

ADAMANTIUS

**Annuario di Letteratura Cristiana Antica
e di Studi Giudeoellenistici**

Rivista del Gruppo Italiano di Ricerca su
“Origene e la tradizione alessandrina”

Journal of the Italian Research Group on
“Origen and the Alexandrian Tradition”

24

2018

*The Coptic Book: Codicological Features,
Places of Production, Intellectual Trends*



Morcelliana

Adamantius

Rivista del Gruppo Italiano di Ricerca su
“Origene e la tradizione Alessandrina”

*

Journal of the Italian Research Group on
“Origen and the Alexandrian Tradition”

24

(2018)



Adamantius

*Rivista del Gruppo Italiano di Ricerca su
"Origene e la tradizione alessandrina"*

*Journal of the Italian Research Group on
"Origen and the Alexandrian Tradition"*

Comitato Scientifico Scientific Committee

Gilles Dorival (Aix-en-Provence / Marseilles),
Giovanni Filoramo (Torino), Alain Le Boulluec (Paris), Christoph Marksches (Berlin),
Claudio Moreschini (Pisa), Enrico Norelli (Genève), David T. Runia (Melbourne),
Guy Gedaliahu Stroumsa (Oxford / Jerusalem),
Robert Louis Wilken (Charlottesville, Virginia)

Comitato di Redazione Editorial Board

Roberto Alciati, Osvalda Andrei, Guido Bendinelli, Paola Buzi,
Antonio Cacciari (vicedirettore), Francesca Calabi, Alberto Camplani (direttore scientifico),
Tessa Canella, Nathan Carlig, Francesca Cocchini, Chiara Faraggiana di Sarzana, Emiliano Fiori,
Mariachiara Giorda, Leonardo Lugaresi, Valentina Marchetto, Angela Maria Mazzanti, Adele Monaci,
Andrea Nicolotti, Domenico Pazzini, Lorenzo Perrone (direttore responsabile), Francesco Pieri,
Teresa Piscitelli, Emanuela Prinziavalli, Marco Rizzi, Pietro Rosa, Agostino Soldati, Stefano Tampellini,
Daniele Tripaldi (segretario), Andrea Villani, Claudio Zamagni

Corrispondenti esteri Foreign correspondents

Cristian Badilita (Romania), Marie-Odile Boulnois (France),
Harald Buchinger (Austria), Dmitrij Bumazhnov (Russia), Augustine Casiday (United Kingdom),
Tinatin Dolidze (Georgia), Samuel Fernández (Chile), Michael Ghattas (Egypt),
Anders-Christian Jacobsen (Denmark), Adam Kamesar (U.S.A.), Aryeh Kofsky (Israel),
Johan Leemans (Belgium), José Pablo Martín (Argentina), Joseph O'Leary (Japan),
Anne Pasquier (Canada), István Perczel (Hungary), Henryk Pietras (Poland),
Jana Plátová (Czech Republic), Jean-Michel Roessli (Switzerland),
Riemer Roukema (The Netherlands), Samuel Rubenson (Sweden),
Anna Tzvetkova (Bulgaria), Martin Wallraff (Germany)

La redazione di *Adamantius* è presso il Dipartimento di Filologia Classica e Italianistica, Alma Mater Studiorum – Università di Bologna, Via Zamboni 32, I-40126 Bologna (tel. 0512098517, fax 051228172). Per ogni comunicazione si prega di rivolgersi al Prof. Alberto Camplani (e-mail: alberto.camplani@uniroma1.it) o al Prof. Antonio Cacciari (e-mail: antonio.cacciari@unibo.it). Il notiziario segnerà tutte le informazioni pervenute che riguardino specificamente il campo di ricerca del gruppo, registrando in maniera sistematica le pubblicazioni attinenti ad esso. Si prega d'inviare dissertazioni, libri e articoli per recensione all'indirizzo sopra indicato.

Indice
Adamantius 24 (2018)

1. *Contributi*
- 1.1 *Sezioni monografiche*
- 1.1.1 *The Coptic Book: Codicological Features, Places of Production, Intellectual Trends*
 - PAOLA BUZI, *Introduction* 6-8
 - MARILENA MANIACI, *Ricordo di Paul Canart (25 ottobre 1927 – 14 settembre 2017)* 9-11
 - GIANFRANCO AGOSTI, *Greek and Coptic Paideia in Late Antique Egypt: Comparing the Incomparable?* 12-21
 - SOFÍA TORALLAS TOVAR, *Athanasius' Letter to Dracontius: A Fourth-Century Coptic Translation in a Papyrus Roll (P.Monts.Roca inv. 14)* 22-38
 - PAOLA BUZI, *The Coptic Papyrus Codices Preserved in the Museo Egizio, Turin: New Historical Acquisitions, Analysis of Codicological Features, and Strategies for a Better Understanding and Valorization of the Library from Thi(ni)s* 39-57
 - TITO ORLANDI, *The Monasteries of Shenoute and Macarius: A Comparison Between Two Libraries* 58-65
 - FRANCESCO BERNO, *The Coptic Reception of the Homilies on the Epistle to the Hebrews by John Chrysostom (CPG 4440), with Some Notes on the Composition of MONB.CR (= CLM 325): A Survey and New Textual Identifications* 66-74
 - ELISABETH R. O'CONNELL, *Theban Books in Context* 75-105
 - ANNE BOUD'HORS, *Le P. Bodmer 58 comme témoin de la vie culturelle et religieuse dans la région thébaine au début du vi^e siècle* 106-117
 - TOMASZ GÓRECKI† e EWA WIPSZYCKA, *Scoperta di tre codici in un eremo a Sheikh el-Gurna (TT 1151-1152): il contesto archeologico* 118-132
 - RENATE DEKKER, *The Early Sahidic Version of the Encomium on Bishop Pesynthius of Koptos from Shaykh Abd al-Qurna: On the Progress of Its Edition* 133-142
 - ÁGNES T. MIHÁLYKÓ, *The Thrice-Blessed Pesynthios of Koptos and the Presanctified Holies: Some Notes on a Coptic Pastoral Letter (P.Berol. 11346)* 143-149
 - ALBERTO CAMPLANI – FEDERICO CONTARDI, *The Canons Attributed to Basil of Caesarea in the Context of the Canonical Literature Preserved in Coptic* 150-164
 - NATHAN CARLIG, *Codicological Remarks on the Pseudo-Basil Codex from Hermitage MMA 1152 (Cairo, Coptic Museum, inv. 13448)* 165-183
 - PRZEMYSŁAW PIWOWARCZYK, *Preliminary Remarks on the Recently Identified Leaves with Martyrium Petri from Sheikh Abd el-Gurna* 184-194
 - AGOSTINO SOLDATI, *One of the Oldest Extant Coptic 'Colophons'* 195-199
 - JULIAN BOGDANI, *Linking Coptic literary manuscripts to the archaeological context by means of Digital Humanities: The case of 'PATHs' project* 200-210
- 1.1.2 *Lectures on Philo – De vita Mosis*
 - CLAUDIO ZAMAGNI, *Introduzione* 211-212
 - FRANCESCA CALABI, *Regalità, profezia, sacerdozio di Mosè secondo Filone alessandrino* 213-226
 - FRANCESCA SIMEONI, *Assimilazione e immutabilità. Modelli platonici della relazione tra Mosè e Dio in Filone di Alessandria* 227-237
 - MANUELA BARETTA, *Ipotesi sul pubblico del De vita Mosis di Filone alessandrino* 238-244
 - LEONARDO LUGARESÌ, *Dio e l'uomo nel teatro del mondo. Agonismo spirituale, vita inautentica e rappresentazione del potere nella riflessione di Filone sugli spettacoli* 245-263
 - ANGELA MARIA MAZZANTI, *L'importanza della krisis fra enunciazione teorica e lettura degli avvenimenti. La Legatio ad Gaium di Filone di Alessandria* 264-275
 - ILARIA L.E. RAMELLI, *Philo as One of the Main Inspirers of Early Christian Hermeneutics and Apophatic Theology* 276-292

GUIDO BENDINELLI, *Filone e Origene interpreti di Mosè* 293-305

CLAUDIO ZAMAGNI, *Filone nella letteratura cristiana antica: la sintesi eusebiana di Hist. eccl. II 4,2-3 e la testimonianza sui 'terapeuti' (II 16,2-17,24)* 306-311

MASSIMO GARGIULO, *Una esegesi per tutti: le Quaestiones tra giudaismo rabbinico, mondo greco e tradizioni popolari* 312-324

DOMENICO PAZZINI, *Creazione, nominazione, linguaggio: Genesi 1-2 in Filone, Origene, Walter Benjamin* 325-333

1.2

Articoli

ALEX LEONAS, *Notes concerning Philo's chronology and social position* 334-348

VÍT HUŠEK, *Scholia of Clement of Alexandria in the Coptic Catena on the Gospel* 349-359

ANTONIO CACCIARI, *Sugli hapax legomena nelle Homiliae in Psalmos origeniane* 360-370

ADELE MONACI CASTAGNO, *Eusebio di Cesarea, Gerusalemme e la Palestina (313-324/325 d.C.)* 371-397

MANOLIS PAPOUTSAKIS, *Is He the Rider of the Quadriga? Ephrem the Syrian on Julian's Apotheosis* 398-415

GIOVANNI MANDOLINO, «Come un indovino»: *doppia creazione e immagine di Dio nel De opificio hominis di Gregorio di Nissa* 416-434

ALESSANDRO CAPONE, *Stoici, qui nostro dogmati in plerisque concordant: Gerolamo e lo stoicismo* 435-450

CARLA LO CICERO, *Rufino traduttore di Gregorio di Nazianzo. Pastori di pecore (o bovini) e pastori di anime: riecheggiamenti virgiliani e ricordi di scuola (Gr. Naz. or. 2,9 – Rufin. Greg. Naz. orat. 1,9)* 451-462

ELISA DAL CHIELE, *Gubernat aquam qualiter illi placuerit. Una citazione non identificata in Agostino, cons. ev. III 48* 463-468

CARMEN ANGELA CVETKOVIĆ, *Contested Authority in the Twelfth Century Latin West: Bernard of Clairvaux's Reception of Origen* 469-484

RUBÉN PERETÓ RIVAS, *The two versions of Evagrius Ponticus' Kephalaia Gnostika. A New Discussion on Their Authenticity* 485-492

1.3

Note e Rassegne

TESSA CANELLA, *Lo sviluppo teologico cristiano dell'idea di tolleranza: a margine di un recente volume di Peter Van Nuffelen* 493-505

LORENZO PERRONE, *Tra le linee dei conflitti: Coabitazioni culturali e religiose ad Alessandria e in Egitto fra I e VI sec.*, con un'appendice di ALBERTO CAMPLANI, *Momenti di trasformazione storico-culturale e percorsi di coabitazione nelle zone marginali* 506-519

GUALTIERO CALBOLI, *I Commenta in Ciceronis Rhetorica di Mario Vittorino: una nuova edizione commentata* 520-531

2.

Notiziario

2.1

Riunioni del Gruppo 532-536

2.2

Notizie su tesi e attività didattiche 537-541

[TERESA PISCITELLI]

3.

Repertorio bibliografico

3.1

Pubblicazioni recenti su Origene e la tradizione alessandrina (a cura di L. PERRONE) 542-615

0. *Bibliografie, repertori e rassegne; profili di studiosi*, 542; 1. *Miscellanee e studi di carattere generale*, 544; 2. *Ellenismo e cultura alessandrina*, 556; 3. *Giudaismo ellenistico*, 556; 4. *LXX*, 558; 5. *Aristobulo*, 562; 6. *Lettera di Aristeo*, 563; 7. *Filone Alessandrino*, 563 (1. *Bibliografie, rassegne, repertori*; 2. *Edizioni e traduzioni*; 3. *Miscellanee e raccolte*; 4. *Studi*); 8. *Pseudo-Filone*, 565; 9. *Flavio Giuseppe*, 566 (1. *Bibliografie, rassegne, repertori*; 2. *Edizioni e traduzioni*; 3. *Miscellanee e raccolte*; 4. *Studi*); 10. *Cristianesimo alessandrino e ambiente egiziano*, 566 (1. *Il contesto religioso egiziano*; 2. *Il periodo delle origini*; 3. *Gnosticismo, ermetismo e manicheismo*; 4. *La chiesa alessandrina: istituzioni, dottrine, riti, personaggi e episodi storici*; 5. *Il monachesimo*); 11. *Clemente*

INDIRIZZARIO DEI MEMBRI DEL GRUPPO

- Alessandrino*, 577; 12. *Origene*, 578 (1. *Bibliografie, rassegne, repertori*; 2. *Edizioni e traduzioni*; 3. *Miscellanee e raccolte*; 4. *Studi*); 13. *L'origenismo e la fortuna di Origene*, 590; 14. *Dionigi Alessandrino*, 591; 15. *Pierio di Alessandria*; 16. *Pietro di Alessandria*; 17. *Alessandro di Alessandria*, 591; 18. *Ario*, 592; 19. *Eusebio di Cesarea*, 592; 20. *Atanasio*, 594; 21. *I Padri Cappadoci*, 595 (1. *Basilio di Cesarea*, 595; 2. *Gregorio di Nazianzo*, 596; 3. *Gregorio di Nissa*, 597); 22. *Ambrogio di Milano*, 605; 23. *Didimo il Cieco*, 605; 24. *Evagrio*, 605; 25. *Rufino di Aquileia*, 606; 26. *Teofilo di Alessandria*, 606; 27. *Sinesio di Cirene*, 606; 28. *Gerolamo*, 606; 29. *Agostino*, 609; 30. *Isidoro di Pelusio*; 31. *Cirillo Alessandrino*, 611; 32. *Nonno di Panopoli*, 612; 33. *Pseudo-Dionigi Areopagita*, 613; 34. *Cosma Indicopleuste*; 35. *Giovanni Filopono*, 614; 36. *Massimo il Confessore*, 615.
- 3.2 *Segnalazioni di articoli e libri* 616-652
[MARIA DELL'ISOLA, MARCO SETTEMBRINI, ANDREA NICOLOTTI, ROMANO PENNA, ARIANNA ROTONDO, CLEMENTI MAZZUCCO, ANDREA VILLANI, OSVALDA ANDREI, LEONARDO LUGARESÌ, LORENZO FOCANTI, JEAN-MARIE AUWERS, STEFANO FRANCHINI].
4. *Comunicazioni*
- 4.1 *Congressi, seminari e conferenze*
- 4.1.1 *Congressi: cronache* 653-658
Philon d'Alexandrie dans l'Europe moderne: réception d'un corpus judéo-hellénistique (XVI-XVIII s.), Lyon, 7-9 novembre 2018 [FRANCESCA CALABI]. XVI Convegno del GIROTA 27-28 aprile 2018 – Portogruaro (VE) *Il cristianesimo in Anatolia tra Marco Aurelio e Diocleziano: tradizione asiatica e tradizione alessandrina a confronto* [MAURIZIO GIROLAMI].
- 4.1.2 *Seminari: cronache* 658-661.
Summer School in Coptic Literature and Manuscript Tradition (Centre for the Study of Manuscript Cultures, Hamburg, 17-21 settembre 2018) [MARTA ADESSI]
- 4.1.3 *Progetti di ricerca* 662-667
A proposito di PAThs [PAOLA BUZI, ALBERTO CAMPLANI, MARIA CHIARA GIORDA]
5. *Indici*
- 5.1 *Indice delle opere di Origene* (M. ADESSI) 668-669
- 5.2 *Indice degli autori moderni* (M. ADESSI) 670-684
6. *Indirizzario*
- 6.1 *Elenco dei membri del Gruppo* 685-688
- 6.2 *Elenco dei collaboratori di Adamantius 24 (2018)* 689-690
7. *Libri e periodici ricevuti* 691-694
8. *Pubblicazioni del Gruppo* 695-696
- Opere di Origene* 697
- Annuncio delle due sezioni monografiche di «Adamantius» 25 (2019)* 698

1. Contributi

1.1 Sezioni monografiche

1.1.1 The Coptic Book: Codicological Features, Places of Production, Intellectual Trends

Introduction

by
Paola Buzi

The theme section of this issue of *Adamantius* collects the proceedings of the international conference *The Coptic book between the 6th and the 8th centuries: codicological features, places of production, intellectual trends* (Rome, “Sapienza” Università di Roma – Academia Belgica, 21-22 September 2017)¹, organized within the scientific activities of the ERC project “PATHs - Tracking Papyrus and Parchment Paths: An Archaeological Atlas of Coptic Literature. Literary Texts in their Geographical Context: Production, Copying, Usage, Dissemination and Storage”, plus two more contributions – respectively dedicated to the Coptic version of the letter of Athanasius to the monk Dracontius, transmitted by a horizontal roll, and to the Coptic tradition of John Chrysostom’s homilies on the Epistle to the Hebrews – that, although exceeding the chronological limits dealt with the conference, are extremely relevant for the reconstruction of the development of the Christian Egyptian book and literary tradition.

It is important to stress that the term ‘book’ is meant here both as a material object – with its specific codicological and palaeographic features –² and as a carrier of texts and intellectual products. Moreover, it must be clear that the adjective “Coptic” is used in this context to refer to the entire Late Antique Christian Egyptian book production, therefore written also in Greek, and not only to books that transmit texts in the Coptic language.

The choice of dedicating a conference – the first of the “PATHs” project – to the book production between the 6th and the 8th centuries was not fortuitous: despite the important recent progresses made in the understanding of this period of the history of the Coptic book³ – and of the book in general, since Egypt can be considered a real laboratory of the physical features of codices, in terms of formats, quire systems, bookbindings, combination and arrangement of texts –, much remains to be clarified and explored, such as the nature of

¹ ERC Advanced Grant (2015) project n° 687567, hosted by “Sapienza” Università di Roma (paths.uniroma1.it; <https://atlas.paths-erc.eu>). See P. BUZI, *Tracking Papyrus and Parchment Paths: An Archaeological Atlas of Coptic Literature: Literary Texts in Their Geographical Context; Production, Copying, Usage, Dissemination and Storage (PATHs)*, *Early Christianity* 8 (2017), 507-516; P. BUZI – J. BOGDANI – N. CARLIG – M. GIORDA – A. SOLDATI, “*Tracking Papyrus and Parchment Paths*”: A New International project on Coptic Literature, *Rivista del Museo Egizio* 1 (2017) [<https://rivista.museoegizio.it/>]; P. BUZI – F. BERNO – J. BOGDANI, *The ‘PATHs’ Project: an Effort to Represent the Physical Dimension of Coptic Literary Production (Third–Eleventh centuries)*, *Comparative Oriental Manuscripts Studies Bulletin* 4.1 (???) 39-58.

² More and more specialists of manuscripts and early printed books, of various cultural areas and disciplines, are now studying the textual/cultural aspects of books in strict relation with their physical features, internal and external. See for instance B.J. FLEMING, *The Materiality of South Asian Manuscripts from the University of Pennsylvania MS Coll. 390 and the Rāmamālā Library in Bangladesh*, *Manuscript Studies* 1.1 (Spring 2017) 3-26, and B. WAGNER, M. REED (eds.), *Early Printed Books as Material Objects. Proceeding of the Conference Organized by the IFLA Rare Books and Manuscripts Section Munich, 19-21 August 2009*, Berlin-Munich 2010.

³ For the case of Thebes see A. BOUD’HORS, *À la recherche des manuscrits coptes de la région thébaine*, in *From Gnostics to Monastics. Studies in Coptic and Early Christianity in Honor of Bentley Layton*, ed. D. BRAKKE - S.J. DAVIS - S. EMMEL, Leuven - Paris, Bristol (CT) 2017, 175-212; EAD., *Copie et circulation des livres dans la région thébaine (VII^e-VIII^e siècles)*, in *“Et maintenant ce ne sont plus que village...” Thèbes et sa région aux époques hellénistique, romain et byzantine*, ed. A. DELATTRE, P. HEILPORN, Brussels 2008, 149-161; EAD., *Copyist and Scribe: Two Professions for a Single Man? Palaeographical and Linguistic Observations on Some Practices of the Theban Region According to Coptic Texts from the Seventh and Eighth Centuries*, in *Scribal Repertoires in Egypt from the New Kingdom to the Early Islamic Period*, ed. J. CROMWELL - E. GROSSMAN, Oxford 2017, 274-295.

libraries and their criteria of selection, the tastes and the interests that were behind their formation, but also the evolution in the making of the codex and the professional competences involved⁴. The scant information concerning all these aspects that are provided by well-known 9th-11th-century libraries in fact is even poorer for previous periods.

A better knowledge of this phase of the Coptic book production will contribute to the definitive abandonment of the misleading praxis for using the most famous mediaeval libraries – White Monastery, Monastery of the Archangel Michael (Hamūli), Monastery of Macarius (Scetis) – as a model and a meter on which to measure the entire history of Coptic manuscript tradition.

Moreover, also thanks to recent discoveries due to active archaeological excavations, it appears clearer and clearer that it is possible to talk about a “regionality of the book production”, being the area of Thebes one of the most generous in providing new finds consisting of books, in all possible forms and writing supports, that shed light on the cultural trainings and literary tastes of the inhabitants of urban settlements (such as Jeme) and of a constellation of different forms of ‘monasteries’ (from essential and remote hermitages to well-organized *topoi*).

Whenever possible, therefore, it becomes essential to take into consideration the place(s) where a text was copied and a book was manufactured and stored and has circulated. In this way, cultural orientations and literary tastes in specific areas of Egypt will be singled out, while changes in the manufacture of codices will emerge, in a manuscript tradition that offers the oldest witnesses for the use of codex.

The theme section is articulated in three parts. The first – *Literary culture(s), and book production in Egypt between the 4th and the 10th centuries* – that aims at analyzing different libraries and regional milieus of Late Antique and early Mediaeval Egypt, is opened by an article of Gianfranco Agosti, which deals with the common ground of Greek and Coptic *paideia*, comparing the Late Antique Greek learned poetry with the contemporary Coptic hagiographic production. Then Sofía Torallas Tovar discusses one of the most important bibliographical discoveries of the last years, a papyrus roll containing Athanasius of Alexandria’s *Letter to Dracontius* in Coptic version, that much adds to our knowledge of the cultural activities of early Egyptian Church institutions. The section continues with a contribution of Paola Buzi dedicated to the ancient library of the cathedral of This, consisting of a number of Coptic codices dating to the end of the 7th century or the beginning of the 8th, preserved in the Egyptian Museum, Turin, and now the object of a complete re-examination within the activities of the “PATHs” project, with particular attention to ancient restorations and re-writings and the codicological features. The criteria of selection and arrangement of the works of two important Christian libraries of early mediaeval Egypt, that of the Monastery of Apa Shenoute and that of the Monastery of Macarius, which represent different manners of preservation of the Coptic literary tradition, are the object of Tito Orlandi’s contribution. Lastly, the section offers an accurate *status quaestionis* of the reception of John Chrysostom’s homilies dedicated to the Epistle to the Hebrews (Francesco Berio).

The second section – *Coptic Books from the Theban region* – takes its inspiration from the discovery of the three Theban Coptic books of the so-called pit MMA 1152 by Tomasz Górecki and his team⁵, whose provenance is archaeologically well documented, a fact of great importance for a project like “PATHs”, that aims at analysing the Coptic book in strict relation to the geo-archaeological context. The section, however, is opened by a more general and at the same time very accurate overview of the literary manuscripts, in Greek and Coptic, found in Thebes, with a particular attention to their archaeological contexts (Elisabeth R. O’Connell). This is followed by a contribution on one of the most interesting multiple-text manuscripts of the Theban area, *P. Bodmer 58*, as far as the content and the physical aspects are concerned (Anne Boud’hors).

⁴ In this respect, the contribution of A. MARAVELA, *Monastic book production in Christian Egypt*, in *Spätantike Bibliotheken. Leben und Lesen in den frühen Klöstern Ägyptens*, ed. H. FROSCHAUER, C.E. RÖMER, Wien 2008, 25-38 is very useful.

⁵ T. GÓRECKI, *Sheikh Abd el-Gurna (Hermitage in Tomb 1152). Preliminary Report, 2005*, *Polish Archaeological Mission 22* (2017) 263-274; ID., *Sheikh Abd el-Gurna*, in A. MAJEWSKA, *Seventy Years of Polish Archaeology in Egypt. Catalogue of the Exhibition. Egyptian Museum in Cairo, 21 October - 21 November 2007*, Warsaw 2017, 176-181; ID., ‘It might come in useful’: *Scavenging among the Monks from the Hermitage in MMA 1152*, *Étude et Travaux 27* (2014) 129-150.

Most of the contributions of this section are, therefore dedicated, to the archaeological context of discovery (this is the case of the article written by Tomasz Górecki† and Ewa Wipszycka), to the texts that are transmitted by the codices (Renate Dekker, Alberto Camplani with the collaboration of Federico Contardi, Przemysław Piwowarczyk), to their codicological features (Nathan Carlig), to the liturgical aspects of the historical contexts (Agnes Mihálykó), and to scribal subscriptions (Agostino Soldati).

Lastly, the third sections contain an article by Julian Bogdani that aims at showing how digital humanities, with their broad and diversified tools and methodologies, can contribute to a better knowledge of Late Antiquity, notably of Christian Egyptian manuscript and literary production in its geographical context.

A few days before the conference, we received the sad news of the passing of Mons. Paul Canart, an inspirer and guide for several of the authors of this theme section. He had been invited to take part in the conference as discussant and therefore I find it appropriate and dutiful to celebrate his memory with a brief *ricordo* of his human and scientific qualities by Marilena Maniaci. It is our way to thank him for his extraordinary teachings in the fields of codicology and palaeography.

Paola Buzi

ERC Advanced Grant 2015 Principal Investigator:

«PATHs - Tracking Papyrus and Parchment Paths: an Archaeological Atlas of Coptic Literature.

Literary Texts in their Geographical Context.

Production, Copying, Usage, Dissemination and Storage»

**The Coptic Reception of the *Homilies on the Epistle to the Hebrews* by John Chrysostom (CPG 4440),
with Some Notes on the Composition of MONB.CR (= CLM 325):
A Survey and New Textual Identifications¹**

by

Francesco Berno

O. INTRODUCTION

As it has been observed¹, the Coptic fortune of Chrysostom's *Homilies on Hebrews* can hardly be overrated. The exceptional dissemination this paper is going to observe is reasonably due to several factors – including their use in liturgical (and, more extensively, monastic) activities, as well as their distinctly moral-oriented nature, not to mention their heresiological potential² – the analysis of which goes way beyond the much more limited scope of the present contribution. Indeed, the first and main goal of this paper is to supplement and further integrate the identifications provided mainly by Sever Voicu³ and by Alin Suciuc of the textual units actually translated into Coptic⁴, as well as to stress in the clearest possible terms that the Chrysostomic Coptic tradition differs essentially from its Greek counterpart, due to the extraordinary degree of interpolatory activity shown by the former.

A second section will focus on the manuscripts by which the homilies are preserved, with special reference to MONB.CR (= CLM 325⁵), whose peculiar structure will be briefly sketched.

A third and conclusive paragraph will offer some remarks and an overview of the redrafting processes underlying the Coptic reception of the entire Chrysostomic and ps.-Chrysostomic⁶ corpus, revealing a pro-

¹ This paper was conceived in the framework of the ERC Advanced Grant (2015) project n° 687567 “PATHs. Tracking Papyrus and Parchment Paths: An Archaeological Atlas of Coptic Literature. Literary Texts in their Geographical Context: Production, Copying, Usage, Dissemination and Storage” (P.I.: Paola Buzi), hosted by Sapienza Università di Roma (Rome, Italy).

² Cf. A. SUCIUC, *The Homilies on the Epistle to the Hebrews by John Chrysostom: A Complement to the Coptic Version* (<https://alinsuciuc.com/2011/07/12/the-homilies-on-the-epistle-to-the-hebrews-by-john-chrysostom-a-complement-to-the-coptic-version/>; last accessed on 30 January 2019).

³ *Inter alia*, I am thinking here of the problematic relationship between Christianity and Judaism as addressed by the letter, and of the debate concerning the legitimacy of those Jewish-Christians who still maintained regular and substantial contacts with the Synagogue. It would be significant to analyse in depth the development of such fundamental issues over the period of the Coptic reception of this anonymous epistle.

⁴ S. VOICU, *Per una lista delle opere trasmesse in copto sotto il nome di Giovanni Crisostomo*, in *Christianity in Egypt: Literary Production and Intellectual Trends in Late Antiquity. Studies in honor of Tito Orlandi*, ed. P. BUZI, A. CAMPLANI, Roma 2011, 575-610; 589-590.

⁵ An identification of the Parisian leaves, with the indication of their overall content (the homiletic series on *Hebrews*, indeed), but without the attribution of the Coptic texts to a single Greek homily, was offered in E. LUCCHESI, *Répertoire des manuscrits coptes (sahidique), publiés de la Bibliothèque nationale de Paris*, Geneva 1981 and, partially, in É. PORCHER, *Analyse des manuscrits coptes 131¹⁻⁸ de la Bibliothèque nationale, avec indication des textes bibliques*, RdE 1 (1933) 105-160; 231-278; 2 (1934) 65-123. It is worth noticing that we have no evidence of a Bohairic transmission of this homiletic series.

⁶ A Coptic Literary Manuscript (CLM) entry is a univocal numerical identifier attributed by PATHs project to all complete, reconstructed, and fragmentary preserved Coptic manuscripts. See the *PATHs Mission Statement* (<http://paths.uniroma1.it/>) and the introduction to the section “manuscripts” in *PATHs' Atlas* (<https://atlas.paths-erc.eu/manuscripts>).

⁷ However, this classification is not unambiguous, even more in an extremely “fluid” literary tradition, such as Coptic, and for an author whose literary afterlife and fortune are debated and controversial, such as Chrysostom. Such a questionable partition will be used here in the interests of brevity. On this matter, see W. MAYER, *A Life of Their Own. Preaching, Radicalisation, and the Early ps.-Chrysostomica in Greek and Latin*, in *Philologie, herméneutique et histoire des textes entre Orient et Occident. Mélanges en hommage à Sever J. Voicu*, ed. F.P. BARONE, C. MACÉ, P. UBIERNA, Turnhout 2017, 977-1004, and S. VOICU, “*Furono chiamati giovanitti...*”. *Un'ipotesi sulla nascita del corpus pseudocrisostomico*, in *Philomathestatos. Studies in Greek and Byzantine Texts Presented to Jacques Noret for His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. B. JANSSENS, B. ROOSEN, P. VAN DEUN, Leuven 2004, 701-711.

per *ars combinatoria* involved in the selection, arrangement, textual re-elaboration, and collection of this homiletic *corpus*.

Nevertheless, I must point out that several important questions are going to remain unanswered. In particular, the following list of extant translations is intended to be updated on an ongoing basis by future identifications and textual acquisitions, as well as by developments in our understanding of Coptic literary activity. The provisional nature of this contribution is revealed also by the absence of an inquiry devoted to the redactional history and the textual variations of the Greek text itself. Indeed, for the sake of convenience, the Greek originals taken into consideration are from Jacques Paul Migne's *PG* 63, 9-236, which, in turn, reproduces the edition by Bernard de Montfaucon⁷. Furthermore, it cannot be ruled out that what will be here indicated as a relevant textual variant should be intended as a translation of an as yet unknown Greek reading. Since the fragments potentially preserving Chrysostomic works and not yet identified are numerous, it is important to stress that only the secure identifications are presented below, leaving aside the leaves too badly damaged or too fragmentarily preserved⁸.

Moreover, any and every entry discloses characteristic (unique, indeed) emending and rewriting phenomena, to such an extent that the correspondence between Greek and Coptic texts is frequently hard to trace. The most considerable and significant deviations will be reported and cursorily analysed.

1. CHRYSOSTOM'S HOMILIES ON THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS EXTANT IN COPTIC⁹

– *hom.* 4: Manchester, *P.Ryl.Copt.* 25, f. 4 (MONB.CP; *PG* 63, 41.20 – 63, 41.46). The initial title introduces the following text as «the 6th sermon (πνευματικὸν λόγος) [...] that the blessed John [...] preached, commenting upon the Epistle to the Hebrews»¹⁰.

– *hom.* 5: Manchester, *P.Ryl.Copt.* 25, f. 4 (MONB.CP; *PG* 63, 50.40 – 63, 51.3). The text of the 5th homily is consecutive to the text of the 4th, the unmarked transition being in Manchester, *P.Ryl.Copt.* 25, f. 4r, lin. 21; Manchester, *P.Ryl.Copt.* 25, f. 1 (MONB.CP; *PG* 63, 51.33 – 63, 54.9)¹¹.

– *hom.* 7: Cairo, *IFAO Copte* f. 171 (MONB.CP; *PG* 63, 64.3 – 63, 66.7); possibly Wien, *K 09170* (MONB.CP)¹².

⁷ B. DE MONTFAUCON, *Sancti patris nostri Ioannis Chrysostomi opera omnia qua extant...*, vol. 12, Parisiis 1728.

⁸ As a mere instance, this is the case of Cairo, *IFAO Copte* 226r-v (MONB.OT), whose edition is offered by C. LOUIS, *Catalogue raisonné des manuscrits littéraires coptes conservés à l'IFAO du Caire. Contribution à la reconstruction de la Bibliothèque du monastère Blanc* (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, École Pratique des Hautes Études, Section des Sciences Religieuses, Paris 2005), 439-441 (= no. 99). This fragment preserves a work which is classified by the CMCL with an independent *clavis* entry (*De vita caelesti*; CC 0478).

⁹ For each homily the complete shelfmark of the manuscript(s) by which it is preserved is indicated – when two or more shelfmarks are connected by '+', they preserve consecutive pages – as well as the reference, given in brackets, to the Greek text actually translated, as it was printed in the *PG*, and the indication of the codicological unit they once belonged. Due to the above-mentioned radical difference between Greek and Coptic tradition, the correspondence between the Coptic text and his supposed Greek model should not be perceived as an evidence to assume the transmission in Coptic of the entire original homily.

¹⁰ W.E. CRUM, *Catalogue of the Coptic Manuscripts in the Collection of the John Rylands Library, Manchester*, Manchester-London 1909, no. 62, already highlighted the quotation, on the first lines of the leaf, from Heb 2, 14. The only Chrysostom homily on Hebrews quoting this passage is the 5th, «with the text of which – Crum added, perhaps too quickly – the Coptic passage does not correspond». However, mismatches between what is declared by the *inscriptio* and the position of the homily in the relative Greek series are not isolated cases, especially in Chrysostomic collections. This happens twice, for instance, in the Bohairic MACA.AC (= CLM 72). Thus, it is not unlikely that antigraphs revealing arrangements of Chrysostom's homilies different than the ones we currently know have circulated in Coptic environments (both Sahidic and Bohairic).

¹¹ C.M. SCHNEIDER, *The Text of a Monastic Discourse, On Love and Self-Control. Its Story from the Fourth Century to the Twenty-First*, Collegeville 2017, 118, footnote 228, rightly notes that Greek and Coptic texts correspond closely on the recto, namely between *PG* 63, 51.33 and 63, 52.42, while, on the verso, «the Coptic and Greek are still discussing the same theme but not in the same way. The words match only occasionally, but with increasing frequency as both texts draw to their close». Nevertheless, it seems to me that the Coptic text parallels in a consistent way the argumentative structure, as well as the literary construction (see, for instance, the quotation from Eph 6, 12), of the Greek one at least until *PG* 63, 54, 9. I was not able to identify, instead, the last lines of Manchester, *P.Ryl.Copt.* 25, f. 1v, which appear to me as an original conclusive digression.

¹² Although C.M. SCHNEIDER, *The Text of a Monastic Discourse*, cit., 118, footnote 227, tentatively states that such

- *hom.* 12: Paris, *BnF Copte* 131³, f. 27 (CLM 5201; PG 63, 100.44 – 63 102.9).
- *hom.* 15: Paris, *BnF Copte* 131², f. 147 (MONB.CR; PG 63, 136.38 – 63, 63, 136.56); Paris, *BnF Copte* 131⁵, f. 087 *scriptio superior* (MONB.OT; PG 63, 136.59 – 63, 137.18). It is relevant to note that the 15th homily is (partially) preserved by two ancient codicological units. See also the case of the 17th sermon.
- *hom.* 16: Venice, *Biblioteca Marciana Or.* 192, ff. 79-84 (MONB.CR; PG 63, 126.1 – 63, 128.27). The text of the 16th homily ends at Venice, *Biblioteca Marciana Or.* 192, f. 84r, col. b, lin. 22 (ΝΗΤΟΥΩΩ ΔΗ ΕΣΟΤΤΙΣ ΝΑΝ). In Venice, *Biblioteca Marciana Or.* 192, f. 080r, col. a, lin. 14, about twenty lines of the Greek text (PG 63, 126.15-36) are strongly summarized.
- *hom.* 17: Venice, *Biblioteca Marciana Or.* 192, f. 84 (MONB.CR; PG 63, 131.42 – 63, 132.3). The text of the 17th homily begins in Venice, *Biblioteca Marciana Or.* 192, f. 84r, col. b, lin. 23 (ΧΕΚΑΣ ΖΗΟΥΣΥΝΗΔΥΣΙΣ ΝΚΑΘΑΡΟΝ); Naples, *Biblioteca Nazionale I.B.* 11, ff. 100-106¹³ (MONB.CR; PG 63, 132.8 – 63, 135.5); Naples, *Biblioteca Nazionale I.B.* 16, ff. 20-23 *scriptio superior* (MONB.OT; PG 63, 132.57 – 63, 133.36). In Venice, *Biblioteca Marciana Or.* 192, f. 84v, the portion of text parallel to PG 63, 131.42-54 exhibits a significant revision, departing from a literal translation of its source.
- *hom.* 24: Wien, *K 09817-09822* (MONB.CR; PG 63, 169.45 – 63, 172.20; section 63, 170.46 – 63, 171.3 is omitted). The text of the 24th homily ends at Wien, *K 09822r*, col. b, lin. 22 (ΖΑΠΣ ΓΑΡ ΕΡΟΝ ΠΕ ΕΤΡΕΥΔΟΚΙΜΑΖΕ ΜΠΟΥΑ ΠΟΥΑ ΜΗΟΝ ΖΗΝΑΙ¹⁴). In Wien, *K 09817r*, the following initial title (unfortunately severely damaged) is preserved: ΟΥΛΟΓΟ[Σ ΝΤΕ] ΠΕΧΡΗΣ[ΟΣΤΟ]ΜΟΣ ΕΤΟ[ΥΑΔΒ] ΑΥΩ ΠΕΝ[ΕΙ]ΩΤ Δ[ΠΑ ΙΩΡΑ]ΝΗΣ [ΠΑΡΧΗΕ]ΠΙΚ[ΟΠΟΣ ΝΚΩΣ]ΤΑΝΤΗΝΟΥΠΟΛΙΣ ΕΑΓΤΑΥΟΦ ΧΕ ΩΩΕ ΕΡΟΝ [...]ΠΩ ΓΑΡ ΚΑΝ[...] ΝΩΔΑΡΡΕΝΝΑΕΙΝ [...] ΣΥΝΧΩΡΗΣΙΣ ΝΤΕΠΝΟΥΓΤΕ ΤΗΝΤΖΗΓ ΝΛΑΔΥ ΔΗ ΑΥΩ ΟΝ ΧΕ ΝΩΩΕ ΔΗ ΕΚΑΝΗΤΩΒΗΡ ΝΑΝ ΜΗ ΝΡΩΜΕ ΕΘΟΟΥ· ΑΛΛΑ ΕΤ Ρ[...]ΝΠΩΤ ΕΒΟΛ [Μ]ΜΟΥ· ΧΕΚΑΣ Ε[...]ΩΒΗΣΟΜ Ε[...] ΝΑΝ ΝΟΥΟΕΩ ΝΗ ΝΘΟΤΕ ΜΠΟΥΓΤΕ ΡΡΑΙ ΝΖΗΤΗ ΖΗΟΥΕΙΡΗΝΗ ΝΤΕΠΝΟΥΓΤΕ ΖΑΜΗΝ. I will discuss the relevance of this heading later. In Wien, *K 09821r*, col. b, the Greek text underwent an extensive redrafting activity¹⁵.
- *hom.* 25: Wien, *K 09822* + London, *BL Or.* 03581A, f. 18 (MONB.CR; PG 63, 172.25 – 63, 175.1). The text of the 25th homily begins at Wien, *K 09822r*, col. b, lin. 23, with a textual section marked as a scripturistic quotation (ΚΑΤΑ ΘΕ ΕΓΧΗΖ ΧΕ ΖΗΟΥΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΔΒΡΑΖΑΝ ΑΓΤΑΛΕ ΙΣΑΑΚ ΕΡΡΑΙ ΕΥΠΕΙΡΑΖΕ ΜΗΟΙ¹⁶) and with a speculation on Abraham's faith and temptation (Inc.: ΕΩΧΕ ΔΠΠΕΙΡΑΣΜΟ ΘΕ ΜΗΤΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΕΒΑΒΡΑΖΑΝ ΝΣΩΤΠ). Although this passage has no known formally literal counterpart from the extant Greek tradition, it seems to me that it was supposed to act as a connecting element with the previous textual unit and as a summary introduction to the model, by recapitulating its main theme. Furthermore, in London, *BL Or.* 03581A, f. 18v, col. b, lin. 5-10, one finds the quotation from 1Cor 6, 7 (διὰ τί οὐχὶ μᾶλλον ἀδικεῖσθε; διὰ τί οὐχὶ μᾶλλον ἀποστερεῖσθε; // εἶπε οὗ ρω σενάχιτηγτι δη ησωνς εἶπε οὗ ρω σενάβεστηγτι δη), which cannot be traced back in the Greek model¹⁷.

a damaged fragment «seems to begin with a correspondence to PG 63:63, around line 18», and, consequently, that it is supposed to immediately precede the IFAO sheet, I have some reservations about such identification. The connection with the theme of the 7th homily is undeniable, but the extant text attests an extensively revised version. To give just one example, and waiting for more specific inquiries, the quote from Mt 16, 27, in the present form (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεσθαι ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ, καὶ τότε ἀποδώσει ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὴν πράξιν αὐτοῦ, rewritten as follows: φηγὴ κάρ νει πώμρε ηἰρῶμε εφρῆμοσ εξεμηπῶροнос [μηπεφ]οογ αγω κνατ ἡπογα πογα κατα νεφρβηγε) does not appear at all in the Greek text.

¹³ A partial (*I.B.* 11, ff. 101r-105v) edition of these leaves was published in A.A. GIORGI, *Fragmentum Evangelii S. Iohannis Graeco-Copto-Thebaicum Saeculi IV...*, Romae 1789, 425-440.

¹⁴ «It is necessary for us to be examined one by one on this point».

¹⁵ In particular, see the repetition of Lk 13, 25. Moreover, it has to be noted that, in Wien, *K 09819r*, col. b, lin. 9, the Coptic text (ΠΧΟΕΙΣ ΜΗ ΡΡΑΙ ΔΗ ΖΗΠΕΚΡΑΝ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΕΥΕ ΑΥΩ ΔΗΝΕΧΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΟΝ ΕΒΟΛ ΑΥΩ ΔΗ ΡΡΑΖ ΗΣΟΗ) adheres to the extended version of the quotation from Mt 7, 22 (Κύριε κύριε, οὐ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι ἐπροφητεύσαμεν, καὶ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι δαμόνια ἐξεβάλομεν, καὶ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι δυνάμεις πολλὰς ἐποιήσαμεν;). Instead, it seems that Chrysostom had followed a short version here (Κύριε, οὐ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι προεφητεύσαμεν, καὶ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι δυνάμεις πολλὰς ἐποιήσαμεν;).

¹⁶ «As it is written, by faith Abraham raised Isaac up being tempted».

¹⁷ However, it is interesting to note that this quote, in the present form, is almost an *hapax* in Chrysostom's production, recurring only in the 16th homily *On Matthew* (PG 57, 248.30), at the beginning of the 16th homily *On John* (PG 59, 101.50), and in the 23rd homily *On 2Corinthians*. Nevertheless, the framework within which the quote is inserted

- *hom.* 26: Paris, *BnF Copte* 131², f. 148 (MONB.CR; PG 63, 182.46 – 63, 183.57).
- *hom.* 29: Leiden, *Rijksmuseum van Oudheden* 104 (MONB.CR; PG 63, 206.37 – 63, 206.52). The first twelve lines of Leiden, *Rijksmuseum van Oudheden* 104r, col. a, until the quotation from Mt 11, 8, do not parallel the Greek text, although they seem to share the same lexical references¹⁸.
- *hom.* 30: Wien, K 09828 (MONB.CR; PG 63, 212.36 – 63, 212.53).
- *hom.* 31: Wien, K 09829 (MONB.CR; PG 63, 216.2 – 63, 216.16); Paris, *BnF Copte* 131², ff. 159-160 (MONB.CR; PG 63, 216.38 – 63, 217.7).
- *hom.* 32: London, *BL. Or.*03581A, f. 19 + Paris, *BnF Copte* 131², f. 149 (MONB.CR; PG 63, 222.3 – 63, 222.42); Wien, K 09828 + Paris, *BnF Copte* 131², f. 150 (MONB.CR; PG 63, 224.15 – 63 224.51). In London, *BL. Or.*03581A, f. 19r we read the following *inscriptio*, attesting a different writing-style (but reasonably by the same hand as the one to which the main text is ascribable): ρΟΜΙΩΣ ΚΕΛΟΓΟΣ ΝΤΕΠΣΟΦΟΣ ΝΑΝΕ ΖΗΝΑΠΟΥΓΤΕ ΑΠΑ ΙΩΡΑΝΗΝΣ ΠΑΡΧΗΠΕΠΚΟΠΟΣ ΝΚΩΣΤΑΝΤΙΝΟΥΠΟΛΙΣ ΕΑΦΤΑΥΟΦ ΧΕ ΝΩΥΕ ΔΗ ΕΤΡΕΝΤΑΧΡΟΝ ΕΧΗΝΑΠΕΙΒΙΟΣ ΧΕ ΕΝΣΕΝΑΜΟΥ(Ν) ΕΒΟΛ ΔΗ ΑΥΩ ΧΕ ΤΕΘΛΙΥΙΣ ΕΡΝΟΒΡΕ ΝΑΝ ΕΖΟΥΝ ΕΠΕΝΤΟΝ ΑΥΩ ΟΝ ΧΕ ΤΗΡΧΡΙΑ ΠΟΥΝΟΣ ΝΣΠΟΥΔΗ ΕΡΟ(Ν) ΩΑΝΤΗΝΕΩΣΗΜΟΝ ΕΜΑΤΕ ΝΤΕΧΑΡΙΣ ΝΤΑΝΧΙΤΣ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΙΤΗΠΠΟΥΓΤΕ ΑΥΩ ΧΕ ΟΥΝΟΣ ΝΡΗΥ ΠΕ ΠΩΩ ΝΝΕΓΡΑΦΗ ΕΤΟΥΔΑΒ ΖΗΟΥΕΙΡΗΝΗ ΝΤΕΠΠΟΥΓΤΕ ΖΑΝΗΗ¹⁹. I shall return to this issue later.
- *hom.* 33: Berlin, *Ms. Or.* 1606, f.6 + Paris, *BnF Copte* 131², ff. 151-156 (MONB.CR; PG 63, 229.23 – 63, 232.13). The text of the 33rd homily ends in Paris, *BnF Copte* 131², f. 156r, col. b, lin. 8 (ΑΥΩ ΝΤΕΙΖΕ ΤΗΝΝΑΜΑΤΕ ΝΤΠΕ ΜΗ ΝΑΓΑΘΟΝ ΕΤΗΡΗΤΣ). In Paris, *BnF Copte* 131², f. 152r, we find an interesting textual addition²⁰.
- *hom.* 34: Paris, *BnF Copte* 131², ff. 156-158 (MONB.CR; PG 63, 235.1 – 63, 236.22). The text of the 34th homily begins at Paris, *BnF Copte* 131², f. 156r, col. b, lin. 17 (ΠΚΩ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΝΕΝΝΟΒΕ ΠΕ ΜΗ ΠΟΥΟΠ ΕΤΩΡΟΠ ΝΑΝ). Nevertheless, the text is not consecutive to the end of the previous homily (see *hom.* 33), since a brief interlude is inserted between the two works, which, obviously, does not parallel the Greek text: ΝΩΔΑΝΦΕΙ ΓΑΡ ΖΗΟΥΓΩΠΕΜΟΤ ΖΑΠΡΟΔΡΕΧ ΝΤΗΝΤΕΡΗΚΕ ΤΊΝΑΣΩΚ ΩΑΡΟΝ ΠΕ ΝΤΕΧΑΡΙΣ ΝΠΕΠΠΩ ΕΤΟΥΔΑΒ²¹.

does not parallel any Greek text. In a different form, the passage appears also in the 25th homily *On Hebrews* (PG 63, 175.17), and it is likely that the text we currently read is an original elaboration on this occurrence.

¹⁸ By way of example, one can compare the Greek and Coptic sentences immediately preceding the quotation from Mt 11, 8: οὐχὶ ἐν κολάσει εἰσὶ; Τὰ δὲ νῦν, εἰπέ μοι, οὐ τοιαῦτα // ΑΥΩ ΣΕΩΡΟΠ ΝΠΟΟΥ ΖΗΤΚΟΛΑΣΙΣ ΜΗ ΝΡΕΝΤΕΙΜΙΝΕ ΔΗ ΝΕΝΕΤΩΡΟΠ ΤΕΝΟΥ. Finally, it has to be noted that the Coptic homily does not include the Greek reference in PG 63, 206.35-36 to the «kings of the Gentiles» (πάντες δὲ οἱ βασιλεῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν, Βαβυλωνίων, Αἰγυπτίων, οὐχὶ κακῶς τὴν ζωὴν κατέστρεψαν; cf. Lk 22, 25).

¹⁹ «Likewise, another sermon by him who is really wise in the things of God, Apa John, archbishop of Constantinople, which he pronounced (on the fact) that it is not necessary that we rely upon the things of this life, because they won't remain and because the affliction is profitable for us in the rest, and again (on the fact) that we need a great concern so that we could obtain the Grace which was given to us by God, and (on the fact) that reading the Holy Scripture is a great profit. In God's peace. Amen».

²⁰ The Greek text runs as follow: Ὅτε εὐεργετήθη και ἀπηλλάγη τῶν κακῶν ὁ Ἐζεκιῆς, ἐπήρθη εἰς ὕψος ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ ὅτε ἠρώσθη, τότε ἐταπεινώθη, τότε ἐγγὺς ἐγένετο τοῦ Θεοῦ. Ὅτε, φησὶν, ἀπέκτεινεν αὐτοὺς, τότε ἐξεζήτουν αὐτὸν, και ἐπέστρεφον και ὠρθίζον πρὸς τὸν Θεόν· και πάλιν· Ὅτε ἐπαχύνθη και ἐλιπάνθη, ἀπελάκτισεν ὁ ἡγαπημένος. Πινώσκειται γὰρ Κύριος κρῖματα ποιῶν. The Coptic redactor (or, far more likely, already his antigraph) must have found the reference to Ezekiel misleading, since it seems to suggest that the second quotation was also from the same prophet. Consequently, he replaced 'φησὶν' with the more exegetical 'κατὰ πρ(ε)β(η)τα {πεντα}δαγεια. χροοφ χε' («according to what David has said»).

²¹ «If we tolerate, through the acceptance of (the) Grace, the distress of the misery, we attract to ourselves the Grace of the Holy Spirit».

2. THE MANUSCRIPTS, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO MONB.CR

As we have cursorily seen, at least²² three Sahidic codicological units²³, which once belonged to the library of the White Monastery, preserve sections of Chrysostom's *Homilies on Hebrews*, that is, MONB.CP (= CLM 323)²⁴, MONB.CR (= CLM 325), and MONB.OT (= CLM 581). For present purposes, the parchment codex MONB.CR²⁵ takes on particular importance, since, unlike the two other codices, it consists exclusively of *excerpta* from Chrysostom's works. For obvious reasons, it is not possible to provide here an even partial edition of this codex. Nevertheless, I would like to offer a few improvements to the reconstruction of his structure and literary content.

The above-mentioned²⁶ long initial titles²⁷ are a good place to start this analysis. Indeed, instead of introducing a single homily – as is the case, for instance, of another important Chrysostomic collection, namely the Bohairic MACA.AC (= CLM 72)²⁸ –, they are placed at the beginning of larger textual units, which, in turn, are compilations of several excerpts by Chrysostom's homilies, woven together and slightly revised by an editor. In fact, after informing about the author (ἸΩΡΔΑΝΗΝΗΣ ΠΑΡΧΗΠΕΠΚΟΠΟΣ ΝΚΩΣΤΑΝΤΙΝΟΥΠΟΛΙΣ) and the “literary genre”²⁹ ([κε]λογοσ), these extended *inscriptions*, respectively at λ and cz, mark the main themes of each collected homily with the customary expression “ἀγὼ οὖν καὶ” («and again about/that»),

²² Paris, *BnF Copte* 1313, f. 27 seems to have belonged to a fourth White Monastery codex. According to A. SUCIU, *The Homilies on the Epistle to the Hebrews by John Chrysostom: A Complement to the Coptic Version*, cit., «[t]he paleographical comparison with other manuscripts from the White Monastery has revealed that the fragment was copied by the same scribe to which we owe the *Apophthegmata Patrum* codex (MONB.EG). [...] However, despite the fact that both of them were obviously copied by the same scribe, I have doubts that the Chrysostom bit should be attributed to the *Apophthegmata* codex». Provisionally, CLM entry no. 5201 has been attributed to this parchment folio.

²³ See T. ORLANDI, *Terminology for the Identification of Coptic Literary Documents*, *Journal of Coptic Studies* 15 (2013) 87-94; 91: «[t]he codicological units correspond to what in the more fortunate traditions are simply and rightly called “the codices”. In the Coptic environment I propose to use a different terminology, because in most cases we are confronted with sparse groups of sheets, which through the research of the scholars are presented as having been part of an original codicological unit, with all the uncertainties which accompany such operation».

²⁴ A survey on the content of this palimpsest – which includes, *inter alia*, homilies by Gregory of Nyssa, Basil of Caesarea, Severus of Antioch, and Severian of Gabala – is available in C.M. SCHNEIDER, *The Text of a Monastic Discourse*, cit. 113-120. See also T. ORLANDI, *Coptic Texts Related to the Virgin Mary. An Overview*, Roma 2008, 17.

²⁵ A codicological reconstruction of this dismembered manuscript presumably produced between the 10th and the 12th century was offered by P. BUZI, *Catalogo dei manoscritti copti borgiani conservati presso la Biblioteca Nazionale “Vittorio Emanuele III” di Napoli con un profilo scientifico di Stefano Borgia e Georg Zoega e una breve storia della formazione della collezione Borgiana*, Roma 2009, 247-248. See also P. BUZI, *Coptic Manuscripts 7. The Manuscripts of the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin Preussischer Kulturbesitz. Homiletic and Liturgical Manuscripts from the White Monastery. With two documents from Thebes and two Old Nubian Manuscripts*, Wiesbaden 2014, 146-148, and A. SUCIU, *The Borgian Coptic Manuscripts in Naples: Supplementary Identifications and Notes to a Recently Published Catalogue*, *OrChrP* 77 (2011) 299-235.

²⁶ For the full texts, see under the entries of hom. 24 and 32.

²⁷ On the variety and heterogeneity shown by the use, position, structure, and role of Coptic titles, see P. BUZI, *Miscellanea e florilegi. Osservazioni preliminari per uno studio dei codici copti pluritestuali: il caso delle raccolte di excerpta*, in *Christianity in Egypt: Literary Production and Intellectual Trends in Late Antiquity. Studies in honor of Tito Orlandi*, ed. P. BUZI, A. CAMPLANI, Roma 2011, 177-203; EAD., *Titoli e autori nella tradizione copta. Studio storico e tipologico*, Pisa-Roma 2005; EAD., *Titles in the Coptic Manuscript Tradition: Complex Structure Title and Extended Complex Structure Titles*, in *Coptic Studies on the Threshold of a New Millennium*, ed. M. IMMERZEEL e J. VAN DER VLIET, Leuven-Paris-Dudley, MA 2004, 309-316.

²⁸ All thirty-eight homilies of this codex from the Monastery of St. Macarius have their own title, which gives clear indication of their relative position in the corresponding Greek series. For an analysis of this manuscript, see P. BUZI – F. BERNO – A. SOLDATI – F. VALERIO, *Vat. copt. 57. A Codicological, Literary and Paratextual Analysis*, *COMSt Bulletin* 4.2 (2018), 162-193. See also S. VOICU, *Vaticano Copto 57, in Coptic treasures from the Vatican Library: a selection of Coptic, Copto-Arabic and Ethiopic manuscripts: papers collected on the occasion of the tenth International Congress of Coptic Studies (Rome, September 17th-22nd, 2012)*, ed. P. BUZI, D.V. PROVERBIO, Roma 2012, 151-162.

²⁹ However, particular care should be taken in considering this questionable piece of information. As remarked by T. ORLANDI, *Terminology for the Identification of Coptic Literary Documents*, *Journal of Coptic Studies* 15 (2013) 87-94; 92, «a kind of homogeneization [of the literary genres] has been introduced before the X century, and it is not advisable to reproduce the terminology found in the title of late manuscripts».

indicating a clear perception of the Coptic text's composite nature³⁰. A third, entirely comparable *inscriptio*, in Naples, *Biblioteca Nazionale I.B.* 11, f. 85v [ρλ] must be added to these two headings. Here we read: ρΟΗΟΙΩΣ ΚΕΛΟΓΟΣ ΝΤΕΠΕΧΗΣΟΣΤΟΜΟΣ ΕΤΟΥΔΑΒ ΑΠΑ ΙΩΡΑΝΗΝΗΣ ΠΑΡΧΗΠΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΣ ΝΚΩΣΤΑΝΤΙΝΟΥΠΟΛΙΣ· ΕΑΦΤΑΥΟΦ ΕΤΒΕ ΤΕΚΡΙΣΙΣ ΕΤΝΑΩΩΠΕ· ΧΕ ΝΩΑΝΚΑ ΠΕΣΡΠΜΕΕΥΕ ΖΗΠΠΕΖΗΤ· ΜΕΡΕΛΑΔΥ ΜΠΑΘΟΣ ΘΗΣΟΜ ΕΡΟΝ· ΑΥΩ ΧΕ ΖΕΝΡΒΗΥΕ ΕΥΜΕΖ ΝΝΕΡΩΛΖΦ ΝΕ ΝΜΥΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ ΝΤΕΚΚΛΥΣΙΑ· ΑΥΩ ΕΤΒΕ ΠΝΔ ΕΡΟΥΝ ΝΖΗΚΕ ΖΗΟΥΕΡΗΝΗ ΝΤΕΠ[ΝΟΥΤΕ]³¹.

For present purposes, this *inscriptio* is of the utmost interest in at least two respects. First, we can read (and evaluate) the entire following textual unit, which is preserved *in extenso*. Second, the text that the title introduced is the result of a complex editing activity of three Chrysostom's homilies on the Gospel of John (CPG 4425).

It seems worth reconstructing the structure of this 'Coptic homily' – such is, indeed, the most appropriate definition of this “new” textual unit –, in order to retrace the boundaries and the methods of the interpolatory process.

As just stated, the work as we read it in Coptic consists of selected sections from three authentic Greek homilies by John Chrysostom, namely the 45th, 46th, and 47th of the series dedicated to the Fourth Gospel. In Naples, *Biblioteca Nazionale I.B.* 11, f. 86r ([ρλα]), the text begins by adhering to PG 59, 255.48. Thus, this first section runs until f. 90v, col. b, lin. 3 (ρμ), and parallels the Greek text between PG 59, 255.48 and PG 59, 258.10³². Here begins³³ the second part, which covers PG 59, 260.53 – 59, 262.47³⁴, ending at f. 94v, col. b, lin. 22 (ρμη). After a short transitional passage³⁵, which reworks and summarizes PG 59, 262.47–54, at f. 95r, col. b, lin. 7 ([ρμϵ]) the last and longer excerpt begins³⁶, translating between PG 59, 268.18 and PG 59, 270.14, and completing the homily in f. 99v (ρμη)³⁷.

Fortunately, in Naples, *Biblioteca Nazionale I.B.* 11, f. 85, we can read the closing lines of the work immediately preceding this long textual unit. I was able to identify them as the Sahidic translation of PG 59, 170.10–20, that is, of the final section of the 29th homily on the Gospel of John by Chrysostom.

This clearly shows that an entire section of MONB.CR was dedicated to this Greek series. Moreover, such a “thematic” division presided over the arrangement of the whole codex. Indeed, along with this large section reserved for the homilies *On John*, and the other, even more substantial part consisting of the sermons *On Hebrews*, a third series found a place in our manuscript, namely the homilies *De diabolo tentatore* (CPG 4332). Naples, *Biblioteca Nazionale I.B.* 11, ff. 81–82 preserve a consistent translation of PG 49, 244. 60 – 49, 247.27³⁸ (1st homily *De diab.*), and, after a twenty-folio lacuna, in Naples, *Biblioteca Nazionale I.B.* 11, f. 83³⁹ and Wien, K 09826, we read PG 49, 250.54 – 49, 251.11.

Consequently, it seems appropriate to conclude that MONB.CR originally preserved a complete transla-

³⁰ See P. BUZI, *From Single-Text to Multiple-Text Manuscripts: Transmission Changes in the Coptic Literary Tradition. Some Case-Studies from the White Monastery Library*, in *One-Volume Libraries: Composite and Multiple-Text Manuscripts*, ed. M. FRIEDRICH – C. SCHWARKE, Berlin 2016, 93–109; 99–100.

³¹ «Likewise, another sermon by the saint Chrysostom Apa John, archbishop of Constantinople, which he pronounced about the judgement that will happen, (on the fact) that, if we keep its memory in our hearts, no passion has power over us, and (on the fact) that works full of fears are the mysteries of the Church, and about the mercy towards the poor. In God's peace».

³² Although the conformity between Greek and Coptic is almost exact, the following issues must be reported: in f. 86v, col. a, lin. 15 (Inc. ΑΥΩ ΜΑΡΕΝΤΑΟΥΟΦ) begins a relatively long section which redrafts and modifies the Greek text, mainly by overexposing the moral concerns of its model; in f. 88r, col. b, lin. 14 (PG 59, 256.31) about five lines of the Greek text are missing.

³³ Inc. ΖΗΠΑΙ ΓΑΡ ΕΡΕΠΕΧΡ ΣΩΚ ΜΜΟΝ.

³⁴ The section between PG 59, 262.8 and 59, 262.14 has been omitted by the Sahidic witness.

³⁵ Inc. ΜΑΡΕΝΗΕΕΥΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΧΕ.

³⁶ Inc. ΠΜΟΥΤΕ ΓΑΡ ΜΕΦΑΝΑΓΓΑΖΕ ΜΜΟΝ.

³⁷ Here again, the Coptic translation is relatively faithful to the Greek text.

³⁸ F. 82v, col. b presents a less accurate translation, since some linguistic labels and thematic features of the model are re-used in new narrative motifs. For instance, the mention of the [ε]ΤΟΥΔΑΒ ΙΕΡΗΝΙΑΣ, as well as the discussion on ΝΠΟΒΕ ΜΠΔΑΟΣ, cannot be found in the original dictate, which, nevertheless, is shaped by a succession of speeches by prophets and Hebrew kings.

³⁹ The text in f. 83 bears clear signs of reworking. The quotations from Ps 84, 3 and 31, 1–2 are missing from the model.

tion of, at least, the 1st homily *De diabolo tentatore*, while the presence of the other two sermons of the series in missing leaves between πβ and πϞ cannot be excluded.

Finally, an updated codicological and content-oriented synoptic reconstruction of MONB.CR can be tentatively outlined as follows:

Wien, *K 09817-09824* (α - ις; 24th and 25th hom. on Hebrews); London, *BL. Or.03581A*, ff. 18-19 (ιζ - ιη; 25th hom. on Hebrews); Paris, *BnF Copte 131²*, f. 148 ([λζ] - λη; 26th hom. on Hebrews); Naples, *Biblioteca Nazionale I.B. 11*, ff. 81-82 ([ηε] - ηη; 1st hom. De diab.); Naples, *Biblioteca Nazionale I.B. 11*, f. 83 ([οθ] - π; 1st hom. De diab.); Wien, *K 09826* (πα - πβ; 1st hom. De diab); Berlin, *Ms. Or. 1641*, f. 1 ([ρθ] - ρι)⁴⁰; Naples, *Biblioteca Nazionale I.B. 11*, f. 84 (ρκγ - ρκΔ; on John⁴¹); Naples, *Biblioteca Nazionale I.B. 11*, ff. 85-99 (ρκθ - ρηη; 29th, 45th, 46th, and 47th hom. on John); Venice, *Biblioteca Nazionale 192*, ff. 79-84 ([ρζα] - ρζβ; 16th and 17th hom. on Hebrews); Naples, *Biblioteca Nazionale I.B. 11*, ff. 100-106 (ροε - ρπε; 17th hom. on Hebrews); Paris, *BnF Copte 131²*, f. 147 (ρφα - ρφβ; 15th hom. on Hebrews); London, *BL. Or.03581A*, f. 006B (cz - ch; 32nd hom. on Hebrews); Paris, *BnF Copte 131²*, f. 149 ([cθ] - ci; 32nd hom. on Hebrews); Wien, *K 09827* ([cθ] - ck; 32nd hom. on Hebrews); Paris, *BnF Copte 131²*, f. 150 ([cka] - ckv; 32nd hom. on Hebrews); Berlin, *Ms. Or. 1606*, f. 6 (ckr - ckΔ; 33rd hom. on Hebrews); Paris, *BnF Copte 131²*, ff. 151-158 ([ckε] - ch; 33rd and 34th hom. on Hebrews); Leiden, *Rijksmuseum van Oudheden 104* ([cna] - cnv; 29th hom. on Hebrews); Wien, *K 09828* ([coe] - cos; 30th hom. on Hebrews); Wien, *K 09829* ([cpa] - cpv; 31st hom. on Hebrews); Paris, *BnF Copte 131²*, ff. 159-160 ([cpe] - cpi; 31st hom. on Hebrews); Naples, *Biblioteca Nazionale I.B. 11*, f. 107 (τγ - τΔ; 49th hom. on John⁴²); Naples, *Biblioteca Nazionale I.B. 11*, f. 108 ([τνα] - τνβ⁴³); Naples, *Biblioteca Nazionale I.B. 11*, f. 109 (τζε - τζς).

As for this last folio, the case is particularly complex. The extant text begins with a quotation from Gal 4, 4-5 (ὁτε δὲ ἦλθεν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου, ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, γενόμενον ἐκ γυνακός, γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον, ἵνα τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον ἐξαγοράσῃ, ἵνα τὴν υἰοθεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν // ντερπειχωκ δε μπεροειω ει αππογτε τηνοογ ηπερωηρε εαρωαπε εβολ ρηνογρημε αρωαπε ραππομος χε εφεωωπ ηνετρα ππομος). The text goes on to specify how Christ's nativity happened, namely εβολ ρητεθεοαοκος ετογααβ μαρια («from the saint Mary, mother of God»). This is enough to state that we are dealing with a late pseudo-Chrysostomic composition, and that the theology it expresses is more at home in the Egyptian post-Ephesian debate on the nature of Jesus than in 4th century Anatolia. Obviously, the passage deserves more detailed and specific examinations. However, here I would like to limit myself to reminding that several works by heterodox authors (or by authors formally condemned by the Great Church) can be discovered under the name of the bishop of Constantinople. It can be assumed – and, as far as I can see, MONB.CR is further evidence of this – that *corpora* of such texts circulated also in Coptic environments⁴⁴.

⁴⁰ I was not able to identify the content of this isolated leaf. Particularly, the relationship between the quotation from Mt 25, 41 (Πορεύεσθε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, οἱ καταραμένοι, εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον, τὸ ἡτοιμασμένον τῷ διαβόλῳ καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ // σαρετηγτη εβολ ημοι νερτρογορτ ετσατε ηρωαηερ ταϊ ηταγσβτωτς ηπιαβολος ηη ηεφαγγελος) and the framework within which it is inserted in the Coptic text does not find comparison in any Chrysostomic work.

⁴¹ The last lines of this leaf seem to echo PG 59, 97 and ff., but the correspondence is far from being exact.

⁴² PG 59, 273.3 – 59, 274.8. F. 107v, col. b, presents a strongly revisited text.

⁴³ These last extant leaves are fraught with several outstanding issues. As for f. 108, the eulogy of Paul (ρικων ητε τμε; τελειον ητε τπιστικ εσκη εβολ; ηος ηκγρζ ητεισοτ ητε τμητεγσεβης [«image of the truth»; «perfection of the complete faith»; «great herald of this sort of godliness»]) cannot be found in the present form in Chrysostom, even though, obviously, it fits well with Chrysostom's great appreciation of the Apostle. On this matter, see M. MITCHELL, *The Heavenly Trumpet: John Chrysostom and the Art of Pauline Interpretation*, Tübingen 2000.

⁴⁴ On this fascinating phenomenon, see S. VOICU, *L'immagine di Crisostomo negli spuri*, in *Chrysostomsbilder in 1600 Jahren*, ed. M. WALLRAFF e R. BRÄDLE, Berlin-New York 2008, 61-96 («refugium peccatorum», 66) and ID., *Nestorio e la Oratio de epiphania (CPG 4882) attribuita a Giovanni Crisostomo*, Aug. 43 (2003) 495-499. E. CATTANEO, *Trois homélies pseudo-chrysostomiennes sur la pâque comme œuvre d'Apollinaire de Laodicée. Attribution et étude théologique*, Paris 1981. Due to its thematic proximity with this fragment on the Nativity, the pseudo-Chrysostomic homily *In hypapante* (CPG 4756) is of particular relevance. Cf. E. BICKERSTEDT, *Edition with a Translation of a Hypapante Homily Ascribed to John Chrysostom*, OrChrP 32 (1966) 53-77. Comparable revisions of John's "Mariology" are attested by other Chrysostomic collections, also in Greek: see S. VOICU, *Il florilegio crisostomico del Vat. Gr. 790*, in *Studia codicologica*

3. SOME CONCLUDING REMARKS

The Coptic reception of Chrysostom's literary *corpus* exhibits peculiar and recurring features⁴⁵. As I have stressed elsewhere⁴⁶, the final redactor's extensive freedom to cut, redraft, and recompose the Greek models is among the most pronounced traits shown by the Sahidic translations of Greek homiletic series. It remains to be highlighted that the arrangement of MONB.CR keeps the memory of the relative position occupied by each homily in the corresponding Greek series, since the Coptic textual units largely preserve several ordered sequences of their model: the homilies on *Hebrews* nos. 24, 25, and 26 are tied together in this order, as well as homilies nos. 32, 33, and 34, and, then, sermons nos. 29, 30, and 31. This structure is due to a careful selection of Greek passages which seems to aim at enucleating the ethical and paraenetic core of Chrysostom's works and at prioritising the Greek *ethika*, that is, the exhortative sections which customary close Chrysostom's compositions⁴⁷.

Actually, the Sahidic renderings of Greek depart from literal translation especially when the expression draws close to the exegetical sections of the original texts. The erudite concerns stemming from these learned speculations had to be perceived by the Coptic redactor as oblivious to the interest of the Coptic readers. He felt free therefore to ignore (or at least to considerably downsize) them, in order to create an original literary production, which was able to effectively meet new expectations and needs, evoking an image of Chrysostom as teacher of monastic virtues and wisdom. This appears to have been the rationale underlying the creation of Coptic collections of redrafted Greek *ethika*, and, more broadly, presiding over the Coptic reception of the Greek homiletic tradition⁴⁸.

Finally, it has to be noted that MONB.CR lacks all indication to the reader, and this makes it unlikely that the manuscript could be intended as an homiliary for liturgical services, that is as a lectionary⁴⁹. Instead, it appears to have been conceived as a handbook of uplifting readings, taken from one of the most influential, revered and popular Early Church Fathers⁵⁰.

Francesco Berno

Dipartimento di Storia, Antropologia, Religioni, Arte, Spettacolo
Università Sapienza di Roma
francesco.berno@uniroma1.it

Abstract. The present article aims at providing a fresh review of the Coptic reception of the *Homilies on the Epistle to the Hebrews* by John Chrysostom. Along with an exhaustive analysis of the scholarly contribution on such a relevant

(TU 124), Berlin 1977, 493-502 (with reference to the text no. 13, Voicu notes that «l'interpretazione, non identificata, sembra creata apposta per soppiantare quella del Crisostomo [PG 57, 464-466], nota per il suo tono poco elogiativo nei confronti di Maria»; 496).

⁴⁵ For a detailed *status quaestionis*, see T. ORLANDI, *Gregorio di Nissa nelle letteratura copta*, VetChr 18 (1981) 333-339.

⁴⁶ F. BERNO – P. BUZI – A. SOLDATI – F. VALERIO, *Vat. copt. 57*, cit., especially 179-180.

⁴⁷ On this quite peculiar, bipartite structure of Chrysostom's homiletic Greek texts, see J.H. BARKHUIZEN, *John Chrysostom, Homily 50 on Matthew 14:23–36* (PG 58, 503–510). *A Perspective on His Homiletic Art*, Acta Classica 38 (1995) 43–65, and A. MOULARD, *Saint Jean Chrysostome. Sa vie, son œuvre*, Paris 1941.

⁴⁸ For a more detailed discussion, see F. BERNO, *The Literary Content. An Introduction*, in *Detecting Early Mediaeval Coptic Literature in Dayr al-Anbā Maqār, between Textual Conservation and Literary Rearrangement: The Case of Vat. copt. 57*, ed. by P. BUZI, Città del Vaticano 2019, forthcoming.

⁴⁹ Cf., at least, O.H.E. BURMESTER, *The Homilies or Exhortation of the Holy Week Lectionary*, Muséon 43 (1932) 20-70, and, more recently, U. ZANETTI, *Homélie copto-arabes pour la Semaine Sainte*, Aug. 23 (1983) 517-523.

⁵⁰ For an overview on the Coptic fortune of Chrysostom, suffice it to refer to S. VOICU, *John Chrysostom in the Oriental Languages*, Comparative Oriental Manuscript Studies Newsletter 5 (2013), 41-46. About eighty extant works are ascribed in Coptic to Chrysostom, including more than forty authentic compositions by John, about thirty-five *pseudoepigrapha* transmitted under his name and a more limited *corpus* of literary works attributed in Coptic to other authors, while in Greek to Chrysostom, or, conversely, ascribed in Coptic to John, while in Greek to other authors. A constantly updated *regesto* in PATHS' database: paths.authors.53, <http://paths.uniroma1.it/atas/authors/53>. See also P. BUZI – J. BOGDANI – F. BERNO, *The 'PATHS' Project: An Effort to Represent the Physical Dimension of Coptic Literary Production (Third-Eleventh centuries)*, COMSt Bulletin 4.1 (2018) 39-58, especially 50-56.

topic, new textual identifications are offered, with the correlative goal to give an updated codicological and content-oriented synoptic reconstruction of MONB.CR, the main Coptic testimony of Chrysostom's homilies *On Hebrews*. This significant manuscript is analysed in comparison with other Coptic witnesses entirely or almost entirely consisting of Chrysostom's works. Finally, some textual and historical remarks on the Coptic rewritings of Greek homilies and homiletic corpora supplement the contribution, in order to retrace the methods and the boundaries of these interpolatory processes.

Keywords. John Chrysostom. Homilies on Hebrews. Coptic translations. Coptic reception. Rewriting. Homiletic corpora.