BIFAO 113 (2013), p. 381-432

Antonia St Demiana

In Michaelem. The Encomium on Michael the Archangel Attributed to Severus of Antioch
Editorial Remarks

The semi-diplomatic edition of P. IFAO Copte inv. 133-136, 157-158 presented here was produced on the basis of transcripts made from high resolution images provided by the Ifao and from the original folios in Cairo on my visits to the Ifao in 2012-2013.¹

In the present edition, the editorial method used is that described by Bentley Layton in his edition of Nag Hammadi Codex II.² The text has been divided according to prosodic units. Apart from the single spaces indicating word division, wherever the copyist has left a space between two characters (alphabetic or otherwise) as a type of punctuation mark (that is, the space was intentionally and significantly made noticeable to the reader), this space has been encoded in the transcription and has been represented as accurately as possible.³

Where a letter cannot be identified with certainty on the basis of the palaeographical traces only, this is indicated by a dot under the letter (see ṢṢṢ). Therefore, a letter whose reading is certain from the context may receive a dot when its traces are ambiguous; while a letter without a dot may represent a badly damaged letter whose traces are unambiguous.⁴
In the edition, enlarged letters in ekthesis in the manuscript have been enlarged and offset in the margin from the remainder of the text.

The manner in which diacritics have been represented in the present edition is outlined below in the section on ‘DIACRITICS’. With regard to the restoration of lacunae, supralinear strokes have been included and positioned, or omitted, to reflect the scribal tendencies of the copyist (e.g. the scribe does not use a stroke on the first ⲩ in ⲩⲟϩⲓ). For those words for which scribal habits are unidentifiable due to the irregularity of the diacritics (e.g. the scribe is inconsistent in his use of ⲩ-ⲓ and ⲩ-ⲓ-), supralineation has been restored according to the standard Sahidic system.

In conjunction with a few of my own additions, the abbreviations and symbols used and their definitions, are taken directly from Layton’s Coptic Gnostic Chrestomathy⁶ and his edition of Nag Hammadi Codex II.⁶

Editorial Sigla

[... ] Uncertain remains of letters, or lacuna long enough to suit 3 standard letters (ⲃ being the standard) and 3 interliteral spaces; [... ] = 2 letters, etc.

[ ± 3 ] Uncertain remains of letters, or lacunae indicated by the approximate number of remains of letters or letters missing in the manuscript.

[aaa] The ancient author's text, restored where the manuscript is missing.

AAA Palaeographically ambiguous letters.

(aaa) Ancient author’s text that was accidentally omitted by the ancient copyist (e.g. letters added to correct haplography).

{aaa} Letters that are not part of the ancient author’s text but were erroneously written in the manuscript (e.g. letters to be deleted to correct dittography).

. Line-final ⲃ.

> Diple.

> Budded diple.

Introduction

At the Institut français d’archéologie orientale in Cairo, are six folios catalogued as “Sévère d’Antioche sur Pâques et Michel” (“Severus of Antioch on Easter and Michael”), and bearing the inventory numbers P. IFAO Copte inv. 133-136, 157-158. These were purchased for the institute probably in 1882 by the French Egyptologist Gaston Maspero.⁷ The fragments contain a significant portion of what has become known as the Encomium on Michael the Archangel attributed to Severus of Antioch.

According to the Ifao Archives’ provisional catalogue, P. IFAO Copte inv. 133-136, 157-158 possibly come from a parchment manuscript originally belonging to the library of the Monastery

---

of Saint Shenoute in Atripe (modern-day Sohag), Egypt.\(^8\) The only fragments which survive from this manuscript are those housed in the Ifao. The date assigned to the fragments by the Ifao is “Fin xi\(^\text{e}\)-début xii\(^\text{e}\) siècle?”\(^9\) (“approximately the late 11th to early 12th century”). Like the majority of codices and fragments which come from the White Monastery library, they are written in the Sahidic dialect of Coptic.

Numerous homilies and encomia on Michael the Archangel are preserved in Coptic. Most of these, however, are attributed to authors other than Severus of Antioch, and their content is entirely different to that of this encomium.\(^10\) The Encomium on Michael attributed to Severus of Antioch is extant in the following manuscripts and fragments:\(^11\)

– M592\(^12\) at the Pierpont Morgan Library is a parchment codex including a Sahidic fragment. It was originally catalogued by Henri Hyvernat\(^13\) and then by Leo Depuydt. The fragment was copied around 822/23-913/14 AD at the Monastery of St Michael, Fayum.\(^14\)

– M603\(^15\) at the Pierpont Morgan Library is a parchment codex containing a Sahidic version of the encomium. It was originally catalogued by Hyvernat\(^16\) and then by Depuydt. M603 was copied in 902/3 AD at the Monastery of St Michael, Fayum.\(^17\)

– BL Or.7597 at the British Library is a parchment codex containing a Sahidic version of the encomium. It has been catalogued by Layton,\(^18\) and was edited and translated into English by E.A. Wallis Budge.\(^19\) Budge implies that MS BL Or.7597 is part of the so-called “Edfu” collection in the British Library,\(^20\) but Layton suggests that the character of the manuscript indicates either that it was “copied far north in the Fayum and possibly has nothing to do with the “Edfu” collection,” or that it was destined for shrines other than those of Edfu.\(^21\) In agreement with Layton, Tito Orlandi lists this manuscript as one copied in the Fayum.\(^22\) It has been dated between the 10th and 11th centuries by Layton,\(^23\) but more specifically to the second half of the 11th century by Budge.\(^24\)
– BL Or.8784 at the British Library is a bilingual Coptic and Arabic paper manuscript. It contains a Bohairic version (with a parallel Arabic version) of the encomium which was first catalogued by Robert Curzon, later by Layton, and was edited and translated into English by Budge. The copy is dated to 1210 AD.

– BL Or.3581B(20) is a paper leaf in Sahidic belonging to the British Library. It was first catalogued by W.E. Crum. He suggests that the paper manuscripts featured in his catalogue were copied in Nitria, but provides no date.

Among the witnesses mentioned above, there are only two containing portions of recensions parallel to P. IfAo Copte inv. 133-136, 157-158, namely: BL Or.8784 and BL Or.7597. As well as the Arabic version found in BL Or.8784 (French translation by Émile Amélineau) P. IfAO Copte inv. 133-136, 157-158 is also paralleled by an Ethiopic version found in BL Or.691, copied in the 15th century. Like the Arabic version of BL Or.8784, the Ethiopic text was probably translated from a Coptic original.

Although the beginning of the Encomium on Michael is missing from the Ifao folios, its title can be found in the following versions. The title of M603 reads:

Οὐλογος ητε πατριαρχεις σευνροσ παρχηνεικοικος ναπαλογια εοφαξε ετρε μεντομανθητη μινούγε μιντιαρρησι αμαρχαγελος μιναν αμένε γικουι λε ο ετεκ τουρικην ετουλαν εκολα ψητη πομα μπαρχαγελος ζαντι εροσ ιτερομενε ετμαλυ αμομαξε ο ετεκ Μακεως ηπεραγεμενη εις ημερηνει μη πενοτρε πεταγεαυο πειλογος αε ιεομ μπηχουους ρνλωΦ ρη ουερινην ιτε μινουγε μαμιν

A homily by the patriarch Severus archbishop of Antioch, speaking about the mercies of God and about the freedom of speech of Michael the Archangel. He also said some things about the holy Sunday because the feast of the archangel happened to coincide with it in that year. He also spoke about Matthew the merchant and his wife and children. He delivered this sermon on the 12th of Hator. In God’s peace. Amen.

25 Classified as CMCL AU in the CMCL indicating that its provenance is unknown.
26 Layton 1987, p. xlvii, mentions that BL Or.8784 is one of the Parham manuscripts originally catalogued by Robert Curzon. After Curzon’s death, his son published the descriptive part of Curzon’s collection: Catalogue of Materials for Writing, Early Writings on Tablets and Stones, Rolled and Other MSS and Oriental MS Books, in the Library of the Honourable Robert Curzon at Parham in the County of Sussex (London, 1849). BL Or.8784 corresponds to Parham no. 146, and to 231.2 in the present Layton Catalogue (1987, p. 395, 396).
27 Layton 1987, p. 395, 396 (no. 231.2)
29 The CMCL database lists BL Or.3581B(20) as BL Or.3581B(23).
30 Crum 1905, p. 135 (no. 306).
31 Crum 1905, p. xi-xii.
34 This MS is listed as “Brit. Mus. MS. Orient. no. 691” in W. Wright 1877, p. 163; but in an email correspondence from the Asia Pacific and Africa Collection Reference Team at the British Library (dated 13 May, 2013), I was informed that this inventory number is now: BL Or.691. Cf. also Budge 1894, p. vi, 195-216 (text).
35 I.e. the Feast of the Resurrection.
36 Depuydt 1993, p. 219 (text and translation).
The title of BL Or.7597 reads:

The discourse which the man, who was truly inspired by Christ, the holy Patriarch and Archbishop of Antioch, Saint Severus, pronounced on the compassion of God and the freedom of speech of the holy Archangel Michael. He also spake a little concerning holy Sunday (i.e. Easter Sunday) because the festival of the Archangel fell by chance on the same day that year. He spake also concerning Matthew the merchant, and his wife, and his sons. This discourse was pronounced on the twelfth day of the month of Hathor, when all the people of the city were celebrating the festival of the holy Archangel in peace.37

The title of BL Or.8784:

[Here beginneth] the discourse of Abba Severus, the holy patriarch and Archbishop of Antioch, in which he shewed forth the compassion of God, and spake concerning the presence of the holy Archangel Michael, and of his love towards man, and how he delivereth men from the snares of the Devil. In it he also spake briefly concerning the holy Lord's Day – now in that year the festival of the holy Archangel Michael happened to fall upon the holy Lord's Day – and he spake, moreover, concerning Matthew the merchant, and his wife, and his son[s], and of how

37 Budge 1915, p. 156 (text), p. 735 (translation).
they believed in God through the prayers of the holy Archangel Michael. This discourse was pronounced on the twelfth day of the month Athor, at the gathering together of the multitude to celebrate the festival of the holy Archangel Michael at his shrine, in the peace of God. Amen.\footnote{Budge 1894, p. 63 (text), p. 57\textsuperscript{*} (translation).}

It is reasonable to assume, therefore, that the Ifao bifolia belong to a work which had a similar title, for example, “A Homily on the Compassion of God and the Freedom of Speech of Michael the Archangel...”, etc.

As can be inferred from the title, the Encomium on Michael the Archangel was presumably composed especially for a feast of the archangel which coincided with the Feast of the Resurrection. As is often the case with edification literature, the text is interspersed with numerous miracles, several of which are narrative parts. The discourse begins with a series of quotations from the Psalms and the Gospel of Saint Matthew, followed by the author’s call to believers to celebrate the twofold festival since God and Michael the Archangel are present to receive their prayers. After this brief introduction, the author proceeds to tell the story of a rich merchant named Gedsôn\footnote{“Kêtsôn” (ⲕⲉⲧⲥⲱⲛ) in the Bohairic version of BL Or.8784 (Budge 1894, p. 66, 69, 71 [text], p. 53\textsuperscript{*}, 56\textsuperscript{*}, 58\textsuperscript{*} [translation]).} in order to demonstrate the power of God and the efficaciousness of Michael’s help to those who believe in him.\footnote{According to Terry Wilfong (2001, p. 299) “most Coptic saints’ lives were intended to be read aloud, especially on specific holy days; thus the writer often addresses his audience directly to point out the relevance or importance of specific incidents.” This information evidently applies to In Michaelem.}

Gedsôn was a native of \textit{Entikê} who, on one occasion, sailed to Galonia\footnote{“Kalônia” (ⲡⲁⲛⲟⲩⲓⲉ) in the Bohairic version (Budge 1894, p. 66, 70, 71 [text], p. 53\textsuperscript{*}, 56\textsuperscript{*}, 57\textsuperscript{*} [translation]). According to the Sahidic version of BL Or.7597, Galonia was “the city of the Philippians” (Budge 1915, p. 161 [text], p. 740 [translation]).} to sell his merchandise. He arrived there early in the month of Hator when the citizens were preparing to celebrate the festival of Michael the Archangel at his shrine. After a series of events leading to his conversion to Christianity, Gedsôn sought baptism. He travelled to his native town to persuade his wife to become Christian, and then returned to Galonia with his wife, and their four sons. The bishop baptised them, giving them the names of Matthew, Irene, John, Stephen, Joseph, and Daniel.

Following their short stay in Galonia, Matthew and his family returned to \textit{Entikê} where he soon died, and after which the citizens of \textit{Entikê} began to persecute Irene and her sons (because they had become Christians). On the advice of John, they went to live in \textit{Entia} (the capital of \textit{Entikê}).\footnote{For a discussion on \textit{Entikê} and \textit{Entia} see Composition, p. 392-395.} The encomium then relates how the Devil, being envious of Matthew’s sons because of their good works, stirred up trouble against them. They were accused of plundering the house of a magistrate named Sêlôm, and then of the murder of a man. In both trials, they were brought before Gesanthos, the king of \textit{Entia}/\textit{Entikê}, and Michael the Archangel appeared and proved their innocence. Between these two events, the narrative also includes a short story of how John settled an outstanding debt for two men, saving them from death.
King Gesanthos and all of Entikê believed in Christianity because of what they had seen, and Gesanthos wrote to the emperor Constantine asking him to send a bishop to baptise them. Constantine then wrote to John, the Archbishop of Ephesus, who set out for Entia/Entikê, taking with him all that was necessary for the founding of a church.

After the church was built, the archbishop baptised all the people and consecrated John the son of Matthew as bishop over them. The new bishop built a church in honour of Michael the Archangel and consecrated it on the 12th day of Hator. On the same day, the bishop, the king, and the entire multitude went to the temple of Zeus and destroyed it. These things were reported to Constantine who glorified God. The encomium ends with exhortations to a godly life.\(^44\)

P. IFAO Copte inv.133-136, 157-158 relate only a small part of In Michaelem, namely:
- the second half of the story of Sêlôm’s stolen goods (ff.133r a.1-157r b.6);
- the account of John (Matthew’s son) paying the debt for the two men (ff.157v a.1-157v b.14);
- the narrative of the murder of the man (ff.134r a.1-158r a.18);
- the writing of the letters by King Gesanthos to Constantine, and from Constantine to John of Ephesus (ff.158r b.1-136v b.); and,
- John of Ephesus’ trip to Entia and whom he took with him in order to establish the church (f.136v b.10-28).

In f.157r b.17-26, we also find a small portion of text not found in either the Bohairic version or the Sahidic version of BL Or.7597:

\[
\begin{align*}
|\text{ⲧⲟⲩⲁⲃ\,ⲛⲉ\,ⲩϩⲉⲫ\,ⲩ\,ⲡⲉ\,ⲣⲉ\,ⲇ\,ⲉ\,ⲉ|\
|\text{ⲧⲟⲩⲁ\,ⲟⲩ\,ⲇ\,ⲉ\,ⲃ\,ⲑ\,ⲗ\,ⲃ\,ⲉ\,ⲁ\,ⲗ\,ⲑ\,ⲓ\,ⲃ\,ⲉ\,ⲁ\,ⲗ\,ⲑ\,ⲓ\,ⲃ\,ⲉ\,ⲑ\,ⲗ\,ⲃ\,ⲉ\,ⲁ\,ⲗ\,ⲑ\,ⲓ\,ⲃ\,ⲉ\,ⲑ\,ⲗ\,ⲃ\,ⲉ\,ⲁ\,ⲗ\,ⲑ\,ⲓ\,ⲃ\,ⲉ\,ⲑ\,ⲗ\,ⲃ\,ⲉ\,ⲁ\,ⲗ\,ⲑ\,ⲓ\,ⲃ\,ⲉ\,ⲑ\,ⲗ\,ⲃ\,ⲉ\,ⲁ\,ⲗ\,ⲑ\,ⲓ\,ⲃ\,ⲉ\,ⲑ\,ⲗ\,ⲃ\,ⲉ\,ⲁ\,ⲗ\,ⲑ\,ⲓ\,ⲃ\,ⲉ\,ⲑ\,ⲗ\,ⲃ\,ⲉ\,ⲁ\,ⲗ\,ⲑ\,ⲓ\,ⲃ\,ⲉ\,ⲑ\,ⲗ\,ⲃ\,ⲉ\,ⲁ\,ⲗ\,ⲑ\,ⲓ\,ⲃ\,ⲉ\,ⲑ\,ⲗ\,ⲃ\,ⲉ\,ⲁ\,ⲗ\,ⲑ\,ⲓ\,ⲃ\,ⲉ\,ⲑ\,ⲗ\,ⲟ\,ⲙ\,ⲧ\,ⲟ\,ⲧ\,ⲉ.\
\end{align*}
\]

These holy youths, however, were not troubled in their spirit, nor distressed, but were enduring happily, receiving grace through God.

With reference to content, the Bohairic version of BL Or.878\(^45\) is a very close parallel to the Ifao fragments (the majority of differences being dialectal), while the Sahidic version of BL Or.7597\(^46\) contains some parallel text but with many longer passages of direct speech, numerous lengthy prayers, and substantial additions to the narrative not found in its shorter Sahidic counterpart of P. IFAO Copte inv. 133-136, 157-158.\(^47\)

In view of the overwhelming similarity of the text in the Bohairic version to that of P. IFAO Copte inv. 133-136, 157-158, and the relatively late dating of the Bohairic copy, we may assume that the Bohairic recension derived from the same Sahidic prototype from which...
the Ifao fragments descended. That is, the Bohairic recension was probably translated from a copy of the shorter Sahidic recension. Regarding the longer Sahidic version, it would appear from the considerable additions in the text that it has come from an independent recension rather than the same archetype as that of the Ifao folios and the Bohairic recension. In terms of dating, it remains difficult to ascertain which of the two Sahidic recensions precedes the other.

**Codicological Description**

P. IfAO Copte inv. 133-136, 157-158 consist of six consecutive parchment folios (or three bifolia) originating from one and the same codex. The binding is absent, but holes providing evidence of the original stitching can still be seen. All of the fragments are damaged in some form (i.e. large holes or missing portions of parchment), but folios inv. 157-158 in particular are poorly preserved, resulting in substantial loss of text.

**Collation**

As already noted, since there are no other known fragments from the same codex to date, and due to the absence of signatures (i.e. quire numbers) on the folios themselves, it is impossible to determine the composition of codex in which these folios originated or the placement of the fragments within the codex with accuracy. It is likely, however, that P. IfAO Copte inv. 133-136, 157-158 are sheets two to seven of a regular quaternion in which the folios were paginated on the verso only.\(^{48}\) No ancient pagination is expressed on the recto of any of the fragments.

The fragments comprise three consecutive sheets or bifolia (i.e. 133-136, 157-158, 134-135); these were originally collated and paginated as follows: f.133: [讘-讝] [19-20] (hair-flesh); f.157: [讝-(Conv.)] [21-22] (flesh-hair); f.134: [讘-(Conv.)] [23-24] (hair-flesh); f.135: [讘-(Conv.)] [25-26] (flesh-hair); f.158: [(Conv.)-讘] [27-28] (hair-flesh); f.136: [讘-(Conv.)] [29-30] (flesh-hair). The collation of the fragments may be more clearly understood from *Figure 1* below.

*FIG. 1. Collation of the Fragments.*

\(^{48}\) This observation is based on the codicological analysis of P. IfAO Copte inv. 133-136, 157-158 by Louis in her *Catalogue raisonné des manuscrits littéraires coptes conservés à l’Ifao du Caire*, in press.
Parchment

The flesh and hair sides of the fragments are easily distinguishable by colour and grain. Gregory’s Rule has been observed (i.e. hair-side faced hair-side, and flesh-side faced flesh-side at any opening of the parchment quires of the codex in which the fragments originated), as evidenced by the fact that P. IFAO Copte inv. f.133v and f.135r are flesh-side; f.157v and f.134r are hair-side; f.134v and f.135r are flesh-side; f.135v and f.158r are hair-side; and, f.158v and f.136r are flesh side. All of the fragments are ruled with vertical lines of Leroy U type no. U 00/2.

Layout

At their largest points, the fragments measure 308 mm in height and 227 mm in width, whereas the size of the written area is an average of 252 × 158 mm. The text on each page is written in two columns, with 28-29 lines per column. The width of column A is 65 mm and the width of column B is 60 mm. The intercolumnium measures about 30 mm. Two ancient page numbers are preserved: 24 (ⲕⲇ) and 26 (ⲕⲗ), written on the verso of f.134 and f.135 respectively.

Writing and Orthography

Script

The script is an upright bimodular Coptic uncial, with three-stroke ⲣ; narrow ⲝ, ⲟ, and ⲛ; and short Ⲝ; ⲝ and ⲝ. Ⲟ is larger than the other letters. The writing is narrow, and vertical strokes are provided with serifs; the ink colour is black. The height of ten lines of text (together with their interlinear spaces) measures 87 mm.

Diacritics

The system of diacritics in the manuscript is characterised by a both non-standard and irregular use. From a formal point of view, the supralinear strokes are both single-letter and connective, and vary from a line of three or four millimetres (the shape of which can be a curve or a circumflex) to a shorter line. Due to the limitations of the font, in most cases I have employed regular single and connective supralinear strokes, with the variations noted below. With respect to their position on letters, the supralinear strokes in the fragments may be categorised as follows:

• Single-Letter Supralineation

The single-letter supralinear stroke (whether straight or curved; see below) on any given letter is mostly written by the scribe above the top left of the letter, i.e. it is not centred; occasionally extending left into the spatial area between the letter and the preceding letter. In such cases,
the placement of the supralinear stroke is open to more than one description, i.e. it may be either single or connective, and sometimes it is impossible to distinguish a two-letter *bindestrich* from a broad single-letter stroke above its letter.\(^\text{53}\) Since no contrast of meaning is expressed by the placement of such markings, it would seem that the ancient copyist has made no effort to distinguish them. Consequently, with reference to the choice of single or connective supralinear strokes, I have chosen the typographic representation closest to the manuscript.\(^\text{54}\)

There are exceptions to the above where the stroke is centred over a letter: f.133r a.10; f.157v b.9; f.134v a.14, 15; f.134v b.19, 20; f.135r b.7; f.135v a.18, 19; f.135v b.2; and f.136v a.14, 25.

Occasionally, the stroke surmounts the top right of a letter: f.133v a.16; f.157r a.18; f.135v a.19; f.135v b.13 (which is also a curved stroke); f.136r a.27; and f.136v a.7, 14.

In two instances, the stroke is slightly diagonal, slanting upward to the right. This is probably due to the stroke being hastily written: f.133r a.10; f.158r a.2 (which is also slightly curved).

- **Connective Supralineation (** *Bindestrich* **)**

  The connective supralinear stroke (whether straight or curved) over two consonant letters in the manuscript usually begins above the top right of the first letter and extends to the top left or top centre of the following letter.

  There are exceptions to the above where the stroke is centred over the two letters: f.133r a.18; f.134v a.1 (which is also a curved stroke), 13; and f.158v b.12 (the stroke here also leans slightly upward to the left).

- **Curved or Circumflex Supralineation**

  The copyist often uses a curved single or curved connective supralinear stroke over consonant letters.

  - Single: f.133r a.20; f.133r b.25; f.157v b.3; f.134v b.9, 12, 19, 20; f.135r a.16, 27; f.135v b.2,13; f.158r b.1; f.158v b.7; f.136v a.7, 14; f.136v b.15.

  - Connective: f.133r a.11, 12, 18, 21; f.157v a.6, 9; f.134r a.8; 134v a.1, 13 (both strokes are centred); f.134v b.6, 7, 19, 20; f.135r a.23; f.158r a.5; f.136r a.28; f.136v b.1, 21.

  The above curved strokes are distinguishable from a circumflex which is usually a tiny mark over a single letter: f.133r b.11, 17; f.158r a.4, 5; f.136v b.18; and f.136v b.27 (above the top left of \(\text{ⲡ}\)).

  In three instances, the circumflex is connective: situated between \(\text{ϧ} \) and \(\text{ⲱ} \) at f.153r b.7; and between \(\text{ϧ} \) and \(\text{ⲱ} \) at f.158r b.1; f.158v a.24; and f.136r a.20.

- **Supralineation on Nomina Sacra**

  \(\text{Ⲓ} \) always appears for \(\text{ⲧⲒⲟⲩⲥ} \), and \(\text{ⲓⲏⲥⲟⲩⲥ} \) always appears for \(\text{ⲧⲒⲟⲩⲥ} \) with the connective supralinear stroke written above the top right of \(\text{ⲧ} \), extending to the top right of \(\text{ⲟ} \). \(\text{ⲓⲏⲥⲟⲩⲥ} \) always appears for \(\text{ⲧⲒⲟⲩⲥ} \), with the connective supralinear stroke written only above \(\text{ⲧ} \) and \(\text{ⲟ} \). This is perhaps uncommon for the nomen sacrum \(\text{ⲧⲒⲟⲩⲥ} \) for which the connective stroke is usually written above all three letters.

\(^\text{53}\) Layton 1989, p. 28.
\(^\text{54}\) Layton 1989, p. 28.
The supralineation in the fragments, strictly speaking, does not follow the standard Sahidic system. This is evidenced by irregularity in the use of supralineation other than the strokes employed for nomina sacra; and also in particular cases where one may find consistency in the presence or absence of supralineation over \( \mathfrak{m} \) and \( \mathfrak{n} \) which shall be discussed below. Overall, examples of standard southern use of supralineation marking tautosyllabic sonorants alternate with instances where supralinear strokes occur on letters encoding non-tautosyllabic sonorants. On the other hand, tautosyllabic consonantal letters are often irregularly surmounted by a supralinear mark.

In all occurrences of the prepronominal form of the direct object preposition \( \mathfrak{m} \mathfrak{n} \) and the postponed subject indicator \( \mathfrak{m} \mathfrak{n} \), the supralinear stroke on the first \( \mathfrak{m} \) or \( \mathfrak{n} \) is omitted where the standard system requires its inclusion. In all but two instances (f.158r b.16; f.158v a.17), when a personal suffix is attached to a preposition (e.g. \( \varepsilon \varrho \omega \tau \gamma \mathfrak{m} \mathfrak{n} \mathfrak{t} \mathfrak{i} \mathfrak{a} \mathfrak{n} \mathfrak{g} \mathfrak{i} \) f.133r a.6; \( \chi \lambda \tau \alpha \kappa \epsilon \gamma \mathfrak{m} \mathfrak{n} \mathfrak{t} \mathfrak{i} \mathfrak{a} \mathfrak{n} \mathfrak{g} \mathfrak{i} \) f.133r a.12; \( \chi \kappa \omega \gamma \mathfrak{m} \mathfrak{n} \mathfrak{t} \mathfrak{i} \mathfrak{a} \mathfrak{n} \mathfrak{g} \mathfrak{i} \) f.133r b.21, 25) or conjugation base (e.g. \( \iota \tau \rho \epsilon \gamma \mathfrak{m} \mathfrak{n} \mathfrak{t} \mathfrak{i} \mathfrak{a} \mathfrak{n} \mathfrak{g} \mathfrak{i} \) f.133r b.21-22), the relevant suffix has a single supralinear stroke or bindestrich as expected in standard Sahidic.

The preposition \( \chi \mathfrak{m} \) - is always rendered with a supralinear stroke which is usually connective. There are ten examples of the supralinear stroke representing a line-final \( \mathfrak{n} \) (f.133r b.18; f.133v a.26; f.134v a.16; f.134v b.6; f.135r b.13, 21; f.135v a.1, 5; f.158r b.8; f.158v b.8). In most cases, \( \iota \) is either devoid of any supralinear mark or has a dieresis in the form of double dots. These are used over both consonantal \( \iota \) and vocalic \( \iota \) although inconsistently.

Diacritics can also be seen on other vowels:

- \( \omicron \), which can receive a supralinear stroke over it and demonstrates a northern mark of tautosyllabication (\( \chi \gamma \delta \rho \chi \mathfrak{x} \) f.133r b.7; \( \chi \alpha \theta \iota \mathfrak{h} \) f.133v a.18; \( \chi \lambda \alpha \omega \lambda \mathfrak{h} \) f.158v b.12). The reason why the copyist has used a connective supralinear stroke over \( \chi \alpha \omega \) in \( \chi \lambda \alpha \omega \lambda \mathfrak{h} \) rather than a single stroke over \( \omicron \) is unclear.

- \( \epsilon \), on which we find a supralinear stroke (\( \chi \rho \omega \) f.133v a.27-28; \( \chi \iota \kappa \iota \kappa \gamma \chi \mathfrak{n} \mathfrak{h} \) f.157v b.9-10; \( \iota \kappa \chi \kappa \chi \kappa \) f.136v a.25) or a circumflex (\( \chi \iota \gamma \iota \gamma \gamma \lambda \gamma \gamma \lambda \mathfrak{i} \) f.133r b.10-11; \( \chi \iota \kappa \kappa \kappa \alpha \chi \gamma \gamma \lambda \mathfrak{i} \) f.133v b.21-22).

Under the guise of redundancy, the examples \( \chi \lambda \alpha \omega \lambda \mathfrak{h} \), \( \chi \rho \omega \), \( \chi \iota \kappa \iota \kappa \gamma \chi \mathfrak{n} \mathfrak{h} \mathfrak{c} \), \( \chi \iota \gamma \iota \gamma \lambda \gamma \lambda \mathfrak{i} \), and \( \chi \iota \kappa \kappa \kappa \alpha \chi \gamma \gamma \lambda \mathfrak{i} \) show the great care exercised by the scribe concerning the separation of words at the end of the line which, in the practice of scriptoria, are prosodic and not morphological. The parepigraphic signs employed on vowel letters are abundantly documented by the Touton and Phantoou manuscripts, and their function of markers of tautosyllabication is well known.\textsuperscript{56}

\textit{Punctuation and Ornamentation}

Punctuation throughout the fragments is limited to a single raised black dot or a dot positioned slightly lower, mostly preceded and followed by a space. In all cases, the dot is used either to delimit groups of words or signify the end of a sentence or paragraph. A noticeable feature of the manuscript is the use of spaces between words which appear to have been used in place of punctuation, and therefore, have the same function.

\textsuperscript{55} The circumflex is situated between \( \mathfrak{p} \) and \( \chi \).

The manuscript is extensively decorated with enlarged initials (ranging from 1½-3 times the size of the average letter in the manuscript) and greatly enlarged initials (more than three times the size of the average letter in the manuscript) in ekthesis. Except for two examples on f.157v a.19, 16 (on which we find a budded diplo before each initial), the enlarged and greatly enlarged initials are used instead of paragraphoi to set off paragraphs. Some of these initials are reddened or lined with a colour that may have been yellow, but this colour is difficult to discern. The greatly enlarged ω at f.134r a.4-8 has a black and red decorative s-pattern in the letter’s vertical stroke; the ι at f.158v a.21-26 has the same s-pattern on its vertical strokes while its horizontal stroke features a red and black interlacing pattern. At f.134v a.20 and f.158v a.4, both of the ι are accompanied by a red and green decoration: the design at f.134v a.20 consists of red circles and semi-circles and two small green leaves; f.158v a.4 comprises a similar pattern of red and yellow(?) circles and a green swirl design.

In terms of other paratextual graphemes, f.136r a.4-21, f.136r b.16-28, and f.136v a.3-27, feature black vertical diplo lines in the left hand margins of the columns, but the purpose of these diplo lines here is obscure. Dividers such as these are usually horizontal and only exceptionally vertical; moreover, dividers consisting exclusively of diplo lines are rare. Another decorative element in the manuscript includes flourishes extending into the left margin of the first stroke of the letter μ, and the third stroke of κ, and χ.

The ornamentation on the page numbers on pages 24 (f.134v) and 26 (f.135v) is minimal, consisting of a simple black horizontal rule above and below the numerals. The horizontal rule below the numeral on page 24 can no longer be seen due to damage of the parchment.

Linguistic Features and Provenance

P. IFAO Copte inv. 133-136, 157-158 are written in standard Sahidic; and apart from the irregularity of the diacritics, divergences from the standard Sahidic system are nowhere noted. Although the manuscript does not display any dialectal influences, the system of page numbering on the verso of the folios is typical for manuscripts copied in northern Egypt, particularly in the Fayum. The occurrence of parepigraphic signs on vowel letters in P. IFAO Copte inv. 133-136, 157-158 is also indicative of the Fayum as the provenance of the fragments. Interestingly, all of the other surviving parchment Sahidic witnesses of the Encomium on Michael by Severus of Antioch were copied in the Fayum as well.

Composition

We may take advantage of the fragments presented here to briefly discuss the composition of the encomium and the historiographical goal of the author. Very frequently in Coptic literature, the lives of saints were the subjects of sermons, homilies, and encomia in which...
the life of the saint was used to make specific points or highlight certain themes of concern to the writer.\textsuperscript{60} Similarly, it is not unusual to find the encomiast of \textit{In Michaelem} constructing a narrative in which he uses the miracles of Michael the Archangel and draws on two historical figures from very different periods (Constantine and John of Ephesus) in addition to a third, probably fictional, character (King Gesanthos) to suit his purposes.

P. IFAO Copte inv. ff.158v a.21-136v b.16 give an account in which King Gesanthos\textsuperscript{61} of \textit{Entia/Entikê} writes to the emperor Constantine, who in turn sends a letter to John, archbishop of Ephesus. The mention of the emperor's name and of the bishop's provides the first chronological framework of the scene: either 306-337, the period of Constantine I's reign; or c. 558-c. 585 when John was archbishop. There is an obvious mistake here—the episode is historically impossible since Constantine and John of Ephesus were not contemporaries. According to Budge, it is "clear that John of Ephesus is meant by the writer of the \textit{Encomium}, for he was famous as a founder of churches and monasteries. For Constantine we should probably read 'Justinian'."\textsuperscript{62} The question of the dating of the encomium will be discussed below, nonetheless the inclusion of John of Ephesus in the text indicates a \textit{terminus a quo} no earlier than the second half of the 6th century.

The historiographical agenda of the author does not contain surprises: Christianity is the supreme religion which has triumphed over Paganism throughout the world. It is quite understandable, therefore, that the author would use Constantine instead of Justinian in the narrative. In a patently anti-Pagan text such as \textit{In Michaelem}, Constantine's name is in all probability not arbitrarily chosen and serves to propagate the author's anti-Pagan agenda.

In agreement with Budge, it is also important to note that in 542, John of Ephesus was commissioned by the emperor Justinian I (527-565) to lead a missionary campaign in Asia Minor during which John is reported to have converted 70,000 people, and caused 98 churches and 12 monasteries to be built for them.\textsuperscript{63} He was consecrated bishop of Ephesus around 558, and was then recalled to Constantinople to combat the idolatry still prevalent in and around the capital.\textsuperscript{64} In his \textit{Ecclesiastical History}, John describes himself as "superintendent of the heathen and breaker of idols" (ii. 4).\textsuperscript{65} If we consider the events depicted in the encomium in which John of Ephesus "rejoiced exceedingly at the return of the city,"\textsuperscript{66} and travelled to \textit{Entia} to establish a church,\textsuperscript{67} it becomes evident that John's inclusion in the story is also deliberate. The miracles performed by Michael the Archangel are presented as an impetus for the conversion of King Gesanthos and the people of \textit{Entikê} from Paganism to Christianity.

With reference to \textit{Entikê} and \textit{Entia}, a few points must be made. Each appears once in the IFAO fragments as \textit{ⲧⲉⲛⲧⲓⲕⲏ} (f.135v a.21), and \textit{ⲧⲉⲛⲧⲓⲕⲏ} (f.136v a.10-11). The attestations of these toponyms in other Coptic manuscripts are discussed by oscar von Lemm in his \textit{Kleine koptische Studien}.\textsuperscript{68} According to von Lemm's study, \textit{Entikê} and \textit{Entia}—\textit{ϯⲧⲓⲕⲏκⲓ}, \textit{ϯⲧⲉⲛⲧⲓⲕⲏκⲓ} (ⲧⲉⲛⲧⲓⲕⲏⲉ) and \textit{ⲧⲉⲛⲧⲓⲕⲏ}, \textit{ⲧⲉⲛⲧⲓⲕⲏ}, \textit{ⲧⲉⲛⲧⲓⲕⲏ}, \textit{ⲧⲉⲛⲧⲓⲕⲏ} (ⲧⲉⲛⲧⲓⲕⲏ)\textsuperscript{69}—are both designations for

\textsuperscript{60} Wilfong 2001, p. 299.
\textsuperscript{61} Apart from the extant manuscripts and fragments of the \textit{Encomium on Michael attributed to Severus of Antioch}, the name Gesanthos (or Kesanthos) to date is unattested elsewhere.
\textsuperscript{62} Budge 1894, p. xxv-xxvi.
\textsuperscript{64} Saugt 1992, p. 445.
\textsuperscript{65} Payne Smith 1860, p. 90.
\textsuperscript{66} f.136v b.10-16.
\textsuperscript{67} f.136v b.16-28.
\textsuperscript{68} von Lemm 1899, p. 405-407.
\textsuperscript{69} von Lemm 1899, p. 407.
the country of “India”. Entikê also means “India”, the country, in the Coptic text of George Sobhy’s edition of Le Martyre de Saint Hélias, et L’Encomium de l’évêque Stéphano de Hnès sur Saint Hélias, where it appears three times as ὀγγίτικος.70

The Encomium on Michael, however, makes a distinction between Entikê and Entia: the longer Sahidic version mentions twice that Entia is the capital of Entikê.71 In the Bohairic version, Matthew’s family relocates to the “royal city”.72 Although the Bohairic text does not specify that this “royal city” is Entia, the “royal city” here is meant as Entikê’s capital. In the longer Sahidic version also, Gesanthos is once named “King of Entia”,73 and in another instance, “King of Entikê”.74 The fact that the author refers to Gesanthos as king of both Entikê and Entia, probably means that since Gesanthos is king of Entikê (with Entia as its capital), it follows that he may also be referred to as the king of Entia.

In the IFAO version, the Bohairic version, and longer Sahidic recension, both Entikê and Entia are often simply referred to as “the city”.75 It is well known that in Coptic texts, geographical names, especially the names of countries, usually occur with the definite article, and that countries are often called cities.76 Thus we should assume that when the encomiast mentions the “return of the city”,77 it is the conversion of the whole country of Entikê (including Entia) that is intended.78

Tito Orlandi suggests that “India” in the Encomium on Michael really means Ethiopia.79 Indeed, “India” in all probability does not refer to the real geographical country of India, for historically, John of Ephesus did not missionise there; but he did not preach in Ethiopia either. It would appear, rather, that “India” is a reference to a generic distant location outside of Egypt with pagan inhabitants in need of catechising, as opposed to a real geographical entity.

The text of P. IFAO Copte inv. 133-136, 157-158 features three terms which might shed some light on the historical circumstances: πατρίκιος patrikios (f.134r a.28–b.1; f.157v a.12);80 ζωλοκόττιος holokottinos (f.157v a.14; f.157v b.4, 8–9, 22);81 and φιλοφιλικος philofilos (f.136v b.26).82 The title patrikios (Gk. πατρίκιος from Lat. patricius) refers to a high-ranking dignity which was etymologically connected with the Roman status of patricius. The dignity of patrikios was introduced by Constantine I as an honorific title for the most senior ranks

---

70 Sobhy 1919, p. 3, 29 (text), p. 96, 103 (translation).
72 Cf. Budge 1894, p. 73 (text), p. 59* (translation). This part of the story is, of course, missing from the Ifao fragments which begin with the account of Sêlôm’s stolen property.
74 Cf. Budge 1915, p. 172 (text), p. 751 (translation). In the Bohairic and Ifao versions his name is found passim simply as “King Gesanthos.”
75 “The city” τῆς Ἀνασί (ἡ Ἀνάσι) is used in P. IFAO Copte inv. f.134r a.10; f.134v b.5; f.134v a.1-2, 21; f.136v a.10; f.136v b.16, and is found passim in the Bohairic and longer Sahidic version.
77 f.136v b.10-16.
78 Compare with f.135v a.15-22: λαμΗ ἐκτενογοαίᾳ μεθόρου μινιμιμοι τῆς ἑγεργής “he came to life for the salvation of the king and the whole multitude of Entikê.”
80 Written πατρικικος and πατηρικος in Budge 1915, p. 165 (text), p. 745 (translation); πατηρικος in Budge 1894, p. 75, 76 (text), p. 60* (translation).
81 Rendered ζωλοκόττιος (x1) and ζωλοκόττιος (x3) in Budge 1915, p. 168 (text), 747 (translation); and λογοκοι (x6) in Budge 1894, p. 72, 77 (text), p. 58*, 62* (translation). In both Crum 1939, p. 140b, and Förster 2002, p. 483, 569, λογοκοι is listed as a Coptic equivalent of ζωλοκόττιος (ἀλοκόττιος). Λογοκοι (m. m.) is attested only in Bohairic (cf. Crum 1939, p. 140b).
82 Written φιλοφιλικος in Budge 1915, p. 174 (text), 753 (translation); φιλοφιλικος in Budge 1894, p. 83 (text), p. 67* (translation).
of the imperial administration in the Eastern Empire. Between the 8th and 10th centuries, this dignity was granted to the most important governors and generals. *Patrikios* depreciated thereafter and disappeared after the beginning of the 12th century. 83

The *holokottinos* (Gk. ὅλοκόττινος) is the gold coin *solidus* of the Late Roman Empire. 84 Initially, it was the name of Diocletian’s gold coin (struck 60 to the Roman pound) which was first mentioned in his tariff of 301; but the name is more particularly applied to its successor (struck 72 to the pound). It was introduced by Constantine I at the mint of Trier in 309. Under Constantine and his successors, it was the standard gold coin of the Byzantine Empire until the collapse of the Empire in the 15th century. 85 In Egypt, from about 496 until the end of the Byzantine period, taxes and private accounts were calculated in gold, and the *solidus* was apparently in circulation. 86 The terminology for the *solidus* varies. According to L.C. West and A.C. Johnson, it was called “νομισμάτων, or νόμισμα 87 and, by a word of Coptic origin ὅλοκόττινος, sometimes described as χρυσοῦ”. 88 Roger Bagnall identifies the same names for the *solidus*, but states that ὅλοκόττινος is not originally a Coptic word but a Greek-Latin hybrid. 89

The word *Philoponos* (Gk. φιλόπονος) is a sobriquet meaning “labourer” or “lover of work.” 90 In the encomium, it refers to members of the *philoponoi*, or church helpers, of the late 4th to late 10th centuries. 91 The *philoponoi* were a lay confraternity whose members were especially dedicated Christians known primarily for their diligence in attending church services. Most of the *philoponoi* were from aristocratic backgrounds and were celibates, but among them were also married men. 92 The *philoponoi* established a meeting hall known as the *philoponion* and they were organised into divisions and ranks. The local clergy, and especially the bishop, established and controlled their forms of activity and their autonomy was limited. 93

The *philoponoi* were based mainly in cities and towns throughout Egypt for specific purposes. They functioned as representatives of lay congregations to the patriarch, and their status as a recognised group within the church also meant that they could participate in patriarchal processions; they had close relationships with certain monasteries and often lent financial support to them; and in the schools of Alexandria, the *philoponoi* provided additional religious guidance. 94 Given the role of the *philoponoi* it is not surprising, on the one hand, that the encomiast would choose to mention them in John of Ephesus’ mission to establish the church of Entia. On the other hand, their role in John’s mission is questionable since the *philoponoi* mainly operated in Late Antique Alexandria, and there is no evidence of activity for this confraternity outside of Egypt.

84 Černý 1976, p. 72.
85 Kazhdan 1991, p. 1924.
86 West, Johnson 1944, p. 138.
87 νομισμα appears as ομισμα and homisma in the longer Sahidic recension; cf. Budge 1915, p. 159, 161, 162 (text), p. 738, 741, 742 (translation).
88 West, Johnson 1944, p. 137.
89 Bagnall 1985, p. 15-16.
90 Kazhdan 1657.
91 Although “the most recent document that mentions the *philoponoi* dates to the end of the tenth century…there is little possibility that confraternities played a significant role after the first fifty years of Arab rule...in Egypt” (Wipszycka 1991, p. 586).
Authorship

The discussion about the composition of the encomium is directly related to the one concerning the authorship of the text. The title of the encomium indicates that Severus of Antioch was its author. Severus (born ca. 456 AD; died 538) was the anti-Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch, and as such, a strong opponent of the decisions of the Council of Chalcedon (451). He ascended the patriarchal throne of Antioch in 512 during the rule of the anti-Chalcedonian emperor Anastasius. He was patriarch until 518, when Justin I became emperor. After Justin’s rise to power, Severus was deposed and exiled to Alexandria. He is venerated as one of the most important saints by the Oriental Orthodox Churches and is known as one of the greatest orators of the early Church.95

Severus’ person and works were condemned by imperial edict in 536, resulting in the end of the transmission of his works in Greek; only fragments in the original Greek have come down to us.96 The chief medium through which we know Severus’ works is the Syriac tradition. There are 125 surviving homilies in Syriac,97 but In Michaelem is not recognised or listed amongst them as one of Severus’ genuine works.98 In the Clavis Patrum Graecorum also, the Encomium on Michael is included as a pseudonymous work.99

Indeed, the encomium does not offer any evidence which confirms that Severus of Antioch was the author. There are, perhaps not surprisingly in view of the subject matter of the encomium, no references to the Christological disputes in which the patriarch was involved, nor to his episcopate, or to his twenty-year exile in Egypt from 518.100 There are also no allusions to any historical events which might reveal the author or the specific audience for which the encomium was composed. Moreover, as we have already seen, the encomium contains historical inconsistencies which again point away from Severus as its author; neither the content nor the style of the encomium support the association with the Antiochian patriarch.

With good reason, In Michaelem should be attached to the genre of pseudepigrapha which flourished in the 7th and 8th centuries. Like these works, the Encomium on Michael is attributed to a famous author of an earlier century, it describes some historically false episodes that could not have been invented in the earlier period, and was written long after the period in which it was set.101 In his preface to Saint Michael the Archangel: Three Encomiums, Budge states that “there is no reason for doubting that the three encomiums102 were written about the beginning of the viith century of our era.”103 In the absence of unambiguous internal and external criteria, we may consider this period as most likely for the composition of the text.

95 Allen, Hayward 2004, p. 22.
97 I.e. the so-called “Cathedral Homilies” that Severus delivered during the six years of his patriarchate. They were translated into Syriac initially by “Paul of Callincum in 528, and subsequently by Jacob of Edessa in the second half of the seventh century” (Allen, Hayward 2004, p. 49-50).
99 Geerard 1979, 331.
100 Allen, Hayward 2004, p. 22.
102 One of which is, of course, the encomium by Severus.
103 Budge 1894, p. vii.
Transmission

As regards the original language of the text, it is extremely difficult to determine if the encomium was composed initially in Greek or in Coptic.¹⁰⁴ The incidence of words borrowed from Greek in this work is relatively high, but this does not assist in determining the original language of the work.¹⁰⁵

If we take into consideration the fact that many manuscripts of the 7th to 8th centuries that are falsely ascribed to one of the church fathers were composed in Coptic,¹⁰⁶ then we may perhaps include *In Michaelem* in the same category.

Another possible criterion for judging whether a work’s original language is Coptic or Greek is discussed by K.H. Kuhn in the *Panegyric of Apollo* where he refers to the work of E.A.E. Reymond and J.W.B. Barns.¹⁰⁷ They state that “if a writing is not intended to have any circulation or interest outside Egypt, it may well be composed in Coptic; but if it is intended for a wider public it may be assumed to have been originally in Greek.”¹⁰⁸ If we apply this criterion to *In Michaelem*, we may conclude that its original language was Greek, for the encomium deals with the evangelisation of a Christian community outside of Egypt. However, no Greek original of the encomium has been identified or preserved, and since there is no reliable way of deciding the original language of the discourse, this question must finally remain open.


¹⁰⁴ Emmel 2007, p. 93.
¹⁰⁵ Kuhn 1966, p. xix.
¹⁰⁸ Reymond, Barns 1973, p. 18.
In the margin, perpendicular to the first word in column A, is an annotation: ἐροϑ ("to him") written in a different hand (but the same as that of the marginal note on f.157r), indicating that it was probably added after the copying of the manuscript.

The preposition ἐροϑ here functions as a resumptive pronoun in a relative construction. The missing text preceding ἐροϑ can be restored from Budge 1894, p. 74 (text), 60* (translation). See also p. 422.

ⲁϥⲉⲣ for ⲁⲥⲉⲣ. (Crum 1939, p. 337b).

ⲕⲉⲟⲥ for ḫⲉⲥⲉⲣⲩⲥ. This is the only instance in the text where this proper name appears with a κ. It always appears in the Boharic version as ⲕⲉⲟⲥ (Budge 1894, p. 78, 79, 81, 83), and in the longer Sahidic version as ⲕⲟⲥ (Budge 1915, p. 165, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 176).
Both the Bohairic (Budge 1894, p. 75, 76) and the longer Sahidic version (Budge 1915, p. 166, 167) have σαλάω.
There is a marginal annotation from the top left-hand side of column A to the right-hand side of column B written in a different hand: "Then the archbishop... Athanasius and John...". It is separated from Columns A and B with a line of dashes.
P. IFAO Capte inv. f.157v

2 [Mн] t ἵωοου
6[± 4] o[... ουγειν]
χ[ΗΤ] ΧΑΙΤΑΡΑΩΟΥ
λογρω[Mech] ΑΙΑΚΑΛΕ
10 πρω[με c] ΝΑΥ ε
ΠΡ[ο 2] ωC ΕΡΕΞΗ ἈΥΜ[οσιο] Ν ΕΡΟΟΥ
ΠΕΞΑΙ Ν[ΛΥ ΧΕΕΥ]
ω[Ν][Η]· ΜΠΩΝΗΤ
ΠΕΞΑΙ ΝΑΧ ΧΕΜ
ΜΟΗ ΑΛΛΑ ΕΥΤΗ
ΤΑΛΥ ΚΕΝΑΜΟΟΥ
ΤΟΥ
ΠΕΞΑΙ ΝΑΧ ΧΕΜ
ΜΟΗ ΑΛΛΑ ΕΥΤΗ
ΤΑΛΥ ΚΕΝΑΜΟΟΥ
ΤΟΥ

One line is missing here

5 ΠΡΩ ΑΕ [ΧΗ] · ΜΗ] ΡΩ
10 Μ[Ε ΧΗΛΥ ΓΕΟΟΤΟ]Υ
ΕΤΕ[± 8] ΑΥ
ΜΗ[± 10]
ΤΕΙΜ[± 8]
ΠΣΟΙ[ΟΚΟΤΤΙΝΟΣ]
ΠΕΞΑΙ ΝΑΧ ΧΕΜ
ΜΟΗ ΑΛΛΑ ΕΥΤΗ
ΤΑΛΥ ΚΕΝΑΜΟΟΥ
ΤΟΥ

Five lines are missing here
P. IFAO Copte inv. f.134r

The sequence of ω-ω (within the bound group) is simplified as ω, i.e. ἴτερογωνον instead of ἴτερογωνον (3rd pers. pl. precursive (or temporal) conjugation + infinitive: "when they had finished").
In Michaelem. The Encomium on Michael the Archangel Attributed to Severus of Antioch

Pl. 5. P. IFAO Copte inv. 134r. © IFAO, J.-Fr. Gout.
P. IFAO Copte inv. f.134v

ΚΑ

τὰ ἧπειρον ἠπειρομένῳ
λέγων μνών ἡγαίων
μηδεῖ ἤπειρον ἡγαίων
5
με γαρ ἐπεμοῦρον
ἄοκοι κοὐσυν ἰεί
ἐπὶ ἤπειρον μνών.

ἐγυξίν ηδὲ μνώς
ἐρατεί ἰππρο
εἰροῦς ἀκοῶ
πέ μεροῦς ἐγχοῖο
μνώς ἡμιπιπρ
(locale αἰνε[γ]οοειων)
μπίσε οὑγινέ
αιντον πο[ν]?
ἐρατέν εκολ .Relative

τὸτε ἐγγεζαίο μνω
οὐ ερατοῦ ἱνὴ
τὸ εκολ ἰππρ[πο]
μπεκ[μ]οτ [νηεϊ]
κατα[λκος]
Ἄρω ἐ[τενιου]
εἰς[παρατελος]
μιξα[η]λα [ἀξι]
μπεςκοτ ἄου

116 τηννοογο για τηννοογο.
117 αἰνε[γ]οοειων για ἁνεοοειων.
118 Αν alternative reading could be

theta[n]αντ[ην]ς[θ][ν]
P. IFAO Copte inv. f.135r

τὴν ἀντιοχείαν εἰς τὸν Παρθηνοὺς ἐνοχόν
πρὸς τὸ ἐπεχεῖν τὴν ἐθνικότερήν
Πρὸς τὸ ἐπεχεῖν τὴν ἐθνικότερήν

5 ἐπεχεῖν τὴν ἐθνικότερήν

Παρθηνὸς ἐν Παρθηνοῦν ἐνοχόν
πρὸς τὸ ἐπεχεῖν τὴν ἐθνικότερήν

10 ἐπεχεῖν τὴν ἐθνικότερήν

Τὸ ἐπεχεῖν τὴν ἐθνικότερήν

15 ἐπεχεῖν τὴν ἐθνικότερήν

Two lines are missing here

119 See p. 398.

The circumflex is situated between ῥ and χ.
In Michael. The Encomium on Michael the Archangel Attributed to Severus of Antioch

Pl. 7. P. IFAO Copte inv. 135r. © Ifao, J.-Fr. Gout.
P. IFAO Copte inv. f.135v

κς

ηκ Μικούη Ψκοτη
πνεπνευτογαλακ
χεάλλανα βούκ
ηγχοος μπμερέχ

5
μμοουτη χεάκμπρα
μπμογτε ιττ
πε ταμον επεν
τημποομε μμοκ

πν122ουτε αε ιμαι

5
ρομε εφουκω
εττηπερηα ξι
εουγ λυγ ικε
πιστεγε ερογ ιη
τεχνηρα τιρες

10
ετμμαυ ιη
κτο ιτεψγυκ
μπρόμε ερογ
μκενον ιτιδη
ετβε πουγκαί ιμη

15
πο μπιπμπνοε
τιρη ιτετηκαί122
λπρομε φοψι ε
βολ εφχαο μμοκ
χεουγι νακ ε πη

20
πο γεσαοοος χεακ
τοκαλ ακκμοος
εσραί μπμπαρχαγ
γελοο μηχανα
πνοε ιαρκιετρα

25
τυγοο ετοοομ
ηπηγυε.
καλαρ ιμπωμε
ετογιαλα εροογ

ηιδικαοοε πε
λγφ εφουγαλ.
αγφ ιτοοογ ιη
αγμοοογ ιη ηλλα
ογκερατιε πε

Η122 καιομετ
αιμαρ.
ετε βετκενοφ
ηπ μελημοε ιη

15
πετιηναογχ
ταοο ακμποα
ηλαφ ειαρχαγ
γελοο ετογαλακ
πανη ειεκαογ

20
πιρε μπ[νοχ]
τε ξτετηλαγ]
εροογ [± 7]
ερογ [ζιπετη]
ηετ [τηρα]

25
ιτετηκαφ[.]
νεφρυη[.ιη

Two lines are missing here [μη]

121 Ηα ηηεο of ηηι is εκθεσις.
122 Τεθηκία is always ωεηεν εθιςις thus
in the Bohairic and longer Sahidic
version, but appears once as Τεθαικη
and another time as Τεθαιηκη in the
longer Sahidic version (Budge 1915,
p. 172, 173).
P. IFAO Capte inv. f.158r

\[\text{\textcopyright IFAO 2021} \]

The circumflex is situated between \( \text{n} \) and \( \text{p} \).

\[\text{\textcopyright IFAO 2021} \]

The text here has been restored based on Budge 1894, p. 81 in which the Bohairic reads: οⲩⲛⲟⲩϯⲡⲉϥⲟⲛϧⲡⲉ. Half of ω is in ekthesis. The circumflex is situated between ρ and ş. Half of o is in ekthesis.
The circumflex is situated between η and ρ.
In Michaelem. The Encomium on Michael the Archangel Attributed to Severus of Antioch

PL. II. P. IFAO Copte inv. 136r. © IFAO, J.-Fr. Gout.
\textit{P. IFAO Copte inv. f.136v}

\begin{align*}
129 & \text{With respect to } \varepsilon \kappa \omicron \alpha \upsilon [\nu], \text{ see p. } 426.
\end{align*}
Translation

[“Fear not my children, for God, in Whom we believe,]130 [P. IFAO inv. f.133r a begins] and His great, strong Archangel Michael, will save you from all evil—not particularly from a slander against you.”131

As she was saying these (things),132 behold a voice came out of heaven133 saying, “Fear not; no evil will befall you. I am Michael the Archangel; I will watch over you, guard you, and save you from all evil.”

While they were still standing before the governor who was questioning them about the stolen things of the magistrate, the Archangel Michael took the form of a pat [f.133r b begins]rician134 of King Kesanthos and approached from the distance.135 When the governor saw him, he arose and stood up, and besought him saying, “You also come, sit down, and listen to this dispute.”136 And in this manner, he sat down.

And the governor ordered that the youths be brought before him, and he said to them, “Hasten and give the stolen things of the magistrate (back) to him before I137 inflict punishment upon you.”

And they answered saying, “As the God [f.133v a begins] of the Chris[tian]s lives, and by the glory of His great Archangel Michael, we have never taken part in this matter.”138

And the holy Archangel Michael said to the governor, “I know how the truth will be manifest. Let the youngest brother of these men be taken, and bring him into the house of the chief watchman, and let him139 cry out saying, ‘In the name of Jesus Christ, let40 the stolen things of Sêlôm the magistrate, on account of which they have accused us, appear!’”

And immediately, [f.133v b begins] the governor made the youth be taken inside, as the Archangel had said to him. And the youth cried out saying, “In the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and the holy Archangel Michael, let41 the stolen things of Sêlôm the magistrate appear!”

---

130 The English translation here has been restored from Budge 1894, p. 60*, since the Coptic text of f.133r a.1-6 (ⲉⲣⲟϥⲙⲛⲡⲉϥⲛⲟϭ |ⲛⲁⲣⲭⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ |ⲉⲡⲉⲑⲟⲟⲩ ⲆⲣⲱⲧⲐⲙ |ϫⲉⲉϩⲓϩⲗⲁ |ⲉⲣⲱⲧⲐⲙ |ⲉⲣⲱⲧⲐⲙ |ϫⲉⲉϩⲓϩⲗⲁ) closely parallels the Bohairic text of Budge 1894, p. 74.

131 The context of the fragments can be determined from the Bohairic version which corresponds to the beginning of P. IFAO Copte inv. f.133r a. f.133r a is a continuation of a narrative part of the encomium in which the four youths, John, Stephen, Joseph, and Daniel, are accused of stealing the goods of Sêlôm and are brought before the governor, as their mother, Irene, follows them and speaks to them (cf. Budge 1894, p. 74-75 [text], p. 59*-60* [translation]).

132 εἰκόνως ἄν χιλαί: “she” here refers to Irene, the mother of the four youths (cf. Budge 1894, p. 75 [text], p. 60* [translation]).

133 οἰκογονίας ἡγεῖ Ἐρω: Latin: the author uses a well-known biblical formula here (and also at f.133v b.18-19 and f.134v b.10-11) common in the New Testament, e.g. Mat. 3:17, 17:5; Mk. 1:11; Lk. 3:22; and Jn. 12:28.

134 For a discussion about παρτ[ικιοι] (also found in f.137v a.12) see Composition on p. 394-395.

135 χηριείς: literally, “he came at a distance…” (CRUM 1939, p. 471b).

136 ημῶν ὑπας: literally, “these disputes.”

137 ἡμᾶς-πῆς: circumstantial conversion of the negative completive (or ‘not yet’) conjugation. As such, this is to be translated: “…before I inflict punishment.” Note that the circumstantial conversion here is simply written ἡμᾶς- for ἡμᾶς- (cf. LAYTON 2004 a, p. 260, §336).

138 παρὶ τῆς γῆς: literally, “matter of this sort.”

139 ιεροθείων ἔρωτον: Layton 2004 a, p. 277-278, § 351-352, on the conjunctive as an extension of preceding text.

140 εἰκογονίας ἔρωτον: main-clause optative (or third future) in which the meaning is greatly affected by the type of discourse (cf. LAYTON 2004 a, p. 264, § 527). In this case, the optative bears the meaning of a strong wish, and should be translated as “let” (cf. LAYTON 2004 a, p. 264, § 338).

141 εἰκογονίας ἔρωτον: see previous note.
And behold, immediately a voice occurred and everyone heard (it) saying, “Go down to the cellar and you will find everything which you seek; for these youths are innocent of the offence.”142

[f.157v a begins] Immediately, they went down and they found all the stolen things, and they went and told the governor what had happened and he marvelled greatly. And (when) he turned around43 to tell what had happened to the patrician, that is Michael, he did not know where [he had gone].

[Then he] rejoiced [exceedingly], and he [set the four youths free, and they went to their] house… great…144 the [f.157 b begins] good deeds [which they] did unto everyone, so that everyone [marvelled] at their good life.

And again, the Devil… he did not… evil… These holy youths, however, were not troubled in their spirit, nor distressed, but were enduring happily, receiving grace through God… said… these…

[f.157v a begins] …ten days… passed from the time that these (things) befell them, a man accused two men before the king of not having paid a former (debt of) taxes.145 And the king [gave the two men over to]… holokottinoi… and they did not… And as (those) who were in charge of them were beating146 them, the holy John met them147 opportunely, and he said to the soldiers who were in charge of them, “For what reason are these men being beaten?”

[f.157 v b begins] They said to him, “We are going to demand one-hundred holokottinoi148 from each (man).” He said to them, “If they give the two-hundred holokottinoi are they still in149 danger?” They said to him, “No, but if they do not give them, they will be killed.” [Then John said]… holokottinoi…

---

142 ceovlak e[nborn]: literally, “they are innocent of sin.” The text here has been restored based on the corresponding Bohairic text which reads: ceovlak e hori “they are innocent of the offence” (Budge 1894, p. 76 [text], p. 61* [translation]).

143 aktephai[n]: Literally, “he turned his face.”

144 The lacuna in the Coptic text is too large to attempt reconstruction. The corresponding Bohairic text reads: evf dios mvh nem apkhnglos do ovaia mwha ph di ovaia ke em ovaia totoy dem… “glorifying God and His holy Archangel Michael” (Budge 1915, p. 167 [text], p. 746 [translation]). The lacuna in P. IFAO inv. f.157r a most likely corresponds to the Bohairic since the Coptic in 157r b which follows, closely parallels it; the only difference being the word hol[o] of which we can see traces at f.157 a.22.

145 žiwv erpi0la0[on] episou thisaou: literally, “as having taxes to them before.” Concerning thisaou, the letter after 2 in the manuscript is damaged. It may be restored to thisaou (“before (in time),” cf. Crum 1939, p. 283a) or thisaou (“formerly,” cf. Crum 1939, p. 283a). Both are possible with regard to meaning; thisaou is more satisfactory in terms of context, but palaeographically, thisaou is more probable.

146 rhpize (from ὑβρίζω): used here (and also at f.133r b.24-25; f.157v a.27) in a legal sense, literally meaning to “commit a physical outrage on one” as punishment (cf. Liddell, Scott, Jones 1940, p. 1594).

147 eixi0[on]: literally, “he came upon them,” i.e. happened to meet them.

148 For a discussion about the holokottinon, see Composition on p. 394-395. Although the Coptic text uses the singular form of the noun holokottinon, the word should be translated in the plural since the amounts referred to in the text are plural.

149 ceovlak eni akh[la00[n]: literally, “they still continue (to be) in danger.”
...these pious (brethren), and he was envious of them and was warring against them. And he stirred up another trial against them, which was this:

It came to pass after these things that a man of the city invited one of his friends in the evening; and that man was living near the house of these pious (brethren). And when they had finished eating and drinking, the man arose to go to his house. And as he was walking in the main street of the city, a serpent bit him on the foot and he fell down and died immediately, and no man knew what had happened to him. And when the night-watchman of the city was doing his nightly round, together with those who were with him, they found the man stretched out dead. And they lit a lamp and examined his entire body and they did not know what had happened to him; but they prepared the (man) who had died for burial and when it was morning, they took him out to the tomb.

And the Devil took the form of a man and proclaimed in the midst of the city saying, “I have understood the death of this man who died today, (and) I know who it was who killed him. This murder was not committed by any man except these four young strangers who dwell in the street of our god Zeus, and I am (ready) to bear witness to this fact.”

And the word spread throughout the whole city, and the governor heard (it) and he brought the matter to King Gesanthos. And immediately, the king sent and had the four youths brought to him with their hands tied behind them, and chains around their necks. And as they were being brought before the king, behold a voice occurred to them saying, “Fear not, for the time of tribulation has passed and relief has reached you from the Lord.”

Then they were set before the king as condemned criminals. And behold immediately the Archangel Michael [took] the form of a great general [of Constantine], the Emperor of the Romans, and came beckoning from afar.

And when King Gesanthos saw him, he arose and stood up before him; and when he had come up to him they sat down together.

And the Archangel Michael saw the youths standing there in that manner, and he said to the king, “What is the business of these (youths) who are standing like this before you?” And he told him what had happened saying… by night… hand over…

Michael said to him, “In our country, when a man dies a death of this sort and one does not know with certainty who killed him, the dead (man) is brought forward and we question him, and he speaks and tells us who killed him. So now, if you wish to know the truth, let the (man) who died be brought here and we will question him and he will tell us what happened to him.”
Immediately, King Gesanthos commanded, and the dead (man) was brought out. And the Archangel Michael said to the youngest brother of these pious men, “Daniel, go and say to this dead man: ‘In the name of the God of heaven, tell us what has happened to you.’”

Then God—the man-loving (One), wishing to make His name glorious and so that all might believe in Him in that entire region—made the soul of the man to return to him again and he came to life for the salvation of the king and the whole multitude of Entikê.

And the man cried out saying, “Woe unto you, O King Gesanthos, for you have dared to sit down with the Archangel Michael, the great general-in-chief of the powers of heaven! For truly, these men who have been slandered are righteous and innocent. And it is not they who killed me, but it was a serpent which bit me and I died. And by reason of the excellence of these men, this great good has reached you, and you were made worthy to see the holy Archangel. And behold, the wonders of God (which) you have seen… [in all your] heart, and forsake… in which there is no profit, that the God of heaven may forgive you your previous sins. For truly, a great (act of) grace has been shown to me today, for I have seen the Archangel Michael through these righteous men.”

And immediately, the Archangel Michael flew [to the heights in great glory, and the king saw him and all the multitude]…

...[the heart] of the king [became quiet from the fear(ful), and the] great and marvellous thing which he had seen. The king arose [and kissed] John [saying,] “… that we believe in Him now.”

And John preached to the king and the whole multitude the name of the Lord [Jesus] Christ. [And the king] and [all] the multitude cried out [saying], “Jesus Christ [is the living] God!”

And the holy John said to the king, “Arise and write to Constantine, the emperor of the Romans… [and] baptise you in the name [of the] Father, and [the] Son, and the Holy Spirit.”

And King Gesanthos wrote a letter to Emperor Constantine saying, “Gesanthos, whom men call king, dares to write to the ruler and emperor Constantine, the servant of Christ. Greeting! A great (act of) grace has reached us from the Good God who has remembered us, delivered us from the worship of polluted idols, and turned us to Himself by His great goodness… Christ…”

156 See the note about 烝⾹ above.
157 The lacuna is too big to attempt reconstruction of the Coptic text. The English translation could perhaps be restored from Budge 1894, p. 65*, since the Coptic text in f.135v a, which follows the lacuna at the end of f.135v a, closely parallels the Bohairic text of Budge 1894, p. 80.
158 The rest of the lacuna is too big to attempt reconstruction of the Coptic text. The English translation could perhaps be restored from Budge 1894, p. 65*, since the Coptic text in f.138v b, which follows the lacuna at the end of f.135v a, closely parallels the Bohairic text of Budge 1894, p. 80.
159 ˎⲧⲙⲏⲧⲉ ˎⲧⲙⲣⲓⲗⲟⲩ ⲁⲣⲟⲁ ⲁⲣⲟⲱⲥⲙⲓⲛⲉ ⲉⲣⲟ ⲁⲣⲟⲥⲈⲛ ⲁⲣⲟⲱⲥⲙⲓⲛⲉ ⲧⲙⲏⲧⲉ literally means "set right," (vb. intr. cf. Crum 1939, p. 338 a, b), but in this context it should probably be translated as "became quiet." Compare: ˎⲧⲙⲏⲧⲉ ⲁⲣⲟⲩⲣⲟ ⲁⲣⲟⲱⲥⲙⲓⲛⲉ ⲁⲣⲟⲱ "the heart of the governor became quiet" (Budge 1894, p. 80 [text], p. 65* [translation]).
160 Ωϩηγοⲧⲁτο ωϩηγοⲧο ωϩηγοⲧο ωϩηγοⲧο ωϩηγοⲧο ωϩηγοⲧο "Thou art the god who livest" (Budge 1914, p. 3 [text], p. 255 [translation]).
161 The lacuna is too big to attempt reconstruction of the Coptic text. The English translation could perhaps be restored from Budge 1894, p. 66, since the Coptic text in f.136r a, which follows the lacuna in f.135v b, closely parallels the Bohairic text of Budge 1894, p. 81.
Furthermore, we entreat your honoured lordship to send unto us one of the great bishops who are before you to enlighten us in the doctrine of the upright faith, show us the way (in which we may) go unto God, and give unto us the holy seal (of baptism). For truly, if you will do this for us, you will receive another crown from Christ. May the God-loving emperor be saved by the might of the God of all creation.”

And in great haste, the letter was taken and given\(^\text{162}\) to Constantine the emperor. And when he had read the letter, he marvelled exceedingly about what had happened and glorified God. And with great solicitude, he wrote to Apa John the Bishop of Ephesus in this manner:

“Before all things, I kiss your holy hands, which truly hold\(^\text{163}\) the flesh of the Son of God. Great joy has come unto us from God, and behold I sent it to you also, knowing that you will rejoice exceedingly. Please then, undertake a little\(^\text{164}\) toil—believing confidently with all your heart that your toil is not in vain—do it then for (the sake of) Christ who accepted suffering for the whole race of man. Trouble yourself and go to the city of Entia, and heal those who dwell therein with the doctrine of Christ, and bring them away from the service of idols, and baptise them in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit. And this shall be unto you a praiseworthy act before Christ and His holy apostles, that we may be saved together through the might of Jesus Christ.”

And the Emperor sent (this letter) to Apa John, the Archbishop of Ephesus, together with the letter of King Gesanthos. When the Archbishop read the letter, he rejoiced exceedingly at the return of the city. Then he took with him three presbyters, two deacons, a reader, three singers of Psalms, twelve labourers\(^\text{165}\), and other servants. And…\(^\text{166}\)

\(^{162}\) \(\text{λυχι} \ \text{μενεσα} \ \text{λυ} \ \text{μενο[ο]υ} \): literally, “they took the writings and gave them…”

\(^{163}\) \(\text{αι} \ \text{εταματε} \ \text{ιτσαρι} \ \text{μενομε} \ \text{μενοι} \ \text{εισονμα}: \) literally, “these which truly hold the flesh of the Son of God.” Appositive relative construction introduced by \(\text{αι} \).

\(^{164}\) \(\text{εκομπι}: \) 2nd pers. masc. sg. circumstantial converter of the first present \(\text{εκ-} \) + the Greek verb \(\text{θαρρειν} \) (meaning “to believe confidently that”).

\(^{165}\) \(\text{φαλωνοιος}: \) a technical term which could also be translated here as “church helpers,” cf. the discussion under Composition on p. 392-395.
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