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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

I STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this study is to investigate the textual relationship between the Sahidic Coptic version of the Old Testament and its Vorlage. Essential to the problem is the textual relationship between the Sahidic version, the Septuagint, and the Hebrew text. It has been commonly accepted that the Sahidic version of the Old Testament is a direct translation from the Greek without direct Hebrew influence. However the Sahidic text seems to display certain accommodations to the Hebrew text. Therefore it may be asked, what is the origin of these Hebrew accommodations in the Sahidic text which otherwise appears to be a good witness to the oldest known tradition of the Septuagint?

II JUSTIFICATION OF THE STUDY

Why should a Biblical scholar be concerned with the relationship of the Coptic versions to Old Testament textual studies? In reply to the question, it can be observed that the Coptic versions have been among the earliest and most
faithful witnesses to the primitive Septuagintal text.¹ The Sahidic text, the oldest of the Coptic versions, was translated no later than the second half of the third century A.D. and several of the extant manuscripts date from the fourth and fifth centuries A.D.² In contrast to many of the other translations of the Septuagint, the Coptic texts have the same geographical origin as the Septuagint. Peterson has added further justification by noting that "the chief value of the Old Testament Coptic versions lies in the fact that they furnish evidence, which enables the student to ascertain the oldest pre-Hexaplaric forms of the LXX . . . ."³ Father Barthélemy has recently pointed out that the Coptic versions, especially the Sahidic and Achmimic, have textual affinities with a first century A.D. recension of the Septuagint on the basis of the Masoretic


text. Therefore it would appear that the Coptic texts merit a higher regard among students of the Biblical text.

W. Spiegelburg observed about fifty years ago that "It is remarkable how little use has been made of the Coptic text by students of the Septuagint." Even today evaluations of the Coptic versions in relation to either the Greek or Hebrew Bible have been few. However several listings of Coptic materials have been compiled to make the extant material more accessible.


materials can be found to make the problem of the textual relationship of the Sahidic version worthy of investigation.

III PREVIOUS STUDIES OF THE PROBLEM

This section shall be devoted to a survey of the significant approaches to the problem of Old Testament textual transmission. The survey will include (a) observations on the nature of the Greek and Hebrew textual transmission previous to the translation of the Sahidic text and (b) several proposed solutions to the problem of the translation base of the Sahidic version. However no attempt shall be made to present the various discussions of Old Testament textual transmission prior to the fifth

century B. C. Neither will the transmission of Coptic versions subsequent to the translation of the Sahidic text be considered.

There appears to be no disagreement over the origin of the Greek version of the O. T. as a direct translation from the Hebrew. The famous letter of Aristeas to his brother Philocrates maintains that seventy-two elders from Palestine were invited by Ptolemy Philadelphus to Alexandria to translate the Pentateuch into Greek. The correctness of this tradition is debated. The origin of the rest of the Greek Old Testament is a matter of even greater uncertainty.

One of the earliest indications of the transmission history of the Septuagint is given by Jerome. He writes of three recensions of the Septuagint which were known to him: one by Hesychius, who was located in Egypt; one by Origen, found in Palestine; and one by Lucian, prevalent in Syria. On the basis of Jerome's statement, Paul de Lagarde has propounded the theory that behind all these various recensions was an original prototype. This theory was further developed by Alfred Rahlfs, M. L. Margolis, J. A.

---

Montgomery, and H. M. Orlinsky. However, Paul Kahle has denied the validity of Lagarde's basic thesis. He points out that the differences between Codex B and the New Testament quotations of the Septuagint are too diverse to suggest a single prototype. The origin of the Septuagint was, Kahle thinks, similar to that of the Aramaic Targums. There were many attempts at translation which gave rise to independent texts which have provided the various readings.

The most vigorous opponent of Kahle has been H. M. Orlinsky. Orlinsky has followed closely the basic theory of Lagarde and the work of M. L. Margolis. Orlnsky maintains that, even though there are differences between the various Septuagintal texts, their basic similarity points to a single prototype. Excellent studies by Frank

---

9Ibid.


Cross, Jr.13 and Patrick W. Skehan14 concerning Septuagintal and Hebrew materials in the Dead Sea Scrolls have shed much light on this controversy.

The evidence presented by Cross deals primarily with the textual history of the Book of Samuel. From Qumran, especially in the historical books, there have been found Hebrew manuscripts which are very closely related to the tradition of the Septuagint. On the basis of these observations Cross has stated, "These manuscripts establish once for all that in the historical books of the Septuagint translators faithfully and with extreme literalness reproduced their Hebrew Vorlage.15 Similar evidence for the Pentateuch has been found. In the book of Exodus, 4QExa represents the same tradition as the Septuagint.16 There is also a manuscript of Exodus in Paleo-Hebrew which is a

---


16 Ibid., p.184.
collateral witness to the Samaritan tradition.\textsuperscript{17}

On the basis of the above, Cross has concluded that the manuscript, IQ\textsuperscript{Sam}\textsuperscript{b}, reflects a text which antedates both a proto-Masoretic and Septuagintal tradition. IQ\textsuperscript{Sam}\textsuperscript{b} represents an Old Palestinian text-type which probably had its origin in the fifth century Jewish community. From this text-type (about the fourth century B. C.), diverged both the Egyptian textual tradition and the proto-Samaritan tradition. The Egyptian tradition became the Vorlage of the Septuagint.\textsuperscript{18}

Concerning the problem of the origin of the proto-Masoretic text, Cross has stated that it is not likely that this tradition would have developed parallel with the Old Palestinian or with its related text in Egypt. The proto-Masoretic text evidently developed outside of Palestine, presumably in Babylon during the fourth and third centuries B. C. It was then introduced into Palestine during the Maccabean period or even as late as the Herodian period. Gradually this text supplanted the Palestinian text and became the authoritative text of the Hebrew Bible around the beginning of the second century A. D.\textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{17}Ibid., p.186.
\textsuperscript{19}Ibid., p.287.
As the Dead Sea Scrolls have shed new light on the problem of textual transmission of the Hebrew Old Testament, they have served a similar function for Septuagintal studies. Whereas, before the Qumran discoveries, scholars were hesitant to admit, and even denied, recensional work on the Septuagint before the second or third century A.D., Patrick Skehan now points out that recensional activity was prevalent before the Christian era.20

Skehan has suggested three stages in the transmission of the Greek Old Testament.21 First, there was the earliest Alexandrian rendering of the Egyptian Hebrew text. Next came the proto-Lucian revision of the second and first century B.C. The third was the proto-Theodotian recension of the first century A.D. The proto-Lucian recension was a revision of the Alexandrian or Old Greek made to conform to the Palestinian Hebrew text. It is identified with the quotes from Josephus and the sixth column of Origens Hexapla.22 In the proto-Theodotionic recension, the Palestinian tradition was rejected, and the proto-Masoretic text was used as the Hebrew base. This Greek recension was later

---

20 Skehan, op. cit., p.93.
21 Ibid., p.95.
22 Ibid.
revised by Symmachus and Aquila to comply with the official Rabbinic text\textsuperscript{23} and can be identified with the fifth column of Origen's Hexapla.\textsuperscript{24} Now it is becoming evident that Origen, instead of being the originator of a new recension, came at the end of a development which was almost entirely a Jewish endeavour.

The evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls reaffirms the basic thesis of Lagarde as opposed to Kahle. Skehan has admitted that, lacking the Qumran materials, it is understandable why Kahle had difficulty making sense out of the confusion which the Septuagintal problem presented.\textsuperscript{25} The new material, however, has substantially established that there was a standard Greek tradition from which the various divergent readings have developed.

On the basis of the above observations, it is now possible to proceed to the various proposed solutions to the problem of a translation base for the Sahidic version. An exhaustive presentation of these proposals will not be given rather only the significant conclusions.


\textsuperscript{24}Skehan, \textit{op. cit.}, p.94.

\textsuperscript{25}\textit{Ibid.}, p.95.
The problem seems to center about the accommodations of the Sahidic version to the Hebrew text. Even though most scholars deny any direct influence of the Hebrew text on the Sahidic version, yet there have been a few who have accounted for the Hebrew accommodations in this manner. Among those who have suggested such a solution are; William H. Green, Wilhelm H. L. De Wette, and P. Augustine Ciasca. However Ciasca is the only one to present this solution in the context of direct Coptic studies. Ciasca has come to this conclusion on the basis of his editing the Sahidic text of the Minor Prophets. In contrast to these men, every other conclusion presented in this study presupposes no direct influence of the Hebrew text.

Paul Kahle suggests that Origen's Hexapla adequately accounts for these Hebrew accommodations. In the fifth column of Origen's Hexapla, an obelus was used to mark those


passages found only in the Greek and an asterisk was used to mark the passages agreeing with the Hebrew text but not the Septuagint. This column was frequently copied with the signs omitted. Kahle has suggested that this type of text was used by the Coptic translators. However, Grossoux has pointed out that the Sahidic versions do not include numerous Hexaplaric additions and omissions which are found in important Greek manuscripts.\(^{30}\) Grossoux has suggested that the final conclusion is uncertain, but that the numerous Hebrew accommodations were most likely taken from Aquila, Symmachus, or some other translation which is no longer extant.\(^{31}\)

Another approach anticipated by Grossoux has been proposed by J. Barton Payne.\(^{32}\) He found both Lucianic and Hexaplaric readings in I Samuel, but the Sahidic version antedates both the works of Origen and Lucian.\(^{33}\) Therefore a "pre-recensional" text was used as the translation base.

\(^{30}\) Grossoux, op. cit., p.113.

\(^{31}\) Ibid.


\(^{33}\) Payne dates the original translation of the Sahidic version about 250 A.D., Ibid., p.51.
for the Sahidic version. Barthélemy, in his study in the Minor Prophets has identified this translation base with Quinta, a Greek manuscript, which was used by Origen in the Hexapla. The text contained the same Hebraisms as those found in the Coptic versions.

As a result of this survey several conclusions can be suggested: (a) Due to the new evidence which has been gleaned from the Qumran scrolls, it is now possible to more adequately approach the problem of the translation base of the Sahidic Old Testament, (b) The current scholarly opinion seems to deny any direct influence on the Sahidic version by the Hebrew text, (c) Several scholars have suggested pre-Origin recensional activity on the Septuagint as the cause for the Hebrew accommodations of the Sahidic version.

IV SIGNIFICANCE OF PAPYRUS BODMER XVI

Up to this point, this study has developed the problem of the Vorlage of the Sahidic text in the context of the

---


35 Quinta belongs to a textual tradition called by Barthélemy. Frank Cross has identified this recension with the proto-Theodotion recension of the first century A. D., Cross, "The History of the Biblical Text," p.283.

entire Old Testament. In an investigation of this scope it is impossible to cover such a broad area, therefore this study shall be limited to one manuscript, Papyrus Bodmer XVI. It is the task of this part of the study to reveal the reasons for choosing Papyrus Bodmer XVI.

Papyrus Bodmer XVI is a single codex made of vellum. The manuscript has been remarkably preserved with only a few marginal notes missing. It contains a continuous text of Exodus 1:1-15:21. This particular portion of the Old Testament was chosen because the Pentateuch has been largely neglected in Coptic studies. Perhaps this neglect may be due to the fragmentary nature of the Sahidic text in the Pentateuch. Bodmer XVI is the only Coptic witness to large parts of Exodus 1:1-15:21. Prior to the publication of this text only the following Sahidic passages from Exodus had appeared: Exodus 1:1-6, 19:22; 2:4-6, 17-19, 23, 24; 3:12, 13, 15, 16; 4:6, 7, 10, 23-25, 29, 30; 5:11-13, 17, 18; 6(two scraps not identified); 7(two more scraps not identified). Bodmer XVI now makes it possible to perform more extensive studies in Exodus.

The date of Bodmer XVI makes this a significant manuscript to study. The editor of the Bodmer XVI, Rudolphe Kasser, has suggested that the manuscript could be dated in the third century A.D., but the thickness of the letters and somewhat cursive effect of the writing at times would
more likely indicate a date of composition in the fourth century A.D.\textsuperscript{37} It can be added to Kasser's observations that the lack of ornamentation and the thick vertical and thin horizontal lines would place this manuscript in the same period as Codex Vaticanus and Codex Siniticus. Robert Lyons, Professor of New Testament at Asbury Theological Seminary, has suggested that the script is very similar to that of Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus.\textsuperscript{38}

Since this investigation is emphasizing particularly the Sahidic text, Bodmer XVI is valuable because it is a good witness to the classical Sahidic text. There are comparatively few dialectal corruptions, and the linguistic characteristics are that of the Sahidic text. These characteristics include the extensive use of sonant consonants, the absence of aspirated stops, and the lack of two letters, \textit{J} and \textit{Q}, which are not found in Sahidic texts.

In summary, Bodmer XVI has been chosen as the basis of this discussion for the following reasons: (a) no significant investigation has been done in the book of Exodus, (b) the early date of Bodmer XVI, and (c) because

\textsuperscript{37}\textit{Ibid.}, p.9.

\textsuperscript{38} Suggested in private conversation
Bodmer XVI is an extensive and good witness to the Sahidic text of Exodus.

V PROCEDURE OF STUDY

The procedure used in this investigation is to present a description of Bodmer XVI and to illustrate by a table of variants the relationship of the text of Bodmer XVI to the Swptuagint and the Masoretic text.

The description of Bodmer XVI will not be simply an addition of information but rather an attempt to ascertain if any of the characteristics of the manuscript, Bodmer XVI, can be helpful in determining the Vorlage of the Sahidic text of Exodus. The description of the manuscript includes its orthographical characteristics, a discussion of Sahidic phonemics in relation to personal names, paleographical characteristics, and observations about the closing rubric of the manuscript.

The table of variants comprises the major portion of this investigation. The table consists of a collation of Bodmer XVI against Rahlfs' text of the Septuagint.

\footnote{Alfred Rahlfs (ed.), \textit{Septuaginta} (seventh edition; Stuttgart: Wurttembergische Bibelanstalt, 1937).}
comparison of these variants with Kittel's Hebrew text, and a collection of supporting evidence for the variant readings of Bodmer XVI. The supporting evidence was obtained from the textual apparatuses of Brooke and McLean, Holmes and Parsons, and Field's edition of Origen's Hexapla.

The determination of variants in a study of this nature is most difficult because the problems of collation are greatly amplified when the comparison is between more than one language. The peculiarities of each language must always be kept in mind in order to avoid apparent variants that are inevitable in translation. W. Till notes that in comparison of the Coptic language with the Greek, one must pay special attention to the use of conjunctions, the


43 Fridericus Field, Origenis Hexaplorum (Vadus: Georg Olms Hildesheim, 1964), I.
article, possessives, moods, tenses, and word order.\textsuperscript{44} The rules governing their usage vary greatly. Often more than one translation may be possible for a given construction. Thus he can say that "the Coptic version is always to a certain degree, an interpretation by the translator."\textsuperscript{45}

Where such variants do appear, they normally have not been included in the table of variants. Occasionally some manuscript support is found for what looks like idiomatic variation. In such cases, the variant with its support has been listed. An example of an idiomatic variation is found in Exodus 4:22. The Greek reads ταῦτα λέγει ὁ Κύριος (thus says the Lord), but the Coptic reads \textit{Naï \textit{Neter} \textit{Ptoeoic Æw} \textit{Mm00n}} (lit. these which the Lord says them). Such apparent variants are simply good Coptic idioms.

The table of variants of Bodmer XVI against Rahlfs' text of the Septuagint is divided into five columns. The first column has witnesses for the Old Greek; the second for the Hesychian recension; the third for the Lucian recension; the fourth for the Hexaplaric witnesses; and the


\textsuperscript{45}Ibid.
fifth for unclassified support. A variant which has no support is indicated by the symbol 0. The reading of the Masoretic text is indicated by the symbol TM. If the Masoretic text agrees with neither the Coptic nor the Greek, the Hebrew has also been included. Additional tables analyze the table of variants. This is followed by a conclusion to the study.

VI LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

It is not within the bounds of this presentation to exhaust every avenue of approach presented by a study of this nature. Rather, certain limitations have been made in order to place this study within its proper scope of investigation. These limitations have been necessary in order to present adequately the material which has been proposed. One may ask why has the problem been raised if no answer is to be given? It has been the feeling of this writer that unless the basic problem was exposed, this study would have no unifying principle to justify its continuation. Even though it is impossible to give an adequate answer to the problem, nevertheless the reader shall be able to see the ultimate goal of the investigation. It is hoped that the groundwork laid by this study can be amplified by further investigation so a more adequate answer can be given.
It should be noted that the division of the witness in the table of variants is only tentative. One is limited in this area because the classification of Septuagint witnesses has not been clarified sufficiently to make a definitive statement. However this classification of the witnesses has been used in order to give preliminary consideration to the relationship of the Sahidic text of Exodus to the recensional activity on the Septuagint.

Throughout this investigation no attempt has been made to be exhaustive in the presentation of the different facets of study, neither has any attempt been made to compare Bodmer XVI with the other Coptic manuscripts of Exodus. The orthographic and paleographic characteristics, as well as the spelling of proper names, are not totally explained. In many cases, they are simply noted with no explanation. Only personal conjectures have been suggested as to the meaning of the closing Rubric. Nevertheless the writer has felt it necessary to note these characteristics so that further study might be able to give them more significance than is now possible.
CHAPTER II

THE MANUSCRIPT, PAPYRUS BODMER XVI

The aim of this chapter is to describe the characteristics of the manuscript and to make a comparison of the text Bodmer XVI with both the Septuagint and the Masoretic text. The underlying purpose for both the description and the comparison is to help answer the problem of the Vorlage of the Sahidic text of Exodus.

When noting the characteristics of a manuscript, it is necessary to include many items which may not help in answering the problem. However unless each item is considered, there is a possibility that something may be overlooked which could have a vital bearing upon the ultimate solution to the problem. Therefore in the description of the manuscript, which includes the orthographic characteristics, Sahidic phonemics and personal names, paleographic characteristics, and the closing rubric, items will be mentioned which will have no direct bearing upon the ultimate solution of the problem.

\[1\text{Much of the material presented in this chapter is based on the introduction to }\textit{Papyrus Bodmer XVI} \text{ and personal observations.}\]
The comparison of the text of Bodmer XVI with the Septuagint and the Masoretic text will be accomplished by means of a table of variants with supporting witnesses for the readings of Bodmer XVI. The purpose of the table is to give the necessary foundation upon which a solution to the problem may be found. The arrangement of the witnesses and the inclusion of some of the variants, most likely, is not final. Enough data has been organized that some suggestions will be made in the conclusion as to what is the nature of the Vorlage of this text.

I ORTHOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Perhaps the division between this section and a succeeding section on the paleographic characteristics is somewhat ambiguous. Orthography, the art of writing words according to standard usage, is by definition only one aspect of the broader category of paleography, study of ancient writing. However this division has been made to bring together the various items which do not conform to the usual standard of spelling. The orthography of Bodmer XVI is good, but there are times when irregular forms appear. These may be due to dialectal influences or they may be due to the survival of some archaic forms.

One common irregularity involves the nasal . Often the $N$ is doubled e.g. $\tilde{\text{m}}\tilde{\text{n}}\tilde{\text{nc}}\tilde{\text{a}}$ (2:23, 8:25) for $\tilde{\text{m}}\tilde{\text{n}}\tilde{\text{nc}}\tilde{\text{a}}$
The nasal frequently precedes $\Gamma \alpha \rho$ and $\Delta \epsilon$. Kahle has suggested that perhaps this indicates a sonant pronunciation. $^2$ $\overline{\Delta} \epsilon$ occurs about twice as many times in this manuscript as $\Delta \epsilon$. $N$ is frequently omitted before names which begin with $\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{I}}$ e.g. $\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{E}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{O}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{V}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{C}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{A}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{I}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{O}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{C}}$ (3:8, 8:5) and $\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{O}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{O}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{P}}$ (8:1). It is also customary for $N$ to go to $M$ before labials.

Kasser has noted that the scribe hesitates between $l$ and $\epsilon l$. The demonstratives are usually $\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{E}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{E}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{I}}$, $\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{E}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{E}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{I}}$, and $\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{E}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{E}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{I}}$ in this manuscript. Exceptions though are found: $\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{E}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{E}}$ (1:18; 4:9, 17:12:2), $\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{E}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{I}}$ (8:8), $\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{E}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{I}}$ - corrected to $\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{E}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{I}}$ (9:1), and $\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{E}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{I}}$ (12:17). Also of interest are the three vocalizations of $\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{E}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{E}}$ - with $\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{E}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{O}}: \overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{E}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{E}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{O}}$ (8:5), $\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{E}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{I}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{E}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{O}}$ (12:2), and $\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{E}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{I}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{E}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{O}}$ (12:3, 6). The letter $\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{I}}$ never shifts to $\epsilon l$ in $\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{C}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{A}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{K}}$. Among the verbal auxiliary forms one finds $\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{E}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{I}}$ - II present, $\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{E}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{I}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{W}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{A}}$ - conditional, $\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{E}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{I}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{N}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{A}}$ - II future, and $\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{E}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{I}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{E}}$ - III future.

In 11:1, the text reads $\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{K}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{A}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{P}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{A}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{N}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{G}}\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{H}}$. At first glance it is hard to make sense out of the expression. But Kahle has noted that $\overset{\text{Bar}}{\text{A}}$ is often used for $\epsilon$. He has further

noted that this is an indication of the Subachmimic dialect, with e instead of a l this word can easily be translated "another plague."

Several more hesitations or differences in orthography can be noted: MONE (2:7) and MOONE (3:1), disposing of aymtom for aytom (8:110, ñarp for ñarp (10:29). In 6:30 one notices the use of K for Í in ANOK ANK.

Only two forms nomina sacra, the abbreviation of sacred words, are found in this manuscript: ÊH and ÊNA.

To the writer, one item of interest which Kasser does not deal with adequately is the problem of the murmuvowel. This is indicated orthographically by a horizontal line placed above certain consonants. Several scholars have tried to equate it with the Hebrew shewa or a type of murmuvowel. Neither Plumley nor Worrell agree with this observation. They consider this line an indication of a sonant consonant. In this regard, Worrell's presentation is worthy of careful consideration.

---

3Ibid., p.72.
6Worrell has defined a sonant as a syllable-forming element. Therefore vowels are sonants, but also, consonants can perform this same function. The l, m, and n, of battle, chasm, and heaven are sonants. They are pronounced as though spelled batl, kasm, and heavn. Ibid., p.11.
Worrell felt that the very short vowels had dropped out of the Egyptian language leaving syllabic consonants. In order to insure the proper division of syllables, a stroke was placed over the sonorous centers of syllables. The stroke was extended either way to include letters which belong to the same syllable. Therefore $\text{\textit{NTNNTMN))[\text{\textit{MN))[\text{\textit{MN)}}[\text{\textit{MN}}$ ("and we bring old age") would read as follows: $\text{\textit{NTNNTMN))[\text{\textit{MN)}}[\text{\textit{MN}}$. In Bohairic this same word would be written $\text{\textit{NENOMETZELA}}$. The syllables in Bohairic are indicated by the vowels which may have been preserved in the orthography because of a slower manner of speaking.\(^7\) When consonants like $\text{\textit{M}}, \text{\textit{N}}, \text{\textit{W}}$ appear as sonants in Bohairic, they are marked with a dot or a grave accent.

As has been noted, some scholars suggest that these strokes serve the same function in Coptic as the shewa in Hebrew or a type of murmuvowel.\(^8\) However the shewa is a vanishing vowel in an unaccented syllable. These appear in words like $\text{\textit{BB}}, \text{\textit{MM}}, \text{\textit{NN}}, \text{\textit{LL}}$ and $\text{\textit{PP}}$ on the accented syllable.

\(^7\text{Ibid.}, p.12\)

\(^8\text{Worrell, op. cit.}, pp.12,13. Worrell has noted Peyrom, Stern, Mallon, Steindorff, and Erman as ones who call it a murmuvowel and Till as one who defines the murmuvowel in terms of a Hebrew shewa.
In one further observation, Worrell has suggested that certain consonants in Sahidic are normally incapable of being sonants because they are voiceless stops: $k, \pi, \tau, \lambda, \sigma$. The remaining consonants are divided into two groups: $b, \lambda, m, n, p$ which are more audible and $c, y, y, 2$ which are less audible, (note that the more audible consonants are voiced and the less audible consonants are voiceless). The first group can occur sonantly in accented or unaccented syllables, the latter in only unaccented sonant syllables. The voiceless stops act as sonants if they occur in the initial or final position. There are some indications that in Bohairic an initial voiceless stop was preceded by a prosthetic vowel.\(^9\)

When comparing the manuscript with Worrell's observations, one notes that Kasser has inadequately indicated the supra-linear strokes. The following is a comparison between Kasser's orthography and the orthography of Bodmer XVI. (Kasser will be cited first, then the manuscript): 1) $\varepsilon\acute{n}-\varepsilon\acute{n}$  (1:14)  2) $\sigma w\gamma \tilde{t} \varepsilon\acute{n}-\sigma w\gamma \tilde{t} \varepsilon\acute{n}$  (2:25)  3) $\varepsilon t m n \tilde{t} \tilde{t} \tilde{t} \tilde{t} \tilde{t} \tilde{t} \tilde{t}$ (5:7) A final $\tau$ acting as a sonant is found in 5:3 $\tau w m \tilde{t}-\tau w m \tilde{t}$. Examples of $b, \lambda, m, n$ in accented and

\(^9\)Ibid., pp.11-14.
unaccented syllables can be found: $\text{κεβε} (4:25), \text{νλοσι} (4:29), \text{θύτν} (12:13)^{10}$

These observations can be made concerning the orthography of this manuscript: (a) very few irregularities in spelling appear in the manuscript; (b) none of these irregularities should be used as a basis for a variant when comparing this text with any other text: (c) the orthography of Bodmer XVI does not appear to give any insights as to a possible solution of the problem.

II PROPER NAMES AND SAHIDIC PHONEMICS$^{11}$

The study of proper names could come under the discussion of orthographic characteristics, however, since proper names can play a key role in a comparison of two languages, it appeared best to give them separate treatment. It is the aim of this particular division to compare the proper names as they occur both in Sahidic and in the Greek$^{12}$

---

$^{10}$A thorough examination of the manuscript has not been made, but in a number of spot checks, no occurrences of $\text{c, u, q, } 2$ as sonants were found in accented syllables.

$^{11}$A phonemic chart of Sahidic consonants has been included in the appendix.

$^{12}$In the discussion, no attempt shall be made to include Hebrew personal names. No apparent differences of spelling in the proper names of Bodmer XVI can be accounted for by Hebrew orthography. However, the Hebrew words have been included in the table of variants so that the reader may make a comparison of all three languages.
Where differences of spelling occur, they will be noted. Suggestions will be made as to possible reasons for the differences. For example, one geographical name is spelled Μαγδωλος in the Greek, but *MEΣΤΩΛ* in Bodmer XVI. What is the cause for this change in spelling? In order to answer this question, it is necessary to know some of the basic phonemic characteristics of the Sahidic dialect.

According to Worrell, one of the distinctive features of Sahidic, in contrast to Bohairic, is the absence of voiced and aspirated stops.¹³ In Sahidic there are five stops (*Π, Τ, Κ, Δ, and Σ*) whereas in English there are six (b, d, g, p, t, and k). Of these six only p, t, and k occur in Sahidic, but they are always pronounced unaspirated as the p in spin. The Greek voiced stops, *β, δ, and γ* appear in Sahidic only in loan words. Sahidic included two phonemic stops not found in English: *ʎ* an old Egyptian palatal, pronounced similar to the st in posture; and *ơ* an Egyptian palatalized velar, pronounced similar to the c in vacuum.¹⁴

¹³ Worrell, op. cit., p.19.
¹⁴ Ibid., pp.87,88.
In the Sahidic fricatives, $\delta$, $c$, $\gamma$, $\zeta$, and $\eta$, voicing does not occur except at the bi-labial point of articulation. According to Worrell, the letters $\eta$ and $B$ are pronounced as bi-labials rather than like the English $f$ and $v$.\(^{15}\)

Now a possible solution to the differences in spelling between $\text{Μαγδώλος}$ and $\text{Μεστωλ}$ can be suggested. It is common for the Egyptian $g$ to become $\sigma$ in Sahidic. A similar shift has happened in this word. Because there are no voiced stops in Sahidic, the $\delta$ changes to $T$. Another example of the $\delta$ to $T$ shift is found in the name $\lambda\omega\tau$ for $\text{Αωδ}$. The $\lambda$ appears to be a scribal misinterpretation. In unicals $\Lambda$ and $\lambda$ are very similar in form. The scribe seemingly mis-took the $\Lambda$ for an $\lambda$. Since there is no z sound in Sahidic, $\text{Σεξπτ}$ comes into this text as $\text{Σεξεπ}$. The Sahidic $\zeta$ occurs both initially and medially in certain proper names. When it occurs initially it usually represents the Greek rough breathing mark. $\text{Εβραία}$ reads $\text{Εβραία}$, and $\text{Πουβην}$ reads $\text{Πούβην}$. Medially $\zeta$ appears in $\text{Αβραάμ}$ for $\text{Αβραάμ}$, $\text{Μαάδιαμ}$ for $\text{Μαάδιαμ}$ and $\text{Μαάριαμ}$ for $\text{Μαάριαμ}$. One name which may prove useful in determining the textual affinities of Bodmer XVI is $\text{Ιωχάβεδ}$ for $\text{Ιωχάβεδ}$. The substitution of the $\lambda$ for $\delta$

\(^{15}\text{Ibid.}, p.88.$
occurs also in several Greek witnesses. However more supporting evidence is needed in order to make a final decision. Several other changes occur which, as yet, seem to be unexplainable. These include \( \text{αιθίω} \) for \( \text{αβιασαφ} \), \( \text{βελεφων} \) for \( \text{βαελεσεφων} \), \( \text{εεφωρα} \) for \( \text{εεπφωρα} \), and \( \text{κοχωθ} \) for \( \text{κοχωθ} \). The following evaluations pertaining to proper names can be made: (a) the changes in spelling between the Greek and Coptic orthography tend to support Worrell's conclusions on the nature of Sahidic phonemics; (b) perhaps these changes indicate that the scribe wrote according to how he pronounced the word rather than according to the demands of Greek orthography; (c) except for one instance, the differences of spelling found in Bodmer XVI are peculiar to the Sahidic text or at least to this manuscript.

IV PALEOGRAPHIC DETAILS OF PAPYRUS BODMER XVI

It is the intent of this section to note those paleographical particulars which do not properly fall under the category of orthography. These include a description of the codex, punctuation and other marks, and errors and corrections. The study of Coptic paleography has not been pursued as extensively as Greek and Latin
Therefore the observations of Greek paleography will be used at several points of observation. The underlying aim of this study is to see if any information can be gained which will help in determining the textual affinities of Bodmer XVI.

The codex. Bodmer XVI is composed of six quires with five quires containing eight leaves (16 pages) and one quire containing six leaves (12 pages). There is a total of ninety-two pages with eighty-four pages of text. The text is written on both sides of a leaf which measures 13.5 by 16 cm. The measurement of the text is 11.8 by 9.6 cm. The cover is a sheet of vellum of which each half measures 13.8 by 16.5 cm. The edge of the cover is folded inside the first leaf and the last leaf. These two leaves in addition to the second and next to the last leaves, are left blank in order to give additional protection to the manuscript. The quires are sewn together at the back by thin strips of vellum. The arrangement of the leaves is according to the classical method, flesh-skin, skin-flesh, skin-skin, flesh-skin.

---

16 Only two works have been brought to the attention of this writer, which treat the subject of Coptic paleography: Viktor Stegmann, Koptische palaographie (Heidelberg: von F. Bilabel, 1936); and Kahle, Bala'izah.
flesh-skin etc. The quires are not signed in this manuscript.

The manuscript appears to have been ruled on both sides of the leaf. Possibly the lines were made by a stylus rather than a pen. The ruling is not obvious on every one of the photographic copies, only the original manuscript would reveal whether every page was ruled. The ruling includes vertical lines to determine the width of the column and horizontal lines to keep the lines straight. No prickings can be seen in the photographs. The letters are placed on the line rather than suspended from the line.

There are twenty-one lines on every page with approximately twenty to twenty-three letters per line. The scribe divided words at the end of a line, but tried to avoid this by writing much smaller at the end of the line.

**Punctuation and other marks.** An apostrophe occurs quite frequently. It follows mostly the consonants η, τ, and κ and sometimes μ and λ. When they do not have a Greek termination, proper names end with an apostrophe (ια κωβ'). The numbering of pages is by the use of the Greek symbols (α', ι', ια').

A mark of diaeresis occurs above i and ů. The mark is used when these letters begin a word or when they do not
form a dipthong with a preceding vowel.\textsuperscript{17}

Several times at the end of a line, a mark of suspension occurs. It is a raised horizontal line at the right hand edge of the column which indicates an \textsuperscript{N} An example is found in Exodus 1:2 \textsuperscript{2}\textsuperscript{POYBH} for \textsuperscript{2}\textsuperscript{POYBHN}

Several marks of punctuation are used to indicate divisions in the text. In the first four chapters a major division is marked with a double point (:) and included in the margin is the sign \textsuperscript{>} which was used apparently to further emphasize the separation. After the fourth chapter, the double point continues to be used, but the sign is not used. Other divisional marks include a raised point (\textsuperscript{•}) or simply a break in the text.

Errors and corrections. Kasser has pointed out that the scribe meticulously corrected his copy. The corrections appear to be all by the same hand. The different methods used for correcting the text include an oblique line drawn through an unwanted letter (\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{E}2PAI}), a series of dots within parenthesis above the letters (\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{E\textsuperscript{M} m\textsuperscript{K}\textsuperscript{A}l})), a letter inserted above the line (\textsuperscript{OVBA\textsuperscript{T}O\textsuperscript{C}}), or words and grammatical

\textsuperscript{17}cf. E. Maunde Thompson, \textit{An Introduction to Greek and Latin Paleography} (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1912), p.63.
suffixes and prefixes added above the line (ΕΕΙΝΕ, ΕΙΝΕ, ΤΗΠΟΤ ΝΕΛΙΤΗ ΠΕΝΤΑΙΑ). Several corrections are found in the margins. In every case where there could be any doubt as to where the correction should be inserted an oblique line with two dots is used (·/.). In one marginal reading in Exodus 2:23, two arrows are used to indicate where the text belongs as well as the sign mentioned above. At several places erasures have been made leaving the surface rough. The original manuscripts were not available for the writer to see, yet the corrections appear to be by the same hand. This can only be confirmed, though, by a comparison of ink used in writing of the manuscript.

As far as the problem of this study is concerned, the paleographical details of this manuscript render insignificant help. However, the rendering of these details should be helpful when this study is compared with other Coptic studies of a similar nature. The paleography of this manuscript is very similar to that found in Greek manuscripts.

V THE CLOSING RUBRIC

At the end of the manuscript, there is an interesting rubric which is set off from the text by a series of symbols noted above as division markers (― ― ―). The rubric reads ΠΥΡΙΤ ΙΜΕΡΟΣ ΜΠΙΝΟΜΟΣ, "The First part of the Law." Another similar rubric translated, "The Second
Law of Moses," occurs within the Bodmer collection at the beginning of Bodmer XVIII. In another manuscript of the Bodmer collection, Bodmer XXI, several passages from Joshua are found which includes only the narrative passages with no indications that the inclusion of the various listings and geographical materials was ever intended.

These may have more than obvious significance. Whereas Bodmer XVI contains few elements of a legislative character, customs of particular importance to the Jewish people are present in this passage (the passover, the first-born, and circumcision). Kasser has noted that this section of Exodus would have a preeminent role during the feast of the Passover. In Deuteronomy 1-10 is found the text of the prayers of the synagogue. The narrative sections of Joshua would be used, most likely for the public reading of Scripture. Thus these sections were important in Jewish liturgy.

A final answer to the significance of these selections is not within the bounds of this study. But several observations can be submitted for further investigation. One of the questions which these sections raises is why should a Christian Coptic community be using what could

18 Kasser, op. cit., p.15.
possibly be Jewish material used for liturgical purposes? It may be that the Coptic community was using manuscripts that had originally been translated into Greek for the Egyptian Jewish community. This selection could also be the result of a purely Coptic selection of those Old Testament materials which they felt were important. In the earlier days of the Coptic Christian community, possibly the importance of the New Testament overshadowed that of the Old Testament resulting in a selection of Old Testament passages necessary for proper New Testament interpretation. There is also a remote possibility that this selection was due to a direct influence of a Jewish community in Egypt. This possibility is not likely but since these proposals are merely personal conjectures of the writer, every possible solution should be proposed. These passages appear to be fertile ground for further observation.

Thus far this chapter has been dealing with the various characteristics of the manuscript with small attention to the text. Most of the characteristics are not helpful in ascertaining the Vorlage of the Sahidic text. Two areas though which appear to be helpful are the personal names and the closing rubric. The rest of this chapter will be a consideration of the text in the form of a table of variants.
The text of Bodmer XVI, the Septuagint, and the Masoretic text will be compared along with a listing of supporting evidence for Bodmer XVI.
TABLES FOR
PAPYRUS BODMER XVI

I

CHART OF PAPYRUS BODMER XVI'S
VARIANTS FROM THE SEPTUAGINT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERSE</th>
<th>VARIANT</th>
<th>OLD GREEK</th>
<th>HESYCHIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Βενίαμιν</td>
<td>ΒΕΝΙΑΜΕΙΝ</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Νεφθαλις</td>
<td>ΝΕΦΘΑΛΕΙΜ</td>
<td>y a₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>εξέχεν</td>
<td>ΕΝΤΑΨΕΙ ΕΒΟΙΛΩ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>σφόδρα</td>
<td>ΤΜ omit</td>
<td>Boh Cyr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>τῶν εδανει</td>
<td>ΑΥΤΟΥ</td>
<td>ΑΠΕΥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>τὸ γενός</td>
<td>ΠΣΕΒΝΟΣ</td>
<td>y a₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>οὖν</td>
<td>ΤΜ omit</td>
<td>y Eth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ηνίκα</td>
<td>ΝΕΥΨΩΠΕ</td>
<td>TM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>τοὺς</td>
<td>ΝΕΝΔΑΚΕ</td>
<td>TM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>καὶ . . . βία</td>
<td>TM] omit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Σεπφοράς</td>
<td>ΚΕ ΦΦΩΡΑ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>μαίας</td>
<td>ΤΜ] add</td>
<td>ΝΝΣΕΒΡΔΙΟΣ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUCIAN</td>
<td>HEXAPLARIC</td>
<td>UNCLASSIFIED WITNESSES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$b b o w c_2$</td>
<td>$c k l m b_2$</td>
<td>$e f n q s u d_2$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Arm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c k m x A m$</td>
<td>$a i d_2$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syr-hex (*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arm</td>
<td></td>
<td>$r d_2$ Lat Tyc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$b w$</td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$b b o w c_2$</td>
<td>$M k l m x b_2$</td>
<td>$e f i j q r s u v z d_2$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16 18 Or Ath Chr Tyc Tract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c_2$</td>
<td>$x b_2$</td>
<td>$i* s v z$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lat Or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER II

1 ἔλαβεν ΤΜΙ add ΝΔΥ
ΝΟΥΣΙΜΕ

1 τῶν θυγατέρων ΤΜΙ a₂
ΕΒΟΛ Ῥι/Ν ΝΥΕΕΡΕ

2 αρσενὶ ΝΟΥΣΗΡΕ ΤΜ

5 τὴν αβρααὶ ΝΤΕΣ ΖΗΣΑΛ
ΤΜ

9 μοι 1 J omit ΤΜ

9 τον μισθοὺν ΜΠΟΥΒΕΚΕ
ΤΜ

11 τινὰ ΤΜΙ omit a₂ Boh Cyrus

14 εἰπεν ΤΜΙ ΝΔΥ
added above the line

14 εἰ οὔτως ἘΞΕΙ ΤΜ

14 τοῦτο J omit ΤΜ Sah
Arm Syr-hex  F Lat

efijrs

x Syr-hex

Arm

cxArm  qu

m e

n

Arm
15 ἐλθὼν δὲ εἰς γην
Μαθαιο ομιτ TM

16 Ἰοθόρ

1 ομιτ ὁμοιώματι
νοοῦσα . . . Ἰοθὸρ
omitted in TM

17 αὐτὰς

2 ἀπὸ τοῦ TMJ add ἌΣΗΠΟ
ΝΕΥΕΣΟΟΥ ἘΒΟΛ 2ΤΟΤΟΥ

18 ἈΣΗΠΟ

19 Σεψφωράμε CE ΦΩΡΑ ΝΤ ΘΥ

20 η γυνή

ομιτ TM

21 η γυνή

ομιτ TM

22 αὐλοτρις

ΤΜJ add ΑΣΗΠΟ
ΔΕ ΝΚΕΥΗΡΗ ΑΥΜΟΥΤΕ
ΕΠΕΥΡΑΝ ΣΕ ΕΛΙΕΖΕΡ

23 εργασία TMJ add ΕΣΑΗΑΤ

24 τον στεναγμον αὐτῶν TMJ

ΕΠΕΥΡΑΨ ΚΑΚ ΜΝ
ΠΕΡΑΨ ΔΖΟΜ

25 αὐτοις

24 αὐτοί TMJ add ΤΑΙ

25 αὐτοὶς

ομιτ TM

1 Manuscript ο adds ο γαρ ὅς του προς μου βοήθος μου καὶ
εξήλητο με εὐ χείτρος φαραώ. The remaining manuscripts read
tο δε ονόμα του δευτερου εκαλεσεν ελιεζερ ο γαρ θς του προς
μου βοήθος μου καὶ ερρυσατο με εὐ χείτρος φαραώ.
M m x        Lat Phil
Syr-hex(txt)  

Arm Syr-hex  Lat Phil

\(^{a?} \text{r}\)

b b o w       M(*) k l m
v(*) x z(*)   F e f i j n r s u y \? d_2
b_2

F i^{a?} r Lat Thdt
CHAPTER III

1 ιωθορ TMJ omit p

1 Μαδιών μαδιγωμ J

1 ορος j add ΜΠΝΟΥΤΕ TM a₂ d Cyr

1 χωρης TM] add ΠΤΟΟΥ

ΜΠΙΧΟΙΣ ΠΝΟΥΤΕ

3 το μεγα TMJ omitted but added in the margin

4 ιδειν TMJ omit

6 θεος² TMJ omit g Cyr

8 εκεινης TMJ ΝΚΗΜΕ

8 Γεργεσαιων και Ευαιων] Eth

ΝΕΥΔΙΟΣ ΜΗ ΝΕΓΕΡ

ΓΕΚΔΙΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΠΔ!

9 τους υιους Ισραηλ TMJ

ΜΠΙΛΑΟΣ

12 τουτω TMJ omit

14 και ειπεν² TMJ omit g Sah

16 εν TMJ add ΠΚΑΣ

17 και Ευαιων TMJ omit
b m

b c k m x Arm i * q s z d₂ 18 Lat Eus Syr-hex

ø₂

f i r Ath

ø₂ M Arm Syr-hex F 1 4 1 6 Lat (Ευαίων καὶ Τεργεστών)

5 1 4 5 1 7

e j Eus Thdt

ø

a f i a? r
CHAPTER IV

3 εἰπεν ΤΜ] add ΝΑΥ Eth

4 προς μνησθην ΤΜ] ΝΑΥ Cyr

5 τῆς κερκου] ΜΠΕΨΧΗΤ ΤΜ Boh

5 τῆς κερκου] ΜΠΕΨΧΑΤ ΤΜ Boh

7 παλιν ΤΜ] add ΝΑΥ Eth Boh

7 την χειρα] ΝΤΕΨΙΧ ΤΜ y A p t Boh Cyr

8 μηδε εισακουσωσιν της φωνης ΤΜ] omit Boh

8 της φωνης ΤΜ] omit d*(uid)

9 καὶ εσται ΤΜ] omit Boh Cyr
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M c k l m x b₂</th>
<th>F e j n q s u v z d₂</th>
<th>Lat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arm</td>
<td>Syr-hex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M c k l x b₂</th>
<th>e f i j n q r u v z d₂</th>
<th>Lat</th>
<th>Or</th>
<th>Chr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arm</td>
<td>Syr-hex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>c x Syr-hex</th>
<th>Lat</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>83</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>x</th>
<th>Lat</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>x</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Arm</th>
<th>83 Lat</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>c k l m x b₂</th>
<th>e f n Lat Or</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arm</td>
<td>Syr-hex*(εβρ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>f (omits only της φωνης)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

|            | m                           |     |
The following readings are cited: ευλογος F* M(txt) b* e g j(txt) n v(txt) w y z(txt) b₂ c₂; ευλογετος m x Syr Phil Cyr.
CHAPTER V

3 εις την ερημον TMJ omit Cyr

5 φαινοντας TMJ add % (marginal note mutilated)

5 λαος add ΜΠΚΑΣ TM y a2 Eth Ad g h p t Boh
CHAPTER VI

3 κυριος TMJ omit

7 λαονι ΝΟΥΛΑΔΟC TM a2 p t Boh(uid)
7 ἐμοῦ ὁμιτ ἹΜ
12 μοῦ ὁμιτ ἹΜ
13 συνεταξεῖν ἹΜ ἁπ ἐβωκ (d) (p) τ Ἐθ
15 Ἰαμουηλ ἐμοὐ ἸHM
15 Ἀωδι ἄωτι 70 ὀ,i
15 Ἰαχιν ἄχειμι
16 τα ἐν ΤΜ ἐν ἹΜ ΠΟΜΠΕ
16 ἐπταὶ ἁπ ἹΜ ΠΟΜΠΕ 7 ἐτ Ἐθ
18 ἐκατον τριακοντα ὑμ ἹΜ ΠΟΜΠΕ
19 Ἰωχαβεδ Ἰωχαβελ ἸHM
19 ἐκατον τριακοντα δυο ὑμ ἹΜ ΠΟΜΠΕ
21 Ναφεν ἸΑΚΗ ἸHM
21 Ζεχρι ἙΧΡΗΗΗΗΗΗ ἹΜ
23 θυγατέρα ΤΜ ἹΜ ΠΟΜΠΕ ἹΜ ΠΟΜΠΕ
$c_2 \quad \text{Mckx Arm} \quad \text{Syr-hex}$

$\text{F}^\text{amg af i r v z Phil}$

$m$

$y^a? 83$

$b \quad \text{in r}$

$b\text{w} \quad b_2 \text{ Arm Syr-hex}(\#) \quad n \ 29$

$\text{Mck (x) Arm} \quad \text{F}^b? \text{af ij ra s v Lat}$

$o \quad \text{af ij (32) (78)}$

$\text{boc}_2 \quad \text{Mckl mx b}_2 \quad \text{Fae j nq } \text{suv zd}_2$

\text{Arm Syr-hex}$
CHAPTER VII

1 λεγώντω omit TM  y a₂ Eth  d g h p Boh

2 αὐτοῦ TM] ΝKHME  y  Boh

3 τὰ τερατα] ΝΛΨΗΡΗΕ  TM  Boh A

4 τοὺς υἱοὺς TM] omit

6 οὔτως εποίησεν TM] omit

10 εὐετείλατο TM] ΧΟΟΕ  

11 καὶ³ TM] omit  a₂ Eth  d g p

12 αὐτοῦ TM] add ΕΣΡΑΙ  ΕΧΝ ΠΚΑΣ  

18 καὶ εποίησαί ο ΠΟΤΑΜΟΣ TM] omitted but added in the margin
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b w</th>
<th>c k m</th>
<th>a f i n q r u v z Phil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b w c₂</td>
<td></td>
<td>j v z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w c₂</td>
<td></td>
<td>e j v z Lat Did</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c₂</td>
<td></td>
<td>f i r 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b w</td>
<td>c k m x</td>
<td>f⁷ a q s u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Syr-hex(*ερ)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>f n s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b w</td>
<td></td>
<td>F* e j n Thdt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER VIII

2 καί ανιβιβασθή ΤΜΙ omit

2 καί ανηγαγέν τούς βατραχούς ΤΜΙ omit ΤΜΙ  a₂ Boh

3 των Αὐγουστιων ἹΚΗΜΕΤΜ

4 εἰπεν ΤΜΙ add ΝΔΥ Eth

4 τοὺς βατραχούς ΤΜΙ NEEKROYP

4 κυρίω ΤΜΙ add ΠΕΥΝΟΥΤΕ

5 αφαιρεῖτ... έκ ΤΜΙ omitted but added above the line


5 τους βατραχοὺς TMJ
[ΝΕΕΙ]ΚΡΟΥΡ

5 σου ἕπεται TMJ add ἘΒΟΛ Τrors

5 απὸ TMJ omit

13 τῷ χείρι ΝΤΕΚΣΙΑ

16 εν τῇ ερμω] omit TM y a₂ Eth d g h p t

17 καὶ πλησιονικαὶ . . .
κυνομυνης TMJ omitted
but added in the margin

20 εἰς TMJ omit

20 γῇ TMJ add ΘΡŶ

22 ευαντιον αὐτων] ΝΠΕΥΜΤΟ ἘΒΟΛ TM

24 αποτενετε] omit TM

25 ὀβε] ΕΙΣ ΖΗΜΗΣ TM Eth Boh

25 καὶ απελευ αὐ νῇ τῇ κυνομυνης TMJ ΝΤΕΠΑΥ

25 κυρὶω TMJ ΠΕΝΝΟΥΤΕ

26 τὸν θεον] ΓΩΔΟΕΙC
ΠΝΟΥΤΕΙ ΠΝ;
s

\( c \times \text{Arm} \quad a \)

\( wc_2 \quad c k l m \times b_2 \quad \text{Arm Syr-hex} \quad a e j n v z \)

s 130

\( \text{Syr-hex}(\theta') \)

\( a_2 \quad k m v(\alpha' \theta') \quad e j 16 25 32 \)

\( \text{Syr-hex} \)
CHAPTER IX

2 οὐν] omit TM

4 εν τῷ καὶ ῥῳ εκεῖνῳ] omit TM

7 τῶν κτηνῶν TM] ΝΑ

9 Αἰγυπτοῦ¹ TM] omit

9 επὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ επὶ τὰ τετραπόδα TM] omit

10 καὶ¹ TM] ΔΜΩΫΣΧΗΣ

10 Μωσῆς TM] omit

12 συνεταξεν] add ΔΜΩΫΣΧΗΣ y TM

13 μου TM] add ΓΡΑΙ 21 ΠΔΑΙĒ

14 καὶ¹ TM] add ΕΓΡΑΙ ΕΠΣΗΤ

15 καὶ τον λαὸν σοῦ θανατῶ B α2 TM] ΝΤΑΜΟΥΟΥΤ ΜΠΕΚΛΑΟΣ

16 διεπερηθετ] add ΕΡΟΚ TM Eth

19 οὐ εστίν] add ΤΗΡΥ TM

21 τῇ διάνοιᾳ] ΠΕΥΣΗΤ TM Boh
71

O  Mcklmxb₂  aef₁jnr₀vz₀d₀₂
  Arm Syr-hex

fi

fi

bw₀c₀₂  Mcklmxb₂  AᵃaᵉjˢwᶻEthᶠ
  Arm Syr-hex

bow  km₀b₀₂  Ff₉rₛu₀d₀₂

c₀₂  v(mg)  z(mg)

km₀x Arm
  Syr-hex
  a f
καὶ διετρέχεντο πυρ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ΤΜ ὁμιτ
κυρίος χαλαζοῦν ΤΜ ὁμιτ
σφόδρα ὁμιτ ΤΜ Β
d g
ην δὲ τὴν χαλαζὰ καὶ ΤΜ ὁμιτ
οφιμα γαρ ην ΤΜ ὉΝΥΟ
ΝΓΑΡ Ν2ΑΕ ΠΤΕ
καὶ 4 ΤΜ ὁμιτ ΠΣΗΤ
των θεραποντων]
ΝΝΥΥΖΜΖΔΑ ΤΜ

CHAPTER X
καὶ ὁμιτ ΠΣΗΤ ΤΜ t Boh
τως τεκνοῦς των τεκνῶν
υμῶν ΤΜ ὉΝΤΝ ΥΨΡΕ ΕΝΕΥ
ΥΨΡΕ
εμπεπαίχα] ΝΝΕΝΤΑΙΔΟΥ]
π
μου ΤΜ ὁμιτ ΘΡΟΥ
πολληνι] ὁμιτ ΕΜΑΤΕ
περισσου ΤΜ ἘΦΟ
bwmefijnrud2

 bw ov(mg)x anz(mg) Arm Syr-hex(*)

 71 Tert

 71
The omission is supported by f m n g Lat.

This is a difficult reading. Kasser suggests that it should read *M Π Τ Ρ Ε Κ Υ W I T E*, *Papyrus Bodmer XVI*, p. 126.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Greek Text</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ζητείτε Ἰ  add ἄνωθεν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ἡμοῦσαν Ἰ add μὴ ἀπρων</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>τὴν χειρὰ ἄνεκος ἰδίας</td>
<td>y a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>επηρεύσ[σ] ὑπὸ τὴν Ἰ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>οὖν νοοῦν Ἰ add Νοῦθν ἡ ἀνεκομο ἄντουρος</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>τὴν χειρὰ ἄνεκος ἰδίας</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>καὶ Ἀρών Ἰ omit Ἰ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>ἡμοῦν Ἰ add Ἐκ  ἀνέκομο ἡ ἀνεκομο 21 ναὶ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>ημοῦν Ἰ add Θροῦ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>προσώπου Ἰ ἐκ  Ἰ Eth</td>
<td>Boh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHAPTER XI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Greek Text</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>σφόδρα Ἰ omit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>παντωμ Ἰ omit Ἰ</td>
<td>y Eth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>μεσον Ἰ omit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\begin{align*}
\text{ow} \quad c_2 & \quad M \ k \ l \ m \ x \ b_2 \quad a \ e \ f \ i \ j \ n \ q \ r \ s \ u \ v \ z \ d_2 \\
\text{Arm} \quad \text{Syr-hex} & \quad \text{Lat} \\
\text{bw} & \quad c \ k \ m \ x \\
\text{Syr-hex(txt)} & \quad a \ \text{Lat} \\
\end{align*}
Του βρονού] ΠΕΥΘΡΟΝΟΣ

Εἰδῆς] ΕΚΕΝΔΥ[

ὁ αυτὸς TMJ omiτ

πληθυνών] omiτ TM y a₂ Eth Ad g h p t Boh

Ἀγυπτώ] TMJ add ΠΕΤΑΜΤΟ ἘΒΟΛ ΜΦΑΡΑΩ

παντα TMJ omiτ a₂ d p t

καὶ τα ρετατη] omiτ TM

ταυτα TMJ omiτ Eth

ἐν γῇ Ἀγυπτώ] omiτ TM y a₂ Eth d g h p t Boh

CHAPTER XII

αὐτῷ] omiτ ἂ ὧ ὡ ὧ

ἀρσεν TMJ add ΕΜΑΤΑΒΙΝ ζιωπυ y d h p t Cyr

ἀπὸ τον αρνων και των ερίφων λημψεοθε TMJ ΕΤΕΤΕΧΙΤΥ ἘΒΟΛ ζὴnet21618 μν ἄμας ἄθαλητε ΝΤΕΤΕΧΙΤΥ
ckmx Arm a 32 128
Syr-hex(*γ*)

M c l m x b₂, a e j n u v z Lat
Arm Syr-hex

M b₂ i* j(mg) s

b c Syr-hex.

kl fi*

b w c₂ M c l m x b₂ a e j n s u v z d₂
Syr-hex

14 16 25 52 54 73 83 130 Aug

b w k l m j n s d₂ Chr Prisc
7 λημφονται ΤΜĮ ΝΤΕΣΚΙ

7 θησουσίν ΤΜĮ ΝΤΕΣΚΙ

7 επὶ τὴν φλικὴν εὖ τοὺς
οἰκολογοῦντες ἑνῳ 

8 εδονται ΤΜĮ ΝΤΕΣΝΟΥΝ Eth

11 τὰ υποδηματαί
ΕΠΕΝΕΝΤΑΣΟΟΥΣ ΤΜ

11 αἱ βασιλεῖαί
ΕΠΕΝΕΝΤΑΣΕΡΟΟΘ ΤΜ

12 γῆ ΤΜĮ omit

13 τῶν οἰκιῶν ΤΜĮ
ΝΕΣΗΚΙ

13 εὐπρεπῶν ΤΜĮ ΕΥΕΤ
ΘΥΤΗ

14 πασαὶ ΤΜĮ omit TM

14 αὐτὴν Ἡ ΤΜĮ add ΝΨΔ
ΜΠΑΟΕΙΣ

16 εσταὶ ΤΜĮ ΕΥΕΜΟΥΤΣΕ

16 ποιηθεῖσται ΤΜĮ
ΕΤΕΣΘΕ ΑΔΥ

1ἐν Τ ἐπὶ 108 118 Syr-hex α′ σ′ θ′.
Tract

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{o c}_2 & \quad \text{M c k l m x b}_2 \quad \text{a e j n u v z d}_2 \quad \text{Or Chr} \\
& \quad \text{Arm Syr-hex} \quad \text{Thdt Cyp De-P-C} \\
\text{b b o w c}_2 & \quad \text{M c k l m x b}_2 \quad \text{a e j n u v z d}_2 \quad \text{Or Chr} \\
& \quad \text{Arm Syr-hex} \quad \text{Thdt Cyp De-P-C} \\
\text{b b w c}_2 & \quad \text{M c k l m x b}_2 \quad \text{a e j n q u v z d}_2 \quad \text{Jul-ap-Cyr} \\
& \quad \text{a? r} \\
\text{l x}
\end{align*} \]
17 εντολήν ταύτην
εγινέτολομη λίγα

18 εέσσεθε . . . εσπερας
omit

21 εαυτοῖς
omit TM

27 θυσία
add ἔνειψε

27 ἐν Ἀγγίτω
omit

27 τοὺς Ἀγγίτους

27 τοὺς οἰκους

27 προσεκνησέν
add ἔπιτοιχί

29 τοῦ θρόνου

30 πάντες
omit

32 τα προβάτα

34 πρὸ τοῦ ζυμωθῆναι
ta fυραματα aυτων
omit

34 τῶν ὦμων

35 καὶ
add ζενθαλαγ

Boh

Boh

d p t 74 Boh
Arm a

ckmx Arm a
Syr-hex(*y')
Lat

ckmx Arm a
Syr-hex(*ePp)

ckmx Arm a
Syr-hex(*y')

k x Syr-hex a
37 σωκομματα [-] [κοκκοθα] 
38 σφοδρα [ΤΜ] omit 
39 εγκρυφιας [-] [ΝΣΕΝΕΚΡΟ] 
39 εποιησαν [ΤΜ] ΕΤΑΜΙΕ 
40 χανααν [-] add [ΝΤΟΟΥ] 
42 αυτη [-] omit TM 
43 και [Ααρων] [ΤΜ] omit 
43 λεγων [-] omit TM 
43 πας [ΤΜ] omit 
44 τινος [ΤΜ] omit 
44 η[ ] ΔΥ] [-] y a2 Eth 
48 τις [-] omit TM 
48 κυριω [ΤΜ] omit 
48 ης [ΤΜ] add [ΕΣΤΙΝ] 
50 ουτως εποιησαν [ΤΜ] omit
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Greek Text</th>
<th>TMJ</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>λεγών ΤΜΙ</td>
<td>omit</td>
<td>Eth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>πρωτοτόχου πρωτογενές</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cyr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>κυριος ΤΜΙ</td>
<td>omit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ο Θεος</td>
<td></td>
<td>pt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ἀνάγεις ΠΕΚΝΟΥΤΕ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ωρῶν ΤΜΙ ΉΟΥΝΟΟΥΕ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>κυρίω ΤΜΙ</td>
<td>add</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ΠΕΚΝΟΥΤΕ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>πάν διανοιγον μητράν ΤΜΙ</td>
<td>omitted but added in the margin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>των Βουκλιων</td>
<td></td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ΝΝΕΚΕΞΟΟΥ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>μετα ταυτα λεγων τι</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>ΠΟΗΤ ΜΟΑΡΑΩ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Boh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>εξ ΤΜΙ</td>
<td>add</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>ΠΚΑΣ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER XIV

2 Μαγδαλινή ΜΕΓΤΩΛΑ Βηθ. Boh

2 Βελοσελαφωνί ΝΒΕΛΣΕΦΩΝΙ Α₂ ΓΩΣ ΑΥΣ

3 ουτω ΤΜΙ omit

3 εν τη γη ΤΜΙ omit

4 και εποιησαν ουτως ΤΜΙ omit

5 Αιγυπτιώνι ΦΧΗΜΕΙ Α₁ Ο Chern.

5 και ΤΜΙ add ΠΣΗΤ

6 αυτω ΤΜΙ add ΤΡΟΥ Eth

8 και ΤΜΙ add ΠΣΗΤ

8 και ΤΜΙ add ΑΥΚΩΤ

8 και ΤΜΙ add ΑΥΚΩΤ α₂ t Boh

8 και ΤΜΙ add ΑΥΚΩΤ α₂ t Boh
c1  F1* 71 76
An Thdt

x

m Arm  37
37

Syr-hex

b2  A^  f  i  n  s
9,10 φαραώ TMJ add ΜΝ
Νέματος Όλεν

9 καὶ τὰ αρματα φαραώ TMJ
omit

9 οἱ ἑπετεῖς Νέματος Ὑπετεύς
ΤΜ

9 αὐτοῦ TMJ add ΥΠΡΟ

9 Βέσσεπφων εὶς Βελεσφωνί a₂
Θῦ ἢ ζ

10 τὸ λ εἰς ὕφαλμον οίκ
Εἴδοτον TM

10 ορωσην TMJ add ΕΡΟΟΥ
Εἴδοτον Νέματος

11 γη Ṽ οθι TM
omit

11 ημας TMJ omit

12 ταυτη γ οθι TM
omit

12 ημας TMJ omit

15 αὐξενεζωσαν TMJ
Αἴετοτοκε Ἔπαιγον

16 σου TMJ omit

The Coptic reading appears in verse nine and the LXX reading in verse ten.

Kasser suggests that Αἴετοτοκε should read Αἴετοοκε. Bodmer Papyrus XVI, p. 175.
m (x) Arm Syr-hex(*)
a e (f) (1*) 14 16

32

c m x Arm Syr-hex(*)
P^b a

w

b w c_2 M c k m P^? e f j n q r v z d_2 Phil Or Eus Ath Chr

c_2

k Or

c^*
17 αρμασίνιοι ΝΕΥΓΑΡΜΑ TM

18 φαραώ TMJ add ΜΝ

18 αρμασίνιοι ΝΕΥΓΑΡΜΑ TM

19 εκ τῶν οπίσθεν] 2I

19 καὶ εστὶ ἐκ τῶν οπίσων αὐτῶν TMJ omit

20 καὶ διηλθεὶς ἡ νυξ] omit]

21 τὴν χεῖρα] ΝΤΕΥΣΙΑΣ

21 τὴν θάλασσαν] TMJ omit

22 υδῷρ TMJ add ΝΕΥΩΟΟΠ

22 τεῖχος] TMJ omit TM

23 κατεδιώξαν] add 2I

23 τα αρματα] ΝΕΥΓΑΡΜΑ TM

27 τὴν χεῖρα] ΝΤΕΥΣΙΑΣ

29 υδῷρ TMJ add ΑΥΛΥΣΙΤΕ
$b$
\[
\begin{align*}
&c \, m \times \text{Arm} \\
&\text{Syr-hex}(\ast \alpha' \, \theta') \\
&c \times \text{Arm} \\
&\text{Syr-hex}(\ast \gamma') \\
&c \, m \times \text{Arm} \\
&\text{Syr-hex}(\ast) \\
&\text{f} \\
&\text{f} \\
&c \, k \, l \, m \times \text{Arm} \\
&\text{a \ Eus} \\
&\text{Syr-hex}(\ast) \\
&\text{f} \, i \\
&\text{o} \\
&x \, \text{Arm} \, \text{Syr-hex} \\
&\text{r \ Or} \\
&c \, m \times \text{Arm} \\
&\text{a} \\
&\text{Syr-hex}(\ast) \\
&c \, k \, l \, m \times \text{Arm} \\
&\text{a} \\
&\text{Syr-hex}(\ast \gamma')
\end{align*}
\]
29 δεξιων] add ἀμοιν ΤΜ

29 τειχος] omit ΤΜ Eth

31 καὶ επιστευσαν τῷ θεῷ
ΤΜ] omitted but added in
the margin

31 επιστευσαν ΤΜ] a2

CHAPTER XV

1 λεγοντες ΤΜ] omit

5 βυθον ΤΜ] ε ὑ [μικ] Μ [πν] ὁγν

7 πληθει ΤΜ] πακε

13 σου1 ΤΜ] omit Boh

13 τουτοι] omit ΤΜ

15 ὡς ζωιων] ἀμωβει ΤΗΣ] 2 ρις B*

16 ἐῳς αν παρελθῃ ο λαος
σου κυριε ΤΜ] omit

16 σου3 ΤΜ] add κυριε

17 εισαγαγων] εκειτου ΤΜ

17 κυριε2 ΤΜ] omit
x Arm
Syr-hex(*)

x Arm

Syr-hex

b c_2 M l m a e f i j n r s u v z d_2

Arm 154

Luc

c Syr-hex(*α')

66 151
19 φαραώ TMJ add ἘΝΙ
    ΝΕΥΤΗΣΜΑΛ

19 ἀρμασίν ТМΙ add ΤΗΡΟΥ

19 νῦν ΤΜΙ add ΝΤΕΡΥΒΑ

20 εξιλθοεις TMJ add ΑΝΟΥΣΟΥ
nZ(mg)
## II SUMMARY OF PAPYRUS BODMER XVI'S VARIANTS

1. **Total Variants**
   - Singular: 109
   - Corrected Total: 223

2. **Total Support by Text-types**
   - Old Greek: 77
   - Hesychian: 87
   - Lucian: 71
   - Hexaplaric: 127

3. **Support by Old Greek Witnesses**
   - $a_2$: 36
   - $y$: 31
   - Eth: 31
   - B: 8

4. **Support by Hesychian Witnesses**
   - Boh: 86
   - t: 39
   - d: 38
   - p: 38
   - g: 35
   - h: 34
   - Cyr: 23
   - A: 22
   - Sah: 9

5. **Support by Lucian Witnesses**
   - w: 45
   - b: 42
   - c: 36
   - o: 17

6. **Support by Hexaplaric Witnesses**
   - Arm: 70
7. **Support by Unclassified Witnesses**

a. **Uncials**

\[
\begin{array}{c}
F_b \\
F^b \\
F^{amg} \\
A_a \\
A^{amg}
\end{array}
\]

b. **Minuscules**

| a  | b  | c  | d  | e  | f  | g  | h  | i  | j  | k  | l  | m  | n  | o  | p  | q  | r  | s  | t  | u  | v  | w  | x  | y  | z |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 44 | 39 | 37 | 36 | 34 | 34 | 31 | 30 | 28 | 26 | 25 | 23 | 20 | 68 | 64 | 63 | 60 | 53 | 33 | 32 | 32 |

b. **Versions**

| Lat | 34 |

d. **Church Fathers**

| Cyr | 23 |
| Or  | 11 |
8. Hexaplaric Evidence

* 28
\(\gamma\) 8
\(\epsilon\beta\rho\) 4
\(\alpha\) 2
\(\sigma\) 1
\(\theta\) 1

9. Masoretic Evidence

Total Agreement of Bodmer XVI with TM 103
Agreement Without Support 21
No Agreement Between Bodmer XVI, TM, or LXX 41
CHAPTER III

CONCLUSIONS

The table of variants with the accompanying charts is an attempt to show the relationship between Bodmer XVI and the Septuagint.\(^1\) The ultimate objective of this comparison is to find the Greek Vorlage of the Sahidic text of Exodus, however, this study shall only give preliminary suggestions as to the nature of this Vorlage. The objective of this chapter is to consider; (a) the total variants of Bodmer XVI, (b) the selection of the text types, (c) the relationship of Bodmer XVI to these text types, (d) the principal witnesses to Bodmer XVI, (e) the relationship of Bodmer XVI to the Hebrew text, (f) areas for further discussion, and (g) some final conclusions.

The tables contain 332 variants of Bodmer XVI against Rahlfs' text of the Septuagint. Of this total, 109 are single readings without any attestation. A corrected total of the variants would be 223. Every manuscript has single variants which normally are not considered in the totaling of the actual variants. It is possible that future evidence

\(^1\)Many witnesses have not been classified and they appear in a separate column in the table of variants.
may present witnesses for some of these readings, therefore they have been included in the table of variants.

The selection of text-types has been an area of difficulty in the execution of this study. This entire aspect of Septuagintal studies appears to be very inconclusive. The division of witnesses into text-types has been done on the basis of the observation of several scholars. In spite of the tentative nature of the proposed division of witnesses, this grouping appears sufficiently accurate to be beneficial for this study.

The witnesses have been divided into four text-types: Old Greek, Hesychian, Lucian, Hexaplaric. The following is a listing of the text-types according to the percentage of their agreement with Bodmer XVI: Hexaplaric - 57%, Hesychian - 39%, Old Greek - 35%, and Lucian - 32%.

Bodmer XVI agrees most frequently with the Hexaplaric

---

witnesses. This text-type also has the highest number of single agreements with Bodmer XVI (45 out of 127 compared with 19 out of 87 of Hesychian text-type). The Old Greek and Lucian text-types have the lowest number of single agreements (7 each). Even though Bodmer XVI shows little affinity with the Old Greek or Lucian text-types, their importance must not be ignored for numbers alone is not the final determination of a text-type of a manuscript. Evidence must be weighed rather than merely counted. Bodmer XVI does present a remarkably high degree of agreement with the witnesses to Origen's Hexapla.

The major single witnesses include the Bohairic and the witnesses of the Hexaplaric text-type (M, C, K, l, m, x, b2, Arm., and Syr-hex). The Bohairic would be expected to have an agreement with Bodmer XVI since Sahidic and Bohairic are dialects of the same language. The Bohairic has a 39% agreement with the readings of Bodmer XVI. Among the witnesses to the Hexaplaric text-types, only three (M, l, b2,) agree with Bodmer XVI less than fifty times. Witnesses c, k, m, x, Arm, and Syr-hex agree with Bodmer XVI between 24% and 31% of the time.

One may ask, is the percentage of agreement presented by the Hexaplaric text-type sufficient to put Bodmer XVI as a witness to a Hexaplaric text? In the opinion of this writer this evidence is not adequate to decide the issue.
either way. The 57% agreement of the Hexaplaric witnesses does indicate an affinity with a text having some of the characteristics of Origen's fifth column of the Hexapla.

Certain observations should be made concerning the other text-types. The Lucian text-type has had little influence on Bodmer XVI. The highest agreement is 45 whereas manuscript o, an excellent Lucian witness, agrees only 17 times. Bodmer XVI appears to also have slight agreement with the Old Greek and Hesychian text-types, which come the closest to the original text. On the basis of the variants this is so, but it should be noted that the 223 variants are only a small deviation from the standard Septuagintal text represented by Codex B. Therefore it is possible to say that Bodmer XVI has very high percentage of agreement with the text-type represented by Codex B.

As was stated in the introduction, the central issue in determining the Vorlage of the Sahidic text is the problem of the Hebrew accommodations. These accommodations have been found in Bodmer XVI. Out of the 223 variants, 103 of the readings of Bodmer XVI agree with the Masoretic text. This is 46% of the total variants. This is a good indication why these Hebrew accommodations are a central part of the problem of this study. Supporting evidence can be found in 81 of these variants. The Hexaplaric text-
type supports these 81 variants 95% of the time. Only six of the variants with supporting evidence do not have any Hexaplaric witnesses. Once again, this aspect of the study indicates a strong relationship between the Hexapla and Bodmer XVI. However there are 21 variants which cannot be accounted for by Hexaplaric influence. Further evidence is needed in order to answer fully the problem of these Hebrew accommodations.

In the development of this study, several areas of further study have been made evident. (a) Further study needs to be done in relation to the problem of Septuagintal text-types. This is necessary in order to evaluate fully the importance of the Sahidic texts. (b) Additional studies need to be done in other areas of the Sahidic Old Testament. These studies then need to be integrated with each other and the evidence presented by the other Coptic dialects. (c) In Bodmer XVI, comprehensive grammatical, historical, and theological studies need to be made in order to account more accurately for each variant. (d) A comparison of Bodmer XVI with both the Septuagintal and Hebrew materials of Exodus found in the Dead Sea Scrolls could prove to be very interesting. The variants with Hebrew accommodations should be especially noted in this area of investigation.

The conclusions of this study can be stated as follows:
(a) Bodmer XVI is a good witness to the text-type represented by Codex B.

(b) The variants of Bodmer XVI agree most frequently with the Hexaplaric witnesses.

(c) Bodmer XVI does contain Hebrew accommodations which can be found in Origen's fifth column of the Hexapla, but cannot be totally accounted for by this source.

(d) The conclusions of this study have only been preliminary and it is hoped they may serve as the basis for further investigation.
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APPENDIX
### APPENDIX

#### CHART OF SAHIDIC CONSONANTAL PHONEMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bilabial</th>
<th>Alveolar</th>
<th>Alveo-Palatal</th>
<th>Palatal</th>
<th>Velar</th>
<th>Pharyngeal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stops</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaspirated</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>p((p))</td>
<td>t((t))</td>
<td>c((x))</td>
<td>K((k))</td>
<td>k((k))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fricatives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>f((f))</td>
<td>b((b))</td>
<td>h((h))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grooved</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>s((s))</td>
<td>s((y))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frictionless</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasal</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>m((m))</td>
<td>n((n))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>l((l))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vibrants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trilled</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>r((r))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semivowels</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>w((w))</td>
<td>y((y))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>