

ISSN 2410-0951

COMSt  
Comparative Oriental Manuscript Studies  
COMSt  
Bulletin

Volume 8 • 2 • Special Issue • 2022

Edited by  
Alessandro Bausi, Paola Buzi, Javier Del Barco,  
Emiliano Fiori, Marilena Maniaci,  
Eugenia Sokolinski

COMSt

*Comparative Oriental Manuscript Studies Bulletin* is the biannual on-line and print-on-demand journal of the European research network Comparative Oriental Manuscript Studies. Born in 2009 as a European Science Foundation Research Networking Programme, the network has been affiliated to the Centre for the Study of Manuscript Cultures (<https://www.csmc.uni-hamburg.de/>) since 2016.

*Comparative Oriental Manuscript Studies Bulletin* welcomes articles, project descriptions, conference reports, book reviews and notes on all topics connected with the written cultures of the Mediterranean Near and Middle East and related traditions or offering a comparative perspective. Contributions should be sent to Comparative Oriental Manuscript Studies, Hiob Ludolf Centre for Ethiopian and Eritrean Studies, Asien-Afrika-Institut, Universität Hamburg, Alsterterrasse 1, 20354 Hamburg, Germany; [eugenia.sokolinski@uni-hamburg.de](mailto:eugenia.sokolinski@uni-hamburg.de). For submission guidelines and former issues visit <https://www.aai.uni-hamburg.de/en/comst/publications/bulletin.html>.

#### **Editorial Board**

Alessandro Bausi, Hamburg, Germany

Paola Buzi, Rome, Italy

Javier Del Barco, Madrid, Spain

Emiliano Fiori, Venice, Italy

Marilena Maniaci, Cassino, Italy

#### **Editorial Secretary**

Eugenia Sokolinski, Hamburg, Germany

#### **Advisory Board**

Tara Andrews, Vienna, Austria

Patrick Andrist, Munich, Germany

Ewa Balicka-Witakowska, Uppsala, Sweden

Malachi Beit-Arié, Jerusalem, Israel

Pier Giorgio Borbone, Pisa, Italy

Françoise Briquel Chatonnet, Paris, France

Valentina Calzolari, Genève, Switzerland

Ralph Cleminson, Winchester, UK

Matthew Driscoll, Copenhagen, Denmark

Alessandro Gori, Copenhagen, Denmark

Dickran Kouymjian, Fresno, USA – Paris, France

Marco Palma, Cassino, Italy

Ira Rabin, Berlin – Hamburg, Germany

Lara Sels, Leuven, Belgium

Gaga Shurgaia, Naples, Italy

Jan-Just Witkam, Leiden, The Netherlands

Copyright © COMSt (Comparative Oriental Manuscript Studies) 2022

Publication date February 2023

This journal is published under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International license (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) [www.creativecommons.org](http://www.creativecommons.org).



ISSN 2410-0951

# Contents

## The Transmission of Mark's Endings in Different Traditions and Languages

Papers presented at the International Workshop, Lausanne, 2–3 June 2022  
eds Claire Clivaz, Mina Monier, and Dan Batovici

<i>A Multilingual Turn: Introducing the 'MARK16' COMSt Bulletin</i> (Claire Clivaz)	303
<b>Greek and Latin Traditions</b>	
<i>Physical Discontinuities in the Transitions between the Gospels: Reassessing the Ending of Mark in Codex Sinaiticus, Vaticanus and Alexandrinus</i> (Patrick Andrist)	313
<i>The Text and Paratext of Family 1 in Mark 16</i> (Tommy Wasserman)	345
<i>'According to the Egyptians': Mark 16 in GA 72</i> (Mina Monier)	365
<i>Framing Mark: Reading Mark 16 in a Catena Manuscript</i> (Anthony P. Royle and Garrick V. Allen)	385
<i>Was Salome at the Markan Tomb? Another Ending to Mark's Gospel</i> (Elizabeth Schrader Polczer)	401
<i>'The End of the Beginning': Mark's Longer Ending (16:9–20) and the Adaptation of the Markan Storyline</i> (James A. Kelhoffer)	421
<i>The Ending of Mark in Tatian's Diatessaron</i> (Nicholas J. Zola)	439
<i>Mark 16 and the Eusebian Apparatus: Greek and Latin Solutions</i> (W. Andrew Smith)	475
<b>Other Languages</b>	
<i>The Shorter Ending of the Gospel of Mark in the Coptic Versions</i> (Anne Boud'hors and Sofia Torallas Tovar)	495
<i>The Endings of the Gospel of Mark in Syriac Witnesses</i> (David G. K. Taylor)	513
<i>Mc 16 dans les manuscrits arabes du Sinaï — Réflexions de méthode pour leur utilisation en critique textuelle. Diversité des versions, rubriques, langues sources, variantes fausses et vraies</i> (Jean G. Valentin)	541
<i>The Endings of Mark in Ethiopian Translation and Transmission</i> (Curt Niccum)	561
<i>Mark 16 in the Persian Harmony of the Gospels</i> (Ali B. Langroudi)	581
<i>The Displaced Endings of Mark in Armenian Biblical Manuscripts</i> (Dan Batovici)	603
<i>Mark 16:9–20 in Armenian Medieval Literature: A Commentary by Barseł Maškevorc 'i</i> (Armine Melkonyan)	625

<i>Un essai de panorama de Marc 16 dans la tradition géorgienne</i> (Bernard Outtier)	647
<b>History of the Reception</b>	
<i>Cerinthus and the Gospel of Mark: The Priority of the Longer Ending</i> (Joan E. Taylor)	675
<i>Trajectories in the History of Textual Scholarship on Mark's Endings: A Reconsideration</i> (Jan Krans and An-Ting Yi)	712
<i>Mark 16 from the Sixteenth to the Nineteenth Century: Why Were the Doubts not Expressed Earlier?</i> (Régis Burnet)	731

# **Special Issue**

## ***The Transmission of Mark's Endings in Different Traditions and Languages***

**papers presented at the International Workshop,  
Lausanne, 2-3 June 2022**

**edited by  
Claire Clivaz,  
Mina Monier,  
and Dan Batovici**



# The Shorter Ending of the Gospel of Mark in the Coptic Versions

*Anne Boud'hors and Sofia Torallas Tovar,  
IRHT/CNRS, Paris and University of Chicago*

This article aims to clarify the issue of the endings of Mark in the Coptic versions. It endeavors to show that the endings of Mark fit within the general context of the textual history of the Sahidic Coptic versions of the Gospel of Mark as recently proposed by the authors. It also examines the details of the *conclusio brevior*, prevalent in part of the Coptic tradition, as shown by the research carried out within the framework of the 'SNSF Mark 16' project directed by Claire Clivaz. In addition, it highlights some of the particularities of the textual tradition of the ending of Mark, which could indicate an influence of a monastic environment in Upper Egypt.

Our current research on the endings of Mark in the Coptic versions is a continuation and deepening of the work we have been doing for more than thirty years on the Coptic versions of this Gospel, especially in the Sahidic dialect.<sup>1</sup> In this paper we will briefly present the main achievements of our research on the Coptic versions. Then, after emphasizing the invaluable contribution of the Swiss National Science Foundation 'Mark 16' project to our progress in the understanding of Mark's endings in Coptic, we will present the details of the question of variants for the ending of Mark 16 in the Coptic tradition.<sup>2</sup>

In studying the endings of the Gospel of Mark in Coptic we were not starting from zero. Two seminal articles were written at different points of the twentieth century. Joseph Michael Heer (1912), in his description and edition of the bilingual lectionary sa 14L (/1602 for the Greek part) had already identified an Upper Egyptian tradition including Coptic and bilingual witnesses coming from the same place, namely the monastery of Shenoute (or White Monastery). Paul Kahle (1951) had at his disposal most of the Coptic witnesses of the Shorter Ending (9 in all, in three different dialects). Not known to these two scholars, however, were the crucial witness sa 1, a complete parchment codex dated to the fifth century, as well as the small fragment sa 366.<sup>3</sup> With the help of this new textual material, we have been able to reconstruct the history of the Coptic Sahidic text of Mark, and, as we hope to show here, the endings of Mark fit the general picture of our reconstruction. Conversely,

1 See Boud'hors and Torallas Tovar 2021.

2 Special thanks are due to one of our anonymous reviewers for a very careful reading and many suggestions which helped improve the text.

3 For the reference system of the Sahidic and Fayyumic manuscripts of the New Testament, see Schmitz and Mink 1986–1991 (as well as <<http://intf.uni-muenster.de/smr/>>, this and other URIs last accessed 20 November 2022).

we will try to show that this history contributes to a better understanding of the Shorter Ending in the Coptic versions, especially its last part, which is quite complicated.

### *1. Overview of the Coptic Versions of Mark*

Witnesses of one or more versions of the text of Mark are preserved for three dialects of Coptic: Sahidic (S), the literary language of the Nile Valley from the fourth to the tenth centuries; F5, a variety of Fayyumic, the dialect of the Fayyum region (70 km southwest of Cairo); and B5, medieval Bohairic, the language of Lower Egypt, which became the liturgical language of the Coptic Church from the eleventh century. While the Gospel is preserved in its entirety in several witnesses for the two most important dialects (S and B), there are only a few fragments in F5, but fortunately one of these fragments contains chapter 16. In the following, we consider the witnesses we have as witnesses of versions, and we use for them the sigla Sa, Fa and Bo.

Between the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century, George Horner was already able to publish a critical edition of the New Testament in each of the two main dialects, versions Sa and Bo.<sup>4</sup> In the absence of a complete witness, Horner's edition of the Sahidic text was in fact heterogeneous, based on a collection of fragments from different manuscripts of what we discovered were different versions. The publication in the 1970s and 1980s of two complete manuscripts of Mark, one of which can be dated to the fifth century,<sup>5</sup> as well as the identification of two additional versions, one of which is a revision of the other,<sup>6</sup> made it necessary to prepare a new critical edition. Since the early 2000s, we have been working on securing the foundation of this edition, trying to reconstruct the history of the text in this dialect and to situate the different witnesses in this textual history. We have recently published the results of this preliminary study<sup>7</sup> and we summarize here the main conclusions, which concern the existence of three types of texts (ancient, revised and mixed, that we label sa I, sa II and sa III):<sup>8</sup>

4 Horner 1898 and Horner 1911.

5 Barcelona, Archivo Histórico SJ de Cataluña, P.Palau Ribes inv. 182, edited by Quecke 1972 and New York, Morgan Library & Museum MS M 569, edited by Aranda Pérez 1988.

6 Orlandi 1973, Boud'hors 1993.

7 Boud'hors and Torallas Tovar 2021. See also <<https://manuscripts.hypotheses.org/3971>> and <<https://manuscripts.hypotheses.org/3995>>. We are grateful to our colleagues at the INTF (Münster), Siegfried Richter and Katharina Sandmaier, who are continuing the work of Schmitz and Mink 1986–1991 (see <<http://intf.uni-muenster.de/smr/>>), for their help on many points and their willingness to collaborate.

8 We indicate the versions with Roman numerals and the actual manuscripts with Arabic numerals.

- sa I (representing sa I): text of the manuscript Barcelona, Archivo Histórico SJ de Cataluña, P.Palau Ribes inv. 182<sup>9</sup> (fifth century), which transmits an ancient translation of Mark; this translation would later be revised, but will continue to be copied and used for several centuries; the version transmitted by this manuscript can therefore be called sa I (ancient version). For chapter 16, the only witness for this version is precisely this manuscript.
- sa II: a revised version of the first translation, according to principles of standardization and harmonization (a phenomenon for which a kinship with the Greek GA 032 manuscript can be detected);<sup>10</sup> it is attested by numerous witnesses, the oldest of which can be dated to the fifth–sixth century. None of these manuscripts is complete: it is therefore a reconstructed text,<sup>11</sup> for which there are several lacunae and uncertain passages.
- sa 9 (representing sa III): text of the manuscript New York, Morgan Library & Museum M 569<sup>12</sup> (Fayyum, ninth century), which presents a mixed type of text (sa III), standing between the two preceding ones. It is probably the witness of compilation work carried out in the Fayyum;<sup>13</sup> this mixed text was then transmitted by several manuscripts, all later than sa 9. The only witness for the end of Mark in sa III is sa 9.

The Bo medieval version that has been preserved is not earlier than the eighth century,<sup>14</sup> and we do not know whether there existed an earlier version (pbo = palaeobohairic),<sup>15</sup> as there is for the Gospel of John.<sup>16</sup> The Bo version translates the Greek text quite literally and seems to be independent of Sa.

As for the Fa version, it remains difficult to have a clear idea, and even to determine whether there was one or several different versions, due to the fragmentary state of the evidence. Nevertheless, the scanty Fayyumic witnesses present syntactic and lexical choices that argue for a relative independence from Sa and Bo.<sup>17</sup> We will see this in particular for the ending of Mark.<sup>18</sup>

9 Ed. Quecke 1972.

10 For the date of GA 032, see Orsini 2019, 155–157.

11 Most of the time the one from the Horner 1911 edition, but not always.

12 Ed. Aranda Pérez 1988.

13 See Boud'hors and Torallas Tovar 2020.

14 Funk 2013, 541.

15 Miroshnikov 2019b, 180–182.

16 P.Bodmer III. See Kasser 1958 and Askeland 2012, 167–173, 177.

17 Aranda Pérez 1979 gives interesting insights into the ‘diatessaric’ tendency of the Fayyumic version.

18 The only Fayyumic witness to the ending of Mark is the manuscript fa 32, preserved in the Russian National Library in St Petersburg (Copt. Φ. 920, no. 53), published in Elanskaja 1969 (p. 106 for the passage in question). The edition is of good quality, but we regret the absence of an image for the passage concerned. According to Elanskaja (p. 111), the fragment is lost; hence our only source of information is

One can immediately get an idea of the textual situation of the different translations by looking at verse 8, before the possible additions.

sa 1 <sup>8</sup>αγω ντερογει εβολ ρη πεμραου αγπωτ νερεουροτε γαρ νημαυ. αγω νεγρ ωπηρε υπογχε λααυ δε νωαχε ελλαυ νεγρ ροτε γαρ'

And when they came out of the tomb, they fled. For fear was with them and they were amazed. And they did not say anything to anyone, for they were afraid.

sa 9 <sup>8</sup>αγω ντερογει εβολ επεμρααυ αγπωτ νερεουροτε γαρ νημαυ πε. αγω νεγρ ωπηρε υπογχε λααυ δε νωαχε ελλαυ νεγρ ροτε γαρ' (same translation as for sa 1)

sa II <sup>8</sup>αγω ντερογσωτη αιει εβολ ρη πεμρααυ αγπωτ νερεουροτε γαρ νημαυ πε. αγω νεγρ ωπηρε υπογχε λααυ δε νωαχε ελλαυ νεγρ ροτε γαρ'

And when they heard, they came out of the tomb and fled. For fear was with them and they were amazed. And they did not say anything to anyone, for they were afraid.

Witnesses for sa II: sa 103 (8\*) sa 474 sa 14<sup>L</sup> sa 357<sup>L</sup>

αγω om. sa 357<sup>L</sup> | ηπεμρααυ sa 14<sup>L</sup> | λααυ (1) om. sa 14<sup>L</sup>! | γαρ πε sa 357<sup>L</sup>

There is a noteworthy variant in sa II, which presents an additional clause, ντερογσωτη, 'when they heard'. This can be compared to Greek: ακουσασαι εξηλθον απο του μνημειου και εφυγον GA 099; και ακουσασαι εξηλθον και εφυγον απο του μνημειου GA 032 (or W); και ακουσασαι και εφυγον απο του μνημειου GA 038 (or Θ) 565

fa 32 <sup>8</sup>[α]γι εβα[λ αγω<sup>2</sup> εγ]πητ ραβαλ [επεμ]ρεογ η[εαγστωτ] χιτογ πε [μεν ογστ]ηλτελ [αγω] υπογτα[μα η]λαπη [ηαγελ ρα]† γαρ πε

They went out (and) fled from the tomb, for a trembling had seized them, and a disturbance.<sup>19</sup> And they did not tell anyone, for they were afraid.

Bo <sup>8</sup>ογορ αγι εβολ αγπωτ εβολ ρα πιμραυ. νεαγσөөртер γαρ ταρωογ πε νεν ογτωμηт. ογορ υπογχε ρλι ηρλι. ναγερ ρο† γαρ πε.

And they came out and fled from the tomb. For a trembling had seized them, and amazement. And they did not say anything to anyone, for they were afraid.

At this point, a remark can be made about the Coptic translations which should be of use later. The word order of the Sahidic ('to come out of the tomb and flee', not 'to come out and flee from the tomb' as in Greek και εξελθουσαι εφυγον από του μνημείου) is conditioned by the fact that in Coptic 'to come out' is almost always constructed as 'to come out of' (ει εβολ ρη/e-), with the directional adverb being preferably directly followed by the place comple-

von Lemm's unreliable edition of 1885. Below we have followed the text proposed by Wolf-Peter Funk in his unpublished concordance of dialect F5. Our anonymous reviewer suggested interesting new reconstructions, which shows that the text deserves a reedition, but it does not change the general tendency of the Fa version. On this manuscript, see also Miroshnikov 2019a, 297.

19 Both terms used in Fa mean 'trembling'.

ment. As a result, the variant attested by GA 099 (ακουσασαι εξηλθον απο του μνημειου και εφυγον) appears to be a calque of the Coptic sa II,<sup>20</sup> which itself is a translation of the variant attested by GA 032. The Bohairic version preferred to translate the Greek more literally (αγι εβολ αγφωτ), and the Fayyumic version probably chose to render the participial turn of the Greek by applying it to the second verb (εγ]πητ ‘fleeing’) if the reconstruction is correct.

## 2. The Endings of Mark 16

In our research on the Sahidic versions of Mark chapter 16 has always remained somewhat undeveloped, due to the confusing situation of the witnesses, especially in verse 8. In a recent and still unpublished article,<sup>21</sup> we have attempted to elucidate the question of the endings by listing and examining in detail the Coptic and bilingual (Greek/Coptic) witnesses. We will repeat here some of the remarks made in that article, but it should be emphasized from the outset that the systematic examination of the witnesses undertaken by Claire Clivaz and Mina Monier in the framework of the ‘Mark 16’ project, as well as Claire Clivaz’s work on the *conclusio brevior*,<sup>22</sup> have shed considerable light on these questions. While we were describing a confused situation without understanding it completely, we now believe that we are in a position to give a reasoned description, which confirms our hypotheses on the Coptic translations. Let us summarize these results before taking them up in detail:

sa 1 has a Short Ending. The text ends in verse 8 with the *subscriptio*: ‘Gospel according to Mark’ (πεγαγγελιον κκατα μαρκος).<sup>23</sup> The further circulation of this Short Ending is attested by an amulet (sa 393var).<sup>24</sup>

20 This is hardly surprising, given that GA 099 is a bilingual manuscript, and comes from an Upper Egyptian monastery: see below 3.1.

21 Boud’hors and Torallas Tovar forthcoming.

22 Clivaz 2021, Monier 2021, Monier 2022. All the images of the manuscripts we will be dealing with in the following are available at <<https://mark16.sib.swiss/>>.

23 In accordance with the text of the large Greek uncials κ and B (Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus). However, unlike these two manuscripts, sa 1 seems to have the ‘Western’ order of the Gospels, with Mark last, an order that is usually accompanied by the Long Ending (uncials GA 05 [or D] and GA 032 [or W]).

24 Fribourg, Bibel und Orient Museum ÄT 2006.8 (TM 135855) a seventh- to ninth-century parchment amulet, no provenance; cf. Emmenegger 2012. Amulets of this type give the beginning and end of each of the four gospels (see Sanzo 2014).

sa II has the *conclusio brevior*: verse 8 is followed by an addition, preceded by an introductory sentence in distinctive layout.<sup>25</sup> Then a transitional sentence follows (also in distinctive layout) introducing the Long Ending (vv. 9–20).

sa 9 has the same structure as sa II, but the introductory and transitional phrases are not highlighted by any distinguishing marks in the manuscript.

sa 357<sup>L</sup> is not a gospel manuscript but a hagiographic collection,<sup>26</sup> normally considered sa II. It contains, among a series of readings for the feast of a local holy monk Apa Harôn (region of Aswan), the whole of chapter 16 (vv. 1–20),<sup>27</sup> including the Long Ending, but without any addition to verse 8.

Fa, as far as can be judged from the only surviving witness, has the *conclusio brevior*, perhaps without the first introductory sentence, and with a wording of the transitional sentence very close to that of the Greek witnesses.

Bo seems to have had the Long Ending without any addition in verse 8. However, two witnesses, which are marked A (Huntington 17) and E<sub>1</sub> (London, BL Or. 1315) in Horner's edition, have the addition to v. 8 in the left or lower margin copied by a later hand.<sup>28</sup> We will return to these additions below.

Let us now leave aside sa 1 and 357<sup>L</sup>, to focus on the other witnesses, those which attest the *conclusio brevior*.

### **3. Detailed Comparison of Greek and Coptic Witnesses in the *conclusio brevior***

#### **3.1. Coptic Witnesses: Some Details**

In order to situate the Coptic witnesses in relation to the Greek manuscripts, we will now look closely at their material aspects. The witnesses of sa II attesting the *conclusio brevior* (in a more or less complete way, due to their fragmentary character) are five in number:<sup>29</sup> sa 14<sup>L</sup>, a bilingual lectionary

25 By distinctive layout we mean that the manuscripts present the text copied in different style and size, often marked with lines above and below. On these 'paratexts', see Monier 2022, 12.

26 London, British Library, Oriental 7029.

27 On the purpose of this passage among the readings for this feast, see Dijkstra and van der Vliet 2020, 17.

28 Both are bilingual (Coptic-Arabic) manuscripts. The Shorter Ending is not in the Arabic text. See Monier 2022, 10.

29 The manuscripts sa 102 and sa 121 do not preserve any word of the *conclusio brevior*. However, their text corresponds to the end of the transitional sentence, as we shall see below.

(whose Greek part is known under the abbreviation GA /1602), sa 102, sa 121, sa 366, sa 474. With the exception of sa 366, a very small fragment whose provenance is unknown, all the others come from the library of the monastery of Shenoute, also known as the ‘White Monastery’, founded at the end of the fourth century in Upper Egypt.<sup>30</sup> It is also from this monastery that the Greek folio known as GA 099 comes from, and it cannot be excluded that it belonged to a bilingual lectionary of the type of sa 14<sup>L</sup>, to which it bears a strong resemblance.<sup>31</sup> These two manuscripts, as well as sa 102 and sa 121, are copied in two columns in a biblical majuscule with very marked contrast of thick and thin strokes. Dated very variably by scholars in the past, these manuscripts have recently been convincingly attributed to the period seventh–eighth-century,<sup>32</sup> coincidentally also the date assigned to GA 099. As for sa 474, the date is slightly later (tenth century?), and its palaeographic characteristics bring it closer to manuscripts copied in the Fayyum (before being sent to Upper Egypt). sa 9 also comes from a monastery in the Fayyum, so we are perhaps dealing here with two different production environments, one, Upper Egypt, being the cradle of sa II, the other, the Fayyum, a region where various traditions co-existed.

### 3.2 Introduction to Addition after v. 8

The Greek text has a number of different versions of the addition:

- GA 019 φερετε που και ταυτα, ‘these too are introduced somewhere (= in other manuscripts?)’ (with distinctive layout)
- GA 099 εν τισι των αντιγραφων ταυτα φερεται, ‘in some copies, these are introduced’ (with distinctive layout)
- GA /1602 εν αλλοις αντιγραφοις ουκ εγραφη ταυτα, ‘in other copies these are not written’ (with distinctive layout)

30 It is possible that the version sa II was produced in this monastery, an epicenter of Egyptian monasticism at that time. On this library see Orlandi 2002, Suciú 2014.

31 On sa 14<sup>L</sup>, see Heer 1912 and Depuydt 1993, no. 54. The folio 099 was edited by Amélineau 1895, then reedited by Horner 1898 with improvements. It is a mystery to us how Horner was able to decipher the front of this parchment folio, which is now completely illegible, and already very difficult to read at the end of the nineteenth century, according to Amélineau. It is not clear that he had access to special lighting or photographs, or even to a transcription that predates Amélineau’s edition. In any case, it is impossible to verify Horner’s readings for the distinctively written sentences. In terms of content, sa 14<sup>L</sup> features Mark 16:1–20 in Greek, then in Coptic, and the same may have been true of the manuscript to which GA 099 may have belonged.

32 See Suciú 2020, 383–388.

- catenae GA 1422 and GA 2937<sup>33</sup> αὕτη ἡ ὑποθεσις οπιθεν εστι εἰς το εφοβουνο γαρ, ‘this addition following (the text) is ‘because they feared’’.<sup>34</sup>

The other Greek manuscripts, GA 083, GA 044, GA 274<sup>ms</sup> and GA 579 and the Vetus Latina 1 do not have the introductory sentence of the addition.

The situation in the Coptic manuscripts is as follows:

- sa 14<sup>L</sup> ρη ρηκεαντιγραφον δε ναι χι ερογν εροου, ‘and in other copies these are appended to them’ (with a distinctive layout, a forked *paraphros*, smaller characters, and spacious line division). It is noteworthy that the Coptic version is a mixture of the translation of the Greek of GA 11602, the Greek part of the same manuscript (‘in other copies’), and of that of the Greek of GA 099 (‘these are added/introduced’).
- sa 9 ρη ρηκεαντιγραφον δε ναι χι ερογν εροου, ‘and in other copies, these are appended to them’, presents the same phrasing as sa 14<sup>L</sup>, but in continuous text, without a distinctive layout.
- sa 366 and sa 474 present a *lacuna*.
- bo 13 or E<sub>1</sub> (London, British Library, Oriental 1315) has ἕεν κεγραφη, ‘in another writing’ (in the paragraph inserted in the lower margin).
- bo 2 or A (London, British Library, Huntington 17) omits this sentence in the marginal addition.
- fa 32 has a lacuna (but perhaps not big enough to have contained the whole sentence).

### 3.3. Text of the Addition: towards a Critical Edition

Following the introductory indication, the addition itself presents the following text in Greek:

παντα δε τα παρηγγελμενα τοις περι τον Πετρον συντομωσ εξηγιλαν. μετα δε ταυτα και αυτος ο ις εφανη αυτοις, απο ανατολης και αχρι δι αυσεωσ εξαπεστιλεν δι αυτων το ιερων και αφθαρτον κηρυγμα της αιωνιου σωτηριασ αμην.

inc. [...] ταυτα 083 | ο ις 019 099 274 579 2937: ις 044 083 1422 | εφανη αυτοις 019 099: om. 083 274 579 1422 2937, om. αυτοις 044 11602 | ανατολης: ανατολης ηλιου 099: ανατολων 274 | αχρι: μεχρι 044: om. και before αχρι 083 | αμην: om. 019

(the most important variant is the omission of εφανη αυτοις)

The Vetus Latina 1 reads:<sup>35</sup>

33 Chains are based on the principle of distinctive layout.

34 These two manuscripts are not exactly of the same type, but they attest similar variations for this passage. See Monier 2021, 8 and Monier 2022, 12, where the translation is ‘this hypothesis is at the rear of ‘for they were afraid’’.  
35 On the *cum puero* variant, see Clivaz 2021.

*Omnia autem quaecumque praecepta erant et qui cum P[et]ro erant breuiter exposuerunt posthaec et ipse Iesus adparuit et ab orientem usque in orientem misit per illos sanctam et incorruptam [praedicationem] salutis aeternae. Amen.*<sup>36</sup>

The Sahidic Coptic has the addition attested in sa 9, sa 14<sup>L</sup> and partially in sa 474 and 366. The text below is that of sa 9, with the variants in other manuscripts listed in apparatus:

ΝΕΝΤΑΦΩΝΟΥ ΔΕ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΕΤΟΟΤΟΥ ΝΝΑ ΠΕΤΡΟΣ ΑΦΧΟΟΥ ΞΗ ΟΥΩΩΩΤ ΕΒΟΛ. ΜΗΝΣΑ  
ΝΑΙ ΔΕ ΨΩΟΥ ΟΝ ΔΙΤ ΟΥΩΝΖ ΝΑΥ ΕΒΟΛ ΑΥΩ ΞΙΝ ΕΜΜΑ ΝΩΑ ΜΠΡΗ ΩΑ ΝΝΑ ΝΖΩΤΠ  
ΑΦΧΟΟΥ ΕΒΟΛ ΞΙΤΟΟΤΟΥ ΜΠΤΑΩΕ ΟΕΙΩ ΕΤΟΥΑΑΒ ΑΥΩ ΝΑΤΤΑΚΟ ΝΤΕ ΠΟΥΧΑΙ ΜΠΩΑ  
ΕΝΕΞ ΖΑΜΗΝ

ΑΦΧΟΟΥ sa 9: ΑΥΧΟΟΥ sa 14<sup>L</sup> (lac. sa 366 sa 474) | ΑΥΩ sa 9 sa 474: om. sa 14<sup>L</sup> (lac. sa 366)

And all that he had commanded to the companions of (lit.: to those of) Peter, they told (var. sa 9: he told) briefly. And after that Jesus appeared to them again. (And) from the places of the rising of the sun to the places of the setting, he sent through them the holy and imperishable proclamation of the eternal salvation. Amen.

The only Fayyumic manuscript for this section presents a very fragmentary text, however the preserved text allows us to spot a variant: ‘great’ (ΝΑΣ), where the other versions have ‘holy’ (ΙΕΡΟΝ, *sanctam*, ΕΤΟΥΑΑΒ):

[...]Υ ΔΑΤ ΔΝ[ΣΕΜΗΙ<sup>37</sup> ΕΛ]ΑΥ ΝΝΑ[10–12]Υ[...] ΜΠΝΑΣ ΕΞΙ ΔΙ[Ω] ΑΥΩ ΝΑ[ΤΤΑΚΑ] ΝΤΕ  
Π[ΟΥΧΕΙ Ν]ΩΑ ΕΝΕ[Ξ ΖΑΜΗΝ]

[...] he commanded them to the [...] the great and imperishable proclamation of the eternal salvation. Amen.

In Bohairic Coptic there are two different versions in the two witnesses described above:<sup>37</sup>

bo 2 (added in the left hand margin at 90<sup>o</sup>):

ΟΥΟΖ ΝΗ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΕΤΑΦΩΝΖΕΝ ΜΜΟΥ (sic for ΜΜΩΟΥ?) ΝΝΗ ΕΤΑΥΙ ΜΕΝΕΝΣΑ ΠΕΤΡΟΣ:  
ΟΥΟΖ ΞΕΝ ΟΥΩΝΖ ΕΒΟΛ ΑΥΣΑΧΙ ΜΜΩΟΥ: ΟΥΟΖ ΜΕΝΕΝΣΑ ΝΑΙ ΔΕ ΟΝ ΑΦΟΥΩΝΖ ΕΡΩΟΥ  
ΝΧΕ ΙΗΣ ΙΣΧΕΝ ΜΜΑ ΝΩΑΙ ΝΤΕ ΦΡΗ ΩΑ ΝΕΦΜΑ ΝΖΩΤΠ ΟΥΟΖ ΑΦΟΥΩΡΠΟΥ ΕΞΙ ΩΕΝΝΟΥΧΙ  
ΕΘΟΥΑΒ ΝΑΤΜΟΥΝΚ ΝΤΕ ΠΩΩΝ Ξ ΝΕΝΕΞ ΔΜΗΝ.

And all that he had commanded to those who followed Peter, they told openly.<sup>38</sup> And after that Jesus appeared to them again from the places of the rising of the sun to the places of its setting. And he sent them for the holy and imperishable proclamation of eternal life. Amen.

<sup>36</sup> Text according to Clivaz 2021, 83.

<sup>37</sup> For a German translation, see <<https://mr-mark16.sib.swiss/show?id=Qk8y>>.

<sup>38</sup> This translation avoids the difficult ‘and’ before ‘they told’. Our anonymous reviewer suggested that ΕΤΑΦΩΝΖΕΝ could be interpreted as a second perfect. Then we would not need to ignore the ΟΥΟΖ: ‘And all those things were the ones that he commanded and they told them openly’.

bo 13 (added in the lower margin in smaller characters). A supplementary note says it has been added ‘in another writing’,  $\beta\epsilon\lambda\ \kappa\epsilon\rho\rho\alpha\phi\eta$ ; the Arabic side also has an addition with the same content in the lower margin, without the clarification ‘in another writing’, but with the mention of a Sahidic origin for the passage (f. 212v right margin):

ϩΩΒ ΔΕ ΝΙΒΕΝ ΕΤΑΥΡΕΝΖΕΝ ΠΕΤΡΟΣ ΕΡΩΟΥ: ΑΦΑΙΤΟΥ ΒΕΝ ΟΥΩΩΤ ΕΒΟΛ: ΜΕΝΕΝΣΑ ΝΑΙ  
ΔΕ ΑΦΟΥΟΝΖΦ ΕΡΩΟΥ ΝΧΕ ΙΗϸ ΙΣΧΕΝ ΝΙΜΑ ΝΩΑΙ ΝΤΕ ΦΡΗ ΩΑ ΝΕΦΜΑ ΝΡΩΤΠ: ΕΒΟΛ  
ΖΙΤΟΤΟΥ ΑΦΟΥΩΡΠ ΗΠΡΙ ΩΙΩ ΕΘΟΥΑΒ ΝΑΤΩΩΒΕΝ ΒΕΝ ΟΥΟΥΧΑΙ ΝΕΝ[εε].

And all that was commanded to Peter, he did briefly. And after that, Jesus appeared to them; from the places of rising of the sun to the places of its setting; through them he sent the preaching, holy, undefiled, in eternal salvation.

### 3.3.1. *Comment on the First Sentence*

Given the differences in translation, it can be noticed that the first sentence posed difficulties in understanding, which resulted in confusion of pronouns and their referents. We understand the Greek text as follows: ‘They briefly told Peter’s companions all that had been commanded to them’.<sup>39</sup>

The Sahidic Coptic has followed the word order of the Greek literally, and uses an active turn of phrase, thus arriving at a substantially different result: ‘All that he had commanded to the companions of (lit.: to those of) Peter, they told (var. sa 9: he told) briefly’. The active form seems to be present also in Fa and in Bo Hunt. 17. There remains the question about the subject ‘he’. Can this be the young man sitting by the tomb?

The Bohairic witnesses are substantially different from each other:

- bo 2: ‘And whatever he had commanded to those who followed Peter, they told it openly’.
- bo 13: ‘And all that was commanded to Peter, he did it briefly’.

The first one is quite close to the Sahidic translation, except for the use of ‘openly’. The second one sounds rather interpretative.

### 3.3.2. *Comment on the Second Sentence*

‘Then Jesus himself also appeared to them, (+/- and) from the east to the west He sent forth through them the sacred and incorruptible proclamation of eternal salvation, amen’.

The variant  $\epsilon\phi\alpha\nu\eta\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$  (‘appeared to them’) is present in Coptic Sa and Bo (Fa has a lacuna there), as well as in VL 1, and in the Greek testimonies of GA 019 and GA 099. On the other hand, GA 044 and l1602 feature it

39 For the text of VL 1, which poses specific problems, see Clivaz 2021.

partially.<sup>40</sup> The omission of αυτοις in the latter manuscripts could be explained by the vicinity of αυτος. It should also be noted that the omission of the full clause is already found in GA 083, the Sinaitic palimpsest (which seems to be the earliest Greek witness to the *conclusio brevior*).

The Greek variant ανατολης ηλιου ‘sunrise’ of GA 099 (but not I1602) could have been influenced by the Coptic, εμμα ναα ηπη, ‘the places of rising of the sun’, a periphrasis frequent in Coptic for the expression of ‘sunrise’, although not absolutely necessary (e.g. Matt 2:1 has νεμα ναα without the addition of ηπη for the sun).<sup>41</sup>

The variant addition of ‘and’ before απο ανατολης is attested by VL 1, sa 9 and sa 474 (the latter two come from the same region), but no Greek witness includes it; bo 13 does not have it; bo 2 seems to have interpreted the sentence differently, as if ‘the places of the rising of the sun to the places of its setting’ were the places for Jesus to appear.

It is also noteworthy that the two Bo witnesses have different translations for ‘proclamation’ and ‘imperishable’, and bo 2 has ‘life’ where all the rest have ‘salvation’.

The Fa text, as noted above, has a peculiar variant, and gives ‘great’ (νασ) where the other versions have ‘holy’.

Finally, the final ‘Amen’ is omitted by bo 13, and also by the Greek text of GA 019.

### 3.4. Introduction to the Long Ending

After the addition to v. 8, the Greek text in MSS GA 019, GA 044, 083, catenae GA 1422 and GA 2937 has the following introductory sentence to the Long Ending:

εστιν δε και ταυτα φερομενα μετα το εφοβουντο γαρ  
And these too are placed after ‘for they were afraid’.

The manuscripts display different distinctive layouts: a frame in GA 019, the use of *eisthesis* in GA 044, smaller characters for GA 083. Other manuscripts present no means of highlighting the text: GA 274, GA 579.

There is a variant text εστιν δε [ε και ταυ]τα φερομε[να] (with distinctive layout) followed by ειχεν γαρ αυτας τρομος και εκστασις ουδενι ουδεν ειπον εφοβουντο γαρ in MSS GA 099 and I1602 (the two White Monastery manu-

40 Again, the two Greek witnesses from the White Monastery in Upper Egypt, 099 and I1602, do not coincide completely.

41 Also Matt 8:11 απο ανατολων και δυσμων translates εβοληνη νεμα ναα ηπη ημα ηρωτι; Gn 13.11 etc. Examples with the additional ηπη are frequent in the OT (e.g. Num 21:11, Deut 4:41), but in the NT this is the only example in the Gospels (+ Rev 7:2 and 16:2).

scripts), ‘And this also is introduced’, followed by the addition of the entire v. 8b.

VL 1 does not have a Long Ending, since it ends with the addition to v. 8.

The text of the Coptic Fa witness has (with a distinctive layout):

νεικεκαγ[ι δε] φαγει μνη[σα] νει <ν>αγελ ρα† γαρ πε

And these other words come after these (namely) ‘for they <were> afraid’.<sup>42</sup>

This is the only Coptic reading close to the Greek text of GA 019 et al.

The Sahidic versions have some variation:

sa 9 ναϊ δε ον ηπ ερογν εροογ μνησα ναϊ δε νερεογστωτ αμαρτε μμοογ  
 μν ογωτορτρ αγω μπογχε λααγ νφαχε ελααγ νεγρ ροτε γαρ (non-distinctive layout, only large initials as any other paragraph beginning, ‘And these too are added to them after these, namely “a trembling held them ...”’).

sa 14<sup>L</sup> ναϊ δε ον χι ερογν εροογ (distinctive layout smaller characters separated by intermittent lines above and below, ‘And these too are appended to them’)

νερεογστωτ δε αμαρτε μμοογ μν ογωτορτρ αγω μπογχε λααγ νφαχε ελααγ  
 νεγρ ροτε γαρ

sa 474 ναϊ δε ον ηπ ε[ρο]γν εροογ (distinctive layout, significantly smaller characters and double rubricated lines above and below, ‘And these too are added to them ...’)

νερεογστωτ αμαρτε μμοογ μν ογωτορτρ [α]γω μπογχε λ[α]α[γ ν]φαχε ελααγ  
 νεγρ [ρο]τε γαρ

There is a lacuna in sa 366; sa 9 and sa 474 use the verb ωπ/ηπ ‘to include, to count in’, while sa 14<sup>L</sup> prefers χι ‘to take’. This might be a regional variation. However, sa 474 is closer to sa 14<sup>L</sup> in that it presents a distinctive layout for the addition.

There is therefore in sa II and sa 9, as in GA 099 and I1602, a repetition of a longer portion of verse 8b, but with a different wording:

Sa: νερεογστωτ (δε) αμαρτε μμοογ μν ογωτορτρ. αγω μπογχε λααγ  
 νφαχε ελααγ νεγρ ροτε γαρ.

(And/for) a trembling held them, and an upheaval. And they did not say a word to anyone, for they were afraid.

Greek: ειχεν γαρ αυτας τρομος και εκστασις [και] ουδενι ουδεν ειπον  
 εφοβουντο [γαρ]

Compare 8b:

42 The text must be emended here, as it was suggested by our anonymous reviewer, because the prefix of the Imperfect is necessary.

Sa:  $\text{N}\epsilon\text{P}\epsilon\text{O}\gamma\text{Z}\text{O}\text{T}\epsilon\ \text{G}\alpha\text{P}\ \text{M}\text{M}\text{M}\alpha\gamma\ (\text{P}\epsilon)\ \alpha\gamma\omega\ \text{N}\epsilon\gamma\text{P}\ \omega\text{P}\text{N}\text{H}\text{P}\epsilon.\ \text{M}\text{P}\text{O}\gamma\chi\epsilon\ \lambda\lambda\alpha\gamma\ \Delta\epsilon\ \text{N}\omega\alpha\chi\epsilon\ \epsilon\lambda\lambda\alpha\gamma\ \text{N}\epsilon\gamma\text{P}\ \text{Z}\text{O}\text{T}\epsilon\ \text{G}\alpha\text{P}.$

For fear was with them and they were amazed. And they said no word to anyone, for they were afraid.

Greek:  $\epsilon\iota\chi\epsilon\text{n}\ \gamma\alpha\rho\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha\varsigma\ \tau\rho\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\kappa\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \omicron\upsilon\delta\epsilon\text{n}\ \omicron\upsilon\delta\epsilon\text{n}\ \epsilon\iota\text{P}\omicron\text{n}\ \epsilon\text{f}\omicron\beta\omicron\upsilon\text{n}\text{t}\omicron\ \gamma\alpha\rho$

In the repetition the Greek is translated more accurately. The earlier translation of v. 8 was a bit rough (which is sometimes a feature of sa 1)<sup>43</sup>: the revised sa II could have changed the translation of sa 1, but it did not do so (perhaps out of respect or lack of imagination).

The repetition of 8b, attested in sa 9, sa 14<sup>L</sup> and sa 474, is also attested in sa 102 and sa 121, albeit fragmentarily. However, the fragmentary testimony allows us to conclude that these two manuscripts most likely attested the *conclusio brevior*.

sa 102 [ ...  $\text{M}\text{M}\text{O}\text{I}\text{O}\gamma\ \text{M}\text{N}\ \text{O}\gamma\omega\tau\text{O}\text{P}\text{T}\text{P}'\ \alpha\gamma\omega\ \text{M}\text{P}\text{O}\gamma\chi\epsilon\ \lambda\lambda\alpha\gamma\ \text{N}\omega\alpha\chi\epsilon\ \epsilon\lambda\lambda\alpha\gamma\ \text{N}\epsilon\gamma\text{P}\text{Z}\text{O}\text{T}\epsilon\ \text{G}\alpha\text{P}$

sa 121  $\text{I}\alpha\text{M}\alpha\text{Z}\text{T}\epsilon\ \text{M}\text{M}\text{O}\text{I}\text{O}\gamma\ \text{M}\text{N}\ \text{O}\gamma\omega\tau\text{I}\text{O}\text{P}\text{T}\text{P}\ \alpha\gamma\omega\ \text{M}\text{P}\text{I}\text{O}\gamma\chi\epsilon\ \lambda\lambda\text{I}\alpha\gamma\ \text{N}\text{I}\omega\alpha\chi\epsilon\ \epsilon\lambda\lambda\alpha\gamma\text{I}$

The lengthening presented by 8b seems therefore to be peculiar to the Upper Egyptian milieu. What caused its inclusion in GA 099, I1602? Perhaps the need for precision came from Coptic Sa, which, because of the rough translation of the first part of 8b, resulted in a repetition of  $\text{Z}\text{O}\text{T}\epsilon\ \text{G}\alpha\text{P}$ , thus an ambiguity ('For fear was with them, and they were amazed. And they said no word to anyone, for they were having fear'), which did not exist in Coptic Fa. This repetition might have been inserted in order to pick up more clearly with the text, after a lengthy insertion.

Along with the lengthening of the repetition of v. 8b, a syntactic break occurred with the retraction of  $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha$ . It is consummated in sa 14<sup>L</sup> with the addition of  $\Delta\epsilon$  after  $\text{N}\epsilon\text{P}\epsilon\text{O}\gamma\text{C}\text{T}\omega\text{T}$ . In contrast, this break does not exist in sa 9, which says precisely: 'And these too are added to them after these, namely "a trembling held them ..."'. As sa 9 is probably the result of a compilation made in the Fayyum, it is possible that the Fa version played a role in the wording of sa 9.

As for the Bohairic Coptic version, there is a supplementary complexity. bo 13 has no trace of the transitional sentence to the Long Ending (the same

43 The reality may be a bit more complicated: 'fear' ( $\text{Z}\text{O}\text{T}\epsilon$ ) could correspond to the variant  $\phi\acute{\omicron}\beta\omicron\varsigma$  attested by GA 05 and GA 032; while the word  $\epsilon\kappa\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma$  has given rise to many different translations in the Coptic biblical texts, no other example is known of a translation by  $\omega\text{P}\text{N}\text{H}\text{P}\epsilon$ , 'amazement', but Bo uses  $\tau\omega\text{M}\text{T}$ , which has the same meaning.

is true for VL 1, GA 044 and GA 579). By contrast, bo 2 has it, embedded in the marginal addition, immediately after the *conclusio brevior*:

bo 2 ΝΑΙ ΟΝ ΝΘΩΟΥ ΕΥΗΠ{1} ΝΤΟΤΟΥ ΟΥΟΖ ΜΕΝΕΝΑ ΝΑΙ ΕΦΕΤΑΡΩΟΥ ΝΡΑΝΩΘΟΡΤΕΡ ΝΕΜ ΡΑΝΡΟΧΡΕΧ ΟΥΟΖ ΗΠΟΥΧΕ ΖΛΙ ΝΡΛΙ ΝΓΑΧΙ ΝΑΥΕΡ ΖΟΤ ΓΑΡ.

And these too are counted with them, (namely): ‘And after these things he shall set them up for upheavals and torments. And they did not say a word to anyone, for they were afraid’.

Here we see the same phenomenon as in Sa: the terms of the addition are not the same as in v. 8b, which has ΝΕΔΟΥΧΘΕΡΤΕΡ ΓΑΡ ΤΑΡΩΟΥ ΠΕ ΝΕΜ ΟΥΤΩΜΤ. ΟΥΟΖ ΗΠΟΥΧΕ ΖΛΙ ΝΡΛΙ. ΝΑΥΕΡ ΖΟΤ ΓΑΡ, ‘For a trembling had reached them, and an amazement. And they said nothing to anyone, for they were afraid’. This is quite interesting, as Bo already had a fairly literal translation of the Greek in 8b. This means that the translation of this reprise was done independently of the text of 8b in Bo, most likely from the Sahidic. Nevertheless, it poses several difficulties:

- ΜΕΝΕΝΑ ΝΑΙ could be a trace of the *μετά* here (as in sa 9), with an anticipatory *ΝΑΙ*; the *ΟΥΟΖ* (‘and’) is unexpected, but this sometimes occurs in Bo.
- the form *ΕΦΕΤΑΡΩΟΥ* is difficult to justify as a translation of *εἶχεν αὐτάς*, from the point of view of both tense and person. The tense looks like a future, which makes no sense, and the syntax seems to be incorrect: should we consider ‘he’ to be impersonal and understand ‘upheavals and torments had reached them’?<sup>4</sup>
- the plural before the nouns *ΩΘΟΡΤΕΡ* and *ΖΟΧΡΕΧ* is nowhere to be found: one can at best invoke, for the latter, the proximity of the Greek forms of singular (*ἔκστασις*) and plural (*ἔκστάσεις*).
- What to make of the lexical choice? *ΩΘΟΡΤΕΡ* and *ΘΕΡΤΕΡ* are not synonyms, but their phonetic proximity has often caused confusion between them; *ΖΟΧΡΕΧ* seems less fortunate than *ΤΩΜΤ*: it is never used elsewhere to translate *ἔκστασις*.

#### ***4. Recapitulation of the Hypothesis for the Introduction to the Long Ending***

When incorporating the transitional phrase to v. 9, the translator of sa II realized that there might be an ambiguity because of the presence of *ΖΟΤΕ ΓΑΡ* twice in v. 8b. He therefore retranslated all of verse 8b, not just the last few

44 This use of the impersonal does not seem to be known to us in Coptic. Our anonymous reviewer suggests that this Bohairic text could be a poorly executed translation from Arabic. In Arabic, when the subject follows the verb, the verb remains singular regardless of the number of the subject. This could explain the ‘he’ of the Bohairic. Moreover, Arabic perfect can be used as optative, which would explain the use of third future in the Bohairic.

words, more literally from the Greek, to eliminate ροτε and ραπ from the first part of the sentence. Due to the length of the restatement, only the sentence ‘And these too are added/appended to them’ was written in a distinctive way, the rest was treated as continuous text.

This repetition influenced the copyists of the Greek witnesses of the White Monastery in Upper Egypt (GA 099 and I1602, probably both bilingual), who integrated it.

sa 9, the result of a compilation work in the Fayyum, had access to a Fa version that normally translated the common transitional phrase from Greek. This led to a reintroduction of the phrase ‘after that’, but not of the distinctive layout, which was already absent in the introduction to the *conclusio brevior*.

Only one Bo manuscript chose to account for this transitional phrase, but with several clumsy features. Since this manuscript seems to be a product of Lower Egypt, it could have been influenced by Sahidic manuscripts from the Fayyum, of the type of sa 9.

### References

- Aranda Pérez, G. 1979. ‘La version fayúmica del Monasterio Blanco (Mc 8,24–9,12) (Ensayo metodológico para el estudio de las versiones coptas)’, *Rivista degli Studi Orientali*, 53 (1979), 71–93, 223–233 (repr. *Le Muséon*, 95 (1982)).
- 1988. *El Evangelio de San Marcos en copto sahidico*, Textos y Estudios Cardinal Cisneros, 45 (Madrid: CSIC, 1988).
- Askeland, C. 2012. *John’s Gospel: The Coptic Translations of its Greek Text*, Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung, 44 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012).
- Boud’hors, A. 1993. ‘L’Évangile de Marc en copte-sahidique: essai de clarification’, in D. Johnson ed., *Acts of the Fifth International Congress of Coptic Studies, Washington, 12–15 August 1992* (Roma: Centro Italiano Microfiches, 1993), II, 53–65.
- Boud’hors, A. and S. Torallas Tovar 2020. ‘Philological Work on the Sahidic Gospel of Mark in the Ninth Century: the Case of sa 123’, *Journal of Coptic Studies*, 22 (2020), 29–44.
- 2021. ‘Towards a Textual History of the Gospel of Mark in Sahidic Coptic. Prolegomena to a New Critical Edition’, in H. Strutwolf, G. Gäbel, A. Hüffmeier, M.-L. Lakmann, G. S. Paulson, and K. Wachtel, eds, *Novum Testamentum Graecum. Editio Critica Maior, I: Die synoptischen Evangelien, 2: Das Markusevangelium, Teil 3: Studien* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2021), 203–220.
- forthcoming. ‘A propos d’une inscription copte du temple d’Abydos: retour sur les finales de l’évangile de Marc en copte sahidique’.

- Clivaz, C. 2021. 'Mk 16 im Codex Bobiensis. Neue Materialien zur *conclusio brevior* des Markusevangeliums', *Zeitschrift für Neues Testament*, 47 (2021), 59–85.
- Depuydt, L. 1993. *Catalogue of Coptic Manuscripts in the Pierpont Morgan Library*, I–II (Leuven: Peeters, 1993).
- Dijkstra, J. and J. van der Vliet 2020. *The Coptic Life of Aaron, Critical Edition, Translation and Commentary*, Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae, 155 (Leiden: Brill, 2020).
- Elanskaja, A. I. 1969. Коптские рукописи Государственной публичной библиотеки имени М.Е. Салтыкова-Щедрина (Коптские rukopisi Gosudarstvennoj public'noj biblioteki imeni M.E. Saltykova-Šchedrina, 'Coptic Manuscripts in the M. E. Saltykov-Shchedrin State Public Library'), *Palestinskij Sbornik*, 20 (83) (Leningrad: Nauka, 1969).
- Emmenegger, G. 2012. 'Ein koptisches Amulett als Beleg für den kurzen Markusschluss', *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 103 (2012), 142–145.
- Funk, W.-P. 2013. 'The Translation of the Bible into Coptic', in J. C. Paget and J. Schaper, eds., *The New Cambridge History of the Bible, I: From the Beginnings to 600* (Cambridge: University Press, 2013), 536–546.
- Heer, J. M. 1912. 'Neue griechisch-säidische Evangelienfragmente', *Oriens Christianus*, N.S. 2 (1912), 1–55.
- Horner, G. 1898. *The Coptic New Testament in the Northern Dialect*, I (Oxford: Clarendon, 1898).
- 1911. *The Coptic New Testament in the Southern Dialect*, II (Oxford: Clarendon, 1911).
- Kahle, P. E. 1951. 'The End of St. Mark's Gospel. The Witness of the Coptic Versions', *The Journal of Theological Studies*, NS 2/1 (1951), 49–57.
- Kasser, R. 1958. *Papyrus Bodmer III. Évangile de Jean et Genèse I–IV*, *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium*, 177, 178 (Louvain: Peeters, 1958).
- Miroshnikov, I. 2019a. 'The Coptic Versions of the Acts of Andrew and Matthias (CANT 236), with an Edition of IFAO Copte inv. 132', *Le Muséon: Revue d'études orientales*, 132 (2019), 291–328.
- 2019b. 'A New Witness to the Paleo-Bohairic Version of the Bible: A Fragmentary Manuscript of the Epistle to the Hebrews in Early Bohairic', *Journal of Coptic Studies*, 21 (2019), 173–208.
- Monier, M. 2021. 'Mark's Ending in the Digital Age: Paratextual Evidence, New Findings and Transcription Challenges', *The Journal of Sacred Texts, Cultural Histories, and Contemporary Contexts*, 12/1 (2021), 75–98.
- 2022. 'Mark's Endings in Context: Paratexts and Codicological Remarks', *Religions*, 13/6 (2022 = G. Allen and K. Rodenbiker, eds, *Titles, Paratexts, and*

*Manuscript Communication: Jewish and Christian Literature in Material Context*), 548 (1–20).

- Orlandi, T. 1973. ‘Review of H. Quecke, *Das Markusevangelium Saïdisch* (Barcelona, 1972)’, *Studia Papyrologica*, 12 (1973), 107–109.
- 2002. ‘The Library of the Monastery of Saint Shenute at Atripe’, in A. Egberts, B. P. Muhs and J. van Der Vliet, eds., *Perspectives on Panopolis. An Egyptian Town from Alexander the Great to the Arab Conquest. Acts from an International Symposium Held in Leiden on 16, 17 and 18 December 1998*, *Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava*, 31 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 211–231.
- Orsini, P. 2019. *Studies on Greek and Coptic Majuscule Scripts and Books*, *Studies in Manuscript Cultures*, 15 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2019).
- Quecke, H. 1972. *Das Markusevangelium saïdisch. Text der Handschrift PPalau Rib. Inv.-Nr. 182 mit den Varianten der Handschrift M 569*, *Papyrologica Castroctaviana, Studia et textus*, 4 (Barcelona: Papyrologica Castroctaviana, 1972).
- Sanzo, J. E. 2014. *Scriptural Incipits on Amulets from Late Antique Egypt: Text, Typology, and Theory*, *Studien und Texte zu Antike and Christentum*, 84 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014).
- Schmitz, F.-J. and G. Mink 1986–1991. *Liste der koptischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments. Die sahidischen Handschriften der Evangelien*, I.1, I.2.1, I.2.2, *Arbeiten zur neutestamentlicher Textforschung*, 8, 13, 15 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1986, 1989, 1991).
- Suciu, A. 2014. ‘Coptic Scribes and Manuscripts. Dated and Datable Codices from the Monastery of Apa Shenoute. I: The Codices of the Scribe Victor, the Son of Shenoute (First Half of the 12th Century)’, *Journal of Coptic Studies*, 16 (2014), 195–215.
- 2020. ‘The Sahidic Tripartite Isaiah: Origins and Transmission within the Coptic Manuscript Culture’, *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 66/2 (2020), 377–406.