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Abstract

Early Coptic Singular Readings in the Gospel of John:
A Collection, Cataloging and Commentary on the Singular Readings of P. Mich. Inv. 3521,
PPalau Rib. Inv.-Nr. 183 and Thompson’s Qau El Kebir Manuscript

by

Daniel B. Sharp

Claremont Graduate University 2012

The aim of this work is to take the methodology developed by Ernest Cowell, and further
refined by James R. Royse, of cataloging singular readings of Greek scribes and seek to apply it
to Coptic scribes. This study focuses on the text of John found in P. Mich Inv. 3521 and the
singular readings of that manuscript. In order to have a basis of comparison, singular readings
from two other Coptic versions of John are cataloged as well. In total 1619 singular readings
have been identified in the three manuscripts.

Following Colwell and Royse, the readings have been further divided into orthographic,
sensible and nonsense readings. The sensible and nonsense readings have been further divided
and categorized into additions, omissions, substitutions, transpositions and verbal prefixes. All of
these entries are then noted in the accompanying database with appropriate commentary so that
the reader may format and use the information in a variety of ways.

---

Kelsey Museum of Archaeology Studies (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1962); Rodolphe Kasser, *Papyrus
Bodmer III: Évangile de Jean et Genèse I-IV, 2 en Bohaïrique* (Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1958); Herbert
Thompson, *The Gospel of St. John According to the Earliest Coptic Manuscript* (London: British School of
Archaeology in Egypt, 1924).
In addition to the database, detailed commentary has been provided on the singular readings of P. Mich. Inv. 3521 with the following conclusions: Like Greek scribes, Coptic scribes are more likely to omit something than to add something; The category of “transpositions as corrected leaps” which James Royse found useful in his work, has proved unhelpful when dealing with this papyrus; and finally some preliminary analysis about the scribe of P. Mich. Inv. 351 is given.
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Introduction

A careful study of what scribes actually did, with a resultant catalogue of readings produced by scribes, is essential for textual criticism.²

Ideally, of course, all the major witnesses to the text of the New Testament—that is, the continuous Greek manuscripts, the lectionaries, the versional manuscripts, and the Fathers—would be studied in detail in order to provide this same kind of information concerning scribal habits, translational tendencies, and so on. One’s assertions could then be based on empirical evidence about the witnesses. . . . Utilizing what was discovered for the particular witnesses, one could then proceed to formulate generalizations about scribal habits that would firmly rest on the documents themselves.³

This project is an attempt to contribute to this call for a catalogue of scribal habits. I will focus my study on three Coptic manuscripts of the Gospel of John.⁴ In upcoming sections I will address the importance of the Coptic versions to the study of the New Testament, and the particular value these three manuscripts have within Coptic texts. I will begin, however, by providing an overview of textual criticism for the purpose of explaining why many in the field now feel the need to catalogue scribal habits.

Bruce Metzger points out, “The necessity of applying textual criticism to the books of the New Testament arises from two circumstances: (a) none of the original documents is extant, and (b) the existing copies differ from one another.”⁵ But textual criticism did not begin in modern times, or with the New Testament. The Church Father Origen recognized the need to critically evaluate the textual variants within the scriptures of the Hebrew Bible, both as they existed in the

---

⁴Husselman, Gospel of John; Hans Quecke, Das Johannesevangelium Saïdisch: Text der Handschrift Rib. PPalaun Inv.-Nr. 183 mit den Varianten der Handschriften 813 und 814 der Chester Beatty Library und der Handschrift 569 (Rome and Barcelona: Papyrologica Castroctaviana, 1984); Thompson, Gospel of St. John
various Greek translations and also in comparison to Hebrew versions. In the ancient world, the awareness of variant readings was not limited to Christian circles. Stanley Fredrick Bonner explains that part of a classical education was learning about the variant readings that existed in the epics of Homer, and learning to argue in favor of one reading or another. As the field of textual criticism progressed, it attempted to develop a more “scientific” approach to distinguish between variant readings. Two complementary criteria emerged for evaluating variant readings: internal criteria and external criteria.

The first major methodology used in textual criticism is internal criteria. This methodology employs the process of recognizing variants within a given passage and attempting to choose between the variants by using two criteria: First, What is the author most likely to have written? Second, what error is most likely to have been created by a scribe?

In the case of determining which reading is most likely to have been written by the author, such considerations as the style, vocabulary and theology of the author are taken into consideration. The immediate context of the reading, harmony of usage by the author elsewhere, etc., are also considered.

An example of this criterion in action can be seen in Metzger’s discussion on Galatians 1:3, in making a decision between the variants, “πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου” (our Father and Lord), or “πατρὸς καὶ κυρίου ἡμῶν” (Father and our Lord), he wrote:

---

9 Metzger and Ehrman, *Text of the New Testament*, 302-3. Others have slightly different criteria for internal methods. Hort used intrinsic probability and transcriptional probability, but the ideas were rather similar; see Westcott and Hort, *New Testament*, 20-9.
A majority of the Committee preferred the sequence πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου because it accords with Paul’s usage elsewhere (Ro 1:7; 1 Cor 1:3; 2 Cor 1:2; Eph 1:2; Php 1:2; Phm 3). The apostle’s stereotyped formula was altered by copyists who, apparently in the interest of Christian piety, transferred the possessive pronoun so it would be more closely associated with “Lord Jesus Christ.”

Metzger makes his argument chiefly by appealing to Paul’s usage of the phrase in other places; in other words, he appeals to the internal criteria of the author’s style; then he makes an argument about what a copyist is likely to change.

When considering the errors most likely to be introduced by scribes, there are also general rules that are observed, such as: the more difficult reading is to be preferred; the shorter reading is to be preferred; the reading that does not attempt to harmonize a passage with another text is to be preferred, etc.

An example of one of these rules of criticism can be found in Metzger’s discussion on Acts 16:8; here the decision is between παρελθόντες (passing by) or διελθόντες (passing through). Metzger notes on the committee’s decision to choose the former:

The Western reading, “passing through Mysia” (διελθόντες . . . instead of παρελθόντες), is distinctly the easier reading, for the ordinary sense of παρελθεῖν, “to pass alongside,” does not fit the context, which requires something like “passing by” in the sense of neglecting. It seems unlikely, as Knowling observes, “that διελθ., a common word, should have been changed to παρελθ.—the converse is far more probable.”

Thus, based on the criterion that the harder reading is to be preferred (supported by the rationale that a scribe is far more likely to change a less common word to a more common one), the committee selects the more difficult reading παρελθόντες.

---


To summarize, one who employs the methodology of internal criteria looks at the passage within the context of what an author is likely to have written, and what a scribe is likely to have changed. Hort, who supported and helped develop the idea of internal criteria, also warned against “habitual reliance on the sufficiency of internal evidence of readings,” believing that this method was more subjective and less reliable than external criteria.14

When employing external criteria, one evaluates the strength of a reading based on evidence outside the reading itself—looking at the genealogical relationships between manuscripts with the aim of identifying them with specific places and times. Generally the relationship between manuscripts focuses on perceived errors in a text.15 “The basic principle that underlies the process of constructing a stemma, or family tree, of manuscripts is that, apart from accident, identity of reading implies identity of origin.”16

In modern times it was the New Testament scholar Johann Albrecht Bengel who first argued that the relationship between manuscripts needed to be understood so that evidence for a reading could be “weighed and not counted.”17 Bengel recognized that later manuscripts were copies of earlier manuscripts. Some of these copies and their exemplars still survived and could be categorized into “companies, families, tribes, and nations.” These genealogical groups could then be tied to a geographic location and perhaps even a date. Once these manuscripts had been sorted according to their genealogy, the witnesses should be weighed and not counted; in other words, a variant reading that appeared numerous times within a given family should count as only one witness for that reading.

14 Westcott and Hort, New Testament, 30; See also, John Scott Porter, Principles of Textual Criticism: with their Application to the Old and New Testaments (London: Simms and M'Intyre, 1848), for another example of the nineteenth century view that external evidence is more reliable and better than internal evidence.
17 Ibid., 158-9.
Bengel’s approach “was adopted with varying success by classical scholars of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and brought to fruition in a brilliant burst of scholarship in the 1830s.” It was during this decade that the process was further developed by Karl Lachmann. Lachmann’s innovation was to propose that, since not all exemplars and manuscripts are available, one can postulate a common source when that source is obvious but not extant. Thus one can begin to fill in the branches of a manuscript’s missing family tree.

Confidence in this method continued to grow throughout the nineteenth century. The New Testament scholar F. J. A. Hort argued that, “So far as genealogical relations are discovered with perfect certainty, the textual results which follow from them are perfectly certain too, being directly involved in historical facts . . .” Another scholar noted, “Since Westcott and Hort, the genealogical method has been the canonical method for restoring the original text of the books of the New Testament. It dominates the handbooks. Sir Frederic Kenyon, C. R. Gregory, Alexander Souter, and A. T. Robertson are a few of the many who declare its excellence.”

Despite this grand support for the genealogical method, or external criteria, even Hort recognized problems with it, specifically the problem of mixture. Mixture occurred when “a text copied from one exemplar was corrected by a different exemplar.” Mixture can also occur when a given manuscript uses two exemplars to establish its text. The recognition of mixture, despite Hort’s attempts to deal with it, left a cloud of uncertainty over appeals to external

---

19 See Metzger and Ehrman, *Text of the New Testament*, 207-08, for an excellent example of Lachmann’s theory.
21 Colwell, *Studies*, 63.
22 Ibid., 67.
criteria, and during the twentieth century some scholars began to doubt that an appeal to external criteria could be justified. This cloud of uncertainty has grown darker as more problems with external criteria have become apparent.\footnote{For an excellent discussion of some of these problems and how they arose, see Colwell, Studies, 63-83.}

With increasing emphasis, scholars of the twentieth century have begun to argue that, as G.D. Kilpatrick says, “each reading has to be judged on its merits and not on its supports, concluding that one cannot accept or reject textual types or manuscripts as wholes.”\footnote{G. D. Kilpatrick, “Western Text and Original Text in the Gospels and Acts,” Journal of Theological Studies XLIV (1943): 33.} J. K. Elliott, a prominent New Testament scholar, has argued for a new method of textual criticism that:

allows the internal considerations for a reading’s fitness to stand as the original to override purely documentary considerations . . . The age and number of manuscripts supporting that reading are not usually considered in this method; no particular manuscript is favored nor is there any predilection for any specific text.\footnote{J. K. Elliott, “In Defence of Thoroughgoing Eclecticism in New Testament Textual Criticism,” Restoration Quarterly 21, no. 2 (1978): 96.}

A similar approach was adopted by Kurt Aland in two key scholarly Greek texts of our day: The Novum Testamentum Graece and The Greek New Testament.\footnote{Barbara Aland et al., eds., The Greek New Testament, 4th rev. ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft; United Bible Societies, 2001).} The “local genealogical method,” as this approach was called, ignored the relationships of manuscripts as a whole, but did consider the relationship between manuscripts on a reading-by-reading basis. As E. J. Epp explains:

This application of the genealogical method means that Aland has amended the almost universal agreement among NT textual critics regarding the classical genealogical method—namely, that while it is not applicable at the level of “text-types,” it may be useful at the level of textual “families”—for Aland now goes
one step farther by claiming that the method is applicable only at the level of the individual variation-unit. This approach that most twentieth-century textual critics have taken—moving away from Hort's, Lachmann’s and Bengel’s theories about creating a genealogical relationship between manuscripts to form text types tied to geographical or historical locations—has led one modern manual on textual criticism to state, “It is now possible to move on, abandoning the concept of the text-type and, with the new tools and methods now available, retelling the history of the text.”

The decreasing emphasis on external criteria, classically seen as one of the key methods of textual criticism, has placed increased emphasis on internal criteria. It was within this new framework that Colwell expressed the need for a catalogue of readings produced by scribes:

In the last generation we depreciated external evidence of documents and have appreciated the internal evidence of readings . . . . We need to recognize that the editing of an eclectic text rests upon conjectures. If these conjectures are to be soundly based, they must rest upon transcriptional probability as well as intrinsic probability. If the conjectures as to transcriptional probability are to be soundly based, they must rest upon a knowledge of scribal habits. A careful study of what scribes actually did, with a resultant catalogue of readings produced by scribes, is essential for textual criticism.

As outlined earlier, transcriptional probability, which considers what a scribe is likely to have written, operates on certain principles that have been developed based on the assumptions of modern scholars. For example, one axiom is that the shorter reading is to be preferred. This is founded on the theory that scribes are more likely to add to a text than to omit anything;

---


especially when dealing with sacred scripture, a scribe is not likely to leave any word out.\footnote{While Griesbach’s original axiom was fairly nuanced, in practice many textual critics today simply state the shorter reading is to be preferred Royse, \textit{Scribal Habits}, 705-36.} The results of several recent studies, however, do not support this conclusion. These recent studies have concluded that scribes were much more likely to omit than to add.\footnote{Ibid., 720-32.} This conclusion forces the textual critic to reevaluate the other axioms as well, and attempt to base them on the more certain ground of data on the practices of scribes.

One of the questions that arise when attempting to understand the habits of a scribe is: which readings did a scribe create and which readings existed in the scribe’s exemplar? Colwell’s method for dealing with this question was to isolate singular readings. A singular reading is a reading “without other manuscript support,” and is used “on the assumption that these readings are the creation of the scribe.”\footnote{Colwell, \textit{Studies}, 108.} This methodology has been used by other scholars and has gained some acceptance as a method for understanding the habits of scribes.\footnote{Barbara Aland, “The Significance of the Chester Beatty Papyri in Early Church History,” in \textit{Earliest Gospels}, ed. Charles Horton, \textit{Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series} (London: T & T Clark Intl, 2004); Colwell, \textit{Studies}, 106-24; Peter M. Head, “Observations on Early Papyri of the Synoptic Gospels, Especially on the ‘Scribal Habits’,” \textit{Biblica} 71, no. 2 (1990); Peter M. Head, “The Habits of New Testament Copyists: Singular Readings in the Early Fragmentary Papyri of John,” \textit{Biblica} 85, no. 3 (2004); Royse, \textit{Scribal Habits}; Juan Hernández, Jr, \textit{Scribal Habits and Theological Influences in the Apocalypse: the Singular Readings of Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, and Ephraemi}, WUNT (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006); Dirk Jongkind, \textit{Scribal Habits of Codex Sinaiticus} (Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2007).}

I have chosen my current topic of study because of this movement in textual criticism. By focusing my study on singular readings, I will be contributing to work currently being done in the field. I have narrowed my focus to the three editions of the Gospel of John published by Husselman, Quecke, and Thompson for the following three reasons:

First, The International Greek New Testament Project (IGNTP) is currently working on an edition of the Gospel of John. This edition will include a critical apparatus, not only of Greek
variants, but of many of the versions as well, including the Coptic.\(^{35}\) Because of this ongoing project, the Gospel of John is currently at the forefront of the minds of textual critics around the world, and this dissertation may prove helpful to that project.

Second, because so much is already being done on the Greek texts of the Gospel of John by the IGNTP, I decided to focus on one of the versions. “The Coptic versions of the biblical texts often have been used for textual criticism.”\(^{36}\) Walter C. Till asserted, “generally the Coptic versions represent a text which is at an earlier stage of development than the Greek texts known to us. It is precisely this fact which gives the Coptic versions their value for textual criticism.”\(^{37}\) The introduction to the 27\(^{th}\) edition of the *Novum Testamentum Graece*, in speaking of the Latin, Syriac and Coptic versions of the New Testament, states, “their value as witnesses to the textual tradition of the Greek New Testament, which is our concern at present, has become increasingly clear through decades of debate . . . these three versions are important witnesses for establishing the [Greek] text.”\(^{38}\) Thus current editions of the *Greek New Testament* use the Coptic versions in their apparatus to support their text, as will the upcoming IGNTP edition of the Gospel of John, making my decision to focus on Coptic manuscripts a relevant one.\(^{39}\)

Having thus demonstrated the importance of the Coptic versions and the current emphasis on the Gospel of John, the third reason I chose these particular manuscripts of the Gospel of John to work with is that these are the Coptic manuscripts used to establish the text of the current


\(^{36}\) Walter C. Till and John Rylands Library (Manchester), *Coptic and its Value* (Manchester: John Rylands Library, 1957), 238.

\(^{37}\) Ibid., 239.


Nestle Aland edition. The Greek text for the Gospel of John, in this edition, uses only four Coptic manuscripts: Husselman’s, Quecke’s, Thompson’s and a Proto-Bohairic version published by Kasser. My original intention was to include Kasser’s edition along with the other three in my dissertation, but I have chosen to exclude this edition from the current study due to the difficulty encountered in attempting to access the original manuscript.

Kasser edited Papyrus Bodmer III, a fourth or fifth-century codex of the Gospel of John. The edition he published contains only four grainy photographs of the text. The manuscript is currently housed at the Foundation Martin Bodmer in Geneva, Switzerland, which has no photographs of any kind of the manuscript. I traveled to the Foundation in order to view the manuscript and verify the accuracy of Kasser’s transcription. I was graciously allowed two days to work with the manuscript, but during that time was able to examine only the first twenty-two pages of Kasser’s forty-six page edition of the Gospel of John. During the brief time I was able to spend with the manuscript, I discovered dozens of errors in his transcription, some of which the author himself noted in a later publication, and many of which he did not. One interesting example is on folio 5 line 2; in Kasser’s original publication of Bodmer III he transcribed: \(\text{\varepsilon\tau\alpha\varsigma\upsilon\phi}\ \text{\tau\alpha\omicron\omicron}\). In his later article Kasser corrected this passage to read: \(\text{\varepsilon\tau\alpha\varsigma\phi\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\omicron\omicron}\). When I worked with the original manuscript, I read: \(\text{\varepsilon\tau\alpha\varsigma\phi\epsilon\tau\alpha\omicron\omicron}\). Another example is the word: \(\text{\epsilon\beta\omicron\omicron}\), which is clearly visible on Folio 5 line 19. Kasser, however, fails to record the entire word in either publication. There are dozens of other examples.

---

40 Aland et al., eds., Novum Testamentum Graece: post Eberhard Nestle et Erwin Nestle, 70*.
41 Kasser, Bodmer III.
42 Ibid., 5.
I have attempted to gain more time to work with the original manuscript to ensure that my work would be accurate, but I have been unable to secure that time. Thus, any findings I would have made on Papyrus Bodmer III would have been suspect and would have required further checking against the original manuscript. Therefore I decided that the best procedure for the current study was to omit Papyrus Bodmer III entirely and focus on the remaining manuscripts. These three manuscripts have provided enough data to begin a catalogue of scribal habits among Coptic scribes; Papyrus Bodmer III will have to wait for a later study.

The aim of this study, then, is to create a catalogue of the singular readings of the manuscripts of Husselman, Quecke, and Thompson. I will then organize the readings into three categories: (1) nonsense readings—readings which cannot exist in their grammatical form, or where gender, number or case do not match; (2) orthographic singular readings—readings which are singular because they spell a word in a way unattested to by other manuscripts in that verse, but which follow some clear and acceptable orthographic rules; and (3) sensible readings—plausible readings that are singular to this manuscript. In addition to categorizing these readings, I will also provide a commentary on significant readings, providing possible explanations as to how they might have arisen, etc. Once the singular readings have been categorized and the commentary presented, I will organize the findings in a database that can be accessed by other scholars, who may find the information useful. I will also demonstrate how the information may be used by formulating conclusions on the habits of the scribe of P. Mich. Inv. 3521.
Methodology

As previously discussed, the use of singular readings to determine the habits of a scribe has a growing following in textual criticism. This method, however, is not a new one. Hort made use of singular readings, or “individualisms,” as early as the 1880s. He explained:

Individualisms may obviously belong to various types, from purely clerical errors to alterations of purely mental origin. Sufficient clerical errors betray themselves, beyond the possibility of doubt, to enable us with a little care to form an estimate of the degree of general accuracy attained by the scribe of a given document, and also of the kinds of mistakes to which he was prone.\(^44\)

Strictly defined, “singular readings” are readings “which have no other direct attestation whatever.”\(^45\) The reasoning for using singular readings is that, “in most readings the student cannot determine whether or not a scribe copied or originated the reading.”\(^46\) For example, let’s assume I were doing a study of the scribal habits of the scribe of P\(^66\) and came across the variant in John 1:18: μονογενὴς θεός. This variant has support from the following witnesses: N\(^*\) B C\(^*\) L pc sy\(^hmg\); Or\(^n\) Did. Thus the student attempting to discuss the scribal habits of the scribe of Codex Sinaiticus has no method to determine if this reading is the creation of this scribe, and thus indicative of his character, or if the scribe simply copied this reading from his exemplar.\(^47\) Isolating the singular readings of a manuscript is done “on the assumption that these readings are the creation of the scribe.”\(^48\) Royse points out two questions that arise from this assumption:

\(^{45}\) Ibid., 230.
\(^{46}\) Colwell, *Studies*, 108.
\(^{47}\) If the student were discussing the character of the manuscript of Sinaiticus, then this reading would be relevant, for it tells us something about the kind of text preserved in Sinaiticus, although it does not tell us anything about its scribe.
\(^{48}\) Colwell, *Studies*, 108.
First, will such a list of singular readings include every scribally created reading? And second, will all singular readings be created by that scribe?\

Royse’s answer to this first question is in the negative. It is clearly possible that a scribe could create a reading that could also be independently created by another scribe. Such a variant would not appear in a list of singular readings. As a theoretical example: a fourth-century Egyptian scribe might have come across the name of Jesus in an epistle of Paul and added the phrase “the Lord” to this name out of reverence. Likewise, another scribe in Rome, centuries later, may have added the same phrase in the same passage. Thus both scribes created a new reading independently, and a reading that gives us information about the scribes (they were Christian and had a theology that saw Jesus as Lord), but because the manuscript record identifies this theoretical variant in two places, it would not appear in our list of singular readings. This hypothetical situation shows the clear possibility that a list of singular readings will not produce every reading created by a scribe. But as Royse points out, in the absence of a methodology to distinguish between scribal creations that appear elsewhere in the manuscript tradition and scribal creations that are singular, working with just the singular readings is the safer course.

Royse spends a great deal more time on the second question: will all singular readings be scribally created? Is it not possible, in theory, that some of the singular readings of a manuscript are readings that existed in a Vorlage that is no longer extant? Thus, for example, if some of the singular readings are omissions, using this fact to assume something about the carelessness of a

---

49 Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 42.
50 There are, of course, ways other than independent attestations that the creation of a scribe can become part of the manuscript record and not remain a singular reading. Another obvious one is if the singular readings of a scribe are then transmitted in a copy made of that manuscript.
51 Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 42.
scribe may be misleading, since the scribe may have been accurately copying the omissions of his Vorlage.

The initial response to this objection was that there are enough surviving Greek manuscripts of the New Testament, and contamination between manuscripts is so plentiful, that the likelihood was that singular readings were the creation of the scribe and ought not to be attributed to an unknown Vorlage. While this argument may be true with Greek manuscripts, the current study is interested in the Coptic versions of the New Testament (and of those limited only to the Gospel of John), which has far fewer witnesses than the Greek. There is certainly the possibility within the Coptic tradition that an unknown Vorlage may contain readings which I might consider singular. There are two responses to this objection.

The first is that textual criticism is always an adapting discipline. To some extent, all the conclusions I make are open to reinterpretation with the discovery of new manuscripts. While it is possible that a new Coptic manuscript may come to light that will show that one or another of the readings I have considered singular was not, in fact, the creation of a scribe, it seems highly improbable that the 1,621 singular readings I discovered among the three manuscripts will all be confirmed by some other find. Thus, while minor adaptations may need to be made if and when new manuscript evidence comes to light, surely enough data are currently available to give some insight into the habits of these scribes.

The second response to the objection that what appears to be a singular reading is in fact the reading of a scribe’s lost Vorlage is given by Royse in his discussion of the “complex scribe.” Royse deals with the idea of an isolated tradition:

Let us say that we are looking at an extant manuscript a, which was the only copy made from a now lost manuscript b, and that the Vorlage of b has left its influence

\[52\text{Ibid., 54.}\]
on other extant manuscripts. (Thus, the tradition is isolated only at b—a.) Some of the readings created by the scribe of b—those errors that were obvious to the scribe of a—will have been “corrected” by the scribe of a to (presumably) otherwise attested readings, and thus will not appear in a at all. Other readings created by the scribe of b will have been simply copied by the scribe of a, and some of these will be singular. And the scribe of a will have created his own readings, and some of these will be singular. The list of singular readings of a will thus include some (but probably not all) of the creations of the scribe of b, as well as some (but probably not all) of the creations of the scribe of a. Royse concludes that, since the Vorlage of b had effects on other manuscripts, the singular readings of a will be the result of only two scribes: that of a and b. But, as Royse argues, we can consider the effects of these two scribes as one complex scribe working on the Vorlage of b, and manuscript b is just “a link in the production of a, a link that has left no other trace, exactly as occurs with a scribe’s memory or the reading of a lector.” Thus one can treat the workings of a complex scribe as those of a regular scribe, with the realization that the complex scribe may “skew our conclusions . . . [in] the judgment, in some absolute terms, of the accuracy of the scribe.” When one discovers that the complex scribe has made twice as many errors due to homoeoteleuton as another scribe x, it tells us something about the quality of manuscript a, but not necessarily something about the exact habits of the scribe of a, for one is left with no way of knowing if a produced twice as many omissions as x or if a produced the same amount of omissions as x, but those omissions were compounded by the omissions of b, and thus appear to be twice as many. In the case of the complex scribe, one can make conclusions about the tendencies of the complex scribe of manuscript a, but must be careful about drawing too many conclusions about the exact scribe of a. In this work, I shall follow Royse’s terms:

I will speak of a manuscript’s “scribe” in the ordinary way, that is, meaning the person who actually wrote the manuscript. Discussions of the scribe’s handwriting or corrections, for instance, will obviously refer to this one person.

53 Ibid., 51-2.
54 Ibid., 54.
And most of the singulars should, without doubt, be attributed to this one person. However, in the discussions of patterns of errors . . . it should be kept in mind as a theoretical possibility that these patterns are in fact the results of the activity of a complex scribe.55

Thus the two main questions about singular readings have been answered: First, will all scribally created readings occur among the singular readings? No, but enough will that one will have sufficient data to work with to gain a picture of the habits of a scribe. Second, will all singular readings be scribally created? Yes, if one takes into account the work of the complex scribe.56

Despite stating that “a first impression of the quality of a manuscript can be gained from its singular readings,”57 Barbara Aland has expressed concern about limiting one’s study to singular readings with two objections. Her first objection is that this type of study leaves out other readings and materials that could be useful in understanding the “Eigenarten des Papyrus.”58 While this may be true if one’s goal were to develop criteria to assess the manuscripts of the New Testament, this is not the goal of an examination of singular readings. Rather, the goal is to assess the habits of a scribe (or a complex scribe). Aland is objecting that the methodology will not produce a goal that the method was not designed to produce. As Royse points out, “The examination of singular readings was not intended to be a way to judge all the ‘Eigenarten’ of a manuscript.”59 Thus, the first objection by Aland is easily dismissed.

Her second objection is that the method of examining singular readings is not useful for fragments but only for significant papyri. This may be the case, depending on the size of a

55 Ibid., 55.
56 For a much more detailed discussion and defense of these positions, see ibid., 41-56.
59 Royse, Scribal Habits, 61.
“fragment.” I, however, found myself agreeing with Royse’s sentiment: “Perhaps I may be permitted to say that I have wished more than once that the singular readings studied here . . . were not so numerous as they are . . .” Regardless of the merits of Aland’s objection to the examination of fragments, the objection does not apply to the current study, in that all of these manuscripts are fairly intact, and the most fragmentary of them, P. Mich. Inv. 3521, contains over a hundred singular readings.

The benefits and objections of singular readings having been dealt with, one can now turn to the methodology of isolating a singular reading. The ideal method would be to check each reading against all known manuscripts, but for obvious reasons this method has proved impractical, and thus the use of the apparatus of critical editions has been employed. Royse employed the most extensive use of editions:

. . . editions of von Soden, Clark, Nestle-Aland (25th, 26th, and 27th), the United Bible Societies (both 3rd and 4th), Aland’s Synopsis, Legg, the International Greek New Testament Project, Das Neue Testament auf Papyrus, and Swanson have all been utilized here, following an initial collation using Tischendorf.61 When dealing with Coptic manuscripts, one is not richly blessed with critical editions and apparatuses. The main Coptic editions of the New Testament are those of Horner.62 My collection of singular readings was made from an initial collation using both of Horner’s apparatuses. Kasser collated an additional forty-three manuscripts against the Sahidic text of Horner, and these too have been utilized in this study.63 I also used Thompson’s The Coptic Versions of the Acts of the Apostles and the Pauline Epistles in the Sahidic Dialect, which

60 Ibid., 62.
61 Ibid., 65.
contains an appendix of readings listing where the Gospel of John of manuscripts A and B differs from Horner’s editions; the edition of Kasser of Papyrus Bodmer III, using my own corrections where available, as well as Kasser’s corrections in his later publications, and some fragments of John published by Kahle. In addition to these resources, I also checked each manuscript used in this study against the others.

What were not consulted in this study were the Greek editions of the Gospel of John, and this was a methodological choice. Metzger points out that much has been written on the limitations of using Coptic to reconstruct Greek. Rufus Moretz, who wrote his dissertation on the Coptic versions of the Gospel of John and their relation to Greek texts stated:

Because of widely differing characteristics of structure and syntax between Coptic and Greek, any effort to determine an underlying Greek text solely on the basis of the Coptic version of the Greek abounds with difficulties.

It is precisely because of these difficulties that I decided not to use Greek readings as witnesses to the Coptic text; any attempt to compare the two would force one to translate the Coptic into the Greek. The process of making that translation would influence the outcome of the Greek and thus the data resulting from that translation. Due to the subjective nature of translating between the two languages, it is more prudent to avoid using Greek resources and restrict the current study to singular readings among known Coptic texts. Once I have used the Coptic witnesses to isolate a singular reading, however, I will look at Greek support and parallels when they are relevant.

---

65 Kasser, Bodmer III; Kasser, Selon Saint Jean; Kasser, “Rêexaminté”.
66 Paul Eric Kahle, Bala’izah: Coptic Texts from Deir el-Bala’izah in upper Egypt (London: Published on behalf of the Griffith Institute, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford by Oxford University Press, 1954), 344-49.
A second methodological decision that had a direct bearing on the outcome was the way in which dialects are dealt with in this study. Each manuscript is in a different dialect: P. Mich. Inv. 3521 is in Middle Egyptian with Fayumic influence; Qau el Kebir is in Subakhmimic; PPalau Rib. Inv. Nr. 183 is in Sahidic. For much of the Gospel of John, P. Mich 3521 and Qau el Kebir are the only witnesses to the text within their particular dialect and thus would create a large number of singular readings, especially orthographic ones. These readings would not be particularly relevant, since they would merely display the dialectal rendering of the same word in other texts. Thus, the decision was made to ignore all dialectal readings. A reading was considered dialectal if it was covered by the author of the primary edition in the “dialect” section of the introduction to the text. An example can be found in Husselman’s edition where she states, “in 3521 the perfect prefix is always ḫ α̂ .” Thus the instances where the inclusion of the letter ḫ to the regular perfect verbal prefix α will not be included in this list of singular readings.69

The methodology I employed was as follows: first I checked each of the published transcriptions of the three manuscripts in question against either digital photographs of the original or the actual original manuscripts. The corrections that I made to each transcription will be noted in the appropriate chapter. After I had an updated transcription of each manuscript, I collated the transcriptions against Horner’s edition, looking for singular readings. Each singular reading that was discovered was then checked against the other two manuscripts, updates to Horner’s edition and P. Bodmer III. The remaining singular readings were then placed into three broad categories: orthographic readings; nonsense readings and sensible readings.

Orthographic readings, as the name implies, are singular readings that are caused by a unique spelling of a recognizable word. This spelling is unique in the location it exists but may

69 Husselman, Gospel of John 11.
not be unique to the language; in other words, the spelling of the word may be attested in lexicons like Crum’s or Smith’s, but the spelling is not attested in other manuscripts at that precise location. If this spelling is due to a dialectal shift, then it is not included in this list because, as stated earlier, all dialectal singulars are ignored. If, however, the spelling of a word is not attested in other manuscripts at that location, then it is placed on the list of orthographic readings. The difficulty in this practice is distinguishing between an orthographic reading and a nonsense reading. My experience was similar to that of Royse, who wrote:

In fact, attempting to discriminate precisely between orthographic readings and nonsense readings has caused much fluctuation in my preliminary work, and I cannot claim to be entirely satisfied with the present classification. My principle has been to place under orthographic readings those readings that can be reasonably seen as alternative spellings of the usual readings, or that involve well-established phonetic substitutions . . . but many of the readings called “orthographic” are quite likely to be simple lapses, or the result of syntactic confusion. Other students may, therefore, wish to consider some of these readings to be nonsense singulars . . .

I have followed the same methodology as Royse in my dissertation, classifying as orthographic readings those which reasonably can be seen as alternative spellings, that are attested as alternate spellings in lexicons, or that involve regular Coptic phonetic substitutions.

Nonsense readings, as defined by Colwell, are readings that “include words unknown to grammar or lexicon, words that cannot be constructed syntactically, or words that do not make sense in the context.” Royse finds it useful to classify these readings further between “strictly nonsense” readings (those which are not words at all [or orthographic variants of a word]) and

---

70 Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 82.
72 Colwell, *Studies*, 111.
‘nonsense in context’ readings (the other nonsense readings).”  

Since the purpose of this study is to understand the habits of scribes, and the number and frequency of nonsense singulars has been understood to shed some light on the care of the scribe, I have found Royse’s further classification helpful in better understanding the habits of scribes.  

Then the question of corrections within a manuscript itself arises, since many “corrections” within a manuscript take place at the nonsense readings. Which should be considered as the reading of the manuscript: the original reading or the correction? Again, the guiding goal of this study is not a consideration of the text that a manuscript preserves, but rather a discussion of the habits of the scribes of these manuscripts—and, specifically, the scribe who originally created each manuscript. With that goal in mind, the method for this study will be to catalogue every correction made in the manuscripts and then make a case-by-case determination as to whether the correction is in the hand of the original scribe. If it is judged that the correction was made by the scribe, then the corrected reading will be considered the text in that part of the manuscript. If, however, the correction is judged to be the work of a later hand, then the uncorrected reading will be considered the text of the manuscript.  

I am not a paleographic expert, so it is possible that some of my classifications may be erroneous. I will use the notes in the editions of Thompson, Husselman, and Quecke to assist in my judgments. As stated above, I will also include a complete appendix of all corrections so that those interested may go back and revisit the question of authorship of the corrections.  

The final category that the singular readings will be divided into is the sensible readings. These are readings that make sense in their context and are legitimate alternatives to other readings (the other nonsense readings).”

---

74 Ibid., 91.
75 I certainly did not create this methodology for dealing with correctors; Royse used the same methodology. Ibid., 74-9.
readings. This is the largest group of singulars and will be further subdivided into omissions, additions, substitutions (where one word is substituted for another with the same meaning), transpositions and verbal changes.\textsuperscript{76}

With this basic outline of the methodology of this study, I will move to an examination of P. Mich. Inv. 3521.

\textsuperscript{76} Royse used the same categories, minus the verbal changes, which I found very useful when dealing with Coptic verbs. Ibid., 94.
P. Mich. Inv. 3521

**Overview**

“P. Mich. Inv. 3521 arrived at the University of Michigan on October, 1926 in a collection of miscellaneous papyri purchased in Egypt in 1925.”

Though it was received by the University at this time, it was not until 1962 that a transcription of the manuscript was published.

Crum did have access to some photostats of the manuscript and made use of them for his Coptic dictionary.

Kahle also made use of P. Mich. Inv. 3521 in his study, so the manuscript was known but not widely available.

Since its publication 3521 has been used mostly in studies of other Coptic texts by way of comparison.

It has also been used in the Nestle-Aland *Novum Testamentum Graece* as part of the support of early versions to the Greek text.

Twenty-nine folios of the codex remain, although all of them only partially. Because of the large degree of variation on any given folio (ranging from eleven letters per line to twenty-two; upper margins varying from 2 cm. to 1.3 cm.; left margins varying from 1.5 to 2.5 cm.; and the number of lines varying from fifteen to twenty), it is nearly impossible to conjecture how many folios would have been required to complete the Gospel of John, and thus how many folios are missing from our surviving manuscript.

Husselman does state with confidence, however,

---

78 Ibid.
80 Kahle, *Coptic Texts*.
81 Kasser, *Selon Saint Jean*; Moretz.
82 Aland et al., eds., *Novum Testamentum Graece: post Eberhard Nestle et Erwin Nestle*, 70*.
that the codex was clearly a single-quire manuscript. The manuscript has been dated to the early part of the fourth century, based chiefly on paleography.

The extant text begins in John 6:11 and contains text up to John 15:11, with various folios missing in between and many of the surviving pages extremely fragmentary.

---

84 Ibid., 6.
85 Ibid., 9-10.
Corrections to Published Transcription

Prior to locating the singular readings of P. Mich. Inv. 3521, I collated Husselman’s transcription against photographs available online of the codex at APIS. In doing so I found five corrections:

John 6:40 ὑπερατ for ὑπερατ Husselman did not write an epsilon which is clearly visible in the photograph.

John 6:52 δ. for η. The letter δ immediately precedes a lacuna but is very clear. The transcription should probably be written δ[ε] whereas Husselman writes η[αυμι]. αυμι is probably written in the lacuna in P. Mich. Inv. 3521 but since the lacuna appears at the end of the line and, as Husselman herself argued, the letters per line of this manuscript can vary a great deal, it is certainly possible that the word δε preceded this word. There is one other Coptic manuscript with a δε in this location, so this is not singular.

John 6:66 ζα ου λαμι for ζαορλαμι. The lambda in Husselman’s transcription appears at the end of the line, while the alpha would be the initial letter of the next line. Upon close inspection of the photograph, it seems to me that what Husselman has recorded as a lambda is in fact an alpha. The second alpha (the one allegedly at the beginning of line 9) does not exist. There is perhaps, a dot of ink there, but it does not appear to be a letter. Thus, the λαμι that Husselman had such a hard time explaining (there is no such Coptic word) is in fact λι.

John 6:68 ἀνεε[ψε] for ἀνεψ[ε]

87 Horner, Southern Dialect, John 6:52.
88 Husselman, Gospel of John 56.
John 10:3 Περεν for Нерен. This is a singular for a plural. Both readings are attested elsewhere, and the Greek manuscripts are also divided on this reading.

With these updates to Husselman’s transcription, one can now begin to evaluate the work of the scribe of P. Mich. Inv. 3521.

**Corrections by the Scribe**

There is only one correction in P. Mich. Inv. 3521. It appears to be in the hand of the scribe. It occurs on folio 19 Verso line 2, in John 9:40. The scribe has added a τ in the left margin. These letters are the last two letters of the verb ευτυ, the initial two letters of the verb being written as the final letters of the previous line. Without these two letters the verb εω means “to drink.” Thus the sentence would be nonsense, reading: They drank, namely some from the Pharisees and they said to him . . . Whereas clearly the sentence should be, “They heard, namely some of the Pharisees. . .”

**Orthographic Singulars**

Excluding orthographic singulars which Husselman explains in her introduction (vowel shifts, regular verbal prefixes, etc.), there are still 9 orthographic singulars in P. Mich. 3521, accounting for around 8 percent of the 112 singular readings.\(^{89}\) These can be categorized in the following manner:

1. Spellings that are known to Smith or Crum but occur in no other known manuscripts in this location.
   a. John 7:21 ουωτ for Νουωτ. Crum states that to omit the Η is archaic Sahidic.\(^ {90}\)
   b. John 9:32 εζιν listed in Crum as a form of ΖΙΝ.\(^ {91}\)

---

\(^{89}\) Ibid., 11-4.
\(^{90}\) Crum, *A Coptic Dictionary*, 494A.
c. John 14:19 ωνας listed in Crum as a spelling variant of ωνθ. 92

d. John 15:5 ατζεντ listed in Crum as a spelling of αζεντ. 93

2. Unusual spellings that seem to be based on some Bohairic form of the word:

a. John 7:13 and 13:28 γι for γιλ. γιλ is the Bohairic form of the word, Crum lists

γιλ as the Fayumic spelling but the lambda is missing in this manuscript both in

7:13 and in 13:28. 94 In 13:28 Husselman even makes a note that Crum’s reading

of this passage (which is cited in his dictionary) is incorrect. 95

b. John 7:35 Νισελλαη for the Bohairic Νιοτεινιν or the Sahidic Νεσελλαη. This

manuscript has the typical Sahidic spelling but the ιι typical of the Bohairic.

3. Words that are unknown in lexicons and possibly a spelling error:

a. John 6:12 τοτε for θοτε. The context of this makes this form most likely an

imperative, which Crum lists as θοτε in the Fayumic. 96 Unfortunately this

manuscript has a lacuna or is missing pages in other locations where this word

appears so it is difficult to tell how it might be spelled elsewhere in the

manuscript (see 4:6, 6:13, 11:47, 11:52, 15:6, 18:2). Therefore, I cannot tell if this

is the regular way the scribe spelled this word, or if this is an error in this one

instance.

b. John 6:68 αννεεγε for αννεεγε. This is a very difficult passage because the

91 Ibid., 773A.
92 Ibid., 525A.
93 Ibid., 25B-6A.
94 Ibid., 667B.
95 Husselman, Gospel of John 79.
96 Crum, A Coptic Dictionary, 448A.
transcription that Husselman has is wrong. She omits a letter after the $n$ but there is clearly something there. It is difficult to say if it is a $c$ or an $e$, and thus it is difficult to be certain about the nature of this singular, but it appears that the scribe doubled the $e$ instead of the $n$ in this word.

**Nonsense Singulars**

Of the one hundred twelve singular readings, only three are nonsense readings. This means only 2.7% of the singular readings created by this scribe were nonsense, while using the same methodology the scribes of Qau El Kebir and P. Palau Rib Inv. 183 created 5.08 % and 4.17% respectively. For reference purposes, Royse found the nonsense singulars in his study to vary from 3.9% to 16.3%, so this is below any of his findings as well.\(^7\)

John 6:36 πικτευεν for πικτευε ἀν. Within the Fayumic dialect the postpositive negative particle ἀν is written ἐν, so within this Coptic manuscript what one would expect to find is πικτευε ἐν. This form is what one does find in John 6:64 on folio 6 verso lines 1 and 2. By omitting the epsilon the scribe has left a nonsense reading.

John 6:40 πικτευεραυ for πικτευε ερω. Ignoring the vowel shifts that are common for this dialect, one can see that the scribe has again omitted an epsilon at the end of the word πικτευε (or at the beginning of ερω). In 6:35, folio 3 verso line 1, the scribe writes πικτευε εραι without omitting the epsilon, this is almost the same wording, so the omission of the epsilon is not part of the dialect, or at least not one done consistently by the scribe, but rather is an

---

\(^7\) Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 120, 254, 373, 492, 577, 652.
omission caused by the scribe writing one epsilon instead of two. This is essentially the same error that occurred in the previous example.

John 6:63 ₫₦INEI. Exactly what was in the Vorlage is conjectural. The majority of Sahidic manuscripts have ₫₦AAP ₫₦UAZE written in this location. The majority of Boehairic manuscripts have ₫ɔɔi ₫ {@0} ₫HIP ₫NICAZI in this verse. Husselman conjectures that the scribe intended to write the Fayumic Coptic word ₫HINE, the equivalent of ₫AAP, followed by the plural demonstrative pronoun ₫NEI.98 Thus the scribe should have written ₫₦INE ₫NEI and omitted the syllable ₫NE leaving the nonsense reading ₫₦INEI. Given that this scribe has twice created a nonsense reading by omitting a doubled letter, I find Husselman’s conjecture persuasive that this scribe omitted here a doubled syllable to create a nonsense reading.

These nonsense readings are all caused by omissions: the final epsilon of ₫MECE being omitted by the initial epsilon of the next word, in the first two instances, and in the final example the syllable ₫NE being omitted. The other thing that will be noted is that two of these singular readings, the first and the last, are most likely to have occurred if the exemplar of this text was also in Fayumic Coptic. The initial epsilon that was omitted from ₫EN is actually written as ₫AN in most Coptic dialects. Also, the omission of the syllable ₫NE, only makes sense if the exemplar had the peculiar Fayumic word ₫NINE written in its text. It is possible that these omissions occurred in some other way, but the easiest explanation is that this scribe was looking at a Fayumic text and made his omissions while copying that text.

98 Husselman, Gospel of John 55.
Sensible Readings

Additions

There are nine sensible additions in P. Mich. Inv. 3521. This accounts for 9% of the sensible readings. Additions make up 9.5% of the sensible readings of Qau El Kebir and 15.7% of PPalau Rib. Inv. 183, so this manuscript is the lowest of the three. Of the six Greek papyri in Royse’s study additions ranged from 10.4% to 18.9% of all singular readings, with the average being 13.2%, so this Coptic manuscript is a little bit low on the range of the Greek manuscripts, but nothing too shocking.

One of the additions the scribe made was of a single letter, marking the object, \( n \), in John 6:70. This manuscript writes \( \text{\textmu\textmu}\text{\textbar} \) while Horner’s Bohairic text has \( \text{\textmu}\text{\textbar} \). Both are contractions for the number twelve.

One of the additions made by the scribe is the addition of \( \text{\textne} \) (John 11:30) after the preterit converter \( \text{\textne} \). Layton explains this use:

Invariable \( \text{\textne} \) occurs with some other types of sentence, especially preterit clauses; but not as an essential pattern constituent. Here, the category or structure optionally signaled by \( \text{\textne} \), the motivation for its use, and the conditions of its occurrence are at present unknown.\(^99\)

While the inclusion of the optional \( \text{\textne} \) occurs only one time as a singular reading in this manuscript, it occurs three times in Qau El Kebir and twice in PPalau. There are no instances where the omission of the invariable \( \text{\textne} \) after preterit \( \text{\textne} \) results in a singular reading in any of the three manuscripts consulted for this study.

The most common addition is the addition of one word:

\(^{99}\) Layton, Grammar, 223.
John 6:23. This means “in” and is used in the phrase, “in some other ships.” Horner’s Sahidic text is written, “And behold some other ships came out of Tiberias, near the place which they ate the bread . . .” This manuscript reads, “and in some other ships they came out of Tiberias near the place which they ate the bread. . .” In both passages the meaning is a little unclear, Metzger comments on the Greek in his textual commentary that there is a “multiplicity of variants” for this passage, each trying to clarify its meaning.\textsuperscript{100} This passage adds to that multiplicity and it remains unclear to me if it is the disciples from verse 22 that are the ones who came in the boat from Tiberias—clarifying the movements of the disciples in verse 22, or if it is the multitude in verse 24 that came from in the boats, clarifying how it is that they would have boats later on even though the narrative just said that there were no other boats. It seems that the scribe inserted \textit{hi} to help clarify this confusing passage, but his attempt was not successful.

John 9:27 \textit{ou\nu}. This is the Greek word \textit{ou\nu} meaning “therefore, then, or thus.” The entire phrase in this manuscript is \textit{ou\nu \ λ\nu\nu} whereas both the Sahidic and Bohairic texts of Horner has simply \textit{ou\nu}. The Bohairic text of Horner lists \textit{ou\nu \ λ\nu\nu} and \textit{ou\nu\nu\nu} as variants in the apparatus.\textsuperscript{101} So some Coptic manuscripts do have \textit{ou\nu\nu\nu} in this location but they omit \textit{ou\nu}. The entire phrase \textit{ou\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu} should be translated as “what then again” and this phrase does appear in two Greek manuscripts: Codex Vaticanus and P75 have τί \textit{ou\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu} written here, which is the exact equivalent found in this manuscript.\textsuperscript{102}

\textsuperscript{100} Metzger, \textit{Textual Commentary}, 182.
\textsuperscript{101} Horner, \textit{Northern Dialect}, 160.
\textsuperscript{102} Aland et al., eds., \textit{Novum Testamentum Graece: post Eberhard Nestle et Erwin Nestle}, 280.
John 9:36 ΑΥ. Tischendorf and NA have ἀπεκρίθη ἐκεῖνος καὶ εἶπεν written in this spot. Horner’s Sahidic text has simply πεζας, while his Bohairic text has ἀπερονω πεζας. The apparatuses of both texts mention several variants but none have the addition of ΑΥ here, although it would be the translation of the Greek καὶ that occurs in this spot.

John 9:39 ἄξα. This is the Fayumic spelling of the word εις and is a particle meaning “verily” or “indeed.” P. Mich. Inv. 3521 omits all of verse 38 and the first words of verse 39. This omission is not singular as it also occurs in Qau El Keibr. This manuscript, however, makes the transition from verse 37 to the remaining portion of 39 smoother by adding the word ἄξα.

Horner’s Sahidic text reads:

37. Said Jesus to him, Thou sawest him, and he who speaketh to thee is that (one). 38. But he, said to him, Lord, I believe. And he worshiped him. 39. Said Jesus to him, I came indeed to this world for a judgment . . .

Thompson’s translation of Qau El Kebir reads:

37. Jesus said unto him, Thou hast seen him and he that speaketh with thee is he. 39. I came into this world unto judgment . . .

And 3521 would read (granting the reconstructions made by Husselman):

37. Said Jesus to him, you saw him and the one who speaks to you is he. 39. Indeed I came to this world for a judgment . . .

The inclusion of ἄξα helps to serve as a connection between 37 and 39 and shows that the omission of 38 was not accidental. These verse are also missing in some Greek witnesses, including P.

John 9:41 ρω. The adding of the word “indeed” has no Coptic parallels. It emphasizes that if the Pharisees were indeed blind they would have no sin.

103 Crum, A Coptic Dictionary, 64B.
105 Thompson, Gospel of St. John , 60.
106 Aland et al., eds., Novum Testamentum Graece: post Eberhard Nestle et Erwin Nestle, 281. It also says that these verses are omitted in one Sahidic manuscript, but I could not find any support for this.
John 10:24 δὲ (dialectal rendering of δὲ therefore).¹⁰⁷ This has no parallels in Greek or other versions. The scribe adds the word “therefore” making the verse read, “The Jews surrounded him saying to him, Until when, therefore, are you taking away our hearts? If you are Christ say to us openly.”

The only addition of more than one word occurs in John 12:2, and part of it is in a lacuna. Ἡμεῖς τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ μὴ ἴδῃ. The vast majority of manuscripts have some form of ἵππαξ at the end of this phrase “with him,” instead of “with Jesus.” Bodmer III does appear to have “with Jesus” in this location but it is in part of the manuscript that I have been unable to verify, so for this study I will continue to call this singular. Another interesting part of this singular is the verb ἴδῃ—to see. The final upsilon of this word is half in a lacuna, and there is a small chance that it is actually a ż, which would make this the Fayumic spelling of the word in Horner’s Sahidic edition ἱπῆξ.¹⁰⁸ So this reads either, “Lazarus was one of those who was seen with them was with Jesus,” or “Lazarus was one of those who reclined beside them with Jesus.” Also the addition of the phrase, Ἡμεῖς τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ meaning “beside them” or “with them” is singular with no parallel. This was a difficult reading to categorize because it is both an addition and also a substitution. This same substitution also appears in John 13:28 when talking about those that reclined with Jesus eating during the last supper. So this is a consistent substitution as well as an addition. In order to reflect this, I have counted this first instance as an addition and the second one as a substitution.¹⁰⁹

---

¹⁰⁷ Crum, A Coptic Dictionary, 802A.
¹⁰⁸ Horner, Southern Dialect, John 12:2; Crum, A Coptic Dictionary, 247A.
¹⁰⁹ See singular reading number 159 in John 13:28 for more information on the other reading.
Omissions

Of the 100 sensible readings 12 are omissions. That 12% is the lowest of any of the Coptic manuscripts and also lower than any of Royse’s findings among the Greek papyri. Eight of the omissions are of only one word:

John 6:13 omit ἦν. The demonstrative pronoun is omitted. The Bohairic text of Horner reads "loaves of barley, those which remained." Here we have “loaves of barley which remained.” The Sahidic also omits the demonstrative pronoun but has a different form of the sentence altogether. This reading follows the Bohairic but omits the demonstrative pronoun.

John 6:71 πέ. This πέ is the πέ after preterit πέ and is present in the Sahidic text of Horner. This manuscript, however, changes the verb πέψζω to the circumstantial αφζω, and thus does not require the πέ and it is omitted.

John 6:71 omits παί. The majority of Coptic manuscripts have παί σάρ written here, “For this he who will deliver him up . . .” A few manuscripts in the apparatus of Horner’s Bohairic text agree with this manuscript in omitting σάρ but the omission of παί is singular. The remaining reading in this manuscript is perfectly sensible, “But he spoke it concerning Judas the son of Simon the Iscariot, the one who will betray him.” While sensible, I see no Greek equivalent in either NA or Tischendorf; both have οὗτος γὰρ in this location.

John 7:40 πέ. This is not an optional πέ after the preterit πέ. This is the sentence, “This

---

110 While αφζω may appear to be the 1st perfect, in this dialect that would be written αφζώ; this is the Sahidic εψζω with the appropriate dialectal vowel shift, this verbal change, and its issues are addressed as a separate singular reading, see singular reading 82.

111 Horner, Northern Dialect, 407.
truly is the prophet.” The πε is the copular pronoun. Layton, in his lengthy discussion on nominal sentences, defines several patterns of nominal sentences. Pattern one is the interlocutive pattern, which since John 7:40 is a quote of the multitude applies here. This pattern has a predicate and a noun. The example he gives is ἄνγε ὁ προφήτης, “I am a prophetess.”¹¹² In section 286 he identifies the formal classifications of predicates and lists the demonstrative pronoun παί as one of them.¹¹³ This form of the nominal sentence does not require the copular pronoun πε. Thus this sentence πει προφήτης, “this is the prophet” could be possible. It could, however, be that the πε was omitted in error as the eye leapt over one πε in the phrase πεπροφήτης, but since the remaining sentence is sensible and possible, I give the scribe the benefit of the doubt and classify this as the sensible omission of πε.

John 9:30 Ντωτή. The second person personal pronoun is omitted here. Again it is difficult to tell if this is omitted by a scribal leap or if it was intentionally left out. It is unneeded in the sentence since the Coptic verb indicates the person and number. The form, however, of the verbal auxiliary used here is Ντετή, and thus it is easy to see how the scribe could have accidentally omitted Ντωτή.

John 9:40 Νετητήματ. This changes the phrase “some of the Pharisees who were with him heard” to “some of the Pharisees heard.”

John 11:22 Ντε πνοήτε. It is possible that this manuscript has a similar word order to A²

¹¹² Layton, Grammar, 206.
¹¹³ Ibid., 224.
which places the phrase "From God" before θυμάτ, and thus the phrase is not omitted in this manuscript but lost in the lacuna. I see no Greek parallel that omits “from God.” The phrase in the Sahidic text of Horner reads, “. . . all things which thou wilt ask from God, he will give to thee.” This manuscript has, “. . . all things which thou wilt ask, he will give to thee, namely God.” The restating of the subject “God” at the end of the phrase is also found in the Bohairic text of Horner, so that is not singular. It is impossible to tell if this is an omission or a transposition following Qau El Kebir, but in the absence of further evidence I will label it tentatively as an omission.

John 14:23 ζ. The inclusion of ζ is so formulaic that it seems very unusual that it should be omitted, “Jesus answered and said that,” occurs several times and always includes ζ. There is no reason the eye should skip from ἤξη over ζ, unless it occurred at the end of the line in the Vorlage. A search of the first few pages shows that the formula includes ζ every time it is visible (half a dozen times): 6:12, 6:28, 6:29, 6:32, 6:61, 6:65. I see no reason why this ζ is omitted other than carelessness.

John 14:23 αὐω. No Greek manuscripts of NA or Tischendorf support this reading, or any Coptic. The manuscript is relatively clear here and αὐω is clearly omitted.

John 15:9 ἡρα. The phrase is “remain in my love” and the Sahidic text of Horner has, ὀφραῖ ἐν ταλαπ. The Bohairic has Ὀφρι ἐν ταλαπ. This manuscript has ὀφ.
Smith states that ṣraith ṣn means “in, within.”\textsuperscript{115} ṣn alone can have a similar meaning of “in” or “among,” so there may not be much difference between these two readings.\textsuperscript{116} While the omission of ṣraith in the phrase ṣraith ṣn occurs only here in the extant part of this manuscript, it does occur as singular readings in two places in Qau El Kebir (3:15 and 9:3) and one time in PPalau Rib. Inv. 183 (17:13).

There are two singular omissions in this manuscript that are longer than one word. Both are two word omissions.

John 10:5 Ἰν πτοκ. This omission leaves the phrase, “they will not follow a stranger.” This sentence makes sense in context; the contrasting conjunction Ἰν is not needed to make the point. Horner says the Ἰν is also omitted in some Armenian manuscripts.\textsuperscript{117}

John 11:55 ζεκας εὐηβοοη. Horner translates the phrase “that they should cleanse themselves.”\textsuperscript{118} The previous page is missing and the initial word on this page is ὑπαξχα. Tischendorf, NA and UBS make no mention of any Greek manuscripts omitting this phrase. Theologically the people cleansing themselves are people seeking Jesus and there seems to be no reason to omit this passage on theological grounds. I can see no clear way that the eye would leap to omit this passage either. I can see no grounds as to make a judgment about why or how this was omitted.

\textsuperscript{115} Richard Smith, \textit{A Concise Coptic-English Lexicon}, 2nd ed., Resources for Biblical Study (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999), 51.
\textsuperscript{116} Ibid., 49.
\textsuperscript{117} Horner, \textit{Southern Dialect}, John 10:5.
\textsuperscript{118} Ibid., John 11:55.
Transpositions

Due to the fragmentary state of Mich. 3521 and the reconstructed nature of its transcription, it is sometimes difficult to tell if a singular reading is caused by an omission or by a transposition. Often the word, or words, in question are words that are reconstructed in a lacuna. Other times the words immediately preceding or following the passage in question are missing. In these instances it becomes difficult to determine if a word has been omitted or transposed because the possibility remains that the word was transposed to a location in the sentence that is now in a lacuna. I have already given an example of this issue above when discussing what I have labeled as an omission in John 11:22. Since the passage in question occurs at the very beginning of that folio and the preceding folio is missing, it is impossible to tell with certainty if the clause is missing or transposed to earlier in the sentence. In this section, as I focus on transpositions, there is another passage with similar problems:

John 7:25 ζω υμᾶς. The reconstructed transcription of Husselman reads:


The phrase ζω υμᾶς is expected after the initial Δε. It is clearly not in this location, and since Husselman has lacunae to fill, she finds a suitable place for it. I am convinced here of Husselman’s reconstruction, and thus it appears that the verb is moved to later in this sentence, making [βάλ γν ρεμ τςι]εροτσα[λήμ one long subject. Since this sentence must have a verb somewhere, it seems most likely that this is a transposition, although it is possible that the verb is omitted by scribal error, perhaps because the scribe confused ζω and Δε.
Including the above example in the list of transpositions, there are 6 sensible transpositions in P. Mich. Inv. 3521, or 6% of the sensible readings. This compares to 5% of the readings in Qau El Kebir and 6.9% of the readings in PPalau Rib. Inv. 183. Transpositions make up the lowest percentage of any type of sensible readings in all three Coptic manuscripts. Royse also found some manuscripts with small percentages of transpositions, with P47 having the fewest with 3.8%, although there were wider fluctuations among the papyri he studied than along my Coptic texts, with the highest being 22.9%.119

John 6:18 ἡτε θάλασσα δε γακ των ιεροι ἐρρη απο ονο νυ ην ην ηνολ μπαλ. This translates to, “But the sea, it arose up, a great wind (blowing) outside.” Horner’s Sahidic text has, ἐρρη ὄνοδον ἰτατ οι οι οι οι οι οι, “But a great wind (blowing) forth, the sea rose up.”120 The Bohairic has: φιομ ἰτατ νασκιο μπε νυ αρη ιε ουν ιοπουν ιο, “And the sea was being (lit. coming) disturbed (lit. awake), a great wind blowing.”121 Thus we see that in the Sahidic texts the clause begins with discussion of the wind and concludes with discussion of the sea. The Bohairic and 3521 both begin with a discussion of the sea and conclude with the wind, but the verbs and tenses are different between the two. Thus 3521 looks more like a transposition of the Sahidic than it does the Bohairic. Part of the confusion may come from the Greek underlining this verse, ὁτε θάλασσα ἀνέμου μεγάλου πνέοντος διεγείρετο.122 There appears to be confusion amongst the scribes about how to deal with the genitive participial clause.

119 Royse, Scribal Habits, 153, 380.
120 Horner, Southern Dialect, John 6:18.
121 Horner, Northern Dialect, John 6:18.
John 7:4 ἡτατ. NA has ζητεῖ αὐτὸς ἐν παρρησίᾳ εἶναι written here, and this placement of αὐτὸς (ἡτατ.) is followed by the Sahidic text: ητατη ηνατα ηνατα ηνατα ηνατα ἐν ουπαρησια. This manuscript moves it to read ητατη ηνατα ηνατα ηνατα ηνατα ἐν ουπαρησια. Although there are some variants given in Tischendorf, there are no Greek manuscripts or versions that support this location. This placement appears to be a creation of the scribe.123

John 9:27 ἐρμαθηθής ἦν γων for ἐρμαθηθής γων. γων or ἐρμαθηθής means “also you” or “even you” and the meaning of the phrase, “do you wish to become his disciples also” does not change much with the movement.

John 9:31 ἀλλα εὐωπι εοναι πε εὐωμι ἦν for ἀλλα εὐωπι εοπμουτε πε ουα in the Sahidic or ἀλλα εὐωπι εουμαμμουτε πε ουα in the Bohairic. Horner translates his passages, “But if one is a man of God” and “but if anyone is a worshipper of God” respectively. Moving the ουαι earlier in the sentence more closely approximates its position in the Greek: ἀλλ’ εάν τις θεοσεβῆς ἦ.

John 15:5 ἐν for ἐν ἐδω. This is the transposition of the negative particle ἐν. I see no clear explanation as to why a scribe would make this change.

Transpositions as Corrected Leaps

One of the categories that Royse discusses in his work is “transpositions as corrected leaps.” Royse gives Colwell’s explanation of this idea:

By a leap [from the same to the same] the scribe jumps over a word, copies the following word, looks back to his exemplar, catches his error, and writes in the omitted word out of order.\textsuperscript{124}

Of the six transpositions in P. Mich. Inv. 3521 I could find no examples that could be explained as having resulted from a corrected leap—even if one imagined the exemplar in Sahidic, Bohairic, Fayumic or even Greek. While this category proved very useful in Royse’s study I found that it did not apply to this manuscript.\textsuperscript{125}

**Substitutions**

Substitutions make up the largest percentage of singular readings in 3521. The 51 substitutions account for 51\% of all sensible readings. Substitutions account for the most of any category of sensible singular readings in Qau El Kebir as well, but only 35\% of the overall count. In PPalaau there are fewer substitutions and they make up only 16.7\% of the sensible singular readings. We can categorize the sensible readings into four types:

1. Where P. Mich. Inv. 3521 uses a Coptic word in instances where other Coptic manuscripts maintain a Greek word.

2. Where this manuscript uses a Greek word where other Coptic manuscripts employ a Coptic word.

3. Where this manuscript uses a Coptic word different than the Coptic word used in other manuscripts, but makes the substitution consistently throughout the manuscript, allowing for the possibility that this was a regular dialectal substitution of the scribe.

4. Where this manuscript uses a Coptic word different than the Coptic word used in

\textsuperscript{124} Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 157.

\textsuperscript{125} See for example his discussion on transpositions as corrected leaps in chapter four, ibid., 157-61.
other manuscripts, but where the Coptic word in the majority of the other Coptic texts is also used elsewhere by this scribe in this manuscript, thus demonstrating that it is a work known to and within the vocabulary of the scribe.

Because of the fragmentary nature of P. Mich. Inv. 3521 it is not always possible to distinguish between categories 3 and 4. For example, a word may occur nine times in the Gospel of John but only be extant in one place in this manuscript; thus it is not possible to ascertain if this is a regular substitution by the scribe. In such instances I will assume that it is not a regular substitution but will note it accordingly in the comments.

Coptic for Greek

There are two instances where 3521 substitutes a Coptic word when other Coptic witnesses maintain a Greek word.

John 6:61 \(\text{ji}=\nu\nu\) for \(\text{petckandalize}\). Crum cites this passage in his dictionary giving \(\text{ckandalize}\) as the Greek equivalent of \(\text{ji}=\nu\nu\).\(^{126}\)

John 12:47 \(\text{aha}\) for \(\text{gar}\). While this manuscript uses \(\text{gar}\) in other locations,\(^{127}\) here it substitutes the Coptic word \(\text{aha}\) meaning “indeed.”\(^{128}\)

Greek for Coptic

There is only one example of this type of substitution in this manuscript:

John 7:40 \(\text{oun}\) for \(\text{e}\). \(\text{oun}\) is the Greek word in this location in both NA and Tischendorf.

This manuscript maintains the Greek word. This does occur often in the Bohairic text (for

\(^{126}\)Crum, \textit{A Coptic Dictionary}, 786B.  
\(^{127}\)See 7:1, 4 and 5 for three examples.  
\(^{128}\)Smith, \textit{Lexicon}, 8.
example see John 9:16, where both Horner’s Bohairic text and P. Mich. Inv. 3521 have ὅρις, but in this location the Bohairic has Ἀρι instead.

Consistent Coptic Substitutions
There are seventeen singular substitutions that can be classified as a substitution that occurs consistently throughout the manuscript.

**狃 волос for ὅρις**. The Coptic Etymological Dictionary shows that these two words do not come from the same etymology. Their meanings are similar (answered or repeated) but they are different words. Crum in his listing for ὅρις gives no Fayumic spelling, but rather lists the word狃 волос as the Fayumic equivalent. This substitution is consistent in this manuscript; every time the Sahidic of Horner has ὅρις this manuscript (when visible) writes狃 волос (see 6:29, 7:21, 9:11, 9:25, 10:25 and 14:23). This is the largest occurrence of this type of substitution, making up six of the seventeen.

**ꜣ for ꜣ** is another example of a consistent substitution. Crum states that Fayumic normally has ꜣ for ꜣ and that Bohairic has ꜣ, but this manuscript consistently uses ꜣ. In most cases when this manuscript uses ꜣ it is not singular because the Bohairic also has ꜣ. But in one instance, John 6:66, the Bohairic surprisingly uses a form of ꜣ while this manuscript continues to use ꜣ.

---

130 Crum, A Coptic Dictionary, 502B.
131 Singular reading numbers 57, 91,110, 114, 141and 167, respectively.
132 Crum, A Coptic Dictionary, 29A.
133 See for example John 13:27.
Δετ for κρό. The Fayumic spelling of κρό, according to Crum, is κρα. This manuscript, however, in the two times the word appears in John 6, substitutes the Fayumic spelling of ελτ (see 6:17 and 6:22).

Πεψι for λακι. Like the previous example, this is a case where Crum gives a Fayumic spelling of the word used in the majority of manuscripts, but this scribe uses a different word with a similar meaning. Both words mean “fragment” and are used in the story of the feeding of the crowd and the gathering of the fragments left over. The substitution is made consistently in this manuscript (John 6:12, 6:13).

Οτα- for ομα- . Crum points out that these words are related. This scribe consistently uses the form of the word that omits the initial ο (See John 6:22 and 7:11).

Σι Τκορ for ΣΟΤΕΠ. ΣΟΤΕΠ is a phrase that means “quickly” and appears three times in Horner’s Sahidic text of the Gospel of John (11:29, 31 and 13:27). Only two of those passages are extant in this manuscript and in both cases it substitutes this phrase, Τκορ being the Fayumic word for “speed.”

The last two instances are a little less clear-cut. They are clearly instances of singular readings, but there is some ambiguity about to which category they may belong. The first example is the Coptic word ᄒ for, which never occurs in this manuscript. It is usually replaced

---

134 Crum, A Coptic Dictionary, 115A.
135 Ibid., 61A.
136 Ibid., 139A.
137 Ibid., 198B.
138 Ibid., 406B.
with ἰνθηχ, which is also used in Bohairic and thus is not singular. In 6:66, however, the word αἰθί appears to be used. I say “appears” because the spelling αἰθί is not attested in Crum. The word αἰθί means a “multitude” but Crum lists the Fayumic spelling as αἰθή which is not what is written here. The other complication in this reading is that the transcription is in dispute. Husselman has αἰοῦειη written here, which, as I argued in the “corrections to the published transcription” section, cannot be supported from the photographs. The reading should be transcribed εἰοῦειη: This is the 1st perfect nominal prefix εἰ, then the indefinite article οῦ, then αἰθί meaning “multitude.” Thus, “a multitude of his disciples went . . .” Husselman’s εἰοῦειη is both singular and not a word. She conjectures αἰοῦη is for ροῦη, but the meaning is still unclear. ροῦη meaning “plenty” or “enough” plenty of his disciples, does not seem to make much sense in context.

The other more difficult case is one that occurs twice in the manuscript. I classified the first instance as an addition and this one as a regular substitution to do justice to the complexity of the singular. Νεθαν αἰ τοῦων, meaning those who were reclining at dinner, occurs in John 13:28 and in John 12:2. In both instances the Sahidic Coptic text of Horner has simply some form of the verb ἀνηκ.

Inconsistent Substitutions

These are substitutions that a scribe makes when the word normally used in Horner’s Sahidic Coptic text, or in other Coptic manuscripts, is a word that is used by the scribe of P.

139 See John 6:60 or 10:20 for examples.
140 Crum, A Coptic Dictionary, 22B.
141 Husselman, Gospel of John 56.
Mich. Inv. 3521 in other locations but in this particular singular the scribe replaces that word with another. This occurs 31 times in this manuscript. An example of this type of change is what happens with the word ṝει in this manuscript.

다는 word is a word that occurs frequently in the Sahidic form of the New Testament. From John 6:13 to 10:26 (where the majority of P. Mich is extant) it occurs sixty times. Forty of those times ṝει occurs in a place where 3521 has a lacuna. This manuscript does retain ṝει in 6:13 and 9:10 (written in the Fayumic spelling of ṝΗ). It omits ṝει in 6:28, 42, 7:6, 8:42, 9:10 and 10:24, but none of those instances are singular and thus are not in the above list of singular omissions of 3521. It does substitute another word for ṝει 12 times, with one of those instances listed above as a substitution of a Greek word for a Coptic in 7:40. Other examples of those substitutions occur in this section, where this scribe, knowing and using the word ṝει elsewhere in this manuscript (6:13, 9:10, 6:66 and 10:24), chooses to substitute another word for it, even though by doing so, he sometimes created singular readings.

Δει for ṝει is the most common choice the scribe makes. He does this in 6:41, 52 and 9:18.

ζουτ for ṝει occurs once in 7:11. This is: ζω + suffix οτ, “them too.” The translation could then be, “the Jews, they too, were seeking Jesus.” Or ζουτ could be used in contrast and read, “but the Jews were seeking . . .”\textsuperscript{142} This is singular, it does make sense, in fact it may make more sense than the standard Sahidic text. This may be an example of a scribe making a better

\textsuperscript{142}Crum, A Coptic Dictionary, 652A.
word choice, correcting to context.

This type of substitution also works the other way, with the scribe replacing the word \( \Delta \varepsilon \), a word which the scribe uses regularly, and uses \( \delta \nabla \) (see 6:52, and 6:60). In this context \( \delta \nabla \) does not have its regular meaning of “therefore,” but rather has its negative meaning of “no longer.”

In one instance the difference is caused by dropping the article:

John 10:18 \( \text{Oun} \) \( \varepsilon \text{zovcia} \) for \( \text{Oun} \) \( \tau \varepsilon \text{zovcia} \). The dropping of the article \( \tau \) is consistent in both usages in John 10:18 and the article is also not used in the Greek version. The Bohairic uses a different noun (\( \epsilon \rho \mu \omega \mu \nu \)) but also omits the article; this then may not be a scribal error, but a choice to omit the article, or possibly part of this scribe’s exemplar. The reading means “I have authority,” not “I have the authority.”

These examples illustrate the types of singular substitutions that exemplify a scribe changing a word which they are familiar with to another word.

Verbal Changes

There are 22 singular readings caused by unique verbal structures. These are 22 % of all sensible readings, and this is low compared to the 35.1% and 34.3% of Qau el Kebir and PPalau respectively. In Qau El Kebir the scribe has a consistent tendency to replace the 3\(^{rd}\) Future tense with the 2\(^{nd}\) future; in P. Mich. Inv. 3521 there are no general consistent changes that cause the

---

143 Smith, *Lexicon*, 56.
When dealing with Coptic verbs, however, there are some areas where one can expect to find opportunities to create singular readings: The first area is in the use of the nominal or pronominal subject with the verb. For example, the phrase, “Jesus cried out” could be written \( \text{(ic) \; \varepsilon \; \iota \; \lambda \; \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \alpha \; \lambda \; \\ \gamma \; \kappa \; \\ \alpha \; \kappa \; \\ \iota \; \nu \; \\ \lambda \; \alpha \; \nu \; \\ \varepsilon \; \sigma \; \\ \omicron \; \lambda \; \kappa \; \\ \alpha \; \kappa \; } \) with the subject, Jesus, written before the verb. Or it could be written: \( \text{\omicron \; \iota \; \lambda \; \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \kappa \; \alpha \; \kappa \; \\ \iota \; \nu \; \\ \lambda \; \alpha \; \nu \; \\ \varepsilon \; \sigma \; \\ \omicron \; \lambda \; \kappa \; \\ \alpha \; \kappa \; } \) with the subject written attached to the verb. Or the sentence could also be constructed: \( \text{\omicron \; \iota \; \lambda \; \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \kappa \; \alpha \; \kappa \; \\ \iota \; \nu \; \\ \lambda \; \alpha \; \nu \; \\ \varepsilon \; \sigma \; \\ \omicron \; \lambda \; \kappa \; \\ \alpha \; \kappa \; \pi \; \omicron \; \iota \; } \) with the subject written in another location in the sentence and indicated by the use of \( \pi \; \omicron \; \iota \), or the dialectal equivalent. Given these possibilities to construct a phrase that means essentially the same thing in three different ways, there certainly exist opportunities for singular readings to be created.

A similar issue is introduced by the way in which some verbs can indicate the object by attaching it directly to the verb as a suffix. The choice to attach an object as a suffix or to indicate it separately with or without a direct object marker, also allows for plenty of opportunities for singular readings.

Two other obvious types of singular readings involving verbs are when the person or number of a verb has changed, and finally when the tense of the verb has changed. These then are the four major categories to evaluate these verbal readings:

1. Nominal vs. pronominal subject
2. Attached vs. unattached object
3. Person and number
4. The tense of the verb

\(^{145}\) See singular reading numbers 859, 861, 863, 901, 917, 1005, 1038, 1112, 1192, and 1280 for a few examples of this tendency in Qau El Kebir.
Only one singular reading is caused by the decision to use a nominal subject where no other manuscript does. John 11:30 has \textit{περιθαρεῖν} ὡς ἐπιτρέψῃ. Whereas some manuscripts have \textit{περιθαρεῖ} before the verb and some after, all agree in writing \textit{περιθαρεῖ}.

Only one singular reading is caused by the placement of the suffix. John 12:47 reads \textit{εἰς τὸν πολὺς}. This is a 3rd Future. Horner’s Sahidic text also has a 3rd Future. His Bohairic has a conjunctive. The verb is in Crum, “I may save the world.”\textsuperscript{146} The Sahidic reads, “I should save it,” with the object attached to the verb. The Bohairic has the word also written out but retains the object marker \textit{π} (written \textit{μ} before \textit{π}). The \textit{μ} may have dropped out here due to the repetition of the letter, but it is also possible that the scribe decided not to use the object marker.

There is also only one singular caused by the changing of the person. In John 9:41 it is the second person plural replacing the first person plural: \textit{τεταίνεται} for \textit{τεταίνηται}. The context is that Jesus is rebuking some Pharisees. The verse in the standard Sahidic text translates to, “But now you say that we see.” But here it reads, “but now that you say that you see.”

The remaining singular readings are caused by the scribe using a different tense than other Coptic manuscripts. As stated above, there are no clear patterns that emerge, and all the remaining readings are sensible ones.\textsuperscript{147}

\textsuperscript{146}Crum, \textit{A Coptic Dictionary}, 243B.

\textsuperscript{147}See the commentary on singular readings 49, 50, 51, 55, 61, 62, 68, 82, 112, 121, 123, 128, 139, 161, 169 and 173 for more information on these readings.
Conclusions

Royse wrote:

One of the most venerable canons of textual criticism is that the shorter reading is generally to be preferred . . . but the discovery that all six of the papyri analyzed here omit more often than they add makes it important to return to this principle, and to ask how earlier scholars could have formulated a rule that so clearly—as it turns out—goes against the scribal activity evidenced in our papyri.¹⁴⁸

He then goes on to review scholarly opinion on the subject with names like Griesbach, Hort, Metzger, and the Alands, all arguing for, or supposing that the shorter readings is to be preferred, and Kilpatrick, A. C. Clark and a more nuanced view of Metzger on the other side, arguing that addition may not be the “natural” tendency of scribes.¹⁴⁹ After reviewing these opinions, Royse puts forth his own findings and that of others and then concludes, “The investigation pursued here would seem to make impossible any simple preference for the shorter text within the New Testament. In particular, as long as the competing readings are all early, the preference must lie with the longer reading.”¹⁵⁰

One of the useful results of this study is that it also demonstrates that among early Coptic scribes there was a stronger tendency to omit than to add. There are fifteen omissions in Mich 3521 compared to nine additions. All of the nonsense readings were caused by omissions. The only scribal correction to this manuscript was also caused by an initial omission that the scribe corrected. This tendency is even more apparent in the other two manuscripts; both Qau El Kebir and PPalau Rib. Inv. 183 are more than twice as likely to omit something than to add something. As noted in the commentary above, not every omission can be explained by homeoteleuton;

¹⁴⁸ Royse, Scribal Habits, 705.
¹⁴⁹ Ibid., 705-17.
¹⁵⁰ Ibid., 734.
some appear to be simple carelessness, although more likely than not the resulting reading remains a sensible one.

Another interesting finding of this study is that unlike Royse who found the category of “transpositions as corrected leaps” useful in his study, there appear to be no examples of this in this Coptic manuscript. This, of course, leads to the question of what is it that explains the transpositions in this manuscript? One possible explanation is to appeal to Greek parallels; perhaps the Coptic manuscript is reflecting another form of the Greek text. This, however, also did not prove useful. There were no clear examples among the transpositions where the Coptic text of 3521 reflected a Greek text known to Tischendorf or Nestle-Aland. While the word order does not parallel exactly any Greek text, it is possible that it reflects the difficulty in attempting to translate a Greek text. The transposition in 6:18 for example (Ὠάλασσα ἄνεμου μεγάλου πνέοντος διεγείρετο) may best be explained as an attempt to express the Greek ἥτε θάλασσα ἀνέμου μεγάλου πνέοντος διεγείρετο. The different locations of the Coptic negation particle ἀν (ἐν in this dialect) in a sentence may be explainable as the result of a unique translation. Since the word does not appear in the Greek text, the translator into Coptic is left with some options as to where to place it. The transposition in John 15:5 may be an example of this.

This leads to the question what is the relationship of P. Mich. Inv. 3521 to the Greek manuscripts? Husselman wrote:

That it [the Fayumic textual archetype] was an independent translation seems unlikely because of the close verbal parallels, now with the Sahidic and now with the Bohairic text. It seems equally unlikely that either version alone could have provided the basis for it. It is more probable that
the translator had both the Sahidic and the Bohairic texts at hand, and that he adapted for the Fayumic version whichever best suited his own interpretation or the usages of his dialect.¹⁵¹

Husselman’s discussion is not about P. Mich. Inv. 3521 but about the Fayumic text which it preserves. Her assumption is that there were a number of Fayumic texts of the Gospel of John, and that this manuscript is representative of that tradition, but is not itself the original Fayumic text. She sees the original Fayumic text as coming after the Sahidic and Bohairic texts and as a conscious harmonization of the two into the Fayumic dialect according to the “interpretation” and dialect usage of the scribe. This paints a rather complicated picture of a translator with a Sahidic text in front of him, along with a Bohairic text, and the scribe going back and forth, not only between chapters, verses, but within sentences and picking and choosing the individual words that best suit his needs. In my mind, this process seems unnecessarily burdensome and not very likely. Husselman also fails to give a reason as to why she believes that the Sahidic and Bohairic versions predate the Fayumic. Also, her reasoning for formulating this hypothesis is her conclusion that there are “close verbal parallels” between the Sahidic, Bohairic and Fayumic texts.¹⁵² I have two objections to this claim.

First, if one were to assume close verbal parallels between these three versions, Husselman does nothing to explain why the direction of these parallels should flow from the Sahidic and Bohairic to the Fayumic. Rather than positing a scribe that consulted two manuscripts while constructing a third (as Husselman does), is it not simpler to suggest that the Sahidic and Bohairic texts independently translated the Fayumic text to suit their own “interpretations” and dialect usages? If the Sahidic arose from the Fayumic, and if the Bohairic arose from the Fayumic, would that not explain the parallels between them equally well? The

¹⁵² Ibid., 17.
dating of the dialects and their relationship to each other is still a matter disputed by Coptic scholars, but Husselman assumes a relationship that she does not argue for.\textsuperscript{153}

Second, another issue with Husselman’s view is the “close verbal parallels” that she sees between the Sahidic, Bohairic and the Michigan manuscripts. She finds only sixteen independent readings.\textsuperscript{154} Metzger updates her findings to twenty-five because “she counts as only one a given grammatical or lexical variant even though it may occur in several passages throughout the codex.”\textsuperscript{155} I, however, in this study found 112 singular readings in P. Mich. Inv. 3521, more than four times more than Metzger’s updated numbers. It is not clear to me that the “close verbal parallels” that Husselman argues for, exist.

Thus, putting aside Husselman’s view that this was not an independent translation, and examining the data from this study, the first conclusion is one that was stated above in the “nonsense readings” section: the nonsense readings of this manuscript are most likely to have occurred if this scribe was looking at a Fayumic text; the omission due to homeoteleuton of an epsilon in singular reading 58 and the omission of the syllable \textit{ne} in singular reading 73, are only possible if the exemplar was in Fayumic. Thus, this particular scribe was most likely using a Fayumic exemplar.

When asking about the relationship of 3521 to Greek texts, and if it is possible that this manuscript itself is a translation of a Greek text, the observation that the nonsense readings arose from a Fayumic exemplar may not be relevant. If a scribe were making a translation from a


\textsuperscript{154} Husselman, \textit{Gospel of John} 17.

Greek papyrus to a new codex, it seems likely (although not certain) that the scribe would have some intermediary step. That is, the scribe would work out the translation from Greek into Coptic on some less expensive material, perhaps a wax tablet, and then copy the already translated passage from the wax tablet onto the new papyrus. If this is the case, then it is possible that the evidence of a Fayumic exemplar that the nonsense readings betray, is actually evidence of this intermediary stage. That is, the Fayumic exemplar that the scribe was copying was actually his own notes. It is still possible that the text behind 3521 is a Greek text that this scribe is translating.

Turning attention from the nonsense to the significant readings I noted that in John 7:40 this scribe had the Greek word οὖν left untranslated. This occurs elsewhere in the manuscript as well, but here it is singular. As I began to examine the use of this word within this manuscript I noted that six of the significant singular readings are best explained as a result of uncertainty of how to express the Greek οὖν in the exemplar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3521</th>
<th>Horner’s Sahidic</th>
<th>Horner’s Bohairic</th>
<th>NA and Tischendorf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:40</td>
<td>οὖν</td>
<td>δε</td>
<td>Λε</td>
<td>οὖν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:52</td>
<td>λε</td>
<td>δε</td>
<td>οὖν</td>
<td>οὖν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:60</td>
<td>λε</td>
<td>δε</td>
<td>οὖν</td>
<td>οὖν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:11</td>
<td>ζωογ</td>
<td>δε</td>
<td>οὖν</td>
<td>οὖν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:18</td>
<td>λε</td>
<td>omit</td>
<td>omit</td>
<td>οὖν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:27</td>
<td>οτ οτι θν</td>
<td>οτ ον</td>
<td>οτ ον</td>
<td>τι πάλιν with οτ ον πάλιν in P75 and Vaticanus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In these six instances the best explanation for the creation of the singular reading is that the scribe was working with knowledge of the Greek οὖν.
Another interesting case is the addition of the word \( \Delta \) in John 7:41 and 10:21.\(^{156}\) This word, equivalent to the Greek \( \pi\alpha\lambda\nu \) (Sahidic \( \text{ον} \)), has no parallel in Coptic and no Greek support. What is interesting, however, is that the Greek phrase, \( \alpha\lambda\lambda\omicron\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omicron\nu \), is what the Greek has in both these places, with a \( \Delta \epsilon \) listed in the apparatus (again in both instances). So what we have is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3521</th>
<th>Horner’s Sahidic</th>
<th>Horner’s Bohairic</th>
<th>NA and Tischendorf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:41</td>
<td>( \zeta\epsilon\kappa\alpha\nu\text{ι }\Delta )</td>
<td>( \zeta\alpha\kappa\epsilon\chi\omega\omicron\tau\text{ι }\Delta )</td>
<td>( \alpha\lambda\lambda\omicron \text{[δε]} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:21 has the same reading except that ( \Delta \epsilon ) appears in the apparatus of Horner’s Sahidic text.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While it is difficult to explain how \( \Delta \) could have arisen accidently for \( \Delta \epsilon \), and even more difficult to explain it happening twice, it is possible to see that the relationship is explained by the scribe attempting to express this Greek phrase \( \alpha\lambda\lambda\omicron \text{δε}\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omicron\nu \).

Yet another example of an occasion where a singular reading of P. Mich. Inv. 3521 is best explained, not by an appeal to the Sahidic or Bohairic (or any other Coptic text), but rather to a Greek text occurs in 6:40.\(^{157}\) The singular part of this reading is the addition of \( \varepsilon\omega \). This emphasis seems to indicate the presence of \( \dot{\epsilon}\gamma\omega \) which appears in some Greek manuscripts. This reading also omits the initial \( \alpha\nu\text{ω} \), which seems to imply that the Greek was \( \kappa\alpha\text{ι }\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\omega \) which the translator took for “even I.” The phrase \( \Delta\nu\text{οκ }\varepsilon\omega \) appears 7 times in the majority Sahidic text of the Gospel of John: 1:31, 1:33, 6:44, 6:56, 6:57, 10:15, 12:32, 14:16, 14:21, 15:9, 17:18. In each place the NA Greek behind the phrase is \( \kappa\dot{\alpha}\gamma\omega \). \( \dot{\kappa}\gamma\omega \) is sometimes simply translated in Sahidic

\(^{156}\) Singular readings number 101 and 138.

\(^{157}\) Singular reading number 63.
as \textit{ἀνθω \ θωκ}, as in 10:28, 10:38, 15:4 or 15:5. This singular of the scribe seems to indicate some knowledge of the Greek meaning of καγω. The question is: Did the scribe see \textit{ἀνθω \ θωκ} in a Coptic manuscript and, knowing the Greek that normally underlies that translation decided to express it as \textit{ἀνακ \ θω}, or did the scribe see και followed later by εγω in the Greek and decide to translate that as \textit{ἀνακ \ θω}? Either way this seems to indicate that the scribe is—at least—making stylistic changes based on Greek knowledge—if not directly translating from Greek manuscripts.

These examples indicate that singular readings of P. Mich. Inv. 3521 are, in many instances, best explained by looking at a Greek text. This makes Husselman’s claim that the Fayumic text is a mixture of the Bohairic and the Sahidic unlikely, unless one were to add that the scribe was also using a Greek text along with the other two. This seems unnecessarily complicated. A simpler way to account for the data is to say that the scribe made a translation of a Greek text. To make this translation the scribe prepared a Fayumic draft, either of small sense units or middle range ones, and then copied that draft onto the final papyrus. This level of mental exertion would account for why the scribe only needed to make one correction to his final draft, and why there are so few nonsense readings. The scribe produced a very readable and sensible copy, with the fewest number of corrections or nonsense readings of the Coptic manuscripts in the study.\textsuperscript{158}

In conclusion, this study supports the findings of Royse and others that scribes are more likely to omit than to add; this is true with Coptic scribes as it is with Greek ones. It also calls into question the statement by Husselman that P. Mich. 3521 comes from a Fayumic tradition that takes a little from the Sahidic and a little from the Bohairic, finding that many of its singular

\textsuperscript{158} The number is the fewest based on percentage of singular readings, not just fewest by counting—which since 3521 has less extant material would not be a fair comparison.
readings are best explained by an appeal directly to the Greek. These are but two of the initial findings of the data that I have accumulated. Along with this brief analysis, I provide the database that I compiled that will allow all interested parties to examine the data and form their own conclusions and aid in their research and future studies.
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