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

BY ARIEL SHISHA-HALEVY

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

* * *

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

* * *

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

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

¹ Abbreviations used: CS = Cleft Sentence, DS = Disiunctio Sinuthiana, NS = Nominal Sentence, PN = Proper Name, US = “Unexpected Syntax”.
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here we have, even beyond Shenoute’s *parole* and *usage* (and stylistic signature fingerprint) clues to his idiolectal *langue* and idiom. This is the first *raison d’être* of this treatise. A second point concerns juncture, which is paramount and informs most of the constructions presented. A third *raison d’être*, not last and certainly not least, is the need to leave the box of post-Polotsky conception of Coptic grammar, and turn to other trails and levels, such as expressive or colloquial syntax. I will try and address the question of grammatical deviation from (our conceived) norms in a half-understood dead language such as Coptic.

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

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

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

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

1.3.1 Focalization. Nexus focusing. Thematization and rhematization. Superordination

1.3.2 Hermeneutics. Lemmatization and thematization of quotes

1.4 Juncture contours: construction rupture (‘anacoluthon’). Cohesion and delimitation features, zero. Reference. Prosody

1.4.1 Linkage and delimitation

1.4.2 Prosody. Parenthesis. Augens. ‘Foreshadowed’ elements


1.4.4 Reference: cataphora. Prolepsis

1.4.5 Topicalization. Nominativus Pendens. Antecedent- and other resumptions

1.4.6 Coordination. Disjunction. Parataxis

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

1.6 ‘Adjectives’ and animacy gender

1.7 Person

1.8 Adverbials. Conjugation mediators

1.9 Patterning

1.10 Sequencing (‘word order’), placement

1.11 Negation

1.12 Conversion. Conjugation bases

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

1.14 Matters of style. Disiunctio Sinuthiana

1.15 Miscellaneous construction shifts

* * *

1.1 Narrative and rhetorical functions.\(^4\) Tensing

(1) Chass. 105 \[\text{ἐνώθεικεν ὁ Ὀγύμωρ πεντακώνωι ἐναμονῇ ἐςοῦν ἐτεέσσελοκόγε...} \]

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

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

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

(2) Chass. 103 οὐρῷμε πετεούντας μμαγγ νῳρε εκαγ αφώωτ μμαςε ετσανάφτ πογα μεν αφηναη νητοογ μμερος πκεογα δε αφηναη νομερος νοητ...

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

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

(3) Leip. III 104 ἀγσωβ άγνεξπασε εζογν εζραβ ἀγεβεςπεφζο γγίογε εροφ γκσωβε μμοφ αγάκλψ εξωφ...

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

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

(4) Leip. III 110 αίναγ όν εκεογα ντμίνε ντερεβσωντ νκαογνααη ερηειμτοογ νογντ ικητ λγω αγάκγεογα ετεβςιχ

Continued vision narrative. Note the superordination by λγω (“at that point”, “then”).

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

(5) Leip. III 209f. κεζων όν εππρεων νονκογεη ν επογοβω αίναγ εροφ αίναγ εροφ εκαει ετοοτογ ννετογυμ μμοφ

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

I also saw another animal, slightly shining or white. I saw it as it fell into the hands of those who would devour it.
(6) Leip. III 203 ἑρῳνβὼκ ἑγοῦν ἐνοὺν ἑῳνβαὶ ἱεαρεβῦλα ἡἐῃαὶ δὲ ὑἐοὶ ἱαρ᾿αβῦλα ἱεαρᾳμοος ἑγεῖ ἱαρεῆς ἀγω ὑν ἱεαραντῳος ἱαρεμεῖλα ἱερμοοδε ἑπὶα μνπαἰ ἱεαρανβὼκ δὲ ὑἐοὐν ἱαρῄςαμε ἀγῷ ἱερανεὶ ἑβολ ἱαρεκοος ἑκανεῖα μνπαἰ

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

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

(7) Chass. 31 ἐῳ-οὐντᾳκ-κλενχε ἰοὐγοεῖῳ ἀλλα ὅντο

The existential verboids ὁὐντα= and μντα= are not Present tense, but atemporal; the same seems to apply to the statements of existence/non-existence ὁγν- and μν-.

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

(8) Leip. III 42 ἐεἴ ἰοὐγοῳμε ἐπρο ἐὐντα βμαυ ν‐ε‐ἐ‐κ‐μαυ ἱηαραξωρα ἐαξκοογ ἰκσῶγ μμπχυ ἱτεβναρ‐ἐμαυ βω ἱοιε ἐαξκοογ ἰκσωγ μμκαζ‐ἐε‐ἀς‐κογ...

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

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

(9) Leip. III 202 ἐξοος ἐ ἱενογνόβε ἰἐναὐτ

...to tell you that your sins are grave.

(10) Amél. II 392 ἐξοος ἐ ἱεμπογχαί‐βατι‐ς ἤμ πετο μμντρε ἱαγχι

To say they have not been baptized — who testified that they have?
(11) Cod. XO 95 (Boud’hors Canon 8) εἰς ἄνωθεν χειριή ἐφέτων πράσεως ἡ Ναωψ τενού ρασω (cf. also Cod. XO Boud’hors Canon 8, 82, 88).

If I say ‘χαίρε’ (‘rejoice!’), where is the joy? Or is it abundant, the joy?

(12) Cod. DS 28f. (Orlandi, Contra Origenistas 343) εκείνοι οὖν τὸ εἰς ἄνωθεν τὸ νέον χε…

If things are not like that, say henceforth.

(13) Chass. 65 εὐθεία τενούς ἀργελοκαρνταγτασεις ἡμιογοιοιν αὐχ ὅπως πεντακ ιε πνοεις οὐε ναβρίων ἡμναγογων

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

Also the οὖν τὸ εἰς ἄνωθεν (N-) set, see §1.9 below; ἀλλὰ Χ ἀλλὰ Υ: see below, §1.9: How can you compare X and Y?

Here are four argumental-technical terms, initial-boundary signals, opening chunks or blocks, almost all high-level topics. Rather improbably (6th-century chronology notwithstanding), they put one in mind of (Babylonian) Talmudic Hebrew or Aramaic correspondents. The Coptic terms have several sub-functions; they are difficult to translate. Without claiming direct Rabbinical contacts, there may be underground missing links, or a common source, or some kind of interference — Philo of Alexandria, Greek or Persian traditional methodology and technical terminology — speculation runs wild; but Shenoute’s argumentative rhetoric does evoke other systems.

Further wide-scope study is obviously required; Shenoute’s use of Greek learned “particle amalgams” and adverbials, word order, focalization, his exegetical technique and so on, all seem relevant.

(See §1.13 for narrative roles of the Conjunctive; § 1.10 for placement issues).

* * *

5 Like … כלומד לומד, אם תᜃפי לומד, יוסי לומד, אומר קסחת, הוא שמע, אל מחר … חמיד, and many more.

6 See Bacher 1899-1905.
1.2 Protases and apodoses

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

* * *

1.2.1 Protatics

(14) Leip. IV 94 ἐνεγνωμνηται λαξαι νεγναψεμοι άν

ηνατα μπετροεις ουβενετζνειτοπος

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

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

(15) Leip. IV 156 ενεετβεταγην άν ιείξω ιηνα ιηνογ

πε παροογφη αρποι μπρωμε ξεεγογων ναα νηε

A remarkable irrealis protasis, probably schematizable as {#FOCUS + TOPIC# + APODOSIS}, with the topical internal conversion ιηε-

It should be remembered that, both historically and synchronically, the irrealis protasis does not positively and beyond doubt point to the circumstantial conversion of ιηε-

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

(16) Leip. III 51 κοσυφ χοουνπητνογν ιημ ετο ηαπιστοσ...

Τζθηκ χακ ιηοιτε ιηνα-ικεκηπιον ηθηογ ιθε

Ετογμες ικεκις ιμινε ιμινε

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

(17) Amél. II 461 κοσυφ εβηκ εξογν ετιντερο ινπηγε

ψοπε εροκ ημεινα ταρεκωνκ ερος γηνα ηπηα

ετιμαγ

If you wish to enter the Kingdom of Heaven, receive it here unto yourself, and it will receive you unto itself in that place.
A colloquial juxtaposition of two allocutive clauses, which may be construed as formally unmarked question and response (cf. ed.’s punctuation), but may certainly and, I think, preferably be construed as protasis+apodosis complex; the apodosis itself may be complex (e.g. Imperative + ταρεψ). In such protatic status we find the Present followed by an Imperative (more rarely, the Perfect).

(18) Amēl. II 364 ὁρώμενε ἐπνούσε οὖν οὐκ ἐμπνῄσκασθαι ψευδάρχης ὄνομα ὑπὸ καίρου ἡμετεροπλακαίον ἡμῶν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐπιποτήνων ἡμῶν ἑνὸς...

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

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

* * *

1.2.2 Apodotics. Post-imperative syntax. Responsive syntax

(19) Cod. XO p. 260bis (Boud’hors, Canon 8) οἶνον κατακεφαλείν οἴμοις ἀνετερεγενενητά ποτε προφυγόν ἐροῦ ἀνῇτην ἀντανοῦο ῥαγ κατατοῦον ὑνεπεμπετρω Ἰαράι ἡνήτην

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

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

(20) Cod. XO p. 250 (Boud’hors, Canon 8, with n. 729) ἦ εἰσεξαρχὴν ηνταραμ ςανεικυνασθῃ ρενκοῦι ἡντνογχαὶ ἡνῆτοο...ἄγω εἰετετεμαῦο ετετυποούς εἰςον ημιμενήν ἐτοαὐαῦ άγὼν ἐκοπνε εὔττβήνυ

As the ed. observes, άγω reinforces the apodosis; it may be added that άγω, like Greek καί, has in Coptic (when not coordinating) a superordinating role (Denniston 308f., Blass-Debrunner § 442,7).
And surely, if many are called in these congregations, few shall be saved in them... what then are you doing, gathering together with the holy brethren and the pure sisters?

(21) Paris BN 1301 f. 139 p. 345 (Young, Coptic Manuscripts, p. 102, no note) ἄγω τῇοοὐν ἐπολαγ έτεςώε εάξαν μητν θηττην πε

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

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

(22) Cod. XO p. 184 (Boud’hors, Canon 8, with n. 530) ...εμεεγε εροογ ξεντοογ με νεωπε ντοογ αν με

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

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

(23) Cod. XO 301 (Boud’hors, Canon 8, with n. 967; Introduction, §10. Grammaire, p. 42) ...είτμκαθυτν ωαντετηρντ... είτμκαθυτν ωαντετηρντογεθακε

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

... If I don’t leave you to become worms! If I don’t leave you to become deep darkness!
This is one of the two instances in Shenoute’s works known to me of the apodotic ጐⲥⲱⲧⲙ, a non-durative, base conjugation form (Shisha-Halevy 1973). It is the survival of an old Egyptian form, in Sahidic homonymous with the ጐⲧⲝⲱⲧⲙ-less protatic form: the two are absolutely non-connected, synchronically or diachronically. Whereas the protatic form (the negative well attested in Shenoute, as ጐⲧⲙⲥⲱⲧⲙ) is clearly related to the Conditional, while the apodotic, to my knowledge affirmative only, has no associated fuller form. In our passage, why is the second-half apodosis what seems to be a Focalizing Aorist? The aorist is probably the first term in the apodotic paradigm of the Conditional; still, there is here no adverbial candidate to be focal, and the autofocal Focalizing Aorist is (again, to my knowledge) rare. Or can it be that ጐⲧⲝ- implies a Focalizing Tense association of the apodotic ጐ-?

The thing to look for is apodotic ጐⲥⲱⲧⲙ in dialects A, B, M or L.

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

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

Where is the Wolf? (= show me the Wolf), and the Shepherd will pursue it.
(27) Amél. I 37 ἰαμογινε ταρείνε

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

It’s good to inquire-and-find.

(28) De Iudicio f. X p. 40 (Behlmer) εἰεμαρντωμ ερμπρο μπεθοογ νιμ ετηιεη μμοογ αγω ντειεε τεναρβολ πε επκωρτ ντεζεννα

The special interest here is in the quadruple superordination in a protasis-less apodotic clause: ειε-, αγω, ντειεε, πε.

(29) Amél. I 39 αψαομ αγω τψου ψω νμμε

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

Sigh, and I too sigh with you.

(30) Leip. III 45 εψκεσαρε πναρετικος μππζλζη πψρψ εβολ μνεγζξ ηκεζιογ εζραι ηνψγκριζε χεεγψλλα ειενζαλατε ψψογ ειεε ηπαι ξαρα ηντοπ εγνψψερ εβολ μνεντζζ

The presentative ειε acts here as superordinative apodosis marker. The Focalizing Present following χε- expresses a discredited claim.

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

* * *

1.2.3 Protasis-apodosis complexes

The protasis-apodosis irrealis modality concord is a standard, normative junctural contour, yet often richly manipulated by Shenoute to express sophisticated logical nuances, and for rhetorical purpose. Indeed, this is a striking instance of non-anacoluthic syntax, for the apodosis paradigm is very rich. Here I present only a selection of combinatory examples, out of an embarras de richesse. No two passages are truly the same:
(31) Cod. XO 81 (Boud’hors Canon 8, n. 188) ἐνενογονὲν ἐνρῴῳ ἐκνῃνηβινῃ ἣ μνατε ἐκἠν ᾗ ἡ μπνούτε ἐκνῃνηβινῃ ἢ μπνονήν ἐνεμάρηπογα ποὺ ἡ πρῶμε πρῶμε ἡ ἐβολ νεναπονία...

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

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

(32) Leip. IV 167 εὐῳπεν ἡναπεγροοὐῳ ᾗς ἄρχῃς ἡναπρογοψν ἀν ἡ πεςρὶβα γαρ ἡ μοις ἁρρβολ εὐκριμα ἡναποοὺ ἠτναζαγος ἡναεζῳβ ἁμῖντοιν

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

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

(33) Canon 7.3 § 6 (3) = Cod. XU 96 (Wisse) ἁπογοὺῳ ἵν πε ἡναπαταμίο πε

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

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

(34) Cod. XO 245f. (Boud’hors, Canon 8) ἐνεμπεπεῇῳ ἡμοὶ ὑῳ εὐῳπεν ἀγῳ ἰν ἡ ἐκναργουῳῳπεη... ἐβολ των ἦ ἐτῆου εἰναξίῃγακ ἐβολ

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

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

So too (among many):

(35) Leip. IV 11 ἐνεμπεπεννοβε γαρ ἀγῳ ἁνανομία κίμ ἐπε ἡμπαζ ἠρετήπῃ βογ ἐκαζηατι ἡ ἐκονγου ἐβολ ἑσκόκμ ἀγῳ ἐκκβτωτ εἰπε καταπεγοգῳω
Had not our sins and our transgressions moved heaven and earth, what is the Sword doing, upright and clearly drawn, and ready to do according to its will?

(36) Cod. XO 294 (Boud’hors, Canon 8, n. 946) ἐνερέπνημα ωοοπ ἀν ἄγω πεζοογ ἐτερεπνννυτε νατακο ηνετηψυχη μνητεωμα μμαγ ἄγω ενεπκαιρος πε ουμονον ἡετνετρονμος ἵωκε ηνετνεπενρογενε γημ ἀνεκκαρτ σαρωτη νκεηι ηνετναπηγε σικωτη νλα ηειναταζο ερατον ον νζεηεκε ζηηζηη ιηειεγηαλωηη νηατρηενευηε μηωτη ηανετενσονυηε γημ ηνενζαλατε ηηπε ουςκ ηενεςαρζ ηηατενηαγ μμελος ηκροκ άγω ηεινακκωνε μηωτη ζηηζαμε ηαε ηνηουηη βηντβαζαλ...

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

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

(37) Chass. 17 ενεμπεπννυτε γαρ ωακε μηρκωμε χπητρπεηρρομε ενεμπρεπεζνενυηο γραν ηπητογ ετεμπεκεογα λαγ ενεμπρππατας ηατοομ εβαλ των εβαλαοος ξεται τε τεκριςις ξεαπογοιειν ει επκοκμοε

The negative irrealis protasis is clearly different from the affirmative. The three protases, a rhetorical triad, outweigh the apodosis, which is in fact a reductio ad absurdum; indeed, the whole is close to an
εὐαχρίστηθεν complex. The triple rejected negation is of course a forceful affirmation; and the “pseudo-apodosis” is a rhetorical question referring, like the protasis, to unquestionable reality. Note that the 3rd plural pronoun has no clear referate.

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

(38) Chass. 13 εὐχαριστάσας ὁ προειράζει μοι ἐπεξερρέουσι
 ἀν ἀλλὰ ἔνθεν ἐπάφχομεν ἐκ ναροῦ πε

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

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

(39) Paris BN 130 f.3 (Cod. YW 81) εὐρεθερηνοῦτε ἐναγρίζει
 ὁμοιὸν ἐν ἔνθασωπνον ὅπως ἐν ἔνθεν ἐπακαθάριζε
 ρῶ νομίκα πο ἄγω νηπιασωπν ἐροκ πο νηρῶ στὸ

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

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

And a clear-structured passage:

(40) De Iudicio f. XVIII ro (Behlmer, p. 218-9, nn. 174-5) ἀκωπτὸ
 ἐροκ μπιχοεῖσι ἀκεῖνας νονυμας εἰραί εἰρωκ ἐλάσμπκα
 ἄγω ἀκοβτε νακ νογιαμητον ρήμαντερο νμπυντε
 ἀκωπτὸ εροκ μπιμειεύε εεοοο ακωπτὸ εροκ μπαλιμιμ
 ετρεκασοξα ζραίνητες ναχρήθη μιμονεβε νιμ...

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

You have received the Lord unto yourself — you brought a blessing on yourself on earth, and prepared a resting-place for yourself in
the Kingdom of Heaven. You received the evil thought unto yourself — you received the demon, that he may counsel you inside every uncleanliness and every sin…

* * *

1.3 Information packaging. Focalization. Topicalization

1.3.1 Focalization. Nexus focusing. Thematization and rhematization. Superordination

(41) Cod. XO 304 (Boud’hors, Canon 8, with n. 978) \( \text{απάντητ ὦ \( \text{ω̂ο̂} \) αὐθον ἐβολής πεμκαὶς νῇ ἔτους} \)

Such lexemic repetition is tagmemic, signalling thematization. It replaces the morphological Focalizing Conversion: it also has a rhythmical role, and is highly effective rhetorically (cf. the German \( \text{und zwar} \) connector).

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

(42) Cod. XO 304 (Boud’hors, Canon 8, with n. 976) \( \text{ἀιὲ τὸν ἐπειράω} \) \( \text{εἰὸ νοὐ μὴρῳμὲ ἀνοκοὐρεφρνοὺς εἰναμοῦτε νοὺς} \) \( \text{ἐτβερὼμὲ} \)

Focalization can be effected by syntactic, not morphological (conversion) tagmemes. (Moreover, several idiosyncrasies of \( \text{τὸν} \) “where” come to mind, albeit not their connection to the focalization issue: \( \text{τὸν} \) enters the second position of the Durative Present pattern, and, following \( \text{ἐρτὸν} \) “where is it that he is?”, a nominal theme is not adjoined by \( \text{νὲί} \), but in immediate appositive adjunction.

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

(44) Leip. III 202 \( \text{ἐτβεναι} \) \( \text{ῥω} \) \( \text{εἰανοῦτε} \) \( \text{ἐπὶ τιμὴ} \) \( \text{νῆττιμα} \)

A triple array of putative focussing exponents: the position of \( \text{ἐτβεναι} \), the focalizing particle \( \text{ῥω} \), and the apparent circumstantial morphology of the topic (cf. CGC §2.5). However, some reservation or at least discussion is called for. The first is not conclusive, for initial position is ambivalent, for prominence applies to topicalization as well as focussing. The functional range of the particle \( \text{ῥω} \) is still in need of study, and is broader and more complex than contrastive focussing. Similarly, the function of the Circumstantial topics often seems
to be a reduced or more formal type of focus. And, of course, the combination of all three exponents may well differ from that of any single one. (Actually, we have here three sub-paradigms, with εαν- commuting with ηνταµ- and η¬-).

This is why God has taken revenge of those people.

(44) Cod. XO 71 (Boud’hors, Canon 8, with n. 158) ἄω ὄν τενού ἐναὐσῳπν τνεζενκοοὺγε ρωμμο ενεψςυνάγωνη ἐτβενεἰσβυγε ηεἰρβυγε ὦν ἅλοιμος...

Focalizing reiteration: “these very same acts” (CGC §1.3.3). Moreover, in combination with ὄν, we encounter the rhyme of a special Nominal Sentence: κεκρυβ πεκρυβ ὄν πε “Your form is always the same” (Shisha-Halevy 1984, 186). In both cases, ὄν has a prosodic role, serving to delimit the colon.

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

(45) Leip. IV 121 ἐωψεν ἄε ἐωψανει ηειογκαιρος ντεπνωβε ἐμοὶ ἐχννετουηθη ηπειμα ʔμπκαιρος ετθμαγ ἐτβεπτον νηθ ετναι εχννογνημ...ἄω ʔμπκαιρος ετθμαγ πετναογνω εἰπωτ νακ επξαιε ʔμα νημ ἐτρηψογκαί δο νελεγθερος εβολ ʔννεισκαζογ...

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

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

(46) Cod. XO 98 (Boud’hors, Canon 8 with n. 247) ἐψχεςετετνξω μµος ντωθ...χε...ἐψχω μµος νηθν ᾱω...χεςεθςοογν ἄν πε χε—...

πε “it means that...” occurs as rhematizer following various clause forms, often converted. Most familiar is the narrative or irrealis-modal conditional ηεν-, and of course the Future in apodosi. The interesting point here is that it is componential of an apodosi, yet not in itself apodotic of εψχε, but thematic.

If you say ... that ..., I, for my part, tell you ... that it means that you don’t know that.
(47) Cod. XO 110 (Boud’hors, Canon 8) ...εγείρει ντευψυχη ωσραι επμογ. αγμωντογ γαρ
...tormenting their souls unto death: for indeed they were put to death.

(48) Cod. XO 197 (Boud’hors, Canon 8 with n. 561) πινεψβηγε μπνογτε μμαγ τενογ ετβεζενεδρνοβε επενωγω ων ρε ετεγειρε. εγειρε ωε
Do away now with God’s works for sinners’ sake, although you (f.) don’t want them to sin — and then, indeed, they did sin.

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

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

(49) Leip. III 96 ... ξωο εσωχενταυψωσε κρητ νταυψους γαρ
... as if they became distraught — and indeed they did become distraught.

(50) Leip. III 113 ... αγω ριτηναι παςεβος ετγμαγ ηαφοκρεγ Νεεποβοη Νφαβλα εβολ αν ηπους ων ρη ρω
And thereupon, that impious one will gnash his teeth and dissolve and also break up — indeed, he is broken.

(51) Leip. IV 24 ιαειατογ ινεντανεγβαλ χωτρ ετβεπειβε ετβειε χεαγρπαλβολος νβαλε αγω εοββαλε ρω πε ιναξρν-νετερειε ωοον ινμαγ
Blessed are they whose eyes failed for thirst of Jesus, for they have blinded the Devil — and indeed, he is blind before those with whom Jesus is.
(52) Canon 7.7 §15 (1) = XU 331 (Wisse) μᾶλλον δὲ δεναωωςτ ἀν ἐβολ μμοογ νεπαράφγςις ν消极η ναηθμων πνούτε πκοεις πεξ ἰς ναωαθν ἐβολ μμοφ ἡ 

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

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

(53) Cod. XO 75 (Boud’hors, Canon 8) ἡ εἰσαντμαραγωμ ἐρωτη. ὁμω γρ. ἡ πεπα μπούτε ετενπξ μμοφ νειον ρώγε ἀν εσαραγωμ ἐρωτη

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

(54) Chass. 102 … κεμοναξος κεθην ερνητεια. ιντοογ 

“‘They are indeed’ is responsive syntax; counter-intuitively, and contrary to prosodic appearance ne is rhematic, ιντοογ thematic.

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

(55) Paris BN 130² f. 24 (Cod. XV 151) αρηκανυς δὲ ὁν ενεγ μποογ ζηνεπεξ ζνογ ηνεπθουκολ ἡ ζηνενμα εγεη 

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

Have you ever pierced a snake with a lance inside his holes or in crevices — pierce also Sin with the commandments and the teaching.
A question is here posed by “basic”, morphologically unmarked clauses, where we should expect a Focalizing Tense, i.e. where an interrogative adverbial should condition — here a Focalizing Perfect. It seems there are a few adverbials liable to this feature; ὅπου “where?” is one such.

(57) Canon 7.7 §2 (3) (Wisse) = Cod. XL 275 ἀναγρεψκισιον ἔτεσοι ἔτανεψμελος ἐς ἔταςκμελῃ Μαογγ ἔτανεψτοπος ἐς ἔταςείμνταξακε ἐς ἔτμμαγ ἤπειραιογ αἶπραν Μπνοὔετα ἔταπκατανακ ἐς ἔτραψε ἐκμ-πτάκο ἔτατεκρίτικε ἔς ἔτουναταγών ἐραν ἐρος ἔτανκολαςικ ἐς ἔτατμιντερο ἐς

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

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

* * *

1.3.2 Hermeneutics. Lemmatization and thematization of quotes
(see also exx. 70, 134, 179, 185, 207)

(58) Amél. II 465f. οὐ πε οὐ πε οὐ πε οὐ πε οὐ πε οὐ πε οὐ πε...

Explication of “forward” and “backward” (in Sh.’s preceding allegory: the herd moving back or forward of the shepherd). This fascinating
hermeneutic construction set, symptomatic of Shenoute’s syntax, has a striking junctural basis. The main interest here, to my mind, lies in the junctural “freezing” of the “bit” extracted from the citation and thereafter neutralized and rendered inert, indifferent to obtaining grammar — as it were, inert, kept out of or above — a metatext — its parole environment. (Ed. resorts here to emendation.) We find variations on the basic scheme of # theme (detached from quotation, unmodified) — rheme #. Consider also the following loci.

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

(59) Chass. 169 ⲙⲛⲣⲁⲣⲉ ⲟⲩⲟⲩ Ⲫⲧⲙⲓⲗⲗⲉ ⲗⲥⲛⲭⲟⲩⲥ ⲗⲧⲟⲩ ⲙⲱϩⲛ ⲧⲡⲓⲏ ⲜⲧⲣⲈⲱ ⲙⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲙⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲥⲛⲟⲩ ⲙⲟⲟⲡ ⲣⲧⲉ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ Ⲫⲧⲙⲓⲗⲗⲉ Ⲙⲛⲓ ⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲜⲧⲣⲈⲱ ⲙⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲙⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲥⲛⲟⲩ ⲙⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲥⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲛ)o

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

(60) Leip. IV 181 ογ δε πε χεεγογις ηνωγ ογις ηνωγ πε χεεκτκμεεγε εροο υ χεερνψμε θεογ χεκααγ ςανατου θηρου ηεν

[Ed. “εγογις ηνωγ suspicor”]

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

(61) Cod. XO 253 (Boud’hors, Canon 8) “...τβω ηελοοε ενταρψῠῳ ” ενταρψῠῳ ενιμ ηεαίς

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

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

(62) Leip. III 214 ωσω δε πε αγω χαιε χεεκνπεηκαιογ ηγητοι ογις ηνωγαγγελος η ουπη ντενπογ...
The copular NS is here instructive, since its theme is zero-articled (and coordinated by ὧς, not ϑι-) — a feature of the copular pattern only — and its rheme a χε- included clause, again exclusive to this pattern.

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

* * *

1.4 Juncture contours: construction rupture (‘anacoluthon’).
Cohesion (linkage) and delimitation features. Zero.⁷

Reference. Prosody

1.4.1 Linkage and delimitation⁸

(63) Leip. III 183 μαλιστα ἀνξοογ ἄνωτ ἀνξοογ

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

Especially since we said them again and again.

(64) Leip. IV 205 ἀπετεσφως ἑξιπκας τηρς ἄςω πετπαρας ἄντοικομενη τηρς νεας νεω πνογως ῥηονειω νιμ ἄςω μμηνε μμηνε ητεψωντε πε απεωξωτ ἡων εβαι εξων

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

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

(65) Cod. XO 217 (Boud’hors, Canon 8, n. 616) ευχαριστείτε εν' ἕξω τίτι κατασφαιρίζωντες

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

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

(66) Cod. XO 292 (Boud’hors, Canon 8) ενθανατο εἰ εἰκονομοθετοκεν αὐτοὶ τοιαῦτα εὐχαριστοῦν

Lest they come upon these abodes and wipe us out.

(67) Leip. III 215 οὐ γνῶσις πενταγράμμων εἰπαπρονεις ηώς καὶ τυχόν ένεργοι άγαλμα πάνω στεριάν

Here we witness the combination of two different links: the Relative converter, and the non-durative (substantival) infinitive, as is made clear by the second object construction; the first has the converbs (‘adverbial infinitives’ is not a contradiction in terms), which is subject to Stern-Jernstedt; the substantival infinitive is not.

A separate issue is the relation of this construction, frequent in Shenoute’s work, to subcategorization by means of the Conjunctive. Obviously, the infinitive is less categorized: no negation, no actor exponence.

We need a contrastive distribution outline; different is also the “sub-coordination” linkage of the two forms with the nuclear verb.

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

(68) Cod. XO 290.18ff. (Boud’hors, Canon 8) ΠΡΩΝΗΣΗΝ έΜΒΟΥΝ άγαλμα τοιούτων ένεργοι

See Boud’hors and Shisha-Halevy 2012, for the stative verb as a (relatively) independent adverbial. However, the Stative here is a conditioned auxiliary, the durative alterant of ρ.ΜΝΤΡΕ.

The wise know and testify.

(69) Canon 7.1 §23 (1) = DG fgt 6 ῡαυτοῦ (Wisse)

... εγκώ μπετερεπογά δούλα εἰρή μμοψ
πεταχαίμ χεογκαταρτος πε
πετογαλβ χεογκανιος πε
πάντα χεπναστρωμε
άγαλμα πρεπάνςονος χεπετόκεοτε ντεφψψψχ καλακ
πνατ χεναγαγος
άγαλμα πεταρεοεπαϊκαιον χεπετομε ντειρννη
πρεληνχ χενραχαε μπονούτε...
The dilemma in interpreting this generally clear, definition glossary-like passage is, whether we have Nominal Sentences, with alternation or variation of zero/non-zero delocutive pronominal themes, or two NS’s alternating with a repeated naming construction; or a series of Nominal Sentences, with their themes (ⲡⲉ) and thereafter zero. What guides us is noun determination. The NS rhemes are indefinite, the Proper Names are formally definite. The first constituent is thematic, the second rhematic. (A related query regards the nature and meaning of υε-.)

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

(70) Canon 7.1 §3 (1) = XU 2 (Wisse)

ⲑⲇⲧⲁⲣⲣⲑ ⲇⲟⲩⲩ ⲫⲧⲣⲓⲣⲣⲧⲧⲧⲣⲉⲣⲓⲟⲩⲧ

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

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

(b) The “delocutivation”, shift from 1st-person to 3rd-person,
and (c) the freezing of the conversion in ϑⲇⲧⲓ-, Circumstantial in (I), a freezing inertia characterizing the lemmatization in (II) of the quote I Cor. 13:3b, 1-3).

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

(71) Leip. IV 164 ἂλλα ἵμ μετεποίησε μπνοῦτε μὴ κατηγορεῖ γνώμην

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

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

* * *
1.4.2 Prosody. Augens. Parenthesis. ‘Foreshadowed’ enclitics

(72) Cod. XO 259bis (Boud’hors, Canon 8, with n.800) ἀντιπρῶτος ἀντεσθοῦτον τοῦτον εὑροῦς 

That accursed manner of behaving, which you have taught yourselves and have not put behind you.

ὅπως seems to be narrative circumstantial (my “and” in the translation). The difficulty of the singular nucleus referate of the plural Augens is, I believe, not so much a case of adsensus (.getTag- may be a generic comprehensive determinator, the plural its components), as of the relative independence of the Augens, in adverbial status, syntagmatically far removed from the 3rd plur., which may be the referate of ἀντεσθοῦτον. Consider:

(73) Leip. IV 68 ταξινόμησαν τέλος ἐνώπιάλη

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

(74) Leip. III 118 γενωπτε τῆρον πεκάγιν ἐνωκαξε 

Another invaluable signal, instructive for mapping junctural links and delimitations, is the verbum dicendi insert (incise narrative), usually πεκαγ(ITION). It does not break a colon. (The data concerning this striking boundary have not yet been collected or evaluated.)

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

(75) Cod. XO 253-4 (Boud’hors. Canon 8, with n. 751) ἐκείνως ἄνω 

A tentative suggestion: the absence of ἄνω- with ἄνω- may be considered a rhetorical delimitation (with ἄνω) of rhythmical significance, the “said” unit being relatively independent of the rest of the passage, which in turn is rhythmically heavy. The pathos of these rhetorical exclamative questions is evident. The two “where...?” clauses that make up the contents of saying have their own syntactical irregularity in the absence of ἄνω. The distribution of ἄνω/-zero must yet be studied; the latter is rare in Shenoute.

9 Cf. Shisha-Halevy 1986, § 6.0.3.3; Boud’hors 2013a, Introduction, § 12.3.
I shall also say: ‘Where is the gentleness and the prudence? Where is the shame and the firmness of our heart and the good thought of the beginning of those who enter these abodes?’

(76) Leip. III 96-97

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

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

(77) Cod. XO 240 (Boud’hors, Canon 8) 

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

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

(78) Cod. XO 189 (Boud’hors, Canon 8) 

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

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

(79) Cod. XO 266bis (Boud’hors, Canon 8) 

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

* * *

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

(80) Chass. 79 τειcbw ἀγω πειλογος πανενταγυσινποννηρων ἔν μπαραθόν μαγαγ

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

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

(81) Cod. XO 272 (Boud’hors, *Canon* 8) εψχετβοτε μπκοείς έν ηπαρβαλ ἀγω ματσβω...

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

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

(82) Cod. XO 267-258bis (Boud’hors, *Canon* 8, with n. 793) ψαρενταγκοο ςθον ετςοντ ρα ἀγω εθοογ εματε ετβεκεεσωον ρω ἀν ψαγκοωγ...

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

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

(83) Cod. XO 277f. (Boud’hors, *Canon* 8) ... χεπετμοςτε μπεκςον εψωον ριπκακε... ἀγω χεπετμοςτε μπεκςον ουρεκεσεβρμενε πε ἀγω αικαίν ἀγω εψθεαγυον εροκ κατα νηα νεναισπ ννενςβγε ἀν ἐνογη
The substitution of πετ- by a plural pronoun is instructive: beside the alternating πετ- (/πετ-/πετ-), the immutable πετ-, the zero-article lexicalizing (οɣ-, χɣn-, zero-...) πετ-, we have, as here, an invariable generic πετ-. It is evident that the paradigmatics (substitutability) and syntagmatics (combinatorics) are integrated.

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

(84) Paris BN 131f. 57v (= Young, Coptic Manuscripts 133, 137 with n.634) ... ἔβολα ὀἰμπεντακάαγ ...  
  Ed.’s note attempts to account for this sgl. determinator vs. plur. object conflict (“one contribution, two coins”). While it would be grammatically difficult, such a possibility cannot be dismissed.  
  ...from what she gave.

(85) Leip. III 138 πεἰσάκε εὖνα ϊνατολαμα ντάξοος μπεμτο  
  ἔβολα ἦνακνή ρπικός καμε...  
  No simple anaphora here, since the neutric feminine wavers between ana- and cataphora.  
  These two things I’ll dare say in the presence of my truly believing brethren.

(86) Cod. XO 185 (Boud’hors, Canon 8, with n.534) μπετενάκαάοος  
  ὄτοις γίνηζενκοογε χεερετεκκήνη ἦταμονίγ ἴασ  
  νεσωγ νήν νού μνογ ἔποττι νήν νηνής ἦνη  
  At first sight, this is a condemnable case of discord: εκκήνη feminine, anaphoric νεσωγ, εὐσωττ masculine. Twice! Still — and it is the very recurrence that suggests this — what about “the Tent...it is beautiful... and it is exquisite...” — no direct anaphora, but two neutric pronouns? After all, the masculine is the Coptic unmarked gender. (The editor suggests attraction to the preceding νεσωγ, ζωττ, XO 184, referring to πεοού  
  κτεκκήνη).  
  No one will be able to say in other words that the Tent, the one not made by hand, was of such and such beauty, or was exquisite like this or that person.
(87) Cod. XO 188 (Boud’hors, Canon 8, with n. 544) … \textit{nсетмка-оутаxро exнoугтаxро етеретeом етммав таxpну eзрai eωc}

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

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

(88) Leip. III 172 \textit{ناилаωυ нσενιοτε εουνρενρωμε μπιστος нαμ нαγνωμειε ρντσγαωμα μπαωειε ετευνουουε αυω ετευνουωυ ετεουυταυρ ερογη нσενιοτε етeсωω нαμ καταπνουτε}

No clear substitute for “fathers”, but the repetition of “fathers” is arguably an echo-substitute, as well as elegant closure of the rhetorical unit.

\textit{Blessed are fathers to whom truly faithful people will submit in the Lord’s Congregation, for the sake of God and for the love they have for their fathers.}

* * *

1.4.4 \textit{Reference: cataphora. Prolepsis}

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

(89) Chass. 94 \textit{онтwс аиоp дxeупоνηpоn пe ειwянтмωw нpтн нтpме}

\textit{In fact, I considered it wicked if I didn’t tell you the truth.}

(90) Amél. II 273 \textit{мp нpсгp pω ан xεpεμωмпепнa мpωεиe нp мpωp ан пe}

\textit{Is it not written: he who does not have the Lord’s spirit, it isn’t his?}

(91) Leip. III 191 \textit{мpоутaс нан етpεнcoυntepиии мpζλαнт н пξoεи}

\textit{It has not been given us to know the way of the fowl or of the ship.}
(92) Amél. I 59  ἐντρεὶσαμφὶ ἐπὶ ἐπὶ ἀπὸ ὑπὲρ ἐπὶ ἔμπνευς ἃ πεπίπο

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

(93) Leip. III 24  ἐντεῖνει ἐν ἐξήταλυς

It’s not proper to add to my pain.

(94) Amél. II 216  ἐμπονᾶγα ἐνεγερῆ ἐνερ

It is better if they had never seen one another.

(95) Chass. 65  ἔχειμον ἐρνοῦε δῶ πειμεῖπε

It’s up to us to sin or not to sin.

(96) Amél. I 125  ἐνενοῦες πε δῶ ὦγη πε ἐμοογοῦπ

πε focalizes ἐνενοῦες; πε- attenuates ἐνοῦες. The two πε elements are disparate, for their patterns are not the same, but their functions are akin.

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

(97) Leip. IV 69  καταὶδε ἐτηγὰς ἔεέφηραιμεν ἐγῆς ἐκοῦογ

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

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

The feature of the neutric pronouns — q-, -c-, cataphoric to clauses — usually nexus- substantivated (as “that” forms, or correspondent) — is one of the main typological traits of Coptic. This is an instance of a type of Flexionsisolierung, with the pronoun representing or heralding or anticipating the clause in theme-actor or object status, through formal cataphoric reference. The frequency of this construction points to an idiosyncratic Shenoutean rhetorical-rhythmic trait. The precise regulation or (partial?) variation of feminine or masculine representants is still an open question: a thorough investigation (beyond the need to represent “that” clauses inside the verb clause) must take count of the following: at least four parameters: (a) the lexeme and its semantics; (b) the “that”-clause issue (one cannot ignore the difference between the “universal subordinator” ἅε- and the prospective ἐτρε-, with the infinitive); (c) the representant pronoun, (d) the syntactic environment of the complex. Variation would meet nicely the signifier and definition of “neuter gender”, namely “neither” masculine nor
feminine, apparently realized as their free variation. The prevalence of substantival clauses, and their rhetorical importance, are no doubt associated with Shenoute’s predilection for this cataphoric construction mode.

(98) Amél. I 161 ἐτευγοὶ ἐγνατρεγωμὴν ἐπὶ Χεντζοογν 
παί is here cataphoric to a quote. Always masculine, and the only way for a content clause to be governed as object of a verb of perception. The neatness, even beauty of the Coptic cataphoric neutric pronominal structure or other cases of ἓ-, is marked by the neutric παί-. This applies to both “that” forms, ἔς- and ἐτε-.

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

(99) Chass. 122-3 ἀγ γαρ πε πκεσωὶν ἀγ πκεκερανὸς 
... Since what is any fury and any thunder that is greater than this, that the Lord God Christ, the Son of God, should close the heart of a people?

(100) Amél. II 169 ουςοὶ ἀν πενταίκοογ Χε... (v.l. πενταίκοογ) 
The ubiquitous quote-opening signal raises at least the question. An anaphora/ cataphora coupling is manifested by the fem./masc. pronouns. The masculine is a constituent of the nexus-negated CS, the feminine is cataphoric; but the variant reading, beside being perfectly compatible with Χε-, echoes the masculine topic.

(101) Cod. XO 51 (Boud’hors Canon 8) ... ἡμε ον ζηιηγη- 
...and also the way you have aborted (lit. ‘made fall the womb of’) the women you had impregnated.

(102) De Iudicio f. LIV rº p. 139 with n. 510 (Behlmer) ... ἐναγαὶ ἐπαζοῦ ἐγεροῦ ἑιηηὲ ἐπαζοῦ ἡμοῦ ἐμαζοῦ 
... documents to be torn, to the debit of the poor, who cannot pay them.
In the cataphoric inalienable "possession", or rather personal-sphere part/whole association, we find the invariable masculine (unmarked gender) as a formal "dummy" slot-filler. The possessor is always specific. This applies also to grammaticalized ex-nouns, in compound prepositions. Most enigmatic, however, is the immutable masculine — which, being immutable, is not masculine — with the nota relationis ṭ-, as the pronominal form of the preposition ṭ-ερό=. Yet this seems to occur only with the homonym ṭ- “in debit of, owing”, where, like other inalienables, only the pronominal is used.

They are in the hands of God’s rage.

Non-anaphoric ταί τε ὑπὲρ ἣν ὄνομα τὴν ἀπομείναντα ἔργα ὡς σάλον τοῦ ὄνομα ἐντελείως ἀρχαῖον ἐν παλαιότεροις ἁλων. Ὁ μεταφραστός ἑν ὀψιν οὐκ ἐστὶν ἀπειροῦμεν χρήματα ὧν ὄνομα ἔλαθον ἀρχαὶ ἔργα.

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

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

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

10 Modern Irish (is) amhlaidh. Old French si- seem to be close correspondents in narrative.
(106) Cod. XO 78 (Boud’hors, Canon 8) ἀροπ ΜΠΡΩΥΝΠΑΙ Ἡ

nai ἑξεεἰπε ὧξῃٻότε

Again, a “that”-form rhetorical feature: avoiding a substantive-clause object, its theme is proleptically singled out as object, then pronominalized in an anaphoric χε- clause. This is a common construction in Bohairic and Theban Sahidic.

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

(107) Canon 7.7 §2 (3) (Wisse) = XL 275 εἴσηπε ηπρόοπε ἀν

ζητοῦν ἡνεἰβύε ἐτμῆου χε-ννεγῳψε ον...

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

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

* * *

1.4.5 Topicalization. Nominativus Pendens. Antecedent- and other resumptions

(108) Cod. XO 235 (Boud’hors, Canon 8) ἐνεωοὺς ητεξρία θηρε

ηκωματικὸν εζογν ἥν ἡνωεῖκ ἡναξοῖτε ἡναίεξ

ηανραούης θηροῦ ηταϊκονία μπενεωούς εζογν

ἀγω ταῦποι ἀν

A resumption at first sight only. In fact, the plural pronouns are appositive specifications, not substitutes. The feminine τεξρία is resumed by ταῦποι. We also have here a nice pun — κωοὺς εζογν “gather, hoard” and κωοὺς εζογν “assembly”.

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

(109) Leip. IV 92 πεικεζῳβδε ον ἡπειοβῳτ εταμενετογνυς

ζηηεμπος χεζεςῳβῳτ νε ἀγω ψεπννῃρον νε

ηπετηαιςελε

Only apparently zero formal resumption of the topic; the twin Nominal Sentences, while contentualizing πεικεζῳβδ, simultaneously resume and represent it.
This thing, too, I have not forgotten to tell those who dwell in these abodes — namely, that they are a flaw and bad for those who are neglectful.

(10) Leip. IV 68 ἄγῳ πετογωνε ἐγκκε νὰ λ ἰπερψὰλ πταγενμᾶ σὲ ἑογγίγηνοτα μὴνσε σοοὶς ἵθην ἐγῳλα

A drastic doubly anacoluthic shift in resumptive syntax: τα- is anaphoric to the contextual “manner of praying”.

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

(11) Amél. I 199 εβῶκ μὲν ἐντοπος ἡμαρτυρος εψελα εψω εψαλλει ετββοκ εψετεπροςφορα 2νοτε μπεκ σανογ... εψω δε εογωμ εσωβε μαλλον δε επορνευε δψω εστβρωμε... ογανομια τε

Remarkable in this multiple topicalization is the masc. resumption, but also the non-adverbial, but substantival status of ε- + INF. The second ‘resumption,’ feminine as theme in the endophoric NS, is not resumptive at all but internally anaphoric to a feminine indefinite article.

The 2nd masc. pronoun in ετββοκ is the generic person.

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

(12) Amél. II 443 τοτε δε χεπεγωνο μπεκσαν υττων ναν εψαγκταρου ηθοπ μηον ψιντειπαραθρησις ητειμινε ογον νιμ σοογυ μπαι

Here a substantivized clause is topical, and resumed deictically.

I suggest that (a) τοτε “vests” χε-, which does not open alone the “that” complex, (b) rhythmical factors seem to preclude the immediate object construction σοοη-μπαι in closure.

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

(13) Leip. III 130 νεικοογε πνογεταθρινε γντηντε μπαι μναι εττμαγ γνογαι μμε
As for these others, God will adjudge between this one and those ones, in true judgement.

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

(114) Chass. 151 ρωμε μεν νιμ επο νευσεβης καταχοτ νιμ ἡντερακης, ερωματεσεβης ἡντεραν ωρανωακε αρανακτει ετεψυχη ετμμαγ
Any person who is pious in every way at his beginning, should he turn impious at his end, the Word is vexed with that soul.

(115) Chass. 81 ζμπαι ον τηναλομτ ηντη ᾄως τηνογτων αν
A classic case of double adverbial mixed reference: a striking anacoluth, colloquial, possibly even focalizing “in this” by position and repetition.

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

(116) Leip. IV 82 ουμηνης εγεοογη εγονης μενεμερης νημασογουπης αν μποα νοα
Another type of fuzzy resumption; the generic perspective is evident in the 2nd masc. “generic person”.

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

(117) Chass. 35 ετβεμπειραμος ας ετκβαλπτει ηντογ ηνκουμα ηνετ ώγβεικλογισμος νβοτε μπωκ αν πε πζωβ
Another fuzzy resumption-word, correlated to the initial topic-marker ετβε-, “As for…. Regarding…”

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

(118) Cod. XO 283 (Boud’hors, Canon 8) ετβεπιπετηνροογη ουγμοτ εροι αν πε
As for taking care of you, this is not a favour to me.
(119) Leip. III 21 νδοον ετεκοογνη ετετνκοογν χεβαει \ ωαρωτν

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

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

(120) Leip. IV 34 ταρϰη νταϰεωτν μπρωμε ριϰμπκας

“Our beginning which” in Coptic.

_The beginning when He created Man on earth._

(121) _De Iudicio_ (Behlmer) X νο p. 38 ἀμντε δε νοε ετεναϰϯογν

_The coordination of zero-article terms is either by ϫι_, where bracketed or otherwise juncturally tight (in a close-juncture group) applies, or ςω, in a loose unit; a unique ςω/ςι- quasi-paradigm (ςω is loose, ςι- is closely prefixed to a noun).

_Thus woe unto those that are called ‘brother’ and ‘father’ and ‘mother’ and ‘son’ and ‘daughter’_.

(122) Cod. XO 260bis (Boud’hors, _Canon_ 8 with n. 809) Τετναϰετογ Ρη \ Ντοοτογ Ννειρεπτως 2ραι Νθης Ρω ετκωτε Ννι εηι
You will find them in the hands of those meddlers that turn from house to house.

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

(124) Cod. XO 262bis (Boud’hors, Canon 8 with n. 817) ΝΧΠΟ ᾽ΩΟΥ ΝΤΕΓΒΩ ΑΓΩ ΕΤΚΑΝΑΨΤ ΝΪΗΤΟΥ ΜΝΝΕΨΗΡΕ
You too, mother-viper’s breed and your stomach fed with her offspring.

(125) Leip. III 170 ΕΨΧΕΕΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΝΕΖ ΝΤΑΓΕΝΧΒΣ ΝΕΨΧΕΡΟ ΩΨΨΧΕΝΑ
The collocative Aorist paratactic pair is almost a compound, with the two antonyms alliterating, punning, and probably a single metric unit. This is very different from the narrative zero-concatenated “complex event”, and from the listing “cataloguing” coordination.

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

* * *

1.5 Noun determination and its implications. Proper Names.

Zero article. Article nuclearity

(126) Cod. XO 274 (Boud’hors, Canon 8) ΖΕΝΡΨΜΕ ΖΡΑΙ ΝΪΗΤΝ… ΟΥ ΠΕΤΒΒΡ ΝΪΗΤΟΥ ΝΚΑΝΑΙ… ΝΪΨΤΝ ΒΕ ΕΤΣΟΟΥΝ Ω ΝΡΨΜΕ ΕΤΗΡΡΑΙ ΝΪΗΤΝ…
Adverbiajacent adjuncts adjoin non-specific noun phrases directly, whereas specific nuclei are expanded by Relative clauses. It is debatable whether a zero element must be postulated in the former case.

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

(127) Amél. II 453 ΠΕΝΤΑΨΨΨΨΨΨΨΕ ΔΕ ΝΨΗΡΕ ΝΤΟΡΓΗ ΑΓΩ ΝΨΗΡΕ ΜΠΤΑΚΟ ΜΝΨΚΑΚΕ
The grammar-book rule, according to which the non-specific nucleus is expanded by ΝΤΕ-, when the satellite is specific — and in fact, ΝΤΕ- occurs in cases of inequispecificity — this rule still stands; but
the **n-nte- notae relationis** paradigm includes yet another, prepositional **n-** term, probably truly possessive (and not “attributive”), possibly even inalienable.

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

(128) Canon 7.3 §10 (3) (Wisse) = XU 104 εὐχε†ναακε ẓοce μαɪɪcτα ႊγγ...  
A difficult protasis. I suggest interpreting it as a Present, with Stative rheme, and an infinitival theme (†-ναακε); the grammatical point would be the absence of ὁγγ-. The existential “prop” expected before a non-specific noun; the infinitive is a noun *sui generis*, where determination is concerned.

*If childbirth is painful, even deadly…*

(129) Leip. III 208 άιναγ ἄνοκ εὐγα εὐχενταρταρωγγυργή ὁ ὑγαρακων εαμούουγ... ὡγνογογ ομργή εμούε ῖε  ὧγ ερομ νηντς  
The delocutive NS admits in Shenoute a *zero*-articled noun rheme (Shisha-Halevy 1984, 178ff.). The admitted lexemes seem to form a closed or half-open list. Two intermeshed questions present themselves. Theoretical — is this a case of true *zero*, or a *nil*, that is, a rhamatic noun-lexeme, not syntagm? And diachronic, is this a distinct Coptic correspondent, or even descendant, of the Egyptian “Sentence with Adjectival Predicate”? This episode seems to be a vision, in which case “as if” may be dropped.

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

(130) Leip. III 214 ἡενταγρχαι εγω ωωψ...  
Beyond the coordination issue (εγω vs. ωψ-), we face here the theoretical problem of *zero vs. nil* in auxiliation, word-formation and copular verbs.

*They who became waste and desolation…*

(131) Chass. 95 ἡςεδεικαστρηπον ωακε ἡςαγ εκω  
The possessum, *zero*-articled, is resumed by a *zero* object. Similar (in Coptic — English precludes here a *zero* article):

*No tribunal has a word to say.*
(132) Leip. III 165 $\pi \tau \gamma \omega \psi \varepsilon \tau \tau \varsigma \omicron \mu \acute{\omega} \tau \omicron \omega \tau \mu \epsilon \pi e\iota$

Whoever wishes to be disobedient, let him be.

(133) Cod. XO 118 (Boud‘hors, Canon 8) $\varepsilon \omega x e \omega \alpha r \epsilon r r w m e \rho m a \ \nu \mu \mu m o \ \varepsilon \pi n n o y t e \ \varepsilon \h n \varepsilon \gamma \mu \nu n \tau \alpha \phi \varepsilon \beta h c \ \omega \alpha r \epsilon r r w m e \ o n \ \rho m a \ \nu t \tau e \pi n n o y t e \ \varepsilon \omega (n) \ \varepsilon \rho o \gamma n \ \varepsilon \rho o o y \ \varepsilon \h n \varepsilon \gamma \varepsilon \beta h \nu e \ \nu a i k a i o c y n h \ldots$

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

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

(134) Cod. XO 239 (Boud‘hors, Canon 8, with n. 688) $\omicron \gamma \rho o \omicron \gamma t \ \alpha \gamma \omega \ \omicron \gamma \zeta \iota \omicron \mu e \tau \alpha \kappa o \ \nu t e \gamma \zeta \epsilon \lambda \pi \kappa a k e \ \epsilon t e \tau e \gamma \zeta \epsilon \lambda \pi c \ \pi e \ \pi \tau \beta \beta \beta \nu \nu \nu \tau \kappa \alpha \rho \zeta \ \mu \mu \mu a t e \ldots$

A striking case of attributive adnominal (“Relative”) clause, with a non-specific nucleus,\(^{11}\) as interpreted by the editor. However, it may well be a case of hermeneutical $\epsilon \tau e\ldots \pi e$, overruling the specificity factor.

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

(135) De Iudicio f. LVIII r\(^{6}\) (Behlmer) $m h \ \gamma e r \rho w \ \nu t o q \ \alpha n \ \pi e \ \omega e$

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

But aren’t sticks too wood(en)?

(136) Amél. II 174 $\alpha \omicron \nu \gamma h e n \gamma o \alpha \omega \ \alpha \omicron \nu \gamma h e n r p w m e \ \alpha n$

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

We are lies, not humans.

(137) Amél. II 174 .petxøœœλε innitus των τοις τηρην
The augens expands the definite article (nucleus of the second τοις), which (unlike the first τοις) is exocentric, referring to God, not to “light”.

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

(138) De Iudicio f. LVI v° p. 144 (Behlmer) ʍ ϣⲧⲧ ⲛⲟⲩⲏ ⲛⲟⲩⲏⲧ ⲧⲣⲥ
The compatibility of the object marker ⲛ- with the zero article is questionable, and instances are rare. One would expect a Focalizing Aorist.

Does one crucify a god?

(139) Leip. IV 154 …εχμερετευν εχροψ
… who loves heavy burdens.

and

(140) P. Michigan 158, f. 16 r° (Young, Coptic Manuscripts, 54) … ετυμοιτε εκτυ επνυν ρε
… not to put on me clothes of theirs.

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

and

(141) Leip. III 205 ȧγαπη εξαυκ εβολ
Perfect love.

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

12 See Boud’hors 2013a, notes 343, 348.
well be the unmarked gender term. Another question concerns the formal expression of the conditioned masculine: the evidence of very rare adnominal (circumstantial) NS in Mich.158 (ex.135) is compromised by the alleged double gender of Ϙⲟⲓⲧⲉ (Crum CD 720b), which is still in need of examination (in Shenoute — feminine only?). The role of statistics — “a given lexeme is mostly/usually masculine/feminine”, as revealed only in its compatibility with a definite article or demonstrative — is unsatisfactory and unclear, indeed an obscuring factor. Ex. 136 is instructive in that its feminine classification is morphological (ex-Greek), and overruled by the zero neutralization. (Yet as a matter of fact, ⲏⲃⲗⲏ, like so many of ex-Greek words in Coptic, is synchronically Coptic, and belongs in a separate Coptic sublexical system, with its own Coptic rules).

(142) Amél. II 3 έβολ τωι Ξεγναμούτε ἐπενίπε Ξεκελεβίν άγω χιε ζημερευς μηρένκοογε ἐναϊσψώογ
A passage of great theoretical interest. First and foremost, we glimpse here Shenoute’s epistemological reflection on naming and conceptualization. Then, the zero articles for concept-naming (Nennform). Then, the neat coordinative opposition of όγω (non-bracketing) to ςι — (inside bracketing) in zero-article syntax. Not least, the syntax of έβολ τωι “whence?”: to my knowledge, this is the only interrogative-focus Cleft Sentence with ως- + Focalizing Future for glose (topic).

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

(143) Amél. I 77 μούτε ἐροφ χεσεμκας ηςήτ ζιλυπη ξιαςάζομ ζιουώας ηςήτ
Beside naming syntax, and the interesting feature of the intrinsic specificity of a “called” PN, we face here the dilemma of reading the name as “he who is characterized by heartache, pain, sighing and depression”, or properizing “Heartache-Pain-Sighing-Depression”, rhetorically perhaps more effective.

Call him ‘he of heartache, pain, sighing and depression’.

(144) Leip. III 57ff. passim, catalogic listing) ουξαςς τε ωγσωςνε τε ουγον τε ογσικε ωςς τε ογσεετε τε ωγρρυ τε (and so on).
The deep difference between this pattern — the Delocutive NS — and the Endophoric one (Shisha-Halevy 1987), is here clear-cut. In this long text, the basis for V. Jernstedt’s seminal 1949 article, τς “she” refers to the allegorical Bride of the Song of Song; the rhemes,
whether feminine or masculine — all indefinite — stand in a nexal relation to the theme τε. This is their only relation. On the other hand, in the Endophoric pattern (e.g. τεπρω τε “it is winter”, πωμι τε “it is summer”), beside the nexal interdependence, there is **concord** — the theme conditions the theme’s gender/number. Thus, there is no conflict between the femininity of τε and the masculinity of, say, ρρο or κον. Another question regards the indefinite article, nuclear in its syntagm. The issue of two homonymous indefinite articles, ου^fem^, ου^masc^, historically founded, is here irrelevant, since the theme τε has no reference to the articles. Another issue is the catalogue-like listing of the Bride’s attribute, the pivotal part of the exegesis.

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

(145) *De Iudicio* f. LXVII ν o p. 166 (Behlmer) ΝΤΩΚ ΔΕ Ω ΠΡΜΜΑΟ ΝΡΕΨΧΙΝΟΝΚ ΗΝΟΥΚ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΚΟΟΥΖ ΕΡΟΥΗ ΕΥΚΗ ΕΡΡΑΙ ΖΑΤΕΚΕΞΟΥΣΙΑ

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

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

(146) *De Iudicio* LXI τ p. 153 (Behlmer) ΠΕΙΩΒ ΓΡΑ ΧΕΡΩΜΕ ΕΡΟΥΑΛΒ ΟΥΜΝΤΡΜΜΑΟ ΤΕ

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

*This concept, ‘holy man’, means wealth.*

* * *
1.6 ‘Adjectives’ and the human-animacy gender

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

In a selective outline:

God, the Lord — (-ος) (147) Amél. I 87 πνούτε πναήτ Νωάντηθη Ναραοκ Πατος God the merciful, compassionate, long-suffering, good.

The Congregation, people — (-ος) (148) Chass. 123 τακαρτος Νωνάγωρ Πηριη the impure congregation.

Humans, persons, names — (-ος) — (149) Chass. 191 Νίβαλα Μπονπος the wicked servants.

Human inalienables — (-ος) (150) Amél. II 527 Πιβα K Mπονπος the evil eye.

Animals — (-ον) (151) Leip. III 47 Κενακτον Νζων tiny animals.

Plants — (-ον) (152) Amél. II 402 Κενθηθ Μπονπον bad weeds.

The Devil, demons — (-ον) (153) Paris BN 131⁵ f.56 (John Chrysostomos) Ναμαν Ναρπιόν the wild demons.

Objects, materials — (-ον) (154) Amél. II 74 Κενακτον Ννουβ smallest pieces of gold

---

13 It is not clear to what extent this gender applies to the rhetorical “adjective” construction (see CGC Chapter 3), although the fewer exx. do comply (cf. Amél.II 74 Κενακτον Ννουβ Ντιατ, although most instances are personal (-ος)).

(156) Amél. II 486 νεικβω μπονήρον these evil teachings.

(157) Amél. I 163 ἐτβενεγνπαζίκ ναγαον because of their good practices.

(158) Cod. XO 206 (Boud’hors, Canon 8) τενμντατκοογν νεκρικόν our ignorance of the flesh.

* * *

1.7 Person

(159) BL Or 3851A f.160 (Cod. DT 58) ὑγωνέειν ο νογεΒ ηντν ἕπον μαγετν

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

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

(160) Amél. I 73 ἃντο η ἃντο καζωτν εβον

Rhetorical inclusion of delocutive in allocutive perspective. Not anacoluthic.

You (fem.) and she, withdraw!

(161) Chass. 90 ἔτθνων ἄνω τηναείμε επετνως μμοκ

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

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

14 A nice feature is the well-attested μντ-‐ον (e.g. Amél. II 54)
(162) Chass. 98  ** neger nrapmao n2hti tnhp n2hke**

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

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

(163) Cod. XO 116 (Boud’hors, *Canon* 8, with n. 289)  **etbenai kan ekbanqi mpiswme he ephantnqi erp hennepqctoi rw ei erpai h rsw erol...**

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

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

(164) Cod. XO 151 (Boud’hors, *Canon* 8, with n. 421)  **nqetretko w mp2apo xshitcppnh h nq6a mpiswme Nqimoc etpmscwma ywp nntshwq mmpq nqhtou**

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

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

(165) Leip. III 144  **nqningonc entalaly nnai etxw mmos xennabwck erole mpimea etbntl nqok xettqmo mmoqy qntamntepxqningonc**

Delocutive — locutive (plur.) — locutive (sgl., hub speaker) — delocutive again. The speaker overrules. Nice example of person layering, or discourse blending. Not anacoluthic. A well-attested phenomenon, probably rooted in colloquial style, and definitely not an error (in fact, it is attested from Middle Egyptian on). Curiously,
three of the instances of allocutive/locutive/delocutive perspectival blending predicate “love” verbs, which feature also other idiosyncrasies. The interlocutive perspective seems to “seep” across the “say” boundary, while the delocutive acts as a basic, constant cohesive factor. The impression is that the interlocutives/delocutives tension is resolved by the latter’s overrule, or at least persistence. At any rate, it is evident that the boundary between the singular speaker’s locution (Shenoute) and the plural’s locution is sharply demarcated; indeed, juncture contours are here paramount.

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

(166) Leip. III 120 ἑντιγυγοι τρω ἐρον ἐβολ ἔν ἡντιγυγου ἐτενετήμαγ
Leipoldt notes, in apparent despair, “totus hic locus corruptus esse videtur”. Twin echo focalizations in locutive plur. and speaker’s/narrator’s comment. The resumption is fuzzy and of pejorative deixis.

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

(167) Chass. 88 ἑρμανογα δε ξοος χε τιμε τινοτε κέπεχτη τρη δετεψγθη τηρκ δετεψκον τηρκ μνημεσεγε τρου μνημερε-πετριτογρκ δετεβκε μνεμαντυτθ αν
A nice glissement from locutive to delocutive perspectives, rhetorically forceful: the observer’s delocutive — Shenoute. Note that this transition entails also a shift from subjective to objective. Not anacoluthic.

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

Compare, for Shenoute’s delocutive:

(168) Leip. III 153 ἑρρανογα χοος χε τιμε τετενημαγ ἐρο ας εμοκτε σωμπ μπεκον τετηναγ ἐρο...
*Should one say, ‘I love God’, whom he does not see, and yet hating his brother, whom he does see.*
An extreme, complete 360-grade sweep from allocutive (1) to allocutive (2) with rhetorical-dramatic effect. Not anacoluthic. The focalizing Present seems to be autofocal, expressing the discredited claim (CGC p.77f.).

* * *

(169) Vienna K 9040 (Young, Coptic Manuscripts, p. 23f. with n. 6) ΠΕΤΜΕΕΥΕ ΧΕΕΡΕΠΕΤΧΩ ΝΑΨ ΝΗΛΩ ΧΕΤΟΓΑΨΚ ΤΩΝΕ ΚΜΕ ΜΜΟΨ ΝΑΜΕ

He who thinks that he who tells him this, ‘I love you very much’, you really love him.

Consider also:

(170) Leip. III 88 ...ΝΕΕ ΝΤΑΝΝΑΝ ΓΩΣ ΓΕΠΝΙΚΑΣ ΓΕΧΩΟΓ ΕΠΡΙΜΗ ΓΕΓΟΠΝ ΧΕΤΣΟ ΓΡΟΟΥ

Just as we saw many, scattering earth over their head, weeping, entreating, saying ‘spare them!’

1.8 Adverbials. Conjugation mediators

(See also §1.9)

(171) Cod. XO 281 (Boud’hors, Canon 8 with n. 894) ΖΜΜΑ ΝΙΜ ΓΑΨ ΖΝΝΓΥΛΑΨΨΗ ΟΝ ΜΑΓΑΝ

I suggest considering ΜΑΓΑΝ here in the light of the adverbial status of the augens in Leip. IV 67-8 ΤΑΖΕΝΜΑ ΜΑΓΑΝ, “we alone, on our own”: at least as a contributing factor in a personal mix-up.

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

(172) Leip. IV 37 ΚΑΝ ΜΑΡΝΩΨΙΨ ΖΗΤΟΥ ΝΝΙΨΑΨΕ

The editor (n. 5) apparently does not accept, or recognize, the adverb ΚΑΝ “at least”, in Coptic to my knowledge solely introducing imperatives and jussives (Greek: Blass-Debrunner 1965, §374B, with Tabachowitz’s addenda, p. 41). While the post-imperativatal slot is significantly open to special clause forms15, the pre-imperative one is almost entirely closed. In fact, ΚΑΝ (exclusively or especially Shenooutean?) may be unique in Sahidic in this privilege.

At least let us be ashamed before such words.

The extensive stretch interpolated inside the future clause, consisting of adverbials only, is significant both for determining the different circumstants and the juncture contours (§1.4).

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

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

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

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

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

Compare the next passage:

Special patterns predicating adverbials are old in Egyptian. The role played by morphological loan-adverbs is fascinating, in view of the Greek-origin adjectival subsystem, and the dearth of non-prepositional adverbs in Egyptian. The Greek-origin adverbials are more than lexical items: they have syntactical value and built-in valency and connectedness. Another point to consider here is the theme-marker, η-, yet another homonym in the abundance of η-morphs.
(177) Canon 7.4 §21 (2) = DG fgt.5 r° (Wisse) 
nim netnāxōoc an
xe nerooye men nanoyy ynetnhtoy de kakwsc

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

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

(178) Amél. I 96 ἑρπκεο ὀν νααxe
They are also inimical.

(179) Chass. 105 τνπκεργογεϝωντ

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

We also rather infuriate.

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

(180) Chass. 102 καιγαρ ερεβαλ μμαγ ετβεναγ, αγω πμααxe
ετβεςωτμ, εικω μπαι, xeeptmtrmmag woop
ετβενα, αγω τεζογια ετβεργαπ

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

* * *
1.9 Patterning

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

(181) Leip. III 107 ἀληθείας ην ἡ ἐσῳάς ἑσῃ ἐξεσαμώνες ην ἅπασης ἡμετροπος ἡμών ἧς

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

The template ην ἡ ἐσῳάς ἑσῃ - is formal, formulaic to a degree, opening a vision or dream texteme, alternating in Coptic at large with ἑσῃ, ἑσῃ + circumstantial or circumstantial alone. The clause form here is circumstantial, conditioned by ἑσῃ -.

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

(182) Leip. IV 14 πρῶτης πετρων ἐπότισε ἐν θεῆς ἑσῃ ἔσῃ ἔτεκως ἡμῶν ἐτοιμάζω τοὺς ἑπετρών ἐπότισε ἐν θεῖες ἐν θεῖας ἐποτίσατε τὸ ἱερό τι ζητεῖσθαι ἡμῶν ἔτεκως ἡμῶν ἔτερον θελής ἡμῶν ἔτοιμος ζητεῖσθαι η ἐπέτηρι

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

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

(183) Leip. IV 85 οὐγὼν ἐπότισε ἐν θεῖες ἡμῶν ἐπότισε ἐν θεῖες ἐποτίσατε τὸ ἱερό τι ζητεῖσθαι ἡμῶν ἔτοιμος ζητεῖσθαι η ἐπέτηρι

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

Truly a bad matter (the thing is clear).

16 There can hardly be any doubt about the rhythmical nature of Shenoute’s prose delivery. However, all that one can achieve at present are (a) isolate the rhythmics of specific patterns, (b) determine prosodic contours, cola and relationships of clitics, (c) locate the tone in many general cases.
A remarkable situational clause, with a zero theme ("It is as though..."). Or may name be thematic, or in some way associated with the theme?

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

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

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

"Thus also...” “So too...” — one of the most important structuring rhetorical devices in the Shenoutean text; a familiar, typically Shenoutean, anacoluthic figured signal, is in fact an array of anaphoric NS constructions. This is a main-clause, second-term component of inclusion, expansion or comparison figures. Often, this is a hermeneutic figure. The variation/alternation (?) is in this integrated construction formally complicated. Some schematic principles follow, the main operative parameters being (1) gender and number of the satellite; (2) nota relationis / no nota relationis; (3) concord/discord of the satellite. The construction consist of ἄνειε, deictic adverbial; οὐ, particle/adverbial “also”; τε/τε/τε, thematic pronoun. The last is perhaps the most intriguing, for the masculine and feminine seem to vary freely, while the plural is regulated by concord. Noteworthy is also the adnexal Circumstantial closing the ἄνειε unit. The connecting οὐ (or augens) is a constant component, as is the deictic τεi-.

Although typically anacoluthic, it is not “wrong” in any way; on the contrary, it is idiomatic (with a modicum of formulaicity): both discord and (άνειε ο-) are entirely valid grammatically.
(186) Leip. IV 89 ηντίεζε ον πε γηςνο νιμ ετρενετογνυργαν χαρμογνω... (NS omitted by Ms. A)
Thus also with any object, that they who dwell in these congregations should take care.

(187) Canon 7.5 §3(2) = XG 176 (Wisse) ... ἀγω ηντίεζε ον τε πτάκο ετάναι εχννεγκεκεπέ
And thus also the perdition which will come also upon their remnants.

(188) Leip IV 106 ηντίεζε ον τε γενχίμε εαςἴγνεεερε χημ ετοοτογ
Thus also women that have given girls into their hands.

(189) Leip. IV 84 ηντίεζε ον πε ογρωμε ν ογχίμε εγσανραγομ χνογνψε χ εαγσωσε
Thus also a man or a woman if they get weak in an illness or when they are wounded.

(190) Cod. XO 259bis (Boud’hors, Canon 8) ηεζε ον πε πψνβε μπτατ αγω πνοτ
Thus also the rust of silver and copper.

(191) Leip. IV 80 ηντίεζε ον νε νετμπημα ννετψψε
Thus also they who are in the place of the sick.

(192) Chass. 194 ηντίεζε ον πε παίκαος ινβ...ηντίεζε ον τε ηνςαγαος ημπνηνρος
Thus also Job the Righteous; thus too the good and the wicked.

(193) Leip. IV 163 ηντίεζε ον τε νρονε γεα ινήν... αγω ηντίεζε ον τε ηντνναγναπννννον δχογνη ενηι αγω χνογμα εγμα
Thus it is also with some of us... and thus it is also with those who change from house to house and from place to place.

(194) Leip. III 48 ηντίεζε χνων ννεναληχ ημπαρετικος νιμ εγμεζεν νναραγ χεαγψν χνννψνψειν
Thus it is with the pagans and every heretic too, they thinking of themselves that it is in the light they are.
(195) Leip. IV 104 nteῖγε on ταῦτα ὑπονόημα εὐχαίρει ἡ ἡμέρα: on nteῖγε

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

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

(196) Amél. II 346 μοῖρε εξήμονε (see also ex. 224)

Distinctive expressive-exclamative modal pattern A, possibly colloquial.

Wonder upon wonder!

(197) Cod. XO 257 (Boud’hors Canon 8) ὄντεογ ὑπε ἐμίῳ ἔρως ἡ βίωντ

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

How long for fighting, rage and fury?

(198) Cod. XO 256 (Boud’hors Canon 8) εἰς τοῦργ ἐκπνα εἰς τῆλο αἰτήμοόγκογ ἐτρεγὼ ἐρωτὲν ἁπεισὼν

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

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

(199) Cod. XO 283 (Boud’hors, Canon 8) ἀλλο κον ἱουήρῃ ἁεἰωτ ἡμᾶς ἱουεῃρη ἱουηνη ἱουβήρῃ ἐμίῃς ἀλλο ἂλοο

Another of Shenoute’s three “distinction” patterns, together constituting a major rhetorical motif and template. Although constructed as
two nexal subunits, we rarely find a single ἄλλο -. Remarkable is the rhetorically effective asymmetry: a “heavy” first flank, a brief single second flank. This pattern is affirmative only: rhetorical-question cases like Amé. II 411 (ἣ ἄλλο πρῶμε ἄν Ναργος... ἄλλο πήν Ναργος...) are not really negative. It seems we should be able to trace the pattern back to later (koine?) Greek, but I for one was not able to detect a clear Greek source with correlative predicative ἄλλο.

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

(200) Cod. XO 250 (Boud’hors, Canon 8 n. 732) οντες τετνογοντες εβαλ τετνους τετνες. ητειρε ἁν. ηττακο ἁν ὁν. ηττων ἁν ἡςεηετηεπε γμοο γνωςε ἀν ετεττακο γμοογ

Important, and difficult. We seem to have here a rare Coptic Wechselsatz (“balanced construction”) type of NS17 (pace Ed., n. 732), well established as a clause pattern since Old Egyptian. The sub-pattern, perhaps the oldest, that we have is homo-lexemic. Note the two punctuation marks: component and pattern delimiters. This “equation clause”, in Ed.’s translation, comes to mean “vraiment vous êtes la preuve que j’ai ma manière et vous la vôtre”, while denying (n. 732) this is a NS. I suggest reading τετνογοντες ξε- as “you seem/pretend/appear as if/that”). The passage is obviously ironic.

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

(201) Vienna K 9197 p. 91 (Orlandi 1985) ... ἐνέκβηςε νοιςν ἡε ἀιω ενους γε νοιςκ

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

... your works being his, and his being yours.

17 Shisha-Halevy 1984, 184ff.; 2007, 700, s.v.
Yet another Wechselsatz pattern.

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

How is it that a month should pass before you catch him who has defiled himself or who has stolen!?

Among the many clauses with interrogative adverbial focus, fascinating in their complicated subsystem of Basic, Focalizing and Circumstantial tenses (e.g. ετε-ογ, ναως ης),ⁱ⁸ εβολ-των stands out, syntactically as well as semantically: a rhetorical exclamation, somewhat between “how?” and “why?”, an indignant, exasperated “how come?”. Note the theme-topic form — strikingly, χε- with Focalizing Future, or (rarely) -πε- formally mediating between focus and topic.

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

* * *

1.10 Sequencing (‘word order’), placement

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

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

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

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

Since from the beginning until now you have been lying.

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

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

* * *

1.11 Negation

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

A few days after noticing this published passage, Stephen Emmel informed me of another, unpublished one: YB 71 ενεγεοογν ακ. Of the 15 non-Scripture exx. I am aware of to date, a considerable documentation, almost all are either Present (incl. Present-based Future) or Second Tense pattern, also the Present template.
Do not envy such malignant person — he won’t give you anything to eat, for he is merciless.

(209) Cod. XO 237 (Boud’hors, Canon 8, with n. 680) enempe neixoos an pe

Rather than an “absolute” use of the negative base, the protasis here is a tensed Perfect base, anaphoric; its relative independence corresponds to the nuclear status of the conjugation base. The compatibility with the Imperfect apodosis points to the existence of the past-sphere. (Consider [ε]mmon, not a base, for a Present-core extensive protasis).

If not, I would not have said it.

(210) A sophisticated rhetorical figure-pattern, the template of which is # [EXIST] NEG¹ — “that” — NEG² #, effecting an exceptionally strong claim of totality. is a Shenoutean favourite, but not exclusive to Shenoute or Sahidic. The pattern is dichotomous. The first term is a statement of non-existence: mn- or, perhaps more typically, a negative value “what/who” rhetorical question; the second term seems to allow any negative clause. The two terms are linked by adnominal “that” (xe-), the universal subordinator in Coptic, strikingly opposed to the adnominal circumstantial.

Leip. III 69 …emnkeznaay zhhentaywine ncowoy xe-mpoyntoy nay
… there being no object in what they had asked for that was not brought them.

(211) Chass. 125 αγω μμνεπικτικ μμνεζελπικ πρωβ ναμδοον χενξωοοπ νας αν

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

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

(212) Leip. III 217 αγω ηνηαα γηηεζεγελαγ επη ετιβολ η γηζεγεζεγεβ εροβ ςηζηντου ... χεζενεβολ αν γηπκας ιθρον υε ου δε γζωβ γηζεγεγεβ επαπουν ςιηντην αγου ρετούνु ηννοου εροβ ... χεζενεβολ ησυζε ιθρον υε
What object is it, in what they have given for the external house or what they have been working on therein, that isn’t, all of it, of the earth? And what is it, in what they are working on for the internal one, and what they are giving for it...that is not, all of it, of heaven?

(213) BL Or. 8664 p. 33 (Shisha-Halevy 1975) ΝΤϹΟΟΥΝ ΑΝ ΧΕΚΝΑϹΝΟΥΡΩΜΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΗϹΑΡ ΕΠΟ ΝΝΟΕΙΚ ΕΤΖΙΜΕ ΜΝΕΤΖΙΤΟΥΡΩ... ΧΕΜΝΟΥΕΙΡΕ ΝΤΟΨ ΕΤΨΩ

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

Note the familiar formal transition of negativity from content-clause to the governing clause: “know that...not...” to “ don’t know that...”

(214) Leip. III 212 ... ΕΤΡΕΨΤ ΕΠΑΨΟΥ ΕΗΝ ΑΝ

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

... that they should regress, not progress.

(215) Leip. III 205 ...ΖΗΝΤΝΑΙΚΑΙΟϹΥΝΗ ΝΝΟΥΕΙΟΤΕ ΝΤΨ ΑΝ

... by the righteousness of your fathers, not yours.

* * *

1.12 Conversion. Conjugation bases

(216) Leip. IV 28 ΤΕϹΗΜΕ ΕΤϹΖΜΟΟϹ ΜΝΟΨΑΙ ΚΑΤΑϹΑΡΨ (emended by the editor to ΕΤϹΖΜΟΟϹ)

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

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

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

(217) Cod. XO 262bis (Boud’hors, Canon 8 with n. 818) \textit{ετετσχανθης εφοογ άπκας ομκογ ḫ οοογ} 

The “normative” construction would have the Circumstantial as adnexal object of “find”. The unconverted form may belong to a colloquial register. (See Boud’hors 2013a, Introduction § 10, p. 42, for \textit{εγγανθη}- to express oath-like assertion).

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

(218) Leip. III 31 ωλλα ωαρκτοψ ϋ γν ρνδουψ ϋ νβολ \textit{nτοq nτοq on ῥε μπεφογοειν} 

The Shenoutean NS with the peculiar iterated-pronoun/noun rhyme — here \textit{nτοq nτοq} — expressing immutability and unchanging-ness (Shisha-Halevy 1984, 186) is often Circumstantial, and (my impression) as a rule zero-converted.

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

(219) Amél. II 33 εωχετνογχ γε ηκαπετεανοννετενογχ νε... 

\textit{ανον-} is here theme, \textit{νετενογχ νε} rheme in a Relative Interlocutive NS; \textit{νετενογχ νε} a Relative Delocutive NS. This elegant locus has an imbrication of Relative Nominal Sentences.

If we follow him, whose we are.

(220) Leip. III 162 ται ϋ τε γε νγωγ νιμ ετρνοβε μπεμτο \textit{εβολ μπαειε ενεινε εζραι εξψιν μαγαν μαεννοε βεϕογ} 

Personal shift, from generic to inclusive 1\textsuperscript{st} plural.

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

(221) Leip. III 94 ογγαν ημαγ μπαε μπωνζ μπεταγρος \textit{εγλαγνεθε μπεζοογ μνηγψιν} 

Two passages illustrating the rhematic or adnexal conversion, infelicitously called “circumstantial”: adjoining a predicative to text or
clause, noun or pronoun (which is by the same token thematic). In opposition to the Relative conversion, similarly adnominal, but attributive. The prevalent view, seeing the Circumstantial adnominal to a non-specific (indefinite or zero-articled) noun, and the Relative to a specific one, is therefore incorrect. This brings home the deeply significant fact that both predicative and attributive complements are compatible with adnominal status.

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

(222) Leip. III 36 ἔρωμεν εὐθαναπεργήμαλ βάλε ἥν τεκέωμε εἴον νεαείε ωμπε μμομ μεπκάκ εἰι μμεπμτμ εβολ

The penchant of existentials for contracting paratactic expansion (“There was a farmer had a dog” syntax) is illustrated here. Arguably, ἔρωμεν/οὐνομάξε governs the entire protasis + apodosis complex.

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

(223) Chass. 68 οὐνομαξε καὶ στοικέξοομ αν ἡνακοομ Ζενοβίτει

There is something, even if I don’t wish to say it, I shall.

(224) Cod. XO 97 (Boud’hors, Canon 8, with n. 244) Μπικατμ ἡ μπετικατμ ἦτων ἤτως εκμπερισμε koneksi ειτε ζοοτ ειτε θημε ῶλεπτακο μπιπόρμ μπενκελλίσ μπιμαγ εἲ ερμα εσωτν ητεμουσάλα εκμπουσάλα ουπατία εκστοπηνο στοεστοπηνο στατεταλα εγγώκπι ηντν

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

(225) Canon 7.7 §15 (2) Cod. XU 332 (Wisse) άγω ογ πε χεμερελας ταλετοτι εκστοπην ηνες ατας εναγον ηντεπτομον σοοντι. Μη εσω ομσ πείρ χεμερεογονε χεμεροκαος χεμερεπικαος χεμερογον ην ετως ηνεγραφι άγω εντωμ εροο αμεροηονηζ ηνεπιη άγω ηνεπτοις τηρου πογα πογα ηντεπαζος ημεφβιος ειτε ζοοτ ειτε θημε...
Repeated conjugation base and nominal actor alone, anaphoric to the quoted negative Aorist base (Luke 9:62), without reference to the lexical verb (infinitive). The conjugation form ends with no lexical component. Clearly, it is the base + actor, the nuclear grammaticalized Coptic ‘sdm.f’ that counts, syntactically as well as literarily.

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

* * *

1.13 “That”-forms (nexal substantiation).
The Conjunctive: sequelling roles. Modalities

The tension between χε-, general subordinator in Coptic, and the prospective “that”, etpeq-, and the Conjunctive, probably the most enigmatic form in Coptic verb syntax, informs many constructions of Shenoute’s Sahidic.

(226) Leip. IV 80 ουνηστιατε ταί ηγυποκριτες ετρεπετειρε μμος εωντ εβολ χεεγναςωκ μμοψ ανογω.

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

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

(227) Canon 7.7 §9 (3) Cod. XU 306 (Wisse) αψ μμα η ληηαψ \( χεκναμογ \) επεινι μνηνηςηησ ηηρν ασραι επεπτωμε μνηνηςηησε ερουω χεεγναλλικτος ηη ηητητουν \( χο \) ανοου ηαιειγναγων ασραικ αγο coq...

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

What place or thing didn’t that person call up to God about, saying ‘may you bless this house and all those in it even up to its bricks
and those that are considered insignificant, and then, those that dwell in these abodes, for their part, pollute and defile it.

(228) De Iudicio f. LV νο. p. 142 (Behlmer) ναι γὰρ ἐν εἰκονίᾳ οὐκ ἐνεκάνει ἑνωμένη ἑνεπαφαίει ἐπανομῶνει· ἔγγεις ἐξωθο ἐβολαὶ ἐμπλήνει

The Conjunctive here does not “carry on” or “continue” any clause, but the sequel — not ‘continuing’ the NS, but presenting in scenario or tableau the (often unexpected) eventual outcome, the dénouement.

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

(229) Leip. III 204 νοὲ γὰρ νομρωμὲν εὑρίσκισσενοοὐ εαχεὶ ἀπογονειosalογῳ ἐτερωμῆνος ἐνεκαὶ ναξ ἤττιβκ ἐβολαὶ ἐνπερισσενοοὐ εἰρεῶοο ντρ ἐμαὶ ἐνομπεσοοὐ...

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

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

(230) Amél. II 250 μεσομότ νομρωμὲν εὑρπωτ ζάπο νομονούι ντεγγαρζ εἰ εξωθ ἂγω ἄγων επεβητ ἄγρωττοτῃ ἐβολαὶ ἐτερχο ντεπροφ λοκσφ

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

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

(231) Leip. III 64 f. νοὲ εὐκοβως ἀν εἰς ναὶ ντίμας ὁμωκ νκεφα ἡνλαὶ ἐγκοβοῦ ἄγω ἄγω ἂν ὁμ εὐκοβωσο ετερπωμὲν ἂν αὐτ νυαίς ὁμωκ μνετητοῦκεκ

An instructive passage. The Conjunctives are here probably modal — injunctive “that” — forms; the first and second parts are slightly anacoluthic (no “thus”, and an asymmetric resumption, respectively).
Another point of interest regards diathesis: εἰπει “to be done” reveals the neutrality of the Coptic infinitive. The injunctive’s opposition to the imperative is not clear.

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

(232) Cod. XO 288 f. (Boud’hors, Canon 8, with Introduction §9, p. 41) πέτετνωινε ἄν πέτετνρψότε ἄν ηαεβής μμονάχος εἰτε ᾱοούτε εἰτε κρίμε ᾱραί ᾱηνεῖτοπος εἰετετρψογοςγορτ ἵναρπαί...

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

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

(233) Leip. IV 60 νενταγχος χετνναογωμ ρηπεξοογ νταγχος χεσεναογωμ νητγ μγ υνον μενωγωμ

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

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

(234) Leip. IV 94 νεγναγωγ ηναγενανηγε ετςεβω ναγ πογα πογα μπερψαξε αγω περτωγ αγω πετναμεγε εροξ εξοοξ χεμνογα μνογτ γιʔων αγω μννα σαγ ναγ αγω μπετμεγε επεκογτων
Triply anacoluthic: fuzzy gender reference of πονα πονα and subsequent masculine pronouns (unless masculine ἀπε is presupposed); the enigmatic ἄε-, universal subordinator, which may be considered here contentual-causal; and any of the last three αγω, which may be superordinating (main clause).

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

(235) Canon 7.8 §20 Cod. XU 423 (Wisse) Νίμ γαρ πετναψι ωαντπξοογ Νίμ πετναεκε ωαντπκστμ εροογ

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

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

(236) Leip. IV 67 τενυλλα δε ετμμαγ ετρεψγμε παρτκ επεκντ εματε μπναγ ετπαςφξαιζε μμοζ...

ετρε- as prospective contentualizing “that”-form. Shenoute evidently, if implicitly, disapproves.

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

(237) Leip. IV 66 μονον ετμκααδ υαν νευνειδη εταλπξθζοκα εγραι ηιαυη πνεοε επεκωντ ηνοινε πε

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

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

* * *
1.14 Matters of style. Disiunctio Sinuthiana

(238) Cod. XO 289 (Boud’hors, Canon 8 n. 930) εἰναροῦ ἄνθν ἡ
ογ πετναάαβ μπβολ νετενεςήπιαν ενεικναώρι

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

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

(239) Amél. I 154f. τῷρθν ἡ πεμκαζ ἄνθτ ἑτεπννούγτε εἰνη
η ἑτεπάνξτε εξηνεπνχογχε η νετπνανοχογ εβολ
άνθτε

In this important passage, we encounter a DS instance with the resumptive pronominal object, in the Present-Based Future but not in the Present. This is probably related to the Stern-Jernstedt feature of the Present, but one wonders why not εἰνη μμοογ? (Cf. Cod. XO 55 νετείπε η νετναίπε νρνψνηε ννοιμος; Cod. XO 108 νετνπος μμος / νενταγος). Another point of interest is the resumption of “fury”, the first noun, but not the second, “heartache”. Note that the first disjunction in the passage does not form a DS; I would suggest even a distinct η homonym.

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

(240) Cod. XO 285 (Boud’hors, Canon 8) σεο ύμμο επςωμα η
περςωμα

I suggest, tentatively, that ‘inclusive coverage’ is the prime principle of the DS, rather than alternativity or correction or precision (the disjunction η notwithstanding) — that is, inclusive coverage of
the continuum between the two pseudo-alternatives. This figure forces us to determine the specific meaning of the two. (Another instance: ἀγών and ἐτέβοι are not synonyms; both, and their blending, are subsumed in the complex.) πεθώμα and πεθεψώμα merge into a compound concept — “the Body that is His Body”.

They are estranged to the Body or His Body.

(241) Leip. III 48 f. ὀμόνοιον δὲ χειραγρεωβήν σεοι νωβόι αλλά
μπεροούν ὁν μπεγμοῦν χεναιρεωβίν ὑμπτρεγκαταργεῖ
κεινενγμοτ

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

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

* * *

1.15 Miscellaneous construction shifts

(242) Leip. IV 86 ετέβοι νεε χελαποπε εξοος
χελανομενογινον ἐπμα νωπε ντον εξοος
χελακυοι ρετανομομη

A classic anacoluthon: ἐπμα “instead” replaces the “why?” clause (“… aren’t we ashamed?”). By no means condemnable, for it is clear and syntactically sound/

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

(243) Leip. III 15 ετεναυοοος ναού ηπε χενπρατνθυτν ἀν
πκτανακ

No ἁ- adjoining, but appositive syntax; like the major “regular” case of theme apposition, εττων + APP, the theme is adverbial.

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