A BOHAIRIC FRAGMENT OF THE ACTS OF MATTHEW IN THE CITY OF THE PRIESTS AND OTHER COPTIC FRAGMENTS FROM THE GENIZAH OF THE UMAYYAD MOSQUE IN DAMASCUS

1. Introduction

The Genizah of the Great Umayyad Mosque in Damascus stands as one of the most significant, albeit little known and poorly researched, manuscript finds of the 20th century. From this stash emerged a myriad of parchment and paper manuscripts, mostly Muslim literary and documentary texts in Arabic, from copies of the Qurʾān and theological works to pilgrimage certificates and legal civil contracts. However, among them there are also Jewish and Christian writings in a large variety of languages, including Hebrew, Aramaic, Arabic, Syriac, Christian-Palestinian Aramaic, Armenian, Georgian, Coptic, Greek, Latin, and Old French. The present paper introduces a Bohairic Coptic fragment discovered in the Damascus Genizah, which contains portions of the Acts of Matthew in the City of the Priests (CANT 268; BHO 738-739), a text that belonged to the collection of apocryphal acts of the apostles used in the Egyptian non-Chalcedonian church. Apart from the fact that the fragment represents the first attestation of this apocryphal text in Coptic, its provenance from Damascus only adds to the significance. The fragment is one of the rare examples of Coptic manuscripts that have not been discovered on Egyptian soil, documenting thus the presence of Coptic enclaves abroad. I will first offer an overview of the circumstances in which the manuscripts from the Genizah of the Umayyad Mosque in Damascus were discovered. Then I will introduce four Coptic fragments found in this location. The article also includes a study and an edition with accompanying English translation of the Bohairic fragment of the Acts of Matthew in the City of the Priests.

1 The Muslim documents, some of which have been transferred to the Turkish and Islamic Art Museum in Istanbul, are known especially thanks to the publications of Dominique Sourdel and Janine Sourdel-Thomine, see SOURDEL – SOURDEL-THOMINE, Nouveaux documents; Eid., À propos des documents; Eid., Trois actes de vente; Eid., Une collection médiévale; Eid., Certificats de pèlerinage par procuration; Eid., Certificats de pèlerinage; Eid., Mariage et séparation; Eid., Gouvernance et libéralités.

2 A couple of Jewish documents have been published in AShur, A Marriage Contract; BOHAK – MORGENSTERN, Magical Booklet.
2. The Genizah of the Umayyad Mosque in Damascus

The manuscripts were immured for centuries in the Bayt al-Māl or the Qubbat al-khazna (the “Treasury Dome”), a small octagonal pavilion decorated with Byzantine-style mosaics, located in the northwest part of the courtyard of the Great Umayyad Mosque. As rumors concerning the existence of a Genizah in this mosque reached Germany at the end of the 19th century, the German scholar Bruno Violet was appointed in 1900 for an official research mission to Damascus to study the non-Muslim manuscripts. Violet spent slightly more than a year there, during which time he analyzed and transcribed various fragments from the Genizah. In order to show the relevance of the discovery, he chose to edit one of the most intriguing fragments: a Greek-Arabic diglot parchment bifolio containing Ps. 77:20-31, 51-61 (LXX). The Greek text is accommodated on the left-hand column of the pages, while the Arabic translation is on the right-hand column. The oddity of this manuscript lies in the fact that the Arabic text is transliterated into Greek characters. Before his departure from Syria in the summer of 1901, Violet received approval to photograph some of the fragments. This set of photographs is held today in the Brandenburg Academy in Berlin (call number BBAW/GCS, Akz.-Nr. 481).

Through diplomatic approaches from Germany to the Ottoman Empire, the batch of fragments studied by Violet, comprising 1558 items, was sent in 1902 to Berlin to be studied by German scholars. The fragments were initially housed in the Royal Museums, from where they were later transferred to the State Library. The “Christmas gift of the Sultan,” as the fragments had been called, benefited from a couple of enthusiastic articles written by Hermann von Soden. However, the publication of the material was slow-paced and, when at the end of the year 1908 the Ottoman Empire suddenly requested the fragments, most of them were still unedited. Consequently, remnants of 33 manuscripts were hastily photographed before the entire lot was sent back to the legal owner at the beginning of 1909.

---

3 For the following discussion, I found particularly useful Radicotti – D’Ottone, I fragmenti; Bandt – Rattmann, Damaskusreise; D’Ottone, Manuscripts as Mirrors; Vollandt, Beyond Arabic.
4 On the circumstances of Violet’s visit to Damascus, see Bandt – Rattmann, Damaskusreise, p. 5-11.
5 Violet, Psalmfragment.
6 Known as the “Violet Fragment,” this manuscript has received some attention in scholarly literature, see, e.g., Macdonald, Literacy, p. 100-103; Corriente, The Psalter Fragment; Mavroudi, The Violet Fragment; Vollandt, Beyond Arabic.
7 Bandt – Rattmann, Damaskusreise, p. 12.
8 Von Soden, Weihnachtsgeschenk; idem, Bericht.
9 I count here the total number of different manuscripts which were photographed. The number of the individual leaves and fragments is higher.
Little is known concerning the fate of the fragments after their return to the Ottoman Empire. Violet thought that they ended up in the Topkapi Museum in Istanbul, but this information can be rejected as speculation since it could not be verified. William Hatch, who made a research visit to the National Museum in Damascus in March 1929, furnishes more relevant testimony. According to Hatch’s report, while searching through the collection of the museum in order to find the debris from the Qubbat al-khazna, he “saw many fragments of manuscripts in Greek, Syriac, Armenian, Coptic, and Arabic”10. It seems thus plausible to suppose that at least some of the Christian fragments were still kept at that time in the National Museum in Damascus. Unfortunately, due to the current unstable political situation in Syria, it cannot be confirmed if the fragments are still in the same location.

There is evidence that some manuscripts emerged from the cache many decades before Violet’s mission to Damascus. Possibly, some such fragments had been scattered and sold abroad. For example, Kurt Treu was able to document that 23 parchment leaves from the Damascus Genizah, which contain Greek translations from the ascetical homilies of Isaac the Syrian, are *membra disjecta* from the codex to which *Paris, BnF Supplément grec 693* also belonged11. The 78 leaves in the National Library of France were acquired in September 1867 in Paris from an unknown source. Nevertheless, their codicological connection with the folios photographed by Violet helps us to establish that they very likely came from the Qubbat al-khazna. However, other possible fragments from the same stash which may currently be housed in Western collections cannot be identified in the absence of proper acquisition records.

3. *Four Coptic Fragments from the Damascus Genizah. Description and Content*

As the current whereabouts of the fragments are unknown, the photographs taken by Violet during his stay in Damascus, together with those made in Berlin, remain to date our main sources of documentation. The photographs taken while the fragments were in Berlin are inserted in two folders, which have received the call numbers Mss. simulata orientalia 5 and 6. The first folder contains photographs of the vestiges of a parchment codex featuring the Syriac translation of Theodore of Mopsuestia’s commentary on Ecclesiastes (*CPG 3836*)12. The second includes photographic

---

11 Treu, *Remnants*.
reproductions of fragments in various languages. The photographs were kept in the State Library in Berlin, but they disappeared in the turmoil of the Second World War and were considered lost. However, they were recovered in 1999 and are currently available in electronic format on the website of the library.

Notably, the folder Mss. simulata orientalia 6 contains photographs of four Coptic fragments discovered in the Qubbat al-khazna. Thus, folio 27r accommodates photos of two fragments, while folio 28r has photographs of their reverse sides. Likewise, folio 29r includes photographs of two additional fragments. The opposite sides of these fragments feature on folio 30r. Below is a more detailed description of the fragments in question. Obviously, as they are not available for autoptic examination, the description cannot be exhaustive.

(1) Folios 27r, 28r, top fragment.

- **Description:** incomplete leaf of a palimpsest manuscript.
- **Material:** parchment.
- **Dating:** ca. 6th-7th c. for the Coptic text/ca. 11th c. for the Arabic text.
- **Content:** Matth. 27:29-46 in Fayyumic/Islamic text.

The manuscript is a Coptic-Arabic palimpsest, with the more recent Arabic script written upside down in relation to the Coptic. The recto and verso of the fragment were reversed when the photographs were taken, so that f. 28r = true recto and f. 27r = true verso. On one side of the Arabic fragment are mentioned 'Amr ibn al-'Āṣ (the commander of the Muslim army that conquered Egypt in 641 CE), 'Abdallāh al-Zubayr, and the Umayyad caliph Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam. In fact, the upper Arabic text seems to belong to the ninth-century Muslim historian al-Madāʾinī. The story relates to the Umayyad governor al-Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf, who interrogates a Khārijite rebel.

The **scriptio inferior** is in a relatively early, neat Fayyumic hand. The text is arranged as two columns. Enough is legible on the basis of the photos to recognize that the recto (hair side) features Matth. 27:29-38, while the verso (flesh side) gives Matth. 27:38-46 in dialect F5. This portion of the Gospel of Matthew is not attested elsewhere in Fayyumic manuscripts.


14 I am grateful to Sean Anthony (Ohio State University) for helping me to identify the content of the Arabic text.

15 VON SÖDEN, Bericht, p. 828, describes this fragment as, “ein Blatt eines neustamentlischen Fajumpalimpsests.” For dialect F5, see KASSER, System of Sigla, p. 147.
(2) Folios 27r, 28r, bottom fragment.

**Description:** complete leaf of a small-dimension codex.

**Material:** paper.

**Dating:** 12th c.?

**Content:** *Kataxioson* 1-10 in Bohairic.

The fragment partly preserves the prayer known as *Kataxioson*\(^{16}\). The surviving portion offers the beginning of the text, only a few of the opening words being lost. Since the Egyptian tradition has kept separately both the monastic and the cathedral offices, the *Kataxioson* is recited in the Coptic rite during the vespers (i.e. the 11\(^{th}\) hour) raising of incense, but also during the compline (i.e. the 12\(^{th}\)) hour of the *Horologion*. The Damascus fragment has some *variae lectiones* compared to the text of the *Kataxioson* published by Oswald Burmester\(^{17}\).

(3) Folios 29r, 30r, top fragment.

**Description:** fragment from the superior part of a leaf.

**Material:** parchment.

**Dating:** 10th c.

**Content:** *Acts of Matthew in the City of the Priests*.

The script is the typical Bohairic uncial widely attested in the ninth-to early eleventh-century parchment codices from Wādī an-Natrūn. This fragment is thoroughly discussed below.

(4) Folios 29r, 30r, bottom fragment.

**Description:** complete leaf of a medium-size codex.

**Material:** paper.

**Dating:** 12th c.?

**Content:** unidentified.

The text is in the Sahidic dialect of Coptic, but the orthography is very irregular. The fragment features a lament of Mary, the mother of Jesus, who cries for the death of her son. The author entreats the audience to listen to the sweet words that Mary pronounced, “while she was in the house of John,” presumably the apostle. No parallel to this text can presently be provided.

---

\(^{16}\) This must be the fragment analyzed and correctly identified by Stephen Emmel, Mary Farag, and Samuel Moawad in December 2009 upon Cordula Bandt’s request, as one can imply from Bandt – Rattmann, *Damaskusreise*, p. 20.

Violet’s personal notes, which are kept in the collection of the Berlin Academy, include also a list of the manuscripts that he checked in Damascus. This checklist mentions the existence of nine parchment and nine paper fragments written in Coptic. It is thus clear that the majority of Coptic fragments found in the Qubba were not photographed. We have no further information concerning the present location of these fragments.

4. The Significance of the Coptic Fragments from the Damascus Genizah

The Coptic fragments found in the Genizah of the Umayyad Mosque in Damascus have remained almost unnoticed by Coptologists. In his 1903 report concerning the transfer of the non-Muslim fragments from Damascus to Berlin, von Soden announced that the publication of the Coptic material had been entrusted to Carl Schmidt\(^\text{18}\). At that time, Schmidt was freshly appointed – largely through Harnack’s intervention – in the Kirchenväterkommission of the Berlin Academy, and was thus the obvious choice to publish the Coptic fragments from the Qubbat al-khazna\(^\text{19}\). However, for reasons that remain unknown, Schmidt did not edit any of them, nor mention them in his publications. Consequently, the existence of the fragments was gradually forgotten, especially after the photographs deposited in the collection of the Staatsbibliothek were considered lost\(^\text{20}\).

This state of affairs is regrettable given that the fragments are doubly remarkable. Firstly, as we have seen, at least two of them provide hitherto unknown texts. Thus, the Fayyumic palimpsest has a portion of the Gospel of Matthew that has no other witness in this dialect. Likewise, the *Acts of Matthew in the City of the Priests* has previously been thought to be extant only in Arabic and Ethiopic. The Damascus fragment reveals that a Coptic version also existed and that represents the Vorlage of the Arabic translation. Secondly, the Coptic fragments from the Qubbat al-khazna are among the few manuscripts in this language found outside the frontiers of Egypt. In order to properly understand their relevance, a condensed overview of the Coptic manuscripts of non-Egyptian provenance is warranted.

Major deposits of Coptic manuscripts written in the Sahidic dialect have been unearthed at Faras, Qasr el-Wizz, Qasr Ibrim, and elsewhere in Nubia. They feature a large variety of biblical, liturgical, literary, and legal texts. These manuscripts show that Coptic occupied a special place in Nubia, being used, alongside Greek and Old Nubian, for the literary


\(^{19}\) On this period of Carl Schmidt’s life, see Marksches, *Carl Schmidt*, p. 15-17.

\(^{20}\) As I have mentioned above, the photos were recovered only in 1999.
output of the local church\textsuperscript{21}. Coptic was also employed as a language of the administration in Nubia, until it came to be gradually replaced by the vernacular idiom\textsuperscript{22}. It should be emphasized that, while written in Sahidic, these manuscripts were produced and used exclusively by Nubian Christians. Therefore, although one cannot exclude that some of them could have been imported from Egypt, they should not be regarded as artifacts of Coptic provenance. Consequently, they are not germane to the present discussion.

Bohairic liturgical manuscripts were used, and some of them even produced, between the 13th and the 17th centuries in the Coptic diaspora in Cyprus. The origin of the Egyptian monastic community on the island of Cyprus goes back to the period of the Crusades. When Guy de Lusignan, the king of Jerusalem, became also Lord of Cyprus in 1192, he populated the island with Christians convened from Palestine and Syria\textsuperscript{23}. Among these settlers were Copts from Jerusalem, who received land in Nicosia for the building of churches and monasteries\textsuperscript{24}. A number of 16 Bohairic liturgical manuscripts were acquired by the German scholar and traveler Johann Michael Wansleben in 1671 in Nicosia and are now preserved in the National Library in Paris\textsuperscript{25}. The colophons of the manuscripts record that some of them were brought from Egypt, while others were inscribed in the local scriptoria by Coptic copyists.

A bilingual Bohairic-Arabic Horologion manuscript was found in the library of the Melkite Monastery of St. Catherine, situated in the Sinai Peninsula\textsuperscript{26}. Furthermore, in the same location were found two parchment leaves containing Hebr. 7:10-8:7 in the early variety of Bohairic, which are datable on paleographical grounds to the 6th c. CE. They were brought from Sinai by Nikodim P. Kondakov and are currently kept in the National Library of Russia in Saint Petersburg\textsuperscript{27}. The damage pattern of the leaves suggests that, at a certain point, they were recycled and reused as flyleaves in a younger manuscript. Likewise, folio 144v of the Sinaitic parchment manuscript Georgian 38 is a palimpsest whose scriptio inferior contains

\textsuperscript{21} An overview of the problem can be found in OCHALA, Multilingualism.
\textsuperscript{22} On the use of Coptic as a legal language in Nubian documents, see RUFFINI, Medieval Nubia, p. 144-151.
\textsuperscript{23} EDBURY, Kingdom of Cyprus, p. 22.
\textsuperscript{24} On the presence of Copts in Cyprus, see BURMEISTER, Copts in Cyprus; HALKIN, Monastère copte. For the Coptic presence in Jerusalem, see MEINARDUS, Copts in Jerusalem.
\textsuperscript{25} This collection is amply documented in BOUD’HORS, Manuscrits coptes ‘chypriotes’.
\textsuperscript{26} This is MS Arabic 389, a paper manuscript tentatively dated to the 13th c. CE, see CLARK, Checklist, p. 35; ATIYA, Arabic Manuscripts, p. 10.
\textsuperscript{27} See MIROSHINIKOV, Epistle to the Hebrews.
a Bohairic private letter mentioning the monastic settlement of Scetis (ⲧⲉϣⲓϩⲏⲧ)\textsuperscript{28}. As the Georgian codex dates to 979 CE, the Bohairic manuscript must be older.

Finally, a Bohairic parchment leaf has been found in the collection of the Syrian Orthodox Monastery of St. Mark in Jerusalem. The fragment was used as an endpaper in a Syriac liturgical manuscript (shelf mark no. 64)\textsuperscript{29}. The Bohairic leaf preserves a portion from the *Martyrdom of Macrobius* (clavis coptica 0286), a saint commemorated by Coptic Christians on Baramhāt \textsuperscript{20}. While the Syriac codex is datable to the 15th or 16th c., the paleographical features of the Bohairic fragment suggest that it is arguably older, probably not later than the 10th c. But how did this Coptic fragment end up in Jerusalem? A scribal note in Garšūnī written on f. 99r of the Syriac codex provides the answer to this question:

> May the mercy of God be on the one who has donated this book to the monastery of our Lady the mother of God, the monastery of Scetis, and on the one who made effort again and returned it to the monastery of Scetis.

This indicates that, before coming into the possession of the Monastery of St. Mark in Jerusalem, the Syriac manuscript belonged to the Monastery of the Syrians in the Wādī an-Natrūn, situated in Egypt, to the West of the Nile delta. It is thereby confirmed that the ultimate provenance of the Bohairic fragment reused as endpaper in the Syriac codex now in Jerusalem must be one of the Coptic monasteries from Scetis. Notably, the only other known fragment from the Bohairic version of the *Martyrdom of Macrobius* was found pasted in yet another Syriac liturgical manuscript from Scetis. The fragment in question is preserved in the National Library in Paris as *BnF Copte* 151, f. 1 and was published by Paul Devos\textsuperscript{31}. The paleographical inspection of the Paris fragment demonstrates beyond reasonable doubt that it belonged to the same Bohairic codex as the one found in Jerusalem.

As far as I am aware, these examples are the only known cases of Coptic manuscript finds made outside the Egyptian borders. Thus, as Egypt remains almost the only reservoir of manuscripts written in this language, the discovery of some additional fragments in Damascus is noteworthy.

\textsuperscript{28} GARI\-TTE, *Catalogue*, p. 146-147, 152.

\textsuperscript{29} SUCIU, *Martyrdom of Macrobius*. Description and select photographs of the manuscript (including the Coptic endpaper) are available on the online database of the Hill Museum & Manuscript Library at http://www.vhmml.us/research2014/catalog/detail.asp?MSID=126817 (retrieved: August 2018). The description has been prepared by Adam McCollum.

\textsuperscript{30} On Macrobius, see ORL\-ANDE, *Macrobius*. The synaxary note on this saint can be found in BASS\-ET, *Le synaxaire arabe* 4, p. 190 [832]-193 [835].

\textsuperscript{31} DEVOS, *Macrobe*. 
The question that immediately arises is: how did these Coptic fragments end up in the Genizah of a mosque from Damascus? Answering this question proves to be difficult, not least because the contacts of Coptic Christians with Damascus are poorly documented. The early eighth-century Greek papyri from Aphrodito, which constitute some of the earliest sources mentioning the Umayyad mosque, attest that Egyptian artists and skilled workers contributed to its building under the caliph al-Walid. However, Damascus was the capital of the Umayyad Empire and it is unlikely that any Coptic church could be established there. Much later in the Ayyubid period – when the latest Coptic manuscripts from the Genizah were probably produced – al-Amjad, a wealthy Copt from the affluent al-῾Assāl family, maintained a guest house in Damascus which served as a sort of research center for Copto-Arabic scholars from Egypt. It is in this house that the al-῾Assāl brothers transcribed Arabic biblical and patristic manuscripts that were not available in their country.

The fact that the scholars of the al-῾Assāl family had to make frequent visits to Damascus in search of manuscripts, and the foundation of the al-Amjad house there, suggest that no Coptic enclave existed in the city. This is hardly surprising considering that, while it is true that some Copts settled in Jerusalem (from where they spread westward to Cyprus when Guy de Lusignan became king of the island), the migration influx of Egyptians was inherently inferior compared to that of other Christians living within the eastern orbit. As Paul Peeters adroitly remarked a long time ago, “l’Égypte chrétienne ne possédait rien qui ressemblât à ces postes avancés que d’autres Églises orientales ont jetés en pays étranger et par où elles communiquaient avec le reste du monde.”

This lack of mobility is due to the different historical context in which the Copts evolved. Although Egypt had been at the forefront of opposition to the Christological definition promulgated at the Council of Chalcedon in 451 CE, and consequently faced the Byzantine heavy-handed policy toward anti-Chalcedonians, this region had not suffered the savage persecutions that we find in other parts of the empire, most notably in Syria and Palestine. After the failure of the policies of reconciliation between Chalcedonians and Miaphysites implemented by the emperors Zeno and Anastasius, those who repudiated the Council of Chalcedon in the East

---

were heavily persecuted. For example, when Justin I accessed to power in 518 CE, he issued a series of edicts which expelled the anti-Chalcedonian bishops from their sees and closed the monasteries inhabited by monks who rejected the council. As a consequence of this policy, the Miaphysite bishops Severus of Antioch and Julian of Halicarnassus fled to Egypt, which was a safer place.

We encounter a different situation also in Armenia, where local communities were not only oppressed from the 6th century onwards – when they officially rejected the pronouncements of the Council of Chalcedon – but they were often dislocated from their lands and transplanted elsewhere in the Byzantine Empire. During Islamic rule, the heavy taxation policies imposed by the ’Abbāsid caliphs caused some Armenian princely families to move to Byzantine territories. The progressive annexation of the Bagratid principalities by the Byzantines during the reigns of Basil II and Constantine IX Monomachos in the 10th-11th centuries triggered another massive exodus, this time in the opposite direction, many Armenians fleeing to Muslim lands. These voluntary and involuntary migrations led to the establishment of numerous Armenian churches and monasteries in Italy, the Balkans, Palestine, Syria, Iran, Egypt, and elsewhere. If the testimony of Anasta vardapet is admissible, at the end of the 6th century there were 70 Armenian churches and monasteries in Jerusalem and its surroundings alone. In their turn, Georgian Christians, especially after the acceptance of the Chalcedonian formula, founded monastic colonies throughout Palestine and also in Syria, Greece, and Sinai.

Wide dissemination of these populations throughout the Byzantine Empire, and later, Islamic territories, is something that the Egyptian Christians never experienced. Many Armenian and Georgian manuscripts that belonged to the diasporic enclaves attest to the fact that these communities were actively involved in the growth, preservation, and transmission

---

36 On these edicts, and Justin’s religious policy in general, see Vasiliev, Justin the First, p. 132-253.
37 On the dissemination of Armenians in the Byzantine Empire, see e.g., Charanis, Ethnic Changes, p. 28-31; Idem, Armenians, p. 12-16; Thomson, Origins, p. 37-38; Garsoian, Armenian Integration.
39 The report of Anasta vardapet, an Armenian pilgrim in the Holy Land, has long been considered dubious, but its authenticity is defended by Garsoian, Anasta vardapet. The text was published by Alishan, Deux descriptions. Although clearly exaggerated, the report at least indicates a significant presence of the Armenians in the Holy Land. On the Armenian pilgrimage to the Holy Land, see, e.g., Stone, Holy Land Pilgrimage.
of the literary heritage of their national churches. Seen against this background, it is not surprising that fragments of Armenian and Georgian manuscripts were discovered in the Damascus Genizah since the activity of these ethnic groups in the Holy Land and Syria is historically verified. One can equally find an explanation for the existence of fragments written in Syriac, Christian-Palestinian Aramaic, and Arabic. These languages were already in the early Islamic period widely used in the Christian monastic communities from Palestine and Syria. However, as Coptic churches abroad are very rare and, in any case, no such church seems to have existed in Damascus, the presence of Coptic fragments in the Qubbat al-khazna is somewhat intriguing.

While cognizant that the evidence is sketchy, I would nevertheless like to point out that there are hints that the fragments have some connection with Christian communities from Jerusalem or, possibly, with the crusaders. As noted previously, Coptic churches and monasteries existed in the Holy City. Likewise, while, despite their constant attempts, the crusaders failed to conquer Damascus, the possibility that some fragments in the Genizah of the Umayyad mosque may derive from them is particularly attractive. For example, at least three fragmentary manuscripts written in Old French were discovered in the Qubbat al-khazna. They contain the *Fierabras* (an anonymous *chanson de geste*), a *vita* of St. Mary of Egypt, and a poem on the miraculous birth of Jesus. It is reasonable to speculate that they belonged to a Western religious community, a pilgrim, or a crusader. Furthermore, there are a number of Latin manuscripts that can be connected with the crusaders, including a twelfth-century letter in which Baldwin III, the king of Jerusalem between 1143 and 1162, grants protection to a merchant from Tyre, whom he calls “Bohali, filium Ebenisten,” to sell his goods overseas to Egypt. Although only tersely stated

---

41 See especially Griffith, *Greek into Arabic*; idem, *Monks of Palestine*; idem, *From Aramaic to Arabic*.

42 Tobler, *Bruchstücke*; see also Minervini, *Frammenti epici*.

43 Transcribed in Von Soden, *Bericht*, p. 827; reedited on the basis of the photo available on the website of the State Library in Berlin by Minervini, *Frammenti epici*, p. 103. A very good survey of the Latin manuscripts from the Damascus Qubba can be found in Ammirati, *Latin Fragments*. As the king is identified in the letter as “Balduinus per gratiam Dei in sancta Iherusalem Latinorum rex quartus,” Von Soden, Minervini, and Radiciotti – Ottone, wrongly infer that the document was issued by Baldwin IV. However, this opening formula was used by Baldwin III, who was indeed the fourth king of Jerusalem, being preceded by Baldwin I, Baldwin II, Fulk, and Queen Melisende. The formula is common in the seven letters of Baldwin III published in Migne’s *PL* 155, col. 1139-1153. The author of the letter of protection found in Damascus is correctly identified for the first time as Baldwin III in Kedar, *Subjected Muslims*, p. 172 n. 99, followed by D’Ottone, *Manuscripts as Mirrors*, p. 76. On this issue see, Ammirati, *Latin Fragments*, p. 103.
in previous research, the Hagiopolite origin of the Jewish and Christian (including Coptic) fragments from the Qubbat al-khazna constitutes, in my opinion, the most viable hypothesis\textsuperscript{44}. But how were the fragments transferred from Jerusalem to Damascus? Unfortunately, the answer to this vexing question is likely to remain elusive since we lack access not only to the actual fragments, but also to a detailed description of the cache before they were removed from it.

5. The Bohairic Fragment of the Acts of Matthew in the City of the Priests

Fragment 3 in the description above contains portions from the Bohairic version of the \textit{Acts of Matthew in the City of the Priests}. The script of this fragment closely resembles that of the Bohairic manuscripts produced in the Coptic monasteries of Scetis (Wādī an-Natrūn), particularly during the 9th, 10th, and, less frequently, early 11th centuries\textsuperscript{45}. Consequently, the Qubbat al-khazna fragment can paleographically be dated to the same period.

While it is true that the fragment was found in Damascus, can anything be said about its ultimate provenance? As I have already anticipated, its distinct type of script is usually associated with the Bohairic manuscripts from the monasteries of Scetis\textsuperscript{46}. In addition to the fragment in question, the only similar manuscripts discovered outside Scetis are the aforementioned fragment of the \textit{Martyrdom of Macrobius} kept in the Monastery of St. Mark in Jerusalem and a leaf of unidentified literary content unearthed during the archeological excavations at the Monastery of St. Antony at the Red Sea, whose dates can be fixed on paleographical grounds to the 10th century\textsuperscript{47}. However, as noted previously, it is certain that the fragment found in Jerusalem also ultimately derives from one of the Coptic

\textsuperscript{44} See Von Soden, \textit{Bericht}, p. 826-827; D’Ottone, \textit{Manuscripts as Mirrors}, p. 76-77; Minervini, \textit{Frammenti epici}, p. 102-103.

\textsuperscript{45} I envisage here some of the dated parchment manuscripts brought by Giuseppe Simone Assemani in 1715 from Scetis, which are housed today in the Vatican Library as Vat. Copt. 58-69. These volumes are miscellanies formed of quires and leaves from different parchment codices. See the description of the manuscripts in Hebbelynck — van Lantschoot, \textit{Codices Coptici Vaticani} 1, p. 385-523. For the colophons of these manuscripts, many of which are dated, see Luisier, \textit{Les colophons}.

\textsuperscript{46} Although the Bohairic manuscripts discovered at the monasteries of St. Macarius and St. Bishoy are routinely called “Nitrian” in academic parlance, this designation is fallacious. This label is based on the topographical confusion between ancient Nitria and Wādī an-Natrūn (Scetis), see Evelyn White, \textit{Monasteries of the Wādi ‘n Natrūn} 2, p. 17-36.

\textsuperscript{47} This fragment was published by Hugo Lundhaug in Blid \textit{et al.}, \textit{Excavations}, p. 194-196.
monasteries in Scetis. Can we thus infer a common origin for the other two? Unfortunately, the dearth of information concerning the production of Bohairic manuscripts in the first millennium deters a conclusion in this regard. As all similar Bohairic manuscripts datable between the 9th and early 11th centuries come almost exclusively from the Coptic monasteries of Scetis, it remains largely obscure if this type of script was exclusively used in the Scetiote scriptoria or if the association is simply a misrepresentation due to an accident of preservation. In conclusion, while the Qubbat al-khazna fragment may theoretically derive from Scetis, from where it was later transferred to Damascus, the question remains open.

Until now, the Acts of Matthew in the City of the Priests has been known only in Arabic and Ethiopic. Agnes Smith Lewis published the Arabic text after a single manuscript from the Monastery of the Syrians in the Wādī an-Naṭrūn. It is likely that the Arabic translation was made from Bohairic. The terminus ante quem for the rendering into Arabic is provided by the quotations from our text in Ibn Kātib Qaysār’s commentary on the Apocalypse of John, which dates to 1266/1267 CE. In 1899, Ernest Wallis Budge edited the Ethiopic (Go’az) version. The Ethiopic text belongs to the ṭEBƚ : rophe liːː, the Combat of the Apostles, which is a translation of the Copto-Arabic collection of apocryphal acts, probably made in the 13th or 14th century, and later augmented with several other texts related to the apostles. In the Arabic and Ethiopic versions, the Acts of Matthew in the City of the Priests is followed by the Martyrdom of Matthew (CANT 269; BHO 722-724), which has survived also in Sahidic, but only in an abridged recension.

The text belongs to the Copto-Arabic collection of the apocryphal acts of the apostles used in the Egyptian non-Chalcedonian Church. The entire collection was translated into Arabic from Bohairic, probably

---

49 Graf, GCAL 1, p. 259 n. 1. On Ibn Kātib Qaysār’s commentary on the Apocalypse, see Davis, Ibn Kātib Qaysār.
50 Budge, Contendings 1, p. 94, 101-113 (Ethiopic text), 2, p. 111-129 (English translation). Another English translation, based on a different manuscript, is available in Malan, Conflicts, p. 43-56. The Ethiopic text published by Budge was translated into French in Péres, Actes de Matthieu.
51 Bausi, Gadla hawāyāt.
52 A Sahidic fragment in the British Library was published by Crum, Catalogue British Museum, p. 130-131 (= no. 297).
53 On this collection, see Graf, GCAL 1, p. 258-262. The first who remarked that this must be the collection of the non-Chalcedonian Patriarchate of Alexandria was Guidi, Gli Atti apocrifi, p. 2.
in the 12th century. The Bohairic versions of the apocryphal acts are in their turn based on earlier Sahidic models. Georg Graf, seconded by Alessandro Bausi, judiciously remarked that the Arabic collection, which was subsequently translated into Gaʾaz, originally contained 28 texts, albeit the surviving manuscripts often contain additional pieces. The original collection featured: Preaching of Peter (CANT 204), Martyrdom of Peter (CANT 190.IV), Martyrdom of Paul (CANT 211.V), Acts of Andrew and Philemon (CANT 240), Acts of Andrew and Bartholomew (CANT 238), Martyrdom of Andrew (CANT 235), Preaching of James, son of Zebedee (CANT 273.1), Martyrdom of James, son of Zebedee (CANT 273.2), Acts of John by Ps.-Prochorus (CANT 218), Dormition of John (CANT 215.II), Acts of Philip and Peter (CANT 252.1), Martyrdom of Philip (CANT 252.2), Preaching of Bartholomew in the Oasis (CANT 261), Martyrdom of Bartholomew (CANT 260), Acts of Thomas (CANT 245.II), Martyrdom of Thomas (CANT 245.II), Acts of Matthew in the City of the Priests, Martyrdom of Matthew, Martyrdom of James, son of Alpheus (BHO 390-391), Preaching of Simon the Canaanite (CANT 282.1), Martyrdom of Simon the Canaanite (CANT 282.2), Acts of Peter and Thaddeus (CANT 299), Acts of Andrew and Matthias in the City of the Cannibals (CANT 236), Martyrdom of Matthias (CANT 280.2), Preaching of James, brother of the Lord (CANT 276.1), Martyrdom of James, brother of the Lord (CANT 276.2), Martyrdom of Mark (CANT 287), Martyrdom of Luke (CANT 292-294).

Most of these texts do not have a correspondent in Greek and it is likely that they were originally composed in Coptic. Both the Sahidic and Bohairic collections of the apocryphal acts of the apostles are only fragmentarily preserved. With the exception of the Acts of Matthew in the City of the Priests and the Martyrdom of Luke, all 28 aforementioned writings exist in Sahidic. However, the Martyrdom of Luke is extant in two Bohairic manuscripts. Thus, the only text that has not been attested until now in

---

54 Graf, GCAL 1, p. 258-260; Bausi, Gadla hawāryāt, p. 87-88.
55 The most complete inventory of the Sahidic manuscripts containing the apocryphal acts of the apostles can be found in Lucchesi, Contribution codicologique.
56 The Martyrdom of Luke is preserved in two Bohairic manuscripts from the Monastery of St. Macarius in Scetis. The complete text is extant in Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, Vat. Copt. 68, ff. 16-21 (ca. 10th c. CE); description in Heibyényck – van Lantschoot, Codices Coptici Vaticani 1, p. 500-501, published by Balestri, Il martirio, republished by Balestri – hyvernAT, Acta martyrum II, p. 1-8. Fragments of a dismembered paper codex containing the same text are currently kept in Cairo and Cambridge, see Gaselee, Martyrdom of St. Luke; Evelyn White, Monasteries of the Wādi ’n Natrūn 1, p. 27-50. Three additional folios of the same manuscript were once in the possession of
any Coptic dialect is the *Acts of Matthew in the City of the Priests*. The Bohairic fragment discovered in Damascus helps us establish with certainty that the last piece of the 28-texts collection existed also in the vernacular language of Egypt.

The location of Matthew’s preaching in our text raises some problems. The Arabic version mentions that the apostle proclaimed the gospel “in the city (country) of the priests” (في بلاد الكهنة)\(^{57}\). The Ethiopic simply renders the Arabic, እስከር ከሁኔት : (“the city [country] of the priests”)\(^{58}\). As modern translators inadequately preferred to transliterate the Arabic and the Ethiopic term እስከር ከሁኔት : , the text is largely known today as the *Acts of Matthew in the City (or Country) of Kahenat*. Nevertheless, the tradition according to which the apostle Matthew would have preached in the city of the priests (Kahenat) is not attested elsewhere except in Arabic and Ethiopic sources depending on our text\(^{59}\). Given that only a small fragment is preserved from the Bohairic version, it cannot be ascertained that the same location was registered in Coptic as well.

Notably, the *Encomium on the Twelve Apostles* attributed to Severian of Gabala (*CPG* 4281; clavis coptica 0331), which is extant in two different recensions\(^{60}\), furnishes a list of the missionary journeys of the apostles. As this text was most likely originally composed in Coptic, it proves to be something of a touchstone for the Egyptian traditions concerning the apostles. According to one of the recensions of the encomium, which has survived only in Sahidic, Matthew preached the gospel in Lycaonia, region situated in Asia Minor. Sever J. Voicu perceptively suggested that, in the Arabic version of the *Acts of Matthew in the City of the Priests*, the reading الكهنة (“priests”) represents a transcription mistake of the toponym لوكنيه (Lycaonia)\(^{61}\). This hypothesis is palatable and, if it is correct, the corruption

---

William Hatch, but their current location is unknown to me, see Hatch, Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha.


\(^{58}\) Budge, *Contendings* 1, p. 101.

\(^{59}\) See, e.g., the Copto-Arabic synaxary (Babeh 12), which resumes at this point the *Acts of Matthew*, Bassett, *Le synaxaire arabe* 1, p. 330 [116]-332 [118].

\(^{60}\) One recension is preserved only in Sahidic, while the other is attested in Sahidic, Bohairic, and Arabic. Sahidic text of the first recension in Depuydt, *Encomiastic* [T.], p. 85-130 (Coptic text), [V.], p. 65-101 (English translation); reedition in Righi, *Severiano di Gabala* 1, p. 118-213 (Sahidic text and Italian translation). Only the Arabic text of the second recension has been edited until now in Righi, *Severiano di Gabala* 2, p. 262-407.

must have occurred quite early because the “country of the priests” ( البلاد الكهنة) appears already in the oldest known Arabic manuscript, Sinai, Arabic 539, which has tentatively been dated to the 12th c. CE\(^62\).

In the beginning of the text, the apostles Peter and Andrew meet Matthew upon their return from the Country of the Barbarians (بلاد البربر), where they accomplished their missionary journey\(^63\). Matthew tells them that he travelled to the Country of the Blessed (بلاد المغبوطين)\(^64\). According to Matthew’s account, this place is inhabited by the nine and a half tribes to whom God gave the Promised Land. The text probably relies here upon a tradition stemming from IV Esdr. 13:39-49, which mentions that the nine and a half Jewish tribes settled in a paradisiac distant land called Arzareth, situated somewhere beyond the river Euphrates\(^65\). The text continues by describing the daily life of the inhabitants of this country. The author employs a common literary topos that combines the Greco-Roman myth of the Golden Age and the biblical theme of the earthly Paradise\(^66\). Thus, Jesus Christ visits the citizens of the Country of the Blessed every day and preaches in their church; the inhabitants of the land do not care about riches; they do neither eat meat nor drink wine, but rather honey and dew; they do not feel sexual desire; they wear clothes made from the leaves of trees; they do not lie; the children do not die before their parents; there is no dry season or cold weather in their country, but only pleasant mild winds.

After the account of Matthew’s sojourn in the Country of the Blessed, Jesus appears to the three apostles and assigns them the places of their next missionary journeys: Peter is sent to Rome, Andrew to Mysia, and Matthew to the City of the Priests. Matthew prays and he is taken upon a

\(^{62}\) Sinai, Arabic 539, f. 158v. See the photograph of the title page at https://www.loc.gov/resource/amedmonastery.00279390416-ms/?sp=161 (retrieved: August 2018). For the content of this manuscript see VAN ESBRÖECK, Une collection, p. 196-197. A twelfth-century date is suggested by ATIYA, Arabic Manuscripts, p. 21; see also KAMIL, Catalogue, p. 47. SMITH LEWIS, Mythological Acts, p. xx, dated the manuscript to the 16th c. CE, but this is certainly too late.

\(^{63}\) The Ethiopic has, “Greece” (፲ርእ፡), BUDGE, Contendings 1, p. 101.

\(^{64}\) The Ethiopic has, “Ferakomnos, which means, ‘of the Happy Ones’” (፲ርእ፡፲ር፡እለ፡በትርጓሜሱ፡ፍሡኃን), BUDGE, Contendings 1, p. 101.

\(^{65}\) See the English translation of the relevant passage in STONE, Fourth Ezra, p. 393-394. Given that the Acts of Matthew in the City of the Priests was probably composed directly in Coptic, it is worth mentioning that 4 Ezra circulated in this language and could theoretically be available to the author of the text; on 4 Ezra in Coptic, see Suciu, 4 Ezra. The nine and a half tribes feature also in 2 Baruch 77:17-78:1 and in a poem by Commodian, see LIED, The Other Lands, p. 171-174; BAUCKHAM, The Nine and a Half Tribes.

\(^{66}\) DELUMEAU, Une histoire du paradis 1.
cloud near his destination. Searching for the road into the city, the apostle meets a young shepherd who explains to him that it may be dangerous to enter unless he dresses like the inhabitants, shaves his hair and beard, and holds a palm branch in his hand. The young shepherd who conversed with Matthew turns out to be Christ. Entering the city, the apostle introduces himself to the citizens as an Egyptian. The first person converted by Matthew is Armis, the priest of the temple of Apollo, who is revered as supreme god by the locals. Then, they lock the temple and convert the members of Armis’ household. The next morning, the king wants to enter the temple, but he finds the door closed. Consequently, he orders that Matthew and Armis are arrested, tortured, and executed. However, some of the citizens, having already been persuaded that Matthew’s God is mightier than Apollo, try to hinder the execution. While the apostle is about to be burned by the soldiers, the news of the death of the king’s son reaches the palace. The king promises Matthew that if he resurrects his son, he will become a Christian. The apostle makes a prayer and the boy comes back to life. Thus, the king converts together with all the citizens. The text ends with the account of the building of a church in the city and Matthew’s ordination of Armis as the first bishop of the place.

The new Bohairic fragment features portions from Matthew’s report concerning the Country of the Blessed inhabited by the nine and a half tribes. Below are the beginning and the end of the fragment together with the Arabic and Ethiopic parallels.

**Incipit:**


 […] to [heaven]. And I said to [those] [...], “[How] have you found such [honor]?”

> ثم قلت لهم كيف اسحقتم هذه الكرامة إلى السما بمجد عظيم. ثم قلت لهم كيف اسحقتم هذه الكرامة…to heaven with great glory. Then I said to them, “How have you become worthy of this honor?”

---

The young does not speak in place of the elders [in] our country. The lions are in our midst [...]

The young does not speak before the elder. The lions are sitting...

While the Bohairic omits and adds some words, overall the text agrees quite well with the Arabic and Ethiopic versions. However, there is one instance in which the Bohairic is manifestly divergent: in the Arabic and Ethiopic, the inhabitants of the Country of the Blessed explain to Matthew that their clothes are made “from the leaves of trees” (من أوراق الأشجار/لايفاكلا : دبما : )69. The Bohairic has a different reading here, “[but we] wrap ourselves with the [...] of the sea (الماح ونإتإن إوليا هنن[...] . ω† ἴνεφιον). Nevertheless, given that the Arabic and Ethiopic Acts of Matthew in the City of the Priests have not been critically edited, one should not exclude the possible textual diversity of these versions in the manuscript tradition.

Although the Bohairic fragment discovered in the Qubbat al-khazna preserves only a minuscule portion of the Acts of Matthew, its significance is not reducible to its few variant readings. The fragment features a hitherto unknown text in Coptic, adding to our knowledge of the vernacular literature of Christian Egypt. Furthermore, the Acts of Matthew in the City of the Priests has until now been the only treatise of the original Egyptian Arabic collection of 28 apocryphal acts of the apostles without a known Coptic model. Its identification thus puts the last piece in the puzzle, helping us to establish with certainty that the text circulated also in Coptic. Last but not least, this and the other Coptic fragments from the Qubbat al-khazna document a poorly attested phenomenon: diasporic Egyptian communities.

68 Smith Lewis, Acta Mythologica, p. 48; Budge, Contendings 1, p. 102-103.
69 Smith Lewis, Acta Mythologica, p. 48; Budge, Contendings 1, p. 102.
6. Text and translation\textsuperscript{70}

Recto (hair side):

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{(...) to heaven. And I said to} \\
&\text{[those], "[How] have you} \\
&\text{found such [honor], that [our} \\
&\text{Lord] is celebrating with} \\
&\text{you?" And they said to me,} \\
&\text{"Have you not heard of the} \\
&\text{nine (and) a half tribes that} \\
&\text{he brought into the Good} \\
&\text{Land? We are they. [When]} \\
&\text{the hour of midday comes,} \\
&\text{Gabriel the Archangel [of]} \\
&\text{God [comes, the 144 000 chil-} \\
&\text{dren] following him, the ones} \\
&\text{[...]} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Verso (flesh side):

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{[...]} \\
&\text{[We do not] ever [wrap]} \\
&\text{ourselves with clothes [from} \\
&\text{those that are] made by} \\
&\text{human hand, [but we] wrap} \\
&\text{ourselves with the [...] of the} \\
&\text{sea. We do not ever lie, nor} \\
&\text{we ever take two wives in} \\
&\text{our country, nor do children} \\
&\text{ever die before their parents} \\
&\text{in our country, nor do [the} \\
&\text{young] ever speak in place} \\
&\text{of the elders [in] our coun-} \\
&\text{try. The lions are in our} \\
&\text{[midst] [...]} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\textsuperscript{70} I am grateful to Matthias Müller (University of Basel) for suggesting a couple of restorations of the lacunae.

\textsuperscript{71} The Arabic has "the Promised Land" (ارض الميعاد), while the Ethiopic reads “the Land of Inheritance” (የከንዘ : ይሬን) instead of “the Good Land” (የከንዘ ሥራውን).
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Abstract — At the beginning of the 20th c., numerous fragments of Jewish and Christian manuscripts in different languages were discovered in the Treasury Dome (Qubbat al-khazna) of the Great Umayyad Mosque in Damascus. According to the notes of Bruno Violet, who studied and partly photographed the manuscripts during a research mission to Damascus, among them there were also 18 Coptic
fragments. Four of them were photographed while the manuscripts were in Berlin in 1908. The photographs of the Coptic fragments from the Damascus Qubba are currently kept in the State Library in Berlin. The present article introduces these four fragments and discusses their content and their relevance for Coptic studies. Special attention is given to one of them, a tenth-century Bohairic fragment of the *Acts of Matthew in the City of the Priests*, which represents the first attestation of this apocryphal text in Coptic.