Greek conjunctions in non-literary Coptic in the Late Byzantine/Early Islamic Period

Samuel Cook

DECLARATION

I, Samuel Cook, certify that this thesis has not been submitted for a higher degree to any other university or institution.

Date: 9th October, 2015

Summary

Despite the long history of loanword studies in Coptic, little is known about lexical borrowing in non-literary texts. Furthermore, little research has been conducted on the borrowing of Greek function words into the Egyptian language. This study examines the use of Greek loanwords in non-literary Coptic texts through a focus on three classes of Greek conjunctions – enclitic conjunctions, subordinating conjunction and coordinating conjunctions. Data from this study is drawn from legal texts and letters from the Theban region, composed in the 7th and 8th centuries.

The results from this study have important implications for our understanding of Greek and Egyptian language contact, the language of non-literary texts, and scribal practices in Late Antique Egypt. In particular, the presence of Greek conjunctions appears to be closely tied to the formulaic sections of documents. In many cases there appears to be a preference outside of these formulae for native Egyptian constructions. Furthermore, the uneven distribution of words within and outside of these formulae suggest certain Greek conjunctions were more integrated into the language of non-literary Coptic texts than others whose use may be influenced be the structure of earlier Greek documents.

Contents

List of Tables

Abbreviations

Ø – zero article

1, 2, 3 – 1st/2nd/3rd person

ABST – abstract prefix

ACC – accusative

ACT - active

ADH – adhortative

ADV – adverb

AGNT – prefix forming agent from a verb

AOR – aorist

APOD – conjunction marking apodosis (ⲉⲓⲉ)

ART – article

ATTR – attributive marker

CAUS.INF – causative infinitive

CIRC – circumstantial converter

CNJ - conjunction

CNJV – conjunctive

COND – conditional

COP – copula

DAT – dative

DEF – definite

DEM – demonstrative

DIR – direct

DTC – deictic article

ENCL – enclitic conjunction

EXT – existential predicate

F – feminine

FNLS – finalis

FOC – focalising/2nd tense converter

FUT – future (1st future)

GEN – genitive

HAB – habitual

IMP – imperative

INDC – indicative

INDP – independent pronoun

IND – indirect

INDF – indefinite

INTS – intensive pronoun

LMT – limitative

M – masculine

N - neuter

NEG – negative

NEG.POSS – negative possessive particle (ⲙⲛⲧⲉ-)

OBJ – object

P.C – participium conjunctum

PERF – 1st perfect

PFRM – performative ⲉϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ

PL – plural

POSS.ART – possessive article

POSS.PRN – possessive pronoun

PRIV – privative prefix

PRS – present

PRT – preterit converter

QUAL – qualitative

REL – relative

REL.ABS.PRN – relative absolute pronoun

SG – singular

TEMP - temporal

Corpus Material

O.Ashm.Copt. = Biedenkopf-Ziehner, A., (2000) *Koptische Ostraka II: Koptische Ostraka aus dem Ashmolean Museum in Oxford*, Wiesbaden

O.Brit.Mus.Copt. II = Biedenkopf-Ziehner, A., (2000) *Koptische Ostraka 1: Koptische Ostraka aus dem Britischen Museum in London*, Wiesbaden

O.Frangé = Boud'hors, A. and Heurtel, C., (2010), *Les ostraca coptes de la TT 29; Autour du moine Frangé, vol 1. Textes*, Bruxelles

O.Med.Habu Copt. = Stefanski, E. and Lichtheim, M., (1952), *Coptic Ostraca from Medinet Habu* OIP LXXI, Chicago

P.KRU = Crum, W. E., (1912), *Koptische Rechtsurkunden des achten Jahrhunderts aus Djeme (Theben),* Leipzig

Acknowledgements

1. Introduction

Languages are not static entities. They continually develop and change, not only through internal development but also through the influence of external forces. In particular, words may travel freely between languages as a result of prolonged contact, through a process traditionally described by linguists and grammarians as 'borrowing' or 'loaning'. The presence of loanwords in a language is therefore evidence of social, cultural and language contact between two groups. As such, the study of loanwords in ancient languages provides scholars with an insight into cultural contact and language change in antiquity.

Throughout the history of Coptic studies, the borrowing of Greek loanwords has been a major focal point of research into the language. Along with the adoption of the Greek script, the presence of Greek words is one of the most marked differences between Coptic and the earlier stages of the Egyptian language. However, despite the high level of discussion surrounding Greek lexical borrowings, there are still areas which require further study. In particular, little has been discussed regarding the use of loanwords in non-literary texts, or the borrowing of Greek function words into Coptic.

1.1 Aims and scope

The present study aims to develop a clearer understanding of the use of Greek loanwords in non-literary Coptic. More specifically, it seeks to investigate the way in which Greek function words were employed in documentary texts. Throughout the study, the following questions are considered:

- How are Greek function words used to express relationships between words, clauses and ideas in non-literary Coptic?

- How prevalent are Greek function words in non-literary texts, and in what environments do they appear?
- What do the results reveal about the use of Greek loanwords by scribes?

To a lesser degree, this study also makes comparisons to existing literature on Greek loanwords in Coptic literature in order to highlight any significance between literary and non-literary loans.

To demonstrate the use of function words in non-literary Coptic, data is drawn from legal texts and letters from the Theban region, composed during the 7th and 8th centuries CE – spanning the end of the Byzantine period and the beginning of Islamic rule in Egypt. By this time, Greek and Egyptian had been in close contact for over a millennium. As such, Greek loanwords had become an established part of the Egyptian vocabulary.

The results of this study will help to develop a clearer understanding of the use of Greek loanwords in Coptic as a whole. Furthermore, by examining the language of non-literary texts in greater detail, this study will contribute to the growing body of knowledge surrounding scribes, scribal practice, and scribal training in Late Antique Egypt. More broadly, these results will help to explore the complex social, cultural and linguistic interactions between Greek and Egyptian communities in antiquity. This can reveal much about the way in which languages and cultures interact not only in the past, but also in modernity.

1.2   Definitions

1.2.1. – What is a loanword?

The definition of 'loanword' is not as straightforward as it may first appear, and is the subject of much debate amongst linguists and Copticists alike. For the most part the definition hinges

on the degree to which particular words are integrated into the receptor language. One German school of thought divides borrowed words into two categories: *Lehnwörter* – words which are fully integrated into the language – and *Fremdwörter* – words which are not fully integrated[1]. This terminology has entered into discussions of loanwords in Coptic.

However, the distinction between *Lehnwörter* and *Fremdwörter*, and the definition of 'integration' is not always clear. Winter-Froemel, noting the ambiguity of the term in previous discussions surrounding loanwords, suggests that 'integration' applies to the process by which a word from the source language changes its form to conform to the structure of the target language[2]. Following this definition, as Böhlig points out, the majority of Greek words in Coptic would need to be classed as *Fremdwörter* unless their orthography had been completely assimilated into the native Egyptian system (for example ϩⲁⲅϭⲁⲗ from the Greek ἄγκυρα)[3].

Furthermore, the terms *Fremdwörter* and the English equivalent 'foreign word' are highly subjective. Tubach notes that a word that is considered to be foreign one day may be seen as an integrated part of the native vocabulary then next[4]. Furthermore, the perception of a word as 'foreign' or 'integrated' may differ between communities and individuals. It is, in fact, difficult to ascertain how these words were perceived day-to-day in the absence of native speakers to provide primary evidence. Consequently, it is difficult to distinguish between *Lehnwörter* and *Fremdwörter* in an ancient language. The way in which loanwords have been

---

[1] Haspelmath, (2009), pg. 43

[2] Winter-Froemel, (2008), pg. 159

[3] Böhlig, (1954a), pg. 6

[4] Tubach, (1999a), pg. 413

determined in this study will be discussed in greater depth in Chapter 2.2, *Methodology* (see 2.2.3.).

1.2.2. – What is a 'function word'?

The definition of the term 'function word' is also subject to ongoing linguistic debate. Traditionally, words are divided into two categories - 'content' words, which carry semantic value, or 'function' words, which carry "non-conceptual" meaning, and are directly related to the grammatical structure of a language[5]. However, while some word classes such as particles and conjunctions fall clearly under the heading of 'function word', others such as adverbs and prepositions are more problematic.

The difficulties in categorisation can be exemplified by the way in which various linguists classify prepositions. For example, Chung and Pennebaker include prepositions in their discussions of functions words, which they define as 'the cement that holds content words together'[6]. Similarly, van Hout and Muysken, who describe function words as any word which does not have a clear link to 'cultural content', also include prepositions in this definition[7].

However, the function of prepositions is not as straightforward as other parts of speech. Corver and van Riemsdijk note that, while prepositions are more grammatical than verbs, nouns and adjectives, they "seem less functional, in a sense, than determiners"[8]. While they

---

[5] Corver and van Riemsdijk, (2001), pg. 3; cf: Murphy, (2010), pg. 14 who also employs the terms lexical/grammatical words and 'open/closed-class' words.

[6] Chung and Pennebaker, (2007), pg. 347

[7] van Hout and Muysken, (1994), pg. 42

[8] Corver and van Riemsdijk, (2001), pg. 4

may define relationships between certain words (such as κατά: 'according to', διά: 'through' to use some Greek examples), they also denote more content specific relationships such as location and direction (for example, περί: 'around/near', ἀπό: 'away from'[9]) Consequently, some scholars believe that a distinction should be made within the category of prepositions between content-based and function-based[10].

While it is evident that the dichotomy between 'content' words and 'function' words is too absolute, it is not the aim of this study to enter into the linguistic debate surrounding the categorisation of word classes. However, the term 'function word' is often used ambiguously in literature regarding loanword studies, without any indication of what the author considers to be a function word. For the purposes of this study therefore, the term 'content' word will apply to the traditional word classes of nouns/pronouns, verbs and adjectives, while 'function' word will be used for all other word classes, including the more 'semi-lexical' categories of adverbs and prepositions.

1.3   Background

1.3.1. – Language Contact and Language Usage in Late Antique Egypt

The history of cultural and linguistic contact between Egyptians and Greeks begins prior to the conquest of Alexander. Prolonged contact began in the 7th century BCE with the establishment of the first major Greek settlement, Naukratis[11] which was a centre for seaborne

---

[9] It should also be noted that certain prepositions have both grammatical and content functions depending on their context, such as περί – 'near, around' (content)/'about, concerning' (grammatical).

[10] Mardale, (2011); Corver and van Riemsdijk, (2001), pg. 4; van Riemsdijk, (1990)

[11] Literary evidence regarding the dating of Greek settlement in Naukratis does not match the archaeological evidence. According to Herodotus the site was given to Greek traders by Amasis II, who ruled from c. 570 – 526

5

trade between Egypt and Greece[12]. Further contact was established during the late 7th century, when Greek and Carian mercenaries were settled near the army camps of the Saite Pharaoh, Psammetichos I (663 – 609 BCE), in the north-eastern coastal city of Pelusium[13]. During the 6th century, these Greeks were resettled in Memphis by the Pharaoh Amasis where they were known as 'Hellenomemphites'[14]. Nevertheless, Torallas-Tovar suggests that this initial contact resulted in only minimal lexical transfer between the two cultural groups[15].

The conquest of Alexander and the establishment of Greek rule in Egypt instigated a more pronounced linguistic shift in Egypt. Greek became a prestige language, associated with the ruling class. Since no Ptolemaic rulers, (with the exception of Cleopatra according to Plutarch[16]), learnt Egyptian, those members of the indigenous population wishing to become part of this ruling elite were required to learn Greek, thus promoting the spread of bilingualism amongst the upper classes of Egyptian society[17]. Furthermore, Greek education

---

BCE (Herodotus, *Histories*, 2.178). However, pottery from the site dates Greek occupation to c. 660 BCE; Matthews and Roemer, (2003), pg. 12; c.f. Petrie, (1890), pg. 273.

[12] Matthews and Roemer, (2003), pg. 12, Lewis, (2001), pg. 8

[13] Torallas Tovar, (2010a), pg. 255; Torallas Tovar, (2010b), pg. 18. Despite the earlier settlement of Naukratis for the purposes of trading, Torallas Tovar argues that the settlement of these mercenaries was the real starting point of permanent contact between Greeks and Egyptians; Torallas Tovar, (2010a), pg. 255.

[14] Pfeiffer, (2013), pg. 4b

[15] Torallas Tovar, (2010a), pg. 254

[16] Plutarch, *Antony*, 27.3-4. It is curious, however, that this does not explicitly state that Cleopatra knew Egyptian, but rather that she knew a number of languages even though her predecessors had not even attempted to learn the native language.

[17] On bilingualism/multilingualism and literacy in Ptolemaic Egypt, see Thompson, (2009); (1994a); (1994b); (1992a); (1992b); Fewster, (2002); Clarysse, (1993)

was linked to schools, while Demotic was linked to the temples[18]. Therefore, as the temples were increasingly deprived of funding and the local religion began to decline, Greek became more accessible than the native script for those learning to read and write[19].

Between the Ptolemaic and Roman periods, the production of Demotic material declined drastically. In 1993, Lewis estimated the number of known Demotic documents dated to the Ptolemaic period to be 600 (not including unpublished material); however those dated to the Roman period numbered only 60[20]. By the 1st century CE, Demotic was almost entirely absent from both administrative texts[21] and from private correspondence[22]. From this point, letters between individuals were written solely in Greek, even if both parties required an interpreter[23].The latest Demotic documents were produced in the 3rd century CE[24], although by this time the use of Demotic was mostly restricted to the religious sphere.

The development of the Coptic script provided a new opportunity for the production of non-literary texts in the indigenous language of Egypt. The first letters in Coptic appeared in the late 3rd century to 4th century[25] CE. The earliest attested legal texts in Coptic originate from

---

[18] Clarysse, (1992), pg. 51; Maehler, (1983)

[19] See Torallas-Tovar, (2010a), pp. 256 – 257; Bagnall, (1988).

[20] Lewis, (1993), pg. 279

[21] Torallas-Tovar, (2010a), pg. 256; Depauw, (2003); Bagnall, (1993), pg. 237; Lewis, (1993)

[22] Richter, (2008), pg. 741

[23] Depauw, (2006), pg. 299; Clarysse, (1993), pg. 201

[24] Lewis, (1993), pg. 276

[25] Richter in Keenan, J. G., et. al., (2014), pg. 135; Richter, (2008)

around 560 to 570 CE, composed by the bilingual poet and notary Dioscorus of Aphrodito[26].
The dominance of Greek and the absence of Demotic from documents in the intervening
centuries had important implications for the development of the Coptic non-literary textual
tradition[27].

Despite the growing use of Coptic for administrative and private documents, Greek still held a
dominant position in non-literary texts until after the Arab conquest of 641 (from which point
the production of Greek texts gradually declined). In the 6th and 7th centuries CE, legal
documents continued to be composed in Greek for individuals who stated that they could not
understand the language[28]. Letters also continued to be written in Greek for several centuries
after the conquest. Richter notes one unpublished Greek letter dated as late as the 10th century,
however specimens dated after the early 8th century are rare[29].

1.3.2   Greek Loanwords in Egyptian

Despite the length and depth of contact between Greece and Egypt, the true extent of the
lexical influence of Greek is not visible prior to the establishment of Coptic. Clarysse lists
only 114 Greek loanwords in Demotic[30]. These words were mostly limited to certain
categories of words: honorific titles, official titles and technical terms (particularly in relation

---

[26] Richter in Keenan et. al., (2014), pg 136. Förster, Fournet and Richter suggest that the earliest Coptic legal
document is P.Lond. inv. 2849, which is most likely part of the archive of Dioscorus – see Förster, Fournet and
Richter, (2012).

[27] Literature surrounding the influence of Greek and Demotic documents on the structure and language of Coptic
non-literary texts will be discussed below; see Literature Review.

[28] Clackson, (2004), pg. 23

[29] Richter, (2009), f. 8

[30] Clarysse, (1987)

to administration, finance and the military)[31]. Furthermore, it is (for the most part) only loaned nouns which are attested[32].

There are several factors which may influence this low occurrence of Greek loanwords attested in Demotic:

1. Written texts are slower to reflect changes which occur in the spoken language. As such, the Demotic textual evidence (and indeed Coptic textual evidence) does not reveal the extent of lexical borrowing that would have existed in spoken Egyptian[33].

2. According to initial results published by the Dictionary and Database of Greek Loanwords in Coptic (DDGLC) project, 41% of Greek loanwords in Coptic are related to religion and belief – the largest percentage of any semantic sub-category[34]. As such, the adoption of Christianity under the Byzantine Empire would have coincided with a large influx of Greek terminology and concepts associated with this new religion.

3. Scholarship on the Demotic script and Demotic texts has only begun to develop rapidly in the last few decades. Between 1983 and 2013, Clarysse identified a further

---

[31] Clarysse, (1987)

[32] Richter, (2009), pg. 407. Grossman (f.c) notes the incorporation of Greek verbs into 2nd/3rd century CE Demotic ostraca from Narmouthis, using the 'light-verb' strategy; *iri* + infinitive (the antecedent of the Coptic p̄ + infinitive construction). In these texts, the Greek verb is written in the Greek alphabet from left to right, while the rest of the texts is written in the Demotic script from right to left. However, Grossman suggests that, linguistically, the language of these texts is more akin to early varieties of Coptic, and categorises them as such (ft. 15).

[33] C.f. Richter, (2009), pg. 406

[34] Richter, (2013), pg. 79

9

18 Greek loanwords from his original list of 96[35]. It is therefore possible that as our understanding of the Demotic script develops, further loanwords will be identified.

It is not until the emergence of Coptic as a distinct writing system that the extent to which lexical items were borrowed from Greek into Egyptian became visible in written documents. Tubach estimates that around 20% of the vocabulary of Coptic is comprised of Greek loanwords[36]. Unlike Demotic, these words were drawn from every part of speech. Table 1.1 shows the breakdown of these borrowings based on early results published by the DDGLC project[37].

Table 1.1: Division of Greek loanwords across word classes

Nouns	65%
Adjectives	14%
Verbs	17%
Conjunctions, adverbs and particles	3.6%
Prepositions	0.4%

As this table reveals, function words (assuming the definition includes prepositions and adverbs), make up only 4% of the Greek loanwords attested in Coptic, while conjunctions (and the word class traditionally referred to as 'particles') form only a fraction of this figure. Nonetheless, the significance of the borrowing of these words in terms of their possible structural influence of Greek on Egyptian, as well as what this suggests regarding the level interaction between the two languages, is such that they are worthy of further investigation.

---

[35] Clarysse, (2013); Clarysse, (1987)

[36] Tubach, (1999a)

[37] Richter, (2013), pg. 77, Table 4

1.4   The Study

After locating this study within existing scholarship regarding both non-literary Coptic texts and Greek loanwords in Coptic, analysis of the data will be presented over three chapters. Chapter 3 examines enclitic conjunctions, traditionally referred to as 'particles'. Chapter 4 analyses subordinating conjunctions, with particular reference to differences between literary and non-literary loans. Chapter 5 discusses Greek coordinating conjunctions which, for the most part, express a wider range of relationships than their native counterparts.

Throughout these chapters, analysis will focus on the range meanings associated with each conjunction in the corpus, as well as the use of these conjunctions in various repeating patterns. Particular attention is paid to the appearance of these conjunctions in epistolary and legal formulae. As a discussion of these results reveal, the use of Greek conjunctions is tied closely to epistolary and legal formulae. Furthermore, patterns of distribution suggest that certain Greek words were more integrated into the written language than others.

2. Literature Review and Methodology

2.1 Literature

The research presented in this study forms part of ongoing investigation in two branches of Coptic Studies; the examination and discussion of Coptic documentary texts and the study of Greek loanwords in Coptic. However, there is little overlap between these two areas in existing literature. The growing discourse surrounding documentary texts has focused on the information they provide about Late Antique Egyptian society, rather than the language of these documents. Similarly, the study of Greek loanwords in Coptic has focused on literary rather than non-literary loans. As such, an overview of literature shows that there is a need for further study to better understand loanword usage in Coptic as a whole.

2.1.1. – Coptic Papyrology and the Study of Documentary Texts

The study of Coptic documentary texts, and indeed Coptic as a whole, is a relatively recent development. The interest of 19th and early 20th century scholars was drawn to Egypt by the presence of Greek papyri, rather than those texts written in the native language. In particular, as Clackson notes it was the possibility of discovering previously unknown works of Classical authors which drew the attention of scholars, rather than an interest in Egyptian history[1]. Consequently, Coptic material was often left unexamined and untranslated.

Furthermore, early papyrology in general focused on literary rather than documentary material. The publication of non-literary material was often met with indifference, or even

---

[1] Clackson, (2004), pg. 21; cf. Bagnall, (2009), pg. xvii

scorn, by scholars whose interest lay in the literary works of antiquity[2]. This attitude is exemplified by comments made in the publication of non-literary texts from Elephantine by Margoliouth in 1912, in which the author writes; "not one per cent of those (texts) which are deciphered and edited with so much care tell us anything worth knowing"[3].

The situation has changed in the past few decades with an increased interest in non-literary material. This has followed a wider trend in the study of Ancient History towards the study of "microhistory" - the examination of history through the perspective of the individual, or the individual in relation to the group, particularly through the use of documentary evidence[4]. For example, recent studies by Cromwell[5], Richter[6], MacCoull[7] and others have drawn on Coptic documentary texts to explore scribal practices, education, bilingualism, law, and daily life in Late Antique communities of the Egyptian *chora*, particularly in the Theban region[8].

---

[2] For a more detailed discussion of early papyrologists and their interest in literary material, see van Minnen, (1993).

[3] Margoliouth, (1912), pg. 73

[4] See North, (2009); Levi, (2004), Ginzburg, (1992); (1989)

[5] Cromwell, (2012); (2011); (2010a), (2008)

[6] Richter, (2010) ; (2009); (2008)

[7] MacCoull, (2009); (1997); (1989)

[8] On bilingualism/multilingualism in documentary papyri, see also Vierros, (2012); Fournet, (2009); Fewster, (2002); Oreál, (1999). On scribal practices and education, see also Bucking, (2007a); (2007b). On law in Late Antique Egypt, see also Keenan, Manning and Yiftach-Firanko, (2014). For discussions on daily life in Late Antique Egypt, see in particular Wilfong, (2002). The works and authors listed here represent only a fraction of the recent research into the society of Late Antique Egypt through the utilisation of documentary texts. However, this research is largely unrelated to the present study, and therefore it is not pertinent to provide an exhaustive list.

However, despite the shift towards the study of non-literary texts, relatively few scholars have examined the language of these documents. The most extensive study is Richter's *Rechtssemantik und forensische Rhetorik,*[9] which presents an overview of language use in legal texts with a particular focus on the influence of earlier Demotic and Greek terminology on legal phraseology. Other discussions surrounding non-literary language are narrower in focus, generally consisting of commentary on notable linguistic features in the publication of a single text[10] or a particular archive[11].

In addition, there is a growing body of work which focuses on the epistolary and legal formulae. These studies[12] reveal the dual influence on the phraseology of Coptic documents from their Greek and Demotic predecessors. For example, Richter amongst others notes that the internal formulae for Coptic letters is closely modelled on contemporary Greek patterns, such as the common address formulae using the Greek ϫⲁⲓⲣⲉ/ϫⲁⲓⲣⲉⲧⲉ/ϫⲁⲓⲣⲉⲓⲛ[13]. On the other hand, the use of the verb ⲥϩⲁⲓ - 'to write' – in the opening address formula of letters is uniquely Egyptian in origin; based on the earlier Demotic formula using the verb of saying *A p3 nty ḏd n B* – 'A is the one who says to B'[14].

---

[9] Richter, (2002)

[10] For example the discussion on protatic ⲉϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ and performative ⲉⲓⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ in P.CLT 10 by Cromwell and Grossman, (2010).

[11] See, for example the publication of the O.Frangé corpus by Boud'hors and Heurtel which discusses lexical, morphological and orthographic traits particular to the corpus; Boud'hors and Heurtel, (2010), pp. 26 – 32

[12] See for example Biedenkopf-Ziehner, (2001); (1996); (1983); Richter, (2008); Choat, (2007); Cromwell, (2010b); Krall, (1889)

[13] Richter, (2008), pg. 748, f. 35; cf. Förster, (2002), pp. 862 – 863

[14] Choat, (2007), pg. 672; cf. Depauw, (2006), pp. 144 – 145.

Although detailed studies of the language of Coptic documents are limited, there has been ongoing theoretical discourse in the field surrounding the differences between literary and non-literary language. Richter and Almond, amongst others, have suggested that documentary texts are less static than their literary counterparts, and are more prone to exhibiting changes in the spoken language[15]. This is particularly true when compared to Biblical texts, which Richter believes were constructed through a conscious decision to mirror the stylistic register of the Greek from which they were translated[16].

However, scholars also note the limitations of using the language of documentary texts to make inferences regarding the nature of spoken Coptic. Although the language of documentary texts may reflect changes in the spoken language more quickly than their literary counterparts, both Almond and Richter note that the two registers have their own unique history, set of traditions and purposes which set them apart[17]. This view is shared by scholars who argue that the rigid structure of Coptic documentary texts obscures the more colloquial traits of the spoken language[18].

---

[15] Almond, (2010), pg. 25; Richter, (2006), pg. 314. Compare, for example, the use of the more conservative and archaic 'classical' Middle Egyptian for religious literature and the use of Late Egyptian for administrative texts in the New Kingdom. There are however exceptions - Richter notes that, in the work of Shisha-Halevy on Shenoutian Sahidic (Shisha-Halevy, 1986), there are references to linguistic features which are more colloquial and informal than the Biblical literary standard (Richter, 2006, pg. 313). The difference may therefore lie between translational/non-translational texts, rather than literary/non-literary.

[16] Richter, (2006), pg. 313

[17] Almond, (2010), pg. 25; Richter, (2006), pg. 311

[18] For example, Torallas Tovar, (2010a), pg.254; Bagnall, (1993), pg. 238; Quaegebeur, (1982), pg.126; cf. Richter, (2006); Versteegh, (2002), pp. 57–66

Additionally, the use of language in a document fails to reflect the proficiency of a scribe in that language. However, Clackson notes that there has been a trend in papyrological studies to ascribe ethnic identity to the author of a document based purely on the language which they use.[19] For example, in her discussion of artistic patronage in the construction of monumental tombs, Thomas argues that the composition of related documents in Greek indicates that the patrons who wrote them were Greek[20]. Aside from the complex question of ethnic identity in the multicultural environment of Ptolemaic and Late Antique Egypt, this assumption does not take into account the extent to which scribes where bilingual in both Greek and Egyptian. Rather, it presumes that the composition of a document in Greek indicated that the writer was a native speaker of the language.

Furthermore, the highly formulaic nature of documentary texts means that scribes did not necessarily need a thorough grasp of the language in which they were writing. Bucking suggests that, depending on the type of text being composed, Egyptian scribes writing in Greek could function with only a minimal knowledge of the language; limited to the reproduction of formulae following model texts[21]. While this suggestion may underestimate the extent to which proficiency in Greek was necessary for scribes to carry out their work, it is certainly true that the use of either Greek or Egyptian in a document does not necessarily convey the level of their knowledge of either language.

As these discussions show, further research is required to better understand language use in Coptic documentary texts. In particular, it is clear that the relationship between the use of Greek and Egyptian in documents and the proficiency of scribes in these languages is not

---

[19] Clackson, (2004), pg. 22

[20] Thomas, (1992), pg. 319

[21] Bucking, (2007a), pg. 238.

straightforward. The extent to which the formulaic structure of documentary texts influences the use of Greek terms and constructions in these documents is in need of further investigation. It is possible that a greater understanding of the use of Greek in non-literary Coptic, and of the proficiency of Late Antique scribes in the language, may be facilitated through a closer examination of Greek loanwords in Coptic documents.

2.1.2. – Greek Lexical Borrowing in Coptic

Research into the use of Greek loanwords in Coptic has formed a large part of the scholarship surrounding the language. This is hardly surprising given the highly visible impact of Greek on the language of Egypt: both in the use of the Greek alphabet, and in its vocabulary which is estimated to be comprised of around 20% Greek loanwords[22]. Most recently, Greek loanwords have been the focus of a large-scale project based at the Universität Leipzig[23] – the Dictionary and Database of Greek Loanwords in Coptic (DDGLC). This project not only draws on the history of Coptic scholarship on Greek-Egyptian language contact, but also incorporates linguistic research[24].

However, despite the extensive literature examining Greek lexical borrowing into Coptic, there are still areas that require further study. For example, research has focused on loanwords in literary texts, particularly in the Sahidic and Bohairic translations of the New Testament[25]

---

[22] Tubach, (1999a)

[23] Currently the project is in the process of moving to Berlin.

[24] This includes close ties to the Loanword Typology Project at the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Leipzig: see the work of Haspelmath, (2008); (2009)

[25] Notably, Behlmer, (1999); Bauer, (1975); Böhlig, (1954a); Böhlig, (1958), Lefort, (1950) cf: Wessely, (1910) who provides a list of Greek words appearing in the Psalms, as well as their Grundform in various dialects. The publication however lacks a discussion of their meanings and usages.

and in the Manichaean papyri[26]. As such, few studies have focused on the use of Greek

loanwords in non-literary Coptic. The most significant, Förster's *Wörterbuch der*

griechischen Wörter in den koptischen dokumentarischen Texten, provides an extensive list of

Greek loanwords in documentary texts and variations in their orthography[27], but does not

fully explore the variations in meaning and use of each lexical entry[28].

Furthermore, the borrowing of content words has received more attention than the borrowing

of function words. Since nouns and verbs are flectional in Greek, the study of content words

has been of interest to scholars in examining the strategies through which inflected Greek

words were adopted and realised in the less flectional Coptic morphological system. In

particular, a large number of studies have discussed the borrowing of Greek verbs in an

attempt to identify the Grundform of borrowed verbs and to understand the diachronic

development of loan verb integration in Coptic[29]. As such, the presence of Greek function

words in Coptic has been mostly overlooked.

Those few studies which discuss Greek function words in Coptic do so with a varying degree

of depth. The study of Gregorios on Greek conjunctions in Coptic[30], part of a series on

different classes of Greek loanwords, is the only major study to focus exclusively on Greek

function words[31]. More commonly, scholars discuss the use of Greek subordinating

---

[26] Demaria, (2005); Tubach, (1999b); Böhlig, (1954b); Böhlig, (1953); Alberry, (1937)

[27] Förster, (2002)

[28] This, however, is more of a reflection of the purpose of the Wörterbuch than any failings by the author – cf.
the criticisms of this work by Hasitzka and Satzinger, (2004/2005), and Förster's response (2006/2007).

[29] For studies dealing exclusively with loan-verb integration, cf: Almond, (2010) Grossman (fc.)

[30] Gregorios, (1991)

[31] However, two papers were presented on the subject at the Inaugural Conference of the DDGLC Project,
Leipzig in 2010; by Müller (2010) on Greek conjunctions and by Oreál (2010) on Greek particles.

conjunctions as part of wider studies comparing Greek and Egyptian clause patterns in Coptic[32]. These studies provide a detailed discussion on clause and sentence structure in Coptic, with Hasznos in particular concluding that contact with Greek altered the syntax of the Egyptian language. However, they are limited by the fact that they draw their data almost exclusively from literary sources[33].

Despite the lack of detailed discussions on the use of Greek function words in Coptic, there has been much theoretical discussion surrounding the significance of the borrowing of these words. The presence of loaned content words reflects cultural contact between two societies, wherein words are borrowed for objects, ideas and concepts which do not appear in the society of the receptor language. However since function words are structural elements of a language, the motivations behind the borrowing of function words are more nuanced, reflecting a deeper level of interaction between the superstrate and substrate languages.

Consequently, the borrowing of Greek particles and conjunctions has been used as evidence for Greek structural interference in Coptic. Hasznos (as mentioned above) and Reintges both suggest that the presence of Greek function words represents not only lexical borrowing but also grammatical borrowing[34]. In particular, in her examination of a passage from the Coptic Gospel of John, Hasznos notes that Greek connecting particles and conjunctions appear in translations where the original Greek text has none, suggesting that their use is deeply ingrained in the Coptic grammatical structure[35].

---

[32] See Müller, (2009); (2012); Hasznos, (2012); Wilson, (1970).

[33] The comments and observations around particular function words in these studies is discussed in more depth in Chapters 3, 4 and 5 alongside the author's discussion of the data from the corpus.

[34] Reintges, (2004); Hasznos, (2004/5); Hasznos, (2005); Hasznos, (2006), Hasznos, (2012)

[35] Hasznos, (2006), pg. 97

However, this idea has been refuted by other scholars, arguing for minimal structural influence of Greek on Coptic. For example, Richter, following the Matrix Language Turnover Hypothesis of Myers-Scotton, notes that the borrowing of Greek function words is limited to those grammatical elements which work with the structure of Coptic[36]. This argument is built on early work of scholars in the field of contact linguistics who believe that structural elements can only be borrowed if they are similar to structural features already contained in the substrate language[37].

It is evident from existing scholarship that further study is required to better comprehend both the use of Greek loanwords in non-literary texts, and the language of these documents in general. Since loanword studies have focused on literary evidence, investigation into non-literary loans is required to develop a clearer understanding of Greek lexical borrowing into Coptic as a whole. In particular, since much of the literary material consists of biblical or other translations, it is important to gain an insight into Greek lexical borrowing in the written language in instances where there is no underlying Greek text which may influence the presence of loanwords.

Furthermore, it has been demonstrated that studies into the borrowing of function words can highlight the structural influence of Greek on Coptic. Therefore, a close examination of loaned function words in non-literary texts will advance knowledge regarding the complex interactions between the Greek and Coptic languages. In particular, this will provide an insight into language use amongst scribes in Late Antique Egypt and the degree to which Greek grammatical structures influenced their composition of Coptic sentences. While this

---

[36] Richter, (2009), pp. 408 – 409; c.f. Myers-Scotton, (1998)

[37] Meillet, (1921); Sapir, (1921); Jakobson, (1930). For a more thorough discussion on their theories, c.f. Thomason, (2001), pp. 63 - 64

will not necessarily reflect the extent of scribes' proficiency in Greek, as scholars have noted, it will nonetheless provide useful information regarding conscious language choice in the composition of documentary texts,

2.2   Methodology

2.1.1. – The Corpus

The body of texts from which the corpus has been developed originate from the Theban region. Thebes is the source of the largest number of Coptic documentary texts discovered to date[38], and therefore provides a significant body of primary evidence for the study. Furthermore, the scribes of Thebes themselves have been the focus of much discussion surrounding scribal practices and education in Late Antique Egypt[39]. As such, a focus on Theban material will help to contribute to the growing understanding of scribes in the area. All documents selected for the study are dated broadly from around 600 – 800 CE – the end of the Byzantine period to the early Islamic period.

The main corpus of legal texts has been collected from Crum's publication of legal papyri from Djême (P.KRU), short texts on ostraca from Medinet Habu collated by Stefanski and Lichtheim (O.Med.Habu Copt.), and Biedenkopf-Ziehner's publication of Coptic ostraca in the British and Ashmoleon museums (O.Brit.Mus.Copt. II and O.Ashm.Copt.). A sample of private letters has also been included in the study. These are short correspondences to and from the monk Frangé, discovered in TT29 and published by Boud'hors and Heurtel (O.Frangé). Table 2.1 details the amount of texts in each corpus and the number of texts which contained tokens used in this study, as well as details of their provenance and dating.

---

[38] See Wilfong, (1989) for a comprehensive discussion of the Theban texts.

[39] See in particular the work of Cromwell, (2012); (2011); (2010a), (2008)

Table 2.1: Details of the collections in the corpus

Collection	Number of texts	Number of texts containing useable tokens	Provenance	Date
Letters				
O.Frangé	780	119	TT 29	O.Frangé 1 – 627: 7th C. CE O.Frangé 752 – 805: 8th C. CE O.Frangé 628 – 751: no secure date (7th – 8th C. CE)
Legal Texts				
P.KRU	122	96	Medinet Habu	7th – 8th C. CE
O.Med.Habu Copt.	84	12	Medinet Habu	7th – 8th C. CE
O.Brit.Mus.Copt. II	11	5	Deir el-Bahri (Monastery of Phoibamon)	early 7th – early 8th C. CE
O.Ashm.Copt.	2	1	Theban area (precise location unknown)	O. Ashm. Copt. 1: early 7th C. CE O. Ashm. Copt. 11: early 8th C. CE
Total (legal texts)	*219*	*114*		
Total (corpus	**999**	**233**		

The corpus is designed to allow comparisons to be made of loanword usage across a range of non-literary genres. This includes not only comparisons between letters and legal texts, but also between different types of legal texts, including sales documents, acknowledgements of debts and loans, acknowledgments of donations to monasteries, testaments and settlements of disputes. This provides a broader snapshot of loanword usage in private documents than a study of a single textual genre could achieve.

In certain cases, examples from literary material are provided in order to compare loanword usage between literary and non-literary Coptic. Examples were drawn from a selection of Sahidic biblical texts from the Bauer card archive, held in the offices of the DDGLC project at the University of Leipzig[40], as well as from the literary works of Besa[41], collected during a one-month visit to the DDGLC project in Leipzig from their digitised database.

No records exist of which manuscripts were used by Bauer in the collection of her data, and therefore the examples used cannot be dated. However, the archive consists of Greek function words broken down into their various Coptic sublemma, and therefore provided a useful point of comparison to the non-literary data. From the collection of Besa, codices A – C and F - H are believed to have been copied during the 7th and 8th centuries[42], and their production is therefore contemporaneous with the non-literary corpus. Kuhn dates codices D and I to the 9th century, and codex E to the 8th and 9th centuries[43].

2.1.2. – Word Selection

As discussed previously, the term 'function word' is problematic (see Chapter 1, *Introduction*, 1.1.2). In this study, the more debatable 'semi-lexical' categories such as prepositions and adverbs do not form part of this study. Rather, analysis is limited to three types of Greek conjunctions – enclitic conjunctions[44], coordinating conjunctions and subordinating

---

[40] Now available online: http://research.uni-leipzig.de/ddglc/bauer/index.html

[41] These codices represent the work of Besa, who was Shenoute's successor in the White monastery. However, several of the texts are now believed to be the work of Shenoute, rather than Besa. Emmel, (2004), pp. 129 – 130

[42] Kuhn, (1956). However, Suciu notes that the dating of these texts is tentative (private correspondence with Alin Suciu).

[43] Kuhn, (1956)

[44] Traditionally termed 'particles' – for a discussion of this definition, see Chapter 3, *Enclitic Conjunctions,* 3.1

conjunctions. The role of these conjunctions is to express relationships between words and clauses, and also to facilitate the flow of information through a text. As such, by focusing on this word class it is possible to explore the extent to which Greek loanwords are used to construct meaning in Coptic documents.

In the study, the following words are examined:

Enclitic conjunctions: ⲅⲁⲣ, ⲇⲉ, ⲙⲉⲛ, ⲟⲩⲛ

Coordinating conjunctions: ⲁⲗⲗⲁ, ⲉⲓⲙⲏⲧⲓ, ⲉⲓⲧⲉ, ⲏ, ⲕⲁⲛ, ⲙⲉⲛⲧⲟⲓⲅⲉ, ⲟⲩⲇⲉ

Subordinating conjunctions: ⲉⲓ, ⲉⲡⲉⲓⲇⲏ, ⲕⲁⲓⲅⲁⲣ, ⲕⲁⲓⲡⲉⲣ, ⲙⲏⲡⲟⲧⲉ, ⲙⲏⲡⲱⲥ, ⲡⲱⲥ, ⲡⲱⲥⲧⲉ

This list constitutes all conjunctions found within the corpus.

2.2.3. – Data Collection and Analysis

Each word was recorded at the Greek lemma level (that is, the word in its original Greek orthography), the Coptic sublemma level (that is, the word divided into its separate meanings and usages) and the attestation level (that is, each instance of the word with is particular orthography, the context in which it appears and a reference to its position). Where passages contain a series of coordinating conjunctions, particularly lists of nouns connected by ἤ, εἴτε or οὔδε, each instance of the word received a separate entry at the attestation level.

Each entry at the attestation level recorded the complete context of the function word. This not only includes the clause in which the word is contained, but also all clauses with which the function word may interact. Tokens were not included in the data set if any major damage obscured the context surrounding the function word, if morphemes were damaged and either omitted or restored by the editor, or if the word itself had been partially or wholly restored by the editor. These measures sought to provide an accurate understanding of the use and

meaning of the function word in each attestation and ensure the validity of the analysis. Tokens were still included where the editor has restored internal or final letters, particularly vowels, within nouns and verbs in the surrounding context. While these restorations may affect the meaning of the passage, they do not have any bearing on the morphological or syntactic structure of the clauses.

Furthermore, function words have not been included if they form part of set expressions borrowed directly from Greek. These occur in contexts where the surrounding Greek words bear no Coptic morphology, but exhibit Greek case endings, verb declensions and so forth. For example, a common phrase in formulae within sales documents reads: ⲉⲛ ⲡⲁⲥⲏ ⲁⲅⲁⲑⲏ ⲕⲁⲓ ⲕⲁⲗⲏ ⲡⲣⲟⲉⲣⲉⲥⲉⲓ - 'through every good and fair choosing'. Since all nouns and adjectives possess a Greek dative singular ending, and there are no Coptic morphemes such as an attributive marker which link them, it is considered to be a set expression. Therefore, in this case the καί would not be included in the study.

2.2.4. – Glossing Conventions

The recorded extracts were translated, and glossed using the Morphological Interlinear Glossing guidelines developed by the Department of Linguistics at the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology in Leipzig[45]. This method labels individual morphemes, and therefore highlights the grammatical relationship of tokens to their surrounding environment. Abbreviations specific to Coptic are modelled on the conventions used by Müller in his discussions of Greek and Egyptian clause patterns in Coptic[46]. These conventions are used in all examples presented in the subsequent chapters.

---

[45] Available at <www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resources/glossing-rules.php>

[46] Müller, (2012); (2009)

3. Enclitic Conjunctions

The term 'enclitic conjunctions' refers to the class of words traditionally defined in Greek as 'particles'. These words are postpositive in nature, and therefore cannot come first in clause; preferring to take second position in both Greek and Coptic (though this is not always the case). The primary function of these enclitic conjunctions is connectivity – that is, they either link back or project forward to other clauses and ideas.

In the corpus, four enclitic conjunctions occur: γάρ, δέ, μέν and οὖν[1]. These words share common features – namely their connective function and their use in focalising constructions. Furthermore, they appear predominately, but not exclusively, in particular epistolary and legal formulae[2]. However, the distribution of these words within and outside of formulae is not even. These patterns of distribution have significant implications for understanding the importance of Greek function words in the written language, as well as the factors behind language choice amongst Egyptian scribes.

3.1   Definitions

Traditionally, γάρ, δέ, μέν and οὖν have been categorised by Greek and Coptic scholars as 'particles'. However, this terminology, as well as others such as 'discourse marker', 'discourse particle' etc., is often ill-defined and does not accurately convey the function of

---

[1] In the following chapters, discussion is focused on the Coptic usage of Greek function words, although their original Greek usage is mentioned where relevant. For more detailed discussions on the Greek usage of these words, see Denniston, (1934) and Smyth, (1956), pp. 631 ff.

[2] Throughout this study, formulae are labelled according to their identification and classification in Biedenkopf-Ziehner, (2001).

this word class. It is therefore pertinent to examine and reconsider the traditional terminology of Classical Greek scholarship in light of recent and past discussions in the field of linguistics.

The term 'particle' is subject to a variety of different understandings. Schourup notes that the term is often applied to all un-inflecting word classes such as conjunctions, adverbs[3]. Both Oréal and Denniston, for example, include conjunctions such as ἀλλά in their study of Greek 'particles'[4]. Other scholars exclude prepositions, adverbs and conjunctions from their definitions[5]. However, it is often the case that the term 'particle' is used to refer to lexical items that do not fit clearly into another category[6].

The alternate terms 'discourse marker', or 'discourse connectives' (coined by Blakemore in her work *Semantic Restraints of Relevance*[7]), are equally as problematic. In the first place, discussions of these terms are mostly centred on speech acts rather than written texts[8]. Secondly, most research conducted on the class of 'discourse markers' focuses on the English language[9], and there are inherent dangers in the direct transfer of terminology between different languages[10]. Furthermore, as with particles, the terms are employed with a variety of

---

[3] Schourup, (1999), pg. 229

[4] Oreál, (1997); Denniston, (1934)

[5] C.f. Hartmann, (1993), pg. 2953

[6] Schourup, (1999), pg. 229; Zwicky, (1985), pg. 292

[7] Blakemore, (1987)

[8] See for example the definition of 'discourse particles' as words which show 'the speaker's epistemic attitude towards the propositional content of an utterance' provided by Zimmermann, (2011), pg. 2012.

[9] Blakemore, (2002), pg. 2; Schourup, (1999)

[10] A relevant example for the case of Coptic is the term 'Aorist', which in discussion of Middle Egyptian refers to a tenseless verb form with imperfective aspect, while in Greek refers to a verb form with past tense and perfective aspect. See Green, (1987).

different understandings. While there is uniformity in the idea of discourse

markers/connectives as elements expressing connectivity, they are variously applied to

English utterances such as 'well' or 'oh', conjunctions such as 'however', 'nonetheless', or

adverbs such as 'even'[11].

This classification is important in understanding the different role of individual classes of

Greek function words. For example, the most common English word used in discussions

surrounding discourse markers/connectives is the adversative conjunction 'but'. In Greek, the

adversative coordination of phrases can be expressed by both the conjunction ἀλλά, and the

lexeme δέ (in certain contexts). The use of these two function words to construct an

adversative relationship can be illustrated by comparing examples (1) and (2).

(1) ογⲆⲉ   Ⲙⲡ=Ⲕ-ⲁⲁ=ⲥ   ⲉⲧⲃⲉ   ⲡ-Ⲛⲟγⲧⲉ
     neither   NEG.PERF=2.M.SG-do.INF=3.F.SG   concerning   DEF.ART.M.SG-God

     ογⲆⲉ   Ⲙⲡ=Ⲕ-ⲁⲁ=ⲥ   ⲉⲧⲃⲎⲎ=ⲧ   ϫⲉ
     nor   NEG.PERF=2.M.SG-do.INF=3.F.SG   concerning=1.SG CNJ

     ⲁⲚⲟⲔ   ⲡⲉ=Ⲕ-ⲥⲟ(Ⲛ)   ⲁⲗⲗⲁ
     IND.1.SG   POSS.ART.M.SG=2.M.SG-brother   **but**

     ⲁ=Ⲕ-ϭⲓ-Ⲛ-ⲥⲧⲃⲟⲉⲓϩ   Ⲛ-Ⲛ-ϭⲚⲎγ
     PERF=2.M.SG-take.INF-DEF.ART.PL-tools   of-DEF.ART.PL-brothers

     *"Neither have you acted (done it) concerning God, nor have you acted concerning me
     – I your brother – but rather you have carried the tools of the brothers."* (*O.Frangé*
     177.4-8)

(2) ⲁγⲱ   ⲁ=ï-[ϫⲓ]   ⲟⲚ   Ⲕⲁⲗⲱⲥ   ⲉⲧⲃⲎⲧ=ϥ
     and   PERF=1.SG-[take.INF]   also   good   concerning=3.M.SG

     ⲉ=Ⲕ-ⲣ   -ⲡ-Ⲛⲁ   ⲉ=Ⲕ-ϫⲟⲟγ   Ⲛⲁ=ï
     CIRC=2.M.SG-do.INF-DEF.ART.M.SG-mercy   CIRC_PRS=2.M.SG-send IND.OBJ=1.SG

---

[11] For a more comprehensive overview of definitions applied to particles/discourse markers/discourse

connectives, c.f. Blakemore, (2002); Pons Bordería, (2001); Schourop, (1999).

N̄TA-p̄	-AT-POOYϢ ·	EϢϢΠE	ΔE	N=q̄-ϪOO=C
CNJV-do.INF-PRIV-concern		if	**ENCL**	CNJV=3.M.SG-say.INF=3.F.SG

ϪE	M̄Π=ï-CPϤE	EPO=ϥ
CNJ	NEG.PERF=1.SG-be.occupied	to=3.M.SG

"'And I have also received good concerning it, since you have done a kindness by letting me know (lit: sending to me) so that I may become free of concern." But if he says; "I have not been occupied with it…" (O.Frangé 774.10-15)

What semantic difference, if any, lies between the adversative qualities of the Greek function words in (1) and (2)? An initial observation may deduce that ἀλλά coordinates clause while δέ coordinates larger sections of text or ideas, related to the flow of discourse throughout the document. However this does not always hold true, and a thorough grasp of semantics and pragmatics would be needed to evaluate this observation.

Nonetheless, there is a clear structural difference between the two – that is, in (1) the function word takes an initial clause position while in (2), since δέ is post-positive, it takes second position. As such, following the tradition of Layton, the term 'enclitic conjunctions' will be used[12], in order to distinguish this word class from traditional conjunctions on the basis of its position in the clause. However, it is hoped that further research into the use of enclitic conjunctions will yield more accurate terminology, and determine whether they should be regarded as functionally separate from 'traditional' conjunctions.

3.2   Enclitic conjunctions in topicalisation.

As stated earlier, the primary role of enclitic conjunctions is to connect different ideas or clauses. However, in a number of cases within the corpus, enclitic conjunctions appear to have a secondary role – namely in topicalised constructions. In the corpus, γάρ, δέ, μέν and

---

[12] See Layton, (2011), pp. 181 – 182

οὖν often appear in second position behind an emphasised element of a clause. This topicalised element can be the subject (or possessor of the subject), direct or indirect objects, or an adverbial phrase (either a 'true' adverb or a prepositional phrase). These patterns are demonstrated in examples (3) – (7).

Topicalisation of Subject:

(3)   ⲁⲛⲟⲕ   ⲙⲉⲛ   ⲅⲛ-ⲟⲩ-ⲁⲧ-ⲱⲁⲩ
        INDP.1.SG   ENCL   INDP.1.SG-INDF.ART.SG-PRIV-worthy

        ⲅⲛ-ⲉⲓ   <ⲉ>-ⲣⲁⲧ=ⲛ
        CNJV_2.M.SG-come.INF   to-ø.feet=1.PL

"As for me, I am unworthy of your coming to us." (*O. Frangé* 259.29 – 30 v.)

Topicalisation of Possessor of Subject:

(4)   ⲛⲧⲟⲕ   ⲙⲉⲛ   ⲛⲉ=ⲕ-ϩⲓⲟⲟⲩ   ⲥⲟ`ⲩ´ⲧⲱⲛ
        INDP.2.M.SG   ENCL   POSS.ART.PL=2.M.SG-paths   PRS.be.straight.QUAL

"As for you, your paths are straight." (*O.Frangé* 259.8-9)

Topicalisation of Direct Object:

(5)   ⲧⲉ-ⲧⲉⲙⲏ   ⲟⲩⲛ   ⲁ=ⲛ-ⲭⲓⲧ=ⲥ   ⲛ-ϭⲓⳉ
        DEF.ART.F.SG-price   ENCL   PERF=1.PL-receive.INF=3.F.SG   from-ø.hand

        ⲉ-ϭⲓⳉ
        to-ø.hand

"As for the price, we have received it from hand to hand…" (*P.KRU* 3.x+39)

Topicalisation of adverbial phrase – Adverb:

(6)   ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ   ⲇⲉ   ⲡ-ⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ   ⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ   ⳉⲉ
        now   ENCL   DEF.ART.M.SG-God   PRS.know.INF   CNJ

ма=ï-тѡ϶·	є-тє=ч-єιрннн
NEG.HAB=1.SG-mix.INF	in-POSS.ART.F.SG=3.M.SG-peace

"Now, God knows that I do not meddle in his peace..." (*O.Frangé* 159.10-12)

Topicalisation of adverbial phrase – Prepositional phrase:

(7)	єтвє-паι	гар	а=N-тѡк	N-϶нт
	concerning-DEM.PRN.M.SG	ENCL	PERF=1.PL-be.strong.INF	in-ø.heart

єχѡ=к
upon=2.M.SG

"For, on account of this, we have consented with you…" (*P.KRU* 75.x+40)

The appearance of enclitic conjunctions in second position behind the topicalised element is similar to their appearance in focalising constructions. Layton notes that, in Coptic cleft sentences, enclitic conjunctions may stand in second position behind the focalised element, as seen in example (8)[13].

(8)	адам	гар	пє-Nта=γ-пласє	ммо=ч	ϣорπ̄
	Adam	ENCL	COP.M.SG-REL.PERF=3.PL-form	DIR.OBJ=3.M.SG	first

"For it was Adam who was formed first." (1 Tim 2:13)

In (8), the enclitic conjunction γάρ signals a break between what Layton terms the focal point and the nexus morph (joining element between subject and predicate) + topic element[14].

	адам	гар	пє	+	Nταγпласє ммоч
	Focal Point	*ENCL*	*Nexus Morph*	+	*Topic Element*

---

[13] Layton, (2011), pg. 368

[14] Layton, (2011), pg. 368

Similarly, in examples (3) – (7), the enclitic conjunction signals a break between the topicalised element and the main clause:

(5)　　　　ⲧⲉⲧⲉⲙⲏ　　　　　ⲟⲩⲛ　　　　　　　ⲁⲛ.ⲭ.ⲓⲧⲥ
　　　　　Topicalised element　　　　*ENCL*　　　　　*Main Clause*

The presence of enclitic conjunctions in topicalisation/focalisation has also been observed in Greek texts. For example, de Kreij amongst others notes the use of μέν for constructions in which the emphasised element[15] occupies initial position with μέν in second position to separate it from the rest of the clause[16]. This is particularly common in the poetic works of authors such as Homer, as shown in (9) [17], and Pindar.

(9)　　ἡμῖν　　　　　　μὲν　　　　τόδ᾽　　　　　　　ἔφηνε
　　　　PRN.1.PL.DAT　　　**ENCL**　　　DEM.PRN.N.ACC.SG　　　reveal.3.SG.AOR.INDC.ACT

　　　　τέρας...　　　　　　Ζεύς
　　　　portent.N.ACC.SG…　　Zeus

　　　"It is to us that Zeus has revealed this portent…" (Homer, *Iliad* 2, 324)

It is unlikely that topicalisation/focalisation is part of the overall function of enclitic conjunctions. Firstly, these conjunctions are still used to express connectivity in these constructions. Secondly, topicalisation/focalisation regularly occurs without the presence of any enclitic conjunction, as demonstrated in (10).

---

[15] Usually a noun or pronoun, although Denniston notes constructions using relatives, adjectives, adverbs and verbs in initial position; Denniston, (1934), pp. 360-361.

[16] de Kreij, (2014), pp. 73 – 74; c.f. Fränkel, (1933), pg. 336; Denniston, (1934), pg. 359 ff.

[17] Example taken from Denniston, (1934), pg. 360

(10) ⲧⲉ-ⲧⲓⲙⲏ   ⲛ-ⲧⲓ-ⲙⲓⲛⲉ   ⲁ=ⲥ-ⲉⲓ

      DEF.ART.F.SG-price   in-DEF.ART.F.SG-way   PERF=3.F.SG-come.INF

      ⲉ-ⲧⲟⲟⲧ=ⲛ   ϩⲓ-ⲧⲟⲟⲧ=ⲧⲏⲩⲧⲛ

      to-ø.hand=1.PL   from-ø.hand=2.PL

"The price in this manner has come to us from you…" (*P.KRU* 10.41)

It is most likely that, since enclitic conjunctions appear in non-initial position, they are

convenient elements to place within the clause in order to separate the emphasised element

from the main topic or clause. However, it is possible that the purpose of this separation is to

further accentuate the topicalised/focalised element.

3.3   γάρ

Within the corpus, 10 occurrences of γάρ were identified – 4 within the Frangé letters[18]

 and 6 within the legal texts in P.KRU. The use of γάρ is straightforward; in all cases it is used

to show a cause and effect relationship between clauses, although with less force than a more

explicit causal construction such as the native Egyptian ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϫⲉ. γάρ does not appear in any

set epistolary or legal formulae; rather, all 10 tokens appear in – that is, in areas of

documentary texts which are not bound by formulae, and therefore in which scribes have free

use of the language[19]. However, the tokens can be divided into 4 distinct patterns.

---

[18] It is important to note that this refers to the number of tokens which occur in passages in which there is no

damage which obscures the meaning of the conjunction. According to the index compiled by Boud'hors and

Heurtel (2010), 11 tokens appear in the O.Frangé collection, although some of these appear to be debated.

[19] The term "free" position will be used throughout the rest of the study to denote these areas of the texts.

3.3.1 - ⲅⲁⲣ - 'for/since' (6 tokens)

In this pattern, γάρ appears on its own without clear links to other function words either in the same clause or subsequent clauses. However, as shown in example (11) below, more than one γάρ can appear in succession to create a string of concessive clauses.

(11) *"For I trust in God and his kindness…*

ⲟⲩⲛ-ϭⲟⲙ	`ⲅⲁⲣ´²⁰	ⲙ̄ⲙⲟ=ⲕ·	ⲛ=ⲓ̄-ⲟⲩⲱⲛϩ̄
EXT-ø.power	**for**	with=2.M.SG	CNJV=2.M.SG-clarify.INF

ⲡⲉⲓ̈-ϩⲱⲃ	ⲉⲃ[ⲟⲗ]	ⲙ̄ⲛ̄-ϣⲁϫⲉ	ⲅⲁⲣ
DEM.ART.M.SG-matter	ADV	NEG.EXT-ø.word	**for**

ⲛ̄-ⲧⲉⲓ̈-ϩⲉ	ⲛⲁ-ϩⲱⲡ`	ⲉⲣⲟ=ⲕ·
of-DEM.ART.F.SG-way	FUT-escape.INF	to=2.M.SG

…for you have power to clarify this matter. For no word of this kind will escape you." (*O.Frangé* 320.12-14)

3.3.2 - ⲅⲁⲣ... ⲁⲗⲗⲁ - 'for… but' (2 tokens)

In two instances, as demonstrated in (12), γάρ introduces a negative statement which is then followed by the adversative conjunction ἀλλά (see Chapter 5, 5.2.2.c).

(12) *"…since no man will be able to come against you regarding the young boy of this document, either us or a son or a brother or an heir or a relative near or distant...*

ⲙ̄ⲡ=ⲛ-ⲣ-ϩⲱⲃ	ⲅⲁⲣ	ⲉ-ⲙϣ̄ϣⲉ	ⲁⲗⲗⲁ
NEG.PERF=1.PL-do.INF-ø.work	**for**	CIRC-NEG_it.is.fitting	but

ⲉ=ⲛ-ⲟⲩⲏϩ	ⲛⲥⲁ-ⲧ-ϭⲟⲙ	ⲛ-ⲛ-ⲛⲟⲙⲟⲥ
FOC_PRS=1.PL-follow.QUAL	after-DEF.ART.F.SG-power	of-DEF.ART.PL-law

ⲉⲧ-ⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ
REL-PRS.be.holy.QUAL

---

[20] It is interesting here that γάρ was inserted above the line by the scribe, according to Crum's transcription. This shows that γάρ is a vital part of the clause, and could not be omitted without changing the meaning of the passage.

...for we have not done work, it not being fitting[21], but rather we follow the power of the holy laws..." (*P.KRU* 82.23-24)

3.3.3 - ⲝⲉ… ⲅⲁⲣ - 'for/since' (1 token)

In one passage, γάρ appears with the Coptic conjunction ⲝⲉ[22], as demonstrated in (13).

(13) ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲙⲟⲩⲱⲧ　　　　　ⲅⲁⲣ　　　　ⲛ-ⲛⲁ-ⲗⲟⲅⲓⲥⲙⲟⲥ
　　　PERF=1.SG-examine.INF　　for　　　　DIR.OBJ-POSS.ART.PL_1.SG-considerations

　　　ⲉⲧⲃⲉ　　　　ⲛⲁ-ⲛⲟⲃⲉ　　　　　　　ⲝⲉ　　　ⲙⲛ-ⲣⲱⲙⲉ　　　ⲅⲁⲣ
　　　concerning　POSS.ART.PL_1.SG-sin　　CNJ　　NEG.EXT-ø.man　　**for**

　　　ⲯⲟⲟⲡ　　　　　　ⲡⲁⲓ　　　　　　　ⲉⲧ-ⲛⲁ-ⲱⲛⲯ
　　　PRS.exist.QUAL　　DEM.PRN.M.SG　　REL-FUT-live.INF

　　　ⲛ=ⳅ-ⲧⲙ-ⲣ　　　　-ⲛⲟⲃⲉ　　　ⲉⲣⲟ=ⲕ
　　　CNJV=3.M.SG-NEG-do.INF-ø.sin　　to=2.M.SG

...for I have examined my considerations concerning my sins. For no man exists, this one who will live and will not sin against you..." (*P.KRU* 106.84-85)

3.3.4 - ⲟⲩ ⲅⲁⲣ - interrogative (1 token)

In one instance, shown in (14), γάρ is combined with the Coptic interrogative pronoun ⲟⲩ "what".

(14) ⲁ-ⲧⲁⲯⲁⲙ　　　　ⲙ̄-ⲫⲟⲓⲃⲁⲙⲱⲛ　　ⲟⲩⲱⲣⲝ̄　　　ⲡⲉ=ⲥ-ⲙⲉⲣⲟⲥ
　　　PERF-Taham　　　of-Phoibamon　　renounce.INF　POSS.ART.M.SG=3.F.SG-share

　　　ⲉ=ⲣ-ⲛⲁ-ⲧⲁⲯⲟ　　　　　ⲟⲩ̄　　　ⲅⲁⲣ
　　　FOC=2.F.SG-FUT-attain.INF　**what**　**then**

"Taham (daughter) of Phoibamon has renounced her share; what, then, will you attain?" (*O.Frangé* 206.15-18 r.)

---

[21] In order the keep translations as close as possible to the original Coptic structure, the circumstantial is translated throughout this study using the English gerund wherever relevant.

[22] This pattern is also attested in literary texts, noted in the database of the DDGLC project.

3.4   δέ

The enclitic conjunction δέ appears 206 times in the corpus – 10 times in the Frangé letters and 196 in legal texts. The primary function of δέ is to connect a clause to a previous clause or topic. Three main uses of δέ are found in the corpus: δέ introducing additional information, δέ introducing a result of a previously mentioned state of affairs, and δέ used in an adversative sense. These appear predominately (but not exclusively) in particular formulae.

3.4.1 – δέ introducing additional information

The use of δέ can mark additional information on a previously mentioned topic, either in the preceding clause or earlier in the document. This occurs frequently where δέ is used in focalising constructions. In these constructions, the previous topic is the focalised element, as demonstrated in (15).

(15)   *"I gave him a little place to live in my house, with his household goods… And as for my inheritance that belongs to me now, no man acting as his representative will take from within it.*

ⲉⲧⲃⲉ	ⲡ-ϩⲓ	ⲇⲉ	ⲛⲧⲁ=ⲓ-ⲧⲁⲁ=ϥ
concerning	DEF.ART.M.SG-house	**ENCL**	REL.PERF=1.SG-give.INF=3.M.SG

ⲛⲁ=ϥ	ⲉ-ⲁ=ϥ-ⲟⲩⲱϩ	ⲛ-ϩⲏⲧ=ϥ	ϣⲁⲛⲧ=ϥ-ⲙⲟⲩ
IND.OBJ=3.M.SG	CIRC-PERF=3.M.SG-live.INF	in=3.M.SG	LMT=3.M.SG-die.INF

ⲛⲛⲉ-ⲧⲉ=ϥ-ⲥϩⲓⲙⲉ	ⲉϣ-ⲕⲗⲏⲣⲟⲛⲟⲙⲉⲓ	ⲙⲙⲟ=ϥ
NEG.ADH-POSS.ART.F.SG=3.M.SG-wife	able-inherit	DIR.OBJ=3.M.SG

…And concerning the house which I gave him, he having lived in it until he died, his wife will not be able to inherit it…" (*P.KRU* 67.x+33-34)

The use of δέ to introduce additional information can be observed in the following recurring formulae.

a) ⲛ̄ϩⲟⲩⲟ ⲇⲉ (ⲛ̄ϩⲟⲩⲟ) – "and moreover"

This pattern is common as part of the greeting formulae in letters where the author wishes to single out a particular member of a family group in their greetings, as demonstrated in (16).

(16)

ⲁⲛⲟⲕ	ϥⲣⲁⲛⲅⲉ	ⲙⲛ̄-ⲙⲱ̈ⲥⲏⲥ	ⲛⲓ-ⲉⲗⲁⲭⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ
INDP.1.SG	Frange	with-Moses	DTC.ART.PL-humble

ⲉ=ⲩ-ⲥϩⲁⲓ	ⲉ=ⲩ-ϣⲓⲛⲉ·	ⲙ̄-ⲙⲁⲓ-ⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ
CIRC_PRS=3.PL-write.INF	CIRC_PRS=3.PL-greet.INF	DIR.OBJ-ø.love.P.C-God

ⲡⲉⲗⲟⲩⲥⲧⲣⲉ	ⲙⲛ̄-ⲧⲉ=ϥ-ⲥϩⲓⲙⲉ	ⲉⲧ-ⲁⲛⲓⲧ
Peloustre	with-POSS.ART.F.SG=3.M.SG-wife	REL-PRS.be.good.INF

ⲙⲛ̄-ⲛⲉ=ⲩ-ϣⲏⲣⲉ	ⲛ̄-ϩⲟⲩⲟ	ⲇⲉ	ⲛ̄-ϩⲟⲩⲟ
with-POSS.ART.PL=3.PL-child	in-great	ENCL	in-great

ⲧⲛ̄-ϣⲓⲛⲉ·	ⲉ-ⲡⲉ=ⲧⲛ̄-ϣⲏⲣⲉ	ϣ[ⲏ]ⲙ	ⲃⲁⲑⲟⲩⲏⲗ
PRS.1.PL-greet.INF	to-POSS.ART.M.SG=2.PL-child	small	Bathouel

"I am Frange, with Moses, the humble, they writing and greeting the God-loving Peloustre and his wife who is good, and their children. Moreover, we greet your young son Bathouel." (O.Frangé 163.2-11)

b) ⲉⲓⲣϩⲟⲩⲟ/ⲉⲛⲣϩⲟⲩⲟ ⲇⲉ ⲧⲁϫⲣⲟ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟϥ – "And moreover I/we strengthen it…"

This phrase forms part of the "Intitulatio" in the opening of legal texts[23] in which the scribe emphasises the use of witnesses to validate the document, as shown in (17).

(17)   *"…we subsequently appointing a scriber to subscribe for us this untransgressable written deed of sale, unimpeachable by the laws.*

ⲉ=ⲛ-ⲣ-ϩⲟⲩⲟ	ⲇⲉ	ⲧⲁϫⲣⲟ	ⲙ̄ⲙⲟ=ϥ
PFRM[24]=1.PL-do.INF-ø.more	ENCL	strengthen.INF	DIR.OBJ=3.M.SG

---

[23] Biedenkopf-Ziehner, (2001), pp 7-8; 47

[24] For a discussion of the 'performative ⲉⲓⲥⲱⲧⲙ', see Cromwell and Grossman, (2010), pp. 156 – 157

ϩⲓⲧⲛ-ϩⲉⲛ-ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ
through-INDF.ART.PL-witness

"…And we moreover strengthen it through witnesses…" (*P.KRU* 1.15-22)

c) ⲉϫⲛⲛⲁⲓ ⲇⲉ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ - "and on top of all these things"

d) ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ/ⲉⲛⲱⲣⲕ ⲇⲉ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲥ - "And subsequently, I/we swear…"

These two phrases occur in the "oath" formula in legal texts[25]; adding additional information which serves to establish the legitimacy of the document, as shown in (18) and (19) respectively. The phrase ⲉϫⲛⲛⲁⲓ ⲇⲉ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ also follows the "request to comply with the document" formula[26], as demonstrated in (20).

(18) *"And the one who will dare to take you to court concerning it, he be a stranger to the father and the son and the Holy Spirit, and he will be in compliance with the power of this document and everything which is written on it.*

ⲉϫⲛ-ⲛⲁⲓ	ⲇⲉ	ⲧⲏⲣ=ⲟⲩ	ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲱⲣⲕ
upon-DEM.PRN.PL	**ENCL**	all=3.PL	PFRM=1.SG-swear.INF

ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲣⲁⲛ	ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ	ⲡ-ⲡⲁⲛⲧⲱⲕⲣⲁⲧⲱⲣ
IND.OBJ-DEF.ART.M.SG-name	of-DEF.ART.M.SG-God	DEF.ART.M.SG-Almighty

And on top of all these things, I swear by the name of God the Almighty…" (*P.KRU* 20.97-104)

(19) *"I am willing and agree without any deceit, fear, violence, fraud, robbery or requisition, there being no force placed upon me, but rather through every good and fair choosing.*

---

[25] Biedenkopf-Ziehner, (2001), pp. 17-18; 50

[26] This is not identified as a separate formula by Biedenkopf-Ziehner, but is often attached to the end of the "curse" or "penalty" formulae (see below).

ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲱⲣⲉⲕ	ⲇⲉ	ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲟ=ⲥ	ⲛ-ⲧⲉ-ⲧⲣⲓⲁⲥ
PFRM=1.SG-swear.INF	**ENCL**	after=3.F.SG	IND.OBJ-DEF.ART.F.SG-trinity

ⲉⲧ-ⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ	ⲛ-ⲅⲟⲙⲟⲟⲩⲥⲓⲟⲛ
REL-PRS.be.pure.QUAL	ATTR-consubstantial

And subsequently, I swear by the holy, consubstantial Trinity…" (*P.KRU* 4.22-24)

(20)   *"…firstly, that one should not have any profit, but, in the first place, he is a stranger to the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, and he pays the penalty of a fine to the present authority…*

ⲉⲭⲛ-ⲛⲁⲓ	ⲇⲉ	ⲧⲏⲣ=ⲟⲩ	ⲛ=ϥ-ⲉⲓ	ⲉⲅⲟⲩⲛ
above-DEM.PRN.PL	**ENCL**	all=3.PL	CNJV=3.M.SG-come.INF	ADV

ⲛ=ϥ-ⲅⲱⲛ	ⲉ-ⲧⲉ-ⲕⲁⲑⲁⲣⲁ	ⲱⲛⲏ
CNJV=3.M.SG-comply	to-DEF.ART.F.SG-genuine	ø.document

…And on top of all this, he should enter and comply with this genuine document of purchase…" (*P.KRU* 5.53-58)

3.4.2 – δέ introducing resulting state of affairs

In certain cases, the enclitic conjunction δέ introduces an idea or action which results from the previous action described. Although there is cause and effect relationship between the two clauses, the use of δέ makes this relationship less stated than an actual result clause[27]. This use of δέ occurs in the following patterns and formulae.

a)   ⲭⲓⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ⲇⲉ (ⲅⲱⲥⲧⲉ) ⲉⲣⲟ⸗ – "(so that) from now…"

This pattern appears in the "possession" formula of legal texts[28]. The use of ⲭⲓⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ⲇⲉ, as demonstrated in (21) stands as an alternative to ὥστε + result clause (see Chapter 4, 4.7.1.).

---

[27] See below for the one occurrence of δέ + ὥστε.

[28] Biedenkopf-Ziehner, (2001), pp. 18-20

However, in one passage δέ is followed by ὥστε, as shown in (22). As such, the sense of a result is made more explicit.

(21)

ⲧⲉ-ⲧⲓⲗⲓⲁ	ϯⲙⲏ	ⲁ=ⲥ-ⲉⲓ	ⲉ-ⲧⲟⲟⲧ
DEF.ART.F.SG-full	ⲫ.price	PERF=3.F.SG-come.INF	to-ⲫ.hand_1.SG

ϩⲓ-ⲧⲟⲟⲧ=ⲉⲕ…	ⲟⲓⲕⲟⲑⲉⲛ	ⲛⲟⲩⲃ	ⲛ-ⲇⲱⲕⲓⲙⲱⲛ
from-ⲫ.hand=2.M.SG…	from.private.resources	ⲫ.gold	ATTR-tested

ⲁⲩⲱ	ⲛ-ⲕⲉⲫⲁⲗⲓⲟⲛ	ⲝⲓⲛ-ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ	ⲇⲉ	ⲉⲣⲟ=ⲕ…
and	ATTR-valid	from-now	ENCL	to=2.M.SG…

ⲉ=ⲕ-ⲛⲁ-ⲉⲓ	ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ	ⲛ=ⲅ-ⲁⲙⲁϩⲧⲉ
FOC=2.M.SG-FUT-come.INF	ADV	CNJV=2.M.SG-take.possession.INF

"The full price has come into my hands from your hands… from private resources, tested and valid gold. And from now on, for yourself… you will enter and take possession…" (*P.KRU* 4.45-50)

(22)

ⲁⲛⲟⲕ	ⲓⲱⲥⲏⲡ	ⲡ-ϣⲏⲣⲉ	ⲛ-ⲁⲛⲑⲁⲛⲁⲥⲓⲟⲥ
INDP.1.SG	Joseph	DEF.ART.M.SG-son	of-Anthanasios

ⲧⲉ-ⲧⲁϫⲣⲱ	ⲙⲙⲱ=ⲧⲛ	ⲡⲣⲟⲥ-ⲱⲣⲝ	ⲛⲓⲙ
PRS_1.SG-declare.INF	DIR.OBJ=2.PL	through-ⲫ.oath	every

ϫⲉ	ⲙⲡⲉ-ⲕⲉ-ⲗⲁⲁⲩ	ϣⲱϫⲡ	ⲉⲡⲁϩⲟⲩ	ϩⲛ-ⲡ-ⲙⲉⲣⲟⲥ
CNJ	NEG.PERF-other-any	remain.INF	ADV	in-DEF.ART.M.SG-part

ⲛ-ⲕⲁϩ	ⲉⲧ-ⲙⲙⲁⲩ	ⲙⲡ=ⲓ-ⲧⲁ=ϥ
of-ⲫ.land	REL-there	NEG.PERF=1.SG-give.INF=3.M.SG

ⲛⲏ=ⲧⲛ	ⲝⲓⲛ-ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ	ⲇⲉ	ϩⲱⲥⲧⲉ	ⲉⲣⲱ=ⲧⲛ
IND.OBJ=2.PL	from-now	ENCL	so.that	to=2.PL

ⲧⲁⲣⲉ=ⲧⲉⲧⲛ-ⲉⲓ	ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ	ⲛ=ⲧⲉⲧⲛ-ⲁⲙⲁϩⲧⲉ
FNLS=2.PL-come.INF	ADV	CNJV=2.PL-take.possession.INF

"I, Joseph son of Anthanasios, declare to you with every oath that nothing remains of that part of that land that I have not given you, so that from now on, you may enter for yourselves and take possession…" (*P.KRU* 7.32-35)

41

b) (ⲉⲡⲉⲓⲇⲏ…) ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ⲇⲉ - "and now"

The opening of the body of documents generally begins with a statement regarding a prior situation or action leading to composition of the document. In this pattern, ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ⲇⲉ introduces a subsequent action or state arising from this prior action, as demonstrated in (23). In some cases, the body of the document is introduced by the Greek subordinating conjunction ἐπειδή (see Chapter 4, 4.2.2.a.), resulting in the pattern ⲉⲡⲉⲓⲇⲏ… ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ⲇⲉ[29].

(23)   ⲙⲉ=ⲕ-ⲉⲓ   ⲛ=ⲅ̄-ⲣ   -ⲡ-ϣⲁ

    NEG.HAB=2.M.SG-come.INF   CNJV=2.M.SG=do.INF-DEF.ART.M.SG-festival

    ϩⲙ̄-ⲡ-ⲧⲟⲡⲟⲥ   ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ   ⲇⲉ   ⲕⲱ   -ϩⲱⲃ   ⲛⲓⲙ
    in-DEF.ART.M.SG-topos   now   **ENCL**   IMP.cease-ø.thing   every

    ⲛ̄ⲥⲱ=ⲕ   ⲛ=ⲅ̄-ⲉⲓ   ϩⲛ̄-ⲟⲩ-ϭⲉⲡⲏ
    after=2.M.SG   CNJV=2.M.SG-come.INF   in-INDF.ART.SG-hurry

"You do not come and perform the festival in the topos. So now, cease everything and come quickly." (*O.Frangé* 187.12-16 v.)

c) ⲟⲩⲕ ⲉⲝⲉⲥⲧⲓ ⲇⲉ - "And it is not possible…"

This phrase occurs in the "distance" formula[30] as shown in (24). However, οὐκ ἔξεστι is only followed by δέ once in the corpus.

(24)   ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲡⲗⲏⲣⲟⲩ   ϩⲓⲧⲟⲟⲧ=ⲧⲏⲩⲧⲛ   ⲛ-ⲧ-ⲧⲉⲗⲉⲓⲁ
    PERF=1.SG-be.satisfied   through=2.PL   IND.OBJ-DEF.ART.F.SG-full

    ⲧⲓⲙⲏ   ⲉⲓⲥ_ⲡⲗⲏⲣⲉⲥ   ⲟⲩⲕ   ⲉⲝⲉⲥⲧⲓ   ⲇⲉ
    ø.price   in_full   NEG   be.possible.3.SG.PRS.INDC.ACT   **ENCL**

    ⲛⲁⲓ…   ⲉ-ⲉⲓ   ⲉⲃⲟⲗ   ⲉⲣⲱ=ⲧⲛ   ϩⲁ-ⲗⲁⲁⲩ
    IND.OBJ=1.SG…   to-come.INF   ADV   to=2.PL   concerning-any

---

[29] Biedenkopf-Ziehner, (2001), pg. 12; 48

[30] Biedenkopf-Ziehner, (2001), pp. 20-22; 50-52

ⲛ̄ϩⲱⲃ
ATTR-ø.matter

"I have been satisfied by you with the price in full. Therefore it is not possible for me… to come against you concerning any matter. (*P.KRU* 28.x+32-34)

3.4.3 – Adversative δέ

The remaining use of δέ in the corpus is as an adversative conjunction "but". As stated above, unlike the coordinating conjunction ἀλλά which coordinates two adjacent clauses, δέ appears to create an adversative relationship between two broader ideas spanning larger sections of text. δέ as an adversative conjunction appears in the following phrases and formulae.

a) δέ with conditionals – "but if"

The use of δέ in conditional clauses occurs often throughout the corpus of legal texts, both within and outside of formulae. This occurs in the following patterns.

i. ⲉⲓ ⲧⲉ ⲉⲥϣⲁⲛϣⲱⲡⲉ - "but if it happens"

In 5 passages within the P.KRU texts, δέ appears in the "penalty"[31] and "curse"[32] formulae in the set phrase ⲉⲓ ⲧⲉ ⲉⲥϣⲱⲡⲉ, as shown in (25). In all cases, δέ is written as ⲧⲉ (see Chapter 4, 4.1.1.).

(25) *"Whoever will dare, for example, and sue you regarding the two courtyards, he will pay ten holokottinos and he will never benefit.*

ⲉⲓ	ⲧⲉ	ⲉ_ⲥ_ϣⲁⲛ-ϣⲱⲡⲉ	ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ-ⲟⲩⲁ	ⲧⲟⲗⲙⲁ
if	ENCL	CNDT_3.F.SG-happen.INF	CNJV-one	dare.INF

---

[31] Biedenkopf-Ziehner, (2001), pp. 23-26; 52-53

[32] Biedenkopf-Ziehner, (2001), pp. 26-32; 53-55

ϩⲛ-ϣΗⲢⲉ	ϩⲛ-ⲤⲟⲚ	Η	ⲔλΗⲢⲟⲚⲟⲘⲟⲤ	Η	λⲁⲁⲨ
through-ø.son	through-ø.brother	or	ø.heir	or	any

Ⲛ-ⲢⲱⲘⲉ	ⲉ=ϥ-ⲉⲓⲢⲉ	Ⲙ-ⲡⲉ=Ⲛ-ⲡⲢⲟⲤⲟⲡⲟⲚ
ATTR-ø.man	CIRC=3.M.SG-act.INF	IND.OBJ-POSS.ART.M.SG=1.PL-representative

...But if it happens that one will dare through a son, a brother, an heir, or any man acting as our representative…." (*P.KRU* 3.53-57)

ii. <u>ⲉⲣϣⲁⲚⲟⲨⲁ ⲁⲉ ⲧⲟλⲘⲁ/ⲉⲓϣⲁⲚⲧⲟλⲘⲁ ⲁⲉ</u> - "but if one dares/but if I dare" etc.

This phrase occurs in the "curse" and "penalty" formulae, as demonstrated in (26), as well as the "distance" formulae.

(26)   *"We note the validity of this document.*

Ⲣ_ϣⲁⲚ-ⲟⲨⲁ	ⲁⲉ	ⲧⲟλⲘⲁ	ⲔⲁⲚ	ⲧⲉⲚⲟⲨ	ⲔⲁⲚ
CNDT-one	ENCL	dare	whether	now	or

ϣⲁ-ⲟⲨⲟⲉⲓϣ	ⲚⲓⲘ	ϣⲟⲣⲡ	ⲘⲉⲚ	ⲭⲉ
at-ø.time	any	firstly	ENCL	CNJ

ⲉⲚⲉ[33]-ⲡ-ⲉⲧ-ⲘⲘⲁⲨ	†-ϩΗⲨ	Ⲛ-λⲁⲁⲨ
NEG.ADH-DEF.ART.M.SG-REL-there	give.INF-ø.benefit	ATTR-any

...But if one dares, whether now or at any time, firstly that one will not receive any benefit" (*P.KRU* 44.x+99-103)

iii. <u>ⲉϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲁⲉ ⲉϥϣⲁⲚⲤⲱⲧⲘ̄/ⲉϥϣⲁⲚⲤⲱⲧⲘ̄ ⲁⲉ</u> - "but if…"

Elsewhere outside of legal formulae, δέ appears in conditional clauses with an adversative sense, as demonstrated in (27).

---

[33] The regular form is ⲚⲚⲉ-.

(27)   *"And concerning Thatre, my daughter, and your own sister, you will not be able to throw her out that place in which she lives while she is alive in her days…*

ⲉ_ⲥ_ϣⲁⲛ-ⲙⲟⲩ	ⲇⲉ	ⲉⲓⲧⲉ	ⲕ³⁴-ⲟⲛϩ
CNDT_3.F.SG-die.INF	**ENCL**	either	CIRC_PRS_2.M.SG-live.QUAL

ⲛⲧⲟⲕ	ⲉⲓⲧⲉ	ⲉ=ⲕ-ⲙⲟⲟⲩⲧ
INDP.2.M.SG	or	CIRC_PRS=2.M.SG-die.QUAL

But if she dies, either you being alive or you being dead…" (*P.KRU* 67.x+90-91)

b) <u>ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲧⲟⲗⲙⲁ ⲇⲉ - "but the one who dares"</u>

This pattern is used in the "curse" and "penalty" formulae, as demonstrated in (28).

(28)   *"And if my brothers take you to court, it is I who submits to you concerning every matter which comes against you.*

ⲡ-ⲉⲧ-ⲛⲁ-ⲧⲟⲗⲙⲁ	ⲇⲉ	ⲛ=ⲉϥ-ⲉⲓ	ⲉⲃⲟⲗ
DEF.ART.M.SG-REL-FUT-dare	ENCL	CNJV=3.M.SG-come.INF	ADV

ⲉⲣⲟ=ⲕ	ⲉⲛⲉϩ…	ⲡⲣⲟⲧⲱⲧⲩⲡⲟⲩ	ⲙⲉⲛ	ϥ-ⲟ
to=2.M.SG	ever…	firstly	ENCL	PRS_3.M.SG-act.QUAL

ⲛ-ϣⲙⲙⲟ	ⲉ-ⲡ-ⲁⲛⲁϣ	ⲉⲧ-ⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ
IND.OBJ-ø.stranger	to-DEF.ART.M.SG-oath	REL-PRS.be.pure.QUAL

But as for the one who dares to come against you ever… firstly he is a stranger to the holy oath." (*P.KRU* 4.66)

c) <u>ⲡⲣⲱⲧⲟⲛ ⲙⲉⲛ… ⲇⲉ</u>

This occurs several times in the "curse" and "penalty" formulae throughout the corpus, as shown in (29).

---

³⁴ Most likely the Circumstantial with an unwritten ⲉ.

(29)   ⲡⲣⲱⲧⲟⲛ   ⲙⲉⲛ   ⲛⲛⲉ=ϥ-ⲱⲫⲉⲗⲉⲓ   ⲛ-ⲗⲁⲁⲩ
         firstly   ENCL   NEG.ADH=3.M.SG-receive.benefit   DIR.OBJ-any

         ⲉⲃⲟⲗ_ϩⲛ-ⲧ-ⲧⲟⲗⲙⲏⲥⲓⲥ   ⲉⲛⲧⲁ=ϥ-ⲁⲁ=ⲥ
         through-DEF.ART.F.SG-reckless.act   REL.PERF=3.M.SG-do.INF=3.F.SG

         ⲉ_ϥ_ⲉ-ϣⲱⲡⲉ   ⲇⲉ   ϩⲁ-ⲡⲉ-ⲕⲣⲓⲙⲁ
         ADH_3.M.SG-exist.INF   **ENCL**   under-DEF.ART.M.SG-judgement

         ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲁⲛⲁϣ   ⲉⲧ-ⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ
         of-DEF.ART.M.SG-oath   REL-PRS.be.pure.QUAL

"… firstly he will not receive any benefit through this reckless act which he has done, but he will be subject to the judgement of the holy oath." (*P.KRU* 75.x+115-116)

d)   <u>Adversative δέ with other function words</u>

In several cases, δέ is used in conjunction with other function words which convey an adversative relationship.

i.   <u>ⲙⲉⲛⲧⲟⲓⲅⲉ ⲇⲉ - "but/at any rate"</u>

In a similar manner to the set phrase ⲉⲓ ⲧⲉ outlined above, δέ always occurs after the compound coordinating conjunction μέντοι γε, as example (31) demonstrates (see also Chapter 5, 5.5.).

(31)   *"…so that you will be lord of that house from its foundations to its feet…*

         ⲙⲉⲛⲧⲟⲓⲅⲉ   ⲇⲉ   ⲉⲣ_ϣⲁⲛ-ⲧⲉ-ⲡⲣⲟⲑⲉⲥⲙⲓⲁ   ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲅⲉ
         but   **ENCL**   CNDT-DEF.ART.M.SG-deadline   occur

         ⲙⲡⲉ=ⲓ-ⲧⲁⲁ=ϥ   ⲛⲁ=ⲕ
         NEG.PERF=1.SG-give.INF=3.M.SG   IND.OBJ=2.M.SG

…But if the deadline occurs and I have not given it to you…" (*P.KRU* 58.11-16)

ii.   ⲙⲟⲛⲟⲛ ⲇⲉ

In several cases, δέ appears with the Greek adverb μόνον "but/only", as demonstrated in (31).
This forms part of a particular pattern in testaments – ⲙⲟⲛⲟⲛ ⲇⲉ ⲛⲛⲉ-A ϫⲓ ⲟⲩⲇⲉ ⲛⲛⲉ-A ϯ "But
A will not buy or sell…".

(31)   *"…(all) is to belong to my three grandsons, Hemail, Shenoute and Stephen.*

ⲙⲟⲛⲟⲛ	ⲇⲉ	ⲛⲛⲉ-ϣⲉⲉⲣⲉ	ⲛ-ⲥϩⲓⲙⲉ	ϫⲓ
but	ENCL	NEG.ADH-ø.daughter	ATTR-ø.female	buy.INF

ⲏ	ⲛⲥⲓ[35]ϯ	ϩⲛ-ⲧⲁ-ⲉⲕⲕⲗⲏⲥⲓⲁ	ϣⲁ-ⲉⲛⲉϩ
or	CNJV=3.F.SG-sell.INF	from-POSS.ART.F.SG_1.SG-church	to-ever

…But no daughter may buy or sell from in my church ever." (*P.KRU* 66.34-35)

3.4.4. – δέ in formulae

As the above analysis demonstrates, δέ is often employed within specific formulae in both
letters and legal texts. These are summarised in table 3.1.

Table 3.1: Distribution of δέ in epistolary and legal formulae

Formula	Number of Tokens
Epistolary greeting formula (ⲛ̄ϩⲟⲩⲟ ⲇⲉ ⲛ̄ϩⲟⲩⲟ)	4
"Intitulatio" (ⲉⲓⲣϩⲟⲩⲟ ⲇⲉ ⲧⲁϫⲣⲟ)	19
"Oath" (ⲉⲓⲟⲣⲕ ⲇⲉ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲥ ⲙⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲡⲁⲛⲧⲟⲣⲕⲣⲁⲧⲱⲣ)	25
"Distance"	4
"Curse"	23

---

[35] This follows the transcription of Crum. No special note is made by him of the appearance of ⲓ before ϯ.

"Penalty"	7
"Possession"	21
Stipulation of price (ⲧⲧⲓⲙⲏ ⲇⲉ ⲛⲧⲁⲛⲥⲩⲙⲫⲟⲛⲉⲓ)	5
Request to comply with the document (ⲉⲝⲛⲛⲁⲓ ⲇⲉ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲛ϶ⲉⲓ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲛ϶ϩⲱⲛ)	8
"But A will not buy or sell" (testaments) (ⲙⲟⲛⲟⲛ ⲇⲉ ⲛⲛⲉ-A ϫⲓ ⲟⲩⲇⲉ ⲛⲛⲉ-A †)	4
Total	**120**

Consequently, 120 of the 206 tokens of δέ in the corpus occurs in formulae – 4 in the letters and 116 in legal texts. The significance of these figures will be discussed in 4.7.

3.5 μέν

The enclitic conjunction μέν occurs 140 times within the corpus; 60 times in the O.Frangé letters and 80 in the P.KRU legal texts. The use of μέν is almost exclusively limited to particular formulae – 125 tokens are used in formulae across the corpus, leaving only 15 tokens used elsewhere in the documents.

Unlike δέ which links backwards to a preceding clause or topic, μέν is used to project forward to a particular idea. Furthermore, all 125 tokens which are used in formulae accompany a focalised adverbial phrase, such as ϩⲁⲑⲉ ⲛ̅ϩⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲙ "before everything" in letters and ⲛ̅ϣⲟⲣⲡ/ⲡⲣⲱⲧⲟⲛ "in the first place" in legal texts. The effect of this pattern is curious – on one hand, it is the adverbial element which is focalised. However, since μέν projects forward, it arguably shifts the focus of the clause back onto the main verbal phrase and its dependents.

3.5.1. – μέν in the epistolary address formula

54 of the 60 tokens for μέν which appear in the O.Frangé letters are contained in the opening

address formula. This consists of a focalised adverbial phrase with μέν in second position,

followed by a greeting directed at the recipients of the letter, as demonstrated in (32).

(32) ⲛ̄-ϣⲟⲣⲡ   ⲙⲉⲛ   ⲙ̀-ⲡⲁ̣-ϣⲁⲭⲉ   ⲛ-ⲉⲗⲁⲍ̌ⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ·
      in-first   **ENCL**   of-POSS.ART.M.SG_1.SG-speech   ATTR-unworthy

      ⲉ=ï-ⲥϩⲁï   ⲉ=ï-ⲧⲁⲙⲱ   ⲛ̄-ⲧⲥⲓⲥ·
      CIRC_PRS=1.SG-write.INF   CIRC_PRS=1.SG-inform.INF   IND.OBJ-Tsis

      ⲧ-ⲙⲱⲛⲁⲭⲏ   ⲭⲉ…
      DEF.ART.F.SG-nun   that

"At the beginning of my unworthy speech, I write and I inform Tsis the nun that…" (*O.Frangé* 215.4-7)

The remaining 6 tokens which occur in the O.Frangé archive do not appear in any formulae,

and are therefore used in "free" positions.

3.4.2. - μέν in legal texts – the "curse" and "penalty" formulae

In the P.KRU texts, the appearance of μέν in the "curse" and "penalty" formulae accounts for

71 of the 80 tokens found in the legal texts. In this formula one or more μέν appear focalising

an adverbial element meaning "firstly" or "in the first place". This projects forward to the

statement of the curse or penalty which will befall any man who transgresses the stipulations

of the document, as demonstrated in (33).

(33) ⲡ-ⲉⲧ-ⲛⲁ-ⲉⲓ   ⲉⲃⲟⲗ   ⲉⲣⲱ=ⲧⲛ   ⲛ̄ⲋ-ⲉⲛⲁⲅⲉ
      DEF.ART.M.SG-REL-FUT-come.INF   ADV   to=2.PL   CNJV=3.M.SG-go.to.court

      ⲛⲏⲧⲛ…   ϣⲟⲣⲡ   ⲙⲉⲛ   ⲛⲛⲉ-ⲡ-ⲉⲧ-ⲙⲙⲁⲩ
      IND.OBJ=2.PL…   first   **ENCL**   NEG.ADH-DEF.ART.M.SG-REL-there

ⲱⲫⲉⲗⲉⲓ	ⲛ-ⲗⲁⲁⲩ	ⲡⲣⲟⲧⲟⲧⲩⲡⲟⲥ	ⲙⲉⲛ
receive.benefit	DIR.OBJ-any	firstly	**ENCL**

ϥⲟ	ⲛ-ϣⲙⲙⲟ	ⲉ-ⲡ-ⲉⲓⲱⲧ
PRS_3.M.SG-act.QUAL	IND.OBJ-ø.stranger	to-DEF.ART.M.SG-father

ⲙⲛ-ⲡ-ϣⲏⲣⲉ	ⲙⲛ-ⲡⲉ-ⲡⲛⲁ	ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ
with-DEF.ART.M.SG-son	with-DEF.ART.M.SG-spirit	REL-PRS.be.pure.QUAL

"The one who will come against you and take you to court… firstly that one will not receive any benefit (but) in the first place he is a stranger to the father and the son and the Holy Spirit." (P.KRU 10.51-56)

In the "curse" and "penalty" formulae, μέν may also be linked to a second μέν, as demonstrated in (34), or to δέ, as shown in (35).

(34)
ⲛ-ϣⲟⲣⲡ	ⲙⲉⲛ	ⲛⲛⲉ-ⲡ-ⲉⲧ-ⲙⲙⲁⲁⲩ	ⲟⲫⲉⲗⲉⲓ
in-first	**ENCL**	NEG.ADH-DEF.ART.M.SG-REL-there	gain.profit

ⲛ-ⲗⲁⲁⲩ	ⲁⲗⲗⲁ	ⲛ-ϣⲟⲣⲡ	ⲛ-ⲧⲩⲡⲱⲥ	ⲙⲉⲛ
DIR.OBJ-any	but	in-first	ATTR-ø.place	**ENCL**

ⲉ=ϥ-ⲟ	ⲛ-ϣⲙⲙⲟ	ⲉ-ⲡ-ⲉⲓⲱⲧ
FOC_PRS=3.M.SG-act.QUAL	IND.OBJ-stranger	to-DEF.ART.M.SG-father

ⲙⲛ-ⲡ-ϣⲏⲣⲉ	ⲙⲛ-ⲡⲉ-ⲡⲛⲉⲩⲙⲁ	ⲉⲧ-ⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ
with-DEF.ART.M.SG-son	with-DEF.ART.M.SG-spirit	REL-PRS.be.pure.QUAL

…firstly that one will not derive any profit, but rather in the first place he is a stranger to the father and the son and the Holy Spirit." (P.KRU 5.53-54)

(35)
ⲡⲣⲱⲧⲟⲛ	ⲙⲉⲛ	ⲛⲛⲉ=ϥ-ⲱⲫⲉⲗⲉⲓ	ⲛ-ⲗⲁⲁⲩ
firstly	ENCL	NEG.ADH=3.M.SG-receive.benefit	DIR.OBJ-any

ⲉⲃⲟⲗ_ϩⲛ-ⲧ-ⲧⲟⲗⲙⲏⲥⲓⲥ	ⲉⲛⲧⲁ=ϥ-ⲁⲁ=ⲥ
through-DEF.ART.F.SG-reckless.act	REL.PERF=3.M.SG-do.INF=3.F.SG

ⲉ_ϥ_ⲉ-ϣⲱⲡⲉ	ⲇⲉ	ϩⲁ-ⲡⲉ-ⲕⲣⲓⲙⲁ
ADH_3.M.SG-exist.INF	ENCL	under-DEF.ART.M.SG-judgement

ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲁⲛⲁϣ	ⲉⲧ-ⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ
of-DEF.ART.M.SG-oath	REL-PRS.be.pure.QUAL

> *"... firstly he will not receive any benefit through this reckless act which he has done, but he will be subject to the judgement of the holy oath."* (*P.KRU* 75.x+115-116)

3.6 οὖν

The enclitic conjunction οὖν occurs 86 times within the corpus; 9 times in the Frangé letters and 77 times in the legal texts. The use of οὖν is straightforward – in all cases it is translated as "therefore" or "then", creating a sense of a result or consequent action. Within the corpus of letters, οὖν does not appear in any set phrases or formulae. However, in legal texts over half of the 77 tokens appear in legal formulae.

3.6.1. - οὖν in legal formulae

In the legal texts, 48 tokens appear in particular formulae. A further 5 phrases in which οὖν appears are repeated in the corpus. However, since each of these 5 phrases appears only twice in the P.KRU texts and do not form part of any well attested legal formulae, they are not included in the discussion below[36]. As such, οὖν occurs 29 times in the legal texts outside of legal formulae.

a) The "security" formula: ⲉⲡⲉⲕⲱⲣⲝ/ⲉⲡⲉⲓⲱⲣⲝ/ⲉⲩⲱⲣⲝ ⲟⲩⲛ[37]

The most common use of οὖν in the corpus is its appearance in the "security" formula which occurs 33 times. As demonstrated in (36), οὖν follows a focalised adverbial phrase - ⲉⲡⲉⲕⲱⲣⲝ/ⲉⲡⲉⲓⲱⲣⲝ/ⲉⲩⲱⲣⲝ "for your/this/an assurance". However, in one passage shown in (37), this adverbial phrase is absent and the formula is introduced by ⲉⲓⲥ ⲅⲏⲏⲧⲉ ⲟⲩⲛ.

---

[36] For a list of these 10 tokens and the phrases in which they occur, see Appendix.

[37] Interestingly, there is one occurrence of μὲν in place of οὖν in this formula in the corpus – P.KRU 81.48)

(36)   *"Since you have obliged me and have given three gold holokotinoi to me for my*
        need… now by the will of God I am prepared to give them to you in the month of
        Paone…

ⲉ-ⲡⲉ=ⲕ-ⲟⲩⲱⲣⲝ		ⲟⲩⲛ	ⲁ=ï-ⲥϩⲁⲓ
to-POSS.ART.M.SG=2.M.SG-assurance		**ENCL**	PERF=1.SG-write.INF

ⲧⲉ-ⲁⲥⲫⲁⲗⲓⲁ	ⲛⲁ=ⲕ
DEF.ART.F.SG-security	IND.OBJ=2.M.SG

… Therefore, for your assurance I have written this security for you…"
(*O.Med.Habu.Copt.* 61.7-16)

(37)   *"I, Paham, am writing to Jacob: all things that came to me from my parents... are all*
        to belong to you and your children…

ⲉⲓⲥ_ϩⲏⲏⲧⲉ	ⲟⲩⲛ	`ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲥⲙⲛ´	ⲧⲉ-ⲇⲓⲁⲑⲏⲕⲏ
behold	**ENCL**	PERF=1.SG-establish.INF	DEF.ART.F.SG-testament

… Therefore behold! I have established this testament…" (*P.KRU* 67.97-105)

b) The "possession" formula: ϩⲱⲥⲧⲉ ⲟⲩⲛ

In 5 cases, as demonstrated in (38), οὖν appears in the "possessive" formula following the

Greek subordinating conjunction ὥστε (see Chapter 4, 4.7.1).

(38)
ⲧⲉ-ⲧⲓⲗⲓⲁ	ϯⲙⲏ	ⲁ=ⲥ-ⲉⲓ	ⲉ-ⲧⲟⲟⲧ=ⲛ
DEF.ART.F.SG-full	ø.price	PERF=3.F.SG-come.INF	to-hand=1.PL

ϩⲓ-ⲧⲟⲟⲧ=ⲉⲕ	ⲉ=ⲥ-ⲙⲏϩ
from-hand=2.M.SG	CIRC=PRS_3.F.SG-complete.QUAL

ⲉ=ⲥ-ⳡⲏⲩ	ⲙ-ⲡ-ⳡⲓ
CIRC=PRS_3.F.SG-measure.QUAL	in-DEF.ART.M.SG-measure

ⲛ-ⲡ-ⲕⲁⲥⲧⲣⲟⲛ	ⳝⲏⲙⲉ	ϩⲟⲥⲧⲉ	ⲟⲩⲛ	ⲉⲣⲟ=ⲕ…
of-DEF.ART.M.SG-kastron	Djême	**so.**that	**ENCL**	to=2.M.SG…

ⲉ=ⲕ-ⲛⲁ-ⲉⲓ	ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ	ⲛ=ⲅ-ⲁⲙⲁϩⲧⲉ
FOC=2.M.SG-FUT-come.INF	ADV	CNJV=2.M.SG-take.possession.INF

"The full sum has come into our hands from yours, it being complete, it being measured in the scale of the kastron (of) Djême, so that therefore for yourself... you will come in and take possession..." (*P.KRU* 1.73-80)

c) The "free-will" formula: ⲁⲛⲉⲓ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲣⲟϥ

In the P.KRU papyri, οὖν occurs once in the "free-will" formula[38], as shown in (39).

(39)   *"After you gave us this ½ + 1/3 holokotinoi satisfactorily, you sought to take receive this written document of release from us.*

ⲁ=ⲛ-ⲉⲓ	ⲟⲩⲛ	ⲉⲣⲟ=ϥ	ⲉ=ⲛ-ⲟⲩⲱϣ
PERF=1.PL-come.INF	ENCL	to=3.M.SG	CIRC_PRS=1.PL-be.willing.INF

ⲁⲩⲱ	ⲉ=ⲛ-ⲡⲓⲑ[ⲉ]
and	CIRC_PRS=1.PL-agree

...Therefore we went to it, we being willing and agreeing..." (*P.KRU* 36.44-46)

d) The "penalty" formula: ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁⲧⲟⲗⲙⲁ ⲟⲩⲛ

In one text, οὖν appears as an alternative to δέ in the "penalty" formulae, as shown in (40).

(40)   *"And anyone who speaks against or opposes this our wish that has been set down, at any occasion or time...*

ⲡ-ⲉⲧ-ⲛⲁ-ⲧⲟⲗⲙⲁ	ⲟⲩⲛ	ⲉ-ⲉⲓ	ⲉⲃⲟⲗ	ⲉⲣⲟⲕ ...
DEF.ART.M.SG-REL-FUT-dare	ENCL	to-come.INF	ADV	to-2.M.SG...

ⲡⲣⲱⲧⲟⲛ	ⲙⲉⲛ	ⲛⲛⲉ=ϥ-ⲱⲫⲉⲗⲉⲓ	ⲛ-ⲗⲁⲁⲩ
firstly	ENCL	NEG.ADH=3.M.SG-receive.benefit	DIR.OBJ-any

ⲉⲃⲟⲗ_ϩⲛ-ⲧ-ⲧⲟⲗⲙⲏⲥⲓⲥ	ⲉⲛⲧⲁ=ϥ-ⲁⲁ=ⲥ
through-DEF.ART.F.SG-reckless.act	REL.PERF=3.M.SG-do.INF=3.F.SG

ⲉ_ϥ_ⲉ-ϣⲱⲡⲉ	ⲇⲉ	ϩⲁ-ⲡⲉ-ⲕⲣⲓⲙⲁ
ADH_3.M.SG-exist.INF	ENCL	under-DEF.ART.M.SG-judgement

---

[38] Biedenkopf-Ziehner, (2001), pp. 8-11; 48-49

| ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲁⲛⲁϣ | ⲉⲧ-ⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ |
| of-DEF.ART.M.SG-oath | REL-PRS.be.pure.QUAL |

"… the one who will dare, therefore, to come against you… firstly he will not receive any benefit through this reckless act which he has done, but he will be subject to the judgement of the holy oath." (*P.KRU* 75.x+102-116)

e) <u>(ⲉⲡⲉⲓⲇⲏ…) ⲟⲩⲛ in the body of documents</u>

In the opening of the body of legal texts, the use of the Greek subordinating conjunction ἐπειδή to introduce a prior event or action is followed by οὖν introducing a resulting action (see Chapter 4, 4.2.2.b.). This occurs 5 times in the set phrase ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲁⲡⲣⲱϣⲉ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲛⲇⲓⲕⲁⲓⲟⲗⲟⲅⲓⲁ "after receiving sufficient proof", as demonstrated in (41).

(41)

| ⲭⲉ-ⲉⲡⲉⲓⲇⲏ | ϩⲙ-ⲡⲉⲓ-ⲕⲁⲓⲣⲟⲥ | ⲡⲁⲓ… |
| CNJ-re: | in-DEM.ART.M.SG-time | DEM.PRN.M.SG… |

| ⲁ=ⲛ-ⲉⲛⲉⲅⲉ | ⲙⲛ-ⲛⲉ=ⲛ-ⲉⲣⲏⲩ |
| PERF=1.PL-go.to.court | with-POSS.ART.PL=1.PL-companion |

| ⲛ_ⲛⲁϩⲣⲛ-ⲡ-ⲉⲩⲇⲟⲕⲓⲙⲱᵀ | ⲕⲟⲙⲉⲥ | ⲡ-ϣⲏⲣⲉ | ⲛ-ⲭⲁⲏⲗ |
| before-DEF.ART.M.SG-renowned | Komes | DEF.ART.M.SG-son | of-Khael |

| ⲡ-ⲇⲓⲟⲓⲕ/ | ⲉⲧⲃⲉ-ⲧ-ⲕⲗⲏⲣⲟⲛⲟⲙⲓⲁ | ⲧⲏⲣ=ⲥ |
| DEF.ART.M.SG-treasurer | concerning-DEF.ART.F.SG-inheritance | all=3.F.SG |

| ⲙ-ⲡⲉ=ⲛ-ⲙⲁⲕⲁⲣⲓⲟⲥ | ⲛ-ⲉⲓⲱⲧ | ⲕⲟⲥⲙⲁ… |
| of-POSS.ART.M.SG=1.PL-late | ATTR-ø.father | Kosma… |

| ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲁ-ⲡ-ⲣⲱϣⲉ | **ⲟⲩⲛ** | ⲛ-ⲇⲓⲕⲁⲓⲟⲗⲟⲅⲓⲁ |
| after-DEF.ART.M.SG-sufficient | **ENCL** | ATTR-ø.proof |

| ⲉ-ⲁ=ⲛ-ⲁⲁ=ⲩ | ⲙⲛ-ⲛⲉ=ⲛ-ⲉⲣⲏⲩ… |
| CIRC-PERF=1.PL-do.INF=3.PL | with-POSS.ART.PL=1.PL-companion… |

| ⲁ=ϥ-ⲕⲉⲗⲉⲩⲉ | ⲛⲁ=ⲛ |
| PERF=3.M.SG-command | IND.OBJ=1.PL |

"Greetings! Re: In this time…we have gone to court with our companions before the renowned Komes, the son of Khael the treasurer concerning all the inheritance of our late father Kosma… Therefore after receiving sufficient proof, we having made them to each other… he has commanded to us…" (*P.KRU* 43.x+8-18)

3.6.2 – οὖν in temporal constructions

In 9 cases, οὖν occurs with constructions which express a temporal clause. These include:

a) Clauses introduced by the preposition ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲁ-/ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱ⸗ "after", such as in the phrase ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲁⲡⲣⲱϣⲉ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲛⲇⲓⲕⲁⲓⲟⲗⲟⲅⲓⲁ "after receiving sufficient proof" shown in (41) above, or following the construction ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲁ + ⲧⲣⲉϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ in (42) below.

b) The temporal clause conjugation ⲛⲧⲉⲣⲉϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄, shown in (43) below.

c) The construction ϩⲙ̄ + ⲡ + ⲧⲣⲉϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄, as demonstrated in (44) below.

(42)

ⲛⲧⲉⲣ=ⲛ-ⲛⲁⲩ	ⲉⲣⲱ=ⲧⲛ	ⲉ=ⲧⲉⲧⲛ-ⲟⲩⲱϣ:
TEMP=1.PL-see.INF	to=2.PL	CIRC_PRS=2.PL-be.willing.INF

ⲉ-ⲕⲁⲧⲁⲃⲁⲗⲉ-ⲟⲣⲕⲟⲥ	ⲛⲁ=ⲛ	ⲡⲣⲟⲥ-ⲑⲉ
to-lay.down-ø.oath	IND.OBJ=1.PL	according.to-DEF.ART.F.SG_way

ⲛⲧⲁ=ⲛ-ⲭⲟⲟ=ⲥ	ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲁ-ⲧⲣⲉ=ⲧⲉⲧⲛ-ⲃⲱⲕ	**ⲟⲩⲛ**	ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ
REL.PERF=1.PL-say.INF=3.F.SG	after-CAUS.INF=2.PL-go.INF	**ENCL**	ADV

ⲉ-ⲡ-ϩⲁⲅⲓⲟⲥ	ⲁⲡⲁ	ⲃⲓⲕⲧⲱⲣ	ⲛ=ⲧⲉⲧⲛ-ⲁⲣⲭⲉⲓⲥⲑⲁⲓ
to-DEF.ART.M.SG-holy	Apa	Victor	CNJV=2.PL-begin

ⲛ-ⲱⲣⲕ
to-swear.INF

"When we saw you willing to lay down the oath with us as we said, subsequently therefore, you went into (the church of) the holy Apa Victor and began to swear..." (*P.KRU* 36.38-41)

(43) *"I determined that, if he lived, I would donate him to the monastery of Apa Phoibamon on the mountain of Djeme for the preservation of my soul.*

ⲛⲧⲉⲣ=ⲓ-ⲛⲁⲩ	**ⲟⲩⲛ**	ⲉ-ⲡ-ϣⲏⲣⲉ	ⲕⲟⲩⲓ
TEMP=1.PL-see.INF	**ENCL**	to-DEF.ART.M.SG-child	small

ⲉ-ⲁ=ϥ-ⲁⲁⲓ	ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲟⲩⲱϣ	ⲉ-ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲃⲁ
CIRC-PERF=3.M.SG-increase.in.age.INF	PERF=1.SG-desire.INF	to-transgress

...Then when I saw the small child, he having increased in age, I desired to transgress..." (*P.KRU* 89.x+2-4)

(44)   *"...as the tongue of the sweet-smelling incense, the holy Paul the apostle, said:*

ⲭⲉ	ⲡ-ⲛⲁ	ϣⲁ=ϥ-ϣⲟⲩϣⲟⲩ	ⲙⲙⲟ=ϥ
CNJ	DEF.ART.M.SG-mercy	HAB=3.M.SG-rejoice.INF	DIR.OBJ=3.M.SG

ⲉⲭⲛ-ⲧⲉⲓ-ⲕⲣⲓⲥⲓⲥ	ϩⲙ-ⲡ-ⲧⲣⲁ-ⲙⲟϣⲧ
against-DEM.ART.F.SG-judgement	in-DEF.ART.M.SG-CAUS.INF_1.SG-reflect.INF

ⲟⲩⲛ	ⲉ-ⲡⲁⲓ	ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲣ-ⲡ -ⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ	ⲟⲛ
ENCL	to-DEM.PRN.M.SG	PERF=1.SG-do.INF-DEF.ART.M.SG-thought	also

ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲉⲛⲧⲁ-ⲛⲉ=ⲛ-ⲉⲓⲟⲧⲉ	ⲛ-ⲁⲡⲟⲥⲧⲟⲗⲟⲥ
of-DEF.ART.M.SG-REL.PERF-POSS.ART.PL=1.PL-fathers	DEF.ART.PL-apostole

ⲭⲟⲟ=ⲥ	ϩⲛ-ⲛ-ⲕⲁⲑⲟⲗⲓⲕⲟⲛ	ⲉⲧ-ⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ
say.INF=3.F.SG	in-DEF.ART.PL-Catholic.Epistle	REL-PRS.be.pure.QUAL

...'Mercy rejoices against this judgement'. Therefore when I reflected on this, I remembered also that which our fathers the apostles said in the holy Catholic Epistles..." (*P.KRU* 106.76-80)

3.7   Conclusion

The use of the enclitic conjunctions γάρ, δέ, μέν and οὖν in the corpus is largely

uncontroversial. However, the distribution of enclitic conjunctions across the corpus is worthy

of note. Table 3.2 summarises the number of tokens for each enclitic conjunction for both

letters and legal texts.

Table 3.2: Distribution of enclitic conjunctions across the corpus

	Letters	*Legal Texts*	*Total*
γάρ	4	6	**10**
δέ	10	196	**206**
μέν	60	80	**140**
οὖν	9	77	**86**
Total	**83**	**361**	**444**

An initial analysis suggests that the use of Greek enclitic conjunctions is more common in legal texts than in letters. However, the distribution of each individual conjunction is significant. The number of tokens for γάρ is minimal, and therefore it is difficult to make assumptions about their wider use in non-literary Coptic (although their scarcity may be evidence of a preference for other causal constructions). On the other hand, the tokens for μέν are distributed relatively evenly across letters and legal text, while the majority of tokens for δέ and οὖν occur in legal texts.

The significantly higher percentage of tokens for μέν occurring in letters as compared to δέ and οὖν can be attributed to the use of μέν in the greeting formula for letters. Furthermore, οὖν appears in no formulae within the letters, and δέ appears only in the ⲛ̄ϩⲟⲩⲟ ⲇⲉ ⲛ̄ϩⲟⲩⲟ formula which occurs only occasionally in the greeting section of letters. As such, it is clear that the appearance of enclitic conjunctions is closely linked to their use in formulae.

This is further emphasised when examining the distribution of Greek enclitic conjunctions inside and outside of epistolary and legal formulae. While γάρ appears exclusively outside of formulae, it only occurs 10 times in the corpus and again cannot be considered significant

here. Table 3.3 summarises the distribution of δέ, μέν and οὖν across epistolary and legal formulae and in "free" positions outside of formulae.

Table 3.3: Distribution of δέ, μέν and οὖν in formulae and "free" positions

	In formulae			"Free" usage			Total
	Letters	Legal Texts	Total	Letters	Legal Texts	Total	
δέ	4	116	**120**	6	80	**86**	206
μέν	54	71	**125**	6	9	**15**	140
οὖν	0	48	**48**	9	29	**38**	86
Total	*58*	*241*	***293***	*21*	*114*	***139***	*432*

As Table 3.3 demonstrates, the use of enclitic conjunctions is more prevalent in formulae than in "free" positions. However, the distribution is not even across the three conjunctions. μέν rarely appears outside of formulae – only 15 of 140 tokens are used in "free" positions. On the other hand, the distribution of δέ and οὖν is more even, with just over half of the tokens appearing in formulae for each.

This has significant implications for the use of Greek function words in Coptic. The scarcity of μέν outside of formulae suggests that it was not a significant part of the active vocabulary of the scribes, and its use was more influenced by existing non-literary structures inherited from Greek documents. On the other hand, δέ and οὖν are less restricted in use. Therefore, this potentially indicates that they were more integrated into the formal written language than μέν.

It is possible that there is a particular feature of μέν which limits its use in non-literary Coptic texts outside of formulae. For example, while μέν projects forward to particular ideas or topics, δέ and οὖν link backwards. Interestingly, the native Egyptian enclitic conjunctions (such as ϭⲉ 'therefore', or the earlier Egyptian *is* 'truly', *swt* 'but' *tr* 'indeed', etc) also appear to link backwards to the preceding clauses. As such, it is possible that δέ and οὖν were more easily borrowed into the language because the fulfilled the same function as elements of the native lexicon, while μέν expressed a function that was not present in the native structure of the language. The use of Greek function words to broaden the range of relationships expressed by the Egyptian language will be explored further in Chapters 4 and 5.

4. Subordinating Conjunctions

Subordinating conjunctions express relationships between clauses, and thus are a vital part of the way in which meaning is structured in a language. The borrowing of Greek subordinators into Coptic has therefore been of particular interests to scholars such as Müller[1] and Hasznos[2] who compare patterns of Greek and Egyptian subordination to examine the effects of lexical borrowing on the structure of Coptic. As such, Greek subordinating conjunctions have received the most attention of any other class of Greek function word. Nevertheless, little has been discussed of their use outside of literary Coptic.

The following subordinating conjunctions were identified in the corpus:

- The conditional conjunction εἰ.

- The causal/temporal conjunction ἐπειδή.

- The compound conjunction καὶ γάρ (the inclusion of this conjunction in this chapter is discussed below).

- The concessive conjunction καίπερ.

- The avertive conjunctions μήποτε and μήπως.

- The conjunction/adverb ὡς.

- The conjunction of result, ὥστε.

---

[1] Müller, (2012)

[2] Hasznos, (2012)

Analysis of the patterns of distribution of these words across the corpus suggests that in most cases there is still a clear preference for native Egyptian subordinating constructions. As such, the presence of these Greek subordinators in the corpus is intrinsically linked to documentary formulae.

4.1 εἰ

The use of the conditional conjunction εἰ within the corpus is limited. Only five tokens occur, all found within the P.KRU legal papyri. 4 of the 5 tokens appear in the "curse" and "penalty" formulae, while only 1 appears outside of any legal formulae. Furthermore, all followed by the enclitic conjunction ⲧⲉ (δέ)[3]. As such, εἰ never occurs in isolation within the corpus, and the combination ⲉⲓ ⲧⲉ is often considered to be a unit in its own right[4].

The orthography of ⲉⲓ ⲧⲉ is worthy of comment. There are several possible factors influencing the writing of δέ as ⲧⲉ. Firstly, this could be influenced by the orthography of the coordinating conjunction εἴτε, which is alternately realised in Coptic as ⲉⲓⲧⲉ or ⲉⲓⲆⲉ, since Coptic did not distinguish between /t/ and /d/. Furthermore, this writing may have become entrenched in an earlier stage of the language and therefore ⲉⲓ ⲧⲉ is a fossilised expression, since εἰ does not appear elsewhere in the corpus[5]. Alternatively, ⲧⲉ could be a borrowing of the Greek conjunction τε which is not attested elsewhere in the corpus, or in Coptic in

---

[3] See Chapter 3.

[4] In Crum's transcription of the P.KRU texts, he recorded several of these tokens as a single unit, 'ⲉⲓⲧⲉ' (e.g. P.KRU 28.x+40, Crum, 1912, pg. 105). ⲉⲓⲧⲉ is also recorded as a single expression in the Bauer Card Archive; see below.

[5] See also the discussion of εἴ in literary Coptic below.

general[6]. If this is the case, this would further suggest that ⲉⲓ ⲧⲉ was borrowed as a single unit, and neither conjunction was an established part of the lexicon of written Coptic. However, the spelling ⲉⲓ ⲇⲉ occurs in legal texts from other regions[7], and therefore ⲉⲓ ⲧⲉ is more likely a rendering of εἰ δέ rather than εἰ τέ.

4.1.1 – The protasis and apodosis of conditionals with ⲉⲓ ⲧⲉ

All five tokens appear in protases consisting of ⲉⲓ ⲧⲉ + ⲉⲥϣⲁⲛϣⲱⲡⲉ (conditional) + Conjunctive – that is, "if it happens that…". It appears that this is a set phrase, one of several patterns which scribes could draw upon to introduce the "curse" formula. Consequently, εἰ does not appear in the corpus outside of this set expression.

The apodosis of the five conditionals using εἰ is formed by either the Future II, as shown in (1), or the Negative Adhortative, as shown in (2).

(1)

ⲉⲓ	ⲧⲉ	ⲉ_ⲥ_ϣⲁⲛ-ϣⲱⲡⲉ	ⲛⲧⲉ-ⲟⲩⲁ	ⲧⲟⲗⲙⲁ		
if	ENCL	COND_3.F.SG-happen.INF	CNJV-one	dare.INF		

ϩⲛ-ϣⲏⲣⲉ	ϩⲛ-ⲥⲟⲛ	ⲏ	ⲕⲗⲏⲣⲟⲛⲟⲙⲟⲥ	ⲏ	ⲗⲁⲁⲩ
through-ø.son	through-ø.brother	or	ø.heir	or	any

ⲛ-ⲣⲱⲙⲉ	ⲉ=ϥ-ⲉⲓⲣⲉ	ⲙ-ⲡⲉ=ⲛ-ⲡⲣⲟⲥⲟⲡⲟⲛ
ATTR-ø.man	CIRC=3.M.SG-act.INF	IND.OBJ-POSS.ART.M.SG=1.PL-representative

ⲏ	ⲟⲩ-ϣⲙⲙⲟ	ⲉ=ϥ-ⲛⲁ-ϣⲱⲡⲉ
or	INDF.ART.SG=stranger	FOC=3.M.SG-FUT-become.INF

---

[6] ⲧⲉ is not included in the Bauer Card Archive, or in the Wörterbuch of Förster (2002).

[7] For example; ⲉⲓⲇⲉ ⲙⲏ ⲅⲉ ⲙⲛⲧⲉⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ⲕⲗⲏⲟⲛⲟⲙⲟⲥ ϩⲱϥ ⲛⲉⲙⲁⲕ ⲉⲡⲱⲓ̈ⲛⲉ - *"and if not, that no heir go to law with you over what is mine…"* (*P.Cair.Masp.* III 67353 r.15), from a legal text by Dioscorus of Aphrodito in the 8th century Qurra archive. Example and translation from MacCoull, (1988), pg. 41; 43.

ϩⲁ-ⲡⲉ-ⲡⲣⲟⲥⲧⲱⲙⲟⲛ
under-DEF.ART.M.SG-fine

"If it happens that one will dare through a son, a brother or any man acting as our representative or a stranger, he will be subject to the fine." (*P.KRU* 3.53-57)

(2)	**ⲉⲓ**	ⲧⲉ	ⲉ_ⲥ_ϣⲁⲛ-ϣⲱⲡⲉ	ⲛⲧⲉ-ⲟⲩⲁ	ⲧⲟⲗⲙⲁ
	if	ENCL	COND_3.F.SG-happen.INF	CNJV-one	dare.INF

ⲱⲥ_ⲉⲕⲟⲥ	ⲛ=ϥ-ⲉⲛⲓⲅⲉ	ⲙⲙⲏ=ⲧⲛ
for.example	CNJV=3.M.S-take.to.court	DIR.OBJ=2.PL

ⲕⲁⲑ_ⲟⲓⲟⲛ_ⲇⲏ_ⲡⲟⲧⲉ_ⲧⲣⲱⲡⲟⲛ	ⲉⲧⲃⲉ	ⲧⲉⲓ-ⲱⲛⲏ	ⲏ
in.whatever.way	concerning	DEM.ART.F.SG-contract	or

ⲙⲉⲣⲟⲥ	ⲛⲧⲁ=ⲥ	ⲉ-ⲡ-ⲧⲏⲣ=ϥ	ⲉⲡⲉ_ⲧⲟ
ø.part	of=3.F.SG	to-DEM.ART.M.SG-all=3.M.SG	then

ⲉⲣⲉ-ⲡ-ⲉⲧ-ⲛⲁ-ⲧⲟⲗⲙⲁ	ⲉ-ϩⲱⲃ	ⲛ-ⲧⲉ-ⲙⲓⲛⲉ
FOC-DEF.ART.M.SG-REL-FUT-dare	to-ø.thing	in-DEF.ART.F.SG-way

ⲛⲛⲉ=ϥ-ϯ-ϩⲏⲩ	ⲛ-ⲗⲁⲁⲩ
NEG.ADH=**3.M.SG**-gain.INF-ø.profit	ATTR-any

"If it happens that one will dare, for example, to take you to court in whatever way concerning this document, or any part of it at all, then the one who will dare such a thing, he will not gain any benefit…" (*P.KRU* 7.52-54)

Example (2) is notable for its use of the Greek phrase ⲉⲡⲉⲧⲟ (ἐπὶ τῷ) to introduce the apodosis. This occurs 6 times within the corpus[8], but this is the only passage in which it follows εἰ.

---

[8] P.KRU 7.55, 19.105, 74.38, 78.9, 78.60, 106.137.

4.1.2　ⲉⲓ in Literary Coptic

The use of ⲉⲓ in Coptic as a whole is rare. Rather, there is a clear preference for the indigenous constructions ⲉϣⲭⲉ/ⲉϣⲱⲡⲉ + Conditional, if any conjunction is used to introduce the protasis[9]. However, the presence of ⲉⲓ is attested in literary texts. Bauer, for example, notes the combination of ⲉⲓ + ⲧⲉ in Sahidic, such as example (3) from the Sahidic New Testament.

(3)　**ⲉⲓ**　　ⲧⲉ　　ⲉϣⲭⲉ　　ϩⲛ̄-ⲟⲩ-ⲭⲁⲣⲓⲥ　　　　　ⲉⲓⲉ
　　　if　　ENCL　　if　　through-INDF.ART.SG-grace　　　APOD

　　　ⲛ̄-ⲟⲩ-ⲉⲃⲟⲗ　　　　　ϭⲉ　　ⲁⲛ　　ⲡⲉ
　　　NEG-INDF.ART.SG-ADV　　CNJ　　NEG　　COP.M.SG

　　　ϩⲛ̄-ⲛⲉ-ϩⲃⲏⲩⲉ
　　　through-DEF.ART.PL-works

　　　"But if through grace, then it is no longer through the works." (Rom. 11:6)[10]

The rarity of ⲉⲓ in Coptic in general and the fact that most attested uses (if not all) appear in this pattern, as well as other factors outlined above, suggest that ⲉⲓ ⲧⲉ may have been borrowed as a single unit.

4.2　ἐπειδή

The subordinating conjunction ἐπειδή occurs 81 times in the corpus. 26 tokens appear in the O.Frangé letters, while the remaining 55 are contained in the legal documents. The use of ἐπειδή is limited mostly to one particular function – to introduce the main body of documents. However, it also appears variously as a causal or a temporal subordinator.

---

[9] See Mülller, (2012), pg. 126 ff.

[10] In this case, ⲉⲓ ⲧⲉ is copied across directly from the original Greek, which may have some bearing on the presence of ⲉⲓ in this and other translational literature.

4.2.1 – ἐπειδή introducing the body of a document (= 73 tokens)

The most common use of ἐπειδή within the corpus is to introduce the body of a document. It functions as a marker to signal the beginning of the main content of the text following the opening formulae. As example (4) shows, ἐπειδή in this position does not always correspond to an exact translation in English[11].

(4) ⲉⲡⲓⲆⲏ   ⲁ=ⲣ-ⲭⲟⲟ=ⲥ   ⲙ̄-ⲡⲁⲛⲧⲉⲗⲉⲩ   ⲭⲉ
     re: PERF=2.F.SG-say.INF=3.F.SG   IND.OBJ-Panteleu   that

     ⲁ-ⲑⲉⲱⲧⲣⲉ   ⲭⲟⲟ=ⲥ   ⲭⲉ   ⲙⲁ=ⲓ̈-ⲧⲱϩⲙⲉ
     PERF-Theotre   say.INF=3.F.SG   CNJ   NEG.HAB=1.SG-invited.INF

     ⲉ-ⲧ-ⲉⲗⲱⲗⲉ   ⲛ̄-ϥⲣⲁⲛⲅⲉ   ⲛ̄-ⲕⲉ-ⲥⲟⲡ   ⲉⲛⲉϩ·
     to-DEF.ART.F.SG-vineyard   of-Frange   at-other-time   ever

     "Re: You said to Panteleu that Theotre said; 'I (will) not invite (you) to the vineyard of Frange again ever.'" (*O.Frangé* 170.1-5)

Therefore, in this position it appears that ἐπειδή has lost its function as a subordinating conjunction. Instead it appears to function as a visual signpost, related to the flow of the text as a whole than to the specific syntax of the clause. This usage is also attested in Greek documents[12].

Gregorios suggests that in the opening of documents the conjunction had become meaningless and could be omitted without any alteration to the meaning of the text, similar to the Classical Arabic phrase أما بعد (ammā ba'd) used in the writing of letters[13]. It is certainly true that

---

[11] The function of the conjunction introducing the body of a document in these cases has been indicated by 're:', following the convention of translation in the database of the DDGLC project.

[12] Gregorios, (1991), pg. 80

[13] Gregorios, (1991), pg. 80

ἐπειδή does not introduce the body of the text in every document within the corpus. For example, in the O.Frangé corpus, Frangé shows no consistency in their inclusion of ἐπειδή after the greeting formulae. This suggests that, at least in letters, scribes were at liberty to choose whether or not to introduce the main text with ἐπειδή.

There are, however, two environments within the corpus of letters in which ἐπειδή may arguably still possess a subordinating function while introducing the body of the text:

a) Causal: ⲉⲡⲉⲓⲇⲏ + Perfect I… Perfect I

In several cases, there appears to be a direct cause and effect relationship between clause A (ⲉⲡⲉⲓⲇⲏ + Perfect I) and clause B (Perfect I). As such, ἐπειδή may be understood as subordinating a causal clause, as evident in (5).

(5) **ⲉⲡⲉⲓⲇⲏ**   ⲁ=ⲓ̈-ⲧⲁⲛϩⲟⲩⲧ=ⲕ̅   ϩⲱⲥ   ⲉⲓⲱⲧ
     since   PERF=1.SG-trust.INF=2.M.SG   as   ø.father

ⲁ=ⲓ̈-ϯ-ⲡⲥⲟⲛ   ⲛⲁ=ⲕ
PERF=1.SG-give.INF-Pson   IND.OBJ=2.M.S

"Since I have trusted you as a father, I have given Pson to you" (*O. Frangé* 210.9)

b) Temporal: ⲉⲡⲉⲓⲇⲏ + Perfect I (verb of coming)… Perfect I

The exception to the above pattern is the use of a verb of coming in clause A. In this case, the clause subordinated by ἐπειδή may be equated with a temporal cause, as demonstrated by (6).

(6) **ⲉⲡⲓⲇⲏ̅**   ⲁ-ⲧⲉ=ⲕ-ⲁⲅⲁⲡⲏ   ⲉⲓ
     when   PERF-POSS.ART.F.SG=2.M.SG-charity   come.INF

ⲉ-ⲡ-ⲧⲟⲟⲩ	ⲛ̄-ϫⲏⲙⲉ	ⲁ=ï-ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲓ
to-DEF.ART.M.SG-mountain	of-Djême	PERF=1.SG-bid

ⲛ̄-ⲧⲉ=ⲕ-ⲙ̄ⲛ̄ⲧ-ϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ	ⲛ̄-ⲥⲟⲛ	ϫⲉ
DIR.OBJ-POSS.ART.F.SG=2.M.SG-ABST-lord	ATTR-ø.brother	CNJ

ⲕⲱⲧ-ⲟⲩ-ϭⲁⲧ	ϣⲏⲙ	ⲛⲁ=ï
IMP.make.INF-INDF.ART.SG-ϭⲁⲧ	small	IND.OBJ=1.SG

'   *"When your Charity came to the mountain of Djême, I bid to your brotherly lordship: Make for me a small ϭⲁⲧ."* (*O.Frangé* 120.18-22 r.)

These two patterns, however, are open to interpretation. Since the majority of tokens used in the opening of documents cannot be analysed as subordinators, it is unclear as to whether (5) and (6) were intended to be used as such.

4.2.2. – Further patterns involving ἐπειδή to introduce the body of documents

As stated above, the use of ἐπειδή to signal the beginning of the body of documents is related to the cohesive flow of the text, rather than the syntax of the individual clause. As such, certain patterns may be identified in which ἐπειδή is complemented by another element in order to create a flow of information.

The body of both legal texts and letters generally begins with a declaration of previous circumstances which led to the composition of the document. In letters, this may constitute a reiteration of an earlier communication, either written or verbal, while in legal texts this includes details of a prior event, such as the sale of a piece of land, a verbal agreement, or a court case disputing the division of inheritance. As such, ἐπειδή is closely connected to the motivation behind the composition of the document.

Within the corpus, several patterns occur in which a second (generally adverbial) element is used to introduce the resulting state or action arising from these prior circumstances. In these passages, both ἐπειδή and the second adverbial element act as markers related to the wider flow of discourse within the text. These patterns occur as follows;

a) ⲉⲡⲉⲓⲇⲏ… ⲉⲓⲥ ϩⲏⲏⲧⲉ (ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ)/ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ:

(7) ⲭⲉ-**ⲉⲡⲉⲇⲏ**   ⲁ=ⲓ-ϯ   -ⲟⲩⲉⲟⲩ   ⲉⲃⲟⲗ   ⲛⲁⲕ
     CNJ-**re:**   PERF=1.SG-give.INF-INDF.ART.SG-donkey   ADV   IND.OBJ=2.M.SG

     ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ   ⲉⲓⲥ_ϩⲏⲏⲧⲉ   ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲡⲱⲗⲕ   ⲛⲏⲙⲁ=ⲕ
     now   behold   PERF=1.SG-settled.INF   with=2.M.SG

     ϩⲁⲣⲟ=ⲥ
     concerning=3.F.SG

"I sold a donkey to you. Now behold, I have settled with you concerning it…"
(*O.Med.Habu.Copt.* 80.6-10)

b) ⲉⲡⲉⲓⲇⲏ + 1ˢᵗ Perfect… ⲟⲩⲛ *(see Chapter 3, 3.6.1e)*:

(8) ⲭⲉ-**ⲉⲡⲉⲓⲇⲏ**   ϩⲙ-ⲡⲉⲓ-ⲕⲁⲓⲣⲟⲥ   ⲡⲁⲓ…
     CNJ-**re:**   in-DEM.ART.M.SG-time   DEM.PRN.M.SG…

     ⲁ=ⲛ-ⲉⲛⲉⲅⲉ   ⲙⲛ-ⲛⲉ=ⲛ-ⲉⲣⲏⲩ
     PERF=1.PL-go.to.court   with-POSS.ART.PL=1.PL-companion

     ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲁ-ⲡ-ⲣⲱϣⲉ   ⲟⲩⲛ   ⲛ-ⲇⲓⲕⲁⲓⲟⲗⲟⲅⲓⲁ
     after-DEF.ART.M.SG-sufficient   ENCL   ATTR-ø.proof

     ⲉ-ⲁ=ⲛ-ⲁⲁ=ⲩ   ⲙⲛ-ⲛⲉ=ⲛ-ⲉⲣⲏⲩ…
     CIRC-PERF=1.PL-do.INF=3.PL   with-POSS.ART.PL=1.PL-companion…

     ⲁ=ϥ-ⲕⲉⲗⲉⲩⲉ   ⲛⲁ=ⲛ
     PERF=3.M.SG-command   IND.OBJ=1.PL

"Greetings! Re: In this time…we have gone to court with each other… Therefore after receiving sufficient proof, we having made them to each other… he has commanded to us…" (*P.KRU* 43.x+8-18)

c) ⲉⲡⲉⲓⲇⲏ + 1st Perfect… (ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ) ⲇⲉ (see Chapter 3, 3.4.2b):

(9) **ⲭⲉ_ⲉⲡⲉⲓⲇⲏ**   ϩⲛ-ⲧⲉ-ⲣⲟⲙⲡⲉ   ⲧⲁⲓ   ⲉⲧ=ⲛ-ⲛϩⲏⲧ=ⲥ
    since   in-DEF.ART.F.SG-year   DEM.PRN.F.SGG   REL=1.PL-in=3.F.SG

    ⲇⲉⲕⲁⲧⲏⲥ   ⲓⲛⲇⲓⲕ/   ⲁ-ⲡ-ⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ
    tenth.F.GEN.SG   indictment   PERF-DEF.ART.M.SG-God

    ⲉⲛ   -ⲟⲩ-ⲛⲟϭ   ⲛ-ⲥⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲥⲓⲥ   ⲉⲭⲱ=ⲓ
    bring.INF-INDF.ART.SG-great   ATTR-ø.distress   upon=1.SG

    ⲙⲛ-ⲧⲉ=ⲧⲛ-ⲙⲁⲁⲩ   ⲛⲙⲙⲏ=ⲧⲛ
    with-POSS.ART.F.SG=2.PL-mother   with=2.PL

    ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲧⲓ   -ⲡ-ⲏⲓ   ⲛ-ⲧⲉ=ⲧⲛ-ⲙⲁⲕⲁⲣⲓⲁ
    PERF=1.SG-give.INF-DEF.ART.M.SG-house   of-POSS.ART.F.SG=2.PL-late

    ⲙ-ⲙⲁⲁⲩ   ⲥⲁⲣⲣⲁ   ⲉⲃⲟⲗ   ⲛⲁ-ⲕⲟⲥⲙⲁ   ⲡ-ϣⲏⲣⲉ
    ATTR-ø.mother   Sarra   ADV   IND.OBJ-Kosma   DEF.ART.M.SG-son

    ⲛ-ⲓⲱⲥⲏⲫ…   ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ   ⲇⲉ   ⲧⲓ-ϩⲟⲙⲟⲗⲟⲅⲉⲓ
    of-Joseph…   now   ENCL   PRS_1.SG-agree

"Since in this year which we are in, of the 10th indictment, God has brought a great distress upon me and you mother and you, I have sold the house of your late mother Sarra to Kosma the son of Joseph… Now I agree…" (*P.KRU* 19.11-25)

4.2.3. – ἐπειδή in other positions

Within the corpus, ἐπειδή occurs 8 times outside of its use to signal the body of a document.

As with the subordinating patterns outlined in 4.2.1., ἐπειδή introduces either a causal clause

or a temporal clause.

a) Causal clause – 'since' (= 5 tokens)

The use ἐπειδή to introduce a causal clause occurs 5 times in the corpus - twice in the

O.Frangé letters and 3 times in the P.KRU legal papyri, as demonstrated in (10).

(10) ⲘⲘⲞⲚ   ⲁ=ϥ-ⲘⲞⲨ   ⲈⲠⲀⲒ[14]   ⲡ-ⲆⲒⲔⲀⲒⲞⲚ
      for.surely   PERF=3.M.SG-die.INF **since**   DEF.ART.M.SG-righteous
      ϨⲰ=Ⲛ   ⲡⲈ   Ⲉ-ⲦⲢⲈ=Ⲛ-ⲢⲞⲈⲒⲤ
      INTS=1.PL   COP.M.SG   to-CAUS.INF=1.PL-guard.INF

      Ⲉ-Ⲧ-ϬⲞⲘ   Ⲛ-ⲠⲈ-ⲦⲞⲈⲢⲀⲤⲆⲒⲔⲞⲚ
      to-DEF.ART.F.SG-authority   of-DEF.ART.M.SG-donation.document

"For surely he has died since it is righteous for us too that we guard the authority of the donation document." (P.KRU 97.57-59)

b) <u>Temporal clause - 'when' (= 3 tokens)</u>

In three donation documents, ἐπειδή is used to introduce a temporal subordinate clause. In one passage, shown in example (11), the temporal force of is reiterated by the construction Ϩⲙ + Definite Article + Causative Infinitive.

(11) **ⲈⲠⲈⲒⲆⲎ**   Ϩⲙ-ⲡ-ⲦⲢⲈ=Ⲩ-ⲬⲠⲈ   ϢⲈⲚⲞⲨⲦⲈ
      when   in-DEF.ART.M.SG-CAUS.INF=3.PL-beget.INF   Shenoute

      ⲠⲀ-ⲘⲈⲢⲒⲦ   Ⲛ-ϢⲎⲢⲈ   ⲀϤ-ⲠⲚⲞⲨⲦⲈ
      POSS.ART.M.SG_1.SG-beloved   ATTR-ø.son   PERF-DEF.ART.M.SG-God

      ⲔⲈⲖⲈⲨⲈ   Ⲁ=ϥ-ϨⲈ   ⲈϨⲢⲀⲒ   Ⲉ_Ⲩ-ϢⲰⲚⲈ
      command.INF   PERF=3.M.SG-fall.INF   ADV   to_INDF.ART.SG-illness

      Ⲛ-ⲤⲰⲘⲀⲦⲒⲔⲞⲚ
      ATTR-physical

"When Shenoute, my beloved son, was born, God commanded and he fell to a physical illness…" (P.KRU 93.9)

---

[14] Förster, (2002, pg. 275) and Crum (as evidenced in his index to the P.KRU texts) consider ⲈⲠⲀⲒ here to be a writing of ἐπειδή, rather than the conjunction ἐπεί which is similar in use, but rare in Theban documents (cf., Gregorious, 1991, pp. 79-80; Layton, 2001, pg. 401).

4.3   καὶ γάρ

The compound conjunction καὶ γάρ is recorded 7 times in the corpus, all within the O.Frangé archive and all outside of set formulae[15]. This conjunction is difficult to categorise. Traditionally labelled as a 'particle', it is comprised of the coordinating conjunction καί, and the enclitic conjunction γάρ. It possesses the force of a causal subordinator, and in this sense is similar in usage to γάρ. However, it is clause initial; hence it has been included in this chapter.

Smyth suggests two interpretations for the Greek καὶ γάρ which have a slight distinction from γάρ; 1) *and in fact* – introducing a new, important thought and with less emphasis than γάρ alone, and 2) *for also* –also suggesting the introduction of a new idea or thought[16]. However, there appears to be no clear distinction in usage between γάρ and καὶ γάρ within the corpus. Furthermore, without qualitative evidence from native speakers, it is difficult to assess whether one is more or less emphatic than the other.

4.3.1. – καὶ γάρ introducing a causal clause

In two of the 7 tokens, as demonstrated in (12), καὶ γάρ introduces a causal clause. The causal function of καὶ γάρ possesses less force than other causal constructions (such as the native compound conjunction ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϫⲉ).

---

[15] Other tokens occur both in this archive and in the body of legal texts. However, the surrounding contexts were too badly damaged for these tokens to be included in this study.

[16] Smyth, (1956), pg. 640

(12)   ⲧⲁⲁ=ⲥ   ⲓⲱⲥⲏⲫ   ϩⲓⲧⲛ=ⲡⲁⲩⲗⲟⲥ   ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲥⲁⲭⲱ
        IMP.give.INF=3.F.SG   Joseph   from-Paul   of-DEF.ART.M.SG-ⲥⲁⲭⲱ

        ⲕⲁⲓ_ⲅⲁⲣ   ⲡ-ⲧⲟⲡⲟⲥ   ⲣ-ⲭⲣⲓⲁ   ⲛⲏ=ⲩ
        for   DEF.ART.M.SG-topos   PRS.make.INF-ø.need   IN.OBJ=3.PL

"Give it (to) Joseph from Paul (son) of the ⲥⲁⲭⲱ, for the topos has need of them." (*O.Frangé* 651.10-14 v.)

In this case, καὶ γάρ functions in the same way as the 10 tokens of the enclitic conjunction γάρ identified in the corpus.

4.3.2. – ⲭⲉ… ⲕⲁⲓ ⲅⲁⲣ introducing further information

The remaining 5 tokens, καὶ γάρ introduces a clause following one or more causal constructions introduced by the Coptic conjunction ⲭⲉ. As (13) demonstrates, while there is still a clear cause/effect relationship between statement a) - "Do a kindness… since… I have not sought another place" and statement b) introduced by καὶ γάρ - "for indeed… you cannot oppose me…", statement b) appears to add further information and stands as a separate thought.

(13)   *"Do a kindness and inquire after the skin and send a response of his to me, that I may take it…*

        ⲭⲉ   ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲕⲱ   ⲛ̄-ϩⲧⲏ=ï   ⲉⲣⲟ=ϥ
        since   CIRC=1.SG-put.INF   in-heart=1.SG   to=3.M.SG

        ⲙ̄ⲡ=ⲓ-ϣⲓⲛⲉ   ⲉ-ϭⲉ-ⲙⲁ   **ⲕⲁⲓ_ⲅⲁⲣ**
        NEG.PERF=1.SG-seek.INF   to-ø.other-place   **for.indeed**

        ⲉ-ⲡ̄-ⲡⲣⲉⲥⲃ/   ⲧⲁⲁ=ϥ   ⲛ̄-ϭⲉ-ⲣⲱⲙⲉ
        CIRC-DEF.ART.M.SG-priest   PRS.give.INF=3.M.SG   IND.OBJ-ø.other-man

        ⲛ=ϥ-ⲕⲁⲁ=ⲧ   ⲙⲁ=ⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄-ϣ-ⲧⲱⲟⲩⲛ
        CNJV=3.M.SG-abandon.INF=1.SG   NEG.HAB=2.PL-able-oppose.INF

        ϩⲁⲣⲟ=ï
        against=1.SG

... since, I taking him to heart, I have not sought another place. For indeed, if the priest gives it to another man and abandons me, you cannot oppose me." (*O.Frangé* 641.5-9)

This function appears to reflect Smythe's suggestion of καίγαρ being used to introduce a new thought or idea. However, the same effect is achieved by multiple chains of γάρ (see for instance 3.3.1, example (11) above). Therefore, once more the usage of καὶ γάρ is comparatively similar to γάρ.

4.4   καίπερ

The subordinating conjunction καίπερ only occurs three times in the corpus, all within the P.KRU legal papyri[17]. καίπερ is used typically in both Greek and Coptic to introduce concessive clauses[18]; however, it is not as common as the use of the native Egyptian Circumstantial converter. Müller notes that any clause type and verb form can follow καίπερ[19].

4.4.1 – καίπερ + Present I

All three of the tokens consist of the pattern καίπερ + Present I ϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄, as demonstrated in (14). These three tokens occur in the same phrase – "ⲕⲁⲓⲡⲉⲣ ⲛⲛⲟⲙⲟⲥ ⲛⲑⲉⲓⲕⲱⲛ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲃⲁⲥⲓⲗⲓⲕⲱⲛ ⲕⲉⲗⲉⲩⲉ – hence the lack of variation in the verb form following καίπερ[20]. The main clause is comprised of either the Finalis or the Negative Adhortative. Although the

---

[17] P.KRU 85, 98 and 99. It is worth nothing that all three of these texts are child donation documents.

[18] Layton, (2011), pg. 402; Förster, (2002), pg. 364; Smyth, (1956), pg. 654

[19] Müller, (2009), pg. 143

[20] Müller notes that usually there are no restrictions on the clause type or verb form following καίπερ, although the Conjunctive is more usual, and the circumstantial represents a later development. Müller, (2009), pg. 143.

traditional meaning of καίπερ is concessive – "although" – this does not appear to be the case in the three examples. A causal meaning – "since the godly and secular laws command (it)" – would be more fitting. As such, this demonstrates a usage of καίπερ which differs from those previously attested in literary Coptic.

(14) ⲧⲁⲣⲉ=ϥ-ϣⲱⲡⲉ   ⲉ=ϥ-ⲗⲏⲧⲟⲩⲣⲅⲉⲓ   ⲉⲣⲟ=ϥ
      FNLS=3.M.SG-exist.INF   CIRC_PRS=3.M.SG-serve   to=3.M.SG

      ϩⲛ-ⲡ-ⲥⲉⲉⲡⲉ   ⲙ-ⲡ=ϥ-ⲱⲛϩ   ⲧⲏⲣ=ϥ
      in-DEF.ART.M.SG-remainder   of-POSS.ART.M.SG=3.M.SG-life   all=3.M.SG

      ⲕⲁⲓⲡⲉⲣ   ⲛ-ⲛⲟⲙⲟⲥ   ⲛ-ⲑⲉⲉⲓⲕⲱⲛ   ⲁⲩⲱ   ⲛ-ⲃⲁⲥⲓⲗⲓⲕⲱⲛ
      since   DEF.ART.PL-law   ATTR-godly   and   ATTR-secular

      ⲕⲉⲗⲉⲩⲉ   ⲛ-ⲧⲉⲓ-ϩⲉ
      PRS.command   in-DEM.ART.F.SG-way

      "...so that he will exist serving him for the remainder of his whole life, since the godly and secular laws command (it) in this way." (*P.KRU* 98.x+18-20)

4.5   μήπως and μήποτε

The conjunctions μήπως and μήποτε are both used to introduce avertive clauses[21]. Müller notes that, in Coptic, avertive clauses are more commonly introduced by μήποτε than μήπως in Sahidic[22]. While there are limited attestations of either word within the corpus, the data reflects this trend, as shown in table 4.1. Furthermore, natives Egyptian constructions which express avertive clauses are rare[23].

---

[21] Three tokens of μήποτε occur with the meaning 'on no account' – P.KRU 67.15, P.KRU 67.103 and P.KRU 69.27. However, since these are adverbial in usage they are not included in the analysis below. (See Appendix)

[22] Müller, (2012), pg. 142

[23] Müller does not list any native Egyptian constructions in his discussion of the avertive; Müller, (2012), pp. 138 – 139. However, Boud'hors has argued that the affix ⲙⲛⲧⲉ- in used in Theban documents for this purpose; Boud'hors, (2010).

Table 4.1: Distribution of μήποτε and μήπως across the corpus

	Letters	*Legal Texts*	*Total*
μήποτε	1	9	**10**
μήπως	1	3	**4**
Total	**2**	**12**	**14**

4.5.1. – Patterns involving μήπως

 The use of μήπως is straightforward. All 3 tokens in the P.KRU texts are followed by the

Conjunctive, as demonstrated in (15) while the single token in the O.Frangé letters is followed

by the Present I (16).

(15)   ⲉ=ⲛ-ϭⲱϣⲧ   **ⲙⲏⲡⲱⲥ**   ϩⲛ-ⲟⲩ-ϣⲥⲛⲉ   {ⲛⲉ}
        CIRC_PRS=1.PL-look.INF   **lest**   in-DEF.ART.SG-sudden

        ⲛ=ⲧⲛ-ϣⲓⲃⲉ   ϩⲙ-ⲡⲉⲓ-ⲱⲛϩ
        CNJV=1.PL-change.INF   in-DEM.ART.M.SG-life

        ...we looking lest suddenly we change in this life…" (P.KRU 75.48-49)

(16)   ⲁⲣⲓ-ⲧ-ⲁⲅⲁⲡⲏ   ⲡⲁ-ⲥⲟⲛ   ⲫⲟⲓⲃⲁⲙⲱⲛ
        IMP.do.INF-DEF.ART.F.SG-love   POSS.ART.M.SG_1.SG-brother   Phoibamon

        ⲛ=ⲅ̄-ⲙⲟⲟϣⲉ   ⲙⲛ̄-ⲯⲁⲧⲉ   ⲉ-ⲡⲏⲓ   ⲛ̄-ϭⲱⲛⲉ
        CNJV=2.M.SG-go.INF   with-Psate   to-DEF.ART.M.SG-house   of-Kione

        ⲡ-ϣⲏⲣⲉ   ⲙ̄-ⲡⲁⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ   ⲛ̄-ⲧϣⲛ̄ⲡⲉⲧⲣⲉ   ⲛ=ϥ̄-ⲱϣ
        DEF.ART.M.SG-son   of-Papnoute   of-Tshenpetre   CNJV=3.M.SG-read.INF

        ⲧⲉ-ⲡⲗⲁϫ   ⲉ-ⲧⲉ=ϥ-ⲥϩⲓⲙⲉ   **ⲙⲏⲡⲟⲥ**   ϭⲱⲛⲉ
        DEF.ART.F.SG-ostracon   to-POSS.ART.F.SG=3.M.SG-wife   **in.case**   Kione

        ⲟⲩⲁⲧⲃ̄   ⲉ-ⲧ-ⲕⲁⲉ
        PRS.go.away.QUAL   from-DEF.ART.F.SG-field

"Do a favour, my brother Phoibamon, and go with Psate to the house of Kione, the son of Papnoute of Tshenpetre, that he may read this ostracon to his wife, lest Kione is away from the field." (*O.Frangé* 197.1-8 r.)

As Gregorios notes, the Conjunctive is used with prospective events[24]. Conversely, the use of the Present I in example (16) refers to a condition that may exist simultaneously with another prospective event, (although the use of μήπως with the Present I is uncommon).

4.5.2. – Patterns involving μήποτε

All 10 occurrences of μήποτε are followed by the Conjunctive. In 4 cases, μήποτε follows the native Egyptian verb of fearing – ⲣ̄-ϩⲟⲧⲉ, as demonstrated in (17). In all instances, μήποτε is preceded by the Coptic conjunction ⲭⲉ.

(17)   ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲣ-ϩⲟⲧⲉ   ⲭⲉ-**ⲙⲏⲡⲟⲧⲏ**   ⲛⲧⲉ-ⲧ-ⲁⲡⲟⲫⲁⲥⲓⲥ
       PERF=1.SG-do.INF-ø.fear   CNJ-**lest**   CNJV-DEF.ART.F.SG-judgement

       ⲧⲁϩⲟ=ⲓ
       befall.INF=1.SG

"I was afraid lest judgement befall me." (*P.KRU* 69.18-19)

Gregorios notes that, as with μήπως, μήποτε is usually followed by the Conjunctive for a prospective event or the Perfect for a past event[25]. However, as example (17) shows, in the corpus the Conjunctive is used regardless of the context (in this case it occurs with a past event).

---

[24] Gregorios, (1991), pg. 85

[25] Gregorios, (1991), pg. 85

4.6 ὡς

Within the corpus, ὡς occurs 7 times as a subordinating conjunction. All 7 tokens occur in the P.KRU legal papyri. A further 8 tokens appear in which ὡς functions as an adverb "as/like"[26] – 2 in the P.KRU legal papyri and 6 in the O.Frangé letters. As such, while ὡς is present in both types of non-literary texts with almost the same frequency, it does not function as a subordinating conjunction within the corpus of letters.

4.6.1. ὡς introducing causal clause – 'since' (= 5 tokens)

The main use of ὡς as a subordinating conjunction in the corpus is to introduce a causal clause, as shown in (18). It is followed by the Circumstantial + Present I, or the Perfect I.

(18) ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉⲓ   ⲙⲙⲟ=ϥ
      PERF=1.SG-request   DIR.OBJ=3.M.SG

      ϩⲛ-ϩⲉⲛ-ⲣⲙⲉⲓⲟⲟⲩⲅⲉ   ⲉ-ⲛⲁϣⲱ=ⲟⲩ   ϩⲱⲥ
      through-INDF.ART.PL-tears   CIRC-be.many=3.PL   **since**

      ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ   ⲛ-ⲧ-ⲙⲛⲧ-ⲛⲁ_ϩⲧ
      CIRC_PRS=1.SG-know.INF   DIR.OBJ-DEF.ART.F.SG-ABST-compassionate

      ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ
      of-DEF.ART.M.SG-God

      "I have requested it under many tears, since I know the charity of God." (*P.KRU* 80.21-22)

4.6.2. -- ὡς + Circumstantial indicating purpose - 'as if' (= 2 tokens)

In 2 cases, ὡς is used to introduce a clause of purpose, as demonstrated in (19).

---

[26] E.g. ⲉⲡⲉⲓⲇⲏ ⲁⲓ̈ⲧⲁⲛϩⲟⲩⲧⲕ̅ ϩⲱⲥ ⲉⲓⲱⲧ, "Since I trusted you *as* a father…" (O.Frangé 210.9-10)

(19) ⲛⲛⲉ-ⲧⲉ=ϥ-ⲥϩⲓⲙⲉ   ⲉϣ-ⲕⲗⲏⲣⲟⲛⲟⲙⲉⲓ   ⲙⲙⲟ=ϥ
NEG.ADH-POSS.ART.F.SG=3.M.SG-wife   be.able-inherit   DIR.OBJ=3.M.SG

ⲛ=ⲥ-ⲟⲩⲱϩ   ⲛϩⲏⲧ=ϥ   ϩⲱⲥ   ⲉ=ⲥ-ⲟ
CNJV=3.F.S-place.INF   in=3.M.S   **as.if**   CIRC_PRS=3.F.S-act.QUAL

ⲛ-ⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ   `ⲉⲣⲟ=ϥ´
DIR.OBJ-ⲟ̸.lord   to=3.M.S

"His wife will not be able to inherit it and she will not live in it as if to be lord over it…" (*P.KRU* 67.34-35)

4.7 ὥστε

28 occurrences of ὥστε were found within the corpus of non-literary texts. Of these, only 1 appeared in the O.Frangé letters, while the remaining 27 were contained in the "possession" formula of the P.KRU legal papyri. In the corpus, ὥστε is realised variously as ϩⲱⲥⲧⲉ or ϩⲱⲥⲇⲉ. In the "possession" formula, the latter is analysed by Biedenkopf-Ziehner as ϩⲱⲥ + ⲇⲉ[27], possibly as a result of the alternate pattern ϫⲓⲛⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ⲇⲉ (see Chapter 3, 3.4.2a). However, since ϩⲱⲥⲇⲉ is a well attested orthographic variation of ϩⲱⲥⲧⲉ[28], since no isolated incidences of ϩⲱⲥ occur in the "possession" formulae in the corpus, and since the orthography ϩⲱⲥⲧⲉ commonly appears in this position, the interpretation by Biedenkopf-Ziehner is less likely.

4.7.1. – ὥστε introducing result clause – "so that" (=26 tokens)

26 of the 28 tokens introduce a result clause. The following verb form is either the Conjunctive ⲛϥ̄ⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄, the Future II ⲉϥⲛⲁⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄, or the Finalis ⲧⲁⲣⲉϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄. The Greek

---

[27] Biedenkopf-Ziehner, (2001), pg. 18ff.

[28] See Förster, (2002), pg. 899

conjunction is often accompanied by the Greek enclitic conjunctions οὖν (and rarely δέ), and the native Egyptian preposition ⲉⲣⲟ⸗[29]. Table 4.2 shows the distribution of these patterns with various verb forms.

Table 4.2: Distribution of patterns for result clauses with ὥστε.

	+ Conjunctive	*+ Future II*	*+ Finalis*	*Total*
ϩⲱⲥⲧⲉ	6	-	-	**6**
ϩⲱⲥⲧⲉ ⲉⲣⲟ⸗	1	8	5	**14**
ϩⲱⲥⲧⲉ ⲟⲩⲛ	-	1	-	**1**
ϩⲱⲥⲧⲉ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲣⲟ⸗	-	4	-	**4**
ⲇⲉ ϩⲱⲥⲧⲉ ⲉⲣⲟ⸗	-	-	1	**1**
Total	**7**	**13**	**6**	**26**

The use of the Future II here is in need of further discussion. It is possible that the form ⲉϥⲛⲁⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ could be the Circumstantial Future I. However several features of these result clauses with ὥστε in the P.KRU legal papyri point towards the use of Future II. Firstly is the

---

[29] This is most likely a calque of the Greek construction ὥστε σέ attested in Greek sales documents from the Byzantine period – for example; ὥστε σὲ τὸν ὠνούμενον… κρατεῖν καὶ κυριε[ύ]ε[ιν] – *"...with the result that you, the purchaser… (may) hold and control…"* (*P. Lond.* V 1735.9). The use of ⲉⲣⲟ⸗ in these passages is interesting, as this is not attested outside of the Theban legal texts, and there is no consistency as to how this has been translated. Richter, following the analysis of Crum, suggests that is an 'elliptic' usage, and translates it as "it is up to you"; Richter, (2001), pg. 192; c.f. Crum CD 51b/2a:1. It is also possible that this reflects the Greek 'dative of advantage/disadvantage", that is: "A has occurred so that you, *for your own benefit*, you will come in and take possession…" – see Kendall, (1980), pg. 383; c.f. Smyth, (1956).

nature of the formulae themselves. The result clause functions to stipulate that the subject of the clause *and no other* benefits from the terms outlined in the document, as shown in (20). This contrastive force is part of the function of the focalisation converter[30].

(20)   т-тιмн   N-тєι-мιнє   а=с-єι
      DEF.ART.F.SG-price   in-DEM.ART.F.SG-way   PERF=3.F.SG-come.INF

      а-тот   ?ι-тот=к   нток   арωн
      to-ø.hand_1.SG   from-ø.hand=2.M.SG INDP.2.M.SG   Aron

      п-ϣнрє   N-сєн`ө´   п-єт-ϣωп
      DEF.ART.M.SG-son of-Senouthios   DEF.ART.M.SG-REL-PRS.buy.INF

      ?ωсає   єро=к   хιн-тєноγ   ϣа-єнє?
      so.that   to=2.M.SG   from-now   to-forever

      є=к-на-єι   а?оγн   N=г-р   -п-хоєιс
      FOC=2.M.SG-FUT-come.INF   ADV   CNJV=2.M.SG-act.INF-DEF.ART.M.SG-lord

"The sum, like this, has come into my hands from your hands, you, Aron the son of Senouthios, the buyer, that for yourself, from now until forever, you (and no one else) will come in and be owner…" (*P.KRU* 12.29-30).

Secondly, two other features of the formulae seek to emphasise the subject of the result clause: a) the inclusion in some passages of the independent pronoun нток/нтωтн introducing the name of buyer, and b) the use of the preposition єро≠ "to" in 12 of the 13 clauses involving єчнасωт̄м to introduce the subject before the main verb. Both of these strategies emphasise the subject of the result clause to ensure that there is no doubt as to who benefits from the stipulations of the document. Thus the Future II is most likely employed to contribute to this repeated emphasis of the subject.

---

[30] Layton, 2011, pg. 354

4.7.2. – Verb forms in result clauses after ὥστε

The use of different verb forms following ὥστε is an interesting feature of these result clauses. In his study of Shenoutean grammar, Shisha-Halevy suggests that in literary texts ϩⲱⲥⲧⲉ + Conjunctive expresses an intended consequence, while ϩⲱⲥⲧⲉ + Causative Infinitive suggests a consequence "naturally or automatically ensuing, objective, unintentional and even undesirable"[31]. However, Hasznos notes in her study of Greek and Coptic clause patterns that there is no semantic difference between the 10 occurrences of ϩⲱⲥⲧⲉ + ⲉ + Infinitive and the 2 occurrences of ϩⲱⲥⲧⲉ + Conjunctive[32].

Similarly, in the data from the corpus it does not appear that the choice between Future II, Conjunctive or Finalis after ὥστε has any bearing in the sense of the clause. All three verb forms appear to be used to express intended consequences. For example, both Future II and the Conjunctive appear in formulae which state that party A has done something so that party B will have ownership of something, or benefit from something stated in the document, as demonstrated in examples (21) and (22).

(21)
ⲧⲉ-ⲧⲉⲗⲉⲓⲁ	ⲧⲓⲙⲏ	ⲛ-ⲧⲓ-ⲙⲓⲛⲉ	ⲁ=ⲥ-ⲉⲓ
DEF.ART.F.SG-full	ⲫ.price	in-DTC.ART.M.SG-way	PERF=3.F.SG-come.INF

ⲉ-ⲧⲟⲟⲧ	ϩⲓⲧⲟⲟⲧⲕ…	**ϩⲱⲥⲧⲉ**	ⲉⲣⲟ=ⲕ…
to-hand_1.SG	from-hand=2.M.SG…	**so.that**	to=2.M.SG…

ⲉ=ⲕ-ⲛⲁ-ⲉⲓ	ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ	ⲛ=ⲅ-ⲁⲙⲁϩⲧⲉ
FOC=2.M.SG-FUT-come.INF	ADV	CNJV=2.M.SG-take.possesion.INF

"The full price in this way has come to my hand from your hand… so that for yourself… you will enter and take possession…" (*P.KRU* 14.48-54)

---

[31] Shisha-Halevy, (1986), pg. 209

[32] Hasznos, (2012), pp. 66 - 67

(22) ⲁⲩⲱ   ⲁⲛⲟⲛ   ϩⲱⲱ=ⲛ   ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ   ⲓⲁⲕⲱⲃ   ⲙⲛ-ⲏⲗⲓⲁⲥ
      and   INDP.1.PL   INTS=1.PL   now   Jacob   with-Elias

      ⲛⲓ-ⲁⲗⲁⲭⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ   ⲉⲛⲧ=ⲁⲩ-ϣⲣⲡ-ⲥϩⲁⲓ   ⲛ-ⲧ-ⲡⲉ
      DTC.ART.PL-humble   REL.PERF=3.PL-first-write.INF   in.DEF.ART.F.SG-upper

      ⲉ-ⲁ=ⲛ-ⲁⲛⲁⲇⲓⲇⲟⲩ   ⲙⲙⲟ=ⲟⲩ   ⲛⲁ=ⲕ   ⲉⲛⲧⲉⲩⲑⲉⲛ
      CIRC-PERF=1.PL-distribute   DIR.OBJ=3.PL   IND.OBJ=2.M.SG   hence

      ⲛⲧⲟⲕ   ⲥⲧⲉⲫⲁⲛⲟⲥ   **ϩⲱⲥⲧⲉ**   ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲁ-ⲡⲉ=ⲛ-ⲛⲕⲟⲧⲕ
      INDP.2.M.SG   Stephanos   **so.that**   after-POSS.ART.M.SG=1.PL-death

      ⲛ=ⲅ-ⲉⲡⲉⲣⲉⲓⲇⲉⲥⲑⲁⲓ   ⲙⲙⲟ=ⲟⲩ
      CNJV=2.M.SG-prevail.over   DIR.OBJ=3.PL

*"And we ourselves now, Jacob and Elias the humble who they wrote beforehand
above, we having distributed them to you hence, you, Stephanos, so that after our
death you may prevail over them…"* (*P.KRU* 75.x+78-82)

It is possible, however, that certain factors have influenced the choice of verb form. For
instance, 18 of the 19 instances of ϩⲱⲥⲧⲉ + Future II/Finalis are used with intransitive verbs[33],
while 6 of the 7 instances of ϩⲱⲥⲧⲉ + the Conjunctive occur with transitive verbs[34].
Furthermore, the combination ϩⲱⲥⲧⲉ + the Conjunctive only occurs in testaments and child
donation documents, while ϩⲱⲥⲧⲉ + Future II only occurs in land/property sales and
settlements. A wider study of result clause patterns in non-literary texts would be required to
examine whether any of these trends are significant.

---

[33] ⲉⲓ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ "enter", ϩⲱⲛ "comply", ϣⲱⲡⲉ "exist". The single transitive verb used is "act as a lord/be owner"
(P.KRU 13.32).

[34] ⲭⲡⲟ "acquire", ⲉⲡⲉⲣⲉⲓⲇⲉⲥⲑⲁⲓ "prevail over", ⲉⲓⲣⲉ/ⲣ̄ϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ "do/be owner", ⲱⲡ "to count". The single intransitive
verb is ⲉⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉ "sue" (P.KRU 85.x+38).

The pattern ϩⲱⲥⲧⲉ + ⲉⲧⲣⲉϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ which appears in literary Coptic is not attested within the corpus. More common is the use of ϩⲱⲥⲧⲉ + Future II which is used in half of the result clauses. However, ϩⲱⲥⲧⲉ + Future II does not appear to be common in literary Coptic. Müller notes that the conjunctive is the most common verb form to follow ὥστε, and that "occasionally also other patterns are attested such as the marked future (Future II)"[35].

4.7.3. - ϩⲱⲥⲧⲉ ⲉ + Infinitive introducing purpose – "so as to" (= 1 token)

In one text, shown in (23), ὥστε is followed by ⲉ + Infinitive in order to convey a sense of purpose or intention[36].

(23)   *"And it is not possible… to be able to alter or change that which I have made clear…*

ⲏ	ⲛ=ϥ-ⲁⲓⲛⲉⲅⲉ	ⲛ-ⲧⲁ-ⲥϩⲓⲙⲉ
or	CNJV=3.M.SG-take.to.court	DIR.OBJ-POSS.ART.F.SG_1.SG-wife

ⲕⲁⲧⲁ	ⲗⲁⲁⲩ	ⲛ-ⲥⲙⲟⲧ	**ϩⲱⲥⲧⲉ**	ⲉ-ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲃⲁ
according.to	ⲫ.any	ATTR-ⲫ.way	**so.as**	to-violate

ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲉⲛⲧⲁ=ⲓ	-ⲟⲩⲉϩ-ⲥⲁϩⲛⲉ	ⲙⲙⲟ=ϥ
DIR.OBJ-DEF.ART.M.SG-REL.PERF=1.SG-place.INF-ⲫ.supply		DIR.OBJ=3.M.SG

…or to take my wife to court in any way, so as to violate that which I have commanded… (*P.KRU* 74.77-82)

---

[35] Müller, (2012), pg. 138. Müller notes however that such cases, which appear in Bohairic, only apply if one analyses ⲉϥⲛⲁⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ as the use of a 'Sahidized' form of the focalisation marker in Nitrian Bohairic (as opposed to the 'standard' Bohairic Future II ⲁϥⲛⲁⲥⲱⲧⲉⲙ), rather than as a circumstantial converter, e.g. "Assemble for me all the rich of the village… ϩⲱⲥⲧⲉ ⲉⲓⲛⲁϫⲱ ⲛⲱⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲩⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ - *so that* I can tell them a secret", *Panegyric on the Innocent Saints*: Müller, (2012), pg. 138, ft. 42.

[36] C.f. Müller, (2012), pg. 135; Layton, (2011), pg. 417; Gregorios, (1991), pg. 92

4.8   Conclusion

The data outlined above reveals some interesting trends in the use of Greek subordinating conjunctions in non-literary Coptic. To begin, subordinating conjunctions appear to be more common in legal texts than in letters. 39 tokens appear in the corpus of letters, compared to 109 in the legal texts. Furthermore, 24 of the 29 conjunctions found in the letters consist of ἐπειδή used to introduce the body of the letter. As such, outside of this formulaic usage only 5 subordinating conjunctions appear in the body of letters - ἐπειδή introducing a causal clause (2 tokens), ὥστε (1 token), μήποτε (1 token) and μήπως (1 token).

This leads to another important observation – namely, that most of the subordinating conjunctions listed are found either predominately or entirely in formulae and set phrases. In total, Greek subordinating conjunctions appear 101 times in set expressions within the corpus – 24 times in the letters and 77 times in the legal texts. Consequently, the use of Greek subordinating conjunctions in the corpus only occurs 44 times in "free" positions – that is, outside of formulae or set expressions.

Furthermore, the patterns in which these 44 tokens are found are infrequent. Many of these patterns only occur once or twice in the corpus, such as the use of ὡς to express intention (4.6.2). Therefore outside of formulae, the use of Greek conjunctions is sporadic; not falling consistently into particular usages or possessing specific meanings, but rather appearing in isolated constructions.

There is, however, one notable exception. The pattern which occurs with the most frequency outside of formulae or set phrases is the use of μήποτε or μήπως to express an avertive clause (14 tokens)[37]. This is highly significant, since native constructions which convey the sense of the avertive in the Egyptian language are rare. As such, the most common use of Greek subordinating conjunctions in 'free' positions occurs where there is no common way in which the scribe could express the same idea in the native vocabulary[38]. The trends outlined above are summarised in Table 4.3 below.

Consequently, the data from this study shows that Greek subordinating conjunctions are mostly limited to set expressions in non-literary Coptic. It is possible therefore that these conjunctions were not part of the active vocabularies of scribes, but rather were present in the texts because of their use in similar formulae contained in earlier Greek documents which influenced the structure and the language of Coptic non-literary texts. A comparative study of both Greek and Coptic material would be required to assess this hypothesis.

---

[37] Interestingly, these two conjunctions, along with ὡς, are the only subordinating conjunctions in the corpus which occur exclusively in these 'free' positions. However, ὡς, as noted above, only occurs 7 times as a subordinator, and these tokens are distributed across two different modes of use. Therefore patterns involving ὡς are not as common as those involving the avertive construction.

[38] Compare this to conditional and concessive clauses for which the Greek conjunctions εἴ and the καίπερ occur only in set phrases, whereas in 'free' positions are expressed through native Egyptian constructions such as ⲉϥϣⲁⲛⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ and the Circumstantial respectively.

Table 4.3. Summary of trends in the use of Greek subordinating conjunctions

	Letters	*Legal Texts*	*Total*
Formulae/set phrases	24	77	**101**
Avertive constructions	2	12	**14**
Other	10	20	**30**
Total	**39**	**109**	145

Furthermore, it appears that there was a preference amongst scribes to use native Egyptian subordination patterns where the structure of legal or epistolary formulae did not dictate the use of Greek conjunctions. This is particularly likely when one considers that the most common subordination pattern which employs Greek conjunctions outside of set expressions is the avertive, for which native constructions were rare in the written language. Further studies focusing on the distribution of these 'free' patterns amongst particular scribes may illuminate the extent to which the use of Greek subordinating conjunctions in non-literary Coptic was a personal preference or a feature of Coptic as a whole.

5. Coordinating Conjunctions

Coordinating conjunctions perform much the same function as enclitic conjunctions, outlined in Chapter 3. However, two particular points set these two word classes apart. On one hand, as stated earlier, an initial examination suggests that enclitic conjunctions coordinate larger ideas while coordinating conjunctions express relationships between individual words and clauses. On the other, unlike enclitic conjunctions, coordinating conjunctions are clause initial.

In the corpus, 8 Greek coordinating conjunctions were identified:

1. The disjunctive coordinators εἴτε, ἤ and κἄν
2. The negative conjunctives οὐδέ/οὔτε
3. The adversative coordinators ἀλλά and μέντοι γε
4. The exceptive coordinator εἰ μή τι

As a discussion of Greek and Egyptian coordination patterns shows, the borrowing of Greek conjunctions both extends the range of relationships which the language can express, as well as making these relationships more explicit. Nevertheless, these Greek coordinators are still mostly confined to legal formulae. Furthermore, certain words exhibit less variation in use and meaning than their literary counterparts.

The distinction between the negative conjunctions οὐδέ and οὔτε is difficult in Coptic. Since Egyptian did not distinguish between the alveolar consonants /d/ and /t/, both Greek conjunctions were realised in Coptic as either ⲟⲩⲇⲉ or ⲟⲩⲧⲉ. As such, it is often difficult to identify which of the conjunctions is intended. However, the difference between the two conjunctions is minimal; οὔτε is correlative – that is, it can coordinate individual words as

89

well as clauses – while οὐδέ is used only to coordinate clauses[1]. Throughout this study the two words are treated together, although those positions in which only οὔτε is possible are highlighted.

5.1   Greek and Egyptian patterns of coordination – a comparison

Before the date is presented, several observations should be made regarding the types of coordinators which appear in the corpus, as well as patterns of coordination in Coptic in general. In the corpus, there is a notable absence of Greek conjunctive coordinators, particularly the conjunction καί which only appears in set phrases written entirely in Greek, such as the phrase ⲉⲛ ⲡⲁⲥⲏ ⲁⲅⲁⲑⲏ ⲕⲁⲓ ⲕⲁⲗⲏ ⲡⲣⲟⲉⲣⲁⲓⲥⲏ - 'through every good and fair choosing'. Instead, a conjunctive relationship is expressed through the native Egyptian prepositions ⲙⲛ̄ and ⲑⲓ for substantives, and ⲁⲩⲱ for other parts of speech, as well as the Conjunctive verb form ⲛ̄ϥ̄ⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄.

On the other hand, the Greek coordinating conjunctions which appear in the corpus are used to express coordinating relationships which cannot be conveyed through the native Egyptian vocabulary. Similar to the avertive conjunctions μήποτε and μήπως (see Chapter 4, *Subordinating Conjunctions*, 4.4) for which equivalent native constructions are uncommon, there are no Egyptian conjunctions which directly express disjunction, negative coordination, or exception. Other parts of speech may be used to convey a similar meaning, such as the preposition ⲑⲓ as disjunctive coordinator[2] or ⲛ̄ⲥⲁ after negative expressions as an exceptive

---

[1] Smyth, (1956), pp. 660 - 662

[2] Crum CD 645a.

coordinator[3]. However, these prepositions are more ambiguous than the Greek conjunctions εἴτε, ἤ and κἄν.

Finally, adversative coordination appears to be conveyed through both Greek and Coptic conjunctions. On one hand is the use of the Greek ἀλλά and μέντοι γε, as this study shows, and on the other are Egyptian words such as ⲛ̄ⲧⲟϥ and ϩⲱⲱϥ[4] (although these appear to be uninflecting forms of the independent pronoun base ⲛ̄ⲧⲟ⸗ and the intensive pronoun ϩⲱⲱ⸗ respectively. Furthermore, adversative coordinators are attested in earlier stages of the language through the use of enclitic such as *swt*, in Middle Egyptian[5] or *ḥr* in Late Egyptian[6]. It is possible that other coordinating relationships such as disjunction or exception entered into the language through the borrowing of Greek conjunctions, facilitating the adaption of native words to convey these newly borrowed concepts[7]. However, further research on the native Egyptian patterns of coordination in Coptic and earlier stages of the language would be required to investigate these possibilities.

---

[3] Lambdin, (1983), pg. 143

[4] Layton, (2011), pg. 182

[5] Allen, (2010), pg. 199

[6] Junge, (2005), pg. 88. However, like the Coptic ϩⲓ, this word can be also be used to express conjunction, as well as possessing a number of other functions.

[7] This would not violate the theory proposed by Myers-Scotton, (1998) that structural elements are borrowed only if they fit into the existing structures of the substrate language since, as discussed below, these Greek coordinating conjunctions appear in the same positions as native Egyptian coordinators. Therefore, while the relationships between words or clauses which they express are not conveyed by the native lexicon, they still work to the structure of the language.

91

5.2   εἴτε, ἤ and οὐδέ/οὔτε

The coordinating conjunctions εἴτε, ἤ and οὐδέ/οὔτε are all similar in use. Both εἴτε and ἤ are used to express disjunctive relationships between clauses or various parts of speech, while οὐδέ/οὔτε is used in the same positions to show a negative conjunctive relationship (see below). While in letters these conjunctions all occur in "free" positions, within legal texts they appear almost exclusively in particular set formulae:

1. The "distance" formula
2. The "curse" formula.
3. The "penalty" formula.

The distribution of these conjunctions across the corpus is outlined in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1 – Distribution of εἴτε, ἤ and οὐδέ/οὔτε across the corpus

	Letters	*Legal Texts*	*Total*
εἴτε	6	149	**155**
ἤ	9	245	**245**
οὐδέ/οὔτε	9	518	**527**
Total	**24**	**912**	**936**

5.2.1. – εἴτε, ἤ and οὐδέ/οὔτε as part of lexical chains

The high number of tokens for these three coordinating conjunctions is a result of the appearance of long chains of coordinated words within a single passage[8]. For the purposes of

---

[8] For example, P.KRU 23.41-48 contains a string of 23 tokens for οὐδέ.

this discussion, the tokens have been grouped into what has been termed 'lexical chains'. For

example, in (1) three lexical chains can be identified:

(1)   *"The one who will come against you ever,*

ⲟⲩⲆⲉ	ⲀⲚⲞⲔ	ⲟⲩⲆⲉ	ⲤⲞⲚ	ⲟⲩⲆⲉ	ⲤⲰⲚⲉ	ⲟⲩⲆⲉ
neither	INDP.1.SG	**nor**	ø.brother	**nor**	ø.sister	**nor**

ⲱⲞⲩⲚ_ⲞⲩⲀ	ⲟⲩⲆⲉ	ⲱⲞⲩⲚ_ⲤⲚⲀⲨ	ⲟⲩⲆⲉ
ø.first.degree.relative	**nor**	ø.second.degree.relative	**nor**

ⲅⲀ-ⲠⲀ-ⲉⲓⲰⲦ	[ⲙ]Ⲛ-ⲦⲀ-ⲘⲀⲀⲨ
ø.from-POSS.ART.M.S_1.SG-father	[wi]th- POSS.ART.F.S_1.SG-mother

Ⲛ=ϥ-ⲉⲚⲀⲅⲉ	ⲚⲀ=Ⲕ	ⲅⲚ-ⲆⲒⲔⲀⲤⲦⲎ[ⲢⲒⲞⲚ]	Ⲏ
CNJV=3.M.SG-take.to.court	IND.OBJ=2.M.SG	in-ø.cou[rt]	**or**

Ⲙ-Ⲡ-ⲂⲞⲖ	Ⲛ-ⲆⲒⲔⲀⲤⲦⲎⲢⲒⲞⲚ	ⲅⲚ-ⲦⲞⲱ	Ⲏ
in-DEF.ART.M.SG-outside	of-ø.court	in-ø.district	**or**

Ⲙ-Ⲡ-ⲂⲞⲖ	Ⲛ-ⲦⲞⲱ
in-DEF.ART.M.SG-outside	of-ø.district

...neither I nor a brother nor sister nor first-degree relative nor second-degree relative nor one representing my father [an]d my mother and take you to court, in the cou[rt] or outside of the court, in the district or outside the district..." (*P.KRU* 15.71-75)

Chain 1: ⲟⲩⲆⲉ coordinating substantives:

ⲟⲩⲆⲉ ⲀⲚⲞⲔ ⲟⲩⲆⲉ ⲤⲞⲚ ⲟⲩⲆⲉ ⲤⲰⲚⲉ ⲟⲩⲆⲉ ⲱⲞⲩⲚⲞⲩⲀ ⲟⲩⲆⲉ ⲱⲞⲩⲚⲤⲚⲀⲨ ⲟⲩⲆⲉ ⲅⲀⲠⲀⲉⲓⲰⲦ

[ⲙ]ⲚⲦⲀⲘⲀⲀⲨ

Chain 2 = Ⲏ coordinating adverbials:

ⲅⲚⲆⲒⲔⲀⲤⲦⲎ[ⲢⲒⲞⲚ] **Ⲏ** ⲘⲠⲂⲞⲖ ⲚⲆⲒⲔⲀⲤⲦⲎⲢⲒⲞⲚ

Chain 3 = Ⲏ coordinating adverbials:

ⲅⲚⲦⲞⲱ **Ⲏ** ⲘⲠⲂⲞⲖ ⲚⲦⲞⲱ

In most cases, as can be seen in example (1), the particular Greek conjunction used throughout a single chain remains consistent: all conjunctions in Chain 1 are οὔτε, all in Chain 2 are ἤ, etc. However, in a few cases the lexical chains combine more than one Greek conjunction (such as ειτε… ⲏ or ⲟⲩⲇⲉ… ⲏ), or both Greek and Coptic conjunctions (such as ⲟⲩⲇⲉ… ϩⲓ or ⲟⲩⲇⲉ…ⲙⲛ̄).

The alternation between εἴτε/οὐδέ/οὔτε and ϩⲓ/ⲙⲛ̄ in certain patterns has significant implications for the borrowing of Greek function words into Coptic. As stated previously, the borrowing of function words has been considered by some scholars[9] as evidence of the interference of Greek in the grammatical structure of Coptic[10]. On the other hand, Richter, following the Matrix Language Turnover Hypothesis of Myers-Scotton[11], suggests that only those function morphemes which work with the grammatical structure of the Coptic language can be borrowed[12].

This theory is supported by the alternation between εἴτε/οὔτε and ϩⲓ/ⲙⲛ̄, as demonstrated in (2) in which both οὔτε and ϩⲓ are used to coordinate substantives.

---

[9] See Reintges, (2004); Hasznos, (2004/5); Hasznos, (2005); Hasznos, (2006), Hasznos, (2012)

[10] See Chapter 2, 2.1.2).

[11] Myers-Scotton, (1998)

[12] Richter, (2009), pp. 408 – 409. The classification of words in his argument, however, is somewhat problematic. Richter cites an example from an Achmimic text (*First Letter of Clement 42.4*) stating; "all content morphemes up to prepositions are borrowed from Greek, while structure building morphemes are Egyptian without exception." (Richter, 2009, pg. 409). Here Richter classes prepositions as content rather than function morphemes (see 2.2 Methodology for a discussion of the classification of prepositions). However, the 'structure building morphemes' include the native Egyptian preposition ⲙⲛ̄ used to coordinate substantives - ⲛ̄ⲉⲡⲓⲥⲕⲟⲡⲟⲥ ⲙⲛ̄ ϩⲉⲛⲇⲓⲁⲕⲟⲛⲟⲥ "bishops *and* deacons".

(2)	ⲉ-ⲙⲛ-ⲗⲁⲁⲩ		ⲛ-ⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ	ⲕⲏ		ⲉ⳿ⲣⲁⲓ	ⲉⲣⲟ=ⲓ
	CIRC-NEG.EXT-any		ATTR-ø.force	PRS.put.QUAL		ADV	to=1.SG

	ⲟⲩⲁⲉ	ⲗⲁⲁⲩ	ⲛ-ⲕⲣⲟϥ	ϩⲓ-ϩⲟⲧⲉ
	nor	any	ATTR-ø.fraud	**or**-ø.fear

"... there being no force placed upon me nor any fraud or fear..." (*P.KRU* 106.23-24)

In (2), the coordination of nouns using both the Greek conjunction and the Coptic preposition follow the same construction – *coordinating element + ø.substantive*. Since both the Greek and Coptic words are interchangeable in these environments, it is clear that there is no modification to the grammatical structure of the native Egyptian language in order to accommodate the borrowed function words. Rather, the Greek coordinating conjunctions take over the function previously held by the Coptic prepositions[13]. The same argument can be applied to the use of Greek coordinating conjunctions in place of the native Egyptian ⲁⲩⲱ in the coordination of verbs and adverbial phrases.

5.2.2. - General patterns of coordination using εἶτε, ἤ and οὐδέ/οὔτε

Throughout the corpus, are used to coordinate the following elements:

a) Clauses: (Conjunction +) main clause + conjunction + main clause

In almost all cases, this pattern consists of the coordination of verbal clauses, as demonstrated in (3). However, in two of the P.KRU texts[14], ἤ is used to coordinate non-verbal clauses, as demonstrated by (4).

---

[13] The use of prepositions such as 'with' to coordinate nouns also appears in earlier stages of the Egyptian language – compare Coptic ⲙⲛ̄ to patterns involving Middle Egyptian *ḥnꜥ* and Late Egyptian/Demotic *irm*.

[14] P.KRU 89.21 and P.KRU 100.35

(3) ⲙ̄ⲡⲣ̄-ⲙⲱ-ϩⲙⲟⲟⲩ·   ⲟⲩⲇⲉ   ⲙ̄ⲡⲣ̄-ⲛ̄   -ⲧ-ⲉⲱ·
NEG.IMP-scoop.INF-ø.water   **nor**   NEG.IMP-bring.INF-DEF.ART.F.SG-donkey
.

ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ   ⲉ=ⲕ-ⲛⲏⲩ
ADV   CIRC_PRS=2.M.SG-come.QUAL

"Do not scoop water, nor bring the female donkey when you come." (O.Frangé 200.8-10)

(4) ⲁ=ⲛ-ⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ   ⲉⲃⲟⲗ   ⲝⲉ   ⲟⲩ
PERF=1.PL-think.INF   ADV   CNJ   what

ⲡⲉⲧ=ⲛ-ⲛⲁ-ⲧⲃⲃⲟ=ϥ   ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ   ⲏ
COP.M.SG_REL=1.PL-FUT-purify.INF=3.M.SG   IND.OBJ-DEF.ART.M.SG-God   or

ⲟⲩ   ⲡⲉⲧ=ⲛ-ⲛⲁ-ⲧⲁⲁ=ϥ   ⲛⲁ=ϥ
what   COP.M.SG_REL=1.PL-FUT-give.INF=3.M.SG   IND.OBJ=3.M.SG

"We considered: 'what is it that we will purify for God or what is it that we will give to him …?'" (P.KRU 100.35-36)

In one of the O.Frangé letters, shown in (5), ἤ is also used to coordinate direct speech.

(5) ⲉϣⲱⲡⲉ   ⲇⲉ   ⲛ=ϥ̄-ⲝⲟⲟ=ⲥ   ⲝⲉ
if   ENCL   CNJV=3.M.SG-say.INF=3.F.SG   CNJ

ⲙ̄ⲡ=ï-ⲥⲣϥⲉ   ⲉⲣⲟ=ϥ   ⲏ̄   ⲝⲉ
NEG.PERF=1.SG-be.at.leisure.INF   to=3.M.SG   **or**   CNJ

ⲙ̄ⲡ=ï-ϭⲛ̄-ⲣⲱⲙⲉ
NEG.PERF=1.SG-find.INF-ø.man

"But if he says; 'I have not been at leisure with it,' or 'I have not found anyone'..." (O.Frangé 774.13-16)

b) <u>Substantives (nouns, pronouns and adjectives)</u>

This category can be further divided according to whether the substantives coordinated are

part of the subject (6), object (7) or indirect object (8) of the verbal predicate (or non-verbal in

the case of coordinated subjects). Furthermore, in this category, ⲟⲩⲧⲉ/ⲟⲩⲇⲉ can only be a

rendering of the Greek οὔτε since οὐδέ can only be used to coordinate clauses.

i.   Subjects: Subject₁-verb + object + conjunction + subject₂

(6)   ⲉ=ϥ-ⲟⲩⲱϣ   ⲉⲛⲉⲕⲉ   ⲛⲁ=ⲕ   ⲉⲓⲧⲉ
      CIRC_PRS=3.M.SG-wish.INF   go.to.court   IND.OBJ=2.M.SG   **either**

      ⲭⲱⲣ   ⲉⲓⲧⲉ   ⲭⲱⲣ   ⲛ-ⲭⲱⲣ   ⲉⲓⲧⲉ   ⲣⲱⲙⲉ
      ø.kinsman   **or**   ø.kinsman   of-ø.kinsman   **or**   ø.man

      ...he wishing to take you to court, either a kinsman near or distant or a man…"
      (*P.KRU* 67.x+106)

ii.   Direct objects: ⲙ̄ⲙⲟ=pronoun/ⲙ̄-noun + conjunction + noun

(7)   ⲣⲟⲉⲓⲥ   ⲭⲉ   ⲛ-ⲧⲉⲧⲛ-ⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ   ⲁⲛ
      watch.INF   CNJ   NEG_PRS=2.PL-know.INF   NEG

      ⲙ-ⲡ-ϩⲟⲟⲩ   ⲟⲩⲇⲉ   ⲧⲉ_ⲩⲛⲟⲩ
      DIR.OBJ-DEF.ART.M.SG-day   **nor**   DEF.ART.F.SG_hour

      "Watch, since you do not know the day nor the hour." (*P.KRU* 74.17-18)

iii. Indirect objects: ⲛⲁ=pronoun/ⲛ̄-noun + conjunction + noun/ⲛⲁ=[15]pronoun

(8)   ⲁⲩⲱ   ⲟⲩⲕ   ϩϫⲓⲥ   ⲛⲁ=ⲓ   ⲟⲩⲇⲉ
      and   NEG   be.possible.3.SG.PRS.INDC.ACT   IND.OBJ=1.SG   **nor**

      ⲛⲁ-ⲗⲁⲁⲩ   ⲛ-ⲣⲱⲙⲉ   ⲉ-ⲡⲟ=ⲓ   ⲡⲉ
      IND.OBJ-any   ATTR-ø.man   CIRC-POSS.PRN.M.SG=1.SG   COP.M.S

      "And it is not possible for me, nor for any man, he being mine…" (*P.KRU* 81.37)

---

[15] It is interesting that in two cases (P.KRU 79.x+53 and P.KRU 81.37), the coordinated indirect object consists

of the indefinite pronoun ⲗⲁⲁⲩ introduced by the prepronominal indirect object marker ⲛⲁ=, rather than the

prenominal form which usually accompanies ⲗⲁⲁⲩ.

iv. <u>Adverbials:</u> (Conjunction +) prep.-noun/adverb + conjunction + (prep.-)noun/adverb

(9) *"The one who will come against you ever...*

ⲛ=ϥ-ⲉⲛⲁⲅⲉ	ⲛⲁ=ⲕ	�》ⲛ-ⲇⲓⲕⲁⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ	ⲏ
CNJV=3.M.SG-take.to.court	IND.OBJ=2.M.SG	in-ø.court	**or**

ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲃⲟⲗ	ⲛ-ⲇⲓⲕⲁⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ
in-DEF.ART.M.SG-outside	of-ø.court

… and takes you to court, in the court or outside of the court, or if I bring any prosecution against you…" (*P.KRU* 11.48-49)

(10)
ⲏⲛ-ⲥⲟⲛ	ⲏ	ⲕⲗⲏⲣⲟⲛⲟⲙⲟⲥ	ⲏ	ⲗⲁⲁⲅ	ⲛ-ⲣⲱⲙⲉ
through-ø.brother	**or**	ø.heir	**or**	ø.any	ATTR-ø.man

"...through a brother or (through) an heir or (through) any man…" (*P.KRU* 3.54-55)

In (10), the preposition governing the initial noun is implied for the following coordinated nouns.

5.2.4. – Special usages of εἴτε, ἤ and οὐδέ/οὔτε

While the overall coordinating function of εἴτε, ἤ and οὐδέ/οὔτε is straightforward, several patterns involving these conjunctions are worthy of note.

a) <u>ἤ + Conjunctive</u>

In 21 passages, ἤ appears with the Conjunctive ⲛϥ̄ⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ to continue the force of the previous verb[16], as demonstrated in (11).

---

[16] P.KRU 5.47-52, P.KRU 10.54, P.KRU 11.49, P.KRU 15.74-78, P.KRU 18.x+49, P.KRU 22.x+34-42, P.KRU 24.96-105, P.KRU 25.41, P.KRU 27.53-55, P.KRU 41.83-85, P.KRU 66.x+35; x+56-57, P.KRU 70.57, P.KRU 75.x+102; x+111, P.KRU 76.x+13, P.KRU 90.x+5, P.KRU 95.x+26, P.KRU 105.x+4, P.KRU 107.x+22 and

(11) oyⲇⲉ   ⲗⲁⲁⲩ   ⲛ-ⲣⲱⲙⲉ   ⲉ=ϥ   -ⲉⲓⲣⲉ
      neither   any   ATTR-ø.man   CIRC=3.M.SG-act.INF

      ⲛ-ⲡⲁ-ⲡⲣⲱⲥⲱⲡⲱⲛ   ⲏ   ⲛ=ϥ-ⲛ
      DIR.OBJ-POSS.ART.M.SG_1.SG-representative   **or**   CNJV=3.M.SG-bring.INF

      -ⲇⲱⲣⲉⲁ   `ⲁ´ⲃⲟⲗ   ⲁⲣⲟ=ⲕ
      -ø.gift   ADV   to=2.M.SG

      ...nor any man, he acting as my representative or bringing a deed of gift to you…
      (*P.KRU* 18.48-49)

In this case, the use of the Greek conjunction makes the function of the Coptic Conjunctive more explicit; that is expressing a disjunctive relationship, while the bare ⲛϥ̄ⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ does not distinguish between disjunction and conjunction.

The use of ἤ + Conjunctive is also attested in literary texts. 15 tokens are used in this way in the sermons of the Besa Codices, as shown in (12).

(12) ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲥ   ⲉ=ⲩ-ⲛⲁ-ⲙⲟⲩⲟⲩⲧ   ⲙ̄ⲙⲟ=ⲛ   ⲏ
      CNJ   FOC=3.PL-FUT-kill.INF   DIR.OBJ=1.PL   **or**

      ⲛ̄=ⲥⲉ-ⲑⲙ̄ⲕⲟ=ⲛ
      CNJV=3.PL-maltreat.INF=1.PL

      "...in order that they will kill us or maltreat us." (*Besa Codex A* , Fr. 34, MS. 420)

O.Med.Habu.Copt. 69.5. Both ἤ and οὐδέ appear with the Conjunctive in other documents, however, in those cases the Conjunctive is used to introduce a result/purpose clause.

b) οὔτε without a negative predicate

For most chains of substantives/adverbials coordinated by οὔτε, there is a clear negative

predicate either preceding or following the chain, as shown in examples (13) and (14)

respectively.

(13) ⲭⲉ   ⲚⲚⲈ-ⲗⲁⲁⲨ   Ⲛ-ⲣⲱⲘⲈ   ⲈϢϬⲘϬⲞⲘ   Ⲉ-Ⲉⲓ
      since   **NEG.ADH**-any   ATTR-ø.man   have.power.INF   to-come.INF

      ⲈⲂⲞⲖ   ⲈⲣⲞ=Ⲕ   ⲈⲚⲈ�   **ⲞⲨⲆⲈ**   ⲤⲞⲚ   **ⲞⲨⲆⲈ**   ⲤⲱⲚⲈ
      ADV   to=2.M.SG   ever   **neither**   ø.brother   **nor**   ø.sister

      ⲞⲨⲆⲈ   ϢⲎⲣⲈ   **ⲞⲨⲆⲈ**   Ⲭ ⲞϨ   Ⲛ-Ⲭ ⲞϨ
      nor   ø.son   **nor**   ø.kinsman   of-ø.kinsman

   *"...since no man will be able to come against you ever, neither a brother, nor a sister,
   nor a son, nor a distant kinsman…"* (*P.KRU* 1.91-94)

(14)   *"The one who will come against you ever…*

      ⲞⲨⲆⲈ   ⲀⲚⲞⲚ   **ⲞⲨⲆⲈ**   ⲗⲁⲁⲨ   Ⲛ-ⲣⲱⲘⲈ   ⲚⲒⲘ
      neither   INDP.1.PL   **nor**   any   ATTR-ø.man   all

      Ⲉ=Ⲩ-ⲈⲒⲣⲈ   Ⲙ-ⲡⲈ=Ⲛ-ⲡⲣⲞⲤⲱⲡⲞⲚ…   ϢⲞⲣⲡ
      CIRC_PRS=3.PL-act.INF   IND.OBJ-POSS.ART.M.SG=1.PL-representative…   first

      ⲘⲈⲚ   ⲚⲚⲈ-ⲡ-ⲈⲦ-ⲘⲘⲀⲨ   ⲱⲫⲉⲗⲉⲓ   Ⲛ-ⲗⲁⲁⲨ
      ENCL   NEG.ADH-DEF.ART.M.SG-REL-there   have.profit   DIR.OBJ-any

   *…neither we nor any man acting as our representative… in the first place that one
   will not have any profit…"* (*P.KRU* 8.x+19-23)

However, in a number of cases, there is no clear negative which compliments the use of ⲞⲨⲆⲈ.

All but one of these cases occur in the 'curse' formulae, as demonstrated in (15).

(15) ⲡ-ⲉⲧ-ⲛⲁ-ⲉⲓ   ⲉⲃⲟⲗ   ⲉⲣⲱ=ⲧⲛ   ⲟⲩⲇⲉ   ⲁⲛⲟⲕ
       DEF.ART.M.SG-REL-FUT-come.INF   ADV   to=2.PL   **neither**   INDP.1.SG

       ⲙⲛ-ⲛⲁ-ⲱⲏⲣⲉ   ⲙⲛⲁ(sic)-ⲕⲗⲏⲣ/
       with-POSS.ART.PL_1.SG-child   with_POSS.ART.PL_1.SG-heir

       ⲛ=ϥ-ⲉⲛⲅⲉ   ⲛⲏⲧⲛ   ϩⲁϩⲧⲛ-ⲗⲁⲁⲩ   ⲛⲉϫⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ
       CNJV=3.M.SG-take.to.court   IND.OBJ=2.PL   before-any   ATTR-ø.authority

       ϣⲟⲣⲡ   ⲙⲉⲛ   ⲉ=ϥ-ⲟ   ⲛ-ϣⲙⲙⲟ
       first   ENCL   FOC_PRS=3.M.SG-act.QUAL   IND.OBJ-ø.stranger

       ⲉ-ⲡ-ⲉⲓ(sic)   ⲙⲛ-ⲡ-ϣⲏⲣⲉ   ⲙⲛ-ⲡⲉ-ⲡⲛⲁ
       to-DEF.ART.M.SG-father   with-DEF.ART.M.SG-son   with.DEF.ART.M.SG-spirit

       ⲉⲧ-ⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ
       REL-PRS.be.pure.QUAL

"The one who will come against you, neither I and my children and my heirs, and who will take you to court before any power, firstly he is a stranger to the father and the son and the holy spirit." (*P.KRU* 43.x+61-64)

It is likely that the absence of any negative to compliment the use of οὔτε in these passages is the result of the omission of the phrase ⲛⲛⲉⲡⲉⲧⲙⲙⲁⲩ/ⲛⲛⲉϥϯϩⲏⲩ ⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩ/ ⲱⲫⲉⲗⲉⲓ ⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩ without any further alteration to the wording of the formulae. In other documents where this phrase is omitted in the curse formula, οὔτε is replaced by εἴτε, as demonstrated in (16).

(16) ⲡ-ⲉⲧ-ⲛⲁ-ⲉⲓ   ⲉⲃⲟⲗ   ⲉⲣⲟ=ⲕ   ⲉⲛⲉϩ   ⲉⲓⲧⲉ
       DEF.ART.M.SG-REL-FUT-come.INF   ADV   to=2.M.SG   ever   **either**

       ⲁⲛⲟⲛ   ⲉⲓⲁⲉ   ⲛⲉ=ⲛ-ϣⲏⲣⲉ   ⲛ=ϥ-ⲉⲛⲁⲅⲉ
       INDP.1.PL   **or**   POSS.ART.PL=1.PL-son   CNJV=3.M.SG-go.to.court

       ⲛⲁ=ⲕ   ϩⲁϩⲧⲛ-ⲗⲁⲁⲩ   ⲛ-ⲉϫⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ   ϥ-ⲟ
       IND.OBJ=2.M.SG   before-any   ATTR-ø.authority   PRS_3.M.SG-act.QUAL

       ⲛ-ϣⲙⲙⲟ   ⲉ-ⲡ-ⲉⲓⲱⲧ   ⲙⲛ-ⲡ-ϣⲏⲣⲉ
       IND.OBJ-ø.stranger   to-DEF.ART.M.S-father   with-DEF.ART.M.SG-son

       ⲙⲛ-ⲡⲉ-ⲡⲛⲁ
       with-DEF.ART.M.SG-spirit

"The one who will go against you ever, either we or our sons and who will take you to court before any authority, he is a stranger to the father and the son and the spirit…" (*P.KRU* 40.27-30)

The choice between οὔτε and εἰτε in the absence of a negative predicate does not appear to be influenced by any specific factors, but rather either pattern may be selected at the discretion of the scribe. Furthermore, a single scribe may use both conjunctions in different documents. For example, both (15) and (16) above were composed by the same scribe - Aristophanes son of Johannes.

5.3   ἀλλά

Within the corpus, 116 tokens of the adversative conjunction ἀλλά were recorded. Of these, 12 appeared in the O.Frangé letters, while the remaining 104 were contained in the legal texts. As with εἰτε, ἤ and οὐδέ/οὔτε, the use of ἀλλά, is more or less straightforward. In the majority of cases it is used to show an adversative relationship between two clauses. However, in one case it is used to introduce a question (see below 5.2.2.b).

As stated previously, the functions of both ἀλλά and δέ overlap. On the surface, it appears that ἀλλά coordinates two adjacent clauses, while δέ, traditionally described as a 'discourse marker', expresses an adversative relationship between two ideas across larger sections of text. However, as demonstrated above (see 3.4.3c), ἀλλά and δέ may both appear in the same position in the "curse" and "penalty" formulae, suggesting that, at least in written Coptic, the two were interchangeable.

5.3.1. – ἀλλά in legal formulae

In legal texts, ἀλλά appears mainly in two formulae – the "free-will" formula, shown in (17), and the "curse" and "penalty" formulae, shown in (18). In the case of the "curse" and "penalty" formula, ἀλλά stands in place of the common Greek construction μέν... δέ (see Chapter 3, 3.4.3.c.), demonstrating how little difference exists between the adversative function of these two conjunctions. Two tokens of ἀλλά also appear in the "distance" formula[17].

The appearance of ἀλλά in these formulae accounts for 75 of the 105 tokens which appear in legal texts. Interestingly, of the remaining 30 tokens, 18 occur in testaments, 12 of which are contained solely in P.KRU 67. It is clear that testaments are less rigid in their form than settlements and sales documents, and thus allow a greater flexibility for the use of language.

a) The "free-will" formula:

(17) ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲟⲩⲱϣ   ⲁⲩⲱ   ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲡⲉⲓⲑⲉ   ⲭⲱⲣⲓⲥ   ⲗⲁⲁⲩ
      CIRC=1.SG-PRS.desire.INF   and   CIRC=1.SG-PRS-agree   without   any

      ⲛ-ⲕⲣⲟϥ   ϩⲓ-ϩⲟⲧⲉ   ϩⲓ-ⲭⲓ-ⲛ-ϭⲟⲛⲥ   ϩⲓ-ⲁⲡⲁⲧⲏ
      ATTR-ø.deceit   or-ø.fear   or-ø.use.INF-DIR.OBJ-ø.violence   or-ø.fraud

      ϩⲓ-ⲥⲩⲛⲁⲣⲡⲁⲅⲏ   ϩⲓ-ⲡⲉⲣⲓⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ   ⲉ-ⲙⲛ-ⲟⲩ-ⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ
      or-ø.robbery   or-ø.requisition   CIRC-NEG.EXT-INDF.ART.SG-force

      ⲛ-ⲟⲩⲱⲧ   ⲕⲏ   ⲛⲁ=ⲓ   ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ   ⲁⲗⲗⲁ[18]
      ATTR-single   PRS.put.QUAL   IND.OBJ=1.SG   ADV   **but**

      ⲉⲛ   ⲡⲁⲥⲏ   ⲁⲅⲁⲑⲏ   ⲕⲁⲓ   ⲕⲁⲗⲏ
      through   every.DAT.SG   good.DAT.SG   and   fair.DAT.SG

---

[17] P.KRU 7.50 and P.KRU 76.x+57

[18] Although here ἀλλά is directly followed by a purely Greek phrase, it has not been considered part of this Greek expression but rather as a standalone element coordinating the Greek clause with the preceding Egyptian clause.

ⲡⲣⲟⲉⲣⲁⲓⲥⲏ
choosing.DAT.SG

"…I desiring and agreeing without any deceit, fear, violence, fraud, robbery or requisition, there being no single force placed upon me, but rather through every good and fair choosing." (*P.KRU* 15.19-23)

b) The "curse" formula:

(18)   ⲛⲛⲉ-ⲡ-ⲉⲧ-ⲙⲙⲱ   ⲧⲓ-ϩⲏⲩ   ⲛ-ⲗⲁⲁⲩ   **ⲁⲗⲗⲁ**
        NEG.ADH-DEF.ART.M.SG-REL-there   receive.INF-ø.profit   DIR.OBJ-any   **but**

        ⲉ=ϥ-ⲛⲁ-ϣⲱⲡⲉ   ⲉ=ϥ-ⲟ   ⲛ-ϣⲙⲙⲟ
        FOC=3.M.SG-FUT-exist.INF   CIRC_PRS=3.M.SG-act.QUAL   DIR.OBJ-ø.stranger

        ⲉ-ⲡ-ⲓⲱⲧ   ⲙⲛ-ⲡ-ϣⲏⲣⲉ   ⲙⲛ-ⲡⲉ-ⲡⲛⲁ
        to-DEF.ART.M.SG-father   with-DEF.ART.M.SG-son   with-DEF.ART.M.SG-spirit

        ⲉⲧ-ⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ
        REL_PRS.be.pure.QUAL

"…that one will not receive any profit, but rather he will be a stranger to the father and son and the Holy Spirit." (*P.KRU* 21.74-76)

5.3.2. – Other patterns using ἀλλά

a) ἀλλά – "nevertheless"

Outside of the legal formulae, the majority of tokens consist of ἀλλά in isolation – that is,

without any other associated function word (although there are some exceptions – see

example (20) below) – with the meaning 'but' or 'but rather'. For example, in (19) ἀλλά is

used in the sense 'do not do A, but rather do B'. More generally, this pattern also conveys the

idea 'A is not the case, but rather B'.

(19) ⲙ̅ⲡ̅ⲣ̅-ⲥⲧⲟ=ï̈   ⲉⲃⲟⲗ   ⳉⲁ-ⲡⲉ-ⲙⲉⲣⲟⲥ
      NEG.IMP-reject.INF=1.SG   ADV   concerning-POSS.ART.M.SG_2.F.SG-share

      ⳉⲙ̅-ⲫⲟⲗⲟⲕ/   ⲉⲧ-ⲁ-ⲯⲁⲩⲁ   ⲃⲁϭ=ϥ̅
      in-DEF.ART.M.SG_holokottinos   REL-PERF-Psaua   place.INF=3.M.SG

      ⲉⲭ̅ⲛ̅-ⲛⲁ-ⲥⲛⲏⲩ   ⲛ̅-ϭⲟⲛⲥ̅   ⲉⲣⲟ=ï̈   ⲁⲛⲟⲕ
      from-POSS.ART.PL_1.SG-brothers   through-ø.violence   to=1.SG   INDP.1.SG

      ϥⲣⲁⲛⲅⲉ   ⲁⲗⲗⲁ   ⲥⳉⲁï̈   -ⲟⲩ-ⲃ̅ⲗ̅ϫⲉ   ⲛⲁ=ï̈   ⲧⲁⲭⲩ
      Frange   **but**   IMP.write.INF-INDF.ART.SG-sherd   IN.OBJ=1.SG   ADV

      "Do not reject me concerning your share in holokottinoi which Psaua has placed
      upon my brothers through violence against me – I, Frange – but rather write a sherd
      to me quickly." (O.Frangé 206.6 rt. – 14 v.)

However, in two letters[19], the use of ἀλλά suggests a contrast between two statements in

which the coordinated statement occurs *in spite of* the previous statement – 'A is the case, *but*

nevertheless B'[20], as demonstrated in (20)

(20) ⲁⲛⲟⲕ   ⲙⲉⲛ   ⲅⲛ-ⲟⲩ-ⲁⲧ-ϣⲁⲩ
      INDP.1.SG   ENCL   INDP.1.SG-INDF.ART.SG-PRIV-worthy

      ⲅⲛ-ⲉⲓ (sic)   <ⲉ>ⲣⲁ=ⲧⲛ   ⲁⲗⲗⲁ   ⲁⲣⲓ-ⲧ-ⲁⲅⲁⲡⲏ
      CNJV_2.M.SG-come.INF   to=1.PL   **but**   IMP.do-DEF.ART-goodness

      ⲅⲛ-ⲉⲓ=ⲥ (sic)   ⳉⲁ-ⲡ-ⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ̣
      CNJV_2.M.SG-do.INF=3.F.SG   according.to-DEF.ART.M.SG-God

      "As for me, I am unworthy that you may come to us. But nevertheless, do a kindness
      and do it according to God." (O.Frangé 259.28-31 v.)

---

[19] O.Frangé 185.7 (vs) and O.Frangé 259.30 (vs)

[20] This is similar to the pattern noted in the database of the DDGLC project: ⲉϣⲭⲉ… ⲁⲗⲗⲁ "even if X…

nonetheless Y". However neither this nor any function besides that of an adversative conjunction 'but/but rather'

appear in the Besa Codices.

b) ἀλλά introducing a (rhetorical) question

In O.Frangé 259, ἀλλά is also used to introduce a rhetorical question, as shown in (21).

(21) ⲡ-ⲛⲟⲩⲧ`ⲉ´   ⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ   ϫⲉ   <ⲙ>ⲡ=ⲓ-ⲁⲙⲉⲓⲗⲉ
      DEF.ART.M.SG-God   PRS-know.INF   that   NEG.PERF=1.SG-neglect

      ⲛ-ⲟⲩ-ⲅⲟ<ⲟ>ⲩ   <ⲛ-ⲟⲩ>ⲱⲧ   ⲛ-ⲡⲓ-ϣⲓⲛⲉ
      DIR.OBJ-INDEF.ART.SG-day   ATTR-single   of-DTC.ART.M.SG-inquiry

      ⲥⲁ-ⲡⲉ=ⲕ-ⲅⲱⲃ   ⲁⲗⲗⲁ   ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲛⲁ-ⲣ-ⲟ<ⲩ>   ϫⲉ
      after-POSS.ART=2.M.SG-affair **but**   FOC=1.SG-FUT-do-what   since

      ⲧⲉ-ⲙⲟⲟϣⲉ   ⲉⲃⲟⲗ   ⲁⲛ
      PRS.1.SG-go.INF   out   NEG

"God knows that I have not neglected a single day of the inquiry after your affairs, but what will I do, since I do not go out?" (*O.Frangé* 259.14-19 r.)

This is the only example in the corpus of the use of ἀλλά to introduce a question. It is unsurprising that this example comes from one of the O.Frangé letters since the more rigid structure of legal texts, as well as their content, does not readily accommodate the direction of questions at the named participants. Rather, this appears to be a rhetorical device more usually associated with literary Coptic, appearing in Biblical translations as shown in (23).

(23) *"Jesus began saying to the multitudes concerning John;*

      ⲁⲗⲗⲁ   ⲛⲧⲁ=ⲧⲉⲧⲛ-ⲉⲓ   ⲉⲃⲟⲗ   ⲉ-ⲛⲁⲩ   ⲉ-ⲟⲩ
      but   FOC.PERF=2.PL-come.INF   ADV   to-see.INF   to-what

      ⲉ_ⲩ-ⲡⲣⲟⲫⲏⲧⲏⲥ   ⲉⲅⲉ   ϯ-ϫⲱ   ⲙⲙⲟ=ⲥ
      to_ART.SG-prophet   yes   PRS_1.SG-say.INF   DIR.OBJ=3.F.SG

      ⲛⲏ=ⲧⲛ   ϫⲉ   ⲟⲩ-ⲅⲟⲩⲉ-ⲡⲣⲟⲫⲏⲧⲏⲥ   ⲡⲉ
      IND.OBJ=2.PL   CNJ   ART.SG-greater-prophet   COP.M.SG

'But what did you come to see? A prophet? Yes, I say to you that he is a greater prophet.'" (Matt. 11:9)

c) ⲅⲁⲣ/ⲭⲉ… ⲁⲗⲗⲁ (ⲙⲁⲗⲗⲟⲛ) - "for/since… but rather"

In this pattern, statement A is introduced either by the Greek enclitic conjunction γάρ (see

Chapter 3, 3.3.2.), as demonstrated in (23), or by the Coptic conjunction ⲭⲉ, shown in (24) -

"since A is not the case… but rather B".

(23) ⲡ-ⲣⲱⲙⲉ   ⲅⲁⲣ   ⲛⲁ-ϭⲛ̄   -ⲡ-ⲉⲧ=ϥ̄-ⲙⲉ
      DEF.ART.M.SG-man   **for**   FUT-meet.INF-DEF.ART.M.SG-REL=3.M.SG-PRS.love.INF

      ⲙ̄ⲙⲟ=ϥ   ⲁⲛ   ⲛ̄-ⲛⲁⲩ   ⲛⲓⲙ·   ⲁⲗⲗⲁ
      IND.OBJ=3.M.SG   NEG   at-time   any   **but**

      ϣⲁⲣⲉ-ⲡⲉ-ⲥϩⲁï   †-ⲉⲓⲛⲉ   ⲛⲁ=ⲩ
      HAB-DEF.ART.M.SG-letter   give.INF-ø.likeness   IND.OBJ=3.PL

      ⲛ̄-ⲛⲉ=ⲩ-ⲉⲣⲏⲩ
      of-POSS.ART.PL=3.PL-companion

      "For the man will not always find the one he loves, but the letter gives them the
      likeness of each other." (O.Frangé 773.21-23 v.)

(24) ⲭⲉ   ⲛⲛⲉ-ⲗⲁⲁⲩ   ⲙ-ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲃⲁⲥⲓⲁ   ϣ[ⲱ]ⲡⲉ   ⲛϩⲏⲧ=ⲥ
      since   NEG.ADH-any   ATTR-ø.transgression   ex[i]st.INF   in=3.F.SG

      ⲁⲗⲗⲁ   ⲙⲁⲗⲗⲟⲛ   ⲛ=ⲥ-ϣⲱⲡⲉ   ⲛ-ⲁⲧ-ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲃⲁ
      but   rather   CNJV=3.F.SG-exist.INF   DIR.OBJ-ø.PRIV-trangress

      ⲙⲙⲟ=ⲥ   ⲁⲩⲱ   ⲛ-ⲁⲧ-ⲡⲉⲣⲓⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ   ⲙⲙⲟ=ⲥ
      DIR.OBJ=3.F.SG   and   DIR.OBJ-ø.PRIV-circumscribe   DIR.OBJ=3.F.SG

      ϩⲛ-ⲛ-ⲛⲟⲙⲟⲥ
      through-DEF.ART.PL-law

      "...since no transgression will h[a]ppen in it, but rather it will be untransgressible
      and uncircumscribable through the laws." (P.KRU 74.34-36)

d) ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲙⲁⲗⲗⲟⲛ - "but rather"

As evident in (24) above, ἀλλά sometimes appears with the Greek μάλλον. This also occurs as

a standalone unit in the pattern 'A… ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲙⲁⲗⲗⲟⲛ B', as seen in (25) below.

(25) ⲁⲩⲱ   ⲉⲭⲛ-ⲛⲁⲓ   ⲧⲏⲣ=ⲟⲩ   ⲉ=ⲛ-ⲱⲣⲕ
      and   over-DEM.PRN.PL   all=3.PL   PFRM=1.PL-swear.INF

      ⲛ-ⲧⲉ-ⲧⲣⲓⲁ   ⲉⲧ-ⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ   ⲉⲛⲧⲁ=ⲛ-ⲱⲣⲡ-ⲧⲁⲥⲥⲉ
      IND.OBJ-DEF.ART.F.SG-trinity   REL-PRS.be.pure.QUAL   REL.PERF=1.PL-first-place

      ⲙⲙⲟ=ⲥ   ⲭⲉ   ⲉⲛⲉ-ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲃⲁⲥⲓⲁ
      DIR.OBJ=3.F.SG   CNJ   NEG.ADH-ø.trangression

      ⲉ-ⲡ-ⲧⲏⲣ=ϥ   ϣⲱⲡⲉ   ⲙⲙⲟ=ⲥ   ⲁⲗⲗⲁ
      to-DEF.ART.M.SG-entire=3.M.SG   exist.INF   DIR.OBJ=3.F.SG   **but**

      ⲙⲁⲗⲗⲟⲛ   ⲛ=ⲥ-ϣⲱⲡⲉ   ⲛ-ⲁⲧ-ⲕⲓⲙ   ϣⲁ-ⲉⲛⲉϩ
      rather   CNJV=3.F.SG-exist.INF   DIR.OBJ-PRIV-moveable   to-ever

"And above all this, I swear to the holy trinity which we first placed that no
transgression in its entirety will exist, but rather it will be immovable forever…"
(*P.KRU* 75.x+122-124)

The use of μάλλον appears to intensify the contrastive function of ἀλλά; highlighting that B is

the case or will happen *instead of* A.

5.3.3. –Literary vs. non-literary uses of ἀλλά

Since ἀλλά is mostly restricted to legal formulae, its usage is narrower than that of its literary

counterparts. In all but one pattern recorded within the corpus[21], ἀλλά was used to show an

adversative relationship between two clauses. However, a further usage can be identified in

in the biblical material within the Bauer archive: ἀλλά introducing a change in topic, seen in

example (26).

---

[21] See example (21), introducing a (rhetorical) question.

(26) ογοει   νΗ=τΝ̄   ερ_ϣαν-Ν̄-ρωμε   τΗρ=ογ   ταειε=τΗγτΝ̄ ·
     woe   IND.OBJ=2.PL   COND-DEF.ART.PL-man   all=3.PL   honour.INF=2.PL

     νε=γ-ειρε   Γαρ   Ν̄-τει-ϩε   πε
     PRT=3.PL-act.INF   for   in-DEM.ART.F.SG-way   COP.M.SG

     Ν̄-νε-προφΗτΗс   Ν̄-ΝΟγx ·   αλλα   †-xω
     IND.OBJ-DEF.ART.PL-prophet   ATTR-ø.false   but   PRS_1.SG-say.INF

     Μ̄ΜΟ=с   νΗ=τΝ̄   Ν-ετ-сωτΜ̄   ερΟ=ι ·   xε
     DIR.OBJ=3.F.SG   IN.OBJ=2.PL   DEF.ART.PL-REL-hear.INF   to=1.SG   CNJ

     μερε   -νε=τΝ̄-xιxεγε
     IMP.love.INF-POSS.ART.PL=2.PL-enemies

*"Woe to you, if all men honour you; for they used to act in this way to the false
prophets. But I say to you who hear me: "Love your enemies…"* (Lk 6:26-27)

This, as with the use of to introduce a question, appears to be a particular rhetorical device
employed mainly in literary texts. However, it is possible that an examination of a wider
corpus of non-literary evidence would reveal more attestations of this pattern[22].

5.4   εἰ μή τι

In the corpus, 15 tokens of the compound conjunction εἰ μή τι occur. Only one token appears
in the O.Frangé letters, while the remaining 14 occur in the P.KRU legal papyri.

5.4.1. – ειΜΗτι + Conjunctive – "if… not" (1 token)

This pattern is only attested once in the corpus, and is the only occurrence of εἰ μή τι in the
collection of letters:

---

[22] As a result of the rigid structure of legal texts, however, it is likely that the use of ἀλλά in this way would be
limited to letters.

(27)   ⲉⲓⲙⲏⲧⲓ   ⲛ̄=ⲅ̄-ⲣ̄-ϩⲱⲃ   ϩⲓ̈ⲱ=ϥ   ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲕ

if.not   CNJV=2.M.SG-do.INF-ø.work   on=3.M.SG   INDP.2.M.SG

ⲙ̄ⲡⲣ̄-ⲧⲁⲁ=ϥ   ⲛ̄-ⲣⲱⲙⲉ

NEG.IMP-give.INF=3.M.SG   IND.OBJ-ø.man

"If you are not to work on it yourself, do not give it to anyone." (*O.Frangé* 198.7-8)

5.4.2. – ⲉⲓⲙⲏⲧⲓ ⲉ + noun – "except for" (14 tokens)

The remaining 14 tokens all occur in the pattern ⲉⲓⲙⲏⲧⲓ ⲉ + noun – "except for", as evident in

example (28).

(28)   ⲉⲣⲉ-ϣⲉⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ   ⲛⲁ-ϥⲓ-ⲡ-ⲏⲓ   ⲉⲧⲉ=ⲓ-ⲛϩⲏⲧ=ϥ

         FOC-Shenoute   FUT-take.INF-DEF.ART.M.SG-house   REL=1.SG-in=3.M.SG

ⲉⲓⲙⲏⲧⲉⲓ   ⲉ-ⲧ-ⲣⲓ   ⲛⲧⲁ-ⲧⲥⲱⲛⲉ   ⲛ-ⲗⲉⲱⲛⲧⲓⲟⲥ

except   for-DEF.ART.F.SG-room   REL.PERF-Tsone   of-Leontios

ϣⲟⲡ=ⲥ

receive.INF=3.F.SG

*"…Shenoute will take the house which I am in, except for the room which Tsone,
(daughter) of Leontios has received."* (*P.KRU* 70.35-36)

5.4.3. – εἰ μή τι in literary Coptic

The use of εἰ μή τι in all registers of Coptic is rare. Müller notes that, in literary Sahidic, it is

used mainly in translations of Greek texts[23]. As with ἀλλά, the use of εἰ μή τι appears to be

restricted in the corpus of documentary evidence. In particular, εἰ μή τι appears with a wider

range of verb forms in literary texts, as shown in (29), (30), and (31) below.[24]

---

[23] Müller, (2012), pg. 127. He also notes that εἰ μή τί is rare in Bohairic.

[24] See Layton, (2011), pg. 401; Gregorios, (1991), pp. 78 – 79

a) ⲉⲓⲙⲏⲧⲓ ϫⲉⲕⲁⲥ + Adhortative

(29) ⲡ-ⲣⲉϥ-ϫⲓⲟⲩⲉ   ⲙⲉ=ϥ-ⲉⲓ   ⲉⲧⲃⲉ-ⲗⲁⲁⲩ
      ART.M.SG-AGNT-steal.INF   NEG.HAB=3.M.SG-come.INF   concerning-anything

      ⲉⲓⲙⲏⲧⲓ   ϫⲉⲕⲁⲥ   ⲉ_ϥ_ⲉ-ϩⲱϥⲧ̄
      except   CNJ   ADH_3.M.SG-steal.INF

      "The thief does not come concerning anything, except that he may steal…" (John 10:10)

b) ⲉⲓⲙⲏⲧⲓ + Conditional

(30) ⲉ=ⲩ-ⲛⲏⲩ   ⲇⲉ   ⲉⲡⲉⲥⲏⲧ   ϩⲓϫⲛ-ⲡ-ⲧⲟⲟⲩ
      CIRC_PRS=3.PL-come.QUAL   ENCL   ADV   from-DEF.ART.M.SG-mountain

      ⲁ=ϥ-ϩⲱⲛ   ⲉⲧⲟⲟⲧ=ⲟⲩ   ϫⲉⲕⲁⲁⲥ   ⲉⲛⲛⲉ=ⲩ-ⲧⲁⲩⲉ
      PERF=3.M.SG-order.INF   to=3.PL   CNJ   NEG.ADH=3.PL-repeat.INF

      -ⲛ-ⲉⲛⲧⲁ=ⲩ-ⲛⲁⲩ   ⲉⲣⲟ=ⲟⲩ   ⲉ-ⲗⲁⲁⲩ   **ⲉⲓⲙⲏⲧⲓ**
      -DEF.ART.PL-REL.PERF=3.PL-see.INF   to=3.PL   to-anyone   **unless**

      ⲉⲣϣⲁⲛ-ⲡ-ϣⲏⲣⲉ   ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲣⲱⲙⲉ   ⲧⲱⲟⲩⲛ
      COND-DEF.ART.M.SG-son   of-DEF.ART.M.SG-man   rise.INF

      ⲉⲃⲟⲗ_ϩⲛ-ⲛ-ⲉⲧ-ⲙⲟⲟⲩⲧ
      from-DEF.ART.PL-REL-die.QUAL

      "When they came down from the mountain, he ordered them that they would not repeat those things which they had seen to anyone, unless the son of man should rise from among those who are dead." (Mk. 9:9)

c) ⲉⲓⲙⲏⲧⲓ + Circumstantial

(31) ⲙ̄ⲙⲛ̄-ϣϭⲟⲙ   ⲅⲁⲣ   ⲛ̄-ⲗⲁⲁⲩ   ⲉ-ⲣ̄-ⲛⲉⲓ-ⲙⲁⲉⲓⲛ
      NEG.EXT-possibility   for   DIR.OBJ-anyone   to-do.INF-DEM.ART.PL-sign

      ⲉⲧ=ⲕ̄-ⲉⲓⲣⲉ   ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲕ   ⲙ̄ⲙⲟ=ⲟⲩ ·   **ⲉⲓⲙⲏⲧⲓ**
      REL_PRS=2.M.SG-do.INF   INDP.2.M.SG   DIR.OBJ=3.PL   **unless**

      ⲉⲣⲉ-ⲡ-ⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ   ϣⲟⲟⲡ   ⲛⲙ̄ⲙⲁ=ϥ
      CIRC-DEF.ART.M.SG-God   PRS.exist.QUAL   with=3.M.SG

"For it is not possible for anyone to do these signs which you do, unless God is with him." (John 3:2)

However, it is likely that the limited appearance of in εἰ μή τι in the corpus accounts for the lack of variation in the following verb form. A larger study of documentary material may reveal patterns other than ⲉⲓⲙⲏⲧⲓ + Conjunctive in non-literary Coptic.

5.5   κἄν

The conjunction κἄν is recorded 40 times in the data. 3 tokens appear in the O.Frangé letters, while the remaining 37 are contained within the P.KRU legal texts. As a conjunction, κἄν has two functions: firstly as a coordinator – "whether…or" – and secondly as a subordinator – "even if"[25]. A third usage, κἄν used in the sense of 'at least', is attested in one passage[26]. However in this usage, which Gregorios notes is rare, κἄν functions as an adverb[27].

5.5.1. – Coordinator – ⲕⲁⲛ… ⲕⲁⲛ - "whether… or"

As a coordinating conjunction, κἄν is used to coordinate words and phrases in the same patterns as εἴτε, ἤ and οὐδέ/οὔτε;

    a) Coordinating clauses

    b) Coordinating adverbial phrases

    c) Coordinating subjects

---

[25] Since the main use of κἄν in the corpus is as a coordinating conjunction, it has been included in this chapter rather than in Chapter 4 on subordinating conjunctions.

[26] O. Frangé 793.16 (Vs) - ⲕⲁⲛ ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣ̄ϭⲱ ⲛ̄ϣⲟⲩ [ⲧⲛⲛⲟ]ⲟⲩ ϩⲟⲓ̈ⲛⲉ ⲛⲁⲓ̈ - "Now, *at least*, do not tarry without sending some to me."

[27] Gregorios, (1991), pg. 84

However, as (33) demonstrates, the use of κᾰ́ν as a coordinator introduces a sense of doubt to clause which is not expressed through εἴτε or ἤ. Whereas εἴτε and ἤ only occur in a clauses in which there is already an inherent sense of unreality such as conditional clause, future clauses, or negative clauses in any tense, κᾰ́ν can be used in clauses that would be realis if coordination were conjunctive (and) rather than disjunctive (or).

(33) ⲁ-ⲛⲁ-ⲥⲛⲏⲩ   ϥⲓⲧ=ϥ   ⲉ-ϫⲓⲟⲩⲉ   ⲉⲣⲟ=ⲓ
    PERF-POSS.ART.PL_1.SG-siblings   take.INF=3.M.SG   to-rob.INF   to=1.SG

    ⲕⲁⲛ   ⲛ=ⲟⲩ-ϣⲏⲣⲉ
    or.perhaps   POSS.ART.PL=3.PL-child

"My siblings have taken it in order to rob me, or perhaps their children…" (*P.KRU* 76.76)

5.5.2. – κᾰ́ν + subordinate clause - "even if" (= 1 token)

κᾰ́ν appears only once in the corpus as a subordinating conjunction.

(34) ⲙⲛ-ⲣⲱⲙⲉ   ⲅⲁⲣ   ϣⲟⲟⲡ   ⲡⲁⲓ
    NEG.EXT-ⲫ.man   for   PRS.exist.QUAL   DEM.PRN.M.SG

    ⲉⲧ-ⲛⲁ-ⲱⲛϩ   ⲛ=ϥ-ⲧⲙ-ⲣ-ⲛⲟⲃⲉ   ⲉⲣⲟ=ⲕ   **ⲅⲁⲛ**
    REL-FUT-live.INF   CNJV=3.M.SG-NEG-do.INF-ⲫ.sin   to=2.M.SG   **even.if**

    ⲟⲩ-ϩⲟⲟⲩ   ⲛ-ⲟⲩⲱⲧ   ⲡⲉ   ⲡⲉ=ϥ-ⲁϩⲉ
    INDF.ART.SG-day   ATTR-single   COP.M.SG   POSS.ART.M.SG=3.M.SG-life

    ϩⲓϫⲙ-ⲡ-ⲕⲁϩ
    upon-DEF.ART.M.SG-earth

"… For no man exists, this one who will live and not sin against you, even if his life is a single day upon the earth…" (*P.KRU* 106.85-86)

5.6 μέντοι γε

The compound conjunction μέντοι γε is recorded 7 times in the data, all within the P.KRU legal texts. In all 7 cases, it is accompanied by the Greek enclitic conjunction δέ (see Chapter 3, 3.4.3.c). The meaning of μέντοι γε is consistent throughout the corpus; functioning as an adversative conjunction, as demonstrated in (35). Two tokens occur in the pattern ⲙⲉⲛⲧⲟⲓⲅⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲭⲉ, as shown in (36). In these cases, translators such as MacCoull[28] render this unit with the English phrase 'at any rate'. However, the inherent meaning of μέντοι γε in these two passages is still adversative

(35)   ⲉⲧⲃⲉ   ⲡ-ⲏⲓ   ⲇⲉ
       concerning   DEF.ART.M.SG-house   ENCL

       ⲛⲧⲁ-ⲡⲁ-ⲉⲓⲱⲧ   ϩⲟⲣⲓⲍⲉ   ⲙⲙⲟ=ϥ
       REL.PERF-POSS.ART.M.SG_1.SG-father   lay.down   DIR.OBJ=3.M.SG

       ⲛⲁⲓ   ⲉⲧⲉ-ⲡ-ⲏⲓ   ⲛ-ⲕⲛⲏⲛⲏⲛ
       DEM.PRN.PL   REL-DEF.ART.M.SG-house   of-Knenene

       ⲛⲁ-ⲛⲁ-ϣⲏⲣⲉ   ⲛ-ⲥϩⲓⲙⲉ   ⲛⲉ   **ⲙⲛⲧⲉϭⲉ**
       REL.ABS.PRN.PL-POSS.ART.PL_1.SG-child   ATTR-ø.wife   COP.PL   **but**

       ⲇⲉ   ⲉⲣ_ϣⲁⲛ-ⲛ-ϣⲏⲣⲉ   ⲙ-ⲡⲁ-ⲥⲟⲛ   ϭⲛ
       ENCL   COND-DEF.ART.PL-son   of-POSS.ART.M.SG_1.SG-brother   find.INF

       ⲭⲁⲣⲧⲏⲥ   ⲉ-ⲁ=ⲩ-ⲥⲙⲛⲧ=ϥ   ⲛⲁ=ⲩ
       ø.document   CIRC-PERF=3.PL-draw.up.INF=3.M.SG   IND.OBJ=3.PL

       ⲙⲛⲧⲉ-`ⲛⲁ´-ϣⲉⲉⲣⲉ   ϩⲱⲃ   ⲛⲙⲙⲁ=ⲩ   ϣⲁ-ⲉⲛⲉϩ
       NEG.POSS-POSS.ART.PL_1.SG-daughter   business   with=3.PL   to-ever

       "Concerning the house which my father laid down for me, which (is) the house of Knenene, they are of my female children. But if the children of my brother produce a document, it having been drawn up for them, my daughters (will) have no business with them." (*P.KRU* 76.x+36-38)

---

[28] MacCoull, (2009)

(36) ⲛⲁⲓ   ⲉⲧ=ⲕ-ⲛⲁ-ⲥⲟⲧⲡ=ⲟⲩ   ⲅⲱⲱ=ⲕ
      DEM.PRN.PL   REL=2.M.SG-FUT-choose.INF=3.PL   INTS.PRN=2.M.SG

      ⲛ=ⲅ   -ϯ-ⲡ-ⲙⲁ   ⲉ-ⲧⲟⲟⲧ=ⲟⲩ   **ⲙⲉⲛⲧⲟⲓⲅⲉ**
      CNJV=2.M.SG-give.INF-DEF.ART.M.SG-place   to-ø.hand=3.PL   **but**

      ⲇⲉ   ⲭⲉ   ⲉⲛⲉ=ⲕ-ⲉϣ-ⲧⲁⲁ=ϥ
      ENCL   CNJ   NEG.ADH=2.M.SG-be.able-give.INF=3.M.SG

      ⲛ-ⲥⲩⲅⲅⲉⲛⲏⲥ   ⲛⲧⲁ=ⲕ   ⲕⲁⲧⲁ   ⲥⲁⲣⲝ
      IND.OBJ-blood.relative   of=2.M.SG   according.to   ø.flesh

"…, these ones who you will choose yourself, and to whom you will give this place, but/at any rate, you will not be able to give it to a blood relative of yours according to the flesh." (P.KRU 75.x+104-105)

5.7   Conclusion

From the data outlined above it is clear that, as with other types of Greek conjunctions, coordinators are mostly restricted to legal formulae. This is particularly clear in the case of εἴτε, ἤ, κἄν and οὔτε, which appear in long chains within a single formula containing up 20 or more tokens. Furthermore, those coordinating conjunctions which do not appear in formulae have the least number of attestations in the corpus – εἰ μή τι (15 tokens) and μέντοι γε (7 tokens). This would suggest that there is a preference for native Egyptian coordinators in "free" position in the texts.

However, as discussed in 5.1., the use of Greek conjunction both broadens the range of coordinating relationships the language may express, as well as being more specific in their meaning than native Egyptian coordinating patterns. Furthermore, one of the main uses of the Egyptian preposition ⲅⲓ "and/or" in the corpus is in the "free-will" formula in legal texts. This suggests that both Greek and Egyptian coordinators are rare outside of formulae, and that coordination occurs through asyndeton. These hypotheses could be tested through a more detailed study of general coordinating patterns in non-literary texts.

Furthermore, a brief comparison to literary uses of coordinating conjunctions shows that certain words are more restricted in their use and meaning. For example, both ἀλλά and εἰ μή τι do not display the same variety of uses in the corpus as they do in Coptic literary texts. This is most likely due to the rigid structure of legal texts which restricts the use of more 'rhetorical' devices associated with literary texts. It is unsurprising therefore that the only more literary use of ἀλλά occurs in the O.Frangé letters, which are less formulaic in structure. As such, it appears that the use of coordinating conjunction in non-literary Coptic is closely tied to content, purpose and structure of the texts, as is also the case with both enclitic and subordinating conjunctions.

6. Conclusion

On the basis of this study, several observations may be made regarding both the use of Greek function words in non-literary Coptic, and also language choice and scribal practice in the Theban documents. It must be recognised that these results represent only a small sample of non-literary texts, limited to one particular area and dialect, and that further research is required both to better contextualise these findings, and also to establish a deeper understanding of Greek loanword use and non-literary Coptic as a whole. Nevertheless, some conclusions may be drawn.

6.1 – General trends and observations

Following this study, it is apparent that Greek function words appear most frequently in the formulaic sections of Coptic documentary texts. However, the distribution of tokens across formulae and 'free' positions is not consistent across different words and word classes. This suggests that certain words (such as δέ and οὖν) had become an integrated part of the formal written language employed by scribes, while others (such as μέν and εἰ) were not – being limited only to the rigidly structured elements of documentary texts.

Furthermore, the data shows that Greek coordinating conjunctions are more numerous in the legal texts than in the corpus of letters. This is most likely due to the high number and frequency of legal formulae compared to epistolary formulae. Nevertheless, the same Greek function words occurred across both letters and legal texts. Only the conditional conjunction εἰ appeared exclusively in the legal texts, with no tokens recorded in the O.Frangé letters. However, since only 5 tokens were recorded overall, it is more likely that the absence of εἰ in the letters is a reflection of the scarcity of the Greek conjunction in Coptic in general, rather than an indication that it was more common for use in legal texts.

117

Throughout the corpus, the meaning and syntactic use of Greek function words appeared largely consistent with their literary counterparts. However, certain features of Greek function words in the corpus differentiate them from their use in literary Coptic. In particular, certain words appear to have a more restricted range of meanings, such as ἀλλά and εἰ μή τι. This can most likely be attributed to the differences in content and purpose between the two textual registers; the rigid structure of documentary texts does not allow for the same sort of rhetorical devices which appear in literature. Only letters, which are more flexible in form and which are more personal in nature, use conjunctions in constructions more commonly associated with literary Coptic.

Furthermore, several patterns appear in the corpus which are not attested in literary texts, such as the use of καίπερ to introduce causal clauses, or which are uncommon in literary texts, such as ϩⲱⲥⲧⲉ + Future II. However, further comparative studies of literary and non-literary Coptic would be required to see if such features mark a difference in language use between the two textual registers, or if they represent isolated constructions which are rare in the language in general. This is particularly true in the case of ϩⲱⲥⲧⲉ + Future II, which may be more common in non-translational literature as opposed to Biblical texts influenced by underlying Greek result clause constructions.

6.2 – Language choice and scribal practices

The results discussed above show a clear relationship between the use of Greek function words in non-literary texts, and the structure and content of the documents themselves. However, these texts do not exist in isolation, but rather are deliberate acts of writing by trained scribes which reflect a long tradition of scribal practice and education. As such, several inferences can be made regarding language choice and language use amongst scribes in Late Antique Egypt.

Firstly, the high frequency of Greek function words in formulae suggests an influence of earlier Greek documents on the language and structure of Coptic non-literary texts. It is possible that the presence of Greek conjunctions in these formulae is indicative of an attempt to mirror the language and register of earlier Greek documents, in the same way Biblical translations may reflect an attempt to emulate the original underlying Biblical Greek text. However, a comparative study of Greek and Coptic documentary material would be required to validate this assumption.

Nevertheless, the patterns of distribution for Greek conjunctions across formulae and 'free' positions suggests that, despite the possibility of expressing certain constructions through the use of Greek function words, there was a tendency amongst scribes to use native Egyptian constructions. Comparisons to secondary literature show that this is also the case in literary Coptic, such as a preference for the use of the Circumstantial over the Greek καίπερ to express concessive clauses. This suggests that the written language overall was quite conservative; adopting Greek function words to express new ideas and relationships, but adhering to Egyptian modes of expression where possible.

It therefore appears that, outside of formulae, Greek conjunctions were mainly employed in non-literary Coptic in order to express relationships between words, clauses and ideas which could not be expressed by the native Egyptian lexicon. This is particularly true of Greek coordinating conjunctions, whose native Egyptian counterparts are limited in number and meaning, as well as the use of μήπως and μήποτε to introduce avertive clauses for which native constructions were uncommon. This phenomenon is comparable to the borrowing of Greek content words. As stated in the introduction, a large number of Greek verbs and nouns borrowed into the Egyptian language consisted of Christian terminology, Greek military and administrative titles, and legal terminology. These represent ideas and concepts which were

119

either new to the Egyptian culture, or which had a slightly different meaning to existing Egyptian terms, thus necessitating the adoption of the Greek terminology. As such, the use of Greek function words appears to reflect a general trend to adopt words which either express new ideas or relationships, or which broaden the range of meanings expressible by the language.

The case of μέν, however, is more complex. While it is structurally similar to other Greek and Egyptian conjunctions, its function differs in that it projects forward to particular ideas while other enclitic conjunctions link backwards. This suggests that while Greek conjunctions may be adopted to show semantic relationships which are inexpressible through the native lexicon – such as expressing disjunction or negative conjunction – they are less open to borrowing if they convey structural relationships which are not expressed through the native lexicon, such as projecting forward to a proposition later in the discourse as opposed to linking back to a previous clause. This reflects the claims of Richter and others, outlined in Chapter 2, that elements are more likely to be borrowed if they work within the structure already contained in the substrate language.

 The discussions and hypotheses facilitated by this study highlight the importance of developing a deeper understanding of non-literary Coptic. An examination of Coptic documents uncovers information not only about the language itself, but also about the scribes who composed them. Furthermore, these discussions show that understanding the use of loanwords, and particularly the borrowing of function words, helps to show the influence of Greek on the native Egyptian language. Consequently, further research into Greek loanwords, and non-literary texts, will continue to contribute to the growing picture of language contact and language use in Late Antique Egypt.

Bibliography

Abbreviations

Acta Ant. Hung. = Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae

AS/EA = Asiatische Studien/Études Asiatiques

BACE = Bulletin of the Australian Centre for Egyptology

BASP = Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists

CdÉ = Chronique d'Égypt

CSCO = Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium

JCoptS = Journal of Coptic Studies

JEA = Journal of Egyptian Archaeology

LingAeg = Lingua Aegyptia

OCP = Orientalia Christiana Periodica

OLP = Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica Leuven

ZÄS = Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde

Allberry, C. R. C., (1937), "Greek and Latin Words in the Coptic Manichaean Papyri" *Proc.5thInt.Congr.Pap.* Oxford

Allen, J. P., (2010), *Middle Egyptian: An Introduction to the Language and Culture of Hieroglyphs*, Cambridge

Almond, M., (2010), "Language Change in Greek Loaned Verbs," *LingAeg* 18, 19-31

_____., *A comparative study of loanword integration in fourth-century Coptic literature* (diss. Macquarie, 2011)

Bagnall, R. S., (1993), Egypt in Late Antiquity, New Jersey

_____., (1988), "Combat ou vide: christianisme et paganisme dans l'Égypte romaine tardive." *Ktèma* 13: 285-296

_____., (2009), "Introduction" in R. S. Bagnall (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology*, New York, xvii - xxi

Bauer, G., (1975), *Konkordanz der nichtflektierten griechischen Wörter im bohairischen Neuen Testament*, Wiesbaden

Behlmer, H., (1999), *Die häufigsten griechischen Lehnwörter im sahidischen Neuen Testament*. Reader, Göttingen

Biedenkopf-Ziehner, A., (1983), *Untersuchungen zum koptischen Briefformular unter Berücksichtigung ägyptischer und griechischer Parallelen*, Würzburg

_____., (1996), "Motive einiger Formeln und Topoi aus ägyptischen Briefen in paganer und christlicher Zeit," *Enchoria* 23, 8 – 31

_____., (2001), *Koptische Schenkungsurkunden aus der Thebais: Formeln and Topoi der Urkunden, Aussagen der Urkunden, Indices* Göttinger Orientorschungen IV. Reihe Ägypten 41, Göttingen

Blakemore, D., (1987), *Semantic Constraints on Relevance*, Oxford

_____., (2002), *Relevance and Linguistic Meaning: The Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse Markers*, Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 99, Cambridge

Böhlig, A., (1953), *Ein Lexikon der griechischen Wörter im Koptischen. Die griechisch-lateinischen Lehnwörter in den koptischen manichäischen Texten. Studien zur Erforschung des christlichen Ägyptens, Heft 1.1. Aufl.*, München.

_____., (1954a), *Die griechischen Lehnwörter im sahidischen und bohairischen Neuen Testament,* München

_____., (1954b), *Ein Lexikon der griechischen Wörter im Koptischen. Die griechisch-lateinischen Lehnwörter in den koptischen manichäischen Texten. Studien zur Erforschung des christlichen Ägyptens, Heft 1. 2. Aufl.*, München

_____., (1958), *Die griechischen Lehnwörter im sahidischen und bohairischen Neuen Testament. Register und Vergleichstabellen zu Heft 2*, München

Boud'hors, A., (2010), "La forme ⲙⲛⲧⲉ- en emploi non autonome dans les textes documentaires thébains", *JCoptS* 12, 67-80

Boud'hors, A. and Heurtel, C., (2010), *Les ostraca coptes de la TT 29; Autour du moine Frangé, vol 1. Textes*, Bruxelles

Bucking, S., (2007a), "On the Training of Documentary Scribes in Roman, Byzantine, and Early Islamic Egypt: A Contextualized Assessment of the Greek Evidence", *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 159, 229 – 247

_____., (2007b), "Scribes and Schoolmasters? On Contextualising Coptic and Greek Ostraca Excavated at the Monastery of Epiphanius" *Journal of Coptic Studies* 9, 21 - 47

Choat, M., (2007), "Epistolary Formulae in Early Coptic Letters" in *Actes du huitième congrès international d'études coptes, Paris, 28 juin – 3 juillet 2004*, (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 163), Leuven/Paris.Dudley, vol 2, 667 – 678

Chung, C. and Pennebaker, J., (2007), "The Psychological Functions of Function Words" in K. Fiedler (ed.) *Social Communication*, New York, 343 – 359

Clackson, S. J., (2004), "Papyrology and the Utilization of Coptic Sources" in P. M. Sikpesteijn and L. Sundelin (eds) *Papyrology and the History of Early Islamic Egypt*, Leiden, 21 – 44

Clarysse, W., (1987), "Greek Loan-Words in Demotic," in S. Vleeming (ed.) *Aspects of Demotic Lexicography: Acts of the Second International Conference for Demotic Studies*, Leiden, 19-21 September 1984 = Studia Demotica 1, Leuven, 9 – 33

_____., (1992), "Some Greeks in Egypt", in J. Johnson (ed*.) Life in a multi-cultural society: Egypt from Cambyses to Constantine and beyond*, Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 51, Chicago, 51 – 56

_____., (1993), "Egyptian Scribes Writing Greek," *Chronique d'Égypte* 68, 186–201

_____., (2013), "Determinatives in Greek Loan-Words and Proper Names," in S. Vleeming and W. Clarysse (eds) *Aspects of Demotic Orthography: Acts of the International Colloquium held in Trier*, 8th November 2010 = Studia Demotica 11, Leuven, 1 - 24

Corver, N. and van Riemsdijk, H., (2001), "Semi-lexical Categories" in N. Corver and H. van Riemsdijk (eds) *Semi-lexical Categories: the Function of Content words and the Content of Function Words,* Berlin; New York, 1 - 22

Cromwell, J., *Individual Scribal Practice at Jeme: The Papyri Documents of Aristophanes son of Johannes*, (diss. Liverpool 2008)

_____., (2010a), "Aristophanes Son of Johannes: An Eighth-Century Bilingual Scribe? A Study of Graphic Bilingualism" in A. Papaconstantinou (ed.) *The Multilingual Experience in Egypt, from the Ptolemies to the ʿAbbāsids*, Surrey, 221 – 232

_____., (2010b), "Εν ονοματι του θεου του παντοκρατοροσ: Variation and Specificity in Christian Invocation Formulae from Jeme" *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 174, 151 – 155

_____., (2011), "A Case of Sibling Scribes in Coptic Thebes" *BACE* 22, 67 - 82

_____., (2012), "Following in Father's Footsteps : The Question of Father-Son Scribal Training in Eigth Century Thebes," in P. Schubert (ed.) *Actes du 26e Congrès international de papyrologie Genève, 16–21 août 2010*, Genève,

Cromwell, J. and Grossman, E., (2010), "Condition(al)s of Repayment: P CLT. 10 Reconsidered," *JEA* 96, 149 – 160

Demaria, S., (2005) "Die griechischen Entlehnungen in den koptischen manichäischen Texten" in: A. van Tongerloo and L. Cirillo (eds.) *Il Manicheismo. Nuove Prospettive della Richerca (Quinto Congresso Internazionale di Studi sul Manicheismo, Napoli, 2-8 Settembre 2001)*. Manichaean Studies 5, Turnhout, 96 – 114

Denniston, J. D., (1934), *The Greek Particles*, Oxford

Depauw, M., (2003), "Autograph Confirmation in Demotic Private Contracts," *CdÉ* 78: 66–111

_____., (2006), *The Demotic Letter. A Study of Epistolographic Scribal Traditions Against their Intra- and Intercultural Background*, Bamberg

Emmel, S., (2004), *Shenoute's Literary Corpus: Volume 1,* Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 599, subsidia 111, Louvain

Fewster, P., (2002) "Bilingualism in Roman Egypt" J. N. Adams, M. Janse, and S. Swain, (eds) *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Word,* Oxford

Förster, H., (2002), *Wörterbuch der griechischen Wörter in den koptischen dokumentarischen Texten*, Berlin

_____., (2006/2007), "Mos bonus – Zum Vernunftprinzip der "Guten Sitte"" *Enchoria* 30, 1 – 6

Förster, H., Fournet, J., and Richter, T. S., (2012), "Une misthôsis copte d'Aphrodité (P.Lond. inv. 2849): le plus ancien acte notarié en copte?" in *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete* 58:2, 344 – 359

Fournet, J., (2009), "The Multilingual Environment of Late Antique Egypt: Greek, Latin, Coptic, and Persian Documentation" in R. S. Bagnall (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology*, New York, 418-451

Fränkel, E., (1933), "Kolon und Satz II. Beobachtungen zur Gliederung des antiken Satzes" *Nachrichten der Göttinger Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse*, 319-354

Ginzburg, C., (1989), *Clues, Myths and Historical Method* (J. Tedeschi and A. Tedeschi Trans.), Baltimore

_____., (1992), *The Cheese and the Worm* (J. Tedeschi and A. Tedeschi Trans.), Baltimore

Green, M., (1987), *The Coptic Share Pattern and Its Ancient Egyptian Ancestors: A Reassessment of the Aorist Pattern in the Egyptian Language*, Warminster

Gregorios, A., (1991), "Greek Loan Words in Coptic: Greek conjunctions in Coptic," *Bulletin de la Société d'Archéologie Copte* 30, 77 – 92

Grossman, E., (fc.), "Grammatical variation and language change: the case of Greek verb lexemes in Coptic" in J. Cromwell and E. Grossman (eds) *Beyond Free Variation. Scribal Repertoires in Egypt from the Old Kingdom to the Early Islamic Period. Conference University College, Oxford September 14th – 16th 2009*

Hartmann, D., (1993), "Particles", *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics,* Vol. 1, Oxford, 2953 – 2958

Hasitzka, M. R. M. and Satzinger, H., (2004/2005), "Ein Index der gräkokoptischen Wörter in nichtliterarischen Texten oder: Was ist ein Wörterbuch?" *Enchoria* 29, 19 – 31

Haspelmath, M., (2008), "Loanword typology: Steps toward a systematic cross-linguistic study of lexical borrowability" in T. Stolz, D. Bakker and R. Palomo (eds) *Aspects of Language Contact: New Theoretical, Methodological and Empirical findings with special focus on Romanisation Processes. Empirical Approaches to Language Typology* 35, Berlin, 43 – 62

_____., (2009), "Lexical Borrowing: Concepts and Issues" in M. Haspelmath and U. Tadmo (eds) *Loanwords in the World's Languages: A Comparative Handbook*, Berlin, 35 – 54.

Hasznos, A., (2004/05), "Die Struktur der Konsekutivsatze im Neuen Testament", *Enchoria* 29, 32 - 43

_____., (2005), "A Greek Accusativus cum Infinitivo Construction and its Equivalents in Coptic" *ZÄS* 132, 92 – 93

_____., (2006), "A Case Where Coptic is More Syndetic than Greek" *Acta Ant. Hung.* 46, 91 – 97

_____., (2012), *Graeco-Coptica: Greek and Coptic clause pattern*, Wiesbaden

van Hout, R. and Muysken, P., (1994), "Modelling lexical borrowability," *Language Variation and Change* 6, 39 – 62

Jakobson, R., (1930), *K charakteristike evrazijskogo jazykovogo sojuza*, Prague

Junge, F., (2005), *Late Egyptian Grammar: An Introduction*, Oxford

Keenan, J. G., et. al., (2014), "The language of law" in J. G. Keenan, J. G. Manning and U. Yiftach-Firanko (eds) *Law and Legal Practice in Egypt from Alexander to the Arab Conquest*, Cambridge, 96 – 144

Kendall, M. B., (1980), "The unethical dative" in K. Klar et. al. (eds) *American Indian and Indoeuropean Studies: Papers in Honor of Madison S. Beeler*, the Hague, 383-394

Krall, J., (1889) "Koptische Briefe", *Mitteilungen aus der Sammlung der Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer* 5, 21 – 59

de Kreij, M., *The Metalanguage of Performance: A discourse perspective on particle use in Homer and Pindar*, (diss. Hiedelberg, 2014)

Kuhn, K. H., (1956), *Letters and Sermons of Besa,* Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 157, Scriptores Coptici 21, Louvain

Lambdin, T. O., (1983), *Introduction to Sahidic Coptic*, Georgia

Layton, B., (2011), *A Coptic Grammar*, Porta Linguarun Orientalium 20, Wiesbanden

Lefort, L. T., (1950), *Concordance du Nouveau Testament sahidique, I: les mots d'origine grecque.* Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 124, subsidia 1. Louvain.

Levi, G., (2004), "On Microhistory" in P. Burke (ed.) *New Perspectives on Historical Writing*, Pennsylvania

Lewis, N., (1993), "The Demise of the Demotic Document: When and Why" *JEA* 79, 276 – 281

_____., (2001), *Greeks in Ptolemaic Egypt: Case Studies in the Social History of the Hellenistic World*, Classics in Papyrology 2, Connecticut

MacCoull, L. S. B., (1989), "The Teshlot Papyri and the Survival of Documentary Coptic in the Eleventh Century," *OCP* 55, 201-208

_____., (1988), *Dioscorus of Aphrodito: His Work and His World*, Berkeley

_____., (1997), "Dated and datable Coptic Documentary Hands before A.D. 700," *Le Muséon* 110, 349-366

_____., (2009), *Coptic Legal Documents. Law as Vernacular Text and Experience in late Antique Egypt.* Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 377. Arizona State University- Turnhout

Maehler, H., (1983), "Die griechische Schule im ptolemäischen Ägypten", in E. Van't Dack, P. von Dessel and W. van Gucht (eds) *Egypt and the Hellenistic World. Proceedings of the International Colloquium, Louvain – 24-26 May 1982*, Studia Hellenistica 27, Louvain, 191 – 203

Mardale, A., (2011), "Prepositions as a semi-lexical category," *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics* 13:2, 35 – 50

Margoliouth, D.S., (1912), "The Elephatine Papyri" *The Expositor* 8:3, 69 – 85

Matthews, R. and Roemer, C., (2003), "Introduction: The Worlds of Ancient Egypt – Aspects, Sources, Interactions" in R. Matthews and C. Roemer (eds) *Encounters with Ancient Egypt, Vol.2, Ancient Perspectives on Egypt,* London,

Meillet, A., (1921), *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale*, Paris
127

van Minnen, P., (1993), "The Century of Papyrology" *BASP* 30, 5 – 18

Müller, M., (2009), "Contrast in Coptic I: Concessive Constructions in Sahidic" *Lingua Aegyptia* 17, 139 – 182

_____., (2010), "Greek Conjunctions in Coptic. An overview", paper presented the Inaugural Conference of the DDGLC Project, Leipzig, 26 – 28 April

_____., (2012), "Greek Connectors in Coptic: A Contrastive Overview II - Semantically Subordinating Connectors," *Lingua Aegyptia* 20, 111 – 164

Murphy, M. L., (2010), *Lexical Meaning*, Cambridge

Myers-Scotton, C., (1998), "A Way to Dusty Death: The Matrix Language Turnover Hypothesis" in L. Grenoble and L. Whaley (eds) *Endangered languages: Language loss and community response*, Cambridge, 289 – 316

North, J. A. (2009) "Ancient History Today." *A Companion to Ancient History*. A. Erskine, (ed). Blackwell Reference Online. 04 June 2015 http://www.blackwellreference.com/

Oréal, E., (1997), "Sur la fonction argumentative des quelques particules greques", *Lalies* 17, 229 - 249

_____., (2010). "Greek particles in Coptic: What are they used for (and why)?", paper presented the Inaugural Conference of the DDGLC Project, Leipzig, 26 – 28 April

_____., (1999), "Contact Linguistique: Le Cas Du Rapport Entre Le Grec Et Le Copte", *Lalies*, 19 (Actes des sessions de linguistique et de littérature, Aussois, 24-29 août 1998), 289 - 306.

Petrie, W. M. F., (1890), "The Egyptian Bases of Greek History", *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 11, 271-277

Pfeiffer, S., (2013), "Egypt and Greece Before Alexander", *UCLA Encyclopedia of Egyptology*, 1(1). UCLA: Department of Near Eastern Languages and Cultures. nelc_uee_8779. Retrieved from: http://escholarship.org/uc/item/833528zm

Pons Bordería, S., (2001), "Connectives/Discourse Markers: An Overview", *Quaderns de Filologia, Estudis Literaris* 6, 219 - 214

Quaegebeur, J., (1982), "De la préhistoire de l'écriture copte," *OLP* 13: 125 – 136

Reintges, C. (2004), "Coptic Egyptian as a bilingual language variety" in: P. B. de la Peña, S. Torallas Tovar and E. R. Luján (eds) *Lenguas en contacto: el testimonio escrito*, Madrid, 69-86

Richter, T. S., (2002), *Rechtssemantik und forensische Rhetorik. Untersuchungen zu Wortschatz, Stil und Grammatik der Sprache koptischer Rechtsurkunden*, Leipzig

_____., (2006), "'Spoken' Sahidic. Gleanings from non-literary texts," in V. Lepper et. al. (eds) *"After Polotsky". Akten des Kolloquiums im Gedenken an den 100. Geburtstag von Hans Jakob Polotsky (1905 – 1991) in Bad Honnef bei Bonn, 9.-11. November 2005, = LingAeg* 14, 311 – 323

_____., (2008), "Coptic Letters", *AS/EA* 62, 739 – 770

_____., (2009), "Greek, Coptic and the 'language of the Hijra': the rise and decline of the Coptic language in late antique and medieval Egypt" in H. Cotton et. al. (eds) *From Hellenism to Islam: Cultural and Linguistic Change in the Roman Near East*, Cambridge, 401 – 446

_____., (2010) "Coptic Legal Documents, with Special Reference to the Theban Area," in G. Gabra and H. N. Takla (eds) *Christianity and Monasticism in Upper Egypt: Nag Hammadi - Esna*, Cairo, 121 – 141

_____., (2013), "Zwischen der Epoche der Pyramidenbauer und den Anfängen des Christentums: Sprachwandel im ägyptischen Wortschatz und das Leipziger Projekt Database and Dictionary of Greek Loanwords in Coptic (DDGLC)", *Journal der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschafen* 11, 67 – 80

van Riemsdijk, H., (1990), "Functional Prepositions" in H. Pinkster and I. Genée (eds) *Unity in Diversity*, Dordrecht, 229-241

Sapir, E., (1921), *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech*, New York

Schourup, L., (1999), "Discourse markers", *Lingua* 3.4, 227 - 265

Shisha-Halevy, A., (1986), *Coptic Grammatical Categories. Structural Studies in the Syntax of Shenoutean Sahidic.* Analecta Orientalia 53, Rome

Smyth, H. W., (1956), *Greek Grammar*, New York

Thomas, T. K., (1992), "Greeks or Copts?: Documentary and Other Evidence for Artistic Patronage During the Latte Roman and Early Byzantine Periods at Herakleopolis Magna and Oxyrhynchos, Egypt" in J. Johnson (ed.) *Life in a Multi-Cultural Society: Egypt from Cambyses to Costantine and beyond*, Chicago, 317 – 322

Thomason, S. G., (2001), *Language Contact*, Edinburgh

Thompson, D. L., (1992a), "Language and Literacy in Early Hellenistic Egypt" in P. Bilde et al. (eds), *Ethnicity in Hellenistic Egypt*, Aarhus, 39-52

_____., (1992b), "Literacy and the Administration in Early Ptolemaic Egypt" in J. Johnson (ed.) *Life in a multi-cultural society: Egypt from Cambyses to Constantine and beyond*, Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 51, Chicago, 323-326

_____., (1994a), "Conquest and Literacy: The Case of Ptolemaic Egypt" in D. Keller-Cohen (ed.) *Literacy: Interdisciplinary Conversations*, Cresskill, New Jersey, 71-89

_____., (1994b), "Literacy and Power in Ptolemaic Egypt" in A. K. Bowman and G. Woolf (eds) *Literacy and Power in the Ancient World*, Cambridge, 67-83

_____., (2009), "The Multilingual Environment of Ptolemaic Egypt: Egyptian, Aramaic, and Greek Documentation" in R. S. Bagnall (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology*, New York,

Torallas-Tovar, S., (2010a) "Greek in Egypt", in E. J. Bakker (ed.) *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*, Chichester, 253-266.

_____., (2010b) "Linguistic Identity in Graeco-Roman Egypt", in A. Papaconstantinou (ed.) *The Multilingual Experience in Egypt, from the Ptolemies to the 'Abbāsids*, Surrey, 17 – 46

Tubach, J., (1999a), "Bemerkungen Zur Geplanten Wiederaufnahme Des Wörterbuchprojekts „Griechische Lehnwörter Im Koptischen" in Halle", in S. Emmel et al (ed.) *Ägypten und Nubien in Spätantiker und Christlicher Zeit. Akten Des 6. Internationalen Koptologenkongresses Münster, 20.-26. Juli 1996. Bd. 2: Schrifttum, Sprache, Gedankenwelt*, Münster, 405 - 19.

_____., (1999b), „Griechische Lehnwörter in den koptischen Manichaica. Zur Problematik eines Lehnwortschatzes in einer Übersetzung aus einem anderen Kulturbereich" in S. Grunert and I. Hafemann (eds) *Textcorpus und Wörterbuch. Aspekte zur ägyptischen Lexikographie. Probleme der Ägyptologie* 14, Leiden-Berlin-Köln, 329-343

Versteegh, K., (2002), "Dead or Alive? The Status of the Standard Language" in J. N. Adams, M. Janse and S. Swain (eds.) *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Text*, Oxford, 52 – 76

Vierros, M., (2012), *Bilingual Notaries in Hellenistic Egypt: A Study of Greek as a Second Language*, Collectanea Hellenistica 5, Brussels

Wessely, C., (1910), *Die griechischen Lehnwörter der sahidischen und boheirischen Psalmenversion. Denkschriften der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 54/3, Wien.

Wilfong, T., (1989), "Western Thebes in the Seventh and Eighth Centuries; A Bibliographic Survey of Jême and Its Surroundings" *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 26:1 – 2, 89 – 145

_____. (2002), *Women from Jeme: Lives in a Coptic Town in Late Antique Egypt*, Ann Arbor

Wilson, (1970), *Coptic future tenses: syntactical studies in Sahidic*, The Hague

Winter-Froemel, E., (2008), "Studying loanwords and loanword integration: Two criteria of conformity", *Newcastle Working Papers in Linguistics* 14, 156 – 176

Zimmermann, M., (2011), "Discourse Particles" in K. von Heusinger, C. Maienborn and P. Portner (eds), *Semantics: An International Handbook of Natural Language Meaning, Volume 2*, HSK 33.2, Berlin, 2011 - 2038

Zwicky, A. M., (1985), "Clitics and Particles", *Language* 61, 283 - 305

Appendix – Index of Tokens

The following constitutes a list of references to all tokens used in this study. Where more than one token appear in a line or passage, the number of tokens is indicated in brackets next to the entry.

ἀλλά

O.Brit.Mus.Copt.II 2.6
O.Frangé 30.16
O.Frangé 108.14 v
O.Frangé 177.7
O.Frangé 185.7
O.Frangé 206.13 v
O.Frangé 252.9
O.Frangé 259.17-18 r.; 30 v
O.Frangé 260.7
O.Frangé 347.17
O.Frangé 768.15 r.
O.Frangé 773.22 v
P.KRU 1.35; 97
P.KRU 2.13
P.KRU 3.x+14
P.KRU 4.22
P.KRU 5.17; 19; 53
P.KRU 6.12; 30
P.KRU 7.17; 50; 54
P.KRU 9.x+31
P.KRU 11.16
P.KRU 12.18
P.KRU 13.54
P.KRU 14.25
P.KRU 15.22
P.KRU 18.x+55
P.KRU 20.26; 41; 89; 94
P.KRU 21.28; 71; 74
P.KRU 23.9; 55
P.KRU 24.38; 40
P.KRU 27.17
P.KRU 29.x+14; 16
P.KRU 35.60
P.KRU 36.31; 48; 58
P.KRU 37.x+68
P.KRU 42.36
P.KRU 44.x+103
P.KRU 50.68
P.KRU 65.11; 15; 74
P.KRU 66.x+16; 22; 81
P.KRU 67.x+20; 26; 35; 37; 49; 61; 63; 82; 96; 102
P.KRU 68.38; 80; 81; 89

(ἀλλά continued…)

P.KRU 69.48; 60
P.KRU 70.14; 52
P.KRU 74.29; 35; 89; 97
P.KRU 75.x+27; 124
P.KRU 76.x+9; 16; 57
P.KRU 79.x+42; 60
P.KRU 80.33; 46
P.KRU 81.42
P.KRU 82.24; 28
P.KRU 84.28
P.KRU 85.x+8; 29
P.KRU 86.40
P.KRU 87.x+21
P.KRU 88.15
P.KRU 90.x+6
P.KRU 93.26
P.KRU 95.x+21
P.KRU 98.x+35; 36
P.KRU 99.x+8
P.KRU 104.x37; 50
P.KRU 106.25; 56; 181; 194
P.KRU 107.x+194
P.KRU 110.27
P.KRU 111.x+16
P.KRU 122.x+23

γάρ

O.Frangé 206.18
O.Frangé 320.12; 13
O.Frangé 773.21 v
P.KRU 65.18
P.KRU 75.x+37; 40
P.KRU 82.23
P.KRU 106.84; 85

δέ

O.Frangé 89.7 r.
O.Frangé 120.26 v
O.Frangé 159.10
O.Frangé 163.8 r.
O.Frangé 187.6 r.; 14 v
O.Frangé 761.4 v

133

O.Frangé 766.3 r.
O.Frangé 774.13 r.
O.Frangé 805.7
O.Med.Hab.Copt.72.13
O.Med.Hab.Copt 73.9; 16
P.KRU 1.21; 37; 67; 95
P.KRU 2.9; 14; 29; 42
P.KRU 3.4; 53
P.KRU 4.14; 23; 41; 49; 66
P.KRU 5.8; 20; 36; 57
P.KRU 6.23
P.KRU 7.9; 24; 34; 52
P.KRU 9.x+49
P.KRU 10.43; 58
P.KRU 11.17
P.KRU 12.9; 40
P.KRU 13.53
P.KRU 14.26; 83
P.KRU 15.23; 51; 91
P.KRU 16.27
P.KRU 19.24; 46
P.KRU 20.32; 69; 103
P.KRU 21.20; 42; 46; 78
P.KRU 22.x+15; 49
P.KRU 23.53
P.KRU 24.19; 41; 74; 114
P.KRU 25.26
P.KRU 27.18
P.KRU 28.x+10; 11; 16; 33; 40; 49
P.KRU 29.x+16
P.KRU 35.50; 71
P.KRU 36.11; 56
P.KRU 37.x+60; 85; 98
P.KRU 38.49
P.KRU 39.x+7
P.KRU 41.61; 94
P.KRU 42.18; 28
P.KRU 43.x+50
P.KRU 44.x+56; 62; 97; 101
P.KRU 45.11 (x2)
P.KRU 46.x+15
P.KRU 48.x+14; 52
P.KRU 50.8; 31; 44; 58; 65
P.KRU 51.3
P.KRU 54.12
P.KRU 56.17
P.KRU 58.15
P.KRU 62.25
P.KRU 66.x+14; 17; 23; 35; 45; 46; 78
P.KRU 67.x+19; 33; 36; 46; 53; 59; 62;

(67).x+82; 88; 90; 111
P.KRU 68.9; 19; 34; 43; 47; 58; 66; 68; 86
P.KRU 69.13
P.KRU 70.21; 49; 57; 58
P.KRU 71.30; 41 r.
P.KRU 74.57; 67; 70; 86
P.KRU 75.x+22 (x2); 24; 26; 85; 102; 105;
113; 133
P.KRU 76.x+10; 18; 30; 34; 36; 37; 38;
51; 54; 77
P.KRU 70.x+19
P.KRU 80.40
P.KRU 81.41
P.KRU 82.17; 31
P.KRU 83.x+13
P.KRU 84.13; 27
P.KRU 85.x+21
P.KRU 87.x+36
P.KRU 89.28; 31; 38
P.KRU 91.18; 26
P.KRU 92.x+5; 42; 44
P.KRU 95.x+12
P.KRU 96.22; 58; 72
P.KRU 98.x+28; 37
P.KRU 99.x+41
P.KRU 100.4; 19; 43; 46; 54
P.KRU 104.x+27; 53
P.KRU 106.31; 89; 102; 125; 131; 132;
136; 173; 193; 198; 201; 206

εἰ

P.KRU 3.53
P.KRU 7.52
P.KRU 28.x+40
P.KRU 50.65
P.KRU 80.40

εἰ μή τι

O.Frangé 198.7
P.KRU 55.16
P.KRU 56.21
P.KRU 57.12
P.KRU 67.x+94/95
P.KRU 68.36
P.KRU 70.35
P.KRU 81.25
P.KRU 86.15
P.KRU 97.x+44; 65
P.KRU 98.x+25
P.KRU 99.x+22

(εἰ μή τι continued…)
P.KRU 104.x+29
P.KRU 106.56

εἴτε
O.Brit.Mus.Copt.II 13.5 v. (x2)
O.Frangé 327.4 (x2)
O.Frangé 644.11 (x2)
O.Frangé 766.10; 11 r.
O.Med.Habu.Copt. 69.9-11 (x6)
O.Med.Habu.Copt. 73.15
O.Med.Habu.Copt. 83.10 (x2)
P.KRU 6.28-29 (x5)
P.KRU 9.x+ 61-67 (x11)
P.KRU 19.56-59 (x3)
P.KRU 24.103 (x3)
P.KRU 40.27-28 (x2)
P.KRU 54.13
P.KRU 65.44 (x3); 54-55 (x10); 57-58
(x11); 69-71 (x8)
P.KRU 67.x+28 (x4); 48 (x2); 58; 72-73
(x3); 91 (x2); 98 (x3); 106 (x3); 113-114
(x5); 122-123 (x5); 126 (x3)
P.KRU 68.23-24 (x2); 35 (x2); 79
P.KRU 70.46-47 (x2)
P.KRU 79.x+50-51 (x2); 55-58 (x5)
P.KRU 81.37-38 (x4)
P.KRU 82.22-23 (x6)
P.KRU 90.x+4 (x3)
P.KRU 93.35-36 (x3)
P.KRU 97.x+25
P.KRU 98.x+14 (x2)
P.KRU 99.x+34
P.KRU 106.141-143 (x7); 177-178 (x4);
214 (x2)
P.KRU 108.x+28-31 (x5)

ἐπειδή
O.Brit.Mus.Copt.II 7.1
O.Brit.Mus.Copt.II 12.1/2
O.Frangé 15.6 r.
O.Frangé 53.13 v
O.Frangé 68.4 r.
O.Frangé 117.5
O.Frangé 120.19 v
O.Frangé 139.5/6
O.Frangé 155.5
O.Frangé 164.1
O.Frangé 170.1
O.Frangé 176.3
O.Frangé 190.2

(ἐπειδή continued…)
O.Frangé 210.9
O.Frangé 213.7
O.Frangé 252.3
O.Frangé 263.6
O.Frangé 321.6
O.Frangé 343.9/10
O.Frangé 347.5
O.Frangé 349.x+6
O.Frangé 355.4
O.Frangé 511.4
O.Frangé 629.7/8 r.
O.Frangé 752.1 r.
O.Frangé 773.29 v
O.Frangé 774.25 v
O.Frangé 788.6
O.Med.Habu.Copt. 57.8
O.Med.Habu.Copt. 61.7
O.Med.Habu.Copt. 69.2
O.Med.Habu.Copt. 70.7
O.Med.Habu.Copt. 72.4
O.Med.Habu.Copt. 73.5
O.Med.Habu.Copt. 75.3
O.Med.Habu.Copt. 80.6/7
P.KRU 3.9
P.KRU 7.13
P.KRU 10.11
P.KRU 19.11
P.KRU 35.22
P.KRU 36.16
P.KRU 37.x+9
P.KRU 38.17
P.KRU 39.x+12
P.KRU 40.12
P.KRU 41.18/19
P.KRU 42.x+4
P.KRU 43.x+8
P.KRU 44.x+8
P.KRU 45.16
P.KRU 50.13
P.KRU 51.3
P.KRU 55.5
P.KRU 56.6
P.KRU 57.5
P.KRU 60.2
P.KRU 62.5
P.KRU 63.5
P.KRU 64.8
P.KRU 65.21
P.KRU 68.26
P.KRU 69.7
P.KRU 80.8

P.KRU 81.11
P.KRU 82.10
P.KRU 84.4
P.KRU 85.x+9
P.KRU 86.12; 17
P.KRU 91.5
P.KRU 93.6; 9
P.KRU 96.14
P.KRU 97.x+57; 66
P.KRU 100.9
P.KRU 104.x+12
P.KRU 106.50
P.KRU 107.x+9
P.KRU 115.3

ἤ

O.Ashm.Copt. 1.6
O.Frangé 320.10
O.Frangé 322.11; 12
O.Frangé 645.9
O.Frangé 761.13 r.
O.Frangé 773.18 v.
O.Frangé 774.15; 23-24 (x2) r.
O.Med.Habu.Copt. 52.5
O.Med.Habu.Copt. 69.5-6 (x2)
P.KRU 3.54-56 (x3)
P.KRU 4.69-70 (x2)
P.KRU 5.47-52 (x10)
P.KRU 8.x+22
P.KRU 10.53-54 (x3)
P.KRU 11.49 (x2)
P.KRU 12.38-39 (x4)
P.KRU 13.51 (x3)
P.KRU 15.74-79 (x6)
P.KRU 18.x+49
P.KRU 19.58-60 (x2)
P.KRU 21.66
P.KRU 22.x+34-42 (x10)
P.KRU 23.46; 51
P.KRU 24.96-105 (x11)
P.KRU 25.41 (x2)
P.KRU 27.53-55 (x4)
P.KRU 28.x+37-41 (x5)
P.KRU 35.63-66 (x4)
P.KRU 37.x+37; 45-51 (x6); 60
P.KRU 38.34
P.KRU 39.x+57-63 (x8)
P.KRU 41.83-85 (x3)
P.KRU 42.33- 35 (x3)
P.KRU 44.x+81; 88-91 (x4)

P.KRU 48.x+33-35 (x4); 43-45 (x3)
P.KRU 50.64-65 (x3)
P.KRU 52.23
P.KRU 65.69-72 (x5); 76
P.KRU 66.x+35; 56-57 (x4); 61
P.KRU 67.x+40; 59; 91; 101 (x2); 120-121
(x3)
P.KRU 68.54-55 (x2); 64; 67; 77-79 (x6);
91-94 (x8)
P.KRU 70.48; 57
P.KRU 71.36
P.KRU 74.45; 77-83 (x12); 86-88 (x3)
P.KRU 75.x+10; 16; 64; 85; 88; 95-99
(x8);102-104 (x4); 109-111 (x6)
P.KRU 76.x+13; 63
P.KRU 84.35-36 (x3)
P.KRU 87.x+21; 33
P.KRU 88.13-14 (x4)
P.KRU 89.21
P.KRU 90.x+5 (x2)
P.KRU 92.x+33
P.KRU 95.x+4; 26
P.KRU 98.x+14-15 (x3)
P.KRU 99.x+35-36 (x5)
P.KRU 100.35
P.KRU 105.x+4-5 (x2); 20
P.KRU 106.159-166 (x9); 188-192 (x6)
P.KRU 107.x+21-22 (x4)
P.KRU 122.x+49

καὶ γάρ

O.Frangé 179.12
O.Frangé 348.3
O.Frangé 352.12
O.Frangé 633.8
O.Frangé 641.6/7
O.Frangé 651.13 v
O.Frangé 793.13 v

καίπερ

P.KRU 85.x+27
P.KRU 98.x+19
P.KRU 99.22

κἄν

O.Frangé 106.3; 5
O.Frangé 793.16 v
P.KRU 13.53 (x2)
P.KRU 28.x+40
P.KRU 42.x+35

(κἄν continued...)

P.KRU 44.x+101
P.KRU 65.58; 59; 70; 71 (x2)
P.KRU 67.x+121
P.KRU 68.63; 64; 77
P.KRU 69.44 (x2)
P.KRU 74.70; 71; 82; 84; 85
P.KRU 75.x+110
P.KRU 76.x+63; 76
P.KRU 81.22 (x2)
P.KRU 84.17; 34 (x4)
P.KRU 89.22
P.KRU 100.36
P.KRU 106.86; 193 (x2)

μέν

O.Frangé 10.1
O.Frangé 11.1
O.Frangé 12.1
O.Frangé 17.1
O.Frangé 18.1
O.Frangé 29.1
O.Frangé 36.1
O.Frangé 37.1
O.Frangé 38.2
O.Frangé 42.1
O.Frangé 43.2
O.Frangé 73.1
O.Frangé 137.5
O.Frangé 164.8
O.Frangé 175.2
O.Frangé 177.1
O.Frangé 181.1
O.Frangé 188.1
O.Frangé 211.2
O.Frangé 215.4
O.Frangé 259.8; 29
O.Frangé 261.7
O.Frangé 320.3
O.Frangé 323.1
O.Frangé 329.1
O.Frangé 336.1
O.Frangé 341.1
O.Frangé 343.4; 17
O.Frangé 364.1
O.Frangé 375.2
O.Frangé 382.1
O.Frangé 386.1
O.Frangé 387.1
O.Frangé 389.1
O.Frangé 390.1

(μέν continued...)

O.Frangé 393.1
O.Frangé 416.1
O.Frangé 420.1
O.Frangé 422.1
O.Frangé 423.1
O.Frangé 428.1
O.Frangé 430.1
O.Frangé 433.2
O.Frangé 436.1
O.Frangé 437.1
O.Frangé 446.1
O.Frangé 530.1
O.Frangé 628.1
O.Frangé 629.1
O.Frangé 632.1
O.Frangé 635.1
O.Frangé 641.1
O.Frangé 655.1
O.Frangé 753.1
O.Frangé 757.1
O.Frangé 760.1 r.
O.Frangé 761.1
O.Frangé 793.1
P.KRU 1.95
P.KRU 2.43; 44
P.KRU 4.74
P.KRU 5.53; 54
P.KRU 6.29
P.KRU 8.x+22; 23
P.KRU 10.55; 56
P.KRU 11.51; 52
P.KRU 13.54; 55
P.KRU 14.76; 77
P.KRU 15.80; 81
P.KRU 21.74
P.KRU 22.42; 43
P.KRU 23.54
P.KRU 24.106; 108
P.KRU 25.43
P.KRU 26.x+19
P.KRU 27.43; 56
P.KRU 28.x+42
P.KRU 35.26; 57; 58
P.KRU 37.x+67; 68
P.KRU 39.x+63; 64
P.KRU 41.85; 87
P.KRU 42.35
P.KRU 43.x+63
P.KRU 44.102; 104
P.KRU 45.54; 55

(μέν continued…)

P.KRU 46.x+28; 29
P.KRU 48.x+45; 46
P.KRU 50.68
P.KRU 52.24
P.KRU 65.20; 74
P.KRU 66.x+47
P.KRU 68.81
P.KRU 69.59; 61
P.KRU 70.51
P.KRU 74.88
P.KRU 74.x+14; 115
P.KRU 76.x+71
P.KRU 80.45
P.KRU 81.41; 48
P.KRU 83.x+11; 12
P.KRU 84.28
P.KRU 85.x+41
P.KRU 88.14
P.KRU 92.x+43
P.KRU 94.4
P.KRU 97.x+28
P.KRU 98.x+47
P.KRU 104.x+36
P.KRU 106.70; 179; 193; 197
P.KRU 107.x+23

μέντοι γε
P.KRU 58.15
P.KRU 75.x+85; 105
P.KRU 76.x+37; 38; 77
P.KRU 122.x+29

μήποτε
O.Frangé 652.8
P.KRU 66.7
P.KRU 67.15; 66; 89; 103
P.KRU 68.45
P.KRU 69.8; 19; 27
P.KRU 74.20
P.KRU 89.11
P.KRU 100.25

μήπως
O.Frangé 197.18
P.KRU 67.x+79
P.KRU 75.x+48
P.KRU 100.48

οὐδέ/οὔτε
O.Brit.Mus.Copt.II 14.2 (x2)

(οὐδέ/οὔτε continued…)

O.Frangé 155.10-12 (x2)
O.Frangé 160.6
O.Frangé 177.4-5 (x2)
O.Frangé 185.4
O.Frangé 200.9
O.Frangé 355.9
O.Frangé 769.6
O.Med.Habu.Copt. 70.12
O.Med.Habu.Copt. 72.10-11 (x3)
O.Med.Habu.Copt. 73.13 (x3)
O.Med.Habu.Copt. 80.11-12 (x2)
O.Med.Habu.Copt. 89.4-8 (x3)
O.Med.Habu.Copt. 90.5-6 (x2); 4-6 v. (x3)
P.KRU 1.93-94 (x4)
P.KRU 2.40-42 (x7)
P.KRU 4.67-68 (x6)
P.KRU 5.45-46 (x10)
P.KRU 7.47-48 (x7)
P.KRU 8.x+19 (x2)
P.KRU 10.52-53 (x6)
P.KRU 11.49-48 (x6)
P.KRU 12.36-38 (x8)
P.KRU 13.46-50 (x11)
P.KRU 14.70-72 (x6)
P.KRU 15.71-72 (x6)
P.KRU 16.43-47 (x5); 56 (x2)
P.KRU 18.x+43 (x2); 47-48 (x5); 52-55 (x5)
P.KRU 19.51-54 (x5)
P.KRU 20.75-83 (x13)
P.KRU 21.59-62 (x10)
P.KRU 22.x+30-32 (x11)
P.KRU 23.41-48 (x23); 50-53 (x3)
P.KRU 24.92-95 (x9)
P.KRU 25.39 (x2)
P.KRU 26.x+13-14 (x5)
P.KRU 27.52-53 (x4)
P.KRU 28.x+35-38 (x9)
P.KRU 31.x+29-30 (x10)
P.KRU 36.54-57 (x5)
P.KRU 37.x+35-48 (x24); 64
P.KRU 38.35-38 (x10)
P.KRU 39.x+54-56 (x7)
P.KRU 41.78-81 (x6)
P.KRU 42.30-31 (x9)
P.KRU 43.x+63
P.KRU 44.x+69-82 (x22); 87-90 (x4)
P.KRU 45.50-52 (x8)
P.KRU 46.x+26-27 (x7)
P.KRU 48.x+30 (x2); 39 (x2)

οὖν

ὡς

O.Frangé 59.4; 5
O.Frangé 165.2
O.Frangé 176.4
O.Frangé 210.10
O.Frangé 275.12
P.KRU 67.x+34
P.KRU 68.39; 80
P.KRU 80.22
P.KRU 82.15
P.KRU 93.14
P.KRU 104.x+4
P.KRU 106.170

ὥστε

O.Frangé 388.9
P.KRU 1.77
P.KRU 2.33
P.KRU 3.x+43
P.KRU 7.34
P.KRU 11.38
P.KRU 12.30
P.KRU 13.32
P.KRU 14.52
P.KRU 23.28
P.KRU 27.37
P.KRU 28.x+22
P.KRU 39.x+36
P.KRU 40.24
P.KRU 43.38
P.KRU 44.x+37
P.KRU 45.40
P.KRU 50.45
P.KRU 70.22
P.KRU 74.82
P.KRU 75.x+62; 80
P.KRU 79.x+24
P.KRU 80.35
P.KRU 85.x+25; 31; 33; 38
P.KRU 86.28
P.KRU 93.11