



**HAL**  
open science

# Towards a Textual History of the Gospel of Mark in Sahidic Coptic. Prolegomena to a New Critical Edition

Anne Boud'Hors, Sofia Torallas Tovar

► **To cite this version:**

Anne Boud'Hors, Sofia Torallas Tovar. Towards a Textual History of the Gospel of Mark in Sahidic Coptic. Prolegomena to a New Critical Edition. *Novum Testamentum Graecum. Editio Critica Maior. I. Die synoptischen Evangelien. 2. Das Markusevangelium. Teil 3. Studien*, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, pp.203-220, 2021, 978-3-438-05616-D0. halshs-03328782

**HAL Id: halshs-03328782**

**<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-03328782v1>**

Submitted on 30 Aug 2021

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# Towards a Textual History of the Gospel of Mark in Sahidic Coptic. Prolegomena to a New Critical Edition

Anne Boud'hors & Sofía Torallas Tovar

The purpose of this contribution is to present the preliminary results of our research on the reconstruction of the textual history of the translation of the Gospel of Mark into Sahidic Coptic. This research is based on the study of the manuscript tradition following philological methods, though not necessarily seeking to situate the text of the Coptic versions in the Greek textual tradition. What interests us most is the history of the Sahidic Coptic text. However, clarification on the history of the Sahidic versions could undoubtedly be revealing for the history of the Greek text (see in particular the relation with the W manuscript).<sup>1</sup> To attain this goal, however, the history of the transmission in Coptic must be elucidated first. More precisely, this means we do not envisage cases (except as an exception, by way of comparison) where the Sahidic tradition is uniform and situated on one side or the other of the Greek tradition, most often as a witness to the Alexandrian text, as Hans Quecke has already noted. The cases that interest us are those in which the Sahidic tradition is divided and there are possible explanations for divergence. We maintain that this division is not arbitrary but can be accounted for, going somewhat beyond the cautious conclusions of H. Quecke in his introduction to the edition of sa1.<sup>2</sup> We believe that we have arrived at a general outline that is more or less satisfactory for the history of the tradition, even if there are still large areas of doubt.

We are now in a position to give the following conclusions:

- We can clearly discern three different branches of the manuscript tradition, two of them represented by complete manuscripts.
- Each manuscript—or fragment thereof—of the Gospel of Mark can be assigned to one of these three branches (albeit with some uncertainties).
- We can provide a detailed account of a number of variants, possibly in relation to the Greek tradition.

---

<sup>1</sup> We refer to Greek manuscripts according to the following sigla corresponding to the GA numbers: 01 = Ⲙ; 02 = A; 03 = B; 04 = C; 05 = D; 032 = W; 038 = Θ.

<sup>2</sup> H. Quecke, *Das Markusevangelium Saidisch. Text der Handschrift PPalau Rib. Inv.-Nr.182 mit den Varianten der Handschrift M569*, Barcelona 1972, p. 48: «In den Abweichungen zeigt sich keine unmittelbar in die Augen grössere Affinität zu einer bestimmten Textform oder Handschrift(engruppe)».

Our ultimate goal is a new critical edition of Mark. This article is just one more step in the process, in order to make our hypotheses and results as clear as possible. Concretely, this could mean one day, if editors of critical editions of the Greek NT agree, that it would be possible to simply cite “sa1/saI, saII, sa9/saIII” in the apparatus of Mark to distinguish three different Coptic traditions.

## 1. The Three Branches of the Textual Tradition: History of Research

Although already highlighted in various publications, the main steps of the research on Sahidic Mark must be summarized again here as a preamble, including the editorial history of Mark and a description of the most recent developments.<sup>3</sup>

### 1.1 The contribution of complete manuscripts

Until 1972, the text of the Gospel of Mark was known only through fragments, gathered in Horner’s edition,<sup>4</sup> where it was impossible to see any coherence. In 1972, Hans Quecke published an edition of a complete manuscript of the Gospel of Mark dating to the 5<sup>th</sup> century, kept in Barcelona (henceforth sa1);<sup>5</sup> this MS included variants of another complete manuscript, kept at the Pierpont Morgan Library in New York (M569), which was a later manuscript (datable to the 9<sup>th</sup> century) and at that point still unpublished. In his introduction, Quecke noted a general agreement of the text with the Alexandrian Greek type (represented by the Greek manuscript B), as well as some Western variants. It later turned out that this manuscript was part of a Gospel manuscript in which the Gospel of Mark occupied the fourth position, in accordance with the so-called “Western” order. Quecke also noted a significant number of discrepancies between the various Sahidic witnesses.

In 1973, reporting on Quecke’s edition, Tito Orlandi hypothesized that the Coptic textual tradition could be divided into two branches, based on linguistic and textual arguments:<sup>6</sup> a presumably **ancient** version, that could be called “short” version, attested by the Barcelona manuscript and a witness

---

<sup>3</sup> A slightly different version of this story in French is available online (<https://manuscripts.hypotheses.org/3971> and <https://manuscripts.hypotheses.org/3995>).

<sup>4</sup> G. W. Horner, *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Southern Dialect*, Volume 1: Matthew and Mark, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1911.

<sup>5</sup> P. Palau Ribes inv. 182. Quecke, *Das Markusevangelium*.

<sup>6</sup> T. Orlandi, review of H. Quecke, *Das Markusevangelium Săidisch* (1972), *Studia Papyrologica* XII (1973), p. 107-109.

in Horner's edition (no. 72, now sa 162) and a longer **revised** version, represented by the majority of fragments from Horner's edition and by M569 (henceforth sa 9).<sup>7</sup>

In 1985, Anne Boud'hors identified another fragmentary witness to the "ancient" tradition at the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris (Horner no. 18, now sa 143), which confirmed Orlandi's hypothesis. In an attempt to characterize a few textual variants to distinguish the two versions, Anne Boud'hors hypothesized that the early version reflected an Egyptian type of text, while the variants of the long version often reflected a Palestinian type.<sup>8</sup> This hypothesis must be considered insufficient, if not false. On the one hand, not all the variants can be characterized as "Palestinian" (or "Caesarean"); on the other hand, contacts are clear only with the text of manuscript W, they are much rarer with the other witnesses of the "Caesarean" group.

Between 1986 and 1991 the three volumes of the *Liste der Koptischen Handschriften der Evangelien* were published in Münster, a comprehensive list of the Sahidic Coptic manuscripts of the Gospels, which now allowed a complete study of the manuscript tradition.<sup>9</sup>

In 1992, the number of witnesses to the early version could be increased to four, and it became possible to study more closely the differences between the two main versions (at that time called T1 and T2), on lexical, morpho-syntactic, and textual levels.<sup>10</sup> The conclusions confirmed Tito Orlandi's article: the revision performed by T2 aimed at precision of expression, updating certain archaisms and also, to a large extent, linguistic harmonization with the parallel passages of Matthew and Luke in Coptic. This tendency towards harmonization was clearly reflected in a large number of textual variants differentiating the two versions of the Gospel of Mark; such harmonizing variants were sometimes shared by witnesses of the Palestinian (or Caesarean) type, but the question of whether it was really necessary to go back to a Greek model or whether it was sufficient to invoke a harmonization made with the Coptic translations of the other gospels, remained open. We will return to this question in the third

---

<sup>7</sup> This manuscript, from the Library of Saint Michael in Fayyum, was edited by G. Aranda Perez, *El evangelio de san Marcos en copto sahidico* Madrid 1988 (Textos y estudios "Cardenal Cisneros"). The so-called critical apparatus of this edition is riddled with errors and almost unusable. The manuscript was later described by L. Depuydt, *Catalogue of Coptic Manuscripts in the Pierpont Morgan Library*, Leuven 1993, n° 13.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. A. Boud'hors, "Fragments coptes-sahidiques du Nouveau Testament à la Bibliothèque nationale de Paris", in *Actes du colloque "Bible et informatique: le texte" (Louvain-la-Neuve, 2-4 sept. 1985)*, pp. 389-398. Orlandi's review, unknown to the author at that point, was not used in this article. The work on Mark was carried out at the time within the framework of the "Marc multilingue" project, directed by C.-B. Amphoux, and based his selections on the types of text represented by the Greek majuscule manuscripts.

<sup>9</sup> F.-J. Schmitz & G. Mink, *Liste der koptischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments. I. Die sahidischen Handschriften der Evangelien*, Bd I.1, I.2.1, I.2.2, Münster 1986, 1989, 1991.

<sup>10</sup> A. Boud'hors, "L'Évangile de Marc en copte-sahidique: essai de clarification", *Acts of the Fifth International Congress of Coptic Studies*, vol. 2, Rome, 1993, pp. 53-65.

part of this article. Finally, a rudimentary *stemma* of the Sahidic Mark manuscript tradition was proposed, in which sa 9 occupied a floating, intermediate position between the two editions.

From 2001 on, the authors of this paper worked together to establish a new critical edition, chapter by chapter.<sup>11</sup> We distinguished three types of text for the Sahidic version:

- “sa 1”, the main witness of the “ancient” version
- “sa 9”, the main “mixed” version which, because of its floating position, could not always be clearly linked to one or the other versions
- “sa II” to refer to the “revised” recension, which cannot be represented by a single manuscript, given the fragmentary nature of the documentation, but by several manuscripts that must be collated to ensure that they did indeed present the same type of text.

## 1.2 Recent Discoveries and Progress

### 1.2.1. Discovery of sa92

The identification of fragments of a papyrus codex of the Gospel of Mark in the collection of the University of Leipzig was made in 2008 by T. Sebastian Richter. The text was quickly identified as a witness to sa I. Several years of joint work with the directors and conservator of the collection led to the reconstruction of the codex and the editing of the text (P.Lips. Inv. 3000).<sup>12</sup> Twenty-nine leaves are extant, ranging from an almost complete leaf (32 cm high x 20 cm wide) to small fragments of one or two cm<sup>2</sup>. The leaves contained the text of Mk 6:14 to 15:17 in a very uneven state of preservation. Internal criteria, such as state of language and codicological characteristics as well as external criteria, i.e. circumstances of acquisition, allow us to situate the production of this codex in the Fayyum, and a date of 7<sup>th</sup>-8<sup>th</sup> century can be proposed on the basis of paleography. This manuscript is the best-preserved witness of the sa I

---

<sup>11</sup> An example of this presentation is A. Boud'hors & S. Torallas Tovar, « Mc 1,1-11. La tradition manuscrite copte », in *Évangile de Marc. Les types de texte dans les langues anciennes (Mélanges de Sciences Religieuses 62.2)*, Lille, 2005, pp. 37-49. The work was still part of the above-mentioned project “Marc multilingue”.

<sup>12</sup> This codex was briefly presented in A. Boud'hors, “The Gospel of Mark in Sahidic Coptic: new insights”, in Buzi, Paola, Alberto Camplani, and Federico Contardi, eds. *Coptic Society, Literature and Religion from Late Antiquity to Modern Times. Proceedings of the Tenth International Congress of Coptic Studies, Rome, September 17th-22th, 2012 and Plenary Reports of the Ninth International Congress of Coptic Studies, Cairo, September 15th-19th, 2008*. *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 247. Leuven 2016, pp. 855-864. The edition of the text is forthcoming: A. Boud'hors, “Fragments d'un codex de papyrus de l'évangile de Marc (6,14-15,27). P.Lips. Inv. 3000 (sa 92)”, Leipzig.

tradition, apart from the manuscript sa 1. Some of its features are presented in the article by K. Schroeder and S. Richter.<sup>13</sup>

### 1.2.2. The corrections of sa 123

The manuscript sa 123 (Horner 73), a tetra-gospel from the White Monastery, whose fragments are scattered between London, Paris, and Venice, is datable to the 9<sup>th</sup>-10<sup>th</sup> century. It features substantial corrections in its section of the Gospel of Mark, in the form of marginal additions, lines, or portions of lines scratched and erased, sometimes replaced by another text, written on top, or in the interlinear or marginal space. The way in which Horner noted these corrections in his apparatus made it impossible to deduce what might have motivated them. Once we had all the images of the Gospel of Mark's leaves (nine in total) at our disposal, we studied these corrections closely and understood their general characteristics, which can be described in three overall observations:<sup>14</sup> 1) the text of sa 123, before correction, is in general affiliated to sa I, with some contaminations of sa II and some readings of its own; 2) the corrections aim at bringing the text closer to that of sa II; 3) the corrections are not systematic.

The text of this manuscript has also been studied in detail in Schroeder and Richter's article, with sa 123\* designating its initial state and sa 123C its corrected state. It suffices here to underline the implication that seems to follow from the process of correcting sa 123: on the one hand, sa 123\* can be seen as an additional witness to sa I; on the other hand, sa 123C is a mixed text between sa I and sa II, which we see under construction; sa 9 could be the result of a compilation work of the same kind, but not identical.

### 1.2.3. The family sa III

Finally, by working on the critical edition of certain chapters, we have been able to establish that three other manuscripts: sa 125, sa 152, and sa 156 are quite closely affiliated with sa 9. This allows us to define sa 9 as the principal, perhaps oldest, representative of the main mixed type, attested in a family of four manuscripts. It is tempting to call this type "saIII".

---

<sup>13</sup> See pages XX-XX in the present volume.

<sup>14</sup> A. Boud'hors & S. Torallas Tovar, "Philological Work on the Sahidic Gospel of Mark in the Ninth Century: The Case of sa 123", *Journal of Coptic Studies* 22 (2020) pp. 29-44.

#### 1.2.4. Collaboration with the INTF

While, as stated above, our research was mainly situated within the framework of the “Marc multilingue” project, the collaboration with our Münster colleagues, first Gerd Mink and Franz-Jürgen Schmitz, and then Richter and Schroeder, was always fruitful. Mink’s caution concerning the difficulties of comparing Greek and Coptic texts remains valid.<sup>15</sup> Regular maintenance of the SMR has allowed us to update our documentation. For about a year we have been able to work with the “Zeilenversion,” developed by Richter and Schroeder, thanks to which many details could be finalized in the classification of the manuscripts and study of the variants.

In light of the assessment described above, the history of the transmission of the Sahidic text can be reconstructed as follows:

(a) There is an “ancient” translation (sa I) whose earliest witness is the sa 1 manuscript; this translation may have been produced in the Fayyum towards the end of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century. For the moment, it is only a hypothesis, which needs to be supported by a precise study of the language of the manuscript sa 1. On the textual level, given the date of this version and the fact that the Greek text of Mark remained subject to variation for a long time, the variants of sa I should be closely considered, especially those that do not seem to be attested in Greek.

(b) The ancient translation was thoroughly revised, both linguistically and textually (sa II). The earliest witness to this revised translation could be a quotation from Mk 9:3 in Canon 8 of Shenoute, who was superior of the White Monastery from the end of the 4<sup>th</sup> to the middle of the 5<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>16</sup> It is possible that the revision took place at the White Monastery, under the supervision of Shenoute himself, but this remains a hypothesis.<sup>17</sup>

(c) Both translations are in circulation; the ancient translation sa I remains the minority and seems to circulate more in the Fayyum and northern Middle Egypt. (It is also less uniform, with witnesses

---

<sup>15</sup> *Die koptischen Versionen des Neuen Testaments: Die sprachlichen Probleme bei ihrer Bewertung für die griechische Textgeschichte*, Berlin 1972.

<sup>16</sup> The manuscript that provides this quotation is from the 8<sup>th</sup> century, but it is generally believed that Shenoute’s works were transmitted in a very stable way: see A. Boud’hors, *Le Canon 8 de Chénouté (d’après le manuscrit Ifao Copte 2 et les fragments complémentaires). Introduction, édition critique, traduction*, Le Caire 2013, vol. 2, p. 411 et n. 369.

<sup>17</sup> This hypothesis could be supported by the fact that the manuscript sa 143, copied at the White Monastery in the 7<sup>th</sup> or 8<sup>th</sup> century, is one of the few manuscripts in Upper Egypt to attest to sa I, basis for the revision of sa II. See below on sa 143 at the White Monastery.

bearing traces of contamination.) The revised translation sa II seems to be used in the entire Nile Valley. The majority of lectionaries use sa II, except for two (which appear to be related to the Fayyum).<sup>18</sup>

(d) In the 9<sup>th</sup> century, the first witnesses of a mixed text appear, the result of a compilation of the two translations sa I and sa II. Now it is no longer a question of sporadic contamination but of a true “new text.” This is shown, on the one hand, by the manuscript sa 123, which reveals how the compilation could have been done and, on the other hand, by the existence of a “family” (sa III) composed by sa 9, sa 125, sa 152, and sa 156. This fact shows that at least one mixed type was authoritative, but it is likely that other manuscripts attest to various types of mixed texts.

## 2. Classification of manuscripts

A practical consequence of these recent advances is that it is now possible to classify almost all witnesses into one of the three textual categories. The table of distribution of the manuscripts proposed below should be used with the awareness that most of the manuscripts are very fragmentary. (See the article by Richter and Schroeder in this volume for details on the attestation chapter by chapter.) Thus, sa I is often attested only by sa 1, and sa II is sometimes lacking for whole verses. We have not mentioned the date of the witnesses (for this, see Richter and Schroeder). Certainly, dating Coptic manuscripts is a hazardous task. It can be argued, however, that in general manuscripts in bimodular script are later than those in biblical majuscule.<sup>19</sup> Regarding the provenance of the manuscripts, it seems that, unless there is evidence to the contrary, sa I was used mainly in Fayyum, and in northern Middle Egypt, while sa II is widespread throughout Upper Egypt (probably from Hermopolis), with mixed types found in the two great libraries of the Monastery of St. Michael in Hamuli and the White Monastery, the latter probably imported many manuscripts from the Fayyum in the 10<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>20</sup>

The following five charts contain the manuscripts and manuscript fragments distributed in the three versions described above (sa I, sa II and sa III), followed by a group of mixed texts that do not coincide exactly with sa III, and a section for unclassified fragments.

---

<sup>18</sup> A. Boud'hors, “L’apport des lectionnaires à l’histoire du texte copte sahidique de l’évangile de Marc”, in D. Atanassova & T. Chronz (eds.), *Beiträge zu Gottesdienst und Geschichte der fünf altkirchlichen Patriarchate für Heinzgerd Brakmann zum 70. Geburtstag* Münster u. a. 2014 (*orientalia – patristica – oecumenica* 6,1–2), pp. 39–46.

<sup>19</sup> On Coptic paleography, see A. Boud'hors, “Issues and Methodologies in Coptic Palaeography”, in *The Oxford Handbook of Egyptian Epigraphy and Palaeography*, ed. V. Davies & D. Laboury, Oxford 2020, chap. IV.8, pp. 617–633.

<sup>20</sup> Depuydt, *Catalogue of Coptic Manuscripts*, 1, p. CXV. C. Nakano, “Indices d’une chronologie relative des manuscrits coptes copiés à Toutôn (Fayoum)”, *Journal of Coptic Studies* 8 (2006) pp. 147–159.

Abbreviations:

SMR	= Schmitz-Mink-Richter database ( <a href="http://intf.uni-muenster.de/smr/">http://intf.uni-muenster.de/smr/</a> )
Horner	= Horner's mss numbers or shelf mark when the manuscript was not registered by Horner.
Mat.	= Material (not specified when it is parchment)
Pps	= papyrus
WM	= White Monastery
Bibl. Maj.	= Biblical majuscule
Bimod.	= bimodular script
Unimod.	= unimodular script (different of Biblical maj.)

**Manuscripts belonging to sa I**

SMR	H(orner)	Mat.	Provenance	Script	Remarks
sa 1	P.Palau Ribes 182		?	Bibl. maj.	5 <sup>th</sup> century, oldest witness of Mark
sa 40	NY, PM 664 B(5)		WM?	Bimod.	Copied in Fayyum?
sa 92	P.Lips. 3000	Pps	Fayyum	Unimod.	Some peculiar readings
sa 94	Oxford, Bodl. Ms.Copt.c.62(P)		?	Bimod.	Palimpsest, underlying text
sa 109	H 70 + 106		WM	Bimod.	Copied in Fayyum? <sup>21</sup> Traces of contamination sa II and sa 9
sa 123*	H 73		WM	Bimod.	Fayyumic style?
sa 143	H 18		WM	Bibl. maj.	Oldest witness of sa I in the WM
sa 162	H 72 + 77 <i>part</i>		WM	Bimod.	Some peculiar readings, very little contamination
sa 188	Paris, BnF 161(10), f. 145a-d		?	Bimod.	Some peculiar readings, but basic affinity with sa1
sa 253	Louvain-L-N, coll. Lefort		?	Bimod. ?	Very fragmentary, but no affinity with sa II
sa 477	NY, PM 601, f. 11		Fayyum (from a binding)	Bimod.	Close to sa 1, with some peculiar readings and some sa 9 readings
sa 480	Cairo, Coptic Museum 3776 (239)		WM ?	Bimod.	Small fragment

<sup>21</sup> The script is close to that of the White Monastery manuscripts written in Fayyumic.

sa 483	Cairo, Coptic Museum 3810 (257)		WM ?	?	Lectionary?
sa 15L	NY, PM 573		Fayyum	Bimod.	Close to sa 1, with some peculiar readings and some sa 9 readings
sa 298L	H 15 <sup>L</sup> + 26 <sup>L</sup> + 30 <sup>L</sup>		WM	Bimod.	Copied in Fayyum?

### Manuscripts belonging to sa II

SMR	Horner	Mat.	Provenance	Script	Remarks
sa 7	H g	Pps	Thebes	Bibl. maj.	
sa 102	H 8		WM	Bibl. maj.	
sa 103	H 20		WM	Bibl. maj.	
sa 112	H 114 + H 134		WM	Bimod., sloping	Not always reliable (peculiar or mixed)
sa 113	H 38 + H 66		WM	Bibl. maj.	
sa 120	H 9		WM	Bibl. maj.	
sa 121	H 13 + H 40		WM	Bibl. maj.	
sa 122	H 51		WM	Bibl. maj.	
sa 127	H 110		WM	Bimod.	Copied in Fayyum? Some peculiar readings and traces of influence from sa 9
sa 129	H 130		WM	Bibl. maj.	
sa 131	H 37		WM	Bibl. maj.	
sa 133	H 50 + H 48		WM	Bibl. maj.	
sa 140	H 14 + 64 part		WM	Bibl. maj.	
sa 144	H 15		WM	Bibl. maj.	
sa 147	H 74		WM	Bimod.	Some peculiar readings
sa 149	Louvain-L-N coll Lefort		?	?	
sa 151	H 55		WM	Bibl. maj.	
sa 158	H 10		WM	Bibl. maj.	
sa 160	H 83		WM	Bimod.	
sa 161	H 56		WM	Bibl. maj.	
sa 189	H 81		WM	Bimod.	Some peculiar readings
sa 198	H 113		WM	Bimod.	
sa 213	Inv. Sorbonne 2518	Pps	Middle Egypt	Bibl. maj.	Oldest witness of sa II (5-6 <sup>th</sup> cent.?)

sa 230	H 61		?	Bibl. maj.	
sa 245	Heidelberg Inv. 256	Pps	?	Bimod.	Small fragments
sa 249	Berlin P.22088	Pps	?	Bimod.	Fragment
sa 281	Dublin, Chester Beatty	Pps	?	?	Small fragment
sa 287	Vienna, K 7530	Pps	Upper Egypt	Bimod.	
sa 366	P.Duke inv 814		?	Bibl. maj.	Very small fragment
sa 470	Cairo, Coptic Museum 3845(268)		Antinoe ( ?)	Bimod.	
sa 474	H 103 + 108 <i>part</i>		WM	Bimod., Touton style	Formerly sa 134 <sup>22</sup> Lectionary?
sa 476	Private coll (formerly Caldwell)		WM ?	Bibl. maj.	
sa 478	London, BL Or 6954(3)		WM	Bibl. maj.	Possibly joins another WM manuscript?
sa 481	Vienna, K 7536-40, 7563	Pps	Upper Egypt	Bibl. maj.	Same script as sa 242 ?
sa 484	Oslo, fr. 19		WM	Bibl. maj.	Joins another WM manuscript ?
-----	Deir el Bahari, Inv. 826	Pps	Deir el- Bahari (Thebes)	Bimod.	Small fragment
-----	QIC 1966a		Qasr Ibrim	Bimod.	From Nubia !
sa 14L	NY, PM 615		WM ? <sup>23</sup>	Bibl. maj.	Bilingual Greek-Coptic
sa 16L	H m <sup>L</sup>	Pape r	WM ?	Bimod.	Bilingual Coptic-Arabic
sa 291L	H f <sup>L</sup>	Pape r	WM ?	Bimod.	Glosses in Arabic
sa 292L	H g <sup>L</sup>	Pape r	WM ?		
sa 294L	H b <sup>L</sup>		WM	Bimod.	
sa 296L	H 33 <sup>L</sup>		WM	Bimod.	
sa 297L	H a <sup>L</sup> <i>part.</i>		WM	Bibl. maj.	3 columns
sa 301L	H 4 <sup>L</sup> + 6 <sup>L</sup>		WM	Bibl. maj.	
sa 303L	Hg <sup>L</sup> <i>part.</i> + 18 <sup>L</sup> + 44 <sup>L</sup>		WM	Bimod.	Many peculiar and/or harmonizing readings
sa 315L	H 2 <sup>L</sup>		WM	Bibl. maj.	Single fragment
sa 320L	Vienna, K 9105		WM	Bibl. maj.	

<sup>22</sup> SMR classifies only BnF 161(4) f. 26h under this number, but Oxford, Bodl. 11b f. 7 (= sa 134 I) possibly belongs to it.

<sup>23</sup> It does not come from the Hamuli find (Depuydt, *Catalogue of Coptic Manuscripts*, p. LXIX).

sa 323L	H 30		WM	Bimod.	
sa 335L	H g <sup>L</sup> + a <sup>L</sup> <i>part.</i>		WM	Bibl. maj.	Bilingual Greek-Coptic, 3 columns
sa 336L	H 3 <sup>L</sup> + 5 <sup>L</sup>		WM	Bibl. maj.	Partially bilingual Greek-Coptic
sa 343L	London, BL Or 7021 II-IV	Paper	Upper Egypt (Esna ?)	Bibl. maj.	Bilingual Greek-Coptic dated to the 987 CE

### Manuscripts belonging to sa9/saIII

sa 9	NY, PM 569		Fayyum	Bimod.	Complete manuscript
sa 125	H 86 <i>partim</i>		WM	Bimod.	Script close to Fayyumic mss of the WM
sa 152	H 127		WM	Bimod.	Like sa 125, but less fluent
sa 156	H 120		WM	Bimod.	Fayyumic style (decoration and diacritics)

### Other mixed texts

sa 53	NY, PM 664 A(5)		WM ?	Bimod., Touton style	
sa 123C	H 73 <sup>c</sup>		WM	Bimod.	Manuscript corrected and lined up (incompletely) with sa II
sa 134	H 103 + 108 <i>part</i>		WM	Bimod., Touton style	Quite close to sa 1/sa 9, with some cumulative readings (sa 1/sa 9 + sa II)
sa 165	H 77 <i>part e</i> + 84 + 107		WM	Bimod.	
sa 650	Munich, BSB, no.? (lost)		?	Bimod.?	Uncertain, because small

### Manuscripts not yet classified

sa 51	NY, PM 664 B(32)		WM ?	Bimod.	Too small, but seems to have peculiar readings
sa 146	H 54		WM	Bibl. maj.	Too small
sa 233	Manchester, JRL, Copt. Ms. 32 b			Bimod.	Palimpsest, underlying text; too small
sa 242	Vienna, K 7457	Pps	Upper Egypt ?	Bibl. maj.	Very small; script as sa 481?
sa 471	Dublin, TCD, fr.		?	Bimod.,	Too small

	11062/8			Touton style	
sa 304L	H 19 <sup>L</sup>			Bimod.?	Too small (sa I with contamination?)
sa 311L	Dublin, CBL 2025	Pps	?	?	Too small
sa 333L	Paris, BnF 133(2) f. 8b		WM	Bimod.	sa II or sa 9 (long ending of Mark)
sa 349L	H 1 <sup>L</sup>	Paper	WM		Bilingual Coptic-Arabic; a single verse
sa 357L	London, BL Or 7029	Paper	Esna	Bimod.	Lectionary; long ending; peculiar
-----	H e <sup>L</sup>				lost?

## 2.1. sa 1 or sa I?

It remains problematic to determine whether there really was a sa I version, given the insufficient attestation of Mark's text for this type outside of the Barcelona manuscript, sa 1. Of the fourteen witnesses in our table, most are either very small or have suspected contamination. However, the three most faithful witnesses of sa I, namely sa 92, sa 143, and, to a lesser extent, sa 162, allow us to refine some of the relationships between them and sa 1.

These witnesses do not share all the singularities of sa 1, however, as seen in the following examples:

(a) 3:1 (and 3:3): in the healing of the man with the "dry hand", the Greek ἐξηραμμένη is translated in sa 1 with □□□□□, "dead"; this variant, which does not find an echo in the Greek, is perhaps a free translation. It is not taken up by sa 162, which has υ□□□□□ like the rest of the sa witnesses.

(b) 7:35: "and immediately his ears were opened, and the bond of his tongue was loosened"; sa 1 omits "immediately" (variant attested in Greek) and repeats "opened" (□□□□□□) instead of "loosened" (□□□□□ □□□□), which seems more like an error than a variant. In fact, sa 92, sa 109, and sa 143 omit "immediately" and have instead "loosened."<sup>24</sup>

Moreover, sa I witnesses are rarely free of contamination, to varying degrees; sa 92 is probably the closest to sa 1, but with particular readings. Among the manuscripts of the White Monastery, sa 143 is

<sup>24</sup> Observe, however, that sa 92 and sa 143 only have □□□□□ (without □□□□□).

the closest witness to sa 1, It is particularly precious because its handwriting (Biblical majuscule) allows us to establish that it was copied at the White Monastery and is therefore the oldest witness to the presence of sa I in the monastery.<sup>25</sup> However, sa 143 is not directly dependent on sa 1; it differs from it with minor variations, at least two of which are especially important. In 7:30, sa 143 reads □□ □□□□ ρ□□□□ (translation of ἐξεληλυθός), a contamination between sa 1 (□□ ρ□□□□, supported by sa 9 and sa 109) and sa II (□□ □□□□ □ρ□□□□).<sup>26</sup> In 8:3, sa 143 does not omit “go home” (□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ / Greek εἰς οἶκον αὐτῶν) which is found in sa 1 (and in sa 92) possibly due to the influence of the parallel passage of Mt 15:32.

## 2.2. Variety of mixed types

Our preliminary work on sa 123, which has undergone more or less systematic corrections, has shown that sa 123\* (the manuscript before corrections) was also a fairly good witness of sa I (but not free of contamination), while sa 123C (the manuscript after corrections) presents a text that is in many places close to sa II, thus a mixed type, comparable but not identical to that attested by sa 9. For the latter, we have been able to identify three manuscripts (sa 125, sa 152, sa 156), which present somewhat similar paleographic characteristics as sa 9. These Mss are more particularly related to sa 9 on the textual level and constitute a kind of family, which we propose calling “sa III.” It appears that there are several types of mixed texts in the manuscripts copied in the Fayyum or in the continuation of this compilation work (possibly carried out in the White Monastery as well, after the 9<sup>th</sup> century). The relationships between these different manuscripts remain to be refined. The example of the relationship between sa 123 (from the White Monastery) and sa 9 (copied at the Fayyum) is a good illustration of this. They share very few exclusive affinities:

- 2:6: sa 123 as well as sa 9 omit ρ□□□□, but for the rest the text agrees with sa I ;
- 11:30: sa 123\* aligns with sa 9 in reading □χ□□ □□□□, vs. □χ□□ □□□ sa 1 and sa II; this is all the more confusing since the reading □□□□ is not taken up by sa 125 and sa 156, although they are from the same family as sa 9;

<sup>25</sup> It remains difficult to date sa 143 precisely. Perhaps to the 7<sup>th</sup>-8<sup>th</sup> century.

<sup>26</sup> This could also be the reading of sa 92 : [. . □□□□ ρ□□]□□.

- 12:26: sa 123 and sa 9 (and sa 156) have ϣⲓ ⲓⲓⲓⲓⲓⲓ, whereas ϣⲓ ⲓⲓⲓⲓⲓⲓ is read in sa 1, sa II (and sa 125).

The existence of these mixed types raises several questions about the reasons for and timing of the compilation work. If the first witnesses to such work date from the 9<sup>th</sup> century and if, as we have seen, the work was undertaken in the Fayyum region, it is tempting to relate this philological work to the constitution (or reconstitution) of the library of the monastery of Saint Michael in the Fayyum, which likely took place between about 840 and 920.<sup>27</sup> The need for new manuscripts could have led those involved in their production (copyists, clergymen, monks) to realize there was a lack of a homogeneous text for Mark and try to revise it once again. The relationship between the Fayyum and Upper Egypt probably always existed, but a circulation of manuscripts from the scriptorium of Touton (Fayyum) – where part of the manuscripts of Saint Michael were produced – to the White monastery is well attested in the 10<sup>th</sup> century, which could explain the presence of mixed types of witnesses in the White monastery.

### 2.3. sa II in Upper Egypt

The revised translation sa II seems to have been the only version in use throughout the Nile Valley. Most lectionaries use sa II, except for two (which appear to be Fayyum-related). As noted above, the White Monastery provided an impressive number of witnesses to sa II, and the attestation of this type in a manuscript of Shenoute's sermons raises the question of whether the monastery itself was where the revision of the translation took place. Witnesses of sa II outside the White Monastery allow us to identify the extent of its spread.

Although they are even more fragmentary than the parchment manuscripts, the papyrus witnesses are nevertheless valuable since they are survivors of manuscripts from libraries other than the two main ones already mentioned. Now, with the exception of sa 92, a papyrus codex copied in the Fayyum and witness to sa I, the other papyrus manuscripts are witnesses to sa II. This is expected for Upper Egyptian manuscripts, such as sa 7, which comes from a manuscript copied in the region of present-day Luxor in the 7<sup>th</sup>-8<sup>th</sup> centuries, or the small fragment of Dayr al-Bahari (same provenance), or sa 287, of unknown precise provenance but probably from the same region.<sup>28</sup> It is also the case for sa 245

---

<sup>27</sup> See L. Depuydt, *Catalogue of Coptic Manuscripts*, pp. CXII-CXVI.

<sup>28</sup> A. Boud'hors & E. Garel, "Que reste-t-il de la bibliothèque du monastère de Saint-Phoibammon?", in A. Łajtar, A. Obłuski, I. Zych (eds.), *Aegyptus et Nubia Christiana. The Włodzimierz Godlewski Jubilee Volume on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday*, Warsaw 2016, pp. 47-60.

and sa 249, fragments whose provenance is uncertain; the fragment sa 213<sup>29</sup> is of particular importance because its codicological and paleographical characteristics allow us to attribute an early date to it, perhaps as early as that of sa 1, making it the oldest witness to sa II, while a provenance from a monastery in Middle Egypt (more likely the region of Antinoupolis) can be proposed. This is interesting for two reasons: it is an attestation of sa II in this region and provides a date for the revision of sa II. Note also that sa 470 is a parchment fragment supposedly from Sheikh Abadeh (Antinoe) and that it has the sa II text type. Finally, an unpublished leaf from Qasr Ibrim in Nubia provides the first 19 verses of Mk 1 in the sa II translation.<sup>30</sup>

To these various fragments the witness of some non-literary texts can be added, especially amulets, which contain the beginning (and sometimes the end) of the four gospels.<sup>31</sup> The most interesting is an amulet preserved in Freiburg, which contains the beginning and end of Mark in a translation conforming to sa I, notably with the “short” ending of the Gospel in 16:8. In two parietal inscriptions in an equally magical context—one in Abydos (Upper Egypt) and the other in Nubia— sa II is used for the ending of Mark (16:18b-20 and 16:20 respectively).<sup>32</sup> A tablet from Qarara (northern Middle Egypt), dated 8<sup>th</sup>-9<sup>th</sup> century, attests Mk 6:23-27 in a translation that seems to be of a mixed type: in this region, the influence of sa I is thus still significant at a rather late period.<sup>33</sup> We can therefore estimate that sa II was in circulation from the south of Oxyrhynchos to Nubia.

### 3. Selection of variants

In this section we seek to illustrate in as representative a manner as possible the main dynamics of variation from one tradition to another. After studying the translation of *καί* in the gospel as a whole, we present, as a series of case studies, the most striking variants of seven of the sixteen chapters (1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 11, 14).

---

<sup>29</sup> Inv. Sorbonne 2518, edited by M. Pezin, “Coptica Sorbonica II”, *LOAPL* 4 (1993), pp. 41-55, esp. 44-45. New edition by A. Boud’hors forthcoming in *Coptica Sorbonensia*.

<sup>30</sup> We are grateful to Joost Hagen for providing an image and transcription of this fragment.

<sup>31</sup> These testimonies have not been included in the database SMR. On Biblical incipits in amulets, see Joseph E. Sanzo, *Scriptural Incipits on Amulets from Late Antique Egypt*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2014, esp. pp. 77-102 for artifacts with Gospel incipits.

<sup>32</sup> On these witnesses see A. Boud’hors & Sofia Torallas Tovar, “A propos d’une inscription copte du temple d’Abydos : retour sur les finales de l’évangile de Marc en copte”, forthcoming.

<sup>33</sup> Edition A. Delattre & K. A. Worp, “Trois tablettes de bois du Musée de Leyde”, *Chronique d’Egypte* 87 8.1(2012), pp. 361-382, esp. pp. 371-374.

### 3.1. The translation of *καί*

The Greek text of Mark includes a large number of occurrences of *καί* as a sentence coordinator where *δέ* would often be expected instead. Coptic, in general, uses both the Egyptian conjunction  $\square\square$  and the Greek particle  $\square\square$ . We had already noticed that the sa II revision tends to replace a number of  $\square\square\square$  in sa I with  $\square\square$ .<sup>34</sup> Thus, three possible cases arise: (1) **sa** uniformly translates *καί* with  $\square\square\square$ ; (2) **sa** uniformly translates *καί* with  $\square\square$ ; (3) the translation of *καί* divides the **sa** tradition.

Examples :

(1) 4:13  $\square\square\square \square\square\chi\square\eta \square\square\square$  **sa**

(2) 4:21  $\square\square\chi\square\eta \square\square \square\square\square$  **sa**

(3) 4:24  $\square\square\square \square\square\eta\chi\square \square\square\square\square$  sa I sa 9 /  $\square\square\eta\chi\square \square\square \square\square\square\square$  sa II

6:42  $\square\square\square \square\square\square\square\square\square \square\square\square\square\square$  sa I /  $\square\square\square\square\square\square \square\square \square\square\square\square\square$  sa II

9 sa II

Let us observe the cases in inverse order

#### 3.1.1. The translation of *καί* divides the **sa** tradition

In this case, sa I has  $\square\square\square$  and sa II  $\square\square$ , while sa 9 is either one way or the other,<sup>35</sup> with different tendencies from episode to episode. There are 129 occurrences of this variation. The reverse phenomenon (sa I has  $\square\square$ , sa II  $\square\square\square$ ) is very rare: 1:18 (sa I and sa 9 have  $\square\square$  sa II  $\square\square\square$ , translation of *καὶ εὐθύς*), 4:34a (same distribution, but here Greek has *δέ*), 5:24b (sa 1 has  $\square\square$  vs. sa 9 sa II  $\square\square\square$ , Greek *καί*), 10:52 (sa 1 has  $\square\square$  in accordance with Greek B, both sa 9 and sa II  $\square\square\square$  as the other Greek majuscule manuscripts). At this stage of the research, we do not see any systematic pattern emerging behind the choices of the revision. For example, the expression *καὶ εὐθύς* has sometimes been translated

<sup>34</sup> Boud'hors, "L'évangile de Marc", p. 59. It is important to realize that not just any coordinating *καί* is in question here but most often those cases that introduce a progression or a change of episode or point of view. It should also be pointed out that the change of particle is sometimes accompanied by a change of conjugation prefix (especially perfect/temporalis).

<sup>35</sup> Exceptional case in 8:13 where sa 9 appears in opposition to sa 1 and sa II

as □□□ □□□□□□□ throughout **sa**, sometimes as □□□□□□□ □□ in part of the tradition. This is similar for the translations of *καὶ λέγει, καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς*, etc.

While variants sometimes exist in Greek where *δέ* replaces *καί* in some witnesses, the influence of a Greek model seems to be of little consequence in the choice of □□ in **sa**, unless it is a more global variant. Similarly, the influence of parallel passages in Matthew or Luke is not decisive<sup>36</sup> since these passages very often have *καί* as well.

### 3.1.2. The tradition uniformly translates *καί* as □□.

There are 115 occurrences of this translation. Again, neither the existence of variants in Greek nor the influence of parallels seems decisive. We also note that this phenomenon is prevalent for some passages and not for others. This fact argues again for a uniform **sa** version.

### 3.1.3. Other cases

Sometimes **sa** 1 does not feature any particle, while the Greek has *καί*, and **sa** 9 and **sa** II have □□, as in 2:13, 2:16, and 2:19. But in the first two of these cases, the evidence of **sa** 480 (**sa** I) shows that these may be readings specific to the manuscript **sa** 1, which were not subsequently preserved in the other manuscripts of the family. It also happens that **sa** 1, in agreement with the Greek, does not have any particle, and **sa** II adds □□ (2:21, 3:34, 4:7). Conversely, in 6:43, **sa** 1 has □□□, but **sa** 9 and **sa** II have nothing. These cases remain marginal compared to the variation discussed in the previous paraphrase.

To complete the picture, we would still need to calculate the number of occurrences where **sa** translates *καί* uniformly with □□□. But it can already be seen that the occurrences where the Sahidic tradition is unitary in the translation of *καί* with □□ are almost as numerous as those where it is divided. This clearly raises questions about the modalities of the ancient translation (quality of the model(s), principles of translation, etc.), which are particularly complex to grasp as well as about the choices of those involved in the revision. With these questions in mind, it would be instructive to compare the **sa** translation of Mark with that of the other synoptic gospels. A brief survey in Matthew

---

<sup>36</sup> Pace Boud'hors, "L'évangile de Marc", p. 59.

allows for some preliminary remarks, which would require further investigation: in Greek Matthew there seems to be a more frequent use of *δέ* and *τότε*; the *sa* translation tends not to translate *καί* at the beginning of a sentence or in the dialogue (however, note that *καὶ ἰδοὺ* is regularly translated by □□□ □□□). It is more rarely translated by □□, and if it happens, it only divides the tradition in exceptional cases; when that does happen, the division cannot possibly be placed in relation to manuscript families.

### 3.2. Case Studies on the Sahidic text of the Gospel of Mark

#### 3.2.1. Chapter 1

Mark, chapter 1 provides a good overview of the different aspects of the history of the *sa* version, containing different types of variants: lexical, morpho-syntactic, and textual and giving a notion of the mixed position of *sa* 9. The lexical variants are quite numerous: replacing a word borrowed from Greek with an Egyptian/Coptic word, or a Greek word with another Greek word, or a Coptic word with another Coptic word.<sup>37</sup> Thus, for the verb *κηρύσσειν* in 1:4, 1:14, and 1:38, □□□□□□□ (sa 1 and sa 9) is replaced with □□ϣ□ □□□ϣ (sa II); but in 1:7 and 1:45, it is □□ϣ□ □□□ϣ that is used throughout *sa*. The parallel (of 1:4) Mt 3:1 has □□ϣ□ □□□ϣ, and Mt 4:17 likewise (parallel of 1:14). However, Lk 4:44 (parallel of 1:38) has □□□□□□□; 1:7 and 1:45 have no parallel.

Table of translations of *κηρύσσειν*. The asterisk (\*) marks passages that are not exactly parallel:

	sa 1 sa 9	saII	// Mt	// Lk
1:4	□□□□□□□	□□ϣ□ □□□ϣ	3:1 □□ϣ□ □□□ϣ	3:3 □□□□□□□
1:7	□□ϣ□ □□□ϣ	□□ϣ□ □□□ϣ	-----	-----
1:14	□□□□□□□	□□ϣ□ □□□ϣ	4:17 □□ϣ□ □□□ϣ	4:18* □□ϣ□ □□□ϣ
1:38	□□□□□□□	□□ϣ□ □□□ϣ	-----	4:42 □□□□□□□
1:45	□□ϣ□ □□□ϣ	□□ϣ□ □□□ϣ	-----	-----

<sup>37</sup> For instance, □□□□ □□□ / ϣ□□□ □□□, see A. Boud'hors, "Chercher' en copte: à propos d'une variation lexicale", in J. P. Monferrer-Sala & A. Urban (eds.), *Sacred Texts. Explorations in Lexicography*, Frankfurt 2009 (*Studien zur romanischen Sprachwissenschaft und interkulturellen Kommunikation* 57), pp. 15-29.

Sa I is characteristically not systematic in its choices. It must be noted that in 5:20 and in 14:9 all **sa** has □□□□□ □□□□□. On the other hand, sa II seems to be quite systematic here, but in 6:12, all **sa** has □□□□□□□□. The influence of the parallels is noticeable, but not necessarily decisive (cf. 1:38) and can be counterbalanced by the concern for uniformity. Notably, the influence of the parallels also plays a role in 1:5 (translation of *χώρα*) and 1:7 (translation of *ικανός*).

Another significant passage is the quotation from Isaiah 40:3: □□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□. <sup>38</sup> Luisier<sup>39</sup> quotes another witness with the variant □□□□□ □□□□□□□□ : □□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□.

Is 40:3	Mt 3:3	Mk 1:3 sa1 (sa9)	Mk 1:3 saII	Lk 3:4
□□□□□	□□□□□	<u>□□□□□□□□</u>	<u>□□□□□</u>	□□□□□
□□□□□□□□	□□□□□□□□	□□□□□□□□	□□□□□□□□	□□□□□□□□
□□□□ □□□□	□□□□ □□□□	□□□□ □□□□	□□□□ □□□□	□□□□ □□□□
□□□□□□ □□	□□□□□□ □□	<u>□□□□□□□□</u>	<u>□□□□□□</u> □□	□□□□□□ □□
□□□□ □□□□□□	□□□□□	□□□□□□□□	<u>□□□□□</u>	□□□□□
□□□□□□□□	□□□□□□□	□□□□□□□	□□□□□□□	□□□□□□□
§□□□□□□□	□□□□□□□□	□□□□□□□□	□□□□□□□□	□□□□□□□□
<u>□□□□□□□□□□/</u>	□□□□□□□□□□	□□□□□□□□□□	<u>□□□□</u>	□□□□□□□□□□
var.	□□□□	□□□□	□□□□□□□□□□	□□□□
§□□□□□□□□□□	□□□□□□□□	□□□□□□□□□□	□□□□	□□□□□□□□
□□□□ □□□□□□	□□□□□□□□		□□□□□□□□	□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□			<u>□□□□□□□□</u>	

The variants from Luke are particularly interesting: the manuscript sa 120 has □□□□□□□□ instead of □□□□□□, whereas for Mark the same sa 120 (witness of sa II) has □□□□□□! The situation is reversed for sa 1 (which has □□□□□□□□ in Mark and □□□□□□ in Luke) and sa 120. The same sa 120 does not have □□□□□□- before □□□□□□□□ in Luke; □□□□□□ is the reading of sa 9 and sa 120 in

<sup>38</sup> Text from the Pierpont Morgan Library manuscript, M 568.  
<sup>39</sup> See Ph. Luisier, *Les citations vétéro-testamentaires dans les versions coptes des évangiles*, Genève 1998, pp. 207-210.

Luke, but sa 1 has □□□□□ □-, which is phonologically close to □□□□□□-, as noted by H.

Quecke.<sup>40</sup> Thus we could determine the origin of the variant □□□□□ of sa 1 for Mark (Luke sa 148 and sa 293L also have □□□□□-, perhaps due to the same error).

In chapter 1 the position of the text sa 9 between sa I and saII seems to vary according to the verses. In the following paragraphs we will present some examples of its position:

(a) Baptism of Jesus (Mk 1:2-11): sa 1 and sa 9 vs. sa II

In 1:1, sa 1 presents a unique and isolated variant (the omission of  $\acute{\upsilon}\iota\omicron\tilde{\upsilon}\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\tilde{\upsilon}$ ),<sup>41</sup> shared by some Greek witnesses, and perhaps related to the fact that Mark comes last in the Barcelona manuscript. After 1:1, the tradition is clearly divided in the episode of the Baptism, between sa 1 and sa 9 on one side and sa II on the other. The affinity of sa 1 and sa 9 is shown by their common and erroneous(?) (see above) translation of  $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omicron\mu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\tau\epsilon$  with □□□□□. The only two exceptions are the readings □□□□ □□ □□□□□ (sa 9 sa II) vs. □□□□ □□□□□□ (sa 1) in Mk 1:2, a correction inspired perhaps by the parallel of Lk 3:4 (□□□ □□□□□) and †□□□□□□□□ (sa 9) vs. □□□□□□□ (sa 1 sa II) in Mk 1:8.

(b) Healing of the leper (Mk 1:40-45): sa 1 vs. sa 9 and sa II

Here the situation is the opposite. The translation here has been revised according to the parallels in Mt 8:2-4 and Lk 5:12-16. Moreover, sa 9 has an isolated reading in 1:40a, where it is the only manuscript to have □□□□□□□□□□ □□□□, according to Greek  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \gamma\omicron\nu\nu\pi\epsilon\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$ . (But note that sa II is here attested by only one manuscript, sa 121.)

In the rest of the chapter, the situation more fluid. The revision sa II has made some lexical changes, either influenced by parallels or for better adaptation to the Greek text. In 1:16a,  $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omega\nu$  translated with □□□□□□□□ in sa 1 (influenced by Mt 4:18?), has been corrected to □□□□□□□□ in sa II, also adopted by sa 9. An interesting phenomenon occurs in 1:32a:  $\acute{\omicron}\tau\epsilon\ \acute{\epsilon}\delta\upsilon\ \acute{\omicron}\ \acute{\eta}\lambda\iota\omicron\varsigma$  was translated in sa 1 with □□□□□□ □□□□□□, the same reading as in Lk 4:40 (which translates  $\delta\acute{\upsilon}\nu\omicron\nu\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\tilde{\upsilon}$

---

<sup>40</sup> Quecke, *Das Markusevangelium*, p. 48 and n. 5.

<sup>41</sup> Also attested in the papyrus amulet sa 479; or *Bodleian Coptic Inscription 426*, (see Sanzo, *Scriptural Incipits*, pp. 78-80).

ήλιου). Sa II modified the text in  $\xi\alpha\ \alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\ \alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\ \alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha$ , probably under the influence of another parallel passage. Sa 9 chose to return more literally to Mk 1:32 and translate it exactly with  $\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\ \alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha$ . (Note that this is also an isolated reading, which shows that the composer of sa 9 allowed himself a certain latitude, or that we do not have all his working instruments at our disposal.) In 1:38, the translation of  $\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\chi\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\varsigma\ \kappa\omega\mu\omicron\pi\acute{o}\lambda\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  (or another Greek text?) seems to have caused variations between the three texts (sa 1 reading  $\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\ \alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\ \alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha$ / sa II  $\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\ \alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\ \alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\ \alpha\alpha\ \alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha$ / sa 9  $\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\ \alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\ \alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha$ ). In 1:22b, H. Quecke thinks that sa 1 may have omitted  $\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha$  by mistake.<sup>42</sup>

The texts of sa 1 and sa II share similar readings against sa 9 only in cases where sa 9 has an isolated reading: except for the variant in 1:40a, these are generally peculiarities of sa 9: 1:14a where sa 9 translates  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  with  $\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\ \alpha\alpha$ , 1:15b where sa 9 adds the particle  $\sigma\alpha$  after  $\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha$ , and 1:16b where sa 9 has the reading “his brother” instead of “Simon's brother.”

### 3.2.2. Chapter 3

Chapter 3 is scarcely attested for sa II, mostly only with sa 112, a complicated manuscript that contains a reasonably sound text with many isolated readings and very irregular spelling. It may be the product of dictation from a good text copied by a deficient scribe. The other witnesses (sa 120, sa 133, sa 158) are merely fragmentary. Sa I is attested not only by sa 1, but also by fragments of other manuscripts (sa 40, sa 143, sa 162). The family of sa 9 is not represented in this chapter, except for the Pierpont Morgan manuscript itself.

There are many cases of lexical variants in this chapter that can be explained internally, perhaps stylistically, or in correspondence with the Greek manuscripts. One of the interesting lexical variants, already mentioned above (§ 2.1), isolates the ms. sa 1 with  $\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha$ , while the other manuscripts including sa 162, which normally aligns with sa I, have  $\omega\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha$ , both in 3:1 and 3:2 for Greek  $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\eta\gamma\alpha\mu\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\nu$  and  $\xi\eta\gamma\acute{\alpha}\nu$  ( $\xi\eta\gamma\acute{\alpha}$  in Mt 12:10 and Lk 6:6 and 6:8). Sa I also has the variant  $\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha$  (sa 1)/  $\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha$  (sa 162 and probably sa 123\*) for Greek  $\theta\epsilon\gamma\alpha\pi\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\epsilon\iota$ , while sa 9 and all other

---

<sup>42</sup> Quecke, *Das Markusevangelium*, p. 24.





### 3.2.3. Chapter 5

It must be noted that the only reliable testimony of sa II for much of the chapter (at least up to 5:13a), is sa 147. (Sa 112 has peculiar readings and sa 152 is of the sa 9 type.). The manuscript sa 650, with its mixed text type, is interesting for a few verses.

There are several lexical issues in this chapter. In 5:7, all **sa** translated φωνή with ρ□□□□, whereas the parallel of Lk 8:28 has □□□. (The parallel of Matthew does not have this word.) Thus, it had no influence, unlike in chapter 1. The same Greek word is translated with □□□ in 9:7a. Note that ρ□□□□ is more frequent in Mark than in the other Gospels. The lexical variants of this chapter, which aim at greater precision on the part of sa II or at harmonization, are adopted or rejected by sa 9 according to a seemingly arbitrary system (which is probably not always so).

Sa 9 aligns with sa II in:

verse	sa1	sa 9 sa II	Greek
5:1	□□□υ□	□□	ἦλθον
5:4	□□□σ□-	ρ□□ϥ	συντετριφθαι
5:5b(2)	ρ□□□□	□□ρ	κατακόπτων
5:13b	□□□□ρ□	□□† □□□□□□□□	ᾠρμησεν
5:16	□□□□	□□□□	διηγήσαντο
5:33b(2) ( <i>idem</i> , 5:34b)	□□□□□	□□□υ□□□ □□□□□ϣ,	ἴσθι ὑγιής
5:36b	□□□□□	□□□□□	μόνον
5:43b	□□□□□□□□□□	□□□□□† □□□ □□□□□	δοθῆναι αὐτῇ φαγεῖν

But aligns with sa 1 in:<sup>46</sup>

<sup>46</sup> For 5:23a, 5:23b, and 5:29b, see below.



□□□□□□□□□□ σ□ [□□□□□ζ, to be connected with Lk 8:49 (parallel passage)

□□□□□□□□□□ σ□ □□□□□ζ for the Greek μηκέτι σκύλλε τὸν διδάσκαλον.

There are several cases for harmonizations with the parallel passages of Matthew or Luke. For some of them we do not need to suppose its origin is in harmonization in the Greek text. Here we can distinguish two cases: where the Sahidic tradition is unitary and where the tradition is divided. For cases where the Sahidic tradition is unitary, examples are at the end of 5:13, □□□□□ or “they died,” which seems to translate ἀπέθανον from Mt 8:32 rather than ἐπίγνοντο from the Greek witnesses of Mark. In 5:12,<sup>49</sup> Quecke notes that all sa omit ἵνα εἰς αὐτοὺς εἰσέλθωμεν: this omission may have been inspired by the parallel Mt 8:31, but it may also be due to a concern for simplification in a rather repetitive passage.

There are even more cases, however, where the Sahidic tradition is divided: In 5:11, sa 9, omits “great” before “flock,” perhaps trying to harmonize with Mt 8:30. In 5:13b, sa 1 has translated ὠρμησεν with □□□□□ζ□, while sa II (with sa 9) chooses □□† □□□□□□□□; the same verb ὠρμησεν is used in the parallel passages of Mt 8:32 and Lk 8:33 and is translated □□† □□□□□□□□ in the Sahidic version of these passages. Here the harmonization is clearly internal to the Coptic. This case is exemplified in the table below, as well as in the episode of the healing of the hemorrhaging woman, where the phenomenon of harmonization by sa II is clear, with sa 9 being situated rather unpredictably on one side or the other.<sup>50</sup>

Mk	grec	copte sa	Mt	grec	copte sa	Lk	
5:13b	ὠρμησεν	□□□□□ζ□ sa 1 □□† □□□□□□□□□ sa 9 sa II	8:32	ὠρμησεν	□□† □□□□□□□□ □	8:33	= Matthew grec et copte
5:23a	ἐσχάτως ἔχει	□□□□ζ □ϣ□□□□ sa 1 ζ□□ □□□□□ sa 9 sa II	9:18	ἄρτι ἐτελεύτησεν	□□□ □□□□□□	8:42	ἀπέθνησκεν □□□□□□□□□

<sup>49</sup> See Anne Boud’hors, “Le caractère harmonisant des traductions de l’Évangile de Marc en copte sahidique”, in *Textual Research on the Psalms and Gospels. Recherches textuelles sur les psaumes et les évangiles. Papers from the Tbilisi Colloquium on the Editing and History of Biblical Manuscripts. Actes du Colloque de Tbilisi, 19–20 septembre 2007*. Edited by Christian-B. Amphoux J. Keith Elliott with Bernard Outtier, Leiden-Boston : Brill, 2012, pp. 251-261, esp. p. 256.

<sup>50</sup> Boud’hors, “Le caractère harmonisant” pp. 256-257.

5:23b 1	ἐπιθῆς τὰς χεῖρας	□□ □□□□□ sa 1 sa 9 <u>□□□□</u> <u>□□□σ□χ</u> sa II	9:18	ἐπίθεις τὴν χεῖρά σου	□□□□ □□□σ□χ	-----	
5:23b 2	ἵνα σωθῆ καὶ ζήση (var. ζήσεται ι)	χ□ □□□□□ □□□□ζ sa 1 sa 9 <u>□□□ □□□□□ζ</u> (□□) sa II	9:18	καὶ ζήσεται	□□□ □□□□□ζ	-----	
5:25a	οὔσα ἐν ρύσει αἵματο ς	□□□□□□□□□ ϣ□□□□ □□□□ sa 1 <u>□□□□□□□□□</u> <u>ζ□□□□</u> sa 9 sa II	9:20	αἰμορροοῦ σα	□□□□□□□ □□ (ϣ□□□) ζ□□□□	8:43	οὔσα ἐν ρύσει αἵματος / □□□□□□□□ □ ζ□□□□
5:25b	δώδεκα ἔτη	□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ sa 1 □□□□□□□□□□ □□ sa 9 <u>□□□□□□□□□□</u> <u>□</u> sa II	9:20	δώδεκα ἔτη	□□□□□□□.	8:43	ἀπὸ ἐτῶν δώδεκα □□□□□□□□□ □□
5:29b	ἴαται	□□□□ sa 1 sa 9 <u>□□□□χ□□</u> sa II	9:22 *	ἔσωθη	□□□□χ□□	8:47 *	ὥς ἰάθη □□ □□□□□□□
5:34b	καὶ ἴσθι ύγιής	□□□□□ sa 1 □□□ϣ□□□□ □□□□□χ sa 9 sa II	9:22 *	ἔσωθη	□□□□χ□□		

Whereas, in 5:13b, 5:23b1, and 5:25b the concern of the translator to render the same Greek term with the same Coptic term is evident (with in addition, in 5:23b1, a certain “updating” of an archaic

expression), more distance from the Greek text of Mark is evident in the harmonization of 5:23b2 and, to a lesser extent, that of 5:25a. In 5:29b and 5:34b, the influence of the parallel passage of Matthew has prevailed over that of Luke. (These passages are not strictly parallel to that of Mark.) The case of 5:23a is instructive: the translation of ἐσχάτως ἔχει by sa 1 (“suffers from illness”) might have seemed insufficient; the revision of sa II prefers an interpretative translation (“is close to death”), which relies partially on the parallel passages without imitating them.

Some harmonizations (fewer in number?) are already the subject of variants in Mark’s Greek text, for example: 5:33b, where the Greek (common reading) is καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν, “and tell him the whole truth” and the text translated by sa 1 (□□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□). The Greek variant (W et al.): καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ἔμπροσθεν πάντων πᾶσαν τὴν αἰτίαν αὐτῆς, “and told him before all his case” is instead the text translated by sa II (and sa 9), □□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□ □□□□□□□□□ □□□□, “she told him his case in the presence of everyone”.<sup>51</sup>

The variant, also of the Caesarean type (except manuscript Θ), seems to be influenced by the parallel passage in Lk 8:47 (δι ἧν αἰτίαν ἥψατο αὐτοῦ ἀπήγγειλεν ἐνώπιον παντός τοῦ λαοῦ, “she told in the presence of all the people why she had touched him”). Two arguments make it possible to say here that the harmonization was not made independently of the Greek: on the one hand, the phrasing of the two parallels is not similar enough; on the other hand, the Coptic translation of the passage of Luke did not preserve the Greek word αἰτία, but translated it (□□□□ □□ □ϩ□□). Thus, the influence could not be exerted directly from Coptic Luke to Coptic Mark.

In 5:17, □□□□□□□□□□ □□ of sa 1 seems to reflect the variant of D Θ καὶ παρεκάλουν, against the common reading καὶ ἤρξαντο παρακαλεῖν/ □□□□□□□ □□ □□□□□□□□. Note that sa 9 has □□□□□ here and not □□□□□□□□□□ as in 5:20a since it does not follow sa 1 but could be reminiscent of the parallel passage of Mt 8:34 (παρακάλεσαν/ □□□□□□□□□□). In 5:40a, sa 9 and sa II have the addition □□□□□□□ □□ □□□□□, which corresponds to the variant of W εἰδότες ὅτι ἀπέθανεν: it is noteworthy that this addition is found, with identical wording, in the parallel of Lk 8:53; it remains unclear whether this addition of sa II was made from a Greek model or as a direct harmonization from the translation of Luke. Finally, in 5:42b, the reading of B ἐξέστησαν εὐθὺς is followed by sa 1 and sa 9, while that of D, ἐξέστησαν πάντες is surprisingly reflected in sa II.

---

<sup>51</sup> Boud’hors, “The Gospel of Mark in Sahidic Coptic: New Insights”, pp. 858-859.



to chapter 5, we can observe that in 5:21 all sa omit *πάλιν* in the sentence *καὶ διαπεράσαντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν πλοίῳ πάλιν τὸ πέραν*, whereas P<sup>45</sup> has *πάλιν*, as do the majority of Greek witnesses. In 5:22, the Greek tradition is divided between *καὶ ἔρχεται τις* (D), *καὶ ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται τις* (W), *καὶ ἔρχεται εἷς* (Θ κ Β) and *καὶ ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται εἷς* (A), while P<sup>45</sup> has only *καὶ ἰδοὺ*. All sa have □□□ □ϣ□□ □σ□ □□□, i.e. without *ἰδοὺ*, distancing them from P<sup>45</sup>, and it is not possible to know whether □□□ translates *τις* or *εἷς*. So, there is no particular affinity between the Coptic versions and P<sup>45</sup> in chapter 5.

However, the situation in chapter 9 seems to be different. In 9:3, P<sup>45</sup> does not have *οὕτως*, unlike sa. In 9:6, sa does not follow the Alexandrian text which has *ἀποκριθῆ* but has □ϣ□ □□□□, which could translate *λαλεῖ* (P<sup>45</sup> W) but also *λαλήσει*, as in other witnesses (including D). This agreement between sa and the same two manuscripts occurs again in 8:38 (omission of *λόγους* in *ὅς γὰρ ἐὰν ἐπαισχυνθῆ με καὶ τοὺς ἐμούς λόγους*, sa □□□□□↑ ϣ□□□ □□□ □□□ □□ □□□□□□□□ □□). In 8:15, sa<sup>9</sup> and sa II are in agreement with P<sup>45</sup> and W (*τῶν Ἡρωδιανῶν*) against the Alexandrian text *Ἡρώδου* followed by sa 1. (But note that sa 143, which is usually close to sa 1, has *τῶν Ἡρωδιανῶν*.) In 8:17, P<sup>45</sup> and W are in agreement with sa II (addition of *ὀλιγόπιστοι*, cf. Mt 16:8) against sa I and sa 9.

### 3.2.5. Chapter 11

Chapter 11 is well attested in the Sahidic manuscripts. It is especially interesting that this chapter is attested for the three manuscripts of the family of sa 9 for most of its text with some interesting examples of disagreement within the family.

Some lexical variations in this chapter seem to be internal to Coptic, choices in following the Greek with a loan word or departing from it with an etymologically Egyptian term, like 11:2 □□□□/↑□□ (sa 1 vs. sa 9 and sa II, where Greek invariably has *κώμην*) or 11:3 □ϣ□/□ □□□□ (sa<sup>1</sup> and sa<sup>9</sup> vs. sa II), where the versions do not align with a specific Hellenizing or nativizing trend. A recurrent variant □□□□ϣ□ / □□□□□ also appears in this chapter in 11:32, which probably goes back to a difference in the Greek witnesses with *ὄχλον* κΒ for □□□□ϣ□ in sa 1, which aligns with the Alexandrian text, and *λαόν* DWΘA for □□□□□ in sa 9 and sa II.

There is an interesting variant in 11:17, where sa 1 stands alone in aligning with the Alexandrian text giving the negative ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ, which corresponds to the Greek οὐ γέγραπται (W $\delta$ BA) in a rhetorical question; sa 9 and sa II however, have the affirmative ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ corresponding to γέγραπται in D $\Theta$ , although this phenomenon can also be explained by harmonization, cf. Mt 21:13 and Lk 19:46, which both have γέγραπται.

A possible case of harmonization is 11:7 ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ / ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ (sa 1 and sa 9 vs. sa II) where the Greek witnesses invariably have forms of the verb καθίζω, while Mt 21:7 has ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ (for Gk ἐπεκάθισεν) and Lk 19:35 ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ (for Greek ἐπεβίβασαν). Another clear case is in the episode of the fig tree, in a structural part of the narrative 11:14 in which sa 1 has ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ and sa 9 (and the three manuscripts) and sa II (sa 103, sa 121, sa 129) incorporate the subject, ⲛⲓⲛⲓ, only present in W (ὁ Ἰησοῦς) in the Greek tradition. It can be explained as harmonization already in the Greek text, Mt 21:21 has ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ corresponding to Greek ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς. This can be explained in two ways: on the one side, if the Coptic is adopting the harmonization from the Greek, this brings our sa II text closer to the Greek W. It can also be explained as a harmonization within the Coptic tradition. However, it does not align with W in 11:12 εἰς βηθανίαν, in which all sa have ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ as in Greek ἀπὸ βηθανίας.<sup>56</sup>

A few variants are isolated and consistent in the family sa 9 vs. sa 1 and sa II: 11:8 ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ (attested in the four manuscripts) vs. ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ and 11:15 ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ vs. ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ. (Mt 21:10 has the sg., but it does not need to be explained by harmonization since the following verb is singular and can be an internal adjustment, which is already in Greek D.) However, there are also a few disagreements within the family of sa III, e.g. 11:10 ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ sa 152 sa 156 (~ sa 1) vs. ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ only in sa 9 and sa 125. On the other hand, sa 152 has 11:7 as ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ vs. ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ in the other three manuscripts. These variations make us think that sa 9 and sa 125 tend to run parallel, and sa 152 often features variant readings, perhaps in alignment with sa II.

The verse 11:29 has an example in which sa has disagreements which might go back to the Greek versions. Sa 1 and sa 9 have ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ with the Alexandrian text, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς (A $\delta$ B),

---

<sup>56</sup> But see above 3.2.1.





