

## RES BIBLIOGRAPHICAE

An Emerging New Dialect of Coptic<sup>1</sup>

Ariel SHISHA-HALEVY

The work under review presents in full, with a translation and extensive erudite philological, textual and grammatical annotations, detailed indices and long descriptive, historical and linguistic introductions, the elegant *editio princeps* of forty-four Coptic texts (fifty-four epistolary and documentary texts in all, of which fifty-two are papyri) from the site of Ismant el-Kharab (the Dakhle oasis, at the Roman-period village of Kellis). All were written to members or associates of a textile-processing Manichaean or Christian-Manichaean community at the place, and are datable to the fourth century A.D. (mainly 355-380). These texts are written in a special dialect of Coptic, which — as W.-P. Funk believes — may be the closest yet to “L” pure and simple — a dialect exhibiting some interesting features, on some of which I shall very briefly dwell in the following review (which focusses only on the linguistic, not the historical or archaeological aspects of this exciting find). They are not easy, but are remarkably rich in interesting grammatical features and of considerable syntactic interest.

The extensive *Introduction* (pp. 4-45) is of a high standard of scholarship and covers most aspects of the site, describing it and putting it in its historical context. Personally, I find especially interesting the detailed prosopography (pp. 19-58), the discussion of the religious milieu (pp. 72-83) of the texts, and of course the linguistic profile (pp. 84-95). This is the first and to date the only sketch of the fascinating grammatical system revealed in this corpus, focussing on certain of its special or unique (especially morphemic) features, and on its dialectological status (coded L\*), which is determined mainly by (morpho-)phonological and morphological isoglossing. Among its striking features I find worthy of mention the non-vocalic affirmative pre-suffixal Perfect base  $\mathfrak{z}=\mathfrak{}$ , apparently opposed to  $\mathfrak{a}=\mathfrak{}$  and  $\mathfrak{z}\mathfrak{a}=\mathfrak{}$  (an issue discussed at length, pp. 86 ff.), but above all the attestation of  $\mathfrak{a}-$  for the circumstantial converter (p. 89 f.). I would take exception to the use of certain sweeping statements in this context, such as (p. 89) “Promiscuous usage of  $\epsilon-/$   $\mathfrak{a}-$  in converter type elements or the converted Present has always been a trademark of the Second Tense morpheme”, which is probably not true and anyway unwarranted without a proper corpus-based structural investigation. However, it is admittedly difficult to account for  $\epsilon-/$   $\mathfrak{a}-$  in circumstantial slots in terms of paradigmatic opposition (I believe  $\mathfrak{a}$  here is a graphemic notation of a central unstressed vowel: see below). Incidentally, the association of  $\bar{n}-$  in  $\bar{n}\bar{i}\epsilon-$ , presented

<sup>1</sup> Review-article of Iain CARDNER – Anthony ALCOCK – Wolf-Peter FUNK (eds.), *Coptic Documentary Texts from Kellis*, Volume 1: *P. Kell. V (P. Kell. Copt. 10-52; O. Kell. Copt. 1-2)*. With a contribution by C. A. Hope and G. E. Bowen. Dakhleh Oasis Project: Monograph, 9. Oxford, Oxbow Books, 1999. [vii]-364 p., 54 pl. 21,3 × 30,4. £60.00.

here as a frequent variant of  $\epsilon\epsilon-$  (p. 92), with the “adverbializer” — which is typically *adverbal*, following verbal forms or clauses in general — is problematic. I would rather opt for a phonetic nasal realization. An interesting syntactical feature pointed out in the grammatical profile is  $\Delta-$  + infinitive co-ordinated to and “carrying on” imperatives (p. 93 f.); this phenomenon, familiar from Semitic (esp. Biblical Hebrew), may be comparable to Sahidic  $\epsilon\tau\tau\epsilon\epsilon-$  in preceptive textemes (see A. Shisha-Halevy, *Coptic Grammatical Categories* [AnOr 53; Rome 1986] 205 f. n. 63).

The Indices (pp. 282-331) of Native Words, Loan Words, Personal Names, Conjugations, Triadic Pronominals and Subjects, are reliable and elegantly conceived and are a priceless tool for working through the texts and compiling material for grammatical and lexical study. (The Sentence Converters are presented twice, in the “Native Words” and “Conjugations” listings.)

The work concludes by presenting a revised edition/translation of the Syriac-Coptic Kellis fragments edited in the past (pp. 344-364).

The Coptic texts are a treasure trove for sophisticated, high-grade *epistolary grammar*, such as is amply forthcoming in any stage of Egyptian, from Middle Egyptian to Demotic, but is scant in Coptic. In a more critical mood: the grammatical analysis in the work under review is not rigorous enough for a linguist’s taste. The treatment of grammatical (esp. syntactic) issues is by no means shoddy, but sometimes impatient and simplistic. As a rule, syntactic topics are rather thinly treated; there are numerous questions that require to be thought about further.

#### Brief Observations on specific noteworthy grammatical features

##### I. The post-imperative slot: $\tau\alpha\tau\epsilon\epsilon-$ and the Conjunctive

$\tau\alpha\tau\epsilon\epsilon\omega\tau\tau\epsilon$  is not final; the locutor’s “personal guarantee” is restricted to the 2nd person; otherwise it is sequelling-consequential. Usually interlocutive:

*Sequelling consecutive*  $\tau\alpha\tau\epsilon\epsilon-$ : No. 19 line 78  $\tau\alpha\tau\epsilon\epsilon-$  “Write it (the letter) properly, and then we shall find ...” rather than final; No. 20 lines 38 ff. “Do not neglect to write concerning your health, and then we shall (be able to) leave our house”, and 50 f. “Do not delay to write to us through them, and then we shall be without worry”. Delocutive only in No. 48 line 41 f.  $\tau\alpha\tau\epsilon\epsilon\omega\tau\tau\epsilon\omega\tau\tau\epsilon\omega\tau\tau\epsilon$   $\pi\omega\epsilon$  in “money grammar”, expressing the sum total concluding a calculation (“making ...”, “to make ...”). The profile of  $\tau\alpha\tau\epsilon\epsilon-$  in the corpus considerably weakens the editors’ conjectured reconstruction in No. 29 line 7 f.  $\pi\epsilon\iota\ \pi\epsilon\ \pi\alpha\omega\alpha\eta\alpha\ \omega\alpha\pi\iota\omega\tau\ \pi\pi\omega\tau\epsilon\ \pi\tau\mu\eta\epsilon\ \tau\alpha$  [p]εραϊς.

*The Conjunctive*: No. 11 line 25  $\sigma\epsilon\epsilon\iota\ \eta\eta\iota\ \tau\epsilon\iota\ \rho\omega\tau\ \rho\alpha\tau\eta\kappa$ ; No. 12 line 8 f.  $\sigma\eta-\tau\omega\ \mu\mu\eta\alpha\ \eta\sigma\alpha\tau\ \dots\ \kappa\tau\eta\eta\alpha\gamma\sigma\epsilon\ \tau\eta\sigma\mu\eta\tau\omega\ \eta\epsilon\tau\ \eta\omega\tau\ \rho\alpha\iota\tau\epsilon$  “... and we shall make them into a garment” (not “we can make them ...”, as translated); No. 32 line 25 “fight in every way to put on its shield and you will be at ease in it for ever” (not “that you may be ...”).

##### II. The circumstantial converter $\Delta-$ (cf. the Introduction, p. 89)

Some at least of the alleged instances are possibly, if not probably cases of *asyndetic paratactic* narrative linkage. So No. 15 line 11  $\rho\alpha\iota\omega\alpha\tau\tau\epsilon\ \Delta\iota\sigma\epsilon\iota\ \eta\epsilon\kappa$

ΜΠΙΟΞΕ “I have hurried to write ...”; “already” (locutive) in No. 21 line 8 **ΑΠΟΥΩ** **ΑΠ-**, 25 line 34 **ΑΙΟΥΩ** **ΑΙ-**, perhaps even **ΜΗΝΚΑΠΤΡΙΟΥΩ** **ΑΙ-** (No. 17 line 9); see also below, note to No. 22 line 44 **ΑΙΘΗΤΣ** **ΑΥΜΑΞ-**. Incidentally, **ΑΙΡΕΩΕ** is the invariable form of the Perfect for this verb (I have not checked other correlations of this tense-form in the lexicon), e.g. No. 15 line 24, 16 line 13, 34 line 16, 31 line 21 f. with the paratactic **ΑΙ-**, and so on. However, **†ΝΑΕΣ** **ΑΙΡΕΩΕ** (No. 15 line 24; cf. **†ΝΑΕΩ** **ΕΙΡΕΩΕ** No. 35 line 48, 36 line 39) is clearly circumstantial, as is **Α-** in No. 25 lines 16 and 56, three concurring forms of the 2nd plur. circumstantial: **ΕΡΕΤΗ-**, **ΑΡΕΤΗ-**, **ΕΤΕΤΗ-**.

### III. Tempuslehre

(1) *The Aorist*: affirmative. Not in itself habitative or generic. Locutive: No. 17 line 23 **ΨΑΝ-** “we need, must”; No. 48 line 22 **ΨΑΡΗ-** personal undertaking; No. 17 line 50 **ΨΑΙ-** personal undertaking. Habituality only in **ΠΕΨΑΙ-** (No. 19 line 49). Delocutive: sequelling (“and then ...”) in No. 50 line 8 f. **ΚΝΑΞΙΣΕ** ... **ΨΑΡΑΟΥΑΝ** **ΝΙΜ** **ΞΕΣΤΩ**. Again, habituality is evident only in (**ΠΕ** ...) **ΨΑΩ-** (No. 19 line 50). Negative: converted only. No. 32 lines 4f. 10f. **ΕΤΕΜΑ** (**ΡΕ**) - clearly echoes Mt. 6:19-20. Only **ΕΜΑΚΤΗΝΑΥ** No. 42 line 15 is ‘authentic’: “you not writing”, in the sense of “it not being (in) your nature to write”.

(2) **ΑΩ-** vs. **ΞΑΩ-**: some hints of difference (based on general impression, not precise examination): **ΑΩ-**: following the presentative **ΕΙΣ(ΤΕ)** (No. 15 lines 15, 21; No. 17, lines 18, 32); **ΕΨΩΠΕ** (No. 20 line 50, for some reason translated here as Present); **ΠΩΣ** (No. 20 line 53); **ΧΕ-** (No. 25 line 56); asyndetic sequel to **ΞΑΩ-** (No. 15 lines 11); to the thematic **ΟΥΩ** (No. 21 line 8, 25 line 35) and thematic **ΘΗΤΣ** (No. 22 line 44); to other tenses (No. 17 line 45); in the formulaic **ΑΙΡΕΩΕ** **ΤΟΠΟΥ**. On the other hand, **ΞΑΩ-** and **ΞΩ-** are the main narrative carriers (in letters, often a *perfectum praesens*): No. 15 lines 9, 11, 14, 20 etc., No. 19 *passim*, etc.

(3) *The “Future” tenses* (the following concerns only the co(n)textually clear, unfragmentary instances):

(a) All functions listed below are affirmative only. Practically the only negative future occurring is the negative energetic future **ΝΗΕ-**, always following **ΧΕ-**: No. 28 line 19, No. 25 line 58, No. 35 line 33, No. 36 line 24, No. 39 line 26 (**ΧΕΝΙΧΟΣ** “pour ne pas dire”). See below, note on No. 39 line 31 f.

(b) **†ΝΑ-** **ΤΗΝΑ-** - sequelling undertaking “and I/we shall ...” (cf. **ΤΑΡΕΩ-**): No. 35 line 47, 36 line 37 ff. Generally speaking, **†ΝΑ-**, **ΤΗΝΑ-** range in function between undertaking and expressed intention: No. 15 line 17 f., lines 33, 48, 49, No. 19, lines 51, 54, 59, No. 20 line 32, No. 24 line 27.

(c) **ΚΝΑ-**, **ΓΗΝΑ-**, **ΚΑ-** (etc.) - assured, no-doubt future: “(I know for sure that) you/he will ...”, often in *apodosis*: No. 24 line 26, No. 25 line 4, No. 26 line 48, No. 31 line 50, No. 36 lines 29, 35, No. 39 line 3, No. 40 line 5, No. 50 lines 7, 10.

(d) Forms following **Χ(Ε)-** with *verba dicendi* and other content-valency verbs, object actant “that” (**ΧΕΩΑ-**, **ΧΕΩΝΑ-**): **ΕΙΒΑΩΤ** **ΕΒΑΩ** **ΧΕΙΝΑΠΕΥ** **ΑΡΟ** (No. 29 line 4); **ΡΑΞΙΟΥ** No. 31 line 29 f.; No. 35 line 37 **†ΡΑΞΙΟΥ** ... **ΧΕΚΑΩΕΙ** (not protatic “if you can write” as translated by the editors); No. 22 line 10, 25 line 12 ff., 31 line 12 f., 42 line 9 f. (**ΩΛΗΩ**).

(e) Forms following **Χ(Ε)-** outside the valency matrix of (c) - consecutive “so that”, final; content-clause: **ΧΕΚΑ-** No. 35 line 39; **ΧΕΚΑ-** No. 35 line 39;

**χεϥηα-** No. 22 line 64; **χε-εϥα-ρ-** in “money grammar”, introducing the total in addition (“to make ...”), No. 44 line 30. — Forms following **κεκαϥε** — final: No. 19 line 11; appositive to **πει**: No. 20 line 6 ff.

(f) Initial **εϥηα-**, **εκα-**, **εηα-**: jussive 3rd person, injunctive 2nd person, hortative 1st plural: **εϥηαμϥηη** jussive “let it remain” (No. 31 line 26); No. 35 line 17 f. **ερελοϥτοϥ ηαχι** “let L. receive”; No. 36 line 26 **εκηατειτοϥ ηεϥ** (“you shall give them to him”, contrast with line 29 **εηατειτοϥ ηεκ** “he will surely give them to you”). **εκαιωε**, **εκα†** injunctive “may you wash”, “may you give” (No. 35 lines 12 f., 15, 20) as usual in magical invocations, from Demotic on, probably negated as a negative imperative (No. 35 line 17); No. 38 line 3 **εηαβη-ποϥω** “let us ...”.

(g) Circumstantial **εϥηα-**, conditioned by **εϥωπε** (No. 19 lines 73, 82 and No. 37 line 31) or unconditioned “when about to ...” (No. 19 line 20).

#### IV. Discourse Signals — “Sentence Particles”

Coptic, and pre-Coptic Egyptian, was a “particle language”; the contact with Greek only helped to enrich and refine the system of discourse signals which, needless to say, is often crucial for a precise, sensitive translation (“indeed” as almost the sole rendering of many particles is unacceptable). In epistolary grammar, as in our corpus, the role of discourse signals is especially prominent.

(1) **ϥε**: not “indeed” or “moreover” (as in the rendering of No. 12 line 12 etc.). It is an important operator, a delimiter in articulating the epistolary texture, an anaphoric link (“in view of all said so far” — a mirror image of **ϥαρ**, see below; this recalls Egyptian *grt* rather than LE-Demotic *-gr* “also”; cf. Coptic non-enclitic final “adverbial” **-ϥε**. Of course, it signals by the same token also a new rhetorical epistolary unit, of which it marks the initial boundary, and in which it typically broaches a new theme). It occurs in the corpus:

(a) following imperatives or adverbials preceding imperatives: No. 12 line 9, No. 22 line 12, No. 37 line 25;

(b) immediately following initial presentative and adverbial elements (**ειθε**, **†ηου**, **εις-**, **ειςτε** — *jst grt* goes back to Old/Middle Egyptian — and **εηιδη**. All these combinations are well attested elsewhere in Coptic, see Crum, *Dictionary* 802 a-b, and may somewhat moderate the anaphoric force of **ϥε** itself): No. 17 line 48, No. 20 lines 34, 50 (mistranslated here as a conditional), No. 31 line 26, No. 50 line 4;

(c) broaching a new subject, marking the topic: **ηταριϥωταμ ϥε** ... (No. 31 lines 20, 34); **ακϥει ϥε ηει χε** ... No. 12 line 12;

(d) interrogative + **ϥε**, with the particle marking the rhetoricity of the question: (No. 20 line 14 “Where did you forget us!” — note here the colon-second placement of **ϥε**, No. 42 line 14 “What are those things you do!”).

(e) In “arithmetic syntax” (part of “money grammar”), **ϥε** marks a new beginning which is still anaphorically referent: “now from this ...” (No. 48 line 42).

It is hard to distinguish the function of **ϥε** from that of **ϥηη** in slots (a-b), albeit in different texts (No. 36 line 36, No. 43 line 16, No. 41 line 12).

(2) **ρω** is in common use in the corpus. Again, not as “indeed”, but as a generally postpositive (word-enclitic) *focusser*, esp. of those clause constituents which the Focalizing (*alias* Second Tense) Conversion and other focalization signals do

not apply to or touch: Greek γε, περ are immediately called to mind. Note that ρω occasionally occupies colon-enclitic (colon-second) position, and is thus found to seemingly precede its "focussee". The affinity of ρω with negation is striking (cf. Greek οὐπερ, "by no means, not ... at all"), here in No. 11 line 15, No. 50 line 25. No. 25 line 23 ("the day for which we pray", implying or presupposing "it is for this day we pray"); cf. the Greek relative pronoun + γε. In No. 31 line 25 the nexus is focalized ("we did find remembrance"), so too No. 32, lines 45 ("I did hear"), No. 36, 31 ("I do know"); No. 24 line 27 f. ("you will find that he is really coming south"). In εὐ ρω τε ἴκεσαναγκη No. 31 line 54 f. the interrogative is focalized; No. 26 line 34 ("write it really well"). For τεως ρω "so long", εὐποτε ρω "just when" (No. 39 lines 22, 23), cf. Greek -γε or -περ again. In No. 39 line 31 f. πτηπαωει εις πησαν ρω φχω μμας we ought to have the postnegator εἰ instead of εις, and ρω focalizing the topic πησαν.

(3) ειε, rarely π̄ιε, are variants of an anaphoric-superordinating signal ("in view of [all] this"). In *apodosi*, preceding imperatives (almost always ειε: No. 19 lines 36, 45, No. 20 lines 35, 50, No. 37 line 31, No. 40 lines 26, 33). Preceding the sum total in money grammar ("thus making ..."), the form is π̄ιε in No. 15 line 48, No. 48 lines 21, 39. We find it once preceding the Conjunctive, apodotic even without an explicit protasis (No. 20 line 15). No. 48 line 34 π̄ιε κρωωε θε ετ-κρωω-εσ αρις is not "Now, are you satisfied ...?" but "In view of all this, you are authorized: please do as you like" — a case of ορωω- + infinitive (also in No. 47 line 30 f. — W.-P. Funk).

(4) γαρ, in a sense the mirror image of σε, marks most typically a textual unit as justifying or giving a reason for the very occurrence of the foregoing text. Its semantics do not so much concern causality, but grounding in basing-in-giveness: it bases a foregoing segment or its situation or even (meta-textually!) its very existence, in an association of inevitability, naturalness or ensuingness, validating the foregoing information. Consider No. 20 line 51, no. 25 line 45, No. 37 lines 14, 26, No. 39 line 28, No. 40 line 6, No. 50 lines 7, 20, 26. Another important role of γαρ is topicalizing and introducing a new theme or background information into epistolary discourse: No. 25 line 42, No. 37 lines 20, 22 f., No. 40 line 11.

(5) μμεν is in the corpus not a correlative particle, but a cataphoric unit delimiter (cf. Denniston's "preparatory" role: No. 19 line 30, No. 21 line 8, No. 22 lines 32, 64, No. 24 line 4, No. 25 line 35, No. 34 line 17). In all these cases, μμεν is also a strong topicalizing signal for the subsequent textual unit, which is high-level rhematic.

(6) δε is a topicalizing connector, but rarely (and weakly) contrastive (so in No. 25 line 43 and No. 50 line 17), but usually signalling and following the first term of a new point made (formally mostly following (pro)nominals, more rarely verb clauses and imperatives). It is important as an articulation exponent in the epistolary texture, as it were marking paragraphs in the exposition. Consider No. 19 line 77; No. 20 lines 18, 24, 57; No. 21 line 17; No. 22 line 24; No. 25 line 57; No. 29 line 13; No. 34 line 15; No. 35 line 14; No. 36 line 16; No. 38 line 9.

Notes on individual instances of grammar, idiom and translation:  
striking or problematic cases

No. 16, Line 19 (etc.): I find remarkable (π)†- for the Conjunctive 1st person sgl., a morphology almost exclusive to the Kellis dialect (rare instances also in L6

— W. P. Funk), inasmuch as it completes the morphological “missing link” between the Conjunctive and the Durative Conjugation pattern. Thus, an instance like **†ει ηηι** (No. 40 line 11), distinctive (macro-)syntactically by its sequelling status and morphosyntactically by the *infinitive* (where a converb would be **ηηϣ**), and by the *Aktionsart*-signalling or valential augens **ηηι**, or **†ετηϣηητϣ** (No. 40 line 8), with an immediate pronominal object revealing the infinitive rather than the converb, raise the nice point of whether a base is here zeroed or not. But *n-/zero* is not a base at all, and the conjunctive a *sui generis* converbal nexus pattern, marked as adnexal by the nota relationis *n-* (so Shisha-Halevy, *Categories*, Chapter Seven). As a matter of fact, I find **η†σωτμ** more than supports, if not clinches, this analysis.

The Makarios family letters (Nos. 19-28) pp. 154 ff. are stylistically and grammatically the most interesting and sophisticated.

No. 19, Line 8: **πει αν πε πρητε †ηου ϣωπε ρη-ρηναναστροφατε εϣρωεϣ**, with the particle (not adverb) **†ηου** belonging rather in the Nominal Sentence, and **πει** cataphoric: “Also, this is now the way: involve yourself in worthy (living) habits ...” (not “matters”; cf. **αναστροφατε** “Lebensformen” in *Man. Hom.* 29:27).

Line 24 f. **εϣωπε [βε ο]ηη ηηρηϣ**: I doubt the def. article; the specific existant would be difficult, even ungrammatical. — Line 29: **παχεϣ**, remarkably common in this epistolary corpus, is here always translated as “he says”; this is defensible, since this narrative verboid does not really carry a tense category marking, but gets its time reference macrosyntactically, from the narrative environment.

Line 48: **ουδιακων εραυηανεϣ αβαλ μμο πεταϣρα-** is a Cleft Sentence. Translate “It is a deacon who has been turned out that ...”. — Line 50: **αϣρακ ηηηηαι** rather “What do you want with me?”, not “what do you have against me?” — Line 51: **ρωμε εϣηαε ρατηϣ** is probably “one who comes to him ...”, and not as translated.

No. 20, Lines 9 f., 19, 53: **πωϣ** “how” is opposed in this text to **ηαϣ ηρε** with Focalizing Present in line 18; also No. 26 lines 25, 36 (negative clauses). **πωϣ** occurs always governed by “I wonder” (**†ρημαιρε, †ρηαημαρε**). — Line 12: **τηϣ** is remarkable as imperative.

Line 15: **εϣ [[με]] μμα βε ατηρηηωβϣ η ατηημερ-ρωη ειε τηδη-ηηρηη ρωηε**: I find the Conjunctive in *apodosis* following **ειε** very interesting (Shisha-Halevy, *Categories* p. 206 f.); this is not a Present tense, as translated (the Index gives this *locus* as Conjunctive). “Where did you forget us or fill our mouth? Then we, too, shall learn our lesson!” and not as translated (“Indeed, how could you forget us ...? then do we know our own heart?”); cf. *gm-jb/hʾty*, *Wb* V 169 “know how to use (well)”, Crum, *Dictionary* 820b “learn wisdom”. I could not find a (metaphorical?) non-reflexive **μερ-ρω** in Coptic or pre-Coptic Egyptian (Hannig, *Wörterbuch* 352 suggests “auf Wort vertrauen” for *mḥ m rj-*, seems irrelevant to our *locus*); could this be an Egyptian euphemistic reference to embalming/burying?

Line 21: Is **ειρε** here anaphoric to **ρ-ηηεοϣε** “remember” in line 20 f., and **εϣχε ερεειρε** not “if you do so” (referring to **αρελο** “you have ceased remembering us at all ...”), but probably “even if you (do) remember ...”.

Line 40: **κασ ερετεησαηηε** is an epistolary turn of phrase introducing a new topic (“For your information”); cf. Late Egyptian *r rdjt rh* ... (see editors’ note,

p. 171).  $\omega\omega\pi\epsilon\ \epsilon\tau\epsilon\tau\eta\sigma\alpha\gamma\eta\epsilon$  means “be knowing, know” rather than “happen you know”. — Line 50  $\epsilon\iota\sigma$  is here clearly presentative and the translation as protasis unjustified.

No. 21, Line 16:  $\tau\epsilon\tau\alpha\eta\chi\iota\tau\epsilon$  seems be the topic of a Cleft Sentence, with  $\sigma\gamma\kappa\omicron\upsilon\iota\ \eta-$  its focus (“all we received was ...”), rather than “what we did receive”, especially since the latter would demand an unparallelled construction with the following text. Admittedly, this leaves the responsive  $\mu\pi\eta\chi\iota$  with a zero object.

No. 22, Line 13-14: The editors/translators failed to identify here  $\sigma\upsilon\tau-\sigma\upsilon\tau-$  (Sah.  $\sigma\upsilon\epsilon\tau-\sigma\upsilon\epsilon\tau-$ : Crum, *Dictionary* 495b-496a) “... is one thing — ... is another”, which must be added to the glossary and the translation modified accordingly.

Line 27: It is far from certain that  $\eta\epsilon\omega\ \eta\theta\epsilon$  and  $\epsilon\mu\pi\iota\chi\iota$  actually belong to the clause (as focus and topic). If they do, we have here a case, unique in the corpus, of circumstantial topic following a focalized adverb, in which case it will mean “how is it that ...”, not “why ...” (cf. Shisha-Halevy, *Categories* § 2.5; B. Layton, *A Coptic Grammar* [Wiesbaden 2000] § 459 f.).

Line 32:  $\text{†}\omega\omega\pi\ \mu\epsilon\eta\ \mu\pi\epsilon\theta\mu\alpha\tau\ \theta\eta\sigma\upsilon\alpha\iota\omega\ \eta\mu\mu\ \text{[}\epsilon\text{]}\tau\epsilon\epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\ \mu\mu\alpha\sigma\ \eta\mu\mu$  not “I thank you, at every moment that you do it ...”, with no real referate for “it”, but with  $\mu\mu\alpha\sigma$  referring to  $\theta\mu\alpha\tau$ : “I thank you, every time you do (me) a favour” or similar, or simply “I thank you on every occasion” (in No. 19 line 11 f. the  $\text{†}\omega\omega\pi-\theta\mu\alpha\tau$  construction must mean “so that I may thank you, and God too may thank you”, and not as translated).

Line 44:  $\alpha\upsilon\mu\alpha\theta-$  cannot be circumstantial (to  $\alpha\iota\theta\eta\tau\epsilon$ ), because of its direct object construction, and must be paratactic; this opens the way to interpreting other apparently subordinate  $\alpha\sigma-$  cases, not as circumstantial but as Perfect (see above). — Line 46:  $\text{†}\rho\mu\alpha\iota\theta\epsilon\ \mu\pi\epsilon\iota\ \alpha\iota\sigma\alpha\tau\mu\epsilon\sigma$  is yet another very striking case of paratactic Perfect, here adnominally expanding the demonstrative: “that (which) I heard”, “what I heard”.

Line 61: We should consider taking  $\epsilon[\eta\iota]\lambda\eta$  here as introducing, like *alioquin*, an irrealis apodosis; in that case,  $\epsilon\eta\epsilon-\eta\tau\omicron-\sigma\gamma\kappa\alpha\theta\eta\kappa\omicron\upsilon\mu\text{[}\epsilon\text{]}\eta\eta\ \theta\omega\epsilon$  would be protatic (“were you ...”), not interrogative as proposed by the editors. Cf.  $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota$  “denn sonst”, “wenn es anders wäre”; see Blass-Debrunner §§ 360.2 Anm., 456.3 Anm.; corresponding to Coptic (Sah. etc.)  $\epsilon\mu\mu\omicron\eta\sigma$ ,  $\epsilon\omega\chi\epsilon\ \mu\pi\epsilon$ , Rom. 3:6, Heb. 9:26, 10:2, I Cor. 7:14.

No. 25, Line 16: Of all the morphological issues, I find most striking — one might say, disturbing — the  $\alpha$ -/ $\epsilon$ - variants of circumstantial/Focalizing Present in the Kellis dialect. Three concurring forms of the 2nd pl. Circumstantial Present occur here concomitantly:  $\chi\epsilon\theta\eta\alpha\tau\alpha\iota\sigma\ \eta\eta\iota\ \alpha\tau\omega\tau\eta\ \theta\iota\sigma\upsilon\sigma\alpha\eta$ .  $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\tau\eta\sigma\alpha\chi$   $\theta\eta\pi\epsilon\tau\eta\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ .  $\alpha\pi\epsilon\tau\eta\sigma\alpha\chi\ \theta\eta\pi\epsilon\tau\eta\theta\eta\tau$ .  $\epsilon\tau\epsilon\tau\eta\sigma\alpha\chi\ \theta\eta\pi\epsilon\tau\eta\psi\eta\chi\eta$  (similarly in line 56). The only plausible explanation I can think of is that the grapheme  $\alpha$  stands uniquely (?) in this corpus as a marked grapheme for the *unstressed central Shva* [ə]: telling final instances are  $\eta\sigma\theta\omicron\eta\alpha$ ,  $\kappa\eta\mu\alpha$  in No. 31;  $\rho\omega\mu\alpha$  in No. 31;  $\omega\alpha\tau\alpha-$  in No. 50;  $\pi\epsilon\omega\eta\pi\epsilon$  “my son” etc., No. 19 *passim*; see editors’ note, p. 165.

Line 39:  $\tau\omega\epsilon\ \sigma\iota\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\ \eta\epsilon\ \theta\eta\eta\alpha\eta\alpha\tau\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\eta\sigma\ \eta\epsilon$  etc. is of interest for the uncommon and instructive occurrence of a feminine determinator with an obligatory plural resumption. — Line 39 f.  $\theta\eta\omega\beta\epsilon\tau\ \dots\ \epsilon\upsilon\theta\ \eta\sigma\eta\eta\epsilon$  “some friends who are doctors”, and not as translated (“some friends ... They are doctors”).

Line 58:  $\chi\epsilon-\eta\eta\sigma\upsilon\chi\iota-\epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\ \alpha\tau\alpha\upsilon$  “(you fear) that they would have a hex put upon them”, from the dictionary (and grammar) of magic:  $\chi\iota-$  here perhaps not

“take”, but “say”, “utter” (cf. *dd-r*, *Wb* II 391); but *ειρε* may be associated with *ειερ-* “eye” (*jr.t*) or *tjy-r*? (Hannig, *Wörterbuch* 945). Incidentally, *ερετηρ-εατε* here is a nice instance of the Focalizing Present in a rhetorical question.

No. 26, Line 26 f.: *ετβε-επιστολη ετετηχι μμαϛ*: I must confess that this construction, of a zero-determined ‘feminine’ noun (‘feminine’ in the sense of primary gender selection, as evident in definite determination when the determinator is coreferent with the noun lexeme) resumed and represented by a masculine pronoun — a syntax by now well understood, well documented and apparently the rule — never ceases to fascinate me. Our *locus* illustrates the juncturally significant fact, never yet explicitly stated, that the resumption must be *by a suffix pronoun* and within the restricted scope of an adnexal (adnominal circumstantial) or attributive (relative) verbal expansion. (In No. 24 line 26 f. *αϛτηναϛ-επιστολη πεν καδητε ρω ρηηϛ* the feminine suffix is thus signalled as cataphoric, not anaphoric to *επιστολη*.)

Line 48: *επαωινε αραη* it is hardly interrogative: “she will no doubt greet us” (*in apodosi*; see above).

No. 31, Line 54 f.: *εϛ ρω τε τκεαηαγκη* “This emergency also, what is it actually?” and not as translated. *αηαγκη* is one of those Greek loan-words that have been integrated, not only into the Coptic lexicon but even into the syntactic pattern repertory (see Layton, *Grammar* § 487). For the focalizing *ρω*, see above.

No. 32, Line 17 f.: *τωινε (αρο) τονου εη-αγαηη μμαινοϛτε*: I find the zero determination of the expanded *αγαηη* noteworthy (“God-loving” qualifies “love”). — Line 28: *εαπαε ατ-σητε* is translated here “once you have laid the foundation”; one would need support for this conjunctive use of *απαε*, in Greek and/or Coptic.

Line 46: *αιωτω ρω γε-τεωωινε εις εηεεουϛ ειρλϛηη* “I did hear that you are sick; I have been grieving for days” and not as translated. — Line 48 f.: *ουχειτε εν αηη-πεουχειτε*, in view of the negation probably not existential (“(There is) no health without your health”, but “Health is no health ...”, which may be a doubly haplographic writing of an endophoric (*ου*)*ουχειτε εν τε* — unless of course this is an idiomatic expression, in Egyptian or another language borrowed in Coptic.

No. 35, Line 11: *εραεβ ηηινο ηταραβια ...*: The adverbial *ηηινο* “at the time” is here (like often *τηου*) colon-enclitic; I see no call for the editors’ difficulty here (note on p. 227).

Line 37: *τραειου μμακ ... κεκαεει* is not protatic, as translated by the editors, but “I beg you to write”. Contrast the performative Focalizing (*i.e.* Second Present) *αιαειου* in Oxyrhynchite, P. B.L.Or 11173(2) ro 1.22 (ed. Schenke 1992) *αιαειου ουη μμαϛ αιαειου μμα* “I beg them, then, I beg you ...”.

Line 39: *τετεηε* as “what is written” could be an uncommon neutric feminine deictic (determinator). But can the feminine pronoun here be a representative resumption of *τετραε* (*ηητετραε* on line 37): “the one written”?

Line 45: *ααα ουεει εερωεϛ* is an autonomous clause, and very probably a special Cleft Sentence pattern (and so to be translated “a written document is what is useful”, perhaps better “a written document is what counts”), perhaps gnomic.

Line 47 f.: *εωβ εκουαωϛ ηηιμα κεεεε ηηη τηαεϛ*: zero-article *εωβ* for the indefinite “anything” is here topicalized and resumed by personal anaphoric



pronoun (also in No. 36 line 37 ff.). The zero article seems to have a rather extended range in this corpus.

No. 37, Line 19: *κιμ α-* in *malam partem*, translated here as “shake” (for “hostile action against the Manichaeans”): one needs some supporting evidence. Could we have here an older meaning of the lexeme, “throw against” = “attack”, Egyptian *kmʾ r-*?

Line 25 f.: *αρχει νει γε-ακρ-ο* “write me how you are (doing)”: In this ancient idiomatic construction, the focalized interrogative joins the Focalizing (*olim* Second) Present in the sense of “πῶς ἔχεις”, while the relative-topic Cleft Sentence has the meaning of “What are you doing?”; cf. H. J. Polotsky, “Une règle concernant l’emploi des formes verbales dans la phrase interrogative en néo-égyptien”, *ASAE* 40 (1940) 241-245, p. 244 f. Note that both Akhmimic and Lycopolitan forms of “what?”, respectively *ο* and *εϛ*, occur in our dialect in morpho-phonemic alternance, the former an enclitic, the latter non-enclitic; cf. also Nos. 22 line 17, 24 line 12, 31 line 54, 42 line 14.

No. 38, Line 3 f. *†θαρρε γεκκι μμαι δρακ* “I take courage, for you receive me to you”, and not as translated.

No. 39, Line 20: *γε-νιχος γε-πνσαν πετρος* “not to mention our brother Peter”, and not as translated.

Line 31: *αρετηνο γεπτηναυει εις πνσαν ρω φχω μμδς ...*: Probably *πτηναυει εις* and not as read (*εις*): this would then be the only instance for negated *πδ-* future; “you see whether we will be able to come. Indeed look, our brother, he says” is improbable. Better “you see (that) we won’t be able to come”.

Line 32: *φναρω[ω]ε ααρει* “he will suffice”, not “will be glad” (a lapsus in the translation only, correct in the Index. There are other instances of divergence between translation and Indices).

No. 40, Line 5 f. *ist* to be restored *πθε ρωττη[νε ετε]τη-*.

Line 23: *ταχα εϛ ταχα ρωτ φητ ...* is another of the enigmatic turns of phrase in the corpus; hardly “well perhaps, perhaps I myself” as translated (we would need at least some support from Greek for *τάχα* or *εὖ τάχα* (a search through the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* database, covering the language until the 6th century A.D., could not find either). In later Greek, *τάχα* has a finely nuanced semantic spectrum (“apparently, supposedly”, “I wonder if ...”, “wohl”), and “perhaps” seems too simple; the context here is of little help. A correlative *τάχα ... τάχα ...* is called for; *εϛ* may well be the pronoun “what?” (or even the indefinite “something”); or can *εϛ* be *ειρε* + 3rd pl. object (*εοϛ* in No. 44 line 3)? At any rate, the augens *ρωτ* occurs here in a colon-second placement (it is referable to the 1st sgl. in fit). If *εϛ* is the Greek adverb, then the correlation with *ρωτ* would be at least syntactically apt, since the augens is an inflected adverbial (cf. Layton, *Grammar* §§ 152-158).

No. 41, Line 4 ff.: *οϛδε μπετηρωβ νεν μπετηρω γε-πτετηρω*: without supporting evidence, I find it hard to accept *γε-* with the conjunctive as a factive past “that” clause (“that you were finished”, so the editors); it must be a non-factive prospective “that you shall” or something similar. I see here also a slight lexical problem as well as a question of valency. The verb lexeme *οϛω* in the Conjunctive may be the one related to the noun *οϛω* “message” (“Kunde”, “Botschaft”, also “Angelegenheit”); we would then have a *figura etymologica* rather than a pun. Incidentally, all these and *οϛω* “cease, have done” are historically

related, through the etymon *w/h*. In  $\alpha\phi\epsilon\iota\ \mu\pi\epsilon\tau\eta\theta\alpha\beta\epsilon\ \eta\lambda\alpha\gamma\epsilon\ \eta\sigma\tau\omega$  I suggest the masc. sgl. object refers to the messenger, not "it" ("he came, you not having sent him with any message"), although we still need support for the direct object of  $\theta\omega\beta$  being the messenger, not the message.

Line 7 f.:  $\chi\eta\text{-}\mu\mu\lambda\eta\ \epsilon\tau\epsilon\mu\pi\epsilon\tau\eta\theta\eta\text{-}\rho\mu\epsilon\phi\phi\epsilon\iota$  is rhetorical and patently sarcastic (as is often the case with the Focalizing Negative Perfect): "Or may it be perhaps that you did not find someone who can write?"

No. 42, Line 14 ff.:  $\epsilon\gamma\ \beta\epsilon\ \eta\epsilon\ \eta\theta\beta\eta\gamma\epsilon\ \epsilon\tau\kappa\epsilon\iota\rho\epsilon\ \mu\mu\lambda\alpha\gamma\ \epsilon\mu\lambda\alpha\kappa\tau\eta\eta\lambda\alpha\gamma\text{-}\omicron\gamma\epsilon\text{-}\eta\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\lambda\eta\ \eta\epsilon\eta\ \epsilon\pi\tau\eta\eta\phi$  "What are those things that you do, never writing to us at all?" and not as translated.

No. 43, Line 7:  $\tau\omicron\gamma\eta\eta\omicron\gamma\ \beta\epsilon\ \eta\epsilon\ \tau\eta\eta\lambda\alpha\gamma$  for "It's (the) time, then: send" is syntactically difficult. The endophoric pattern would be  $\tau\omicron\gamma\eta\eta\omicron\gamma\ \tau\epsilon$ , and the pragmatic-situational formal theme  $\eta\epsilon$  would hardly predicate  $\tau\omicron\gamma\eta\eta\omicron\gamma$ . One wonders whether an infinitive as non-formal theme ("It's the time, then, to send") would not change the syntactic situation.

No. 45, Commentary, p. 261 (on  $\eta\text{-}/\eta\tau\epsilon\text{-}$ ): the treatment is over-simplifying, in the traditional or classroom approach, which does not do justice to this difficult topic. Cf. A. Shisha-Halevy, "Pluridimensional Oppositions: Three Case Studies in Scripture (Pentateuch) Bohairic", in: *Coptology: Past, Present and Future. Studies in Honour of Rodolphe Kasser*, edd. S. Giversen, M. Krause, P. Nagel (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 61; Leuven 1994) 225-247.

No. 46, Line 1:  $\omicron\gamma\eta\eta\tau\alpha\iota\ \eta\eta\tau\omicron\tau\epsilon$  etc. is of interest, combining the highly grammaticalized and mid-way grammaticalized forms of the prepositional phrase "in my/his hand(s)". Their very compatibility indicates this is not "I have in his hands"; we seem to have here an acknowledgement of debt: "I owe him", cf. Demotic *wn-mtw.k j.jr-n.j* "I owe you", lit. "you have against me" (Sethe, *Bürgerschafts-urkunden* 211 f.). This is the construction continued in the Coptic  $\omicron\gamma\eta\eta\tau\alpha\kappa\ \epsilon\phi\omicron\iota$  and similar (Layton, *Grammar* § 392), with  $\epsilon\text{-}$  marking the debtor,  $\eta\tau\epsilon\text{-}$  the creditor. But we also find in Demotic, closer to our construction, [*wn-]mtw.j r-'wy.k* "you owe me", lit. "I have in your hands", *ibid.* 302 f., 346, 783; also presentatively *jws mtw.k 'wy.j* "I owe you" (Erichsen, *Dem. Lesestücke* II/2 p. 14): here too  $\eta\tau\epsilon\text{-}$  indicates the creditor, but it is  $\eta\tau\eta\eta\text{-}/\eta\tau\omicron\tau\omicron\tau\text{-}$  that marks the debtor. So, while  $\eta\tau\omicron\tau\omicron\tau\text{-}$  alone may indicate a possessor (Layton, *Grammar* § 393), its compatibility with  $\eta\tau\epsilon\text{-}$  in  $\omicron\gamma\eta\eta\tau\alpha\text{-}$  changes the former into marking the debtor, the latter into marking the creditor.

No. 47, Line 17 f.:  $\epsilon\phi\epsilon\lambda\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\gamma\ \eta\lambda\alpha\chi\iota\text{-}\eta\iota\theta\eta\tau\eta\eta\eta\alpha\phi\eta\ \dots$  injunctive instruction: "Let Loutou receive this centenarium", and not as translated.

No. 48, Line 29:  $\omicron\gamma\phi\epsilon\chi\epsilon\ \eta\epsilon\tau\alpha\kappa\chi\eta\eta\omicron\gamma\iota\ \alpha\phi\alpha\phi$  is interesting, being formally a Cleft Sentence but expressing existence: "There is a thing you have asked me about", and not as translated. — Line 30 f.:  $\kappa\alpha\lambda\eta\eta\epsilon\ \chi\epsilon\ \dots\ \kappa\omicron\gamma\omega\omega\text{-}\phi\iota\ \dots$  "You know that ... please take ..." ( $\omicron\gamma\omega\omega$  pronominal, with  $\phi\iota$  its object: W.-P. Funk), and not as translated. — Line 34 f.:  $\eta\eta\epsilon\ \kappa\phi\omega\omega\epsilon$  "In view of all this, you are authorized ..." and not "are you satisfied?".

No. 50, Line 7 f.:  $\dagger\phi\alpha\lambda\eta\eta\epsilon\ \gamma\alpha\phi\ \chi\epsilon\text{-}\kappa\eta\alpha\theta\iota\sigma\epsilon\ \chi\epsilon\text{-}\eta\tau\omicron\kappa\ \eta\epsilon\ \eta\omicron\gamma\alpha\epsilon\tau\bar{\kappa}\ \omega\alpha\phi\alpha\omicron\upsilon\alpha\eta\ \eta\eta\mu\ \theta\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\phi$ . The Nominal Sentence pattern is here of interest: the augens  $\eta\omicron\gamma\alpha\epsilon\tau\bar{\kappa}$  seems to be an essential part of the construction; cf. Layton, *Grammar* p. 200 (patterns 9-11). The aorist is sequential: "... and then everyone will exert themselves until they (can) rest", and not as translated.

Line 26 f:  $\epsilon\rho\alpha\nu\theta\iota\varsigma\epsilon \ \gamma\alpha\rho \dots \ \kappa\eta\text{-}\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\bar{\iota}\sigma\eta\tau\eta\mu\epsilon$ : in view of  $\gamma\alpha\rho$ , this is not a case of the circumstantial  $\epsilon\lambda$ - Perfect, as stated in the Conjugations Index, p. 325, but a Focalizing (Second) Perfect: "It is since we parted from you ... that we have toiled" or "As soon as we parted from you, we have toiled".

Dept. of Linguistics  
The Hebrew University  
Jerusalem 91905 (Israel)