

How *The Gospel of Jesus's Wife* Might Have Been Forged A Tentative Proposal*

By Andrew Bernhard
Master of Studies, Oxford University
andrew.bernhard@gmail.com

The purpose of this article is to explain how the *Gospel of Jesus's Wife* (*Gos. Jes. Wife*)¹ might have been forged. Certainly, rigorous examination of the recently discovered papyrus fragment by specialists in Coptic papyrology and scientists able to evaluate the age of the manuscript and its ink will provide important information about whether *Gos. Jes. Wife* could be an authentically ancient text. However, it has already become clear that there are some striking similarities between this text and *The Gospel of Thomas* (*Gos. Thom.*)² known from Nag Hammadi Codex II (NHC II), and these similarities deserve to be investigated promptly in detail. Textual analysis alone could provide strong evidence that *Gos. Jes. Wife* may be a modern forgery.

In this article, I will argue that *Gos. Jes. Wife* appears to be a “patchwork” text that was “constructed out of small pieces – words or phrases – culled from the Coptic Gospel of Thomas.”³ By using excerpts from a genuinely ancient text, a modern forger could have composed a text fragment that appeared authentically ancient even to highly reputable and capable scholars.⁴ A forger would have dramatically improved his or her chances of avoiding a mistake in grammar or

* Special thanks to Mark Goodacre and Michael Grondin for their invaluable feedback on drafts of this article. Of course, any and all shortcomings of this article belong to the author alone.

¹ In this article, *Gos. Jes. Wife* refers exclusively to the 14 partial lines of Coptic text found on the papyrus fragment presented by Karen King at the 10th International Congress of Coptic Studies on September 18, 2012. It remains to be determined whether these lines of text were, in fact, once part of a larger literary work.

² In this article, *Gos. Thom.* always refers to *The Gospel of Thomas* from Nag Hammadi, the only complete copy of this text that has survived from antiquity. It is a Coptic translation of the gospel, which was most likely originally composed in Greek.

³ See: Francis Watson, “The *Gospel of Jesus' Wife*: How a Fake Gospel-Fragment was Composed,” <http://markgoodacre.org/Watson.pdf> (accessed October 9, 2012). Mark Goodacre has featured Watson’s various articles about this subject on his blog, both in draft and revised formats. See Goodacre’s posts on September 27 and 29, 2012: *NT Blog*, <http://www.ntweblog.blogspot.com> (accessed October 9, 2012). Watson deserves credit for initially proposing the “patchwork” forgery hypothesis.

However, it should be noted that this article offers an alternative version of the “patchwork” forgery hypothesis, one that should be distinguished from Watson’s because it provides substantively different explanations for how most of the text of *Gos. Jes. Wife* could have been composed, postulates that a potential forger might have possessed an extremely limited ability to manipulate Coptic text, and identifies a potential modern resource that may have been used in forging the text.

⁴ Such as Karen King of Harvard Divinity School, AnneMarie Luijendijk of Princeton University, Roger Bagnall of the Institute for the Study of the Ancient World at New York University, and Ariel Shisha-Halevy of Hebrew University. See: Karen King with contributions by AnneMarie Luijendijk, “Jesus Said To Them, ‘My Wife . . .’: A New Coptic Gospel Papyrus,” http://www.hds.harvard.edu/sites/hds.harvard.edu/files/attachments/faculty-research/research-projects/the-gospel-of-jesus-wife/29865/King_JesusSaidToThem_draft_0920.pdf (accessed October 9, 2012).

word usage by selecting *Gos. Thom.* in particular for source material.⁵ Tools that parse every single word of the Coptic text, such as “Grondin’s Interlinear,” are easily accessible.⁶ The forger would only have needed a basic knowledge of the language (i.e., the ability to modify a noun with a possessive prefix and to switch masculine pronoun markers to their feminine counterparts).⁷

How *The Gospel of Jesus’s Wife* might have been composed

A modern forger might have composed *Gos. Jes. Wife* by rearranging *short* excerpts from *Gos. Thom.*⁸ The commentary below explains how each line of text found on the recto (→) of the papyrus fragment containing *Gos. Jes. Wife* might have been composed by a modern forger with limited knowledge of Coptic.⁹ Unless otherwise noted, transcriptions and English translations of *Gos. Jes. Wife* are identical with those presented by Karen King.¹⁰ Transcriptions and English translations of pertinent passages from *Gos. Thom.* are those of the present author. Following standard papyrological conventions, uncertain letters are indicated by dots beneath them, and text that has been lost in lacunae but restored by a modern editor is enclosed in square brackets []; all

⁵ There is no shortage of resources that an interested individual could use to understand and even decipher the Coptic text of *Gos. Thom.*: Andrew Bernhard, “The Gospel of Thomas: Online & In Print,” *gospels.net*, <http://www.gospels.net/thomas> (accessed October 9, 2012).

⁶ Using Grondin’s Interlinear, almost anyone who knew English could ascertain the meaning of practically every letter of *Gos. Thom.* See “Appendix III” for a sample of this work, which is available in its entirety online: Michael Grondin, *An Interlinear Coptic-English Translation of the Gospel of Thomas*, http://www.gospel-thomas.net/x_transl.htm (accessed October 9, 2012).

⁷ It is worth noting that it seems highly unlikely any Coptic expert would attempt to forge a text using excerpts from *Gos. Thom.*, the most famous writing preserved in the entire language. Indeed, if *Gos. Jes. Wife* is a modern forgery derived from *Gos. Thom.*, this suggests strongly that the forger was probably not highly proficient in Coptic.

⁸ The “patchwork” hypothesis as it is presented here suggests that a modern forger essentially “cut and pasted” individual words and short phrases of no more than four words from *Gos. Thom.* to create *Gos. Jes. Wife* (presumably because he or she had only minimal ability to construct Coptic text). This method of composing *Gos. Jes. Wife* would not be analogous to the technique of borrowing full sentences and extended passages from another text, the way many scholars believe Matthew and Luke borrowed material from Mark or the *Egerton Gospel* borrowed from John. See: Mark Goodacre, email to Gthomas: The Gospel of Thomas Discussion Group mailing list, September 30, 2012, <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/gthomas/message/10319>. Timo Paananen’s critique of Watson’s initial version of the “patchwork” hypothesis simply would not apply here. Cologne Papyrus 255 (P. Köln 255) exhibits a fundamentally different type of literary relationship to John than *Gos. Jes. Wife* does to *Gos. Thom.* As Paananen points out, three consecutive lines on the verso of P. Köln 255 have parallels with a single verse in John (5:46), suggesting that an *extended* passage of text has been borrowed. Indeed, John 5:46 is the basis for restoring lost text in these lines of P. Köln 255. See: Timo Paananen, “Another ‘Fake’ or Just a Problem of Method: What Francis Watson’s Analysis Does to Papyrus Köln 255,” [http://blue.butler.edu/~jfmgrat/GJW/Another Fake Or Just a Problem of Method by Timo S. Paananen.pdf](http://blue.butler.edu/~jfmgrat/GJW/Another_Fake_Or_Just_a_Problem_of_Method_by_Timo_S._Paananen.pdf) (accessed October 9, 2012); cf., Tobias Nicklas, “The ‘Unknown Gospel’ on Papyrus Egerton 2” in *Gospel Fragments*, ed. Thomas Kraus (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 32.

⁹ The six lines of text on the verso (↓) contain only three complete Coptic words, one of which is not clearly legible and another of which is extremely common in Coptic texts (εβωλ). Considering whether these words were copied from another ancient text would be pointless; they could have come from anywhere.

¹⁰ “The Gospel of Jesus’s Wife: A New Coptic Gospel Papyrus”, <http://www.hds.harvard.edu/faculty-research/research-projects/the-gospel-of-jesus-wife> (accessed October 9, 2012).

textual restorations in *Gos. Thom.* are adopted from Layton’s critical edition.¹¹ Saying numbers (e.g., *Gos. Thom.* 101) as well as page and line numbers of text in NHC II are given (i.e., 49.36 designates “page 46, line 36”) for *Gos. Thom.* For illustrative purposes, verbatim parallels between *Gos. Jes. Wife* and *Gos. Thom.* have been underlined; pronominal prefixes and suffixes that a modern forger might have switched from masculine to feminine are printed in bold>.

Gos. Jes. Wife (→).1

Coptic transcription: ⲛⲁⲗⲉⲓ ⲁⲛ ⲧⲁⲙⲁⲁⲩ ⲁϥⲧ ⲛⲁⲉⲓ ⲡⲱⲛⲉ

English translation:] “not [to] me. My mother gave to me li[fe . . .”

A modern forger could have composed *Gos. Jes. Wife* (→).1 by juxtaposing words found in close proximity to each other in *Gos. Thom.* 101:

NHC II 49.35	ⲙⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲧⲁⲉ ϥⲛⲁⲱⲡ ⲙⲁⲑⲏⲧⲏϥ ⲛⲁⲗ
NHC II 49.36	<u>ⲉⲓ</u> ⲁⲛ <u>ⲧⲁⲙⲁⲁⲩ</u> ⲓⲁⲣ ⲛⲧⲁϥ[
NHC II 50.1	[. .]ⲟⲗ ⲁⲉ ⲛⲙⲉ <u>ⲁϥⲧ ⲛⲁⲉⲓ</u> ⲙⲡⲱⲛⲉ

It appears that *Gos. Jes. Wife* (→).1 may be nothing more than a conflation of the first three words of NHC II 49.36 and the final three words of NHC II 50.1. These two lines of text are consecutive in NHC II, the former at the bottom of page 49, the latter at the top of page 50. The visible text is virtually identical with what would be expected if it had been copied from *Gos. Thom.* 101, and the partial words at both ends of the line can be satisfactorily restored on the basis of this saying.¹²

¹¹ Bentley Layton, ed. Vol. 1 of *Nag Hammadi Codex II, 2-7 Together with XIII, 2**, *Brit. Lib. Or.4926(1), and P.Oxy. I, 654, 655* (Leiden: Brill, 1989).

¹² The fact that *Gos. Jes. Wife* (→).1 and NHC II 49.35 both begin with ⲉⲓ (presumably the final two letters of ⲛⲁⲉⲓ) should not be overemphasized. Watson takes this as evidence that a forger was “dependent on the one extant manuscript of the Coptic *GTh*, the line division of which he or she slavishly follows at this point.” See: Watson, “How a Fake Gospel-Fragment was Composed.” However, it has also been suggested, “Watson’s argument about the ‘line break’ cannot bear the weight he places on it. Manuscripts written in *scriptio continua* break words up all the time, and the word in question is among the most common words there is.” See: Michael Peppard, “Is the ‘Jesus’ Wife’ Papyrus a Forgery? And other queries.” *Commonweal*, September 25, 2012, <http://www.commonwealmagazine.org/blog/?p=20919> (accessed October 9, 2012). Regardless, the far left portion of the line in *Gos. Jes. Wife* might also have been lost when the papyrus was fragmented, in which case there would not even be a word division between lines to compare in the different manuscripts.

The only difference between the parallels is that *Gos. Jes. Wife* lacks the preposition $\bar{\mu}$ that would ordinarily be expected before $\pi\omega\eta\epsilon$,¹³ but it is present in *Gos. Thom.* Intriguingly, as the result of a typographical error, the same $\bar{\mu}$ has accidentally been omitted in the pdf version of Grondin's Interlinear.¹⁴

Gos. Jes. Wife (→).2

Coptic transcription:]ϥ πεχε μ̄μαθητης ν̄ις χε ϥ[

English translation:] The disciples said to Jesus, “ .[

A modern forger could have composed *Gos. Jes. Wife* (→).2 by copying the only decipherable words in the line from *Gos. Thom.* 12 (NHC II 34.25), 18 (NHC II 36.9), or 20 (NHC II 36.26), where they appear verbatim:

NHC II 34.25	τ̄ν̄νααϥ <u>πεχε</u> <u>μ̄μαθητης</u> <u>ν̄ις</u> <u>χε</u> τ̄ν̄
NHC II 36.9	ρ̄ρωμε <u>πεχε</u> <u>μ̄μαθητης</u> <u>ν̄ις</u> <u>χε</u> χο
NHC II 36.26	<u>πεχε</u> <u>μ̄μαθητης</u> <u>ν̄ις</u> <u>χε</u> χοοc

The letter traces at the line endings of *Gos. Jes. Wife* (→).2 are meaningless without further context and, consequently, cannot be compared to any passages in *Gos. Thom.*

¹³ On this point, King calls attention to: Bentley Layton, *A Coptic Grammar*, 2nd ed. (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2004), 135. The “more usual phrase” would indeed be $\tau \bar{\mu}$ - $\bar{\mu}\eta\omega\epsilon$ $\bar{\mu}$ - $\eta\alpha\epsilon$, which includes the verb plus a marker for both the direct and indirect objects. However, the direct object is not always marked with the double object infinitive $\tau\eta\alpha\epsilon$ (cf. Luke 11:29). See: King, “Jesus Said To Them, ‘My Wife.’”

¹⁴ Although the omission of $\bar{\mu}$ before $\pi\omega\eta\epsilon$ in *Gos. Jes. Wife* (→).1 is not necessarily a grammatical error, it still might be considered evidence that a forger was dependent on a modern text (in this case, the pdf version of Grondin's Interlinear). It should be noted that the $\bar{\mu}$ is correctly present in the online version of Grondin's Interlinear: <http://gospel-thomas.net/log101.htm> (accessed October 9, 2011). The bizarre sequence of events that led to the realization that the $\bar{\mu}$ had accidentally been omitted in the pdf version of Grondin's Interlinear was begun by: Mark Goodacre, email to Gthomas: The Gospel of Thomas Discussion Group mailing list, September 28, 2012, <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/gthomas/message/10310>.

Gos. Jes. Wife (→).3

Coptic transcription:] ⲁⲣⲛⲁ ⲙⲁⲣⲓⲁⲙ ⲙⲓⲡⲟⲗⲁ ⲙⲓⲞⲢ ⲁ[ⲛ(?)

English translation:] deny. Mary is [not (?)] worthy of it[

A modern forger could have composed *Gos. Jes. Wife* (→).3 by copying words found on page 51 of NHC II in *Gos. Thom.* 110 (NHC II 51.5) and 114 (NHC 51.19-21):

NHC II 51.5	ⲛⲉⲢⲣⲉ ⲣⲙⲓⲙⲁⲟ ⲙⲁⲣⲉⲢⲁⲣⲛⲁ ⲙⲓⲡⲕⲟⲢⲙⲟⲢ
NHC II 51.19	ⲛⲁⲮ ⲭⲉ ⲙⲁⲣⲉ ⲙⲁⲣⲓⲁⲙ ⲉⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛⲉⲛⲏⲧⲛ̅
NHC II 51.20	ⲭⲉ ⲛⲥⲓⲟⲙⲉ ⲙⲓⲡⲟⲗⲁ ⲁⲛ ⲙⲓⲡⲟⲛⲉⲗ ⲡⲉⲭⲉ ⲧⲥ
NHC II 51.21	ⲭⲉ ⲉⲓⲥⲛⲏⲧⲉ ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲧⲛⲁⲥⲟⲕ ⲙⲓⲞⲢ ⲭⲉ

The text of *Gos. Jes. Wife* (→).3 may well be merely a “patchwork” of words and short phrases that appear in close proximity to each other in NHC II. It is not clear whether the final ⲁ is supposed to be the beginning of the word ⲁⲛ (“not”).¹⁵ If it was intended to be, then the parallel would be with the two consecutive words ⲙⲓⲡⲟⲗⲁ ⲁⲛ in NHC II 51.20. If it was not intended to be, the parallel would be limited to the single word ⲙⲓⲡⲟⲗⲁ.

The only difference in wording between the potential parallels is that ⲙⲁⲣⲓⲁⲙ in *Gos. Jes. Wife* (→).3 lacks the ⲉ found in the name ⲙⲁⲣⲓⲁⲙ as it appears in *Gos. Thom.*¹⁶

¹⁵ King notes, “The sentence could be restored to end with the negator ⲁ[ⲛ, but this is not grammatically required. The ⲁ could also begin a new sentence.” See: King, “Jesus Said to Them: ‘My Wife.’”

¹⁶ Whether the omission of ⲉ in ⲙⲁⲣⲓⲁⲙ should be considered significant or not is unclear. The name “Mary” appears to have been spelled in three primary ways (ⲙⲁⲣⲓⲁ, ⲙⲁⲣⲓⲁⲙ, and ⲙⲁⲣⲓⲁⲙⲙⲏ) in ancient Christian texts preserved in Sahidic Coptic (i.e., Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Acts, Romans, *Gos. Thom.*, *Sophia of Jesus Christ*, *Dialogue of the Savior*, *Gospel of Mary*, *Gospel of Philip*, and *Pistis Sophia*). See: George Horner, *The Coptic Version of the New Testament* (7 vol.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911); Antti Marjanen, *The Woman Jesus Loved: Mary Magdalene in the Hammadi Library and Related Documents* (New York: Brill, 1996), 39, 57, 78, 95, 173, 206. Marjanen notes that the spelling ⲙⲁⲣⲓⲁⲙ appears once in the *First Apocalypse of James* (129). The name is usually spelled ⲙⲁⲣⲓⲁ in Greek, but ⲙⲁⲣⲓⲁ, ⲙⲁⲣⲓⲁ, and ⲙⲁⲣⲓⲁ are also attested (BDAG 3). Intriguingly, Grondin’s Interlinear renders ⲙⲁⲣⲓⲁⲙ as “Mariam” in *Gos. Thom.* 21 and 114 (obviously, “Mariam” is intended as an English translation, not a direct transcription from the Coptic). Is it possible that a forger relying on Grondin’s Interlinear might have omitted the ⲉ in ⲙⲁⲣⲓⲁⲙ based on how the word is translated in English there? Yes. However, to borrow Goodacre’s words on this point, “Pure speculation, but offered as part of the continued discussion.” See: Mark Goodacre, email to Gthomas: The Gospel of Thomas Discussion Group mailing list, September 28, 2012, <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/gthomas/message/10310>.

Gos. Jes. Wife (→).4

Coptic transcription:]ΔΝ Μ[Μ]ΟΥ ΠΕΧΕ ΤΣ ΝΑΥ ΤΑΞΙΜΕ ΜΝ[¹⁷

English translation:]not death. Jesus said to them, “My wife . . . ”

King transcribed this line:] / ΠΕΧΕ ΤΣ ΝΑΥ ΤΑΞΙΜΕ ΜΝ[. However, the letters at the beginning of the line appear to be decipherable in images available online.¹⁸ Enough of the first three letters (ΔΝΜ), as well as the υ at the end of the restored word ΜΜΟΥ¹⁹ seems visible in the images that these letters could almost be printed without dots beneath each of them.

Assuming the opening words of the line (ΔΝ ΜΜΟΥ) are correct, it is not difficult to see why a modern forger relying on *Gos. Thom.* might have structured line 4 as he or she did. The initial ΔΝ ΜΜΟΥ is intended to indicate the end of a statement, as it does at the end of *Gos. Thom.* 18 (NHC II 36.17) and 19 (NHC II 36.25):

NHC II 36.17 ΔΝ ΜΜΟΥ ΠΕΧΕ ΤΣ ΧΕ ΟΥΜΑΚΑΡΙΟΣ

NHC II 36.25 ΝΑΧΟΥΘΝΟΥ ΦΝΑΧΙ ΤΠΕ ΔΝ ΜΜΟΥ

The following words, which could have been copied verbatim from *Gos. Thom.* 12, indicate the beginning of a response by Jesus (just as they indicate the beginning of Jesus’s response to his disciples in *Gos. Thom.* 12):

NHC II 34.27 ΕΤΝΑΡ̄ ΝΟΣ ΕΡΡΑΪ ΕΧΩΝ ΠΕΧΕ ΤΣ ΝΑΥ

Then, the key word ΤΑΞΙΜΕ (“my wife”) would have been inserted next so that it had to be understood as the first word spoken by Jesus. Although ΤΑΞΙΜΕ does not appear in this precise form in *Gos. Thom.*,²⁰ it could easily have been formed by someone with extremely rudimentary knowledge of Coptic.²¹

¹⁷ Both the transcription and English translation of *Gos. Jes. Wife* (→).4 given above are those of the present author.

¹⁸ Harvard has posted a high resolution image of the photo: http://news.hds.harvard.edu/files/papyrus_front_lg.jpg (accessed October 9, 2012). The *New York Times* also posted an image with an excellent zoom feature: Laurie Goodstein, “A Faded Piece of Papyrus Refers to Jesus’ Wife” *New York Times*, September 18, 2012, <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/09/19/us/historian-says-piece-of-papyrus-refers-to-jesus-wife.html> (accessed October 9, 2012).

¹⁹ The present author respectfully disagrees with King’s assessment in “Jesus’s Wife Said, ‘My Wife,’”: “Just before ΠΕΧΕ an oblique stroke (/) appears. Its function is unclear. It may be the stroke of an upsilon, but that is unlikely given its shape.” This author believes the oblique stroke is most likely the stroke of an upsilon; however, it must be acknowledged that King has viewed the manuscript directly and he has not.

²⁰ The root word ΤΑΞΙΜΕ appears eight times in *Gos. Thom.*, but never in the singular with the possessive adjective.

²¹ The information needed to compose this word is usually covered very early in introductory Coptic grammars. For example, see: Thomas Lambdin, *Introduction to Sahidic Coptic* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1983). In Lambdin’s grammar, the word meaning “woman; wife” is introduced on page 2 and the possessive article is introduced on page 11.

The letters $\text{m}\bar{\text{n}}$, which appear at the end of *Gos. Jes. Wife* (\rightarrow).4, may be nothing more than space filler. This letter combination appears as an independent unit or at the beginning of a word in 35 places in *Gos. Thom.*, and it is meaningless without additional context.

The most notable textual feature of this line is the absence of $\text{x}\epsilon$: $\text{n}\epsilon\text{x}\epsilon$ is typically followed by $\text{x}\epsilon$ to introduce direct discourse.²² Intriguingly, the $\text{x}\epsilon$ is absent in both *Gos. Jes. Wife* and its *Gos. Thom.* parallel.²³

Gos. Jes. Wife (\rightarrow).5

Coptic transcription:] . . . $\text{c}\bar{\text{n}}\bar{\text{a}}\bar{\text{w}}\bar{\text{p}}\bar{\text{m}}\bar{\text{a}}\bar{\text{e}}\bar{\text{h}}\bar{\text{t}}\bar{\text{h}}\bar{\text{c}}\ \bar{\text{n}}\bar{\text{a}}\bar{\text{e}}\bar{\text{i}}\ \bar{\text{a}}\bar{\text{y}}\bar{\text{w}}\bar{\text{[}}$

English translation:] . . . she will be able to be my disciple and²⁴ . . . [

A modern forger could have composed *Gos. Jes. Wife* (\rightarrow).5 simply by adapting words found in *Gos. Thom.* 55:

NHC II 42.26	$\bar{\text{a}}\bar{\text{n}}\ \bar{\text{m}}\bar{\text{n}}\ \bar{\text{t}}\bar{\text{e}}\bar{\text{q}}\bar{\text{m}}\bar{\text{a}}\bar{\text{a}}\bar{\text{y}}\ \bar{\text{q}}\bar{\text{n}}\bar{\text{a}}\bar{\text{w}}\bar{\text{p}}\bar{\text{m}}\bar{\text{a}}\bar{\text{e}}\bar{\text{h}}\bar{\text{t}}\bar{\text{h}}\bar{\text{c}}\ \bar{\text{a}}\bar{\text{n}}$
NHC II 42.27	$\bar{\text{n}}\bar{\text{a}}\bar{\text{e}}\bar{\text{i}}\ \bar{\text{a}}\bar{\text{y}}\bar{\text{w}}\ \bar{\text{n}}\bar{\text{q}}\bar{\text{m}}\bar{\text{e}}\bar{\text{s}}\bar{\text{t}}\bar{\text{e}}\ \bar{\text{n}}\bar{\text{e}}\bar{\text{q}}\bar{\text{c}}\bar{\text{n}}\bar{\text{h}}\bar{\text{y}}\ \bar{\text{m}}\bar{\text{n}}$

If a modern forger did use *Gos. Thom.* 55 to compose *Gos. Jes. Wife* (\rightarrow).5, he or she made only two minor alterations to the text: 1.) changing the initial pronoun from masculine singular (q) to feminine singular (c); and 2.) omitting the word $\bar{\text{a}}\bar{\text{n}}$ (“not”). Thus, the words of *Gos. Thom.* 55, “. . . he will not be able to be my disciple and . . .” could be transformed simply into “. . . she will be able to be my disciple and . . .” in *Gos. Jes. Wife* (\rightarrow).5.

²² See: Layton, *A Coptic Grammar*, 302. King states that she does not regard the absence of $\text{x}\epsilon$ “to be a case of an error requiring emendation, nor an indication of the fragment’s inauthenticity,” noting that *Gos. Thom.* “varies its usage of $\text{n}\epsilon\text{x}\epsilon$ with and without $\text{x}\epsilon$,” as do some Manichaean texts pointed out by Shish-Halevy. See: King, “Jesus Said To Them, ‘My Wife.’”

²³ Although the use of $\text{n}\epsilon\text{x}\epsilon$ without $\text{x}\epsilon$ in *Gos. Jes. Wife* (\rightarrow).4 is not necessarily a grammatical error, it still might be considered evidence that a forger was copying text from the lone Coptic copy of *Gos. Thom.* available in the modern world (i.e., NHC II). It is not clear that $\text{x}\epsilon$ would have been absent in other Coptic versions of *Gos. Thom.* that circulated in antiquity.

²⁴ It is not clear why King omitted “and” from her translation of *Gos. Jes. Wife* (\rightarrow).5; admittedly, the word does not enhance our understanding of the line, but it is present.

Gos. Jes. Wife (→).6

Coptic transcription:]ⲓ ⲙⲁⲣⲉⲣⲟⲙⲉ ⲉⲑⲟⲟⲩ ⲱⲁϥⲉ ⲛⲉ[

English translation:] Let wicked people swell up . . . [

This line of text is the most difficult in *Gos. Jes. Wife*, both in terms of understanding it as it appears²⁵ and explaining how a modern forger might have composed it using *Gos. Thom.*

Words similar to those found in *Gos. Jes. Wife* (→).6 do appear in *Gos. Thom.* 45 (NHC II 41.2-3) and 47 (NHC II 41.17):

NHC II 41.2	ⲫⲣⲟⲙⲉ ⲱⲁϥⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲓⲡⲟⲛⲏⲣⲟⲛ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ
NHC II 41.3	ⲉⲙⲓ ⲡⲉϥⲉⲣⲟ ⲉⲑⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲉⲛⲓ ⲡⲉϥⲉⲛⲧ ⲁⲩ
NHC II 41.17	ⲫⲉⲩⲩⲃⲣⲓⲛⲉ ⲙⲓⲙⲟϥ ⲙⲁⲣⲉⲣⲟⲙⲉ ⲥⲉ ⲫⲣⲁⲥ

A modern forger could have composed *Gos. Jes. Wife* (→).6 just by rearranging the words from *Gos. Thom.*, putting ⲙⲁⲣⲉⲣⲟⲙⲉ in place of ⲫⲣⲟⲙⲉ (the base word ϣⲟⲙⲉ is an obvious potential link), moving ⲉⲑⲟⲟⲩ up a line so it followed ϣⲟⲙⲉ,²⁶ and accidentally omitting an ⲓ when copying ⲱⲁϥⲉⲓⲛⲉ.²⁷ It appears that the person who copied *Gos. Jes. Wife* onto the papyrus fragment really did try to write ⲱⲁϥⲉⲓⲛⲉ rather than ⲱⲁϥⲉⲛⲉ: he or she seems to have initially

²⁵ King and her colleagues had to debate the identity of the infinitive. King initially suggested that ⲱⲁϥ might be “a previously unattested form of ⲱⲟϥ (be destroyed),” presumably regarding the letters ⲉⲛⲉ as the beginning of a new word (there are, of course, no spaces between words on the papyrus). However, Shisha-Halevy, Luijendijk, and an unknown reviewer for *Harvard Theological Review* convinced her that the infinitive was more likely ⲱⲁϥⲉ (to swell) and presumably only the letters ⲛⲉ belonged to the next word. Thus, King went with the legitimate transcription and translation above. However, it has been pointed out that ⲱⲁϥⲉ is not a particularly common word in early Christian texts: Peppard, “Is the ‘Jesus’ Wife’ Papyrus a Forgery?” And King’s understanding of the line, according to Alin Suciuc and Hugo Lundhaug, “although not entirely impossible, would constitute an awkward and unparalleled cursing formula.” See: Alin Suciuc and Hugo Lundhaug, “A Peculiar Dialectical Feature in the Gospel of Jesus’s Wife,” *Patristics, Apocrypha, Coptic Literature and Manuscripts*, <http://alinsuciuc.com/2012/09/27/alinsuciuc-hugo-lundhaug-an-interesting-dialectal-feature-in-the-gospel-of-jesus-wife-line-6> (accessed October 9, 2012).

²⁶ Intriguingly, the juxtaposition of ϣⲟⲙⲉ ⲉⲑⲟⲟⲩ creates a grammatical structure that is so subtly unusual that probably only a Coptic linguist would recognize it. Shisha-Halevy pointed this out to King in an email, “Grammatically, ϣⲟⲙⲉ ⲉⲑⲟⲟⲩ is very interesting, for this is a case of zero-determined generic noun a antecedent of a relative (not circumstantial!).” King comments on this statement, “While unusual, it attests to an as-yet only partially understood phenomenon.” See: King, “Jesus Said To Them, ‘My Wife.’”

²⁷ “The only line with no apparent parallel in *Gos. Thom.* was until recently, line 6. However, Oli Homron, Andrew Bernhard and Päivi Vähäkangas realized, independently from each other, that this line also goes back to material from the *Gos. Thom.*” See: Alin Suciuc and Hugo Lundhaug, “On the So-Called Gospel of Jesus’s Wife. Some Preliminary Thoughts,” *Patristics, Apocrypha, Coptic Literature and Manuscripts*, <http://alinsuciuc.com/2012/09/26/on-the-so-called-gospel-of-jesus-wife-some-preliminary-thoughts-by-hugo-lundhaug-and-alin-suciuc/> (accessed October 9, 2012).

omitted the first ε by accident and then, in an effort to correct the mistake, went back and transformed the initial ι into an ε.²⁸

So *Gos. Jes. Wife* (→).6 was apparently intended to read: μαρερωμε εθουυ θαρεινε. All of these words appear in identical form in *Gos. Thom.*

However, such a line of text is grammatically impossible. A single infinitive (εινε: to bring) cannot be modified by two different verbal prefixes (μαρε- and θαρ-), and anyone asserting *Gos. Jes. Wife* is merely a “patchwork” of words and short phrases from *Gos. Thom.* must answer a difficult question: how could a forger responsible for half a dozen other lines of reasonably coherent Coptic text suddenly slip up and compose a line of nonsense?

Intriguingly, the answer might be that a modern forger misunderstood Grondin’s Interlinear. In this Coptic/English interlinear translation of *Gos. Thom.*, μαρερωμε (NHC II 41.17) is rendered as “no man,” εθουυ (NHC II 41.3) as “which-is-wicked,” and θαρεινε (NHC II 41.2) as “does-he-bring.”

The potential source for confusion is μαρερωμε, which would be regarded as a combination of the injunctive prenominal prefix (μαρε-) and its noun (ρωμε) in standard Sahidic. However, in *Gos. Thom.* 47, μαρε- is actually a dialectal variant of μερε-, the negative habitual prenominal prefix.²⁹ In isolation, μερερωμε could be rendered as “a man does not.” In its *Gos. Thom.* context, though, it has a meaning that is functionally equivalent to “no man” (as it is rendered in Grondin’s Interlinear).³⁰

²⁸ “θαρενε seems to be a misspelling which the copyist attempted to correct. This is relatively clear from the unusual shape of the first *epsilon*, which seems to derive from an *iota*.” See: Suciu, “A Peculiar Dialectical Feature in the Gospel of Jesus’s Wife.” See “Appendix II” for a comparison of the different epsilons present on the papyrus fragment of *Gos. Jes. Wife*.

²⁹ See: Lance Eccles, *Introductory Coptic Reader: Selections from the Gospel of Thomas with Full Grammatical Explanations* (Kensington, MD: Dunwoody Press), 45. The comment on the full verbal phrase in *Gos. Thom.* 47 reads: “μαρερωμε σε. A MAN DOES NOT DRINK. Standard Sahidic μερερωμε σε. Negative habitual (IV.10). σε is the construct of *co* to drink.” See also: Suciu, “A Peculiar Dialectical Feature.” Suciu and Lundhaug make the same point, describing “μαρε- as a dialectal variant of the negative aorist μερε-” and noting that Michael Grondin had indicated in a comment on their previous blog post “that precisely this form of the negative aorist is attested several times in the *Gospel of Thomas* (cf. 39.6; 39.13; 41.17; 46.21).” The previous blog post is: Suciu, “On the So-Called Gospel of Jesus’s Wife.” Suciu and Lundhaug admittedly use more current terminology in their post; μερε- is labeled the “aorist negative” prefix in: Bentley Layton, *Coptic in 20 Lessons: Introduction to Sahidic Coptic in 20 Lessons* (Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 79. Those who relied on Lambdin’s *Introduction to Sahidic Coptic* to learn grammar as students simply have a tendency to retain older terminology.

³⁰ The pertinent sentence of Coptic text from *Gos. Thom.* 47 is: μαρερωμε σε ρπας αυω ντεγυνοϋ νεπιθυμει αυω ηρη βερρε. This might be rendered literally: “A man does not drink old wine and immediately desire to drink new wine.” Or it might be rendered equivalently: “No man drinks old wine and immediately desires to drink new wine.” Both would be valid translations, but the latter captures the sense of the underlying Coptic more vividly.

Obviously, an individual with limited knowledge of Coptic would have been oblivious to the grammatical nuances of $\mu\alpha\rho\epsilon\rho\omega\mu\epsilon/\mu\epsilon\rho\epsilon\rho\omega\mu\epsilon$ in *Gos. Thom.* 47. So a forger might have looked at Grondin’s Interlinear and inferred erroneously that it was actually a third person singular subject: “no man” (rather than a verbal prefix combined with its noun). Such an individual could easily have mistakenly believed that the words $\mu\alpha\rho\epsilon\rho\omega\mu\epsilon$ $\epsilon\theta\theta\omicron\upsilon$ $\omega\alpha\varrho\epsilon\iota\omicron\epsilon$ were subject ($\mu\alpha\rho\epsilon\rho\omega\mu\epsilon$), modifying adjective ($\epsilon\theta\theta\omicron\upsilon$), and verb ($\omega\alpha\varrho\epsilon\iota\omicron\epsilon$). He or she might have written these words intending them to mean, “No wicked man brings (forth) . . . ”³¹ If this is in fact what happened, a minor scribal error is probably all that prevented *Gos. Jes. Wife* from being detected promptly as a modern forgery.

Gos. Jes. Wife (→).7

Coptic transcription:] . $\underline{\Delta}\text{NOK } \dagger\omega\theta\theta\omicron\pi \text{ NMMA}\epsilon \text{ } \underline{\epsilon\tau\upsilon\epsilon} \text{ } \pi\text{[}$

English translation:] . . . As for me, I dwell with her in order to . [

A modern forger could have composed *Gos. Jes. Wife* (→).7 by copying words found in *Gos. Thom.* 30 (NHC II 39.4-5) and 29 (NHC II 38.33):

NHC II 39.4	$\text{NOYTE NE PM}\Delta \text{ } \overline{\epsilon\Upsilon\bar{\eta}} \text{ } \text{CNA}\Upsilon \text{ } \text{H OYA } \underline{\Delta\text{NOK}}$
NHC II 39.5	$\dagger\omega\theta\theta\omicron\pi \text{ NMMA}\epsilon \text{ } \text{PEXE } \overline{\tau\text{C}} \text{ } \overline{\text{M}\bar{\eta}} \text{ } \text{PROFH}$
NHC II 38.33	$\text{XE } \overline{\text{P}\bar{\eta}\Delta} \text{ } \Delta\epsilon \text{ } \underline{\epsilon\tau\upsilon\epsilon} \text{ } \text{PCOMA } \text{OY}\omega\pi\eta\text{PE}$

The first three words could have been copied from near the top of page 39 in NHC II; the only difference between the parallels is that *Gos. Jes. Wife* has the feminine singular pronominal suffix (c) where *Gos. Thom.* has the masculine singular (q). The last full Coptic word ($\epsilon\tau\upsilon\epsilon$) is found in the next-to-last line of page 38 in NHC II. It is followed by the masculine singular definite article (π) in both *Gos. Jes. Wife* (→).7 and *Gos. Thom.* 29.

³¹ Suciú and Lundhaug also arrive at the conclusion this was the intended meaning of the line. See: Suciú, “A Peculiar Dialectical Feature.” See also: Andrew Bernhard, “Does Line 6 of *The Gospel of Jesus’ Wife* Reveal the Author’s Dependence on Grondin’s Interlinear Translation of *The Gospel of Thomas*?” *gospels.net*, <http://www.gospels.net/gjw/GJW6.pdf> (accessed October 9, 2012).

Gos. Jes. Wife (→).8

Coptic transcription: ⲁⲃⲔ] . ⲠⲮⲉⲓⲕⲱⲛⲓ . . [

English translation:] an image [

A modern forger could have composed *Gos. Jes. Wife* (→).8 by copying the text from *Gos. Thom. 22*:

NHC II 37.34 ⲛⲟⲩⲉⲣⲏⲧⲉ ⲠⲮⲉⲓⲕⲱⲛⲓ ⲉⲡⲓⲙⲁ ⲛⲟⲩⲉⲓⲕⲱ

This text is simply the combination of the indefinite article (ⲠⲮ) and the Greek loan word ⲉⲓⲕⲱⲛ (v).

Conclusion

Gos. Jes. Wife can be understood well as a modern forgery consisting almost exclusively of words and short phrases found in virtually identical form in *Gos. Thom.* Every word in *Gos. Jes. Wife* (with the unsurprising exception of ⲧⲁⲛⲓⲙⲉ: “my wife”) can be traced back to *Gos. Thom.*, and each line of the text (with the unsurprising exception of line 4) contains words and phrases found in close proximity to each other in *Gos. Thom.* Line 1 juxtaposes three words from the beginning of one line of text in NHC II with three words from the end of the next. Line 2 contains words that could have been copied verbatim from *Gos. Thom.* 12, 18, or 20. Line 3 may be a “collage” of words from *Gos. Thom.*, but all of them appear on page 51 of NHC II. Line 5 need not be regarded as anything more than a simple adaptation of part of *Gos. Thom.* 55. Line 6 contains only words that appear on page 41 of NHC II.³² Line 7 brings together partial phrases from *Gos. Thom.* 29 and 30. Line 8 and *Gos. Thom.* 22 both contain the same combination of the indefinite article (ⲠⲮ) and the word Greek loan word ⲉⲓⲕⲱⲛ (v).

If *Gos. Jes. Wife* is in fact a modern forgery derived from *Gos. Thom.*, a technique that the forger might have used to create it should now be fairly obvious. The forger might have composed most of the text just by bringing together reasonably compatible words and phrases found in close proximity to each other in *Gos. Thom.*, changing masculine singular pronouns (ϣ) to their feminine equivalents (ϥ) in lines 5 and 7 (presumably to keep the text focused on a female character). With line 4 – the line that managed to transform a papyrus scrap with a little bit of

³² If ⲱⲁϥⲉⲛⲉ is accepted as an accidental corruption that ⲱⲁϥⲉⲓⲛⲉ.

Coptic on it into an international sensation – the forger would have been more deliberate, beginning with words that conclude a statement in two *Gos. Thom.* sayings, then using a phrase to indicate the beginning of a response by Jesus from a different location in *Gos. Thom.*, and finally inserting the lone word not found in identical form in *Gos. Thom.*: ⲧⲁⲗⲓⲙⲉ (“my wife”).

It is extremely suspicious that every unusual feature of *Gos. Jes. Wife* that King had to consider as a potential sign of forgery could probably be attributed to a modern forger’s limited knowledge of Coptic and his or her resultant dependence on NHC II and Grondin’s Interlinear. The ⲛ̄ that would ordinarily have been expected before ⲡⲜⲛⲉ in line 1 may be missing because of a typographical error in Grondin’s Interlinear. The expected ⲭⲉ may be missing from line 4 because the text was copied directly from NHC II. A modern forger’s misunderstanding of Grondin’s Interlinear may have resulted in the odd text of line 6. Someone with little Coptic knowledge may have juxtaposed ⲡⲜⲙⲉ ⲉⲑⲟⲟⲩ in line 6 without realizing that the result was an unusual grammatical construction. A forger may even have accidentally omitted the ⲉ in ⲙⲁⲣⲓⲗⲁⲙ in line 4 because Grondin’s Interlinear translated the name into English as “Mariam.”

Given the extraordinary similarities between the two different texts, it seems highly probable that *Gos. Jes. Wife* is indeed a “patchwork” of *Gos. Thom.* Most likely, it was composed after 1997 when Grondin’s Interlinear was first posted online. It will be exciting to learn what additional insights papyrologists and scientists can provide about the possible origin of *Gos. Jes. Wife* once they have had sufficient opportunity to analyze the manuscript in detail.

Appendix I: Synopsis of Gos. Jes. Wife/Gos. Thom. Parallels

<i>Gos. Jes. Wife</i> Recto (→)	<i>Gos. Thom.</i> Saying (Nag Hammadi Codex II)
1 <u>να]ει αν ταμααυ ας† ναει πφ[νε</u>	101 (49.35) <u>μααυ ν̄ταζε φναφ̄ρ μ[αθ̄ητης να]</u> 101 (49.36) <u>ει αν ταμααυ γαρ ν̄τας[</u> 101 (50.1) <u>[. .]ολ̄ δε ν̄με ας† ναει ν̄πωνε</u>
2]ς πεχε ν̄μαθ̄ητης ν̄ις χε ς[12 (34.25) <u>τ̄ν̄μααϷ πεχε ν̄μαθ̄ητης ν̄ις χε τ̄ν̄</u> 18 (36.9) <u>ρ̄ρωμε πεχε ν̄μαθ̄ητης ν̄ις χε χο</u> 20 (36.26) <u>πεχε ν̄μαθ̄ητης ν̄ις χε χοος</u>
3]. <u>αρνα μαριαμ ν̄πφα ν̄μος αν(?)</u>	110 (51.5) <u>ν̄φ̄ρ ρ̄ν̄μαο μαρεφ̄αρνα ν̄π̄κοσμος</u> 114 (51.19) <u>ναυ χε μαρε μαριζ̄αμ ει εβολ ν̄ητ̄ν̄</u> 114 (51.20) <u>χε ν̄ς̄ιομε ν̄πφα αν ν̄πωνε πεχε τ̄ς</u> 114 (51.21) <u>χε εις̄ηητε ανοκ †νασ̄ωκ ν̄μος χε</u>
4] <u>αν ν̄[ν]ου πεχε τ̄ς ναυ τᾱσιμε ν̄ν̄[</u>	18 (36.17) <u>αν ν̄μου πεχε τ̄ς χε ουμακαριος</u> 19 (36.25) <u>νασοϷου φναχι †πε αν ν̄μου</u> 12 (34.27) <u>ετναρ̄ νος ε̄ραϊ εχων πεχε τ̄ς ναυ</u> <u>ν̄ν̄ appears as an independent unit or at the beginning</u> <u>of a word in 35 places in Gos. Thom.</u>
5]. . . <u>σναφ̄ρ̄μαθ̄ητης ναει αυφ[</u>	55 (42.26) <u>αν ν̄ν̄ τεφ̄μααυ φναφ̄ρ̄μαθ̄ητης αν</u> 55 (42.27) <u>ναει αυφ̄ ν̄φ̄μεστε νεφ̄σ̄ηη ν̄ν̄</u>
6]ι <u>μαρερωμε ε̄ουου φαφε νε[</u>	45 (41.2) <u>ρ̄ρωμε φαφε̄ῑνε ν̄ε̄ν̄πον̄ηρον εβολ</u> 45 (41.3) <u>ε̄ν̄ πεφε̄ε̄ο ε̄ουου ε̄τ̄ε̄ν̄ πεφ̄ητ̄ αυ</u> 47 (41.17) <u>ρ̄ε̄ῡβ̄ριζε ν̄μοϷ μαρερωμε σε ρ̄π̄ας</u>
7]. <u>ανοκ †φ̄οοπ̄ ν̄μας ε̄τ̄βε π[</u>	30 (39.4) <u>νουτε νε π̄μα ε̄ν̄ σ̄ναυ η ουα ανοκ</u> 30 (39.5) <u>†φ̄οοπ̄ ν̄μαϷ πεχε τ̄ς ν̄ν̄ προφ̄η</u> 29 (38.33) <u>χε π̄ν̄α δε ε̄τ̄βε π̄σ̄μα ουφ̄ηρε</u>
8 ±6] . <u>οῡζ̄ικ̄ων . . [</u>	22 (37.34) <u>νο̄ῡε̄ρη̄τε οῡζ̄ικ̄ων̄ ε̄π̄μα ν̄οῡζ̄ικ̄ω̄</u>

Appendix II: Epsilons in *Gos. Jes. Wife*

Epsilons visible on the papyrus fragment³³ tend to be “wide and round.”³⁴



However, one epsilon in the string of letters at the end of line 6 is an anomaly: “ϩⲁϣⲉⲛⲉ seems to be a misspelling which the copyist attempted to correct. This is relatively clear from the unusual shape of the first epsilon, which seems to derive from an iota.”³⁵



It seems likely that the copyist of *Gos. Jes. Wife* actually intended to write the word ϩⲁϣⲉⲓⲛⲉ.

³³ Images of both sides of the papyrus fragment are available online: “The Gospel of Jesus’s Wife: A New Coptic Gospel Papyrus,” Harvard Divinity School, <http://www.hds.harvard.edu/faculty-research/research-projects/the-gospel-of-jesus-wife> (accessed October 9, 2012).

³⁴ King, “Jesus Said To Them, ‘My Wife.’”

³⁵ Suciu, “A Peculiar Dialectical Feature.”

Appendix III: A Sample of Grondin's Interlinear

An Interlinear Coptic-English Translation of the Gospel of Thomas by Michael Grondin has been online since 1997 and was last updated in 2002. The excerpt below shows clearly that a potential forger who knew English could have ascertained the meaning of practically every letter of *Gos. Thom.* without knowing much Coptic.³⁶

50:01/608	[ΕΒ]ΟΛ [ΤΑ·ΜΑΛΥ] ΔΕ Η·ΜΕ ΑC·† ΝΑ·ΕΙ ·Π·ΩΝΖ	27
	forth; my-mother, hwvr, true, she-gave to-me The-Life.	
50:02/609	ΠΕΧΕ·ΙC [ΧΕ Ο]ΥΟΕΙ ΝΑ·Υ Η·ΦΑΡΙCΑΙΟC ΧΕ	28
102*	*Said-JS89 this: Woe to-them, the-Pharisees, for	
50:03/610	ΕΥ·ΕΙΝ[Ε Ν·Ν]ΟΥ·ΟΥΖΟΡ ΕΦ·ΗΚΟΤΚ` ΖΙΧΝ·Π·ΟΥ-	29
	they-resemble a-dog ()resting upon-the-man-	
50:04/611	-ΟΝΕΦ` Ν·[ΖΕΝ]·ΕΖΟΟΥ ΧΕ ΟΥΤΕ Φ·ΟΥΩΜ ΑΝ	26
	-ger of-some-oxen, for n/nor he-eats not	
50:05/612	ΟΥΤΕ Φ·[ΚΩ Α]Ν Η·Ν·ΕΖΟΟΥ Ε·ΟΥΩΜ ΠΕΧΕ·ΙC	21+6
103*	n/nor he-permits not the-oxen to-eat. *Said-JS90	
50:06/613	ΧΕ ΟΥ·Μ[ΑΚΑ]ΡΙΟC ΠΕ Π·ΡΩΜΕ ΠΑΕΙ ΕΤ·CΟΟΥ	29
	this: a-blessed-one is(m) the-man, the-one who-knows	
50:07/614	ΧΕ Ζ[Ν·ΑΩ] Η·ΜΕΡΟC Ε·Ν·ΛΗCΤΗC ·ΝΗΥ ΕΖΟΥ	27
	that in-which part do-the-thieves come in,	
50:08/615	ΩΙΝΑ [ΕΦ·Ν]Α·ΤΩΟΥΝ` ΝΦ·CΩΟΥΖ Ν·ΤΕΦ·`	24
	so he-may-arise &()-gather his-	
50:09/616	·ΗΝΤ[ΕΡΟ] ΑΥΩ ΝΦ·ΜΟΥΡ Η·ΜΟ·Φ` ΕΧΝ·ΤΕΦ·`	25
	-kingdom, and ()()-bind him (self) upon-his-	
50:10/617	·ΤΠΕ [ΖΑ]·Τ·ΕΖΗ ΕΜ·ΠΑΤΟΥ·ΕΙ ΕΖΟΥΝ ΠΕ-	23+2
104.1>	-loins from-the-beginning, bef\ore-they-come in. > Sa-	
50:11/618	-ΧΑ·Υ Ν·ΙC ΧΕ ·ΑΜΟΥ ΝΤΝ·ΦΛΗΛ` Η·ΠΟΟΥ	24
	-id-they to-JS91 this: Come(sg), (we)-pray today,	
50:12/619	ΑΥΩ ΝΤΝ·Ρ·ΝΗCΤΕΥΕ ΠΕΧΕ·ΙC ΧΕ ΟΥ ΓΑΡ	14+13
104.2*	and (we)-fast. *Said-JS92 this: (for) What (--),	
50:13/620	ΠΕ Π·ΝΟΒΕ ΝΤΑΕΙ·Α·ΑΦ` Η ΝΤΑΥ·ΧΡΟ ΕΡΟ·ΕΙ	28
	is(m) the-sin I-have-done(), or they-have-won over-me	
50:14/621	ΖΝ·ΟΥ ΑΛΛΑ ΖΟΤΑΝ ΕΡΩΑΝ·Π·ΝΥΜΦΙΟC ·ΕΙ	28
104.3>	in-what? > Rather, when should-the-bridegroom come	
50:15/622	ΕΒΟΛ ΖΗ·Π·ΝΥΜΦΩΝ ΤΟΤΕ ΜΑΡΟΥ·ΝΗ`	24
	out of-the-bridal-chamber, then let-them-fa\	
50:16/623	-CΤΕΥΕ ΑΥΩ ΜΑΡΟΥ·ΦΛΗΛ` ΠΕΧΕ·ΙC ΧΕ ΠΕ-	17+10
105*	-st, and let-them-pray. *Said-JS93 this: He-	
50:17/624	-Τ·ΝΑ·CΟΥΩΝ·Π·ΕΙΩΤ` ΗΝ·Τ·ΜΑΛΥ CΕ·ΝΑ·ΜΟΥ-	27
	-who-will-know-the-father and-the-mother, they-will-ref-	
50:18/625	-ΤΕ ΕΡΟ·Φ` ΧΕ Π·ΩΗΡΕ Η·ΠΟΡΝΗ ΠΕΧΕ·ΙC ΧΕ	19+8
106.1*	-er to-him as "the-son of(the)harlot." *Said-JS94 this:	

³⁶ The excerpt above is reproduced by permission of Michael Grondin. For the entire Coptic/English interlinear, see: http://www.gospel-thomas.net/x_transl.htm.