

EÖTVÖS LORÁND TUDOMÁNYEGYETEM
BÖLCSÉSZETTUDOMÁNYI KAR

DOKTORI DISSZERTÁCIÓ

HASZNOS ANDREA

GRAECO-COPTICA: GREEK AND COPTIC CLAUSE PATTERNS
A GÖRÖG NYELV HATÁSA A KOPTRA: GÖRÖG NYELVI HATÁSOK A KOPT
MELLÉKMONDATOKBAN

Történelemtudományok Doktori Iskola

A doktori iskola vezetője: Dr. Gergely Jenő

Egyiptológia Doktori Program

A program vezetője: Dr. Bács Tamás

A doktori bizottság tagjai:

Elnök: Dr. Sz. Jónás Ilona DSc., professor emerita

Bírálok: Dr. Peter Nagel professor

Dr. Tóth Péter PhD

Titkár: Dr. Schreiber Gábor PhD

Tagok: Dr. Takács Gábor PhD

Dr. Liptay Éva PhD (póttag)

Dr. Horváth Judit, egyetemi docens (póttag)

Témavezető: Dr. Luft Ulrich DSc, egyetemi tanár

Budapest, 2009.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Texts and Editions Examined	III
Acknowledgements	V
0. Introduction	1
0.1 Loanwords and Bilingualism	6
0.2 Translations from Greek	11
1. Clauses with ἵνα and Clauses with κεκα and the Infinitive Constructions	14
1.1 Final Clause/Clause of Purpose	15
1.1.1 Clause Patterns	20
1.1.1.1 Clause-with-conjunction patterns	20
1.1.1.1.1 κεκα and κε with future 3 or 2	21
1.1.1.1.2 κεκα plus conjunctive	22
1.1.1.1.3 μηποτε (and μηπως) plus conjunctive	24
1.1.1.1.4 ζινα plus future 3	25
1.1.1.2 Clause Conjugations	26
1.1.1.2.1 The future conjunctive	26
1.1.1.2.2 The conjunctive	30
1.1.1.2.3 The limitative φαντε	30
1.1.1.3 The circumstantial	31
1.1.2. Infinitive Constructions	35
1.1.2.1 Greek infinitive – Coptic ε +infinitive construction	37
1.1.2.2. Greek του̅/ εις/ προς +infinitive	38
1.1.2.3 Constructions after verbs of motion	40
1.1.3 Greek – Coptic Equivalents	41
Conclusions	46
1.2 Object Clauses and Infinitive Constructions after Verbs of Exhorting	50
1.2.1 Clause-with-conjunction vs. infinitive patterns	51
1.2.1.1 The clause pattern ζινα + conjunctive/future 3	57
1.2.2 The conjunctive	58
1.2.3 The optative	59

1.3 Subject Clauses and Infinitive Constructions	59
1.3.1 Clause pattern vs. infinitive construction	60
1.3.2 Greek – Coptic equivalents	63
1.3.3 Others	64
1.3.3.1 The circumstantial	64
1.3.3.2 The conditional	64
1.3.3.3 The conjunctive	64
Conclusions (Object and Subject)	65
1.4 Complementary and Epexegetic Clauses/Infinitive Constructions	67
1.4.1 Clauses vs. infinitive constructions	67
1.4.1.1 ⲭⲉⲗⲁⲕⲉ plus conjunctive pattern	71
1.4.1.2 The ⲉⲓⲛⲁⲕ plus conjunctive pattern	72
1.4.1.3 The ⲉⲱⲕⲣⲉ + infinitive pattern	73
1.4.2 The conjunctive	75
Conclusions	77
2. Clauses/Infinitives of Result	79
2.1 Clause of Result or Infinitive of Result?	79
2.2 Greek – Coptic equivalents	79
2.3 The infinitive construction and the conjunctive after ⲉⲱⲕⲣⲉ	81
2.3.1 The conjunctive after ⲉⲱⲕⲣⲉ and other Greek conjunctions / particles/ /modifiers	83
2.4 Final clause patterns	85
2.5 The ⲉ plus infinitive pattern	86
2.6 ⲱⲛⲧⲉ	87
Conclusions	87
Final Conclusions	89
Appendix	95
Bibliography	137

LIST OF TEXTS AND EDITIONS EXAMINED

Gospel of Matthew

HORNER, 1969
PEREZ, 1984
SCHENKE, 1981
ALAND ET AL., 1994
NESTLE – ALAND, 1993
GRIESBACH, 1909
ALFORD, 1849

Gospel of John

HORNER, 1969
QUECKE, 1984
THOMPSON, 1924
ALAND ET AL., 1994
NESTLE – ALAND, 1993
GRIESBACH, 1909
ALFORD, 1849

Epistle to the Romans

HORNER, 1969
ORLANDI, – QUECKE, 1974
ALAND ET AL., 1994
NESTLE – ALAND, 1993
GRIESBACH, 1909
ALFORD, 1849

Pachom:

Instruction Concerning a Spiteful Monk (Spiteful)
Instruction on the Six Days of the Passover (Passover)
Fragments
Precepts

LEFORT, 1956

Precepts and Institutes

Theodore: <i>Instruction 3</i>	LEFORT, 1956
Horsiese: <i>Instructions</i> <i>Regulations</i> Letters	LEFORT, 1956
Shenoute: Young 4 Young 5 Young 6-7 Young, 21 Young 28 Young 30 Elanskaya 1.1.b.707 Elanskaya I.1.b.716 Elanskaya I.1.b.658 <i>Adversus graecos (Adv graecos)</i> <i>Ad philosophum gentilem (Ad phil)</i> <i>De eis qui e monasterio discesserunt (Monast disc)</i> British Library Oriental (BLO)	YOUNG, 1993 ELANSKAYA, 1991 LEIPOLDT, 1908 SHISHA-HALEVY, 1975

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my Doktorvater, Professor Ulrich Luft for his constant support and selection of research topic and also for making it possible for me to go and study in Bonn. I would like to thank Professor Peter Nagel for his help and guidance in Bonn and at the Rheinische Friedrich Wilhelms Universität Bonn, and for the specification of my research topic to Coptic clauses. I am very grateful to the Gertrud-und-Alexander-Böhlig-Stiftung and the Brigitte und Martin Krause Stiftung for their financial support in my two semesters in Bonn. I am also grateful to Professor László Török for his personal and professional support. I would like to thank Dr. Tamás A. Bács for the trust he put in me and his support. And I am also grateful to Árpád Miklós Nagy. And mostly, I am grateful to my husband and son for their endless love, patience and support.

0. Introduction

The present study joins the long line of works dedicated to the examination of the Coptic language. Quite understandably, it was self-evident in the scholarly world before the beginning of the 19th century that Egyptian philology means the study of the Coptic language as there was no access to hieroglyphic texts and their language at the time. The history of the study of Coptic, according to Étienne Quatremère, starts with Theseus Ambrosius in the 16th century¹ who studied other languages of the Near East also,² however, the beginnings thereof in Europe might be placed even to the 15th century when Bernhard von Breydenbach published the first printed Coptic alphabet in his *Peregrinatio in Terram Sanctum* (1486) after his journey to the Holy Land and Egypt.³ Also quite long is the history of trying to interpret the relationship so evidently present between the last phase of the Egyptian language and Greek. Athanasius Kircher in the 17th century, studying the Coptic language tried to define this relationship and came to the rather interesting conclusion that Greek originates in Egyptian, more precisely in Coptic, an opinion he himself refuted later.⁴ Today, the study of this relationship is very intense and advanced, but still far from concluded.

However, “the era when Coptic was the only known phase of the Egyptian language and Egyptian philology was synonymous with the study of Coptic” ended in fact before Jean-François Champollion’s decipherment of the hieroglyphs, with Étienne Quatremère’s 1808 publication,⁵ which discusses the – then not completely new – theory that Coptic must be the original language of Egypt, the continuation of that of the pharaohs. After Champollion’s achievement, then, “the centre of scholarly interest moved inevitably to

* “The characteristics of a language nest in the characteristics of the sentence.”

¹ POLOTSKY, 1987b: 5.

² He started the study of Syriac in Europe, publishing the first printed Syriac grammar in 1539, *Introductio in Chalaicam linuam, Syriacum atque Armenicam et decem alias linguas*, COWPER ET AL., 1858: ix.

³ As argued in IRSAY-NAGY, 2006: esp. 129-130.

⁴ *Quod enim Kircherus in Prodromio Copto linguam Graecam ab Aegyptia sive Copta fluxisse asserit, refutatione non eget, cum ipse a viris doctis monitus, & rei evidentia convictus, errorum hunc revocavit Ling. Copt. Restit. p. 507.* cited from August Pfeiffer’s *Critica Sacra* (1702), brought to my attention by Professor Ulrich Luft. Reference is made therein to Kircher’s *Prodromus...* and *Lingua Aegyptiaca...*, see Bibliography.

Ancient Egypt, (...) one must speak of a rift between Pagan and Christian Egypt”⁶ – a regrettable separation of studying ancient Egyptian and studying Coptic took place. Christian Carl Josias Bunsen, diplomat and a scholar of many interests, already warns in the first volume of his five-volume *Ägyptens Stelle in der Weltgeschichte* that “all hope of significant progress depends on the indispensable prerequisite that Egyptology shall be accompanied by an equally thorough Coptology”.⁷ According to him the event that made this separation final was the 1845 appointment of Moritz Gotthilf Schwartz Professor of Coptic Language and Literature at the University of Berlin, where Richard Lepsius was Professor *extraordinarius* of Egyptology – that created a Coptology independent of Egyptology.⁸ Bunsen’s *Koptologie* term refers to the Coptic language not to “Coptic studies in a wider sense, which did not yet exist”⁹ – and from a “language oriented”¹⁰ approach, it really is a mistake to place it outside of Egyptology. The division of Egyptology and Coptology can only be argued for from a “culture oriented”¹¹ viewpoint, as the cultural, religious and art historical studies of the two indeed require different knowledge, although it is only natural that a country of 5,000 years of recorded history should have quite different periods. The term ‘Coptic Studies’ was born in 1976 at the First International Congress of Coptology in Cairo, entitled “Colloquium on the Future of Coptic Studies”,¹² and includes the study of the Coptic language, literature, architecture and archaeology, art history, and religion; and also today, Greek-Egyptian language contact problems are an integral part of it.

As opposed to Adolf Erman’s statement that Coptic is “*the only phase of the Egyptian language which we really understand*”,¹³ I would like to emphasize that we are far from understanding it fully, and there is no consensus on certain critical points among scholars; it is especially true of studying its relationship with Greek.

⁵ POLOTSKY, 1987b: 5, referring to the work entitled: *Recherches critiques et historiques sur la langue et la littérature de l’Égypte*.

⁶ POLOTSKY, 1987b: 5.

⁷ This quotation comes from the English translation of the mentioned book (*Egypt’s Place in Universal History*, see Bunsen, 1848-67 in Bibliography), but as it was not accessible for me, I am quoting it from POLOTSKY, 1987: 12.

⁸ POLOTSKY, 1987b: 12.

⁹ POLOTSKY, 1987b: 12.

¹⁰ POLOTSKY, 1987b: 6.

¹¹ POLOTSKY, 1987b: 6.

¹² The publication thereof, WILSON, 1978.

¹³ In the Preface to his Grammar, quoted in Breasted’s translation, 1894: iii.

Focusing on that issue now, Coptic scholarship is still quite far from having an agreement on how and where the Egyptian language was affected by Greek. It is indeed an intriguing question whether outside of loanwords Greek had any influence on Coptic, and great scholars have raised that question several times: Hans-Friedrich Weiß in 1966 said “Griechische sowohl hinsichtlich des Sprachstiles und der Syntax mehr oder weniger deutliche Spuren hinterlassen hat”¹⁴ and further, Hans Jakob Polotsky in 1987: „Daß der Einfluß des Griechischen sich nicht auf den Wortschatz, und auch auf dem Gebiete der Syntax nicht auf den Gebrauch griechischer Partikeln beschränkt haben wird, ist öfters vermutet, aber nie konkret glaubhaft gemacht worden.“¹⁵ The Greek loanwords are rather clearly visible and evident traces of influence, drawing conclusions on syntactical influence, on the other hand is indeed all the more difficult as the method best applicable is not at hand. In bilingual situations when two (or even more) languages are in contact and interference is possible, it is measured by comparing the individual languages to their varieties elsewhere, where no language contact exists.¹⁶ The difficulty with measuring any influencing by Greek on Coptic is that Coptic has no variety outside of Egypt, i.e. free of Greek contact.¹⁷ Peter Nagel, when making his valuable observations on Greek influence, also points out: “Wenn man sich klarmacht, dass die koptische Schriftsprache direkt oder indirekt dem Griechischen verpflichtet ist, so ist der Einfluss der griechischen Syntax um so schwerer wägbare, als eine nichtgräzisierte, also „rein“ koptische Schriftsprache, nicht existiert.“¹⁸

What is certain, however, is that after Alexander the Great had set foot on Egyptian soil, a long-lived bilingual situation came into being raising the issues of peoples in contact and languages in contact, and with the arrival of Christian Greek texts and their translations, also “texts in contact”.¹⁹ The fact that Greek came ‘from the above’ must never be forgotten when trying to understand the motivations for its impact on the Egyptian language, the totally different nature and ‘genetics’ of the two languages is but a secondary factor: “it is the sociolinguistic history of the speakers, and not the structure of

¹⁴ WEISS, 1966: 183.

¹⁵ POLOTSKY, 1987a: 158.

¹⁶ BYNON, 1997: 220.

¹⁷ An examination in the other way around, i.e. studying Greek in such an environment – although naturally has its difficulties – has its more clear-cut criteria because Greek has other varieties, as HÄGG, 1978 makes some notes on Nubian Greek, and how the influence of the native tongue can be pinpointed.

¹⁸ NAGEL, 1971: 348.

¹⁹ SHISHA-HALEVY, 1990: 100/fn.4.

their language, that is the primary determinant of the linguistic outcome of language contact.“²⁰

The aim of the present paper is to make observations on syntax and stylistics in translated and original Coptic literature, sifting out the syntactic patterns showing Greek influence in one or both text groups, showing how certain patterns came to be used in Coptic clearly through translations,²¹ and raising the question whether those syntactic influences which came to the Egyptian language through the bilingual situation can be detected with certainty.²² With these observations I would also like to help develop the criterium system needed to determine whether a Coptic text was written in Coptic or Greek originally. I think one such criterium was introduced by Siegfried Morenz who studied the $\overline{\text{N}}\overline{\text{O}}$ -construction²³ and made valuable observations on its different use in translations (word order) and original writings (emphasis or the introduction of long subjects) – Karlheinz Schüssler also adding to this, noting: “there is no doubt that the Christians introduced this word in order to be able to follow the Greek word order in translation”.²⁴ Such observations do exist, however, a comprehensive work on the criteria would be very useful.

In the present study the final clauses, consecutive clauses, object clauses/infinitive constructions after verbs of exhorting and subject clauses/infinitive constructions will be examined from the point of view of syntactic grecism in translations and in original Coptic texts.

Thus, summing up, translated and original Coptic writings will be examined in the chapters and sections to follow:

1. this way it may be possible to see whether there is a difference in the measure of Greek syntactical influence in the two types of text, i.e. clause patterns of translated texts exhibit a greater resemblance to Greek clause patterns, while the original Coptic sentences might exhibit resemblance to Greek to a lesser degree and of different type, and

²⁰ THOMASON-KAUFMAN, 1988: 35.

²¹ On the importance of “umfangreiche und systematische” studies of the impact of Coptic translation activity, see FEDER, 2006: 301-303 where he lists works of Polotsky, Lefort, Mink and Funk as starting studies in this direction but so far no comprehensive study on the topic has been completed.

²² As I think also the bilingual situation might have had impact on syntax, not only on vocabulary.

²³ MORENZ, 1952.

²⁴ SCHÜSSLER, 2008: 56. Its extensive use is undoubtedly the ‘product’ of the Coptic language phase, however, SETHE, 1925: 295/fn.3 draws our attention to one occurrence in Demotic (in the form *n-gr*).

2. these investigations may be of help in creating the criteria for distinguishing with certainty a Coptic text originally written in Coptic and a translated Coptic text originally written in Greek: to determine which constructions and syntactical elements are characteristic of the text of one or the other.

In the most fundamental grammars, Till and Layton, the text base is Coptic Biblical texts, i.e. translated, and some Coptic authors with no distinction between the two; even such syntactical phenomena as conjunctions (even Greek) plus clause patterns, which in some cases are quite different in the two text types, are handled in one group and it is not explained or even observed where some of these patterns come from. Naturally, the two text types represent the same language and separating the two cannot be an aim, but such an approach in a descriptive (and prescriptive) grammar which does not mention or try to account for certain conspicuous syntactical phenomena, especially in the case of Coptic which is laden by its relationship with Greek, is questionable.²⁵ Even with these critical remarks, I would like to emphasize that the above mentioned grammars are outstanding and still the basic grammatical reference.

It gives a much more precise picture about the language if it is made clear which syntactic patterns are the result of the contact with another language, just as it is evident from the beginning of the study of the Coptic language that Greek loanwords are and should be identified in Coptic. Why not do the same with larger syntactic units? Taking the presumption that original and translated Coptic writings will be different in (some) syntactical aspects, we can examine the two text types separately and compare them. Identifying the patterns present or more characteristic in one or the other will refine our picture of the language and will be *lehrreich* about translation techniques, and might give us a ‘handbook’ to deciding whether a text was originally written in Greek or Coptic.

It must be admitted, though, that a number of questions will still remain unanswered, as translated Coptic literature (the Bible) obviously made its influence on Coptic authors. That is why Georg Steindorff was so enthusiastic about the Coptic documentary texts edited just at his time: “Sind sie doch die einzigen uns erhaltenen, größeren koptischen

²⁵ This objection is also raised by Glenn Snyder in her review on LAYTON’s Grammar, SNYDER: 2005, 2: „The question is not whether categories should be used, for they must be, but which categories are used, why, and for what ends. Here one has to decide between various criteria: simplicity of presentation, ability to account for complex variation (e.g., in orthography or an author’s style), translation into a target language (whose grammatical values and categories do not correspond to the translated language), and so forth.”

Sprachdenkmäler, die nicht selbst Übersetzungen aus dem Griechischen und Arabischen oder doch durch Übersetzungen aus dem Griechischen, vornehmlich durch die Bibel, in ihrer Sprachweise beeinflusst sind. Sie zeigen uns zum ersten und letzten Male nach den demotischen Texten einen rein ägyptischen Satzbau.²⁶ Although there may indeed be syntactical differences between literary and non-literary Coptic texts – the syntax of the latter (but also the former) must still be given some attention²⁷ – I would reject together with Sebastian Richter²⁸ the idea of a “rein ägyptischer Satzbau” in Coptic, as – even taking translations out of the picture – already long before Coptic, Egyptian literacy as well as everyday life had been interwoven with Greek.

Here another issue, that of spoken versus written language arises²⁹ which is a genuine problem of modern scholarship since it studies a dead language with only written records, thus it is rather difficult to determine the use of loanwords or “loan-patterns” in real spoken Coptic.

0.1 Loanwords and Bilingualism

The most conspicuous, immediately visible influence of contact with Greek and the intense bilingual situation is beyond doubt the ‘borrowing’ of the Greek alphabet. It is in itself a great change in the history of a language, and in Egyptian in particular, where: “Das vorkoptische Ägyptisch wurde in solchen Zeichen und Zeichengruppen fixiert, die nur den Konsonanten oder Konsonantengruppen darstellen und folglich allein das Skelett des Lautkörpers wiedergeben. (...) Die Einbeziehung vokalischer Zeichen war schriftgeschichtlich ein revolutionärer Akt und stellte die Ägyptische Sprache vor eine neue Ausgangsposition. Sie führte erstmals zur Kongruenz zwischen dem Sprachverlauf und seiner zeichenhaften Darstellung.”³⁰

For the second sight already, the next – and most studied – phenomenon, that of Greek loanwords in Coptic and their very intense use becomes evident. Although it is self-evident that their form, semantic field, and syntactic behaviour (incorporation in the

²⁶ STEINDORFF, 1891: 1, cited from RICHTER, 2004: 146 as the ZÄS volume was not available in Budapest.

²⁷ The contribution that the study of non-literary texts have cannot be doubted, see also the examination thereof in CRUM, 1930: 124-127.

²⁸ RICHTER, 2004: 146; also NAGEL, 1971: 348 who warns that even the first Coptic authors were largely influenced by translation literature (e.g. the New Testament).

²⁹ This problem is dealt with by RICHTER, 2008; RICHTER, 2004.

conjugation system, compatibilities, etc.) should be given systematic study, there still is no comprehensive dictionary of Greek loanwords in Coptic, as Crum did not include the words of Greek origin in his essential dictionary it has been a desideratum ever since. Alexander Böhlig in 1955 reported that he is working on a dictionary, "ein Gesamtlexikon aller griechischen Wörter im Koptischen mit Belegstellen und Schreibvarianten beabsichtigt und als Ergänzung zu W.E. Crums Coptic Dictionary gedacht ist"³¹; later, in 1969 Hans-Friedrich Weiß published a "Probeartikel" about the preparation for such a lexicon.³² But even today, we have only a large index rather than a lexicon, as Monika Hasitzka and Helmut Satzinger³³ point out in connection with Hans Förster's dictionary,³⁴ and that based on only non-literary texts.

Greek loanwords are indeed present in great numbers in Coptic texts (one fifth of Coptic vocabulary³⁵), and in this respect there does not seem to be much difference, at least not in the number of them in original vs. translated writings.³⁶ The question whether these words were 'put' into Coptic vocabulary through the immense translation activity³⁷ or they penetrated the language in the long bilingual situation, naturally arises. Paul Kahle, to whom we are indebted for – among other things – the Middle-Egyptian dialect, had the opinion that Greek words came into Coptic only through the translations of the Christian texts, especially the Bible,³⁸ Alexander Böhlig, on the other hand, as well as Louis-Théophil Lefort, expressed the view "daß bei der Herausbildung einer koptischen Schriftsprache eine große Menge griechischer Wörter verwendet wurden, die durch den bilingualen Zustand des ägyptischen Lebens auch Allgemeingut der ägyptischen Bevölkerung geworden waren."³⁹ Peter Nagel expressed a similar opinion in his 1971 work.⁴⁰ This had also been Arthur Vööbus' opinion, who in his time thought it impossible to answer the question of the origin of these words satisfactorily, but said "it would be a

³⁰ NAGEL, 1971: 329.

³¹ BÖHLIG, 1955:90.

³² WEIB, 1969: 79-80.

³³ HASITZKA – SATZINGER, 2004/5: 19.

³⁴ FÖRSTER, 2002.

³⁵ VERBEECK, 1991: 1168.

³⁶ "Koptische Originalschriften weisen den gleichen oder höheren Prozentsatz an griechischen Wörtern (...) auf wie Übersetzungstexte." NAGEL, 1971: 333.

³⁷ "Can, indeed, the translation-work of the Biblical books be made responsible for the invasion of Greek words into the Coptic language?" poses the poetic question VÖÖBUS, 1954: 225.

³⁸ BÖHLIG, 1955: 90.

³⁹ BÖHLIG, 1955: 90.

⁴⁰ NAGEL, 1971: esp. 333-334.

mistake to ascribe the whole phenomenon to the translation of the Biblical texts“; ⁴¹ and his argument is very convincing saying that hellenism in Egypt had been present long before Christianity and the loanwords seen in Coptic are not confined to the Christian religion but cover all fields of life.⁴² The fact that in Demotic hardly any Greek loanwords can be found⁴³ is not an argument for the opinion that Greek words were not in use in the Egyptian language and were only taken over with the start and in the course of the translations of the Bible. Demotic, unlike Coptic, was becoming a more and more rigid, almost artificial language register,⁴⁴ and had gone out of everyday use after the first century AD and “had gradually become a linguistic register connected to Egyptian religion and magic.”⁴⁵ And as such it was characterized by ‘purism’,⁴⁶ it was not open to foreign linguistic influence – as opposed to the spoken idiom. I think the NT translations themselves show best how much colloquial Egyptian was interwoven with Greek: these translations which were made “aus missionarischen Zwecken”,⁴⁷ i.e. for the part of the society who did not speak Greek good enough to be able to read the Gospels in Greek,⁴⁸ abound with Greek loanwords.⁴⁹ Using Greek words in translations prepared for the non-speakers of Greek makes sense only if we assume that these words, or most of them, were part of the used vocabulary,⁵⁰ otherwise the translations are of no great use. In Coptic, as a new language phase in the history of the Egyptian language and as a literary idiom, after so many centuries again the spoken and the written idiom met inasmuch as Copts started to write down the spoken idiom again, rather than using Demotic or Greek.⁵¹ A similar

⁴¹ VÖÖBUS, 1954: 225-226.

⁴² VÖÖBUS, 1954: 226.

⁴³ CLARYSSE, 1987: 10-12, points out that Demotic vocabulary is remarkably independent of Greek, the few Greek words that do exist in it, belong to the sphere of administration and the army.

⁴⁴ HINTZE, 1947: 87.

⁴⁵ RICHTER, 2008a: 741.

⁴⁶ NAGEL, 1971: 333.

⁴⁷ NAGEL, 1971: 333.

⁴⁸ i.e. “beyond the boundaries of urban settlements, the boundaries of linguistic hellenization” RICHTER, 2008a: 741; also VÖÖBUS, 1954: 213; meaning that the part of the population outside hellenized cities could not read Greek or understand Greek sentences, but: “Greek influence was well established and strong everywhere, and the development of the beurocratic system inherited from the Ptolemies, coupled with the augmented responsibilities of the local authorities, required a certain degree of knowledge of Greek and literacy even in the smaller towns and villages.” RUBENSON, 1995: 97.

⁴⁹ On the question of “Fremd-oder Lehnwort” see WEIB, 1966.

⁵⁰ cf. NAGEL, 1971: 333.

⁵¹ Before the birth of Coptic, there was an interesting language “gap” in the everyday life of Egypt and “the use of Coptic for letter-writing allowed monolingual Egyptians for the first time in centuries to communicate over distances without the assistance of translators, since Demotic, the former written norm of Egyptian, had disappeared from everyday contexts after the first century CE” (RICHTER, 2008a: 741) – and thus from about 100 A.D. to the third century, natives had to communicate in Greek letters even if both sender and receiver needed a translator for that (RICHTER, 2008a: 742).

'language reform' took place earlier, marking the turn of Middle-Egyptian and Late Egyptian. Such sudden changes take place from time to time in the written language,⁵² a characteristic feature of which is permanence, as opposed to the spoken idiom which changes continually (much like a living being). Quite understandably, the two must be adjusted now and then for people to be able to understand the written idiom. Now, in the time of Late Egyptian, a significant difference between written and spoken language had developed through the centuries and the Amarna reform 'legitimized' the spoken language.⁵³ Coptic also reflects the spoken Egyptian idiom of its time, unlike Demotic, and so its vocabulary is a very good indicator of the presence of Greek loanwords in the language, although it must be admitted that the translation activity might have brought in some additional words (technical terms of Christianity, among others) and enhanced the use of others.

On the other hand, more recent works raise further questions to consider, for example Tonio Sebastian Richter in his paper at the Leipzig Conference.⁵⁴ In his view, we cannot see the real picture about how much these Greek words were in fact used, as only a narrow register is represented in the written texts, which gives us an "impressionist" picture.⁵⁵ It is indeed necessary to classify the examined texts as to date, and genre – literary or non-literary –⁵⁶ and also writer and intended audience⁵⁷/receiver to get a more 'clear' picture on how, how much, and who used Greek loanwords – in what form, with what semantic field, etc.

The form of the Greek loanwords in Coptic has always been an issue as they clearly display a look different from that known in classical Attic. In 1927 Henri Peter Blok mentioned as a *novum* the situation that scholars no longer consider the 'strange' forms as "Transkriptionsfehler" of the unlearned monks, "wie es z.B. Amélineau tat, einfach emendierte" the problematic Greek words.⁵⁸ Naturally, the forms employed by the Copts come mostly from Greek itself, for their difference from classical forms koine Greek is

⁵² HINTZE, 1947: 85.

⁵³ HINTZE, 1947: 85; TAKÁCS, 1999: 315.

⁵⁴ RICHTER, 2008b.

⁵⁵ RICHTER, 2008b: 2.

⁵⁶ According to Richter, three issues must be considered here: 1. the spoken vs. written issue – non-literary and late Coptic texts are promising from that aspect, 2. the attitude towards Greek loans of translated vs. genuine Coptic texts, 3. the date of the texts is important: there seems to have been a decline in the use of Greek loans from the 9th century onwards, RICHTER, 2008b: 2.

⁵⁷ cf. RUBENSON, 1995: 98-99.

⁵⁸ BLOK, 1927: 50.

mostly responsible,⁵⁹ and it is enough to see a grammar of that⁶⁰ to be able to account for such vowel changes that are so familiar to the reader of Coptic texts: ἡδονῆ **ΖΥΔΟΝΗ**; εἰρήνη **ΟΙΡΗΝΗ**; ἀναχωρητής **ΑΝΑΧΩΡΙΤΗΣ** etc. Further, while mostly the pronounced forms were taken over⁶¹ and written down,⁶² the very same vocabulary items are used with different spellings – this inconsistency, the various spellings are probably the result of sometimes writing down the pronounced form, on other occasions the right spelling, the original Greek form was aimed at: e.g. **ΟΙΡΗΝΗ**, **ΙΡΗΝΗ**, **ΕΙΡΗΝΗ**; **ΘΥΛΑΚΙΑ**, **ΘΥΛΗΚΙΑ**, etc. In literary texts, then, the form of the Greek loanwords in Coptic⁶³ is understandable from the phonology of the Greek spoken in Egypt and it is also useful to know the original spelling of the words. The Greek spoken in Egypt – as a regional variety – has some features not present in the Greek elsewhere, which might partly be the “internal development of Egyptian Greek itself”⁶⁴ and partly show traces of the influence of Egyptian.⁶⁵

Naturally, not only phonetic-phonological issues present themselves in Greek loanwords, but also semantic – what semantic field they have as opposed to their use in Greek; stylistic – for what style and language register each was employed, as opposed to possible Coptic counterparts,⁶⁶ etc.; and syntactic – how are they built into the Coptic sentence,

⁵⁹ WEIB, 1966: 185.

⁶⁰ e.g. GIGNAC, 1976-81.

⁶¹ In Syriac, on the other hand, as Sebastian BROCK points out, 1999: 256: “most Greek words were taken over in their written form, rather than as pronounced: this is indicated by the retention of *upsilon* represented by *waw*. (...) only a few Greek borrowings in Syriac feature in a form that must represent spoken usage”; the impact of iotacism, however, is visible: “δηνάριου -dinara (emphatic ending); κίνδυνος -qindunos/qundinos (!); κλήρος -qliros; ἐκλειψις -eqlipsis”; further, similarly to Coptic, the *spiritus asper* is frequently assumed in the place of the *spiritus lenis*: “άρωμα -haroma” (p. 256). In Coptic e.g. ἐλπῖς and ἔθνος are most often written **ΖΕΛΠΙΣ** and **ΖΕΘΝΟΣ** respectively, among many others.

⁶² WEIB, 1966: 185.

⁶³ The reverse phenomenon can also be encountered, a case where a Coptic word occurs in a Greek literary text is discussed by JERNSTEDT, 1929: 122-124; but in this case the word is indeed difficult to recognize (σκατζύ for πκογχι) as the XIVth century manuscript probably underwent several scribal errors since the composition in the VIIth century, and the word was no longer understood.

Again, copticism might be suspected behind a ὁ Χριστός in a Greek papyrus, as in Greek required no definite article, being treated as a proper noun as opposed to Coptic where it is always **ΠΕΧḲ**; as also in the name Σεμπρώνια Τασαβεῖνα on another, where most probably the Coptic possessive prefix **ΤΑ** can be seen, SUPESTEJN, 1978:172-3.

⁶⁴ HORROCKS, 1997: 63.

⁶⁵ For possible phonological features, see HORROCKS, 1997: 62. For Egyptian Greek, see THEODORSSON, 1977 and the earlier mentioned GIGNAC, 1976-1981.

⁶⁶ Greek words probably had a higher prestige, cf. ORÉAL, 1999: 293.

e.g. which form the Greek verbs display,⁶⁷ etc.; for all these we have but individual studies⁶⁸ about individual texts, but again no comprehensive work. There is hope, however, as a large-scale lexicographical project devoted to the compilation of a Database and Dictionary of Greek Loanwords in Coptic (*DDGLC*) came into existence, and there will be a conference in Leipzig, 26-28 April 2010 – a joint project, organized by Eitan Grossman and Dr. Sebastian Richter on behalf of the Linguistic Department of the Hebrew University and the Egyptological Institute of the University of Leipzig and supported by the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology and the Saxonian Academy of Sciences – ”intended to create a discussion between linguists, Coptacists and classicists, in order to raise important theoretical issues, as well as to prepare and support the practical work of compiling DDGLC.”⁶⁹

0.2 Translations from Greek

Translation is quite a complex activity as a good knowledge of both source language and target language should be present, the meaning of the source text must be conveyed accurately and the target text must be clear and understandable for the speakers of the target language, even without any knowledge of the source language. This is not such an easy task, especially when dealing with two so different languages as Greek and Coptic, which naturally have mainly totally different means of expression and ways of building up sentences and relationships between them. Just for the sake of example, Coptic is clearly a language with a tendency for asyndeton, therefore sentences like the following:

ΛΟΠΠΟΝ ΑΠΑΓΥΣΤΗΣ ΤΑΥΘΟΥΨΑΛΞΕ ΖΗΠΕΣΤΑΥΡΟΣ ΑΠΧΘΕΙΣ ΚΑΝΕΦΝΟΒΕ ΗΛΑΓ ΕΒΟΛ
ΛΑΧΙΤῆ ΕΠΠΑΡΑΔΙΣΟC

(*Spiteful* 6, 21-23) obviously need some kind of 'linking' when translated to most other languages. Greek evidently has its own characteristics encountered by the Coptic translators when they so intensely and enthusiastically started translating the Gospels for their fellow Egyptians. Translating words and sentences from Greek into Coptic is not the sole issue, the background of translating is more complex.

⁶⁷ LEFORT, 1950; STEINDROFF, 1951; BÖHLIG, 1953.

⁶⁸ HOPFNER, 1918; GASELEE, 1929-30; LEFORT, 1950; GIRGIS, 1963-64; DRESCHER, 1969; DRESCHER, 1970; YOUNG, 1969; FUNK, 1984; GRODDEK ET AL., 2006; RICHTER, 2008b.

⁶⁹ Quoted from the invitation letter sent to me by the organizers.

Translation techniques in antiquity were studied by Sebastian Brock⁷⁰ and he relies on Cicero and Horace when introducing the dichotomy of techniques. Both authors express the view that the translator of literary texts applies the method of *sensus de sensu*, which is clearly the superior one to the slave-like *verbum e verbo* technique employed by the translators of legal and business documents.⁷¹ When Christianity and its missionary activity arrives, however, this "neat dichotomy between literary and non-literary translation (...) breaks down"⁷² because the literary writings to be translated in this case, are sacred, "ubi et verborum ordo mysterium est" – as Jerome wrote in his letter to Pammachius;⁷³ word order is thus also to be followed if possible, and the endeavour to do so is visible in the Coptic translations as well, one very obvious sign of that being the extensive use of the $\overline{\text{N61}}$ -construction.⁷⁴ So it is very important to bear in mind with the Coptic NT translations that the Greek "text is an authoritative source, given, ever-present, decoded (but also interpreted and often imitated) by the author of the target text; the other text is created on the basis of the source text".⁷⁵ Peter Nagel points out that as opposed to the NT translations: "Die koptischen Übersetzer gingen zuweilen recht frei mit ihrer Vorlage um, wenn es kein kanonischer Text war."⁷⁶ That kind of literal or pattern-to-pattern nature is really the 'specialty' of the Bible translations, and it is no Coptic invention, it appeared already in the Greek translation of the Old Testament (Septuagint), whose language thus abounds in hebraisms.⁷⁷ There is, however, also no comprehensive study on the Coptic translations from that aspect – how do they start (literal/sense-to-sense) and what direction do they take? Is there a clearly seizable trend? Manal Youstri Gabr's study examines the Gospel of John only and confines itself to the study of the positions of the subject, i.e. word-order issues, but he concludes that the earlier versions were characterized by the sense-to-sense translation technique, which later moved towards the word-to-word method.⁷⁸ This would not be surprising as studies on the Old Testament translations show the same phenomenon: "Diese Studien zeigen, daß frühe, freier gehaltene und sinngemäßere Übersetzungen im Laufe der Zeit als unzureichend

⁷⁰ BROCK, 1979.

⁷¹ BROCK, 1979: 69-70.

⁷² BROCK, 1979: 70.

⁷³ cited from BROCK, 1979: 69.

⁷⁴ MORENZ, 1952; SCHÜSSLER, 2008.

⁷⁵ SHISHA-HALEVY, 1990: 100/fn.4.

⁷⁶ NAGEL, 1998: 41.

⁷⁷ BROCK, 1979: 70-72; FÖLDVÁRY, 2008.

⁷⁸ GABR, 1990: ii; 116-122.

empfunden worden waren und daher überarbeitet oder vollständig ersetzt worden sind.”⁷⁹ The reason for this turn towards literal translations might be the canonization process, the gradual growth of the prestige of the texts, leading to the conclusion that a precise and exact translation of the original is ‘a must’. That seems to be paralleled in Coptic by the treatment of Greek words, connected to Christianity, as it seems that the first Coptic translators tried hard to translate everything – except for the words that had no Egyptian equivalent – and later they chose to ‘loan’ Greek words,⁸⁰ this way they could be certain that no mistranslation is made. The motivation for a close imitation of the Greek and a shift towards hellenization is shown in Brock’s study on Syriac, and not only in translations: ”During the fifth, and above all in the sixth and seventh centuries, the ever increasing prestige of all things Greek in the eyes of most Syriac writers brought about a dramatic change that affected almost all areas of Syriac writing; the impress of Greek can thus be seen in genre and syntax, as well as in vocabulary where there is a vast increase during this period in the number of Greek and Latin words which enter Syriac and very often gain wide currency.”⁸¹ This observation supports Weiß’ opinion that in Syriac these Greek words were rather *Fremdwörter*, not used for centuries before getting into the translations,⁸² which is shown also by the fact that they were taken over in their written rather than spoken forms (see previous section). The Greek words in Coptic, on the other hand, are really loanwords, most of them used for centuries in Egypt before the translation activity, they are of all kinds (verbs and particles also in great numbers as opposed to Syriac), from the most various fields of life, and were used in the way they were pronounced (i.e. spoken) in the Egyptian Greek of the time.⁸³ It is further supported by the fact that on several occasions the Coptic translations have a Greek word different from the one found in the Greek original text,⁸⁴ because clearly the translator employs the loanword known and used already in the Egyptian idiom for the given meaning.⁸⁵

⁷⁹ FEDER, 2006: 302, referring to – among others – to the studies of Sebastian Brock on the Syriac translations; he also emphasizes that no similar studies on the Coptic translations have been made.

⁸⁰ GASELEE, 1929-30: 225.

⁸¹ BROCK, 1999: 253.

⁸² WEIB, 1966: 194.

⁸³ WEIB, 1966: 204-205.

⁸⁴ HOPFNER, 1918: 12-13.

⁸⁵ WEIB, 1966: 208; FEDER, 2002: 84. Let me bring some examples from the Greek and Coptic *Vita Antonii*: for ‘strife’ the Greek text (BARTELINK, 1994) has ἀμιλλὰ (837A 1) and the Coptic (GARITTE, 1949) translates it with the Greek loanword ΔΡΩΝ (1, 6); the word ‘church-building’ is used as κυριακόν in the Greek version (841A 11; 841B 6; 844A 20), the Coptic translates with ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑ (3, 11-12; 3, 26; 4, 15). In the present corpus, an example can be Mt 8, 18 in dialect M where Greek κελεύω is translated with ΕΠΙΤΑΧΕ.

1. Clauses with ὅτι and Clauses with ὅτις and the Infinitive Constructions

When examining the clause-system of Coptic, one must remember that regarding clauses and/or verb forms, the Egyptian language cannot quite be looked at as one uniform entity. Naturally, the several-thousand-year old idiom displays a number of changes, involving syntax, and it underwent a „Systemumbau“⁸⁶ altogether. The direction of language development is towards an analytic, in place of a synthetic system⁸⁷ and conversion.⁸⁸ In pre-Coptic Egyptian the language possessed certain verb forms which could stand in the place where in another language a clause would be found; very good examples are the relative forms for the function of a relative (or adjective) clause, for the clause of circumstance (or adverb clause) there are the circumstantial verb forms, and for the that-clause (or noun clause) there are the emphatic forms or „ancestors of the Coptic second tenses“.⁸⁹ In these cases the non-presence of a clause with a conjunction is natural. By the Coptic phase of the language the above mentioned verb forms cease to exist as a result of the analytic tendency of the language, and become replaced by converters; other clause types also become more frequent, partly also in place of verb-forms. That can be seen as a simplification of verbal morphology, which it really is, but at the same time a complication of other parts of the language, in this case clause syntax, inevitably occurs.⁹⁰ Let us now turn our attention to the final clause patterns.⁹¹

In classical Attic the conjunction ὅτι was used to introduce final clauses (i.e. adverbial clauses). The Hellenistic period, however, saw an interesting change in the use of ὅτι -clauses: in the frequency of their application and in the syntactic positions they could occupy; they began to be used very often at the expense of infinitival constructions and to appear in places atypical in classical Attic⁹² – as object of certain verbs, in subject

⁸⁶ NAGEL, 1971: 328.

⁸⁷ HINTZE, 1947; SCHENKEL 1966; POLOTSKY 1987a: 16; LOPRIENO, 1995: 7.

⁸⁸ HINTZE, 1947.

⁸⁹ POLOTSKY 1987a: 18; cf. also LOPRIENO, 1995: 73.

⁹⁰ As THOMASON-KAUFMAN, 1988: 23 put it – „a language is not just one system, but a system of systems. All its systems interact, and (...) a change that simplifies one subsystem is likely to complicate another.“

⁹¹ For the list of texts studied, see the beginning of the dissertation: LIST OF TEXTS AND EDITIONS EXAMINED; in the case of the NT, Matthew will be examined in dialects S and M, John in dialects S and L, Romans in dialect S basically as the M text in this case is very fragmentary (ORLANDI, – QUECKE, 1974).

⁹² BLASS-DEBRUNNER, 1961: §369; HORROCKS, 1997: 75.

position, etc. It is certainly not our aim to investigate the reasons for that,⁹³ but we will collect the syntactic positions this clause type and its ‘rivals’ (i.e. more often than not the infinitive) tend to fill, and examine the Coptic translation varieties, and then the same syntactic positions in original Coptic writings, which may show in what ways and to what extent Coptic syntax was influenced by Greek (patterns) and whether this influence can be observed mainly in translations, i.e. it is translation induced, or in original and translation to the same extent.

The examination will focus on patterns, or surface structures/external forms, as they are part of the language and very good indicators of language contact and language change, influencing may be very strong and intense even if ‘only’ the surface structures are affected.

1.1 Final Clause/Clause of Purpose

To determine the possible Greek influence on Coptic clause patterning in the case of the final, the means and ways of expression, the clause patterns in Greek and Coptic will be examined first. After that, the translated and original text base will be compared, patterns identified, differences between translated and original clauses recognized, conclusions drawn.

In the classical language of Greek, final meaning was expressed either by a final clause, with the pattern conjunction ἵνα, ὡς, ὅπως, (in negation ἵνα μή, ὡς μή, ὅπως μή, μή) plus subjunctive if the main verb is present, or *optativus (obliquus)* after a preterit main verb (sometimes even then the subjunctive was used);⁹⁴ or by a future participle (or less frequently the *participium imperfectum*), sometimes together with ὡς;⁹⁵ or by an infinitive,⁹⁶ especially after verbs like δίδωμι, ἐπιτρέπω, ἀίρέομαι, πέμπω, ἀφικνέομαι.

⁹³ See for example HORROCKS, 1997: 75: „The extension of finite (subjunctive) clauses introduced by final conjunctions, especially ἵνα, at the expense of infinitival structures: this was possibly connected with the historically wider range of uses of Latin *ut*, e.g. in final and consecutive clauses, indirect commands, and various ‘future-referring’ complement and adjunct structures. Since this process began in the Hellenistic period, however, the most we can say is that contact with Latin may have reinforced and/or accelerated the trend.“

⁹⁴ BORNEMANN-RISCH, 1999: §276.

⁹⁵ BORNEMANN-RISCH, 1999: §246.g

⁹⁶ BORNEMANN-RISCH, 1999: §237.2

From the Hellenistic period, and in the language of the New Testament, the infinitive of purpose after verbs of motion became more frequent than in classical Greek (in earlier times, in Homer, it was used much more than with Attic writers who only use it after certain verbs see above); analytical constructions with ἵνα became serious rivals of the infinitive at the same time – the choice between the two seems to be a matter of preference;⁹⁷ it will be examined below how often and where one or the other is used in the NT books Matthew, John and Romans. At this time the optative is not used after ἵνα even after a preterit verb form.⁹⁸ The future participle is rather infrequent in the language of the NT, and sometimes the imperfect participle stands in its place.⁹⁹

In Coptic the most typical final patterns are¹⁰⁰ the clauses introduced by **ⲭⲉⲗⲁⲥ** or **ⲭⲉ** followed by future 3 or 2, and the **ⲉ** plus infinitive construction; in the negative the negative future 3 after **ⲭⲉⲗⲁⲥ** or **ⲭⲉ** can be used, a **ⲙⲏⲡⲟⲩⲉ** or **ⲙⲏⲡⲟⲩⲥ** with the conjunctive (this clause type having some additional semantic nuance), and the negated **ⲉ** plus infinitive construction. Far less frequent – especially in S – is the pattern **ⲭⲉⲗⲁⲥ** plus conjunctive; non-existent in literary S, but present in B is the pattern **ⲉⲓⲛⲁ** with the conjunctive, and in the here examined dialect M the pattern **ⲉⲓⲛⲁⲥ** with future 3. The future conjunctive and its alleged final use¹⁰¹ will be examined in the chapter, see later **1.1.1.2.1**, the conjunctive will also be briefly discussed here, **1.1.1.2.2**;¹⁰² further, the final use of the circumstantial present¹⁰³ will be seen, **1.1.1.3**.

The tables below show the final patterns and the number of their occurrences in the texts analysed. In the case of the translations of Matthew and John,¹⁰⁴ the Middle-Egyptian and the Lycopolitan dialects respectively are also taken into consideration, but only as reference, as Sahidic is the basis for the present study. The reason for that is the neutral

⁹⁷ BLASS-DEBRUNNER, 1961: §388 and 390.

⁹⁸ MOULTON ET AL., 1963: 26.

⁹⁹ BLASS-DEBRUNNER, 1961: §418 – in fact for the future participle the only example seems to be Mt 27, 49.

¹⁰⁰ TILL, 1961: §423; LAYTON, 2004: §502

¹⁰¹ Cf. Till, 1961: §311: from certain uses of the future conjunctive "sich der Sinn eines Finalsatzes entwickelt".

¹⁰² TILL, 1961: §423, 323.

¹⁰³ TILL, 1961: §§423, 328, 329.

¹⁰⁴ On the S translations of John, and its 'peculiarities', see SCHÜSSLER, 2008.

nature¹⁰⁵ and standard literary idiom character of the latter, and the fact that the authors examined here who basically created original Coptic literature¹⁰⁶ and from whom there are Coptic original texts surviving, Pachom and Shenoute also wrote in this dialect.

¹⁰⁵ "it is 'neutral' or, better, most leveled, dialectologically speaking; it is the dialect most difficult to characterize distinctively, a 'mean' dialect, the one with the fewest exclusive traits and the most isoglosses shared with others" SHISHA-HALEVY, 1991: 195.

¹⁰⁶ On the problem of whom to call the first original Coptic author, see NAGEL, 1971: 348; also RUBENSON, 1992.

GREEK (Total 234) **fig.1**

	Matthew	John	Romans
ἵνα subj	19	98	23
ὅπως subj	12	1	3
μήποτε subj	8*	-	-
infinitive	24	6	3
prep and/or article + inf	13	-	13
part impf	4	5	1
part fut	1	-	-
Total	81	110	43

*in Mt 7,6 most Greek variants have a future indicative after the conjunction, but in the Codex Sinaiticus there is subjunctive¹⁰⁷

SCOPTIC (Total 234) **fig.2**

	Matthew	John	Romans
ΧΕΚΑC fut3	33	80	15
ΧΕΚΑC fut2	-	5**	1
ΧΕ fut3	-	9	10
ΧΕ fut2	-	1**	-
ΧΕΚΑC conj	-	-	1
ΜΗΠΟΤΕconj	8	-	-
circ pres	4	5	1
ϵ+inf	34*	10	14
ϵ+art+inf	2	-	1
Total	81	110	43

*in Mt 14,23 the variant in Perez (manuscript M 569) is not an ϵ+infinitive, but a perfect 1

**all of them are only text variants beside future 3, see later in the section

¹⁰⁷ New Testament Transcripts: <http://nttranscripts.uni-muenster.de>; the future indicative is used in Koine Greek in places where it had not appeared in classical Greek, for example after ἵνα and final μή, BLASS-DEBRUNNER, 1961: §369.

M COPTIC MATTHEW (Total 81) fig.3

ⲭⲉⲕⲉⲥ fut3	17
ⲭⲉ fut3	11
ⲒⲎⲌⲌⲤ fut3	3
ⲎⲎⲠⲠⲤⲉ conj	3
ⲎⲎⲠⲠⲤ conj	5
ⲠⲌⲎⲤⲉ	2
circ pres	5
pf 1	2
fut conj	1
ⲉ+inf	25
ⲉ+article+inf	4
prep+noun	1
conj	2
Total	81

L COPTIC JOHN (Total 93) fig.4

ⲭⲉⲕⲌⲤⲉ fut3	49
ⲭⲉⲕⲌⲤⲉ fut2	16
ⲭⲉ fut3	4
ⲭⲉ fut2	6
ⲭⲉⲕⲌⲤⲉ conj	1
fut conj	2
Ⲍ+inf	12
circ pres	3
Total	93*

* clauses are missing because the MS is not complete

ORIGINAL COPTIC LITERATURE (Total 240)

fig.5

	Pachom	Theodore	Horsiese	Shenoute
ⲭⲉ fut3	16	5	12	19
ⲭⲉ fut2	4	1	2	1
ⲭⲉⲗⲁⲕ fut3	-	1	20	12
ⲭⲉⲗⲁⲕ fut2	4	1	5	9
ⲭⲉⲗⲁⲕ conj	-	1	-	-
ⲙⲏⲡⲟⲩⲉ conj	5	3	1	-
ⲉ inf	8	19	37	54
Total	37	31	77	95

1.1.1 Clause Patterns

Under this heading all patterns will be discussed that express purpose, are not infinitive constructions, and are not independent (see below, perfect 1 as translation of a final infinitive?). The Greek participles of purpose will, by necessity, partly be discussed here, as they are translated by the Coptic circumstantial clause in most of the cases.

1.1.1.1 Clause-with-conjunction patterns: this subclass contains those clauses which follow the pattern: conjunction + verb form = subordinate clause, as opposed to the so-called 'clause-conjugations' and the converted clauses (circumstantial).

In the Sahidic Matthew, John and Romans the most frequently used final clause pattern is the ⲭⲉⲗⲁⲕ plus future 3 with 79.14% (129 out of a total of 163 clauses). The second place is taken by the ⲭⲉ plus future 3 clause pattern which is 11.65% of the clauses (19 out of 163); the third is the ⲙⲏⲡⲟⲩⲉ plus conjunctive pattern, but it has a limited range as it can be used only in negatives, of course – it is 4.90% (8 out of 163); the ⲭⲉⲗⲁⲕ plus fut 2 pattern is 3.68% (6 out of 163), and ⲭⲉ with future 2 is 0.61% (1 out of 163), the same number as the ⲭⲉⲗⲁⲕ plus conjunctive pattern.

In the original text material, the clause-with-conjunction patterns are as follows: the most frequently used pattern is ⲭⲉ plus future 3 with 42.62% (52 out of 122 clauses); the second place is taken by ⲭⲉⲗⲁⲕ plus future 3 with 27.04% (33 out of 122); the third is ⲭⲉⲗⲁⲕ plus future 2 with 15.57% (19 out of 122); the next most frequent is ⲙⲏⲡⲟⲩⲉ plus

conjunctive with 7.37 %, but we know that it is only used in negatives; **xe** plus future 2 is 6.55% of all clauses (8 out of 122); **xekac** plus conjunctive is 0.82% (1 out of 122).

1.1.1.1.1 xekac and xe with future 3 or 2: The most frequent and most evident final clauses are **xekac** and **xe** with the future 3 or 2. This overwhelming majority and dominance of the **xekac** plus future 3 pattern (79.14%, see above) in the Sahidic New Testament is shown also in Lefort's 1948 study, where he examined all the NT books in the S version.¹⁰⁸ In his article Lefort eventually concludes that there is basically no future 2 in the S NT used with **xekac** or **xe** – the cases attested are indeed mere text variants, and rather few in number.¹⁰⁹ In the text material of the present study, they are as follows in the S version:

Jn 5, 34: in Horner **xekac** fut2, in Quecke **xekac** fut3.

Jn 6, 5: in Horner **xe** fut2, in Quecke **xe** fut3.

Jn 15, 16 in Horner **xekac** fut2, in Quecke **xekac** fut3.

Jn 16, 33: in Horner **xekac** fut2, in Quecke **xekac** fut3.

Jn 19, 4: in Horner **xekac** fut2, in Quecke **xekac** fut3.

Jn 20, 31 (the second final of the two): in Horner **xekac** fut2, no text critical remarks; in Quecke **xekac** fut3.

Rm 3, 19: in Horner there is no variant.

In meaning, there is no difference between the two conjunctions, the same recurring passages are translated with **xekac** in some places and then with **xe** in others,¹¹⁰ or between the patterns; however, Shisha-Halevy suspects that there is more to their distribution than mere choice: "**xekaac** vs. **xe-εqεcωtm** and **xe** vs. **xekaac εqηacωtm** – an opposition the functional resolution of which must await some future study."¹¹¹

¹⁰⁸ LEFORT, 1948: 66.

¹⁰⁹ LEFORT, 1948: 68-69, speaking of the whole NT: „sur quelque 650 propositions finales introduites par **xekac** ou **xe**, on constate que 10 fois *une partie* de la tradition manuscrite a utilisé la forme **ετετνα** qui est celle du futur II, à moins que ce ne soit une forme akhmisante du futur III; de même certains mss ont, *une seule fois*, ajouté un **na** au verbe assez éloigné de son auxiliaire **ερε**, lequel sert à la fois au futur II et au futur III.”

¹¹⁰ LEFORT, 1948: 67.

¹¹¹ SHISHA-HALEVY, 1986: 197.

In the Middle-Egyptian dialect version of Matthew, no future 2 occurs in these clauses. In the text of the Lycopolitan John, however, fut 2 is much more frequently used with **ⲭⲈⲔⲀⲘ** and on some occasions also with **ⲭⲈ** than in S¹¹² (see fig.4).

In the original Coptic material it is rather conspicuous that **ⲭⲈ** occurs far more frequently here than in the NT, and future 2 is also used more than in the NT.¹¹³

Pachom, *Spiteful 5, 24*

ⲚⲐⲂⲘⲘⲤⲚⲈⲐⲪⲀⲬⲈ ⲘⲈ ⲚⲀⲚ ⲭⲈⲔⲀⲘ ⲈⲚⲚⲀⲔⲤⲈⲮⲈⲮⲈ ⲈⲠⲚⲠⲮⲈ

Shenoute, Young 21 129, 12-13

ⲈⲠⲠⲠⲮⲠ ⲚⲐⲐⲠ ⲈⲠⲤⲤⲚⲤⲚⲠⲠⲠⲮⲈ ⲭⲈⲈⲠⲤⲚⲠ ⲚⲀⲚ ⲚⲤⲤⲚⲚⲠⲠ ⲈⲚⲀⲠⲤⲈ ⲚⲚⲚⲚⲠ ⲈⲠⲠⲠⲮⲠ...

In the original material, then, a far less 'biased' distribution of the clause patterns evolves, the rate of **ⲭⲈⲔⲀⲘ/ⲭⲈ** with future 3/future 2 is more balanced, with **ⲭⲈ**+future 3 dominating only with 42.62% as opposed to the 79.14% of **ⲭⲈⲔⲀⲘ**+future 3 in the translations. That shows that the **ⲭⲈⲔⲀⲘ**+future 3 pattern became the pattern-to-pattern translation¹¹⁴ of the **ⲓⲛⲀ** (ὅπως) plus subjunctive clause type, thus its dominance can be explained by Greek influence, the impact of its very close translation to be more precise.

1.1.1.1.2 ⲭⲈⲔⲀⲘ plus conjunctive: In the S NT texts examined here, there is but one example of the **ⲭⲈⲔⲀⲘ** plus conjunctive pattern:

Rm 6, 4

Greek: **ⲓⲛⲀ** ὡςπερ ἠγέρθη Χριστὸς ἐκ νεκρῶν διὰ τῆς δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς, οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς περιπατήσωμεν

S Coptic: **ⲁⲮⲐⲐⲠⲤⲚⲈⲚ** ... **ⲭⲈⲔⲀⲘ** ⲔⲀⲠⲀ ⲐⲈ ⲚⲐⲠⲤⲤⲚⲠⲠⲮⲠⲠⲮⲠ ⲈⲠⲠⲠ ⲤⲚⲚⲚⲤⲚⲠⲠⲠⲮⲠ ⲤⲚⲚⲚⲠⲠⲠⲮⲠ ⲚⲠⲤⲚⲚⲠⲠⲮⲠ ⲤⲚⲚⲚⲠⲠⲮⲠ

In the sentence there is an interposition between conjunction and verb, and that seems to be the difference to the other **ⲭⲈⲔⲀⲘ**-clauses. In the examined original texts there is also one example of that pattern, also with an interposition, in Theodore's Instruction:

41, 20-22

ⲭⲈⲔⲀⲘ ⲈⲠⲠⲀⲚⲠⲠⲔⲀⲠⲠⲠⲠⲠⲠⲠⲠ ⲠⲠⲠⲠⲤⲚⲚⲠⲠⲮⲠⲠⲮⲠ ⲠⲠⲠⲠⲚⲚⲚⲚⲠⲠⲮⲠ ⲚⲚⲚⲚⲠⲠⲮⲠ ⲈⲠⲠⲠⲮⲠ ⲈⲠⲠⲠⲮⲠⲮⲠⲮⲠ ⲭⲈ ...

With the other authors, Pachom, Horsiese, and Shenoute, the pattern does not occur in the examined texts, in connection with Shenoute Shisha-Halevy notes that "the construction

¹¹² see also Thompson's remark on that, THOMPSON, 1924: XVIII/fn. 1.

¹¹³ cf. Shisha-Halevy's note on that, SHISHA-HALEVY, 1986: 197/fn. 51.

is uncommon¹¹⁵ in his works. In the Sahidic NT, however, it can be found on several occasions beside Rm 6,4, all the others appear in the NT books outside of the scope of the present work.¹¹⁶ According to Lefort, they have one feature in common, namely the interposed adverbial (“temporelle, conditionelle, et surtout participiale, etc.”¹¹⁷) clause.¹¹⁸ In Rm 5, 21, however, there is an interposition also, and the clause still contains the future 3 rather than the conjunctive, therefore Lefort concludes that „la proposition intercalaire n’est pas la cause, mais tout au plus une condition de l’emploi du conjonctif après **ΧΕΚΑΣ**.”¹¹⁹

In the Lycopolitan John version, on the other hand, the conjunctive appears with **ΧΕΚΑΣ** again after an interposition, which is not adverbial, but the emphasized object:

Jn 11,52

Greek: οὐχ ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἔθνους μόνον ἀλλ’ ἵνα καὶ τὰ τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ τὰ διεσκορπισμένα συναγάγη εἰς ἓν

L Coptic: **ΖΑΦΘΕΝΟΣ ΟΥ ΜΟΝΟΝ ΑΛΛΑ ΧΕΚΑΣΕ ΑΝ ΝΩΗΡΕ ΝΤΕΠΙΝΟΥΓΤΕ ΕΤΧΑΡ ΑΒΑΛ ΝΚΑΧΖΟΥΓ ΛΥΜΑ ΝΟΥΩΤ**

S Coptic: **ΖΑΠΖΘΝΟΣ ΑΝ ΝΜΑΤΕ ΑΛΛΑ ΧΕΚΑΣ ΟΝ ΝΩΗΡΕ ΗΠΙΝΟΥΓΤΕ ΕΤΧΟΡΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΕΦΕΣΟΟΥΖΟΥ ΕΥΜΑ ΝΟΥΩΤ**

This leads us to the next question: what is the syntactic role and/or explanation for the conjunctive after **ΧΕΚΑΣ**? Lefort, when discussing the phenomenon, states that the conjunctive is clearly not governed by **ΧΕΚΑΣ**, rather an anacoluthon is at play in these sentences,¹²⁰ that is, the final clause starts with the conjunction, then an interposition follows and only after that scission is the final clause completed with the verb, which may optionally be the conjunctive; but this interposition – as we have seen above – is just one condition and “not the conditioning factor for the conjunctive”¹²¹ and Lefort goes on to conclude that the conjunctive here has „a special modal value”,¹²² the volitive and is in parataxis.¹²³ “To what is the conjunctive coordinated”¹²⁴ then, asks Shisha-Halevy rightly;

¹¹⁴ They could also be called “grammatical calques”, see SHISHA-HALEVY, 1990: 100; BYNON, 1997:222.

¹¹⁵ SHISHA-HALEVY, 1986: 207.

¹¹⁶ They are as follows (see LEFORT, 1948: 69): Mc 10,35; 14,35; Lc 14,10; 1Cor 7,29; 9,18; 16,2; 2Cor 8,6; 9,3; 9,8; Php 1,27; 2,28; 2Th 3,12; Tit 2,12; 3,7; Heb 9,15; 10,36; 1Pe 2,12; 2,24; 3,1; 2Jh 6

¹¹⁷ LEFORT, 1948: 70.

¹¹⁸ see also LAYTON, 2004: §355.

¹¹⁹ LEFORT, 1948: 70; also Layton, 2004, §355: „In a clause of purpose **ΧΕΚΑ(Α)C** optionally is expanded by the conjunctive if an adverbial clause stands between **ΧΕΚΑ(Α)C** and the conjunctive.”

¹²⁰ LEFORT, 1948: 70.

¹²¹ SHISHA-HALEVY, 1986: §7.2.6.1.

¹²² SHISHA-HALEVY, 1986: §7.2.6.1.

¹²³ LEFORT, 1948: 72.

¹²⁴ SHISHA-HALEVY, 1986: §7.2.6.1.

in Lefort's view it seems to be in parataxis with the verb of the interposed clause: "l'action du verbe au conjonctif y est intimement liée à la réalisation de l'action, ou de l'état indiqués dans la phrase intercalaire ; si bien que, dans l'esprit du sujet parlant, les deux actions s'enchaînent naturellement."¹²⁵ Shisha-Halevy's solution seems plausible, the interposition is adverbial, "really protatic" and the conjunctive after that has an "apodotic-resuming role".¹²⁶

But how are we to interpret the cases where not an adverbial (or protatic?) clause is interposed, but the object, as in L Jn 11, 52? Here, it cannot be in special linkage with the action in the clause as there is none.

Elsewhere in Coptic, the conjunctive follows not only **ⲭⲉⲕⲁϢ** but **ⲒⲒⲛⲁ** too, also in final clauses. In B **ⲒⲒⲛⲁ** + conjunctive as final clause pattern is general, whereas, in S literary idiom it does not occur,¹²⁷ neither with conjunctive nor with future 2 or 3. In B **ⲒⲒⲛⲁ** introduces final clauses (then followed by the conjunctive), and also in some gnostic texts the conjunction occurs, there not only with the conjunctive, but also with future 2 and followed by **ⲭⲉ**+ fut 2.¹²⁸ In the text material examined here, there is no **ⲒⲒⲛⲁ**+ conjunctive in S, as can be expected; in M there is **ⲒⲒⲛⲁϢ** + future 3 in final clauses, and **ⲒⲒⲛⲁϢ** + conjunctive stands exclusively in **ⲓⲛⲁ**-clauses other than final (complementary/epexegetic clauses, object clauses after verbs of exhorting), see later, in 1.2.1.1 and 1.4.1.2.

1.1.1.1.3 ⲙⲏⲡⲟⲩⲉ (and ⲙⲏⲡⲟⲩⲱϢ) is a loan-conjunction always followed by the conjunctive. It is used in this translated material only when the Greek original has the pattern **μῆποτε** plus subjunctive, this happens in Matthew alone; it certainly has an additional nuance in meaning – 'so that it *never/no way* happens' – to the other negative finals. Where the negation of the final clause in the Greek takes the form of **ⲓⲛⲁ** or **ⲔⲡⲱϢ** **μῆ**, then one of the **ⲭⲉⲕⲁϢ** or **ⲭⲉ** plus negative fut 3 patterns is used: in Matthew there are 4 **ⲓⲛⲁ μῆ** patterns, all of them translated with **ⲭⲉⲕⲁϢ** plus neg fut 3 (7,1; 17,27; 26,5; 26,41); and there is 1 **ⲔⲡⲱϢ μῆ** pattern, also translated with **ⲭⲉⲕⲁϢ** plus neg fut 3 (6,18).

¹²⁵ LEFORT, 1948: 72.

¹²⁶ SHISHA-HALEVY, 1986: §7.2.6.1.

¹²⁷ NAGEL, 1971: 350.

¹²⁸ NAGEL, 1971: 349-350, see examples there.

In John no μήποτε patterns occur; there are altogether 14 ἵνα μή patterns, 11 times translated with **κεκας** plus neg fut 3 (3,16; 3,20; 4,15; 5,14; 6,12; 12,40; 12,42; 12,46; 16,1; 18,28; 18,36;), and 2 times translated with **κε** plus neg fut 3 (7,23; 12,35; 19,31); there is no ὅπως μή here. In Romans there are no such negations.

In the Middle-Egyptian Matthew the Greek μήποτε plus subjunctive patterns are translated with **μηποτε** plus conjunctive on 3 occasions (4,6; 5,25; 13,29), and with **μηπως** plus conjunctive on 5 occasions (7,6; 13,15; 15,32; 25,9; 27,64). The four ἵνα μή patterns are translated with **κε** plus negative future 3 on three occasions (7,1; 26,5; 26,41), and with **κεκες** plus negative future 3 on one occasion (17,27); the one ὅπως μή pattern is translated with **κεκες** plus negative future 3 (6,18).

In the original text material **μηποτε** plus conjunctive occurs altogether 9 times: 5 times in Pachom (*Spiteful* 3,23; 4,6; 11,22; 13,2; 22,14), 3 times in Theodore (*Instr* 3 46,4; 58,21; 59,13), and once in Horsiese (*Letters* 63,27), and not once in Shenoute. In the rest of the negative finals **κεκας** or **κε** plus negative future 3 is used.

For the conjunctive after Greek conjunctions see later, **2.3.1**.

1.1.1.1.4 The ζινας plus future 3 pattern occurs in the present text corpus only in the M Matthew:

Mt 14, 15

Greek: ἀπόλυσον τοὺς ὄχλους ἵνα ἀπελθόντες (...) ἀγοράσωσιν ἑαυτοῖς βρώματα

M: απολυ μηπιηφε ζινας εογεψε νεγ (...) νσεωπε τροφι νεγ

S: κα μηπιηφε εβολ κεκας εγεβωκ (...) νσεωπι ναγ μηπετογναογομη

Mt 27, 26

Greek: τὸν δὲ Ἰησοῦν φραγελλώσας παρέδωκεν ἵνα σταυρωθῆ

M: μηδε δε ζαφραγελλογ μηαζ ζαφπαραιογ μηαζ νεγ ζινας εογεσρωγ μηαζ

S: ιε δε αφραγελλογ μηοζ αφπαραιογ μηοζ κεκας εγεσρωγ μηοζ

Mt 28, 8

Greek: ἔδραμον ἀπαγγεῖλαι τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ

M: ζαγψε νεγ (...) ζινας εογεταμε νεφμηαθης

S: αγπωτ (...) εχιπογω ννεφμηαθης

This pattern is, naturally the exact equivalent in syntactic position and meaning of the **κεκα** or **κε** plus future 3 (or 2) pattern, the only difference being the conjunction, which in this case is the slightly altered form of Greek ἵνα as loanword, which does not occur in S literary idiom – see above, **1.1.1.1.2**.

1.1.1.2 Clause Conjugations

1.1.1.2.1 The future conjunctive is mentioned as having final meaning (see **1.1** earlier), but it is not found in the S Matthew, John or Romans translation as final,¹²⁹ nor in the original writings. It is, however, used twice in L and once in M translating a Greek final clause:

Mt 23, 26

Greek: Φαρισαῖε τυφλέ, καθάρισον πρῶτον τὸ ἐντὸς τοῦ ποτηρίου, ἵνα γένηται καὶ τὸ ἐκτὸς αὐτοῦ καθαρόν.

S: ΠΕΦΑΡΙΣΣΑΙΟΣ ΠΕΛΕ ΤΕΒΟ ΝΦΟΡΠ ΜΠΣΑΝΖΟΥΝ ΜΠΑΠΟΤ ΜΗ ΠΠΙΝΑΞ ΧΕΚΑΣ ΕΡΕΠΕΥΚΕΣΑΜΒΟΛ ΦΩΠΕ ΕΡΤΕΒΗΥ

M: ΠΦΑΡΙΣΑΙΟΣ ΠΒΛ'Η ΜΑΤΟΥΒΕ ΖΙΖΟΥΝ ΝΦΑΡΠ ΜΠΑΠΑΤ ΜΝ ΠΠΙΝΑΞ ΝΤΑΡΕΠΚΕΖΙΒΑΛ ΦΩΠΕ ΕΡΤΟΥΓΗΟΥΤ'

Jn 3, 17

Greek: οὐ γὰρ ἀπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἵνα κρίνη τὸν κόσμον

S: ΝΤΑΠΗΟΥΓΕ ΓΑΡ ΤΉΙΝΕΥ ΠΩΗΡΕ ΑΝ ΕΠΚΟΣΜΟΣ ΧΕ ΕΦΕΚΡΙΝΕ ΜΠΚΟΣΜΟΣ

L: ΝΤΑΠΗΟΥΓΕ ΓΑΡ ΤΉΙΝΑΥ ΗΠΕΦΩΗΡΕ ΕΝ ΑΠΚΟΣΜΟΣ ΤΑΦΑΪΚΡΙΝΕ

Jn 9, 36

Greek: καὶ τίς ἐστίν, κύριε, ἵνα πιστεύσω εἰς αὐτόν;

S: ΠΧΟΕΙΣ ΝΗΠΠΕ ΧΕ ΕΒΕΙΠΙΣΤΕΥΕ ΕΡΟΦ

L: ΠΧΑΕΙΣ ΝΗΠΠΕ ΤΑΕΙΑΪΠΙΣΤΕΥΕ ΛΡΑΦ

In Jn 3, 17 it is further interesting that in the second part of the sentence, which is the very same final, also L uses a final clause pattern, **κεκα** plus future 2.

¹²⁹ cf. POLOTSKY, 1950: 87: "L'emploi de **ταρε** - est limité, dans la Bible sahidique, à deux types de phrase. Dans l'un, il traduit le futur grec coordonné par **καὶ** à un impératif (type „Cherchez et vous trouverez") ou, plues rarement, à une question rhétorique. Dans l'autre, limité à la 1^{re} pers. pl., il traduit en général l'aoriste du subjonctif en tête de phrase."

When arguing for the final use of the future conjunctive, Till¹³⁰ has as a sole example *Liber Ecclesiasticus* 31, 9 which, however, is not a sentence where one has to or should take the future conjunctive as having final meaning¹³¹ in "the sense of deliberate purpose"¹³² or as standing in the place of a final clause:

ΝΙΜΠΕ ΤΑΡΨΙΜΑΚΑΡΙΖΕ ΨΙΜΟϚ 'Who is he? That we may call him blessed.' (temporary translation)

Here, the future conjunctive is the classical "post-imperative apodotic form with a promissive overtone",¹³³ with the only seemingly problematic difference that it follows a question, not an imperative. Shisha-Halevy,¹³⁴ analysing Shenoute's idiom, says that „the distribution of **ΤΑΡΕϚ-** has been extended to post-interrogative" environments, which, as we can see, occurs in the Biblical idiom as well.¹³⁵ Also Layton speaks about its use „in sequel to a question", he however adds that when the future conjunctive appears in such environments, it "implies an unspoken imperative commanding the interlocutor to answer the question".¹³⁶ Thus, the passage from *Liber Ecclesiasticus*, which is the very example in Layton as well, will be interpreted as follows:

'Who is he? – (Tell me,) and we will call him blessed.'

This evaluation seems well-grounded when one sees the Greek original that the Coptic translator had before him:

Τίς ἔστιν; καὶ μακαριοῦμεν αὐτόν

Therefore, there is no need to look for uses or meanings of this and similar cases of future conjunctive other than the original one, which is not a rival to the final clause, however, a slight final overtone should not be denied, a "final desirable result rather than downright deliberate purpose".¹³⁷ And this very use must evidently be seen in Jn 9, 36 which is

¹³⁰ TILL, 1961: §311

¹³¹ About the uses and meanings of the future conjunctive in the Sahidic Bible, and about the Greek forms it translates see POLOTSKY, 1944: 107 where he says: "Si la valeur primitive de **ΤΑΡΕ-** est nettement distincte du sens final, elle en est cependant voisine."

¹³² SHISHA-HALEVY, 1986: §7.2.1.1.5.1

¹³³ SHISHA-HALEVY, 1986: §7.2.1.1.5.1; LEFORT speaks of a modal role of the future conjunctive, "mode subjectif", and in his opinion it corresponds and was somehow 'developed' to translate the Greek potential optative, LEFORT, 1947: 10-11; this idea is rejected by POLOTSKY, 1950: esp. 90; cf. also FEDER, 2006: 301.

¹³⁴ SHISHA-HALEVY, 1986: §7.2.1.1.5.1

¹³⁵ POLOTSKY, 1944: 110 had also recognized this use of the future conjunctive.

¹³⁶ LAYTON, 2004: §358,b

¹³⁷ SHISHA-HALEVY, 1986: §7.2.1.1.5.1

basically a paraphrase of the OT sentence, with the difference that the Greek has $\kappa\alpha\iota$ plus *futurum* in the OT passage and a $\text{'}\nu\alpha$ -clause in the NT.

That leaves us with two examples of the (seemingly) final future conjunctive, one in M and one in L. In the case of Mt 23, 26 the future conjunctive follows an imperative, where its traditional place is, and so that can also be understood as a classical post-imperative future conjunctive: "make the inside of your cup clean, and then the outside will also be clean". So in Mt 23, 26 and Jn 9, 36 the future conjunctive is used in the classical way in M and L respectively, while S employs the $\chi\epsilon\kappa\lambda\alpha\varsigma$ or $\chi\epsilon$ final clause pattern. The reason for that is evidently the Greek original, where a $\text{'}\nu\alpha$ -clause is used in each case; that means that the translation technique of the translators S, M and L differs here. The translator of S aims at a literal translation and at following the original as closely as possible, and again translates the pattern. The Matthew and John places evidently allow such interpretations as present in M – a slightly promissive, relative future time action with "final desirable result"¹³⁸ after an imperative – and in L – the seemingly post-interrogative in fact post-imperative promissive action –, because $\text{'}\nu\alpha$ -clauses had quite a wide spectrum in Koine Greek (see above 1.1). The strict final value of the $\text{'}\nu\alpha$ -clause used in Jn 9, 36 is further questioned by the *Liber Ecclesiasticus* passage where $\kappa\alpha\iota$ plus *futurum* is used in its place in the very same context. The M and L translators interpreted the passages and made them "more Coptic" using the traditional (late!) Egyptian¹³⁹ form for the meaning implied or felt.

That difference in translation technique might in turn be explained by the date of the texts: with Matthew we have a S manuscript dated to the second half of the 8th century,¹⁴⁰ and a M manuscript from the 4-5th century;¹⁴¹ with John we have a S manuscript from the 5th century,¹⁴² and a L manuscript from the 4th century.¹⁴³ Thus, one might assume an earlier text version for the two smaller dialects, which flourished in the 4-5th centuries,¹⁴⁴ and maybe a later text version for the S texts present. Now, it seems that the Coptic NT translations went from *sensus de sensu*, which allowed more room for interpretation, to

¹³⁸ SHISHA-HALEVY, 1986: §7.2.1.1.5.1

¹³⁹ see JUNGE, 1996: 237, *dj=j jr=f sdm* > $\tau\alpha\rho\epsilon\varrho\omega\tau\tau\eta$; and also LOPRIENO, 1995: 230.

¹⁴⁰ PEREZ, 1984: 28.

¹⁴¹ SCHENKE, 1991: 162.

¹⁴² GABR, 1990: 11.

¹⁴³ THOMPSON, 1924: xiii.

¹⁴⁴ NAGEL, 1991: 153; SCHENKE, 1991: 162.

verbum e verbo,¹⁴⁵ which would explain why the later translators insisted on the final clause pattern in these passages – it is a word to word, or better, pattern-to-pattern translation.

The L version of Jn 3, 17 is rather peculiar as the future conjunctive is not in post-imperative position here, in fact it is in a narrative, following a past tense verb – Lefort himself admits about it: "Plus curieux encore est le cas de Jean en dialecte A² (...) que l'éditeur estime, avec raison, être une transposition du sahidique".¹⁴⁶ According to Layton, the future conjunctive "very rarely" occurs in narratives expressing purpose,¹⁴⁷ so this passage in L (not in S!) might be one of the very few cases. And this is the only case in the examined text corpus where the future conjunctive "is opposed to other final constructions".¹⁴⁸

In the original material no 'final' future conjunctives were found. In Shenoute's writings, even the classical usage of the future conjunctive is found more rarely than in the Scripture idiom,¹⁴⁹ therefore, the passage below is worth mentioning.

Young 6-7, 39a, 18:

ΟΥΘΕΙ ΗΠΕΤΗΝΑΟΥΧΕ ΑΝ ΗΠΣΟΕΙ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΗΠΕΚΒΑΛ ΤΑΡΕΚΝΑΥ ΕΒΟΛ ΕΝΕΧΠΙΧΗ
ΕΒΟΛ ΖΗΠΒΑΛ ΗΠΕΚΣΟΝ

That, however, is a NT reference rather than a Shenoute-sentence – a reference where the beginning of the sentence, the imperative, the very trigger of the future conjunctive is missing and replaced by **ΟΥΘΕΙ ΗΠΕΤΗΝΑ-**, 'Woe to him, who...'. That is the only peculiarity of the passage and at first sight might seem something else, but it is evidently the classical future conjunctive, quoted from Lk 6, 42:

Greek: ἐκβαλε πρῶτον τὴν δοκὸν ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου, καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου ἐκβαλεῖν.

Coptic: ΝΕΧ ΠΣΟΙ ΗΨΩΡΗ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΗΠΕΚΒΑΛ ΤΑΡΕΚΝΑΥ ΕΒΟΛ ΕΝΕΧΠΙΧΗ ΕΒΟΛ
ΕΤΖΗΠΒΑΛ ΗΠΕΚΣΟΝ

In Mt 7, 5 the very same passage is translated with a future I rather than the future conjunctive.

Greek: ἐκβαλε..καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις ἐκβαλεῖν

¹⁴⁵ GABR, 1990: ii; BROCK, 1979: 80, in the case of Greek into Latin and also into Syriac.

¹⁴⁶ LEFORT, 1948: 72/fn 10.

¹⁴⁷ LAYTON, 2004: §358, e.

¹⁴⁸ SHISHA-HALEVY, 1986: §7.2.1.1.5.1

¹⁴⁹ SHISHA-HALEVY, 1986: §7.2.1.1.5.1

Coptic: **ΝΟΥΧΕ ... ΤΟΤΕ ΚΝΑΝΑΥ ΕΒΟΛ ΕΝΕΧΠΙΧΗ ΕΒΟΛ**

1.1.1.2.2 The conjunctive: the only place to discuss here is Mt 5, 28 in the M version, otherwise no conjunctives are found in final positions (for Mt 27, 49 in M, see **1.1.1.3**). The reason why it should be examined here is that it seems to translate a final infinitive construction:

Greek: **πᾶς ὁ βλέπων γυναῖκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτήν**
M: **ΟΥΑΝ ΝΙΗ ΕΤΣΩΦΤ ΕΥΣΖΙΜΕ ΝΚΕΠΘΗΜΙ ΕΡΑΣ**

The S version again has the pattern-to-pattern translation and thus an infinitive construction: **ΟΥΟΝ ΝΙΗ ΕΤΝΑΩΦΤ ΝΣΛΟΥΣΖΙΜΕ ΕΣΠΘΗΜΕΙ ΕΡΟC**. In the M version of the sentence, I do not see a conjunctive used in final sense; it is again a slightly different understanding or interpretation of the Greek sentence, thus the verb form is not intended to be the exact equivalent of a final infinitive construction: 'everyone who looks at a woman *and desires* her'¹⁵⁰ is how the M translator interpreted the Greek, which is not too far a meaning.¹⁵¹

1.1.1.2.3 The Limitative φΑΝΤΕ occurs as final¹⁵² in the present text corpus only twice in the M Matthew. In the original writings no final **φΑΝΤΕ** occurs, but there are a few consecutive ones, see **2.6**.

Mt 23, 15

Greek: **ὅτι περιάγετε τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ τὴν ξηρὰν ποιῆσαι ἕνα προσήλυτον**

M: **ΧΕ ΤΕΤΝΗΟΥΦΤ ΝΘΑΛΑΣΣΑ ΜΗ ΠΕΤΦΟΥΟΥΦ ΦΑΝΤΕΤΕΤΝΗΙΡΕ ΝΟΥΕ ΗΠΡΟΣΗΛΥΤΟC**

S: **ΧΕ ΤΕΤΝΗΟΥΦΤ ΝΤΕΘΑΛΑΣΣΑ ΜΗ ΠΕΤΦΟΥΟΥΦ ΕΡΟΥΑ ΗΠΡΟΣΗΛΥΤΟC**

¹⁵⁰ Which is the classical use of the conjunctive, being part of the "conjunctive chain" as "con-joiner", as Depuydt formulated it, the English 'Don't drink and drive' being a very good parallel, DEPUYDT, 1993: 9-10.

¹⁵¹ As mentioned earlier, 1.1.1.1.2, I do not think the conjunctive has modal sense and each example of it, after a more careful study, turns out to have one of the original uses of the conjunctive. The examples of MINK, 1972: 207 are not "im prohibitive[n] bzw. adhortative[n] Sinn" but simply continuing the infinitive dependent on **ἵπαρακαλεῖ**, and the examples on 214 are not final but the translation of another text variant **κού σώσει** rather than the final participle/infinitive. Note also Stern, 1880: §448: "Folge und Wirkung oder Zweck und Absicht in der untergeordneten Abhängigkeit vom Hauptsatze drückt der Conjunctiv für sich allein nicht aus, wenn er diese Bedeutung nicht aus jenem selbst, etwa aus einem Futur oder Imperativ oder Infinitiv entnimmt." cf. SHISHA-HALEVY, 1995: 311.

¹⁵² TILL, 1961: §§423, 312.

Mt 26, 58

Greek: ἐκάθητο μετὰ τῶν ὑπηρετῶν ἰδεῖν τὸ τέλος

M: ζακζμας μη νζγπηρετης ψαντηνε επετηνεωοπε

S: νεαζμοος μη νζγπερετης εναγ εθαη

In both cases, the limitative translates a Greek final infinitive, and the S version again follows the Greek pattern, using the final ε plus infinitive pattern (see later 1.1.2). The exact, word to word or rather pattern-to-pattern translation, aimed at in the (known) S NT(s), is naturally the infinitive construction. Why does the M translator choose the limitative instead, which is clearly not an evident final construction? As it cannot be accounted for by the Greek original form, the reason must be the meaning of the final infinitive felt by the translator; it is in fact on the borderline between an aim or purpose and a ("final desirable) result"¹⁵³ (Shisha-Halevy's expression is again applicable). The meaning of **ΨΑΝΤΕ-** is really not that far from a consequence or result as it will be shown in the section on consecutive clauses (2.6), therefore it was used as result and since "the dividing line between purpose (*in order to*), intended result (*so as to*), and consequential result (*so that*) is sufficiently fluid",¹⁵⁴ the limitative was sometimes also used to express purpose.¹⁵⁵

1.1.1.3 The circumstantial is not evidently a final clause type at first sight, but it is said by Till to be sometimes used as final,¹⁵⁶ but this usage is not mentioned by Layton.¹⁵⁷ In the present corpus the circumstantial present only occurs as final in the translated material, translating a final *partitipium coniunctum*, and once translating an infinitive construction in Matthew 11, 1 where interestingly enough, both the Perez-version and M has this pattern, whereas in Horner the ε+infinitive can be found (see figs. 10, 11 at the end of the chapter for equivalents). Till's examples¹⁵⁸ also come from translated texts, one from Luke and the other from the *Apophthegmata Patrum* (see below).

¹⁵³ SHISHA-HALEVY, 1986: §7.2.1.1.5.1

¹⁵⁴ LAYTON, 2004: §504.

¹⁵⁵ As mentioned earlier, Till also mentions that "seltener" it is used to express result or purpose, TILL, 1961: §§ 312, 423.

¹⁵⁶ TILL, 1961: §§ 423, 328, 329.

¹⁵⁷ about the circumstantial LAYTON, 2004: §§413-433.

¹⁵⁸ in §329 and §423.

Basically, the Coptic – the Egyptian in a wider sense – circumstantial does not have final function or meaning,¹⁵⁹ and I did not find any such clauses in Pachom's, Shenoute's, Theodore's or Horsiese's writings. Another fact is, that considering syntactical functions and meaning, the Greek *partitipium coniunctum* and the Coptic circumstantial are rather similar, and the former is translated with the latter in most cases when a translation is needed. One function of a conjunct participle is to express purpose,¹⁶⁰ the future participle is especially used that way,¹⁶¹ but in NT Greek the present participle is more common as final.¹⁶²

The only exception in the present corpus to the rule that the Greek participle of purpose is translated with the Coptic circumstantial is:

Mt 27, 49

Greek: ἄφες ἴδωμεν εἰ ἔρχεται Ἡλίας σῶσων αὐτόν.

S: ⲟⲱ ⲛⲧⲏⲛⲛⲁⲗ ϫⲉ Ϸⲏⲁⲓⲁϭ ϩⲏⲛⲛⲉ ⲛⲏⲛⲟϥ ⲛⲓⲛⲟϥ ⲛⲓⲛⲟϥ

M: ⲟⲱ ⲛⲧⲁⲣⲛⲏⲛⲉ ϫⲉ Ϸⲏⲁⲓⲁϭ ⲛⲏⲛⲟϥ ⲛⲓⲛⲟϥ ⲛⲓⲛⲟϥ

In the Greek text the well-known classical usage of the future participle is seen, after a verb of motion, with a clearly final meaning. The very same meaning can be and often is achieved with the final infinitive in NT Greek,¹⁶³ and that is exactly what one finds as text variation in Codex Sinaiticus:¹⁶⁴

ἄφες ἴδωμεν εἰ ἔρχεται Ἡλίας σῶσαι αὐτόν.

The S translation, then, might have the Codex Sinaiticus text as its origin, translating the final infinitive with its regular equivalent (see 1.1.2 and fig. 10), the ε plus infinitive construction. However, it cannot be excluded that the final future participle was translated with the ε plus infinitive.¹⁶⁵ We have seen that the final participles in this text corpus are regularly translated with the circumstantial present, but it is an important difference that all the others are present participles, which have a much wider range of uses and as

¹⁵⁹ On the circumstantial in the earlier phases of the language, see LUFT, 1983: §§ 7.1 and 7.3.1.3; JOHNSON, 1976: 32-99; JUNGE, 1996: 122-125; LOPRIENO, 1995: § 7.9.5.D.

¹⁶⁰ DE WITT BURTON, 1898: §442.

¹⁶¹ In classical Attic exclusively the future participle, BORNEMANN-RISCH, 1999: §246.g; for NT usage of final future participle, see PORTER, 1992: §5.5, and DE WITT BURTON, 1898: §442.

¹⁶² BLASS-DEBRUNNER, 1961: §418

¹⁶³ BLASS-DEBRUNNER, 1961: §§390, 418

¹⁶⁴ New Testament Transcripts: www.nttranscripts.uni-muenster.de

conjunct participles might indeed have several meanings,¹⁶⁶ the final meaning is not so obligate and evident at first sight – translating them therefore with a circumstantial present, which again comprises several meanings,¹⁶⁷ is very understandable and less ‘risky’. Did the Coptic translators take the present participles as simple *partitipium coninunctum* and disregarding or not recognizing their final meaning simply applied the regular translation equivalent? Or did they deliberately create a final circumstantial to be able to retain the *partitipium coninunctum* – circumstantial equivalence, thus being able to give a pattern and content translation at the same time? I do not know yet. But if we assume that in Mt 27, 49 the future participle version was the *Vorlage*, then it might show that the translators took that as a more obvious final and therefore translated it with a more obvious Coptic final pattern, the ϵ plus infinitive.

This passage in M is further interesting because of its use of the conjunctive. In Bohairic, the same verb form occurs:¹⁶⁸

ⲬⲀⲤ ⲛⲧⲈⲚⲚⲀⲮ ⲬⲈ ⲒⲎⲎⲐⲮ ⲛⲬⲈ ⲎⲒⲀⲤ ⲛⲧⲈⲒⲎⲀⲒⲎⲈⲒ

and there is also a S version using the conjunctive:¹⁶⁹

ⲔⲬ ⲛⲧⲧⲛⲀⲮ ⲬⲈ ⲒⲎⲒⲀⲤ ⲛⲎⲮ ⲛⲒⲒⲎⲐⲮⲒⲎ ⲈⲎⲐⲮ

It would be very difficult to account for the conjunctive as translation of either the final infinitive or the final future participle, as I cannot accept the modal use of the Coptic conjunctive (see above, 1.1.1.2.2) which Mink refers to regarding this passage: “man den Subjunktiv in finalem Sinn gebraucht.”¹⁷⁰ It is a far more acceptable possibility that the versions with the conjunctive were based on a different text variant, for example the one cited by Mink:¹⁷¹

ἄφεζ ἰδῶμεν εἰ ἔρχεται Ἡλίας καὶ σώσει αὐτόν.

The two *praesens imperfectum* verb forms coordinated with καὶ are exactly what one would expect to be the *Vorlage* for the Coptic *praesens* I continued by the conjunctive.

¹⁶⁵ As MINK, 1972: §24 also points out.

¹⁶⁶ DE WITT BURTON, 1898: §§434–453; PORTER, 1992: §§5.1–5.6; BLASS-DEBRUNNER, 1961: §418.

¹⁶⁷ TILL, 1961: §328; LAYTON, 2004: §421.

¹⁶⁸ MINK, 1972: §24.

¹⁶⁹ MINK, 1972: §24.

¹⁷⁰ MINK, 1972: §24.

¹⁷¹ §24.

Now, the passage where the circumstantial present translates a final infinitive and not a participle – at least based on the known text variants:

Mt 11, 1

Greek: μετέβη ἐκεῖθεν τοῦ διδάσκειν καὶ κηρύσσειν

S (Perez): ⲁⲒⲠⲠⲟⲛⲉ ⲈⲐⲠ ⲒⲒⲠⲠⲁ ⲈⲒⲒⲠⲁⲮ ⲈⲒⲒⲠⲐⲠⲟⲩⲱ

S (Horner): ⲁⲒⲠⲠⲟⲛⲉ ⲈⲐⲠ ⲒⲒⲠⲠⲁ ⲈⲒⲒⲠⲁⲮ ⲈⲒⲒⲠⲐⲠⲟⲩⲱ

M: ⲒⲁⲒⲠⲠⲟⲛⲉ ⲈⲐⲠ ⲒⲒⲠⲠⲁ ⲈⲒⲒⲠⲉ ⲈⲒⲒⲠⲐⲠⲟⲩⲱ ⲁⲒⲱ ⲈⲒⲒⲠⲠⲟⲩⲱ

The text variant in Horner seems to be the only one to follow the Greek original in the final. Two possibilities follow from that: 1) we might suspect a variant with a final participle not known by the NT text critics, but that is not very probable and for the time being cannot be answered; 2) or else we might accept that in this passage the final infinitive was indeed translated in several versions with a circumstantial present. In this respect, Mt 11, 1 would not be a sole case; Till's examples of the final circumstantial mentioned above are also translated Coptic passages¹⁷² and seem also to translate final infinitives rather than final participles:

Apophthegmata Patrum, Macarius 2:¹⁷³

ⲁⲒⲱ ⲛⲉⲮⲛⲏⲛⲓ ⲛⲟⲓ ⲛⲒⲐⲛⲟⲟⲩⲉ ⲈⲒⲒⲠⲠⲁⲓⲉ ⲈⲒⲒⲠⲐⲠⲟⲩⲱ ⲒⲒⲠⲠⲁ ⲈⲒⲒⲠⲁⲮ

καὶ ἦλθον τὰ κτήνη τῆς ἐρήμου πιεῖν ἐξ αὐτῆς.

Luke 1, 59 (in this case there is a circumstantial future)

Coptic (S): ⲁⲒⲉⲓ ⲈⲒⲛⲁⲒⲐⲠⲉ ⲒⲠⲠⲟⲩⲱ Ⲡⲏⲏ

Greek: ἦλθον περιτεμεῖν τὸ παιδίον

In the Luke-example, however, the question arises whether the Ⲉⲓ +circumstantial future is really intended to be final, an exact translation of the Greek final infinitive, or is the 'normal' periphrastic¹⁷⁴ use 'they came being about to circumcise him' (= 'they were about to').

The issue of the Greek final infinitive translated with the Coptic circumstantial, whether it originates in the conjunct participle being translated with that, is worth noting and needs

¹⁷² That the Coptic version of the *Apophthegmata Patrum* is the translation of the Greek, see HOPFNER, 1918: 1-11, 17-21 (see RUBENSON, 1995: 146-147); BOUSSET, 1923: 1-13 (see RUBENSON, 1995:147).

¹⁷³ ZOECA, 1973: 347, 9; MIGNE, 1857-66: vol. LXV col. 259-260.

¹⁷⁴ LAYTON, 2004: §427.

further investigation in the future, I would not like to draw any final conclusions on that now.

And closing down the thoughts on the final circumstantial, let me note a special case of translation in Romans 15, 15:

Greek: ἔγραψα ὑμῖν ἀπὸ μέρους ὡς ἐπαναμνησκῶν ὑμᾶς

Coptic (S): ⲗⲓϢⲗⲓ ⲛⲏⲧᲚ̅ ⲗⲡⲟⲙⲉⲣⲟⲥ ϣⲟϥ ⲉⲓⲧ̅ ⲛⲏⲧᲚ̅ ⲏⲡⲓⲙⲉⲉⲓⲅⲉ

Where even ὡς is taken over as a loanword from the well-known ὡς plus participle construction¹⁷⁵ to follow the Greek original precisely, resulting in the final ϣⲟϥ plus circumstantial pattern – of which I know no parallel.¹⁷⁶

1.1.2. Infinitive Constructions

An infinitive construction could be used to express purpose both in Greek¹⁷⁷ and in the Egyptian language.¹⁷⁸ It is no wonder, then, that the ε plus infinitive construction is present in great numbers in translated¹⁷⁹ and original Coptic writings as well, in the former (mostly) as the natural translation equivalent of the Greek final infinitive, and in the latter as a natural final pattern which does not need to have a *Vorlage*.

Mt 2, 2

Greek: καὶ ἦλθομεν προσκυνῆσαι αὐτῷ

S: ⲗⲛⲉⲓ ⲉⲟⲓⲱⲡⲧ ⲛⲗⲗ

M: ϣⲗⲛⲉⲓ ⲉⲟⲓⲱⲡⲧ ⲛⲉⲗ

Jn 4, 38

Greek: ἐγὼ ἀπέστειλα ὑμᾶς θερίζειν ὃ οὐχ ὑμεῖς κεκοπιᾶκατε

S: ⲗⲛⲟⲕ ⲗⲓϣⲉⲓⲧⲏⲧᲚ̅ ⲉⲱϣⲥ ⲏⲡⲉⲧⲉ ⲏⲡⲉⲧᲚ̅ⲏⲧⲓϣⲉ ⲉⲣⲟϥ

¹⁷⁵ It can have three different usages, 1. a subjective comparative clause (*as if/as though*), 2. a subjective clause of cause (*with the consideration that*), 3. and (mainly with future participle) purpose (BORNEMANN-RISCH, 1999: §246.g); although it might be debated on the grounds that this is not a future participle, I think this is a participle of purpose and it does not necessarily have to be the future in NT Greek, as was mentioned earlier.

¹⁷⁶ Nor do the grammars; in LAYTON, 2004: §422 the ϣⲟϥ plus circumstantial pattern is introduced as having the – expected – meaning *as/as if/on the grounds that*, and in §505 ⲛⲟⲉ, the Coptic equivalent of ϣⲟϥ in comparisons is discussed.

¹⁷⁷ For classical, see: BORNEMANN-RISCH, 1999: §237.2; WOLFF, 1956: §33; for later and NT Greek, see: BLASS-DEBRUNNER, 1961: §390; DE WITT BURTON, 1898: §366; PORTER, 1992: § 2.2; RADERMACHER, 1925: 186;

¹⁷⁸ GARDINER, 1957: §163; ALLEN, 2000: §14.11; JUNGE, 1996: §2.2.3; JOHNSON, 1976: 279; LUFT, 1983: §7.5.3; TILL, 1961: §§423, 338; LAYTON, 2004: §502; for final infinitives in Shenoute, see RUDNITZKY, 1956: 49-50.

¹⁷⁹ In the NT translations, see MINK, 1972: 208.

L: ΔΝΑΚ ΔΕΙΧΛΥΤΗΝΕ ΔΩΣΖ ΝΠΕΤΕ ΗΠΕΤΗΩΠΖΙΣΕ ΔΡΑϞ

Pachom, *Spiteful* 6, 26

ΝΓΑΓΩΝΙΖΕ ΖΩΦΚ ΟΥΒΕΗΠΑΘΣ ΗΠΑΔΙΑΒΟΛΟΣ ΕΤΗΟΥΑΖΚ̄ Ν̄ΣΩϞ

Shenoute, Elanskaya 1.1.b.707 85, 26a

ΕΚΩΑΝΟΥΩΝ ΗΡΩΚ ΕΨΑΧΕ ΕΧΗΠΡΑΝ ΗΠΧΟΕΙΣ

From that it follows that in the NT texts the use of the Coptic infinitive pattern strongly depends on the Greek pattern, whereas, in the original texts the author is much more free to choose the final pattern – clause or infinitive – more natural to him.

First of all, comparing the rate of final clause patterns vs. ε+infinitive patterns we find that there is a significant difference in the overall picture between the two text types: in translated texts the clauses are some 70%, while in original they are only slightly more than the infinitives:

fig.6

	Greek	Transl Coptic (S)	Original Coptic
Final clause patterns	70.09%	69.66%	50.83%
Infinitive constructions	25.21%	26.07%	49.17%
Other*	4.70%	4.27%	-

*in Greek that is the participles, in Coptic the circumstantial present

The Greek seems to favour the clause patterns and the Coptic translation shows a stunning similarity to the Greek in the percentage of clauses and infinitives, as opposed to the percentages found in the original literature. This 1) shows a very strong adherence to the original and a very precise, pattern-to-pattern translation in the NT, and 2) indicates that a marked stylistic difference might be expected between the Coptic idiom of the NT and the original Coptic texts. At this stage, this remains a cautious and general statement, as the individual authors or texts can exhibit 'deviations' from that rule; among the translations, Matthew displays a rather balanced use of the two patterns, though still with clauses in majority, and among the Coptic authors it is Pachom whose idiom seems to differ quite significantly from the others, using the clause patterns with such overwhelming majority, whereas Theodore and Shenoute seem to prefer the infinitive:

fig.7

Greek	Matthew	John	Romans
Final clause patterns	48.15%	90%	60.47%
Infinitive constr	45.68%	5.45%	37.21%
Other	6.17%	4.55%	2.32%

fig.8

Coptic	Matthew	John	Romans
Final clause patterns	50.62%	86.37%	62.79%
Infinitive constr	44.44%	9.09%	34.88%
Other	4.94%	4.54%	2.33%

fig.9

Original	Pachom	Theodore	Horsiese	Shenoute
Final clause patterns	78.38%	38.70%	51.94%	43.16%
Infinitive constructions	21.62%	61.30%	48.06%	56.84%

Adding up though, even with these differences, the use of the final infinitive is more extensive in the original literature than in the translations.

1.1.2.1 In the original material, only one type of final infinitive construction is present, the ϵ plus infinitive, including naturally both simple and causative infinitives. The ϵ plus infinitive in the NT translations is the equivalent of the Greek infinitive in most cases, see figs. 10-14 for exceptions which are usually other final constructions, but there are two cases where a perfect I stands in the place of the expected infinitive:

Mt 14, 23 – where the perf I in S is only a text variant

Greek: ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος κατ' ἴδιαν προσεύξασθαι

S (Horner): ἀγαλε εἰραι εχῆπτοου μαγαλα εφλη

S (Perez): ἀλλὰ εἶπαι ἐκῆπτοοῦ μαγαλά ἀφῶλη

M: ζαφαλά εἶρη ἐκῆπταῦ νσαγσε ζαριζαραφ ζαφπροσεγχε

Mt 24, 1 – where the S has the infinitive

Greek: προσῆλθον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπιδείξαι αὐτῷ τὰς οἰκοδομὰς

S: ἀφῆπεγογοι εροφ νδνεφμαθητις ετογοφ επκωτ

M: ζανεφμαθητις ζαγει ερετφ ζαγτανογαφ ενκοτ

In the Greek, there is no text variant with a *verbum finitum*, but in Horner's critical apparatus a Syriac and an Ethiopian version is listed where also a verb form other than the infinitive stands, 'and they showed' translates Horner. That naturally raises the suspicion that a Greek *Vorlage* with a *verbum finitum* must have existed. In Coptic the perfect 1 is evidently not a final clause pattern and does not normally translate an infinitive or clause of purpose.

1.1.2.2. In Greek the infinitive sometimes stands with τοῦ,¹⁸⁰ and sometimes with a preposition εἰς or πρός.¹⁸¹ These constructions all express purpose, τοῦ and εἰς plus infinitive appearing in Matthew and Romans – the latter clearly in favour of εἰς τῷ+infinitive; πρός plus infinitive is only present in Matthew in the examined text corpus. From a translation aspect, from these infinitive constructions the τοῦ infinitive is the most unanimously translated into Coptic, always with the ε plus infinitive¹⁸² in both S and M:

Mt 13, 3

Greek: ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπείρων τοῦ σπείρειν

S: ἀφει εβολ νδσι πετχο εχο

M: πετνεχχα ζαφι εβαλ εχχα

Also quite unanimously treated is the εἰς τῷ+infinitive, although twice it is translated with a definite article plus the infinitive construction:

Mt 20, 19 – where only M uses the article:

Greek: παραδώσουσιν αὐτὸν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν εἰς τὸ ἐμπαῖξαι

¹⁸⁰ BLASS-DEBRUNNER, 1961: §400; DE WITT BURTON, 1898: §397.

¹⁸¹ BLASS-DEBRUNNER, 1961: §402, 2 5; DE WITT BURTON, 1898: §406.

¹⁸² see also MINK, 1972: 230.

S: ἡσπαρᾶδιου ἦμοϋ εἶστοτοϋ ἡνζεθνοϋ εἶωπε ἦμοϋ

M: ησπαρᾶδιου ημαϋ εϋρη επϋγνηεδριον ηνζεθνοϋ επτρογϋοβε ημαϋ

Rm 11, 11

Greek: τῷ αὐτῶν παραπτῶματι ἢ σωτηρία τοῖς ἔθνεσιν εἰς τὸ παραζηλώσαι αὐτούς

S: ϋἡπεγϋε αποχαιωωπε ἡνζεθνοϋ επἦκωϋ ηαϋ

And once, in Rm 4, 16, it is translated with **κεκας** future 3, but in this Greek sentence there is a ἵνα before the infinitive construction.

The πρὸς plus infinitive used in Matthew alone, has several translation variants, in fact the simple ε plus infinitive is used only once, in 5, 28, and only in S, whereas the M has a conjunctive (see 1.1.1.2.2):

Greek: ὁ βλέπων γυναῖκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτήν

S: ογον ηηη εἴηαωωτ ηαογϋηε εεπειογηει εροϋ

M: ογαν ηηη εἶωωτ εγϋηε ηεπειογηηι εραϋ

In 6,1 it is a clause in S and an infinitive construction with the definite article in M:

Greek: μὴ ποιεῖν ἐμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων πρὸς τὸ θεαθῆναι αὐτοῖς

S: εἴηαϋ ηηεητο εβολ ηηερωηε κεκας εγεηαγ ερωἦηη

M: εἴηειρε ηἡεἡηεηηηοϋηη ηἡεηηα εβαλ ηηρωηε επτρογηε εροἦηη

In 13, 30 it is translated with an infinitive construction with the definite article in S and in M:

Greek: δῆσατε αὐτὰ εἰς δέσμας πρὸς τὸ κατακαύσαι αὐτά

S: ηἡεἡηορογ ηζηωλ επροκϋογ

M: ηαρογ ηζεηωραω επτρογραϋογ

In 26, 12 there is an infinitive construction with the definite article in S, and a definite noun in M:

Greek: βαλοῦσα γὰρ αὕτη τὸ μύρον τοῦτο ἐπὶ τοῦ σώματός μου πρὸς τὸ ἐνταφιάσαι με ἐποίησεν

S: ται γαρ ηἡαοηογχε ηἡειοϋη εϋραι εχηηαωωηα ηἡαααε επροϋστ

M: τει γαρ εθαογοἡε ηἡειαϋη εχηηαωωηα εζαεεε εἡαεεε

It is interesting to see these variations from a dialectological aspect, S and M employ different solutions for the translation of this pattern on most occasions, only once (13, 30)

do they have the same pattern; it is another argument for thinking that the M version of Matthew was not made from the S version¹⁸³ – but that is subject of a different study; and it is worth noting also that, unlike with the other infinitive constructions, here there is not just one ‘right’ translation – there is **κεκαλ** fut 3 (also in S 23, 5), conjunctive, a definite noun, **ε** plus infinitive, and **ε** plus definite article plus infinitive.

1.1.2.3 The infinitive constructions seem to be preferred after verbs of motion¹⁸⁴ in Matthew (25 out of 36 infinitives follow a verb of motion) and John (4 out of 6 infinitives follow a verb of motion), but not in Romans (only 2 out of 16 are after a verb of motion) where the infinitive (mostly with **εις**) is used invariably in any environment. In John, the verbs of motion are frequently followed also by the **ἵνα**-clause, even if the subjects are identical (most of the cases) and thus an infinitive would be ideal – in these cases, i.e. when a verb of motion is followed by a final clause with identical subject, the Coptic tends to translate with an **ε**+infinitive construction, for example (see APPENDIX for all occurrences):

Jn 4, 8

Greek: οἱ γὰρ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἀπεληλύθεισαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἵνα τροφὰς ἀγοράσωσιν

S: **νεφμαθητης γαρ νεαγβωκ εζραι ετπολις εφωπ ναγ ηπετογναουηῆ**

L: **νεφμαθητης γαρ νεαγβωκ αζρη ατπολις ατρογταγαικ**

Jn 12, 20

Greek: ἦσαν δὲ Ἕλληνές τινες ἐκ τῶν ἀναβαινόντων ἵνα προσκυνήσωσιν

S: **νεγῆζενογειενιν δε εβολ ζῆνετβηκ εζραι εοφωπΎ**

L: **νεγῆζενογαειανιν αβαλ ζῆνετβηκ αζρη απωαειε αγωπΎ**

On some occasions, however, the clause pattern is followed by the translators, in five cases in S (11,11; 11,19; 11,31; 12,47; 12,47) and in two cases in L (11,11; 11,19).

In the original Coptic writings, the final infinitives are not more preferred after verbs of motion, only in ten cases do they follow a verb of motion, and three of them are quotations in Shenute (Ad phil 54, 9; 54, 25; 55, 13) from *Canticorum*, which are therefore again translations.

¹⁸³ I disagree here with GABR, 1990: 113-114 who states that obviously the M version was made based on the S.

¹⁸⁴ As its usual syntactic environment, BLASS-DEBRUNNER, 1961: §390.

1.1.3 Greek – Coptic Equivalents

Summarizing the final patterns in the translated material, with regard to Greek and Coptic equivalents, I refer to the tables below, which show very clearly that the Coptic translations can be called pattern-to-pattern translations, following the Greek as closely as possible choosing the pattern which is the most similar to the original.

The cases where the translated pattern differs from the original are:

Only M differs in Mt 5, 28 in using the conjunctive instead of the infinitive, see **1.1.1.2.2**. In Mt 6, 1 S uses a clause instead of an infinitive, see **1.1.2.2**. Two Coptic variants (one S and M) use a circumstantial present instead of a final infinitive in Mt 11, 1, see **1.1.1.3**. In Mt 14, 23 two Coptic versions, one S and one M, and in Mt 24, 1 M use perfect 1 instead of a final infinitive, see **1.1.2.1**. In Mt 23, 5 the Greek $\pi\rho\delta\varsigma\ \tau\acute{o}$ infinitive is translated in the S version with $\chi\epsilon\kappa\alpha\varsigma$ future 3. In Mt 23, 15 the M version has $\varphi\alpha\upsilon\tau\epsilon$ instead of a final infinitive, see **1.1.1.2.3**. In Mt 23, 26 and 26, 58 M has future conjunctive, see **1.1.1.2.1**. In Mt 27, 49 S uses a final infinitive for the Greek future participle, and M uses a conjunctive, see **1.1.1.3**. In Mt 28, 8 M translates the Greek final infinitive with a $\varrho\iota\eta\alpha\varsigma$ -clause. In Jn 3, 17 and 9, 36 the L version has a future conjunctive to translate the final clause, see **1.1.1.2.1**. In Jn 4, 8; 6, 38; 12, 20 both S and L translate a Greek final clause with a final ϵ +infinitive construction; in Jn 11, 31 and 12, 47 only L translates a Greek final clause with a final ϵ +infinitive construction, see **1.1.2.3**. In Jn 19, 16 both S and L translate a Greek final clause with a final ϵ +infinitive.

MATTHEW: GREEK – S COPTIC

fig.10

Coptic Greek	ⲬⲉⲚⲀⲘ + fut 3	ⲙⲏⲛⲟⲩⲉ + conj	ⲉ+inf	ⲉ+article +inf	Circumst	Perf 1*
ἴνα + subj	19	-	-	-	-	-
ὅπως + subj	12	-	-	-	-	-
μήποτε+subj	-	8	-	-	-	-
infinitive	-	-	24	-	-	1
prep/art+inf	2	-	9	2	-	-
part fut	-	-	1	-	-	-
part impf	-	-	-	-	4	-

*occurring only as a text variant in 14, 23 where the version(s) in Horner has ⲉ+inf. Perez has perf 1.

MATTHEW: GREEK – M COPTIC

fig.11

Coptic Greek	ⲭⲉⲕⲉⲥ + fut 3	ⲭⲉ + fut 3	ⲗⲓⲛⲁⲥ + fut 3	ⲙⲏⲛⲓⲱⲥ + conj	ⲙⲏⲛⲓⲱⲧⲉ + conj	ⲱⲁⲛⲧⲉ-	circumst	fut conj	conj	ⲉ+inf	ⲉ+article +inf	Prep +noun	Perf 1
ἴνα + subj	7	9	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
ὅπως + subj	10	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
μήποτε+subj	-	-	-	5	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
infinitive	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	19	-	-	2
prep/art+inf	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	6	4	1	-
part fut	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
part impf	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-

JOHN: GREEK – S COPTIC

fig.12

Coptic	ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲐ	ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲐ	ⲭⲉ	ⲭⲉ	ⲉ+inf	Circumst
Greek	+ fut 3	+ fut 2	+ fut 3	+ fut 2		
ἵνα + subj	80	4*	9	1	4	-
ὄπωϛ + subj	1	-	-	-	-	-
infinitive	-	-	-	-	6	-
part impf	-	-	-	-	-	5

*plus one variant in Jn 5,34 Horner has future 2, manuscript P Palau Rib (Quecke) has future 3.

JOHN: GREEK – L COPTIC

fig.13

Coptic	ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲐⲉ	ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲐⲉ	ⲭⲉ	ⲭⲉ	ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲐⲉ	fut conj	ⲕ+inf	Circumst
Greek	+ fut 3	+ fut 2	+ fut 3	+ fut 2	+ conj			
ἵνα + subj	49	15	4	6	1	2	6	-
ὄπωϛ + subj	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
infinitive	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	-
part impf	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3

The total number of finals is fewer than the Greek and S versions because the manuscript¹⁸³ is not complete.

ROMANS: GREEK – S COPTIC

fig.14

Coptic	ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲥ + fut 3	ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲥ + fut 2	ⲭⲉ + fut 3	ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲥ + conj	ⲉ+inf	ⲉ+art +inf	Circumst
ἵνα + subj	13	1	8	1	-	-	-
ὅπως + subj	1	-	2	-	-	-	-
infinitive	-	-	-	-	3	-	-
prep/art+inf	1	-	-	-	11	1	-
part impf	-	-	-	-	-	-	1

¹⁸⁵ ed. by THOMPSON, 1924.

CONCLUSIONS

1. It may be asserted that the majority of the finals is expressed with the clause-with-conjunction patterns **ⲭⲉⲕⲁϯ** or **ⲭⲉ** plus future 3 or future 2 in both translated and original text types. The rate of final clause patterns vs. infinitive constructions is, however, considerably different, see fig. 6. The clauses with conjunction – disregarding now the clause conjugations and others – are 69.66% (163 out of 234) of all finals in translations, and 50.83% (122 out of 240) in original texts. In original writings the rate is even reversed with Shenoute and Theodore, who use more final infinitive constructions than final clause patterns. This is obviously accounted for by the fact that in Greek ἵνα-clauses are in majority and by the Coptic translation technique which aimed at a very precise translation, translating patterns in many cases to follow the original as closely as possible. This will be even more obvious in those syntactical positions where one would not expect a **ⲭⲉⲕⲁϯ**-clause at all (see 1.2.1; 1.3.1; 1.4.1).

Since the pressure of a Greek original is not present with Coptic authors (vs. translators), their choice of pattern is different and the **ϵ** plus infinitive is more frequently used than in translations; the final clause patterns are not in such majority. The final clause patterns are in fact more characteristic of Greek, of which the clauses governed by conjunctions are very typical and their system is especially subtle mainly in classical Attic, than of Egyptian where the system of subordination, embedding, etc. is rather different,¹⁸⁶ the language is rather sparing in conjunctions¹⁸⁷ and these, in turn, act quite differently from the Greek-type conjunctions and convert the sentence into a clause¹⁸⁸ rather than govern or determine it and its predicate in any way. Without wishing to make structural analyses, I raise the question whether ἵνα or ὅπως plus subjunctive and the **ⲭⲉⲕⲁϯ** or **ⲭⲉ** plus future 3 (or 2) clauses are identical on the structural level. 'No' would certainly be the answer of the structuralist colleagues, however, the surface structure of the two is rather similar and that is a reason enough for the Coptic translators to have a preference for their own Coptic clause-type rather than the infinitive when exactly a clause-type was used in the Greek *Vorlage*. I suggest therefore that in the rise of the number of final clause-with-conjunction patterns in Coptic, the interactions between Greek and Egyptian played a

¹⁸⁶ see LOPRIENO 1995: 225; 229.

¹⁸⁷ GARDINER, 1957: §30.

¹⁸⁸ LOPRIENO 1995: 150-152.

significant role; at the same time I would like to emphasize the analytical tendency¹⁸⁹ of the Egyptian language development, which has its roots in pre-Greek times¹⁹⁰ and undoubtedly prepared the ground for the more extensive presence of clauses in the place of certain verb forms – as even in Late Egyptian the final-prospective *sḏm=f* existed and was used to express purpose,¹⁹¹ in 'the place of' a final clause; and this inner change of the language¹⁹² was later interwoven with the bilingual situation and the Greek-dependent literacy.

It is worth mentioning that the conjunction *ⲭⲉⲗⲁϥ* does not have a pre-Coptic predecessor; considering all this, the *ⲉ* plus infinitive construction in the finals seems to be a more 'genuine' Egyptian way of expressing purpose,¹⁹³ whereas the clause pattern and its abundance was urged by the translations.¹⁹⁴ In this sense the *Ⲓⲛⲁϥ* plus future 3 pattern, used in M, also belongs here, displaying a further Greek influence, the use of the loanword.

2. Only in the translated Coptic texts do we find the *ⲉ* plus definite article plus infinitive pattern, which was triggered by the *ⲉⲓϥ τὸ* infinitive and even more by the *πρὸς τὸ* infinitive patterns, thus enriching the palette of Coptic final patterns, which is again a stylistic influence on the language. For the time being, I assume that it is characteristic only of the translation idiom of Coptic. Further research might confirm or refute that.

The widening of the range of Coptic final patterns is a linguistic influence of the Greek language.

3. There are, however, considerable differences in the choice and preference of clause pattern between translated versus original Coptic texts: the pattern most frequently used, and in fact in overwhelming majority in the S NT is *ⲭⲉⲗⲁϥ* plus future 3 – 79.14% of all

¹⁸⁹ HINTZE, 1947 and also HINTZE, 1950; and SCHENKEL, 1966 who summarized the analytic tendency briefly and precisely: "an Stelle einer Morphemverbindung eine Wortverbindung tritt" (p. 124).

¹⁹⁰ The 'visible' dividing line is between Middle Egyptian and Late Egyptian (Neuägyptisch), see HINTZE, 1947: 89; Late Egyptian is the language phase when the traces of the analytical tendency and conversion are first seen: "Die zweite Erscheinung, die dem Neuägyptischen ein so andersartiges Aussehen gegenüber dem Altägyptischen verleiht, ist das Streben zur analytischen Sprachform." HINTZE, 1947: 96.

¹⁹¹ JUNGE, 1996: 3.4.2.

¹⁹² Professor Nagel has a similar opinion: "Der typologische Umbau hat die Adaptierung des Griechischen erleichtert, ist jedoch nicht durch das Griechische bewirkt worden." NAGEL, 1971: 349.

¹⁹³ For finals in earlier Egyptian, see GARDINER, 1957: §§219, 304.3; LOPRIENO 1995: 145; JUNGE, 1996: § 5.3.3; JOHNSON, 1976: 279-280.

¹⁹⁴ I have said and will say again that translations from Greek had a major role in the formation and development of Coptic literary syntax, see also LEFORT, 1947, 10: "Nous tenons pour certain que l'influence des traducteurs sur la langue littéraire sahidique fut principalement d'ordre syntaxique."

final clauses, whereas in the original text corpus the **ⲭⲉ** plus future 3 is in majority, but even that is only 42.62% of all clauses (**ⲭⲉⲕⲗⲁϢ** plus future 3 is a mere 27.04%); future 3 and future 2 are used in a less biased fashion, although future 3 is still in majority: **ⲭⲉⲕⲗⲁϢ** plus future 3 occurs 34 times, **ⲭⲉⲕⲗⲁϢ** plus future 2 occurs 19 times, **ⲭⲉ** plus future 3 on 51 occasions and **ⲭⲉ** plus future 2 on 8 occasions (i.e. 27 future 2 vs. 85 future 3); so the choice between these clause types seems much less rigid and regulated in the original literature. In S translations, **ⲭⲉⲕⲗⲁϢ** plus future 3 seems to have developed as the *par excellence* final clause pattern, always at hand when the Greek original had a ἵνα (less frequently ὅπως) plus subjunctive final clause pattern.

This is a very strong stylistic influence on the Coptic writing which prevails in the S translation idiom. Subsequently it most probably has an impact on Coptic as a whole as the authors who started the original Coptic literature were 'raised on' and 'lived in' the language of the Scriptures, translated from Greek. These are read intensively, learnt by heart and are example-like for the monks who started to write in Coptic.¹⁹⁵ That causes similarity between the two text types: **ⲭⲉⲕⲗⲁϢ**-clauses are used extensively, in which translation literature probably had a role, but also the 'traditional' **ⲉ**+infinitive construction is used, in the original more frequently as there is no outside urge for the clause. Besides that, it is very possible that the bilingual situation could have had such impacts on the language, but it is difficult to prove and requires further study.

4. The **ⲭⲉⲕⲗⲁϢ** plus conjunctive pattern is "a typical New Testament construction"¹⁹⁶, not found frequently in original texts; this pattern is in close connection with word order, a clause is interposed between conjunction and verb form (hence anacoluthon) which happens in the Greek original, and the Coptic translator follows it. This pattern is then strongly Greek-dependent and translation induced; where it occurs in original writings, it must be the imitation of the NT idiom.

5. The strong dependence on the Greek pattern in translations is further shown by the study of the future conjunctive. In Mt 23, 26 and Jn 9, 36 where the passage and the Greek ἵνα-clause pattern could be interpreted in an alternative way, in dialects M and L respectively the future conjunctive is applied to express the shade of meaning felt by the

¹⁹⁵ see ROUSSEAU, 1985: 81.; RUBENSON, 1995: 120; not only for those who actually wrote literary works, but for everyone wishing to be member of a monastery it was compulsory to learn certain passages by heart, see also METZGER, 1977: 105.

¹⁹⁶ SHISHA-HALEVY, 1986: 197/fn.51.

translator in the ἕνα–clause. The S versions follow strictly the pattern disregarding the possible interpretations. In the S text of the studied corpus, the classical use of the future conjunctive is seen, the "post-imperative apodotic form with a promissive overtone",¹⁹⁷ and it does not occur in final positions; for example:

Mt 7,7

Greek: Αἰτεῖτε καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν, ζετεῖτε καὶ εὐρήσετε, κρούετε καὶ ἀνοιγήσεται ὑμῖν.

S Coptic: ΛΙΤΕΙ ΤΑΡΟΥ† ΝΗΤḢ· ΨΙΝΕ ΤΑΡΕΤΕΤḢΩΙΝΕ· ΤΩΖḢ ΤΑΡΟΥΩΝ ΝΗΤḢ·

In Shenoute, on the other hand, this use of the future conjunctive is pushed into the background by αγω + fut 1.¹⁹⁸ In the original material analysed here, no 'final-suspicious' future conjunctive occurs.

In conclusion, the future conjunctive has no final use in the analysed text material, the only questionable case remains Jn 3, 17 in the L version.

6. The ζωc+circumstantial present pattern is born due to Greek influence because even the introductory particle of the final participle was taken over in the translation.

7. Dialect M has more variety in its choice of pattern for the final. It applies **χεκεc** fut 3, **χε** fut 3, **ζινac** fut 3, **ηηποτε** conj, **ηηπωc** conj, **ψαντε**, **ε+inf**, **ε+article+inf**, preposition+noun, circumstantial present, conjunctive, future conjunctive, and perfect 1 (see figs. 3 and 11). Dialect L also has slightly more variety than S: its use of the fut 2 after **χεκαcε** and **χε** is more solid and frequent, and it applies the future conjunctive also (see figs. 12 and 13). All this shows that dialect S is the most regulated and standardized in its translation of the finals, its choice of pattern is consistent and solid and always based on the Greek original (with some exceptions); it applies a strict pattern-to-pattern translation technique, not giving individual interpretations to Greek final patterns, not varying forms like M and L does occasionally (see 1.1.1.2.1).

¹⁹⁷ SHISHA-HALEVY, 1986: 7.2.1.1.5.1

¹⁹⁸ SHISHA-HALEVY, 1986: 7.2.1.1.5.1

1.2 Object Clauses and Infinitive Constructions after Verbs of Exhorting

The clauses and infinitive constructions after the verbs 'order (sy to do sg), ask (sy to do sg), tell (sy to do sg), force, command (sy to do sg)' and also 'plan/plot to' will be examined here. The terminology comes from descriptive grammars of Greek,¹⁹⁹ and as this group is inevitably encountered by Coptic translators, it will be studied how they are treated by them and what happens in original writings after that verb group. Significant differences between the two Coptic text types are expected in this case resulting from the new use of ἵνα-clauses in later Greek in this environment and its copying in translations. Considering the problem is also provoked by Till's statement that: "Wenn der Objektsatz ein Ziel angibt, kann er die Form eines Finalsatzes annehmen."²⁰⁰

In classical Greek the regular construction after verbs of exhorting is the infinitive/*accusativus cum infinitivo*,²⁰¹ and also the infinitive/*accusativus cum infinitivo* can be used as subject with certain impersonal verbs or equivalent expressions ('be worthy of, it is necessary, it is appropriate', and the like).²⁰² In the language of the NT, on the other hand, these verbs and adjectives are frequently followed by a ἵνα-clause – a phenomenon almost unknown in classical Greek²⁰³ – , which is a tendency described by Moulton as well: "ἵνα instead of almost any infinitive (even subject infinitive e.g. In 16,7 συμφέρει ὑμῖν ἵνα ἔγω ἀπέλω and in 1 Co 9,18), for exegetic infinitive, in demands after verbs of willing and the like, and also in ecclastic sense, marks the beginning of a process which ended in the disappearance of the infinitive and substitution of ἵνα with subjunctive in Modern Greek."²⁰⁴

The basic patterns in Coptic in object position after verbs of exhorting and as subjects/subject expansions are infinitive constructions²⁰⁵ and final clause patterns,²⁰⁶ the details will be given in the sections to follow.

¹⁹⁹ The English term is a little complicated and always needs specification as to which verbs are in mind; the Hungarian term is very good and can be applied for various verbs and environments (*célzatos alanyi és tárgyi mellékmondatok*), and also shows that there is always a purpose implied (for this term see the translator's note in BORNEMANN-RISCH, 1999: §276, footnote).

²⁰⁰ TILL, 1961: §415.

²⁰¹ BORNEMANN-RISCH, 1999: §233; DE WITT BURTON, 1898: §202.

²⁰² BORNEMANN-RISCH, 1999: §234.

²⁰³ DE WITT BURTON, 1898: §202. ὅπως (μή) with the future indicative after verbs of reflection, striving, guarding was a regular form in classical Greek, but not found in the idiom of the NT, BLASS-DEBRUNNER, 1961: §369

²⁰⁴ MOULTON ET AL., 1963:103 and also 99; also BLASS-DEBRUNNER, 1961: §§ 388, 392.

²⁰⁵ In Till, 1961: §335 – "Ersatz eines Objektsatzes durch einen Infinitiv".

1.2.1 Clause-with-conjunction vs. infinitive patterns

The clause-with-conjunction pattern used in the Greek is ἵνα/ὅπως with the subjunctive, the latter conjunction being rather rare in the examined text corpus and in the NT in general: "in so far as it appears at all, is confined to the purely final sense and to combinations with verbs of asking (παρακαλεῖν etc.)."²⁰⁷ In John and Romans it does not occur after these verbs, only in Matthew: 8, 34 after παρεκάλεσαν and in 9, 38 after δεήθητε. In the clauses following this verb group, just as in real final clauses, the choice between the two Greek conjunctions is irrelevant for the Coptic translator, both are translated with the usual **ⲭⲉⲕⲁϢ/ⲭⲉ**, without any systematical change between the two. The variation of Coptic clause patterns in that syntactical position is not very great in S, **ⲭⲉⲕⲁϢ** plus future 3 (future 2 as a variant again as in finals, see 1.1.1.1.1) and **ⲭⲉ** plus future 3 are used; in M, again, more variation can be found:

fig. 15

GREEK	Matthew	John	Romans	Total
ἵνα + subj	12	11	-	23
ὅπως + subj	2	-	-	2
inf	11	1	3	15
total	25	12	3	40

²⁰⁶ LAYTON, 2004: §521.

²⁰⁷ BLASS-DEBRUNNER, 1961: §369.

fig. 16

COPTIC	Matthew S	John S	Romans	S total	Matthew M	John L
ⲭⲎⲔⲁⲥ fut 3	14	8	-	22	1	6
ⲭⲎⲔⲁⲥ fut 2	-*	-*	-	-*	-	1
ⲭⲎ fut 3	-	2	-	2	7	2
Ⲏ+inf	11	2	3	16	9	3
ϩⲎⲁⲥ fut 3	-	-	-	-	3	-
ϩⲎⲁⲥ conj	-	-	-	-	3	-
conj	-	-	-	-	1	-
optative	-	-	-	-	1	-
total	25	12	3	40	25	12

*occurs in S only as text variant: in Mt 28, 10 Horner has fut 3, Perez has fut 2; in Jn 15, 16 Horner has fut 2, Quecke has fut 3.

Based on the evidence of S (confirmed by L), Coptic again strongly depends on the Greek patterns, following the clause vs. infinitive pattern almost always, in an even more slave-like manner than in the case of the final clauses.

fig. 17

S Coptic	ⲭⲎⲔⲁⲥ + fut	ⲭⲎ + fut 3	Ⲏ + inf
Greek	3*		
ϣⲎⲁ + subj	20	2	1
ⲟⲩⲣⲱⲥ + subj	2	-	-
infinitive	-	-	15

* ⲭⲎⲔⲁⲥ + fut 2 occurs in Mt 28, 10 (Perez) and in Jn 15, 16 (Horner) as text variant to translate ϣⲎⲁ + subjunctive.

fig. 18

M Coptic Greek	ⲬⲉⲕⲉⲚ + fut 3	Ⲭⲉ + fut 3	ⲒⲒⲛⲁⲚ + fut 3	ⲒⲒⲛⲁⲚ + conj	conjunctive	optative	ⲉ + inf
ἵνα + subj	1	5	3	3	-	-	-
ὅπως + subj	-	2	-	-	-	-	-
infinitive	-	-	-	-	1	1	9

fig. 19

L Coptic Greek	Ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲕⲉ + fut 3	Ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲕⲉ + fut 2	Ⲭⲉ + fut 3	ⲉ + inf
ἵνα + subj	6	1	2	2
Infinitive	-	-	-	1

A non-adherence to the Greek original can be found in John 17, 4 where both S and L have an infinitive construction where the original has a clause (the infinitive is used only once in the Greek John in this position, Jn 4, 40 where both dialects follow).

17, 4

Greek: δέδωκάς μοι ἵνα ποιήσω

S: ⲈⲚⲦⲀⲚⲘⲁⲗⲗ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲈⲦⲠⲁⲗⲗ

L: ⲛⲦⲀⲚⲦⲉⲉⲗ ⲛⲛⲉⲓ ⲁⲦⲠⲁⲉⲉⲗ

In 15, 17 while S follows the Greek clause pattern, L has an infinitive construction, not a clause:

Greek: ταῦτα ἐντελλομαι ὑμῖν ἵνα ἀγαπάτε ἀλλήλους

S: ⲛⲁⲓ ⲈⲒⲒⲠⲛ ⲛⲞⲞⲠ ⲈⲦⲈⲦⲒⲦⲒⲦⲒ ⲬⲉⲕⲁⲚ ⲈⲦⲈⲦⲒⲛⲉⲠⲉⲠⲉⲛⲈⲦⲒⲠⲉⲠⲒⲦⲒ

L: ⲛⲒⲉⲓ ⲁⲉ ⲠⲠ ⲛⲞⲛⲗ ⲁⲦⲞⲦⲒⲦⲒⲦⲒⲛⲉ ⲁⲦⲒⲠⲠⲉⲛⲈⲦⲒⲠⲉⲠⲒⲦⲒ

In the original Coptic texts here examined the rate of Ⲭⲉ(ⲕⲁⲕ)–clauses vs. ⲉ+infinitives is strikingly different:

fig. 20

	Pachom	Shenoute	Theodore	Horsiese	total
ϵ + inf	5	16	10	8	39
ⲭϵ/ⲭϵⲕⲁⲥ fut 3	1	1*	-	-	2
Total	6	17	10	8	41

*quotation

As seen in the table, in the original writings, the preference for infinitive constructions in this position is obvious.

One of the two occurrences of the final clause pattern is a quotation from Matthew in Shenoute and therefore not original writing:

Ad phil 59, 2 (quotation from Mt 9, 38):

ϭⲓⲛⲓⲭⲟⲓϥ ⲏⲡⲱⲗϥ ⲭϵⲕⲁⲥ ⲉⲓⲛⲉⲭⲉⲣⲓⲁⲧⲏϥ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉⲡⲉⲓⲓⲱⲗϥ

The other is the only place where the ⲭϵ with future 3 occurs as non-translation:

Pachom, *Spiteful* 18, 14-15:

ⲁⲮⲱⲛ ⲉⲦⲟⲟⲧ̄ⲛ ⲉⲦⲃⲉⲡⲣⲁⲱⲉ ⲭϵⲉⲛⲉⲛⲓⲱⲉ ⲙⲏⲧⲁⲮⲏ ⲛⲉⲛⲧ̄ⲓ

This verb, **ⲱⲛ**, is otherwise always followed either by the infinitive construction (*Spiteful* 2, 27; 8, 28; 22, 8; just like its synonyms, see APPENDIX) or by direct discourse and so the imperative (which happens of course with other such verbs too):²⁰⁸

Pachom, *Spiteful* 8, 28

†ⲱⲛ ⲉⲦⲟⲟⲧ̄ⲛ ⲉⲛⲁⲧⲉ ⲉⲦⲣⲉⲕⲙⲉⲦⲉⲡⲉⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲦⲱⲟⲩⲉⲓⲧ

Pachom, *Spiteful* 15, 2-3

ⲉⲓⲱⲛ ⲁⲉ ⲉⲦⲟⲟⲧ̄ⲛ ⲛⲟⲡⲓⲭⲟⲓϥ ⲭϵⲙⲉⲣⲉⲛⲉⲧ̄ⲛⲓⲭⲓⲭⲉⲩⲉⲩⲉ

First of all, it is rather surprising to see final clause patterns in this syntactical position at all as it is rather 'un-Egyptian', but on the other hand, 'very koine-Greek'. Further, the fact that they are not very common in original Coptic texts in this object position, signals that the phenomenon is a translation induced one and may not have become standardized in Coptic as a whole, so that Coptic authors (vs. translators) would have employed it

²⁰⁸ These direct discourse forms are not included in the present study, they are naturally present in the Greek NT as well, and so in the translations.

extensively in their writing; it may have been alien to the nature of the Egyptian ear. It was definitely a development in Greek, visible in the NT idiom (see above, 1.2), but it has no traces in Egyptian and also in its latest phase occurs almost exclusively in the translations of such Greek texts. Although "im Koptischen haben die voraufgehenden Sprachstufen geringeren Vergleichswert infolge des zeitlichen Abstandes und des sich sukzessiv vollziehenden typologischen Umbaus der ägyptischen Sprache",²⁰⁹ it is still worth mentioning that no similar construction in pre-Coptic could be found,²¹⁰ and it is only partly in line with one of the main tendencies of the Egyptian language development, namely the analytic tendency²¹¹ in so far as clauses rather than synthetic verb forms are used. It could still be argued that the appearance of final clause patterns – once becoming so preferred – in object position could be an inner development of the Coptic language, but it is more than suspicious that it is so definitely characteristic of translations.

fig. 21

	Greek	Transl Coptic (S)	Original Coptic
Final clause patterns	62.5%	60%	4.88%
Infinitive constructions	37.5%	40%	95.12%

Looking at some verbs occurring in both text types, the difference of the preferred pattern can be well seen.

A) The verb *πέιθω* is applied in both the translated and original texts, and in the translation it has the final clause pattern after it, following the Greek original:

Mt 27, 20

Greek: οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ἐπεισαν τοὺς ὄχλους ἵνα αἰτήσωνται τὸν Βαραββᾶν

S: *ΝΑΡΧΙΕΡΕΥΣ ΔΕ ΗΝ ΝΕΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΕΡΟΣ ΑΥΠΕΙΘΕ ΠΙΠΗΗΦΕ ΧΕΚΑΣ ΕΥΕΛΙΤΕΙ ΝΒΑΡΑΒΒΑΣ*

M: *ΝΑΡΧΙΕΡΕΥΣ ΔΕ ΗΝ ΝΕΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΕΡΟΣ ΖΑΥΠΘΕ ΗΠΗΗΦΕ ΖΗΝΑΣ ΕΟΥΕΛΙΤΙ ΝΒΑΡΑΒΒΑΣ*

In Theodore and Shenoute, on the other hand, where no 'outside force' is present, the verb is followed by the infinitive construction:

Theodore, *Instruction*

59, 1-2

²⁰⁹ NAGEL, 1971: 349.

²¹⁰ As object of verbs (esp. 'give, command, wish') the infinitive is used or a nominalized verb phrase, LOPRIENO, 1995: 182; 200-201; JUNGE, 1996: 229; GARDINER, 1957: §313.

²¹¹ HINTZE, 1947.

ελαπειθε ἦμοϛ ἡοπισωτηρ ετρεφμεστεἰογωϱ τηροϱ ἦπιαων

Shenoute, *Monast disc* 149, 26

νεμενεϱπειθε ἦμοογιπε ετρεϱσαζωοϱ εβολ ἡζωβ ηημ εθοοοϱ

B) Again, the verb **σῖσοπ** is used in translation (for παρακαλέω or δέομαι) and original writing as well, the loanword **ΠΑΡΑΚΑΛΕΙ** also occurs, with different patterns: in the Coptic (S and M) NT it occurs in Mt 8, 34 and 14, 36 with the final clause pattern following Greek παρακάλω with clause, and in Mt 9, 38 following δεήθητε with clause; in Rm 12, 1 and 16, 17 παρακαλέω/ΠΑΡΑΚΑΛΕΙ stands with the infinitive construction in Greek and Coptic.

In the original texts, on the other hand, the verb (whether **σῖσοπ** /**σοπιϛ** or **ΠΑΡΑΚΑΛΕΙ**) only occurs with the infinitive construction²¹² (Pachom, *Excerpta* 29b,29-29a,16; Theodore, *Instruction* 47, 34; 48, 7-8; 50, 33; 56, 6; Shenoute, *Monast disc* 139, 14; Horsiese, *Instruction* 7 78, 1-2; *Regulations* 86, 4-5).

In Shenoute it is especially nice to see this verb and all the others with related meaning always used with the infinitive construction, for example:

Monast disc 139, 14

αγω ἡνασεπισωποϱ ετρεϱκω ηαι εβολ

and once, unexpectedly, the **κεκας** clause appears in this environment because the author quotes from a translated text (the NT, see earlier, below fig. 20).

C) Interestingly, the verb **κελεύω** is always used with the infinitive in the Greek NT books examined (Mt 8, 18; 14, 9; 14, 19; 14, 28; 18, 25; 27, 58; 27, 64), and the Coptic versions act accordingly: in S the verb is translated with **οϱεζσαζνε** and takes the infinitive construction, in M it is **κελεγε**²¹³ and takes the infinitive construction with two exceptions, Mt 14, 28 (conjunctive, see 1.2.2) and Mt 27, 64 (optative, see 1.2.3).

In the original, as expected, **οϱεζσαζνε** stands with the infinitive construction, just like all other such verbs (unless with direct discourse):

Theodore, *Instruction* 53, 11

εαοϱεζσαζνε ἡνεφαγγελοϛ ἡχωρεζἡτεγδοη ετεριε ἡπερωαχε ετρεϱβολἡ εβολ ζἡἡἡρρε ἡνεηνοβε

²¹² With the one exception described earlier, where Shenoute quotes Mt 9, 38.

²¹³ Except in 8, 18 where another Greek loanword **επιτασσε** is used.

1.2.1.1 The clause pattern ζINAC + conjunctive/future 3 occurs only in the M version of Matthew in the examined text corpus, similarly to the ζINAC + future 3 in the finals, see above 1.1.1.1.2 and 1.1.1.1.4.

As seen in fig. 18 above, the conjunctive is used three times (14, 36; 20, 21; 26, 63) and the fut 3 also three times (12, 16; 27, 20; 28, 10) after a verb of exhorting, that is, their use is very balanced. The question as to what determines the choice between them naturally arises. The places where the conjunctive follows ζINAC :

14, 36

Greek: παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν ἵνα μόνον ἄψωνται τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ

M: ΝΑΥΤΟΒΞ ΗΜΑΦ ΠΕ ΖΙΝΑΦ ΝΣΕΧΕΞ ΗΜΕΤΕ ΕΠΛΑΥ ΗΠΕΦΖΑΙΤΕ

20, 21

Greek: εἶπε ἵνα καθίσωσιν οὗτοι οἱ δύο υἱοί μου

M: ΛΧΙΦ ΖΙΝΑΦ ΝΤΕΠΑΦΗΡΕ ΣΝΕΥ ΖΗΑΦ

26, 63

Greek: ἔξορκίζω σε κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος ἵνα ὑμῖν εἴπησ ἔι σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς

M: ΨΤΑΡΚΑ ΗΜΑΦ ΗΠΗΨ ΕΤΑΝΖ ΖΙΝΑΦ ΝΚΤΑΜΑΝ ΧΕ ΝΤΑΚ ΕΤΕ ΠΕΨΡ̄

And the places where ζINAC + future 3 follows the verb as object:

12, 16

Greek: καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα μὴ φανερὸν αὐτὸν ποιήσωσιν

M: ΖΑΦΕΠΤΙΜΑ ΝΕΥ ΖΙΝΑΦ ΗΝΕΥΟΓΑΝΖΦ ΕΒΑΛ

27, 20

Greek: ἔπεισαν τοὺς ὄχλους ἵνα αἰτήσωσιν τὸν Βαραββᾶν

M: ΖΑΥΠΘΕ ΗΠΗΨΕ ΖΙΝΑΦ ΕΟΥΕΛΙΤΙ ΝΒΑΡΑΒΒΑΦ

28, 10

Greek: ἀπαγγείλατε τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου ἵνα ἀπέλθωσιν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν

M: ΤΑΜΕ ΝΑΣΝΗΟΥ ΖΙΝΑΦ ΕΟΥΕΨΕ ΝΕΥ ΕΤΓΑΛΙΛΑΙΑ

The sentence patterns are much the same and there does not seem to be any possibility for subcategorizing the verbs semantically, from which it follows that the ζINAC + conjunctive and the ζINAC + future 3 patterns are equivalents and are in free variation in the given syntactic position in M. The ζINAC + conjunctive pattern only occurs in object clauses after verbs of exhorting and as complementary clauses (see 1.4.1.2) in the M Matthew, not in 'pure' final clauses, where ζINAC stands with the future 3 (see 1.1.1.1.4).

On the question of the conjunctive after the Greek conjunctions see later, **2.3.1**.

1.2.2 The conjunctive appears in this object position only in the M version of Matthew where the S has an $\epsilon+$ infinitive, following closely the Greek original:

14, 28

Greek: κέλευσόν με ἐλθεῖν πρὸς σε ἐπὶ τὰ ὕδατα

M: κελεγε νει νται ερετκ ριχνημαγ

The Greek sentence again has an infinitive (an *accusativus cum infinitivo* to be exact) as object of the verb 'command'. In the M version of the passage, in my opinion, two interpretations are possible: 1) The conjunctive is not object. It is not important what semantic value the main verb has, the important thing is here that it is in the imperative. In M, a different structure from the Greek can be seen: the conjunctive is not the object of the main verb, but rather continues it. Imperatives are frequently continued by conjunctives (with the same imperatival meaning of course), but in these cases the subject of imperative and conjunctive is identical, when not, then it is the typical place of the future conjunctive as "post-imperatival apodotic form"²¹⁴ (see above **1.1.1.2.1**). In Mt 14, 28 the subject of the second verb is the first person singular, where the future conjunctive is normally replaced by the conjunctive.²¹⁵ So in this sentence the verb form would not be in object position after a verb of exhorting, but rather there is an imperative plus future conjunctive in the M version.

Despite the difference of structure from the Greek assumed in this interpretation, the M sentence is very close in meaning: lit. 'Command me and I will go to you on water', but again undoubtedly less close than the S version which follows the pattern strictly (on interpretations vs. literal/pattern-to-pattern translations see **1.1.1.2.1**):

ΟΥΕΖΣΑΖΝΕ ΝΑΙ ΕΤΡΑΕΙ ΦΑΡΟΚ ΡΙΧΝΗΜΟΥ

2) The other interpretation is of course the one, which takes the conjunctive as object of the verb κελεγε. This would not be an isolated phenomenon as the conjunctive occurs in real object position after certain verbs²¹⁶ (the exhorting and/or final *Anklang* is a prerequisite) and thus "kann die Bedeutung eines Objektsatzes haben"²¹⁷.

²¹⁴ SHISHA-HALEVY, 1986: §7.2.1.1.5.1.

²¹⁵ Or by the $\lambda\omega$ plus future I, cf. the examples from Biblical Coptic by POLOTSKY, 1944: 108-113, where he shows that the usage and the environments are the same, the only difference is the person.

²¹⁶ Already in Late Egyptian it is attested after *hm, tbn*, see Volten, 1964: 64-65; and it is introduced as the "sequencing prospective „that“-form" role of the conjunctive by Shisha-Halevy as "content object to a special inventory of verbs (*παράκαλει ογωω* etc.)", SHISHA-HALEVY, 1995: 313; conjunctive as object,

In the original text material examined no conjunctive was found in object position.

1.2.3 The optative is also present once in M where both in Greek and in S an object infinitive stands after a 'command':

27, 64

Greek: κέλευσον οὖν ἀσφαλισθῆναι τὸν τάφον

M: κελεγε ογν μαρογχαπα εροφ

S: ογερσαζνε σε ετρεγορḫ ἡπταφοc²¹⁸

Again, the S version follows the Greek pattern very closely in its verb plus object infinitive, which is indirect discourse instead of a dialogue where the command or request itself is given in direct quotation with an imperative. That is what the M version has, but as the person is the third person (plural), the optative is applied (as jussive command²¹⁹) instead of the imperative which is used only with second persons. So the translator of M uses direct discourse, the verb form is that used in a dialogue (allocution), independent of the Greek and S object infinitive after the verb of exhorting. Another indication of the M version's independence of S.

1.3 Subject Clauses and Infinitive Constructions

"Subjektsätze, in denen ein Ziel zum Ausdruck gebracht wird, können die Form eines Finalsatzes haben",²²⁰ writes Till in his *Grammatik*. Continuing the chain of thought of section 1.2, the motivation or explanation for that phenomenon in Coptic will be studied here. It is very similar to the syntactical position described in the previous sections, and very similar results are expected as to Greek patterns, their Coptic translations, and the patterns present in original Coptic writings.

STERN, 1880: §§440, 443; in §445 Stern remarks that in this position S prefers the ε+infinitive construction, while in B the conjunctive is "zwar das gewöhnliche", and M is closer to B than to S in this respect.

Another study on the Late Egyptian conjunctive is LICHTHEIM, 1964 that deals with the so-called "independent conjunctive expressing a wish, command, or injunction" (p. 4), which is however questionable (SHISHA-HALEVY, 1995: 311).

²¹⁷ TILL, 1961: §416.

²¹⁸ The text version in Perez has ετρεγορḫ

²¹⁹ LAYTON, 2004: §340.

²²⁰ TILL, 1961: §422.

In classical Greek, with impersonal verbs and equivalent expressions (ἔξεσσι, πρέπει, κάλόν ἐσσι, συμφέρει etc.), the infinitive or *accusativus cum infinitivo* could stand as subject.²²¹ In the NT, ἵνα-clauses can be used in all these cases,²²² except when the infinitive "has become firmly established" after an expression, ἔξεσσι for one.²²³

1.3.1 Clause pattern vs. infinitive construction: It is not surprising then that, besides the infinitive construction, also in the Coptic NT final clause patterns are found as subject with the given expressions. It is undoubtedly the result of the pattern-to-pattern translation of the Greek *Vorlage* as in the case of the object clauses. There is again, just like in the case of object clauses, quite a difference between translated Coptic and original Coptic texts:

fig. 22

Greek	Matthew	John	Romans	total
ἵνα +subj	5	9	-	14
infinitive	16	5	1	22
total	21	14	1	36

fig. 23

S Coptic	Matthew	John	Romans	total
ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲥ fut3	4	8	-	12
ⲭⲉ fut3	1	1	-	2
ⲉ +inf	15	5	1	21*
total	20	14	1	35

*in verse 27, 15 the part 'it was a habit' and so the following infinitive is left out in S

²²¹ BORNEMANN-RISCH, 1999: §234.

²²² BLASS-DEBRUNNER, 1961: §393; DE WITT BURTON, 1898: §§ 213, 214.

²²³ BLASS-DEBRUNNER, 1961: §393.

fig. 24

M Coptic	Matthew
ϵ +inf	13
conjunctive	7
conditional	1
total	21

fig. 25

L Coptic	John
ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲘⲉ fut2	6
ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲘⲉ fut3	3
ⲁ+inf	5
total	14

fig. 26

Original Coptic	Pachom	Shenoute	Theodore	Horsiese	total
ⲭⲉ fut3	-	1*	-	-	1
ϵ+inf	11	30	4	19	64
circumstantial	1	-	-	-	1
conditional	1	-	-	-	1
total	13	31	4	19	67

*quotation

Considering first of all the rate of final clause vs. infinitive patterns, it can be observed that in subject position the infinitive constructions are in majority in the Greek original, and thus also in the Coptic translations of the NT books. The rate in this case, however, tells us more about Greek than about Coptic as the Coptic translation very strongly depends syntactically on the Greek, again giving a pattern-to-pattern translation – quite like with object clauses.

In the original Coptic text corpus, the infinitive constructions are in vast majority and a final clause pattern occurs only once, when it is quoted from the NT, so it is a translation:

Shenoute, *Ad phil* 59, 30 quoting Mt 10, 25:

Ⲉⲗⲱ ⲉⲡⲉⲥⲃⲟⲩⲓ ⲭⲉⲉⲩⲉⲡⲱⲡⲉ ⲛⲟⲉ ⲡⲓⲡⲉⲩⲁⲗ

The original of which is:
ⲗⲟ ⲉⲡⲉⲥⲃⲟⲓ ⲭⲉⲣⲉⲫⲱⲡⲉ ⲛⲟⲈ Ⲣⲡⲉⲣⲥⲁⲗ

and the original of that is:
 ἄρκετον τῷ μαθητῇ ἵνα γένηται ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος αὐτοῦ

This is another very nice example of the phenomenon that from the original Coptic syntactic environment a sentence/clause becomes conspicuous by having a different construction from the ones in the environment, because it is a translated Coptic sentence/clause; we have seen in section 1.2.1 that the **ⲭⲈⲘⲘⲥ**-clause after the verb **ⲥⲡⲓ** in Shenoute (*Ad phil* 59, 2) only occurred because it was a quotation from Mt 9, 38. This shows at the same time that the very appearance of the subject final clause pattern in Coptic happened as a result of translations from Greek, and the translation technique, which is a pattern-to-pattern one; the final clause pattern does not seem to be used in subject position in original writings, based on the present text corpus.

The following table will show the exact rate of clauses vs. infinitives:

fig. 27

	Greek	Translated Coptic (S)	Original Coptic
Final clause pattern	38.89%	40%	1.49%
Infinitive constr	61.11%	60%	95.52%
Other*	-	-	2.99%

*circumstantial present and conditional

A very good example for the preferred pattern in Greek/translated Coptic vs. original Coptic is given by the expression 'it is not my/his will':

Mt 18, 14

Greek: οὐκ ἔστιν θέλημα ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ πατρὸς (...) ἵνα ἀπόληται ἐν τῶν μικρῶν τούτων

S: **Ⲣⲡⲟⲗⲟⲩⲱⲩ ⲁⲛⲡⲉ ⲢⲡⲉⲡⲉⲦⲟ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲢⲡⲉⲗⲉⲱⲦ (...)** **ⲭⲈⲘⲘⲥ ⲉⲣⲉⲗⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛⲟⲓ ⲟⲗⲁ Ⲣⲛⲉⲓⲕⲟⲗⲓ**

(Also in Jn 6, 39; 6, 40)

Shenoute, *Ad phil* 45, 24-25 (speaking of God, referring exactly to the above NT-place):

Ⲣⲡⲉⲣⲟⲗⲟⲩⲱⲩ ⲁⲛⲡⲉ ⲉⲦⲣⲉⲗⲗⲱ Ⲧⲁⲕⲟ ⲗⲢⲡⲉⲣⲦⲁⲛⲉⲓⲟ

Monast disc 131, 8

Ⲣⲡⲁⲟⲗⲟⲩⲱⲩ ⲁⲛⲡⲉ ⲉⲦⲣⲉⲡⲭⲟⲥⲓⲕ ⲕⲱ ⲛⲁⲗ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ

1.3.2 The Greek – Coptic equivalents are:

fig. 28

S	ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲕ	ⲭⲉ	ⲉ +
Coptic	fut 3	fut 3	inf
Greek			
ἵνα subjunctive	12	2	-
infinitive	-	-	21

fig. 29

L	ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲕⲉ	ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲕⲉ	ⲁ +
Coptic	fut 3	fut 2	inf
Greek			
ἵνα subjunctive	3	6	-
infinitive	-	-	5

fig. 30

M Coptic	ⲉ +	conj	cond
Greek	inf		
ἵνα subjunctive	1	3	1
infinitive	12	4	-

In S and L, there is no deviation from the Greek pattern, each clause is translated with a clause, and each infinitive is translated with the infinitive construction. The tendency seen earlier is observed again as to the choice of final clause: L uses the future 2 frequently, whereas S does not use it at all; in S the only variation is that of ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲕ and ⲭⲉ.

M is again quite different from the other Coptic versions. It does not use final clause patterns at all, in this sense is very independent of the Greek original, and much more free in its choice of pattern in the subject position. One has to remember that also in object position the clause patterns were rather different from S, but there were clause patterns.

Here, the Greek ἵνα + subjunctive pattern is translated with the conjunctive, the conditional or the ε + infinitive instead.

1.3.3 Others: Looking at the alternative patterns used in M and in the original writings, one will find the conjunctive, the conditional and the circumstantial present.²²⁴

1.3.3.1 Circumstantial: In original texts, the infinitive construction is clearly not in paradigm with the final clause pattern in this syntactic position, but with the conditional and the circumstantial. Among the subject clauses expressing an aim, no conjunctive was found in the examined original texts, but in a closely related sentence type it occurs, see discussed later **1.4.2**. The circumstantial, on the other hand, appears in Pachom as subject expansion of **ΝΑΝΟΥC**:

Spiteful 5, 32 – 6, 1

ΝΑΝΟΥC ΝΑΚ ΕΚΦΛΗΛ ΕΚΡΙΜΕ ΕΚΑΨΑΖΟΗ ΦΑΝΤΕΚΟΥΧΑΙ Ν̄ΖΟΥΟ ΕΡΟC
ΕΤΡΕΚΚΑΠΕΚΖΗΤ ΕΒΟΛ

There is also an example with the ε + infinitive after the expression in Horsiese:

Instruction 7 76, 3

ΝΑΝΟΥC ΝΑΙ ΕΨΑΧΕ Ν̄ΖΟΥΕΚΑΡΩΙ

1.3.3.2 There is only one example of **the conditional**²²⁵ in such subject position, also in Pachom:

Excerpta 29b, 10 – 30b, 3

Ν̄ΟΥΔΙΚΑΙΟΝ ΑΝΠΕ ΕΦΦΑΝΧΠΕΝΕΦΩΗΡΕ Ν̄ΤΕΝ̄ΚΙΝΑΔΥΝΟC Ν̄ΤΗΝ̄ΤΖΗΚΕ ΤΑΖΟΙ

In the M version of Matthew, there is also one example of the conditional in subject position, in the above mentioned verse 10, 25 where S has **xe** + future 3:

Greek: ἀρκετὸν τῷ μαθητῇ ἵνα γένηται ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος αὐτοῦ

M: κΥΝ ΕΠΙΜΑΘΗΤΗC ΛΦΦΑΝΕΡΘΗ ΗΠΕΦCΕΖ

1.3.3.3 The conjunctive as subject²²⁶ occurs in the M version of Matthew on several occasions. It will be discussed below in **1.4.2**, together with the similar complementary position.²²⁷

²²⁴ For entity statements as subject and subject expansion, see LAYTON, 2004: §§ 486-488.

²²⁵ It occurs more often in subject position with expressions not having an implicit aim (although it is sometimes hard to decide), eg. Shenoute, BLO 89, 15-20: ΟΥΝΟC Ν̄ΝΟΒΕ ΝΑΠΠΕ Ν̄ΦΑΝΟΦ̄Ν̄ ΕΝΕΤΗΗΥ ΝΑΝ (also 89, 27-29; 54).

CONCLUSIONS (OBJECT AND SUBJECT)

1. The final clause pattern is used frequently as object and subject with certain verbs and expressions in NT Greek, and the Coptic translations again follow the original very closely, also applying the final clause pattern in these positions. Pattern-to-pattern translation is even stronger than in the case of finals, with fewer 'deviations', and more obvious because unlike with finals, here such syntactic units are present which had not been characteristic of the language and are used basically only in translations. That is a marked stylistic impact on Coptic.
2. That syntactical effect seems to leave original writings basically untouched, where the regular pattern with these expressions is the infinitive construction. The phenomenon was induced by translations, which subsequently did not quite influence Coptic authors in this case.
3. The transposition of the **ⲭⲉⲕⲁϢ**-clause from an originally adverbial (final clause) status to a nominal (object/subject) status²²⁸ is a Greek linguistic influence. The nominalized **ⲭⲉⲕⲁϢ**-clause appears and is used as object of certain verbs and as subject after certain expressions due to translations from Greek. Not in any object or subject position though, the meaning is a determining factor, the preceding verb or expression must imply an aim or purpose.
4. Further, the appearance of final clause patterns in object and subject position, that is the pattern-to-pattern rather than sense-to-sense translation of such constructions, and thus the introduction of a new syntactic pattern, raises the question of how 'natural' were the Coptic translations.
5. Dialect M has the most variation in the patterns after verbs of exhorting as well, i.e. it is the most independent translation of the three. It deviates from the Greek pattern occasionally, and also to a certain Greek pattern it has more than one solution, for example a **ⲓⲛⲁ**-clause, while also a clause in M, can be **ⲭⲉ** future 3, **ⲭⲉⲕⲉϢ** future 3, **ⲉⲓⲛⲁϢ** future 3, or **ⲉⲓⲛⲁϢ** conjunctive. Again, S is the most standardized and has the most

²²⁶ STERN, 1880: §442: where Stern also remarks that in S in this position the infinitive construction is preferred, B likes the conjunctive and M is undoubtedly closer to B than to S also in this respect; TILL, 1961: §421.

²²⁷ For the conjunctive and the +infinitive in such environments, see SHISHA-HALEVY, 1986: 7.4: "adnominal 'that'-form function" and "adverbial 'that'-form function".

²²⁸ No similar phenomenon was discussed by Polotsky in his transposition theory in classical Egyptian, POLOTSKY, 1976.

solid translation equivalents, does not vary patterns, aims rather at a very close, pattern-to-pattern translation of the Greek.

6. In subject position, the M dialect does not apply the final clause pattern at all (neither **xερεc/xε**, nor **zιnαc**-clauses), thus being closest to original Coptic writings among translations; again proving to be the most independent of the Greek original.

1.4 Complementary and Epexegetic Clauses/Infinitive Constructions

There is another subclass worth mentioning within the ἵνα-group, the members of which in the present text corpus are not very numerous and so further investigation is undoubtedly needed. This subclass is nonetheless also rather *lehrreich* from the point of view of Greek syntactic influence, and original vs. translated Coptic literature. The following belong here and will (partly) be dealt with here: "Complementary limitation of nouns and adjectives signifying *authority, power, fitness, need, set time*, etc."²²⁹ And further, "complementary or epexegetic limitation of verbs of various significance; the clause defines the content, ground, or method of the action denoted by the verb, or constitutes an indirect object of the verb",²³⁰

In classical Greek the infinitive is used with such expressions,²³¹ in the NT idiom,²³² however, again the ἵνα/ὅπως-clause can occur in almost all these cases²³³ (ὅπως far less frequently), except with some expressions which take only the infinitive.²³⁴ In the present work those expressions are examined which may take both the infinitive and the final clause pattern, and besides studying their Coptic translations, these and similar expressions will be examined in the original texts. This subclass is studied because the appearance of the final clause pattern in it seems again to be Greek, and more precisely, translation induced. As to the clause – infinitive rate in translated vs. original Coptic, very similar results to object and subject position are expected in this case, based on the results of the previous sections. Since infinitives are expected in original literature, no Greek expressions are included which only take the infinitive (like δύνωμαι, which acts in fact as a kind of auxiliary)²³⁵ because then it would be difficult to see if and where Greek influence lies.

1.4.1 Clauses vs. infinitive constructions: There are several expressions in the NT books examined which take the infinitive on some occasions and the final clause pattern on

²²⁹ DE WITT BURTON, 1898: §216.

²³⁰ DE WITT BURTON, 1898: §217.

²³¹ BORNEMANN-RISCH, 1999: §237 and §234.

²³² On the epexegetic infinitive in NT, PORTER, 1992: §2.2

²³³ DE WITT BURTON, 1898: §215; BLASS-DEBRUNNER, 1961: §393.

²³⁴ For example δεῖ and ἐξεστίν, BLASS-DEBRUNNER, 1961: §393.

²³⁵ δύνωμαι and its Coptic counterpart οὔνησομ (in translation and original) always take the infinitive construction in the text corpus.

others; the Coptic translations naturally almost always follow. Some of these expressions then appear also in original Coptic texts (as loanwords or as Coptic equivalents) and they always take the ϵ + infinitive (for a complete list of occurrences with verb forms see APPENDIX).

A good example is ἱκανός/ ἄξιος (εἰμί) – ἦπα

Mt 8, 8

Greek: οὐκ εἰμί ἱκανός ἵνα ... εἰσέλθῃς

S: ⲛⲉⲩⲏⲡⲁ ⲁⲛ ⲕⲉⲕⲁⲥ ⲉⲕⲉⲓ ⲉⲗⲟⲩⲛ

Pachom, *Spiteful* 8, 19

ⲁⲓⲣⲉⲛⲏⲡⲁ ⲉⲧⲣⲉϥⲟⲩⲟⲩ ⲉϥⲩⲏⲣⲁⲛ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲃ ⲛⲏⲕⲟⲓⲥ

Theodore, *Instruction* 50, 31 (for a following infinitive with $\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon$ see 1.4.1.3)

ⲁⲓⲁⲛ ⲛⲏⲡⲁ ⲟⲛ ⲉⲧⲣⲉϥⲧ ⲛⲁⲛ ⲛⲟⲕⲟⲓ ⲛⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩ ϩⲏⲡⲁⲃⲁⲓ

In the case of the above expression, 'be worthy', it would be tempting to think that the conditioning factor for clause – infinitive in Greek is the subject of main clause and ἵνα–clause/infinitive, i.e. when the subjects are identical there would be an infinitive, when different then clause. Comparing Mt 8, 8 and 3, 11 (οὐκ εἰμί ἱκανός τὰ ὑποδήματα βαστάσαι) this seems exactly to be the motivation, but taking this latter and the same sentence in Jn 1, 27 as examples, one sees that no such system can exist: οὐκ εἰμί ἄξιος ἵνα λύσω αὐτοῦ τὸν ἱμάντα τοῦ ὑποδήματος. The Coptic (S) translator might have been disturbed by the lack of this system and maybe therefore he translated 1, 27 with an ϵ + infinitive rather than a clause as the subjects are identical. The M translation of Mt 8, 8 is closely related to this subject-problem: **ⲛⲉⲩⲏⲡⲁϥ ⲉⲛ ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲕⲉⲓ** using the causative infinitive construction instead of the clause applied by both Greek and S; in Coptic, if one does not need to or want to adhere to a Greek clause pattern, there is another way of indicating the new subject in such syntactical positions and still using an infinitive construction, namely the causative infinitive in its "persönlicher Infinitiv"²³⁶ quality.²³⁷

²³⁶ TILL, 1961: §335.

²³⁷ See my 2005 article in ZÄS 132 (HASZNOS, 2005) where I was discussing the system of infinitive and causative infinitive in the ϵ + infinitive construction after the verb ἄξιόω. The problem whether there was

The expression ὥρα ἔρχεται/ (ἔστί) stands regularly with a following final clause pattern in Greek (Jn 12, 23; 13, 1; 16, 2; 16, 32) which is translated by a final clause pattern into Coptic, with the exception of 16, 2 where the L version employs the conjunctive, see below 1.4.2.

Jn 12, 23

Greek: ἐλήλυθεν ἡ ὥρα ἵνα δοξασθῆ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου

S: ατεγνογει χεκαε εφεχεισογ ἡσι πωηρε ἡπρωμε

L: ατογνογει χεκασε εφαχειαγ χι πωηρε ἡπρωμε

In Rm 13, 11 the infinitive is used with the expression.

In the original writings, the infinitive construction is found after similar expressions, (with the exception of a conjunctive in Pachom, see later 1.4.2)

Pachom, *Spiteful* 19, 31

πεογοειω τενογπε παι ετρῆω εβολ ἡἡπεπροφθης χε...

Horsiese, *Regulations* 92, 20-21

ερωληπεογοειωφωπε εσηἡπενκογι ἡοεικ

In the following tables the Greek – Coptic equivalents are shown in the translated texts:

fig. 31

S	χεκαε	χε	ζοτε	ε +	ζωστε	ε
Coptic	fut 3	fut 3	fut 2	inf	+	
Greek					inf	
ἵνα subjunctive	13*	1	1	1	-	
ὅπως subjunctive	2	-	-	-	-	
infinitive	-	-	-	13	-	
ὥστε inf	-	-	-	1	1	
τοῦ inf	-	-	-	1	-	

*future 2 is a text variant in Jn 16, 32 in Horner

any developed system in using the infinitive when the subjects are identical and the causative infinitive when the subjects are different (as POLOTSKY, 1987a: 153 states) – in object, complementary and final positions, needs further study and I deliberately left it out of the present study.

fig. 32

L	ⲭⲎⲔⲁⲐⲈ	ⲭⲎⲔⲁⲐⲈ	ⲭⲎ	ⲭⲎⲔⲁⲐⲈ	ⲁ +	conj
Coptic	fut 3	fut 2	Fut 3	conj	inf	
Greek						
ἵνα subjunctive	7	3	2	1	-	1
infinitive	-	-	-	-	5	1

fig. 33

M Coptic	ⲭⲎⲔⲎⲐ	ϠⲒⲛⲁⲐ	Ⲏ +	ϠⲱⲐⲧⲎ
Greek	fut 3	conj	inf	inf
ἵνα subjunctive	-	-	1	-
ὅπως subjunctive	1	1	-	-
infinitive	-	-	4	-
ὥστε inf	-	-	-	2

As the tables show, the translations are again very close to the original, they are pattern-to-pattern translations. In S there is a difference to the Greek original in Jn 16, 2 where a time clause is used in the place of the final clause pattern, but then in 16, 25 the Greek itself also has a ὅτε-clause in the same sentence, which the meaning naturally allows. Otherwise the usual patterns and the regular translation equivalents are present, **ⲭⲎⲔⲁⲐⲈ** of course dominating over **ⲭⲎ**; and future 2 is but a text variant again.

In L, again future 2 is extensively used and now there is more variety as to conjunction and following verb form (**ⲭⲎⲔⲁⲐⲈ**, **ⲭⲎ**; future 3, future 2, conjunctive) than in S and also the plain conjunctive is used.

Dialect M gives also a very close pattern-to-pattern translation in the case of the complementary clauses, though their number is rather small in this material. There is just one clause – infinitive construction deviation from the Greek (Mt 8, 8), but that happens in S as well (Jn 1, 27). There is variation in the conjunctions **ⲭⲎⲔⲎⲐ**/ **ϠⲒⲛⲁⲐ**.

As could be expected, the rate of final clause patterns and infinitives in this syntactical position is very similar to the object and subject positions seen earlier, and a significant difference exists also here between original and translated Coptic writings:

fig. 34

	Greek	Translated Coptic (S)	Original Coptic
Final clause pattern	52.94%	47.06%	-
Infinitive constr	47.06%	50%	96.77%
Other*	-	2.94%	3.23%

*in translations there is one **ⲫⲟⲩⲧⲉ** (ὅτε) with future 2; in the original there is one conjunctive

The final clause patterns in complementary/epexegetic position are not used in the examined original writings, and the infinitive construction makes up an overwhelming majority. The infinitive construction occurs once with **ⲫⲟⲩⲧⲉ**, see below 1.4.1.3.

1.4.1.1 **ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲥ** plus conjunctive occurs in complementary position only once in this text material, and only in dialect L:

Jn 5, 7

Greek: ἄνθρωπον οὐκ ἔχω ἵνα ὅταν ταραχθῆ τὸ ὕδωρ βάλῃ με εἰς τὴν κολυμβήθραν·

L: ⲡⲏⲏⲧⲣⲟⲙⲉ ⲙⲏⲉϥ ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲥⲉ ⲉⲣⲉⲡⲓⲙⲁϥ ⲛⲁⲧⲱⲗ ⲡⲓⲕⲛⲁⲭⲧ ⲁⲗⲣⲏⲓ ⲁⲧⲕⲟⲗⲱⲙⲉⲛⲉⲃⲣⲁ

S: ⲡⲏⲏⲧⲣⲟⲙⲉ ⲡⲏⲙⲁϥ ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲥ ⲉⲣⲱⲡⲁⲓⲙⲟⲟϥⲧⲱⲗ ⲉⲑⲉⲛⲟⲭⲧ ⲉⲡⲉⲥⲏⲧ ⲉⲧⲕⲟⲗⲱⲙⲉⲛⲉⲃⲣⲁ

That is the very same case as seen with the finals in 1.1.1.1.2, where an interposition comes in between **ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲥ** and the verb form; the interposition is mostly an adverbial clause but in Jn 11, 52 there is an object interposed which results in the **ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲥ**+conjunctive pattern. The fact that this is a complementary rather than a final clause is irrelevant from the point of view of the verb form following **ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲥ** – the same conclusions can be drawn about this pattern as the ones in section 1.1.1.1.2, the conjunctive present after **ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲥ** in final positions. When an adverbial clause, in this case the circumstantial future, divides the conjunction from the verb form, the "apodotic-

resuming role”²³⁸ is very plausible for the conjunctive.²³⁹ The case with the object interposed is more problematic (see 1.1.1.1.2).

In any case, in the S version where the interposition is also present of course, the final clause pattern **κεκακ** plus future 3 remains untouched.

1.4.1.2 The **ζηνακ plus conjunctive** pattern occurs only in dialect M, as can be expected. In complementary position no **ζηνακ** plus future 3 pattern is found, unlike in object position after verbs of exhorting, where both patterns occurred, see 1.2.1.1 and for the **ζηνακ** in finals with future 3 see 1.1.1.1.2 and 1.1.1.1.4.

The only occurrence of the pattern is Mt 12, 14 after the expression **συμβούλιον ἔλαβον**. That expression occurs three times in Matthew and is followed by different patterns, which will be shown below together with the S version:

12, 14

Greek: ἐξεληθόντες δὲ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι συμβούλιον ἔλαβον κατ' αὐτοῦ ὅπως αὐτὸν ἀπολέσωσιν

M: **ζαγει δε εβαλ νση νεφαρικαιος ζαγειρε νογσακνε ερακ ζηνακ νσεροτβε ημακ**

S: **αχιψοκνε εροκ κεκακ εγεμοογτι**

22, 15

Greek: τότε πορευθέντες οἱ Φαρισαῖοι συμβούλιον ἔλαβον ὅπως αὐτὸν παγιδεύσωσιν ἐν λόγῳ

M: **τοτε ζαγωε νεγ νση νεφαρικαιος ζαγειρε νογσακνε ερακ κεκεκ εογεδορο ερακ ζηνογεχε**

S: **αχι ηογωοκνε κεκακ εγεδοπι ζηογωαχε**

27, 1

Greek: συμβούλιον ἔλαβον πάντες οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ κατὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ὥστε θανατῶσαι αὐτόν

²³⁸ SHISHA-HALEVY, 1986: §7.2.6.1.

²³⁹ Diachronically: to the conjunctive standing as apodosis after temporal or conditional clauses in Late Egyptian, see VOLTEN, 1964: 65.

M: **ΖΑΓΕΙΡΕ ΝΟΥΣΑΧΝΕ ΝΘΗ ΝΑΡΧΙΕΡΕΥΣ ΜΗ ΝΕΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΕΡΟΣ ΗΠΑΛΟΣ ΕΪΠΕ ΖΩΣΤΕ ΕΖΑΤΕΩ**

S: **ΛΧΙΩΦΟΧΝΕ ΝΘΗ ΝΑΡΧΙΕΡΕΥΣ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΜΗ ΝΕΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΕΡΟΣ ΗΠΑΛΟΣ ΖΩΣΤΕ ΕΜΟΓΟΥΤ ΗΜΟΙ**

In 12, 14 and 22, 15 the Greek original has ὅπως plus subjunctive final clause pattern in the complementary position, and both M and S translate it in a pattern-to-pattern manner, applying the Coptic final clause pattern; again, while S uses the 'regular' **ΧΕΚΑΣ** plus future 3 pattern, M applies once the **ΧΕΚΕΣ** plus future 3 and once the **ΖΗΝΑΣ** plus conjunctive pattern. As seen in the earlier sections, the latter pattern does not appear in pure final clauses.

However, the Greek Matthew does not only use the final clause pattern after **συμβούλιον ἔλαβον**, but also the ὥστε plus infinitive pattern in 27, 1 – see following section.

1.4.1.3 The ΖΩΣΤΕ + infinitive occurs in complementary/exegetic position after two expressions in the examined translated texts: **συμβούλιον ἔλαβον** only in 27,1 (for the Greek and Coptic sentences see previous section), and **ἔδωκεν ἐξουσίαν** Mt 10, 1.

In the previous section it was shown that final clause patterns were used after **συμβούλιον ἔλαβον** as complementary clauses expressing an aim; in its third occurrence, on the other hand, there is an infinitive of result with ὥστε as introductory particle²⁴⁰ – of course also in complementary position,²⁴¹ and with no difference in meaning. Again, the fact is that the pattern in Coptic is completely determined by the Greek pattern, so the latter should be examined for explanation. Blass and Debrunner also point out that result (real and possible), intended result and purpose are sometimes hard to distinguish and so ἵνα/ὅπως-clauses and the infinitive of result with or without ὥστε tend to occupy each other's places.²⁴² That is what clearly happens in the examples given above where the very same expression, **συμβούλιον ἔλαβον**, with the same meaning and reference induces now the final clause pattern, then the infinitive of result.²⁴³

²⁴⁰ BLASS-DEBRUNNER, 1961: §391.

²⁴¹ In my article (HASZNOS, 2004/2005: 41) I regarded Mt 10, 1 and 27,1 clauses of result, but they are only formally so.

²⁴² BLASS-DEBRUNNER, 1961: §391.

²⁴³ The ambiguity of purpose and result is not at all exclusive for Greek, it exists in Coptic as well (and not only in translations), see LAYTON, 2004: §504.

Although the pattern is syntactically the complement of the expression – i.e. it is not an adverbial clause of purpose or result – the alternation of the surface structure is understandable; it is due to the fact that the expression governing it implies both purpose ('they plotted against him *in order to kill him*') and an intended (hoped) result as well ('they plotted against him *so that he will be killed*').

The other example of the **ῥωττε** + infinitive, this time present only in M, is also quite interesting as the governing expression ἔδωκεν ἐξουσίαν induces 3 different patterns:

Mt 10, 1

Greek: ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων ὥστε ἐκβάλλειν αὐτά

M: ῥαϕτ̄ νεγ̄ ντεζογ̄γιᾱ ἐνιπ̄π̄ν̄ᾱ νακαθαρ̄των ῥωττε̄ ἐριοῡε̄ μιμαγ̄

S: λϕτ̄ ναγ̄ ν̄τεζογ̄γιᾱ ν̄νεπ̄π̄ν̄ᾱ ν̄ακαθαρ̄των ἐνογ̄χ̄ εβοᾱ

The S version applies the **ε** plus infinitive construction without consecutive **ῥωττε**, and the plain infinitive construction is exactly one of the further possibilities (in Jn 1, 12 and 5, 27) after ἔδωκεν ἐξουσίαν:

Jn 1, 12

Greek: ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τέκνα θεοῦ γενέσθαι

S: λϕτ̄ ναγ̄ ν̄τεζογ̄γιᾱ ἐτρεγ̄ωπ̄τε̄ ν̄ωη̄ρε̄ ν̄τεπ̄νογ̄τε̄

And the third possibility is the final clause pattern, in Jn 17, 2:²⁴⁴

Greek: ἔδωκας αὐτῷ ἐξουσίαν πάσης σαρκός ἵνα πᾶν ὃ δέδωκας αὐτῷ δώσῃ αὐτοῖς ζωὴν αἰώνιον

S: ἐντακτ̄ ναγ̄ ν̄τεζογ̄γιᾱ ν̄σαρ̄ξ̄ νιμ̄ χεκᾱς ογ̄ον̄ νιμ̄ ἐντακταλ̄γ̄ ναγ̄ ἐφετ̄ ναγ̄ ν̄ογ̄ων̄η̄ φαε̄νε̄η̄

L: ν̄τακτ̄ νεγ̄ ν̄τεζογ̄γιᾱ ν̄σαρ̄ξ̄ νιμ̄ χεκᾱς ογ̄αν̄ νιμ̄ ν̄τακτε̄ε̄τογ̄ ν̄ηεῑ ειατ̄ νεγ̄ ν̄ογ̄ων̄η̄ φᾱλλη̄η̄ε̄

In the case of ἔδωκεν ἐξουσίαν the same argument can be made about the alternation of **ῥωττε** plus **ε**+infinitive and the final clause pattern as above in the case of

²⁴⁴ I admit that in this particular sentence the clause could be confused with a final clause, but based on a very similar sentence in Marc 11, 28, I am sure this one is also a complementary: τίς σοι ἔδωκεν τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην ἵνα ταῦτα ποιῆς; Coptic: νιμ̄ πενταϕτ̄ νακ̄ ν̄τειε̄ζογ̄γιᾱ χεκᾱς ἐρε̄ ναι

συμβούλιον ἔλαβον. In Greek also the infinitive can follow this expression and when it does, it is normally translated into Coptic with the **ε** plus infinitive, see section 1.4.1.

In the examined original writings, this pattern occurs once in complementary position, after **ἦπφα**:

Theodore, *Instruction* 3 41, 26:

ΑΛΛΑΝ ἦπφα ζωστε ετρενῖρωϩ ἦπενζισε

The first half of the sentence and thus the whole sentence structure is the same as 50, 30-31 (seen in 1.4.1 above) **τῆπῆζμοτ (ἦτοοτῆ)**²⁴⁵ **ἦτῆπνογτε πειωτ ἦπενχοεic ic** **πεῶε χεαλααν ...**; so the **ε**+infinitive pattern and the **ζωστε ε**+infinitive pattern are equivalents and in paradigm after **ἦπφα**, though the latter is far less frequent in this text corpus. The occurrence of **ζωστε** in complementary position reminds us of the pattern used in translated Coptic texts where the Greek original **ὥστε** plus infinitive of result induced this Coptic form. This use of **ζωστε** by Theodore, then, might be an imitation of translated Coptic literature, the NT, where through Greek influence not only real result infinitives but also complementary and exegetic ones had sometimes a **ζωστε** before them; in the examined translated (and Greek) texts the expression **ἵκανός/ ἄξιός/ ἦπφα** does not take **ζωστε** plus infinitive, although it exactly expresses a "consequence resulting from some quality",²⁴⁶ which explains why Theodore might have used the complementary **ζωστε ε**+infinitive pattern after that word.

1.4.2 The Conjunctive is used A) once in original texts in this syntactical position:

Pachom, *Spiteful* 11, 19-20

ω πεβιηη ππαγτε παι ηῖρῆρηιον

In the translated material it occurs only in dialect L twice, of which 16, 2 is closely related in meaning to the Pachom-place:

Greek: **ἔρχεται ὧρα ἵνα πας ὁ ἀποκτείνας ὑμᾶς δόξη λατρεῖαν προσφέρειν τῷ θεῷ**

L: cῆnhῆ xioγoγnoγ ἦτεoγaη ηηη ετῆaηoγoγτ ἦηωτῆ ηεεγε χε εῖρηε ἦoγῆῶε ἦπnoγτε

²⁴⁵ present only in 41, 25

²⁴⁶ The term is used by BLASS-DEBRUNNER, 1961: §379 in connection with qualitative-consecutive relative clauses.

The conjunctive in the Pachom-sentence could just as well be put among the subject-expansions²⁴⁷ but can also be analyzed as a complementary or exegetical 'expansion' of the nominal sentence ΠΝΑΥΤΕ ΠΑΙ. That similarity, sometimes overlap, is why the conjunctive in subject position in M (1.3.3.3) will also be discussed here.

The conjunctive as subject or subject expansion has historical roots in the Egyptian language, this is one of the syntactic positions where Volten was speaking of the "pseudo"-conjunctive,²⁴⁸ differentiating it from the classical continuing conjunctive:

Pap. Spiegelberg X₁₃₋₁₄: *jn p3 shn nfr mtw=j tj* "is it the best counsel that I let (the army of Egypt arm itself?)"

An example from the M Matthew where the conjunctive is used similarly, where both Greek and S have the infinitive construction (also 18, 7; 18, 8; 18, 9) is 17, 4:

ΝΑΝΟΥΣ ΝΕΝ ΝΤΝΩ ΗΠΕΙΕ

And another, where Greek and S have the final clause pattern, while M still uses the conjunctive (also 5, 30 and 18, 6) is 5, 29:

ΣΡΗΛΦΡΕ ΓΑΡ ΝΕΚ ΝΤΕΟΥΣ ΝΝΕΚΜΕΛΟΣ ΤΑΚΑ

The Pachom-sentence also joins this group, where again the conjunctive expands the subject, in this case of a nominal sentence. In Shisha-Halevy's classification this use of the conjunctive is the "sequencing prospective „that"-form"²⁴⁹ which in his view is the successor of the old prospective „that"-forms *sdm.w=f* and *sdm=f*, rather than of an ancient use of the conjunctive.²⁵⁰

B) A different case is Jn 13, 10

Greek: οὐκ ἔχει χρεῖαν εἰ μὴ τοὺς πόδας νίψασθαι

L: **Ἰὴϛ̄ϛ̄ϛ̄ϛ̄ϛ̄ ρ̄η εἰμητι Ἰ̄ϛ̄ιανερ̄ογ̄ριτε**

S: **Ἰ̄ϛ̄ϛ̄ϛ̄ϛ̄ ρ̄η εἰμητι εἰα νερογερ̄ητε**

where there is an εἰμητι interposed between 'he does not need' and 'to wash', which very probably is the cause for the conjunctive rather than the infinitive. In the L John, both other occurrences (2, 25; 16, 30) of χρεῖαν ἔχω have the final clause pattern **κεκαλε** future 2, following the Greek pattern. No conjunctive occurs otherwise with that

²⁴⁷ For the conjunctive in this position as part of the entity statement group, see LAYTON, 2004: §§486-487.

²⁴⁸ VOLTEN, 1964: 61.

²⁴⁹ And within that "an appositive theme in a delocutive nominal sentence: ΠΑΙΚΛΙΟΝ/ΟΥΔΙΚΛΙΟΝ ΠΕ +conj", SHISHA-HALEVY, 1995: 313.

expression. It is very similar to the **ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲥ** plus conjunctive cases, seen in 1.1.1.1.2, where there is an interposition between **ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲥ** and the verb form which then turns from future 3 to the conjunctive. However, this interposed **Ⲉⲓⲙⲏⲧⲓ** does not seem to cause any syntactical changes in S, where the **Ⲉ** + infinitive (though the first **Ⲉ** is missing through haplography) stands after the expression **ⲡⲭⲣⲓⲁ**, following the Greek *Vorlage*.

CONCLUSIONS

1. In the translated texts, all three dialects have very close pattern-to-pattern translations this time, and they all use the final clause pattern in the majority of the cases when Greek has the final clause. Dialect L has most variety in the final clause pattern now, dialect M varies the **ⲒⲒⲛⲁⲥ** +conjunctive and the **ⲭⲉⲕⲉⲥ**+future 3 patterns, and S again is the most consistent and pattern-strict using basically the **ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲥ**+future 3 pattern to translate Greek **ἕλϰ/ὄπως** +subjunctives.
2. The **ⲒⲒⲛⲁⲥ** plus conjunctive pattern appears here as well, only in dialect M. It seems to be used in M exclusively for object and complementary clauses expressing an aim, not for pure final clauses.
3. The **Ⲓⲱⲥⲧⲉ** plus infinitive pattern occurs in translations, where the Greek original has it. That is thus again a Greek syntactical influence, caused by the pattern-to-pattern translation technique. In Greek it is originally a consecutive pattern, but as purpose and result are sometimes mixed, that pattern is sometimes mixed with final patterns, even in places where the syntactic position is not a real final or consecutive one, but an object or complementary one. In the examined material the Coptic translators follow the pattern rather than the sense, using the final clause pattern in non-final positions and using the consecutive pattern in non-result and non-final but complementary positions.
4. Behind the appearance of the **Ⲓⲱⲥⲧⲉ** **Ⲉ** + infinitive pattern in complementary position in original writings, Greek syntactical influence might be detected, it may be an example of the stylistic influence the NT translations had on the original Coptic literature; another possibility is naturally that the pattern was already part of the Coptic idiom through hellenization, thus was used by both translators and authors. Its sole occurrence in Theodore does not seem to support the latter possibility. The pattern is otherwise rather scarcely represented in the examined corpus (both translated and original).

²⁵⁰ SHISHA-HALEVY, 1995: 312-313.

5. In original writings, the final clause patterns do not appear in complementary/epexegetic position. The infinitive constructions are used in almost every case.
6. The appearance and extensive use of the final clause pattern in complementary/epexegetic position only happens in translated Coptic in the examined text material; its use is again translation induced.
7. The conjunctive in subject (expansion) and complementary position is not new, examples of it can be seen already in Late Egyptian. In the examined text material rather few of these conjunctives are present, but it occurs in both translated and original Coptic texts.

2. Clauses/Infinitives of Result

As a next group, the clauses of result will be studied in the examined text corpus, also collecting features in common and differences between the translated and the original Coptic writings. Some clauses of conceived result are also grouped here, where again ἵνα/ ὅπως-clauses appear in the Greek original. Also, I am referring to sections 1.1.1.2.3 where the ambiguity of purpose and result has been discussed.

2.1 Clause of Result or Infinitive of Result? A consecutive clause in Greek takes either the indicative or the infinitive after ὥστε,²⁵¹ the former expressing the actual result, the latter a possible or expected result.²⁵² In the NT idiom, however, this distinction had probably disappeared as the indicative is very rare, the infinitive dominating throughout: in the examined text corpus the indicative appears only once (Jn 3, 16), and according to De Witt Burton, this is the only place in the NT where the ὥστε with the indicative is in clearly subordinate position.²⁵³ In the NT books, not only the ὥστε plus infinitive but also the infinitive in itself can express result:²⁵⁴ in the examined NT books there is an εἶς τό plus infinitive in Romans 1, 20 expressing result. The question now inevitably arises, whether one can speak about a 'clause' here, with conjunction plus governed verb form or ὥστε is really an introductory particle²⁵⁵ for the infinitive of result. This question is relevant, among others, because it arises also in the case of Coptic consecutives.²⁵⁶ Definitely clauses are – as always – the ἵνα / ὅπως plus subjunctives found as clauses of conceived result in this material (Mt 23, 35; Jn 9, 2).

2.2 In the translated texts, the **Greek – Coptic equivalents** are as follows:

²⁵¹ BORNEMANN-RISCH, 1999: §275; DE WITT BURTON, 1898: §234; BLASS-DEBRUNNER, 1961: §391; PORTER, 1992: §2.2 (the latter two discuss basically the infinitive of result).

²⁵² BORNEMANN-RISCH, 1999: §275; DE WITT BURTON, 1898: §235.

²⁵³ DE WITT BURTON, 1898: §236; cf. also: "The use of the indicative after ὥστε in really dependent clauses, possible in Attic, is not genuine NT idiom." BLASS-DEBRUNNER, 1961: §391.

²⁵⁴ BLASS-DEBRUNNER, 1961: §391, 4.

²⁵⁵ BLASS-DEBRUNNER, 1961: §391.

fig. 35

S	ⲗⲱⲥⲧⲉ	ⲗⲱⲥⲧⲉ	ⲗⲱⲥⲧⲉ	ⲭⲎⲔⲔⲔ	ⲭⲎ	Ⲏ +
Coptic	Ⲏ + inf	conj	pf 1	fut 3	fut 3	inf
Greek						
ὥστε inf	10	2	-	-	-	-
ὥστε indicative	-	-	1	-	-	-
ὅπως subj	-	-	-	1	-	-
ἵνα subj	-	-	-	1	1	-
ἕως τό inf	-	-	-	-	-	1

fig. 36

L Coptic	ⲗⲱⲥⲧⲉ	ⲭⲎⲔⲔⲎ
Greek	pf 1	fut 3
ὥστε ind	1	-
ἵνα subj	-	1

fig. 37

M Coptic	ⲗⲱⲥⲧⲉ	ⲗⲱⲥⲧⲉ	ⲭⲎⲔⲔⲔ
Greek	Ⲏ + inf	conj	fut 3
ὥστε inf	1	9	-
ὅπως subj	-	-	1

It is clear that where the Greek original has the 'traditional' ὥστε plus infinitive (or indicative), then the Coptic also takes the loanword ⲗⲱⲥⲧⲉ and uses it together with either the Ⲏ + infinitive or the conjunctive when the Greek has an infinitive, or with a *verbum finitum* (perfect 1 here) when the Greek has the indicative.

²⁵⁶ On consecutive clauses in the Coptic NT see my article, HASZNOS, 2004/2005, where they are called clauses.

Jn 3, 16 (the sole indicative)

Οὕτως γὰρ ἠγάπησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν κόσμον, ὥστε τὸν υἱὸν τὸν μονογεῆ
ἔδωκεν

S: ΤΑΙ ΓΑΡ ΤΕ ΘΕ ΕΝΤΑΠΠΟΥΓΤΕΜΕΡΕ ΠΚΟΣΜΟΣ ΖΩΣΤΕ ΠῶΦΗΡΕ ΠῶΓΩΤ ΛΗΤΑΛΛ

L: ΤΕΕΙ ΓΑΡ ΤΕ ΘΕ ΝΤΑΠΠΟΥΓΤΕΪΡΡΕ ΠΚΟΣΜΟΣ ΖΩΣΤΕ ΠῶΦΗΡΕ ΠῶΓΩΤ ΛΗΤΕΕΛ

Mt 15,33 (infinitive in Coptic)

Πόθεν ἡμῖν ἐν ἐρημίᾳ ἄρτοι τοσοῦτοι ὥστε χορτάσαι ὄχλον τοσοῦτον;

S: ΕΝΝΑΖΕ ΕΤΕΙΑΦΗ ΝΟΕΙΚ ΤΩΝ ΖΗΠΕΙΧΑΙΕ ΖΩΣΤΕ ΕΤΣΙΕ ΟΥΜΗΦΕ ΝΤΕΙΒΟΤ

M: ΑΝΝΕΘΝ ΟΥΑΦΕ ΟΥΝ ΝΑΙΚ ΤΟΝ ΖΗΠΕΙΜΑΝΧΑΙΗ ΖΩΣΤΕ ΕΤΣΙΕ ΠΕΙΜΗΦΕ ΝΤΕΙΒΑΤ

Mt 27,14 (conjunctive in Coptic)

Καὶ οὐκ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ πρὸς οὐδὲ ἐν ῥῆμα ὥστε θαυμάζειν τὸν ἡγεμόνα
λίαν

S: ΝΤΟΦ ΔΕ ΜΠΕΦΟΥΦΩΒ ΝΑΛΛΑΥ ΝΦΑΧΕ· ΖΩΣΤΕ ΝΦΡΩΠΗΡΕ ΝΦΙ ΠΖΗΓΕΜΩΝ ΕΜΑΤΕ

M: ΜΠΧΧΕΟΥΦ ΝΕΦ ΝΟΥΣΕΧΕ ΜΜΕΤΕ· ΖΩΣΤΕ ΝΤΕ ΠΖΗΓΕΜΑΝ ΕΡΩΠΗΡΕ ΕΜΑΦΑ

First of all, it is again evident that the Coptic translations are very close to the original, the Greek syntactic patterns are followed. The Coptic **ε** plus infinitive is of course the precise translation equivalent of the Greek infinitive, as seen throughout the study, the conjunctive, on the other hand, raises some questions.

2.3 The infinitive construction and the conjunctive after ΖΩΣΤΕ can be found both in translated and in original Coptic writings. Shisha-Halevy, when studying Shenoute's idiom, remarks: "The conjunctive after ΖΩΣΤΕ is in paradigm with **ε**- infinitive and the "that"-form **ΕΤΡΕΦΩΤΗ**; the conjunctive usually expresses an *intended* consequence, whereas **ΕΤΡΕΦ** conveys the meaning of a consequence naturally or automatically ensuing, objective, unintentional and even undesirable" with the footnote: "Somewhat like the Greek opposition of ὥστε + finite verb vs. ὥστε + infinitive".²⁵⁷ Although the opposition in Greek is not 'intended/not intended', but rather 'real or actual/ not real'.

In the translations there can be no aspiration to follow an opposition present in classical Greek (see 2.1) as the Greek itself has almost only the infinitive, as seen above, and where it does have a *verbum finitum* to express a very real result, then the Coptic also translates with a conjugated verb form with time reference, rather than the "atemporal"²⁵⁸ conjunctive. It is also remarkable that in the NT, the S and M versions differ substantially as S applies basically the **ε** plus infinitive, only in two places the conjunctive after ΖΩΣΤΕ

²⁵⁷ SHISHA-HALEVY, 1986: §7.3.1.1 and fn. 73.

(Mt 13, 32; 27, 14), whereas M applies the conjunctive after **ζωστε** nine times and the **ε** plus infinitive only once (Mt 15, 33). The two places where (also) S has the conjunctive are no different semantically, no more real or intended than all other consecutives (eg. Mt 13, 2; 13, 54 and 15, 30 are also past tense contexts like 27, 14 and S has the infinitive construction), and the only feature in common, which is not present in the other consecutives is the presence of the **ἴσῃ** construction in the sentence:

Mt 13,32

Καὶ γίνεται δένδρον, ὥστε ἐλθεῖν τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ κατασκηνοῦν ἐν τοῖς κλάδοις αὐτοῦ

S: **ϰαϰῤῥ οὔνοϰ ἴϰοοϰε· ἴϰωϰε εὔνοϰ ἴϰἡ· ζωϰτε ἴϰεεἰ ἴϰἡζαατε ἴϰτε**

Mt 27,14

Καὶ οὐκ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ πρὸς οὐδε ἐν ῥῆμα ὥστε θαυμάζειν τὸν ἡγεμόνα λίαν

S: **ἴτοϰ δε ἡπεροϰωϰε ἡααϰ ἡϰαϰε· ζωϰτε ἡϰρωϰἡρε ἡἰ ἡζἡεῖων εῖατε**

In the S translation of the NT then, the basic translation equivalent of the ὥστε plus infinitive is the **ζωστε** plus **ε** + infinitive, a precise pattern-to-pattern translation, which is in complementary distribution with the conjunctive – the latter being used when the nominal subject must be expressed after the verb form and so **ἴσῃ** is employed,²⁵⁹ evidently to follow the Greek word order.²⁶⁰

In the original texts, on the other hand, this opposition does not work; in Pachom's *Fragments* there are two **ζωστε** plus conjunctive constructions (28a,11; 29b,24), in *Spiteful* there is one (3,12), in Horsiese's *Regulations* there are two (90, 8; 90, 18) all of them without **ἴσῃ**. In the examined Shenoute-texts only the **ε** + infinitive follows **ζωστε** so the opposition there cannot be examined. Theodore, however, is very similar to the S NT in using the **ζωστε** plus conjunctive construction only when there is **ἴσῃ** (*Instr* 3 40, 24 **ζωστε ἡῤῥωτ ἡἰπεινοϰ ἡτεἰμἡνε ερατοὔ ἡἡκοϰἡκοἡ; 40, 30 ζωστε ἡῤῥαὔ ἡἰπετοὔεϰἡῤῥεϰωῡα**). It should be examined therefore whether another conditioning factor for infinitive construction/conjunctive can be found. Looking at the sentences from a semantic point of view, I think a good system of real (actual, has happened) result/expected or generally true (not yet happened) result evolves, for example:

²⁵⁸ SHISHA-HALEVY, 1995: 301.

²⁵⁹ Or the other way around, according to Depuydt: 1993: 42-43, the **ἴσῃ** is employed because of the conjunctive so that the nominal subject does not get in between the two verbs, as they very closely belong together. That, however, does not explain the use of the conjunctive after consecutive **ζωστε**.

Spiteful 3, 12 (past narrative context, the result also happened in the past)

ἀγενῶσαι ... ἐψάλλειβι ἡμοὶ φαντεπαζήτ παλαε ζωστε ἵταμεεγε χεῖνταβου
αν τε εαζερατ

Fragments 28a, 11 (past narrative context, the result also happened in the past)

αϕωνε ρῖουνοβ ἡωνε ζωστε ἡϕωπε ρῖουεκτασις

In these (and most other cases of the conjunctive), I would not speak of the results being "intended"²⁶¹ but they actually happened as a result of the action in the main clause.

The results expressed by the ζωστε plus ε+ infinitive pattern, on the other hand, seem to have a general or a future reference, and they have not yet been realized, for example:

Fragments 29a, 3-4

οϕτε παι παωρη ετρεκει ζωωκ εζραι επειμα ζωστε ετρεγκρινε ἡμοκ

Having discussed the consecutives in the Greek NT idiom and the loss of the classical Greek system of real/expected result = indicative/infinitive, infinitives being used in the great majority of the cases, NT Greek cannot really be the source of such a distinction. Additionally, when Greek did employ the indicative on one occasion, then Coptic translated it with a perfect I rather than a conjunctive. It follows from that that the infinitive/conjunctive distinction after ζωστε is either an inner development of the language,²⁶² or it is a non-translation influence of the Greek language which happened in the long bilingual situation ("primäre Hellenisierung"²⁶³), not through translations of the NT – that, however is impossible either to prove or to refute. It is also a question why the conjunctive is used for real result, which took place in the past following from the happenings in the past narrative of the main clause, rather than a past conjugated verb form, for instance a perfect I. That leads us to the next section.

2.3.1 The conjunctive after ζωστε and other Greek conjunctions / particles / modifiers. Besides the distribution of the infinitive vs. conjunctive after ζωστε, the function, meaning or origin of the conjunctive after that and other Greek conjunctions needs to be discussed. In the examined text material the conjunctive was seen in the S

²⁶⁰ About the importance of word order and its reproduction, cf. BROCK, 1979: 81.

²⁶¹ SHISHA-HALEVY, 1986: §7.3.1.1.

²⁶² This whole system of consecutives is a late phenomenon in the language, and again an analytic form; in classical Egyptian, result was expressed occasionally with the *sḏm=f* form, "virtual clause of result"; the *jl* particle with *sḏm=f* which expresses mostly "desired future consequence"; or with the *sḏm.jn=f* verb form which indicates sequel in past narratives or less frequently it is used "to name or describe a consequence to take place in the future" (GARDINER, 1957³: §§220, 228, 429).

²⁶³ NAGEL, 1971: 334.

dialect only after **μηποτε** and **ζωστε**, its appearance after the Coptic conjunction **κεκας**, only with an interposed adverbial clause,²⁶⁴ has been discussed, see 1.1.1.1.2 and 1.4.1.1.1. In dialect M it was seen employed after **μηποτε**/ **μηπως**, **ζινας** and **ζωστε**.²⁶⁵ After the negative final **μηποτε** / **μηπως** the conjunctive is invariably used, in both S and M; dialect M uses more Greek conjunction+conjunctive patterns than S in the given material, it prefers conjunctive after **ζωστε** as opposed to S where the **ε**+infinitive is the regular form, and M employs also **ζινας** – not used in literary S – with the conjunctive, thus standing closer to dialect B.²⁶⁶

After **ζωστε** the conjunctive is in paradigm with the **ε** plus infinitive, see 2.3. Depuydt was of the opinion that this use of the conjunctive is new, came "with the advent of Greek influence on Egyptian"²⁶⁷ and did not study it when discussing the function of the verb form in the "conjunctive chain".²⁶⁸ Shisha-Halevy, on the other hand, states that this is the "sequencing prospective „that“-form" in which we can see the survival of the old prospective „that" *s_{dm}.w=f* and the so-called prospective *s_{dm}=f*, – although it is not clear how the conjunctive overtook this function – and one of the cases where the conjunctive is in this syntactic status is the "post-conjunctive and post-adverbial „coupling" clause form: **αρηγ**+conj, **ζωστε**/ **μηποτε** +conj, **κε**+conj".²⁶⁹ This is one group then, a Greek conjunction + conjunctive;²⁷⁰ the conjunctive is neutral in its semantic properties in this position and the 'meaning' is given by the conjunction, thus they together build up a new unit²⁷¹ and a semantic field, final or consecutive or even an object or complementary position after certain verbs and expressions. That is why Shisha-Halevy's phrasing is very adequate: "post-conjunctive and post-adverbial „coupling" clause form".²⁷² The **ζωστε**, when standing with the conjunctive then, is different from the **ζωστε** before the infinitive construction because in the latter it has only "semantisch präzisierende

²⁶⁴ In dialect L there is one case (Jn 11,52) where the interposition is the emphasized object, rather than an adverbial clause, the precise role of that conjunctive is still questionable (see earlier, 1.1.1.1.2).

²⁶⁵ The conjunctive after Greek conjunctions in S and B, STERN, 1880: §448.

²⁶⁶ cf. STERN, 1880: §448 on B using **ζινα** and S not.

²⁶⁷ DEPUYDT, 1993:13.

²⁶⁸ DEPUYDT, 1993: 5-6.

²⁶⁹ SHISHA-HALEVY, 1995: 313.

²⁷⁰ In the present study they can be found in the following sections: 1.1.1.1.3: finals – **μηποτε** / **μηπως** +conj; 1.2.1.1: object position – in M **ζινας** +conj; 1.4.1.2: complementary position – in M **ζινας** +conj; 2.3: consecutive – **ζωστε**+conj.

²⁷¹ As Shisha-Halevy puts it: "a modifier preceding a non-autonomous verb form to create a new autonomous whole" SHISHA-HALEVY, 1986: §7.3.1.1.

²⁷² SHISHA-HALEVY, 1995: 313.

Funktion²⁷³ as the ε+infinitive can in itself express result not only with the support of the introductory particle.

2.4 Final clause patterns can be found in the Greek original as ἵνα/ὅπως + subjunctive and – as can be expected – are translated into Coptic with the final clause patterns **ⲬⲎⲔⲐⲥ/ⲬⲎ** + future 3. Their number is rather small, one final clause pattern of result occurs in each examined NT book:

Mt 23, 35 (main clause in verse 34)

Greek: (...) καὶ διώξετε ἀπὸ πόλεως εἰς πόλιν ὅπως ἔλθῃ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς πᾶν αἷμα δίκαιον

S: ⲢⲦⲦⲦⲢⲠⲠⲠ ⲢⲦⲠⲠⲠ ⲬⲎⲎⲠⲠⲠⲠⲠ ⲎⲠⲠⲠⲠ ⲬⲎⲔⲐⲥ ⲎⲎⲎⲎ ⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎ ⲢⲎⲎⲎ ⲠⲢⲠⲠⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎ ⲢⲎⲎⲎ ⲠⲢⲠⲠⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎ

M: ⲢⲦⲦⲦⲢⲠⲠⲠⲎⲎ ⲢⲢⲠⲠⲎ ⲎⲎⲎⲎ ⲬⲢⲢⲠⲠⲠⲠⲠⲠ ⲎⲎⲠⲠⲠⲠⲠ ⲬⲎⲔⲐⲥ ⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎ ⲢⲢⲎⲎ ⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎ ⲎⲎⲎⲎ ⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎ ⲢⲦⲦⲦ ⲢⲢⲠⲠⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎ

Here, the reference of the whole sentence is future, it is not something that has actually happened, but rather a prophecy, thus the result expressed in the clause is not actual but imagined; it will be realized if/when the actions in the main clause have been realized.

Jn 9, 2

Greek: τίς ἡμαρτεν οὗτος ἢ οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ ἵνα τυφλὸς γεννηθῆι;

S: ⲢⲢⲎⲎ ⲢⲎⲢⲠⲠⲠⲢⲢⲢⲎⲎⲎ ⲢⲢⲢⲎⲎ ⲬⲢⲎ ⲢⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎ ⲬⲎⲔⲐⲥ ⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎⲠⲠⲠ ⲎⲎⲎⲎ ⲢⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎ

L: ⲢⲢⲢⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎ ⲢⲦⲦⲦⲢⲢⲢⲎⲎⲎⲎ ⲢⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎ ⲬⲢⲎ ⲢⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎ ⲬⲎⲔⲐⲥ ⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎ ⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎ

In this case the meaning implied is: it is a known fact that he is blind – the question is, whether this fact is at all the result of somebody sinning, i.e. the cause/antecedent is inferred, the question being provocative.

Rm 11, 11

Greek: μὴ ἑπταίσαν ἵνα πέσωσιν;

S: ⲢⲦⲦⲦⲬⲎⲠⲠⲢⲢⲎ ⲬⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎⲎ

In all these instances, one is dealing with a conceived result – let me quote De Witt Burton's observations here: "The relation of thought between the fact expressed in the principal clause and that expressed in the clause of conceived result introduced by ἵνα is that of cause and effect, but it is recognized by the speaker that this relation is one of

²⁷³ NAGEL, 1971: 349.

theory or inference rather than of observed fact. In some cases the effect is actual and observed, the cause is inferred. So, e.g., John 9:2. In other cases the cause is observed, the effect is inferred. So, e.g., 1 Thess. 5:4. In all the cases the action of the principal clause is regarded as the necessary condition of that of the subordinate clause, the action of the subordinate clause as the result which is to be expected to follow from that of the principal clause.²⁷⁴

In the original material one **xe+** future 3 and one **xeκac** + future 2 pattern was found with consecutive meaning:

Pachom, *Spiteful* 17, 26-27

ΤΕΝΟΥ ΟΥ ΠΕΤΚΩΛΑΤ ΗΜΟΙ ΧΕΚΕΡΦΩΗΜΟ ΕΡΟΙ;

Here, on the other hand, the situation and the result is real, it is happening now, **τενου**, that the monk is becoming a stranger, through the anger in his heart. It is thus not a conceived result.

Horsiese, *Instruction* 7 77, 5

ΕΚΩΦΤ ... ΦΑΝΤΕΚΘΗΤΕΥΚΕΡΙΑ ΝΗΤ ΝΑΩ ΝΗΕΤΖΑΠΕΚΤΩΠ ΖΙΖΟΥΗ ΝΤΕΚΩΤΗΗ ΧΕΚΑΚ ΕΡΕΠΝΟΥΓΤΕ ΖΩΩΚ ΗΠΠΕΦΧΡΣ ΙΣ ΝΑΠΩΖΤ ΝΤΕΦΟΡΗΗ ΗΠΠΕΦΩΝΤ ΕΖΡΑΙ ΕΧΩΚ

There is future reference in this clause, the result will definitely happen if the monk continues his habitual behaviour.

2.5 The ε plus infinitive pattern occurs in the translated material only once when the Greek original has an infinitive without *ὥστε* and with *εἰς τό* to express result.²⁷⁵

Rm 1, 20

Greek: τὰ γὰρ ἀόρατα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου τοῖς ποιήμασιν νοούμενα καθορᾶται ἢ τε ἀίδιος αὐτοῦ δύναμις καὶ θειότης εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἀναπολογήτους

S: ΝΕΦΠΕΘΗΠ ΓΑΡ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΗΠΣΩΝΤ ΗΠΚΟΣΜΟΣ· ΖΗΝΕΦΤΑΜΙΟ ΕΥΝΟΕΙ ΗΜΟΟΥ· ΣΕΝΑΥ ΕΡΟΟΥ ΕΤΕ ΤΕΦΩΝΤΕ ΦΑΕΝΕΖ ΗΠΤΕΦΗΗΤΝΟΥΓΤΕ ΕΤΡΕΥΦΩΠΕ ΕΗΗΤΟΥ ΦΑΧΕ ΗΜΑΥ ΕΧΩ

In the original texts the **ε+infinitive** construction occurs to express result more often, for example:

Theodore, *Instruction* 3 50, 1

ΤΕΝΟΥΘΕ ΗΗΨΑΝΑΙ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΛΥΦΙΝΕ ΗΣΑΚΤΟΟΥ ΕΤΡΕΥΓΧΡΟΠ ΗΝΕΝΤΑΥΕΙ ΕΡΑΤΟΥ

²⁷⁴ DE WITT BURTON, 1898: §219.

²⁷⁵ BLASS-DEBRUNNER, 1961: §391, 4.

Shenoute, *Monast disc* 145, 3

ΑΝΟΚ ΔΕ ΝΕΙΟ ΗΠΑΧΘΕΙΣ ΑΝΤΕ ΕΤΡΑΠΩΤ ΝΤΟΟΤΟΥ ΝΗΕΤΧΙ ΝΗΟΙ ΝΘΟΝΣ

From the two examples it is evident that both real result – in the first instance – and conceived result can be expressed by the infinitive construction, the Shenoute-sentence clearly has a 'real' cause in the main clause ('I was not in control of myself') and the result is inferred, it would have been realized if the cause had not been negative (the real result would be 'I was in control of myself so that I could run away from them').

2.6 **ΦΑΝΤΕ**, the Coptic limitative sometimes has consecutive meaning.²⁷⁶ In the examined text corpus, this can be found only in the original Coptic writings:

Spiteful 10, 11

ΠΑΙ ΝΤΑΦΛΩΝΙΖΕ ΟΥΒΕΠΧΩΖΗ ΦΑΝΤΕΦΡΡΡΟ ΕΧΝΝΕΦΧΑΧΕ

Spiteful 11, 20

Η ΝΓΡΘΕ ΝΟΥΚΩΖΤ ΦΑΝΤΕΚΡΩΚΖ ΝΤΚΑΚΙΑ ΤΗΡΣ

Shenoute, *Monast disc* 143, 7

ΑΥΩ ΗΠΕΝΕΤΗΜΑΥ ΕΙ ΦΑΝΤΕΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΩΝΗΤ ΕΡΟΟΥ ΝΚΤΡΕΥΘΚ ΕΠΕCΗΤ ΕΑΗΝΤΕ ΕΥΘΝΖ

It is not always evident whether the limitative or the consecutive meaning is to be understood, or both can be acceptable in some sentences.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Also in this case, Coptic has pattern-to-pattern translation in the examined NT books. In fact, there is no deviation from the Greek pattern at all, when there is an indicative after **ὥστε**, the Coptic also applies a conjugated verb form with time reference (perfect 1), when there is a final clause pattern, the Coptic translates with one.

2. The appearance of the final clause pattern in translations is due to the Greek pattern and the translation technique.

3. In translations, the final clause pattern in consecutives only appears when the Greek original employs it; since the Greek uses it only with clauses of conceived result, in

²⁷⁶ TILL, 1961: §312.

translated Coptic only in clauses of conceived result do we find the final clause pattern. In original writings, a clause of real result can have a final clause pattern occasionally.²⁷⁷

4. Although the ϵ +infinitive construction seems to be a proper way of expressing result, since the Coptic authors employ it, in the translations this only occurs when the Greek original employs an infinitive of result without $\acute{\omega}\sigma\tau\epsilon$. That, together with the last point, results again in a significant stylistic difference between translated and original Coptic writings. And again shows the strong pattern-to-pattern translation technique.

5. In the NT translations $\phi\lambda\alpha\eta\tau\epsilon$ is not used to translate a Greek consecutive form. In the present material it only occurs as consecutive pattern in the original writings.

6. All three dialects follow the Greek pattern in this case, no deviations occur even in M. This is the only examined clause-type where this happens, and this shows well that this pattern was an organic part of the language as a whole.

²⁷⁷ cf. "ambiguity of purpose and result" LAYTON, 2004: §504.

FINAL CONCLUSIONS

At the end of the study, it will be concluded that Greek syntax had influence on Coptic syntax. The patterns for final clauses/infinitives, object and subject clauses/infinitives and clauses/infinitives of result were all influenced by the Greek means of expression in these. The separation of the two text types, translated literary idiom and original literary idiom showed that significant differences exist between the choice of pattern of the two. That subsequently shows that certain Greek-influenced phenomena are evidently the result of the translation activity, remaining confined to the translation idiom; others are used by the Coptic authors as well – in this case two possible reasons may be, a) the text of the NT translations influenced their idiom, or b) these patterns were known and used due to the long bilingual situation.

1. In the examined texts, several syntactic patterns were found which are used *only* in the translated material and follow precisely the Greek syntactic pattern, even though it has no 'past' in the Egyptian language: $\chi\epsilon\kappa\alpha\kappa$ +fut 3 (fut 2)/ $\chi\epsilon$ +fut 3/ $\zeta\iota\eta\alpha\kappa$ +fut 3/ $\zeta\iota\eta\alpha\kappa$ +conj (i.e. final clause patterns) in object and subject position after certain expressions which take the final clause pattern in NT Greek also, and in complementary position $\zeta\omega\upsilon\tau\epsilon$ ϵ +infinitive pattern is added to these. The Coptic translation idiom is thus different from the original writings syntactically-stylistically; really telling are the cases where there is a NT-quotation in a Coptic author and the syntactic pattern is different from the one used normally by that author: e.g. 1) in Shenoute a quotation from the NT (Mt 9, 38) in *Ad phil* 59, 2 where there is a $\chi\epsilon\kappa\alpha\kappa$ +fut 3 clause in object position after the verb $\kappa\omicron\tau\iota\kappa$ which always takes the infinitive construction as object in Shenoute and the other authors, 2) also in Shenoute, a $\chi\epsilon$ +fut 3 pattern is found in subject position after $\bar{\epsilon}\zeta\omega$ quoted from Mt 10, 25 in *Ad phil* 59, 30, where normally an infinitive construction (more rarely circumstantial present, conditional) is employed in original Coptic – these are exactly the cases where the translated Coptic texts differ substantially as they again follow or rather copy the Greek pattern and use final clause patterns where they would not be used in Egyptian. The question of how 'natural' the Coptic translations were arises. The motivation for a very literal, in our case let us call it pattern-to-pattern, translation is the sacred nature of the text whose language is considered inspired and sacred (cf. Jerome: 'where even word order is a mystery'²⁷⁸), thus has to be put into any

²⁷⁸ In his Letter to Pammachius, cited from BROCK, 1979: 69-70.

other language very precisely,²⁷⁹ "to bring the reader to the original" and not "the original to the reader".²⁸⁰ Just as in the case of the Hebrew Old Testament, whose Greek translation was also "accepted as inspired"²⁸¹ and was not to be altered.²⁸² Ἐπεὶ καλῶς καὶ ὁσίως διηρμήνευται καὶ κατὰ πᾶν ἠκριβομένως, καλῶς ἔχον ἔστιν ἵνα διαμείνῃ ταῦθ' οὕτως ἔχοντα, καὶ μὴ γένηται μηδεμία διασκευή.²⁸³

It is thus a chosen technique, not some kind of incompetence in Coptic stylistics and syntax, to copy the given Greek patterns; the translators knowingly create in many cases non-Coptic-like but necessarily very Greek-like patterns, and thus sentences, in their texts. As Sebastian Brock points out, the translator has to make a decision at the beginning of his work about what technique he will follow, *sensus de sensu* or *verbum e verbo*; the criteria for his choice are 1. the nature of the text he is translating, 2. the relative prestige of the two languages concerned and 3. the extent to which the source language is still widely known.²⁸⁴ In the bilingual land of Egypt, Greek was naturally known by everyone, though evidently not spoken by all the population and not on the same level. The prestige of Greek was quite understandably high, the fact that it is the language of the Gospels obviously added to that in the eyes of the Christians. The nature of the text in this case needs no further comment – from all these it inevitably follows that very literal, based on the present study, pattern-to-pattern translations are made.

Also, the aim with sacred, canonical texts is beyond doubt uniformity. This is best shown in the present material in the S texts, which are the most pattern-strict and consistent. It is most likely undesirable to have a large number of translation varieties for the NT books, with each translator having his own personal favourite patterns for the final clauses, clauses of result, etc. In this text corpus it is the M dialect that shows most varieties in these clause patterns, choosing from the conjunctions (**ΜΗΠΩΣ** besides **ΜΗΠΟΤΕ** ; **ΖΗΝΑC** besides **ΧΕΚΑC**) with following verb forms (conjunctive besides future 3) and independent verb forms/clause conjugations more freely than the others, and this dialect definitely shows the most deviations from the Greek pattern:

²⁷⁹ "This is a situation of "texts in contact" (...) as well as "languages in contact". SHISHA-HALEVY, 1990: 100/fin.4.

²⁸⁰ BROCK, 1979: 73.

²⁸¹ BROCK, 1979: 72.

²⁸² Just as the original Scriptures are not to be altered, cf. Deut 4, 2.

²⁸³ *AristEpist* 310, 3-6.

²⁸⁴ BROCK, 1979: 70-74.

S deviates in 3.33% of the cases (12 times out of 360)

L deviates in 8.51% of the cases (12 times out of 141)

M deviates in 14.29% of the cases (21 times out of 147). As mentioned earlier, S really shows very precise and reliable pattern-to-pattern translations.

With this very close translation of the sacred text of the New Testament, with all its syntactic grecisms then, the Coptic text becomes marked and another sacred text with its sacred language is born.²⁸⁵

2. With original writings, naturally, it has to be borne in mind that the idiom of the authors is individual with its own characteristics, and the genres they write in is also a determining factor: for example, the language and style of 'Regulations' for a monastic community will be different from an 'Instruction' or 'Logos'. It must also be remembered that the founder of monasticism, and thus the creator of the genre 'regulations for the community', Pachom – the author of the oldest Coptic original literature²⁸⁶ still extant – was influenced in his language by his military past, the style of the regulations is very similar to the Roman military command formulae, as shown by Professor Peter Nagel.²⁸⁷ Further, the above described 'sacred language' of the Coptic NT inevitably had its influence on the Coptic authors who 'grew up' on it and learnt large parts by heart, and so when they started writing, a lot of formulae and patterns must have permeated into their language use. There are, however, features which are common to the original writings as opposed to the translations:

A) in finals, the clauses are in majority everywhere, but in original writings the infinitive constructions are used more extensively (inf: 49.17% - clauses: 50.83%) than in translations (inf: 26.07% - clauses: 69.66%). The choice of final clause pattern is not so rigid and regulated in originals: the $\chi\epsilon\kappa\lambda\sigma$ +future 3 pattern became the *par excellence* S translation equivalent for the Greek $\iota\nu\alpha$ ($\delta\pi\omega\varsigma$)–clauses, but in the original it is not so dominant at all, and its use in that material might be influenced by the NT translations.

The growing preference for clauses as such is partly a natural, inner development of the language, the analytical tendency referred to throughout the study. But translations and then the extensive reading of the translated texts undoubtedly had a role in it – the Greek

²⁸⁵ cf. FÖLDVÁRY, 2008, writing about the translations of the Old Testament and the hebraisms therein, which are thus marked and build up a sacred language.

²⁸⁶ NAGEL, 1974: 114.

²⁸⁷ NAGEL, 1974.

language of the NT clearly shows this preference and the Coptic translations copy that, while Coptic authors are still more free from it.

The **μηποτε** plus conjunctive pattern appears in translation only when the Greek original has the **μήποτε** plus subjunctive negative final pattern – it is not very frequent, and is used in the original texts almost to the same degree; its use there might be the result of imitating the NT translations. A comparative analysis with non-literary Coptic texts would probably show whether it was used outside literary texts at all.

The **ϷιναϷ** plus future 3 pattern does not appear in original writings, just as it is not used in the S translations. It is confined to the M translations in the present text material.

The **ε+definite article+ infinitive final** pattern is used only in the translated text material to translate the Greek **εἰς τό/πρός τό +infinitive** patterns. This widening of the range of Coptic final patterns is a linguistic influence of Greek, however, it seems to have affected only the translation idiom.

The conjunctive and the future conjunctive have no modal value and are not employed in the place of finals – no Greek influence has to be sought here.

B) **κεκαϷ+fut 3 (fut 2)/ κε+fut 3/ ϷιναϷ+fut 3/ ϷιναϷ+conj** (i.e. final clause patterns) in object and subject position after certain expressions which take the final clause pattern in NT Greek are clearly the result of translations. These patterns in the given syntactical position do not occur in original texts, only when quoted (the one exception remains *Spiteful* 18, 14), but are employed when the Greek original requires in translations. This results 1) in a marked stylistic-syntactic difference between translated and original Coptic texts, and 2) in the birth of the nominalized **κεκαϷ**-clause in Coptic.

C) The final clause patterns **κεκαϷ+fut 3 (fut 2)/ κε+fut 3/ κεκαϷε+conj** (only L)/ **ϷιναϷ+conj** (only M) in complementary/epexegetic position occur only in translations, but there they are used extensively due to the pattern-to-pattern translation technique. This linguistic impact of the Greek is again translation induced, and seems to be part only of the translation idiom.

The **ϷωϷτε+ ε+infinitive** pattern is used in the translations almost always when the Greek original employs it in complementary/epexegetic position; in the original texts it only occurs in Theodore once, which raises some questions. Was this pattern in

complementary position used in the whole of the Coptic idiom, unlike the final clause patterns which are confined to translations? Or was Theodore imitating the NT idiom? Or is there an insertion in his text which is a translated passage? Again, the study of more literary and non-literary Coptic texts can probably give answers to these questions.

D) In the case of the consecutives, original and translated literature use the same **ⲗⲟⲩⲧⲉ** patterns, but the choice of infinitive / conjunctive is different: S translations use basically the **ϵ+**infinitive, only **ⲛⲟⲓ** triggers a conjunctive with no difference in semantics, whereas in the original writings there seems to be a system for using the conjunctive for real (has happened) result and the **ϵ+**infinitive for not real (not yet happened) result. The disappearance or lack of such a system in the translations is Greek influence, because the translators imitated the Greek pattern, **ὄσπε** plus infinitive, which at that stage of the language was not in opposition with another pattern based on the real/expected result distinction (one exception in John where the real result is with indicative).

The very presence of the **ⲗⲟⲩⲧⲉ** consecutive patterns in both text types extensively, shows that it is not translation induced. It may therefore be, most probably, part of the Coptic idiom as a whole. It is another possible explanation that the authors of the original texts were influenced by the translated idiom of the NT and took the pattern over – this seems less likely, as the pattern is slightly different in their writings (see above).

The limitative **ⲩⲁⲛⲧⲉ** is employed only in the original writings to express result, this is due to the fact that Coptic translators translated patterns (at least in the here examined clauses), and no such pattern exists in Greek.

Again Theodore acts uniquely among the authors: in the consecutives he uses the **ⲗⲟⲩⲧⲉ** plus conjunctive pattern in the same way as it is used in the S NT translation idiom, i.e. conjunctive is used instead of **ϵ+**infinitive only when the **ⲛⲟⲓ**-construction occurs in the sentence.

3. The function of the conjunctive as "post-conjunctive and post-adverbial „coupling" clause form"²⁸⁸ after **ⲙⲏⲡⲟⲩⲧⲉ**, **ⲙⲏⲡⲟⲩⲥ**, **ⲗⲟⲩⲧⲉ**, **ⲗⲓⲛⲁⲥ** in our text corpus is still a little perplexing. Shisha-Halevy suggests that it has the function of the old prospective „that"-form *sdm.w=f* and the so-called prospective *sdm=f*,²⁸⁹ but it is not clear where the

²⁸⁸ SHISHA-HALEVY, 1995: 313.

²⁸⁹ SHISHA-HALEVY, 1995: 313.

conjunctive gets this function from. In this usage it really looks like a general clause-form, 'invented' to be used in clauses with Greek conjunctions, especially in M and B.

This examination shows that there is Greek syntactic influence on the level of patterns/surface structures on the Coptic language, and that translated and original idioms are not the same in this respect. With all these Greek-influenced patterns in the Coptic sentence, I agree with Lüddeckens: "Die griechische Lehn-oder Fremdwörter und auch syntaktische Beeinflussungen durch das Griechische haben jedoch nichts an dem Charakter des Koptischen als ägyptischer Sprache geändert."²⁹⁰

²⁹⁰ LÜDDECKENS, 1980: 260.

APPENDIX

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS OF GRAMMATIC TERMS

affirm	affirmative
caus inf	causative infinitive
conj	conjunctive
fut 2	second future
fut 3	third future
inf	infinitive
imp	imperative
L	Lycopolitan dialect
M	Middle-Egyptian dialect
neg	negative
part	participle
S	Sahidic dialect
subj	subjunctive

1.1 Final Clauses

Translated Coptic Literature Gospel of Matthew

Conjunctions: ἵνα ὅπως μήποτε ; χεκαϛ χε μηποτε μηπως ριναϛ

1,22	ἵνα – subj	M: χε – fut 3 S: χεκαϛ – fut 3
2,2	inf after ἦλθομεν	M: ε+inf S: ε+inf
2,8	ὅπως – subj	M: χεκεϛ – fut 3 S: χεκαϛ – fut 3
2,13	τοῦ inf	M: ε +inf S: ε +inf
3,13	τοῦ inf	M: ε +inf S: ε +caus inf
2,15	ἵνα – subj	M: χεε – fut 3 S: χεκαϛ – fut 3
2,23	ὅπως – subj	M: χεκεϛ – fut 3 S: χεκαϛ – fut 3
4, 1	inf	M: ε +inf S: ε +caus inf
4,6	μήποτε – subj	M: μηποτε – conj S: μηποτε – conj
4,14	ἵνα – subj	M: χεκεϛ – fut 3 S: χεκαϛ – fut 3
5,16	ὅπως – subj	M: χεκεϛ – fut 3 S: χεκαϛ – fut 3
5, 17	inf after ἦλθον	M: ε +inf S: ε +inf
5, 17	inf after ἦλθον	M: ε +inf S: ε +inf

5,25	μήποτε – subj	M: ΜΗΠΟΤΕ – conj S: ΜΗΠΟΤΕ – conj
5, 28	πρὸς τό + inf	M: conj S: ε +inf
5,45	ὅπως – subj	M: ΧΕΚΕC – fut 3 S: ΧΕΚΑC – fut 3
6, 1	πρὸς τό + inf	M: ε +def article + caus inf S: ΧΕΚΑC fut 3
6,2	ὅπως – subj	M: ΧΕΚΕC – fut 3 S: ΧΕΚΑC – fut 3
6,4	ὅπως – subj	M: ΧΕΚΕC – fut 3 S: ΧΕΚΑC – fut 3
6,5	ὅπως – subj	M: ΧΕΚΕC – fut 3 S: ΧΕΚΑC – fut 3
6,16	ὅπως – subj	M: ΧΕ – fut 3 S: ΧΕΚΑC – fut 3
6,18	ὅπως μή – subj	M: ΧΕΚΕC – neg.fut 3 S: ΧΕΚΑC – neg.fut 3
7,1	ἵνα μή – subj	M: ΧΕ – neg. fut 3 S: ΧΕΚΑC – neg.fut 3
7,6	μήποτε – fut.ind./subj	M: ΜΗΠΩC – conj S: ΜΗΠΟΤΕ – conj
8,17	ὅπως – subj	M : ΧΕ – fut 3 S: ΧΕΚΑC – fut 3
8, 29	inf after ἦλθεC	M: ε +inf S: ε +inf
9,6	ἵνα – subj	M: ΧΕΚΕC – Fut 3 S: ΧΕΚΑC – Fut 3
9, 13	inf after ἦλθον	M: ε +inf S: ε +inf
10, 34	inf after ἦλθον	M: ε +inf

	S: ε+inf
10, 34 inf after ἦλθον	M: ε+inf S: ε+inf
10, 35 inf after ἦλθον	M: ε+inf S: ε+inf
11, 1 τοῦ inf after μετέβη	M: circ praes S: ε+inf variant in Perez: circ praes
11, 7 inf after ἐξήλθατε	M: ε+inf S: ε+inf
11, 8 inf after ἐξήλθατε	M: ε+inf S: ε+inf
11, 9 inf after ἐξήλθατε	M: ε+inf S: ε+inf
12, 10 ἴνα – subj	M: κεκεσ fut3 S: κεκακ fut3
12,17 ἴνα – subj	M: κεκεσ – Fut 3 S: κεκακ – Fut 3
12, 42 inf after ἦλθεν	M: ε+inf S: ε+inf
13, 3 τοῦ inf after ἐξήλθεν	M: ε+inf S: ε+inf
13,15 μήποτε – subj	M: μηπως – conj S: μηποτε – conj
13,29 μήποτε – subj	M: μηποτε – conj S: μηποτε – conj
13, 30 πρὸς τό inf	M: ε+def article + caus inf S: ε+def article + inf
13,35 ὅπως – subj	M: κεκεσ – fut 3 S: κεκακ – fut 3
14,15 ἴνα – subj	M: ζινακ –fut 3 S: κεκακ –fut 3

14, 23 inf after ἀνέβη	M: perf I S: ε+inf variant in Perez perf 1
15,32 μήποτε – subj	M: ΜΗΠΩΣ – conj S: ΜΗΠΟΤΕ – conj
16, 1 part impf after προσελθόντες	M: circ pres S: circ pres
17,27 ἵνα μή – subj	M: ΧΕΚΕC - neg.fut 3 S: ΧΕΚΑC – neg.fut 3
18,16 ἵνα – subj	M: ΧΕΚΕC – fut 3 S: ΧΕΚΑC – fut 3
19, 3 part impf after προσῆλθον	M: circ pres S: circ pres
19,13 ἵνα – subj	M: ΧΕ – fut 3 (foll by Conj) S: ΧΕΚΑC – fut 3 (foll by Conj)
19,16 ἵνα – subj	M: ΧΕ – fut 3 S: ΧΕΚΑC – fut 3
20, 19 εἰς τό inf(3x) 3x	M: ε+ def art+ caus inf (1x), then conj S: ε+ inf (1x); conj 3x
20, 20 part impf after προσῆλθεν	M: circ pres S: circ pres
20, 28 inf (3x) after ῆλθεν	M: ε+caus inf(1x); ε+inf (2x) S: ε+caus inf (1x); ε+inf (2x)
21,4 ἵνα – subj	M: ΧΕ – fut 3 S: ΧΕΚΑC – fut 3
22, 3 inf	M: ε+inf S: ε+inf
22, 35 part impf	M: circ pres S: circ pres
22,11 inf after εἰσελθών	M: ε+inf S: ε+inf

23,5 πρὸς τὸ inf	M: ε + def art + caus inf S: κεκας – fut 3
23, 15 inf after περιάγετε	M: limitativ ψαντε S: ε+inf
23,26 ἵνα – subj	M: fut conj ἵταρε- S: κεκας – fut 3
24, 1 inf after προσῆλθον	M: perf I S: ε+inf
24, 45 τοῦ inf	M : ε+caus inf S : ε+inf
25, 9 μήποτε subj	M : μηπως conj S: μηποτε conj
25, 10 inf after ἀπερχομένων	M: ε+inf S: ε+inf
26,2 εἰς τὸ inf	M : ε+inf S : ε+caus inf
26, 5 ἵνα μή subj	M : κε neg fut3 S : κεκας neg fut3
26,12 πρὸς τὸ inf	M: ε+ noun S: ε + def art + inf
26,16 ἵνα – subj	M : κε- fut 3 S : κεκας – fut 3
26,41 ἵνα μή – subj	M : κε – neg.fut 3 S : κεκας neg.fut 3
26,55 inf after ἐξήλθατε	M : ε+inf S: ε+inf
26,56 ἵνα – subj	M: κεκες – fut 3 S: κεκας fut 3
26,58 inf after εἰσελθών	M: limitativ ψαντε S: ε+inf
26,59 ὅπως – subj	M: κεκες – fut 3

	S: κεκα – fut 3
27,26 ἵνα – subj	M: ζηνα – fut 3 S: κεκα – fut 3
27,31 εἰς τὸ inf	M: ε+inf S: ε+inf
27, 49 fut part after ἔρχεται	M: conj S: ε+inf
27,64 μήποτε subj	M: μηπως – conj S: μηποτε – conj
28,1 inf after ἦλθεν	M: ε+inf S: ε+inf
28,8 inf after ἔδραμον	M: ζηνα+ fut 3 S: ε+inf

Gospel of John

Conjunctions: ἵνα ὅπως ; **κεκα κε**

1,7 ἵνα – subj	S: κεκα – fut 3
1,7 ἵνα – subj	S: κεκα – fut 3
1,8 ἵνα – subj	S: κεκα – fut 3
1,19 ἵνα – subj	S: κεκα – fut 3
1,22 ἵνα – subj	S: κεκα – fut 3
1,31 ἵνα – subj	S: κεκα – fut 3
1, 31 part impf after ἦλθον	S: circ pres
1,33 inf	S: ε+inf
3,15 ἵνα – subj	S: κεκα – fut 3 L: κεκαε – fut 2
3,16 ἵνα μή – subj (foll by affirm subj)	S: κεκα – neg.fut 3 (foll by affirm fut 3) L: κεκαε – neg.fut 3 (foll by affirm fut 2)
3,17 ἵνα – subj	S: κε – fut 3 L: fut conj

3,17	ἵνα – subj	S: ἕκακ – fut 3 L: ἕκακε – fut 2
3,20	ἵνα μή – subj	S: ἕκακ – neg.fut 3 L: ἕε – neg.fut 3
3,21	ἵνα – subj	S: ἕκακ – fut 3 L: ἕκακε – fut 3
4,7	inf after ἔρχεται	S: ε +inf L: α +inf
4,8	ἵνα – subj after ἀπεληλύθεισαν ident su	S: ε +inf L: α +caus inf
4,15	ἵνα μή – subj	S: ἕκακ – neg.fut 3 L: ἕκακε – neg.fut 3
4,15	inf after διέρχωμαι	S: ε +inf L: α +inf
4,36	ἵνα – subj	S: ἕκακ – fut 3 L: ἕκακε – fut 3
4, 38	inf	S: ε +inf L: α +inf
5,14	ἵνα μή – subj	S: ἕκακ – neg.fut 3 L: ἕκακε – neg.fut 3
5,20	ἵνα – subj	S: ἕκακ – fut 3 L: ἕκακε – fut 3
5,23	ἵνα – subj	S: ἕκακ – fut 3 L: ἕκακε – fut 2
5,34	ἵνα – subj	S: ἕκακ – fut 2 L: ἕκακε – fut 3
5,36	ἵνα – subj	S: ἕκακ – fut 3 L: ἕκακε – fut 2
5,40	ἵνα – subj	S: ἕκακ – fut 3 L: ἕκακε – fut 3

6,5	ἵνα – subj	S : xe – fut 2 L : xe – fut 2
6,6	part impf	S : circ pres L : circ pres
6,12	ἵνα μή – subj	S : xekac – neg.fut 3 L : xekace – neg.fut 3
6,15	ἵνα – subj	S : xekac – fut 3 L : xekace – fut 2
6,28	ἵνα – subj	S : xekac – fut 3 L : xekace – fut 3
6,30	ἵνα – subj	S : xekac – fut 3 L : xekace – fut 3
6,38	ἵνα – subj after καταβέβηκα ident su	S : e +caus inf L : a – inf
6,50	ἵνα – subj after καταβαίνων (foll by μή subj) diff su	S : xekac neg.fut 3 (cond interposed in between) L : xekace – fut 3 (foll by a neg conj)
7,3	ἵνα – subj/fut ind	S : xekac – fut 3 L : xe – fut 2
7, 23	ἵνα μή – subj	S : xe neg.fut3 L : missing pages in Ms
7,32	ἵνα – subj	S : xekac – fut 3 L : xekace – fut 3
8,59	ἵνα – subj	S : xekac – fut 3 L : xe – fut 2
9,3	ἵνα – subj	S : xekac – fut 3 L : xekace – fut 3
9, 36	ἵνα – subj	S : xe – fut 3 L : fut conj
9, 39	ἵνα – subj	S : xekac – fut 3 L : xekace – fut 3

10,10 ἵνα – subj	S: κεκα – fut 3 L: κεκαε – fut 3
10,10 ἵνα +subj after ἦλθον diff su	S: κεκα – fut 3 L: κεκαε – fut 3
10,17 ἵνα – subj	S: κεκα – fut 3 L : κεκαε – fut 2
10,31 ἵνα – subj	S: κεκα – fut 3 L: κεκαε – fut 3
10, 38 ἵνα – subj	S: κεκα – fut 3 L : κεκαε – fut 3
11,4 ἵνα – subj	S: κεκα – fut 3 L : κεκαε – fut 2
11,11 ἵνα – subj after πορεύομαι ident su	S: κεκα – fut 3 L: κεκαε – fut 3
11,16 ἵνα – subj	S: κεκα – fut 3 L: κεκαε – fut 3
11,19 ἵνα – subj after ἐληλύθεισαν ident su	S: κεκα – fut 3 L : κεκαε – fut 3
11,31 ἵνα – subj after ὑπάγει ident su	S: κε – fut 3 L: α + inf
11,42 ἵνα – subj	S: κεκα – fut 3 L : κεκαε – fut 3
11,52 ἵνα – subj	S : κεκα – fut 3 L : κεκαε – Conj (interposed object)
11,55 ἵνα – subj	S: κεκα – fut 3 L: κεκαε – fut 3
11,57 ὅπως – subj	S: κεκα – fut 3 L : κεκαε – fut 2
12,7 ἵνα – subj	S : κε – fut 3 L : κε – fut 3
12,9 ἵνα – subj	S: κεκα – fut 3

		L : κεκασε – fut 3
12,20	ἵνα – subj after ἀναβαινόντων ident su	S: ε + inf L: α + inf
12, 33	part impf	S: circ pres L: circ pres
12, 35	ἵνα μή – subj	S: κε – neg.fut 3 L: κε – neg.fut 3
12, 36	ἵνα – subj	S: κεκαε – fut 3 L: κεκασε – fut 3
12, 38	ἵνα – subj	S: κεκαε – fut 3 L: κεκασε – fut 3
12,40	Isaiah-quotation ἵνα μή – subj	S: κεκαε – neg.fut 3 L: κεκασε – neg.fut 3
12,42	ἵνα μή – subj	S: κεκαε – neg.fut 3 L: κεκασε – neg.fut 3
12,46	ἵνα μή – subj	S: κεκαε – neg.fut 3 L: κεκασε – neg.fut 3
12,47	ἵνα – subj after ἦλθον ident su	S: κε – fut 3 L: α + inf
12, 47	ἵνα – subj after ἦλθον ident su	S: κεκαε – fut 3 L: missing in Ms
13,15	ἵνα – subj	S: κεκαε – fut 3 L : verse 15 is omitted
13,18	ἵνα – subj	S: κεκαε – fut 3 L : κεκασε – fut 2
13,19	ἵνα – subj	S : κεκαε – fut 3 L : κεκασε – fut 3
13, 24	inf	S: ε +inf L: α +inf
14,2	inf after πορεύομαι	S: ε +inf L: α +inf

14,3	ἴνα – subj	S: ἔεκαε – fut 3 L : ε – fut 3
14,13	ἴνα – subj	S: ἔεκαε – fut 3 L : ἔεκαε – fut 2
14,16	ἴνα – subj	S: ἔεκαε – fut 3 L: ἔεκαε – fut 3
14,29	ἴνα – subj	S: ἔεκαε + fut3 L: ἔεκαε + fut 3
14,31	ἴνα – subj	S: ἔεκαε – fut 3 L : ε – fut 2
15,2	ἴνα – subj	S: ἔεκαε – fut 3 L: ἔεκαε – fut 3
15,11	ἴνα – subj	S: ἔεκαε – fut 3 L: part of verses 11 and 12 is omitted in Ms
15, 16	ἴνα – subj	S: ἔεκαε – fut 2 L : ἔεκαε – fut 3
15,25	ἴνα – subj	S: ἔεκαε – fut 3 L: ἔεκαε – fut 3
16,1	ἴνα μή – subj	S: ἔεκαε – neg.fut 3 L: ἔεκαε – neg.fut 3
16,4	ἴνα – subj	S: ἔεκαε – fut 3 L : ἔεκαε – fut 3
16,24	ἴνα – subj	S: ἔεκαε – fut 3 L: ἔεκαε – fut 2
16,33	ἴνα – subj	S: ἔεκαε – fut 2 L : ἔεκαε – fut 3
17,1	ἴνα – subj	S: ἔεκαε – fut 3 L: ἔεκαε – fut 2
17,11	ἴνα – subj	S: ἔεκαε – fut 3 L: the last clause of verse 11 is omitted
17,12	ἴνα – subj	S: ἔεκαε – fut 3

	L : χε – fut 2
17,13 ἵνα – subj	S: χεκας – fut 3 L: χεκασε – fut 3
17,19 ἵνα – subj	S: χεκας – fut 3 L : χεκασε – fut 2
17,21 ἵνα – subj	S: χεκας – fut 3 L: χεκασε – fut 3
17,21 ἵνα – subj	S: χεκας – fut 3 L: χεκασε – fut 3
17,21 ἵνα – subj	S: χεκας – fut 3 L: χε – fut 2
17, 22 ἵνα – subj	S: χεκας – fut 3 L: most of verse 22 is missing
17,23 ἵνα – subj	S: χεκας – fut 3 L: verse 23 is missing
17,26 ἵνα – subj	S: χεκας – fut 3 L : χεκασε – fut 3
18,9 ἵνα – subj (main clause elliptic)	S: χεκας – fut 3 L: χεκασε – fut 3
18,28 ἵνα μή – subj (foll by subj)	S: χεκας – neg.fut 3; fut 3 L : χεκασε – neg.fut 3; fut 2
18,32 ἵνα – subj	S: χεκας – fut 3 L: χεκασε – fut 3
18, 32 part impf	S: circ pres L: circ pres
18,36 ἵνα μή – subj	S: χεκας – neg.fut 3 L: χεκασε – neg.fut 3
18,37 ἵνα – subj	S: χεκας – fut 3 L : χεκασε – fut 2
19,4 ἵνα – subj	S: χεκας – fut 2 L: χεκασε – fut 3

19,16 ἵνα – subj	S: ε+caus inf L: λ+caus inf
19,24 ἵνα – subj	S: χεκαϛ – fut 3 L: χεκαϛε – fut 2
19,28 ἵνα – subj	S: χε – fut 3 L: that clause is not present here
19, 31 ἵνα μή – subj	S: χε – neg.fut 3 L: χε – neg.fut 3
19,35 ἵνα – subj	S: χεκαϛ – fut 3 L: χεκαϛε – fut 3
19,36 ἵνα – subj	S: χεκαϛ – fut 3 L: χεκαϛε – fut 2
20,31 ἵνα – subj	S: χεκαϛ – fut 3
20, 31 ἵνα - subj	S: χεκαϛ – fut 2
21, 3 inf after ὑπάγω	S: ε +inf
21, 19 part impf	S: circ pres
Letter to the Romans	
1, 11 ἵνα+subj	S: χεκαϛ +fut3
1,11 εἰς τό+inf	S: ε+inf
1,12 inf	S: ε+caus inf
1,13 ἵνα+subj	S: χεκαϛ +fut3
1,24 τοῦ inf	S: ε+caus inf
3,4 Ps 51, 6-quotation ὁπως+subj	S: χεκαϛ +fut3
3, 8 ἵνα+subj	S: χε +fut3
3, 19 ἵνα+subj	S: χεκαϛ +fut2
3,26 εἰς τό+inf	S: ε+caus inf

4, 11 εἰς τό+inf	S: ε +caus inf
4, 11 εἰς τό+inf	S: ε +caus inf
4,16 εἰς τό+inf	S: χεκακ +fut3
5, 20 ἵνα+ subj	S: χεκακ +fut3
5,21 ἵνα+ subj	S: χεκακ +fut3
6, 1 ἵνα+ subj	S: χε +fut3
6, 4 ἵνα+ subj	S: χεκακ +conj
6,6 ἵνα+ subj	S: χεκακ +fut3
6,6 τοῦ inf	S: ε+caus inf
6,12 εἰς τό+inf	S: ε+caus inf
7,4 εἰς τό+inf	S: ε+caus inf
7,4 ἵνα+subj	S: χε+fut 3
7,13 ἵνα+subj	S: χεκακ+fut 3
7, 13 ἵνα+subj	S: χεκακ+fut 3
8,4 ἵνα+subj	S: χε+fut 3
8,17 ἵνα+subj	S: χε+fut 3
8,29 εἰς τό+inf	S: ε+caus inf
9,11 ἵνα+subj	S: χεκακ+fut 3
9,17 Ex 9,16-quotation ὅπως+subj	S: χε+fut 3
9,17 Ex 9,16-quotation ὅπως+subj	S: χε+fut 3
9,23 ἵνα+subj	S: χε+fut 3
10,6 inf after ἀναβήσεται	S: ε+inf

10,7 inf after καταβήσεται	S: ε+inf
11,11 εἰς τό+inf	S: ε + def art+ noun
11,19 ἵνα+subj	S: χεκακ+fut 3
11,31 ἵνα+subj	S: χεκακ+fut 3
11,32 ἵνα+subj	S: χεκακ+fut 3
12,2 εἰς τό+inf	S: ε+caus inf
[12,15 – 13,7 Horner is missings]	
14,9 ἵνα+subj	S: χε+fut 3
15,6 ἵνα+subj	S: χεκακ+fut 3
[15,7-15,14 missing in Horner]	
15, 15 ὡς + part impf	S: ζωκ + circ pres
15,16 εἰς τό inf	S: ε +caus inf
15,16 ἵνα+subj	S: χεκακ+fut 3
16,2 ἵνα+subj	S: χε+fut 3

Original Coptic Literature:

Pachom, *Instructions Concerning a Spiteful Monk*:

2,5	χε +fut3	
3, 9	χε +fut2	Prov. 6, 4-5-quotation
3,23	μηποτε + conj	interposition
4, 6	μηποτε + conj	
5,4	χε +fut3	
5,6	χε + neg.fut3	
5, 24	χεκακ +fut2	
6,8	χε + neg.fut3	
6, 26	ε + neg inf	
8, 21-22	χε +fut3	
9,4	ε +caus inf	

11,10-11	ⲭⲉ + neg.fut3	
11, 22	ⲙⲏⲡⲟⲩⲉ + conj	
12, 30-31	ⲭⲉⲕⲁϭ +fut2	
13,2	ⲭⲉ +fut2	
	ⲙⲏⲡⲟⲩⲉ + conj	
13, 21	ⲉ + caus inf	Ps 100, 8-quotation although the first half of the sentence is replaced by that of 100, 3
13,24-25	ⲭⲉ +fut3	
15, 12-13	ⲭⲉ +fut2	
15, 22	ⲭⲉ + neg.fut3	Lk 6,37 - quotation
16,27	ⲭⲉ + neg.fut3	
16,31-32	ⲭⲉ + neg.fut3	
17,19-20	ⲭⲉ +fut2	
17,25	ⲭⲉ +fut3	
18, 4-5	ⲉ +caus inf	
18, 5-6	ⲉ +caus inf	
18, 19	ⲭⲉ +fut3	
18,22	ⲭⲉ + neg.fut3	
19,10-11	ⲭⲉ + neg.fut3	
20,12-13	ⲭⲉ +fut3	
22,14	ⲙⲏⲡⲟⲩⲉ + conj	

Excerpta

27b, 11 **ⲉ**+caus inf

Passover

25,1	ⲉ +caus inf
25, 6-7	ⲭⲉⲕⲁϭ +fut 2
25, 14-16	ⲭⲉ +fut 3
25, 23-24	ⲭⲉⲕⲁϭ +fut 2

Praecepta

30, 22 **ⲉ** + inf after „get up” **ⲧⲱⲟϥⲎ**

Praecepta et instituta

35, 19 **ⲉ**+ caus inf

Shenute

Young 28

171, 23 **xε** +neg.fut 3 **xε** **ἸΝΝΑΧΕΖΑΖ** – idiomatic, no main clause

Young 6-7

39a, 11 **xε** + neg.fut 3

38b, 30 **xε**+neg.fut 3

39b, 51-54 2x **xε** +neg.fut 3 Mt 7, 1-quotation

39b, 33 **xε** + fut 3

40a, 5-6 **ε** +caus inf

42b, 32-33 **ε** +caus inf

43b, 52 **xε** +neg.fut 3

Elanskaya 1.1.b.707

85, 26a **ε**+inf

86, 27a **ε**+caus inf

Elanskaya 1.1.b.716

91,6a-7a **xε****ΚΑΚ** +neg.fut3

92, 1a-3a **xε****ΚΑΚ** +neg.fut3

Elanskaya 1.1.b.658

98, 1b **ε**+caus inf

99, 12a **ε**+caus inf

99, 5b-6b **ε**+caus inf

Young, 21

128, 13-14 **xε** +neg.fut3

129, 12-13 **xε** +fut3

130, 2 **xε****ΚΑΚ** +fut2

132, 17 **xε****ΚΑΚ** +fut3

Ad phil

44, 11 **ε**+ inf after **ε**Ι

47, 23 **xε** +neg.fut3

51, 21 **ε**+caus inf

54, 9 **ε**+caus inf after **ε**ΩΚ ; Cant 6, 2-quotation

54, 25 **ε**+caus inf after **ε**ΩΚ ; Cant 6, 11-quotation

55, 13 **ε**+caus inf after **ε**ΩΚ ; Cant 7, 13-quotation

58, 18 **xε****ΚΑΚ** +fut2

61, 7 **ε**+ caus inf

62, 16 **ε**+ caus inf

62, 18	xεKAC +fut2	
BLO		
57, 19	ε+ neg inf	
57, 34	ε+ neg caus inf	
57, 52	xε +fut3	
57, 57	xε +fut2	
58, 5	xε +fut3	
58, 11	xε +fut3	
58, 18	ε+ neg caus inf	
65, 39	ε+ caus inf	
68, 1	ε+ neg caus inf	
69, 57	ε+ caus inf	
70, 18	ε+ neg caus inf	
70, 20-4	xεKAC +neg.fut3	
73, 18	ε+ neg caus inf	
73, 35	ε+ neg caus inf	
74, 30	ε+ neg caus inf	
75, 17	ε+ neg inf	
75, 19	ε+ neg caus inf	
76, 55	ε+ inf	after NHY
78, 48	ε+ caus inf	
80, 28	ε+ caus inf	
81, 30	xε +neg fut3	
81, 53	ε+ neg inf	
82, 2	xεKAC + fut2	
82, 15	xεKAC + fut3	
82, 26	ε+ neg inf	
82, 28	xε +neg.fut3	
82, 42	xεKAC +fut2	
84, 21	ε+ caus inf	
87, 22	ε+ caus inf	
87, 38-9	xεKAC +fut3	
88, 49-51	xεKAC +fut2	
90, 21	ε+ caus inf	

90, 9-10	xε +neg.fut3
93, 28	xεKAC +fut2
94, 39	ε + caus inf
<i>Monast disc</i>	
116, 10	ε + neg inf
116, 13	ε + caus inf
117, 6	ε + caus inf
117, 23	ε + caus inf
119, 3	ε + caus inf
119, 9	xε +neg.fut3
119, 20	xεKAC +fut2
119, 29	ε + caus inf
120, 3	ε + inf
120, 3	ε + neg caus inf
120, 8	xεKAC +fut3
121, 14	ε +caus inf
122, 3	xεKAC +fut3
122, 9	xεKAC +fut2
126, 6	ε +caus inf
129, 22	ε +caus inf
131, 2	ε +caus inf
131, 4	ε +caus inf
132, 3	ε +caus inf
132, 22	ε +caus inf
135, 28	xεKAC +fut3
139, 10	xε +fut3
140, 18	xεKAC +fut3
140, 30	xε +fut3
143, 14	xεKAC +fut3
144, 18	ε +caus inf
144, 21	ε +caus inf
146, 21	xεKAC +neg.fut3
149, 7	ε +caus inf
150, 1	ε +caus inf

Horsiese***Instruction 1***

67, 6	ϵ + neg inf	Ps 33, 13-16-quotation
69, 27	xεKAC + fut3	
69, 30	xε + fut 2	folll by conj

Instruction 3

70, 31-32	xε + fut 3	Prov 3, 9-10-quotation; foll by conj
71, 33	xεKAC + fut3	

Instruction 4

72, 2	ϵ + inf	
72, 8	ϵ + caus inf	
72, 9	ϵ + caus inf	
72, 12	ϵ + caus inf	
72, 12-13	ϵ + caus inf	
72, 13	ϵ + caus inf	
72, 29-30	ϵ + neg caus inf	

Instruction 5

73, 14	xεKAC + fut3	
73, 16	ϵ + caus inf	
73, 19	ϵ + caus inf	
74, 3	xεKAC + fut2	
74, 5	xεKAC + fut2	
74, 7	xεKAC + fut3	Heb 2, 14-quotation
74, 9	xε + neg.fut3	

Instruction 6

74, 29	ϵ + caus inf	
75, 4	xε + fut3	
75, 8	ϵ + caus inf	
75, 14-15	xεKAC + fut2	then foll by conj

Instruction 7

76, 2-3	ϵ + caus inf	
76, 13	xε + neg.fut3	
77, 24	xεKAC + neg.fut3	

78, 33	ε + inf	after NHY
78, 34-79, 1	3x ε + inf	
79, 16	ε + neg inf	
79, 21	xε + fut2	
Regulations		
83, 11	xε + neg.fut3	
83, 21	xεKAC + fut3	folll by conj
84, 16	ε+inf	
84, 25	ε+caus inf	
86, 28	ε + inf	after TΩOYH
86, 29	ε + inf	after TΩOYH
86, 32	ε + caus inf	
86, 33	xεKAC + fut3	
87, 1	ε + inf	after TΩOYH
87, 5	ε + caus inf	
87, 8	ε + caus inf	
88, 9	xεKAC + fut3	
88, 25	ε + neg caus inf	
88, 28	ε + neg caus inf	
88, 29	ε + inf	
88, 30	xε + fut3	
88, 30-31	ε + caus inf	
89, 3-4	xεKAC + fut2	
89, 23	xεKAC + fut3	
89, 28-29	xεKAC + fut3	
90, 5	xεKAC + fut2	
90, 15	xεKAC + fut3	
91, 14	ε+ caus inf	
91, 23	xεKAC + neg fut3	
91, 32	xεKAC + fut3	
92, 2	xεKAC + fut3	folll by a conj
92, 8	xε + neg fut3	
92, 29	xεKAC + neg fut3	

93, 12-3	ΧΕΚΑΚ + fut3	folll by a conj
93, 27	ϵ + inf	
95, 5	ΧΕ + neg fut3	folll by a conj
95, 7	ϵ + neg inf	
95, 14	ϵ +caus inf	
96, 34	ΧΕΚΑΚ + neg fut3	folll by a conj
98, 23	ϵ + neg inf	
99, 10	ΧΕ + neg fut3	
99, 15	ΧΕ + neg fut3	

Letters

63, 27	ΜΗΠΟΤΕ + conj	
64, 4	ΧΕΚΑΚ + fut3	Rm 12, 2 - quotation
64, 5	ΧΕ + fut3	
64, 6-7	ϵ + caus inf	
64, 17	ΧΕ + fut3	Ex 20, 12- quotation
64, 29	ΧΕΚΑΚ + fut3	
64, 30	ΧΕΚΑΚ + fut3	
65, 16	ΧΕΚΑΚ + fut3	
65, 19	ϵ + inf	Eccl 12, 13-14-quotation

Theodore

Instruction 3

40, 30	ϵ +neg caus inf	
41, 20-22	ΧΕΚΑΚ + conj	with interposed conditional
42, 3	ϵ +caus inf	
43, 31-32	ΧΕΚΑΚ +fut 2	folll by conj
45, 6	ϵ +inf	
45, 10-11	ΧΕ +fut2	
45, 31	ϵ +caus inf	
46, 3	ϵ +caus inf	
46, 4	ΜΗΠΟΤΕ +conj	
46, 33	ϵ +inf	
47, 4	ϵ +caus inf	

47, 20	xe +neg fut3	
47, 21	xe +neg fut3	
49,7	xe +fut3	2 Cor 12, 7 quotation
49, 16	xe +neg fut3	
50, 7	e +caus inf	
50, 14	xekac + fut3	
52, 24, 27, 29	e +caus inf (3x)	
52, 31	e +caus inf	
53, 6	e +neg inf	
53, 8	e +caus inf	
54, 1	e +neg inf	
54, 4-5	xe + neg fut3	
57, 1	e +caus inf	
58, 13	e +caus inf	
58, 15-16	e +caus inf (2x)	
58, 21	mh pote + conj	
59, 13	mh pote + conj	

1.2 Object clauses after verbs of exhorting

Gospel of Matthew

Constructions: ἵνα/ὅπως + clauses; infinitive constructions

_____ **ξε/ξεκακ/ ῥινακ** clauses; inf constr; conjunctive; conditional

Object:

4,3 εἰπέ - ἵνα subj	M: ξε - fut 3 S: ξεκακ - fut 3
8, 18 inf after ἐκέλευσεν	M: ε + caus inf S: ε +inf
8,34 παρεκάλεσαν – ὅπως subj	M: ξε – fut 3 S: ξεκακ – fut 3
9,38 δεήθητε – ὅπως subj	M: ξε – fut 3 S: ξεκακ – fut 3
12,16 ἐπετίμησεν – ἵνα μή subj	M: ῥινακ – neg.fut 3 S: ξεκακ – neg.fut 3
14,9 inf after ἐκέλευσεν	M: ε +inf S: ε +inf
14,19 inf after κελεύσας	M: ε +caus inf S: ε +caus inf
14, 22 2x inf after ἠνάγκασεν	M: ε +caus inf (foll by conj) S: 2x ε +inf
14, 28 inf after κέλευσον	M: conj S: ε +caus inf
14,36 παρεκάλουν – ἵνα subj	M: ῥινακ – conj S: ξεκακ – fut 3
15,35 inf after παραγγείλας	M: ε +caus inf S: ε +caus inf
16,1 inf after ἐπηρώτησαν	M: ε +caus inf S: ε +inf
16,20 διεστείλατο – ἵνα subj	M: ξε – neg.fut 3 S: ξεκακ – neg.fut 3

18,25 2x inf after ἐκέλευσεν	M: ε+inf; foll by limitativ ΩΑΝΤΕ S: ε+caus inf; foll by conj
19,7 2x inf after ἐνετείλατο	M: 2x ε+inf S: 2x ε+inf
20,21 εἰπέ – ἵνα subj ‘tell sy to’	M: ϒΙΝΑC - conj S: ΧΕΚΑC – fut 3
20,31 ἐπετίμησεν – ἵνα subj	M: ΧΕ – fut 3 S: ΧΕΚΑC – fut 3
24,20 προσεύχεσθε – ἵνα μή subj	M: ΧΕ - neg. fut 3 S: ΧΕΚΑC – neg.fut 3
26,4 συνεβουλεύσαντο – ἵνα subj	M: ΧΕΚΕC – fut 3 S: ΧΕΚΑC – fut 3
26,63 ἐξορκίζω σε ... ἵνα – subj	M: ϒΙΝΑC – conj S: ΧΕΚΑC – fut 3
27,20 ἔπεισαν – ἵνα subj	M: ϒΙΝΑC – fut 3 S: ΧΕΚΑC – fut 3
27,32 ἠγγάρευσαν – ἵνα subj	M: ΧΕ – fut 3 S: ΧΕΚΑC – fut 3
27,58 inf after ἐκέλευσεν	M: ε+inf S: ε+caus inf
27, 64 inf after κέλευσον	M: opt S: ε+caus inf
28,10 ἀπαγγείλατε – ἵνα subj	M: ϒΙΝΑC – fut 3 S: ΧΕΚΑC – fut 2 in Perez/ fut3 in Horner
Gospel of John	
4,40 inf after ἠρώτων	S: ε+inf L: ε+caus inf
4,47 ἠρώτα ἵνα —subj	S: ΧΕΚΑC - fut 3 L: ΧΕΚΑCΕ - fut 3
11,53 ἐβουλεύσαντο ἵνα – subj	S: ΧΕΚΑC - fut 3 L: ΧΕΚΑCΕ - fut 2

12,10 ἐβουλεύσαντο ἵνα – subj	S: κεκα - fut 3 L: κεκα ε - fut 3
13,2 βεβληκός τις εἰς τὴν καρδίαν – ἵνα subj	S: κεκα - fut 3 L: κε - fut 3
15, 16 ἔθηκα ὑμᾶς ἵνα – subj (3x)	S: κεκα – fut 2 in Homer; fut3 in Queeke; foll by 2 conjs L: κεκα ε – fut 3 foll by conj; κεκα ε–fut 2
15,17 ἐντέλλομαι ἵνα – subj	S: κεκα - fut 3 L: α + inf
17,4 δέδωκάς μοι ἵνα – subj	S: ε +caus inf L: α +caus inf Note: can be interpreted as 'give'+ final; or as 'command'+object!
17,15 ἐρωτῶ ἵνα – subj	S: κε - fut 3 L: κε - fut 3
17, 15 (ἐρωτῶ) ἵνα – subj	S: κεκα - fut 3 L: κεκα ε - fut 3
19,31 ἠρώτησαν .. ἵνα – subj (2x) 3)	S: κε – neg fut 3 (foll by κεκα - fut 3) L: κεκα ε – neg fut 3 (foll by κεκα ε - fut 3)
19,38 ἠρώτησεν .. ἵνα – subj	S: κεκα - fut 3 L: κεκα ε - fut 3

Romans

1, 10 inf after δεόμενος	S: ε +inf
12,1 inf after παρακαλῶ	S: ε +inf
16,17 inf after παρακαλῶ	S: ε + caus inf

Original literature:

Pachom,

Instructions Concerning a Spiteful Monk

2, 27	ε + inf	after ζων
8, 28	ε +caus inf	after ζων
15, 30	ε +caus inf	after αναγκασε

18, 14-15 **xe** + fut3 after **ζων**

22, 8 **ε**+neg inf after **ζων**

Excerpta

29b, 29-29,a16

ε+neg caus inf after **ΠΑΡΑΚΑΛΕΙ**

Shenute,

Young 28

169, 37-38 **ε**+caus inf after **φλη**

Young 5

34a, 27 **ε**+caus inf after **φλ̄**

34b, 52-55 **ε**+caus inf after **ΑΝΑΓΚΑΖΕ** as transitive verb: 'force me'

Young 6-7

38b, 39-40 **ε**+caus inf after **ΠΡΟΤΡΕΠΕ**

43a, 17-22 **ε**+caus inf after **χω** 'tell sy to'

Young, 21

130, 19-21 **ε**+neg caus inf after **φλη**

then 3 more **ε**+caus inf's belonging to the same verb

Ad phil

45, 20 **ε**+caus inf after **φλη**

59, 2 **χεκac** + fut3 after **σοπc** Mt 9, 38 quotation (see above)

61, 12 **ε**+caus inf after **ΠΑΡΑΓΓΕΙΛΕ**

Monast disc

119, 7 **ε**+2x neg inf after **επιτιμα**

134, 9 **ε**+neg caus inf after **επιβολευε**

139, 14 **ε**+caus inf after **σοπcπ**

143, 26 **ε**+caus inf after **†cβω**

144, 4 **ε**+caus inf after **ΑΝΑΓΚΑΖΕ**

144, 6 **ε**+caus inf after the above (the first caus inf is followed by two conjunctives, then an **η** disjuncts and then comes the second caus inf)

144, 7 **ε**+caus inf after **ολιβε**

149, 26 **ε**+caus inf after **πειθε**

Theodore's Instruction 3

44, 7	ε+caus inf	after ΔΝΑΓΚΑΖΕ
46, 15	ε+caus inf	after ΔΝΑΓΚΑΖΕ
47, 34	ε+caus inf	after ΣΟΠĀ
48, 7-8	ε+caus inf	after ΠΑΡΑΚΑΛΕΙ
50, 33-	ε+caus inf (5x; also neg)	after ΣΟΠĀ
52, 17	ε+inf	after ΕΠΙΒΟΥΛΕΥΕ
53, 11	ε+caus inf	after ΟΥΕΖΣΑΖΝΕ
53, 21	ε+neg caus inf	after ΦΛΗΛ
56, 6	ε+neg inf	after ΠΑΡΑΚΑΛΕΙ
59, 1-2	ε+caus inf	after ΠΕΙΘΕ

Horsiese,

Instruction 5

73, 21-22	ε + caus inf	after ΣΥΜΑΝΕ
-----------	--------------	--------------

Instr 6

75, 24-28	ε + caus inf	after ΕΤΕΙ
	ε + caus inf	after ΕΤΕΙ

Instr 7

76, 31	ε + caus inf	after ΦΡΚ
78, 1-2	ε + caus inf	after ΣΟΠC (foll by conj)

Regulations

86, 4-5	ε + caus inf	after ΣΟΠC
97, 17-19	ε + caus inf (2x)	after ΤΩΒΞ̄ (foll by conj)

Letters

65, 21	ε + caus inf	after ΦΛΗΛ
--------	--------------	------------

1.3 Subject clause/inf

Matthew

3, 15 inf after πρέπον ἔστιν	M: εἶπε ᾧ ε +inf S: εἶπε ᾧ ε +inf
5,29 συμφέρει – ἵνα subj	M: conj S: ἔκει κε – fut 3
5,30 συμφέρει – ἵνα subj	M: conj S: ἔκει κε – fut 3
10,25 ἀρκατόν (ἔστιν) ἵνα subj	M: cond S: ἔ – fut 3
12,2 inf after οὐκ ἔξεστιν	M: ε +inf S: ε +inf
12,10 inf after ἔξεστιν	M: ε +inf S: ε +inf
12,12 inf after ἔξεστιν	M: ε +inf S: ε +inf
14,4 inf after οὐκ ἔξεστιν	M: ε +inf S: ε +inf
15,26 inf (2x) after οὐκ ἔστιν καλόν	M: 1x plain inf, 1x ε +inf S: ε +inf (2x)
17,4 καλόν ἔστιν ἡμᾶς	M: conj S: ε +caus inf
18,6 συμφέρει – ἵνα subj	M: conj S: ἔκει κε – fut 3
18,7 inf after ἀνάγκη	M: conj S: ε +caus inf
18,8 inf (2x) after καλόν σοι ἔστιν	M: conj (2x) S: ε +inf; foll by conj
18,9 inf after καλόν σοι ἔστιν	M: conj (2x) S: ε +inf; foll by conj

18,14 οὐκ ἔστιν θέλημα – ἵνα subj	M: ε+caus inf S: χεκακ – fut 3
19,3 inf after ἔξεστιν	M: ε+caus inf S: ε+inf
19,10 inf after οὐ συμφέρει	M: ε+inf S: ε+inf
20,15 inf after οὐκ ἔξεστιν	M: ε+inf S: ε+inf
22,17 inf after ἔξεστιν	M: ε+inf S: ε+inf
27,6 inf after οὐκ ἔξεστιν	M: ε+inf S: ε+inf
27,15 inf after εἰώθει	M: ε+inf S: there is no 'it was a traditon'
John	
4,34 ἐμὸν βρῶμά ἐστιν ἵνα – subj	S: χεκακ – fut 3 L: χεκακε – fut 2
5,10 inf after οὐκ ἔξεστίν σοι	S: ε+inf L: α+inf
6,29 τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ ἔργον...ἵνα subj	S: χε – fut 3 L: χεκακε – fut 2
6,39 τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ θέλημα...ἵνα subj	S: χεκακ – fut 3 L: χεκακε – fut 3
6,40 τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ θέλημα...ἵνα subj	S: χεκακ – fut 3 L: χεκακε – fut 3
11,50 συμφέρει – ἵνα subj	S: χεκακ – fut 3 L: χεκακε – fut 2
13, 14 ὀφείλω + inf	S: φψε + ε inf L: σψε + α inf
15,12 αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἐντολή .. ἵνα – subj	S: χεκακ – fut 3 L: χεκακε – fut 3
16,7 συμφέρει ἵνα – subj	S: χεκακ – fut 3

		L: κεκασε - fut 2
17,3	αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ αἰώνιος ζωὴ ἵνα – subj	S: κεκαε - fut 3 L: κεκασε - fut 2
18,14	inf after συμφέρει	S: ε+caus inf L: ε+caus inf
18,31	inf after οὐκ ἔξεστιν	S: ε+inf L: λ+inf
18,39	συνήθεια .. ἵνα – subj	S: κεκαε - fut 3 L: κεκασε - fut 2
19, 7	ὀφείλει + inf	S: ωφε +ε inf L: ωφε + ε+caus inf

Romans

14,21 neg inf (2x) after καλόν (ἐστίν) S: **ε +neg inf** (2x)

Pachom,

Spiteful

5, 21	ε + inf	after ωφε Hebr 11, 6
5, 32	circ pres	after ηλθουε
6,1	ε+caus inf	cont the previous with ηλθουε ερωε
10, 24	ε+ caus inf	after ηλθωε
23, 19	ε+ caus inf	after ουτε τεχρια

Excerpta

29b,10 – 30b,3:

cond after **ηλογικαιον αν πε**

Praecepta et instituta

33, 33	ε + caus inf	after ετεωφε
33, 34	ε+inf	after ετεωφε
34, 1	ε+ neg inf	after ετεωφε
34, 2	ε+ neg inf	after ετεωφε
34, 4	ε+ inf	after ετεωφε
34, 6	ε+ inf	after ετεωφε

34, 7 ε+ inf after ετερωθε

Shenoute

Young 5

33a, 2-4 ε+inf after ΟΥΔΙΚΑΙΟΥΣΥΝΗ ΤΕ

Young 21

126, 48 ε+caus inf after ΖΑΠ̄ ΓΑΡ ΠΕ

126, 12-13 ε+ inf after ετερωθε

128, 40 ε+caus inf after ΖΑΠ̄

131, 25-28 ε+caus inf after ΟΥΑΓΑΘΟΝ ΑΝ ΠΕ (1 more ε+inf follows)

131, 37-132,39 ε+caus inf after ΤΑΝΑΓΚΗ ΤΕ ΑΥΘ ΤΕΧΡΕΙΑ ΤΕ

Elanskaya I.1.b. 716

91, 10a-11a ε+caus inf after ΩΦΕΛΕΙΑ ΑΝ

91, 19a-21a ε+caus inf after πετωθε

91, 26a ε+neg inf after (πετωθε) : elliptic, πετωθε is not there (3 more ε+infs follow)

92, 35a-1b ε+caus inf after (neg) πετωθε (1 more ε+inf follows)

Ad phil

45, 24-5 ε+caus inf after ΗΠΕΡΟΥΘΩ ΑΝΠΕ

59, 26 ε+caus inf after ΖΑΠ̄

59, 30 χε + fut 3 after ⲉϯω Mt 10, 25 quotation

Monast disc

117, 15 ε+ inf after ωθε

118, 25 ε+ inf after ωθε

118, 27-8 ε+ caus inf after ωθε

120, 4 ε+ inf after ωθε

122, 11 ε+ caus inf after πετερωθε ΠΕ

131, 8 ε+caus inf after ΗΠΛΟΥΘΩ ΑΝΠΕ

144, 28 ε+caus inf after ρω

145, 13	ε+caus inf	after ΔΝΑΓΚΗ ΤΕ
148, 21	ε+caus inf	after ΠΕΤΕΨΘΕ ΠΕ
150, 18	ε+caus inf	after ΠΕΤΕΨΘΕ ΠΕ

BLO

64, 21-2	ε+ inf	after ΕΤΕΨΘΕ
64, 26-7	ε+ inf	after ΕΤΕΨΘΕ
66, 40	ε+ inf	after Ν̄ΣΠΡΕΠΕΙ ΔΝ
66, 56-8	ε+ inf	after ΠΕΤΕΨΘΕ ΔΝ ΠΕ
77, 5	ε+ inf	after ΨΘΕ
77, 48	ε+ inf	after ΟΥΔΑΝΑΓΚΑΙΟΝ ΠΕ
88, 17-25	ε+ neg caus inf (2x)	after ΟΥΔΑΝΑΓΚΑΙΟΝ ΠΕ
88, 35-7	ε+caus inf	after ΟΥΔΑΝΑΓΚΑΙΟΝ ΠΕ

Theodore, Instruction

43, 15	ε+caus inf	after ΖΑΠ̄
52, 23	ε + inf	after ΖΗΥ
53, 26	ε+caus inf	after ΠΕΤΕΨΘΕ ΠΕ
59, 12	ε+caus inf	after ΠΕΤΕΨΘΕ ΠΕ

Horsiese, Instruction

68, 6-7	ε + caus inf	after ΠΕΤΕΨΘΕ
---------	--------------	---------------

Horsiese, Instruction 3

71, 5	ε + caus inf	after ΟΥΦΟΥΨΟΥ ΠΕ
-------	--------------	-------------------

Horsiese, Instruction 4

72, 19-20	ε + caus inf	after ΟΥΝΟΒ̄ Π̄ΜΑΚΑΡΙΟΣ ΠΕ ΠΑΙ
72, 25-27	ε + caus inf:	after ΤΕΧΡΙΑ (...) ΠΕ

Horsiese, Instr 7

76, 3	ε + inf (2x)	after ΝΑΝΟΥΣ
-------	--------------	--------------

Regulations

83, 18-19	€ + caus inf	after ΖΑΠC
89, 38	€ + neg caus inf	after ΦΦΕ
90, 11	€ + 3 x neg inf	after ΦΦΕ
91, 19	€ + inf	after ΦΦΕ
91, 22	€ + inf	after ΦΦΕ
92, 20	€ + inf	after ΦΦΕ
93, 2	€ + caus inf	after ΦΦΕ
96, 31	€ + caus inf	after ΕΦΦΕ
97, 5	€ + caus inf	after ΕΤΕΦΦΕ
98, 14	€ + inf	after ΕΤΕΦΦΕ
98, 14	€ + inf	after ΕΤΕΦΦΕ
98, 15	€ + inf	after ΤΑΝΑΓΚΗ ΤΕ
98, 22	€ + caus inf	after ΦΦΕ

Letters

65, 27	€ + caus inf	after ΠΕΤΕΦΦΕ ΠΕ
--------	--------------	------------------

1.4 Complementary and Exegetic Clauses introduced by ἵνα / Infinitive

Constructions

Matthew

3,11 inf after εἰμι ἵκανός	M: ε+inf S: η + inf
3, 14 inf after χρείαν ἔχω	M: η + inf S: η + inf
8,8 ἵνα subj after εἰμι ἵκανός	M: ε+caus inf S: κεκα fut 3
9, 6 inf after ἐξουσίαν ἔχει	M: ε+ inf S: ε + inf
10,1 ὥστε – inf after ἔδωκεν ἐξουσίαν	M: ωστε ε – inf. S: ε – inf
12, 14 ὅπως subj after συμβούλιον ἔλαβον	M: η inf conj S: κεκα fut3
14,16 inf after οὐ χρείαν ἔχουσιν	M: ε+caus inf S: ε +caus inf
22,15 ὅπως subj after συμβούλιον ἔλαβον	M: κεκε – fut 3 S: κεκα – fut 3
27,1 ὥστε – inf after συμβούλιον ἔλαβον	M: ωστε ε – inf S: ωστε ε – inf

John

1,12 inf after ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν	S: ε+caus inf L: -
1,27 ἵνα + subj after οὐκ εἰμι ἄξιος	S: ε+inf
2,25 ἵνα + subj after οὐ χρείαν εἶχεν	S: κεκα – fut 3 L: κεκαε – fut 2
5,7 ἵνα + subj	S: κεκα – fut 3 L: κεκαε – conj (interposition)
5,27 inf after ἐξουσίαν ἔδωκεν	S: ε+caus inf

	L: ε+caus inf
6,7 ἵνα + subj after οὐκ ἀρκοῦσιν	S : χΕΚΛC – fut 3 L : χΕ – fut 3
8,56 ἵνα + subj after ἡγαλλιάσατο	S: χΕΚΛC - fut 3 L: χΕΚΛCε - fut 3
10, 18 inf after ἐξουσίαν ἔχω	S: ε+inf L: λ+inf
10, 18 inf after ἐξουσίαν ἔχω	S: ε+inf L: λ+inf
11,57 ἵνα + subj after δεδώκεισαν .. ἐντολὰς	S: χΕΚΛC - fut 3 L: χΕΚΛCε - fut 3
12,23 ἵνα + subj after ἐλήλυθεν ἡ ὥρα	S: χΕΚΛC +fut3 L: χΕΚΛCε +fut3
13,1 ἵνα + subj after ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα	S: χΕ – fut3 L: χΕ – fut3
13,10 inf after ἔχει χρείαν	S: ε+inf L: conj
13,34 ἵνα + subj after ἐντολὴν .. δίδωμι	S: χΕΚΛC - fut 3 L: χΕΚΛC - fut 3
15,8 ἵνα + subj after ἐν τούτῳ ἐδοξάσθη	S: χΕΚΛC - fut 3 L: χΕΚΛCε - fut 3
15,13 ἵνα + subj after μείζονα ταύτης ἀγάπην ἔχει	S: χΕΚΛC + fut 3 L: χΕΚΛCε +fut3
16, 2 ἔρχεται ὥρα ἵνα – subj	S: ζΟΤΕ – fut 2 L: conj
16,30 οὐ χρείαν ἔχεις ἵνα – subj	S: χΕΚΛC - fut 3 L: χΕΚΛCε - fut 2
16,32 ἔρχεται ὥρα ἵνα – subj	S: χΕΚΛC – fut 2 (in Quecke fut 3) L: χΕΚΛCε – fut 2
17,2 ἔδωκας αὐτῷ ἐξουσίαν ... ἵνα ... subj	S: χΕΚΛC +fut3

L: **κεκαε** +fut3

19,10 inf after ἐξουσίαν ἔχω
S: **n+inf**
L: **α+inf**

19,10 inf after ἐξουσίαν ἔχω
S: **n+inf**
L: **n+inf**

Romans

9,21 inf after ἔχει ἐξουσίαν S: **ε+inf**

11,8 τοῦ +inf ἔδωκεν (...) ὀφθαλμούς S: **ε+ inf:**

13, 11 inf after ὄρα (ἐστίν) S: **ε+ inf:**

Original Literature

Pachom

Spiteful

8, 19	ε+caus inf	after ῤῖῖῖῖῖῖ
11, 19-20	conj	after ῖῖῖῖ ῖῖ ῖῖῖ
11, 32	ε+inf	after ῖῖῖῖῖ
17, 20	ε+inf	after ῖῖῖῖῖῖῖ Lk 10, 19
19, 3	ε+inf	after ῖῖῖῖῖῖ
19, 31	ε+ caus inf	after ῖῖῖῖῖῖῖ ῖῖῖῖῖ ῖῖ ῖῖῖ

Shenute

Young, 21

129, 28	ε+inf	after ῖῖῖῖῖ
132, 2	n+inf	after ῖῖῖῖῖ
129, 40	ε+inf	ῖῖῖῖῖῖ ῖῖῖῖῖ

Adversus Graecos

42, 6 **ε+inf** after **ῖῖῖῖῖ**

Ad phil

58, 20 **ε+inf** after **ῖῖῖῖῖ**

Monast disc

118, 5 **ε+caus inf** after **ῖῖῖῖῖ**

119, 28	ε+caus inf	after ρωφε
128, 25	ε+inf	after μπωλ
142, 31	ε+caus inf	after ρῖπωλ
148, 5	ν+inf	after μπωλ

Theodore,

Instruction 3

41, 26	ζωστε+ ε+caus inf	after ἦπωλ
44, 10-11	ν +inf	after ἐμῆθε
44, 11-12	ε +inf	after ἐμῆθε
47, 7-8	ν +inf	after ῥωλγ
50, 21	ε+inf	after σετωτ
50, 31	ε+caus inf	after ἦπωλ
52, 4	ε+inf	after σετωτ

Horsiese

Regulations

82, 16	ε+caus inf	after †σο
85, 14-15	ε+inf	after μῆται παρρησια ... εωθ
85, 20	ν+inf	after ἦπωλ
91, 26	ε+ inf	after ρωφε
91, 27	ε+ inf	after ρωφε
92, 20-21	ε+ inf	after πεογοειθ ωπε
94, 24-5	ε+ inf	after οὔνταν τεζογια ε...
94, 25	ε+ inf	after οὔνταν εζογια ε...

2. Clauses/Infinitives of Result

Gospel of Matthew

Conjunction: ὥστε (mostly); ἵνα ὅπως (less frequently)

8,24	ὥστε – inf.	M: ῥωστε – conj S: ῥωστε ε+caus inf
8,28	ὥστε – neg inf.	M: ῥωστε – conj S: ῥωστε ε+neg.caus inf
12,22	ὥστε – inf.	M: ῥωστε – conj S: ῥωστε ε+caus inf
13,2	ὥστε – inf.	M: ῥωστε – conj S: ῥωστε ε+caus inf
13,32	ὥστε – inf.	M: ῥωστε – conj S: ῥωστε – conj
13,54	ὥστε – inf.	M: ῥωστε – conj S: ῥωστε ε+caus inf
15,30-31	ὥστε – inf.	M: ῥωστε – conj S: ῥωστε ε+caus inf
15,33	ὥστε – inf.	M: ῥωστε ε – inf. S: ῥωστε ε – inf.
23, 35	ὅπως subj	M: χεκεε fut3 S: χεκαε fut3
24,24	ὥστε – inf.	M: ῥωστε – conj S: ῥωστε ε – inf
27,14	ὥστε – inf.	M: ῥωστε – conj S: ῥωστε – conj

Gospel of John

3,16	ὥστε – ind	S: ῥωστε - pf 1 L: ῥωστε - pf 1
9,2	ἵνα + subj	S: χεκαε + fut 3 L: χεκαεε +fut 3

Romans

1,20 εἰς τό+inf

	S: ϵ +caus inf
7,6 ὄστε – inf.	S: $\zeta\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon$ – ϵ +caus inf
11, 11 ἵνα + subj	S: $\chi\epsilon$ +fut 3
15,19 ὄστε – inf.	S: $\zeta\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon$ – ϵ +caus inf

Original literature:

Pachom,

Spiteful

3, 12 $\zeta\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon$ + conj	
9, 31-2 $\zeta\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon$ + ϵ caus inf	
14,15 $\zeta\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon$ + ϵ caus inf	
14,18-9 $\zeta\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon$ + ϵ inf	1Cor 13, 2-3 quotation
10,11 $\varphi\alpha\upsilon\tau\epsilon$	
11, 20 $\varphi\alpha\upsilon\tau\epsilon$	
12, 17 $\varphi\alpha\upsilon\tau\epsilon$	
17,26-27 $\chi\epsilon$ + fut 3	

Excerpta (Fragments from P.)

28a, 11 $\zeta\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon$ + conj
29a, 3-4 $\zeta\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon$ + ϵ caus inf
29b, 24 $\zeta\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon$ + conj

Shenute,

Young 6-7, Vienna K 930, 929, 927, 926

43a, 25	ϵ +caus inf
---------	----------------------

Elanskaya 1.1.b.707

86, 3a-7a	ϵ +caus inf
86, 13-17a	ϵ +caus inf

BLO

72, 44	$\varphi\alpha\upsilon\tau\epsilon$
78, 31	$\varphi\alpha\upsilon\tau\epsilon$

83, 63 $\varphi\lambda\eta\tau\epsilon$
86, 11 $\zeta\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon + \epsilon$ caus inf

Monast disc

128, 2 $\zeta\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon + \epsilon$ caus inf
143, 4 $\zeta\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon + \epsilon$ caus inf
143, 7 $\varphi\lambda\eta\tau\epsilon$
145, 3 $\epsilon + \text{caus inf}$

Horsiese,

Instruction 1

69, 25 $\varphi\lambda\eta\tau\epsilon$

Instruction 7

77, 5 $\chi\epsilon\kappa\alpha\sigma + \text{fut 2}$

Regulations

87, 36 $\varphi\lambda\eta\tau\epsilon$
89,38-90,1 $\epsilon + \text{caus inf}$
90, 8 $\zeta\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon + \text{conj}$
90, 18 $\zeta\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon + \text{conj}$ (interposition)
90, 24 $\epsilon + \text{caus inf}$
95, 9 $\epsilon + \text{caus inf}$

Theodore

Instruction 3

40, 24 $\zeta\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon + \text{conj}$
40, 30 $\zeta\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon + \text{conj}$
41, 20-22 $\zeta\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon + \epsilon$ caus inf
46, 19 $\zeta\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon + \epsilon$ caus inf
50, 1 $\epsilon + \text{caus inf}$
58, 7 $\zeta\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon \epsilon + \text{caus inf}$
58, 30 $\zeta\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon + \text{caus inf}$

BIBLIOGRAPHY

List of Abbreviations:

Acta Ant. Hung.	Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae
Aeg	Aegyptus
AnOr	Analecta Orientalia
ANTF	Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung
AristEpist	<i>Aristeae Epistula</i> in: Pelletier, A., <i>Lettre d'Aristée à Philocrate. Texte critique, traduction, commentaire, index</i> , Sources Chrétiennes 89 (1962) Paris
ASAE	Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte
AS/EA	Asiatische Studien/Études Asiatiques
BSAC	Bulletin de la Société d'archéologie copte
CE	Atiya, A. S. (ed.), <i>The Coptic Encyclopedia</i> , vols. 8, Macmillan Publishing Company 1991
CP	Polotsky, H. J., <i>Collected Papers</i> , Jerusalem 1971
CSCO	Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium
IOS	Israel Oriental Studies
JCoptS	Journal of Coptic Studies
JEA	Journal of Egyptian Archaeology
MDAIK	Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo
OLA	Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta
SAOC	Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der alchristlichen Literatur
ZÄS	Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde
ZDMG	Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft

WORKS CONSULTED

- BÖHLIG, 1953: BÖHLIG, A., "Griechische Deponentien im Koptischen" *Aeg* 33, 91-96
- BÖHLIG, 1955: BÖHLIG, A., "Beiträge zur Form griechischer Wörter im Koptischen" *ZÄS* 80, 90-97
- BLOK, 1927: BLOK, H.P., „Die griechischen Lehnwörter im Koptischen“ *ZÄS* 62, 49-60.
- BROCK, 1999: BROCK, S., *From Ephrem to Romanos. Interactions between Syriac and Greek in Late Antiquity*, Ashgate: Variorum
- BROCK, 1979: BROCK, S., "Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity" *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 20, 69-87, N.C.
- BUNSEN, 1848-67: BUNSEN, C. C. J., *Egypt' Place in Universal History. An Historical Investigation in Five Books*, (transl. by Cottrell, C. H. from *Aegyptens Stelle in der Weltgeschichte. Geschichtliche Untersuchung in fünf Büchern*, Hamburg: Gotha 1845-67) London: Longmans (referred to in POLOTSKY, 1987b)
- BYNON, 1997: BYNON, TH., *Történeti nyelvészet*, (transl. by Gherdán, T. – Számadó, T. from *Historical Linguistics*, Cambridge 1977), Budapest
- CLARYSSE, 1987: CLARYSSE, W., *Greek Loan-words in Demotic*, in: Vleeming, S. P. (ed.), *Aspects of Demotic Lexicography*, Leuven: Peeters
- COWPER ET AL., 1858: COWPER, B. H. – HOFFMANN, A. G. – LONGFIELD, G., *The Principles of Syriac Grammar*, Williams and Norgate
- CRUM, 1930: CRUM, W.E., "Ein neues Verbalpräfix im Koptischen" *ZÄS* 65, 124-127.

- DEPUYDT, 1993: DEPUYDT, L., *Conjunction, Contiguity, Contingency. On Relationships Between Events in the Egyptian and Coptic Verbal Systems*, New York – Oxford: Oxford University Press
- DRESCHER, 1969 : DRESCHER, J., "Graeco-Coptica", *Le Muséon* 82, 85-100.
- DRESCHER, 1970 : DRESCHER, J., "Graeco-Coptica II", *Le Muséon* 83, 139-155.
- ERMAN, 1894: ERMAN, A., *Ägyptische Grammatik*, Berlin (English translation by Breasted, J.H., *Egyptian Grammar. With Table of Signs, Bibliography, Exercises for Reading and Glossary*, London / Edinburgh 1894)
- FEDER, 2002: FEDER, F., *Biblia Sahidica. Ieremias, Lamentationes (Threni), Epistula Ieremiae at Baruch*, TU 147, Walter de Gruyter
- FEDER, 2006: FEDER, F., „Die „Gräzität“ koptischer Bibelübersetzungen. Wege der Übertragung heiliger Schriften“, *Lingua Aegyptia* 14, 301-310.
- FÖLDVÁRY, 2008: FÖLDVÁRY, M. I., "Szent nyelv vagy szent nyelvek?", www.foldvary.eoldal.hu/cikkek
- FÖRSTER, 2002: FÖRSTER, H., *Wörterbuch der griechischen Wörter in den koptischen dokumentarischen Texten*. TU 148, Berlin – New York
- FUNK, 1984: FUNK, W-P., "Bemerkungen zur Sprachvergleich griechisch-koptisch" in: Nagel, P. (ed.), *Graeco-Coptica*, Halle, 147-180
- GABR, 1990: GABR, M. Y., *Philological Studies on the Coptic Versions of the Gospel of John*, PhD Thesis at the University of Liverpool

- GASELEE, 1929-30 GASELEE, St., "Greek Words in Coptic" *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 30, 224-228.
- GIRGIS, 1963-4: GIRGIS, V., "Greek Loanwords in Coptic", *BSAC* 17, 63-73.
- GRODDEK ET AL., 2006: GRODDEK, D. – LINDKEN, T. – SCHAEFER, H., „**ΜΟΥΛΙΑΡΗΣ** „Maultiertreiber“: ein bislang verkanntes griechisches Lehnwort lateinischer Provenienz im Koptischen“ *JCOptS* 8 127-136
- HASITZKA – SATZINGER, 2004/2005: HASITZKA, M.R.M. – SATZINGER, H., "Ein Index der gräkokoptischen Wörter in nichtliterarischen Texten oder: Was ist ein Wörterbuch?" *Enchoria* 29 (2004/5), 19-32
- HASZNOS, 2005: HASZNOS, A., "A Greek *Accusativus cum Infinitivo* Construction and its Equivalents in Coptic" *ZÄS* 132, 92-93
- HASZNOS, 2004/2005: HASZNOS, A., "Die Struktur der Konsekutivsätze im koptischen Neuen Testament" *Enchoria* 29, 32-43
- HÄGG, 1978: HÄGG, T., "Some Remarks on the Use of Greek in Nubia" in J.M. Plumley (ed.), *Nubian Studies. Proceedings os the Symposium for Nubian Studies, Selwyn College, Cambridge*
- HINTZE, 1947: HINTZE, F., *Die Haupttendenzen der ägyptischen Sprachentwicklung*, Zeitschrift für Phonetik und Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft 1/3.
- HINTZE, 1950: HINTZE, F., „Konversion“ und „analytische Tendenz“ in der ägyptischen Sprachentwicklung, Zeitschrift für Phonetik und Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft 4.
- HOPFNER, 1918: HOPFNER, Th., *Über Form und Gebrauch der griechischen Lehnwörter in der koptisch-sahidischen Apophthegmenversion*, Wien
- HORROCKS, 1997 HORROCKS, G., *Greek. A History of the Language and its Speakers*, London and New York

- IRSAY-NAGY, 2006: IRSAY-NAGY, B. J., "A Journey to Egypt in 1483 and the Beginnings of Coptic Studies in Europe" *Acta Ant. Hung.* 46, 129-149
- JERNSTEDT, 1929: JERNSTEDT, P., "Graeco-Coptica" *ZĀS* 64, 122-135
- JOHNSON, 1976: JOHNSON, J., *The Demotic Verbal System*, SAOC 38, Chicago
- KIRCHER, 1636: KIRCHER, A., *Prodromus Coptus sive Aegyptiacus ... in quo cum Linguae Coptae, sive Aegyptiacae, quondam Pharaonicae, origo, aetas, vicissitudo, inclinatio...*, Romae
- KIRCHER, 1643: KIRCHER, A., *Lingua Aegyptiaca Restituta, opus tripartitum...*, Romae (both works by Kircher are referred to in Pfeiffer's study)
- LEFORT, 1947: LEFORT, L.Th., "A propos de syntaxe copte. **ⲧⲁⲢⲉ ⲙⲁⲢⲉ ⲙⲓⲡⲓⲣⲉ**", *Le Muséon* 60, 7-28.
- LEFORT, 1948: LEFORT, L.Th., "**ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲥ** dans le NT sahidique" *Le Muséon* 61, 65-73
- LEFORT, 1950: LEFORT, L.Th., „Gréco-copte“ in: *Coptic Studies in Honor of Walter Ewing Crum*, Boston: The Byzantine Institute
- LICHTHEIM, 1964: LICHTHEIM, M., "Notes on Late-Egyptian Conjunction" *Studies in Egyptology and Linguistics in Honour of H.J. Polotsky*, edited by H.B. Rosén, Jerusalem, 1-8
- LÜDDECKENS, 1980: LÜDDECKENS, E., "Ägypten", *Die Sprachen im römischen Reich der Kaiserzeit*. Beihefte der Bonner Jahrbücher 40, Cologne, 241-265
- METZGER, 1977: METZGER, B. M., *The Early Versions of the New Testament*, Oxford
- MINK, 1972: MINK, G., *Die koptischen Versionen des Neuen Testaments* in: K. ALAND (ed.), *Die alten Übersetzungen des Neuen*

- Testaments, die Kirchenväterzitate und Lektionare*, ANTF 5, 160-299.
- MORENZ, 1952: MORENZ, S., "Die ⲛⲟⲓ-Konstruktion als sprachliche und stilistische Erscheinung des Koptischen", *ASAE* 52, 1-15.
- NAGEL, 1971: NAGEL, P., 'Die Einwirkung des griechischen auf die Entstehung der koptischen Literatursprache' F. Altheim – R. Stiehl (eds.), *Christentum am Roten Meer*, vol.1 Berlin: De Gruyter, 327-355.
- NAGEL, 1974: NAGEL, P., „Diktion der römischen Kommandosprache in den Praecepta Pachomius" *ZÄS* 101, 114-120
- NAGEL, 1998: NAGEL, P., "Ein koptisches Fragment aus Kyrill von Jerusalem (Cat. VI 22-24) über die Anfänge des Manichäismus (P. Heid. Inv. Kopt. 450)", *Études Coptes IV* (Cahiers de la bibliothèque copte 8), 40-52
- NAGEL, 1991: NAGEL, P. "Lycopolitan (or Lyco-Diospolitan or Subakhmimic)" in *CE* vol. 8, 151-159
- ORÉAL, 1999: ORÉAL, E., "Contact Linguistique. Le cas du rapport entre le grec et le copte", *Lalies. Actes des sessions de linguistique et de littérature* 19, 289-306
- PFEIFFER, 1702: PFEIFFER, A., *Critica Sacra, De Sacri Codicis Partitione, Editionibus Variis, Linguis Originalibus ...* Lipsiae
- POLOTSKY, 1944: POLOTSKY, H. J., *Études de syntax copte*, Le Caire 1944
- POLOTSKY, 1950: POLOTSKY, H. J., "Modes grecs en copte?", Malinine, M. (ed.), *Coptic Studies in Honour of Walter Ewing Crum*, The Byzantine Institute, 73-90
- POLOTSKY, 1976 : POLOTSKY, H. J., "Les transpositions du verbe en égyptien classique", *IOS* 6, 1-50.

- POLOTSKY, 1987a: POLOTSKY, H. J., *Grundlagen des koptischen Satzbaus*, I, Georgia: Scholars Press Decatur
- POLOTSKY, 1987b: POLOTSKY, H. J., "Egyptology, Coptic Studies and the Egyptian Language", Ray, J. D. (ed.), *Lingua Sapientissima* 5, Cambridge (Faculty of Oriental Studies), 5 – 21
- RICHTER, 2004: RICHTER, T. S., "Zur Sprache thebanischer Rechtsurkunden: auffällige Konstruktionen im Bereich der Zweiten Tempora" in: *Coptic Studies on the Threshold of a New Millennium* (Proceedings of the Seventh International Congress of Coptic Studies, Leiden, 27 August – 2 September 2000), *OLA* 133
- RICHTER, 2008a: RICHTER, T. S., 'Coptic Letters', *AS/EA* LXII/3, 739-770.
- RICHTER, 2008b: RICHTER, T. S., Lexical Borrowing into Coptic. A Case Study in Loanword Typology, paper at the Leipzig Conference 2008 (not yet published)
- ROUSSEAU, 1985: ROUSSEAU, P., *Pachomius: The Making of a Community in Fourth-Century Egypt*, Berkely: University of California Press
- RUDNITZKY, 1956: RUDNITZKY, G., "Zum Sprachgebrauch Schenutes. Teil I-III", *ZÄS* 81, 48-58; 129-139; 143-151
- RUBENSON, 1992: RUBENSON, S., „St. Antony, „The First Real Coptic Author“?“ In: *Actes du IV^e Congrès copte. Louvain-la-Neuve, 5-10 septembre 1988*, Louvain-la-Neuve, 16-27.
- RUBENSON, 1995: RUBENSON, S., *The Letters of St Antony. Monasticism and the Making of a Saint*, Minneapolis
- SCHENKE 1991: SCHENKE, H-M., "Mesokemic (or Middle-Egyptian) " in *CE*, vol. 8, 162-164

- SCHENKEL, 1966 SCHENKEL, W., “Die Konversion, ein Epiphänomen der kemischen (ägyptisch-koptischen) Sprachgeschichte“, *MDAIK* 21, 123-132
- SCHÜSSLER, 2008: SCHÜSSLER, K., “Peculiarities of the Coptic Translations of the Gospel of John“ *JCoptS* 10, 41-62
- SETHE, 1925: SETHE, K., “Das Verhältnis zwischen Demotisch und Koptisch und seine Lehre für die Geschichte der ägyptischen Sprache“ *ZDMG* 79, 290-316
- SHISHA-HALEVY, 1986: SHISHA-HALEVY, A., *Coptic Grammatical Categories: Structural Studies in the Syntax of Shenoutean Sahidic*, AnOr 53, Rome: Pontificum Institutum Biblicum
- SHISHA-HALEVY, 1990: SHISHA-HALEVY, A., “The ‘Tautological Infinitive’ in Coptic: a Structural Examination” *JCoptS* 1, 99-127
- SHISHA-HALEVY, 1991: SHISHA-HALEVY, A., “Sahidic” in: *CE*, vol. 8, 193-202
- SHISHA-HALEVY, 1995: SHISHA-HALEVY, A., “Some Reflections on the Egyptian Conjunctive”, *Divitiae Aegypti. Koptologische und verwandte Studien zu Ehren von Martin Krause*, Wiesbaden, 300-314.
- SIJPESTEIJN, 1978: SIJPESTEIJN, P. J., “Copticisms in Greek Documents?” *Aeg* 58, 172-3.
- SNYDER, 2005: SNYDER, G., “Review on Bentley Layton: *A Coptic Grammar*” Society of Biblical Literature (<http://www.bookreviews.org>)
- STEINDORFF, 1891: STEINDORFF, G., “Neue koptische Urkunden aus Theben”, *ZÄS* 29, 1.f. (cited from RICHTER, 2004)
- THEODORSSON, 1977: THEODORSSON, S.-T., *The Phonology of Ptolemaic Koine*, Göteborg

- THOMASON – KAUFMAN, 1988: THOMASON, S. G. – KAUFMAN, T., *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*, University of California Press
- VERBEECK, 1991: VERBEECK, B., “Greek Language” in *CE* 4, 1165-1170.
- VOLTEN, 1964: VOLTEN, A., “The Late Egyptian Conjunctive” in: Rosén, H.B. (ed.), *Studies in Egyptology and Linguistics in Honour of H.J. Polotsky*, Jerusalem, 54-80.
- VÖÖBUS, 1954: VÖÖBUS, A., *Early Versions of the New Testament: Manuscript Studies*, Stockholm
- WEIB, 1966: WEIB, H-F., “Zum Problem der griechischen Fremd-und Lehnwörter in den Sprachen des christlichen Orients“, *Helikon* 6, 139-209.
- WEIB, 1969: WEIB, H-F., “Ein Lexikon der griechischen Wörter im Koptischen” *ZÄS* 96, 79-80.
- YOUNG, 1969: YOUNG, D.W., “Precept”: A Study in Coptic Terminology”, *Orientalia* 38, 505-519.

TEXT EDITIONS AND TRANSLATIONS CONSULTED:

- ALAND ET AL., 1994: ALAND, B. – ALAND, K. – KARAVIDOPOULOS, J. – MARTINI, C.M. – METZGER, B.M. (eds.), *The Greek New Testament*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft 1994⁴
- ALFORD, 1849: ALFORD, H., *The Greek New Testament: with a Critically Revised Text: a Digest of Various Readings: Marginal References to Verbal and Idiomatic Use: Prolegomena: and a Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, London: Francis & John Rivington
- BARTELINK, 1994: BARTELINK, G. J. M., *Athanasius: Vie d'Antoine*, Sources Chrétiennes 400, Paris: Éditions du Cerf

- ELANSKAYA, 1991: ELANSKAYA, A. I., *Coptic Literary Texts of the Pushkin State Fine Arts Museum in Moscow*, Studia Aegyptiaca XIII, Budapest
- GARITTE, 1949: GARITTE, G., *S. Antonii Vitae versio Sahidica*, CSCO 117, Scriptorum copticum IV, 1, Paris
- GRIESBACH, 1909: GRIESBACH, J. J., *Novum Testamentum Graece*, London: J. MacKinlay, et Cuthell et Martin
- HORNER, 1969: HORNER, G. (ed.), *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Southern Dialect* vols 7, Osnabrück: Otto Zeller
- LEFORT, 1956: LEFORT, L.Th., *Oeuvres de S. Pachom et de ses disciples*, CSCO 159, Scriptorum copticum 23, Louvain
- LEIPOLDT, 1908: LEIPOLDT, J., *Sinuthii archimandritae vita et opera omnia III*, CSCO 42, Scriptorum copticum 4, Louvain
- MIGNE, 1857-66: MIGNE, J.P., *Patrologia Graeca*, vol. LXV, Paris
- NESTLE – ALAND, 1993: NESTLE, E. – ALAND, K., *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 27th revised edition, Stuttgart 1993 in: New Testament Transcripts: <http://nttranscripts.uni-muenster.de>
- ORLANDI, – QUECKE, 1974: ORLANDI, T. – QUECKE, H., *Papiri della università degli studio di Milano (P. Mil. Copti)*, Milano
- PEREZ, 1984: PEREZ, G. A., *El evangelio de San Mateo en copto sahidico*, Madrid
- QUECKE, 1984: QUECKE, H., *Das Johannesevangelium saïdisch. Text der Handschrift Ppalau Rib. Inv.Nr. 183 mit den Varianten der Handschriften 813 und 814 der Chester Beatty Library und der Handschrift 924569*, Roma-Barcelona
- SCHENKE, 1981: SCHENKE, H-M. (ed.), *Das Matthäus-Evangelium im mittelägyptischen Dialekt des Koptischen (Codex Scheide)*, TU 127, Berlin: Akademie Verlag

- SHISHA-HALEVY, 1975: SHISHA-HALEVY, A., "Unpublished Shenoutiana in the British Library" *Enchoria V*, 53-108
- THOMPSON, 1924: THOMPSON, SIR H., *The Gospel of St. John According to the Earliest Coptic Manuscript*, London
- VEILLEUX, 1980: VEILLEUX, A. (transl.), *Pachomian Coinonia I: The Life of Saint Pachomius and His Disciples; II: Pachomian Chronichles and Rules; III: Instructions, Letters, and Other Writings of St. Pachomius and His Disciples*, Michigan
- YOUNG, 1993 : YOUNG, D. W., *Coptic Manuscripts from the White Monastery: Works of Shenute*, Textband, (Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, XII. Folge), Wien
- ZOEGA, 1973: ZOEGA, G., *Catalogus Codicum Copticorum Manuscriptorum*, Hildesheim-New York: Georg Olms Verlag (Nachdruck)

GRAMMARS CONSULTED:

- ALLEN, 2000: ALLEN, J. P., *Middle-Egyptian. An Introduction to the Language and Culture of Hieroglyphs*, Cambridge University Press
- BLASS – DEBRUNNER, 1961: BLASS, F. – DEBRUNNER, A., *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, transl. by R.W. Funk, Chicago and London
- BORNEMANN – RISCH, 1999: BORNEMANN, E. – RISCH, E., *Görög nyelvtan (transl. by Mayer, P.)*, Budapest 1999 (*Griechische Grammatik von Eduard Bornemann unter Mitwirkung von Ernst Risch*, Frankfurt am Main 1978)
- ČERNÝ – GROLL, 1978: ČERNÝ, J. – GROLL, S. I., *A Late Egyptian Grammar*, Rome

- DE WITT BURTON, 1898: DE WITT BURTON, E., *Moods and Tenses of New Testament Greek*, Chicago, 3rd edition
- GARDINER, 1957: GARDINER, SIR A.H., *Egyptian Grammar. Being an Introduction to the Study of Hieroglyphs*, Oxford: Griffith Institute, 3rd edition
- GIGNAC, 1976-81: GIGNAC, F.A., *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, 2 vols. Testi e documenti per lo studio dell'antichità 55, Milan
- JOHNSON, 1976: JOHNSON, J., *The Demotic Verbal System*, in: SAOC 38, Chicago
- JUNGE, 1996: JUNGE, F., *Einführung in die Grammatik des Neuägyptischen*, Wiesbaden
- LAYTON, 2004: LAYTON, B., *A Coptic Grammar with Chrestomathy and Glossary. Sahidic Dialect* (Porta Linguarium Orientalium 20), Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag (second edition)
- LOPRIENO, 1995: LOPRIENO, A., *Ancient Egyptian. A Linguistic Introduction*, Cambridge University Press
- LUFT, 1983: LUFT U., *A démotikus nyelv*, Budapest
- MOULTON ET AL., 1963: MOULTON, J.H. – HOWARD, W.F. – TURNER, N., *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, 5 vols, Edinburgh 1906-1976 (I am always referring to vol. 3 (1963))
- PORTER, 1992: PORTER, S.E., *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*, Sheffield: JSOT Press
- RADERMACHER, 1925: RADERMACHER, L., *Neutestamentliche Grammatik*, Tübingen: Verlag von J.C.B. Mohr
- STERN, 1880: STERN, L., *Koptische Grammatik*, Leipzig: T.O. Weigel
- TILL, 1961: TILL, W.C., *Koptische Grammatik*, Leipzig

WOLFF, 1956

WOLFF, F., *Griechische Satzlehre*, Berlin: Volk und Wissen
Volkseigener Verlag

CONCORDANCES CONSULTED:

DRAGUET, R., *Index copte et grec-copte de la Concordance du Nouveau Testament Sahidique* (CSCO 124, 173, 183, 185), CSCO 196, Subs 16, Louvain 1960

LEFORT, L. TH., *Concordance du Nouveau Testament I. Les mots d'origin grecque*, CSCO 183, subs. 13, Louvain 1964

SCHMOLLER, A., *Handkonkordanz zum Griechischen Neuen Testament*, Stuttgart :
Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 3rd revised edition 1994

WILMET, M., *Concordance du Nouveau Testament Sahidique*, CSCO 173, Subs. 13,
vols.2, Louvain 1957

DICTIONARIES CONSULTED:

BAUER, W., *Griechisch – deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und frühchristlichen Literatur*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin – New York 1988

CRUM, W.E., *A Coptic Dictionary*, Oxford 1939

GYÖRKÖSY A. – KAPITÁNYFY I. – TEGYEY I., *Ógörög – magyar nagyszótár*, Budapest 1993

LAMPE, G. W. H., *A Patristic Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford University Press 1961

LIDDELL, H. G. – SCOTT, R., *A Greek – English Lexicon*, Oxford University Press, 9th
revised edition, 1996

VARGA ZS., *Újszövetségi görög – magyar szótár*, Budapest 1992

WESTENDORF, W., *Koptisches Handwörterbuch*, Heidelberg 1965-1977

FURTHER READING

- BARNS, J. W. B., "Egypt and the Greek Romance" *Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek* 5 (1956), 29-36.
- BARNS, J. W. B., "Shenute as a Historical Source" in *Actes du Xè congrès international de papyrologues*, 1964
- BÖHLIG, A., *Die griechischen Lehnwörter im sahidischen und bohairischen Neuen Testament*, Studien zur Erforschung des christlichen Aegyptus, Heft 2, München 1954.
- BÖHLIG, A., *Ein Lexikon der griechischen Wörter im Koptischen. Die griechisch-lateinischen Lehnwörter in den koptischen manichäischen Texten*, München 1958
- BORGHOUTS, J. F. "A New Approach to the Late Egyptian Conjunctive" *ZÄS* 106 (1979), 14-24.
- BOWMAN, A. K., *Egypt after the Pharaohs*, Oxford University Press 1990
- BROWN, G. M., "Coptico-Graeca: The Sahidic Version of St. Athanasius' Vita Antonii" *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 12, 1971, 59-64.
- BUTCHER, E.L., *The History of the Church of Egypt*, 2 vols., London 1897
- CLARYSSE, W., "Egyptian Scribes Writing Greek", *Chronique d'Égypte* 68 (1993) 186-201
- DEPAUW, M., *The Demotic Letter. A Study of Epistolographic Scribal Traditions Against their Intra- and Intercultural Background*, Demotische Studien 14, Sommerhausen 2006
- DEPUYDT, L., "New Horizons in Coptic and Egyptian Linguistics" *Chronique d'Égypte* 53 (1988), 391-406
- DUMMER, J., "Angaben der Kirchenväter über das Koptische" in: NAGEL, P. (ed.), *Probleme der koptischen Literatur*, 17-57, Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg 1968
- EMMEL, S., "The Mystery of FR – BN Copte 13 and the 'Codex St. Louis': When Was a Coptic Manuscript First Brought to Europe in 'Modern' Times?", *JCoptS* 6 (2004), 5-29

- FUNK, W-P., "On a Semantic Typology of Conditional Sentences", *Folia Linguistica* 19 (1985) 365-413
- FUNK, W-P., "Toward a Synchronic Morphology of Coptic" in: WILSON, R. McL., (ed.), *The Future of Coptic Studies*, Leiden 1978, 104-124
- FUNK, W-P., "Beiträge des mittellägyptischen Dialekts zum koptischen Konjugationssystem" in YOUNG, D. W., (ed.), *Studies Presented to Hans Jakob Polotsky*, Massachusetts 1981, 177-210
- GRIFFITH, F. Ll., *The Date of the Old Coptic Texts and their Relation to Christian Coptic*, *ZÄS* 39 (1901) 78-82
- HASZNOS, A., "A Case Where Coptic is More Syndetic than Greek" *Acta Ant. Hung.* 46 (2006), 91-97
- JOEST, Ch., "Horsiese als Redaktor von Pachoms Katechese I 'An einen grollenden Mönch'." *JCoptS* 9 (2007) 61-94
- KASSER, R., "Les temps seconds dans le Papyrus bilingue (copte et grec) de Hambourg" in YOUNG, D. W., (ed.), *Studies Presented to Hans Jakob Polotsky*, Pirtle and Polson Publishers 1981, 211-220.
- KRAUSE, M., "Die Koptologie im Gefüge der Wissenschaften" *ZÄS* 100 (1974), 108-125.
- LEE, A. D., *Pagans and Christians in Late Antiquity*, London and New York: Routledge 2000
- LEWIS, N., *Life in Egypt Under Roman Rule*, Oxford 1983
- LUCCHESI, E., "Un mot grec rare attesté en copte (Shenouté)" *Philologus* 121 (1977), 317-318
- MILNE, J. G., *A History of Egypt Under Roman Rule*, London: Methuen 1898
- OSING, J., *Der spätägyptische Papyrus BM 10808*, Ägyptologische Abhandlungen 33, Wiesbaden 1976
- PEREMANS, W., "Le bilinguisme dans les relations gréco-egyptiennes sous les Lagides" *Studia Hellenistica* 27. *Egypt and the Hellenistic World*, Lovani 1983

- POLOTSKY, H. J., "The Coptic Conjugation System", *CP*, 392-422
- POLOTSKY, H. J., "Zur koptischen Wortstellung", *Orientalia* 30 (1961), 294-313
- SCHÜSSLER, K. (hrsg.), *Biblia coptica. Die koptischen Bibeltexte, Band 1: Das sahidische Alte und Neue Testament*, Lieferung 1: sa 1-20, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag 1995
- SCHÜSSLER, K. (hrsg.), *Biblia coptica. Die koptischen Bibeltexte, Band 3: Das sahidische Alte und Neue Testament. Vollständiges Verzeichnis mit Standorten*, Lieferung 1: sa 500-520, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag 2001
- SHISHA-HALEVY, A., "Apodotic ⲉⲓⲥⲱⲩⲧⲏ" *Le Muséon* 86 (1973), 455-66
- SHISHA-HALEVY, A., "Protatic ⲉⲓⲥⲱⲩⲧⲏ: A hitherto Unnoticed Coptic Tripartite Conjugation-Form and Its Diachronic Connections", *Orientalia* 43 (1974), 369-381
- SHISHA-HALEVY, A., "The Circumstantial Present as an Antecedent-less (i.e. Substantial) Relative in Coptic", *JEA* 62 (1976), 134-37
- SHISHA-HALEVY, A., "The Coptic Circumstantial Present with an Empty (Impersonal) Actor-Suffix and Adverbial Function", *JEA* 61 (1975), 256-57
- SHISHA-HALEVY, A., *Coptic Grammatical Categories: A Course for Academic and Private Study*, *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 30, Leuven: Peeters Press 1988
- SHISHA-HALEVY, A., *Coptic Grammatical Chrestomathy* in: *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 30, Leuven: Peeters Press 1988
- SIDARUS, A., "Medieval Coptic Grammars in Arabic: The Coptic muqaddinat", *JCOptS* 3 (2001), 63-81
- SIDARUS, A., "Plurilinguisme en Égypte sous la domination gréco-romaine" *JCOptS* 10 (2008) 183-202
- TILL, W. C., *Coptic and its Value*, Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 40, No.1., 229-258, 1957
- TIMM, S., *Das christlich-koptische Ägypten in arabischer Zeit 1-6*, Wiesbaden 1984 – 1992
- WEIGANDT, P., „Zum Text von Joh. X, 7“, *Novum Testamentum* IX (1967) 43-51, Leiden

WEIß, H-F., *Beobachtungen zur Frage der griechischen Komponente in der Sprache des Schenute*, Halle 1968 (Wiss.Beitr.Univ.Halle-Wittenberg 1968/1), 173-185

WESSELY, K., *Die griechischen Lehnwörter der sahidischen und bohairischen Psalmenversion*, Wien 1910

“The rest is silence...”

Shakespeare