

A new papyrus codex with texts from the Pauline letters in Coptic A preliminary report

Hans-Gebhard Bethge

Resumé: *Nový koptský papyrový kodex obsahující texty z Pavlových listů – předběžná zpráva*

V souvislosti s *editio princeps* kodexu Tchacos vešla před pěti lety ve známou existenci větších částí dosud neznámého a původně objemného saidského rukopisu na papyru, jenž je v soukromém vlastnictví ve Švýcarsku. Kodex pochází pravděpodobně ze 4. století, má rozsah 21 listů (42 stran) plus fragmenty různé velikosti a obsahuje pavlovské texty z 1K, Žd, Ga, Ef, Fm, Ko a 1Te. Tento příspěvek představuje rukopis a přípravu jeho publikace. Upozorňuje též na určité textové zvláštnosti i na dosud nevyřešené otázky stran tohoto bezpochyby významného rukopisu, který se řadí k nejstarším svého druhu.

The textual basis for the New Testament in terms of antique and, in particular, Greek manuscripts has expanded steadily, albeit not very remarkably. For Coptic (textual) witnesses, however, the picture is quite different. Looking back on the last decade, we have seen an increasing number of new manuscripts. Apart from a considerable number of publications of minor manuscripts, there have been several editions of substantial manuscripts over the last few years. To give just one example, the manuscript of *Matthew* (chapter 5–28) from the Schøyen Collection, dating from the 4th century, was published more ten years ago by Hans-Martin Schenke.¹ And, in addition, the Papyrus Michigan 3520, which dates back to the same time and contains, among others, an intriguing text from *First John* and from *Second Peter*, was published in 2003.² I mention these books because the texts which were revealed because of them are exceptionally notable and therefore worth being discussed more widely. This has, unfortunately, only happened to a very limited extent up to this point.

¹ *Das Matthäus-Evangelium im mittelägyptischen Dialekt des Koptischen (Codex Schøyen). Coptic Papyri. Volume I. Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection II*, Oslo 2001.

² *Papyrus Michigan 3520 und 6868 (a). Ecclesiastes, Erster Johannesbrief und Zweiter Petrusbrief im fajumischen Dialekt*, TU 151, Berlin/New York 2003.

This paper introduces a new, as yet unknown but fairly substantial and comprehensive manuscript to the public. This manuscript is comprised of the remains of what was originally a much larger codex containing texts from the Corpus Paulinum.

Provided that the information that we have is accurate, this still unnamed codex was found by peasants near El Minia in Middle Egypt at the end of the 1970s.³ They found it along with the so called Codex Tchacos, which contains five writings (*The Letter of Peter to Philip*, [*The First Revelation of James*, *The Gospel of Judas*, *The Book of Allogenes* and parts of the hermetic tract on rebirth [CH XIII]). The find also includes a parchment codex comprising the text of the *Book of Exodus* and a mathematical treatise, both in Greek. In 1983, Stephen Emmel, a well known coptologist, was able to briefly examine the find before it was placed on the international antiquities market and became inaccessible to scientific evaluation. It was not until the year 2000, when the Swiss antique dealer Frieda Tchacos-Nussberger acquired three of the manuscripts, that the situation improved.

The codex I want to speak of, i.e. the one containing texts from the Corpus Paulinum, has been briefly referred to several times in the past, namely by Herbert Krosney⁴ as well as by Rodolphe Kasser⁵ and James M. Robinson.⁶ However, further details have not yet come to light.

Frieda Tchacos-Nussberger, the owner of the manuscript, entrusted Gregor Wurst (University of Augsburg) with editing the codex. In turn, he asked me more than two years ago whether I would like to join him in doing so and I, of course, happily and gratefully accepted.

From January to April 2010, on the occasion of an exhibition at the Augsburg University Library, a few pages of the codex were presented to

³ Cf. R. Kasser, "Lost and Found: The History of Codex Tchacos", in: R. Kasser – G. Wurst (eds.) *The Gospel of Judas. Together with The Letter of Peter to Philip, James, and A Book of Allogenes from Codex Tchacos. Critical Edition*, Washington 2007, 1–25.

⁴ *The Lost Gospel. The Quest for the Gospel of Judas Iscariot*, Washington, D. C. 2006, 111–112.

⁵ Cf. "The Story of Codex Tchacos and the Gospel of Judas", in: R. Kasser – M. Meyer – G. Wurst, *The Gospel of Judas*, Second Edition, Washington 2008, 61.

⁶ *The Secrets of Judas: The Story of the Misunderstood Disciple and His Lost Gospel*, San Francisco 2006, 117–118.

the public for the first time, together with, among others, some pages from the Codex Tchacos, including those from the Gospel of Judas.⁷ At this point and until early July 2011 the remaining parts of the originally larger codex, consisting of texts from the Corpus Paulinum, were kept in Augsburg to be prepared for their edition of the codex. During that time, Gregor Wurst put together a few fragments and a number of pages or larger passages of text could therefore be restored, at least partially. Between January 2010 and July 2011, during several stays in Augsburg, I subjected the texts to an intensive examination, sometimes with the aid of UV light, among other methods. In this way, I was able to produce preliminary transcriptions. Since the autumn of 2011, I have checked these against new photographs, as well as against transcriptions by Gregor Wurst, and we have, in addition, discussed many difficult readings. It is certain that further questions, and also perhaps new ones, will also have to be clarified on the basis of the originals, which are now back in Switzerland.

The codex that I have the pleasure of presenting here is among the oldest manuscripts of Paul that we know of. The manuscript probably dates back to the 4th century. Despite being in a partially fragmentary state, it is a rather large and voluminous manuscript. As far as I know, only the Milan Manuscript edited by Tito Orlandi⁸ is longer while being, at the same time, fairly old. The codex was written in the Middle Egyptian Coptic dialect and has been dated to the end of the 4th or the beginning of the 5th century. The Papyrus Bodmer XIX, edited by Rodolphe Kasser,⁹ originates from the same time but, in addition to *Matthew* 14–28, contains nothing more than *Romans* 1:2–2:3. Other major Coptic manuscripts have to be dated to later times, such as the codex comprising the Corpus Paulinum, published by Herbert Thompson nearly 80 years ago,¹⁰ which dates back to the 7th century; or the very large, albeit incomplete, manuscript from the Pierpont Morgan Library that dates from the 9th century.¹¹ As to the Greek textual tradition, except for Papyrus 46, we only have a more or less frag-

⁷ Cf. the exhibition catalogue: G. Hägele -G. Wurst, *Novum opus ex veteri. Vom Judas-Evangelium zur Furtmeyr-Bibel. Biblische und apokryphe Handschriften aus Antike und Mittelalter*, 2010, 6.18–23.

⁸ *Lettere di s. Paolo in copto-ossirinichita*, Milano 1974 (= Papiri dell'Università di Milano, vol. V).

⁹ *Papyrus Bodmer XIX. Evangile de Matthieu XIV,28 – XXVIII,20. Epître aux Romains I,1 – II,3 en sahidique*, Cologny-Genève 1962.

¹⁰ *The Coptic Version of the Acts of the Apostles and the Pauline Epistles. Chester Beatty Codex A/B*, Cambridge 1932.

¹¹ M 570 and M 571.

mentary confirmation in papyri and old majuscule manuscripts according to the manuscript list in Nestle-Aland.¹² Only the Codices Sinaiticus and Vaticanus and, a little later, Alexandrinus and Claromontanus, offer more material, though in different amounts thereof.

The remains of the new codex contains at least 21 sheets, that is 42 pages, many of which are more or less complete whereas others only survive in fragments or have been – as I mentioned – partially reconstructed from various fragments. The sheet size measures around 24.5 × 15.5 cm. Each sheet comprises 30 to 35 lines with about 25 letters per line respectively, occasionally containing more and sometimes fewer letters.

The following texts have been preserved:

First Corinthians (I Cor): 8:5–9:13 (2 pages)

Hebrews (Heb): 11:30–13:25 + subscription (6 pages)

Galatians (Gal): adscriptio 1:1–3:19; 4:24–27; 5:5–8 (8 pages)

Ephesians (Eph): 2:11–3:21; 4:2–12.16–20.26–29; 5:4,12.18–25;
5:27–6:1.6–12.15–20 (11 pages)

Philippians (Phil): some traces of the adscriptio as well as 1:1–3.9–28;
2:2–4.14–15 (5 pages)

Colossians (Col): 1:16–18.24–27; 2:1–3,21; 3:21–4:15 (as photograph only); 4:15–18 + subscriptio (more than 8 pages)

First Thessalonians (I Thess): adscriptio as well as 1:1–2:19 (nearly 5 pages)

Looking at the image, it is striking how different the pages appear from those belonging to the Codex Tchacos. The handwriting in particular is clearly different. There are more lines per page and more letters per line. In a way, one is reminded of some of the Nag Hammadi Codices. The face of the text is edged in red frame, thereby presenting another external feature. However, as we can see, the scribe took the liberty of repeatedly ignoring this on the right and bottom margins. Moreover, some lines are considerably longer. As can be imagined, for some fragments this complicates the reconstruction of the pages.

As with other manuscripts in the Coptic, as well as in the Greek, textual tradition, corrections appear again and again, such as in Heb 12:11 and

¹² 28. Revidierte Auflage, Stuttgart 2012, 792–810.

12:13 or Kol 3:17. Furthermore, there are also occasional slips of the pen or errors, as for example in Heb 12:10, Gal 1:17, Eph 3:4 or 1Thess 1:5. Punctuation seems rare, but occurs, for example, in Eph 3:4 and 5:11. Incidentally, a spatium can be found, as in Gal 1:13; 2:2; Col 2:11.

The language of the manuscript is Sahidic, showing however a few peculiarities. It is noticeable that, instead of a supra-linear stroke, there is often an ϵ – thus, for example, $\varrho\epsilon\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}$ instead of $\varrho\bar{\eta}$ or $\tau\epsilon\tau\epsilon\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}$ instead of $\tau\epsilon\tau\bar{\eta}$. This is not, however, always applied consistently: we can also find the version $\bar{\eta}\varrho\bar{\eta}\tau\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}$ or $\tau\bar{\eta}\rho\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}$, sometimes without the supra-linear stroke.

Some particular spellings need to be set apart from the above; for example, $\omicron\gamma\tau\epsilon$ instead of $\omicron\gamma\Delta\epsilon$ (Heb 12:5), $\Delta\Gamma$ instead of $\Delta\eta\Gamma$ (Gal 1:10), $\zeta\epsilon$ instead of $\kappa\epsilon$ (Gal 1:19) or $\text{C}\Delta\text{P}\Delta\bar{\zeta}$ instead of $\text{C}\Delta\text{P}\bar{\zeta}$ (passim), $\epsilon\eta\Delta\psi\omega\psi$ instead of $\epsilon\eta\Delta\psi\omega\psi$ (I Thess 1:5) or $\eta\omicron\gamma\tau\epsilon$ instead of $\eta\omicron\gamma\tau\epsilon$ (I Thess 1:6). As previously mentioned, a subscriptio (following Heb and Col) can be found on two occasions and twice we find a complete superscriptio (preceding Gal and I Thess).

It is also significant that various traces of pagination can be discovered and observed, most of all well preserved. Gal 1 shows traces from $\text{P}\eta\Delta$ (141). Gal 2 has got $\text{P}\eta\text{B}$ (142) and $\text{P}\eta\Delta$ (144), Heb 13:14–25 shows $\text{P}\eta$ (140). Pagination corrections occur on two pages of Heb where the erroneous count of 160 has been amended to the correct count of 130 (thus, λ instead of $\bar{\zeta}$). We find this on the pages with the texts of Heb 11:30–39 and 12:10–20.

As a result, the count of $\text{P}\lambda\Theta$ (139) is therefore accurate on the page with Heb 13:3–14. That only traces of page numbering survive, when they survive at all, is caused by the fragmentary condition of the associated pages. It is not uncommon with some of the pages that it is just their upper parts which are missing.

There is a connection between this manuscript's special sequence of Paul's Epistles and the preserved paginations. Most likely, Heb was placed before Gal. All else, however, is far from certain. It seems that the probable order was Rom, 1 and 2 Cor, Heb, Gal, Eph, Phil, Col, 1 and 2 Thess. Whether the Pastoral Epistles had been part of the codex is, however, impossible to ascertain. Presumably, Phlm was included. On the other hand, it is not conceivable to think of a sequence as in Papyrus 46, which would render the order: Rom, Heb, 1 and 2 Cor, Eph, Gal and so on. As the re-

constructed sheet of 1Cor 8 and 9 lacks pagination and nothing of Rom has been preserved, there is no solution to this question. It is unlikely that 1 and 2 Cor followed Gal. Further analysis and indexing will therefore have to consider the order of the individual epistles.

Notwithstanding the genuinely interesting question of the sequence of the individual manuscripts, another already intimated aspect emerges. As the preserved paginations reveal, the codex might not only have contained texts from the Corpus Paulinum. If Heb is somewhere around page 130 and – as one may assume – 1 and 2 Cor as well as Rom, or at least Rom, had preceded them, then space would remain for something additional. It is unclear, though, what texts or writings these could have been, and it can therefore only be speculated upon. Surprisingly enough, one page in this codex, at a rough estimate, is nearly equivalent to one page in Nestle-Aland's *Novum Testamentum Graece*. Taking into account the aforementioned long epistles, the pages occurring at the beginning may therefore have been preceded by approximately 100 pages of Pauline texts. It still remains a mystery as to what else could have been there. Earlier on, Gregor Wurst and I had considered a theory that had supposed the *Acts* to be the codex's opening script. However, this can hardly be the case as it is far too long. Careful thought could now be given to an idea that the so called Catholic epistles may have been positioned right at the beginning. The space available would probably have been sufficient. Given the state of current knowledge, however, this exciting question still awaits an answer.

Let us now look at the nature of the text itself and some of its characteristic features. In the first instance, this manuscript – to the degree to which it has been preserved and made accessible – in general displays a more or less normal text without too many or too wide a range of variations. Due to its generally fragmentary condition and the particular absence of certain passages – the whole of Rom, 2 Cor and 2 Thess and the greater part of 1 Cor – many obvious questions remain unsolved. Just to give a couple of examples, we have, sadly, no knowledge of the opening address to Ephesians nor do we have any information on the conclusion of Rom.

In spite of these issues, the preserved text shows itself to contain some remarkable facets, some of which I would now like to highlight in the established order of the manuscript.

I Cor 8:10: there is no equivalent to σέ = “you” (that is ΕΡΟΚ), which can usually be found in Coptic and in many Greek texts (ἐάν γάρ τις ἴδῃ σὲ τὸν ἔχοντα γνῶσιν = “For if any one sees you a man of knowledge”). This manuscript displays the text without “you” as does p 46 B F G latt.

Heb 11:35: ΕΜΠΟΥ[Ω]ΦΠ ΕΡΟΟΥ ΜΠΩΤΕ. This matches Greek text which, in this instance, has no variant in the edition by Nestle-Aland. Other Coptic witnesses have ΜΠΩΤΕ ΜΠΕΥΩΜΔ, which corresponds to ἀπολύτρωσιν τῶν σωμάτων αὐτῶν = “release of their body”. Hence, what we have here is obviously an inner-Coptic variant displaying a shorter text.

Heb 11:37: Other Sahidic witnesses read ΔΥΟΥΔΥΟΥ = ἐπίρθησαν (“they were sawn [into pieces]”) at the beginning of the verse. This manuscript has, again, a shorter text. The sequence is the same as in p 46. The evidence is, however, a little weak. The text is seriously damaged and one could instead think of ΔΥ[ΠΕΙ][Ρ] ΔΖ[Ε] (“they were tempted”). The Greek textual tradition has, as specialists know, many variants, mainly due to the additional ἐπειράθησαν (= “they were tempted”) that many important witnesses display and which, as far as I am aware, has not been met with in the Sahidic tradition so far.

Heb 12:4: Here we find an additional ΓΔΡ like in other manuscripts. As for the Greek tradition, this is attested for by D*L.

Heb 12:10: Here the text is shorter than usual. It is possible that this is an accidental omission, namely of the ΕΟΥΝΟΥΡΕ ΕΡΟΝ as equivalent to ἐπὶ τὸ συμφέρον (= “for our benefit” or “to a profit” or “advantage for us”), or it may be an idiosyncratic textual form: “This one, however, he makes so that we may become partakers in (or: “that we may share”) his holiness” (ΠΑΙ ΔΕ ΠΤΟΥ Π Ε[ΤΡΕ]ΝΧΙ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΕ[Μ] ΠΕΟΥΟΥ). Of course, at this stage, it is impossible to decide for sure.

Heb 12:21: As in other Coptic manuscripts, there is no equivalent in the Greek textual tradition to the καὶ at the beginning of the verse. ΝΕΥΝΟΥΖΟΥΤ[Ε] is most probably a misspelling. It has to be emended and altered into ΝΕΥ{ΟΥ}ΖΟΥΤ[Ε], which is equivalent to the Greek term φοβερὸν (“terrifying” or “fearful”).

While other Coptic witnesses translate τὸ φανταζόμενον (“the sight” or “being manifest”) as ΕΟΥΟΥΝΖ ΕΡΟΟΥ, that is, as a circumstantial clause in the present tense (a present participle), this new manuscript presents a relative clause using the past tense = perfect (ΖΟΥΤΩΣ ΝΕΥ{ΟΥ}ΖΟΥΤ[Ε Π]Ε ΝΤΑΟΥ[ΥΩΝΖ] ΕΡΟΟΥ; “it was something fearful that had appeared”).

Heb 13:4: Unlike in the Greek text and other Coptic witnesses – which do not present any variants – the ΔΥΩ (καὶ) is missing.

Heb 13:9: In this passage, provided it is not a misspelling, we come upon an inner-Coptic variant: instead of ΕΥΨΟΒΕ we find only ΨΟΒΕ as a translation for ποικίλαις (= “various”).

Gal 1:16: Unlike other Coptic manuscripts, this manuscript does not show ΕΙΕΤΑΩΘΟΕΙΩ with ΜΜΟΥ as equivalent to εὐαγγελίζομαι αὐτόν, but with

ⲙⲙⲐⲐ, which may well be the equivalent to αὐτό or αὐτά (“it”). This has not been attested to so far. Needless to say, this could be a writing error.

Gal 2:16: As in the rest of the Coptic tradition there is no δέ, as – for example – in Papyrus 46 A, at the beginning of this verse.

Gal 3:4: At the end of the verse, the second ⲈⲒⲬⲬ (“in vain”) appears to have been omitted accidentally.

Gal 3:8 et seq.: The well known end of verse 8, which is transmitted without any variants and the usual beginning of verse 9 (ⲒⲬⲐⲐⲐⲈ ⲛⲈⲈⲐⲐⲐ ⲒⲈⲛ ⲐⲐⲒⲐⲐⲐⲐⲐ = ὥστε οἱ ἐκ πίστεως (“so that those out of the faith”), most probably had not been written here. This might be an accidental omission. The state of the manuscript here does not permit us to clarify this.

Gal 3:17: If we cannot achieve better legibility, the text as we know it cannot be fitted in the lacuna, for it is too long. Similar issues occur in other passages.

Eph 3:3: At the beginning of the verse, as in other Coptic witnesses, there is no equivalent to the Greek ὅτι. The Greek tradition is ambivalent: p 46 B and other manuscripts do not have the ὅτι as opposed to, for example, Codex Sinaiticus A C D.

Eph 4:11: Despite the lacuna in the text, it is clear that the end of the verse, which is of crucial importance to the content of Eph, does not read ⲁⲒⲬⲬ ⲛⲐⲐⲁⲒ (καὶ διδασκάλους = “and [as] teachers”) like most other Coptic manuscripts but ⲒⲈⲛⲐⲐⲐⲐⲐⲐ ⲛⲐⲐⲁⲒ (= “others [as] teachers”) instead. In Greek, this would equate to τοὺς δέ before διδασκάλους, which, however, has not been attested to. Of course, not every Coptic passage is necessarily preceded by a corresponding Greek one. It may also be the result of a vagueness in the translation. One, therefore, has to be careful about assuming a certain Greek wording behind a Coptic phrase – and this does not only apply in this instance.

Eph 4:28: Here, again, the text of Eph 4:26–31 is rather fragmentary. What we can see here is nothing but a piece of 16 lines without margins on the right or left. It seems that verse 28 is shorter in its second half. It is difficult to say, though, whether any parts of the text are missing. For this passage, the Coptic tradition is not consistent. The Greek witnesses, too, show different variants, both as to the positioning of τὸ ἀγαθόν (“the good”) as well as to the occurrence of ταῖς [ἰδίας] χερσίν (“with their [own] hands”).

Col 1:25: Here the text is even more fragmentary. Provided that we are right in supposing ⲈⲐⲐⲐⲐⲐⲐ ⲈⲈⲐⲐ (πληρῶσαι = “fulfil/bring to fullness”), there was definitely more in that lacuna than the text we know of. Maybe one could think of the addition of ⲈⲒⲐⲐⲐⲐ ⲈⲐⲐⲐⲐⲐⲐ (“for you”). Of course, in the Greek tradition there is no second εἰς ὑμᾶς. As mentioned above: we have to be careful about assuming a certain Greek wording behind a Coptic phrase.

Col 2:2: In the Greek tradition, the text shows many variants, and it exhibits a few noteworthy features in this manuscript too. There is no equivalent to the genitive τῆς συνέσεως, but there is ⲈⲐⲐⲐⲐⲐⲐⲐⲐⲈⲈ (“of the understanding” or: “of the knowledge”) instead. However, this does not necessarily equate to εἰς τὴν σύνεσιν.

The end of the verse, which in both Greek and Coptic witnesses shows different variants, leads to the assumption that, originally, there was something other than ΠΝΟΥΤΕ [ΠΕΩΤ ΜΠΕΧC (του θεου πατρος του Χριστου = “of God the Father of the Christ”). A glance at the apparatus of Nestle-Aland, as well as Horner’s edition, indicates what one could have considered here. This, however, remains an assumption.

Col 2:14: In the first part of the verse, it is not possible to fill in the lacuna on the basis of the variants that we know of. It is appropriate to read ΧΙΡΟΓΡΑΦΟ[Ν ΠΑΙ] ΕΤ[ΕΡΟΝ (= “the handwriting, [this] which is/was against [us]”). The meaning remains unchanged.

As in other Coptic manuscripts, there is no equivalent to the Greek και in verse 14b. Col 2:16: Listing various items criticised by the author of the text, the new manuscript consequently puts Η (= “or”). This corresponds to Codex Sinaiticus A C D and other Greek witnesses.

Col 3:17: At the beginning of the verse we come across ΔΥΩ ΖΕΝ ΖΩΒ ΝΙΜ (“and in every thing/work”), which would be the equivalent to εν παντι εργω. Here as well, however, we have to bear in mind what I mentioned above (that we have to be rather careful about assuming a certain Greek wording behind a Coptic phrase). Instead of ΖΜ ΠΩΔΧΕ Η ΖΜ ΠΖΩΒ (εν λογω η εν εργω = “in the word or in the work”), the text displays ΝΕΜ (και = “and”).

Col 4:3 speaks of the “mystery of Christ” (Μ[ΥC]Τ[ΗΡ]ΙΟΝ ΜΠΕΧC) and not, as in other Coptic manuscripts, of the “mystery of God”, as witnessed in the Greek tradition by Codex Vaticanus (prima manus) among others.

In Col 4:8, in the purpose clause, there is a variant that has already been witnessed not only by the known Coptic tradition (ΧΕΚΑC ΕΙΘΕΙΜ[Ε] ΕΠΕΤΕΝΟΥΩ) but also in the Greek tradition by Papyrus 46 Codex Sinaiticus (correction) C D (correction) and the majority text: ἵνα γνῶ τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν (= “that I know how you are [doing]”) instead of ἵνα γνῶτε τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν (ΧΕΚΑC ΕΤΕΤΠΕΙΜΕ ΕΠΕΝΟΥΩ = “that you learn how we are [doing]”).

Col 4:12 does not, after “so that you may stand”, show any equivalent to τέλειοι και = ΠΤΕΛΕΙΟC ΔΥΩ (“perfect and ...”). As far as I know, this has neither been witnessed for in the Coptic nor in the Greek tradition. Possibly, this is an accidental omission of two words.

1 Thess 2:2: The location “in Philippi”, unlike in other Coptic manuscripts that we know of, is attributed to the verb παρρησιάζειν (= “have courage” or: “become bold”) and not to the two verbs at the beginning of the verse.

1 Thess 2:7: Here, ΝΙΚΟΥΕΙ is equivalent to the Greek term νήπιοι (= “little ones”), as in Papyrus 65, Codex Sinaiticus*, B, C, D*. Other Coptic witnesses display the equivalent of ἥπιοι (= “meek”) of Codex Sinaiticus A (correction) C (correction) D (correction).

Hans-Gebhard Bethge

Finally, we come to the question as to how work on this new codex will proceed. Given the fact that we both have some very legible pages but also pages and fragments of extremely poor legibility, it is currently impossible to give a definite or even approximate date for publication. The intended publication will be comprised of a facsimile reproduction of the manuscript in its original size as well as transcriptions thereof by way of a critical edition. Moreover, offering translations of the texts is also being considered. It goes without saying that there will also be a linguistic index and further interpretations.

Hans-Gebhard Bethge
Theologische Fakultät
Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin
bethgehg@cms.hu-berlin.de