its disappearance would probably be progressive, with a certain period of contemporaneous usage of the protodialect by the conservatives and of the dialect by the innovators in the same area (see LANGUAGE(S), Coptic).

It will be instructive here to borrow some component parts from the synoptic table of Vergote in a slightly modified order, adapting and illustrating as follows: for periods, MK = Middle Kingdom, NK = New Kingdom, pc = Saitic and Greco-Roman (or proto-Coptic) period, C = Coptic period; for dialects, L = A2 of Vergote; S ... = S, F, and its subdialects, as well as M and V, which were still unknown to Vergote in 1945; L ... within the pc period = pL (and through P a reconstructed *pS). Without postulating or defining any phonological difference between them, two varieties of /xs/ would henceforth be distinguished here: the major form whose evolution was /g/ > /s/ in L ... is /xs/; and the minor form that evolved into /h/ in L ... is /xh/.

(MK) h > (NK) h > (pc) /h/ > (C) /h/; for example, hkr > xko L, S ... , B, A, to be hungry.

(MK) h > (NK) h > (pc) /h/ > (C) /h/; for example, hh > xol L, S ... , B, A, thing.

(MK) x> (NK) x> (pc) /xs/ [A], /x/ L ... , [B] > /xs/ A, /x/ B, but /h/ L, S ... ; for example, htw òvyñ B, P (and a reconstructed *pS), òvyñ A, pl, but òvyñ L, S ... , inside part.

x = (MK) x > (NK) x > x = (pc) /xs/ [A], /x/ L ... , [B] > /xs/ A, /x/ B but /h/ L ... ; for example, nh òvñ B, òvñ P and a reconstructed *pS, òvñ òvñ A (and pl through òvñ pl), but òvñ L, S ... , to live.

x = (MK) x > (NK) x > (pc) /ç/ L ... , [B], but /x/ [A], then (pc) /ç/ L ... , [B] > (C) /s/ L, S ... , B, and (pc) /xs/ [A] > /x/ A; for example, hpr > òvñ P and a reconstructed *pS), òvñ pl, etc., and /çopī/ pB] > òvñ S, L, òvñ M, òvñ W, V, F, B, but /x/opī/ pA] > òvñ A, to become.

(MK) ò > (NK) ò > (pc) /s/ > (C) /s/; for example, òp, òvñ L, S ... , B, A, to receive.

[See also: Dialect I; Dialect P.]
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SAHIDIC. Sahidic (siglum S) is a major Coptic dialect, earlier known as Upper Egyptian, Theban, or the southern dialect; the term "Sahidic," used by Athanasius of Ous, was adopted by Stern (1880). In twentieth-century Coptology, S has been the main dialect of study and research—indeed Coptic par excellence, today totally supplanting Bohairic in this respect (compare, for instance, its precedence in Crum, 1939, to that of Bohairic in Stern, 1880). This
process, virtually complete by 1915 (cf. Erman, 1915, pp. 180f.), may be said to have been initiated by Steindorff’s grammar of 1894; yet note early statements favoring Sahidic as “older,” “richer,” and “purer” (Stern, 1880, p. 1; Sethe, in Kahle, 1954, p. 202), and “magis regularis atque ad analogiam exacta” (Peyron, 1841, p. xix), the earliest observation of its relatively innovating, leveling nature. Indeed, the reputation of S as “old,” or at least “older” than Bohairic, is due rather to its early documentation and its chronological precedence over Bohairic, which replaced it as the Coptic koine, than to typological fact.

Still the prestige of Sahidic is certainly justified by its rich literature, both original and translated, scriptural and nonscriptural (homiletic, patristic, monastic, Gnostic, magical, poetic), religious and nonreligious (epistolary, documentary, legal, medical). Sahidic was probably the first Coptic dialect into which the Scriptures were translated, apparently in the third century; by the fourth, the translation was completed. Almost all original Coptic literature was written in Sahidic (see Antony of Egypt, Saint; Pachomius, Saint; Shenute, Saint). By the ninth century, S had become the official dialect of the Coptic church, but as early as the fourth century, perhaps even earlier, it was a common Pan-Egyptian written literary dialect, spread at least from Heliopolis to Aswan. In subsequent centuries, it completely replaced the minor dialects (A, L, M) as a colloquial idiom. By the time of the Arab conquest of Egypt, S was the sole literary dialect beside northern Bohairic. From the ninth century onward, S gradually receded before Bohairic, a process much accelerated from the eleventh century on.

Sahidic occupies “a position apart from all other dialects” (Polotsky, 1970, pp. 560) in that, first, it is “neutral” (Worrell, 1934, p. 73; Kahle, 1954, p. 241) or, better, most leveled, dialectologically speaking; it is the dialect most difficult to characterize distinctively, a “mean” dialect, the one with the fewest exclusive traits and the most isoglosses shared with others. Second, it raises (1) the diachronic, nondescriptive question of its local origin and “proper domain” (the statement by Athanasius of Quṣ that Sahidic is “the dialect of Mṣr” is not helpful here) and (2) the synchronic question of its integration in the overall dialectological scheme. Question 1 is controversial: Worrell (1934, pp. 68ff.) considered its initial range to have been Oxyrhynchus and the lower valley (his “region IV” or perhaps an area even more northerly); Vergote (1973b, Vol. 1a, pp. 2f.) and Kasser (1980a, pp. 103ff.) suggested it spread southward from around Saqqara-Memphis (perhaps Worrell’s “region II”), Polotsky (1970, p. 561) considered Thebes as a possible point of origin. Rather extreme appear Kahle’s thesis (1954, pp. 256ff.) tentatively identifying its point of origin in Alexandria, and Schenke’s denying Sahidic any original local basis, considering it to be a koine type of idiom born out of contacts, interaction, and leveling of local dialects (1981, pp. 349ff.; Vergote’s conception seems to be the most plausible.

In any case, the characterization, still encountered, of Sahidic as “artificial” to a degree is descriptively irrelevant. It is true that standard literary Sahidic is largely “a gift” of the translation of the Bible (and in this sense many literary languages are “artificial”) and that Sahidic probably owes its drastic expansion to the progressive suppression of distinctive phenomena. What specific traits Sahidic has, it shares most usually with Akhmimic and Subakhmimic in contrast to Bohairic and Fayyumic. (“Middle Egyptian” really occupies a roughly middle position between the two dialect clusters.) This is, however, no more than an impression and may be proved erroneous by a precise investigation.

Although standard, or “pure,” Sahidic is more of a construct, an idealized average, a research point de repère than linguistic reality, some varieties of the dialect approach it more closely than others (see below); Sahidic is a Mischia dialect, an aggregation of linguistic habits only imperfectly and variously standardized (cf. Mink, 1978, pp. 91ff.; his statement that “die Annahme von Dialekten ist ... sprachwissenschaftlich ein Konstrukt” is especially cogent when applied to Sahidic). However, extreme cases of “tainting” (e.g., by Fayyumic, Bohairic, Subakhmimic) must be specially treated. The dialect P, documented in the Papyrus Bodmer VI text of Proverbs published by Kasser (1960), is held by Vergote (1973a, p. 57) and Kasser (1980a, pp. 62ff.) to be a “protodialect of Sahidic,” with non-Sahidic (Theban or Subakhmimic) traits; according to Nagel (1965), it represents early Theban.

1. Standard Sahidic

1.1 Phonology, Morphophonology, and Orthography. As a rule, S agrees with Bohairic in points of vocalism, while sharing its consonantism with A–L—according to Kasser, in a way reflecting an evolutive scale (see Vergote, 1973b, sec. 60 p. 58, and Kasser, 1981, sec. 25, for lists of “isophones”).

1.1.1. Sahidic has no aspirate phonemes: θ, ϕ, and χ are (in native words) monogram graphemes repre-
senting a combination of two phonemes. (They may have a different standing in the system of Greek-origin phonology.)

1.1.2. Sahidic has only one unvoiced laryngeal spirant (/h/).

1.1.3. x and e represent distinct phonemes (velo-palatal or palatalized stop and alveolar affricate, respectively, xx and ee, as in xa, say, and ea, remain).

1.1.4. Sahidic has at least one laryngeal stop phoneme (/X/ = Vergote's and Kasser's /�/), synchronically suprasegmental: "(proneness to) vocalic reduplication." Its distribution is complex (see Sattzinger, 1979), with the allophones "zero" (e.g., non-syllabic /X/ in the final position and pronominal junctive: 退税, truth) and α (syllabic, pretonic /X/; 退税, informal). In p, the laryngeal stop has its own sporadic grapheme (Ł).

1.1.5. In Sahidic there is no progressive sibilant assimilation to /s/ (ɔλαγο, make live, nourish), but progressive sibilant assimilation to /s/ does take place (φακε, speak).

1.1.6. Sonorants (/b/, /d/, /m/, /n/, and /r/) closing the tone syllable are graphically "reduplicated," occurring in two neighboring syllables as syllabic and nonsyllabic (onset): ɂγεα, plow; ɂναο, old; ㄚπ, report; ㄚν, be fat; ㄚφ, new.

1.1.7. The Sahidic vowel in the unstressed syllable (after Polotsky, 1957a) is outlined in Table 1.

1.1.8. Stressed α represents the allophone of /o/ before /h/ and /X/ (чки, be painted; тελ, ten thousand). In similar prelaryngeal environments, ε represents /a/ (εγεο, be left over; εφ, way).

1.1.9. Orthography (see in exhaustive detail Kasser, 1980a). Diagrams: α, ο. Monograms: ο, φ, α, ε, ι, ποντε, God, is not included among the nomina sacra abbreviations. The superlinear stroke occurs above one or more nonvocalic elements, signifying their syllabic phonological status (not their phonetic value or manner of actualization; see Polotsky, 1957a, pp. 221ff., 1971, pp. 227ff.). Proclitic prosodic: relative weakness is fully reflected in the standard orthography; see 1.3.7.

1.2 Morphology (Systemic and Nonsystemic) and Word Formation.

1.2.1. A superficial vocalic e-merger of the four converters (e-; circ., e- second present, ne- preterite, ετ(e)- relative) is characteristic of Sahidic; of these, the first two are actually homonymous. The relative and second perfect forms are not homonymous in the best standard orthography (eετε- versus ΕΠε-; Polotsky, 1957a, pp. 232ff., 1971, p. 232, 1960, sec. 11 obs., e.g., Mt. 20:28 and Eccl. 19:15).

1.2.2. The Sahidic future tense is the extended bipartite otence; the so-called third future (ετεσ'ε) is a mode rather than a tense (cf. Polotsky, 1950, pp. 34ff., 1971, pp. 219ff.) and has very limited convertibility (only circ. of the negative base: Polotsky, 1957a, p. 233, 1971, p. 233, 1960, pp. 400, 401, 1971, pp. 246ff.). otence is a special second-person singular feminine future form.

1.2.3. The S conjunctive presuffixed base consists of a nasal (ŋ) and no dental, except for the first-person singular (ŋτε-, ntag-). The conjunctive is in S a conjugation form apart, standing midway between the tripartite and bipartite patterns, with τε- (pre-nominal etag-) marking the modifier status of a nexus of (pro)noun and infinitive; morphologically, this special status is manifested in the pronominal elements, which are (with a single exception in the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pretonic</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sonorant</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sonorant</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\emptyset$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φήνη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φήνη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(var. $\emptyset$)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
first singular) identical with the bipartite actor pronouns (prefix pronouns).

1.2.4. ταπευτήρης, the causative or “future” conjunctive, a specific postimperative, postinterrogative form with a first singular causation or guarantee sense (Polotsky, 1944, pp. 1ff., 1971, pp. 106ff.), is a typically Sahidic form. The causative infinitive is used as a noncausative “that” form after several prepositions (but less usually after others).

1.2.5. Sahidic employs a specific “temporal” clause conjugation, tripartite pattern form (τεταρτέονος[τε]) distinct from the second and relative perfect forms.

1.2.6. The negated conditional conjugation form has in Sahidic two variants (alternants), namely ενταύτηνεςαύτη and αντίτηνεςαύτη.

1.2.7. A special pronominal allomorph of all converters and some tripartite conjunction bases is characterized by the ending -φε.

1.2.8. Verbs of Greek origin occur in Sahidic in a zero-stem form (usually identical with the Greek imperative) and are directly incorporated in the conjugation and generally grammatical forms without the intermediation of an auxiliary: θυματέως, πενεμφερεῖν, σωματερεῖν (imperative/infinitive).

1.2.9. The verb τατά, give, has in S two imperatives, τατά and τατά (Polotsky, 1950, pp. 76ff., 1971, pp. 211ff.).

1.2.10. Pronominals: Sahidic has a ternary determination category—definite, indefinite, and zero (ἰ, ἐνάτον, ὁ διάδο-) determinators, expanded by noun lexemes. The proclitic form of the demonstrative ἦν, namely ἦ, has (wherever distinct from ἦν, the proclitic allomorph of ἦν) affective and specially designative value (Polotsky, 1957a, pp. 229ff., 1971, pp. 231ff.).

1.2.11. Numbers are expressed as a rule by numeral words, not letters (e.g., Acts 23:23).

1.2.12. The first-person singular suffix-pronoun ἦ has the allomorphs ἁ (ἡν-ἀ- γο-TP- and ἃ (as object of infinitives following a consonant or ἐκ/ or prepositions in similar environments). The second-person singular feminine suffix-pronoun consists of the allomorphs ἐφ-φε after conjugation bases ἐφ-ἐφ-τεα as object of infinitives. The second-person plural suffix-pronoun consists of the allomorphs τουτο- and τουτοτε. The third-person plural suffix-pronoun is nonsyllabic after τετερ- τετε-, τετεο (possessive article). A special objective pronominal-paradigm is characterized by the third-person plural term ἃφα (οὐτα). (This paradigm occurs mostly after another pronoun, e.g., as pronominal object of the possession verb ὑπάρχω.)

1.2.13. ὑπάρχω forms in Sahidic lexical (nongrammatical) action nouns.

1.3 Syntagmaties and Prosody.

1.3.1. Focalization patterns: The second tense focalizes in Sahidic not only adverbials but also actor and object (pro)nouns, and may even be autofocal, that is, with the verb lexeme or predicative adverb itself the information focus (see Polotsky, 1944, pp. 51ff., 1971, pp. 155ff., 1960 sec. 32 obs., 1971, pp. 408ff., as in Lk. 20:13, ὃλοκληρον, “What shall I do?”; Sir. 5:4, ἐφακοῦσα νῦν ἡμών, “What has happened to me?”; Acts 12:15, ἐφαινομένον, “Thou art mad”; Ps. 67:28, ἐφαίμαυτος, “Ibi est”). The cleft sentence with (pro)nomin al focus (vedette; Polotsky, 1962) has the form “(pro)noun-νο- (etc.),” with the close marker tending to be invariable, and omissible only after a personal-pronoun focus (Polotsky, 1962, p. 420, 1971, p. 421).

1.3.2. Nominal syntagmaties: The nominal expansion of a noun syntagm is effected by -νηθε - regulated by the determination of the nuclear noun and/or other expansions thereof, apparently with no lexical considerations involved.

1.3.3. θέ- is limited to coordinating non-zero-determined nouns; the range of αγων is accordingly extended. (Zero-determined nouns are coordinated by means of -α-.)

1.3.4. After converters, an indefinite or zero-determined actor noun does not necessarily condition a θυματ-νηθε allogram of the bipartite pattern (Polotsky, 1960, sec. 21 and 35).

1.3.5. Final clauses are expressed by the conjuctions τε, τεκακάκαc followed by future III or the second future (circ. negative future III following τεκακάκαc; Polotsky, 1957a, p. 233, 1971, p. 233) and not by means of the conjunctive (which does; however, resume τεκακάκαc after an interposition; Lefort, 1948). The S conjunctive occurs after a limited number of conjunctions (the consecutive τεκτε and ἔρως [ἐρως], both of Greek origin) and does not usually function as a “that” form or expand impersonal verb predications (Stern, 1880, p. 275, sec. 445).

1.3.6. The possession-predicating οὐσία and ἰερατα have in Sahidic verboid status—that is, partake of all syntactic properties of verbal predications (conjunction forms): the possessum may be expressed pronominally as an object adjacent of the pronominal possessor (Acts 3:6, περικταμ- “that which I have”; see ibid., sec. 316).

1.3.7. Prosody: Prosodic proclitic weakness is consistently reflected in the standard S orthography (see Erman, 1915: οὐσία-ηθε, ἀπείρων . . . ; ἀπείρων; οὐσία; ἐτε; etc.). The relative converter joins in Sahidic in close juncture with the converted conjunctive occurs mostly after another pronoun, e.g., as pronominal object of the possession verb ὑπάρχω.)
gation form (e.g., Lk. 12:5). Vowel reduplication occurs sporadically in monosyllabic, final-laryngeal words before an enclitic (ου̂μεν ἰε; Polotsky, 1957a, p. 231, 1971 p. 232, 1957b, pp. 348ff., 1971, pp. 390ff.).

1.4 Lexicon. As a rule, Sahidic shares lexical isoglosses at least with Akhmimic and/or Lycopolitan (or Subakhmimic), such as ἔγγραφο, push, protrude. (This, however, may be refuted by further, more sophisticated investigation.) Lexemes not occurring in Bohairic seem relatively more common than exclusive S + B ones (e.g., ἡρωπεῖν, wound; ἑκοί, go: τύχε, throw; ἠπνόει, approach; ἰδομέν, turn; κομή, sneer; οὐ̂μεν, answer; σώμα, particle), on the other hand; χοῦν-ντίννοογ, send). Relatively few conjunctions of Greek origin are found in Sahidic.

2. Varieties of Sahidic

2.1 Classical, or Scriptural, Sahidic. As a rule, classical Sahidic conforms to the standard described above. However, more-precise scanning is called for in this case, differentiating between the Old and New Testaments, between various parts thereof, and even between the various manuscripts. Sahidic boasts more early (fourth or fifth century) manuscript sources than any other dialect of Coptic, and in this corpus many idiosyncrasies are observable, which may be subsumed together under the heading of "early Sahidic." The grouping of manuscripts in this category is helpful: the British Library Deuteronomy-Jonah and Psalms (Budge, 1898, 1912); the Bodmer Papyri, complemented by Chester Beatty and University of Mississippi fragments (Kasser, 1961, 1962, 1964, 1965) with linguistic introductions (note the forms θαγό, θαγά, οῖτιν, with; the rarity of the preterite relative prefix ἐπί, Dt. 4:42; total assimilation of nasals to sonorants; omission of nasals, etc.); the Turin Wisdoms (de Lagarde, 1883); the Berlin Psalter (Rahlf, 1901); and recently the Palau Ripes Gospels (Quecke 1972, 1977; note the idiosyncrasies pointed out in the editor's extraordinary introductions). οῖτιν, ἐπί (negative aorist), θαγό second-person plural object, variation of ἐπί- ~ ετέρον, τέχνη, ~ τέχνη, sporadic omission of adverbial Ν- (τεχνῶν, κακός, οὐ̂μόν̄), even some special lexemes. See in general Kahle's (1954, p. 233) discussion of this kind of manuscript; "Old Coptic" similarly presents mainly Sahidic traits (ibid., pp. 242ff., 252ff.).

2.2 "Gnostic" Sahidic. One must distinguish here between the Gnostic texts with no special dialecto-

logical problem (the Pistis Sophia, the Bruce Codex, some of the Nag Hammadi tractates) and such Nag Hammadi tractates as exhibit non-Sahidic traits. The former group conforms by and large to the early-Sahidic type, with some idiosyncrasies (total nasal assimilation, ἐπί- relative prefix, ᾀγογ for the classical τάφος, -A-future οὐ̂μον, 2ο εἰς (ἡμέρα); [PS 178f., 313]), perhaps a more pronounced tendency to resume a converter/conjugation base after a nominal extraposition (PS 31, 173, 275f., 320). A profile of the Nag Hammadi idiom(s) or idiolect(s) will eventually be achieved on the basis of a series of monographs (cf. Nagel, 1969; Layton, 1973, 1974). The Nag Hammadi grammatical systems, which vary from text to another, often seem inconsistent even in one and the same text. One encounters tractates written by a "speaker of some form of dialect A" (Layton, 1974, p. 379, Codex II). Certain texts (notably in codices III, V, and especially VII, tractates 2, 3, and 5) reveal Bohairic or "Middle Egyptian" (morpho-)syntactic traits, e.g., open juncture of the relative converter (III, 42.5f.), interrogative pronouns before basic tenses (VII, 103.3f.), the conjunctive a "that" form (VII, 80.13, 99.29f.), the relative compatible with indefinite determinators (οὐ̂μο-ντίνα, VII, 85.11f.), relative conversion of the future III (III, 114.2f.), and, most striking, a four-term determination category with consequences for the expansion of the noun syntagm (ἕ-τίτε). Codices II and V reflect early Sahidic with non-Sahidic traits, mostly Akhmimoid (A, L, and, in the case of Codex V, Middle Egyptian as well). Note the following coloring in varying ratios: A forms of lexemes and morphs (μαθαύ, κοί, καθήκος, τούθ, χοῖ); lexical Akhmimicisms (e.g., ἐφετε, fear; ἀκηθε, cease [also Pistis Sophia]; τακοί, make, create); ἐπί - ἐπί- (negative imper.); τέ - ἐ with Greek loan-verbs; ἐ - ἐ for the definite article before a consonant cluster; ἐπί- (possessive article second singular feminine), ὁν-, τον- (third plural); the perfects κακός, κακός, ὁν-, ἐπί-; κακός.

2.3 Nonliterary, Postclassical, and Late Sahidic. These terms, often confused (if only by implication), demand clear definition. On the one hand, there are late literary texts, especially hagiographical, martyrological, and liturgical, but also popular literature and poetry (Drescher, 1947; Till, 1935-1936; Ermann, 1897; Junker, 1908, etc.), mostly posterior to the Arab conquest. This corpus has to be carefully distinguished from the extremely important one, of high standardization, of postclassical literary Sahidic of the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries (note espe-
cially Pachomius' writings and, above everything, the linguistic usage in Shenute's works, considered by the present writer at least as significant for the description of Sahidic grammar as is the scriptural idiom).

On the other hand, there is the immense body of nonliterary sources of late documentation, largely overlapping the late-5 corpus in its grammatical norm. This category includes letters (private, formal, official), documents (receipts, contracts and agreements, demands, testaments), magical and medical recipes and spells (see, e.g., Chassinat, 1921), and so on. This corpus has had very scant attention hitherto (see Crum, 1926, Vol. 1, chap. 10; Kahle, 1954, chap. 8), and grammatical investigation of this area is still a future goal—perhaps the greatest challenge before Coptic linguistics today.

The overpowering impression conveyed by these texts, apart from their sheer numbers (major collections have been found at Thebes, al-Ashmûnain, Wâdi Sarjah, Dayr al-Bala'izah, Armanit, and Aphrodite), is their bewildering variety and degrees of deviation from the classical standard; but therein lies their value. The letters (eighth—eleventh centuries in all catalogic collections, e.g., the British Library and the John Rylands Library ones, by Crum; Berlin, by Sätzinger; Vienna, by Krall and Till) and documentation legal texts (again, in most collections) are to a large extent characterized by formulas. The poetic (eighth—eleventh centuries), magical (seventh—tenth centuries; Kropp, 1930—1931; Stegemann, 1934), and liturgical (see Quecke, 1970, pp. 350—89, M 574, a ninth-century manuscript) all to a lesser or greater extent exhibit non-Sahidic characteristics (Akhmimoid, Fayumic, Bohairic). Striking are the following traits:

Phonological (if not dialectal) and orthographic: Vocalic and (to a lesser extent) consonantal variation is common; note especially the vocalic (ε-) treatment of syllabic nasals (he, with; ηη, he) and the fluctuations 6 ~ 2, 6 ~ k, 6 ~ q, voiced ~ unvoiced, aspirated ~ unaspirated. Many magical texts show Fayyumic stress: (stressed 2 for ο, ε for 2, k for η and even η, and 6 for η), although some (e.g., Kropp's A and B) are pure standard Sahidic; so on the whole is the Bala'izah collection. Some texts (e.g., Till's Martyrdoms) show a mixture of the S superlineation and Bohairic DINKIM. Observe that incomplete or hesitant standardization must on no account be taken for "misspelling" (cf. Kahle, 1954, p. 254, n. 5; Kahle's lists [chap. 8] constitute an unsurpassed, indeed unparalleled description of the phonologic-orthographic usage of the Theban nonliterary sources).

Morphological. First-person singular ιωταντικα; second plural τετυμει (Theban); second singular feminine εη (converser), δη (perfect) (Polotsky, 1960, p. 422, obs. 1); ἴξων, relative aorist, ἴη- future (F); τετα- conjunctive (especially Theban, but also elsewhere; also τετα-; εη- future, ἴη- future base, ἴη(τ) conditional (all Theban); verb lexeme sporadically unreduced before the direct nominal object; verb-lexeme morphology—(Theban) ουγη, ουγην, τη τη).

Tempuslehre and syntax. A future-eventual use of ἴη; a final "subjunctive" use of the conjunctive (e.g., Martyrdoms 1.8.1, Ryl. 290, 321, also Theb., Kahle, 1954, pp. 160ff.), also in a "that"-form role, as direct object (Martyrdoms 1.5.9), even with past tenses; future final-consecutive use of ταποκεφη (Ryl. 316, Martyrdoms 1.5.29, Epiph. 162.26); ιωταντικα (also final) and Xηιααη acquire the value of content-clauses (cf. En). The second tense is used as a "that" form outside the cleft sentence (BKU 335 Δ PKKON ΤΑΜΟΗ ΤΙΑΟΚ. "Our brother has told me that you found him." The circumstantial occurs adnominally, attributable to a definite nucleus (Kropp D 20 ΙΝΟΣ ΝΑΟΣ ΕΠ ΝΗΜΗΝ ΝΟΨ ΓΕΟΝ, "The great eagle whose wings are spread"); the circumstantial as clause in a cleft sentence (Kropp D ΤΟΚ ΠΕ ΕΚΤΑΓΕ ΤΗΡΗΤΟΝ, "It is you who pour"); the possessive επάνθιν (e.g., Ryl. 325, 341), also ηη as an augens of the possessive article ηηη (KRU 36 ΤΑΙΗΙΗΣ ΤΟΝ ΝΗΜΗΝ ΝΗΗΟΗΗΝ). Note such Bohairic-like features as οηα νηα (Martyrdoms 1.5.8.1, a generic relative, an indefinite ηηηα), ηηακεφη (relative/second perfect) used as a temporal clause, ηηα ηηη (Martyrdoms 1.3.7); also ηηα- ηηη (ibid. 34.3).

2.4 Sahidic Alloedy With Other Dialects (cf. Crum's Σ and 5). This is, in view of the reservations and observations made above, to be understood as an ad hoc text-specific descriptive appellation (ADIOLECT) rather than a clear, definable dialectological phenomenon. The quality and degree of component admixture vary considerably from one case to another, and it is doubtful whether dialectologically meaningful classification and gradation are at all feasible. For instance, the Fayyumicisms peculiar to many S manuscripts in the Morgan collection are neither predictable nor uniformly distributed. In "Pseudo-Shenute," M 604 (Kuhn, 1960), the F element consists of sporadic grammatical characteristics -ιωταντικα, negative conditional ιωταντικα, second singular feminine possessive article εη, and lexical-phonological
Fayyumicisms: cont, own, what (interrogative). In the unpublished parallel source, B. L. Or. 12689, the vocalism and generally the phonological shape of words is drastically affected.

3. Bibliographical Information


3.2 Grammars and Grammatical Monographs. Stern, 1880 (best grammar yet); Steindorff, 1894, 1904 (reprint 1930), and 1921; Till, 1961 (still the most commonly used, for its convenience rather than for descriptive merit); Plummer, 1948, and Walters, 1972, are rather sketchy. Dialect compendia: Wilson, 1970; Kickasola, 1975.

3.3 Dictionaries. There is no special Sahidic lexicon, but the Sahidic component of Crum's Dictionary (also Spiegelberg and Westendorf's Handwörterbuch) is certainly adequate. Wilmet's invaluable Concordance (1957–1959) covers the Sahidic New Testament. Many text editions include special glossaries.
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SHENUTEAN IDIOM. "Shenutean Coptic" is the term applied to the idiom, including the grammatical norm and stylistic-phraseological usage, observable in the corpus of writing by the archimandrite Apa Shenute (334–451), outstanding among Coptic literary sources in that it constitutes the single most extensive homogenous and authentic testo di lingua for Sahidic and Coptic in general. This corpus provides the linguist with a precious opportunity to achieve a consistent and complete description of a grammatical system. The other extensive corpus, that of the Scriptures, although somewhat earlier and so enjoying the prestige of a "classical" <i>état de langue</i>, has the disadvantage of being translated from the Greek; its native Coptic constituent element can be properly determined only after a complete structural description of the grammatical system of its Vorlage, precise knowledge of the quality and degree of its dependence upon this Vorlage, and diastratic-contrastive application of an independent, untranslated grammatical system such as that abstractable from Shenute's works. The desirability of such a grammar makes an early analysis of this corpus of paramount importance.

Compilation of the Corpus

Although only slightly more than half of all known or surmised Shenute sources have been edited to date (1982), there is no great difficulty about compiling most of the extant corpus: the task of isolating unattributed Shenute fragments from the host of homiletic and rhetoric-epistolary ones is largely technical. Linguistic (grammatical and stylistic-phraseological) data extractable from the unambiguously Shenutean sources in the three major editions (Amélineau, 1907–1914; Leipoldt and Crum, 1908–1913; Chassinat, 1911) and the many minor ones—mostly in catalogic collections (by Crum, Munier, Pleyte-Boeser, Rossi, Wessely, and Zoega) and occasionally in special publications (e.g., by Guérin, Lefort, Teza, Young, and the present writer), as well as unpublished sources—serve as probes for locating other sources. Identification on the basis of stylistic impression alone, although certainly unavoidable as a practical guide, is not always adequate, especially when the style is untypically pedestrian rather than in the usual powerful, involved vein. The main unedited collections of Sinuthiana are those in Paris and Vienna repositories and in British libraries (Oxford, Cambridge, and Manchester).

Linguistic Characterization

Shenute's dialect is what is conventionally conceived of as high-standard literary Sahidic, albeit with distinct Akhmimoid traces (Shisha-Halevy, 1976a), which are probably due to his native Akhmimic background and consist mainly of (morpho-)phonologic, morphologic, idiomatic, and lexical features, with more elusive syntactic affinities. (Present-day knowledge of Akhmimic syntax is notoriously inadequate, because of insufficient evidence.) Some of the more striking phenomena in Shenute's grammatical usage are the idiosyncratic use of the conjunctive and of object constructions and the favoring of one of the "mediators" or lexeme premodifiers (Γάφως, Τοιαύτης, οικίας (Π)); note two (or several) distinctive nominal-sentence patterns, namely # β-ιν-# (e.g., Leipoldt, 1908–1913, IV, 23.22, Φιλάλεος ἡ πρεσβύτερος τοῦ Ἱεροῦ Ναοῦ Σαλαμίνης; Amélineau 1907–1914, 1, 228, Ἰακώβιος τοῦ Ἱεροῦ Ναοῦ Σαλαμίνης) and a hyperbatic construction with a demonstrative subject (Chassinat, 1911, 150.3f, Θησείον τοῦ Ἱεροῦ Ναοῦ Σαλαμίνης, "These are 'the cords which broke'"; καλότερα, used adnominally (ibid., 125.38ff, οἰκίας ἔνθετον, οἰκίας ἔνθετον, οἰκίας ἔνθετον, οἰκίας ἔνθετον), "There is no faith, there is no hope of goodness that does not belong to it").

As regards the use of the second tenses, one finds numerous distinctive figures and constellations variously combining topicalizations and loci. Striking is the cleft sentence with the circumstantial topic...