A Few Notes Concerning
Mr. Joseph Warren Wells' Edition of the
Sahidic and Bohairic Texts of the New Testament

New Testament scholars and students are indebted to Mr. Wells for his work on the text of the Coptic New Testament. His algorithmic skills and his long interest in the Sahidic text are beginning to bear fruit. Such fruit enables enhanced abilities for those who work with the Coptic texts. Mr. Wells is probably the first person to actually present a work which is a nucleus for a true *standardized* text of both the Sahidic and Bohairic texts. At this point in time, the texts (as standardized texts) are still being perfected, yet even at this stage we can observe the obvious benefits.

Once a finalized standard text results, we can then use it as a collation base, and begin to add tons and tons (hopefully) of weighty evidence and manuscript readings. Without going into great detail, the benefits of Mr. Wells' work are:

- Coptic abbreviations are written out in full
- Minimal use of accents, tremas and supralinear strokes.
- Separation of single word "phrases" into their individual parts of speech (prepositions written as separate words et al).
- Standardization of punctuation
- The digital database is easy to work with, no Unicode needed.

Mr. Wells admits his indebtedness to the labors of the folks involved with the PHI CD, as well as to the labors of Mr. Hany Takla, and the editions of numerous published texts of the Coptic New Testament(s).

As concerns Mr. Wells' Sahidic text:

It is almost identical with that of the work of Mr. Hany Takla of the St. Shenouda the Archimandrite Coptic Society, especially in the Pauline Corpus. However, Wells has improved Takla's work by presenting more consistent data as regards the separations of pronouns and prepositions from their objects and or nouns, this improvement was accomplished via database comparisons via computer.

Despite the improved word divisions, both Takla and Wells rely heavily upon Horner's work on the Sahidic text, however Takla better reflects the earlier Sahidic text of the Beatty papyri, as stated in his "introduction" to the Coptic CD, which introduction is here reproduced:

The Gospels

Source:

Bohairic Text: Oxford Bodleian Library, Ms Huntington 17, 1174 AD, paper, 20 lines.
Exceptions from the margin readings of the manuscript:
Mt 10:42
Mt 13:43
Mt 17:21
Mk 6:37
Mk 7:16
Mk 11:26
Mk 15:28
Lk 4:17
Lk 14:27
Lk 22:43
Lk 22:44
Lk 23:17
Lk 23:34
Lk 23:38
Jn 14:19

English Text: King James Version, 1611 AD

Greek Text: Nestle-Aland 26th edition

Lycopolitan Text: Cambridge University Library, British Foreign Bible Society Ms. ???, 4th century AD, papyrus, 2 columns

Middle Egyptian Text: New Jersey, Princeton University, Codex Scheide, 4-5th Century AD, parchment. (St. Matthew only)

Old Bohairic Text: Geneva Bodmer Library Ms. III, 4th century AD, papyrus

Sahidic Text:
1. St. Matthew: New York Pierpont Morgan Library, M569, 8-9th Century AD, parchment, 1-col.
2. St. Mark: Barcelona P.Palau Rib. Inv. -Nr.182, 5th century AD, parchment, 2-columns.
3. St. Luke: Barcelona P.Palau Rib. Inv. -Nr.181, 5th century AD, parchment, 2-columns.
4. St. John: Barcelona P.Palau Rib. Inv. -Nr.183, 5th century AD, parchment, 2-columns.

Edition:

Bohairic Text: Horner, *the Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Northern Dialect*, Oxford 1898-1905. v.1 (Matthew-Mark), v.2 (Luke-John)

English Text: Online Bible version 6.0 KJV-module, electronic version.

Greek Text: CCAT Greek New Testament electronic version.

Lycopolitan Text: Thompson, *The Gospel of St. John According to the Earliest Coptic Manuscript*, London 1924. (St. John only)

Middle Egyptian Text: Schenke, *Das Matthaus-Evangelium im Mittelägyptischen Dialekt des Koptischen (Codex Scheide)*, Berlin, 1981. (St. Matthew only)

Old Bohairic Text: Kasser, *Papyrus Bodmer III. Evangile de Jean et Genese I-IV,2 en Bohairique*. Louvain CSCO T.177 Script. Copt. T. 25 (Text), CSCO T.178 Script. Copt. T.26 (French Translation). (St. John only)

Sahidic Text:
1. St. Matthew: Perez, G. A., *El evangelio di San Matteo en Copto Sahidico*, Madrid 1984.
2. St. Mark: Quecke, *Das Markusevangelium Saidisch*, Barcelona 1972.
3. St. Luke: Quecke, *Das Lukasevangelium Saidisch*, Barcelona 1977.
4. St. John: Quecke, *Das Johannesevangelium Saidisch*, Barcelona 1984.

Method of editing:

Bohairic Text: Same text as the printed edition with italicized additions from other manuscripts.
The pointing system was revised to make the text more understandable grammatically

English Text: Same as the electronic edition

Greek Text: Same as the electronic edition, except for changing the notation of the verse numbers to match the parallel text.

Middle Egyptian Text: Same as the printed edition

Lycopolitan Text: Same as the printed edition.

Old Bohairic Text: Same as the printed edition.

Sahidic Text: Same text as the printed edition with the pointing system was revised to make the text more uniform

The Pauline Epistles

Source:

Bohairic Text: London British Library, OR.424, 1307 AD, paper
Exception from Paris National Library Copte 65, 1609 AD, paper:
Rm 16:24, 2Tes 1:2

English Text: King James Version, 1611 AD

Greek Text: Nestle-Aland 26th edition

Sahidic Text: Dublin, Chester Beatty Library Ms A., 600 AD, parchment

Edition:

Bohairic Text: Horner, *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Northern Dialect*, Oxford 1898-1905. v.3

English Text: Online Bible version 6.0 KJV-module, electronic version.

Greek Text: CCAT Greek New Testament electronic version.

Sahidic Text: Thompson, H., *The Coptic Version of the Acts of the Apostles and the Pauline Epistles in the Sahidic Dialect*, Cambridge 1932

Method of editing:

Bohairic Text: Same text as the printed edition with italicized edition from other manuscripts.

The pointing system was revised to make the text more understandable grammatically

English Text: Same as the electronic edition

Greek Text: Same as the electronic edition, except for changing the notation of the verse numbers to match the parallel text.

Sahidic Text: Same text as the printed edition with the pointing system was revised to make the text more uniform

The Catholic Epistles

Source:

Bohairic Text: London British Library, OR.424, 1307 AD, paper

English Text: King James Version, 1611 AD

Greek Text: Nestle-Aland 26th edition

Sahidic Text: New York Pierpont Morgan Library, M572, 9th Century AD, parchment

Edition:

Bohairic Text: Horner, *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Northern Dialect*, Oxford 1898-1905. v.4

English Text: Online Bible version 6.0 KJV-module, electronic version.
Greek Text: CCAT Greek New Testament electronic version.

Sahidic Text: Schussler, *Die Katholischen Briefe in der Koptischen (Sahidischen) Version*, CSCO T.528, Script. Copt. T.45, Louvain 1991

Method of editing:

Bohairic Text: Same text as the printed edition with italicized edition from other manuscripts.
The pointing system was revised to make the text more understandable grammatically

English Text: Same as the electronic edition

Greek Text: Same as the electronic edition, except for changing the notation of the verse numbers to match the parallel text.

Sahidic Text: This is a hybrid text incorporating the different manuscripts used in the edition with the pointing system revised to make the text more uniform

The Acts of the Apostles

Source:

Bohairic Text: London British Library, OR.424, 1307 AD, paper
Exception from the manuscript margin readings(?): 1:11, 15:34

Sahidic Text: Dublin, Chester Beatty Library Ms B., 600 AD, parchment

English Text: Online Bible version 6.0 KJV-module, electronic version.

Greek Text: CCAT Greek New Testament electronic version.

Edition:

Bohairic Text: Horner, *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Northern Dialect*, Oxford 1898-1905. v.4

English Text: Online Bible version 6.0 KJV-module, electronic version.

Greek Text: CCAT Greek New Testament electronic version.

Sahidic Text: Thompson, H., *The Coptic Version of the Acts of the Apostles and the Pauline Epistles in the Sahidic Dialect*, Cambridge 1932

Method of editing:

Bohairic Text: Same text as the printed edition with italicized edition from other manuscripts.
The pointing system was revised to make the text more understandable grammatically

English Text: Same as the electronic edition

Greek Text: Same as the electronic edition, except for changing the notation of the verse numbers to match the parallel text.

Sahidic Text: Same text as the printed edition with the pointing system was revised to make the text more uniform

Revelation

Source:

Bohairic Text: London British Library, OR.8773 (Curzon 128), 1320 AD, paper.
Exception: 9:15

English Text: King James Version, 1611 AD

Greek Text: Nestle-Aland 26th edition

Sahidic Text: London, British Library, OR.6803, 12th century AD, paper
Exception: 1:1-8a missing, 22:15-21 (a Berlin MS)

Edition:

Bohairic Text: Horner, *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Northern Dialect*, Oxford 1898-1905. v.4

English Text: Online Bible version 6.0 KJV-module, electronic version.

Greek Text: CCAT Greek New Testament electronic version.

Sahidic Text: Budge, *Coptic Biblical Texts in the Dialect of Upper Egypt*, London 1912. First 8-1/2 verses missing, last 7 verses supplied from Goussen, *Studia Theologica*, Leipzig, 1895.

Method of editing:

Bohairic Text: Same text as the printed edition with italicized edition from other manuscripts.
The pointing system was revised to make the text more understandable grammatically

English Text: Same as the electronic edition

Greek Text: Same as the electronic edition, except for changing the notation of the verse numbers to match the parallel text.

Sahidic Text: Same text as the printed edition with the pointing system revised to make the text more uniform

---

Above material from: COPTIC CD Volume 1. St. Shenouda the Archimandrite Coptic Society, Los Angeles, 1998. (Mr. Hany Takla - editor).

It is to be noted that Mr. Takla used Thompson's work for the text of the Pauline epistles. Hence Takla's text is much more ancient than that proposed by Wells. This was a sound move as Horner, in the Sahidic, is known to be lacking. But there are numerous textual differences between Thompson's work and Horner's. So a standardized text needs to be produced which Mr. Wells has apparently done.

However, earlier, the folks at the University of Pennsylvania produced a text of the Sahidic which was eclectic. Dr. Bentley Layton later oversaw its proofreading and production resulting in the PHI CD text (the Packard Humanities Institute).

The problem with the PHI text was/is there is no documentation existing which explains why they chose such-and-such a reading. As one reads the Sahidic, it usually follows Thompson's text, then suddenly it switches to a reading via Horner. In 1997 or 1998, I pointed out a now famous change in the text of the PHI Coptic CD at Romans 16:26, [on the TC-List web site] where suddenly a reading from Horner is injected. This occurred as such changes were deemed appropriate by Dr. Layton and Brakke. Note the copy below, of a 1997 letter from Dr. Brakke:

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

**COLLEGE OF
ARTS AND SCIENCES**

9 June 1997

Mr. Gary S. Dykes
P.O. Box 4337
Visalia, CA 93278

Dear Mr. Dykes:

Bentley Layton forwarded to me your letter of 7 May, which I enclose, since I was
the last Yale person to work on the PHI Coptic New Testament. That was in the
summer of 1990, so please forgive me if my memory is hazy.

That summer I agreed to proofread a text of the Sahidic NT that had been typed in at
the Univ. of Pennsylvania. What text they used I do not know. What I did was
proofread and change the text using what Prof. Layton and I believed to be the best
available text for each book. For example, in the case of Mark, that was the Quecke
edition. I cannot say from memory--and I have gone through my files--what that
would be for Romans. I doubt that I would have added conjectures unless they
were presented in a printed edition as virtually certain.

I left with the PHI people a list of the editions I used for each book so that they
could answer inquiries such as yours. If they have told you that the text for
Romans is Thompson, and the CD reading does not match that, then I assume that
it is an error on my part. (It probably would have been in the Penn text, and I
would have failed to remove it.) It would be wonderful if you would report such
errors to PHI so that they can be fixed in the future.

The bottom line is that the Sahidic NT on the PHI CD accurately represents the
current state of scholarly work on the text of the Sahidic NT: there is no standard
edition, and persons such as yourself must decide for what text, precisely, you are
creating a concordance.

I hope that this helps you to evaluate your use of the PHI CD in your project.

With best wishes, I am

Very truly yours,

David Brakke
Assistant Professor of Religious Studies

**DEPARTMENT OF
RELIGIOUS STUDIES**

Sycamore Hall 230
Bloomington, Indiana
47405-2601

812-855-3531
Fax: 812-855-4687

cc: Bentley Layton

The folks at PHI state that Thompson was the base text(s) for the Pauline epistles, via Brakke's own admission, below:

Text Editions used in Preparation of the Coptic New Testament

Matthew:

G. Arandá Pérez, ed. El Evangelio de San Mateo copto sahidico. Madrid, 1984.

Mark:

Hans Quecke, ed. Das Markusevangelium saïdisch. Barcelona, 1972.

Luke:

Hans Quecke, ed. Das Lukasevangelium saïdisch. Barcelona, 1977.

John:

Hans Quecke, ed. Das Johannesevangelium saïdisch. Barcelona, 1984.

Acts, Pauline Epistles, and Hebrews:

Sir Herbert Thompson, ed. The Coptic Version of the Acts of the Apostles
    and the Pauline Epistles in the Sahidic Dialect. Cambridge, 1932.

Catholic Epistles and Revelation:

George Horner, ed. The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Southern
    Dialect otherwise called Sahidic and Thebaic. Vol. 7. Oxford, 1911–
    24.

David Brakke
February 1990

The above FAX copy was received from Brigitte Comparini, of PHI. It shows the list of sources sent to them by Brakke of his work on the PHI/University of Pennsylvania Coptic text. Clearly we can see that Brakke and Layton utilized a single source for the Pauline epistles, but they moved from Thompson to Horner without warning or notice!

Thus the resulting PHI text as produced by Brakke and Layton, will not be considered as any sort of a standardized edition. Nor is it being updated or revised, so it lies dormant.

However, it is useful for those who need to examine the supralinear strokes and tremas, et al. Below is a sample of the PHI text of I Corinthians 1:1,2, using the font as supplied by Mr. Gary S. Dykes:

1.1 ⲧⲉⲡⲣⲟⲥⲕⲟⲣⲓⲛⲑⲓⲟⲩⲥ· ⲡⲁⲩⲗⲟⲥ ⲡⲁⲡⲟⲥⲧⲟⲗⲟⲥ ⲉⲧⲧⲁϩⲙ̄ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲭⲥ̄ ⲓⲥ̄ ϩⲓⲧⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲙ̄ⲛ̄ⲥⲱⲥⲑⲉⲛⲏⲥ ⲡⲥⲟⲛ
1.2 ⲉⲩⲥϩⲁⲓ̈ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲕⲕⲗⲏⲥⲓⲁ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲧⲁⲓ̈ ⲉⲧϣⲟⲟⲡ ϩⲛ̄ⲕⲟⲣⲓⲛⲑⲟⲥ. ⲛⲉⲧⲧⲃ̄ⲃⲏⲩ ϩⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲭⲥ̄ ⲓⲥ̄ ⲛⲉⲧⲧⲁϩⲙ̄ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ. ⲙ̄ⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲧⲉⲡⲓⲕⲁⲗⲉⲓ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣⲁⲛ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲛϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲓⲥ̄ ⲡⲉⲭⲥ̄ ϩⲙ̄ⲙⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲩ ⲛⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲛ.

Now compare the above PHI text with Wells, Sahidic below:

IC-01-01= ⲡⲁⲩⲗⲟⲥ ⲡⲁⲡⲟⲥⲧⲟⲗⲟⲥ ⲉⲧⲧⲁϩⲙ ⲙⲡⲉⲭⲣⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ ⲓⲏⲥⲟⲩⲥ ϩⲓⲧⲙ ⲡⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲙⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲙⲛ ⲥⲱⲥⲑⲉⲛⲏⲥ ⲡⲥⲟⲛ
IC-01-02 ⲉⲩⲥϩⲁⲓ ⲛⲧⲉⲕⲕⲗⲏⲥⲓⲁ ⲙⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲧⲁⲓ ⲉⲧϣⲟⲟⲡ ϩⲛ ⲕⲟⲣⲓⲛⲑⲟⲥ. ⲛⲉⲧⲧⲃⲃⲏⲩ ϩⲙ ⲡⲉⲭⲣⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ ⲓⲏⲥⲟⲩⲥ ⲛⲉⲧⲧⲁϩⲙ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ. ⲙⲛ ⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲧⲉⲡⲓⲕⲁⲗⲉⲓ ⲙⲡⲣⲁⲛ ⲙⲡⲉⲛϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲓⲏⲥⲟⲩⲥ ⲡⲉⲭⲣⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ ϩⲙ ⲙⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲛⲧⲁⲩ ⲛⲙⲙⲁⲛ.

Here is the Sahidic and Bohairic from Takla:

Bohairic	Sahidic
1:Ⲁ ⲡⲣⲟⲥ ⲕⲟⲣⲓⲛⲑⲓⲟⲩⲥ ⲁ̄ ⲃ ⲁ 1:1 ⲡⲁⲩⲗⲟⲥ ⲡⲁⲡⲟⲥⲧⲟⲗⲟⲥ ⲉⲧⲑⲁϩⲉⲙ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲓⲏⲥ ⲡⲭⲥ̄ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲫⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲙ̄ⲫϯ ⲛⲉⲙ ⲥⲱⲥⲑⲉⲛⲏⲥ ⲡⲓⲥⲟⲛ 1:2 ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲕⲕⲗⲏⲥⲓⲁ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲫϯ ⲑⲏ ⲉⲧϣⲟⲡ ϧⲉⲛ ⲕⲟⲣⲓⲛⲑⲟⲥ ⲛⲏ ⲉⲧⲁⲩⲧⲟⲩⲃⲱⲟⲩ ϧⲉⲛ ⲡⲭⲥ̄ ⲓⲏⲥ ⲛⲏ ⲉⲧⲑⲁϩⲉⲙ ⲉⲑⲟⲩⲁⲃ ⲛⲉⲙ ⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲃⲉⲛ ⲉⲑⲙⲟⲩϯ ⲉⲫⲣⲁⲛ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲛϭⲥ̄ ⲓⲏⲥ ⲡⲭⲥ̄ ϧⲉⲛ ⲙⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲃⲉⲛ ⲛ̄ⲧⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲉⲙ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲛ	1:1 ⲡⲁⲩⲗⲟⲥ ⲡⲁⲡⲟⲥⲧⲟⲗⲟⲥ ⲉⲧⲧⲁϩⲙ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲭⲥ̄ ⲓⲥ̄ ϩⲓⲧⲙ ⲡⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲙⲛ ⲥⲱⲥⲑⲉⲛⲏⲥ ⲡⲥⲟⲛ 1:2 ⲉⲩⲥϩⲁⲓ̈ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲕⲕⲗⲏⲥⲓⲁ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲧⲁⲓ̈ ⲉⲧϣⲟⲟⲡ ϩⲛ ⲕⲟⲣⲓⲛⲑⲟⲥ. ⲛⲉⲧⲧⲃ̄ⲃⲏⲩ ϩⲙ ⲡⲉⲭⲥ̄ ⲓⲥ̄ ⲛⲉⲧⲧⲁϩⲙ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ. ⲙⲛ ⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲧⲉⲡⲓⲕⲁⲗⲉⲓ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣⲁⲛ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲛϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲓⲥ̄ ⲡⲉⲭⲥ̄ ϩⲙ ⲙⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲩ ⲛⲙⲙⲁⲛ.

Below is a copy of Horner's Bohairic text. It is from I Corinthians 6:13 - 9, on its facing page Horner provides an English translation with more apparatus! (Pauline Epistles freely available from *Google*!).

ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲁⲛ⳿ ⲉⲝⲉⲥⲧⲓⲛ ⲛⲏⲓ ⲉⲉⲣ ⳿ ⲅⲱⲃ ⲛⲓⲃⲉⲛ⳿
ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉϣ ⲅ̄ⲗⲓ ⲓⲣⲓ ⲙ̄ⲡⲁⲉⲣϣⲓϣⲓ⳿   ¹³ ⲛⲓ-
ⲫⲣⲏⲟⲩⲓ ⲁⲩϫⲏ ⲛ̄ϯⲛⲉⲭⲓ⳿ ⲟⲩⲟⲅ ϯⲛⲉⲭⲓ
ⲛ̄ⲛⲓⲫⲣⲏⲟⲩⲓ⳿ ⲑⲁⲓ ⲇⲉ ⲛⲉⲙ ⲛⲓⲕⲉⲭⲱⲟⲩⲛⲓ ⲫϯ
ⲛⲁⲕⲟⲣϥⲟⲩ.

λβ Ⲡⲓⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲇⲉ ⲛⲁϥϫⲏ ⲛ̄ϯⲡⲟⲣⲛⲓⲁ ⲁⲛ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ
ⲙ̄ⲡⲟ̄ⲥ⳿ ⲟⲩⲟⲅ, ⲡⲟ̄ⲥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲓⲥⲱⲙⲁ⳿   ¹⁴ ⲫϯ ⲇⲉ
ⲁϥⲧⲟⲩⲛⲟⲥ ⲡⲉⲛⲟ̄ⲥ⳿ ⲟⲩⲟⲅ, ⲁⲛⲟⲛ ⲅⲱⲛ ⲉϥⲉ-
ⲧⲟⲩⲛⲟⲥⲧⲉⲛ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲅⲓⲧⲉⲛ ⲧⲉϥϫⲟⲙ⳿   ¹⁵ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ-
ⲧⲉⲛⲉⲙⲓ ⲁⲛ ϫⲉ ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲥⲱⲙⲁ⳿ ⲅⲁⲛⲙⲉⲗⲟⲥ
ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲡⲭ̄ⲥ ⲛⲉ⳿ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲱⲗⲓ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲛ̄ⲛⲓⲙⲉⲗⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ
ⲡⲭ̄ⲥ⳿ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲁⲓⲧⲟⲩ ⲙ̄ⲙⲉⲗⲟⲥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲣⲛⲏ⳿ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲥ-
ϣⲱⲡⲓ⳿   ¹⁶ ϣⲁⲛ ⲧⲉⲧⲉⲛⲉⲙⲓ ⲁⲛ⳿ ϫⲉ ⲫⲏ ⲉⲧ-
ⲧⲱⲙⲓ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟϥ ⲉϯⲡⲟⲣⲛⲏ⳿ ⲟⲩⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲱⲧ
ⲡⲉ⳿ ⲉⲩⲉϣⲱⲡⲓ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ ⲙ̄ⲡ̄ⲃ ⲉⲩⲥⲁⲣⲝ
ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲱⲧ⳿

¹⁷ Ⲫⲏ ⲇⲉ ⲉⲧⲧⲱⲙⲓ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟϥ ⲉⲡⲟ̄ⲥ ⲟⲩⲡ̄ⲛ̄ⲁ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲱⲧ⳿|
¹⁸ Ⲫⲱⲧ ⲥⲁⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ϯⲡⲟⲣⲛⲓⲁ. ⲛⲟⲃⲓ ⲛⲓⲃⲉⲛ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲡⲓⲣⲱ-
ⲙⲓ ⲛⲁⲁⲓϥ ϥⲥⲁⲃⲟⲗ ⲙ̄ⲡⲓⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲫⲏ ⲇⲉ ⲉⲧⲉⲣ-
ⲡⲟⲣⲛⲉⲩⲓⲛ ⲁϥⲉⲣⲛⲟⲃⲓ ⲉⲡⲉϥⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲙ̄ⲙⲓⲛ
ⲙ̄ⲙⲟϥ⳿   ¹⁹ ϣⲁⲛ ⲧⲉⲧⲉⲛⲉⲙⲓ ⲁⲛ⳿ ϫⲉ ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛ-
ⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲟⲩⲉⲣⲫⲉⲓ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲡⲓⲡ̄ⲛ̄ⲁ ⲉⲑⲟⲩⲁⲃ ⲡⲉ⳿ ⲫⲏ
ⲉⲧϣⲟⲡ ϧⲉⲛ ⲑⲏⲛⲟⲩ⳿ ⲫⲏ ⲉⲧⲁⲣⲉⲧⲉⲛϭⲓⲧϥ
ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲛ ⲫϯ⳿ ⲟⲩⲟⲅ, ⲛ̄ⲑⲱⲧⲉⲛ ⲫⲱⲧⲉⲛ ⲁⲛ⳿

ⲛ̄ⲛⲉϣ] T*BCFGHJMNOP: ⲛⲉϣ, L*ADEKL by error.   ⲓⲣⲓ]
ⲉⲓⲣⲓ, K.   ¹³ⲁⲩϫⲏ] ⲉⲩϫⲏ, OJ.   ⲟⲩⲟⲅ, ϯⲛⲉⲭⲓ 2°]
+ ⲁⲩϫⲏ, H: om. N homeot.   ⲑⲁⲓ ⲇⲉ]-ⲧⲉ, CGJO.   ⲛⲓⲕⲉ.]
ⲛⲁⲓⲕⲉ., B.   ⲡⲓⲥⲱⲙⲁ] ⲡⲥ., C.   ⲛⲁϥϫⲏ] ⲁϥϫⲏ, B.
ⲡⲟⲣⲛⲓⲁ] cf. Gr. Ⲛ̄ADP al plu.   ⲟⲩⲟⲅ, ⲡⲟ̄ⲥ] om. N homeot.
ⲙ̄ⲡⲓⲥⲱⲙⲁ] om. E₁*.   ¹⁴ ⲫϯ ⲇⲉ] om. ⲇⲉ, B.   ⲡⲉⲛⲟ̄ⲥ]
+ ⲓ̄ⲏ̄ⲥ ⲡⲭ̄ⲥ, CHJ: ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲛⲟ̄ⲥ ⲓ̄ⲏ̄ⲥ, F.   ⲉϥⲉⲧⲟⲩⲛⲟⲥⲧⲉⲛ]
-ⲛⲟⲥⲉⲛ, BDL; cf. Gr. Ⲛ̄CD³EKL al pler f vg^cle syr^utr arm aeth Ath
Euth^ood &c.: ⲛ̄ⲧⲉϥ ⲧⲟⲩⲛⲟⲥⲧⲉⲛ, J, cf.? Gr. A(B)D*PQ 37.
93. (67**) &c.   ¹⁵ ⲛⲉⲧⲉⲛⲥⲱⲙⲁ] cf. Gr. unc. (exc. Ⲛ̄*A).

13

Finally, it behooves me to show a sample from the 1904 work of Balestri, below a copy of a page his Sahidic text:

359

ⲭⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲕⲁ
ⲧⲁ ⲡⲓⲡⲛ̄ⲁ̄ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩ
*col. 2. 9 *ⲱⲧ. ⲕⲉⲟⲩⲁ̄
ⲇⲉ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲡⲓⲥⲧⲓⲥ
ϩⲙ ⲡⲓⲡⲛ̄ⲁ̄ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩ
ⲱⲧ· ⲕⲉⲟⲩⲁ̄ ⲇⲉ
ⲛ̄ϩⲉⲛϩⲙⲟⲧ ⲛ̄
ⲧⲁⲗϭⲟ ⲕⲁⲧⲁ ⲡⲓ
ⲡⲛ̄ⲁ̄ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲱⲧ.
10 ⲕⲉⲟⲩⲁ̄ ⲇⲉ ⲛ̄ϩⲉⲛ
ⲉⲛⲉⲣⲅⲏⲙⲁ ⲛ̄
ϭⲟⲙ· ⲕⲉⲟⲩⲁ̄ ⲛ̄
ⲟⲩⲡⲣⲟⲫⲏⲧⲓⲁ·
ⲕⲉ ⲟⲩⲁ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲇⲓⲁ
ⲕⲣⲓⲥⲓⲥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛ̄ⲁ̄·
ⲕⲉⲟⲩⲁ̄ ⲛ̄ϩⲉⲛⲅⲉ
ⲛⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ⲁⲥⲡⲉ·
ⲕⲉⲟⲩⲁ̄ ϩⲉⲛϩⲉⲣ
ⲙⲏⲛⲓⲁ ⲛ̄ⲁⲥⲡⲉ.
11 ⲛⲁⲓ ⲇⲉ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ
ⲡⲓⲡⲛ̄ⲁ̄ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲱⲧ·
ⲡⲉⲧⲉⲛⲉⲣⲅⲉⲓ
ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲉϥⲡⲱϣ·
ⲉⲭⲙ̄ ⲡⲟⲩⲁ̄ ⲡⲟⲩⲁ
ⲕⲁⲧⲁ ⲑⲉ ⲉⲧϥ̄
12 ⲟⲩⲁϣⲥ̄. ⲛ̄ⲑⲉ
ⲅⲁⲣ ⲉⲟⲩⲁ̄ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲥⲱ
ⲙⲁ ⲉⲟⲩⲛⲧϥ̄ ϩⲁϩ
ⲙ̄ⲙⲉⲗⲟⲥ· ⲙ̄
ⲙⲉⲗⲟⲥ ⲇⲉ ⲧⲏ

ⲣⲟⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲥⲱⲙⲁ ϩⲁϩ ⲛⲉ
ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲱⲧ ⲡⲉ ⲟⲩⲥⲱⲙⲁ·
ⲧⲁⲓ ⲧⲉ ⲑⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉ
13 ⲭⲥ. ⲕⲁⲓ ⲅⲁⲣ ϩⲛ̄
*ⲟⲩⲡⲛ̄ⲁ̄ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲱⲧ' *p. ⲡⲇ̄:
ⲁⲛⲟⲛ ⲧⲏⲣⲛ̄ ⲛ̄ col. ⲓ.
ⲧⲁⲛⲃⲁⲡⲧⲓⲍⲉ
ⲉⲩⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩ
ⲱⲧ· ⲉⲓⲧⲉ ⲓ̈ⲟⲩ
ⲇⲁⲓ· ⲉⲓⲧⲉ ⲟⲩ
ⲉⲓⲉⲛⲓⲛ· ⲉⲓⲧⲉ
ϩⲙ̄ϩⲁⲗ· ⲉⲓⲧⲉ ⲣⲙ̄
ϩⲉ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲩ
ⲧⲥⲟⲛ ⲧⲏⲣⲛ̄ ϩⲛ̄
ⲟⲩⲡⲛ̄ⲁ̄ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲱⲧ
14 ⲕⲁⲓ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲡⲥⲱⲙⲁ
ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲙⲉⲗⲟⲥ ⲛ̄
ⲟⲩⲱⲧ ⲁⲛ ⲡⲉ·
ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ϩⲁϩ ⲛⲉ.
15 ⲉⲣϣⲁⲛ ⲧⲟⲩⲣⲏ
ⲧⲉ· ϫⲟⲟⲥ ϫⲉ ⲛ̄
ⲁⲛⲅ̄ ⲧϭⲓⲭ ⲁⲛ ⲛ̄
ⲛ̄ⲅ̄ ⲟⲩⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲁⲛ
ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲥⲱⲙⲁ·
ⲟⲩ ⲡⲁⲣⲁ ⲧⲟⲩ
ⲧⲟ̄ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲉⲃⲟⲗ
ⲁⲛ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲥⲱⲙⲁ
16 ⲧⲉ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲣϣⲁⲛ
ⲡⲙⲁⲁϫⲉ ϫⲟⲟⲥ
ϫⲉ ⲛ̄ⲁⲛⲅ̄ ⲡⲃⲁⲗ

¹⁰ ⲇⲉ] n. 83 om. – ⲛ̄ϩⲉⲛⲉⲛⲉⲣⲅⲏⲙⲁ] n. 83 ⲛ̄ϩⲉⲛⲉⲣⲕⲏⲙⲁ – ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲡⲣⲟⲫⲏⲧⲓⲁ] n. 83
ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲡⲣⲟⲫⲏⲧⲓⲁ (sic) – ϩⲉⲛϩⲉⲣⲙⲏⲛⲓⲁ] n. 80 ⲛ̄ϩⲉⲛϩⲉⲣⲙⲏⲛⲓⲁ; n. 83 ⲛⲟⲩϩⲉⲣⲙⲏⲛⲓⲁ —
¹² ⲉⲟⲩⲛⲧϥ̄] n. 83 ⲉⲟⲩⲛ̄ⲧⲁϥ – ϩⲁϩ alt.] nn. 80 et 83 ϩⲁϩ – ⲛⲉ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲱⲧ ⲡⲉ ⲟⲩⲥⲱ-
ⲙⲁ] nn. 80 et 83 ⲛⲉ ⲟⲩⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲱⲧ ⲡⲉ – ϩⲁϩ ⲛⲉ et ⲟⲩⲥⲱⲙⲁ addita a 2. m. —
¹³ ⲟⲩⲉⲓⲉⲛⲓⲛ] n. 80 ⲟⲩⲉⲉⲓⲉⲛⲓⲛ; n. 83 ⲟⲩⲉⲉⲓ̈ⲉⲛⲓ̈ⲛ – Alt. ⲉⲓⲧⲉ in n. 83 est ⲉⲓ̈ⲇⲉ – ϩⲛ̄
ⲟⲩⲡⲛ̄ⲁ̄] n. 83 ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲡⲛ̄ⲁ̄ — ¹⁵ ⲧⲟⲩⲣⲏⲧⲉ] n. 80 ⲧⲟⲩⲉⲣⲏⲧⲉ; n. 83 ⲧⲟⲩⲉ̄ⲣⲏⲧⲉ – ⲛ̄ⲛⲅ̄]
nn. 80 et 83 ⲛⲁⲛⲅ̄ — ¹⁶ ⲁⲛ alt.] n. 80 om.

1 Cor. XII, 9-16.

Note, he provides a fine apparatus of the variants seen in the numerous Coptic manuscripts he used (noted in his introduction).

It is hoped that Mr. Wells' text will not meet the same fate as that which befell the haphazard PHI Coptic text. To avoid such a fate, he needs to clearly justify why such and such a reading occurs. Or he needs to precisely follow a single printed edition (as Takla did of Thompson's text of the Beatty papyrus of the Pauline Epistles and Acts).

Mr. Wells notes that the PHI text has its flaws. Consequently, he moves to produce his new edition, named SAHIDICA. He states:

> " A new text of the Sahidic New Testament has been developed. It is called the Sahidica text and is based on the Coptic New Testament developed by the Packard Humanities Institute (PHI). In turn, the PHI version was based on the edition by George Horner."

Here, below is a reproduction of Wells' sources: Borrowed from J.W. Wells' site: www.sahidica.warpco.com [also - www.sahidica.com]

The development of the Sahidica text has, from its inception, been based on automated systems. More specifically, it has been developed using proprietary analysis, formatting, and pattern-recognition software created by the editor. The Sahidica text was based on The Coptic New Testament, an electronic publication, which was edited by David Brakke (Cop0001.Txt on PHI-CD 5.3 dated 7/2/91. Los Altos. Packard Humanities Institute. 1991).

However, the Sahidica text is very different from the PHI version. Literally thousands of changes have been made to the text. These changes involve primarily specific standardization and a partial level of clitic disintegration (i.e. the separation of certain proclitic words). Such changes were made to enhance readability and simplify statistical analysis of the text. Changes to the actual content of the text are fewer in number and have been made only where the PHI version has errors or idiosyncratic readings that fail to represent the overall Sahidic textual tradition.

Most of these changes have been made by pattern-recognition and analysis software, developed for this purpose by the editor. In turn, the resultant text has been further analyzed, validated, and formatted using automated systems.

At this juncture, it is important to make a clarification. As in the case of the master text for first Peter (mentioned above), the resultant Sahidica text was not produced by the automated systems. Rather, it was produced by hand using the information supplied by the automated systems. Therefore, while automation does much of the collation and analysis, editorial decisions are still left to the editor.

Sahidica Version Basis

Except for the general epistles, the primary basis of the Sahidica text is the same as the basis of the PHI text. In addition to comparing PHI with its source documents, additional documents have been collated with a view to giving a better representation of the overall tradition of the Sahidic version. The basis of the Sahidica text is given below.

Section	Primary Basis	Collated Primarily Against
Matthew	Pierpont Morgan Library M-569	Bodmer XIX
Mark	PPalau Rib. Inv.Nr.182	Pierpont Morgan Library M-569
Luke	PPalau Rib. Inv.Nr.181	Pierpont Morgan Library M-569
John	PPalau Rib. Inv.Nr.183	Pierpont Morgan Library M-569
Acts	Chester Beatty B (Copt.Ms.814)	Berlin P.15926 + British Museum MS Or.7594
Pauline	Chester Beatty A (Copt.Ms.813)	Pierpont Morgan Library M-570 + M-571
James-Jude*	Pierpont Morgan Library M-572	Pierpont Morgan Library M-573 + M-601
Revelation	Berlin MS Or.408 = British Museum Ms Or.3518	British Museum MS Or.6803

*Note: First Peter was collated primarily against the Crosby-Schøyen Ms.193.

An impressive list of sources, but his resulting text is mixed, and we students can only wonder as to which resource generated such-and-such a reading. I find that Wells followed the Thompson text rarely when it differed from Horner's text. Where did he accept a reading which differs from say, Horner? He needs to show/mark these differences.

I tested some of the new Wells Sahidic text in Romans and I Corinthians. (NOTE: I refer to this work of Wells not as the SAHIDICA text, but rather abbreviated as WS, the Bohairic being WB). I discovered

that he followed the edition of Horner almost exclusively. He did not apparently incorporate any readings from the Morgan Pierpont MSS, nor from Thompson, even when both agreed against Horner.

It has also been observed that none of the keyboards (font mappings) of the True Type fonts are equivalent, all three (PHI, Takla, Wells) differ. Of the three I prefer the PHI mapping as it includes paratextual (trema and supralinear marks, and "slings") which are easy to input.

Below is a copy, again via Brigitte Comparini of PHI of their font mapping scheme, with some additional data I requested. With this data I was able to map one of my fonts to produce an easier to read PHI output (at least easier to read in my experience). My font for rendering the PHI Coptic CD, is freely available upon request.

Φ The Packard Humanities Institute

300 Second Street, Los Altos, CA 94022, USA
TEL (415) 948-0150   FAX (415) 948-5793
INTERNET:74754.2713@compuserve.com

Coptic Beta Code

Greek Letters:

A B C D E F G H I K L M N O P Q R S T U W X Y Z
ⲁ ⲃ ⲍ ⲇ ⲉ ⲫ ⲅ ⲏ ⲓ ⲕ ⲗ ⲙ ⲛ ⲟ ⲡ ⲑ ⲣ ⲥ ⲧ ⲩ ⲱ ⲭ ⲯ ⲍ

Egyptian Letters:

h s t f g j
ϩ ϣ ϯ ϥ ϭ ϫ

A discrete superlinear stroke over a letter is indicated
by back-slash preceding the letter:

        \N = N̄

A continuous superlinear stroke is indicated by pointed
brackets around the affected letters:

        <PNA> = ⲡⲛⲁ̄

A sling over several letters is indicated by pointed bracket
and 3:

        <3EI>3 = ⲉⲓ̂

A hook is represented by a slash after the letter:

        K/ = ⲕ

A type of single quotes is represented by square brackets
and 12:

        [12D]12 = 'ⲁ'

Letters with subscript dots, diaereses, and circumflexes are
indicated as in Greek Beta Code with "?", "+", and "="
respectively.

18

It is further to be noted, that none of the three digital Coptic producers, utilized Balestri's work of 1904. Though fragmentary, it is an accurate work and presents texts from the seventh through 10th centuries. Certainly a third witness would have been useful when Brakke and Layton needed to make an editorial decision. (Though Layton states [in a personal letter to me], that he was not responsible for the proof-reading, yet he was the senior editor!).

Mr. Wells plans [or, he hopes to] to add variant readings to his work, which will clarify the textual sources for each variation from Horner or Takla. Once his "standardized" text is clearly validated, then we can fully rely upon it. Perhaps we can assist with the validation process. Until then [when all variations betwixt Thompson and others are noted in an apparatus] much testing of Wells' Sahidic text remains. Good free PDF versions of Wells' texts are offered on the site:

www.biblical-data.org (navigate to the versions/Coptic pages)

As concerns Wells' Bohairic text:

His Bohairic text rarely deviates from Horner in the Pauline epistles (and herein Horner's text is quite good). However, as opposed to Takla, Wells actually joins word units which traditionally were not united. Below is a sample from I Corinthians 1: 2:

IC-01-02 NϯEKKΛHCIΔ NTEϕNOYϯ ΘH ETϢOΠ ḆENKOPINΘOC NH ETΔYTOYBϢOY ḆENΠXPICTOC IHCOYC NH ETΘΔϨEΜ EΘOYΔB NEM OYON NIBEN EΘΜOYϯ EϕPΔN ΜΠENϬOIC IHCOYC ΠXPICTOC ḆENΜΔI NIBEN NTϢOY NEΜ NTΔN.

19

This is just the opposite of his methodology seen in the Sahidic version! One may especially note the union of the preposition ϧⲉⲛ (ḇⲉⲛ) with its following object or noun. Wells has yet to explain such behaviors! His Bohairic text, even as published, needs to be corrected, as I found some minor errors.

IN CONCLUSION

Wells' Sahidic text, should become our standard text. Separating the word units is a great advancement over previous timid attempts. The text is better understood when word divisions reflect modern linguistics, and the database is much easier to work with. The resulting text is also much easier to read and compare to other languages as well. Perhaps Mr. Wells can provide for the supralinear strokes and the trema as well in a future version, though they are not really necessary and perhaps just are an added font formatting burden. Personally, I think I prefer the clean text without the tremas and connective/supralinear strokes!

As for his Bohairic text, it is a nice database to work with, but the word divisions need more standardization, and the text needs proofreading, errors are seen.

Mr. Wells! may your labors continue to bear fruit, and for what has already been produced, I for one, am grateful!