Nicht auszuschließen ist freilich, daß ein ursprünglich semantisch be-
gründetes Regelwerk im Laufe der Sprachgeschichte (nach Wegfall des *nfr*
sw-Satzes bzw. im Zuge des Wegfalls dieses Satzes) in einen bloßen For-
malismus uminterpretiert wurde.

*   *

*

Dieser Beitrag sei Ihnen, lieber Herr Westendorf, zugeeignet als
kleines Zeichen der Erinnerung an die großen Wohltaten, die ich Ihnen
verdanke. - Manch ein Empfänger einer Festgabe hat schon darüber ge-
stöhnt, wie teuer ihn der Genuß einer solchen Ehrung zu stehen kommt:
wie viele Jahre es ihn kostet, all das zu widerlegen, was verbunden mit
seinem Namen in die Annalen der Wissenschaft einzugehen sich anschickt.
Aus persönlicher Sicht wünschte ich, daß Ihnen das bei diesem Beitrag
erspart bliebe - für die Wissenschaft freilich wäre es ein Gewinn,
wenn Sie in der Debatte um den Nominalsatz abermals ausholten, wie Sie
das schon einmal in Ihren pfiffigen *Beiträgen zum altägyptischen Nomi-*
nalsatz getan haben.

NOTES ON SOME COPTIC NOMINAL SENTENCE PATTERNS

Ariel Shisha-Halevy

There can be no doubt that of all issues of Coptic pattern grammar,
it is the Nominal Sentence that has had the most monographic attention[1].
Whatever the reasons for this special cultivation - the relative famili-
arity of this pattern set (known in similar forms from Egyptian and Semi-
tic), its (again relative) compactness and transparency as regards inter-
nal structure and external relations of its constituents, the urge of
typological interest in a verbless predication pattern - the happy out-
come is that today, although many details are still controversial, the
patterns have been by and large isolated and their formal (if not always
functional) analysis more ore less agreed upon. Most important of all,
following the Polotskian illumination of 1962, to the effect that the
operative terms in this analysis are the "logical" (not "grammatical")
subject and predicate (i.e. the theme or topic and rheme or comment/fo-
cus), we are now on the right descriptive road which will eventually lead
to a full statement on the subject. In a brief reformulation of the
system as seen by POLOTSKY, we distinguish the following patterns[2]:

(1) *Interlocutive* binary Nominal Sentences with a special (in Sahidic
and "Middle Egyptian" morphophonemically marked) set of subjective pro-
clitic personal pronouns, with the nexus manifested in the relative pro-
sodic lightness of the pronominal subject: (*Leip.* IV 190, 2f.) *ang-ourôme*
nasthenês "I am a weak man"; (*P* 131^6, 88 ro) *ntk-ousarkikon têrk* "You are
completely of flesh"; (*Cat.* 42) *ntk-nim ntok* "Who are you anyway?";
(*P* 130^4, 104, p.123) *an-hensabe* "We are clever"; (*Wess.* 9, 118 a, 18f.)
ntetn-pôtn an "You are not your own". This pattern is in suppletive
assignation with the binary *delocutive* pattern.

(2), in which the subject is again pronominal and of relatively light pro-
sodic weight, anaphoric[3], of the demonstrative pronominal paradigm-set
and following its predicate: (Wess. 9, 139 a, 6ff.) ousophos pe "He is
wise"; (Cat. 42) ouŝeere ŝêm ntaf te "She is a girl of his"; (Leip. IV
166.18) noui ne "They are mine". This delocutive pattern is expandable
by a noun syntagm, "epexegetically" appositive to the pronoun pe/te/ne,
which then is no longer ana-, but cata-phoric, marking the subsequent
noun as thematic.

(2'), the only pattern marking a noun as theme (non-prominent topic):
(Chass. 82.49) ou te tenhelpis "What is our hope?"; (Leip. III 79.23ff.)
oumakarios pe peusebês "Blessed is the pious"; (ibid. 90.19) pôk pe
pnoub, pôk pe phat "Yours is the gold, yours the silver"; (Amél. II 32)
henhap ne neiŝaje ehrai ejôn "These words are judgements on us"; (Mun.
178) ntôtn ne neskopos mplaos "YOU are the people's watchmen".

Or, pattern (2) may be as it were "propped" or thematically founded on a
noun/pronoun in frontal extraposition, which then serves as a prominent
topic for the subsequent clause (this pattern, common in antitheses, is
cotextually marked):

(2'') (Leip. III 142.29f.) anon-henrefrnobe, ntof de oupetouaab pe "We
are sinners, but He – He is holy"; (ibid. 141.14f.) nekŝaje mnnektôŝ
têrou henme ne, nouei de henŝol ne "All your words and commandments are
true, but·mine – mine are false". With an interlocutive subject, we have
the analogous (1''): (BKU 191²) anok de ank-ouhêke "... but as for me –
I am a pauper"; (Chass. 166.6ff.) anon de anon-napehoou "... but we – we
are of the day".

Finally, a third major pattern (3) that is not subject to binary Immedi-
ate-Constituents analysis: a ternary pattern with initial subject (theme,
topic) and final predicate (rheme) formally interconnected by a medial
copula pe (te,ne). This pattern, usually affirmative, usually unmodified,
is the most problematic of all, and our understanding of its structure,
constituency, distribution and paradigmatic relations is as yet very in-
complete[4]: a special study is here called for. It is macrosyntactically

marked by special cotextual boundness, e. g. as a link in a "thematic
progression" ("sorites") chain[5], as the response-constituent of a dia-
logue Wechselrede, answering identity questions, as the hermeneia con-
stituent of a parable[6]. It is distinguishable from pattern (2') in func-
tion[7] as well as in prosodic contour[8]. Consider the following exx.:
(Chass. 65, 24ff.) "If we are sheep," tephusis nnesoou pe ouahou nsa-
pŝôs name "the nature of sheep is to follow the real shepherd"; (ibid.
139, 32ff.) ("Snakes and snakes' offspring") nhof men etsôŝe hijmpkah ne
hellên nim "(By) the snakes crawling upon the earth (I mean) all pagans";
(ibid. 141, 20ff.) ("The glory of the Lord in the islands of the sea")
thalassa pe pkosmos, nnêsos ne nekklêsia mpeKhristos "The sea means the
world, the islands mean Christ's Churches"; (Leip. III 152-3) ouoei
nnetnaŝôpe nasebês hrai nhêtn "Woe to them who will be impious amongst
you" – nasebês ne netstoebol nnentolê nneneiote "The impious are those
who reject the commandments of our Fathers" – nettsto ebol mpŝaje mp-
joeis ne netmoste nnethitouôou njioue "Rejecting the Word of the Lord
are those who hate their neighbours covertly"; (ibid. IV 198, 5f.) nim
pe pai ... pai pe Paulos "Who is this? ... This is Paul". Note, moreover,
that this pattern is the one used for (a) predicating an infinitive, (b)
non-polemic, "plain" identifying predicative information.

*   *   *

In the following pages, I shall dwell on some Nominal Sentence con-
structions which, even if not central and particularly common[9], never-
theless reward a close inspection by special insight into the structure,
constituency and relations of the Nominal Sentence in general.

I ZERO DETERMINATION IN THE NOMINAL SENTENCE

As a rule, studies of the Nominal Sentence refer to the nominal
term(s) as "noun" tout court, i. e. in a broad paradigmatic conception,

---

3) A non-anaphoric subpattern is formally distinct by the automatic concord of its sub-
ject "pronoun" (really situational, cf. CALLENDER Ch. IV) with the predicate determi-
nator: pseu pe, pkairos pe "it is time" (Leip. IV 75.1; III 74.14); pŝôm pe, teprô te
"it is summer/winter" (ibid. IV 110.222; 111.2); thaê te "It is the end" (Chass. 23.
6f.). The subject here is non-phoric (or "homophoric"), purely formal, a focus-mar-
ker. (Cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 1976, 45).

4) For instance, its relationship to a superficially homonymous pattern in which it is
apparently not possible to assign thematic/rhematic roles to either of the terms – a
solemn anacletic pro-/acclamatory sentence # pronoun – pe – proper noun# (e.g. RE 10,
161 a 27ff.: ntok pe pnoute mme mauaak, unless the augens serves here as focus-mar-
ker). Needless to say, without the application of suprasegmental and/or macrosyntac-
tic data, pattern (3) would usually coincide (again, superficially) also with (2').

5) Cf. DANEŠ 1970.

6) Cf. POLOTSKY 1962, 426f. (= CP 431f.); SHISHA-HALEVY 1976, 48f.

7) Basically informative (vs. polemic or assertive) focality in pattern (2'); contrast
(Amél. II 403) (Who is the Paraclete?) Paulos pe pparaklêtos vs. pparaklêtos name
pe pepneuma etouaab auô Paulos an pe.

8) Consider for instance (Amél. II 76) pŝôf nnepsukhê nhenrôme euarkhei mnnetouarkhei
eroou pe joos ... or (ibid. 364) ara-pounof nouŝêre ebol hntmntrmmao entapefeiôt
taas naf pe ouhoou, also Leip. III 90, 5ff.; IV 51, 6f. In fact, the copula pe (te/
ne) is a structurally different entity (in paradigmatic/syntagmatic assignment and
prosodic properties) from the pronominal phoric subject/focus marker – pe/te/ne.

9) The present study is illustrated almost exclusively with representative examples
from the corpus of Shenoute's writings (see the Bibliography for source abbrevia-
tions in use). Some of the constructions discussed here are characteristic and in-
deed diagnostic of Shenoutean linguistic usage.

and not as a *noun syntagm*, i. e. determinator nucleus followed by a le-
xeme expansion. The price paid for this unsophisticated view[10] is heavy
- first of all in missing the insight that it is the determinator which
is the real predicate, not the lexeme (except as part of the predicate
phrase) - which means that our Nominal Sentence is really a "Pronominal
Sentence"[11]; secondly, this results in under-classification. In the
first of the present series of studies, we shall examine cases of *zero
determination* of constituents of the Nominal Sentence ("zero determina-
tion: the significant-absence term[12] of the full ternary determination
paradigm including also the "definite" and "indefinite" terms. This ex-
cludes such cases as *ouêr pe* (*Wess.* 9, 117 b, 22ff.); *hah ne* (*Leip.* IV
177, 13); *aš te* (*ibid.* III 22, 4) etc., for which the paradigms are *bi-
nary* or even reduced to a single term and their zero therefore different
in value (= structural identity). On the other hand, the *infinitive*
(verb lexeme) is included, although its determination system is special,
with *ou-* (Sgl. only) severely restricted and "zero" comprising both
"*sôtm*" and "*esôtm*".

(1) First, the *zero-determinated predicate*:

(a) # *predicate* - *pe* - *infinitive/the n* # (pattern (2'))[13]; nexus:
affirmative (rhetoric negation only), Basic and Circumstantial. Lexeme
constituency in the predicate: "half-closed" list of verb lexemes and

---

10) A remarkable exception being of course JERNSTEDT 1949 - but even he discusses only
indefinite determination.

11) Here as often elsewhere, one realizes that the patterns are in Coptic primarily
(i. e. in the *langue*) stateable for *pronouns* (and "*proverbs*", to include the con-
jugation bases); the noun (or verb-) lexemes are but their expansion, in the actu-
alization taking place in the *parole*.

12) A thorough structural study of Coptic determination is a long-due desideratum,
with zero determination being no doubt the term in most urgent need of elucidation
(cf., for English and French, JESPERSEN 1949, Ch. XV; GUILLAUME 1919, Chs. XVIII-
XXII; DUBOIS 1965, 149ff.).

13) See, very briefly, LAYTON 1981, 262 (∅- and indefinite determination are not
distributionally coextensive, *pace* LAYTON (*ibid.* 261) - e. g. before *ke-*, with
-nim or as object of the durative infinitive). This is the only mention of this
construction I am aware of (JERNSTEDT does not treat zero determination in 1949;
KICKASOLA 1975, 70; 77 considers as cases of zero-determinated predicate such (pro-)
nominals as are not subject to full paradigm of determination: numbers and proper
names - on the latter see below, notes 19-20). In the general discussions it is
overlooked, the vague "indeterminateness" subsuming both indefinite and zero terms
of the category. (Consider TILL 1956, 398; CHAINE 1955, 37; SETHE 1916, 169 -
following STERN, he considers the # adverb - *pe* # construction to be a case of the
"indeterminate" nom. predicate; mistakenly, I believe, since this is a distinct
modifier-predicating pattern in complementary distribution with the Bipartite Pat-
tern.

---

abstract noun-lexemes[14].

(*moihe* "wonder")[15] (*Amél.* I 114) (An exquisite house) *emoihe pe nau
erof ê ešôšt nsôf* "which it is wonderful to see or to look upon"/(*Leip.*
III 208, 7f.) (I saw as if a man came upon a snake or dragon and killed
it, and could not have enough smashing its head or mutilating its whole
body) *hnounoš norgê emoihe pe nau erof nhêts* "in a great fury in which
it is amazing to see him" - LEIPOLDT here emended the text, unnecessari-
ly, into *oumoihe*.

(*siše* "bitterness", *bote* "abomination") (*SH Or.* 159) (Description of
reprehensible marital relations) ... *esiše pe the eterephai šaje mn-
teshime, auô ebote pe the etereteshime šaje mnphai* "it being bitter,
the way the husband talks to his wife, and abominable, the way the wife
talks to her husband".

(*šipe* "shame", *šlof* "disgrace")(*Amél.* I 228) *šlof pe joou, šipe pe
sôtm eroou* "It is a disgrace to say (these things) and a shame to listen
to them". Sim. *BL Or.* 3581 A 66 (*Cat.* No. 198) *ešje-šipe pe je-nai, šipe
pe sôtm eroou, eie-šipe nouêr pe aau*; also *Amél.* I 210; *Wess.* 18, 137 b;
Chass. 185-6.

(*orgê* "wrath")(*Amél.* II 395) *ê orgê an pe joos je-fhiôôf noujaje
mmalakos* "and isn't it infuriating (or: "doesn't it provoke wrath") to
say that He (i. e. Christ) descends on an effeminate enemy?".

(*mkah nhêt* "grief")(*Leip.* IV 23, 22) *mkah nhêt pe sôtm eneišaje* "It
is grievous, listening to these words".

(*hote* "fear")(*Lefort Berl. Sitz.*) *neumntrefjioua têrou ... hote pe
joou* "It is fearful to recite all their blasphemies".

(*raše* "joy")(*Chass.* 183, 23) *oumounhoou efoš eraše pe nau epefšroš*
"Plentiful rain the sprouting (following) which it is a joy to behold".

(b) *nobe* "sin", *rôme* "man" in (*Guérin RE* 10, 161 b, 28f.) *nobe pe
penran rôme an* "Our name is 'sin', not 'man'" is different (although the
pattern is the same) and very telling: for this is a *naming construction*
- the lexemes are used nonappelatively, as proper names. So too in
(*ibid.* 161 b, 29f.) *ountak netenouk ne eangelos rntou nnahrak, auô*

---

14) The attestation of *nouj* "falsehood", *me* "truth" and other lexemes - approximately
those subject to *hyperdetermination* (see below) resulting in the "attributization"
of the determinator-lexeme functional relationship ("one with the quality of .../
a thing of ...") - may be expected. (Cf. in Bohairic *methmêi an te je ...*, DE VIS,
Homélies II 228, 4f.).

15) *henmoihe* ("Θαυμαστοί"), perhaps also *oumoihe te* (e. g. *SH Ench.* 94), like *oume pe*
"it is true" (cf. POLOTSKY 1962, 418f. = *CP* 423f.) is a case of *hyperdetermination*
(*indefinite* + ∅-); *psullabê* "the syllabary", *pme* "the true one", *pmoihe* "the won-
drous one", *pšom* "the mighty one" etc. (SHISHA-HALEVY 1976, 33; *Chass.* 59, 20ff.;
GUÉRIN RE 10, 161a, 27ff.; 163a, 32f.) are instances of a *definite* + ∅ - hyperde-
termination; compare *outeimine, henteimine* where the indefinite determinator is
expanded by a definite (demonstrative) one (JERNSTEDT 1949 §15).

dikaios an hipistos hipetauaab "You have your own, whose name before you
is 'angel', not 'righteous' or 'believer' or 'holy'". (Here we have the
only binominal Nominal Sentence pattern in Coptic, a residual naming
construction preserved only for the subject *rnt=*, the predicate "proper
noun" or *nim* "who?".

(c) A zero-determinated infinitive, in the ternary pattern (3):
subject - pe - predicate # , with the subject definite. Here the pre-
dicate constituency seems open; the infinitive (zero-determinated, with-
out *e-*[16]) does not commute with a non-verbal noun lexeme[17]. Some exx.
(of many):

(*Leip.* III 66-7) *oukoun mpjôk an mpnomos pe tm-ranaš nnouj ... alla
pjôk ebol mpnomos pe tm-ranaš eptêrf ... mpjôk an ebol mpnomos pe tm-
hôtb, ... alla pjôk mpnomos pe tm-aheratk oube-ppethoou* "Surely the per-
fect carrying-out of the Law is not, not to perjure oneself, but not to
swear at all? The perfect carrying-out of the Law is not, not to kill,
but not to resist (or: "fight") the evil one?"/(*ibid.* IV 195, 8, quoted
from *Rom.* 14,17) *tmntero gar an mpnoute pe ouôm hisô* "The Kingdom is not
eating and drinking"/(*Chass.* 65, 24ff.) *tephusis nnesoou pe ouahou nsa-
pšôs name, auô teuphusis an te eouahou nsa-pouôns psatanas* "The nature
of sheep is to follow the real shepherd; it is not their nature, to fol-
low the wolf, Satan"; note the shift from patt. (3) to negatived (2') -
supplying the negative for (3) - with *e + infinitive* the subject allo-
morph of the zero-determined infinitive.

                    *   *   *

In the cases (a) - (b) we witness a predication of the lexeme itself,
not of a determinator or noun syntagm (indeed, *articlelessness* would per-
haps be more apt as a definition of this *bare lexeme* than zero determi-
nation). Thus, on the face of it, it would seem that what we have here
is a "true" Nominal (not Pronominal) sentence[18]. However, further con-
sideration leads us to another, somewhat paradoxical conclusion. The
zero-determinated predicate noun is compatible only with the delocutive

16) TILL (1956 §7a) does refer to the "articlelessness" of the infinitive; however,
   his conclusion that the infinitive is therefore "not nominal" is a *non sequitur*.

17) A rare case of a non-verbal predicate: (*Leip.* IV 183, 6) *peunoute gar pe rôme*
   "Man is their God".

18) One discerns (with reservations) here an affinity with the pre-Coptic Egyptian
   "sentence with adjectival predicate"; cf. SETHE 1916 §§126, 133; CHAINE 1955, 23ff.
   "proposition de caractère adjectif" - our Ø-determinated noun would be what he
   calls a "mot adjectif" (Cf. the "attributs adjectivés" of GUILLAUME 1919, 283f.
   and the "statut d'adjectif" of the predicative zero-determinated noun, DUBOIS
   1965, 150 f.).

pronominal predicate *pe* and is incompatible with *ang-* etc.: this property
it shares with the class of *demonstrative and personal pronouns*[19] and
proper names[20] - all marked for specificity of reference, all not pre-
dicatable by an interlocutive pronoun (pattern (1) above; patterns (2),
(2'), (2'') have the most free predicate commutability)[21]. This class
is thus a meeting-point of the maximally specific (proper names) and the
minimally specific (personal pronouns), but only in a paradigmatic sense:
for the latter are, in a macrosyntactic, textual, syntagmatic analysis
equally hyper-specific, their reference being to a certain (pro)nominal
segment of the text (both pronouns and proper names are of conditioned,
non-pertinent reference value[22]). We see then that our predication is
after all "pronominal" - or rather a "naming" ("*Nennform*") predication:
the predicate is the "name" of the noun, an uncotextual, non-anaphoric
langue-form of the lexeme[23]. The case of (c) is different only in that
a verb lexeme is predicated for which the characteristic is not only the
absence of an article but also the absence of *e-*, here possibly indica-
ting the more salient inclusion of the infinitive as a constituent (*vs.*

19) Also the indefinites *hah* and *hoine* and the interrogative *ou* (not *nim*, see n.21) -
   ntk-ouou "What (sort of creature) are you?" (*Leip.* III 38,17) proves this point,
   predicating as it does the determinator *ou-* and not the interrogative pronoun. As
   for *hah*: it is indeterminable, i. e. stands, like a proper name, outside the deter-
   mination system (cf. *rouhe*, *htooue*, "evening", "dawn"; historically, *hh* seems to be
   a proper name indeed. *tnjek-hah* (*Marc.* 5,9) "We are many" is suppletive). I cannot
   account for the mutual exclusion of the interlocutive subject and the anaphoric
   pronoun *hoine* (*oua* is admissible in this pattern, e. g. *II Cor.* 11,22), unless here
   too the key factor is the incompatibility with any determinator.

20) Another syntactic property common to Coptic proper names and personal pronouns and
   perhaps due to their hyper-definite nature is their inability to constitute the
   nucleus of an *attributive* phrase ("*prôme ndikaios*"), but only of an *appositive* one
   ("*iôb pdikaios*", "*anok pebiên*"): cf. HALLIDAY-HASAN 1976, 147 ("proper name not
   capable of further specification"). The Egyptian-Coptic proper name as such has
   never been specially studied (for discussions of the issue in general, see GARDINER
   1957; KURYLOWICZ 1960; JESPERSEN 1949 Ch. XVI, for English). As I see it, the pro-
   per name differs from the common noun mainly in the *act of signification*: the pro-
   per name is an exponent of ad-hoc identification, with no recurring, regular and
   predictable *signifié* application.

21) This is the case in (Shenoutean?) Sahidic. In Fayumic we do find (*Marc.* 8,28 CHAS-
   SINAT) *ntek-iôhannês* (S and B avoid here this construction, cf. *Mt.* 16,14; *Luc.* 9,
   19). The interrogative pronominalization of the proper name, viz. *nim* "who?", is
   allowed in the interlocutive pattern: *ntk-nim ntok*? (*Cat.* 42); *anon-nim*? (*Leip.* III
   107f.), but then *nim* is *classificatory* as well as identificatory, pronominalizing
   common nouns no less then proper names. In pre-Coptic Egyptian, the proper name is
   compatible with the interlocutive independent pronoun: see GILULA 1976, 160ff.;
   JUNGE 1981, 450 ("zu allen Zeiten gebräuchlich" - not in Coptic). The affinity of
   the proper name with the zero-determinated lexeme is well demonstrated in I Cor.
   3,22, where "*ptêrf*" is specified by *Paulos, Apollô* and *Kêpha* on the one hand, *kos-
   mos, ônh* and *mou* on the other; *netšoop* and *netnašôpe* close the list, proving that
   formal definiteness (these are not further determinatable) is not incompatible
   with "abstract" notional signification.

22) In contradistinction to a personal pronoun, a proper name is not marked as cohesi-
   ve , either as a referent or referate (cf. HALLIDAY-HASAN 1976, 281).

23) Cf. GUILLAUME's (1919, 95) "forme spécifique du nom", which is "inactuel".

complement) of the pattern.

(2) A *zero-determinated subject* is encountered in pattern (3), i. e.
subject - copula - predicate # , in its glossing-hermeneutical role.
The predicate is a noun, determinate *pet-* or a *je*-clause; the subject is
lemmatic:

(*Amêl.* I 391) (The etymology of *daimôn/daimonion*: What means ("is")
the name "daimonion"?) *daimonion pe petsooun ê petpôš nhenmeros ... dai-
monion pe petsooun mpôš nhentoe* "'daimonion' means 'he who knows' or 'he
who allots' ... 'daimonion' means 'he who knows to allot'"[24].

(*Leip.* III 214) *nentaurjaie auô šôf senajoos eroou ... je-senakôt nmma
njaie, auô nentaušôf ... senaaau nbrre šaeneh ... šôf de pe auô jaie je-
nemn-petnanouf nhêtou* "Of them who became desolate and waste it shall be
said: "The desolate places and those that have been laid waste shall be
built ... they shall be made new for ever: "laying waste" and "desolation"
mean that there was no good in them".

(*Chass.* 122, 18ff.)(... like a horse famous for his gallop, falling
(*efhe*) often backwards (*nsa-pahou*) - *he men nsa-pahou pe je-hah nsop
assahôs ebol mmof* ... "Falling backwards means, that it (i. e. the Syna-
gogue of the Jews) moved away from Him (i. e. her Creator)".

(*Chass.* 137, 30ff.)(*"phof naouem-kah nthe mpoeik"* - "The snake shall
eat soil like bread" (*Jes.* 24,15) - *ouem-kah nthe mpoeik pe je-seoušt
nnše mnnône* "Eating soil like bread means, that they worship the objects
made of wood and stone".

(*Chass.* 142, 11ff.)("Fertile land that has been made salt" - *pai
ntautaaf mmlh*) - *mlh de pe je-atmntapistos ômôom nhêtou* "'Salt' means,
that infidelity prevailed among them".

$$*\qquad*\qquad*$$

In this case, the topic has an additional role of *exponent of lexical
cohesion*[25]. This accounts for its zero determination, which indicates
the reference to the verb lexeme predicated earlier in the text in a con-
jugation form, i. e. with zero determination. (The contentualization of
the lexeme by means of *je-* (not *etre-* !) ought perhaps to be rendered,
not "X means that" but "predicating X is tantamount to *saying* ...").

II *PATTERN-FINAL SUBJECT DEMONSTRATIVE*

The position reserved in pattern (2') for a noun syntagm, appositive-
ly lexicalizing the formal subject *pe*, may be occupied by a demonstrative
pronoun of the *pai* paradigm: (*Amêl.* I 462) *kemkah nhêt pe pai* "This is
yet another sorrow". This construction, a familiar landmark in Shenoute's
writings (and yet another "symptom of Shenouteanity") deserves attention,
not only from a stylistic point of view[26], but also and especially from
a syntactic-grammatical one - not least because of the remarkable place-
ment of *pai*, exponent of interclausal linkage, in the slot intended for
the lexicalizing noun.

Some examples (chosen from many others):

(*Chass.* 9, 19ff.) *ntoou ne nai ntaushai etbêêtou je-* "They are those
of whom it was written that ..."; (*ibid.* 150 passim) *nnouh ne nai ntau-
sôlp, nlaos ne nai mtaur-at-nahte ... neierôou ne nai ntaušooue, ntbt ne
nai ntaumou etbe-peibe, nrôme ne nai ntauoue ebol mpeKhristos ...* etc.
"These are the ropes that broke, the peoples that became unbelieving ...
the rivers that dried up, the fish that died of thirst, the people that
moved far away from Christ ..." - note the inner structure of the text
here, with subunits of allegoric predications preceding a non-allegoric
one. (*ibid.* 152, 5ff.) *ntos on te tai etoušaje eros je-* "This is she, of
whom it is said that ..."; (*Leip.* 80, 6ff.) *ounêsteia te tai nhupokritês
etre ... ouagapê te tai mmntatsooun ... etre ...* "This is a hypocritical
fast, to expect to be forced to eat ... this is a witless (kind of) cha-
rity, to sear to a fasting man 'We shall not leave unless you eat'";
(*Mich.* 158, 14a, 6ff.) *mpma an pe pai etre-nai mn*(sic) *šôpe euoneh*(sic)
... neikooue de eumoout "This is not the place for these to be alive and
for those to be dead"; (*Wess.* 9, 129b, 6ff.) *... etefmntrmmao te tai auô
tefhelpis* "... this being his riches and his hope"; (*ibid.* 140c, 4ff.)
henplanê ne nai auo henjaje ne etme "They are misleading and hostile to
the truth"; (*Chass.* 121, 9ff.) *nim te tai - tinatamôtn je-nim te* "Who is
she? I will tell you who she is"; (*Cat.* 42) (We read) *theikôn nnim napo-
stolos te tai auô je-tanim mprophêtês te tai ...* "whose Apostle's image
this is, and whose Prophet's that". Contrast also *the te tai n-* (e. g.
Amêl. I 12) with the ubiquitous *tai te the n-/ete-*.

$$*\qquad*\qquad*$$

---

24) Cf. *Etym. Magn.* (GAISFORD) 723. See also *Orion. Thebani Etymologicum* (STURTZ), p.
43; *Tzetzes ad Hesiod. Opera* (GAISFORD, III 101f., ad *Erga* 121); *Scholia ad Illiad.*
222 (DINDORF I 36); *Plato Crat.* 398b; *Alcman* 65 (PAGE).

25) Cf. HALLIDAY-HASAN 1976, Ch. 6, 318ff.

26) This is not the place for defining "style" *vs.* "syntax" as domains of descriptive
linguistics. I shall but say that, if the essence of style is in its relativity to
a general norm, then Shenoute's style is relative to a complete mystery, since non-
Scriptural "normal" literary grammatical usage is in Coptic totally *terra incognita*.
Indeed, the actual state of our knowledge of Coptic syntax hardly warrants this
distinction, even if it were viable from the theoretical point of view.

Two observations are called for. (a) The high incidence of a *definite* and *expanded* (by *n-* or relative) predicate in this construction. Indeed, it would seem that the minimal pattern - analyzable, but irreducible? - is # N *pe pai* # , with */pe pai/* in terms of Immediate Constituents a complex ana-/cataphoric logical subject + focus marker which, in comparison with */pe/* alone, has enhanced phoric (cohesive) force[27].

(b) A separate issue is the motivation or conditioning of this placement of *pai*, or, put differently, the selection of this construction from others in paradigm with it. From a stylistic point of view, this construction is hyperbatic, and may be (at least partly) accounted for by various expressive, rhythmic and rhetoric considerations[28]. Grammatically, this, pattern is immediately opposeable to patt. (3): # *pai pe* N (*et-/n-*) # - consider (*Leip.* IV 31, 21f.) *nai ne nesiour etemntou-šēre mmau nte-tsarks* "They are the eunuchs that have no child of the flesh", or (*ibid.* 198, 5f.) *nim pe pai ... pai pe Paulos* - with a special macrosyntactic marking[29] and basic (the lowest) informational ("Communicative Dynamism") grading (see above), and on both counts different from our construction. A third conceivable member of this paradigm, namely pattern (2'')(**pai* N *pe*) is definitely un-Sahidic[30]. (Note that a relative expansion of the predicate could lead in this case to homonymy with a Cleft construction, a homonymy avoided by the interposition of the demonstrative). It thus appears that our hyperbatic construction is indeed of grammatical significance and motivation.

III *THREE NOTES ON THE COPTIC "WECHSELSATZ"*

(1) By "Wechselsatz"[31] in the present context I mean a "correlative" or "balanced" construction, a Nominal Sentence in which both (pro)nominal

---

27) Cf. HALLIDAY 1967, 231ff. Two remarkable cases of an anaphoric Nominal Sentence worthy of separate study are (a) *-pe* anaphorically representing the *glose* of a Nominal Cleft Sentence, e. g. (*Chass.* 103, 30ff.) (*ene-mmonakhos ... netēp ernēsteia jn-ntok pe* "Is it the monks who are obliged to fast, or is it you?"; (b) a pronominal *predicate* anaphoric to an indefinite or definite determinator, e. g. (*Amél.* II 62) *teshime etjō mmos je-ang-ouparthenos eouei an te* "The woman who says 'I am a virgin' while she isn't one", also *SH Or.* 159-160; (*SH Or.* 157) (*tape nteshime pe peshai*) - *ntof name pe* "(The husband is the wife's head) - and he really is".

28) See GERBER 1885, 550ff; 552ff.; 556f.

29) Consider the "hermeneutic" or glossing *ete pai pe* X, alternating with *ete* X *pe*, where *ete-* is a lemma-gloss mediating device rather than a bona-fide relativ (cf. ELANSKAJA 1960).

30) Cf. SHISHA-HALEVY 1981, 321.

31) Originally EWALD's term (*Ausf. Gramm.* (1870) 864ff.), although used by him in a broader application, of correlative constructions in general. Cf. REGULA's "Zwillingssatz" (after KALEPKY: REGULA 1951, 86). For Egyptian-Coptic, see SETHE 1916 §§145, 138(?); GILULA 1976, esp. 170ff.; *Orientalia* 43, 379 n. 46; 381 n. 50.

---

terms are of equal functional (thematic/rhematic) and possibly prosodic weight, the true rheme of the sentence being in their very nexus. In a transformational view, this type of sentence may be regarded as a condensatory combination of two predications with the respective roles of theme/rheme alternately transposed. Such a configuration is indeed attested; it may of course be understood as a resolution or explication of the *Wechselsatz* in an unambiguous *cotext-pattern* pairing two (3 + 3) or (2'' + 3) sub-units[32]:

(*P* 130², 109 vo) *nekkarpos mponēron ne nouou auō nouou ne nouk* "Your evil fruits are theirs, and theirs are yours"; (*Wess.* 9, 129a, 22ff. = 146a, 26ff.)... *enekhbēue nouf ne auō nouf ne nouk* "Your works being His and His Yours"; note in both instances the cohesive value of the anaphoric possessive pronoun in the second constituent of the complex pattern. (*Chass.* 79, 51ff.) *naš nhe peuouōš an pe pouōš nndaimōn auō epouōš nndaimōn pe peuouōš* "How (can it be that) their desire is not the demons' desire, the demons' desire being moreover[33] theirs?". (*Leip.* IV 41, 22f.) *tmntrmnhēt nnahrau pe tmntathēt, auō tmntathēt nnahrau pe tmntrmnhēt* "Wisdom is for them folly, and folly is for them wisdom" - note the invariable *pe* copula between two feminine nouns.

(2) The true *Wechselsatz* merges superficially (i. e. without the application of suprasegmentals) with patt. (3), although some prosodic distinction is discernible: (*Amél.* II 83)(You cannot know by their form alone) *aš pe aš* "which is which"; (*Chass.* 54, 55ff.; 59, 31ff.) *pši ntpe pe pši mpkah* "The measure of the sky is identical with the measure of the land"; (*Amél.* II 2) *nefmelos ne netnmelos ekmerous* "His limbs are partly yours"; (*Guérin RE* 10, 162a, 41ff.) *petenekhbēue ne nef hbēue ... auō enekouōš ne nouf* "You, whose works are His works and whose wishes are His". Observe the lexical uniformity of two nominal terms. Not so in (*Leip.* III 22, 16) *anon pe ntof* "We and he are identical"[34]. The prosodic contour of the Wechselsatz is hinted at in (*Chass.* 185, 8ff.) *ešje-the nneteretorgē naei ejōou ebol je-mntau-Iēsous mmau je-eunašn-tefhaibes etepefna pe te the on etounajōlj nhēts nši-netōš auō on etsōtm ...* "If like those on whom the Wrath will fall, because they have not Jesus to hide under ("find") His shade, which is His mercy, will also be implicated they who read and listen to (these words), ...": the distinct prosodic nature of *te* is here revealed by the extensive interposition preceding it and indicated by the punctuation.

---

32) Cf. GILULA 1976, 160f.

33) The *modifier* (not conjunction) *auō*, see SHISHA-HALEVY 1975, 474; 1976, 52.

34) Cf. *Pistis Sophia* 231f. *prōme etmmau pe anok auō anok pe prōme etmmau ... anok pe ntoou auō ntoou pe anok*; cf. GILULA 1976, 160f.; 172f.

(3) A very different, highly idiomatic Nominal Sentence pattern which in a sense belongs here is *(pro)noun - (pro)noun on pe* (2nd,3rd persons or sgl.masc.; no negation; *pe* invariable, *on*, the sole modifier admitted, evidently essential to the construction; the nominal topic often extraposed) in the sense of "X is/remains immutable, unchanging":

(Chass. 143, 20ff.) (The synagogue of the Jews lost its walls and was destroyed,) *nsobt de ntoou ntoou on pe* "but the walls still last, the same"; *(Leip.* III 31, 9ff.) (Clouds may obscure the sun, but it returns) *nfouðnh ebol (e)ntof ntof on pe hmpefouoein* "and reappears unchanged in its light" - so to the Church of Christ, *ntos ntos on pe* "remains unchanged"; *(ibid.* 42, 22f.) *nefhbêue auô neftôš jinn-šorp ntoou ntoou on pe* "His works and His commandments since the beginning are ever the same"; *(Chass.* 21-2) *pekhrb pekhrb on pe auô ntok ntok on pe* "Your form is immutable and You are immutable" (addressed to Satan); *(Amél.* II 290) *pisatanas pisatanas on pe ... nekšaje mnnekentolê ntoou ntoou on pe* "Satan is ever Satan ... Your words and commandments never change".

<center>*   *   *</center>

Two analytic alternatives present themselves. Either this is a case of pattern (2''), with topical extraposed pronoun and an existential and self-assertive "*anok pe*" predication[35], modified by *on* "still" indicating changelessness - "It still remains true that *ntof pe*"; or we have a separate special pattern in which the *predicate phrase* is "*ntof ntof*", with a reiterated (pro)noun signifying self-identity. In either case, *pe* is non-phoric. The fact that an extraposed nominal topic often precedes this construction points perhaps to the latter interpretation, which would meet however with the objection that, unlike Bohairic[36], Sahidic does not express changelessness or self-identity by nominal reiteration.

---

35) Consider *Ps.* 101,27 (Sah.) *ntok de ntok on pe auô nekrompe naðjn an* (Boh. 101,28, without *on*) which may be an instance of our construction ("You rest immutable") or an existential predication; *Heb.* 13,8 *Iêsous peKhristos ntof nsaf pe auô ntof on mpoou pe ...*, often quoted or paraphrased with variations by Shenoute (cf. *Leip.* III 93, 8; *Chass.* 63, 56ff.; *Amél.* I 121; II 290 etc.) may be existential, but may also be a case of adverbial predication, suppletive to the Bipartite; *Mal.* 3,6 (Akhm.) *anak pe pjaeis petnnoute aou mpišibe* seems to be an instance of the self-assertive predication mentioned above (footnote 4). The connection with the difficult *petentof pe* "whoever it be" *(Gal.* 3,10; *Ruth* 3,10) is not clear. Consider also the following remarkable cases of "existential" or rhematizing *-pe*: *Gal.* 6,3 *anok pe* "I am something"; *anon pe* DE VIS, *Homélies* II 265, 15f., answering the question *nthôten atetn ...*; *I Cor.* 7,4 *peshai pe, tefshime te,* where *pe, te* seems but a formal *appui* for the rhematic noun.

36) e. g. *taisarks taisarks an te (I Cor.* 15,39), also *II Cor.* 3,18; 4,13; 12,18; *Hen.* 6,11 - an idiomatic construction rivalling *pai- rô* (and *ou- nouôt?).*

ABBREVIATIONS USED FOR THE QUOTED SOURCES (SHENOUTE TEXTS):

Amél.   E. AMÉLINEAU, *Oeuvres de Schenoudi*, Paris, 1907-1914

BKU   *Ägypt. Urkunden aus d. königl. Museen zu Berlin; Koptische Urkunden*, Berlin 1904

BL Or.   British Library Oriental Ms...

Chass.   E. CHASSINAT, *Le quatrième livre des entretiens et épîtres de Shenouti*, Le Caire, 1911

Guérin RE 10   H. GUÉRIN, "Sermons inédits de Senouti", *Rev. Egyptologique* 10, 148-164 (1902)

Lefort Berl. Sitz.   Text ed. by LEFORT in *Berl. Akad. Sitzungsberichte (Philos.-histor.)* 1912, p. 430

Lefort Cat.   L.-Th. LEFORT, "Catechèse christologique de Chenoute", *ÄZ* 80, 40-45 (1955)

Leip.   J. LEIPOLDT, *Sinuthii Archimandritae Vita et Opera Omnia*, III (Paris 1908); IV (Paris 1913); (= *CSCO* 42/copt. 4, 73/copt. 5)

Mich. 158 (unpublished) Michigan Copt. Ms. 158 (CRUM's "550")

Mun.   H. MUNIER, *Manuscrits coptes*, Le Caire 1916

P   (unpublished) Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fonds copte

SH Ench.   A. SHISHA-HALEVY, "Unpublished Shenoutiana in the British Library", *Enchoria* 5, 53-108 + Plates 9-30 (1975)

SH Or.   *idem,* "Two New Shenoute Texts from the British Library", *Orientalia* 44, 149-185 (1975)

Wess. 9   C. WESSELY, *Studien z. Paläographie u. Papyruskunde,* IX, Leipzig 1909 (= *Griech. u. kopt. Texte, I)*

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

CALLENDER 1970   J.B. Callender, *Coptic Nominal Sentences and Related Constructions*, Chicago, Ill. (Univ. of Chicago Dissertation)

CHAINE 1955   M. Chaine, *La proposition nominale dans les dialectes coptes,* Paris

DANEŠ 1970   F. Daneš, "Zur linguistischen Analyse der Textstruktur", *FL* 4, 72-78

DUBOIS 1965   J. Dubois, *Grammaire structurale du français: nom et pro-
               nom*, Paris

ELANSKAJA 1960   A.I. Elanskaja, "Sintaksiceskaja rol' opredelitel'nyx
                  predlozenij v koptskom jazyke", *Pal. Sbor.* 5 (68) 32-44

GARDINER 1957   Sir A.H. Gardiner, *The Theory of Proper Names*, Oxford

GERBER 1885   G. Gerber, *Die Sprache als Kunst*[2], vol. I, Berlin

GILULA 1976   M. Gilula, "An Unusual Nominal Pattern in Middle Egyptian",
               JEA 62, 160-175

GUILLAUME 1919   G. Guillaume, *Le problème de l'article et sa solution
                  dans la langue française*, Paris

HALLIDAY 1967   M.A.K. Halliday, "Notes on Transitivity and Theme in Eng-
                 lish, Part 2", *JL* 3, 199-244

HALLIDAY - HASAN 1976   M.A.K. Halliday and R. Hasan, *Cohesion in English*,
                         London

JERNSTEDT 1949   P.V. Jernstedt, "K determinacii v koptskom jazyke", *So-
                  vetsk. Vostokoved.* 6, 52-62, with German translation by
                  P. NAGEL (1978) in *wiss. Zeit. Univ. Halle* 27, 95-106

JESPERSEN 1949   O. Jespersen, *Modern English Grammar, VII: Syntax*, Lon-
                  don-Copenhagen

JUNGE 1981   F. Junge, "Nominalsatz und Cleft Sentence im Ägyptischen",
              in: *Studies Presented to Hans Jakob POLOTSKY* (ed. Dwight W.
              YOUNG), Beacon Hill, 431-462

KICKASOLA 1975   J. Kickasola, *Sahidic Coptic (N)...AN Negation Patterns:
                  A Morpho-Syntactic Description of Sentences and Adjuncts*,
                  (Brandeis Dissertation), Ann Arbor

KURYŁOWICZ 1960   J. Kuryłowicz, "La position linguistique du nom propre",
                   in: *Esquisses linguistiques*, Wroclaw-Kraków, 182-192

LAYTON 1981   B. Layton, "Compound Prepositions in Sahidic Coptic", in:
               Studies Presented to Hans Jakob POLOTSKY ed. Dwight W.
               YOUNG), Beacon Hill, 239-268

POLOTSKY 1962   H.J. Polotsky, "Nominalsatz und Cleft Sentence im Kopti-
                 schen", *Or.* 31, 413-430 (= *CP* 418-435)

         CP   *Collected Papers*, Jerusalem 1971

REGULA 1951   M. Regula, *Grundlegung und Grundprobleme der Syntax*, Hei-
               delberg

SETHE 1916   K. Sethe, *Der Nominalsatz im Ägyptischen und Koptischen*,
              Leipzig (Abh. sächs. Gesellschaft d. Wissenschaften, philos.-
              histor., 33/3)

SHISHA-HALEVY 1975   A. Shisha-Halevy, "Two New Shenoute Texts: Gramma-
                      tical-Phraseological Commentary", *Or.* 44, 469-484

              1976   "Unpublished Shenoutiana: Grammatical-Phraseologi-
                      cal Commentary", *Enchoria* 6, 29-62

              1981   "Bohairic - Late Egyptian Diaglosses: A Contribution
                      to the Typology of Egyptian", in: *Studies Presented
                      to Hans Jakob POLOTSKY* (ed. Dwight W. YOUNG), Beacon
                      Hill, 314-338

TILL 1956   W. Till, "Die Satzarten des Koptischen", *MIO* 2, 378-402

VERGOTE 1950   J. Vergote, "La phrase nominale en copte", in: *Coptic
                Studies in Honour of Walter Ewing CRUM*, Boston, 229-249