PROCLITIC FORMS OF THE VERB + IN COPTIC

By STEPHEN EMEL

It is entirely appropriate that the centennial of the publication of Ludwig Stern's admirable Koptische Grammatik (1880) should be marked by a volume of Coptic studies in honor of H. J. Polotsky, ἡμεῖς δὲν περιγράψαντες. The remarks I venture to offer on this occasion are motivated by a priceless principle taught me by Professor Polotsky, that while we are still confronted by gross exceptions to the "rules" it is wisest to assume that we have yet to grasp the rules truly. Indeed, the interest of the construction discussed below did not fail to attract Polotsky's attention (see OLZ 52 [1957] 233), and I am pleased to dedicate my own findings concerning it to his honor.

In the announcement of his discovery of the t-causative verb formed from +, "give," Kurt Sethe also drew attention to a still more peculiar construction with the verb + in the phrase ὅταν...رارκε. Of this expression, for which one might well expect *ἐναρκταν ἀνα or at least *ἐναρκτ...οτροχον ἀνα, Sethe remarked, "Es scheint...bei uns ein Rückfall in das Älteste vorzuliegen; er wird aber wohl nur zufällig sein." In truth, he concluded, following a suggestion by Spiegelberg, "dürfte...der Parallelsinus mit ἐναρκτ-ce zu der Wahl der ungewöhnlichen Form des Objektsaardruckes und der damit augenscheinlich zusammenhängenden Wortstellung veranlaßt haben." But whatever his stylistic intent, the Coptic translator's choice of expression ought also to represent a syntactic reality. And indeed, more examples of this peculiar construction have continued to appear since the publication of Sethe's remarks.

To be sure, the construction is relatively rare and in that sense exceptional. But the number and variety of examples, as well as the clearly idiomatic nature of some, are now such as to warrant a renewed appraisal of the place of the construction within Coptic grammar. I begin by presenting these examples, many of which have already been
noted elsewhere, in order to let the construction speak for itself.


v.l. (S) τον αὐτὸν καὶ ἠπεακούον (Pierpont Morgan MS 366 fol. 76v col. 2:9-10 [facsimile vol. 1:1, 1521]).

2. Nag Hammadi Codex 111 118:23 (crypto-A2) ἱπποτὴς ἱππακτομον Ἰωσῆς (Facsim. NHC II pl. 130) "when they had given them a good scare."

3. NHC VI 25:17-18 up (crypto-A2) μακαρισμένης εἰκόνα (Facsim. NHC VI pl. 29) "give us this staff!"

4. Berlin Papyrus 8502 B 32:15 (crypto-A2) καταβαίνοντας ημῖν (Till, *P. Berlinin. 8502* 104) "he gave him every authority."


6. I Cl 60:4 (A) κτηνισογονίων τοῦ Θεοῦ (Schmidt, *Clementbriefe* 119) ἔδωκε καὶ ἔδωκεν καὶ ἔδωκεν ἦτος.

7. Berlin Papyrus 11349, line 26 (S) ἐγκαταστάσας τῆς ἡπτοῦ ἐν τῷ "he did not give me any of them."

8. P. Lond. V 1709 (S) ἐγκαταστάσεις (H. I. Bell, Greek Papyri in the British Museum: Catalogue, with Texts 5 [Oxford 1917] 136) "what is given to her?"


10. Iκ 11:29 (S) ἐγκαταστάσεις (Horner's MS 9, 17, 53, 61 [= P. J. Haestini, *Sacrament Bibliorum Fragmenta Coptico-Schidica* 3 [Rome 1904 pl. 391]), ἐγκαταστάσεις (Quecke, Iκ. 185) καὶ ἐγκαταστάσεις ἔδωκεν οὐκ ἔδωκεν ἄνευ τῆς δόσεως.

v.l. (S) ἐγκαταστάσεις (Horner's MS 6, 89, 91, 91).

(B) οὕς οὐκ ἐγκαταστάσεις (Horner).

11. Hermas sim. VIII 6:2 (S) ἑπταπλήθως ἐγκαταστάσεις (L.-Th. Lefort, *Les pères apostoliques en copte* [CSCO 135 (Copt. 17); Louvain 1952])
26) ἵπποις σοι ἔδωκε μετάνοιαν.

12. NHC II 84:5 (crypto-A2) ἀληθινεῖς (Faos. NHC II pl. 96) "they glorify her."

13. NHC II 115:23-24 (crypto-A2) λαβήσατε (Faos. NHC II pl. 127) "he gave them respite."

14. NHC VI 58:7-8 (crypto-A2) καθισεῖς (Faos. NHC VI pl. 62) "you give me power."

15. NHC XIII 40:33-34 (crypto-A2) . . . ἱτιθαγγυιασμένος (Faos. NHC XI, XII and XIII pl. 110; the passage is probably to be restored ἵτιθαγγυιασμένος) "I give them shape."

16. NHC XIII 45:15-16 (crypto-A2) σαλαμινοφορός ἡμετέροφορός (Faos. NHC XI, XII and XIII pl. 115) "they who enchrone will enchrone you."

17. NHC I 30:25-26 (A2) λαμψηγίτε ἀφή (Faos. NHC I pl. 34) "he gave them means (?) to understand."

18. NHC I 31:16-19 (A2) λαμπχομενε νοηθήπαντα (Faos. NHC I pl. 35) "he gave them thought and wisdom."


(S) ἰστέθηκο χεν θυμίδαρα (Kasser [P. Bodmer XVII]).

(B) ἰστέθηκο θυμίδαρα (Lagarde).

20. Ex 2:9a (A) τετεμεχεσθε ἤποιρας (Lacau, "Textes coptes" 54) καὶ ἔδωκε σοι τὸ παιδίον.

(S) ἰστέθηκο θυμίδαρα (Kasser [P. Bodmer XVII]).

(B) ὅπος θυμίδαρα (Lagarde).

21. Ex 2:9b (A) αὐτεμεχεσθε (Lacau, "Textes coptes" 54) καὶ ἔδωκε σοι τὸ παιδίον.

(S) αὐτεμεχεσθε (Kasser [P. Bodmer XVII]).

(B) ὅπος θυμίδαρα (Lagarde).

22. Ascension of Isaiah 10:27 (A) οὐκ εἶπον τὸν τετεμεχεσθε (P. Lacau, "Fragments de l'Ascension d'Isaie en copte," Misseron 59 [1946] 459) "nor did they give him glory."
23. 1 Sam 21:10 (LXX) (S) ἡμᾶς (J. Drescher, *The Coptic Sahidic Version of Kingdoms I, II* (Samuel I, II) [CSCO 313 (Copt. 35); Louvain 1970] 67 [= 21:9 in his edition]) δὸς μου αὐτῷν.
   v.1. (S) ἄνικ ἡμᾶς (Drescher, *Kingdoms* 67af).
24. 2 Sam 20:21 (S) μακαρί (Drescher, *Kingdoms* 170) δὸς αὐτόν μου.
   v.1. (S) μακαρί αὐτός (Quecke, *MR* 133 [P. Palau Rib. 181]).
   (B) οὐκ ημᾶς ζήνα (Horner).
26. Mk 10:37 (S) μακαρίς ζήκας (Horner’s MSS 40 [Leiden 10, not 52 as Horner reported] and 120 [John Rylands 11 (formerly Crawford Coptic 3)], which Horner misread; cf. E. Amélineau, *Fragments copistes du Nouveau Testament dans le dialecte thôbain,* RB 5 (1884) 109)³;
   Quecke, *MR* 133 a 17af [Pierpont Morgan MS 569]; C. Wessely, *Griechische und koptische Texte theologischen Inhalts 3* [Studien zur Palaeographie und Papyruskunde 12; Leipzig 1912] 11 [SER no. 218b, MS K 9021-9022]) δὸς ἢμεν ὅμη.
   v.1. (S) μακαρί ζήκας (Quecke, *MR* 133 [P. Palau Rib. 181]).
27. NHC II 49:31 (crypto-A²) ἅπαξλεπίσκου (Pacc. *NHC II* pl. 61) "give it to me."

I expect that more examples still await discovery. (See addendum below.)

The construction with which we are concerned consists of a form of the verb ἡμᾶς followed by ἅπαξ following immediately by the nominal (determined or bare) or pronominal direct object of ἡμᾶς and is apparently a phenomenon of "upper Egyptian" Coptic.¹³ Five spellings of the verb are attested in the construction, all exhibiting vocalic weakness.¹⁴

† S, crypto-A₂, A² (exx. 1, 2, 4, 10 [¹²], 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 25)
τιθὼ S, crypto-A₂ (exx. 7, 8, 9, 12, 15, 27)
τα S (P. Palau Rib. 181, ex. 10 [²⁶])
τε A (exx. 5, 6, 19, 20, 21, 22)
μα S, crypto-A₂ (exx. 3, 23, 24, 26)

With regard to ἅμεν, Polotsky has shown that in Sahidic this venerable
Imperative form successfully resisted usurpation by the infinitive only in the expressions MANAY and MANAN, which he suggests were "unie sous un seul accent d'intensité, en conséquence de quoi l'imparfait non-acentué aurait revêtu sa forme proclitique, sinon strictement 'construit'." I am inclined to think that the form of the infinitive in our construction, however it be spelled, must also be proclitic in this sense and form a prosodic unity with NA'. That this is so is especially clear in the case of T(N)NA', where the verb and the preposition merge in a phrase that cannot be analyzed satisfactorily into distinct morphological elements. Neither TN nor T has any existence as a living form of the verb + apart from the expression T(N)NA'. That the other spellings of the verb in our construction coincide with spellings of the prosodically bound pronominal forms is hardly surprising.

Even without the evidence of the spelling T(N)NA', the very fact that the direct object of + follows this phrase immediately in our construction provides sufficient evidence of its prosodic unity. But even if this unity provides the occasion for the immediate addition of the direct object, it cannot by itself explain such peculiar syntax. Here we must follow Sethe's lead and acknowledge that our construction is best understood as belonging to a respectable group of constructions all of which owe their existence to the causative element derived from +. A particularly interesting syntactic parallel is provided by ΧΩΑ (Crum 773 b, "strike, deal blows"). Although, as Černý has explained, this word is etymologically the same as the other three words of this form distinguished by Crum (774 a), it is unique in its syntax. The direct object of the verb is not the suffix of ΧΩΑ, but rather what follows this suffix, usually without the mediation of N- as in 1 Thes 2:2 ΧΩΝΑΧΩΣ "they gave us trouble." Here, as in our construction, MAN retains its function as an independent prepositional complement to the verb, though in this case the immediate addition of the direct object can be accounted for historically by the role of ΖΩΣ as the subject of the root verb ΖΩ.
This is reminiscent in turn of a similar construction with several other t-causative verbs to which Spiegelberg first called attention. A good example is 1 Cor 3:2 (ed. Thompson; also two of Horner's three MSS) άπειροντος. *"Das Merkwürdige dieser Konstruktion der Kausativa τον und τινο,"* noted Spiegelberg, *"liegt hier darin, daß sie ein Objekt ohne ον zu sich nehmen und dabei enttont werden."* This peculiarity appears to be the rule for another t-causative verb, one of those formed from το. To the examples collected by Crum (439 b 14-20) can be added Heb 7:6 ἀντικαταλαμβάνεται and, in the imperative, Lk 12:58 ΜΑΤΣΕ (v.l. ΜΑΤΣ) ου ήλπει ομαλά. As Sethë rightly pointed out, Spiegelberg's construction is to be compared with τεκτων and with the prenominal (and presuffixed) forms of t-causative verbs such as τινοις, τινος and τινος. In each case the immediate object (προτες, προτό, ου, ουτω and so on) can be accounted for historically as the direct object of the root verb (κατα, ἀν, εἰπε and so on).

For our construction, however, such an historical explanation does not seem possible. And yet, that the construction was well-rooted in the language seems to me the only adequate explanation for a baffling but well-attested construction in the Theban ostraca. Had a grammatical index to this corpus been compiled, wrote Crum, *"it would have recorded a remarkable construction ... which is difficult to explain except as an ellipse, wherein the verb is assumed but unexpressed."* The verb in ellipse appears to be none other than ἀν and a few examples can serve for many to show the similarity of this construction to ours.

διακαταλαμβάνομαι ... ἔχει διακαταλαμβάνοντα "they have not [given] me the solidus ... and [(you) give] me the other."24

ἀνακαταλαμβάνει "I [gave] him four pair."25

οἱ ἄνδρες "I will (give) it thee."26

ἄναγεντο "I have not (given) it to him."27

ἄνεικος "I (gave) it to you."28

συναγεντο "I have not (given) them to you."29

Although Crum drew attention to the immediate addition of a second suf-
fix pronoun to ʰَاँ' in this construction and compared it to our exx. 24 and 25, he failed to note that this exactly corresponds to the immediate addition of a nominal direct object in the majority of his examples. In fact, the Theban construction and our construction are identical except with regard to the expression of the verb. That this is not expressed in the Theban examples can only be an indication of the extent to which our construction was rooted in the common language, such that a statement like ʰَاँ' ʰाँ' ʰाँ' ʰाँ' could be understood as nothing else but ʰَاँ' ʰाँ' ʰाँ' ʰाँ', that is, ʰَاँ' ʰाँ' ʰाँ' ʰाँ'. But whether our construction (and its Theban abbreviation) is finally to be judged an archaic colloquialism that survived by virtue of the old causative valence of the verb ʰाँ' or a neologism created on the basis of the same virtue must, I think, remain an open question.

Excursus I

The purely prosodic nature of the bond between ʰाँ' and ʰाँ' in ʰَاँ' ʰाँ' led me to expect that the latter would not occur in the vicinity of a postpositive particle but became, for example, ʰَاँ' ʰَاँ', as usual. I was thus pleasantly surprised to have two examples come to my attention in which the bond appears to have held despite the presence of a postpositive particle. The rather cryptic nature of both recommends their presentation by way of excursus.

The first example occurs in the long version of The Apocalypse of John in NHC II 11:7-10 अस संहा अंतो वेहार वेहार वेहार वेहार वेहार वेहार वेहार वेहार वेहार वेहार वेहार. In the several editions and translations of this text known to me वेहार is commonly equated with वेहार, "send." But there are several objections to such an analysis. First, an absolute form of this verb spelled वेहार is, as one might expect, otherwise unattested. In The Apocalypse of John the word occurs six times, not counting the passage quoted above, in two different spellings: वेहार (19:18, 20:15, 23:15, 23:18-19) [a dictionary of 23:15], 24:14) and वेहार (25:3). That वेहार could be the Coptic trans-
lator's mistaken "correction" of $A_2$ θύμα is virtually out of the question, especially since he clearly knew the proper $S$ spelling.\textsuperscript{31} Second, for μνοον to occur with neither a direct nor an indirect object is notably rare.\textsuperscript{32} The awkwardness of such an expression is even reflected in the modern versions of this passage.\textsuperscript{33}

The alternative analysis of this passage is that θύμα is τρόπος bound to ἦν (i.e., ἦντες) and thus followed by ἐκ: "but he did not give unto them from the power of the light."\textsuperscript{34} The expression ἦντες (followed by ἦν dia obj) was clearly known to the translator since it occurs five times elsewhere in the text.\textsuperscript{35} μνοον does not occur elsewhere in NHC II, but such a spelling need occasion no surprise in a crypto-$A_2$ manuscript.

Unfortunately, the parallel version in NHC IV has a large lacuna at the relevant place (the middle of p. 17) and at first sight the versions in NHC III and BG seem to omit the passage. The short recension moves immediately from NHC II 11:7 to 12:4. But the former of these two passages in NHC II, quoted above, is partially reiterated in the latter (12:4-8): ἅ ἐν ἡμείς ἐκ νοον ἐνθεμένης ἐστιν ἡ δόξη τοῦ κόσμου ἐκ νοον ἐστιν ἡ ἐνθεμένης καὶ ἡ δόξη τοῦ κόσμου ἐκ νοον ἐστιν. Compare this with the parallel versions in NHC III 18:12-19 and BG 42:13-43:2:

What is added here that is missing from the parallel in NHC II 12:4-8 is the sentence with which we are concerned from the initial statement in NHC II 11:7-10.\textsuperscript{36} θύμα is thus paralleled in the shorter versions not by a form of μνοον but by τρόπος.
Proclitic Forms of the Verb † in Coptic

The second example, both more striking and more cryptic, occurs in Lagarde’s MS of Sirach, which contains several instances of our construction,37 in 37:21 (LXX) ἡπιοπτερασία γὰρ ἡπιοτερασίος (Lagarde, *Egyptiaca* 173 [= 37:27 in his edition])38 ou γὰρ ἐσθήν αὐτῷ ἔριπα κυρίου χρῶς. The Greek makes it clear that the expression is not to be analyzed as ἡπιοπτερασία γὰρ, though ἡπιοτερασία for ἡπιοτερασία, quite unexpected in this manuscript and to my knowledge unique, is perhaps to be explained as a mistaken "correction" made in the course of the Coptic textual tradition. (This passage is unfortunately lacking in Thompson’s MS.) Less likely is the explanation of †οὶ γὰρ as a vocalically reduced form of †οῖ.".

Excursus II

In order to satisfy my curiosity about the usual word order of objects after the verb †, I collected 506 examples from the S and B Old and New Testaments with the help of concordances to the Greek texts. The sole criterion for admitting an example to my statistics was that it contain † in the absolute state and both a direct object (with ἔν or ἔνωτον) and an indirect object (with ἔν or ἔνοικος). Although I have no illusions about the completeness of my examples, I do consider them to be sufficient in number to reveal the tendency of the language. For what they may be worth I present my statistics in tabular form on the following page.

The overall tendency can be stated easily. The direct object generally precedes the indirect object except when the direct object is a noun and the indirect object a pronoun. This is no surprise. What is noteworthy is the extent to which B opposes this tendency in choosing word order 2a over 2b even against the Greek (box 2a,6) or when the Greek word order cannot be transferred verbatim into Coptic (box 2a,γ). The other exceptions to the general tendency are all in favor of the Greek (boxes 1b,δ and 2a,α)39 except the one S example in box 2a,γ.40

The relatively weaker tendency of B ἡ ἀν αὐτοῦ to precede ἔν-dir obj may
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coptic word order:</th>
<th>Greek word order:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>α</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;give&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a  ū-dir obj ū-indir obj</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b  ū-indir obj ū-dir obj</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a  ū-dir obj ū-π</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b  ū-π ū-dir obj</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a  ū-π ū-indir obj</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b  ū-indir obj ū-π</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a  ū-π ū-π</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b  ū-π ū-π</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a  ū-π ū-π</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b  ū-π ū-π</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* "different." I mean that in the Greek one or both of the objects precedes the verb or that the Greek uses an expression of which the Coptic is more or less a paraphrase.
Proclitic Forms of the Verb ṫ in Coptic

well be part of the explanation for the lack of a "lower Egyptian" counterpart to τ(ο)ματα. Only two possible examples are known to me, the second of which is very dubious.

1. H. De Vis, Homélies coptes de la Vaticane 2 (Coptica consilio et impensis Instituti Rask-Oerstediani edita 5; Haarlem 1929) 195, line 3 (B) ἔπεσας ἐπί τὴν ἱέρα καὶ ἔπεσεν "and he gave me a little pay."


v.1. (F) ἔπεσας ἐπὶ τὸ πέντεμα (W. E. Crum and F. G. Kenyon, "Two Chapters of St. John in Greek and Middle Egyptian," JTS 1 [1900] 427).

(B) στορματάς ἐπὶ τοὺς πλημμυρούς καὶ (v.1. στορματάς, ἐπὶ τοὺς πλημμυρούς) (Horner).

(S) ἔπεσας ἐπὶ τὸ πέντεμα (Horner).

(A2) ἔπεσας ἐπὶ τὸ πέντεμα (Thompson).

Addenda: Probably to be added between exx. 16 and 17 above is NHC I 113:3-5 (A2) (crypto-Sahidic?) πρὸς Ἰσαὰκ ἰνιγραφοῦντος πεπτεύσαντες ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰσαὰκ (Fascs. NHC I pl. 118) "it is the variety of the scriptures that has provided them with lawyers."

NOTES

1 See example 25 below.


3 Hereafter abbreviated NHC. I refer to these manuscripts as they are reconstructed in The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices published under the auspices of the Department of Antiquities of the Arab Republic of Egypt in conjunction with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (Leiden 1972 and following); hereafter abbreviated Fascs. NHC.

4 I use this term, introduced by B. Layton, "Editorial Notes on the
'Expository Treatise Concerning the Soul' (Tractate II 6 from Nag Hammadi), BASP 14 (1977) 66, to refer to 5 texts apparently written by a native speaker of Ar. W. C. Till, Die gnostischen Schriften des koptischen Pamphyleton Sammelbands 8502 (TU 60 [2nd ed. revised by H.-M. Schenkel]; Berlin 1972) 21-22, proposed this explanation for the dialectal peculiarities of the Berlin gnostic codex, at least some of the Nag Hammadi codices, and part of the gnostic Bruce codex. Such an explanation had already been given by W. E. Crum, The Monastery of Epiphanius at Thenea 1: The Literary Material (New York 1926) 235-36, for the language of some of the Theban ostracra.

The remarks of P. Nagel, "Grammatische Untersuchungen zu Nag Hammadi Codex II" in F. Altheim and R. Schöbel (eds.), Die Anrainer In der alten Welt V:2. Das christliche Akanon (Berlin 1969) 461-63, apropos this example require clarification. He has suggested that here, as well as in our ex. 13, "spricht man besser von 'Ausfall der Objektspraeposition'" than of some novel syntactic relationship (though he does not challenge the authenticity of our ex. 27; see further note 12 below). In support of this suggestion he adduces a passage from which the direct object marker ἐν seems clearly to have been omitted, NHC II 35:11-12 εἰσερχομαι ἱνα σα ἐμφανίζητε. But this is rather an example of an orthographic peculiarity that occurs frequently in NHC II, the variation of ἐ with ἐν before prevocalic ὢ, and which is not unknown elsewhere (see H. Quecke, Das MarkusEvangelium saiteisch [Papyrologica Castroctaviana, Studia et textus 4; Barcelona 1972] 39, 44-46 and the references given there, and Das Lukasevangelium saiteisch [Pap. Cast., Stud. et Text. 6; Barcelona 1977] 73). In NHC II this phenomenon is limited to words spelled ἐ (excepting the plural definite article), e.g., 33:10 ἐὰν περιεχόμενον σα ὀνειρεῖ, 35:11-12 quoted above, 37:25 ετελθομεν τερπομαζον σα, 38:3 εγε Ὀσ σα ὀνειρεῖ, 43:32-33 θανάτωσ ὀνειρεῖ, perhaps 44:20 κείτωσ ὁ ρουμ, possibly 45:18-20 πεπραυχόμεν ἀπόφασ ὁν κατάφερον σα ὀνειρεῖ, "whosoever knows the entirety but lacks one (thing) has lacked the entire place," 50:19 = 37:25 quoted above, 104:24 ἐπίστ σα ὀνειρεῖ, 106:3-4 ἐφανερασ ὀνειρεῖ ὑπὸ ὑποκλησα, 108:21 ἐπάνω ὀνειρεῖ, 112:10 ἐπάνω ἐν ὀνειρεῖ (cf. 112:25 ἐπάνω ὀνειρεῖ), 113:22-23 ἐπάνω ἐπέφτασε ὀνειρεῖ, 128:2 ἐπάνω ἐν ὀνειρεῖ, ἐπάνω σα ὀνειρεῖ for ὀνειρεῖ. (Incidentally, such evidence suggests that the widespread occurrence of ὀνειρεῖ for ὀνειρεῖ after fully stressed nouns may be due to the survival of a feature of preclassical orthography rather than to a special syntactic and prosodic bond. Cf. A. Rahlf, "The Berliner Handschrift des saitisch-wisstens zu Göttingen. phil.-hist. Kl., n.s. 4:4; Berlin 1901) 45.) This variation ἐ/ἐν before preverbal ὢ would appear to have as its inverse the variation ἐ/ἐν before preconsonantal ὢ (as well as before preconsonantal εἰ, vowels, and syllabic consonants); cf. B. Layton, "The Text and Orthography of the Coptic Hystasias of the Apathon (GC II, 4 Kr.)." ZPE 11 (1973) 186-87. Since the ὢ in
question in NHC II 118:23 (out ex. 2) is preconsonantal, the absence of \( \text{\textdegree} \) before it is not likely to be the orthographic variant discussed here and the passage must rather be accepted as a clear example of the peculiar syntax with which we are concerned.

Hereafter abbreviated BC.

I have confirmed this reading by a photograph in the possession of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity (Claremont, California).

I am indebted to Hans-Martin Schenke for transcribing this and several other passages from the papyrus in Berlin for me.

I have confirmed this reading by a photograph kindly supplied by the John Rylands Library.

In the examples above, \( \text{\textdegree} \) is attested with all of the suffix pronouns except 2 fem. sing. (but see Excursus II below).

In the examples above, the attested forms of the pronominal direct object of \( \text{\textdegree} \) are 3 sing. -\( \text{\textdegree} \) and -\( \text{\textdegree} \) and 3 pl. -\( \text{\textdegree} \), the Coptic descendant of the old absolute personal pronoun.

Since several examples of our construction have occasionally been dismissed as examples of the (presumably erroneous) "omission of \( \text{\textdegree} \)" it is perhaps not superfluous to point out that this is clearly not the case in exx. 23-27 and that it is not likely to be the case in exx. 9-22. The existence of these nineteen examples is sufficient justification for adding exx. 1-8 to them.

See further Excursus II below.

\( \text{\textdegree} \) may appear to be an exception, but it need hardly be noted that this was also a standard spelling of the prosodically bound pronominal form. The vocalic weakness of this latter form is apparent in the A and F spellings \( \text{\textdegree} \) and \( \text{\textdegree} \).


Phonetically similar is \( \text{\textdegree} \) (< \( \text{\textdegree} \) - \( \text{\textdegree} \) + 3 pl. suffixed subject). The causative infinitive may well be a restricted but not yet fossilized use of the verb form \( \text{\textdegree} \).

Polotsky, "Modes grecs" 77-79, has pointed out that \$ \( \text{\textdegree} \) is only very rarely attested as a pronominal form.

If a cause for the prosodic bond between \( \text{\textdegree} \) and \( \text{\textdegree} \) is sought, it is
probably to be found in the age-old tendency of ἐν to follow as closely upon its governing verb as possible. Cf. H. J. Polotsky, "Zur koptischen Wortstellung," OR 30 (1961) 313, and Excursus II below.


20 W. Spiegelberg, "Koptische Missellen," ZÄS 53 (1917) 135. To his three examples from Shenoute Crum (416 a 16-17, 434 a 6-5 up, 682 b 4 up [an example from Mani]) added five more with ἔνο and ἔνοι.

21 Crum (392 b 26, 28-29) mistook ἔναντι as a presuffixal form of ἐν. Analyzed thus, the passage in Lk is incoherent. On the contrary, the Coptic translator's rendering of Ἰὰν ἔγγυ性质 ἐπιλάλθησα ἀντί ἐνοεί by "let him provide the means for settling with you" is no doubt a laudable attempt to paraphrase the intention of the Greek, perhaps "be ready to compromise yourself for the sake of a settlement."

22 Sethe, "Kausativ von ἔν" 143.


24 W. E. Crum, Coptic Ostraca (London 1902) 69 (no. 403, lines 5 and 11).


26 Crum, Epiphanios II 83 (no. 332, line 7).

27 Crum, Epiphanios II 95 (no. 403, lines 6-7).

28 W. E. Crum, Varia Coptica (Aberdeen 1939) texts p. 37 (no. 120, line 17).

29 Crum, Short Texts 14 (no. 40, lines 15-16).

30 Crum, Epiphanios II 287 (no. 532 note 1), where he also points out the intriguing fact that this "elliptical" construction is apparently excluded from the Present system. One must wonder if this might be the effect of the Stern-Jernstedt Rule. In all but a few of the occurrences of Crum's construction the direct object involved is either a determined noun or a pronoun and thus inadmissible as an immediate direct object in the Present system (the exceptions are
all numerals). It should be noted that in some of our examples where the tense is Present, exx. 14 and 15, the direct object is a bare noun. (The tense in exx. 6, 19 and 20 is Conjunctive.)

31 As Nagel has demonstrated ("Grammatische Untersuchungen" 410–15; cf. "Die Bedeutung der Nag Hammadi-Texte für die koptische Dialektgeschichte" in F. Nagel ed., Von Nag Hammadi bis Zypern [Berliner Byzantinistische Arbeiten 43; Berlin 1972] 22), the translator of The Apocalypse of John (as well as the translators of the six texts that follow it) in NHC II was well aware of the vocalic correspondences between his own dialect and S (ε → λ; λ → ο). That he was at pains to present proper S orthography is especially clear in the examples of "overcorrection" listed by Nagel ("Grammatische Untersuchungen" 414–15), where a properly S λ was "corrected" to ο, thus producing completely improper spellings such as τω νο μο (for ταυ νο μο, NHC II 30:29). In view of this, the transformation την ου → την ου would be impossible to account for.

32 Crum lists no "intransitive" use of τιμων except in the expression τιμων τικε., "send for." Apart from the latter expression, τιμων occurs without a direct object only four times in the S New Testament, but in each of these instances it has a prepositional complement: with ο to in Acts 10:33 and 15:25 (for the latter only Horner's MS α; v.1. τιμωντος, ταυνομον), with η as in Phil 4:16, and in 1 Thes 3:5 τιμωντος ευθείας ευθείας το γνωστο πτωτον υπιπο. In all four instances the Greek also lacks a direct object. Other such Greek expressions are rendered by ἄξων with no direct object (Mt 2:16, 11:2, 14:10; Mk 6:17; Jn 11:3; Acts 5:21, 7:14, 10:32, 11:13, 13:15, 20:17) or by ἄξων or ταυνο with a direct object supplied from the context (Lk 7:19; Acts 11:29, 19:31, 23:30; Apoc 1:11).

33 F. Wisse, "The Apocalypse of John" in J. M. Robinson (ed.), The Nag Hammadi Library in English (San Francisco and Leiden 1977) 104: ". . . but he did not send out from the power of the light . . . . . ."; M. Krause and F. Labib, Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes (Abhandlungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Cairo, Koptische Reihe 1; Wiesbaden 1962) 140: "Er sandte aber nicht von der Lichtkraft . . . . . ."; R. Kasser, "Bibliothèque gnostique III: Le livre secret de Jean (versets 125–394)," Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie, 3rd series, 16 (1966) 168: ". . . mais il ne leur <en> envoya pas (hors) de la puissance de lumière . . . . . ."; S. Giversen, Apokryphon Johannes (Acta Theologica Danica 5; Copenhagen 1963) 67: ". . . but he did not send them any of that power of light . . . . . ." Note that direct and indirect objects have been supplied in the last two versions.

34 For the expression ἀν with no direct object ἄν οι ἐν- see 1 Jo 4:13 αν ἐνα ενοτα ἐνοτα ἐνοτα ἐν θαυματοσ τεταρτον ἐν θαυματοσ, Mt
25:8 ΜΑΝΗ εἶ σοι ἐλπὶς ᾦν ἐν τῷ ἐλαῖῳ ὑμῶν.

35 NHC II 5:13, 21, 27, 33; 6:33. The parallel versions (NHC III 1, NHC IV 1, BG 2), when preserved, have ἔλθει in each instance. For the occurrence of τῷ ἐλθεῖ elsewhere in NHC II see our exx. 12 and 27 above.

36 By this I do not mean to express an opinion on the chronology of the literary relationship between the long and short recensions of The Apocryphon of John, but only to point out that the passage in NHC II 11:8-10 = NHC III 18:13-16 = BG 42:15-18. I see that Kasser, "livre secret de Jean (versets 125-394)" 165-69, has already drawn attention to this fact.

37 See exx. 9 and 25 above. What appears to be yet another example in Sir 17:23 (LEX = 17:18 in Lagarde, Aegyptiaca 135) is probably to be read ἑτοίμασέ τοι.

38 I was able to confirm this reading by a photograph in the possession of Professor Polotsky.

39 I have come across one example in a where word order is used against the Greek, 1 Cl 61:1 ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ἐμπιστευομένου ἀδέλφου (Schmidt, Clemensbrief 119) ἔδωκας τὴν ἐξουσίαν ... αὐτοῖς. The Coptic translator has transposed the antecedent of ἀδέλφου into this verse from 60:4.

40 2 Cor 8:10 ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν ἡμᾶς χαίρειν ὑμᾶς τῇ ἀδελφῇ, where the presence of καί is difficult to account for in any case (it is absent from some B MSS).