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Abstract

This paper explores a particular aspect of the semantics of adposition borrowing, focusing on the extent to which polysemy networks associated with model language adpositions are copied in the target language. We make use of the distinction between comparative concepts and descriptive categories (Haspelmath 2010) to describe the integration of loanwords in a target language, in this case Greek-origin adpositions in Coptic. Taking the Greek-origin adposition κατά (katá) in Coptic as a case study, we show that entire polysemy networks are not borrowed. Rather, only some sections – not necessarily contiguous on a semantic map – of polysemy networks are borrowed. We conclude that this points to the possibility that loanwords are borrowed in individual constructions.

1 Introduction

This paper explores a particular aspect of the semantics of adposition borrowing, focusing on the extent to which polysemy networks associated with model (or ‘donor’) language adpositions are borrowed (or ‘copied’) in the target (or ‘recipient’) language. Taking the Greek-origin adposition κατά (katá)2 in Coptic as a case study, we show that entire polysemy networks are not borrowed. Rather, only some sections – not necessarily contiguous – of polysemy networks are borrowed.

For the purposes of this article, we assume that the meanings or senses associated with an adposition are not necessarily contextually derived from a single basic (and usually very abstract) meaning. We also assume that these meanings or senses are not organized or

---

1 Jerusalem (<eitan.grossman@mail.huji.ac.il>) & Liège (F.R.S.-FNRS) (<s.polis@ulg.ac.be>). This contribution is the synthesis of three originally independent papers, namely Grossman (2010) and Polis (2010, 2013). We gratefully acknowledge the help of Baudouin Stasse (University of Liège) with the treatment of data and the statistics for this paper. Guillaume Lescuyer and Thanasis Georgakopoulos (University of Liège) provided useful comments on a draft of this paper. We also gratefully acknowledge the support of the Israel Science Foundation for the project Adposition borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective (grant 248/13).

2 Transliteration of Coptic is according to the Leipzig-Jerusalem proposal in Grossman & Haspelmath (2015). Glosses are according to the Leipzig Glossing Rules (https://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resources/glossing-rules.php); category labels used here that are not found in the Leipzig list are: HAB – habitual, IMPF – imperfect, MOD – modifier, PTCL – particle, SBRD – subordinator.
distributed randomly at the semantic level. Following a trend of research in lexical semantics, we consider that polysemy permits more interesting hypotheses about – and possibly more insightful analyses of – the one-to-many form-function mappings associated with adpositions (e.g., Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2008, Hagège 2010). The burst of work on semantic maps³ has provided a useful tool for evaluating the empirical validity of polysemy, and it will be used here in a language contact situation for comparing the polysemy networks of adpositions in the source and target language.

Different scenarios are possible when describing the transfer of polysemic items from a Source to a Target language. Given an adposition α that covers a connected region of five points on a semantic map in a Model language (Fig. 1, left), one can envision five scenarios:⁴

(1) The whole polysemy network of the adposition α is borrowed (= Full Pattern [PAT] Transfer⁵).
(2) A connected region of the polysemy network is borrowed (= Partial PAT Transfer 1);
(3) Disconnected regions of the polysemy network are borrowed (= Partial PAT Transfer 2; see Fig. 1, Case 1).
(4) A connected region of the polysemy network is borrowed, but the meaning of the adposition α in the target language also extends to a new connected region on the semantic map (Innovative PAT Transfer 1; cf. Fig. 1, Case 2).
(5) A connected region of the polysemy network is borrowed, but the meaning of the adposition α in the target language also extends to (a) new disconnected region(s) on the semantic map (Innovative PAT Transfer 2).


A sixth option, which is not considered here, is that no PAT is dragged along with MAT in the transfer; this would mean that none of the senses of the polysemic item in the source language are copied in the target language, rather only new meanings are.

The distinction between matter (MAT) and pattern (PAT) transfer (see below Section 2) was introduced by Matras & Sakel (2007b; see further Sakel 2007) and will be used throughout this paper.
Some of these scenarios intuitively appear to be more likely than others. In light of the paucity of research on this question, however, the goal of this contribution is to provide an empirical corpus-based case study to address this issue. The article is structured as follows. In Section 2, we present an overview of how polysemy networks have been dealt with in language contact studies. Section 3 provides background information about the language contact situation between Greek and Coptic, and briefly describes the integration of Greek-origin adpositions in Coptic. Section 4 presents a case study on ⲕⲧⲁ (kata) in Coptic, focusing on translations of the New Testament into the Sahidic and Bohairic dialects.

2 Polysemy networks in language contact: status quaestionis

Polysemy networks have been intensively dealt with in analyses of PAT transfer (also known as calquing or replication), i.e., when only the organization, distribution, and mapping of grammatical and semantic meaning of the source language is replicated, while the form itself is not borrowed. However, PAT transfer has received much less attention in the language contact literature in the context of MAT transfer, i.e., when the morphological material (and phonological shape) of one language is replicated in another language.

2.1 Polysemy and PAT transfer

In the domain of PAT transfer (especially in the literature on contact-induced grammaticalization), polysemy networks are of paramount importance. Indeed, one of the major issues is to describe and explain how new patterns of polysemy (or, more broadly, polyfunctionality) occur under the impact of language contact. This phenomenon has

---

Figure 1: Two cases of PAT Transfer between a model and a target language
(the circles represent meanings associated with the adposition α; intensity of grey represent frequency)

---

received various labels over time, including identification (Weinreich 1953); borrowed meanings (Breu 2003); polysemy copying (Heine & Kuteva 2005); pivot-matching (Matras & Sakel 2007b); distributional assimilation (Gast & van der Auwera 2012).

Even if they differ with respect to the types of mechanisms and explanations involved, these labels all refer to a similar phenomenon that one can synthesize as follows: “Given one form \(x\) in \(M\) and one form \(y\) in \(T\), which share at least one similar function/meaning so that they can be matched by speakers, the number of functions of \(y\) in \(T\) is extended, based on the polysemy network of \(x\) in \(M\).”

For the sake of illustration, an example quoted by Matras (2009: 26) shows the influence of German on Hebrew in the case of a 4:6-year-old child:

(1) German – M
   
   *Das ist aber schön!*  
   this is but nice  
   “This is very nice indeed!”

Hebrew – T

   *ze avál yafé!*
   this but nice
   “This is very nice indeed!”

As Matras points out (2009: 27), *aber* in German is a modal particle that is identical to a contrastive conjunction (‘but’), while in Hebrew, the translation equivalent *avál* (‘but’) has only the contrastive function. The bilingual child, in this particular instance of discourse, identifies the two (‘pivot-matching’), which licenses the use of *avál* as a modal particle, thereby expanding its polysemy network with a new function.

2.2 Polysemy and MAT transfer

In the domain of MAT transfer, on the other hand, i.e., when a sign (a form-meaning pairing) is borrowed, questions related to the transfer of polysemic items have been studied much less systematically. This is especially true for grammatical items\(^7\) such as adpositions, which are notoriously polysemous.

However, Wiemer & Wälchli (2012) have shown, based on several examples, that MAT and PAT transfers occur often together in grammatical borrowing. They stress that “[a] major question is how much pattern structure a borrowed item can possibly drag along” (Wiemer & Wälchli 2012: 45). This is, in a way, just another way of phrasing the question at the heart of this article. In order to address it, they usefully distinguish two dimensions of borrowability:

---

\(^7\) Heine & Kuteva (2003, 2005, 2012), for instance, explicitly refrain from examining MAT transfers in their study of grammatical change.
(1) Traditional: what kind of MAT can be borrowed? (*borrowability scales, likelihood of transfer*, focusing on MAT categories and semantic/pragmatic properties of these categories)

(2) Neglected: as carrier of what kind of PAT?

At this point, it should be noted that this second (‘neglected’) issue, has already been broached in previous studies on borrowability. Aikhenvald (2007: 26–35), for example, pays attention to semantic aspects of borrowing when she lists – in the 16th and final position – ‘unifunctionality and semantic transparency,’ i.e., a lack of polysemy, as among the factors that facilitate borrowing. Regarding the question “as carrier of what kind of PAT?”, Johanson (2002) suggested a basic distinction between:

(1) *Global copying*, when an entire sign (signifier/signified) is borrowed.
(2) *Selective copying*, when only certain aspects of a unit from the model code are transferred.

A survey of the literature indicates that the second scenario is typical of the borrowing of polysemous items. However, it seems that there are very few studies focusing specifically on how networks of meanings associated with a polysemic item are transferred from one source language to a target language.

3 Adposition borrowing between Greek and Coptic

3.1 The language contact situation

Coptic (Afroasiatic, Egypt) is the latest phase of the Ancient Egyptian language, attested from around the 3rd century CE till its speakers shifted to Arabic; this shift probably began around the 10th century and ended sometime after the 14th century CE. Coptic is characterized by significant dialectal variation (Funk 1988), with about a dozen literary dialects, including Akhmimic, Bohairic, Fayyumic, Lycopolitan, Mesokemic or Middle Egyptian, Sahidic, and a number of additional, more poorly attested dialects and subdialectal varieties (Kasser 2006), as well as a number of nonliterary varieties found in everyday texts (e.g., letters, financial documents, and legal documents). Coptic is written in a variety of Greek-based alphabets, with a number of graphemes adapted from indigenous scripts.

---

8 Regarding adpositions, Matras (2007) notes that, in the spatial domain: “‘Core’ relations (‘in’, ‘at’, ‘on’) are borrowed less frequently than ‘peripheral’ relations (‘between’, ‘around’, ‘opposite’), and this finds some support in the appearance of ‘between’ as the most frequent borrowing in the sample.” Nothing is said, however, about other semantic domains or about polysemic items.

9 See for instance the remarks in Kukanda (1983: 10), monosemic borrowing of polysemic lexemes in Lingala; Mann (1993); Stolz & Stolz (1996: 108, borrowed elements are often used in a subdomain of their original use); Breu (2003: 361–363, reconfiguration of the signified in T, but “no statement can be made about the percentage of semantic adaptations and the complications that arise in the process”). Wiemer & Wälchli (2012: 45–50) argue that selective copying is the rule rather than the exception.

Greek (Indo-European) was spoken and written in Egypt from the early-to-mid first millennium BCE, with limited evidence for contact before Coptic; there are relatively few Greek loanwords in pre-Coptic Egyptian, except for very late Demotic, the stage of Egyptian immediately preceding Coptic (Ray 2007; Rutherford 2010). The varieties of Greek that are relevant to the complex contact situation include the written Koine of the Septuagint, the New Testament, and other literary and non-literary corpora, as well as the local spoken Greek varieties, which sometimes show borrowings (lexical, grammatical, phonological) from local Coptic varieties (Torallas Tovar 2010; this volume).

Little is known for certain about the actual types and extent of Greek-Egyptian bilingualism. Estimates range from extensive to minimal. Some linguists and historians estimate the degree of bilingualism to such an extent that they consider Coptic to be a ‘bilingual variety,’ involving significant ‘code mixing’ (Reintges 2001, 2004b); others are skeptical.12

3.2 Greek-origin prepositions in Coptic

In order to summarize the formal aspects of the integration of Greek-origin adpositions in Coptic, we make use of the distinction between comparative concepts and descriptive categories articulated by Haspelmath (2010). Beyond both matching the comparative concept ‘adposition,’ Greek and Coptic adpositions – as language-specific descriptive categories – have distinctive characterizations, with some common features but also with several different ones. We note the following:

First, inherited Coptic adpositions are prepositions, as are Greek ‘proper’ adpositions.13

(2) nnahrn-p-noute
    in_presence_of-art:m.sg-god
‘in the presence of God’

Second, inherited Coptic prepositions can be head-marked, showing suffixed person indexes, while Greek prepositions are not head-marked (in Greek). Table 1 shows the inflection of the allative preposition e- e- in Sahidic (Layton 2004: 70, §86).

---

11 For details about the Greek-Egyptian contact situation, see Oréal (1999), Fewster (2002), Ray (2007), and Grossman (2013). The study of Greek-origin loanwords in Coptic is currently the object of intensive research in the Database and Dictionary of Greek Loanwords in Coptic (DDGLC) project, headed by Tonio Sebastian Richter (Berlin). The state of the art can be seen on the project’s website: http://www.uni-leipzig.de/~ddglc/.

12 For a recent empirical evaluation of the possible influence of Greek on Coptic morphosyntax, see Grossman (2016a), which demonstrates that Greek played no role in the development of the cross-linguistically unusual prefixing preference of Coptic.

13 In Greek, some ‘improper’ adpositions can be postpositional (see e.g., Bortone 2010: 139). See below under §4.2 for the distinction between ‘proper’ and ‘improper’ prepositions in Greek. No adpositions are postpositions in Coptic.
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Person Person index
1sg ero-i
2sg.M ero-k
2sg.F ero
3sg.m ero-f
3sg.f ero-s
1pl ero-n
2pl erō-tn
3pl ero-ou

Table 1: The person paradigm of a head-marked Coptic preposition

Third, inherited Coptic prepositions often show allomorphy, depending on whether the preposition has a suffixed person index or a lexical noun phrase complement. Greek prepositions have no such allomorphy (in Greek). Table 2 shows the base allomorphy of some Coptic prepositions (Layton 2004: 163–164, §202).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexical noun phrase</th>
<th>Person index</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e-</td>
<td>ero-</td>
<td>ALLATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ša-</td>
<td>šaro-</td>
<td>‘towards’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ha-</td>
<td>haro-</td>
<td>‘under’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etbe-</td>
<td>etbēē-</td>
<td>‘because of, concerning’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mn-</td>
<td>nmma-</td>
<td>COMITATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nahrn-</td>
<td>nahr-</td>
<td>‘in the presence of’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oube-</td>
<td>oubē-</td>
<td>‘opposite, towards’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ačn-</td>
<td>ačnt-</td>
<td>‘without’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Base allomorphy of some Coptic prepositions

Fourth, inherited Coptic prepositions are often flags, i.e., mark valential arguments of verbs, as do Greek prepositions (in Greek). In (3), for example, the allative preposition e-/ero- marks the stimulus argument.

(3) ΔΗΝΑΥ έΡΟΩ (Shenoute, III,38)\(^ {14} \)
    \[ a-i-nau \quad ero-f \]
    PST-1SG-see ALL-3SG.M
    ‘I saw him.’

Fifth, inherited Coptic prepositions do not govern case on nominal or pronominal complements, while Greek prepositions do (in Greek). In (4), for example, the allative preposition e- is incompatible with other case markers, which in Coptic are all prefixes (see Grossman 2015, 2016a).

---

Sixth, most inherited Coptic prepositions can occur as predicates in a clause pattern devoted to adverbial predicates, while Greek has no such dedicated pattern.

Seventh, inherited Coptic prepositions are either reconstructible to the earliest stages of the language or were grammaticalized (mostly) from relational nouns (e.g., body part terms) or nouns with locative meaning (6), while Greek adpositions are mostly grammaticalized from earlier free adverbial elements.

Table 3 summarizes and compares these properties with respect to inherited Coptic prepositions and Greek prepositions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Inherited Coptic</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linear order</td>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>(Mostly) preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffixed person markers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base allomorphy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flags</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govern nominal case</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicates in locative predicate clause pattern</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Turning to the Greek-origin prepositions in Coptic, we find six that are commonly attested. They are presented in Table 4 below:

18 Two of them, χωρίς (xôris) and ὡς (hôs), belong to the ‘improper’ prepositions in Greek (see §4.2 below).
In terms of semantics, it should be noted that none of these six prepositions encodes basic spatial meanings in Coptic, which is consistent with the generalization in Matras (2007) regarding the semantics of the adpositions that are borrowed: adpositions with basic spatial meanings are only rarely borrowed. Note however that πρός (pros) can encode direction in Greek, which can be considered a basic spatial meaning. What is interesting here is that Coptic does not borrow this meaning, but rather a more abstract one.

Unlike Greek prepositions in Greek, Greek-origin prepositions in Coptic do not select case-suffixes on the complement. This obviously has an influence on the semantics of the prepositions, since in Greek, prepositions and case markers together constitute constructions. Moreover, they do not form part of compound verbs with inherited lexical items, nor are they identical to free adverbial elements, unlike the ‘proper’ Greek prepositions. Unlike inherited Coptic prepositions, Greek-origin prepositions in Coptic are always compatible with nominal complements, but rarely inflect for person-marking. Nor, with very few exceptions, do they mark valential arguments of verbs. Finally, they cannot be predicates in the clause construction dedicated to adverbial and prepositional predicates. These differences are summarized in Table 5 below.

### Table 5: The features of inherited Coptic and Greek adpositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPERTY</th>
<th>INHERITED Coptic</th>
<th>GREEK</th>
<th>GREEK-IN-COPTIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linear order</td>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>Mostly preposition</td>
<td>Always preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffixed person markers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, but limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base allomorphy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, but limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flags</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govern nominal case</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicates in locative predicate clause pattern</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This indicates that Greek-origin prepositions are only partially integrated into Coptic morphosyntax, and constitute a distinctive descriptive category of Coptic.

---

19 In fact, based on a database of more than a hundred contact situations in which adpositions were borrowed, borrowed adpositions that allow head-marking of person always allow lexical nominal complements, so we have a implicational universal of adposition borrowing (LEXICAL > PRONOMINAL).
In the extant documentation, Coptic dialects do not necessarily borrow the same prepositions (and not with the same frequency), which leads to a rough hierarchy of preposition borrowing across Coptic dialects, based on Table 6:

κατά (kata) > προς (pros), πάρα (para) > ὅσο (hós), χώρις (khôris) > αντί (anti)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIALECTS</th>
<th>κατά</th>
<th>προς</th>
<th>πάρα</th>
<th>ὅσο</th>
<th>χώρις</th>
<th>αντί</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mesokemic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akhmimic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayyumic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lycopolitan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bohairic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahidic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Greek-origin prepositions across Coptic dialects (shaded boxes indicate attestation)

The focus on κατά in this article is motivated by the fact that it is the most frequently borrowed preposition in the Coptic dialects. As noted above, we limit this investigation to Sahidic and Bohairic, which are the dialects that borrow the most prepositions from Greek.

4 The Greek-origin preposition κατά in Coptic

After a presentation of the corpus used for this case study (§4.1), we examine the polysemy network of κατά in Greek (§4.2). Based on a tentative semantic map of the meanings expressed by this preposition in Classical Greek (§4.2.1), we trace the evolution of the polysemy of this preposition in New Testament Greek (§4.2.2). This allows us to systematically compare the meanings attested for κατά/κατά in the Greek and Coptic versions of the New Testament (§4.3). Finally, we characterize the integration of κατά in the Coptic grammatical system (§4.4).

4.1 The corpus

As noted above, the corpus investigated here is limited. We focus on the Coptic versions of the New Testament attested in the Sahidic and Bohairic dialects. It is important to stress

---

that this is a corpus of translated texts. As Shisha-Halevy (1990: 100, n. 4) puts it, the kind of language contact between Greek and Coptic in this case

“is (...) a distinct type of bilinguality: not a matter of double linguistic competence, but the contact of two texts. One text is an authoritative source, given, ever-present, decoded (but also interpreted and often imitated) by the author of the target text; the other text is created on the basis of the source text. This is a situation of ‘text in contact’ (encoded with decoded) as well as ‘languages in contact.’”

As such, the generalizations made in this paper apply only to these corpora and not to ‘Greek’ or ‘Coptic’ in general. We assume that this is a sound preliminary step in order to have the description of a single corpus with which it will be possible to compare the grammar and semantics of the preposition in other corpora. Furthermore, since many Coptic texts are full of intertextual citations and ‘echos’ of the New Testament (see, e.g., Behlmer, this volume), it is useful to have a picture of this corpus.

There are at least two advantages to limiting the scope of the study to a relatively small corpus (c. 138 000 tokens in Greek). First, a restricted and relatively homogeneous corpus allows a high degree of granularity in the semantic description. Second, the Coptic dialects dealt with here – Sahidic and Bohairic – are rather heterogeneous themselves, with significant lexical and grammatical differences across sub-corpora. Early and later Bohairic, for example, are quite different in terms of borrowed prepositions: in the former corpus, only κατά and πρός are attested, while in later Bohairic, at least five Greek-origin prepositions regularly occur.

4.2 The polysemy network of κατά in Greek

The preposition κατά is one of the eighteen so-called ‘proper’ prepositions in Greek and is already attested in the earliest corpora (e.g., Homer). Regarding its semantics, there

21 The juxtaposing of two texts imposes “a semantic judgment, the setting forth of a semantic path which may reasonably be taken to have led from one text to another” (Barr 1979: 285) and “the solution had to be semantic, in correct representation of the meanings, and not formal, in exact following of the formal patterns of the original” (Barr 1979: 325).
23 See also the observations in Janse (2002).
24 See Matras & Sakel (2007a: 3) for some generalizations about borrowing that have been proposed with reference to a case study of a single contact situation.
25 In the same vein, see Layton’s (1981) study of compound prepositions in the Sahidic version of the New Testament: “then these results might be used on the one hand to investigate how far the Old Testament books or Shenute represent the same kind of Sahidic as the New Testament […], or on the other hand to build a definite framework within which to define the differences among the dialects.”
26 They are distinguished from other prepositions by the fact that they share a peculiar morphosyntactic behavior: “beside functioning as prepositions, they can also be found in compound verbs, and have a function similar to English or German verbal particles, as up in give up, or auf- in Germ. aufhören, ‘to give up’” (Luraghi 2003: 75). As preverbs, they actualize one or several meanings of the prepositions. ‘Improper’ prepositions, on the other hand, “are adverbs used like prepositions,
is agreement among scholars\(^{27}\) that this preposition denotes a(n originally downwards) trajectory.\(^{28}\) It governs two cases:\(^{29}\)

(1) genitive, with the spatial meaning “down (from or upon, into)”
(2) accusative, with the spatial meaning “throughout, along(side)”

From Homeric down to Classical Greek, there are significant differences between the senses that can be expressed by this preposition, as well as differences in the relative frequency of these meanings. Based on the corpora, lexicographical tools, and grammatical studies available,\(^{30}\) the senses of κατά governing the accusative and genitive cases can be divided between three semantic domains: the spatial, the temporal, and the conceptual. Here is a list of twelve meanings typically covered by the preposition in Classical Greek:

(1) Spatial
(a) Extension (‘throughout’)
(b) Motion along (‘alongside’)\(^{31}\)
(c) Motion downward (‘down from, down upon or over, down into’)
(d) Direction (‘towards, at’, incl. vows or oaths ‘to, by’ somenone)

(2) Temporal
(a) Temporal situation (‘at, during’)
(b) Temporal approximation (‘around, about’)

(3) Conceptual
(a) Conformity (‘according to, corresponding to’)
(b) Area (‘about, concerning’)
(c) Cause, reason (‘because of’)
(d) Manner (‘adverbial reading’)
(e) Distributive (‘by’)
(f) Hostility (‘against’)

but incapable of forming compounds. The case (usually the genitive) following an improper preposition depends on the preposition alone without regard to the verb; whereas a true preposition was attached originally, as an adverb, to a case depending directly on the verb” (Smyth 1920: §1647, see further §1699–1700).

\(^{27}\) See however Brugmann (1904: 479), who suggested that the oldest meaning was probably “along something so as to remain in connection and contact with the object” (“so an etwas entlang, dass man mit dem Gegenstand in Verbindung und Berührung bleibt”) and Humbert (1960: 311) “glissement d’un objet qui épouse une surface inclinée”.

\(^{28}\) On the spatial use of κατά in Homer, see Georges (2006).

\(^{29}\) In Cognitive Linguistic terms, one would say that the difference in meaning between the genitive and the accusative is related to the position of the landmark relative to the trajectory.

\(^{30}\) Especially the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae and the LSJ; for recent linguistic approaches to the polysemy of this preposition, see Luraghi (2003: 197–213); Bortone (2010, especially p. 233 on the later evolution of its uses).

\(^{31}\) We include here fictive motion, e.g. “the island of Cephallenia lies along Acarnania and Leucas” (Th. 2.30.2); see the examples discussed in Méndez Dosuna (2012: 215–218).
4.2.1 Towards a semantic map of the meanings associated with the preposition κατά

In the literature, there is apparently no semantic map that covers the full range of meanings expressed by the preposition κατά in Greek.32 The map presented in Figure 2 is therefore tentative and should be evaluated based on further crosslinguistic evidence, but it should be noted that it is compatible with the semantic map drawn in Grossman & Polis (2012) based on a crosslinguistic sample of 54 allative markers in Rice & Kabata (2007); it respects the connectivity hypothesis (Croft 2001: 96) when mapping the diachronic development of κατά in Greek; and it integrates the results of Luraghi (2003: 213) regarding the semantic extensions of κατά + accusative in Ionic-Attic.

Figure 2: A preliminary semantic map of the senses covered by κατά in Classical Greek (the senses marked by * are expressed by κατά + genitive; all others by κατά + accusative)

4.2.2 The polysemy network of κατά in NT Greek

When compared to Classical Greek, the meaning of κατά underwent considerable changes33 by the time of the New Testament Greek.34 As already stated by Regard (1919): “[l]es sens

32 Note that the semantic map model has been applied to the preposition εἰς (eis) in Georgakopoulos (2011).
33 It was already the case during the Ptolemaic Period, see e.g. Mayser (1934: 337): “[d]er erste Blick in eine ptolemäische Urkunde […] läßt erkennen, daß der Gebrauch der Präpositionen im Vergleich zur klassischen Zeit wesentlich zugenommen hat.” See also Mayser (1934: 427–428): “[d]ie relative Häufigkeit von κατά in den ptol. Urkunden übertrifft zwar die des N.T. […] steht aber weit zurück hinter dem Gebrauch bei Polybios, bei dem κατά […] die allererste Stelle einnimmt und in allerlei neuen Bedeutung verwendet wird.”
34 For the main tendencies of the evolution of κατά in New Testament Greek, see inter alii Deissmann (1901: 138–140); Moulton (1908, 1: 98–105); Regard (1919: 466–490); Robertson (1934: 607–609);
usuals de l’époque classique sont représentés par un petit nombre d’exemples avec le génitif, par un grand nombre avec l’accusatif.” More precisely, the ratio between κατά + genitive and κατά + accusative is 16% vs 84% in our data. In terms of distribution and semantics, the analysis of the corpus shows that:

(1) There are 74 occurrences of κατά + genitive.
- The spatial meanings “down from” (1 token) and “down over, into” (9 tokens) are poorly attested.35
- The “against” (maleficiary) [conceptual] meaning is the best attested one (56 tokens; 75% of the examples with genitive).36
- One new spatial meaning appears with the genitive: extension in space “throughout” (= κατά + accusative; already in Polybius), but only in Luke and Acts, and always quantified by ὅλος “entire” (see Regard 1919: 489; Robertson 1934: 607; Blaß, Debrunner & Funk 1961: §225).

(2) There are 396 tokens of κατά + accusative.
- The conformity meaning [conceptual], with its variants “in accordance with, according to, similarly to,” is attested 240 times and represents more than 50% of all the occurrences of κατά in the New Testament.
- The distributive meaning [conceptual] is also well attested, with 57 tokens.
- Extension of the meaning of the preposition to the spatial allative meaning “to,” which was not attested in Classical Greek (diachronically, only the semantics associated with the trajectory remains).

Figure 3 provides a detailed overview of the distribution of the meanings associated with κατά in New Testament Greek.37

35 For Ptolemaic Greek, see Mayser (1934: 428): “[d]ie locale Bedeutung (von – herab) ist völlig erloschen. Dagegen ist der reine Genitiv mit der Richtung nach unter […] in zwei Beispielen vertreten.”
36 See also Modern Greek, e.g., ψήφισε κατά του νέου νόμου “(s)he voted against the new law.”
37 For Ptolemaic Greek, see Mayser (1934: 428): “[d]ie locale Bedeutung (von – herab) ist völlig erloschen. Dagegen ist der reine Genitiv mit der Richtung nach unter […] in zwei Beispielen vertreten.”
Figure 3: Distribution of the senses of κατά in New Testament Greek

As shown by Figure 4, the frequency of the preposition in the different books of the New Testament varies considerably:38 the Apocalypse and the Gospels cluster together with few tokens of κατά, Acts occupies an intermediary position, and the Epistles showing a high number of tokens.

Figure 4: Token frequency of κατά in the New Testament

38 On the types or varieties of Greek in the New Testament, see Horrocks (2010: 149).
4.3 The polysemy network of κατά in Coptic

Existing grammatical descriptions usually emphasize two meanings for this Greek-origin preposition in Coptic: (1) the CONFORMITY meaning “according to, like” (e.g., Shisha-Halevy 1986: 58; Layton 2004: §200–202) and the DISTRIBUTIVE meaning “X by X” (e.g., Reintges 2004a: 110).

Based solely on these accounts of the meaning of the preposition, one might naturally infer that among all the functions attested for the preposition κατά in post-Classical Greek, Coptic borrowed the two best attested meanings of κατά + ACCUSATIVE. In turn, this would indicate that:

1. frequency matters;
2. meanings belonging to the CONCEPTUAL domain (not only forms, but form-function pairing) are favored in this case of borrowing, which is expected given the borrowability scales (cf. fn. 8);
3. the cases (genitive vs accusative) might have an influence on borrowability, since none of the senses attested for κατά + GENITIVE are borrowed.

In fact, the actual distribution of κατά in the corpora examined here is more diverse and leads to more fine-grained conclusions about the borrowing of this polysemic item.

4.3.1 Meanings of κατά in New Testament Coptic

The analysis of the corpus shows that the meanings expressed by κατά + GENITIVE are never PAT-transferred:39 both Bohairic and Sahidic Coptic use other constructions to encode these functions. Frequency is probably not the only factor here, since the meanings expressed by κατά + GENITIVE are never borrowed, not even the maleficiary semantic role (“against”)40 which represents 12% of the tokens of κατά in New Testament Greek. As already noted by Godron (1965) while commenting on a rare occurrence of κατά with this meaning in Sahidic (possibly directly influenced by the Greek Vorlage), “[t]rès probablement, cette acception de κατά n’a jamais été d’un usage courant, d’abord parce qu’elle constituait un doublet inutile du vieux mot, bien égyptien, e- et sans doute aussi, à cause d’une ambiguïté possible que le grec évitait par l’emploi de cas différents, je veux parler de la signification ‘conformément à’, ‘selon’, passée en copte, presque contradictoire avec le sens de ‘contre’”.

In other words, both the existence of inherited Coptic expressions for this meaning and the possible ambiguity with the ‘positive’ meaning “according to” induced by the lack of an opposition between genitive and accusative cases in Coptic might have acted as inhibiting factors for the PAT-transfer of this meaning of the preposition.

39 Outside this corpus, see Shisha-Halevy (1986: 58 n. 146) for Shenoutean Sahidic: “I have found no instance of kata in the sense ‘against’ or ‘as for’”). In the documentary corpus, see however CPR iv, 1, 7 [vii-viii], quoted by Förster (2002: 384).
40 The fact that κατά + GENITIVE was not borrowed has never been an obstacle to the borrowing of compound Greek verbs and nouns such as καταφρόνη καταφρόνη “to disdain,” καταλαλεί καταλαλεί “to slander,” etc. It is therefore worth noticing that a phenomenon such as the one which took place with the Greek prefix προ- (cf. Funk 1978: 102–103) did not occur with κατά.
On the other hand, several meanings expressed by κατά + ACCUSATIVE in Greek are indeed PAT-transferred, both in the Sahidic and in the Bohairic versions of the New Testament. The borrowing is almost systematic for the conformity meaning and usual for other conceptual meanings of the preposition.

**Conformity** ("according to," "corresponding with," "by")

(7) **Greek** ἀποδώσει αὐτῷ ὁ κύριος κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ (2 Tim. 4:14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sahidic</th>
<th>Bohairic</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ere-p-čeels</td>
<td>ere-p-cois</td>
<td>Lord repay=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tòðbe=na-f</td>
<td>tišebio=na-f</td>
<td>according-poss:pl-3sg.m-deeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kata-ne-f-hbêue</td>
<td>kata-ne-f-hbéoui</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"The Lord will repay him according to his deeds."42

(8) **Greek** οὐ κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην ἣν ἐποίησα τοῖς πατράσιν αὐτῶν (Heb. 8:9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sahidic</th>
<th>Bohairic</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>en-kata-t-diat'êkê=an</td>
<td>kata-t-diat'êkê=an</td>
<td>not after the covenant that I made with their fathers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"(…) not after the covenant that I made with their fathers.”

(9) **Greek** κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν ἐγνωρίσθη μοι τὸ μυστήριον (Eph. 3:3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sahidic</th>
<th>Bohairic</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kata-ou-côlp</td>
<td>kata-ou-côrp</td>
<td>by-indf-revelation outside PST-3pl-tell-1sg all-art:M.sg-mystery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"The mystery was made known to me by revelation.”

**Area** ("about,” “concerning,” “regarding”)

(10) **Greek** κατὰ δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐν νόμῳ (γενόμενος ἄμεμπτος) (Phil. 3:6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sahidic</th>
<th>Bohairic</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kata-t-dikaiosunê</td>
<td>kata-t-met'mei</td>
<td>&quot;(… blameless) as regards the righteousness which is in the law.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that κατά is usually not borrowed in Coptic when the “area” meaning in Greek is understood as a genitival construction:

41 Approximately 70% of the occurrences of κατά in Greek are rendered with κατα in Coptic.
42 English translations usually follow the English Standard Version.
(11) Greek ὁ Φῆστος τῷ βασιλεῖ ἀνέθετο τὰ κατὰ τὸν Παῦλον (λέγων) (Acts 25:14)

Sahidic φϊςτος αὶτεὶθθηπρο με φϊς

pʰéstos a-f-tame-p-rro e-p-hôb

Festus PST-3SG.M-tell-ART:1SG-king ALL-ART:1SG-matter

ἡπαξλος εἰχω

m-paulos e-f-êô

of-Paul SBND-3SG.M-say

Bohairic αφϊςτος χαὶρωβ ἡπαξλος θχτοτη

a-pʰéstos kʰa-p-hôb m-paulos xatot-f

 pst-Festus put-ART:1SG-matter of-Paul in_the_hands-3SG.M

ἡπογρο εὰχω

m-p-ouro e-f-êô

of-ART:1SG-king SBND-3SG.M-say

“(…) Festus explained to the king the matter concerning Paul, (saying …)”

Distributive (“by”43)

(12) Greek τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον κατὰ πόλιν διαμαρτύρεταί μοι (Acts 20:23)

Sahidic πενευμα ετογαλβ ρημπερ继续保持 καταπολικ

pe-pneuma et-ouaab rmntre=na-i kata-polis

ART:M.SG-Spirit REL-IS_holy testify=DAT-1SG DISTR-town

Bohairic πενευμα εηογαλβ χεφθεσενεν καταπολικ

pi-pneuma etʰ-ouab f-ermet⁷re=nê-i kata-polis

ART:M.SG-Spirit REL-IS_holy 3SG.M-testify=DAT-1SG DISTR-town

“The Holy Spirit testifies for me from town to town.”

(13) Greek κατὰ δὲ ἑορτὴν ἀπέλυεν αὐτοῖς ἕνα δέσμιον (Mark 15:6)44

Sahidic καταςα=δε ραηκαουγ εβολ ηουα εφην

kata-ša=de ša-f-kô=na-u ebol n-oua efcêp

distr-feast=ptcl hab-3SG.M-release=DAT-3PL outside ACC-INDF imprisoned

Bohairic καταςα=δε ραηκαουγ ηουα εηοαερσηουγ εβολ

kata-p-śai=de na-f-kô=ô n-ouai efonk= nó-ou ebol

distr-ART-feast=ptcl IMPF-3SG.M-release ACC-one imprisoned=DAT-3PL outside

“Now at each feast he used to release one prisoner for them.”

43 Mostly with nouns referring to numbers, space, and time, except when inherited adverbial expressions such as ἕκκατα mmêne ‘daily’ (cf. Shisha-Halevy 1986: 43) or τερόμπε terompe ‘yearly, a year’ (cf. Shisha-Halevy 1986: 45; see Reintges 2004: 100 on καταρόμπε katarompe ‘each year’).

44 Note that temporal extension (see below, example 14) appears to be another possible reading both in Greek and Coptic.
Figure 5: The distribution of κατὰ in New Testament Coptic
(without the conjunctural uses, for which see §4.4)

As shown by Figure 5, the conceptual meanings documented in earlier grammatical
descriptions are by far the best represented both in Sahidic and in Bohairic, but κατὰ also
occurs – even though much less frequently – with some temporal and spatial meanings. In
the temporal sphere, the preposition occurs in both dialects when the κατὰ-headed phrase
refers to an extension in time:

**Temporal extension** (“during,” “around”)

(14) Greek  κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ πειρασμοῦ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ (Heb. 3:8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sahidic</th>
<th>Bohairic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>κατὰ p-ehou</td>
<td>katar-pi-ehou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>during-ART:M.SG-day</td>
<td>during-ART:M.SG-day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of-ART:M.SG-trial</td>
<td>of-ART:M.SG-trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in-ART:M.SG-desert</td>
<td>below on-ART:M.SG-desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m-p-pirasmos</td>
<td>nte-pi-pirasmos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hnt-eremos</td>
<td>nhrêi hi-p-şafe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neg πειρασμὸς</td>
<td>neg ἡγημαχε</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“(Do not harden your hearts as in the rebellion), during the day of testing
in the desert”

In the spatial domain, on the other hand, Sahidic and Bohairic behave differently. While
the allative/purposive use of κατὰ is attested in both dialects, it is only Bohairic that
expresses local extension with this preposition when the context excludes a distributive
interpretation.
Goal ("towards")

(15) Greek κατὰ σκοπὸν διώκω (Phil. 3:14)
Sahidic e-i-pe-t kata-pe-skopos
Bohairic kata-ou-soms ebol e-i-coći

"(Forgetting what lies behind and straining forward to what lies ahead),
I press on toward the goal (for the prize of the upward call of God in
Christ Jesus)."

Spatial extension ("across," "through," "throughout")

(16) Greek οὔτε ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς οὔτε κατὰ τὴν πόλιν (Acts 24:12)
Sahidic oude hn-neu-sunagôgê oude kata-polis
Bohairic oude xen-ni-sunagôgê oude kata-polis

"(And they did not find me either in the temple…) or in the synagogues
or across the city"

(17) Greek διήρχοντο κατὰ τὰς κώμας εὐαγγελίζομενοι (Luke 9:6)
Sahidic ne-u-mooše=pe kata-timi e-u-euaggelize
Bohairic na-u-mošt=pe kata-timi e-u-hišennoufi

"(And they departed) and went through the villages, preaching the
gospels (and healing everywhere)"

In the first example above, ρη (hn) is used instead of κατά in Sahidic, probably because
the spatial extension is the only interpretation available in this context. In the second case,
on the other hand, a distributive reading ("village by village", or the like) is possible and
κατά is attested both in Sahidic and Bohairic. We shall see in Section 4.3.2 below that

45 This is one of the very rare examples in which a Greek-origin preposition plays a role in marking
valency patterns in Coptic.
46 The spatial extension of this example could be more appropriately characterized as a fictive motion,
see Luraghi (2003) and Méndez Dosuna (2012).
47 Note that the "across" meaning in Greek derives from the combination of the prefix διά- of the verb
with the prepositional phrase introduced by κατά, whereas in Coptic κατά alone denotes the spatial
extension meaning.
despite a very similar usage distribution of the Greek-origin preposition κατὰ in Sahidic and Bohairic (cf. Fig. 5 and Fig. 6), meaningful dialectal differences can be identified.

4.3.2 Differential borrowing between Sahidic and Bohairic

A case of differential borrowing between Sahidic and Bohairic is to be found at the margins of the CONFORMITY/AREA conceptual domains. Whenever the norm “according to” or “in relation to” which the predication takes place is understood as a reason or as a cause, κατὰ tends not to be used in Bohairic, which prefers the inherited preposition χεν (xen), whereas κατὰ is commonly attested in Sahidic for this meaning.48

**Cause (“because of”) – Sahidic only**

(18) Greek  Ἐἰ ἐξεστὶν ἀνθρώπῳ ἀπολῦσαι τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν  (Matt. 19:3)

**Sahidic**

ene-ek’estei
ene-ekek’estei m-p-rôme e-nouče ebol n-te-f-shime
q-is_allowed dat-art:m.sg-man inf-throw away acc-poss:sg-3sg.m-wife
κατὰ αἴτια
kata-aitia
for-reason any

**Bohairic**

an-sše nte-pi-rômi hi-te-f-shimi ebol
q-it_is_right sbv-art:m.sg-man put-poss:sg-3sg.m-wife outside
χεν
xen-nobi
in-sin any

“Is it lawful for a man to divorce one’s wife for any reason?”

48 Compare however the Sahidic and Bohairic versions of Phil. 4.11.
(19) Greek μηδὲν κατ᾽ ἐριθείαν μηδὲ κατὰ κενοδοξίαν (Phil. 2:3)

Greek:

en-men-ερηθίαν=NEG
kata-κενοδοξίαν

Sahidic:

en-tetn-r-laau=an
kata-ou-t-tón

oude
kata-ou-mntšonšou

Bohairic:

n-teten-er-hli=an
xen-ou-šcnên
oude
xen-ou-maiôou

e-f-šouit

“Do not do anything because of ambition or vain conceit”

Another case of differential borrowing is the Greek expression κατά + CARDINAL NUMBER, which is not rendered similarly in Sahidic and Bohairic. In New Testament Sahidic, κατά is never used in this case: the determined cardinal number is repeated, a construction attested in both Coptic and Koine Greek.49 In Bohairic, on the other hand, there is an opposition between ό-determined numbers (κατά ό-noun ό-noun)50 and determined numbers (κατά is not used, only repetition).51

49 Shisha-Halevy (1986: 46) “[t]he syntagm ‘ό-noun lexeme → ό-noun lexeme’ is a member of the postadjunctive modifier paradigm and occupies a slot in the valency matrix with no further marking”. Layton (2004: 52–53, §62): The reiteration of the definite article phrase as the meaning “each…, every…, Each and every…” while the zero article phrase reiterated has the meaning “One … after another, … by …”. Layton (2004: 175, §228): “[a]dverbial modifiers expressing successive distribution (one … after another; … by …) are formed by reiteration of any zero article phrase or bare cardinal number, without initial preposition. E.g. ύοο ύοο ςκ ςκ όνειρο one day after another, day by day, daily; όν ον ma ma one place after another; όνα “όνα šm šm little by little; όνα όνα όνα one by one; όνα όνα ρα ρα snau snau two by two.”

50 The construction κατά ό-noun ό-noun is also attested in Sahidic (see e.g. Layton 2004: 53, §62.b.iv) but does not seem to occur in the New Testament. In the Manichaean variety of Lycopolitan (L4), one regularly finds this construction, which appears at first glance to be a redundant marking of the distributive function, with both adpositional marking (by means of κατά) and reduplication. This is not unexpected in language contact situations, since Muysken (2008: 179-180), for instance, observes that prepositions borrowed from Spanish collocate with inherited case markers in informal spoken Quechua.

51 On ‘doubling’ in Coptic, see further Bosson (1995: esp. 112): “il faut noter que la juxtaposition d’expressions composées ou de simples vocables, dont l’acception est identique (bien que souvent le vocabulaire des unes soit plutôt d’origine pharaonique, celui des autres, d’origine grecque), est un trait caractéristique de la langue copte. Ce phénomène reflète une sorte de besoin pour les Coptes de renforcer la notion qu’ils souhaitent exprimer en la répétant de façon multiple.”
Polysemy Networks in Language Contact

Distributive (number) – Bohairic only

(20) Greek ἐξήγειτο καθ’ ἑν ἕκαστον ὧν ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς (Acts 21:19)

Sahidic αἰτήγητος ὁγια p-oua n-ne-hbêue

pst-3sg.m-pronounce-art:sg.m-one ART:SG.M-one ACC-ART:PL-things

nta-tempyte aay

nt-a-p-noute aa-i

rel-pst-art:m-God do-3pl

Bohairic ναχαξι ιατότογ κατάογαι ογαι ινι

na-f-saçi xatot-ou kata-ouai ouai n-nê

impt-3sg.m-say to-3pl dist-one one ACC-DEM:PL

εταφ

et-a-p<now>/t ait-ou

rel-pst-God do-3pl

“(After greeting them), he related one by one the things that God had done (among the Gentiles through his ministry)”

(21) Greek τὸ δὲ καθ’ ἑις ἄλληλων μέλη (Rom 12:5)

Sahidic πογάδε p-oua αἰνον-μ-μέλος ι-νη-ερηγ

p-oua de p-oua anon-m-melos n-nen-erêu

art:sg.m-one=ptcl art:sg.m-one 1pl-art:pl-part of-our-fellows

Bohairic πι-ογα πι-ογα ι-νηον αινοραξιμινελος ιτε-nen-ερηγου

pi-ouai pi-ouai mmo-n anon-han-melos nte-nen-erêou

art:sg.m-one art:sg.m-one of-1pl 1pl-indf.pl-part of-our-fellows

“So we are each of us members of each other.”

In Figure 7 below, the meanings identified for the Greek-origin preposition κατά in New Testament Coptic are highlighted on the semantic map presented in §4.2.1 (Figure 2). As can be observed, most of the meanings frequently attested in New Testament Greek (§4.2.2 & Figure 3) are indeed PAT-transferred in Coptic, but there are also some differences between dialects in terms of the non-core meanings of the preposition. Furthermore, the maleficiary (“against”) meaning, which represents no less than 12% of the attestations of κατά in the Greek version, is not attested for the preposition κατά in New Testament Coptic (§4.3.1). One might speculate that, besides the existence of several inherited constructions for expressing this meaning, the incompatibility of nominal case with adposition in Coptic might have impeded the borrowing. Indeed, κατά + ACCUSATIVE “in accordance with,” is clearly distinct from κατά + GENITIVE “against” in Greek, whereas the lack of case in Coptic would have led to two rather opposite meanings “in accordance with” vs “against” for a single construction: κατά + NOUN.
One observes that, strictly speaking, the meanings of κατὰ do not cover a connected region on the semantic map either in Bohairic or in Sahidic. This is mainly due to the fact that motion-associated meanings are not attested in New Testament Coptic for this preposition. However, if one takes a more statistical approach, one observes that more than 93% of the uses of the preposition correspond to a connected region of the map.52

4.4 The integration of κατὰ in the Coptic grammatical system

In this section, the integration of κατὰ in the Coptic grammatical system is evaluated, mostly focusing on the Sahidic version of the New Testament.53 Until this point, we have systematically excluded uses of κατὰ in Coptic that are not expressed by κατά in Greek. However, the Greek-origin preposition was used in many cases where the Greek prefers another construction (c. 45% of the occurrences of κατὰ in Sahidic).

The preposition κατὰ is indeed used productively in Sahidic when Greek has another construction (e.g., πρὸς or διὰ + accusative, adverbs, etc.) with a meaning associated with the conceptual domain covered by κατὰ in Coptic (7 examples). Such examples are good evidence for the semasiological integration of κατὰ in the Coptic grammatical system for expressing senses such as “in accordance with” (conformity) and “each, by” (distributive):

52 Furthermore, the temporal extension meaning (‘during’) is likely to be connected to the spatial extension meaning (‘throughout’) on the semantic map based on a proper typological survey.

53 Following Shisha-Halevy (1986), one can suggest that the assimilation scale of a loanword can be established “in terms of productivity, of integration into the Coptic semasiological system, and (sometimes) in terms of phonological structure and properties […].”
Conformity – Greek πρὸς vs Coptic κατὰ
(22) Greek μή (...) ποιήσας πρὸς τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ (Luke 12:47)
Sahidic e-mnf-f-ire kattapa-ke-f-ois
sb-3sg.m-neg.prep by-sg.m-fut
“(And that servant who knew his master’s will but did not get ready or)
act according to his will”

Distributive – Greek different constructions vs Coptic κατὰ
(23) Greek νηστεύω δὶς τοῦ σαββάτου (Luke 18:12)
Sahidic t-nêsteue n-sop snau kata-sabbaton
1sg.prs-fast mod-time two distr-week
“I fast twice a week, (I give tithes of all that I get)”

(24) Greek διήλθον ευαγγελιζόμενοι τον λόγον (Acts 8:4)
Sahidic a-u-mooše e-u-tašeoeiš m-p-šače kata-polis
3sg.pst-3pl-preach acc-art:m.sg-word distr-city
“(Now, those who were scattered) went about preaching the word.”

Furthermore, the comparative locution κατὰ ϑεό + relative clause translates many Greek adverbs and conjunctions in Sahidic: ὡς (6), ὥσπερ (2), ὡσαύτως (1), ἐφ’ᾄρ (1), καθά (1), καθότι (4), καθάπερ (10), καθὼς (171). The following examples illustrate the highly productive use of κατὰ ϑεό + relative clause for rendering such Greek idioms:

Greek καθός, ὡς, etc. – Coptic κατὰ ϑεό
(25) Greek ὁ μὲν υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὑπάγει καθὼς γέγραπται περὶ αὐτοῦ (Matt 26:24)
Sahidic p-šêre=men m-p-rome na-bôk
art:m.sg-son=ptcl of-art:m.sg-man fut-go
katta-t-he et-sêh etbêêt-f
according_to-art:m.sg-manner rel-written concerning-3sg.m
“(The Son of Man goes) as it is written about him”

54 Note the relationship between the use of verbs with the prefix διά- in Greek and prepositional phrases with κατα in Coptic (see above the note on example 17).
55 See Layton (2004: 505–506) regarding the adverbial expression of comparison just as, as ἵναι and κατὰ ϑεό. Comparison of equality can also be introduced either by the Coptic expression ‘n-t-he ≠ sb-3sg.m-neg.prep “as, like (lit. in the way/manner...).” Sometimes, other words of similar semantics such as smot “pattern,” mine “sort, quality, manner,” cot “size, form,” or maiê “kind” are employed (see Müller, this volume).
(26) **Greek** καὶ ὡς εἰώθει πάλιν ἔδιδασκεν αὐτοῖς (Mark 10:1)

**Sahidic** auō kata-t-he e-ša-f-aa-s

and according to ART.F.SG manner REL-HAB-3SG.M-do-3SG.F

καὶ ὡς εἰώθει πάλιν ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς (Mark 10:1)

**Bohairic**

and according to ART.F.SG manner REL-HAB-3SG.M-do-3SG.F

“And again, as was his custom, he taught them”

From a morphosyntactic viewpoint, even if κατά inflects for person-marking in Coptic (i.e., καταrho- kataro-), the allomorph seems to be systematically avoided in the translation of the New Testament. As a result, the occurrences of κατά + PRONOUN in Greek are rendered by other constructions in Coptic. The only exceptions (only two occurrences) are found in Sahidic (but never in Bohairic) when κατα functions as an intensifier. Compare the following examples:

(27) **Greek** ὡς καὶ τινες τῶν καθ᾽ὑμᾶς ποιητῶν εἰρήκασιν (Acts 17:28)

**Sahidic**

ησον nt-a-hoine n-ne-m-poitês ēoo-s

in_the_manner=even REL-PST-some of-POSS:PL-2PL-poet say-3SG.F

Bohairic

mphrêti et-a-u-čo-s nče-han-kekōouni ebol

in_the_manner REL-PST-3PL-say-3SG.F NOM-INDEF.PL-others outside

“(`In him we live and move and have our being’), as even some of your own poets have said”

(28) **Greek** νεκρά ἐστιν καθ᾽ἑαυτήν (James 2:17)

**Sahidic**

εσ-μουτ kataro-s

e-s-moout according to 3SG.F

Bohairic

f-mōout xarixo-f

3SG.M-dead INTENS-3SG.M

“(So also, the faith, if it does not have works,) is dead by itself”

This intensifier use of the person-marked form of κατα is further illustrated by the following example, where New Testament Greek has the adjective ἴδιος:

56 Shisha-Halevy (1986: 59) “[o]f all Greek origin preposition, only κατα and παρά have pre-pronominal allomorphs (καταrho-, παραrho-).” Since then, a few occurrences of προςρο- (< Greek πρός) have been noted (see Layton 2004: 200).
(29) Greek (ὁ δὲ θεὸς δίδωσιν αὐτῷ σῶμα καθὼς ἠθέλησεν,) καὶ ἕκάστῳ τῶν 
σπερμάτων ἰδίον σῶμα (1 Cor. 15:38)

Sahidic ⲁⲩ ⲟⲩ ⲙⲟⲩ ⲡⲟⲩ ⲛ-ⲛⲉ-ϭⲣⲣⲱⲱⲧ ⲕⲧⲁⲣⲟⲥ

and one-body dat-art:m.sg one of-art:pl seed by-3sg.m

“(But God gives it a body as he has decided), and to each kind of seeds 
its own body”

It is beyond the scope of the present paper to further evaluate the multiple dimensions of 
the integration of κατὰ in the Coptic grammatical system, even though this preposition 
would be an ideal candidate for a thorough study, since it is attested quite early in Egyptian 
documents, and one could describe the successive steps of its integration into Coptic. 
What matters here is that κατὰ could be used productively in the Coptic New Testament, 
even when Greek opted for other expressions, and entered semasiological domains that 
were not originally associated with the Greek preposition.

5 Conclusions

This paper provides empirical evidence for addressing the main question of Section 2.2: 
when a lexical item is transferred from one language to another, how much PAT does it 
carry along? As we have seen, Johanson (2002) made a distinction between global copying, 
when an entire sign (signifier+signified) is borrowed, and selective copying, when 
only certain aspects of a unit from the model code are transferred.

Global copying is certainly not appropriate for describing the borrowing of κατὰ, 
since several uses of the preposition in Greek are not PAT-transferred into Coptic, even 
though the semantics of the preposition in Sahidic and Bohairic is much richer than one 
might imagine when looking at the existing grammatical and lexicographical descriptions:
besides the conceptual senses (conformity, area, distributivity), spatial (“throughout, 
towards”) and temporal (“during”) meanings are also attested. As a matter of fact, it is 
doubtful whether languages do ever borrow an entire complex polysemy network.

Selective copying thus appears to be a more appropriate description. However, even if 
limited in terms of frequency, the differences between the meanings borrowed in Sahidic 
and Bohairic (§4.3.2) show that the structural ‘ecology’ of the target language may 
constrain the outcome of the borrowing in terms of PAT. Moreover, the occurrence of uses 
that are not known to the source language (§4.4) show that the label selective copying is 
not much more felicitous. As such, we suggest rather referring to a process of adaptative 
copying when referring to cases in which partial PAT-transfer and the development of new 
functions occurs, as we have shown in the case study on κατὰ in Section 4.

57 Indeed, in the Narmouthis ostraca (c. 2nd century A.D.), we have an early example of a “Greek 
embedded language island […] which] did not intrude into the Egyptian structure in [its] capacity 
as function word” (Richter 2008, referring to κατὰ Ⲡⲧⲡⲱ in ODN 184,10; the fact that the Greek 
accusative is used for Ⲡⲧⲡⲱ is telling in this respect).
Furthermore, we have shown that the functions associated with κατα in Coptic do not correspond to a clearly connected region on a semantic map, as one might have expected based on the connectivity hypothesis (Croft 2001: 96). This lack of connectivity seems to be due to the fact that the core spatial meaning motion (‘along’) is not borrowed in Coptic. However, it should be pointed out that this meaning is not at all salient in New Testament Greek, which may have led to its absence in our corpus. As such, the lack of connectivity, while synchronically puzzling, may have a simple diachronic explanation (cf. van der Auwera’s [2008] claim that the best semantic map is a diachronic semantic map). The selective and adaptive copying of parts, not necessarily contiguous, of a polysemy network, points to the need for a more fine-grained constructional approach to borrowing, in which ‘matter’ is copied context-by-context.58

Finally, from a methodological point of view, we have argued that both semantic maps and the distinction between comparative concepts and descriptive categories allow linguists to describe the integration of linguistic items into the semantic and morphosyntactic structures of a target language in a precise way. Semantic maps state the network of polyfunctionality associated with a particular item, as well as the relationships between the diverse functions or senses, while the comparison of descriptive categories allows a fine-grained analysis of the integration of an item or class of items into the grammar of the target language. This approach has already produced some interesting results. For example, in Grossman & Richter (this volume), it is argued that Greek-origin infinitives do not carry over all of their morphosyntactic properties into Greek, but nor do they behave identically to inherited Coptic infinitives. Grossman (2016b) shows that Greek loan verbs in Coptic are integrated only partially into the Coptic transitive construction, in some respects behaving like bivalent intransitives, which in turn suggests that we may have to speak of ‘loanword transitivities’ as we do of ‘loanword phonologies.’ In the present article, we have shown that Greek-origin prepositions pattern like inherited Coptic prepositions primarily with respect to the properties that Greek prepositions and Coptic prepositions share anyway, and acquire only gradually and partially the particular properties that differentiate between the Greek and Coptic categories.

As a final envoi, a point to consider is whether the facts of language contact – both matter replication and pattern replication – indicate that Haspelmath’s comparative concepts are in some respects cognitively ‘real’: bilingual speakers seem to make use of them, as do translators, when they match structurally distinct descriptive categories from different languages within their repertoire.

References


58 Cf. The remarks in fn. 3 regarding the semantic map model.


Behlmer, Heike. This volume. Differentiating Lexical Borrowing According to Semantic Fields and Text Types – A Case Study, $$$.


Georgakopoulos, Thanasis. 2011. *Gnosiai proseggisi tis simiasiologikis allagis ton protheseon tis Ellinikis: I periptosi tis eis* [A cognitive approach to semantic change in Greek prepositions: The


Georges, Coulter H. 2006. The spatial use of ἀνά and κατά with the accusative in Homer, in: Glotta 82, 70–95.


Müller, Matthias. This volume. Greek connectors in Coptic. A constrastive overview I, $$$.


