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 4th and 5th century by the Archimandrite Shenoute, held at the turn of the first millennium an impressive library. 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 18th 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 palace 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.

Although the manuscripts were described by Georg Zoega in his *Catalogus codicum Copticorum manu scriptorum*, 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, 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. The new catalogue mentions all these possible designations, while adding the actual library call numbers of the fragments. In this way the confusion is

---

2 Published post-mortem (Rome 1810).
5 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. 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). 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. It goes without saying that they are not the only supplements to the Naples man-

---


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

8 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 131¹, f. 9 (pp. 247-248) and 131¹, 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.⁹ 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,¹⁰ 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 tidier¹¹ 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.

---


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

¹¹ 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)\(^{12}\)
- Paris BN 1317, f. 34 (pp. 121-122)
- Naples IB.01, f. 30 (pp. 151-152)
- Naples IB.09, f. 23 (pp. 159-160)\(^{13}\)
- Paris BN 1311, f. 9 (pp. 247-248)
- Paris BN 1311, f. 10 (xxx-xxx)
- Cairo Coptic Museum 9277 (pp. xxx-xxx)\(^{14}\)
- Vienna K 7589 (pp. xxx-xxx)\(^{15}\)
- Vienna K 9220 (pp. xxx-xxx)

One of the most interesting literary pieces of this codex is preserved on the recto of Paris BN 1311, 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paris BN 1311, f. 9r</th>
<th>ps.-Athanasius, <em>De Cruce et Passione</em> (PG 28, coll. 225C-228A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>incipit ... οὐσίωτ ὃς ἀγωνίας ἔχειμα οὐ ἔπειτα οὐκ ἔστιν Οὐκ οἴσει ἐπεβίωσε· μὴ μοιηθῇ</td>
<td>... προσκυνοῦντα τὸν Κύριον, καὶ ἐπιπλήττοντα καὶ τῷ ἄλλῳ λῃστῇ ... ἀντὶ δὲ τῆς χολῆς τὰ γλυκύτερα ὑπὲρ μέλι καὶ κηρίον λόγια χαρίσηται ἡμῖν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desinit ... ἔπειτα ἐκ πολίωθε ἔχει ἀχαρίζε τὸν ἀγωνίας ἐπέβιωσε· μὴ μοιηθῇ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


\(^{13}\) 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).


\(^{15}\) 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 1297*, 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, 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).*17 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.18 This is one of the numerous fragments mistakenly ascribed to Shenoute,19 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.

---


18 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.

19 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. 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 and P. Devos have remarked, part of the Sahidic Vita Iohannis de Lykopoli (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. However, three supplementary fragments from Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris were omitted until a relatively recent date and must be added to MONB.EN: BN 132 2, f. 105 (which

---

20 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 Cyrillus, Hist. eccl. V, 25,2; Augustine, Civ. Dei V, 26; John Cassian, Cox. inst. IV, 23. The story illuminates the hagiographical confusion between John of Lycopolis, John Kolobos and Shenoute of Atripe. 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 (Σενούφιος, τοῦτο γὰρ ὄνομα τῷ μαφόριῳ ἄνδρι), 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.

24 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 12913, f. 64 form a single folio paginated 3-4), 1321, f. 52 (pp. 23-24) and 1313, 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).25

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”26 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.27 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, Misaed 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.28


28 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 (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 sac. VI-VII der Phillippsbibliothek in Cheltenham (Strasbourg 1915) p. xvii. On page 15 of the Chester
This inventory number includes three leaves from the Asceticon of Isaiah of Scetis (CPG 5555; Clavis coptica 0217), published by Antoine Guillaumont. The catalogue supplements the inventory of Guillaumont’s codex A (= 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).

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 inédita, 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. They are paginated consecutively from 193 to 204 and can be ascribed to Logos 28 (= Syriac Logos 22). 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 Giovanni di Babilonia.”

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 Giovanni di Babilonia.”

For the content of this codex, check A. Guillaumont, “La recension copte de l'Ascéticon 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’Ascéticon copte, p. ix n. 1.


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). Returning from Vienna to Naples, the fragments catalogued by Paola Buzi under the lemma IB.14, ff. 29-30 as parts of the Regulae of Horsiese and attributed in the past also to Shenoute, are in fact from the codex of Isaiah (= Logoi 21 ["On the Repentance"], 20 ["On the Humility"], 7 ["On the Virtues"]).\(^{37}\) In Paris, we find BN 131\(^5\), f. 45 (pp. 171-172), which belongs to Logos 22 (= Syriac Logos 20),\(^{38}\) 131\(^5\), f. 64 to Logos 25 (= Syriac 7),\(^{39}\) 131\(^7\), f. 47 to Logos 16 (= Syriac 15),\(^{40}\) whereas 131\(^5\), f. 146v-r, as small as it is, can be recognized as a part of Logos 21 (= Syriac 14).\(^{41}\)

Finally, from Guillaumont's list of this codex should be removed Vienna K 9646, 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\(^4\), f. 144 (pp. [189]-[190]) (= Greek Logos 12),\(^{43}\) 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\(^5\), f. 48. Although this folio is

---

\(^{34}\) 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 14th quire.

\(^{35}\) Buzi, *Catalogo*, pp. 287-288. For their specific place in the codex, cf. infra.


\(^{40}\) 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.

\(^{41}\) On the verso (the true recto) of BN 131\(^5\), 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.

\(^{42}\) *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.

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 13115, f. 64 (pp. xxx-xxx) = unpublished  
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 1317, f. 47 (pp. xxx-xxx) = unpublished  

Logos 3  
Naples IB.09, f. 59 (pp. 117-118) = Guillaumont, pp. 6-7  

Logos 3/15  
Naples IB.09, f. 57 (pp. 131-132) = Guillaumont, pp. 7-8  
Naples IB.14, f. 29 (pp. 135-136) = unpublished  
Paris BN 1315, f. 146 (pp. xxx-xxx) = unpublished  
London BL Or. 3581A, f. 152 (pp. xxx-xxx) = Guillaumont, pp. 12-13  
London BL Or. 3581A, f. 152 (pp. xxx-xxx) = Guillaumont, pp. 12-13  

Logos 21  
Naples IB.14, f. 30 (pp. [151]-[152]) = unpublished  
Leiden Rijksmuseum 111 (pp. 157-158) = Guillaumont, pp. 10-11  
London BL Or. 3581A, f. 152 (pp. xxx-xxx) = Guillaumont, pp. 12-13  

Logos 22  
Paris BN 1315, f. 45 (pp. 171-172) = unpublished  

Logos 23/28  
Paris BN 1315, 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  

Logos 28/?44  
Paris BN 12913, 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. 3.45 The leaf represents

---

44 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.

45 MS F 1976/4, f. 3 is not mentioned in W. Pleyte & P. A. A. Boeser, *Manuscrits 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 im-
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.46

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 1304, f. 99 (pp. 93-94); 1315, 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 1322, 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 traced by Delio Vania Proverbio47 and Enzo Lucchesi,48 we can add two 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.

46 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.
other testimonies from Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris: BN 131, f. 90 and 131, 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. BN 131, f. 147 joins two other fragments (Paris BN 131, 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, 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.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. As regards Oxford, Clarendon Press b.3, ff. 5-8b, 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 the same codex as London BL Or. 3581B, f. 19, which equally corresponds to ps.-Evodius homily on the Virgin.

“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.


50 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.

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

52 Cf. Crum, Catalogue BM, p. 133 (= no. 302); published by Robinson, Apocryphal Gos-
Returning now to Naples IB.12, f. 25 (paged 85-86), this was seemingly preceded in the codex by Paris BN 1317, f. 37 (pp. 19-20), Vatican Borg. copt. 109, cass. XXV, fasc. 119 (Zoega CXIX)\(^53\) (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.\(^54\)

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).\(^55\) This is ascertained by the frequent references to Mark, Barnabas...
and Paul. Moreover, the second fragment (IB.13, f. 64) overlaps the text of London BL Or. 3581B, f. 18, 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, 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 12914, f. 74 (pages 49-50 of the original manuscript). All the fragments identified by Crum are available in the edition (with French translation) of René-G. Coquin.

Now, the paleographical traits indicate that Paris BN 1324, 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, the references to the “abominable council (σύνοδος)” and “the impious (ἀσεβής) Pulcheria” suggesting that codex MONB.NC grouped together texts of anti-Chalcedonian tenure.

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).

60 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 1324, f. 318.
IB.14, ff. 29-30 (Zoega CCLXXXVII)

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

IB.14, ff. 31-32 (Zoega CCLXXXIX)

Paris BN 1315, f. 90 (Ephrem, De perfectione monachi, MONB.NE; cf. supra), 1316, f. 29 (Shenoute, MONB.YU), and 1316, 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 1311, 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.61

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.62 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 Crucem63 and from New York, M595, ff. 1r-27v, for De passione I.

---

61 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).


63 Campagnano, Omelie copie, pp. 75-149.
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 1315, f. 117 (pp. [19]-[20])64 = 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)65 = Campagnano,
pp. 102-112

De passione I
Paris BN 1317, 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)66 = M595, f. 8v, col. I-9r,
col. I
Paris BN 1317, f. 60 (pp. [133]-[134]) = M595, f. 13v, col. II-14r, col. I
Paris BN 1316, f. 54 (pp. 139-140) = M595, f. 15r, col. II-15r, col. I
Paris BN 12913, f. 64 (pp. 159-160) = M595, f. 20v, col. I-21r, col. II
Paris BN 12917, f. 68 (pp. 131-132) = M595, f. 11r, col. II-12r, col. II
Paris BN 1317, f. 64 (pp. [129]-[130]) = M595, f. 10v, col. II-11r, col. II

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

The two folios (pp. 195-196, 199-200), whose content is described in the
catalogue as "on the resurrection of the flesh," were already identified as

64 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.

65 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 12917, 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.

66 Munier, Manuscrits coptes, pp. 16-18.

67 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. Luc-
quotes also Vienna K 9537 and K 9538 as parts of the codex, but I think they belong to an-
other manuscript, as both the ductus and the page numbers (= pp. 9-12) suggest. It should
be also stressed that a second fragment from Vienna, K 2308, represents another bit of the
same folio.

68 Crum, Catalogue BM, p. 109 (= no. 246).
parts of Epiphanius’ *Ancoratus* (CPG 3744; *Clavis coptica* 0140) by Enzo Lucchesi, and presented in an article by Delio Vania Proverbio. 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.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clarendon Press b.4, f. 63</th>
<th>Epiphanius, <em>Ancoratus</em>71</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>incipit [...] ΧΕ ΜΑΡΩΥΟΣ Τ ΝΑΗ ΝΑΓ-</td>
<td>50,5 προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἀγ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΝΕΑΟΣ ΜΠΝΟΥΤΕ</td>
<td>γελοι θεοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desinit ΆΛΛΑ ΠΕΣΑΧ ΧΕ ΟΥ ΠΕΤΕ-</td>
<td>52,1 Ἀλλά, φασί, τί οὖν λέγεις; θέλων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΧΩ ΜΜΟΘ</td>
<td>ἐγένησεν ὁ πατήρ ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If Epiphanius’ work has survived indeed in two different Sahidic codices, rather than a single one copied alternatively by two scribes, then the new testimony from Oxford must be ascribed to MONB.HA:

Epiphanius, *Ancoratus*

Cairo Coptic Museum 9287 (pp. xxx-xxx) = chap. 15,2-873
Paris BN 1311, ff. 19-21 (pp. 65-70) = chap. 29,7-32,7
Paris BN 1311, ff. 22-24 (pp. 75-80) = chap. 34,3-37,2
New York Pierpont Morgan M706b (pp. 93-94) = chap. 43,6-44,474
Clarendon Press b.4, f. 63 (pp. 105-106) = chap. 50,5-52,1
London BL Or. 3581A, f. 153 (pp. 115-116) = chap. 55,7-56,475

---

71 I have consulted the Greek text in K. Holl, *Epiphanius I. Ancoratus und Panarion haer. I-33* (GCS, 25; Leipzig 1915).
74 Described and edited in Depuydt, *Catalogue*, pp. 163-165 (= no. 82); identified by Camplani, “Epifanio,” p. 327.
Cambridge CUL Or. 1699 L (beginning of the 10th quire) = chap. 65,1-876
London BL Or. 3581A, f. 142 (pp. 193-194) = chap. 95,1-96,3
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 1303, ff. 55-58 (pp. 211-218) = chap. 104,6-108,1
Paris BN 1311, f. 18 (pp. 219-220) = chap. 108,1-109,2

IB.14, f. 50 (Zoega CCXCII)

Paris BN 1311, 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, although today they are lost in the lacuna. Part of the same sermon (and codex) are Paris BN 1305, f. 133 + 1316, f. 85 (forming together a single leaf paged 19-20) and 1311, f. 33 (pages 21-22). The surviving parts are silent concerning the authorship of the text, but on the verso of BN 1311, f. 33, which was the last page of the homily, we can read: ΠΑΙ ΠΕ ΠΕΖΩΟΥ ΝΤΑΝΑΛΜΗΙΣ ΜΠΕΝΖΟ΢ΙΟ΢ ΙΣ ΠΕΧΣ ΠΕΝΣΩΣΗΡ, 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 1311, f. 8 (pp. 47-48) and Naples IB.14, ff. 34-35 (pp. [51]-[52] and [57]-[58]), the recto of the first fragment being the title page of the text, which is introduced as an exegesis (εξηγηςις) 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 ΑΘΑΝΑΣΙΟΣ ΠΙΡΧΙΕΠΙΚΟΠΟΣ ΝΡΑΚΟΣ.

---

76 Fragment attributed to Shenoute in A. Shisha-Halevy, Coptic Grammatical Categories, pp. 207, 218.
78 Zoega, Catalogus, p. 633.
79 Page numbers given according to Zoega, who was still able to read them, cf. his Catalogus, p. 632.
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* (PG 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codex A (MONB.OP)</th>
<th>Codex B (MONB.OQ)</th>
<th>Codex C (MONB.DV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ps.-Athanasius, <em>De ascensione Christi</em></td>
<td>ps.-Athanasius, <em>De ascensione Christi</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lacuna</td>
<td>lacuna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB.14, f. 50 (pp. [15]-[16])</td>
<td>Naples IB.14, f. 34v-r (pp. [51]-[52])</td>
<td>Naples IB.11, f. 77 (pp. 293-294)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lacuna</td>
<td>Naples IB.14, f. 35v-r (pp. [57]-[58])</td>
<td>Naples IB.11, f. 78r (295)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris 1305, f. 133 + 1316, f. 85 (pp. 19-20)</td>
<td>Vienna K 9478 (pp. [597]-[607])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris BN 1311, f. 33 (pp. 21-22)</td>
<td>lacuna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ps.-Chrysostom, <em>In Pentecosten I</em></td>
<td>ps.-Chrysostom, <em>In Pentecosten I</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris BN 1311, ff. 34-36 (pp. 23-28)</td>
<td>lacuna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lacuna</td>
<td>lacuna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris BN 12917, f. 62 (pp. 35-36)</td>
<td>Naples IB.14, f. 38 (pp. 83-84)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lacuna</td>
<td>lacuna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leiden 131, ff. 1-2 (pp. [39]-[42])</td>
<td>Paris BN 1313, f. 123 (pp. 89-90)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lacuna</td>
<td>lacuna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris BN 1313, f. 64 (pp. 47-48)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

84 Identified in Lucchesi, *Répertoire des manuscrits*, p. 75.
85 Identified in Lucchesi, *Répertoire des manuscrits*, p. 82; cf. Idem, "D"Un encomio copto'.”
As Paola Buzi rightly observes, these folios belonged to one of the Pa-chomian codices. Other supplements from the same codex were identified by Enzo Lucchesi.

Although left without attribution, the folios are from a codex (MONB. FV) containing the so-called In canticum vinae (Clavis coptica 0020).

The content of IB.16, f. 3, whose pagination is lost, was identified as Cyril of Alexandria’s Epistola II ad Succensum (CPG 5346), a document which was used to support both Chalcedonian and anti-Chalcedonian arguments. 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):91

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Naples IB.16, f. 1</th>
<th>Oratio ad Augustas de fide (PG 76, col. 1388 = Schwartz, ACO 1.1.5)10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἔτε πάσιν ἐς κατὰ τεσσάρυς· καὶ ἔρχονται ζητομορφοὶ νέμαζαν· ἐφ’ οἷς ἐνεχόμενοι ἰμασκός· ταί ὑπ’ ὑμῖν ἔτε σαφεῖς ζητομορφοὶ· τοιοῦτοι οὐνταί μμαγ· νεαντία ντάνα λατιγύγγος· ξύμπιγγε· εύειναι οὖν εὐγείραι νεο· νούσια νατανοχ· ἀγω νοῖτον· ἐτε νεμανοίς νε· μμενεοὐ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

91 Greek text taken from Schwartz, ACO, 1.1.5: p. 47.
94 The fragments were still considered Shenoutean in Shisha-Halevy, *Coptic Grammatical Categories*, p. 255.
95 See Emmel, *Shenoute’s Literary Corpus*, p. 906.
96 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

The same fragment was taken over in the Greek *catenae* on the Epistles of Paul, where is explicitly attributed to Cyril of Alexandria.92

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,93 and his attribution went unchallenged for a long time.94 However, Stephen Emmel counted them among the *dubia* in his *magnum opus* concerning the Shenoutean literature.95 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.96
The Coptic text corresponds to the Macarian Homily C 38 (= no. 26 in Collection III). These two Neapolitan leaves represent the outermost bifolio of the 9th quire, with the signature being visible on both of them, which means that there is a significant gap of six folios in between.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Naples IB.16, f. 4r</th>
<th>ps.-Macarius, <em>Hom. C 38</em> (Klostermann &amp; Berthold, p. 140)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ΕΝΝΑΜΕΓΕΥΕ ΔΕ ΟΝ ΧΕ ΣΕΧΩΟΠ ΝΟΙΟΥΡ ΝΑΣΤΕ Η ΝΣΟΙΑΙ Η ΜΝΜ- ΤΡΜΝ2ΗΤ- Η ΟΥΗΡ ΝΤΕΧΝΗ ΝΕΠΙΚΗ- ΜΕΙ Η ΝΣΩΒ Η ΝΣΠΟΥΔΗ Η ΜΝΜΝΤΡΜ- ΜΑΟ ΕΥΧΟΒΕ ΖΗΟΥΑΤΟ ΝΚΜΟΤ- ΑΥΩ ΖΝΝΑΙ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΝΗΨΟΟΠ ΑΝ ΝΟΙΠΣΩΒ ΕΤΟΣΥΡΙΑ ΜΜΟΚ ΑΥΩ ΕΤΟΥΩΝΖ ΝΗΤΨ ΝΟΙΕΝΧΡΙΣΤΙΑΝΩΣ</td>
<td>Πόσαι γλῶσσαι ἐν κόσμῳ, πόσαι ουράι, πόσαι φρονήσεις, πόσαι τέχνεις, πόσαι ἐπι- στήμαι καὶ ἐπιτηδεύματα καὶ σοφίδη καὶ πλοῦτος ἐν τῇ γῇ, καὶ οὐδὲν τούτων ἐστὶν ὁ χρῆσοι καὶ ἐν ᾧ ζωὶς Χριστιανοὶ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ΙϹΙΠΤΩΝ 3ΑΙΝΟΓΕΝΕΟ ΜΠΑ- ΖΡΟΥ 2ΙΑΝΝΗΓΑΒΝΜΝΑΙΣΕ 3ΜΠΕΥΓΩΜΑ desinti .ΝΗΤΝ ΝΜΝΤΗΜΜΑΟ ΝΝΠΗΥΕ- ΑΥΩ ΤΕΝΓΥΜΝΑΖΕ ΝΝΝΤΝΓΩΜΑ 2Ν[...]</td>
<td>οἱ τὴν ὑβρίν τοῦ σταυροῦ μου βαστάσαντες ἐν τοῖς ὦμοις αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ πάθη μου ἐν τοῖς σώμασιν αὐτῶν ... τὸν σοφάννον πλοῦτον. Καὶ γὰρ ἐν τῇ χαμευνίᾳ τὰ σώματα ὦμῶν γυμνάζοντες</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This succession of the Macarian pieces suggests that the Coptic manuscript followed the order of the tradition TV, represented by three Arabic 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.


99 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.
codices, Vaticani arabici 70 & 80 and Parisinus arabicus 149, our fragments corresponding to homilies 13 and 16 in this collection. 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), 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. 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.

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

Three leaves of an unidentified text. Despite a formal resemblance, Paris BN 1314, ff. 129-132, mentioned as

---

100 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.

101 See the edition, with Latin translation, by G. Garitte, Lettres de Saint Antoine. Version géorgienne et fragments copiés (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 (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.

102 This is also Paola Buzi’s hypothesis, based on Enzo Lucchesi’s suggestion, see Buzi, Catalogo, p. 321.

103 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.
related fragments, belong to another manuscript.\textsuperscript{104} The next six folios in the Paris collection, namely BN 131\textsuperscript{4}, ff. 133-138, can be rather traced to the same codex as IB.16, ff. 8-11. These were identified by Sever Voicu\textsuperscript{105} on the basis of Porcher’s “catalogue”\textsuperscript{106} as ps.-Chrysostom, \textit{In Psalmum 50, hom. 2} (CPG 4545; \textit{Clavis coptica} 0486; PG 55, coll. 575-588). To them can be added BN 130\textsuperscript{5}, f. 126, which corresponds to the same homily.

\textit{In Psalmum 50, hom. 2} was probably preceded by the first homily on the same psalm (no surviving fragments), and followed by \textit{Si qua in Christo nova creatura} (CPG 4701; \textit{Clavis coptica} 0482; PG 64, coll. 25-34), another chrysostomic \textit{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 \textit{Si qua in Christo} and its Greek original. These \textit{variae lectiones} can prove to be important since the Greek manuscript base of the homily in question is so limited.\textsuperscript{107}

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.

\textbf{MONB.OS}

ps.-Chrysostom, \textit{In Ps. 50, hom. 2}

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

ps.-Chrysostom, \textit{Si qua in Christo}

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

\textsuperscript{104} To the same scribe, and possibly to the same codex, we can join Vienna K 9126.

\textsuperscript{105} 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.


Unidentified fragments

- Paris BN 1316, f. 5 (pp. 163-164)
- Paris BN 1316, f. 6 (pp. 169-170)
- London BL Or. 3581A, f. 157 + Cairo IFAO 244 (pp. 171-172)
- Paris BN 1324, f. 321 (pp. 197-198)
- Naples IB.16, f. 11 (pp. xxx-xxx)
- Naples IB.16, ff. 8-10 (pp. 231-236)
- Paris BN 1316, f. 118 (pp. xxx-xxx)
- Paris BN 1317, f. 43 (pp. xxx-xxx)
- London BL Or. 3581A, f. 158 (pp. xxx-xxx)
- 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*:109 Paris BN 1315, f. 87 (pp. [107]-108),110 1321, f. 88 (pp. 115-116), 1317, f. 68 (pp. xxx-xxx), 1324, f. 285 (pp. xxx-xxx), 1324, 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
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109 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*, from which I found a fragment, Paris BN 1315, f. 27, corresponding to the 12th 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).