

# THE BORGIAN COPTIC MANUSCRIPTS IN NAPLES: SUPPLEMENTARY IDENTIFICATIONS AND NOTES TO A RECENTLY PUBLISHED CATALOGUE

ALIN SUCIU  
Helsinki/Québec

The National Library “Vittorio Emanuele III” in Naples possesses one of the oldest and largest collections of Coptic (Sahidic) manuscripts in the world. The deposit is formed of dismembered fragments whose original provenance is the library of the White Monastery, situated in Upper Egypt, near the ancient town of Panopolis. This Coptic monastery, presided over many decades during the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> century by the Archimandrite Shenute, held at the turn of the first millennium an impressive library.<sup>1</sup> However, once the Coptic language fell into decay and was replaced by Arabic, the library’s old parchment books became useless and they gradually deteriorated.

When the first European travelers arrived at the White Monastery toward the middle of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, the Coptic codices were already long-forgotten and torn to pieces. The damaged fragments have been randomly transported to Western archives by different individuals at various moments, the White Monastery manuscripts being thus irreversibly dispersed.

Many of them arrived in Rome through the intermediary of the Jesuit missionaries sent to Egypt by the Cardinal Stefano Borgia, the secretary of the congregation *Propaganda Fide*. They were deposited in the Borgia palace in Velletri until the Napoleonic conquest, when, for security reasons, the collection was split and some of the fragments were moved to the Altamps palace in Rome. After the death of Stefano Borgia, his nephew, Camillo, sold the Velletri nucleus of manuscripts to Joachim Murat, the French general who became the king of Naples. From his hands, the White Monastery fragments wandered again as fortune dictated and finally ended up in the National Library in Naples, where they still remain today.

Although the manuscripts were described by Georg Zoega in his *Catalogus codicum Copticorum manu scriptorum*,<sup>2</sup> while they were still in the Museo di Velletri, a new, updated catalogue has been required for a long time. Zoega was a pioneer of Coptology, no doubt a valiant and brilliant one whose shortcomings must not be judged harshly. But despite obvious merits, his catalogue was limited by a rudimentary knowledge of the Coptic language and literature. Besides, he could not be aware of the other White Monastery fragments which come to complete the Borgian manuscripts, because most of these arrived in Europe after his death.

In this sense, the recent catalogue of Paola Buzi, published among the *Memorie* of the *Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei*,<sup>3</sup> is a long-awaited work which fills a bibliographic void and offers a starting point for further research. Most probably, her book will be the reference source for the Borgian Coptic fragments in Naples for decades to come.

It is divided in two parts: 1) an extensive historical introduction that contains three chapters; 2) the catalogue itself, devoted to descriptions, bibliographies and different other records which are relevant for the knowledge of the manuscripts. Those interested in the

---

<sup>1</sup> On the White Monastery library in general, see T. Orlandi, “The Library of the Monastery of St. Shenute at Atripe,” in A. Egberts, B. P. Muhs & J. van der Vliet (eds.), *Perspectives on Panopolis: an Egyptian Town from Alexander the Great to the Arab Conquest* (Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava, 31; Leiden 2002) p. 211-231.

<sup>2</sup> Published post-mortem (Rome 1810).

<sup>3</sup> P. Buzi, *Catalogo dei manoscritti copti borgiani conservati presso la Biblioteca Nazionale “Vittorio Emanuele III” di Napoli* (Accademia dei Lincei – Memorie, Ser. IX, 25/1; Rome 2009).

history of Coptic studies will find in the first part of the book useful details on the formation of the Borgia Oriental collection, as well as on its founder (p. 15-36), on the history of the Borgia Museum (p. 37-75), and on the trajectory of the Coptic fragments until they were catalogued by Georg Zoega (p. 77-101). Paola Buzi documents not only the Roman and Vatican archives, but also Zoega's personal papers, very little explored before, which are in the Kongelige Bibliotek in Copenhagen.

The second part is devoted to the description of the manuscripts. It is noteworthy that even today there is no uniform system of reference for the Naples fragments. Thus, they are quoted either according to the numbers assigned by Zoega in his catalogue, or after the cardboard boxes and the paper fascicles in which the folios are being held in the bookshelf, or according to the succession of the leaves in each of the boxes.<sup>4</sup> The new catalogue mentions all these possible designations, while adding the actual library call numbers of the fragments.<sup>5</sup> In this way the confusion is avoided and the identification of a specific item according to its previous systems of reference is easy to make. A synoptic table attached at the end of the book (p. 356-367) indicates the correspondences between the inventory numbers of the library and the different designations assumed by the manuscripts in the past.

The catalogue includes as well several fragments from box 17 which were not mentioned by Zoega (IB.17, ff. 1-17).

Each lemma offers, as far as possible, the reconstruction of the codex to which the fragment(s) originally belonged, the content of the item, followed by a brief paleographical description. It is in fact one of the few catalogues of Coptic manuscripts which tries to take into consideration all the identifiable fragments of the same original codicological unit.<sup>6</sup> This effort of reconstructing the ancient codices of the White Monastery from the dismembered fragments that can be recovered is fundamental. To that end, Paola Buzi adopts the sigla system established by Tito Orlandi, the director of the project *Corpus dei manoscritti copti letterari* (CMCL).<sup>7</sup> According to the CMCL system of classification, each reconstructed codex receives two letters, preceded by MONB (= the abbreviation for "Monastero Bianco"), e.g. MONB.AA, MONB.AB, MONB.AC etc.

Working on such a rich deposit of manuscripts as the National Library in Naples is surely a rare privilege but a difficult task at the same time. It is generally not easy to identify the White Monastery Coptic fragments since most of them do not bear a title or any other formal indication concerning the authorship. Reading Paola Buzi's book, it is, however, surprising to see how little is left without attribution. In the future, perhaps a list of updates will cover even these gaps.

I should like to submit herein some additions and identifications, based on my own research on the Neapolitan collection of Coptic fragments in particular and on their White Monastery "siblings" in general.<sup>8</sup> It goes without saying that they are not the only supplements to the Naples manuscripts that can be adduced. I will not mention others of minor relevance as well

<sup>4</sup> Cf. A. van Lantschoot, "Cotation du fonds copte de Naples," *Le Muséon* 41 (1928) p. 217-224; J.-M. Sauget, "Introduction historique et notes bibliographiques au catalogue de Zoega," *Le Muséon* 85 (1972) p. 25-63.

<sup>5</sup> See already P. Buzi, "The Borgia Coptic Manuscripts Collection Preserved in Naples. A New Catalogue," in N. Bosson & A. Boud'hors (eds.), *Actes du Huitième Congrès international d'Études coptes* vol. 1 (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta, 163; Louvain 2007) p. 41-50.

<sup>6</sup> Previous attempts in this direction were made by W. E. Crum in his brilliant works *Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire. Nos 8001-8741: Coptic Monuments* (Cairo 1902), *Catalogue of the Coptic Manuscripts in the British Museum* (London 1905), *Catalogue of Coptic Manuscripts in the Collection of the John Rylands Library Manchester* (Manchester 1909), and by B. Layton, *Catalogue of Coptic Literary Manuscripts in the British Library Acquired Since the Year 1906* (London 1987).

<sup>7</sup> CMCL is a scholarly project in which both Paola Buzi and I participate; see <http://cmcl.let.uniroma1.it/>.

<sup>8</sup> During my research I identified several new codices which are called now MONB.OO, MONB.OQ, MONB.OP, MONB.OR, MONB.OS, and MONB.OT.

as many fragments paleographically and, perhaps, codicologically related but whose identity is still unknown. Aware of the dangers to infer too much on the basis of unidentified fragments, I tried to avoid the charge of explaining the *obscurum per obscurius* and I left them aside.

<http://suciualin.wordpress.com/>



monastery and sailed to Alexandria in order to meet the archbishop Theophilus. As regards the two Vienna fragments (K 9064-9065) of MONB.NX, it must be specified they were published by Walter Till.<sup>27</sup> The Viennese material offers the account of the voyage made by Apa John to Babylon, where he was sent by Theophilus to find the relics of the three Hebrew saints, Ananias, Misael and Azarias.

Although the finding of these relics is attributed both to John Kolobos and John of Lycopolis, Amélineau's assumption that the character called "Apa John" in the Sahidic fragments would be John Kobolos is, however, not exact, since the one named here must be John of Lycopolis. This is ascertained by a homily of ps.-Theophilus of Alexandria on the three Hebrew saints (CPG 2626; *Clavis coptica* 0392), to which our Sahidic text is partly parallel, and whose hero is "John the ἑγκλειστος" or John of Siout, both names referring to John of Lycopolis.<sup>28</sup>

#### **IB.09, f. 23 (Zoega CCXXVII)**

Cf. *supra* IB.01, f. 30

#### **IB.09, ff. 57-59 (Zoega CCXXXV\* & CCXXXV)**

This inventory number includes three leaves from the *Asceticon* of Isaiah of Scetis (CPG 5555; *Clavis coptica* 0217), published by Antoine Guillaumont.<sup>29</sup> The catalogue supplements the inventory of Guillaumont's codex A<sup>30</sup> (= MONB.BQ) with another fragment which has not been recognized before. Thus, IB.17, f. 6 is rightly identified as Logos 25 (= Syriac Logos 7).<sup>31</sup>

This, however, is not the only fragment of MONB.BQ omitted in Guillaumont's edition, others still waiting to be published. To that end, I will draw here a preliminary inventory of this manuscript's *inedita*, which outnumber the edited items.

First of all, we have six intact leaves, known for a long time, in the collection of IFAO in Cairo (nos. 52-57), whose publication was envisaged but unfortunately never accomplished

---

414-422.

<sup>27</sup> W. Till, "Ein saidischer Bericht der Reise des Apa Johannes nach Babylon," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 37 (1938) p. 230-239.

<sup>28</sup> The homily of ps.-Theophilus, preserved also in Arabic and Ethiopic, was published after a Bohairic manuscript by H. De Vis, *Homélies coptes de la Vaticane* vol. 2 (*Coptica*, 5; Copenhagen 1929) p. 121-157. No less than ten parchment folios from a still unpublished Sahidic version, can be found in the Chester Beatty collection, Dublin (MS 820D, ff. 1-10). The Chester Beatty fragments are different in some regards from the Bohairic text published by De Vis. On the identity of John the ἑγκλειστος, cf. W. E. Crum, *Der Papyruscodex saec. VI-VII der Phillippsbibliothek in Cheltenham* (Strasbourg 1915) p. xvii. On page 15 of the Chester Beatty manuscript, Theophilus has a vision in which the three Hebrew saints ask him to send "John, the one who lives in the kenobion of Siout" to search for their relics (parallel text in De Vis, *Homélies coptes*, p. 130). For the confusion between John of Lycopolis and John Kolobos, which I already mentioned, the reader will consult the forthcoming article by T. Orlandi, "Tradizioni copte sui Tre Giovani di Babilonia."

<sup>29</sup> Guillaumont, *L'Asceticon copte*, p. 5-7, 8-9 (edition), 52-53, 57-58 (French translation).

<sup>30</sup> For the content of this codex, check A. Guillaumont, "La recension copte de l'*Asceticon* de l'Abbé Isaïe," in *Coptic Studies in Honor of Walter Ewing Crum* (Boston 1959) p. 52-55. All fragments except Leiden 118, were already announced by Guillaumont in this article; for the identification of the Leiden fragment, cf. Guillaumont, *L'Asceticon copte*, p. ix n. 1.

<sup>31</sup> For the Syriac text see R. Draguet, *Les cinq recensions de l'Asceticon syriaque d'abba Isaïe, I. Les témoins et leurs parallèles non-syriaques. Édition des logoi I-XIII* (CSCO, 289. Scriptores syri, 120; Louvain 1968) p. 90-91. The translation is available in Idem, *Les cinq recensions de l'Asceticon syriaque d'abba Isaïe, I. Introduction au problème isaïen. Version des logoi I-XIII avec des parallèles grecs et latins* (CSCO, 293. Scriptores syri, 122; Louvain 1968) p. 107-108.

by Antoine Guillaumont and René-Georges Coquin.<sup>32</sup> They are paginated consecutively from 193 to 204 and can be ascribed to Logos 28 (= Syriac Logos 22).<sup>33</sup> To the same Logos belong a leaf in the Stadtbibliothek in Berlin, MS 1613, f. 8 (p. 205-206), and a complete bifolio in the Papyrussammlung of the National Library in Vienna, K 9766-9765 (p. 207-208, 221-222).<sup>34</sup> Returning from Vienna to Naples, the fragments catalogued by Paola Buzi under the lemma IB.14, ff. 29-30<sup>35</sup> as parts of the *Regulae* of Horsiese and attributed in the past also to Shenoute,<sup>36</sup> are in fact from the codex of Isaiah (= Logoi 21 ["On the Repentance"], 20 ["On the Humility"], 7 ["On the Virtues"]).<sup>37</sup> In Paris, we find BN 131<sup>5</sup>, f. 45 (p. 171-172), which belongs to Logos 22 (= Syriac Logos 20),<sup>38</sup> 131<sup>5</sup>, f. 64 to Logos 25 (= Syriac 7),<sup>39</sup> 131<sup>7</sup>, f. 47 to Logos 16 (= Syriac 15),<sup>40</sup> whereas 131<sup>5</sup>, f. 146v-r, as small as it is, can be recognized as a part of Logos 21 (= Syriac 14).<sup>41</sup>

Finally, from Guillaumont's list of this codex should be removed Vienna K 9646,<sup>42</sup> which contains indeed an excerpt from Isaiah of Scetis but was copied in a different hand and belongs to the Patristic *florilegium* MONB.LY, not to our manuscript. A second Isaiah fragment of MONB.LY, unnoticed by Guillaumont, is Paris 131<sup>4</sup>, f. 144 (p. [189]-[190]) (= Greek Logos 12),<sup>43</sup> which preceded K 9646 in the codex.

Guillaumont's mistaken association of the Viennese fragment with MONB.BQ is further demonstrated by the fact that the same pagination, 191-192, has to be restored on Paris BN 131<sup>5</sup>, f. 48. Although this folio is damaged in the upper part, its page numbers are easily assignable now on the basis of textual continuity with IFAO no. 52 (paginated 193-194).

The newly identified fragments allow us to formulate a reasonable hypothesis concerning the order of the *logoi* in this codex, an order which was not transparent enough in Guillaumont's codicological reconstruction.

Logos 25

London BL Or. 3581A, ff. 148-151 (p. 5-12) = Guillaumont, p. 1-5

<sup>32</sup> See R.-G. Coquin, "Le fonds copte de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale du Caire," in *Écritures et traditions dans la littérature copte. Journée d'études coptes, Strasbourg 28 mai 1982* (Cahiers de la bibliothèque copte, 1; Louvain 1983) p. 14.

<sup>33</sup> Syriac text in Draguet, *Les cinq recensions de l'Ascéticon syriaque d'abba Isaïe, II. Édition des logoi XIV-XXVI* (CSCO, 290. Scriptores syri, 121; Louvain 1968) p. 314-324, French translation in Idem, *Les cinq recensions de l'Ascéticon syriaque d'abba Isaïe, II. Version des logoi XIV-XXVI avec des parallèles grecs* (CSCO, 294. Scriptores syri, 123; Louvain 1968) p. 376-384.

<sup>34</sup> Berlin 1613, f. 8 and Vienna K 9766 are consecutive and they find a parallel in Draguet, *Logoi XIV-XXVI*, 1: 324-327, 2: p. 384-386, whereas Vienna K 9765 in 1: 336-336, 2: 393-394. The two Viennese conjugated leaves represent the outermost bifolio of the 14<sup>th</sup> quire.

<sup>35</sup> Buzi, *Catalogo*, p. 287-288. For their specific place in the codex, cf. *infra*.

<sup>36</sup> Attributed to Shenoute in Shisha-Halevy, *Coptic Grammatical Categories*, p. 218.

<sup>37</sup> IB.14, f. 29: parallels in Draguet, *Logoi XIV-XXVI*, 1: 205-208, 2: p. 257-259. IB.14, f. 30: parallels in Draguet, *Logoi XIV-XXVI*, 1: 224, 2: p. 274; Draguet, *Logoi I-XIII* 1: p. 21, 2: 13; Draguet, *Logoi I-XIII* 1: p. 180-182, 2: 222-226. The headings which appear in the manuscript indicate the title of Logoi. In discussing Shisha-Halevy's attribution to Shenoute, Emmel, *Shenoute's Literary Corpus*, p. 901 is cautious, remarking that "[t]he headings on f. 30 would be extraordinary in a codex of Shenoute's works."

<sup>38</sup> Parallel in Draguet, *Logoi XIV-XXVI*, 1: 299-300, 2: p. 365-366.

<sup>39</sup> Parallel in Draguet, *Logoi I-XIII*, 1: p. 78-80, 2: 100-101.

<sup>40</sup> Parallel in Draguet, *Logoi XIV-XXVI*, 1: 244-246, 2: p. 306-311. This fragment does not preserve any trace of page numbers, but I placed it the codex according to the position of Greek Logos 16 in MONB.BR, another Sahidic manuscript of the *Asceticon*.

<sup>41</sup> On the verso (the true recto) of BN 131<sup>5</sup>, f. 146 survives enough from James 2:17 to identify the parallel in Draguet, *Logoi XIV-XXVI*, 1: 215, 2: p. 266, whereas the recto (the true verso) has the text of Ephesians 5:6 and finds a parallel in Draguet, *Logoi XIV-XXVI*, 1: 216, 2: p. 266.

<sup>42</sup> *Editio princeps* in C. Wessely, *Griechische und koptische Texte theologischen Inhalts V* (Studien zur Palaeographie und Papyruskunde, 18; Leipzig 1917) p. 91-93 (= no. 279); reedited with French translation in Guillaumont, *L'Asceticon copte*, p. 11-12, 60-62.

<sup>43</sup> Syriac Logos 18; parallel in Draguet, *Logoi XIV-XXVI*, 1: 285-286, 2: p. 355-356.

	Paris BN 131 <sup>5</sup> , f. 64 (p. xxx-xxx) = unpublished
	Leiden Rijksmuseum 118 (p. xxx-xxx) = Guillaumont, p. 15-16
	Naples IB.17, f. 6 (p. xxx-xxx) = unpublished
Logos 4	Naples IB.09, f. 58 (p. 57-58) = Guillaumont, p. 5-6
Logos 16	Paris BN 131 <sup>7</sup> , f. 47 (p. xxx-xxx) = unpublished
Logos 3	Naples IB.09, f. 59 (p. 117-118) = Guillaumont, p. 6-7
Logoi 3/15	Paris BN 129 <sup>13</sup> , f. 53 (p. 123-124) = Guillaumont, p. 7-8
Logos 21	Naples IB.09, f. 57 (p. 131-132) = Guillaumont, p. 8-9
	Naples IB.14, f. 29 (p. 135-136) = unpublished
	Paris BN 131 <sup>5</sup> , f. 146 (p. xxx-xxx) = unpublished
	London BL Or. 3581A, f. 152 (p. xxx-xxx) = Guillaumont, p. 12-13
Logoi 21/20/7	Naples IB.14, f. 30 (p. [151]-[152]) = unpublished
	Leiden Rijksmuseum 111 (p. 157-158) = Guillaumont, p. 10-11
Logos 22	Paris BN 131 <sup>5</sup> , f. 45 (p. 171-172) = unpublished
Logoi 23/28	Paris BN 131 <sup>5</sup> , f. 48 (p. [191]-[192]) = Guillaumont, p. 13-15
	Cairo IFAO nos. 52-57 (p. 193-204) = unpublished
	Berlin Stadtbibliothek 1613, f. 8 (p. 205-206) = unpublished
	Vienna K 9766 (p. 207-208) = unpublished
	Vienna K 9765 (p. 221-222) = unpublished
Logoi 28/? <sup>44</sup>	Paris BN 129 <sup>13</sup> , f. 36 (p. xxx-xxx) = Guillaumont, p. 16-17

### IB.10, ff. 10-27 (Zoega CCXXXIX)

The call number IB.10, ff. 10-27 consists of a series of folios from the Acts of the Council of Nicaea, which are part of codex MONB.EF. To the dismembered fragments known until now, a specimen from the Rijksmuseum in Leiden can be added, i.e. F 1976/4, f. 3.<sup>45</sup> The leaf represents pages 39-40 of the manuscript, and would fall thus in the lacuna between Vatican Borg. copt. 109, cass. XXIX, fasc. 159, ff. 9 (p. 29-30) and 5 (p. 47-48).

### IB.10, ff. 48-54 (Zoega CCXLII)

Although these seven parchment leaves are left unidentified, they have affinities with other fragments classified under MONB.YI, which is liable to contain – as the following two entries in the catalogue – works by John the Archimandrite. All we know about this enigmatic figure of the Coptic literature, is that he seemed to be one of the White Monastery's archimandrites after Shenoute, but further research is needed concerning his personality and work.<sup>46</sup>

The content of MONB.YI, according to the CMCL database: Leiden Rijksmuseum 130 (p. 17-18); Oxford Clarendon Press b.4, ff. 83-88 (*olim* 100-105) (p. 19-30); Naples IB.10, f. 48 (p. 47-48); IB.10, f. 49 (p. 51-52); IB.10, ff. 50-51 (p. 55-58); IB.10, f. 52 (p. 61-62); Paris

<sup>44</sup> This second discourse, whose lemma can be read on the Paris fragment, apparently has not been yet identified in any other language than Coptic. It appears in both Sahidic manuscripts of the *Asceticon* (MONB.BO and MONB.BR). MONB.BR has more text, especially since E. Lucchesi, "Apa Zénobe," p. 77, appended to it a new fragment in the British Library.

<sup>45</sup> MS F 1976/4, f. 3 is not mentioned in W. Pleyte & P. A. A. Boeser, *Manuscripts coptes du Musée des Pays-Bas à Leide* (Leiden 1897) because it did not integrate the collection of the Rijksmuseum in Leiden until 1976, when it was sold to this institution by the antiquity dealer Johannes Möger. Möger occupied a significant role in the trajectory of Coptic manuscripts from Egypt to the Western archives after the Second World War, being perhaps the most important dealer in the post-Nahman era. Some of the notable manuscripts that went through Möger's hands are the Michaelides papyri, the "Gospel" of the Savior (P. Berol. 22220), and an unpublished codex of the Acts of the Apostles in Sahidic (Pierpont Morgan M910). Among the Leiden fragments acquired from Möger together with F 1976/4, f. 3, are worth to be mentioned here F 1976/4, f. 31 (ps.-Evodius, *De passione*) and F 1976/4, f. 2, which belongs to John Chrysostom's *In Ep. ad Romanos, hom. 7* (= PG 60, coll. 447-448) and represents the only Coptic fragment from this work attested until now.

<sup>46</sup> On John the Archimandrite, see e.g., Crum, *Catalogue John Rylands*, p. 35; A. Shisha-Halevy, "Two New Shenoute-Texts from the British Library," *Orientalia* 44 (1975) 477 n. 18; Emmel, *Shenoute's Literary Corpus*, p. 91.

Now, the paleographical traits indicate that Paris BN 132<sup>4</sup>, f. 318, as well as two pairs of conjugated leaves (paginated from 99 to 106) which are held today in the papyrus collection of the French Institute in Cairo (call number IFAO nos. 18-21), can be attached to the same codex. The fragments come from an unknown writing attributed to Dioscorus of Alexandria,<sup>60</sup> the references to the “abominable council (σύνοδος)” and “the impious (ἄσεβης) Pulcheria” suggesting that codex MONB.NC grouped together texts of anti-Chalcedonian tenure.

#### **IB.14, ff. 29-30 (Zoega CCLXXXVII)**

Isaiah of Scetis, *Asceticon*, cf. *supra* IB.09, ff. 57-59

#### **IB.14, ff. 31-32 (Zoega CCLXXXIIX)**

Paris BN 131<sup>5</sup>, f. 90 (Ephrem, *De perfectione monachi*, MONB.NE; cf. *supra*), 131<sup>6</sup>, f. 29 (Shenoute, MONB.YU), and 131<sup>6</sup>, f. 30 (Shenoute, MONB.CZ), do not belong to the list of MONB.BI's fragments (ps.-Peter of Alexandria, *De divitiis*).

#### **IB.14, ff. 34-35 (Zoega CCLXXXIX)**

These two fragments are joined by Vienna K 9478 and Paris BN 131<sup>1</sup>, f. 8. On their identity, cf. *infra* IB.14, f. 50.

#### **IB.14, f. 37, scil. IB.14, f. 36 (Zoega CCLXXXIX)**

Although IB.14, f. 36 is ascribed to MONB.GD, which would contain, according to the catalogue, only a homily on the Cross by ps.-Cyril of Jerusalem (CPG 3602; *Clavis coptica* 0120), we recognize it as part of *De passione I* (CPG 3598; *Clavis coptica* 0114), an unpublished sermon from the Coptic cycle of the same author. The fragment offers an “apocryphal” dialogue between Jesus Christ and Pilate, based upon the Gospel of John 18:33-38, and finds a parallel in Pierpont Morgan M595, ff. 13v-14r, a complete manuscript of ps.-Cyril's sermon on the Passion.<sup>61</sup>

It is important to note that folios IB.13, ff. 44-46 are equally from the same homily, and not from *In Crucem*. In fact, many of the fragments enumerated as members of MONB.GD appear to be from ps.-Cyril of Jerusalem's *De passione I*.<sup>62</sup> I have updated the fragments' list, eliminating some and adding others, mentioning, however, that the inventory is still possibly incomplete. The following parallels are taken from Antonella Campagnano's edition of ps.-Cyril of Jerusalem, *In Crucem*<sup>63</sup> and from New York, M595, ff. 1r-27v, for *De passione I*.

*In Crucem*      Vienna K 9475 (p. 15-16) = Campagnano, p. 86-88  
                     Oxford Bodleian Library Copt.e.177(P) (p. [17]-[18]) = Campagnano p. 88-89  
                     Paris BN 131<sup>5</sup>, f. 117 (p. [19]-[20])<sup>64</sup> = Campagnano, p. 90

(535-566 A.D.), *BSAC* 30 (1991) p. 1-24.

<sup>60</sup> The attribution to Dioscorus is apparent at various moments in the manuscript; for example, on IFAO 21v, the narrator has a vision in which an angel calls him: “He said to me: ‘Dioscorus, Dioscorus, do not be afraid!’” Dioscorus is again addressed by name on the skin side of BN 132<sup>4</sup>, f. 318.

<sup>61</sup> We have another copy of this sermon on the Passion in Pierpont Morgan M594 as well as in at least four fragmentary White Monastery codices, but M595 is preferable because it is better preserved than all the others; description of M595 in L. Depuydt, *Catalogue of Coptic Manuscripts in the Pierpont Morgan Library* vol. 1 (Corpus of Illuminated Manuscripts, 4. Oriental Series, 1; Louvain 1993) p. 345-350 (= no. 170).

<sup>62</sup> Cf. A. Campagnano, *Ps. Cirillo di Gerusalemme. Omelie copte sulla passione, sulla Croce e sulla Vergine* (Milano 1980) p. 18, although the structure of MONB.GD is not traced there.

<sup>63</sup> Campagnano, *Omelie copte*, p. 75-149.

<sup>64</sup> Identified by E. Lucchesi, “L’homélie copte de Cyrille de Jérusalem en l’honneur de la Sainte Croix. Nouveaux apports,” *Analecta Bollandiana* 98 (1980) p. 84, where the author ascribes it to a different codex than ours.



Naples IB.12, ff. 14-15 (p. 35-38), IB.13, ff. 41-42 (p. 39-42), IB.12, ff. 16-17 (p. 43-46), IB.13, f. 43 (p. 47-48)<sup>65</sup> = Campagnano, p. 102-112

*De passione I* Paris BN 131<sup>7</sup>, f. 18v-r (p. [97]-[98]) = M595, f. 1r, col. I-1v, col. I

Naples IB.13, ff. 44-46 (p. 101-106) = M595, f. 2r, col. II-4r, col. I

Paris Louvre 10039a (p. xxx-xxx) = M595, f. 6r, col. I-6v, col. I

Cairo Coptic Museum 9227 (p. 121-122)<sup>66</sup> = M595, f. 8v, col. I-9r, col. I

Paris BN 131<sup>7</sup>, f. 64 (p. [129]-[130]) = M595, f. 10v, col. II-11r, col. II

Paris BN 129<sup>17</sup>, f. 68 (p. 131-132) = M595, f. 11r, col. II-12r, col. II

Paris BN 131<sup>7</sup>, f. 60 (p. [133]-[134]) = M595, f. 12r, col. I-12v, col. I

Naples IB.14, f. 36 (p. 137-138) = M595, f. 13v, col. II-14r, col. II

Paris BN 131<sup>6</sup>, f. 54 (p. 139-140) = M595, f. 14r, col. II-15r, col. I

Paris BN 129<sup>17</sup>, f. 64 (p. 159-160) = M595, f. 20v, col. I-21r, col. II

Vienna K 2644<sup>67</sup> + K 2308 (p. xxx-xxx) = M595, f. 25v, col. I-25v, col. II

London BL Or. 3581A, f. 147 (p. xxx-xxx)<sup>68</sup> = M595, f. 27r, col. II-27v, col. II

### IB.14, ff. 41-42 (Zoega CCXC)

The two folios (p. 195-196, 199-200), whose content is described in the catalogue as “on the resurrection of the flesh,” were already identified as parts of Epiphanius’ *Ancoratus* (CPG 3744; *Clavis coptica* 0140) by Enzo Lucchesi, and presented in an article by Delio Vania Proverbio.<sup>69</sup> In the same publication, the reader can find the complete bibliography related to *Ancoratus* in Coptic, whereas for the *status quaestionis* a study by Alberto Camplani is still the most useful guide.<sup>70</sup>

I should like to mention the existence of another fragment from the Woide collection in Oxford, Clarendon Press b.4, f. 63 (*olim* 82) (p. 105-106), which contains the text of *Ancoratus* 50,5-52,1.

Clarendon Press b.4, f. 63	Epiphanius, <i>Ancoratus</i> <sup>71</sup>
<i>incipit</i> [...] ⲭⲉ ⲙⲁⲣⲟⲩⲱⲱⲧⲧ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲛⲟⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲉⲗⲟⲥ ⲙⲡⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧⲉ.	50,5 προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι θεοῦ
<i>desinit</i> ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲡⲉⲭⲁⲕ ⲭⲉ ⲟⲩ ⲡⲉⲧⲉⲕⲭⲱ ⲙⲙⲟⲩ· ⲉϥⲟⲩⲱⲱ ⲛⲟⲓⲡⲉⲓⲱⲧ [...]	52,1 Ἀλλά, φασί, τί οὖν λέγεις; θέλων ἐγέννησεν ὁ πατήρ...

If Epiphanius’ work has survived indeed in two different Sahidic codices, rather than a

<sup>65</sup> Folios IB.13, ff. 41-46 are attributed *en gros* to ps.-Cyril’s *On the Cross* in E. Lucchesi, “L’homélie copte,” p. 83 n. 4. This identification goes for the first three fragments but not for IB.13, ff. 44-46 (= ps.-Cyril of Jerusalem, *De passione I*). The other fragment signaled by Lucchesi, Paris BN 129<sup>13</sup>, f. 31, is in my opinion from a different manuscript of *In Crucem*. Forbes Robinson published and translated IB.13, f. 42 (the recto only partly), IB.12, ff. 16-17 and IB.13, f. 42 (recto only) in his *Apocryphal Gospels*, p. 178-185.

<sup>66</sup> Munier, *Manuscripts coptes*, p. 16-18.

<sup>67</sup> Published by H. Förster, “Ich habe dich dem Johannes gegeben, den ich liebe,” *Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum – Journal of Ancient Christianity* 7 (2003) 3-13; identified by E. Lucchesi, “Identification de P. Vindob. K. 2644,” *Orientalia* 76 (2007) p. 174-175. Lucchesi quotes also Vienna K 9537 and K 9538 as parts of the codex, but I think they belong to another manuscript, as both the *ductus* and the page numbers (= p. 9-12) suggest. It should be also stressed that a second fragment from Vienna, K 2308, represents another bit of the same folio.

<sup>68</sup> Crum, *Catalogue BM*, p. 109 (= no. 246).

<sup>69</sup> D. V. Proverbio, “Introduzione alle versioni orientali dell’*Ancoratus* di Epifanio,” *Miscellanea Marciana* 12 (1997) p. 69.

<sup>70</sup> A. Camplani, “Epifanio (*Ancoratus*) e Gregorio di Nazianzo (*Epistulae*) in copto: identificazioni e *status quaestionis*,” *Augustinianum* 35 (1995) p. 327-343.

<sup>71</sup> I have consulted the Greek text in K. Holl, *Epiphanius I. Ancoratus und Panarion haer. 1-33* (GCS, 25; Leipzig 1915).

proper identification, the style and the themes treated indicate as author the same Cyril. In fact, the first lines of Naples IB.16, f. 1 find a very close parallel in Cyril of Alexandria's *Oratio ad Augustas de fide* (CPG 5220):

Naples IB.16, f. 1	<i>Oratio ad Augustas de fide</i>
<p>ΕΤΕ ΠΧΟΕΙC ΠΕ ΚΑΤΑ ΤΕΦΥCΙC·  ΚΑΝ ΕΑΦΩΠΕ ΖΝΤΜΟΡΦΗ ΝΖΜΖΑΛ·  ΕΦΟ ΟΝ ΝΘΕ ΕΝΕΦΟ ΜΜΟC· ΤΑΙ ΟΝ  ΤΕ ΘΕ ΕΤΝΧΩ ΜΜΟC ΕΡΟΦ· ΧΕ ΑΦΧΙ  ΝΤΜΝΤΑΡΧΕΙΕΡΕΥC· ΖΜΠΤΡΕΦΩΠΕ  ΝΤΝΖΕ· ΚΑΙΤΟΙ ΟΥΝΤΑΦ ΜΜΑΥ·  ΝΖΕΝΤΒΑ ΝΤΒΑ ΝΛΙΤΟΥΡΓΟC ΖΝΜΠΗΥΕ·  ΕΥΕΙΝΕ ΝΑΦ ΕΖΡΑΪ ΝΖΕΝΘΥCΙΑ  ΝΑΤCΝΟΦ· ΑΥΩ ΝΟΙΗΤΟΝ· ΕΤΕ  ΝΖΥΜΝΟC ΝΕ· ΜΝΝΕΟΟΥ</p>	<p>(PG 76, col. 1388 = Swartz <i>ACO</i> 1.1.5)<sup>92</sup>  ὥσπερ γὰρ καίτοι τῇ φύσει κύριος ὢν  μεμένηκεν ὅπερ ἦν, κὰν εἰ γέγονεν ἐν τῇ  τοῦ δούλου μορφῇ, οὕτω φαμέν ὅτι καίτοι  μυρίος ἔχων ἐν οὐρανῳ τοὺς ἱεουργοῦντας  αὐτῷ, τὰς νοητὰς δηλονότι καὶ ἀναιμάκτους  θυσίας, ὕμνος καὶ δοξολογίας</p>

The same fragment was taken over in the Greek *catenae* on the Epistles of Paul, where is explicitly attributed to Cyril of Alexandria.<sup>93</sup>

#### IB.16, ff. 4-5 (Zoega CCCVI)

These two folios (p. 131-132, 145-146) were edited and translated into French by Émile Amélineau among the works of Shenoute,<sup>94</sup> and his attribution went unchallenged for a long time.<sup>95</sup> However, Stephen Emmel counted them among the *dubia* in his *magnum opus* concerning the Shenoutean literature.<sup>96</sup> This caution was necessary since IB.16, ff. 4-5 belong in fact to one of the spiritual homilies of ps. Macarius, which are recorded thus also in Sahidic.<sup>97</sup>

The Coptic text corresponds to the Macarian Homily C 38 (= no. 26 in Collection III<sup>98</sup>). These two Neapolitan leaves represent the outermost bifolio of the 9<sup>th</sup> quire, with the signature being visible on both of them, which means that there is a significant gap of six folios in between.<sup>99</sup>

Naples IB.16, f. 4r	ps.-Macarius, <i>Hom.</i> C 38
---------------------	--------------------------------

letter in the Chalcedonian *Florilegium Cyrillianum*, as well as in its refutation by the *Philalethes* of Severus of Antioch, R. Hespel, *Sévère d'Antioche, Le Philalèthe* 2 vols. (CSCO, 133 & 134. Scriptores syri, 68 & 69; Louvain 1952). Similarly, the anti-Chalcedonian miscellany edited by Coquin, reports that the letter was invoked by both sides in the debate concerning the person of Christ, cf. Coquin, "Fragments d'une chronique," p. 12, 19-20. The same letter to Succensus is quoted as an authority in John of Nikiu's *Chronicle* (R. H. Charles, *The Chronicle of John (c. 690 A.D.), Coptic Bishop of Nikiu* [London 1916; repr. Amsterdam 1966] p. 148).

<sup>92</sup> Greek text taken from Schwartz, *ACO*, 1.1.5: p. 47.

<sup>93</sup> J. A. Cramer, *Catenae Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum* vol. 7: *In Epistolas S. Pauli ad Timotheum, Titum, Philemona, et ad Hebraeos* (Oxford 1844) p. 477.

<sup>94</sup> É. Amélineau, *Œuvres de Shenoudi: Texte copte et traduction française* vol. 2 (Paris 1914) p. 487-491.

<sup>95</sup> The fragments were still considered Shenoutean in Shisha-Halevy, *Coptic Grammatical Categories*, p. 255.

<sup>96</sup> See Emmel, *Shenoute's Literary Corpus*, p. 906.

<sup>97</sup> As P. Géhin discovered, "The Virtues of Saint Macarius," preserved only in Bohairic, proves to be a compilation which takes over various pieces of the Macarian corpus. Bohairic text edited by Amélineau, *Histoire des monastères*, p. 118-202; for a list of parallels, see P. Géhin, "Le Dossier Macarien de l'Atheniensis 2492," *Recherches Augustiniennes* 31 (1999) 89-147, here 147.

<sup>98</sup> This collection, which contains forty-three homilies, was partly edited by E. Klostermann & H. Berthold, *Neue Homilien des Makarius/Symeon I. Aus Typus III* (Texte und Untersuchungen, 72; Berlin 1961), cf. also Pseudo-Macaire, *Œuvres spirituelles I. Homélie propres à la Collection III* (ed. V. Desprez. SC, 275; Paris 1980).

<sup>99</sup> Our Coptic text covers Klostermann & Berthold, *Neue Homilien*, p. 140,11-141,12; 146,21-147,24.

<p>ΕΝΝΑΜΕΕΥΕ ΔΕ ΟΝ ΧΕ ΣΕΩΟΟΠ  Ν̄ΟΙΟΥΗΡ ΝΑΣΠΕ Η ΝΣΟΦΙΑ Η  ΜΜΝΤΡΜΝΖΗΤ· Η ΟΥΗΡ ΝΤΕΧΝΗ  ΝΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΕΙ Η ΝΖΩΒ Η ΝΣΠΟΥΔΗ Η  ΜΜΝΤΡΜΜΑΟ ΕΥΩΟΒΕ ΖΝΟΥΑΤΟ  Ν̄ΣΜΟΤ· ΑΥΩ ΖΝΝΑΙ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΝΨΩΟΟΠ  ΑΝ Ν̄ΟΙΠΖΩΒ ΕΤΟΥΡΧΡΙΑ ΜΜΟΨ ΑΥΩ  ΕΤΟΥΟΝΖ ΝΖΗΤΨ Ν̄ΟΙΝΕΧΡΙΣΤΙΑΝΟΣ</p>	<p>(Klostermann &amp; Berthold, p. 140)  Πόσαι γλώσσαι ἐν κόσμῳ, πόσαι σοφίαι, πόσαι φρονήσεις, πόσαι τέχναι, πόσαι ἐπιστήμαι καὶ ἐπιτηδεύματα καὶ σπουδὴ καὶ πλοῦτος ἐν τῇ γῇ, καὶ οὐδὲν τούτων ἐστὶν ὃ χρήζουσι καὶ ἐν ᾧ ζῶσι Χριστιανοί.</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The next identifiable fragment from this codex, is Paris BN 102, f. 12 (p. 179-180) and contains a part of the Homily C 12 (= no. 6 in Collection III).<sup>100</sup>

<p><b>Paris BN 102, f. 12</b></p> <p><i>incipit</i> [ΤΩ]ΟΥΝ ΖΑΠΝΟΘΝΕΘ ΜΠᾹϞ̄Ρ̄Ο̄  ΖΙΧ̄ΝΝΕΥΝΑΖΒ Μ̄ΝΝΑΖΙϞΕ Ζ̄ΜΠΕΥϞΩΜΑ</p> <p><i>desinit</i> ...NHT̄N̄ N̄TMNTΡΜΜΑΟ N̄M̄ΠΗΥΕ·  ΑΥΩ ΤΕΤ̄Ν̄ΓΥΜΝΑΖΕ ΝΝΕΤΝϞΩΜΑ  ΖΝ[...]</p>	<p><b>ps.-Macarius, Hom. C 12</b>  (Klostermann &amp; Berthold, p. 25-26)  οἱ τὴν ὕβριν τοῦ σταυροῦ μου βαστάσαντες ἐν τοῖς ὥμοις αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ πάθη μου ἐν τοῖς σώμασιν αὐτῶν  ...τὸν οὐράνιον πλοῦτον. Καὶ γὰρ ἐν τῇ χαμευνίᾳ τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν γυμνάζοντες</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

This succession of the Macarian pieces suggests that the Coptic manuscript followed the order of the tradition TV, represented by three Arabic codices, Vaticani arabici 70 & 80 and Parisinus arabicus 149, our fragments corresponding to homilies 13 and 16 in this collection.<sup>101</sup> Now, there are sixteen folios missing in the lacuna between pages 146-179, and the stichometry indicates that six of them were occupied by the end of homily 13 and the beginning of homily 16, leaving just enough space for the homilies 14 and 15. It is likely that, as the Arabic collection TV is attributed to Symeon, the same authorship occurred in the Sahidic manuscript.

Interestingly enough, the *Letters of Saint Antony*, represented by two other folios in Naples (IB.01, ff. 18-19),<sup>102</sup> are copied by the same hand and it is tempting to place them in the codex of ps.-Macarius, which we conveniently baptized MONB.OR.<sup>103</sup> As to the provenance of the manuscript, a second codex (MONB.XN) transcribed by the copyist in question and invested with a colophon, indicates that he was a monk of the White Monastery.<sup>104</sup>

<sup>100</sup> The existence of a fragment paleographically related to IB.16, ff. 4-5 was pointed out to me by Mr. Enzo Lucchesi and I thank him for calling my attention to it.

<sup>101</sup> On the Arabic tradition in general, see Graf, *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur*, p. 389-392. Those pieces preserved only in Arabic, were translated into German by W. Strothmann, *Makarios/Symeon, Das arabische Sondergut* (Göttinger Orientforschungen, I. Reihe: Syriaca, 11; Wiesbaden 1975). For a concordance between the manuscripts TV and the different Macarian collections, see the synopsis of W. Strothmann in H. Dörries, *Symeon von Mesopotamien. Die Überlieferung der messalianischen "Makarios"-Schriften* (Texte und Untersuchungen, 55/1; Leipzig 1941) p. 471-475; and that of Strothman, *Das arabische Sondergut*, p. 7-14.

<sup>102</sup> See the edition, with Latin translation, by G. Garitte, *Lettres de Saint Antoine. Version géorgienne et fragments coptes* (CSCO, 148 & 149. Scriptores iberici, 5 & 6; Louvain 1955) 1: p. 11-12, 41-46 (text), 2: p. 7-8, 27-30 (translation). For an English translation of Antony's Letters, see S. Rubenson, *The Letters of St. Antony. Monasticism and the Making of a Saint* (Studies in Antiquity and Christianity; Minneapolis 1995). It should be, however, explicitly said, against Rubenson's statement on p. 15, that the Naples fragments are on parchment and not papyrus, whereas the seventh century dating proposed by Zoega and taken over by Rubenson is obviously obsolete.

<sup>103</sup> This is also Paola Buzi's hypothesis, based on Enzo Lucchesi's suggestion, see Buzi, *Catalogo*, p. 321.

<sup>104</sup> MONB.XN contains works by Shenoute and the consensus among scholars says that his genuine works were copied exclusively in the White Monastery. The codex was copied for the Monastery of Apa Shenoute at

## *Index of the Coptic manuscripts quoted in the previous pages*

<b>AUSTRIA</b>	131 <sup>3</sup> , ff. 18-24	<b>Cambridge (Corpus Christi College)</b>
<b>Vienna (Österreichische Nationalbibliothek)</b>	131 <sup>3</sup> , f. 27	541 8
K 2308	131 <sup>3</sup> , f. 38	<b>Cambridge (University Library)</b>
K 2644	131 <sup>3</sup> , f. 39	Or. 1699 F
K 7589	131 <sup>3</sup> , ff. 47-48	Or. 1699 L
K 9064	131 <sup>3</sup> , f. 64	Or. 1699 U
K 9065	131 <sup>4</sup> , ff. 129-132	<b>London (British Library)</b>
K 9126	131 <sup>4</sup> , ff. 133-138	Or. 3581A, f. 138
K 9220	131 <sup>4</sup> , f. 144	Or. 3581A, f. 142
K 9475	131 <sup>4</sup> , f. 146	Or. 3581A, f. 147
K 9478	131 <sup>5</sup> , f. 30	Or. 3581A, ff. 148-151
K 9537-9538	131 <sup>5</sup> , f. 45	Or. 3581A, f. 152
K 9547	131 <sup>5</sup> , f. 48	Or. 3581A, f. 153
K 9646	131 <sup>5</sup> , f. 64	Or. 3581A, ff. 157-158
K 9646	131 <sup>5</sup> , f. 87	Or. 3581B, f. 18
K 9760	131 <sup>5</sup> , f. 90	Or. 3581B, f. 19
K 9765-9766	131 <sup>5</sup> , f. 117	Or. 3581B, ff. 84-85
K 9789	131 <sup>5</sup> , f. 147	Or. 6807, f. 3
K 9805	131 <sup>6</sup> , ff. 5-6	<b>Oxford (Bodleian Library)</b>
	131 <sup>6</sup> , f. 29	Copt.e.177(P)
	131 <sup>6</sup> , f. 30	<b>Oxford (Clarendon Press)</b>
<b>EGYPT</b>	131 <sup>6</sup> , f. 34	b.3, ff. 5-8b
<b>Cairo (Coptic Museum)</b>	131 <sup>6</sup> , f. 54	b.4, f. 63 ( <i>olim</i> 82)
9227	131 <sup>6</sup> , f. 85	b.4, ff. 83-88 ( <i>olim</i> 100-105)
9277	131 <sup>6</sup> , f. 118	b.5, ff. 42-47
9287	131 <sup>6</sup> , f. 123	
<b>Cairo (IFAO)</b>	131 <sup>7</sup> , f. 18	
nos. 18-21	131 <sup>7</sup> , f. 37	
nos. 22-29	131 <sup>7</sup> , f. 43	
nos. 52-57	131 <sup>7</sup> , f. 47	
nos. 98-100	131 <sup>7</sup> , f. 60	
no. 244	131 <sup>7</sup> , f. 64	
no. 263	131 <sup>7</sup> , f. 68	
no. 314	131 <sup>7</sup> , f. 75	
	131 <sup>8</sup> , f. 147	
<b>FRANCE</b>	132 <sup>1</sup> , f. 52	
<b>Paris (Bibliothèque Nationale)</b>	132 <sup>1</sup> , f. 88	
102, f. 12	132 <sup>2</sup> , f. 6	
129 <sup>12</sup> , f. 14	132 <sup>2</sup> , f. 105	
129 <sup>13</sup> , f. 31	132 <sup>2</sup> , f. 106	
129 <sup>13</sup> , f. 36	132 <sup>3</sup> , f. 217	
129 <sup>13</sup> , f. 53	132 <sup>4</sup> , f. 285	
129 <sup>13</sup> , f. 64	132 <sup>4</sup> , f. 287	
129 <sup>14</sup> , f. 74	132 <sup>4</sup> , f. 318	
129 <sup>15</sup> , f. 62	132 <sup>4</sup> , f. 321	
129 <sup>17</sup> , f. 64	<b>Paris (Louvre)</b>	
129 <sup>17</sup> , f. 68	10039a	
130 <sup>3</sup> , ff. 55-58		
130 <sup>4</sup> , f. 99		
130 <sup>5</sup> , f. 126		
130 <sup>5</sup> , f. 133		
131 <sup>1</sup> , f. 8		
131 <sup>1</sup> , f. 9		
131 <sup>1</sup> , f. 10		
131 <sup>1</sup> , f. 33		
131 <sup>1</sup> , ff. 34-36		
131 <sup>3</sup> , f. 2		
	<b>GERMANY</b>	
	<b>Berlin (Papyrussammlung)</b>	
	P. Berol. 22220	
	<b>Berlin (Staatsbibliothek)</b>	
	1613, f. 8	
	<b>GREAT BRITAIN</b>	

IB.14, ff. 41-42

IB.14, f. 50

IB.15, ff. 11-14

IB.15, ff. 23-26

IB.16, f. 1

IB.16, f. 3

IB.16, ff. 4-5

IB.16, ff. 8-11

IB.16, f. 14

IB.16, ff. 20-23

IB.17, ff. 1-17

IB.17, f. 6

IB.17, f. 18

***Vatican (Biblioteca  
Apostolica)***

Borg. copt. 109, cass. XXV,  
fasc. 119

Borg. copt. 109, cass. XXIX,  
fasc. 166, ff. 1-2

Borg. copt. 109, cass. XXIX,  
fasc. 159, f. 5

Borg. copt. 109, cass. XXIX,  
fasc. 159, f. 9

#### **NETHERLANDS**

***Leiden (Rijksmuseum van  
Oudheden)***

111 = Insinger 66

118 = Insinger 73

130 = Insinger 85

131 = Insinger 86

F 1976/4, f. 2

F 1976/4, f. 3

F 1976/4, f. 31

#### **NORWAY**

***Oslo (University Library)***

no. 197

#### **UNITED STATES**

***Michigan (University Library)***

158.31

***New York (Pierpont Morgan  
Library)***

M594

M595

M706b

M910

<http://suciualin.wordpress.com/>