

VARIATION AND STANDARDISATION

**A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE GRAPHEMIC REALISATIONS
OF THE VOWEL-GLIDES BETWEEN THREE EARLY SAHIDIC
MANUSCRIPTS AND CLASSICAL SAHIDIC**

SUSAN PRICE, MA

SUBMITTED IN FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF RESEARCH

DEPARTMENT OF ANCIENT HISTORY

FACULTY OF ARTS

MACQUARIE UNIVERSITY, SYDNEY

OCTOBER 2014

CONTENTS

Abstract.....	i
Declaration.....	iii
Acknowledgements.....	v
Abbreviations and Sigla.....	vii
1. Introduction.....	1
2. Literature Review.....	5
2.1 Scholarship on Early Sahidic.....	5
2.2 Scholarship on the Vowel-Glides.....	11
2.3 Conclusion.....	14
3. Methodology.....	15
3.1 Methodology Discussion.....	15
3.2 Research Approach.....	17
3.3 Corpus.....	17
3.4 Method.....	22
4. Comparative Typologies of the Vowel-Glides.....	25
4.1 Introduction.....	25
4.2 Typologies of the Vowel-Glide /i/~j/	30
4.3 Typologies of the Vowel-Glide /u/~w/	45
4.4 Conclusion.....	53
5. Concluding Remarks.....	56
Bibliography.....	57
Appendices: Vowel-Glide Typologies.....	63
Appendix 1: Chester Beatty <i>Mss.</i> 813 and 814	65
Appendix 2: British Library <i>Or.</i> 7594.....	95
Appendix 3: Papyrus Bodmer XVIII.....	127
Appendix 4: Papyrus Bodmer XXIII.....	141

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Comparative typology of the vowel /i/.....	30
Table 2: Comparative typology of the glide /j/.....	31
Table 3: Comparative typology of the vowel /u/.....	45
Table 4: Comparative typology of the glide /w/.....	46
Table 5: Forms of οΥΟΕΙΩ with the definite article.....	49
Table 6: Comparative typology of the vowel-glide /i/~j/.....	53
Table 7: Comparative typology of the vowel-glide /u/~w/.....	54
Table 8: Typology of the vowel /i/.....	65
Table 9: #ΕΙ vs. ΕΙ̃.....	66
Table 10: Definite article + #ΕΙ vs. Ι.....	67
Table 11: C + Ι vs. ΕΙ~ΕΙ̃.....	68
Table 12: Greek ι: C + Ι vs. ΕΙ~ΕΙ̃.....	69
Table 13: Greek ει: C + Ι vs. ΕΙ~ΕΙ̃ (excluding verb endings).....	70
Table 14: Greek ει: C + Ι vs. ΕΙ~ΕΙ̃ (verb endings).....	71
Table 15: Greek ει: C + Ι vs. ΕΙ~ΕΙ̃ (verbs of another class).....	73
Table 16: Greek ει~ι: C + Ι vs. ΕΙ (impersonal verbs).....	73
Table 17: G + ΕΙ vs. ῖ.....	75
Table 18: Typology of the glide /j/.....	76
Table 19: Clitic + #ΕΙ vs. Ι~ῖ.....	78
Table 20: VG# G = ῖ vs. ΕΙ~ΕΙ̃.....	79
Table 21: Variation with the 1 st person singular suffix pronouns in accented syllables.....	80
Table 22: 1 st person singular pronominal subject of verbal conjugations: ἄ + ῖ vs. ΕΙ̃.....	80
Table 23: 1 st person singular pronominal subject of verbal conjugations: ε + ῖ vs. ΕΙ̃~ΕΙ.....	81
Table 24: Variation with demonstrative articles.....	82
Table 25: Variation in the glide at a syllable boundary.....	83
Table 26: Variation in the glide in the ‘covered’ position.....	84
Table 27: Variation in the intervocalic glide.....	85
Table 28: Typology of the vowel /u/.....	87
Table 29: Forms of οΥΧΑῖ with the definite article.....	88
Table 30: Typology of the glide /w/.....	89
Table 31: Variation with the converted existential.....	90
Table 32: Variation with the converted predication of possession.....	90
Table 33: Forms of οΥΟΕΙΩ with the definite article.....	91

Table 34: Objects of coalescence.....	92
Table 35: $\mathbf{H} + \Upsilon$ vs. \mathbf{OY}	94
Table 36: $\mathbf{\lambda} + \Upsilon$ vs. \mathbf{OY}	94
Table 37: Typology of the vowel /i/.....	95
Table 38: $\#\epsilon\mathbf{I}$ vs. $\widehat{\epsilon}\mathbf{I}$ vs. $\epsilon\mathbf{\ddot{I}}$	96
Table 39: $\mathbf{C}\epsilon\mathbf{I}$ vs. $\mathbf{C}\widehat{\epsilon}\mathbf{I}$	98
Table 40: $\mathbf{C} + \mathbf{I}$ vs. $\epsilon\mathbf{I}$	98
Table 41: Greek \mathbf{I} : $\mathbf{C} + \mathbf{I}$ vs. $\epsilon\mathbf{I}$	99
Table 42: Greek $\epsilon\mathbf{I}$: $\mathbf{C} + \mathbf{I}$ vs. $\epsilon\mathbf{I}$ (excluding verb endings).....	100
Table 43: Greek $\epsilon\mathbf{I}$: $\mathbf{C} + \mathbf{I}$ vs. $\epsilon\mathbf{I}$ (verb endings).....	101
Table 44: Greek \mathbf{I} : $\mathbf{C} + \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{C}$ vs. $\mathbf{C} + \epsilon\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{C}$	103
Table 45: Typology of the glide /j/.....	104
Table 46: Clitic + $\#\epsilon\mathbf{I}$ vs. \mathbf{I} vs. $\mathbf{\ddot{I}}$	105
Table 47: Clitic + $\#\epsilon\mathbf{I}$ vs. \mathbf{I} vs. $\mathbf{\ddot{I}}$	106
Table 48: $\mathbf{C} + \mathbf{I}$ vs. $\epsilon\mathbf{I}$	107
Table 49: $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{H}$ $\mathbf{G} = \epsilon\mathbf{I}$ vs. $\mathbf{\ddot{I}} \sim \mathbf{I}$	108
Table 50: $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{O}$ $\mathbf{G} = \epsilon\mathbf{I}$ vs. $\mathbf{\ddot{I}} \sim \mathbf{I}$	108
Table 51: $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{\omega}$ $\mathbf{G} = \epsilon\mathbf{I}$ vs. $\mathbf{\ddot{I}}$	109
Table 52: $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{OY}$ $\mathbf{G} = \epsilon\mathbf{I}$ vs. $\mathbf{\ddot{I}}$	110
Table 53: $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{\lambda}$ $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{\ddot{I}}$ vs. $\epsilon\mathbf{I}$	110
Table 54: Variation with demonstrative articles.....	111
Table 55: Variation with construct participles.....	112
Table 56: $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{O}, \mathbf{H}$ $\mathbf{G} = \epsilon\mathbf{I}$ vs. $\mathbf{\ddot{I}} \sim \mathbf{I}$	113
Table 57: Variation in the intervocalic glide.....	114
Table 58: Typology of the vowel /u/.....	116
Table 59: $\mathbf{C} + \mathbf{OY}$ vs. $\widehat{\mathbf{OY}}$	117
Table 60: Typology of the glide /w/.....	118
Table 61: Variation with the converted existential.....	120
Table 62: Variation with the converted predication of possession.....	120
Table 63: Forms of $\mathbf{OYOEI\omega}$ with the definite article.....	121
Table 64: $\mathbf{H} + \mathbf{OY}$ vs. $\mathbf{\gamma} \sim \widehat{\mathbf{\gamma}}$	123
Table 65: $\mathbf{\lambda} + \Upsilon$ vs. \mathbf{OY}	124
Table 66: $\mathbf{H} + \mathbf{OY}$ vs. $\mathbf{\gamma}$	126
Table 67: $\mathbf{\lambda}, \epsilon + \Upsilon$ vs. \mathbf{OY}	126

Table 68: Typology of the vowel /i/.....	127
Table 69: Greek εΙ: C + ΕΙ vs. Ι.....	129
Table 70: ΠΟΛΙC vs. ΠΟΛΕΙC.....	129
Table 71: Typology of the glide /j/.....	130
Table 72: 1 st person singular pronominal subject of verbal conjugations: Α + ἰ~ἱ vs. ΕΙ.....	133
Table 73: 1 st person singular pronominal subject of verbal conjugations: Ε + ἰ~ἱ vs. ΕΙ.....	134
Table 74: Variation with demonstrative articles.....	134
Table 75: Variation with the construct participle.....	134
Table 76: Typology of the vowel /u/.....	136
Table 77: Typology of the glide /w/.....	137
Table 78: Typology of the vowel /i/.....	141
Table 79: #ΕΙ vs. Εἰ.....	141
Table 80: Greek εΙ: C + ΕΙ vs. Ι (verb endings).....	143
Table 81: Typology of the glide /j/.....	145
Table 82: V= Η G = ΕΙ vs. Εἰ.....	147
Table 83: V= Ο G = ΕΙ vs. ἰ~ἱ.....	147
Table 84: ΟΥΧΑἰ~ΟΥΧΑΙ vs. ΟΥΧΑΕΙ.....	148
Table 85: Variation with demonstrative pronouns.....	149
Table 86: ΝΑἰ~ΝΑΙ vs. ΝΑΕΙ.....	149
Table 87: 1 st person singular pronominal subject of verbal conjugations: Α + ἰ~ἱ vs. ΕΙ.....	150
Table 88: 1 st person singular pronominal subject of verbal conjugations: Ε + ἰ vs. ΕΙ~Εἰ.....	150
Table 89: Variation with demonstrative articles.....	151
Table 90: ΖΑΕΙΒΕC vs. ΘΑἰΒΕC.....	151
Table 91: Typology of the vowel /u/.....	152
Table 92: Typology of the glide /w/.....	154
Table 93: Η + ΟΥ vs. ὦ~ῶ.....	157
Table 94: Η + ὠ~ῶ vs. ΟΥ.....	158

ABSTRACT

The high degree of graphemic variation in the Sahidic literary manuscripts of the 4th and 5th centuries CE reflects a written language in a state of flux at a time when the orthographic rules were not fixed. This thesis offers a comparative typological study of regular and free variation exhibited in the graphemic realisations of the vowel-glides /i/~j/ and /u/~w/ in the early manuscripts of the 4th and 5th centuries and in those representing the classical, or standard, Sahidic of the 6th and 7th centuries. The corpus includes three 4th-5th century literary manuscripts: British Library *Or.* 7594; Papyrus Bodmer XVIII; and Papyrus Bodmer XXIII. Chester Beatty *Mss.* 813 and 814 have been selected as the *comparanda*, being excellent representatives of standard Sahidic. A synchronic and diachronic comparison of the respective typologies allows one to gain valuable insight into the dynamic state of the written language and the process by which the orthography becomes standardised. The questions addressed in this thesis seek to complement previous scholarship on the state of the language of early Sahidic, particularly the linguistic studies on the Nag Hammadi codices. By providing valuable data which may serve as *comparanda*, and by developing a reliable method based on the recent theories and methodologies of historical linguistics and language change, this thesis seeks to lay the foundation for future research into Coptic orthography.

DECLARATION

I, Susan Price, certify that this thesis has not been submitted for a higher degree to any other university or institution.

Signature: _____

Date: _____

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Associate Professor Malcolm Choat, the Ancient History MRes Director, and Associate Professor Andrew Gillett for their advice and support throughout the MRes program this year.

In particular, I owe a great debt of gratitude to Dr Victor Ghica, my supervisor, who has been generous with his guidance, patience and constant encouragement in nurturing my research skills. His enthusiasm for Coptic linguistics and for my project, and his willingness to share his knowledge have been invaluable for the completion of this thesis.

ABBREVIATIONS AND SIGLA

<i>A</i>	Akhmimic
<i>A</i> ²	Subakhmimic (Lycopolitan)
<i>B</i>	Bohairic
<i>BL</i>	British Library <i>Or.</i> 7594
<i>C</i>	consonant
<i>CB</i>	Chester Beatty <i>Mss.</i> 813 and 814
<i>ES</i>	early Sahidic
<i>F</i>	Fayumic
<i>G</i>	glide
<i>IPA</i>	International Phonetic Alphabet
l.	<i>lege</i> (read)
<i>L</i>	Lycopolitan
<i>M</i>	Mesokemic
n.	note
<i>NH</i>	Nag Hammadi Codex
<i>P</i>	Dialect P
<i>P.Bodm. 6</i>	Papyrus Bodmer VI
<i>P.Bodm. 18</i>	Papyrus Bodmer XVIII
<i>P.Bodm. 23</i>	Papyrus Bodmer XXIII
<i>S</i>	Sahidic
<i>S</i> ^a	Sahidic with Akhmimic tendency
<i>V</i>	vowel
var.	variant
vs.	versus

1. INTRODUCTION

Late antique Egypt was a period of immense change both linguistically and culturally. The 3rd and 4th centuries CE witnessed two major developments in Egypt. The first, the creation of the new Coptic alphabet: the logograms, phonograms, and so forth of the hieroglyphic, hieratic and demotic writing systems had eventually been replaced by an alphabetic system of writing based on the Greek alphabet. With the addition of several other letters derived from demotic, the Egyptians now had a script which represented more closely their native spoken language. This new linguistic development coincided with the second major development, the rise of Christianity and its competing religious sects in Egypt, and the foundation of the institution of monasticism. Since Christianity relies on the authority of Scripture, biblical and other religious texts began to be translated and copied using this new script into a number of regional dialects, the most well-attested dialects being Sahidic, Bohairic, Fayumic, Lycopolitan (previously designated Subakhmimic), Akhmimic, and Mesokemic (or Middle Egyptian), all of which were located along the Nile valley, the Fayum oasis, and the Delta.¹

By the 4th century the southern dialect of Sahidic emerged as the pan-Egyptian *lingua franca*, becoming the standard literary language of all Egypt.² This privileged position was achieved probably due to its dialectal neutrality, most of its isoglosses being shared with those of the other dialects. This resulted in the potential to be understood by speakers of those dialects.³ The realisation of this neutrality can be understood as the assimilation of features from the other dialects and the suppression of distinctive traits.⁴ Sahidic, therefore, can be considered a dialectal ‘average’, a *Mischdialekt* or a middle dialect, as Mink has coined, and has pertinently described as a conglomeration of linguistic characteristics which are only imperfectly and unevenly standardised.⁵ Mink’s remarks apply particularly to the period of

1 The attribution of a dialect to a geographical region is problematic, since the origins of manuscripts are often obscure. For a discussion on the problems, cf. Funk (1988). For a summary of the various views on the distribution of the dialects, cf. Kasser (1991d).

2 Worrell (1934), p. 73; Kahle (1954), p. 233; Polotsky (1970), p. 560; Shisha-Halevy (1991), p. 195.

3 Shisha-Halevy (1991), p.195.

4 Shisha-Halevy (1991), p.195; The question of the origin of Sahidic and the process of its integration into the dialectal framework is much debated. For discussions on the scholarly opinions on the origin of Sahidic, cf.: Shisha-Halevy (1991), p.195; Satzinger (1985); Funk (1988), pp. 152-154; Polotsky (1970), pp. 560-561.

5 Mink (1978), p. 92.

‘early’ Sahidic, the primitive stage of the dialect to which the literary manuscripts of the 4th and 5th centuries attest, and in which we find an orthography in a state of flux, characterised by variation, and rich in graphemic options.

It was not until the 6th century that we see, in what has become known as ‘classical’ Sahidic,⁶ a remarkably standardised orthography, coinciding with the time when the scriptoria, in which the literary texts were produced, had become almost exclusively monastic.⁷ Within these scriptoria the process of standardising the orthography strengthened, a process which involved the progressive elimination of variant forms in the writing. The high degree of variation attested in the early manuscripts, however, reflects a period before the dominance of these monastic scriptoria, at a time when there was no institutional authority or orthographic regulator.

What we have in the early Sahidic manuscripts is an orthography that encodes a phonological system, a system about which we have little understanding. We can only seek to understand this phonological system by scrutinising the standards that the scribes have laid down for us in their orthography, including, most importantly, every variation.⁸ A comprehensive study of the orthography of early Sahidic has never been undertaken. We do not have the anatomy of Sahidic between the 4th and 6th centuries. The traditional grammars tend to disregard the variants in the literary texts as ‘scribal corruption’ or ‘dialectal contamination’, and, instead, present a standardised idiom, an ideal, or idealised state of the language.⁹ They fail to represent faithfully the reality of the language, that which was actually written. Yet, since we can expect variation to have a certain degree of regularity, at least at the

6 Shisha-Halevy (1991), p. 198, also calls it ‘scriptural Sahidic’.

7 Metzger and Ehrman (2005), pp. 24-31: In the 4th century, with the legalisation of Christianity, it is argued (but not proved) by Metzger and Ehrman that copies of the biblical books were produced by scribes in commercial scriptoria by dictation, which would explain the high degree of variation where scribes might confuse similar sounding letters. From the 5th century, with the strengthening of monasticism, copies were produced in the monastic scriptoria, where, instead of writing by dictation, monks would work individually, copying texts for the needs of the monastery or their benefactors.

8 Funk (2009), p. 71.

9 Layton (2004), for example, in his *Coptic Grammar*, refrains from using examples from the 4th century texts displaying variations claiming: “Those Nag Hammadi texts whose language resembles Sahidic display a non-Standard mix of isoglosses, sometimes fluctuating, from all over Egypt ... dialectal peculiarities ... Even the work entitled Pistia Sophia, whose language in many ways resembles standard biblical Sahidic, shows peculiarities ... other texts ... their non-Standard peculiarities are signalled by tacit omission here.” p. xii n. 5.

scribal level, the orthography should be able to be described, even if more complex patterns come to light.¹⁰ The task remains to explain, first, what the early Sahidic orthographic system prescribed, and second, what the system tolerated. Examining the manuscripts themselves, alongside well-worked editions, makes it possible to construct a more nuanced description of the language.

Taking the two vowel-glides /i~/j/ and /u~/w/ as a case study, the focus of this project is to introduce a sound and rigorous methodology which will permit a description of an orthographic system that includes variation. The aim is to formulate functional typologies of the graphemic realisations of these phonemic elements by analysing both regular and free variation attested in three 4th-5th century biblical manuscripts: British Library *Or.* 7594, Papyrus Bodmer XVIII, and Papyrus Bodmer XXIII. Such a schema will involve a synchronic comparison, along with a diachronic comparison with the so-called ‘standard’ or ‘classical’ Sahidic of the 6th century, as represented by the Chester Beatty *Mss.* 813 and 814.

The principle underpinning the method of analysis is that of ‘free variation’ as proposed by Roquet.¹¹ Free variation is observed in the fluctuation between alternative graphemic forms of the vowel-glides which coexist as options, not only within a presumed synchronic corpus of manuscripts, but also within one and the same manuscript and by one and the same scribe.¹² A comparison of the nature and frequency of free variation occurring with the vowel-glides in the early Sahidic manuscripts with their correspondences in the classical texts allows us a glimpse into the process of standardisation, as the relative frequency of one graphic form increases or decreases with respect to the other in the various phonological environments, and finally becomes resolved in the standardised rules of distribution.

10 Cf. Weinreich, Labov, and Herzog (1968), pp. 101, 151.

11 Roquet (1982).

12 Roquet (1982), p. 28, defined ‘free variation’ as a binary linguistic choice, a fluctuation between alternative forms which may occur at every level of language analysis: phono-graphemic, morpho-syntactic, lexical, and even semantic.

This project will build on the previous linguistic studies on the Nag Hammadi codices undertaken by Funk,¹³ Cherix,¹⁴ and Ghica,¹⁵ and will contribute to our understanding of early Sahidic orthography, first, by adding to the corpus of early Sahidic linguistic studies regarding the vowel-glides, and second, by developing a systematic methodology which will initially produce functional typologies of one graphemic element, the vowel-glides, and which can, in the future, be extended to include all phono-graphemic, morpho-syntactic and lexical items.

13 Funk (1995).

14 Cherix (1994).

15 Ghica (2006).

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 SCHOLARSHIP ON EARLY SAHIDIC

The orthography of early Sahidic has been a neglected area of research in the scholarship. Confronted with the problem of variation exhibited in the early manuscripts of the 4th and 5th centuries CE, much of the previous scholarship has focussed its attention on attempting to determine the dialectal status of the texts. More recently, however, a number of scholars have shifted the focus to view variation in terms of the natural processes of language change, and standardisation emerging as a result of such forces.¹ The application of newly articulated theories and methodologies derived from the field of historical linguistics provides a counterpoint to the notion of dialectal influences, bringing to the fore the role of variation in the standardising of Sahidic.²

Variation was first highlighted in Paul Kahle's monumental 1954 publication, *Bala'izah*, in which he noted that virtually all 4th century Sahidic manuscripts displayed, to at least some extent, what he called 'archaisms' or 'misspellings'.³ An extensive chapter was devoted to a rich collection of material on 'dialectal variation' and 'dialectal misspellings' in Sahidic non-literary texts, along with 4th and 5th century literary texts, that he classified as early Coptic manuscripts.⁴ Kahle's terminology here is instructive. Archaisms and misspellings, according to Kahle, are to be attributed to dialectal influences. Such an interpretation had a powerful influence on subsequent scholars who assumed that variation apparent in the early Sahidic manuscripts was solely the result of dialectal contamination.

Since Kahle's publication, most of the research on early Sahidic has been carried out on the Nag Hammadi codices. Dated to the 4th century, these comprise copies of translations from the Greek, most of them in Sahidic, some in Lycopolitan, but exhibiting varying degrees

1 Cf. Roquet (1982), Cherix (1994), and Ghica (2006) on variation in relation to the Nag Hammadi texts; cf. also Grossman (2009) and Almond (2010) on variation and the integration of Greek loan words into Coptic.

2 For theoretical and methodological discussions on language change, cf.: Weinreich, Labov, and Herzog (1968), pp. 97-195; Keller (1994); Lass (1997); Croft (2000); Fleischman (2000), pp. 33-58.

3 Kahle (1954), p. 263.

4 Kahle (1954), p. 48-192; for the list of texts from this period, cf. pp. 269-274.

of deviation from the classical standard.⁵ Much of the discussion on the state of the language of the Sahidic Nag Hammadi texts has, therefore, been concentrated on these non-Sahidic features. The earlier studies have investigated the language of the texts through the lens of dialectology, from which various interpretations emerged and new labels applied. Nagel, in his analysis of *NH II*, on the graphemic, phonological, morphological, and syntactic levels, noted that most of the variants corresponded to Lycopolitan, some to Akhmimic, but there were others which he linked to dialect *P*, the Theban dialect attested in *P.Bodm. 6*, considered to be the earliest stage of Sahidic.⁶ He argued that the Coptic of this codex represented the Gnostic sociolect of Upper Egypt, which he termed ‘Upper Egyptian Sahidic’.⁷ Layton turned his attention to the deeper level of syntax in his study of the *Hypostasis of the Archons* in *NH II* which, he asserted, provides a clearer picture of the underlying dialect of the translator.⁸ He concluded that the syntactic structure was Subachmimic (Lycopolitan) and, consequently, the text was translated by a native speaker of Lycopolitan trying to conform to the prestigious and orthodox dialect of Sahidic.⁹ The more superficial phono-graphemic variants, on the other hand, were due to subsequent copies by scribes of various origins. The term ‘Crypto-Subachmimic’ (Crypto- *A*²) was thus coined to characterise the language.¹⁰

Although each of these interpretations has brought new insights to the question of non-Sahidic traits in the individual codices, the application of sub-dialectal labels had the result of overgeneralising the dialectal influence.¹¹ More importantly, two problems arise from their approach. First, the definition of the problem in terms of dialectal influences would naturally demand an answer in such terms. If you look for dialectal correspondences, no doubt you will find them. Second, none of these studies brought to the question secure *comparanda*. On what criteria are their comparisons based? Is it valid to compare these 4th century texts with the Sahidic of the standard grammars? Do these grammars actually reflect the reality of the Sahidic of the 4th century? And is it valid to make assertions about non-Sahidic traits without

5 On the Nag Hammadi library, cf. Emmel (1991), pp. 1771-1773.

6 Nagel (1969), pp. 393-469; edition of *P.Bodm. 6*: Kasser (1960); for dialect *P*, cf. Nagel (1965), pp. 30-49.

7 Nagel (1969), p. 469.

8 Layton (1974), pp. 351-425; Layton (1976), pp. 31-101.

9 Layton (1974), pp. 374, 379.

10 Layton (1977), p. 66, n. 2.

11 Shisha-Halevy (1976), p. 353, n. 1; Funk (1993), pp. 163-164; Funk (1993), p. 164: “A legend was born: the legend of most or all of the ‘Sahidic’ Nag Hammadi texts being to a greater or lesser degree influenced by the Subachmimic dialect, or dialects (whatever this may mean)”.

comparing them, first, with the other texts in the corpus, then, with other contemporary biblical texts? In fact, we do not have a systematic description of early Sahidic, nor of any of the other dialects, for that matter.

Indeed, Shisha-Halevy added a note of caution in classifying texts according to “sub-dialects, transition dialects or ‘dialectules’”.¹² Reducing the “textual admixtures or blendings of dialects” to the category of subdialect oversimplifies the issue and “only creates new fictions”.¹³ In the case of the Nag Hammadi codices, by treating them as a corpus, a “strictly internal corpus-grammar”, or as a language unity, he has introduced the notion of ‘idiolect’, which he termed ‘Gnostic’ Sahidic.¹⁴ Applying this notion to the idiom of Shenoute, Shisha-Halevy maintained that the Akhmimic-like alternations in Shenoute’s writings were due to his linguistic background, rather than a mixed dialect, or a Sahidic-Akhmimic sub-dialect. Fully aware that the problem of occasional Akhmimic vocalisation in early Sahidic was still unsolved, he ventured to attribute the vocalic variants present in the manuscripts to the insufficient establishment of an orthographic standard and a scribe slipping into his own vernacular.¹⁵

Funk, too, advocated the consideration of the texts of the Nag Hammadi library as a corpus, but not as a linguistic unity, as Shisha-Halevy suggested, rather, in light of their diversity.¹⁶ Highlighting the limitations of the past endeavours of Nagel and Layton, Funk took a different approach and proposed a methodological framework for a full-scale analysis of all the texts.¹⁷ Instead of looking for non-Sahidic forms, Funk called for, in the first place, a systematic description of the state of the language of each of the texts, followed then by a comparison with each other. Using dialectally relevant variables, and applying a method of seriation and cluster analysis, trends would emerge which would result in the establishment of ‘groups’, not necessarily dialectal, but sharing linguistic characteristics.¹⁸ The results of the application of this method confirmed that the linguistic diversity was largely conditioned by

12 Shisha-Halevy (1976), p. 353, n. 1; Shisha-Halevy (1976), p. 353, cites, for example, the attribution *S^a* denoted by Crum (1939), p. xiii - Sahidic with Akhmimic tendency.

13 Shisha-Halevy (1976), p. 353, n. 1.

14 Shisha-Halevy (1991), p. 198.

15 Shisha-Halevy (1976), p. 354, n. 4.

16 Funk (1993), p. 163.

17 Funk (1993), p. 164-165.

18 Funk (1993), pp. 164-165; for a more detailed application of this method, cf. Funk (1995a).

dialectal geography along the north-south axis.¹⁹ This method has provided a much more complex picture of the dialectal affiliations of the codices, along with the adoption of some more sub-dialectal labels: crypto-Bohairic, crypto-*L6*, crypto-*A*.²⁰ A number of two-dimensional models have mapped out the geographical provenance (the translation from Greek) of the texts along one axis, and the process of Sahidicisation (the editorial work) along the other, the two being indicative of the history of transmission.²¹ This process of Sahidicisation is seen at the level of orthography, whereby the scribes strive for uniformity. It is at this level, the orthography of the codex, Funk maintained, that valuable insights might be gained which would necessitate, for any comparative study, the availability of a comprehensive orthographic analysis of not only the Nag Hammadi corpus, but of other 4th century texts as well.²²

Such a detailed and systematic typological study was undertaken by Pierre Cherix in his doctoral thesis on variation in the Nag Hammadi *Codex VI*.²³ The contribution of his study to our understanding of the language of the Sahidic of the Nag Hammadi texts lies in, on the one hand, his bifocal perspective, and on the other, his comparative method. Cherix looked at the texts, not only in terms of dialectal affiliation, but also with regard to the chronological stage of the language. Applying a statistical comparison to both regular and free variation, alongside their classical Sahidic correspondences, his objective was to bring to the debate new data which could be subjected to descriptive analysis, rather than venture new solutions.²⁴ As a result of his analysis, Cherix has offered some valuable interpretations as to the state of the language of this codex, based on whether a variant was a dialectism or an archaism, set within the context of contemporary Sahidic and Lycopolitan texts.²⁵ Although there is a lack of clarity in his conclusion due to some confusion throughout the study as to what is considered an archaism or a dialectism,²⁶ Cherix has thrown new light on the role of variation in our understanding of these early texts. He concluded that the Sahidic of the 4th century orthodox

19 Funk (1993), p. 169; Funk (1995a), p. 113.

20 Funk (1993), pp. 171-172.

21 Funk (1995a), p. 120.

22 Funk (1995a), p. 126.

23 Cherix (1994).

24 Cherix (1994), p. 25.

25 Cherix (1994), pp. 141-172.

26 Cherix (1994), pp. 173-174: On the one hand, Cherix claimed that the majority of variants can be considered archaisms, but some are due to dialectal influence; then a few sentences along he maintained that there is no dialectal influence, that the language reflected that of the pre-classical texts.

Christian communities was coloured, according to the scriptoria, by the local dialects that gave the texts their ‘idiolectal’ character; and similarly, within the circle of heterodoxy, the variants were due to the linguistic milieu of the scribes in which Lycopolitan manuscripts were copied, at a time when the orthography was not yet fixed.²⁷

Underlying both Cherix’s and Shisha-Halevy’s arguments that the Nag Hammadi texts and the corpus of Shenoute were copied or written at an early stage of Sahidic, reflected by the fluidity of the orthography, are the theories and methodologies of historical linguistics and language change, as proposed by Gerard Roquet.²⁸ In his assessment of the language of the Nag Hammadi texts, Roquet consciously turned his attention away from the interdialectal focus to the principle of ‘free variation’, which can be interpreted as a sign of the language in the process of transformation, rather than an indication of interdialectality.²⁹ Linguistic variation is an inherent characteristic of language and the material by which language changes.³⁰ Roquet defined free variation as the hesitation between alternative forms, at every level of the language, in the same text, by the same scribe, or in the same corpus.³¹ These alternative forms coexist in a linguistic community, and gradually, the relative frequency of one form increases with respect to the other. This is the process of standardisation. Standard or classical Sahidic, according to Roquet, would be the final outcome of this gradual elimination of alternative forms, resolved into the rules of grammar.³² The numerous variant traits in the Nag Hammadi codices, therefore, indicate an early, dynamic, state of the written language, before the rules were largely fixed. This mechanism is well illustrated not only in the Nag Hammadi codices, but also in the other early Sahidic texts of the 4th century.

Based on his observations on variation in the linguistic features of contemporary Sahidic literary manuscripts dated to the 4th and 5th centuries, Victor Ghica, in his doctoral thesis on *NH VI. 1*, situated the Nag Hammadi corpus within the pre-classical period of the Sahidic dialect, not only chronologically, but also linguistically, the orthographic anomalies

27 Cherix (1994), pp. 146, 152, 174.

28 Roquet (1982), p. 32, premised his approach on the seminal work of Weinreich, Labov, and Herzog (1968).

29 Roquet (1982), p. 29.

30 For more recent work on variation and language change, cf. Keller (1994), Lass (1997), Croft (2000), Fleischman (2000), pp. 33-58.

31 Roquet (1982), p. 28.

32 Roquet (1982), p. 29: “...la somme de toutes les [variation libre] résolues en règles de grammaire...”.

arising from a situation of diglossia as suggested by Satzinger,³³ and the operation of free variation proposed by Roquet.³⁴ What the previous scholarship termed ‘dialectisms’ or ‘archaisms’, Ghica attributed to the effects of diglossia.³⁵ He argued that in a sense these dialectisms are a reality, but to name them as such conceals the fact that they had been assimilated into the inclusive koine Sahidic of this period.³⁶

The Sahidic dialect can be understood as a dialectal mean, or a middle dialect, characterised by its neutrality which resulted from both the assimilation of features from other dialects and the suppression of distinctive characteristics.³⁷ According to Ghica, and rightly so, the Sahidic dialect achieved its neutrality and emerged as the *lingua franca* along the Nile as a result of numerous dialectal influences: “Le sahidique véhiculaire du début du 4th siècle, tel que nous le révèlent les manuscrits de l’époque, brasse, tout comme le fleuve qui dessine son aire de dispersion, tous les parlers de la Vallée.”³⁸ The so-called non-Sahidic traits present in *NH VI. I* are assumed by Ghica to be variant regional forms admissible and tolerated in a primitive Sahidic orthography, an orthography striving for homogeneity and neutrality.³⁹ The orthography of this manuscript represents a state of permeability; at times a rudimentary written language, at times reflecting the classical forms, and at times assuming the features of other dialects, most particularly Lycopolitan and Akhmimic, the two with which Sahidic shares most of its isoglosses.⁴⁰ The graphemic and phonographemic variations are, therefore, to be interpreted as the mark of an orthography and phonology undergoing progressive neutralisation and synthesis.⁴¹ The notion of diglossia and free variation proposed by Ghica in his study of *NH VI. I* is arguably the most reasonable interpretation of the language of this text, an interpretation which can be extended to the other Sahidic texts of this period.

33 Satzinger (1985), p. 310, addressed the issue of the northern CON, PAN and southern CAN, PEN vocalic dichotomy, and sought to explain the presence of the northern vocalism in the southern Sahidic dialect as a result of the idiom of the capital, Memphis, being acquired in the Thebiad at the beginning of the Persian period, as a pathway to political and administrative influence. This led to a situation of diglossia in the south, with the gradual intermingling of the two idioms, with Sahidic being the product of a local variant of the upper class vocalisation.

34 Ghica (2006), pp. 207-209; 218.

35 Ghica (2006), p. 219.

36 Ghica (2006), p. 219.

37 Shisha-Halevy (1991), p. 195; cf. Worrell (1934), p. 73; Kahle (1954), p. 241.

38 Ghica (2006), p. 219.

39 Ghica (2006), p. 221.

40 Ghica (2006), p. 220; cf. Satzinger (1985), p. 310.

41 Ghica (2006), p. 222.

2.2 SCHOLARSHIP ON THE VOWEL-GLIDES

No comprehensive description of Sahidic orthography has ever been published. The Coptic grammars tend to describe a standardised idiom rather than the orthographic reality which is reflected in the manuscripts.⁴² Much of the scholarship on the vowel-glides in Sahidic is restricted to these grammars and to the texts describing Coptic phonology, in which the rules of the distribution of the various graphemes (regular variation) are defined in terms of the so-called standard.⁴³

An important contribution to our general understanding of the orthography of the vowel-glide /i/~j/ is that of Quecke.⁴⁴ Quecke's focus was on the alternative writing of the single grapheme ⲓ and the digraph ⲓⲁ; an extensive and wide-ranging survey of the graphic forms used in the various dialects over different periods of time. Such a broad scope has its limitations and these were expressed from the outset: a comprehensive and systematic formulation of the rules for each of the dialects, and for each stage of the language, was beyond the scope of his study.⁴⁵ Instead, the broader and more general perspective highlighted the complexities of this one element of the alphabet. The starting point for Quecke was Till's *Achmîmisch-koptische Grammatik*, concerning the problem of ambiguity in the realisation of the digraph ⲓⲁ, which could represent either /i/~j/, or /e.i/~e.j/.⁴⁶ Quecke's objective was to determine the extent to which the ambiguous rendering of this vowel-glide may have caused problems for those reading the text and in what ways the scribes attempted to control such ambiguities. The value of Quecke's study lies in his observations on the use and the various forms of the trema and the circumflex along with the wide range of manuscripts he brought forward to illustrate his points.

Pertinent statements regarding the irregularity of graphemic realisations of the vowel-glides in early Sahidic are generally limited to the introductions of the critical editions. The most important of these that enumerate the cases of variation, to a greater or lesser degree of

42 Sahidic grammars include: Stern (1880); Steindorff (1904); Till (1955); Layton (2004).

43 For phonological treatments of the vowel-glides, cf.: Peust (1999), pp. 60-61, 260-262; Vergote (1973a), pp. 10-11; Vergote (1973b), p. 49; Hintze (1980); Loprieno (1995), pp. 46-50; Kasser (1980), pp. 80-92; Kasser (1982); Kasser (1983); Kasser (1997), pp. 6-11.

44 Quecke (1984b), pp. 289-326.

45 Quecke (1984b), pp. 289-290.

46 Quecke (1984b), p. 290; Till (1928), § 5c.

analysis, are: the collection of Bodmer papyri, edited by Kasser;⁴⁷ the editions of *Mark*, *Luke* and *John*, edited by Quecke;⁴⁸ and the edition of *Acts* by Hintze and Schenke.⁴⁹ The value of these lists lies in the ‘real’ data that is made available, upon which further investigations can build.

The three studies that deal more systematically with the orthography of the vowel-glides in early Sahidic are those of Funk, in his linguistic treatment of *NH VI. 2*,⁵⁰ Cherix, in his *Variantes*,⁵¹ and Ghica, in his study on *NH VI. 1*.⁵² Funk employed a synchronic approach, following the structural model of Hintze,⁵³ in his formulation of orthographic rules applied to the vowel-glides by the scribe of the *NH VI. 2* manuscript. This involved the construction of matrices describing the conditions under which the different graphemic forms were prescribed, including the variant forms which were tolerated. He avoided making any distinction between the vocalic and consonantal functions of the vowel-glides because of the lack of scholarly consensus regarding their phonetic value, adding that such a differentiation would be unnecessary for a purely orthographic description.⁵⁴ However, relevant phonological comments have been included in his detailed analysis of the scribal tendencies. The adoption of such a method for a synchronic analysis of the orthography of this text would certainly offer the way forward, as Funk would wish, for a linguistic study of all the manuscripts of this period.⁵⁵ However, although synchronic analysis of vowel-glides, or any phono-graphemic element of the orthography, is essential, it does little to shed light on the process of language change and standardisation.

Cherix, on the other hand, has taken a combination of a synchronic and diachronic perspective. He established a classification of variation at the graphemic, phono-graphemic, morphological, syntactic, and lexical levels, and statistically analysed these in all the manuscripts of *NH VI* in comparison with their correspondences from classical Sahidic, as

47 Kasser (1961); Kasser (1962a); Kasser (1962b); Kasser (1962c); R. Kasser (1964); Kasser (1965).

48 Quecke (1972); Quecke (1977); Quecke (1984a).

49 Hintze and Schenke (1970).

50 Funk (1995b), pp. 13-53: For the vowel-glides, cf. pp. 25-42.

51 Cherix (1994): For the vowel-glides, cf. pp. 34-45, 122-124.

52 Ghica (2006): For the vowel-glides, cf. pp. 222-234.

53 Hintze (1980).

54 Funk (1995b), p. 26.

55 Cf. Funk (2009), pp. 71-72; Funk (1993), pp. 164-165.

attested in the Chester Beatty biblical texts.⁵⁶ Rather than formulating rules for the graphemic distribution of the vowel-glides, Cherix's focus was on variation within the rules. Relative attestations of the variants for each text of the codex allowed for both a synchronic and a diachronic comparison. Cherix took the further step of comparing *NH VI* with other contemporary 4th century biblical texts, however, only a small selection of variants were chosen for comparison, and unfortunately, the vowel-glides were not among this selection. Unlike Funk's detailed descriptive analysis of the vowel-glides, Cherix's was limited to statistics. The strength of Funk's method lies in the level of detail in his classification and analysis, whereas Cherix's comparative method has the advantage of giving us a more accurate picture, through his statistics, of the extent of variation in these manuscripts.

Like Funk, Ghica restricted his investigation to a synchronic description of the linguistic traits of *NH VI. I*, but like Cherix, 'free variation' was the underlying methodological principle in his description of the graphemic, phono-graphemic, morpho-syntactic, and lexical features attested in the text. The data for the vowel-glides were organised following the rules of distribution defined by Funk.⁵⁷ Variant graphemic forms were highlighted with reference to other early Sahidic manuscripts, particularly the Bodmer papyri, and accompanied by an analysis, tracing and critiquing that of Funk. The results of all three studies confirm the prevalence of free variation, but not random variation. Distinct patterns of distribution emerged where free variation occurred predominantly only in certain phonological environments, emphasising the struggle for priority between the variant forms in an orthography striving for homogeneity. These studies have provided rich data for our understanding of the vowel-glides in early Sahidic, and the methods employed have furnished a sound methodological foundation for the study of variation.

⁵⁶ Cherix (1994), pp. 34-119.

⁵⁷ Funk (1995b), pp. 27-42.

2.3 CONCLUSION

In summary, each of the studies discussed has highlighted the challenges faced when dealing with scribal variation in this early period of the Coptic writing system. Nevertheless, each attempt at solving the problem, through different perspectives and various methodologies, has made a valuable contribution to our understanding of early Sahidic. Although the written texts may provide less than perfect evidence for the spoken language, they do offer excellent evidence for the written language, the scribal habits of the various communities. All of the research has implicitly, and in some cases, explicitly, underlined the need for a comprehensive and systematic description of the orthography of these early manuscripts as a first step. The present study is building on these previous studies and, in particular, the methodological premises of Cherix and Ghica, by adding to the corpus of early Sahidic texts to be studied synchronically and implementing secure *comparanda* in order to achieve more reliable results diachronically.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 METHODOLOGY DISCUSSION

Funk highlighted the task faced when attempting to describe the phonological system of a dead language, by quoting Polotsky:¹

What we have before us is an orthography in which, around the year 300, an anonymous linguistic scholar laid down his phonological analysis of Sahidic. We cannot do more than seek to understand his analysis. If he happens to do a bad job, we cannot go far beyond him: phonetic recordings of speech, which could be used to correct him in certain details or for us to try our own analysis, do not exist. It is an error to believe that unorthographic texts *eo ipso* are also ‘phonetic’, although it can be admitted in certain cases they may suggest, or allow one to draw, certain conclusions.²

Labov once described the task as “making the best use of bad data”.³ Yet, it can be argued that the manuscripts we have available to us can offer ‘good data’, if we scrutinise the data on their own terms, not as the representations of the spoken language in the first place, but as representations of the written language, which is what they are.⁴ The description of the standards of orthography, the patterns of written conventions, which necessarily includes variation, nevertheless, remains the foundation for the reconstruction of a phonological system.⁵

Most of the previous studies on early Sahidic have been approached synchronically, influenced by the concepts of linguistic structuralism, whereby the underlying structure of a language can be described as a static, homogenised system.⁶ On this basis, heterogeneity, or

1 Funk (2009) p. 71.

2 Polotsky (1957), p. 221, translated by Funk (2009), p. 71.

3 Labov (1994), p. 11.

4 Stenroos (2009), pp. 2-3.

5 Funk (2009), p. 71.

6 These theories originated from the work of the Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure; cf. Saussure (1983), p. 89.

variation, could only be attributed to dialectal influences. Roquet, on the other hand, challenged this approach by introducing the principle of ‘free variation’, whereby alternative forms of a linguistic element (graphemic, phonemic, morpho-syntactic, and lexical) may be tolerated within the language system.⁷ The high degree of free variation in the early Sahidic texts points to a dynamic state of the written form of the language, an orthography in the process of change, in the process of standardisation.

Roquet’s approach has been supported by theories from the fields of historical linguistics and sociolinguistics, that stress that variation is an inherent aspect of language and one that motivates language change.⁸ Weinreich, Labov and Herzog’s seminal article on the theory of language change sought to span the divide between synchronic and diachronic perspectives by elaborating an approach that could be both structural and historical.⁹ Based on this theory, the solution to the question of heterogeneity, or variation, in the early Sahidic texts lies in dissolving “the identification of structuredness with homogeneity”¹⁰ and constructing a methodology, whereby “orderly differentiation”¹¹ can be accepted and described. The method of analysis adopted for my research project is based on Weinreich *et al.*’s theory of ‘structured heterogeneity’, and the principle of ‘free variation’, proposed by Roquet, and applied by Ghica¹² and Cherix.¹³

The aim of the present study is to formulate functional typologies of the vowel-glides in early Sahidic by describing, first, what the early Sahidic orthographic system prescribed for the vowel-glides (regular variation), and second, what the system tolerated (free variation). This typology will then be compared with that of classical Sahidic. By doing so, it makes it possible to construct a more nuanced description of the written Sahidic dialect and provides new insights into the mechanisms involved in the process of its standardisation.

7 Roquet (1982), pp. 28-36.

8 For theoretical and methodological discussions on language change, cf.: Weinreich, Labov, and Herzog (1968), pp. 97-195; Keller (1994); Lass (1997); Croft (2000); Fleischman (2000), pp. 33-58.

9 Weinreich, Labov, and Herzog (1968), p. 98.

10 Weinreich, Labov, and Herzog (1968), pp. 101, 151.

11 Weinreich, Labov, and Herzog (1968), pp. 101, 151.

12 Ghica (2006).

13 Cherix (1994).

3.2 RESEARCH APPROACH

The research will, therefore, take both a synchronic and a diachronic approach to answer the following research questions:

- How does each scribe, in both early and classical Sahidic, graphically represent the vowel-glides in different phonological environments (regular variation)?
- To what extent does graphemic alternation occur between and within the manuscripts (free variation)?
- Under what conditions does variation occur?
- What are the similarities and differences between early and classical Sahidic in regard to the graphemic realisations of the vowel-glides?
- What role does free variation play in the process of standardisation?

3.3 CORPUS

The corpus comprises three 4th-5th century Sahidic biblical manuscripts: British Library *Or.* 7594 edited by Budge (1912) and collated by Thompson (1913); Papyrus Bodmer XVIII edited by Kasser (1962c); and Papyrus Bodmer XXIII also edited by Kasser (1965). The 6th century Chester Beatty *Mss.* 813 and 814 edited by Thompson (1932) will serve as the *comparanda* for classical Sahidic. This small corpus of texts is an appropriate size and length for this Masters research project. The British Library and Bodmer manuscripts were chosen to represent early Sahidic due to their substantial length, their good condition, and the availability of photographs, which allows a large amount of reliable data to be yielded. There are also very good text editions with informative introductions. The Chester Beatty codices are similarly substantial, in perfect condition, and are considered to be the best examples we have of classical Sahidic. I also have access to photographs of these manuscripts.

Any attempt to describe the standards of orthography found in these ancient manuscripts must be based, as precisely as possible, on the secure dating and provenance of the manuscripts. If the circumstances of discovery are unknown, the tools of palaeography must be relied on to date the documents. Coptic palaeography, however, is a relatively new

discipline, and Coptic manuscripts are, therefore, difficult to date using these techniques.¹⁴ It has previously been assumed that Coptic manuscripts could be dated by comparing them to dated Greek texts. Such an approach has been questioned by Kahle who noted a lack of consistency between contemporary Greek and the Coptic scripts that had been dated on external evidence.¹⁵ Kasser, too, advised caution since “in Coptic practice Greek scripts appear as a borrowed element and are frequently related diachronically to the same scripts evolving in Greek usage, so a Coptic script that possesses the same graphic characteristics as a Greek one may nevertheless be of a clearly later date”.¹⁶ Consequently, judgements concerning the dating of the manuscripts in this present study, which are, in most cases, based on palaeographic analysis, should be made cautiously, especially when their dating has been based on comparisons with Greek documents. The provenance and dating of each of the manuscripts are discussed below.

British Library Or. 7594 (BL)

Edition: Budge, E.A.W. (1912), *Coptic Biblical Texts in the Dialect of Upper Egypt*, London.

Collation: Thompson, H. (1913), *The New Biblical Papyrus. A Sahidic Version of Deuteronomy, Jonah, and Acts of the Apostles from Ms. Or. 7594 of the British Museum*, London.

Catalogue: Layton, B. (1987), *Catalogue of Literary Manuscripts in the British Library Acquired since 1906*, London, 3-5.

Date : 350 CE (Budge); 350-450 CE (Orsini)

Provenance: Egypt – Hermopolis (El-Ashumein) [found and written]

Material: papyrus

British Library Or. 7594 is a papyrus codex written in literary uncials and comprising a miscellany of incomplete Old and New Testament books: *Deuteronomy*, *Jonah* and *Acts*. Following *Acts* there are fragmentary extracts from the *Apocalypse of Elijah* (identified by Schmidt in 1925),¹⁷ written in the Coptic language, but with a cursive hand. The dating of this

14 Cf. Layton (1985), pp. 149–58; Kasser (1991b), pp. 175-184; Emmel (1993), pp. 22–49; Boud’hors (2006), pp. 95-109; Orsini (2008), pp. 121-150.

15 Kahle (1954), pp. 260-263.

16 Kasser (1991b), pp. 179-180.

17 Schmidt (1925), pp. 312-321 .

codex to the mid-4th century, the *terminus ante quem*, was originally determined by Kenyon “with practical certainty”, based on the comparison of a large number of dated Greek papyri with the cursive script of the colophon.¹⁸ Hebbelynck also favoured an early dating, based on the handwriting, the materials, and also the archaic character of the orthography.¹⁹ Orsini, more recently, brought the *terminus ante quem* forward to the mid-5th century, asserting that palaeographic comparisons can be made with documentary material from the first half of the 4th century to the late 5th century.²⁰ The covers of the codex were made up of fragments of Greek papyri documents, mainly accounts and contracts, which were dated to the late 3rd, early 4th century by Bell from the Department of Manuscripts at the British Museum.²¹ This dating was confirmed for Bell by an examination of the coinage mentioned in the documents.²²

Budge states that the manuscript “was found in Upper Egypt, and was acquired ... in the spring of ... 1911”.²³ More detail about the discovery was provided in a later publication by Budge in which he related the story of being taken by the man who discovered the manuscript to the tomb near El Ashmunein (Hermopolis), where it was originally found, wrapped in linen between the feet of a mummy.²⁴ According to Thompson, the documents found in the binding confirm that it was bound in Hermopolis at an early date.²⁵ Thompson concluded that, although *Acts* was written in pure Sahidic, *Deuteronomy* exhibited features of the dialect of Hermopolis.²⁶

Due to the considerable differences in the handwriting, it appears that there were two hands: the first hand wrote *Deuteronomy* and *Jonah*; the second, *Acts*.²⁷ Budge concluded that the codex was a copy which was used for private purposes.²⁸

18 Budge (1912), p. lxiii.

19 Hebbelynck and Thompson (1921), p. 80.

20 Orsini (2008), pp. 133-134.

21 Budge (1912), pp. xiv- xvii.

22 Budge (1912), pp. xvi-xvii.

23 Budge (1912), p. xi.

24 Budge (1920), pp. 372-374.

25 Thompson (1913), p. 12.

26 Thompson (1913), pp. 12-13.

27 Thompson (1913), pp. 4, 6; Hebbelynck and Thompson (1921), p. 9; Orsini (2008), p. 133; Nagel (1994), pp. 347-355; Budge (1912), p. xii, on the other hand, claims that the three books were written by the same scribe.

28 Budge (1912) p. lxxxiii.

Papyrus Bodmer XVIII (*P.Bodm. 18*)

Edition: Kasser, R. (1962c), *Papyrus Bodmer XVIII. Deutéronome I - X, 7 en sahidique*, Cologne-Geneva

Catalogue: K. Schüssler, K. (1995), *Biblia Coptica = Die koptischen Bibeltexte*, 1.1, Wiesbaden, 83.

Date: 4th century CE (Kasser); 350-399 (Orsini)

Provenance: Upper Egypt (Kasser (1962c)); Debba (Kasser (1988)); Dishna, Upper Egypt (Robinson)

Material: papyrus

Papyrus Bodmer XXIII (*P.Bodm. 23*)

Edition: Kasser, R. (1965), *Papyrus Bodmer XXIII. Esaïe XLVII, 1 – LXVI, 24 en sahidique*, Cologne-Geneva.

Catalogue: Schüssler, K. (1996), *Biblia Coptica = Die koptischen Bibeltexte*, 1.2, Wiesbaden, 106.

Date: 4th century CE (Kasser); 350-450 CE (Orsini)

Provenance: Upper Egypt, north of Thebes (Kasser 1965); Debba (Kasser 1988); Dishna, Upper Egypt (Robinson 2011)

Material: papyrus

P.Bodm. 18 and *P.Bodm. 23* belong to the Bodmer papyri, a collection of Greek and Coptic manuscripts on papyrus and parchment, the majority of which were acquired by Martin Bodmer, the Swiss bibliophile and collector, and founder of the Bibliotheca Bodmeriana (now the Fondation Martin Bodmer).²⁹ With the absence of assured archaeological evidence, the provenance of the Bodmer papyri has been a matter of debate, and information regarding their discovery and marketing has been veiled in a shroud of secrecy. Kasser, in his introductions to *P.Bodm. 18* and *P.Bodm. 23* could only go as far as proposing Upper Egypt, or a little to the north of Thebes, as their place of origin.³⁰ Later, however, he claimed that the dealer who supplied most of the collection, on his death bed, had confided in him, revealing that the manuscripts were found in 1950-51 in Debba, a few miles

²⁹ Kasser (1991a), pp. 48-53.

³⁰ Kasser (1962c), p. 12; Kasser (1965), p. 7, n. 1.

from Nag Hammadi.³¹ Robinson, on the other hand, who had spent many years of investigation and dozens of interviews, uncovered information which suggested that the manuscripts were found near the village of Dishna, 22 kilometres north-east of Nag Hammadi, and not far from the Pachomian monastery at Phbow, where they were probably originally housed in the library.³²

Kasser dates both manuscripts to the 4th century.³³ Orsini asserts that the handwriting in *P.Bodm. 18* is consistent with the graphic characteristics of the second half of the 4th century, and he attributes the hand of *P.Bodm. 23* to the period between the end of the 4th and beginning of the 5th century.³⁴

Chester Beatty Mss. 813 (*CB Epistles*) and 814 (*CB Acts*)

Edition: Thompson, H. (1932), *The Coptic Version of the Acts of the Apostles and the Pauline Epistles in the Sahidic Dialect*, Cambridge.

Catalogue: Schüssler, K. (2001) *Biblia Coptica = Die koptischen Bibeltexte*, 1.3, Wiesbaden, 36-39.

Codex A: *Epistles Copt. Ms. 813*

Date: c. 600 CE (Thompson); 500-550 CE (Orsini)

Provenance: Monastery of Apa Jeremiah, Saqqara [found and written]

Codex B: *Acts of the Apostles Copt. Ms. 814*

Date: c. 600 CE (Thompson); 525-574 CE (Orsini)

Provenance: Monastery of Apa Jeremiah, Saqqara [found and written]

Material: parchment

Three biblical manuscripts (*Copt. Mss. 813, 814 and 815*), in excellent condition, were acquired by Chester Beatty in 1924-1925 on the antiquities market in Cairo, and although statements of provenance from such a source are rarely reliable, the purported circumstances of their discovery may help in assigning a date to them.³⁵ They were alleged to have been found in a pot near the Giza pyramids buried with some coins from the reigns of Justinian I

31 Kasser (1988), pp. 191-192.

32 Robinson (2011), esp. pp. 108-129.

33 Kasser (1962c), p. 12; Kasser (1965), p. 17.

34 Orsini (2008), pp. 130- 131.

35 Thompson (1932), p. ix.

(527-565 CE), Justin (565-578 CE), and perhaps Maurice (582-602 CE), which would suggest that they were buried around the turn of the 6th-7th century.³⁶

Whatever their archaeological context, internal evidence suggests that the codices belonged to the Monastery of Apa Jeremiah at Saqqara, and that they were written in the same scriptorium.³⁷ Each codex was written by a different hand, but the script and format display a family likeness, and, according to Thompson, were probably not written far apart, Codex A being the earliest, followed by Codex B and C.³⁸ Taking into account both the external and internal palaeographic evidence, Thompson dates the codices the late 6th, early 7th century.³⁹ Orsini, on the other hand, dates the earliest codex to the first half of the 6th century based on the characteristics of the handwriting, and Codex B perhaps some years later.⁴⁰

3.4 METHOD

The first part of this study is devoted to formulating functional typologies of the graphic forms, including all variant forms, of the vowel-glides for each of the manuscripts. These are presented in tables, with pertinent comments, and can be found in the Appendices. The second part is a synchronic comparison of vowel-glide typologies of the three 4th-5th century manuscripts, followed by a diachronic comparison with their correspondences in classical Sahidic. This will constitute the body of this thesis.

A. Data Collection

All the occurrences of the vowel-glides /i~/j/ and /u~/w/ (ⲓ~ⲙⲓⲥⲓⲥⲓ and ⲟⲩ~ⲩ~ⲩ~ⲟⲩ) in each of the manuscripts, both the early and classical Sahidic manuscripts, will be identified, although not every instance will necessarily be included in the typologies, generally only examples for each phonological environment. Every occurrence of variation,

36 Thompson (1932), p. x.

37 Thompson (1932), p. ix: The colophon at the end of Codex C (*Ms.* 815) invokes “the Father, the Son, the Holy Spirit, our father Michael, our father Gabriel, our mother Mary, our mother Sibylla, Apa Jeremiah, Apa Enoch...” which is the formula regularly used at the Monastery of Apa Jeremiah.

38 Thompson (1932), pp. ix-x, xix.

39 Thompson (1932), pp. xv-xx.

40 Orsini (2008), pp. 138-139.

however, will be listed.

B. *Classification*

The graphemes representing the vowel-glides in each of the texts will be classified according to their syllabic/phonological environment and presented in tables. Their vocalic and consonantal function will be treated separately. Therefore, there will be four tables of typology for each text, one for each /i/, /j/, /u/, and /w/.

For the Chester Beatty codices the tables of typology include the following:

- Case (or rule) number;
- Syllabic context;
- Allograph (and variant/s) for each codex;
- Examples and phonemic transcriptions (*IPA*).

For the three early Sahidic manuscripts the tables of typology include the following:

- Case (or rule) number;
- Syllabic context with examples from classical Sahidic (*CB Acts*);
- Allograph (and variant/s) for each manuscript;
- Examples.

C. *Variants*

Tables of variants, when applicable, are included: the left hand column is used for the standard grapheme (or the norm for the particular text); the right hand column is used for the variant form. For each lexeme/morpheme listed, the reference in the text is given in brackets (biblical book, chapter, verse). A percentage of attestations is noted (excluding lacunae).

D. *Comparative Typologies*

- Discussion on the phonemic value of vowel-glides and the graphic options available for rendering them;
- Comparative analysis of the graphemic distribution of the vowel-glides in the early Sahidic manuscripts, including variation both between, and within, each;
- Comparative analysis of their graphemic distribution, and variation, in the two Chester

Beatty codices;

- Diachronic comparison between the early and classical manuscripts.
- Discussion on the trends over time on the distribution of the vowel-glide graphemes, and the role of free variation in the process of orthographic standardisation.

4. COMPARATIVE TYPOLOGIES OF THE VOWEL-GLIDES

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The orthography of the 4th-5th century Sahidic manuscripts, which are considered in this study, reflects an early stage of the written dialect. Graphemic variation is a characteristic feature of these manuscripts, which clearly indicates a period when the Sahidic orthography had not yet become fully standardised. This is particularly evident in the case of the two vowel-glides that exhibit variation both in the distribution of the allographs between the manuscripts, and in the choice of allograph within the same environment (free variation). The progressive elimination of variation demonstrates the mechanism by which the written language becomes more stable, indeed, standardised. Having said that, it must be understood that what is termed the ‘standard’ Sahidic orthography is not necessarily defined as a static or fixed system, but rather a dynamic one, in which earlier variant writings may persist, and others disappear. A comparison of the early Sahidic graphic representations of the vowel-glides with those of the so-called ‘standard’, or classical, correspondences should illuminate this process.

Before addressing the dynamics of the graphemic realisations of the vowel-glides in early Sahidic and the process of standardisation, it is first necessary to explain the meaning of ‘vowel-glides’, and to define the relationship between the vowels and their corresponding glides. ‘Glides’ are also known as ‘semi-vowels’ or ‘semi-consonants’, terms highlighting the blurring of the distinction between their vocalic (syllable nucleus) or consonantal (non-nucleus) values. Vowels and consonants can, in general, be distinguished by the degree of constriction of airflow by the lips and tongue, the constriction being greater with consonants than with vowels. There is an obvious distinction between most vowels and consonants. But in the case of the vowel-glides, there is little articulatory difference between the two, that is, the two high vowels, /i/ and /u/, are produced in the same place of articulation as the respective glides /j/ and /w/, the only difference being the degree of constriction. These vowels are therefore often phonetically indistinguishable from their consonantal counterparts, the difference generally being imposed by their phonological environment, or their position

within the syllable.¹

Thus, when dealing with a dead language, as Coptic is, we are faced with significant difficulties when attempting to distinguish the phonetic value of these two phonemes in certain situations.² Furthermore, the orthographic practices of the scribes do not always help the reader since the same graphemes can be used for both the vowel and the glide in the Sahidic dialect:³ $\text{ⲓ} \sim \text{ⲓ} \sim \text{ⲉ} \text{ⲓ} \sim \text{ⲉ} \text{ⲓ}$ for /i/ and /j/, and $\text{ⲟ} \text{Ⲯ} \sim \text{ⲟ} \text{Ⲯ} \sim \text{Ⲯ} \sim \text{Ⲯ}$ for /u/ and /w/.⁴ Kasser has suggested that, for the Coptic scribes, there was no need to distinguish the vowel-glides graphically because in their “phonetic conscience” there was no real opposition between them, there being only one phoneme, clearly vocalic, and only rendered as a glide under certain circumstances.⁵ He introduced the novel hypothesis that the graphemes $(\text{ⲉ}) \text{ⲓ} \sim \text{ⲓ}$ and $(\text{ⲟ}) \text{Ⲯ}$, on the one hand, represented the syllabic vowels of slow, laboured speech which would have been articulated as such in the process of writing (‘bradysyllabation’), but on the other hand, were pronounced as glides in normal rapid speech (‘tachysyllabation’).⁶ However, the use of the different graphemic forms of the vowel-glides, as can be seen in the tables presented in this study, may indicate that there was an attempt in many cases to distinguish the opposition between the two phonemes in the writing system, dependent more on their phonological environment than on the speed of articulation.

The scholarly consensus holds that these graphemes realise both vowels and consonants in the written system, but there is no absolute agreement as to whether a vocalic or consonantal value should be assumed in individual cases.⁷ Although in the original Egyptian system of writing vowels were not indicated, hieroglyphs did exist for the glides, *i* /j/ and *w* /w/, which, since they were so closely related to their corresponding vowels, were

1 Clark, Yallop and Fletcher (2007), p. 47.

2 For phonological treatments of the vowel-glides, cf.: Peust (1999), pp. 60-61, 260-262; Vergote (1973a), pp. 10-11; Vergote (1973b), p. 49; Hintze (1980); Loprieno (1995), pp. 46-50; Kasser (1980), pp. 80-92; Kasser (1982); Kasser (1983); Kasser (1997), pp. 6-11.

3 In Bohairic /i/~/j/ is realised only as ⲓ , and consequently $\text{ⲉ} \text{ⲓ}$ always expresses a phonemic sequence, never a single phoneme. Cf. Peust (1999), p. 61.

4 For a summary of the evidence which should be taken into account when distinguishing between the two phonological interpretations of the vowel-glides, cf. Peust (1999), pp. 260-262.

5 Kasser (1980), p. 90.

6 Kasser (1982).

7 Vergote (1973b), p. 49 § 41; Loprieno (1995), p. 50; Quecke (1984), p. 290 n. 1.

sometimes treated as unessential, as were the vowels, and frequently omitted.⁸ Some scholars suggest that these consonants “may have developed into Coptic vowels where the syllable structure suggests this”,⁹ or the graphemes functioned as consonants “wherever they were such in Egyptian ... which does not exclude the possibility that phonologically /j/ and /w/ may at times be phonetically realised as vowels.”¹⁰ Although there are difficulties in determining the vocalic or consonantal value of the vowel-glides in certain circumstances, for this present study I have attempted to make this distinction between the two phonemes in the orthographic description, and as such have followed the phonological reconstructions which have been proposed by Peust.¹¹

The basic graphemes which represent the vowel-glides in Sahidic include the single iota ι and the digraph €ι for /i/~j/, and the single upsilon γ and the digraph ογ for /u/~w/. In the Chester Beatty codices the form of the omicron sitting between the two branches of the upsilon (ϣ)¹² is also seen at the end of a line.¹³ In addition to these alphabetic signs two additional marks, or diacritics, the trema (or diaeresis) and the circumflex can be employed. These two diacritics differ in both their position and function, but both appear to reduce ambiguity for the reader.¹⁴

The trema appears as two dots, rarely as one dot, almost exclusively over the iota (ι̇). The upsilon rarely carries a trema, being restricted to Greek loan words,¹⁵ and the only instance of this type in the manuscripts studied here occurs in the Hebrew name ΜΩϣ̇CΗC

8 Gardiner (1994), p. 28; cf. Peust (1999), p. 199: “Egyptian had none of these means of vowel notation. Modern egyptologists would agree that, eg. the signs for glides (<i>, <j>) were generally not used to write the phonetically related vowels /i/ or /u/.”

9 Peust (1999), p. 261: cf. Steindorff (1951), p. 33 ff.; Vergote (1973b), p. 49 § 41.

10 Peust (1999), p. 261: cf. Hintze (1980), p. 23-91, especially p. 48; Quecke (1984), p. 290; Loprieno (1995), p. 50.

11 Funk (1995b), p. 26, and Ghica (2006), p. 223, avoided making a distinction between the two phonemes, giving priority to the orthography over any phonological theory.

12 Due to font restrictions this is not an accurate representation as the omicron is larger than the character shown here.

13 This is quite common in the *Epistles*, for example, *Rom.* 2.27, *I Cor.* 10.31; but only occurs twice in *CB Acts* (16.25, 25.3). This form never occurs in *P.Bodm.* 18, contrary to the claim of Kasser (1962c), p. 13: “les lettres ο et γ forment le compendium habituel (ο surmonté des branches du γ)”, nor in *P.Bodm.* 23 or *BL* 7594. On the writing of the digraph ογ, cf. Quecke (1973), pp. 273-284.

14 Quecke (1984), p. 325.

15 Quecke (1984), pp. 295-296.

(Μωϋσῆς).¹⁶ The grapheme ῖ is used extensively in early and classical Sahidic, and generally serves as an alternative form of the digraph εῖ in its function as rendering the glide /j/. It most commonly follows a vowel and indicates the individuality of the two sounds, the vowel and the glide, thus signalling that the two do not constitute a diphthong.

The circumflex, on the other hand, is rarer and its function is more obscure. It can also be used in more varied situations and over a variety of graphs, written over single vowels or linking pairs of graphemes. In the case of the vowel-glides, εῖ and οῖ (εῖ and οῖ), it seems to designate the graphic unity of the two characters. The form and position of the circumflex can vary between manuscripts. It can have a clear angular form, like a gable, or it can take the form of a curved, oblique line, or even a straight line similar to a superlinear stroke. It can appear above the digraph (εῖ and οῖ) or a little to right, or covering only the single iota or upsilon (ῖ and ῡ). In cases of crasis, where the omicron is dropped, the circumflex can also span another vowel (ἄῖ and ἡῖ). The critical editions do not always accurately reflect the placement of the diacritics. In the edition of the Chester Beatty codices, Thompson avoids including the circumflex altogether, apart from a few exceptions, where they do, in fact, appear throughout the manuscript, mostly as an oblique line.¹⁷ Budge and Kasser, while including all the diacritical marks, locate the circumflexes over the iota in their editions in the cases where they are placed over the digraph in the manuscripts.¹⁸ Given that each scribe is subject to the usual fluctuations in the execution of these characters, for this present project, the most common form of the circumflex used by each scribe is represented in the data. In contrast to the trema, which is used relatively consistently in both early and classical Sahidic, the circumflex is used much less consistently, which raises questions as to the understanding of its practical function.

It should be noted that in the Song of Moses, *Deut.* 32-34, in the British Library manuscript, there is evidence that diacritics were added to the text by a later hand, possibly,

16 CB: Μωϋ̇ς (passim); P.Bodm. 18: Μωϋ̇ς (Deut. 1.2) vs. Μωϋς (Deut. 1.1, [1.3], [1.5], 4.44, 4.45, 4.46, 5.1, 6.4); P.Bodm. 23: Μωϋ̇ς (Isa. 63.12); BL Deut.: Μωϋ̇ς (Deut. 29.1, 29.2, [30.20], [31.1], 31.9, 31.10, 31.14, [31.24], 31.22, 31.30, 32.44, 32.48, 33.1, 33.4, 34.1, 34.4, 34.5, 34.7, 34.8 x2, 34.9 x3, 34.10, 34.12) vs. Μωϋς (Deut. 5.1, 6.4 32.44, 32.45); BL Acts: Μωϋς (Acts 3.22, 6.11, 6.14, 7.20, 7.22, 7.29, 7.31, 7.32, 7.35, 7.40, 7.44, 13.39, 15.1, 15.5, 15.21).

17 Thompson (1932).

18 Budge (1912); Kasser (1962c; 1965).

according to Budge, for singing purposes.¹⁹ Such accents include the acute accent and the circumflex which appear on many of the vowels, as well as the vowel-glides.²⁰ In this part of the text, many of the circumflexes are formed differently to the earlier ones, and the ink is of a lighter colour, indicating a later addition.

Mention must also be made of words of Greek origin because of their extensive use in the Coptic texts.²¹ Greek words transcribed into Sahidic generally preserved their original orthography, but the forms became fixed, having been freed from the various declension and conjugation endings. During the Hellenistic and Roman periods the spoken Greek language underwent significant changes, particularly with the reduction of distinctive vowel phonemes. However, the literary texts continued to be written in, and copied with, the classical Greek orthography and accordingly, in the early Sahidic literary manuscripts, the Copto-Greek words generally observed the classical Greek spelling, although non-classical koine spellings were not absent from these manuscripts, reflecting the common pronunciation. In the koine Greek of the Roman period, the graphemes ι and ει both realised the vowel /i/, and consequently the alternation between these two graphemes was common, not only in the written Greek, but also in the Sahidic manuscripts, where the optionality between ι and ει was widespread.²² The use of the Coptic grapheme γ in Copto-Greek words renders the Greek grapheme υ, but also occasionally η or unstressed ει.²³

¹⁹ Budge (1912), p. xiv; Thompson (1913), p. 9, asserts that these signs were made by a later hand.

²⁰ For example: Ⲫⲟⲩⲟ̇ (Deut. 32.14, 33.28), ⲓⲟⲩⲁⲗ̇ (Deut. 34.2, 33.7), ⲛⲁⲩⲩ̇ (Deut. 31.23, 32.44, 34.9); ⲗⲗⲗⲗ̇ (Deut. 34.6), ⲕⲗ̇ⲙⲗ (Deut. 32.10), ⲛⲗ̇ “see” (Deut. 26.7, 32.49, 32.52), ⲛⲗ̇ “to them” (Deut. 31.2, 31.4, 31.5, 31.28, 32.21, 32.35, 32.41, 34.4), ⲛⲙⲙⲗ̇ (Deut. 29.25, 31.16), ⲕⲛⲗ̇ (Deut. 31.4), ⲛⲗⲃⲗ̇ “Nabau” (Deut. 34.1), ⲙⲟ̇ (Deut. 32.50 x2), ⲛⲟ̇ⲩⲩⲉ (Deut. 32.37), ⲟ̇ (Deut. 32.20).

²¹ Kasser (1991c), pp. 215-222.

²² Girgis (1966), p. 76 §4.

²³ Girgis (1966), p. 78-92 §4-§19; Peust (1999), p. 201.

4.2 TYPOLOGIES OF THE VOWEL-GLIDE /i/~j/

Table 1: Comparative typology of the vowel /i/

Case	Syllabic Context *Examples	Early Sahidic				Classical Sahidic	
		<i>P.Bodm. 18</i>	<i>P.Bodm. 23</i>	<i>BL Deut./Jon.</i>	<i>BL Acts</i>	<i>CB Epistles</i>	<i>CB Acts</i>
A1	#'V €I	€I (var. €Î~î)	€I (var. €Î~î)	€I (var. €Î~î)	€I (var. €î~î~î)	€I (var. €î~î~î)	€I (var. €î~î)
A2	#(')VC €IC-	€I	€I	€I	€I	€I (var. €î)	€I
A3	(')(C)CV ⲁI	I (var. €I)	I (var. €I~€Î)	I (var. €I~€Î)	I (var. €I~î)	I (var. €I~€î)	I (var. €I~€î)
A4	(')(C)CVC(C) nim	I (var. €I)	I (var. €I)	I (var. î~€I)	I (var. €I)	I (var. €I)	I (var. €I)
A5	'(C)GV oγ€I	€I	€I (var. €Î)	€I (var. €Î)	€I	€I (var. €î)	€I
A6	'(C)GVC ⲟⲟⲩⲉⲣⲧ	€I	€I	€I	€I	€I (var. î)	€I (var. î)

Key

V = vowel

G = glide

C = consonant

(C) = possibility of one or more consonants

= segment boundary

' = accented syllable

. = syllable divider

Ø = no occurrences

*Examples – taken from classical Sahidic (Chester Beatty *Acts*)

Table 2: Comparative typology of the glide /j/

Case	Syllabic Context Examples		<i>Early Sahidic</i>				<i>Classical Sahidic</i>	
			<i>P.Bodm. 18</i>	<i>P.Bodm. 23</i>	<i>BL Deut./Jon.</i>	<i>BL Acts</i>	<i>CB Epistles</i>	<i>CB Acts</i>
B1	#'GV ⲉⲓⲱ		ⲉⲓ (var. ⲓ~ⲓ̃)	ⲉⲓ (var. ⲓ~ⲓ̃)	ⲉⲓ (var. ⲓ̃)	ⲉⲓ (var. ⲓ~ⲓ̃)	ⲉⲓ (var. ⲓ̃)	ⲉⲓ (var. ⲓ~ⲓ̃)
B2	#'GVC(C) ⲉⲓⲱⲧ		ⲉⲓ (var. ⲓ)	ⲉⲓ (var. ⲓ̃)	ⲉⲓ (var. ⲉⲓ~ⲓ̃)	ⲉⲓ (var. ⲓ)	ⲉⲓ (var. ⲓ)	ⲉⲓ (var. ⲓ̃)
B3	'(C)CGV ⲉⲓⲱ		ⲓ (var. ⲉⲓ)	ⲓ	ⲓ (var. ⲉⲓ~ⲓ̃)	ⲓ	ⲓ	ⲓ
B4	'(C)CGVC ⲉⲓⲉⲓⲱ		ⲓ	ⲓ	ⲓ (var. ⲉⲓ)	ⲓ	ⲓ	ⲓ
B5	'(C)VG# ⲏⲓ̃ ⲉⲓⲱⲓ̃ ⲉⲓⲱⲓ̃ ⲓⲱⲓ̃ ⲓⲱⲓ̃	V = H	ⲉⲓ	ⲉⲓ (var. ⲉⲓ)	ⲉⲓ (var. ⲓ̃)	ⲓ̃ (var. ⲉⲓ~ⲓ̃)	ⲓ̃ (var. ⲉⲓ~ⲉⲓ̃)	ⲓ̃
		V = O	ⲉⲓ	ⲉⲓ (var. ⲓ̃~ⲓ̃)	ⲉⲓ (var. ⲓ̃)	ⲓ̃ (var. ⲉⲓ~ⲓ̃)	ⲓ̃ (var. ⲉⲓ~ⲉⲓ̃)	ⲓ̃ (var. ⲉⲓ)
		V = ⲱ	Ⲁ	ⲉⲓ	ⲉⲓ	ⲓ̃ (var. ⲉⲓ)	ⲓ̃	ⲓ̃
		V = OY	ⲓ̃	ⲉⲓ (var. ⲓ̃)	ⲉⲓ (var. ⲓ̃)	ⲓ̃ (var. ⲉⲓ)	ⲓ̃	ⲓ̃
		V = ⲗ	ⲓ̃ (var. ⲓ̃~ⲓ̃~ⲉⲓ)	ⲓ̃ (var. ⲉⲓ~ⲓ̃)	ⲓ̃ (var. ⲉⲓ)	ⲓ̃ (var. ⲉⲓ~ⲓ̃)	ⲓ̃ (var. ⲉⲓ̃)	ⲓ̃
	(C)VG# ⲗⲓ̃- ⲉⲓ̃-	V = ⲗ	ⲓ̃ (var. ⲓ̃~ⲉⲓ)	ⲉⲓ (var. ⲓ̃~ⲓ̃)	ⲓ̃	ⲓ̃ (var. ⲉⲓ~ⲓ̃)	ⲓ̃ (var. ⲉⲓ̃)	ⲓ̃
		V = ⲉ	ⲉⲓ (var. ⲓ̃~ⲓ̃)	ⲉⲓ (var. ⲉⲓ~ⲓ̃)	ⲓ̃ (var. ⲓ)	ⲓ̃ (var. ⲓ)	ⲓ̃ (var. ⲉⲓ~ⲉⲓ̃)	ⲓ̃
B6	'(C)VG.CV(C) ⲉⲓⲱⲓ̃ⲉ		V = O ⲉⲓ	ⲉⲓ (var. ⲓ̃)	V = O, H ⲉⲓ	V = O, H ⲉⲓ (var. ⲓ̃~ⲓ̃)	V = O, H ⲓ̃ (var. ⲉⲓ)	V = O ⲓ̃ (var. ⲉⲓ)
			V = ⲗ ⲓ̃		V = ⲗ ⲓ̃ (var. ⲉⲓ)	V = ⲗ ⲉⲓ	V = ⲗ ⲓ̃	V = ⲗ, H ⲓ̃
B7	'(C)VGC# ⲉⲓⲱⲓ̃		ⲉⲓ	ⲉⲓ	ⲉⲓ (var. ⲓ̃)	ⲉⲓ	ⲉⲓ (var. ⲓ̃)	ⲉⲓ (var. ⲓ̃)
B8	CVC.'GV ⲓ̃ⲱⲓ̃ⲉⲓⲱ		Ⲁ	Ⲁ	Ⲁ	ⲉⲓ	ⲉⲓ	ⲉⲓ
B9	'(C)V.GV(C) (C)V.'GV(C) ⲉⲓⲱⲓ̃ⲉ		ⲉⲓ	ⲉⲓ (var. ⲓ̃)	V = OY ⲉⲓ	ⲉⲓ (var. ⲓ̃~ⲓ̃)	ⲉⲓ (var. ⲓ̃~ⲉⲓ̃)	ⲓ̃ (var. ⲉⲓ~ⲉⲓ̃)
					V = ⲗ, ⲉ ⲓ̃			

Comparative Typology of the Vowel-Glide /i/~j/ (Cf. Tables 1 and 2)

The choice of grapheme $\text{ⲓ} \sim \text{ⲓ̇} \sim \text{ⲉⲓ}$ ($\text{ⲉ̇ⲓ} \sim \text{ⲉ̇ⲓ̇} \sim \text{ⲉ̇ⲓ̇} \sim \text{ⲉ̇ⲓ̇}$) to represent the vowel-glide /i/~j/ is dependent on its phonological environment. Free variation, however, is the characteristic feature of the early Sahidic manuscripts. The distribution of the allographs is not fully fixed and may vary from manuscript to manuscript and scribe to scribe. Furthermore, one and the same scribe may fluctuate between alternative graphic forms in the same environment, not only in the manuscripts under investigation in this present study, but also in other early manuscripts.²⁴ In the later, classical manuscripts, although the extent of free variation diminishes, in certain environments it resists complete standardisation, and indeed, variation sometimes becomes a regular and predictable feature in that environment.

1. /i/~j/ lexeme-initial (Cf. Appendices: Cases A1, A2 and B1, B2)

ES:²⁵ ⲉⲓ (var. $\text{ⲉ̇ⲓ} \sim \text{ⲉ̇ⲓ̇} \sim \text{ⲓ̇} \sim \text{ⲓ̇}$) *CB*:²⁶ ⲉⲓ (var. $\text{ⲉ̇ⲓ̇} \sim \text{ⲓ̇}$)

At the beginning of a lexeme the vowel-glide /i/~j/ is generally represented by the digraph ⲉⲓ in both early and classical Sahidic. The digraph functions as a vowel, unless it is followed by a vowel in the same syllable, in which case it assumes the value of a consonant (glide): for example, ⲉⲓⲣⲉ /'i.rə/, and ⲉⲓⲱⲧ /'jot/. Proper nouns of Hebrew origin are the exception to this rule, and in this case ⲓ̇ is regular, whether it has a vocalic or consonantal value: for example, ⲓ̇ⲥⲁⲗⲕ , ⲓ̇ⲕⲱⲃ .

In the manuscripts considered here, the common variant form, the digraph surmounted by a circumflex ⲉ̇ⲓ (var. ⲉ̇ⲓ̇), occurs to a greater or lesser extent, depending on the scribe, with the lexeme-initial vowel /i/, in particular, with the verb $\text{ⲉ̇ⲓ} \sim \text{ⲉ̇ⲓ̇}$ (ⲉ̇ⲓ̇) “to come”. In *BL 7594*, the scribe of *Deuteronomy* uses the digraph with the circumflex with this word on all but one occasion, and in *Jonah* it is consistently employed. On the other hand, the scribe of *Acts* never

24 Cf. Kahle (1954), p. 78-80; Kasser (1964), pp. 18-19; Kasser (1961), p. 12; Kasser (1962a), pp. 26-28; Kasser (1962b), pp. 17-18; Quecke (1977), pp. 53-54; Quecke (1972), pp. 30-31; Quecke (1984a), pp. 41-43, 45; Hintze and Schenke, (1970), pp. 11-12; Funk (1995b), pp. 25-37; Cherix (1994), pp. 36-45; Ghica (2006), pp. 222-229.

25 *ES* = Early Sahidic, as represented by the three 4th-5th century manuscripts under investigation: *P.Bodm. 18* = Papyrus Bodmer XVIII, *Deuteronomy* 1-10, 7; *P.Bodm. 23* = Papyrus Bodmer XXIII, *Isaiah* 47.1-66; *BL* = British Library *Or. 7594 Deuteronomy, Jonah, and Acts*.

26 *CB* = Chester Beatty Library *Ms. 813 (Epistles)* and *Ms. 814 (Acts)* which represents the classical standard.

uses the circumflex, on this, or at the beginning of any other word. Rather, we see a trema appearing on two occasions (less than 2% of the time) over the iota of the digraph, $\epsilon\ddot{\iota}$ (*BL Acts* 1.8, 7.34).²⁷ Is this a variant or a *lapsus calami*? As we shall see, the scribe of *Acts* makes use of the trema in other unexpected situations. The scribe of *P.Bodm. 23* employs the circumflex only on this word in lexeme-initial position, and prefers it to the bare digraph, with $\hat{\epsilon}\hat{\iota}$ occurring 73% of the time.²⁸ It occurs only once in *P.Bodm. 18* (*Deut.* 1.20). Several other lexemes also display this feature in *BL 7594*, but only in *Deuteronomy*, where the scribe fluctuates between the two forms: $\epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\sim\hat{\epsilon}\hat{\iota}\pi\epsilon$, $\epsilon\iota\eta\epsilon\sim\hat{\epsilon}\hat{\iota}\eta\epsilon$, $\epsilon\iota\beta\epsilon\sim\hat{\epsilon}\hat{\iota}\beta\epsilon$, $\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\sim\hat{\epsilon}\hat{\iota}\mu\epsilon$.²⁹ This scribe tends to employ the circumflex only when it functions as a vowel in this and other positions.³⁰

The variable use of the circumflex persists into the 6th century in the Chester Beatty codices with the scribe of the *Epistles* who employs it with the vowel in this position, but not the glide.³¹ In *CB Acts*, the later and more standardised of the two codices, it appears relatively consistently with the verb “to come” but rarely elsewhere.

When preceded by the definite article, or other preformative clitic, the digraph is retained, with a few exceptions. On rare occasions in the *BL* manuscript, the digraph of the glide is replaced by $\ddot{\iota}$: $\epsilon\ddot{\iota}\omicron\lceil\text{P}\lambda\rceil\text{z}\bar{\epsilon}$ “to see it” (*BL Deut.* 28.68), $\pi\lambda\ddot{\iota}\omega\tau$ (*BL Deut.* 26.5), $\epsilon\gamma\ddot{\iota}\omicron\rho\bar{\mu}$ (*BL Acts* 28.6), and the unusual $\eta\epsilon\ddot{\iota}\lambda\omega\lambda\omicron\eta$ “to idols” (*BL Acts* 15.20). This occurs once in the Chester Beatty codex of *Acts*.³² In most of these cases the $\ddot{\iota}$ follows a vowel (except $\epsilon\gamma\ddot{\iota}\omicron\rho\bar{\mu}$).

On other occasions, the epsilon of the vocalic and consonantal digraph is sometimes dropped when preceded by a consonant, particularly the definite article: $\pi\iota\beta\epsilon$ (*P.Bodm. 23 Isa.* 50.2); $\pi\iota\epsilon\rho\omicron\lceil$ (*P.Bodm. 23 Isa.* 48.18) (*BL Acts* 16.13); $\pi\iota\omega\tau$ (*BL Acts* 1.4, 1.7, 28.8);

²⁷ In the edition of Budge (1912) the trema appears over the iota in *Acts* where it cannot be seen in the photographs of the manuscript: *Acts* 10.21, 10.38, 11.20, 14.2, 16.27, 19.37, 20.31, 21.5, 21.10, 22.12. Thompson (1913) makes no emendation here.

²⁸ Cf. Appendix 4, Table 79.

²⁹ Cf. Appendix 2, Table 38.

³⁰ The possible exceptions include: $\varsigma\eta\lambda\rho\sim\hat{\epsilon}\hat{\iota}\epsilon\rho\beta\omicron\omicron\eta$ (*BL Deut.* 28.56), $\rho\epsilon\varsigma\epsilon\omega\sim\hat{\epsilon}\hat{\iota}\epsilon\rho\beta\omicron\omicron\eta$ (*BL Deut.* 18.10), and $\eta\epsilon\text{z}\hat{\epsilon}\hat{\iota}\epsilon\text{z}$ (*BL Deut.* 32.14).

³¹ Cf. Appendix 1, Table 9.

³² $\text{z}\lambda\text{-}\ddot{\iota}\lambda\tau$ (*CB Acts* 26.9).

ⲡⲓⲗⲟⲗⲟⲛⲓ (BL Acts 7.41), and also ⲡⲓⲗⲟⲗⲟⲛ “to idols” (BL Acts 21.25); ⲗⲁⲓ (BL Acts 5.7) for ⲗⲁⲉⲓ “she came”; and in the case of ⲉⲓⲁⲧⲭ̄ (P.Bodm. 18 Deut. 3.27, 4.19), for ⲉⲓⲁⲧⲭ̄, the vowel and glide coalesce, resulting in syntagmatic resyllabification, or modification of the syllable structure, thus /fi.'jat/ > /'fjat/.

This phenomenon also occurs in classical Sahidic: ⲡⲓⲗⲟⲧ (Rom. 15.6), ⲡⲓⲗⲟⲧ (Eph. 6.23), ⲡⲓⲗⲟⲧⲓ (2 Tim. 1.2); ⲡⲓⲣⲉ (2 Cor. 8.10); ⲡⲓⲛⲉⲓ (Rom. 6.5) (Heb. 7.15); ⲡⲓⲗⲟⲗⲟⲛ (1 Cor. 8.7); ⲡⲓⲉⲓⲃ (1 Cor. 15.56) and ⲡⲉⲕⲓⲉⲓⲃ (1 Cor. 15.55); ⲡⲓⲉⲣⲟ (Acts 16.13). According to Funk, the writing of ⲡⲓⲗⲟⲧ rather than ⲡⲓⲉⲓⲗⲟⲧ is an example of syntagmatic resyllabification, /'jot/ > /pi.'ot/.³³ Such a modification can be seen quite clearly in cases where a word is divided at the end of a line, as in ⲡⲓⲗⲟⲧ (Rom. 15.6), however, in other cases it is difficult to prove, since the rules of Coptic syllabification allow both ⲡⲓⲉⲓⲗⲟⲧ and ⲡⲓⲗⲟⲧ to be realised /'pjot/. The representation of the vowel-glide in this context is analogous with the following rule (/i/~j/ following a consonant), where both the vowel and the glide take the form of ⲓ when preceded by a consonant, and as such, in the examples above, the lexicalisation of the spelling seems to have resulted.³⁴

It should be noted in the case of ⲉⲓⲁⲣ-ⲉⲓⲉⲣⲃⲟⲟⲛⲉ (BL Deut. 28.56) and ⲣⲉⲑⲉⲱ-ⲉⲓⲉⲣⲃⲟⲟⲛⲉ (BL Deut. 18.10), it is possible that resyllabification may have taken place as a result of the addition of the preformative morphemes, the phonemic value of the digraph being modified to a vowel: /sna.ri.ər.'βɔː.nə/ and /rə. fə.ʃi.ər.'βɔː.nə/. This interpretation is based on the assumption that this scribe tends to only use the digraph carrying a circumflex if its phonemic value is vocalic.³⁵ It is interesting to note that the form of the circumflex in both these cases reflects the style of the first hand of *Deuteronomy*.

This lexicalisation of the orthography is clearly demonstrated, in the early and the classical manuscripts, when the definite article precedes the biblical proper nouns which begin with the vowel-glide *ī*. This *ī* is similarly replaced by the simple iota: ⲡⲓⲟⲣⲗⲁⲛⲛⲥ "Jordan" (*passim*); ⲡⲓⲉⲃⲟⲩⲥⲁⲓⲟⲥ "the Jebusite" (*passim*); ⲡⲓⲥⲣⲁⲛⲗ "Israel" (*passim*); ⲉⲓⲉⲣⲟⲩⲥⲁⲗⲗⲙ "Jerusalem" (P.Bodm. 23 Isa. 66.10), but ⲉⲓⲉⲣⲟⲩⲥⲁⲗⲗⲙ (P.Bodm. 23 Isa.

³³ Funk (1995b), pp. 28, 31-32.

³⁴ Funk (1995b), p. 31.

³⁵ The only other possible case of ⲉⲓ representing the glide is ⲛⲉⲣⲉⲓⲉⲓⲃ (BL Deut. 32.14), but resyllabification may have occurred here too.

49.15); $\Pi O \Upsilon \Delta \dot{\Lambda} \dot{\iota}$ (*CB Rom.* 2.10, 2.17, 2.28 x2, 2.29 x2, 3.1, 10.12). It is interesting to note that there is one occurrence with the plural definite article $\mathbf{n-}$ (without the superlinear stroke), $\mathbf{n} \Pi O \Upsilon \Delta \dot{\Lambda} \dot{\iota}$ / $nju. 'daj/$ (*CB Rom.* 3.9), in contrast to the usual plural article $\bar{\mathbf{n}}$, where the trema is regularly retained, as is its syllabification, $\bar{\mathbf{n}} \Pi O \Upsilon \Delta \dot{\Lambda} \dot{\iota}$ / $\bar{n}.ju. 'daj/$.

2. /i~/j/ following a consonant (Cf. Appendices: Cases A3, A4 and B3, B4)

ES: \mathbf{i} (var. $\epsilon \mathbf{i} \sim \hat{\epsilon} \mathbf{i} \sim \ddot{\mathbf{i}}$)

CB: \mathbf{i} (var. $\epsilon \mathbf{i} \sim \epsilon \mathbf{i}$)

In the post-consonantal position the vowel-glide /i~/j/ is generally represented by the grapheme \mathbf{i} . The iota functions as a vowel, unless it is followed by a vowel in the same syllable, in which case it functions as a consonant: for example, $\mathbf{x} \mathbf{i}$ /ci/, $\mathbf{m} \mathbf{i} \epsilon$ /'mi.sə/, $\mathbf{n} \mathbf{i} \mathbf{m}$ /'nim/, $\mathbf{z} \mathbf{i} \mathbf{h}$ /'hje/, $\mathbf{t} \mathbf{i} \mathbf{o}$ /'tsjɔ/, $\mathbf{z} \mathbf{i} \mathbf{o} \mathbf{m} \epsilon$ /'hjo.mə/, $\mathbf{z} \mathbf{i} \epsilon \mathbf{i} \mathbf{b}$ /'hjiβ/, $\epsilon \mathbf{b} \mathbf{i} \mathbf{h} \mathbf{n}$ /ə. 'βjen/.

The graphic realisation of the glide /j/ in this position is fairly stable. The variant $\epsilon \mathbf{i}$ occurs twice in *P.Bodm. 18*³⁶ and three times in *BL 7594*,³⁷ once with a circumflex: $\mathbf{n} \epsilon \mathbf{z} \hat{\epsilon} \mathbf{i} \epsilon \mathbf{i} \mathbf{b}$ (*BL Deut.* 32.14) vs. $\mathbf{o} \Upsilon \mathbf{z} \mathbf{i} \epsilon \mathbf{i} \mathbf{b}$ (*BL Deut.* 14.20). The case of $\mathbf{z} \hat{\epsilon} \mathbf{i} \epsilon \mathbf{i} \mathbf{b}$ is an interesting example in that two adjacent vowel-glides are both rendered by the digraph, the first carrying a circumflex. It appears that this scribe is attempting to distinguish the two phonemes, and since he tends to only use the circumflex when the digraph functions as a vowel, it could suggest that he is reading here /'hijβ/ rather than the usual /'hjiβ/.³⁸ There is one example in this manuscript where $\ddot{\mathbf{i}}$ appears in this environment: $\sigma \ddot{\mathbf{i}} \epsilon$ “goat” (*BL Deut.* 32.14).

In classical Sahidic there is no variation with the graphic representation of the glide in this environment.

The vowel /i/ in this position is also quite stable with little variation. With native Egyptian words in a closed syllable there is no variation. In an open syllable, however, the

36 $\mathbf{T} \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{E} \mathbf{I} \mathbf{O} (=)$ (*P.Bodm. 18 Deut.* 9.16, 10.1) vs. $\mathbf{T} \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{I} \mathbf{O} (=)$ (*P.Bodm. 18 Deut.* 4.23, 4.25, 9.12).

37 $\mathbf{T} \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{E} \mathbf{I} \mathbf{O} (=)$ (*BL Deut.* 32.6) vs. $\mathbf{T} \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{I} \mathbf{O} (=)$ (*BL Deut.* 9.12, 9.16, 10.1, 10.3, 10.5, 16.21, 32.15); $\Theta \bar{\mathbf{B}} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{I} \mathbf{O} \neq$ (*BL Deut.* 22.29) vs. $\Theta \bar{\mathbf{B}} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{I} \mathbf{O}$ (*BL Deut.* 26.6, 26.7).

38 Cf. Peust (1999), p. 260. In cases where two vowel-glides are adjacent it is sometimes difficult to decide between their vocalic or consonantal values. In this case, the long form of the definite article, which is used with this word ($\mathbf{n} \epsilon \mathbf{z} \mathbf{i} \epsilon \mathbf{i} \mathbf{b}$), would normally indicate that the word begins with a consonant cluster, therefore, the first vowel-glide would otherwise have a consonantal value. The same rule can also be extended to $\mathbf{z} \mathbf{i} \mathbf{o} \mathbf{m} \epsilon$ ($\mathbf{n} \epsilon \mathbf{z} \mathbf{i} \mathbf{o} \mathbf{m} \epsilon$) /'hjo.mə/.

variant digraph occurs, most particularly with the word $\text{c}\epsilon\text{i}\sim\text{c}\hat{\epsilon}\text{i}\sim\text{c}\text{i}$ “to become satisfied”. In the *BL* manuscript the scribe of *Acts* is consistent with the rule and writes ci (*Acts* 27.38). On the other hand, the scribe of *BL Deut.* alternates between $\text{c}\epsilon\text{i}$ (67%) and $\text{c}\hat{\epsilon}\text{i}$ (33%).³⁹ In *P.Bodm.* 18 ci is written once (*Deut.* 6.11) and $\text{c}\epsilon\text{i}$ twice (*Deut.* 8.10, 8.12). In *P.Bodm.* 23 $\text{c}\hat{\epsilon}\text{i}$ is regular. The opposition of these allographs in this lexeme is resolved in classical Sahidic where the digraph (with and without the circumflex) has become the standard, defying the prescribed rule for this domain: $\text{c}\epsilon\text{i}$ (*Rom.* 15.24) (*Col.* 2.23); $\text{c}\hat{\epsilon}\text{i}$ (*Acts* 27.38) (*Phil.* 4.12).

In the early manuscripts, apart from $\text{c}\epsilon\text{i}\sim\text{c}\hat{\epsilon}\text{i}$, the digraph is rarely employed. On two occasions only in *BL Deut.* the digraph is used: $\theta\epsilon\text{i}\text{m}\epsilon$ “the wife” (*Deut.* 5.21), and $\text{p}\epsilon\text{i}\text{c}\epsilon$ “boil” (*Deut.* 16.7). In *P.Bodm.* 23 we find $\text{p}\epsilon\text{i}\text{p}\epsilon$ (*Isa.* 60.3) (and $\overline{\text{p}\text{r}\epsilon\text{i}\epsilon}$ (*Isa.* 60.19)) “light”. The variant is found more often in the lengthier Chester Beatty codices, especially in the *Epistles* where the digraph is employed, most commonly at the end of the line.⁴⁰

There are several instances where the scribe of *BL Acts* adds a trema (a typical feature of this scribe): $\text{n}\sigma\text{i}$ (*Acts* 19.33, 22.30); $\bar{\text{m}}\text{p}\text{i}$ – (*Acts* 20.27, 20.33) – the trema with one point (40%); and $\text{x}\lambda\text{i}\text{o}\gamma\lambda$ (*Acts* 19.37), which is either a variant spelling of $\text{x}\text{i}\text{o}\gamma\lambda$ (*Acts* 18.5), or perhaps a scribal error, the trema triggered by the preceding vowel λ (cf. Case B6). The trema in this position does not appear in the Chester Beatty manuscripts.

In words of Greek origin the Greek vowels i and ϵi , representing the phoneme /i/, exhibit some variation, as in the Greek, when transcribed into Sahidic, with the interchangeability of the Coptic graphemes i and ϵi . In general, the tendency is to follow the Greek orthography in the early manuscripts: Greek i > Sahidic i , and Greek ϵi > Sahidic ϵi . Most of these scribes uniformly render Greek i with Sahidic i , with only a few exceptions. Variation, however, is most prominent in *BL Deut.*, particularly highlighted with the Greek $\epsilon\pi\text{i}\theta\upsilon\text{m}\epsilon\text{i}\nu/\epsilon\pi\text{i}\theta\upsilon\text{m}\acute{\iota}\alpha$ ($\epsilon\text{p}\epsilon\text{i}\theta\gamma\text{m}\text{i}$, $\epsilon\text{p}\epsilon\text{i}\theta\gamma\text{m}\epsilon\text{i}/\epsilon\text{p}\text{i}\theta\gamma\text{m}\text{i}\alpha$, $\epsilon\text{p}\epsilon\text{i}\theta\gamma\text{m}\text{i}\alpha$) and $\epsilon\pi\text{i}\kappa\alpha\lambda\epsilon\text{i}\nu$ ($\epsilon\text{p}\text{i}\kappa\alpha\lambda\text{i}$, $\epsilon\text{p}\text{i}\kappa\alpha\lambda\epsilon\text{i}$, $\epsilon\text{p}\epsilon\text{i}\kappa\alpha\lambda\epsilon\text{i}$, $\epsilon\text{p}\epsilon\kappa\alpha\lambda\epsilon\text{i}$).⁴¹ There is also notable fluctuation between i and ϵi with the Sahidic form of $\pi\acute{o}\lambda\text{i}\varsigma$, which is written $\text{p}\text{o}\lambda\text{i}\text{c}$ 84% of

39 Cf. Appendix 2, Table 39.

40 Cf. Appendix 1, Table 11.

41 Cf. Appendix 2, Table 42.

the time and ΠΟΛΕΙC 16% in *BL Deut.* and ΠΟΛΕΙC always in *Jonah*.⁴² Similarly, in *P.Bodm. 18* half the time ΠΟΛΙC is written, the other half, ΠΟΛΕΙC.⁴³ The scribes also generally respect the Greek spelling with the digraph ει, except the scribe of *Acts* who prefers the single iota to transcribe both ι and ει.

Exceptionally, in the case of Greek lexemes ending in εια, the Greek diphthong ει is always rendered with the single iota in early Sahidic: for example, ΒΟΗΘΙΑ (βοήθεια), ΝΗΣΤΙΑ (νηστεία), and ΠΟΡΝΙΑ (πορνεία). This spelling is firmly established in classical Sahidic.

With regard to Copto-Greek verb endings, derived from the contract verbs -έω/-έομαι (imperative -ει, or infinitive -εῖν, -εῖσθαι)⁴⁴ the digraph is maintained in *P.Bodm. 18*, *P.Bodm. 23* (but ΚΛΗΡΟΝΟΜΙ (*Isa. 57.13*), ΚΑΤΑΠΑΤΙ (*Isa. 63.6*)), and *BL Jon.* In contrast, the scribe of *BL Deut.* alternates freely between the two forms (ι 77% of the time and ει 23%),⁴⁵ and the later of the *BL* scribes, the scribe of *Acts*, always employs the iota (but ΑΡΧΕΙ (*Acts 11.15*)), having assimilated the Greek orthography into the emerging rules of Sahidic orthography in this environment.

This situation continues into the classical period, with the alternation of ει and ι in Copto-Greek words in an open syllable. In a closed syllable, however, the iota is regular, even where the Greek has the digraph ει. The scribe of the *Epistles*, the earlier of the two manuscripts, exhibits the greater variation and frequently renders the vowel /i/ (ι or ει) with the digraph, particularly at the end of a word. This is illustrated well with the verb endings where he uses ει 54% of the time and ι 46%.⁴⁶ Variation with the writing of the vowel in the Copto-Greek words is also not uncommon in *CB Acts*, the manuscript which is the most standardised. While largely favouring ι, the digraph appears, mainly at the end of certain verbs: -ΚΑΛΕΙ~ΚΑΛΕΙ and ΑΡΧΕΙ~ΑΡΧΕΙ.⁴⁷ The choices made by these two scribes

⁴² Cf. Appendix 2, Table 44.

⁴³ Cf. Appendix 3, Table 70.

⁴⁴ In Sahidic the verb appears either in the form of Greek 2nd person singular active imperative (Stern (1880), pp. 159-160), or derives from the infinitive (Böhlig (1954), p. 46). The question has not been resolved in the scholarship. For a discussion on the literature, cf. Förster (2002), pp. xv, xxxv.

⁴⁵ Cf. Appendix 2, Table 43.

⁴⁶ Cf. Appendix 1, Tables 14, 15 and 16.

⁴⁷ Cf. Appendix 1, Tables 14 and 15.

demonstrate, on the one hand, the resistance of the Greek orthography, and on the other, the strength of the forces of standardisation in this environment being imposed on the Greek loan words.

3. /i/ following a glide (Cf. Appendices: Cases A5, A6)

ES: $\epsilon\iota$ (var. $\epsilon\hat{\iota}$) CB: $\epsilon\iota$ (var. $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\sim\ddot{\iota}$)

When the vowel /i/ follows a glide, in contrast to a pure consonant as in the previous case, the digraph is employed: $\omicron\gamma\epsilon\iota$ /'wi/, $\omicron\gamma\epsilon\iota\eta\epsilon$ /'wi.nə/, $\varsigma\omicron\gamma\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon$ /'hwi.tə/, $\omega\omicron\gamma\epsilon\iota\tau$ /'ʃwit/, $\varsigma\iota\epsilon\iota\beta$ /'hjiβ/.

In an open syllable the only variation occurs with the use of the circumflex. The scribe of *BL Deut.* always writes $\omicron\gamma\epsilon\hat{\iota}$ (but $\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\hat{\iota}$ (*BL Deut.* 19.5, 11) "to one"), as does the scribe of *P.Bodm. 23*. The one occurrence in *P.Bodm. 18* (*Deut.* 4.42) does not show a circumflex. The circumflex is also employed consistently with this lexeme by the scribe of the *Epistles* in the Chester Beatty codex: $\omicron\gamma\epsilon\tilde{\iota}$ (1Cor 7.2 x2) (*Gal.* 4.24). There are no occurrences of this lexeme in *CB Acts*. The only other example of the use of the circumflex in this domain is $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\hat{\iota}$ in *BL Deut.* which also occurs in *CB Heb.* 7.9, $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\tilde{\iota}$.

In a closed syllable there is no variation in the early Sahidic manuscripts. In the Chester Beatty codices, however, both scribes have the option to make use of the iota with the trema to shorten the word if it comes at the end of a line: $\omega\omicron\gamma\ddot{\iota}\tau\mid$ (*Eph.* 4.17, 5.6), and $\lambda\lambda\gamma\ddot{\iota}\lambda\mid$ (*Acts* 1.16). This is an interesting development in the orthography of the vowel in this environment. Although the iota with a trema is occasionally employed to represent the vowel /i/ in the early Sahidic manuscripts, the use of this grapheme in this environment is not seen in any of the early manuscripts that I have looked at.

In all the aforementioned cases the graphemic distribution of the vowel-glides is highly standardised in the three 4th-5th century manuscripts under investigation: $\epsilon\iota$ for lexeme-initial /i/ and /j/, and $\ddot{\iota}$ for biblical names; ι for /i/ and /j/ following a consonant in the same syllable; $\epsilon\hat{\iota}$ for the vowel /i/ following the glides /j/ and /w/. Alternative forms exist and are used in free variation by all the scribes, especially the digraph carrying a circumflex. Indeed,

these variants persist into the classical period, some of which became the norm: for example, $\text{C}\epsilon\text{I}\sim\text{C}\epsilon\grave{\text{I}}$ becomes the standard for this word, contrary to rule of distribution; the use of the circumflex over the word “to come” ($\epsilon\grave{\text{I}}$) has become the standard for the scribe of *CB Acts*, the more standardised of the two Chester Beatty codices. At the same time, the circumflex drops out of use in *Acts* in other environments where it appeared in early Sahidic.

The situation becomes more complex when a vowel precedes the vowel-glide in the same syllable, in which case the grapheme functions as a glide. The graphemic distribution varies according to the type of vowel, and the glide’s position within the syllable, and within the word. Moreover, the distribution varies according to the scribe. The rules are more fluid, and this flexibility prevails in the 6th century. Free variation is a characteristic feature of the glides in contact with vowels, and in these environments, highly resistant to standardisation.

4. /j/ at the end of a segment or syllable following the vowels H , O , W , and OY

(Cf. Appendices: Cases B5, B6)

ES: $\epsilon\text{I}\sim\text{ï}$ (var. $\epsilon\grave{\text{I}}\sim\text{I}\sim\text{I}$) *CB*: ï (var. $\epsilon\text{I}\sim\epsilon\grave{\text{I}}$)

When the glide follows the vowels H , O , and W , at the end of a segment (Case B5), or closing a syllable at a syllable boundary (Case B6), the majority of the early manuscripts favour the use of the digraph: for example, $\text{H}\epsilon\text{I}$ /'ej/, $\text{XO}\epsilon\text{I}$ /'cɔj/, $\text{ZIXW}\epsilon\text{I}$ /hi.'coj/, $\text{ZO}\epsilon\text{INE}$ /'hɔj.nə/. *P.Bodm. 18* is the most consistent in this regard, always using the digraph with no variant forms. The scribe of *BL Acts*, while using the digraph when the glide occurs at the end of a syllable within a segment, prefers the grapheme ï at the end of a segment: for example, $\text{XO}\epsilon\text{I}\epsilon\text{I}$ /'lɔj.kɪə/, $\text{XO}\text{ï}$ /'cɔj/. The circumflex over the digraph functioning as a glide is avoided in the *BL* manuscript,⁴⁸ *P.Bodm. 18*, and used only rarely in *P.Bodm. 23*.⁴⁹

Following the vowel H , the very common lexeme $\text{H}\epsilon\text{I}\sim\text{H}\epsilon\grave{\text{I}}\sim\text{H}\text{ï}$ “house” displays the greatest variation. In *P.Bodm. 23* the digraph carries a circumflex with the lexeme $\text{H}\epsilon\text{I}\sim\text{H}\epsilon\grave{\text{I}}$ in 29% of occurrences; elsewhere the plain digraph is used.⁵⁰ In the *BL* manuscript the scribe of *Deuteronomy* writes $\text{H}\epsilon\text{I}$ 30 times (never with the circumflex), but $\text{H}\text{ï}$ once (*BL Deut. 5.21*).

48 With the possible exceptions: $\text{CNA}\rho\text{-}\epsilon\grave{\text{I}}\epsilon\text{PBOONE}$ (*BL Deut. 28.56*) and $\text{P}\epsilon\text{C}\epsilon\text{W-}\epsilon\grave{\text{I}}\epsilon\text{PBOONE}$ (*Deut. 18.10*) $\text{Z}\epsilon\grave{\text{I}}\epsilon\text{IB}$ (*Deut. 32.14*); cf. Case B4.

49 Only $\text{H}\epsilon\grave{\text{I}}$ (*Isa. 56.7, 58.7 x3, 65.21*) and $\text{-}\epsilon\grave{\text{I}}\text{NA-}$ (*Isa. 57.16 x2*)

50 Cf. Appendix 4, Table 82.

On the other hand, in this manuscript the scribe of *Acts* writes $\text{H}\ddot{\text{I}}$ 68% of the time and $\text{H}\epsilon\text{I}$ elsewhere.⁵¹ This scribe occasionally omits the trema in cases where it is expected, in this and in other environments.⁵²

Included in this domain is the 1st person singular pronominal suffix, which the scribes of *P.Bodm. 18*, *BL Deut.* and *BL Jon.* invariably render with the digraph. The scribe of *P.Bodm. 23* uses the variant $\ddot{\text{i}}$ three times, and i without the trema once.⁵³ The scribe of *BL Acts*, in contrast, always writes the suffix pronoun with the allograph $\ddot{\text{i}}$ (occasionally without the trema) with only three exceptions: $\text{2}\lambda\rho\text{O}\epsilon\text{I}$ (*Acts* 2.10), $\text{7}\lambda\text{M}\text{O}\epsilon\text{I}$ (*Acts* 23.30), and $\epsilon\chi\omega\epsilon\text{I}$ (*Acts* 8.24).

When the glide follows vocalic OY the digraph is favoured in *P.Bodm. 23* (except in the case of the suffix pronoun, $\text{N}\text{OY}\epsilon\ddot{\text{i}}$ (*Isa.* 66.2)), and in *Deuteronomy* and *Jonah* in the *BL* manuscript (except $\text{K}\text{OY}\ddot{\text{i}}$ (*Deut.* 28.38)). On the other hand, the iota with the trema is consistent in *BL Acts*. There is only one example in *P.Bodm. 18*: $\text{K}[\text{OY}]\ddot{\text{i}}$ (*Deut.* 1.17).

At the end of a syllable, but not at the end of a segment (Case B6), following these vowels, the digraph predominates and is used consistently in *P.Bodm. 18*, *P.Bodm. 23*, *BL Deut.* and *Jon.* without variation: for example, $\text{6}\text{O}\epsilon\text{I}\lambda\epsilon$, $\text{2}\text{O}\epsilon\text{I}\tau\epsilon$, $\lambda\text{O}\epsilon\text{I}\delta\epsilon$. It is striking that the scribe of *BL Acts*, who prefers the grapheme $\ddot{\text{i}}$ to render the glide following these vowels elsewhere, in this environment it is only utilised on three occasions.⁵⁴

It is most interesting to observe that the distribution of the allographs in this environment in the British Library *Acts* is very similar to the Chester Beatty codex of *Acts*. Indeed, the opposition between $\epsilon\text{I}\sim\epsilon\hat{\text{I}}$ and $\ddot{\text{i}}$ (following the vowels H , O , ω , and vocalic OY) begins to be resolved in the Chester Beatty codices, the dominance of the digraph realising the glide in the majority of the early manuscripts gradually being superseded by $\ddot{\text{i}}$. Although $\ddot{\text{i}}$ is generally the preferred option in the *Epistles*, free variation continues to persevere: for

51 Cf. Appendix 2, Table 49.

52 For example: HI (*Acts* 7.20).

53 $\bar{\text{M}}\text{M}\text{O}\epsilon\ddot{\text{i}}$ (*Isa.* 65.11), $\bar{\text{M}}\text{M}\text{O}\epsilon\text{i}$ (*Isa.* 49.5), $\epsilon\rho\text{O}\epsilon\ddot{\text{i}}$ (*Isa.* 48.12), $\epsilon\rho\text{O}\epsilon\text{i}$ (*Isa.* 49.26).

54 $\text{2O}\ddot{\text{I}}\text{N}\epsilon$ (*BL Acts* 19.9) vs. $\text{2O}\epsilon\text{I}\text{N}\epsilon$ (*BL Acts* 6.9, 10.23, 12.1, 14.4, 15.1, 15.5, 15.24, 17.4, 17.6, 17.18 x2, 19.13, 19.31, 23.9, 23.12, 27.44 $\text{2O}\epsilon[\text{I}\text{N}\epsilon]$, 28.24); $\text{2O}\ddot{\text{I}}\text{T}\epsilon$ (*BL Acts* 23.23) vs. $\text{2O}\epsilon\text{I}\text{T}\epsilon$ (*BL Acts* 7.58, 9.39, 11.15, 14.14, 16.22, 18.6, 20.33, 22.20); $[\lambda]\text{M}\text{H}\text{I}\text{T}\bar{\text{N}}$ (*BL Acts* 16.36) vs. $\lambda\text{M}\text{H}\epsilon\text{I}\text{T}\bar{\text{N}}$ (*BL Acts* 16.15) (*BL Jon.* 1.7).

example, with the particular word $\text{H}\epsilon\text{I}\sim\text{H}\epsilon\text{I}\sim\text{H}\ddot{\text{I}}$ the digraph resists standardisation and appears $\text{H}\epsilon\text{I}$ 44%, $\text{H}\epsilon\text{I}$ 33%, and $\text{H}\ddot{\text{I}}$ 23% of occurrences.⁵⁵ In contrast to the early manuscripts where the circumflex on the digraph functioning as a glide only occurs on the word $\text{H}\epsilon\text{I}$ (rarely elsewhere), the scribe of the *Epistles* uses it frequently whenever the digraph has a consonantal value.

The allograph $\ddot{\text{i}}$ finally becomes fixed in *CB Acts*, with only a few exceptions, most of which occur at the end of a syllable followed by another syllable: $\text{zO}\epsilon\text{I}\text{r}\epsilon$ (*Acts* 11.15); $\text{zO}\epsilon\text{I}\text{r}\epsilon$ (*Acts* 14.14); $\text{zO}\epsilon\text{I}\text{N}\epsilon$ (*Acts* 10.23, 11.20). The latter are good examples of syntagmatic resyllabification (in ‘bradysyllabation’): $\text{zO}\epsilon\text{I}\text{r}\epsilon$ /‘hɔ.i.tə/ (*Acts* 14.14) vs. $\text{zO}\ddot{\text{I}}\text{r}\epsilon$ /‘hɔj.tə/ (*Acts* 22.20, 22.23) (*1 Tim.* 2.9); and $\text{zO}\epsilon\text{I}\text{N}\epsilon$ /‘hɔ.i.nə/ (*Acts* 10.23, 11.20) vs. $\text{zO}\ddot{\text{I}}\text{N}\epsilon$ /‘hɔj.nə/ (*Acts* 19.31) (*Rom.* 11.25) (*Gal.* 2.12) (*2 Tim.* 2.18, 2.20).

5. /j/ at the end of a syllable following the vowels α and ϵ

(Cf. Appendices: Cases B5, B6)

ES: $\ddot{\text{i}}$ (var. $\epsilon\text{I}\sim\epsilon\text{I}\sim\text{I}\sim\ddot{\text{i}}$) *CB*: $\ddot{\text{i}}$ (var. $\epsilon\text{I}\sim\epsilon\text{I}$)

When the glide /j/ follows the vowel α in accented syllables the preference is for the allograph $\ddot{\text{i}}$ (occasionally I) at the end of a segment, with little variation, in all the early manuscripts. In *P.Bodm. 18*, the variant ϵI occurs once in a lexeme: $\text{OY}\alpha\epsilon\text{I}$ (*Deut.* 3.11). The iota with a circumflex appears on a few occasions in this manuscript where a trema would be expected: for example, $\text{I}\alpha\hat{\text{I}}$ (*Deut.* 7.16, 8.10, 9.3); $\text{T}\alpha\hat{\text{I}}$ (*Deut.* 4.6, 9.5); $\alpha\text{OY}\alpha\hat{\text{I}}$ (*Deut.* 1.11, 8.13).⁵⁶ In *P.Bodm. 23* the variant ϵI occurs occasionally, most particularly with the demonstrative pronoun $\text{T}\alpha\ddot{\text{I}}$, where $\text{T}\alpha\epsilon\text{I}$ occurs 18% of the time.⁵⁷ Similarly, in the *BL* manuscript the variant ϵI appears rarely: $\text{zT}\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\text{I}$ (*Deut.* 32.15 x2), $[\alpha]\text{OY}\alpha\epsilon\text{I}$ (*Deut.* 7.22), $\alpha\text{OY}\alpha\epsilon\text{I}$ (*Acts* 6.1).

At the end of a syllable followed by another syllable (Case B6) the distribution varies. The grapheme $\ddot{\text{i}}$ is consistent in *P.Bodm. 18*, and in *BL Deut.* and *Jon.*, with one exception:

⁵⁵ Cf. Appendix 1, Table 20.

⁵⁶ Kasser (1962c), p.13 suggests that in this case it is a malformation of the trema, perhaps caused by writing the trema quickly without raising the calamus from the papyrus. It is rare at the beginning of the manuscript, but increases towards the end.

⁵⁷ Cf. Appendix 4, Table 85.

Ⲅⲁⲉⲓⲣⲉ (*BL Deut.* 32.14). In contrast, there is a preference for ⲉⲓ in *P.Bodm.* 23: ⲕⲁⲉⲓⲙⲉ (*Isa.* 53.9, 57.2), ⲛⲁⲉⲓⲃⲉⲙ (*Isa.* 51.16, 57.5) vs. ⲑⲁⲓⲃⲉⲙ "the shade" (*Isa.* 49.2). There is only one example in *BL Acts* and the digraph is used, as it is in the case where the glide follows the other vowels in this environment: ⲛⲁⲉⲓⲃⲉⲙ (*Acts* 5.15).

There is no evidence of variation at the end of a segment or syllable by the scribe of *Acts* in the Chester Beatty codex, in which case the iota with the trema is always used. In the *Epistles* the variant is only employed twice: ⲁⲓⲁⲉⲓ (*Phil.* 1.20, *2 Cor.* 10.15) vs. ⲁⲓⲁⲓ (*Eph.* 4.16, *Col.* 2.19).

In an unaccented syllable, however, with the demonstrative articles, and the 1st person singular pronoun of the conjugation bases, the distribution of the allographs varies between the manuscripts. Unlike the preference for ⲓ in an accented syllable, the scribe of *P.Bodm.* 23 inclines towards the use of the digraph following the vowel ⲁ in an unaccented syllable, yet exhibiting considerable fluctuation between ⲉⲓ and ⲓ.⁵⁸ Following the vowel ⲉ he almost exclusively uses the digraph (ⲡⲉⲓ– (*Isa.* 65.3) being the one exception). Twice the circumflex is used: ⲉⲉⲓⲛⲁ– (*Isa.* 57.16 x2). Following the vowel ⲁ, *P.Bodm.* 18 has a clear preference for the iota carrying the trema (once with a circumflex) with only a few variations: ⲁⲉⲓ– (*Deut.* 1.20, 3.2), ⲉⲛⲧⲁⲉⲓ– (*Deut.* 1.35). Following the vowel ⲉ this scribe favours the digraph, like the scribe of *P.Bodm.* 23, but with considerable free variation (ⲉⲓ– 65%, ⲓ– 35%).⁵⁹ Again, the circumflex replaces the trema on rare occasions. The scribes of the *BL* manuscript choose ⲓ to represent the glide after both ⲁ and ⲉ without variation, apart from the sporadic omission of the trema in *Acts*, and the unusual spelling, on a few occasions, of the demonstrative article where ⲁ is substituted for ⲉ.⁶⁰ In this case the variant form (ⲉⲓ rather than ⲓ) follows: ⲡⲁⲉⲓ– (*Acts* 6.14, 7.7, 9.14), ⲧⲁⲉⲓ– (*Acts* 1.17).⁶¹

In classical Sahidic, after the vowel ⲁ in the conjugation bases, the scribe of the *Epistles* always renders the 1st person singular pronominal subject with ⲓ, except in one instance which occurs at the end of the line (ⲛⲧⲁⲉⲓ– (*Phil.* 2.16)). Following the vowel ⲉ in the conjugation bases, however, the iota with the trema is employed 68% of the time, and the

58 Cf. Appendix 4, Table 87.

59 Cf. Appendix 3, Table 73 and 74.

60 Thompson (1913), p. 13: A peculiar characteristic of this scribe is the substitution of ⲁ for ⲉ.

61 Cf. Appendix 2, Table 54.

7. /j/ beginning a syllable (not a segment)

(Cf. Appendices: Cases B8, B9)

ES: $\epsilon\iota$ (var. $\ddot{\imath}$)

CB: $\epsilon\iota\sim\ddot{\imath}$ (var. $\ddot{\imath}\sim\epsilon\iota$)

There are only two examples of this case where the preceding syllable is closed, $\rho\bar{\mu}\epsilon\iota\eta$ / $\rho\mu'je$ / and $\rho\bar{\mu}\epsilon\iota\omicron\omicron\gamma\epsilon$ / $\rho\mu'j\omicron.w\omicron$ /, and the digraph is always used in early and classical Sahidic, in the same way it is used at the beginning of a lexeme.

In the intervocalic position, when the preceding syllable is open, the early manuscripts, in most cases, prefer the digraph: for example $\tau\alpha\epsilon\iota\omicron$ / $ta.'j\omicron$ /, $\tau\omicron\gamma\epsilon\iota\omicron$ / $tu.'j\omicron$ /, $\chi\alpha\epsilon\iota\epsilon$ / $'ca.j\epsilon$ /. *P.Bodm. 18* uses it exclusively. *P.Bodm. 23* has one exception: $\eta\alpha\ddot{\imath}\alpha\tau$ (Isa.56.2). *BL Acts* fluctuates between the two allographs, using the digraph 80% of the time.⁶⁵ *BL Deut.*, on the other hand, always employs the allograph $\ddot{\imath}$ when following the vowel α or ϵ of the preceding syllable, and $\epsilon\iota$ after vocalic $\omicron\gamma$ ($\mu\omicron\gamma\epsilon\iota\omicron\omicron\gamma\epsilon$ (*BL Deut. 5.8*) and $\tau\omicron\gamma\epsilon\iota\eta$ (*BL Deut. 33.15*)). The choice of allograph, in this case, corresponds with its use in Case 5: $\ddot{\imath}$ after α or ϵ , and $\epsilon\iota$ after $\omicron\gamma$.

It is in this domain that the two scribes of the Chester Beatty codices differ in the preferred choice of allograph. The scribe of the *Epistles* prefers the digraph, like most of the early scribes, but switches quite frequently between the two allographs, specifically when the preceding vowel is α , in which case he uses the digraph (occasionally with the circumflex) 68% of the time, and the iota with the trema 32%.⁶⁶ The scribe of *CB Acts* renders the glide in this environment with $\ddot{\imath}$, the only exception occurring with the following word: $\omicron\gamma\epsilon\epsilon\iota\epsilon\eta\eta\eta$ (67%) vs. $\omicron\gamma\epsilon\ddot{\imath}\epsilon\eta\eta\eta$ (33%).

⁶⁵ Cf. Appendix 2, Table 57.

⁶⁶ Cf. Appendix 1, Table 27.

4.3 TYPOLOGIES OF THE VOWEL-GLIDE /u/~/w/

Table 3: Comparative typology of the vowel /u/

Case	Syllabic Context Examples	<i>Early Sahidic</i>				<i>Classical Sahidic</i>	
		<i>P.Bodm. 18</i>	<i>P.Bodm. 23</i>	<i>BL Deut./Jon.</i>	<i>BL Acts</i>	<i>CB Epistles</i>	<i>CB Acts</i>
C1	#(')V OYNAAM	OY (var. Y)	OY (var. Y)	OY (var. Y~OY)	OY (var. Y)	OY (var. Y)	OY (var. Y)
C2	(')(C)CV MOY	OY	OY	OY (var. OY)	OY	OY	OY
C3	'(C)CVC(C) ZOYN	OY	OY	OY (var. OY)	OY	OY	OY

Table 4: Comparative typology of the glide /w/

Case	Syllabic Context Examples		Early Sahidic				Classical Sahidic	
			<i>P.Bodm. 18</i>	<i>P.Bodm. 23</i>	<i>BL Deut./Jon.</i>	<i>BL Acts</i>	<i>CB Epistles</i>	<i>CB Acts</i>
D1	#(')GV oγλ		oγ	oγ (var. γ)	oγ (var. γ)	oγ (var. γ)	oγ	oγ
D2	#(')GVC(C) oγωμ		oγ	oγ (var. γ)	oγ (var. γ)	oγ (var. γ)	oγ (var. γ)	oγ (var. γ)
D3	'(C)CGV zoγeɪɾe		oγ	oγ	oγ	oγ	oγ	oγ
D4	'(C)CGVC zoγeɪɾɾ		oγ	oγ	oγ	oγ	oγ	oγ
D5	(')(C)VG(C) mooy ɾwoyɪn naɲoyɾoy ɾɪɪɪɾɪ naɪ peɪ- xooyɾ	V = o	oγ	oγ	oγ (var. oγ̂)	oγ (var. γ)	oγ	oγ
		V = ω	oγ	oγ	oγ	oγ	oγ	oγ
		V = oγ	∅	∅	oγ	oγ	oγ	oγ
		V = ɪ	γ	oγ (var. γ~γ̂)	oγ (var. γ~γ̂) ɪɪ (ɪ̂ɪ̂)	γ (var. oγ)	γ	γ
		V = λ	γ	γ (var. oγ)	γ (var. oγ) aɪ (âɪ̂)	γ	γ	γ
		V = e	γ (var. oγ)	γ	γ (var. oγ~oγ̂)	γ	γ	γ
		V = oo	γ	γ	γ	γ	γ	γ
		V = o	oγ	oγ	oγ	oγ	oγ	oγ
D6	(C)V.'GV(C) '(C)V.GV(C) kooye xooye zɪɪɪɪ aɪɪ meeyɪ	V = i	oγ	oγ	oγ	oγ	oγ	oγ
		V = ɪ	oγ	oγ	oγ	oγ	oγ	oγ
		V = ɪ	γ (var. oγ)	γ (var. γ̂~oγ)	oγ (var. γ)	γ	γ (var. oγ)	γ
		V = λ	γ	γ	γ aɪ (âɪ̂)	γ (var. oγ)	γ	γ (var. oγ)
		V = e	γ	γ	γ (var. oγ)	γ	γ	γ

Comparative Typology of the Vowel-Glide /u~/w/ (Cf. Tables 3 and 4)

In contrast to the vowel-glide /i~/j/, the field of distribution of the /u~/w/ vowel-glide $\text{OY} \sim \gamma$ is more limited, yet variation is still common.⁶⁷ Apart from certain conditions, described below, the grapheme OY represents the vowel /u/ at the beginning, end, or middle of a segment consistently from early to classical Sahidic. The glide /w/ is also regularly realised OY at the beginning of a word and following a consonant. Variation in the distribution of $\text{OY} \sim \gamma$, however, occurs when the glide follows a vowel: OY when following O , W and OY ; and γ following A , E , OO and H . The latter vowel, H , provokes the greatest variation.

1. /u~/w/ lexeme-initial (Cf. Appendices: Cases C1 and D1, D2)

ES: OY (var. $\text{OY} \sim \gamma$) *CB*: OY (var. γ)

At the beginning of a lexeme the vowel-glide is written OY , or in the case of *BL Deut.*, once with a circumflex (OY° *BL Deut.* 32.20): for example, OY /'u/, OYBE /'u.βə/, OYNAM /'u.nam/, OY- /u/, OYXAI /u.'caj/, OYWH /u.'ʃe/, OYA /'wa/, OYEI /'wi/, OYEINE /'wi.nə/, OYEPHTe /wə.'re.tə/, OYWM /'wom/, OYOEIW /'wɔjʃ/, OYN- /wɪ/.

This rule stands (with certain exceptions listed below) even when the initial OY is preceded by a proclitic segment ending in the vowel A or E (where it would in other environments be rendered by γ), such as prepositions (eg. E , ETBE , WA , NCA), proclitic pronouns (eg. NA), future auxiliary (NA-), conjugation bases (eg. NTe- , NTA-) adjectives (eg. KE) and conjunctions (eg. XE): for example, ETBEOY (*CB Acts* 3.12), NCAOYNAM (*CB Acts* 2.34), WAOYMAΘHTHC (*CB Acts* 21.16). This is standard in the two Bodmer papyri and the Chester Beatty codices.⁶⁸ In the *BL* manuscript, in both *Deuteronomy* and *Acts*, however, the variant form of γ is employed on several occasions when the lexeme-initial glide is prefixed by one of these segments, particularly preceding the lexemes OYA and

⁶⁷ For examples in other early Sahidic manuscripts, cf. Kahle (1999), pp. 88-89; Kasser (1964), p. 19; Kasser (1961), p. 12; Kasser (1962a), pp. 28-29; Kasser (1962b), p. 20; Quecke (1977), p. 54; Quecke (1972), p. 32; Quecke (1984a), p. 43; Hintze and Schenke, (1970), pp. 16-19; Funk (1995b), pp. 37-42; Cherix (1994), pp. 34-35; Ghica (2006), pp. 230-234.

⁶⁸ Except NTAYTWM (*Rom.* 11.25) “that a hardness...” (Perfect II), and perhaps $\text{XE}[YA]$ “blaspheme” in *Bod* 23 (*Isa.* 66.3).

ΟΥΕΙ:

- with the preposition Ε: ΕΥΕΙ (*BL Deut.* 19.5, 19.11), ΕΥΑ (*BL Acts* 7.24) vs. ΕΟΥΑ (*BL Acts* 23.17, 21.8);
- with the Perfect I conjugation base: ΑΥΑ (*BL Acts* 5.25);
- the adjective ΚΕ: ΚΕΥΑ “another one” (*BL Deut.* 28.30), and (*BL Acts* 1.20, 4.12, 23.6) vs. ΚΕΟΥΑ (*BL Acts* 8.34).

In the following cases, in early and classical Sahidic, variation may occur under the influence of certain preformative clitics:

- The indefinite article ΟΥ–, which otherwise maintains the digraph after prepositions and the conjugation bases, is regularly reduced to –Υ– when preceded by the preposition Ε, and the Perfect I conjugation nominal base Α. For example: ΕΥΛΛΟC (*Rom.* 10.21) “to a people” ΑΥΜΑΕΙΝ (*Acts* 4.16) “a sign has...”.⁶⁹
- A few of the nouns beginning with ΟΥ (ΟΥΩΗ “night”, ΟΥΝΟΥ “hour”, ΟΥΖΟΟΡ “dog”), are preceded by the long form of the definite article prompting crasis and resyllabification: ΤΕΥΩΗ, ΤΕΥΝΟΥ, ΝΕΥΖΟΟΡ.⁶⁹ Two other nouns exhibit fluctuation between the long and short article: ΟΥΟΕΙΩ “time” and ΟΥΧΑΪ “health”. In the case of ΟΥΧΑΪ, the early manuscripts and *CB Acts* are consistent with the use of the short form of the definite article, whereas the scribe of the *Epistles* alternates equally between the short and the long form.⁷⁰ When the long form is used crasis occurs provoking syntagmatic resyllabification: ΠΟΥΧΑΪ /pu.'caj/ vs. ΠΕΥΧΑΪ /pəw.'caj/. The lexeme ΟΥΟΕΙΩ exhibits a greater degree of divergence between the scribes, and a greater frequency of fluctuation between the long and the short form of the article, and the long form + ΟΥ and the long form + Υ (cf. Table 5).

⁶⁹ Certain nouns denoting divisions of time are prefixed by the long forms of the definite article: ΖΟΟΥ “day”, ΡΟΜΠΕ “year”, ΟΥΩΗ “night”, ΟΥΝΟΥ “hour”, ΟΥΟΕΙΩ “time”. Cf. Depuydt (1993), pp. 369-375, for discussion on long articles preceding such nouns and the possible phonetic explanations.

⁷⁰ Cf. Appendix 1, Table 29.

Table 5: Forms of ΟΥΟΕΙΩ with the definite article

	Short form ΠΟΥΟΕΙΩ/ΝΟΥΟΕΙΩ /ˈpɔwɔjɪf/ /nɔ.ˈwɔjɪf/	Long form ΠΕΟΥΟΕΙΩ/ΝΕΟΥΟΕΙΩ /pəˈwɔjɪf/ /nə.ˈwɔjɪf/	Long form with crasis ΠΕΥΟΕΙΩ/ΝΕΥΟΕΙΩ /pəwˈɔjɪf/ /nəwˈɔjɪf/
<i>P.Bodm. 18</i>	0%	100%	0%
<i>P.Bodm. 23</i>	33%	0%	67%
<i>BL Deut.</i>	0%	0%	100%
<i>BL Acts</i>	11%	11%	78%
<i>CB Epistles</i>	18%	12%	70%
<i>CB Acts</i>	0%	63%	37%

- The converted existential and possessive predicates experience significant variation between ΟΥ and Υ in the early and classical manuscripts. *P.Bodm. 18* and *BL Deut.* are consistent with the use of the digraph.⁷¹ On the other hand, although there is only one example, in *P.Bodm. 23* the upsilon alone is used: ΤΕΤΕΥΝΤΑΣ (*Isa.* 54.1). The scribe of *BL Acts* alternates between the two allographs, but preferring the reduced form: Υ 73% of occurrences and ΟΥ 27%.⁷² The hesitation between the two forms continues in the classical manuscripts, the upsilon alone being the preferred option: *CB Epistles* - Υ 76% and ΟΥ 24%; *CB Acts* - Υ 84% and ΟΥ 16%.⁷³ As in the case of ΟΥΟΕΙΩ and ΟΥΧΑΙ a syntagmatic resyllabification takes place: ΕΟΥΝ /ə.wn/ vs. ΕΥΝ /əwɪn/.
- The sequence ΟΥ-ΟΥ is sometimes the object of coalescence, simplified as ΟΥ in both the early and classical manuscripts.⁷⁴

⁷¹ *Bod 18*: ΕΤΕΟΥΝΤΑ (*Deut.* 4.7), ΕΤΕΟΥΝΤΑΧ (*Deut.* 4.8), ΕΤΕΟΥΝΤΑΚΑ (*Deut.* 4.38); *BL*: -ΕΟΥΝ- (*Deut.* 24.10), ΕΟΥΝΤΑ (*Deut.* 24.10), -ΕΤΕΟΥΝΤΕ-/ ΕΤΕΟΥΝΤΑ (*Deut.* 15.2, [15.3] x2, 24.10, 24.11).

⁷² Cf. Appendix 2, Tables 61 and 62.

⁷³ Cf. Appendix 1, Tables 31 and 32.

⁷⁴ *Bod 18*: ΜΑΡΟΥ(ΟΥ)ΩΣ (*Deut.* 3.19), perhaps ΕΟΥ(ΟΥ)ΩΜ (*Deut.* 2.6); *Bod 23*: ΣΝ(ΟΥ)ΟΥΟΕΙΩ (*Isa.* 49.8), Ν(ΟΥ)ΟΥΝΟΑ (*Isa.* 49.13), ΝΝ(ΟΥ)ΟΥΕΡΗΤΕ (*Isa.* 49.23), (ΟΥ)ΟΥΩΝΣ (*Isa.* 51.3), ΣΙΤΝ(ΟΥ)ΟΥΟΕΙΩ (*Isa.* 51.8), [(ΟΥ)ΟΥ]ΩΩΑ (*Isa.* 59.7), (ΟΥ)ΟΥΩΤΝ (*Isa.* 65.11), Ν(ΟΥ)ΟΥΝΟΑ (*Isa.* 66.20) and possibly ΑΠ(ΟΥ)ΟΥΟΕΙΝ (*Isa.* 60.1) “the light” or “your light” (as in the Greek), and ΠΕΟΥΟΕΙΝ (*Isa.* 60.3) could be read as Π(ΟΥ)ΟΥΟΕΙΝ; *BL Acts*: (ΟΥ)ΟΥΕΙΕΝΙΝ (*Acts* 16.1, 16.33) “a Greek”; *CB Epistles*: ΠΡΟΣ(ΟΥ)ΟΥΟΕΙΩ (*1 Cor.* 7.5) (*2 Cor.* 4.18) “for a time”; *CB Acts*: Ν(ΟΥ)ΟΥΟΕΙΩ (*Acts* 19.22) “for a time”; ΩΑ(ΟΥ)ΟΥΟΕΙΩ (*Acts* 13.11) “for a time”, Ν(ΟΥ)ΟΥΟΕΙΝ (*Acts* 13.47) “as a light”, (ΟΥ)ΟΥΕΙΕΝΙΝ (*Acts* 16.1), (ΟΥ)ΟΥΕΙΕΝΙΝ (*Acts* 16.3) “a Greek”.

2. /u/~/w/ following a consonant (Cf. Appendices: Cases C2, C3 and D3, D4)

ES: $\text{o}\gamma$ (var. $\text{o}\hat{\gamma}$)

CB: $\text{o}\gamma$

Following a consonant the vowel /u/ and the glide /w/ are always realised $\text{o}\gamma$ in the early and classical manuscripts: for example, $\text{m}\text{o}\gamma$ /'mu/, $\text{c}\text{i}\text{o}\gamma$ /'sju/, $\text{m}\text{o}\gamma\text{t}\epsilon$ /'mu.tə/, $\text{t}\alpha\text{i}\text{o}\gamma$ /'ta.ju/, $\text{t}\text{o}\gamma\epsilon\text{i}\text{o}$ /tu.'jə/, $\text{z}\text{o}\gamma\epsilon\text{i}\text{t}\epsilon$ /'hwi.tə/, $\text{w}\text{o}\gamma\epsilon\text{i}\text{t}$ /'fwit/. The variant of the digraph carrying a circumflex in this environment in *BL Deut.* occurs at the end of the text, all of them after 29.18.⁷⁵ Are these true variants or accents for reading or singing purposes, as Budge suggests?

3. /w/ following a vowel (Cf. Appendices: Cases D5, D6)

a) Following o , ω , i and $\text{o}\gamma$

ES: $\text{o}\gamma$ (var. $\text{o}\hat{\gamma}$)

CB: $\text{o}\gamma$

Following the vowels o , ω , i and $\text{o}\gamma$ the digraph is stable in early and classical Sahidic: for example, $\text{m}\text{o}\text{o}\gamma$ /'mɔw/, $\text{z}\text{o}\text{o}\gamma$ /'hɔw/, $\text{t}\omega\text{o}\gamma\text{n}$ /'town/, $\text{k}\text{o}\text{o}\gamma\epsilon$ /'kɔ.wə/, $\text{x}\text{i}\text{o}\gamma\epsilon$ /'ci.wə/, $\text{m}\text{o}\gamma\text{o}\gamma\text{t}$ /'muwt/.

There are two exceptions in the *BL* manuscript: $\text{t}\bar{\text{b}}\text{b}\text{o}\hat{=}\gamma$ (*Acts* 11.9) and $\text{q}\text{t}\text{o}\hat{\gamma}$ (*Acts* 11.5). On two occasions the scribe of *BL Deut.* employs the circumflex: $\text{z}\text{o}\text{o}\hat{\gamma}$ (*Deut.* 34.8) $\text{t}\alpha\text{t}\alpha\text{m}\acute{\text{o}}\hat{=}\text{o}\hat{\gamma}$ (*Deut.* 32.20). Once again, these occur at the end of *Deuteronomy* where the use of the circumflex is quite frequent, as has been mentioned, and in these two cases the circumflexes were written by the second hand.

b) Following α , ϵ and oo

ES: γ (var. $\text{o}\gamma\sim\text{o}\hat{\gamma}$)

CB: γ (var. $\text{o}\gamma$)

When these vowels precede, the glide is represented by the upsilon only: for example, $\text{n}\alpha\gamma$ /'naw/, $\text{p}\epsilon\gamma$ /'pəw/, $\alpha\gamma$ /'aw/, $\alpha\gamma\omega$ /a'wo/, $\alpha\gamma\epsilon\text{i}\text{n}$ /a.'win/, $\text{m}\epsilon\epsilon\gamma\epsilon$ /'mɛ:.wə/. The double vowel oo is distinguished from the single omicron in the following lexemes: $\text{x}\text{o}\text{o}\hat{=}\gamma$ /'cɔ:w/ “say them” vs. $\text{x}\text{o}\hat{=}\text{o}\gamma$ /'cɔw/ “send them”; $\text{z}\text{o}\text{o}\gamma$ /'hɔ:w/ “day” vs. $\text{z}\text{o}\text{o}\gamma^{\dagger}$ /'hɔw/ “to be bad”.⁷⁶

⁷⁵ $\text{m}\text{o}\hat{\gamma}$ (*Deut.* 30.19, 31.14, 31.27, 31.29, 32.50 x2, 33.1, 33.6, 34.5, 34.7); $\text{c}\text{m}\text{o}\hat{\gamma}$ (*Deut.* 30.19, 33.13, 33.23); $\text{w}\text{o}\hat{\gamma}\text{w}\text{o}\hat{\gamma}$ (*Deut.* 33.29); $\text{n}\text{o}\hat{\gamma}\text{t}\epsilon$ (*Deut.* 32.37); $\text{m}\text{o}\hat{\gamma}\epsilon\text{i}$ (*Deut.* 33.20, 33.22); $\text{n}\text{o}\hat{\gamma}\text{n}\epsilon$ (*Deut.* 29.18); $\text{z}\text{m}\text{o}\hat{\gamma}$ (*Deut.* 29.23); $\text{n}\text{o}\hat{\gamma}\text{n}$ (*Deut.* 33.13); cf. Budge (1912), p. xiv.

⁷⁶ The interpretation of the double vowel representing a lengthening of the vowel is a highly contested issue. Cf. Peust (1999), pp. 205-210, for a summary of the debate. Peust takes the position that gemination

There are only a few examples of variation in the early manuscripts: $\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{O}\mathfrak{Y}$ “to/for them” (*BL Deut.* 1.39, 5.9); $\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{O}\mathfrak{Y}$ (*BL Deut.* 1.46, 5.5, 5.15); $\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{C}\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{O}\mathfrak{Y}$ (*BL Deut.* 2.8) vs. $\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{C}\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{Y}$ (*BL Deut.* 2.4, 2.5, 2.12); $\mathfrak{Z}\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{E}\mathfrak{O}\mathfrak{Y}$ ⁷⁷ (*P.Bodm.* 23 *Isa.* 47.7); and $\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{Z}\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{O}\mathfrak{Y}$ ⁷⁸ (*P.Bodm.* 23 *Isa.* 65.4). A more common exception occurs with the lexeme $\mathfrak{X}\mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{X}\mathfrak{E}\mathfrak{E}\mathfrak{Y}$ (plural of $\mathfrak{X}\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{X}\mathfrak{E}$) which displays a number of spellings:⁷⁹ two forms appear in *P.Bodm.* 18, $\mathfrak{X}\mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{X}\mathfrak{E}\mathfrak{O}\mathfrak{Y}$ (*Deut.* 1.42, 7.5) and $\mathfrak{X}\mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{X}\mathfrak{E}\mathfrak{E}\mathfrak{Y}$ (*Deut.* 6.19); in *BL Deut.*, $\mathfrak{X}\mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{X}\mathfrak{E}\mathfrak{O}\mathfrak{Y}$ ($\mathfrak{X}\mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{X}\mathfrak{E}\mathfrak{O}\mathfrak{Y}$) is the usual form, but we also see $\mathfrak{X}\mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{X}\mathfrak{E}\mathfrak{O}\mathfrak{Y}\mathfrak{E}$.⁸⁰

There is only one instance of the variant allograph written in the later Chester Beatty manuscripts: $\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{O}\mathfrak{Y}|\mathfrak{O}\mathfrak{O}\mathfrak{Y}$ (*Acts* 15.33).⁸¹

c) Following \mathfrak{H} *ES:* $\mathfrak{Y}\sim\mathfrak{O}\mathfrak{Y}$ (var. $\mathfrak{Y}\sim\mathfrak{O}\mathfrak{Y}\sim\mathfrak{O}\mathfrak{Y}$) *CB:* \mathfrak{Y} (var. $\mathfrak{O}\mathfrak{Y}$)

It is in this environment, when the glide follows the eta /e/, that variation proves to be the strongest: for example, $\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{Y}\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{N}\sim\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{O}\mathfrak{Y}\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{N}$ /'tew.tɛn/, $\mathfrak{Z}\mathfrak{B}\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{Y}\mathfrak{E}\sim\mathfrak{Z}\mathfrak{B}\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{O}\mathfrak{Y}\mathfrak{E}$ /'hβe.wə/.

In *P.Bodm.* 23 we find variation with the suffix pronouns ($\mathfrak{Z}\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{O}\mathfrak{Y}$ (*Isa.* 48.2) vs. $\mathfrak{Z}\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{Y}$ (*Isa.* 57.13)), the statives ($\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{O}\mathfrak{Y}$ 28 times vs. $\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{Y}$ (*Isa.* 55.11), $[\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{H}]\mathfrak{Y}$ (*Isa.* 47.9)), at the end of a lexeme ($\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{O}\mathfrak{Y}$ (*Isa.* 57.13) vs. $\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{Y}$ (*Isa.* 64.5)), and at the beginning of a syllable within a lexeme ($\mathfrak{Z}\mathfrak{B}\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{O}\mathfrak{Y}\mathfrak{E}$ 6 times vs. $\mathfrak{Z}\mathfrak{B}\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{Y}\mathfrak{E}\sim\mathfrak{Z}\mathfrak{B}\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{Y}\mathfrak{E}$ 4 times). But overall there is a preference for the digraph, especially towards the end of the manuscript: $\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{O}\mathfrak{Y}$ occurs 71%

expresses long vowels. The alternative hypothesis is that the doubling of a vowel indicates a vowel plus a glottal stop. I have followed the reconstructions of Peust for this project, therefore, for the sake of consistency, I am treating the doubling of a vowel as a long vowel, as in the case of $\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{E}\mathfrak{E}\mathfrak{Y}\mathfrak{E}$ /'mɛ:.wə/. In Sahidic this situation does not include the doubled vowel-glides, as in the cases of $\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{O}\mathfrak{Y}\mathfrak{O}\mathfrak{Y}\mathfrak{T}$ /'muwt/ and $\mathfrak{Z}(\mathfrak{E})\mathfrak{I}(\mathfrak{E})\mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{B}$ /'hjiβ/. Cf Peust (1999), p. 214 n. 242: “ $\mathfrak{O}\mathfrak{Y}\mathfrak{O}\mathfrak{Y}$ in $\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{O}\mathfrak{Y}\mathfrak{O}\mathfrak{Y}\mathfrak{T}$ is to be interpreted as /uw/, as is evident both from the etymology (*mut*) and from the status pronominalis of the verb ($\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{O}\mathfrak{O}\mathfrak{Y}\mathfrak{T}$ - /'mɔwt/; n. 241 “ $(\mathfrak{E})\mathfrak{I}(\mathfrak{E})$ in dialects other than Akhmimic do not denote a long vowel eg. $\mathfrak{Z}\mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{E}\mathfrak{T}$ “pit” < Demotic *hyt* is probably /'hjit/.” Nevertheless, caution is advised regarding such reconstructions based on etymology since we know little about apophonic transformations of Egyptian words throughout millennia.

77 Crum (1939), p. 635a: pl. $\mathfrak{Z}\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{E}(\mathfrak{E})\mathfrak{Y}$, $\mathfrak{Z}\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{E}\mathfrak{O}\mathfrak{Y}$ *S*.

78 Crum (1939), p. 212b: $\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{Z}\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{Y}$, $-\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{O}\mathfrak{Y}$, $\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{Y}\mathfrak{E}-$ *S*.

79 Crum (1939), p. 799b: $\mathfrak{X}\mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{X}\mathfrak{E}\mathfrak{E}\mathfrak{Y}$, $\mathfrak{X}\mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{X}\mathfrak{E}\mathfrak{E}\mathfrak{Y}\mathfrak{E}$, $\mathfrak{X}\mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{X}\mathfrak{E}\mathfrak{O}\mathfrak{Y}$ (old MSS), $\mathfrak{X}\mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{X}\mathfrak{E}\mathfrak{E}\mathfrak{Y}$, $\mathfrak{X}\mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{X}\mathfrak{E}\mathfrak{E}\mathfrak{Y}\mathfrak{E}$, $\mathfrak{X}\mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{X}\mathfrak{E}\mathfrak{Y}\mathfrak{E}$ *S*.

80 $\mathfrak{X}\mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{X}\mathfrak{E}\mathfrak{O}\mathfrak{Y}$ (*BL Deut.* 1.42, 6.19, 7.15, 12.10, 20.1, 20.3, 20.4, 23.9, 25.19, 28.25, 28.31, 28.48, 28.68, 30.7, 32.27 x2, 32.31, 32.41, 32.43, 33.29); $\mathfrak{X}\mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{X}\mathfrak{E}\mathfrak{O}\mathfrak{Y}$ (*BL Deut.* 33.7); $\mathfrak{X}\mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{X}\mathfrak{E}\mathfrak{O}\mathfrak{Y}\mathfrak{E}$ (*BL Deut.* 33.11).

81 Cf. Ghica (2006), p. 234; Funk (1995b), p. 39; Quecke (1984a), p. 43: $\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{O}\mathfrak{Y}\mathfrak{O}\mathfrak{O}$ 13 times and once $\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{Y}\mathfrak{O}\mathfrak{O}$ (*John* 14.49).

and $\text{H}\hat{\Upsilon}$ ($\text{H}\Upsilon$) 29%.⁸² The significant exception occurs with the lexeme $\text{ΤΗ}\hat{\Upsilon}\text{Τ}\bar{\text{N}}$ ($\text{ΤΗ}\Upsilon\text{Τ}\bar{\text{N}}$) which occurs 15 times, and $\text{ΤΗ}\text{O}\Upsilon\text{Τ}\bar{\text{N}}$ (*Isa.* 55.12) only once.⁸³ The line break here suggests a syntagmatic resyllabification, /'te.u.t̃/. In most cases where the single upsilon is used it carries a circumflex, $\text{H}\hat{\Upsilon}$, occasionally $\text{H}\bar{\Upsilon}$. The circumflex is also used at times in *BL Deut.* ($\text{Τ}\bar{\text{B}}\text{B}\text{H}\hat{\Upsilon}$ (*Deut.* 23.10), $\text{Τ}\lambda\chi\text{P}\text{H}\hat{\Upsilon}$ (*Deut.* 33.28)), but once again, at the end of the manuscript, added by a later hand, where its function is questionable. Like *P.Bodm.* 23, variation is characteristic of *BL Deut.* and *Jon.*, with the digraph taking priority.⁸⁴

On the other hand, *BL Acts* and *P.Bodm.* 18 almost exclusively employ the upsilon alone. The only use of the digraph in *P.Bodm.* 18 is $\text{O}\eta\text{O}\Upsilon\epsilon$ (*Deut.* 7.5), and in *Acts* it occurs only with $\text{O}\Upsilon\eta\text{O}\Upsilon$ (*Acts* 1.12, 22.21), never $\text{O}\Upsilon\text{H}\Upsilon$.

The early manuscripts clearly testify the struggle for priority of one allograph over another in this environment. In the manuscripts where the digraph predominates, variation is prevalent. In the manuscripts where the upsilon is favoured, variation is infrequent. In the classical manuscripts, the upsilon alone becomes the standard, yet the digraph persists as a variant form in the *Epistles*, but only in the case of the two plurals, $\text{z}\text{B}\text{H}\Upsilon\epsilon\sim\text{z}\text{B}\text{H}\text{O}\Upsilon\epsilon$ and $\text{π}\text{H}\Upsilon\epsilon\sim\text{π}\text{H}\text{O}\Upsilon\epsilon$, where the glide begins a syllable.⁸⁵ The scribe of *Acts*, as usual, regularly uses the now standard upsilon.

82 Cf. Appendix 4, Table 93 and 94.

83 Cf. Appendix 4, Table 93.

84 Cf. Appendix 2, Table 64 and 66.

85 Cf. Appendix 1, Table 35.

4.4 CONCLUSION

The detailed comparative typologies of the vowel-glide graphemes as rendered in the early and classical Sahidic manuscripts investigated in this study highlight the mechanism of free variation in the process of standardising the orthography of these graphemes. The 4th-5th century manuscripts are witnesses of the nascent Sahidic orthography, an orthography which was in a state of flux, no doubt influenced by several competing dialects prevalent at that time. Free variation is a characteristic feature of these early manuscripts, yet clear patterns of graphemic distribution of the vowel-glides begin to emerge in the different phonological environments, and gradually evolve to the point when, within only a century or two, they become highly standardised. These patterns of distribution can be seen in the following summary comparative tables (Tables 6 and 7) which indicate the preferred choice of allograph by each scribe in the respective environments.

Table 6: Comparative typology of the vowel-glide /i/~j/

Context	<i>Early Sahidic</i>				<i>Classical Sahidic</i>		
	<i>P.Bodm. 18</i>	<i>P.Bodm. 23</i>	<i>BL Deut./Jon.</i>	<i>BL Acts</i>	<i>CB Epistles</i>	<i>CB Acts</i>	Examples
# + V-G	ⲉⲓ	ⲉⲓ	ⲉⲓ	ⲉⲓ	ⲉⲓ	ⲉⲓ	ⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲉⲓⲱⲧ
C + V-G	ⲓ	ⲓ	ⲓ	ⲓ	ⲓ	ⲓ	ⲙⲓⲥⲉ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲓⲛⲏ
G + V	ⲉⲓ	ⲉⲓ	ⲉⲓ	ⲉⲓ	ⲉⲓ	ⲉⲓ	ⲟⲩⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲓⲉⲓⲃ
h + G#	ⲉⲓ	ⲉⲓ	ⲉⲓ	ⲓ̇	ⲓ̇	ⲓ̇	ⲏⲓ̇
o + G#	ⲉⲓ	ⲉⲓ	ⲉⲓ	ⲓ̇	ⲓ̇	ⲓ̇	ⲭⲟⲓ̇
ⲱ + G#	Ⲁ	ⲉⲓ	ⲉⲓ	ⲓ̇	ⲓ̇	ⲓ̇	ⲓ̇ⲭⲱⲓ̇
ⲟⲩ + G#	ⲓ̇	ⲉⲓ	ⲉⲓ	ⲓ̇	ⲓ̇	ⲓ̇	ⲕⲟⲩⲓ̇
ⲁ + G#	ⲓ̇	ⲓ̇~ⲉⲓ	ⲓ̇	ⲓ̇	ⲓ̇	ⲓ̇	ⲧⲁⲓ̇
ⲉ + G#	ⲉⲓ	ⲉⲓ	ⲓ̇	ⲓ̇	ⲓ̇	ⲓ̇	ⲛⲉⲓ̇-
V + GC	ⲉⲓ	ⲉⲓ	ⲉⲓ	ⲉⲓ	ⲉⲓ	ⲉⲓ	ⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ
. + GV	ⲉⲓ	ⲉⲓ	ⲓ̇~ⲉⲓ	ⲉⲓ	ⲉⲓ	ⲓ̇	ⲭⲁⲓ̇ⲉ

As can be seen in Table 5, the principal graphemes that represent the vowel /i/ are ⲉⲓ and ⲓ, and the glide /j/ is realised ⲉⲓ and ⲓ̇, except when preceded by a consonant. The choice of allograph to render the vowel-glide /i/~j/ beginning a lexeme, or following a consonant or

glide, is fixed very early in the development of Sahidic orthography. However, it is when the glide /j/ follows a vowel, at a syllable boundary, that the optionality between the graphemes becomes more prevalent, and the differences between early and classical Sahidic become more apparent. The digraph is the dominant allograph for the glide in the early manuscripts, although the iota with a trema tends to be preferred after the vowel λ . In contrast, $\ddot{\iota}$ is favoured, following all the vowels, by the later scribes. The exception to this rule concerns the use of the digraph for the glide in the ‘covered’ position which, in the 4th-5th century manuscripts, is unusually stable, and indeed, remains the standard in the later texts, the variant only used at the end of a line.

Table 7: Comparative typology of the vowel-glide /u/~w/

Context	Early Sahidic				Classical Sahidic		
	<i>P.Bodm.</i> 18	<i>P.Bodm.</i> 23	<i>BL</i> <i>Deut./Jon.</i>	<i>BL Acts</i>	<i>CB</i> <i>Epistles</i>	<i>CB Acts</i>	Examples
# + V-G	oY	oY	oY	oY	oY	oY	oY $\overline{\text{N}}$ AM
C + V-G	oY	oY	oY	oY	oY	oY	MOY
o + G	oY	oY	oY	oY	oY	oY	MOOY
ω + G	oY	oY	oY	oY	oY	oY	τωoY $\overline{\text{N}}$
i + G	oY	oY	oY	oY	oY	oY	χioY $\overline{\text{E}}$
oY + G	∅	∅	oY	oY	oY	oY	nanOY $\overline{\text{E}}$ oY
h + G	Y	oY	oY	Y	Y	Y	τHYτ $\overline{\text{N}}$
λ + G	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	hAY
ε + G	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	πEY-
oo + G	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	χoo $\overline{\text{E}}$ Y

The distribution of the allographs realising the vowel-glide /u/~w/ is less complex (cf. Table 7). The vowel is rendered by the digraph oY. The glide is also written with the digraph except after the vowels λ, ε, and oo where the single upsilon Y is employed. The choice between the two graphemes occurs when the glide follows the vowel h, in which case the early scribes fluctuate between the two allographs, the digraph finally yielding to the upsilon in the classical period. The circumflex which occurs quite frequently in early Sahidic, although it continues to exist to some extent in the classical manuscripts with the /i/~j/ digraph (ēi), disappears from the allographs expressing /u/~w/ (ōY and Y).

Of the early manuscripts, the book of *Acts*, the last biblical book in the British Library codex, most reflects the classical standard in terms of the graphemic distribution of the vowel-glides. The progression from the glide /j/ being rendered by the digraph to being superseded by the iota with the trema is striking when comparing the texts of *Deuteronomy* and *Jonah* with that of *Acts*, especially since these texts are part of one codex, although written some time apart. The dating of this codex was originally attributed to the mid-4th century by Kenyon⁸⁶ and Hebbelynck,⁸⁷ but more recently, Orsini⁸⁸ has brought forward the *terminus ante quem* to the mid-5th century. The orthography of the vowel-glides in *Acts* may provide further evidence to confirm Orsini's conclusion of a later date.

These graphemic elements typical of the early manuscripts, particularly the frequent use of the digraph for the glide /j/, persisted in the Chester Beatty collection, being most evident in the *Epistles*. The codex which contains the *Epistles* is dated by Orsini to 500-550 CE, and that of *Acts* to 525-574 CE,⁸⁹ both, it is argued, having been produced in the same scriptorium in the monastery of Apa Jeremiah at Saqqara.⁹⁰ As such, the comparison of the vowel-glides in these two codices sheds light on the dynamics of standardisation. The optionality of the various graphic forms observed in the *Epistles*, on the one hand, reflects the situation displayed in the earlier manuscripts, but on the other hand, points to a resolution indicated in the standardised 'rules' of distribution as represented in *Acts*, where the variant forms have been to a large extent eliminated.

86 Budge (1912), p. lxiii.

87 Hebbelynck and Thompson (1921), p. 80.

88 Orsini (2008), p. 133-134.

89 Orsini (2008), p. 138-139.

90 Thompson (1932), p. ix.

5. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The predominant theme which has emerged from this investigation of scribal orthographic practice, specifically in relation to graphemic realisations of the vowel-glides, is the relative degree of regularity and variation exhibited in the early and classical Sahidic manuscripts. The synchronic approach complemented by a diachronic one applied to this study has highlighted the dynamics of orthographic change in the Sahidic literary manuscripts from the 4th to the late 6th century in Egypt, and reveals the active influence of the transmitters of the texts, the scribal hands. Free variation can be seen to be the vehicle by which the written language became standardised, in that certain variant forms prevailed into the 6th century, while others were abandoned. What was free variation in the 4th and 5th centuries, as these manuscripts reveal, became regular variation in the classical period, as strict orthographic rules are imposed in the strengthening monastic scriptoria. Yet language never stands still, and the mechanism of free variation persists, even in a highly standardised orthography such as that displayed in the Chester Beatty codices.

This thesis has sought to furnish a secure methodology for future studies on Coptic orthography and to provide a detailed collection of data on two orthographic elements, the graphemic realisations of the two vowel-glides in Sahidic. It is my hope that these data will serve as reliable *comparanda* for further linguistic analyses of early Sahidic manuscripts, most particularly, the Sahidic manuscripts of the Nag Hammadi codices.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Almond, M. (2010), “Language Change in Greek Loaned Verbs”, *Lingua Aegyptia* 18, 19-31.
- Böhlig, A. (1954), *Die griechischen Lehnwörter in sahidischen und bohairischen Neuen Testament*, Munich.
- Boud’hors, A. (2006), “Paléographie et codicologie coptes: progrès et perspectives (1996–2004),” in A. Boud’hors and D. Vaillancourt (eds.), *Huitième congrès international d’études coptes (Paris, 2004) I Bilans et perspectives 2000–2004*, Paris, 95-109.
- Budge, E.A.W. (1912), *Coptic Biblical Texts in the Dialect of Upper Egypt*, London.
- (1920), *By Nile and Tigris*, vol. 2, London.
- Cherix, P. (1994), *Les variantes coptes non sahidiques classiques attestées dans le Codex Cairensis Gnosticus VI: essai de typologie*, Lausanne.
- Clark, J., Yallop, C. and Fletcher, J. (2007), *An Introduction to Phonetics and Phonology*, 3rd edn., Oxford.
- Croft, W. (2000), *Explaining Language Change: an Evolutionary Approach*, Harlow, England.
- Crum, W.E. (1939), *A Coptic Dictionary*, Oxford.
- Depuydt, L. (1993), “On Coptic Sounds”, *Orientalia (Nova Series)* 63, 338-375.
- Emmel, S. (1991), “Nag Hammadi Library”, in A.S. Atiya (ed.), *The Coptic Encyclopedia*, vol. 6, New York, 1771-1773.
- (1993), “Recent Progress in Coptic Codicology and Paleography (1988-1992),” in T. Orlandi and D. W. Johnson (eds.), *Acts of the Fifth International Congress of Coptic Studies, Washington, 12-15 August, 1992*, vol. 1, Rome, 22–49.
- Fleischman, S. (2000), “Methodologies and Ideologies in Historical Linguistics: On Working with Older Languages”, in S. Herring, P. Van Reenen, and L. Schössler (eds.), *Textual Parameters in Older Languages*, Amsterdam, 33-58.
- Förster, H. (2002), *Wörterbuch der griechischen Wörter in den koptischen dokumentarischen Texten*, Berlin-New York.
- Funk, W-P. (1988), “Dialects Wanting Homes: a Numerical Approach to the Early Varieties of Coptic”, in J. Fisiak (ed), *Historical Dialectology: Regional and Social*, Berlin, 149-192.
- (1993), “Toward a Linguistic Classification of the ‘Sahidic’ Nag Hammadi Texts”, in D.W.

- Johnson (ed.), *Acts of the Fifth International Congress of Coptic Studies. Washington, 12-15 August 1992*, vol. II (*Papers from the Sections Part I*), Rome, 163-177.
- (1995a), “The Linguistic Aspect of Classifying the Nag Hammadi Codices”, in L. Painchaud and A. Pasquier (eds.), *Les textes de Nag Hammadi et le problème de leur classification: Actes du colloque tenu à Québec du 15 au 19 septembre 1993*, Quebec, 107-147.
- (1995b), “L’orthographe du manuscrit”, in P.-H. Poirier, W.-P. Funk, *Le Tonnerre, intellect parfait (NH VI,2) (BCNH, section “Textes”, 22)*, Paris, 13-53.
- (2009), “Methodological Issues in the (Morpho)phonological Description of Coptic” in G. Goldenberg and A. Shisha-Halevy (eds.), *Egyptian, Semitic and General Grammar: Studies in Memory of H.J. Polotsky*, Jerusalem, 70-91.
- Gardiner, A. (1994), *Egyptian Grammar: Being an Introduction to the Study of Hieroglyphs*, 3rd edn., Oxford.
- Ghica, V. (2006), *Les Actes de Pierre et des douze apôtres (NH VI, 1)*. Doctoral thesis, Université Laval, Quebec, and École Pratique des Hautes Études, Paris.
- Girgis W.A. (1966), “Greek Loan Words in Coptic”, *Bulletin de la Société d’archéologie copte* 18, 71-96.
- Girgis W.A. (Anba Gregorios) (2001), “Greek Loan Words in Coptic”, *Bulletin de la Société d’archéologie copte* 40, 61-88.
- Grossman, E. (2009), “Grammatical Variation and Language Change: The Case of Greek Verb Lexemes in Coptic”, paper presented to: *Beyond Free-Variation: Scribal Repertoires in Egypt from the Old Kingdom to the Early Islamic Period, 14th-16th September, 2009*, Oxford, 1-16.
- Hebbelynck, A. and Thompson, H. (1921), “L’unité et l’âge du papyrus copte biblique Or. 7594 du British Museum”, *Le Muséon* 34, 71-80.
- Hintze, F. (1980), “Zur koptischen Phonologie”, *Enchoria* 10, 23-91.
- Hintze, F. and Schenke, H.M. (1970), *Die Berliner Handschrift der sahidischen Apostelgeschichte (P.15926)*, (*Texte und Untersuchungen*, 109), Berlin.
- Kahle, P.E. (1954), *Bala’izah. Coptic Texts from Deir el-Bala’izah in Upper Egypt*, vol. 1, London.
- Kasser, R. (1960), *Papyrus Bodmer VI. Livre des Proverbes. (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium. Scriptores Coptici, tomus 27)*, Leuven.

- (1961), *Papyrus Bodmer XVI. Exode I - XV, 21 en sahidique*, Cologne-Geneva.
- (1962a), *Papyrus Bodmer XIX. Évangile de Matthieu XIV, 28 – XXVIII, 20. Épître aux Romains I, 1 – II, 3 en sahidique*, Cologne-Geneva.
- (1962b), *Papyrus Bodmer XXI. Josué VI, 16-25, VII, 6 – XI, 23, XXII, 1-2, 19 – XXIII, 7, 15 – XXIV, 23 en sahidique*, Cologne-Geneva.
- (1962c), *Papyrus Bodmer XVIII. Deutéronome I-X, 7 en sahidique*, Cologne-Geneva.
- (1964), *Papyrus Bodmer XXII et Mississippi Coptic Codex II. Jérémie XL, 3 - LII, 34. Lamentations. Épître de Jérémie. Baruch I, 1 – V, 5 en sahidique*, Cologne-Geneva.
- (1965), *Papyrus Bodmer XXIII. Esaïe XLVII, 1 – LXVI, 24 en sahidique*, Cologne-Geneva.
- (1980), “Prolégomènes à un essai de classification systématique des dialectes et subdialectes coptes selon les critères de la phonétique, I, Principes et terminologie”, *Le Muséon* 93, 53-112.
- (1982), “Syllabation rapide ou lente en copte, I. Les glides /j/ et /w/ avec leurs correspondants vocaliques ‘/i/’ et ‘/u/’ (et phonèmes appariés analogues)”, *Enchoria* 11, 23-37.
- (1983), “Ⲅⲓ ou ⲓ pour /i/ ou /j/ dans les dialectes coptes”, *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists*, 20, 123-126.
- (1988), “Status quaestionis 1988 sulla presunta origine dei cosiddetti Papiri Bodmer”, *Aegyptus* 68, 191-194.
- (1991a), “Bodmer Papyri” in A.S. Atiya (ed.), *The Coptic Encyclopedia*, vol. 1, New York, 48-53.
- (1991b), “Paleography” in A.S. Atiya. (ed.), *The Coptic Encyclopedia*, vol. 8, New York, 175-184.
- (1991c), “Vocabulary, Copto-Greek” in A.S. Atiya. (ed.), *The Coptic Encyclopedia*, vol. 8, New York, 215-222.
- (1991d), “Geography, Dialectal” in A.S. Atiya (ed.), *The Coptic Encyclopedia*, vol. 8, New York, 133-141.
- (1997), “Considérations de phonologie dialectale copte: 1. l’alphabet de S etc.”, *Le Muséon* 100, 1-32.
- Keller, R. (1994), *On Language Change: The Invisible Hand in Language*, trans. B. Nerlich, London.
- Labov, W. (1994), *Principles of Language Change*, vol.1, Oxford.

- Lass, R. (1997), *On Explaining Language Change*, Cambridge.
- Layton, B. (1974), "The Hypostasis of the Archons", *Harvard Theological Review* 67, 351-425.
- (1976), "The Hypostasis of the Archons", *Harvard Theological Review* 69, 31-101.
- (1985), "Towards a New Coptic Palaeography", in T. Orlandi and F. Wisse (eds.), *Acts of the Second International Congress of Coptic Studies. Roma, 22–26 September 1980*, Rome, 149–58.
- (1987), *Catalogue of Literary Manuscripts in the British Library Acquired since 1906*, London.
- (2004), *A Coptic Grammar. With Chrestomathy and Glossary. Sahidic Dialect*, 2nd edn., Wiesbaden.
- Loprieno, A. (1995), *Ancient Egyptian: A Linguistic Introduction*, New York.
- Metzger, B.M. and Ehrman, B.D. (2005), *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*, 4th edn., New York-Oxford.
- Mink, G. (1978), "Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft und Koptologie", in R. McL. Wilson (ed.), *The Future of Coptic Studies*, Leiden, 71-103.
- Nagel, P. (1965), "Der frühkoptische Dialekt von Theben", in *Koptologische Studien in der DDR (Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg, Sonderheft)*, 30-49.
- (1969), "Grammatische Untersuchungen zu Nag Hammadi Codex II", in Fr. Altheim and R. Stiehl (eds.), *Die Araber in der alten Welt*, vol. V/2, Berlin, 393-469.
- (1994), "Aufbau und Komposition des Papyruskodex BL Or. 7594 der British Library" in S. Giversen, M. Krause and P. Nagel (eds.) *Coptology: Past, Present, and Future: Studies in Honour of Rodolfe Kasser*, Leuven, 347-355.
- Orsini, P. (2008), "La maiuscola biblica copta", *Segno e Testo: International Journal of Manuscripts and Text Transmission* 6, 121-150.
- Peust, C. (1999), *Egyptian Phonology: An Introduction to the Phonology of a Dead Language*, Göttingen.
- Polotsky, H.J. (1957), "Review of W.C. Till, *Koptische Grammatik (saïdischer Dialekt) mit Bibliographie, Lesestücken und Wörterverzeichnissen (LSOS, 1)*, Leipzig, O. Harrassowitz, 1955", in *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 52, 219-234.
- (1970), "Coptic", in Th.A. Sebeok (ed.), *Current Trends in Linguistics*, vol. VI (Linguistics

- in South West Asia and North Africa), Hague-Paris, 558-570.
- Quecke, H. (1972), *Das Markusevangelium Saïdisch. Text der Handschrift PPalau Rib. Inv.-Nr.182 mit den Varianten der Handschrift M 569*, (*Papyrologica Castroctaviana, Studia et Textus*, 4), Barcelona.
- (1973), “Die Schreibung des ⲟϣ in koptischen Handschriften”, *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 22, 275-284.
- (1977), *Das Lukasevangelium Saïdisch. Text der Handschrift PPalau Rib. Inv.-Nr.181 mit den Varianten der Handschrift M 569*, (*Papyrologica Castroctaviana, Studia et Textus*, 6), Barcelona.
- (1984a), *Das Johannesevangelium Saïdisch. Text der Handschrift PPalau Rib. Inv.-Nr.183 mit den Varianten der Handschriften 813 und 814 der Chester Beatty Library und der Handschrift M 569*, (*Papyrologica Castroctaviana, Studia et Textus*, 11), Barcelona.
- (1984b), “Zur Schreibung von i/j in der koptischen Buchschrift”, in Fr. Junge (ed.) *Studien zu Sprache und Religion Aegyptens: Zu Ehren von Wolfhart Westendorf, überreicht von seinen Freunden und Schülern*, vol. 1 (*Sprache*), Göttingen, 289-326.
- Robinson, J.M. (2013), *The Story of the Bodmer Papyri: From the First Monastery’s Library in Upper Egypt to Geneva and Dublin*, Cambridge.
- Roquet, G. (1982), “Variation libre, tendance, durée. De quelques traits de langue dans les *Nag Hammadi Codices*”, in *Écritures et traditions dans la littérature copte. Journée d’études coptes, Strasbourg 28 mai 1982 (CBC, 1)*, Leuven, 28-36.
- Satzinger, H. (1985), “On the Origin of the Sahidic Dialect”, in T. Orlandi and F. Wisse (eds.), *Acts of the Second International Congress of Coptic Study, Roma, 22-26 September, 1980*, Rome, 307-312.
- Saussure, F. de. (1983), *Course in General Linguistics*, C. Bally, and A. Sechehaye (eds.), with cooperation of A. Riedlinger, trans. and annot. R. Harris, London.
- Schmidt, C. (1925), “Der Kolophon des Ms. orient. 7594 des Britischen Museums: eine Untersuchung zur Elias-Apokalypse” in *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Berlin, 312-321.
- Schüssler, K. (1995), *Biblia Coptica = Die koptischen Bibeltexte*, 1.1, Wiesbaden.
- (1996), *Biblia Coptica = Die koptischen Bibeltexte*, 1.2, Wiesbaden.
- (2001), *Biblia Coptica = Die koptischen Bibeltexte*, 1.3, Wiesbaden.
- Shisha-Halevy, A. (1976), “Akhmîmoid Features in Shenoute’s Idiolect”, *Le Muséon* 89, 353-

- (1991), “Sahidic”, in A.S. Atiya. (ed.), *The Coptic Encyclopedia*, vol. 8, New York, 194-202.
- Steindorff, G. (1904), *Koptische Grammatik mit Chrestomathie, Wörterverzeichnis und Literatur*, Berlin.
- Stenroos, M. (2009), “From Scribal Repertoire to Text Community: The Challenge of Variable Writing Systems”, paper presented to: *Beyond Free-Variation: Scribal Repertoires in Egypt from the Old Kingdom to the Early Islamic Period, 14th-16th September, 2009, Oxford*, 1-26.
- Stern, L. (1880), *Koptische Grammatik*, Leipzig.
- Thompson, H. (1913), *The New Biblical Papyrus. A Sahidic Version of Deuteronomy, Jonah, and Acts of the Apostles from Ms. Or. 7594 of the British Museum*, London.
- (1932), *The Coptic Version of the Acts of the Apostles and the Pauline Epistles in the Sahidic Dialect*, Cambridge.
- Till, W. (1928), *Achmîmisch-koptische Grammatik mit Chrestomathie und Wörterbuch*, Leipzig.
- (1955), *Koptische Grammatik (Saïdischer Dialekt) mit Bibliographie, Lesestücken und Wörterverzeichnissen*, Leipzig.
- Vergote, J. (1973a), *Grammaire copte*, t. 1a (*Introduction, phonétique et phonologie, morphologie synthématique [structure des sémantèmes], partie synchronique*), Leuven.
- (1973b), *Grammaire Copte*, t.1b, (*Introduction, phonétique et phonologie, morphologie synthématique [structure des sémantèmes], partie diachronique*), Leuven.
- Weinreich, U., Labov, W., and Herzog, M. (1968), “Empirical Foundations for a Theory of Language Change”, in W. P. Lehmann and Y. Malkiel, (eds.), *Directions for Historical Linguistics: a Symposium*, Austin, Texas, 95-195.
- Worrell, W.H. (1934), *Coptic Sounds*, Michigan.

APPENDICES

VOWEL-GLIDE TYPOLOGIES

APPENDIX 1: CHESTER BEATTY MSS. 813 AND 814

A. Graphemic forms of the vowel /i/ (i~e~e~i)

Table 8: Typology of the vowel /i/

Case	Syllabic Context ¹	CB Ms. 814 <i>Acts</i>	CB Ms. 813 <i>Epistles</i>	Examples
A1	#'V	ei (var. e~i)	ei (var. e~i~i)	e~ei /'i/ eipe /'i.rə/ eime /'i.nə/
A2	#(')VC	ei	ei (var. ei)	eiC- /is/
A3	(')(C)CV	i (var. ei~e~i)	i (var. ei~e~i)	xi /ci/ qi /'fi/ cei /'si/ mice /'mi.sə/ cime /'shi.mə/ pi- /pi/ (†-) /ti/ ni- /ni/
A4	(')(C)CVC(C)	i (var. ei)	i (var. ei)	nim /'nim/ kin- /kin/
A5	'(C)GV	ei	ei (var. ei)	oyei /'wi/ oyeme /'wi.nə/ zoeyete /'hwi.tə/
A6	'(C)GVC	ei (var. i)	ei (var. i)	ayei /a.'win/ woyei /'fwit/ zeib /'hjiβ/ dayeia /da.'wid/

Key

V = vowel

G = glide

C = consonant

(C) = possibility of one or more consonants

= segment boundary

' = accented syllable

. = syllable divider

Ø = no occurrences

¹ Phonological reconstructions are based on Peust (1999).

Case A1: #V V = €I (var. €Ĩ~Ĩ~Ĩ)

At the beginning of lexemes, in an open syllable, the vowel /i/ is represented by the digraph €I (var. €Ĩ):

€I~€Ĩ, €IPE~€ĨPE, €IME~€ĨME, €ING, €IBE, €IDE.

In Copto-Greek the initial vowel /i/ is also rendered with the digraph:

€IKH, €IMH, €IPHHNIKON, €ITΛ, €IMHTI, €IMHTEI
€ITE~€ĨTE, €IΔΔΛON~€ĨΔΔΛON.

€IPHHH is regularly written ⲓⲣⲏⲏⲏ with the definite article.

Note: ζΙΚΩΝ (*Rom.* 1.23) (2 *Cor.* 3.18), ΘΙΚΩΝ (*Rom.* 8.29) (1 *Cor.* 11.7, 15.49 x2) (2 *Cor.* 4.4) (*Col.* 3.10) (*Heb.* 10.1) = εἰκῶν. Cf. Case 3: /i/ following a consonant.

Use of the circumflex: The scribe of *Acts* always writes the verb €I “to come” with a line over the iota which, although similar to a superlinear stroke, most likely represents an abbreviated circumflex.² The scribe of the *Epistles* also makes use this quasi circumflex, however, less consistently and in more varied situations. Since the most frequent form in both *Acts* and the *Epistles* is the oblique line, this is the form of the circumflex which will be used for these two Chester Beatty codices (€Ĩ).

Table 9: #€I vs. €Ĩ

Standard: €I	Variant: €Ĩ
€I (<i>Acts</i> 16.13, 17.13, 18.5, 20.21, 24.1, 25.17, 25.23, 27.5) (<i>Epistles</i> : 94 occurrences) <i>Acts</i> : 5% <i>Epistles</i> : 83%	€Ĩ (<i>Acts</i> : 147 occurrences) (<i>Rom.</i> 15.24) (1 <i>Cor.</i> 7.5, 10.1, 14.23, 16.10. 16.12 x2) (2 <i>Cor.</i> 5.8, 7.6, 7.7, 8.17, 8.19) (<i>Heb.</i> 3.16) (<i>Gal.</i> 3.19, 3.23, 4.4) (<i>Phil.</i> 3.11) (1 <i>Thess.</i> 2.18) (1 <i>Tim.</i> 3.13) <i>Acts</i> : 95% <i>Epistles</i> : 17%
€IPE (<i>Acts</i> : <i>passim</i>) (<i>Epistles</i> : 76 occurrences) <i>Acts</i> : 100% <i>Epistles</i> : 94%	€ĨPE (<i>Acts</i> : Ø) (<i>Rom.</i> 1.9) (1 <i>Cor.</i> 9.23, 9.27) (2 <i>Cor.</i> 8.24) (<i>Phil.</i> 1.4) <i>Acts</i> : 0% <i>Epistles</i> : 6%
€IME (<i>Acts</i> : <i>passim</i>) (<i>Epistles</i> : 45 occurrences) <i>Acts</i> : 100% <i>Epistles</i> : 98%	€ĨME (<i>Acts</i> : Ø) (2 <i>Cor.</i> 3.2) <i>Acts</i> : 0% <i>Epistles</i> : 2%
€ITE (€ĨTE) (<i>Acts</i> : Ø) (<i>Epistles</i> : 60 occurrences) <i>Acts</i> : Ø <i>Epistles</i> : 97%	€ĨTE (<i>Acts</i> : Ø) (2 <i>Cor.</i> 12.2 x2) <i>Acts</i> : Ø <i>Epistles</i> : 3%

² The only other instance of this scribe’s use of the circumflex with the digraph is occasionally at the end of the following lexemes: ἀρχεῖ (*Acts* 1.22, 8.35, 10.37, 18.26), ἐπικαλεῖ (*Acts* 7.59), ἐγκαλεῖ (*Acts* 26.2), and κεῖ (*Acts* 27.38).

Standard: ει	Variant: εἰ
ΕΙΛΩΛΟΝ (εἰδωλον) (<i>Acts: passim</i>) <i>(Rom. 2.22) (1 Cor. 5.10, 6.9, 8.1, 8.4, 8.10, 10.7, 10.14, 10.19, 12.2) (2 Cor. 6.16) (Gal. 5.20) (Eph. 5.5) (Col. 3.5) (1 Thess. 1.9)</i> <i>Acts: 100% Epistles: 80%</i>	Εἰλωλον (<i>Acts: Ø</i>) (<i>1 Cor. 10.19</i>) Εἰλωλον (<i>1 Cor. 5.11, 8.4, 8.10</i>) <i>Acts: 0% Epistles: 20%</i>

With a preformative clitic: This rule is observed even when preceded by a preformative segment, with the following exceptions in the *Epistles* where the epsilon is omitted when preceded by the definite article.

Table 10: Definite article + #ει vs. ι

Standard: ει	Variant: ι
ΠΕΙΡΕ (<i>Epistles: Ø</i>) <i>Acts: Ø Epistles: 0%</i>	ΠΙΡΕ (<i>2 Cor. 8.10</i>) “the doing” <i>Acts: Ø Epistles: 100%</i>
ΠΕΙΝΕ (<i>Rom. 5.14</i>) (<i>Heb. 1.3</i>) (<i>Phil. 3.21</i>) <i>Acts: Ø Epistles: 60%</i>	ΠΙΝΕ (<i>Heb. 7.15</i>) “the likeness” ΠΙΝΕΙ (<i>Rom. 6.5</i>) <i>Acts: Ø Epistles: 40%</i>
ΠΕΙΛΩΛΟΝ (<i>Acts 7.41</i>) <i>Acts: 100% Epistles: 0%</i> Note: ΠΕΙΛΩΛΟΝ (<i>Acts 15.20, 15.29</i>) <i>(Rom. 2.22) (1 Cor. 8.1, 8.4, 8.10, 12.2) (2 Cor. 6.16) (1 Thess. 1.9)</i>	ΠΙλωλον (<i>1 Cor. 8.7</i>) <i>Acts: 0% Epistles: 100%</i>

Biblical names/proper nouns: The exception to this rule occurs with biblical names where *ῑ* is regular:

Ἰσαακ, Ἰσακ, Ἰσραηλιτης, Ἰσσαι (*Acts 13.22*) for Ἰεσσαί.

The trema is always omitted when the singular definite article is cliticised:

πισραηλ, πῑηλ.

Case A2 #(')VC **V = ει** (var. **εἰ**)

There is only one example of the vowel in this domain, and on one occasion the digraph carries a circumflex:

εἰς-, εἰς- (*Heb. 2.13*).

Case A3: '(C)CV and CV V = 1 (var. $\epsilon_1 \sim \epsilon_1$)

When the vowel /i/ follows a consonant, in an open syllable, it is generally realised by the grapheme **i**. For example:

χ_1 , q_1 , MICE , ZITM , CZIME , XICE , CMINE , WINE , SINE , PI- , (I-) , NI- .

Variation: The exception to this rule occurs with the lexeme `cEI` which is consistently written with the digraph:

$\mathfrak{c}\epsilon\mathfrak{i}$ (*Rom.* 15.24) (*Col.* 2.23); $\mathfrak{c}\epsilon\mathfrak{i}$ (*Acts* 27.38) (*Phil.* 4.12) [Crum (1939), p. 316b: $\mathfrak{c}\epsilon\mathfrak{i}$, $\mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{i}$].

Note Crum's entry for the following:

- **επισα** (*Acts* 7.43) [Crum (1939), p. 313a: **σα**, *Σεπεισα*, *Ac 7 43 Σεπισα*];
- **πι** (*Acts* 20.37) (*Rom.* 16.16) (*I Cor.* 16.20) (*2 Cor.* 13.12) (*I Thess.* 5.26) [Crum (1939), p. 260a: **πει** (*S*), **πι** (*SAF*) “kiss”];
- **πιρ** (*Acts* 26.13) [Crum (1939), p. 267a: **πειρε**, **πιρε** (*S*); 267b: **νταχιπιρ** (l. -ρε) *Mor* 40, 37 (*S*)].

The variants $\epsilon\iota\sim\epsilon\dot{\iota}$ occur almost exclusively in the *Epistles*, and often appear at the end of a line.

Table 11: C + 1 vs. $\epsilon_1 \sim \epsilon_1'$

Standard: ι	Variant: ει~ει̃
<p>Ϡι (<i>Acts</i>: 62 occurrences) (<i>Epistles</i>: 129 occurrences)</p> <p><i>Acts</i>: 100% <i>Epistles</i>: 93%</p>	<p>Ⲫⲉι (<i>Rom.</i> 1.27) (<i>Gal.</i> 3.2) (2 <i>Cor.</i> 1.15) Ⲫⲉι (<i>Rom.</i> 9.33) (1 <i>Cor.</i> 3.14, 6.7, 7.2) (<i>Heb.</i> 13.11) Ⲫⲉ̣̅̇ι (<i>I Cor.</i> 11.8) <i>Acts</i>: 0% <i>Epistles</i>: 7%</p>
<p>ϡι (<i>Acts</i>: 13 occurrences) (<i>Epistles</i>: 40 occurrences)</p> <p><i>Acts</i>: 100% <i>Epistles</i>: 93%</p>	<p>ϡⲉι (<i>I Cor.</i> 5.2) ϡⲉι (2 <i>Tim.</i> 2.16) ϡⲉ̣̅̇ι (<i>Eph.</i> 4.14) <i>Acts</i>: 0% <i>Epistles</i>: 7%</p>
<p>ⲛι “thresh, beat” (<i>I Cor.</i> 9.9, 9.10) <i>Acts</i>: Ø <i>Epistles</i>: 67%</p>	<p>ⲛⲉι (<i>I Tim.</i> 5.18) <i>Acts</i>: Ø <i>Epistles</i>: 33%</p>
<p>ⲛⲓⲧⲏ̄/ⲛⲓⲧⲏ̅ (<i>Acts</i>: 66 occurrences) (<i>Epistles</i>: 244 occurrences) <i>Acts</i>: 100% <i>Epistles</i>: 98.8%</p>	<p>ⲛⲉⲓⲧⲏ̅ (<i>Gal.</i> 3.19) – rubbing on the ε ⲛⲉⲓⲧⲏ̅ (<i>I Cor.</i> 1.10) ⲛⲉⲓⲧⲏ̅ (2 <i>Cor.</i> 1.4) <i>Acts</i>: 0% <i>Epistles</i>: 1.2%</p>
<p>ⲛⲓⲁⲟϥ (<i>Acts</i> 16.24) (<i>Rom.</i> 7.22) (1 <i>Cor.</i> 5.12) (2 <i>Cor.</i> 4.16, 7.6) <i>Acts</i>: 100% <i>Epistles</i>: 80%</p>	<p>ⲛⲉⲓⲁⲟϥ (<i>Eph.</i> 3.17) <i>Acts</i>: 0% <i>Epistles</i>: 20%</p>
<p>ⲡⲉⲑⲓⲣⲟϥ≠ (<i>Rom.</i> 13.9, 13.10, 15.2) (1 <i>Cor.</i> 6.1) (<i>Eph.</i> 4.25) <i>Acts</i>: Ø <i>Epistles</i>: 83%</p>	<p>ⲡⲉⲑⲉⲓⲣⲟϥⲕ (<i>Gal.</i> 5.14) <i>Acts</i>: Ø <i>Epistles</i>: 17%</p>

Standard: ⲓ	Variant: ⲉⲓ~ⲉ̀
ⲛⲟⲩ <i>(Acts: 168 occurrences)</i> <i>(Epistles: 117 occurrences)</i> <i>Acts: 100% Epistles: 99.2%</i>	ⲛⲟⲩ̀ (2 Tim. 3.17) <i>Acts: 0% Epistles: .8%</i>
1 st person singular of the Temporal conjugation ⲛⲓⲧⲉⲣⲓ- (<i>Acts</i> 11.15, 22.11, 22.17, 23.27, 24.20, 25.15) <i>(1 Cor. 2.1, 13.11) (2 Cor. 2.12, 2.13, 11.9) (Gal. 2.14) (Phil. 4.15)</i> <i>Acts: 86% Epistles: 100%</i>	ⲛⲓⲧⲉⲣⲉⲓ- (<i>Acts</i> 22.6) <i>Acts: 14% Epistles: 0%</i>

Words of Greek origin:

a) Greek **ⲓ** is generally rendered with Sahidic **ⲓ**. Variation occurs in the *Epistles* in the following:

Table 12: Greek **ⲓ**: C + **ⲓ** vs. **ⲉⲓ~ⲉ̀**

Standard: ⲓ > ⲓ	Variant: ⲓ > ⲉⲓ~ⲉ̀
ⲉ̀ⲧⲓ ⲉⲧⲓ (<i>Acts</i> 2.26, 9.1, 10.44) <i>(Heb. 11.4)</i> <i>Acts: 100% Epistles: 7%</i>	ⲉⲧⲉⲓ (<i>Rom.</i> 5.6, 5.8) (<i>1 Cor.</i> 3.3, 12.31) (<i>2 Cor.</i> 1.10) (<i>Heb.</i> 7.10, 7.15, 9.8, 11.36, 12.26, 12.27) ⲉⲧⲉ̀ (<i>1 Cor.</i> 15.17) (<i>Heb.</i> 10.37) <i>Acts: 0% Epistles: 93%</i>
ⲙⲉ̀ⲧⲓ ⲙⲉⲧⲓ (<i>Acts</i> 10.47) <i>(2 Cor. 12.18)</i> ⲉ̀ⲓ ⲙⲉ̀ⲧⲓ ⲉⲓⲙⲉⲧⲓ (<i>Acts</i> 8.31, 11.19, 15.1, 17.21, 24.21, 27.22) <i>Acts: 100% Epistles: 5%</i>	ⲙⲉⲧⲉⲓ (<i>2 Cor.</i> 1.17, 3.1) ⲉⲓⲙⲉⲧⲉⲓ (<i>Rom.</i> 7.7, 13.1, 14.14) (<i>1 Cor.</i> 2.11, 7.5, 12.3, 15.36) (<i>2 Cor.</i> 2.2, 12.5, 12.13, 13.5) (<i>Heb.</i> 3.18) (<i>Gal.</i> 1.7, 2.16, 6.14) (<i>Phil.</i> 4.15) (<i>1 Tim.</i> 5.19) (<i>2 Tim.</i> 2.5) <i>Acts: 0% Epistles: 95%</i>
ⲟ̀ⲧⲓ ⲟⲧⲓ (<i>Acts</i> 4.16) <i>(2 Cor. 11.21)</i> <i>Acts: 100 % Epistles: 33%</i>	ⲟⲩⲭ ⲟⲧⲉⲓ (<i>2 Cor.</i> 1.24) (<i>Phil.</i> 4.17) <i>Acts: 0 % Epistles: 67%</i>
ⲉ̀ⲡⲓⲑⲙⲉ̀ⲱ ⲉ̀ⲡⲓⲑⲙⲓ (<i>Acts</i> 20.33) <i>(Rom. 7.7, 13.9) (1 Cor. 10.6) (1 Tim. 3.1)</i> ⲉ̀ⲡⲓⲑⲙⲉⲓ (<i>1 Cor.</i> 10.6) (<i>Gal.</i> 5.17) <i>Acts: 100% Epistles: 86%</i>	ⲉ̀ⲡⲉⲓⲑⲙⲓ (<i>Heb.</i> 6.11) <i>Acts: 0% Epistles: 14%</i>
ⲁ̀ⲃⲓⲕⲟⲥ ⲁ̀ⲃⲓⲕⲟⲥ (<i>Acts</i> 24.15) <i>(Rom. 3.5)</i> <i>Acts: 100% Epistles: 50%</i>	ⲁ̀ⲃⲉⲓⲕⲟⲥ (<i>Heb.</i> 6.10) <i>Acts: 0% Epistles: 50%</i>

b) Greek ει is also generally rendered with Sahidic ι. Variation occurs in the following:

Table 13: Greek ει: C + ι vs. ει~ει (excluding verb endings)

Standard: ει > ι	Variant: ει > ει
ἐπειδή ΕΠΙΔΗ (<i>1 Cor.</i> 1.22) <i>Acts: 0% Epistles: 20%</i>	ΕΠΕΙΔΗ (<i>Acts</i> 13.46, 14.12, 15.24) (<i>1 Cor.</i> 1.21, 15.21) (<i>Heb.</i> 2.14) (<i>Phil.</i> 2.26) <i>Acts: 100% Epistles: 80%</i>
συνείδησις CΥΝΙΔΗCIC (<i>Rom.</i> 2.15, 9.1, 13.5) (<i>1 Cor.</i> 8.7, 8.10, 8.12, 10.25 10.27, 10.28, 10.29 x2) (<i>2 Cor.</i> 1.12, 4.2) (<i>Heb.</i> 9.9, 9.14, 10.2, 10.22, 13.18) (<i>1 Tim.</i> 1.5, 3.9, 4.2) (<i>2 Tim.</i> 1.3) (<i>Titus</i> 1.15) <i>Acts: 0% Epistles: 100%</i>	CΥΝΕΙΔΗCIC (<i>Acts</i> 23.1, 24.16) CΙΝΗΔΗCIC (<i>1 Tim.</i> 1.19) <i>Acts: 100% Epistles: 0%</i>
ἀντικείμενος ΑΝΤΙΚΙΜΕΝΟC (<i>1 Cor.</i> 16.9) <i>Acts: Ø Epistles: 50%</i>	ΑΝΤΙΚΕΙΜΕΝΟC (<i>2 Thess.</i> 2.4) <i>Acts: Ø Epistles: 50%</i>

c) In the case of contract verb endings -έω/-έομαι (imperative -ει; infinitive -εῖν, -εῖσθαι), there is strong optionality between the two allographs ι and ει~ει. Following a vowel, ι is always used (cf. Case B5).

Greek ει > Sahidic ι:

ΑΠΟΡΙ (*Acts* 2.12, 5.24, 10.17, 25.20); ΑΠΟΡΙ (*2 Cor.* 4.8 x2) ἀπορέω;
 ΑCΚΙ (*Acts* 24.16) ἀσκέω;
 ΑCΧΥΜΟΝΙ (*1 Cor.* 13.5) ἀσχημονέω;
 ΑΤΑΚΤΙ (*2 Thess.* 3.7) ἀτακτέω;
 ΒΟΗΘΙ (*Acts* 16.9, 21.28) (*2 Cor.* 6.2) (*Heb.* 2.18) βοηθέω;
 ΕΥΧΑΡΙCΤΙ (*Acts* 27.35, 28.15) εὐχαριστέω;
 ΚΑΤΑΦΡΟΝΙ (*Rom.* 2.4) (*1 Cor.* 11.22) (*Heb.* 12.2) (*1 Tim.* 4.12, 5.12, 6.2) (*Titus* 2.15)
 καταφρονέω;
 ΚΑΤΗΓΟΡΙ (*Acts* 22.30, 24.2, 24.8, 24.13, 24.19, 25.5, 25.11, 25.16, 28.19)
 κατηγορέω;
 ΚΛΗΡΟΝΟΜΙ (*1 Cor.* 6.9, 6.10, 15.50 x2) (*Heb.* 1.4, 1.14, 6.12, 12.17) (*Gal.* 4.30, 5.21)
 κληρονομέω;
 ΚΟCΜΙ (*1 Tim.* 2.9, 3.2) (*Titus* 2.10) κοσμέω;
 CΥΜΦΩΝΙ (*Acts* 15.15) συμφονέω;
 CΥΝΕΥΔΟΚΙ (*Acts* 8.1, 22.20) συνευδοκέω;
 ΤΙΜΩΡΙ (*Acts* 22.5); ΔΙΜΩΡΙ (*Acts* 26.11) τιμωρέω;

φορι (*Rom.* 13.4) (*1 Cor.* 15.49 x2) φορέω;

χορηγι (*Gal.* 3.5) χορηγέω.

Greek ει > Sahidic ει:

αμελει (*Heb.* 2.3, 8.9) (*1 Tim.* 4.14) ἀμελέω;

αθετει (*1 Cor.* 1.19) (*Heb.* 10.28) (*Gal.* 2.21, 3.15) (*1 Thess.* 4.8 x2) ἄθετέω;

καθηγει (*Acts* 18.25) (*1 Cor.* 14.19) (*Gal.* 6.6); καθηκει (*Gal.* 6.6) καθηγέομαι;

καταλλαι (*Rom.* 1.30) καταλαλέω;

παρτηρει (*Gal.* 4.10) παρατηρέω;

But: απιλη³ (*Acts* 4.21) ἀπειλέω or ἀπείλω (απιλη (*Acts* 9.1) where it is a noun ἀπειλή).

Table 14: Greek ει: C + ι vs. ει~ει (verb endings)

Standard: ει > ι	Variant: ει > ει~ει
<p>παρακαλέω</p> <p>ΠΑΡΑΚΑΛΙ (<i>Rom.</i> 16.17) (<i>2 Cor.</i> 12.18) (<i>2 Thess.</i> 3.12) (<i>1 Tim.</i> 2.1)</p>	<p>ΠΑΡΑΚΑΛΕΙ (<i>Acts</i> 16.39)</p> <p>(<i>Rom.</i> 12.1, 12.8) (<i>1 Cor.</i> 1.10, 4.13, 4.16, 16.12, 16.15) (<i>2 Cor.</i> 2.8, 6.1, 7.6 x2, 8.6, 10.1) (<i>Heb.</i> 3.13, 10.25, 13.19, 13.22) (<i>Eph.</i> 4.1, 6.22) (<i>Phil.</i> 4.2) (<i>Col.</i> 4.8) (<i>1 Thess.</i> 4.1, 4.10, 4.18, 5.11, 5.14) (<i>2 Thess.</i> 2.17) (<i>1 Tim.</i> 5.1, 6.2) (<i>Titus</i> 2.6) (<i>Philem</i> 9, 10)</p> <p>ΠΑΡΑΚΑΛΕΙ (Phil. 4.2) (<i>Titus</i> 2.15)</p> <p>ΠΑΡΑΚΑ ΛΕΙ or ΠΑΡΑΚΑ ΛΙ (<i>Rom.</i> 15.30)</p>
<p>ἐπικαλέω</p>	<p>ΕΠΙΚΑΛΕΙ (<i>Acts</i> 9.14, 9.21, 22.16, 25.11, 25.25, 28.19)</p> <p>ΕΠΙΚΑΛΕΙ (Acts 7. 59, 15.17, 25.12, 25.21, 26.32)</p> <p>ΕΠΙΚΑΛΕΙ (<i>Rom.</i> 10.12, 10.13, 10.14) (<i>1 Cor.</i> 1.2) (<i>2 Cor.</i> 1.23) (<i>Heb.</i> 11.16) (<i>2 Tim.</i> 2.22)</p>
<p>ἐγκαλέω</p>	<p>ΕΓΚΑΛΕΙ (<i>Acts</i> 23.28, 23.29, 26.7)</p> <p>ΕΓΚΑΛΕΙ (Acts 26.2)</p>
<p>προκαλέω</p> <p><i>Acts:</i> 0% <i>Epistles:</i> 9%</p>	<p>ΠΡΟΚΑΛΕΙ (<i>Gal.</i> 5.26)</p> <p><i>Acts:</i> 100% <i>Epistles:</i> 91%</p>
<p>κοινωνέω</p> <p>ΚΟΙΝΩΝΙ (<i>Rom.</i> 12.13, 15.27) (<i>Heb.</i> 2.14) (<i>Gal.</i> 6.6) (<i>Eph.</i> 5.11) (<i>1 Tim.</i> 5.22)</p> <p><i>Acts:</i> 0 <i>Epistles:</i> 86%</p>	<p>ΚΟΙΝΩΝΕΙ (<i>Phil.</i> 4.14)</p> <p>ΚΟΙΝΩ ΝΕΙ or ΚΟΙΝΩ ΝΙ (<i>Phil.</i> 4.15)</p> <p><i>Acts:</i> 0 <i>Epistles:</i> 14%</p>

³ Girgis (1966), p.79 § 6 η for ι.

Standard: ει > ι	Variant: ει > ει-ει
<p>διακονέω ΔΙΑΚΟΝΙ (<i>Acts</i> 6.2, 19.22) (<i>Rom.</i> 15.25) (2 <i>Cor.</i> 3.3, 8.19, 8.20, 11.8) (<i>Heb.</i> 6.10 x2) (<i>1 Tim.</i> 3.13) <i>Acts:</i> 100% <i>Epistles:</i> 89%</p>	<p>ΔΙΑΚΟΝΕΙ (<i>1 Tim.</i> 3.10) <i>Acts:</i> 0% <i>Epistles:</i> 11%</p>
<p>ἐνηργέω ΕΝΕΡΓΙ (<i>1 Cor.</i> 12.6, 12.11) (2 <i>Cor.</i> 1.6) (<i>Heb.</i> 4.12) (<i>Gal.</i> 5.6) (<i>Eph.</i> 2.2) (<i>Phil.</i> 2.13) (<i>Col.</i> 1.29) (2 <i>Thess.</i> 2.7) (<i>Philem</i> 6) <i>Acts:</i> Ø <i>Epistles:</i> 50%</p>	<p>ΕΝΕΡΓΕΙ (<i>Rom.</i> 7.5) (<i>1 Cor.</i> 16.9) (2 <i>Cor.</i> 4.12) (<i>Gal.</i> 2.8 x2, 3.5) (<i>Eph.</i> 1.11, 1.20, 3.20) (<i>1 Thess.</i> 2.13) <i>Acts:</i> Ø <i>Epistles:</i> 50%</p>
<p>λυπέω ΛΥΠΗ (2 <i>Cor.</i> 7.8, 7.9 x3, 7.11) (<i>1 Thess.</i> 4.13) <i>Acts:</i> Ø <i>Epistles:</i> 37%</p>	<p>ΛΥΠΕΙ (<i>Rom.</i> 14.15) (2 <i>Cor.</i> 2.2 x2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.7, 6.10, 7.8) (<i>Eph.</i> 4.30) <i>Acts:</i> Ø <i>Epistles:</i> 63%</p>
<p>προσκαρτερέω ΠΡΟΣΚΑΡΤΕΡΗ (<i>Acts</i> 1.14, 2.42, 2.46, 8.13, 10.7) (<i>Rom.</i> 12.12) (<i>Col.</i> 4.2) <i>Acts:</i> 100% <i>Epistles:</i> 67%</p>	<p>ΠΡΟΣΚΑΡΤΕΡΕΙ (<i>Rom.</i> 13.6) <i>Acts:</i> 0% <i>Epistles:</i> 33%</p>
<p>ὁμολογέω ΟΜΟΛΟΓΗ (<i>Acts</i> 7.17, 23.8, 24.14) (<i>Rom.</i> 10.9) (<i>1 Tim.</i> 6.12) (<i>Titus</i> 1.6) <i>Acts:</i> 100% <i>Epistles:</i> 50%</p>	<p>ΟΜΟΛΟΓΕΙ (<i>Rom.</i> 10.10) (<i>Heb.</i> 11.13, 13.15) <i>Acts:</i> 0% <i>Epistles:</i> 50%</p>
<p>ἐξομολογέομαι ΕΞΟΜΟΛΟΓΗ (<i>Acts</i> 19.18) <i>Acts:</i> 100 % <i>Epistles:</i> 0%</p>	<p>ΕΞΟΜΟΛΟΓΕΙ (<i>Rom.</i> 14.11) (<i>Phil.</i> 2.11) <i>Acts:</i> 0 % <i>Epistles:</i> 100%</p>
<p>καταργέω ΚΑΤΑΡΓΗ (<i>Rom.</i> 3.3, 3.31, 6.6) <i>Acts:</i> Ø <i>Epistles:</i> 60%</p>	<p>ΚΑΤΑΡΓΕΙ (<i>1 Cor.</i> 1.28) (2 <i>Thess.</i> 2.8) <i>Acts:</i> Ø <i>Epistles:</i> 40%</p>
<p>ἐπιθυμέω ΕΠΙΘΥΜΗ (<i>Acts</i> 20.33) (<i>Rom.</i> 7.7, 13.9) (<i>1 Cor.</i> 10.6) (<i>1 Tim.</i> 3.1) ΕΠΕΙΘΥΜΗ (<i>Heb.</i> 6.11) <i>Acts:</i> 100% <i>Epistles:</i> 71%</p>	<p>ΕΠΙΘΥΜΕΙ (<i>1 Cor.</i> 10.6) (<i>Gal.</i> 5.17) <i>Acts:</i> 0% <i>Epistles:</i> 29%</p>
<p>βαρέω ΒΑΡΗ (2 <i>Cor.</i> 1.8, 5.4) ἐπιβαρέω <i>Acts:</i> Ø <i>Epistles:</i> 50%</p>	<p>ΒΑΡΕΙ (2 <i>Cor.</i> 12.16) ΕΠΙΒΑΡΕΙ (2 <i>Cor.</i> 2.5) <i>Acts:</i> Ø <i>Epistles:</i> 50%</p>
<p>ἐκκακέω ΕΓΚΛΑΘΗ (2 <i>Cor.</i> 4.1) (2 <i>Thess.</i> 3.13) <i>Acts:</i> Ø <i>Epistles:</i> 40%</p>	<p>ΕΓΚΛΑΘΕΙ (2 <i>Cor.</i> 4.16) (<i>Gal.</i> 6.9) (<i>Eph.</i> 3.13) <i>Acts:</i> Ø <i>Epistles:</i> 60%</p>
<p>φθονέω ΦΘΟΝΗ (<i>Titus</i> 2.7) <i>Acts:</i> Ø <i>Epistles:</i> 33%</p>	<p>ΦΘΟΝΕΙ (<i>Gal.</i> 3.1, 5.26) <i>Acts:</i> Ø <i>Epistles:</i> 67%</p>
<p>αἰτέω ΑΙΤΗ (<i>Acts</i> 3.14, 7.46, 9.2, 12.20, 13.21, 13.28, 25.3, 25.15) (<i>1 Cor.</i> 1.22) (<i>Eph.</i> 3.20) <i>Acts:</i> 100% <i>Epistles:</i> 67%</p>	<p>ΑΙΤΕΙ (<i>Eph.</i> 3.13) <i>Acts:</i> 0% <i>Epistles:</i> 33%</p>

Standard: εἰ > ἰ	Variant: εἰ > εἰ~εἲ
παραιτέομαι ΠΑΡΑΙΤῚ (Acts 25.11) (Heb. 12.25) (1 Tim. 4.7, 5.11) Acts: 100% Epistles: 43%	ΠΑΡΑΙΤῚ (Heb. 12.19, 12.25) (2 Tim. 2.23) (Titus 3.10) Acts: 0% Epistles: 57%
φυσάω (contract -άω) ΦΥCἰ (Gal. 2.15, 4.8) Acts: Ø Epistles: 50%	ΦΥCῚ (Rom. 2.14) (Eph. 2.3) Acts: Ø Epistles: 50%

d) This type of verb ending is also applied to a number of Greek verbs of another class. For example, -ω > -έω verbs in Sahidic may have the ending ἰ or εἰ instead of εῖ:⁴

ἈΡΧἰ (Rom. 15.12) Ἀρχω “to rule”;
ΘΑΛΠῚ (Eph. 5.29) (1 Thess. 2.7) θάλλπεω.

Table 15: Greek εἰ: C + ἰ vs. εἰ~εἲ (verbs of another class)

Standard: εἰ > ἰ	Variant: εἰ > εἰ~εἲ
Ἀρχομαι “to begin” ΑΡΧἰ (2 Cor. 3.1, 8.6, 8.10) (Gal. 3.3) (Phil. 1.6) Acts: 0% Epistles: 100%	ΑΡΧῚ (Acts 1.1, 2.4, 11.4, 11.15, 24.2, 27.35) ΑΡΧῚ̀ (Acts 1.22, 8.35, 10.37, 18.26) Acts: 100% Epistles: 0%
ψάλλω ΨἈΛΛἰ (Eph. 5.19) Acts: Ø Epistles: 25%	ΨἈΛΛῚ (Rom. 15.9) (1 Cor. 14.15) ΨἈΛΛῚ̀ (1 Cor. 14.15) Acts: Ø Epistles: 75%

e) Impersonal verbs appear in the form of the Greek 3rd person singular present indicative:⁵

ἸΔΟΚἰ (Acts 15.22, 15.25, 15.28, 15.34) δοκεῖ.

Table 16: Greek εἰ~ἰ: C + ἰ vs. εἰ (impersonal verbs)

Standard: εἰ~ἰ > ἰ	Variant: εἰ~ἰ > εἰ
ἔξεστι ΕΞΕCῚῑ (1 Cor. 10.23) Acts: Ø Epistles: 25%	ΕΞΕCῚῚ (1 Cor. 6.12 x2, 10.23) Acts: Ø Epistles: 75%
πρέπει ΠΡῚῑ (Heb. 2.10) Acts: Ø Epistles: 33%	ΠΡῚῚ (Heb. 7.26) (Eph. 5.3) Acts: Ø Epistles: 67%

⁴ Girgis (2001), pp. 72-75 § 191-196.

⁵ Girgis (2001), p. 68 § 186.

Taking into account all these verbs, the scribe of *Acts* uses the grapheme ι 64% of the time, and ει 36% (most of which are limited to -καλει~καλεὶ and αρχει~αρχεὶ). The scribe of the *Epistles* uses ι 46% of cases, and ει 54%.

f) Greek ε > Sahidic ει~ι: Stressed é generally maintains its spelling in Coptic.⁶ But note παραγγέλω:

ΠΑΡΑΓΓΙΛΕ – regular in *Acts* (*Acts* 1.4, 4.17, 4.18, 5.28, 5.40, 10.42, 15.5, 16.18, 16.23, 17.30, 23.22, 23.30);

ΠΑΡΑΓΓΕΙΛΕ - regular in the *Epistles* (*1 Cor.* 7.10, 11.17) (*1 Thess.* 4.11) (*2 Thess.* 3.6, 3.10, 3.12) (*1 Tim.* 1.3, 4.11, 6.13, 6.17); except ΠΑΡΑΓΓΙΛΕ (*1 Tim.* 5.7).

Case A4: '(C)CVC(C) and CVC V = ι (var. ει)

In a closed syllable there is a strict adherence to this rule:

ΝΙΜ, ΚΙΜ, ΣΙΝ-, ΠΟΛΙC (πόλις).

But note the following biblical name:

ΒΕΝΙΑΜΕΙΝ (Βενιαμίν) (*Acts* 13.21) (*Rom.* 11.1) (*Phil.* 3.5).

Case A5: '(C)GV G = /w/ V = ει (var. εὶ)

In contrast to the previous rule, when the vowel /i/ follows a glide in an open syllable the digraph is employed:

ΟΥΕΙΝΕ, ΣΟΥΕΙΤΕ, ΛΕΥΕΙΤΗΣ (Λευίτας).

Variation: The digraph generally carries a circumflex at the end of a lexeme:

ΟΥΕῚ (“one” fem.) (*1Cor* 7.2 x2) (*Gal.* 4.24) – always with circumflex;
 ΛΕΥΕῚ (*Heb.* 7.9) vs. ΛΕΥΕΙ (*Heb.* 7.5, 7.9) Λευι̃.

⁶ Girgis (1966), p. 87 § 12.

Case A6: '(C)GVC G = /w/ or /j/ V = €ɪ (var. ĩ)

In a closed syllable the digraph realises the vowel when preceded by a glide. In this case the second vowel-glide element, €ɪ, is interpreted as vocalic, the first, consonantal.⁷ The variant occurs at the end of a line only:

ϞΟΥ€ΙΤ~ϞΟΥĩΤ, ΛΑΥ€ΙΛ~ΛΑΥĩΛ (Δαυίδ), ϑΙ€ΙΒ, Ι€ΙΒ.

Table 17: G + €ɪ vs. ĩ

Standard: €ɪ	Variant: ĩ
ϞΟΥ€ΙΤ (<i>Acts</i> 4.25, 14.15) (<i>Rom.</i> 1.21, 4.14, 8.20) (<i>I Cor.</i> 1.17, 3.20, 9.15, 15.10, 15.14 x2, 15.17, 15.58) (<i>Gal.</i> 2.2) (<i>Col.</i> 2.8) (<i>I Thess.</i> 2.1) (<i>I Tim.</i> 1.6, 6.20) (<i>2 Tim.</i> 2.16) (<i>Titus</i> 3.9) <i>Acts: 100% Epistles: 90%</i>	ϞΟΥĩΤ (<i>Eph.</i> 4.17, 5.6) <i>Acts: 0% Epistles: 10%</i>
ΛΑΥ€ΙΛ (Δαυίδ) (<i>Acts</i> 2.25, 2.29, 2.34, 4.25, 7.45, 13.22 x2, 13.34, 13.36, 15.16) (<i>Rom.</i> 1.3, 4.6, 11.9) (<i>Heb.</i> 4.7, 11.32) (<i>2 Tim.</i> 2.8) <i>Acts: 91% Epistles: 100%</i>	ΛΑΥĩΛ (<i>Acts</i> 1.16) <i>Acts: 9% Epistles: 0%</i>

⁷ In cases like this, where two vowel-glides are adjacent, it is sometimes difficult to decide which is the vowel and which is the glide. Most of the time the etymology is consistent with GV, but it is not out of the question that apophonic transformations may occur over time. In the case of ϑΙ€ΙΒ the long form of the definite article, which is used with this word (Τ€€ϑΙ€ΙΒ), indicates that the word begins with a consonant cluster, therefore, the GV sequence is appropriate here. The same also applies to ϑΙΟΜ€ (Ν€€ϑΙΟΜ€). Cf. Peust (1999), p. 260, 214 n. 242.

B. Graphemic forms of the glide /j/ (ĩ~ı~eı~eĩ)

Table 18: Typology of the glide /j/

Case	Syllabic Context		<i>CB Ms. 814 Acts</i>	<i>CB Ms. 813 Epistles</i>	Examples
B1	#'GV		εı (var. ı~ĩ)	εı (var. ĩ)	εıω /'jo/ εıοτє /'jɔ.tə/
B2	#'GVC(C)		εı (var. ĩ)	εı (var. ı)	εıωτ /'jot/
B3	'(C)CGV		ı	ı	շիı /'hje/ τcio /'tsjɔ/ շıome /'hjo.mə/
B4	'(C)CGVC		ı	ı	τcioɣ /'tsjɔf/ շıeıβ /'hjiβ/ εβıııı /ə.βjen/
B5	'(C)VG#	V = ı	ĩ	ĩ (var. eı~eĩ)	ıı /'ej/
		V = o	ĩ (var. eı)	ĩ (var. eı~eĩ)	մıoı /m.'mɔj/ oγoı /'wɔj/
		V = ω	ĩ	ĩ	εχω≠ı / ə.coj/
		V = oγ	ĩ	ĩ	κογı /'kuj/
		V = ɒ	ĩ	ĩ (var. eĩ)	αωαı /a.'faj/
	(C)VG#	V = ɒ	ĩ	ĩ (var. eĩ)	αı- /aj/
		V = ε	ĩ	ĩ (var. eı~eĩ)	πεı- /pəj/
B6	'(C)VG.CV(C)		V = o ĩ (var. eı)	V = o, ı ĩ (var. eı)	շoıne /'hɔj.nə/ αııııτı̄ /a.'mej.tɾ/
			V = ɒ, ı ĩ	V = ɒ ĩ	շαıβεc /'haj.βəs/
B7	'(C)VGC#		εı (var. ĩ)	εı (var. ĩ)	ıաeıı /'majn/ cշաeı≠ɣ /'shajf/ չoεıτ /'cɔjt/ oεıκ /'ɔjk/ oγoεıω /'wɔjɬ/ χoεıc /'cɔjs/
B8	CVC.'GV		εı	εı	րմeıı /rɱ'je/
B9	'(C)V.GV(C) (C)V.'GV(C)		ĩ (var. eı~eĩ)	εı (var. ĩ~eĩ)	չαıε~չաeıε /'ca.jə/ ταıo~ταeıo~ταeıo /ta.'jɔ/ τογeıo /tu.'jɔ/

Case B1: #'GV **G = ει** (var. ι~ĩ)

At the beginning of lexemes, in open syllables, the glide /j/ is represented by the digraph ει:

εια, ειαλ, ειοπε, ειοτε, ειω, ειωρ̄μ, ειορ̄μ, ειωρ̄ζ, ειορ̄ζ, ειωζε, ειερωυ.

With a preformative clitic: On one occasion the epsilon is omitted when preceded by the definite article:

πiero| (*Acts* 16.13) [Crum (1939), p. 82a: εiero, iero].

Coalescence of two adjacent glides:

τε̄ioπε (*Acts* 19.25) “this trade” (τε̄i(εi)οπε) [Crum (1939), p. 81a: ειοπε, ioπε].

Biblical names/proper nouns:

ιᾱων/ιᾱσσων, ιω̄ζαννης, ιω̄ηλ, ιᾱκωβ, ιᾱκκωβος/ιᾱκωβος, ιω̄σης, ιω̄σηφ, ιο̄υνια, ιο̄ππη, ιο̄υλιος, ιο̄υστος, ιο̄υλας, ιο̄υλα, ιο̄υλαĩ; ιο̄υλαια (regular with the definite article).

The initial glide regularly loses the trema when followed by the singular definite article:

θieroυσαλημ (*Epistles*), θιᾱημ (*Acts*), πιο̄υλαĩ.

On one occasion the plural definite article is employed without the superlinear stroke, in which case syntagmatic resyllabification has taken place:

πιο̄υλαĩ /nju.'daj/ (*Rom.* 3.9).

This is in contrast to the usual plural definite article ᾱ, where the trema is retained:

ᾱ̄ιο̄υλαĩ /ɲ.ju.'daj/ (*Acts*: 61 occurrences) (*Epistles*: 12 occurrences).

Case B2: #'GVC(C) **G = ει** (var. ι~ĩ)

At the beginning of a lexeme, in a closed syllable, the glide is also realised with the digraph:

ειωτ, ειατ̄.

With a preformative clitic: As in the previous Case A1, the digraph is sometimes reduced to a simple iota when preceded by the definite article, or other preformative. In one case the digraph is replaced by ĩ where it follows the preformative segment ζα-. Cf. Case B5, the domain where the grapheme ĩ follows the vowel α within a segment.

Table 19: Clitic + #€I vs. ι~ĩ

Standard: €I	Variant: ι~ĩ
<p>π€ΙΩΤ (Acts 1.4, 1.7, 2.33, 28.8) (Eph. 5.20) (Rom. 8.15) (1 Cor. 8.6, 15.24) (2 Cor. 1.3 x2, 11.31) (Heb. 12.9) (Gal. 1.1, 1.3, 4.2, 4.6) (Eph. 1.3, 1.17, 2.18, 3.14, 4.6) (Phil. 2.11) (Col. 1.3, 1.12, 3.17) (Titus 1.4)</p> <p>π π€ΙΩΤ (Rom. 6.4) This is a case of dittography. Perhaps the scribe intended to write π ΩΤ, but resumed the usual spelling in the next line. There are two other examples of dittography in this same verse.</p> <p>Acts: 100% Epistles: 88%</p>	<p>π ΩΤ (Rom. 15.6) πΩΤ (Eph. 6.23) πΩΤ (2 Tim. 1.2)</p> <p>Acts: 0% Epistles: 12%</p>
<p>Crum (1939), p. 76a: €ΙΒ, €Ι€ΙΒ, €Ι€Β</p> <p>Acts: Ø Epistles: 0%</p>	<p>π€ΙΒ (1 Cor. 15.56), π€ΚΙ€ΙΒ (1 Cor. 15.55)</p> <p>Acts: Ø Epistles: 100%</p>
<p>Crum (1939), p. 73a: €ΙΑ, €ΙΑΤ⁂ (S), ΙΑΤ⁂ (B) ΞΑ-€ΙΑΤ⁂ (Rom. 1.13) (2 Cor. 1.9)</p> <p>Acts: 0% Epistles: 100%</p> <p>Note: €ΙΑ (Heb. 11.38); ΜΝΤ-€ΙΑ (Eph. 6.6) (Col. 3.22); ΤΟΥΝ-ΟΥ€ΙΑΤ⁂ (Heb. 11.7); ΤCΑΒ€-€ΙΑΤ⁂ (Rom. 11.34); ΤC€Β€-€ΙΑΤ⁂ (Acts 8.31, 10.22) (1 Cor. 2.16).</p>	<p>ΞΑ-ĩΑΤ (Acts 26.9)</p> <p>Acts: 100% Epistles: 0%</p>

Case B3: '(C)CGV G = ι

The glide following a consonant, in an open syllable, is always rendered with a iota:

ΞΗ, ΤCΙΟ, ΞΙΟΜ€, ΘΙ€, ΞΙΟΥ€.

Case B4: '(C)CGVC G = ι

The glide following a consonant, in a closed syllable, is also always rendered with a iota:

ΤCΙΟϠ, ΞΙΟΡ (< €ΙΟΡ), €ΒΙΗΝ, ΞΙ€ΙΒ.

Case B5: '(C)VG# and (C)VG#**a) Accented syllables '(C)VG#**

V = Η	Acts: G = ĩ	Epistles: G = ĩ (var. €Ι~€İ)
V = Ο	Acts: G = ĩ (var. €Ι)	Epistles: G = ĩ (var. €Ι~€İ)
V = Ω	Acts: G = ĩ	Epistles: G = ĩ
V = ΟΥ	Acts: G = ĩ	Epistles: G = ĩ
V = Α	Acts: G = ĩ	Epistles: G = ĩ (var. €İ)

The final glide /j/ following a vowel, in accented syllables, is represented by the allograph ï̃, with a number instances where the variants €̃ and €̃̇ (€̃ (53%) and €̃̇ (47%)) are employed, mostly by the scribe of the *Epistles*. There is only one example of the scribe of *Acts* using the variant (οϣο€̃ (Acts 18.2)).

ΧΟΪ, ΜΑΤΟΪ, ΘΒΟΪ, CΤΟΪ, ΖΛΜΟΪ, ΟΥΟΪ, ΝΟΪ (νοέω), ΜΕΤΛΝΟΪ (μετανοέω);

աճա՛ի, աղա՛ի, աշրա՛ի, եշրա՛ի, փաշրա՛ի, շրա՛ի, շա՛ի, շկա՛ի, օյճա՛ի, ծա՛ի, բա՛ի,
 տա՛ի, նա՛ի.

Table 20: VG# G = \mathbb{F}_2 vs. $\epsilon_1 \sim \epsilon_2$

Standard: ἱ	Variant: ει~ει
<p>ἡῖ (<i>Acts</i> 2.2, 2.36, 2.46, 4.34, 5.42, 7.10, 7.20, 7.42, 7.47, 7.49, 8.3, 9.11, 9.17, 10.2, 10.6, 10.17, 10.22, 10.30, 10.32, 11.11, 11.12, 11.13, 11.14, 12.7, 12.12, 16.15 x2, 16.31, 16.32, 16.34 x2, 17.5, 18.7 x2, 18.8, 19.16, 20.20, 21.6, 21.8)</p> <p>(<i>Rom.</i> 16.11) (<i>1 Cor.</i> 14.35) (<i>2 Cor.</i> 5.1) (<i>Heb.</i> 3.3, 8.8, 11.7) (<i>Col.</i> 4.15) (<i>1 Tim.</i> 3.4) (<i>Philem</i> 2)</p> <p>⟨ἡῖ⟩ or ⟨ἡει⟩ (<i>2 Tim.</i> 2.20)</p> <p><i>Acts: 100% Epistles: 23%</i></p>	<p>ἡει (<i>Rom.</i> 16.10) (<i>1 Cor.</i> 16.15, 16.19) (<i>2 Cor.</i> 5.1) (<i>Heb.</i> 3.2, 3.5, 3.6 x2) (<i>Gal.</i> 6.10) (<i>Eph.</i> 2.19) (<i>Phil.</i> 4.22) (<i>1 Tim.</i> 3.15, 5.8, 5.13, 5.14) (<i>2 Tim.</i> 1.16) (<i>Titus</i> 1.11)</p> <p>ἡει̃ (<i>Rom.</i> 16.5) (<i>1 Cor.</i> 1.16, 11.22, 11.34) (<i>Heb.</i> 3.4, 8.8, 8.10, 10.21) (<i>1 Tim.</i> 3.5, 3.12, 5.4) (<i>2 Tim.</i> 3.6, 4.19)</p> <p><i>Acts: 0% Epistles: 77%</i></p>
<p>οὔοῖ (<i>Acts</i> 7.31, 7.57, 8.29, 8.30, 9.1, 10.28, 14.5, 19.29, 21.33, 22.26, 22.27, 23.14, 28.9)</p> <p>(<i>Heb.</i> 4.16, 7.25, 10.1, 10.22, 11.6, 12.22) (<i>1 Tim.</i> 6.3)</p> <p><i>Acts: 93% Epistles: 87%</i></p>	<p>οὔοει (<i>Acts</i> 18.2)</p> <p>(<i>Heb.</i> 12.18)</p> <p><i>Acts: 7% Epistles: 13%</i></p>
<p>ἁῖᾱῖ (<i>Eph.</i> 4.16) (<i>Col.</i> 2.19)</p> <p><i>Acts: Ø Epistles: 50%</i></p>	<p>ἁῖᾱει̃ (<i>Phil.</i> 1.20) (<i>2 Cor.</i> 10.15)</p> <p><i>Acts: Ø Epistles: 50%</i></p>

ОУВН≠і, 2АТН≠і;

$$\tau_{\lambda 20} \neq i, \quad \theta_{\bar{B} B 10} \neq i;$$
 $\text{NOY} \neq \text{i};$
$$O\Upsilon\bar{N}T\lambda\neq i/\Upsilon\bar{N}T\lambda\neq i, M\bar{N}T\lambda\neq i.$$

Table 21: Variation with the 1st person singular suffix pronouns in accented syllables

Standard: ĩ	Variant: Ǝ
ʒṯḤ≠ĩ (<i>Rom.</i> 19.5 x2) (2 <i>Cor.</i> 2.3, 7.8) (<i>Phil.</i> 3.4) <i>(Philem 21)</i> <i>Acts: Ø Epistles: 86%</i>	ʒṯḤ≠Ǝ (2 <i>Cor.</i> 7.8) <i>Acts: Ø Epistles: 14%</i>
ṁṀṀ≠ĩ (<i>Acts</i> : 21 occurrences) (<i>Epistles</i> : 33 occurrences) <i>Acts: 100% Epistles: 97%</i>	ṁṀṀ≠Ǝ (<i>Gal.</i> 5.11) <i>Acts: 0% Epistles: 3%</i>

b) Unaccented preformatives (C)VG#

V = λ Acts $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{i}$ Epistles $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{i}$ (var. $\epsilon\mathbf{i}$)

V = € Acts **G** = ï Epistles **G** = ï (var. €1~€1)

The glide /j/ functioning as the 1st person singular pronominal subject of verbal conjugations preceded by the vowel **א** is realised **י** with only one exception, in the *Epistles*. The construct participles, **אֵי**- and **מֵאֵי**-, are also regular. Following the vowel **ע** in the verbal conjugations and the demonstrative articles, the scribe of *Acts* is also consistent with the use of **י**. On the other hand, the *Epistles* display considerable optionality between the allographs **י** and the digraph (**עֵי**- 59% ~ **עִי**- 41%) following the vowel **ע**.

Table 22: 1st person singular pronominal subject of verbal conjugations: $\lambda + \ddot{\text{v}}$ vs. $\epsilon\grave{\text{i}}$ [illegible]

Table 23: 1st person singular pronominal subject of verbal conjugations: **ε + ῑ** vs. **εἰ~εἰ**

Conjugation	Standard: ε + ῑ	Variant: ε + εἰ~εἰ
Present Circumstantial / Present II	<p>εἰ- (<i>Acts</i> 11.5, 14.10, 17.23 x2, 20.19, 20.21, 20.25, 20.31, 20.35, 22.3, 22.4 x2, 22.6, 22.11, 22.17, 22.20 x2, 23.28, 23.30, 24.10, 24.12 x2, 24.14 x2, 24.17, 24.18, 24.21, 25.10, 25.18, 25.20, 26.6, 26.11 x2, 26.17, 26.22 x2, 26.26, 28.17, 28.20) (<i>Rom.</i> 1.9, 1.10, 3.5, 6.19, 7.1, 7.14, 15.15, 15.16, 15.24 x2, 15.29) (<i>I Cor.</i> 2.1, 4.14, 5.3 x3, 5.10, 6.5, 7.6, 7.29, 7.35, 9.8, 9.17, 9.18, 9.19, 9.20, 9.26 x2, 9.27, 10.15, 10.19, 13.11, 13.12, 14.6, 15.10, 15.34 x2) (<i>2 Cor.</i> 1.23, 2.3, 7.3, 8.8, 10.1, 10.2, 10.9, 11.21, 12.16) (<i>Heb.</i> 2.13, 6.14) (<i>Gal.</i> 1.13, 1.14, 2.2, 3.17) (<i>Eph.</i> 1.16, 4.17, 5.32, 6.21) (<i>Phil.</i> 1.4, 1.6, 1.9, 1.16, 1.25, 3.6, 3.10, 3.12, 3.13 x2, 3.14, 3.18, 4.17 x2) (<i>Col.</i> 1.24, 2.4) (<i>I Tim.</i> 3.14) (<i>2 Tim.</i> 1.4, 1.5) (<i>Philem</i> 4, 5, 9 x3, 21 x2) εἰ (<i>Gal.</i> 4.11) <i>Acts: 100% Epistles: 70%</i></p>	<p>εεἰ- (<i>Rom.</i> 15.20, 15.29) (<i>I Cor.</i> 9.23, 9.26, 16.7) (<i>2 Cor.</i> 1.17, 7.3, 7.8, 10.1, 11.9, 11.21, 11.23, 13.2) (<i>Heb.</i> 6.14, 11.32) (<i>Gal.</i> 1.10, 1.14, 1.15, 2.20, 3.15, 4.18, 5.11) (<i>Eph.</i> 4.17) (<i>Phil.</i> 2.12) (<i>Col.</i> 1.29, 2.5) (<i>I Tim.</i> 1.13) (<i>2 Tim.</i> 1.4, 1.12) εεἰ- (<i>I Cor.</i> 4.14) (<i>2 Cor.</i> 11.8, 13.2) (<i>Eph.</i> 1.16) (<i>Phil.</i> 3.12) (<i>Col.</i> 2.5) (<i>2 Thess.</i> 3.17) <i>Acts: 0% Epistles: 30%</i></p>
Imperfect	<p>νεῖ- (<i>Acts</i> 2.25, 10.30 x2, 11.5, 11.11, 18.14, 22.19, 22.20, 23.5, 25.11, 25.22, 26.11 x2) (<i>Rom.</i> 7.7, 9.3) (<i>I Cor.</i> 4.4, 13.11 x2) (<i>2 Cor.</i> 1.15, 7.8, 8.8, 9.3, 11.17, 12.14) (<i>Gal.</i> 4.20) (<i>Phil.</i> 4.11) (<i>2 Thess.</i> 2.5) (<i>Philem</i> 13) <i>Acts: 100% Epistles: 60%</i></p>	<p>νεεἰ- (<i>Rom.</i> 15.18, 15.22) (<i>I Cor.</i> 13.11) (<i>Gal.</i> 1.13) (<i>Phil.</i> 3.18) νεεἰ- (<i>Rom.</i> 7.9) (<i>I Cor.</i> 4.14) (<i>2 Cor.</i> 7.3) (<i>Gal.</i> 1.10, 1.13) <i>Acts: 0% Epistles: 40%</i></p>
Adhortative (Future III)	<p>ννεῖ- (<i>Phil.</i> 1.20) <i>Acts: Ø Epistles: 50%</i></p>	<p>ννεεἰ- (<i>I Cor.</i> 8.13) <i>Acts: Ø Epistles: 50%</i></p>
Conditional	<p>εἰῶαν- (<i>Acts</i> 24.25) (<i>Rom.</i> 11.27, 15.24, 15.28) (<i>I Cor.</i> 9.16 x2, 13.1, 13.3, 14.6, 14.11, 14.14) (<i>2 Cor.</i> 12.6, 12.10) (<i>Phil.</i> 1.27, 2.23) (<i>Titus</i> 3.12) <i>Acts: 100% Epistles: 71%</i></p>	<p>εεἰῶαν- (<i>2 Cor.</i> 10.8) (<i>I Tim.</i> 3.15) εεἰῶαν- (<i>Rom.</i> 15.32) (<i>I Cor.</i> 16.2, 16.3, 16.5) <i>Acts: 0% Epistles: 29%</i></p>
Aorist Negative Circumstantial	<p><i>Acts: Ø Epistles: 0%</i></p>	<p>εμεεἰ- (<i>2 Cor.</i> 11.29) <i>Acts: Ø Epistles: 100%</i></p>
Future I Circumstantial/ Future II	<p>εῖνα- (<i>Acts</i> 18.6, 20.22, 22.21, 26.2, 26.12, 28.19) (<i>Rom.</i> 15.24, 15.25) (<i>I Cor.</i> 14.6) (<i>2 Cor.</i> 12.5) (<i>Heb.</i> 11.32) <i>Acts: 100% Epistles: 71%</i></p>	<p>εεἶνα- (<i>2 Cor.</i> 11.30) (<i>I Tim.</i> 1.3) <i>Acts: 0% Epistles: 29%</i></p>
Summary	<p><i>Acts: 100% Epistles: 68%</i></p>	<p><i>Acts: 0% Epistles: 32%</i></p>

Table 24: Variation with demonstrative articles

Standard: ε + ἰ	Variant: ε + εἰ-ει
<p>πεῖ- (<i>Acts</i> 1.6, 1.19, 1.21, 1.24, 2.12, 2.33, 2.38, 3.16, 4.17, 4.22, 5.4, 5.20, 5.28, 5.38 x2, 6.5, 6.13 x2, 6.14, 7.4, 7.7, 7.29, 7.60, 8.21, 8.29, 9.13, 9.14, 9.21 x2, 10.17, 10.18, 11.12, 13.26, 15.6, 16.28, 17.6, 17.18, 19.27, 19.37, 19.40, 20.18, 21.11, 21.28 x2, 22.22, 22.26, 23.9, 23.13, 23.17, 23.18, 23.25, 23.27, 23.30, 24.2, 24.5, 24.10, 24.19, 25.5, 25.17, 25.22, 25.24 x3, 26.26, 26.31 x2, 28.4, 28.28)</p> <p>(<i>Rom.</i> 4.9, 7.24, 8.18, 9.9, 11.5, 12.2, 15.28) (<i>1 Cor.</i> 1.20, 2.6 x2, 2.8, 3.18, 3.19, 4.2, 5.10, 7.31, 11.25, 11.26, 14.21, 15.19) (<i>2 Cor.</i> 1.10, 4.7, 8.19, 9.4, 9.12, 11.10, 12.3, 12.13) (<i>Heb.</i> 6.3, 9.9, 10.10, 10.33) (<i>Gal.</i> 1.4, 5.8) (<i>Eph.</i> 1.21, 5.32) (<i>Phil.</i> 1.29) (<i>Col.</i> 1.27, 4.8) (<i>1 Thess.</i> 3.3) (<i>1 Tim.</i> 4.8, 6.17) (<i>2 Tim.</i> 4.10) (<i>Titus</i> 2.12)</p> <p><i>Acts: 100% Epistles: 61%</i></p>	<p>πεεῖ- (<i>Rom.</i> 3.26, 5.2, 6.2) (<i>1 Cor.</i> 5.3, 7.31, 11.5) (<i>2 Cor.</i> 8.20) (<i>Heb.</i> 7.8, 9.11) (<i>Eph.</i> 2.2, 2.8)</p> <p>πεει- (<i>Rom.</i> 11.25, 13.6, 13.9) (<i>1 Cor.</i> 2.12, 5.2, 13.13) (<i>2 Cor.</i> 1.15, 3.10, 4.4, 8.14, 9.3) (<i>Heb.</i> 7.1, 12.1, 13.14) (<i>Gal.</i> 6.16) (<i>Eph.</i> 6.12, 6.22)</p> <p>πεε(ι) (<i>2 Cor.</i> 7.11)</p> <p><i>Acts: 0% Epistles: 39%</i></p>
<p>τεῖ- (<i>Acts</i> 1.16, 1.17, 1.25, 2.6, 2.40, 4.27, 6.3, 8.19, 8.35, 10.30, 16.12, 16.20, 17.19, 18.10, 19.25)</p> <p>τεῖ(ει)οπε, 22.3, 22.4, 22.28, 24.21, 26.7, 27.23, 28.20 x2, 28.22)</p> <p>(<i>Rom.</i> 16.22) (<i>1 Cor.</i> 3.12, 4.13, 8.9, 11.5) (<i>2 Cor.</i> 2.6, 8.6, 8.7) (<i>Heb.</i> 7.22) (<i>Gal.</i> 4.25) (<i>Col.</i> 3.13) (<i>1 Thess.</i> 5.27) (<i>1 Tim.</i> 1.18) (<i>2 Tim.</i> 2.19) (<i>Titus</i> 1.13)</p> <p>ἡ τεῖμινε (<i>Acts</i> 16.24, 18.15, 22.22)</p> <p>(<i>Rom.</i> 16.18) (<i>1 Cor.</i> 7.15, 11.16) (<i>2 Cor.</i> 3.4, 3.12, 12.3, 12.5) (<i>Heb.</i> 8.1, 12.3, 13.16) (<i>Gal.</i> 5.23) (<i>Philem</i> 9)</p> <p>ἡ τεῖζε (<i>Acts</i> 3.18, 7.1, 13.34, 14.1, 15.15, 15.23, 17.11, 20.11, 21.11, 22.24, 23.11, 24.9, 24.14)</p> <p>(<i>Rom.</i> 6.4, 9.20) (<i>1 Cor.</i> 3.15, 5.3, 7.7, 7.11, 11.25, 7.26, 9.24, 9.26 x2) (<i>Eph.</i> 4.20) (<i>Gal.</i> 5.21) (<i>1 Tim.</i> 3.8, 3.11, 5.25)</p> <p><i>Acts: 100% Epistles: 41%</i></p>	<p>τεεῖ- (<i>1 Cor.</i> 4.11, 14.21) (<i>2 Cor.</i> 1.10, 3.12, 4.1) (<i>Heb.</i> 2.3) (<i>Phil.</i> 2.2)</p> <p>τεει- (<i>1 Cor.</i> 9.12, 11.14) (<i>2 Cor.</i> 9.13) (<i>Heb.</i> 4.7) (<i>Gal.</i> 6.11) (<i>Eph.</i> 3.8) (<i>Col.</i> 4.16)</p> <p>ἡ τεεῖμινε (<i>Rom.</i> 2.2) (<i>1 Cor.</i> 5.1, 7.28) (<i>Heb.</i> 7.26) (<i>Gal.</i> 6.1) (<i>Phil.</i> 2.29) (<i>2 Thess.</i> 3.12) (<i>Titus</i> 3.11)</p> <p>ἡ τεεῖμινε (<i>2 Cor.</i> 10.11)</p> <p>ἡ τεειμινε (<i>1 Cor.</i> 5.5, 5.11, 16.16, 16.18) (<i>2 Cor.</i> 2.7, 12.2, 11.13)</p> <p>ἡ τεεῖζε (<i>Rom.</i> 2.3, 5.21, 6.11, 10.6, 15.20) (<i>1 Cor.</i> 7.40) (<i>2 Cor.</i> 9.5) (<i>Heb.</i> 2.14, 5.3, 6.9, 6.15, 10.25, 11.14) (<i>Gal.</i> 6.2) (<i>Eph.</i> 5.28) (<i>Phil.</i> 4.1) (<i>2 Thess.</i> 3.17) (<i>Titus</i> 2.3)</p> <p>ἡ τεειζε (<i>1 Cor.</i> 9.15, 14.25) (<i>2 Cor.</i> 8.6) (<i>Heb.</i> 4.4, 9.6, 9.21) (<i>Gal.</i> 1.6) (<i>Eph.</i> 5.27, 6.9) (<i>Phil.</i> 3.17) (<i>1 Thess.</i> 4.17) (<i>1 Tim.</i> 2.9) (<i>Titus</i> 2.6)</p> <p><i>Acts: 0% Epistles: 59%</i></p>
<p>νεῖ- (<i>Acts</i> 1.15, 3.24, 4.16, 5.5, 5.8, 5.24, 5.32, 5.35, 5.36, 5.38, 10.44, 13.42, 14.15, 16.17, 16.20, 16.35, 16.36, 16.38, 19.37, 20.34, 21.5, 21.15, 21.38, 25.20, 26.29)</p> <p>(<i>Rom.</i> 15.23) (<i>Heb.</i> 1.2, 13.16) (<i>2 Cor.</i> 7.1) (<i>1 Thess.</i> 3.3, 4.18) (<i>2 Tim.</i> 3.5, 3.8)</p> <p><i>Acts: 100% Epistles: 73%</i></p>	<p>νεεῖ- (<i>1 Cor.</i> 6.13)</p> <p>νεει- (<i>1 Cor.</i> 7.15) (<i>2 Tim.</i> 1.12)</p> <p><i>Acts: 0% Epistles: 27%</i></p>

Standard: ε + ĩ	Variant: ε + εĩ~ει
Summary <i>Acts: 100% Epistles: 52%</i>	Summary <i>Acts: 0% Epistles: 48%</i>

Case B6: '(C)VG.CV(C) G = ĩ (var. ει)

V = ο	<i>Acts: G = ĩ (var. ει)</i>	<i>Epistles: G = ĩ (var. ει)</i>
V = η	<i>Acts: G = ĩ</i>	<i>Epistles: G = ĩ (var. ει)</i>
V = ι	<i>Acts: G = ĩ</i>	<i>Epistles: G = ĩ</i>

When the glide closes a syllable within a lexeme, ĩ takes precedence, but with variation following the vowels ο and η. Following the vowel ι, the iota with a trema is stable.

δοῖλε, λοῖδε~λοειδε, zoĩne~zoeine, αμῆϊτῆ~αμῆεϊτῆ;
 ζαῖβε, ζαῖ=coγ.

Table 25: Variation in the glide at a syllable boundary

Standard: ĩ	Variant: ει
αμῆϊτῆ (<i>Acts</i> 16.15, 16.36) <i>Acts: 100% Epistles: 0 %</i>	αμῆεϊτῆ (<i>2 Cor.</i> 6.17) <i>Acts: 0% Epistles: 100 %</i>
λοῖδε (<i>Acts</i> 10.29, 13.28, 22.24 λοῖδε, 23.28, 27.30) λοιδε (<i>Acts</i> 10.21) (<i>1 Thess.</i> 2.5) <i>Acts: 100% Epistles: 50 %</i>	λοειδε (<i>Phil.</i> 1.18) <i>Acts: 0% Epistles: 50 %</i>
zoĩne (<i>Acts</i> 6.9, 12.1, 14.4, 15.1, 15.5, 15.24, 17.4, 17.6, 17.18 x2, 17.28, 17.32, 19.9, 19.13, 19.31 zoĩne, 21.16, 23.9, 23.12, 27.44, 28.24) (<i>Rom.</i> 3.3, 3.8, 11.14, 11.17, 11.24, 11.25 zoĩne) (<i>1 Cor.</i> 4.18, 8.5, 8.7, 9.22, 10.7, 10.8, 10.9, 10.10, 12.28, 15.6, 15.12, 15.34) (<i>2 Cor.</i> 2.16 x2, 8.13, 10.2, 10.12) (<i>Heb.</i> 3.16, 4.6, 10.25, 13.2) (<i>Gal.</i> 1.7, 2.12 zoĩne) (<i>Eph.</i> 4.11 x2) (<i>Phil.</i> 1.15, 1.16) (<i>2 Thess.</i> 3.11) (<i>1 Tim.</i> 1.3, 1.6, 1.19, 4.1, 5.15, 5.24, 6.10, 6.21) (<i>2 Tim.</i> 2.18 zoĩne, 2.20 zoĩne) <i>Acts: 91% Epistles: 100%</i>	zoleine (<i>Acts</i> 10.23, 11.20) <i>Acts: 9% Epistles: 0%</i>
zoĩte (<i>Acts</i> 7.58, 9.39, 16.22, 18.6, 20.33, 22.20 zoĩte, 22.23 zoĩte) (<i>Heb.</i> 1.11) (<i>1 Tim.</i> 2.9 zoĩte) <i>Acts: 78% Epistles: 100%</i>	zoeite (<i>Acts</i> 11.15) zoleite (<i>Acts</i> 14.14) <i>Acts: 22% Epistles: 0%</i>

Case B7: '(C)VGC#**G = €I (var. ĩ)**

In the ‘covered’ position, the variant form is mostly used at the end of a line, rarely elsewhere:

ἄοεῖτ, μοεῖτ, κοεῖτ, οεῖκ, οὐοεῖω, ἄοεῖς, οὐοεῖν, ὠοεῖω, ὠοεῖχ,
μαεῖν, καεῖν, σταεῖτ, θαεῖτ (τ+σταεῖτ), ἄραεῖτ, λεῖκ, σταεῖς.

Table 26: Variation in the glide in the ‘covered’ position

Standard: €I	Variant: ĩ
οὐοεῖω/-εγὼεῖω (<i>Acts</i> : 23 occurrences) (<i>Epistles</i> : 109 occurrences) <ογ>οεῖω (<i>1 Cor.</i> 15.58) ογ(ο)εῖω (<i>Phil.</i> 1.4) <i>Acts</i> 85% <i>Epistles</i> : 96%	οὐοῖω/-εγὼῖω (<i>Acts</i> 1.7, 8.11, 14.17) -εγὼῖω ἐτῆμαγ (<i>Acts</i> 7.20) οὐοῖω (<i>Rom.</i> 3.26, 5.6) (<i>Heb.</i> 4.7, 9.9) (<i>Philem</i> 4) <i>Acts</i> : 15% <i>Epistles</i> : 4%
ταῶοεῖω (<i>Acts</i> 1.2, 3.24, 4.29, 4.31, 5.20, 8.4, 8.40, 11.20, 13.5, 13.38, 14.15, 15.36, 16.10, 16.17, 17.3, 17.13, 17.23, 21.8) (<i>Rom.</i> 2.21, 10.8, 10.15, 16.25) (<i>1 Cor.</i> 1.21, 2.4, 9.14, 9.27, 11.26, 15.11, 15.12, 15.14) (<i>2 Cor.</i> 1.19, 4.5, 11.4 x2) (<i>Gal.</i> 1.8, 1.9, 1.11, 1.16, 1.23, 2.2, 5.11) (<i>Eph.</i> 4.11) (<i>Phil.</i> 1.17, 1.18) (<i>Col.</i> 1.23, 1.28) (<i>1 Thess</i> 2.9) (<i>1 Tim.</i> 3.16) (<i>2 Tim.</i> 4.2, 4.5, 4.17) (<i>Titus</i> 1.3) <i>Acts</i> : 75% <i>Epistles</i> : 87%	ταῶοῖω (<i>Acts</i> 4.2, 7.52, 14.21, 16.21, 17.18) ταῶοῖω (<i>Acts</i> 5.42) ταῶοῖω (<i>Rom.</i> 10.14) (<i>1 Cor.</i> 1.23) (<i>Gal.</i> 1.8) (<i>Phil.</i> 1.15, 4.15) <i>Acts</i> : 25% <i>Epistles</i> : 13%
ἄοεῖς (<i>Acts</i> : 110 occurrences) πεἰς (<i>Acts</i> 9.20) (<i>Epistles</i> : 280 occurrences) <i>Acts</i> : 97% <i>Epistles</i> : 94%	ἄοῖς (<i>Acts</i> 4.26, 4.29, 9.17) (<i>Rom.</i> 5.1, 5.11) (<i>2 Cor.</i> 1.2, 1.14) (<i>Heb.</i> 1.10, 8.8) (<i>Eph.</i> 1.21) (<i>Phil.</i> 3.1, 4.23) (<i>Col.</i> 1.3, 3.24) (<i>2 Thess.</i> 3.16) (<i>2 Tim.</i> 1.18 x2, 2.24) (<i>Philem</i> 20, 25) ἄοῖς (<i>Phil.</i> 4.23) <i>Acts</i> : 3% <i>Epistles</i> : 6%
ροεῖς (<i>Acts</i> 20.31) (<i>1 Cor.</i> 16.13) (<i>2 Cor.</i> 11.27) (<i>Heb.</i> 13.17) (<i>Eph.</i> 6.18) (<i>Col.</i> 4.2) (<i>1 Thess.</i> 5.6, 5.10) <i>Acts</i> : 100% <i>Epistles</i> : 87%	ροῖς (<i>2 Cor.</i> 6.5) <i>Acts</i> : 0% <i>Epistles</i> : 13%
οεῖκ (<i>Acts</i> 2.42, 2.46, 7.11, 20.11, 27.35 ολεῖκ) (<i>1 Cor.</i> 10.16, 1.17 x2, 11.23, 11.26, 11.27, 11.28) (<i>2 Cor.</i> 9.10) (<i>Heb.</i> 9.2) (<i>2 Thess.</i> 3.8, 3.12) <i>Acts</i> : 83% <i>Epistles</i> : 100%	οῖκ (<i>Acts</i> 20.7) <i>Acts</i> : 17% <i>Epistles</i> : 0%
νοεῖκ (<i>Rom.</i> 2.22 x2, 7.3 x2, 13.9) (<i>1 Cor.</i> 6.9) <i>Acts</i> : 0 <i>Epistles</i> : 86%	νοῖκ (<i>Heb.</i> 13.4) <i>Acts</i> : 0 <i>Epistles</i> : 14%
νοεῖν (<i>Acts</i> 16.26) <i>Acts</i> : 50% <i>Epistles</i> : 0	νοῖν (<i>Acts</i> 21.30) <i>Acts</i> : 50% <i>Epistles</i> : 0
Possessive predicate ετῆγῆταῖς (<i>1 Cor.</i> 15.31) ετῆγῆταῖς (<i>2 Cor.</i> 2.4) <i>Acts</i> : 0% <i>Epistles</i> : 100%	πετῆογῆταῖς (<i>Acts</i> 3.6) <i>Acts</i> : 100% <i>Epistles</i> : 0%

ĩ	ει-εὶ
<p>οΥεϊένιν (<i>Acts</i> 6.1, 16.1, 21.37) (<i>Rom.</i> 1.16, 2.9, 2.10, 3.9, 10.12) (<i>I Cor.</i> 12.13) <i>Acts</i>: 33% <i>Epistles</i>: 100%</p>	<p>οΥεειένιν (<i>Acts</i> 9.29, 11.20, 16.3, 19.10, 20.24) οΥεεὶένιν (<i>Acts</i> 21.28) <i>Acts</i>: 67% <i>Epistles</i>: 0%</p>

C. Graphemic forms of the vowel /u/ (ΟΥ~Υ)

Table 28: Typology of the vowel /u/

Case	Syllabic Context	<i>CB Ms. 814 Acts</i>	<i>CB Ms. 813 Epistles</i>	Examples
C1	#(')V	ΟΥ (var. Υ)	ΟΥ (var. Υ)	ΟΥ /'u/ ⁸ ΟΥΒΕ /'u.βə/ ΟΥΝΑΜ /'u.nam/ ⁹ ΟΥ- /u/ ΟΥΧΑΪ /u.'caj/ ¹⁰ ΟΥΩΗ /u.'fe/ ¹¹
C2	(')(C)CV	ΟΥ	ΟΥ	ΜΟΥ /'mu/ ΟΙΟΥ /'sju/ ΜΟΥΤΕ /'mu.tə/ ΤΑΪΟΥ /'ta.ju/ ΤΟΥΕΙΟ /tu.'jə/
C3	'(C)CVC(C)	ΟΥ	ΟΥ	ΜΟΥΟΥΤ /'muwt/ ¹² ΚΟΥΪ /'kuj/ ΝΟΥΖΟΥ (/nuw/) ΕΖΟΥΝ /ə.'hun/

Case C1: #(')V V = ΟΥ (var. Υ)

At the beginning of a segment the vowel /u/ is realised ΟΥ:

ΟΥ, ΟΥΒΕ, ΟΥΝΑΜ, ΟΥΕΡΗΤΕ, ΟΥ-, ΟΥΧΑΪ, ΟΥΩΗ.

With a preformative clitic: This rule stands (with certain exceptions listed below) even when the initial ΟΥ is preceded by a clitic segment. For example: prepositions (eg. Ε, ΕΤΒΕ, ΩΔ, ΝΑ); proclitic pronouns (eg. ΠΑ), future auxiliary (ΝΑ-), conjugation bases (eg. ΝΤΕ-, ΝΤΑ-), adjectives (eg. ΚΕ) or conjunctions (eg. ΧΕ). For example:

ΕΤΒΕΟΥ (*Acts* 3.12), ΝΑΟΥΝΑΜ (*Acts* 2.34) ΩΔΟΥΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ (*Acts* 21.16).

But: ΝΤΑΥΤΩΜ (*Rom.* 11.25) “that a hardness has...” (Perfect II).¹³

In the following cases variation occurs under the influence of certain clitics:

- The indefinite article ΟΥ- is regularly reduced to -Υ- when it is preceded by the preposition Ε and the Perfect I conjugation nominal base Α. For example:

ΕΥΛΑΟC (*Rom.* 10.21) “to a people” ΑΥΜΑΕΙΝ (*Acts* 4.16) “a sign has...”.

⁸ Peust (1999), p. 264: ΟΥ “what?”, “seems to be a syllabic variety of w rather than an original vowel /u/...”.

⁹ Depuydt (1993), p. 375: ΟΥΝΑΜ from demotic *wnm*.

¹⁰ Peust (1999), p. 145: /u.'caj/, although p. 124 /'wcaj/; ΟΥΧΑΪ < *wɔʒ*.

¹¹ Depuydt (1993), p. 375: ΟΥΩΗ < *wh*.

¹² Peust (1999), p. 214 n. 242: “ΟΥΟΥ in ΜΟΥΟΥΤ is to be interpreted as /uw/, as evident both from the etymology (*mwt*) and from the status pronominalis of the verb (ΜΟΟΥΤ - /'mɔwt/)”; n. 241: “(ε)ι(ε)ι in dialects other than Akhmimic do not denote a long vowel eg. ΖΕΙΤ “pit” < demotic *hyt* is probably /'hjit/; but p. 154: ΜΟΥΟΥΤ /mu:t/ where Peust interprets double vowels as a means of lengthening the vowel.

¹³ Cf. Thompson (1932), p. 110, who notes this “unusual crasis”.

- A few lexemes beginning with οΥ, two of which denote time, are preceded by the long form of the definite article (οΥΩΗ, οΥΝΟΥ, οΥΖΟΟΡ) and in these cases Υ is regularly used (ΤΕΥΩΗ, ΝΤΕΥΩΗ, ΤΕΥΝΟΥ, ΝΤΕΥΝΟΥ, ΝΕΥΖΟΟΡ).¹⁴
- Fluctuation between the short and long form of the article occurs with the lexeme οΥ:ΧΑΪ: ποΥ:ΧΑΪ~πεΥ:ΧΑΪ. In the case where the long form is used the omicron is omitted provoking resyllabification: /pu.'caj/ vs. /pəw.'caj/.¹⁵

Table 29: Forms of οΥ:ΧΑΪ with the definite article

Short form of the definite article: π + οΥ	Long form of the definite article: πΕ + Υ
<p>ποΥ:ΧΑΪ (Acts 4.9, 16.17) (Eph. 6.17) (1 Thess. 5.8) (2 Thess. 2.14) (2 Tim.3.15) (Heb. 2.10) Acts: 100% Epistles: 50%</p>	<p>πεΥ:ΧΑΪ (Rom. 11.11) (2 Cor. 6.2) (Heb. 5.9, 6.9, 11.7) Acts: 0% Epistles: 50%</p>

Case C2: (') (C) CV V = οΥ

The vowel is always rendered οΥ following a consonant in an open syllable:

ΜΟΥ, ΜΟΥΤΕ, ΝΟΥΤΕ, ΤΕΝΟΥ;
 ΜΠΟΥ-, ΝΤΕΡΟΥ-, ΜΑΡΟΥ-, ΩΑΝΤΟΥ-, ΜΠΑΤΟΥ-, ΕΤΟΥ-;
 ΤΗΡ=ΟΥ.

Case C3: ' (C) CVC (C) V = οΥ

The vowel is also always rendered οΥ following a consonant in a closed syllable:

ΖΟΥΝ, ΕΖΟΥΝ, ΖΙΖΟΥΝ, ΜΟΥΟΥΤ, ΚΟΥΪ, ΝΟΥΪ, ΝΟΥ=ΟΥ, ΝΑΝΟΥ=ΟΥ,
 ΑΥ:ΧΝΟΥ=ΟΥ.

¹⁴ Cf. Depuydt (1993), pp. 369-375 for a discussion on long articles preceding nouns denoting time divisions, and the phonemic value of the initial digraph.

¹⁵ Cf. Peust (1999), p. 260; Depuydt (1993), p. 375.

D. Graphemic forms of the glide /w/ (οΥ~Υ)

Table 30: Typology of the glide /w/

Case	Syllabic Context		CB Ms. 814 <i>Acts</i>	CB Ms. 813 <i>Epistles</i>	Examples
D1	#(')GV		οΥ	οΥ	οΥΑ /'wa/ οΥεῖ /'wi/ οΥεῖνε /'wi.nə/ οΥεϱητε /wə.'re.tə/
D2	#(')GVC(C)		οΥ (var. Υ)	οΥ (var. Υ)	οΥωμ /'wom/ οΥῆ- /wḥ/ οΥοειω /'wɔjʃ/
D3	'(C)CGV		οΥ	οΥ	ζοΥεῖτε /'hwi.tə/
D4	'(C)CGVC		οΥ	οΥ	ωοΥεῖτ /'fwit/
D5	(')(C)V \bar{G} (C)	V = ο	οΥ	οΥ	ζοοΥ “to be bad” /'hɔw/
		V = ω	οΥ	οΥ	τωοΥν /'tow.ɲ/
		V = οΥ	οΥ	οΥ	ἡανοΥζοΥ /'na.nuw/
		V = η	Υ	Υ	τηΥτηῆ /'tew.tḥ/
		V = α	Υ	Υ	ἡαΥ /'naw/ αΥ- /aw/
		V = ε	Υ	Υ	πεΥ- /pəw/
		V = οο	Υ	Υ	ζοοΥ “day” /'hɔ:w/ ¹⁶
D6	(C)V.'GV(C) '(C)V.GV(C)	V = ο	οΥ	οΥ	κοοΥε /'kɔ.wə/
		V = ι	οΥ	οΥ	χιοΥε /'ci.wə/
		V = η	Υ	Υ (var. οΥ)	πηΥε /'pe.wə/
		V = α	Υ (var. οΥ)	Υ	αΥω /a'wo/ αΥειν /a.'win/
		V = ε	Υ	Υ	μεεΥε /'mɛ:.wə/

Case D1: #(')GV G = οΥ

At the beginning of a segment, in an open syllable, the glide is always realised οΥ:

οΥΑ, οΥεῖ, οΥεῖνε, οΥεϱητε;

With a preformative clitic: For example:

παοΥω (*Eph.* 6. 21), κεοΥα (*Acts.* 1.20).

¹⁶ Peust (1999), p. 235: The distinction between ζοοΥ “to be bad” /'hɔw/ and ζοοΥ “day” /'hɔ:w/ can be determined by taking into consideration the forms from other dialects. “ζοοΥ “bad” must be /'hɔw/ because the Akhmimic form is ζαΥ, but ζοοΥ “day” must be /'hɔ:w/ because the Akhmimic form is ζοοΥε.

Case D2: #()GVC(C) G = oγ (var. γ)

As in case D1, the glide is represented by the digraph beginning a segment in a closed syllable:

oγωμ, oγoειω, oγn̄-, oγn̄τε-/oγn̄τα;

With a preformative clitic: For example:

ωλογοειω (*Acts*. 13.11), λoγωz (*Acts*. 2.26), xεoγoν (*Rom*. 6.3).

In the following cases variation occurs under the influence of certain clitics:

- *Converted existential:* ε/νε/-ετε + γn̄- (var. oγn̄-)

Table 31: Variation with the converted existential

Conjugation	Standard: ε/νε/-ετε + γn̄-	Variant: ε/νε/-ετε + oγn̄-
Circumstantial	εγn̄- (<i>Acts</i> 1.15, 16.14, 18.24, 19.40, 24.11, 27.39) (<i>Rom</i> . 15.14) (<i>Heb</i> . 5.2) (<i>Gal</i> . 3.21) (2 <i>Tim</i> . 3.15, 5.24) <i>Acts</i> : 100% <i>Epistles</i> : 83%	εoγn̄- (1 <i>Thess</i> . 2.7) <i>Acts</i> : 0% <i>Epistles</i> : 17%
Imperfect	νεγn̄- (<i>Acts</i> 3.2, 4.33, 8.9, 9.10, 9.36, 10.1, 11.20, 12.5, 12.18, 14.8, 14.12, 16.1, 19.14, 20.8, 20.9, 28.7) νεγ(n̄) (<i>Acts</i> 11.24) <i>Acts</i> : 94% <i>Epistles</i> : 0%	neoγn̄- (<i>Acts</i> 26.32) (<i>Heb</i> . 7.11) (<i>Gal</i> . 4.15) <i>Acts</i> : 6% <i>Epistles</i> : 100%

- *Converted predication of possession:*

ε/νε/-ετε + γn̄τε-/γn̄τα (var. oγn̄τε-/oγn̄τα)

Table 32: Variation with the converted predication of possession

Conjugation	Standard: ε/νε/-ετε + γn̄τε-/γn̄τα	Variant: ε/νε/-ετε + oγn̄τε-/oγn̄τα
Circumstantial 1	εγn̄τε-/εγn̄τα (<i>Acts</i> 2.47, 4.37, 18.24, 19.14, 21.23, 23.18) (<i>Rom</i> . 1.14, 2.20, 12.6, 15.23) (1 <i>Cor</i> . 7.12, 7.13, 13.2) (2 <i>Cor</i> . 3.12, 4.1, 4.13, 7.1, 9.8, 10.15) (<i>Heb</i> . 4.14, 5.14, 10.1, 10.19, 12.1) (<i>Eph</i> . 4.28) (<i>Phil</i> . 1.23, 1.30, 2.2, 3.4) (<i>Col</i> . 2.23) (1 <i>Tim</i> . 1.19, 3.4, 3.7, 3.9, 4.8, 5.4, 5.12, 6.8) (2 <i>Tim</i> . 2.19, 3.5) (<i>Titus</i> 1.6) (<i>Philem</i> 8) <i>Acts</i> : 86% <i>Epistles</i> : 88%	εoγn̄τε-/εoγn̄τα (1 <i>Cor</i> . 6.1, 12.12) (<i>Col</i> . 3.13) (1 <i>Tim</i> . 5.16) εoγn̄τε- / εoγn̄τα (<i>Acts</i> 24.15) (<i>Gal</i> . 6.10) <i>Acts</i> : 14% <i>Epistles</i> : 12%

Conjugation	Standard: Ε/Νε/-ετε + γν̄τε-/γν̄τα	Variant: Ε/Νε/-ετε + ογν̄τε-/ογν̄τα
Imperfect	-νεγν̄τε-/νεγν̄τα (Acts 13.5, 18.18, 21.9) (Heb. 12.9) Acts: 100% Epistles: 33%	-νεογν̄τε-/νεογν̄τα (Rom. 6.21) (Heb. 9.1) Acts: 0% Epistles: 67%
Relative	-ετεγν̄τε-/ετεγν̄τα (Acts 25.19) (Rom. 12.4) (1 Cor. 7.29, 15.31) (2 Cor. 2.4) (Heb. 7.6, 11.10) (Gal. 2.4, 4.27) (Eph. 3.12) (1 Tim. 6.16) (Philem 5) Acts: 20% Epistles: 55%	-ετεογν̄τε-/ετεογν̄τα (Rom. 12.4) (1 Cor. 8.10) (Heb. 2.14, 3.3, 4.15, 10.35) (1 Tim. 6.2) -ετεογν̄τε-/ετεογν̄τα (Acts 3.6, 4.34, 11.29 23.19) (2 Cor. 8.11, 8.12) Acts: 80% Epistles: 45%

- *Long and short form of the article with lexeme-initial ογ*: As with the case of ογ:χαῖ (Case C1), fluctuation between the long and short form of the definite article also occurs with the lexeme ογοειω.¹⁷ In addition, with this particular word, there is variation between the use of ογ and γ with the long form of the article.

Table 33: Forms of ογοειω with the definite article

Short form of the definite article π + ογ	Long form of the definite article πε/νε + ογ	Long form of the definite article πε/νε + γ
πογοειω (1 Cor. 16.12) (Heb. 11.11) (Phil. 4.10) (1 Thess. 2.17) (2 Tim. 4.2 x2) Acts: 0% Epistles: 18%	πεογοειω (Acts 7.17, 12.1, 17.30) (Heb. 11.32) (Gal. 4.3) (2 Tim. 4.6) νεογοειω (Acts 3.19, 3.21) (Titus 1.2) Acts: 63% Epistles: 12%	πεγοειω (Acts 19.23, 24.25) (Rom. 6.20, 13.11) (1 Cor. 4.5, 7.29, 7.39, 13.11) (2 Cor. 6.2) (Heb. 2.15, 5.12, 9.10) (Gal. 4.1, 4.4, 6.10) (Eph. 2.12, 5.16) πεγοϊω (Acts 7.20) (Col. 4.5) νεγοειω (Rom. 16.25) (Heb. 9.26) (Eph. 1.10, 2.7) (1 Thess. 5.1) (1 Tim. 4.1) (2 Tim. 1.9) (Titus 1.2) νεγοϊω (Acts 1.7) Acts: 37% Epistles: 70%

- *Coalescence of ογ-ογ*: The sequence ογ-ογ (initial ογ lexeme preceded by the indefinite article) sometimes coalesces to ογ (19%). Elsewhere ογογ is maintained (22 occurrences – 81%).

¹⁷ Cf. Depuydt (1993), pp. 369-375.

Table 34: Objects of coalescence

Standard: $\text{o}\gamma\text{-o}\gamma$	Variant: $\text{o}\gamma\langle\text{o}\gamma\rangle$
$\text{πρoco}\gamma\text{o}\gamma\text{o}\epsilon\text{i}\omega$ (<i>Heb.</i> 11.25) <i>Acts: ∅ Epistles: 33%</i>	$\text{πρoco}\gamma\text{o}\epsilon\text{i}\omega$ (<i>1 Cor.</i> 7.5) (<i>2 Cor.</i> 4.18) “for a time” <i>Acts: ∅ Epistles: 67%</i>
$\text{ἡ}\text{o}\gamma\text{o}\gamma\text{o}\epsilon\text{i}\omega$ (<i>Rom.</i> 7.9) <i>Acts: 0% Epistles: 100%</i>	$\text{ἡ}\text{o}\gamma\text{o}\epsilon\text{i}\omega$ (<i>Acts</i> 19.22) “for a time” <i>Acts: 100% Epistles: 0%</i>
	$\text{ω}\lambda\text{o}\gamma\text{o}\epsilon\text{i}\omega$ (<i>Acts</i> 13.11) “for a time” <i>Acts: 100% Epistles: ∅</i>
	$\text{ἡ}\text{o}\gamma\text{o}\epsilon\text{i}\nu$ (<i>Acts</i> 13.47) “as a light” <i>Acts: 100% Epistles: ∅</i>
	$\text{o}\gamma\epsilon\text{i}\epsilon\text{n}\text{i}\nu$ (<i>Acts</i> 16.1); $\text{o}\gamma\epsilon\epsilon\text{i}\epsilon\text{n}\text{i}\nu$ (<i>Acts</i> 16.3) “a Greek” <i>Acts: 100% Epistles: ∅</i>

Case D3: '(C)CGV **G = $\text{o}\gamma$**

There is only one example of the glide $\text{o}\gamma$ following a consonant in an open syllable:

$\text{zo}\gamma\epsilon\text{i}\tau\epsilon$.

Case D4: '(C)CGVC **G = $\text{o}\gamma$**

In a closed syllable there is only one instance of the glide $\text{o}\gamma$ following a consonant:

$\omega\text{o}\gamma\epsilon\text{i}\tau$.

Case D5: '(C)VGC(C)

$V = \text{o}, \omega, \text{o}\gamma$ *Acts: G = $\text{o}\gamma$* *Epistles: G = $\text{o}\gamma$*

$V = \lambda, \epsilon, \text{h}, \text{oo}$ *Acts: G = γ* *Epistles: G = γ*

Following o, ω , and vocalic $\text{o}\gamma$, the glide is realised $\text{o}\gamma$. Following $\lambda, \epsilon, \text{h}$, and oo , the glide is realised γ .

a) $V = \text{o}, \omega, \text{o}\gamma$ **G = $\text{o}\gamma$**

Lexical forms:

$\text{mo}\gamma\gamma, \text{zo}\gamma\gamma^{\dagger}, \text{eo}\gamma\gamma, \text{to}\gamma\gamma, \text{zo}\gamma\gamma\tau, \text{t}\omega\gamma\gamma\text{n}, \text{c}\omega\gamma\gamma\text{z}, \text{p}\rho\omega\gamma\gamma, \text{t}\omega\gamma\gamma,$
 $\epsilon\text{i}\epsilon\rho\omega\gamma\gamma$.

3rd person pronominal suffixes:

$\epsilon\rho\text{o}\gamma, \bar{\text{m}}\text{mo}\gamma, \epsilon\chi\omega\gamma, \bar{\text{n}}\text{c}\omega\gamma, \text{zi}\chi\omega\gamma, \text{z}\omega\gamma, \text{n}\lambda\text{n}\text{o}\gamma\gamma$.

b) V = λ, ε, η, οο G = γ

Lexical forms:

ναγ, μααγ, τηγτῆ, ερηγ, κωκασηγ, τηγ, σηγ, cnhγ,
 2οογ “day” 2οοεγ.

Statives:

nhγ, ογhγ, ταῖhγ, ταειhγ, ταμihγ, τμαῖhγ, ταχhγ.

3rd person plural suffix pronouns:

nmmaεγ, naεγ, पेखाεγ, न॑त्हεγ, ογbhεγ.

3rd person plural pronominal subjects:

αγ-, ῆταγ-, ωαγ-.

εγ-, neγ-, neyna-, εγε-, enneγ-, meγ-.

Possessive articles:

πεγ-, τεγ-, neγ-.

Case D6: (C)V.'GV(C) and '(C)V.GV(C)

V = ο, ι Acts: G = ογ Epistles: G = ογ

V = η Acts: G = γ Epistles: G = γ (var. ογ)

The intervocalic glide, following ο and ι, is rendered by ογ. The intervocalic glide, following η, is always realised γ in *Acts*, but variation is displayed in the *Epistles*.

a) V = ο, ι G = ογ

κοογε, 2ιογε, 2ιοογε.

b) V = η Acts: G = γ Epistles: G = γ (var. ογ)

Acts: 2bhγε, phγε.

Epistles: 2bhγε~2bhογε, phγε~phογε.

Table 35: $\mathbf{H} + \gamma$ vs. $\mathbf{O}\gamma$

Standard: Υ	Variant: ΟΥ
<p>Ⲛⲉⲛⲩⲥ (<i>Acts</i> 7.22, 7.41, 19.18, 21.19, 26.20) <i>(Rom.</i> 2.6, 3.20, 3.27, 3.28, 4.2, 4.6, 8.13, 9.12, 11.6, 13.12) <i>(I Cor.</i> 16.14 <i>(2 Cor.</i> 11.15) <i>(Heb.</i> 1.10, 2.7, 3.9, 4.3, 4.4, 4.10, 6.1, 9.14, 10.1, 10.24, 11.1) <i>(Gal.</i> 1.13, 2.16 x3, 3.2, 3.5, 3.10, 5.19) <i>(Eph.</i> 2.10, 4.22, 5.11) <i>(Col.</i> 1.21, 3.9) <i>(I</i> <i>Tim.</i> 2.10, 4.12, 5.10, 5.25, 6.18) <i>(2 Tim.</i> 1.9, 2.4, 4.14) <i>(Titus</i> 1.16, 2.7, 2.14, 3.8, 3.14) <i>Acts: 100% Epistles: 94%</i></p>	<p>Ⲛⲉⲛⲟⲩⲥ (<i>Rom.</i> 9.32) (<i>I Tim.</i> 6.5) (<i>Titus</i> 3.5)</p> <p><i>Acts: 0% Epistles: 6%</i></p>
<p>ⲡⲏⲛⲩⲥ (<i>Acts</i> 2.34, 7.56) <i>(Rom.</i> 2.22) <i>(Heb.</i> 1.10, 4.14, 7.26, 8.1, 9.23 x2, 12.23, 12.25) <i>(Eph.</i> 1.3, 1.10, 2.6, 3.10, 3.15, 4.10, 6.9, 6.12) <i>(Phil.</i> 2.10, 3.20) <i>(Col.</i> 1.5, 1.16, 1.20) <i>(I Thess.</i> 1.10) <i>Acts: 100% Epistles: 92%</i></p>	<p>ⲡⲏⲛⲟⲩⲥ (<i>2 Cor.</i> 5.1) (<i>Eph.</i> 1.20)</p> <p><i>Acts: 0% Epistles: 8%</i></p>

c) $\mathbf{V} = \lambda, \epsilon$ *Acts*: $\mathbf{G} = \gamma$ (var. $\circ\gamma$) *Epistles*: $\mathbf{G} = \gamma$

The intervocalic glide, following ʌ and ɛ, is realised ɥ, with one exception in *Acts*:

ΑΥΩ, ΜΕΕΥΕ.

Table 36: $\lambda + \gamma$ vs. $O\gamma$

Standard: Υ	Variant: $\text{O}\Upsilon$
$\Upsilon\Delta\Upsilon\text{O}(\neq)$ (<i>Acts</i> 2.11, 8.33, 15.12, 15.25, 16.36, 19.18, 19.31, 21.26, 23.30, 24.25, 26.24) (2 <i>Cor.</i> 4.9) (<i>Heb.</i> 6.8, 9.5) (<i>Eph.</i> 1.21) (2 <i>Tim.</i> 2.19) $\Upsilon\Delta\Upsilon\text{E-}$ (<i>Acts</i> 11.4, 19.13, 21.19) (<i>Rom.</i> 15.20) (<i>Heb.</i> 7.6) (<i>Eph.</i> 3.15, 5.3) <i>Acts</i> : 93% <i>Epistles</i> : 100%	$\Upsilon\Delta\text{O}\Upsilon \text{O}\neq\text{O}\Upsilon$ (<i>Acts</i> 15.33) <i>Acts</i> : 7% <i>Epistles</i> : 0%

APPENDIX 2: BRITISH LIBRARY OR. 7594

A. Graphemic forms of the vowel /i/ (ι~ει~ῑ~ϊ~ῖ)

Table 37: Typology of the vowel /i/

Case	Syllabic Context *Examples	<i>BL Deuteronomy</i>	<i>BL Jonah</i>	<i>BL Acts</i>	Examples
A1	#'V ει	ει (var. ῑ~ῖ)	ει (var. ῑ)	ει (var. ῑ~ῖ)	ει~ῑ~ῖ εἶπε~ῑπε
A2	#(')VC ειC-	ει	∅	ει	ειC-
A3	(')(C)CV χι	ι (var. εἰ~ῑ)	ι (var. εἰ)	ι (var. εἰ~ῖ)	χι χῑ Cι~Cει
A4	(')(C)CVC(C) νιμ	ι (var. εἰ~ῖ)	ι (var. εἰ)	ι (var. εἰ)	νιμ
A5	'(C)GV ογι	ει (var. ῑ)	∅	ει	ογι~ῑ ογινε
A6	'(C)GVC ογογιτ	ει	ει	ει	ογογιτ

*Examples from classical Sahidic (Chester Beatty – *Acts*)

Case A1: #'V V = εἰ (var. ῑ~ῖ~ῖ~ῖ)

At the beginning of a lexeme, in an open syllable, the vowel /i/ is rendered by the digraph εἰ, and, in the case of *Deuteronomy* and *Jonah*, often carrying a circumflex (ῑ):¹⁸

Deut.: ῑ, εἶπε~ῑπε, εἶνε~ῑνε, εἶβε~ῑβε, εἶμε~ῑμε.

Jon.: ῑ, εἶπε~ῑπε, εἶμε, εἶνε.

Acts: εἰ~ῑ, εἶπε, εἶμε, εἶνε.

The initial vowel /i/, in Copto-Greek lexemes, is also rendered with the digraph:

ειλ.ωλον, ειρηνη, ειρηνικε, ειμητι.

Note: εἰπλ.η (*Acts* 15.24), εἰπλ.η (*Acts* 14.12), εἰπλ.ε (*Acts* 13.46) ἐπειδή.

¹⁸ In the edition of Budge (1912) the circumflex is placed over the iota (ῑ).

With a preformative clitic: When preceded by the definite article, or other preformative clitic, this rule applies, with the following exceptions:

αἰ “she came” (*Acts* 5.7);

πιδωλον “the idol”, πιδωλον “to idols” (*Acts* 21.25).

Use of the circumflex: The circumflex occurs regularly over the digraph of the verb “to come” in *Deuteronomy* and *Jonah*, and at times with other words. It does not appear in *Acts* in the lexeme-initial position, but the trema is found twice surmounting the iota of the digraph (εῖ).¹⁹ The trema could be functioning like a circumflex in this case, or it is possibly a variant writing.

Table 38: #εἰ vs. εῖ vs. εῖ

εἰ	εῖ	εῖ
εἰ (<i>Deut.</i> 28.19) (<i>Jon.</i> : Ø) (<i>Acts</i> : 110, [5] occurrences) <i>Deut.</i> : 2% <i>Jon.</i> : 0% <i>Acts</i> : 98%	εῖ (<i>Deut.</i> 1.44, 2.14 x2, 6.4, 9.15, 10.1, 10.5, 10.7, 10.22, 11.5, 11.10, 12.9, 12.26, 13.2, 13.13, 14.28, 16.1, [16.3 x2], 16.6, 16.8, 18.6, 22.6, 23.4, 24.20, 25.1, 26.3, 26.5, 28.22, 28.25, [28.45], 28.57, 28.60, 29.7, 29.20, 29.22, 30.1, 31.2, 32.2, 32.17, 33.2, 33.16, 33.18) (<i>Jon.</i> 1.2, 1.7, 1.8, 2.4, 2.6, 2.8) <i>Deut.</i> : 98% <i>Jon.</i> : 100% <i>Acts</i> : 0%	εῖ (<i>Acts</i> 1.8, 7.34) <i>Deut.</i> : 0% <i>Jon.</i> : 0% <i>Acts</i> : 2 %
εἶπε (<i>Deut.</i> 5.10, 5.13, 5.16, 5.32, 5.33, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.18, 6.24, 9.18, 10.18, 11.2, 11.9, 12.8 x2, 12.14, 12.25, 12.28 x2, 12.30, 12.31, 13.11, [15.15], 16.1, 16.13, 17.10, 17.12, 19.3, 19.9, 22.5, 22.7, 22.21, 24.8 x2, 24.18, 24.22, 25.16 x2, 28.1, 31.4, 31.9, 32.27, [30.8], [30.13], [31.12], [31.21], 32.47, 33.21) [εἶ]πε (<i>Deut.</i> 16.10) (<i>Jon</i> 1.13, 4.2) (<i>Acts</i> 4.28, 6.8, 7.24, 7.36, 8.2, 8.6, 8.13, 9.36, 12.8, 12.9, 13.22, 14.15, 15.3, 16.18, 19.11, 19.14, 19.19 x2, 20.31, 27.37) ἦνεἶπε (<i>Acts</i> 19.37) dittography <i>Deut.</i> : 63% <i>Jon.</i> : 100% <i>Acts</i> : 100%	εῖπε (<i>Deut.</i> 6.25, 11.32, 12.4, 12.30, 15.1, 15.5, 15.17, 16.12, 16.13, 17.2, 17.10, 18.9, 19.20, 22.21, 24.20, 25.15, 28.15, 28.58, 28.63, 29.9, 29.24, 30.5, 30.10, 31.5, 32.46, 34.9) <i>Deut.</i> : 37% <i>Jon.</i> : 0% <i>Acts</i> : 0%	

¹⁹ Budge (1912) places the trema over the iota in *Acts* where it is not apparent in the photographs (*Acts* 10.21, 10.38, 11.20, 14.2, 16.27, 19.37, 20.31, 21.5, 21.10, 22.12).

ει	ῑ	ῑ̃
εἶνε (Deut. 7.19, 14.22, 17.5, 17.14, 26.10) (Jon.: passim) (Acts: passim) Deut.: 50% Jon.: 100% Acts: 100%	εῖνε (Deut. 14.27, 28.28, 28.35, 28.49, 29.27) Deut.: 50% Jon.: 0% Acts: 0%	
εἶμε (Deut. 7.9, 11.2, 29.6, 29.9) (Jon.: passim) (Acts: passim) Deut.: 80% Jon.: 100% Acts: 100%	εῖμε (Deut. 11.2) Deut.: 20% Jon.: 0% Acts: 0%	
εἶβε (Deut. 28.48) Deut.: 50% Jon.: 100% Acts: 100%	εῖβε (Deut. 32.10) Deut.: 50% Jon.: 0% Acts: 0%	

Biblical names/proper nouns: The exception to this rule occurs with biblical names where ῑ̃ is regular:

Deut.: ἱσαακ, ἱσακ, ἱ.δ.ο.υ.μ.α.ι.ο.ς (with a preformative: ο.υ.ῑ̃.δ.ο.υ.μ.α.ι.ο.ς “an Edomite”).

But εἰσκα[χαρ] (Ἰσσαχὰρ) (Deut. 33.18).

Jon.: Ø

Acts: ἱσαακ, ἱσακ (7.8 x2 – trema with one point).

The initial glide regularly loses the trema when followed by the singular definite article:

πισραηλ, πῑηλ (πῑηλ/ πῑηλ̄).

Note: τ.ῑ̃.τ.α.λ.ικ.η (Acts 10.1) Ἰταλικῆς.

Case A2 #()VC

V = εἰ

There is only one example in this domain:

εἰς-.

Case A3: '(C)CV and CV

V = ι (var. εἰ~ῑ̃~ῑ̃)

When the vowel /i/ follows a consonant, in an open syllable, it is generally rendered by the grapheme ι. For example:

φι, φιβε, φικε, φῑνε, ϑι, ζῑμε, ζῑκε, χῑβιν, χῑ, χῑκε, δῑνε;
 χῑσι-, ῑ̃τερι-, ῑ̃σι-, πι-, νι-, ῑ̃πι-.

Variation: The exception to this rule concerns the lexeme ci~cei~cῑ̃, which in

Deuteronomy is always written with the digraph, sometimes with a circumflex towards the end of the manuscript.²⁰ In *Deuteronomy* there is also one occurrence each of $\text{c}\hat{\text{e}}\text{in}\acute{\text{e}}$ “fullness” (*Deut.* 33.23)²¹ and $\text{c}\hat{\text{e}}\text{in}\epsilon$ “pass through” (*Deut.* 23.14). In *Acts* it is written ci (*Acts* 27.38).

Table 39: $\text{c}\hat{\text{e}}\text{i}$ vs. $\text{c}\hat{\text{e}}\hat{\text{i}}$

ei	$\hat{\text{e}}\text{i}$
$\text{c}\hat{\text{e}}\text{i}$ (<i>Deut.</i> 6.11, 11.16, 14.28, 23.25, 31.20) $\text{c}\hat{\text{e}}\text{in}\epsilon$ (<i>Deut.</i> 23.14) <i>Deut.</i> : 67%	$\text{c}\hat{\text{e}}\hat{\text{i}}$ (<i>Deut.</i> 32.15, 33.23) $\text{c}\hat{\text{e}}\hat{\text{i}}\text{in}\acute{\text{e}}$ (<i>Deut.</i> 33.23) <i>Deut.</i> : 33%

Other variants (or particular spellings):

- $\text{n}\hat{\text{o}}\text{i}$ (*Acts* 19.33, 22.30). Note also: $\text{n}\hat{\text{o}}\text{i}$ (*Acts* 2.5, 8.30, 9.36); $\bar{\text{m}}\hat{\text{o}}\text{i}$ (*Acts* 22.26) and $\text{n}\hat{\text{o}}\text{o}\text{i}$ (*Acts* 23.12); $\bar{\text{n}}\hat{\text{o}}\text{i}$ (*passim*);
- $\bar{\text{m}}\pi\text{i}-$ (*Acts* 20.27, 20.33) vs. $\bar{\text{m}}\pi\hat{\text{i}}-$ (*Acts* 10.14, 20.20, [20.31], 24.11);
- $\text{x}\lambda\text{i}\text{o}\gamma\lambda$ (*Acts* 19.37) vs. $\text{x}\lambda\text{i}\text{o}\gamma\lambda$ (*Acts* 18.5) – possible variant spelling, or perhaps a scribal error. [Crum (1939), p. 468b: $\text{x}\lambda$, $\text{x}\epsilon$ $\text{o}\gamma\lambda$ “speak blasphemy”] The trema on the iota could be triggered by the preceding vowel λ (cf. Case B5).

Apart from the exceptions mentioned above, there are two other examples of fluctuation between the two allographs.

Table 40: $\text{C} + \text{i}$ vs. $\text{c}\hat{\text{e}}\text{i}$

i	$\text{c}\hat{\text{e}}\text{i}$
$\theta\text{i}\text{m}\epsilon$ “the wife” (<i>Deut.</i> 22.24, 22.30, 25.7, 25.9, 25.11) $\text{z}\text{i}\text{m}\epsilon$ (<i>Deut.</i> 22.29) <i>Deut.</i> : 83%	$\theta\hat{\text{e}}\text{i}\text{m}\epsilon$ (<i>Deut.</i> 5.21) <i>Deut.</i> : 17%
$\pi\text{i}\text{c}\epsilon$ “boil” (<i>Deut.</i> 14.20) <i>Deut.</i> : 50%	$\pi\hat{\text{e}}\text{i}\text{c}\epsilon$ (<i>Deut.</i> 16.7) <i>Deut.</i> : 50%

²⁰ Budge (1912), p. xiv; Thompson (1913), p. 9: The scribe frequently places the circumflex over various vowels towards the end of the manuscript, in the Song of Moses in particular (*Deut.* 32-34). Most of these, and other diacritical marks, were added later probably for singing purposes.

²¹ Where Budge (1912) has $\pi\hat{\text{e}}\text{c}\hat{\text{e}}\text{i}\text{m}\epsilon$ (*Deut.* 33.23) Thompson (1913), p. 28 has emended it to $\pi\text{c}\hat{\text{e}}\hat{\text{i}}\text{m}\epsilon$, with the comment, “ $\text{c}\hat{\text{e}}\text{i}\text{in}-$ is written over an erasure, the n over π prob”.

Words of Greek origin:

a) Greek ι is generally rendered with Sahidic ι. The scribe of *Acts* almost exclusively uses the simple iota, whereas *Jonah* and *Deuteronomy* exhibit more variation. For example:

ΛΔΙΚΙΑ, ΛΔΙΚΟΣ, ΕΤΙ, ΜΗΤΙ, ΕΙΜΗΤΙ, ΖΟΤΙ.

But note: ΠΟΛΕΙΤΗ[С] (*Acts* 21.39) (πολίτης), ΑΜΑΘΕΙ (*Jon.* 1.1) (Ἀμαθί).

Table 41: Greek ι: C + ι vs. ει

ι > ι	ι > ει
ἐπιθυμέω ΕΠΙΘΥΜΙ (<i>Acts</i> 20.33) <i>Deut.</i> : 0% <i>Jon.</i> : Ø <i>Acts</i> : 100%	ΕΠΕΙΘΥΜΙ (<i>Deut.</i> 5.21, 7.25, 12.20, 14.25) ΕΠΕΙΘΥΜΕΙ (<i>Deut.</i> 5.21, 14.25) <i>Deut.</i> : 100% <i>Jon.</i> : Ø <i>Acts</i> : 0%
ἐπιθυμία ΕΠΙΘΥΜΙΑ (<i>Deut.</i> 12.20) <i>Deut.</i> : 33% <i>Jon.</i> : Ø <i>Acts</i> : Ø	ΕΠΕΙΘΥΜΙΑ (<i>Deut.</i> 12.21) ΕΠΕΙΘΥΜΙΑΗ (<i>Deut.</i> 9.22) <i>Deut.</i> : 67% <i>Jon.</i> : Ø <i>Acts</i> : Ø
ἐπικαλέω ΕΠΙΚΑΛΙ (<i>Deut.</i> 12.26) (<i>Acts</i> 7.59, 7.60, 9.14, 9.21, 22.16, 26.32, 28.19) ΕΠΕΚΑΛΕΙ (<i>Deut.</i> 17.8) <i>Deut.</i> : 20% <i>Jon.</i> : 0% <i>Acts</i> : 100%	ΕΠΕΙΚΑΛΙ (<i>Deut.</i> 14.22, 33.19) ΕΠΕΙΚΑΛΕΙ (<i>Deut.</i> 12.5, 26.2) (<i>Jon.</i> 1.6) [ΕΠΕΙ]ΚΑΛΙ (<i>Acts</i> 17.17) <i>Deut.</i> : 80% <i>Jon.</i> : 100% <i>Acts</i> : 0%

b) Greek ει is generally rendered ι in *Acts* and ει~ι in *Deuteronomy* and *Jonah*:

ΕΠΙΔΗ (*Acts* 13.46, 14.12), ΕΠΠΙΔΗ (*Acts* 15.24) ἐπειδή;

[СΥ]ΠΠΙΔΗCIC (*Acts* 23.1) συνείδησις;

ΑΒΙΡΩΝ (*Deut.* 11.6) Ἀβειρών;

ΑΠΙΛΕ (*Acts* 4.21) ἀπειλέω, or ἀπείλω, ΑΠΙΛΗ (*Acts* 9.1) ἀπειλή.

It is interesting to note that the following are regular throughout the manuscripts:

ΝΗΣΤΙΑ (νηστεία), ΠΟΡΝΙΑ (πορνεία), ΠΛΑΤΙΑ (πλατύς, εἶα, ύ) ΠΟΛΙΤΙΑ (πολιτεία).

Table 42: Greek ει: C + ι vs. ει (excluding verb endings)

ει > ι	ει > ει
ἐπεί	ἐπει (Jon. 1.10) Deut.: Ø Jon.: 100% Acts: Ø
πειρασμός ΠΙΡΑΣΜΟΣ (Deut. 6.16) (Acts 20.19) Deut.: 25% Jon.: Ø Acts: 100%	ΠΕΙΡΑΣΜΟΣ (Deut. 7.19, 9.22, 29.3) Deut.: 75% Jon.: Ø Acts: 0%
πειράζω ΠΙΡΑΖΕ (Acts 5.9, 15.10, [16.7], [24.6]) Deut.: 0% Jon.: Ø Acts: 100%	ΠΕΙΡΑΖΕ (Deut. 6.16, 33.8 x2) Deut.: 100% Jon.: Ø Acts: 0%
χειμάρρος ΧΙΜΑΡΟΣ (Deut. 10.7) Deut.: 50% Jon.: Ø Acts: Ø	ΧΕΙΜΑΡΡΟΣ (Deut. 9.21) Deut.: 50% Jon.: Ø Acts: Ø
πείθω ΠΙΘΕ (Acts: <i>passim</i>) Deut.: 0% Jon.: Ø Acts: 100%	ΠΕΙΘΕ (Deut. 13.7) Deut.: 100% Jon.: Ø Acts: 0%

c) In the case of the -έω/-έομαι contract verb endings, the scribe of *Acts* prefers ι and the scribe of *Deuteronomy* and *Jonah* favours the digraph. Following a vowel, ῑ is always used (cf. Case B5).

Greek ει > Sahidic ι:

ΑΙΤΙ (Acts 3.14, 7.46, 9.2, 12.20, 13.21, 13.28 ΑΤΙ) αἰτέω;
 ΑΠΟΡΙ (Acts 2.12, 5.24, 10.17) ἀπορέω;
 ΑΣΚΙ (Acts 24.16) ἀσκέω;
 ΔΙΑΚΟΝΙ (Acts 6.2, 19.22) διακονέω;
 ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΙ (Acts 28.15) εὐχαριστέω;
 ΚΑΤΗΓΟΡΙ (Acts 24.8, 28.19), ΝΑΤΗΡΙ (Acts 22.30), ΓΑΤΗΓΟΡΙ (Acts 24.2);
 ΚΑΤΗ(ΓΟ)ΡΙ (Acts 24.13) κατηγορέω;
 ΠΡΟΣΚΑΡΤΕΡΙ (Acts 1.14, 2.42, 2.46, 8.13, 10.7) προσκαρτερέω;
 ΣΥΜΦΩΝΙ (Acts 15.15) συμφονέω;
 ΣΥΝΕΥΔΟΒΙ (Acts 8.1, 22.20) συνευδοκέω;
 ΤΙ[ΜΩ]ΡΙ (Acts 22.5) τιμωρέω;
 ΖΟΜΟΛΟΓΙ (Acts 7.17, 24.14 ΖΟΜΟΛ(ΟΓ)Ι) ὁμολογέω;
 ΟΞΟΜΟΛΟΓΙ (Acts 19.18) ἐξομολογέομαι;
 ΓΡΑΨΗΤΙ (Deut. *subscriptio*) γραψέω;
 Note: ΑΠΙΛΕ (Acts 4.21) ἀπειλέω or ἀπείλω.

Greek ει > Sahidic ʕi:

ΑΣΧΗΜΟΝΕΙ (*Deut.* 24.3) ἀσχημονέω;

ΛΥΠΕΙ (*Deut.* 15.10) (*Jon.* 4.1 x2) λυπέω;

ΘΑΛΠΕΙ (*Deut.* 22.6) θάλλπεω.

Table 43: Greek ει: C + i vs. ʕi (verb endings)

ει > i	ει > ʕi
ἀνομέω ΑΝΟΜΙ (<i>Deut.</i> 9.12) <i>Deut.</i> : 50% <i>Jon.</i> : Ø <i>Acts</i> : Ø	ΑΝΌΜΕΙ (<i>Deut.</i> 31.29) <i>Deut.</i> : 50% <i>Jon.</i> : Ø <i>Acts</i> : Ø
ἀρχομαι “to begin” ΑΡΧΙ (<i>Acts</i> 1.1, 1.22, 2.4, 10.37, 11.4, 18.26, 24.2) <i>Deut.</i> : Ø <i>Jon.</i> : Ø <i>Acts</i> : 87%	ΑΡΧΕΙ (<i>Acts</i> 11.15) <i>Deut.</i> : Ø <i>Jon.</i> : Ø <i>Acts</i> : 13%
βοηθέω ΒΟΗΘΙ (<i>Deut.</i> 28.29, 28.31) (<i>Acts</i> 16.9) ΒΟΗΤΙ (<i>Acts</i> 21.28) <i>Deut.</i> : 50% <i>Jon.</i> : Ø <i>Acts</i> : 100%	ΒΟΗΘΕΙ (<i>Deut.</i> 22.27, 32.38) <i>Deut.</i> : 50% <i>Jon.</i> : Ø <i>Acts</i> : 0%
ἐπιθυμέω ΕΠΕΙΘΥΜΙ (<i>Deut.</i> 5.21, 7.25, 12.20, 14.25) ΕΠΙΘΥΜΙ (<i>Acts</i> 20.33) <i>Deut.</i> : 67% <i>Jon.</i> : Ø <i>Acts</i> : 100%	ΕΠΕΙΘΥΜΕΙ (<i>Deut.</i> 5.21, 14.25) <i>Deut.</i> : 33% <i>Jon.</i> : Ø <i>Acts</i> : 0%
ἐπικαλέω ΕΠΕΙΚΑΛΙ (<i>Deut.</i> 14.22, 33.19) ΕΠΙΚΑΛΙ (<i>Deut.</i> 12.26) (<i>Acts</i> 7.59, 7.60, 9.14, 9.21, 22.16, 28.19) [ΕΠΙ]ΚΑΛΙ (<i>Acts</i> 15.17) ΕΠΙΚ[ΑΛΙ] (<i>Acts</i> 26.32) παρκαλέω ΠΑΡΑΚΑΛΙ (<i>Acts</i> 16.39) ἐγκαλέω ΕΝΓΑΛΙ (<i>Acts</i> 23.28, 23.29) <i>Deut.</i> : 50% <i>Jon.</i> : 0% <i>Acts</i> : 100%	ΕΠΕΙΚΑΛΕΙ (<i>Deut.</i> 12.5, 26.2) (<i>Jon.</i> 1.6) ΕΠΕΚΑΛΕΙ (<i>Deut.</i> 17.8) <i>Deut.</i> : 50% <i>Jon.</i> : 100% <i>Acts</i> : 0%
κληρονομέω ΚΛΗΡΟΝΟΜΙ (<i>Deut.</i> 1.39, 5.33, 6.1, 6.18, 7.1, 8.1, 9.23, 10.11, 11.8 x2, 11.10, 11.11, 11.23, 11.29, 11.31, 12.1, 12.29, 15.4, 16.20, 17.14, 23.20, 25.19, 26.1, [28.21], 28.63, 30.5 x2, 30.16, 30.18, 31.3, 31.13, 31.16, 32.47, 32.49) <i>Deut.</i> : 94% <i>Jon.</i> : Ø <i>Acts</i> : Ø	ΚΛΗΡΟΝΟΜΕΙ (<i>Deut.</i> 2.9, 33.23) <i>Deut.</i> : 6% <i>Jon.</i> : Ø <i>Acts</i> : Ø

d) Impersonal verbs appear in the form of the Greek 3rd person singular present indicative:

Ν̄.Δ.Ο.ΣΙ (*Acts* 15.22, 15.25, 15.28, 15.34) δοκεῖ.

e) Greek ε > Sahidic Ɛⲓ~ⲓ: Stressed Ɛ generally maintains its spelling in Coptic. But note the following renderings of παραγγέλω:

ΠΑΡΑΓΓΕΙΛƆ (Acts 1.4, 4.17, 4.18, 5.28, 5.40, 10.42, 16.23, 17.30, [23.22]);

ΠΑΡΑΓΛΕΙΛƆ (Acts 23.30);

ΠΑΡΑΓΓΕΛΕΙ (Acts 16.18);

ΠΑΡΑΓΓΕΙΛΙΑ (Acts 5.28, 16.24) παραγγελία.

Case A4: '(C)CVC(C) and CVC V = ⲓ (var. Ɛⲓ~ⲓ)

In a closed syllable there is strict adherence to this rule in *Acts*, but variation occurs in *Deuteronomy* and *Jonah*:

Ⲣⲓⲙ, ⲕⲓⲙ, ⲙⲉⲣⲓⲧ, Ͳⲓⲛ, ⲑⲓⲛ-.

Variation: The circumflex also appears over the grapheme ⲓ on one occasion towards the end of the book of *Deuteronomy*, where it appears frequently over various vowels:²²

ⲙⲉⲣⲓⲧ (Deut. 33.5) vs. ⲙⲉⲣⲓⲧ (Deut. 7.13, 15.16 33.12, 13.8, 23.5, 32.15, 33.12, 33.26)

Note: Ͳⲓ̄ⲛ (Acts 3.2); Ͳⲓⲛ (passim).²³

Words of Greek origin and biblical names/proper nouns:

ⲁⲃⲁⲣⲓⲛ (Deut. 32.49) Ἀβαρεῖν,

ⲁⲗⲁⲙⲁⲣⲓⲥ (Acts 17.34) Δάμαρις.

But note the use of the digraph in the following:

ⲑⲗⲓⲫⲉⲓⲥ (Deut. 26.7, 28.53, 28.57, 31.17) (Jon. 2.3) θλίψις;

ⲑⲁⲣⲥⲉⲓⲥ (Jon. 1.3 x3, 4.2) θαρσις;

ⲓⲁⲣⲓⲗⲉⲓⲛ (Deut. 11.29) Γαριζιν;

ⲓⲁⲕⲉⲓⲙ (Deut. 10.6) Ἰακίμ.

Note: ⲉⲗⲟⲙⲟⲗⲟⲓⲥⲉⲓⲥ (Jon. 2.10) ἑξομολήσεως.

²² For example: ⲥⲟⲩⲟ̄ (Deut. 33.28), ⲓⲟⲩⲁ̄ⲗ̄ (Deut. 34.2, 33.7), ⲛⲁⲩⲩ̄ (Deut. 31.23, 32.44, 34.9).

²³ Cf. Kahle (1954), p. 57.

Table 44: Greek ι: C + ι + C vs. C + ει + C

ι	ει
<p>πόλις ΠΟΛΙΣ (<i>Deut.</i> 6.10, 12.14, 12.15, 12.17, 12.18, 12.21, 13.12, 13.13, 13.16, 14.20, 14.26, 14.27, 14.28, 15.7, 15.22, 16.5, 16.11, 16.14, 17.2, 17.8, 18.6, 19.5, 19.7, 19.9, [22.17], 22.18, 22.21, 22.23, [22.24], 22.24, 24.14, 25.8, 28.3, 28.16, 28.52 x3, 28.55, [28.58], [31.12]) <i>(Acts: passim)</i> <i>Deut.: 84% Jon.: 0% Acts: 100%</i></p>	<p>ΠΟΛΕΙΣ (<i>Deut.</i> 13.15, 19.1, 19.2, 19.9, 19.11, 19.12, 34.3) <i>(Jon.</i> 1.2, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.5 x3, 4.11) <i>Deut.: 16% Jon.: 100% Acts: 0%</i></p>
<p>πρᾶξις ΠΡΑΞΙΣ (<i>Acts subscriptio</i>) <i>Deut.: Ø Jon.: Ø Acts: 50%</i></p>	<p>ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ (<i>Acts superscriptio</i>) <i>Deut.: Ø Jon.: Ø Acts: 50%</i></p>
<p>Βενιαμίν ΒΕΝΙΑΜΙΝ (<i>Acts</i> 13.21) <i>Deut.: 0% Jon.: Ø Acts: 100%</i></p>	<p>ΒΕΝΙΑΜΕΙΝ (<i>Deut.</i> 33.12) <i>Deut.: 100% Jon.: Ø Acts: 0%</i></p>

Case A5: '(C)GV G = /w/ V = ει (var. $\epsilon\iota$)

In contrast to the previous rule, when the vowel /i/ follows a glide in an open syllable the digraph is always employed:

ΟΥΕΙΝΕ, ΣΟΥΕΙΤΕ, ΛΕΥΕΙΤΗΣ.

Variation: In *Deuteronomy* the digraph carries a circumflex at the end of lexemes:

- ΟΥΕῖ “one” f. (*Deut.* 12.5, 12.14, 13.12, 15.7, 16.5, 17.2, 18.6).
But: ΕΥΕῖ “to one”: (*Deut.* 19.5), ΕΥΕῖ! (*Deut.* 19.11).
- ΛΕΥΕῖ (*Deut.* 10.8).

Note: ΟΥΕΙΔΑῖ (*Acts* 18.24 - for ΟΥῖΟΥΔΑῖ).

Case A6: '(C)GVC G = /w/ or /j/ V = ει

In a closed syllable the digraph realises the vowel when preceded by a glide. In this case the second vowel-glide element, ει, is interpreted as vocalic, the first, consonantal:

ΩΟΥΕΙΤ, ΑΥΕΙΝ, ΔΑΥΕΙΔ (Δαυίδ);
ΣΙΕΙΒ (*Deut.* 14.20) (*Acts* 8.32), ΣΕΙΕΙΒ (*Deut.* 32.14).

B. Graphemic forms of the glide /j/ (ει~êī~ī~ï)

Table 45: Typology of the glide /j/

Case	Syllabic Context		<i>BL Deuteronomy</i>	<i>BL Jonah</i>	<i>BL Acts</i>	Examples
B1	#'GV ειω		ει (var. ï)	ει (var. ï)	ει (var. ī~ï)	ειω ειote
B2	#'GVC(C) ειωτ		ει (var. êī~ï)	∅	ει (var. ī)	ειωτ
B3	'(C)CGV ειη		ι (var. ει~ï)	ι	ι	ειη τcio ειome
B4	'(C)CGVC ειειβ		ι (var. êī)	ι	ι	τcioφ ειειβ~2êīειβ
B5	'(C)VG# ηī χ.οī ε.χ.ωī κογī αφ.αī	V = η	ει (var. ï)	∅	ï (var. ī~ει)	ηει~ηī
		V = ο	ει (var. ï)	ει (var. ï)	ï (var. ī~ει)	χ.οει~χ.οī
		V = ω	ει	ει	ï (var. ει)	ειχ.ωει~ειχ.ωī
		V = ογ	ει (var. ï)	ει	ï (var. ει)	κογει~κογī
		V = α	ï (var. ει)	ï	ï (var. ī~ει)	αφ.αī~αφ.αει
	(C)VG# αī- εī-	V = α	ï	ï	ï (var. î~ει)	αī- φ.αī~φ.αει-
B6	'(C)VG.CV(C) 2οīνε~2οεινε 2αīβεc		V = ο ει	V = ο, η ει	V = ο, η ει (var. ï~ι)	2οεινε~2οīνε αμ.η.ε.ι.τ.ñ~αμ.η.ι.τ.ñ 2αειβεc~2αīβεc
			V = α ï (var. ει)	V = α ï	V = α ει	
B7	'(C)VGC# χ.ο.ε.ι.~χ.ο.ι.~c		ει (var. ï)	ει	ει	χ.ο.ε.ι.~χ.ο.ι.~c
B8	CVC.'GV ρ.μ.ε.ι.ο.ο.γ.ε		∅	∅	ει	ρ.μ.ε.ι.ο.ο.γ.ε
B9	'(C)V.GV(C) (C)V.'GV(C) χ.α.ι.ε		V = α, ε ï	∅	ει (var. ï~ι)	τ.α.ι.ο~τ.α.ε.ι.ο χ.α.ι.ε~χ.α.ε.ι.ε μ.ο.γ.ε.ι.ο.ο.γ.ε τ.ο.γ.ε.ι.η
			V = ογ ει			

Case B1: #'GV**G** = €I (var. I~i)

At the beginning of a lexeme, in an open syllable, the glide /j/ is represented by the digraph €I:

€IΔ, €IEΒΗ, €IOT€ , €IEPO, €IΩ, €IΩTE, €IΩZE, €IEPΩOY, €IΩZE, €IΩP̄M, €IOP̄M, €IΩP̄Z, €IOP̄Z, €IOP̄Z, €IOP̄E.

With a preformative clitic: This rule applies when it is preceded by the definite article or other preformative morpheme, with only a few exceptions.

Table 46: Clitic + #€I vs. I vs. i

€I	I	i
π€IEPO (Deut. 11.24)	πIEPO (Acts 16.13) ²⁴	
π€NTAY€IOP̄Z (Acts 27.39)		€iO[PA]ZC (Deut. 28.68) “to see it”
€Y€IOP̄M (Acts 1.10)		€YiOP̄M (Acts 28.6) i slightly raised

Coalescence of two adjacent glides: T€iOPE (Acts 19.25) (T€i(€I)OPE). This also occurs in the same place in the Chester Beatty codex.

Biblical names/proper nouns:

iAK€IM, iAKΩB, iHCOYC, iOYΔA, iΩCHΦ, iΩNAC, iΩNA, iOPH, iΩHΛ.

But note the loss of the trema in the following:

iΩZANNH€ (Acts 1.13) vs. iΩZANNH€ (x16);

iAKΩB (Acts 7.8) vs. iAKΩB (x5).

The initial glide regularly loses the trema when preceded by the singular definite article:

πIEBOYCAIOC;

πIOPΔANHC;

ΘIEPOYCAΛHM/TZIEPOYCAΛHM;

†OYΔAIA (x3); †OYΔAiA (Acts 21.10); †OYΔAI (Acts 2.9).

But: πiOYΔAi (Acts 19.17), in contrast to πiOYΔAi (passim).

Note also: n€YOUNOYΔAi (Acts 19.14) (CB: n€YnOYΔAi);

OY€IΔAi (Acts 18.24 for OYiOYΔAi), €YOUNA (Acts 18.1).

24 Cf. also CB: πIEPO (Acts 16.13); and P.Bodm. 23: πIEPO (Isa. 48.18).

Case B2: #'GVC(C) **G = €I** (var. €i~i~i)

At the beginning of a lexeme, in a closed syllable, the glide is realised with the digraph:

€IΩΤ, €I€2, €I€2ΩΗΝ, –€IΔΤ≈.

Note the following:

- ΟΥΝ̄€IΔΔΥ “a linen” (*Deut.* 22.11) – [Crum (1939) 88a: €IΔΔΥ: Crum cites *Deut.* 22.11 Ν€IΔΔΥ for €IΔΔΥ.];
- ΔΥΤCΒ̄ΒΟΤC̄ (*Acts* 10.22). Cf. *CB*: €ΔΥΤC€Β€–€IΔΤC̄.

With a preformative clitic: As in Case B1, this rule applies when the glide is preceded by a preformative segment, with a few exceptions.

Table 47: Clitic + #€I vs. I vs. i

€I	I	i
Π€IΩΤ (<i>Acts</i> Ø) Π€IΩΤ (<i>Deut.</i> : <i>passim</i>) <i>Deut.</i> : 100% <i>Acts</i> : 0%	ΠIΩΤ (<i>Acts</i> 1.4, 1.7, 28.8) <i>Deut.</i> : 0% <i>Acts</i> : 100%	ΠIΩΤ (<i>Deut.</i> 26.5) “my father” <i>Deut.</i> : 100%

On two occasions in *Deuteronomy* the circumflex is used with the digraph:

€ΝΑΡ€I€ΡΒΟΟΝ€ (*Deut.* 28.56); Ρ€C€Ω€I€ΡΒΟΟΟΝ€ (*Deut.* 18.10).

But: CΝΑΡ€I€ΡΒΟΟΝ€ (*Deut.* 28.54).

Case B3: '(C)CGV **G = I** (var. €I~i)

The glide following a consonant, in an open syllable, is rendered with a iota:

2IH, ΤCIO, 2IOM€, 2IΩ≈, 2IΩΩ≈, 2IOOY€, €BIΩ,

Θ̄Β̄ΒIO, Θ̄Β̄ΒI€–, ΤΑMIO, ΤΑMIE–, ΤΑMIO≈.

Variation:

σi€ “goat” (*Deut.* 32.14).

Variation also occurs in *Deuteronomy* in the following cases.

Table 48: C + ι vs. €ι

ι	€ι
Θ̄ΒΒΙΟ (<i>Deut.</i> 26.6, 26.7) (<i>Acts: passim</i>) <i>Deut.</i> : 67% <i>Jon.</i> : Ø <i>Acts</i> : 100%	Θ̄ΒΒ€ΙΟ≠ (<i>Deut.</i> 22.29) <i>Deut.</i> : 33% <i>Jon.</i> : Ø <i>Acts</i> : 0%
ΤΑΜΙΟ (<i>Deut.</i> 9.12, 9.16, 10.1, 10.3, 16.21) ΤΑΜΙΟ≠ (10.5, 32.15) (<i>Jon.</i> : <i>passim</i>) (<i>Acts: passim</i>) <i>Deut.</i> : 7% <i>Jon.</i> : 100% <i>Acts</i> : 100%	ΤΑΜ€ΙΟ≠ (<i>Deut.</i> 32.6) <i>Deut.</i> : 13% <i>Jon.</i> : 0% <i>Acts</i> : 0%

Case B4: '(C)CGVC G = ι (var. €ι)

The glide following a consonant, in a closed syllable, is also rendered with a iota:

Τ̣CΙΟϣ, ϣΙΟΟΡ.

Variation: One exception appears in *Deuteronomy*:

ϩ€Ι€ΙΒ (*Deut.* 32.14) vs. ϩΙ€ΙΒ (*Deut.* 14.20) (*Acts* 8.32)

Case B5: '(C)VG# and (C)VG#**a) Accented syllables '(C)VG#**

V = Η	<i>Deut./Jon.</i> : G = €ι (var. ï)	<i>Acts</i> : G = ï (var. ι~€ι)
V = Ο	<i>Deut./Jon.</i> : G = €ι (var. ï)	<i>Acts</i> : G = ï (var. ι~€ι)
V = Ω	<i>Deut./Jon.</i> : G = €ι	<i>Acts</i> : G = ï (var. €ι)
V = ΟΥ	<i>Deut./Jon.</i> : G = €ι (var. ï)	<i>Acts</i> : G = ï (var. €ι)
V = Α	<i>Deut./Jon.</i> : G = ï (var. €ι)	<i>Acts</i> : G = ï (var. ι~€ι)

After the vowels Η, Ο, Ω, and ΟΥ, the final glide /j/, in an accented syllable, is expressed graphically by €ι in *Deuteronomy* and *Jonah*, with only a few variations. The scribe of *Acts* prefers ï, but occasionally omits the trema. Following the vowel Α, the allograph ï is favoured by both scribes.

i) $V = \mathbf{H}$ *Deut./Jon.: $\mathbf{G} = \epsilon\mathbf{I}$ (var. $\ddot{\mathbf{I}}$) Acts: $\mathbf{G} = \ddot{\mathbf{I}}$ (var. $\mathbf{I} \sim \epsilon\mathbf{I}$)*

Table 49: $V = \mathbf{H}$ $\mathbf{G} = \epsilon\mathbf{I}$ vs. $\ddot{\mathbf{I}}\mathbf{I}$

$\epsilon\mathbf{I}$	$\ddot{\mathbf{I}}\mathbf{I}$
$\Theta\mathbf{H}\epsilon\mathbf{I}$ (<i>Deut.</i> 6.11) <i>Deut.: 100% Jon.: \emptyset Acts: \emptyset</i>	
$\Sigma\lambda\tau\mathbf{H}\epsilon\mathbf{I}$ (<i>Deut.</i> 32.34) <i>Deut.: 100% Jon.: \emptyset Acts: \emptyset</i>	
	$\Theta\Upsilon\mathbf{B}\mathbf{H}\ddot{\mathbf{I}}$ (<i>Acts</i> 28.19) <i>Deut.: \emptyset Jon.: \emptyset Acts: 100%</i>
$\mathbf{H}\epsilon\mathbf{I}$ (<i>Deut.</i> 30 occurrences) (<i>Acts</i> 4.34, 5.42, 10.2, 10.22, 11.13, 16.15, 16.31, 16.32, 16.34, 20.20 $\mathbf{H}\epsilon[\mathbf{I}]$, 21.6) <i>Deut.: 97% Jon.: \emptyset Acts: 32%</i>	$\mathbf{H}\ddot{\mathbf{I}}$ (<i>Deut.</i> 5.21) (<i>Acts</i> 2.2, 2.46, 2.36, 7.10, 7.42, 7.47, 7.49, 8.3, 9.11, 9.17, 10.6, 10.17, 10.30, 10.32, 11.11, 11.12, 11.14, 12.7, 12.12, 16.15, 16.34, [17.5], 18.7, 18.8, 19.16, 21.8) $\mathbf{H}\mathbf{I}$ (<i>Acts</i> 7.20) <i>Deut.: 3% Jon.: \emptyset Acts: 68%</i>

ii) $V = \mathbf{O}$ *Deut./Jon.: $\mathbf{G} = \epsilon\mathbf{I}$ (var. $\ddot{\mathbf{I}}$) Acts: $\mathbf{G} = \ddot{\mathbf{I}}$ (var. $\mathbf{I} \sim \epsilon\mathbf{I}$)*

Table 50: $V = \mathbf{O}$ $\mathbf{G} = \epsilon\mathbf{I}$ vs. $\ddot{\mathbf{I}}\mathbf{I}$

$\epsilon\mathbf{I}$	$\ddot{\mathbf{I}}\mathbf{I}$
$\Sigma\lambda\lambda\mathbf{O}\epsilon\mathbf{I}$ (<i>Deut.</i> 29.10) <i>Deut.: 100% Jon.: \emptyset Acts: \emptyset</i>	
$\mathbf{O}\Upsilon\mathbf{O}\epsilon\mathbf{I}$ (<i>Deut.</i> 5.23, 5.27, 12.5, 20.2, 25.9, 25.11, 26.3, 28.49, 33.2 $\mathbf{O}\Upsilon\mathbf{O}\epsilon\mathbf{I}\mathbf{O}$, 28.49) (<i>Jon.</i> 1.6) (<i>Acts</i> 7.31, 8.29, 8.30, 9.1, 10.28 $\mathbf{O}\Upsilon\mathbf{O}\epsilon[\mathbf{I}]$, 21.33, 22.26, 22.27, 28.9) $\mathbf{P}\lambda\Upsilon\mathbf{O}\epsilon\mathbf{I}$ (<i>Deut.</i> 22.14) $\mathbf{P}\epsilon\Upsilon\mathbf{O}\epsilon\mathbf{I}$ (<i>Acts</i> 14.5, 19.29) $\mathbf{P}\epsilon\Upsilon(\mathbf{O})\epsilon\mathbf{I}$ (<i>Acts</i> 23.14) $\tau\mathbf{O}\sigma\tau\mathbf{O}\Upsilon$ mistake for $\mathbf{P}\epsilon\Upsilon\mathbf{O}\epsilon\mathbf{I}$ (<i>Acts</i> 7.57) <i>Deut.: 100% Jon.: 100% Acts: 100%</i>	
$\tau\lambda\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{O}\neq\mathbf{I}$ (<i>Deut.</i> 31.17) <i>Deut.: 100% Jon.: \emptyset Acts: \emptyset</i>	
	$\mathbf{M}\lambda\tau\mathbf{O}\ddot{\mathbf{I}}$ (<i>Acts</i> 12.6, 12.18, 21.32 x2, 21.35, 23.23, [23.31], 27.42, 28.16) $\mathbf{M}\lambda\tau\mathbf{O}\mathbf{I}$ (<i>Acts</i> 10.7, 12.4, 27.31, 27.32) <i>Deut.: \emptyset Jon.: \emptyset Acts: 100%</i>
	$\tau\mathbf{C}\lambda\mathbf{B}\mathbf{O}\neq\mathbf{I}$ (<i>Acts</i> 10.28) <i>Deut.: \emptyset Jon.: \emptyset Acts: 100%</i>
	$\tau\mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{O}\neq\mathbf{I}$ (<i>Deut.</i> 32.51) <i>Deut.: 100% Jon.: \emptyset Acts: \emptyset</i>
	$\chi\mathbf{P}\mathbf{O}\neq\mathbf{I}$ (<i>Acts</i> 22.3, 22.28) <i>Deut.: \emptyset Jon.: \emptyset Acts: 100%</i>

iv) V = oY Deut./Jon.: G = eɪ (var. ȳ) Acts: G = ȳ (var. eɪ)

Table 52: V = oY G = eɪ vs. ȳ

eɪ	ȳ
κοΥeɪ (Deut. 25.6, 25.13, 25.14, 26.5, 28.62) (Jon. 3.5) Deut.: 83% Jon.: 100% Acts: 0%	κοΥȳ (Deut. 28.38) (Acts 5.34, 5.36, 8.10, 27.14) Deut.: 17% Jon.: 0% Acts: 100%
νοΥ≠eɪ (Acts 4.32) “mine” Deut.: Ø Jon.: Ø Acts: 100%	

v) V = ʌ Deut./Jon.: G = ȳ (var. eɪ) Acts: G = ȳ (var. ɪ~eɪ)

Lexical forms:

παȳ, τὰȳ, ναȳ, 2ȳ, ἀγαȳ, οΥχαȳ, c2ȳ, (-)2παȳ.

But without the trema in: παɪ (Acts 10.16, 14.3), ναɪ (Acts 15.8, 15.27, 20.36), οΥχαɪ (Acts 2.21), (-)2παɪ (Acts 15.4, 16.8), c2αɪ (Acts 15.23).

Suffix pronouns:

να≠ȳ, 2να≠ȳ, ν̄μμα≠ȳ, νεμα≠ȳ, ν̄β̄λλα≠ȳ, πεχα≠ȳ, εΥν̄τα≠ȳ.

Table 53: V = ʌ G = ȳ vs. eɪ

ȳ	eɪ
	2τᾱ́eɪ (Deut. 32.15 x2) Deut.: 100% Jon.: Ø Acts: Ø
αϣȳ (Deut. 8.1, 11.8, 11.21, 28.47, 30.16) αϣαɪ (Deut. (6.3) (Acts 6.7, 9.31, 12.24) Deut.: 87% Jon.: Ø Acts: 75%	[α]ϣαeɪ (Deut. 7.22) αϣαeɪ (Acts 6.1) Deut.: 13% Jon.: Ø Acts: 25%

b) Unaccented preformatives (C)VG#

V = ʌ Deut./Jon.: G = ȳ Acts: G = ȳ (var. ɪ~eɪ)

V = e Deut./Jon.: G = ȳ (var. ɪ) Acts: G = ȳ (var. ɪ)

i) The glide /j/ functioning as the first person singular pronominal subject of verbal conjugations preceded by vowels, namely ʌ and e, is consistently, without variation, realised in *Deuteronomy*, *Jonah* and *Acts* by the allograph ȳ. Occasionally the trema is missing in *Acts*, and in one case a circumflex replaces the trema. The trema is omitted once in *Deuteronomy*.

- *Present Circumstantial / Present II: εῖ-* (*passim*) (εἰ- *Acts* 14.10, 20.35, 24.14)
But: εῖε- (*Acts* 24.12).
- *Imperfect: νεῖ-* (*passim*) (νεἰ- *Acts* 2.25, 22.20).
But: πεεῖωτῆ (Acts 22.19) for νεῖωτῆ “I was imprisoned”.
- *Future I Circumstantial/ Future II: εῖνα-* (*passim*) (εἶνα- *Acts* 22.21).
- *Perfect I: αῖ-* (*passim*).
But: λεῖμε for αῖεἰμε (*Acts* 12.11) and λεἰ for αῖεἰ (*Acts* 23.27); λεῖ for αῖεἰ (7.34); αῖ (*Acts* 1.1).
- *Perfect I Relative/ Perfect II: ἤταῖ-, (-)ενταῖ-* (*passim*).
- *Habitual: εἴαῖ-* (*passim*).

ii) Following the vowel ε in the demonstrative article, the glide /j/ is always written in *Deuteronomy* and *Jonah* with the allograph ῖ: πεῖ-, τεῖ-, νεῖ- (νεἰ- *Deut.* 30.7).

The scribe of *Acts*, on the other hand, displays a few variants. A peculiar characteristic of this scribe is the substitution of α for ε.²⁵ In the two cases where the variant form (εἰ rather than ῖ) occurs in the demonstrative article, it follows this replacement α vowel.

Table 54: Variation with demonstrative articles

ε + ῖ-ι	α + ῖ	α + εἰ
<p>πεῖ- (<i>Deut.</i>: <i>passim</i>) (<i>Jon.</i>: <i>passim</i>) <i>(Acts</i> 1.6, 1.19, 1.21, 1.24, 2.12, 2.33, 3.16, 4.17, 4.22, 5.4, 5.20, 5.38 x2, 6.5, 6.13 x2, 7.4, 7.29, 7.60, 8.21, 8.29, 9.21 x2, 10.17, 10.18, 11.12, 13.26, 16.28, 17.6, 17.18, 19.37, 19.40, 21.11, 22.22, 23.9, 23.13, 23.17, 23.18, 23.25, 23.27, 23.30, 24.2, 24.5, 24.10, [26.31], 28.4) πεἰ- (<i>Acts</i> 2.38, 5.28, 22.26) <i>Deut.</i>: 100% <i>Jon.</i>: 100% <i>Acts</i>: 90%</p>	<p>παῖ- παῖρωμε (<i>Acts</i> 9.13) παῖωαχε (<i>Acts</i> 15.6) <i>Deut.</i>: 0% <i>Jon.</i>: 0% <i>Acts</i>: 4%</p>	<p>παεἰ- ᾠπαεἰμα (<i>Acts</i> 6.14, 7.7, 9.14) <i>Deut.</i>: 0% <i>Jon.</i>: 0% <i>Acts</i>: 6%</p>
<p>τεῖ- (<i>Deut.</i>: <i>passim</i>) (<i>Jon.</i>: <i>passim</i>) <i>(Acts</i> 1.25, 2.6, 2.40, 3.18, 4.27, 6.3, 8.19, 13.34, 14.1, 15.15, 16.12, 16.20, 16.24, 17.19, 18.10, 18.15, 21.11, 22.3, 22.4, 22.22, [22.24], 22.28, 23.11, 24.9, 24.14, 27.23, 28.20 x2) τεῖ(ε)οπε (19.25) τεἰ- (<i>Acts</i> 15.23, 20.11) <i>Deut.</i>: 100% <i>Jon.</i>: 100% <i>Acts</i>: 91%</p>	<p>ταῖ- ᾠταῖζε (<i>Acts</i> 7.1, 17.11) <i>Deut.</i>: 0% <i>Jon.</i>: 0% <i>Acts</i>: 6%</p>	<p>ταεἰ- ᾠταεἰαἰακονια (<i>Acts</i> 1.17) <i>Deut.</i>: 0% <i>Jon.</i>: 0% <i>Acts</i>: 3%</p>

²⁵ Thompson (1913), p. 13.

€ + ï~i	λ + ï	λ + €i
ñ€ï- (<i>Deut.</i> : <i>passim</i>) (<i>Jon.</i> : Ø) <i>(Acts</i> 1.15, 5.8, 5.24, 5.36, 5.38, 14.15, 16.17, 16.20, 16.35, 16.36, 16.38, 19.37, 20.34, 21.15) ñ€i- (<i>Acts</i> 5.35) <i>Deut.</i> : 100% <i>Jon.</i> : Ø <i>Acts</i> : 79%	ñλï- ñλïϞλλϞ€ (<i>Acts</i> 5.5, 5.32, 10.44, 13.42) <i>Deut.</i> : 0% <i>Jon.</i> : Ø <i>Acts</i> : 21%	<i>Deut.</i> : 0% <i>Jon.</i> : Ø <i>Acts</i> : 0%

iii) This rule is consistently observed in *Deuteronomy* with the construct participle Ϟλï- (*Deut.* 5.14, [5.21]). On the other hand, the scribe of *Acts* alternates between the two allographs. Here again, it is the λ vowel which prompts the variant form:

Table 55: Variation with construct participles

λ + ï	λ + €i
Ϟλï- (<i>Deut.</i> 5.14, [5.21]) <i>(Acts</i> 16.35) <i>Deut.</i> : 100% <i>Jon.</i> : Ø <i>Acts</i> : 0%	Ϟλ€i- (<i>Acts</i> 23.23) <i>Deut.</i> : 0% <i>Jon.</i> : Ø <i>Acts</i> : 50%
μλï- (<i>Acts</i> 28.7) <i>Deut.</i> : Ø <i>Jon.</i> : Ø <i>Acts</i> : 50%	μλ€i- (<i>Acts</i> 28.2) <i>Deut.</i> : Ø <i>Jon.</i> : Ø <i>Acts</i> : 50%

iv) Note also the spelling of the interrogative particle in *Acts*, €€i- (*Acts* 21.38, 23.9) in contrast to €ï€- in the Chester Beatty codices.

Case B6: '(C)VG.CV(C)

V = o *Deut./Jon.*: G = €i *Acts*: G = €i (var. ï)

V = h *Deut./Jon.*: G = €i *Acts*: G = €i (var. i)

V = λ *Deut./Jon.*: G = ï (var. €i) *Acts*: G = €i

When the glide closes a syllable within a lexeme, the digraph is preferred following the vowels o and h by both scribes, with variation in *Acts*. When preceded by the vowel λ, the digraph is employed in *Acts*, but the scribe of *Deuteronomy* and *Jonah* favours ï, with one exception.

a) V = o, h *Deut./Jon.*: G = €i *Acts*: G = €i (var. ï~i)

Deut.: Ϟο€iλ€, Ϟο€iτ€, λο€iϞ€, ο€iπε, ο€iλ€.

Jon.: λμh€iτñ̄.

Acts: λο€iϞ€, Ϟο€iλ€, Ϟο€iνε~Ϟοïνε, Ϟο€iτ€~Ϟοïτ€, λμh€iτñ̄~[λ]μhιτñ̄.

Table 56: V = O, H G = €I vs. İ~I

€I	İ~I
ΑΜΗΕΙΤῆ (Acts 16.15) (Jon. 1.7) Deut.: Ø Jon.: 100% Acts: 50%	[Α]ΜΗΙΤῆ (Acts 16.36) Deut.: Ø Jon.: 0% Acts: 50%
ΖΟΕΙΝΕ (Acts 6.9, 10.23, 12.1, 14.4, 15.1, 15.5, 15.24, 17.4, 17.6, 17.18 x2, 19.13, 19.31, 23.9, 23.12, 27.44 ΖΟΕ[ΙΝΕ], 28.24) Deut.: Ø Jon.: Ø Acts: 94%	ΖΟΪΝΕ (Acts 19.9) Deut.: Ø Jon.: Ø Acts: 6%
ΖΟΕΙΤΕ (Acts 7.58, 9.39, 11.15, 14.14, 16.22, 18.6, 20.33, 22.20) Deut.: Ø Jon.: Ø Acts: 89%	ΖΟΪΤΕ (Acts 23.23) Deut.: Ø Jon.: Ø Acts: 11%

- b) V = λ Deut./Jon: G = İ (var. €I) Acts: G = €I
 Deut.: ΚΑΪCE, ΖΑΪBEC, CΖΑΪ≠COY, CΔEIPC (Deut. 32.14).
 Jon.: ΖΑΪBEC (Deut. 33.12) (Jon. 4.5, 4.6).
 Acts: ΖΔEIBC (Acts 5.15).

c) *Words of Greek origin:* The scribe of *Acts* occasionally places a trema over the iota of the Greek diphthong:

ΠΑΪΔΕΥΕ (Acts 22.3) παιδεύω;
 ΑΪΤΙΑ (Acts 28.18), ΑΪΤΙ (Acts 28.20) αἰτία.
 Note: ΚΑΪΦΑΣ (Acts 4.6) Καϊάφας. (CB: ΚΑΪΦΑΣ);
 CΤΟΪΚΟΣ (Acts 17.18) Στοϊκός (CB: CΤΟΪΚΟΣ).

Case B7: '(C)VGC# G = €I (var. İ)

In the 'covered' position the digraph is regular:

Deut.: ΟΕΙΤ, ΧΟΕΙΤ, ΜΟΕΙΤ, CΟΕΙΤ, ΟΕΙΚ, ΝΟΕΙΚ, ΟΥΟΕΙΤ, ΧΟΕΙC, ΦΟΕΙΩ,
 ΟΥΟΕΙΩ/ΠΕΥΟΕΙΩ, ΤΑΦΕΟΕΙΩ;
 ΜΑΕΙΝ, [ΧΙΑ]ΕΙΚ (Deut. 20.5), [ΧΙΠΕC]ΔΕΙΚ (Deut. 20.5).
 Jon.: ΠΕΥΟΕΙΩ, ΧΟΕΙC, ΖΟΕΙΜ.
 Acts: ΧΟΕΙC, ΧΟΕΙΤ, ΜΟΕΙΤ, ΡΟΕΙC, CΟΕΙΤ, ΟΕΙΚ, ΝΟΕΙΝ, ΟΥΟΕΙΝ,
 ΟΥΟΕΙΩ/ΠΕΟΥΟΕΙΩ/ΠΕΥΟΕΙΩ, ΦΟΕΙΩ, ΤΑΦΕΟΕΙΩ, ΜΑΕΙΝ, ΘΑΕΙΤ
 (ΤΖΔΕΙΤ), ΖΚΔΕΙΤ, ΠΕΤΕΟΥΝΤΑΕΙ≠C.

But note: ΝΟΪ for ΝΟΕΙΝ (Acts 16.26)

Variation: The one exception is ⲭⲟϣⲓⲥⲓ (*Deut.* 6.4, 29.27, 32.4), the variant occurring at the end of a line only, as in the Chester Beatty codices.

Case B8: CVC'GV G = ⲉⲓ

At the beginning of a syllable, following a closed syllable, the digraph renders the glide.

ⲡⲙⲉⲓⲟⲟϣⲉ (*Acts* 20.19, 20.31)

Case B9: '(C)V.GV(C) and (C)V.'GV(C)

V = ⲁ, ⲉ *Deut.*: G = ⲓ *Acts*: G = ⲉⲓ (var. $\text{ⲓ} \sim \text{ⲓ}$)

V = ⲟϣ *Deut.*: G = ⲉⲓ *Acts*: G = \emptyset

In *Deuteronomy* the intervocalic glide, beginning a syllable preceded by an open syllable, is realised ⲓ following the vowels ⲁ and ⲉ , as it is in Cases B5 and B6. On the other hand, the glide is rendered ⲉⲓ (var. ⲓ) in *Acts*. Following vocalic ⲟϣ , the scribe of *Deuteronomy* employs the digraph, as in Case B5.

a) V = ⲁ, ⲉ *Deut.*: G = ⲓ *Acts*: G = ⲉⲓ (var. $\text{ⲓ} \sim \text{ⲓ}$)

Deut.: $\text{ⲉⲓⲉ-}, \text{ⲉⲓⲟϣⲁ};$

$\text{ⲧⲁⲓⲉ}, \text{ⲧⲙⲁⲓⲉ(-)}, \text{ⲭⲁⲓⲉ} (\text{ⲭⲁⲓⲉ}), \text{ⲧⲁⲓⲟ}, \text{ⲧⲁⲓⲟϣ}, \text{ⲧⲁⲓⲟⲩ}, \text{ⲧⲟⲁⲓⲟ}, \text{ⲛⲁⲓⲁⲧ};$

Acts: $\text{ⲉⲓⲉ-}, \text{ⲟϣⲉⲓⲉⲓⲉⲛⲓⲛ} \sim \text{ⲟϣⲉⲓⲉⲓⲉⲛⲓⲛ};$

$\text{ⲭⲁⲓⲉⲓ}, \text{ⲧⲙⲁⲓⲉⲓ(ⲓ)}, \text{ⲧⲁⲓⲟϣ}, \text{ⲧⲁⲓⲉⲓⲟ} \sim \text{ⲧⲁⲓⲟⲩ}.$

Note: ⲉⲓⲉ- (*Acts* 23.9, 21.38) interrogative particle (*CB*: ⲉⲓⲉ) (cf. Case B5).

Table 57: Variation in the intervocalic glide

ⲉⲓ	$\text{ⲓ} \sim \text{ⲓ}$
Adhortative (Future III) ⲉⲓⲉ- (<i>Acts</i> 16.30, 23.35) <i>Deut.</i> : 0% <i>Jon.</i> : \emptyset <i>Acts</i> : 100%	ⲉⲓⲉ- (<i>Deut.</i> 5.31, 10.2, 31.28) <i>Deut.</i> : 100% <i>Jon.</i> : \emptyset <i>Acts</i> : 0%
ⲟϣⲉⲓⲉⲓⲉⲛⲓⲛ (<i>Acts</i> 6.1, 9.29, 11.20, 16.1, 16.3) ⲟϣⲉⲓⲉⲓⲉⲛⲓⲛ (<i>Acts</i> 20.24) ⲟϣⲉⲓⲉⲓⲉⲛⲓⲛ (<i>Acts</i> 19.10) ⲟϣⲉⲓⲉⲓⲉⲛⲓⲛ (<i>Acts</i> 21.37) <i>Deut.</i> : \emptyset <i>Jon.</i> : \emptyset <i>Acts</i> : 86%	ⲟϣⲉⲓⲉⲓⲉⲛⲓⲛ (<i>Acts</i> 21.28) <i>Deut.</i> : \emptyset <i>Jon.</i> : \emptyset <i>Acts</i> : 14%
ⲭⲁⲓⲉⲓ (<i>Acts</i> 1.20, 7.36, 7.44) <i>Deut.</i> : 0% <i>Jon.</i> : \emptyset <i>Acts</i> : 75%	ⲭⲁⲓⲉ (<i>Deut.</i> 9.28, 11.24) (<i>Acts</i> 12.17) ⲭⲁⲓⲉ (<i>Deut.</i> 7.22) <i>Deut.</i> : 100% <i>Jon.</i> : \emptyset <i>Acts</i> : 25%

ει	ĩ-ı
ΤΑΕΙΟ (<i>Acts</i> 2.33, 24.3, 28.10) [†ΤΑ]ΕΙΟ (<i>Acts</i> 20.24) (Budge: [†ΜΑ]ΕΙΟ; CB: †ΤΑΐο) <i>Deut.: 0% Jon.: Ø Acts: 80%</i>	ΤΑΐΟ (<i>Deut.</i> 10.17) ΤΑΐΕ (<i>Deut.</i> 5.16) ΤΑΐΗΟΥ (<i>Deut.</i> 7.6, 28.58) ΤΑΐΗΥ (<i>Acts</i> 5.34) <i>Deut.: 100% Jon.: Ø Acts: 20%</i>
ΤΜΑΕΙΟ(=) (<i>Acts</i> 13.39 x2) <i>Deut.: 0% Jon.: Ø Acts: 100%</i>	ΤΜΑΐΕ(-) (<i>Deut.</i> 25.1) <i>Deut.: 100% Jon.: Ø Acts: 0%</i>
	ΤΑΐΟΥ (<i>Deut.</i> 22.29) ΤΑΙΟΥ (<i>Acts</i> 13.20) <i>Deut.: 100% Jon.: Ø Acts: 100%</i>
	ΤῶΑΐΟ≠ (<i>Deut.</i> 25.1) <i>Deut.: 100% Jon.: Ø Acts: 0%</i>
	ΝΑΐΑΤ≠ (<i>Deut.</i> 33.29) <i>Deut.: 100% Jon.: Ø Acts: 0%</i>
	ΕΐΟΥλ (<i>Deut.</i> 12.15, 12.22, 15.22) <i>Deut.: 100% Jon.: Ø Acts: 0%</i>

Note the following biblical names/proper nouns in *Acts*:

- ΗCΑΐΑC (*Acts* 8.28, 8.30), vs. ΗCΑΕΙΑC (*Acts* 28.25) (CB: ΗCΑΐΑC) Ἡσαΐας
- [ΓΑ]ΐΙΟC (*Acts* 20.4) (CB: ΚΑΐΟC), vs. ΓΑΕΙΟC (*Acts* 19.29) (CB: ΓΑΐΟC) ΓάϊοC
- ΤΑΧΑΐΑ (*Acts* 18.12, 18.27, 19.21) (CB: ΤΑΧΑΙΑ) Ἀχαΐα
- ΒΕΡΟΙΑ (*Acts* 17.10, 17.13, 20.4) (CB: ΒΕΡΟΙΑ) Βέρροια
- ΖΕΒΡΑΙΟC (*Acts* 6.1), ΜῆΤΖΕΒΡΑΙΟC (*Acts* 21.40, 22.2) (CB: ΖΕΒΡΑΙΟC) Ἡβραίος
- ΑΙΝΑΙΑC (*Acts* 9.33), ΑΝΑΝΙΑC (*Acts* 22.12) (CB: ΕΝΝΑΙΑC) Ἀνανίας
- †ΟΥΛΑΙΑ (*Acts* 1.8, 10.37, 10.39, 11.1, 11.29, 12.19, 15.1), [†]ΟΥΛΑΙΑ (*Acts* 21.20), †ΟΥΛΑΐΑ (*Acts* 21.10), †ΟΥΛΑΙΑ (*Acts* 8.1), †ΟΥΛΑΐ (*Acts* 9.31), †ΟΥΛΑΐ (*Acts* 2.9) (CB: †ΟΥΛΑΙΑ) Ἰουδαία

b) V = ουγ *Deut.:* G = ει *Acts:* G = Ø

ΜΟΥΕΙΟΟΥΕ (*Deut.* 5.8), ΤΟΥΕΙΗ (*Deut.* 12.2, 32.22, 33.15).

C. Graphemic forms of the vowel /u/ (οΥ~ὀΥ~ϒ)

Table 58: Typology of the vowel /u/

Case	Syllabic Context	<i>BL Deuteronomy</i>	<i>BL Jonah</i>	<i>BL Acts</i>	Examples
C1	#(')V οΥΝΑΜ	οΥ (var. ὀΥ~ϒ)	οΥ (var. ϒ)	οΥ (var. ϒ)	οΥ οΥΝΑΜ οΥΧΑΪ οΥΩΗ
C2	(')(C)CV ΜΟΥ	οΥ (var. ὀΥ)	οΥ	οΥ	ΜΟΥ~ΜὀΥ ΜΟΥΤΕ ΤΑΪΟΥ ΤΟΥΕΙΟ
C3	'(C)CVC(C) ΖΟΥΝ	οΥ (var. ὀΥ)	οΥ	οΥ	ΕΖΟΥΝ ΜΟΥΟΥΤ ΚΟΥΕΙ~ΚΟΥΪ

Case C1: #(')V V = οΥ (var. ὀΥ~ϒ)

At the beginning of a segment the vowel /u/ is realised οΥ, on one occasion in *Deuteronomy* with a circumflex:

οΥ (ὀΥ *Deut.* 32.20), οΥ-, οΥΝΑΜ, οΥΧΑΪ, οΥΩΗ.

With a preformative clitic: In the following cases variation occurs under the influence of certain clitics:

- The indefinite article οΥ- is regularly reduced to -ϒ- when it is preceded by the preposition ε and the Perfect I conjugation nominal base λ. For example:
εΥΜΑΕΙΝ (*Deut.* 6.8), εΥΜΑ (*Deut.* 19.5), εΥΝΟΣ (*Deut.* 7.21), ΕΛΥΚΑΚΕ (*Deut.* 5.22).
Note also: ΝΕΥΝΟΣ (*Jon.* 3.3) - Imperfect ΝΕ + indefinite article.
- A few of the lexemes denoting time beginning with οΥ are preceded by the long form of the definite article (οΥΩΗ, οΥΝΟΥ), and in these cases ϒ is regularly used (ΤΕΥΩΗ, ΤΕΥΝΟΥ, ΝΤΕΥΝΟΥ).
- Note: οΥΧΑΪ is regularly written with the short form of the definite article (ΠΟΥΧΑΪ).

Case C2: (')(C)CV V = οΥ (var. ὀΥ)

The vowel is rendered οΥ following a consonant in an open syllable:

ΜΟΥ, ΜΟΥΤΕ, ΝΟΥΤΕ, ΤΕΝΟΥ, ΚΙΟΥ;
ΠΟΥ-, ΜΠΟΥ-, ΝΤΕΡΟΥ-, ΜΑΡΟΥ-, ΑΡΟΥ-;
ΤΗΡ=ΟΥ.

Variation: One can observe in *Deuteronomy*, particularly towards the latter part of the manuscript, as previously mentioned, the frequent use of the circumflex over the digraph. The same phenomenon also occurs with vowel and glide combinations ($\text{אֲיִ} \sim \text{אִי}$; $\text{הֲיִ} \sim \text{הִי}$).

Table 59: C + oy vs. öy

oy	öy
moy (<i>Deut.</i> 17.5, 17.6, 17.12, 19.5, 19.6 x3, 19.11, [20.5], 22.8, 22.26, 24.3 24.7, 24.16 x3, 25.5, 25.6, 28.21) but moyoy (<i>Deut.</i> 5.25) – reduplication of oy ²⁶ <i>Deut.</i> : 66%	möy (<i>Deut.</i> 30.19, 31.14, 31.27, 31.29, 32.50 x2, 33.1, 33.6, 34.5, 34.7) <i>Deut.</i> : 34%
cmoy (<i>Deut.</i> : 28 and [2] occurrences) <i>Deut.</i> : 90%	cmöy (<i>Deut.</i> 30.19, 33.13, 33.23) <i>Deut.</i> : 10%
woywoy (<i>Deut.</i> 10.21) <i>Deut.</i> : 50%	wöywöy (<i>Deut.</i> 33.29) <i>Deut.</i> : 50%
$\text{noy}^{\text{r}}\text{te}$ (<i>Deut.</i> : 302 and [16] occurrences) <i>Deut.</i> : 99.7%	$\text{nöy}^{\text{r}}\text{te}$ (<i>Deut.</i> 32.37) <i>Deut.</i> : 0.3%
	$\text{möy}^{\text{r}}\text{ei}$ (<i>Deut.</i> 33.20, 33.22) <i>Deut.</i> : 100%
	$\text{nöy}^{\text{r}}\text{ne}$ (<i>Deut.</i> 29.18) <i>Deut.</i> : 100%
	zmöy (<i>Deut.</i> 29.23) <i>Deut.</i> : 100%

Case C3: '(C)CVC(C) V = oy (var. öy)

The vowel is also rendered oy following a consonant in a closed syllable:

eoyn , moyoy^{r} , $\text{ko}^{\text{r}}\text{ei} \sim \text{ko}^{\text{r}}\text{i}$, noyoy , $\text{nöy}^{\text{r}}\text{n}$ (*Deut.* 33.13).

²⁶ Cf. Kahle (1954), p. 87.

D. Graphemic forms of the glide /w/ (oY~oŷ~Y~ŷ)

Table 60: Typology of the glide /w/

Case	Syllabic Context		<i>BL Deuteronomy</i>	<i>BL Jonah</i>	<i>BL Acts</i>	Examples
D1	#(')GV oYλ		oY (var. Y)	oY	oY (var. Y)	oYλ oY€INE
D2	#(')GVC(C) oYωM		oY (var. Y)	oY	oY (var. Y)	oYωM oYN~oYñ-
D3	'(C)CGV zoY€IT€		oY	∅	oY	zoY€IT€
D4	'(C)CGVC ωoY€IT		oY	oY	oY	ωoY€IT
D5	(')(C)VG(C) MOOY TFOYN NANOY≈OY THYTñ NAY PEY- XOO≈Y	V = o	oY (var. oŷ)	oY	oY (var. Y)	MOOY
		V = ω	oY	oY	oY	TFOYN
		V = oY	oY	∅	oY	MOYOYT
		V = H	oY (var. Y~ŷ) HY (Hŷ)	oY (var. Y)	Y (var. oY)	THOYTñ~THYTñ
		V = λ	Y (var. oY) λY (λŷ~ŷ)	Y	Y	NAY~Nλŷ
		V = €	Y (var. oY~oŷ)	Y	Y	PEY- X!XEOY
		V = oo	Y	Y	Y	zoOY “day”
D6	(C)V.'GV(C) '(C)V.GV(C) KOoy€ XIOY€ ZBY€ AYω MEEY€	V = o	oY	oY	oY	KOoy€
		V = I	oY	oY	oY	XIOY€
		V = H	oY (var. Y)	oY	Y	ZBY€~ZBY€
		V = λ	Y λY (λŷ)	Y	Y (var. oY)	AYω TAYO~TAYO≈
		V = €	Y (var. oY)	∅	Y	MEEY€ EYŵ~EOYŵ

Case D1: #(')GV **G = oγ (var. γ)**

At the beginning of a segment, in an open syllable, the glide is realised oγ:

oγλ, oγεινε, oγερhte.

With a preformative clitic: Note the following variations with clitics.

Preposition ε:

εγει “to one” (*Deut.* 19.5, 19.11), εγλ (*Acts* 7.24), εoγλ (*Acts* 23.17, 21.8).

Perfect I conjugation base λ:

λγλ (*Acts* 5.25), λ[oγλ] (*Acts* 11.28).

Adjective κε:

κεγλ “another one” (*Deut.* 28.30) (*Acts* 1.20, 4.12, 23.6) vs. κεoγλ (*Acts* 8.34)

Case D2: #(')GVC(C) **G = oγ (var. γ)**

At the beginning of a segment, in a closed syllable, the glide is realised oγ:

oγωμ, oγοειω, oγωω, oγω2,

oγn~oγn̄-, oγnte-/oγnta≠~oγn̄te-/oγn̄ta≠

With a preformative clitic: Note the following variations:

- εγωμ “to eat” (*Deut.* 2.6);
- παγοει (*Deut.* 22.14);
- -παγομογ (*Deut.* 28.55);
- χε εγn̄- (*Acts* 24.2) vs. χε oγn̄- (*Acts* 7.12, 17.7, 18.10, 20.23);
- παoγn̄pωε (*Acts* 5.23) (CB: παnoγpωε “the guards”) - metathesis;
- παγpωε (*Acts* 12.7, 12.19) (CB: [n]anoγpωε *Acts* 12.19);
- νεγεωn̄ (*Acts* 10.29) (CB: n̄oγεωn̄ “without” from oγωω “pause”);
- Error - εγm̄πκωτε for εtm̄πκωτε (*Acts* 5.16).

In the following cases variation occurs under the influence of certain clitics:

- *Converted existential:* ε/nε/-ετε + γn̄/γn̄- (var. oγn̄-)

Table 61: Variation with the converted existential

Conjugation	ε/NE/-ETE + YN/YN̄-	ε/NE/-ETE + OYN-
Circumstantial	εYN- (<i>Acts</i> 18.24, 24.11, 27.39) <i>Deut.</i> : 0% <i>Jon.</i> : Ø <i>Acts</i> : 60%	εOYN- (<i>Deut.</i> 24.10) (<i>Acts</i> 19.40) εOY (<i>Acts</i> 1.15) <i>Deut.</i> : 100% <i>Jon.</i> : Ø <i>Acts</i> : 40%
Imperfect	NEYN̄- (<i>Acts</i> 9.36, 12.5) NEYN- (<i>Acts</i> 3.2, 8.9, 9.10, 10.1, 11.24, 12.18, 14.8, 14.12, 16.14) <i>Deut.</i> : Ø <i>Jon.</i> : Ø <i>Acts</i> : 85% Note: NEYOYNONOY.A.Aİ (<i>Acts</i> 19.14) (CB: NEYN̄IOY.A.Aİ) [NE]YOYNZEEN- (<i>Acts</i> 20.8) (CB: NEYN̄ZEEN-)	NEOYN (<i>Acts</i> 16.1) [N]EOYN (<i>Acts</i> 20.9) <i>Deut.</i> : Ø <i>Jon.</i> : Ø <i>Acts</i> : 15%

- *Converted predication of possession:*

ε/NE/-ETE + YN̄TE-/YN̄TA≠ (var. OYN̄TE-/OYN̄TA≠)

Table 62: Variation with the converted predication of possession

Conjugation	ε/NE/-ETE + YN̄TE-/YN̄TA≠	ε/NE/-ETE + OYN̄TE-/OYN̄TA≠
Circumstantial	εYN̄TE-/εYN̄TA≠ (<i>Acts</i> 24.15) εYN̄TE-/εYN̄TA≠ (<i>Acts</i> 2.47, 4.37, 18.24, 19.14, 23.18) <i>Deut.</i> : 0% <i>Jon.</i> : Ø <i>Acts</i> : 100%	εOYN̄TK (<i>Deut.</i> 24.10) <i>Deut.</i> : 100% <i>Jon.</i> : Ø <i>Acts</i> : 0%
Imperfect	NEYN̄TE-/NEYN̄TA≠ (<i>Acts</i> 13.5, 18.18, 21.9) NEYN̄TE-/NEYN̄TA≠ (<i>Acts</i> 21.9) <i>Deut.</i> : Ø <i>Jon.</i> : Ø <i>Acts</i> : 80%	NEOYN̄TE-/NEOYN̄TA≠ (<i>Acts</i> 21.23) <i>Deut.</i> : Ø <i>Jon.</i> : Ø <i>Acts</i> : 20%
Relative		-ETEYOYN̄TE-/ETEYOYN̄TA≠ (<i>Acts</i> 4.34) -ETEYOYN̄TE-/ETEYOYN̄TA≠ (<i>Deut.</i> 15.2, [15.3] x2, 24.10, 24.11) (<i>Acts</i> 3.6, 11.29 23.19) <i>Deut.</i> : 100% <i>Jon.</i> : Ø <i>Acts</i> : 100%

- *Long and short form of the article with lexeme-initial OY*: In *Acts* fluctuation between the long and short form of the definite article occurs with the lexeme OYOΘEIOY. In addition, there is a hesitation between the use of OY and Y with the long form of the article. The scribe of *Deuteronomy* is consistent in writing PEYOΘEIOY.

Table 63: Forms of ογοειω with the definite article

Short form of the definite article π/ῃ + ογ	Long form of the definite article πε/νε + ογ	Long form of the definite article πε/νε + γ
ῃογοειω (<i>Acts</i> 1.7) <i>Deut.</i> : 0% <i>Acts</i> : 11%	πεογοειω (<i>Acts</i> 12.1) <i>Deut.</i> : 0% <i>Acts</i> : 11%	πεγοειω (<i>Acts</i> 7.17, 7.20, 19.23, 20.18) πεγοειω (<i>Acts</i> 3.19, 3.21, 17.30) (<i>Deut.</i> : <i>passim</i>) <i>Deut.</i> : 100% <i>Acts</i> : 78%

- *Coalescence of ογ-ογ*: The sequence ογ-ογ (initial ογ lexeme preceded by a clitic) sometimes coalesces to ογ:

ογεειενιν (*Acts* 16.1, 16.3) “a Greek” (CB: ογεϊενιν, ογεειενιν);

ωλογοειω (*Acts* 13.11) “for a time” (CB: ωλογοειω);

ῃνογοειν (*Acts* 13.47) (CB: ῃνογοειν “as a light”);

εωλαλαμε2 (*Acts* 4.36) (CB: εωλαουλαμε4);

εγην (*Acts* 7.56); εογην (*Acts* 16.27) (CB: εγογην);

πεγοει (*Acts* 14.5, 19.29) πεγ(ο)ει (*Acts* 23.14) vs. πεγ|ογοει (*Acts* 28.9) (CB: πεγογοϊ).

Case D3: '(C)CGV **G = ογ**

There is only one example of the glide ογ following a consonant in an open syllable:

2ογειτε.

Case D4: '(C)CGVC **G = ογ**

In a closed syllable there is only one example of the glide ογ following a consonant:

ωογειτ.

Case D5: '(C)VG(C)

V = ο, ω, ογ *Deut./Jon.*: G = ογ (var. $\widehat{\text{ογ}} \sim \widehat{\text{ογ}}$) *Acts*: G = ογ (var. γ)

V = η *Deut./Jon.*: G = ογ (var. $\gamma \sim \widehat{\gamma}$) *Acts*: G = γ (var. ογ)

V = α, ε, οο *Deut./Jon.*: G = γ (var. $\text{ογ} \sim \widehat{\text{ογ}} \sim \widehat{\gamma}$) *Acts*: G = γ

Following the vowels ο, ω, and ογ, the glide is generally realised ογ. When preceded by the vowels α, ε, and οο, the allograph γ is employed. The strongest optionality occurs when preceded by the vowel η, in which case the scribe of *Deuteronomy* and *Jonah* prefers the

digraph, whereas the scribe of *Acts* favours the single upsilon.

a) V = ο, ω, οΥ Deut./Jon.: G = οΥ (var. $\hat{\omicron}\Upsilon \sim \hat{\omega}\Upsilon$) Acts: G = οΥ (var. Υ)

Lexical forms:

εοοΥ, μοοΥ (μοοΥε Deut. 23.4), τοοΥ, ροοΥ, ροοΥτ, ρο $\hat{\omicron}\Upsilon$ (Deut. 34.8),
ταταμο $\hat{\omega}\Upsilon$ (Deut. 32.20), μο $\hat{\omega}\Upsilon$ (Deut. 33.8);
ρρωοΥ, ρωοΥ², τωοΥ², τωοΥ, ειερωοΥ;
μοΥοΥτ.

But: ϣτοΥ (Acts 11.5)

3rd person pronominal suffixes:

ερο $\hat{\omega}\Upsilon$, $\bar{\mu}\mu\omicron\hat{\omega}\Upsilon$, τσαβο $\hat{\omega}\Upsilon$, τακο $\hat{\omega}\Upsilon$, τα $\lambda\omicron\hat{\omega}\Upsilon$;
ερω $\hat{\omega}\Upsilon$, ε $\chi\omega\hat{\omega}\Upsilon$, κρω $\hat{\omega}\Upsilon$, $\bar{\eta}\rho\omega\hat{\omega}\Upsilon$, $\lambda\iota\chi\omega\hat{\omega}\Upsilon$, ρω $\hat{\omega}\Upsilon$.
But: τ $\bar{\beta}\beta\omicron\hat{\omega}\Upsilon$ (Acts 11.9).

b) V = η Deut./Jon.: G = οΥ (var. Υ $\sim\hat{\Upsilon}$) Acts: G = Υ (var. οΥ)

Lexical forms:

Deut.: εrhoΥ, -κα $\lambda\eta\omicron\Upsilon$, οΥhoΥ, $\lambda\eta\tau\omicron\Upsilon$, cnoΥ, (cno $\hat{\eta}\omicron\Upsilon$ Deut. 33.24),
ε $\chi\eta\omicron\Upsilon$, thoΥτ $\bar{\eta}\sim\tau\eta\Upsilon\tau\bar{\eta}$.
Jon.: -κα $\lambda\eta\omicron\Upsilon$, thoΥ $\sim\tau\eta\Upsilon$.
Acts: thoΥτ $\bar{\eta}$, εphΥ, thΥ, ε† $\lambda\eta\Upsilon$, -κα $\lambda\eta\Upsilon$, cnoΥ, $\lambda\eta\Upsilon$.

Statives:

Deut.: τα $\lambda\iota\hat{\eta}\omicron\Upsilon$, $\theta\bar{\mu}[κ]\omicron\Upsilon$, noΥ $\sim\eta\Upsilon$, τ $\bar{\beta}\beta\eta\omicron\Upsilon\sim\tau\bar{\beta}\beta\eta\Upsilon$,
τα $\chi\rho\omicron\Upsilon\sim\tau\alpha\chi\rho\hat{\eta}\Upsilon$.
Acts: τα $\lambda\iota\hat{\eta}\Upsilon$, ηhΥ.
But: οΥhoΥ (Acts 1.12, 22.21) – never οΥhΥ.

3rd person plural suffix pronouns:

Deut.: Ø.
Jon.: Ø.
Acts: $\lambda\tau\eta\hat{\omega}\Upsilon$, $\lambda\eta\tau\eta\hat{\omega}\Upsilon$, οΥbh=[Υ] (Acts 13.8).

Table 64: $\mathbf{h} + \mathbf{o}\gamma$ vs. $\gamma \sim \hat{\gamma}$

$\mathbf{o}\gamma$	$\gamma \sim \hat{\gamma}$
(-) $\mathbf{T}\mathbf{H}\mathbf{O}\gamma\mathbf{T}\bar{\mathbf{n}}$ (<i>Deut.</i> : 64 occurrences) <i>Deut.</i> : 93% <i>Jon.</i> : \emptyset <i>Acts</i> : 0%	(-) $\mathbf{T}\mathbf{H}\gamma\mathbf{T}\bar{\mathbf{n}}$ (<i>Deut.</i> 11.27, 11.28, 12.7, 23.16, 28.14) (<i>Acts</i> : <i>passim</i>) <i>Deut.</i> : 7% <i>Jon.</i> : \emptyset <i>Acts</i> : 100%
$\mathbf{n}\mathbf{H}\mathbf{O}\gamma$ (<i>Deut.</i> 9.21, 23.4, 23.23, 24.9, 25.17, 28.34, 28.67, 32.29) <i>Deut.</i> : 89% <i>Jon.</i> : \emptyset <i>Acts</i> : 0%	$\mathbf{n}\mathbf{H}\gamma$ (<i>Deut.</i> 13.6) (<i>Acts</i> : <i>passim</i>) <i>Deut.</i> : 11% <i>Jon.</i> : \emptyset <i>Acts</i> : 100%
$\mathbf{T}\bar{\mathbf{b}}\mathbf{b}\mathbf{H}\mathbf{O}\gamma$ (<i>Deut.</i> 12.15, 15.22) <i>Deut.</i> : 50% <i>Jon.</i> : \emptyset <i>Acts</i> : \emptyset	$\mathbf{T}\bar{\mathbf{b}}\mathbf{b}\mathbf{H}\gamma$ (<i>Deut.</i> 12.22) $\mathbf{T}\bar{\mathbf{b}}\mathbf{b}\mathbf{H}\hat{\gamma}$ (<i>Deut.</i> 23.10) <i>Deut.</i> : 50% <i>Jon.</i> : \emptyset <i>Acts</i> : \emptyset
$\mathbf{T}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{H}\mathbf{O}\gamma$ (<i>Deut.</i> 6.8, 7.19, 7.21, 10.17, 11.2, 11.18) <i>Deut.</i> : 86% <i>Jon.</i> : \emptyset <i>Acts</i> : \emptyset	$\mathbf{T}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{H}\hat{\gamma}$ (<i>Deut.</i> 33.28) <i>Deut.</i> : 14% <i>Jon.</i> : \emptyset <i>Acts</i> : \emptyset
$\mathbf{T}\mathbf{H}\mathbf{O}\gamma$ (<i>Jon.</i> 1.4) <i>Deut.</i> : \emptyset <i>Jon.</i> : 50% <i>Acts</i> : \emptyset	$\mathbf{T}\mathbf{H}\gamma$ (<i>Jon.</i> 4.8) <i>Deut.</i> : \emptyset <i>Jon.</i> : 50% <i>Acts</i> : \emptyset

c) $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{e}, \mathbf{oo}$ *Deut./Jon.*: $\mathbf{G} = \gamma$ (var. $\mathbf{o}\gamma \sim \mathbf{\hat{o}}\gamma \sim \hat{\gamma}$) *Acts*: $\mathbf{G} = \gamma$

Lexical forms:

$\mathbf{m}\mathbf{a}\mathbf{a}\gamma$, $\mathbf{k}\mathbf{\hat{a}}\gamma\mathbf{m}\mathbf{a}$, $\mathbf{a}\mathbf{a}\mathbf{a}\gamma$, $\mathbf{m}\mathbf{a}\mathbf{a}\gamma$, $\mathbf{n}\mathbf{a}\gamma$, $\bar{\mathbf{n}}\mathbf{e}\mathbf{i}\mathbf{a}\mathbf{a}\gamma$, $\mathbf{c}\mathbf{n}\mathbf{a}\gamma$, $\mathbf{T}\mathbf{n}\mathbf{a}\gamma$, $\mathbf{z}\mathbf{n}\mathbf{a}\mathbf{a}\gamma$, $\mathbf{n}\bar{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{m}\mathbf{a}\gamma$
 $\psi\gamma\mathbf{x}\mathbf{h}\mathbf{a}\mathbf{a}\gamma$;
 $\mathbf{c}\mathbf{a}\mathbf{b}\mathbf{e}\mathbf{e}\gamma$, $\mathbf{x}\mathbf{e}\gamma$.

3rd person plural suffix pronouns:

$\mathbf{n}\bar{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{m}\mathbf{a}\mathbf{\hat{e}}\gamma$, $\mathbf{n}\mathbf{a}\mathbf{\hat{e}}\gamma$, $\mathbf{p}\mathbf{e}\mathbf{x}\mathbf{a}\mathbf{\hat{e}}\gamma$, $\mathbf{x}\mathbf{o}\mathbf{o}\mathbf{\hat{e}}\gamma$.

3rd person plural pronominal subjects:

$\mathbf{a}\gamma$ -, $\bar{\mathbf{n}}\mathbf{T}\mathbf{a}\gamma$ -, $\mathbf{w}\mathbf{a}\gamma$;
 $\mathbf{e}\gamma$ -, $\mathbf{n}\mathbf{e}\gamma$ -, $\bar{\mathbf{n}}\mathbf{n}\mathbf{e}\gamma$ -, $\mathbf{e}\mathbf{T}\mathbf{p}\mathbf{e}\gamma$.

Possessive articles:

$\mathbf{p}\mathbf{e}\gamma$ -, $\mathbf{T}\mathbf{e}\gamma$ -, $\mathbf{n}\mathbf{e}\gamma$.

Variation: An exception to this rule is the lexeme $\mathbf{x}\mathbf{i}\mathbf{x}\mathbf{e}\mathbf{o}\gamma$ (plural of $\mathbf{x}\mathbf{a}\mathbf{x}\mathbf{e}$)²⁷ (*Deut.* 1.42, 6.19, 7.15, 12.10, 20.1,²⁸ 20.3, 20.4, 23.9, 25.19, 28.25, 28.31, 28.48, 28.68, 30.7, 32.27 x2, 32.31, 32.41, 32.43, 33.29), $\mathbf{x}\mathbf{i}\mathbf{x}\mathbf{e}\mathbf{\hat{o}}\gamma$ (*Deut.* 33.7), $\mathbf{x}\mathbf{i}\mathbf{x}\mathbf{e}\mathbf{o}\gamma\mathbf{e}$ (*Deut.* 33.11).²⁹

27 Crum (1939), p. 799b: $\mathbf{x}\mathbf{i}\mathbf{x}\mathbf{e}\mathbf{e}\gamma$, $\mathbf{x}\mathbf{i}\mathbf{x}\mathbf{e}\mathbf{e}\gamma\mathbf{e}$, $\mathbf{x}\mathbf{i}\mathbf{x}\mathbf{e}\mathbf{o}\gamma$ (old MSS), $\mathbf{x}\mathbf{i}\mathbf{n}\mathbf{x}\mathbf{e}\mathbf{e}\gamma$, $\mathbf{x}\mathbf{i}\mathbf{n}\mathbf{x}\mathbf{e}\mathbf{e}\gamma\mathbf{e}$, $\mathbf{x}\mathbf{i}\mathbf{n}\mathbf{x}\mathbf{e}\gamma\mathbf{e}$ S).

28 Note that Thompson (1913), p. 22 emends Budge's reading $\mathbf{n}\mathbf{e}\mathbf{k}\mathbf{x}\mathbf{i}\mathbf{x}\mathbf{e}[\mathbf{o}\gamma\mathbf{e}]$ (*Deut.* 20.1) to $\mathbf{n}\mathbf{e}\mathbf{k}\mathbf{x}\mathbf{i}\mathbf{x}\mathbf{e}[\mathbf{e}\gamma]$ or $[\mathbf{e}\mathbf{o}\gamma]$ if there are three letters.

29 Kahle (1954), p. 67 "perhaps due to Subakhmimic or Middle Egyptian".

The scribe of *Deuteronomy* occasionally uses the circumflex over \aleph or γ ($\aleph\hat{\sim}$ or $\gamma\hat{\sim}$) especially towards the end of the manuscript, as has been mentioned earlier:

- Table 65:
- $\lambda + \gamma$
- vs.
- $O\gamma$

Y	OY
<p>NA[≠]Y “to/for them” (<i>Deut.</i> 1.42, 2.9, 2.12, 2.14, 5.1, 5.9, 5.30, 5.31, 7.2, 7.5, 9.12, 9.27, 9.28, 10.9, 10.11, 11.9, 11.16, 13.13, 17.3, 20.3, 23.6, 23.8, 26.6, 28.14, 29.2, 29.17, 29.26 x2, [30.17], 31.7, [31.20], 31.23, 32.21, 32.33, 32.43, 32.46)</p> <p>NA[≠]Y (<i>Deut.</i> 31.2, 31.4, 31.5, 31.28, 32.21, 32.35, 32.41, 34.4)</p> <p><i>Deut.</i>: 95%</p>	<p>NA[≠]OY “to/for them” (<i>Deut.</i> 1.39, 5.9)</p> <p><i>Deut.</i>: 5%</p>

124

b) V = **н** Deut./Jon.: **G** = **οΥ** (var. **Υ**) Acts.: **G** = **Υ**

Deut.: **ⲡⲏⲟⲩⲥ**~**ⲡⲏⲟⲩⲥ**, **ⲡⲏⲟⲩⲥ**, **ⲡⲏⲟⲩⲥ**.

Jon.: **ⲡⲏⲟⲩⲥ**.

Acts: **ⲡⲏⲩⲥ**, **ⲡⲏⲩⲥ**, **ⲡⲏⲩⲥ**.

Table 66: **н** + **οΥ** vs. **Υ**

οΥ	Υ
ⲡⲏⲟⲩⲥ (Deut. 2.7, 5.13, 11.2 x2, 11.4, 11.5, 11.6, 11.7, 12.7, 14.28, 15.10, 16.8, 23.20, 23.21, 26.6, [28.12], 28.20, [29.2], [30.9], 31.29, 32.4 x2, [33.11]) (Jon. 3.10) Deut.: 95% Jon.: 100% Acts: 0%	ⲡⲏⲩⲥ (Deut. 29.9) ⲡⲏⲩⲥ (Acts 7.22, 7.41, 19.18, 21.19) Deut.: 5% Jon.: 0% Acts: 100%
ⲡⲏⲟⲩⲥ (Deut. 32.43) Deut.: 100% Jon.: \emptyset Acts: 0%	ⲡⲏⲩⲥ (Acts 2.34, 7.56) Deut.: 0% Jon.: \emptyset Acts: 100%
ⲡⲏⲟⲩⲥ (Deut. 7.5, 12.3) Deut.: 100% Jon.: \emptyset Acts: 0%	ⲡⲏⲩⲥ (Acts 17.23) Deut.: 0% Jon.: \emptyset Acts: 100%

c) V = **ⲗ**, **ⲥ** Deut./Jon.: **G** = **Υ** (var. **οΥ**) Acts: **G** = **Υ** (var. **οΥ**)

ⲗⲩⲱ, **ⲙⲗⲩⲗⲗ** (**ⲙⲗⲩⲗⲗ** (Deut. 33.28), **ⲙⲗⲩⲗⲗ** (Deut. 29.14)), **ⲧⲗⲩⲟ**, **ⲧⲗⲩⲥ**;

ⲙⲥⲥⲩⲥ, **ⲥⲩⲥ**.

Note the following:

ⲗⲩⲱ (Deut. 32.34, 33.7), **ⲗⲩⲱ** (Deut. 32.40, 33.3)

Table 67: **ⲗ**, **ⲥ** + **Υ** vs. **οΥ**

Υ	οΥ
ⲥⲩⲱ “pledge” (Deut. 24.6, 24.10, 24.12, 24.17) Deut.: 80% Jon.: \emptyset Acts: \emptyset	ⲥⲟⲩⲱ (Deut. 24.11) Deut.: 20% Jon.: \emptyset Acts: \emptyset
ⲗⲏⲗⲩⲱ “oaths”	ⲗⲏⲗⲟⲩⲱ (Deut. 29.12) ⲗⲏⲗⲟⲩⲱ (Deut. 29.14) Deut.: 100% Jon.: \emptyset Acts: \emptyset
ⲧⲗⲩⲟ (=) (Acts 2.11, 8.33, 15.12, 15.25, [16.36], 19.18, 19.31, 21.26) (Deut.: <i>passim</i>) Deut.: 100% Jon.: \emptyset Acts: 87%	ⲧⲗⲟⲩⲟ (Acts 23.30) (CB: ⲧⲗⲟⲩⲟⲩⲱ (Acts 15.33)) Deut.: 100% Jon.: \emptyset Acts: 13%

APPENDIX 3: PAPYRUS BODMER XVIII

A. Graphemic forms of the vowel /i/ (ι~ει~ⲉⲓ~ⲓ̄)

Table 68: Typology of the vowel /i/

Case	Syllabic Context Examples*	<i>P.Bodm. 18</i> <i>Deuteronomy 1-10.7</i>	Examples
A1	#'V ει	ει (var. ⲉⲓ~ⲓ̄)	ⲉⲓ~ⲉⲓ̄ ⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲉⲓⲣⲉ
A2	#(')VC ειC-	ει	ⲉⲓC-
A3	(')(C)CV ⲭⲓ	ι (var. ⲉⲓ)	ⲭⲓ ⲱⲓ ⲉⲓ~ⲉⲓ̄ ⲉⲓⲛⲉ
A4	(')(C)CVC(C) ⲛⲓⲙ	ι (var. ⲉⲓ)	ⲛⲓⲙ ⲭⲓⲛ ⲭⲓⲭⲛⲓⲧ
A5	'(C)GV ⲟⲩⲉⲓ	ει	ⲟⲩⲉⲓ ⲟⲩⲉⲓⲧⲉ
A6	'(C)GVC ⲱⲟⲩⲉⲓⲧ	ει	ⲱⲟⲩⲉⲓⲧ

*Examples from classical Sahidic (Chester Beatty – *Acts*)

Case A1: #'V V = ⲉⲓ (var. ⲉⲓ̄~ⲓ̄)

At the beginning of a lexeme in an open syllable, including words of Greek origin, the vowel /i/ is represented by the digraph:

ⲉⲓ~ⲉⲓ̄, ⲉⲓⲛⲉ, ⲉⲓⲃⲉ, ⲉⲓⲣⲉ, ⲉⲓⲛⲉ, ⲉⲓⲣⲛⲛⲛ.

Note: ⲭⲓⲕⲱⲛ (*Deut.* 4.16) (εἰκών) (cf. Case A3).

Variation: On one occasion only, with the word “to come”, the circumflex is placed over the digraph:³¹

ⲉⲓ̄ (*Deut.* 1.20) vs. ⲉⲓ (*Deut.* 1.19, 1.24, 1.31, 1.44, 2.14 x2, 2.23, 2.32, 3.1, 4.45, 4.46, 6.4, 9.7 x2, 9.15, [10.1, 10.5, 10.7])

Biblical names/proper nouns: The exception to this rule occurs with biblical names where ⲓ̄ is regular: ⲓ̄ⲥⲁⲁⲕ.

³¹ Kasser (1962c) places the circumflex over the iota in his edition.

The trema is always omitted when prefixed with the singular definite article: ΠΙΣΡΑΗΛ.

Case A2 #(')VC V = ει

There is only one example of the vowel /i/ in this environment:

ΕΙC–

Note the vowel beginning a syllable (not a lexeme) which occurs in the following proper nouns:

ΞΕΔΡΑΕΙΝ (Ἐδάειν), ἸΛΕΙΡ (Ἰαείρ), ΞΡΑΦΑΕΙΝ (Ῥαφαείν).

Case A3: '(C)CV and CV V = ι (var. ει)

When the vowel /i/ follows a consonant, in an open syllable, it is rendered by the grapeme ι:

ΑΡΙ, [Α]ΧΙ[≠], ΕΜΑΡΙ–, ΘΙΜΕ “the wife”, ΜΙΝΕ, ΜΙΩΕ, ΕΜΠΙ–, ΝΤΕΡΙ–, ΝΣΙ–, ΠΕΝΙΠΕ, ΠΙ–, ΡΙΜΕ, ΣΜΙΝΕ, ΣΖΙΜΕ, ΩΙ, ΩΙΑΕΙ, ΩΙΝΕ, ΦΙ(–), ΖΙ(–), ΖΙΤΕ, ΖΙΤῆ, ΖΙΤΟΟΤ[≠], ΖΙΧῆ/ῆ, ΖΙΧΩ[≠], ΧΙ(–), ΧΙCΕ, ΧΙΟΥΕ, ΧΙΧΕΟΥ, (ΧΙΧΕΕΥ *Deut.* 6.19), ΧΙΧΝΙΤ.

Variation: The exception to this rule concerns the lexeme CΕΙ~CΙ:

CΕΙ (*Deut.* 8.10, 8.12) vs. CΙ (*Deut.* 6.11).

In *Deut.* 8.12 it appears that the scribe initially wrote CΙ, and then corrected himself, writing the Ε over the original Ι.

Words of Greek origin:

a) There is some variation in the realisation of the vowel in words of Greek origin. Greek ι is consistently rendered with Sahidic ι, whereas Greek ει is generally transcribed with either ει or ι:

- ΟΡΙΝΗ (*Deut.* 2.37) ὀρεινή;
- ΑΜΜΑΝΙΤΗΣ (*Deut.* 2.20) Ἀμμανείτης;
- ΜΙCΩΡ (*Deut.* 3.10) Μεισώρ.

Table 69: Greek ει: C + ει vs. ι

ει > ει	ει > ι
χειμάροος ΧΕΙΜΑΡΡΟΣ (<i>Deut.</i> 2.36, 2.37, 3.8, 3.16 x3, 4.48, 9.21, [10.7]) 89%	ΧΙ ΜΑΡΡΟΣ (<i>Deut.</i> 3.12) 11%
Μωαβεΐτης ΜΩΑΒΕΙΤΗΣ (<i>Deut.</i> 2.9) 33%	ΜΩΑΒΙΤΗΣ (<i>Deut.</i> 2.11, 2.29) 67%

b) In the case of the -έω/-έομαι contract verb endings the digraph is maintained:

ΛΝΟΜΕΙ, ΕΠΙΘΥΜΕΙ, ΕΠΙΚΑΛΕΙ, ΚΛΗΡΟΝΟΜΕΙ, ΑΡΧΕΙ.

Case A4: '(C)CVC(C) and CVC V = ι (var. ει)

In a closed syllable this rule is strictly followed:

ΜΕΡΙΤ[≠], ΜΖΙΤ[≠], ΝΙΜ, ΠΕΤΖΙΤΟΥΩ[≠], ΠΣΙΣ, ΦΙΤ[≠], ΧΙΤ[≠], ΧΙΝ, ΧΙΧΝΙΤ[≠], ΘΙΧ.

Words of Greek origin: As in the previous case, the scribe observes the Greek orthography, ι transcribed as ι, and ει rendered as ει. The only exception occurs with the lexeme πόλις, in which case the scribe fluctuates between ΠΟΛΙΣ and ΠΟΛΕΙΣ.

Table 70: ΠΟΛΙΣ vs. ΠΟΛΕΙΣ

ι > ι	ι > ει
πόλις ΠΟΛΙΣ (<i>Deut.</i> 1.22, 1.28, 2.36 x2, 3.4, 3.5, 3.10, 3.19, 4.41, 4.42, 6.10, 9.1) 50%	ΠΟΛΕΙΣ (<i>Deut.</i> 2.34 x2, 2.35, 2.36, 2.37, 3.4 x2, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 3.10, 3.12) 50%

Case A5: '(C)GV G = /w/ V = ει

When the vowel /i/ follows a glide, in an open syllable, the digraph is always employed:

ΟΥΕΙ, ΖΟΥΕΙΤΕ.

Case A6: '(C)GVC G = /w/ V = ει

In a closed syllable the digraph also realises the vowel following a glide:

ΦΟΥΕΙΤ.

B. Graphemic forms of the glide /j/ (ĩ~î~ı~ει)

Table 71: Typology of the glide /j/

Case	Syllabic Context		<i>P.Bodm. 18</i> <i>Deuteronomy 1-10.7</i>	Examples
B1	#'GV ειω		ει (var. ĩ~ı)	εια ειοτε
B2	#'GVC(C) ειωτ		ει (var. ı)	ειωτ
B3	'(C)CGV ειη		ı (var. ει)	ειη ειome ειω ταμιο~ταμειο
B4	'(C)CGVC ειειβ		ı	ειοορ
B5	'(C)VG# ηĩ χοĩ εχοĩ κογĩ ααĩ	V = η	ει	ηει
		V = ο	ει	ογοει ημοει
		V = ω	∅	∅
		V = ογ	ĩ	κ[ογ]ĩ
		V = α	ĩ (var. î~ı~ει)	παĩ ααĩ~ααĩ ηαĩ
	(C)VG# αĩ- εĩ-	V = α	ĩ (var. î~ει)	αĩ- ααĩ~ααει-
		V = ε	ει (var. ĩ~î)	εĩ~εει- πεει- πεĩ-
B6	'(C)VG.CV(C) ειηει		V = ο ει	ειηει
			V = α ĩ	ειηει
B7	'(C)VG# οεικ		ει	μαειν χοειτ χοεικ
B8	CVC.'GV ρηειη		∅	∅
B9	'(C)V.GV(C) (C)V.'GV(C) χαει		ει	ταει ταειη χοει τογειη μογειοογε εει-

Case B1: #'GV G = εἰ (var. ῑ~ι)

At the beginning of a lexeme, in an open syllable, the glide is realised εἰ:

εἰλ, εἰεὐϞην, εἰοτε, εἰερο, εἰωρ̄.

Biblical names/proper nouns: The iota with a trema is regular beginning biblical names:

ῑακωβ, ῑαβοκ, ῑησοῦς.

The initial glide loses the trema when preceded by the definite article:

πιορ.Δ.ανης, πιεβοῦσαιος “the Jebusite”.

When preceded by the demonstrative article the iota with the trema remains:

πεεῖῑορ.Δ.ανης (*Deut.* 3.27, 4.21, 4.22)

But note the following:

- αῦωθ ἰαεῖρ (*Deut.* 3.14) vs. ῑαεῖρ (*Deut.* 3.14) “Auoth Jair” Ἰαείρ;
- εἰεῖαα (*Deut.* 2.32) “in Jasa” Ἰασσά;
- εἰεφονη (*Deut.* 1.36) “of Jephone” Ἰεφοννή.

Case B2: #'GVC(C) G = εἰ (var. ι)

At the beginning of a lexeme, in a closed syllable, the glide is expressed with the digraph:

εἰωτ̄.

With a preformative clitic: Note the following exception: αἰατ̄ (Deut. 3.27, 4.19) for αἰ-εἰατ̄. Here we find the coalescence of the vowel + glide, resulting in syntagmatic resyllabification: /fi.'jat/ > /'fjat/.

Case B3: '(C)CGV G = ι (var. εἰ)

The glide following a consonant, in an open syllable, is rendered by the iota:

εἰοῦ, εἰη, εἰομε, εἰωω̄, εἰοοῦε, εἰω, τ̄αμιο (τ̄αμιε-).

Variation: The one exception occurs with the following lexeme:

τ̄αμιο (*Deut.* 4.23, 4.25, 9.12) vs. τ̄αμειο (*Deut.* 9.16, 10.1 [τ̄]αμει[ο]).

Case B4: '(C)CGVC **G = ι**

The glide following a consonant, in a closed syllable, is also rendered by the iota:

ⲭ.ΙΟΟΡ.

Case B5 '(C)VG# and (C)VG#

a) Accented syllables '(C)VG#

V = Һ, օ	G = ԷԻ
V = օΥ	G = ֿի
V = օ	G = ֿի (var. ֿի~ֿԻ~ԷԻ)
V = օ	G = ∅

Following the vowels Һ and օ the final glide /j/, in an accented syllable, is consistently rendered ԷԻ. There is only one example of the glide following vocalic օΥ, and here the scribe employs ֿի. Variation occurs when the vowel օ precedes the glide, in which case the scribe favours ֿի. Occasionally the scribe uses a sort of a circumflex (slightly curved line) where a trema would be expected. This could be a graphic malformation of the trema caused by the scribe writing quickly without lifting the calamus from the papyrus. It is rare at the beginning of the manuscript, but becomes more frequent towards the end.³²

i) V = Һ, օ G = ԷԻ

Lexical forms:

ⲱⲏⲈԷԻ, ҺԷԻ, ⲥⲗⲗօⲈԷԻ, օΥօⲈԷԻ, ԸⲃօⲈԷԻ.

1st person singular suffix pronouns:

ⲙⲙօⲥԷԻ, ԷրօⲥԷԻ, [ⲱⲗր]օⲥԷԻ (10.1), ԿⲧօⲥԷԻ.

ii) V = օΥ G = ֿի

Կ[օΥ]ֿի (*Deut.* 1.17)

³² Kasser (1962c), p. 13.

Table 73: 1st person singular pronominal subject of verbal conjugations: € + ĩ~î vs. €I

Conjugation	€ + ĩ~î	€ + €I
Present Circumstantial / Present II	€ĩ- (<i>Deut.</i> 3.21, 3.23, 9.13, 9.25, 9.26) €î- (<i>Deut.</i> 9.18) 67%	€€I- (<i>Deut.</i> [1.9], 1.16, 2.26, 3.18) 33%
Imperfect	NEĩ- 0%	NE€I- (<i>Deut.</i> 5.5) 100%
Future I Circumstantial/ Future II	€ĭNA- (<i>Deut.</i> [1.12], 7.17) 20%	€€INA- (<i>Deut.</i> 2.27 x2, 2.28 x2) 80%
Future Imperfect	(€)NEĭNA- (<i>Deut.</i> 9.9) 100%	0%

Table 74: Variation with demonstrative articles

€ + ĩ~î	€ + €I
PEĩ- (<i>Deut.</i> [1.5], 3.25, 3.26, [9.27], [9.28]) 7%	PE€I- (<i>Deut.</i> [1.6], 1.31 x2, 1.32, 1.35, 2.3, 2.14 PI[€]€I-, 3.18, 3.21, 3.25, 3.27, 3.28, 4.6, 4.8, 4.21, 4.22 x2, 4.32, 5.3, 5.28, 5.31, 6.23, 7.17, 9.4, 9.6, 9.7, 9.12, 9.13) 93%
TEĩ- 0%	TE€I- (<i>Deut.</i> 2.7, 4.32, 5.3, 5.25, 8.17) 100%
NEĩ- (<i>Deut.</i> 4.6, 4.42, 6.6, 6.20 x2, 6.24, 6.25, 7.11 x2, 7.19 x2, 7.22, 9.5) NEî- (<i>Deut.</i> 7.11) 60%	NE€I- (<i>Deut.</i> 1.35, 4.30, 6.20, 7.12, 9.4 x2) 30%

Table 75: Variation with the construct participle

λ + ĩ-	λ + €I-
qλĩ- (<i>Deut.</i> 2.26 qλĩŵINE, 5.14 qλĩNA2B̄) 67%	qλ€I- (<i>Deut.</i> 5.21 qλ€INA2B̄) 33%

Case B6: '(C)VG.CV(C)

V = O G = €I

V = λ G = ĩ

When the glide closes a syllable within a lexeme, the previous rule (Case 5B) is observed, the digraph following O, and ĩ used after the vowel λ.

so[€Iλ€] (*Deut.* 1.16), zo€Iŵ€ (*Deut.* 8.4)c2λĩ≠COŷ (*passim*)

Case B7: '(C)VGC# **G = €ɪ**

In the ‘covered’ position the digraph is consistently used, even following the vowel λ , where it is otherwise rendered $\ddot{\imath}$ (cf. Case 5B).

$\chi\omicron\epsilon\iota\tau$, $\omicron\epsilon\iota\kappa$, $\nu\omicron\epsilon\iota\kappa$, $\omicron\gamma\omicron\epsilon\iota\omega$, $\omega\omicron\epsilon\iota\omega$, $\mu\alpha\epsilon\iota\eta$, $\chi\omicron\epsilon\iota\varsigma$.

Case B8: CVC'GV

\emptyset

Case B9: '(C)V.GV(C) and (C)V.'GV(C) **G = €ɪ**

The use of the digraph here contrasts to Case B5, where the glide is generally realised $\ddot{\imath}$ following the vowels λ and $\omicron\gamma$. In this environment, however, the use of €ɪ could be an extension of Case B1, in this case, beginning a syllable, not a segment.

$\tau\alpha\epsilon\iota\epsilon$, $\tau\alpha\epsilon\iota\eta\gamma$, $\chi\alpha\epsilon\iota\epsilon$, $\tau\omicron\gamma\epsilon\iota\eta$, $\mu\omicron\gamma\epsilon\iota\omicron\omicron\gamma\epsilon$, $\epsilon\epsilon\iota\epsilon$ – (Adhortative base).

C. Graphemic forms of the vowel /u/ (οΥ~Υ)

Table 76: Typology of the vowel /u/

Case	Syllabic Context	<i>P.Bodm. 18</i> <i>Deuteronomy 1-10.7</i>	Examples
C1	#(')V οΥΝΑΜ	οΥ (var. Υ)	οΥ οΥΝΑΜ οΥ- οΥΩΗ
C2	(')(C)CV ΜΟΥ	οΥ	ΜΟΥΤΕ ΜΠΟΥ- ΤΗΡΟΥ
C3	'(C)CVC(C) ΞΟΥΝ	οΥ	ΞΟΥΝ ΜΟΥΟΥΤ Κ[ΟΥ]ϊ

Case C1: #(')V V = οΥ (var. Υ)

At the beginning of a segment the vowel /u/ is realised οΥ.

οΥ, οΥ-, οΥΒΕ, οΥΝΑΜ, οΥΩΗ.

In the following cases variation occurs under the influence of certain clitics:

- The indefinite article οΥ- is regularly reduced to -Υ- when it is preceded by the preposition ε, and the Perfect I conjugation nominal base λ. For example: ΕΥΜΑΕΙΝ (*Deut.* 6.8), ΕΥΝΟΘ (*Deut.* 1.28, 7.21, 9.14), ΕΛΥΚΑΚΕ (*Deut.* 5.22).
- A few of the lexemes beginning with οΥ are preceded by the long form of the definite article (οΥΩΗ, οΥΝΟΥ), and in these cases Υ is regularly used (ΤΕΥΩΗ, ΝΤΕΥΝΟΥ).

Case C2: (')(C)CV V = οΥ

The vowel is rendered οΥ following a consonant in an open syllable:

ΜΟΥΤΕ, ΝΟΥΤΕ, ΤΕΝΟΥ, ΣΙΟΥ;

ΜΠΟΥ-, ΝΤΕΡΟΥ-, ΜΑΡΟΥ-;

ΤΗΡΟΥ.

Case C3: '(C)CVC(C) V = οΥ

The vowel /u/ is also rendered οΥ following a consonant in a closed syllable.

ΞΟΥΝ, ΜΟΥΟΥΤ, Κ[ΟΥ]ϊ.

D. Graphemic forms of the glide /w/ (ογ~γ)

Table 77: Typology of the glide /w/

Case	Syllabic Context		<i>P.Bodm. 18</i> <i>Deuteronomy 1-10.7</i>	Examples
D1	#(')GV ογλ		ογ	ογλ ογεί ογερhte
D2	#(')GVC(C) ογωμ		ογ	ογωμ ογοειω ογν~ογñ-
D3	'(C)CGV ζογειτε		ογ	ζογειτε
D4	'(C)CGVC φογειτ		ογ	φογειτ
D5	(')(C)VG(C) μοογ τφοογν νανογ~ογ τηγτñ ναγ πεγ- χοο~γ	V = ο	ογ	μοογ
		V = ω	ογ	τφοογν cφοογ2
		V = ογ	∅	∅
		V = η	γ	τηγτñ cνηγ ñηγ
		V = λ	γ	ναγ
		V = ε	γ (var. ογ)	πεγ- τεγ- ñεγ- χιξεογ~χιξεεγ
		V = οο	γ	χοο~γ
D6	(C)V.'GV(C) '(C)V.GV(C) κοογε χιογε zβηγε αγω μεεγε	V = ο	ογ	μογειοογε pcoογε τβñoογε zioογε
		V = ι	ογ	χιιογε
		V = η	γ (var. ογ)	zβηγε φhoογε
		V = λ	γ	αγω
		V = ε	γ	μεεγε

Case D1: #(')GV G = ογ

At the beginning of a segment, in an open syllable, the glide /w/ is realised ογ.

ογλ, ογλλ̄, ογεί, ογερhte, ογοze, ογωτ̄2 / ογωτ̄2, ογωñ̄2, ογωφ̄b̄,
ογωφ̄c̄, ογωφ̄τ̄, ογωφ̄q̄.

Note the following haplography: ñεκ(ογ)οει (*Deut. 5.27*)

Case D2: #(')GVC(C) **G = oγ**

At the beginning of a segment, in a closed syllable, the glide is realised oγ:

oγ^{aa}b, oγ^{a2}ca²ne (Deut. 6.17, 6.25), oγ^{e2}ca²ne (Deut. 5.10, 7.9), oγn-,
oγnt², oγoei, oγoei², oγon, oγof², oγom, oγem- (oγ^m- Deut.
9.18), oγom², oγon², oγe², oγa², oγof², oγ², oγa², oγh²;
oγn~oγⁿ-, oγnte-/oγnta²~oγⁿte-/oγⁿta².

With a preformative clitic: The digraph is maintained in the following cases:

- Converted existential: neoγn (Deut. 1.35)
- Converted predication of possession: eteoγnt² (Deut. 4.7), eteoγⁿta² (Deut. 4.8), eteoγⁿta² (Deut. 4.38).
- The lexeme oγoei² is always preceded by the long form of the definite article: neoγoei² (*passim*).

Coalescence: The sequence oγ-oγ coalesces to oγ in the following:³³

ma²roγ(oγ)² (Deut. 3.19); eoγ(oγ)²om (Deut. 2.6).

Note also: ²aaaγ (Deut. 4.2) for ²aaa oγ- “but a ...”

Case D3: '(C)CGV **G = oγ**

There is only one example of the glide /w/ following a consonant in an open syllable:

²oγeit².

Case D4: '(C)CGVC **G = oγ**

In a closed syllable there is only one example of the glide /w/ following a consonant:

oγoit².

Case D5: (')(C)VG(C)

V = o, ω	G = oγ
V = h	G = γ
V = a, e, oo	G = γ (var. oγ)

³³ According to Kasser (1962c) these could be haplographies p. 16.

a) V = ο, ω G = ογ

Lexical forms:

εοογ, εσοογ, εσοογ, μ̄ν̄τ̄ς̄ν̄οογ̄ς̄ μ̄οογ, μ̄οογ̄τ̄ς̄, ν̄τ̄οογ, ποογ,
σοογ, σοογ̄ν, τ̄οογ, γ̄τ̄οογ, σοογ, σοογ̄τ̄, ρ̄οογ, ρ̄οογ,
μ̄ν̄τ̄ε̄ρ̄ωογ, ρ̄ρ̄ωογ, σ̄ωογ̄ς̄, τ̄ωογ̄ν.

3rd person pronominal suffixes:

ε̄ρ̄ο̄ς̄ογ, κ̄τ̄ο̄ς̄ογ, μ̄μ̄ο̄ς̄ογ, τ̄ᾱκ̄ο̄ς̄ογ, τ̄ᾱρ̄ο̄ς̄ογ, τ̄ς̄ᾱβ̄ο̄ς̄ογ;
ε̄ρ̄ς̄ω̄ς̄ογ, μ̄ν̄ν̄ς̄ω̄ς̄ογ, ν̄ᾱρ̄ς̄ω̄ς̄ογ, ν̄ε̄ς̄ω̄ς̄ογ, ν̄ς̄ω̄ς̄ογ, ρ̄ῑς̄ω̄ς̄ογ,
ς̄ω̄ς̄ογ.

b) V = η G = γ

Lexical forms:

τ̄ηγ̄τ̄ν̄, ρ̄ᾱτ̄ηγ, σ̄ν̄ηγ.

Statives:

κ̄τ̄ηγ, ν̄ηγ, τ̄ᾱε̄ῑηγ, τ̄ᾱρ̄ηγ.

c) V = α, ε, οο G = γ (var. ογ)

Lexical forms:

λααγ, μααγ, (ε̄τ̄)ν̄μααγ, ναγ (“see”), σ̄ναγ, ρ̄νααγ, ρ̄ε̄γ̄.

3rd person plural suffix pronouns:

νᾱς̄γ, ν̄μ̄μᾱς̄γ, ρ̄οο̄ς̄ γ.

3rd person plural pronominal subjects:

αγ̄-, ν̄τ̄αγ̄-;

εγ̄-, εγ̄να-, εγ̄ϖ̄αν-, νεγ̄-, ν̄νεγ̄-, (ε̄)τ̄ρεγ̄-.

Possessive articles:

πεγ̄-, τεγ̄-, νεγ̄-

Biblical names:

η̄σαγ (Deut. 2.4, 2.5, 2.12)

Variation: The only exception occurs with the following lexeme:

ρ̄ῑς̄ε̄ογ (Deut. 1.42, 7.5) vs. ρ̄ῑς̄ε̄εγ (Deut. 6.19).

Case D6: '(C)V.GV and (C)V.'GV(C)

V = o, i G = oγ

V = h G = γ (var. oγ)

V = λ, ε G = γ

a) **V = o, i G = oγ**

moγeiooγe, pcooγe, tēnooγe, ziooγe, xioγe.

b) **V = h G = γ (var. oγ)**

zēhγe (*Deut.* 1.30, 2.7, 5.13, 9.7).

qhoγe (*Deut.* 7.5).

c) **V = λ, ε G = γ**

λγw, tλγo, tλγe-.

mēeγe, eγe-.

APPENDIX 4: PAPYRUS BODMER XXIII

A. Graphemic forms of the vowel /i/ (i~ει~ῖ)

Table 78: Typology of the vowel /i/

Case	Syllabic Context Examples*	<i>P.Bodm. 23</i> <i>Isaiah 47.1-66.24</i>	Examples
A1	#'V ει	ει (var. ῖ~ι)	ει~ῖ εινε ειρε
A2	#(')VC ειC-	ει	ειC-
A3	(')(C)CV χι	ι (var. ει~ῖ)	χι χι mice cῖ πειρε ni- ᾠπi-
A4	(')(C)CVC(C) nim	ι (var. ει)	nim
A5	'(C)GV ογει	ει (var. ῖ)	ογῖ ογῖνε
A6	'(C)GVC ογογειτ	ει	ογογειτ ρειβ ρειτ λαγεια

*Examples from classical Sahidic (Chester Beatty – *Acts*)

Case A1: #'V V = ει (var. ῖ~ι)

At the beginning of a lexeme, in an open syllable, the vowel /i/ is represented by the digraph ει.

ει~ῖ, ειρε, εινε, εινε, ειβε, ειλωλον, ειρηνη.

Variation: In the case of the verb “to come” this scribe generally places a circumflex over the digraph (ῖ).³⁴

Table 79: #ει vs. ῖ

ει	ῖ
ει (<i>Isa.</i> 50.2, 60.7, 63.4, 63.14, [66.7], [66.23]) 27%	ῖ (<i>Isa.</i> 48.1, 48.3, 48.5, 49.18, 56.1, 59.14, 60.1, 60.4, 62.1, 63.4, 66.5) 73%

³⁴ In the edition of Kasser (1965) the circumflex is placed over the iota only.

With a preformative clitic: On one occasion the epsilon is dropped when preceded by the definite article:

πιβε “the thirst” (*Isa.* 50.2).

Biblical names/proper noun: “Israel” always occurs with the definite article:

πισραηλ, π̄ιηλ.

Case A2 #(')VC **V = ει**

There is only one example of the vowel /i/ in this environment:

ειC-.

Case A3: '(C)CV and CV **V = ι (var. ει~ε̂ι)**

When the vowel /i/ follows a consonant, in an open syllable, it is generally realised ι:

αρι, κιβε, मिने, मिसे, मिϣε, ρεκρικε, ριμε, cμινε, cζιμε, ϣινε, ϣιπε, ϣι,
 ζι, ζιसे, 2̄ρϣιρε, χι, χιसे, ṁπι-, ṁδι-, पि-, नि-.

Variation: The exception to this rule concerns the lexeme cε̂ι, which is always written with the digraph carrying a circumflex:

cε̂ι (*Isa.* 55.2, 56.11, 58.11, [66.11]); cε̂ι (*Isa.* 65.15).

Another exception is πειρε “light/shining” and its alternative unusual spelling:

π̄ρειε (*Isa.* 60.19) vs. πειρε (*Isa.* 60.3).³⁵

Words of Greek origin: The Greek orthography is generally respected.

a) Greek ι > Sahidic ι. For example:

αγριον, αιχμαλωτιζε, ανομια, γιγας, δαιμονιον, διαθηκη, δικαιος,
 δικαιοσυνη, διωκε, επιθυμει, επικαλει, ετι, ευαγγελιζε, θηριον,
 θλιβε, θυσια, θυσιαστηριον, κληρονομια, κρικος, κρινε, κρισι[C],
 κριτης, λιβανος, μαστιγξ, μερις, μυρσινη, ουριον, παραδιου,
 περικεφαλαια, ταλαιπωρια, χιων, ζυποποδιον, αςσυριος, [λ]ιβλ[ν]ος,
 μαδιζαμ, σαμαρια.

³⁵ Crum (1939), p. 267a: πειρε, πι. S, also πρεε S, πριε A, πρειε, πριε A².

b) Greek ει > Sahidic ει:

ΛΠΕΙΛΗ, ΠΑΡΑΔΕΙCOC, CΑΠΠΕΙΡOC, CΤΕΙΡΑ.

But note the exception: CΙΩΝ (*passim*) Σείων.

In the following domain the iota renders Greek ει:

ΒΟΗΘΙΑ (*Isa.* 47.15) βοήθεια, ΝΗCΤΙΑ (*Isa.* [58.3], 58.5 x2, 58.6) νηστεία, ΠΟΡΝΙΑ (*Isa.* 57.9) πορνεία; Note: ΒΟΗΘΙΑ (*Isa.* 50.9) for ΒΟΗΘΕΙ.

c) In the case of the έω/έομαι contract verb endings the digraph is maintained except in two instances:

ΛΘΕΤΕΙ, ΛΙΤΕΙ, ΑΡΧΕΙ (ΑΡΧΕΙ *Isa.* 63.19), ΒΟΗΘΕΙ, ΕΠΙΘΥΜΕΙ, ΕΠΙΚΑΛΕΙ, ΖΩΓΡΑΦΕΙ, ΚΟCΜ[ΕΙ], ΛΥΠΕΙ, ΠΑΡΑΚΑΛΕΙ.

Table 80: Greek ει: C + ει vs. ι (verb endings)

ει > ει	ει > ι
κληρονομέω ΚΛΗΡΟΝΟΜΕΙ (<i>Isa.</i> 49.8, 53.12, 54.3, 58.11, 60.21, 61.7, 65.9 x2) Κ[ΛΗΡ]ΟΝΟΜΕΙ[Α] (<i>Isa.</i> 63.18) - ε placed over the ι 90%	ΚΛΗΡΟΝΟΜΙ (<i>Isa.</i> 57.13) 10%
καταπατέω	ΚΑΤΑΠΑΤΙ (<i>Isa.</i> 63.6) 100%

d) Greek ε > Sahidic ει:

εΥΠΟΜΕΙΝΕ (*Isa.* 59.9, 60.9, 64.3 ε placed over the ι) ύπομένεω.

Case A4: '(C)CVC(C) and CVC V = ι (var. ει)

In a closed syllable the vowel is rendered ι.

ΜΕΡΙΤ, ΜΡΙC, ΜΖΙΤ, ΝΙΜ, ΠΙΝ, ΡΙΡ, CΙΤ, [C]ΚΙΜ, ΦΙΚ, ΦΜΦΙΤ, ΦΙΤ, ΧΙΤ, ΧΙΝ, ΧΙΝΧΗ, CΙΧ.

Words of Greek origin: As in Case A3, the Greek orthography is generally observed, with the following exception:

ΘΛΙΨΕΙC (*Isa.* 57.13, 65.16) vs. ΘΛΙΨΙC (*Isa.* 63.9) θλίψις.

Case A5: '(C)GV G = /w/ V = ει (var. εῖ)

When the vowel /i/ follows a glide the digraph is employed, carrying a circumflex on two occasions:

ΟΥΕΙΝΕ, ΛΕΥΕΙΤΗ[C] (*Isa.* 66.21) Λευίτας;
ΚΕΟΥΕῖ (*Isa.* 47.10); ΚΕΟΥΕῖ (*Isa.* 47.8); Κ[ε]ΟΥΕ(ι) (*Isa.* 47.10).

Case A6: '(C)GVC G = /w/ or /j/ V = ει

In a closed syllable, as in the previous case, the digraph realises the vowel.

ΩΟΥΕΙΤ, ΣΙΕΙΒ, ΣΙΕΙΤ, ΛΑΥΕΙΔ. (Δαυίδ).

B. Graphemic forms of the glide /j/ (ει~ϊ~ι~ῑ)

Table 81: Typology of the glide /j/

Case	Syllabic Context		<i>P.Bodm. 23 Isaiah 47.1-66.24</i>	Examples
B1	#'GV ειω		ει (var. ι~ϊ)	εια ειοτε
B2	#'GVC(C) ειωτ'		ει (var. ῑ)	ειωτ'
B3	'(C)CGV ζηη		ι	ζηη τ'cie- ταμιο
B4	'(C)CGVC ζειεβ		ι	χοορ ζειεβ ζειετ' cioyp
B5	'(C)VG# ηῑ χοῖ εχοῖ κογῑ αφαῖ	V = η	ει (var. ῑ)	ηει~ηῑ φηει ζτηει
		V = ο	ει (var. ῑ~ι)	εβοει~εβοῖ
		V = ω	ει	εχοωεῖ ncωεῖ
		V = ογ'	ει (var. ῑ)	κογ'ει noγ'ῑ
		V = α	ῑ (var. ι~ει)	ογ'αῖ~ογ'αει ταῖ~ταει
	(C)VG# αῖ- εῖ-	V = α	ει (var. ῑ~ι)	αει~αῖ- φαῖ-
		V = ε	ει (var. ῑ~ῑ)	εει- पेει~πεῖ-
B6	'(C)VG.CV(C) ζοῖνε		ει (var. ῑ)	ζοειτε ζαειβες~θαῖβες
B7	'(C)VGC# οεικ		ει	μαειν μοειτ' χοεικ
B8	CVC.'GV ρῑμειη		∅	∅
B9	'(C)V.GV(C) (C)V.'GV(C) χαῖε		ει (var. ῑ)	ναειῶ ταεινογ' χαειε τογ'ειη μογ'ειooγ'ε εει(ε)- ναῖατ'

Case B1: #'GV **G = €I** (var. ι~ĩ)

At the beginning of a lexeme, in an open syllable, the glide /j/ is realised €I.

€IA, €IOTE, €IAT̃€, €IEPO.

With a preformative clitic: The iota replaces the digraph in the following lexeme when preceded by the definite article (cf. also *CB* and *BL Acts* 16.13).

πIEPO “the river” (*Isa.* 48.18) vs. νεIEPWOY “the rivers” (*Isa.* 50.2)

Biblical names/proper nouns: The iota with a trema is regular beginning biblical names:

ĩAKWB (*Isa.* 48.1, 48.20, 49.5, 49.6, 49.26, 58.1, 59.20, 65.9) [I]AKW[B] (*Isa.* 48.12),

But: IAKWB (*Isa.* 58.14);

ĩOY.AA (*Isa.* 48.1, 65.9).

The trema is normally omitted in biblical names with the definite article. But note the one exception:

ΘIEPOYCAAHM (*Isa.* 66.10) vs. ΘĩEPoyCAAHM (*Isa.* 49.15); ΘIHM (*passim*).

Case B2: #'GVC(C) **G = €I** (var. ĩ)

At the beginning of a lexeme, in a closed syllable, the glide is represented by the digraph:

€IWT̃.

Variation: Note the following Copto-Greek lexeme:

ĩACΠIC (*Isa.* 54.12).

Case B3: '(C)CGV **G = I**

The glide following a consonant, in an open syllable, is always rendered with a iota:

CIOY, TAMIOW, TAMIOW-, TAMIÕ, MATAMIE, ZIOW̃, ZIH, ZIOOY€, TCIE-,
Θ̄BBIO/Θ̄BBIO, Θ̄BBIÕ Θ̄BBIOHOY/Θ̄BBIH[Y].

Case B4: '(C)CGVC **G = I**

The glide following a consonant, in a closed syllable, is also always rendered with a iota:

XCIOOP (< €IOOP), ZEIB, ZEIT̃, CIOYP.

Case B5: '(C)VG# and (C)VG#

a) Accented syllables '(C)VG

V= η	G = ει (var. ῥι)
V= ο	G = ει (var. ϊ~ι)
V= ω	G = ει
V= ογ	G = ει (var. ϊ)
V= α	G = ϊ (var. ι~ει)

The final glide following the vowels **η**, **ο**, **ω** and **ογ**, in accented syllables, is generally represented by the allograph **ει**, the variant **ϊ** occasionally being used after the vowel **ο**, and the circumflex covering the digraph sometimes appearing after **η**. On the other hand, following the vowel **α**, the glide is realised **ϊ** (var. **ει**).

i) V= **η G = **ει** (var. **ῥι**)**

Table 82: V= **η** G = **ει** vs. **ῥι**

ει	ῥι
ωηει (<i>Isa.</i> 51.1) 100%	
ζηηει (<i>Isa.</i> 63.5) 100%	
ηει (<i>Isa.</i> 48.1, 56.5, 56.7 x2, 58.1, 60.7 x3, 63.7, 64.10, 66.1, 66.20) 71%	ηῥι (<i>Isa.</i> 56.7, 58.7 x3, 65.21) 29%

ii) V= **ο G = **ει** (var. **ϊ~ι**)**

Table 83: V= **ο** G = **ει** vs. **ϊ~ι**

ει	ϊ~ι
τμαειοει (<i>Isa.</i> 50.8) 100%	
θμκοει (<i>Isa.</i> 50.9) 100%	
νοει (<i>Isa.</i> 47.7) (νοειν) 100%	

ει	ϊ~ι
ϺΒΟΕΙ (<i>Isa.</i> 51.5 x2, 51.9, 53.1, 59.16, 63.12) 67%	ϺΒΟΪ (<i>Isa.</i> 52.10, 63.5) ϺΒΟΙ (<i>Isa.</i> 62.8) 33%
ΜΜΟϺΕΙ (<i>Isa.</i> 50.2, 57.8, 58.2, 65.1, 65.5) 71%	ΜΜΟϺΪ (<i>Isa.</i> 65.11) ΜΜΟϺΙ (<i>Isa.</i> 49.5, [61.10]) 29%
ΕΡΟϺΕΙ (<i>Isa.</i> 48.16, 49.1 x2, 49.20, 50.2, 50.4, 50.8 x3, 50.9, 51.1, 51.4, 51.5, 51.7, 55.2, 55.3, 57.11, 57.13, 65.1, 65.5, 66.4) 91%	ΕΡΟϺΪ (<i>Isa.</i> 48.12) ΕΡΟϺΙ (<i>Isa.</i> 49.26) 9%

iii) V = ω G = ει

1st person singular suffix pronouns:

NCΩϺΕΙ, ΡΩϺΕΙ, ΕΧΩϺΕΙ.

iv) V = ογ G = ει (var. ι)

Lexical forms:

ΜΟΥΕΙ, ΚΟΥΕΙ, ΜΝΤΚΟΥΕΙ.

1st person singular suffix pronouns:

ΝΟΥϺΪ “mine” (*Isa.* 66.2)

v) V = α G = ι (var. ι~ει)

Lexical forms:

(Ε)ΖΡΑΪ, ΖΑΪ, ΦΑΪ (*Isa.* 54.1) “the husband”, CΖΑΪ, ΡΕΨCΚΑΪ, ΛΩΑΪ.

Table 84: ΟΥΧΑΪ~ΟΥΧΑΙ vs. ΟΥΧΑΕΙ

ϊ~ι	ει
ΟΥΧΑΪ (<i>Isa.</i> 49.6, 49.8, 49.24, 49.25, 51.5, 51.8, 51.14, 52.7, 52.10, 56.1, 59.11, 60.6, 60.18, 61.10, 63.8) ΟΥΧΑΙ (<i>Isa.</i> 51.6, 59.17, [62.1], 63.1) 95%	ΟΥΧΑΕΙ (<i>Isa.</i> 47.15) 5%

Table 85: Variation with demonstrative pronouns

יִי	עִי
נאִי (Isa. 48.20, 49.4, 49.6, 49.15, 50.7, 51.7, 52.6, 53.12, 54.9, 57.10, [59.9], 61.1, 64.5, 65.5, 65.8, 65.13, 65.16) 100%	
נאִי (Isa. 47.15, 48.17, 49.5, 49.7, 49.8, 49.22, 49.25, 50.1, 51.1, 51.16, 52.14, 54.10, 55.11, 61.11, 62.5, 63.12, 63.14 נאִי, 65.8, 66.1, 66.13) נאִי (Isa. 55.9) נאִי (Isa. 62.5, 66.22) 82%	נאִעִי (Isa. 58.5, 58.6, 59.21, 61.7, 64.5) 18%
נאִי (Isa. 47.7, 47.8, [47.10], 48.11, 48.16, 49.12, 49.21 x3, 50.11, 51.6, 51.12, 52.5 x2, 56.1, 56.2, 56.4 x2, 57.6, 57.10, 57.12, 57.13, [57.15], 60.8, [61.9], 62.6, 64.11, 65.7, 65.13, 66.2 x2, 66.3, 66.5, [66.12], 66.19) 94%	נאִעִי (Isa. 58.14) נאִעִי (Isa. 48.1 – עִי inserted over the נ) 6%

1st person singular suffix pronouns:

נממאִי, [נבננ]אִי (Isa. 47.8)

Table 86: נאִי~נאִי vs. נאִעִי

יִי	עִי
נאִי “to/for me” (Isa. 48.5 x2, 49.3, 49.5, 49.6 x2, 49.20, 49.21 x3, 50.4 x2, 50.7, 54.17, 58.4, 65.8, 65.13 x3, 65.14, 65.15, 66.1, [66.3], 66.20, 66.21) נאִי (Isa. 66.3) 96%	נאִעִי (Isa. 65.3) 4%

b) Unaccented preformatives (C)VG

V = נ G = Glide עִי (var. יִי)

V = ע G = Glide עִי (var. עִי~יִי)

In contrast to the representation of the glide following the vowel נ in accented syllables where the scribe prefers the allograph יִי, in unaccented syllables, namely, the demonstrative articles and the 1st person singular conjugation prefixes, there is a distinct preference for the עִי allograph following נ and also ע, with variation occurring more frequently following נ. On the other hand, the glide in the construct participle נאִי– is consistently rendered by the allograph יִי (Isa. 57.9, 63.9 x2).

Table 87: 1st person singular pronominal subject of verbal conjugations: $\lambda + \ddot{\text{I}}\text{-I}$ vs. ϵI

Conjugation	$\lambda + \ddot{\text{I}}\text{-I}$	$\lambda + \epsilon\text{I}$
Perfect I	<p>$\lambda\ddot{\text{I}}\text{-}$ (<i>Isa.</i> 48.14 - $\ddot{\text{I}}$ above the λ, 48.14, 48.15, 49.8, 50.1 x2, 50.2, 50.7, 55.4, 60.15, 63.3 x2, 65.1, 65.2, 65.12)</p> <p>$\lambda\text{I}\text{-}$ (<i>Isa.</i> 47.6, [47.6], 49.4, 51.16, [57.18])</p> <p>$\lambda(\text{I})\text{-}$ (<i>Isa.</i> 48.8, 63.6)</p> <p>27%</p>	<p>$\lambda\epsilon\text{I}\text{-}$ (<i>Isa.</i> 48.3 x2, 48.5, 48.6, 48.10 x2, 48.15 x2, 48.17, 49.4 x2, 49.6, 49.7, 49.8 x2, 49.16, 50.2, 50.6, 50.7, 51.2 x4, 51.3 x2, 54.7, 54.8 x2, 54.16, 57.17 x3, 57.18 x3, 60.10 x2, 60.15, 62.6, 63.3, 63.5 x2, 63.6 $\lambda\epsilon\text{I}$, 63.7, 65.1, 65.12, 66.4 x2, 66.9)</p> <p>73%</p>
Perfect I Relative / Perfect II	<p>$(-)\epsilon\text{NT}\lambda\ddot{\text{I}}\text{-}$ (<i>Isa.</i> 50.1, 51.16, 57.16)</p> <p>$\text{P}\epsilon\text{N}[\text{T}\lambda\text{I}]\text{-}$ (<i>Isa.</i> 66.9)</p> <p>30%</p>	<p>$\bar{\text{N}}\text{T}\lambda\epsilon\text{I}\text{-}$ (<i>Isa.</i> 48.16, 58.6)</p> <p>$\text{N}\text{T}\lambda\epsilon\text{I}\text{-}$ (<i>Isa.</i> 50.1)</p> <p>$\epsilon\text{NT}\lambda\epsilon\text{I}\text{-}$ (<i>Isa.</i> 54.9, 55.11, 58.5, 59.21)</p> <p>70%</p>

Table 88: 1st person singular pronominal subject of verbal conjugations: $\epsilon + \ddot{\text{I}}$ vs. $\epsilon\text{I} \sim \epsilon\hat{\text{I}}$

Conjugation	$\epsilon + \ddot{\text{I}}$	$\epsilon + \epsilon\text{I} \sim \epsilon\hat{\text{I}}$
Present Circumstantial / Present II	$\epsilon\ddot{\text{I}}\text{-}$	<p>$\epsilon\epsilon\text{I}\text{-}$ (<i>Isa.</i> 47.7, 47.8 $\epsilon\epsilon\text{I}\text{-}$, 48.14, 49.1, 52.7, 57.10, 63.1)</p> <p>100%</p>
Imperfect	$\text{N}\epsilon\ddot{\text{I}}\text{-}$	<p>$\text{N}\epsilon\epsilon\text{I}\text{-}$ (<i>Isa.</i> 48.16, 49.21)</p> <p>100%</p>
Adhortative (Future III) Negative $\bar{\text{N}}\text{N}\lambda$	$\text{N}\text{N}\epsilon\ddot{\text{I}}\text{-}$	<p>$\bar{\text{N}}\text{N}\epsilon\epsilon\text{I}\text{-}$ (<i>Isa.</i> 65.8)</p> <p>100%</p>
Conditional	$\epsilon\ddot{\text{I}}\text{QAN}\text{-}$	<p>$\epsilon\epsilon\text{I}\text{QAN}\text{-}$ (<i>Isa.</i> 57.11)</p> <p>100%</p>
Future I Circumstantial/ Future II	$\epsilon\ddot{\text{I}}\text{N}\lambda\text{-}$	<p>$\epsilon\epsilon\text{I}\text{N}\lambda\text{-}$ (<i>Isa.</i> 66.2)</p> <p>$\epsilon\epsilon\hat{\text{I}}\text{N}\lambda\text{-}$ (<i>Isa.</i> 57.16 x2)</p> <p>100%</p>

Table 89: Variation with demonstrative articles

€ + ĩ	€ + €I
π€ĩ- (<i>Isa.</i> 65.3) 14%	π€€I- (<i>Isa.</i> 47.9, 52.5, 52.6, 57.3, 66.9) π€I- corrected to π€€I- by inserting € above (<i>Isa.</i> 62.4) 86%
τ€ĩ- 0%	τ€€I- (<i>Isa.</i> 48.14, 52.15, 53.7, 57.20 τ€[€]I-, 58.5, 63.1, 65.8, 65.22) [<i>Isa.</i> 66.8 x2] 100%
ν€ĩ- 0%	ν€€I- (<i>Isa.</i> 49.12) 100%

Case B6: '(C)VG.CV(C) G = €I (var. ĩ)

The only case where the glide is rendered by ĩ, it follows the vowel λ.

ΟΕΙΛΕ, ΖΟΕΙΤΕ, ΑΜΗΕΙΤ̄Ν/ΑΜΗΕΙΤ̄Ν̄, ΚΑΕΙΕ;
ΖΑΕΙΒΕC~ΘΑΪΒΕC.

Table 90: ΖΑΕΙΒΕC vs. ΘΑΪΒΕC

€I	ĩ
ΖΑΕΙΒΕC (<i>Isa.</i> 51.16, 57.5) 67%	ΘΑΪΒΕC “the shade” (<i>Isa.</i> 49.2) Θ[ΑΙ]ΒΕC (<i>Isa.</i> 51.16) (or Θ[ΑΕΙ]ΒΕC) 33%

Case B7: '(C)VGC# G = €I

In the ‘covered’ position the digraph is regular.

ΜΟΕΙΤ, ΣΟΕΙΤ, ΟΕΙΚ, ΝΟΕΙΚ, ΝΟΕΙΤ, ΟΥΟΕΙΝ, ΟΥΟΕΙΩ, ΦΟΕΙΩ, ΤΑΦΕΟΕΙΩ,
ΤΟΕΙC, ΖΟΕΙΜ, ΧΟΕΙC, ΜΑΕΙΝ, ΖΚΑΕΙΤ.

Case B8: CVC'GV

Ø

Case B9: '(C)V.GV(C) and (C)V.'GV(C) G = €I (var. ĩ)

The intervocalic glide is rendered with the digraph, with one exception:

ΤΑΕΙΗΟΥ, ΤΜΑΕΙΟϚ, ΤΜΑΕΙΕ-, ΧΑΕΙΕ, ΝΑΕΙΩ, ΤΟΥΕΙΟ;
€€I(€) (*Isa.* 49.20) Adhortative base .

But: ΝΑΪΑΤϚ (*Isa.* 56.2).

C. Graphemic forms of the vowel /u/ (OY~Y)

Table 91: Typology of the vowel /u/

Case	Syllabic Context	<i>P.Bodm. 23</i> <i>Isaiah 47.1-66.24</i>	Examples
C1	#(')V OY'NAM	OY (var. Y)	OY OY'NAM OY-
C2	(')(C)CV MOY	OY	MOYTE CIOY MPOY- THPOY
C3	'(C)CVC(C) EZOYN	OY	EZOYN MOYT' MOYEI KOYEI CIOYP

Case C1 #(')V V = OY (var. Y)

At the beginning of a segment the vowel /u/ is realised OY:

OY, OY-, OYBH³, OYNOY, OYNO⁴, OY'NAM, OY²M̄ (OY²M̄), OY²OP (OY²OOP pl.), OY²M̄, OY.XAĭ~OY.XAEI.

In the following cases variation occurs under the influence of certain clitics:

- The indefinite article OY- is reduced to -Y- when it is preceded by the preposition E, and the Perfect I conjugation nominal base λ. For example:

EYOY.XAĭ (*Isa.* 49.6), EYλλAY (*Isa.* 49.4), EYNOYNO⁴ (*Isa.* 51.3), AY²PN²-EI (*Isa.* 63.14), AY²C²IME-† (*Isa.* 66.8);

But note the one possible exception: [E]OY²M̄N²†[OP]ΦANOC (*Isa.* 47.8).

- A few of the lexemes beginning with OY are preceded by the long form of the definite article, one of which occurs in this manuscript (OYNOY), and in this case Y is regularly used (N²TEYNOY).
- Note that the short form of the definite article is used with OY.XAĭ: thus, POY.XAĭ (*Isa.* 52.7).
- The sequence OY-OY (initial OY lexeme preceded by the indefinite article) sometimes coalesces to OY:³⁶
²N̄(OY)OYOEI⁴ (*Isa.* 49.8), N̄(OY)OYNO⁴ (*Isa.* 49.13), N̄N(OY)OYEPHT⁴ (*Isa.* 49.23), (OY)OY²DN² (*Isa.* 51.3), ZIT²N̄(OY)OYOEI⁴ (*Isa.* 51.8), [(OY)OY]OY²Q̄

36 Cf. Kasser (1965), p. 25.

(*Isa.* 59.7), <ΟΥ>ΟΥΩΤ̄Ν (*Isa.* 65.11), ᾠ<ΟΥ>ΟΥΝΟϣ (*Isa.* 66.20) and possibly ἁπ<ΟΥ>ΟΥΘΕΙΝ (*Isa.* 60.1) “the light” or “your light” (as in the Greek), and πε<ΟΥΘΕΙΝ (*Isa.* 60.3).³⁷

Case C2 (')(C)CV V = ου

The vowel is always rendered ου following a consonant in an open syllable.

ΜΟΥ, ΜΟΥΤΕ, ΝΟΥΤΕ, ΤΕΝΟΥ, ΤΟΥΕΙΟ, CΙΟΥ;
 ΠΟΥ-, ΤΟΥ-, ΝΟΥ-, ᾠΠΟΥ-, ΕΜΠΑΤΟΥ-, ΜΑΡΟΥ-, ΕΤΟΥ-;
 ΤΗΡ<ΟΥ.

Case C3 '(C)CVC(C) V = ου

The vowel is always rendered ου following a consonant in a closed syllable:

ΕΞΟΥΝ, ΜΟΥΤ, ΜΟΥΕΙ, ΚΟΥΕΙ, CΙΟΥΡ, ΜΟΥΕΙ, ΜΝΤ̄ΚΟΥΕΙ, ΝΟΥ<̄.

³⁷ πε<ΟΥΘΕΙΝ could be read as π<ΟΥ>ΟΥΘΕΙΝ. Kasser (1965), p. 134, observes that ε̣ is written on an irregular part of the papyrus and suggests that it could have either been an attempt to write Ο, or perhaps the scribe wanted to write πε<ΟΥΘΕΙΝ “their light”.

D. Graphemic forms of the glide /w/ (oγ~γ)

Table 92: Typology of the glide /w/

Case	Syllabic Context		<i>P.Bodm. 23</i> <i>Isaiah 47.1-66.24</i>	Examples
D1	#(')GV oγλ		oγ (var. γ)	oγλ oγῒ oγερητε
D2	#(')GVC(C) oγωμ		oγ (var. γ)	oγωμ oγοειω oγῒ-
D3	'(C)CGV zoγeιτε		oγ	[z]oγo
D4	'(C)CGVC woγeιτ		oγ	woγeιτ
D5	(')(C)VG(C) mooy t'woyn n'anoγ≈oγ t'hytῒ naγ peγ- xooy≈γ	V = o	oγ	mooy zooy zooyt
		V = ω	oγ	t'woyn eiepwoy ῑpwoy
		V = oγ	∅	∅
		V = h	oγ (var. γ̂~γ)	nhoγ~[nh]γ̂~nhγ t'hytῒ~t'hytῒ~t'hoγtῒ
		V = λ	γ (var. oγ)	naγ z'aeoy
		V = e	γ	peγ-
		V = oo	γ	xooy≈γ
D6	(C)V.'GV(C) '(C)V.GV(C) kooye xioye z'bye ayw meeγe	V = o	oγ	kooye ziooye ztooye
		V = i	oγ	xioγλ
		V = h	γ (var. γ̂~oγ)	z'bye~z'bye~z'byê
		V = λ	γ	ayw
		V = e	γ	meeγe~meeγe eyw

Case D1: #(')GV **G = oγ** (var. γ)

At the beginning of a segment, in an open syllable, the glide is realised oγ:

oγλ, oγεί, oγε, oγeine, oγephTe, oγooSe, oγω, oγῶ, oγωλc̄,
oγωnῶ, oγωnḡ, oγωTn̄, oγωTḡ, oγωωc̄, oγωωT̄, oγωωq̄, oγωz̄m,
oγom̄, oγoSp̄.

Variation with a preformative clitic:

ⲭⲉ[γλ] “blaspheme” (*Isa.* 66.3) vs. ⲭⲓoγλ (*Isa.* 52.5);
n̄-ⲓ(oγ)λωoγ (*Isa.* 66.4) – haplography.

Case D2: #(')GVC(C) **G = oγ** (var. γ)

As in case D1, the glide is graphically expressed with the digraph beginning a segment in a closed syllable:

oγon, oγaλb, oγhnb, oγe2ca2ne, oγeδpo, oγhoγ, oγn̄- (oγn- *Isa.* 49.15), oγ(n)Te- (*Isa.* 47.14), oγoein, oγoeiω, oγon, oγωm, oγem- (oγm̄- *Isa.* 65.25), oγωn, oγωT, oγωω, oγλω̄, oγωz, oγe2-, oγh2, oγox̄.

With a preformative clitic: Variation occurs under the influence of certain clitics:

- Converted predication of possession:
TeTeγn̄TAc = TeTe + oγn̄TAc (*Isa.* 54.1)
- Long and short form of the definite article with lexeme-initial oγ:
neOγoeiω (*Isa.* 50.4, 54.9) vs. poγoeiω (*Isa.* 64.8) (cf. poγx̄āi (*Isa.* 52.7)).

Case D3: '(C)CGV **G = oγ**

There is only one example of the glide in this environment:

[z]oγo.

Case D4: '(C)CGVC **G = oγ**

In a closed syllable, following a consonant, there is only one example:

ωoγeiT.

Case D5: (')(C)VG(C)

V = o, ω	G = oγ
V = h	G = oγ (var. $\hat{\gamma} \sim \gamma$)
V = a, e, oo	G = γ (var. oγ)

a) V = o, ω G = oγ

Lexical forms:

εοογ, εσοογ, εζοογ, μοογ, \bar{n} τοογ, \bar{m} ποογ, πεθooγ, σοογn
(σοογ \bar{n}), σοογ $\bar{t}\bar{n}$, σοογz, σοογz \neq , σοογzε, τnnοογ \neq (τ \bar{n} nnοογ \neq),
τοογ, φογσοογφε, ζοογ, ζοογτ, ζροογ, χοογ, σοογnε;
ειερωογ, \bar{p} ρωογ, cωογz, cωογz \neq , τωογn, ζλογλωογ.

3rd person pronominal suffixes:

ερο \neq ογ, \bar{m} μο \neq ογ, τακο \neq ογε (Isa. 65.8), ταλβο \neq ογ, ταμιο \neq ογ,
ταζο \neq ογ, ταχπο \neq ογ;
εχω \neq ογ, \bar{n} cω \neq ογ, pω \neq ογ.

b) V = h G = oγ (var. $\hat{\gamma} \sim \gamma$)

The variant forms are found mostly after Isa. 60.16.³⁸ In total, hoγ occurs 71% of the time, and h $\hat{\gamma} \sim \gamma$ 29%.

Lexical forms:

ζατhoγ, ζhoγ, αζhoγ, εχhoγ, cnh $\hat{\gamma}$ (Isa. 66.5), cnh $\hat{\gamma}$ (Isa. 66.20)

Statives:

ταkhoγ, choγ, oγhoγ, ζhoγ, τchoγ, ταειhoγ, τογχhoγτ.³⁹

3rd person plural suffix pronouns:

oγbh \neq ογ.

38 Kasser (1965), p. 24: Accounting for the total possibilities, the following proportions can be calculated:
before Isa. 60.16, hγ 88%, hoγ 12%; after Isa. 60.16, h $\hat{\gamma} \sim \gamma$ 44%, hoγ 56%.

39 Crum (1939), p. 448b: τογχhoγ S; τογχhoγτ a B form.

Table 93: H + OY vs. Ŷ~Y

OY	Ŷ~Y
TH OYT̄N̄ (<i>Isa.</i> 55.12) 6%	THŶ~T̄N̄ (<i>Isa.</i> 50.1 x2, 50.2, 50.9, 52.5, 52.11, 55.12, 65.12, 65.15, 66.13 x2) THŶ~T̄N̄ (<i>Isa.</i> 65.12) THYT̄N̄ (<i>Isa.</i> 50.10 x2, 55.3) 94%
THOY (<i>Isa.</i> 57.13) 50%	THŶ (<i>Isa.</i> 64.5) 50%
NHOY (<i>Isa.</i> 47.9, 47.11 x3, 47.13, 49.12, 49.17, 51.4, 51.15, 51.11, 52.12, 54.15, 55.10, 55.12, 57.16, 59.19 x2, 59.20, 60.5, 60.6, 60.13, 60.14, 61.5, 62.11, 63.1, 66.15, 66.18 x2) 93%	NHY (<i>Isa.</i> 55.11 [66.24]) [NH]Ŷ (<i>Isa.</i> 47.9) 7%
Θ̄BB̄HOY (<i>Isa.</i> 54.11, 58.4, 61.1) Θ̄BB̄HOY (<i>Isa.</i> 58.10) 80%	Θ̄BB̄HŶ (<i>Isa.</i> 49.13) Θ̄BB̄H[Y] (<i>Isa.</i> 58.3) [Θ̄BB̄HY] (<i>Isa.</i> 66.2) 20%
zTH≠OY (<i>Isa.</i> 48.2)	zTH≠Ŷ (<i>Isa.</i> 57.13)

c) V = λ, ε, oo G = Y (var. OY)

Lexical forms:

λλλY, λλλY, λλY, λ̄λλλY, λ̄λλλY, [λ̄λλY], λ̄λλλY;
λ̄T̄EYNOY, λ̄EY~T̄-.

3rd person plural pronominal subjects:

λY-, ελY-, λ̄NT̄λY-, λ̄T̄λY-, ελ̄λY-;
εY-, λ̄EY-, λ̄NNEY-, εT̄PEY-.

Possessive articles:

λEY-, T̄EY-, λEY.

3rd person plural suffix pronouns:

λλ≠Y, λ̄λλλλ≠Y, λλ≠Y, T̄λλλ≠Y;
λ̄.oo≠Y, λ̄.oo≠Y.

Variation: Note the following two exceptions: λ̄λ̄EOY (*Isa.* 47.7) “final things”,⁴⁰ λ̄λ̄λ̄OY “tomb” (*Isa.* 65.4).⁴¹

⁴⁰ Crum (1939), p. 635a: pl. λ̄λ̄E(ε)Y, λ̄λ̄EOY S.

⁴¹ Crum (1939), p. 212b: λ̄λ̄λλλY, -λ̄OY λ̄Yε- S.

Case D6: '(C)V.GV(C) and (C)V.'GV(C)

V = o, ı **G = oγ**

V = h **G = γ** (var. $\hat{\gamma} \sim o\gamma$)

V = a, e **G = γ**

a) **V = o, ı** **G = oγ**

κοογε, $\overline{\tau\beta\eta\sigma\sigma\gamma\epsilon}$, φοογε, σιοογε, στοογε;

αιογα (*Isa.* 52.5); but note $\alpha\epsilon[\gamma\alpha]$ “blaspheme” (*Isa.* 66.3). Cf. Case D1.

b) **V = h** **G = γ** (var. $\hat{\gamma} \sim o\gamma$)

Table 94: **h + γ~ $\hat{\gamma}$ vs. oγ**

γ~$\hat{\gamma}$	oγ
πηγε (<i>Isa.</i> 49.13) 100%	
σβηγε (<i>Isa.</i> 60.21, 64.3, 66.18) σβη $\hat{\gamma}$ ε (<i>Isa.</i> 66.19) 40%	σβηογε (<i>Isa.</i> 48.9, 59.6 x2, 64.7, 65.7, 65.22) 60%

c) **V = a, e** **G = γ**

μεεγε (μεγε *Isa.* 54.4, 57.8), εγω

αγω, μαγαα \neq τ, ταγε-.