

## Considering CL 1699, is there enough evidence to correct the attestation of *copt*, –ă (1887, DLR)?

Adina Chirilă\*

Faculty of Letters, History and Theology, West University, Bd. Vasile Pârvan 4, 300223 Timișoara, Romania

### Article info

#### History:

Received September 17, 2015

Accepted October 11, 2015

Published February 12, 2016

#### Key words:

lexical borrowing

historical lexicology

translation

### Abstract

In 1699, translating from Greek a text by Maxim the Peloponnesian, Antim Ivireanul uses a word that, at first glance, coincides with a neologism attested in Romanian no sooner than the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, as a French loan: *copt*, –ă, ‘Locuitor [...] al Egiptului, descinzând din vechile secte creștine ale Euticheenilor’ [Inhabitant (...) of Egypt, descending from the ancient Christian sects of the Euticheens]. In order to answer the question in the title, the author had to conduct a semantic analysis of the corresponding word in the Greek source-text, i.e. *κόπται* (and also its etymology), since, for the period when Maxim the Peloponnesian writes, the Greek lexicography indicates only the existence of the ancient form *κόπτης* (pl. *κόπται*), derivative of the verb *κόπ(τω) –της* ‘to cut, to strike’. The study leads towards an affirmative answer, and might also cast a new light on the language dynamics of the post-byzantine era.

## 1. A name for some heretics

Chapter 32 of **MP 1690 / CL 1699** (64<sup>v</sup> – 68<sup>r1</sup>) belongs to the first part of the book called *Ἐγχειρίδιον κατὰ τοῦ σχίσματος...*, in which the author, Maxim the Peloponnesian, attacks the issue of the *primacy of the Roman pontiff*, as one of the main doctrinal divergences between the Orthodox and the Catholic Church (i.e., according to the Romanian subtitle of the book: „noao aflare de a fi Papa al Rîmului începătoriu, și Cap tuturor” 3<sup>r</sup>). The title of the 32<sup>nd</sup> chapter, *Cum că beserica răsăritului, avînd nevoi, să împreună cu sfinții și să aseamănă lui Hristos. Pentru aceaia, cu mult iaste și mai bună decît cea de la apus. Și răspuns la cîte defăimează păpistașii pe beserica răsăritului pentru robiia. Și cum că latinii sînt împreunați cu ereticii și ei sînt eretici* (64<sup>v</sup>), represents the conclusion of a comparative analysis of the history of the two churches in the light of the christic, then paulinian, warning about the distress that the believers would suffer in the world. The warning appears in the beginning of the chapter as a collection of rhetorical questions and allusions to several New Testament passages, never mentioned but easily identifiable (e.g. *Mt*, 10, 16, *Lk*, 10, 3, *Jn*, 16, 33; *2Tim*, 3, 12):

„Iară încăși, cînd au fost neamul cel blagocestiv în pace de lupi? Adecă de tirani și de cei împotriva credinței? Cînd au rămas beserica lui Hristos izbăvită, ca să nu caște asupra ei porțile iadului? Măcară că și cu toate acéstea niciodată n-au putut să o biruiscă nimica. N-auzi că Hristos n-au zis să dea besericii lui odihne, ci nevoi și pedépse? N-ai auzit că zicea Hristos cătră ucenicii lui că-i trimite ca pe niște oi în mijlocul lupilor? N-auzi pre marele propovédnic Pavel că strigă și zice: ceia ce vor să viețuiscă pravoslavnicéște să vor goni?” (64<sup>v</sup>).

In the demonstration, the existence of certain relations between the Roman Church and some religious groups which, at some point in history, have agreed on a different interpretation of the biblical texts,

\*Email address: [chiriladina@yahoo.com](mailto:chiriladina@yahoo.com).

<sup>1</sup>The page numbering is mine, A.C., and includes the two leaves of *Predoslovie* [the Foreword] (here: 1<sup>r</sup> – 2<sup>v</sup>), that are unnumbered in the original printed text.

hence “heretical”, is used as an argument for the idea that the Roman Church might eagerly seek material prosperity and worldly comfort rather than proper ways to keep the christic and apostolic principles, thus mocking those who, through sufferings and martyrdom, remain truly faithful. Further on, Maxim the Peloponnesian writes:

Δὲν κάμνει χρεία λοιπὸν, διὰ τὰ ἐλθῆ ὁ λόγος εἰς τὸ προκείμενον, νὰ κάμνετε αὐτὰ τὰ μορμολίκεια πατριάρχας αὐτοῦ, ὡς ἂν νὰ μὴν ἀπόμειναν ἐδῶ εἰς τὴν ἀνατολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν παντελῶς εὐσεβεῖς καὶ ὀρθόδοξοι χριστιανοὶ, διατὶ δὲν εἶναι εἰς τὴν ὑποταγὴν τοῦ Ῥώμης, τὸν ὁποῖον θέλετε νὰ τὸν προσκυνοῦν ὄλοι, καὶ νὰ τὸν ὑποτάσσονται, καὶ ἀπ’ ἐκεῖ, ας εἶναι κόπται, μονοθελίται καὶ μονοφυσίται, ἀρειανοὶ, καὶ παρόμοιοι αἰρετικοὶ. (MP 1690, 124),

what, in the translation of Antim Ivireanul, appears as:

„Nu trebuiaște dară (pentru să vie cuvîntul la povéstea noastră) să faceți acéste mămîie patriiarși acolo, ca cum n-ar fi rămas aicea în besearica răsăritului nimic blagocestivi și pravoslavnici creștini, pentru căci nu iaste supt plecarea rîmlénului, căruia veți să i să închine toți și să i să pléce iară decii, fie măcară **copte**, sau de ceia ce vor numai o voie și o ființă la dumnezeire, ariiani și alți eretici asemene acestora.” (CL 1699, 67<sup>r</sup>).

It seems that the author conceives and uses a category with three elements (at least in the Romanian version), all bearing the semantic content [+ heresy]: 1) *copte* [Copts], 2) *ceia ce vor numai o voie și o ființă la dumnezeire* [those who believe that there is only one will and one nature in divinity], and 3) *ariiani* [Arians]. The third, as a lexical unit, is attested at Varlaam, 1643, ‘Anhänger von Arius. – Daher: Schismatiker. Abtrünniger’ (TDRG<sub>2</sub>, s.v.; also, DLR, s.v.), while the first, naming a type of heresy (or anything else!), has not been yet discovered in any other old or pre-modern Romanian text.

Are we to believe that, through the translation of Antim Ivireanul, we witness the first use of the word *copt*, –ă in Romanian, with a meaning resembling that expressed in DLR, „Locuitor [...] al Egiptului, descinzând din vechile secte creștine ale Euticheenilor” (s.v.) [Inhabitant (...) of Egypt, descending from the ancient Christian sects of the Euticheens]? Does this fact add almost two centuries back to the life of the specified word in the Romanian vocabulary, and correct its etymology (cf. DLR, s.v., „Ion Ghica, *Scrisori către Vasile Alecsandri*, București, Editura Librăriei Socec & Comp, 1887”)? Or is there a different case?

## 2. An homonymy registered rather late

To consider MP 1620/1690 the actual Greek source for the Romanian CL 1699 form *copte* is a possibility that faces some difficulties from the Greek language, concerning the actual existence at the beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup> century (1620, when Maxim the Peloponnesian wrote the manuscript of *Ἐγχειρίδιον κατὰ τοῦ σχίσματος...*) of a Greek noun referring to a certain population (i.e. the Copts) with a certain Christian tradition.

The form *κόπται* (n., pl., N; sg.: *κόπτῃς*) is registered in Greek dictionaries as a derivative of the verb *κόπτω* (‘to cut, strike’, Lat. *caedo*, LIDDELL–SCOTT, s.v.; BAILLY, s.v.), either as an element belonging to *κόπτω*’s entry (agent name, see CHANTRAINE, s.v., see C.1), 2) and D), or as a lemma, when it has a distinct religious meaning, based on its use in the patristic texts:

**κόπται, οἱ** “‘those who sunder or divide’, name given to Mahomedans as dividers of Trin[ity]” (LAMPE, s.v.; ‘cutter, one that cuts or divides’ SOPHOCLES, s.v.; ‘Teiler (der Trinität)’, LBG 1, s.v. *κόπτης, ου, ὅ*), often being cited John of Damascus with his *Liber de haeresibus*:

[engl.: “Moreover, they [the *Ismaelites*, *Ἰσμαηλίται*, n.n., A.C.] call us *Heteriasts*, or *Associators*, because, they say, we introduce an associate with God by declaring Christ to [be] the Son of God

and God. We say to them in rejoinder: ‘The Prophets and the Scriptures have delivered this to us, and you, as you persistently maintain, accept the Prophets. So, if we wrongly declare Christ to be the Son of God, it is they who taught this and handed it on to us.’ [...] And again we say to them: ‘As long as you say that Christ is the Word of God and Spirit, why do you accuse us of being Hetæriasts? For the word, and the spirit, is inseparable from that in which it naturally has existence. Therefore, if the Word of God is in God, then it is obvious that He is God. If, however, He is outside of God, then, according to you, God is without word and without spirit. Consequently, by avoiding the introduction of an associate with God you have mutilated Him [τὸν Θεὸν ἐκόψατε αὐτόν, n.n., A.C.]. It would be far better for you to say that He has an associate than to mutilate [κόπτειν, n.n., A.C.] Him, as if you were dealing with a stone or a piece of wood or some other inanimate object. Thus, you speak untruly when you call us Hetæriasts; we retort by calling you Mutilators [Κόπτας, n.n., A.C.] of God.’] (LH, 101, p. 155–156; cf. PG 94. 768, in KOTTER, p. 63–64).

It is unlikely that Maxim the Peloponnesian refers to Muslims when talks about *κόπται*, although, on one hand, John of Damascus (whom, nevertheless, Maxim cites on the issue of the Holy Spirit’s source, CL 1699, 75<sup>f</sup>; see also 101<sup>f</sup>) sees them as heretics (next to other one hundred heresies), and, on the other hand, Maxim also has a certain kind of heresy in mind. The heretics that preoccupy the 17<sup>th</sup> century polemist are of Christian nature, since they are of those towards whom the Roman Church has harboured / was harbouring unionistic plans. It is less important for the present study, and perhaps impossible to identify the genus *κόπται* in the taxonomy of heresies as they appear at Maxim the Peloponnesian, “κόπται, μονοθελίται, και μονοφυσίται, ἀρειανὸι” (MP 1620/1690, 124): taking into account the knowledge that Maxim might have had about the doctrine and the religious practices of the *Monothelites*<sup>2</sup>, *Monophysites*<sup>3</sup> and *Arians*<sup>4</sup>, either from a treatise like that of John of Damascus, or from the confused general knowledge of the Middle Ages about the Oriental religions (Hamilton, 2006, p. 150f), the reader may interpret *κόπται* as category, with *μονοθελίται*, *μονοφυσίται* and *ἀρειανὸι* as components, or as a type of Christianity opposing the others, or, finally, a type of doctrine opposing only *ἀρειανὸι*, and manifesting itself in two sub-types.

In any case, the denotative meaning of the term *κόπται* (sg. *κόπτης*) is equivocal in itself. One might be suggested by the previous uses of the word, by, e.g., John of Damascus (see also Nicetas Choniates, *apud* LBG 1, s.v. *κόπται*), as a derivative noun of the verb *κόπτω*: *cutters* or *mutilators* (indeed, the “heresies” which Maxim writes about are among those accused of negating the duality of Jesus’ nature), the case against it being held by the context of the chapter, and by the absence of a determinative for *κόπται* (cf. *κόπτας τοῦ Θεοῦ*, LH, 101, p. 155)... Nevertheless, such a reading would have led, in the Romanian translation, to a linguistic choice similar with those that cover the next two elements: \**ceia ce taie / strică / mutilează* ([those who cut / brake / mutilate], cf. *ceia ce vor numai o voie și o ființă la dumnezeire* [those who believe that there is only one will and one nature in divinity] – *μονοθελίται, και μονοφυσίται*)—which doesn’t happen.

The second possibility of interpretation is the one actually present in the translator’s choice, entailing the use of a neologism not quite perfectly adapted to the Romanian morphology: *copte* < N-Gr. *Κόπται* ‘Copts’. The problem with this theory is that the Greek dictionaries themselves do not register the exist-

<sup>2</sup>LH, 99, p. 152: “The *Monothelites* originated with Cyril of Alexandria, but received their definite establishment from Sergius of Constantinople. They proclaim two natures and one hypostasis in Christ, but they hold one will and one operation, thus destroying the duality of the natures and coming very close to the teachings of Apollinaris.”

<sup>3</sup>LH, 83, p. 138–139: “The *Egyptians*, who are also called *Schematics* and *Monophysites*, separated from the orthodox church on the pretext of the document [approved] at Chalcedon [and known as] the *Tome*. [...] Because of their strong attachment to Dioscorus of Alexandria, who was deposed by the Council of Chalcedon for defending the teachings of Eutyches, they opposed this council [...]. Their leaders were Theodosius of Alexandria, from whom come the *Theodosians*, and James of Syria, from whom come the *Jacobites*. [...] Although they hold individual substances, they destroy the mystery of the Incarnation.”

<sup>4</sup>LH, 69, p. 127: “The *Arians*, who are also called *Ariomanites* and *Diatomites*, are they who say that the Son of God is a creature and that the Holy Ghost is the creature of a creature. They assert that Christ did not receive His soul from Mary, but only His body.”

ence of a word *Κόπτης* o ‘Copt’ in the Greek language prior to the work of Maxim the Peloponnesian (see **KRIARA**, where the investigated corpus, from 1100 to 1669, doesn’t produce the word with the here requested meaning). However, the use of the Romanian *copte* ought not to be ignored, since it might cast a new light over the language dynamics of the post-byzantine era.

\*

Through years, several hypothesis concerning the etymology of the Copts’ name have emerged, but the hypotheses that seems to have gained the value of truth is the one involving the reduction and transformation of the Greek word *Αιγύπτιος* to the Arabic [*qibṭīyīn*], or to the consonantal root [*kpt*], present in the administrative documents after the conquest of Egypt in 641<sup>5</sup>. The term functioned as an ethnonym with the same meaning as its Greek etymon and no consideration for the “pagan” or Christian status of its bearers.

In this situation, the word is unlikely to re-enter the Greek language, under any simplified form, and, in fact, it doesn’t appear in lexicons depicting the Greek language of the respective period (cf. *κοπιτής*, *ου*, adj. m. ‘de Koptos’, *Κοπτός*, *οὔ* (ή), ‘ville d’Egypte’, **BAILLY**, s.v.).

The premises of a change are firstly related to the need of distinguishing between the Christian population of Egypt and the Islamic or Islamized one, especially after the middle of the 7<sup>th</sup> century. The word developed a supplementary religious meaning (**ATIYA**, p. 599–600), so the Arab. [*qibt*] (coined also as a self-designator, with a specific Coptic form) began to refer to “[n]ative inhabitants who remained Christian” (**Rowberry & Khalil**, 2010, p. 86). Later, a new semantic nuance was added, with a negative or positive religious connotation, depending on the context, i.e. \*‘an Egyptian practicing a certain type of Christianity’. Further on, when the accent falls on the religious component of the significant (with its doctrinal features and its traditions), the word tends towards ethnical ambiguity<sup>6</sup>; so that, in 1170 for example, when the German pilgrim Johann of Würzburg enumerates the Christian communities that he finds in Jerusalem, the *Egyptians* and the *Copts* represent two separate groups:

„Sic sic describendo venerabilia loca in sancta civitate Jerusalem, incipiendo ab ecclesia sancti sepulchri, circumeundo per portam David usque ad eadndem reversi sumus, plures omittendo capellas et inferiores ecclesias, quas habent ibi diversarum nationum et linguarum homines. Sunt namque ibi græci, bulgari, latini, alemanni, hungari, scoti, navarri, britanni, angli, franci, rutheni, bohemi, georgiani, armeni, jacobitæ, suriani, nestoriani, indi, ægyptii, copti, capheturici, morani et alii quamplures, quos longum esset enumerare, sed in his finem hujus opusculi faciemus.” (**DTR** 1874, p. 189–190);

also, several centuries later, the confusion can be so big that, in 1524, the Dominican Bernard of Luxemburg notes: “Copti sunt Christiani, sed hæretici, *in partibus Indiae* hincinde habitantes...” (**CH** 1529, Liber II, *Hæretici de litera C*, H1<sup>r-v</sup>).

Still, the use of a word to continue the Arabic [*qibt*] or perhaps another eastern linguistic form *with a meaning as discussed here* did not let many traces in the medieval literature, be it in Greek, Latin, or vernaculars (**Hamilton**, 2006, p. 110; see, as *argumentum ad silentio*, **KRIARA** s.v., **GAFFIOT** s.v., **OLD** s.v., etc.)<sup>7</sup>.

<sup>5</sup>For detailed presentations and analyses of the problem, see **Aufière & Bosson** (2001, p. 1–15), **Hamilton** (2006, p. 24–25), **ATIYA**, p. 599.

<sup>6</sup>On this matter, **ATIYA**, p. 599–600, writes: “the frequent extension in the religious sense of the word ‘Copt’ to Christian Ethiopians, Syro-Jacobites, and Armenians, makes it radically and arbitrarily empty of its essential ethnic base. Its application in these communities to the period that precedes the formation and use of the word by the Arab conquerors of Egypt makes this usage as anachronistic and unjustifiable as when used in referring to this same period in Egypt. [...] The word ‘Copt’ is to be discarded when discussing the Syro-Jacobites and the Armenians and whatever may concern them. Nor can it designate the Ethiopians, who are of a different race and language. But it may be used to describe ecclesiastical and administrative affairs such as their dogma and liturgy. Concerning Ethiopians, it is normal to speak of the Coptic hierarchy, Coptic Christians, and Coptic liturgy.”

<sup>7</sup>The texts that speak about the relations between the oriental Christians and the rest of the Christianity (after the Council

Not till the next epoch such a word is attested:

**Κόπτης ο**: ονομασία των μονοφυσιτών χριστιανών της Αιγύπτου και της Αιθιοπίας<sup>8</sup> [...] [λόγ. αντδ. < γαλλ. **cop(te) –της** < αραβ. quft < κοπτικό kyptaios, gyptios < ελνστ. Αιγύπτιος] (**MGD**<sup>9</sup>, s.v.; [Rom. *copt*, Engl. *Copt*]),

a homonym for the derivative noun form of the verb **κόπτω**, namely **κόπτης ο** (& **κόφτης**): θηλ. **κόφτρια**: ειδικός τεχνίτης ο οποίος κόβει [...] [λόγ. **κόπ(τω) –της**] (**MGD**, s.v.; [Rom. *tăietor*, Engl. *cutter*]).

The opinion is that **Κόπτης** represents a French loan into modern Greek, as in the case of the Rom. *copt*, –*ǎ* (**DLR**, s.v.), the French word being itself attested in the 17<sup>th</sup> century as a borrowed word from Arabic: «*copte* 1664, Thévenot<sup>10</sup> (*cofte*); désigna d’abord les chrétiens d’Égypte, puis l’anc. langue démotique; ar. *kupt*, du gr. *aiguptios*, égyptien» (**LAROUSSE**, s.v.; see also **QUILLET**, s.v.; cf. Engl. *Copt*, 1615 [ad. Arab. *quft*, *qift* ‘the Copts’...]). A native Egyptian Christian, belonging to the Jacobite sect of Monophysites..., **SOED**, s.v.).

### 3. Conclusions

If we accept as facts the things mentioned so far, it follows that **Κόπτης** ‘Copt’ is a word whose apparition in Greek can be traced to the 17<sup>th</sup> century, in 1664–1665. Till then, upon certain proof, we are to take into consideration for **κόπτης** only the derivative meaning from the verb **κόπτω**. However, paying attention to the 1620 (published in 1690) text of Maxim the Peloponnesian and also its 1699 Romanian translation by Antim Ivireanul, two hypotheses emerge:

- a) the form **Κόπτης** ‘Copt’, irrespective of **κόπτης** ‘cutter’, has to be in use before the attestation of its alleged French etymon (a fact that is plausible, since, in general, the presence of a word in a given language is an act that precedes its use in writing); Maxim uses it, Antim recognizes it, on the basis of his knowledge of Greek acquired while living in Constantinople, and uses it for the first time in a Romanian text, in an adapted form, in 1699;
- b) **Κόπτης** ‘Copt’ is a post-1669 (also, post-1664) form, as inferred by **KRIARA**, but appears in language prior to Antim Ivireanul’s translating activity; Antim, on the basis of the contemporary Greek language, only believes to recognize the word in Maxim’s text, although the Greek writer from the beginning of the century had a different meaning in mind when he used the noun.

In these, there are elements that should be analysed with the means of modern Greek lexicology. As for the Romanian case, it is obvious that Antim Ivireanul introduces in his text from 1699 a neologism that

---

of Chalcedon, 451) use names that indicate, rather hazily, religious factions and doctrinal nuances. For instance, the *Cantate Domino*, written after the Council of Florence (1441), refers to “Primo etenim Greci et hi, qui subsunt quatuor patriarchalibus sedibus multas gentes nationes que et ydiomata continentibus, deinde Armeni, multorum populorum gens, hodie vero *Iacobini*, magni etiam per Egiptum populi, sancte sedi apostolice uniti sunt.” (**COD** 2013, p. 567), while the name Copt appears only in the modern, editorial title “*Bulla Unionis Coptorum Æthiopicumque*”.

<sup>8</sup>The explanation continuing with: “**διαφ.** το μων.κόπται ‘Μωαμεθανοί’, επειδή διαιρούσαν την Αγία Τριάδα”, in order to prevent precisely the confusion with the Muslims.

<sup>9</sup>**MGD**: “*The Modern Greek Dictionary* is a modern and comprehensive definitional, orthographic, and etymological dictionary of Modern Greek. It was published in December 1998 by the Institute for Modern Greek Studies of the Aristotile University of Thessaloniki, and is the product of many years of methodical labor. It is the first dictionary of Modern Greek to set forth lexicographical principles. It includes phonetic transcriptions, a link from each entry to its inflectional model, and an attempt to list as large a number as possible of expressions and phrases of Modern Greek, and its greatest advantage is its etymological approach.” (!), [online].

<sup>10</sup>Jean de Thévenot (1633–1667), French traveler to the East, skilled in several Oriental languages, natural science, especially in botany. In 1664 he published *Relation d’un voyage fait au Levant...*, where, at p. 501, we read: «*Les Cofits* sont Chrestiens, mais Iacobites, c’est à dire, qui suiuent l’heresie d’Euthiches & de Dioscore, il y en a pourtant quelques-vns parmy eux qui sont orthodoxes, & qui sont appelez Malkites.» (**Thévenot**, 1664).

refers to a certain type of heresy, irrespective of the meaning of the verb κόπτω<sup>11</sup>. We can't see in the use of *copte* an effect of a linguistic transfer caused by a lack of competence, since, in several other places, Antim translates correctly and properly several elements belonging to the paradigm of the Greek verb κόπτω, as in **CL 1699**:

„Iară latinii și ale scripturii, și ale părinților, și încă și ale sfintelor săboară învățături le strămută și le izvretesc, uneori tâlcuindu-le rău, alteori *rumpîndu-le* și împiedecîndu-le den orînduiala lor.” (1<sup>r</sup>); cf. οἱ δὲ λατῖνοι καὶ τῆς γραφῆς καὶ τοῦ πατέρων, καὶ ἔτε τοῦ ἁγίων συνόδων τὰ ῥητὰ διαστρέφουν, πότε παρεξηγῶντες τα, καὶ πότε **κατακόπτωντες** τα ἀπὸ τὸν ἀκολουθίαντων. (**MP 1690**, *Predoslovie*).

or in **NT 1703**:

„iară alții *frîngea* stîlpări den copaci și așternea pre cale” (*Mt*, 21, 28) și „iară alții *tăia* stîlpări den copaci și le așternea pre cale” (*Mc*, 11, 8); cf. ἄλλοι δὲ **ἐκοπτον** κλάδους ἀπὸ τῶν δένδρων καὶ ἐστρώννουσιν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ. (**N-A**);

„Și o *plîngea* toți și să văieta” (*Lc*, 8, 52); cf. ἔκλαιον δὲ πάντες καὶ **ἐκόπτοντο** αὐτήν. (**N-A**), „iară mergea după el mulțime multă de oameni și de muieri, ceale ce *plîngea* și jāliia pre el” (1703, *Lc*, 23, 27); cf. Ἦκολούθει δὲ αὐτῷ πολὺ πλῆθος τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ γυναικῶν αἱ **ἐκόπτοντο** καὶ ἐθρήνον αὐτόν. (**N-A**), unde este implicat vb. κόπτομαι ‘to beat one’s breast through grief, Lat. plangere’ (**LIDDELL-SCOTT**, s.v., κόπτω); etc.

The direct etymon of the Romanian neologism can't be, taking into account the epoch and the translator, a French form, but the Greek word κόπτης, pl. κόπται that would later become stable as κόπτης, pl. κόπτες ‘Copt’. Because there are no exhaustive corpora of the old and early modern literature, we can't easily see if the neologism reappeared after 1699, and, if this would be the case, how often, till Ion Ghica uses it<sup>12</sup>. To this moment, *copt*, -ă has not been discussed in studies concerning the enrichment of the Romanian vocabulary during the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries<sup>13</sup>.

## Bibliography

### A. Sources

CL 1699 = *Carte sau lumină cu drēpte dovediri din dogmele Besēricii Răsăritului, asupra dejghinării papistașilor*, Snagov.

MP 1620 = [Maxim Peloponesianul], *Ἐγχειρίδιον κατὰ τοῦ σχίσματος...*, manuscris.

MP 1690 = [Maxim Peloponesianul], *Ἐγχειρίδιον κατὰ τοῦ σχίσματος...*, [București].

N-A = *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Nestle–Aland 27h Edition, Stuttgart, 1993.

NT 1703 = *Noul Testament*, București.

### B. Dictionaries and studies

ATIYA = A.S. Atiya (ed.) (1991). *The Coptic Encyclopedia*, vol. II, Macmillan Publishing Company.

Aufrère, S.H. & Bosson, N. (2001). *Un dictionnaire des curiosités égyptiennes... Un approche de sémantique historique*, in N. Bosson (éd.), *Études coptes VII (Cahiers de la Bibliothèque Copte 12)*, Louvain, p. 1–15.

BAILLY = A. Bailly, *Dictionnaire Grecque-Français*, Hachette, [s.a.].

CH 1529 = Bernardus Lutzenburgus, *Catalogus hereticorum omnium pene qui ad hęc usque tempora passim literarum monumentis proditi sunt*, Köln.

<sup>11</sup>In the case of the following two names, the translator acts differently and bases the Romanian equivalents on the meaning of lexical components of the Greek terms: μόνος ‘one’ + θέλημα ‘will’, and φύσις ‘nature’.

<sup>12</sup>At least one favourable circumstance appears, through Petru Maior, in his *Procanon* (1783); among the heresies and heretics, Petru Maior names those „ce zicea o lucrare și o voe în Christos” [“who proclaim only one work and one will of Christ”] (**PMP 1783**, p. 97–98), perhaps the *Monothelites* and the *Monophysites*. But the writer does not go further to connect them with the Copts, unlike Maxim the Peloponnesian / Antim Ivireanul (from whom he cites elsewhere, see **Chirilă, 2013**).

<sup>13</sup>Cf. „*Coptus*, g.f. orașel egiptenesc” [“Egyptian small town”], **CORBEA**, s.v.

- CHANTRAINE = P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots*, tome I, A – Δ, Paris, Éditions Klincksieck, 1968.
- Chirilă, A. (2013). *Relația dintre Carte sau lumină..., Snagov, 1699 și Procanon [...] alcătuit și întocmit de Petru Maior, 1783*, in RITL, VII, nr. 1–4, p. 107–116.
- COD 2013 = G. Alberigo, G.L. Dossetti, P.-P. Joannou, C. Leonardi, P. Prodi & H. Jedin (a cura di), *Conciliorum Œcumenicorum Decreta*, edizione bilingue, Bologna, Centro editoriale dehoniano, p. 567–583.
- CORBEA = Teodor Corbea (1650). *Dictiones latine cum valachica interpretatione*, ediție de Alin-Mihai Gherman, vol. I. *Studii introductiv, note și text*, Cluj, Clusium, 2001.
- DLR = *Dicționarul limbii române. C*, tomul I, partea II, București, 1940.
- DTR 1874 = *Descriptions Terre Sanctæ ex seculo VIII. IX. XII. et XV. [...]* Nach hand- und druckschriften herausgegeben von Titus Tobler, Leipzig.
- GAFFIOT = F. Gaffiot, *Dictionnaire latin–français*, Paris, Hachette [s.a.].
- Hamilton, A. (2006). *The Copts and the West, 1439–1822. The European Discovery of the Egyptian Church*, Oxford University Press.
- KOTTER = B. Kotter (ed.), *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos. IV. Liber de hæresibus. Opera polemica*, Berlin, New York, Walter de Gruyter, 1981.
- KRIARA = I. N. Kazazes & T. A. Karanastasses (ed.), *Επιτομή του Λεξικού της Μεσαιωνικής Ελληνικής Δημόδους Γραμματείας (1100–1669), και φτάνει ως την παραθήκη, το τελευταίο λήμμα που δημοσίευσε ο Εμμανουήλ Κριαράς*, vol. I–II, Thessalonike, 2001–2003, [online].
- LAMPE = G. W. H. Lampe (ed.), *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1961.
- LAROUSSE = Albert Dauzat, Jean Dubois, Henri Mitterand, *Dictionnaire étymologique et historique du français*, Larousse, 1994.
- LBG I = E. Trapp, *Lexikon zur byzantinischen Gräzität, besonders des 9.–12. Jahrhunderts*. 1. Band A–K, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1994.
- LH = *The Fathers of the Church. St. John Of Damascus Writings*. Translated by Frederic H. Case Jr., Catholic University of America Press, 2010.
- LIDDELL–SCOTT = H.G. Liddell, R. Scott, *A Greek–English Lexicon*, compiled by.... A New Edition Revised and Augmented throughout by Sir H. Stuart Jones, Oxford, [s.a.].
- MGD = [engl. *Modern Greek Dictionary*], *Λεξικό της κοινής νεοελληνικής*, Thessalonike, 1998, [online].
- OLD = *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1968.
- PG 94 = J.-P. Migne's *Patrologiæ Græcæ. Tomus XCIV. Joannis Damasceni. Opera omnia quæ existant*, 1864.
- PMP 1783 = *Procanon. Ce cuprinde în sine cele ce sînt de lipsă spre înțelesul cel deplin și desevêrșit al canónilor și atotă tocmeala bisericescă, spre folosul mai cu samă a Românilor, alcătuit și întocmit de Petru Maior*, in *Procanonul lui Petru Maior după manuscriptul autograf existent în Academia Română*, București, Tipografia „Cărților Bisericești”, 1894.
- QUILLET = *Dictionnaire Quillet de la langue française*, A–C, Paris, 1975.
- Rowberry, R. & Khalil, J. (2010). *A Brief History of Coptic Personal Status Law*, in “Berkeley Journal of Middle Eastern & Islamic Law”, vol. 3, p. 81–139, CrossRef.
- SOED = C.T. Onions (ed.), *The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary on Historical Principles*, vol. I, A–M, Oxford, Clarendon Press, [s.a.].
- SOPHOCLES = Evangelinus Apostolides Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, Hildesheim – New York, Georg Olm Verlag, 1975.
- Thévenot, J.de (1664). *Relation d'un voyage fait au Levant dans laquelle il est curieusement traité des estats sujets au Grand Seigneur et des singularitez particulières de l'Archipel, Constantinople, Terre-Sainte, Égypte, pyramides, mumies [sic], déserts d'Arabie, la Meque, et de plusieurs autres lieux de l'Asie et de l'Afrique outre les choses mémorables arrivées au dernier siège de Bagdat, les cérémonies faites aux réceptions des ambassadeurs du Mogol et l'entretien de l'auteur avec celui du Pretejan, où il est parlé des sources du Nil*, Paris, [online].
- TDRG<sub>2</sub> = H. Tiktin, *Rumänisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch*, ed. a II-a, überarbeitete und ergänzte Auflage von Paul Miron, Band I–III, Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1986, 1988, 1989.