conjugation, it is a clear enough sign that this lexeme has an inherent atelic aspect / *Aktionsart*.

ΒΑΘΑΝΙΖΕ ‘suffer, be in pain’ is the most transparent instance of an interdependence between the syntactic and the lexical aspect. All the non-causal tokens of this verb attested in the DDGLC data base occur in the durative conjugation which means that the lexeme was strictly atelic in Sahidic. Interestingly, the almost synonymous ληπει ‘grieve’ is aspect-neutral. Thus, beside the most general semantic idea, each verb has a specific shade of meaning that must be considered in translation.

Verbs of atelic *Aktionsart* are found among the monodiathetic group, as well as among the labile class. Atelic monodiathetics are identified by the same criterion of compatibility we applied to the labile group. They are mostly confined to the Bipartite conjugation, thus constituting a structural parallel to non-resultative statives of the native vocabulary, such as οηζ ‘live’. Some such instances are ηηστηγε ‘fast’, παρამεινε ‘stay, linger’, μελε ‘be of concern’, χρεωσται ‘owe’, σπαταλα ‘live wantonly’, ταλλιπωρει ‘be unhappy’, ζγηρηται ‘serve’.

Aspectual constraints on the agentful verbs

Further on, aspectual construals are different for the non-causatives denoting spontaneous events (here belongs the majority of the labile group) and those with an obligatory agent participant in their semantic structure, i.e., agentful or passive verbs. Passive verbs generally seem to avoid eventive conjugation, though exceptions (βαπτιζε ‘be baptized’, πληροζ ‘be satisfied’) are possible. Thus, a causative-passive labile verb will mostly have a causative reading in the Tripartite conjugation, whereas the Bipartite is compatible with both the causative and the passive reading. Causative-anticausative labile verbs, on the contrary, are not liable to any aspectual or diathetic constraints.

The aspectual divergence between spontaneous and passive verbs is not unique to loan verbs in Coptic. One can observe similar developments in Russian and Latin (see Polinsky 2001). Why, despite the semantic affinity between anticausative and passive voice, an anticausative verb has more chances to be coded with the punctual aspect, than an agentful / passive one, is as yet unclear.

In neither case does the distribution of a loan verb form match that of a native one. The functional field of an anticausative labile verb is broader than that of a native absolute infinitive, since it includes also the stative-resultative function. A labile verb with a passive alternant occupies the same paradigmatic slots as the native marked forms, namely, the causative eventive and the non-causative durative slot. However, it also has a causative durative reading which is only possible with the native absolute infinitive.

Similarly to the native verbal subsystem, the lability inside the eventive conjugation is available, as a rule, to causative-anticausative verbs, but not for causative-passive verbs. Thus, aspect-diathesis correlation is ultimately defined by identical semantic principles for both loan and native verbs.

3.6 Greek verbs in Sahidic: voice and aspect system (summary)

Taken together, the results of the present study suggest that the Graeco-Sahidic verbal subsystem represents a near-final stage of transition from morphological to templatic voice marking. Indeed, the Greek middle-passive suffix morpheme in Sahidic is an extremely rare marker occurring in the following cases:

- 1) It is retained on several verbal lexemes that function as deponents in Koine Greek, mostly co-occurring with non-transitive valency patterns (see 3.5.2.2, Table 8);
- 2) In the older text corpora (NHC), the suffix marks the non-causative member of a given voice opposition; the shorter form is unmarked for voice, i.e., may usually have a causative, as well as a non-causative / passive reading (see 3.5.1.1, Table 7);
- 3) It is also occasionally employed in newer texts, mostly in the documentary ones; this use of the suffix morpheme may be completely unwarranted by the morphological properties of the source lexeme (cf., e.g., ἀνηκεῖσθαι and ἀνήκω ‘belong’), but seems to be triggered by (or, at any rate, correlate with) various semantic and syntactic factors, such as the stative aspect of the predicate, agent-preserving valency reduction (alias detransitivization), the component of the agent’s affectedness / involvedness in the semantics of the verb.

The above list highlights two important points. Firstly, the sporadic flashings of the middle-suffix in the later texts rather support the idea that, despite being confined to non-standard variants of Sahidic, this form might not, after all, have been the result of an intra-dialectal influence, but might be a vestige of a more archaic state inside Sahidic itself. One could argue that documentary texts occasionally recurred to the suffixed form in order to maintain the conservative character of the legal idiom.³⁴³ Secondly, it should be emphasized that the use of the morpheme does not seem to be as accidental as it is commonly believed. Its permanent association with the non-causal semantics and the intransitive syntax indicates a great degree of affinity with its Greek prototype. It would not, therefore, be too far-fetched to assume that the Greek voice morphology had been initially borrowed into Sahidic by way of *parallel system borrowing* (in the sense that it consequently applied to the loan verbal vocabulary in the meaning close to that of the source language) and then eventually faded and disappeared under the pressure of native valency-changing mechanisms. Such an idea seems to me to provide a better (at least, more economical) explanatory frame for the occurrences of the suffix in Sahidic, than the presently advocated point of view, according to which the voice morpheme was randomly lexicalized in the process of borrowing and did not ever code the oppositions of voice.³⁴⁴

343 This explanation is, however, rejected by T.S. Richter (p.c.), according to whom it is highly improbable that an archaic form would appear in a corpus so late (VI C.E.) and so closely linked to the Greek legal code.

344 Such an opinion is expressed, e.g., in Grossman & Richter (2017:221). Funk (2017:378) takes this to be true for Bohairic. This would, of course, essentially weaken our hypothesis regarding Sahidic, for it is unlikely that the two dialects should pursue different policies in so crucial a thing.

Labile lexemes with morphological passive alternants (ἀναπαύε, πειθῶ, πλανά, ὠφελεῖ) represent, as it were, a battlefield of the two rivalling strategies for valency reduction. The ultimate decline of the morphological strategy might have been connected with the functional fuzziness of the suffix morpheme. Indeed, with some lexemes and corpora, it may mark the combination of a non-causative reading with the stative aspect and the present tense (as is obviously the tendency with πλανάσθαι ‘err’ in NHC II, VII and IX), yet in other cases it would preferably mark the eventive passive (see πειθῆσθαι ‘obey, be persuaded’ in NHC VI & VII, and in Codex Tchacos). The source of this fuzziness must be the absence of isomorphism between the Coptic and the Greek voice category.³⁴⁵ In Coptic, the Greek passive voice morpheme may mark the combination of the passive voice with the stative aspect, i.e., the combination that is morphologically distinguished in Coptic, or else it may follow the Greek categorial distinctions and mark the passive voice, irrespectively of the aspect (which seems to be the most frequent situation). Moreover, the case of πειθῆσθαι proves that sometimes the passive suffix may be interpreted as an alternative to the native templatic voice marking; here it marks the combination of passive voice and non-stative aspect, i.e., precisely that combination which is unmarked in the native verbal grammar.

Generally, the means of valency alternation for Greek loan verbs comprise templatic lability, the remnants of the morphological marking, and the syntactic tools, i.e., valency increase through the causativizing prefix τρε-, and valency reduction through the ‘impersonal passive’ construction. It is difficult to assess the relative frequency of the templatic vs. the syntactic alternation. It must be noticed, however, that the templatic alternation was applied to a relatively limited number of lexemes, between 60 and 70 in the whole corpus of Sahidic attested in the DDGLC data base. Such solid literary corpora, as Shenoute’s Canons or the Sahidic New Testament, make use of 8 to 16 loan labile lemmata, all in all. Many verbs of the labile class display an asymmetric, or partial lability, in other words, they are basically monodiathetic verbs with sporadic valency changes. Thus, in the loan part of the Sahidic verbal vocabulary, the mechanism of lability was productive, but rather irregular.

Lability seems to be the main strategy of voice alternation for such loan verbs whose semantics does not include an obligatory animate / volitional actor. This tendency of Coptic largely corroborates the observation made in Smith (1970) and reiterated in Levin & Rappaport-Hovav (1995):

“The transitive causative verbs that detransitivize are those in which the eventuality can come about spontaneously, without the volitional intervention of an agent.”³⁴⁶

As shown in 3.5.3.2, the group of labile Graeco-Sahidic verbs comprises also several lexemes with a volitional agent construed in the semantics of the verb, such as ζωγραφεῖ ‘paint’, καθίστα ‘appoint’, κοσμεῖ ‘adorn’, στεφανοῦ ‘crown’ etc. These, however, are

345 This issue is discussed at length in 3.4.

346 Levin & Rappaport-Hovav (1995:102).

mostly avoided in the eventive conjugation; similarly to Egyptian stative forms, these verbs are employed in the durative conjugation with a resultative meaning.

Besides spontaneous verbs with inanimate patients, the class of labile verbs includes quite a few verbs with animate patients. Their semantics can be subsumed under the notion of spontaneity, if we define spontaneity as the property of an event that does not result from a volitional activity of an agent. A large part of these verbs consists of the verbs denoting an emotion (εΥΦΡΑΝΕ ‘enjoy’, ΤΡΥΦΑ, ΖΗΛΔΑΝΗ ‘delight in’, ΛΥΠΕΙ ‘be sad’, ΒΑΣΑΝΙΖΕ ‘be in pain’, σκΥλλει, τΑρασσε ‘be troubled’ etc.) or the verbs with a component of ‘unintentional’ in their semantics (ΑΝΑΓΚΑΖΕ ‘be compelled’, ΠΛΑΝΑ, ΠΑΡΑΒΑ, ΠΑΡΑΓΕ ‘err’, σΚΑΝΔΑΛΙΖΕ ‘stumble, be offended’). If the non-causative reading of an active transitive verb with an animate patient excludes spontaneity, this verb does not, as a rule, form a labile counterpart. Exceptions, such as ΒΑΠΤΙΖΕ ‘baptize’, ΚΑΘΙΣΤΑ ‘appoint’, ΠΛΗΡΟΥ ‘satisfy’, are scarce. Labile causativization of these verbs (e.g., *ΑΦΑΠΑΤΑ ΜΗΟΣ as ‘he made her deceive’) does not take place, because the core event already has a volitional actor. Yet another category of verbs that are resistant to lability, are the verbs denoting some kind of mental activity, such as ΔΙΣΤΑΖΕ ‘hesitate’, ΜΕΤΑΝΟΕΙ ‘repent’, ΕΠΙΝΟΕΙ ‘perceive, conceive’ etc. The difference in the treatment of these verbs as opposed to the verbs of emotional change must mean that Coptic conceives the performer of a mental activity as more agent-like compared to a subject of an emotional change. This interpretation is in congruence with the observations made in Tsunoda (1985). According to Tsunoda, verbs of knowledge (‘know’, ‘understand’) tend to map onto transitive structures more frequently, than verbs of feeling (‘like’, ‘fear’). One could possibly extend Tsunoda’s analysis to all verbs of mental activity, as possessing – to a certain degree – semantics of volition or control.

The absence of aspect-encoding morphology makes syntagmatic features the sole criterion of aspectual constraints on loan verbs. The present study has found two kinds of such constraints, namely, two semantic properties that confine the verb to the durative conjugation pattern, turning it into a structural analogue of stative. The strong preference for the durative conjugation is typical for: 1) monodiathetic intransitive verbs with atelic *aktionsart*, mostly denoting a certain way of life or behavior; 2) non-active members of a labile pair with agentful (i.e., passive proper) meaning. In this last case, the form, as a rule, has resultative reading. Outside these cases, no direct analogy can be established between any of the Coptic verbal forms and the Greek infinitive in terms of their distribution (see 3.5.3.5). Thus, rather than following some formal criteria in the adaptation of loan verbs, Coptic applies to them the same grammatical principles that define the distribution of native forms.

Appendix 1. Morphology ~ diathesis correlation in Greek loan verbs

ἀπολαύε - ἀπολαύεσθαι

Besa Codex F - Fr. 40 - Fragment, Paris 130.5,127r, Kuhn (1956:129)

ἦταρει ὡδρωτῆ χεκακ εφνααπολαυε ἦνετῆπιγη ετωογο εβολ ἦογελος•

'he came to you in order that he might enjoy your fountains which pour forth sweetness'

BL Pap 78 - P.Mon.Phoib.Test. 4, 25-26, Garel 2020

μη ογειωτε μμοῦῶ εωμῆ πεγειβε λγω εγαπολαυεσθαι εβολ ρῆ ἦἡαγαθο[η] ἦατωαχε εροογ

'and a drop of water to quench their thirst and enjoy the good things which words cannot describe'

ἀρνα - ἀρνεσθαι

Paris - Bibliothèque Nationale Copte 78.16-17 - Martyrdom of Apa Colluthus 17r, G. Schenke (2013:90-91)

πετνααρνα μμοι μπιτο εβολ ἦἡρωμε †αρνα μμογ ρω μπιτο εβολ μπαιωτ ετῆῆ μπειγε ἦἡ νεφαγγελος ετογααβ•

'Whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my father which is in heaven, and His holy angels'

Nag Hammadi Codex VII - Second Treatise of the Great Seth, 52, (Riley 1996:154)

ἦπιραρνεσθαι μεν ναγ• λγω ετραωπε ἦογῆρσ•

'While, on the one hand, I did not reject them, and so became (the) Messiah...'

διαστελλε - διαστελλεσθαι

P.KRU 48, 15-17

νητετηρ πχοεις νημερος μμα ντανδιασταλε μμογ νητην νηπε

that-PRF-1PL-'specify' DO-3PL

'and become owner of the place-shares which we have specified for you (pl.) above'

Pierpont Morgan M.579, Encomium on St. Antony, f.78v b

ναι οη νταφδιαστε<λλε>σθαι ετβηητογ εφναμογ λγω αφκααγ νκληρονομει<α>

νηεφειοτε μη νεφωηρε

'And about these he gave precise instructions as he was about to die, and he left them as an inheritance to his fathers and his children'

μαρτυρει - μαρτυρεσθαι

ParShem, 26, Wisse (1996:78)

εσῆμαρτυρι ἦνετογααβ ἦτε τῆῆτ `νοσ

'bearing witness to the holy things of the greatness'

Or. 4885 Ro - P.KRU 59, Crum (1912)

αἰπαρακαλεῖ νηενρωμε ναζιοπιστος αἰμαρτυρεσθαι ερος

'I have asked trustworthy men who have testified to it'

P.KRU 69, Crum (1912)

αἰπαρακαλε νουρεφσζαι μη ζενκοϋμντρε ετρε<γ>μαρτηρεσθαι ζαροι

'I have furthermore beseeched a subscriber and witnesses that <they> might testify on my behalf'

πρασσε - πραττεσθαι

MONB.FY - Historia Ecclesiastica Coptica, Orlandi (1968-70 I,22)

πεκειωτ γαρ π̄ρο αϋρπογραφη ετεφκαθερεσις αϋω αϋπ<ρ>ασσε ἡμοϋ ρι πεπαρχος

'For your father, the emperor, signed his excommunication and he enacted this through the governor'

BL Pap 78 - P.Mon.Phoib.Test. 4, 22-26, Garel (2020)

επειδ̄η μαγκοτου {μα} εβολ εϋρ̄ ρωβ̄ επ̄ετ̄νᾱνο̄γγ̄ αϋω εϋπρατεσθαι ετ̄δικαιωσ̄υνη
ἡνεροοῡ τηροῡ ἡπεϋωηε

'Since they do not turn away from their laboring towards what is good, and their practicing righteousness through all the days of their life'

σιχανε - σιχανεσθαι

ParShem, 45,3, Wisse (1996:116)

ϋναρ̄ ραε̄ ἡϋπ̄ηρε• οϋν̄ ραε̄ ναρ̄σιχανε ἡμοϋ

He will perform many wonders. Many will loathe him

ParShem, 2, 23-24, Wisse (1996:28)

αϋναϋ εϋνοσ̄ ἡμοοῡ ἡκακε• αϋω αϋρ̄σιχανεσθαι

And he saw a great, dark water. And he was nauseated

Appendix 2. Non-alternating Greek loan verbs

The table contains active-stem loan verbs that do not display causative alternation in Sahidic. This class is represented by two groups: 1) *hapax legomena* that are *a priori* attested in one diathesis only; 2) well-attested non-labile verbs. The absence of causative alternation in the first group may be accidental. Therefore, keeping the two groups apart seemed to be a more accurate approach. The list does not include uncertain restorations of *hapax legomena* (such as [ΔΠΟ]ΓΕΙΛ[Ε] for ἀποτίλλω ‘pull, pluck out’). Omitted are also such verbs that are not attested in a finite form and predicative function. These may appear in Coptic as participles (e.g., <πλύνω> ΠΕΠΛΗΜΜΕΝΗΣ ‘rinsed’), nominal derivations (e.g., <προσεδρεύω> Τ-ΣΙΝ-ΠΡΟΣΕΥΔΡΕΥΕ), or parts of multi-word expressions and formulae (e.g., <γίγνομαι> ΜΗ ΓΕΝΟΙΤΟ, <χαίρω> ΧΑΙΡΕ).

The two rightmost columns supply the argument structure (excluding A- and P-arguments) and the basic diathesis of each verb. Generally, however, the argument structure of a loan verb seems to be less fixed than that of an average native verb. Some verbs can take direct objects, as well as non-transitive prepositional phrases. Such is the case of ΔΙΩΚΕΙ ‘pursue, chase’ which, if my observations are correct, tends to be transitive in the past tense and intransitive in the present tense. In this and other cases of diathetic non-causative alternation, the diathesis of the verb is marked as ‘(in)transitive’ in the table. The term ‘reflexive’ is applied to cases where the position of DO can only be occupied by a reflexive pronoun which therefore constitutes a formal marker of the intransitive diathesis.

Notation:

DO : the argument corresponding to the direct object of the English equivalent

dath. eth. : dativus ethicus, here used in the same sense Hebrew grammarians use to describe the construction of the type: “lekh-lekha”, lit.: “go to yourself”, which is an exact parallel of the Coptic construction in question. Though Muraoka (1978) argues that the term is ill-advised, I employ it here for want of a better one.

pred. compl. : predicative complement, as in: “The court appointed him *ambassador* in Spain”.

N^D : alternation set N- / NΔ=

N^{Acc} : alternation set N- / NHO=

N : only nominal arguments are attested, therefore impossible to establish the alternation class of the argument.

Harax legomena

Greek form	Coptic form	Meaning	Non-A/P- actants (if present)	Transitive / Intransitive / Unclear
ἀγγέλλω	αγγελι	‘bring a message’		intransitive
ἀκονάω	ακони	‘become alert’		intransitive
ἀνακεφαλαιογράφω	ανακεφαλαιογραφει	‘summarize’	‘for’: Ν ^D	transitive
ἀναλυτρόω	αναλυτρωσε	‘resume possession of’		unclear
ἀναλύω	αναλυ	‘dissolve, annul’		transitive
ἀνανεύω	αναανευσε	‘renew’		transitive
ἀναπλάσσω	αναπλασσε	‘form anew’		unclear
ἀναπληρόω	αναπληρωγ	‘pay homage to’		unclear
ἀντιγράφω	αντιγραφει	‘write back, respond to’	‘to’: Ν ^D , ‘that’: ε	intransitive
ἀντιφωνέω	αντιφωνη	‘stand surety, vouch’	‘to’: Ν ^D , ‘for’: ε-	intransitive
ἀπαγοράζω	απαγοραζε	‘redeem’		unclear
ἀπάγω	απαγε	‘be led away’ (?)		unclear
ἀποδέχομαι	αποδεχε	‘accept, welcome’		transitive
ἀποδίδωμι	αποδιδογ	‘hand over’	‘to’: Ν ^D	transitive
ἀποκηρύσσω	αποκηρυσσε	‘renounce’		transitive
ἀποστατέω	αποστατει	‘be unconcerned’		intransitive
ἀπτίζω	απτιζε	‘put a hand’	‘on’: ε,χ,η-	intransitive
ἀρκέω	αρκει	‘suffice’	‘for’: ε-	intransitive
ἀφίστημι	αποστα	‘put away’		transitive
βάπτω	βαψον	‘dip, plunge’		unclear
βασκαίνω	βασκανε	‘envy’	‘to’: ε-	intransitive
βατταλογέω	βατταλογι	‘babble, stammer’		intransitive
βουλλόω	βογλλιζε	‘seal’	‘with’: η-	transitive
γενεαλογέω	γενεαλογει	‘trace a pedigree’		intransitive
γογγύζω	κογγιζε	‘murmur, grumble’		intransitive
δέχομαι	δεχι	‘receive’		unclear
δημεύω	δημεγε	‘seize for public property’		transitive
διαγράφω	διαγραφη	‘conceive, imagine’		transitive
διαλύω	διαλυε	‘resolve, settle’	‘with’: ηη	intransitive
διαμαρτυρέω	†δηαρτερε	‘protest, object’		unclear
διασφύζω	διασφωσγ	‘send, transfer’	‘to’: Ν ^D	transitive
ἐγκωμιάζω	εγκωμιαζε	‘praise in speech’		transitive

Greek form	Coptic form	Meaning	Non-A/P- actants (if present)	Transitive / Intransitive / Unclear
ἐκκλίνω	εκκλινε	'retire'		intransitive
ἐκφράζω	εξεφρασε	'express, edit'		transitive
ἐνθυμέομαι	ενθυμει	'meditate'		intransitive
ἐντινάσσω	εντινασσε	'crash, collide'	'with': ερογν ερην-	intransitive
ἐξάγω	εξαγε	'drive away'		transitive
ἐπεξεργάζομαι	επεξαργαζε	'work on'		transitive
ἐπισωρεύω	επισωρεγε	'accumulate'		transitive
ἐπιτηδεύω	επιτηδεγε	'attempt at'	e + inf.	intransitive
ἐπιφέρω*	επενεγκε	'ascribe'		
θεολογέω	θεολογει	'speak of God'		unclear
θροέω	θροι	'cry aloud'		intransitive
ἰατρέω	γιατρεγε	'heal'		transitive
ιδιάζω	ειδιαζιν	'make particular'		transitive
κακολογέω	κακολογει	'slander'		transitive
καρπίζω	γρυπαζε	'be freed' (?)		unclear
κατακενόω	κατακενε	'leave empty, desert'		transitive
καταλλάσσω	καταλλασσε	'exchange'		transitive
κατάρχω	καταρκει	'begin, start'		intransitive
καταστρέφω	καταστρεφι	'turn around'		intransitive
καυτηριάζω	καυτηριζε	'brand'		transitive
κινέω	κινησαι	'take legal action'	'against': κατα	intransitive
κρατέω	κρατεγε	'grasp, seize' (?)	'at': ρη	intransitive
κροτέω	κροτεγε	'pat'		transitive
κυμαίνω	γινεν	'swell' (?)		unclear
λαγχάνω	λαχα	'obtain' (?)	DO : ε-	intransitive
λευκόω	λεγκη	'bleach'		transitive
λογογραφέω	λογραφη	'write down'	DO : ε-	intransitive
μεριμνάω	μεριμνα	'be anxious'		intransitive
μεστόω	μεστε	'be filled' (?)	'with': ∅	unclear
μεταβάλλω	μεταβαλε	'change the position of'		reflexive
μεταγίζω	μεταγριζε	'transfer'		transitive
μεταμορφόω	μεταμορφογ	'transform oneself'		reflexive
μετρέω	μητρεγε	'measure'		transitive

Greek form	Coptic form	Meaning	Non-A/P- actants (if present)	Transitive / Intransitive / Unclear
μονάζω	ΜΟΝΑΖΕΙ	'live in solitude' (?)		unclear
νομίζω	ΝΟΜΙΖΟΝ	'consider'		intransitive
νουθετέω	ΝΟΥΘΕΤΕΙ	'chastise'		transitive
ξενιτεύω	ΞΕΝΙΤΕΥΕ	'go abroad'		reflexive
όλιγωρέω	ΟΛΙΓΩΡΕΙ	'be negligent'		intransitive
παιδαγωγέω	ΠΕΔΑΓΩΓΕΙ	'study' (?)		transitive
παραβάλλω	ΠΑΡΑΒΑΛΛΕΙ	'submit'		transitive
παροράω	ΠΑΡΟΡΑ	'neglect'		transitive
πατέω	ΠΑΤΕΙ	'tread on'		transitive
πειράω	ΠΕΙΡΑ	'try, test'		transitive
περάω	ΠΗΡΑ	'sail across'		transitive
περιάγω	ΠΕΡΙΑΓΕ	'lead around'		unclear
περιγράφω	ΠΕΡΙΓΡΑΦΕ	'falsify'		transitive
περικακέω	ΠΕΡΙΚΑΚΕΙ	'be exhausted'		intransitive
περιλαμβάνω	ΠΕΡΙΛΑΜΒΑΝΕ	'comprehend'		transitive
πιστόω	ΠΙΣΤΟΥ	'prove faithful'	'to': ε-	intransitive
πλεονεκτέω	ΠΛΕΟΝΕΚΤΕΙ	'claim too much'		intransitive
πολεύω	ΠΟΛΕΥΕ	'go around for' (?)		unclear
πραιδεύω	ΠΡΑΙΤΑ	'rob'		unclear
προκριματίζω	ΠΡΟΚΡΙΜΑΤΙΖΕ	'prejudice'		transitive
προμηνύω	ΠΡΟΕΜΗΝΕΥ	'announce beforehand'		transitive
προξενίζω	ΠΡΟΞΕΝΙΖΕ	'secure'		transitive
προσάγω	ΠΡΟΣΑΓΕ	'bring forth'		transitive
προσποιέω	ΠΡΟΣΠΟΙΕΙ	'add'		transitive
προσφωνέω	ΠΡΟΣΦΩΝΕΙ	'address, speak to'		transitive
προτάσσω	ΠΡΟΤΑΣΣΕ	'be prefixed' (?)		unclear
προτείνω	ΠΡΟΔΕΙΝΑ	'put forward'	'to': Ν ^D	transitive
ρόγεύω	ΡΟΚΟΥ	'pay out'		unclear
σαββατίζω	ΣΑΒΒΑΤΙΖΕ	'keep Sabbath'	'for' (?): Ν	intransitive
σιαίνω	ΣΙΑΝΕ	'bother'		transitive
σκορπίζω	(C)ΚΟΡΠΙΖΕ	'scatter'		transitive
σοφίζω	ΣΟΦΙΖΕ	'devise, concoct'		transitive
στηρίζω	ΣΤΗΡΙΖΕ	'be firm, fixed'		intransitive
στίζω	ΣΤΙΖΕ	'punctuate'		transitive

Greek form	Coptic form	Meaning	Non-A/P- actants (if present)	Transitive / Intransitive / Unclear
συγκαταβαίνω	ϢΥΝΚΑΤΑΒΑ	‘be merciful, lenient’		intransitive
συλλογίζομαι	ϢΥΝΛΟΓΙΖΕ	‘consider, discuss’		transitive
συμβοηθέω	ϢΥΝΒΟΗΘΕΙ	‘assist’	‘to’: ΜΝ	intransitive
συνέχω	ϢΥΝΕΧΕ	‘be kept, contained’	‘in’: ϢΝ	intransitive
συνομιλέω	ϢΥΝΟΜΟΛΕΙΝ	‘converse’	‘with’: ΜΝ	intransitive
συντίθημαι	ϢΕΝΤΗΘΙ	‘consent’	‘to’ (?): Ν	unclear
συστέλλω	ϢΥϢΤΙΔΕ	‘remove, expel’		transitive
συστρέφω	ϢΥϢΤΡΟΦΕΙ	‘contract, roll up’		intransitive
σφίγγω	ϢΦΙΝΓΟΥ	‘bind tightly’	‘to’: ΕϢΟΥΝ Ε-	transitive
ὑμνολογέω	ϢΥΜΝΟΛΟΓΕΙ	‘sing hymns’		intransitive
ὑπισχνέομαι	ϢΥΠΙϢΧΟΥ	‘promise’		unclear
ὑποκορίζομαι	ϢΥΠΟΚΟΡΕΥΕ	‘give an endearing name’	‘to’: ϢΑΡΑΤ=	intransitive
ὑπονοέω	ϢΥΠΟΝΟΕΙ	‘surmise, consider’		transitive
ὑποχωρέω	ϢΥΠΟΧΟΡΕΙ	‘withdraw’	dat. eth.: Ν ^D	intransitive
φαρμακεύω	ΦΑΡΜΑΚΕΥΕ	‘practice witchcraft’		intransitive
φιλονικέω	ΦΙΛΟΝΙΚΗ	‘be rivals’		intransitive
φιλοπονέω	ΦΙΛΟΠΟΝΕΙ	‘love labour’		intransitive
φροντίζω	ΦΡΟΝΤΙΖΕ	‘consider, think’	‘about’: Ε-	intransitive
χαρακτηρίζω	ΧΑΡΑΚΤΗΡΙΖΕ	‘characterize, portray’		transitive
χηρεύω	ΧΗΡΕΥΕ	‘be widowed’		intransitive
χωνεύω	ΧΩΝΕΥΕ	‘pour, cast (metal)’	‘to’: Ε-	transitive
ψέγω	ΨΕΓΕ	‘blame’		transitive

Verbs with more than one attestation

Greek form	Coptic form	Meaning	Non-A/P actants (if present)	Transitive / Intransitive / Unclear
ἀγανακτέω	ΑΓΑΝΑΚΤΕΙ	‘be(come) indignant’		intransitive
ἀγαπάω	ΑΓΑΠΑ	‘love’		transitive
ἀγιάζω	ΞΑΓΙΑΖΕ	‘consecrate’		transitive
ἀγνεύω	ΞΑΓΝΕΥΕ	‘purify oneself’		reflexive
ἀγνωμονέω	ΑΓΝΩΜΟΝΕΙ	‘act / treat unfairly’		(in)transitive
ἀγωνίζομαι	ΑΓΩΝΙΖΕ	‘struggle’	‘against’: ΟΥΒΕ	intransitive
ἀδικέω*	ΑΔΙΚΕΙ	‘act wrongly’	‘towards’ (?): Ν	unclear
ἀθετέω	ΑΘΕΤΕΙ	‘disown, reject’		transitive
ἀθλέω	ΑΘΛΙ	‘fight, compete’	‘with’: ΜΗ	intransitive
αἰτέω	ΑΙΤΕΙ	‘ask, demand’		two DOs
αἰχμαλωτεύω	ΑΙΧΜΑΛΩΤΕΥΕ	‘imprison, lock up’		transitive
αἰχμαλωτίζω	ΑΙΧΜΑΛΩΤΙΖΕ	‘take captive’		transitive
ἀκολουθέω	ΑΚΟΛΟΥΘΕΙ	‘follow, accompany’		transitive
ἀκριβάζω	ΑΚΡΙΒΑΖΕ	‘investigate thoroughly’		transitive
ἀκυρώω	ΑΚΥΡΟΥ	‘reject, devalue’		transitive
ἀλλάσσω	ΑΛΛΑΣΣΕ	‘exchange’		transitive
ἀλληγορέω	ΑΛΛΗΓΟΡΕΙ	‘interpret allegorically’		transitive
ἀμελέω*	ΑΜΕΛΕΙ	‘be negligent, delay’		intransitive
ἀμφιβάλλω	ΑΜΦΙΒΑΛΕ	‘be in doubt, dissent’		intransitive
ἀναδίδομι	ΑΝΑΔΙΔΟΥ	‘hand over’	‘to’: Ν ^D	transitive
ἀναθεματίζω	ΑΝΑΘΕΜΑΤΙΖΕ	‘pronounce accursed’		transitive
ἀνακαλέω	ΑΝΑΚΑΛΕΙ	‘call back, summon’		transitive
ἀνακρίνω	ΑΝΑΚΡΙΝΕ	‘examine, question’		transitive
ἀνακτάομαι	ΑΝΑΚΤΑ	‘refresh oneself’		reflexive
ἀναλαμβάνω	ΑΝΑΛΑΜΒΑΝΕ	‘raise, take up’		transitive
ἀναστατόω	ΑΝΑΣΤΑΤΟΥ	‘unsettle, upset’		transitive
ἀναστρέφω	ΑΝΑΣΤΡΕΦΕ	‘live among’		intransitive
ἀνατρέπω	ΑΝΑΣΤΡΕΠΕ	‘upset, overturn’		transitive
ἀναχωρέω	ΑΝΑΧΩΡΕΙ	‘withdraw, depart’	dat. eth.: Ν ^D	intransitive

Greek form	Coptic form	Meaning	Non-A/P actants (if present)	Transitive / Intransitive / Unclear
άνδραγαθέω	ΑΝΔΡΑΚΑΘΕΥΕ	'be brave, behave manly'		intransitive
άνομέω	ΑΝΟΜΕΙ	'act lawlessly'		intransitive
άντιλέγω	ΑΝΤΙΛΕΓΕ	'object, contradict'	'to': N ^D	intransitive
άξιόω	ΑΖΙΟΥ	'beg, entreat'		transitive
άπαγγέλλω*	ΑΠΑΓΓΕΙΛΕ	'inform, bring a message'	'to': ε- or N ^D	intransitive
άπαιτέω	ΑΠΑΙΤΕΙ	'require, demand'		transitive
άπαντάω	ΑΠΑΝΤΑ	'meet, encounter'	'with': N ^D	intransitive
άπαρνέομαι	ΑΠΑΡΝΑ	'deny'		transitive
άπατάω	ΑΠΑΤΑ	'mislead, deceive'		transitive
άπειλέω	ΑΠΕΙΛΕ	'threaten, admonish'	'to': ε- or N ^D	intransitive
άπελπίζω	ΑΦΕΛΠΙΖΕ	'lose hope, despair'	'of': ε-	intransitive
άπιστέω	ΑΠΙΣΤΕΙ	'refuse to believe'	'to': ε- or N ^D	intransitive
άποβάλλω	ΑΠΟΒΑΛΕ	'throw, cast'		transitive
άποδεικνυμι	ΑΠΟΔΙΚΝΕΥΕ	'demonstrate, prove'	'to': N ^D ; 'that': χε	intransitive
άποδημέω	ΑΠΟΔΗΜΕΙ	'go on a journey'	'to': ε- (place), αδ- (person)	intransitive
άποκαθίστημι	ΑΠΟΚΑΘΙΣΤΑ	'establish'		transitive
άπολογίζομαι	ΑΠΟΛΟΓΙΖΕ	'pay back'	'to': N ^D	transitive
άπολύω	ΑΠΟΛΥ	'divorce, release'		transitive
άποσοβέω	ΑΠΟΣΟΒΕ	'reject'		transitive
άποστερέω	ΑΠΟΣΤΕΡΙ	'deprive'		transitive
άποστηθίζω	ΑΠΟΣΤΗΘΙΖΕ	'learn by heart'		transitive
άποτάσσω	ΑΠΟΤΑΣΣΕ	'renounce'		transitive
άποφαίνω*	ΑΠΟΦΑΝΕ	'condemn; make an effect'	'on': εχN-, ριχN-	transitive (?)
άποχαρίζομαι	ΑΠΟΧΑΡΙΖΕ	'give as a gift'		transitive
άρέσκω	ΑΡΕΣΚΕ	'please'	'to': N ^D	intransitive
άριστάω	ΑΡΙΣΤΑ	'have a meal'		intransitive
άρπάζω	ΡΑΡΠΑΖΕ	'seize, snatch'		transitive
άρχω	ΑΡΧΕΙ	'rule'	'over': εχN-, ε-	intransitive
άρχω	ΑΡΧΕΙ	'begin'	'DO': ε-	intransitive
άσκεέω	ΑΣΚΕΙ	'train (self or a discipline)'		(in)transitive
άσπάζομαι	ΑΣΠΑΖΕ	'kiss, embrace'		transitive

Greek form	Coptic form	Meaning	Non-A/P actants (if present)	Transitive / Intransitive / Unclear
ἀσφαλίζω	αϭφαλιζε	‘guard, protect’		transitive
ἀσχημονέω	αϭχημονει	‘behave unseemly’		intransitive
ἀτακτέω	αϭτακτι	‘rebel’		intransitive
ἀτονέω	αϭτονι	‘be exhausted, weakened’		intransitive
αὐτουργέω	αϭτουργει	‘farm’	‘on / for’ : ε-ϭαρατ=	intransitive
ἀφορίζω	αϭφωριζε	‘excommunicate’		transitive
βιάζω	βιαζε	‘force, violate’		transitive
βλασφημέω*	βλαϭφημη	‘blaspheme’		transitive / ε-
βοηθέω	βοηθει	‘help’	‘to’: ε- or n ^D	intransitive
γράφω	γραφει	‘write’		unclear
δαιμονίζομαι	δαμονιζε	‘be possessed’		intransitive
δαμάζω	δαμαζε	‘subdue’		transitive
δαπανάω	δαπανη, δαπανιζε	‘spend’		transitive
δεικνεύω	δικνεγε	‘explain’	‘to’: n ^D	transitive
δειπνέω	διπνει	‘dine, feast’		intransitive
δηλώω	δηλογ	‘specify’	‘to’: n ^D	transitive
δημιουργέω	δημιοργει	‘create, make’		unclear
δημοσιώω	δημοσιουγ	‘make public’		transitive
δηφεντεύω	δηφεντεγε	‘defend’		transitive
διαβάλλω	διαβαλλε	‘slander’		transitive
διαδέχομαι	διαδεχε	‘succeed’		transitive
διακονέω	διακονει	‘serve, minister’	‘to’: n ^D	intransitive*
διακρίνω	διακρινε	‘discern’		transitive
διανέμω	διανεμη	‘distribute’		transitive
διατρέπω	διατρεπε	‘be confused’		intransitive
διατρίβω	διατριβε	‘waste time’		intransitive
διδάσκω	διδασκε	‘teach, instruct’		transitive
δικάζω	δικαζε	‘judge, litigate’	‘to’: ε- anim., εϭn- inanim. obj.	intransitive
δικαιολογέομαι	δικαιολογει	‘plead in court’		intransitive
διοικέω	διοικει	‘arrange, take care of’		transitive
διορθόω*	διορθουγ	‘correct, set straight’	DO: n ^D or n ^{Acc}	transitive (?)
διστάζω	διϭταζε	‘doubt’	‘in’: ε-	intransitive

Greek form	Coptic form	Meaning	Non-A/P actants (if present)	Transitive / Intransitive / Unclear
διώκω	ΔΙΩΚΕΙ	'chase, pursue'	DO: N ^{Acc} or NΔ-	(in)transitive
δοκέω	ΔΟΚΕΙ	'seem'	'to': N ^D	intransitive
δοκιμάζω	ΔΟΚΙΜΑΖΕ	'try, test'		transitive
δωρίζω	ΔΩΡΙΖΕ	'donate'	'to': N ^D (person), εΞΟΥΝ ε- (institution)	transitive
ἐγγυάω	ΕΓΓΥΑ	'go surety for'	'to': N ^D	transitive
ἐγκακέω	ΕΓΚΑΚΕΙ	'be discouraged'		intransitive
ἐγκαλέω*	ΕΓΚΑΛΕΙ	'sue'		intransitive
ἐγκρατεύομαι	ΕΓΚΡΑΤΕΥΕ	'control oneself'		intr. / refl.
ἐκλαμβάνω	ΕΓΛΑΒΕ	'take, pick out'		transitive
ἐλέγχω	ΕΛΕΓΧΕ	'rebuke'		transitive
ἐλευθερώω	ΕΛΕΥΘΕΡΟΥ	'release, set free'		transitive
ἐλπίζω	ΖΕΛΠΙΖΕ	'hope, put one's hope'	'in': ε-	intransitive
ἐμποδίζω	ΕΜΠΟΔΙΖΕ	'hinder, delay'		transitive
ἐνάγω	ΕΝΑΓΕ	'sue, proceed (against)'	'against': N ^D	intransitive
ἐνοχλέω	ΕΝΟΧΛΕΙ	'bother, annoy'	DO: N ^D	intransitive
ἐξαπατάω	ΕΞΑΠΑΤΑ	'deceive, beguile'		transitive
ἐξιλέω	ΕΞΕΛΕΙ	'go free'		intransitive
ἐξετάζω	ΕΞΕΤΑΖΕ	'scrutinize'		transitive
ἐξομολογέω	ΕΞΟΜΟΛΟΓΕΙ	'confess, praise'	DO: N ^D or N ^{Acc}	(in)transitive
ἐξορίζω	ΕΞΩΡΙΖΕ	'banish'		transitive
ἐπαινέω	ΕΠΑΙΝΟΥ	'praise, commend'		transitive
ἐπηρεάζω	ΕΠΗΡΕΑΖΕ	'insult, threaten'	'to': N ^D	intransitive
ἐπιβουλεύω	ΕΠΙΒΟΥΛΕΥΕ	'plot, conspire'	'against': ε-	intransitive
ἐπιδίδωμι	ΕΠΙΔΙΔΟΥ	'hand over'	'to': N ^D	transitive
ἐπιθυμέω	ΕΠΙΘΥΜΕΙ	'desire, want'	DO: ε-	intransitive
ἐπικαλέω	ΕΠΙΚΑΛΕΙ	'call, invoke'		transitive
ἐπινοέω*	ΕΠΙΝΟΕΙ	'conceive, think of'		unclear
ἐπιτάσσω	ΕΠΙΤΑΣΣΕ	'order, command'	'to': N ^D	intransitive

Greek form	Coptic form	Meaning	Non-A/P actants (if present)	Transitive / Intransitive / Unclear
ἐπιτελέω*	επιτελει	'celebrate'	DO: n ^{Acc} /εχN-	(in)transitive
ἐπιτιμάω	επιτιμα	'rebuke, censure'	DO: n ^D	intransitive
ἐπιτρέπω	επιτρεπε	'give commission'	DO: n ^D	intransitive
ἐπιφέρω	επιφερε	'move to and fro'		intransitive
ἐρίζω	εριζε	'quarrel'	'with': MN	intransitive
ἐρμηνεύω	ερμηνεγε	'interpret'		transitive
ἐτάζω	εταζε	'test'		transitive
εὐαγγελέω /-ίζομαι	εγαγγελιζε	'proclaim'	'to': n ^D	transitive
εὐδοκέω	εγδοκει	'be content'		intransitive
εὐδοκιμέω	εγδοκιμε	'be famous'		intransitive
εὐλογέω	εγλογει	'praise'		transitive
εὐπορέω	εγπορει	'supply, furnish'		transitive
εὐχαριστέω	εγχαριστη	'give thanks'	'to': n ^D	intransitive
ἠσυχάζω	εσχαζε	'be silent, at rest'		intransitive
θάλλω	θαλλει	'take care of'		transitive
θαρρέω	θαρρει	'be confident; rely'	'upon': e-; n ^D ; εχN-;	intransitive
θαυμάζω	θαυμαζε	'be amazed at'		transitive
θεραπεύω	θεραπεγε	'heal, restore'		transitive
θεωρέω	θεωρει	'see, look at'		transitive
θυσιάζω	θγιαζε	'sacrifice'	'to': n ^D	transitive
ιστορέω	ειστορι, ειστοριζε	'relate, narrate'	'to': n ^D	transitive
καθαίρω	καθαιρογ	'remove, expel'		transitive
καθηγέομαι	καθηγει	'teach, instruct'		transitive
καινοτομέω	καινοτομει	'renew'		transitive
καλέω	καλει	'call, summon, invite'		transitive
κανονίζω	κανωνιζε	'prompt, coach'		transitive
καπνίζω	καπνιζε	'fumigate'		transitive
καταβάλλω	καταβαλλε	'contribute'		transitive
καταγινώσκω	καταγινωσκε	'condemn, censure'		transitive
καταδικάζω	καταδικαζε	'condemn'	'to': e-	transitive
κατακρίνω	κατακρине	'condemn'	'to': e-	transitive
καταλαλέω	καταλαλει	'slander, malign'		transitive
καταλαμβάνω	καταλαμβάνε	'seize, comprehend'		transitive

Greek form	Coptic form	Meaning	Non-A/P actants (if present)	Transitive / Intransitive / Unclear
κατανεύω	κατανεγε	'bow, assent'		intransitive
κατανοέω	κατανοι	'contemplate'		transitive
καταντάω	καταντα	'arrive, attain, reach'	'at': ε-	intransitive
καταπατέω	καταπατι	'trample on, despise'		transitive
καταπλάσσω	καταπλασσε	'apply as a poultice'		transitive
καταποντίζω	καταποντιζε	'throw into sea'		transitive
καταστέλλω	καταστειλε	'put in order, calm down'		transitive
κατηγορέω	κατηγορει	'accuse, reproach'		transitive
κατοικέω	κατοικι	'dwell, take a part'	'in': ε-, ρη-	intransitive
κελεύω	κελεγε	'order'	'to': η ^D -	transitive
κερδαίνω	κερτων	'gain profit' (?)		unclear
κηρύσσω	κηρυσσε	'preach, proclaim'	'to': η ^D -	transitive
κιθαρίζω	κιθαριζε	'play the lyre, play'		transitive
κινδυνεύω	κινδυνεγε	'be in danger; be liable'	'for': η ^{Acc} /ρα	(in)transitive
κλασματίζω	κλασματιζε	'break (bread)'		transitive
κληρονομέω	κληρονομει	'inherit'		transitive
κληρώω	κληρογ	'inherit, obtain'	DO: ε- or η ^{Acc}	(in)transitive
κολακεύω	κολακεγε	'flatter'	'to': ε-	intransitive
κρεμάννυμι	κρεμνατιζε	'hang'		transitive
κρίνω	κρινε	'judge'		transitive
κυβερνάω	κιβερνα	'steer, navigate'		transitive
κυρώω	κyroγ	'ordain'		transitive
κωλύω	κωλυε	'prevent, hinder'		transitive
λακτίζω	λακτιζε	'kick, hit'		transitive
λάμπω	λαμπεγε	'shine'		intransitive
[λεαντηριον]	λεαντηριε	'polish'		transitive
λειτουργέω	λιτογορει	'conduct mass; serve'	'to': ε-	intransitive
λεπτύνω	λεπτανε	'make thin'		transitive
λευκοφορέω	λεγκοφορει	'dress in white'		intransitive / reflexive
λογίζομαι	λογιζε	'recite'		transitive

Greek form	Coptic form	Meaning	Non-A/P actants (if present)	Transitive / Intransitive / Unclear
λογχίζω	λογχιζε	‘pierce with a spear’		transitive
μαγεύω	μαγεγε	‘enchant’		transitive
μακαρίζω	μακαριζε	‘bless’		transitive
μαλάσσω	μαλασσε	‘soften’		transitive
μαρτυρίζω	μαρτυριζε	‘bear witness’	‘to’: ε-	intransitive
μαστιγώω	μαστιγοϋ	‘flog’		transitive
μαυλίζω	μαγλιζε	‘abuse, treat ill’		transitive
μελετάω	μελετα	‘contemplate’		transitive
μέλω	μελει	‘be of concern’		intransitive
μέμφομαι	μεμφει	‘blame, reproach’	DO: ε-	intransitive
μερίζω	μεριζε	‘separate, divide’		transitive
μεσάζω	μεσασε	‘divide, distribute’		transitive
μετανοέω	μετανοει	‘repent’	‘of’: εβολ ρη-, εχην-, ρα-	intransitive
μεταστοιχείω	μεταστοικει	‘shape, fashion’		transitive
μετέχω	μετεχε	‘partake’	‘in’: ε- or η ^{Acc}	(in)transitive
μηνύω	μενεγε	‘reveal, make known’	‘to’: η-	transitive
μυσταγωγέω	μυσταγωγιη	‘initiate, lead into’		transitive
νηστεύω	νηστεγε	‘fast’		intransitive
νοέω	νοει	‘observe, perceive’	DO : ε- or η ^{Acc}	(in)transitive
νομοθετέω	νομοθετι	‘give laws’	‘to’: η ^D	unclear
οικονομέω	οικονομει	‘manage, take care of’		transitive
όκνέω	οκνει	‘hesitate, delay’		intransitive
όμιλέω	ρομηλει	‘teach, preach’	‘with, to’: ε-, ηη	intransitive
όμοιάζω	ρομοιωζε	‘be like’	‘to’: ε-	intransitive
όμολογέω	ρομολογει	‘acknowledge, confess’	DO: η ^D or η ^{Acc}	(in)transitive
όνομάζω	ονομαζε	‘name’		transitive
όπλίζω	ροπιλιζε	‘arm’		transitive
όρίζω	ροριζε	‘appoint, decree’	‘to’: η ^D	transitive
όρχέομαι	ορχει	‘dance’		intransitive
παραγγέλλω	παραγγειλε	‘command, instruct’	‘to’: η ^D	intransitive

Greek form	Coptic form	Meaning	Non-A/P actants (if present)	Transitive / Intransitive / Unclear
παραδειγματίζω	ΠΑΡΑΔΕΙΓΜΑΤΙΖΕ	‘put to shame; exemplify’		transitive
παραδείκνυμι	ΠΑΡΑΔΙΣΙ	‘mock, slander’	DO: n-	unclear
παραδέχομαι	ΠΑΡΑΔΕΧΕ	‘accept, take’		transitive
παραδίδωμι	ΠΑΡΑΔΙΔΟΥ	‘give over, betray’	‘to’: n ^D	transitive
παραιτέομαι	ΠΑΡΑΙΤΕΙ	‘decline’		transitive
παρακαλέω	ΠΑΡΑΚΑΛΕΙ	‘beseech’		transitive
παραλαμβάνω	ΠΑΡΑΛΑΜΒΑΝΕ	‘accept, receive’		transitive
παραλλάσσω	ΠΑΡΑΛΛΑΣΣΕ	‘change, alter’		transitive
παραμένω	ΠΑΡΑΜΕΙΝΕ	‘stay, wait, serve’	‘for/ to’: ε-	intransitive
παρανομέω	ΠΑΡΑΝΟΜΕΙ	‘transgress, violate’		transitive
παρασκευάζω	ΠΑΡΑΣΚΕΥΑΖΕ	‘make ready, force’		transitive
παρατηρέω	ΠΑΡΑΤΗΡΙ	‘observe. attend’	‘to’: ε-	intransitive
παραχειμάζω	ΠΑΡΑΧΙΜΑΖΕ	‘be stormy; spend winter’		intransitive
παραχωρέω	ΠΑΡΑΧΩΡΕΙ	‘surrender, give up on’	‘to’: n ^D	transitive
παρέρχομαι	ΠΑΡΕΛΘΕ	‘pass by, skip, omit’		transitive
παριστάνω	ΠΑΡΙΣΤΑ	‘present’	‘to’: n ^D	transitive
παρρησιάζομαι	ΠΑΡΡΗΣΙΑΖΕ	‘declare boldly, dare to’		reflexive
πάσχω	ΠΑΘΕΙ	‘suffer, endure’		transitive
πατάσσω	ΠΑΤΑΣΣΕ	‘hit, strike’		transitive
πειράζω	ΠΕΙΡΑΖΕ	‘try, tempt’		transitive
πενθέω	ΠΕΝΘΕΙ	‘grieve’	‘for’: ε- or n ^D	intransitive
περιεργάζομαι	ΠΕΡΙΕΡΓΑΖΕ	‘diligently work’	‘on’: nca-	intransitive
περιχέω	ΠΕΡΙΧΕ	‘spread, anoint’		transitive
περιχρίω	ΠΕΡΙΧΡΕ, ΠΕΡΙΧΡΙΑ	‘anoint’		transitive
πήσσω	ΠΗΣΣΕ	‘fasten, nail down; crucify’		transitive
πιστεύω	ΠΙΣΤΕΥΕ	trust, believe	‘to’: n ^D or ε-	intransitive
πλάσσω	ΠΛΑΣΣΕ	‘create, form’	pred. compl.: n-	transitive

Greek form	Coptic form	Meaning	Non-A/P actants (if present)	Transitive / Intransitive / Unclear
πλεαω	πλεα	'sail'		intransitive
πλήσσω	πλησσε	'be dumbstruck'		intransitive
πολεμέω	πολεμει	'wage war'	'against': μη, εν-	intransitive
πονηρεύω	πονηρευε	'act maliciously'		intransitive
πορνεύω	πορνευε	'commit adultery'		intransitive
πρέπω	πρεπει	'be fitting'	'to': η ^D	intransitive
πρεσβεύω	πρεσβευε	'intercede, help'	'for': εν-	intransitive
προβάλλω	προβαλε (εβολ)	'emanate, produce'		transitive
προδίδωμι	προδιδομι	'betray, surrender'		transitive
προέρχομαι	προελθε	'come forth, emanate'		intransitive
προιστάω	προιστα	'preside'	'over': ε-	intransitive
προκαλέω	προκαλει	'provoke'		transitive
προκόπτω	προκοπτε	'advance, progress'		intransitive
προλαμβάνω	προλαμβανε	'anticipate' (?)		unclear
προνοέω	προνοει	'foresee'		transitive
προσαγορεύω	προσαγορευε	'greet'		transitive
προσδοκάω	προσδοκα, προσδοκει	'hope, expect'	DO: ε-	intransitive
προσέρχομαι	προσελθε	'approach; prosecute'	DO: ε-	intransitive
προσέχω	προσεχε	'care, attend'	'for, to': ε-	intransitive
προσκαρτερέω	προσκαρτερει	'remain, persist, wait'	'for': ε-	intransitive
προσκυνέω	προσκυνει	'worship, prostrate before'	'DO': η ^D or η ^{Acc}	(in)transitive
προσφέρω	προσφερει	'sacrifice'	'to': η ^D	transitive
προσχαρίζομαι	προσχαριζε	'gratify, satisfy'	'DO': η ^D	intransitive
προτρέπω	προτρεπει	'urge, exhort'		transitive
προφητεύω	προφητευε	'prophesy'		transitive
πυκτεύω	πυκτευε	'fight, box'	'against': ογθε	intransitive

Greek form	Coptic form	Meaning	Non-A/P actants (if present)	Transitive / Intransitive / Unclear
πυρόω	πγρογ	'set on fire, purify by fire'		transitive
ρεύματιζομαι	ρρεγματισε	'suffer from a flux'		intransitive
ρίπιζω	ρρεπιζε	'flap (wings)'		transitive
σαλπίζω	σαλπιζε	'blow a trumpet'		intransitive
σαφηνίζω	σαφηνιζε	'mention, clarify'		transitive
σεληνιαζομαι	σεληνιαζε	'suffer from epilepsy'		intransitive
σημαίνω	σημανε	'indicate, suggest, predict'		transitive
σημειώω	σημιογ	'note, write down'		transitive
σκεπάζω	σκεπαζε	'cover, protect, shelter'		transitive
σκευάζω	σκεγαζε	'prepare'		transitive
σκιρτάω	σκιρτα	'leap, frolic'		intransitive
σκοτόω	σκοθογ, σκοτεγε	'become dizzy, in the dark'		intransitive
σκώπτω	σκωπιτε	'mock'		transitive
σπαταλάω	σπαταλα	'live wantonly'		intransitive
σπουδάζω	σπογλαζε	'hurry be eager'		intransitive
σταυρόω	σταγρογ	'crucify'		transitive
στηλιτεύω	στηλιτεγε	'scorn, ridicule'		transitive
στοιχέω	στοικει	'agree'	'to': ε-	intransitive
στρατεύω	στρατεγε	'wage war; be a soldier'		intransitive / reflexive
στρεβλόω	στρεβλογ	'be concerned'		intransitive
συγκρίνω	συγκρινε	'compare'		transitive
συγχωρέω	συγχωρει	'allow, grant'	'to': Ν ^D	transitive
συζητέω	συζηητει	'dispute'	'about': ετβε	intransitive
συλλάω	συλα	'rob'		transitive
συμβουλεύω	συμβογλεγε	'counsel, advise'	'to': Ν ^D , DO: ε-	intransitive
συμπείθω	σεμπιθε	'make an agreement'	'with': μη	intransitive
συμφανίζω	συμφανιζε	'mention'		transitive
συμφωνέω	συμφωνει	'agree'	to /with?: ε-, μη	intransitive
συναινέω	συναινει	'agree'	to /with?: ε-, μη	intransitive

Greek form	Coptic form	Meaning	Non-A/P actants (if present)	Transitive / Intransitive / Unclear
συνακολουθέω	ϢΝΑΚΟΛΟΓΘΙ	‘follow’	‘after’: ΝΑ	intransitive
συναλίζω	ϢΝΑΛΙΖΕ	‘reach an agreement’	‘with’: ΜΝ	intransitive
συναλλάσσω	ϢΝΑΛΛΑϢϢΕ	‘exchange’		transitive
συνέρχομαι	ϢΝΗΛΘΑΙ	‘join’	‘with /for’: ΜΝ, Ε-	intransitive
συνευδοκέω	ϢΝΕΥΔΟΚΕΙ	‘agree, approve’	‘with /of’: ΜΝ, Ε-	intransitive
συντάσσω	ϢΝΤΑΖΕ	‘agree, instruct, order’		unclear
συντελέω	ϢΝΤΕΛΕΙ	‘contribute’		transitive
συντιμάζω	ϢΝΤΙΜΑΖΕ	‘value, estimate’	‘at’: Ε-	transitive
συρίζω	ϢΝΡΙΖΕ	‘whistle, hiss’		intransitive
σφραγίζω	ϢΦΡΑΓΙΖΕ	‘seal, cross’		transitive
σχολάζω	ϢΧΟΛΑΖΕ	‘have leisure’	‘for’: Ε-	intransitive
σωματίζω	ϢΩΜΑΤΙΖΕ	‘draw up (a document)’		transitive
σωφρονέω	ϢΟΦΡΟΝΙ	‘be of a sound mind’		intransitive
ταλαιπωρέω	ΤΑΛΑΙΠΩΡΕΙ	‘be miserable, afflicted’		intransitive
ταχύνω	ΤΑΧΗ	‘make haste’		intransitive
τελειώω, τελέω	ΤΕΛΙΟΥ, ΤΕΛΕ	‘finish, complete’		transitive
τηρέω	ΤΗΡΕΙ	‘protect, keep’		transitive
τιμάω	ΤΙΜΑ	‘honour’		transitive
τιμωρέω	ΤΙΜΩΡΕΙ	‘punish’		transitive
τολμάω	ΤΟΛΜΑ	‘dare’		intransitive
τριβώ	ΤΡΙΒΕ	‘rub, pound’		transitive
τυπώω	ΤΥΠΟΥ	‘form, mould’		transitive
τυραννέω	ΤΥΡΑΝΝΕΥΕ	‘suppress’		transitive
ὕβριζω	ϢΥΒΡΙΖΕ	‘insult, abuse’		transitive
ὕμνεύω, ὕμνέω	ϢΥΜΝΗ, ϢΥΜΝΕΥΕ	‘sing praises, glorify’	‘to, for’: Ε-	intransitive
ὕπαγορεύω	ϢΥΠΑΓΟΡΕΥΕ	‘dictate’		transitive
ὕπηρετέω	ϢΥΠΗΡΕΤΕΙ	‘serve’	‘to’: Ν ^D or Ν ^{Acc}	(in)transitive
ὕποβάλλω	ϢΥΠΟΒΑΛΛΕ	‘throw, submit’	‘to’: Ν ^D	transitive
ὕπογράφω	ϢΥΠΟΓΡΑΦΕ	‘sign’	DO: Ε-	intransitive

Greek form	Coptic form	Meaning	Non-A/P actants (if present)	Transitive / Intransitive / Unclear
ὑποδέχομαι	ϩΥΠΟΔΕΧΕ	'receive (taxes)'		transitive
ὑποκρίνω	ϩΥΠΟΚΡΙΝΕ	'counterfeit'		intransitive
ὑπομένω	ϩΥΠΟΜΗΝΕ	'endure, remain, wait'	'for': ε-	intransitive
ὑπομνήσκω	ϩΥΠΟΜΗΝΙΖΕ	'come back to one's mind; admonish'		trans. / refl.
ὑποτάσσω*	ϩΥΠΟΤΑССЕ	'obey, submit oneself'	'to': η ^D	intransitive
ὑστερέω	ϩΥΣΤΕΡΕΙ	'lag behind, fail'		transitive
φεύγω	ΦΙΚΕ	'flee'		intransitive
φθονέω	ΦΘΟΝΕΙ, ΦΘΟΝΕΥΕ	'envy'	'to': ε-	intransitive
φιλοκαλέω	ΦΙΛΟΚΑΛΕΙ	'tend to, maintain'		transitive
φιλοσοφέω	ΦΙΛΟСОΦΕΙ	'study, investigate'		transitive
φλεγμαιίνω	ΦΛΕΚΗΝΑ	'be inflamed'		intransitive
φορέω	ΦΟΡΕΙ	'bear, carry'		transitive
φραγελλόω	ΦΡΑΓΕΛΛΟΥ	'flog, scourge'		transitive
φρονέω	ΦΡΟΝΕΙ	'understand'	DO: ε- or η-	unclear
χαλάω	ΧΑΛΑ	'let down, lower'		transitive
χαλινώω	ΧΑΛΙΝΟΥ	'bridle, restrain'		transitive
χαράττω	ΧΑΡΑΧΟΝ, ΧΑΡΑΤΤΙΝ	'engrave'		transitive
χαρίζω	ΧΑΡΙΖΕ	'give, grant'	'to': η ^D	transitive
χειροτονέω	ΧΕΙΡΟΤΟΝΕΙ	'ordain'	pred. compl.: η-	transitive
χλευάζω	ΧΛΕΥΑΖΕ	'jest, scoff'		transitive
χορεύω	ΧΩΡΕΥΕ	'celebrate'		intransitive
χορηγέω	ΧΟΡΗΓΕΙ, ΧΩΡΗΓΕΙ	'supply'	'to': η ^D	transitive
χρεωστέω	ΧΡΕΩΣΤΕΙ	'owe'	'to': η ^D	transitive
χρηματίζω	ΧΡΗΜΑΤΙΖΕ	'exist; give oracles; act'	'on behalf of': ϩα	intransitive
χρησιμεύω	ΧΡΥΣΙΜΕΥΕ, ΧΡΥΣΙΜΟΥ	'be useful'		intransitive
χωρέω	ΧΩΡΕΙ	'contain; describe'		transitive
ψάλλω	ΨΑΛΛΕΙ	'sing, make music'		intransitive

Bibliography

- Abraham, Werner. 2006. 'Introduction: Passivization and typology. Form vs. function – a confined survey into the research status quo', in: W. Abraham, L. Leisiö (eds.), *Passivization and Typology: Form and function* [Typological Studies in Language 68], 1-28. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Abramova. 2019. "Yuridicheskoe deloproizvodstvo. Posobie dlia bakalavrov" (Legal paperwork. Bachelor's Guide). Moscow: Prospect.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2002. *Language contact in Amazonia*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Allen, James P. 2014. *Middle Egyptian: An Introduction to the Language and Culture of Hieroglyphs* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Almond, Mathew 2010. 'Language Change in Greek Loaned Verbs', in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 18, 19-31.
- Apresjan, Jurij D. 1974. "Lexicheskaya semantika. Synonymicheskiye sredstva yazyka" (Lexical Semantics. Synonymous Means of Language). Moscow: Nauka.
- Arkadiev, Peter. 'From resultative to passive: a view from Northwest Caucasian'. Paper presented at the conference "Typology of Morphosyntactic Parameters 2018", Moscow, 22–24 October 2018. (https://inslav.ru/sites/default/files/arkadiev2018_nwresult_tmp.pdf)
- Arkipov, Ilya, Maxim Kalinin & Sergey Loesov. 2021. 'A Historical Overview of Akkadian Morphosyntax', in: J.-P. Vita (ed.), *History of the Akkadian Language, vol. I: Linguistic Background and Early Periods*. London-Leiden: Brill.
- Bagnall, Roger S. & Raffaella Cribiore. 2006. *Women's Letters from Ancient Egypt, 300 BC – AD 800*, Volume I. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Bentein, Klaas. 2011. 'Towards the identification of verbal periphrasis in ancient Greek: A prototype analysis', in: *Acta Classica* 54:1-25.
- Böhlig, Alexander. 1953. 'Griechische Deponentien im Koptischen', in: *Aegyptus* 33 (*Raccolta di Scritti in Onore di Girolamo Vitelli IV*), 91-96, Pubblicazioni dell'Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore: Vita e Pensiero.
- 1955. 'Beiträge zur Form der griechischen Wörter im Koptischen', in: *ZÄS* 80, 90-97.
- 1995. 'Die Form der griechischen Verben in den Texten von Nag Hammadi', in: C. Fluck, L. Langener, S. Richter, S. Schaten & G. Wurst (eds.), *Divitiae Aegypti. Koptologische und verwandelte Studien zu Ehren von Martin Krause*, 19-28. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Booij, Geert. 1996. 'Inherent versus contextual inflection and the split morphology hypothesis', in: *Yearbook of Morphology* 1995, 1-16. (<https://geertbooij.files.wordpress.com/2014/02/booij-1996-inherent-and-contextual-inflection-yom.pdf>).
- Borer, Hagit. 2005. *Structuring sense II: The normal course of events*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bortone, Pietro. 2010. *Greek prepositions from antiquity to the present*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Buttmann, Alexander. 1877. *Des Apollonios Dyskolos Vier Bücher über die Syntax, übers. und erläutert von A. Buttmann*, Berlin: Ferd. Dummlers Verlagsbuchhandlung, Harrwitz und Gossmann.
- Bybee, Joan L., Revere D. Perkins & William Pagliuca. 1994. *The evolution of grammar: Tense, aspect, and modality in the languages of the world*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Canger, Una & Anne Jensen. 2007. 'Grammatical borrowing in Nahuatl', in: Y. Matras & J. Sakel (eds.), *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*, 403–418. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Černý, Jaroslav. 1976. *Coptic Etymological Dictionary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cobbinah, Alexander & Friederike Lüpke. 2009. 'Not cut to fit – zero coded passives in African languages', in: M. Brenzinger & A.-M. Fehn (eds.), *Proceedings, 6th World Congress of African Linguistics*, 133-144. Cologne: Köppe.
- Coghill, Eleanor. 2015. 'Borrowing of Verbal Derivational Morphology between Semitic Languages: the case of Arabic verb derivations in Neo-Aramaic', in: F. Gardani, P. Arkadiev & N. Amiridze (eds.), *Borrowed morphology*, 83-108. Berlin, Boston & Munich: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Combs, Jason Robert and Joseph G. Miller. 2011. A Marriage-Gift of Part of a Monastery from Byzantine Egypt, in: *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 48 (2011) 79-88.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1981. 'Aspect and voice: Some reflections on perfect and passive', in: P. Tedeschi and A. Zaenen (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics, vol. 14: Tense and aspect*. New York: Academic Press.
- 1985. 'Causative verb-formation and other verb-deriving morphology', in: Th. Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description, Vol. 3: Grammatical categories and the lexicon*, 301-348. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crum, Walter E. 1939. *Coptic Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- DeLancey, Scott. 1987. 'Transitivity in Grammar and Cognition', in: R. Tomlin (ed.), *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse*, 53-68. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Deuydt, Leo. 2002. 'Eight Exotic Phenomena of Later Egyptian Explained', in: K. Ryholt (ed.), *Acts of the Seventh International Conference of Demotic Studies, Copenhagen, 23-27 August 1999* ([Carsten Niebuhr Institute Publ 27], 101-129. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press.
- 2009. 'Demotic Script and Demotic Language (IV): Consolidation of a New Rule of Grammar Differentiating Demotic from Coptic', in: G. Widmer & D. Devauchelle (eds.), *Actes du IXe congrès international des études démotiques, Paris, 31 août - 3 septembre 2005* [Bibliothèque d'étude 147], 103-121. Le Caire : Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale.
- Dimitrova-Vulchanova, Mila. 2012. 'Voice', in: R.I. Binnick (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Tense and Aspect*, 937-959. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dinneen, Francis P. 1968. 'Analogy, Langue and Parole', in: *Lingua* 21 (1968), 98-103.
- Dixon, Robert M.W. & Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald. 2000. 'Introduction', in: R.M.W. Dixon & A.Y. Aikhenvald (eds.). *Changing valency. Case studies in transitivity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Doron, Edit. 2003. 'Agency and Voice: The Semantics of the Semitic Templates', in: *Natural Language Semantics* 11, 1-67.
- Dowty, David R. 1991. 'Thematic Proto-Roles and Argument Selection', in: *Language* 67, 547-619.
- Edel, Elmar. 1955. *Altägyptische Grammatik*. Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum.
- Egedi, Barbara. 2015. 'Greek Loanwords and Two Grammatical Features of Pre-Coptic Egyptian', in: P. Kousoulis and N.Lazaridis (eds.), *Proceedings of the tenth international congress of egyptologists, University of the Aegean, Rhodes 22-29 May 2008*. [Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 241], 1333-1345. Peeters.
- 2017. 'Remarks on Loan Verb Integration into Coptic', in: E. Grossman, P. Dils, T.S. Richter & W. Schenkel (eds.), *Greek Influence on Egyptian-Coptic: Contact-Induced Change in an Ancient African Language*. [DDGLC Working Papers 1], 195-206. Hamburg: Widmaier Verlag.
- Elanskaya, Alla I. 2010. "*Grammatika koptskogo jazyka: Sahidskij dialekt*" [Grammar of the Coptic Language: Sahidic dialect]. St.Petersburg: Nestor-Istorija.
- Emmel, Stephen. 2006. 'Coptic Grammatical Terminology before and after Polotsky: Transitivity and Case (with sōtm "Hear" for an Example)', in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 14, 31-54.
- Emmel, Stephen. 2021. *Shenoute, Canon 1* (unpublished preliminary edition, translations: S. Becker).
- Engsheden, Åke. 2006. 'Über die Markierung des direkten Objekts im Koptischen', in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 14, 199-222.
- 2008. 'Differential object marking in Sahidic Coptic', in: F. Josephson, I. Söhrman (eds.): *Interdependence of diachronic and synchronic analyses*, 323-344. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Fillmore, Charles. 1969. 'Types for Lexical Information', in: Kiefer, F. (ed.) *Studies in Syntax and Semantics*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Funk, Wolf-Peter. 1978a. 'Zur Syntax des koptischen Qualitativs', in: *ZÄS* 105 (1), 94-114.
- 1978b. 'Toward a synchronic morphology of Coptic', in: Wilson, R. McL.(ed.), *The future of Coptic studies* [Coptic Studies 1], 104-124. Leiden: Brill.

- 1995. 'The Linguistic Aspects of Classifying the Nag Hammadi Codices', in: L. Painchaud, A. Pasquier (eds.), *Les textes de Nag Hammadi et le problème de leur classification. Actes du colloque tenu à Québec du 15 au 19 septembre 1993*. [Bibliothèque copte de Nag Hammadi - Études 3], 107-147. Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval.
- 2017. 'Differential Loan across the Coptic Literary Dialects', in: E. Grossman, P. Dils, T.S. Richter & W. Schenkel (eds.), *Greek Influence on Egyptian-Coptic: Contact-Induced Change in an Ancient African Language*. [DDGLC Working Papers 1], 368-397. Hamburg: Widmaier Verlag.
- (unpublished) A Work Concordance to Shenoute's Canons.
- Gardani, Francesco, Peter Arkadiev & Nino Amiridze (eds.). 2015. *Borrowed morphology*. Berlin, Boston & Munich: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Gardani, Francesco. 2018. 'On morphological borrowing', in: *Language and Linguistics Compass* 12(10), 1–17.
- 2020. Morphology and contact-induced language change, in: Anthony Grant (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of language contact*, 96–122. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gardiner, Alan H. 1957. *Egyptian Grammar; Being an Introduction to the Study of Hieroglyphs*. Oxford: Griffith Institute, Ashmolean Museum.
- Gast, Volker, Van der Auwera, Johan. 2012. 'What is 'contact-induced grammaticalization'? Examples from Mayan and Mixe-Zoquean', in: B. Wiemer, B. Wälchli, and B. Hansen (eds.), *Grammatical Replication and Borrowability in Language Contact*. [Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs, 242]. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Genušienė, Emma Š. 2006. 'Passives in Lithuanian (in comparison with Russian)', in: W. Abraham and L. Leisiö (eds.), *Passivization and Typology: Form and function* [Typological Studies in Language 68], 29–61. John Benjamins.
- Gerritsen, Nelleke. 1988. 'How passive is 'passive' -sJa?', in: A.A. Barentsen, B.M. Groen & R. Sprenger (eds.) *Dutch studies in Russian linguistics* [Studies in Slavic and general linguistics, 11], 97-179. Amsterdam: Brill Rodopi.
- Gianollo, Chiara. 2014. 'Labile verbs in Late Latin', in: *Linguistics* 52 (4), 945–1002.
- Girgis, Waheeb A. 1955. *Greek Words in Coptic Usage*. Manchester: University of Manchester, Faculty of Arts.
- Givón, Talmy. 1984. *Syntax: A Functional-Typological introduction*. Volume I. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- 1995. *Functionalism and Grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Greenberg, Joseph H. 1966. *Language universals: With special reference to feature hierarchies*. The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Grossman, Eitan. 2009. 'Periphrastic Perfects in the Coptic Dialects: A Case Study in Grammaticalization', in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 17 (2009), 81-118.
- Grossman, Eitan & Tonio Sebastian Richter. 2015. 'The Egyptian-Coptic language: its setting in space, time and culture', in: E. Grossman, M. Haspelmath & T.S. Richter (eds.), *Egyptian-Coptic Linguistics in Typological perspective*, 69–101. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- 2017. 'Dialectal Variation and Language Change: The Case of Greek Loan-Verb Integration Strategies in Coptic', in: E. Grossman, P. Dils, T.S. Richter & W. Schenkel (eds.), *Greek Influence on Egyptian-Coptic: Contact-Induced Change in an Ancient African Language*. [DDGLC Working Papers 1], 207-236. Hamburg: Widmaier Verlag.
- Grossman, Eitan. 2019. 'Language-Specific Transitivity in Contact: The Case of Coptic', in: *Journal of Language Contact*, vol.12 issue 1 2019, 89-115.
- Gruber, Jeffrey S. *Studies in Lexical Relations*. PhD Dissertation, MIT 1965.
- Haiman, John. 1983. 'Iconic and Economic Motivation', in: *Language* 59, 781–819.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1987. *Transitivity alternations of the anticausative type*. (Arbeitspapiere des Instituts für Sprachwissenschaft N.F. Nr. 4). Cologne: Universität zu Köln.

- 1993. 'More on the typology of inchoative/causative verb alternations', in: B. Comrie & M. Polinsky (eds.), *Causatives and Transitivity* [Studies in Language Companion Series 23]. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 87–120.
- 2000. 'Periphrasis', in: G. Booij, C. Lehmann & J. Mugdan (eds.), *Morphology: A Handbook on Inflection and Word Formation*. [Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft] Vol. 1. Berlin: De Gruyter. 654–64.
- 2008a. 'Loanword typology: Steps toward a systematic cross-linguistic study of lexical borrowability', in: T. Stolz, D. Bakker & R. Salas Palomo (eds.), *Aspects of language contact: New theoretical, methodological and empirical findings with special focus on Romancisation processes*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 43–62.
- 2008b. 'Frequency vs. iconicity in explaining grammatical asymmetries', in: *Cognitive Linguistics* 19(1) 2008, 1–33.
- 2010. 'Comparative concepts and descriptive categories in crosslinguistic studies', in: *Language* 86 (3), 663–687.
- 2011. On S, A, P, T, and R as comparative concepts for alignment typology, in: *Linguistic Typology* 15(3), 535–567.
- 2015a. 'Transitivity prominence', in: A. L. Malchukov & B. Comrie (eds.), *Valency classes in the world's languages: A comparative handbook*, vol. 1. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 131–147.
- 2015b. 'A grammatical overview of Egyptian and Coptic', in: E. Grossman, M. Haspelmath & T.S. Richter (eds.), *Egyptian-Coptic Linguistics in Typological perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 103–145.
- 2016. 'Universals of causative and anticausative verb formation and the spontaneity scale', in: *Lingua Posnaniensis* 2016, 33–63.
- Haspelmath, Martin, Andreea Calude, Michael Spagnol, Heiko Narrog & Elif Bamyacı. 2014. 'Coding causal-noncausal verb alternations: A form-frequency correspondence explanation', in: *Journal of Linguistics* 50(3). 587–625.
- Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva. 2005. *Language Contact and Grammatical Change*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hopper, Paul & Sandra Thompson. 1980. 'Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse', in: *Language*, 56, 251–99.
- Jernstedt, Petr V. 1925. 'Zum Gebrauch des koptischen Qualitativs'. *Doklady AN SSSR* 1925, 23–26.
- 1959. *Koptskie teksty Gosudarstvennogo Ermitazha*. [Coptic texts of the State Hermitage]. Moscow-Leningrad: AN SSSR.
- 1986. *Issledovanija po grammatike koptskogo jazyka*. [Studies in the grammar of Coptic language]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Johnson, Janet H. 1976. *The Demotic Verbal System*. Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
- Junge, Friedrich. 2005. *Late Egyptian Grammar: An Introduction*. Transl. David Warburton. Oxford: Griffith Institute.
- Khrakovsky, Viktor S. 1989. 'Semanticheskie tipy mnozhestva situacij i ih estestvennaja klassifikacija' [Semantic types of situational multitude and their natural classification], in: Khrakovsky (ed.), *Tipologija iterativnyh konstrukcij [Typology of iterative constructions]*. Leningrad: Nauka, 5–53.
- Kittilä, Seppo. 2002. *Transitivity: Towards a Comprehensive Typology*. [Publications in General Linguistics 5]. University of Turku.
- Kossmann, Maarten. 2010. 'Parallel System Borrowing: Parallel morphological systems due to the borrowing of paradigms', in: *Diachronica*, Vol. 27:3 (2010), 459–488.
- Kühner, Raphael & Bernhard Gerth. 1898. *Ausführliche Grammatik der Griechischen Sprache von Dr Raphael Kühner*. Zweiter Teil: Satzlehre. Dritte Auflage in zwei Bänden in Neuer Bearbeitung besorgt vom Dr Bernhard Gerth. Erster Band. Hannover und Leipzig. Hahnsche Buchhandlung.

- Kulikov, Leonid. 1998. 'Passive, Anticausative and Classification of Verbs: The Case of Vedic', in: *Typology of verbal categories: Papers presented to Vladimir Nedjalkov on the occasion of his 70th birthday* [Linguistische Arbeiten 382], 139-154. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- 1999. 'Split causativity: remarks on correlations between transitivity, aspect, and tense', in: W. Abraham & L. Kulikov (eds.), *Tense-Aspect, Transitivity and Causativity: Essays in honour of Vladimir Nedjalkov*. [Studies in Language Companion Series 50], 21-42. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- 2014. 'The decline of labile syntax in Old Indo-Aryan: A diachronic typological perspective', in: *Linguistics* 52(4) [Special issue: Typology of Labile Verbs: Focus on Diachrony], 1139-1165.
- Labov, William. 1994. *Principles of Linguistic Change, Vol. 1: Internal factors*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lambdin, Thomas O. 1983. *Introduction to Sahidic Coptic: New Coptic Grammar*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press.
- Lakoff, George. 1977. 'Linguistic Gestalts', in: W.A. Beach, S.E. Fox, S. Philosoph (eds.), *Papers from the Thirteenth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society*, 236-287. Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Lavidas, Nikolaos. 2009. *Transitivity Alternations in Diachrony: Changes in Argument Structure and Voice Morphology*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Layton, Bentley. 2011. *A Coptic Grammar with Chrestomathy and Glossary: Sahidic Dialect*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag. (3rd edition).
- Lefort, Louis Théophile. 1950. *Concordance du Nouveau Testament sahidique, I. Les mots d'origine grecque*. Subs. 1. [Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, 124. Subsidia, 1]. Louvain: Imprimerie orientaliste L. Durbecq.
- Letuchiy, Alexander. 2010. 'Interpreting the spontaneity scale', in: P. Brandt, M. Garcia García (eds.), *Transitivity: Form, Meaning, Acquisition, and Processing*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- 2013. "Tipologija labil'nyx glagolov: Semantičeskije i morfosintaksičeskije aspekty" (Typology of Labile Verbs: Semantic and Morphosyntactic Aspects). Moscow: Jazyki slavjanskoj kul'tury.
- (online) 'Typology of systems of labile verbs' (http://aletuchiy.narod.ru/handouts_articles/Transitivity/handout_Lancaster_new.pdf).
- Levin, Beth, & Malka Rappaport Hovav. 1995. *Unaccusativity*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Liddell, Henry George, Henry Stuart Jones, Robert Scott & Roderick McKenzie. 1996. *Liddell and Scott Greek-English Lexicon* (9th edition, 1940). Clarendon Press: Oxford.
- Lincke, Eliese-Sophia. 2018. Sahidic-Coptic prepositions in a typological perspective. PhD Thesis (forthcoming).
- Luraghi, Silvia. 2010. 'The extension of the transitive construction in Ancient Greek', in: *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 42.1, 60-74.
- Ljutikova, Ekaterina & Anastasiya Bonch-Osmolovskaya. 2006. 'A very active passive: Functional similarities between passive and causative in Balkar', in: L. Kulikov, A. Malchukov & P. De Swart (eds.), *Case, Valency and Transitivity* [Studies in Language Companion Series 77]. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 393-416.
- Malaise, Michel et Jean Winand. 1999. *Grammaire raisonnée de l'égyptien classique* [Aegyptiaca Leodiensia 6]. Liège: C.I.P.L.
- Matras, Yaron & Jeannette Sakel (eds.). 2007. *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*. [Empirical approaches to language typology 38]. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Matras, Yaron. 2011. 'Universals of structural borrowing', in: P. Siemund (ed.), *Linguistic universals and language variation*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 200-229.
- Mel'čuk, Igor & Alexandr Xolodovič. 1970. "K teorii grammatičeskogo zaloga" [On the theory of grammatical voice], in: *Narody Azii i Afriki*, 1970 (4).
- Mel'čuk, Igor. 1993. 'The inflectional category of voice: towards a more rigorous definition', in: B. Comrie & M. Polinsky (eds.), *Causatives and Transitivity* [Studies in Language Companion Series 23]. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 1-47.

- Mithun, Marianne. 2012. 'Morphologies in contact: Form, meaning, and use in the grammar of reference', in: T. Stolz, M. Vanhove, H. Otsuka, and A. Urdzu (eds.) *Morphologies in Contact*. [Studia Typologica 10], 15-36. Berlin: Akademia Verlag.
- Muraoka, Takamitsu. 1978. 'On the so-called dativus ethicus in Hebrew', in *The Journal of Theological Studies, New Series*, Vol. 29, No. 2 (October 1978), 495-498.
- Muysken, Pieter. 2000. *Bilingual speech. A typology of code-mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 2010. 'Scenarios for language contact', in: R. Hickey (ed.), *Handbook of language contact*, 265-281. Oxford: Blackwell.
- 2017. 'Using Scenarios in Language Contact Studies: Linguistic Borrowing into Coptic', in: E. Grossman, P. Dils, T.S. Richter & W. Schenkel (eds.), *Greek Influence on Egyptian-Coptic: Contact-Induced Change in an Ancient African Language*. [DDGLC Working Papers 1], 3-16. Hamburg: Widmaier Verlag.
- Næss, Åshild. 2007. *Prototypical Transitivity* [Typological Studies in Language (TSL) 72]. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Nedjalkov, Vladimir P. 1969. "Nekotoryje verojatnostnyje universalii v glagol'nom slovoobrazovanii" (Some probabilistic universals in verbal derivation), in: I.F. Vardul' (ed.), *Jazykovyje universalii i lingvističeskaja tipologija*, 106–114. Moscow: Nauka.
- Nedjalkov, Vladimir P. & Georgij G. Sil'nickij. 1969. 'Tipologija morfoloģiceskogo i leksiceskogo kauzativov' (The typology of morphological and lexical causatives), in: A. Xolodovic (ed.), *Tipologija kauzativnyx konstrukcij: Morfoloģiceskij kauzativ*, 20-50. Leningrad: Nauka. [Translated: Nedjalkov, V.P. & G.G. Sil'nickij. 1973. 'The Typology of Morphological and Lexical Causatives', in: F. Kiefer (ed.). *Trends in Soviet Theoretical Linguistics*. Dordrecht: D.Reidel.]
- Nedjalkov, Vladimir & Sergey Jaxontov. 1988. 'The Typology of Resultative Constructions', in V. Nedjaikov (ed.), *Typology of Resultative Constructions*, 3-62. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Paducheva, Elena & Mati Pentus. 2008. 'Formal and informal semantics of telicity', in: Rothstein, Susan (ed.), *Theoretical and Crosslinguistic Approaches to the Semantics of Aspect*, 191-215. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Parker, Richard A. 1961. 'The Durative Tenses in P. Rylands IX', in: *JNES*, Vol. 20 (1961), 180–87.
- Perlmutter, David M. 1978. 'Impersonal Passives and the Unaccusative Hypothesis', in: *Proceedings of the 4th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 157-190. University of California Press.
- Polinsky, Maria. 2001. 'Grammatical voice', in: N.J. Smelser, P.B. Baltes (eds.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 6348-6353. New York: Elsevier.
- Polotsky, Hans Jakob. 1957. 'Review of W. C. Till, Koptische Grammatik (saïdischer Dialekt)', in: *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 52, 219–234.
1960. 'The Coptic conjugation system', in: *Orientalia* 29, 4, 392-422. Copy at <http://www.tinyurl.com/y2wennve>.
- 1987-1990. *Die Grundlagen des koptischen Satzbaus*, Vol.1-2. [American Studies in Papyrology 28-29]. Atlanta / Georgia.
- Quack, Joachim Friedrich. 2020. *Demotische Grammatik: Version 2020* (forthcoming).
- Reintges, Chris H. 1995. 'Stem allomorphy, verb movement and Case assignment in Coptic Egyptian', in: *Linguistics in the Netherlands*, Volume 12, Issue 1 (1995), 191 – 202.
- 2001. 'Aspects of the morphosyntax of subjects and objects in Coptic Egyptian', in: T. van der Wouden and H. Broekhuis (eds.), *Linguistics in the Netherlands* 18, 177-188. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- 2004. *Coptic Egyptian (Sahidic Dialect): A Learner's Grammar*. Köln: Rüdiger Köppe.
- 2013. 'Sapirian 'drift' towards analyticity and long-term morphosyntactic change in Ancient Egyptian', in: R. Kikusawa and L. A. Reid (eds.), *Historical Linguistics 2011: Selected Paper from the 20th International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Osaka, 25–30 July 2011*, 289–328. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- 2015. 'Old and Early Middle-Egyptian stative', in: E. Grossman, M. Haspelmath & T.S. Richter (eds.), *Egyptian-Coptic Linguistics in Typological perspective*, 387-455. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Richter, Tonio Sebastian. 2015. 'Early encounters: Egyptian-Coptic studies and comparative linguistics in the century from Schlegel to Finck', in: E. Grossman, M. Haspelmath & T.S. Richter (eds.), *Egyptian-Coptic Linguistics in Typological perspective*, 3-69. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Rothstein, Susan. 2008. 'Telicity, atomicity and the Vendler classification of verbs', in: Rothstein, Susan (ed.), *Theoretical and Crosslinguistic Approaches to the Semantics of Aspect*, 43-77. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sakel, Jeanette. 2007. 'Types of loan: matter and pattern', in Y. Matras & J. Sakel (eds.), *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*, 15-29. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Satzinger, Helmut. 1976. *Neuägyptische Studien. Die Partikel ir – Das Tempussystem*. [Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, Beiheft 6.] Wien.
- (online) Late Egyptian, part 2. (https://homepage.univie.ac.at/helmut.satzinger/Texte/LEgn_2.pdf).
- Seifart, Frank. 2015. 'Direct and indirect affix borrowing', in: *Language*, Vol. 91/3 (2015), 511-532.
- Siewierska, Anna. 1984. *The passive: A comparative linguistic analysis*. London: Croom Helm.
- Schenkel, Wolfgang. 1978. 'Infinitiv und Qualitativ des Koptischen als Verbaladverbien, oder die Jernstedtsche Regel und die Satzarten des Koptischen', in: *Enchoria* 8 (1978), 13-15.
- Sethe, Karl. 1922. 'Ein Missbrauch des Qualitativs im Koptischen', in: *ZÄS* (1922), 138.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi & Prashant Pardeshi. 2002. 'The Causative Continuum', in: M. Shibatani (ed.), *The Grammar of Causation and Interpersonal Manipulation* [Typological studies in language 48], 85-126. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Shisha-Halevy, Ariel. 1981. Bohairic-Late Egyptian Diaglosses: a Contribution to the Typology of Egyptian. In D. W. Young (ed.), *Studies Presented to H.J. Polotsky*. Beacon Hill, 413-438.
- 1986. *Coptic Grammatical Categories: Structural Studies in The Syntax of Shenoutean Sahidic*. Analecta Orientalia 53. Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum.
- 2017. 'A Structural-Interferential View on Greek Elements in Shenoute', in: E. Grossman, P. Dils, T.S. Richter & W. Schenkel (eds.), *Greek Influence on Egyptian-Coptic: Contact-Induced Change in an Ancient African Language*. [DDGLC Working Papers 1], 441-455. Hamburg: Widmaier Verlag.
- Simpson, Robert S. 1996. *Demotic Grammar in the Ptolemaic Sacerdotal Decrees*. Oxford: Griffith Institute, Ashmolean Museum.
- Smith, Carlota S. 1970. 'Jespersen's 'Move and Change' Class and Causative Verbs in English', in: M.A. Jazayery, E.C. Polome and W. Winter (eds.), *Linguistic and Literary Studies in Honor of Archibald A. Hill, Vol.2 : Descriptive Linguistics*, 101-109. The Hague: Mouton, 1970.
- Steinbach-Eicke, Elisabeth. 2017. 'Experiencing is Tasting. Perception Metaphors of Taste in Ancient Egyptian', in: *Lingua Aegyptia* 25 (2017), 373-390.
- Steindorff, Georg. 1951. *Lehrbuch der koptischen Grammatik*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Stern, Ludwig. 1880. *Koptische Grammatik*. Leipzig: T. O. Weigel Verlag.
- Stolz, Thomas. 2015. 'Adjective-noun agreement in language contact: loss, realignment and innovation', in: F. Gardani, P. Arkadiev & N. Amirdze (eds.), *Borrowed morphology*, 269-303. Berlin, Boston & Munich: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Tenny, Carol. 1987. *Grammaticalizing aspect and affectedness*. Ph.D. dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Department of Linguistics and Philosophy.
- 1994. *Aspectual roles and the syntax-semantics interface* [Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy 52]. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.
- Testelec Ya.G. 1998. 'On two parameters of transitivity', in: L. Kulikov & H. Vater (eds.), *Typology of verbal categories: Papers Presented to Vladimir Nedjalkov on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday*. [Linguistische Arbeiten, 382], 29-46. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Thomason, Sarah Grey & Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language Contact, Creolization and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Till, Walter C. 1955. *Koptische Grammatik (Säidischer Dialekt)*. Leipzig: Otto Harassowitz.
- Torallas Tovar, Sofia. 2010. 'Greek in Egypt', in: E. J. Bakker (ed.), *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*, 253-266. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- 2017. 'The Reverse Case: Egyptian Borrowing in Greek', in: E. Grossman, P. Dils, T.S. Richter & W. Schenkel (eds.), *Greek Influence on Egyptian-Coptic: Contact-Induced Change in an Ancient African Language*. [DDGLC Working Papers 1], 97-113. Hamburg: Widmaier Verlag.
- Trapp Erich, Wolfram Hörandner, Johannes Diethart et al. Lexikon zur byzantinischen Gräzität, besonders des 9.–12. Jahrhunderts. (Online edition: <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/lbg/>).
- Tsunoda, Tasaku. 1981. 'Split case-marking in verb types and tense/aspect/mood', in: *Linguistics* 19 (1981), 389-438.
- 1985. 'Remarks on Transitivity', in: *Journal of Linguistics* 21 issue 2 (1985), 385-396.
- Vendler, Zeno. 1957. 'Verbs and Times', in: *The Philosophical Review*, Vol. 66, No. 2. (Apr., 1957), 143-160.
- Verkuyl, Henk J. 1972. *On the compositional nature of the aspects*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- 1993. *A theory of aspectuality: The interaction between temporal and atemporal structure*. [Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 64]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 1999. *Aspectual issues: Structuring time and quantity*. [CSLI Lecture Notes, 98]. Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information.
- Wallace, Daniel B. 1996. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of New Testament Greek with Scripture, Subject, and Greek Word Indexes*. Grand Rapids MI: Zondervan Publishing House.
- Weinreich, Uriel. 1953. *Languages in Contact*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Wichmann, Søren & Jan Wohlgemuth. 2008. 'Loan verbs in a typological perspective', in: T. Stolz, D. Bakker, R. Salas Palomo (eds.), *Aspects of Language Contact. New Theoretical, Methodological and Empirical Findings with Special Focus on Romancisation Processes*. [Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 35], 89-122. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Winand, Jean. 2015. 'The Oblique Expression of the Object in Ancient Egyptian', in: E. Grossman, M. Haspelmath & T.S. Richter (eds.), *Egyptian-Coptic Linguistics in Typological perspective*, 533-560. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Winters Margaret E. 1990. 'Toward a theory of syntactic prototypes', in: S. L. Tsahatzidis (ed.), *Meanings and prototypes: Studies in linguistic categorization*, 285-306. London: Routledge.
- Wohlgemuth, Jan. 2009. *A typology of verbal borrowings*. [Trends in linguistics: Studies and monographs 211]. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Wunderlich, Dieter. 2006. 'Towards a structural typology of verb classes', in: D. Wunderlich (ed.), *Advances in the Theory of the Lexicon*, 57-166. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Xolodovič, Alexandr A. 1970. "Zalog.1: Opredelenie. Isčislenie". [Voice.1: Definition. Calculus], in: *Kategorija zaloga. Materialy konferencii*, 2-26. Leningrad: Institut jazykoznanija AN SSSR.
- Young, Dwight Wayne. 1961. 'On Shenoute's Use of Present I', in: *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 20 (1961), 115-119.
- Zakrzewska, Ewa D. 2017a. "A Bilingual Language Variety" or "the Language of the Pharaohs"? Coptic from the Perspective of Contact Linguistics', in: E. Grossman, P. Dils, T.S. Richter & W. Schenkel (eds.), *Greek Influence on Egyptian-Coptic: Contact-Induced Change in an Ancient African Language*. [DDGLC Working Papers 1], 115-161. Hamburg: Widmaier Verlag.
- 2017b. 'Complex verbs in Bohairic Coptic: Language Contact and Valency', in: B. Nolan, E. Diedrichsen (eds.), *Argument realisation in complex predicates and complex events: Verb-verb constructions at the syntax-semantic interface*, 213-243. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Text sources

- Allen, James P. 2002. *The Heqanakht Papyri*. [PMMA 27]. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art. German translation: I. Hafemann.
- Amélineau, Émile. 1914. *Oeuvres de Schenoudi : texte copte et traduction française*. Tome 1, 2. Paris: Ernest Leroux. English translation: N. Speransky.
- Barns, John W. B., Henrik Zilliacus. 1960. *The Antinoopolis Papyri, part II*. London: Egypt Exploration Society. English: N. Speransky.
- C. Barry et al. (eds.). 2000. *Zostrien*. [BCNH.T 24]. Québec; Leuven: Les presses de l'Université Laval; Peeters. English translation: D. Burns.
- Bilabel, Friedrich. 1934. *Griechische, koptische und arabische Texte zur Religion und religiösen Literatur in Ägyptens Spätzeit*. [Veröffentlichungen aus den badischen Papyrus-Sammlungen]. Heidelberg: Verlag der Universitätsbibliothek. English translation: A. Grons.
- Boud'hors, Anne. 2013. *Le Canon 8 de Chénouté. Introduction, édition critique*. Le Caire: Institut français d'archéologie orientale. English translation: N. Speransky.
- Boud'hors, Anne, Chantal Heurtel. 2016. *Frangué, moine d'Égypte : une correspondance sur terre cuite au VIIIe siècle*. Lis et parle.
- Budge, Ernest A.W. 1913. *Coptic Apocrypha in the Dialect of Upper Egypt: Edited, with English Translations*. Oxford: Horace Hart.
- Budge, Ernest A. W. 1914. *Coptic Martyrdoms etc. in the Dialect of Upper Egypt*. London: Printed by order of the Trustees.
- Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* (BASP) 48 (2011), 79-88 (Miller, Joseph G., ed.).
- Camino, Ricardo A. 1954. *Late-Egyptian Miscellanies*. London: Oxford University Press, 497-501. German translation: L. Popko.
- Chapman, Paul. 1993. 'Homily on the Passion and Resurrection Attributed to Evodius of Rome', in: L. Depuydt (ed.), *Homiletica From the Pierpont Morgan Library*. [CSCO 524]. Louvain: Peeters.
- Chapman, Paul, Leo Depuydt. 1993. *Encomiastica from the Pierpont Morgan Library: 5 Coptic homilies attributed to Anastasius of Euchaita, Epiphanius of Salamis, Isaac of Antioch, Severian of Gabala, and Theopompus of Antioch*. [CSCO/SC 544/47; 545/48]. Louvain, Paris: Peeters. English translation: A. Grons.
- Chassinat, Émile. 1921. *Un papyrus médical copte: Publié et traduit*. [MIFAO 32]. Le Caire: L'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale. English translation: A. Grons.
- Coles, Revel A., Herwig Maehler, Peter J. Parsons. 1987. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. London: Egypt Exploration Society.
- Cramer, Maria, Martin Krause. 2008. *Das koptische Antiphonar*. Jerusalem Theologisches Forum 12. Münster: Aschendorff. English translation: A. Grons.
- Crégheur, Eric. 2013. *Édition critique, traduction et introduction des "deux Livres de Iéou" (MS Bruce 96), avec des notes philologiques et textuelles*. Québec: Université Laval. English translation: A. Winterberg.
- Cristea, Hans-Joachim. 2011. *Schenute von Atripe: Contra Origenistas. Edition des koptischen Textes mit annotierter Übersetzung und Indizes einschließlich einer Übersetzung des 16. Osterfestbriefs des Theophilus in der Fassung des Hieronymus (ep. 96)*. [STAC 60]. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. English translation: S. Becker.
- Crum, Walter E. 1902. *Coptic Ostraca: From the collections of the Egypt Exploration Fund, the Cairo Museum and Others*. London: The Egypt Exploration Fund.
- Crum, Walter E. 1905. *Catalogue of the Coptic manuscripts in the British Museum*. Vol. 1. London: British Museum Dept. of Oriental printed books and manuscripts.
- Crum, Walter E. 1910. *Greek papyri in the British Museum. Vol. 4. The Aphrodito Papyri, edited by H. I. Bell, M.A. With an Appendix of Coptic Papyri, edited by W. E. Crum, M.A.* London: The Trustees of the British Museum.

- Crum, Walter E. 1915. *Der Papyruscodex Saec. VI - VII der Phillippsbibliothek in Cheltenham. Koptische theologische Schriften: Mit einem Beitr. von A. Ehrhard*. Strasburg: Karl J. Trübner.
- Crum, Walter E. 1925. 'Koptische Zünfte und das Pfeffermonopol', in: *ZÄS* 60, 103-111. English translation: A. Gröns.
- Crum, Walter E., G. Steindorf. 1912. *Koptische Rechtsurkunden des achten Jahrhunderts aus Djéme (Theben)*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs. English translation: F. Krueger.
- Crum, Walter E., H. G. Evelyn White. 1926. *The Monastery of Epiphanius at Thebes*. New York
- Dirkse, Peter A., Douglas M. Parrott. 1979. *Nag Hammadi Codices V, 2-5 and VI, with Papyrus Berolinensis 8502, 1 and 4*. [NHS 11]. Leiden: Brill.
- Duttenhöfer, Ruth. 1994. Ptolemäische Urkunden aus der Heidelberger Papyrus-Sammlung (P. Heid. VI). Heidelberg : C. Winter. English translation: N. Speransky.
- Funk, Wolf-Peter. Unpublished. *A Work Concordance to Shenoute's Canons*. Quebec City. 2007.
- Gardiner, A.H. 'Inscriptions from the tomb of Si-renpowet I., prince of Elephantine', in: *ZÄS* 45, 1908-1909, 123-132.
- Gardiner, A.H. 1909. Die Erzählung des Sinuhe und die Hirtengeschichte, Hieratische Papyrus aus den Königlichen Museen zu Berlin, vol. V. Leipzig. English translation: N. Speransky.
- Garel, Esther. 2020. *Héritage et transmission dans le monachisme égyptien: Les testaments des supérieurs du topos de Saint-Phoibammôn à Thèbes (P.Mon.Phoib.Text.)*. [Bibliothèque d'études coptes 27]. Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale.
- Garitte, Gérard. 1943. 'Panégyrique de saint Antoine par Jean, évêque d'Hermopolis', in: *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 9:3, 100-34, 330-65. English translation: F. Krueger.
- Goehring, James E. 2012. *Politics, Monasticism, and Miracles in Sixth Century Upper Egypt: A Critical Edition and Translation of the Coptic Texts on Abraham of Farshut*. [Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 69]. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Grenfell, Bernard P., Hunt, Arthur S. 1898. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri. Volume VIII (Nos 1073-1165)*. London: Egypt Exploration Fund.
- Griffith, Francis Ll., Herbert Thompson. 1921. *The Demotic Papyrus London and Leiden*. London.
- Hedrick, Charles W., Douglas M. Parrott. 'The (Second) Apocalypse of James', in: *Nag Hammadi Codices V, 2-5 and VI, with Papyrus Berolinensis 8502, 1 and 4*. [NHS 11]. Leiden: Brill.
- Jernstedt, Petr V. 1959. Koptskie teksty Gosudarstvennogo muzeia izobrazitel'nykh iskusstv imeni A.S. Pushkina. [Coptic texts of Pushkin State Museum]. Moscow-Leningrad: AN SSSR.
- Kuhn, Karl Heinz. 1956. Letters and Sermons of Besa. *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 157/ Scriptorum Coptici 21*. Louvain: Imprimerie Orientaliste L.Durbecq.
- Landgrafova, Renata, Peter Dils. Strukturen und Transformationen des Wortschatzes der ägyptischen Sprache, Sächsische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Leipzig. TLA
- Lanne, Emmanuel. 1958. Le Grand Euchologe du Monastère Blanc: Text Copte édité avec traduction française. [Patrologia Orientalis 135]. Paris: Firmin-Didot et Cie.
- Lapp, Günther. 1997. *The Papyrus of Nu (BMEA 10477), Catalogue of Books of the Dead in the British Museum*, vol. I. London: British Museum. English translation: N. Speransky.
- Layton, Bentley (ed.). 1989. *Nag Hammadi Codex II, 2-7 Together With XIII, 2**, BRIT. LIB. OR. 4926(1), and P.OXY. I, 654, 655. Vol. 1. New York: Brill.
- Layton, Bentley. 2014. *The Canons of Our Fathers: Monastic Rules of Shenoute*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lefort, Louis-Théophile. 1956. *Œuvres de S. Pachôme et de ses disciples*. [CSCO / CS 159/23; 160/24] Louvain: Durbecq.
- Leipoldt, Johannes. 1954. *Sinuthii Archimandritae Vita et Opera Omnia iv*. [Scriptores Coptici 5]. Louvain: Imprimerie Orientaliste L.Durbecq.
- Leipoldt, Johannes. 1955. *Sinuthii Archimandritae Vita et Opera Omnia iii*. [Scriptores Coptici 2]. Louvain: Imprimerie Orientaliste L.Durbecq.
- Lexa, František. 1926. *Papyrus Insinger: les enseignements moraux d'un scribe égyptien du premier siècle après J.-C*. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner. German translation: G. Vittmann.

- Lundhaug, Hugo. 2010. *Images of Rebirth: Cognitive Poetics and Transformational Soteriology in the Gospel of Philip and the Exegesis on the Soul*. Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- MacRae, George. 1979. *Apocalypse of Adam, in Nag Hammadi Codices V, 2-5 and VI, with Papyrus Berolinensis 8502, 1 and 4*, ed. D.M.Parrott. Nag Hammadi Studies XI. Leiden: Brill.
- Maspero, Jean. 1911. *Papyrus grecs d'époque byzantine, Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire*. Tome 1. Le Caire: Imprimerie de l'IFAO. English translation: N. Speransky.
- Maspero, Jean. 1913. Maspero, Jean. 1911. *Papyrus grecs d'époque byzantine, Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire*. Tome 2. Le Caire: Imprimerie de l'IFAO. English translation: N. Speransky.
- Maspero, Jean. 1916. Maspero, Jean. 1911. *Papyrus grecs d'époque byzantine, Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire*. Tome 3. Le Caire: Imprimerie de l'IFAO. English translation: N. Speransky.
- Mina, Togo. 1937. *Le Martyre d'Apa Epima*. Cairo: Imprimerie Nationale. English translation: V. Walter.
- Müller, C. Detlef G. 1968. *Die Homilie über die Hochzeit zu Kana und weitere Schriften des Patriarchen Benjamin I. von Alexandrien*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Müller, Matthias, Sami Uljas. 2019. *Martyrs and Archangels: Coptic Literary Texts from the Pierpont Morgan Library*. [Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum]. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Munro, Irmtraut. 1994. *Die Totenbuch-Handschriften des 18. Dynastie im Ägyptischen Museum Cairo: Tafelband*. [Ägyptologische Abhandlungen 54]. Harassowitz.
- Nestle, Eberhard, Aland, Barbara, Aland, Kurt. 2012. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 28. Auflage. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Orlandi, Tito. 1968. *Storia della chiesa di Allessandria. Vol.II: da Teofilo a Timoteo II. Testo copto, traduzione e commento*. [Studi Copti 2]. Milano, Varese: Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino. English translation: S.Becker.
- Peel, Malcolm, Birger A. Pearson. 1996. 'The Teachings of Silvanus', in: *Nag Hammadi Codex VII: Text, Translation, and Notes*. [NHMS 30]. Leiden; New York; Köln: Brill.
- Pleyte, W., Boeser, P.A.A. 1897. *Manuscripts coptes du Musée des Pays-Bas à Leide*. Leiden: Brill. English translation: N.Speransky.
- Poirier, Paul-Hubert. 2006. *La Pensée Première à la Triple Forme (NH XIII, 1)*. [BCNH.T 32]. Québec; Louvain; Paris; Dudley, MA: Les presses de l'Université Laval; Peeters. English translation: D. Burns.
- Rahlf's, Alfred, Hanhart, Robert. 2006. *Septuaginta Id est Vetus Testamentum graece*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Rossi, Francesco. 1892. 'Transcrizione con traduzione italiana dal testo copto di un sermone sulla Passione del nostro Signore Gesù Cristo con vari altri frammenti copti del Museo Egizio di Torino', in: *Memorie della Reale Accademia delle Scienze di Torino* 42, 111-143. English translation: N.Speransky.
- Rupprecht, Hans-Albert, Joachim Hengstl. 1997. *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten*. Wiesbaden: Harassowitz.
- Ryholt, Kim. 1999. *The Carlsberg Papyri 4. The Story of Petese Son of Petetum*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press. German translation: L. Popko.
- Salomons, Robert P. 1996. *Papyri Bodeleianae I*. [Studia Amstelodamensia ad epigraphicam, ius antiquum et papyrologicam pertinentia 34]. Amsterdam: Gieben. English translation: N. Speransky.
- Schenke, Gesa. 2013. *Das koptisch hagiographische Dossier des Heiligen Kolluthos, Arzt, Märtyrer und Wunderheiler: eingeleitet, neu ediert, übersetzt und kommentiert*. [CSCO 650]. Louvain: Peeters.
- Schenke Robinson, Gesine. 2004. *Das Berliner "Koptische Buch" (P20915). Eine Wieder Hergestellte Frühchristlich-theologische Abhandlung*. [CSCO 611]. Louvain: Peeters.

- Schenke, Hans-Martin. 1981. *Das Matthäus-Evangelium im mittelägyptischen Dialekt des Koptischen: Codex Scheide*. [Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 127]. Berlin: Akademie Verlag. English translation: V. Walter.
- Schiller, Arthur. 1932. *Ten Coptic Legal Texts*. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Arts.
- Schiller, Arthur. 1968. 'The Budge papyrus of Columbia University', in: *Journal of American Research Center in Egypt* 7, 79-118. American Research Center in Egypt.
- Schmidt, Carl, Violet MacDermot. 1978. *Pistis Sophia*. [NHS 9]. Leiden: Brill.
- Sheridan, J. Mark. 1998. *Rufus of Shotep: Homilies on the Gospels of Matthew and Luke: Introduction, Text, Translation, Commentary*. Rome: Centro Italiano Microfiches.
- Sheridan, J. Mark. 2012. *From the Nile to the Rhone and beyond: Studies in Early Monastic Literature and Scriptural Interpretation*. [Studia Anselmiana 156]. Rome: Editions Sankt Ottilien.
- Smith, Mark J. 2002. *On the Primaeval Ocean. The Carlsberg Papyri* 5. Copenhagen: Carsten Niebuhr Institute Publications 26.
- Smith, Mark J. 2005. *Papyrus Harkness (MMA 31.9.7)*. Oxford: Griffith Institute Publications.
- Spiegelberg, William. 1910. *Der Sagenkreis des Königs Petubastis*. Leipzig: J.C.Hinrichs.
- Spiegelberg, William. 1917. *Der ägyptische Mythos vom Sonnenaug, der Papyrus der Tierfabeln, Kufi. Nach dem Leidener demotischen Papyrus I 384*. Straßburg: Straßburger Druckerei und Verlagsanstalt.
- Steindorf, Georg. 1913. *Das Grab des Ti*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs.
- Till, Walter C., Hans-Martin Schenke. 1972. *Die gnostischen Schriften des koptischen Papyrus Berolinensis 8502: Hg. übers. und bearb. von Walter C. Till. 2., erw. Aufl. bearb. v. Hans-Martin Schenke*. [Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 60]. Berlin: Akademie Verlag. English translation: A. Winterberg.
- Töpfer, Susanne. 2013. *Eine (Neu-)Edition der Textkomposition "Balsamierungsritual". pBoulaq 3, pLouvre 5158, pDurham 1983.11+pSt.Petersburg 18128*, Diss. Heidelberg.
- Vitelli, Girolamo. 1906. *Papiri fiorentini*. Milano: Hoepli. English translation: N.Speransky.
- G. Vitelli, M. Norsa et al. (eds.). 1917. *Papiri greci e latini V*. [Publicazioni della Società Italiana per la ricerca dei papiri greci e latini in Egitto]. Firenze: Tipografia Enrico Aiani. English translation: N.Speransky.
- Vittmann, Günther. *Der demotische Papyrus Rylands 9:1 Text Und Übersetzung*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz. English translation: N. Speransky.
- Waldstein, Michael, Frederik Wisse 1995. *The Apocryphon of John: Synopsis of Nag Hammadi Codices II,1; III,1; and IV,1 with BG 8502,2*. [NHMS 33]. Leiden: Brill.
- Wansink, Craig. 1991. 'Encomium on the Four Bodiless Creatures', in: *Homiletica from the Pierpont Morgan Library: Seven Coptic Homilies Attributed to Basil the Great, John Chrysostom, and Euodius of Rome*. [CSCO /SC 524/43; 525/44]. Louvain: Peeters.
- Wessely, Carl. 1909. *Griechische und Koptische Texte Theologischen Inhalts I*. Leipzig: Verlag von Eduard Avenarius.
- Wisse, Frederik, Birger A. Pearson. 1996. *Nag Hammadi Codex VII: Text, Translation, and Notes*. [NHMS 30]. Leiden; New York; Köln: Brill.
- Wisse, Frederik, Douglas M. Parrott 1979. 'The Concept of Our Great Power', in: *Nag Hammadi Codices V, 2-5 and VI, with Papyrus Berolinensis 8502, 1 and 4*. [NHS 11]. Leiden: Brill.
- Zauzich, Karl-Theodor. 1993. *Papyri von der Insel Elephantine (= Dem. Pap. Berlin, Lfg. III)*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Index of Greek Verbs

ἀγανακτέω.....	180	ἀντιποιέω.....	133
ἀγαπάω.....	180	ἀντιφωνέω.....	176
ἀγγέλλω.....	176	ἀξιόω.....	181
ἀγιάζω.....	180	ἀπαγγέλλω.....	181
ἀγνεύω.....	180	ἀπαγοράζω.....	176
ἀγνωμονέω.....	180	ἀπάγω.....	176
ἀγωνίζομαι.....	136, 139, 180	ἀπαιτέω.....	181
ἀδικέω.....	180	ἀπαντάω.....	181
ἀθετέω.....	180	ἀπαρνέομαι.....	136, 181
ἀθλέω.....	180	ἀπατάω.....	181
αἰσθάνομαι.....	132	ἀπειλέω.....	181
αἰτέω.....	180	ἀπελπίζω.....	181
αἰχμαλωτεύω.....	180	ἀπιστέω.....	181
αἰχμαλωτίζω.....	180	ἀποβάλλω.....	181
ἀκολουθέω.....	180	ἀποδείκνυμι.....	181
ἀκονάω.....	176	ἀποδέχομαι.....	136, 176
ἀκριβάζω.....	180	ἀποδημέω.....	181
ἀκυρόω.....	180	ἀποδίδωμι.....	176
ἀλλάσσω.....	109, 180	ἀποκαθίστημι.....	181
ἀλληγορέω.....	180	ἀποκηρύσσω.....	176
ἀμελέω.....	180	ἀπολαύω.....	132
ἀμφιβάλλω.....	180	ἀπολογίζομαι.....	136, 181
ἀναγκάζω.....	180	ἀπολύω.....	181
ἀναδίδωμι.....	180	ἀποσοβέω.....	181
ἀναθεματίζω.....	180	ἀποστατέω.....	176
ἀνακαλέω.....	180	ἀποστερέω.....	181
ἀνακεφαλαιογράφω.....	176	ἀποστηθίζω.....	181
ἀνακρίνω.....	180	ἀποτάσσω.....	181
ἀνακτάομαι.....	138, 180	ἀποτίλλω.....	175
ἀναλαμβάνω.....	180	ἀποφαίνω.....	181
ἀναλίσκω.....	156	ἀποχαρίζομαι.....	136, 181
ἀναλυτρόω.....	176	ἀπτίζω.....	176
ἀναλύω.....	176	ἀράομαι.....	133
ἀνανεύω.....	176	ἀρέσκω.....	181
ἀναπλάσσω.....	176	ἀριστάω.....	181
ἀναπληρόω.....	176	ἀρκέω.....	176
ἀναστατόω.....	180	ἀρμόζω.....	156
ἀναστρέφω.....	180	ἀρνέομαι.....	132
ἀνατρέπω.....	180	ἀρπάζω.....	181
ἀναχωρέω.....	180	ἀρχεῖν.....	167
ἀνδάνω.....	156	ἀρχεσθαι.....	167
ἀνδραγαθέω.....	181	ἄρχω.....	181
ἀνέχομαι.....	133	ἀσκέω.....	181
ἀνέχω.....	132, 133	ἀσπάζομαι.....	136, 181
ἀνήκω.....	132, 170	ἀσφαλίζω.....	182
ἀνομέω.....	181	ἀσχημονέω.....	182
ἀντιγράφω.....	176	ἀτακτέω.....	182
ἀντιλέγω.....	181	ἀτονέω.....	182

αυξάνω.....	155, 156	διορθόω.....	182
αυτουργέω.....	182	διστάζω.....	155, 182
ἀφίστημι.....	176	διώκω.....	183
ἀφορίζω.....	182	δογματίζω.....	156
βαπτίζω.....	156	δοκέω.....	183
βάπτω.....	176	δοκιμάζω.....	183
βασανίζω.....	156	δωρέομαι.....	148
βασκαίνω.....	176	δωρίζω.....	183
βατταλογέω.....	176	ἐγγυάω.....	183
βδελύσσομαι.....	135	ἐγκακέω.....	183
βεβαιόω.....	156	ἐγκαλέω.....	183
βιάζω.....	182	ἐγκρατεύομαι.....	136, 138, 183
βλασφημέω.....	182	ἐγκωμιάζω.....	176
βοηθέω.....	182	ἐκκλίνω.....	177
βουλλόω.....	176	ἐκλαμβάνω.....	183
γενεαλογέω.....	176	ἐκμαρτυρέω.....	145
γογγύζω.....	176	ἐκφράζω.....	177
γράφω.....	182	ἐλέγχο.....	183
γυμνάζω.....	156	ἐλευθερώω.....	183
δαμονίζομαι.....	136, 139, 182	ἐλπίζω.....	183
δαμάζω.....	182	ἐμποδίζω.....	183
δαπανάω.....	148, 182	ἐμφανίζομαι.....	134
δεικνεύω.....	182	ἐμφανίζω.....	132, 134
δειπνέω.....	182	ἐνάγω.....	183
δέχομαι.....	136, 176	ἐνθυμέομαι.....	136, 177
δηλώω.....	182	ἐνοχλέω.....	183
δημεύω.....	176	ἐντινάσσω.....	177
δημιουργέω.....	182	ἐξάγω.....	177
δημοσιόω.....	182	ἐξαπατάω.....	183
δηφεντεύω.....	182	ἐξειλέω.....	183
διαβάλλω.....	182	ἐξετάζω.....	183
διαγράφω.....	176	ἐξηγέομαι.....	132
διαδέχομαι.....	136, 182	ἐξομολογέω.....	183
διακονέω.....	152, 182	ἐξορίζω.....	183
διακρίνω.....	182	ἐπαινέω.....	183
διαλέγομαι.....	134	ἐπεξεργάζομαι.....	177
διαλέγω.....	132, 134	ἐπερείδω.....	133, 134
διαλύω.....	176	ἐπηρεάζω.....	183
διαμαρτυρέω.....	145, 176	ἐπιβουλεύω.....	183
διαμαρτύρομαι.....	146	ἐπιδίδωμι.....	183
διανέμο.....	182	ἐπιθυμέω.....	183
διαστέλλω.....	132	ἐπικαλέω.....	183
διασφύζω.....	176	ἐπινοέω.....	183
διατίθεμαι.....	134	ἐπισωρεύω.....	177
διατίθημι.....	133, 134	ἐπιτάσσω.....	183
διατρέπω.....	182	ἐπιτελέω.....	184
διατρίβω.....	182	ἐπιτηδεύω.....	177
διαφέρω.....	132	ἐπιτιμάω.....	184
διδάσκω.....	182	ἐπιτρέπω.....	184
δικάζω.....	182	ἐπιφέρω.....	177, 184
δικαιολογέομαι.....	182	ἐπιχειρέω.....	132
διοικέω.....	182	ἐρίζω.....	184

έρμηνεύω.....	184	κατάρχω.....	177
ἔρχομαι.....	136	καταστέλλω.....	185
ἐτάζω.....	184	καταστρέφω.....	177
εὐαγγελέω.....	184	καταφρονέω.....	156
εὐαγγελίζομαι.....	136	κατέχω.....	155, 156
εὐδοκέω.....	184	κατηγορέω.....	185
εὐδοκιμέω.....	184	κατοικέω.....	185
εὐλογέω.....	184	κατορθόω.....	156
εὐπορέω.....	184	καυτηριάζω.....	177
εὐφραίνω.....	156	κελεύω.....	185
εὐχαριστέω.....	184	κεράννυμι.....	156
ζωγραφέω.....	156	κερδαίνω.....	185
ἡδάνω.....	156	κηρύσσω.....	185
ἡσυχάζω.....	184	κιθαρίζω.....	185
θάλπω.....	184	κινδυνεύω.....	185
θαρρέω.....	184	κινέω.....	177
θαυμάζω.....	184	κλασματίζω.....	185
θεολογέω.....	177	κληρονομέω.....	185
θεραπεύω.....	184	κληρώω.....	185
θεωρέω.....	184	κοινωνέω.....	156
θλίβω.....	156	κολακεύω.....	185
θροέω.....	177	κολλάω.....	156
θυσιάζω.....	184	κοσμέω.....	156
ιατρεύω.....	177	κουφίζω.....	156
ιδιάζω.....	177	κρατέω.....	177
ίστορέω.....	184	κρεμάννυμι.....	185
καθαίρω.....	156, 184	κρίνω.....	185
καθαρίζω.....	156	κροτέω.....	177
καθηγέομαι.....	156, 184	κτάομαι.....	133
καθίστημι.....	156	κυβερνάω.....	185
καινοτομέω.....	184	κυμαίνω.....	177
κακολογέω.....	177	κυριεύω.....	132
καλέω.....	184	κυρόω.....	185
κανονίζω.....	184	κωλύω.....	185
καπνίζω.....	184	λαγχάνω.....	177
καρπίζω.....	177	λακτίζω.....	185
καταβάλλω.....	184	λάμπω.....	185
καταγινώσκω.....	184	λειτουργέω.....	185
καταδικάζω.....	184	λεπτύνω.....	185
κατακενόω.....	177	λευκοφορέω.....	185
κατακρίνω.....	184	λευκόω.....	177
καταλαλέω.....	184	λογίζομαι.....	136, 185
καταλαμβάνω.....	184	λογογραφέω.....	177
καταλλάσσω.....	177	λογχίζω.....	186
κατανεύω.....	185	λυπέω.....	156
κατανοέω.....	185	μαγεύω.....	186
καταντάω.....	185	μαθητεύω.....	113, 156
καταξιόω.....	156	μακαρίζω.....	186
καταπατέω.....	185	μαλάσσω.....	186
καταπλάσσω.....	185	μαρτυρέω.....	132, 145, 147
καταποντίζω.....	185	μαρτυρίζομαι.....	147
καταργέω.....	156		

μαρτυρίζω	186	παραλαμβάνω	187
μαρτύρομαι	145, 147	παραλλάσσω	187
μαστιγώ	186	παραμμένο	187
μαυλίζω	186	παραμυθέομαι	156
μελετάω	186	παραμυθίζω	156
μέλω	186	παρανομέω	187
μέμφομαι	136, 186	παρασκευάζω	187
μερίζω	186	παρατηρέω	187
μεριμνάω	177	παραχειμάζω	187
μεσάζω	186	παραχωρέω	187
μεστόω	177	παρέρχομαι	136, 187
μεταβάλλω	177	παριστάνω	187
μεταγγίζω	177	παροράω	178
μεταμορφόω	177	παρρησιάζομαι	187
μετανοέω	186	πάσχω	187
μεταστοιχεύω	186	πατάσσω	187
μετέχω	186	πατέω	178
μετρέω	177	πειράζω	156, 187
μηνύω	186	πειράω	178
μονάζω	178	πενθέω	187
μυσταγωγέω	186	περάω	178
νέμω	150	περιάγω	178
νηστεύω	186	περιγράφω	178
νήφω	180, 181	περιεργάζομαι	187
νικάω	147	περικακέω	178
νοέω	186	περιλαμβάνω	178
νομίζω	178	περιχέω	187
νομοθετέω	186	περιχρίω	187
νουθετέω	178	πήσσω	187
ξενιτεύω	178	πιστεύω	152, 187
οικειόω	133, 134	πιστόω	178
ὀκνέω	186	πλάσσω	187
ὀλιγορέω	178	πλεαώ	188
ὀμιλέω	186	πλεονεκτέω	178
ὀμοιάζω	186	πληρόω	156
ὀμολογέω	186	πλήσσω	188
ὀνομάζω	186	πλύνω	175
ὀπλίζω	186	πολεμέω	188
ὀρίζω	186	πολεύω	178
ὀρχέομαι	186	πολιτεύω	132, 135
παιδαγωγέω	178	πονηρεύω	188
παιδεύω	156	πορνεύω	188
παραβαίνω	156	πραγματεύομαι	132
παραβάλλω	178	πραιδεύω	178
παραγγέλλω	186	πράσσω	132
παράγω	155, 156	πρέπω	188
παραδειγματίζω	187	πρεσβεύω	188
παραδείκνυμι	187	προβάλλω	188
παραδέχομαι	136, 187	προδίδωμι	188
παραδίδωμι	187	προέρχομαι	188
παραιτέομαι	187	προιστάω	188
παρακαλέω	187	προκαλέω	188

προκόπτω.....	188	σπουδάζω.....	189
προκριματίζω.....	178	σταυρώω.....	189
προλαμβάνω.....	188	στεφανόω.....	156
προμαρτυρέω.....	145	στηλιτεύω.....	189
προμηνύω.....	178	στηρίζω.....	178
προνοέω.....	188	στίζω.....	178
προξενίζω.....	178	στοιχέω.....	189
προσαγορεύω.....	188	στολίζω.....	156
προσάγω.....	178	στρατεύομαι.....	138
προσδοκάω.....	188	στρατεύω.....	189
προσεδρεύω.....	175	στρεβλόω.....	189
προσέρχομαι.....	136, 188	συγκαταβαίνω.....	179
προσεύχομαι.....	132	συγκρίνω.....	189
προσέχω.....	188	συγχωρέω.....	189
προσκαρτερέω.....	188	συζητέω.....	189
προσκυνέω.....	188	συλλάω.....	189
προσποιέω.....	178	συλλογίζομαι.....	136, 179
προσφέρω.....	188	συμβοηθέω.....	179
προσφωνέω.....	178	συμβουλεύω.....	189
προσχαρίζομαι.....	136, 188	συμπείθω.....	189
προτάσσω.....	178	συμφανίζω.....	189
προτείνω.....	178	συμφωνέω.....	189
προτρέπω.....	188	συναινέω.....	189
προφητεύω.....	188	συνακολουθέω.....	190
πυκτεύω.....	188	συνακτιζέω.....	190
πυρώω.....	189	συναλλάσσω.....	156, 190
ρεύματιζομαι.....	189	συνέρχομαι.....	136, 190
ρίπιζω.....	189	συνευδοκέω.....	190
ρογέω.....	178	συνέχω.....	179
σαββατίζω.....	178	συνήδομαι.....	156
σαλεύω.....	156	συνίστημι.....	156
σαλπίζω.....	189	συνομιλέω.....	179
σαφηνίζω.....	189	συντάσσω.....	190
σέβομαι.....	133	συντελέω.....	190
σεληνιαζομαι.....	189	συντιθημαι.....	179
σημαίνω.....	189	συντιμάζω.....	190
σημειόω.....	189	συρίζω.....	190
σιαίνω.....	178	συστέλλω.....	179
σικχαίνομαι.....	135	συστρέφω.....	179
σικχαίνω.....	132, 135	σφίγω.....	179
σκανδαλίζω.....	156	σφραγίζω.....	190
σκεπάζω.....	189	σχηματίζω.....	156
σκέπτομαι.....	132	σχολάζω.....	190
σκευάζω.....	189	σωματίζω.....	190
σκιρτάω.....	189	σωφρονέω.....	190
σκορπίζω.....	178	ταλαιπωρέω.....	190
σκοτώω.....	148, 189	ταράσσω.....	156
σκύλλομαι.....	138	τάσσω.....	156
σκύλλω.....	156	ταχύνω.....	190
σκόπτω.....	189	τελειόω / τελέω.....	190
σοφίζω.....	178	τέρπομαι.....	135
σπαταλάω.....	189	τέρπω.....	132, 135

τηρέω.....	190	χορηγέω	191
τιμάω.....	190	χρεωστέω	191
τιμωρέω.....	190	χρηματίζω	191
τολμάω.....	190	χρησιμεύω	191
τριβώ	190	χωνεύω.....	179
τρυφάω	156	χωρέω.....	191
τυπώ	190	ψάλλω	191
τυραννεύω.....	190	ψέγω.....	179
ύβρίζω	190		
ύμνεύω / ύμνέω	190		
ύμνολογέω	179		
ύπαγορεύω	190		
ύπηρετέω.....	190		
ύπισχνέομαι	136, 179		
ύποβάλλω.....	190		
ύπογράφω.....	190		
ύποδέχομαι.....	191		
ύπόκειμαι	133		
ύποκορίζομαι	179		
ύποκρίνω.....	191		
ύπομένω	191		
ύπομνήσκω.....	191		
ύπονοέω	179		
ύποτάσσω.....	156, 191		
ύπουργέω	132		
ύποχωρέω.....	179		
ύστερέω.....	191		
φαίνω	133		
φανερώνω	156		
φαρμακεύω.....	179		
φεύγω	191		
φθονέω	148, 191		
φιλοκαλέω	191		
φιλονικέω	179		
φιλοπονέω.....	179		
φιλοσοφέω.....	191		
φλεγμαινώ	191		
φορέω	191		
φραγελλώνω.....	191		
φρονέω	191		
φροντίζω	179		
χαίρω.....	175		
χαλάω	191		
χαλινώνω.....	191		
χαρακτηρίζω	179		
χαράττω	191		
χαρίζομαι	136		
χαρίζω.....	191		
χειροτονέω	191		
χηρεύω	179		
χλευάζω	191		
χορεύω.....	191		

Index of Coptic Greek-origin verbs

αΓΑΝΑΚΤΕΙ	180	ΑΝΤΙΛΕΓΕ	181
ΑΓΑΠΑ	180	ΑΝΤΙΦΩΝΗ	176
ΑΓΓΕΛΙ	176	ΑΞΙΟΥ	181
ΑΓΝΩΜΟΝΕΙ	180	ΑΠΑΓΓΕΙΛΕ	181
ΑΓΩΝΙΖΕ	136, 139, 180	ΑΠΑΓΕ	176
ΑΔΙΚΕΙ	180	ΑΠΑΓΟΡΑΖΕ	176
ΑΘΕΤΕΙ	154, 180	ΑΠΑΓΤΕΙ	181
ΑΘΛΙ	180	ΑΠΑΝΤΑ	181
ΑΙΣΘΑΝΕ	132, 136, 139	ΑΠΑΡΝΑ	136, 181
ΑΙΣΘΑΝΕΣΘΑΙ	132	ΑΠΑΤΑ	181
ΑΙΤΕΙ	180	ΑΠΕΙΛΕ	181
ΑΙΧΜΑΛΩΤΕΥΕ	180	ΑΠΙΣΤΕΙ	181
ΑΙΧΜΑΛΩΤΙΖΕ	158, 180	ΑΠΟΒΑΛΕ	181
ΑΚΟΛΟΥΘΕΙ	180	ΑΠΟΔΕΧΕ	136, 176
ΑΚΟΝΙ	176	ΑΠΟΔΗΜΕΙ	181
ΑΚΡΙΒΑΖΕ	180	ΑΠΟΔΙΔΟΥ	159, 176
ΑΚΥΡΟΥ	180	ΑΠΟΔΙΚΝΕΥΕ	181
ΑΛΛΗΓΟΡΕΙ	180	ΑΠΟΚΑΘΙΣΤΑ	181
ΑΜΕΛΕΙ	180	ΑΠΟΚΗΡΥΣΣΕ	176
ΑΜΦΙΒΑΛΕ	180	ΑΠΟΛΑΨΕ	132, 137, 138, 139, 173
ΑΝΖΑΙΣΚΕ	151, 158, 160, 165	ΑΠΟΛΑΨΕΣΘΑΙ	132, 137, 173
ΑΝΖΗΚΕΙ	132, 141, 142	ΑΠΟΛΟΓΙΖΕ	136, 181
ΑΝΖΗΚΕΣΘΑΙ	132, 141, 170	ΑΠΟΛΥ	181
ΑΝΨΠΟΙΕΣΘΑΙ	133	ΑΠΟΡΕΙ	151, 158, 160, 164
ΑΝΑΓΚΑΖΕ	150, 151, 160, 172	ΑΠΟΣΘΗΤΙΖΕ	159
ΑΝΑΓΚΑΖΙΝ	153	ΑΠΟΣΟΒΕ	181
ΑΝΑΔΙΔΟΥ	180	ΑΠΟΣΤΑ	176
ΑΝΑΘΕΜΑΤΙΖΕ	180	ΑΠΟΣΤΑΤΕΙ	176
ΑΝΑΚΑΛΕΙ	180	ΑΠΟΣΤΗΘΙΖΕ	181
ΑΝΑΚΕΦΑΛΙΩΓΡΑΦΕΙ	176	ΑΠΟΤΑΣΣΕ	181
ΑΝΑΚΡΙΝΕ	180	ΑΠΟΤΕΙΛΕ	175
ΑΝΑΚΤΑ	138, 180	ΑΠΟΦΑΝΕ	181
ΑΝΑΛΑΜΒΑΝΕ	180	ΑΠΟΧΑΡΙΖΕ	136, 181
ΑΝΑΛΥ	176	ΑΡΑΣΘΑΙ	133, 136, 139
ΑΝΑΛΥΤΡΩΣΕ	176	ΑΡΕΣΚΕ	181
ΑΝΑΝΕΥΣΕ	176	ΑΡΙΣΤΑ	181
ΑΝΑΠΑΥΕ	125, 126, 131, 137, 171	ΑΡΚΕΙ	176
ΑΝΑΠΛΑΣΣΕ	176	ΑΡΝΑ	132, 137, 139, 158, 173
ΑΝΑΠΛΗΡΟΥ	176	ΑΡΝΕΙΣΘΑΙ	132, 137, 173
ΑΝΑΣΤΑΤΟΥ	180	ΑΡΧΕΙ	101, 167-168, 181
ΑΝΑΣΤΡΕΦΕ	180	ΑΡΧΕΙΣΘΑΙ	100, 167-168
ΑΝΑΤΡΕΠΕ	180	ΑΣΚΕΙ	181
ΑΝΑΧΩΡΕΙ	180	ΑΣΠΑΖΕ	136, 181
ΑΝΔΡΑΚΑΘΕΥΕ	181	ΑΣΦΑΛΙΖΕ	182
ΑΝΕΧΕ	132, 136, 138, 139, 157	ΑΣΧΗΜΟΝΕΙ	182
ΑΝΕΧΕΣΘΑΙ	121, 132, 139	ΑΤΑΚΤΙ	182
ΑΝΟΜΕΙ	181	ΑΤΟΝΙ	182
ΑΝΤΙΓΡΑΦΕ	176	ΑΥΖΑΝΕ	150, 151, 153, 154, 158, 160

αγτοργρει.....	182	δικαζε.....	182
αφελπιζε.....	181	δικαιολογει.....	182
αφωρισε.....	182	δικνεγε.....	182
βαρει.....	125, 126, 128	διοκει.....	159, 182
βαρεισθαι.....	126, 128, 131	διορθου.....	182
βασανιζε.....	150, 151, 154, 158, 160, 164, 169, 172	διπνει.....	182
βασανιζιν.....	153	δικταζε.....	172, 182
βασκανε.....	176	διωκει.....	158, 175, 183
βατγαλογι.....	176	δογματιζε.....	151, 160
βαφον.....	176	δοκει.....	183
βιαζε.....	182	δοκιμαζε.....	158, 183
βλαπτει.....	125-126	δωριζε.....	148, 183
βλασφνηι.....	182	εγγα.....	183
βονοει.....	182	εγκαιει.....	183
βογλλιζε.....	176	εγκαιει.....	183
γενεαλογει.....	176	εγκρατεγε.....	136, 138, 183
γενοιγο.....	175	εγκωμιαζε.....	176
герτων.....	185	εглаβε.....	183
γμεν.....	177	εκline.....	177
γραφει.....	182	ελεγε.....	183
γρυπαζε.....	177	ελεγθερου.....	183
γυμναζε.....	151, 160	εμποδιζε.....	183
δαμονιζε.....	136, 139, 182	εμφανιζε.....	132, 136, 159
δαμαζε.....	182	εμφανισθαι.....	132, 147
δαπανεγε.....	148	εναγε.....	183
δαπανη.....	148, 182	ενεργει.....	151, 160
δαπανιζε.....	148, 182	ενεχесθαι.....	141
δεχι.....	136, 176	ενογνει.....	136, 177
δηлог.....	182	ενοχλει.....	183
δνηεγε.....	176	εντιнассе.....	177
δνηιοργρει.....	182	εзаге.....	177
δνηосιογ.....	182	εзаπαга.....	183
δнфентεγε.....	182	εzelei.....	183
δiαβαλλε.....	158, 182	εzeтaze.....	183
διαγραφη.....	176	εzeφpαce.....	177
διαδεχε.....	136, 182	εzhгi.....	132, 139, 140
διακονει.....	182	εzhгicoe.....	132, 140
διακpine.....	182	εzomολογει.....	183
διαλεγει.....	132, 139, 140	εzωpize.....	158, 183
διαλεγειςθαι.....	132, 140	επαينوγ.....	158, 183
διαλλε.....	176	επεzαpгаze.....	177
διανemη.....	182	επεpειдесθαι.....	133, 136
διαstelle.....	132, 137, 141, 173	επnpαze.....	183
διαstelleсθαι.....	132, 137, 141, 173	επιβογλεγε.....	183
διαсωсou.....	176	επιге.....	151
διατιөесθαι.....	133	επιδдоγ.....	183
διαтpепe.....	182	επιογνει.....	183
διαтpивe.....	182	επикаλει.....	183
διαφepει.....	132, 141, 142	επinoei.....	172, 183
διαφepειςθαι.....	132, 141, 142	επicωpεγε.....	177
дидаске.....	182	επitасce.....	183
		επitειeи.....	184

επιτηδευε.....	177	καταρκει.....	177
επιτιμα.....	184	καταστειλε.....	185
επιτρεπε.....	184	καταστρεφι.....	177
επιφερε.....	184	καταφρονει.....	151, 160
επeneγκe.....	177	κατεχε.....	151, 160
επιχειρει.....	132	κατηγορει.....	158, 185
επιχειρεισθαι.....	132	κατοικι.....	164, 185
εριζε.....	184	κατορθου.....	151, 160
εσχαζε.....	184	καυτηριζε.....	177
εγαγγελιζε.....	136, 184	κελεγε.....	185
ευδοκει.....	184	κελεγεσθαι.....	144
ευδοκιμη.....	184	κερα.....	151, 154, 158, 160
εγλογει.....	184	κηρυσσε.....	185
εγφρανε.....	151, 154, 158, 160, 172	κιβερνα.....	185
εγχαριστη.....	184	κιθαριζε.....	185
ζωγραφει.....	151, 154, 158, 160, 171	κιναγνευε.....	164, 185
θαλλει.....	154, 158, 184	κινησαι.....	177
θαρρει.....	184	κλασματιζε.....	185
θαυμαζε.....	184	κληρονομη.....	185
θεολογει.....	177	κληρου.....	185
θεραπειγε.....	158, 184	κογγιζε.....	176
θλιβε.....	150, 151, 154, 158, 160	κοινωνει.....	152, 166
θροι.....	177	κολαζε.....	125, 126
θυσιαζε.....	154, 184	κολακεγε.....	185
ειδιδασιν.....	177	κολλα.....	151, 154, 158, 160
καθαιρου.....	184	κοσμη.....	151, 154, 158, 160, 171
καθαρι.....	151, 158, 160	κουφιζε.....	151, 154, 158, 160
καθαριζε.....	151, 158, 160	κραμματιζε.....	185
καθηγει.....	136, 184	κρατεγε.....	177
καθιστα.....	151, 160, 171, 172	κρινε.....	158, 185
καινοτομη.....	184	κροτεγε.....	177
κακολογει.....	177	κτασθαι.....	133, 136, 147
καλει.....	184	κυριεγε.....	132, 141, 144
καλωπιζε.....	151	κυριεγεσθαι.....	132, 141, 144
κανωνιζε.....	184	κυρου.....	185
καπιιζε.....	184	κωλυε.....	154, 158, 185
καταβαλε.....	184	λακτιζε.....	185
καταβινωσκε.....	184	λανπειγε.....	185
καταδικαζε.....	184	λανθανε.....	151
κατακене.....	177	λαχα.....	177
κατακρινε.....	158, 184	λεαντηριε.....	185
καταλλαλει.....	154, 158, 184	λευκοφορει.....	185
καταλαμβανε.....	184	λιτουργει.....	185
καταλλασσε.....	177	λογιζε.....	136, 185
κατανευε.....	185	λογραφη.....	177
κατανοι.....	185	λογχιζε.....	186
καταντα.....	185	λυπτανε.....	186
καταζιογ.....	151, 160	μαγεγε.....	186
καταπατι.....	185	μαθητεγε.....	151, 160
καταπλασσε.....	185	μακαριζε.....	186
καταποντιζε.....	185	μαλασσε.....	186
καταρχει.....	151, 160	μαρτυρει.....	132, 137, 141, 145-147, 148, 173

μαρτυρεσθαι.....	132, 137, 141, 145-147, 148, 173	παραμενε	169, 187
μαρτυριζε	147, 148, 186	παρηνυοιζε	151, 156, 158, 160
μαστιγοϋ	186	παρηνομι	187
μαγλιζε.....	186	παρασκευαζε.....	187
μελει.....	169, 186	παρατηρι	187
μελετα	186	παραχιμαζε	187
μεμφει.....	136, 186	παραχωρει.....	187
μενεγε.....	186	παρελθε	136, 187
μεριζε	186	παρορα.....	178
μεριμμα	177	παρρησιαζε.....	136, 137, 187
μεсασε	186	πατασσε	154, 158, 187
μεταβαλε	177	πατει.....	178
μεταγγιζε.....	177	πεδαγωγει.....	178
μετανορφοϋ	177	πειθε	125, 126, 130, 151, 171
μετανοει	172, 186	πειεσθαι	171
μεταστοιχει	186	πειρα.....	178
метехе.....	186	πειραζε	151, 160, 187
μισθοϋ	159	πειραзин.....	153
μнτρεγε	177	пенθει	187
μοναζει	178	περιαγε	178
μϋσταγωγιν	186	περιγραφε	178
nenei.....	132	περιεργαζε.....	187
nenesθαι.....	132	περικακει	178
νηστεγε.....	164, 169, 186	περιλανθανε.....	178
νηφε	151, 154, 160, 166	περιχε	187
nikesθαι.....	129-130	περιχρε	187
noei.....	186	πηρα	178
nomizon	178	πнссе	187
nomoethi	186	пиктеγε.....	188
noyethi.....	178	πισтеγε.....	100, 187
zenitege.....	178	πισтоϋ	178
oikeiouthai	133, 136	плана	125, 126, 128, 151, 171, 172
oikonomei	154, 186	планасθαι	126, 171
oligwrei	178	плассе	187
onomaζε	186	πλα.....	188
orhei.....	136, 186	πλεονектеi.....	178
paθei.....	187	πληροϋ	151, 154, 158, 160, 163, 169, 172
paidеge	151, 160	πληροφορει.....	125, 126
parrista.....	186	πληροφορεiсθαι.....	126, 128
paraba	151, 160, 172	πлнссе	188
paravallei.....	178	πολεми.....	188
paraggeile	186	ποлеγε.....	178
paradeignatize	187	πολιτεγε.....	132, 136, 139, 140
paradexe	136, 187	πολιτεγεсθαι	132, 140
paradisi.....	187	поннреге.....	188
paradilaou	154, 158, 187	порнеге.....	188
paraitei.....	187	πραγматεге.....	132, 139, 140
parakalei.....	125, 126	πραγматεγεсθαι.....	132, 140
parakaleiсθαι.....	126, 128	πραгта	178
parallanthane	187	прассе	132, 137, 141, 143, 174
parallasse	187	праттесθαι.....	132, 137, 141, 143, 174
		πρεπει	188

пресвеуе.....	188	σκυλλει.....	138, 151, 160, 172
прориста.....	188	σκωπιτε.....	189
провале.....	188	σοφιζε.....	178
προδεина.....	178	σοφрони.....	190
προδιδου.....	188	σπαταλα.....	169, 189
προελθε.....	188	σπουδαζε.....	189
προεμνηу.....	178	στασιαζε.....	151
прокалlei.....	188	σταυροу.....	154, 155, 158, 189
прокопте.....	188	στεφανου.....	151, 158, 160, 165, 171
прокринатize.....	178	στηριζε.....	178
проламване.....	188	стизе.....	178
проноеi.....	188	στοικει.....	189
прозенize.....	178	στοлизе.....	151, 158, 160
просаге.....	178	стратеуе.....	138, 189
просагореуе.....	188	стревлоу.....	189
просдока.....	188	суглитеуе.....	189
просдокеi.....	188	сугкрине.....	189
проселθε.....	136, 188	сугла.....	189
просеухе.....	132, 139, 140	симвоулеуе.....	189
просеухесоаi.....	132, 140	сумиоу.....	189
проскартереi.....	188	сумфанize.....	189
проскүнеi.....	188	сумфωνει.....	189
проспоиеi.....	178	сумριста.....	151, 158, 160, 189
просфереi.....	188	сумροмолеиn.....	179
просфωνει.....	178	сумнаге.....	151
просхарize.....	136, 188	сумнаinei.....	189
протассе.....	178	сумнакологѳи.....	190
протрепе.....	188	сумнализе.....	190
профнтеуе.....	188	сумнаλλассе.....	151, 158, 190
пүроу.....	189	сумνονѳеi.....	179
сававатize.....	178	сумнеудокеi.....	190
салеуе.....	151, 154, 158, 160	сумнехе.....	179
салпize.....	189	сумнзhteи.....	189
сафниize.....	189	сумнлѳаi.....	136, 190
савесоаi.....	133, 136, 139, 140	сумнкатаβα.....	179
селниаζε.....	189	сумногize.....	136, 179
сенпѳе.....	189	сумнтаζε.....	190
сентнѳи.....	179	сумнтеlei.....	190
снмане.....	189	сумнтиаζε.....	190
сиане.....	178	сумнхѳрей.....	190
сихане.....	132, 137, 139, 140, 174	сүре.....	151
сиханесоаi.....	132, 137, 140, 174	сүризе.....	190
скандаллизе.....	151, 160, 172	сүстиле.....	179
скандаллизин.....	153	сүстрофеi.....	179
скепаζε.....	154, 189	сфингоу.....	179
скептеi.....	132, 138, 139, 140	сфрагize.....	154, 190
скептисоаi.....	132, 138, 140	схннатize.....	151, 156, 158, 160
скеуаζε.....	189	схολаζε.....	190
скүрта.....	189	сѳнатize.....	190
скоѳоу.....	148, 189	тассе.....	151, 154, 160
скопpize.....	178	теле / телиоу.....	190
скотеуе.....	148, 189	терпе.....	132, 136, 139, 140

τερπεσθαι.....	132, 140	ζεταζε.....	184
τηρει.....	190	ζηδανη.....	151, 156, 158, 160, 172
τινα.....	190	ζιατρεγε.....	177
τινωρει.....	190	ζιστορι / ζιστοριζε.....	184
τολμα.....	190	ζομελει.....	186
τρεφε.....	125, 126	ζομοιωζε.....	186
τριβε.....	190	ζομολογει.....	158, 186
τρυφα.....	151, 158, 160, 172	ζοπιζε.....	186
τυπογ.....	190	ζοριζε.....	186
τυραννεγε.....	190	ζρεπιζε.....	189
φαινεςθαι.....	133, 139, 140	ζρεγματισε.....	189
φανερογ.....	151, 160	ζροκογ.....	178
φαρνακεγε.....	179	ζυβριζε.....	190
φθονει.....	148, 191	ζυμνεγε / ζυμνι.....	190
φθονεγε.....	148, 191	ζυμνολογει.....	179
φικε.....	191	ζυπαγορεγε.....	190
φιλοκαλει.....	191	ζυπηρεται.....	169, 190
φιλονικη.....	179	ζυπισχογ.....	136, 179
φιλοπονει.....	179	ζυповαλλε.....	190
φιλοσοφει.....	191	ζυπογραφε.....	190
φλεκμα.....	191	ζυποδεχε.....	191
φορει.....	154, 191	ζυποινει.....	179
φραγελλογ.....	191	ζυποκεισθαι.....	133, 136, 141
φρονει.....	191	ζυποκορεγε.....	179
φροντιζε.....	179	ζυποκρине.....	191
χαιρε.....	175	ζυπομине.....	191
χαλα.....	191	ζυπομνιζε.....	154, 191
χαλινογ.....	191	ζυποτασσε.....	149-150, 166, 191
χαρακτηριζε.....	179	ζυπογργει.....	132, 148
χαραζον/ χαραττιν.....	191	ζυπογργεισθαι.....	132, 148
χαριζε.....	136, 191	ζυποχορει.....	179
χειροτονει.....	158, 191	ζυστερει.....	191
χιρεγε.....	179		
χλεγαζε.....	191		
χορηγει / χωρηγει.....	191		
χρωσται.....	164, 169, 191		
χρηματιζε.....	191		
χρυσινεγε / χρυσινογ.....	191		
χωνεγε.....	179		
χωρει.....	191		
χωρεγε.....	191		
ψαλλει.....	191		
ψεγε.....	179		
ωκνει.....	186		
ωφελει.....	125, 126, 129, 171		
ωφελεισθαι.....	126, 129		
ζαγιαζε.....	159, 180		
ζαγνεγε.....	180		
ζαπιτιζε.....	176		
ζαρπαζε.....	181		
ζελιπιζε.....	183		
ζερμνηνεγε.....	154, 155, 159, 184		

Index of Coptic native verbs

αωαι	30, 40, 41, 55, 57, 81, 153	πωρχ	53
αλε	55	πωτ	102
αμαρτε	100	πωωνε	57-59
βωκ	30, 102	ρωκρ	40, 42
βωλ	49-50	ρωτ	40, 55
ει	85, 100, 102	ρζαι	55
ειβε	38, 44	σαροϋ	25, 93-95
εινε	55, 76-80	σινε	55
εινε ¹	55	σκαλ	45
εινε ²	96, 100	σμηε	57
ειρε	34, 55	σμοϋ	25, 95
κασκς	57	σoβτε	30, 55, 95
κιν	25, 59	σοϋν	30, 55, 76- 80, 81
κμον	55	σοϋτη	57
κννε	30, 40-41, 56	σορσρ	73
κρομρμ	55	σοϋολοϋλ	73
κω	55, 149	σρφε	28, 40, 55
κωωϱ	75-76	σωϱ	100
κωρϱ	75	σωϱϱ	100
κωτ	45, 55, 86	σωκ	57
κωτε	139	σωντ	57
λοοφε	164	σωοϋρ	49, 52-53, 57
λωμς	55	σωρμ	48-49
με	73-74	σωτη	25, 35, 55, 74-75, 79, 81
μϱε	30	τρνο	54
μκαρ	100	ταωο	55
(ρ) μντρε	146-147	ταχρο	100
μοονε	57	ταειο	95
μοοϱε	93, 99, 100	τακο	32, 39, 40, 42, 61
μοστε	73-74	ταλσο	29, 40, 42
μοϋ	44	ταλο	55
μοϋρ	26, 30, 32, 40, 41, 55, 62, 93	τββο	95
μοϋν	39-41, 55, 100	τοντη	95, 100
μοϋτε	25, 57	τωμς	30
ναρτε	100	τωπε	55
νορνε	73	ωβρ	57
νορμη	49, 51	(†) ωμς	153
οϋοπ	87, 95	ωνε	30, 40, 169 (οηε)
οϱωϱ	32	ωπ	32, 40, 43, 95
οϱωη	55	ωρχ	100
οϱωη	57, 165	ϱληλ	57
οϱωνε	23, 30, 32, 40, 43, 46, 168	ϱοχνε	57
οϱωσϱ	100	ϱοτϱτ	45
οϱωωχε	45	ϱοϋο	96 (ϱοϱεττ)
πρσραστ	164	ϱωλη	25
πωϱ	57	ϱωλς	45
πωρ	30, 40, 42, 57, 75	ϱωπ	55
πωρϱ	32, 40, 41	ϱωπε	44, 55, 83- 106

ⲡⲱⲱⲧ	45
ⲡⲱⲱⲥⲉ	49, 51, 57
ⲡⲱⲭⲗ	100
ⲡⲓ	30
ⲗⲁⲣⲉⲗ	5, 26, 35, 39, 168
ⲗⲓⲟϥⲉ	25, 75, 81
ⲗⲓⲥⲉ	45
ⲗⲓⲦⲉ	58
ⲗⲕⲟ	38, 44
ⲗⲗⲟⲥ	93
ⲗⲙⲗⲙ	57
ⲗⲙⲟⲟⲥ	61
ⲗⲱⲣⲱ	55
ⲗⲱⲱ	100
ⲗⲱⲢⲧ	45
ⲗⲱⲛ ¹	53-54, 60-61
ⲗⲱⲛ ²	75
ⲗⲱⲡ	31, 45
ⲗⲱⲣⲱ	55
ⲗⲱⲣⲡ	101
ⲗⲱⲱⲙⲉ	55
ⲭⲣⲟ	25
ⲭⲱ	33, 55
ⲭⲱⲗⲙ	92, 94
ⲭⲱⲕ	93, 94
ⲭⲱⲗⲗ	45
Ⲑⲓⲛⲉ	55
Ⲑⲟⲭⲥⲉⲭ	45
Ⲑⲱⲱⲧ	25, 55, 96, 100
Ⲑⲱⲡⲉ	95
Ⲑⲱⲱⲭⲉ	45
†	31, 55, 130

Lingua Aegyptia – Studia Monographica

Recent Publications and Backlist

ISSN 0946-8641

DOI: 10.37011/studmon

Lingua Aegyptia – Studia Monographica 24

Grammatik des Bohairischen

Matthias Müller

The grammar presents a comprehensive introduction to the Bohairic Coptic dialect. It is divided into 12 chapters covering the major features of the grammar and is augmented by three chapters with short introductions to Bohairic literature, indications of both time reckoning and measurements, as well as an additional chapter introducing patterns specific to the texts of Nitrian monasteries (or better, Sketis). As the grammar is intended for learners, students, and scholars as well as coptologists/egyptologists and linguists, almost all examples are extensively glossed. Furthermore, the book contains extensive annotated texts for reading from the Scripture as well as from literary and even some documentary texts, as well as a glossary to the texts.

Lingua Aegyptia –
Studia Monographica 24
Hamburg 2021, paperback,
xxiv+936 pages

ISSN: 0946-8641
ISBN: 978-3-943955-24-8

€ 49 (subscribers' price: € 45)
(incl. German VAT, excl. shipping)

Lingua Aegyptia – Studia Monographica 25

Egyptian Root Lexicon

Helmut Satzinger & Danijela Stefanović

The Egyptian Root Lexicon presents the envisaged roots of the Egyptian words, hypothetically established on the basis of attested lexemes on obvious phonetic and semantic resemblance. As the etymological research in the field of Afro-Asiatic is not sufficiently advanced, the lexical roots are not set up on an etymological basis. The main part of the book contains the roots (numerically marked with DRID identifier) in alphabetic arrangement, with their subsequent lexemes marked with an identity number, the "ID," as created by the Thesaurus Linguae Aegyptiae (TLA), of the Berlin Academy of Sciences. The roots section is followed by extensive indexes, including a lexeme index and an index of roots of Semitic origin. A selected bibliography concludes the work.

Lingua Aegyptia –
Studia Monographica 25
Hamburg 2021, hardcover,
viii+717 pages

ISSN: 0946-8641
ISBN: 978-3-943955-25-5

€ 89 (subscribers' price: € 69)
(incl. German VAT, excl. shipping)

Lingua Aegyptia – Studia Monographica 27

Wer schreibt die Geschichte(n)?

*Die 8. bis frühe 12. Dynastie im
Licht ägyptologischer und ägyptischer
Sinnbildungen*

Antonia Giewekemeyer

This study concerns itself with the 8th to early 12th dynasties. A period allegedly interpreted by the Egyptians themselves as a period of change and divided into a time of decline and a time of restoration or renaissance. Antonia Giewekemeyer reconsiders these Egyptological reconstructions by both analysing their scholarly development and by surveying the available contemporaneous Egyptian sources. As a result, she argues that the Egyptian sources emphasise continuation and coherence instead of restoration or renaissance. Furthermore, she demonstrates how the modern experience of change affected and finally misled Egyptological reconstructions.

Lingua Aegyptia –
Studia Monographica 27
Hamburg 2022, cloth,
xxx+530 pages, German text

ISSN: 0946-8641
ISBN: 978-3-943955-27-9

€ 89 (subscribers' price: € 69)
(incl. 7% German VAT, excl. shipping)

Lingua Aegyptia – Studia Monographica

ISSN: 0946-8641

- 1 Frank Kammerzell, *Panther, Löwe und Sprachentwicklung im Neolithikum*.
1994 (hardcover, 100 pages), out of print
- 2 Gerald Moers (ed.), *Definitely: Egyptian Literature: Proceedings of the symposion “Ancient Egyptian literature: history and forms”, Los Angeles, March 24–26, 1995*.
1999 (hardcover, X+142 pages), out of print
- 3 Dörte Borchers, Frank Kammerzell & Stefan Weninger (eds.), *Hieroglyphen – Alphabete – Schrifthereformen: Studien zu Multiliteralismus, Schriftwechsel und Orthographieneuregelungen*.
2001 (hardcover, VI+270 pages), € 49, now € 30
- 4 Stephan Jäger, *Altägyptische Berufstypologien*.
2004 (hardcover, X+340+xlvi+XCIV pages), out of print
- 5 José M. Galán, *Four Journeys in Ancient Egyptian Literature*.
2005 (hardcover, V+186 pages), out of print
- 6 Anthony Spalinger, *Five Views on Egypt*.
2006 (hardcover, VIII+176 pages), out of print (PDF online)
- 7 H.J. Polotsky, *Scripta Posteriora on Egyptian and Coptic*,
edited by Verena M. Lepper & Leo Depuydt.
2007 (hardcover, VI+230 pages), € 49, now € 35
- 8 Petra Andrassy, Julia Budka & Frank Kammerzell (eds.), *Non-Textual Marking Systems, Writing and Pseudo Script from Prehistory to Modern Times*.
2009 (hardcover, VIII+312 pages), out of print (PDF online)
- 9 Eitan Grossman, Stéphane Polis & Jean Winand (eds.),
Lexical Semantics in Ancient Egyptian.
2012 (hardcover, vi+490 pages), € 69 (subscribers' price: € 59)
ISBN: 978-3-943955-09-5
- 10 R.B. Parkinson,
The Tale of the Eloquent Peasant: A Reader's Commentary.
2012 (hardcover, xii+384 pages), € 59 (subscribers' price: € 49)
ISBN: 978-3-943955-10-1
- 11 Gerald Moers, Kai Widmaier, Antonia Giewekemeyer, Arndt Lümers & Ralf Ernst (eds.),
Dating Egyptian Literary Texts.
“Dating Egyptian Literary Texts” Göttingen, 9–12 June 2010, Volume 1
2013 (hardcover, xiv+653 pages), € 95 (subscribers' price: € 79)
ISBN: 978-3-943955-11-8
- 12 Andréas Stauder,
Linguistic Dating of Middle Egyptian Literary Texts.
“Dating Egyptian Literary Texts” Göttingen, 9–12 June 2010, Volume 2
2013 (hardcover, xx+568 pages), € 85 (subscribers' price: € 69)
ISBN: 978-3-943955-12-5

- 13 Marc Brose,
Grammatik der dokumentarischen Texte des Mittleren Reiches.
2014 (cloth, xx+553 pages), € 85 (subscribers' price: € 69)
ISBN: 978-3-943955-13-2
- 14 Andréas Stauder,
The Earlier Egyptian Passive. Voice and Perspective.
2014 (cloth, xviii+448 pages), € 69 (subscribers' price: € 59)
ISBN: 978-3-943955-14-9
- 15 Eitan Grossman, Stéphane Polis, Andréas Stauder & Jean Winand (eds.),
On Forms and Functions: Studies in Ancient Egyptian Grammar.
2014 (cloth, vi+366 pages), € 59 (subscribers' price: € 49)
ISBN: 978-3-943955-15-6
- 16 Julia Budka, Frank Kammerzell & Sławomir Rzepka (eds.),
Non-Textual Marking Systems in Ancient Egypt (and Elsewhere).
2015 (cloth, x+322 pages), € 59 (subscribers' price: € 49)
ISBN: 978-3-943955-16-3
- 17 Eitan Grossman, Peter Dils, Tonio Sebastian Richter & Wolfgang Schenkel (eds.),
Greek Influence on Egyptian-Coptic: Contact-Induced Change in an Ancient African Language. DDGLC Working Papers 1
2017 (cloth, viii+534 pages), € 89 (subscribers' price: € 69)
ISBN: 978-3-943955-17-0
- 18 Kristina Hutter,
Das sdm=f-Paradigma im Mittellägyptischen: Eine Vergleichsstudie verschiedener Grammatiken.
2017 (paperback, x+289 pages, incl. 47 tables), € 49 (subscribers' price: € 39)
ISBN: 978-3-943955-18-7
- 19 Gaëlle Chantrain & Jean Winand (eds.),
Time and Space at Issue in Ancient Egypt.
2018 (paperback, viii+242 p.), € 55 (subscribers' price: € 39)
ISBN: 978-3-943955-19-4
- 20 Marwan Kilani,
Vocalisation in Group Writing: A New Proposal.
2019 (paperback, vi+150 pages), € 39 (subscribers' price: € 29)
ISBN: 978-3-943955-20-0
ISBN (OPEN ACCESS PDF): 978-3-943955-90-3 | doi.org/10.37011/studmon.20
- 21 Gaëlle Chantrain,
Éléments de la terminologie du temps en égyptien ancien.
2020 (paperback, xxxiv+344 pages), € 59 (subscribers' price: € 49)
ISBN: 978-3-943955-21-7
- 22 Kathrin Gabler, Rita Gautschy, Lukas Bohnenkämper, Hanna Jenni, Clémentine Reymond, Ruth Zillhardt, Andrea Loprieno-Gnirs & Hans-Hubertus Münch (eds.),
Text-Bild-Objekte im archäologischen Kontext: Festschrift für Susanne Bickel.
2020 (cloth, xxii+293 p., 23 colour, 60 b&w illustrations), € 65 (subscribers' price: € 49)
ISBN: 978-3-943955-22-4

- 23 Simon Thuault,
La dissemblance graphémique à l'Ancien Empire: Essai de grammatologie cognitive.
2020 (paperback, xx+376 pages, illustrations), € 59 (subscribers' price: € 49)
ISBN: 978-3-943955-23-1
- 24 Matthias Müller
Grammatik des Bohairischen.
2021 (paperback, xxiv+936 pages), € 49 (subscribers' price: € 45)
ISBN: 978-3-943955-24-8
- 25 Helmut Satzinger & Danijela Stefanović,
Egyptian Root Lexicon.
2021 (hardcover, viii+717 pages), € 89 (subscribers' price: € 69)
ISBN: 978-3-943955-25-5

All prices include German VAT (7%).

For orders, standing orders and further information:

www.widmaier-verlag.de
orders@widmaier-verlag.de

North American customers may also contact the official distributor ISD
(for issues since volume 9):

www.isdistribution.com