

Three New Coptic Papyrus Fragments of 2 Timothy and Titus (*P.Mich.* inv. 3535b)

BRICE C. JONES

brice.jones@concordia.ca

Concordia University, Montreal, QC H4B 1R6, Canada

This article publishes for the first time the extant remains of a Sahidic Coptic papyrus codex containing portions of 2 Timothy 1–4 and Titus 1. The papyri are currently housed in the University of Michigan Papyrology Collection. Overlooked for nearly a century, these new papyri extend the manuscript evidence for the Sahidic text of these Deutero-Pauline epistles. The edition includes a transcription, paleographical analysis, commentary, as well as images of the fragment.

I. THE FRAGMENTS

The University of Michigan Papyrology Collection contains numerous Coptic biblical manuscripts that have been published over the years, not least of which is the famous Middle-Egyptian Fayyumic codex of the Gospel of John (*P.Mich.* inv. 3521).¹ There are, however, a number of Coptic fragments at Michigan that have never been published or identified. Just recently, for example, I published *P.Mich.* inv. 546, a Sahidic parchment fragment of the Gospel of Luke, and *P.Mich.* inv. 547, some early Christian fragments with Gospel excerpts written in Fayyumic.² The collection thus continues to reveal its contents. In March 2013, I examined three Coptic papyrus fragments from the Michigan collection and securely identified all

¹Elinor M. Husselman, ed., *The Gospel of John in Fayyumic Coptic (P. Mich. Inv. 3521)* (Kelsey Museum of Archaeology Studies 2; Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1962). For a list of corrections to Husselman's edition in addition to those documented by Hans-Martin Schenke, see Brice C. Jones, "P.Mich. inv. 3521," *BASP* 49 (2013): 299–300. An inventory of Coptic biblical manuscripts in the Michigan collection was prepared by multiple contributors in William H. Worrell, ed., *Coptic Texts in the University of Michigan Collection* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1942).

²On *P.Mich.* inv. 546, see Brice C. Jones, "A New Sahidic Fragment of the Gospel of Luke from the Michigan Collection," *NovT* 56 (2014): 198–204. On *P.Mich.* inv. 547, see idem, "Two Unidentified Christian Fragments in the Michigan Collection," *ZPE* 186 (2013): 121–23.

three fragments as copies of 2 Timothy 1–4 and Titus 1. In this article, I publish for the first time all three fragments, which are assigned the Michigan inventory number 3535b.³

The papyri published here were purchased from the well-known Cairo dealer Maurice Nahman in 1925 and came to the University of Michigan in October 1926 as a gift of Oscar Webber and Richard H. Webber of Detroit. The archaeological provenance of the papyri is unknown. There are several different Coptic manuscripts in the Michigan collection under the inventory number “3535,” all purchased from Nahman in 1925 and likely brought together due to the similar language of composition (Coptic). Inventory 3535a (michigan.apis.2003) is a small papyrus fragment of Gal 5:11–6:1, which was published by Gerald M. Browne in 1979.⁴ Inventory 3535c (michigan.apis.8868) is a larger unpublished documentary papyrus fragment. Inventory 3535d (michigan.apis.4639) is a small, unidentified scrap of parchment that may be from an amulet. Inventory 3535e (michigan.apis.8869) is a small, unpublished papyrus fragment of a documentary nature. Our papyri have the inventory number 3535b and are codicologically unrelated to the other manuscript fragments bearing the inventory number “3535.” The Galatians papyrus (3535a) is written in a different hand and dialect than inventory 3535b and thus was presumably not part of the same codex as our Deutero-Pauline fragments.

Fragment 1 is broken on all sides except the bottom, where the lower margin has been preserved. It measures 4.7 x 10.7 cm and contains twelve partial lines of text on both the recto and verso. Fragment 2, which measures 3 x 14 cm, also preserves only the lower margin, and contains seventeen partial lines on the recto and eighteen partial lines on the verso. Fragment 3, measuring 2.3 x 5.5 cm, is broken on all sides and contains seven partial lines of text on the recto and eight partial lines on the verso. The contents of the fragments are conveniently listed in the following table according to recto (R) and verso (V):

<i>Fragment 1</i>	<i>Fragment 2</i>	<i>Fragment 3</i>
R: 2 Tim 2:26–3:3	R: 2 Tim 1:18–2:6	R: 2 Tim 4:18–20
V: 2 Tim 2:14–18	V: 2 Tim 1:6–11	V: Titus 1:7–9

The fragments are written in the same hand, and so we are dealing with a multitext codex, likely comprised of (at least) the *corpus Paulinum*. In terms of sequence, frg. 2 would have come first in the codex, followed by frgs. 1 and 3. All three papyri

³For permission to publish the fragments here, I thank Prof. Arthur Verhoogt, Acting Archivist of the University of Michigan Papyrology Collection. Images have been digitally reproduced with the permission of the Papyrus Collection, Graduate Library, University of Michigan.

⁴Browne, *Michigan Coptic Texts* (Papyrologica Castroctaviana, Studia et textus 7; Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1979), 6.

belong to separate folios, and, as the contents demonstrate, there are gaps of text between them. The average number of letters per line (the reconstructed text considered) is around twenty-two to twenty-four. Based on these calculations, we may conclude that the number of lines missing between the last word of frg. 1V and the beginning of the extant portion of frg. 1R is approximately twenty-eight lines. Since the lower margin of frg. 1 is preserved, we may therefore add the approximate number of missing lines (ca. twenty-eight) with those extant (twelve) to get a total of approximately forty lines per page. These calculations demonstrate that the codex of which our fragments were once a part was medium to large in size and written in a single column.

The script may be characterized as biblical majuscule or unimodular (i.e., uniform in dimension and shape), upright and roughly bilinear. The curved back of σ is heavily extended upward and to the right to such a degree that it hovers over two or more subsequent letters (cf. frg. 1R line 5 and frg. 2V line 5). Otherwise, the hand is largely undecorated, except for light finials on the tips of some letters (e.g., λ , γ , π). The thickness of strokes is virtually uniform; horizontal strokes are at times only slightly thinner than the vertical strokes. The scribe is inconsistent in his or her use of “single-letter” or “connective” supralinear strokes for consonants in the sonorant class (i.e., β , λ , μ , ν , ρ).⁵ The trema (or diaeresis) is written over the letter ι (see frg. 1R line 7), and logical punctuation is present occasionally in the form of a middle dot (e.g., frg. 1R line 10). The scribe has added accidentally omitted text interlinearly in frg. 1R line 4 (ρ) and frg. 1V line 10 ($\mu\bar{\eta}\ \phi\bar{\iota}\lambda\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$).

In view of the difficulties in dating Coptic manuscripts, I have followed others in not assigning a specific date.⁶ Most coptologists will agree with Christian Askeland’s lament that “the most intimidating and crucial desideratum for Coptic literature is the development of an objective science of Coptic manuscript dating.”⁷ We can note that the dialect is classical Sahidic, which was standardized in the periods prior to the Arab conquest of ca. 640 C.E. Professor Karlheinz Schüssler has brought to my attention the many similarities in handwriting between our 3535b

⁵On the distinction between “single-letter” and “connective” systems of supralineation, see Bentley Layton, *A Coptic Grammar: With Chrestomathy and Glossary. Sahidic Dialect* (3rd rev. ed.; *Porta Linguarum Orientalium* n.s. 20; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2011), §38 (31–32).

⁶On the difficulties in dating Coptic manuscripts, see Bentley Layton, “Towards a New Coptic Palaeography,” in *Acts of the Second International Congress of Coptic Studies, Roma 22–26 September 1980* (ed. Tito Orlandi and Frederik Wisse; Rome: CIM, 1985), 149–58. The standard manual of Coptic paleography remains that of Viktor Stegemann, *Koptische Paläographie: 25 Tafeln zur Veranschaulichung der Schreibstile koptischer Schriftdenkmäler auf Papyrus, Pergament und Papier für die Zeit des III.–XIV. Jahrhunderts. Mit einem Versuch einer Stilgeschichte der koptischen Schrift* (2 vols.; *Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums und des Mittelalters* C/1; Heidelberg: Bilabel, 1936).

⁷Askeland, “The Coptic Versions of the New Testament,” in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis* (ed. Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes; 2nd ed.; *New Testament Tools, Studies, and Documents* 42; Leiden: Brill, 2013), 219.

and *P.Mich.* inv. 3992, another Sahidic papyrus codex housed in Michigan.⁸ According to Elinor M. Husselman, 3992 “was written perhaps as early as the third century A.D. and certainly not later than the fourth.”⁹ Paul E. Kahle placed it in the fourth century, and most of the literature supports this date.¹⁰ While I think that we should be cautious of assigning a rigid date for *any* Coptic manuscript, the similarities in script between our papyri and 3992 and the general consensus regarding the dating of the latter suggest that our codex may have been written sometime between the fourth and sixth centuries.

The correspondence between the text of our Coptic papyri and the Greek NT is close. There is only one significant variation unit where our text is extant that may be noted here. In 2 Tim 2:18 some manuscripts (Ⲣ F G 048 33 *pc*) omit the definite article in the phrase τῆν ἀνάστασιν (“the resurrection”). The editors of the 25th edition of Nestle-Aland’s *Novum Testament Graece* left the article τῆν out of the printed text but subsequent editions retain it. The editorial committee of the UBS Greek NT gave it a “C” rating and enclosed it within brackets “in order to indicate that Ⲣ F G 048 33 Cyril may correctly represent the original in omitting the word.”¹¹ In frg. 1V, line 11, our text follows the majority of manuscripts in reading the definite article (τἈΝΑΣΤΑΣΙC).

II. TEXT

For convenience, restorations of lacunae and word division are based on the edition of Herbert Thompson (unless otherwise noted), which is based on a famous codex in the Chester Beatty collection (Ms. A; Copt.Ms. 813; Schmitz/Mink sa 4; Schüssler sa 505) that contains the complete text of the Pauline and Deutero-Pauline epistles.¹² Punctuation, tremeta, and supralinear strokes have been reproduced as they appear in the papyri with the exception that connective supralinear

⁸The complete codex originally contained John, an unknown text, 1 Corinthians, Titus, Psalms, and Isaiah. *P.Mich.* inv. 3992 is still unpublished, even though it is regularly cited and described in the literature. See, e.g., Bruce M. Metzger, *The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission and Limitations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), 111; Simon J. Gathercole, “The Titles of the Gospels in the Earliest New Testament Manuscripts,” *ZNW* 104 (2013): 61. See also the comments in the APIS catalogue at <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/a/apis/x-16134>.

⁹ Husselman, “The Collection of Papyri,” in Worrell, *Coptic Texts in the University of Michigan Collection*, 5.

¹⁰ Kahle, *Bala’izah: Coptic Texts from Deir el-Bala’izah in Upper Egypt* (2 vols.; London: Oxford University Press, 1954), 1:270.

¹¹ Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (2nd ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994), 579–80.

¹² Herbert Thompson, *The Coptic Version of the Acts of the Apostles and the Pauline Epistles in the Sahidic Dialect* (Cambridge: University Press, 1932).

strokes have been positioned over the letter of the most likely intended syllabic consonant. The transcript has been arranged according to the sequence of fragment numbers (recto first), not according to the sequence of text. We have also compared our transcript with the edition of George W. Horner, which is cited in the commentary below at relevant points of discussion.¹³

Fragment 1, recto: 2 Timothy 2:26–3:3

1	[αγω ἡσεν]ηφε εβ[ολ ρῆ τσορσ̄ ἡ-] [πδιαβ]ολος εγσнп [εβολ ριτοοτϥ] [εποϥ]ϥϥ ἡπετῆμα[γ. ειμε δε] [επαι χ]ε `ρ' ἡθαν ἡνερ[οοϥ σεν-]	2 Tim 2:26 2 Tim 3:1
5	[αϥωπε] ἡσιρενοϥοειϥ [εγἡαϥτ̄.] [ἡρωμε γ]αρ ναϥωπε ἡ[μαῖπεϥ-] [ἡτον ἡμ]αῖρομῆτ ββα[βερωμε ἡ-] [χασιρηт ἡ]χатоϥα ἡσε[σωτῆ αν] [ἡσανεϥει]οτε ἡνατϥῆ[ρμoт εϥ-]	2 Tim 3:2
10	[χαρῆ ἡρε]φιϥε' ἡοϥα[ρηт ἡδια-] [βολος ἡα]ταμαρτε ϥ[εο αν ἡρη-] [μερος εϥ]μοστε ἡπε[тнаноϥϥ]	2 Tim 3:3

Fragment 1, verso: 2 Timothy 2:14–18

1	[ἡνετσωτῆ σ]επῆ [ταροκ ератк̄] [ἡοϥσωт]ῆ ἡπἡοϥте [ἡοϥεργат-] [hc емεϥ]χιϥῆπε еϥϥ[ωωт ἡп-] [ϥαδε ἡт]ме' нснм δε[е етϥо-]	2 Tim 2:14, 15 2 Tim 2:16
5	[ϥεит αγω] етвнт ἡп[ρϥϥωϥ] [еϥи ρаро]οϥ' насевн[с гар на-] [прокопт]е еπεροϥ α[γω πεϥ] [ϥαδε на]ρϥογамоме ἡ[θε ноγтаг-] [граиνα н]αῖ еγεβολ ἡρ[ηтоϥ пе ρϥ-]	2 Tim 2:17
10	[μεναιο]с' ἡἡφιληтос' ναῖ ентаϥῆ[ρде етме] [εϥχω] ἡмос δε ϥт[анастасис] [οϥω есωω]πε еϥϥοϥῆ [ἡтпистис]	2 Tim 2:18

¹³Horner, *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Southern Dialect Otherwise Called Sahidic and Thebaic*, vol. 5 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1920).

Fragment 2, recto: 2 Timothy 1:18–2:6

1	[..]	
	[πχοειс ρῖπερ]σοῦ ετ[ῖμαγ ἀγω]			2 Tim 1:18
	[νεπταφαδγ η]αῖ τηρ[οῦ ρῖνεφε-]			
	[σοс κσοογн η]μοοῦ ἡ[ρογο.]			
5	[ἦτοκ σε παφη]ρε σῆσ[ομ ρῖπε-]			2 Tim 2:1
	[ρμοτ ετρῖπε]χс ιс ἀγ[ω νεπτακсо-]			2 Tim 2:2
	[тμοῦ ἦτοот] ριτῖρδ[ρ ῖμῖтρε ηαῖ]			
	[καδγ ερραῖ] [[ρ]]ῖρῖπ[ιстос ἡ-]			
	[ρωме ηαῖ εγн]αφσῖс[ομ εтс-]			
10	[δβερεηкоογε] φῖρце [ρωс μα-]			2 Tim 2:3
	[тоῖ εηαηογ] ἡтеπεχ[с ιс ме-]			
	[релаδγ εφо] ῖματοῖ [таρῖ ἡῖ]			2 Tim 2:4
	[ηερβηγε ἡп]βιοс δε ε[φεареске]			
	[ῖпептаφαδγ] ῖματοῖ[ι εφωπε]			
15	[δε οη ερω]αηογα ρ[ωοειх ме-]			2 Tim 2:5
	[φχκлом ει]μηтῖ ἡγ[μωε ка-]			
	[λωс πογοειε] εтρосε [ἦтоφ εφадγ-]			2 Tim 2:6

Fragment 2, verso: 2 Timothy 1:6–11

1	[трекеи]ρε ῖ[пмеεγε εтρεк+ογ-]			
	[рот ἡ]πε[ρ]μο[т ῖппоγте ρηтῖ]			2 Tim 1:6
	[ριτῖп]ταλο [ῖηαβιχ ἡтаппоγте]			2 Tim 1:7
	[гар † η]αν αν [ἡογῖηα ἡηῖтσωβ]			
5	[αλλα] ἡσoм ρ[ιαγпη ριηῖт-]			
	[ρῖῖρ]ηт ἡп[ρ+φпε се ἡтῖηῖтῖ-]			2 Tim 1:8
	[тре ἡ]пепχρ[ис ογδε ηαῖ петмнр ἡтаφ]			
	[αλλ]α φῖρ[исе ἡῖпεγαггеллиoη ката-]			
	[тσoм] ῖппоγ[те παῖ εптаφтаηρoη ἀγω]			2 Tim 1:9
10	[αφт]αρῖη ρ[ἡογтωρῖ εφογαав еηката-]			
	[ηε]ῖρβηγε [αν αλλα катаπεφтωφ ἡ-]			
	[μη] ῖμοφ ἡῖ[теφχαριс ептаφтаас]			
	[ηαν ρ]ῖπεχс ιс [ραoη ἡηεγοειω ἡωα-]			
	[ен]ερ εасογφ[ηῖ δε εвол теηογ ρι-]			2 Tim 1:10
15	[тппо]γωηῖ [εвол ῖппепсωтнр пεχс ιс]			
	[εα]φογωсῖ [μεη ῖппоγ аφογωηῖ]			
	[δε] εвол ἡ[пωηῖ ἡῖтῖηῖтаттако]			
	[ριτῖп]εγαггели[οη παῖ ептаγкаат-]			2 Tim 1:11

Fragment 3, recto: 2 Timothy 4:18–20

1	[ϣνατοϣοἰ ε]ρϣ[η ετεϣμῆτερο ετρῆτπε π]αῖ πε[οοϣ ναϣ ϣαενερ] [ῆενερ ραμ]ηη· ϣ[ηε επρικα μῆ-] [ακϣλα μῆη]απηῖ [ῆονησιφοροс]	2 Tim 4:18 2 Tim 4:19
5	[αεραστοс ϣ]ϣ ρῆ[κορινηοс αῖκα-] [τροφιμοс] αε [ρῆμιλητοс εϣϣω-] [..]	2 Tim 4:20

Fragment 3, verso: Titus 1:7-9

1	[ενοϣηοϣϣῑ αν π]ε [ενοϣ-] [μαῖρηϣ ῆϣλοϣ] αν [πε αλλα] [εϣο ῆμαῖϣῆμ]ο ῆμα[ῖπετναοϣϣ] [ῆρακ ῆδικαιοс] εϣοϣα[ав негкра-] 5 [тнс εϣσοлаῖ ῆπ]ϣααε [ετῆροτ ка-] [татесва хека]с εϣεϣ[ῆῆом] [εсопῑρῆтесв]ϣ ετοϣ[οх αϣω] [.]	Titus 1:7 Titus 1:8 Titus 1:9
---	---	-------------------------------------

III. COMMENTARY

Fragment 1, Recto

- 7 ḅβḅ[βερωμε: The assimilation of syllabic ḅ to the following consonant (here β) is common. According to Bentley Layton, “In some early manuscripts, morphs spelled ḅ- are often replaced by the variants ḅ-, λ, ῖ when followed by non-syllabic β, λ, ρ respectively.”¹⁴
- 8 ḅε[ῑωτῆ: The editions of both Thompson and Horner read ενεσεωτῆ.
- 9 ḅηατῶῖ[ρμοτ: The editions of both Thompson and Horner read ḅατῶῖ[ρμοτ. The additional *nu* is a common variant doubling of the morph ḅ-, especially before vowels.¹⁵
- 11 ϣ[εο: The back of the *sigma* is clear before the break, which means the scribe did not include the initial *nu*, which is read in the edition of Thompson. Horner’s edition lacks the word completely, which at this point reads ḅαταμαρτε ḅ[αν]ημεροс.
- 12 ḅπε[τναοϣϣ: The editions of Thompson and Horner read ḅππετναοϣϣ (Horner: ḅππετναο[ϣϣ]), with the additional *pi*.

¹⁴Layton, *Coptic Grammar*, §21b (21).¹⁵See *ibid.*, §22b (21).

Fragment 1, Verso

- 2–3 [ἡγοεργατ | ης εμεϛ]χιωηϛ: We have restored the lacuna with Thompson’s text. The manuscripts consulted by Horner are fragmentary at this point, so that his text at 2 Tim 2:15 reads ⲃⲉⲡⲏ ⲉⲧⲁⲗⲟⲕ ⲉⲣⲁⲧḲ ἡⲟϥⲟⲩⲧἡ ἡⲡⲏⲟϥⲧⲉ [ⲉⲕ]ⲟⲩⲧ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ἡⲡⲟⲩⲁⲗⲉ ἡⲧⲏⲉ.
- 10 ⲉⲛⲧⲁϥᲣ[ⲗⲁⲉ: The sentence converter ⲉⲛⲧ as read here is found in Horner’s edition with the common orthographic alternative as ἡⲧ.
- 12 ⲉϥⲟⲩ]ⲏⲉ: The papyrus lacks the following ⲁϥⲟ that is read in both Thompson’s and Horner’s editions. Here, the Greek *καί* stands behind ⲁϥⲟ, but this does not necessarily mean that the *Vorlage* of the Coptic translator did not contain this word. Elina Perttilä has demonstrated that asyndeton is very common in Coptic texts, and that “to read the Greek behind the Coptic text is in the case of conjunctions mostly impossible.”¹⁶

Fragment 2, Recto

- 8 [[ⲗ]]ἡⲗἡⲏ[ⲓⲧⲟⲥ: The scribe initially wrote ϣἡ ϣἡⲏⲓⲧⲟⲥ but canceled the initial *horeh* with a cross-stroke, thereby producing the reading ἡⲗἡⲏ[ⲓⲧⲟⲥ, a mistake for the correct ἡⲗⲉⲏⲏⲓⲧⲟⲥ (read in both Thompson and Horner).

¹⁶Elina Perttilä, “How to Read the Greek Text behind the Sahidic Coptic,” in *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Raija Sollamo* (ed. Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta; JSJSup 126; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 376. Layton states that, with main clauses in the past tense, “asyndeton expresses closer linkage than ⲁϥⲟ, ⲁⲉ, ἡἡἡⲥⲟ-ⲥ, or other conjunctions” (*Coptic Grammar*, §237 [183]).

