

Work-Notes on Shenoute's Rhetorical Syntax:
ⲉⲱⲭⲉ and **ⲁⲣⲁ** – Suspension of Disagreement, Irony
and *reductio ad absurdum*

Ariel Shisha-Halevy, Jerusalem

Für Jürgen, meinen göttingischen Mentor,
Inbegriff des göttingischen Gelehrten

The following are notes taken in the course of an ongoing long-term study on “Shenoute's Rhetorical Syntax”, mapping the grammatical (mainly syntactic) poetics of Shenoute's published and unpublished work, with a focus on rhetorical value and effect of forms and constructions. I wish to present here textual and descriptive materials on some not unimportant rhetorical devices which, beyond having rhetorical functions (such as *lusis*), also signal tonal and emotional nuances, in particular bearing on Shenoute's often underplayed sardonic sense of humour, irony and sarcasm. Note that this is a mere outline: the observations basic, brief and often laconic, discursive and occasionally repetitive, the theses tentative and often, I fear, half-baked, the bibliographical referencing minimal, the illustration no more than representative.

1. **ⲉⲱⲭⲉ**

These formal/functional impressions – a tentative descriptive, formal and functional, account of what is probably the most striking rhetorical device in Shenoute's work – are based on hundreds of occurrences in texts edited by Leipoldt (most exx. presented here), Chassinat, Behlmer (*De iudicio*), Young, Pleyte-Boeser, Orlandi, Shisha-Halevy, with additional ones in most other editions (excluding Amélineau and most unpublished fragments), as well as the unedited White Monastery Codex XO (= Cairo IFAO Copt. Cod. II)¹; I suppose this would add up to between 500 and 550 occurrences of the construction, all told (276 occurrences are listed in

1 My warm thanks to Dr. Anne Boud'hors, the editor of this exquisite codex, for permission to quote from it.

Wolf-Peter Funk’s electronic concordance of Shenoute’s Canons). On the average, we find **εψχε-** nearly once on every page: you couldn’t say that of any other form or rhetorical device in Shenoute.

Broadly speaking, we have here a binary correlative rhetorical configuration, one of many – in fact, binary correlative structures are the most prominent in Shenoute’s formal system of rhetoric, note the following configurations of distinction and comparison **οΥΕΤ-** ... **οΥΕΤ-** ..., **αλλο-** ... **αλλο-** ..., **εΙC-**... **εΙC-**..., **τω ετω Ν-** ... **ΜΝ-** ..., **ΝΘΕ Ν-** ... **ΤΑΙ ΤΕ ΘΕ Ν-**... and so on. I shall present here the main logical constellations for **εψχε-** and its *Nachsatz*, with their formal characteristics and specific semantics. Note that I treat here initial **εψχε-** only, not adjunctal or appositive-constituent **εψχε-**,² nor **ζωC εψχε-** and **καν εψχε** – in fact, one of my points is that these last two are distinct elements, and **εψχε** *alone* never expresses in Shenoute “as if” or “although”.

Attributing “condition” semantics to **εψχε** is rash, and seems due to an immediate, simplistic, erroneous association of **εψχε-**, primarily induced by “translation interpretation”, the rendering by “if”. Real condition with protatic **εψχε**, if at all attested, is extremely rare – in fact, **εψχε-** is the least conditional of all protatic forms.³ In having this clear-cut formal differentiation of protatic types (in contradistinction to Indo-European and Semitic), Coptic is typologically remarkable. I use “apodosis” in the rhetorical technical sense of “sequencing clause” ensuing from the protasis and “releasing” it: *Nachsatz*.

Schematically, **εψχε** constructions may be represented in information-structure terms as:

[premiss protatic text, thematic-topical]
(objectively or subjectively) implies
[implication apodotic text, rhematic-focal].

The most schematic or emic semantic template may be stated as:

2 E.g. (“if indeed/in fact”) **ΜΗ ΟΥΩΠΕ ΝΑΝ ΑΝ ΠΕ ΕΨΧΕ-ΤΗΝΝΑΨΦΙ-ΤΨΟΡΠ ΑΝ ΑΨΩ ΤΜΕΖCΝΤΕ ΝΤΝΟΒΩΝ ΟΝ ΕΦΙΤΜΕΖΨΟΜΤΕ** (Leipoldt III, 27).

3 Which must account for its compatibility with the Conditional, as in: **Η ΕΨΧΕΝΤΑΨΧΟΟC, ΧΕ-ΕΨΝΑΚΑΝΕΝΝΟΒΕ ΝΑΝ ΕΒΟΛ, ΕΨΔΑΝΨΟΦΟΥ Η ΕΨΔΑΝΤΨΟΒΟΥ, ΑΝΨΟΒΟΥ ΚΑΚΩC** (Leipoldt IV, 158:12), consider also *ibid.* pp. 19, 31, 153 etc., and note ex. (43) below.

(i) (Protasis) universally accepted-as-obtaining state of things, fact or claim (typically, by an ad-hoc or provisional waiving of objection or denial – conceded for argument's sake); an unquestionable or uncontested state of things, fact or claim.

(ii) (Apodosis) (1) inevitable, natural or assured consequence or implication of (i); (2) absolute impossibility or non-existence for a state of things, fact or claim; (3) absolute or enhanced possibility of existence for the same state of things: (“certainly, indeed”, “how much more, all the more...”).

It is of the essence that the implication is presented as ineluctable – a veritable equation – and the conclusion often as impossible or absurd, or unacceptable, creating an impasse, thus rendering the premiss as logically flawed and unacceptable – this is often (not invariably) the rhetorical point. It is remarkable that, at least in Shenoute's rhetorical poetics, the **εϣξε**- complex is so often, indeed typically, ironic or sardonic.

Used typically (at least patterns II and III) in *lusis*, the dismantling of the opponent's case, by showing it to be absurd, illogical, unacceptable even to him: in that sense, while the premiss is (as said) typically a case of provisional suspension of disagreement, the conclusion/implication is uncontested, forcing agreement on both parties. The powerful rhetorical leverage of the construction results from this triple merging of uncontestedness with ineluctability and unacceptability.

General Characteristics

The **εϣξε** construction provides a metaphrastic topicalization of text, followed by a focalized textual segment of text. The crucial points to note here are:

(1) considering the pattern, not the element **εϣξε** and its scioe – textual segment –alone, not only in structuralist principle (“environment determines/defines function”) but for its rhetorical status as figure or constellation: the packaging of foregoing text or issue as topic and as universally accepted or unquestionable;

(2) observing the signals of internal linkage between the two flanks of the implicature, most strikingly homolexemicity (which is often a real pattern constituent) and/or **ON**, and/or the augens **Ϸϣϣ** in the apodosis; this linkage is very different from that, say, of the irrealis **ENE-** + **NE-** or the generic **εϣϣAN-** + **ϣϣϣ-**;

(3) observing superordination and/or focalization signals in the apodosis, like initial **ΕΙΕ-**, **ΟΝΤΩΣ**, **ΑΛΗΘΩΣ**, and most notably rhetorical questions (which are really non-interrogative, but rhetorically focal assertions “packaged” as questions; see below, my suggestion regarding **ΑΡΑ**), expressing unacceptability (“how can it be possible that...?”) – **ΕΤΒΕ-ΟΥ ... ΑΝ** and **ΝΑΨ ΝΖΕ ... ΑΝ** and **ΕΒΟΛ ΤΩΝ ... ΑΝ** neutralized – or an *a fortiori* claim (“How much more...?”), or non-existence (“who/what...?”). The RQ apodosis, often negative, is especially typical of the **ΕΨΧΕ** complex, esp. Pattern III below. This is instructive and provides an insight into the RQ function as an assertive, focal utterance in interrogative (dis)guise.

(4) Like **ΧΕ-**, and **ΕΙΕ-**, **ΕΨΧΕ-** has in Sahidic the juncturally remarkable state of *close-juncture prefixed linkage to – and marking of – a stretch of text*, even above a clause, and not a delimited segment like a “word” (a problematic concept anyway) or clause. It is this property that correlates with the absence of restricted constituency of the protasis and apodosis – unlike all other “conditionals”, even **ΕΨΩΠΕ**, and with a looser complex juncture.

(5) The uncontroversial nature of both the protasis, the premiss – either by general consensus, by a formal provisional suspension of disagreement (“let’s suppose”, “granted”), or by absolute authority (esp. Scripture) – and the implication. In fact, it is this suspension of disagreement that gives the construction its considerable rhetorical leverage; in *lusis*, where this consensus is used to demolish the rhetorical opponent’s case, the whole configuration is *ironic*.

The implication, on the other hand, is uncontroversial not by any temporary arrangement, but because it is unavoidable, even inexorable, which gives the whole configuration its rhetorical powerful thrust.

Note also that it is the apodosis that contains the signalling for determining the precise meaning of **ΕΨΧΕ** and of the whole complex; also, that **ΕΙΕ-** may indicate equivalence to an **ΕΨΧΕ**-apodose, even with no protasis:

**ΕΙΕ ΕΨΑΝΤΑΑΣ ΝΑΨ ΕΠΕΙΡΑΖΕ ΜΜΟΚ ΕΠΠΕΘΟΥ ΑΝ ΑΛΛΑ
ΖΝΖΕΝΠΕΙΡΑΣΜΟΚ ΝΕΚΝΑΡΟΥ ΠΕ** (Chassinat, 13).

* * *

Here are the main configurations I find, with minimal representative documentation:

(I) SIMPLE IMPLICATION (RARE):

“IF IT IS (REALLY TRUE/CONCEDED/GIVEN) THAT...,

• THEN IT INEVITABLY/ANYWAY FOLLOWS (ALSO)/NO DOUBT/LET ME ASSURE YOU/YOU SHOULD KNOW THAT...”

Note here: **ON**, **ἄνω** optional *in apodosi*. **ΟΝΤΩΣ** replaces **εἰε**-. Homolexemicity.

- (1) **ΕΨΧΕ-ΟΥΝΖΟΕΙΝΕ ΕΥΜΟΚΖ ΝΖΗΤ ΧΕ-ΑΝΕΥΨΗΡΕ Η ΝΕΥCΝΗΥ ΡΝΟΒΕ, ΟΝΤΩC CΕΜΠΨΑ ΝΤΑΕΙΟ ΝΙΜ** (Leipoldt III, 67,20)
- (2) **ΕΨΧΕ-ΑΤΕΤΝΤΝΤΝΝΕΨΜΑ ΕΤΟΥΑΑΒ ΕΝΜΑ ΝΒΟΙΛΕ ΝΝΛΗCΤΗC, ΨΝΑΧΝΟΥΤΝ ΠΑΝΤΩC** (Leipoldt III, 24,13)
- (3) **ΕΨΧΕ-ΚΟ ΝΝΟΕΙΚ ΕΟΥΝΤΚCΖΙΜΕ ΑΥΩ ΕΨΧΕ-ΤΕΠΟΡΝΗΥΕ ΕΟΥΝΤΕΠΟΥΖΑΙ ΟΝΤΩC ΤΕΤΝΨΟΒΕ ΑΝ ΕΝΕΘΗΡΙΟΝ** (BL Or 8664 p. 32, ed. Shisha-Halevy, *Orientalia*)
- (4) **ΕΨΧΕ-ΟΥΝ-ΚΕΚΟCΜΟC ΜΠΖΡΕ ΜΠΑΙ ΕΙΕ ΨΟ ΝΚΑΚΕ** (Orlandi, *Shenoute contra Origenistas*, 305)
- (5) **ΕΨΧΕ-ΕΤΕΤΝΟ ΑΝ ΝΘΕ ΝΖΕΝΨΜΜΟ ΝΝΑΖΡΑΙ ΖΜΠΑΖΗΤ ΑΥΩ ΖΕΝΡΩΜΕ ΕΙCΟΟΥΝ ΑΝ ΜΜΟΥΨ ΕΙΕ-ΠΕΤΝΡΚΙΜΑ ΖΙΧΩΙ ΑΥΩ ΖΙΧΝΤCΟΟΥΖΕ ΑΝ ΝΤΕΤΝΑΠΕ** (Codex XO, 292)

(IA) “IF IT IS TRUE/(I/YOU/WE KNOW/ADMIT)/GIVEN THAT X,

• THEN IT IS (ALSO) (NECESSARILY) TRUE THAT X+...”

An obvious focalization construction – an *und zwar*-type device. Homolexemicity is a pattern constituent.

- (6) **ΕΨΧΕ-ΟΥΝΤΨΟΥΨΟΜ ΓΑΡ ΟΝ ΕΟΥΝΤΑΨC ΖΝΝΕΤΚΑΜΑ ΝΑΨ ΝΖΗΤΟΥ** (Leipoldt III, 85,13)
- (7) **ΕΨΧΕ-ΨΨΟΟΠ ΟΝ ΕΨΨΟΟΠ ΖΜΠΕΨΛΑC ΜΜΑΤΕ ΑΥΩ ΖΜΠΕΨΖΗΤ ΑΝ** (Leipoldt IV, 24,6)
- (8) **ΕΨΧΕ-ΑΙΧΕ-ΟΥΨΑΧΕ ΝΤΑΙΧΕ-ΠΕΨCΟΟΥΝ ΜΜΟΥΨ** (K 9285 verso ed. Wessely, *Texte IX* 51)
- (9) **ΕΨΧΕ-ΠΡΠΜΕΕΥΕ ΓΑΡ ΜΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΝΑΑΜΑΖΤΕ ΑΝ ΜΠΡΩΜΕ ΕΤΜΡΝΟΒΕ ΜΜΝΑΝΑΨ ΟΝ ΝΑΑΜΑΖΤΕ ΜΜΟΥΨ** (Leipoldt III, 16,25)
- (10) **ΕΨΧΕ-ΜΠΕCΟΥΨΝΤ ΨΑΠΟΥΨ, ΑΙCΟΥΨΝΕ ΑΝΟΚ. ΝΤΑΙCΟΥΨΝΕ ΓΑΡ ΑΝ ΝΒΡΡΕ΄ ΑΛΛΑ ΨCΟΟΥΝ ΜΜΟ ΧΙΝΝΨΟΡΠ** (Leipoldt III, 21,9) – Not concessive!

(IB) DEONTIC IMPLICATION:

“IF IT IS (INDEED) TRUE/A FACT/ CONCEDED THAT..., SEEING THAT...

• THEN (THERE IS NO OTHER WAY BUT THAT WE/YOU/THEY MUST)

[IMPERATIVE/INJUNCTIVE/JUSSIVE/1ST SGL. FUTURE]”

- (11) **ΕΨΧΕ-ΤΝΟΥΩΨ ΕΡΒΟΛ ΕΝΑΙ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΝΤΗΒΩΚ ΕΖΟΥΝ ΕΠΩΝΖ**
ΜΑΡΕΝΚΤΟΝ ΝΤΗΖΑΡΕΖ ΕΝΕΝΤΟΛΗ ΜΠΧΟΕΙΣ (Behlmer, *De iudicio*,
 f. LXXVI vο)
- (12) **ΑΛΛΑ ΕΙΧΩ ΜΠΑΙ ΧΕΕΨΧΕ-ΝΤΗΝΝΑΨΡΠΑΡΘΕΝΟΣ ΑΝ ΜΑΡΗΡΟΕΙΣ**
ΕΠΓΑΜΟΣ ΝΤΑΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΤΑΕΙΟΨ ΑΨΩ ΑΨΤΒΒΟΨ (Leipoldt III, 27,24)
- (13) **ΕΨΧΕ-ΝΑΝΟΥΨΕΙ ΚΟΙΝΩΝΕΙ ΝΜΜΑΙ ΕΨΧΕ-ΝΑΝΟΥΨΙ ΑΝ ΜΠΡΚΟΙΝΩΝΕΙ**
 (Leipoldt III, 30,19-20)
- (14) **ΕΨΧΩ ΜΜΟΣ ΝΑΙ ΧΕΠΕΝΣΟΝ ΑΨΩ ΠΕΝΜΕΡΙΤ, ΕΨΧΕ-ΚΟΥΨΩ ΕΩΝΖ**
ΑΨΩ ΕΝΑΨ ΕΝΕΡΗΤ ΜΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΑΨΩ ΕΑΛΕ ΕΖΡΑΙ ΖΝΟΥΜΝΤΤΕΛΙΟΣ ΨΙ
ΜΜΑΨ ΝΝΑΡΙΚΕ ΜΠΕΚΖΗΤ (Leipoldt III, 98,28)
- (15) **ΕΨΧΕ-ΜΝΒΟΜ ΘΕ ΜΜΟΚ ΕΡΠΑΡΘΕΝΟΣ Ψ ΠΡΩΜΕ ΝΘΕ**
ΜΠΕΤΕΟΥΝΤΑΨ ΜΜΑΨ ΜΠΙΔΩΡΟΝ ΑΨΩ ΝΤΟ ΖΩΩΤΕ ΤΕΣΖΙΜΕ ΕΨΧΕ
ΜΝΒΟΜ ΜΜΟ ΕΠΑΙ ΝΘΕ ΝΤΕΤΡΖΟΥΟ ΝΖΗΤΨ ΕΙΕ-ΚΑΝ ΖΩ ΕΡΟΚ
ΕΤΕΚΣΖΙΜΕ ΚΑΝ ΖΩ ΕΡΟ ΕΠΟΥΖΑΙ
 (BL Or 8664, p. 42, ed. Shisha-Halevy, *Orientalia*) – **ΚΑΝ** “at least”.

(II) IF (AS WILL BE CONCEDED/AS WE KNOW IT TO BE TRUE/AS NO ONE
 WILL DENY) THAT...,

• THEN (HOW MUCH EASIER IT IS TO CONCEDE/ONE CANNOT BUT
 CONCEDE) THAT...,

(OR) • THEN (THERE IS EVEN THE MORE EXTREME CASE) THAT...

THE CLASSIC LOCUS ARGUMENTORUM OF A FORTIORI IMPLICATION: less frequently *a maiore ad minus*, typically *a minore ad maius*. The most prominent and prevalent pattern.

ΠΟCΨ ΜΑΛΛΟΝ and Rhetorical-Question “packaging” are optional *in apodosis*; typically homolexemic.

ΕΙΕ- does not occur before **ΠΟCΨ ΜΑΛΛΟΝ**.

- (16) **ΕΨΧΕ-ΑΨΧΙΒΟΛ ΕΠΝΟΥ[Τ]Ε ΚΑΤΑΝΕΓΡΑΦΗ ΧΕ-ΑΝΧΙΧΕΕΨ ΜΠΧΟΕΙΣ**
ΧΙΒΟΛ ΕΡΟΨ ΕΙΕ-ΝΣΕΝΑΧΙΒΟΛ ΑΝ ΝΣΕΝΑΖΙΑ ΑΝ ΕΝΕΤΖΕΛΠΙΖ[Ε]

ΕΡΟϞ (Leipoldt III, 24,17)

(17) **Η ΕΨΧΕ-ΜΠΕϞϞϞ ΕΤΑΑϞ ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΟϞ ΖΑΡΟΝ ΠΟϞΟ ΜΑΛΛΟΝ
ΝΕϞΑΓΑΘΟΝ** (Leipoldt III, 29,22)

(18) **ΕΨΧΕ-ΠΡΩΜΕ ΝΑΚΑΡΩϞ ΑΝ ΕϞΨΑΝΘΜΘΟΜ ΕΤΩΒΕ ΜΠΕΤΟ ΝΝΟΕΙΚ
ΕΤΕϞϞΖΙΜΕ ΠΟϞΟ ΜΑΛΛΟΝ ΕϞΝΑϞϞϞ ΝΘΙΠΕΝΤΑϞΠΛΑϞϞΕ ΜΜΟΟΥ**
(Leipoldt III, 97,23)

(19) **ΧΕ-ΕΨΧΕ-ΝΓΜΕ ΑΝ ΜΠΕΚϞΟΝ ΕΤΚΝΑϞ ΕΡΟϞ ΝΑΨ ΝΖΕ ΝΤΟϞ
ΕΚΝΑΜΕΡΕΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΜΠΚΝΑϞ ΕΡΟϞ ΕΝΕΖ** (Leipoldt III, 153,9)

(20) **Η ΕΨΧΕ-ΜΠΟΥΚΑΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΝΑϞ ΜΠΕϞΜΤΟ ΕΒΟΛ Η ΕϞΝΑΚΑΡΩΜΕ**
(Leipoldt III, 88,9)

(21) **ΕΨΧΕ-ΤΕΚΤΗϞΙϞ ΔΕ ϞΟΟΥΝ ΜΜΟϞ ΑΝ ΜΜΙΝ ΜΜΟϞ, ΝΑΨ ΝΖΕ
ΕϞΝΑΧΩ ΝΖΕΝΖΒΗϞΕ ΕϞΧΟϞΕ ΠΑΡΑΤΕϞϞϞΙϞ** (Leipoldt III, 224,17)

(III) IRONIC/INVALIDATING IMPLICATION:

“IF IT IS TRUE/SUPPOSING/GRANTED (FOR A MOMENT, FOR THE SAKE OF THE ARGUMENT) THAT...,

• THEN WE MUST ARRIVE AT THE ([EVEN TO YOU]

UNACCEPTABLE/LOGICALLY UNTENABLE/PARADOXAL /ABSURD OR UNEXPECTED) IMPLICATION/THE UNANSWERABLE QUESTION, THAT...”

• THEN THE PARADOX ARISES, THAT...”

• THEN HOW CAN IT BE POSSIBLE, THAT...?”

Note **ΟΝ, ΖΩ**; homolexemicity.

Sarcasm, irony, *reductio ad absurdum*, also pointing to a paradox prove here the premiss wrong and invalidate it.

(22) **ΕΨΧΕ-ΜΠΕϞΩ ΜΜΟϞ ΕΙΕ-ΜΠΟΥΧΠΟϞ ΕΨΧΕ-ΜΠΟΥΧΠΟϞ ΕΙΕ-
ΜΠΕϞΡΡΩΜΕ ΕΨΧΕ-ΜΠΕϞΡΡΩΜΕ ΕΙΕ-ΜΠΟΥϞΤΑϞΡΟΥ ΜΜΟϞ**

(Orlandi, *Shenoute contra Origenistas*, 347) – An ironic syllogistic chain, reducing the main premiss to absurdity and dismantling the entire claim.

(23) **ΑΝΟΚ ΜΕΝ ΓΑΡ ΕΨΧΕ-ΤΑΜΝΤΕΛΑΧΙϞΤΟϞ ΜΝΝΑΖΒΗϞΕ ΝΕΛΑΧΙϞΤΟΝ
ΟΥΟΝΖ ΕΡΩΤΝ ΝΑΨ ΝΖΕ ΕΙΝΑΖΩΠ ΕΠΕΝΤΑϞΤΑΜΙΟΙ Η ΕΙΤΜΑΙΗϞ
ΖΝΟΥ ΝΝΑΖΡΜΠΕϞΧΡΙϞΤΟϞ** (Codex XO, 289)

(24) **ΠΑΗΝ ΕΨΧΕ-ΝΤΑϞΒΩΚ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΙΤΟΟΤΝ ΝΘΙΝΑΙ ΕΤΜΜΑϞ ΧΕ-ΜΠΙΚΑΑϞ
ΕΨΜΨΕ ΜΠΧΟΕΙϞ ΚΑΤΑΘΕ ΕΝΤΑϞΧΟΟϞ ΧΕΝΤΟϞ ΠΕΤΕΜΠϞΚΑΑΝ ΕϞ**

ΝΝΕΝΕΡΗΤ ΜΠΝΟΥΤΕ, ΕΙΕ-ΟΥΝΘΟΜ ΜΜΟΥ ΤΕΝΟΥ ΖΗΠΜΑ
ΕΤΟΥΝΖΗΤΨ ΕΧΩΚ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΝΕΥΕΡΗΤ (Leipoldt III, 133,11)

- (25) ΧΕ-ΕΨΧΕ-ΑΝΟΚ ΠΕΤΝΑΜΕΣΤΕΝΑΙ ΕΤΜΜΑΥ ΕΠΧΙΝΧΗ ΕΝΤΑΥΒΩΚ
ΕΒΟΛ ΖΙΤΟΟΤΝ Η ΝΕΤΝΑΒΩΚ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΙΤΟΟΤΝ ΕΙΕ-ΝΙΜ
ΠΕΤΝΑΜΕΡΙΤΟΥ ... ΕΨΧΕ-ΑΝΟΚ ΠΕΤΝΑΡΧΑΧΕ ΕΡΟΟΥ ΕΠΧΙΝΧΗ ΕΕΙΕ-
ΝΙΜ ΠΕΤΝΑΡΕΙΡΗΝΗ ΝΜΜΑΥ
(Leipoldt III, 122,20)

- (26) Η ΕΨΧΕ-ΝΓΝΑΟΥΨ ΑΝ ΕΤΡΕΤΕΤΕΤΩΚ ΡΩΨΕ ΕΡΟΚ ΝΑΨ ΝΖΕ
ΕΚΝΑΡΩΨΕ ΕΤΕΤΕΤΩΚ ΤΕ Η ΕΣΝΑΖΩ ΕΡΟΚ ΕΡΟΚ (BL Or 8664, p. 33, ed.
Shisha-Halevy, *Orientalia*)

- (27) ΕΨΧΕ-ΨΑΡΕΠΖΑΙΡΕΤΙΚΟΣ ΘΕ ΜΗΠΖΛΛΗΝ ΠΩΡΨ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΝΕΥΘΙΧ Η
ΝΣΕΨΙΤΟΥ ΕΖΡΑΙ ΖΝΘΥΠΟΚΡΙΣΙΣ ΧΕ-ΕΨΨΛΗΛ, ΕΙΣ-ΝΖΑΛΑΤΕ ΖΨΟΥ
ΕΙΡΕ ΜΠΑΙ ΝΖΑΖ ΝΣΟΠ ΕΥΠΩΡΨ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΝΕΥΤΝΖ. (Leipoldt III, 45,3)

- (28) ΕΨΧΕ-ΝΤΩΤΝ ΔΕ ΝΤΕΤΝΑΟΥΨ ΑΝ ΖΝΖΕΝΜΑ ΕΨΨΡΨΩΡ ΑΨΩ ΕΥΚΗ
ΕΒΟΛ ΕΡΕΝΕΘΗΡΙΟΝ ΝΖΗΤΟΥ ΑΨΩ ΕΡΕΝΒΑΨΟΡ ΜΟΣΕ ΝΖΗΤΟΥ
ΜΗΝΖΟΥ ΜΗΝΝΟΥΟΟΖΕ ΑΨΩ ΕΡΕΝΡΙΡ ΜΟΟΝΕ ΖΡΑΙ ΝΖΗΤΟΥ ΕΙΕ-ΝΑΨ
ΝΤΟΥ ΝΖΕ ΕΡΕΠΕΠΝΑ ΜΠΕΧΣ ΝΑΟΥΨ ΖΡΑΙ ΖΝΝΕΤΜΨΥΧΗ
ΕΤΨΡΨΩΡ ΜΗΝΕΤΝΖΗΤ ΕΤΤΑΚΗΥΤ ΜΗΝΕΤΝΣΩΜΑ ΕΤΟ ΜΜΑ ΝΟΥΨ
ΝΝΕΠΝΑ ΝΑΚΑΘΑΡΤΟΝ Η ΝΑΨ ΝΖΕ ΕΡΕΝΕΠΝΑ ΝΝΝΔΙΚΑΙΟΣ
ΜΗΝΕΤΟΥΑΑΒ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΝΑΙ ΕΤΝΩΨ ΝΝΕΥΨΑΧΕ ΝΑΜΤΟΝ ΜΜΟΥ
ΖΑΤΕΤΗΤΝ ΕΡΕΝΔΑΙΜΩΝ ΜΟΣΕ ΝΖΡΑΙ ΝΖΗΤΤΗΥΤΝ ΑΨΩ ΕΥΜΤΟΝ
ΜΜΟΥ ΖΡΑΙ ΖΝΝΕΤΝΜΕΕΥΕ ΝΖΗΤ ΕΤΣΟΟΥ ΑΨΩ ΕΥΣΑΑΝΨ
ΝΝΕΥΚΑΚΙΑ ΖΡΑΙ ΖΝΝΕΤΝΨΟΧΝΕ ΜΗΠΕΤΝΖΗΤ ΕΤΧΑΖΜ

ΕΨΧΕ-ΝΤΕΤΝΑΜΕΡΕ-ΩΤΠ ΑΝ ΕΖΟΥΝ ΕΠΚΑΚΕ ΕΙΕ-ΝΑΨ ΝΖΕ
ΕΡΕΠΕΠΝΑ ΜΠΧΟΕΙΣ ΝΑΜΕΡΕΘΩ ΖΡΑΙ ΖΝΝΕΤΝΖΗΤ ΕΤΕΤΝΟ ΝΚΑΚΕ

ΕΨΧΕ-ΝΤΕΤΝΑΜΑΚΑΡΙΖΕ ΑΝ ΕΝΕΖ ΝΖΕΝΕΙΔΩΛΟΝ ΕΥΤΑΖΗΥ
ΕΡΑΤΟΥ ΖΝΖΕΝΡΠΗΥΕ ΖΕΝΨΕ ΜΝΖΕΝΩΝΕ... ΕΙΕ-ΝΙΜ ΝΤΟΥ
ΝΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΙΤΜΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΠΕΤΝΑΜΑΚΑΡΙΖΕ ΜΜΩΤΝ

(BM 175, ed. Kuhn, *Besa*, 119-120, v. S. Emmel, *Shenoute's Literary Corpus* II, Leuven 2004, p. 938) – A striking case of extended ironical address, even satire. As I see it, the text is incomprehensible unless as a sardonic diatribe: Kuhn seems to have missed this point.

(IV) CORRELATIVITY IMPLICATION:

“JUST AS (WE KNOW/SEE/AGREE), GRANTED/SUPPOSING THAT...,
WHILE (IT IS OR MAY BE TRUE) THAT...,

• SO, BY THE SAME TOKEN (LET ME ASSURE YOU) THAT...”

• STILL, (IT IS ALSO TRUE) THAT...”;

“JUST AS... [METAPHORIC VEHICLE],

SO ... [METAPHORIC TENOR]”

Typically used also for highlighting contrast (cf. **ΑΛΛΟ... ΑΛΛΟ...**, **ΕΙΣ... ΕΙΣ...**, **ΟΥΕΤ-...**, **ΟΥΕΤ-... ΤΩ ΕΤΩ Ν-... ΜΝ-** as well as pungent comparison.

Note **ΟΝ**, **ΖΩΩ**, **ΝΖΟΥΟ**, **ΑΛΗΘΩΣ**, **ΟΝΤΩΣ** *in apodosis* – homolexemicity is here pattern constituent.

(29) **ΑΥΩ ΕΨΧΕ-ΤΝΕΠΕΙΘΥΜΕΙ ΕΤΒΒΟ ΟΝΤΩΣ ΦΟΥΩΨ ΝΖΟΥΟ ΕΤΒΒΟΝ**

(Leipoldt III, 37,2)

(30) **ΕΨΧΕ-ΠΑΣΕΒΗΣ ΠΕΤΒΟΜ ΜΠΑΙΜΩΝ ΕΖΡΑΙ ΕΧΩΦ ΟΝΤΩΣ
ΟΥΜΑΚΑΡΙΟΣ ΠΕ ΠΕΥΣΕΒΗΣ ΧΕ-ΦΒΟΗΘΕΙ ΕΡΟΦ ΝΒΙΠΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ
ΜΠΕΧΣ** (Chassinat, 79)

(31) **†ΝΑΧΟΟΣ ΟΝ ΧΕ-ΕΨΧΕ-ΑΝΜΟΥ ΜΝΠΕΧΣ ΑΝΤΩΟΥΝ ΜΝΠΕΧΣ**

(Chassinat, 166)

(32) **ΕΨΧΕ-ΟΥΝΤΑΚ-ΖΕΝΧΗΦΕ ΝΟΥΟΥΟΕΙΨ ΑΛΛΑ ΤΕΝΟΥ ΜΝΤΑΚ**

(Chassinat, 31) – Not concessive! a nice instance of distorting biased reading. Note the chiasmus, stressing the correlation.

(33) **ΕΨΧΕ-ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΓΑΡ ΧΙ-ΕΟΟΥ ΖΝΝΕΥΣΕΒΗΣ ΦΧΙ ΟΝ ΖΝΝΑΣΕΒΗΣ**

(Chassinat, 113)

(34) **ΕΨΧΕ-ΖΝΤΒΟΜ ΔΕ ΜΠΩΗΡΕ ΝΤΑΝΟΜΙΑ ΕΦΤΡΕΝΡΩΜΕ ΕΙΡΕ
ΝΜΠΑΡΑΦΥΣΙΣ ΕΤΒΕΟΥ ΝΤΟΥ ΖΝΤΒΟΜ ΜΠΕΧΣ ΝΤΝΕΙΡΕ ΑΝ
ΝΝΑΤΕΝΦΥΣΙΣ** (Chassinat, 64)

(35) **ΕΑΙΧΟΟΣ ΧΕ-ΕΨΧΕ-ΟΥΖΑΤ ΕΦΟΤΠ ΠΕ ΠΛΑΣ ΝΝΔΙΚΑΙΟΣ, ΕΙΕΟΥΛΑΣ
ΕΦΧΑΖΜ ΝΖΟΥΟ ΠΕ ΠΛΑΣ ΝΝΑΣΕΒΗΣ** (Leipoldt III, 113,18)

(36) **ΕΨΧΕ-ΟΥΤΑΛΑΙΠΟΡΟΣ ΑΛΗΘΟΣ ΠΕ ΠΕΤΣΩΟΥΖ ΕΖΟΥΝ ΕΝΦ† ΑΝ
ΜΠΕΤΡΒΩΖ ΟΥΜΑΚΑΡΙΟΣ ΟΝ ΑΛΗΘΩΣ ΝΖΟΥΟ ΠΕ ΠΕΤΣΩΟΥΖ
ΕΖΟΥΝ ΕΤΒΕΝΑ** (Leipoldt III, 115,26)

(37) **ΕΨΧΕ-ΑΥΠΩΤ ΝΣΩΕΙ ΣΕΝΑΠΩΤ ΝΣΑΤΗΥΤΝ** (Leipoldt IV, 35,14)

(V) **ΕΨΧΕ** + ANAPHOR OR PRO-TEXT: “THIS BEING SO/THE CASE, ...”

This sophisticated device has two main roles. The first, formal, is to extend and complicate the premiss constituent, and thereby the whole configuration. The second is functional: the resumption serves as a thematizing springboard and focalizes (on a textual scope and plane) the apodosis even further.

- (38) **Η ΣΖΜΠΕΤΝΖΗΤ ΕΝΑΥ ΕΡΟΝ ΚΑΤΑΘΕ ΕΤΝΟΥΕΨ-ΝΑΥ ΕΡΩΤΝ ΕΨΧΕ-ΖΕ ΕΙΕ-ΕΤΒΕΟΥ ΜΠΕΤΝ†ΖΤΗΤΝ ΕΠΑΨΑΧΕ...**
Η ΜΜΟΝ ΝΤΟϞ ΕΣΖΜΠΕΤΝΖΗΤ ΕΤΡΕΤΟΥΙ ΤΟΥΙ ΜΜΩΤΝ ΘΩΨΤ ΕΖΟΥΝ ΕΖΡΜΠΖΟ ΝΤΕΤΖΙΤΟΥΩΣ ΖΜΠΜΑ ΕΤΝΝΑΒΩΚ ΕΜΑΥ ΕΨΧΕ-ΣΕ ΕΙΕ-ΕΤΒΕΟΥ ΕΡΕΤΟΥΙ ΤΟΥΙ ΜΜΩΤΝ ΜΟΩΨΕ ΖΝΟΥΚΡΟϞ (Kuhn, *Besa*, fragment 37, 6 and 9 [Shenoute])

- (39) **ΕΨΧΕ-ΝΤΕΙΖΕ ΤΕ ΕΙΕ-ΧΟΟС ΝΤΟΟΥΝ ΧΕ-...**

(Orlandi, *Shenoute contra Origenistas*, 343) – The apodosis here matches closely the Talmudic rhetorical-hermeneutical signal-phrase *'emor me-'atab* “say, henceforth” to introduce a forced or guided conclusion; consider also (Chassinat, 182) **ΧΟΟС ΖΩΩΝ ΧΕ-**. Indeed, there are numerous parallels between Shenoute’s hermeneutical and argumentative formalities and Talmudic ones, most strikingly turns of phrases involving **ΧΩ**, **СΩΤМ**, **ΝΑΥ**; and, no less strikingly, hermeneutical principles recalling the Talmudic *middot* (“measures”), of which our *a fortiori* **ΕΨΧΕ-** configuration II is clearly one. Since it is hard to envisage a direct Shenoute-Rabbinical association, two possibilities, by no means mutually exclusive, present themselves: first, a common – probably Greek – source (that was S. Lieberman’s suggestion. Both for the Talmud and for Shenoute, we’re talking of the sixth century AD); second, a common areal tradition, extending from India-Persia to Egypt.

- (40) **ΕΨΧΕ-ΘΕ ΤΕ ΤΑΙ ΚΑΑΤ ΤΑΤΡΕΝΕСΝΗϞ ΡΟΥΑΝΑΨ ΝΑΙ** (Leipoldt III, 16,12)

- (41) **ΑΡΑΘΕ ΕΥΝΤΑΝ-ΝΕΙΖΝΑΑΥ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΕΥΚΗ ΝΑΝ ΕΖΡΑΙ ΕΨΧΕ-ΕΖΕ ΕΙΕ-ΑΝΟΝ ΖΕΝΡΩΜΕ ΕΥΧΙΒΟΛ ΧΕΑΝϞΙ ΜΠΕΝСТАΥΡΟС ΑΝΟΥΑΖΝ ΝСАΠΧΟΕΙС** (Leipoldt III, 71-2)

- (42) **ΕΨΧΕ-ΕΨΑΝΒΩΚ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΙΤΟΟΤΝ ΝСΕΤМΖΕ ΕΝΕΥΟΥΨ Η ΝΤΟϞ ΝСΕСΕΙ ΝΝΕΥΠΑΘΟС ΑΥΩ ΝСΕКΤΟΟΥ ΕΡΟΝ ΝКЕСОП ΝСΕΚΩΤΕ ΝСАΘΕ ΝΟΥΩΖ ΝММΑΝ ΑΥΩ ΖΟΤΑΝ ΕΝΨΑΝΤМКАΑΥ ΨΑΥΧΟΟС ОΝ ΖМПАΨΑΙ ΜΠΑΙΒΕ ΝΤΕΥМΝΤΑТСВΩ ΧΕ... ΑΥΩ ΕΨΧΕ-ΟΥΝΖΟΙΝΕ ΝΑΨΑΧΕ ΖΙΝΑΙ, ΖΕΝΚΟΟΥΕ ΔΕ ОΝ ΕΤΡΕΥМΟКМЕК ΝΤΕΙΚΕΖΕ, ОΥΚΟΥΝ ОΥΟΕΙ ΜΠΑΙ ΕТММАΥ ΝНАΖРNNPΩΜΕ ΝТЕИМINE...**

(Leipoldt III, 121,8) the last **ΑΥΩ** is here resumptive: a well established feature of Shenoute’s syntax.

- (43) **ΕΨΧΕ-ΘΕ ΝΝΕΤΕΡΕΤΟΡΓΗ ΝΑΕΙ ΕΧΩΟΥ ... ΤΕ ΘΕ ΟΝ ΕΤΟΥΝΑΧΩΛΧ
ΝΖΗΤC ΝΒΙ-ΝΕΤΩΨ ΑΥΩ ΟΝ ΕΤCΩΤΜ ΑΥΩ ΝΕΤΕΝΟΥΟΥ ΝΕ ΝΙΨΑΧΕ,
ΑΥΩ ΝΤΑΥCΖΑΙCΟΥ ΕΤΒΗΗΤΟΥ ΧΕ-ΕΥΝΑΟΥΧΑΙ ΝCΕΤΜΟΥΧΑΙ, ...
ΕΨΧΕ-CΕ ΘΩΨΤ ΕΧΝ-ΝΕΚCΑΡΞ ΝΓΝΑΥ ΧΕ-ΟΥ ΠΕ ΠΙΚΜΟΜ ΝΨΩΒΖ
ΖΙΤΝΤΖΜΜΕ ΝΜΠΑΡΑΦΥCΙC
ΕΨΧΕ-ΖΕ ΕΤΒΕΟΥ ΜΠCΚΒΟ ΝΒΙ-ΠΕΚΖΗΤ... (Chassinat, 185)**
- (44) **ΝCΗΝΑΤCΤΟΙ ΕΒΟΛ ΑΝ ΟΥΤΕ ΝCΗΝΑΚΑΑΤ ΑΝ ΝCΩC ΧΕ-ΤΕΙΡΕ ΑΝ
ΝΤΕΤΝΖΕ ΝΤΤΩΝ ΑΝ Η ΚΩΖ Η ΜΟCΤΕ...
ΕΨΧΕ-ΖΕ ΜΑΡΕΝΕΤΟΝΖ ΝΜΜΑΙ ΧΟΟC ΧΕ-ΧΙΝΤΑΙΤ-ΠΕΙCΧΗΜΑ ΖΙΩΨΤ
ΧΕΝΤΑΙΚΡΜΡΜ ΕΤΒΕΟΥ ΕΝΕΖ Η ΝΤΑΙΘΝΑΡΙΚΕ ΕΝΙΜ ΕΝΕΖ (Codex XO,
266bis)**

* * *

2. ΑΡΑΘΕ, ΑΡΑ

Another, formally very different device for the *reductio ad absurdum* of the implications a rhetorical opponent's claim or argument, and thereby his whole case, is more direct – but no less focalizing. Among the exponents of so-called Rhetorical Questions in Shenoute's rhetorical idiom – not really questions, but focal assertions packaged as questions – **ΑΡΑ(ΘΕ)**⁴ stands out “what a ridiculous/absurd/inconceivable idea it is, that...”, in *lusis*, as a rule ironic or sarcastic, in *lusis*, unless merely

4 Like many Greek loans into Coptic, the precise etymological details for **ΑΡΑ(ΘΕ)** are not all clear, in particular the functional route. It is very probable that ἄρα, ἄραγε and ἄρ'οὖν are the sources of Coptic **ΑΡΑ** and **ΑΡΑΘΕ** (**ΑΡΑΘΕ** seems, by the functional bi- or tri-furcation of **ΘΕ**, to correspond, at least nominally, to both ἄραγε and ἄρ'οὖν). I could not detect in the Greek Koine the roots of the specialized role discussed here. The entire issue of the rhetorical questions in Coptic requires special study, as do the relations between specific differences within various Greek systems – at the very least, classical Attic and Koine ones – and within the Coptic ones. It is evident, at any rate, that “expecting/presupposing a negative answer” (which, I believe, is anyway a wrong approach to the function of a RQ, which does not expect *any* answer) and a highlighted *reductio ad absurdum* are not the same thing: there are in Coptic several signals for the former, and only **ΑΡΑ** for the latter. Moreover, the compatibility, in Coptic (exx. 50-51) as in Greek (Denniston, p. 47f.), of **ΑΡΑ** and **ΜΗ**, may point to a basically non-interrogative nature of the former. See A. Shisha-Halevy, *Topics in Coptic Syntax: Structural Studies in the Bohairic Dialect*, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 160, Leuven: Peeters 2007, Chapter One, 138ff. See also C.M.J. Sicking, “Particles in Questions in Plato”, in: A. Rijksbaron (ed.), *New Approaches to Greek Particles, Proceedings of the Colloquium held in Amsterdam, January 4-6, 1996 to Honour C.J. Ruijgh on the Occasion of his Retirement*, Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology 7, Amsterdam: Gieben 1997, 157-174.

emphatic. **απα(δευ)** precedes immediately a Focalizing Conversion (“Second Tense”) form, which uses actually a pattern component (unless a Nominal Sentence follows), in “envelope focalization”:⁵ in rhetorical terms, this is a “focalization of inconceivability”, comparable to the Shenoutean “**ΕΝΨΩΝΕ**” or “**ΕΝΨΙΠΕ**” (quoted by Shenoute, attributed to his flock) where we see “focalization of quotedness”, effecting (as in the paraphrastic “soi-disant”, “self-styled”, “you say”) “focalization of disbelief”. In this role, **απα(δευ)** is *paragraph-initial*.

(45) **ΑΡΑΔΕ ΕΡΕΠΧΟΕΙΣ ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΝΑΚΑ-ΠΑΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΟΝ ΕΤΜΜΑΥ ΝΤΕΙΖΕ ΧΕ-
ΑΥΖΡΟΥ ΕΥΚΤΟ ΜΜΟΥ ΕΒΟΛ... ΑΡΑΔΕ ΝΕΤΕΙΡΕ ΝΝΕΙΚΡΟΥ
ΖΗΝΕΙΤΟΠΟΣ ΕΡΕΠΧΟΕΙΣ ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΝΝΙΤΟΠΟΣ ΝΑΚΑΑΥ ΝΤΕΙΖΕ ΧΕ-
ΦΩΨ ΜΜΟΥ ΤΕΝΟΥ** (Codex XO, 298)

(46) **ΑΡΑΔΕ ΕΚΤΜΑΙΝΥ ΧΕ-ΑΠΝΟΒΕ ΡΡΟ ΖΜΠΕΚΣΩΜΑ** (Leipoldt IV, 193, 8)

(47) **ΣΩΤΜ ΕΤΠΑΡΡΗCΙΑ ΝΝΕΤΟΥΑΑΒ ΠΕΧΑΥ ΧΕ-ΤΝΑΧΩ ΑΝΟΚ ΝΝΑΖΒΗΥΕ
ΜΠΡΡΟ
ΝΤΟΚ ΔΕ ΖΩΨΚ ΕΚΝΑΧΕ-ΟΥ ΕΠΡΡΟ ΠΕΧC
ΑΡΑ ΕΚΝΑΧΩ ΕΡΟΥ ΕΝΝΕΚΨΙΠΕ ...
ΠΕΧΑΥ ΟΝ ΧΕ-ΖΑΡΕΖ ΕΡΟΙ ΠΧΟΕΙC ΧΕ-ΤΟΥΑΑΒ
ΕΚΝΑΧΟΟC ΖΩΨΚ ΧΕ-ΟΥ
ΑΡΑ ΕΚΝΑΧΟΟC ΧΕ-ΖΑΡΕΖ ΕΡΟΙ ΧΕ-ΤΧΑΖΜ
ΠΕΧΑΥ ΟΝ ΧΕ-ΕΨΧΕ-ΑΙΝΑΥ ΕΧΙΝΘΟΝC ΖΜΠΑΖΗΤ ΑΥΩ ΟΝ ΖΗΝΑΒΙΧ
ΜΠΡΤΡΕΠΧΟΕΙC ΣΩΤΜ ΕΡΟΙ
ΕΚΝΑΧΟΟC ΖΩΨΚ ΧΕ-ΟΥ**

ΑΡΑ ΕΚΝΑΧΟΟC ΧΕ-ΠΑΖΗΤ ΜΕΖ ΝΧΙΝΘΟΝC ΑΥΩ ΟΝ ΝΑΚΕΒΙΧ

(BL 3581A (57) f. 126 p. 147 [ed. Shisha-Halevy, *Enchoria*, 92]) – A complex, almost poetical rhetorical array, rhythmically structured, with **απα** responding to an interrogative refrain.

(48) **ΑΡΑ ΕΟΥΝΖΕΝΤΗΖ ΜΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΠΠΑΝΤΟΚΡΑΤΩΡ Η ΝΤΑΥΠΑΡΑΓΕ ΜΜΟΝ**
(Chassinat, 186)

(49) **ΑΡΑΔΕ ΝΝΑΨΧΟΟΥ ΤΗΡΟΥ** (Chassinat, 111)

(50) **ΜΗ ΑΡΑΔΕ ΕΡΕΠΡΩΜΕ ΟΥΩΜ ΑΥΩ ΕΥCΩ ΝΤΕΧΡΙΑ ΜΠCΩΜΑ ΕΦΟ
ΝΖΜΖΑΛ ΝΤΖΗ ΜΗ ΓΕΝΟΙΤΟ**

(Chassinat, 110) – the Focalizing Present following the topicalizing Circumstantial; **ΜΗ ΓΕΝΟΙΤΟ** underlines the enormity of the idea.

5 Cf. A. Shisha-Halevy, *Structural Studies in Modern Welsh Syntax: Aspects of the Grammar of Kate Roberts*, Studien und Texte zur Keltologie 2, Münster: Nodus 1998, 28ff.

(51) ΜΗ ΑΡΑ ΕΙΟΥΗΖ ΟΝ ΖΙΧΝΤΜΗΤΕ ΝΧΩΚ ΧΕ-ΚΧΩ ΜΜΟC ΧΕ-ΨΑΝΤΕΟΥ
 ΨΩΠΕ ΜΠϢCΘΗΡ ## ΕΦΧΩ ΜΜΟC ΧΕ-†ΝΑΒΩΚ ## ΕΦΝΕΧΖΟΟΥ
 ΝCΑΖΟΟΥ ΕΤΒΕΟΥ ΕΙΟ ΜΠΙΝΟΘ ΝΒΑΡΟC ΕΖΡΑΙ ΕΧΩΚ (Chassinat, 41).

(52) CΩΤΜ: ΑΡΑ ΝΝΟΥΝ ΝΑΟΥΩΝ ΖΝΟΥΑΙCΘΗCΙC ΕΤΕΝΕΝΖΗΤ ΝΕ
 ΝΤΕΟΥΖΟΤΕ ΝΑΕΙ ΕΖΡΑΙ ΕΧΩΝ

(Chassinat, 11) – Note **CΩΤΜ** here, recalling the Talmudic *ta-shma* “come (and) hear” initiating an argumentative unit (see note to ex. 40 above).

ΕΜΝΤΑΥ-ΙC ΓΑΡ ΜΜΑΥ ΟΥ ΠΕΤΝΑΤΑΧΡΟΟΥ ΑΡΑ ΠΨΕ ΜΝΠΩΝΕ ΠΕ
 ΑΥΩ ΠΚΕCΕΕΠΕ ΑΡΑ ΠΡΗ ΜΝΠΟΟΖ ΠΕ ΜΝΠΚΟCΜΟC ΤΗΡϢ ΝΤΠΕ ΠΕ
 (Chassinat, 119-120)

(53) ΑΡΑ ΕΡΕΠΧΟΕΙC ΨΑΧΕ ΕΠΙΟΥΑ ΜΑΥΑΤϢ ΝΤΑΝΕΦΑΓΑΘΟΝ ΑΨΑΙ ΝΑϢ
 ΧΕ ΠΑΘΗΤ, ΜΗ ΟΥΠΑΡΑΒΟΛΗ ΑΝ ΤΕ ΕϢ†CΒΩ ΝΑΝ ΕΤΜΡΑΘΗΤ

(Chassinat, 194) – A nice opposition of **ΑΡΑ** with the discontinuous **ΜΗ ...ΑΝ**: the former focalizing an untenable idea, the latter non-focal.

(54) ΑΡΑΘΕ ΕΡΕΠΕΝΖΗΤ ΝΑΨΘΜΘΟΜ ΝΨΩΠ ΕΡΟϢ ΝΤΑΓΑΠΗ ΕΖΟΥΝ
 ΕΠΕΤΖΙΤΟΥΩΝ ΜΠΝΨΟΥΩϢ ΝΨΟΡΠ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΝΜΜΝΤΜΑΙΖΟΜΤ ΑΥΩ
 ΝΤΝΕΙΑΑϢ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΜΠΕCΛΩΩΜΕ ΤΗΡϢ ΝΤΝΖΩΚΕ ΜΠΨΗΒΕ ΤΗΡϢ
 ΜΠΜΕ ΕΤΜΜΑΥ ΝΛΟΙΜΟC ΕΒΟΛ ΖΜΠΕΝΖΗΤ (Chassinat, 195)

(55) ΜΗ ΑΡΑ ΕΦΨΑΧΕ ΕΥΧΩΡΑ ΝΑΜΕ ΧΝ-ΜΜΟΝ ΕΓΨΑΧΕ ΕΥΛΑΟC

(Leipoldt III, 58-59) – Clearly, **ΑΡΑ** is here non-interrogative.

(56) ΑΡΑ ΕΥΜΕ ΜΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΝΘΙ-ΝΕΤΜΜΑΥ ΧΕ-ΝCΕΝΑΥ ΑΝ ΕΡΟϢ ΝΖΟ ΖΙΖΟ
 ΕΤΡΕΦΚΩΛΥΕ ΜΜΟΟΥ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΜΠΜΟCΤΕ ΕΤΖΜΠΕΥΖΗΤ

(Leipoldt III, 153, 11) – a nice instance for an absurd suggestion.

ΑΡΑ with negative clauses, while still ironic or sarcastic, is semantically distinct: “you don’t imagine that... (not)...?”, “you don’t mean to say that... (not)...” (or: “what, do you mean to say that... (not)...?”):

(57) ΑΡΑ ΜΠΕΝΕΖΟΟΥ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΝΤΕΡΟΜΠΕ ΡΨΕ ΕΡΩΤΝ
 ΕΤΡΕΤΗΡΝΕΤΠΑΘΟC ΕΤCΗΨ ΝΖΗΤΟΥ (Leipoldt, 96,5)

(58) ΑΡΑ ΝΨΑΧΕ ΜΠΧΟΕΙC ΑΝ ΝΕ ΝΑΙ ΧΕ-ΝΑ ΤΑΡΟΥΝΑ ΝΗΤΝ † ΤΑΡΟΥ†
 ΝΗΤΝ

(Chassinat, 199) – Note the rhetorical Nominal Sentence pattern with the deictic antitopic, typically Shenoutean.⁶

6 Cf. A. Shisha-Halevy. “On Some Coptic Nominal Sentence Patterns”, in: *Studien zu Sprache und Religion Ägyptens zu Ehren von Wolfhart Westendorf I*, Göttingen 1984, 175-189.

- (59) **ΑΡΑ ΕΡΕΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΝΑΚΑΡΩΦ ΕΤΜΚΡΙΝΕ Η ΕΤΜΩΙΝΕ ΝΣΑΝΑΙ** (Leipoldt III, 91, 12)
- (60) (of the sheep and the goats) **ΑΡΑΒΕ ΠΕΙΓΕΝΟC CΝΑΥ ΕΤΖΝΤΕΙΩΑΙΡΕ ΝΟΥΩΤ ΑΥΩ ΕΤΜΟΝΕ ΖΗΝΝΕΙΝΤΗΘ ΝΟΥΩΤ ΕΥCΩ ΖΗΝΝΙΘΩΤ ΝΟΥΩΤ ΜΠΟΥΩΤΩΠ ΕΝΕΥΕΡΗΥ ΖΗΜΠΕΥΟΓΟΕΙΩ ΤΗΡΦ** (Leipoldt III, 219,25)
- (61) (of the sheep and the goats) **ΑΡΑ ΕΥΩΑΝΠΟΡΧΟΥ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΝΕΥΕΡΗΥ ΝΕCΟΟΥ ΜΕΝ ΝCΕΜΤΟΝ ΜΜΟΟΥ ΖΗΝΝΕΥΜΑ ΜΜΟΟΝΕ ΜΝΝΕΥΜΑ ΝΧΙΖΑΙΒΕC ΑΥΩ ΝΕΥΜΑ ΝCΩ ΜΒΑΑΜΠΕ ΔΕ ΝCΕΖΡΑ ΝCΩΟΥ ΕΖΕΝΜΑ ΝΧΑΙΕ ΑΥΩ ΝΩΑΡΒΑ ΖΗΜΠΧΩΝΤ ΜΠΩΩC** pointing to a paradox – **ΑΡΑΒΕ ΜΗΝCΑΠΠΩΡΧ ΕΒΟΛ ΠΟΥΑ ΠΟΥΑ ΝΑΦΙΖΡΑΦ ΑΝ ΕΒΟΛ ΕΦΡΙΜΕ ΕΜΝΠΕΤΝΑCΩΤΜ ΕΡΟΦ** (Leipoldt III, 220) – **ΑΡΑΒΕ** resumes the first **ΑΡΑ**.

Following **ΧΕ-** or **ΧΕΚΑΑC**. In a direct or indirect quotation, or final clause, **ΑΡΑ** seems to introduce a hopeful expected consequence, a surprised realization of a consequence (“...then...!”), a final or consecutive sequel. This evidently is a different entity:⁷

- (62) **ΕΙΩΑΝΤΝΤΝ-ΠΤΩΒΖ ΜΗΠCΟΠCΠ ΝΝΕΤΝΑΕΙ ΕΖΡΑΙ ΕΝΚΟΛΑCΙC ΕΠΖΑΕ ΝΚΟΔΡΑΝΤΗC ΧΕ-ΑΡΑ ΜΗΝCΑΠΡΙΜΕ ΜΗΝCΑΠΝΕΖΠΕ ΕΤCΑΩΕ CΕΝΑΘΝ-ΟΥΝΑ** (Chassinat, 198)
- (63) **ΑΙΡΖΝΑΙ ΖΩ ΕΠΕΝΤΑΚΧΟΟΦ ΧΕ-ΑΡΑ ΠΕΙΩΟΧΝΕ †-ΟΥΜΤΟΝ ΝΑΝ ΤΗΡΝ** (Leipoldt III, 16,15)
- (64) **ΤΕΥΝΟΥ ΕΤΚΝΑΧΟΟC ΝΖΗΤC ΧΕ-ΑΡΑ ΤΜΝΤΑCΕΒΗC CΑΩΕ ΝΤΕΙΖΕ ΜΠΙΕΙΜΕ**
(Chassinat, 163-164) – It is a moot question whether **ΧΕ-ΑΡΑ-** is here an object actant of **ΕΙΜΕ**, postposed to its object rhetorically (as often in Shenoute), or whether it is actantial to **ΧΟΟC**, **ΜΠΙΕΙΜΕ** following object-less.
- (65) **CΟΠ ΜΕΝ Φ†CΒΩ ΝΟΥΧΩΡΑ CΟΠ ΔΕ ΦΠΑΙΔΕΥΕ ΝΟΥΠΟΛΙC ΧΕ-ΑΡΑΝΚΟΟΥΕ ΝΑΜΕΤΑΝΟΙ** (Leipoldt IV, 2,1)
- (66) **ΧΕΚΑC ΕΝΝΑΠΩΤ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΚΡΟΦ ΝΙΜ ... ΑΡΑ ΤΗΝΑΩΑΖΕΡΑΤΝ ΖΟΛΩC ΑΡΑ ΤΕΝΝΑΝΟΥΖΜ** (Leipoldt IV, 2,25f.)
- (67) **ΕΤΒΕΠΑΙ ΠΚΑΙΡΟC ΠΕ ΕΤΡΕΟΥΕΙΩΤ Η ΟΥΜΑΑΥ ΨΩΠΕ ΝΘΕ**

7 Cf. J. Blomqvist, *Greek Particles in Hellenistic Prose*, Lund: Gleerup 1969, 128f. C.M.J. Sicking, and J.M. Van Ophuisen, *Two Studies in Attic Particle Usage: Lysias and Plato*, Mnemosune suppl. 129, Leiden-New York-Köln: Brill 1993, 82, 85f., 109.

ΝΟΥΒΑΡΒΑΡΟΣ ΕΖΟΥΝ ΕΝΕΥΩΗΡΕ ΑΥΩ ΝΕΥΨΕΕΡΕ ... ΝΤΕΙΖΕ ΟΝ ΠΕ
 ΟΥΣΟΝ ΝΟΥΣΟΝ ΑΥΩ ΟΥΣΩΝΕ ΝΟΥΣΩΝΕ ΑΡΑ ΝΤΕ-ΟΥΟΥΧΑΙ ΨΩΠΕ
 ΝΖΑΖ ΕΒΟΛ ΧΕ-ΝΑΨΕΝΕΤΜΟΥ ΕΤΒΕ/ΥΕΟΑΠΑΨΤΗ ΝΤΩΤ ΝΖΗΤ
 ΝΝΟΥΧ

(Leipoldt III, 74,18) – Here Leipoldt's idiosyncratic punctuation is very much in evidence, and his interrogation marks especially misleading; he interprets the *ara* clause as a question, which makes here little sense.

* * *

3. Miscellanea ironica

The following passages have been selected from dozens illustrating Shenoute's often subtle use of irony, sarcasm and sense of the comical (see also many of the instances for **εψχε** above). A formal analysis and typology are obviously needed.

(a) In a comic vein

(68) Satan and his band of demons spreading "The End is Nigh!" panic:

...ΕΚΡΠΚΕΧΙ ΜΠΖΡΒ ΝΖΕΝΜΗΗΨΕ ΝΡΩΜΕ ΜΝΝΕΚΔΑΙΜΩΝ ΕΚΠΗΤ
 ΕΚΑΨΘΑΠ ΧΕ-ΘΑΗ ΤΕ ΕΚΨΤΡΤΩΡ ΕΚΖΕ ΕΚΤΩΟΥΝ ΕΚΡΩΖΤ ΕΠΚΑΖ

(Chassinat, 22)

(69) Shenoute persecuted by an over-affectionate brother in his mountain retreat – Shenoute does not spare himself as well:

ΕΒΟΛ ΤΩΝ ΧΕ-ΟΥΝΡΩΜΕ ΟΝ ΖΡΑΙ ΝΖΗΤΝ ΝΑΕΙ ΝΑΙ ΕΠΜΑ ΕΤΝΖΗΤΥ
 ΜΝΤΕΨΕΤΠΩ ΝΛΟΙΜΟΣ ... ΕΨΜΟΥΤΕ ΕΖΡΑΙ ΕΡΟΙ ... ΜΑΛΙΣΤΑ ΠΕΧΕ-
 ΠΕΤΜΜΑΥ ΖΝΤΑΠΑΤΗ ΝΤΕΨΨΥΧΗ ΝΨΣΟΟΥΝ ΑΝ ΧΕ-ΑΨΧΕΡΕ-ΟΥΚΩΖΤ
 ΖΜΠΑΖΗΤ ΧΕ-”ΑΜΟΥ ΕΖΡΑΙ ΤΑΑΣΠΑΖΕ ΜΜΟΚ” ΨΑΝΤΕΤΑΨΥΧΗ ΣΩΨΥ
 ΖΨΩΨ ΧΕ- “ΤΑΕΙ ΝΑΚ ΕΖΡΑΙ” ΕΨΨΙΝΕ ΝΣΑΟΥΠΙ ΠΑΡΑΠΕΣΟΥΟΕΙΨ...

(Codex XO, 669-670) – the second **χε**- either disjunctive (= **χν**-) or adding appositively to the first. The second **τα**- introduces a deliberative question: "shall I come up to you?" The underlined text seems to be an ironic parenthesis.

(b) In an ironic mode

Shenoute dissembling, speaking tongue-in-cheek (see also above, under **εψχε**-, e.g. exx. 24, 26, 27, 28 etc.):

- (70) **ΑΝΟΚ ΜΕΝ ΓΑΡ ΕΨΧΕ-ΤΑΜΝΤΕΛΑΧΙΣΤΟΣ ΜΗΝΑΖΒΗΥΕ ΝΕΛΑΧΙΣΤΟΝ ΟΥΟΝΖ ΕΡΩΤΗ ΝΑΨ ΝΖΕ ΕΙΝΑΖΩΠ ΕΠΕΝΤΑΨΤΑΜΙΟΙ Η ΕΙΤΜΑΙΗΥ ΖΗΟΥ ΝΝΑΖΡΜΠΕΨΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ** (Codex XO, 289)
- (71) **Η ΕΙΨΑΝΨΙ-ΝΕΙΔΩΛΟΝ ΕΤΖΜΠΕΚΗ ΕΙΝΑΨΖΩΠ ΟΝ ΜΠΡΗ ΖΗΤΠΕ ΜΗΠΟΟΖ ΜΗΝΣΙΟΥ ΝΑΙ ΕΤΚΨΜΨΕ ΝΑΥ Η ΕΙΝΑΚΩΤ ΝΖΕΝΣΟΒΤΕ ΕΝΜΑΝΖΩΤΠ ΕΤΜΤΡΕΚΨΛΗ ΕΝΨΑΜΠΕΜΝΤ Η ΕΙΝΑΡΟΕΙΣ ΖΙΧΜΠΕΙΕΡΟ ΑΥΨ ΖΙΧΝΝΕΚΕΥΡΙΠΟΣ ΕΤΜΤΡΕΚΟΥΨΤΗ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΚΡΟΝΟΣ ΕΖΡΑΙ ΕΝΜΟΥΝΕΙΟΟΥΕ** (Chassinat, 43-44)
- (72) Ironic parenthesis or aside (underlined. See also ex. 69): **ΠΛΗΝ ΕΨΧΕ-ΜΑΑΒ ΑΝ ΖΡΑΙ ΝΖΗΤΤΗΥΤΗ ΝΕΤΟΥΝΑΤΕΚΟΥ ΕΒΟΛ ΕΤΒΕ-ΟΥΑ ΚΑΤΑΝΕΤΝΨΑΧΕ – ΖΕΝΔΙΑΒΟΛΟΣ ΝΕΤΟΥΗΖ ΜΗΖΕΝΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ – ΑΝΟΚ ΚΑΝ †ΟΥ ΝΕΝΤΑΙΧΟΟΣ ΕΤΒΗΗΤΟΥ Η ΣΟΟΥ ΧΕ-...** (Codex XO, 305) – ... **ΚΑΝ** “at least”.

The same opening, **ΠΛΗΝ ΕΨΧΕ-**, in the next example:

- (73) **ΠΛΗΝ ΕΨΧΕ-ΝΤΑΥΒΩΚ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΗΤΟΟΤΗ ΝΒΙΝΑΙ ΕΤΜΜΑΥ ΧΕΜΠΙΚΑΑΥ ΕΨΜΨΕ ΜΠΧΟΕΙΣ ΚΑΤΑΘΕ ΕΝΤΑΥΧΟΟΣ ΧΕΝΤΟΥ ΠΕΤΕΜΠΨΚΑΑΝ Ε† ΝΝΕΝΕΡΗΤ ΜΠΝΟΥΤΕ, ΕΙΕ-ΟΥΝΒΟΜ ΜΜΟΟΥ ΤΕΝΟΥ ΖΜΠΜΑ ΕΤΟΥΝΖΗΤΨ ΕΧΩΚ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΝΕΥΕΡΗΤ**
(Leipoldt III, 133,11) – The ironic point is made in the apodosis.

- (74) **ΑΨ ΓΑΡ ΜΠΕΘΟΟΥ ΝΕΤΕΡΕΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΝΑΚΑΑΥ ΝΑΝ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΑΤΕΝΜΤ(sic)ΨΗΡΕ ΨΗΜ ΝΕ Η ΝΑΤΕΝΜΝΤΖΑΛΟ ΝΕ Η ΝΑΤΕΝΜΝΤΑΤΣΟΟΥΝ ΝΕ Η ΝΕΝΤΑΝΑΑΥ ΝΕ ΖΜΠΣΟΟΥΝ Η ΝΕΝΤΑΝΑΑΥ ΝΕ ΖΑΘΗ ΜΠΑΤΕΝΧΙΠΒΑΠΤΙΣΜΑ ΕΤΟΥΑΑΒ Η ΝΕΝΤΑΝΑΑΥ ΝΕ ΜΗΝΣΑΤΡΕΝΧΙΤΨ Η ΝΑΤΕΝΑΡΧΗ ΝΕΙ ΕΖΟΥΝ ΝΕ ΕΠΕΙΨΖΜ ΜΜΑΚΑΡΙΟΝ Η ΝΑΤΕΝΖΑΗ ΝΕ**

(BL 3581A (57) f. 127 p. 158, ed. Shisha-Halevy, *Enchoria*) – The ironic point, whether **asseruve** or rhetorical-interrogative, is in the response to a “real” (non-rhetorical) question.

Text editions cited

- Behlmer, *De iudicio* = Heike Behlmer, *Schenute von Atripe: De iudicio* (Torino, Museo Egizio, Cat. 63000, cod. IV), Catalogo del Museo Egizio di Torino, Serie Prima – Monumenti e Testi VIII, Torino: Soprintendenza alle Antichità Egizie 1996.
- Chassinat = Emile Chassinat, *Le quatrieme livre des entretiens et epitres de Shenouti*, Mémoires de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale 23, Le Caire: l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale 1911.
- Kuhn, *Besa* = Karl Heinz Kuhn, *Letters and Sermons of Besa*, Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 157-158, Scriptorum Coptici 21-22, Leuven 1956.
- Leipoldt III = Johannes Leipoldt, *Sinuthii archimandritae vita et opera omnia III*, Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 42, Scriptorum Coptici 2, Leipzig 1908.
- Leipoldt IV = Johannes Leipoldt, *Sinuthii archimandritae vita et opera omnia IV*, Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 73, Scriptorum Coptici 5, Leipzig 1913.
- Orlandi, *Shenoute contra Origenistas* = Tito Orlandi, *Shenute, Contra Origenistas*, Roma: CIM 1985.
- Shisha-Halevy, *Enchoria* = Ariel Shisha-Halevy, "Unpublished Shenoutiana in the British Library", in: *Enchoria* 5 (1975), 53-108.
- Shisha-Halevy, *Orientalia* = Ariel Shisha-Halevy, "Two Shenoute-Texts from the British Library", in: *Orientalia* 44 (1975), 149-185.