

Alin Suciu

## The Borgian Coptic Manuscripts in Naples: Supplementary Identifications and Notes to a Recently Published Catalogue

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 Shenoute, 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 Altemps 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> On the White Monastery library in general, see T. Orlandi, “The Library of the Monastery of St. Shenute at Atriye,” 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) pp. 211-231.

OCP 77 (2011) 000-000

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 history of Coptic studies will find in the first part of the book useful details on the formation of the Borgian Oriental collection, as well as on its founder (pp. 15-36), on the history of the Borgian Museum (pp. 37-75), and on the trajectory of the Coptic fragments until they were catalogued by Georg Zoega (pp. 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

<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).

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

<sup>5</sup> See already P. Buzi, "The Borgia Coptic Manuscripts Collection Preserved in Naples. A

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 (pp. 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 manu-

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) pp. 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.

scripts that can be adduced. I will not mention others of minor relevance as well 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.

#### IB.01, ff. 27-28 (Zoega CLXXIV)

Under this call number are held two leaves containing texts attributed to Pachomius, which come from MONB.DV, a codex of *excerpta* from different Patristic authors. However, some of the fragments listed as parts of the codex in question should be removed since they come from another manuscript (now MONB.OO). The paleographical comparison indicates, therefore, that Naples IB.01, f. 30 (pp. 151-152), IB.09, f. 23 (pp. 159-160), Paris BN 131<sup>1</sup>, f. 9 (pp. 247-248) and 131<sup>1</sup>, f. 10 (pp. xxx-xxx) belong to a similar but not identical *florilegium*, which I will discuss in the next entry.

#### IB.01, f. 30 (Zoega CLXXVI)

According to the original titles in the manuscript, the fragment contains the end of a writing by Theodore of Tabennesi and the beginning of another by the same author.<sup>9</sup> Although the catalogue ascribes this leaf to the previously mentioned MONB.DV, it was obviously copied by a different hand and must thus come from a separate codex.

L.-Th. Lefort,<sup>10</sup> one of the editors of the Pachomian authors, already connected IB.01, f. 30 to IB.01, ff. 27-28, but this hypothesis is supported neither with respect to paleography, nor with respect to codicology. Additionally that the hand of IB.01, f. 30 is much tidier<sup>11</sup> than that with which the previous two items were copied, the fragments have also different sizes: 31 × 25 cm for IB.01, ff. 27-28, against 35,5 × 29 cm for IB.01, f. 30.

<sup>9</sup> Edited in É. Amélineau, *Monuments pour servir à l'histoire de l'Égypte aux IV<sup>e</sup>, V<sup>e</sup>, VI<sup>e</sup> et VII<sup>e</sup> siècles. Texte copte publié et traduit* (MMAF, IV/2; Paris 1895) pp. 620-621; reedited in L.-Th. Lefort, *Œuvres de S. Pachôme et de ses disciples* 2 vols. (CSCO, 59 & 60. *Scriptores coptici*, 23 & 24; Louvain 1956) 1: pp. 60-62 (text), 2: 61-62 (translation).

<sup>10</sup> L.-Th. Lefort, *Œuvres de S. Pachôme*, 1: p. xvii (= Theodore no. 4).

<sup>11</sup> This scribe has copied, on a single column, one of the codices having the Festal Letters of Athanasius of Alexandria (MONB.AS or "codex B" according to the classification in L.-Th. Lefort, *S. Athanase. Lettres festales et pastorales en copte* [CSCO, 150. *Scriptores coptici*, 19; Louvain 1955] pp. vii-ix), and on two columns a codex dedicated to the martyr Psote (MONB.DP); cf. e.g. T. Orlandi, *Il dossier copto del martire Psote* (Testi e documenti per lo studio dell'Antichità. Serie copta, 61; Milan 1978) and the *Schriftprobe* no. 16 in W. Till, *Koptische Heiligen- und Martyrerlegenden*, vol. 1 (OCA, 102; Rome 1935).

Now, the following fragments seem to be traceable to the second *miscellanea* manuscript (MONB.OO):

London BL Or. 3581B, ff. 84-85 (pp. 115-118)<sup>12</sup>  
 Paris BN 131<sup>6</sup>, f. 34 (pp. 121-122)  
 Naples IB.01, f. 30 (pp. 151-152)  
 Naples IB.09, f. 23 (pp. 159-160)<sup>13</sup>  
 Paris BN 131<sup>1</sup>, f. 9 (pp. 247-248)  
 Paris BN 131<sup>1</sup>, f. 10 (xxx-xxx)  
 Cairo Coptic Museum 9277 (pp. xxx-xxx)<sup>14</sup>  
 Vienna K 7589 (pp. xxx-xxx)<sup>15</sup>  
 Vienna K 9220 (pp. xxx-xxx)

One of the most interesting literary pieces of this codex is preserved on the recto of Paris BN 131<sup>1</sup>, f. 9, which contains an extract from ps.-Athanasius, *Homilia de passione et Cruce Domini* (CPG 2247; BHG 446g, 449h; *Clavis coptica* 0939), attested also in Greek, Syriac, Armenian and Arabic. The surviving fragment testifies the existence of a Coptic translation of this work, and finds a parallel in PG 28, coll. 225C-228A:

Paris BN 131 <sup>1</sup> , f. 9r	ps.-Athanasius, <i>De Cruce et Passione</i> (PG 28, coll. 225C-228A)
<i>incipit</i> ... ΟΥΩϠΤ ΝΑϢ· ΑΥΩ ΝΕϢΕ- ΠΕΙΤΙΜΑ ΟΝ ΜΠΚΕΛΗCΤΗC	... προσκυνοῦντα τὸν Κύριον, καὶ ἐπι- πλήττοντα καὶ τῷ ἄλλῳ ληστῇ
<i>desinit</i> ... ΕΠΜΑ ΔΕ ΟΝ ΜΠCΙΩΕ ΕϢΕ- ΧΑΡΙΖΕ ΝΑΝ ΝΝΕϢΜΝΤΝΟϢ ΕΤΖΟΛϢ ΝΖΟΥΟ ΕΠΕΒΙΩ· ΜΝΠΜΟΥΛΖ	... ἀντὶ δὲ τῆς χολῆς τὰ γλυκύτερα ὑπὲρ μέλι καὶ κηρίον λόγια χάρισηται ἡμῖν

<sup>12</sup> Crum, *Catalogue BM*, pp. 171-172 (= no. 363).

<sup>13</sup> A. Guillaumont, *L'Asceticon copte de l'abbé Isaïe. Fragments sahidiques édités et traduits* (Bibliothèque d'études coptes, 5; Cairo 1956) pp. 41-42 (edition), 99-100 (French translation).

<sup>14</sup> Edited by H. Munier, *Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire. Nos 9201-9304: Manuscrits coptes* (Cairo 1916) pp. 130-132, see also plate XVIII for the photographic reproduction of the verso.

<sup>15</sup> Published by H. Förster, *Transitus Mariae. Beiträge zur koptischen Überlieferung. Mit einer Edition von P. Vindob. K 7589, Cambridge Add 1876 8 und Paris BN Copte 129<sup>17</sup>*, ff. 28 und 29 (GCS, 14. Neutestamentliche Apokryphen, II; Berlin 2006) pp. 3-41. Förster considers K 7589 part of a lost *Apocalypse of Mary*, but this position is very difficult, if not impossible, to sustain because of the abundance of similar Marianic homilies preserved in Coptic. Theoretically, it may be that the next fragment, K 9220, comes from the one and the same writing, as both are related to the Virgin. However, this is nothing else than a guess since neither of them is identified.

## IB.08, ff. 7-12 (Zoega CCXIII)

A series of five leaves containing the letters of Apa Moses the Archimandrite (*Clavis coptica* 0541). Although the folios are assigned to MONB.NQ,<sup>16</sup> the paleographical features are different enough as to prevent the attribution to this codex. The confusion occurred perhaps because the codex MONB.NQ included also, along with a catechesis by Horsiese, the *Canon* of Moses the Archimandrite (*Clavis coptica* 0237).<sup>17</sup> However, save that both manuscripts preserve different writings of Apa Moses, there is no physical resemblance between IB.08, ff. 7-12 and MONB.NQ.

## IB.08, f. 13 (Zoega CCXIV\*)

To codex MONB.EM, which contains the *Life of Moses the Archimandrite* (*Clavis coptica* 0423), should be attached another fragment from the Thompson collection, now in the Cambridge University Library, i.e. CUL Or. 1699 F.<sup>18</sup> This is one of the numerous fragments mistakenly ascribed to Shenoute,<sup>19</sup> authorship which cannot be defended anymore since the text coincides with a section in the other codex of *Vita Moysis* (MONB.EL), more precisely with IFAO nos. 23v-25r.

<sup>16</sup> The fragments of this codex were identified and published by Lefort, *Œuvres de S. Pachôme*, 1: pp. xx-xxii, 75-78 (introduction and edition), 2: 75-77 (translation) and supplemented by E. Lucchesi, "Le dossier d'Apa Zénobe. Addenda et corrigenda. Appendice II: Un *Logos* inconnu d'Isaïe de Scété. Chenouté, Isaïe et Moïse," *AB* 117 (1999) pp. 76-79 and Idem, "Deux pages inédites d'une instruction d'Horsiese sur les amitiés particulières," *Orientalia* 70 (2001) pp. 183-192.

<sup>17</sup> The "canon" ends on the verso of Paris BN 129<sup>12</sup>, f. 14, where a discourse by Horsiese begins. Edited by R.-G. Coquin, "La 'Règle' de Moïse d'Abydos," in *Mélanges Antoine Guillaumont: Contributions à l'étude des christianismes orientaux* (Cahiers d'Orientalisme, 20; Geneva 1988) pp. 103-110. Even though initially considered to be by Shenoute, Lucchesi, "Apa Zénobe," pp. 76-79 believes that the fragment London BL Or. 6807, f. 3 belongs also to the *Canon* of Moses. On the meaning of ΚΑΝΩΝ in this context, see Lucchesi, "Deux pages inédites," pp. 183 n. 3.

<sup>18</sup> The Cambridge fragments of the two White Monastery codices that contain the *Life of Moses* were edited and translated by Sami Uljas, "The Cambridge Leaves of the *Life of Moses* of Abydos," forthcoming article.

<sup>19</sup> The fragment is ascribed to Shenoute in A. Shisha-Halevy, *Coptic Grammatical Categories* (Analecta Orientalia, 53; Rome 1986) pp. 218. The same attribution can be found in Sir Herbert Thompson's personal notes — deposited together with the fragments in the Cambridge University Library as Or. 1700 —, which describes its content as "homily on the penitence." However, Stephen Emmel counts it among the Shenoute *dubia*, see S. Emmel, *Shenoute's Literary Corpus* 2 vols. (CSCO, 599 & 600. Subsidia, 111 & 112; Louvain 2004) p. 906.

## IB.08, ff. 29-30 (Zoega CCXIIX)

The call number IB.08, ff. 29-30 corresponds to a pair of folios concerning John of Lycopolis, the anchorite of Upper Egypt who, according to a widespread legend preserved in various versions, was so famous that the emperor Theodosius I invited him to Constantinople to receive his blessing before a battle.<sup>20</sup> Paleographically, the fragments are logically assigned to MONB.EN, which was baptized “codex A” in Father Devos’ articles about the Coptic dossier of John of Lycopolis.

As P. Peeters<sup>21</sup> and P. Devos<sup>22</sup> have remarked, part of the Sahidic *Vita Iohannis de Lykopolī* (BHO 515; *Clavis coptica* 0415) is, in fact, the translation of the first chapter from the anonymous *Historia monachorum in Aegypto* and represents — as far as we are aware today — the only Coptic witness of this writing concerning the Egyptian anchorites.

The vestiges of MONB.EN have been systematically recollected by Louis-Théophile Lefort and Paul Devos.<sup>23</sup> However, three supplementary fragments from Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris were omitted until a relatively recent date<sup>24</sup> and must be added to MONB.EN: BN 132<sup>2</sup>, f. 105 (which

<sup>20</sup> *Hist. monach.* I, 1; Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* XXXII, 2; Rufinus, *Hist. eccl.* XI, 19 and 32; Sozomen, *Hist. eccl.* VII, 22,7-8; Theodoret of Cyrhus, *Hist. eccl.* V, 25,2; Augustine, *Civ. Dei* V, 26; John Cassian, *Coe. inst.* IV, 23. The story illuminates the hagiographical confusion between John of Lycopolis, John Kolobos and Shenoute of Atriye. It is quite likely that the episode when John of Lycopolis is invited to Constantinople by Theodosius but the saint refuses to go, parallels *Vita Sinuthii* 53-63. Here, Theodosius (the Younger) learns that Abbot Shenoute is able to perform miracles and hopes to obtain his blessing. Shenoute refuses to go, but he is in the end miraculously transferred by a cloud to Constantinople.

The same confusion between John of Lycopolis and Shenoute can be observed in the anonymous Greek *Life of Saints Cyrus and John* (CPG 7648; PG 87, coll. 3685-3688), where the same legend is recounted. The emperor asks for help before a battle from saint Senoufe, an Egyptian monk whose fame as miracle worker has reached the imperial court in Constantinople. Senoufe (Σενούφις, τοῦτο γὰρ ὄνομα τῷ μακαρίῳ ἀνδρὶ), is not eager to go to the capital, but sends instead to the emperor his μαφόριον and his staff; with their help Theodosius vanquishes his enemies. The story of Senoufe/Shenoute (κατ’ Αἴγυπτον μέγαν Σενούφιον) is reported also by the Byzantine chronographer Michael Glycas (*Annales* IV, ed. I. Bekker, [CSHB; Bonn 1836] p. 478). It is equally interesting that the story related by the *Life of Cyrus and John* and Glycas, enjoyed a certain diffusion from Middle Ages to early modern times, having been often taken over by many authors. All the relevant sources are explored in a study that I have under preparation.

<sup>21</sup> P. Peeters, “Une vie copte de S. Jean de Lycopolis,” *AB* 54 (1936) p. 361.

<sup>22</sup> P. Devos, “Fragments coptes de l’*Historia monachorum* (Vie de S. Jean de Lycopolis BHO 515),” *AB* 87 (1969) pp. 419-421.

<sup>23</sup> Lefort’s identifications were presented by Peeters, “Une vie copte,” pp. 360-361; for further fragments see P. Devos, “Fragments coptes”; Idem, “Feuillets coptes nouveaux et anciens concernant S. Jean de Siout,” *AB* 88 (1970) pp. 153-187.

<sup>24</sup> The fragments have been identified by Devos but they were published only after his death by Ph. Luisier, “Jean de Lycopolis. Derniers fragments parisiens réunis par le Père De-

together with 129<sup>13</sup>, f. 64 form a single folio paginated 3-4), 132<sup>1</sup>, f. 52 (pp. 23-24) and 131<sup>3</sup>, f. 2 (pp. 35-36). Their interest is enhanced by the fact that they correspond to certain sections of *Historia monachorum* which are unattested otherwise in Sahidic (*HM* I, 2-5; 37-39; 57-61).<sup>25</sup>

IB.08, ff. 36-37 + IB.17, f. 18 (Zoega CCXX & CXX)

To MONB.NX we can also add a series of six successive folios (paginated from 107 to 118) from the collection of Clarendon Press, Oxford (b.5, ff. 42-47). They were edited by Amélineau together with the fragments in Naples under the title “Fragments thébains d’une vie de Jean Kolobos”<sup>26</sup> and narrates the circumstances in which a certain Apa John left his 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 ἔγκλειστος” or John of Siout, both names referring to John of Lycopolis.<sup>28</sup>

vos,” in U. Zanetti & E. Lucchesi, *Ægyptus Christiana. Mélanges d’hagiographie égyptienne et orientale dédiés à la mémoire du P. Paul Devos bollandiste* (Cahiers d’Orientalisme, 25; Geneva 2004) pp. 175-193.

<sup>25</sup> Greek text in A.-J. Festugière, *Historia monachorum in Aegypto* (Subsidia Hagiographica, 34; Brussels 1961); cf. also the French translation in Idem, *Les moines d’Orient IV/1. Enquête sur les moines d’Égypte (Historia monachorum in Aegypto) (sic!)* (Paris 1964).

<sup>26</sup> É. Amélineau, *Histoire des monastères de la Basse-Égypte* (Annales du Musée Guimet, 25; Paris 1894) pp. 414-422.

<sup>27</sup> W. Till, “Ein saidischer Bericht der Reise des Apa Johannes nach Babylon,” *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 37 (1938) pp. 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) pp. 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 ἔγκλειστος, cf. W. E. Crum, *Der Papyruscodex saec. VI-VII der Phillippsbibliothek in Cheltenham* (Strasbourg 1915) p. xvii. On page 15 of the Chester



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 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

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*, pp. 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) pp. 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) pp. 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) pp. 107-108.

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

belong a leaf in the Stadtbibliothek in Berlin, MS 1613, f. 8 (pp. 205-206), and a complete bifolio in the Papyrussammlung of the National Library in Vienna, K 9766-9765 (pp. 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 (pp. 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 (pp. [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,

<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: pp. 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*, pp. 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: pp. 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: pp. 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: pp. 365-366.

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

<sup>40</sup> Parallel in Draguet, *Logoi XIV-XXVI*, 1: 244-246, 2: pp. 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) pp. 91-93 (= no. 279); reedited with French translation in Guillaumont, *L'Asceticon copte*, pp. 11-12, 60-62.

<sup>43</sup> Syriac Logos 18; parallel in Draguet, *Logoi XIV-XXVI*, 1: 285-286, 2: pp. 355-356. Identified by E. Lucchesi, "Chénouté a-t-il écrit en grec?," in *Mélanges Guillaumont*, p. 207 n. 10.

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 (pp. 5-12) = Guillaumont, pp. 1-5 Paris BN 131 <sup>5</sup> , f. 64 (pp. xxx-xxx) = unpublished <sup>44</sup> Leiden Rijksmuseum 118 (pp. xxx-xxx) = Guillaumont, pp. 15-16 Naples IB.17, f. 6 (pp. xxx-xxx) = unpublished
Logos 4	Naples IB.09, f. 58 (pp. 57-58) = Guillaumont, pp. 5-6
Logos 16	Paris BN 131 <sup>7</sup> , f. 47 (pp. xxx-xxx) = unpublished
Logos 3	Naples IB.09, f. 59 (pp. 117-118) = Guillaumont, pp. 6-7
Logoi 3/15	Paris BN 129 <sup>13</sup> , f. 53 (pp. 123-124) = Guillaumont, pp. 7-8
Logos 21	Naples IB.09, f. 57 (pp. 131-132) = Guillaumont, pp. 8-9 Naples IB.14, f. 29 (pp. 135-136) = unpublished Paris BN 131 <sup>5</sup> , f. 146 (pp. xxx-xxx) = unpublished London BL Or. 3581A, f. 152 (pp. xxx-xxx) = Guillaumont, pp. 12-13
Logoi 21/20/7	Naples IB.14, f. 30 (pp. [151]-[152]) = unpublished Leiden Rijksmuseum 111 (pp. 157-158) = Guillaumont, pp. 10-11
Logos 22	Paris BN 131 <sup>5</sup> , f. 45 (pp. 171-172) = unpublished
Logoi 23/28	Paris BN 131 <sup>5</sup> , f. 48 (pp. [191]-[192]) = Guillaumont, pp. 13-15 Cairo IFAO nos. 52-57 (pp. 193-204) = unpublished Berlin Stadtbibliothek 1613, f. 8 (pp. 205-206) = unpublished Vienna K 9766 (pp. 207-208) = unpublished Vienna K 9765 (pp. 221-222) = unpublished
Logoi 28/? <sup>45</sup>	Paris BN 129 <sup>13</sup> , f. 36 (pp. xxx-xxx) = Guillaumont, pp. 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>46</sup> The leaf represents

<sup>44</sup> This fragment was identified in Lucchesi, "Chénouté a-t-il écrit en grec?", p. 207 n. 10.

<sup>45</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.BQ 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>46</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

pages 39-40 of the manuscript, and would fall thus in the lacuna between Vatican Borg. copt. 109, cass. XXIX, fasc. 159, ff. 9 (pp. 29-30) and 5 (pp. 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>47</sup>

The content of MONB.YI, according to the CMCL database: Leiden Rijksmuseum 130 (pp. 17-18); Oxford Clarendon Press b.4, ff. 83-88 (*olim* 100-105) (pp. 19-30); Naples IB.10, f. 48 (pp. 47-48); IB.10, f. 49 (pp. 51-52); IB.10, ff. 50-51 (pp. 55-58); IB.10, f. 52 (pp. 61-62); Paris BN 130<sup>4</sup>, f. 99 (pp. 93-94); 131<sup>5</sup>, f. 30 (pp. 111-112); Naples IB.10, f. 53 (pp. 147-148); IB.10, f. 54 (pp. 157-158). Perhaps we should also be considering as part of the same codex London BL Or. 3581A, f. 138 (= Crum no. 238) (pp. xxx-xxx) and Paris BN 132<sup>2</sup>, f. 6 (pp. xxx-xxx).

#### IB.11, ff. 110-136 (Zoega CCLIII)

The fragments belong to MONB.NE, a codex which has not yet received the attention it deserves. This valuable manuscript contained Sahidic translations from the ascetic writings which are transmitted in Greek under the name of Ephrem the Syrian. To the rich inventories of fragments

---

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>47</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.

traced by Delio Vania Proverbio<sup>48</sup> and Enzo Lucchesi,<sup>49</sup> we can add two other testimonies from Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris: BN 131<sup>5</sup>, f. 90 and 131<sup>5</sup>, f. 147, both preserving parts of *De perfectione monachi* (CPG 3971; *Clavis coptica* 0860), whose Greek text has been available for a long time in Assemani's edition.<sup>50</sup> BN 131<sup>5</sup>, f. 147 joins two other fragments (Paris BN 131<sup>7</sup>, f. 75 + Vienna K 9789), in order to form a single folio which bears the page numbers 178-179, the pagination of the manuscript following at this point the sequence even-odd. On this basis we can infer that BN 131<sup>5</sup>, f. 90, whose page numbers are currently lost, must have been paginated 176-177 since it preceded the previously mentioned leaf.

IB.12, ff. 14-17, IB.13, ff. 41-46, IB.14, f. 37 (Zoega CCLVII, CCLXVII & CCLXXXIX)

Fragments of MONB.GD. About the content of this codex, cf. *infra* IB.14, f. 36.

IB.12, f. 25 (Zoega CCLIX)

IB.12, f. 25 is only spuriously attributed to ps.-Evodius, *In Mariam Virginem* (CANT 133; *Clavis coptica* 0151), because the text does not correspond to any of the numerous Sahidic and Bohairic witnesses of this homily.<sup>51</sup>

As regards Oxford, Clarendon Press b.3, ff. 5-8b,<sup>52</sup> which are thought to represent other bits from the same codex, they are indeed part of ps.-Evodius' sermon on the Dormition, but the paleographical inspection shows that they must come from a separate manuscript. For the sake of argument, it must be specified that the Clarendon Press fragments belonged to

<sup>48</sup> D. V. Proverbio, "Auctarium au dossier copte de l'Éphrem grec," *Orientalia* 66 (1997) pp. 78-85.

<sup>49</sup> E. Lucchesi, "Un corpus éphrémien en copte," *AB* 116 (1998) pp. 107-114. E. Lucchesi, "Evagrius copticus," *AB* 117 (1999) p. 284, found intercalated among the Ephremian sermons a work attributed in some Greek manuscripts to Evagrius (*Rerum monachalium rationes* = CPG 2441). It is, however, very likely that this writing has been also transmitted under the name of Ephrem, since we have reasons to believe that codex MONB.NE was exclusively dedicated to him.

<sup>50</sup> J. Assemani, *Sancti Patris Nostri Ephraem Syri opera omnia quae exstant* Ser. 1/Graece et latine 2 (Rome 1743) pp. 412E-414A. Assemani's edition was taken over by K. G. Phrantzoules, 'Θσίου Ἐφραίμ τοῦ Σύρου ἔργα (Thessalonica 1990) 3: pp. 378-381.

<sup>51</sup> A complete inventory of all the surviving fragments of this sermon on the Dormition of the Virgin has not been attempted yet, but I was able to count no less than nine codices in Sahidic and three in Bohairic.

<sup>52</sup> The leaves were described and published by F. Robinson, *Coptic Apocryphal Gospels* (Texts and Studies, 4/2; Cambridge 1896) pp. xxv, 70-87.

the same codex as London BL Or. 3581B, f. 19, which equally corresponds to ps.-Evodius homily on the Virgin.<sup>53</sup>

Returning now to Naples IB.12, f. 25 (paged 85-86), this was seemingly preceded in the codex by Paris BN 131<sup>7</sup>, f. 37 (pp. 19-20), Vatican Borg. copt. 109, cass. XXV, fasc. 119 (Zoega CXIX)<sup>54</sup> (two folios originally paginated 39-42) and Cambridge Or. 1699 U (pp. 73-74). My suggestion is based on the codex format, the paleographical evidence — including the same type of ornaments for the page numbers — and, last but not least, the thematic unity of the texts, which are all focused on the Virgin.

IB.13, ff. 31-38 (Zoega CCLXV)

The leaves, part of a homily on the twelve apostles attributed to Bachios of Maiuma (*Clavis coptica* 0067), are already edited with a French translation by Françoise Morard.<sup>55</sup>

IB.13, ff. 63-64 (Zoega CCLXXIV)

The two fragments, having the page numbers 137-138 and 155-156, do not belong to the *Passio Petri Alexandrini* (*Clavis coptica* 0527), but to the *Encomium on Mark the Evangelist* by John of Shmun (*Clavis coptica* 0186).<sup>56</sup> This is ascertained by the frequent references to Mark, Barnabas

<sup>53</sup> Cf. Crum, *Catalogue BM*, p. 133 (= no. 302); published by Robinson, *Apocryphal Gospels*, pp. 164-167. The text of this codex belongs to a somewhat different recension of ps.-Evodius, but the versions are still close enough to speak about the same sermon. The London fragment recounts the episode of the marriage at Cana Galilee and corresponds, more or less, to the version published by S. Shoemaker, "The Sahidic Coptic Homily on the Dormition of the Virgin Attributed to Evodius of Rome. An Edition from Morgan MSS 596 & 598 with Translation," *AB* 117 (1999) p. 264.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. T. Orlandi, *Coptic Texts Relating to Virgin Mary. An Overview* (CMCL; Rome 2008) pp. 27, 76. Edited in Robinson, *Apocryphal Gospels*, pp. 22-25. Coptic text reproduced in É. Revillout, *Apocryphes coptes du Nouveau Testament* (Études Égyptologiques, 7. Textes, 1; Paris 1876) pp. 12-14. The Vatican fragments contain the so-called "miracles of the Virgin at Bartos," which is attributed, at least in Arabic, to Cyril of Jerusalem (French translation in R. Basset, *Les apocryphes éthiopiens V. Les prières de la Vierge à Bartos et au Golgotha* [Paris 1895 pp. 48-71]; details in G. Graf, *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur*, vol. 1: *Die Übersetzungen* [Studi e testi, 118; Vatican 1944] pp. 253-255). Several Bohairic fragments of the same text were edited in A. van Lantschoot, "Miracles opérés par la S. Vierge à Bartos (fragments bohairiques)," *Studia Anselmiana* 27-28 (1951) pp. 504-511.

<sup>55</sup> F. Morard, "Homélie copte sur les apôtres au Jugement dernier," in D. H. Warren, A. G. Brock & D. W. Pao (eds.), *Early Christian Voices. In Texts, Traditions, and Symbols. Essays in Honor of François Bovon* (Biblical Interpretation Series, 66; Leiden/Boston 2003) pp. 417-430.

<sup>56</sup> The title of the encomium is preserved fragmentarily on Paris BN 131<sup>8</sup>, f. 147v. Both of

and Paul. Moreover, the second fragment (IB.13, f. 64) overlaps the text of London BL Or. 3581B, f. 18,<sup>57</sup> which is from another copy of the encomium on Mark.

#### IB.13, ff. 65-66 (Zoega CCLXXV)

These two folios, whose pagination is missing, offer the text of a debate between the patriarch Theodosius of Alexandria and the emperor Justinian concerning the Council of Chalcedon. Although the dialogue seems to be fictitious, we know that Justinian summoned Theodosius to Constantinople in December 536 and tried to persuade him to accept the definition of Chalcedon during a long debate,<sup>58</sup> but the patriarch continued to maintain his anti-Chalcedonian position.

As it is rightly observed in the catalogue, Vatican Borg. copt. 109, cass. XXIX, fasc. 166, ff. 1-2 (pp. 5-8) belonged to the same codex (MONB.NC). It should be mentioned that Walter E. Crum, who knew the Vatican folios as well as those in Naples, associated them with another fragment, today in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, i.e. BN 129<sup>14</sup>, f. 74 (pages 49-50 of the original manuscript).<sup>59</sup> All the fragments identified by Crum are available in the edition (with French translation) of René-G. Coquin.<sup>60</sup> The vestiges of this anti-Chalcedonian chronicle are completed by an additional fragment in the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek in Vienna (call number K 9616, pagination lost).

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

the Neapolitan fragments were published a long time ago by I. Guidi, "Di alcune pergamene saidiche della collezione borgiana," *Rendiconti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche* V/2 (1893) pp. 513-530; cf. also T. Orlandi, *Studi copti. 1) Un encomio di Marco Evangelista. 2) Le fonti copte della Storia dei Patriarchi di Alessandria. 3) La legenda di S. Mercurio* (Testi e documenti per lo studio dell'Antichità, 22; Milano 1968) pp. 24-26, 30-34 (new edition of IB.13, f. 63 and partly of IB.16, f. 64).

<sup>57</sup> Crum, *Catalogue BM*, pp. 132-133 (= no. 300), cf. Orlandi, *Studi copti*, p. 9.

<sup>58</sup> M. Whitby, *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius Scholasticus* (Translated Texts for Historians, 33; Liverpool 2000) pp. 210-211 n. 30.

<sup>59</sup> W. E. Crum's review of J. Maspero, *Histoire des Patriarches d'Alexandrie*, in *Journal of Theological Studies* 25 (1924) pp. 425-432, here 430.

<sup>60</sup> R.-G. Coquin, "Fragments d'une chronique, relatifs à un patriarche d'Alexandrie, sans doute Théodose (535-566 A.D.)," *BSAC* 30 (1991) pp. 1-24.

Alexandria,<sup>61</sup> the references to the “abominable council (σύνοδος)” and “the impious (ἀσεβής) 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>62</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 Jerusa-

<sup>61</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>62</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) pp. 345-350 (= no. 170).



lem's *De passione I*.<sup>63</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>64</sup> and from New York, M595, ff. 1r-27v, for *De passione I*.

- In Crucem*      Vienna K 9475 (pp. 15-16) = Campagnano, pp. 86-88  
                     Oxford Bodleian Library Copt.e.177(P) (pp. [17]-[18]) = Campagnano, pp. 88-89  
                     Paris BN 131<sup>5</sup>, f. 117 (pp. [19]-[20])<sup>65</sup> = Campagnano, p. 90  
                     Naples IB.12, ff. 14-15 (pp. 35-38), IB.13, ff. 41-42 (pp. 39-42), IB.12, ff. 16-17 (pp. 43-46), IB.13, f. 43 (pp. 47-48)<sup>66</sup> = Campagnano, pp. 102-112  
                     Paris Louvre E 10084 (pp. 81-82) = Campagnano, p. 136  
                     Bolaffi fragment (pagination lost) = Campagnano, pp. 142-144<sup>67</sup>
- De passione I*    Paris BN 131<sup>7</sup>, f. 18v-r (pp. [97]-[98]) = M595, f. 1r, col. I-1v, col. I  
                     Naples IB.13, ff. 44-46 (pp. 101-106) = M595, f. 2r, col. II-4r, col. I  
                     Paris Louvre 10039a (pp. xxx-xxx) = M595, f. 6r, col. I-6v, col. I  
                     Cairo Coptic Museum 9227 (pp. 121-122)<sup>68</sup> = M595, f. 8v, col. I-9r, col. I  
                     Paris BN 131<sup>7</sup>, f. 64 (pp. [129]-[130]) = M595, f. 10v, col. II-11r, col. II  
                     Paris BN 129<sup>17</sup>, f. 68 (pp. 131-132) = M595, f. 11r, col. II-12r, col. II  
                     Paris BN 131<sup>7</sup>, f. 60 (pp. [133]-[134]) = M595, f. 12r, col. I-12v, col. I  
                     Naples IB.14, f. 36 (pp. 137-138) = M595, f. 13v, col. II-14r, col. II  
                     Paris BN 131<sup>6</sup>, f. 54 (pp. 139-140) = M595, f. 14r, col. II-15r, col. I  
                     Paris BN 129<sup>17</sup>, f. 64 (pp. 159-160) = M595, f. 20v, col. I-21r, col. II

<sup>63</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>64</sup> Campagnano, *Omelie copte*, pp. 75-149.

<sup>65</sup> Identified by E. Lucchesi, "L'homélie copte de Cyrille de Jérusalem en l'honneur de la Sainte Croix. Nouveaux apports," *AB* 98 (1980) p. 84, where the author ascribes it to a different codex than ours.

<sup>66</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*, pp. 178-185.

<sup>67</sup> This and nine other Sahidic fragments, all from the White Monastery, were bought in July 2009 by the Italian company Bolaffi from Sotheby's in London. In December 2009, the fragments were presented without identification by Federico Bottigliengo in *Il collezionista* pp. 20-23. In the meanwhile, I have identified all these fragments and I will discuss them soon in an article.

<sup>68</sup> Munier, *Manuscripts coptes*, pp. 16-18.

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

I should like to mention the existence of another fragment from the Woide collection in Oxford, Clarendon Press b.4, f. 63 (*olim* 82) (pp. 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> [...] ΧΕ ΜΑΡΟΥΩΨΤ ΝΑϢ ΝΌΙ- ΝΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ Μ̅ΠΝΟΥΤΕ·	50,5 προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγ- γελοι θεοῦ
<i>desinit</i> ἀλλὰ πεχᾶϣ ΧΕ ΟΥ ΠΕΤΕ- ΚΧΩ Μ̅ΜΟϢ· ΕϢΟΓΩΨ ΝΌΙΠΕΪΩΤ [...]	52,1 Ἀλλά, φασί, τί οὖν λέγεις; θέλων ἐγέννησεν ὁ πατήρ ...

If Epiphanius' work has survived indeed in two different Sahidic codi-

<sup>70</sup> Crum, *Catalogue BM*, p. 109 (= no. 246).

<sup>72</sup> A. Camplani, "Epifanio (*Ancoratus*) e Gregorio di Nazianzo (*Epistulae*) in copto: identificazioni e *status quaestionis*," *Augustinianum* 35 (1995) pp. 327-343.

<sup>73</sup> I have consulted the Greek text in K. Holl, *Epiphanius I. Ancoratus und Panarion haer.* 1-33 (GCS, 25; Leipzig 1915).

ces, rather than a single one copied alternatively by two scribes,<sup>74</sup> then the new testimony from Oxford must be ascribed to MONB.HA:

Epiphanius, *Ancoratus*

- Cairo Coptic Museum 9287 (pp. xxx-xxx) = chap. 15,2-8<sup>75</sup>
- Paris BN 131<sup>3</sup>, ff. 19-21 (pp. 65-70) = chap. 29,7-32,7
- Paris BN 131<sup>3</sup>, ff. 22-24 (pp. 75-80) = chap. 34,3-37,2
- New York Pierpont Morgan M706b (pp. 93-94) = chap. 43,6-44,4<sup>76</sup>
- Clarendon Press b.4, f. 63 (pp. 105-106) = chap. 50,5-52,1
- London BL Or. 3581A, f. 153 (pp. 115-116) = chap. 55,7-56,4<sup>77</sup>
- Cambridge CUL Or. 1699 L (beginning of the 10<sup>th</sup> quire) = chap. 65,1-8<sup>78</sup>
- London BL Or. 3581A, f. 142 (pp. 193-194) = chap. 95,1-96,3<sup>79</sup>
- Naples IB.14, f. 41 (pp. 195-196) = chap. 96,5-97,7
- Naples IB.14, f. 42 (pp. 199-200) = chap. 98,7-99,4
- Paris BN 130<sup>3</sup>, ff. 55-58 (pp. 211-218) = chap. 104,6-108,1
- Paris BN 131<sup>3</sup>, f. 18 (pp. 219-220) = chap. 108,1-109,2

IB.14, f. 50 (Zoega CCXCII)

Paris BN 131<sup>3</sup>, ff. 47-48 should be excluded from the list of fragments related to IB.14, f. 50 since both of them belonged to MONB.CE (Epiphanius of Salamina, *De XII gemmis*).

As the signature on the verso indicates, the Naples folio was the last of the first quire and the page numbers 15-16 are given as certain by Zoega,<sup>80</sup> although today they are lost in the lacuna. Part of the same sermon (and codex) are Paris BN 130<sup>5</sup>, f. 133 + 131<sup>6</sup>, f. 85 (forming together a single leaf paged 19-20) and 131<sup>1</sup>, f. 33 (pages 21-22). The surviving parts are silent concerning the authorship of the text, but on the verso of BN 131<sup>1</sup>, f. 33, which was the last page of the homily, we can read: παῖ πε πεζοοῦ

<sup>74</sup> For different opinions concerning the manuscript(s), cf. E. Lucchesi, "Un corpus épiphaniien en copte," *AB* 99 (1981) pp. 96-98 and A. I. Elanskaya, "A Fragment of *Ancoratus* in Coptic (the Ms. I.1.b.668 of the Pushkin Museum of Fine Arts)," *BSAC* 28 (1986-1989) pp. 5-10.

<sup>75</sup> Munier, *Manuscripts coptes*, pp. 152-154.

<sup>76</sup> Described and edited in Depuydt, *Catalogue*, pp. 163-165 (= no. 82); identified by Camplani, "Epifanio," p. 327.

<sup>77</sup> Cf. Crum, *Catalogue BM*, pp. 110-111 (= no. 248).

<sup>78</sup> Fragment attributed to Shenoute in A. Shisha-Halevy, *Coptic Grammatical Categories*, pp. 207, 218.

<sup>79</sup> Cf. Crum, *Catalogue BM*, p. 108 (= no. 241).

<sup>80</sup> Zoega, *Catalogus*, p. 633.

ΝΤΑΝΑΛΥΜΨΙC ΜΠΕΝΧΟΕΙC ΙC ΠΕΧC ΠΕΝCΩΤΗΡ, which suggests that it was a homily for the Ascension Day.

We are fortunate, however, to discover that Naples IB.14, f. 50 is partly overlapped by Vienna K 9478, which represents therefore a fragment from another copy (hereafter codex B; new CMCL siglum: MONB.OQ) of the same text. This parallel is decisive to unveil the authorship of the sermon, since K 9478 was preceded in the codex by Paris BN 131<sup>1</sup>, f. 8 (pp. 47-48) and Naples IB.14, ff. 34-35 (pp. [51]-[52] and [57]-[58]),<sup>81</sup> the recto of the first fragment being the title page of the text, which is introduced as an exegesis (ΕΞΕΓΗCΙC) of Athanasius of Alexandria on the Ascension of Christ (CPG 2198; Clavis coptica 0446).

Three pages from MONB.DV, represented by Naples IB.11, ff. 77r-78r (pp. 293-295), offer an extract from the same homily and fills an important lacuna in the previous two manuscripts. Here again, the attribution to Athanasius is confirmed by a *subscriptio* which occurs on IB.11, f. 78r: ΑΠΑ ΑΘΑΝΑΣΙΟC ΠΑΡΧΙΕΠΙCΚΟΠΟC ΝΡΑΚΟΤΕ.

Finally, it is interesting to remark that the sermon on the Ascension attributed, perhaps spuriously, to Athanasius was immediately followed in codices A and B by ps.-Chrysostom, *In Pentecosten, sermo 1* (CPG 4536; *Clavis coptica* 0165). The juxtaposition of these two texts in both manuscripts assures their liturgical unity, since the Ascension and the Pentecost represent the last major moments of the Paschal cycle.

Codex A (MONB.OP)	Codex B (MONB.OQ)	Codex C (MONB.DV)
ps.-Athanasius, <i>De ascensione Christi</i>	ps.-Athanasius, <i>De ascensione Christi</i>	
	Paris 131 <sup>1</sup> , f. 8 (pp. 47-48)	
	<i>lacuna</i>	
	Naples IB.14, f. 34v-r (pp. [51]-[52])	Naples IB.11, f. 77 (pp. 293-294)
	<i>lacuna</i>	Naples IB.11, f. 78r (295)
	Naples IB.14, f. 35v-r (pp. [57]-[58])	
<i>lacuna</i>	Vienna K 9478 (pp. [59 <sup>2</sup> ]-[60 <sup>2</sup> ])	
IB.14, f. 50 (pp. [15]-[16])	<i>lacuna</i>	
<i>lacuna</i>		
Paris 130 <sup>5</sup> , f. 133 + 131 <sup>6</sup> , f. 85 (pp. 19-20)		
Paris BN 131 <sup>1</sup> , f. 33 (pp. 21-22)		

<sup>81</sup> Page numbers given according to Zoega, who was still able to read them, cf. his *Catalogus*, p. 632.

ps.-Chrysostom, <i>In Pentecosten 1</i> Paris BN 131 <sup>1</sup> , ff. 34-36 (pp. 23-28) <sup>82</sup> <i>lacuna</i> Paris BN 129 <sup>17</sup> , f. 62 (pp. 35-36) <sup>83</sup> <i>lacuna</i> Leiden 131, ff. 1-2 (pp. [39]-[42]) <sup>84</sup> <i>lacuna</i> Paris BN 131 <sup>3</sup> , f. 64 (pp. 47-48) <sup>85</sup> Vienna K 9547 (pp. 49- 50) <sup>86</sup>	ps.-Chrysostom, <i>In Pentecosten 1</i>    <i>lacuna</i> Paris BN 131 <sup>3</sup> , f. 38 (pp. 83-84) <sup>87</sup> <i>lacuna</i> Paris BN 131 <sup>6</sup> , f. 123 (pp. 89-90) <sup>88</sup> Paris BN 131 <sup>3</sup> , f. 39 (pp. 91-92) <sup>89</sup>	
--	--	--

#### IB.15, ff. 11-14 (Zoega CCXCVII)

As Paola Buzi rightly observes, these folios belonged to one of the Pachomian codices. Other supplements from the same codex were identified by Enzo Lucchesi.<sup>90</sup>

#### IB.15, ff. 23-26 (Zoega CCCIV)

Although left without attribution, the folios are from a codex (MONB. FV) containing the so-called *In canticum vineae* (Clavis coptica 0020).<sup>91</sup>

<sup>82</sup> Cf. E. Lucchesi, *Répertoire des manuscrits coptes (sahidiques) publiés de la Bibliothèque nationale de Paris* (Cahiers d'Orientalisme, 1; Geneva 1981) pp. 69-70.

<sup>83</sup> Identified in Lucchesi, *Répertoire des manuscrits*, p. 48.

<sup>84</sup> Edited by Pleyte & Boeser, *Manuscrits coptes*, pp. 394-399 (= Insinger 86).

<sup>85</sup> Identified in Lucchesi, *Répertoire des manuscrits*, p. 76; cf. Idem, "D'Un encomio copto di Raffaele Arcangelo' à un sermon sur la Pentecôte attribué à Jean Chrysostome," VC 35 (1981) pp. 352-353.

<sup>86</sup> Published in T. Orlandi, "Un encomio copto di Raffaele Arcangelo ('Relatio Theophili')," *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 44 (1974) pp. 211-233; identified by Lucchesi, "D'Un encomio copto'."

<sup>87</sup> Identified in Lucchesi, *Répertoire des manuscrits*, p. 75.

<sup>88</sup> Identified in Lucchesi, *Répertoire des manuscrits*, p. 82; cf. Idem, "D'Un encomio copto'."

<sup>89</sup> The verso of this leaf bears a colophon according to which the codex was copied by the scribe Matthew in the Touton *scriptorium* in the year 656 Era of the Martyrs (939-940 AD). The codex was donated later to the Monastery of Apa Shenoute. Cf. A. van Lantschoot, *Recueil des colophons des manuscrits chrétiens d'Égypte* (Bibliothèque du Muséon, 1; Louvain 1929) pp. 88-90 (= no. LV).

<sup>90</sup> E. Lucchesi, "Nouvelles glanures pachômiennes," *Orientalia* 74 (2005) pp. 86-90.

<sup>91</sup> P. Devos, "Une histoire de Joseph le Patriarche dans une œuvre copte sur le Chant de

## IB.16, f. 1 (Zoega CCCV)

IB.16, f. 1 is an unidentified folio paginated 47-48. From the same scribe, and very likely from the same manuscript, come Naples IB.16, f. 3 and Vienna K 9760 (pp. 94-95 sic!).

The content of IB.16, f. 3, whose pagination is lost, was identified as Cyril of Alexandria's *Epistola II ad Succensum* (CPG 5346),<sup>92</sup> a document which was used to support both Chalcedonian and anti-Chalcedonian arguments.<sup>93</sup> Although the other two leaves still resist a 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):<sup>94</sup>

Naples IB.16, f. 1	Oratio ad Augustas de fide (PG 76, col. 1388 = Schwartz, ACO 1.1.5) <sup>10</sup>
<p>ΕΤΕ ΠΧΟΕΙC ΠΕ ΚΑΤΑ ΤΕΦΥCΙC·  ΚΑΝ ΕΛΧΩΠΕ ΖΗΤΜΟΡΦΗ ΝΖΜΖΑΛ·  ΕΧΟ ΟΝ ΝΘΕ ΕΝΕΧΟ ΜΜΟC· ΤΑΙ ΟΝ  ΤΕ ΘΕ ΕΤΝΧΩ ΜΜΟC ΕΡΟC· ΧΕ  ΛΧΧΙ ΝΤΜΝΤΑΡΧΕΙΕΡΕΥC· ΖΜΠΤΡΕ-  CΩΠΕ ΝΤΝΖΕ· ΚΑΙΤΟΙ ΟΥΝΤΑC  ΜΜΑΥ· ΝΖΕΝΤΒΑ ΝΤΒΑ ΝΛΙΤΟΥΡΓΟC  ΖΝΜΠΗΥΕ· ΕΥΕΙΝΕ ΝΑC ΕΖΡΑΪ ΝΖΕ-  ΝΘΥCΙΑ ΝΑΤCΝΟC· ΑΥΩ ΝΟΙΗΤΟΝ·  ΕΤΕ ΝΖΥΜΝΟC ΝΕ· ΜΝΝΕΟΟΥ</p>	<p>ὥσπερ γὰρ καίτοι τῇ φύσει κύριος ὢν  μεμένηκεν ὅπερ ἦν, κἂν εἰ γέγονεν ἐν  τῇ τοῦ δούλου μορφῇ, οὕτω φαμέν  ὅτι καίτοι μυρίος ἔχων ἐν οὐρανῶι  τοὺς ἱερουργοῦντας αὐτῶι, τὰς νοητὰς  δηλονότι καὶ ἀναιμάκτους θυσίας, ὕμνος  καὶ δοχολογίας</p>

la Vigne," *AB* 94 (1976) pp. 137-154.

<sup>92</sup> Buzi, *Catalogo*, p. 320, following Enzo Lucchesi; corresponding passage in E. Schwartz, *Acta Concilium Oecumenicorum*, vol. 1.6: *Concilium Universale Ephesenum* (Berlin & Leipzig 1927) pp. 160-161. English translation from the parallel Greek text in Cyril of Alexandria, *Letters 1-50* (ed. J. I. McEnerney; The Fathers of the Church, 76; Washington 1987) pp. 202-203.

<sup>93</sup> The letter contains the famous Miaphysite formula μία φύσις τοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένη. Cf. the use of this 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," pp. 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>94</sup> Greek text taken from Schwartz, *ACO*, 1.1.5: p. 47.

The same fragment was taken over in the Greek *catenae* on the Epistles of Paul, where is explicitly attributed to Cyril of Alexandria.<sup>95</sup>

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

These two folios (pp. 131-132, 145-146) were edited and translated into French by Émile Amélineau among the works of Shenoute,<sup>96</sup> and his attribution went unchallenged for a long time.<sup>97</sup> However, Stephen Emmel counted them among the *dubia* in his *magnum opus* concerning the Shenoutean literature.<sup>98</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>99</sup>

The Coptic text corresponds to the Macarian Homily C 38 (= no. 26 in Collection III<sup>100</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>101</sup>

Naples IB.16, f. 4r	ps.-Macarius, <i>Hom.</i> C 38 (Klostermann & Berthold, p. 140)
<p>ΕΝΝΑΜΕΕΥΕ ΔΕ ΟΝ ΧΕ ΣΕΨΟΟΠ          ΝΣΙΟΥΗΡ ΝΑΣΠΕ Η ΝΣΟΦΙΑ Η ΜΜΝ-          ΤΡΜΝΖΗΤ· Η ΟΥΗΡ ΝΤΕΧΝΗ ΝΕΠΙΣΤΗ-          ΜΕΙ Η ΝΖΩΒ Η ΝΣΠΟΥΔΗ Η ΜΜΝΤΡΜ-          ΜΑΟ ΕΥΨΟΒΕ ΖΝΟΥΑΤΟ ΝΣΜΟΤ· ΑΥΩ</p>	<p>Πόσαι γλώσσαι ἐν κόσμῳ, πόσαι σοφαί,          πόσαι φρονήσεις, πόσαι τέχναι, πόσαι ἐπι-          στήμαι καὶ ἐπιτηδεύματα καὶ σπουδὴ καὶ          πλοῦτος ἐν τῇ γῇ, καὶ οὐδὲν τούτων ἐστὶν          ὃ χρῆζουσι καὶ ἐν ᾧ ζῶσι Χριστιανοί.</p>

<sup>95</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>96</sup> É. Amélineau, *Œuvres de Shenoudi: Texte copte et traduction française*, vol. 2 (Paris 1914) pp. 487-491.

<sup>97</sup> The fragments were still considered Shenoutean in Shisha-Halevy, *Coptic Grammatical Categories*, p. 255.

<sup>98</sup> See Emmel, *Shenoute's Literary Corpus*, p. 906.

<sup>99</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*, pp. 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>100</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. Homélies propres à la Collection III* (ed. V. Desprez. SC, 275; Paris 1980).

<sup>101</sup> Our Coptic text covers Klostermann & Berthold, *Neue Homilien*, pp. 140,11-141,12; 146,21-147,24.

2NNAI THPOY N4W00Π AN N6IT2WB ETOYXPPIA MMO4 AYW ETOYON2 N2HT4 N6INEXPICTIANOC	
--	--

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

Paris BN 102, f. 12	ps.-Macarius, <i>Hom. C 12</i> (Klostermann & Berthold, pp. 25-26)
<i>incipit</i> [ΤΩ]ΟΥΝ ΖΑΠΝΟΘΝΕΘ ΜΠΑ- CPOC ΖΙΧΝΝΕΥΝΑΖΒ ΜΝΝΑΖΙCΕ ΖΜΠΕΥCΩΜΑ <i>desinit</i> ...NHTN NTMNTPMMAO NMΠHYE· AYW TETNΓYMNAZE NNETNCΩMA 2N[...]	οί τήν ὕβριν τοῦ σταυροῦ μου βαστάσαντες ἐν τοῖς ὤμοις αὐτῶν καί τὰ πάθη μου ἐν τοῖς σώμασιν αὐτῶν ... τὸν οὐράνιον πλοῦτον. Καὶ γὰρ ἐν τῇ χαμευνίᾳ τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν γυμνάζοντες

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>103</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>104</sup> are copied by the same hand

<sup>102</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>103</sup> On the Arabic tradition in general, see Graf, *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur*, pp. 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) pp. 471-475; and that of Strothman, *Das arabische Sondergut*, pp. 7-14.

<sup>104</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: pp. 11-12, 41-46 (text), 2: pp. 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*



and it is tempting to place them in the codex of ps.-Macarius, which we conveniently baptized MONB.OR.<sup>105</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>106</sup>

#### IB.16, ff. 8-11 (Zoega CCCVII)

Three leaves of an unidentified text.

Despite a formal resemblance, Paris BN 131<sup>4</sup>, ff. 129-132, mentioned as related fragments, belong to another manuscript.<sup>107</sup> The next six folios in the Paris collection, namely BN 131<sup>4</sup>, ff. 133-138, can be rather traced to the same codex as IB.16, ff. 8-11. These were identified by Sever Voicu<sup>108</sup> on the basis of Porcher's "catalogue"<sup>109</sup> as ps.-Chrysostom, *In Psalmum 50, hom. 2* (CPG 4545; *Clavis coptica* 0486; PG 55, coll. 575-588). To them can be added BN 130<sup>5</sup>, f. 126, which corresponds to the same homily.

*In Psalmum 50, hom. 2* was probably preceded by the first homily on the same psalm (no surviving fragments), and followed by *Si qua in Christo nova creatura* (CPG 4701; *Clavis coptica* 0482; PG 64, coll. 25-34), another chrysostomic *spuria* represented by Vienna K 9805 and a bifolio in Michigan, MU 158.31. Although both homilies are attested in Bohairic, the present codex (now MONB.OS) represents their only Sahidic witness presently known. During the collation of the texts, I observed marked differences between the Sahidic translation of *Si qua in Christo* and its Greek original.

---

(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>105</sup> This is also Paola Buzi's hypothesis, based on Enzo Lucchesi's suggestion, see Buzi, *Catalogo*, p. 321.

<sup>106</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 Siout; colophon edited several times, cf. A. van Lantschoot, *Colophons*, pp. 112-113 (= no. LXVIII). Van Lantschoot dated this codex around 1000 A.D. Further bibliography and codicological details in Emmel, *Shenoute's Literary Corpus*, pp. 295-297.

<sup>107</sup> To the same scribe, and possibly to the same codex, we can join Vienna K 9126.

<sup>108</sup> S. Voicu, "Per una lista delle opere trasmesse in copto sotto il nome di Giovanni Crisostomo," forthcoming article. I should like to thank Sever Voicu for sharing with me his article before its publication.

<sup>109</sup> E. Porcher, "Analyse des manuscrits coptes 131<sup>1-8</sup> de la Bibliothèque nationale, avec indication des textes bibliques," *Revue d'égyptologie* 1 (1933) p. 236 [62].

These *variae lectiones* can prove to be important since the Greek manuscript base of the homily in question is so limited.<sup>110</sup>

Finally, a series of other scattered fragments copied by the same scribe might belong to other writings of the chrysostomic corpus, possibly lost, or at least not yet identified, in Greek.

### MONB.OS

ps.-Chrysostom, *In Ps. 50, hom. 2*

- Paris BN 131<sup>4</sup>, f. 133 (pp. <71>-72) = PG 55, col. 576
- Paris BN 131<sup>4</sup>, f. 134 (pp. <73>-74) = PG 55, col. 577
- Paris BN 131<sup>4</sup>, f. 135 (pp. <75>-76) = PG 55, coll. 577-578
- Paris BN 131<sup>4</sup>, f. 136 (pp. <79>-80) = PG 55, col. 578
- Paris BN 131<sup>4</sup>, f. 137 (pp. <81>-82) = PG 55, coll. 578-579
- Paris BN 131<sup>4</sup>, f. 138 (pp. <83>-84) = PG 55, col. 579
- Paris BN 130<sup>5</sup>, f. 126 (pp. xxx-xxx) = PG 55, col. 588

ps.-Chrysostom, *Si qua in Christo*

- Vienna K 9805 (pp. xxx-xxx) = PG 64, coll. 28-29
- Michigan 158.31c-d (pp. <133>-134) = PG 64, col. 30
- Michigan 158.31a-b (pp. xxx-xxx) = PG 64, col. 31

Unidentified fragments

- Paris BN 131<sup>6</sup>, f. 5 (pp. <163>-164)
- Paris BN 131<sup>6</sup>, f. 6 (pp. <169>-170)
- London BL Or. 3581A, f. 157 + Cairo IFAO 244 (pp. <171>-172)
- Paris BN 132<sup>4</sup>, f. 321 (pp. <197>-198)
- Naples IB.16, f. 11 (pp. xxx-xxx)
- Naples IB.16, ff. 8-10 (pp. <231>-236)
- Paris BN 131<sup>6</sup>, f. 118 (pp. xxx-xxx)
- Paris BN 131<sup>7</sup>, f. 43 (pp. xxx-xxx)
- London BL Or. 3581A, f. 158 (pp. xxx-xxx)<sup>111</sup>
- Oslo no. 197 (pp. xxx-xxx)

IB.16, ff. 20-23 (Zoega CCCXI)

There are other fragments from this palimpsest, whose *scriptio superior* was recognized as part of John Chrysostom's *Homilies on Hebrews*.<sup>112</sup> Paris

<sup>110</sup> K.-H. Uthemann, "Die pseudo-chrysostomische Predigt CPG 4701. Kritische Edition mit Einleitung," *OCP* 59 (1993) pp. 5-62; Idem, "Der Codex Parisinus gr. 700 und die pseudo-chrysostomische Predigt CPG 4701," *OCP* 61 (1995) pp. 223-234.

<sup>111</sup> For the description of London BL Or. 3581A, ff. 157-158, cf. Crum, *Catalogue BM*, p. 112 (= no. 252)

<sup>112</sup> For a partial inventory, cf. Voicu, "Per una lista." Beside the three codices signaled until now, the White Monastery library had a fourth manuscript of the *Homilies on Hebrews*,

BN 131<sup>5</sup>, f. 87 (pp. [107]-108),<sup>113</sup> 132<sup>1</sup>, f. 88 (pp. 115-116), 131<sup>7</sup>, f. 68 (pp. xxx-xxx), 132<sup>4</sup>, f. 285 (pp. xxx-xxx), 132<sup>4</sup>, f. 287 (pp. xxx-xxx), Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 541 8 (pp. xxx-xxx). To this codex we gave the siglum MONB.OT.

## SUMMARY

please write one paragraph short summary

Faculty of Theology  
University of Helsinki  
P.O. Box 33  
FI – 00014 Finland

Alin Suciu

Faculté de théologie  
et de sciences religieuses  
Université Laval  
Québec, G1K 7P4  
Canada

from which I found a fragment, Paris BN 131<sup>3</sup>, f. 27, corresponding to the 12<sup>th</sup> homily (= PG 63, coll. 100-102). The fragment comes from the same scribe who copied for the White Monastery the manuscript of the *Apophthegmata Patrum* (MONB.EG).

<sup>113</sup> The secondary script was published, without a proper identification, by U. Bouriant, "Rapport au ministère de l'instruction publique sur une mission dans la Haute-Égypte (1884-1885)," in G. Maspero, *Mémoires publiés par les membres de la Mission archéologique française au Caire* 1 (Paris 1889) pp. 407-408; identified in Lucchesi, *Répertoire des manuscrits*, p. 80.