

**UNIONE ACCADEMICA NAZIONALE  
Corpus dei Manoscritti Copti Letterari**

**LETTERATURA COPTA  
Serie Studi**

**TITO ORLANDI**

**COPTIC TEXTS RELATING TO  
THE CHURCH CANONS  
An Overview**

**Roma - CIM - 2016**

The layout has been prepared by the author, using troff/groff for page layout, and postscript fonts. God bless Unix/Linux and Gnu. The Coptic font has been designed by Alberto Camplani and Alessandro Pardini.

© CIM - Roma  
ISBN 978-88-85354-20-3

## CONTENTS

I. Generalia	5
II. Bibliological and Codicological Units	7
1. The monastery of apa Shenute, 9	
2. The monastery of St. John, 14	
3. Origin not known, 17	
III. Textual Units	21
IV. Historical Classification	39
V. Table of the Works	60
Appendices	65
1. Codicological Units, 65 — 2. Fragments, 66	
3. Bibliographical List, 70	



## I. GENERALIA

During the preparation of the catalogue of the so-called Clarendon Press collection of Coptic manuscripts, in the Bodleian Library of Oxford, which I hope to publish soon, I was confronted with the necessity of clarifying (after some texts relating to the Virgin Mary: Orlandi #a411, 2012) the relationship between the fragments containing canonical texts and the known textual units belonging to this genre. As I did in the case of the Virgin Mary texts, I thought it useful to publish the results in this separate book, because they are interesting in many other respects. All the technical observations made in the *Introduction* to the previous book are valid also for this one, but are not repeated here. They concern the situation of the fragments and works of the Coptic literature, and the terminological problems that it raises. Therefore for the terminology and classification criteria the reader is referred to what is said in the Introduction to the book quoted above, especially to pp. 7-11, about:

Codicological units

Bibliological units, ancient or modern, with their *scriptoria*

Textual units, with their literary genres

Author units

Narrative units

Something I want to add on two issues, whose relevance often eludes the scholars who study Coptic texts: (a) the relationship between the works, and the (sometimes different) titles which accompany them in the different codices; (b) the *corpora* or collections in which the individual texts are included in the different manuscripts. The history of the tradition of the Coptic texts, both in the philological and the literary investigation, cannot be properly appreciated without a clear vision of the situation suggested by the analysis of those two elements.

The persons who have chosen the texts included in one codex were normally guided by their own interests and finalities. They may

have been of liturgical character, such as producing a collection to be read in the relevant celebrations, or for reference in ecclesiastical and monastic questions which might arise, and this is the case of historical texts, or, as in our case, canonical texts in a large sense. They found the texts in manuscripts, which constituted their model, with their own title, but (a) they assumed as obvious that they could change them or leave them unaltered as they saw it fit to their present interest. Therefore the differences in the titles point to the history of the tradition and to the specific interest which they were intended to support. (b) They also might find the texts included in a collection, also accompanied by specific titles; and according to the same rules of behaviour they considered themselves entitled to preserve the collections, or extract individual texts, or constitute other collections, in each case keeping or changing the relative titles.

For this reason we consider as individual separate entities: (a) the texts (eventually parts of one text); (b) the titles, which may be superscribed (inscribed) or subscribed or both; and (c) the collections, when it is clear that they were so intended by the commissioning person. And as such they are treated, from now on, in the database of CMCL (<http://www.cmcl.it>, link: *Clavis Coptica*), with a number of CC (*clavis coptica* or *Clavis Patrum Aegyptiorum*), duly quoted in what follows.

Finally we wish to emphasize that this is *not* a study of the Coptic Church canons but a systematic description of the manuscript documents on which such a study should be based, with some observations on the history of the manuscript tradition.

## II. BIBLIOLOGICAL AND CODICOLOGICAL UNITS

In this section I list the “codicological units” which contain the “textual units” of canonical character, which will be described in section III and V. They are arranged according to the “bibliological units - ancient” to which they probably belong, because it is important to pay attention to the origin of the manuscripts as one of the factors leading to the evaluation of the texts which they contain.

Two provisos: (1) there is in many cases more than one “place of origin” (generally the repository of a monastery or a church) for one manuscript, because the codices, as it seems, were frequently displaced from one repository to another. I list the manuscripts under the heading which seems to have the greatest significance for our purposes. (2) The origin which is indicated is sometimes far from sure, still I believe that it is better to represent the situation in this way (duly declaring the uncertainties) rather than continuing the confused approach common so far in similar cases. For the history of Coptic manuscripts, as well as for the history of the relative literature, it is time to propose a synthesis, a model, uncertain as it may be, in order that it can be improved through constructive discussion, instead of random adjustments of an implicit but undeclared reality.

Inside the “bibliological units - ancient” we classify:

(a) codices in complete or semi-complete conditions, as they are now. Here again it is a relative definition: a codex as we have it now, kept in one “bibliological unit - modern”, may be the result of re-binding together pieces coming from different codices, etc. But again we prefer to run our risks, and the reader be alert. They are identified by means of the call number given to them in the data-base of CMCL (<http://www.cmcl.it>); but also the official call number used in the actual collection is given.

(b) Units virtually identified assigning single sheets or groups of sheets, today kept separately in different “bibliological units - modern”, to the same ancient “codicological unit”, that is, groups of dispersed sheets reasonably considered to have belonged to one and the same codex. They are identified by means of the siglum given to them

in the data-base of CMCL; but also the call number of the single sheets is listed.

(c) Units consisting of one sheet or a small group of sheets, which have not yet found any “complementary” sheet to form a virtual “codicological unit” of the type (b). They are identified by means of the official call number of the relevant collection, slightly modified as it appears in the lists of the data-base of the CMCL.

The units are described according to the following template:

Name of the unit in the CMCL archive.

Localization and content: either quote of the fragments, possibly with the original page number, followed by the “textual unit” contained, or quote of the “codicological unit” followed by the number of folios and the “textual unit” contained.

Material.

Date.

Local language (usually called “dialect”).

Editions (of the parts which concern this study. When otherwise not necessary, only the most recent edition is mentioned).

Comments.



**Bibliological unit - ancient, 1:** The monastery of apa Shenute in the mount Atripe (MONB).<sup>1</sup>

Codicological units, 1. Reconstructed codices

### **MONB.BG**

Localization and content:

MP.I.1.B0712 (p. 1-2); PN.129.14.093 (p. numb. not visible); BL.OR03580.28 (p. numb. not visible); PN.131.3.26 (p. 35-36) PN.129.12.07 (p. 59-60) PN.130.3.50-54 (p. 61-70) = cc0091, *Canones Apostolorum*.

WK.09599 (p. 107-108); WK.09603 (p. 141-142); WK.09600-09602 (p. 143-148); CH.541.46.1-2 (p. 151-152); IB.14.01-02 (p. 157-160); IB.14.03 (p. 177-178) = cc0089, *Canones Athanasii*.

Material: parchment.

Date: ca. 950, cf. Riedel-Crum #0213 (1904) p. 84.

Local language: Sahidic.

Editions: Horner #0231 (1904), p. 459sgg. (PN.129.14.093, BL.OR03580.28, PN.131.3.26, PN.129.12.07). Von Lemm #0191 (1907-15), n. LXXXIX (MP.I.1.B0712). Maspero #0172 (1886), p. 142-3 (PN.129.12.07). Leipoldt #0234 (1904) (PN.130.3.50-54). Munnier #0173, I p. 5ff. (CH.541.46). Riedel-Crum #0213 (1904) p. 143-150; 157-160; 177-178.

Comments: It is possible that between the pages 71 and 107 (lost) was copied cc0088 (*Canones Clementis*; cf. Riedel-Crum #0213 (1904) p. 85).

### **MONB.CV**

Localization and content:

PN.129.14.143 and 142 (p. num. not visible) = cc0010 Agathonicus of Tarsus, *Disputatio cum Iustino Samaritano*; cc0011 *Titulus extravagans de synodo Chalcedonensi*; cc0950 Agathonicus of Tarsus *Apoph-*

---

1. Cf. Orlandi #a300 (2002); #a411 (2012), p. 15. The sigla of the individual fragments are explained in Appendix 2, p. 64ff.

*thegma de incarnatione*; cc0966 *Contra concilium Chalcedonense*.

PN.131.1.26 (p. num. not visible) = end of an unknown homily; beginning of cc0320 (BHG.APP0080, CPG5800). Proclus of Constantinople *In Mariam V.* (from the Acts of Ephesus).

BL.OR06807.11-12 (p. num. not visible) = cc0101 Cyril of Alexandria, *Epilysis XII Capitulorum* (from the Acts of Ephesus).

BL.OR06954.04 (p. numb. not visible) = not identified.

Material: parchment.

Date: X-XII cent.

Local language: Sahidic.

Editions: PN.129.14.143 and 142: Crum #0142 (1915).

Comments: the reconstitution of the codex has been studied especially by Lucchesi #2150 (1984), but still is problematic. This is not very important, because we are interested only in PN.129.14.143 and 142.

## **MONB.EF**

Localization and content:

RV.B109.cass29.159.01-04 (p. 19-26) = cc0955 *Symbolum Nicaenum A*, cc0956 *Anathemata Nicaena*, cc0957 *Nomina Patrum Nicaenorum*.

RV.B109.cass29.159.05 (p. 47-48); IB.10.10-17 (p. 49-64) = cc0019, Anonimo. Athanasius of Alexandria *Didascalia Patrum Nicaenorum-Syntagma doctrinae*.

RV.B109.cass29.159.06-07 (p. 69-72); IB.10.18-23 (p. 73-84) = cc0959 *Epistula Epiphani*, cc0960 *Epistula Rufini*, cc0961 *Narratio de 318 Patribus Nicaeae*, cc0021 *Sententiae Concilii Nicaeni*.

RV.B109.cass29.159.08-09 (page num. not visible) = cc0556 *Canones Concilii Nicaeni*.

PN.129.14.061 (p. 101-102) = cc0962 *Canones Ancyрани*.

CF.061-068 (p. 135-150); PN.129.14.063-070 (p. 151-166);

PN.129.14.062 (p. 167-168) = cc0963 *Canones Antiocheni*, cc0964 *Canones Laodicaeni*, cc0965 *Canones Constantinopolitani*, cc0558 *Symbolum Concilii Constantinopolitani*, cc0559 *Decretum Concilii Ephesini*, cc0008 Agathonicus of Tarsus *Contra Anthropomorphitas-Fides Agathonici*, cc0009 Agathonicus of Tarsus *De resurrectione mortuorum (apophthegma)*, cc0011 *Titulus extravagans de synodo*

*Chalcedonensi*, cc0010 Agathonicus of Tarsus *Disputatio cum Iustino Samaritano*, cc0011 *Titulus extravagans de synodo Chalcedonensi* (again), cc0950 Agathonicus of Tarsus *Apophthegma de incarnatione*, cc0011 *Titulus extravagans de synodo Chalcedonensi* (slightly modified), cc0966 *Contra concilium Chalcedonense*.

MU.0158.27 (p. 181-182) = cc0012 Agathonicus of Tarsus *De providentia contra Stratonicum*.

PN.132.1.55 (p. 185-186); IB.10.24-27 (p. 187-194) = end of cc0012; cc0403 Timoteo II di Alessandria *Diataxeis*.

PN.129.14.094-095 (199-202) = end of cc0403; cc0863 *Diegemata*.

Material: parchment.

Date: aD. 1002-3 (cf. van Lantschoot #1462 (1929) n. 70).

Local language: Sahidic.

Editions: Zoega #4608 (1810), n. 159; Revillout #0284 (1881); Gelzer #0296 (1898), p. 77-93; Crum #0142 (1915); Coquin #1559 (1981).

Comments: the codex was produced for a monastery in Erebe, then transferred to the Monastery of apa Shenoute (cf. van Lantschoot).

### **MONB.FT**

Localization and content:

PN.129.14.075-082 (001-016) = cc5462 *titulus ad canones Hippolyti*; cc0021 *Sententiae Concilii Nicaeni*.

PN.129.14.059 (033-034) = end of cc0021; cc0969 (*Collectio Nicaena C*).

PN.129.14.086 (page num. not visible) = cc0959 *Epistula Epiphanii*; cc0960 *Epistula Rufini*.

BS.FOL1608.1 (081-082); PN.129.14.083 (083-084); BS.FOL1608.2 (085-086) = PN.129.14.084 (089-090) = cc0556 *Canones Concilii Nicaeni*.

PN.129.14.085 (131-132) = cc0967 *Canones Gangrenses*.

Material: parchment.

Date: X-XII cent.

Local language: Sahidic.

Editions: PN.129.14.075-082: Lammeyer #0277 (1912).

Comments: for the general title: [cc5462] Hippolytus of Rome (Ps.),

*Corpus Canonum* cf. below p. 51 and 55-6. According to Alin Suciu (personal communication) the fragments from page 81 to the end are part of a different codicological unit. For our purpose this does not make much difference.

### **MONB.OJ**

Localization and content:

BL.OR03580.29 (page num. not visible, but obviously page 1-2);  
BL.OR03580.30 (page num. not visible); CP.B51.1-4 (051-058);  
BL.OR03580.31 (page num. not visible); MU.0158.23 (071-072);  
CU.OR1699.P1-2 (page num. not visible) = cc0091 *Canones Apostolorum*.

CC.9259 (page num. not visible); BL.OR06954.01 (page num. not visible) = cc0088 *Canones Clementis*.

Material: parchment.

Date: X-XII cent.

Local language: Sahidic.

Editions: MU.0158.23: Blanc #1023 (1954).

Comments:

### Codicological units, 2. Isolated fragments

For the isolated fragments, the origin from the Monastery of apa Shenoute is more debatable than for the other documents. I list the fragments, and I add only the reference to the clavis number, indicating their content.

Localization and content:

**BL.OR03580.27**, 2 ff. = cc0088, *Canones Clementis* 22-26, 51.

Material: parchment.

Date: X-XII cent.

Local language: Sahidic.

Editions: unpublished.

Comments: Cf. Crum #4555 (1905) n. 164. Probably from the same codicological unit as the following.

Localization and content:

**PN.129.12.09** = cc0091, *Canones Apostolorum* 49-50

Material: parchment.

Date: X-XII cent.

Local language: Sahidic.

Editions: Horner #0231 (1904).

Comments: Probably from the same codicological unit as the preceding.

**Bibliological unit - ancient, 2:** The monastery of St. John at Tin (GIOV).<sup>2</sup>

The attribution of the papyrus fragments brought by B. Drovetti from Egypt, now in the Egyptian Museum in Turin, to the library of a monastery in Tin, Upper Egypt, has been proposed by me after van Lantschoot Colophons, p. 180-181, n. CV, and is based on an index placed, as it seems, in front of one of the “codicological units”, TM.63000.03. Be that as it may, certainly the Turin papyri come from one ancient “bibliological unit”, though they are now badly damaged.

The sheets are placed between glass panes, and are referred to by means of the call number of the codex (TM.63000.01, 02, 03, etc.) followed by the number of the glass.

Codicological units. Reconstructed codices<sup>3</sup>

**GIOV.AC**

Localization and content:

TM.63000.03.01-14r (p. 17-43) = cc0840 Cirillo di Alessandria, *In Iohannem Baptistam*;

TM.63000.03.14v-30 (p. 44-86, with scribal error) = cc0319 Proclus of Constantinople, *In Iohannem Baptistam*;

TM.63000.03.31-46r (p. 89-119) = cc0407 *Aphou vita*.

TM.63000.03.46v-49 (p. 120-124, with scribal error);

TM.63000.03.51-56 (p. 131-142); TM.63000.03.57-58 (p. 147-150);

TM.63000.03.63 (p. [151-152]) = cc0019 *Didascalia Patrum Nicaenorum*.

TM.63000.03.63 (p. [151-152], cf. Comments); TM.63000.03.73+59 (p. 153-154) = cc0958 *Epistula Paulini*.

TM.63000.03.73+59v (p. 154); TM.63000.03.60+xx (p. 155-156) =

2. Cf. Orlandi (2013).

3. We classify these codices as “reconstructed” because they are not complete, and the individual sheets are kept under separate glasses. In fact they are all that remains of entire codices, and they have been kept together (with exceptions), both in the place of discovery and in the actual collocation.

cc0959 *Epistula Epiphanii*.

TM.63000.03.60+xx (p. 156); TM.63000.03.62+61r (p. 157) = cc0960 *Epistula Rufini*.

TM.63000.03.62+61 (p. 157-158) = cc0961 *Narratio de 318 Patribus Nicaeae*.

TM.63000.03.62+61v (p. 158); TM.63000.03.63-72 (159-[174]) = cc0276 *Herai Passio*.

Material: papyrus.

Date: VIII-IX cent.

Local language: Sahidic.

Editions: Rossi #1417 (1887-92) fasc. I.2 I.3 I.5; (cf. Orlandi 2013; Revillout #0284, 1881).

Comments: The history of the codex in the Turin museum is very complicated: cf. Orlandi (2013) p. 509-12, 516, 519. Some folios are separated between two glasses.

### **GIOV.AJ**

Localization and content:

TM.63000.09.01-06 (011-022); TM.63000.09.07-14 (page num. not visible); TM.63000.09.15-24 (p. 41-58) = cc0408 *Athanasii ep. Alexandriae vita*.

TM.63000.09.24v-33 (p. 58-78); TM.63000.09.37-40 (p. 79-86); TM.63000.09.34-36 (page num. not visible); TM.63000.09.41-42 (page num. not visible): cc0021 *Sententiae Concilii Nicaeni*.

Material: papyrus.

Date: VIII-IX cent.

Local language: Sahidic.

Editions: Rossi #1417 (1887-92) fasc. I.2 (cf. Orlandi 2013; Orlandi #0109, 1968).

Comments: none.

### **GIOV.AN**

Localization and content:

TM.63000.13 = cc0090 *Canones Basilii*.

Material: parchment.

Date: VIII-IX cent.

Local language: Sahidic.

Editions: Rossi #1417 (1887-92) fasc. II.4 (cf. Orlandi 2013) partially.

Cf. Crum #0225 (1904).

Comments: all the folios of this codex are in fragmentary conditions, and the numeration of the pages is not visible.



**Bibliological unit - ancient, 3:** Origin not known (CMCL).

**Codicological units, 1:** Isolated codices

### **CMCL.AZ**

Localization and content:

GB.61.B, p. 1-4 lacuna;

GB.61.B, p. 5-38 = cc0106 *Erotapokrisis Cyrilli et Stephani*.

GB.61.B, p. 38-73 = cc0203 *Historia Horsiesi*.

GB.61.B, p. 73-88 = cc0008 Agathonicus of Tarsus *Fides Agathonici*.

GB.61.B, p. 89-90 = cc0009 *De resurrectione mortuorum (apophthegma)*.

GB.61.B, p. 90 = cc0011 *Titulus extravagans de synodo Chalcedonensi*.

GB.61.B, p. 90-96 = cc0010 cc0010 Agathonicus of Tarsus *Disputatio cum Iustino Samaritano*.

GB.61.B, p. 96-125 = cc0012 cc0012 Agathonicus of Tarsus *De providentia contra Stratonicum*.

GB.61.B, p. 126-136; GB.61.E, p. 137-138 = cc0013 Agathonicus of Tarsus *De incredulitate*.

Material: papyrus.

Date: VII cent.

Local language: Sahidic.

Editions: Crum #0142 (1915). Cc0012, 0010, 0013 in the CMCL archive (<http://www.cmcl.it>, link: Texts).

### **CMCL.BD**

Localization and content:

BL.OR01320.01-41 (p. a1-81) = cc0088 *Canones Clementis*;

BL.OR01320.42-51 (p. b1-21) = cc0091 *Canones Apostolorum*;

Material: parchment.

Date: a. 1006 (cf. van Lantschoot #1462 (1929) n. 62).

Local language: Sahidic.

Editions: De Lagarde #0165 (1883), p. 209-291; partially Till #0388 (1954).

Comments: Page numbers begin anew with the second work. The codex might come from the library of the Monastery of Shenoute, Atripe.

### **CMCL.BG**

Localization and content:

BL.PAP.XXXVI.01-19; BL.PAP.XXXVI.21-24; [ex-Phillips 16402. 1-4] = cc0089 *Canones Athanasii*.

Material: papyrus.

Date: VIII-IX cent.

Local language: Sahidic.

Editions: Riedel-Crum #0213 (1904).

### **DM.provv01**

Content:

cc0090 *Canones Basilii*.

Material: papyrus.

Date: VIII-IX cent.

Local language: Sahidic.

Editions: It is being published by Alberto Camplani.

Comments: Coptic manuscript found near Deir el Medina.

[**BS.QUART0519**: dated a. 1803-4; modern translation into Bohairic (and Arabic), probably of CMCL.BD.

cc0088 *canones Clementis*; cc0091 *canones Apostolorum*.

Ed. Tattam #0232 (1848); Lagarde #0165 (1883).]

[**BL.OR00440**: XIX cent.; modern copy of CMCL.BD.

cc0088 *canones Clementis*; cc0091 *canones Apostolorum*.]

**Codicological units, 2:** Isolated fragments.

Localization and content:

**DC.MS819C.1-8** = cc0090 *Canones Basilioi*.

Material: parchment.

Date: X-XII cent.

Local language: Sahidic.

Localization and content:

**NM.579.001** = ?cc0088 *Canones Clementis*

Material: parchment.

Date: X-XII cent.

Local language: Sahidic

Comments: cf. Depuydt #4763 (1993) n. 83; Lucchesi #a129 (1995) p. 584. It was *feuille de garde* of New York Morgan n. 579 (MICH.BL).

Localization and content:

**NM.664b.12** = cc0091 *Canones Apostolorum*.

Material: parchment.

Date: X-XII cent.

Local language: Sahidic.

Comments: cf. Depuydt #4763 (1993) n. 61.

Localization and content:

**OB.COPT.B10; OB.COPT.D178A.** = cc0090 *Canones Basilioi*.

Material: papyrus.

Date: VIII-IX cent.

Local language: Sahidic.

Editions: Kahle #0162 (1954) n. 31.



### III. TEXTUAL UNITS

(Note: the “textual units” marked: “outside this research” are listed because they are found in the manuscripts, together with canonical works.)

cc0008: Agathonicus of Tarsus *Fides Agathonici*

**mss.:** CMCL.AZ (p. 73-88). MONB.EF (p. 153-159).

**comments:** In MONB.EF the original text is transformed in order to become suitable for an anthropomorphic theology.

**summary:** Sort of catechetical treatise, composed of: (a) a prologue, in which the author describes the doubts that he must overcome before discussing the subject since his inspiration might come from a demon rather than God; (b) a central discussion concerning anthropomorphism, where the primitive redaction was against this opinion; (c) an exhortatory conclusion regarding, above all, the correct way to pray.

cc0009: *De resurrectione mortuorum (apophthegma)*

**mss.:** CMCL.AZ (p. 89-90). MONB.EF (p. 159-160).

**comments:** Very short aphorism on the body of Christ and the resurrection, inserted in the *corpus* of Agathonicus (cc0561 and cc0971).

cc0010: Agathonicus of Tarsus *Disputatio cum Iustino Samaritano de resurrectione mortuorum.*

**mss.:** CMCL.AZ (p. 90-96). MONB.CV (PN.129.14.143). MONB.EF (p. 160-162).

**comments:** cf. below, p. 49.

**summary:** Dispute with Justin the Samaritan about the Resurrection. The Samaritan is persuaded to believe in the resurrection of the body with arguments all based on passages of the Old Testament. At the end, he asks to be baptized.

cc0011: *Titulus extravagans de synodo Chalcedonensi.*

**mss.:** CMCL.AZ (p. 90). MONB.CV (PN.129.14.143, twice). MONB.EF (p. 159, 162, 163).

**comments:** A kind of title mysteriously inserted in some manuscripts of the works of Agathonicus, mentioning the christology of the Council of Chalcedon. In MONB.EF it appears three times (slightly modified), in MONB.CV two times. In any case it has nothing to do with the works preceding and following.

**summary:** Sentence on Chalcedon used as title or glossa.

cc0012: Agathonicus of Tarsus *De providentia contra Stratonicum*

**mss.:** CMCL.AZ (p. 96-125). MONB.EF (p. 181-194). CN.PCARL30.1-4 (p. 15-16).

**comments:** In fact it is an *erotapokrisis* preceded by a peculiar narrative about a probably imaginary council of Ancyra. In CN.PCARL30.1-4 this text was added without any interruption to cc0013, forming a new text, cc0973.

**summary:** Cf. below, p. 45-48.

cc0013: Agathonicus of Tarsus *Apologia, de incredulitate*

**mss.:** CMCL.AZ (p. 126-138). CN.PCARL30.1-4 (p. 1-15).

**comments:** Evagrius Ponticus is explicitly mentioned (ed. Crum, p. 128-9), and also Homer and Socrates (i.e. Plato). In CN.PCARL30.1-4 this treatise is joined with cc0012, the whole assuming a new homiletic form, cc0973.

**summary:** A treatise in homiletic form, it is composed of: (a) prologue, in which the author describes his difficult spiritual condition and his decision to write in order to help any brothers in similar circumstances; (b) central portion, in which phrases from the scripture are counterposed to sentences of the unbelievers, as a means of setting forth various moral arguments; (c) conclusion, which blames the defection of some Christians who read pagan texts such as works of Homer and Socrates.

cc0019: *Didascalia Patrum Nicaenorum, Syntagma doctrinae* (CPG2264 and 2298).

**mss.:** GIOV.AC (p. 120-152). MONB.EF (p. 47-64).

**comments:** Text with a problematic tradition in many languages,

starting from Greek. It is mainly attributed to Athanasius of Alexandria (ed. Arnold 1685 = Montfaucon, Migne 28,836-845; Batiffol #0212 (1887); Pitra Spic. Sol. IV 1858 p. 456; Munitiz CC.G 5, 1979,91), but also to Epiphanius, Basil, Evagrius Ponticus. Cf. Garitte #0038 (1942), status quaestionis (as in 1942); Riedinger-Thurn (1985); Bausi #a462 (2004); and Kohlbacher #6653 (1999).

**summary:** a. Fides Nicaena (the symbolum) cc0955.

b. Anathematisms cc0956 (+ number of the bishops at Nicaea): Son not coexistent with Father; Sabellius; Photinus; the Holy Spirit; humanity in Christ; resurrection of the flesh; Arians; anthropomorphites.

c. Moralia (the real *didascalía*): Precepts for the monks. Monks, women, fasting. Recommendations to the clergy. Dress, drinking wine, behaviour to other monasteries. Teaching. Behaviour to the laymen.

cc0021: *Sententiae Concilii Nicaeni* (CPG8522)

**mss.:** GIOV.AJ (p. 58-86). MONB.EF (p. 71-84). MONB.FT (p. 1-33).

**comments:** An early forgery (perhaps IVth cent.), constructed so to simulate a Nicene document. The original was most probably in Greek, but no Greek text exists. Cf. Lammeyer #0277 (1912). In the press an edition with commentary by Alistair Stewart.

**summary:** Short symbolum (cc0955). Theological section on free will (*prohairesis*). Attend the church. Women and make up, men and elegance. Virgins: Mary is their model. Chastity in men. The neighbor. Love (ΑΓΑΠΗ) of God and men. The holy communion. Behavior in the church. Sins of the people. Duty of the wealthy. Repentance.

cc0088: *Canones Apostolorum per Clementem*.

**mss.:** BL.OR00440. CMCL.BD (p. a1-81). BL.OR03580.27. BS.QUART0519. MONB.OJ (p. 73-end). NM.579.001. PN.129.12.09.

**comments:** The Church canons of “apostolic” tradition are variously collected and named in the different linguistic environments. In Coptic two texts are known: this one (the other is cc0091) is presented under the name of Clement (scil. of Rome), and according to Coquin

#0754, 1965, partly corresponds to the so-called *Traditio apostolica* attributed to Hippolytus of Rome. The fragment NM.579.001 corresponds to Vööbus CSCO 401 p. 25-27 (cf. Lucchesi #a129, 1995), and was probably part of a different composition.

cc0089: *Canones Athanasii* (CPG2302)

**mss.:** MONB.BG (p. 107-178). CMCL.BG.

**comments:** Preserved only in the Coptic fragments and complete in Arabic. The Coptic version is listed in the catalogue ed. Bouriant #4503 (1889-93). 107 numbered canons in the Arabic translation/version of Michael of Tis, as reported by Abu 'l Barakat (Riedel-Crum #0213, 1904, p. IX-X); in the original it was a continuous (not numbered) text. Published in Riedel-Crum #0213, (1904) and Munier #0173. There is some affinity between this text and cc0638 ps. Shenoute *De ecclesia frequentanda*.

cc0090: *Canones Basilii*. (CPG2977)

**mss.:** DC.MS819C.1-8. DM.provv01. GIOV.AN. OB.COPT.B10. OB.COPT.D178A.

**comments:** [From R.-G. Coquin, Coptic Enc. II 459] “They appear in two series. The first, containing thirteen canons, is shared with the Melchites; the second, of 105 or 106 canons, is peculiar to the Copts. The first series includes disciplinary sanctions with regard to priests or deacons and the prohibition against the burning of relics or of the Eucharist. These canons appear to be borrowed from the works of Saint Basil. The 105 or 106 canons are preserved partly in Coptic, but the complete text has survived in Arabic.” For parts in Ethiopic cf. Crum #0225 (1904), which translates the fragments of GIOV.AN published by Rossi. The Bodleian fragment (from Bala'iza) in Kahle #0162 (1954) n. 31; I could not see Drescher, “Annales Serv. Ant. Égypte” 51 (1951) 247-256. After Coquin's remarks a complete Coptic manuscript witness has been found (near Deir el Medina): DM.provv01, and is being published by Alberto Camplani. The other codices are fragmentary, and a deep investigation on the documents is still wanting (but cf. W. E. Crum, #0225, 1904).



cc0091: *Canones Apostolorum*.

**mss.:** CMCL.BD (p. b1-21). BS.QUART0519. MONB.BG (p. 1-70). MONB.OJ (p. 001-073post). NM.664B.12. PN.161.051-053.

**comments:** The Church canons of “apostolic” tradition are variously collected and named in the different linguistic environments. In Coptic two texts are known: this one (the other is cc0088) is attributed directly to the Apostles. According to Coquin, #0754 (1965) Canons 1-30 derive from the so-called *Constitutio Apostolica*; 31-62 correspond to the *Canones Hippolyti* (Arabic); 63-78 correspond to the so-called *Constitutiones Apostolicae* (book 8).

cc0101: Cyril of Alexandria, *Epilysis XII Capitulorum* (CPG5223)

**mss.:** MONB.CV (Acta Ephesina). MR.064.1-2.

**comments:** Outside this research.

cc0106: Cyril of Alexandria, *Erotapokrisis (Zetemata) Cyrilli et Stephani*.

**mss:** BL.PAP.VI.2-3. BL.PAP.VI.8. CMCL.AZ (p. [1]-38).

**comments:** Outside this research.

cc0203: *Historia Horsesi*.

**mss:** CAIRO.MED.MADI.MMREG16. CMCL.AZ (p. 38-73).

**comments:** Outside this research.

cc0276: *Herai Passio* (BHO 376)

**mss.:** GIOV.AC (p. 158-end). LU.1089.07. LU.1089.10.

**comments:** Outside this research.

cc0319: Proclus of Constantinople, *In Iohannem Baptistam* (CPG5877).

**mss.:** GIOV.AC (p. 44-[88]).

**comments:** Outside this research.

cc0320: Proclus of Constantinople, *In Mariam V.* (BG.APP0080) (CPG5800).

**mss.:** MONB.CV (b). MONB.LY (p. 31b-32). MONB.MN p. 278.

**comments:** Outside this research.

cc0403: Timothy II of Alexandria (Aelurus), Peter of Alexandria, *Responsa canonica, Diataxeis* (CPG2520).

**mss.:** MONB.EF (p. 194-200).

**comments:** Greek text in Joannou II 240-258. Ethiopic translation and general *status quaestionis* in Bausi #a173 (2006).

cc0407: *Aphou vita* (BHO0077).

**mss.:** GIOV.AC (p. 89-119).

**comments:** Outside this research.

cc0408: *Athanasii ep. Alexandriae vita* (BHO0115).

**mss.:** GIOV.AJ (p. 1-58). KP.10236. MONB.GY. OB.COPT.C31. OB.COPT.E028.2. WK.02941A-I.

**comments:** Outside this research.

cc0462: Hippolytus of Rome (Ps.), *Corpus Canonum*;

**mss.:** MONB.FT (p.1-?).

**comments:** Phantomatic collection of canons under the name of Hippolytus, present as a title (cf. cc5462) in only one manuscript, and without much justification. Actually the Graeco-Latin collection known as *Canones Hippolyti* appears in Coptic as canons 31-62 of cc0091.

cc0554: *Collectio Nicaena A*

**mss.:** MONB.EF (p. 19-21).

**comments:** Collection of documents attributed to the council of Nicaea: cc0955 (symbolon), cc0956 (anathemata).

cc0555: *Collectio Nicaena B*

**mss.:** GIOV.AC p. 120-158. MONB.EF (p. 47-70). MONB.FT (PN.129.14.086)

**comments:** Collection of documents attributed to the council of Nicaea: cc0019 (didascalia), cc0958 (subscriptio Paulini), cc0959 (epistula Epiphani), cc0960 (epistula Rufini), cc0961 (de 318 patribus).

cc0556: *Canones Concilii Nicaeni* (CPG8513, 8522)

**mss.:** MONB.EF (RV.B109.cass29.159.08-09). MONB.FT (p. 81-90).

**comments:** Fragments from what appears to be the classical collection of the 20 canons of Nicaea. Joannou I, 1 p. 23-41. Di Berardino p. 18-30.

cc0558: *Symbolum Concilii Constantinopolitani* (CPG8599)

**mss.:** MONB.EF (150-152).

**comments:** Symbolon of Constantinople, inserted after the Canons cc0965 with a long *inscriptio* dealing with the Council (cc5558). Cf. Dossetti #0295 (1967) p. 151-2.

cc0559: *Decretum Concilii Ephesini* (CPG8800)

**mss.:** MONB.EF (152-153).

**comments:** This text was included in the Greek collection of the Canons of Ephesus as the last one (eighth). This Coptic witness shows that it could stay also by itself.

**summary:** Cf. Joannou I, 1 p. 63-65, ACO I,1,7 p. 122, Di Berardino p. 56-61.

cc0561: *Corpus Agathonicaeum A*

**mss.:** CMCL.AZ (p. 73-126).

**comments:** Collection of works attributed to Agathonicus bishop of Tarsus in Cilicia and inserted in the authoritative collections of canones and council acts. Discussed below, p. 53-55.

cc0840: Cyril of Alexandria (?), *In Iohannem Baptistam*;

**mss.:** GIOV.AC (p. [1]-43).

**comments:** Outside this research.

cc0863: *Diegemata*

**mss.:** MONB.EF (p. 200-201).

**comments:** Two apophthegmata appended to cc0403 (see above). In the first Cyril of Alexandria solves a curious problem concerning the baptism of two twins, one of whom was already baptized, but the mother could not identify who it was. In the second an archbishop (possibly the same Cyril) solves the problem concerning the funerals of a woman ready to be baptized, who had suddenly died.

cc0950: *Apophthegma de incarnatione*

**mss.:** MONB.CV (PN.129.14.143). MONB.EF (p. 162-163).

**comments:** Kind of apophthegm or brief tractate on the incarnation, inserted in the Corpus Agathonicaeum A and B, cc0561 and cc0971.

**summary:** Statements on the passion of Christ as God and as man.

cc0955: *Symbolum Nicaenum A.* (CPG8512).

**mss.:** MONB.EF p. 19.

**comments:** Textual element in the Nicean dossier cc0554, and in the works cc0019 and cc0021.

cc0956: *Anathemata Nicaena.*

**mss.:** MONB.EF p. 19-21.

**comments:** Anathemata against Arius, Sabellius, and others, which follow the Symbolon Nicaenum cc0955 in MONB.EF. Element in the collection cc0554 and in cc0019. Cf. Dossetti #0295 (1967) p. 161-167

cc0957: *Nomina Patrum Nicaenorum* (CPG8516)

**mss.:** MONB.EF (p. 21-26).

**comments:** List or signature of the Bishops present at the Council of Nicaea. Cf. below, p. 42.

cc0958: Paulinus of Antioch *Epistula* (CPG2134)

**mss.:** GIOV.AC (p. 151-154).

**comments:** Element in the Nicean dossier cc0555. The Greek text in Athanasius Tomos ad Antiochenos PG 26.809 and Epiph. Panarion haer. 77. Cf. Armstrong (1921); Simonetti (1975) p. 358-70. Cf. below, p. 42-43.

cc0959: Epiphanius of Salamis (?) *Epistula*

**mss.:** GIOV.AC (p. 155-156). MONB.EF (p. 69). MONB.FT p. 35post = PN.129.14.086.

**comments:** Element in the Nicean dossier cc0555 (MONB.EF and GIOV.AC) and cc0969 (MONB.FT). (Cf. cc0958 and cc0960). Cf. below, p. 43.

cc0960: Rufinus (of Rome?) *Epistula*

**mss.:** GIOV.AC (p. 156-157). MONB.EF (p. 69-70). MONB.FT p. 35post = PN.129.14.086.

**comments:** Element in the Nicean dossier cc0555 (MONB.EF and GIOV.AC) and cc0969 (MONB.FT). (Cf. cc0958 and cc0959). Cf. below, p. 43.

cc0961: *Narratio de Spiritu Sancto in concilio Nicaeno*

**mss.:** GIOV.AC (p. 157-158). MONB.EF (p. 70).

**comments:** Element in the Nicean dossier cc0555.

**summary:** When the 318 bishops assembled in Nicaea were counted, the number gave 319. At last it was realized that the invisible present was the Holy Ghost.

cc0962: *Canones Ancyрани* (CPG8501)

**mss.:** MONB.EF (p. 101-102).

**comments:** Horoi 4-8. Joannou I,2 p. 56-73. Di Berardino p. 270-80.

cc0963: *Canones Antiocheni* (CPG8536)

**mss.:** MONB.EF (p. 135-138).

**comments:** Horoi 20-24. Joannou I,2 p. 102-126. Di Berardino p. 300-13.

cc0964: *Canones Laodicaeni* (CPG8607)

**mss.:** MONB.EF (p. 138, 147).

**comments:** Horoi 1-59. Joannou I, 2 p. 130-155. Di Berardino p. 336-51.

cc0965: *Canones Constantinopolitani* (CPG8600)

**mss.:** MONB.EF (p. 148-150).

**comments:** This collection contains (probably with reason) the first five canons, like the best Greek tradition. Joannou I, 1 p. 45-54. Di Berardino p. 354-7.

cc0966: *Contra concilium Chalcedonense*

**mss.:** MONB.CV (PN.129.14.142). MONB.EF (p. 163-168).

**comments:** Homily without title, inserted in the Agathonicus corpus (cc0561), as a text against Chalcedon.

**summary:** Homily or tractate blaming the council of Chalcedon for having been influenced by the heathens in its decisions about the passion of Christ as God. The last part is wanting.

cc0967: *Canones Gangrenses* (CPG8554)

**mss.:** MONB.FT (p. 131-132).

**comments:** Canons with numbers from 61 to 72. It is evident that in the manuscript (MONB.FT) the canons were numbered in sequence, i.e. Nicaea (20), Ancyra (21-45), Neocaesarea (46-60), Gangra 61 ff. like in the Latin collection Turner (1899-1913) II 3.

cc0969: *Collectio Nicaena C.*

**mss.:** MONB.FT (p. 33-34 and PN.129.14.086).

**comments:** Collection of Nicene documents in MONB.FT: cc0970, cc0958 (in lacuna), cc0959, cc0960; with inscription and subscription cc5969. It was preceded by the Gnomai cc0021.

cc0970: *Origo concilii Nicaeni*.

**mss.:** MONB.FT (p. PN.129.14.086v).

**comments:** Fragment (beginning) of a narration concerning the circumstances of the council of Nicaea. It was probably conceived as an introduction to the *Collectio Nicaena C*, cc0969.

cc0971: *Corpus Agathonicaeum B*

**mss.:** MONB.CV (PN.129.14.143 and 142) . MONB.EF (p. 153-194).

**comments:** Collection of works of Agathonicus of Tarsus as found in the mss. MONB.CV (between lacunas) cc0010, cc0011, cc0950, cc0011, cc0966; and MONB.EF: cc0008+cc0009+cc0011, cc0010, cc0011+cc0950+cc0011+cc0966, cc0012.

cc0972: Agathonicus of Tarsus. *Apologia composita*.

**mss.:** CN.PCARL30.1-4.

**comments:** Work obtained joining two originally separated texts, cc0013 (with its *inscriptio* cc5013, p. 1-15) and cc0012, immediately following without separation (p. 15-16). The only manuscript witness is in Fayumic.

cc0974: *Clausula Nicaena*.

**mss.:** MONB.EF p. 21 col. 2.

**comments:** A kind of *clausula*, or conclusive statement, inserted at the end of cc0554, before the *subscriptio*.

**text:** ΕΤΒΕ ΤΠΙCΤΙC ΔΕ ΟΝ ΛCΔΟΚΕΙ ΝΤΕΙΖΕ· ΝΝΕΝ-  
ΤΑΥCΩΟΥΖ ΕΤΝΟC ΝCΥΝΖΟΔΟC· ΑΥΩ ΑΥΖΥΠΟΓΡΑΦΕ  
ΝΤΠΙCΤΙC ΝΟΡΘΟΔΟΞΟC ΝΤΕΙΖΕ ΝΟΙ ΝΕΠΙCΚΟΠΟC·  
ΠΟΥΛ ΔΕ ΠΟΥΛ ΝΝΕΠΙCΚΟΠΟC· ΝΤΟΥΕΙ ΤΟΥΕΙ ΝΜΠΟ-  
ΛΙC ΜΝ ΝΕΥΕΠΑΡ ΧΙΑ· ΞΕ †ΠΙCΤΕΥΕ ΝΤΕΙΖΕ·

cc5008: *titulus ad cc0008*.

**mss.:** CMCL.AZ p. 88.

**text:** *subscriptio:* ΤΠΙCΤΙC ΝΑΠΑ ΑΓΑΘΟΝΙΚΟC  
ΠΕΠΙCΚ(ΟΠΟC) ΝΤΑΡCΟC ΝΚΙΛΙΚΙΑ ΕΝΤΑΨΖΟΜΟΛΟΓΕΙ

ΜΜΟC 2N TCYΝ2ΟΔΟC ΝΤΑCΩΠΕ 2N ΑΓΚΥΡΑ ΝΤΕ  
ΤΓΑΛΑΤΙΑ

cc5009: *titulus ad cc0009.*

**mss.:** CMCL.AZ p. 90.

**text:** inscriptio: ΤΟΥ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΖΟΜΟΙΩC ΠΕΡΙ ΑΝΑC-  
ΤΑCΕΩC

cc5010: *titulus ad cc0010.*

**mss.:** CMCL.AZ p. 90. MONB.EF p. 160.

**text:** CMCL.AZ p. 90: ...ΑΥΓΥΜΝΑCΙΑ ΩΠΕ ΜΝ  
ΝCΑΜΑΡΙΤΗC ΜΝ ΑΓΑΘΟΝΙΚΟC ΕΤΒΕ ΤΑΝΑCΤΑCΙC· ...  
MONB.EF p. 160 : ΑΠΑ ΑΓΑΘΟΝΙΚΟC ΕΦΓΥΜΝΑΖΕ ΜΝ  
ΙΟΥCΤΙΝΟC ΠCΑΜΑΡΙΤΗC ΕΤΒΕ ΤΑΝΑCΤΑCΙC

cc5012: *titulus ad cc0012.*

**mss.:** CMCL.AZ p. 96.

**text:** ΤΟΥ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΑΓΑΘΟΝΙΚΟΥ ΕΠΙCΚΟΠΟΥ ΤΟΥ  
ΤΑΡCΟ ΚΙΛΙΚΙΑC

cc5013: *titulus ad cc0013. titulus ad cc0973.*

**mss.:** CMCL.AZ p. 126 and p. 138. CN.PCARL30.1-4 p. 1.

**comments:** It was used as inscriptio and subscriptio of cc0013 in CMCL.AZ. It was used also (in Fayumic) as inscriptio of cc0973 in CN.PCARL30.1-4.

**text:** CMCL.AZ p. 126: ΑΠΟΛΟΓΙΑ ΑΓΑΘΟΝΙΚΟΥ  
ΕΠΙCΚΟΠΟΥ ΤΑΡCΟ ΚΙΛΙΚΙΑC ΠΕΡΙ ΑΠΙCΤΕΙΑC  
CMCL.AZ p. 138: [α]ΠΑ ΑΓΑΘΟΝΙΚΟC ΠΕΠΙCΚΟΠΟC  
[N̄]ΤΑΡCΟC N̄TKΙΛΙΚΙΑ ΕΤΒΕ [TMN]ΤΑΤΝΑΖΤΕ  
pn.carls p. 1: ΝΕΙ ΝΕ ΝΑΠΟΛΟΓΙΑ ΝΑΓΑΘΟΝΙΚΟC  
ΠΕΠΙCΚΟΠΟC ΝΘΑΡCΟC ΝΤΕ ΤΚΥΛΙΚΙΑ ΕΤΒΕ ΤΜΕΤΑΤ-  
ΝΕΖ† 2N ΟΥΖΙΡΗΝΗ ΝΤΕ ΦΝΟΥ† ΖΑΜΗΝ·

cc5019: *titulus ad cc0019.*

**mss.:** GIOV.AC p. 120.



**comments:** This may be the original title of cc0955, incorporated in cc0019.

**text:** ΤΠΙCΤΙC ἸΝΤΑΥCΜῆΝΤC ῶΝ ΝΙΚΑΙΑ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΙΤῆΝ  
ΘΑΓΙΑ ἸCΥΝΖΟΔΟC·

cc5021: *titulus ad cc0021.*

**mss.:** GIOV.AJ p. 58. MONB.EF p. 71. MONB.FT p. 1.  
MONB.FT p. 33.

**text:** GIOV.AJ p. 58: ΝΕΓΝΩΜΗ ἸΝΤCΥΝΖΟΔΟC ΕΤΟΥΑΑΒ  
MONB.EF p. 71: ΝΕΓΝΩΜΗ ἸΝΤCΥΝΖΟΔΟC ΕΤΟΥΑΑΒ·  
MONB.FT p. 1: ΝΑΙ ΝΕ ΝΓΝΩΜΗ ΝΤCΥΝΖΟΔΟC ΝΝΙΚΑΙΑ

cc5088: *titulus ad cc0088.*

**mss.:** CMCL.BD p. a1. MONB.OJ p. 73post = CU.OR1699.P1.

**text:** CMCL.BD (trascr. Lagarde p. 209): ἸΚΑΝΩΝ ἸΤΕΚΚΛΗ-  
CΙΑ ΝΑΙ ἸΝΤΑ ΝΑΠΟCΤΟΛΟC ΤΑΑΥ ΖΙΤῆΝ ΚΛΗΜΗC ΠΕΝ-  
ΤΑΥΤῆΝΝΟΟΥC ῶΝ ΟΥΕΙΡΗΝΗ ἸΤΕ ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΖΑΜΗΝ  
MONB.OJ p. 73post = CU.OR1699.P1: ΝΚΑΝΩΝ ἸΤΕΚΚΛΗCΙΑ  
ΝΑΙ ἸΝΤΑ ΝΑΠΟCΤΟΛΟC ΤΑΑΥ ΖΙΤῆΝ ΚΛΗΜΗC ΠΕΝ-  
ΤΑΥΤῆΝΝΟΟΥC

cc5090: *titulus ad cc0090.*

**mss.:** DM.provv01 p. 1.

**text:** ἸΚΑΝΩΝ ἸΠΝΟC ΒΑCΙΛΕΙΟC ΠΕΠΙCΚΟΠΟC ἸΤΝΟC  
ΚΑΙCΑΡ[ΙΑ] ΝΤΚΑΠΠΑΤΟΚΙΑ· ΕΤΒΕ Τ[ΠΙC]ΤΙC ἸΤΕΤΡΙΑC  
ΕΤΟΥΑΑΒ (list of content follows).

cc5091: *titulus ad cc0091.*

**mss.:** CMCL.BD p. b1. CMCL.BD p. b21. MONB.BG p. 1.  
MONB.OJ CU.OR1699.P2.

**text:** CMCL.BD p. b1 (trascr. Lagarde): ΝΑΙ ΝΕ ἸΚΑΝΩΝ  
ἸΝΕΝΕΙΟΤΕ ΕΤΟΥΑΑΒ ΝΑΠΟCΤΟΛΟC ἸΠΕΝΧΟΕΙC ΙΗ-  
CΟΥC ΠΕΧΡΙCΤΟC ἸΝΤΑΥΚΑΑΥ ΕΖΡΑΙ ῶΝ ΝΕΚΚΛΗCΙΑ  
CMCL.BD p. b21 (trascr. Lagarde): ΑΥΧΩΚ ΕΒΟΛ ΝCΙ ΝΚΑΝ-  
ΩΝ ΝΝΕΝΕΙΟΤΕ ΕΤΟΥΑΑΒ ΝΑΠΟCΤΟΛΟC ΚΕΦΑΛΑΙΟΝ  
ΟΗ

MONB.BG p. 1: ΝΑΙ ΝΕ ΝΚΑΝΩΝ Ν̄ΝΕΝΕΙΟΤΕ ΕΤΟΥΑΑΒ  
 ΝΑΠΟCΤΟΛΟC ΝΤΑΥΚΑΑΥ ΕΖΡΑΙ ΕΤΒΕ ΠΤΑΖΟ ΕΡΑΤḲ  
 Ν̄ΤΕΚΚΛΗCΙΑ ΕΤΟΥΑΑΒ Ζ̄Ν ΟΥΕΙΡΗΝΗ Ν̄ΤΕ ΠΝΟΥΤΕ·  
 ΖΑΜΗΝ

MONB.BG (trascr. von Lemm Misc 89) p. 1: ΝΑΙ ΝΕ Ν̄ΚΑΝΩΝ  
 Ν̄ΝΕΝΕΙΟΤΕ Ε̄ΤΟΥᾹΑΒ ΝΑΠΟCΤΟΛΟC Ν̄ΤΑΥΚΑΑῩ ΕΖΡΑῙ  
 ΕΤΒΕ Ν̄ΤΑΖΟ Ε̄ΡΑΤḲ Ν̄ΤΕΚΚΛ̄ΗCΙᾹ ΕΤΟΥΑΑΒ Ζ̄Ν  
 ΟΥΕΙΡΗΝΗ Ν̄ΤΕ Π̄ΝΟΥΤΕ· ΖΑΜΗΝ

MONB.OJ p. 73post (CU.OR1699.P2): ΑΥΧΩΚ ΕΒΟΛ Ν̄CΙ  
 ΝΚΑΝΩΝ Ν̄ΝΕΝΕΙΟΤΕ ΕΤΟΥΑΑΒ Ν̄ΑΠΟCΤΟΛΟC  
 ΚΑΙΦΑΛΛΙΟΝ ΟΗ

cc5403: *titulus ad cc0403.*

**mss.:** MONB.EF p. 194.

**text:** ΖΕΝ ΔΙΑΤΑΞΙC Η ΖΝΤΩΨ ΝΤΕ ΠΜΑΚΑΡΙΟC  
 ΠΕΤΡΟC ΠΑΡΧΗΕΠΙCΚΟΠΟC ΝΡΑΚΟΤΕ ΕΑΥΧΝΟΥḲ ΕΡΟΟΥ  
 ΑḲΤΑΥΕ ΠΕΥΒΩΛ·

cc5462: *titulus ad cc0462.*

**mss.:** MONB.FT p. 1.

**comments:** General title of a problematic collection cc0462

**text:** ΝΑΙ ΝΕ ΝΚΑΝΩΝ ΝΤΕΚΚΛΗCΙΑ <illegible> ΝΤ|ΑḲ-  
 CΖΑΙCΟΥ Ν̄CΙ ἸΠΠΟΛΙΤΟC Π<illegible> | CΥΝΖΟΔΟC  
 ΕΤΟΥΑΑΒ ΑḲΤ<illegible>

cc5554: *titulus ad cc0554.*

**mss.:** MONB.EF p. 21.

**text:** ΤΕΧΘΕCΙC Ν̄ΝΕΠΙCΚΟΠΟC· Ν̄Τ̄CΥΝΖΟΔΟC Ν̄ΝΙΚΑΙΑ  
 ΖΑ ΤΠΙCΤΙC

cc5555: *titulus ad cc0555.*

**mss.:** GIOV.AC p. 120. MONB.EF p. 70. MONB.FT  
 PN.129.14.086.

**text:** GIOV.AC p. 120: ΤCΥΝΖΟΔΟC Ν̄ΝΙΚΑΙΑ ΕΤΒΕ ΤΠΙC-  
 ΤΙC ΕΤΟΥΟΧ·

MONB.EF p. 70: ΤΣΥΝΖΟΔΟΣ ἸΝΙΚΑΙΑ  
 MONB.FT p. PN.129.14.086: ΤΑΙ ΤΕ ΤΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΝΤΑΨΩΠΕ  
 ΖΝ ΝΙΚΑΙΑ ΤΠΟΛΙΣ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΙΤΟΟΤΣ ΝΤΣΥΝΖΟΔΟΣ  
 ΕΤΟΥΛΑΒ· ΖΝ ΟΥΕΙΡΗΝΗ ΖΑΜΗΝ

cc5558: *titulus ad cc0558.*

**mss.:** MONB.EF p. 150.

**text:** ΠΑΪ ΠΕ ΠΖΟΡΟΣ ἸΤΠΙΣΤΙΣ ἸΤΑΥΚΑΑΣ ΕΖΡΑΪ  
 ΖΙΤἸ ΤΣΥΝΖΟΔΟΣ ἸΤΑΨΩΟΥΖ ΖἸ ΚΩΣΤΑΝΤΙΝΟΥΠΟΛΙΣ·  
 ΖΙΤἸ ΝΕΚΤΑΡΙΟΣ ΠΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΣ ἸΚΩΣΤΑΝἸΝΟΥΠΟΛΙΣ ΜἸ  
 ΤΙΜΟΘΕΟΣ ΠΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΣ ἸΡΑΚΟΤΕ ΜἸ ΠΚΕ[ΨΕ]ΕΠΕ  
 ἸΝΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΣ· ΕΥΕΙΡΕ ΝΨΕΤΑΙΟΥ ΖΙΤἸ ΚΕΛΕΥΣΙΣ  
 ΜΠἸΡΟ· ΘΕΟΔΩΨΙΟΣ ΕΑΨΚΑΤΑΛΥ ἸΝΕΒΛΑΨΦΥΜΙΑ·  
 ΜΜΑΚΕΔΩΝΙΟΣ ΠΕΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΟΜΑΧΟΣ·

cc5559: *titulus ad cc0559.*

**mss.:** MONB.EF p. 152.

**text:** ΟΥΚΑΝΩΝ ΕΑΨΚΑΑΨ ΕΖΡΑΪ ΖἸ ΕΦΕΨΟΣ · ἸΨΙ  
 ΠΖΑΓΙΟΣ ΚΥΡΙΑΛΛΟΣ· ΠΑΡΧΗΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΣ ἸΡΑΚΟΤΕ· ΜἸ  
 ΠΨΕΕΠΕ ἸΝΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΣ ἸΤΑΨΩΟΥΖ· ΨΑΝ-  
 ΤΟΥΚΑΘΑΙΡΟΥ ἸΝΕΨΤΟΡΙΟΣ·

cc5863: *titulus ad cc0863.*

**mss.:** MONB.EF p. 200 and 201.

**text:** MONB.EF p. 200: ΟΥΔΙΗΚΗΜΑ  
 MONB.EF p. 201: ΚΕΔΙΗΓΗΜΑ

cc5955: *titulus ad cc0955.*

**mss.:** MONB.EF p. 19.

**text:** ΑΨΔΟΚΕΙ ἸΤΕΙΖΕ ἸΝΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΣ ΕΤΟΥΛΑΒ·  
 ΝΤΑΨΩΟΥΖ ΕΤΣΥΝΖΟΔΟΣ ΕΤΟΥΛΑΒ ΕΤΒΕ ΤΠΙΣΤΙΣ·

cc5956: *titulus ad cc0956.*

**mss.:** MONB.EF p. 19.

**comments:** Inscriptio of cc0956.

**text:** ΤΑΙ ΤΕ ΤΠΙCΤΙC Ν̄ΤΑΥΚΑΑC ΕΞΡΑΙ Ν̄CΙ  
Ν̄ΝΕΙΟΤΕ·

*cc5957: titulus ad cc0957.*

**mss.:** MONB.EF p. 21.

**text:** ΝΑΙ ΔΕ Ν̄ΝΡΑΝ Ν̄ΝΕΠΙCΚΟΠΟC· ΝΑΙ Ν̄ΤΑΥΖΥ-  
ΠΟΓΡΑΦΕ· ΝΑΙ Ν̄ΤΑΥCΩΟΥΖ Ζ̄Ν ΝΙΚΑΙΑ· ΕΑΥΖΥ-  
ΠΟΓΡΑΦΕ ΖΑ ΤΠΙCΤΙC ΝΟΡΘΟΔΟΞΟC·

*cc5960: titulus ad cc0960.*

**mss.:** GIOV.AC p. 156. MONB.EF p. 69. MONB.FT p. 35post =  
PN.129.14.086.

**text:** GIOV.AC p. 156: ΖΡΟΥΦΙΝΟC ΠΑΡΧΙΕΠΙCΚΟΠΟC ..[  
MONB.EF p. 69 col. 1: ΡΟΥΦΙΝΟC ΠΑΡΧΗΕΠΙCΚΟΠΟC Ε4CΖΑΙ  
MONB.FT PN.129.14.086: ΖΡΟΥΦΙΝΟC ΠΑΡΧΙΕΠΙCΚΟΠΟC  
Ν̄ΖΡΩΜΗ Ε4C̄ΖΑΪ

*cc5961: titulus ad cc0961.*

**mss.:** GIOV.AC p. 157.

**text:** ΤΕΠΙCΤΟΛΗ Ν̄ΤΑCΩΩΠΕ Ζ̄Ν ΝΙΚΑΙΑ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΙ-  
ΤΟΟΤC· Ν̄ΤCΥΝΖΟΔΟC ΕΤΟΥΑΑΒ

*cc5964: titulus ad cc0964.*

**mss.:** MONB.EF p. 138.

**text:** ΖΕΝΚΑΝΩΝ ΕΑΥΚΑΑΥ ΕΞΡΑΪ Ζ̄Ν ΤCΥΝΖΟΔΟC  
ΕΤΟΥΑΑΒ· Ν̄ΤΑCΩΩΟΥΖ Ζ̄Ν ΛΑΟΔΙΚΙΑ· Μ̄Ν ΠΑΓΓΑΙΑΝΗ·  
ΕΒΟΛ ΖΙΤ̄Ν ΖΑΖ ΝΕΠΑΡΧΙΑ Ν̄ΤΕ ΤΑCΙΑ· ΕΑΥΚΩ  
ΕΞΡΑΪ Ν̄ΝΕΙ ΖΟΡΟC ΝΕΚΚΛΗCΙΑCΤΙΚΟΝ Ν̄ΤCΥΝΖΟΔΟC  
ΕΤΟΥΑΑΒ

*cc5965: titulus ad cc0965.*

**mss.:** MONB.EF p. 148.

**text:** ΖΕΝΚΑΝΩΝ ΕΑΥΚΑΑΥ ΕΞΡΑΪ· ΖΙΤ̄Ν ΤCΥΝΖΟΔΟC  
Ν̄ΤΑCΩΩΟΥΖ· Ζ̄Ν ΚΩCΤΑΝΤΙΝΟΥΠΟΛΙC

cc5969: *titulus ad cc0969.*

**mss.:** MONB.FT p. 33. MONB.FT p. 35post = PN.129.14.086.

**comments:** Title of cc0969, both inscriptio and subscriptio.

**text:** MONB.FT p. 33: ΤΠΙΪΤΤΙϸ Ν[ΤΑϸ]ΩΩΠΕ Ζ̄Ν Ν[Ι]ΚΑῙΑ  
 Τ̄ΠΟ[ΛΙϸ] Ε̄ΒΟΛ Ζ̄ΙΤ̄Ν [Τ]ϸΥΝΖΟΔΟϸ [ΕΤΟΥ]ΑΑΒ  
 MONB.FT PN.129.14.086: ΤΑΙ ΤΕ ΤΠΙϸΤΙϸ ΝΤΑϸΩΩΠΕ ΖΝ  
 ΝΙΚΑΙΑ ΤΠΟΛΙϸ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΙΤΟΟΤϸ ΝΤϸΥΝΖΟΔΟϸ  
 ΕΤΟΥΑΑΒ· ΖΝ ΟΥΕΙΡΗΝΗ ΖΑΜΗΝ·

cc6023: *titulus ad cc0561. titulus ad cc0971.*

**mss.:** CMCL.AZ p. 73. CMCL.AZ p. 125-6. MONB.EF p. 153-4.

**comments:** General title of a collection of Agathonicus

**text:** CMCL.AZ p. 73: ΝΕΓΝΩΜΗ Ν̄ΑΓΑΘΟΝΙΚΟϸ ΠΕΠΙϸΚΟ-  
 ΠΟϸ Ν̄ΤΑΡϸΟϸ Ν̄ΤΚΙΛΙΚΙΑ ΕϸϸΥΝΑΙΝΕΙ Ν̄ΜΜΑϸ Ν̄ΟΙ  
 ΤϸΥΝΖΟΔΟϸ ΕΝΤΑϸΩΩΠΕ Ζ̄Ν ΑΓΚΥΡΑ Ν̄ΤΕ ΤΓΑΛΑΤΙΑ·  
 Ν̄ΤΑ ΤΕΙϸΥΝΖΟΔΟϸ ΔΕ ΩΩΠΕ ΕΤΒΕ Ν̄ΕΥϸΤΑΘΙΑΝΟϸ·  
 CMCL.AZ p. 125-6: ΝΕΓΝΩΜΗ ΝΑΠΑ ΑΓΑΘΟΝΙΚΟϸ  
 ΠΕΠΙϸΚΟΠΟϸ Ν̄ΤΑΡϸΟϸ Ν̄ΤΚΙΛΙΚΙΑ ΕϸϸΥΝΑΙΝΕΙ Ν̄ΜΜΑϸ  
 Ν̄ΟΙ ΤϸΥΝΖΟΔΟϸ ΕΝΤΑϸΩΩΠΕ Ζ̄Ν ΑΓΚΥΡΑ Ν̄ΤΕ  
 ΤΓΑΛΑΤΙΑ· Ν̄ΤΑ ΤΕΙϸΥΝΖΟΔΟϸ ΔΕ ΩΩΠΕ ΕΤΒΕ Ν̄ΕΥ-  
 ϸΤΑΘΙΑΝΟϸ  
 MONB.EF p. 153-4: ΤΠΙϸΤΙϸ ΝΑΑΠΑ ΑΓΑΘΟΝΙΚΟϸ  
 ΠΕΠΙϸΚΟΠΟϸ Ν̄ΘΑΡϸΟϸ Ν̄ΤΚΥΛΗΚΙΑ Ν̄ΤΑϸΖΟΜΟΛΟΓΕΙ  
 Μ̄ΜΟϸ Ζ̄Ν ΤϸΥΝΖΟΔΟϸ Ν̄ΤΑϸΩΩΠΕ Ζ̄ΝΑΓΚΗΡΑ Ν̄ΤΕ  
 ΤΓΑΛΛΑΤΙΑ · ΕΥϸΥΝΗΝΕΙ ΕΡΟϸ ΤΗΡΟΥ · Ν̄ΟΙ  
 ΝΕΠΙϸΚΟΠΟϸ Ν̄ΤΑΥϸΩΟΥΖ ΕΤϸΥΝΖΟΔΟϸ ΝΑΓΚΗΡΑ·  
 ΕΤΒΕ Ν̄ΕΥϸΤΑΘΙΑΝΟϸ ·

cc6025: *titulus ad cc0956.*

**mss.:** MONB.EF p. 21.

**comments:** Subscriptio of cc0956.

**text:** ΕΤΒΕ ΤΠΙϸΤΙϸ ΔΕ ΟΝ ΑϸΔΟΚΕΙ Ν̄ΤΕΙΖΕ· Ν̄ΝΕΝ-  
 ΤΑΥ ϸΩΟΥΖ ΕΤΝΟϸ Ν̄ϸΥΝΖΟΔΟϸ· ΑΥΩ ΑΥΖΥΠΟΓΡΑΦΕ  
 Ν̄ΤΠΙϸΤΙϸ ΝΟΡΘΟΔΟΞΟϸ Ν̄ΤΕΙΖΕ Ν̄ΟΙ ΝΕΠΙϸΚΟΠΟϸ·  
 ΠΟΥΑ ΔΕ ΠΟΥΑ Ν̄ΝΕΠΙϸΚΟΠΟϸ· Ν̄ΤΟΥΕΙ ΤΟΥΕΙ Ν̄ΜΠΟ-  
 ΛΙϸ Μ̄Ν Ν̄ΕΥΕΠΑΡΧΙΑ· ΧΕ †ΠΙϸΤΕΥΕ Ν̄ΤΕΙΖΕ·

cc6027: *titulus ad cc0010.*

**mss.:** CMCL.AZ p. 90.

**comments:** Original inscriptio, or better passage formula, in Greek, of cc0010, after which cc0011 was later inserted, and a (second) inscriptio: cc5010.

**text:** ΠΑΛΙΝ ΤΟΥ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΠΕΡΙ ΤΗΣ ΑΥΤΗΣ

cc6028: *titulus ad cc0088.*

**mss.:** CMCL.BD p. a81.

**comments:** Subscriptio of cc0088.

**text:** (trascr. Lagarde): ΑΥΧΩΚ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΟΙ ΝΚΑΝΩΝ  
ΝΚΛΗΜΗΣ ΚΑΙΦΑΛΛΙΟΝ ΟΑ

#### IV. HISTORICAL CLASSIFICATION

##### Preliminaries

In this section it is not our purpose to clarify the tradition of the canonical texts survived (also) in Coptic language, within the historical development of the texts which in due time formed the canonical collections of the international Church, in Greek, Latin, and other Christian languages. Rather we intend to give a systematic overview and arrangement of the Coptic texts, that may be useful for those interested in the study of the general historical development of the Church canons, which in any case is actually far from being satisfactorily established.

We are well aware that the study of the mutual relations between the manuscripts, and between the works that they contain, presupposes the comparison with the parallel traditions in environments similar to the Coptic, in Greek, in Latin, and the Oriental languages. This will not be found in this contribution, because its aim is not to clarify the historical development of the Canonic literature of the Christian Church in general; and on the other hand in my opinion the situation is far from established, notwithstanding the basic works of Maassen (1870); Turner (1899-1913); Schwartz (1938-63); Joannou (1962-4).

Even we might affirm that the Greek and Latin documents do not allow us to form sufficiently definite ideas at least for the period until the VIIth century, when the Coptic Church became totally independent from the international developments. What is especially discouraging is that the identification of individual works is uncertain, given the clumsy redactional activity testified by the different manuscripts and correspondent collections. Unfortunately the titles given in the manuscripts and by the modern scholars are misleading rather than helping.

For this historical overview we have decided to take into explicit consideration only the Coptic documents, though the reader may trust our knowledge of modern criticism and proposed general assessments

of the documents in use for the international Church. In any case, as we shall see, the Coptic texts represent the situation in Egypt from the VIIth century onwards. What happened before is left to more or less sensible suppositions.

First of all we distinguish three types of “textual units”, from the most simple to the most complicated:

(1) textual compositions (sentences) more or less in the form of an aphorism, not analyzable in simpler elements (a debatable judgment, of course, to the best of our understanding), found in the ‘works’ (see number (2)) but having a life of their own. The texts of this type, number (1), belong to some literary genres, which it is useful to list:

- theological statements (definitions of dogmatic beliefs)
- anathematisms (negative and personalized theological statements)
- prescriptions of ecclesiastical procedures (**ΚΑΝΩΝ**)
- prescriptions of moral behaviour (**ΕΝΤΟΛΗ**) addressed to Christians in general, men and women, or specifically to priests, monks, anchorites, etc.

More objectively defined are (2) the same simple compositions, collected together by an author (I suggest an ecclesiastical authority/officer of more or less high level), thus forming one of the ‘works’ proper, which we find as such in the manuscripts, equipped with titles, at the beginning or at the end or both, and an appropriate layout. But it is to be noted that these works as a rule do not bear the name of an author, being considered, as it appears, as collective documents. They also are distinguished in literary genres:

- confession of a synodus (**ΣΥΜΒΟΛΟΝ**)
- canons issued by councils
- disciplinary canons
- moral canons
- others, like *erotapokriseis*, narrations (**ΔΙΗΓΕΜΑΤΑ**), etc.

(3) The *corpora* assembling a number of works for some definite purpose, often in the literary aspect of *acts* of a council. They also were produced by some ecclesiastical authority (not necessarily the one indicated in the inscription found in the manuscript), and had titles and appropriate layout.



We propose a *model* simulating the possible passages leading from one type of unit to another. It is not an historical, it is a *logical* model, but as such it may be of some use in establishing what actually happened in the history of the manuscript tradition, and also in the development of the canonical regulations.

One must be careful about the *titles* found in the manuscripts, because they are helpful, but also deceptive. Under this denomination we include: general titles, valid for a collection of several works; inscriptions, which go before one individual work; subscriptions, which go after the work. But it may happen that a work began with words able to be considered also as an inscription, and such they became, through an easy modification of the layout, because in the evolution of the manuscript tradition the author was not responsible for the layout of the copies. The redactors (the persons responsible for the copies) or the copyists themselves sometimes placed separating signals after a first sentence felt as an inscription, and this might be cumulated with previous or later inscriptions (and, for that matter, also subscriptions) created by the redactor/copyist. For all these reasons, in the late manuscripts that we have, the titles represent a textual-literary situation as it was understood by the redactors or copyists, not necessarily corresponding to the original project of the authors.

It is also opportune to keep in mind, in dealing with the single manuscripts, the different characters of the manuscript documents according to three typologies, corresponding to different chronological and geographical collocation and consequently a different choice and a different treatment of the texts.

1. The Turin collection (cf. above, p. 14). In the two manuscripts GIOV.AC and GIOV.AJ the two works cc0019 and cc0021 were independent, and were mixed with non canonical texts. There were also in the library the *Canones Basilii* cc0090, the only work, as it seems, of the manuscript GIOV.AN. We note that the library of the monastery of Tin, now in Turin, points to a situation perhaps preceding, in any case different from that of the monastery of Atriipe, which is the main source of our knowledge of the Coptic literature.
2. Papyrus Cheltenham (CMCL.AZ). It is particularly meaningful be-

cause it is outside the mainstream of Coptic documentation. It contains a form of the *corpus* of Agathonicus, which is independent from other canonical collections (it is preceded by the *erotapokrisis* cc0106, attributed to Cyril and by the *Historia Horsiesi* cc0203,) and preserves its Evagrian-Origenistic tendency, later corrected in MONB.EF and MONB.FT. But we note that some additions began to be inserted, making it parallel with canonical council collections.

3. Library of the monastery of Atriipe (cf. above, p. 9). The codices which once belonged to this library are relatively late (IX-XI cent.), and three of them (MONB.CV, MONB.EF, MONB.FT) were dedicated to synodical collections, mixing Nicaea, Agathonicus (especially the *Disputatio cum Iustino*), Ephesus, and Chalcedon. The name of Hippolytus binds them with the canons attributed to the apostles. Other codices contained the *Canones Apostolorum*, and the *Canones Athanasii*. The manuscripts of this library may be considered as representing the situation of the IX and following centuries, after the general systematization of the Coptic literature probably made in the same monastery of Atriipe.

### Individual works

The individual works (i.e. “textual units” of type (2) above, and some insertions) should not be considered as steady and well defined documents, rather as a moment in a developing textual situation. We shall point later to some features which allow us to reconstruct in part such development, but for now we list and describe them as they are fixed in the manuscripts which we have. We have said that most of these texts were composed of brief intrinsically independent statements (type (1) above), in the sense that each of them did not belong to a determined work, even an original one, but stood by itself. We propose this, not because we think that each of the statements was not from the beginning included in some plural collection, but because they could become part of this or that collection independently from a necessary connection with the others. They had, so to speak, a life of their own.

These individual statements were formulated and collected just in order to build works, but such works were composed and freely manipulated in the historical period here considered – say, between the IVth and VIth century – both by interchanging the individual statements, and by adding statements, sometimes in the form of titles, to fit the works into opportune circumstances or to attribute them to this or that authoritative person. We shall see that the works could be in their turn assembled for various purposes that we shall indicate, so becoming parts of composed *collections* (*corpora*).

Some of the works belong to the canonical collections in proper sense, and as such do not raise complicated problems from our point of view, although of course they may be difficult to insert in the historical development of the international collections. Thus we mention the two texts directly referred to the Christ and the Apostles, although one of them (cc0088; the other is cc0091) through the intermediation of Clement of Rome. The Coptic version suggests a complicate relation with the analogous canonical compositions of the international environment. We do not enter into details; first information may be found in Coquin in Atiya #3676 (1991), *Canons, Apostolic, and Canons, Ecclesiastical*. As we have seen, and also shall discuss later, also Hippolytus was taken into consideration by the Copts, but cannot be properly inserted in our model.

On their example, for what we can see, were constructed the personalized canonical collections, sort of anthologies composed from original sentences of venerated Fathers, mixed with spurious material: *Canones Athanasii* cc0089, *Canones Basilii* cc0090, *Responsa Timothei* cc0403 (CPG2520). Each has its own problems, which are outside our research.

More elusive, but also more interesting and important as witnesses to the specifically Egyptian milieu, are the works conceived with reference to theological and prescriptive (governance) issues discussed in the councils. This is the case of cc0019 (*didascalia*) and of cc0021 (*gnomai*), which have in common the explicit reference in the inscription to the council of Nicaea, and the fact of being composed of a first part concerning theological settlements (in cc0019 the *symbolum* fol-

lowed by other statements) and of a second part dedicated to moral exhortations or prescriptions.

Cc0021 is found only in Coptic, but it points to the same milieu of the international canonical texts. It has some peculiarities, in their respect, mainly the initial section on the free will (*prohairesis*), which binds the initial trinitarian statement (not properly the Nicene symbolum, but an homologue substitute) with the main part, concerning Christian behaviour. Cc0019 is well documented in the international tradition, but its transmission is very complicated. The attribution is spread between many authors; in Greek the main redactions are two, one beginning with the Nicene symbolum and some pretended Nicene material (called *didascalia*, CPG 2298), the other containing only the section on Christian behaviour (called *syntagma*, CPG 2264).

Other texts were passed off as parts of the official acts:

Cc0955 (*symbolon*, cf. CPG8512) is simply obvious, and its relation with the other traditions has been studied recently by Dossetti #0295 (1967).

Of the symbolon itself were part some anathematisms; others seem to constitute an independent work: cc0956 (cf. above).

The list of the *Nomina Patrum Nicaenorum* cc0957 (CPG8516), representing also the official signatures of the bishops present, was very popular and submitted to every kind of revision. The Coptic version, at least that of the only codex known to us, appears to derive from an old and valuable Greek version produced in Egypt. Cf. Gelzer #0296 (1898); Bausi (2013).

Three other documents were extracted from heterogeneous, non canonical, collections, and then recycled in the canonical ones, probably because they contained qualified opinions on theological questions of Egyptian(-Coptic) interest, and were kept together with the Coptic (earlier Graeco-Egyptian?) Nicene collections, to which they were originally extraneous:

*Epistula Paulini* = cc0958 (CPG2134). It is related to the circumstances of the so-called schism of Antioch (from the year 327 on), and the Greek text is found in Athanasius Tomos ad Antiochenos PG 26.809 and Epiph. Panarion haer. 77. Cf. Armstrong (1921); Simonet-

ti (1975) p. 358-70. Paulinus is the adversary of Meletius. The text deals with the three Hypostaseis and their common ousia. The Son had a body with nous. Paulinus accepts the dogma of Nicaea, and “every word” of Athanasius, with a sentence which is not present in Greek.

*Epistula Epiphani* = cc0959 does not seem otherwise known, and acknowledges the faith of Nicaea, stressing the assumption by Christ of a body complete of soul and nous.

*Epistula Rufini* = cc0960 also does not seem otherwise known. It is very fragmentary, but seems to stress the presence of the soul with the body of Christ.

All these three texts seem to refer to the heretical opinions discussed in Epiphanius *Haer.* 77, and originally did not belong to the Nicene documents. To them another one was accompanied, composed in order to guarantee that the Holy Spirit was present at Nicaea: *De Spiritu Sancto in concilio Nicaeno* cc0961. No Greek text is extant, though we are sure that, like all the others, it was originally written in Greek.

In the codex MONB.EF we find a number of canonical collections which were considered genuine in the international Church and have parallels in most languages of the Christian Church:

*Canones Concilii Nicaeni* = cc0556 (found also in MONB.FT), cpg8513 (RV.B109.cass29.159.08-09; also in MONB.FT p. 81-86), fragments from what appears to be the classical collection of the 20 canons of Nicaea (Joannou I p. 23-41, Di Berardino p. 18-30).

*Canones Ancyрани* = cc0962 (p. 101-102) corresponding to Joannou II p. 56-73, Di Berardino p. 270-280.

*Canones Antiocheni* = cc0963 (p. 135-138) corresponding to Joannou II p. 102-126, Di Berardino p. 300-313.

*Canones Laodicaeni* = cc0964 (p. 138-147) corresponding to Joannou II p. 130-155, Di Berardino p. 336-351.

*Canones Constantinopolitani* = cc0965 (p. 148-150) corresponding to Joannou II p. 438-444, Di Berardino 354-357.

Of the *Canones Ephesini* (p. 152-3 Joannou I p. 57-65, Di Berardino p. 56-61) only the eighth is part of this collection (cc0559).

In MONB.FT, p. 131-2, we find the *Canones Gangrenses* (cc0967) (Joannou II p. 85-99, Di Berardino p. 290-5) corresponding to the usual numeration 1-11 (lacuna follows), but with other numbers: 52-62. This means that in this case the numeration of the canones was not interrupted with the changing of the councils.

The Coptic version of these texts has never been investigated, as probably it should be worth while.

Another text, which denotes a very fluid situation, that we shall describe more in detail below, is the *Symbolon Concilii Constantinopolitani* = cc0558, preceded by a long title (cc5558) describing the circumstances of the council and naming some of the participants. It was added to the canons of Constantinople in MONB.EF (p. 148-150).

Other texts were inserted for various reasons in the canonical (and Agathonicaean) collections, from unidentified sources:

the homily *Contra concilium Chalcedonense* cc0966;

one *Apophthegma de incarnatione* cc0950;

another apophthegm *De resurrectione mortuorum* cc0009;

and a peculiar case, but also revealing of the activity of the redactors, the *Titulus extravagans de synodo Chalcedonensi* cc0011, which appears repeatedly without any real function of title:

in CMCL.AZ p. 90: ΕΤΒΕ ΤΣΥΝΖΟΔΟΣ ΕΝΤΑΣΩΠΕ ΖΝ  
ΚΑΡΧΗΔΩΝ· ΕΥΧΩ ΜΜΟΣ ΧΕ ΟΥΑΠΑΘΗΣ ΠΕ· ΠΛΟΓΟΣ  
ΕΤΕ ΠΜΟΝΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΠΕ·

in MONB.CV (pn.129.14.143): [ΕΤΒΕ] ΤΣΥΝΖΟΔΟΣ ΔΕ Ν̄ΤΑ-  
ΣΩΠΕ Ζ̄Ν ΧΑΛΚΗΔΩΝ· ΕΥΧΩ ΜΜΟΣ ΧΕ ΠΚΑΤΑΣΑΡ̄Ξ  
ΠΕΝΤΑϸ Ω̄Π̄ΖΙΣΕ ΖΙ ΠΕΣΤΑΥΡΟΣ·

in MONB.EF p. 159-160: ΕΤΒΕ ΤΣΥΝΖΟΔΟΣ ΔΕ Ν̄ΤΑΣΩΠΕ  
Ζ̄Ν ΧΑΛΚΗΔΩΝ ΕΥΧΩ ΜΜΟΣ ΧΕ ΟΥΑΤΩ̄Π̄ΖΙΣΕ ΠΕ  
ΠΛΟΓΟΣ·

and p. 162: ΕΤΒΕ ΤΣΥΝΖΟΔΟΣ ΔΕ Ν̄ΤΑΣΩΠΕ Ζ̄Ν  
ΧΑΛΚΗΔΩΝ· ΕΥΧΩ ΜΜΟΣ ΧΕ ΠΚΑΤΑΣΑΡ̄Ξ  
ΠΕΝΤΑϸΩ̄Π̄ΖΙΣΕ ΖΙ ΠΕΣΤΑΥΡΟΣ·

and p. 163: ΕΤΒΕ ΤΣΥΝΖΟΔΟΣ ΔΕ ΝΤΑΣΩΠΕ ΖΝ-  
ΧΑΛΚΗΔΩΝ ΣΣΥΝΗΝΕΙ ΜΝ ΝΖΛΛΗΝ ΝΘΕ ΕΤΕΡΕ ΝΑΡΙ-  
ΑΝΟΣ ΣΥΝΗΝΕΙ ΜΝ ΜΜΕΛΙΤΙΑΝΟΣ·

This is clearly a *glossa* introduced in a *corpus* already constituted before the council of Chalcedon. But how it happened that it was inserted at different points, and for what specific purpose, remains a matter of speculation.

These last works introduce us in the very interesting, but awfully obscure case of Agathonicus. Few general treatises mention this collection: Bardenhewer (1912-32), IV p. 109; Schmid - Stälin, *Gesch. Gr. Lit.* (1924) II 2, p. 1386; Orlandi in Di Berardino #4169 (1983), I p. 78; Grillmeier #1390 (1990), p. 231-34; Orlandi in Di Berardino #6392 (2000), p. 536-7; and all, except of course my contributions, depend on the totally misleading commentary given by Ehrhard in *Crum* #0142 (1915), p. 129-171. There are two collections of texts (cc0561 and cc0971) under this, for what we know, fictitious name. They represent a compromise between the genre of council and personalized canons. We shall see later how the collections may have been put together; here we comment on the four individual works which appear to be essential in the building of the more or less imaginary character of Agathonicus.

Cc0012 (it may be called *contra Stratonicum*, or *de providentia* or also *gnomai Agathonici Tarsensis*) is the most interesting for our historical purpose. It is formally very complicated, and also contradictory, but just for this reason we tend to believe that it is the oldest of the Agathonicaean texts, the one that has created and promoted the figure of Agathonicus through a series of successive manipulations, and has inspired the other texts, because as it seems it found fortune by the Egyptian christians. The text is divided in first instance in two parts: an historical introduction, and an *erotapokrisis*; but this second part is in turn divided between one part in which the interlocutor is Stratonicus and it is concluded by a long sermon of Agathonicus, and another part in which the questions are posed by other interlocutors, with this peculiarity, that the first two interlocutors are named (respectively Eunomus and Polyphanes), while the other questions are introduced by the formula: **ΟΥCΥΝΖΗΤΗΤΗC**.

The only relevant manuscript preserving the beginning, CM-CL.AZ (P.CARLSB does not matter, cf. *infra* p. 55) has a passage for-

mula, but no inscription. At the end, MONB.EF has no subscription, while CMCL.AZ has an homiletical conclusion (wanting in MONB.EF): “Glory to the Father... etc.” and the subscription: “Sentences (ΓΝΩΜΑΙ) of apa Agathonicus, bishop of Tarsus of Cilicia, accepted by the synod made in Ancyra of Galatia.”

The explanation of this complex composition, independently of the content of the questions (that we briefly resume: it begins with the providence, then deals with various moral themes, like the magic, the homicide, the calumny, the theatre, greedy priests, etc.), is of course very subjective, but we submit our opinion to the judgement of the reader. First of all the historical introduction, which it is opportune to report in full, stays by itself:

1. It happened that a consultation [ΖΗΤΗCIC] was made, when some learned students came to us saying: 2. “You are the shepherds who rule over our generation. 3. Now, God said in the prophet Zacharias: ‘The lips of the priest foster knowledge’. 4. Accordingly we came to you about one problem [ΖΗΤΗΜΑ]. 5. If you solve it for us satisfactorily, you are really priests. 6. If not, you are not priests from God, because the true priest realizes the commandements of the Lord. 7. It is said not only: ‘His lips will help the knowledge’, but also: ‘He is an angel of God of the wonders’.” 8. When they told us these things, we were upset, and the consultation became very serious. 9. The problem [ΖΗΤΗΜΑ] was the following. 10. They said: “We want to know whether the evil and the good and the useful and the damage and the honor and the humiliation come to the man outside the will of God. 11. And whether the demons can become masters of some men or kill some animals. 12. And whether some evil men can damage some men, or acquire kingdoms or governments. 13. And whether a man with good will can accomplish something. 14. And whether it is possible to kill a man without the will of God. 15. And whether it is possible to hurt his neighbour without the will of God. 16. And whether it is possible to straighten our behaviour without the will of God [or may be straight without Him]. 17. Because the heathen solve all this saying that these things happen outside the will of God through what they call the fate [ΖΕΙΜΑΡΜΕΝΗ].” 18. Those who consulted us were fifteen men from Cilicia. 19. When we heard this – we were nine bishops in



the synod held in Ancyra of Galatia – we told them: “After three days we shall solve this question.” 20. The synod of Ancyra of Galatia was made because of the Eustathians, who were mistaken. 21. This man Eustathius convinced a lot of people saying that the marriage is unclean, and had torn apart many husbands from their wives, and many wives from their husbands. 22. [They concord with the synod of Nicaea.] 23. After three days there was the dispute [ΓΥΜΝΑΣΙΑ].

The story and all the details are evidence that this introduction is a secondary addition to one text of *erotapokrisis* already in circulation, in order to add some kind of prestige. The fact that this prestige was searched in far countries (Galatia, Cilicia: 18-19) points, in our opinion, to the fact that really the original text came from outside Egypt, but was adopted by an Egyptian (probably monastic) community. We suppose that the original idea was to collocate the events in Galatia, for unknown reasons, but perhaps Galatia was already connected with the text. We note some additions to the original idea: the characterization of the “learned students” (1); the list of the questions (10-16); the introduction of Cilicia, because Stratonicus, leader of the students, was said to be from Cilicia; and especially the introduction of the synod and of the Eustathians (20-21), who are never mentioned in the second part. Of the several Eustathii mentioned as living in the IVth century, the allusion here may be only to the contested bishop of Sebaste of Pontus (ca. 300-380), who is known as favouring asceticism, but not an heretic one, given that he was close friend of Basil. If ever, he is said to have promoted the heretics called Macedonians. Furthermore, none of the councils of Ancyra known to us had anything to do with the refusal of marriage. The mention of the council of Ancyra is important, because it is present in several titles of the Agathonicaean corpus, and also it is found inside the introduction in cc0012, and in an allusion at the end. On the other hand, Agathonicus is never mentioned in the introduction, but he found his collocation only during the composition of the *corpora*, and only in the titles.

The second part itself is problematic, and I think that the two sub-parts indicated above point to a composition from two previous texts, or to an addition to an existing text. The first sub-part is more in

tune with the introduction, and begins with the presentation of the two discussants: the learned christian Stratonicus, and the bishop Agathonicus. It is to be noted that the names seem created by purpose, opposing Agatho- (good) to Strato- (oppose). But the character of Stratonicus is also ambiguous, because from one side the text says: “One of them stood up, called Stratonicus of Cilicia, who was well versed in the rhetoric of the heathen, and said: I shall speak for the heathen.” But it continues: “He said this not because he was a heathen, rather he was a Christian, loving the road of the salvation”. Yet the first words of Agathonicus seem directed to a heathen.

Then there are three long demonstrations (ΑΠΟΔΕΙΞΙΣ) by Agathonicus, taken from the Scripture, with only one interruption of one cursory sentence by Stratonicus. At the end of this section, Stratonicus asks for an explanation, and after the response of Agathonicus two new discussants are introduced, Eunomos and Polyphanes. They remain inside the initial subject, i.e. the role of the fortune vs. the will of God in the human affairs.

At this point all changes: the style of the text (from *apodeixis* to *erotapokrisis*), the anonymity of the interlocutors, and the subject submitted to discussion or explanation, constituted of rules of behaviour for clergy or laics. For this reason we suppose that the two sub-parts of the second part were originally independent. Also in our opinion the introduction was created for the first sub-part, and the second sub-part was joined, perhaps from the beginning, just as two works of Agathonicus were joined, without any redactional adjustment, in the text of Papyrus Carlsberg (cf. below). The best explanation seems to be that the second sub-part had a separate existence, under the name of Agathonicus, and gave the idea to create the first sub-part. They were put together, and an historical introduction was added, to give special authority to the text.

On the events relating to the formation of the *corpora* we shall speak later. But a last interesting feature of this text is that the theological issue treated in the first part, that of the ΠΡΟΖΑΙΡΗCΙC (although named in a different way) connects it to the beginning of cc0021, also

called *gnomai* and combined with documents from a synod (that of Nicaea) and moral rules.

Cc0008 (*contra anthropomorphitas*) is tightly bound to the titles of the *corpora*, perhaps revealing its function according to the purpose of the author. Of the two manuscripts, the older (CMCL.AZ) calls it (in the title) *gnomai*, and in fact it begins: “Often we have thought of writing some *gnomai*”; the other, MONB.EF, calls it *pistis*, because we find also: “Let us begin to say something on the faith (*pistis*)”. Both state that it was approved by some “council of Ancyra”, of course the same as that discussed above, but mentioned without any specification. The text contains a discussion on the form of God, and in the primitive version, in CMCL.AZ, it was strongly against anthropomorphism;<sup>4</sup> but in CMCL.EF we find a different version, possibly produced in the Shenoutean milieu, perfectly anthropomorphic.

Cc0010 is the most straightforward and unitarian of the texts, being a typical *erotapokrisis* between Agathonicus and Justin. It has no title, in the sense that the beginning (in CMCL.AZ) functioned originally as such: “There was [i.e. The report of] a ΓΥΜΝΑΣΙΑ between the Samaritans and Agathonicus”, although in MONB.EF it becomes: “Apa Agathonicus discussing (ΓΥΜΝΑΣΕ) with Justin the Samaritan”. Both codices present no subscription. The discussion is about the resurrection of the flesh. Justin is convinced, and also converted.

Cc0013, contrary to cc0012, was certainly conceived by one person with a unitary view, but it was added in CMCL.AZ after the closure of the *corpus* of Agathonicus cc0561, therefore it probably had a separate existence. It contains a number of different subjects, whose disposition, together with the mention of Evagrius as a source for inspiration, probably shows the theological and ecclesiastical purpose of the author(s), though we leave such analysis to other specialists. The work is divided in two parts, and each part in several sections. The first part is a general introduction, and explains the psychological attitude of the author: (a) the demon of the incredulity, who afflicts the

---

4. Cf. Grillmeier #3590. – Clark #4426, Gould #3993, Harmless #9534, Bumazhnov #a102 unfortunately do not deal with Agathonicus.

author. (b) Relationship with ecclesiastical colleagues. (c) Remedy suggested by a monk (perhaps an angel). (d) Second temptation defeated in the same way. (e) Third temptation lasting two thousands days and still present. (f) The ecclesiastical authorities and Evagrius. (g) Lamentation and request of help from the spiritual brothers, to whom he submits his remedy to incredulity.

The second part contains that remedy in the form of propositions set forth by the incredulity, and counter-propositions taken from the Scripture. After all, it is a special kind of *erotapokrisis*. It is concluded by an invective against the incredulity, mother of all vices and haereses, and against the Christians who are led astray by the lecture of hellenic poetry and philosophy (Homer and Socrates, i.e. Plato).

### Collections

Apart from the *canonical* character of all the works discussed in this book, we take now into consideration the groups of works which were assembled in order to constitute a collection formally established, with its title(s) and opportune layout. The collections are the result of the selection of a number of homogeneous texts, but in each of the collections, as we have them in the different manuscripts, the selection was made according to peculiar purposes, depending on the necessities suggested by the different historical conditions; and this prevented the formation of established collections. On the other hand, it also appears that the choice was guided by the character of the texts (namely that they contained canons), and therefore the goal of the collections was in principle the same, but it was adapted to individual circumstances which are outside our positive knowledge, even if not outside sensible speculation.

### Nicene collections

The main reference point of the canonico-synodical collections appears to be the council of Nicaea. This may seem obvious, but it is, only to a certain point: as is well known, we do not have the official acts of the council, like e.g. those of Ephesus or Chalcedon, and in my

opinion it is likely that they did not exist. The Coptic documents show that in the Egyptian Church there were ecclesiastical authorities who endeavoured to remedy this situation producing fictitious acts (cc0554, cc0555, cc0969), or to take advantage of the same situation presenting as (fictitious) council acts some lists of moral recommendations in order to give them special status (cc0019, cc0021).

In our manuscripts we find the following collections, that we have identified by means of the general titles often accompanying them, or, when they were (or may have been) lost, by the *de facto* arrangement of the works in the manuscripts:

(1) In the first page of the codex MONB.FT, there is a general title (*inscriptio*, cc5462), in fact not very clear in its meaning regarding the works which follow it: **ΝΑΙ ΝΕ ΝΚΑΝΩΝ ΝΤΕΚΚΛΗCΙΑ** <illegible> **ΝΤΑΥCΖΑΙCΟΥ ΝΒΙ ΙΠΠΟΛΙΤΟC Π** <illegible> **CΥΝ-ΖΔΟC ΕΤΟΥΑΑΒ ΑΥΤ** <illegible> We have called the collection, that it was meant to introduce: *Canones Hippolyti* = cc0462, but we cannot say which works it contained, except for the first one, cc0021 (cf. below). The Greek tradition knew some *Canones Hippolyti*, which, as it seems, were incorporated in cc0091 (*Canones Apostolorum*, nn. 1-30), without any mention of Hippolytus, but this is out of our question.

The first work after the title cc5462 in MONB.FT, with its own specific title (cc5021: **ΝΑΙ ΝΕ ΝΓΝΩΜΗ ΝΤCΥΝΖΟΔΟC ΝΝΙΚΑ-ΙΑ**), is the *gnomai of Nicaea*, cc0021, closed by a subscription (p. 33, cc5021): **ΝΑΙ ΝΕ [ΝΕΓΝΩ]ΜΗ ΝΤ[CΥΝΖΟ]ΔΟC ΕΤΟΥ[ΑΑΒ]**.

(2) A title of difficult interpretation follows (cc5969): **ΤΠΙCΤΙC Ν[ΤΑC]ΩΠΕ ΖΝ Ν[Ι]ΚΑΙΑ ΤΠΟ[ΛΙC] ΕΒΟΛ ΖΙΤΝ [Τ]CΥΝΖΟΔΟC [ΕΤΟΥ]ΑΑΒ**. It is my opinion that this title was the inscription of what I have called *Collectio Nicaena C* (cc0969); it opens without any other specific title of a work, with the narration of the circumstances of the council (cc0970), and is soon interrupted by a lacuna after p. 34. The next preserved leaf with page numbers preserved (p. 81-82) has the *canons of Nicaea* (cc0566), but I think that in between one should collocate the leaf PN.129.14.086, containing the *epistula Epiphani* and the *epistula Rufini* (cc0959 and cc0960). It is

almost certain that cc0958 (*epistula Paulini*) preceded; what is sure is that a title followed (item cc5969): ΤΑΙ ΤΕ ΤΠΙCΤΙC ΝΤΑCΩΩ-ΠΕ ΖΝ ΝΙΚΑΙΑ ΤΠΟΛΙC ΕΒΟΛ ΖΙΤΟΟΤC ΝΤCΥΝΖΟΔΟC ΕΤΟΥΑΑΒ· ΖΝ ΟΥΕΙΡΗΝΗ ΖΑΜΗΝ which we interpret as the *subscription* of the collection (cc0969) beginning at p. 33.

After this subscription there is another title (cc0972), which we interpret as the *inscription* of a work lost in the lacuna which immediately follows: ΠΖΙCΟΝ ΝΤΠΙCΤΙC· ΤΕΝΤΑΥΖΟΜΟΛΟΓΕΙ ΜΜΟC ΖΝ ΝΙΚΑΙΑ ΤΠΟΛΙC· ΕΒΟΛ ΖΙΤΝ ΝΕΠΙCΚΟΠΟC ΝΝΕΜΗΤΡΟΠΟΛΙC ΝΤΟΙΚΟΥΜΕΝΗ ΤΗΡC· ΕΥΜΕΖΩ-ΟΜΤΕΝΩΕΜΝΤΩΜΗΝ· ΝΤΕΥΗΠΕ· After the canons of Nicaea (p. 81 ff., cf. above) and a lacuna we find the canons of Gangra (cc0967) with a peculiar numeration (cf. above).

(3) A true “collection of collections” was MONB.EF, whose first 18 pages are unfortunately missing. In the preserved pages 19-26 there is the sequence of cc0955 (*symbolum nicaenum*), cc0956 (*anathemata*), cc0957 (list of bishops) that certainly formed a collection, which I have called *Collectio Nicaena A* (cc0554; no title surviving, because it begins and ends in lacuna).

In the following lacuna I would place the beginning of what I have called *Collectio Nicaena B* (cc0555), comprising the sequence of cc0019 (*didascalica*), cc0958 (*epistula Paulini*, lost), cc0959 (*epistula Epiphanii*), cc0960 (*epistula Rufini*), cc0961 (the Holy Spirit at Nicaea), exactly like GIOV.AC (cf. below). The following sequence of *canones* of various origin, with some insertions (cf. above), begins and ends in lacuna, and in any case it is much less certain to have formed a collection.

At this point in MONB.EF we find the most extraordinary collection (cc0971, existing also in MONB.CV, very fragmentary) constituted around the elusive person of Agathonicus, and one (possibly never existed) council of Ancyra (cf. above). Before discussing its composition we shall remark that after the collection is collocated some material which as it seems had an independent life and was added for unknown (although conceivable) reasons at the end of the codex: the *responsa Timothei/Petri* cc0403, and two *diegemata* cc0863.

(4) GIOV.AC is an important witness, because it is earlier than the Atripe monastery codices, and from a different ecclesiastical milieu. It contained, together with texts of different character, the *Collectio Nicaena B* (cc0555), introduced by the general *inscriptio* cc5555 (p. 120): ΤΣΥΝΖΟΔΟΣ Ν̄ΝΙΚΑΙΑ ΕΤΒΕ ΤΠΙCΤΙC ΕΤΟΥΟΧ· The end is in lacuna, but we find the *subscriptio* in MONB.EF (p. 70): ΤΣΥΝΖΟΔΟΣ Ν̄ΝΙΚΑΙΑ; and in MONB.FT (PN.129.14.086): ΤΑΙ ΤΕ ΤΠΙCΤΙC ΝΤΑCΩΩΠΕ ΖΝ ΝΙΚΑΙΑ ΤΠΟΛΙC ΕΒΟΛ ΖΙΤΟΟΤC ΝΤΣΥΝΖΟΔΟΣ ΕΤΟΥΑΑΒ· ΖΝ ΟΥΕΙΡΗΝΗ ΖΑΜΗΝ·

#### Agathonicus

The two collections of works under the name of Agathonicus still lack an exhaustive historical and theological investigation. No document or mention of them or of the person of Agathonicus exist in Greek or other languages of the Christianity, although in some of the Coptic texts there is a link with Evagrius Ponticus.

(1) One collection (cc0561) is in codex CMCL.AZ: it is opened and closed by the same title (cc6023):

Inscription, p. 83: ΝΕΓΝΩΜΗ Ν̄ΑΓΑΘΟΝΙΚΟC ΠΕΠΙCΚΟΠΟC Ν̄ΤΑΡCΟC Ν̄ΤΚΙΛΙΚΙΑ ΕCΣΥΝΑΙΝΕΙ Ν̄ΜΜΑϸ Ν̄ΟΙ ΤCΥΝΖΟΔΟC ΕΝΤΑCΩΩΠΕ Ζ̄Ν ΑΓΚΥΡΑ Ν̄ΤΕ ΤΓΑΛΑΤΙΑ· Ν̄ΤΑ ΤΕΙCΥΝΖΟΔΟC ΔΕ ΩΩΠΕ ΕΤΒΕ Ν̄ΕΥCΤΑΘΙΑΝΟC

Subscription, p. 125-126: ΝΕΓΝΩΜΗ ΝΑΠΑ ΑΓΑΘΟΝΙΚΟC ΠΕΠΙCΚΟΠΟC Ν̄ΤΑΡCΟC Ν̄ΤΚΙΛΙΚΙΑ ΕCΣΥΝΑΙΝΕΙ Ν̄ΜΜΑϸ Ν̄ΟΙ ΤCΥΝΖΟΔΟC ΕΝΤΑCΩΩΠΕ Ζ̄Ν ΑΓΚΥΡΑ ΝΤΕ ΤΓΑΛΑΤΙΑ· Ν̄ΤΑ ΤΕΙCΥΝΖΟΔΟC ΔΕ ΩΩΠΕ ΕΤΒΕ Ν̄ΕΥCΤΑΘΙΑΝΟC·

(2) The other collection (cc0971) is in MONB.EF, opened by the same title (cc6023):

p. 153-154: ΤΠΙCΤΙC ΝΑΑΠΑ ΑΓΑΘΟΝΙΚΟC ΠΕΠΙCΚΟΠΟC Ν̄ΘΑΡCΟC Ν̄ΤΚΥΛΗΚΙΑ Ν̄ΤΑϸΖΟΜΟΛΟΓΕΙ Μ̄ΜΟC Ζ̄Ν ΤCΥΝΖΟΔΟC Ν̄ΤΑCΩΩΠΕ Ζ̄ΝΑΓΚΗΡΑ Ν̄ΤΕ ΤΓΑΛΛΑΤΙΑ ΕΥCΥΝΗΝΕΙ ΕΡΟC ΤΗΡΟΥ Ν̄ΟΙ ΝΕΠΙCΚΟΠΟC Ν̄ΤΑΥCΩΟΥΖ

**ΕΤΣΥΝΖΟΔΟΣ ΝΑΓΚΗΡΑ· ΕΤΒΕ ΝΕΥΣΤΑΘΙΑΝΟΣ·**

but closed without any title, probably because a work was added (cc0013; about MONB.CV cf. below). The titles cc6023 (in MONB.CV they are in lacuna, if any) may be considered identical, because the slight differences belong to the kind of liberties that the Coptic redactors/scribes could take, according to custom. Therefore they point to a well determined collection existing at least from the VII cent., approximate date of CMCL.AZ. It may also be said that they were derived from the titles or content of the individual works, especially cc0012, so that it is probable that the individual works pre-existed the collection. In fact, the general title cc6023 is taken from elements of the title of cc0008 (first work) – ΓΝΟΜΑΙ and ΠΙCΤΙC may be considered interchangeable – and of the content of cc0012, probably the text which originated (cf. above) the person of Agathonicus and the council of Ancyra.

Two more observations are in order: (a) the sequence of the works is not exactly the same in the three manuscripts containing the collections; (b) the titles or passage formulas of the individual works are in Greek, not in Coptic as the general ones reported above (cc6023).

For the point (a) the sequence of CMCL.AZ (cc0561) is: cc0008, cc0009, cc0011+cc0010, cc0012 – where cc0011 is clearly a secondary insertion into an older, perhaps original, collection; but it is the only one, so CMCL.AZ may be considered a good document of the original conception of an Agathonicean collection. Very different is the case of MONB.EF (cc0971), where the sequence is: cc0008+cc0009+cc0011, cc0010, cc0011+cc0950+cc0011+cc0966, cc0012. The sign “+” means that there is no layout separation between the works; so we note the unification of cc0008,9,11; and the insertion of cc0950 and cc0966, unified, as shown in the sequence, with cc0011 (twice! and it appeared also before). The passage from this sequence to cc0012 is in lacuna, therefore we do not know whether there was (but it is probable) a layout separation. This, and the fact that the texts were manipulated in order to modify some passages against anthropo-



morphism (cc0008, cf. above), suggests that this collection is later than the former one.

In MONB.CV (PN.129.14.143 and 142) only a part of the collection is extant: (between lacunas) cc0010, cc0011, cc0950, cc0011, cc0966. – What is notable here is that the individual items (even cc0011, twice) are clearly separated from one another by means of an opportune layout. This shows that they were originally independent, and that the insertions were made in one circumscribed milieu, but at different stages or at least with different (so to speak) accuracy.

A special case is found in the Papyrus of the Carlsberg Institute of Papyrology, n. 30. It is the beginning of one codex, where cc0013 was copied, without any indication of a collection, but with a title identical to CMCL.AZ, only translated into Coptic (in this case the Fayumic dialect): ΝΕΙ ΝΕ ΝΑΠΟΛΟΓΙΑ ΝΑΓΑΘΟΝΙΚΟΣ ΠΕΠΙΚΟΠΟΣ ΝΘΑΡCOC ΝΤΕ ΤΚΥΛΙΚΙΑ ΕΤΒΕ ΤΜΕΤΑΤ-ΝΕΖ† ΖΝ ΟΥΖΙΡΗΝΗ ΝΤΕ ΦΝΟΥ† ΖΑΜΗΝ. At the end of cc0013 another Agathonicaean text follows, cc0012, without any division, in order, as it seems, to constitute a single homily or tractate. A procedure like this is by no means uncommon in Coptic, and in any case the dialect of the text points to some peripheral milieu.

For the point (b) we stress the difference between titles like e.g. cc5009: ΤΟΥ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΖΟΜΟΙΩC ΠΕΡΙ ΑΝΑCΤΑCΕΩC or cc5012: ΤΟΥ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΑΓΑΘΟΝΙΚΟΥ ΕΠΙΚΟΠΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΤΑΡCΟ ΚΙΛΙΚΙΑC, and cc6023 (cf. above). In our opinion this means that an original collection was made of some Greek (original) texts, and this was the model for the translation into Coptic, where the titles separating the works were left in Greek, a behaviour not unusual in Coptic manuscripts; but the general title was added later.

### Concluding Remarks

We resume here the fairly complicated observations made in the preceding parts, especially for what concerns the establishment of the collections. First of all we want to dispose of the collection attributed to Hippolytus “of Rome” (cc0462), identified by a title in MONB.FT

(cc5462), and perhaps in the initial lacuna of MONB.EF. The name of Hippolytus represents only a pale reminiscence of the person, who is neglected by the authors of the other prior or contemporary collections; and it is used for texts without connection to those attributed to Hippolytus in the non-Coptic traditions. It is very uncertain which texts, present in the very scarce fragments of MONB.FT, were considered by the author as belonging to the “Hippolytus” collection. Therefore it is better to avoid any judgment, until new documents may clarify the situation.

The most serious collection of Nicene documents is cc0554, called by us *collectio Nicaena A*, found only in MONB.EF, unfortunately with beginning and end in lacuna. It contained (at least) three documents: two of them authoritatively present in the Greek collections (cc0955 Symbolum, and cc0957 episcopal subscriptions list); the third (cc0956), anathematisms other than those comprised with the symbolum, therefore to be taken more seriously than modern scholars have done.

The most typically Coptic (but of Greek-Egyptian origin?) collection of Nicene documents is cc0555 called by us *collectio Nicaena B*. We qualify it so, not only because it is found in three codices: MONB.EF, GIOV.AC, and MONB.FT (partially), but especially because it is introduced by a very peculiar text (cc0019, *Didascalía*), which, though included in various shapes in the Greek tradition, has a clear Egyptian character, is moral rather than canonical, and was purposefully but apocryphally linked to the council of Nicaea and even to Athanasius. – A similar case is that of cc0021 Gnomai, a moral tractate which was linked to Nicaea by means of the probably later addition of a theological discussion imitating a symbolum.

The sequence of canons cc0556, cc0962-5 seems well established in the whole international tradition, because it is preserved in authoritative Greek and Latin manuscripts (Joannou, Turner EOMIA), but in Coptic we note the insertion of the *symbolum Constantinopolitanum* (cc0558) and that it was preceded, in MONB.EF, by the typically Egyptian *gnomae Nicaenae* (cc0021).

For what concerns Agathonicus, after what we have said illustrating the individual works and the individual manuscripts, we propose the following. The fortune of 'Agathonicus' in Egypt began with an original version of cc0012, limited to the *erotapokrisis* (second part), to which was soon added the first part with the invention of the council of Ancyra and Stratonicus. Having this text obtained success, other two texts were created under the name of Agathonicus, cc0008 and cc0010. All this was done in Greek, in an Evagrian monastic milieu (Nitria), where a first Greek *corpus* was assembled, with passage-titles between the works. This collection is not preserved, but we can know its organization from the most ancient Coptic collection, found in CM-CL.AZ, where we find the (copticized) Greek passage-titles quoted above.

The collection of CMCL.AZ was made after the texts were translated into Coptic, but before or after the translation some changes were produced: the *apophthegma de resurrectione* cc0009 and the Chalcedonian allusion cc0011 were inserted before cc0010, and the *apologia* cc0013 was added after the end of the (original) collection. The collection of MONB.EF, leaving aside the textual modifications made for theological reasons (cf. above), presents the insertions of cc0950 and cc0966 accompanied by the twice repeated Chalcedonian allusion cc0011 (in fact the two works concern Chalcedon); and the tacit inclusion of cc0013, in the sense that there is no general subscription of the *corpus*. MONB.FT may be an earlier example of such an arrangement (cf. above).

The relationship between the specific canons, the councils canons, the Agathonicean canons, and the acts of councils is an interesting investigation not yet undertaken for the Coptic evidence, but it is outside the object of the present contribution.

## V. TABLE OF THE WORKS

### Arranged According to Composition

#### Canons Attributed to the Apostles

cc0088: Canones Apostolorum per Clementem		Includes --
mss. CMCL.BD (p. a1-81).	Ins cc5088	Part of --
	Sub cc6028	
[BS.QUART0519.	Ins	Part of --
	Sub ]	
BL.OR03580.27. isolated		
MONB.OJ (p. 73-end).	Ins cc5088	Part of --
	Sub lac	
NM.579.001. isolated		
PN.129.12.09. isolated		
[BL.OR00440. modern copy]		
cc0091: Canones Apostolorum		Includes --
mss. CMCL.BD (p. b1-21).	Ins cc5091	Part of --
	Sub cc5091	
[BS.QUART0519.	Ins	Part of --
	Sub ]	
MONB.BG (p. 1-70).	Ins cc5091	Part of --
	Sub lac	
MONB.OJ (p. 001-073post).	Ins lac	Part of --
	Sub cc5091	
NM.664B.12. isolated		
PN.161.051-053. isolated		

#### Canons Attributed to Important Persons

cc0089: Canones Athanasii (CPG2302)		Includes --
mss. BL.PAP.XXXVI.01-19+21-24+PHILLIPS16402.1-4	Ins lac	Part of --
	Sub lac	
MONB.BG (p. 107-178).	Ins lac	Part of --
	Sub lac	
cc0090: Canones Basilii (CPG2977)		Includes --
mss. DC.MS819C.1-8.	Ins lac	Part of --
	Sub lac	
DM.provv01.	Ins cc5090	Part of --
	Sub lac	
GIOV.AN.	Ins lac	Part of --
	Sub lac	
OB.COPT.B10 (fragment)		
OB.COPT.D178A (fragment)		
cc0403: Timoty II of Alexandria (Aelurus), Peter of Alexandria, Responsa canonica, Diataxeis (CPG2520)		Includes --
mss. MONB.EF (194-200).	Ins cc5403	Part of --
	Sub --	



cc0021: Sententiae Concilii Nicaeni (CPG8522)		Includes cc0955, +
mss. GIOV.AJ (p. 58-86).	Ins cc5021	Part of --
	Sub lac	
MONB.EF (p. 71-84).	Ins cc5021	Part of --
	Sub lac	
MONB.FT (p. 1-33).	Ins cc5021	Part of --
	Sub cc5021	
cc0961: Narratio de 318 Patribus et de Spiritu Sancto in concilio Nicaeno		Includes --
mss. GIOV.AC (p. 157-158).	Ins cc5961	Part of cc0555c1
	Sub lac	
MONB.EF (p. 70).	Ins --	Part of cc0555c1
	Sub --	

## Nicene Texts Additional

cc0958: Paulinus of Antioch, Epistula (CPG2134)		Includes --
mss. GIOV.AC (p. 151-154).	Ins lac	Part of cc0555c1
	Sub lac	
cc0959: Epiphanius of Salamis (?), Epistula		Includes --
mss. GIOV.AC (p. 155-156).	Ins lac	Part of cc0555c1
	Sub --	
MONB.EF (p. 69).	Ins lac	Part of cc0555c1
	Sub --	
MONB.FT p. 35post = PN.129.14.086.	Ins lac	Part of cc0969c1
	Sub --	
cc0960: Rufinus of ?, Epistula		Includes --
mss. GIOV.AC (p. 156-157).	Ins cc5960	Part of cc0555c1
	Sub --	
MONB.EF (p. 69-70).	Ins lac	Part of cc0555c1
	Sub --	
MONB.FT p. 35post = PN.129.14.086.	Ins lac	Part of cc0969c1
	Sub --	

## Council Text Additional

cc0558: Symbolum Concilii Constantinopolitani (CPG8599)		Includes --
mss. MONB.EF (150-152).	Ins cc5558	Part of --
	Sub --	

## Agathonicus Major Texts

cc0008: Agathonicus of Tarsus, Fides Agathonici		Includes --
mss. CMCL.AZ (p. 73-88).	Ins -- [cc6023]	Part of cc0561c1
	Sub cc5008	
MONB.EF (p. 153-159).	Ins -- [cc6023]	Part of cc0971c1
	Sub --	
cc0009: De resurrectione mortuorum (apophthegma)		Includes --
mss. CMCL.AZ (p. 89-90).	Ins cc5009	Part of cc0561c1
	Sub --	
MONB.EF (p. 159-160).	Ins --	Part of cc0971c1
	Sub --	
cc0010: Agathonicus of Tarsus, Disputatio cum Iustino Samaritano de resurrectione mortuorum.		Includes --
mss. CMCL.AZ (p. 90-96)	Ins cc6027 + cc5010	Part of cc0561c1
	Sub --	
MONB.CV (PN.129.14.143).	Ins lac	Part of cc0971c1
	Sub --	
MONB.EF (p. 160-162).	Ins cc5010	Part of cc0971c1
	Sub --	

cc0012: Agathonicus of Tarsus, De providentia contra Stratonicum		Includes --
mss. CMCL.AZ (p. 96-125).	Ins cc5012	Part of cc0561c1
	Sub --	
MONB.EF (181-194).	Ins lac	Part of cc0971c1
	Sub --	
CN.PCARL30.1-4 (p. 15-16).	Ins special case	Part of cc0972
	Sub	
cc0013: Agathonicus of Tarsus, Apologia, de incredulitate		Includes
mss. CMCL.AZ (p. 126-138).	Ins cc5013	Part of --
	Sub cc5013	
CN.PCARL30.1-4 (p. 1-15).	Ins special case	Part of cc0972
	Sub	
cc0972: Agathonicus of Tarsus, Apologia composita		Includes cc0013, cc0012
mss. CN.PCARL30.1-4.	Ins cc5013	Part of --
	Sub lac	

## Agathonicus Texts Additional

cc0011: Titulus extravagans de synodo Chalcedonensi.		Includes --
mss. CMCL.AZ (p. 90).	Ins special case	Part of cc0561c1
	Sub	
MONB.CV (PN.129.14.143, twice).	Ins special case	Part of cc0971c1
	Sub	
MONB.EF (p. 159, 162, 163).	Ins special case	Part of cc0971c1
cc0950: Apophthegma de incarnatione		Includes --
mss. MONB.CV (PN.129.14.143).	Ins --	Part of cc0971c1
	Sub --	
MONB.EF (p. 162-163).	Ins --	Part of cc0561c1
	Sub --	
cc0966: Contra concilium Chalcedonense		Includes --
mss. MONB.CV (PN.129.14.142).	Ins --	Part of cc0971c1
	Sub lac	
MONB.EF (p. 163-168).	Ins --	Part of cc0971c1
	Sub lac	

## COLLECTIONS

cc0462: Hippolytus of Rome, Corpus Canonum		Includes cc0021 +
mss. MONB.FT (p.1-?).	Ins cc5462	Part of --
	Sub ?	
cc0554: Collectio Nicaena A		Includes cc0955, cc0956
mss. MONB.EF (p. 19-21).	Ins lac	Part of --
	Sub cc5554	
cc0555: Collectio Nicaena B		Includes cc0019, cc0958, cc0959, cc0960, cc0961
mss. GIOV.AC p. 120-158.	Ins cc5555	Part of --
	Sub lac	
MONB.EF (p. 47-70).	Ins lac	Part of --
	Sub cc5555	
MONB.FT (129.14.086)	Ins --	Part of --
	Sub cc5555	
cc0969: Collectio Nicaena C		Includes cc0970, [cc0958], cc0959, cc0960
mss. MONB.FT (p. 33-34 and PN.129.14.086).	Ins cc5969	Part of --
	Sub cc5969	

cc0561: Corpus Agathonicaeum A		Includes cc0008,
		cc0009, cc0011+cc0010, cc0012
mss. CMCL.AZ (p. 73-126).	Ins cc6023	Part of --
	Sub cc6023	
cc0971: Corpus Agathonicaeum B		Includes cc0008,
	cc0009, cc0010, cc0011, cc0950, cc0966, cc0012	
mss. MONB.CV (PN.129.14.143 and 142)	Ins lac	Part of --
	Sub lac	
MONB.EF (p. 153-194).	Ins cc6023	Part of --
	Sub --	



**APPENDICES**

## 1. List of the codicological units

BL.OR00440	<b>18.</b>
BS.QUART0519	<b>18.</b>
CMCL.AZ	<b>17, 21, 22, 25, 27, 31, 32, 37, 38, 42, 44-48, 51, 55, 56, 59.</b>
CMCL.BD	<b>17, 23, 25, 33, 34, 38.</b>
CMCL.BG	<b>18, 26.</b>
DM.provv01	<b>18, 33.</b>
GIOV.AC	<b>14, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 33, 34, 36, 41, 54, 55, 58.</b>
GIOV.AJ	<b>15, 23, 26, 33, 39.</b>
GIOV.AN	<b>15, 24, 39.</b>
MONB.BG	<b>9, 24, 25, 33, 34.</b>
MONB.CV	<b>9, 21, 22, 25, 26, 28, 30, 31, 42, 46, 54, 56, 57.</b>
MONB.EF	<b>10, 19-23, 26, 25-37, 42, 45, 46, 48, 51, 54, 55, 58, 59.</b>
MONB.FT	<b>11, 23, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31-37, 42, 45, 46, 53, 55, 58, 59.</b>
MONB.GY	<b>26.</b>
MONB.LY	<b>26.</b>
MONB.MN	<b>26.</b>
MONB.OJ	<b>12, 23, 33.</b>

## 2. List of the fragments

## London, British Library, Oriental Manuscripts

BL.OR00440	21, 60.
BL.OR01320.01-41	17.
BL.OR01320.42-51	17.
BL.OR03580.27	12, 23, 60.
BL.OR03580.28	9.
BL.OR03580.29	12.
BL.OR03580.30	12.
BL.OR03580.31	12.
BL.OR06807.11-12	10.
BL.OR06954.01	12.
BL.OR06954.04	10.
BL.PAP.VI.2-3	25.
BL.PAP.VI.8	25.

## Berlin, Staatsbibliothek

BS.FOL1608.1	11.
BS.FOL1608.2	11.
BS.QUART0519	18, 23, 25, 60.

## Cairo, Coptic Museum (call numbers rather confused)

CAIRO.MED.MADI.MMREG16	25.
CC.9259	12.

## Cairo, Institut Français d'Arch. Orientale

CF.061-068	10.
------------	-----

## Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, Parker Library

CH.541.46.1-2	9.
---------------	----

## Copenhagen, Carsten-Niebuhr-Institutet

CN.PCARL30.1-4	22, 31, 32, 47, 50, 63.
----------------	-------------------------

Cambridge, University Library (Oriental)

CU.OR1699.P1-2 12, 33.

Dublin, Chester Beatty Library

DC.MS819C.1-8 21, 24, 60.

Deir el Medina, Polish Excavations

DM.provv01 18, 24, 33, 60.

[Phillips Library, Cheltenham]

ex-Phillips.16402.1-4 18, 60.

Genève, Bibliothèque Bodmer

GB.61.B 17.

GB.61.E 17.

Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale (Coptic, cupboard I)

IB.10.10-17 10.

IB.10.18-23 10.

IB.10.24-27 11.

IB.14.01-02 9.

IB.14.03 9.

Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek

LU.1089.07 23

LU.1089.10 23

Moscow, Pushkin Museum

MPI.1.B0712 9.

Manchester, John Rylands Library (Crawford collection)

MR.064.1-2 25.

Michigan, University Library

MU.0158.23 12.

MU.0158.27	11.
New York, P. Morgan Library	
nm.579.001	21, 23, 24, 60.
nm.664b.12	21, 25, 60.
Oxford, Bodleian Library (Clarendon Press)	
CP.B51.1-4	12.
Oxford, Bodleian Library (papyrus collection, Coptic)	
OB.COPT.B10	21, 24, 60.
OB.COPT.D178A	24, 60.
OB.COPT.E028.2	21, 26.
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale (manuscripts coptes)	
PN.129.12.07	9.
PN.129.12.09	12, 23, 60.
PN.129.14.059	11.
PN.129.14.061	10.
PN.129.14.062	10.
PN.129.14.063-070	10.
PN.129.14.075-082	11.
PN.129.14.083	11.
PN.129.14.084	11.
PN.129.14.085	11.
PN.129.14.086	11, 26, 29, 30, 33-37, 53, 55, 60.
PN.129.14.093	9.
PN.129.14.094-095	11.
PN.129.14.142	9, 30, 31, 55.
PN.129.14.143	9, 21, 28, 31, 46, 57, 64.
PN.130.3.50-54	9.
PN.131.1.26	9.
PN.131.3.26	9.
PN.132.1.55	11.
PN.161.051-053	25, 60.

## Roma, Biblioteca Vaticana, Codices Borgiani

RV.B109.cass29.159.01-04	10.
RV.B109.cass29.159.05	10.
RV.B109.cass29.159.06-07	10.
RV.B109.cass29.159.08-09	10, 27, 43.

## Turin, Museo Egizio

TM.63000.03.01-14r	14.
TM.63000.03.14v-30	14.
TM.63000.03.31-46r	14.
TM.63000.03.46v-49	14.
TM.63000.03.51-56	14.
TM.63000.03.57-58	14.
TM.63000.03.60+xx	15.
TM.63000.03.62+61	15.
TM.63000.03.63	14.
TM.63000.03.63-72	15.
TM.63000.03.73+59	14, 15.
TM.63000.09.01-06	15.
TM.63000.09.07-14	15.
TM.63000.09.15-24	15.
TM.63000.09.24v-33	15.
TM.63000.09.34-36	15.
TM.63000.09.37-40	15.
TM.63000.09.41-42	15.
TM.63000.13	15.

## Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, Papyrussammlung (koptische Papyri)

WK.09599	9.
WK.02941A-I	26.
WK.09600-09603	9.

### 3. Bibliographical List

The books listed in the CMCL bibliography are arranged according to their number; the others follow in alphabetical order of author.

- 0038 Gérard Garitte, *Une lettre grecque attribuée à Saint Antoine*, Le Muséon 55 (1942) 97-0.523.
- 0109 Tito Orlandi, *Testi Copti. 1. Encomio di Atanasio, 2. Vita di Atanasio* Milano, Cisalpino, 1968 = Testi e documenti per lo studio dell'antichità 21.
- 0142 Walter E. Crum, *Der Papyruscodex Saec. VI-VII der Phillipps-Bibliothek in Cheltenham. Koptische theologische Schriften*, Strassburg, Trubner, 1915 = Schriften der Wiss. Gesellsch. in Strassburg, 18.
- 0162 Paul E. Kahle, *Bala'izah. Coptic Texts from Deir el-Bala'izah in Upper Egypt*, London, Oxford Univ. Press, 1954, 2 vols.
- 0165 Paul A. De Lagarde, *Aegyptiaca*, Gottingae, 1883.
- 0172 Gaston Maspero, *Fragments coptes*, Recueil de Travaux 7 (1886) 46-48, 142-0.544.
- 0173 Henri Munier, *Mélanges de littérature copte I-III* ASAE 19 (1919) 225-241, 21 (1921) 77-88, 23 (1923) 210-228.
- 0191 Oskar E. von LEMM, *Koptische Miscellen* in: Bull. Acad. Impér. de St.-Pétersbourg, 1907-0.5915, passim. Reprint Leipzig, Zentralantiquariat der DDR, 1972. 542 p.
- 0212 Pierre Batiffol, *Didascalia 318 Patrum pseudepigrapha*, Paris, 1887.
- 0213 W. Riedel, W. E. Crum, *The Canons of Athanasius of Alexandria. The Arabic and Coptic Versions*. London, Williams and Norgate, 1904.
- 0225 Walter E. Crum, *The Coptic Version of the "Canons of S. Basil"*, PSBA 26 (1904) 57-62.
- 0231 George W. Horner, *The Statutes of the Apostles, or Canones Ecclesiastici*, London, Williams And Norgate, 1904.
- 0232 Henry Tattam, *The Apostolical Constitutions or Canons of the*

- Apostles in Coptic*, Oriental Translation Fund, 1848 = Oriental Translations Fund Publications 63.
- 0234 Johannes Leipoldt, *Saidische Auszüge aus dem 8. Buche der Apostolischen Konstitutionen*, TU 26, 1b, Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1904.
- 0277 Joseph Lammeyer, *Die sogenannten Gnomen des Concils von Nicaea*, Inaugural Dissertation, Freiburg Beyrouth, 1912.
- 0284 Eugène Révillout, *Le Concile de Nicée d'après les textex coptes et les diverses collections canoniques. Premier volume*, Paris, Maisonneuve, 1881.
- 0295 Giuseppe L. Dossetti, *Il Simbolo di Nicea e di Costantinopoli. Edizione critica*, Roma, 1967 = Testi e Ricerche di Scienze Religiose 2 [reconstruction of MONB.EF by J. Gribomont].
- 0296 Heinrich K. G. Gelzer, *Patrum Nicaenorum nomina latine graece coptice syriace arabice armeniace*, Leipzig, Teubner, 1898 = *Scriptores Sacri et Profani* 2.
- 0388 Walter C. Till, Johannes Leipoldt, *Der koptische Text der Kirchenordnung Hippolyts*, TU 58, Berlin, Akademie, 1954.
- 0754 René-Georges Coquin, *Les canons d'Hippolyte*, PO 35.2, Paris, 1965.
- 1023 J. Blanc, *Fragments inédits de l'Épitomé des Constitutions Apostoliques*, *Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale* 21 (1954) 295-299.
- 1417 Francesco Rossi, *I Papiri copti del Museo Egizio di Torino*, Torino, Loescher, 1887-0.5892, 2 vols., 10 fascicules.
- 1462 Arnold van Lantschoot, *Recueil des colophons des manuscrits chretiens d'Egypte*, Louvain, Ista, 1929 = *Bibl. du Musèon* 1
- 1559 René-Georges Coquin, *Le Corpus Canonum copte. Un nouveau complément: le Ms. Ifao Copte 6*, *Orientalia* 50 (1981) 40-86.
- 2150 Enzo Lucchesi, *L'oratio I "De Laudibus S. Mariae" de Proclus de Constantinople. Version Sahidique...*, in: E. Lucchesi, H.D. Saffrey (eds.), *Mémorial... Festugière*, Genève, Cramer, 1984, pp. 187-0.598.

- 3590 Alois Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche. 2/4: Die Kirche von Alexandrien mit Nubien und Äthiopien nach 451*, Freiburg etc., Herder, 1990.
- 3676 Aziz S. Atiya, *The Coptic Encyclopedia*, New York etc., Macmillan, 1991. 8 vols.
- 4169 Angelo Di Berardino (ed.), *Dizionario Patristico e di Antichità Cristiane*, Casale Monferrato, Marietti, 1983, 3 vols.
- 4503 Urbain Bouriant, *Notes de voyage*, Recueil de Travaux 11 (1889) 131-0.559, 15 (1893) 176-189.
- 4555 Walter E. Crum, *Catalogue of the Coptic Manuscripts in the British Museum*, London, British Museum, 1905.
- 4608 Georg Zoega, *Catalogus Codicum Copticorum Manuscriptorum qui in Museo Borgiano Velitris Adservantur*, Roma, Propag. Fide, 1810. Reprint Leipzig, Hinrichs 1903; Hildesheim, Olms, 1972.
- 4763 Leo Depuydt, *Catalogue of Coptic Manuscripts in the Pierpont Morgan Library*, Leuven, Peeters, 1993 = *Corpus of Illuminated Manuscripts* 4.
- 6392 Angelo Di Berardino (a cura di), *Patrologia, vol. V: Dal Concilio di Calcedonia (451) a Giovanni Damasceno (m. 750). I padri orientali*, Genova, Marietti, 2000.
- 6653 Michael Kohlbacher, *Minor Texts for a History of Asceticism: Edition in Progress*, in: *Ägypten und Nubien in spätantiker und christlicher Zeit. Akten des 6. Internationalen Koptologenkongresses, Münster, 20.-26.Juli.1996*, Wiesbaden, Reichert, 1999 = *Sprachen und Kulturen des christlichen Orients*, 6,1-2, Band 2, p. 144-0.554.
- a129 Enzo Lucchesi, *In Chrysostomum Copticum*, *Analecta Bollandiana* 113 (1995) 362-364.
- a173 Alessandro Bausi, *La versione etiopica delle Risposte Canoniche di Timoteo I attribuite a Pietro di Alessandria (CPG II, nr. 2520)*, *Scrinium* 2 (2006) 41-57.



- a300 Tito Orlandi, *The Library of the Monastery of Saint Shenute at Atripe*, in: A. Egberts, B. P. Muhs, J. van der Vliet (eds.), *Perspectives on Panopolis. An Egyptian Town from Alexander the Great the Arab Conquest*, Leiden Boston Köln, Brill, 2002, pp. 211-232.
- a411 Tito Orlandi, *Coptic Texts Relating to the Virgin Mary. An Overview*, Roma, CIM, 2008 = Unione Accademica Nazionale, Corpus dei Manoscritti Copti Letterari.
- a462 Alessandro Bausi, *La versione etiopica della Didascalia dei 318 Niceni sulla retta fede e la vita monastica*, in: Ugo Zanetti, Enzo Lucchesi, *Aegyptus Christiana*, Genève, Cramer, 2004, p. 225-248.
- Claude B. Armstrong, *The Synod of Alexandria and the Schism at Antioch in A.D. 362*, *Journal of Theological Studies* 22 (1921) 206-221.
- Otto Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*, 2. umgearbeitete Aufl., Freiburg im Breisgau, Herdersche Verlagshandlung, 1912.
- Alessandro Bausi, *Liste etiopiche di vescovi niceni*, in: P. Bruns, H.O. Luthé, (eds.), *Orientalia Christiana (Festschrift Kaufhold)*, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 2013, p. 33-74.
- Angelo Di Berardino (ed.), *I canoni dei concili della chiesa antica*, Roma, Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 2006-[in fieri]. vols. 4 in 6 tomes. = *Studia ephemeridis Augustinianum* 95, 106, 119, 122, 137, 141. Vol. I, C. Noce, C. Dell'Osso e D. Ceccarelli Morolli, *I concili greci*, 2006.
- Wilfried Hartmann and Kenneth Pennington (eds.), *The history of byzantine and eastern canon law to 1500*, Washington, D.C., The Catholic University of America Press, 2012.
- Périklés-Pierre Joannou, *Discipline générale antique (IIe-IXe s.)*, Grottaferrata, Tipografia italo-orientale S. Nilo, 1962. 4 vols.
- Friedrich B. Chr. Maassen, *Geschichte der Quellen und der Literatur des canonischen Rechts im Abendlande bis zum Ausgange des Mittelalters*, Gratz, Leuschner & Lubensky, 1870.

- Tito Orlandi, *The Turin Coptic papyri*, Augustinianum 53 (2013) 501-530.
- Rudolph Riedinger, Hans Thurn, *Die Didascalia CCCXVIII Patrum Nicaenorum und das Syntagma ad Monachos im Codex Parisinus Graecus 1115 (a. 1276)*, Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik 35 (1985) 75-92.
- Eduard Schwartz, *Gesammelte Schriften*, Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 1938. 5 vols., vol. IV: *Zur Geschichte der Alten Kirche und ihres Rechts*, pp. 158-275.
- Manlio Simonetti, *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo*, Roma, Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1975 = *Studia ephemeridis Augustinianum*, 11.
- Cuthbertus H. Turner, *Ecclesiae occidentalis monumenta iuris antiquissima. Canonum et conciliorum graecorum interpretationes latinae*, Oxonii, e typographeo Clarendoniano, 1899, 3 vols.