DIVERSIONS OF JUNCTURE
ON SHENOUTEAN ANACOLUTHIA, AND
OTHER PUZZLES OF UNEXPECTED SYNTAX

By Ariel Shisha-Halevy

"The object of interest to linguistic theory are texts"
(Louis Hjelmslev, *Prolegomena to a Science of Language*
[1961], p.16)
* * *

L'élève Hamlet:
C'est exact, monsieur le professeur,
Je suis "où" je ne suis pas.
Et, dans le fond, hein, à la réflexion,
Être "où" ne pas être,
C'est peut-être aussi la question.
(Jacques Prévert, "L'accent grave", *Paroles* [1949])
* * *

This paper consists of two parts. The first (§1 etc.) is a special commented mini-chrestomathy: I present grammatically classified Shenoutean passages, briefly commenting on their structure and analytic implications. Thereafter (§2 etc., "postliminaries"), I will share with the reader, at some length, reflections on issues arising from consideration of these texts, beginning with a discussion of the meaning and significance of the anacoluthia concept, in a language such as Coptic.[1]

The texts themselves are chosen for their irregularity, or peculiarity, or syntactical complexity, or analytic difficulty, or consequential implications. The passages hardly represent the gamut of special syntax in Coptic grammar. For reasons of space, they are harshly selective, and hardly even representative. The classification is approximative, following the most striking category or feature illustrated. In fact, this paper follows to a degree in the footsteps of a special, insightful structuralist work, deserving of far greater recognition than it has had, namely Henri Frei's *La Grammaire des fautes* (Paris 1929); 'mistakes' to be understood (with the boldest quotes) as valuably indicative phenomena of grammar. For

---

[1] Abbreviations used: CS = Cleft Sentence, DS = *Disiunctio Sinuthiana*, NS = Nominal Sentence, PN = Proper Name, US = "Unexpected Syntax".

here we have, even beyond Shenoute's *parole* and *usage* (and stylistic signature fingerprint) clues to his idiolectal *langue* and idiom. This is the first *raison d'être* of this treatise.[2] A second point concerns juncture, which is paramount and informs most of the constructions presented. A third *raison d'être*, not last and certainly not least, is the need to leave the box of post-Polotsky conception of Coptic grammar, and turn to other trails and levels, such as expressive or colloquial syntax. I will try and address the question of grammatical deviation from (our conceived) norms in a half-understood dead language such as Coptic.[3]

Two final notes, regarding the quoted texts and their translation. For reasons of space, I have to be niggardly in the range quoted, and must content myself with the grammatically most essential cotext. The translation is painfully approximate. I admit to a dislike of total translation in works of grammar, because of this approximateness; first, due to the unavoidable clash between Coptic and the target language — a clash different in the case of e.g. English, or French, or Hebrew. Second, due to the fact that our knowledge of Coptic is still partial — new grammar-books notwithstanding — and does not warrant a confident total translation. At any rate, the translation of a passage here does not reflect its grammatical analysis or structure.

1. A conspectus of types: illustration and brief analytic discussion
    1.1   Narrative and rhetorical functions. Tensing
    1.2   Protases and apodoses
           1.2.1   Protatics
           1.2.2   Apodotics. Post-imperative syntax. Responsive syntax
           1.2.3   Protasis-apodosis complexes
    1.3   Information packaging. Focalization. Topicalization

---

[2] My warm thanks are due to my friends and colleagues in Shenoute, Anne Boud'hors, Stephen Emmel, Wolf-Peter Funk, Bentley Layton and Fred Wisse, for their patient help and advice. Many of my observations echo Anne's sensitive translation and annotation on her rich and difficult Canon Eight (Boud'hors 2013a).

[3] The references to Shenoute sources, (other than the Emmel-Orlandi codex codes, for which see Emmel 2004) or other MS collections codes, or literary categories) are as follows (note that the texts are generally uncollated; this is especially significant in the case of Amélineau's edition):

Amél. = Amélineau E. C., *Œuvres de Schenoudi*, 1907-1914. Chass.= Chassinat, É., *Le quatrième livre des entretiens et épîtres de Shenouti*, 1911. De Iudicio = Behlmer, H., *Schenute von Atripe: De Iudicio,* 1996. Leip.= Leipoldt, J., *Sinuthii Archimandritae Vita et Opera Omnia, III-IV*, 1908, 1913. The Canon 7 texts, edited by Wisse, are as yet unpublished; the paragraph division used here is the editor's working division.

*   *   *

1.1 Narrative and rhetorical functions.[4] Tensing

(1) Chass. 105 ϯⲛⲁϫⲉⲡⲉⲓⲕⲉⲟⲩⲁ ⲟⲛ ⲟⲩϣⲃⲏⲣ ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁϥϫⲛⲟⲩⲓ ⲉⲛⲛⲁⲙⲟⲩⲣ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲧⲉⲥⲥⲉⲣⲁⲕⲟⲥⲧⲏ...

> Episodic narrative opening. This is a different syntactic entity from the focalizing or polemic Cleft Sentence (CS); a so-called Presentational pattern, its distinct structure is evident (indefinite noun, no conversion, affirmation only, text-initial position etc.). As a narrative texteme, it is brief and formalized (mainly *verba dicendi*). The next passage illustrates

---

[4] Cf. Shisha-Halevy 2007, § 1.1.1 and *passim*; 2011.

a similar case, but opening a *paradeigma* or parable texteme, with developed narrative properties.

I'll tell also that other one. A friend asked me, as we were about to be binding (fasting) for Lent.

(2) Chass. 103 ογρωμε πετεογνταϥ ммаγ ηϣηρε cnaγ aϥϣωωτ мпмасε ετcanaϣτ πογa мεη aϥϯnaϥ ηϥτοογ ммεροc πκεογa δε aϥϯnaϥ ηογмεροc ηογωτ...

A similar pattern opens parabolic narrative. Note that the possession verboid is atemporal, like the parable itself — neither Present, nor past; the Perfect is the basic *"zéro de narration"* (Benveniste).

There was a man who had two sons. He killed the fattened calf. One he gave four parts, the other he gave a single part.

(3) Leip. III 104 aγcoϣϥ aγnεχπα6cε ε2ογn ε2ραϥ aγ2εвcπεϥ2o aγ2ιoγε εροϥ aγcωвε ммoϥ aγϯκλψ εχωϥ...

Asyndetic narrative, consisting of numerous concatenated "linguistic events" is semi-vectorial — the order is not really significant — yet iconic, (and thus unlike non-narrative list or catalogic asyndesis, but not unlike hyper-events expressed by two or three asyndetic concatenated affirmative Perfects, similarly iconic). This construction enhances or intensifies the narrative drama.

They hit Him, spat in His face, covered His face, struck him, mocked Him, dealt him blows on the head.

(4) Leip. III 110 aιnaγ on εκεογa ητϯмιnε ητερεϥcωnτ ηcaoγ2ηaaγ ερηειмηтco6 ηoγωτ η2ητϥ aγω aγϯκεογa ετεϥ6ιχ

Continued vision narrative. Note the superordination by aγω ("at that point", "then").

I also saw another of that kind. When he looked for something to do those same acts of folly with, they put another in his hand.

(5) Leip. III 209f. κε2ωon on εϥπρεϣογ ηογκογει н εϥογoвϣ aιnaγ εροϥ aιnaγ εροϥ εaϥει ετooτογ ηnετoγωм ммoϥ

Continuing (internal beginning) of vision narrative. Note the sequencing (placement of "I saw").

I also saw another animal, slightly shining or white. I saw it as it fell into the hands of those who would devour it.

(6) Leip. III 203 ⲉⲣϣⲁⲛⲃⲱⲕ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲛⲟⲩⲏⲓ ⲛⲉϣⲁⲣⲉϣⲗⲏⲗ
ⲉⲣϣⲁⲛⲉⲓ ⲇⲉ ⲟⲛ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϣⲁⲣⲉϣⲗⲏⲗ
ⲉⲣϣⲁⲛϩⲙⲟⲟⲥ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ϣⲁⲣⲉⲱϣⲥ
ⲁⲩⲱ ⲟⲛ
ⲉⲣϣⲁⲛⲧⲱⲟⲩⲛ ϣⲁⲣⲉⲙⲉⲗⲉⲧⲁ ⲉⲣⲉⲙⲟⲟϣⲉ ⲉⲡⲓⲥⲁ ⲙⲛⲡⲁⲓ
ⲉⲣϣⲁⲛⲃⲱⲕ ⲇⲉ ⲟⲛ ⲉⲛⲟⲩⲏⲓ ϣⲁⲣⲉⲭⲁϩⲙⲉ
ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲣϣⲁⲛⲉⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϣⲁⲣⲉⲥⲟⲟϥⲉ ⲛⲥⲁⲡⲉⲓⲥⲁ ⲙⲛⲡⲁⲓ

> Abrupt rhythmical transition, **from narrative to dialogue**. Sarcastic rhetorical address, in prophetic 2nd fem. sgl, to the Congregation/ "Daughter of Zion". (I read ⲱϣⲥ as "read"). Alternatively, this is all narrative, with the narrativizing converter ⲛⲉ- governing the entire passage.

Whenever you entered your house, you would pray; when you sit down, you read; and also, when you arise, you meditate, walking here and there — and when you go home, you defile yourself; and when you go out, you pollute yourself, here and there.

(7) Chass. 31 ⲉϣϫⲉ-ⲟⲩⲛⲧⲁⲕϩⲉⲛⲥⲏϥⲉ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲉⲓϣ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ
ⲙⲛⲧⲁⲕ

> The existential verboids ⲟⲩⲛⲧⲁ= and ⲙⲛⲧⲁ= are not Present tense, but atemporal; the same seems to apply to the statements of existence/non-existence ⲟⲩⲛ- and ⲙⲛ-.

If you ever had swords, now you don't.

(8) Leip. III 42 ⲛⲑⲉ ⲛⲟⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛⲣⲣⲟ ⲉⲩⲛⲧⲁϥ ⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲛϩⲉⲛϩⲙϩⲁⲗ
ϩⲛⲟⲩⲭⲱⲣⲁ ⲉⲁϥϫⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲥⲱⲟⲩ ϩⲙⲡⲥⲏⲩ ⲉⲧⲉϥⲛⲁⲣϩⲛⲁϥ ⲁⲩⲱ
ϩⲟⲓⲛⲉ ⲉⲁϥϫⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲥⲱⲟⲩ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲁϩⲉⲛϩⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲛⲁϣⲱⲟⲩ…

> The verboid of possession in narrative is not Present-tensed, but atemporal.

Like a royal person who had servants in some country, and sent for them anytime he would like; some he sent for after many days.

(9) Leip. III 202 ⲉϫⲟⲟⲥ ⲛⲉ ϫⲉⲛⲟⲩⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲥⲉⲛⲁϣⲧ
…to tell you that your sins are grave.

(10) Amél. II 392 ⲉϫⲟⲟⲥ ⲇⲉ ϫⲉⲙⲡⲟⲩϫⲓⲃⲁⲡⲧⲓⲥⲙⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲡⲉⲧⲟ
ⲙⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ ϫⲉⲁⲩϫⲓ
To say they have not been baptized — who testified that they have?

(11) Cod. XO 95 (Boud'hors *Canon 8*) ⲉⲓϣⲁⲛϫⲟⲟⲥ ϫⲉⲭⲁⲓⲣⲉ
ⲉϥⲧⲱⲛ ⲡⲣⲁϣⲉ ⲏ ⲛⲁϣⲱϥ ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ⲡⲣⲁϣⲉ (cf. also Cod. XO
Boud'hors *Canon 8,* 82, 88).

If I say 'ⲭⲁⲓⲣⲉ' ('rejoicel!'), where is the joy? Or is it abundant,
the joy?

(12) Cod. DS 28f. (Orlandi, *Contra Origenistas* 343) ⲉϣϫⲉ ⲛⲧⲉⲓϩⲉ
ⲁⲛ ⲧⲉ ⲉⲓⲉϫⲟⲟⲥ ⲛⲧⲟⲟⲩⲛ ϫⲉ…

If things are not like that, say henceforth.

(13) Chass. 65 ⲥⲱⲧⲙ ϭⲉ ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛⲧⲁⲩⲧⲁϣⲉⲟⲉⲓϣ
ⲙⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲱⲛϩ ⲡⲉⲭⲥ ⲓⲥ ⲡϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲛⲑⲉ ⲛⲅⲁⲃⲣⲓⲏⲗ
ⲙⲛⲛⲕⲟⲟⲩⲉ

Now then, listen: after all, the angels proclaimed the Light and
Life, Jesus Christ the Lord, like Gabriel and the others.

Also the ⲛⲧⲉⲓϩⲉ ⲟⲛ ⲡⲉ (ⲛ-) set, see §1.9 below; ⲁⲗⲗⲟ X ⲁⲗⲗⲟ
Y: see below, §1.9: *How can you compare X and Y?*

> Here are four argumental-technical terms, initial-boundary signals,
> opening chunks or blocks, almost all high-level topics. Rather improb-
> ably (6th-century chronology notwithstanding), they put one in mind
> of (Babylonian) Talmudic Hebrew or Aramaic correspondents[5]. The
> Coptic terms have several sub-functions; they are difficult to translate.
> Without claiming direct Rabbinical contacts, there may be under-
> ground missing links, or a common source, or some kind of interference
> — Philo of Alexandria, Greek or Persian traditional methodology and
> technical terminology — speculation runs wild; but Shenoute's argu-
> mentative rhetoric does evoke other systems.[6] Further wide-scope study
> is obviously required; Shenoute's use of Greek learned "particle amal-
> gams" and adverbials, word order, focalization, his exegetic technique
> and so on, all seem relevant.

(See §1.13 for narrative roles of the Conjunctive; § 1.10 for place-
ment issues).

<p style="text-align:center">*   *   *</p>

---

[5] Like … כהרי … לא הרי, תא שמע, אמור מעתה, יכול לומר, אם תמצי לומר, תלמוד לומר …
and many more.

[6] See Bacher 1899-1905.

1.2 Protases and apodoses

Protases and apodoses, in the broadest syntactic sense, constitute probably the most striking scatter of Unexpected Syntax, including various putative anacolutha and other constructions of interest. The apodosis and the protasis, each taken on its own, present distinct subsystem, and their combination poses questions of its own. (Note, for instance, that the Imperative may be protatic, where it is followed by an apodotic form; responsive syntax may be apodotic in relation to its allocution.)

<center>*   *   *</center>

1.2.1 *Protatics*

(14) Leip. IV 94 ⲉⲛⲉϩⲛⲟⲩⲙⲛⲧϩⲁϩ ⲛϣⲁϫⲉ ⲛⲉⲩⲛⲁϣϭⲙϭⲟⲙ ⲁⲛ ⲛⲁⲡⲁⲧⲁ ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲣⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲟⲩⲃⲉⲛⲉⲧϩⲛⲛⲉⲓⲧⲟⲡⲟⲥ

> The protasis consists here of a pattern found only *in protasi* — *zero* situational theme, adverbial rheme.

Were it not by loquacity, they couldn't have led him, who watches over those who live in these abodes, astray.

(15) Leip. IV 156 ⲉⲛⲉⲉⲧⲃⲉⲧⲁⲅⲁⲡⲏ ⲁⲛ ⲛⲓⲥ ⲛⲉⲓϫⲱ ⲛⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉⲟⲩ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲁⲣⲟⲟⲩϣ ⲏ ⲁϩⲣⲟⲓ ⲙⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ ϫⲉⲉⲩⲟⲩⲱⲙ ⲛⲁϣ ⲛϩⲉ

> A remarkable *irrealis* protasis, probably schematizable as {#FOCUS + TOPIC# + APODOSIS}, with the topical internal conversion ⲛⲉ-. It should be remembered that, both historically and synchronically, the *irrealis* protasis does not positively and beyond doubt point to the circumstantial conversion of ⲛⲉ-.

Were it not for the love of Jesus that I say these words, what is my care, and what concern I have how people eat?

(16) Leip. III 51 ⲕⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲉⲥⲟⲩⲛⲡϩⲏⲧ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲧⲟ ⲛⲁⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ… ⲧϩⲧⲏⲕ ⲉⲛⲃⲏⲃ ⲛϩⲟⲓⲧⲉ ⲙⲛⲛⲁ-ⲛⲕⲉⲑⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲛⲑⲉ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲙⲉϩ ⲛⲕⲉⲉⲥ ⲙⲙⲓⲛⲉ ⲙⲓⲛⲉ

If you wish to know the heart of any unbeliever, observe hyena dens, and those of all the other beast, how full they are of bones of all sorts.

(17) Amél. II 461 ⲕⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲉⲃⲱⲕ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲧⲙⲛⲧⲉⲣⲟ ⲛⲙⲡⲏⲩⲉ ϣⲟⲡⲥ ⲉⲣⲟⲕ ϩⲙⲡⲉⲓⲙⲁ ⲧⲁⲣⲉⲥϣⲟⲡⲕ ⲉⲣⲟⲥ ϩⲱⲱⲕ ϩⲙⲡⲙⲁ ⲉⲧⲙⲙⲁⲩ

If you wish to enter the Kingdom of Heaven, receive it here unto yourself, and it will receive you unto itself in that place.

A colloquial juxtaposition of two allocutive clauses, which may be construed as formally unmarked question and response (cf. ed.'s punctuation), but may certainly and, I think, preferably be construed as protasis+apodosis complex; the apodosis itself may be complex (e.g. Imperative + ⲧⲁⲣⲉϥ-). In such protatic status we find the Present followed by an Imperative (more rarely, the Perfect).

(18) Amél. II 364 ⲟⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲁⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ϯⲛⲁϥ ⲛⲟⲩⲙⲛⲧⲣⲙⲙⲁⲟ ϩⲓϫⲙⲡⲕⲁϩ ⲛϥⲧⲙⲁⲁϥ ⲛⲙⲡϣⲁ ⲛϯϭⲟⲙ ⲛⲁϥ ⲛⲣⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩϥ ⲛϩⲏⲧⲥ...

The affinity of the Conjunctive with protatic status (cf. Shisha-Halevy, *CGC* §7.2.4) is extensive; I suggest protaticity is scalar. Adnexal ⲉⲁϥ- here is protatic enough to warrant the Conjunctive's sub-cordination.

There was a man to whom God gave riches on earth, yet did not make him worthy of being able to do good with it.

<p style="text-align:center">*   *   *</p>

1.2.2 *Apodotics. Post-imperative syntax. Responsive syntax*

(19) Cod. XO p. 260bis (Boud'hors, *Canon 8*) ϣⲓⲛⲉ ⲛⲥⲁϣⲁϫⲉ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲙⲛϩⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲧⲉⲣⲉⲛⲉⲥⲛⲏⲩ ⲉⲧⲥϭⲣⲁϩⲧ ⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ ⲁⲛ...ⲧⲉⲧⲛⲁϭⲛⲧⲟⲩ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛⲧⲟⲟⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲛⲉⲓⲣⲉϥⲧⲱϩ ϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲛϩⲏⲧⲛ

Two noteworthy features are encountered here. First, the post-Imperatival future, alternative to ⲧⲁⲣⲉϥ- (indeed, a travesty of Mt.7:7 etc., in an ironic passage), with ⲅⲁⲣ replacing the locutive (1st person) component. Second, the same particle serves to focalize the nexus (see §1.3.1), hence may arguably be taken as a focalizer in an *in apodosi* case like ours.

Inquire about every word and every work the quiet brethren don't know…You will surely find them with those meddlers among us.

(20) Cod. XO p. 250 (Boud'hors, *Canon 8,* with n. 729) ⲏ ⲉϣϫⲉϩⲁϩ ⲛⲉⲧⲧⲁϩⲙ ϩⲛⲛⲉⲓⲥⲩⲛⲁⲅⲱⲅⲏ ϩⲉⲛⲕⲟⲩⲓ ⲛⲉⲧⲛⲁⲟⲩϫⲁⲓ ⲛϩⲏⲧⲟⲩ...ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲉⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛⲁⲣⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛⲥⲟⲟⲩϩ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲙⲛⲛⲉⲥⲛⲏⲩ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲥⲱⲛⲉ ⲉⲧⲃⲃⲏⲩ

As the ed. observes, ⲁⲩⲱ reinforces the apodosis; it may be added that ⲁⲩⲱ, like Greek καί, has in Coptic (when not coordinating) a **superordinating** role (Denniston 308f., Blass-Debrunner § 442,7).

And surely, if many are called in these congregations, few shall be saved in them... what then are you doing, gathering together with the holy brethren and the pure sisters?

(21) Paris BN 130[1] f. 139 p. 345 (Young, *Coptic Manuscripts*, p. 102, no note) ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲡϩⲁⲡ ⲉⲧⲉϣϣⲉ ⲉⲁⲁϥ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ ⲧⲏⲣⲧⲛ ⲡⲉ

> The somewhat surprising ⲡⲉ **signals, outside of conditional environment, be it protasis or apodosis, distancing or attenuation** — a punishment that would not be carried out, but should be.

And I know the judgement that would be proper to be done to all of you.

(22) Cod. XO p. 184 (Boud'hors, *Canon 8,* with n. 530) …ⲉⲙⲉⲉⲅⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ ⲭⲉⲛⲧⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲉ ⲛⲥϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲛⲧⲟⲟⲩ ⲁⲛ ⲛⲉ

> Aptly analyzed by the editor in her footnote 530. The apodotic Conjunctive, not common in Shenoute but typical of non-literary and perhaps of Theban Coptic (and of Late Egyptian and possibly Demotic), may in fact be a case of the well-established **sequelling role** of the form ("and the outcome/end…is/was…"), corresponding to the narrative *dénouement*. As the editor discerns, the second Nominal Sentence is Circumstantial, adjoined to ϣⲱⲡⲉ.

…to think it is they — it turns out that it isn't.

(23) Cod. XO 301 (Boud'hors, *Canon 8*, with n. 967; Introduction, §10. Grammaire, p. 42) … ⲉⲓⲧⲙⲕⲁⲑⲏⲩⲧⲛ ϣⲁⲛⲧⲉⲧⲛⲣϥⲛⲧ… ⲉⲓⲧⲙⲕⲁⲑⲏⲩⲧⲛ ϣⲁⲛⲧⲉⲧⲛⲣϩⲟⲩⲉⲕⲁⲕⲉ

> The **zeroed apodosis**, with ⲉϥ(ϣⲁⲛ)ⲧⲙ- protasis, expressing assertion in locutive (1st person) oath assertion modality, has been addressed by A. Boud'hors, but still requires further study. Understanding the mechanism of this construction is not easy. First, in our text we have the protatic ⲉϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ, which cannot be taken simply as a variant of the ϣⲁⲛ- conditional. Second, while, as A. Boud'hors points out, the figure apparently echoes a Biblical oath phrase, its Coptic semantics may well vary; and parallels (e.g. English "See if I don't…") point to a possible **presentative**, not at all conditional framework, and to a colloquial register. Third, the negative exponent is not entirely formalized: its role must be specially examined.

… If I don't leave you to become worms! If I don't leave you to become deep darkness!

(24) Chass. p. 17 ⲉⲣϣⲁⲛⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉⲣⲁⲧⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉϥⲧⲁⲁϥ ⲉⲧⲟⲟⲧϥ ⲛ̄ⲑⲉ
ⲉⲧⲥⲏϩ ⲉⲣϣⲁⲛⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲧⲟϭϥ ⲉⲡϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲛ̄ϥⲕⲁⲧⲉϥϩⲉⲗⲡⲓⲥ
ϩⲓⲱⲱϥ ⲛ̄ⲑⲉ ⲉⲧⲥⲏϩ ⲉϣⲁϥϯ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉϥϫⲁϫⲉ ϩⲁⲛⲉϥⲟⲩⲉⲣⲏⲧⲉ

> This is one of the two instances in Shenoute's works known to me of
> the apodotic ⲉϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ, a non-durative, base conjugation form (Shisha-
> Halevy 1973). It is the survival of an old Egyptian form, in Sahidic
> homonymous with the ϣⲁⲛ-less **protatic** form: the two are absolutely
> non-connected, synchronically or diachronically. Whereas the protatic
> form (the negative well attested in Shenoute, as ⲉϥⲧⲙⲥⲱⲧⲙ) is clearly
> related to the Conditional, while the apodotic, to my knowledge affirm-
> ative only, has no associated fuller form. In our passage, why is the
> second-half apodosis what seems to be a Focalizing Aorist? The aorist
> is probably the first term in the apodotic paradigm of the Conditional;
> still, there is here no adverbial candidate to be focal, and the autofocal
> Focalizing Aorist is (again, to my knowledge) rare. Or can it be that
> ⲉϣⲁϥ- implies a Focalizing Tense association of the apodotic ⲉϥ-?
> The thing to look for is apodotic ⲁϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ in dialects A, B, M or L.

*Should a person become godless, He delivers him unto his (i.e. Satan's)
hands, as is written; but should the person adhere to the Lord and put
his hope in Him, as is written, He throws his enemies under his feet.*

(25) Amél. II 224 f. ⲥⲉⲓ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ̄ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲛ̄ϩⲁⲇⲟⲛⲏ ⲛ̄ϫⲱϩⲙ ϩⲓⲥⲱⲱϥ
ϩⲓϩⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲡⲓⲑⲩⲙⲓⲁ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲯⲩⲭⲏ ϩⲓⲡⲟⲣⲛⲉⲩⲉ
ϩⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲛ̄ϩⲏⲧ ⲧⲁⲣⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛ ⲥⲉⲓ ⲟⲛ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣⲱⲕϩ ⲙⲛ̄ⲡⲕⲱϩⲧ
ⲉⲧⲉⲙⲉϥϣϣⲙ

*Sate yourselves with your pleasures — unclean, polluted, falling
out in your soul's passion, fornicating in your heart's thought —
and you shall also be sated with the burning and the fire that is
never quenched.*

(26) Amél. II 510 ⲉϥⲧⲱⲛ ⲡⲟⲩⲱⲛϣ ⲧⲁⲣⲉⲡϣⲱⲥ ⲡⲱⲧ ⲛⲥⲱϥ

> ⲧⲁⲣⲉϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ is a special apodotic form, a member of the causative
> conjugation, often and not quite aptly called "future conjunctive". In
> the Shenoutean corpus it plays a double role: in the Biblical or higher/
> formal stylistic register, it is truly apodotic, with a locutor's involve-
> ment, up to assurance and even promise (the ⲧⲁ-is historically a finite
> 1st-person verb form); this is its marked opposition to ⲁⲩⲱ + future,
> the main concurrent of ⲧⲁⲣⲉϥ-. Ex. (26) is ironic, in being homolex-
> emic; this is one of the rhetorical features for Shenoutia "Biblical"
> ⲧⲁⲣⲉϥ-; apodotic ⲉⲓⲙⲉ is another favourites (cf. Amél. I 234). A
> second, more colloquial role is apodotic, as a post-imperative "that"
> — rhematic-responsive, with little or no locutor involvement.

*Where is the Wolf? (= show me the Wolf), and the Shepherd will
pursue it.*

(27) Amél. I 37 ⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩϣⲓⲛⲉ ⲧⲁⲣⲛϭⲓⲛⲉ

> The Biblical maxim is here wittily transformed into a bracketed noun clause: the Imperative turned into a nominal subject, the apodotic post-imperatival component, maintaining its status. A special twist is introduced by the locutive-plural apodosis.

It's good to inquire-and-find.

(28) *De Iudicio* f. X p. 40 (Behlmer) ⲉⲓⲉⲙⲁⲣⲛⲧⲱⲙ ⲉⲣⲙⲡⲣⲟ ⲙⲡⲉⲑⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲧⲛⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲧⲉⲓϩⲉ ⲧⲛⲛⲁⲣⲃⲟⲗ ⲡⲉ ⲉⲡⲕⲱϩⲧ ⲛⲧⲅⲉϩⲉⲛⲛⲁ

> The special interest here is in the quadruple superordination in a protasis-less apodotic clause: ⲉⲓⲉ-, ⲁⲩⲱ, ⲛⲧⲉⲓϩⲉ, ⲡⲉ.

(29) Amél. I 39 ⲁϣⲁϩⲟⲙ ⲁⲩⲱ ϯⲱϣ ϩⲱ ⲛⲙⲙⲉ

> In the Shenoutean post-imperatival paradigm, the main terms are ⲧⲁⲣⲉϥ-, the Conjunctive, ⲁⲩⲱ + Future (unmarked). Intriguing and rare is the Present term; semantically, it seems not prospective, but synchronous.

Sigh, and I too sigh with you.

(30) Leip. III 45 ⲉϣϫⲉϣⲁⲣⲉ ⲡϩⲁⲓⲣⲉⲧⲓⲕⲟⲥ ⲙⲛⲡϩⲗⲗⲏⲛ ⲡⲱⲣϣ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛⲛⲉⲩϭⲓⲝ ⲛⲥⲉϥⲓⲧⲟⲩ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ϩⲛⲟⲩϩⲩⲡⲟⲕⲣⲓⲥⲓⲥ ϫⲉⲉⲩϣⲗⲏⲗ ⲉⲓⲥⲛϩⲁⲗⲁⲧⲉ ϩⲱⲟⲩ ⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲙⲡⲁⲓ ⲛϩⲁϩ ⲛⲥⲟⲡ ⲉⲩⲡⲱⲣϣ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛⲛⲉⲩⲧⲛϩ

> The presentative ⲉⲓⲥ acts here as superordinative apodosis marker. The Focalizing Present following ϫⲉ- expresses a discredited claim.

If the heretic and the pagan spread out their arms, and raise them up under the pretence that they pray, see, the birds too do this often, spreading out their wings" .

<p style="text-align:center">*   *   *</p>

1.2.3 *Protasis-apodosis complexes*

> The protasis-apodosis *irrealis* modality concord is a standard, normative junctural contour, yet often richly manipulated by Shenoute to express sophisticated logical nuances, and for rhetorical purpose. Indeed, this is a striking instance of non-anacoluthic syntax, for the apodosis paradigm is very rich. Here I present only a selection of combinatory examples, out of an *embarras de richesse*. No two passages are truly the same:

(31) Cod. XO 81 (Boud'hors *Canon 8*, n. 188) ⲉⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲛⲍ ⲉⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ
ⲍⲛⲛⲉⲛⲍⲃⲏⲩⲉ ⲛⲃⲟⲧⲉ ⲉⲛⲍⲏⲡ ⲇⲉ ⲙⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲍⲛⲛⲉⲛⲍⲃⲏⲟⲩⲉ
ⲙⲡⲟⲛⲏⲣⲟⲛ ⲉⲓⲉⲙⲁⲣⲉⲡⲟⲩⲁ ⲡⲟⲩⲁ ⲏ ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ϫⲱⲕ
ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛⲛⲉϥⲁⲛⲟⲙⲓⲁ…

> The out-of-reality, hypothetical state of things would call for and war-
> rant action encoded here by the jussive, formally apodotic.

If we appeared to people in our abominable deeds, hiding from God
in our wicked deeds — then let each and every one, each and every
person, carry out his transgression.

(32) Leip. IV 167 ⲉϣⲱⲡⲉ ϥⲛⲁϥⲓⲡⲉⲩⲣⲟⲟⲩϣ ⲍⲱⲥ ⲁⲣⲭⲏⲅⲟⲥ
ⲛⲉϥⲛⲁⲣⲟⲩⲍⲙⲟⲧ ⲁⲛ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲉϥⲍⲱⲃ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲡⲉ ⲙⲟⲅⲓⲥ ⲛϥⲣⲃⲟⲗ
ⲉⲩⲕⲣⲓⲙⲁ ⲍⲙⲡⲉⲍⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲧϥⲛⲁϯⲗⲟⲅⲟⲥ ⲍⲁⲡⲉⲓⲍⲱⲃ ϫⲉⲙⲛⲧⲛⲟϭ

> The apodosis is formally unreal, presented as a remote possibility, while
> the protasis coincides with the full (and desirable) nature-of-things
> reality.

Should he care for them as leader, it's not a favour (he would be
doing) — it's his duty after all; (even so) he would hardly escape
judgement, on the day he is to account for what is called 'seniority'.

(33) Canon 7.3 § 6 (3) = Cod. XU 96 (Wisse) ⲛⲉϥⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲟⲛ ⲡⲉ
ⲛⲉϥⲛⲁⲧⲁⲙⲓⲟ ⲡⲉ

> An *irrealis* 'Wechselsatz' ('balanced construction' or 'equation clause')
> complex. Note that the protasis here should not be condemned, since
> ⲉⲛⲉ- as converted form is contestable, synchronically and diachronically.

Also, had He so wished, He would have created.

(34) Cod. XO 245f. (Boud'hors, *Canon 8*) ⲉⲛⲉⲙⲡⲉⲡⲉϯϫⲱ ⲙⲙⲟϥ
ⲟⲩⲱ ⲉϥϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲟⲛ ⲉϥⲛⲁⲣⲍⲟⲩⲟϣⲱⲡⲉ… ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲧⲱⲛ
ⲏ ⲉⲧⲃⲉⲟⲩ ⲉⲓⲛⲁϫⲓϣⲕⲁⲕ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ

> A case of apodotic interrogatives, neutralizing the modalities of the
> protasis.

If what I say had not already come to pass, and also more than
come to pass…how is it or why shall I cry out?

> So too (among many):

(35) Leip. IV 11 ⲉⲛⲉⲙⲡⲉⲛⲉⲛⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲉⲛⲁⲛⲟⲙⲓⲁ ⲕⲓⲙ
ⲉⲧⲡⲉ ⲙⲛⲡⲕⲁⲍ ⲉⲣⲉⲧⲥⲛϥⲉ ⲣⲟⲩ ⲉⲥⲁⲍⲉⲣⲁⲧⲥ ⲏ ⲉⲥⲟⲩⲟⲛⲍ
ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉⲥⲧⲟⲕⲙ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲥⲥⲃⲧⲱⲧ ⲉⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲕⲁⲧⲁⲡⲉⲥⲟⲩⲱϣ

Had not our sins and our transgressions moved heaven and earth,
what is the Sword doing, upright and clearly drawn, and ready to
do according to its will?

(36) Cod. XO 294 (Boud'hors, *Canon 8,* n. 946) ⲉⲛⲉⲣⲉⲡⲙⲁ ϣⲟⲟⲡ
ⲁⲛ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉϩⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲉⲣⲉⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲛⲁⲧⲁⲕⲟ ⲛⲛⲉⲧⲛⲯⲩⲭⲏ
ⲙⲛⲛⲉⲧⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲛⲉⲡⲕⲁⲓⲣⲟⲥ ⲡⲉ ⲟⲩⲙⲟⲛⲟⲛ
ϫⲉⲧⲛⲁⲧⲣⲉⲛⲛⲟⲙⲟⲥ ϩⲱⲱⲕⲉ ⲛⲛⲉⲧⲛⲥⲡⲓⲣⲟⲟⲩⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ
ϫⲉⲣⲉⲕⲱϩⲧ ϩⲁⲣⲱⲧⲛ ⲛⲥⲉϥⲓ ⲛⲛⲉⲧⲛⲁⲡⲏⲩⲉ ϩⲓϫⲱⲧⲛ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ
ⲛⲉⲓⲛⲁⲧⲁϩⲟ ⲉⲣⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲟⲛ ⲛϩⲉⲛϣⲉ ϩⲛⲛϩⲓⲣ ⲛⲛⲉⲓⲥⲩⲛⲁⲅⲱⲅⲏ
ⲛⲧⲁⲧⲣⲉⲅⲉⲓϣⲉ ⲙⲙⲱⲧⲛ ϣⲁⲛⲧⲉⲧⲛϣⲟⲟⲩⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲧⲉⲛϩⲁⲗⲁⲧⲉ
ⲛⲧⲡⲉ ⲟⲩⲱⲙ ⲛⲛⲉⲧⲛⲥⲁⲣϫ ⲛⲧⲁⲧⲉⲧⲛⲁⲁⲩ ⲙⲙⲉⲗⲟⲥ ⲛⲕⲣⲟϥ
ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲉⲓⲛⲁⲕⲱⲛⲥ ⲙⲙⲱⲧⲛ ϩⲛⲛⲁϭⲓϫ ⲛⲑⲉ ⲛⲛⲟⲩⲏⲏⲃ
ⲛⲧⲃⲁϩⲁⲗ…

> The interesting rhetorical "mise-en-scène" here is the film-dynamic,
> zooming-like movement of Shenoute's furious intentional narrative, in
> a prophetic unfolding, from the clear-headed, reasoned protasis to the
> brutal, detailed narrative reality. Other points of interest in the passage
> are the short protasis, carrying the heavy scenic apodosis; also, the
> absence of the *irrealis-world* marker ⲡⲉ. Also significant, albeit com-
> monplace, is the place-and-time *zero* resumption as a "that" clause. It
> is probable that the irrealis modality has here also an attenuative, dis-
> tancing effect. All this, apart from a classic anacoluthon, rhetorically
> forceful. (The editor's note is here valuable.)

If the place and day did not exist, that God should destroy there
your souls; and if it were opportune, I should not only cause the
Laws to scrape your flankss and kindle fire underneath you and
take off your heads, but I should also raise poles along the quarters
of these congregations and see to it that you are hanged from them
until you dry up; and the fowls of the sky shall devour your flesh,
which you have made into limbs of deceit; and I should slay you
with my hands, like the priests of Ba'al.

(37) Chass. 17 ⲉⲛⲉⲙⲡⲉⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ ϣⲁϫⲉ ⲙⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ
ϩⲙⲡⲧⲣⲉϥⲣⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲛⲉⲙⲡϥⲣⲛⲉϩⲃⲏⲟⲩⲉ ϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲛϩⲏⲧⲟⲩ
ⲉⲧⲉⲙⲡⲉⲕⲉⲟⲩⲁ ⲁⲁⲩ ⲉⲛⲉⲙⲡϥⲣⲡⲥⲁⲧⲁⲛⲁⲥ ⲛⲁⲧϭⲟⲙ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ
ⲧⲱⲛ ⲉϥⲛⲁϫⲟⲟⲥ ϫⲉⲧⲁⲓ ⲧⲉ ⲧⲉⲕⲣⲓⲥⲓⲥ ϫⲉⲁⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲉⲓ
ⲉⲡⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ

> The negative *irrealis* protasis is clearly different from the affirmative.
> The three protases, a rhetorical triad, outweigh the apodosis, which is
> in fact a *reductio ad absurdum*; indeed, the whole is close to an

ⲉϣϫⲉ complex. The triple rejected negation is of course a forceful affirmation; and the "pseudo-apodosis" is a rhetorical question refer-ring, like the protasis, to unquestionable reality. Note that the 3rd plural pronoun has no clear referate.

For if God had not spoken with man, as He became man; if He had not done amongst them the deeds that nobody else had done; if He had not made Satan powerless — how is it that He should say 'This is the Judgement: the Light has come into the world'?

(38) Chass. 13 ⲉϥϣⲁⲛⲧⲁⲁⲥ ⲛⲁϥ ⲉⲡⲉⲓⲣⲁⲍⲉ ⲙⲙⲟⲕ ⲉⲡⲡⲉⲑⲟⲟⲩ ⲁⲛ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ϩⲛϩⲉⲛⲡⲓⲣⲁⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲛⲉⲕⲛⲁⲣⲟⲩ ⲡⲉ

The apodosis is here "unreal", and, again, it is an assertion disguised as question: "you will be powerless". But the protasis is an open possibility, and the apodosis too: "in that eventuality, what would you do?"

Should He let him put you to the test — not for evil, but in trials — what would you do?

(39) Paris BN 130² f.3 (Cod. YW 81) ⲉϣϫⲉⲉⲣⲉⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲛⲁϣⲁϫⲉ ⲛⲙⲙⲁⲓ ⲏ ⲉϥⲛⲁϭⲱⲗⲡ ⲛⲟⲩϩⲱⲃ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉⲓⲉⲛⲉϥⲛⲁϣⲁϫⲉ ⲣⲱ ⲛⲙⲙⲁⲕ ⲡⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲉϥⲛⲁϭⲱⲗⲡ ⲉⲣⲟⲕ ⲡⲉ ⲛϩⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲛⲧⲉⲓϩⲉ

Clear and, I think, simple modality differentiation between protasis (Shenoute, reality) and his interlocutor.

If to me God will talk, or disclose anything for me, does this mean He would talk to you, and would He thus disclose anything to you?

And a clear-structured passage:

(40) *De Iudicio* f. XVIII ro (Behlmer, p. 218-9, nn. 174-5) ⲁⲕϣⲱⲡ ⲉⲣⲟⲕ ⲙⲡϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲁⲕⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲙⲟⲩ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲉϫⲱⲕ ϩⲓϫⲙⲡⲕⲁϩ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲕⲥⲟⲃⲧⲉ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲛⲟⲩⲙⲁⲛⲙⲧⲟⲛ ϩⲛⲧⲙⲛⲧⲉⲣⲟ ⲛⲙⲡⲏⲩⲉ ⲁⲕϣⲱⲡ ⲉⲣⲟⲕ ⲙⲡⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲉⲑⲟⲟⲩ ⲁⲕϣⲱⲡ ⲉⲣⲟⲕ ⲙⲡⲇⲁⲓⲙⲱⲛ ⲉⲧⲣⲉϥϣⲟϫⲛⲉ ϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲛϩⲏⲧⲕ ⲛϫⲱϩⲙ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲙⲛⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲛⲓⲙ...

An ingenious colloquial complex of protasis-apodosis and *Wech-selsatz* (correlative, balanced) — not, I think, a banal question-answer set as ed. translates, but a theme-rheme nexus-, with an atemporal Perfect tense.

You have received the Lord unto yourself — you brought a blessing on yourself on earth, and prepared a resting-place for yourself in

the Kingdom of Heaven. You received the evil thought unto yourself
— you received the demon, that he may counsel you inside every
uncleanliness and every sin…

*   *   *

1.3 Information packaging. Focalization. Topicalization

1.3.1 *Focalization. Nexus focusing. Thematization and rhematization.*
      Superordination

(41) Cod. XO 304 (Boud'hors, *Canon 8,* with n. 978) ⲁⲡⲁϩⲏⲧ ⲱϫⲛ
ⲁϥⲱϫⲛ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲙⲡⲉⲙⲕⲁϩ ⲛϩⲏⲧ ⲉⲧⲟϣ

> Such lexemic repetition is tagmemic, signalling thematization. It
> replaces the morphological Focalizing Conversion: it also has a rhyth-
> mical role, and is highly effective rhetorically (cf. the German *und*
> *zwar* connector).

My heart has perished; it has perished for the great heartache.

(42) Cod. XO 304 (Boud'hors, *Canon 8,* with n. 976) ⲁⲓⲉⲓ ⲧⲱⲛ ⲉⲡⲉⲓϩⲱⲃ
ⲉⲓⲟ ⲛⲟⲩ ⲙⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲁⲛⲟⲕⲟⲩⲣⲉϥⲣⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲉⲓⲛⲁⲙⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲛⲟⲩ
ⲉⲧⲃⲉⲣⲱⲙⲉ

> Focalization can be effected by syntactic, not morphological (conver-
> sion) tagmemes. (Moreover, several idiosyncrasies of ⲧⲱⲛ "where"
> come to mind, albeit not their connection to the focalization issue:
> ⲧⲱⲛ enters the second position of the Durative Present pattern, and,
> following ⲉϥⲧⲱⲛ "where is it that he is?", a nominal theme is not
> adjoined by ⲛϭⲓ-, but in immediate appositive adjunction.

Where did I come from, for this matter? What is my business with
man? I am a sinner; what shall I invoke for man?

(44) Leip. III 202   ⲉⲧⲃⲉⲡⲁⲓ ⲣⲱ ⲉⲁⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲡⲓⲧⲓⲙⲁ ⲛⲛⲉⲧⲙⲙⲁⲩ

> A triple array of putative focussing exponents: the position of
> ⲉⲧⲃⲉⲡⲁⲓ, the focalizing particle ⲣⲱ, and the apparent circumstantial
> morphology of the topic (cf. *CGC* §2.5). However, some reservation
> or at least discussion is called for. The first is not conclusive, for initial
> position is ambivalent, for prominence applies to topicalization as
> well as focussing. The functional range of the particle ⲣⲱ is still in
> need of study, and is broader and more complex than contrastive focus-
> sing. Similarly, the function of the Circumstantial topics often seems

to be a reduced or more formal type of focus. And, of course, the combination of all three exponents may well differ from that of any single one. (Actually, we have here three **sub-paradigms,** with ⲉⲁϥ-commuting with ⲛⲧⲁϥ- and ⲁϥ-).

This is why God has taken revenge of those people.

(44) Cod. XO 71 (Boud'hors, *Canon 8*, with n. 158) ⲁⲩⲱ ⲟⲛ ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ⲥⲛⲁϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲛⲧⲉϩⲉⲛⲕⲟⲟⲩⲉ ⲣϣⲙⲙⲟ ⲉⲛⲉϥⲥⲩⲛⲁⲅⲱⲅⲏ ⲉⲧⲃⲉⲛⲉⲓϩⲃⲏⲩⲉ ⲛⲉⲓϩⲃⲏⲩⲉ ⲟⲛ ⲛⲗⲟⲓⲙⲟⲥ…

> Focalizing reiteration: "these *very same* acts" (*CGC* §1.3.3). Moreover, in combination with ⲟⲛ, we encounter the rheme of a special Nominal Sentence: ⲡⲉⲕϩⲣⲃ ⲡⲉⲕϩⲣⲃ ⲟⲛ ⲡⲉ "Your form is always the same" (Shisha-Halevy 1984, 186). In both cases, ⲟⲛ has a prosodic role, serving to delimit the colon.

And now too, it shall come to pass that others will become estranged to His congregations, because of these very same pestilent acts.

(45) Leip. IV 121 ⲉϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲉϥϣⲁⲛⲉⲓ ⲛϭⲓⲟⲩⲕⲁⲓⲣⲟⲥ ⲛⲧⲉⲡⲛⲟⲃⲉ ϭⲙϭⲟⲙ ⲉϫⲛⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲏϩ ϩⲙⲡⲉⲓⲙⲁ ϩⲙⲡⲕⲁⲓⲣⲟⲥ ⲉⲧⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲉⲧⲃⲉⲡⲧⲱⲙ ⲛϩⲏⲧ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲉⲓ ⲉϫⲛⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲙ…ⲁⲩⲱ ϩⲙⲡⲕⲁⲓⲣⲟⲥ ⲉⲧⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲉⲡⲱⲧ ⲛⲁϥ ⲉⲡϫⲁⲓⲉ ϩⲙⲙⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲧⲣⲉϥⲟⲩϫⲁⲓ ϥⲟ ⲛⲉⲗⲉⲩⲑⲉⲣⲟⲥ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛⲛⲉⲓⲥⲁϩⲟⲩ…

> Ed.'s n.2: "ⲁⲩⲱ delendum esse videtur". Superordinating ⲁⲩⲱ may be traced to later Greek (Blass-Debrunner §442,7) or to Biblical usage (Beyer 1968, §3), but let us also consider the non-coordinating "adverbial" roles of ⲁⲩⲱ (*CGC* § 1.3.10).

If it happens that a time comes, and sin overcomes those that dwell here at that time, because of the obtuseness that will come over everyone… And at that time, he who wishes to escape to the desert that he may be saved, is free of these curses.

(46) Cod. XO 98 (Boud'hors, *Canon 8* with n. 247) ⲉϣϫⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛϫⲱ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ ⲛⲧⲱⲧⲛ… ϫⲉ…†ϫⲱ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ ϩⲱ… ϫⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲁⲛ ⲡⲉ ϫⲉ-…

> ⲡⲉ "it means that…" occurs as rhematizer following various clause forms, often converted. Most familiar is the narrative or *irrealis*-modal conditional ⲛⲉϥ-, and of course the Future *in apodosi*. The interesting point here is that it is **componential** of an apodosis, yet not in itself apodotic of ⲉϣϫⲉ, but **thematic**.

If you say … that …, I, for my part, tell you … that it means that you don't know that.

(47) Cod. XO 110 (Boud'hors, *Canon 8*) …ⲉⲩⲑⲗⲓⲃⲉ ⲛⲧⲉⲩⲯⲩⲭⲏ ⲱⲁϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲉⲡⲙⲟⲩ. ⲁⲩⲙⲟⲟⲩⲧⲟⲩ ⲅⲁⲣ

…tormenting their souls unto death; for indeed they were put to death.

(48) Cod. XO 197 (Boud'hors, *Canon 8* with n. 561) ϭⲓⲛⲉϩⲃⲏⲩⲉ ⲙⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲃⲉϩⲉⲛⲣⲉϥⲣⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲉⲡⲉⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲁⲛ ⲡⲉ ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲩⲉⲓⲣⲉ. ⲁⲩⲉⲓⲣⲉ ϭⲉ

Do away now with God's works for sinners' sake, although you (f.) don't want them to sin — and then, indeed, they did sin.

> Nexus focusing ("…and indeed they *were* put to death", [and] they *did* commit [sins]") seems to coincide with parenthetic status, perhaps also with response status. Observe the repeated lexeme, the different particles and the linkage with the preceding thematic text. Ex. (48) is paradoxical and sharply ironic: the Circumstantial conversion of the Shenoutean NS is typically concessive. Note the enveloping punctuation, indicating a separate colon and final particle for the focal-nexus clause.

> Consider also the following, with various particles: ⲣⲱ is a specific focalizer, the others lend their own rhetorical nuance. This seems a favourite Shenoutean stylistic trait (Leipoldt usually condemns these as "*loci corrupti*"):

(49) Leip. III 96 … ϩⲱⲥ ⲉϣϫⲉⲛⲧⲁⲩⲡⲱϣⲥ ⲛϩⲏⲧ ⲛⲧⲁⲩⲡⲱϣⲥ ⲅⲁⲣ

… as if they became distraught — and indeed they did become distraught.

(50) Leip. III 113 … ⲁⲩⲱ ϩⲓⲧⲛⲛⲁⲓ ⲡⲁⲥⲉⲃⲏⲥ ⲉⲧⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲛⲁϩⲣⲟⲭⲣⲉϫ ⲛⲛⲉϥⲟⲃϩⲉ ⲛϥⲃⲱⲗ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛϥⲡⲱϩ ⲇⲉ ⲟⲛ ϥⲡⲏϩ ⲣⲱ

*And thereupon, that impious one will gnash his teeth and dissolve and also break up — indeed, he **is** broken.*

(51) Leip. IV 24 ⲛⲁⲉⲓⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲛⲉⲛⲧⲁⲛⲉⲩⲃⲁⲗ ϫⲱⲧϩ ⲉⲧⲃⲉⲡⲉⲓⲃⲉ ⲉⲧⲃⲉⲓⲥ ϫⲉⲁⲩⲣⲡⲇⲓⲁⲃⲟⲗⲟⲥ ⲛⲃⲁⲗⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲟⲩⲃⲗⲁⲉ ⲣⲱ ⲡⲉ ⲛⲛⲁϩⲣⲛ-ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲣⲉⲓⲥ ϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲙⲙⲁⲩ

Blessed are they whose eyes failed for thirst of Jesus, for they have blinded the Devil — and indeed, he is *blind before those with whom Jesus is.*

(52) Canon 7.7 §15 (1) = XU 331 (Wisse) ⲙⲁⲗⲗⲟⲛ ⲇⲉ ⲛⲉⲧⲛⲁϣⲱⲱⲧ
ⲁⲛ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲉⲓⲡⲁⲣⲁⲫⲩⲥⲓⲥ ⲛ̄ⲍⲃⲏ̄ⲩⲉ ⲛ̄ⲇⲁⲓⲙⲱⲛ
ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲡⲉⲭⲥ ⲓⲥ ⲛⲁϣⲁⲁⲧⲛ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲙⲙⲟϥ ⲏ
ⲥⲉϣⲁⲁⲧ ⲣⲱ

> Beside nexus focusing by ⲣⲱ as well as lexical iteration, we find here
> a personal anacoluthon — no direct resumption of the topic, 1ˢᵗ plural
> (inclusive) shift to 3ʳᵈ plur., reference to an earlier referate. Note that
> ⲏ opening the focalization unit is special — rhetorical-asseverative,
> not interrogative (Boud'hors 2013b).

Moreover, those who will not cut off from themselves such demonic
perversive acts, the Lord God Jesus Christ shall cut us off from Him
— indeed, they are cut off.

(53) Cod. XO 75 (Boud'hors, *Canon 8*) ⲏ ⲉⲓϣⲁⲛⲧⲙⲁϣⲁϩⲟⲙ
ⲉⲣⲱⲧⲛ. ϯⲱϣ ⲅⲁⲣ. ⲙⲏ ⲡⲉⲡⲛⲁ ⲙⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛⲭⲓ ⲙⲙⲟϥ
ⲛ̄ϭⲟⲛⲥ ⲣⲱϣⲉ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲁϣⲁϩⲟⲙ ⲉⲣⲱⲧⲛ

And even if I don't sigh for you — and indeed I do! — does not
the Spirit of God, to whom you do violence, suffice to sigh for you?

(54) Chass. 102 … ϫⲉⲙⲙⲟⲛⲁⲭⲟⲥ ⲛⲉⲧⲏ̄ⲡ ⲉⲣⲛⲏⲥⲧⲉⲓⲁ. ⲛⲧⲟⲟⲩ
ⲛⲁⲙⲉ ⲛⲉ

> "They are indeed" is responsive syntax; counter-intuitively, and con-
> trary to prosodic appearance ⲛⲉ is rhematic, ⲛⲧⲟⲟⲩ thematic.

Is it the monks that are supposed to fast? — Indeed they are (lit.
"It is they").

(55) Paris BN 130² f. 24 (Cod. XV 151) ⲁⲣⲉⲕⲱⲛⲥ ⲇⲉ ⲟⲛ ⲉⲛⲉϩ
ⲙⲡϩⲟϥ ϩⲙⲡⲙⲉⲣⲉϩ ⲛ̄ϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲛⲛⲉϥϣⲕⲟⲗ ⲏ ϩⲛ̄ϩⲉⲛⲙⲁ ⲉⲩϭⲏⲩ
ⲕⲱⲛⲥ ϩⲱⲱϥ ⲙⲡⲛⲟⲃⲉ ϩⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲛⲧⲟⲗⲏ ⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲥⲃⲱ…

> The relationship of ⲁⲣⲉⲕⲱⲛⲥ to the imperative ⲕⲱⲛⲥ seems clear:
> high-level theme-topic, which may be paraphrased as "Seeing that…"
> or even "If….", unmarked for any overt tagmeme other than the pat-
> tern # PERFECT + IMPERATIVE #, with the imperative its high-level
> rheme. This, I believe, exceeds paratactical syntax, such as question +
> response, and is typical of the Shenoutean Perfect.

Have you ever pierced a snake with a lance inside his holes or in
crevices — pierce also Sin with the commandments and the teaching.

(56) Cod. XO 107 (Boud'hors, *Canon 8*) ⲙⲁⲣⲉϥϯϩⲧⲏϥ ϩⲱⲱϥ
ϫⲉⲁϥϣⲁⲁⲣ ⲛⲟⲩⲏⲣ ⲙⲁⲩⲁⲁϥ ϩⲛ̄ⲛⲉϥϭⲓⲭ ⲏ ϩⲛ̄ϩⲉⲛϣⲉ

A question is here posed by "basic", morphologically unmarked clauses, where we should expect a Focalizing Tense, i.e. where an interrogative adverbial should condition — here a Focalizing Perfect. It seems there are a few adverbials liable to this feature; ⲧⲱⲛ "where?" is one such.

(57) Canon 7.7 §2 (3) (Wisse) = Cod. XL 275 ⲁⲛⲅⲟⲩⲣⲉϥϫⲓ6ⲟⲗ ⲉⲧⲃⲉⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲃⲉⲛⲉϥⲙⲉⲗⲟⲥ 6ⲉ ⲉⲧⲛⲗⲟϥⲗⲉϥ ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲃⲉⲛⲉϥⲧⲟⲡⲟⲥ 6ⲉ ⲉⲧⲃⲉⲧⲉⲓⲙⲛⲧϫⲁϫⲉ 6ⲉ ⲉⲧⲙⲙⲁⲩ ϫⲉⲛⲛⲉⲩϫⲓⲟⲩⲁ ⲉⲡⲣⲁⲛ ⲙⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲧⲃⲉⲡⲥⲁⲧⲁⲛⲁⲥ 6ⲉ ⲉⲧⲣⲁⲱⲉ ⲉϫⲙ-ⲡⲧⲁⲕⲟ ⲉⲧⲃⲉⲧⲉⲕⲣⲓⲥⲓⲥ 6ⲉ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲛⲁⲧⲁ2ⲟⲛ ⲉⲣⲁⲧⲛ ⲉⲣⲟⲥ ⲉⲧⲃⲉⲛⲕⲟⲗⲁⲥⲓⲥ 6ⲉ ⲉⲧⲃⲉⲧⲙⲛⲧⲉⲣⲟ 6ⲉ

> A remarkable, sophisticated passage. The enclitic particle 6ⲉ, recurring in and delimiting every response, is intriguing: it reminds one of the Greek focalizing οὖν in negative answers (Denniston 422ff.) but more generally in "emphasizing" οὖν, as well as γάρ in answers (Denniston 73ff.) However, studying 6ⲉ, the oldest of "native" Coptic enclitic particles, with a complicated merger history, cannot build on any specific Greek particle, but must set out from the Coptic system. The prosodic role of this particle is striking; delimiting the cola and defining the syntactic units that break up, asyndetically, the long response (6ⲉ, colon enclitic, occupies a colon-second position). Functionally (and more Shenoutean exx. will surely turn up), one must recognize a **responsive** role, with **a focusing** one, and conjoint **prosodic and rhythmical** features.

I'm a lier. Why? Because of His members which we mortify; because of His abodes; because of such enmity, that may God's name not be blasphemed; because of Satan, who rejoices in the destruction; because of judgement, before which we shall be made to stand; because of the torments; because of the Kingdom.

*   *   *

1.3.2 *Hermeneutics. Lemmatization and thematization of quotes*

(see also exx. 70, 134, 179, 185, 207)

(58) Amél. II 465f. ⲟⲩ ⲡⲉ ϫⲉ2ⲓⲡⲁ2ⲟⲩ ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲏ ϫⲉ2ⲓⲑⲏ ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ … 2ⲓⲡⲁ2ⲟⲩ ⲡⲉ ϫⲉⲧⲡⲉⲧⲣⲁ ⲛⲉⲥⲟⲩⲏ2 ⲛⲥⲱⲟⲩ 2ⲓⲑⲏ ⲇⲉ ⲡⲉ ϫⲉⲁϥⲉⲓ ⲉⲡⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲛ6ⲓⲡϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ…

> Explication of "forward" and "backward" (in Sh.'s preceding allegory: the herd moving back or forward of the shepherd). This fascinating

hermeneutic construction set, symptomatic of Shenoute's syntax, has a striking junctural basis. The main interest here, to my mind, lies in the junctural "freezing" of the "bit" extracted from the citation and thereafter neutralized and rendered inert, indifferent to obtaining grammar — as it were, inert, kept out of or above — a metatext — its *parole* environment. (Ed. resorts here to emendation.) We find variations on the basic scheme of # theme (detached from quotation, unmodified) — rheme #. Consider also the following *loci*.

What does 'backward of them' or 'forward of them' mean? 'backward' means that the Rock stayed behind them; and 'forward' means that He came to the world, the Lord.

(59) Chass. 169 ⲙⲙⲛⲣⲁϣⲉ ϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲛⲁⲥⲉⲃⲏⲥ ⲡⲉϫⲉⲡϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲙⲙⲛⲣⲁϣⲉ ϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲧⲱⲛ ϩⲙⲡⲁⲓⲱⲛ ϭⲉ ⲉⲧⲛⲏⲩ ϫⲛⲙⲙⲟⲛ ⲡⲁⲓ

'There is no joy for the wicked', said the Lord God; 'There is no joy for them' — where? In the coming age, or not, but this one?

(60) Leip. IV 181 ⲟⲩ ⲇⲉ ⲡⲉ ϫⲉⲉⲩⲟⲩⲏϩ ⲛⲥⲱⲟⲩ ⲟⲩⲏϩ ⲛⲥⲱⲟⲩ ⲡⲉ ϫⲉⲛⲉⲧⲕⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ ϧⲉⲙⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ϫⲉⲁⲕⲁⲁⲩ ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲛⲧⲟⲩ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲉⲑⲏ

[Ed. "ⲉⲩⲟⲩⲏϩ ⲛⲥⲱⲟⲩ suspicor"]

And what does 'they follow them' mean? 'Follow them' means, that those you think no-one knows you have committed, all shall be brought up front.

(61) Cod. XO 253 (Boud'hors, *Canon 8*) "…ⲧⲃⲱ ⲛⲉⲗⲟⲟⲗⲉ ⲉⲛⲧⲁⲥⲣϣⲙⲙⲱ" ⲉⲛⲧⲁⲥⲣϣⲙⲙⲱ ⲉⲛⲓⲙ ⲛⲥⲁⲓⲥ

Of junctural interest is also the demarcation of the boundary between the citation the the *hermeneia,* by particle or *zero.* The entire construction set awaits further study. Another rhetorical nicety here is the syntactic and rhythmic use of the homonymy of ⲉⲛⲧⲁⲥ-, Relative and Focalizing Perfect.

The vine that was estranged. Estranged from whom, unless it is Jesus?

(62) Leip. III 214 ϣⲱϥ ⲇⲉ ⲡⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ϫⲁⲓⲉ ϫⲉⲛⲉⲙⲛⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩϥ ⲛϩⲏⲧⲟⲩ ⲟⲩⲇⲉ ⲙⲛⲟⲩⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ ⲏ ⲟⲩⲡⲛⲁ ⲛⲧⲉⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ…

The copular NS is here instructive, since its theme is *zero*-articled (and coordinated by ⲁⲩⲱ, not ϩⲓ-) — a feature of the copular pattern only — and its rheme a ϫⲉ- included clause, again exclusive to this pattern.

And desolation and desert means that there is no good in them, nor angel or spirit of God.

<div align="center">*   *   *</div>

1.4 Juncture contours: construction rupture ('*anacoluthon*'). Cohesion (linkage) and delimitation features. *Zero*.[7] Reference. Prosody

1.4.1 *Linkage and delimitation*[8]

(63) Leip. III 183 ⲙⲁⲗⲓⲥⲧⲁ ⲁⲛϫⲟⲟⲩ ⲁⲛⲥⲱⲧ ⲁⲛϫⲟⲟⲩ

> *Zero* concatenator in narrative (in ⲁϥ- environment) has closer-juncture signifier, typically expressing complex events and special rate of progress iconicity. Here, however, we have — along with rhythmical characterization — repetitive iconicity.

Especially since we said them again and again.

(64) Leip. IV 205 ⲁⲡⲉⲧϭⲱϣⲧ ⲉϫⲙⲡⲕⲁϩ ⲧⲏⲣϥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉⲧⲡⲁⲣⲁⲅⲉ ϩⲛⲧⲟⲓⲕⲟⲩⲙⲉⲛⲏ ⲧⲏⲣⲥ ⲛϩⲁϩ ⲛⲥⲟⲡ ϩⲛⲟⲩϩⲱⲡ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓϣ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙⲙⲏⲛⲉ ⲙⲙⲏⲛⲉ ⲉⲧⲉⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲡⲉ ⲁϥϭⲱϣⲧ ϩⲱⲱⲛ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲉϫⲱⲛ

> The extensive text following ⲁⲡⲉⲧϭⲱϣⲧ may explain the choice of the base-resumption syntax, but the topicalized-nexus construction — the topic base + actor, the resumption base+actor+lexical object of base: evidently, the base os a proforma rheme, in nexus with its actor theme — this construction, common in all dialects, including Sahidic, has specific roles in narrative texture (Shisha-Halevy 2007, Chapter 1). Note the resuming Perfect at the end, which is atemporal or generic.

He who looks upon the entire earth and who passes through the whole world many times secretly, always and daily — that is, God; He has looked upon us, too.

---

[7] Shisha-Halevy 2004, and *CGC*, Chapter 6.
[8] Cf. Shisha-Halevy 2004 (juncture), *CGC* § 6.0.2.2, Index, p. 243 *s.v.;* 2007, Index, p. 702 *s.v.*

(65) Cod. XO 217 (Boud'hors, *Canon 8*, n. 616) ⲉϣϫⲉⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ
ϭⲛⲁⲣⲓⲕⲉ ⲉⲛⲉⲧⲉⲙⲉⲩϭⲱ ⲏ ⲉⲙⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉⲧⲉϥⲇⲓⲁⲑⲏⲕⲏ...

> The infinitive, subcategorized by the Relative negative Aorist (cf.
> *CGC*, Chapter 7), has here, unlike the next *loci*, the extended form of
> the infinitive, and no object.

If God blames those who are not steadfast or abide by His Covenant.

(66) Cod. XO 292 (Boud'hors, *Canon 8*) ⲉⲧⲙⲧⲣⲉⲩ ⲉⲓ ⲉϫⲛ-ⲛⲉⲓⲧⲟⲡⲟⲥ
ⲁⲩⲱ ϥⲟⲧⲛ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ

Lest they come upon these abodes and wipe us out.

(67) Leip. III 215 ⲟⲩ ϩⲱⲱϥ ⲡⲉⲧⲟⲩⲣϩⲱⲃ ⲉⲡⲁⲡϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ
ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲧⲟⲩϯ ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲕⲁⲁⲩ ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ

> Here we witness the combination of two different links: the Relative
> converter, and the non-durative (substantival) infinitive, as is made
> clear by the second object construction; the first has the converbs
> ('adverbial infinitives' is not a contradiction in terms), which is sub-
> ject to Stern-Jernstedt; the substantival infinitive is not.
>
> A separate issue is the relation of this construction, frequent in Shen-
> oute's work, to subcategorization by means of the Conjunctive. Obvi-
> ously, the infinitive is less categorized: no negation, no actor exponence.
> We need a contrastive distribution outline; different is also the "sub-
> coordination" linkage of the two forms with the nuclear verb.

But what are they working at on the internal (house), and adding
to it and installing them in it?

(68) Cod. XO 290.18ff. (Boud'hors, *Canon 8*) ⲛⲣⲙⲛϩⲏⲧ ⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ
ⲁⲩⲱ ⲟ ⲙⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ

> See Boud'hors and Shisha-Halevy 2012, for the stative converb as a
> (relatively) independent adverbial. However, the Stative here is a con-
> ditioned auxiliary, the durative alternant of ⲣ-ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ.

The wise know and testify.

(69) Canon 7.1 §23 (1) = DG fgt 6 rᵒ-vᵒ (Wisse)
… ⲉⲩϫⲱ ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲉⲣⲉⲡⲟⲩⲁ ⲡⲟⲩⲁ ⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲙⲙⲟϥ
ⲡⲉⲧϫⲁϩⲙ ϫⲉⲟⲩⲁⲕⲁⲑⲁⲣⲧⲟⲥ ⲡⲉ
ⲡⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ϫⲉⲟⲩϩⲁⲅⲓⲟⲥ ⲡⲉ
ⲡⲁⲧⲛⲁ ϫⲉⲡⲙⲁⲥⲧⲣⲱⲙⲉ
ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲣⲉϥϫⲓⲛϭⲟⲛⲥ ϫⲉⲡⲉⲧⲙⲟⲥⲧⲉ ⲛⲧⲉϥⲯⲩⲭⲏ ⲙⲁⲩⲁⲁϥ
ⲡⲛⲁⲏⲧ ϫⲉⲡⲁⲅⲁⲑⲟⲥ
ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉⲧϩⲁⲣⲉϩ ⲉⲡⲇⲓⲕⲁⲓⲟⲛ ϫⲉⲡⲉⲧⲙⲉ ⲛⲧⲉⲓⲣⲏⲛⲏ
ⲡϩⲉⲗⲗⲏⲛ ϫⲉⲡϫⲁϫⲉ ⲙⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ...

The dilemma in interpreting this generally clear, definition glossary-like passage is, whether we have Nominal Sentences, with alternation or variation of *zero*/non-*zero* delocutive pronominal themes, or two NS's alternating with a repeated *naming construction*; or a series of Nominal Sentences, with their themes (ⲡⲉ) and thereafter *zero*. What guides us is noun determination. The NS rhemes are indefinite, the Proper Names are formally definite. The first constituent is thematic, the second rhematic. (A related query regards the nature and meaning of ⲭⲉ-.)

… saying what each does:
The polluted 'he is impure'
The pure: 'he is holy'
The merciless: 'man-hater'
And the violent: 'he who hates his own soul'
The merciful: 'good'
And who keeps the Righteous: 'who loves peace'
The pagan: 'God's enemy'.

(70) Canon 7.1 §3 (1) = XU 2 (Wisse)
ⲉⲙⲛⲁⲅⲁⲡⲏ ⲛ2ⲏⲧ ⲡⲉⲭⲁϥ ⲁⲛⲅⲟⲩⲗⲁⲁⲩ
ⲉⲙⲛⲁⲅⲁⲡⲏ ⲛ2ⲏⲧϥ ⲉ2ⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲛⲓⲙ ⲛⲥⲁⲡⲉⲧ2ⲓⲧⲟⲩⲱϥ

At least three marked juncture features are observable in these complex hermeneutical clauses (see above, § 1.3.2):

(a) the rupturing ⲡⲉⲭⲁϥ *incise,* with a very low degree of linkage of the *verbum dicendi* and the *dictum* object; no ⲭⲉ- linkage of the *verbum dicendi* and the *dictum*; the latter is ruptured precisely in the theme/rheme seam line, and in effect, the *incise* marks a high-level rheme.

(b) The "delocutivation", shift from 1st-person to 3rd-person,

and (c) the freezing of the conversion in ⲉⲙⲛ-, Circumstantial in (I), a freezing inertia characterizing the lemmatization in (II) of the quote I Cor. 13:3b, 1-3).

'Without love in me' he said, 'I'm nothing'. Without love in him for whom, unless it be for his neighbour?

(71) Leip. IV 164 ⲁⲗⲗⲁ 2ⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲧⲃⲉⲡⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲙⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲙⲛⲧⲛⲟϥⲣⲉ ⲛⲛⲉⲩⲯⲩⲭⲏ

Not by any means an ellipse, if only since what is omitted or even zeroed cannot be specified. And yet, this is surely not the adverbial-rheme.

But all things for God's Will and the good of their souls.

*   *   *

1.4.2 *Prosody. Augens. Parenthesis. 'Foreshadowed' enclitics*[9]

(72) Cod. XO 259bis (Boud'hors, *Canon 8*, with n.800) †ϭⲓⲛⲣϩⲱⲃ
ϩⲱⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲥϩⲟⲩⲟⲣⲧ ⲛⲧⲁⲧⲉⲧⲛⲧⲥⲁⲃⲉⲧⲏⲩⲧⲛ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ
ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲛⲕⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲥⲁⲧⲏⲩⲧⲛ

*That accursed manner of behaving, which you have taught your-
selves and have not put behind you.*

> ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲛ- seems to be narrative circumstantial (my "and" in the trans-
> lation). The difficulty of the singular nucleus referate of the plural
> Augens is, I believe, not so much a case of *adsensum* (†- may be a
> generic comprehensive determinator, the plural its components), as of
> the **relative independence** of the Augens, **in adverbial status,** syn-
> tagmatically far removed from the 3rd plur., which may be the referate
> of ϩⲱⲟⲩ. Consider:

(73) Leip. IV 68 ⲧⲁϩⲉⲛⲙⲁ ⲙⲁⲩⲁⲁⲛ ⲧⲉ ⲉⲛϣⲗⲏⲗ

*(… that manner of praying) is one for us being on our own as we
pray.*

(74) Leip. III 118 ϩⲉⲛϣⲁϥⲧⲉ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲡⲉⲝⲁⲩ ⲛⲉ ⲛϣⲁⲝⲉ
ⲙⲛⲛⲧⲱϣ ⲉⲧⲉⲣⲉⲡⲁⲓ ⲝⲱ ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲏ ⲉⲧⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ

> Another invaluable signal, instructive for mapping junctural links and
> delimitations, is the *verbum dicendi* insert (*incise narrative*), usually
> ⲡⲉⲝⲁ(ϥ). It does not break a colon. (The data concerning this strik-
> ing boundary have not yet been collected or evaluated.)

*They all are — they say — iniquitous, the words and injunctions
which this one says and does.*

(75) Cod. XO 253-4 (Boud'hors. *Canon 8*, with n. 751) †ⲛⲁⲝⲟⲟⲥ ⲟⲛ
ⲉⲥⲧⲱⲛ ⲧⲙⲛⲧⲣⲙⲣⲁϣ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲙⲛⲧϩⲁⲕ ⲉϥⲧⲱⲛ ⲡϣⲓⲡⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ
ⲡⲥⲟⲟⲩⲧⲛ ⲙⲡⲉⲛϩⲏⲧ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩϥ ⲛⲧⲁⲣⲭⲏ
ⲛⲛⲉⲧⲛⲏⲩ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲛⲉⲓⲧⲟⲡⲟⲥ

> A tentative suggestion: the absence of ⲝⲉ- with ⲝⲟⲟⲥ may be con-
> sidered a rhetorical delimitation (with ⲟⲛ) of rhythmical significance,
> the "said" unit being relatively independent of the rest of the passage,
> which in turn is rhetorically heavy. The pathos of these rhetorical
> exclamative questions is evident. The two "where…?" clauses that
> make up the contents of saying have their own syntactical irregularity
> in the absence of ⲛϭⲓ. The distribution of ⲝⲉ-/*zero* must yet be stud-
> ied; the latter is rare in Shenoute.

[9] Cf. Shisha-Halevy 1986, § 6.0.3.3; Boud'hors 2013a, Introduction, § 12.3.

I shall also say: 'Where is the gentleness and the prudence? Where is the shame and the firmness of our heart and the good thought of the beginning of those who enter these abodes?'

(76) Leip. III 96-97 ⲡⲁⲓ ⲙⲉⲛ ⲁϥϯ ⲛⲁϥ ⲙⲡⲱϣ ⲛⲓⲕⲟⲟⲩⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲧⲟⲩⲉⲓ ⲧⲟⲩⲉⲓ ⲁϥϯ ⲛⲁⲥ ⲙⲡⲱⲥ… ⲛϣⲉⲉⲣⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲧⲟⲩⲓ ⲙⲉⲛ ⲁⲥϯ-ⲡⲱⲥ ϩⲱⲱⲥ ⲟⲛ… ⲧⲕⲉⲟⲩⲉⲓ ⲁⲥϯⲡⲱⲥ ϩⲁⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲕ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ

> Parabolic narrative. A remarkable instance of the "epifunction" of enclitics, demarcating the colon (basic prosodic unit), beside topic-marking and their lexical value.

Him he gave his; the others, each, he gave them theirs… And the daughters, one, she gave hers too…; the other, she gave hers for a single loaf.

(77) Cod. XO 240 (Boud'hors, *Canon 8*) ⲛⲁϣ ⲛϩⲉ ⲟⲩⲁⲅⲁⲑⲟⲛ ⲁⲛ ⲡⲉ ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲉⲙⲡϥϫⲓⲧⲱⲧ ⲛϩⲏⲧ ⲉⲛⲉϩ ⲡⲉ ⲙⲟⲩ ⲛϩⲟⲩⲟ ⲉⲱⲛϩ

> The doubling of ⲡⲉ, the pronominal theme of the Delocutive NS, is the prevalent case of the Foreshadowed Enclitic; this element is a second-grade enclitic.

How is it not better, for him who has never had contentment of heart, to live rather than die?

(78) Cod. XO 189 (Boud'hors, *Canon 8*) ⲉϣϫⲉⲡⲉⲩⲥⲙⲓⲛⲉ ⲙⲛⲡⲉⲩⲥⲁ ⲛϩⲏⲧⲟⲩ ⲡⲉⲩⲥⲱϣϥ ⲟⲛ ⲙⲛⲡⲉⲩⲧϭⲁⲉⲓⲟ ⲟⲩⲟⲛϩ ⲟⲛ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛϩⲏⲧⲟⲩ

> Like ⲡⲉ, ⲟⲛ is a second-grade enclitic, not colon-second. Anne Boud'hors (*Canon 8,* Introduction, §12.3) suggests that ⲭⲉ- too, a proclitic, may occur doubly like an enclitic. Following a collection of evidence for this Shenoutean prosodic feature, we may even be able to infer data concerning rhetorical prosody and rhythm effect (Cf. also Cod. XO 167 (Boud'hors, *Canon 8* with n. 485).

If (it's true that) their beauty and their structure are in them, their contempt too and their disgrace are evident in them.

(79) Cod. XO 266bis (Boud'hors, *Canon 8*) ⲙⲁⲣⲉⲛⲉⲧⲟⲛϩ ⲛⲙⲙⲁⲓ ϫⲟⲟⲥ ϫⲉϫⲓⲛⲧⲁⲓϯⲡⲉⲓⲥⲭⲏⲙⲁ ϩⲓⲱⲱⲧ ϫⲉⲛⲧⲁⲓⲕⲣⲙⲣⲙ ⲉⲧⲃⲉⲟⲩ ⲉⲛⲉϩ ⲏ ⲛⲧⲁⲓϭⲛⲁⲣⲓⲕⲉ ⲉⲧⲃⲉⲟⲩ ⲉⲛⲉϩ

Let those who live with me say: 'Since I put this habit on myself, what did I ever complain about? And what did I ever find fault about?'

* * *

1.4.3 *Reference: anaphora. Number / gender (seeming) discord. Personal-pronoun shift.* Zero.

Here, most typically, many "classic" anacolutha are to be found.

(80) Chass. 79 ⲧⲉⲓⲥⲃⲱ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉⲓⲗⲟⲅⲟⲥ ⲡⲁⲛⲉⲛⲧⲁⲩⲥⲟⲩⲛⲡⲡⲟⲛⲏⲣⲟⲛ ⲛⲉ ⲙⲛⲡⲁⲅⲁⲑⲟⲛ ⲙⲁⲩⲁⲁⲩ

> Anacoluth. The masculine ⲡⲁ- is attracted to ⲡⲉⲓ-, whereas the plural rheme and theme and Augens are the overruling syntax. It is crucial to realize that, under the syntactic circumstances as a whole, attraction included, the NS ⲡⲁ-…ⲛⲉ, despite appearances, **is not a grammatical error.**

This teaching and this logos pertain to those who have known evil and good alone.

(81) Cod. XO 272 (Boud'hors, *Canon 8*) ⲉⲱϫⲉⲧⲃⲟⲧⲉ ⲙⲡϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲡⲉ ⲛϫⲁⲣⲃⲁⲗ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲁⲧⲥⲃⲱ…

> The absence of pronominal concord as well as the relative weight of the two nominal terms, settle the sensitive question of the NS pattern: this is a **copular** pattern, theme-initial, while ⲡⲉ introduces the rheme.

If the abomination of the Lord is the fixed-eyed and the untaught.

(82) Cod. XO 267-258bis (Boud'hors, *Canon 8,* with n. 793) ⲱⲁⲣⲉⲛⲉⲛⲧⲁⲩϫⲟⲟⲩ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲥⲙⲟⲛⲧ ⲁⲛ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲑⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲙⲁⲧⲉ ⲉⲧⲃⲉϫⲉⲥⲉⲱⲟⲟⲡ ⲣⲱ ⲁⲛ ⲱⲁⲩⲥⲟⲱⲟⲩ …

> Anacoluth, in a special nexus-topicalizing construction (conjugation-base topic followed by same-base resumption, here disparate). Two distinct 3rd plur. referent elements (theoretically there are more) — one actor, the second object, clash in this clause, causing an anacoluthic effect: ⲱⲁⲣⲉ-(plur.[1])…ⲱⲁⲩ(plur.[2])-ⲥⲟⲱⲟⲩ(plur.[1]).

All things they said, which are unestablished and exceedingly evil, since they do not exist at all — they are scorned.

(83) Cod. XO 277f. (Boud'hors, *Canon 8*) … ϫⲉⲡⲉⲧⲙⲟⲥⲧⲉ ⲙⲡⲉϥⲥⲟⲛ ⲉϥⲱⲟⲟⲡ ϩⲙⲡⲕⲁⲕⲉ… ⲁⲩⲱ ϫⲉⲡⲉⲧⲙⲟⲥⲧⲉ ⲙⲡⲉϥⲥⲟⲛ ⲟⲩⲣⲉϥϩⲉⲧⲃⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲡⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲩⲧⲛⲧⲱⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲕⲁⲓⲛ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲱϫⲉⲁⲅⲟⲡⲟⲩ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲛⲁⲱ ⲛϩⲉ ⲛⲥⲉⲛⲁⲱⲡ ⲛⲛⲉⲩϩⲃⲏⲩⲉ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲛⲟⲩϥ

The substitution of ⲡⲉⲧ- by a **plural** pronoun is instructive: beside the alternating ⲡⲉⲧ-(/ⲧⲉⲧ-/ⲛⲉⲧ-), the immutable ⲡⲉⲧ-, the *zero*-article lexicalizing (ⲟⲩ-, ϩⲉⲛ-, *zero*-…) ⲡⲉⲧ-, we have, as here, an **invariable generic** ⲡⲉⲧ-. It is evident that the paradigmatics (substitutability) and syntagmatics (combinatorics) are integrated.

…since he who hates his brother, it is in darkness that he lives; and since he who hates his brother is a murderer; and they have been compared to Kain, and, if they have been related to him, how shall their deeds not be related to his?

(84) Paris BN 131⁶ f. 57v (= Young, *Coptic Manuscripts* 133, 137 with n.634) … ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲓⲧⲙⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁⲥⲧⲁⲁⲩ …

Ed.'s note attempts to account for this sgl. determinator *vs.* plur. object conflict ("one contribution, two coins"). While it would be grammatically difficult, such a possibility cannot be dismissed.

… from what she gave.

(85) Leip. III 138 ⲡⲉⲓϣⲁϫⲉ ⲥⲛⲁⲩ †ⲛⲁⲧⲟⲗⲙⲁ ⲛⲧⲁϫⲟⲟⲥ ⲙⲡⲉⲙⲧⲟ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛⲛⲁⲥⲛⲏⲩ ⲙⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ ⲛⲁⲙⲉ…

No simple anaphora here, since the neutric feminine wavers between ana- and cataphora.

These two things I'll dare say in the presence of my truly believing brethren.

(86) Cod. XO 185 (Boud'hors, *Canon 8,* with n. 534) ⲙⲛⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁϣϫⲟⲟⲥ ⲛⲧⲟϥ ϩⲓⲧⲛϩⲉⲛⲕⲟⲟⲩⲉ ϫⲉⲉⲣⲉⲧⲉⲥⲕⲏⲛⲏ ⲛⲁⲧⲙⲟⲩⲛⲅ ⲛϭⲓϫ ⲛⲉⲥⲱϥ ⲛⲑⲉ ⲛⲟⲩ ⲙⲛⲟⲩ ⲏ ⲉϥⲥⲟⲧⲡ ⲛⲑⲉ ⲛⲛⲓⲙ ⲙⲛⲛⲓⲙ

At first sight, this is a condemnable case of discord: ⲥⲕⲏⲛⲏ feminine, anaphoric ⲛⲉⲥⲱϥ, ⲉϥⲥⲟⲧⲡ masculine. Twice! Still — and it is the very recurrence that suggests this — what about "the Tent…it is beautiful… and it is exquisite…" — no direct anaphora, but two neutruic pronouns? After all, the masculine is the Coptic unmarked gender. (The editor suggests attraction to the preceding ⲛⲉⲥⲱϥ, ϥⲥⲟⲧⲡ, XO 184, referring to ⲡⲉⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲧⲉⲥⲕⲏⲛⲏ).

No one will be able to say in other words that the Tent, the one not made by hand, was of such and such beauty, or was exquisite like this or that person.

(87) Cod. XO 188 (Boud'hors, *Canon 8,* with n. 544) … ⲛⲥⲉⲧⲙⲕⲁ-
ⲟⲩⲧⲁϫⲣⲟ ⲉϫⲛⲟⲩⲧⲁϫⲣⲟ ⲉⲧⲉⲣⲉⲧϭⲟⲙ ⲉⲧⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲧⲁϫⲣⲏⲩ
ⲉ2ⲣⲁⲓ ⲉϫⲱⲥ

> Doubly deviant? Seemingly a classroom howler. And yet: the feminine
> suffix arguably refers as neutric feminine, not to "a prop" (ⲟⲩⲧⲁϫⲣⲟ),
> but to "prop upon prop". The relative (attributive) clause apparently
> expanding an indefinite nucleus, has again as antecedent the phrase
> "prop upon prop" (but see Shisha-Halevy 2007, 351f. on the compat-
> ibility of indefinites and the relative conversion).

*… and there shall not be left prop upon prop, on which that force
is propped up.*

(88) Leip. III 172 ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛ2ⲉⲛⲉⲓⲟⲧⲉ ⲉⲟⲩⲛ2ⲉⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ
ⲙⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ ⲛⲁⲙⲉ ⲛⲁ2ⲩⲡⲟⲙⲉⲓⲛⲉ 2ⲛⲧⲥⲩⲛⲁⲅⲱⲅⲏ ⲙⲡϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ
ⲉⲧⲃⲉⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲧⲃⲉⲡⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲉⲧⲉⲟⲩⲛⲧⲁⲩϥ ⲉ2ⲟⲩⲛ
ⲉⲛⲉⲩⲉⲓⲟⲧⲉ ⲉⲧ†ⲥⲃⲱ ⲛⲁⲙⲉ ⲕⲁⲧⲁⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ

> No clear substitute for "fathers", but the repetition of "fathers" is argu-
> ably an echo-substitute, as well as elegant closure of the rhetorical unit.

*Blessed are fathers to whom truly faithful people will submit in the
Lord's Congregation, for the sake of God and for the love they have
for their fathers.*

<div align="center">*   *   *</div>

1.4.4 *Reference: cataphora. Prolepsis*

Consider the following instances of the cataphoric neutric pronoun,
3rd person feminine/masculine in Coptic:

(89) Chass. 94 ⲟⲛⲧⲱⲥ ⲁⲓⲟⲡϥ ϫⲉⲟⲩⲡⲟⲛⲏⲣⲟⲛ ⲡⲉ ⲉⲓϣⲁⲛⲧⲙϫⲱ
ⲛⲏⲧⲛ ⲛⲧⲙⲉ

In fact, I considered it wicked if I didn't tell you the truth.

(90) Amél. II 273 ⲙⲏ ⲛϥⲥⲏ2 ⲣⲱ ⲁⲛ ϫⲉⲡⲉⲧⲉⲙⲛⲧϥⲡⲉⲡⲛⲁ
ⲙⲡϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲡⲁⲓ ⲙⲡⲱϥ ⲁⲛ ⲡⲉ

Is it not written: he who does not have the Lord's spirit, it isn't his?

(91) Leip. III 191 ⲙⲡⲟⲩⲧⲁⲁⲥ ⲛⲁⲛ ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲛⲥⲟⲩⲛⲧⲉ2ⲓⲏ ⲙⲡ2ⲁⲗⲏⲧ
ⲏ ⲡϫⲟⲉⲓ

It has not been given us to know the way of the fowl or of the ship.

(92) Amél. I 59 nccotπ an etmtpentϩinhb nϩoyo etpenxi
мπnoбneб н πexπio

*Is it not preferable that we do not doze off, rather than that we
should be the object of reproach or blame?*

(93) Leip. III 24 ncπpeπei an eoyωϩ exntaλyπн

It's not proper to add to my pain.

(94) Amél. II 216 nanoyc eмπoynay eneyepny eneϩ

It is better if they had never seen one another.

(95) Chass. 65 ecncωn epnobe ayω etмeipe

It's up to us to sin or not to sin.

(96) Amél. I 125 nenanoyc πe ayω oyϩну πe eмooyтϥ

πe focalizes nenanoyc; ne- attenuates nanoyc. The two πe
elements are disparate, for their patterns are not the same, but their
functions are akin.

It would have been good and of benefit to kill him.

(97) Leip. IV 69 kataθe etcнϩ xeeϥenaϩмen eyϩiн ecϩooy

A moot question: is a neutric pronoun, probably masculine, cata-
phoric to þxe-, to be expected here — or postulated as zeroed?

As (it) is written: He will safe us of a bad way.

The feature of the neutric pronouns — ϥ-, -c-, cataphoric to clauses
— usually nexus- substantivated (as "that" forms, or correspondent) —
is one of the main typological traits of Coptic. This is an instance of
a type of *Flexionsisolierung*, with the pronoun representing or herald-
ing or anticipating the clause in theme-actor or object status, through
formal cataphoric reference. The frequency of this construction points
to an idiosyncratic Shenoutean rhetorical-rhythmic trait. The precise
regulation or (partial?) variation of feminine or masculine represent-
ants is still an open question: a thorough investigation (beyond the
need to represent "that" clauses inside the verb clause) must take count
of the following: at least four parameters: (a) the lexeme and its
semantics; (b) the "that"-clause issue (one cannot ignore the difference
between the "universal subordinator" xe- and the prospective etpe-,
with the infinitive); (c) the representant pronoun, (d) the syntactic
environment of the complex. Variation would meet nicely the signifier
and definition of "neuter gender", namely "neither" masculine nor

feminine, apparently realized as their free variation. The prevalence of substantival clauses, and their rhetorical importance, are no doubt associated with Shenoute's predilection for this cataphoric construction mode.

(98) Amél. I 161 ⲉⲧⲃⲉⲟⲩ ⲉϥⲛⲁⲧⲣⲉⲩⲥⲱⲧⲙ ⲉⲡⲁⲓ ϫⲉⲛϯⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲙⲙⲱⲧⲛ ⲁⲛ ⲏ ϫⲉⲥⲁϩⲉⲧⲏⲩⲧⲛ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲙⲙⲟⲓ

> ⲡⲁⲓ is here cataphoric to a quote. Always masculine, and the only way for a content clause to be governed as object of a verb of perception. The neatness, even beauty of the Coptic cataphoric neutric pronominal structure or other cases of ⲉ-, is marked by the neutric ⲡⲁⲓ-. This applies to both "that" forms, ϫⲉ- and ⲉⲧⲣⲉ-.

Why will He make them hear 'I do not know you' or 'keep away from me'?

(99) Chass. 122-3 ⲁϣ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲕⲉϭⲱⲛⲧ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲕⲉⲕⲉⲣⲁⲩⲛⲟⲥ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲁⲁϥ ⲉⲡⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲡϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲡⲉⲭⲥ ⲡϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲙⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲧⲱⲙ ⲙⲡϩⲏⲧ ⲛⲟⲩⲗⲁⲟⲥ

… Since what is any fury and any thunder that is greater than this, that the Lord God Christ, the Son of God, should close the heart of a people?

(100) Amél. II 169 ⲟⲩⲥⲟⲡ ⲁⲛ ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁⲓϫⲟⲟⲥ ϫⲉ… (v.l. ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁⲓϫⲟⲟϥ)

> The ubiquitous quote-opening signal raises at least the question. An anaphora/ cataphora coupling is manifested by the fem./masc. pronouns. The masculine is a constituent of the nexus-negated CS, the feminine is cataphoric; but the variant reading, beside being perfectly compatible with ϫⲉ-, echoes the masculine topic.

(101) Cod. XO 51 (Boud'hors *Canon 8*) … ⲙⲛⲑⲉ ⲟⲛ ⲛⲧⲁⲕⲑⲓⲉ-ϩⲏⲧϥ ⲛⲛⲉϩⲓⲟⲙⲉ ⲉⲧⲉⲉⲧ ⲛⲁⲕ

…and also the way you have aborted (lit. '*made fall the womb of*') *the women you had impregnated.*

(102) *De Iudicio* f. LIV rᵒ p. 139 with n. 510 (Behlmer) … ϩⲉⲛⲥϩⲁⲓ ⲉⲡⲁϩⲟⲩ ⲉⲩⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲛⲛϩⲏⲕⲉ ⲉⲙⲛϭⲟⲙ ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲙⲁϩⲟⲩ

… documents to be torn, to the debit of the poor, who cannot pay them.

(103) Cod. FL 19 (Boud'hors, *Canon 8*) ⲥⲉⲧⲟ ⲉⲧⲟⲟⲧϥ ⲛⲧⲟⲣⲅⲏ ⲙⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ

> In the cataphoric inalienable "possession", or rather personal-sphere part/whole association, we find the invariable masculine (unmarked gender) as a formal "dummy" slot-filler. The possessor is always specific. This applies also to grammaticalized ex-nouns, in compound prepositions. Most enigmatic, however, is the immutable masculine — which, being immutable, is not masculine — with the *nota relationis* ⲛ-, as the pronominal form of the preposition ⲉ-/ⲉⲣⲟ=. Yet this seems to occur only with the homonym ⲉ- "in debit of, owing", where, like other inalienables, only the pronominal is used.

They are in the hands of God's rage.

(104) Leip. IV 26 ⲁⲃⲣⲁϩⲁⲙ ⲡⲉⲛⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲛⲉϥⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲡⲉ ⲉⲧⲣⲉϩⲉⲛϣⲏⲣⲉ ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲛⲁϥ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛⲥⲁⲣⲣⲁ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲥⲁⲣⲣⲁ ⲛⲉⲥⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲡⲉ ⲉⲧⲣⲉϩⲉⲛϣⲏⲣⲉ ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲛⲁⲥ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛⲁⲃⲣⲁϩⲁⲙ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲁⲓ ⲧⲉ ⲑⲉ ⲛⲧⲁⲡϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ † ⲛⲟⲩϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲛⲁⲃⲣⲁϩⲁⲙ ϩⲛⲧⲉϥⲙⲛⲧϩⲗⲗⲟ ⲉⲁϥϫⲡⲟ ⲛⲓⲥⲁⲁⲕ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛⲥⲁⲣⲣⲁ ϩⲛⲧⲉⲥⲙⲛⲧϩⲗⲗⲱ ⲁϥϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲛⲟⲩϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲙⲙⲉⲣⲓⲧ ⲛⲑⲉ ⲛⲟⲩⲧⲃⲁ ⲛϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲉⲟⲩⲁ ⲡⲉ…

> **Non-anaphoric** ⲧⲁⲓ ⲧⲉ ⲑⲉ is elusive and tends to obscurity. In fact, I believe it is in the nice domestic narrative fragment (105) *cataphoric* — a formalized (yet still deictic) element serving to single out and assertively highlight a following clause. The presentative "*voilà*", cataphoric, is an apt rendering; I would be at a loss to find an English correspondent.[10]

Our father Abraham wished for children out of Sarah, and Sarah wished for children out of Abraham. And thus indeed, the Lord God gave Abraham a son in his old age, having begotten Isaak out of Sarah in her old age, and he became their beloved son like ten thousand sons, although he was one only.

(105) Chass. 119 ⲛⲧⲉⲧⲛⲛⲁⲩ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲛϩⲉⲗⲗⲏⲛ ⲙⲛⲛⲣⲉϥϣⲙϣⲉ-ⲉⲓⲇⲱⲗⲟⲛ ϫⲉ ⲉⲣⲉⲡⲉⲩϩⲏⲧ ⲟⲩⲟϣϥ ⲛⲟⲩⲏⲣ

> The thematic perception-verb clause (rhetorical question) precedes an embedded rhetorical question.

Don't you see how ruined is the heart of the pagans and the idolaters?

---

[10] Modern Irish *(is) amhlaidh,* Old French *si-* seem to be close correspondents in narrative.

(106) Cod. XO 78 (Boud'hors, *Canon 8*) ⲁϩⲣⲟϥ ⲙⲡϥⲥⲟⲩⲛⲡⲁⲓ ⲏ
ⲛⲁⲓ ⲭⲉⲥⲉⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲛϩⲉⲛⲃⲟⲧⲉ

> Again, a "that"-form rhetorical feature: avoiding a substantive-clause
> object, its theme is proleptically singled out as object, then pronomi-
> nalized in an anaphoric ⲭⲉ- clause. This is a common construction
> in Bohairic and Theban Sahidic.

What is it that he did not know that this person or these persons
commit abominations?

(107) Canon 7.7 §2 (3) (Wisse) = XL 275 ⲉϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲛ†ⲣϩⲟⲧⲉ ⲁⲛ
ϩⲏⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲛⲉϩⲃⲏⲩⲉ ⲉⲧⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲭⲉ-ⲛⲛⲉⲩϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲟⲛ…

> Anaphoric pronominalization in a ⲭⲉ- clause, of a proleptic object.
> All clauses are negative.

If I am not afraid that those things should happen again.

<p style="text-align:center">*   *   *</p>

1.4.5 *Topicalization*. Nominativus Pendens. *Antecedent- and other*
resumptions

(108) Cod. XO 235 (Boud'hors, *Canon 8*) ⲉⲛⲥⲱⲟⲩϩ ⲛⲧⲉⲭⲣⲓⲁ ⲧⲏⲣⲥ
ⲛⲥⲱⲙⲁⲧⲓⲕⲟⲛ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲛⲛⲓⲙ ⲛⲁⲛⲟⲉⲓⲕ ⲛⲁⲛϩⲟⲓⲧⲉ ⲛⲁⲛⲛⲉϩ
ⲛⲁⲛⲣⲟⲟⲩϣ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲛⲧⲇⲓⲁⲕⲟⲛⲓⲁ ⲙⲡⲉⲛⲥⲱⲟⲩϩ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ
ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲁⲡⲃⲟⲗ ⲁⲛ

> A resumption at first sight only. In fact, the plural pronouns are
> appositive specifications, not substitutes. The feminine ⲧⲉⲭⲣⲓⲁ is
> resumed by ⲧⲁⲡⲃⲟⲗ. We also have here a nice pun — ⲥⲱⲟⲩϩ
> ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ "gather, hoard" and ⲥⲱⲟⲩϩ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ "assembly".

For whom do we hoard all the bodily necessities — of bread-loaves,
of clothes, of oils, of all the needs of the service of our assembly,
and not the external one?

(109) Leip. IV 92 ⲡⲉⲓⲕⲉϩⲱⲃ ⲇⲉ ⲟⲛ ⲙⲡⲉⲓⲟⲃⲱⲧ ⲉⲧⲁⲙⲉⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲏϩ
ϩⲛⲛⲉⲓⲧⲟⲡⲟⲥ ⲭⲉϩⲉⲛϣⲱⲱⲧ ⲛⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ϩⲉⲛⲡⲟⲛⲏⲣⲟⲛ ⲛⲉ
ⲛⲛⲉⲧⲛⲁⲁⲙⲉⲗⲉⲓ

> Only apparently *zero* formal resumption of the topic; the twin Nom-
> inal Sentences, while contentualizing ⲡⲉⲓⲕⲉϩⲱⲃ, simultaneously
> resume and represent it.

This thing, too, I have not forgotten to tell those who dwell in these abodes — namely, that they are a flaw and bad for those who are neglectful.

(110) Leip. IV 68 ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉⲧⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲉϯϩⲓⲥⲉ ⲛⲁϥ ϩⲙⲡⲉϥϣⲗⲗ ⲛⲧⲁϩⲉⲛⲙⲁ ⲁⲛ ⲧⲉ ⲉⲟⲩⲛϩⲉⲛⲛⲟϭ ⲙⲙⲏⲏϣⲉ ⲥⲟⲟⲩϩ ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ ⲉⲩϣⲗⲏⲗ

> A drastic doubly anacoluthic shift in resumptive syntax: ⲧⲁ- is anaphoric to the contextual "manner of praying".

And he who wishes to exert himself in his prayer, it's not appropriate to places where a large crowd is convened in prayer.

(111) Amél. I 199 ⲉⲃⲱⲕ ⲙⲉⲛ ⲉⲛⲧⲟⲡⲟⲥ ⲛⲙⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲟⲥ ⲉϣⲗⲏⲗ ⲉⲱϣ ⲉⲯⲁⲗⲗⲉⲓ ⲉⲧⲃⲃⲟⲕ ⲉϥⲓⲧⲉⲡⲣⲟⲥⲫⲟⲣⲁ ϩⲛⲑⲟⲧⲉ ⲙⲡⲉⲭⲥ ⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩϥ... ⲉⲭⲱ ⲇⲉ ⲉⲟⲩⲱⲙ ⲉⲥⲱⲃⲉ ⲙⲁⲗⲗⲟⲛ ⲇⲉ ⲉⲡⲟⲣⲛⲉⲩⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉϩⲧⲃⲣⲱⲙⲉ... ⲟⲩⲁⲛⲟⲙⲓⲁ ⲧⲉ

> Remarkable in this multiple topicalization is the masc. resumption, but also the non-adverbial, but substantival status of ⲉ- + INF. The second 'resumption,' feminine as theme in the endophoric NS, is not resumptive at all but internally anaphoric to a feminine indefinite article.
>
> The 2nd masc. pronoun in ⲉⲧⲃⲃⲟⲕ is the **generic person.**

To go to the martyrs' sanctuaries, to pray, to read, to chant, to keep oneself pure, to receive the communion in the fear of Christ, is good; … but to sing, to eat, to joke — certainly to fornicate and murder… it's a transgression.

(112) Amél. II 443 ϩⲟⲧⲉⲓ ⲇⲉ ⲭⲉⲡⲉϩⲟⲩⲟ ⲙⲡⲉⲛⲱⲛϩ ⲉⲧⲧⲏϣ ⲛⲁⲛ ⲉϣⲁⲩⲕⲁⲧⲟⲣⲑⲟⲩ ⲙⲙⲟϥ ϩⲓⲧⲛⲧⲉⲓⲡⲁⲣⲁⲧⲏⲣⲏⲥⲓⲥ ⲛⲧⲉⲓⲙⲓⲛⲉ ⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲙⲡⲁⲓ

> Here a substantivized clause is topical, and resumed deictically. I suggest that (a) ϩⲟⲧⲉⲓ "vests" ⲭⲉ-, which does not open alone the "that" complex, (b) rhythmical factors seem to preclude the immediate object construction ⲥⲟⲩⲛ-ⲡⲁⲓ in closure.

That the major part of our ordained life is set right by such circumspection of this kind — everyone knows this.

(113) Leip. III 130 ⲛⲉⲓⲕⲟⲟⲩⲉ ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉⲛⲁⲕⲣⲓⲛⲉ ϩⲛⲧⲙⲏⲧⲉ ⲙⲡⲁⲓ ⲙⲛⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲙⲙⲁⲩ ϩⲛⲟⲩϩⲁⲡ ⲙⲙⲉ

As for these others, God will adjudge between this one and those ones, in true judgement.

> Note the (usually disparaging) fuzzy deictic resumption; here we have the means of providing a deictic tone in resumption. Compare the rhetorical flatness of the resuming personal pronouns. So too:

(114) Chass. 151 ⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲙⲉⲛ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉϥⲟ ⲛⲉⲩⲥⲉⲃⲏⲥ ⲕⲁⲧⲁⲥⲙⲟⲧ ⲛⲓⲙ ϩⲛⲧⲉϥⲁⲣⲭⲏ, ⲉϥϣⲁⲛⲣⲁⲥⲉⲃⲏⲥ ϩⲛⲧⲉϥϩⲁⲏ ϣⲁⲣⲉⲡϣⲁϫⲉ ⲁⲅⲁⲛⲁⲕⲧⲉⲓ ⲉⲧⲉⲯⲩⲭⲏ ⲉⲧⲙⲙⲁⲩ

Any person who is pious in every way at his beginning, should he turn impious at his end, the Word is vexed with that soul.

(115) Chass. 81 ϩⲙⲡⲁⲓ ⲟⲛ ⲧⲛϭⲁⲙⲗⲟⲙⲧ ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲛⲥⲟⲩⲧⲱⲛ ⲁⲛ

> A classic case of double adverbial mixed reference: a striking anacoluth, colloquial, possibly even focalizing "in this" by position and repetition.

In this also we are twisted in it, and not upright.

(116) Leip. IV 82 ⲟⲩⲙⲏⲛϣⲉ ⲉⲩⲥⲟⲟⲩϩ ⲉⲩⲟⲩⲏϩ ⲙⲛⲛⲉⲩⲉⲣⲏⲩ ⲛⲅⲛⲁϣⲥⲟⲩⲛⲡϩⲏⲧ ⲁⲛ ⲙⲡⲟⲩⲁ ⲡⲟⲩⲁ

> Another type of fuzzy resumption; the generic perspective is evident in the 2nd masc. "generic person".

A gathered multitude, living with each other, you cannot fathom everyone's heart.

(117) Chass. 35 ⲉⲧⲃⲉⲙⲡⲉⲓⲣⲁⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲇⲉ ⲉⲧⲕⲃⲗⲁⲡⲧⲉⲓ ⲛϩⲏⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲛⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲛⲛⲉⲧϯ ⲟⲩⲃⲉⲛⲉⲕⲗⲟⲅⲓⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲛⲃⲟⲧⲉ ⲙⲡⲱⲕ ⲁⲛ ⲡⲉ ⲡϩⲱⲃ

> Another fuzzy resumption-word, correlated to the initial topic-marker ⲉⲧⲃⲉ-, "As for…, Regarding…"

Regarding the trials with which you harm the bodies of those who fight your abominable imaginings — this work is not yours.

(118) Cod. XO 283 (Boud'hors, *Canon 8*) ⲉⲧⲃⲉϥⲓⲡⲉⲧⲛⲣⲟⲟⲩϣ ⲟⲩϩⲙⲟⲧ ⲉⲣⲟⲓ ⲁⲛ ⲡⲉ

As for taking care of you, this is not a favour to me.

(119) Leip. III 21 ⲛ̅ϩⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲉⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲏ̅ ⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛ̅ⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ϫⲉϣⲁⲓⲉⲓ ϣⲁⲣⲱⲧⲛ̅

The days you (fem.) or you (plur.) know that I come to you.

> A commonplace yet significant construction: time-antecedent resumed as *zero*, in accordance with the *zero-* marking of the *zero-*marked temporal "*casus adverbialis*". So too:

(120) Leip. IV 34 ⲧⲁⲣⲭⲏ ⲛ̅ⲧⲁϥⲥⲱⲛⲧ ⲙ̅ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ϩⲓϫⲙ̅ⲡⲕⲁϩ

> "The beginning which" in Coptic.

The beginning when He created Man on earth.

(121) *De Iudicio* (Behlmer) X v° p. 38 ⲁⲙⲛ̅ⲧⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲛ̅ⲑⲉ ⲉⲧⲉⲛⲁϣⲱⲟⲩ ⲛ̅ϭⲓⲛⲉⲧϥⲛⲁⲣⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ ϩⲓⲧⲙ̅ⲡⲕⲱϩⲧ ⲛⲁϣⲱⲟⲩ ⲟⲛ ⲛ̅ϭⲓⲛⲉⲧⲛⲁⲣⲃⲟⲗ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲩⲉⲓ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲙⲙⲁ ⲛⲙⲧⲟⲛ ⲉⲧϩⲛ̅ⲙ̅ⲡⲏⲩⲉ

> A probable case of *nominativus pendens* or fuzzy topicalization, although there are here several 3ʳᵈ sgl. masc. resumptions, referring back to "Hell". Ed. prefers the fuzzy topic analysis in her translation.

But Hell, just as many are they whom it will overpower by the Fire, many are also that will escape it that they may enter the resting-places in the Heavens.

<center>* * *</center>

1.4.6 *Coordination. Disjunction. Parataxis*

(122) Canon 7.7 §8 (2) (Wisse) = Cod. YR 193 ⲧⲁⲓ ⲧⲉ ⲑⲉ ⲉⲧⲉⲟⲩⲟⲓ ⲛ̅ⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩϫⲱ ⲙ̅ⲙⲟⲥ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ ϫⲉ-ⲥⲟⲛ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙⲁⲁⲩ ⲁⲩⲱ ϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ϣⲉⲉⲣⲉ …

> The coordination of *zero*-article terms is either by ϩⲓ-, where brack-eted or otherwise juncturally tight (in a close-juncture group) applies, or ⲁⲩⲱ, in a loose unit; a unique ⲁⲩⲱ/ϩⲓ- quasi-paradigm (ⲁⲩⲱ is loose, ϩⲓ- is closely prefixed to a noun).

Thus woe unto those that are called 'brother' and 'father' and 'mother' and 'son' and 'daughter'.

(123) Cod. XO 260bis (Boud'hors, *Canon 8* with n. 809) ⲧⲉⲧⲛⲁϭⲛ̅ⲧⲟⲩ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛ̅ⲧⲟⲟⲧⲟⲩ ⲛ̅ⲛⲉⲓⲣⲉϥⲧⲱϩ ϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲛ̅ϩⲏⲧⲛ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲧⲕⲱⲧⲉ ⲛⲏⲓ ⲉϩⲓ

You will find them in the hands of those meddlers that turn from house to house.

> The Relative pronoun (**not converter**, since in-paradigm with noun or pronoun), may be coordinated with **determinator pronouns**. Similarly:

(124) Cod. XO 262bis (Boud'hors, *Canon 8* with n. 817) ⲛⲭⲡⲟ ϩⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲧⲉϩⲃⲱ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲧⲥⲁⲛⲁϣⲧ ⲛϩⲏⲧⲟⲩ ⲙⲛⲛⲉⲥϣⲏⲣⲉ

You too, mother-viper's breed and your stomach fed with her off-spring.

(125) Leip. III 170 ⲉϣϫⲉⲉⲩϣⲁⲛⲧⲙ†ⲛⲉϩ ⲛⲥⲁϩⲉⲛϩⲃⲃⲥ ⲙⲉⲩⲭⲉⲣⲟ ϣⲁⲩϫⲉⲛⲁ

> The collocative Aorist paratactic pair is almost a compound, with the two antonyms alliterating, punning, and probably a single metric unit. This is very different from the narrative *zero*-concatenated "complex event", and from the listing "cataloguing" coordination.

If one doesn't add oil to the lamps, they don't burn but are extinguished.

<div align="center">*   *   *</div>

1.5 Noun determination and its implications. Proper Names.
Zero article. Article nuclearity

(126) Cod. XO 274 (Boud'hors, *Canon 8*) ϩⲉⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ ϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲛϩⲏⲧⲛ… ⲟⲩ ⲡⲉⲧⲃⲣⲃⲣ ⲛϩⲏⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲥⲁⲛⲁⲓ… ⲛⲧⲱⲧⲛ ϭⲉ ⲉⲧⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲱ ⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲧⲛϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲛϩⲏⲧⲛ…

> Adverbial adjuncts adjoin non-specific noun phrases directly, whereas specific nuclei are expanded by Relative clauses. It is debatable whether a zero element must be postulated in the former case.

People amongst us…what boils in them if not these:…But it is you who know, O people who are amongst us.

(127) Amél. II 453 ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁϥϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲛϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲛⲧⲟⲣⲅⲏ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲙⲡⲧⲁⲕⲟ ⲙⲡⲕⲁⲕⲉ

> The grammar-book rule, according to which the non-specific nucleus is expanded by ⲛⲧⲉ-, when the satellite is specific — and in fact, ⲛⲧⲉ- occurs in cases of inequispecificity — this rule still stands; but

the ⲛ-/ⲛⲧⲉ- *notae relationis* paradigm includes yet another, preposional ⲛ- term, probably truly possessive (and not "attributive"), possibly even inalienable.

He who became son to Fury and son to perdition and darkness.

(128) Canon 7.3 §10 (3) (Wisse) = XU 104 ⲉϣⲝⲉϯⲛⲁⲁⲕⲉ ϩⲟⲥⲉ ⲙⲁⲗⲓⲥⲧⲁ ⲙⲟⲩ…

> A difficult protasis. I suggest interpreting it as a Present, with Stative rheme, and an infinitical theme (ϯ-ⲛⲁⲁⲕⲉ); the grammatical point would be the absence of ⲟⲩⲛ-. The existential "prop" expected before a non-specific noun; the infinitive is a noun *sui generis,* where determination is concerned.

If childbirth is painful, even deadly…

(129) Leip. III 208 ⲁⲓⲛⲁⲩ ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲉⲟⲩⲁ ⲉϣⲝⲉⲛⲧⲁϥⲧⲁϩⲉⲟⲩϩⲟϥ ⲏ ⲟⲩⲇⲣⲁⲕⲱⲛ ⲉⲁϥⲙⲟⲟⲩⲧ… ϩⲛⲟⲩⲛⲟϭ ⲛⲟⲣⲅⲏ ⲉⲙⲟⲓϩⲉ ⲡⲉ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲛϩⲏⲧⲥ

> The delocutive NS admits in Shenoute a *zero*-articled noun rheme (Shisha-Halevy 1984, 178ff.). The admitted lexemes seem to form a closed or half-open list. Two intermeshed questions present themselves. Theoretical — is this a case of true *zero,* or a *nil,* that is, a rhematic noun-lexeme, not syntagm? And diachronic, is this a distinct Coptic correspondent, or even descendant, of the Egyptian "Sentence with Adjectival Predicate"? This episode seems to be a vision, in which case "as if" may be dropped.

I personally saw one, as if he came upon a snake or a serpent, and killed it in a great fury — it was amazing to see him like this.

(130) Leip. III 214 ⲛⲉⲛⲧⲁⲩⲣϫⲁⲓⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ϣⲱϥ…

> Beyond the coordination issue (ⲁⲩⲱ *vs.* ϩⲓ-), we face here the theoretical problem of *zero* vs. *nil* in auxiliation, word-formation and copular verbs.

They who became waste and desolation…

(131) Chass. 95 ⲙⲛⲧⲉⲇⲓⲕⲁⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ ϣⲁϫⲉ ⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲉϫⲱ

> The *possessum, zero*-articled, is resumed by a *zero* object. Similar (in Coptic — English precludes here a *zero* article):

No tribunal has a word to say.

(132) Leip. III 165 ⲡⲉⲧⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲉⲣⲁⲧⲥⲱⲧⲙ ⲙⲁⲣⲉϥⲉⲓⲣⲉ

Whoever wishes to be disobedient, let him be.

(133) Cod. XO 118 (Boud'hors, *Canon 8*) ⲉϣϫⲉϣⲁⲣⲉⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲣⲙⲁ
ⲛϣⲙⲙⲟ ⲉⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ϩⲛⲛⲉⲩⲙⲛⲧⲁⲥⲉⲃⲏⲥ ϣⲁⲣⲉⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲟⲛ
ⲣⲙⲁ ⲛⲧⲣⲉⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ϩⲱ(ⲛ) ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ ϩⲛⲛⲉⲩϩⲃⲏⲩⲉ
ⲛⲇⲓⲕⲁⲓⲟⲥⲩⲛⲏ...

> The plural concord of the generic impersonal pronoun is a feature of
> many languages, as are indefinites. But remarkable here is the *zero*
> article throughout; also the rare feature of a "that" form adjoined by
> the *nota relationis* ⲛ-.

Even if someone renders a place estranged unto God in his acts
of impiety, persons do also render a place so that God may be nigh
to them in their deeds of righteousness.

(134) Cod. XO 239 (Boud'hors, *Canon 8*, with n. 688) ⲟⲩϩⲟⲟⲩⲧ ⲁⲩⲱ
ⲟⲩⲥϩⲓⲙⲉ ⲉⲁⲩⲧⲁⲕⲟ ⲛⲧⲉⲩϩⲉⲗⲡⲓⲥ ϩⲙⲡⲕⲁⲕⲉ ⲉⲧⲉⲧⲉⲩϩⲉⲗⲡⲓⲥ
ⲡⲉ ⲡⲧⲃⲃⲟ ⲛⲧⲥⲁⲣⲝ ⲙⲙⲁⲧⲉ...

> A striking case of attributive adnominal ("Relative") clause, with a
> non-specific nucleus,[11] as interpreted by the editor. However, it may
> well be a case of hermeneutical ⲉⲧⲉ-... ⲡⲉ, overruling the specific-
> ity factor.

A man and a woman, having destroyed their hope in the darkness
— their hope being only purity of the flesh.

(135) *De Iudicio* f. LVIII rᵒ (Behlmer) ⲙⲏ ϭⲉⲣⲱⲃ ⲛⲧⲟϥ ⲁⲛ ⲡⲉ ϣⲉ

> An intriguing case of the copular NS: rarely negative, with both
> initial theme and final *zero*-articled rheme. A *zero*-determinated
> theme is rare (excluded in other NS patterns); the sequence of the
> three enclitics is instructive. The nexus of countable and uncount-
> able is noteworthy too. NB: not "a stick".

But aren't sticks too wood(en)?

(136) Amél. II 174 ⲁⲛⲟⲛϩⲉⲛϭⲟⲗ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲛⲟⲛϩⲉⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲁⲛ

> The rheme of first NS has an ambiguous analysis and reading:
> "lies" and "fake, false". As a matter of fact, this applies (to a lesser
> degree) to the second rheme as well: "men", "human".

We are lies, not humans.

---

[11] Cf. Shisha-Halevy 2007, 238, 351f., 360; 2014.

(137) Amél. II 174 ⲡⲉⲧϭⲟⲟⲗⲉ ⲙⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲧⲏⲣϥ

> The augens expands the definite article (nucleus of the second ⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ), which (unlike the first ⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ) is exocentric, referring to God, not to "light".

He who is wrapped in the Light and who is all light.

(138) De Iudicio f. LVI vᵒ p. 144 (Behlmer) ⲙⲏ ϣⲁⲩⲥⲣⲟⲩ ⲛⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ

> The compatibility of the object marker ⲛ- with the *zero* article is questionable, and instances are rare. One would expect a Focalizing Aorist.

Does one crucify a god?

(139) Leip. IV 154 …ⲉϥⲙⲉⲣⲉⲧⲡⲱ ⲉϥϩⲟⲣϣ

> … *who loves heavy burdens.*

and

(140) P. Michigan 158, f. 16 rᵒ (Young, *Coptic Manuscripts*, 54) … ⲉⲧⲙϯϩⲟⲓⲧⲉ ⲉϫⲱⲓ ⲉⲡⲱⲟⲩ ⲡⲉ

> …*not to put on me clothes of theirs.*

>> A rare instance of a NS theme-and-rheme as a masculine-neuter resumption of a *zero*-articled feminine lexeme (I doubt Crum's suggestion that ϩⲟⲓⲧⲉ is "bi-gender"). Needless to say, only pronouns can reveal this neutralization.

and

(141) Leip. III 205 ⲁⲅⲁⲡⲏ ⲉϥϫⲏⲕ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ

> *Perfect love.*

>> By now a familiar construction, the *zero*-article "feminine" noun, resumed or substituted by a **masculin**e pronoun (or feminine, or plural) is taken for granted as a feature of Coptic syntax in all dialects[12]. However, the main implication, and still main conundrum of this remarkable feature lies, I believe, in the syntactic interference of the lexeme. A neutric (m./f./plur.) reference to a *zero* is probably to be expected, yet can one say that the lexeme plays no role? In other words, where does the gender category reside? Moreover, the neutralization brought about by the *zero* is not complete, since we do not find a feminine pronoun referring to a *zero*-article "masculine" noun syntagm; the masculine pronoun following a "feminine" lexeme may

---

[12] See Boud'hors 2013a, notes 343, 348.

well be the unmarked gender term. Another question concerns the formal expression of the conditioned masculine: the evidence of very rare adnominal (circumstantial) NS in Mich.158 (ex.135) is compromised by the alleged double gender of ϩⲟⲓⲧⲉ (Crum CD 720b), which is still in need of examination (in Shenoute — feminine only?). The role of statistics — "a given lexeme is mostly/usually masculine/feminine", as revealed **only** in its compatibility with a definite article or demonstrative — is unsatisfactory and unclear, indeed an obscuring factor. Ex. 136 is instructive in that its feminine classification is morphological (ex-Greek), and overruled by the *zero* neutralization. (Yet as a matter of fact, ⲁⲅⲁⲡⲏ, like so many of ex-Greek words in Coptic, is synchronically Coptic, and belongs in a separate **Coptic** sublexical system, with its own **Coptic** rules).

(142) Amél. II 3 ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲧⲱⲛ ⲭⲉⲉⲩⲛⲁⲙⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲡⲉⲛⲓⲡⲉ ⲭⲉⲕⲉⲗⲉⲃⲓⲛ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲥⲏϥⲉ ϩⲓⲙⲉⲣⲉϩ ⲙⲛϩⲉⲛⲕⲟⲟⲩⲉ ⲉⲛⲁϣⲱⲟⲩ

> A passage of great theoretical interest. First and foremost, we glimpse here Shenoute's epistemological reflection on naming and conceptualization. Then, the *zero* articles for concept-naming (*Nennform*). Then, the neat coordinative opposition of ⲁⲩⲱ (non-bracketing) to ϩⲓ — (inside bracketing) in *zero*-article syntax. Not least, the syntax of ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲧⲱⲛ "whence?": to my knowledge, this is the only interrogative-focus Cleft Sentence with ⲭⲉ- + Focalizing Future for glose (topic).

How come they should call iron 'axe' and 'sword' and many others?

(143) Amél. I 77 ⲙⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲭⲉⲡⲉⲙⲕⲁϩ ⲛϩⲏⲧ ϩⲓⲗⲩⲡⲏ ϩⲓⲁϣⲁϩⲟⲙ ϩⲓⲟⲩⲱⲗⲥ ⲛϩⲏⲧ

> Beside naming syntax, and the interesting feature of the intrinsic specificity of a "called" PN, we face here the dilemma of reading the name as "he who is characterized by heartache, pain, sighing and depression", or properizing "Heartache-Pain-Sighing-Depression", rhetorically perhaps more effective.

Call him 'he of heartache, pain, sighing and depression'.

(144) Leip. III 57ff. *passim,* catalogic listing) ⲟⲩⲗⲁⲟⲥ ⲧⲉ ⲟⲩⲥⲱⲛⲉ ⲧⲉ ⲟⲩⲥⲟⲛ ⲧⲉ ⲟⲩϣⲏⲣⲉ ϣⲏⲙ ⲧⲉ ⲟⲩϣⲉⲉⲣⲉ ⲧⲉ ⲟⲩⲣⲣⲟ ⲧⲉ ⲟⲩⲣⲣⲱ ⲧⲉ (and so on).

> The deep difference between this pattern — the Delocutive NS — and the Endophoric one (Shisha-Halevy 1987), is here clear-cut. In this long text, the basis for V. Jernstedt's seminal 1949 article, ⲧⲉ "she" refers to the allegorical Bride of the Song of Song; the rhemes,

whether feminine or masculine — all indefinite — stand in a nexal relation to the theme ⲧⲉ. This is their only relation. On the other hand, in the Endophoric pattern (e.g. ⲧⲉⲡⲣⲱ ⲧⲉ "it is winter", ⲡϣⲱⲙ ⲡⲉ "it is summer"), beside the nexal interdependence, there is **concord** — the rheme **conditions** the theme's gender/number. Thus, there is no conflict between the femininity of ⲧⲉ and the masculinity of, say, ⲣⲣⲟ or ⲥⲟⲛ. Another question regards the indefinite article, nuclear in its syntagm. The issue of two homonymous indefinite articles, ⲟⲩ^{fem}, ⲟⲩ^{masc}, historically founded, is here irrelevant, since the theme ⲧⲉ has no reference to the articles. Another issue is the catalogue-like listing of the Bride's attribute, the pivotal part of the exegesis.

She is a people; she is a sister; she is a brother; she is a child; she is a girl; she is a king; she is a queen.

(145) *De Iudicio* f. LXVII vᵒ p. 166 (Behlmer) ⲛⲧⲟⲕ ⲇⲉ ⲱ ⲡⲣⲙⲙⲁⲟ ⲛⲣⲉϥϫⲓⲛϭⲟⲛⲥ ⲛⲟⲩⲕ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲥⲟⲟⲩϩ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲩⲕⲏ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲧⲉⲕⲉϩⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ

The possessive pronoun (= relation pronoun + personal pronoun, actualized relation pronoun) is in this uncommon example revealed as **specific,** since the Present form does not feature the existential ⲟⲩⲛ-. However, the augens may here raise the pronoun on the specificity scale. The prenominal relation pronoun ({ⲡⲁ-}) is non-specific, but specificity-indifferent, since it is not active on the determination paradigm.

But you, O rapacious rich man, all of yours are stacked, put under your ownership.

(146) *De Iudicio* LXI rᵒ p. 153 (Behlmer) ⲡⲉⲓϩⲱⲃ ⲅⲁⲣ ϫⲉⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉϥⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲟⲩⲙⲛⲧⲣⲙⲙⲁⲟ ⲧⲉ

This *locus* is interesting on two counts. First, ϫⲉ- expanding a high-specificity (and also low-specificity) noun; generally used for **adnominal naming,** ϫⲉ- occurs here epistemically to describe a concept, condition or state (ϩⲱⲃ) — "a holy man", which is considered to be "riches". An important role of the *zero* article, beside the generic, lexeme-like actualized noun, is to express the "notion name". Second, syntactically, the topic "the holy-man state", masculine, is resumed by a feminine pronoun, in what must therefore be the theme of an Endophoric NS (Shisha-Halevy 1987); the theme in this pattern is not commonly topicalized.

This concept, 'holy man', means wealth.

*   *   *

1.6 'Adjectives' and the human-animacy gender

Of interest seem to be cases of nuclear refinement of the -oc (human-animate) / -on (non-human-inanimate) gender alternation, in Greek loan-adjectives (*CGC,* Chapter Four). In a sense, these morphs act like two Egyptian determinatives ("classifiers"); they have little to do with Egyptian gender (except for the transition from ternary to binary gender systems), but do seem to revive the old "adjective" category, never entirely lost. Of special interest I find **the fine category of "human inalienables"**, including "mind", "blood", "soul", but not "life", "spirit". Several parameters, syntactic and semantic, Greek and Coptic, may be operative[13]. This system obtains in Shenoutean only; for certain sections we encounter trend and fluctuation. This important systematization, which can be used as typical or symptomatic of Shenoute's authorship, requires further study.

In a selective outline:

God, the Lord — (-oc) (147) Amél. I 87 ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲡⲛⲁⲏⲧ ⲛϣⲁⲛϩⲧⲏϥ ⲛϩⲁⲣϣϩⲏⲧ ⲛⲁⲅⲁⲑⲟⲥ *God the merciful, compassionate, long-suffering, good.*

The Congregation, people — (-oc) (148) Chass. 123 ⲧⲁⲕⲁⲑⲁⲣⲧⲟⲥ ⲛⲥⲩⲛⲁⲅⲱⲅⲏ *the impure congregation.*

Humans, persons, names — (-oc) — (149) Chass. 191 ⲛⲓϩⲙϩⲁⲗ ⲙⲡⲟⲛⲏⲣⲟⲥ *the wicked servants.*

Human inalienables — (-oc) (150) Amél. II 527 ⲡⲓⲃⲁⲗ ⲙⲡⲟⲛⲏⲣⲟⲥ *the evil eye.*

Animals — (-on) (151) Leip. III 47 ϩⲉⲛⲉⲗⲁⲭⲓⲥⲧⲟⲛ ⲛⲍⲱⲟⲛ *tiny animals.*

Plants — (-on) (152) Amél. II 402 ϩⲉⲛⲛⲧⲏϭ ⲙⲡⲟⲛⲏⲣⲟⲛ *bad weeds.*

The Devil, demons — (-on) (153) Paris BN 131[5] f.56 (John Chrysostomos) ⲛⲇⲁⲓⲙⲱⲛ ⲛⲁⲅⲣⲓⲟⲛ *the wild demons.*

Objects, materials — (-on) (154) Amél. II 74 ϩⲉⲛⲉⲗⲁⲭⲓⲥⲧⲟⲛ ⲛⲛⲟⲩⲃ *smallest pieces of gold*

---

[13] It is not clear to what extent this gender applies to the rhetorical "adjective" construction (see *CGC* Chapter 3), although the fewer exx. do comply (cf. Amél.II 74 ϩⲉⲛⲉⲗⲁⲭⲓⲥⲧⲟⲛ ⲛⲛⲟⲩⲃ ϩⲓϩⲁⲧ, although most instances are personal (-oc)).

Abstracts (-ⲟⲛ) (155) Leip. III 155, 16f. … ⲙⲛ ⲍⲉⲛⲙⲛⲧϣⲃⲏⲣ ⲛⲥⲁⲣⲕⲓⲕⲟⲛ[14] … *and carnal kinds of friendship.*

(156) Amél. II 486 ⲛⲉⲓⲥⲃⲱ ⲙⲡⲟⲛⲏⲣⲟⲛ *these evil teachings.*

(157) Amél. I 163 ⲉⲧⲃⲉⲛⲉⲩⲡⲣⲁⲝⲓⲥ ⲛⲁⲅⲁⲑⲟⲛ *because of their good practices.*

(158) Cod. XO 206 (Boud'hors, *Canon 8*) ⲧⲉⲛⲙⲛⲧⲁⲧⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲛⲥⲁⲣⲕⲓⲕⲟⲛ *our ignorance of the flesh.*

<p style="text-align:center">* * *</p>

1.7 Person

(159) BL Or 3851A f.160 (Cod. DT 58) ⲥⲟⲩⲱⲛⲉⲛ ⲱ ⲛⲟⲩⲏⲏⲃ ⲛⲧⲛ†ⲍⲁⲡ ⲉⲣⲟⲛ ⲙⲁⲩⲁⲧⲛ

> Inclusive 1st plur. — imperative, almost in neutralization of the allocutive/locutive plural opposition; opposed to the non-inclusive ⲙⲁⲣⲛ-?

Know ourselves, O priests, and we shall judge ourselves.

(160) Amél. I 73 ⲛⲧⲟ ⲏ ⲛⲧⲟⲥ ⲥⲁⲍⲱⲧⲛ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ

> Rhetorical inclusion of delocutive in allocutive perspective. Not anacoluthic.

You (fem.) and she, withdraw!

(161) Chass. 90 †ⲍⲧⲏⲧⲛ ⲛⲧⲱⲧⲛ ⲉⲛⲉⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲛⲛⲁⲉⲓⲙⲉ ⲉⲡⲉⲧⲛϫⲱ ⲙⲙⲟϥ

> Allocutive (imperative), carried on by inclusive locutive apodotic — "and then we shall understand …". Curious on the whole, though not anacoluthic; neither ⲧⲁⲣⲛ- nor ⲙⲁⲣⲛ- would here do.

Pay attention to the Scriptures and we shall understand what we are saying.

---

[14] A nice feature is the well-attested ⲙⲛⲧ-…-ⲟⲛ (e.g. Amél. II 54)

(162) Chass. 98 ⲛⲉⲧⲟ ⲛⲣⲙⲙⲁⲟ ⲛϩⲏⲧⲛ ⲧⲛⲏⲡ ⲛⲣϩⲏⲕⲉ

> Locutive plural (and not delocutive) resuming the topic, which is allocutive (at least to a degree), thus well performing and defining the inclusive 1st plural.

They who are rich amongst us, we are supposed to be poor.

(163) Cod. XO 116 (Boud'hors, *Canon 8,* with n. 289) ⲉⲧⲃⲉⲡⲁⲓ ⲕⲁⲛ ⲉⲕϣⲁⲛϭⲓ ⲙⲡⲉⲓϣⲱⲛⲉ ⲏ ⲉϥϣⲁⲛⲧⲙϭⲓ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ϫⲉⲛⲛⲉⲡⲉϥⲥⲧⲟⲓ ⲣⲱ ⲉⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲏ ϣⲱϣ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ…

> Difficult, both for the pronouns and ϫⲉ-ⲛⲛⲉ-. Personal shift is not rare in cases of *Disiunctio Sinuthiana*. Both persons here may be generic (Cod. FL has ⲉϥϣⲁⲛ- only, affirmative and negative), but the 3rd sgl. (if not generic) would be obscure. The ϫⲉ- may be the specifying of the proleptic ⲉⲣⲟϥ, and the negation of the Future is "pleonastic" with "tolerate, suffer that (not)…"; but all this is speculation. (Ed. translates "même si on supporte cette maladie, et nul doute qu'il s'efforce que son odeur ne sorte pas du tout…").

Therefore, even if you tolerate that sickness, or if one does not tolerate it that its odour go up or spread out.

(164) Cod. XO 151 (Boud'hors, *Canon 8*, with n. 421) ⲛϭⲉⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲁⲛ ⲡⲉ ⲛⲥⲁⲧⲣⲉⲧⲛⲕⲱ ⲙⲡⲡⲁϩⲣⲉ ϩⲓϫⲛⲛⲉⲡⲗⲏⲅⲏ ⲏ ⲛϣϭⲁ ⲙⲡϣⲱⲛⲉ ⲛⲗⲟⲓⲙⲟⲥ ⲉⲧϩⲙⲡⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲧⲛⲧⲙϩⲱϩ ⲙⲙⲟϥ ⲛϩⲏⲧⲟⲩ

> The transition from 2nd plur. — the basic perspective in this passage — to the inclusive 1st plur., is not rare, and certainly not anacoluthic or irregular; it may coincide with a rise in prominence or affect. In fact, the 1st plur. too is generic in its system. (cf. French *on*).

It isn't anything else but that you (plur.) put the remedy on the wounds or the sores of the pestilent malady on the body and for us not to scratch it (= the remedy) in them (= the wounds and sores).

(165) Leip. III 144 ⲛϫⲓⲛϭⲟⲛⲥ ⲉⲛⲧⲁⲓⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲧϫⲱ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ ϫⲉⲉⲛⲛⲁⲃⲱⲕ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲙⲡⲉⲓⲙⲁ ⲉⲧⲃⲏⲏⲧ ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ϫⲉϯϩⲙⲕⲟ ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ ϩⲛⲧⲁⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉϥϫⲓⲛϭⲟⲛⲥ

> Delocutive — locutive (plur.) — locutive (sgl., hub speaker) — delocutive again. The speaker overrules. Nice example of person layering, or discourse blending. Not anacoluthic. A well-attested phenomenon, probably rooted in colloquial style, and definitely not an error (in fact, it is attested from Middle Egyptian on). Curiously,

three of the instances of allocutive/locutive/delocutive perspectival blending predicate "love" verbs, which feature also other idiosyncrasies. The interlocutive perspective seems to "seep" across the "say" boundary, while the delocutive acts as a basic, constant cohesive factor. The impression is that the interlocutives / delocutives tension is resolved by the latter's overrule, or at least persistence. At any rate, it is evident that the boundary between the singular speaker's locution (Shenoute) and the plural's locution is sharply demarcated; indeed, juncture contours are here paramount.

The acts of violence which I have committed to those who say: 'Because of me [him/you] we shall leave this place' because I humiliate them in my violence.

(166) Leip. III 120 ⲛⲉⲧⲭⲱ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ ⲭⲉⲛⲧⲁⲩⲭⲟⲟⲩ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲉⲣⲟⲛ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲭⲉ ϩⲛⲟⲩⲙⲉ ⲛⲧⲁⲩⲭⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲃⲉⲛⲉⲧⲙⲙⲁⲩ

> Leipoldt notes, in apparent despair, "totus hic locus corruptus esse videtur". Twin echo focalizations in locutive plur. and speaker's/narrator's comment. The resumption is fuzzy and of pejorative deixis.

They who say 'It is about us that all those things were said' — for truly, it is about those persons that they have been said.

(167) Chass. 88 ⲉⲣϣⲁⲛⲟⲩⲁ ⲇⲉ ⲭⲟⲟⲥ ⲭⲉ⳨ⲙⲉ ⲙⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ϩⲙⲡⲉϥϩⲏⲧ ⲧⲏⲣϥ ⲙⲛⲧⲉϥⲯⲩⲭⲏ ⲧⲏⲣⲥ ⲙⲛⲧⲉϥϭⲟⲙ ⲧⲏⲣⲥ ⲙⲛⲛⲉϥⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲙⲡϥⲙⲉⲣⲉ-ⲡⲉⲧϩⲓⲧⲟⲩⲱϥ ⲛⲧⲉϥϩⲉ ⲛⲥⲉⲛⲁⲛϩⲟⲩⲧϥ ⲁⲛ

> A nice *glissement* from locutive to delocutive perspectives, rhetorically forceful: the observer's delocutive — Shenoute. Note that this transition entails also a shift from subjective to objective. Not anacoluthic.

And if one should say, 'I love the Lord God with all his heart and all his soul and all his might and all his thoughts, while not loving his neighbour as himself, he shall not be believed.

Compare, for Shenoute's delocutive:

(168) Leip. III 153 ⲉⲣϣⲁⲛⲟⲩⲁ ⲭⲟⲟⲥ ⲭⲉ⳨ⲙⲉ ⲙⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲧⲉⲛϥⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲁⲛ ⲉϥⲙⲟⲥⲧⲉ ϩⲱⲱϥ ⲙⲡⲉϥⲥⲟⲛ ⲉⲧϥⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲣⲟϥ...

Should one say, 'I love God', whom he does not see, and yet hating his brother, whom he does see.

(169) Vienna K 9040 (Young, *Coptic Manuscripts*, p. 23f. with n. 6)
ⲡⲉⲧⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ϫⲉⲉⲣⲉⲡⲉⲧϫⲱ ⲛⲁϥ ⲛⲛⲁⲓ ϫⲉϯⲟⲩⲁϣⲕ ⲧⲱⲛⲉ
ⲕⲙⲉ ⲙⲙⲟϥ ⲛⲁⲙⲉ

> An extreme, complete 360-grade sweep from allocutive (1) to allocutive (2) with rhetorical-dramatic effect. Not anacoluthic. The focalizing Present seems to be autofocal, expressing the discredited claim (*CGC* p.77f.).

> *He who thinks that he who tells him this, 'I love you yery much',*
> *you really love him.*

> Consider also:

(170) Leip. III 88 …ⲛⲑⲉ ⲛⲧⲁⲛⲛⲁⲩ ⲉ� 2ⲁ 2 ⲉⲩⲡⲛ ⲅ ⲕⲁ 2 ⲉ ϫ ⲱⲟⲩ
ⲉⲩⲣⲓⲙⲉ ⲉⲩⲥⲟⲡⲥ ϫⲉϯⲥⲟ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ

> *Just as we saw many, scattering earth over their head, weeping,*
> *entreating, saying 'spare them!'*

<div align="center">*   *   *</div>

1.8 Adverbials. Conjugation mediators

(See also §1.9)

(171) Cod. XO 281 (Boud'hors, *Canon 8* with n. 894) 2ⲙⲙⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲁⲩⲱ
2ⲛⲛⲥⲩⲛⲁⲅⲱⲅⲏ ⲁⲛ ⲙⲁⲩⲁⲁⲛ

> I suggest considering ⲙⲁⲩⲁⲁⲛ here in the light of the adverbial status of the augens in Leip. IV 67-8 ⲧⲁ 2ⲉⲛⲙⲁ ⲙⲁⲩⲁⲁⲛ, "we alone, on our own": at least as a contributing factor in a personal mix-up.

> *Everywhere, and not only in the congregations (us) alone.*

(172) Leip. IV 37 ⲕⲁⲛ ⲙⲁⲣⲛϣⲓⲡⲉ 2ⲏⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲛⲓϣⲁϫⲉ

> The editor (n. 5) apparently does not accept, or recognize, the adverb ⲕⲁⲛ "at least", in Coptic to my knowledge solely introducing imperatives and jussives (Greek: Blass-Debrunner 1965, §374B, with Tabachowitz's *addenda,* p. 41). While the post-imperatival slot is significantly open to special clause forms[15], the pre-imperative one is almost entirely closed. In fact, ⲕⲁⲛ (exclusively or especially Shenoutean?) may be unique in Sahidic in this privilege.

> *At least let us be ashamed before such words.*

---

[15] Cf. Shisha-Halevy 2007, Index, p. 706 s.v.

(173) CU Or.16/1699 G v° (Young 2001) ογΝϩαϩ ϩΝΝΕΝΤΑγΒѠΚ
ΕΠΕϹΗΤ ΕΡΟϤ ΝϩΗΤΝ ϪΙΝΝϢΟΡΠ ΜΝΝΕΤΝΑΒѠΚ ΟΝ
ΝϩΡΑΙ ΝϩΗΤΝ ΕϩΡΑΙ ΕΡΟϤ ϪΙΝΤΕΝΟγ ΑγѠ ϢΑΤϹγΝΤΕΛΕΙΑ
ΜΠΑΙѠΝ ΝΑΠѠϩ ΜΠΕγϩΗΤ

> The extensive stretch interpolated inside the future clause, consist-
> ing of adverbials only, is significant both for determining the differ-
> ent circumstants and the juncture contours (§1.4).

*Many of those who have gone down into (Hell) amongst us since
the beginning, with those too who will go amongs us down to it
from now on until the end of this age, shall tear their heart.*

(174) Amél. I 113f. ΕΝΕΕΤΒΗΗΤΟγ ΠΑΡΑΚΕϢΗΜ ΠΕ ΝΤΕΠΕΤΡΠΑϩΡΕ
ΕΡΟΝ ϹΛΑΑΤΕ...

> The protasis consists only of a prepositional phrase, in a particular
> pattern with a *zero* theme. This joins several patterns of rhematic
> adverbials.

Were it because of them, our healer would almost slip.

(175) Leip. III 222 ΚΑΛѠϹ ΝϩΟγΟ ΕΝϢΑΝϹΑϩѠΝ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΝΕΝΝΟΒΕ

> Here too the adverbial is predicative (rhematic), while the theme is
> protatic. The ex-Greek adverbial is a productive morphological cat-
> egory, yet with its own syntactic properties. This group comprises
> almost the only non-deictic adverbials in Coptic. The pattern in
> point here is open to a few -ѠϹ items only. Moreover, there are but
> a few adverbials that occur with degree words.

It's rather well, if we distance ourselves from our sins.

Compare the next passage:

(176) Leip. IV 80 ΚΑΚѠϹ ΝϩΕΝΛΑΟϹ ΕγΡ-ΑΝΑϢ ΕΝΕΤΑΡΧΕΙ
ΝϩΗΤΟγ

> Special patterns predicating adverbials are old in Egyptian. The
> role played by morphological loan-adverbs is fascinating, in view
> of the Greek-origin adjectival subsystem, and the dearth of non-
> prepositional adverbs in Egyptian. The Greek-origin adverbials are
> more than lexical items: they have syntactical value and built-in
> valency and connectedness. Another point to consider here is the
> theme-marker, Ν-, yet another homonym in the abundance of Ν-
> morphs.

(177) Canon 7.4 §21 (2) = DG fgt.5 rᵒ (Wisse) ⲚⲒⲘ ⲠⲈⲦⲚⲀϪⲞⲞⲤ ⲀⲚ
ϪⲈ ⲚⲈⲢⲤⲞⲞⲨⲈ ⲘⲈⲚ ⲚⲀⲚⲞⲨⲞⲨ ⲚⲈⲦⲚ2ⲎⲦⲞⲨ ⲆⲈ ⲔⲀⲔⲰⲤ

> Yet another pattern featuring the ex-Greek morphological adver-
> bial as rheme. An immediate quandary: what would be the seman-
> tic opposition of this and *2ⲈⲚⲔⲀⲔⲞⲤ ⲚⲈ (I have no attestation).
> And then, why is the antithesis to predicative "good" expressed
> adverbially?

*Who will deny that the sheep-folds are good; as for what's in them,
though, it's bad.*

(178) Amél. I 96 ⲤⲈⲢⲠⲔⲈⲞ ⲞⲚ ⲚϪⲀϪⲈ

They are also inimical.

(179) Chass. 105 ⲦⲚⲢⲠⲔⲈⲢ2ⲞⲨⲈϯϬⲰⲚⲦ

> The so-called conjugation mediators are infixed in conjugation
> (verb) forms, not as constituents but as so to speak "phantom com-
> ponents", not affecting the internal structure of the form. But here
> only begins the *bizzarerie* of their junctural properties: the media-
> tors, despite their similarities, do not constitute a single category and
> are compatible with each other; despite their seeming adverbiality
> (they functionally resemble, and often correspond to, Greek pre-
> verbs), they do not modify the verbal rheme — in Coptic the expan-
> sion follows the nucleus — but seem, like prepositions, to be nuclear,
> and functionally and structurally to govern the entire nexus (!), so
> to speak "to ride" the nexus. They have some affinity to nexal nega-
> tion, with which their (partial) compatibility is uncommon; and
> more.

We also rather infuriate.

> The following text arguably demonstrates the existence and func-
> tioning of an adverbial (not substantivizing, "that") ϪⲈ-, histori-
> cally precedent as a real gerund or converb (*r-dd*). This hermeneuti-
> cal syntax is typically Shenoutean:

(180) Chass. 102 ⲔⲀⲒⲅⲀⲢ ⲈⲢⲈⲠⲂⲀⲖ ⲘⲘⲀⲨ ⲈⲦⲂⲈⲚⲀⲨ, ⲀⲨⲰ ⲠⲘⲀⲀϪⲈ
ⲈⲦⲂⲈⲤⲰⲦⲘ, ⲈⲒϪⲰ ⲘⲠⲀⲒ, ϪⲈⲈⲢⲈⲦⲘⲚⲦⲢⲘⲘⲀⲞ ϢⲞⲞⲠ
ⲈⲦⲂⲈⲚⲀ, ⲀⲨⲰ ⲦⲈϪⲞⲨⲤⲒⲀ ⲈⲦⲂⲈⲢ2ⲀⲠ

*For the eye is there for seeing, and the ear for hearing — by
which I mean to say, that riches exist for, and authority for doing
justice.*

*   *   *

1.9 Patterning[16]

A selection of interesting clause patterns — unusual, unrecognized, peculiar:

(181) Leip. III 107 ⲁⲗⲏⲑⲱⲥ ⲛⲛⲁⲍⲣⲁⲓ ⲍⲱⲥ ⲉⲱϫⲉⲛⲟⲩⲏⲍ ⲛⲥⲁⲟⲩⲥⲁ ⲛⲛⲧⲟⲡⲟⲥ ⲍⲛⲙⲡⲏⲩⲉ

> A case of # THEME + RHEME # predication of a clause. (This nexal sequence is not strange to Coptic or Egyptian).

> The template ⲛⲛⲁⲍⲣⲁⲓ ⲍⲱⲥ ⲉⲱϫⲉ- is formal, formulaic to a degree, opening a vision or dream texteme, alternating in Coptic at large with ⲍⲱⲥ, ⲉⲱϫⲉ + circumstantial or circumstantial alone. The clause form here is circumstantial, conditioned by ⲍⲱⲥ ⲉⲱϫⲉ-.

Truly, for me it's as if it is apart, in the abodes in heaven, that we live.

(182) Leip. IV 14 ⲡⲣⲍⲙⲙⲉ ⲡⲉⲧⲍⲛⲧⲉⲥϭⲓⲛⲥⲟⲟⲩⲧⲛ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉⲱⲱⲧ ϯⲣⲏⲛⲏ ⲧⲉⲧⲍⲛⲧⲉⲥϭⲓⲛⲕⲧⲟⲥ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲍⲛⲙⲙⲁ ⲉⲧⲥⲕⲱⲛⲥ ⲙⲙⲁⲩ... ⲧϭⲟⲙ ⲡⲉⲧⲍⲛⲡⲉⲥⲁⲙⲁⲍⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲁϫⲣⲟ ⲡⲉⲧⲍⲙⲡⲉⲥⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓ ⲙⲙⲛⲧⲱⲁⲛⲍⲧⲏϥ ⲙⲙⲛⲧⲛⲁⲏⲧ ⲙⲙⲛⲧⲭⲣⲏⲥⲧⲟⲥ ⲙⲙⲛⲧⲣⲙⲣⲁⲱ ⲑⲉⲗⲡⲓⲥ ⲛⲍⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲛⲁⲅⲁⲑⲟⲛ ⲡⲉⲧⲍⲙⲡⲉⲥⲥⲟⲃⲧⲉ ⲏ ⲡⲉⲥⲧⲱⲱ

> The alternation — or variation? — of gender in the topic of the CS series calls for comment (the reading is common to all witnesses). I cannot account for this. But probably of deeper significance is the very value of the patterns — if focalizing at all, then not polemic or contrastive. Remarkable is the tensing: descriptive Present throughout.

("she"= the prophetic Sword). *Steering is in the way she stretches out to cut; peace is in the way she returns from where she stabs; … power is in her grasp; strength is in her course of compassion, of mercy, of gentleness; hope for every good thing is in her plan or set-up.*

(183) Leip. IV 85 ⲟⲩⲍⲱⲃ ⲉϥⲍⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲙⲉ ⲡⲍⲱⲃ ⲟⲩⲟⲛⲍ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ...

> Paragraph beginning. An autonomous announcing, nominal syntactic unit followed by a parenthetic clause.

Truly a bad matter (the thing is clear).

---

[16] There can hardly be any doubt about the rhythmical nature of Shenoute's prose delivery. However, all that one can achieve at present are (a) isolate the rhythmics of specific patterns, (b) determine prosodic contours, cola and relationships of clitics, (c) locate the tone in many general cases.

(184) Canon 7.4 §12 (5) = DG 133 (Wisse) ⲛⲁⲙⲉ ϩⲱⲥ ⲉⲙⲛⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ ⲙⲛⲡⲛⲁ ⲙⲛ6ⲟⲙ ⲙⲙⲛⲡⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲙⲙⲛⲙⲛⲧⲉⲣⲟ…

> A remarkable situational clause, with a *zero* theme ("It is as though…).
> Or may ⲛⲁⲙⲉ be thematic, or in some way associated with the theme?

*Truly, it is as if there was no angel, no spirit, no power, no holy
one, no kingdom.*

(185) Cod. XO 290 (Boud'hors, *Canon 8)* ⲉⲓϣⲁⲛϫⲟⲟⲥ ϫⲉⲉⲓⲥⲁⲙⲛⲧⲉ
ⲉⲓⲥⲧⲙⲛⲧⲉⲣⲟ ⲛⲙⲡⲏⲩⲉ ⲉⲓⲥⲡⲕⲱϩⲧ ⲛⲧⲅⲉϩⲉⲛⲛⲁ ⲉⲓⲥⲡⲕⲁⲕⲉ
ⲉⲓⲥⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲉⲓⲥⲛⲕⲉⲑⲗⲓⲯⲓⲥ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲙⲛⲛⲕⲉⲙⲁⲛⲙⲧⲟⲛ

> Essential in Shenoute's rhetorical structure are the *Distinctions* —
> reducing the world into sharp and crucial oppositions, on the recog-
> nition of which depends essential piety. Most oppositions are binary
> and symmetrical; some are not. All use special patterns, the precise
> semantic differences between which must yet be worked out. In
> ⲉⲓⲥ-… ⲉⲓⲥ-… we have here the proclitic presentative (without the
> deictics ϩⲏⲏ-/ⲡⲉ/ⲧⲉ/ⲛⲉ) in a different role from its narrative or
> dialogic ones; in fact, I would not hesitate to argue, on the basis of
> form and distribution, that they are distinct entities. This text makes
> the lack of symmetry pretty clear; note especially ⲙⲛ- in the last
> dichotomy. See also XO 256.

*If I were to say, 'here is the Kingdom of Heaven — there is the
Fire of Hell', 'here is the darkness — there is the light', 'here are
all other tribulations — and all other places of ease and repose.*

> "**Thus also**…" "**So too…**" — one of the most important structur-
> ing rhetorical devices in the Shenoutean text; a familiar, typically
> Shenoutean, anacoluthic figured signal, is in fact an array of anaphoric
> NS constructions. This is a main-clause, second-term component of
> inclusion, expansion or comparison figures. Often, this is a herme-
> neutic figure. The variation/alternation (?) is in this integrated con-
> struction formally complicated. Some schematic principles follow,
> the main operative parameters being (1) gender and number of the
> satellite; (2) *nota relationis* / no *nota relationis*; (3) concord/discord
> of the satellite. The construction consist of ⲛⲧⲉⲓϩⲉ, deictic adver-
> bial; ⲟⲛ, particle/adverbial "also"; ⲡⲉ/ⲧⲉ/ⲛⲉ, thematic pronoun.
> The last is perhaps the most intriguing, for the masculine and femi-
> nine seem to vary freely, while the plural is regulated by concord.
> Noteworthy is also the adnexal Circumstantial closing the ⲛⲧⲉⲓϩⲉ
> ⲟⲛ ⲡⲉ unit. The connecting ⲟⲛ (or augens) is a constant compo-
> nent, as is the deictic ⲧⲉⲓ-.
>
> Although typically anacoluthic, it is not "wrong" in any way; on
> the contrary, it is idiomatic (with a modicum of formulaicity): both
> discord and (ⲛⲧⲉⲓϩⲉ ⲛ-) are entirely valid grammatically.

(186) Leip. IV 89 ⲛⲧⲉⲓϩⲉ ⲟⲛ ⲡⲉ ϩⲛϩⲛⲟ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲏϩ ϩⲛⲛⲉⲓⲥⲩⲛⲁⲅⲱⲅⲏ ϥⲓⲡⲣⲟⲟⲩϣ… (NS omitted by Ms. A)

Thus also with any object, that they who dwell in these congregations should take care.

(187) Canon 7.5 §3(2) = XG 176 (Wisse) … ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲧⲉⲓϩⲉ ⲟⲛ ⲧⲉ ⲡⲧⲁⲕⲟ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲉⲓ ⲉϫⲛⲛⲉⲩⲕⲉⲥⲉⲉⲡⲉ

And thus also the perdition which will come also upon their remnants.

(188) Leip IV 106 ⲛⲧⲉⲓϩⲉ ⲟⲛ ⲧⲉ ϩⲉⲛⲥϩⲓⲙⲉ ⲉⲁⲩϯ-ϩⲉⲛϣⲉⲉⲣⲉ ϣⲏⲙ ⲉⲧⲟⲟⲧⲟⲩ

Thus also women that have given girls into their hands.

(189) Leip. IV 84 ⲛⲧⲉⲓϩⲉ ⲟⲛ ⲡⲉ ⲟⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲏ ⲟⲩⲥϩⲓⲙⲉ ⲉⲩϣⲁⲛⲣⲁⲧϭⲟⲙ ϩⲛⲟⲩϣⲱⲛⲉ ⲏ ⲉⲁⲩϣⲱϭⲉ

Thus also a man or a woman if they get weak in an illness or when they are wounded.

(190) Cod. XO 259bis (Boud'hors, *Canon 8*) ⲧⲉⲓϩⲉ ⲟⲛ ⲡⲉ ⲡϣⲛⲃⲉ ⲙⲡϩⲁⲧ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡϩⲟⲙⲧ

Thus also the rust of silver and copper.

(191) Leip. IV 80 ⲛⲧⲉⲓϩⲉ ⲟⲛ ⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲧⲙⲡⲙⲁ ⲛⲛⲉⲧϣⲱⲛⲉ

Thus also they who are in the place of the sick.

(192) Chass. 194 ⲛⲧⲉⲓϩⲉ ⲟⲛ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲇⲓⲕⲁⲓⲟⲥ ⲓⲱⲃ…ⲛⲧⲉⲓϩⲉ ⲟⲛ ⲧⲉ ⲛⲛⲁⲅⲁⲑⲟⲥ ⲙⲛⲙⲡⲟⲛⲏⲣⲟⲥ

Thus also Job the Righteous; thus too the good and the wicked.

(193) Leip. IV 163 ⲛⲧⲉⲓϩⲉ ⲟⲛ ⲧⲉ ⲛϩⲟⲓⲛⲉ ϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲛϩⲏⲧⲛ… ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲧⲉⲓϩⲉ ⲟⲛ ⲧⲉ ⲛⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲛⲁⲡⲟⲟⲛⲟⲩ ϩⲛⲟⲩⲏⲓ ⲉⲩⲏⲓ ⲁⲩⲱ ϩⲛⲟⲩⲙⲁ ⲉⲩⲙⲁ

Thus it is also with some of us… and thus it is also with those who change from house to house and from place to place.

(194) Leip. III 48 ⲛⲧⲉⲓϩⲉ ϩⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲛϩⲉⲗⲗⲏⲛ ⲙⲛϩⲁⲓⲣⲉⲧⲓⲕⲟⲥ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲩⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲛⲛⲁϩⲣⲁⲩ ϫⲉⲉⲩϣⲟⲟⲡ ϩⲙⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ

Thus it is with the pagans and every heretic too, they thinking of themselves that it is in the light they are.

(195) Leip. IV 104 ⲛⲧⲉⲓϩⲉ ⲟⲛ ⲧⲙⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲧⲥⲩⲛⲁⲅⲱⲅⲏ ⲉⲥⲛⲁⲉⲓⲣⲉ ϩⲱⲱⲥ ⲟⲛ ⲛⲧⲉⲓϩⲉ

> Of particular interest here are the two distinct (and structurally homonymous) adverbials, with ⲟⲛ occurring twice, one for every subclause.

Thus also the Mother of the congregation, she too will be acting this way.

(196) Amél. II 346 ⲙⲟⲓϩⲉ ⲉⲝⲛⲙⲟⲓϩⲉ (see also ex. 224)

> Distinctive expressive-exclamative modal pattern A, possibly colloquial.

Wonder upon wonder!

(197) Cod. XO 257 (Boud'hors *Canon 8*) ϣⲁⲛⲧⲉⲟⲩ ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲉⲙⲓϣⲉ ϩⲓⲟⲣⲅⲏ ϩⲓϭⲱⲛⲧ

> The "Egyptian" "how long?" phrase, probably colloquial, opposed to the higher-register ϣⲁⲧⲛⲁⲩ; probably southern (Shenoutean, Akhmimic, Lycopolitan). The usual topic syntax is Circumstantial; our passage misses a rheme of the Circumstantial Present, or else has (uniquely to my knowledge) the preposition ⲉ- as topic marker. (Considering ⲉ- Circumstantial converter would require deciding on the Akhmimic pre-nominal form of the converter, well attested in Shenoute).The construction is attested in Late Egyptian.

How long for fighting, rage and fury?

(198) Cod. XO 256 (Boud'hors *Canon 8*) ⲉⲓⲥⲧⲟⲣⲅⲏ ⲉⲓⲥⲡⲛⲁ ⲉⲓⲥⲛϩⲁⲗⲟⲓ ⲁⲓⲧⲛⲛⲟⲟⲩⲥⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲩⲱϣ ⲉⲣⲱⲧⲛ ⲙⲡⲉⲓϣⲱⲙⲉ

> Two distinct functions of ⲉⲓⲥ-, indeed two entities: first here a paired distinction or opposition pattern, one of three favourite figures of Shenoute's, enhancing contrasting notions. Second here, a "regular" presentative, highlighting an event. Incidentally, this presentative, introducing the Perfect, signals a *perfectum praesens tense*. See ex. 185.

Here's Fury — there's Mercy. Look, I have dispatched the Elders that they may read this book to you.

(199) Cod. XO 283 (Boud'hors, *Canon 8*) ⲁⲗⲗⲟ ⲥⲟⲛ ϩⲓϣⲏⲣⲉ ϩⲓⲉⲓⲱⲧ ϩⲓⲙⲁⲁⲩ ϩⲓϣⲉⲉⲣⲉ ϩⲓⲥⲱⲛⲉ ϩⲓϣⲃⲏⲣ ⲛⲁⲙⲉ ⲙⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ ⲁⲗⲗⲟ ⲗⲁⲟⲥ

> Another of Shenoute's three "distinction" patterns, together constituting a major rhetorical motif and template. Although constructed as

two nexal subunits, we rarely find a single ⲁⲗⲗⲟ -. Remarkable is the rhetorically effective asymmetry: a "heavy" first flank, a brief single second flank. This pattern is affirmative only: rhetorical-question cases like Amél. II 411 (ⲏ ⲁⲗⲗⲟ ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲁⲛ ⲛⲁⲅⲁⲑⲟⲥ… ⲁⲗⲗⲟ ⲡϩⲛⲟ ⲛⲁⲅⲁⲑⲟⲛ…) are not really negative. It seems we should be able to trace the pattern back to later (koine?) Greek, but I for one was not able to detect a clear Greek source with correlative predicative ἄλλο.

One thing is a brother and son and father and mother and daughter and sister and truly faithful friend; another thing is a people.

(200) Cod. XO 250 (Boud'hors, *Canon 8* n. 732) ⲟⲛⲧⲱⲥ ⲧⲉⲧⲛⲟⲩⲟⲛϩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϫⲉⲧⲁϩⲉ ⲧⲉⲧⲛϩⲉ. ⲛⲧⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲁⲛ. ⲛ†ⲧⲁⲕⲟ ⲁⲛ ⲟⲛ. ⲛⲧⲱⲧⲛ ⲇⲉ ⲛⲁϣⲉⲛⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲁϣⲉⲑⲉ ⲟⲛ ⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛⲧⲁⲕⲟ ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ

Important, and difficult. We seem to have here a rare Coptic *Wechselsatz* ("balanced construction") type of NS[17] (*pace* Ed., n. 732), well established as a clause pattern since Old Egyptian. The subpattern, perhaps the oldest, that we have is homo-lexemic. Note the two punctuation marks: component and pattern delimiters. This "equation clause", in Ed.'s translation, comes to mean "vraiment vous êtes la preuve que j'ai ma manière et vous la vôtre", while denying (n. 732) this is a NS. I suggest reading ⲧⲉⲧⲛⲟⲩⲟⲛϩ ϫⲉ- as "you seem/pretend/appear as if/that"). The passage is obviously ironic.

In fact, does it really seem to you that my way is your way? I do not act, nor do I destroy. You, however, many are your deeds, and many are the things you destroy.

(201) Vienna K 9197 p. 91 (Orlandi 1985) ... ⲉⲛⲉⲕϩⲃⲏⲩⲉ ⲛⲟⲩϥ ⲛⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲛⲟⲩϥ ⲛⲉ ⲛⲟⲩⲕ

A different kind of *Wechselsatz* is in a sense analytic, following a topicalized delocutive pattern. Note a remarkable concomitant feature in the pattern's environment, namely the converted Circumstantial topic.The *Wechselsatz* itself is copular, and, in a sense, homolexemic, but is actually effected by the two NS conjointly.

… your works being his, and his being yours.

---

[17] Shisha-Halevy 1984, 184ff.; 2007, 700, s.v.

(202) Amél. II 83 ⲙⲛϣϭⲟⲙ ⲉⲉⲓⲙⲉ ϩⲓⲧⲙⲡⲉⲩⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲛⲧⲁϥⲥⲱϣ ϫⲉⲁϣ ⲡⲉ ⲁϣ

> Yet another *Wechselsatz* pattern.

It is impossible to make out by their despicable form which is which.

(203) Amél. I 67 ⲉⲃⲟⲗⲧⲱⲛ ϫⲉⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩⲉⲃⲟⲧ ⲛⲁⲟⲩⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲙⲡⲁⲧⲉⲧⲁϩⲟ ⲙⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁϥϫⲁϩⲙⲉϥ ⲏ ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁϥϫⲓⲟⲩⲉ…
> *How is it that a month should pass before you catch him who has defiled himself or who has stolen!?*

(204) Amél. II 8 ⲉⲃⲟⲗⲧⲱⲛ ⲡⲉ ϫⲉⲉⲩⲛⲁⲣⲛⲉϩⲃⲏⲩⲉ ⲛⲛⲇⲁⲓⲙⲱⲛ

> Among the many clauses with interrogative adverbial focus, fascinating in their complicated subsystem of Basic, Focalizing and Circumstantial tenses (e.g. ⲉⲧⲃⲉ-ⲟⲩ, ⲛⲁϣ ⲛϩⲉ),[18] ⲉⲃⲟⲗ-ⲧⲱⲛ stands out, syntactically as well as semantically: a rhetorical exclamation, somewhat between "how?" and "why?", an indignant, exasperated "how come?". Note the theme-topic form — strikingly, ϫⲉ- with Focalizing Future, or (rarely) -ⲡⲉ- formally mediating between focus and topic.

How is it that they should do the works of the demons!?

* * *

1.10 Sequencing ('word order'), placement

> A complex issue with multiple operative factors. Here are just three cases, but many others in the collection are relevant.

(205) Leip. III 209f. ⲕⲉⲍⲱⲟⲛ ⲟⲛ ⲉϥⲡⲣⲉⲓⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲟⲩⲕⲟⲩⲉⲓ ⲏ ⲉϥⲟⲩⲟⲃϣ ⲁⲓⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲉⲁϥⲉⲓ ⲉⲧⲟⲟⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲱⲙ ⲙⲙⲟϥ

> Continuation focus (or rather descriptive narrative rheme) in vision narrative. "I saw it" is entirely thematic; however, the adnexal ⲉⲁϥⲉⲓ is again rhematic, albeit dynamic.

Another animal too, slightly shining or whitish I saw, falling into the hands of those devouring it.

---

[18] Shisha-Halevy 1986, Chapter 2.

(206) Leip. III 180 ⲉⲡⲉⲓⲇⲏ ϫⲓⲛⲛϣⲟⲣⲡ ϣⲁϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ⲧⲉⲧⲛϫⲓϭⲟⲗ

> Adverbials in pre-clausal position are "preset" topics, thematic base to the rest of the clause.

Since from the beginning until now you have been lying.

(207) Chass. 38 ⲉⲣϣⲁⲛⲧⲃⲁϣⲟⲣ ⲁϣⲕⲁⲕ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲧⲉⲛⲧⲟⲕ ⲡⲉ ⲡϩⲙϩⲁⲗ ⲙⲡⲙⲁⲙⲙⲱⲛⲁⲥ ϩⲛϩⲉⲛϩⲣⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲩⲟϣ ⲉⲣⲉⲡⲙⲟⲩⲓ ⲧⲣⲣⲉ ⲉⲧⲉⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲡⲉ ⲡϩⲙϩⲁⲗ ⲙⲡⲉⲭⲥ

> In this well-known passage, the opening Conditional (so called; rather eventual-temporal) is focal, the closing Circumstantial or Focalizing Present is topical (*CGC*, §2.5). Of special interest are also the placement of the nexal negation, demarcating the first colon; the planting of two ⲉⲧⲉ… ⲡⲉ hermeneutics adjoining the focus and the topic; and, prosodically striking, the placement of the adverbial "in many voices", adjunctal to "cry out", between focus and topic, probably for rhythmic effect. The passage as a whole reverberates with rhetorical pathos.

It is not when the fox howls — that is you, servant of Mammonas — in many voices — that the lion trembles — that is me, servant of Christ.

* * *

1.11 Negation

(208) *De Iudicio* LV vᵒ p. 142 (Behlmer) ⲙⲡⲣⲕⲱϩ ⲉⲡⲓⲣⲉϥϫⲓⲛϭⲟⲛⲥ ⲉⲧⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲛϥⲛⲁϯⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲉⲟⲩⲱⲙ ⲉⲩⲁⲧⲛⲁ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲡⲉ

> To my knowledge this is a first Shenoute instance of the rare archaic construction of prefixal negation with no post-negation (Shisha-Halevy 1981, Funk 2014).[19] Alternatively, ⲗⲁⲁⲩ could perhaps be considered a post-negator, "not a thing, nothing", but so far as I know we have no exx. for ⲗⲁⲁⲩ replacing ⲁⲛ. (The enveloping negation appears first in Late Egyptian, but there are correspondents in earlier phases of Egyptian). Another point of interest in the passage is the uncommon compatibility of the Circumstantial Conversion with the particle ⲅⲁⲣ.

---

[19] A few days after noticing this published passage, Stephen Emmel informed me of another, unpublished one: YB 71 ⲉⲛⲥⲉⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ϫⲉ-. Of the 15 non-Scripture exx. I am aware of to date, a considerable documentation, almost all are either Present (incl. Present-based Future) or Second Tense pattern, also the Present template.

*Do not envy such malignant person — he won't give you anything
to eat, for he is merciless.*

(209) Cod. XO 237 (Boud'hors, *Canon 8*, with n. 680) ⲉⲛⲉⲙⲡⲉ
ⲛⲉⲓϫⲟⲟⲥ ⲁⲛ ⲡⲉ

> Rather than an "absolute" use of the negative base, the protasis here
> is a tensed Perfect base, anaphoric; its relative independence corre-
> sponds to the nuclear status of the conjugation base. The compatibil-
> ity with the Imperfect apodosis points to the existence of the past-
> sphere. (Consider [ⲉ]ⲙⲙⲟⲛ, not a base, for a Present-core extensive
> protasis).

If not, I would not have said it.

(210) A sophisticated rhetorical figure-pattern, the template of which is
[EXIST] NEG[1] — "that" — NEG[2] #, effecting an exceptionally
strong claim of totality. is a Shenoutean favourite, but not exclu-
sive to Shenoute or Sahidic. The pattern is dichotomous. The first
term is a statement of non-existence: ⲙⲛ- or, perhaps more typi-
cally, a negative value "what/who" rhetorical question; the second
term seems to allow any negative clause. The two terms are linked
by adnominal "that" (ϫⲉ-), the universal subordinator in Coptic,
strikingly opposed to the adnominal circumstantial.

Leip. III 69 …ⲉⲙⲛⲕⲉϩⲛⲁⲁⲩ ϩⲛⲛⲉⲛⲧⲁⲩϣⲓⲛⲉ ⲛⲥⲱⲟⲩ ϫⲉ-
ⲙⲡⲟⲩⲛⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲩ

*… there being no object in what they had asked for that was not
brought them.*

(211) Chass. 125 ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙⲙⲛϭⲉⲡⲓⲥⲧⲓⲥ ⲙⲙⲛϭⲉϩⲉⲗⲡⲓⲥ ⲛϩⲱⲃ
ⲛⲁⲅⲁⲑⲟⲛ ϫⲉⲛϥϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲁⲥ ⲁⲛ

> Note here the masculine reference to two ϭⲉ- quantified feminines,
> *zero*-articled Greek loanwords.

*And there is no faith, there is no hope of good thing, that does not
exists for her.*

(212) Leip. III 217 ⲁϣ ⲛϩⲛⲁⲁⲩ ϩⲛⲛⲉⲛⲧⲁⲩⲧⲁⲁⲩ ⲉⲡⲏⲓ ⲉⲧϩⲓⲃⲟⲗ ⲏ
ϩⲛⲛⲉⲛⲧⲁⲩⲣϩⲱⲃ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲛϩⲏⲧⲟⲩ … ϫⲉϩⲉⲛⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲁⲛ ϩⲙⲡⲕⲁϩ
ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲛⲉ ⲟⲩ ⲇⲉ ϩⲱⲱϥ ϩⲛⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲣϩⲱⲃ ⲉⲡⲁⲡϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ
ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩϯ ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲣⲟϥ … ϫⲉϩⲉⲛⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛⲧⲡⲉ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ
ⲛⲉ

What object is it, in what they have given for the external house or what they have been working on therein, that isn't, all of it, of the earth? And what is it, in what they are working on for the internal one, and what they are giving for it…that is not, all of it, of heaven?

(213) BL Or. 8664 p. 33 (Shisha-Halevy 1975) ⲛ̄ϯⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲁⲛ ϫⲉⲕⲛⲁϭⲛⲟⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ̄ϩⲁϩ ⲉϥⲟ ⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲉⲓⲕ ⲉⲧϩⲓⲙⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲧϩⲓⲧⲟⲩⲱϥ… ϫⲉⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲩⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟϥ ⲉⲧⲱϥ

I don't know that you will find a single man out of many, committing adultery with his neighbour's wife… with whose wife too adultery has not been committed.

Note the familiar formal transition of negativity from content-clause to the governing clause: "know that…not…" to " don't know that…"

(214) Leip. III 212 … ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲩϯ ⲉⲡⲁϩⲟⲩ ⲉⲑⲏ ⲁⲛ

A common, yet interesting construction. The negated, **second** adjunct is adjoined without coordination or disjunction marking, and clearly carries focal prominence; this would be unmistakable rhythmically. The negator alternates between -ⲁⲛ and ⲛ-…-ⲁⲛ; the latter in the case of a possessive. (As a matter of fact, ⲧⲱ is not strictly speaking an adjunct, but opposed to ⲛⲟⲩ-).

… that they should regress, not progress.

(215) Leip. III 205 …ϩⲓⲧⲛ̄ⲧⲇⲓⲕⲁⲓⲟⲥⲩⲛⲏ ⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲩⲉⲓⲟⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲱ ⲁⲛ
… by the righteousness of your fathers, not yours.

*   *   *

1.12 Conversion. Conjugation bases

(216) Leip. IV 28 ⲧⲉⲥϩⲓⲙⲉ ⲉⲧⲥϩⲙⲟⲟⲥ ⲙ̄ⲛⲟⲩϩⲁⲓ ⲕⲁⲧⲁⲥⲁⲣⲝ̄ (emended by the editor to ⲉⲧϩⲙⲟⲟⲥ)

A nice instance of the *abundans* pronoun.[20] I believe this is one of the most telling and significant cases of US — syntactic peculiarities — we encounter in Coptic. This construction is by now well attested, albeit rare, and still conflicts with classroom norm;

---

[20] Polotsky 1987, 55 ff.; Shisha-Halevy 2007, 525 f., 597 ff.

it concerns the distinction of Relative converter (our text) *vs*. Relative **pronoun** — the "normal" construction — a crucial opposition not yet well digested (so it seems) in Coptic grammar.

The woman who lives with a husband according to the flesh.

(217) Cod. XO 262bis (Boud'hors, *Canon 8* with n. 818) ⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ϣⲁⲛⲧⲙ̄ϩⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ ⲁⲡⲕⲁϩ ⲟⲙⲕⲟⲩ ⲏ ⲥⲟⲟⲩ

> The "normative" construction would have the Circumstantial as adnexal object of "find". The unconverted form may belong to a colloquial register. (See Boud'hors 2013a, Introduction § 10, p. 42, for ⲉϥϣⲁⲛⲧⲙ- to express oath-like assertion).

See if you don't find that the earth has swallowed or drunk them.

(218) Leip. III 31 ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ϣⲁϥⲕⲧⲟϥ ⲟⲛ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛϥⲟⲩⲱⲛϩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟϥ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟϥ ⲟⲛ ⲡⲉ ϩⲙ̄ⲡⲉϥⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ

> The Shenoutean NS with the peculiar iterated-pronoun/noun rheme — here ⲛⲧⲟϥ ⲛⲧⲟϥ — expressing immutability and unchangingness (Shisha-Halevy 1984, 186) is often Circumstantial, and (my impression) as a rule *zero*-converted.

But it returns and appears again, the same in its light.

(219) Amél. II 33 ⲉϣϫⲉⲧⲛⲟⲩⲏϩ ϭⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁⲡⲉⲧⲉⲁⲛⲟⲛⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩϥ ⲛⲉ…

> ⲁⲛⲟⲛ- is here theme, ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩϥ ⲛⲉ rheme in a Relative Interlocutive NS; ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩϥ ⲛⲉ a Relative Delocutive NS. This elegant *locus* has an imbrication of Relative Nominal Sentences.

If we follow him, whose we are.

(220) Leip. III 162 ⲧⲁⲓ ⲟⲛ ⲧⲉ ⲑⲉ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲧⲣ̄ⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲙⲧⲟ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲙ̄ⲡϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲉⲛⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲉϫⲱⲛ ⲙⲁⲩⲁⲁⲛ ⲛ̄ϩⲉⲛⲛⲟϭ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁϩⲟⲩ

> Personal shift, from generic to inclusive 1st plural.

Thus also anybody who sins before the Lord, we bring great curses upon ourselves.

(221) Leip. III 94 ⲟⲩⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲛ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡϣⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲱⲛϩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲥⲧⲁⲩⲣⲟⲥ ⲉϥⲗⲁⲙⲡⲉⲩⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉϩⲟⲟⲩ ⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲩϣⲏ

> Two passages illustrating the *rhematic* or *adnexal* conversion, infelicitously called "circumstantial": adjoining a predicative to text or

clause, noun or pronoun (which is by the same token thematic). In opposition to the Relative conversion, similarly adnominal, but *attrib-utive*. The prevalent view, seeing the Circumstantial adnominal to a non-specific (indefinite or *zero*-articled) noun, and the Relative to a specific one, is therefore incorrect. This brings home the deeply significant fact that both predicative and attributive complements are compatible with adnominal status.

We have the Tree of Life of the Cross, shining day and night.

(222) Leip. III 36 ⲙⲏ ⲙⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲣϣⲁⲛⲡⲉϥϩⲙϩⲁⲗ ⲣⲃⲗⲗⲉ ⲏ ⲛⲧⲉⲕⲉϩⲱⲃ ⲉϥⲟ ⲛ̅ϭⲁⲉⲓⲉ ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲙ̅ⲙⲟϥ ⲙⲉϥⲕⲁⲁϥ ⲉⲉⲓ ⲙ̅ⲡⲉϥⲙ̅ⲧⲟ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ

> The penchant of existentials for contracting paratactic expansion ("There was a farmer had a dog" syntax) is illustrated here. Arguably, ⲙⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ/ⲟⲩⲛϣⲁϫⲉ governs the entire protasis + apodosis complex.

Isn't there a person, if his servant is blinded, or any other thing that is defective should happen to him, will he not let him come in his presence?

(223) Chass. 68 ⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩϣⲁϫⲉ ⲕⲁⲛ ⲛ̅ϯⲟⲩⲉϣϫⲟⲟϥ ⲁⲛ ϯⲛⲁϫⲟⲟϥ
There is something, even if I don't wish to say it, I shall.

(224) Cod. XO 97 (Boud'hors, *Canon 8*, with n. 244) ⲙ̅ⲡⲕⲥⲱⲧⲙ ⲏ ⲙ̅ⲡⲉⲧⲛ̅ⲥⲱⲧⲙ ⲛ̅ⲧⲱⲧⲛ ⲛⲉⲧϩⲱⲡ ⲉϫⲙ̅ⲡⲉⲓϣⲱⲛⲉ ϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲛ̅ϩⲏⲧⲟⲩ ⲉⲓⲧⲉ ϩⲟⲟⲩⲧ ⲉⲓⲧⲉ ⲥϩⲓⲙⲉ ϣⲁⲛⲧⲉⲡⲧⲁⲕⲟ ⲙⲛⲡϣⲟⲣϣ̅ⲣ ⲙⲛ̅ϩⲉⲛⲕⲉⲑⲗⲓⲯⲓⲥ ⲛ̅ⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲉⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲉϫⲱⲧⲛ <u>ⲛ̅ⲧⲉⲧⲙ̅</u>ⲟⲩϣⲗⲏⲗ ⲉϫⲛⲟⲩϣⲗⲏⲗ ⲟⲩⲛⲏⲥⲧⲓⲁ ⲉϫⲛⲟⲩⲛⲏⲥⲧⲓⲁ ⲟⲩⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩϥ ⲉϫⲛⲟⲩⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩϥ ⲉⲁⲧⲉⲧⲛⲁⲁⲩ <u>ⲉⲩϣⲱϫⲡ</u> ⲛⲏⲧⲛ

> A striking, classic construction-break anacoluthon: the Circumstantial Present replaces the infinitive, following a long, compact, catalogic theme-phrase of the Conjunctive. Note that the Circumstantial conversion occurs as a conversion base, in Shenoute and elsewhere.

(225) Canon 7.7 §15 (2) Cod. XU 332 (Wisse) ⲁⲩⲱ ⲟⲩ ⲡⲉ ϫⲉⲙⲉⲣⲉⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲧⲁⲗⲉⲧⲟⲟⲧϥ ⲉϫⲛⲟⲩϩⲃⲃⲉ ⲛ̅ϥϭⲱϣⲧ ⲉⲡⲁϩⲟⲩ ⲛ̅ⲧⲉⲡⲉϥⲧⲛⲟⲙ ⲥⲟⲟⲩⲧⲛ̅. ⲙⲏ ⲉϥϫⲱ ⲙ̅ⲙⲟⲥ ⲁⲛ ϫⲉⲙⲉⲣⲉⲟⲩⲏⲏⲃ ⲙⲉⲣⲉⲙⲟⲛⲁⲭⲟⲥ ⲙⲉⲣⲉⲭⲣⲓⲥⲧⲓⲁⲛⲟⲥ ⲙⲉⲣⲉⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲧⲱϣ ⲛⲛⲉⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲧⲥⲱⲧⲙ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ ⲙⲉⲣⲉⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲏϩ ϩⲙ̅ⲡⲉϥⲏⲓ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲉϥⲧⲟⲡⲟⲥ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲡⲟⲩⲁ ⲡⲟⲩⲁ ϩⲛ̅ⲧⲉⲡⲣⲁⲝⲓⲥ ⲙ̅ⲡⲉϥⲃⲓⲟⲥ ⲉⲓⲧⲉ ϩⲟⲟⲩⲧ ⲉⲓⲧⲉ ⲥϩⲓⲙⲉ…

Repeated conjugation base and nominal actor alone, anaphoric to
the quoted negative Aorist base (Luke 9:62), without reference to the
lexical verb (infinitive). The conjugation form ends with no lexical
component. Clearly, it is the base + actor, the nuclear grammatical-
ized Coptic 'sdm.f' that counts, syntactically as well as literally.

*And what means 'no one puts his hand to a plough and looks back,
and his furrow is straight'? Doesn't he say 'no priest, no monk,
no Christian, no-one who reads the Scriptures and listens to them,
not those who dwell in His House and in all His abodes, everyone
in the practice of his life, man or woman.*

<p style="text-align:center">*   *   *</p>

1.13 "That"-forms (nexal substantivation).
The Conjunctive: sequelling roles. Modalities

The tension between ⲭⲉ-, general subordinator in Coptic, and the
prospective "that", ⲉⲧⲣⲉϥ-, and the Conjunctive, probably the
most enigmatic form in Coptic verb syntax, informs many construc-
tions of Shenoute's Sahidic.

(226) Leip. IV 80 ⲟⲩⲛⲏⲥⲧⲓⲁ ⲧⲉ ⲧⲁⲓ ⲛϩⲩⲡⲟⲕⲣⲓⲧⲏⲥ ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲡⲉⲧⲉⲓⲣⲉ
ⲙⲙⲟⲥ ⲥⲱⲛⲧ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲭⲉⲉⲩⲛⲁⲥⲱⲕ ⲙⲙⲟϥ ⲛϥⲟⲩⲱⲙ

A complex construction, based on a special NS, recalling that of the
proverbial syntax in "It's an ill wind that blows no one any good";
see Shisha-Halevy 1984, 183f. (a pattern occurring in Shenoute and
Manichaean corps [W.P. Funk]).

*It's a hypocrite fast, that whoever observes it should expect to be
urged to eat.*

(227) Canon 7.7 §9 (3) Cod. XU 306 (Wisse) ⲁϣ ⲙⲙⲁ ⲏ ⲛϩⲛⲁⲁⲩ
ⲡⲉⲧⲉⲙⲡⲉⲡⲁⲓ ⲭⲟⲟⲥ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲉⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲧⲃⲏⲏⲧⲟⲩ
ⲭⲉⲉⲕⲛⲁⲥⲙⲟⲩ ⲉⲡⲉⲓⲏⲓ ⲙⲛⲛⲉⲧⲛϩⲏⲧϥ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ϣⲁϩⲣⲁⲓ
ⲉⲛⲉϥⲧⲱⲃⲉ ⲙⲛⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ ⲭⲉϩⲉⲛⲉⲗⲁⲭⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ
ⲛⲉ ⲛⲧⲉⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲏϩ ⲇⲉ ⲛⲧⲟⲟⲩ ϩⲛⲛⲉⲓⲥⲩⲛⲁⲅⲱⲅⲏ ⲭⲁϩⲙⲉϥ
ⲁⲩⲱ ⲥⲟϥϥ...

An elusive role of the Conjunctive is here well illustrated: the Con-
junctive, not simply "carrying on" or subcategorizing any preceding
form, expresses a **final or eventual outcome and sequel.**

*What place or thing didn't that person call up to God about, saying
'may you bless this house and all those in it even up to its bricks*

and those that are considered insignificant, and then, those that dwell in these abodes, for their part, pollute and defile it.

(228) De Iudicio f. LV vᵒ p. 142 (Behlmer) ⲛⲁⲓ ⲅⲁⲣ ϩⲉⲛϩⲛⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲉ ⲛⲃⲗϫⲉ ⲛⲥⲉⲕⲱⲧⲉ ϣⲁⲩⲟⲩⲱϭⲡ ⲛⲥⲉⲣⲁⲧϣⲁⲩ ⲉⲣϣⲁⲛⲟⲩⲱⲛⲉ ϩⲉ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲉϫⲱⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲙⲡϫⲓⲥⲉ

> The Conjunctive here does not "carry on" or "continue" any clause, but the sequel — not 'continuing' the NS, but presenting in scenario or *tableau* the (often unexpected) eventual outcome, the *dénouement*.

For these are earthenware vessels, they turn and become worthless should a stone hit them from above.

(229) Leip. III 204 ⲛⲑⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛⲟⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉϥϩⲛⲛⲉϥⲡⲉⲑⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲁϥⲉⲓ ⲙⲡⲟⲩⲉ ⲉⲧⲣⲉϥϭⲙⲡⲟⲩϣⲓⲛⲉ ⲛⲧⲉϫⲟⲟⲥ ⲛⲁϥ ϫⲉⲧⲃⲃⲟⲕ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛⲛⲉⲕⲡⲉⲑⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲣⲉϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲧⲟ ϩⲣⲁⲓ ϩⲛⲛⲟⲩⲡⲉⲑⲟⲟⲩ...

> The Conjunctive clearly carries here the decisive development of an ironic, parabolic narrative.

For like a man in his bad ways, coming from afar to call on you (fem.), and you (fem.) tell him 'clean yourself (masc,) from your (masc.) bad ways' — while you yourself (fem.) are in your (fem.) bad ways.

(230) Amél. II 250 ⲙⲡⲉⲥⲙⲟⲧ ⲛⲟⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲁϥⲡⲱⲧ ϩⲁⲡϩⲟ ⲛⲟⲩⲙⲟⲩⲓ ⲛⲧⲉⲟⲩⲁⲣϫ ⲉⲓ ⲉϫⲱϥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛϥⲡⲱⲧ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲡⲉϥⲏⲓ ⲛϥⲡⲣϣⲧⲟⲟⲧϥ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉⲧⲉϥϫⲟ ⲛⲧⲉⲡϩⲟϥ ⲗⲟⲕⲥϥ

> The Conjunctive, here concatenated in a parabolic narrative, carries the crucial enfolding of the plot. In non-parabolic narrative, the Conjunctive is excluded.

As a man fleeing from a lion, with a bear attacking him; he runs into his house, spreads out his hand onto his wall and is bitten by the snake.

(231) Leip. III 64 f. ⲛⲑⲉ ⲉⲧⲕⲟⲩⲁϣⲥ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲁⲁⲥ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲛⲅⲧⲙⲁⲁⲥ ϩⲱⲱⲕ ⲛⲕⲉⲟⲩⲁ ϩⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛϩⲱⲃ ⲉϥϩⲟⲟⲩ ⲁⲩⲱ ϩⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲧⲕⲟⲩⲁϣⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲛⲅⲁⲁⲩ ϩⲱⲱⲕ ⲙⲡⲉⲧϩⲓⲧⲟⲩⲱⲕ

> An instructive passage. The Conjunctives are here probably modal — injunctive "that" — forms; the first and second parts are slightly anacoluthic (no "thus", and an asymmetric resumption, respectively).

Another point of interest regards diathesis: ⲉⲁⲁⲥ "to be done" reveals the neutrality of the Coptic infinitive. The injunctive's opposition to the imperative is not clear.

As you don't wish to be done to you, do not, you too, do to another, in any bad matter. And any matter you wish people to do to you, you too should do to your neighbour.

(232) Cod. XO 288 f. (Boud'hors, *Canon 8*, with Introduction §9, p. 41) ⲡⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛϣⲓⲡⲉ ⲁⲛ ⲡⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛⲣ̄ϩⲟⲧⲉ ⲁⲛ ⲛⲁⲥⲉⲃⲏⲥ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲛⲁⲭⲟⲥ ⲉⲓⲧⲉ ϩⲟⲟⲩⲧ ⲉⲓⲧⲉ ⲥϩⲓⲙⲉ ϩⲣⲁⲓ ϩⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲓⲧⲟⲡⲟⲥ ⲉⲓⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛⲣ̄ⲟⲩⲟⲥϩⲟⲩⲟⲣⲧ̄ ⲛ̄ⲛⲁϩⲣⲁⲓ...

The editor sees ⲡⲉ- as a unique protasis exponent. I doubt that ⲡ(ⲉⲧ)- (note: ⲡ-, not ⲡⲉ) is anything but the substantivized relative, remarkably functioning here as an "abstract relative" i.e. "that" form, as topic or *nominativus pendens*. Admittedly, I cannot offhand quote other examples, but am confident that other attestations for this elusive function will be recovered; "concrete" and "abstract" relatives are formally close in Egyptian and Coptic. Of course, ⲉⲓⲉ- (a superordinating converter-like element, usually following an ⲉϣϫⲉ- topic protasis) alone does not necessarily imply a condition.

That you aren't ashamed, that you do not fear, O impious monks, man or woman in these abodes — all the more accursed you are to me.

(233) Leip. IV 60 ⲛⲉⲛⲧⲁⲩϫⲟⲟⲥ ϫⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲛⲁⲟⲩⲱⲙ ϩⲙ̄ⲡⲉϩⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲧⲁⲩϫⲟⲟⲥ ϫⲉⲥⲉⲛⲁⲟⲩⲱⲙ ⲛ̄ϩⲏⲧϥ̄ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛ̄ⲥⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲟⲩⲱⲙ

Beside the established "that" function of the Conjunctive, a function even more prevalent in Bohairic, the Conjunctive is well attested in a **sequelling** role: not "carrying on" a preceding verb form, but expressing the sequel, outcome, consequence, *dénouement* (in narrative).

Those who said 'we shall eat!', on the day they had said that they would eat on, and yet they didn't eat.

(234) Leip. IV 94 ⲛ̄ⲥⲩⲛⲁⲅⲱⲅⲏ ⲉⲛⲁϣⲉⲛⲁⲡⲏⲩⲉ ⲉⲧϯⲥⲃⲱ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲡⲟⲩⲁ ⲡⲟⲩⲁ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉϥϣⲁϫⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉϥⲧⲱϣ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉⲧϥ̄ⲛⲁⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲉϫⲟⲟϥ ϫⲉⲙ̄ⲛⲟⲩⲁⲡⲉ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ ϩⲓϫⲱⲟⲩ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙ̄ⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩ ϯⲥⲃⲱ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙ̄ⲛⲡⲉⲧⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲉⲡⲉⲧⲥⲟⲩⲧⲱⲛ

Triply anacoluthic: fuzzy gender reference of ⲡⲟⲩⲁ ⲡⲟⲩⲁ and subsequent masculine pronouns (unless masculine ⲁⲡⲉ is presupposed); the enigmatic ⲭⲉ-, universal subordinator, which may be considered here contentual-causal; and any of the last three ⲁⲩⲱ, which may be superordinating (main clause).

The congregations, when the Heads teaching them are many, each with his words and his manner and what he will think of to say, (since) there isn't a single head over them (and) there is no one teaching them, (and) there's no one thinking of what is right.

(235) Canon 7.8 §20 Cod. XU 423 (Wisse) ⲛⲓⲙ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁϣϥⲓ ϣⲁⲛⲧϥϫⲟⲟⲩ ⲏ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲁⲉⲭⲉ ϣⲁⲛⲧϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ

In this passage, ϣⲁⲛⲧϥ- is not a "that"-form and object actant of "tolerate", but an adjunct-circumstant of intransitive verbs. For this amounts to an issue of valency and diathesis and valency. So not "be able to bear saying them", "who will suffer earing them". (In colloquial and later Sahidic, and rarely in Shenoute, ϣⲁⲛⲧϥ- does occur modally, as a near-*finalis,* and very rarely formalized and de-lexicalized as a "that"-form.)

For who will be able to bear up until he says them, or who will suffer until he hears them?

(236) Leip. IV 67 ⲧϭⲓⲛϣⲗⲗ ⲁⲉ ⲉⲧⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲡⲁϩⲧϥ ⲉⲡⲉⲥⲏⲧ ⲉⲙⲁⲧⲉ ⲙⲡⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲧϥⲛⲁⲥⲫⲣⲁⲅⲓⲍⲉ ⲙⲙⲟϥ...

ⲉⲧⲣⲉ- as prospective contentualizing "that"-form. Shenoute evidently, if implicitly, disapproves.

But that manner of praying, that a person should extremely throw himself down when he crosses himself.

(237) Leip. IV 66 ⲙⲟⲛⲟⲛ ⲉⲧⲙⲕⲁⲁϥ ⲛⲁⲛ ⲛⲥⲩⲛⲏⲑⲓⲁ ⲉⲧⲁⲗⲉⲡⲣⲟⲥⲫⲟⲣⲁ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲛϩⲁϩ ⲛⲥⲟⲡ ⲛⲑⲉ ⲉⲡⲥⲱⲛⲧ ⲛϩⲟⲓⲛⲉ ⲡⲉ

Non-finite injunctive. It is not clear to what extent "only" is involved in this usage, or the negativity (ⲉⲧⲣⲉϥ- itself occurs as an injunctive modal "that" in Shenoute).

Only not to make it a habit for us to offer up the Sacrament many times, as it is the custom of some.

*   *   *

1.14 Matters of style. *Disiunctio Sinuthiana*

(238) Cod. XO 289 (Boud'hors, *Canon 8* n. 930) ⲉⲓⲛⲁⲣⲟⲩ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ ⲏ
ⲟⲩ ⲡⲉ†ⲛⲁⲁⲁϥ ⲙⲡⲃⲟⲗ ⲛⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲥⲉϩⲏⲡ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲛⲉⲓⲥⲩⲛⲁⲅⲱⲅⲏ

> A case of *Disiunctio Sinuthiana*, chosen almost at random from innu-
> merable instances. The DS templates, rhetorically forceful and symp-
> tomatic of Shenoute as a central stylistic landmark, a familiar symp-
> tom of Shenoutean authorship, certainly merit special monographic
> treatment. This is not a case of negligent composition, nor (at least
> not merely) a legalistic obsession with precision, but a device of rhe-
> torical sophistication of presentation. The feature comprises several
> subtypes; in the one before us, a case of 'registerial coverage', the
> two questions — both 'rhetorical' — are arguably synonymous
> (as far as we can detect). This is also the editor's insightful view
> and translation. Still, the two differ categorically in their adverbial
> adjuncts, which definitely reveals the two flanks as non-synonymous.
> It's a moot point, I believe, whether the DS is disjunctive or coordina-
> tive; in fact, as a complex linguistic sign, it is neither, or both: it
> expresses coverage of the range between both ends.

*What shall I do for you, or what is it I shall do, beside what is not
hidden from these congregations?*

(239) Amél. I 154f. ⲧⲟⲣⲅⲏ ⲏ ⲡⲉⲙⲕⲁϩ ⲛϩⲏⲧ ⲉⲧⲉⲣⲉⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲓⲛⲉ
ⲏ ⲉⲧⲉϥⲛⲁⲛⲧⲥ ⲉϫⲛⲛⲉⲧϥⲛⲟⲩϫⲉ ⲏ ⲛⲉⲧϥⲛⲁⲛⲟϫⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ
ⲛϩⲏⲧⲉ

> In this important passage, we encounter a DS instance with the resump-
> tive pronominal object, in the Present-Based Future but not in the Pre-
> sent. This is probably related to the Stern-Jernstedt feature of the Pre-
> sent, but one wonders why not ⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ? (Cf. Cod. XO 55
> ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲏ ⲛⲉⲧⲛⲁⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲛϩⲉⲛϩⲃⲏⲩⲉ ⲛⲗⲟⲓⲙⲟⲥ; Cod. XO 108
> ⲛⲉⲧϩⲱϩ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ / ⲛⲉⲛⲧⲁⲩϩⲟϩⲥ). Another point of interest is the
> resumption of "fury", the first noun, but not the second, "heartache".
> Note that the first disjunction in the passage does not form a DS;
> I would suggest even a distinct ⲏ homonym.

*The fury or the grief which God is bringing or will bring upon
those He is casting or those He will cast out of you.*

(240) Cod. XO 285 (Boud'hors, *Canon 8*) ⲥⲉⲟ ⲛϣⲙⲙⲟ ⲉⲡⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲏ
ⲡⲉϥⲥⲱⲙⲁ

> I suggest, tentatively, that 'inclusive coverage' is the prime principle
> of the DS, rather than alternativity or correction or precision (the
> disjunction ⲏ notwithstanding) — that is, inclusive coverage of

the continuum between the two pseudo-alternatives. This figure forces us to determine the specific meaning of the two. (Another instance: ⲁϩⲣⲟ⸗ and ⲉⲧⲃⲉⲟⲩ are not synonyms; both, and their blending, are subsumed in the complex.) ⲡⲥⲱⲙⲁ and ⲡⲉϥⲥⲱⲙⲁ merge into a compound concept — " the Body that is His Body".

They are estranged to the Body or His Body.

(241) Leip. III 48 f. ⲟⲩⲙⲟⲛⲟⲛ ⲇⲉ ⲭⲉϣⲁⲩⲣϭⲱⲃ ⲏ ⲥⲉⲟ ⲛϭⲱⲃ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲙⲡⲉϩⲟⲟⲩ ⲟⲛ ⲙⲡⲉⲩⲙⲟⲩ ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲣϭⲱⲃ ϩⲙⲡⲧⲣⲉⲩⲕⲁⲧⲁⲣⲅⲉⲓ ⲛϭⲓⲛⲉⲩⲥⲙⲟⲧ

> This nice passage of DS is instructive, illustrating the alternation and conditioning of and incidental noun predication by the copular ⲣ- / ⲟ ⲛ-, which is a different entity from the denominal deriving ⲣ-, as in ⲣ-ⲛⲟⲃⲉ, ⲣ-ⲡⲟⲗⲉⲙⲟⲥ. Moreover, we encounter the 'rhematic adjective' issue: such sub-nominals, like ϭⲱⲃ, which do not occur as rhemes of a NS pattern. In fact, this issue has a diachronic facet: what, if any, are the Coptic correspondents of the 'Sentence with Adjectival Predicate' pattern? Yet another question regards the fine semantic opposition between the Aorist and the Present.

But not only do they weaken, or are they weak, but, on the day of their death, they will weaken still, as their forms diminish.

<p style="text-align:center">*   *   *</p>

1.15 Miscellaneous construction shifts

(242) Leip. IV 86 ⲉⲧⲃⲉⲟⲩ ⲛⲑⲉ ⲉϣⲁⲛϣⲓⲡⲉ ⲉⲭⲟⲟⲥ ⲭⲉⲁⲛⲟⲩⲉⲙⲟⲩϩⲛⲟ ⲉⲡⲙⲁ ⲛϣⲓⲡⲉ ⲛⲧⲟϥ ⲉⲭⲟⲟⲥ ⲭⲉⲟⲩⲕⲟⲩⲓ ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁⲛⲟⲩⲟⲙϥ

> A classic anacoluthon: ⲉⲡⲙⲁ "instead" replaces the "why?" clause ("… aren't we ashamed?"). By no means condemnable, for it is clear and syntactically sound/

Why, as we are ashamed to say 'we ate something', instead of being ashamed to say 'a little bit is what we ate'?

(243) Leip. III 15 ⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛⲁⲭⲟⲟⲥ ⲛⲁϣ ⲛϩⲉ ⲭⲉⲛϥϩⲁⲧⲛⲧⲏⲩⲧⲛ ⲁⲛ ⲡⲥⲁⲧⲁⲛⲁⲥ

> No ⲛϭⲓ- adjoining, but appositive syntax; like the major "regular" case of theme apposition, ⲉϥⲧⲱⲛ + APP, the rheme is adverbial.

How will you say that he, Satan, is not among you?!

References

Amélineau, Émile 1907-1914. *Œuvres de Schenoudi,* 2 vols. Paris.

Bacher, Wilhelm 1899-1905. *Die exegetische Terminologie der jüdische Traditionsliteratur*. Leipzig.

Behlmer, Heike 1996. *Schenute von Atripe: De Iudicio*. Torino.

Beyer, Klaus 1968. *Semitische Syntax im Neuen Testament*[2], I/1. Göttingen.

Blass, Friedrich, Debrunner, Albert, & Funk, Robert W. 1961. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature* (F. Blass and A. Debrunner). *A Translation and Revision of the ninth-ten German edition incorporating supplementary notes of A. Debrunner*, by R. W. Funk. Chicago.

Boud'hors, Anne 2013a. *Le Canon 8 de Chénouté (d'après le manuscrit Ifao Copte 2 et les fragments complémentaires). Introduction, édition critique, traduction*, 2 vols. BEC 21. Le Caire.

—. 2013b. "La particule ⲏ (grec ἤ) en position initiale dans la Bible et dans le Canon 8 de Chénouté." In: A. Boud'hors & Catherine Louis (eds.) *Études coptes XII (Actes de la 14ᵉ journée d'études coptes, Rome, 11-13 juin 2009)*. CBC 18. Paris, 225-240.

Chassinat, Émile 1911. *Le quatrième livre des entretiens et épîtres de Shenouti*. MIFAO 23. Le Caire.

Denniston, John D. 1970. *The Greek Particles*[2]. Oxford.

Emmel, Stephen 2004. *Shenoute's Literary Corpus*, 2 vols. CSCO 599-600, Subsidia 111-112. Leuven.

Frei, Henri 1929. *La grammaire des fautes*. Paris.

Funk, Wolf-Peter 2014. "Negative ⲛ- without ⲁⲛ as a Late Survival in Coptic Egyptian." *JCoptS* 16, 125-138.

Havers, Wilhelm 1931. *Handbuch der erklärenden Syntax*. Heidelberg.

Leipoldt, Johannes 1908-1913. *Sinuthii Archimandritae Vita et Opera Omnia, III-IV*. CSCO 42, 73. Paris.

Orlandi, Tito 1985. *Shenute contra Origenistas: Testo con introduzione e traduzione*. Roma.

Polotsky, Hans-Jakob 1987. *Grundlagen des koptischen Satzbaues, I*. Decatur.

Shisha-Halevy, Ariel 1973. "Apodotic ⲉϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ: a Hitherto Unnoticed, Late Coptic Tripartite Conjugation Form and its Diachronic Perspective." *Le Muséon* 85, 455-466.

—. 1981. "Bohairic-Late Egyptian Diaglosses: a Contribution to the Typology of Egyptian." In: Dwight W. Young (ed.), *Studies Presented to H.J. Polotsky*. Beacon Hill, 413-438.

—. 1984. "On Some Coptic Nominal Sentence Patterns." In: *Studien zur Sprache und Religion Ägyptens II, Festschrift W. Westendorf*. Göttingen, 175-189.

—. 1985. "Two New Shenoute-Texts from the British Library." *Orientalia* 44, 149-185, 469-484, pls. 9-10.

—. 1986. *Coptic Grammatical Categories: Structural Studies in the Syntax of Shenoutean Coptic*. Analecta Orientalia 53. Roma (= *CGC* so throughout).

—. 2004. "Juncture Features in Shenoutean Coptic: Linkage and Delimitation." In: *ICCoptS 7*, 155-175.

—. 2007. *Topics in Coptic Syntax: Structural Studies in the Bohairic Dialect*. OLA 160. Leuven.

—. 2011. "Rhetorical Narratives, Tableaux, and Scenarios: Work-Notes on Narrative Poetics in Shenoutean Sahidic Coptic." In: Fredrik Hagen et al. (eds.) *Narratives of Egypt and the Ancient Near East. Literary and Linguistic Approaches*. OLA 189. Leuven, 451-498.

—. 2014. "Circumstantial Vignettes: Reflections on Adnominal, Adverbial, Adnexal: The Coptic 'Circumstantial' Converb." *JCoptS* 16, 155-193.

Young, Dwight W. 1993. *Coptic Manuscripts from the White Monastery: Works of Shenoute,* 2 vols. MPER XXII. Wien.

—. 2001. "An Unplaced Fragment from Shenute's *Fourth Canon*." *JCoptS* 3, 133-147.

Ariel Shisha-Halevy
shisha@mail.huji.ac.il