This work sought to establish Coptic reliably again as a prominent typological landmark on the General Linguistics map, where it all but disappeared after the Second World War, as an Egyptological, orientalist, general-linguistic consultation instrument. The deplorable situation where linguists still had to look to Till’s grammar or (in the US and also outside it) Lambdin’s textbook, or to Loprieno’s compendium2 for Coptic specific or typological information, is now finally over.

The luxuriant documentation and exemplification in Layton’s Grammar is no less than pure pleasure: the reader is (in Denniston’s words) literally bathed in examples. The translation into polished idiomatic English is precise, always sensitive to lexicon and syntax and to the subtle modulations and complexities of the Coptic. I would if I may dwell a little on this aspect of the work. While example and element translation is not tantamount to description, and the conceptual and categorical filter of the translation-target language does inevitably tend to bias comprehension of the study-object language, this is still a primary channel of approach. However, caution is here in order with respect to two difficulties that are in my experience most often encountered: first, differences between the languages in the value of elements or patterns; second, basic discrepancies in the two respective systems.

A striking example of the first difficulty is translating Coptic Cleft Sentence constructions, and especially the Focalizing Conversion (alias Second Tense). Its rendering in French or to a lesser extent British English would correspond with Cleft-Sentences, but normal written American English — or at least its stylistically conscious typical varieties — refrains from using the CS, unless for “heavy” emphasis. Consider the translation of the examples on p. 246 f. The author himself observes on this in his discussion of the Focalizing Conversion (p. 356), but when he says that the “less common English construction It is... that... often has an excessively elaborate and clumsy effect,” one might expect a specification of the variety/register/dialect of “English” that he is referring to as well as the context.

A related difficulty is encountered even with non-focal predicates (Airr-theretypicalexample: barring the Celtic languages, English is, of all NWE-type languages, best suited to render the Egyptian-Coptic Circumstantial thought through the construction “She had a high fever”, “a man who had demons” (the same rhematic preposition in Coptic), “Judas had the money box”, and many more. The equivalence with English “have” stands, of course, but, one may ask, of what article the English “have” exceeds possession by far, and anyway cannot be taken as defining the ‘possession’ range for another language. The only Coptic elements in this range that are felicitously rendered in English are the possessive articles (= English possessive articles: my, your ...) and their unreduced prosodic alternants, the so-called possessive pronouns (mine, yours ...). All others, including (na-), are only very approximately described by awkwardly paraphrastic translating. A second example: barring the Celtic languages, English is, of all NWE-type languages, best suited to render the Egyptian-Coptic Circumstantial thought through the construction “Gerund -ing, which, however, is no less “ambiguous” (cf. p. 338) than the Coptic Circumstantial. I cannot therefore see why (ibid.) English translations often must supply although, when, whenever, while, if (ever), inasmuch as, unless etc.

It is in effect not clear which of the four main “roles” of the Circumstantial (§415)


is in the author’s opinion a real syntactical function, or a reflection of a cate-
gorization engendered in an English-oriented linguistic competence. The Circum-
stantal as a “that” form (p. 342), as in the case of “I found that he was accused”
(παρτέρυκτο παθανος) is certainly a phantom “translation category”, for in Coptic it is normally adnominal to the formal cataphoric (lit. “I found it being ac-
cused”).

Objectible or doubtful translations are extremely rare among the vast num-
ber of examples: John 4:23 “The hour is coming, and this is it” (not “and now is”),
p. 51); 2 Cor 11:22 άρτόν-όνα αμό “I, too, am one” and not “so am I”, p. 43;
προς χή “he is”, not “that is what he is”); Luc. 31:1 (p. 386) ιερονομος-κο-
doslim “more than S.”, not “something greater than S.”; xiphalazoo (p. 265) is
almost exactly “pour ne pas dire”.

Layton’s consistent expository policy is to approach phenomena and features recursively, again and again, revisiting them at different levels of detailedness or
resolution and different subsystemic contexts, with constant cross-referencing. This
is not only practically called for when the canvas is so large and diverse, in a multi-
dimensional system of great complexity and richness, and not only didactically
wise; in the structure that informs all, it also meets the Hjelmslev-Halliday require-
ments of descending structural analysis of grammatical class as class of classes, in
an ever-increasing delicacy of analysis; and, of course, it is true, in the linguistic
system, in which every element and element cluster is held in a mesh of rela-
tionships and (cross-)dependencies, in subsystems that are themselves interrelated,
interdependent or mutually opposed.

Here follow some observations, critical and otherwise, mostly to be considered
a structural linguist’s reactions to the work — highlights of intellectual analytic
pleasure in applying Layton’s statements for so to speak levering reflections on
relationships and (cross-)dependencies, in subsystems that are themselves interrelated,
interdependent or mutually opposed.

II. General

(1) The Preface (p. ix ff.) is important as an explicit, reasoned declaration of
policy. Among the noteworthy points, and one in which I have to declare a special
vested interest, is the explicit aim of making “Shenoute’s grammar more acces-
sible” (p. ix). Prominently stressing the Shenouteanity of specific features in the
course of the exposition — constructions that are distinctively or almost exclusively
Shenoutean — would have helped, and even given us a veritable Grammar of She-
notean usage, which, if stated contrastively, could also put in perspective and re-
lief the relativity of statements about Scripture usage as a marked set and even
contribute to a future contrastive Coptic-Greek presentation.

So, for instance (this is a partial list of features, many of which are attested in
pre-Coptic Egyptian), in §62b zero and indefinite article phrase reiterated (in-
cidentally, the meaning “in any given individual case, respectively” for the latter is
well established); §165 μηηηηνηνή ήτο γίνετε έσοδον; p. 258; the greatly extended
form set and range of μεγάλη (§381); conversions of πάντατη (n. p. 301), of the
Cleff Sentence (p. 372); the interplay of masculine and feminine cataphoric ref-

tence to a clause (p. 393); the conjunctive extending protatic clauses (circum-
stantal or relative, §353); special circumstantial-topic focalizing constructions (p. 365 f.); the Focalizing Conversion extended (p. 364 f.); various figures involv-
ing the Focalizing (§444-460) or the Circumstantial Conversion (p. 342); adnominal
xi in a doubly negative environment (§483, discussed below); narrative appearing (§428); parataxic relative clauses (p. 389); double and triple conversions (§414,
416 f.); and more.

As is generally realized, Sahidic is not monolithic. While Shenoute, the Scrip-
tures, patristic and hagiographical sources are well mined, the work programmat-
ically ignores several important corpora (the great gnostic codices, Pistis Sophia,
the Bruce Codex, see p. x n. 5): an understandable, but perhaps contestable de-
cision, be it only in view of the wealth of instructive special or ‘raisin’ examples
occurring in these rejected sources, whose only disqualifications is in showing
“non-Standard peculiarities”. One may take exception to this, in a work of such
calibre and scope. Non-literary Coptic too is underrepresented, which I find regret-
table because of the rich vein of syntax and morphophonoiology to be struck in
genres of untranslated authentic Coptic — and registers that may be our only win-
dow to more colloquial and idiomatic varieties of Coptic. A special Grammar of
Non-Literary Sahidic is after all not likely to be compiled and published in the
near future.

I also believe it would have been useful to give, in the Preface and on special
occasions throughout, some pertinent contrastive information regarding other dia-
lects (esp. Bohairic: for instance, ονα-η — is anything but rare in Bohairic; cf.
p. 60). A general suggestion, for a future reprint or re-edition: a small select bibli-
ographical list for each topic, for further advanced reading, will satisfy the curiosity
and improve the orientation of the reader whose grammatical sensibilities are excite-
d by the Coptic.)

When variants (esp. morphemic and morphphonemic ones) are presented, a
word on their relative statistical weight and typical corpus/genre/period distribution
would have been helpful (e.g. the 2nd fem. forms in §78 or the suffix pronouns in
§86).

It is in the nature of things in a work of such scope that some chapters and
sections should, subjectively to a reviewer, appear to be particularly successful or
more well-conceived than others. Among my favourites are the Nominal Sentence
(Chapter 13), the Conditional Sentence (§494 ff.), Correlated Comparison (νοε-
στημα γαις και τάτη ιες and the like, §505 ff.), and Reported Discourse (Chapter 24,
§509 ff.). Less successful, although very detailed, and a source of much new infor-
mation are, in my opinion, the Tense System (Chapter 25) and Adverbials
(Chapter 9).

(2) New terminology. This is a major issue and must always be a prime con-
cern for the grammarian, for terms represent concepts, and terminology often has a
way of taking over much of the mental process unconsciouslly, often insistently
and improve the orientation of the reader whose grammatical sensibilities are excite-
d by the Coptic.)
for the Focalizing Conversion), while the muta-
morphs (e.g. c-,
(§395 f.). This terminology is inconsistent, for the immutables look to have their al-
or conjugation-carrying converters (Chapter 14, §171 etc.); "immutable" Converters
ble for gender? Compatible with gender markers?
whole syntagm in the larger syntagmatic whole.
only by the absence of another
full or clear enough. The non-trivial nucleus is rather the constituent of a syntagm
structure, leads into confusion, if not blunder. Why are cyfip-
and not bases?
that defines and signals its commutation properties (paradigm), and represents the
Stative and Eventual Converbs that are nexus morphs
be realized as syllable peak, and not only in onset and coda, as well as for
realization of phonemes — in Coptic, all stop phonemes, including the glottal
syllabic stroke (§38), a
ulated speech" are no less problematic in written texts than are the graphematic re-
veda-vid, ponti-fex pattern, or Proper Names of the Aپک£cri-X.آو<;، Vladimir type.
"Inflated modifier" or "personal modifier" for the Verstärker or augens set
(§13) is only true to a degree, is not
longer a "suffixally conjugated verboids" such as nξεq, rανiγε etc. and others. I suggest that at least for the latter, the old term ("Adjective Verb")
should be at least mentioned: it is not that bad, both historically (in Demotic, where the formation in first productivity attested, it is intimately connected with
the adjective, derived from it means of n-) and synchronically, since it is an
important adjective-correspondent in Coptic.
"Personal morph" (alias personal pronouns) has the double disadvantage of
detaching the personal pronouns from the pronominal association class and ob-
scuring the relationship between different, partly allomorphic subclasses of the per-
sonal pronouns.
"Past tense" for the traditional Latinate 'perfect' (§334) is a welcome and
worthwhile break with tradition. I wish it would catch on.
"Construct participle" for παρ- etc. is misleading. We have here synchronically
a word-formational compounding procedure, with a residual (albeit productive
to a degree) in initial compositi form of verbs, with the nominal in fine
compositi constituent, with either zero or possessive articles, in actantial object
dependency with the i.e. one. Functionally, this is a nomen agentis + object
formation (so Stern, Koptische Grammatik, §173), comparable to English kill-joy
or Italian asciguo-mano and Indo-European compounds (inverse sequence) of the
veda-vid, ponti-fex pattern, or Proper Names of the Aپک£cri-X.آو<;، Vladimir type.
It is not a synchronous participle.
"Inflated modifier" or "personal modifier" for the Verstärker or augens set
(§152 ff.) are correct as a descriptive word-class description, but I think a pithy
functional name is still desirable; the focalizing role of the augens is wholly ig-
nored.
III. Fundamental Notions and Specific Issues
(1) Syllables (§18, 35 ff.), here conceived of as "the minimal units of articu-
lated speech" are no less problematic in written texts than are the graphematic re-
presentation of phones and phonemes, since they raise the uneasy question of the
relationship of written and spoken language. Indeed, the syllable is a problematic
notion in many respects. It is certainly indispensable for the linguistic describing
the realization of phonemes — in Coptic, all stop phonemes, including the glottal
one (an active seorant synchronic phoneme, as ought to be prominently stated) —
can be realized as syllable peak, and not only in onset and codas, as well as for
morphology, even morphology. In the discussion of the syllabic stroke (§38), a
mention of the Bohairic Jinkim would have been in order.

Word division (§19), entirely strange to Coptic and Egyptian analytical sensibili-
y, accommodates the western student's bias, in a subjective and imprecise con-
Word division differs from final-boundary signalling for word-analogue units. Needless to
cept, suited to the (Indo-)European typical parcel unit of lexical stem and grammatical affixes, packaged as a ‘word’, which often conflicts with the Coptic native typology of lexical units preceded by affixes. Moreover, since clauses are constructed of morphs and morph syntagms, the stratificational distinction of syntactic and morphological level easily fades away in Coptic; indeed, this is one of the prime lessons of Coptic typology. The word is no longer a motion of general analytical significance. This might have been pointed out in the exposition.

Morphology _stricto sensu_ plays a very limited role in Coptic, which is one of its main interests, not to say charms. The main morphological interest of Coptic is, I believe, in historical (and in the formidable 4000-year span of Egyptian diachrony Coptic has a unique role to play) as well as dialectal-comparative typological perspectives. This is very striking for instance in the case of the converters, esp. of the Relative and Focalizing ones. The much-quoted “Today’s morphology is yesterday’s syntax” loses its point almost entirely.¹

Juncture — the phenomenology and marking of linkage and delimitation — is of fundamental significance for syntagmatics. Layton’s important perspective on the junctural gradience and status of syntagms and constitutive elements (§27 ff.) highlights the centrality of this issue, but I believe is not among the most successful parts of the book, partly because of the terminology, but mainly due to the too fluid and problematic conceptualization, which raises a number of questions. I shall here refer only to several points and classes that I find especially problematic. It is essential to remember that (by definition) all subtextual units and subunits are mutually linked (“bound”), in different grades of linkage and types of (inter)dependence. However, I doubt that describing _it_ or the _nota relationis_ as “initial bound morph”¹, or determinants, prepositions, infinitives with object as “non-terminal” — in both cases to convey their occurring after (and indeed co-marking) boundaries; or suffix pronouns, but also noun lexemes and Proper Names, as “terminal bound morphs”, to indicate their being or occurring as final delimiters — is the best way of noting the junctural properties of the elements concerned, especially since many or most occur in more than one category. Except for a few grammemes, it is not the element _per se_ that is initial (or non-terminal), but the slot occupant in the construction in question. And then, class 5a (for instance, lexemes and PNₙₙ) can hardly be considered “free of bound relationship”, later even defined as “autonomous”, in cases like _maria gamaat_ or _thodis no_. This is even less acceptable in the case of 5b (_aynu, _h, _epiphanite etc._) and 6 (enclitics, _...nimi — “which never occur in bound relationship”). Underlying the author’s classification here seems to be the somewhat trivializing conception of boundness as prosodically and morphophonologically close juncture — one detects again the word and word-internal juncture as a _point de repère_. This means losing sight of the finer gradation within close juncture and beyond it, of the scalarity of inter-lexemic and inter-grammatical juncture, and indeed of lexemicity and grammemicity in

say, the word may be defined language-specifically as a junctural unit with given junctural delimitative properties and internal linkage, but not ontologically with other definitions.²

¹ See A. Shasha-Halevy, “Stability in Clausal/Phrasal Pattern Constituent Sequencing: 4000 Years of Egyptian (with Some Theoretical Reflections, also on Celtic)”, in: _Stability, Variation and Change of Word-Order Patterns over Time_, ed. B. Semino et al. (Amsterdam/Philadelphia 2000) 71-100.

² I find objectionable the use of “bare” for zero in this instance; “The bareness (Ø morph) of _erP_ is compatible with sing. masc., sing. fem. and plur. antecedent” is even more dubious. Nothing is here really “bare”: the absence of an act expression (whether emphatic or not) is no stranger here than in the case of English “the world that was”.

Different zero elements enter different junctures; hence the need to specify their identity — e.g. the 2nd/s. suffix pronoun: cf. p. 74, Table 7 n. 1.

The use of “enclitic” is too generous or too generally applied: _...nimi_, for instance, is not an enclitic article (p. 48), but a postposed one; nor is _maria_ (ibid.) enclitic. It ought to have been stressed that (§185) encliticity is a relative and scalar property of many elements, rather than an absolute property of a special group of entities. In the case of the enclitic particles (§235b), the characterization “which cannot occur first in their clause” is somewhat skewed as a definition, and “clause” must at least be replaced by “colon” or “prosodic unit”.

The difficult case of “bare _it_” ( _nuissemetromoe_, §405) becomes clearer upon processing conjointly its diachronic systemics (other dialects, notably Ox-ythychale, are also instructive here). For here we have an _it_, similar to the Past relative or ‘participial’ _er_, that is obviously not (yet) really a converter, and so constitutes both relative link and actor-slot occupant, while in the ever better-attested type, _tehnumetromoe_ (Shenoute ed. Leipoldt, IV 28) it is seen in full converter-hood. We have thus in Coptic a state of things eminently analogous to the tension in English between Wf-pronouns and adnominal _that_, or even closer to Italian pronominal _che_ ( _ciui_ etc.) and the currently lower-register “weak relativization” _che_.

I believe _epiphan_ is phonemically not _bVu_ (§189) but _bVu/_, with _V_ the vocale morphemic exponent of the prenominal lexeme; it is not “zero grade”. Similarly, I believe the phonemic difference between the prepositional stems of _etor_ || _to_ and _i_ltot || _thnvr_ is not in the respective absence and presence of a vowel (so Layton, §37) but in the respective higher and lower closeness of linkage with the pronoun. The latter form shows the glottal stop realized as _zro_ in syllabic preconsonantal non-absolute coda, the former in absolute syllabic coda, as a vocale ‘echo’ written as a doubled-vowel complex. In cases like _etor-machtoovo_, only the primary stress must have fallen on the object noun syntagm; the verb lexeme had secondary stress.
The "Second Suffixes" (§90 and p. 311) are still mysterious with regard to their synchronous and diachronic nature, their juncture with the preceding environment, i.e. their left-hand boundaries, and general morphosyntax. They do not always join with "active" analyzable suffix pronouns, or for that matter with suffix pronouns at all: consider ορατος or αμφι and suchlike. Their peculiar morphonology has at any rate nothing to do with phonetic or (morpho)phonemic exclusion or incompatibility. For instance, -ε- is very often an inter-pronominal boundary signal or buffer. (By the way, the vocable doubling in ουκεται is probably also a case of the glottal stop manifest in the hiatus of two identical vowels; see Polotsky, OLE 1957, 231a.) The placement of these suffixes is as a rule conditioned; consider -ε- in τε-ε-μετοικησται "cause him who takes your property to give it back" (Table 12 p. 134), which cannot be final, probably because it does not (adj)join a lexeme or a whole clause. This -ε- neutralizes number in its anaphoricity ("it/"them"). In the contact between pronominal possessor and possessum (p. 309 ff), the case of a zero (2nd sgl. fem.) with a contiguous non-zero condition and overrules its sequence, which is then neutralized and so non-pertinent (thus -ε- "you (have) him"). Another sequence-neutralizing factor is the lexeme (nominal possessor) and grammeme (pronominal possessum): ουκεται στοιχητης -ε-μετοικησται.

(3) Pronouns ("Personal Morphs"), Chapter 4 (see also above, on juncture and morphosyntax, and below on Noun Determination): a perceptive morphological treatment of a deeply interesting and extremely important - arguably the most important - subsystem of features in Coptic syntax. It is of the utmost typological importance to observe that in Coptic, as in other languages, but much more strikingly so than in most European ones, the pronouns, and their kindred the pro-verbs, call the tune: their relation to noun and verb lexemes and syntagms is not auxiliary or complementary, but combinatory as well as representative. The pro-forms actualize ("activate") and integrate the lexemes, and the very few 'morphological forms' there are, in the text; the lexemes themselves (sharply distinct from the grammemes, most of which are pronominalia) are peripheral. Some observations in a more critical spirit follow.

As already implied, I believe the association between nouns and pronouns (and Proper Names) is somewhat misrepresented by subsuming them all as "entity terms" (see §41).

While the terminological coinage is here on the whole unexceptionable (I only take some exception to [εντος] as a "personal prefix"), I for one miss the distinction (originating in Damourette and Pichon's Des mots à la pensée) between interlocutive (= locutive + allocutive) and delocutive, which in Coptic is probably more salient and formally as well as functionally more consequential than in most other languages I am acquainted with.

Personal suffix allomorphs (p. 69, Table 6 with notes). It is obvious that here the allomorphic alternation is of the verbal lexeme (infinitive) itself rather than of the pronoun; it would perhaps have been advisable to present this along with the syllabification factor, which is here essentially involved. Distinguishing the motivant and the conditioning from the motivated and conditioned is a matter of fundamental significance in linguistic analysis. It is a fact that the lexeme — or rather its final boundary — is rather sensitive to morphophonetic alternation. Generally speaking, the interaction and junctural interface of lexeme and grammematic segment is especially intriguing in Coptic. Another question to be cleared up is the hierarchy of primary and secondary morphs, i.e. pertinent vs. alternant morphology (e.g. zero vs. -τ for the 1st sgl.; §89).

(p. 65) and etc. ("Personal Independents") occur, with the invariable η, also in acclamation, proclamation, theodic patterns ("ορατος εις Χ" etc.)

The generic (here called "general") person (p. 64): I am convinced that the 2nd and 3rd sgl. masc. do not meaninglessly fluctuate, although a special study has yet to be conducted into their specific respective distribution and sequencing. The 3rd plural does not properly belong here; it is not really generic, but impersonal. In combination with εος ὑπ' αυτού — in the dynamic passive construction, it is simply another member of the "person/number" category, the pronoun ce-τε-τε-ε-τε-ε (expressing the actor in forms of eventual or dynamic passive diathesis is not the 3rd plural (§175), but a pronominal homonymous with it; it is non-referenceal (as the author himself says), and by this token distinct from the 3rd plural which refers to a "plurality of actors". It is of the essence that in cases like εος θεον τος εστιν he shall be humbled it is the object that makes a passive reading at all possible, since it is only when all the matricial slots are filled that a passive-decodable pattern may be activated. The same is true of the infinitive: ορατος προβαδιστης εις θεον John 19:40 is "according to the custom of the Jews to be buried", and not as translated here (p. 131).

On the "Second Suffixes", brilliantly described in this work, see above.


Determination is a difficult issue, perhaps among the most difficult for any language, only half-understood and with no coherent interpretation yet achieved — a syndrome of several converging categories marked in and around the noun syntagm, rather than a simple category. Its pan-systemic import is well manifested in its recurrence throughout the work. Some critical remarks and reservations about the author's generally very good presentation are called for:

(p. 35) The 'definite articles' are in Sahidic best illustrated by the n- τ- n-series, not πρες etc., which is strongly deictic. I would present the necessity of the determiners more prominently and in the very beginning (§42). The list of article/pronoun pairs is not clear and sometimes questionable: n- is not a determinator, but a quantifier; the thematic pronoun η is not directly related to determination; πρες—possessive pronoun) is determination-indifferent, and is not a determinator at all (see further below); nor would I consider πρες—θεον. Διαθήκη, —πρες ου ουν ημιν article/pronoun pairs in the sense of ου— and ουνι— and ου, η, and ημι. Indeed, I find the "determinator pronoun" (§42 ff) as presented and contrasted with "articles" an altogether problematic notion; I doubt that ου, ουν, ουνι— and most others are in any sense determiners.

(p. 38) πρες—προς— are not 'complex articles' but cases of articles expanded by quantifiers (which precede the lexeme in an entirely different slot, see also §51); πρες— is certainly not complex.

n— (§49; also elsewhere). The motivation of gender (and in a different sense number) in the determiners is indeed "according to what the speaker wishes to communicate", which may be considered somewhat trivial; but when the author says that "the selection of gender is also motivated by the grammatical class and function of the expansion element", namely the lexeme (my italics), he seems to be
missing the syntactical point, for n- in the possessive article, though nuclear, is unequivocally motivated by the expanding lexeme.

Actualization of possessed nouns is expressed either by the possessive article or (for the inalienables §40 ff.) by the suffixed possessor (not ‘self-actualizing’).

The defociotic thematic pronoun (n_TA, §53 ‘nexus pronoun’, also p. 199) has actually nothing to do with the determinators other than a common pre-noun — occurring in the between the singular and plural determination sets; a difference so drastic, in fact, that I would present them in one continuous list, in one column, and not in two as is usual.

The much discussed so-called possessive pronoun [nA-], [num] — perhaps better ‘relating pronoun’, certainly not possessed pronoun — occurring in the pre-determinator, not pre-lexemic slot, is not specific or marked for specificity (its deixis is exclusively anaphoric, never cataphoric), but rather indifferent with regard to specificity; thus not ‘the one related to’ (on p. 47 the author does enclose ‘the’ in parentheses, without comment). That the possessive article “consists of the simple def. article followed by personal intermediates” is not even morphologically correct. At least for the ‘pronounal’ column of the list of possessive constructions (§147), I believe the description is flawed by a fallacious conception. n- isn’t, and cannot be treated as n- expanded by “his”: “when the nucleus has simple def. sense, the possessive article ... (‘the ... of ...’) occurs instead of the simple def. article”. On the other hand, n- is indeed an article (somewhat higher on the specificity scale than n-), and its internal dependency cannot be seen other than through its non-proclitic allomorph (num), which in turn is a pre-personal allomorph of nA- — which is certainly nuclear (expandable by a determined noun or Proper Name), but is not an article or determinant pronoun (pace the author, often, e.g. p. 112).

The deictic functional idiocrasy of [n-] (p. 49) lies in its expressivity, abstracting and intensifying qualities immanent (as senses) in lexemes. This may diachronically be considered a metaphorical application of its original distal role, as in niga or n+x, and still prominently in other dialects, but not in the generic plural in the case of the zero-_article, [n-] is essentially interlocutive rather than proximal (§56). While I would not consider n- (... n+ ... n) n+ to be a basic ‘farther demonstrative’ (§57), it is certainly true that, like yonder in some varieties of English, adnominal n+AMAT supplies the deixis corresponding to the εκτος series in Greek. (§47) Zero article (§§47 f., 59, 145d). Generics. Graphemically indicating all cases of the B-article before every noun in the Coptic texts, in every Coptic example, even in the Chrestomathy and the Index at the end of the book, is courageous — this is about the most confidently structuralist stand-taking possible — and dialectically justifiable, but still open to some objections of a theoretical but even dialectic nature.

2 Sometimes the indicated zero element is not conclusive, or even to objection or at least controversy, as in the case of the zero- article of y+vרא of at-ayin (p. 443 f.).
articles (§50), symmetry between singular and plural is doubtful. Incidentally, the cohesion inside the whole article set is flimsy and breaks down easily, since only the definite articles and demonstratives are deictic; the possessive article and the indefinites are not.

While gender/number do constitute a separate grammatical category, "relative distinctness", "relative distance from the speaker" etc. are at least arguably manifestations or readings of specificity and deixis respectively.

(p. 36 and §60) _nias_ comprises a homonymous pair of determinator ("all") and quantifier ("any", "every"), corresponding to two semantic types of totality. The latter, like _xe_, is compatible with zero determination (also with _δαυς_), §74 d), the former _commutable_ with the latter coordinated by _κοντեς_, the latter by _πτυχα_ (cf. p. 51); the former expanded by the relative, the latter by the circumstantial1. I believe the appearance of an "unstable mixture of features" will prove to be but an impression ensuing from this syntactic variety.

The determination of the infinitive is idiosyncratic in paradigmatic structure (the indefinite has a different value). Also, cases like _μοῦδος-τ_ and _μετα-τ_ (p. 86) relate to specificity via the potential structure of the verb lexeme.

_πετα_ (§10, 411) is a concise account of a complicated subject. The discussion and especially formulation here is open to several reservations; the phrasing seems to betray a slight unease. The invariability, if any, is of _π_—which is in this case not the article but a substantiving pronominal, bringing the relative form into lexicemic status and slot, as a determination with zero determination grade. It is only apparently homonymous with the masculine defl. article. "The noun based on _πετα_—has two characteristics..." is awkward. "Before an articulated attributive _πετα_ (etc.) no article can occur since an article is already present" is tautological and begs the descriptive question. In fact, _πετα_ has three, not two readings and analyses, not really difficult to resolve in actual pattern slots: the third is the very same case-raising formally specific generic as is marked for lexemes by the definite article: "any specific ... that...


The noun defined (§91): I must quarrel with the author’s definition. The noun is not a category, but a cumulative "conglomerate of categories". It must be defined (in Coptic, not universally) by its compatibility with signals of specificity, deixis, number and quantification, and incompatibility with such categories as tense and person. It must also be defined by its privilege of constituency in patterns, e.g. the Nominal Sentence, statements of existence, possessum with the possession verboid, actor in the conjugation forms, parative expansion of articles and many more. The semantic definition here is no more cogent than for the verb: "referring to an object of thought as distinct from predicating a process or action" is objectionable; a "adjectival" analysis of _nias_ is fuzzy, Eurocentric in essence, and, I believe, obscuring in effect. The difference between _παρακτια_ and _ομα_ is real, but is not a directly semantic one detached from the syntactic reality of the noun syntagm. It involves the relationship of the determinator with the lexeme. The text, its pragmatic context and 'hypertext'. The determinator-lexeme relationship in _παρακτια_ ("the syllable-book") is not descriptive, neither is _παρακτια_—in both cases, the determinator represents a hyper-nuclear noun, textually or extratextually present and decodable (n- _κεκολμουμε_, _κεκολμουμε_ etc). This dependency is very different from, and of higher rank than, the dependency between the constituents of _παρακτια_.

The noun defined again (§93): "Gendered common nouns occur as_ attributive terms_. It is the zero article following _π_ that marks them as attributive (cf. also p. 87—zero determination is the reason why the morphological plural hardly ever occurs in an attributive role). Grammatical gender, outside of the noun syntagm a purely cohesive device, is inside the noun syntagm a matter of mutual compatibility and definite determinator-pronominal selection in (Greek-origin words, compatibility of the 'Greek' gender/number suffix with determinator). The modifier of gender number in the linear contextual stretch is in point of fact the determinator and not the lexeme (_παρακτια_; the double compatibility of such lexemes as _παρακτια_ stems historically from their having had morphological sex marking, but synchronically from their containing a sex some activated by the pertinent determinator pronoun.

As already pointed out, several different dependencies and determinator value are grammatical or lexical, but denote; article phrases and possessed nouns are in reality pronouns expanded by lexemes; and so on.

The difference (§93) between the "semantic functions" "denoting" (as in _παρακτια_—outside the usual contrast of denotation and componence) and "describing" (as in _παρακτια_—outside the usual contrast of denotation and componence) is fuzzy, Eurocentric in essence, and, I believe, obscuring in effect. The difference between _παρακτια_ and _ομα_ is real, but is not a directly semantic one detached from the syntactic reality of the noun syntagm. It involves the relationship of the determinator with the lexeme. The text, its pragmatic context and 'hypertext'. The determinator-lexeme relationship in _παρακτια_ ("the syllable-book") is not descriptive, neither is _παρακτια_—in both cases, the determinator represents a hyper-nuclear noun, textually or extratextually present and decodable (n- _κεκολμουμε_, _κεκολμουμε_ respectively). This dependency is very different from, and of higher rank than, the dependency between the constituents of _παρακτια_.
at the basis of gender categorization in Coptic: first (‘primary’ or lexemic gender, with no signifier) the purely formal compatibility selection of non-partitive definite determiners, formal grammatical nucleus, by lexeme classes (in this sense only, gender is ‘inherent’ to them, §115): πτωτικόν ο — the ‘truth’; second, the biological-sex-marking (11.8.3) not ‘genderless’, see below — γενδωρικόν, compatible with both masculine and feminine, themselves primary and pertinent, and partivably expanded by the lexeme; third, the determinator as both a grammatical phonic index and a nucleus to it partivably expanding lexeme: μαθητής — the true one (e.m.), with its own referate, textual-anaphoric or exophoric, overruling the lexemic one. Nouns are ‘gendered’ or ‘genderless’ (§104 ff.): this is taking a stand on the question, very weighty in Coptic, of where gender structurally ‘resides’. The common noun set (§107, 117a) may be united as a case of a glottal-stop feminine mor-US(on)eme, thus as a syntagm. Similar, but morphologically rather more complex, are the instances of plural formation (p. 87), the roles and distribution of which are still enigmatic. Generally speaking, the diachronic loss of the suffix will gender-signalling nucleus of the Egyptian noun syntagm, the phasing- and fading-out of the adjective as a word-class and the emergence of the gender-number signalling definite articles are tightly interrelated. Animate (human) vs. inanimate (non-human) is a gender distinction in Coptic, formally visible only in Greek loan nouns (§117[c]; cf. Shisha-Halevy, Categories, Chapter Four).

The nota relationis (§100[a]; further discussed under noun expansion below) should have provided an opportunity to illustrate the elegant hierarchical sophisti-
cation of the noun phrase, its essentially partitive nature and the nuclearity of the determinators:

\[\text{μαθητής} \rightarrow \text{μαθητης} \rightarrow \text{μαθητής} \rightarrow \text{μαθητής} \]

The nuclearity of the conjugation bases, from several aspects analogous to the determinators, should also have been pointed out apropos of the comparable ΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΚΩΣΜΟΥ: construction (§165). In the final analysis of προσ ΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ, and especially ΜΕΛΗΜΕΝΟΣ ΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ (§102), the nuclei are still προς, τετελεσμένης and the expansion is ΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΚΩΣΜΟΥ: the nota relationis here does not expand the article, nor the lexeme (as in the case of bracket-
ing determinators), but the article-lexeme complex (“some items of the wise

person” class), which, at least when the sequence is commutable with the inverse one, is thematic to the n-introduced rheme — roughly renderable as “wise persons
[that are also classifiable as] scribes”.

The “attribution by means of ἐν-” (§99 ff.) too would have much benefited from association with the nota relationis, for the functional load of “attribution” falls on the zero determinator following ἐν-: “The appurtenance construction” (§148) is part of a complicated system of several determinative or associative patterns combining one (pro)nominial with another by means of the nota relationis ἐν- and ὑπὲρ-, ranging in function from loose appurtenance to intimate (inalienable) possession. Several parameters regulate the formal means, primarily perhaps the specificity of the grammatical nucleus (first the nominal, which when non-specific or highly specific is compatible with ὑπὲρ-). As already intimated, Possession in Coptic (§393 etc.) is part of a spectrum too complex to be adequately handled under this somewhat simple heading. The possessive pronoun and possessive article, the nota relationis associative phases, the existential possessive verb and various thematic prepositions are all constituent parts of this complex. A factor not given due prominence in the exposition is the so-called inalienable-possession relationship. Scalar, not an absolute built-in lexemic factor, properly speaking not pos-
session at all, it is signalled conjointly by convergence of lexeme and envi-
ronmental syntagmatic exponents.

The formalities of noun expansion (§103) are to a striking extent correlated in Egyptian and Coptic to nucleus determination and specificity. This applies to ad-
verbial satellites (including ἐν-—“called”) with indefinite determination, ἐν-—“that”
with zero in negative environment, and, of course, the communis opinio of n
"expan
sion of a noun correlating with specific/non-specific nucleus. However, this last set — the two n expan
sion forms of a nominal, viz. relative and circum-
stantal — should on no account be taken as alternants (so explicitly the author himself, on p. 327). This old facile fallacy is very tempting in its false simplicity and didactically handy automatis
ism, and the author unfortunately perpetuates here (without actually using it) W. Till’s still ineradicable imprint, the “unechter/un-eigentlicher Relativsatz”, by a contrastive presentation such as (§404) Ἐν ἸΗΣΟΥΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ — “the tree that is good, the good tree” vs. Ἐν ὑπὲρ ἸΗΣΟΥΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ — “a tree that is good, a good tree”. This is gravely misleading, since it allows no status for or information on Ἐν ὑπὲρ ἸΗΣΟΥΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ, which is the only environment where the true value of the circumstantial in opposition to the relative becomes evident — not un-
like English-ing, as against who/which/that relatives. This misconception is at the
origin of such phrasing as (ibid.) “the appositive attributive enables both relative and circumstantial to modify all these types of antecedent”. This quite confuses the issues of function (decoding or ‘reading’) and syntactical privilege; the adnominal Circumstantial is anything but “attributive” (§430). I fear the author confuses here the two characterizations, the first formal-syntactic (“attributive” for adnominal?), the second semantic-functional. The two conversions, Circumstantial and Relative, are formally and functionally very different, adnominal-semantic and attributive respectively, a difference adnominally in evidence only when they stand in opposi-
tion, namely following specific nominal or pronominal nuclei: consider ἐν ἸΗΣΟΥΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ ὑπὲρ
“we bore him blind”, ὑπὲρ ἸΗΣΟΥΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ ὑπὲρ ἸΗΣΟΥΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ ὑπὲρ ἸΗΣΟΥΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ (Shenoute ed. Leipoldt III 94) “we have the Tree of Life of the Cross burning bright”, ὑπὲρ ἸΗΣΟΥΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ (Shenoute ed. Leipoldt III 187) “at the time the sun is about to shine”, or, probably most striking, the case of the Circumstantial following ἐν ἸΗΣΟΥΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ — specific noun (Layton §505 iii), where the Circumstantial is adnominal-adnexal, i.e. fully rhematic to the noun’s theme: ΠΟΕΣΙΑ."


simply the way to predicate zero determination, although zero determination is certainly part of their predicative type.

(b) The fact that the deictic pronoun family, of which ne is the enclitic member, cannot in some ways be predicated — a fact which is at the root of the polysemicity of ATEK NE patterns (§280 ff.), is related to the exclusion of (NE) as theme in the interlocutive, an exclusion probably due to the incompatibility of non-phoric, non-deictic interlocutives with the extremely deictic and phoric demonstrative.

(1) The present-tense o-ne — for incidental predication, probably the most extreme case of verbal grammaticization in Coptic (p. 150, §179 ff.), best presented in paradigmatic association with the Nominal Sentence. Its compound-verb connection (p. 141), while certainly of importance, is more problematic, since PENOUN cases neutralize the opposition of "transitive" and copular ("intransitive") — and there's no way of predicting o-ne or non- in the durative, or resolving the corresponding semantic difference. Moreover, there's also the only seemingly copular non- which is not incidental and circumstance-oriented — hence, it is transitive and non-alternating with o-ne: "constitute": Shamoun ed. Chassinat 21 [said to Satan/Κριτός] πάτειν oun τε εγγελίας απο περιστασις απο της γης... πατείν με σα-ω ("Your constitution is not male, nor female, nor befeve, nor equine... nor serpentine", lit. "You do not constitute/make [up] a male", etc.).

There are a few points, about which I must disagree with the author:

I doubt that the pronoun in John 8:12 ATEK NE NOVOCENOC NEPOK [said to Shenoute:] "it is I" in any way as endophoric (§281), for NE is here non-commutable and there is anyway no determinator to refer back to. In fact, ATEK NE cases seem to have either a deictic-anaphoric, or indefinite, or pragmatic (exophoric, non-commutable) role, the last very much like it's or 'er. Indeed, "invariable" ne is treated with a lack of distinction. In §285, for NE outside the NS, we have at least three different statuses. In anaphoric cases (Patterns 9-10) like "... and I am, j'en suis un..." or "and I am, je le suis" (John 13:13, Mt. 26:23 ff., Shamoun Or. 157, all quoted here, p. 221), it is (an)aphoric NE that appears to be schematic, with ATEK thematic, but with a switch of prosodic roles. (The intriguing absence of o-ne as theme in the Interlocutive NS pattern is possibly connected.) Pattern 11 "I am someone", NE seems to be a schematic non-phoric indefinite pronoun (rather than assertive of existence), again with the same strange exchange of prosodic weight. (And again, the exclusion of indefinite pronouns from the theme slot in the Sahidic Interlocutive NS pattern seems to be related.) Pattern 12 (§284: "extension of cleft sentence Pattern 1") is not a separate pattern, but a macrostructurally distinct occurrence of the endophoric one.

See W.-P. Funk, op. cit. 28 f.

A Definitive Sahidic Coptic Grammar

(7) The Cleft Sentence ("CS": Chapter 20, §461 ff.): varieties and ambiguities.

In his account, the author sharply separates the Focalizing Conversion (see below), some patterns of which may be in structure a Cleft Sentence (most patently and closely to the West European CS type in focus-initial cases, and to the Egyptian-African, incl. Ethiopian, type in others) and the CS stricto sensu in normal Egyptian, usage, that is, the construction of nominal or pronoun nominal focus preceding a relative topic. In Egyptian and Coptic, it is often possible to relate the latter constructions formally to the NS, unlike the former one; this explains the location of this feature in the work under review. However, since both functional and formal traits of the two constructions show numerous points of contact or overlap, and (as H. J. Polotsky claimed) the two constructions arguably share a near-complementary-distribution alternation, and both are, in information-structure context and terms, focalizing constructions, I believe they ought to have been presented in contiguity, perhaps following the Nominal Sentence.

The analysis of πτολος εν ερο (§469 ff.) and kindred constructions are, I believe, flawed on two counts. First, formally, since NE is in this case not endophoric — it is properly speaking not textually phoric at all, but pragmatically or situationally anchoring. Second and in consequence, functionally: the Circumstantial is here not just a meaningless variant of the relative. These are rather presentative clauses, and the circumstantial not topical but adnaxial, thematic, with the pronoun not focal in any sense; NE (pragmatic theme) marks the entire rest of the clause as thematic. This type is not found in English at all, and, indeed, is difficult if not impossible to translate adequately into English — but is very Egyptian (from the OE/ME jnk pw sgm.nj on), and occurs in Celtic and French.

It is macrosyntactically operative and marked. The alleged existential role of NE ("its information structure is like the existential sentence expanded by a circumstantial clause", p. 376; also p. 383) stems either from projecting the Vorlage on the Coptic (so for instance in Ps. 18(19):3) or from an ethnocentric rendering perspective (e.g. "there was"), in the narrative-initial slot, at the price of losing the considerably greater sophistication of the Coptic: "Existential NE is, I believe, a phantom entity. ΟΥΡΩΝΕΣ ΝΕ ΟΥΡΩΝΕΣ ΕΚΚΡΟ ΠΟΤΟΝΟΣ ΕΠΕΧΡΙΑ does not mean 'there was a man' (which would be ΝΕ ΟΥΡΩΝΕΣ); ΟΥΡΩΝΕΣ... ΕΚΚΡΟ ΠΟΤΟΝΟΣ ΕΠΕΧΡΙΑ 'a man (...) building a place for his use" is predicated of NE ("'e'est", "'e's", approx. "the case/thing/story is"). So too in Luc. 15:11, in Coptic not "There was a man who had two sons", but "The story goes (or 'sin') that a man had two sons". This existentially introduces or presents, not a nominal entity, a new character, but a fail nexus, an act or a state of affairs or a scene into discourse (pace the author, §462). Similarly distinct from the true CS is the narrative-opening CS-like ΝΕ ΝΡΕΛ (§465): NE here too is not endophoric but situational. Unlike the CS, its structure is not sharply dichotomous (focus /) between the noun and a NE constituent; the noun alone is not focal. I see a related presentative

* Most elaborately perhaps in H. J. Polotsky, Études de synaxe cope (Le Caire 1944) 62 f.; see also idem, Grundlagen des logischen Satzbau (Decatur 1987) 6 f.
* Ariel Shisha-Halevy, "Grammatical Discovery Procedure" (n. 12); also Structural Studies in Modern Welsh Syntax: Aspects of the Grammar of Kate Robert (Minster 1998) 28 ff.
* Indeed, ΑΤΕΚ ΝΕ is compatible with the participial 'I'm' existing, who existed" in the opening of the Middle Egyptian Eloquent Peasant: ΑΤΕΚ ΝΕ means "it happened that there was a man", which might be rendered in English by "(Once upon a time) there was a man".
construction in the epistolary opening signature #PN (n) της- and the CS-like #PN προ- # (§466), similarly not built on the endophoric αλλα, but on a formal non-referential theme; neither is focalizing. The text-grammatically marked παραγωγικος εντολος ... (§482), also a chunk-opening-marking pattern in narrative, is no more existential (and there’s absolutely no suppression or deletion of (απ εν της here!); the translation as “there is ... which ...”, while tempting from an English point of view, is distorting: the Shenoutean passage goes "Many words have we spoken ..." or, suppressing in English the macroscopic chunk-initial distinctiveness of the pattern, "We have spoken many words ...". The text εγκατάλειπτο παραγωγικος εντολος (Aphor. 99) may indeed be rendered "There once was a venerable hermit ...", as translated here (p. 388), but not because the Coptic construction is existential, as εντολος- would be, but only because this is the most immediate idiomatic English functional correspondent to the Coptic pattern.

The relative topic in the αλλα-less CS (§468) is almost as dependent for analytic comprehension on diachronic profile as is the relative occupying the first slot of the Durative nexus pattern (or Conjugation Form) in προςμος εντολη — i.e. a case of relative pronoun, not converter. Moreover, in the relative (in the Coptic noun syntagm, almost invariably dependent on a determiner or deictic pronoun for its operation) alone as topic constituent we have a direct descendant of the Egyptian participle in the very old CS pattern called by A. H. Gardner “Participial Statement”. By the way, it is not clear to me why the focal point here is said to contain a resumptive morph (p. 374).


The trap of definition awaits the student of Coptic, where striking a false descriptive note can result in serious distortion. The Coptic (and generally Egyptian) verb is an elusive entity; but generally too, the verb is the one part of speech that is not "purely" at all, but a set of nexus pattern-syntagms. The verb is not a lexeme, nor a word-class; the infinitive is not a "basic form" of the verb, but a lexical construction. The number and nature of actants, the slots in the idiosyncratic valential matrix, differences, lexemic and syntagmatic, in meaning that ensue upon or correlate with given verb profile. The main structural point here is of course valency, that is, the differences, lexemic and syntagmatic, in meaning that ensue upon or correlate with different formal satellite-anchored syntactic parameters for homonymous lexemes. The number and nature of actants, the slots in the idiosyncratic valential matrix, are distinctive of individual verbs. In this context, "objectless transitive" (§169) can be immediately treated as a case of zero. (Again, zero occupancy of a slot differs from nil: ανακοινοει [p. 131] “they engaged in eating” is a case in point.) Valency, here continuously skirted but never explicitly and systematically invoked and presented, would structure, for instance, cases like kurre απο-δον αποδοσια, here flatly described as “Two combinative adverbs can combine with a single verb", p. 166; the combinative adverbs (post-verbs, as it were) in general have an important valentific significance (§206); valency could replace such statements as (p. 165) the adverb seems to be present because of the context or in the interests of more precise phraseology. Valency is essential in making sense of "incomplete predication" (§185), which it not to be conceived of an αρχαιος as a built-in quality of a verb but rather as a fundamental differentiation — and is at any rate not a case of incomplete predication (p. 150). The author rightly points out rectional constituents (§181), as "marking direct objects" (p. 143), but then describes them also as "contributing to the expression of a particular verbal idea", whereas they are, by definition, totally devoid of meaning as separate segments (they do formally distinguish homonymous
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verb lexemes). The presentation of verbs with two object-actant slots as trivalent would be considerably more satisfying than (p. 144) "the lexically fixed phrasing of many verbs includes combinations that contain more than one preposition". Verb-

The text discusses the Durative Infinitive and its usage. The chapter examines how the Durative Infinitive is used in Coptic and its relation to other verb forms. It also looks at the realization of the Durative infinitive and its adverbial grammeme-lexeme conglomerates. The analysis shows that the Durative Infinitive is not a simple form of the verb but a non-finite convert. The text also explains the opposition of Stative vs. Infinitive and how the opposition defines this category excellently, even covering the absence of this form for certain verb valencies. The presentation of verbs with two object-actant slots as trivalent is also discussed, along with the opposition of Stative vs. Infinitive, which is not discussed by Layton at all.

The Stern-Jernstedi Rule is presented, and the author cogently presents the mediate (n-) object construction as marked. The idea of using "Durative Infinitive" (§308) — which is in fact not an infinitive at all, but a non-finite convert or adverbial form of the verb (like the Stative, and like adverbial-ing in English and -ip, -e etc. in Turkish; the term has by now considerably spread from its Turkological beginnings) — is that one is prone to slip inadvertently into "infinitive" pure and simple and confuse the issue, as happens on p. 235: "When the predicate is an in-

The Aorist (§337, also p. 434) MACAQ, MEQ. I would prefix here a short termi-

The Aorist (§337, also p. 434) MACAQ, MEQ. I would prefix here a short termi-
the work — Shenoute ed. Amelineau I 276.10 apevne-rouv is differently explained (p. 147), and the zero-determined-object exception to the Stem-Jenestradi Rule is not considered from the tense angle (p. 132); see also §168 sub finem. As already pointed out, "timelessness" in the Coptic verb is not of a kind: I believe it is a mistake to combine the Aorist and the Conjunctive as instances of "timeless nexus" (p. 441), for the former signals its own tense — indeed, the Aorist is not "timeless" (p. 274, Table 9) at all, but in a sense "timeless"; the latter (which is yet another convor verb or gerund) is tensed environmentally, like convor verbs in such convor-rich languages as Turkish. In the Nominal Sentence, the timelessness-essential information is certainly close to that expressed in the aorist, but packed as a nominal theme: omeqom is comparable to omeytiois, miynat to omeyom peyovbke ne. The inherent-predication NS is not really on a par with the present (pace the author, §235), whereas the incidental e°a is certainly a present tense.

Futures — tense and modalities (§§184, 311, 338, 341). This is a notoriously difficult issue of general linguistics. Arguably, no futurity is completely free of modal semantic components. Therefore, the contrastive account of the functional and semantic spectra of ouna- and o.polle calls for more than a few lines of passing remark (p. 239). *epel expresses a future tense without explicit connection to the speaker's present situation ... Thus it contrasts with the more usual, durative, present-based na- future ... epel expressing future tense with a strong expectation of fulfillment ..." (p. 264). This over-simplifies things; epe- has some pronounced modalities (the author adopts the term "Optative" for this form; a short terminological history would have been useful here too). Differences between affirmative and negative, between different personal environments; (in)compatibility with interrogation and condition; sequelling (apodic) status; macro syntactic slotting, and so on -- all contribute to the distinctive profile of epel, and, by implication, to that of the na- future (which is imminent rather than immanent, §311). "Per-pot and result" ($502 ff.), also consequence and goal, are merely familiar landmarks in a difficult and often fuzzily demarcated semantic spectrum of sequelling, including also true superordinate apodicticity, as in post-protic and post-inferential slots. Precise parametrizing as well as componential analysis and ranking of constructions (e.g. negation/affirmation, focalization, intentionality, desirability, actor involvement; immediate constituency in combination of several final/consecutive adjuncts, and so on) may serve to resolve this spectrum, in which form and function manaces are not yet clearly demarcated. One minor functional observation: the form ope- (§339), morphologically probably (judging by diachronic and dialectological correspondences) Focalizing Future, is a Jussive/Injunctive rather than Optative.

Existence and Possession. Presentation (Indication): earay with the possession verboid is not untranslatable (p. 306); English "there" is after all there as an analogue for formal location (in English, also formal subject) of existence, which is very rarely unlocated.

The role of possessum determination as a correlate of possession-construction is all but ignored in the discussion (see e.g. p. 309).

Ouvtay with the Circumstantial Converb as second actant (p. 341) has a nexus for possessum: compare French "j'ai mon ami qui est malade", to be analyzed as "j'ai [mon ami qui est malade]", with the adnominal qui comparable to our Circumstantial.

Marc - does not signal the negation of existence, i.e. of omeyom (§477), but is an independent positive exponent of non-existence; grammatically, it is asymmetrical to its affirming "counterpart". I would therefore add Marc- to Table 27 (by the way, the "present tense", attributed to omeyom and earay on p. 383, is essentially different from the "verbal" present tense, and is closer to that of the Nominal Sentence and Cleft Sentence). See above on adnominal xe- expanding the non-existant and the equivalence of rhetorical questioned existence with non-existence.

Neither omeyom-earay- nor epe- are verbal, nor are they thematic. They act 'pre-thematic' clauses, introducing into discourse elements that are subsequently taken up as thematic to rhemes; this is certainly not the case of "a narrative formula at the beginning of a parable, tale, etc." (p. 386), but a living, essential and meaningful construction. Consequently, the nominals or pronominals following them are by no means "subjects" (Table 27, p. 383).

The superordinating role of xe, well brought home by the example quoted from Mt. 2:13, should be explicitly pointed out. This dectic presentative does not exactly correspond to any specific element in English; hence, the author's comparative statement (p. 383) — I would add here Greek (dox), and of course Biblical Hebrew hinneh, Modern Hebrew yineh —, and therefore the translation of some texts cannot do justice to Coptic idiom. This is especially striking in authentic untranslated Coptic, such as Shenoute's sophisticated construction ouna xe teo aay, quoted here, expressing something like "(And if you argue that ...) — then, at a counter-argument,) peacocks are there too (i.e. in the church)" — not independent in any way, but superordinated to the preceding topicalizing xe-clause; the author's "look, there's a peacock over there!" is off the mark. This is quite different from the focalizing xei (§485). Cases like Mt. 15:22 (quoted p. 389) are arguably topicalizing, with the paradigm-narrative opening xe is representative, sensitively and cleverly translated as "Here today (is a parable of) ..." (§481).

The Conjunctive. First, the pronominal morphology (§83): The 1st sg. ta- is apparently supplied by yapel-, and not the other way around (p. 351), while rta- may historically be hybrid. (In the newly emerging Kellis dialect [coded "L" by W.-P. Funk] we find the 1st sg. r- tcm and tcm, also other persons without r-, which I believe all but clinches the case for a formal affinity of the Conjunctive with the durative nexus [Shisha-Haley, Categories, Chapter Seven].) Indeed, r- is not really a conjugation base, for whereas bases constitute a nexus with their suffixed themes (subjects), r- in the Conjunctive governs a whole nexus, and does not form a core nexus with the actor exponent. In fact, it approaches converter status, subordinating nexus to preceding verb/noun; this is not true of any other Clause Conjugation form. In a certain affinity with the nota relations, which (in a sense predicatively) adjoins noun to noun, we have here a kindred morph adjoining nexus to nexus or to noun. The mysterious case of the Conjunctive coordinated to the (relative, circumstantial) present etc. (§353) seems to be not so much a matter of the verbal conversion as such, but of the generic "case-raising" protastic nature of the clause, typically generic: sem, sema, concessive kai, the 'case-laying' (fallisecta) logicalict mnt- and so on. The Conjunctive as a 'that'-form is important, and ought not to be buried away as "con-
The causative conjugation is brilliantly treated by the author: this is a topic I find among the most rewarding in the work. A point I find under-represented is the causative slot. It is not the case that negative final constructions occur “instead of the missing negation” (p. 284): this is not real suppletion in any sense, in view of the special marked semantic load of ταπο-; it is also overrating things to attribute a “speaker’s promise” to ταπο-; the same in question is much more subtle than that, and is subtly blended with the post-imperative sequencing and apoditic components: guaranteed or inevitable sequel would be a closer description. There was certainly an evolution in the role of ταπο- in Sabidic (§358e), although register and genre may also have played a role, and even the most ‘final’ readings still preserve the inevitability factor of the form. The locutive forms are special (if only as a consequence of the historical locutive component in τα-); their initial (rather than “independent” — not post-imperative role) (§358e) is deliberative-interrogative, not “polite request” (other languages use special ‘that’ converters in that function: Modern Greek τα-, Modern Hebrew תג).

The causative conjugation is brilliantly treated by the author: this is a topic I find among the most rewarding in the work. A point I find under-represented is the causative slot. It is not the case that negative final constructions occur “instead of the missing negation” (p. 284): this is not real suppletion in any sense, in view of the special marked semantic load of ταπο-; it is also overrating things to attribute a “speaker’s promise” to ταπο-; the same in question is much more subtle than that, and is subtly blended with the post-imperative sequencing and apoditic components: guaranteed or inevitable sequel would be a closer description. There was certainly an evolution in the role of ταπο- in Sabidic (§358e), although register and genre may also have played a role, and even the most ‘final’ readings still preserve the inevitability factor of the form. The locutive forms are special (if only as a consequence of the historical locutive component in τα-); their initial (rather than “independent” — not post-imperative role) (§358e) is deliberative-interrogative, not “polite request” (other languages use special ‘that’ converters in that function: Modern Greek τα-, Modern Hebrew תג).

The causative conjugation is brilliantly treated by the author: this is a topic I find among the most rewarding in the work. A point I find under-represented is the causative slot. It is not the case that negative final constructions occur “instead of the missing negation” (p. 284): this is not real suppletion in any sense, in view of the special marked semantic load of ταπο-; it is also overrating things to attribute a “speaker’s promise” to ταπο-; the same in question is much more subtle than that, and is subtly blended with the post-imperative sequencing and apoditic components: guaranteed or inevitable sequel would be a closer description. There was certainly an evolution in the role of ταπο- in Sabidic (§358e), although register and genre may also have played a role, and even the most ‘final’ readings still preserve the inevitability factor of the form. The locutive forms are special (if only as a consequence of the historical locutive component in τα-); their initial (rather than “independent” — not post-imperative role) (§358e) is deliberative-interrogative, not “polite request” (other languages use special ‘that’ converters in that function: Modern Greek τα-, Modern Hebrew תג).
I find the "catalogue of adverbial clauses" (§493) helpful only in part, for the members of the list are not all of a kind, and arguably do not sometimes belong together at all, or all in the list, which ought at least to be more clearly subdivided. So, for instance, we find ὑπερ- also a prospective 'that'-form; finite adverbial clauses – clause conjunction forms, like ἐκ- ὦ- ἀπό-, ἀποστάσις-, which typically occur, not in adverbial status but as topicalizing 'presets' of a nexus; ἐκ-, ἀπό- is certainly a topicalizing clause, not normal adverbial or adverb (even if topical clauses may be considered 'premodifiers'); another 'preset' case is ...; see "there"; ἄρατος; and so on.

The "Verbal Pre-extensions" (the 'conjugation mediators' of Shisha-Halevy, Categories Chapter Three), are well presented (§183). This structurally curious feature of Coptic, to my knowledge not yet occurring in earlier stages of the language, is in many ways functionally (and perhaps even formally) analogous to Indo-European preverbs, and like them are in initio compounding constituents rather than true expansions (the determinatum-to-determinants Grundsatz of Coptic is not really violated). However, I wouldn't (as some scholars do) readily attribute this feature to translation influence of the Greek, seeing that it occurs in other languages with analytic verbal conjugation patterns, notably Neo-Celtic. I cannot agree with the author on the point of their modifying "the sentence as such" (p. 146), but believe they are always pre-lexicum (indeed, this is the only way to 'touch' the verb lexeme and modify it in-conjunctive). All this is well reflected in the author's translations. 

Ἐπί- ἀπό is strictly denied prepositional status: it "does not meet the definition of a preposition since it never modifies a preceding verb or verbal clause (nor does it premodify)" (p. 113 and §203). In the first place, this is in no way a prerequisite for preposition-hood; besides, ἀπό- does occur as verbal valential complement (especially where it concurs with *ΤΤ<->Τ<->ο'ρ*'). It is certainly true that ἀπό- is a prospective 'that-form; finite adverbial clauses – clause conjunction forms, like ἐκ- ὦ- ἀπό-, ἀποστάσις-, which typically occur, not in adverbial status but as topicalizing 'presets' of a nexus; ἐκ-, ἀπό- is certainly a topicalizing clause, not normal adverbial or adverb (even if topical clauses may be considered 'premodifiers'); another 'preset' case is ...; see "there"; ἄρατος; and so on.

Conversion (§395 ff.) of noun patterns or clauses is among the most complicated and fascinating topics of Coptic grammar, and among the best-treated in the book. This is one of Coptic's most striking showpieces and lessons for general linguistics. All converters, prefixed to a noun, are links and macrosyntactic status signals, each with its specific information about the status of its nexus within a smaller or larger macrosyntactic frame; this is far more sophisticated and true than the objectionable dichotomic 'ordination' (mainly subordination) model. Here lies my only reservation about the author's approach to this issue. I would emphasize that the binary classification, dividing the four converters (four in all Coptic dialects, and only in Coptic), into two groups of two: the first (Circumstantial and Relative) adjoining a nexus (respectively) predicatively and attributively to a foregoing clause or nominal clause constituent, the second (Focalizing Converter, and ἀπό- 'conventionally called Preterite Converter'), with the ἀπό- conversion of the Present often called 'Imperfect') marking its nexus, in dialogue or exposition

and narrative textemes respectively, as relief terms in the information-structural texture of the text. The interplay and associations of the Relative and Circumstantial are manifold. Consider the adnominal status (see above) and the "adverbial" ἀπό- (§425), which must be related to the "antecedent-less" ἀπό- and in turn to ἔπειτα-. The Focalizing and Preterite Conversions, the latter with and without subsequent ἀπό-, are the main operators in the respective dialogic and narrative textures.

Information structure and appositive relative expansion (§408 ff.). Although the conventional distinction between 'restrictive' and 'non restrictive' is not supported by empirical facts in Coptic (or to my knowledge in other languages), this is, I believe, partly due to its alleged absolute dichotomy; if anything, this feature is a gradient; what we actually have is a continuum of attributive expansion forms (in Sahidic ἔπειτα- ἀπό- ἀπό-), largely correlative with nucleus specificity but also with junctural linkage properties.

Topicalization, formally introduced in §330, is quite properly discussed and illustrated occurringly, apropos of individual patterns. The special construction of the type ἅ- ἀπό-, ἀπό- ἀπό- already referred to (§313, 321, 332) is not uncommon by any means, although of differing weight in different genres and texts: it is quite normal, for instance, in Pistis Sophia, and well attested in the NT and Shenoute, as also in other dialects; it is of considerable interest, since it seems to be a rare case of topicalized nexus between a conjugation base or converter (formal theme) and a nominal theme. Wherever this occurs, it calls for a study of its functional opposition to its non-topicalized correspondent, as for instance in nominal theme-introduction in narrative, ἄριστος- ἀπό- (§332) vs. ἄριστος- ἀπό- vs. ἄριστος- ἀπό-. Adverbials may also be topicalized (cf. §333), as 'presets' (this is formally marked as topic in Late Egyptian, by τ'). I suggest we should see different protases — notably the conditional (§346), ἄριστος- (§344), ἀπό- (§315, 493) — as subtypes of a basic information-structure marked form, namely high-level topic. Generally speaking, temporal clauses are not necessarily modifiers of a 'main statement', even when they follow it, but may, seen text-grammatically, be marked clause or clause-complex forms in the intricate patterning of information packaging or staging or 'chunking'. For instance, the various configurations in narrative of ἄριστος- with subsequent ἀπό- or ἀπό-, or, less typically, the Consecutive (§345) differ in properties of juncture and information blocking from other parameters such as theme switching indicative or symptomatic of juncture. For ἄριστος- (§343 f.), I would suggest "since" as the primary English rendering. For ἀπό- (§346), I would introduce eventuality as a primary component. "If/when eventually ...", I would also point out here its clause association with apodotic maτα-, indicative of genericity. 

Focalization, The Focalizing Conversion ("FC"), alias Second Tenses (§444-460). The augens (§152-158). This is yet another showpiece feature of Egyptian-

20 An almost exact parallel to this slot occurs in Welsh: ῥεθ- "of old", newydd "recently" and others.


22 A terminological new coinage of major importance. Cf. H. I. Parrot, Grundlagen p. 2, sharply on the term 'Second Tense': "eine unabgreichbare, deraus Beseitigung einer
Coptic, and another instance of brilliant discussion by the author. These forms and sets of constructions have been since 1937, both key and keynot of H. J. Polotsky’s gradual unveiling of the entire Egyptian verb system; a word on diachrony and the significance of these forms would not have been amiss.

Rhetorical environment of the FC: not only in the Coffin Texts; see A. Shisha-Halevy, in the Coffin Texts: a Functional Tableau”, JAOS (j)rf well established historically, is instructive. The version of the FC is a case in point; Oxyrhynchite eAq-rte- (Circumstantial Focalizing Future), is not always easy to distinguish (less harmful) than many other terms of Egyptian-Coptic grammar.

Rome, currently being edited by Nathalie Bosson), and perhaps less infelicitous (and certainly venerable Second Tense, going back in Coptic grammatical literature at least to the seventeenth century the Augentischgian Father Bonjour’s manuscript grammar in the Bibliotheca Angelica, Rome, currently being edited by Nathalie Bosson, and perhaps less infectious (and certainly less lasting) than many other terms of Egyptian-Coptic grammar.

Although this is a Sahidic grammar, one may contest the advisability of totally ignoring other dialects, when Sahidic manifests grammatical levelling or merging; the Circumstantial conversion of the FC is a case in point; Oxyrhynchite eAq-rte- (Circumstantial Focalizing Future), well established historically, is instructive.

On (for), the old (Middle Egyptian) ancestor of this augens, with a sharp demarcation of the two roles, see A. Shisha-Halevy, “The role of #antecedent 4- in the FC”, in the FC is a case in point; Oxyrhynchite eAq-rte- (Circumstantial Focalizing Future), is not always easy to distinguish (less harmful) than many other terms of Egyptian-Coptic grammar.

...etc. The signaling of questions is discussed (§511): I find here somewhat questionable the use of “optional”, expressing here and elsewhere the notion of non-obligatory occurrence of a morph; “optional” must surely refer to the meaningfulness of the speaker to use a morph, a decision entailing a choice between distinct entailments.

For Dialogue, such precious features of Coptic as the tensed pro-nuclear response forms (briefly referred to e.g. in §326) have been conspicuous; these too are exquisite typological showpieces of Coptic.
and implying a semantic charge? Cases like \( \text{εἰς τὸν ποταμόν} \) (\( \text{τὰ ποταμὰ ὄν ὄνου} \), \( \text{πρὶ} \) \( \text{τὸ} \) \( \text{παρισκαθεῖ} \) \( \text{ἐπιστό} \)) (p. 285), while occurring in a rhetorical context, are hardly "Rhetorical Questions"; they do solicit an answer.

Reported speech and associated topics are handled well, esp. the important special constructions of verbs of saying and cognition (§513 ff.), where we witness two dominant typological traits in Coptic, namely (a) the tendency to separate the lexical and free component from the formal one, and to represent the former and its grammatical status by grammemes (esp. pronouns), and (b) the typical cataphoric referential vector, to herd subsequent clauses pronominally in the nuclear governing clause. Here again, a rigorous application of the valency model would have clarified complexities. Some remarks: \( \text{καὶ} \) — a grammaticalized converbal adverbial from of \( \text{καὶ} \) — is actantial, and structurally belongs together with the "saying" lexeme. Both \( \text{καὶ ἐπών} \) and \( \text{ἐπών} \) correspond to English "mean, refer to" as early as Demotic (see §515d, e). Indirect Discourse (§519 ff.) is much more problematic; I would not overlook the "shifting" approach, but stick to the signalling description, which brings home the fact that the difference between "direct" (i.e. dialogic) and reported discourse is one of degree and scale, as evident not only in the special blend of both called "Free Indirect Discourse" (style indirect libre, er- lebte Rede) but in the special Egyptian feature of 'obstinate' interlocutive pronominal signals attested from Late Egyptian on.

Negation. Negators are defined (§250) as "morphs that express negation of a nexus ('not');" this is obviously insufficient; witness non-nexal negation, which may relate to the theme, to any nexus constituent or to a focus. The distinction between nexal and non-nexal negation is of course essential in understanding focalizing constructions; see §452 ff. (note that nexal negation does not occur in non-rhetorical interrogative focalization).

The coupling of negative and affirmative systems as in §326 or §305 f., natural to the Eurocentric linguistic instinct and perhaps didactically useful, is scientifically wrong and disturbing. I would certainly always present and illustrate both \( \text{οὐ} \) and \( \text{μὴ} \) independently, and, being so different in several respects, not take one as representative of both. Besides, \( \text{μὴ} \) is not a negator (§250c), not even in the durative nexus pattern, certainly not in existential statements. Negative clauses- forms are only artificially correspondents or even alternants of affirmative ones; since there is pronounced asymmetry in the properties and semantic-functional structure of members of the two lists; even \( \text{μὴ ἂν} \) and \( \text{οὐ} \) differ considerably, let alone \( \text{ἀς ἂν} \) (\( \text{ὁ} \) \( \text{ἀς} \) \( \text{κἂν} \) \( \text{ἀς} \) \( \text{κἂν} \)) and \( \text{οὐ} \). The difference, well pointed out, between the negation of the Focalizing and Circumstantial Conversions (§320), \( \text{οὐ} \) \( \text{κἂν} \) \( \text{κἂν} \) and \( \text{οὐ} \) \( \text{κἂν} \) \( \text{κἂν} \) respectively, is not only a matter of descriptive order, but of a deeper junctural distinction; it means that while the former negates the nexus (the thematic Focalizing eq- and its rheme, the circumstantial converts an already negatived form. While the latter, the former is not and should not be translated as \( \text{οὐ} \) \( \text{κἂν} \) \( \text{κἂν} \) does not negate the conjunction (§236), but the whole final or consecutive clause as an adverbial.

\( ^{38} \) As a rule syllabized \( \text{ας ἂν} \) in Oxyrhynchite
Some exceptional formulations or terminology or translation:

"Restrictive relationship" for ζητούσας κατακεραυν ώστε or οὐκάρως...

"Possessive relationship" (p. 51) for τα., in the case of ταξιδιωτική οίκου...

Proven to be inadequate by the very compatibility of the possessive article and thematic possessive pronoun.

"Affective demonstration" as less satisfactory for the anaphoric-deictic πιστα...

(Luke 15:3-6, p. 52).

"By definition, adverbial modifiers are terms that can modify a preceding verb or verbal clause" (§195) is tautological to a degree. The distinction between "adverbial" (a synthetic part-of-speech term) and adverbial/adnominal (names for analytically isolated syntactic status) is of the essence here; "adverb" may well be adnominal. Incidentally, the modification of a clause may well precede it, albeit in a different information-structure value.

"Rhetorical arrangement" for diverging modifier placement (p. 160) is question-posing, distracting attention from the parametric spectrum between the two extremes of information-structure and prosodic conditioning of placement.

"Verbs of speaking" (§510): "verbs of saying" is preferable.

"Periphrastically for ἀναπτυ ατ..." (p. 301); I suggest that "periphrastic" be reserved for use in cases of auxiliation.

The "Impersonal Predicate" (for Λυττική, ρέ, ρέα, ράνο, εξελεκτι; etc.): Chapter 22): a predicate per se is not personal or impersonal (οὐκοίμεται in οὐκοίμεται isn't any more personal than ἀναπτυ). A pronoun may be referential or not, or perhaps "impersonally" referential.

The imperative, which contains only one main information unit, does not express nexus and so is not a clause" (p. 291). This is a non sequitur, for lexical patterns (i.e., ones with the theme/theme interdependence) are only one — admittedly — prevalent type of clause. Existential and presentative clauses are not cases of nexus; interjective and imperative utterances are fully privileged clauses.

"Completing πά... (πά... τα... for πά... τα... it has only grammatical meaning" (p. 288; also Table 20, p. 287): οὐκοίμεται has τα... as a possible valentional object actant; τα... for its part, is the substantival nexus form compatible as object with the lexeme οὐκοίμεται ("τα... as common noun"). "Grammatical" cannot be contrasted to "causative" meaning, even if the former has a purely formal role.

An ambiguous set of forms such as πετεινούσας μιμοκρ... πετέω... (p. 371): this ambiguity is illusory, existing only within the insignificant, functionally trivial extent of the "word" it is the slot in the pattern that gives the form — any form — its distinctive meaning and indeed functional identity.

"Thus the reader's choice, though subjective, is based upon real structural criteria: the focalization... whose presence is elicited by this conversion is, finally, an act performed by the reader, and yet it is not arbitrary" (p. 354). The italicized words call for further clarification. The author does touch here upon two important points, that of the interfaces between encoder and decoder and between language and parole. But the "choice" is the encoder's (speaker, writer) to make, between formal terrains that exist in-paradigm; the decoder — reader or listener — does not choose,

but interprets these formal terms, these signals, assuming and reconstructing the encoder's choice. Nothing whatever in this procedure is arbitrary.

A final word, on the Indexes — one would jocosely say, only marginally less important than the book itself: these are outstanding. We are offered a Subject Index (469 ff.), followed by a Select Coptic Index (501 ff.). In the Coptic Index, the entries are rationally arranged in the normal Coptic dictionary order, although numerous Greek-origin and other non-Egyptian items are included. My reservations concern only the absence of ταπ., ὑσ., οὐν (ἀπά does occur), the presence of several ι-entries (520) — zero had better be treated as a 'subject' — and, lastly, perhaps a mere matter of personal taste, the sadly mutilated abbreviations of the type "βος of γεννησιεν μην" (507), "pers intermed" (514), "vbl auxilii" (507), "pers pref nom" (501), side by side with full definitions such as "penultimate personal object morph" (505).

In concluding, may I express a grammaticus's gratitude for a work of consummate scholarship, with never an instance of shoddy thinking or sloppy treatment? While there's still so much that remains an enigma in the exquisite Coptic language — even in Sahidic, the least mystifying of Coptic dialects —, present and future scholars will stand in Bentley Layton's debt for supplying the definitive word on most of its features.

Ariel Shisha-Halevy
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