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In Michaelem
The Encomium on Michael the Archangel
Attributed to Severus of Antioch
An Edition of the Coptic Text of P. IFAO Copte Inv. 133-136, 157-158*

ANTONIA ST DEMIANA

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 $\ddot{\alpha} \ddot{\alpha} \ddot{\alpha}$). 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

* Including an introductory study of the fragments; English translation with commentary; and indices of proper names, toponyms, and Græco-Coptic loanwords.

1 I am grateful to Dr Anne Boud’hors and Dr Catherine Louis who initially suggested these fragments for my study. Anne Boud’hors has also generously shared her valuable knowledge and directives throughout my project, and for this I am extremely thankful. I owe an enormous debt of gratitude in particular to my supervisor Dr Victor Ghica and Professor Heike Behlmer for being tremendously supportive and generous with their time, advice, and direction. I also thank Professor Ariel Shisha-Halevy, Professor Hugo Lundhaug, and Dr Naglaa Hamdi who were immensely generous in their assistance to me.

2 Layton 1989, p. 27-36.

3 Based on Stephen Emmel’s observations on significant spaces in manuscripts; cf. Emmel 2008.

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 ⲳ in ⲳⲙⲟⲧⲓ). 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 ⲱ-/ⲓ- and ⲱ/-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 (ⲓ 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.

[aaaa] The ancient author’s text, restored where the manuscript is missing.

aaaa Palaeographically ambiguous letters.

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

{aaaa} 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 Ⲫ.

> 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

---

⁵ Layton 2004b, p. 5.
⁶ Layton 1989, p. 35.
of Saint Shenoute in Atripe (modern-day Sohag), Egypt. 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 xié-debut xiié siècle?” (“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. The Encomium on Michael attributed to Severus of Antioch is extant in the following manuscripts and fragments:

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

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

– BL Or.7597 at the British Library is a parchment codex containing a Sahidic version of the encomium. It has been catalogued by Layton, and was edited and translated into English by E.A. Wallis Budge. Budge implies that MS BL Or.7597 is part of the so-called “Edfu” collection in the British Library, 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. In agreement with Layton, Tito Orlandi lists this manuscript as one copied in the Fayum. It has been dated between the 10th and 11th centuries by Layton, but more specifically to the second half of the 11th century by Budge.
– 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 Nittia, 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:

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.
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.

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...
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.  

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 in order to demonstrate the power of God and the efficaciousness of Michael’s help to those who believe in him.

Gedsôn was a native of Entikê who, on one occasion, sailed to Galonia 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 Entikê where he soon died, and after which the citizens of Entikê began to persecute Irene and her sons (because they had become Christians). On the advice of John, they went to live in Entia (the capital of Entikê). 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 Entia/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.

38 Budge 1894, p. 63 (text), p. 51* (translation).
39 “Kêtson (κητσόν)” in the Bohairic version of BL Or.8784 (Budge 1894, p. 66, 69, 71 [text], p. 53*, 56*, 58* [translation]).
40 According to Terry Wilfong (2003, 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 Michaelum.
41 “Kalônia” (καλονία) in the Bohairic version (Budge 1894, p. 66, 70, 71 [text], p. 53*, 56*, 57* [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]).
42 For a discussion on Entikê and Entia see Composition, p. 392-395.
43 Cf. the discussion on Entikê and Entia in Composition, p. 392-395.
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.\footnote{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.157t 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:

\verb|[Ⲇⲧⲟⲩⲁⲃⲛⲉ\ ␣ⲩϩⲫ\ |ⲩⲱⲧⲡⲉ\ ␣ⲩⲣⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲩⲣⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲩⲣⲟⲧ\ |ⲩⲙⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ|\n
\verb|\ⲧⲟⲩⲁⲃ\ ␣ⲩⲧⲉ\ |ⲩⲙⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ|\n
\verb|\ⲧⲟⲩⲁⲃ\ ␣ⲩⲧⲉ\ |ⲩⲙⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ|\n
\verb|\ⲧⲟⲩⲁⲃ\ ␣ⲩⲧⲉ\ |ⲩⲙⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ|\n
\verb|\ⲧⲟⲩⲁⲃ\ ␣ⲩⲧⲉ\ |ⲩⲙⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ|\n
\verb|\ⲧⲟⲩⲁⲃ\ ␣ⲩⲧⲉ\ |ⲩⲙⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ|\n
\verb|\ⲧⲟⲩⲁⲃ\ ␣ⲩⲧⲉ\ |ⲩⲙⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ|\n
\verb|\ⲧⲟⲩⲁⲃ\ ␣ⲩⲧⲉ\ |ⲩⲙⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ|\n
\verb|\ⲧⲟⲩⲁⲃ\ ␣ⲩⲧⲉ\ |ⲩⲙⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ|\n
\verb|\ⲧⲟⲩⲁⲃ\ ␣ⲩⲧⲉ\ |ⲩⲙⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ|\n
\verb|\ⲧⲟⲩⲁⲃ\ ␣ⲩⲧⲉ\ |ⲩⲙⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ|\n
\verb|\ⲧⲟⲩⲁⲃ\ ␣ⲩⲧⲉ\ |ⲩⲙⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ\ ␣ⲟⲧ|\n
\verb|\ⲧⲟⲩⲁⲃ\ ␣ⲩⲧⲉ\ |ⲩⲙⲟⲧ\ ␣<stdlibed text in the Bohairic version.\n
With reference to content, the Bohairic version of BL Or.8784\footnote{Ref. to hereafter as the ‘longer Sahidic version.’} is a very close parallel to the Ifao fragments (the majority of differences being dialectal), while the Sahidic version of BL Or.7597\footnote{Cf. for example, Budge 1915, paragraph xi, on p. 165 (text), p. 744 (translation); paragraph xii and xiii on p. 166 (text), p. 745 (translation); paragraph xo, xi, and xii on p. 167-168 (text), p. 746-747 (translation); paragraph xii and xiii on p. 169-170 (text), p. 749 (translation); paragraph xii on p. 171 (text), p. 750 (translation).} 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.\footnote{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 these two versions are alike.}
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: [iō-?key][19-20] (hair-flesh); f.157: [kα-?key][21-22] (flesh-hair); f.134: [kτ]-[kκ][23-24] (hair-flesh); f.135: [kg]-[kκ][25-26] (flesh-hair); f.158: [kζ-?key][27-28] (hair-flesh); f.136: [kό-?key][29-30] (flesh-hair). The collation of the fragments may be more clearly understood from *Figure 1* below.

---

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.157r 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 00/2.49

**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.51 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 (ⲁⲝ) and 26 (ⲁⲡ), 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 ⲑ; narrow ⲓ, ⲝ, and Ⲡ; and short ⲣ, ⲯ, and ⲧ. ⲧ 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,

---

51 Letter strokes exceeding into the margin, initials in ekthesis, and marginal annotations have not been included in measuring the written area.
52 Shown here as they appear in the manuscript.
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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{54}

There are exceptions to the above where the stroke is centred over a letter: f.133r a.10; f.135v b.7; 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.137r 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.158v 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 ꜀).

  In three instances, the circumflex is connective: situated between ꜀ and ꜇ at f.135r b.7; and between ꜀ and ꜇ at f.158r b.1; f.158v a.24; and f.136r a.20.

- **Supralineation on Nomina Sacra**

  ꜀ always appears for ἰκόγα, and ꜇ always appears for ἰριγά with the connective supralinear stroke written above the top right of ꜇, extending to the top right of ꜇. ꜀ always appears for ἰкрепά, with the connective supralinear stroke written only above ꜀ and ꜇. This is perhaps uncommon for the nomen sacrum ꜀ for which the connective stroke is usually written above all three letters.

\textsuperscript{53} Layton 1989, p. 28.
\textsuperscript{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 *nomena sacra*; and also in particular cases where one may find consistency in the presence or absence of supralineation over *m* and *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 *ⲉⲙⲟ* and the postponed subject indicator *ⲡⲛⲗ*, the supralinear stroke on the first *m* or *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. *ⲣⲟⲧⲧⲧ* f.133r a.6; *ⲧⲣⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧ* f.133r a.12; *ⲡⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧ* f.133r b.21, 25) or conjugation base (e.g. *ⲟⲣⲧⲧⲧ* f.133r b.21-22), the relevant suffix has a single supralinear stroke or *bindestrich* as expected in standard Sahidic.

The preposition *ⲡⲧⲧⲧ* is always rendered with a supralinear stroke which is usually connective. There are ten examples of the supralinear stroke representing a line-final *n* (f.133r b.18; f.134v a.26; f.134v b.6; f.135r b.13, 21; f.135v a.1, 5; f.158r b.8; f.136r a.8).

In most cases, ⲁ is either devoid of any supralinear mark or has a dieresis in the form of double dots. These are used over both consonantal ⲁ and vocalic ⲁ although inconsistently. Diacritics can also be seen on other vowels:

- ⲫ, which can receive a supralinear stroke over it and demonstrates a northern mark of tautosyllabication (ⲧⲃⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧ f.133r b.7; ⲫⲧⲡⲧⲧⲧ f.135v a.18; ⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧ f.135v b.12). The reason why the copyist has used a connective supralinear stroke over ⲫ in ⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧ rather than a single stroke over ⲫ is unclear.

- ⲧ, on which we find a supralinear stroke (ⲧⲡⲧⲧⲧⲧ f.133v a.27-28; ⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧ f.135v b.9-10; ⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧ f.136v a.25) or a circumflex (ⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧ f.135r b.10-11; ⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧ f.135v b.21-22).

Under the guise of redundancy, the examples ⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧ, ⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧ, ⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧ, and ⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧ show the great care exercised by the scribe concerning the separation of words at the end of the line which, in the practice of *scripторia*, 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.

**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.

---

55 The circumflex is situated between ⲧ and ⲧ.
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 diple 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 ⲧ at f.134r a.4-8 has a black and red decorative s-pattern in the letter’s vertical stroke; the ⲧ 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 ⲧ 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 diple lines in the left hand margins of the columns, but the purpose of these diple lines here is obscure. Dividers such as these are usually horizontal and only exceptionally vertical; moreover, dividers consisting exclusively of diple lines are rare.57 Another decorative element in the manuscript includes flourishes extending into the left margin of the first stroke of the letter ⲧ, and the third stroke of ⲧ, and ⲧ.

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

57 Depuydt 1993, p. CII.
58 Cf. p. 391.
59 As already discussed in the introduction on p. 383-384.
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 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{γενική} (f.135v a.21) and \textit{γενική} (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{γενική}, \textit{γενική} (ἡ Ἰνδιχή) and \textit{γενική}, \textit{γενική}, \textit{γενική}, \textit{γενική} (ἡ Ἰνδία)—are both designations for

---

\textsuperscript{60} Wilfong 2001, p. 299.
\textsuperscript{61} Apart from the extant manuscripts and fragments of the 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} Saugé 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 Hélies, et L’Encomium de l’évêque Stéphanos de Hnès sur Saint Hélies*, where it appears three times as ὁλοκόττινος.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: ΠΑΤΡΙΚΙΟΣ *patrikios* (f.133v a.28-b.1; f.157v a.12);80 ΣΩΛΟΚΟΤΤΙΝΟΣ *holokottinos* (f.157v a.14; f.157v b.4, 8-9, 22);81 and ΦΙΛΟΠΟΝΟΣ *philoponos* (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 *patricios* 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. 731 (translation). In the Bohairic and Ifao versions his name is found passim simply as “King Gesanthos.”
75 “The city” τήναξ (ἡ τόπος) is used in P. IFAO Copte inv. f.134r a.10; f.134r 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: ἐκεῖ ἐτερογιούχαι ὡς ἑπρός κυρίους εὐθύνει “he came to life for the salvation of the king and the whole multitude of *Entikê*.”
80 Written *patrikios* and *patricios* in Budge 1915, p. 165 (text), p. 745 (translation); *patrikios* in Budge 1894, p. 75, 76 (text), p. 60* (translation).
81 Rendered *holokottinos* (XI) and *holokottinos* (x5) in Budge 1915, p. 168 (text), 747 (translation); and *λογοκοσι* (X6) in Budge 1894, p. 72, 77 (text), p. 8*, 62* (translation). In both Crum 1939, p. 140b, and Förster 2002, p. 483, 569, *λογοκοσι* is listed as a Coptic equivalent of *διολοκόττινος*. *λογοκοσι* (nn. m.) is attested only in Bohairic (cf. Crum 1939, p. 140b).
82 Written *philoponos* in Budge 1915, p. 174 (text), 753 (translation); *philoponos* in Budge 1894, p. 85 (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. ὁλοκόττινος) 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 “νόμισμα, or νόμισμα”87 and, by a word of Coptic origin ὁλοκόττινος, sometimes described as χρυσοῦ”.88 Roger Bagnall identifies the same names for the *solidus*, but states that ὁλοκόττινος is not originally a Coptic word but a Greek-Latin hybrid.89

The word *Philoponos* (Gk. φιλόπωνος) 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.
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. 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.

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, 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. 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.” 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.
In the margin, perpendicular to the first word in column A, is an annotation: ጗ⲣⲟⲥ ("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 ጗ⲣⲟⲥ here functions as a resumptive pronoun in a relative construction. The missing text preceding ጗ⲣⲟⲥ can be restored from Budge 1894, p. 74 (text), 60* (translation). See also p. 422.

In the Boharic version as ጗ⲥⲉⲣⲁⲥⲋ (Crum 1939, p. 337b).

The proper name ጗ⲣⲟⲥ. for ጗ⲣⲟⲥ. (Crum 1939, p. 537b).

In the longer Sahidic version as ጗ⲥⲉⲣⲁⲥⲋ (Budge 1915, p. 165, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 176).
PL. 1.  P. IFAO Copte inv. 133r. © IFAO, J.-Fr. Gout.
P. IFAO Copte inv. f.133v

\[\text{\textbf{P. IFAO Copte inv. f.133v}}\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{\[\lambda\]σιργεμων} & \quad \text{τρεγγα μιχα} \\
\text{\[\lambda\]οιημων} & \quad \text{ρε οιμ εισωμη} \\
\text{κατασ εταναρ} & \quad \text{χαρελος θοος} \\
\text{\[\rho\]αρχελος κε έτου} & \quad \text{ηαρ · αρχου}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ακ μιχα} & \quad \text{εβολ ηεμων} \\
\text{πε} & \quad \text{ρε οιμ θεα} \\
\text{\[\rho\]ραχελος} & \quad \text{ηαρ ιαρ} \\
\text{\[\rho\]ραχελος} & \quad \text{εις ιε ρθυ}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{αακ μαρου} & \quad \text{εβολ ηετεπ} \\
\text{πε} & \quad \text{εις ιε ιοω}\text{ομ} \\
\text{\[\lambda\]ου ιηευνου} & \quad \text{παρχων} \\
\text{\[\lambda\]ου ιηευνου} & \quad \text{εις ουνη ιοω} \\
\text{πε} & \quad \text{εβολ ηευν ηιμ} \\
\text{\[\rho\]ραχελος} & \quad \text{κατι εις θεανη} \\
\text{\[\rho\]ραχελος} & \quad \text{τι ιεςη ηε} \\
\text{πε} & \quad \text{πεκαταγιον} \\
\text{\[\lambda\]ου τετηλει} & \quad \text{εμ εσωβ ηιμ} \\
\text{\[\lambda\]ου τετηλει} & \quad \text{εμ εσωβ ηιμ} \\
\text{\[\rho\]ραχελος} & \quad \text{ετετηλειιε} \\
\text{\[\rho\]ραχελος} & \quad \text{εκοου . ηε\[i\]} \\
\text{\[\rho\]ραχελος} & \quad \text{\[\alpha\]ηρε γαρ ηφ\[m\]} \\
\text{\[\rho\]ραχελος} & \quad \text{εκοουλακ ε[νοβε]} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[\text{113 Both the Bohairic (Budge 1894, p. 75, 76) and the longer Sahidic version (Budge 1915, p. 166, 167) have εις αλων.}\]
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 [m[ [i] t âi200y
ɔ[ [ht]âi200y
lɔỵ ω[ [e] ɔiakλe

5 pr[w[ [e] c]lαy e
pr[ o 2]w[... ] epe2ṛ
ɔỵ[o][o]n e epoọ y

P ṛ ṛ p ṛ o o [λ][i] 2[hi]pω
10 m[ e chay etoọ to]γ
et[ ± 8 ]γ
m[i] [± 10 ]
t eim[ ± 8 ]
hrɔl[okɔttinoc]

One line is missing here

P ṛ ṛ n[± 3]e[λ][e]ne [hi]2[... ]
[... ]n[ e] ỵ o[ ... ]
i[ ± 4 ]etuto lo e[... ]
oy e]ỵ2ṇṛị p̣e m

5 pṛ ỵ o[ ... ]
tɔỵλa2k iɔ2[λ][i]
hi[ c] e[ ... ]
ỵ [ ... ][ ... ]ne ðe[ ... ]
ỵ Κ[ [e] 2ṇṛị p̣e]
λɔw ṇe[ ... ]

5 ṇt o[ ... ] epoọ y
xοỵ ς t[ ... ]
ep̣ọ ỵ2ṇṛị p̣e
ṇiṛ[ ... ]ne[ ... ]
κ[ ... ]

Πe[ ... ] ỵ n[ ... ] x̣ 6
ε[ ... ]n[ ... ]
mmoọ y e[ ... ] n
[ ... ]

[ ... ]

Πe[ ... ] ỵ n[ ... ] x̣ 6
ω[ ... ][ ... ][ ... ]
[ ... ]

M[ ... ][ ... ]
[ ... ]

[ ... ]

[ ... ]

[ ... ]

[ ... ]

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

The sequence of `ⲟⲩ-ⲟⲩ` (within the bound group) is simplified as `ⲟⲩ`, i.e. `ⲡⲥⲣⲟⲩⲱ` instead of `ⲡⲥⲣⲟⲩⲟⲩⲱ` (3rd pers. pl. precursive (or temporal) conjugation + infinitive: “when they had finished”).
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P. IFAO Capte inv. f.134v

КΑ

τανα μπεχ
τοογ μαμρε
οιμ ερενεγ
οιιι, μηρ επα

5 5

2ογ μμοογ' μονο'
αρεζκολλαριο''
ειιεγμακ2

6γκι αε μμοογ'
ερατι μιπρο
ειαογεμι αεωω
πε αναοογ εεκαω
μμοο χεμμπ'

10 10

γωτε λεγευς
μενειον γεμει
εφωυλ εσιγωβ

2οτε ανε[γ]ογιει
μπισε ογειε
αιιτων πω[2]
ερωτη εκολωα

15 15

ειωκειείκ

ητοτ αυ'θαο μμο
ου ερατου μιιη
το εκολ μιπ[ρο]
μπεζ[μ]οτ [ισει]
κατα[άικος]

10

αυοδ ι[τεγιογ]
εις[παραγελιος]

25

μιξα[η]λ [αικι]
μπεζομ μου

116 τεηνοογ' μονο'

117 ανε[γ]ογιει
μπεζομ μου.

118 An alternative reading could be

αεριτ[αγυ]αλ[της].
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**P. IFAO Copte inv. f.135v**

\[
\text{τῖνος πῖρρο ἤνε} \\
\text{γραμματος ἄγεις} \\
\text{ποὺς ἑηκαθώμ.}
\]

\[
\text{Πῖρρο ἄγε γεσανοος} \\
\text{ἰστερινὴν ἐρῶν} \\
\text{ἀκτισθουν ἀναγε} \\
\text{ρατχ[119] σιὼν ΜΜΟΧ} \\
\text{ἰστερινοος ἄγ} \\
\text{ἐρῶν ΑΥΣΜΟΟΣ ΣΙΟΥ} \\
\text{ΣΟΝ.}
\]

\[
\text{Παρχατελος ἄγε ἁγ} \\
\text{ναῦ ἑνορἱε ὁνὴ} \\
\text{ἐγκαρεταὐο γευκὴν} \\
\text{[m]ΑΛΙΖΕ ΠΕΧΑΙ} \\
\text{[m]Πῖρρο ξῆοὺ πĽ} \\
\text{πὼβ ἶναι ιτεῖθ} \\
\text{ἰς εὐεχμηνατίζε} \\
\text{σιὼν ΜΜΟΧ} \\
\text{ΠΙΤΟΧ ἄγε ΧΤΑΜΟΧ} \\
\text{[ἐτὲ]πὼβ ἰγκά} \\
\text{[ο]ῳ̣νε εὐχαρῦ} \\
\text{[ΜΟΣ ΞΕ...]ΜΕ ΝΗ} \\
\text{[± 8] ΖΗ} \\
\text{[± 7] ΚΗΘ} \\
\text{[± 7] ΣΗΜΟ} \\
\text{[± 3] ἩΓΕΥΩΝ} \\
\text{[± 2 ΠΑ]ΡΑΙΑΛΟΥ ᾽} \\
\text{Two lines are missing here}
\]

\[
\text{ΠΕΧΕ ΜΗΧΗΛΑ} \\
\text{ΝΑΣ ΧΕΞΑΤΗΝ} \\
\text{ΕΡΑΝΙΝΟΜΕ} \\
\text{ΜΟΥ ΖΗΟΥΜΟΥ} \\
\text{ΙΤΕΙΜΗΝ} \\
\text{ΗΣΕΤΜΗΜΕ [2]Π} \\
\text{ΟΥΣΙΡΧ 120 ἘΠΙΝ} \\
\text{ΤΑΧΜΟΟΥΤΡΧ.} \\
\text{ἈΛΕΙΝΗ ΜΙΗΤ} \\
\text{ΜΟΟΥΤ ἘΤΜΙΤΕ} \\
\text{ΙΤΕΙΧΝΟΥΧ} \\
\text{ΑΥΘ ΜΑΧΑΝΩΧ ἘΠΙΝ} \\
\text{ΧΤΑΜΟΧ ἘΠΙΝ} \\
\text{ΤΑΧΜΟΟΥΤΡΧ} \\
\text{ΤΕΝΟΥΘΕ ΕΦΩΝΕ} \\
\text{ΚΟΥΣΑ ΕΙΜΕ} \\
\text{ἘΤΜΕ ΜΑΡΟΥΙΝΕ} \\
\text{ΜΠΕΝΤΑΧΜΟΥ} \\
\text{ἘΠΕΙΜΑ ΦΤΕΙΝ} \\
\text{ΞΗΟΥΘ ΛΥΘ} \\
\text{ΧΙΘΑΜΟΧ ΕΠΙΝ} \\
\text{ΤΑΧΜΟΟΤΕ Μ} \\
\text{ΜΟΧ.}
\]

\[
\text{ΝΤΕΥΝΟΥ ΛΙΡΡΟ} \\
\text{ΓΕΣΑΝΟΟΣ ΚΕΛΕΥΕ} \\
\text{ἈΛΕΙΝΗ ΜΙΗΤ} \\
\text{ΜΟΟΥΤ ἘΤΜΙΤΕ} \\
\text{ΑΥΘ ΠΕΧΕ ΠΑΡ} \\
\text{ΧΑΓΙΕΛΟΣ ΜΙΧΑ}
\]

---

119 See p. 398.  
120 The circumflex is situated between \( \rho \) and \( \chi \).
P. IFAO Copte inv. f.135v

 McMaster University Library

antonia st demiana

121 Half of n is in ekthesis.
122 Ṯⲧⲉⲛⲕⲏ is always written thus in the Bohairic and longer Sahidic version, but appears once as Ṯⲧⲉⲛⲅⲕⲏ and another time as Ṯⲧⲉⲛⲅⲕⲏ in the longer Sahidic version (Budge 1915, p. 172, 173).
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P. IFAO Copt. inv. f.158r

[보도된 내용은 그리스어로 작성되어 있으며, 일부 기호와 생략된 글자가 포함되어 있습니다.]

[84x697]ⲡⲁⲣⲉⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ
[84x653]ⲧⲡⲉ
[84x639]ⲙⲱ
[84x625]ⲉⲃⲟⲗ
[84x625]ⲛ
[84x625]ⲟⲃⲉ
[84x597]ⲅⲁⲣⲓⲅⲁⲣ
[84x597]ⲁⲟ
[84x597]ϭ
[84x583]ⲧⲃⲉ
[84x575]ⲣⲱⲙⲉ
[84x527]ⲫⲏⲁⲣⲟⲩⲁⲅⲅ
[84x387]ⲧⲁⲣⲉⲛⲡⲓⲥⲧⲉ
[84x289]ⲡϩⲏⲧ
[84x289]ⲡⲁⲣⲟⲩⲁⲅ
[84x289]ⲡϫⲓⲥⲉ
[84x265]ⲡⲁⲣⲟⲩⲁⲅ
[84x243]ⲡⲏⲥ
[84x229]ⲧⲏⲣⲥ
[84x215]

123 The circumflex is situated between 
나 and ⲥ.

BIFAO 113 (2013), p. 381-432    Antonia St Demiana
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P. IFAO Copte inv. f.158v

Text in Greek:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>n[ψε] τηρχ α[ψωφ]</td>
<td>n[ψε] τηρχ α[ψωφ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ε[βολ] χεουγ[νου-]</td>
<td>ε[βολ] χεουγ[νου-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ε[ψον] πε[ι worden]</td>
<td>ε[ψον] πε[ι worden]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>τ[ε] [± 9 ]</td>
<td>τ[ε] [± 9 ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ι[ε] [± 10 ]</td>
<td>ι[ε] [± 10 ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two lines are missing here

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>[ν[ψα]λαττίζε μ</td>
<td>[ν[ψα]λαττίζε μ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[με]κροτ υμ</td>
<td>[με]κροτ υμ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>δ[η] ετούαλκ</td>
<td>δ[η] ετούαλκ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[πρό α] με γελαμ[οο]σ</td>
<td>[πρό α] με γελαμ[οο]σ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>το[λι ηρατ] μ</td>
<td>το[λι ηρατ] μ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>π[ρ] [±126]</td>
<td>π[ρ] [±126]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>μο[ε] [με] κερεκ[αμ]</td>
<td>μο[ε] [με] κερεκ[αμ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>οο[ο]ς ρατογ[κω] [μ]</td>
<td>οο[ο]ς ρατογ[κω] [μ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>μο[ο]ς ερ[ψα] [χεουγ[νρ]</td>
<td>μο[ο]ς ερ[ψα] [χεουγ[νρ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Half of ά is in ekthesis.

Half of ο is in ekthesis.

Half of η is in ekthesis.

The circumflex is situated between η and π.
The circumflex is situated between ١ and ٧.

128 The circumflex is situated between ١ and ٧.
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129] With respect to εχολ[πι], see p. 426.

Nε[ς]αὶ ὁμορρὸ

[Ἀγχηθνοογγογ]υ

WithData regarding ωνυγε[η]τ

��[κ]ι

μή]
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Translation

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

As she was saying these (things),\textsuperscript{132} behold a voice came out of heaven\textsuperscript{133} 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][rician]\textsuperscript{134} of King Kesanthos and approached from the distance.\textsuperscript{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.”\textsuperscript{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 I\textsuperscript{137} 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.”\textsuperscript{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 him\textsuperscript{139} cry out saying, ‘In the name of Jesus Christ, let\textsuperscript{140} 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, let\textsuperscript{141} the stolen things of Sêlôm the magistrate appear!”

\textsuperscript{130} The English translation here has been restored from Budge 1894, p. 60*, since the Coptic text of f.133r a.1-6 (ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲥⲛⲡⲉϥⲛⲟϭ Ⲝⲱⲣⲉ ⲥⲛⲡⲉⲧⲏⲩⲧⲛ ⲙⲭⲏⲗⲙ Ⲝϥⲛⲉϩ ⲫⲧⲔⲟⲟⲩ ⲙⲃ) closely parallels the Bohairic text of Budge 1894, p. 74.

\textsuperscript{131} The context of the fragments can be determined from the Bohairic version which corresponds to the beginning of P. IFAO Coppe 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]).

\textsuperscript{132} Όψω τὰς μηταί: “she” here refers to Irene, the mother of the four youths (cf. Budge 1894, p. 75 [text], p. 60* [translation]).

\textsuperscript{133} Μητρούνμενοι έγείρονται: 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.

\textsuperscript{134} For a discussion about πατρίκιος (also found in f.137v a.12) see Composition on p. 354-355.

\textsuperscript{135} ἔγειρον μητρούνμενοι: literally, “he came at a distance…” (Crum 1939, p. 471b).

\textsuperscript{136} Ηημήνταούία: literally, “these disputes.”

\textsuperscript{137} Μήτρονμενός πείχε: 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 μήτρονμενός for μητρούνμενοι (cf. Layton 2004a, p. 260, §336).

\textsuperscript{138} μητρούνμενοι: literally, “matter of this sort.”

\textsuperscript{139} Μητρούνμενοι έγείρονται: main-clause optative (or third future) in which the meaning is greatly affected by the type of discourse (cf. Layton 2004a, p. 264, §351-352), on the conjunctive as an extension of preceding text.

\textsuperscript{140} Μητρούνμενοι: main-clause optative (or third future) in which the meaning is greatly affected by the type of discourse (cf. Layton 2004a, p. 264, §351-352), on the conjunctive as an extension of preceding text.

\textsuperscript{141} Μητρούνμενοι: 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.157v 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.157v 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...
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…[all your] heart, and forsake… 

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

[f.138r b begins] …[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 [f.138v a begins] [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, “Ges[an]thos, whom men call [king, dares] [f.138v b begins] 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…
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 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 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—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, and other servants. And…
Index of Proper Names

γεσαλοος: f.134v a.25; f.135r a.4; f.135r b.25; f.135v a.25; f.158v a.21, 26-27; f.136v b.9-10
κεσαλοος: f.133r b.1
κοσταλιγιος: f.134v b.28-f.135r a.1; f.135v a.7-8, 24-25; f.158v b.3-4; f.136r a.27-28

Index of T oponyms

ειητια: f.136v a.10-11
ειητικα: f.135v a.21
ειφεοος: f.136v b.12; f.136v b.7

Index of Græco-Coptic Loanwords

ἀγαθός λειοος: f.158v b.8-9, 16
ἀγιος λειοος: f.158v a.4
ἀλλά λαλά: f.157v b.12; f.135v b.8
ἀναγνώστης ληγιοοτις: f.136v b.22
ἀντιλογία ληγιοοτις: f.133r a.11
ἀπαιτεῖν λειτεῖ: f.115v b.2
ἀπόστολος λιοκτολος: f.136v a.26-27
ἀρχάγγελος λρχαλελος: f.133r a.2, 14-15, 26;
 f.133v a.3-4, 8; f.133v b.4-5, 11; f.135r a.11;
 f.135r b.28-29; f.135v a.27-28; f.135v b.17-18;
 f.158r a.9, 13
ἀρχεπίσκοπος λρχεπισκοπος: f.136v b.6-7;
 10-11
ἀρχιστρατήγος λρχιστρατυγος:
 f.135r a.29-f.135v b.1
ἀρχισύμμαχος λρχισύμαχος: f.133v a.19
ἀρχον λρχος: f.133r a.25; f.133r b.23;
 f.133v a.26; f.133v b.16
ἀσπάζομαι λαιαζε: f.136v b.15
ἀυτοκράτωρ λχορκρατυρ: f.158v b.2
βαπτίζειν λαιτεζε: f.158v a.16; f.136v a.18
βίος λιοος: f.157r b.6
γὰρ γαρ: f.133v b.27; f.134v a.5; f.158v b.6;
 f.136r b.21
γένος γενος: f.136v a.6-7
δὲ δε: f.133r a.7; f.133r b.13, 15, 26;
 f.157r b.7; f.157v a.9, 18; f.134r a.8, 13,
 17; f.134r b.5, 12, 19, 21, 25; f.134v a.20;
 f.134v b.8; f.135r a.4, 8, 11, 19; f.135v a.9;
 f.158v a.21; f.136v b.24; f.136v b.3, 12
δημόσιον λχωμοιον: f.157v a.7
διαβάλλειν λδιαλλαε: f.157v a.4
διάβολος λδιαβολος: f.157r b.7; f.134r b.25
δίκαιος λδιακος: f.135v b.5; f.158r a.11
δίάκονος λδιακονος: f.136v b.20
εἰ μή τι εἰμι ηει: f.134v a.12
εἰσδολον λειδολον: f.158v b.12-13; λειδολον:
 f.136v a.17
πίστις παρίστη: ε.136r a.10
πλατεία πλατών: ε.134r a.22
πλην πληθ: ε.135v b.19
πνεύμα, πνεύμα: appearing as πνε
ε.157r b.20; ε.158v a.20; ε.156v b.22
πόλεμος πολυμε: ε.134r a.3
πόλεις πολις: ε.134r a.10; ε.134r b.5;
ε.134v a.1-2, 21; ε.136v a.10; ε.136v b.16
πραξία (from Lat. praeda) πραξία:
ε.133r a.24; ε.133r b.22-23; ε.157r a.3-4
πρεσβύτερος πρεσβυτέρος: ε.136v b.19
πρόσεχος πρόσεχος: ε.134r b.4-5
Ῥωμαίος Ῥωμαίος: ε.135r a.2; ε.158v a.9
σάρξ σάρξ: ε.136r b.18
σκεπάζω σκεπάζω: ε.133r a.16-17
σκύλιαν σκύλιαν: ε.136v a.8
σπουδὴ σπουδὴ: ε.136r a.25
στολίζω στολίζω: ε.138v b.23
στρατηγός στρατηγός (or στρατηγός)
αστικός): ε.134v b.27-28
σφαγής σφαγής: ε.136r a.15-16
συμμαθίες συμμαθίες: ε.135r a.13-14, 17
σώμα σώμα: ε.134r b.14
τάφος τάφος: ε.134r b.24
tόλμαν τόλμαν: ε.135v a.26
tότε τότε: ε.134v b.18; ε.136v b.16-17
tόπος τόπος: ε.136r b.13
ὑβρίζειν ὑβρίζει: ε.132r b.24-25;
ε.157v a.19, 27
ὑπομνήματα ὑπομνήματα: ε.157r b.22-23
φιλόγενος φιλόγενος: ε.136v b.26
φόνος φόνος: ε.134v a.9
χαίρετε χαίρετε: ε.158v b.5
χριστιανός χριστιανός: ε.133v b.1
χώρα χώρα: ε.135r a.14
ψάλτης ψάλτης: ε.136v b.24
ψυχή ψυχή: ε.135r a.16
ψῶτε ψῶτε: ε.157v a.6
ψώτε ψῶτε: ε.157r b.4-5
Bibliography

Allen, Hayward 2004

Amélineau 1888

Ashbrook Harvey 1998

Bagnall 1985
R.S. Bagnall, Currency and Inflation in Fourth Century Egypt, BASP Suppl. 5, Atlanta.

Bagnall 1993
R.S. Bagnall, Egypt in Late Antiquity, Princeton.

Brakke 1991
D. Brakke, et. al. (eds.), Homiletica from the Pierpont Morgan Library: Seven Coptic Homilies Attributed to Basil the Great, John Chrysostom, and Euodius of Rome, CSCO 524, Scriptores Coptici 43, Leuven.

Budge 1894
E.A.W. Budge, Saint Michael the Archangel: Three Encomiums, London.

Budge 1914

Budge 1915
E.A.W. Budge, Miscellaneous Coptic Texts, London.

Černý 1976

Crum 1905

Crum 1939

Depuydt 1993

Emmel 2007

Emmel 2008

Förster 2002

Geerard 1979

Graf 1944
G. Graf, Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur, vol. 1, Studi e Testi 118, Vatican City.

Grant 1998

Haas 1997
C. Haas, Alexandria in Late Antiquity: Topography and Social Conflict, Baltimore.

Kasser 1964
R. Kasser, Compléments au Dictionnaire copte de Crum, Cairo.

Kasser 1994

Kazhdan 1991
Kuhn 1966

Kuhn 1978

Lambdin 1983

Layton 1987

Layton 1989

Layton 2004a

Layton 2004b

Leroy 1976

Lewis, Short 1879

Liddell, Scott, Jones 1940

Louis 2008

Louis in press
C. Louis, *Catalogue raisonné des manuscrits littéraires coptes conservés à l’IFAO du Caire.*
Van Esbroeck 1991

Van Ginkel 1995

Von Lemm 1899

Wace, Piercy 1994

Watts 2006
E.J. Watts, *City and School in Late Antique Athens and Alexandria*, Berkley.

West, Johnson 1944

Wilfong 2001

Wipszycka 1991

Wipszycka 2006

Worrell 1938

Wright 1877