

A NEW EARLY BOHAIRIC TEXT FROM ANTINOË

This fragment of parchment was found in kôm 1 of the northern necropolis on August 16, 1982. It preserves a small portion of chapter 26 of the *Gospel of Matthew*, written in a new variety of Early Bohairic. The book probably belonged to the library of Kollouthos' sanctuary, from which come the fragments of manuscripts, mainly biblical, found at the site¹.

While there are many lacunas, the writing itself is extremely clear and legible. It can be characterized as a mixed form of the biblical majuscule (ⲁ, ⲉ and ⲛ for example) and the alexandrian majuscule (Ⲍ and ⲙ for example). Pasquale Orsini proposes to date the script from the sixth century, preferably the first half².

The paleography can be described as follows. The baseline is not consistently level. Vertical lines are thick, while horizontal lines are thin. Curved letters (ⲉ, ⲟ, Ⲙ, Ⲟ) are round and distinct, with the middle stroke of the ⲉ sometimes but not always extending past the others. Some letters, notably ⲁ and ⲙ, connect horizontally to the following letter at the baseline, while most others maintain a visible separation from preceding and succeeding letters. Letters with a long vertical stroke (ⲧ, ⲡ, Ⲯ, Ⲥ, Ⲡ) often dip somewhat below the base-line, while letters that ascend above the height of the other letters are rare. Some letters, e.g., Ⲍ, ⲕ, and Ⲙ, have slight serifs. Letters with an incomplete circular or cup-like shape, e.g., ⲱ, Ⲳ, and ⲣ, tend to curve slightly inward at the upper left. The lobe of the ⲁ is often quite angular, and is never very rounded. The upper lobe of Ⲃ is considerably smaller than the lower one, and is somewhat angular. Ⲍ sometimes ascends slightly, and has a serif at the top of the diagonal stem. It resembles ⲁ but is larger and the baseline does not curve upwards into the stem as occurs in the ⲁ. ⲛ has three strokes, with the headstroke extending to the right and the left, occasionally touching the surrounding letters. The lobe of ⲡ is high, small, and round. Ⲙ is tilted several degrees to the left, Ⲙ slightly less. The left-right stroke of the Ⲙ tends to be as thick as the vertical strokes of other letters, while the right-left stroke tends to be thinner. The 'triangle' formed tends to be scalene, with the smallest angle at the left side of the base. The tail of Ⲃ extends

* The general introduction and the edition were made by the two authors. The linguistic analysis was written by E. Grossman.

¹ For a preliminary list of the literary texts recently found in the northern necropolis, see A. DELATTRE, *Nouveaux textes coptes d'Antinoë*, in T. GAGOS (ed. by), *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth International Congress of Papyrology*, Ann Arbor 2010, pp. 171-174; A. DELATTRE, *Textes coptes et grecs d'Antinoë*, in R. PINTAUDI (a cura di), *Antinopolis I*, Firenze 2008, pp. 131-162.

² We warmly thank P. Orsini for his comments on the characterization and the date of the script.

below the preceding letter, except when it meets the tail of a preceding λ . The tail of ω curves to the right, and then sharply to the left, but does not go under the letter to the left. The ε is of the type described by Husselman, ‘made like a large round figure 2’³, although the font used here does not do justice to this description. The *upsilon* is also distinctive, as it resembles a *iota* with curving horns.

The supralineation and diacritics in this text are of considerable interest. It is striking that this fragment does not employ supralinear strokes or dots (*djinkim*) at all, except for in the *nomen sacrum* $\overline{\text{IHC}}$. In this it is similar to the other Early Bohairic texts. On the other hand, the *trema* does occur regularly above ι , including in environments where it would not be expected in later Bohairic ($\overline{\text{φΔἰ}}$, $\overline{\text{ΝΔἰ}}$, $\overline{\text{ΜΜΟἰ}}$, $\overline{\text{ΟΥἰΝΑΜ}}$, $\overline{\text{ΜΕΥἰ}}$, $\overline{\text{ΚΕΟΥἰ}}$, $\overline{\text{ΔΥἰ}}$). In all of these cases, it marks a syllable coda following a vowel or a glide, although the examples are possibly too sparse to produce a useful generalization. *Iota* with a single point (ι), found in *P. Bodmer III*, does not occur in the text described here. One should keep in mind, however, Kasser’s observation that «... dans la plupart des copies coptes anciennes, quel que soit leur idiome (à l’exception de *B* “classique”), le tréma est placé systématiquement, en tout cas sur tout graphème *iota* au contact d’un autre graphème vocalique à l’intérieur du même mot, ce *iota* se trouvant soit au début, soit à la fin de la syllabe à laquelle il appartient, marquant alors, par là même, l’une des limites de cette syllabe; le tréma fonctionne ainsi ... comme un signe syllabique, un adjuvant permettant, sinon d’apercevoir aussitôt les limites de chaque syllabe, du moins d’effectuer cette observation dans certaines d’entre elles»⁴.

The reconstruction of the text shows that the page had 28 lines of *ca.* 24-29 letters on *recto* (flesh side) and *ca.* 23-25 on *verso* (hair side). The restitutions are based on Horner’s text of Matthew⁵.

Edition

PSI inv. Ant. 349

16 × 3,9 cm

First half of VIth century (?)

recto

[ΝΝΙΜΗΩ ΧΕ ΕΤΑΡΕ ΤΕΝΙ ΕΒΟΛ ΜΦΡΗ† ΕΡΕ]
 [ΤΕΝΝΗΥ $\overline{\text{NCA}}$ ΟΥΣΟΝΙ ΝΕΜ ΖΑΝΧΗΙ ΝΕΜ]
 [ΖΑΝΩΒΟ† ΕΔΜΟΝΙ Μ]Μ[ΟΙ. ΜΗ ΝΑΙΖΕΜCΙ]
 [ΜΜΗΝΙ ΔΝ ΠΕ $\overline{\text{H}}$]ΕΝ ΠΙΕΡ[ΦΕΙ Ε† CΒΩ ΔΥΩ]
 5 [ΜΠΕΤΕΝ]ΔΜΟΝΙ Μ[ΜΟΙ. ⁵⁶ φΔΙ ΔΕ ΤΗΡC ΔC-]
 [ΩΩΠΙ. ΖΙΝΔ] ΝΤΟΥΧΩ[Κ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΧΕ ΝΙΓΡΑΦΗ]
 [ΝΤΕ ΝΙΠ]ΡΟΦΗΤΗ[C. ΤΟΤΕ ΝΙΜΔΘΗΤΗΣ ΤΗ-]
 [ΡΟΥ ΔΥΧ]ΔC ΔΥΩ ΔΥ[ΦΩΤ. ⁵⁷ ΝΤΩΟΥ ΔΕ ΔΥΔΜΟ-]
 [ΝΙ ΝΙ]HC ΔΥΟΛC Ζ[Δ ΚΑΙΔΦΑ ΠΙΑΡΧΙΕΡΕΥ-]

³ E. HUSSELMAN, *A Bohairic School Text on Papyrus*, JNES 6 (1947), pp. 129-151.

⁴ R. KASSER, *Le Papyrus Bodmer III réexaminé: Amélioration de sa transcription*, Journal of Coptic Studies 2 (2001), pp. 81-112, in part. 98.

⁵ *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Northern Dialect*, Oxford 1898.

- 10 [с. пим]α εναρε νι[σαϣ̄ нем нпресвугте-]
 [ρος θο]γнт εροϣ. ⁵⁸π[ετροс δε ναϣμο-]
 [ωι нс]ωϣ пе зи πογ[ει ωα †αγλη нте]
 [παρχι]ερεϣс. αγω α[ϣωε εϣοϣн ναϣεμ-]
 [σι пе нем ни]ϣγпнретнс [εναγ επιϣωκ.]
 15 [⁵⁹νιαρχιερ]εϣс δε нем п[ιμα н† зап тнрϣ]
 [ναγκω]† пе нса оϣм[ετμεορε нноϣϣ]
 [ϣα ιηс зин]α нсеϣотвϣ. [⁶⁰αγω мпоϣϣи-]
 [ми εαγ]ῑ δε нхе м[μεορε нноϣϣ ?]
 [? ме]ненса на̄ι δε [αγῑ нхе в.]
 20 [⁶¹εϣϣω] ммос. хε φᾱι [?]
 [хе оγο]η ωϣом μο̄ι ε[βελ πιερφει]
 [нте φ† εвол.] αγω нтакот[ϣ ϣен г не-]
 [зооϣ. ⁶²αγω α]ϣτωнϣ нхе [πιαρχιερεϣс]
 [πεϣαϣ н]αϣ. хε αϣок η[кер оγω ?]
 25 [нзи ан хε оγ] η̄ετε на̄ι ер [μεορε]
 [ммоч ϣарок. ⁶³ῑηс δε ναϣω [нρωϣ пе.]
 [πεхе πιαρχιερε]ϣс δε ναϣ. х[ε †тарко-]
 [ммок мφ† εтонϣ. зи]η̄α нтекϣос η[ан. хε]

8. αγω : *omisit* Homer.

[нτωογ] : нѠωογ Homer, cf. v. l. 14.

9. αϣολϣ : αϣεηϣ Homer.

10. [пим]α εναρε νι[σαϣ̄ нем ни][πресвугтерос θο]γнт εροϣ : πιμα εταγѠωογ† εροϣ η̄хе нисαϣ̄ нем нпресвугтерос Homer.

13. α[ϣωε : εταϣωε ναϣ Homer.

15. δε : *omisit* Homer (one finds δε in L, cf. Homer's *apparatus*).

16. м[μεορε нноϣϣ][?] : оϣмнω ммѠεре нноϣϣ Homer. After м[μεορε нноϣϣ, one might restore an expression translating the Greek πολλῶν.

19. ме]ненса на̄ι : еηϣαε Homer.

20. φᾱι [?] : α φᾱι ϣос Homer. One could restore φᾱι [ϣω ммос], but the line would still be too short.

21. ωϣом μο̄ι : ωϣом ммοι Homer.

22. нтакот[ϣ] : εκотϣ Homer.

24. αϣок : *omisit* Homer.

η[кер оγω ?]. The restoration seems to be too short. Perhaps another expression was used.

27. [πεхе πιαρχιερε]ϣс δε ναϣ : оγοε πεхе πιαρχιερεϣс ναϣ Homer.

verso

- [нѠок пе п̄хс п̄ωн̄и мφ† εтонϣ. ⁶⁴πε-]
 [хе ιηс ναϣ. нѠок петакϣос. п̄ληн]
 [?]†[?]
 [ερεтенна]ϣ̄ еп̄ωη[ρι мφρωμι]
 5 [εϣεμси са оγ]ῑηαμ н[†ϣом αγω]
 [εϣηно]ϣ̄ εхеη [ниσηпи тφε.]
 [⁶⁵тоте п̄α]ρϣιερεϣ[с αϣφωϣ̄ ннеϣ-]
 [звωс εϣϣω] ммос. хε [αϣхе оγα]
 [нтенер х̄риа α]н хε ноϣм[εορε.]

ΝΠΠΙΕ
 ΜΟΧΙΑ
 ΠΟΥΧ
 ΟΦΗΤΗ
 ΜΥΕΩΑ
 ΕΛΥΟΛΦ
 ΕΝΑΡΕΝ
 ΗΤΕΡΗΤ
 ΟΥΠΕΡΙΠΟ
 ΕΡΕΥΟΧΥΩ
 ΑΥΠΗΡΕΤΗΟ
 ΕΔΕΝΕΜ
 ΗΤΕΝΟΛΟΤ
 ΜΟΕΝΟΤΕ
 ΕΔΕΝΑΕΚ
 ΕΝΟΜΑ
 ΜΟΟΧΕΡΑ
 ΜΑΟΜΜΟ
 ΟΥΟΠΤΑΟ
 ΤΟΥΝΦΜΕ
 ΗΔΕΛΛΑ
 ΕΤΕΝΑΡΕ
 ΕΔΕΝΑΡ
 ΕΔΕΝΑΡ
 ΑΠΟΚΑ

Recto

ΕΠΡΑ
 ΠΝΑΥ
 ΥΕΔΕ
 ΡΧΙΕΡΕ
 ΜΟΟΧ
 ΜΑΕΝΟΤ
 ΟΥΤΕΜΕ
 ΜΥΥΙΕΡ
 ΕΦΕΜΙΑ
 ΜΕΒΟΤΝΕΙ
 ΠΠΟΥΔΕΝ
 ΕΧΕΑΡΠΗ
 ΜΠΠΕΤΑΡ
 ΜΡΕΜΕΙΟ
 ΟΦΗΛΕΟΤ
 ΚΑΙΚΕΥΚ
 ΜΟΝΟΦΔΕ
 ΑΠΟΠΟΝΑ
 ΕΔΕΛΛΑ
 ΕΝΟΛΕΠ
 ΚΟΜΛΑΥ
 ΜΑΕΦΑΡ
 ΕΠΗΛΑΡ
 ΕΠΕΝΟΥ
 ΡΟΜΜΟΝ

Verso

- 10 [ζηππε †νου ατετεν]σωτεμ ε[πιογα.]
 [66 ου ξε πετετε]νμεγῑ εροϑ. [ντωου δε]
 [αγερ ουω πεχωου.] ξε χεμπω[α μφομου.]
 [67 τοτε αγρι θ]αϑ εβοϑν επ[εϑϑο. αγω]
 [αγ† κοϑρ ναϑ.] ντωου δε να[γϑιοϑι εροϑ.]
- 15 [68 εγχω μμ]οϑ. ξε αρι πρ[οφητεϑιν ναν]
 [π̄χϑ ξε ν]ιμ πεταϑϑιο[γι εροϑ. 69 πετ-]
 [ροϑ δε ν]αϑεμϑι ϑαβ[ολ πε β̄εν †αγλη.]
 [αγω αϑι ϑαρ]οϑ νξε οϑβ[ωκι εϑχω]
 [μμοϑ. ξε νε]οϑ ϑωκ νακχ[η νεμ ιηϑ]
- 20 [πιγαλιε]οϑ. 70 νεοϑ δε δ[ϑχωλ εβολ]
 [μπεμ]θο νοϑον νι[βεν εϑχω μμοϑ.]
 [ξε ν]†εμι αν ξε αρ[εχω μμοϑ ξε οϑ.]
 [71 εταϑι] δε εβολ επιω[θομ αϑναϑ εροϑ]
 [νξε] κϑοϑῑ. αγω [πεχας ννη ετχη ?]
- 25 [μ]μα. ξε φᾱι ϑω[ϑ ναϑχη νεμ ιηϑ]
 [πιρ]εμ ναϑαρε[τ. 72 παλιν ον αϑχωλ]
 [εβο]λ β̄εν οϑαν[αϑ. ξε ν†ϑωοϑν αν μ-]
 [παι]ρ̄ωμι. 73 μενε[νϑα κϑοϑχι δε αγι]

3. [?]†[?] : †χω μμοϑ νωτεν. ξε ιϑεν †νοϑ Horner.

9. νοϑμ[εϑρε] : μ̄μεϑρε Horner.

13. εβοϑν επ[εϑϑο] : εβοϑν β̄εν πεϑϑο Horner.

14. ντωου δε να[γϑιοϑι εροϑ] : οϑοϑ αγϑιοϑι εροϑ Horner.

17. The line is too long: maybe the text had αϑεμϑι and no πε.

20. δ[ϑχωλ] : ναϑχωλ Horner.

25. [μ]μα : μ̄μαϑ Horner. The line is too short; there was probably a variant (one might restore εϑωον instead of ετχη l. 24; but it would add only one letter).

25. φᾱι : νεοϑ Horner.

26. [πιρ]εμ ναϑαρετ : πιναϑαρεοϑ Horner.

Linguistic analysis

This fragment of the Gospel of Matthew is a new witness for Early Bohairic. It is not identical to any of the varieties already attested, differing primarily in having αγω rather than οϑοϑε.

The main witnesses for Early Bohairic are:

1. *P.Bodmer III*, a papyrus codex containing most of the Gospel of John and the beginning of Genesis⁶.

⁶ *Editio princeps* in R. KASSER, *Papyrus Bodmer III. Évangile de Jean et Genèse I-IV, 2 en bohairique*, Louvain 1958, with additional studies by R. Kasser, see note 17.

2. P.Vat. Inv. Copto 9, a papyrus codex containing the Twelve Minor Prophets⁷.
3. P.Heid. Inv. Kopt. 452, a folio of a parchment codex containing the Epistle of James 2:15-19 and 3:2-6⁸.
4. P.Mich. Inv. 926, a Bohairic school text with a syllabary, a list of Biblical names, and the Bohairic text of Rom. 1:1-8, 13-15, and Job 1:1⁹.
5. P.Mich. Inv. 4162, a very fragmentary text dated no later than the sixth century on paleographical grounds¹⁰.
6. *P.Mich. Copt.* 3 (inv. no. 1526), an Early Bohairic letter¹¹.

Only the first two are of any significant length. The other four are very short, which reduces their utility for linguistic study, if not their interest for the history of the Bohairic dialect. One should also take into account the following texts:

7. P.Mich. Inv. 5421, considered to embody a subdialect of Bohairic (*B71*), or a distinct dialect (*K*)¹².
8. *P.Bal.* 19, a papyrus with Phil. 3:19-4:9¹³. The language has been considered a variety of *K*, and has been given its own siglum *K71*. If one follows Kasser, then this too should be considered to be in the Bohairic 'domain'.

Also relevant is the *corpus* of pre-Conquest inscriptions from Kellia, whose language and its interest for the history of Bohairic have been studied in a preliminary fashion by Kasser and Bosson¹⁴.

The dominant approach to the significant variation one finds across these texts is that

⁷ A small part of this text has already been published in R. KASSER - H. QUECKE - N. BOSSON, *Le second chapitre d'Aggée en bohairique B74*, *Orientalia* 61 (1992), pp. 169-204, with commentary in R. KASSER, *Le Pap. Vat. Copto 9, codex des Petits Prophètes (note préliminaire sur la variété subdialectale B74 de ce témoin "Bohairique ancien", IV^e s.)*, in M. RASSART-DEBERGH - J. RIES (éd. par), *Actes du IV^e Congrès Copte, Louvain-la-Neuve, 5-10 sept. 1988*, Louvain 1992, vol. 2, pp. 64-73. The entire text is to be published, with an extensive commentary, in N. BOSSON - R. KASSER - H. QUECKE (†), *Papyrus Vatican Copte 9. Petits Prophètes en bohairique d'attestation ancienne (B4)*, Città del Vaticano (to appear).

⁸ H. QUECKE, *Ein altes bohairisches Fragment des Jakobsbrief (P. Heid. Kopt. 452)*, *Orientalia* 43 (1974), pp. 382-392.

⁹ E. HUSSELMAN, *A Bohairic School Text on Papyrus*, *JNES* 6 (1947), pp. 129-151.

¹⁰ G.M. BROWNE, *Michigan Coptic Texts*, Barcelona, 1979.

¹¹ First edition in W.H. WORRELL, *An Early Bohairic Letter*, *American Journal of Philology* 56 (1935), pp. 103-112.

¹² G.M. BROWNE, *Michigan Coptic Texts*, Barcelona 1979. This text, together with *P.Bal.* 19, has been studied several times in an attempt to establish its dialectal status, see W.-P. FUNK, *Eine frühkoptische Ausgleichsorthographie für Unter- und Mittelägypten ?*, *BSEG* 4 (1980), pp. 33-38 and R. KASSER - H. SATZINGER, *L'idiome du P. Mich. 5421 (trouvé à Karanis, nord-est du Fayoum)*, *WZKM* 74 (1982), pp. 15-32.

¹³ First edition in: P.E. KAHLER, *A Biblical Fragment of the Fourth to Fifth Century in Semi-Bohairic*, *Muséon* 63 (1950), pp. 147-157.

¹⁴ For example, see R. KASSER, *Langue copte bohairique: Son attestation par les inscriptions des Kellia et leur évaluation linguistique*, in S. EMMEL et alii (hrsg. von), *Ägypten und Nubien in spätantiker und christlicher Zeit. Akten des 6. Internationalen Koptologenkongresses, Münster, 20.-26. Juli 1996*, Wiesbaden 1999, Band 2, pp. 335-346; ID., *L'épigraphie copte aux Kellia et l'information qu'elle donne sur l'importance de la langue Bohairique B5*, *Bulletin de la Société d'Archéologie Copte* 37 (1998), pp. 15-48.

they reflect different (sub)dialects, possibly with interference from other dialects, whether Sahidic or one of the Middle Egyptian or Fayyumic varieties. For Kasser, Early Bohairic is considered to comprise several sub-varieties (B4, B71, B74, B74!). These sub-dialectal distinctions are generally made on the basis of orthographical and lexical criteria, e.g., the use of $\text{OY}\text{O}\text{Z}\epsilon$ rather than $\text{OY}\text{O}\text{Z}$ ‘and,’ $\text{MM}\lambda$ rather than $\text{MM}\lambda\gamma$ ‘there,’ the use or non-use of the grapheme ϵ , and a few others.

Another view holds that Early Bohairic texts reflect a stage of development in which the standardization of the dialect was not yet complete. It is impossible at this stage to say whether this emerging standardization embodies different local norms, since we do not know much about where these texts were produced. However, on linguistic grounds, it has been suggested that Early Bohairic is to be located south of the Delta¹⁵, and some of the texts seem to have been found in the Fayyum, e.g., P.Mich. Inv. 4162, found in Karanis. The present text was found in Antinoe, even farther to the south, although this of course does not necessarily mean anything regarding its place of origin¹⁶. Texts with Bohairic affinities, such as *P.Bal.* 19, have been found as far south as Bala’izah.

Linguistic, palaeographical, and codicological aspects of these texts have been described in the various text editions. Additional studies have been published, notably by Kasser¹⁷, Černý¹⁸, and Shisha-Halevy¹⁹. A description of the language of P.Vat. Inv. Copto 9 is to be published, along with the edition of the text²⁰.

Primary distinctive features and orthography

The primary distinctive feature of this variety is the form of the coordinating conjunction, which is $\lambda\gamma\omega$ rather than $\text{OY}\text{O}\text{Z}\epsilon$ (r8, r13, r22, v24). With respect to this this feature,

¹⁵ W.-P. FUNK, *Dialects Wanting Homes: A Numerical Approach to the Early Varieties of Coptic*, in J. FISIÁK (ed. by), *Historical Dialectology, Regional and Social*. Berlin 1988, pp. 149-192.

¹⁶ A fragment of a bilingual psalter Greek-Achmimic was also found (see: A. DELATTRE, *Textes coptes et grecs d’Antinoé*, in PINTAUDI, *Antinoupolis I* cit., pp. 131-162, n° 6).

¹⁷ R. KASSER, *À propos des différentes formes du conditionnel copte*, *Muséon* 76 (1963), pp. 267-270; *L’évangile selon Saint Jean et les versions coptes de la Bible*, Neuchâtel 1966; *Signes critiques majeurs du P. Bodmer III, diplés de répliques et d’affirmations emphatiques ou polémiques, etc., marques de subdivisions textuelles, de l’évangile johannique à la création du monde*, *Dielheimer Blätter zur Archäologie und Textüberlieferung der Antike und Spätantike* 30 (1999), pp. 71-83; *Le Papyrus Bodmer III réexaminé: amélioration de sa transcription*, *Journal of Coptic Studies* 3 (2001), pp. 81-112.

¹⁸ J. ČERNÝ, *The Bohairic verbal prefix $\lambda\text{N}\text{N}\epsilon\gamma$* , *ZÄS* 90 (1963), pp. 13-16; *Coalescence of Verbs with Prepositions in Coptic*, *ZÄS* 97 (1971), pp. 44-46. R. KASSER, *Le Papyrus Bodmer III et les versions bibliques coptes*, *Muséon* 74 (1961), pp. 423-433.

¹⁹ A. SHISHA-HALEVY, *Protatic $\epsilon\gamma\text{C}\text{O}\text{T}\text{M}$: a Hitherto Unnoticed Coptic Tripartite Conjugation Form and its Diachronic Connections*, *Orientalia* 43 (1974), pp. 369-381; *Topics in Coptic Syntax: Structural Studies in the Bohairic Dialect*, Leuven 2007.

²⁰ The most extensive treatment of Early Bohairic grammar, E. GROSSMAN, *Structural Studies in Early Bohairic Syntax* (PhD dissertation, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2009), is still unpublished.

it differs both from other Early Bohairic varieties, on the one hand, and from later Bohairic, on the other. It is shared with K71 (*P.Bal.* 19, see above).

B4/B74	B5	Matthew	K71	Sahidic
ΟΥΟΞΕ	ΟΥΟΞ	ΔΥΩ	ΔΥΩ	ΔΥΩ

A spelling typical of Early Bohairic is $\mu\mu\alpha$ rather than $\mu\mu\alpha\gamma$ ‘there.’ This is attested in v25, although the initial μ is missing.

The orthographic representation of aspiration is sporadic. Of the sites in which aspiration could be expected, one finds the following distribution.

Realized		Not realized
$\phi\lambda\iota$ (r20, v25)		$\pi\omicron\gamma\epsilon\iota$ (r12)
$\chi\omega$ (r26), $\chi[\eta]$ (v19)		
$\eta\theta\omicron\eta$ (v20)		$\eta\tau\omega\omicron\gamma$ (v14), $\eta\sigma\tau\epsilon\eta$ (r17)

This text maintains a distinction between β [x] and γ [h], like Bohairic varieties in general, and in opposition to *K/K71*, although *P.Vat. Inv. Copto 9* has $\gamma\omega\tau\epsilon\eta$ rather than $\eta\omega\tau\epsilon\eta$. The distribution of the two is generally accurate.

Another distinctive feature, which is shared with other Early Bohairic texts, primarily the ‘first hand’ of *P.Bodmer III* (= B), is the existence of $\mu\omicron\zeta$ (r21), a close-juncture variant of $\mu\mu\omicron\zeta$ ²¹.

In all other respects, the orthography is not different from other Bohairic texts, and one may conclude that it reflects the same underlying phonology. There are no examples of σ in the text, which would suggest a link with Kasser’s subdialect *B74*, a scribal norm characterizing *P.Vat. Inv. Copto 9* and part of *P.Bodmer III*. However, this is not significant, since no lexemes that would have σ are attested in the text.

Conjugation system

In such a small text, one cannot hope to find too many verbal forms attested. Nonetheless, an exhaustive list is provided.

- Tripartite: Sentence Conjugations

Unconverted affirmative past $\lambda\rho[\epsilon]-$ (v22), $\lambda[\eta]-$ (r13,v20) $\lambda\gamma-$ (r8, r9)

Affirmative relative past $\epsilon\tau\lambda\eta-$ (v16)

- Tripartite: Clause Conjugations

Conjunctive $\eta\tau\alpha-$ (r22), $\eta\tau\epsilon\kappa-$ (r28), $\eta\tau\omicron\gamma-$ (r6), $\eta\sigma\epsilon-$ (r17)²²

²¹ R. KASSER, *Le système de préfixes verbaux et les graphies $\mu\omicron\zeta$ pour $\mu\mu\omicron\zeta$ (acc.) dans le Papyrus Bodmer III*, *Journal of Coptic Studies* 3 (2001), pp. 153-167.

- Imperative	αρι- (v15)
- Bipartite	
Unconverted Affirmative	ϣ- (v12)
Unconverted Negative	[v9], [v22]
Relative Affirmative	prenom. ετε- (r25)
Imperfect Affirmative	νακ- (v19), ναϣ- (r26, [v17]), [να]ϣ- (v14)
Relative Affirmative Imperfect	prenom. εναρε- (r10),

Other sentence constructions found include the expression of inability ΟΥΟΝ-ΟΥΧΟΜ-ΜΟΙ ‘I can,’ (r21) which is also the sole attestation of the statement of (non-)existence (ΟΥΟΝ-/ΜΜΟΝ-), and the finite ‘interjection’ ΔΒΟ-Κ ‘what’s the matter with you?’ (r24). No nominal sentence patterns occur, other than the Cleft Sentence with interrogative focus (v16).

Articles, quantifiers, and pronouns

The singular indefinite article ΟΥ- occurs, but the plural indefinite is unattested in this text.

The Bohairic opposition between πι- and π- (...π-) is attested, e.g., πιωθουμ vs. πωη[ρι μφρωμι]. Only masculine singular and plural determiners (π-, πι-, πι-) and demonstrative pronouns (φαῖ, ναῖ) occur, i.e., there are no feminine singular determiners or demonstrative pronouns.

masc. sg.	fem.sg.	pl.
π-	-	see below
πι-	-	πι-
φαῖ/φαι	-	ναῖ

There is a possibility that the Early Bohairic article π- is attested in this text²³, but it is based on lacunae, and so must remain speculative.

νιϣαδ		[ν]ζηπηρετης
		μ[μερε]

Nonetheless, the existence of μ- rather than π- before the lacuna makes it likely that we are dealing with the article π-, since the article would have to be in direct contact with a following labial in order to be assimilated to μ-. It is well attested in Early Bohairic, and to a lesser extent (in terms of relative frequency) in later Bohairic.

²² Note that as in other Early Bohairic corpora, both πσε- and πτοϣ- are attested for the 3pl conjunctive.

²³ See H.J. POLOTSKY, *The ‘Weak’ Plural Article in Bohairic*, JEA 54 (1968), pp. 243-245.

No complete possessive articles (e.g., $\pi\epsilon\alpha$ -) or pronouns (e.g., $\phi\omega\alpha$) occur, although the former is likely in v13. Nor do demonstrative articles (e.g., $\pi\alpha\iota$ -) occur.

As for quantifiers, both $\kappa\epsilon$ - ‘another’ (v24) and postpositive $\mu\iota[\beta\epsilon\mu]$ (v21) are attested. The form of the latter is a matter of speculation, since $\mu\iota\mu$ and $\mu\iota\beta\iota$ are also possible, albeit unlikely, reconstructions. Other pronominals include the indefinites $\sigma\gamma\omicron\mu$ (v21) and $\sigma\gamma\iota$ (v24), as well as interrogative $\mu\iota\mu$ ‘who’ (v16). Independent personal pronouns attested are $[\mu\theta]\sigma\kappa$ (v19), $\mu\theta\omicron\alpha$ (v20), $\mu\tau\omega\omicron\gamma$ (v14). The personal suffix pronouns attested are as follows:

$\neq\dot{\iota}$	r21 (conjunctive $\neq\Delta$ r22)
$\neq\emptyset$	v22 $\Delta\mu[\epsilon\chi\omega]$
$\neq\kappa$	r24, r28, v19 (bis)
$\neq\alpha$	r8, r9, r11, r12, r17, r23 (bis), r24, r26, v16, v17, v18
$\neq\epsilon$	r20, v8, v15
$\neq\tau\epsilon\tau\epsilon\mu$	v10, v11
$\neq\gamma$	r6, r8, r9 (v14 ?)

Prepositions and adverbs

There is nothing distinctive about the prepositions and adverbs, which are identical to those found in Bohairic (see lexicon below).

Particles and *augmentia*

Few particles occur in this text. Of the particles borrowed from Greek, only $\Delta\epsilon$ occurs. As regards the *augmentia*, only $\varepsilon\omega\neq$ occurs.

Syntax

There is little that is surprising in terms of Bohairic syntax.

Lexicon

The lexicon is typically Bohairic, e.g., $\lambda\mu\omicron\mu\iota$, $\varepsilon\mu\mu\iota$. The spellings of lexemes common to the majority of the Coptic dialects are as in Bohairic ($\omega\mu\mu\iota$, $\epsilon\mu\mu\omega[\lambda]$, $\sigma\omega\tau\epsilon\mu$, ι , etc.). The lexical and grammatical items that occur in the text are given in the index (see below).

The Greek-origin words that occur are those that are found in Horner’s text. The only Greek-origin verb is marked by $\epsilon\rho$ - ($\lambda\rho\iota$ -), as is consistently the case in Early Bohairic (and Bohairic in general).

Index for : A new Early Bohairic text from Antinoe

1. Egyptian-Coptic lexemes

ΔΜΟΝΙ	‘seize, take’	r5 (ΔΜΟΝΙ)
ΔΝ	negation	v9 ([Δ]Ν), v22 (ΔΝ)
ΔΝΑΩ	‘oath’	v27 (ΔΝ[ΔΩ])
ΔΥΩ	‘and’	r8 (ΔΥΩ), r13 (ΔΥΩ), r22 (ΔΥΩ), v24 (ΔΥΩ)
ΔΒΟϚ	exclamation	r24 (ΔΒΟΚ)
ΒΩΚΙ	‘servant’	v18 (β[ΩΚΙ])
ε-/εΡΟϚ	prep.	r11 (εΡΟϚ), r21 (ε-), v4 (ε-), v10 (ε-), v11 (εΡΟϚ), v13 (ε-), v23 (ε-)
ΕΒΟΛ	‘out’	v23 (εΒΟΛ), v27 ([εΒΟ]Λ)
ΕΜΙ	‘know’	v22 (εΜΙ)
ΕΜΠΩΔ	‘be worthy’	v12 (εΜΠΩΔ)
ΕΜΘΟ	‘presence’	v21 ([εΜ]ΘΟ)
ΕΡΦΕΙ	‘temple’	r4 (εΡ[ΦΕΙ])
ΕΒΟΥΝ	‘inside’	v13 (εΒΟΥΝ)
ΕΧΕΝ-	prep.	v6 (εΧΕΝ-)
ἴ	‘come’	r18 (ἴ), v6 ([ΝΗΘ]Υ)
ΙΡΙ	‘make’	r25 (εΡ-), v15 (ΔΡΙ ΠΡ[ΟΦΗΤΕΥΙΝ])
ΚΕ	‘other’	v24 (κε-)
ΚΩΤ	‘build’	r22 (ΚΩΤϚ)
ΚΩ†	‘pursue’	r16 ([κΩ]†)
ΧΩ	‘put, leave’	r8 ([χ]ΔϚ), r26 (ΧΩ), v19 (χ[Η])
ΜΑ	‘place’	r10 ([Μ]Δ)
ΜΜΑ	‘there’	v25 ([Μ]ΜΑ)
ΜΕΝΕΝΣΑ	‘after’	r19 ([ΜΕ]ΝΕΝΣΑ), v28 (ΜΕΝΕ[ΝΣΑ])
ΜΕΘΡΕ	‘witness’	v9 (Μ[ΕΘΡΕ])
ΜΕΤΜΕΘΡΕ	‘testimony’	r16 (Μ[ΕΤΜΕΘΡΕ])
ΜΕΥἰ	‘think’	v11 (ΜΕΥἰ)
Ν-/ΜΜΟϚ	prep.	r3 ([Μ]Μ[ΟΙ]), r5 (Μ[ΜΟΙ]), r20 (ΜΜΟϚ), r21 (ΜΟἰ), v5 (Ν-), v8 (ΜΜΟϚ), v9 (Ν-), v15 ([ΜΜ]ΟϚ), v21 (Ν-)
Ν-/ΝΔϚ	‘for’	r24 ([Ν]ΔϚ), r27 (ΝΔϚ), r28 (Ν[ΔΝ])
ΝΙΒΕΝ	‘every’	v21 (ΝΙ[ΒΕΝ])
ΝΕΜ	‘and’	r15 (ΝΕΜ)
ΝΙΜ	‘who’	v16 ([Ν]ΙΜ)
ΝΣΑ-/ΝΣΩϚ	‘after’	r12 ([ΝΣ]ΩϚ), r16 (ΝΣΑ-)
ΝΘΟϚ	pers. pron.	v14 (ΝΤΩΟΥ), v19 ([ΝΘ]ΟΚ), v20 (ΝΘΟϚ)
ΝΔΥ	‘see’	v4 ([ΝΔ]Υ)
ΝΧΕ	particle	r18 (ΝΧΕ), r23 (ΝΧΕ), v18 (ΝΧΕ)
π(ε) (in glose of Cleft Sentence)		r25 (πΕΤΕ-), v16 (πΕΤ-)
πΕ (in ΝΔϚ- ...πΕ)		r12 (πΕ), r16 (πΕ)
π-	article	r12 (ΠΟΥ[ΕΙ]), r18 (Μ[ΜΕΘΡΕ] (?)), v4 (ΠΩΗ[ΡΙ])
πι-	deictic article	r4 (πι-), r10 (πι-), r15 (π[ι-]), v23 (πι-)
ΦΔἰ	demonstrative	r19 (ΝΔἰ), r20 (ΦΔἰ), r25 (ΝΔἰ), v25 (ΦΔἰ)
πΕϚ-	possessive	v13 (π[ΕϚ-])
ΡΩΜΙ	‘man’	v26 (ΡΕΜ-), v28 (ΡΩΜΙ)
ΣΑΒΟΛ	‘outside’	v17 (ΣΑβ[ΟΛ])
ΣΩΤΕΜ	‘listen’	v10 (ΣΩΤΕΜ)

τωουν	‘arise’	r23 (τωονς)
εωογ†	‘be gathered’	r11 ([εο]γητ)
ελαϑ	‘spittle’	v13 ([ε]λαϑ)
ογ-	indefinite article	r16 (ογ), v9 (ογ), v18 (ογ), v27 (ογ)
ογει	‘be distant’	r12 (ογ[ει])
ογι	‘one’	v24 (ογι)
ογον	indefinite pronoun	v21 (ογον)
ογον	‘there is’	r21 ([ογο]ν)
ογιναμ	‘right hand’	v5 (σαο]γιναμ)
ωλι	‘hold’	r9 (ολς)
ωθομ	‘gate’	v23 (ω[θομ])
ωχομ	‘power’	r21 (ωχομ)
εν-	‘in’	r4 ([εν]-), v27 (εν-)
εωτεβ	‘kill’	r17 (εωτεβς)
ελ-/εαρς	prep.	r9 (ε[λ]), v18 ([εαρ]οϑ)
ει	prep.	r12 (ει)
εως	‘self’	v19 (εωκ), v25 (εω[ϑ])
εεμσι	‘sit’	v17 (εεμσι)
ειογι	‘strike’	v16 (ειο[γι])
εε	particle	r20 (εε), r24 (εε), r27 (ε[ε]), v8 (εε), v9 (εε), v12 (εε), v15 (εε), v22 (εε), v25 (εε)
εω	‘say’	r28 (εως)
εωκ	‘complete’	r6 (εω[κ])

2. Greek Lexemes

ἀρχιερεύς	r13 ([αρχι]ερεϑς), r15 ([αρχιερ]εϑς), r27 ([αρχιερε]ϑς), v7 ([α]ρχιερεϑ[ς])
Γαλιλαῖος	v20 ([γαλιλε]ος)
δέ	r15 (δε), r18 (δε), r19 (δε), r26 (δε), r27 (δε), v14 (δε), v20 (δε), v23 (δε)
ἵνα	r17 ([ειν]α, r28 ([ει]να)
προφητεύω	v15 (αρι πρ[οφητεϑιν])
προφήτης	r7 ([π]ροφητη[ς])
ὑπηρέτης	r14 (εϑηρετης)

3. Proper Names

ἰης	r9 ([ἱ]ης), r26 ([ἱ]ης)
ναζαρετ	v26 (ναζαρε[τ])
πετρος	r11 (πετρος)