NARRATIVES OF EGYPT AND THE ANCIENT NEAR EAST

Literary and Linguistic Approaches

edited by

FREDRIK HAGEN, JOHN JOHNSTON,
WENDY MONKHOUSE, KATHRYN PIQUETTE,
JOHN TAIT and MARTIN WORTHINGTON

CONTENTS

1500–500 BC

500 BC – AD 2000

AFTERWORD

RHETORICAL NARRATIVES, TABLEAUX AND SCENARIOS: WORK-NOTES ON NARRATIVE POETICS IN SHENOUTEAN SAHIDIC COPTIC[1]

Ariel Shisha-Halevy

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

1. Introduction

In the course of an exploratory study of 'Shenoute's rhetorical syntax', a comprehensive investigation of the syntactic poetics of rhetorical complexes (the grammatical high-order signifiers, for which the signified 'added-value' is 'rhetoricity'), I have encountered a textemic set of rhetorical narrative structures which, I believe, provides important new insights on the grammatical nature, texture, and properties of narrative in general.[2] In this, a pilot study, I shall offer a brief overview of this set, attempting a cursory formal-and-functional description of the individual textemes, and present representative and selective token documentation (usually not more than a single example for each category; more, sometimes many more are attested).[3] Statements made here have no claim to be universally valid, but are meant to describe the Coptic situation. For reasons of space, I have left out most of the secondary literature, whether literary, narratological or linguistic *stricto sensu*; the types discussed are selective, out of the numerous types in my files: I wish here to draw attention to this rich vein of syntactical and stylistic data, to their variety and intricacy, to offer a provisional typology and observations on distinctive grammatical properties, and perhaps to stimulate debate.

The writings of Shenoute (*c*. AD 348–*c*. AD 465) are the most extensive authentic (i.e. untranslated) corpus of Sahidic Coptic and Coptic in general,

[2] On Shenoute's works, Shenoutean Sahidic and the structural account of its grammatical systems, see Shisha-Halevy (1986: 1–14) for general and methodological information; Shisha-Halevy (1992; 2004). For a structural syntactical description of narrative types, see Shisha-Halevy (1997; 1999*b*), cf. (1999*a*) for Modern Welsh and (2007) for Bohairic Coptic.

[3] Cf. Müller (1954: 259–270) for a typology and distribution of narratives in Coptic homilies, yet without formal characterization.

a corpus which (although always appreciated for its high stylistic, literary, and rhetorical sophistication), has in the last decade of the last century gained in scholarly attention, and is currently being re-edited and retranslated as a joint international project.

1.1. *Rhetoric defined*

I cannot enlarge here on the vexed question of the definition and demarcation of rhetorical *vs*. non-rhetorical *vs*.'ordinary' language. The prevalent definitions of rhetoricity are communicative, listener-targeted, pragmatic and telic ('meant to have certain effects on the listener, to persuade or dissuade him or her, counteract his/her own opinion', and similar formulations) and are at best functional, with hardly any formal components or correlatives. Rhetoricity, in a psychologically-oriented speaker's view, correlates with an affective stance: 'referring to a mood, attitude, feeling and disposition, as well as degrees of emotional intensity vis-à-vis some focus of concern'.[4] Of course, emotion, a syndrome with many facets (Plantin 2004: 267), is in this context a linguistic phenomenon rather than a psychological one. As such, the manner in which it is decoded and received is at least as important as its encoding. In the specific case of Shenoutean rhetoric, Malinowski's ethnographic 'coefficient of weirdness, strangeness and unusualness', in constant tension and interplay with the 'coefficient of intelligibility', suggested for the language of magic,[5] seems apt: the former might, in the case of Shenoute, be replaced by a 'coefficient of obscurity'. The riddle (*ainigma*), illustrated below as a special, gnomic narrative type, stands as an icon for the entire rhetorical text.[6] Formally, structuredness and tension between components define the rhetorical textemes.

  Shenoute's own attributes as a speaker, in correlation with his 'passionate and violent nature', have been commented upon: 'Shenoute's literary style mirrors his character. It is highly individualistic and very powerful. Often the speed and passion of his thinking affected the clarity

---

  [4] Ochs *apud* Aijmer (2004); see Havers (1931), Index *sub voce* 'Affekt', for a rich and, by now, classic discussion of affective syntax.
  [5] See Malinowski (1935: 213–231). I owe this reference to Eitan Grossman.
  [6] See Kallen (1981: 28); 'Scrambling the rules of normal language, riddles nevertheless allow for communication within a structure that is deviant from regular communicative language but sanctioned as a special form of discourse within the overall verbal repertoire of the community'. Rhetoric is a special 'form of verbal art', 'language use under specially restricted conditions' (Kallen 1981: 30) and as such would repay study within the context of a general theory of language as well as grammar.

of his expression… His style is a vehicle for conveying his emotions and his strength of character' (Kuhn 1991: 2131, see also his bibliography, especially Johannes Leipoldt's (1903) pioneering *Schenute von Atripe*). Passion and rage (Plantin 2004: 266), indignation and astonishment, grief, despair, and depression seem to be Shenoute's favourite emotional and rhetorical stance. There is no question that Shenoute was a skilful rhetorical craftsman, wielding a range of linguistic firepower that must be studied in detail to be properly appreciated. The variety and sophistication of structure, and the subtlety of his narrative organization, employing numerous rhetorical devices, are certainly impressive.[7]

1.2. *Narrative defined*

Many conventional definitions are loose, simplistic or vague,[8] and all too often excessively schematic and narrow; or else composite, combining incommensurate and different-order (e.g. pragmatic, communicative and syntactical) components. In the present exposition, I shall apply a broad conception of narrative, definable as a linguistically signified staged representation of reality, which may be either dynamic ('animated'), with sequentially signifiable action —*narrative* or *tableau*, picture or scene— in which the actual narration is more or less formal, token or signal, or else static ('frozen'). Usually, dynamic and static segments are combined, with expositive (commenting: see below) ones interpolated. Narrative segments may be enhanced, highlighted or focused, or condensed and abbreviated. Sequentiality of events (not a series of clauses; 'events'

---

[7] The remarkable sophistication of the narrative forms under discussion here is part and parcel of the *Kunstsprache* aspect of rhetorical Coptic, but is no less related to the orality and even colloquiality of Shenoute's texts. It is beyond the scope of this paper to substantiate my claim that Shenoute rings the registerial changes as a rhetorical device; forms, constructions, phrases that are demonstrably spoken register abound in his homilies and 'epistles'. The orality pragmatics, composition and performance of our texts have formal implications; in opposition to 'ordinary language', rhetorical texts share rhythmic constraints and prosodic devices in general (e.g. alliterative figures), formulaic language, and so on, with orally delivered poetry (e.g. Homer, see Bakker 1988 —or parts of the Bible).

[8] Cf. Dahl (1985: 112, defining 'narrative discourse'); 'a series of real and fictive events in the order they are supposed to have taken place'; (defining 'narrative context'); 'we shall say that a sentence occurs in a narrative context if the temporal point of reference…is determined by the point in time at which the last event related in the preceding context took place'. Consider also Van Dijk's definition, also begging several questions (*apud* Brinton 1993: 73); '*Coherent* sequences of *sentences* of a discourse linguistically marked for beginning and/or end, and further defined in terms of *some kind of 'thematic unity'* —for instance, in terms of identical participants, time, location or global event or action': I have italicized the more problematic parts.

understood always as *linguistic* events,[9] and always susceptible to manip-
ulation by the stager-narrator) is certainly a prime or dominant junctural
feature of narrative; both sequencing and internal framing, chunking or
blocking are primary factors of staging, regulating the direction and
rate of flow of narrative information. Narrative tensing provides a whole
palette of representation. In effect, there is no limit to the possible manip-
ulation of reality in its staged linguistic reflection, even up to blurring of
the boundary between reality and its rendering.

1.3. *Macrostructure: narrative modes*

For the basic and broad macro-structuring of the narrative, I prefer 'Evo-
lution Mode' and 'Comment Mode' (Shisha-Halevy 1997; 1999*b*; 2008)
to the conventional and metaphorical (rather than informative) foreground/
background,[10] for several reasons: the implied symmetry (and commen-
surability) of the binary division; the implication of thematicity for the
background; and, practically, the advantage of reserving the latter for true
background (*stricto sensu*) information. However, 'Evolution' and 'Com-
ment' are asymmetrical modes or constantly open information channels,
the factors and operators in a layered narrative, rather than narrative *con-
stituents*. They are hierarchical and interdependent in the sense that the
latter is referential —in fact, often anaphoric, less usually cataphoric— to the
former. The Evolution Mode (EM) is internally linked; the Comment Mode
(CM), referential to EM, is the Narrator's Channel:[11] it is non-sequential;

---

[9] 'Real World Experience' is irrelevant; it 'takes form only by its representation in the
form of a narrative' (Bujis 2005: 10); the fact can only exist linguistically as a term of
representation in discourse (cf. Barthes 1982: 81–89).
   [10] Cf. Hickman (2004: 284): 'The foreground corresponds to the skeleton of the plot-
line, comprising the chronologically ordered situations that make the story move forward
in time. In contrast, the background corresponds to secondary information surrounding the
foreground that need not be chronologically ordered'.
   [11] The Comment Mode in Pentateuch Bohairic Coptic includes the following roles
(I quote from Shisha-Halevy 2007): (1) 'psychologistic' information on internal mental /
emotional / intellectual / cognitive background states (and/or their physical manifestation)
as motive, or cause, or as the reason for Evolution Mode cotext; (2) explicatory-relevance
background: the (physical or metaphysical) ground, motive, or reason for Evolution Mode
co(n)text; (3) 'Omniscient Narrator's Channel'—narrator's interference—shift (or cut)
away from the narrative world to narrator / audience situation, while maintaining the
internal cohesion of the narrative itself. Synoptic, panoramic or 'bird's-eye' view; 'from
then on…'. 'Voice-over'-type telling of 'what is happening'. Narrator's anaphoric (reprise)
abstracting, chronicling, generalizing, paraphrasing, condensing, reviewing, reworking or
elaborating of EM plot information. Internal evaluation of the facts as fraught with sig-
nificance; 'authorial comment'; 'und zwar', 'and (he) did', 'and, in fact…', etc. Narrator's

non-concatenating and externally linked. The shift from EM to CM and back, their relative weight or the syntagmatic interplay between them is a major distinctive trait of narrative textemic types. Rhetorical narratives, like dream narratives (cf. Shisha-Halevy 2007: §1.1.3 (e)), may collapse frontiers between Evolution and Comment Modes.

I cannot join the near-consensus that statal or subordinated forms and constructions (including topicalization) are *ipso facto* 'background' —they are certainly not necessarily CM— as if the foreground is devoid of structuring, and (which is even more difficult to accept) the foreground has no formal status marking. As I see it, the CM comprises all information relating to the EM;[12] the EM comprises all information —events (always linguistic, not 'real'!) including enhanced or focussed action or states— that constitutes the storyline.[13] It is dynamic and, as regards information structure, cumulative (Brinton 1993: 84–85); the CM is relative to the EM (Givón 1987).

1.4. *Sequencing*

Sequencing is a signifier for which the signified is sequelling and narrative evolution. This is not just a matter of linkage (cohesion) and retro-dependence of eventing; it implies higher rhematic status of subsequent events in reference to the thematic accumulation of 'the story so far'. A primary component in the narrative notion, sequencing, is, I believe, overrated, except as basis for staging manipulation: modifying of a basic sequence; disrupting and interrupting it; pausing it (as in a descriptive pause); and slowing it down.[14] This, rather than the iconicity of natural eventing (Orletti 1995; Simone 1995: 160–163) is, I believe, the significance of this basic logical ordering of concatenation links.

---

perspectives on goal, intention, or significance of Evolution Mode context. 'Behind the scene' information. Meta-narrative information. Anaphoric scenic setting: recalling, recapturing, recapitulating or otherwise anaphoric narrative; anaphoric narrative-situation close-up.

[12] Thus, 'When Susan came in, Peter was washing the dishes' and 'When Susan came in, Peter washed the dishes' are both EM, albeit in a different eventing signification and structure.

[13] See Couper-Kuhlen (1989: 12–15); Thompson (1987). Another, and to my mind more serious, theoretical problem, is that 'subordination' is here simplistically taken for granted: what then about 'superordination' or 'inordination'(see Hamp 1973)? Is, for instance, the imperfect a 'main clause'?

[14] For a narratological angle on narrative pause and slow-down, cf. Bal (1997: 104–108).

1.5. *Tensing and narrative time*

Temporality is a fascinating aspect of narrative syntax (cf. Genette 1972: 118–121, 228–238), and all the more so in the case of rhetorical narratives. While the matching of 'story time' —the *hic et nunc*, the programmatically-shared present perspective of speaker and audience— and 'narration time' is considerable, it is by no means the rule. The temporal interface or rather seam of the narrative and its represented 'real world' framework is often abruptly discrepant in the case of rhetorical textemes.[15] As for the internal temporality of the narrative, Harald Weinrich's 'Tempus hat nichts mit Zeit zu tun' (2001: 14, cf. 17–18) is especially apt and cogent.[16] As will be seen in some detail below, the manipulation of narrative time through metaphorics and combinatorics (Weinrich 2001: 192–223, 228–237) is a prominent rhetorical device.

For the Coptic form most resembling the Greco-Romance Imperfect, viz. (Sahidic) ⲛⲉϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ and ⲛⲉϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ ⲡⲉ, time location is not a constant part of its meaning nor its fundamental value.[17] The preterite (usually known as 'perfect') ⲁϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ, in many narrative types doubtlessly the unmarked EM carrier, by no means marks a narrative as past or historical: it is often an unequivocally-clear ahistorical tense, used much as an 'epic preterite' (K. Hamburger: 'a present esthetically distanced and distancing'), or 'epic aorist', or '*aoriste mythique*' (M. Butor) —it is no doubt the '*zéro de narration*', often pseudo-temporal or '*achronie*'(G. Genette)— to convey factivity, or, metaphorically, to connote immediacy or 'having-already-happened', or, only apparently paradoxically, to indicate fictivity.[18]

---

[15] Cf. C. Metz *apud* Genette (1972: 77): 'une séquence deux fois temporelle… il y a le temps de la chose-racontée et le temps du récit (temps du signifié et temps du signifiant). [Cette dualité] nous invite à constater que l'une des fonctions du récit est de monnayer un temps dans un autre temps'.

[16] Cf. Weinrich (2001: 81); 'Wie einfach ist doch die Trias Vergangenheit-Gegenwart-Zukunft, und wie kompliziert wird alles, wenn man versucht, sie mit den Tempus-Strukturen einer gegebenen Sprache in Einklang zu bringen!'

[17] The Imperfect (cf. Le Goffic 1995) is 'incomplete' in its being essentially a 'relief' form, metaphorically either low or high relief, which is ever valued (given its value) by a non-imperfect point of reference (Shisha-Halevy 2007: Chapter 1): this applies to (Boh.) ⲛⲁϥ- , enhanced or focussed Evolution Mode, as well as the Comment Mode ⲛⲁϥ- ⲡⲉ.

[18] Hamburger *apud* Stanzel (1955: 35). While Greek interference cannot be ruled out in Coptic, it is certainly not the sole factor. In the translations below, I have chosen to render the Coptic ahistorical preterite by the English Present Perfect, despite —and indeed *because* of— the 'anti-narrative' nature of the latter, which is typically interlocutive (indeed, locutive: 'nynégocentrique', to use Damourette-Pichon's term) and non-concatenating. This choice is not arbitrary, for the locutivity of the English form suits well the meta-narrative nature of these rhetorical subtextemes, as a rule announced by metaphrastic means: these narratives are all programmatically 'told' by the orator.

It is in Coptic also formally distinct, in its compatibility with the conjunctive, which is incompatible only with the historical preterite. The Coptic aorist ϣⲁϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ, typically sequelling and even apodotic, is largely an 'anti-narrative' tense, yet in generic narratives and tableaux it may stand in opposition to the present as a narrative carrier.[19]

As for discourse genericity, so prevalent in rhetorical narrative forms and especially tableaux,[20] it appears —like specificity, which it negates, and like nominal genericity (cf. Shisha-Halevy 2007: §3.6)— to be graded as well as diverse.[21] The tense form may have a non-specific environment,[22] or it may be combined with apparently specific elements; there may be transition from generic to specific (or less generic), and even transition, or coincidence of non-fictive simulation to genericity. What happens when a non-fictive simulation coincides with genericity? Genericity and narration—is there a contradiction or conflict or tension here?[23] A narrative is essentially atemporal or 'pseudo-temporal', and always temporally autonomous (Genette 1972: 121); temporal and actantial specificity is but a special, and perhaps marked, case.

Regulation of the flow of narrative information is syntagmatically effected also by juncture, by blocking or chunking, which determines narrative texture and sets narrative pace, duration and speed, and —especially significant in rhetorical narratives— rhythm (Genette 1972: 122–143, 183–224; Weinrich 2001: 109–118, 120–126). Narrative stretch —'slow-motion'— is in Coptic a type of focus, signalled by a tense form.

---

[19] See Weinrich (2001: 280–281); for the narrative use of the Modern Welsh aorist (usually known as 'present-future'), see Shisha-Halevy (1997).

[20] Demotic-Egyptian precedents for generic narratives in rhetorical-didactic context are legion, as are magical and mythical narratives. For the former, consider the so-called maxims of P. Insinger (*Ins.*) or of the *Wisdom of Ankhsheshonqi* (*Ankh.*), which often are no less than the pithy hermeneia of such generic narratives, which are clearly implied or, less usually, embryonic gnomic narratives in themselves (I quote M. Lichtheim's (1980) translations, with minor modifications): *Ins.* 12/21 'One does not discover the heart of a servant as long as his master is not attacked'; *Ankh.* 22/23 'Do not drink water from a well and then throw the pitcher into it'; *Ankh.* 10/11–12 'When a man smells of myrrh, his wife is a monkey to him; when a man is suffering, his wife is a lion to him'; *Ankh.* 10/9–10 'If your master is sitting by the river, do not immerse your hand up-river of him'; *Ins.* 20/19 'Happiness came to Isis out of misfortune at the end of what she had undergone'; *Ins.* 35/1 'Violence, want, insult and unkindness will never ever cease'. In the *Myth of the Solar Eye*, a philosophic-religious-didactic tractate in narrative form —which is probably among the two or three most important literary Demotic texts— both the frame-story and the exemplary sub-narratives have the preterite *sḏm.f* as main plot carrier.

[21] Cf. McKay (1988: 197, 202–207) in the context of mythical narratives and the climactic aorist and present tenses.

[22] Generic actants, for instance: Bakker (1988: 33–34).

[23] For genericity in a past narrative context, see McKay (1992: 218–220).

Blocking —framing of concatenation and description units— is effected
by the interplay of links (signifying cohesion and continuity) and delim-
iters, boundary or break signals.[24]

1.6. *Focus*

Focus is a notoriously difficult and elusive concept, in dialogue or nar-
rative. From narrative peaks (as opposed to narrative plateaux as well as
dips) or climax to highlighting or marking for salience, through drawing
attention to current or subsequent significance, enhanced or enriched evo-
lution, presentation and highlighting, we are concerned here with a para-
digmatic scalar notion, probably a cluster of categories marked and signified
by a plethora of formal means, in our type of Coptic: particles, the Focal-
izing Conversion, Cleft Sentence and presentational patterns, and (rare in
Coptic) marked placement ('word order'; cf. Bakker 1988; Brinton 1993;
Shisha-Halevy 1999*b*). Especially striking and prevalent in Shenoute's
rhetorical narratives is the focussing of clauses and stretches of narrative
by the formal device of marking them as 'rhetorical questions'.[25]

2. STRIKING CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RHETORICAL NARRATIVE SET

All the special rhetorical narrative subtypes presented below are signi-
fiers for high-level signifieds, in the sense that they make sense in, or
belong to, special semiotic systems where the semantic reference is made by
explicit, formally-marked interpretation ('*hermeneia*', specialized exegesis),[26]
which by definition belongs to the repertory of rhetorical devices and
has its own formal inventory. That is to say, their rhetoricality is (also)

---

[24] Cf. for various languages Bakker (1993: 284–292); Brinton (1993); Longacre
(1979); Shisha-Halevy (2003; 2004).

[25] The 'rhetorical question' is a general higher-level focussing device, and, from the
informational angle, not interrogative at all; but its use in narrative, to mark a narrative
peak, is a very special case. It occurs in Irish, and in Anglo-Irish: consider the following
from Sean O'Faolain's 'The End of the Record', in *The Stories of Sean O'Faolain's*
(1958): '…and Father Regan gave wan look at him and he closed his eyes for the last
time. With that all the people went on their knees. And they began to pray. If they did,
there were three candles at the head of the dead priest. And didn't the one beside the
window light up?… And they went on praying. And the wind and the storm screaming
about the house, and they watching the wick of the last candle. And, bit by bit, the way
you'd blow up a fire with a bellows, didn't the candle over the priest's head light up until
the whole room was like broad daylight.'

[26] Very often the parabolic or similitude narrative itself contains subtle cataphoric
anticipation signals, mostly lexical or phraseological, to its *hermeneia*.

environmental, a formal cotextual feature. These devices (ⲧⲁⲓ [ⲟⲛ] ⲧⲉ
ⲑⲉ 'thus also …', ⲉⲓ̈ⲭⲱ ⲙⲡⲁⲓ ⲭⲉ 'by which I am saying …', and so
on, following or preceding the narrative itself), are of course the most
obvious signals of rhetoricity, with announcements of ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲇⲉⲓⲅⲙⲁ,
ⲁⲓⲛⲓⲅⲙⲁ or ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲃⲟⲗⲏ, metaphrastics ('as the saying goes …'), meta-
narrative, and of course ⲛⲑⲉ in similitude narratives (below). Estab-
lishing the precise, exhaustive repertory of narrative exponents of
rhetoricality is difficult; the formal distinction between objectivity and
subjectivity, between detachment and affectiveness, narrativity and
historicality (Ricoeur 1981: 179–181), is a requisite for defining
rhetoricality; another, of course, is a non-rhetorical narrative term of
reference, rare in Coptic (albeit not in pre-Coptic Egyptian). But apart
from that, there are numerous grammatical symptoms of rhetoricity, the
moststriking and distinctive of which (illustrated in the actual texts
below) are listed here; their cumulative occurrence or convergence
defines a scale of rhetoricity.

2.1. The sequelling conjunctive, expressing the *dénouement* in gnomic or
      protatic narratives (Shisha-Halevy 1986: §7.2.4, §7.2.4.1, §7.2.6;
      1995)
2.2. The present and aorist in concatenation
2.3. The preterite ⲁϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ in various ahistorical ('non-past'), atem-
      poral or pseudo-temporal roles
2.4. Genericity and atemporality / pseudo-temporality expressed by
      various tenses other than the aorist
2.5. Focussing constructions (Cleft Sentence, Tautological Infinitive,
      Focalizing Conversion, ⲉⲓⲥ-ⲡⲉ…) and particles, especially ⲣⲱ;
      'envelope focussing' (cf. Shisha-Halevy 1998: §1.1); cataphoric
      and nexus-focussing ⲧⲁⲓ ⲧⲉ ⲑⲉ 'thus indeed',[27] and so on. The
      formal so-called rhetorical question (§2.9.2 above) is a focussing
      construction.
2.6.   Special presentational Nominal Sentence and presentative (ⲉⲓⲥ-)
      opening patterns[28]
2.7.   Catalogic enumeration of acts or events

---

[27] This feature occurs in Bohairic, especially of the Nitrian variety. Cf. the similar role
of nexus-prefixed *si* in Romance (Old French, *si che-* in Italian); also *is amhlaidh* + rela-
tive converter in Modern Irish, superficially resembling a cleft sentence (Shisha-Halevy
1998: 217 Observation (2)).

[28] Cf. Genette (1983: 64; 'artifice de présentation'); see Lambrecht (1994: 384 *sub
voce* 'Presentational Sentences').

2.8. Merging or neutralization of Evolution Mode and Comment Mode[29]

2.9. Fragmentability of narratives (see below, illustration of narrative fragments)

2.9.1. Inclusion or marking of a narrative in/as protasis (the rhetorical ⲉϣϫⲉ-, the generic ⲉϥϣⲁⲛ-, the case-raising ⲉϣⲱⲡⲉ) or apodosis

2.9.2. Inclusion or marking of a narrative in/as rhetorical question

2.9.3. Relativization of narrative

2.10. Slight or token action: in dynamic tableaux

2.11. Affective signals: deixis (ⲡⲓ-, -ⲉⲧⲙⲙⲁⲩ), deviant or marked placement

2.12. Narrativization: ⲡⲉϫⲏⲧⲛ 'said you' (as it were, '*quoth ye')

2.13. Use of external and internal articulators; discourse particles: ⲅⲁⲣ,[30] ⲕⲁⲓⲅⲁⲣ; ⲙⲉⲛ… (ⲇⲉ…); ⲛⲧⲟϥ; ⲛϣⲟⲣⲡ…ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲥ ('first … thereafter …'), and so on

2.14. Distinctive use of negative Evolution Mode events

2.15. Distinctive use of the aorist, and aorist / preterite interface

2.16. Distinctive use of asyndetic preterite concatenation

2.17. Manipulation of sentence-extent and theme / rheme ordering

2.18. Interposed narrative / dialogue boundary —ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ— 'said he' (*incise narrative*, *Schaltesatz*: cf. Kieckers 1912–1913)

2.19. Episode boundary marked by ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲥ 'afterwards' and similar

2.20. Multiple topicalization; anticipation (prolepsis)

2.21. Extraposed focalization

2.22. Superordinative ⲁⲩⲱ

2.23. Metaphrastic and meta-narrative introduction marking

2.24. The so-called 'Temporal' ⲛⲧⲉⲣⲉϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ is absent or rare in Shenoutean rhetorical narrative; the linking eventive converb ϩⲙⲡⲧⲣⲉϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ and the 'circumstantial' link ⲉⲁϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ, both typically specifying, also combined; affirmative and negative carrier tenses, in contact in Evolution Mode

2.25. Grammaticalized lexemes: (ⲉ)ⲙⲟⲅⲓⲥ 'hardly'; ⲙⲁⲗⲗⲟⲛ, ⲙⲁⲗⲓⲥⲧⲁ (Shisha-Halevy 1986: 56–58), ⲡⲁⲗⲓⲛ ⲟⲛ (introducing narrative peak or key event; Shisha-Halevy 1986: 56), ⲁⲩⲱ 'moreover', 'what's more', etc.

---

[29] Also, in a special formal way, in dream narratives: for Pentateuch Bohairic, see Shisha-Halevy, (2007: §1.1.3 9 (e)).

[30] Especially common: opening the narrative as if accounting for or answering/anticipating an implicit query.

3. Illustration, typology and grammatical distinction of narratives

Thematically, seven basic emic types are illustrated and discussed:

(a)   Biblical narrative abridged or abbreviated, condensed or modified

(b)   Paradigmatic or exemplary allegorical narrative: ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲇⲉⲓⲅⲙⲁ,
       ⲁⲓⲛⲓⲅⲙⲁ, ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲃⲟⲗⲏ (e.g. Alewell 1913; Schittko 2003)

(c)   Procedural scenario

(d)   Natural-history narrative

(e)   Mythical and/or mystical narrative

(f)   Monastic narrative

(g)   Dynamic tableau

Formally, the narratives may be realized either as narrative fragments
(3.1) or as full narratives (3.2). The actual realizations of these major
hyper-types are as follows.

3.1. *Narrative fragments*

Narrative fragments (as distinct from *abbreviated narrative*) are building-
blocks or contructive elements of the texteme, syntactically-integrated or
embedded in various macro-syntactic slots. Often, these are single-event
segments, and the *narrative environment is implied by them*, and left to
the audience's or reader's imagination.

3.1.1.   Case-history hypothetical narrative (in protasi): non-generic

Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, Copte 130[4] f. 111 p. ϥⲛⲅ (Young 2000:
279):

ⲉⲛϣⲁⲛⲉⲓⲙⲉ ϫⲉ-ⲛⲧⲁⲥⲁⲑⲉⲧⲓ ϫⲉ-ⲙⲛϣϭⲟⲙ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ ⲉϥⲓ ϩⲁⲡϩⲱⲃ
ⲛⲧⲁⲩⲧⲟϣⲥ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲉⲥⲉⲙⲧⲟⲛ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ ϩⲛ-ⲟⲩⲉⲓⲣⲏⲛⲏ ϩⲙ-ⲡⲉⲥⲙⲁ
ⲛϩⲙⲟⲟⲥ ⲉⲛⲉⲥⲛϩⲏⲧϥ ⲛϣⲟⲣⲡ ⲉϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲛⲧⲟϥ ⲛⲧⲁⲥⲁⲑⲉⲧⲓ
ϩⲛⲟⲩ†ⲧⲱⲛ ⲙⲛⲟⲩⲙⲛⲧⲁⲧⲥⲃⲱ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲧⲟⲥ ⲛⲥϫⲓ-ϭⲟⲗ ⲙⲡⲉⲙⲧⲟ
ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲙⲡϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ϫⲉ-ⲛⲧⲁⲓⲁⲑⲉⲧⲓ ϫⲉ-ⲙⲛⲃⲟⲙ ⲙⲙⲟⲓ ⲉⲣ-ⲡⲁⲓ ⲁⲩⲱ
ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲁ-ϩⲉⲛϩⲟⲟⲩ ⲏ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲁ-ϩⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓϣ ⲛⲧⲛⲥⲱⲧⲙ ϫⲉ-ⲛⲧⲁⲥⲁⲑⲉⲧⲓ
ϩⲛⲟⲩⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉϥϭⲛ-ⲁⲣⲓⲕⲉ…

Should we find that it was because she could not handle the work to which
she had been assigned that she gave it up, she may rest undisturbed in her
former position. But should it be the case that it is through contentiousness
and obtuseness that she gave it up and she, for her part, lied before the Lord,
saying: 'It is because I cannot do it that I have given it up', and some days
later or some time later we hear that it was by someone finding fault that
she gave it up…

Of interest here is the conjunctive, a sequelling tense not used for ordi-
nary narratives but typical of generic-gnomic or protatic ones. A remark-
able instance of the conjunctive expressing the generic *dénouement* ('and
the (inevitable) outcome is that…')[31] in a rhetorical narrative is *De Iudi-
cio* (Behlmer 1996) ff. XL ro ⲣⲓⲁ–XLI ro ⲣⲓⲅ:

ⲟⲩⲣⲙⲙⲁⲟ ⲉϥⲟⲩⲏϩ ϩⲛ-ϩⲉⲛⲏⲓ ⲉⲛⲉⲥⲱⲟⲩ ⲉⲩⲣⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ
ⲙⲡⲕⲟⲥⲙⲉⲓ ϩⲟⲓⲛⲉ ϩⲛ-ⲙⲡⲟⲗⲓⲥ ϩⲉⲛⲕⲟⲟⲩⲉ ϩⲛ-ⲛⲕⲱⲙⲏ ⲛϥϣⲱⲡⲉ
ϩⲱⲱϥ ϩⲙ-ⲡϣⲱ ϩⲣⲁⲓ ϩⲛ-ⲁⲙⲛⲧⲉ
ⲟⲩⲣⲙⲙⲁⲟ ⲉⲩⲛⲧⲁϥ ⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲛϩⲁϩ ⲛϩⲃⲥⲱ ⲉⲩϣⲟⲃⲉ ϩⲟⲓⲛⲉ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ-ⲡϣⲱⲙ
ϩⲉⲛⲕⲟⲟⲩⲉ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ-ⲧⲉⲡⲣⲱ ⲛϥϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲇⲉ ϩⲱⲱϥ ⲉϥⲕⲏⲕⲁϩⲏⲩ
ϩⲛ-ⲧⲙⲏⲧⲉ ⲙⲡϫⲁϥ ⲉⲧⲟϣ…

A rich man who lives in beautiful houses, brilliant for their adornment,
    some in the cities, others in the villages, and he ends up in distress down
    in Hell.
A rich man who has many different clothes, some for summer, others for
    winter, and he ends up naked in the Great Frost…(and so on, five cases
    in all).

Note here also the focussing constructions.

3.1.2. Irrealis-hypothetical single-event scenarios in apodosi, rhetorically presented as the key event, as rhematic and even focussed fact

(a) Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, Copte 130[1] (Amélineau 1907: 95, of
people who steal):

---

[31] I fully agree with Heike Behlmer (1996: 246 n. 399) that the conjunctives here are
not adnominal, but neither are they 'exceptionally independent', nor is this role that rare.
In fact, I see this sequelling role of the form as its core function (perhaps preserved in
colloquial idiom), all others being derived from it.

ⲉⲛⲉⲩϩⲛ-ϩⲉⲛⲕⲉⲙⲁ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲏ ⲟⲩⲡⲟⲗⲓⲥ ⲏ ⲟⲩ†ⲙⲉ ⲛⲉⲩⲛⲁⲕⲟⲛⲥⲟⲩ ⲏ
ⲛⲉ-ⲉⲓⲥ-ⲡⲉ ⲁⲩⲕⲟⲛⲥⲟⲩ ⲡⲉ

For had they been in other places, town or village, they would have been
killed, or it may have been that they were in fact killed.

(b) Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, Copte 130[1] (Amélineau 1907: 106–
107):

ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲛⲉⲙⲡⲉⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁϥⲁϩⲉⲣⲁⲧϥ ϩⲓⲟⲩⲛⲁⲙ ⲙⲡⲉⲑⲩⲥⲓⲁⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ ⲉⲓ
ⲉⲡⲓⲥⲁ ⲙⲙⲟϥ ϩⲙⲡⲧⲣⲉϥϫⲓ-ⲟⲩⲕⲟⲧⲥ ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ ⲛϥⲁϩⲉⲣⲁⲧϥ ϩⲓϩⲃⲟⲩⲣ
ⲙⲙⲟϥ ⲛϥϩⲙⲟⲟⲥ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲉϥⲙⲟⲕϩ ⲛϩⲏⲧ ⲉϫⲱ ⲛⲉϥⲛⲁⲡⲱϩ ⲡⲉ ⲏ
ⲉⲓⲥ-ⲡⲉ ⲁϥⲡⲱϩ ⲡⲉ ⲙⲡⲉⲓⲥⲁ ⲙⲡⲕⲁⲧⲁⲡⲉⲧⲁⲥⲙⲁ ϩⲓⲟⲩⲛⲁⲙ ⲙⲙⲟϥ
ⲉⲡⲙⲁ ⲙⲡⲉⲓⲥⲁ ⲙⲡⲕⲁⲧⲁⲡⲉⲧⲁⲥⲙⲁ ϩⲓϩⲃⲟⲩⲣ ⲙⲙⲟϥ

And if he who took up a position to the right of the altar had not moved to
its other side, making a turn and standing to its left, sitting down grieving
for thee (f.), would he have torn this side of the curtain —and indeed he *did*
tear it— on its right, all the way to the other side of the curtain, on its
left?

The elements introducing the narrative segment as an *irrealis* apodosis,
(ⲛⲉ-) ⲉⲓⲥ-ⲡⲉ… ⲡⲉ, ⲉϣⲝⲡⲉ, still wholly mysterious after a century,[32]
must also in some way (perhaps by the presentative component of this
amalgam) rhematize or focus the nexus in their clause. In passage (b),
the narrative segment is part of a rhetorical question, which concords well
with its focused nature.

3.1.3. Abbreviated natural-history case, protasis-to-apodosis: gnomic

Leipoldt (1908: 47):

ⲡⲉⲥⲟⲟⲩ ⲡⲁⲛⲉⲑⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ ⲁⲛ ⲡⲉ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲡⲁⲡϣⲱⲥ ⲡⲉ ⲉϥϣⲁⲛⲙⲟⲩ ⲇⲉ
ϣⲁϥⲣ-ⲡⲱⲟⲩ ϣⲁϥϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲛϩⲣⲉ ϩⲙⲡⲧⲣⲉϥⲧⲁⲁϥ ⲛⲁⲩ
ⲉⲓϫⲱ ⲇⲉ ⲙⲡⲁⲓ ϫⲉ-ⲛⲛⲉⲧⲛϫⲟⲟⲥ ϫⲉ-

The sheep is not the wild beasts', but the shepherd's. When it dies, it
becomes theirs: it turns into food for them, by way of his giving it to them.
I am saying this, so that you should not say…

Note here the initial obtaining situation, expressed by Nominal Sentences;
the use of the generic protasis ⲉϥϣⲁⲛ- and the apodotic aorist; the
explicit metaphrastic *hermeneia*. In Shenoute's natural history narratives,
metaphor, symbol, emblem and myth tend to merge to some degree.

---

[32] Amélineau (1907: 95 n. 4); 'une tournure non encore signalée'.

3.1.4. Premised Biblical episode, negatively presented as topicalizing (ⲉⲱϫⲉ-) protasis (quoting adversary's statement: 'if (as they say)…'), with negating apodotic and focal implication

Shenute contra Origenistas (Orlandi 1985: §347):

> ⲉⲱϫⲉ-ⲙⲡⲟⲩⲥⲧⲁⲩⲣⲟⲩ ⲙⲙⲟϥ ⲉⲓⲉ-ⲙⲡⲉϥⲧⲱⲟⲩⲛ ϩⲙ-ⲡⲙⲉϩϣⲟⲙⲛⲧ
> ⲛϩⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲁϥⲃⲱⲕ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲉⲛⲉϥⲙⲁⲛϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ
>
> If (as they say) He was not crucified, then He did not arise on the third day and go up to His holy dwelling-places.

The EM link ⲉⲁϥ- identifies this as narrative, which, in turn, is characterized by the negative preterite as rhetorical.

3.1.5. Natural history anecdote, with a Comment Mode segment implying an anthropomorphic narrative

Leipoldt (1908: 48):

> ⲙⲉϣⲁⲕ ⲛⲉⲓϩⲱⲟⲛ ϣⲏⲙ ⲉⲧⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲉⲧϩⲛ-ⲛⲉⲗⲕⲱ ⲉϣⲁⲩϣⲱϣ
> ⲙⲛⲡⲧⲏⲩ ϩⲙⲡⲧⲣⲉⲩⲡⲱϣ ⲙⲡⲉⲗⲕⲱ ⲛⲉⲩⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲡⲉ ⲙⲡⲁⲧⲟⲩⲉⲓ
> ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϫⲉ-ⲛⲉⲩϣⲟⲟⲡ ϩⲛ-ϩⲉⲛⲧⲁⲙⲓⲟⲛ ⲉⲩⲙⲉϩ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲛⲧⲉⲓϩⲉ
> ϩⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲛϩⲉⲗⲗⲏⲛ ⲙⲛϩⲁⲓⲣⲉⲧⲓⲕⲟⲥ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲩⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲛⲛⲁϩⲣⲁⲩ ϫⲉ-
> ⲉⲩϣⲟⲟⲡ ϩⲙ-ⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ
>
> It may be, that those tiny animals which are in the sycomore-figs, are scattered in the wind as the figs are cut. They had been thinking, before they came out, that they were living in treasuries full of light. Thus they too, the pagans and all heretics: they believe that it is in light that they are living.

Consider the rhetorical affective deixis of ⲛⲉⲓ-…ⲉⲧⲙⲙⲁⲩ; ⲅⲁⲣ, introducing allegorical narrative, with ⲙⲉϣⲁⲕ, 'it may be that …', and of course the CM form, the core of the (implied, left to be imagined) environmental narrative. The hermeneutical anacoluthon in ⲛⲧⲉⲓϩⲉ ϩⲱⲟⲩ ⲛ-, with the augens and rhematic circumstantial, is clearly rhetorical.

3.1.6. Comment Mode fragment, in a narrative with 'how', 'where', 'what' focussed

Shenute contra Origenistas (Orlandi 1985: §814):

> ⲉⲱϫⲉ-ⲟⲩⲛ-ϭⲟⲙ ⲙⲙⲟⲕ ⲉⲉⲓⲙⲉ ϫⲉ-ⲛⲧⲁⲡⲓⲱⲧ ϫⲡⲉ-ⲡϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲛⲁϣ
> ⲛϩⲉ ⲉⲓⲉ-ⲟⲩⲛ-ϭⲟⲙ ⲟⲛ ⲙⲙⲟⲕ ⲉⲉⲓⲙⲉ ϫⲉ-ϩⲁⲑⲏ ⲙⲡⲁⲧⲟⲩⲥⲛⲧ-ⲧⲡⲉ
> ⲙⲛⲡⲕⲁϩ ⲛⲉ-ⲟⲩ ⲡⲉⲧϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲏ ϫⲉ-ⲛⲉϥⲧⲱⲛ ⲡⲉ ⲛϭⲓ-ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ
> ⲛⲉϥϩⲙⲟⲟⲥ ⲇⲉ ⲡⲉ ⲛⲁϣ ⲛϩⲉ

If you can understand how it is that the Father begot the Son, then you can also understand what, before heaven and earth were created, it was that existed, or where He was, God, and how He was situated.

The Comment Mode form ⲛⲉϥ- + ⲡⲉ conveys true background; it has here a construction noteworthy on two counts: ⲛϭⲓ- following 'Where was he?'; no Focalizing Conversion, the adverbial interrogative focus notwithstanding. The Evolution Mode is here minimal, and indeed has a Focalizing Conversion form.

3.1.7. Biblical episode condensed: relativized abbreviated narrative

Leipoldt (1908: 72):

> ⲥⲉⲟ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛⲁⲧⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ϫⲉ-ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁϥⲥⲙⲟⲩ ⲉϯⲟⲩ ⲛⲟⲉⲓⲕ ⲛⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲁⲩⲱ
> ⲥⲁϣϥ ⲛⲟⲉⲓⲕ ⲁⲛⲁⲓ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲟⲩⲱⲙ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲩⲥⲉⲓ ⲁⲩⲙⲉϩ-ϩⲉⲛⲕⲉⲕⲟⲧ
> ⲛⲧⲟϥ ⲟⲛ ⲡⲉⲧⲥⲙⲟⲩ ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ⲉϩⲛⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲧϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲙ
> ⲉⲧⲡⲓⲥⲧⲉⲩⲉ ϫⲉ-ⲟⲩⲛ-ϭⲟⲙ ⲙⲙⲟϥ ⲉⲣ-ϩⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲧϥⲟⲩⲁϣⲟⲩ

For they are ignorant of the fact that He who blessed five loaves of barley bread and seven loaves of bread and all those people ate and were sated and even filled baskets—that it is He also that now blesses everything that belongs to anyone, who believes that He can do anything He wishes.

Biblical narratives, mythical or epic, have their own Evolution Mode structure. Here we witness an asyndetic sequence which, unlike non-rhetorical narratives, neutralizes looser or closer linkage: in ordinary narrative, zero links express hyper-eventing (cf. Shisha-Halevy 1997: 65–71).

3.1.8. Biblical episode condensed, embedded as abbreviated narrative in a factitive construction

John Rylands Library, Manchester, No. 70 p. ⲥⲗⲑ (Crum 1909: 34–35):

> ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁϥⲧⲣⲉ-ⲡϭⲉⲣⲱⲃ ⲙⲙⲱⲩⲥⲏⲥ ⲕⲧⲟϥ ⲉ-ⲩϩⲟϥ ⲡⲁⲗⲓⲛ ⲟⲛ ⲉⲁϥⲕ-
> ⲧⲟϥ ⲉ-ⲩϭⲉⲣⲱⲃ ⲁϥϣⲱⲡⲉ ϩⲛ-ⲧⲉϥϭⲓϫ ⲛⲑⲉ ⲉⲧⲉⲛⲉϥⲟ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ

He who caused Moses' staff to turn into a serpent, and to turn back again (literally 'it turned') into a staff, and to be (literally 'it came to be') in his hand as it used to be.

Note the linkage contour: ⲁϥ- , ⲉⲁϥ- , ⲁϥ- , with a theme switch in the circumstantial preterite form.

3.1.9. Biblical episode condensed, packaged as rhetorical question

Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, K 924 p. [194] (Young 1993: 33):

> ⲏ ⲟⲩⲡⲟⲣⲛⲏ ⲁⲛ ⲧⲉ ⲣⲁⲁⲃ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲥⲣ-ⲟⲩϩⲏⲧ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ ⲙⲛⲛⲕⲁⲧⲁⲥ-
> ⲕⲟⲡⲟⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲥⲉⲓⲙⲉ ϫⲉ-ⲉⲩϣⲁϫⲉ ⲛⲙⲙⲁⲥ ⲛⲁϣ ⲛϩⲉ ⲧⲁⲓ ⲧⲉ ⲑⲉ
> ⲛⲧⲁⲥⲟⲩϫⲁⲓ ⲛⲧⲟⲥ ⲙⲛⲡⲉⲥⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲙⲛⲧⲉⲥⲙⲁⲁⲩ ⲙⲛⲡⲉⲥⲏⲓ ⲧⲏⲣϥ
> ⲉⲡϣⲟⲣϣⲣ ⲛϩⲓⲉⲣⲓⲭⲱ ⲛⲑⲉ ⲛⲧⲁⲡϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ϣⲁⲁⲣ ⲉⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲏϩ
> ⲛⲏϩⲧⲥ

> And is Raab not a whore? And (yet) she and the spies came to be of one mind, and she understood in what manner they are talking to her; so indeed, she was saved from the destruction of Jericho, she and her father and her mother and all her home, as the Lord God smote those living in it.

Noteworthy here are the introductory Nominal Sentence, not really part of the narrative but its integrating anchor; the cataphoric and focussing ⲧⲁⲓ ⲧⲉ ⲑⲉ.

3.1.10. Biblical figures listed with their distinctive narrative acts packaged as relative expansion

Cambridge University Library Manuscript Or. 16.1699 A 1–2 (Young 1993: 78–79):

> …ⲛⲛⲉⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓϣ ⲛⲁⲣⲭⲁⲓⲟⲥ ϫⲓⲛ-ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲛⲧⲁϥⲣ-ⲁⲧⲥⲱⲧⲙ ϩⲙ-
> ⲡⲡⲁⲣⲁⲇⲓⲥⲟⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ ϫⲓⲛ-ⲛⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ ⲛⲧⲁⲩⲕⲱ ⲛⲥⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲧⲉⲩⲁⲣⲭⲏ
> ⲁⲩⲱ ϫⲓⲛ-ⲡⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲙⲡⲕⲁⲧⲁⲕⲗⲩⲥⲙⲟⲥ ϣⲁϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲉ-ⲡⲕⲱϩⲧ ⲉⲛⲧⲁϥⲉⲓ
> ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ-ⲧⲡⲉ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲉϫⲛ-ⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛⲥⲟⲇⲟⲙⲁ ⲙⲛⲅⲟⲙⲟⲣⲣⲁ ⲁⲩⲱ
> ϫⲓⲛ-ⲫⲁⲣⲁⲱ ⲙⲛⲡⲉϥⲙⲏⲛϣⲉ ⲉⲛⲧⲁⲑⲁⲗⲁⲥⲥⲁ ϩⲱⲃⲥ ⲉϫⲱⲟⲩ
> ϣⲁϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲉ-ⲛⲉⲛⲧⲁⲡⲕⲁϩ ⲟⲙⲕⲟⲩ

> In the olden days, from Man who disobeyed in Paradise, and from the angels who abandoned their origin, and from the water of the flood to the fire that came out of the sky upon the people of Sodom and Gomorra, and from Pharaoh with his army whom the sea covered, to those whom the earth swallowed…

3.1.11. Rhetorical questions: a collage of reminder hints at famous Biblical episodes (on the theme 'the significance of clothes'), brought forward as salient and applied as argument

The transcendent symbolism of clothing and clothing acts, invoked by Shenoute again and again, is thus lent scriptural corroboration, endorsement and validation.

British Library Manuscript Or. 3581A, 169 ro–vo (Young 1998*b*: 75–76):

ⲛⲧⲁϩⲣⲉⲃⲉⲕⲕⲁ ⲁⲛ ⲛⲧⲟϥ ⲉⲓ ⲉⲡⲉⲥⲏⲧ ϩⲓ-ⲡϭⲁⲙⲟⲩⲗ ⲁⲥϫⲓ ⲙⲡⲉⲥⲣϣⲱⲛ
      ⲁⲥϭⲟⲟⲗⲉⲥ
ⲟⲩ ⲛⲧⲟϥ ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁⲓⲱⲥⲏⲫ ⲁⲁϥ ⲛⲛⲉϥⲥⲛⲏⲩ ⲙⲏ ⲛⲧⲁϥϯ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲁⲛ
      ⲛⲥⲧⲟⲗⲏ ⲥⲛⲧⲉ ⲉⲡⲟⲩⲁ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲃⲉⲛⲓⲁⲙⲓⲛ ⲁϥϯ ⲛⲁϥ ⲛϯⲟⲩ ⲛⲥⲧⲟⲗⲏ
      ⲉⲩϣⲟⲃⲉ…
ⲏ ⲛⲧⲁⲙⲙⲁⲑⲏⲧⲏⲥ ⲡⲱⲣϣ ⲁⲛ ⲛⲛⲉⲩϩⲟⲓⲧⲉ ⲉϫⲙ-ⲡⲥⲏϭ ⲁⲩⲧⲁⲗⲉ-ⲓⲥ
      ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲉϫⲱⲟⲩ

Did not Rebecca alight from the camel, take her cloak and wrap herself?
What then did Joseph do to his brethren? Did he not give them two robes
      each, and give Benjamin five different robes?…
Or did the Disciples not spread their clothes over the foal and seat Jesus on
      them?

Of interest is the asyndetic linkage, the Focalizing Conversion putting all action directed at pieces of clothing in focus.

3.1.12. Medical-procedure routine scenarios, gnomic ('The Physician'; 'Treating Snake-Bite'), applied metaphorically[33] as a rhetorical question, responding to a non-rhetorical one

(a) *Shenute contra Origenistas* (Orlandi 1985: §207):

ⲟⲩ ⲡⲉϣⲁⲣⲉⲡⲥⲁⲉⲓⲛ ⲁⲁϥ ⲙⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲧⲉⲣⲉⲧⲉⲡⲗⲏⲅⲏ ϩⲓⲱⲱϥ ⲙⲏ
ⲉϣⲁϥϣⲱⲱⲧ ⲁⲛ ⲙⲙⲟϥ ⲛϣⲟⲣⲡ ϩⲙⲡⲧⲟⲕ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲥ ⲛϥⲑⲉⲣⲁⲡⲉⲩⲉ
ⲙⲙⲟϥ

What does the physician do to the person who has a wound? Doesn't he first cut it with a razor, and afterwards treat him?

Note the adverbial procedural signals (ⲛϣⲟⲣⲡ…ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲥ…), and the sequelling conjunctive. The aorist, too, is noteworthy, since Shenoute seems to prefer to use it for animal and generally 'natural' action (Young 1961): this is certainly a tendency. The focusing of the action (verb lexeme) itself is also indicative.

(b) *De Iudicio* (Behlmer 1996: 161–162), f. LXXVI ro–vo p. ⲣⲡⲉ-ⲣⲡ︦ⲍ︦:

ⲟⲩ ϭⲉ ⲡⲉϣⲁϥⲁⲁϥ ⲛϭⲓ-ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲣϣⲁⲛⲡϩⲟϥ ⲗⲟⲕⲥϥ ⲙⲏ ⲉϣⲁϥϩⲙⲟⲟⲥ
ⲁⲛ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲁⲧϥ ⲙⲡⲉⲧϣⲱⲱⲧ ⲙⲙⲟϥ ⲙⲡⲧⲟⲕ ⲉⲩⲛ-ϩⲉⲛⲕⲟⲟⲩⲉ
ⲁⲙⲁϩⲧⲉ ⲙⲙⲟϥ ⲉⲩϯ-ϩⲙⲟⲩ ϩⲓ-ϩⲙϫ ⲛⲥⲱⲟⲩ ϣⲁⲛⲧⲉⲧⲙⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲧⲏⲣⲥ

---

[33] Metaphors in Shenute's rhetoric may, as here, merge into symbols and/or emblems; this is striking in the case of *Physiologus*-type and other animal stories.

ⲉⲓⲱ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛϥⲱⲛϩ ⲉϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲟⲛ ⲛⲧⲁϥⲛⲓϥⲉ ⲉⲛⲉϥⲃⲁⲗ ⲉϣⲁⲩϯ-
ϩⲙⲟⲩ ⲛⲥⲱⲟⲩ ϣⲁⲛⲧⲉⲧⲙⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲉⲓⲱ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛϩⲏⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲧⲉⲓϩⲉ ⲟⲛ
ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛⲧⲁⲡⲉⲇⲣⲁⲕⲱⲛ ⲡⲛⲟϥ ⲡⲉⲧⲃⲉⲉⲙⲉ ⲡⲥⲁⲧⲁⲛⲁⲥ ⲟⲩⲟⲙϥ…

What then does a person do in case a snake bites him? Does he not sit down
at the feet of the one who cuts him with a razor, with others holding him,
applying salt and vinegar to them, until all the venom is washed away and
he lives. On the other hand, if it is into his eyes that it (the venom) has
blown, they apply salt to them until the venom washes away from them.
Thus too the person whom the dragon-serpent, the twisted one, Satan has
bitten…

See Behlmer (1996: 280 and n. 711). Of special interest here is the expres-
sion of the generic occurrence of snake-bite by means of the adnominal
Eventual ⲉϥϣⲁⲛ-, and not a relative construction ('the person whom a
snake bites'), and the remarkable 3rd-person plural references.[34] Note too
the complex apposition referring to Satan,[35] and the 'envelope focalization'
following ⲉϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲟⲛ.

3.1.13. Minimal Comment Mode + Evolution Mode segment in a personal narrative

Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, Copte 130[5] f. 19 p. ⳝⲇ (Young 1998*a*:
61):

(of Shenoute's valuable cloak)
ⲙⲏ ⲛⲧⲁⲓϩⲟⲛϥ ⲁⲛ ⲭⲉ-ⲛⲛⲉⲣⲱⲙⲉ ϩⲉ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲙⲡⲙⲁ ⲛⲧⲁⲓⲕⲁⲁϥ ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ
ϣⲁⲛⲧⲉⲡⲉⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓϣ ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲛⲧⲁⲧⲁⲙⲱⲧⲛ ⲭⲉ-ⲟⲩ ⲡⲉϯⲛⲁⲁϥ ⲛⲁϥ
ⲁⲩⲱ ϯⲣ-ϣⲡⲏⲣⲉ ⲭⲉ-ⲁϩⲉⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ ϭⲛⲧϥ ϩⲙⲡⲙⲁ ⲉⲧⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲕⲁⲓⲅⲁⲣ
ⲛⲉⲩⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲡⲉ ⲭⲉ-ⲁⲓⲉⲓⲙⲉ ⲭⲉ-ⲁⲩϩⲉ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲉϥϩⲏⲡ ⲛⲧⲙⲏⲧⲉ
ⲛϩⲉⲛⲕⲉⲛⲕⲁ ⲉⲩⲥⲟⲧⲡ ⲁⲩⲱ [ⲉⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩ…ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙⲡⲟⲩϫⲟⲟⲥ ⲛⲁⲓ
ⲭⲉ-ⲁⲛϩⲉ ⲉⲣⲟϥ…][36]

(Following a rambling description and history of the cloak and the damaged
done to it by moths, and Shenoute's consequent emotions)
Did I not instruct about it, that no-one should come upon it where I put it,
until the time should come, when I shall instruct you what to do with it?
And I am surprised that people found it in that place; for they (must) have
surely known that I understood that they came upon it hidden among choice
and [valuable] objects [… and they did not tell me: 'we came upon it'…]

---

[34] Not necessarily, I think, referring notionally to 'wounds', *pace* Behlmer n. 712, but
as a generic, almost dummy, object of ϯ, which cannot without some actant expression
mean 'apply'.

[35] Behlmer translates 'Schlangendrache', for ⲡⲉⲇⲣⲁⲕⲱⲛ ⲛϩⲟϥ, which the plates
show to be the text. Also, the actual text has ⲡⲉⲧⲃⲟⲟⲙⲉ, not ⲡⲉⲧⲃⲉⲉⲙⲉ as printed.

[36] The text is continued in the unpublished codex IFAO 2, currently being prepared for
publication by Anne Boud'hors (forthcoming), p. ⳝⲉ.

The remarkable feature in this text is the preterite form ⲁⲓⲉⲓⲙⲉ, a single compound EM narrative event, affirmative + negative, following a minimal CM. The narrative fragment is introduced by ⲕⲁⲓⲅⲁⲣ. Note, among rhetorical devices, the lexical oppositions and tension between the near-synonymous ϩⲉ ⲉ- and ϭⲓⲛⲉ 'come upon —find', ⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ and ⲉⲓⲙⲉ 'know— understand'.

3.1.14. A single element, ⲡⲉϫⲏⲧⲛ 'said you', neither Evolution Mode nor Comment Mode, neither plot nor background, but the narrative allomorph or narrativized form of 'you said' ('quoth ye'; cf. Kieckrs 1912; 1913; Rosier 1993)

This is in fact an inter-texteme boundary signal, anchored in Evolution Mode, enabling the inclusion of dialogue in narrative. Here, it alone suffices to imply and evoke a narrative frame, in a sarcastic vein discrediting the claim.

Codex IFAO copte 2, unedited; see Boud'hors (forthcoming), p. ⲥⲁ–ⲥⲃ:

> ⲉϣϫⲉ-ⲛⲉⲧⲙⲟⲟⲛⲉ ⲙⲙⲱⲧⲛ ⲧⲣⲉⲧⲛⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲛⲟⲩⲛⲏⲥⲧⲉⲓⲁ ⲙⲛⲟⲩϣ-
> ⲗⲏⲗ ⲏ ⲟⲩⲙⲉⲗⲉⲧⲁ ⲙⲡϣⲁϫⲉ ⲙⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲙⲛϩⲉⲛⲕⲉϩⲃⲏⲩⲉ ⲛⲧⲉⲓϩⲉ ⲏ
> ⲛⲧⲟϥ ⲧⲉⲧⲛⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ ϫⲉ-ⲧⲉⲧⲛϣⲓⲡⲉ ϩⲏⲧⲟⲩ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲧⲉⲧⲛϣⲱⲗ
> ⲙⲡⲏⲓ ⲙⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉϫⲏⲧⲛ ϫⲉ-ⲧⲛⲟ ⲛϩⲙϩⲁⲗ ⲙⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲛⲧⲁ-
> ⲧⲉⲧⲛⲣ-ϩⲙϩⲁⲗ ⲛⲁϥ ϩⲛⲟⲩ…

> If those who shepherd you make you practise fasting and prayer and medi-
> tation on the word of God, and other such things, or else you practise them
> because you are ashamed before them, nonetheless you despoil God's
> house; moreover, 'We are God's servants', you said; in what did you
> become servants unto Him? …

Shenoute is here (and in the wider cotext of the quoted passage) at his most scathingly sarcastic. Signals of irony are: ⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲛⲟⲩⲛⲏⲥⲧⲉⲓⲁ, etc., with an indefinite object noun, as opposed to ⲣ-ⲛⲏⲥⲧⲉⲓⲁ 'fast'; ⲙⲛϩⲉⲛⲕⲉϩⲃⲏⲩⲉ ⲛⲧⲉⲓϩⲉ, 'and other such things', probably the choice of ⲙⲟⲟⲛⲉ 'to shepherd'.

3.1.15. Gnomic case history, condensed relativized narrative

Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, Copte 130[1] f. 37 p. ⲥⲛⲍ (Young 2000: 270–271):

> ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲧⲁⲩϩⲟⲙⲟⲗⲟⲅⲉⲓ ⲙⲡϩⲱⲃ ⲉⲧϩⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲧⲁⲩⲁⲁϥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲁⲟⲩⲟⲓϣ
> (sic) ⲛⲥⲉⲁⲣⲛⲁ ϩⲛⲟⲩⲙⲛⲧϣⲟⲩϣⲟ ϫⲉ-ⲙⲡⲛⲣ-ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲛⲟⲃⲉ

They who confess to the evil deed they have done and, after a time, deny boastfully, saying 'We have committed no sin'.

Note the conjunctive as a generic sequential or rather sequelling form.

3.1.16. Proverbial narrative (cf. Jolles 1968: 150–170)

Bibliotheca Nazionale, Naples, IB 10 (Amélineau 1912: 326 = Zoega No. 238; by Besa, Shenoute's successor, not by Shenoute: cf. Emmel 2004: 897):

ⲟⲩⲛ-ⲟⲩϭⲓⲛϣⲁϫⲉ ϩⲛ-ⲧⲧⲁⲡⲣⲟ ⲛⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ ϫⲉ-ⲁⲩ† ⲛⲟⲩϣⲏⲣⲉ
ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲛϭ ⲉⲁϥⲙⲟⲟⲩⲧϥ ϩⲙ-ⲡⲁϣⲁⲓ ⲙⲡ†ⲡⲓ ⲉⲣⲱϥ

There is a saying in the mouth of the people: 'They gave a child a foal and he killed it by excess of kissing it'.

The main interest of this gnomic narrative —a classical instance of the proverbial story *in nuce*— is that it not tensed generically but as a *paradeigm*a, with the preterite ⲁϥ-. Here, as elsewhere, there is a factor of looser external juncture, correlated with a meta-status: this is a narrative in quotes, hence 'quotable narrative'. Internally, the sequence ⲁϥ- ⲉⲁϥ- represents the unfolding of the gnomic embryonic story.

3.2. *Fully-fledged complex narratives, scenarios and tableaux*

3.2.1. Dynamic tableau (I): 'Penury and Charity'

University of Michigan Library 158, 20a (Young 1993: 160–161):

ϩⲉⲛⲕⲟⲟⲩⲉ ⲇⲉ ϩⲟⲙⲟⲓⲱⲥ ⲉⲩϣⲱⲧⲙ ⲉⲣⲱⲟⲩ ⲙⲡⲣⲟ ⲙⲡⲉⲩⲏⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ
ⲙⲡⲉⲙⲕⲁϩ ⲛϩⲏⲧ ⲛⲧⲉⲩⲙⲛⲧϩⲏⲕⲉ ϫⲉ-ⲙⲛⲧⲁⲩ ⲉⲙⲟⲅⲓⲥ ⲛⲧⲉϩⲉⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ
ⲛϣⲉⲛϩⲧⲏϥ ⲧⲱϩⲙ ⲉⲡⲣⲟ ⲙⲡⲉⲩⲏⲓ ϩⲓⲣⲟⲩϩⲉ ⲏ ⲛⲧⲟϥ ⲕⲉⲛⲁⲩ
ⲉⲩⲛϩⲉⲛⲟⲉⲓⲕ ⲛⲧⲟⲟⲧⲟⲩ ⲏ ⲛⲧⲟϥ ⲕⲉⲭⲣⲓⲁ ⲛⲧⲉ-ⲡⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲁⲓ ⲧⲉ
ⲑⲉ ⲉϣⲁⲣⲉⲛⲉⲧⲙⲙⲁⲩ ϫⲓⲧⲟⲩ ⲉⲩϣⲡ-ϩⲙⲟⲧ ⲛⲧⲟⲟⲧϥ ⲙⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ
ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲧⲟⲟⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲛⲉⲛⲧⲁⲩⲣ-ⲡⲉⲩⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ

Similarly, others shutting themselves up in their home because of the misery of their destitution, for they have nothing; with hardly even compassionate people knocking on their door evenings or at any other time, bringing loaves of bread or any other bodily necessity. And so indeed, those do accept them, thanking God and those who have remembered them.

Of interest here is the cataphoric (and, I believe, nexus-focussing) ⲧⲁⲓ ⲧⲉ ⲑⲉ; the transition from the present to the sequelling aorist; the typically rhetorical and distinctively Shenoutean (ⲉ)ⲙⲟⲅⲓⲥ 'hardly' (cf. Shisha-Halevy 1986: 249).

3.2.2. Dynamic tableau (II): 'The Death-Bed', an extensive, evolving dramatic tableau

De Iudicio (Behlmer 1996: 8–10), f. IV–V, pp. ⲕⲉ–ⲕⲏ:

ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉϥϩⲓϫⲙ-ⲡⲉϥⲙⲁ ⲛⲛⲕⲟⲧⲕ ϥⲛⲁϣⲱⲱⲧ ⲁⲛ ⲙⲡⲟⲉⲓⲕ ⲙⲛⲡ-
   ⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲉϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲉϥⲛⲁϣⲟⲙⲕⲟⲩ
ϥⲥⲗⲥⲟⲗⲧ ⲛⲟⲩⲕⲟⲩⲓ ϩⲓⲧⲙ-ⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲙⲡⲉϩⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲧϥⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲣⲟϥ
ϥϭⲱϣⲧ ⲛⲥⲁ-ⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲙⲛⲡϩⲏⲃⲥ ⲛⲧⲉⲩϣⲏ ⲉϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲡⲉϥϩⲏⲧ
   ⲥⲙⲟⲛⲧ
ⲡⲉϥⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲏ ⲧⲉϥⲙⲁⲁⲩ ⲏ ⲡⲉϥⲥⲟⲛ ⲏ ⲧⲉϥⲥⲱⲛⲉ ⲏ ⲡⲉϥϣⲃⲏⲣ ⲏ
   ⲧⲉϥϩⲙϩⲁⲗ ⲏ ⲛⲧⲟϥ ⲕⲉⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲛⲉⲧⲁϩⲉⲣⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲙⲡⲉϥⲕⲱⲧⲉ ⲉⲩⲥ-
   ⲃⲧⲱⲧ ⲉⲧⲙⲗⲩⲡⲉⲓ ⲙⲙⲟϥ ⲉϥϣⲁⲛⲁⲓⲧⲉⲓ ⲉⲥⲁϩⲱϥ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲉⲕⲁⲁϥ
   ⲉⲡⲉⲥⲏⲧ ⲏ ⲉϫⲓⲧϥ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉⲡⲉⲕⲃⲟ ⲏ ⲉⲡⲉϩⲧ-ⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲉϫⲱϥ ⲏ
   ⲉⲧⲁϩⲥϥ ⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉϩ ⲙⲛϩⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲧϥⲟⲩⲁϣⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲩⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲁϥ
ⲥⲉⲥⲟⲡⲥ ⲇⲉ ⲟⲛ ⲙⲙⲟϥ ⲉⲧⲣⲉϥϫⲓ-ϩⲉⲛⲕⲟⲩⲓ ⲛⲧⲣⲟⲫⲏ ⲉⲁⲩⲧⲁⲙⲓⲟⲟⲩ
   ϩⲙ-ⲡⲉⲩⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲧⲏⲣϥ ⲉⲩⲟ ⲛⲟⲩⲛⲡⲉ ⲛⲥⲙⲟⲧ
ϥⲉⲡⲓⲑⲩⲙⲉⲓ ⲇⲉ ϩⲱⲱϥ ⲛϭⲓ-ⲡⲉⲧϣⲱⲛⲉ ⲉϫⲛⲧ ⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲙⲛⲛⲓⲕⲟⲟⲩⲉ
   ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲕⲉϩⲟⲡⲱⲣⲁ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϫⲉ-ϥⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲉⲱⲛϩ

ϩⲟⲥⲟⲛ ⲇⲉ ⲉⲩⲥⲡⲟⲩⲇⲁⲍⲉ ⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛϭⲓ-ⲛⲉⲧⲙ-ⲡⲉϥⲕⲱⲧⲉ ⲉϥⲙⲟⲕⲙⲉⲕ
   ϩⲱⲱϥ ⲉⲛⲓⲕⲟⲟⲩⲉ

ⲡⲙⲟⲩ ⲁⲣⲭⲉⲓ ⲛⲣ-ϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲉϫⲱϥ
ⲑⲟⲧⲉ ⲛⲛⲉϥⲡⲉⲑⲟⲟⲩ ⲕⲟⲗⲁⲍⲉ ⲙⲙⲟϥ
ϥⲉⲓⲟⲣⲙ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲙ-ⲡⲉϥϩⲏⲧ
   ϥⲟ ⲛϩⲃⲁ ϩⲛ-ⲧⲉϥⲯⲩⲭⲏ
   ϥϣⲧⲣⲧⲱⲣ ϩⲛ-ⲛⲉϥⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ
ⲡⲉϥⲡ̅ⲛ̅ⲁ̅ ⲱϫⲛ ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ ⲕⲟⲩⲓ ⲕⲟⲩⲓ
ϥⲛⲁⲩ ϫⲉ-ⲙⲛⲑⲉ ⲛⲕⲧⲟϥ ϫⲓⲛ-ⲙⲡⲓⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲙⲉⲧⲁⲛⲟⲓ
ⲥⲉⲱϣ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛϭⲓ-ⲛⲉⲧⲛⲉϩⲡⲉ ⲉⲡϫⲓⲛϫⲏ
ⲥⲉⲕⲱⲣϣ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲉⲧⲣⲉϥⲟⲩⲟϣⲃⲟⲩ ⲛϭⲓ-ⲛⲉⲧϥⲟⲓ ⲛⲧⲟⲟⲧⲟⲩ
   ⲉϥⲛⲁⲃⲱⲕ ⲉⲕⲁⲁⲩ
ⲁⲩϫⲓ-ⲣⲱϥ ⲉⲧⲙϣⲁϫⲉ
ⲛϥϭⲱϣⲧ ⲁⲛ ⲛⲥⲁ-ⲛⲉϥⲥⲛⲏⲩ ⲙⲡⲉϥⲣⲟⲟⲩϣ ⲁⲛ ⲡⲉ ⲛⲉϥⲁⲡⲟⲑⲏⲕⲏ
   ⲉⲧⲙⲉϩ
ϥⲁϣⲁϩⲟⲙ ⲉϫⲛ-ⲛⲉϥⲛⲟⲃⲉ
ϥⲗⲩⲡⲏ ϫⲉ-ⲙⲡϥⲣ-ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩϥ
ⲧⲣⲙⲉⲓⲏ ⲕⲱⲧⲉ ϩⲛⲛⲉϥⲃⲁⲗ
ϥⲙⲟⲕϩ ⲛϩⲏⲧ ⲉϫⲙ-ⲡⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲙⲡϩⲟ ⲛⲛⲉⲧϥⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲁⲩⲉⲓ ⲛⲥⲱϥ
   — ⲛⲧⲁⲩⲉⲓ ⲁⲛ ⲛⲥⲱϥ ⲛⲧⲉⲓϩⲉ ϩⲁⲡⲗⲱⲥ ⲛⲑⲉ ⲛϩⲉⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲩⲉ-
   ⲓⲛⲉ ⲙⲙⲟϥ ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲩϫⲓⲧϥ ⲉⲣⲁⲧϥ ⲛⲟⲩⲕⲣⲓⲧⲏⲥ ⲉϥϣⲟⲃⲉ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲣⲟϥ
   ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ϩⲉⲛⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ ⲛⲉⲛⲧⲁⲩⲉⲓ ⲛⲥⲱϥ ⲉⲩⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲙⲙⲟϥ ⲁⲛ ϫⲉ-
   ⲟⲩϩⲟⲧⲉ ⲙⲛⲟⲩⲥⲧⲱⲧ ⲡⲉ ϭⲱϣⲧ ⲛⲥⲱⲟⲩ…

The man, being on his bed will not be deprived of bread and water, if he
   can swallow them;
He draws a little comfort from the light of day, which he sees;
He looks to the light, and to the lamp at night, if his mind is aright.

His father or mother or brother or sister or friend or maidservant or someone else of those standing around him are ready not to cause him distress, should he ask to move him or to lower him, or to take him out to the cool air, or to pour water over him or to anoint him with oil and anything he may wish to be done to him.

They beg him to take some nourishment, which they have prepared with all their love, in many forms;

And he for his part, the sick man, desires to taste of these and of those and also of the fruit, for he wants to live.

While they, those surrounding him, busy themselves doing those things, he, for his part, ponders those other matters:

Death begins to overpower him.
The terror of his evil deeds chastises him.
He is stunned in his mind.
   He is distressed in his soul.
   He is troubled in his thought.
His spirit wanes in him little by little.
He sees there is no way of turning back henceforth to repent.
The mourning ones call out—in vain:
They for whom he is important entreat him to answer them as he is about to leave them:
His mouth has been disabled so he cannot speak.
He does not look to his brethren. His full storehouses do not concern him.
He sighs for his sins.
He grieves that he did not do good.
The tears gather in his eyes.
He is miserable on account of the look of the face of those he sees having come for him:
it is not simply in this way[37] that they have come, like people resembling him, who have come to take him before a judge who is not different from him, but it is angels, not resembling him, that have come for him, for it is terrifying and shudder-causing to look at them…

The formal structure of this passage is sophisticated. The clauses, always verbal-rheme first, are, as a rule, short and terse (cf. Havers 1931: 152–153). The middle sentence marks the transition between earthly hopefulness ('looking to' in the text), and the stark reality of impending death and dire consequences of sinful living. The almost poetic series of relatively short clauses, isocola or parallelistic, though never quoted, carry Biblical overtones (the didactic books, Job, Ecclesiastes, the New Testament) in sentiment, phrasing and even rhythm. The striking alternation between external and internal communication of the dying man ceases abruptly towards the end, the surrounding world recedes —'the

---

[37] ⲛⲧⲉⲓϩⲉ here cataphoric to ⲛⲑⲉ.

surrounding family' turns into 'the mourning ones'—and he is left alone
with his conscience and the certainty and terror of hellfire. Of interest is
also the subtle evolution from external description to internal-emotional
account, realistic, sensitive and remarkably empathic, through a dramat-
ically accelerating development towards the *dénouement*; and yet, the
action here is slight —token action, no more than enough to keep the
picture in motion.[38] The tensing is here almost exclusively present, not
aorist— the scene is not conceived of as generic, but as 'synchronous'
and actual, in a recording, photographic way *performative*, and therefore
very vivid.

3.2.3. Metaphorical and symbolic tableau, gnomic; expansion sequel to Biblical motif

Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, K 9298 p. [ι] (Young 1993:
131):

> ⲡⲩⲗⲏ ⲥⲛⲧⲉ ⲛⲉ ⲉⲩⲃⲏⲩ ⲧⲟⲩⲉⲓ ⲉⲥⲙⲡⲃⲟⲗ ⲛⲧⲟⲩⲉⲓ ⲧⲱⲟⲣⲡ ⲉⲥⲭⲓ-
> ⲙⲟⲉⲓⲧ ⲉⲍⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲧⲙⲉⲍⲥⲛⲧⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲧⲁⲩⲭⲓⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲭⲛⲁⲍ ⲁⲩⲃⲱⲕ ⲉⲍⲟⲩⲛ
> ⲍⲓⲧⲛ-ⲧⲱⲟⲣⲡ ⲁⲛⲉⲩⲍⲓⲥⲉ ⲟⲩⲱ ⲉⲩ[…
>
> In fact, it's two narrow gates, one being outside the other, the first leading
> into the second: those who have been done violence to, and entered by the
> first, their tribulations have ended…

Shenoute's text is referential to the immediately preceding discussion of
the broad and narrow gates (Mt.7:13–14, Luc.13:24). Note the preterite
ⲁ ϥ- in generic-gnomic context.

3.2.4. Evolutive structured double listing of generic acts, the second list rhematic to the first

The extensive passage (*De Iudicio* XVIII ro p. [ⲛⲅ]–XX vo p. ⲛⲏ,
Behlmer 1996: 35–40) is a remarkable, rhetorically subtle and effective
syntactical device, which I see as essentially narrative. It begins as a
series of homolexemic paired or triple 2nd-person preterite clause com-
plexes, with the first clause topical and the second presenting its implica-
tion and consequence (arguably, the first is *also* the higher-level signifier
of the second). These complexes alternate between praiseworthy and
reprehensible acts. Later, this alternation evolves into a chronicle of

---

[38] Consider Gerber (1885: 459); 'Die Fabel gibt einen Gedanken Ausdruck durch Darstel-
lung eines Bildes, welches aus Anlass eines einzelnen Vorgangs, den die Anschauung bietet,
der also der Wirklichkeit entnommen ist, in uns entsteht'. The picture is important, so much
so that the plot is 'eine bloße Scheinhandlung' (Gerber 1885: 464). This applies cogently to
the dynamic tableau which does not change overall even though its details are in motion.

infamy. Remarkably, again, the action is not marked as generic; the
protasis-apodosis interdependence is signalled by mere extraposition
within the pairs: this, and the preterite tensing, conveys *simultaneity,
hyperbolically expressed as overlapping*, and indeed virtual merging,
as well as a *Wechselsatz* (balanced nexus construction) equation-like
dependency. The preterite is also used in a simulation of factivity; contrast
this with the equally protatic 2nd-person-singular preterite (ⲁⲕ-, ⲙⲡⲕ-) in
De Iudicio f. XXVII verso p. ⲟⲏ and following, which, however, has ϥⲛⲁ-
(ⲁⲛ) 'He will (not)', or ⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲛⲁ- (ⲁⲛ) 'the Lord will (not)' as apodo-
sis, and has no immediacy or *Wechselsatz* character. The sequence here is
catalogic, not evolutive. For reasons of space, I do not quote here the full
text.

> ⲁⲕϣⲱⲡ ⲉⲣⲟⲕ ⲙⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲁⲕⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲙⲟⲩ ⲉⲍⲣⲁⲓ ⲉⲭⲱⲕ ⲍⲓⲭⲙ-
> ⲡⲕⲁⲍ ⲛⲛⲉⲍⲟⲟⲩ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲙⲡⲉⲕⲱⲛⲍ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲕⲥⲟⲃⲧⲉ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲛⲟⲩⲙⲁ
> ⲛⲙⲧⲟⲛ ⲍⲛ-ⲧⲙⲛⲧⲉⲣⲟ ⲛⲙⲡⲏⲩⲉ ϣⲁⲉⲛⲉⲍ
>
> ⲁⲕϣⲱⲡ ⲉⲣⲟⲕ ⲙⲡⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲉⲑⲟⲟⲩ ⲁⲕϣⲱⲡ ⲉⲣⲟⲕ ⲙⲡⲇⲁⲓⲙⲱⲛ
> ⲉⲧⲣⲉϥϣⲟⲭⲛⲉ ⲍⲣⲁⲓ ⲛⲍⲏⲧⲕ ⲉⲭⲱⲍⲙ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲙⲛⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲧϥ-
> ⲟⲩⲁϣⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲕⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲁϥ ⲛⲍⲏⲧⲕ
>
> ⲁⲕϣⲱⲡ ⲉⲣⲟⲕ ⲙⲡⲭⲁⲭⲉ ⲁⲕⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲁⲍⲟⲩ ⲉⲍⲣⲁⲓ ⲉⲭⲱⲕ ⲍⲓⲭⲙ-
> ⲡⲕⲁⲍ ⲛⲛⲉⲍⲟⲟⲩ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲙⲡⲉⲕⲱⲛⲍ ⲁⲕⲥⲟⲃⲧⲉ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲛⲟⲩⲕⲱⲧ
> ⲍⲣⲁⲓ ⲍⲛ-ⲁⲙⲛⲧⲉ ϣⲁ-ⲉⲛⲉⲍ
>
> ⲁⲕⲡⲱⲧ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲙⲡⲛⲟⲃⲉ [...] ⲍⲙⲡⲧⲣⲉⲕⲣ-ⲍⲧⲏⲕ ⲉⲁⲕⲥⲟⲧⲡⲥ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲉⲣ-
> ⲡⲁⲅⲁⲑⲟⲛ ⲁⲕⲛⲁⲍⲙⲉⲕ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ [...] ⲁⲕⲥⲟⲃⲧⲉ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲛⲟⲩⲙⲁ ⲛⲙⲧⲟⲛ
> ⲍⲛ-ⲧⲙⲛⲧⲉⲣⲟ ⲛⲙⲡⲏⲩⲉ...
>
> ⲁⲕϣⲟⲭⲛⲉ ⲏ ⲁⲕⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲉⲍⲉⲛⲭⲓⲛϭⲟⲛⲥ ⲍⲓⲭⲙ-ⲡⲉⲕⲙⲁ ⲛⲛⲕⲟⲧⲕ
> ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲕⲭⲟⲕⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛⲑⲉ ⲉⲧⲥⲏⲍ ⲁⲕⲥⲙⲓⲛⲉ ⲏ ⲁⲕⲧⲱϣ ⲛⲁⲕ
> ⲍⲛ-ⲛⲉⲕⲍⲃⲏⲩⲉ ⲉⲑⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲍⲉⲛⲍⲓⲟⲟⲩⲉ ⲉⲩϫⲓ-ⲙⲟⲉⲓⲧ ⲉⲍⲣⲁⲓ ⲉⲁⲙ-
> ⲛⲧⲉ
>
> ⲁⲕⲙⲕⲁⲍ ⲛⲍⲏⲧ ⲛⲑⲉ ⲉⲧⲥⲏⲍ ⲍⲓⲭⲛ-ⲛⲉⲕⲙⲁ ⲛⲛⲕⲟⲧⲕ ⲉⲭⲛ-ⲛⲉⲧⲕⲭⲱ
> ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲁⲕⲕⲧⲟⲕ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲍⲛ-ⲙⲡⲉⲑⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲕⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲏ ⲛⲧⲁⲕ-
> ⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲁⲁⲩ ⲁⲕⲕⲧⲟ ⲛⲧⲟⲣⲅⲏ ⲙⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲙⲙⲟⲕ
> ⲁⲕϣⲱⲙ ⲇⲉ ⲟⲛ ⲙⲡⲕⲱⲧ ⲛⲧⲁⲕⲭⲉⲣⲱϥ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲍⲛ-ⲁⲙⲛⲧⲉ
>
> ⲁⲕⲥⲱⲱϥ ⲙⲡⲉⲣⲡⲉ ⲙⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲍⲛ-ⲍⲉⲛⲙⲛⲧⲛⲟⲉⲓⲕ...ⲁⲕⲧⲁⲕⲟ ⲛⲧⲉⲕ-
> ⲯⲩⲭⲏ ⲙⲛⲡⲉⲕⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲙⲁⲩⲁⲁⲕ ⲍⲙ-ⲡⲉⲍⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲍⲣⲁⲓ
> ⲍⲛ-ⲁⲙⲛⲧⲉ...
>
> ⲁⲕϫⲓ-ⲡⲍⲏⲕⲉ ⲛϭⲟⲛⲥ ⲁⲕⲙⲟⲩⲕⲍ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲣⲫⲁⲛⲟⲥ ⲙⲛⲟⲩⲭⲏⲣⲁ ⲙⲛⲟⲩ-
> ϣⲙⲙⲟ ⲁⲕϫⲓⲧⲕ ⲛϭⲟⲛⲥ ⲙⲁⲩⲁⲁⲕ ⲛⲅⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲁⲛ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲕⲁⲁⲕ
> ⲛϣⲙⲙⲟ ⲉⲡⲛⲁ ⲙⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲍⲓⲭⲙ-ⲡⲕⲁⲍ ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲕⲑⲙⲕⲟⲕ
> ⲙⲙⲓⲛ ⲙⲙⲟⲕ...
>
> ⲁⲕⲧⲱⲣⲡ ⲉⲟⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲭⲛ-ⲡⲉϥⲏⲓ ⲟⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲭⲛ-ⲧⲉϥⲕⲗⲏⲣⲟⲛⲟⲙⲓⲁ ⲏ
> ⲁⲕⲧⲱⲣⲡ ⲙⲡⲉϥⲍⲙⲍⲁⲗ ⲏ ⲡⲉϥⲧⲃⲛⲏ...ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲑⲉ ⲉⲧⲕⲟⲩⲁϣⲥ ⲁⲛ
> ⲉⲁⲁⲥ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲁⲕⲁⲁⲥ ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲍⲓⲧⲟⲩⲱⲕ...ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲕⲥⲟⲧⲡⲥ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲙⲙⲓⲛ
> ⲙⲙⲟⲕ ⲛⲑⲉ ⲉⲧⲕⲟⲩⲁϣⲥ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲁⲁⲥ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲍⲣⲁⲓ ⲍⲛ-ⲧⲅⲉⲍⲉⲛⲛⲁ...

> You have received the Lord unto yourself —you have brought a blessing
> on you on earth, all the days of your life, and have prepared for yourself
> a resting-place in the Kingdom of Heaven for eternity.

You have received unto yourself the evil thought —you have received unto yourself the Demon, to give counsel within you on every uncleanliness and every sin he wants you to commit for him in you.

You have received unto yourself the Enemy —you have brought upon yourself a malediction on earth, all the days of your life, and have prepared a fire for you down in Hell for eternity.

You have fled sin […] as you repented, and have chosen to do good —you have saved yourself from […] you have prepared for yourself a resting-place in the Kingdom of Heaven […]

You have considered or thought of acts of violence on your beds, to carry them out, as it is written —you have established or assigned for yourself, by your deeds, roads leading down to Hell.

You have grieved, as it is written, on your bed,[39] over things you say; you have turned away from the evils you do or you have thought to do —you have turned God's wrath away from you; you have also quenched the fire you kindled for yourself in Hell.

You have defiled God's temple with acts of fornication… —you alone have destroyed your soul and your own body on that day down in Hell…

You have ill-treated the poor, you have distressed an orphan, a widow, and a stranger —you have done violence to yourself, unknowingly, and have estranged yourself from God's mercy on earth now, and have ill-used yourself…

You have deprived a man of his house, a man of his inheritance, or you have seized his servant or his domestic animal…and what you do not wish to be done unto you, you have done unto your neighbour… —you have chosen for yourself what you do not wish to be done unto you, down in Hell…

In her translation Behlmer (1996: 218–220) takes the initial clauses of each set to be interrogative, in the 'is it the case that …?' form of interrogation ('Du hast den Herrn bei dir Empfangen? Du hast einen Segen über dich gebracht …' and so usually), which is of course also used protatically.

Note that subordinate specificatory scenes and sub-episodes are here delimited and marked by the circumstantial pretrerite ⲉⲁϥ-, one of the forms of narrative eventing which is typically (but not exclusively) Shenoutean. Of interest is also the superordinating apodotic ⲁⲩⲱ.

Consider a possible analogue in Leipoldt (1908: 112):

ⲉⲛϣⲁⲛⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛⲧⲙⲉ ⲁⲛⲧⲁⲓⲉ-ⲧⲙⲉ ⲁⲛⲥⲱϣ ⲙⲡϭⲟⲗ ⲉⲛϣⲁⲛⲉⲓⲣⲉ
ⲇⲉ ⲙⲡⲛⲁ ⲁⲛⲧⲁⲓⲉ-ⲧⲙⲛⲧⲛⲁⲏⲧ ⲁⲛⲥⲱϣ ⲛⲧⲙⲛⲧⲁⲧⲛⲁ ⲉⲛϣⲁⲛⲧⲃⲃⲟⲛ
ⲁⲛⲧⲁⲓⲟ ⲙⲡⲧⲃⲃⲟ ⲁⲛⲥⲱϣ ⲙⲡϫⲱϩⲙ ⲛϣⲁⲛⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲛϯⲣⲏⲛⲏ ⲁⲛⲧⲁⲓⲉ-
ϯⲣⲏⲛⲏ ⲁⲛⲥⲱϣ ⲛⲧⲙⲛⲧϫⲁϫⲉ…

---

[39] The 'on your bed' *topos* is pregnant: in Coptic, bed is a 'place of lying-down (ⲛⲕⲟⲧⲕ)', the verb also having the role of a euphemistic alternant of 'die' (suggested by E. Grossman).

> Whenever we practise Truth, we have honoured Truth, we have despised
> Falsehood; whenever we practise Mercy, we have honoured Mercifulness,
> we have despised Mercilessness; whenever we keep ourselves pure, we
> have honoured Purity, we have despised Defilement; whenever we practise
> Peace, we have honoured Peace, we have despised Hostility…

While the possibility of the Conditional, which is extratemporal, having
here past reference ('Whenever we practised Truth …') cannot be ruled out,
I prefer a generic or habitual atemporal reading, in which case the preterite
ⲁⲛ- would be a '*narrative apodotic performative*', expressing the implica-
tion of the generic protasis; the performativity factor ('thereby, therewith')
is an effect of the immediacy factor of the juxtaposition with the preterite.

3.2.5. Gnomic procedure-routine scenario ('The Trapper-Hunter')

Shenoute Contra Origenistas (Orlandi 1985: §601):

> ϩⲁϩ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛⲥⲟⲡ ϣⲁⲣⲉⲡⲃⲉⲣⲏϭ ⲱⲣⲃ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲛⲛⲉⲧϥⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ
>   ⲉⲃⲟⲡⲟⲩ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛϥⲡⲱⲧ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲉϫⲱⲟⲩ ϩⲛ-ⲧⲉϥϭⲟⲙ ⲛϥⲧⲁϩⲟⲟⲩ
>   ⲥⲟⲡ ⲇⲉ ⲟⲛ ⲉϣⲁϥⲕⲁ-ⲧⲉϥϩⲣⲉ ϩⲓϫⲛ-ⲛⲁⲗⲟⲟⲩⲉ ⲏ ⲙⲡⲁϣϥ ϣⲁⲛ-
>   ⲧⲟⲩϫⲱⲗϫ ⲛϭⲓ-ⲛⲉⲧϥϭⲱⲣϭ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ
> ⲧⲁⲓ ⲧⲉ ⲑⲉ ⲙⲡⲥⲁⲧⲁⲛⲁⲥ…

> Often, the trapper encloses those animals he intends to catch and rushes at
>   them forcefully and catches them. But sometimes, he leaves his bait-
>   food in the traps or the snares, until those he is trapping are ensnared.
> So indeed it is with Satan…

The sequentiality is here strong; the aorist is not merely an exponent of
genericity or habit (see also 3.1.12. above), but of *procedurality*. The
focalized aorist is a case of 'envelope focussing', typical of the second
flank of a correlative complex; correlative constructions are of the more
common rhetorical devices used by Shenoute.

3.2.6. Biblical-history interpretatively paraphrased narrative, superimposing
          the Comment Mode (supplying psychological background) on the
          Evolution Mode, which is then presented as presupposed ('known')
          information of lesser Communicative Dynamism, or even as thematic

Leipoldt (1913: 26–25):

> ⲁⲃⲣⲁϩⲁⲙ ⲡⲉⲛⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲛⲉϥⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲡⲉ ⲉⲧⲣⲉϩⲉⲛϣⲏⲣⲉ ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲛⲁϥ
> ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ-ⲥⲁⲣⲣⲁ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲥⲁⲣⲣⲁ ⲛⲉⲥⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲡⲉ ⲉⲧⲣⲉϩⲉⲛϣⲏⲣⲉ
> ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲛⲁⲥ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ-ⲁⲃⲣⲁϩⲁⲙ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲁⲓ ⲧⲉ ⲑⲉ ⲛⲧⲁⲡϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ
> ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ † ⲛⲟⲩϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲛⲁⲃⲣⲁϩⲁⲙ ϩⲛⲧⲉϥⲙⲛⲧϩⲗⲗⲟ ⲉⲁϥϫⲡⲟ
> ⲛⲓⲥⲁⲁⲕ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛⲥⲁⲣⲣⲁ ϩⲛⲧⲉⲥⲙⲛⲧϩⲗⲗⲱ ⲁϥϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲛⲟⲩϣⲏⲣⲉ

ⲙⲙⲉⲣⲓⲧ ⲛⲑⲉ ⲛⲟⲩⲧⲃⲁ ⲛϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲉⲟⲩⲁ ⲡⲉ…ⲓⲥⲁⲁⲕ ⲛⲉϥⲧⲱⲃϩ
ⲙⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲡⲉ ⲉϥⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲉⲧⲣⲉϩⲉⲛϣⲏⲣⲉ ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲛⲁϥ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ
ϩⲛ-ϩⲣⲉⲃⲉⲕⲕⲁ ⲁⲩⲱ ϩⲣⲉⲃⲉⲕⲕⲁ ⲛⲉⲥⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲉⲧⲣⲉϩⲉⲛϣⲏⲣⲉ ϣⲱⲡⲉ
ⲛⲁⲥ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ-ⲓⲥⲁⲁⲕ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲁⲓ ⲧⲉ ⲑⲉ ⲛⲧⲁⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ † ⲛⲁⲩ
ⲕⲁⲧⲁⲡⲉⲩϩⲏⲧ ⲉⲁϥϫⲱⲕ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛⲛⲉⲩⲁⲓⲧⲏⲙⲁ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ…

Abraham our father wished for children from Sarah, and Sarah wished for
children from Abraham —and so indeed, the Lord God gave Abraham a son
in his old age, having begotten Isaac from Sarah in her old age; he became
for them a beloved son, like a myriad of sons, although he was one … Isaac
begged the Lord, wishing for children from Rebecca; and Rebecca, she
wished for children from Isaac —and so indeed, the Lord God gave them
according to their heart, granting all their wishes…

Note again the cataphoric focussing ⲧⲁⲓ ⲧⲉ ⲑⲉ, a striking rhetorical
device; the circumstantial Nominal Sentence in concessive role.

3.2.7. Paradigmatic *exemplum*-type narratives,[40] ahistorical, extratemporal

(a) 'The Father, Son and Two Daughters'

Leipoldt (1908: 96):

ⲟⲩⲛ-ⲟⲩⲡⲁⲣⲁⲇⲉⲓⲅⲙⲁ ⲉⲓⲛⲁϫⲟⲟϥ ⲉⲁⲓⲥⲱⲧⲙ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ϩⲓⲧⲙ-ⲡⲁⲉⲓⲱⲧ
ⲡⲁⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲛⲁⲅⲁⲑⲟⲥ ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲧⲁϥⲥⲙⲛⲥⲛⲧⲉ ⲛⲛⲓⲥⲩⲛⲁⲅⲱⲅⲏ
ⲟⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲡⲉ — ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ — ⲉⲟⲩⲛⲧⲁϥ ⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲛⲟⲩϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ
ϣⲉⲉⲣⲉ ⲥⲛⲧⲉ ⲉⲁϥⲕⲱⲧ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲛϩⲉⲛⲏⲓ ⲉⲛⲅⲛⲁϣⲧⲟⲛⲧⲛ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ
ϩⲁⲣⲟⲥ ⲛⲧⲡⲉ ϩⲙⲡⲉⲩⲥⲙⲓⲛⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉⲩⲕⲟⲥⲙⲉⲓ ⲙⲛⲧⲉⲩ†ⲙⲏ
ⲡⲁⲓ ⲙⲉⲛ ⲁϥ† ⲛⲁϥ ⲙⲡⲱϥ ⲛⲓⲕⲟⲟⲩⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲧⲟⲩⲉⲓ ⲧⲟⲩⲉⲓ ⲁϥ†
ⲛⲁⲥ ⲙⲡⲱⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲏⲡ ⲉϫⲓⲧⲁ ϩⲛⲧⲉϥⲕⲗⲏⲣⲟⲛⲟⲙⲓⲁ. ϩⲛⲟⲩ-
ϣⲥⲛⲉ ⲇⲉ ϩⲱⲥ ⲉϣϫⲉ-ⲛⲧⲁⲩⲡⲱϣⲥ ⲛϩⲏⲧ — ⲛⲧⲁⲩⲡⲱϣⲥ ⲅⲁⲣ
— ⲡϩⲟⲟⲩⲧ ⲙⲉⲛ ⲛⲧⲁϥ† ⲙⲡⲉϥⲏⲓ ⲛⲟⲩϣⲙⲙⲟ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲉⲧⲉ-
ⲟⲩⲛⲧⲁϥⲥⲟⲩ ⲁϥⲧⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲙⲙⲁϥ ⲛϣⲉⲉⲣⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲧⲟⲩⲉⲓ ⲙⲉⲛ ⲁⲥ†-
ⲡⲱⲥ ϩⲱⲱⲥ ⲟⲛ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁⲥϫⲓⲧϥ ⲛⲧⲙ-ⲡⲉⲥⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲁⲥⲧⲁⲁϥ
ⲛⲙⲙⲁϥ ⲧⲕⲉⲟⲩⲉⲓ ⲁⲥ†-ⲡⲱⲥ ϩⲁ-ⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲕ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ
ⲛⲉⲓϣⲁϫⲉ ⲛⲁⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛⲉ ⲉⲧ† ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲁ-ϩⲉⲛⲡⲟⲣⲛⲓⲁ…

There is a *paradeigma* I'm going to tell, which I heard from my father, my
    good father, who founded these communities:
'A man —so he said— had a son and two daughters, for whom he built
    houses such as you won't be able to liken (any) to, under the heaven,
    for their construction and decoration and value. Him (the son) he gave
    his; the others —to each he gave hers, and all they were meant to get
    from his inheritance. Suddenly, it was as if they went mad— indeed,
    they *did* go mad; the son gave his house to a strange woman, and gave all
    he had with it; the daughters —one gave hers too, and gave with it what
    she got from her father; the other, she gave hers for a single loaf of bread.

---

[40] See Alewell (1913); Gerber (1885: 67, 474–482); Haug (1979: 787 *sub voce* 'exem-
plum'); Schittko (2003); Welter (1927, repr. 1973); Wittchow (2001).

> These words refer to people (literally 'are people's') who sell themselves
>   for acts of fornication…'

Of interest is the presentative opening clause (different in Coptic from
the introductory existential); phraseology (ϩⲁⲣⲟⲥ ⲛⲧⲡⲉ); multiple
topicalization syntax (and the use of ⲙⲉⲛ…ⲇⲉ…); Focalizing Conver-
sion: nexus focussing (ⲛⲧⲁⲩⲡⲱϣⲥ ⲅⲁⲣ). The text is ahistorical, extra-
temporal, fairy-tale-like, and in that sense generic.

(b) Paradigmatic *exemplum*-type narrative coupled with a static tableau:
'The Stones and the Three Loads', a complex parable (ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲃⲟⲗⲏ)

Leipoldt (1908: 27):

> ⲟⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲡⲉ ⲉϥⲕⲱⲧ ⲛⲟⲩⲧⲟⲡⲟⲥ ⲉⲧⲉϥⲭⲣⲓⲁ ⲛⲉ-ⲛⲁϣⲉ-ⲛⲱⲛⲉ
>   ⲉⲧⲉⲙⲡⲉϥⲙⲧⲟ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲟⲓⲛⲉ ⲉⲛⲛⲟϭ ϩⲉⲛⲕⲟⲟⲩⲉ ⲉⲩⲥⲟⲃⲕ ⲁϥⲛⲁⲩ
>   ⲉϩⲁϩ ⲛⲧⲉϥϭⲟⲙ ⲁⲛ ⲧⲉ ⲉϥⲓⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲧⲉⲣⲉϥⲕⲟⲧϥ ⲇⲉ ⲙⲡⲉϥϫⲱϩ
>   ⲉⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲛϩⲏⲧⲟⲩ ⲁϥⲙⲉⲕⲙⲟⲩⲕϥ ϫⲉ-ⲉⲓⲉ-ⲟⲩⲗⲓⲃⲉ ⲁⲛ ⲡⲉⲧϣⲟⲟⲡ
>   ⲉⲧⲃⲉ-ⲟⲩ ⲙⲡⲉⲓϥⲓ ⲛⲛⲉⲧⲁⲥⲱⲟⲩ…
> ϣⲟⲙⲧⲉ ⲛⲉⲧⲡⲱ ⲛⲅⲁⲑⲟⲛ ⲛⲉⲧⲕⲏ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ϩⲁϩⲧⲛ-ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲣⲏⲩ…ⲛⲁⲓ
>   ⲉⲩϭⲟϫⲃ ⲉⲛⲉⲩⲉⲣⲏⲩ…
> †ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲃⲟⲗⲏ ⲟⲛ ⲥⲛⲧⲉ ⲟⲩⲉⲓ ⲛⲉ…

> A man was building a place for his use. Many were the stones before him:
>   some large, others small. He saw many that he could not lift. After
>   returning without touching a single one of them, he thought: 'Isn't it
>   crazy? Why didn't I lift the light ones?'…
> Three valuable loads were lying on top of each other, of successively lesser
>   weight (literally 'such as were lesser than each other')…
> Now these two παραβολαί are actually a single one:…

Note the opening presentative constructions, among the most telling fea-
tures of paradigmatic and similitude narratives: they, like Sahidic cleft
patterns, are constructed on the endophoric Nominal Sentence pattern
(cf. Shisha-Halevy 1987: 163–167), but have a non-specific initial sub-
stantive (theme) and a relative *or circumstantial* verbal rheme, in a nexus
predicated of a pragmatic situational theme {ⲡⲉ}.

3.3. *Similitude narratives and tableaux, enframed by* ⲛⲑⲉ *(ⲅⲁⲣ)* ⲛⲟⲩ/
     ϩⲉⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ-…ⲧⲁⲓ *(ⲟⲛ)* ⲧⲉ ⲑⲉ, *'like/as…thus also…'; generic;
     often symbolic or emblematic*

(a) 'Man with Lamps'

Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, K 9313 p. ⲟ (Young 1993:
147):

ⲚⲐⲈ ⲄⲀⲢ ⲚⲞⲨⲢⲰⲘⲈ ⲈⲀϤϪⲠⲞ ⲚϨⲈⲚⲖⲀⲘⲠⲀⲤ. ⲘⲠⲚⲀⲨ ⲈⲦϤⲞⲨⲀϣϤ
Ⲏ ϨⲈⲚϨⲎⲂⲤ ⲈⲦⲢⲈⲨⲢⲞⲨⲞⲈⲒⲚ ⲈⲚⲈⲦϨⲘ-ⲠⲈϨⲎⲒ ⲀⲨⲰ ⲞⲚ ⲀϤϬⲈⲚⲀⲨ
ⲘⲠⲚⲀⲨ ⲈⲦϤⲞⲨⲀϣϤ

ⲚⲦⲈⲒϨⲈ ⲞⲚ ⲀⲠⲚⲞⲨⲦⲈ ⲦⲀⲘⲒⲈ-ⲠⲢⲎ ⲘⲚⲠⲞⲞϨ ⲘⲚⲚⲤⲒⲞⲨ ϨⲘⲠⲈⲞⲨⲞⲈⲒϣ
ⲈⲦⲈϨⲚⲀϤ ⲈⲦⲢⲈⲨⲢ-ⲞⲨⲞⲈⲒⲚ ⲈⲚⲈⲦϣⲞⲞⲠ ⲦⲎⲢⲞⲨ ϨⲒϪⲘ-ⲠⲔⲀϨ
ⲀⲨⲰ ⲞⲚ ⲈϤⲚⲀⲦⲢⲈⲨⲔⲦⲞⲞⲨ ϨⲘⲠⲈⲞⲨⲞⲈⲒϣ ⲈⲦⲈϨⲚⲀϤ ⲠⲢⲎ ⲘⲈⲚ
ⲈⲦⲢⲈϤϣⲰⲠⲈ ⲚⲔⲀⲔⲈ ⲀⲨⲰ ⲠⲞⲞϨ ⲈⲨⲤⲚⲞϤ ⲀⲨⲰ ⲚⲤⲒⲞⲨ ⲈⲦⲚ-
ⲦⲠⲈ ⲈⲦⲘⲦⲢⲈⲨϯ ⲘⲠⲈⲨⲞⲨⲞⲈⲒⲚ

Like a man who produces torches at the time he wants, or lamps, to provide light for those in his house, and he also puts them out[41] at the time he likes.

Thus also God created the sun and the moon and the stars at the time He sees fit, that they may provide light for all that are on earth, and it is at the time He sees fit that He will make them turn, the sun to make it become dark, the moon to make it turn to blood, the stars to cause that they do not shed their light.

This narrative is clearly gnomic. The preterite tense is here either mythical-epic or, just possibly, historical, a cataphoric reflection of the tenor on the vehicle (unless God's act of creation is presented as ongoing!).

(b) 'Stones, Rocks and People'; 'Soldiers and Adversaries'

Leipoldt (1908: 162–163); University of Michigan Library 158, 17 (Young 1993: 76):

ⲚⲐⲈ ⲚϨⲈⲚⲢⲰⲘⲈ ⲈⲀⲨⲤⲰⲔ ⲚϨⲈⲚⲚⲞϬ ⲚⲰⲚⲈ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ ϨⲘⲠϨⲒⲤⲈ
ⲈϨⲢⲀⲒ ⲈϪⲰⲞⲨ ⲈⲀⲨⲞⲨⲰϣϤ ⲚⲚⲈⲨⲔⲈⲈⲤ ⲘⲀⲨⲀⲀⲨ ⲀⲨⲰ ⲈⲀⲨⲞⲨⲈ-
ⲒⲦⲈ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ ⲚⲚⲤⲀⲢⲌ ⲚⲚⲈⲨⲤⲰⲘⲀ ⲘⲘⲒⲚ ⲘⲘⲞⲞⲨ

ⲦⲀⲒ ⲦⲈ ⲐⲈ ⲚⲞⲨⲞⲚ ⲚⲒⲘ ⲈⲦⲢⲚⲞⲂⲈ ⲘⲠⲈⲘⲦⲞ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ ⲘⲠϪⲞⲈⲒⲤ ⲈⲚⲈⲒⲚⲈ
ⲈϨⲢⲀⲒ ⲈϪⲰⲚ ⲘⲀⲨⲀⲀⲚ ⲚϨⲈⲚⲚⲞϬ ⲚⲤⲀϨⲞⲨ...ⲀⲨⲰ ⲈⲚⲤⲰⲔ ⲈϨⲢⲀⲒ
ⲈϪⲰⲚ ⲘⲘⲒⲚ ⲘⲘⲞⲚ ⲚⲚⲤⲀϨⲞⲨ ⲦⲎⲢⲞⲨ ⲚⲚⲈⲄⲢⲀⲫⲎ

ⲀⲨⲰ ⲚⲐⲈ ⲚϨⲈⲚⲢⲰⲘⲈ ⲈⲀⲨⲰⲚⲈ ϨⲈ ⲈϨⲢⲀⲒ ⲈϪⲰⲞⲨ ⲈⲀϤⲢⲀϨⲦⲞⲨ
Ⲉ-ⲠⲈⲤⲎⲦ ⲈϨⲢⲀⲒ ⲈϪⲘ-ⲠⲔⲀϨ ⲀⲨⲰ ⲈⲀϨⲈⲚⲔⲞⲞⲨⲈ ⲦⲞⲖⲘⲀ ⲈⲦⲢⲈⲨⲤⲔⲢⲔ-
ⲰⲢϤ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ ϨⲒϪⲰⲞⲨ ⲈⲀⲨⲤⲞⲔϤ ⲆⲈ ϨⲰⲞⲨ ϨⲚ-ⲦⲈⲨϬⲞⲘ ⲦⲎⲢⲤ
ⲈϨⲢⲀⲒ ⲈϪⲰⲞⲨ ϨⲚ-ⲦⲈⲨⲘⲚⲦⲀⲦⲤⲞⲞⲨⲚ

ⲦⲀⲒ ⲞⲚ ⲦⲈ ⲐⲈ ⲚϨⲈⲚⲢⲰⲘⲈ ⲚϣⲞⲨϣⲞ ⲀⲨⲰ ⲚϪⲀⲤⲒϨⲎⲦ ⲚⲢⲈϤⲢⲚⲞⲂⲈ
ⲚⲦⲀϨⲈ ϨⲰ ⲞⲚ ⲈⲨϯⲤⲂⲰ ⲚϨⲈⲚⲔⲞⲞⲨⲈ...

ⲚⲐⲈ ⲆⲈ ⲚϨⲈⲚⲘⲀⲦⲞⲒ ⲈⲀⲨⲬⲢⲞ ⲈⲚⲈⲦϯ ⲚⲘⲘⲀⲨ ⲎⲘⲠⲠⲞⲖⲈⲘⲞⲤ ϪⲈ-
ⲀⲨⲦⲤⲀⲂⲞⲞⲨ ϨⲒⲦⲚϨⲈⲚⲔⲞⲞⲨⲈ

ⲦⲀⲒ ⲦⲈ ⲐⲈ ⲈϣⲀⲨⲬⲢⲞ ⲈⲚⲈⲨⲬⲀϪⲈ ⲚⲆⲒⲀⲂⲞⲖⲞⲤ ⲈⲦⲢ-ⲠⲞⲖⲈⲘⲞⲤ
ⲚⲘⲘⲀⲨ ⲚϬⲒ-ϨⲈⲚⲢⲰⲘⲈ ⲚⲢⲈϤϪⲒ-ⲤⲂⲰ ⲚⲦⲞⲞⲦⲞⲨ ⲚⲚⲈⲦⲦⲤⲀⲂⲞ
ⲚⲈⲒⲀⲦⲞⲨ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ ϨⲒⲦⲘ-ⲠⲚⲞⲨⲦⲈ ϨⲚ-ⲦⲈⲤⲂⲰ ⲚⲚⲈⲄⲢⲀⲫⲎ

---

[41] Not 'put forth sight', as Young translates (1993: 148 n. 701); this must be an oversight, for the verb ϫ(ⲉ)ⲚⲀ 'quench, put out' is listed in Young's index for the passage in question.

ⲚⲐⲈ ⲆⲈ ⲚϨⲈⲚⲘⲀⲦⲞⲒ ⲈⲀⲨϨⲈ ϨⲘⲠⲈⲘⲖⲀϨ ϨⲀⲢⲀⲦⲞⲨ ⲚⲚⲈⲦϮ ⲚⲘⲘⲀⲨ
ϪⲈ-ⲘⲠⲞⲨⲦⲤⲀⲂⲞⲞⲨ ϨⲒⲦⲚ-ϨⲈⲚⲔⲞⲞⲨⲈ
ⲦⲀⲒ ⲦⲈ ⲐⲈ ⲈϢⲀⲨϨⲈ ϨⲀⲢⲀⲦⲞⲨ ⲚⲚⲈⲨϪⲀϪⲈ ⲚⲤⲀⲦⲀⲚⲀⲤ ⲈⲦϮ ⲞⲨⲂⲎⲨ
ϨⲚⲚⲞⲂⲈ ⲚⲒⲘ ⲚϬⲒ-ϨⲈⲚⲢⲰⲘⲈ ⲚⲀⲦⲤⲰⲦⲘ ⲘⲠⲞⲨⲦⲤⲀⲂⲞⲞⲨ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ
ϨⲒⲦⲚ-ϨⲈⲚⲔⲞⲞⲨⲈ ⲈⲀⲨⲠⲀⲒⲆⲈⲨⲈ Ⲏ̄ⲚⲚⲈⲄⲢⲀⲪⲎ…

Like people who have lugged large rocks from up high down on themselves and have broken their own bones and have wasted away the flesh of their own body —thus also anyone who sins before the Lord: we bring down on ourselves great maledictions…and draw down on ourselves all maledictions of the Scriptures.

And like people on whom a rock has fallen, and has struck them down to earth, and others have ventured to roll it away from them, but have, with all their force, dragged it on top of their own selves in their ignorance —thus also boastful and arrogant, sinful people like myself too, teaching others…

And like soldiers who have overcome their adversaries in combat since they had been instructed by others —thus have they overcome their devilish enemies that do battle with them, people receiving instruction at the hands of those who enlighten them through God with the teaching of the Scriptures.

And like soldiers who have fallen under the feet of their adversaries, since they had not been instructed by others —thus they fall under the feet of their satanic enemies who attack them with sin, disobedient people who have not been instructed by others who were educated in the Scriptures…

I find of interest the tension of tensing and person between the two generic sets, namely the narrative itself and the *hermeneia*: delocutive preterites (ⲀϤ-) in the former, locutive (inclusive! 'you and us') present/ aorist in the latter. Genericity is elemental in both. As I see it, we have in the narrative part primitive dynamic tableaux, rather than true plots.

3.4. *Similitude paradeigma narrative*

'The King's Control'

Leipoldt (1908: 42):

ⲚⲐⲈ ⲚⲞⲨⲢⲰⲘⲈ ⲚⲢⲢⲞ ⲈⲨⲚⲦⲀϤ ⲘⲘⲀⲨ ⲚϨⲈⲚϨⲘϨⲀⲖ ϨⲚⲞⲨⲬⲰⲢⲀ
ⲈⲀϤϪⲞⲞⲨ ⲚⲤⲰⲞⲨ ϨⲘ-ⲠⲤⲎⲨ ⲈⲦⲈϤⲚⲀⲢϨⲚⲀϤ ⲀⲨⲰ ϨⲞⲒⲚⲈ
ⲈⲀϤϪⲞⲞⲨ ⲚⲤⲰⲞⲨ ⲘⲚⲚⲤⲀ-ϨⲈⲚϨⲞⲞⲨ ⲈⲚⲀϢⲰⲞⲨ, ϨⲈⲚⲔⲞⲞⲨⲈ
ⲘⲚⲚⲤⲀ-ϨⲈⲚⲔⲞⲨⲒ ⲚϨⲞⲞⲨ ⲈⲀϤϪⲞⲞⲨ ⲚⲤⲰⲞⲨ, ϨⲈⲚⲔⲞⲞⲨⲈ
ⲈⲀϤϪⲞⲞⲨ ⲚⲤⲰⲞⲨ ϨⲚⲞⲨϬⲈⲠⲎ ⲘⲞⲚⲞⲚ ⲀϤϨⲰⲢⲒϪⲈ ⲚⲞⲨⲚⲞⲘⲞⲤ
ϪⲈ-ⲚⲈⲦⲚⲀⲢ-ⲠⲈϤⲞⲨⲰϢ ϨⲚ-ⲦⲈⲬⲰⲢⲀ ⲈⲦⲘⲘⲀⲨ ϪⲈ-ⲤⲈⲚⲀϪⲒ
ⲚϨⲈⲚⲦⲀⲒⲞ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ ϨⲒⲦⲞⲞⲦϤ ⲚⲈⲦⲚⲀⲀⲐⲈⲦⲈⲒ ⲆⲈ ⲘⲠⲈϤϢⲀϪⲈ
ⲘⲚⲠⲈϤⲞⲨⲰϢ ϤⲚⲀⲦϬⲀⲒⲞⲞⲨ
ⲦⲀⲒ ⲦⲈ ⲐⲈ ⲈⲦⲈⲢⲈⲠⲚⲞⲨⲦⲈ ⲞⲒⲔⲞⲚⲞⲘⲈⲒ ⲘⲠⲢⲰⲘⲈ ⲔⲀⲦⲀⲠⲈⲦⲈϨⲚⲀϤ…

Like a kingly person who has some servants in a certain country, sending for them on the occasion he will see fit; some, sending for them after many days; others, sending for them after a few days; others, sending

for them in a hurry. Besides, he laid down a law that they who will do
his will in that country shall receive honours from him; but they who
will cross his word and his will he shall disgrace.
Even so God directs Man according to his will…

Of interest here is the phrase ⲟⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛⲣⲣⲟ 'a kingly person' (not
ⲟⲩⲣⲣⲟ). Also the broad present, future, preterite temporal palette, with
the preterite conveying factivity (the converter ⲛⲉ- is wholly absent in
rhetorical narratives, except for the imperfect); ⲙⲟⲛⲟⲛ 'however',
'besides'; the proleptic anacoluthon ⲟⲩⲛⲟⲙⲟⲥ ⲭⲉ-…ⲭⲉ-: this is espe-
cially instructive as to the nature of anacoluthia, for the second ⲭⲉ-,
introducing a rhematic constituent, is what stands between the construc-
tion and rhetorical banality, and, moreover, is the only means of isolating
this segment as rhematic.

3.5. *An instance of ainigma: riddle-type (cf. Jolles 1968: 137–149; Kallen
    1981) metaphoric gnomic narrative*

'The Unwatered Mound'

Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna K 9315 ro (Young 2003: 243):

(ⲟⲩⲁⲓⲛⲓⲅⲙⲁ) ⲟⲩⲧⲁⲗ ⲛⲕⲁϩ ⲉϥϫⲟⲥⲉ ⲡⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉϥⲙⲟⲕϩ ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲡ-
ⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲃⲱⲕ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲉϫⲱϥ ⲉⲁⲟⲩⲁ ⲣϩⲛⲁϥ ⲉⲧⲥⲟϥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉϫⲟ
ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ ⲛⲟⲩϭⲣⲟϭ ⲉⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩϥ ⲭⲉ-ⲛⲛⲉϥⲕⲁⲁϥ ⲉϥⲟⲩⲟⲥϥ
ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲟⲩⲇⲉ ⲛⲕⲁϩ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲕⲱⲧⲉ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲟⲩ ⲡⲉⲧⲉϥⲛⲁⲁⲁϥ
ⲁϥϭⲣⲏ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁϥϭⲱϫⲉ ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲣϩⲟⲩⲟ ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ ⲁϥϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲉϥⲙⲟⲧⲛ
ⲉⲧⲥⲟϥ.
ⲧⲁⲓ ϩⲱⲱⲕ ⲧⲉ ⲧⲉⲕϩⲉ…

A mound of high ground, difficult for water to come up over it, one saw fit
to irrigate and sow in it a good seed, so as not to leave it barren, com-
pared to all land surrounding it.[42] What will he do? He has dug and
stripped away the excess and it has become easy to irrigate
—thus you too…

Note the high symbolic character of the action, situation, sequence of
events and participants. Of interest here is also the presentative opening
construction (here and elsewhere, the absence of the converter ⲛⲉ-!).[43]
The non-rhetorical question, in the future tense, breaking into the narra-
tive (probably a distinctive feature of the *ainigma* form) in answered in

---

[42] I take ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲟⲩⲇⲉ- to be the compound preposition ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲟⲩⲧⲉ-; the editor
translates ⲟⲩⲇⲉ as 'and…', with no really negative environment and use for ⲉⲃⲟⲗ.

[43] The editor's translation of the introductory construction by 'Imagine, if you will' is, I
believe, felicitous. Significantly, Young translates the preterites here by an English present
tense: 'he digs and removes the excess earth, and then it becomes easy to water it'.

the latter part of the narrative, which is resumed in the preterite ⲁϥ-. In fact, this unexpected preterite is the main point and the answer of the entire riddle, its rheme.

3.6. *Physiologus-type natural history,*[44] *distinctive and gnomic species-characterization scenario, applied as Similitude*

University of Michigan Library 158, 15a–b p. ⲣⲟⲁ, 15d, p. ⲣⲟⲁ (Young 1993: 150, 153):

ϣⲁⲩϫⲟⲟⲥ ⲇⲉ ⲟⲛ ⲉⲧⲃⲉⲕⲉϩⲱⲟⲛ ϫⲉ-ⲧⲉϥⲕⲁⲕⲓⲁ ϩⲱⲱϥ ⲧⲉ ⲧⲁⲓ.
ϩⲟⲧⲁⲛ ⲉϥϣⲁⲛⲡⲱⲧ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲡⲉⲧⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲉⲃⲟⲡϥ ϣⲁϥⲟⲙⲕϥ
ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲛϥⲕⲱⲧⲉ ⲛⲥⲁ-ⲑⲉ ⲙⲙⲉϩⲣⲱϥ ⲛⲛⲉϥⲙⲉⲗⲟⲥ ⲛϩⲟⲟⲩⲧ
ⲛϥⲁⲁϥ ⲛϭⲱⲃ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϫⲉ-ⲙⲡϥⲣⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲏ ϫⲉ-ⲛϥⲛⲟⲉⲓ ⲁⲛ
ⲛⲧⲉϥⲡⲁⲛⲟⲩⲣⲅⲓⲁ
    ⲧⲁⲓ ⲟⲛ ⲧⲉ ⲑⲉ ⲉϣⲁⲣⲉⲡⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲏ ⲡⲉⲡ̅ⲛ̅ⲁ̅ ⲛⲧⲡⲟⲣⲛⲓⲁ ⲣ-ⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ
    ⲛϭⲱⲃ ⲛϩⲟⲩⲟ ⲇⲉ ⲛⲉⲧϫⲱ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ ϫⲉ-ⲁⲛϯ ⲟⲩⲃⲏϥ…
ⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲟ ⲁⲛ ⲛⲁⲧⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ-ⲧⲉⲙⲟⲩ ϫⲉ-ϣⲁⲥϯϩⲧⲏⲥ ⲉⲡϩⲟ
ⲙⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉϥϭⲱⲃⲉ ⲉϫⲱϥ ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲥⲧⲁⲕⲉ-ⲛⲉϥⲃⲁⲗ ϩⲛ-ⲛⲉⲓⲉⲃ ⲛⲛⲉ-
ⲥⲟⲩⲉⲣⲏⲧⲉ
    ⲧⲁⲓ ⲧⲉ ⲑⲉ ⲉϣⲁⲣⲉⲧⲙⲛⲧⲁⲧϣⲓⲡⲉ ⲙⲡⲥⲁⲧⲁⲛⲁⲥ ⲧⲁⲕⲉ-ⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ
    ⲛⲧⲉⲥⲃⲱ ϩⲛⲛⲃⲁⲗ ⲙ-ⲡϩⲏⲧ…
ϩⲟⲙⲁⲓⲟⲥ ⲟⲛ ⲟⲩⲛ-ⲕⲉϩⲱⲟⲛ ϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲑⲁⲣⲧⲟⲛ ⲉⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩⲡⲙⲟⲩⲓ
ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲡⲭⲱⲣⲉ ϩⲛ-ⲛⲉⲑⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϫⲉ-ⲛⲧⲟϥ ⲙⲉⲛ
ϣⲁϥⲣ-ϩⲟⲧⲉ ⲛⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ ⲇⲉ ⲛⲧⲟϥ ϣⲁϥⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲛⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ
ⲉⲩⲟⲩⲱϣϥ ϩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲱⲃⲉ ⲙⲛⲟⲩⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉϥⲥⲕⲟⲡⲧⲉⲓ (sic) ϩⲱⲥⲧⲉ
ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲩⲣϩⲟⲩⲉⲡⲉⲓⲑⲉ ⲛⲛⲉⲃⲓⲏⲛ ⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲣⲱϩⲧ ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ
ϩⲓⲧⲛ-ⲧⲁⲫⲟⲣⲙⲏ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ

They also say about another animal, that its perniciousness is as follows: whenever it rushes at the one who wishes to catch him, it swallows him into its mouth[45] and tries to bite off his genitals and thus weaken him, because he was not wary of it or because he underestimated its villany.
    Thus also does the thought or the spirit of fornication weaken people, and especially those who say 'We have resisted it'…
No one is ignorant[46] about the cat, that she watches for a man's face, to leap upon it that she might destroy his eyes with the claws of her feet.

---

[44] Fantastic-demonic, zoological or mystic animals or 'beasts': see Young (1993: 157 n. 726). It is of course possible that Shenoute's beasts are 'custom-made', to serve as incorporation vehicles for his ideas, and thus cataphoric to the tenor, in which case the similitude is merely simulated.

[45] Emending ⲉⲣⲟϥ into ⲉ-ⲣⲱϥ. Young translates ϣⲁϥⲟⲙⲕϥ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲣⲟϥ as 'it leaps upon him', implicitly emending the text ⲟⲙⲕϥ, 'swallow him' into ϥϭⲱⲃⲉ, 'leap' (the *hermeneia* has in fact ϥϭⲱⲃⲉ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ). ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲉ- is not attested elsewhere as the object of ⲱⲙⲕ.

[46] A phraseologically focussed, hence rhetorical, alternant of 'everyone knows …'.

> Thus does Satan's shamelessness destroy the light of instruction in the heart's eyes…
Likewise, there is another foul animal, in comparison with which the lion, strongest of all wild animals, is good, for he frightens people;[47] that one, however, brings people down to perdition by joking and mockery, so as all the more to persuade the poor people struck by the same means.

The carrier tense in this and similar cases (this is a common narrative in Shenoute's works) is the aorist, with the conjunctive a sub-link; again, the interface between the aorist and the (negative) preterite is characteristic.

3.7. *Tragic natural-mystical drama experienced by Shenoute in a vision, presented (in Shenoute's emotional perspective) as emblematic dynamic tableaux*

(a) 'The Hapless Victim Falls Prey to Merciless Multiple Predators'

Leipoldt (1908: 209–210):

> ⲕⲉⲍⲱⲟⲛ ⲟⲛ ⲉϥⲡⲣⲉⲓⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲟⲩⲕⲟⲩⲓ ⲏ ⲉϥⲟⲩⲟⲃⲱ ⲁⲓⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲣⲟϥ
> ⲉⲁϥⲉⲓ ⲉⲧⲟⲟⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲱⲙ ⲙⲙⲟϥ ⲉϥⲟⲛϩ ⲉϥϩⲏϣ ⲛⲧⲉⲩⲙⲏⲧⲉ
> ⲉϥⲟⲩⲉϣ-ⲃⲱⲕ ⲛⲧⲟⲟⲧⲟⲩ ⲙⲡϥⲣⲃⲟⲗ ϣⲁⲛⲧⲟⲩⲟ3ⲛⲉϥ
> ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲓⲣ-ⲙⲟⲓϩⲉ ϫⲉ-ⲛⲉⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ ⲡⲉⲧϯ ⲟⲩⲃⲏϥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲥ
> ⲁⲩⲣ-ⲥⲛⲁⲩ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲁ-ⲥⲛⲁⲩ ⲁⲩⲣ-ϣⲟⲙⲛⲧ ⲁⲩⲱ ϥⲧⲟⲟⲩ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙⲏⲧ ⲁⲩⲱ
> ϣⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲟⲩⲙⲏⲏϣⲉ ⲛϩⲍⲟⲟⲛ ⲉⲁⲩⲥⲱⲟⲩϩ ⲉϫⲱϥ ϣⲁⲛⲧϥⲙⲟⲩ.
>
> Another animal, somewhat luminous or white, I saw falling into the hands of those who eat it alive, trying, in distress, to escape them. It did not break free until they finished it off.
> And I was astonished, for it was a single one that attacked it, and then they became two, and, after two, they became three, and four, and ten, and hundred, and a multitude of animals who gathered against it to kill it.

Note that in this remarkable short text, hardly a story, two conjoint narratives are skillfully made to unfold: first, the victim's; second, in the observant Shenoute's focalization, and initially in a Comment Mode focussing Cleft Sentence, the instantaneous —and unnatural, not to say mystical— multiplication of the murderous enemies; both narratives converge in the destruction of the helpless victim. Neither the devoured animal nor its destroyers are specified by name; this is a usual, rhetorically significant practice of Shenoute's, who thus enhances the implicit genericity and intensifies the apocalyptic horror of the scene. The victim,

---

[47] Young (1993: 158) translates ϣⲁϥⲣ-ϩⲟⲧⲉ ⲛⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ as 'he is afraid of people'; I believe, however, that both content (opposition to 'bring down to Hell by laughter and jest') and form (ⲛ-, not ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ- as object) agree with an active 'frighten'.

characterized as 'shining' and 'bright' (hence good and innocent), is helpless against the countless evil devourers. Consider also the subsequent natural-history tableau, 'Animal in Total Confusion is Brought to a Sorry Pass', which evolves into a full apocalyptic vision (Leipoldt 1908: 210–211).

Of syntactical interest here is the introductory focalizing (not topicalizing!) extraposition. The preterite here is a true historical tense, as an experienced story established by ⲀⲒⲚⲀⲨ, 'I saw'; hence the converter ⲚⲈ, as a rule absent in the narrative relative-topic Cleft Sentence. Still, there is an implied genericity which is requisite for the mystic symbolism of the action and emblematic status of the participants.

(b) 'Earthly Creature Unexpectedly Defeats Heavenly Creature'

Leipoldt (1908: 44):

> ⲈⲒϨⲘⲞⲞⲤ ⲀⲚⲞⲔ ϨⲒϪⲚ-ⲞⲨⲦⲞⲞⲨ — ⲠⲈϪⲈⲠⲈⲦϪⲰ ⲚⲚⲀⲒ — ⲀⲒⲚⲀⲨ
> ⲈⲨϪⲰⲞⲚ ⲈϤϨⲀ-ⲠⲀⲎⲢ ⲈϤⲘⲒϢⲈ ⲘⲚⲔⲈϨⲰⲞⲚ ⲈϤϨⲒϪⲘ-ⲠⲔⲀϨ
> ⲀⲒⲢ-ⲞⲨⲚⲞϬ ⲚⲢⲀϢⲈ ϪⲈ-ⲀⲠⲈⲦϨⲎⲖ ϬⲘ-ϬⲞⲘ ⲈϪⲘ-ⲠⲈⲦⲘⲞⲞϢⲈ
> ϨⲒϪⲘ-ⲠⲔⲀϨ ⲘⲚⲚⲤⲀ-ⲞⲨⲀⲠⲢⲎⲦⲈ ⲆⲈ ⲀⲠϨⲰⲞⲚ ⲈⲦϨⲒϪⲘ-ⲠⲔⲀϨ
> ⲔⲦⲞϤ ⲈϪⲘ-ⲠⲈⲦϨⲎⲖ ⲀϤⲀⲘⲀϨⲦⲈ ⲘⲘⲞϤ ⲀϤⲢ-ϪⲞⲈⲒⲤ ⲈⲢⲞϤ
> ⲚⲤⲞⲫⲞⲤ ⲚⲀⲈⲒⲘⲈ ϪⲈ-ⲠⲈⲒϢⲀϪⲈ ⲠⲀ-ϨⲀⲒⲢⲈⲦⲒⲔⲞⲤ ⲚⲒⲘ ⲠⲈ ⲈⲦⲞ ⲚϨⲎⲦ
> ⲤⲚⲀⲨ...

> I, sitting on a hill —says he who is telling this— saw an animal hanging in the air, fighting another animal being on land. I rejoiced greatly, for the flying one prevailed over the one that was walking on land; but, in a minute, the animal that was on land turned on the flying one, took hold of it and overpowered it.
> The wise will understand that this refers to all double-hearted heretics…

This type of mythical narrative is laconic, emblematic and skeletal. Indeed, it is enigmatic; the opening topos —'I, sitting on a hill, saw'[48]— confirms it as a visionary narrative. The teller's participation here is minimal and purely passive, compared with narratives in which it is Shenoute himself who wrestles with the supernatural beings (e.g. Leipoldt 1908: 38–39, cf. 3.8 below). The *locutive* 'the one who tells this', actually 'I who relate this', is remarkable and rhetorically effective, displacing the speaker and thereby contributing to the mystic nature of the passage. Both narratives peak in an unexpected turn of events (unexpected at least for the seer), announced by ⲘⲚⲚⲤⲀ-.

---

[48] The hill or 'mountain' in Egyptian and Coptic (and as a general symbol) is the fringe and limit of civilization, as well as being beyond it; it is the haunt of the inhuman and evil, an interface with, and vantage point for, the Other World.

3.8. *Mystical Personal Vision*[49] *and Prefiguration Narratives*

(a) Shenoute wrestling with the demon

Leipoldt (1908: 38):

ⲉⲓⲥ-ⲟⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉϥϫⲓ ⲙⲡⲉⲥⲙⲟⲧ ⲛ(ⲟⲩ)ⲉⲝⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ ⲉⲁⲩⲧⲛⲛⲟⲟⲩϥ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ
ϩⲓⲧⲙ-ⲡⲉⲧⲟ ⲛⲛⲟϭ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲁϥϫⲱⲧⲉ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ϩⲛ-ⲣⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲛⲉⲓⲧⲟⲡⲟⲥ
ⲁϫⲛ-ϣⲓⲛⲉ ⲉⲣⲉⲕⲉⲟⲩⲁ ⲟⲩⲏϩ ⲛⲥⲱϥ, ϩⲱⲥ ⲉϥϫⲉ-ⲉϥϩⲁⲣⲁⲧϥ ϩⲱⲱϥ
ⲙⲡⲁⲓ ⲁϥⲁⲙⲁϩⲧⲉ ⲙⲙⲟⲓ ⲉⲓⲡⲁⲣⲁⲅⲉ ϩⲛ-ⲛϩⲓⲣ ⲛⲛⲉⲓⲧⲟⲡⲟⲥ ⲉⲓⲙⲟⲕϩ
ⲛϩⲏⲧ ⲉϫⲛ-ⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛⲗⲟⲓⲙⲟⲥ ⲉⲧⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲁϥⲁⲣⲭⲉⲓ ⲛϭⲓ-ⲧⲉϥϭⲓϫ
ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲉⲣⲟⲓ ⲉⲣ-ⲡⲟⲗⲉⲙⲟⲥ ⲛⲙⲙⲁⲓ ⲉϥⲟ ⲛⲑⲉ ⲙⲡⲉⲧϥⲓ-ⲣⲟⲟⲩϣ
ϩⲁ-ⲛⲉⲧⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ϩⲱⲱⲧ ⲁⲓϯ ⲟⲩⲃⲏϥ ϩⲱⲥⲧⲉ ⲉⲧⲣⲁϭⲧ ⲙⲙⲟϥ
ϩⲙ-ⲡⲉϩⲛⲁⲁϩ ⲉⲧⲕⲧⲏⲩ ⲉ-ⲡⲉϥⲙⲁⲕϩ ⲏ ⲉⲧϩⲓ-ⲧⲉϥⲛⲁϩⲃ ⲉⲓϫⲱ ⲛⲛⲉⲓ-
ϣⲁϫⲉ ⲛϯⲣϩⲟⲧⲉ ⲁⲛ ϩⲟⲗⲱⲥ ⲟⲩⲇⲉ ⲛϯϣⲧⲣⲧⲱⲣ ⲁⲛ ⲁⲓϫⲛⲟⲩϥ ϫⲉ-
ⲛⲧⲕⲟⲩⲟⲩ ⲁϩⲣⲟⲕ ⲕϩⲏⲡ ⲙⲡⲕⲟⲩⲱⲛϩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉϣϫⲉ-ⲛⲧⲕ-ⲟⲩⲡ̄ⲛ̄ⲁ̄ ⲏ
ⲟⲩⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ ⲉⲁϥⲉⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲓⲧⲙ-ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ϩⲱⲱⲧ ⲁⲛⲅ-ⲡⲉϥϩⲙϩⲁⲗ
ⲁⲩⲱ ⲕⲁⲛ ⲉⲕϣⲁⲛϭⲱ ⲛϯⲛⲁϭⲱ ⲁⲛ ⲏ ⲛⲅⲧⲁⲙⲟⲓ ⲉϣϫⲉ-ⲛⲧⲁⲩⲧⲛ-
ⲛⲟⲟⲩⲕ ϫⲉ-ⲉⲛⲉ-ⲛⲧⲟⲟⲩ ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁⲩⲣ-ⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲉⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ϫⲛ-ⲁⲛⲟⲛ ⲡⲉⲛ-
ⲧⲁⲛⲣ-ⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲉⲣⲟϥ…ⲙⲙⲟⲛ ⲛϯⲛⲁⲕⲁⲁⲕ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲁⲛ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ϯⲛⲁⲙⲓϣⲉ
ⲟⲩⲃⲏⲕ ⲛϩⲟⲩⲟ ⲉⲛϩⲟⲥⲟⲛ ⲉⲓϫⲱ ⲛⲛⲁⲓ ⲙⲛϩⲉⲛⲕⲟⲟⲩⲉ ⲁϥϣⲱϫⲉ
ⲛⲙⲙⲁⲓ ⲉϥⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲉⲣⲃⲟⲗ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲁⲓϣⲱϫⲉ ⲛⲙⲙⲁϥ ⲁⲓϭⲙ-ϭⲟⲙ
ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲏ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲉϫⲱϥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲧⲉⲣⲉϥⲣ-ⲑⲉ ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲉⲧⲁ ⲟⲓ
ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲁⲓⲣⲁϩⲧϥ ⲛⲧⲟϥ ⲉϫⲙ-ⲡⲕⲁϩ ⲁⲓⲁⲙⲁϩⲧⲉ ⲉϫⲛ-ⲧⲉϥⲙⲉⲥⲧϩⲏⲧ
ϩⲛⲛⲁⲟⲩⲉⲣⲏⲧⲉ ⲉⲓⲁϩⲉⲣⲁⲧ ⲉⲓⲙⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲟⲩⲃⲉ-ⲛⲉⲥⲛⲏⲩ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ
ⲙⲡⲁⲕⲱⲧⲉ ⲉⲩϭⲱϣⲧ ⲛⲥⲱⲓ ϩⲙⲡⲉⲓⲁⲅⲱⲛ ⲧⲏⲣϥ ϫⲉ-ϭⲱⲡⲉ ⲛⲁⲓ
ⲙⲡⲉⲓⲕⲉⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲉⲓⲙⲟⲕⲙⲉⲕ ⲅⲁⲣ ϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲛϩⲏⲧ ϫⲉ-ⲟⲩⲁⲧⲃⲟⲙ ⲡⲉ
ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲣⲱⲙⲉ ϭⲣⲟ ⲉⲡ̄ⲛ̄ⲁ̄ ⲏ ⲉⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ ⲛⲧⲉⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ…ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲥ-ⲛⲉ
ⲙⲡⲉⲥⲛⲁⲩ ⲁⲅⲟⲩⲱⲛϩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲧⲁⲭⲩ ϫⲉ-ϩⲉⲛⲇⲁⲓⲙⲟⲛⲓⲟⲛ ⲛⲉ…

Behold a man taking the form of authority, sent by one greater than himself;
he has penetrated into the gates of the monastery (literally 'these places')
without leave, with another following him as if he, for his part, was in
submission to this one. He caught hold of me as I was passing in the streets
of the monastery (literally 'these places'), troubled at heart because of those
pestilent persons; he began raising his hand against me, to fight me, with
the air of caring for those. I, in turn, attacked him, in order to strangle him
with the object he had around his neck (or over his nape), saying these
words: 'I am not at all afraid, nor am I perturbed'. I asked him: 'What are
you? Why do you hide, and have not shown yourself? If you are a spirit or
an angel who has come from God, I myself, I too am His servant; and even
if you desist, I won't, until you tell me, if indeed you have been sent,
whether it is they that have sinned unto God or it is we that have sinned
unto Him…. Otherwise, I will not let you go, but fight you even more'.
While I am saying these and other things, he wrestled with me, trying to
break free, and I, too, wrestled with him; I prevailed against him (or over

him), and when he appeared to overthrow me, I knocked *him* down on the
ground and pinned down his chest with my feet, standing and calling out to
the brethren I see around me, watching me throughout this entire contest:
'Catch me that other one!', for I was considering in my mind that it is
impossible for a human being to win against a spirit or an angel of God…
and thus, in fact, they both turned immediately out to be demons.

Shenoute's struggle with the demonic creature, even to the forcible inter-
rogation as to his identity, is clearly modelled on Jacob's wrestling with
the Angel (Gen.32:25–26), a famous case of enigmatic dream-like nar-
rative or narrative fragment, much commented on by narratologists. The
theme of Shenoute defending his establishment against disguised satanic
and demonic infiltration —indeed, standing between his congregations
and the devil— is prominent in his rhetoric, and is the most immediate
signifié of the present narrative.

Note the presentative introduction by ⲉⲓⲥ- (ⲉⲓⲥ also introduces the
dénouement) to a fully-fledged, past-tense narrated violent mystical
experience, in a narrative rich in forms (including ⲁϥ- as main carrier,
ⲛⲉϥ-, ⲛⲧⲉⲣⲉϥ-, ⲉⲓⲥ-ⲛⲉ…ⲁⲩ-, ⲉϥ-) and details, descriptive segments,
Comment Mode segments. Note also the narrativizing ⲡⲉⲭⲉ-, which
establishes a framework hierarchy and marks the vision as part of an
enframing narrative; the cataphoric deixis in ⲛⲉⲓϣⲁϫⲉ, without ϫⲉ- to
introduce the direct speech; three focalizations in a row —nexus focussed
in ⲉϣϫⲉ-ⲛⲧⲁⲩⲧⲛⲛⲟⲟⲩⲕ, contrastive focalization of actants in cleft
sentences following; the resulting marked by the presentative ⲉⲓⲥ- in the
special construction with the thematic enclitic ⲛⲉ rhematizing or focuss-
ing a preterite clause.

(b) *Apocalypsis Sinuthii*: selections from a 'vision diary' (by Shenoute?
    Cf. Emmel 2004: vol. 2, 903)

Leipoldt (1913: 198–199):

> ⲁⲓⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲟⲩⲁ ϩⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲁϥⲧⲱⲟⲩⲛ ⲁϥⲁⲥⲡⲁⲍⲉ ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲁϥⲥⲙⲟⲩ
> ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ ⲁⲓⲥⲱⲧⲙ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲉϥⲧⲁⲩⲟ ⲛ̄ϩⲉⲛϣⲁϫⲉ ⲙⲡⲉⲓⲉⲓⲙⲉ ϫⲉ-
> ϩⲉⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲉ ⲁϩⲟⲓⲛⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲟⲩⲱϣⲃ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧϩⲙⲟⲟⲥ ϫⲉ-ⲉϥⲥⲙⲟⲩ
> ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲥⲡⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲛ̄ⲧϩⲉⲃⲣⲁⲓⲟⲥ ⲁⲓϣⲓⲛⲉ ⲇⲉ ϫⲉ-ⲛⲓⲙ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲁⲓ
> ⲡⲉϫⲁⲩ ϫⲉ-ⲡⲁⲓ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲁⲩⲗⲟⲥ ⲡⲁⲡⲟⲥⲧⲟⲗⲟⲥ ⲛⲧⲟϥ ⲟⲛ ⲡⲉⲧⲉ-
> ϣⲁϥⲥⲙⲟⲩ ⲉⲛⲉⲧⲛⲁⲣ̄ϣⲟⲣⲡ ⲉⲡⲥⲱⲟⲩϩ ⲉⲧⲙⲉⲗⲉⲧⲁ ϩⲛ̄-ⲛⲉⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ
> ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ
> †ϩⲟⲙⲟⲗⲟⲅⲉⲓ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ ϫⲉ-ϣⲁⲓⲛⲁⲩ ⲉϩⲟⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲉⲩⲙⲉⲗⲉⲧⲁ ϩⲛ̄-ⲟⲩⲟⲩⲣⲟⲧ
> ⲙ̄ⲛⲟⲩϩⲙⲟⲧ ϣⲁⲓⲛⲁⲩ ⲉ-ⲡⲉⲧⲉⲡⲱϣ ⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ϫⲱⲱⲙⲉ ⲉϥⲧⲁⲩⲟ ⲛⲟⲩ-
> ⲙⲏⲏϣⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲙⲟⲩ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲉϫⲱⲓ ⲁⲩⲱ ϣⲁⲓⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲛⲉⲩⲯⲩⲭⲏ ⲉⲩϫⲓ-
> ⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ϩⲓⲧⲛ̄-ⲛⲉⲃⲣⲏϭⲉ ⲉⲧⲛⲏⲩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ̄-ⲛ̄ϣⲁϫⲉ ⲙⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ…

ⲡⲉⲓϩⲱⲃ ⲛⲧⲁⲓⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ϩⲙⲡⲉⲃⲟⲧ ⲉⲡⲏⲡ ⲁⲓⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲩⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲉϥϩⲁⲡⲉⲥⲏⲧ
ⲙⲡⲉⲥⲧⲉⲣⲉⲱⲙⲁ ⲉⲩⲛ-ϩⲉⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ ϩⲣⲁⲓ ϩⲓϫⲙ-ⲡⲕⲁϩ ⲉⲩⲣϩⲏⲃⲉ
ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲩⲗⲩⲡⲉⲓ ϫⲉ-ⲛⲉⲩⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲉⲥⲱ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲙ-ⲡⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲁⲓⲛⲁⲩ
ⲉⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉϥⲁϩⲉⲣⲁⲧϥ ϩⲓϫⲱϥ ⲉϥⲧⲁⲁⲧⲉ ⲛⲑⲉ ⲙⲡⲣⲏ ⲉϥⲟⲩⲱϣ
ⲁⲛ ⲉϯ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲁⲩⲧⲥⲁⲃⲟⲓ ⲇⲉ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲛⲟⲩⲏⲡⲥ ⲛⲥⲟⲡ ⲉⲣⲉⲛⲉⲧϩⲓ-
ⲡⲕⲁϩ ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉⲓ ⲉⲣⲉⲡⲉⲧϩⲓϫⲛ-ⲙⲙⲟⲩⲛⲉⲓⲟⲟⲩⲉ ⲁⲙⲁϩⲧⲉ
ⲉϫⲱⲟⲩ ⲁⲓⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲡⲧⲱϣ ⲙⲡⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲛϩⲁϩ ⲛⲥⲟⲡ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲙⲡⲓⲛⲁⲩ
ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲉⲛⲉϩ ⲛⲑⲉ ⲙⲡⲉⲓⲥⲟⲡ ⲉϥⲟ ⲙⲡⲉⲓⲥⲙⲟⲧ
ⲛⲧⲉⲣⲉⲛⲡⲱϩ ⲇⲉ ⲉⲡⲉⲃⲟⲧ ⲙⲉⲥⲱⲣⲉ ⲁⲓⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉϥⲕⲱ ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ
ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ϭⲟⲡⲉ ϭⲟⲡⲉ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲥ ⲁⲓⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲩⲛⲟⲃ ⲛⲁϩⲱϥ ⲛϩⲙⲙⲉ
ⲉϥⲛⲏⲩ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲁ-ⲡⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲁϥⲉⲓ ⲉⲡⲉⲥⲏⲧ ⲉϫⲛ-ⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ
ⲙⲛⲛⲧⲃⲛⲟⲟⲩⲉ ⲡⲉϫⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲩ ϫⲉ-ⲟⲩ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲉⲓⲕⲱϩⲧ ⲡⲉϫⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲓ
ϫⲉ-ⲡⲁⲓ ⲟⲩϣⲱⲛⲉ ⲡⲉ ⲙⲛⲟⲩⲙⲟⲩ
ⲁϩⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲓ ϣⲁⲣⲟⲓ ϩⲛ-ⲛⲉϩⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ-ⲛⲉⲩⲧⲃⲛⲟⲟⲩⲉ
ϫⲉ-ⲙⲉϣⲁⲕ ⲉⲛⲧⲁⲩⲣ-ϩⲓⲕ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ ⲡⲉϫⲁⲓ ϫⲉ-ⲙⲙⲟⲛ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲧϭⲓϫ
ⲙⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲧⲉ

I saw one of the saints. He arose and greeted them; he blessed them. I heard
him uttering words I did not understand; some answered those sitting:
'It's in the Hebrew language that he is blessing them (or: 'you')'.
I asked: 'Who is this?'; they said: 'This is the Apostle Paul. It is also
he that is wont to bless those who come first (or: hasten) to the assem-
bly, who meditate on the Holy Writ.'

I avow to you that I see some, meditating with zeal and grace; I see Him,
whose Book it is, conferring a multitude of blessings, and I saw their
souls illuminated by the lightnings coming out of God's words.

It was in the month of Epep that I saw the following thing. I saw a body of
water below the firmament, with people up on earth grieving and dis-
tressed, for they wished to drink of the water. I saw a man standing upon
(the water), shining like the sun, refusing to give them any. He was
pointed out to me a number of times, those on land begging, the one on
the waters having power over them. I saw the ordinance of the water
many times, but have never seen it like this time, in this form.

When we reached the month Mesore, I saw the man releasing the water
(literally 'them') in small quantities. Then I saw a great hot steam
rising after the water; it descended on the people and farm animals.
I said to them: 'What is this fire?' They said to me: 'It's malady and
death'.

Some people approached me those days about their farm animals, suggest-
ing that they had probably been bewitched; I said: 'No, it's rather God's
hand.'

In this progressive account, the recurrence of ⲛⲁⲩ 'see' is significant: it
pushes the report forward; it is also meant to lend the story credibility as
a truly experienced, in a 'live', almost performative kind of reporting.
Noteworthy here is also the asyndetic syntax of the carrier ⲁϥ- (ⲇⲉ is
the connector of narrative blocks or chunks).

The aorist recurs in one highlighted paragraph as ϣⲁⲓⲛⲁⲩ 'I see', apparently non-concatenating, a form the function of which here is not clear to me, but seems at any rate to be a marked form of 'I saw' (I see a connection with the opening †ϩⲟⲙⲟⲗⲟⲅⲉⲓ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ 'I aver / avow to you'). We may glimpse here the role of the locutive aorist, a role well attested in non-literary Coptic, especially legal, magical and similarly ritual textemes, expressing promise, pledging, threat, modally conspicuous by *absolute assurance* (Green 1987: 65–66). Such certainty or assurance as to the truth of the facts may apply in our case. Alternatively, ϣⲁⲓ- here may be a zoom-in signal, introducing detailed, enhanced, as it were a single 'freezing' or 'panning' shot.[50] At any rate, it cannot be generic or habitual, or apodotic-sequelling.

The articulating role of ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲥ 'afterwards' seems to be comparable to that of the episode-initial demonstrative adverbs of the 'then' type in many languages.[51] The rhetorical 'envelope' focussing in ⲙⲉϣⲁⲕ ⲉⲛⲧⲁⲩⲣ-ϩⲓⲕ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ, expressing a subjective claim discredited by the author, is typically Shenoutean (Shisha-Halevy 1986: 77–79). I find remarkable the pinpointing of the visions to the calendric points of reference, and the resulting expression of temporal developments in the transcendent world.

3.9. *Manners- and character-depicting dynamic similitude tableaux*

Leipoldt (1908: 110):

ⲙⲁⲗⲓⲥⲧⲁ ⲁⲓⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲩⲁⲣⲭⲱⲛ ⲛⲁⲏⲕⲁⲥⲧⲏⲥ (sic) ⲉⲣⲉⲛⲉϥϩⲙϩⲁⲗ
†-ⲃⲏⲧ ⲉⲧⲟⲟⲧϥ ⲉϥϣⲁⲛⲣ-ⲟⲩⲉⲓ ⲛⲥⲓϣϥ ⲥⲓϣϥ ⲛϥⲗⲉϥⲗⲱϥⲥ
ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲉⲡⲕⲁϩ ⲡⲁⲗⲓⲛ ⲟⲛ ϣⲁⲩ†ⲕⲉⲟⲩⲉⲓ ⲉⲧⲟⲟⲧϥ
ⲁⲓⲛⲁⲩ ⲇⲉ ⲟⲛ ⲉⲕⲉⲟⲩⲁ ⲛ†ⲙⲓⲛⲉ ⲛⲧⲉⲣⲉϥⲥⲱⲛⲧ ⲛⲥⲁⲟⲩϩⲛⲁⲁⲩ ⲉⲣ-
ⲛⲉⲓⲙⲛⲧⲥⲟϭ ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲩ†-ⲕⲉⲟⲩⲁ ⲉⲧⲉϥϫⲓϫ
ⲡⲁⲓ ⲇⲉ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲙⲁⲉⲓⲛ ⲙⲡϩⲏⲧ ⲛϩⲁϩ ⲛⲁⲣⲅⲟⲥ…

What's more, I saw a magistrate judge whose servants put a palm-leaf[52] in his hand: whenever he reduces it to small fragments and crumbles it onto the ground, they put another in his hand.

And I also saw another of this kind, who, when he has looked at an object to do such stupid things with it, they put another in his hand.

This is the characteristic trait of the heart of many lazy ones…

---

[50] Interpretation suggested by E. Grossman.

[51] Cf. Brinton (1993). A grammaticalized 'after…' phrase has early antecedents in pre-Coptic Egyptian.

[52] In Coptic, a generic *zero* article here, in a compound verb: 'palm-leaf-put'.

Noteworthy here is the genericity of the sequenced events interfaced with the 'historical' ⲁⲓⲛⲁⲩ 'I have seen/I saw'. Thus, the aorist ϣⲁⲩϯ as narrative peak or key event in the first episode corresponds (and stands in tension) to ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲩϯ in the second. ⲡⲁⲗⲓⲛ ⲟⲛ is a boundary signal, introducing the narrative peak. Note the superordinating (and similarly peak-marking) ⲁⲩⲱ.

3.10. *Shenoute's personal narrativized reflections on tension in the monastery*

Leipoldt (1908: 147):

> ϩⲁϩ ⲛⲥⲟⲡ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ-ⲛⲉⲧⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲉⲁⲓϫⲟⲟⲥ ϩⲙⲡⲁϩⲏⲧ ϩⲛⲟⲩⲗⲩⲡⲏ
> ⲉⲧⲣⲁⲟⲩⲱⲙ ⲙⲡⲁⲟⲉⲓⲕ ⲛⲥⲁ-ⲟⲩⲥⲁ ⲉⲉⲓⲡⲟⲣϫ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛⲧⲥⲩⲛⲁⲅⲱⲅⲏ
> ⲧⲏⲣⲥ ϩⲱⲥ-ϫⲁϫⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲉⲓϥⲓ ⲙⲡⲣⲟⲟⲩϣ ⲙⲡⲁⲧⲱϣ ϩⲱⲥ-ϣⲙⲙⲟ
> ⲡⲁⲗⲓⲛ ⲇⲉ ⲟⲛ ⲛⲉⲓϫⲓ-ϣⲟϫⲛⲉ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲙⲁⲩⲁⲁⲧ ϫⲉ-ⲛⲛⲁϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲟⲛ
> ⲛⲥⲕⲁⲛⲇⲁⲗⲟⲛ ⲛⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲧⲉⲓⲙⲓⲛⲉ ϩⲙ-ⲡⲉⲓⲕⲉϩⲱⲃ ⲛϩⲟⲩⲟ ⲇⲉ
> ⲛⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲁⲛ ⲡⲉ ⲉⲗⲩⲡⲉⲓ ⲛⲛⲉⲥⲛⲏⲩ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲙⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ…

> Often, because of those people, I have said in my heart, painfully, that I should eat my bread apart, separated from the entire congregation, like an enemy, and taking care of my own affairs like a stranger; but then I took counsel with myself, that I should not be a stumbling-stone unto those in this matter too, and, moreover, I did not wish to distress all observant brethren…

Note here the special Shenoutean introductory Cleft Sentence (a distinct rhetorical signal: Shisha-Halevy 1987: 172–175) opening Evolution Mode, ⲛⲉⲓ- for enhanced or zoom-in Evolution Mode, in opposition to ⲛⲉⲓ- ⲁⲛ ⲡⲉ (psychological information) in Comment Mode. This is a case of highly personal focalization (in the narratological sense of the term). Here again, ⲡⲁⲗⲓⲛ ⲟⲛ, a boundary signal, marks narrative peak or key event.

3.11. *Shenoute's sarcastic version of resentment against him in the monastery*

Leipoldt (1908: 144–145):

> …ⲕⲁⲓ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲁⲩⲣ-ⲡⲉⲩϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲁⲩⲡⲱⲧ ⲛⲧⲟⲟⲧ ⲉⲉⲓϫⲓ ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲛϭⲟⲛⲥ
> ϩⲱⲥ ⲧⲩⲣⲁⲛⲛⲟⲥ ⲁⲩⲃⲱⲕ ⲉⲡⲙⲁ ⲉⲧⲉϩⲛⲁⲩ ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲇⲉ ⲛⲉⲓⲟ
> ⲙⲡⲁϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲁⲛ ⲡⲉ ⲉⲧⲣⲁⲡⲱⲧ ⲛⲧⲟⲟⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲛⲉⲧϫⲓ ⲙⲙⲟⲓ ⲛϭⲟⲛⲥ
> ϩⲛⲧⲉⲩⲙⲛⲧⲁⲧⲥⲱⲧⲙ ⲙⲛⲛⲉⲩⲕⲉϩⲃⲏⲩⲉ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲉⲧϩⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲉⲓⲣⲉ
> ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲛϭⲓ-ⲛⲉⲧⲙⲙⲁⲩ

> For they became self-sufficient and escaped me, ill-treating them like a tyrant, and went off wherever they want; I, however, I was not self-sufficient

to escape those who ill-treat me in their disobedience and all their other evil
deeds which they do, those persons.

Of interest here is the rhetorically potent contrastive juxtaposition of Evo-
lution Mode preterite and internal-focalization ('inner-voice') Comment
Mode.

3.12. *Prospective enjoined scenario ('Testamentum Sinuthii'), narrating
injunction, prophecy and prediction, laced with autobiographical
narrative*

Leipoldt (1913: 204–206), selection:

...ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ϯⲛⲁϩⲱⲛ ⲟⲛ ⲉⲧⲟⲟⲧⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲩϩⲁⲣⲉϩ ⲉ-ⲛⲁϩⲟⲉⲓⲧⲉ
ⲉⲛⲧⲁⲓⲡⲁϩⲟⲩ ⲛϩⲁϩ ⲛⲥⲟⲡ ⲉⲁⲓⲁⲁⲩ ⲙⲡⲟⲃⲉ ⲥⲛⲧⲉ ⲉⲡϩⲁⲉ ⲉⲓⲙⲟⲕϩ
ⲛϩⲏⲧ ⲉⲙⲁⲧⲉ ϣⲁϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲉⲡⲙⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ-ⲡⲁⲓ ϯⲛⲁϩⲱⲛ ⲉⲧⲟⲟⲧⲟⲩ
ⲛⲛⲉⲥⲛⲏⲩ ⲉⲧⲟ ⲛⲟⲩϩⲏⲧ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ ⲛⲙⲙⲁⲛ ⲛⲉⲧϣⲟⲟⲡ ϩⲛ-ⲛⲉϩⲟⲟⲩ
ⲙⲡⲁⲙⲟⲩ <u>ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲩⲕⲱ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲛⲛⲁϩⲟⲓⲧⲉ ⲉⲧⲡⲏϩ</u> ⲙⲡⲉⲙⲧⲟ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ
ⲛⲛⲉⲧⲛⲏⲩ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲛ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲥⲱⲧⲙ ϩⲙ-ⲡⲉⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓϣ
ⲉⲧⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲏ ⲟⲛ ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲛϣⲁϫⲉ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲥⲏϩ ϩⲙ-ⲡϫⲱⲱⲙⲉ
ⲉⲧⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲏ ⲛⲉⲧⲥⲏϩ ϩⲛ-ⲛⲉⲓⲉⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲗⲏ ⲉⲛⲧⲁⲛⲥⲁϩⲟⲩ ⲏ
ⲛⲉⲧⲛⲛⲁⲥⲁϩⲟⲩ <u>ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲥⲉⲭⲟⲟⲥ</u> ϫⲉ-ⲟⲩ ⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲓϩⲟⲉⲓⲧⲉ ⲉⲧⲡⲏϩ
ⲙⲛⲛⲉⲓϣⲁϫⲉ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲥⲏϩ ⲙⲛⲛⲉⲓⲥⲁϩⲟⲩ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ <u>ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲩⲉⲟⲩ-
ⲱϣⲃ ⲛⲥⲉⲭⲟⲟⲥ</u> ϫⲉ-ⲁⲡⲉⲧϭⲱϣⲧ ⲉϫⲙ-ⲡⲕⲁϩ ⲧⲏⲣϥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉⲧⲡⲁⲣ-
ⲁⲅⲉ ϩⲛ-ⲧⲟⲓⲕⲟⲩⲙⲉⲛⲏ ⲧⲏⲣⲥ...ⲉⲧⲉⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲡⲉ ⲁϥϭⲱϣⲧ ϩⲱⲱⲛ
ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲉϫⲱⲛ ⲛⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓϣ ϩⲛ-ⲟⲩϩⲱⲡ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁϥⲡⲁⲣⲁⲅⲉ ⲛⲛⲉⲛⲥⲩⲛⲁ-
ⲅⲱⲅⲏ ⲛϩⲁϩ ⲛⲥⲟⲡ...ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲩⲉⲭⲟⲟⲥ ϫⲉ-ϩⲙ ⲡⲉⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓϣ ⲉⲧⲙⲙⲁⲩ
ⲁϥⲛⲟⲩϭⲥ ⲉⲣⲟⲛ ⲉⲙⲁⲧⲉ ⲛϭⲓ-ⲡϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ϩⲛ-ⲟⲩⲛⲟϭ ⲛⲟⲣⲅⲏ ⲁⲩⲱ
ⲁϥⲕⲧⲉ-ⲡⲉϥϩⲟ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲙⲙⲟⲛ...

But I hereby enjoin unto them, that they keep my clothes, which I often tore
up, finally reducing them into two pieces, grieving greatly, unto death. That
is why I enjoin unto the brethren that are of one mind with us, they who
live in the days of my death, that they deposit my torn clothes before those
who come after us, and anyone who will be attentive at those times and also
now to all the words written in that book or those written in these epistles
which we have written or which we shall write; and they shall say: 'What
are these torn clothes, and all these written words, and all these maledic-
tions?' And they shall answer and say: 'He who watches over the entire
land and who passes through the whole world, that is, God, has watched
over us also at some time, and has often passed through our congrega-
tions…' And they shall say: 'At that time, He was exceedingly wroth with
us, the Lord, in a great wrath, and turned His face away from us…'

Of interest here is the ⲛⲁ- 'future' used performatively ('I hereby enjoin …');
the Conjunctive, not 'carrying on' any specific clause but sequelling the
foregoing text as a narrative link. The 'Optative' (provisional name)

ⲉⲩⲉ- is not used as a simple jussive (ⲉⲩⲛⲁ- is the usual Shenoutean injunctive), but an elusive blend of prophetic statement, deontic and optative modalities; in our texteme it looks much like a stage-direction mode.

For the 'directed' question and answer, with Shenoute's torn clothing a symbol, emblem and trigger for communal memory and teaching, compare Ex.12:26 and its context; the abundance of ⲁⲩⲱ 'and', as well as phraseology ('And they shall answer and say…'), style and syntax evoke the Biblical echoes of communal recalling: Shenoute's role as the patient, selfless prophet Moses and his flock's as recalcitrant Israelites are made entirely clear. �②ⲙ-ⲡⲉⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓ ⲉⲧⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲏ ⲟⲛ ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ is a distinctive phrase.

3.13. *Injunctive generic procedural case-scenario in preceptive (monastic regulation) context*

The textual variation in this difficult text is considerable; the variant readings quoted are selective.

Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, K 9223 p. ⲍⲍ̄ (Leipoldt 1913: 161–162; Young 1993: 60–61):

ⲉⲧⲃⲉ-ⲛⲉⲧⲙⲟⲩ /ⲧⲉⲧⲙⲟⲩ/ ⲇⲉ ②ⲙⲡ†ⲙⲉ, ⲉⲩ ̅ⲁⲛⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲱⲕ ⲉⲧⲟⲙ-
ⲥⲟⲩ, ⲛ̅ⲛⲉⲣⲱⲙⲉ ϥⲓ-ⲡⲕⲱⲟⲥ ⲙⲁⲩⲁⲁϥ, ⲙⲁⲗⲓⲥⲧⲁ ⲉⲟⲗⲙⲉϥ ⲉ②ⲟⲩⲛ
ⲉⲣⲟϥ ②ⲙ-ⲡⲉϥⲁⲗⲟⲙ ②ⲱⲃ ⲙⲙⲛ̅ⲧⲁⲧⲥⲃⲱ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲑⲛⲉ-ⲡⲉⲃⲗⲟⲃ
ⲉⲡⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲉⲧⲙⲟⲟⲩⲧ ⲛⲧⲉ②ⲉⲛⲛⲟⲃ ⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ ϥⲓ ②ⲓ-ⲭⲱϥ ⲁⲩⲱ ②ⲁ-ⲣⲁⲧϥ
ⲛⲥⲉⲧⲉⲕϥ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲉⲩⲙⲟⲟ ̅ⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲟⲛ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲙⲛⲡⲉⲧⲙⲟⲟⲩⲧ ②ⲣⲁⲓ
ⲛ②ⲏⲧⲛ ⲉⲓⲧⲉ ②ⲛ̅-ⲡ†ⲙⲉ ⲉⲓⲧⲉ ②ⲁⲧⲏⲛ ⲛ̅ⲛⲉⲣⲱⲙⲉ ②ⲛ̅-ⲛⲉⲧϥⲓ
②ⲁ-ⲡⲉⲃⲗⲟⲃ ②ⲣⲁⲓ ⲛ②ⲏⲧⲛ ⲧ②ⲛⲟⲟⲩ ⲉ②ⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲛⲉⲩⲉⲣⲏⲩ ⲕⲁⲧⲁ-ⲧⲉⲛ-
ⲧⲟⲗⲏ ⲉⲧⲥⲏ② ⲛⲁⲛ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲉⲩ ̅ⲁⲛⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲭⲡⲟ ②ⲁ-ⲛⲉⲩⲉⲣⲏⲩ ⲉⲣⲉⲡⲉⲧϥⲓ
ⲉ②ⲣⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲛ-ⲧⲉϥⲛⲁ②ⲃ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛⲧⲉⲡⲉⲧϥⲓ /ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁϥⲉⲓ/ †-ⲧⲱϥ ⲉ②ⲟⲩⲛ
ⲕⲁⲧⲁⲥⲟⲡ ̅ⲁⲛⲧⲟⲩⲡⲱ② ⲉⲡⲙⲁ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲛⲁⲧⲟⲙⲥϥ ⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲣ̅ⲱ
ⲉⲧⲙⲁ ̅ⲁⲓ ⲛ̅ⲭⲡⲟ

ⲛ②ⲟⲥⲟⲛ ⲁⲡⲁⲓ ⲉⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ /†-ⲧⲱϥ ⲉ②ⲟⲩⲛ/ ⲁⲡⲁⲓ †-ⲧⲉϥⲛⲁ②ⲃ ⲉ②ⲟⲩⲛ
/ⲛⲧⲁⲡⲁⲓ ⲉⲛ-ⲧⲱϥ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ/ ⲛ②ⲟⲥⲟⲛ /ⲁⲩⲱ ②ⲟⲥⲟⲛ/ ⲁⲡⲁⲓ †-ⲧⲱϥ ⲉ②ⲟⲩⲛ
/ⲉⲣⲉⲡⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲉⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ/ ⲁⲡⲁⲓ ⲉⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ /ⲛⲧⲉⲡⲁⲓ †-ⲧⲱϥ ⲉ②ⲟⲩⲛ/ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ②ⲙ-ⲡ ̅ⲁⲓ
ⲙⲙⲉ ⲙ̅ⲡⲣⲱⲥⲕ ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲡ ̅ⲁⲓ ⲉ†-ⲙⲧⲟⲛ /ⲉⲧⲙ†-ⲙⲧⲟⲛ/ ⲛ̅ⲛⲉⲧϥⲓ…

Concerning those who die (she who dies) in the village, when they intend to go and bury them, no one should lift up the corpse alone, least of all clasp it to him in his embrace, (which is) a stupid thing (to do), but let the bier be brought close to the dead body, and monastic elders lift (the body) by the head and feet and heave it onto (the bier). Walking out with the dead body amongst us, either in the village or in our place, no one of those who carry the bier should draw close to his fellow-carriers, by the instruction written down for us. However, if they mean to replace one another, let the

one who is lifting up bring his shoulder out, and the one who is to lift put his in from time to time, until they reach the place where they mean to bury him. But not to overdo the replacing.

> (Young's text): as soon as this one came out, that one has (already) put his shoulder in; as soon as this one put his in, that one has (already) come out. Yet (always) in the right measure. Do not delay above reason in resting the bearers…

Note the topicalization by ⲉⲧⲃⲉ-; the parenthetic apposition; the opposition of the jussive ⲉϥⲛⲁ- and the 'obligative' ⲉϥⲉ-, with ⲛⲛⲉ- neutralizing them for the negative; the injunctive ⲉ- (ⲧⲙ) + infinitive.

The strict sequentiality within the individual episodes becomes almost a virtual overlap of actions: the use of the preterites (correlatively, within the (ⲛ)ϩⲟⲥⲟⲛ 'as soon as' framework) in this generic cotext is metaphoric and hyperbolic, to convey maximal, if not absolute, simultaneity of the two acts. In Leipoldt's version, the Focalizing Preterite (ⲛⲧⲁ-) is remarkable. It may be another exponent of the immediacy role (the old Egyptian and Coptic 'no sooner … than …' construction combines a Focalizing Conversion and a Circumstantial Conversion in nexus: Shisha-Halevy 1986: 94).

3.14. *Rhetoricized and paraphrased Biblical history narrative: the Passion and Resurrection*

University of Michigan Library 158, 20g pp. ⲥⲗⲑ–ⲥⲙ (Young 1993: 164–166; the large letters mark sections in the manuscript text):

ⲁⲡⲉⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲛϭⲟⲙ ⲙⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲙⲛⲛⲉϥⲙⲟⲓϩⲉ ⲙⲟⲩϩ ⲙⲡⲕⲁϩ ⲧⲏⲣϥ
ⲁⲩⲱ ⲟⲛ ⲛⲧⲉⲓϩⲉ ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲉⲙⲡⲓⲥⲧⲉⲩⲉ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ
ⲁⲟⲩⲕⲁⲕⲉ ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲉϫⲙⲡⲕⲁϩ ⲧⲏⲣϥ ϫⲓⲛ-ⲙⲡⲛⲁⲩ ⲛϫⲡⲥⲟ ϣⲁ-ⲡϣⲓⲧⲉ
    ⲙⲡⲉϩⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲧⲁⲩⲥ†ⲟⲩ ⲙⲙⲟϥ
ⲙⲡⲉⲛⲉⲧⲛⲉⲓⲟⲧⲉ ⲣϩⲟⲧⲉ ⲟⲩⲇⲉ ⲙⲡⲟⲩⲣϩⲧⲏⲩ ⲉⲡⲓⲥⲧⲉⲩⲉ ⲉⲣⲟϥ
ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲛⲧⲉⲣⲉⲡⲉⲓⲗⲁⲧⲟⲥ ⲡϩⲩⲅⲉⲙⲱⲛ ⲕⲣⲓⲛⲉ ⲉⲕⲁⲁϥ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲁⲩⲱϣ
    ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛϩⲟⲩⲟ ⲉⲩϫⲱ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ ϫⲉ-ⲥ†ⲟⲩ ⲙⲙⲟϥ ⲥ†ⲟⲩ ⲙⲙⲟϥ
ⲛⲧⲟϥ ⲇⲉ ⲡϩⲩⲅⲉⲙⲱⲛ ⲁϥⲓⲱ ⲛⲛⲉϥϭⲓϫ ϩⲛ-ⲟⲩⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲉϥϫⲱ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ
    ϫⲉ-†ⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲙⲡⲉⲥⲛⲟϥ ⲙⲡⲉⲓⲇⲓⲕⲁⲓⲟⲥ
ⲁⲩⲱϣ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛⲧⲟⲟⲩ ϫⲉ-ⲡⲉϥⲥⲛⲟϥ ϩⲓϫⲱⲛ ⲙⲛⲛⲉⲛϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲉⲧⲉ-
    ⲛⲧⲱⲧⲛ ⲡⲉ ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ϫⲉⲕⲁⲥ ⲟⲛ ⲉⲣⲉⲧⲟⲣⲅⲏ ⲙⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲛⲁϭⲱ
    ⲉϫⲱⲧⲛ ⲛⲙⲙⲁⲩ
ⲁⲡⲕⲁⲧⲁⲡⲉⲧⲁⲥⲙⲁ ⲙⲡⲣⲡⲉ ⲡⲱϩ ⲁϥⲣ-ⲥⲛⲁⲩ
ⲛⲧⲟⲟⲩ ⲇⲉ ⲙⲡⲟⲩⲁⲓⲥⲑⲁⲛⲉ
ⲁⲡⲕⲁϩ ⲕⲓⲙ
ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲉⲩⲡⲟⲛⲏⲣⲓⲁ ⲃⲱⲗ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ
ⲁⲙⲡⲉⲧⲣⲁ ⲡⲱϩ
ⲛⲧⲟⲟⲩ ⲇⲉ ⲙⲡⲟⲩⲕⲧⲟⲟⲩ ϩⲛ-ⲧⲉⲩⲕⲁⲕⲓⲁ

ⲁⲩⲧⲁϫⲣⲟ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛⲛⲉⲩϩⲟ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲟⲩⲡⲉⲧⲣⲁ
ⲙⲡⲟⲩⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲉⲕⲧⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲑⲉ ⲛⲧⲁⲡⲉⲡⲣⲟⲫⲏⲧⲏⲥ ϫⲟⲟⲥ
ⲁⲛⲉⲧⲙⲟⲟⲩⲧ ⲧⲱⲟⲩⲛ ⲁⲩⲉⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛⲛⲉⲩⲙ̅ϩⲁⲁⲩ
ⲙⲡⲟⲩⲥⲁϩⲱⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛⲧⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲛⲉⲩϣⲟϫⲛⲉ ⲛⲣⲉϥϩⲱⲧⲃ
ⲁϥⲁϣⲕⲁⲕ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛϭⲓ-ⲡϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ϩⲛ-ⲟⲩⲛⲟϭ ⲛⲥⲙⲏ ⲁϥϯ ⲙⲡⲉϥⲡ̅ⲛ̅ⲁ̅
    ⲉⲛϭⲓϫ ⲙⲡⲓⲱⲧ
ⲙⲡⲟⲩⲣⲓⲙⲉ ⲟⲩⲇⲉ ⲙⲡⲟⲩⲣ-ϩⲧⲏⲩ
ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲁⲩⲕⲱⲛⲥ ⲙⲡⲉϥⲥⲡⲓⲣ ⲛⲟⲩⲗⲟⲅⲭⲏ ϩⲛⲧⲉⲩⲙⲛⲧⲟⲩⲁϩⲓϩⲏⲧ
    ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲁⲧⲣⲉⲩⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲉⲁϥⲟⲩⲱ ⲉϥⲙⲟⲩ
ⲁϥⲧⲱⲟⲩⲛ ϩⲙⲡⲙⲉϩϣⲟⲙⲧ ⲛϩⲟⲟⲩ
ⲙⲡⲟⲩⲣⲙⲟⲓϩⲉ ⲟⲛ ϩⲙⲡⲁⲓ ⲟⲩⲇⲉ ⲙⲡⲟⲩϣⲓⲃⲉ ϩⲛⲧⲉⲩⲙⲁⲛⲓⲁ ⲙⲛⲡⲉ-
    ⲩⲃⲟⲗ
ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲛⲧⲁⲩϯ ⲛϩⲉⲛⲛⲟϭ ⲛϩⲟⲙⲧ ⲛⲙⲙⲁⲧⲟⲓ ⲉⲩϫⲱ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ ϫⲉ-ⲁϫⲓⲥ
    ϫⲉ-ⲛⲉϥⲙⲁⲑⲏⲧⲏⲥ ⲛⲉ ⲛⲧⲁⲩ ⲉⲓ ⲁⲩϥⲓⲧϥ ⲛϫⲓⲟⲩⲉ ⲛⲧⲉⲩϣⲏ ⲉⲛⲛ-
    ⲕⲟⲧⲕ

The glory of God's miracles and His wonders filled the entire earth
And even so, you have not believed in Him, even now.[53]
A darkness descended on the entire earth, from the time of the sixth hour
    until the ninth, on the day they crucified Him
Your fathers have not been afraid, nor have they repented to believe in Him.
But when Pilate the Governor decided to release him, they rather cried out,
    saying 'Crucify him! Crucify him!'
And he, the Governor, washed his hands with water, saying: 'I am innocent
    of the blood of this righteous one'.
They, for their part, cried: 'His blood is upon us and our children' —which
    is you, today, so that the wrath of God may rest upon you and on them
The curtain of the Temple was torn in two
Yet they, for their part, have not perceived
The earth moved
Their wickedness has not dissolved
The rocks split
Yet they, for their part, have not turned back from their evil, for they have
    hardened 'their faces into a rock; they did not agree to turn back', as the
    Prophet has said.[54]
The dead arose and left their graves
They, for their part, have not distanced themselves from their murderous
    counsels
He cried out, the Lord, in a great voice, and gave up His spirit unto the
    hands of the Father
They have neither wept nor felt remorse
But they pierced His side with a spear
In their cruelty, after they saw that He had already died[55]

---

[53] Young's translation here ('and thus also (the praise) of him in whom we now trust'),
seems to me syntactically impossible, but also improbable in structural terms.

[54] Cf. Jer.5:3.

[55] Not 'He finished dying'; Young (1993: 168).

> He arose on the third day
> They have not marvelled even at this, nor have they changed from their
>   frenzy and their untruth,
> But gave much money to the soldiers, telling them: 'Say: "His disciples
>   came and took him by stealth at night, while we were asleep"'.

The rhetorical sophistication of this highly structured dramatic, step-by-step, abridged, commented and edited version of the Passion is impressive. Alternating Evolution and Comment Mode verses create an elegiac poetic effect of strophe and antistrophe. The negative CM has the effect of a 'voice-over' commentary (rather than narrator's intervention; at the same time, this Narrator-perspective narrative is 'external', in tension with the 'internal' narrative of the Passion).[56] The whole is informed by the tension between the affirmative 'historical' preterite Event Mode and the negative Comment Mode segments (pointing out the monstrous cruelty and impervious obstinacy of the historical Jews, identified with ancestors of Shenoute's addressees and objects of his invective, namely heretics, pagans and Jews), a tension between the 'then' and the 'now', which I have tried to convey in the translation by differentiating between the affirmative and negative clauses and rendering the latter, relevant to Shenoute's here and now, by the present perfect. The Shenoutean episode is not a merely retouched or even paraphrased replica of the Biblical one, but a rearranged, to an extent re-staged one, for event sequencing here does not match the original text. The asyndesis here alternates with ⲇⲉ-linkage, and is a prime factor in the poetic form. The final verse, ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲛⲧⲁⲩ†… an adapted quotation (Mt.28:12–3), is marked as narrative peak by the 'envelope focussing' of the whole quoted text.

Contrast the following catalogic, yet in a sense sequential, asyndetic account of the Passion.

Leipoldt (1908: 104):

ⲁⲩⲥⲟⲛ2ϥ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛⲑⲉ ⲛⲟⲩⲗⲏⲥⲧⲏⲥ ⲉⲧⲃⲏⲏⲧⲕ ϫⲉⲕⲁⲥ 2ⲱⲱⲕ ⲉⲩϣⲁⲛ-
   ⲙⲟⲣⲕ ⲉⲧⲃⲏⲏⲧϥ ⲛⲛⲉⲕⲥⲕⲁⲛⲇⲁⲗⲓ⸱ⲍⲉ
ⲁⲩⲥⲟϣϥ ⲁⲩⲛⲉϫ-ⲡⲁⲃⲥⲉ ⲉ2ⲟⲩⲛ ⲉ2ⲣⲁϥ ⲁⲩ2ⲉⲃⲥ-ⲡⲉϥ2ⲟ ⲁⲩ2ⲓⲟⲩⲉ
   ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲁⲩⲥⲱⲃⲉ ⲙⲙⲟϥ ⲁⲩ†ⲕⲗⲯ ⲉϫⲱϥ ⲁⲩ2ⲓⲟⲩⲉ ⲙⲡⲕⲁ2 ⲉϫⲛ-
   ⲧⲉϥⲁⲡⲉ ⲁⲩ†ⲁⲁⲥ ⲉ2ⲟⲩⲛ 2ⲙⲡⲉϥ2ⲟ ⲁⲩⲧⲥⲉϥ-ⲟⲩ2ⲙϫ 2ⲙⲡⲉϥ-
   ⲉⲓⲃⲉ ⲁⲩ† ⲉϫⲱϥ ⲛⲟⲩⲕⲗⲟⲙ ⲛϣⲟⲛⲧⲉ ⲁⲩⲉϥⲧ-ⲛⲉϥⲟⲩⲉⲣⲏⲧⲉ
   ⲙⲛⲛⲉϥϭⲓϫ ⲉⲡϣⲉ ⲁⲩⲛⲟⲃⲛⲉϥ ⲙⲙⲟϥ 2ⲓ-ⲡⲉⲥⲧⲁⲩⲣⲟⲥ…ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲁ-
   ⲛⲉⲩⲙⲛⲧⲁⲥⲉⲃⲏⲥ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲉⲛⲧⲁⲩϫⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲏ ⲛⲧⲁⲩⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲁϥ
   ⲁⲩⲕⲱⲛⲥ ⲙⲡⲉϥⲥⲡⲓⲣ ⲛⲟⲩⲗⲟⲅⲭⲏ

---

[56] Cf. Bakker (1997: 39–41); note the use of ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ 'now' for the 'external' narrative.

> For they bound Him like a bandit because of you; so that you too, when they bind you because of Him, you shall not stumble.
>
> They struck Him, they spat in His face, they covered His face, they hit him, they mocked Him, they showered blows on him, they struck His head with the reed, they slapped His face, they let Him drink vinegar in His thirst, they put a crown of thorns upon His head, they nailed His feet and His hands to the wood,[57] they reviled Him on the Cross … Following all their impieties which they uttered against Him, or did to Him, they pierced His side with a spear.

Here the asyndetic syntax does not express closer and hyper-eventive linkage, as in ordinary narrative. It rather signals catalogic enumeration,[58] with an effect of an almost overpowering dramatic account of inexorable, unrestrained acts too terrible to contemplate; the pronominal agens 'they' —impersonal and faceless in contrast to the very personal account in University of Michigan Library 158— is a link which contributes to the cohesion of the whole avalanche-like burst of violence and hatred. Here too, piercing Jesus's side is well marked as narrative peak.

REFERENCES

AIJMER, K. 2004. Interjections in a Contrastive Perspective. In Weigand, E. (ed.), *Emotion in Dialogic Interaction*: *Advances in the Complex* (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 248). Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 99–120.

ALEWELL, K. 1913. *Über das rhetorische PARADEIGMA*: *Theorie, Beispielsammlungen, Verwendung in der römischen Literatur der Kaiserzeit*. Leipzig: August Hoffmann.

AMÉLINEAU, C.E. 1907. *Œuvres de Shenoudi*, 1. Paris: Leroux.

—. 1912. *Œuvres de Shenoudi*, 2. Paris: Leroux.

BAKKER, E.J. 1988. *Linguistics and Formulas in Homer*: *Scalarity and the Description of the Particle* PER. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

—. 1993. Boundaries, Topics and the Structure of Discourse: an Investigation of the Ancient Greek Particle δέ. *Studies in Language* 17/2, 231–275.

—. 1997. Verbal Aspect and Mimetic Description in Thucydides. In Bakker, E.J. (ed.), *Grammar as Interpretation*: *Greek Literature in its Linguistic Context* (Mnemosyne Supplement 271). Leiden: Brill, 7–54.

BAL, M. 1997. *Narratology*: *An Introduction to the Theory of Narrative* (2nd ed.). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

BARTHES, R. 1982. L'effet du réel. In Barthes, R. et al. (eds.), *Littérature et Réalité*. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 81–89.

---

[57] In Coptic, ϣⲉ 'wood', which, definite, also means 'the Cross', and is here in variation with ⲡⲉⲥⲧⲁⲩⲣⲟⲥ, yet as an alternant selected as more compatible with the nailing cotext. Here is a nice instance of the rhetorical-structural mechanism of 'synonymity'.

[58] Cf. Havers (1931: 254); 'enumerative Redeweise'

BEHLMER, H. 1996. *Schenute von Atripe*: *De Iudicio*. Turin: Ministero per i Beni Culturali e Ambientali / Sopraintendenza al Museo delle Antichitá Egizie.

BOUD'HORS, A. Forthcoming. *Codex IFAO Copte 2*. Cairo: Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale.

BRINTON, L.J. 1993. Episode Boundary Markers in Old English Discourse. In Aertsen, H. and Jeffers, R.J. (eds.), *Historical Linguistics 1989*: *Papers from the 9th International Conference for Historical Linguistics* (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 106). Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 73–89.

BUJIS, M. 2005. *Clause Combining in Ancient Greek Narrative Discourse* (Mnemosyne Supplement 260). Leiden: Brill.

COUPER-KUHLEN, E. 1989. Foregrounding and Temporal Relations in Narrative Discourse. In Schopf, A. (ed.), *Essays on Tensing in English II*: *Time, Text and Modality*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1–29.

CRUM, W.E. 1909. *Catalogue of the Coptic Manuscripts in the Collection of the John Rylands Library*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

EMMEL, S. 2004. *Shenute's Literary Corpus* (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalum 599–600, Subsidia 111–112). Leuven: Peeters.

GENETTE, G. 1972. *Figures III*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

—. 1983. *Nouveau discourse du récit*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

GERBER, G. 1885. *Die Sprache als Kunst*. Berlin: Gärtner.

GIVÓN, T. 1987. Beyond Foreground and Background. In Tomlin, R.S. (ed.), *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse* (Typological Studies in Language 11). Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 175–188.

GREEN, M. 1987. *The Coptic* Share *Pattern and its Ancient Egyptian Ancestors*: *a Reassessment of the Aorist Pattern*. Warminster: Aris & Phillips.

HAMP, E. 1973. Inordinate Clauses in Celtic. In Corum, C. et al. (eds.), *You Take the High Node and I'll Take the Low Node*: *Papers from the Comparative Syntax Festival*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, 229–251.

HAUG, W. 1979. *Formen und Funktionen der Allegorie, Symposion Wolfenbüttel 1978*. Stuttgart: Metzler.

HAVERS, W. 1931. *Handbuch der erklärenden Syntax*. Heidelberg: Winter.

JOLLES, A. 1968. *Einfache Formen* (4th ed.). Tübingen: Niemeyer.

HICKMAN, M. 2004. Coherence, Cohesion and Context: some Comparative Perspectives in Narrative Developments. In Strömqvist, S. and Verhoeven, L. (eds.), *Relating Events in Narrative 2*: *Typological and Contextual Perspectives*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum, 281–306.

KALLEN, J.L. 1981. *Linguistics and Oral Tradition*: *the Structural Study of the Riddle* (Centre for Language and Communication Studies Occasional Papers 2). Dublin: Trinity College Dublin, Centre for Language and Communication Studies.

KIECKERS, E. 1912. Die Stellung der Verba des Sagens in Schaltesätzen im Griechischen und in den verwandten Sprachen. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 30, 145–185.

—. 1913. Zu den Schaltesätzen im Lateinischen, Romanischen und Neuhochdeutschen. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 32, 7–23.

KUHN, K.H. 1991. Shenoute. In Atiya, A.S. (ed.), *The Coptic Encyclopedia*, 8 vols. New York: Macmillan, vol. 7, 2131–2133.

LAMBRECHT, K. 1994. *Information Structure and Sentence Form*: *Topic, Focus and the Mental Representation of Discourse Referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

—. 2002. Topic, Focus and Secondary Predication: the French Presentational Relative Construction. In Beyssade, C. et al. (eds.), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory* (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 232). Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 171–212.

LE GOFFIC, P. 1995. La double incomplétude de l'imparfait. *Modèles Linguistiques* 31 (XIV, 1), 133–148.

LEIPOLDT, J. 1908. *Sinuthii archimandritae vita et opera omnia*, III. Paris: CSCO.

—. 1913. *Sinuthii archimandritae vita et opera omnia*, IV. Paris: CSCO.

LICHTHEIM, M. 1980. *Ancient Egyptian Literature* 3: *The Late Period*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

LONGACRE, R.E. 1979. The Paragraph as a Grammatical Unit. In Givòn, T. (ed.), *Syntax and Semantics 12*: *Discourse and Syntax*. San Diego: Academic Press, 115–135.

—. 1994. The Dynamics of Reported Dialogue in Narrative. *Word* 45, 125–143.

MCKAY, K.L. 1988. Aspectual Usage in Timeless Contexts in Ancient Greek. In Rijksbaron, A. et al. (eds.), *In the Footsteps of Raphael Kühner*. Amsterdam: Gieben, 193–208.

—. 1992. Time and Aspect in New Testament Greek. *Novum Testamentum* 34/3, 209–228.

MALINOWSKI, B. 1935. *Coral Islands and their Magic,* vol. 2: *The Language of Magic and Gardening*. London: George Allen & Unwin.

MÜLLER, C.D.G. 1954. Einige Bemerkungen zur "Ars Praedicandi" der alten koptischen Kirche. *Le Muséon* 67, 231–270.

ORLANDI, T. 1985. *Shenute contra Origenista*. Rome: C.I.M.

ORLETTI, F. 1995. Figure and Ground in Second-Language Narratives: Traces of Iconicity. In Simone, R. (ed.), *Iconicity in Language* (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 110). Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 171–195.

PLANTIN, Chr. 2004. On the Inseparability of Emotion and Reason in Argumentation. In Weigand, E. (ed.), *Emotion in Dialogic Interaction*: *Advances in the Complex*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 265–276.

RICOEUR, P. 1981. Narrative Time. In Mitchell, W.J.T. (ed.), *On Narrative*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 165–186.

ROSIER, L.R. 1993. L'incise *dit-elle*, ou l'attribution du dire en discours rapporté (le paradigme *dit-il*). In Hilty, G. (ed.), *Actes du XX Congrès International de Linguistique et Philologie Romane*. Tübingen: Francke, vol. I/i, 657–663.

SCHITTKO, M.P. 2003. *Analogien als Argumentationstyp — vom Paradeigma zur Similitudo* (Hypomnemata 144). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

SHISHA-HALEVY, A. 1986. *Coptic Grammatical Categories*: *Structural Studies in the Syntax of Shenoutean Coptic* (Analecta Orientalia 53). Rome: The Pontifical Institute.

—. 1987. Grammatical Discovery Procedure and the Egyptian Nominal Sentence. *Orientalia* 56, 147–175.

—. 1992. The Shenoutean Idiom. In Atiya, A. S. (ed.), *The Coptic Encyclopedia*, 8 vols. New York: Macmillan, vol. 8, 202–204.

—. 1995. Some Reflections on the Egyptian Conjunctive. In Fluck, C. et al. (eds.), *Divitiae Aegypti*: *Festschrift Martin Krause*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 300–314.

—. 1997. Literary Modern Welsh Narrative Grammar: Two Features Described. *Journal of Celtic Linguistics* 6, 63–102.

—. 1998. *Structural Studies in Modern Welsh Syntax*: *Aspects of the Grammar of Kate Roberts* (Studien und Texte zur Keltologie 2). Münster: Nodus.

—. 1999*a*. Structural Sketches of Middle Welsh Syntax (II): Noun Predication Patterns. *Studia Celtica* 33, 155–234.

—. 1999*b*. Bohairic Narrative Grammar. In Emmel, S. et al. (eds.), *Ägypten und Nubien in spätantiker und christlicher Zeit*: *Akten des 6. Internationalen Koptologenkongresses, Münster, 20.–26. Juli 1996*, 2 vols. Wiesbaden: Reichert, vol. 2, 375–389.

—. 2003. Juncture Features in Literary Modern Welsh: Cohesion and Delimitation —*Problematik*, Typology of Exponents and Features. *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie* 53, 230–258.

—. 2004. Juncture Features in Shenoutean Coptic: Linkage and Delimitation. In Immerzeel, M. and Van Der Vliet, J. (eds.), *Coptic Studies on the Threshold of a New Millennium*: *Proceedings of the Seventh International Congress of Coptic Studies*. Leuven: Peeters, 155–175.

—. 2007. *Topics in Coptic Syntax*: *Structural Studies in the Bohairic Dialect* (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 160). Leuven: Peeters.

SIMONE, R. 1995. Iconic Aspects of Syntax. In Simone, R. (ed.), *Iconicity in Language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 153–169.

STANZEL, K.H. 1955. *Die Typischen Erzählsituationen im Roman* (Wiener Beiträge zur Englischen Philologie 63). Wien: Wilhelm Braumüller.

THOMPSON, S.A. 1987. Subordination and Narrative Event Structure. In Tomlin, R.S. (ed.), *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse* (Typological Studies in Language 11). Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 435–454.

WEINRICH, H. 2001. *Tempus. Besprochene und erzählte Welt* (6th ed.). Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

WELTER, J.Th. 1927. *L'Exemplum dans la littérature religieuse et didactique du moyen âge*. Paris: Guitard (repr. 1973, Geneva: Slatkine Reprints).

WITTCHOW, F. 2001. *Exemplarische Erzählen bei Ammianus Marcellinus*. Munich: K. G. Saur.

YOUNG, D.W. 1961. On Shenoute's Use of Present I. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 20, 115–119.

—. 1993. *Coptic Manuscripts from the White Monastery*: *Works of Shenute*. Vienna: Verlag Brüder Hollinek.

—. 1998*a*. Additional Fragments of Shenute's *Eighth Canon*. *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 44, 47–68.

—. 1998*b*. Pages from a Copy of Shenute's *Eighth Canon*. *Orientalia* 67, 64–84.

—. 1998*c*. Two leaves from a Copy of Shenute's *Ninth Canon*. *Wiener Zeitschrift zur Kunde des Morgenlandes* 88, 281–301.

—. 2000. Five Leaves from a Copy of Shenute's *Third Canon*. *Le Muséon* 113, 263–293.

—. 2003. Portions of a Coptic Discourse by Shenute (Vienna Incipit List No. 44). *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 33, 231–271.