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Abstract

There are a number of particles mentioned in the ancient Egyptian language in general and the Coptic language in particular, subject to exceptional rules in terms of uses because they were not specified by linguists. In this case, from the researcher's point of view we are talking about the so-called dual Particle of concept and use. The studies have not sufficiently covered it (from the Coptic linguistic aspect) about its nature, importance and its various linguistic uses, so this study will be unique in its form and subject.

The main problem on which the research was based is to determine the use of the Particle, as the opinions of scholars were somewhat confusing, and on the basis of that, the researcher came to study the texts that were clearly exposed to this administration with all linguistic derivations, both ancient and modern, and it became clear from this and that that it is an exceptional tool in terms of derivation and use.
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Introduction:

It is necessary to study a lot of syntax articles when talking about the so-called dual-use Particle. The Particle $\text{mēmoi}$ is located in what is called the dual particle. The studies have not sufficiently covered it (from the Coptic linguistic aspect) about its nature, importance and its various linguistic uses, so this study will be unique in its form and subject.

There are two scientists, who singled out each one of them with a special article for the particle in demotic stage. Other than that, the particle was mentioned in a number of grammar references, whether ancient Egyptian or Coptic, but of course not in detail, especially in the Coptic, there is no single article for this particle.

The main Goal of the study is; tracing the continuity of use of the particle from demotic to Coptic, or rather tracing the extent to which its forms and uses varied during the ages of the ancient Egyptian language.

Q: What could it be $\text{mēmoi}$?

Discussion

Firstly; the verbal study

1- According to the ancient Egyptian language, one of the Semitic languages, so there is a similarity in the meanings of the words in those languages that belong to the same group. In accordance with that rule, note the meaning of $\text{mēmoi}$ that it means "oh if" or "if only". In both cases, it means an event that was supposed to happen but did not happen. Rather, the meaning is summed up in the term "would that".

2- (Oh would that) in linguistic lexicography; A term used for the impossible and may be used for some rare cases of the possible. It is permissible to do it or neglect it when an extra tool enters it. As an accurate look at that problem between the comparison of the meaning of the particle (if) and the Particle (oh would that), It

---

1 The researcher intended at this point to clarify that the Particle has two parallel uses, which will become clear to the reader after studying this research.

Particle: an element, often substantial and weakly stressed, marking a sentence for intersentential relationship and often indicating Prosodic properties of sentence components. For this linguistic term and other terms see; M.Eissa, Study of some Coptic papyri in the Coptic Museum, MA thesis Cairo University, 2004, P. 98

2 A.Gardiner, and C.De wit, Remarques sur la Particle demotique $\text{hmy}$, CdE, 60, 1955, P.288-293; 18.C.De wit, La Particle demotique $\text{hmi}$, CdE, 30, 1940, P.15-18
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can be decided that the particle (if) that is in the hypothetical wish sentences refers to what is supposed to happen or is not likely to happen and varies in its treatment from one example to another while the particle (oh would that) refers to the condition.  

Secondly; the linguistic origin

1- It is not surprising to be some of the words used in the ancient Egyptian language were not of ancient Egyptian origin, because, as we mentioned above, the ancient Egyptian language is in origin a Semitic language, so it is natural that among its words there are words that are not Egyptian. On this point, Groll mentioned in her note no.11 for the Semitic cognates of hn see Halder in his article on Akkadian summa, and by studying these origins, it became clear that the word is of Ugaritic origin hm, appears as a loan word in late Egyptian as hn (if, if only).

2- The Ugaritic Particle Hm "lo!"

Is used to introduce conditional sentences, and precisely this usage is found with Egyptian hn. Haldar agreed with the assumption that the second syllable of the particle contains enclitic –ma (m) to refer to the conditional particles in other Semitic language as follows in Table 1: hn in Semitic language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>hm in Ugaritic</th>
<th>in Aramic dialects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>h3n3</td>
<td>[Nerab]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hn</td>
<td>[Nabataean]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hln</td>
<td>[Mandaic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>[Syriac]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h3n, hm in south-Arabic dialects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that: after the verbs of desire and love, (if) is used instead of (would that); after noun clauses (would that) is used in place of (if)

W.Wrigt, Grammar of the Arabic language, Vol II, Leipzig, 1862, P.249
A.Mokhtar, the contemporary Arabic language lexicon, Egypt, 2008, p.2053
S.Groll and Černy, Late Egyptian Grammar, Rome, 1975, P.153
Halder's article has been documented in footnote No.7
A.Halder, On the problem of Akkadian summa, JCS, 4, No.1, 1950, P.63-64
J.Cantineau, Le Nabateen, I, 1930, 104; II, 1931, 88; Th.Nöildeke, Mändaische Grammatik, 1881, 473ff
M.Hofner, Altsudanarabische Grammatik, 1943, 164ff
3- **Commenting on Previous table**

Haldar see that Ugaritic $hm$, very closely related to the element $sum$ of Akkadian $summ$; the two words can safely be assumed to be etymologically identical. As is well known, an Akkadian $s$ is equivalent to a west-Semitic $h$, as in certain pronominal forms, and further in the causative element, where it is true, Ugaritic has $s$, but also $h$. According to this specific comparison, we find a syntactic feature in the Hebrew conditional particle we find an initial $h$ in ($hn$) as in Ugaritic, or $m$ in ($m$), an interchange of $h$ and $m$ occurs in Semitic also in other cases, as in causative element$^{16}$. Accordingly, it is not surprising that a word like ours begins with $s$ in Akkadian, while other Semitic languages show $h$ or $m$.

Regarding the final consonant, we find $m$ in Akkadian, Ugaritic, and in one alternative in Hebrew and south-Arabic, whereas in Aramic, north-Arabic, and in one alternative in Hebrew and south-Arabic $n$ occurs. Hebrew $hn$ has been taken as an Aramaism$^{17}$, and in south-Arabic the same interchange of $m$ and $n$ is encountered. Regarding the last vowel $u$ in Akkadian $summ$, while the corresponding particles in other Semitic language exhibit $i$ or $e$$^{18}$, this is equal to or $i$ in ancient Egyptian including Coptic. The last note in this regard; Ugaritic $hm$...

---

11 A.Halder, On the problem, P.63

9 in , $\text{؟}^\text{imma} = \text{؟}$ they both fulfill the conditional statement in Arabic language, and both are equal to Ugaritic $hm$ 'lo' (this is made clear in more detail in the Arabic footnote No.21)

12 A.Halder, On the problem, p.63-64 ; W.Ward, Comparative studies,P.33

13 $\text{؟}\text{؟}$: the Akkadian summa, which introduces the normal equivalent of the conditional sentence; it's always followed by the verb in the indicative. Ungnad explained summa tentatively as a permansive formation from $\text{؟}\text{یم} = 3^\text{rd}$ feminine plural. Ungnad viewed summa as a verbal adjective from $\text{؟}\text{یم}$, followed by emphatic-$\text{ما}$. We must take into account that Meek agrees with Ungnad's explanation, but formulates it more precisely by taking summa, as $3^\text{rd}$ masculine singular, the impersonal permansive plus the particle $\text{ما}$.$^{12}$ The most obvious point here that, Akkadian summa, means 'to establish', 'decree' and is not independently attested in the sense of 'to assume, suppose, posit'


14 A.Halder, On the problem, P.63; Gordon, Ugaritic Handbook, 73

15 **Initial**: the first letter of a name or text or a division.

16 J.Montgomery, The hemzah-h in the Semitic, JBL, 46, 1927, P.144ff


18 Hofner, Altsudanarabische, P.164
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"lo"¹⁹ and Hebrew *hn*, *hnh* with the same meaning, so Halder thinks, these particles are probably etymologically related to the conditional particles²⁰.

**Important Note:**
In the Arabic language; it is a functional word that conveys optative thinking, and is often used for the impossible (ليت)²¹, and sometimes for some possible cases (لَو).²² So there is a verbal and implicit difference between would that and if; whereas, the first means the impossibility, or rather, regret over something that could not happen, but the second means that there is a certain possibility that something will happen, but conditionally²³. In addition to, the particle if that is in the hypothetical wishing sentences differs from one to the other²⁴.

![Q²: How was 2ÂMOI expressed linguistically?](image)

**Discussion:**
Some scholars consider it a conditional particle, but others consider it a hypothetical wish particle with unrealistic thinking. In order to study these previous suggestions by scholars, it is necessary to study the texts first to know the determination of the function of 2ÂMOI through the following table. Table 2: linguistic Sources of 2ÂMOI

---

¹⁹ If the form *hn* is to be equated with *hm*, we have in Ugaritic the same interchange as in Hebrew and south-Arabic.

See; C.Goedon, Ugaritic Handbook, III, p.226

²⁰ Halder thinks, that the element *S*um of Akkadian *Summa*, is etymologically identical with *hm*, *hn*, *îm* etc.

This is also confirmed by Ward in his article; that the Ugaritic Particle *hm* is used to introduce conditional sentences, and precisely this usage is found with Ancient Egyptian *hn*, as mentioned in a number of texts.


As for the texts of *hn*, they will be mentioned in setail in the following pages.

²¹ ليت: حرف ناسم يفيد التمنى من أحوالات (إِن) ينصب الاسم ويرفع الخبر، ويستعمل للمستحيل وبعض حالات الممكن، يجوز إعماله أو إهماله عند دخول (ما) الزاده عليه.


²² W.Wrigt, Grammar of the Arabic; A.Mokhtar, the contemporary Arabic,P.2053

²³ W.Wrigt, Grammar of the Arabic, P.249

²⁴ W.Wrigt, Grammar of the Arabic,P.249
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writing forms</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Texts&lt;sup&gt;25&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Writing forms" /></td>
<td>Meeks, AL77.2457 ENG.689</td>
<td>PBM EA 10247 (19,6); (27,4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P.Puchkin 127 (5,6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Karnak-Nord, IV, Text,Fig.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Writing forms" /></td>
<td>Wb.II,481,7-9</td>
<td>P.Louvre E 4892+PBM 10181 (S. 6,7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PBM EA 10249 (Rto. 13,1); (11,12);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PBM EA 10247 (12,7 ) ;(28,8);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P.Chester Beatty I (Vs. C,4,3); (Rto. 15,2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PBN 196.II (Vs.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P.Puchkin 127 (Rto. 5,2 ) ; (5,6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P.Moskau 120 (Rto. 2,29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P.BM 10052,4 (11-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P.Anstasi I, IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Writing forms" /></td>
<td>Er.275,6 CDD,55</td>
<td>°Onchsheshonqy Nos.10/14; 10/25; 11/2; 10/17; 10/16; 11/4; 10/11; 10/22; 10/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Petubastis Nos.2/19;15/15;7/25; 8/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mythus Nos.18/10-11; 16/26-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P.Cairo 50072,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Writing forms" /></td>
<td>CD 675a-b; CED 282 KoptHWB 372; DELC 300b; ChLCS 91a</td>
<td>ShChass 77:16-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ShIv 9;66;92;180;180: 3-6;116:23-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gal 5:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ShIII 83:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P 131,8 94 ro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ShMing 92a: 20-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mun.100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>25</sup> The texts referred to in this table are not only the used texts, but they are the basic texts. Looking at the body of the research, we will notice many examples of ancient Egyptian texts and the Bible in the footnotes.
Commenting on the previous table includes a discussion of a number of problematic, which are lined up as follows:

**The 1st problematic: The Explanation**

\[ \text{h3my (2AMOI)}: \text{It was mentioned for the first time by Erman}^{26} \text{ in Note No.689; where that confirmed by Lexa}^{27} \text{ as a compound word in Insinger Papyrus}^{28}. \text{ As it consists of two parts } h3 \text{ (Non-enclitic Particle}^{29}) + \text{ my (Imperative}^{30}): \text{ antique examples that showed us that the interpretation of particle \text{h3my} \text{ find it in Petubastis}^{31} \text{ and Mythus}^{32}, \text{ it's confirmed that particle } h3my \]

---

26 A.Erman, Neuegyptische Grammatik, P.345
28 *Insinger Papyrus*: It was found in the first century AD in Akhmim, and now preserved in the Leiden Museum, included 25 divisions talking about the exploits of an actual god. This is also confirmed by Maxim Kupreyen, as a compound word where he indicated that h3 / h3.n.tr eventually merge with late Egyptian particle h3 and its variant h3-n3 as shown by Coptic interjection 2A(ơ)O. 2AIE "yea, verily" ,The particle mi is likely the imperative form of either mi "come" or im "give lit". See; M.Kuperyen, Demonstrative Pronouns and articles in Ancient Egypt and Coptic, Berlin, 2020, P.162
29 h3(Oh) : late Egyptian wish particle as have been mentioned by linguistic dictionaries and texts; Wb 3, 11.13-12.10; EAG 866; GEG 238; ENG 690.
30 my: non-enclitic particle derived from hortative imperative verb my (come!) as have been mentioned by linguistic dictionaries and texts; Wb 2, 36.6; EAG 615, 837; GEG 250; CGG 351

At this point, Lexa suggested in his Note.336 that there is an old version from particle hmi that be hmn (steer) i.e. direction and guidance, which was written in Coptic 2MME. We Must not lose sight of Gardiner's note in his article about old kingdom hnmmt

\[ \text{ which mentioned in some rare texts, in JEA, 25, 28 maybe it was an old form of h3m considering that hnmmt may have changed to h3m to h3my See; A.Gardiner, and C.De wit, Remarques sur la Particle demotique hmy, CdE, 60, 1955, P.290; J.Clere, Three New Ostraca of the story of Sinuhe, JEA, 25, 1939, P.28}

See; A.Volten, Das demotische weisheitsbuch analecta Aegyptiaca, II, Kopenhagen, 1941, P.92-94

**Hortative**: Latin linguistic term for giving exhortation (More simply, it means guidance and warning)

So here is the classification of mi is hortative particle from hortative verb.
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(2AMO1); falls under the category of particles used for commands, warnings, and the like. That is, it is a conditional particle that builds on main events in main clause and followed by it in subordinate clause.

**If we move to the discussion more clearly, we will divide the hadith into two parts of**

$h3my$ **One is fixed and the other is variable as follows:**

$h3$: It was written with more than a graphical significance and more than a phonetic significance as well. Van de Walle$^{33}$, mentioned that the combined particle $h3$ is translated in an indicative way so that there is no demand for a positive attitude, but rather a description of a negative situation$^{34}$.

$my$: it is the fixed part of the particle, we find the correct meaning by Lexa$^{35}$, in his note No.336 in which he explained that the particle my, refers to the transition from domination to control because the origin of the particle means (direction and guidance) so, sentences that contain this tool must include a decision or condition generally followed by a circumstantial clause.

**The 2$^{nd}$ problematic: The Etymology**

The issue of etymology is the most complex issue for this particle, since it graphically and phonetically is a bit rambling. As a first look the middle Egyptian particle $h3$ which means (would that), as a synonym$^{36}$ for $h3n3$ which will be discussed in more detail on the next page, back to the point of discussion both in phonetic value $h$ or $h$ there are four hieroglyphic texts$^{38}$ dealing with the status of $h3$, there is a

---

$^{32}$ W.Spiegelberg, Der Ägyptische Mythus vom Sonnenauge: nach dem leiddener demotischer Papyrus I 348, 3$^{rd}$ edition, 2017

$^{33}$ B.Van de walle, Une tablette scolaiure provenant d'Abydos, ZÄS, 90, P.121

$^{34}$ $h3$; whether written in form $h3$ or $h3$ optative particle as mentioned before, used to express an event that we wish would happen if it was supposed to happen. Naturally, its implicit concept is indicative. In addition to what was referred it, $h3$ $hw$ var. $hwy$ are synonymous particles serving to introduce both fulfilled and unfulfilled wishes or request, the enclitic particle 3 is often used to strengthen them. See, R.Merzeban, On the Aspects and Function of the enclitic particle 3, JFTH, 17, Issue 2, 2020, P.221

$^{35}$ F.Lexa, Papyrus Insinger , II, P.73

$^{36}$ **Synonym**: one of two or more words or expressions of the same language that have the same or nearly the same meaning in some or all senses.

$^{37}$ $h3n3$ (if only… would be; oh): as mentioned in Wb 2, 481,7-9

$^{38}$ As Gardiner pointed out in his article; A.Gardiner, and C.De wit, Remarques sur la Particle demotique hmy, CdE, 60, 1955, P.289ff.
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possibility that a transposition occurred between two letters $^{39}$ $h, n$. on the other hand changing of the last $3$ to $m$ to become from $h3$ to $hm$ it is a hypothesis that seems likely to change since we must take into account that $h3$ it was developed in the late era and may have been replaced by a consonant letter or may have increased it we find that development represented in $hm$ or $hn$ in their different forms $^{40}$.

Therefore, we will present a number of suggestions attributed to a number of scholars, which we will discuss with explanation and study;

Johnson $^{41}$ sees, the demotic $\text{hmy}$ $\text{ḥm}'\text{ōh wūd m̀t}'$ came from either $\text{hn}$ $\text{ḥm}'\text{ōh wūd m̀t}'$; $h3n3$ $\text{ḥm}'\text{ōh wūd m̀t}'$, with a change of $n$ to $m$ $^{42}$, not known to Egyptian, or $h3$ plus enclitic particle $\text{my}$.

Late Egyptian $\text{ḥm}'\text{ōh wūd m̀t}'$ $h(3)n(3)\text{wn}$ $^{43}$ was direct ancestor of demotic $\text{hwn-n3w}$. Thus demotic should have forms with $h$ for the irrealis, but without $h$ for the imperfect converter $^{44}$. As a result of the confusion between these two similar forms, however, they were often leveled, either through the spread of $h$ to the imperfect, as in Mythus or through the loss of the $h$ in the irrealis as in Petubastis $^{45}$.

$^{39}$ Possibly the interchange of $h$ to $m$ may be latent in $\text{wHm}$ $\text{ḥm}'\text{ōh wūd m̀t}'$ if the argument put forward by Seth is sound. See; K.Seth, Nachtrage, RecTrav, 24, 1902, P.189

$^{40}$ The researcher means that the diversity of writing graphical forms and then phonetic writing, created a bifurcation of the particle as it becomes clear as follows; $h3$ $\text{ḥm}'\text{ōh wūd m̀t}'$, $h3n3$ $\text{ḥm}'\text{ōh wūd m̀t}'$, $h3n3\text{nw}$ $\text{ḥm}'\text{ōh wūd m̀t}'$, $h3n3\text{rn}$ $\text{ḥm}'\text{ōh wūd m̀t}'$, $h3n3\text{rn}$ $\text{ḥm}'\text{ōh wūd m̀t}'$, $h3n3\text{rn}$ $\text{ḥm}'\text{ōh wūd m̀t}'$. $\text{hwn}$ $\text{ḥm}'\text{ōh wūd m̀t}'$

$^{41}$ J.Johnson, The Demotic verbal system, SAOC, 38, Chicago, 2004, P. 173

$^{42}$ Spiegelberg, points out that the change of $m$ to $n$ is found in the word $\text{hnw}$ $\text{ḥm}'\text{ōh wūd m̀t}'$ "vague" which, in Coptic, becomes $\text{ḥm}'\text{ōh wūd m̀t}'$. However, we need not look so far, for the particle is already found in Papyrus Anstasi I,19.6; 27.4 in the form $h3n3\text{mi}$ $\text{ḥm}'\text{ōh wūd m̀t}'$ and $h3\text{mi}$ $\text{ḥm}'\text{ōh wūd m̀t}'$. See; C.De wit, La Particle demotique $\text{ḥm}'\text{ōh wūd m̀t}'$, CdE, 30, 1940, P.16

$^{43}$ See; H.Satzinger, Der Konditionalsatz mit $\text{ḥm}'\text{ōh wūd m̀t}'$, Neüägyptische Studien, Wien, 1976, P.109-115; W.Till, Der Irrealis im Neüägyptischen, ZÄS, 69, P.112-117; C.De wit, La Particle demotique $\text{ḥm}'\text{ōh wūd m̀t}'$, CdE, 30, 1940, P.15-18

$^{44}$ Converters: The Morphosyntatic phenomenon of marking the syntactic status of a clause; a set of prefixed morphemes marking the syntactic status of a clause.

M.Eissa, Study of some Coptic papyri in the Coptic Museum, MA thesis Cairo University, 2004, P.94

$^{45}$ W.Spiegelberg, Sagenkreis des K.Petubastis, P. 385
Speigelberg\textsuperscript{46}, considered \textit{hn} or \textit{h3n3} prototype\textsuperscript{47} of demotic particle \textit{hmy}, but he prefer the group writing \textit{h3n3-my} \begin{tabular}{c} \textit{h} \textit{3n3} \textit{h} \textit{my} \end{tabular} or \textit{h3-my} \begin{tabular}{c} \textit{h} \textit{3} \textit{h} \textit{my} \end{tabular} as in Anstasi Papyrus I\textsuperscript{48}, not the simple \textit{h3n3} From the very first sight tend to \textit{h3my} rather than \textit{h3n3-my}, because neither Demotic nor Coptic has any trace of a letter \textit{n}\textsuperscript{49}. Erman\textsuperscript{50}, suggest in his dictionary, both of \textit{h3n3} \begin{tabular}{c} \textit{h} \textit{3n3} \textit{h} \textit{my} \end{tabular} and \textit{h3n(w)r} \begin{tabular}{c} \textit{h} \textit{3n(w)r} \textit{h} \textit{my} \end{tabular} mean (oh would that) but it certainly includes the conditional tense, both of the particles is terminated by hortative particle \textit{my} \begin{tabular}{c} \textit{h} \textit{my} \end{tabular}. Also, in his Note\textsuperscript{51} No.690 explained \textit{h3n} as an accidental variable to \textit{h3n3} as conditional-optative particle, also this is what was stated in Note No.820\textsuperscript{52} where the reasons for his assertion according to the texts of Anstasi Payrus I, IV.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline
ShChass 77:16-19 & ShMing 92a: 20-24 \\
ShLv 9:66;92:180; & 2 Cor 11,1 \\
180: 3-6;116:23-24 & EW 44,45 \\
Gal 5:12 & H, I: Cxlvii \\
ShIII 83:5 & Mun.100 \\
BMIS 261,269,382 & P 131.8 94 ro \\
FR 96 & AM 229, 270 \\
I Cor 4,8 & JKP 2, 242 \\
CG 17v & Ex 16,3 \\
Nu 14,2 & Bifao 111,54-57 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{What are Coptic Uses of \textit{2AMOI}?}
\end{table}

Discussion:
It is possible to limit the uses of \textit{2AMOI}\textsuperscript{53} on some grammatical points according to linguistic dictionaries\textsuperscript{54} and grammatical references\textsuperscript{55}.

---

\textsuperscript{46} W.Speigelberg, Der Agyptische Mythus, P.499

\textsuperscript{47} **Prototype**: An original model or proto-image of all representatives of the meaning of a word or of a 'category'

\textsuperscript{48} **Anstasi Papyrus**: Officially known as the British Museum Papyrus No.10247; The papyrus, dated to the Ramesside era, contains a satirical text used to train manuscript scribes.

See: A.Gardiner, Egyptian Hieratic texts, series I, Literary texts of the new kingdom, Part I, Leipzig, 1911

\textsuperscript{49} The issue of replacing or deleting letters is common in the ancient Egyptian language.

\textsuperscript{50} A.Erman, Wb, III,13

\textsuperscript{51} A.Erman, Neüegyptische Grammatik, P.345

\textsuperscript{52} A.Erman, Neüegyptische Grammartik, P.416

\textsuperscript{53} The Coptic compound \textit{2AMOI} "would that" = demotic \textit{hmi} derive from the late Egyptian \textit{h3my}, composed of \textit{h3/h3n3} + the particle \textit{mi}. See; M.Kuperyen, Demonstrative Pronouns, P.162

\textsuperscript{54} Linguistic dictionaries: CD, CED, KoptHwb, DELC, ChLCS
The Coptic Particle ʔahmōi 'Oh would that': Applying on a comparison between The Ancient Egyptian texts and Coptic texts

The uses are divided into Particle and Expression as follows;

- Interjection Particle
- Contrary to fact Particle
- Hypothetical wish Particle
- Impersonal Expression

All uses indicated followed by various verbal prefixes, lined up in the following table: So, the general grammatical construction of ʔahmōi is; ʔahmōi + verbal prefix.

Note: Sometimes, the only use of particle is without verbal prefixes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ʔENɛ</th>
<th>ʔEPɛ</th>
<th>ʔNTɛ</th>
<th>ʔNARɛ</th>
<th>ʔNTA</th>
<th>ʔA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prefix of Preterit conversion in circumstantial</td>
<td>Prefix of circumstantial</td>
<td>Prefix of conjunctive</td>
<td>Prefix of Preterit conversion</td>
<td>Prefix of Focalizing conversion</td>
<td>Prefix of 1st past perfect tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʔEWNARɛ</td>
<td>ʔEPɛ ʔA</td>
<td>ʔENɛ ʔA</td>
<td>ʔEWNARɛ</td>
<td>ʔNɛA</td>
<td>ʔNɛɛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefix of circumstantial + Prefix of Aorist</td>
<td>Prefix of circumstantial / preterit + Prefix of 1st Future</td>
<td>Prefix of real conditional</td>
<td>Prefix of Preterit conversion + Prefix of 1st past perfect tense</td>
<td>Prefix of negative of 3rd Future tense</td>
<td>Prefix of negative 1st past tense</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grammatical references:

This use is not mentioned in the ancient Egyptian texts, but only in Coptic.

As Crum pointed out in CD, 675 but it is taken that he neglected the definition of the places of use, just mention the prefixes.

There is a recent article that includes the of ʔahmōi followed by ʔENɛ in all examples published by IFAO 2011, See; S.Bacot, Quatre Miracles de Saint Menas dans un Manuscrit Copte de l'IFAO (Inv.315-322), BIFAO, 111, 2011, P.35-73 especially P.54-56
2AMOI as an Interjection Particle

Layton\(^6^0\), in his Note N.499a, mentioned 2AMOI as main clauses of the exclamation of regret, expressed as a contrary-to-fact conditional. The grammatical construction of that use is\(^6^1\);

"How good it would have been if …were/had..., if only…were/had..."

There are a number of examples in the bible that apply this rule; we will discuss them as follow\(^6^3\):

- (ShChass 77:16-19) 2AMOI ENE ANG OYMai ZOMT AN AYW MAI PTE TE IOW IAN PE\(^6^4\) 'How good it would have been if I were not (if only I were not) greedy for money and for what does not belong to me'

---

59 Interjection: Group of words which express feeling, curses, and wishes or are used to initiate conversation. Their status as a grammatical category is debatable, as they behave strangely in respect to morphology, syntax, and semantics.


60 B.Layton, A Coptic Grammatical, P.414

61 This construction is standard in terms of using the verbal prefix, but ENE is the only prefix which follows 2AMOI as interjection particle.

62 The usage of ENE in Interjection sentence: ENE (E + NE)

As Satzinger pointed out that \(hn\) used as interjection particle with prefix of circumstantial equal 2AMOI + ENE In sense, what will be the case...? If not...This is the reason, in the researcher’s view, that the interjection sentence depends mainly on the interjection of a situation. So, her being is not complete without the presence of the situation. See; H.Satzinger, Der Konditionalsatz mit \(n\), P.109

Circumstantial: A clause marked by a special conversion as adnexal to another clause or noun/pronoun; often translatable as circumstance.

63 It is noted from the examples that have been studied in interjection context, it depends on the explanation of the meaning of more than one word in what is called redundancy as we read in ; ShChass 77:16-19; the speaker expresses himself in that he did not want to love money, and then he re-explained that this did not concern him, although the meaning became clear from the first expression. ShIv 180: 3-6; The speaker is exaggerated in his speech about what he wonders about except that they are people, whether they are sleeping or those who are still and he increased and expanded on that.

64 For Coptic Parallels with ENE plus independent pronoun ANG; See L.Stern, Koptische Grammatik, Leipzig, 1880, Par.630; W.Till, Koptische Grammatik, Munich, 1961, Par.456
The Coptic Particle  hamstring 'Oh would that': Applying on a comparison between The Ancient Egyptian texts and Coptic texts

- (Shlv 180: 3-6) hamstring  of the nest hawk  ταξι νεαν δε  η  τεγας  αγών  ινάραθον  ηναώω  ου  ναγνωπε  ηνετ  ουνα  αν τοικομηνε  ἑτηπεκαὶ  οῆε  μπιπαραδικο" 'if only people were not asleep (How good it would have been if people were not asleep) or intoxicated, except those who sleep at night, and if only many good things would befall those who inhabit the world so that the earth would come to be like paradise'

Note:
The previous examples, during which the researcher tried to add a more detailed overview of them, as the use of the particle as an exclamation Particle is actually one of the logical assumptions from the grammatical concept, but the researcher not believe that, because there is no sign of exclamation, either negatively or positively .

Reasons of use hamstring (2 hamstring) as a Conditional Particle

- Spiegelberg’s comment on Petubastis, Mythus examples, since he believed the priority of the conditional meaning of the sentences. In addition to his belief that hamstring has a conditional meaning in Heliopolis Myth.
- Erman's look at his dictionary, as he tends to assume conditionals, especially because hamstring is associated with the hortative particle hamstring. In addition to his Note N.820 that reinforced the same assumption.
- Satzinger published an entire article on the hypothetical that it is a conditional particle.
- Some of Onchsheshonqy examples mentioned hamstring as an unrealistic condition. As well as the use of rhwn-n3w as an irrealis particle in Myth examples.

Likewise applying on ancient Egyptian texts equal to Mythus has an example of rwn-h3n prefixed to a clause to form an irrealis excise in Demotic, but they are rare as the following example;
(P.Cairo 50072/ 6) rhwn-n3w ink p3 b3k (n) wήρ "if I were the servant of a Libyan", for ÑΕ uses see; J.Johnson, The Coptic conditional particles šan and Ene in demotic, JNES, 32, No.1/2, 1973, P.167-169

65 A.Gardiner, and M.De wit, Remarques sur la particle, P.289-290
66 A.Gardiner, and M.De wit, Remarques sur la particle, P.290-291
67 A.Erman, Wb, III,13
68 A.Erman, Neuägyptische Grammatik,P.416
69 H.Satzinger, Die Konditionalsatz mit hamstring, P.115
70 J.Johnson, Thus wrote Onchsheshonqy, PP.62,70,83,92
As Gardiner pointed out $h^3\overline{\|
lessor\rangle}$ or $hn\overline{\|
lessor\rangle}$ or $h3n3\overline{\|
lessor\rangle}$ or $hn\overline{\|}$; meant simple "IF" having lost any connections of desire. In the same meaning, it was referred to by Groll.

Layton selects it in his Note No.499b where mentioned 3AM01 + contrary to fact main clause.

**Important Note:**

The most important point is the presentation of the grammatical rule that $(hn)$ and its counterparts in the conditional sentences and knowing the linguistic and grammatical difference between $ir$, $inn$, $bs$ to resolve this problem, or rather to find out the difference between them, we have to look at the linguistic construction for them as follows:

**Table 3:** The grammatical constructions for $ir$, $inn$, $hn$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Real condition</th>
<th>Non-Literary texts</th>
<th>Stories (School texts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ir (EPE)$</td>
<td>$ir (EPE)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$inn (\lambda\eta\eta)$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential condition</td>
<td>$ir iw$</td>
<td>$ir iw/wn$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$inn iw$</td>
<td>$(EPE\ OYN)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreal condition</td>
<td>$h3n33$</td>
<td>$2\lambda\eta\eta1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$(\lambda\eta\eta\eta\eta)$</td>
<td>$bsi$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

71 Those examples are mentioned in the table 2
72 A.Gardiner, Remarques sur la Particle, P.291
73 S.Groll and Cerny, Late Egyptian Grammar, Rome, 1975, P.150
74 B.Layton, A Coptic Grammatical, P.414
75 We can say that there is a particle whose use is similar to the particle in question; or rather an alternative to it, but it is less used. That Particle is $bs$ "if only" used in unfulfilled conditional sentences. $bs$: particle for unfulfilled condition, as we read in; (P.Lancing 2,8) $bs.i$ $r\dot{h}.kw$ $shrw\ n\ ir.f\ ir.i\ sw\ n.k\ sdm.k$ as Satzinger points out; H.Satzinger, Neuagyptische Studien, P.113-114
76 H.Satzinger, Neuagyptische Studien, P.118

*It is clear from the previous table that the uses of the tools mentioned between them may differ, which may not be fundamental, but it must be taken into account.
If we take a closer look, we will find that there is a so-called initial Particle used in bound semantic expressions. Consequence relations and the semantic binding of clause are not restricted to sentences with initial particles, such as inn or hn. They are, however, clearly marked as such in this form. Although, these combinations are not very common, these clause combinations can be presented thus as follows in Table 4: inn, hn in bound semantic expression.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Member &quot;Protasis&quot;</th>
<th>Second Member &quot;Apodosis&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st past sdm.f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st present, 1st future Tw.f sdm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st present Wn m.di.f</td>
<td>1st Present Tw clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathic sentence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pret.sdm.f</td>
<td>3rd future (causative) imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bw.pw.f sdm</td>
<td>Cleft sentence Prospective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd future</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pret.sdm.f bw sdm.f</td>
<td>Wn + 3rd future iw clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal sentence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st present Wn m.di.f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The previous grammatical structures are exactly the structures on which the Coptic sentence containing the particle continued. As for the definition of grammatical

77 Bound semantic expression: Topicalization constructions with an independent sentence (apodosis), proceeded by an initial dependent clause (Protasis) provide one means of expression conditionally. It will be covered in detail in the next pages.

78 F.Junge, LEG, P.267

79 T.Shehab-eldin, the Arabic Equivalent of the Egyptian Conditional Particle ir, JGUAA, 3, 2002, p.30

Note that: ir (ΕΦΕ) as it is used to mean the conditional also means hypothetical wishing.

80 Sentence with Inn will be encountered only in texts from daily life.

81 Cleft sentence: A construction in which a non-verbal element (noun, pronoun or adverbial) is marked as focus and a verb is marked as topic.

82 Prospective: relating to or effective in the future.

83 Pret = abbreviation of Preterit conversion in circumstantial
constructions for *hn* in conditional sentence, it is as shown in Table 5: *hn* in conditional sentence\(^{84}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Protasis</th>
<th>Apodosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Pret.sdm.f</em></td>
<td><em>Wn (bn) iwf (r) sdm</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>bw sdm.f</em></td>
<td><em>bs</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>1(^{st}) present</em></td>
<td><em>Tw f iwi</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Wn m di.f</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cleft sentence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We should pause here, the grammatical constructions used in ancient Egypt clearly continued in the same way, but the only difference was that most of the uses were for the conditional, while in Coptic, as it will become clear, they were for each use separately.

**ΣΑΜΟΙ as a Conditional Particle in Coptic**

1- **Real conditional**

It is the condition that can occur, or rather the real condition, so called (Open conditional) by *εψωπε*\(^{86}\) according to the following grammatical construction:

\[
\text{εψωπε} \quad + \quad \begin{cases} 
\text{Main clause} \\
\text{or} \\
\text{Circumstantial clause by ε}
\end{cases}
\]

There is an example in the bible that applies this rule; we will discuss it as follow:

(BMIS 269)  **ΣΑΜΟΙ ΕΨΩΠΕ ΕΠΣΗΤ Ν ΠΛΑΓΙΟΣ ΜΕΡΚΟΥΡΙΟΣ ΤΗΝ ΠΙΜΜΑΝ Ε ΚΩΤ ΕΡΟΥ Ν ΟΥΜΑΡΤΥΡΙΟΝ** (IF really the heart of St. Macarius would be gracious unto us who build his Martyrium.)

---

\(^{84}\) H.Satzinger, Neüagyptische Studien, P.113

\(^{85}\) Of course, what is meant here is *hn* ṑ and its derivatives.

\(^{86}\) For using of *εψωπε* in Coptic conditional sentence, see; D.Young, Esophage and the conditional conjugation, JNES, 21, No.3, 1962, P.175-185; D.Huttar, Conditional sentences in Coptic, PhD thesis, Brandeis University, 1962, P.54-73
The Coptic Particle وم٢٥٣ 'Oh would that': Applying on a comparison between The Ancient Egyptian texts and Coptic texts

2- Contrary to fact Particle

The grammatical construction of that use is;

Verbal sentence

 קטנה (Apodosis) + Main clause

Preterit conversion in circumstantial+ 1st future

How good it would have been if …were/had…
If only…were/had...

Nominal sentence

There are a number of examples in the bible that apply this rule; we will discuss them as follow:

- (Gal 5:12) ‫_rating(Apodosis) + Main clause‬

If only you would stop here!

- (ShIII 83:5) ‫_rating(Preterit conversion in circumstantial+ 1st future)‬

I only wish that, I could find a fish, my father, and if I could obtain one I would rejoice

- (BMIS 382) ‫_rating(Preterit conversion in circumstantial+ 1st future)‬

-if only the lord would grant us to turn our cheek to anyone who strikes us)

- (ShlV 116:23-24 ) ‫_rating(Preterit conversion in circumstantial+ 1st future)‬

(if only there were forgiveness for them! instead, they will receive additional punishments because of the thefts they committed)

Contrary to fact: an unrealistic condition expresses a hypothetical condition that is impossible to occur in reality; Any condition that is supposed to occur theoretically, and the answer to the condition expresses a hypothetical event that is supposed to occur if the condition is fulfilled.

For more information about Coptic conditional, see; D.Huttar, Conditional sentences in Coptic, PhD thesis , Brandeis University, 1962; D.Young, Unfulfilled conditions in Shenoute's dialect, JAOS, 89, No.2, 1969, P.399-407  
B.Dniel, Coptic language, P.425

Verbal Main clause; ‫_rating(Preterit conversion in circumstantial+ 1st future)‬‬ or ‫_rating(Preterit conversion in circumstantial+ 1st future)‬

Nominal main clause; ‫_rating(Preterit conversion in circumstantial+ 1st future)‬

Using of Preterit conversion نا + 1st future نا; Came to express unreal events that are completely far from reality and impossible to happen. These events were foreseen as a future that will happen, but they did not happen (I wish this had happened). The unrealistic result is used future durative sentence in preterit conversion or nominal sentence in preterit conversion.
(AM 229) "ΔΑΜΟΙ ΝΑΙΝΑΣΧΕΜΑΧΟΝ ΟΝ ἹΝΟΥ ΠΕ ΖΕΟΥΟΘΒΕΚ ΖΩΚ ἘΒΟΛΒΕΝ ΤΠΑΛΑΝΗ ΝΝΑΒΛΟΝ ΕΕΡΡΠΡΟΣΕΝΕΓΓΙΝ ΜΜΟΚ ΜΦΤ ΕΤΟΝ ᾽ΧΕ ΣΙΝΑΛΕΘΕΤ ΝΑΚ ᾽ΗΝΟΥΨΗ ΝΕΝΕΣ2 (if only, I could to heaven still I could snatch you too from the error of idols to bring you to the living god, so that he may give you eternal life)

(Mun.100) ΔΑΜΟΙ ΟΝ ΝΕΥΝΑΤΛΟΓΟΣ ΢ΑΡΟΟΥ ΝΟΙΝΕΙΑΤΚΩΤΜ ΕΤΜΜΑΥ (If only really I could give them the words to listen there).

Note:
The researcher believes that this rule, or rather that grammatical hypothesis is the most obvious of the rules, and it is the closest to the demotic point of view in the use of "IF".

Reasons of use h3my (ΔΑΜΟΙ) as a Hypothetical wish Particle

- The Texts which published by Glanville show as the use of hmy as an hypothetical wish particle, in addition to Anstati Papyrus I, IV texts.
- There are three unpublished texts dating back to dynasty 21 in Moscow Museum strongly reinforced use of h3n3 as a hypothetical particle in addition to Erman's Note N.689.
- The examples given by Till in his article, explain the use of h3nw as a hypothetical wish particle.
- The Examples in "Onchsheshonqy", and Heliopolis myth gave us hmy an optional meaning that is optative thinking.
- Some of the few texts mentioned h3 as a hypothetical wish particle.
- heavy pointed out divided use of ΔΑΜΟΙ into two parts; hypothetical wish, hypothetical result.

Hypothetical wish expression: expressions for involving or being based on a suggested idea or theory.

Texts published by Glanville make clear the use of prepositions after hmy as in "Onchshachenqy (10.11-10.25; 11,1-11,4) See C.De wit, La Particle demotique, P.17-18

Those examples are mentioned in the table 2.


A.Erman, Neuagyptische Grammatik, P.345
W.Till, Der Irrealis im Neuägyptischen, ZÄS, P.116
J.Johnson, Thus wrote "Onchsheshonqy, PP.62,70,83,92
W.Speigelberg, Der Ägyptische Mythus, P.497-499
Optative: a special conjugation form expressing wish, prayer, promise, prophecy etc.
The Coptic Particle onium 'Oh would that': Applying on a comparison between The Ancient Egyptian texts and Coptic texts

Hypothetical wish by onium
The grammatical construction of that use is;

\[
\text{onium ene} \quad \text{onium ne/ nape}
\]

There are a number of examples in the bible that apply this rule; we will discuss them as follow:\textsuperscript{101}:

- (ShMing 92a: 20-24) onium on e anon ioniainen mtntn an əm ənewb nem (How good it would it would be if we were not lazy in everything)
- (ShIv 92:18) onium ne anon oua mmooy (How good it would be if we were one of them)
- (ShIII 83) onium on nwatetnəw nteisə pe (wish you would stay like this)
- (ShIV 66) onium eneydokimaze mmooy nqorti pe (wish they would test them first)
- (AM 270) onium lioi mpêcke smot pe\textsuperscript{102} paih on diôncioi oti nêqht éพบht ebolben ma eema eçkhat éqơxexex rômôj nxe savelioc (would to heaven that I had also succeeded him in grace in the same way also the great Denis had to city and city hide himself persecuted as he was by Sabellius)
- (2Cor11,1) onium napetennæpexeccoem 'mmoî 'nêqkoymi ãen tamedatnht alla woynht nemhî (Oh that, you would bear with me in a little folly and indeed you do bear with me)
- (BMIS 261) onium mîp eizw e pei wîpe wîm m pei zoroma xe eçexooç m pçêisht xe qetanqoyt e nizwb (oh would that I had never related this dream to the young man and would that he had not told it to his father became he trusted me in this matter)

\textsuperscript{100} Sh.Healvy, Coptic Grammatical, P.141-142
\textsuperscript{101} It is assumed that all the examples fall within the scope of the unreal will, so it is expressed through preterit conversion or circumstantial.
\textsuperscript{102} For using pe with 1\textsuperscript{st} past perfect tense, see; G.steindorff, Lehrbuch Koptische, P.156.

As for using particle pe in sentence see,

R.Fawzy, The particle pw in ancient Egyptian language, MA thesis, Faculty of arts, Alexandria University, 2016
(I Cor 4,8) οὐχι αἐμοὶ νεαρεπετενεροῦρο ｚινα ἀνὸν ｚων
´ντενερφφυρνουρο νεμωτεν (wish you own in order to we also own with you)
(P 131.8 94 Ro) ｚαμοὶ ενερενετο ηςμαλ ηπιμαμμωνας νακω
ηςενωβηρ ηννετο ηςμαλ μπεξε ｚνουμε (How good it would it be if
the servants of Mammunas wonders are forgiven, by those who are truly servant of
the right lord)

Note:
All previous examples fall under the scope of hypothetical wish, but the hypothetical
result, somewhat follows another grammatical construction;

Hypothetical result\(^{103}\) by ｚαμοὶ
The grammatical construction of that use is;

\[\text{ｚαμοὶ} + \text{Past future}\(^{104}\) + \text{Nominal sentence}; \ldots \text{πε}\]

We can apply this to what is stated in;
(ShIV 9) ｚαμοὶ ενεταυμουρ ηνουωνε νεκε επευμακς νεεομςογ νεηπελαγος
νθαλακκα αυω νεερννορπε ναγ πε ηπιπκειουδας ηςογο
ετρευμερεπεπαζογ (How good it would be if they tie a millstone to their neck and
divine into the depths of the sea, and it would be better for them, with Judas, too, to love
the curse)

As for the use of ｚαμοὶ without verbal prefixes, it came as follows\(^{105}\);

\[\text{(EW 45) Χε ου πετενναΑιφ ζαμοὶ νιτενωωιτιμμαγατου νε άλλα
} \\text{ανον ｚων τεναμου ᾱην παι ωαε ϑεν πιιβι (what shall we do? If}
\text{only (would that) the beasts, but we ourselves will perish of thirst in this wilderness)}\]
\[\text{(H, I: Cxlvii) ουος ύεμι χεφι εθεεες εβαλ ϊνρατ ου χε πε}
\text{ζαμοπε ηπακκηκ ｏυ πε τεκαπολογία (and say that he was not aware}
\text{of what he wrote, and knew not what he was doing, Oh that he committed himself}
\text{unwittingly to that of which he had no cognizance)}\(^{106}\)

\(^{103}\) Following a remote Protasis (ενε + πε) as we pointed out in previous grammatical
construction
\(^{104}\) Past Future: i.e. Preterit conversion + 1st Future tense.
\(^{105}\) Did not specify the purpose of use ｚαμοὶ without verbal prefixes, but it could be a matter of
linguistic diversity, nothing more.
\(^{106}\) Rather, Oh, I wish I didn't that act
The Coptic Particle "Oh would that": Applying on a comparison between The Ancient Egyptian texts and Coptic texts

Reasons of use for the term "h3my" (άμοι) as a Bound semantic Expression (Impersonal expression)

- The modular construction by Jung.
- The Grammatical construction of Particle suitable to be expression.
- Layton, in his Note N.487d mentioned that there is a small list of 'Impersonal Predicates', among that list, h3my had been mentioned in the sense "How good it would be if ..., if only..."

- h3my as an impersonal expression
  The grammatical construction of that use is:

This construction proceeds by; Preposition e, conjunction xe or in conjunctive, there are a number of examples in the bible that apply this rule; we will discuss them as follow, Note: This use it does not have a subject, but entity statement as a subject.

- (JKP 2, 242) h3my eixeĩ mpoypio...nixowpe tikkwe einwaxe...tcoyowt enanoyte pope (Oh would that you came and heard us more strongly, that begged our god)

107 Impersonal expression: A third person pronoun with no reference to any specific noun; a clause in which such a pronoun serves as theme.
108 F. Jung, Late Egyptian Grammar, P.266
109 Specifically, the grammatical construction of this structure depends on the conjunction.
110 B. Layton, A Coptic Grammatical, P.394
111 xe: subordinating conjunction particle give a causal meaning. As for its use with h3my as an impersonal particle it goes back to the nature of the sentence itself, so the sentence in which h3my is used in it as an impersonal particle is basically semantic bound sentence. So, of course, it is used subordinating conjunction as xe.

For conjunction particle in Coptic, see;
D. Bekhet, Conjunction particles of ancient Egyptian origin, MA thesis, Faculty of arts, Alexandria University, 2017
112 Actually, there is no subject, but the subordinate clause explain and clarify subject (implicitly)
Finally
After studying all the suggestions and uses, we have to ask a very important question that may be the key to studying the particle in the first place. What is the criterion on the basis of which the use of ΣΑΜΩΙ is determined if it is interjection particle, contrary to fact particle, a hypothetical wish particle, or an impersonal expression?

The answer depends on the grammatical structure of each of them as follows; 114

- If it is an Interjection Particle
It must express an affirmative opinion in which the speaker shows what he says and insists on it through the use of aphorisms, overstatements, similes, metaphors, or repetition of words.
It should be noted here that it is not an interrogative sentence, as some think, while it is an emotional sentence accompanied by emotions.

113 The same paragraph was found in (Nu 14,2) ΞΕΑΜΩΙ ΕΝΕ ΑΝΜΟΥ ΠΕ ΧΕ ΑΝΟΙΕΡΒΩΤ ΕΒΟΛ ΗΤΕΝ ΠΟΟΙΚ ΠΟΙΤΕ ΕΝΖΕΜΟΙ ΠΩΙΕΝ ΝΙΛΕΒΗΣ ΝΑΠ ΟΥΟΣ ΕΝΟΥΕΜ ΟΙΚ Ε ΠΣΙ ΧΕ ΑΤΕΤΕΝΕΝ ΕΒΟΛ Ε ΠΑΙΨΑΧΕ Ε ΒΩΤΕΒ ΝΤΑΙΣΥΝΑΓΩΓΗ ΤΗΡΗ ΝΤΕΝ ΠΙΣΚΟ (would we wish we had died in the land of Egypt, or we wished we had died in the wilderness)

114 Those answers and conclusions that the researcher will present to them are the summary of her personal concept of the tool and how to differentiate between each use based on Coptic grammatical references, and personal mental comparisons. For more detailed information see; B.Daniel, Coptic language grammar: Sahidic dialect, 1st edition, 2020; B.Layton, A Coptic Grammatical with chrestomathy and Glossary, sahidic dialect, Wiesbaden: Hamassowitz verlag, 2000; G.Stiendorff, Lehrbuch der koptischen Grammatik, Chicago, 1951; Sh.Healvy, Coptic Grammatical chrestomathy: a course for academic and private study: Louvian: peeters, 1988, Th.Mina, Coptic Grammar, Sahidic dialect, Egypt, 2019, P.755-757, 786-787
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- If it is a Contrary to fact Particle
  It must express a hypothetical condition that is impossible to occur in reality, that is, the conditional statement expresses a condition that is supposed to occur theoretically, and Apodosis in main clause by 2AMOi expresses a hypothetical event that is supposed to occur if the condition is fulfilled.

- If it is a hypothetical wish Particle
  It must express a wish that was supposed to happen, but it did not happen, or rather it is not possible to happen, and it is closer to the unrealistic condition, and they may be equal. But the only difference is that wishful thinking is more used for emotional verbs than the conditional. Therefore, it is expressed in the past tense of the main clause and the future tense of the subordinate clause.

- If it is an Impersonal expression
  It must express the following meaning (it was necessary for this to happen) must be expressed by a person or thing, but that person or thing causing this action is not explicitly mentioned, meaning that the sentence is empty of the ascribed to it, but it expresses it by “it appears that...” Indicate that this expression uses conjunctive and conjunction particles.

Conclusion:

1- Sometimes the meaning of optative is very close to the conditional meaning, this needs a particle that is attributed to it, that was the particle 2AMOi. Therefore, the researcher suggested that the particle be among the so-called dual-use particles.

2- The most logical and reasonable use is to use it as a conditional particle, or rather a conditional optative (hypothetical wish).

3- The most complex problem is the difficulty of determining the identity of the particle due to the conflicting assumptions of scientists.

4- The Coptic linguistic viewpoint is the most reasonable and diverse, or rather the most clearly, because it took into account assumptions that were put forward for the first time.

5- The Examples mentioned 2AMOi in Coptic grammar references depended on some verbal prefixes, while have been neglected many and many others verbal prefixes, which is no less important than the similar ones that have been referred to by linguists scholars.
6- The multiplicity of verbal prefixes used before the particle in Coptic, The multiplicity of actual prefixes used before the participle in Coptic makes examples unique and striking those that were never spelled out before Coptic.

7- It is noted that the use of adverbs and prepositions with the particle in Coptic, was the same case in the ancient Egyptian examples.

8- If we want to include the Particle under a specific category of Particle, it will be included under the so-called dual-use particle. As for the multiplicity of linguistic derivations, it is to make it so exceptionally.
**Linguistic Terms List**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apodosis</td>
<td>The main clause of a conditional sentence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aorist</td>
<td>A special conjugation form of expression general, natural or habitual action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circumstantial</td>
<td>A clause marked by a special conversion as adnexal to another clause or noun/pronoun; often translatable as circumstance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrary-to Fact Particle</td>
<td>An unrealistic condition expresses a hypothetical condition that is impossible to occur in reality; Any condition that is supposed to occur theoretically, and the answer to the condition expresses a hypothetical event that is supposed to occur if the condition is fulfilled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleft sentence</td>
<td>A construction in which a non-verbal element (noun, pronoun or adverbial) is marked as focus and a verb is marked as topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Converters</td>
<td>The Morphosyntactic phenomenon of marking the syntactic status of a clause; a set of prefixed morphemes marking the syntactic status of a clause.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunctive</td>
<td>A special dependent conjugation form expressing mainly extending of a preceding verb form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hortative</td>
<td>Latin linguistic term for giving exhortation (More simply, it means guidance and warning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothetical</td>
<td>Expressions term for involving or being based on a suggested idea or theory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>An addressed verb form expressing command or direct request.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal expression</td>
<td>A third person pronoun with no reference to any specific noun; a clause in which such a pronoun serves as theme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>The first letter of a name, word, or division.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interjection</td>
<td>Group of words which express feeling, curses, and wishes or are used to initiate conversation. Their status as a grammatical category is debatable, as they behave strangely in respect to morphology, syntax, and semantics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-enclitic Particle</td>
<td>The term stated as existing in an existential statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protasis</td>
<td>The subordinate clause of a conditional sentence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prototype</td>
<td>An original model or proto-image of all representatives of the meaning of a word or of a 'category'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preterit conversion</td>
<td>Term for past tense in languages that do not distinguished between aorist, imperfect, and perfect. The preterit describes something that is completed before the speech act it occurs in, and its thus primarily used for epic narrative. Rather, term used collectively for the perfect, imperfect, and past perfect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective</td>
<td>Relating to or effective in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prototype</td>
<td>An original model or proto-image of all representatives of the meaning of a word or of a 'category'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic Bound construction</td>
<td>Topicalization constructions with an independent sentence (apodosis), proceeded by an initial dependent clause (Protasis) provide one means of expression conditionally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summa</td>
<td>Akkadian particle, which introduces the normal equivalent of the conditional sentence; it's always followed by the verb in the indicative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Synonym</strong></td>
<td>One of two or more words or expressions of the same language that have the same or nearly the same meaning in some or all senses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Egyptology abbreviations List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Petubastis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Karnak- Nord IV</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barguet,P. and Leclant, J., (1954) Karnak-Nord, IV (1949-1951) Fouilles conduits par Cl.Robichon (, FIFAO, 25, Fig.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mythus</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Onchsheshonqy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P.Cairo 50072</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P.Chester Beatty 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P.Louvre E 4892+PBM 10181</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuentz,C., (1928-34) La Bataille de Qadech (MIFAO 55), Cairo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P.Moscow 120</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P.Moscow 127</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PBM 10052</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anstasi I</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Wente, Letters from Ancient Egypt (SBL Writings from the Ancient World Series 1), Atlanta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anstasi IV</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PBN 196.II</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ShChass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Gal          | Galantians  
| P            | Paris, Bibliotheque National, fonde Copte |
| BMIS         | Budge, W., (1915) Miscellaneous Coptic texts in the dialect of Upper Egypt, London. |
| Cor          | Corinthians 
| EX           | Exodus 
| CG           | Mikhail, M., (2019) On Cana and Galilee, A sermon by the Coptic patriarch benjamin I, USA. |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Dictionaries abbreviations List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Er</td>
<td>Erichsen, W., (1954) Demotisches Glossar, Munksgaard, Kopenhagen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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