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The Sahidic Version of Kingdoms IV*

GERALD M. BROWNE

In contrast to other parts of the Old Testament, the four books of Kingdoms do not seem to have enjoyed a high degree of popularity with the Copts of early Christian Egypt. Thanks to a single manuscript from the Pierpont Morgan Library, we have a nearly complete text of the Sahidic version of Kingdoms I and II; 1 but only fragments survive of Kingdoms III and IV. 2 It is therefore particularly welcome whenever papyri or parchment leaves of these books appear with portions of text not previously attested in Coptic translation. Hence the importance of P.Mich.inv. 607, of which I here present the editio princeps: 3 this papyrus contains parts of the Sahidic version of Kingdoms IV not hitherto known in Coptic.

P.Mich.inv. 607 was briefly described, without transcription, by E. M. Husselman in W. H. Worrell, *Coptic Texts in the University of Michigan*

* A version of this paper was presented as a public lecture at the University of Illinois (Urbana-Champaign) on 30 April 1976, during the International Papyrological Symposium. In revised form, it was delivered on 13 December 1976, at the First International Congress of Coptology (Cairo, Egypt).

1 James Drescher, *The Coptic (Sahidic) Version of Kingdoms I, II (Samuel I, II), CSCO 313/Copt.35 (Textus), 314/Copt.36 (Versio) (Louvain, 1970).*


3 I am grateful to Professor H. C. Youtie for permission to publish this text. Professor and Mrs. Youtie also very kindly checked my transcript against the papyrus.
It consists of two consecutive leaves of a papyrus codex. Originally, each page contained two columns of writing, and the text they preserve may be tabulated as follows:

| Folio 1 | Recto Col. i: 1.18d–2.2 (19 lines) |
|        | Col. ii: 2.3–2.4 (2 lines)        |
|        | Verso Col. i: 2.6 (5 lines)       |
|        | Col. ii: 2.8–2.10 (20 lines)      |
| Folio 2 | Recto Col. i: 2.11–2.14 (19 lines) |
|        | Col. ii: lost                     |
|        | Verso Col. i: lost                |
|        | Col. ii: 2.19–2.21 (18 lines)     |

Until the appearance of the Michigan papyrus, we had the Sahidic version of only a portion of the text tabulated above: a parchment codex published by G. Maspero in 1892 contained the beginning of Chapter 2 up to the first part of verse 8, and in 1939 W. Till edited a small fragment from a lectionary with a portion of 2.6. Now, thanks to the Michigan papyrus, we have the end of Chapter 1, and a large amount of the material from 2.8 to 2.14, and 2.19 to 2.21.

Both sheets of P.Mich.inv. 607 are broken off at the top, but we may establish the original number of lines with some degree of certainty. A tentative reconstruction of the Coptic, based upon Maspero’s text, suggests that four lines have been lost at the beginning of Folio 1 Verso Col. ii, which would therefore have originally contained 24 lines. Only a small amount of text is missing between the end of Folio 1 Verso Col. ii and the beginning of Folio 2 Recto Col. i; as a likely reconstruction of the Coptic indicates, no more than five lines have vanished from the beginning of this column, and thus, like the preceding, when complete it would have held 24 lines of writing.

On paleographical grounds, the text should probably be assigned to the ninth century of our era, perhaps to the second half: the hand is somewhat similar to that of a Vienna papyrus of Kingdoms IV, recently edited by T. Orlandi and dated by G. Cavallo “forse alla seconda metà del secolo IX.” Despite the affinity of subject matter, it is clear that the Michigan

5 See below, note to 2 R i 1.
6 For the Vienna papyrus, see above, footnote 2; Cavallo’s opinion about the date is from the introduction to the text, p. 25.
and Vienna papyri do not come from the same codex: the writing styles, though similar, are obviously the work of different scribes, and the line lengths of the Vienna text are characteristically shorter than those of the Michigan piece.

The provenance of $P.\text{Mich.}$ inv. 607 cannot be fixed with certainty, but it is possible that it came from the White Monastery in Upper Egypt, the source of many of the Coptic papyri in the Michigan collection; for further information on this subject, see T. Orlandi, "Un projet milanaise concernant les manuscrits coptes du Monastère Blanc," *Le Muséon* 85 (1972) 405.

As lectional aids, the scribe employs both the suprilinear stroke and the point, and although he prefers the latter, he often uses both without apparent distinction: e.g., I V ii 6f $ελικαίος$ and I I $ελικαίος$; 8 $\hat{\nu}ακ$ and I I $\hat{\nu}ακ$. At times the stroke is considerably shortened, so that it is hardly distinguishable from a point. The latter usually appears slightly to the right of the letter, while the stroke is often extended to cover the left side of the letter following. For convenience of typesetting, in this edition I have centered the suprilineation. Diaeresis occurs only once: I R i 8 $ερπα\acute{\imath}$; elsewhere it is replaced by the stroke (e.g., I V ii 12 $ερπα\acute{\imath}$) or the point (e.g., 2 R i 4 $ερπα\acute{\imath}$). The treatment of nomina sacra varies: once a grave-shaped sign is used (I V ii 12 $νεκπ\nu\nu\lambda$), and once a bar (2 R i 8 $\pi\nu\nu\nu\lambda$). The end of a sentence is often, though not invariably, indicated by a medium punctum. A sign shaped like a 7 signals the beginning of a new section, and a coronis marks the inception of Chapter 2. (For the Coptic text, see below, pp. 204 f.)

**Translation**

*Folio* I R i: (1.18d) And the Lord was enraged in anger at the house of Nachaab (*sic*). (2.1) And it happened, when the Lord was about to take up Helias the prophet in an earthquake up to heaven, Helias proceeded with Elisaios out of Galgalon. (2.2) Helias said to Elissaios (*sic*), "Sit here, because it is to Baithel that the Lord has ordered me to go." Elissaios said to him, "The Lord lives, and your soul lives . . ."

R ii: (2.3) . . . "I also know. Be silent." (2.4) Helias . . .

V i: (2.6) . . . "Sit here, because it is to the Iordanes that the Lord has told me to go." And Elisaios said to him . . .

V ii: (2.8) . . . [He] struck the water with it; the water separated on this side and that, and they crossed the dry sea together. (2.9) And when they had crossed, Helias said to Elisaios, "Ask me for a thing, and I shall do it for you before I am taken up from your sight." Elisaios said to him, "Let your spirit become doubled upon me." (2.10) Helias said to him, "You
have exceeded the measure for requesting. If you see me being taken up from your sight, this shall happen to you. But if I am not taken up, this thing shall not happen to you.”

**Folio 2 R i:** (2.11) . . . They separated them from one another. Immediately Helias was taken up in an earthquake up to heaven. (2.12) And Elisaios saw, and he cried out, saying, “My father, charioteer of Israel and its horseman!” And he no longer saw him. Immediately he laid his hands upon his clothes; he tore them; he made them two broken pieces. (2.13) And he raised up the sheepskin of Helias, the one which had fallen upon Elisaios. And he turned; he stood by the bank of the Iordanes. (2.14) He took the sheepskin . . .

**V ii:** (2.19) “. . . [The situation of] the city is good, just as the Lord sees it. But the waters are bad, and the land does not produce.” (2.20) Elisaios said to them, “Bring me a new little pitcher, and throw salt into it.” They got it; they brought it to him. (2.21) And Elisaios arose; he came forth to the channels of the waters; he threw the salt there, saying, “This it is that the Lord says: ‘these waters I have cured, and I . . .’”

**Commentary**

1 R i

3 f. ΝΝΑΛΑΑΒ: read ΝΑΛΑΑΒ (Gr.7 Αχαπ). Gemination of Ν is not unusual with proper names: e.g., 2 Kgs. 15.198 ΝΝΕΤΩ (ΕΘΗ). Cf. also Drescher, Kingdoms, Versio 64 n. i; G. M. Browne, “The Martyrdom of Paese and Thecla (P.Mich.inv. 548),” Cd’E 49 (1974) 205 (ad 83 R ii 17–19).

5 ΔΕ: here, below in line 9, and in 1 V ii 6, 19; 2 R i 5; 2 V ii 4, καί of the original is replaced by ΔΕ; cf. Drescher, Kingdoms, Versio vi: “ὅσε is very rare in the Greek of Kgs., much more so than, for example, in the Greek Genesis, but ΔΕ is very common in the Coptic. Perhaps it was introduced to provide a change from the monotony of the perpetual ΔΥΩ (καί).” Other instances where the Coptic uses one Greek word to render another will be discussed in the commentary; see on 1 R i 6, 2 R i 7, 2 V ii 1, and 2 V ii 7.

6 ΑΝΑΛΑΜΒΑΝΕ: here the Greek has ἀνάγειν. Elsewhere in the

---

7 For the Greek text, I have throughout used A. Rahlfs, Septuaginta, id est Vetus Testamentum graecce iuxta LXX interpretes (Stuttgart, 1935); whenever necessary, I have consulted A. E. Brooke, N. McLean, H. St. J. Thackeray, The Old Testament in Greek . . . , Vol. 2; The Later Historical Books, Part II: I and II Kings (Cambridge, 1939).

8 All citations from 1 and 2 Kgs. are from Drescher’s edition (see above, footnote 1). I shall refer to the text volume as Kingdoms, Textus, and to the translation volume as Kingdoms, Versio.
portion of text covered by the Michigan papyrus, the Greek uses ἀναλαμβάνω to refer to the ascension of Elijah, and this is reflected by the appearance of άναλαμβάνει in the Coptic: 1 V ii 9, 16, (cf. 18 f.), 2 R i 2 f. It is perhaps a desire on the translator's part to be consistent that explains the presence of άναλαμβάνει in the present passage. Cf. further Drescher, Kingdoms, Textus 192.

7 νεπροφήτης: not in Gr. or in M.9

9 ζηλιάκ δόθηκε φιλοσωφείς: ζηλιάκ μοῳς M.

11 νεκέ: cf. Drescher, Kingdoms, Versio vi: "The conjunction 'and' is regularly omitted in sequences of verbs...; nor is 'and' usually found before νεκέ, 'he said,' for καὶ εἶπεν, whether in sequence or not." The conjunction before νεκέ is also omitted in 1 R i 16; 1 V ii 10 f., 13; 2 V ii 5. Note that in M, δόθηκε is added after ζηλιάκ, in the section corresponding to 1 R i 11 f.

12 ελικαίος: elsewhere in this papyrus, the name is spelled ελικαίος; the Greek original varies between Ελισαίος and Ελισαίος; see Rahlfs's apparatus ad 2.1.

13–16 εβ[ο]ρ...βαίον: "because it is to Baithel that the Lord has ordered me to go." The restoration is modeled upon Maspero's text, as is the corresponding section below, 1 V i 8–10. Here the Greek has δις κυρίος ἀπεστάλκεν με ἐνως Βαιθηλ. For a similar expansion of the Greek original, also employing a Second Tense, see 1 Kgs. 10.14, where in response to the question ΝΤΑΤΕΤΒΒΚ ΕΣΩΝ (ποὺ ἐπορεύθητε;), the Coptic has ΝΤΑΝΒΒΚ ΕΚΩΤΕ ΝΈΑ ΝΕΟΟΥ (ζητεῖν τὰς ὀνοματικαί). Cf. also 1 Kgs. 27.10.

16–19 The restorations are modeled upon M.

16 f. νεκέ ελικαίος Ν(α)q: the Greek has καὶ εἶπεν Ελισαίος. When translating such phrases, the Coptic often adds Ν(α)q; cf. 1 V i 11; 1 V ii 11, 14; 2 V ii 6. For the omission of the conjunction, see above, n. to line 11.

1 R ii (the line numbers refer to col. i)

7 f. Despite the scant remnants, a tentative reconstruction, based upon M, suggests that these lines come from the end of 2.3 and the beginning of 2.4. Note especially the verse mark in the margin, signaling the start of a new section. M has served as the model for restoring the two lines.

1 V i (the line numbers refer to col. ii)

7–11 The restoration of this badly damaged section is modeled upon M. Instead of αγω ελικαίος πεξα(ρ) Ν(α)q, Till's lectionary10 has πεξα(ρ) Ν(α)q.

---

9 M designates Maspero's text (see above, footnote 4).

10 See above, footnote 4.
1) _ρωτ:_ i.e., _ἀρωτ_ (Gr. ἐπάταξεν). In Classical Sahidic we expect either _ἀρετ_ _πμοο_ (the reading of M) or _ἀρωτ_ _μμμοο_. The use of the status absolutus for status nominalis, if not simply a mistake, suggests Achmimic influence; see H. Quecke, _Das Markusevangelium säidisch_ (Barcelona, 1972) 45 and n. 4.

2) _ηντιτ:_ after this word the text of M breaks off.

3) _ἀγχιορ:_ read _ἀγχιοορ_; cf. line 5, where the classical spelling is found. Reduction of a double vowel occurs elsewhere in this papyrus only in line 8 of this column; in each case we are probably dealing with a mistake, not a legitimate orthographic variant; cf. Quecke, _Markusevangelium_ 32.

4) _Μταα:_ read _Μτααα_ and cf. preceding note.

5) _Μπατογ-_: i.e., _Εμπατογ-_ (Till, _Koptische Grammatik_ §328).


7) The beginning of verse 11 reads in the Greek: καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτῶν πορευομένων ἐπορεύοντο καὶ ἐλάλουν, καὶ ἤδον ἀρμα πυρὸς καὶ Ἰπποι _πυρὸς_ καὶ διέστειλαν _ἀνὰ μέσον ἀμφοτέρων, κτλ_. This suggests the following exempli-gratia restoration for the lost beginning of this column (for the number of lines, see above, p. 197):

[αςωωπε δε ντοου]  
[εγμοωσε νεγμοωσε]

8) _Ιπποι_: Vaticanus and s (a late ms.).

9) διεστειλεν: Vaticanus. (The Cambridge Septuagint lists other variants, from late mss., which need not be reported here.)
For parallels, cf. the following passages: 1 Kgs. 9.11 ἐντού ἐγνοούσω; 14.26 οὖν πλαοῦ ἰδοὺ ἐγνοούσε. Although only the present Michigan papyrus contains this part of Kingdoms IV in Coptic translation, there is an unmistakable reference to the ascent of Elijah in the Encomium of Stephanus, Bishop of Hnes, on Saint Helias (ed. Sobhy\(^\text{13}\))

72: ΕΙΝΑΙΝΤΩΝΕΝΕΠΟΤΟΝΕΠΟΜΟΝΟΜΟΣΤΥΧ ΝΠΑ ΠΙΡΑΝ ΝΟΥΣΤ ΝΜΜΑΚ ΖΗΛΙΑΚ ΠΕΝΤΑΓΑΛΑΛΜΑΝΕ ΜΜΟΩΤ ΚΙΤΝ 2ΝΣΤΩΩΡ ΝΜ 2ΝΣΡΜΑΝΚΩΣΤ (“je te comparerai à ton homonyme,\(^\text{14}\) à celui qui porte le même nom que toi, Hélias, qui fut emporté par des chevaux et un char de feu”—editor’s translation, 114 f.). It is these last few words, 2ΝΣΤΩΩΡ ΝΜ 2ΝΣΡΜΑΝΚΩΣΤ, which are clearly derived from this portion of the Coptic version of Kingdoms IV, and which may therefore be used for its partial reconstruction. Note that 2ΝΣΤΩΩΡ suggests that the Coptic translator had ἴπτοι, not ἴπτος, in the text he used (see above, footnote 11).

[ἈΠΣ]ΟΡΧΟΥ: i.e., διεστειλαν. If 2ΝΣΤΩΩΡ originally stood in the text (see preceding paragraph), [ἈΠΣ]ΟΡΧΟΥ is more likely than [ἈΠΣ]ΟΡΧΟΥ, i.e., διεστειλεν (see footnote 12).

1 f. [ΝΝΕΥΕΙΡΦΥ: also possible is [ΕΝΕΥΕΙΡΦΥ; cf. 2 Kgs. 1.23 ΜΠΟΥΠΡΧ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΝΕΥΕIxPH (var. ΕΝΕΥΕΙΡΦΥ).

7 ΠΕΝΙΟΧΩC: (i.e., ἤνιοχος). Here the Greek has ἄρμα, and it is likely that we have another example of the tendency of the Coptic translators to substitute one Greek word for another (see above, n. to 1 R i 5). Confronted with ἄρμα, and interpreting it as a vocative, the translator may have decided not to refer to Elijah as a chariot but to be more logical—if less poetic—and to call him a charioteer. We should, however, note that the Old Latin version has agitator, as opposed to currus of the Vulgate,\(^\text{15}\) and it is therefore possible that ἤνιοχος is a legitimate variant within the Greek recension. The Massoretic text here has בְּפַר “chariot,” but the Hebrew word for “charioteer” is בְּפָר. In an unpointed text, both

13 G. P. G. Sobhy, Le Martyre de saint Hélia et l’encomium de l’évêque Stéphanos de Hnès sur saint Hélia (Cairo, 1919).
14 “Homonyme” translates γυμνομονοστυχ, a corruption, perhaps, of μινυμοσ ευχη, i.e., ὀμόνυμος εὐχή.
would be spelled the same, thereby allowing for the possibility of ἀρμα and ἄνόχος as variant readings in the Greek text.

9 ἄγω δέ: for the phrase, see Crum, Dictionary 802b, and cf. 1 Kgs. 20.2.

ἄγαλο: read ἄγαλο (for the interchange of q and γ, see Quecke, Markusevangelium 21 f.).

14 Μελώθ: i.e., μηλωθή.

19 After ΝΤΜΕΛΩΤΗ begins the parchment manuscript of 4 Kgs. 2.14-15, ed. J. Schleifer, SBWien 164.6 (1911) 25.

2 V ii

1 ΝΑΝΟΥΨ: the Greek text here reads ἴδον ἡ κατοίκησις τῆς πόλεως ἀγαθή, and the suffix in ΝΑΝΟΥΨ refers to a masculine noun, the equivalent of κατοίκησις, in the preceding line: e.g., ΜΑ ΝΟΥΨ2 (Crum 508a) or ΜΑ ΝΔΟΕΙΛΕ (808b).

[ΚΑΤ]Α: the Greek has καθώς; see Drescher, Kingdoms, Textus 192: “ΚΑΤΑ takes the place of καθώς often.”

7 ΝΟΥΚΟΥΓ ΝΤΥΑΡΙΑ: here the Greek reads ὀδρίσκη. W. Till, “Die koptischen Versionen der Sapientia Salomonis,” Biblica 36 (1955) 61, gives some instances of “Ausdrücke ... deren Übersetzung aus einer Kombination eines koptischen Wortes mit einem griechischen besteht, das vom selben Stamm ist, wie das übersetzte Wort.” The examples he cites parallel the use of ΟΥΚΟΥΓ ΝΤΥΑΡΙΑ to render ὀδρίσκη; they include: ΑΧΝ ΓΥΡΟΚΡΙΘΙΟΣ (ἀνυπόκριτος), ΜΗΤΑΓΑΘΟΣ (ἀγαθότης), and Τ ΜΠΟΛΙΣ (πεντάπολις).

9 ΔΥΧΙΤΣ ΑΥΕΙΝΕ: καὶ ἑλαβὼν Vaticanus, Lucianic, Hexaplaric; the rest of the tradition adds καὶ ἡμεγκον.

11 ΑΠΤΩΥΝ: intrusive ΤΩΥΝ, with no equivalent in the Greek, characterizes the Coptic of Kgs. See Drescher, Kingdoms, Textus xv.

17 ΝΕΙΜΟΟΥΕ: this short form of the plural of ΜΟΟΥ is not known to me elsewhere, although it finds an analogue in the use of ΜΟΙΕ alongside of ΜΟΙΕΙΕ in Subachmimic (see Kasser, Compléments s.v. ΜΟΟΥ). Also possible is ΝΕΙΜΟΟΥ Ε[Α]ΤΑΛΒΟΟΥ, with ΕΑΤΑΛΒΟΟΥ as Second Perfect (cf. H. J. Polotsky, Etudes de syntaxe copte [Cairo 1944] 48 f. = Collected Papers [Jerusalem, 1971] 152 f.). But both the Greek (ἰκαμα τὰ ὕδατα τάφτα) and the following First Perfect make this interpretation unlikely.

18 ΔΥΨ ΑΙ: Gr. οὐκ ἐσται ἐτι ἐκεῖθεν θάνατος. Here again the Coptic translator has resorted to paraphrase, e.g., ΑΙ[ΑΙ ΜΠΜΟΥ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΣΗΤΟΥ, vel sim.
Faint traces of one line

αγω παοεις αγαθην
tη ουρην εαμ πη η
ναξαλλ

5  αεωηπε Δε ερε πναρ
ειε μελελλαμβανε η
ζηλιας πεπροφητης
η ουκητο ειραι ετην
ζηλιας αε ανασοσ

2.2
μη ελειαοις εβολ ην
γαλαλων· πεξε ην
λιας μελειαοις ηε 2[μο]
oc μακ μπιμα εβ[ολ ηε]
ητα παοεης ηε[ες ηαζ]
η ε ηα[ι ετραβων ηα]
βαε[ηα· πεξε ελι]
εαιος [ηα ηε φοιη η]
βι παο[ειε αγω σονζ]
νηι τητηκψηη

1.18d

7 ζηλιας αε ανασοσ

7 [ειμε γω καρπωτι]

2.3

2.4

2.8

αμηεου περα επιεα
μη παι· αγω αυκιορ
21 ουγοι μπυπεωγον

2.9

ωογ· ιτερουξιοορ

2.6

[μακ μπιμα ηε ητα η]ποεης
[αοοες ηαι ετραβωκ] ηα
[πιοραςας· αγω] ελι
[εαιος πεξαζ να] ηε

5 [μακ μπιμα ηε ητα η]ποεης

7 ζηλιας αε ανασοσ

15 [ειετει] εκβανηαη εροι
[εγαλααμβα] με μμοι
[Ζα πεκρο ερε π]αι αγω
[πε ηακ· εγ]τμανα
[λαμβανε ηε η]μοι ηην

20 [πειρου ηοπε] μακ
Folio 2 (13.5 × 21 cm.)

Recto—Col. i

→ [άγιπ]ορπασο εβολ [Μηνελε] 2.11
ρην ίτεγνον αγαλα[άμ]
βανε ηηλιατις गη ογκω
τε ήεραΐ ετεες έλι 2.12

5 7 σαίος δε ίέπναγ αγν άν
ώφ δε έβολ ευξω άμος
νε παείωτ πεινίοχος
μπηλ αγν πεφζην
πεγη- αγν δε αυλο εσ 10

 latina text

Ναο εροει- ιτεγνον αν 1
τοτη ήνεπροίτε αν
πατο αμα μποδ[ε] 2.13
ηε- αγν αμποω[η η]
γαί ημελωθη η

15 ηηλιας τα εταξζε ε
αν [ε]λιαιος- αγν άν[η]
κτοι αμαζερατη γιτ[ι]
πεσποτοι μπιο[βανης]
αμμι ημελωθη 2.14

Verso—Col. ii

↑ τη[ό]λις Μανογι [κα] 
θε ετερ εποείς ηαγ ε
ροθη ημογνειογυ 2.19

7 δε εσογυ αγν πνας εν
5 ↑ ογς άν ερει πεπεν ε
λιαιος ήαγ νε άν
νογκοη ηηζαπη ννπ
ρε ήτετηνεξ έμνογ εμ2.19
ερ[ο] σ αγςιες αγενε η

10 ομο άκρα- αγν ελιαιος
αμποω άκε εβολ εμ
ηα ήζατη ημογνειο
γε ηαηογχε ηπε

7 έμνο επηά ετμναγ
15 ευξω άμο[ος] ά ναν
νετερ[ε] παοες άνο
μογ νε νειμογυ
[α]νταβουν- αγν ά