

Christian H. Bull\*

# The Coptic Translation of Epiphanius of Salamis's *Ancoratus* and the Origenist Controversy in Upper Egypt

<https://doi.org/10.1515/zac-2022-0020>

**Abstract:** Two manuscripts from around the 9th and the 10th century bear witness to a Coptic translation of the *Ancoratus*, originally written in Greek by Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis, in 374. Like his more famous sequel to this work, the *Panarion*, the treatise defends Nicene orthodoxy from perceived heretics, mainly *Pneumatomachoi*, Arians, Manichaeans, and Origenists. The latter are said to be present in Upper Egypt, where they deny the resurrection of this material body in favor of a spiritual body. The present article argues that the Coptic translation likely took place shortly after the composition of the Greek original, indeed the work was in part commissioned to be used against Origenist monastics in Upper Egypt, thus furnishing a valuable testimony to monastic diversity in the Thebaïd and the lead-up to the Origenist Controversy.

**Keywords:** Epiphanius of Salamis, Origenist Controversy, Coptic Translation, Heresiology, Egyptian Monasticism

In the last quarter of the 4th century of our era, the obdurate bishop Epiphanius of Salamis, on Cyprus, launched a series of attacks on other Christians who were purportedly influenced by the writings of Origen of Alexandria, the famous 3d-century theologian.<sup>1</sup> The most well-known of these attacks, written in 377, is the three-volume *Panarion*, the “Medicine-Chest” containing remedies against eighty contemporary and historical (and fictional) heresies, of which he

---

<sup>1</sup> The standard work is Jon F. Dechow, *Dogma and Mysticism in Early Christianity: Epiphanius of Cyprus and the Legacy of Origen* (Patristic Monograph Series 13; Macon: Mercer University Press, 1988). Two monographs on Epiphanius have recently been published: Young R. Kim, *Epiphanius of Cyprus: Imagining an Orthodox World* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2015); Andrew S. Jacobs, *Epiphanius of Cyprus: A Cultural Biography of Late Antiquity* (Oakland: University of California Press, 2016).

---

**\*Corresponding Author: Christian H. Bull**, University of Bergen, Department of Archaeology, History, Cultural Studies and Religion, Postboks 7805, NO-5020, Vestlandet, Norway; e-mail: Christian.Bull@uib.no.

saw Origenism as one of the most insidious.<sup>2</sup> A few years earlier he had written a more modest work, the *Ancoratus* or “Anchored One,”<sup>3</sup> attacking especially the tenets of the Arians, who denied the full divinity of Christ; the Macedonians or *Pneumatomachoi* (“Fighters against the spirit”), who denied the divinity of the spirit; the Manichaeans, who believed that Christ did not have a material body; and finally certain Origenist ascetics of Upper Egypt, who claimed that the resurrection would not take place “in *this* flesh,” but in some other kind of spiritual flesh. This work was translated into Coptic, a fact that may shed some light on theological tensions within Egyptian monasticism, which contributed to the eruption of the first Origenist controversy in 399. In fact, translations played an important and understudied role in the first Origenist controversy, concerning the theological legacy of Origen of Alexandria in the late 4th and early 5th century.<sup>4</sup> Two of the main belligerents, Rufinus of Aquileia and Jerome, were both avid translators of Greek texts into Latin, to the degree that the latter was later canonized as the patron saint of translators, having translated several books of the Bible into Latin. Jerome had earlier been an admirer of Origen, especially of his textual edition of the Old Testament, the *Hexapla*, which juxtaposed the Hebrew text with one transliteration and four different translations of the text into Greek. Later on, however, he would join Epiphanius and others in seeing the controversial Alexandrian as a heretic.

An episode in the 390s aptly demonstrates the role of translations in the build-up to the Origenist controversy, and will shed some light also on the Coptic translation of the *Ancoratus*, to which we will return. Epiphanius, who was a native of Palestine, had returned to his home country as an old man, “the

---

<sup>2</sup> Translation in Frank Williams, *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis* (2 vols.; NHMS 63/79; 2d ed.; Leiden: Brill, 2009/2013); text in Karl Holl, Marc Bergermann, and Christian-Friedrich Collatz, eds., *Epiphanius 1: Ancoratus und Panarion haer. 1–33 1: Text* (GCS.NF 10/1; 2d ed.; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013); Karl Holl and Jürgen Dummer, eds., *Epiphanius 2: Panarion haer. 34–64* (GCS 31; 2d ed.; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1980); and Karl Holl and Jürgen Dummer, eds., *Epiphanius 3: Panarion haer. 65–80, De fide* (GCS 37; 2d ed.; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009). On Epiphanius as heresiologist, see Aline Pourkier, *L'hérésiologie chez Épiphane de Salamine* (Christianisme Antique 4; Paris: Beauchesne, 1992).

<sup>3</sup> Translation in Young R. Kim, *St. Epiphanius of Cyprus: Ancoratus* (The Fathers of the Church: A New Translation 128; Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 2014); text in Holl, Bergermann, and Collatz, *Epiphanius 1* (see note 2); commentary in Oliver Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre des Epiphanius von Salamis: Ein Kommentar zum “Ancoratus”* (Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte 86; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003).

<sup>4</sup> See Dechow, *Dogma and Mysticism* (see note 1); Elizabeth A. Clark, *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992).

most famous man on the whole earth under the sun,” as Sozomen states, due to his achievements in monastic philosophy and his virtuous way of life.<sup>5</sup> Here he denounced John, the bishop of Jerusalem, as an Origenist, while John in his turn accused Epiphanius of Anthropomorphism.<sup>6</sup> Epiphanius went on to ordain Jerome’s brother as priest, in contravention of John’s authority as bishop, and he tore down a costly tapestry in a church, because he found it to be idolatrous. When John reacted against these actions, Epiphanius wrote a letter in response, defending his actions and further denouncing John. According to Jerome, who at this time resided in the monastery of Paula in Bethlehem, the letter of Epiphanius to John was on everybody’s lips that year: “All of Palestine eagerly snatched away copies of it, either because of the merit of the author or the refinement of the composition.”<sup>7</sup> The letter is now only extant in Jerome’s translation, made the same year,<sup>8</sup> but from what we know from Epiphanius’s other surviving Greek treatises, it is safe to say that his fame must have played a larger part of the letter’s success than his literary style. Obviously, people enjoyed a well-publicized quarrel between famous and influential people as much in Late Antiquity as today. In Jerome’s monastery there was also much interest in the letter, yet not everyone had direct access to it. A certain Eusebius of Cremona was unable to read Greek, and so asked Jerome if he could translate the letter for him, so that he would not

---

5 Sozomen, *Historia ecclesiastica* 6,32,3–4 (SC 495, 420 Festugière/Grillet): ἐπισημότατος ἐπὶ μοναστικῆ φιλosophία γέγονε παρά τε Αἰγυπτίοις καὶ Παλαιστίνιοις, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα καὶ Κυπρίοις, παρ’ οἷς ἠρέθη τῆς μητροπόλεως τῆς νήσου ἐπισκοπεῖν. ὄθεν οἶμαι μᾶλλον κατὰ πᾶσαν ὡς εἰπεῖν τὴν ὑφ’ ἧλιον αἰοιδιμώτατός ἐστιν. See also Jerome, *De viris illustribus* 114 (ed. Claudia Barthold, *Hieronymus: De viris illustribus, Berühmte Männer* [Mülheim/Mosel: Carthusianus, 2011], 250). Jerome elsewhere refers to Epiphanius as πεντάγλωσσος, “learned in five tongues,” namely Greek, Latin, Coptic, Syriac, and Hebrew (*Adversus Rufinum* 3,6 [SC 303, 230,27–28 Lardet]). If this is true he must have learned Latin at a young age, probably destined to go into the imperial administration since this was the most common reason for Eastern Greeks to learn Latin (Alan Cameron, *The Last Pagans of Rome* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011], 641). He probably learned Coptic during his stay in Egypt as a young man, when he forsook his secular career for a monastic one. A sceptical view to Epiphanius’ language-proficiency is expressed by Jürgen Dummer, “Die Sprachkenntnisse des Epiphanius,” in *Die Araber in der Alten Welt* 5,1 (ed. Franz Altheim and Ruth Stiehl; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1968), 392–435.

6 On the incident see Dechow, *Dogma and Mysticism* (see note 1), 397–401.

7 Jerome, *Epistula* 57,2 (CSEL 54, 504,21–22 Hilberg): *Harum exemplaria certatim Palaestinae rapiabantur, vel ob auctoris meritum, vel ob elegantiam scriptionis*. Translations are mine unless otherwise stated.

8 On the chronology, see Megan H. Williams, *The Monk and the Book: Jerome and the Making of Christian Scholarship* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006), 284–288. On Jerome as translator see John N. D. Kelly, *Jerome: His Life, Writing, and Controversies* (London: Duckworth, 1975), 141–152.

miss out on what everyone was talking about. Strikingly, he also asked Jerome to simplify the argument, in effect dumbing the letter down so that he could understand it. Jerome gives us a precious brief glance at a translator in practice: "I did as he wanted, and having sent for an amanuensis I immediately started dictating with great haste, making brief notes on the margins of the pages about the inner meaning that each chapter contained."<sup>9</sup> As most elite authors, Jerome could not be bothered to write himself, but instead dictated to an amanuensis. Epiphanius too dictated the *Ancoratus* to a certain Anatolius.<sup>10</sup> This was also a usual practice for copying texts: one person would read aloud the text to be copied, and a scribe would write it down.<sup>11</sup> The copy would thereupon be collated against the exemplar once again, to check for mistakes. This must be what Jerome was doing when he was annotating chapter headings in the margins, checking the writing of his secretary to correct any scribal errors. The marginal notes containing the inner (*intrinsecus*) meaning of each chapter must have been his way to clarify the essential points of Epiphanius, who is often quite obscure.

If there is an apologetic tone in Jerome's description of his translation, it is because he was in fact accused of having misrepresented the original Greek of Epiphanius. Jerome had become bitter enemies with his former friend Rufinus of Aquileia, and it is clear from his defense that he was accused of being overly liberal in his translation. Indeed, Jerome admits that the goal of his translation was to capture the spirit of Epiphanius's letter, not to translate word for word. Jerome's emphasis that his work was done in haste is a common strategy for him to show how hardworking he is, and perhaps to deflect criticism.<sup>12</sup> Even the conceit of having translated the letter for the private use of a brother at the monastery might be dissimulation, since Jerome in his *Apology against Rufinus* mentions a letter of Epiphanius that he had translated at the request of the author himself, perhaps our letter.<sup>13</sup> If Epiphanius asked for his letter to be translated into Latin, it is also possible that he asked for the *Ancoratus*, which in part deals with Egyptian affairs, to be translated into Coptic, as we shall see it was, with

---

<sup>9</sup> Jerome, *Epistula* 57,2 (505,5–10 H.): *Feci quod voluit; accitoque Notario, raptim celeriterque dictavi: ex latere in pagina breviter adnotans, quem intrinsecus sensum singula capitula continerent. Siquidem et hoc ut sibi soli facerem, oppido flagitarat; postulavique ab eo mutuo, ut domi haberet exemplar: nec facile in vulgus proderet.*

<sup>10</sup> Epiphanius, *Ancoratus* 119,16 (GCS.NF 10/1, 149,26 Holl/Bergermann/Collatz).

<sup>11</sup> See Williams *The Monk and the Book* (see note 8), 43.

<sup>12</sup> Andrew Cain, *The Letters of Jerome: Asceticism, Biblical Exegesis, and the Construction of Christian Authority in Late Antiquity* (Oxford Early Christian Studies; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 174–175.

<sup>13</sup> Jerome, *Adversus Rufinum* 3,33 (302,22–23 L.): *antequam nos ei in suggillationem tui epistulas dictaremus.*

some probability shortly after it had been composed. As for the criticism against Jerome as a translator, we find it in Rufinus's preface to his Latin translation of Origen's *On first principles*. Rufinus had been accused of cleaning up Origen's work for it to be in line with Nicene orthodoxy, which he admits to, since he claims that the original has been corrupted by heretics and needs emendation. He furthermore states that he is merely following the example of Jerome, who so elegantly translated homilies and commentaries of Origen before he abandoned his task as translator to become an author instead.<sup>14</sup> The sarcastic reference to Jerome's eloquence likely implies a lack of fidelity to the original. Clearly, translations and polemics against translations played a significant part in the theological and personal controversies surrounding the legacy of Origen.<sup>15</sup>

## 1 The Composition of the *Ancoratus* and its Relation to Egypt

In 374, roughly twenty years before Epiphanius wrote his letter to John, he had composed the treatise defending Nicene orthodoxy called the *Ancoratus*. Epiphanius was prompted to write the work at the request of some presbyters and monks from Syedra in Pamphilia who were especially worried about the heresy of the *Pneumatomachoi*. In their letters soliciting his aid, which are appended in front of the treatise itself, the presbyters invoke the memory of Athanasius of Alexandria, who had died only the year before. His writings, they say, had counteracted doctrinal errors earlier, but since there are some who still persist in heterodoxy they now come to Epiphanius for authoritative statements on the correct faith.<sup>16</sup> The implication is clearly that Epiphanius has inherited the mantle of Athanasius as the defender of Nicene Trinitarianism. In his prefatory response to the letters, Epiphanius, with great protestations of humility common for the time, agrees to write regarding not only the Spirit, but also the Father and Son, as well as the resurrection of the dead and the incarnation of Christ.<sup>17</sup> Importantly for our concern, he also refers to "our son Hypatius too who came to me from the

---

<sup>14</sup> Origen, *De principiis, Praefatio Rufini* (OECT, 4–9 Behr).

<sup>15</sup> On Jerome and Rufinus, see Henry Chadwick, "Jerome and Rufinus: Controversy About Origen," in idem, *The Church in Ancient Society: From Galilee to Gregory the Great* (Oxford History of the Christian Church; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 433–445.

<sup>16</sup> Epiphanius, *Ancoratus, Prooemium* 3–4 (2,18–3,1 H./B./C.).

<sup>17</sup> Epiphanius, *Ancoratus* 1,2–3 (6,2–18 H./B./C.).

country of the Egyptians because of the same thing.”<sup>18</sup> Since he calls Hypatius his son, it is clear that he is of inferior rank; Epiphanius calls the Pamphylian presbyters brothers, while he calls the monks sons.<sup>19</sup> Since a part of the *Ancoratus* is devoted to problems concerning heterodox ascetics in Upper Egypt, as we shall see, it is likely that Hypatius was a monk from this area, sent to report the affair to Epiphanius.<sup>20</sup> That Epiphanius was also venerated in Egypt as a staunch Athanasian is clear from a letter written just a few years after the composition of the *Ancoratus*, sent by Egyptian bishops exiled to Diocaesarea under Valens to the monks of Nitria, against Apollinaris who they say “accused the venerable archbishop of Cyprus, Epiphanius, who is orthodox and was always in communion with our most blessed *papa* Athanasius.”<sup>21</sup>

Athanasius had spent much of his career trying to put the monasteries of Egypt firmly under the control of the patriarchate of Alexandria,<sup>22</sup> yet with his death there had been turbulence. Peter II was his elected successor, but was swiftly deposed and replaced by the Homoean Lucius, with the connivance of

**18** Epiphanius, *Ancoratus* 1,3 (6,8–10 H./B./C.): καὶ Ὑπατίου τοῦ τέκνου ἡμῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Αἰγυπτίων χώρας πρὸς με διὰ τοῦτο αὐτὸ ἥκοντος.

**19** Epiphanius, *Ancoratus*, proem (5,8–10 H./B./C.).

**20** A certain deacon named Hypatius assisted in the writing of the *Panarion* (*De fide* 25,4 [GCS 37, 526,7 Holl/Dummer]), though there is no reason to believe these two Hypatii are the same person.

**21** Facundus of Hermiane, *Pro Defensione Trium Capitulum* 4,2,49 (SC 478, 172,429–431 Fraïsse-Bétoulières): *accusavit venerabilem archiepiscopum Cypri Epiphanium orthodoxum et communicantem semper beatissimo papae nostro Athanasio*. The meddling of Epiphanius in Egyptian affairs is also attested in a letter attested in a Medieval codex of miscellanies addressed to the Egyptians among other recipients. See Karl Holl, “Ein Bruchstück aus einem bisher unbekanntem Brief des Epiphanius,” in *Festgabe für Adolf Jülicher zum 70. Geburtstag, 26. Januar 1927* (ed. Rudolf Bultmann and Hans von Soden; Tübingen: Mohr, 1927), 159–189 (Greek text pp. 160–164). Holl is of the opinion that this letter was censured by Athanasius in a letter preserved in the *Chronikon Paschale* (ed. Ludwig Dindorf, *Chronicon Paschale* [Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae; Bonn, 1832], 9,7–20; Greek text also in Holl, “Bruchstück,” 187 [note 1]). This identification was disputed recently by David Brakke, “Athanasius’ *Epistula ad Epiphanium* and Liturgical Reform in Alexandria,” *Studia Patristica* 36 (2001): 482–488. Brakke proposes instead that the recipient was the Egyptian bishop Epiphanius of Skheddia, an underling of Athanasius, which would explain the brusque language used. One might add to Brakke’s argument that Athanasius criticizes Epiphanius’s casting blame, but the letter of Epiphanius is uncharacteristically irenic; even Origen is mentioned neutrally. Another letter of Epiphanius attested in a Syriac florilegium is also addressed to Egyptian clerics on the subject of a heretic named Dorotheus; see Joseph Lebon, “Sur quelques fragments de lettres attribuées à saint Épiphane de Salamme,” in *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati* 1 (Studi e Testi 121–126; Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1946), 145–174. Lebon argues that Dorotheus was an Apollinarian.

**22** See David Brakke, *Athanasius and the Politics of Asceticism* (Oxford Early Christian Studies; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995).

Emperor Valens and the bishop of Antioch, Euzoïus.<sup>23</sup> Peter fled to Rome, where he stayed until Valens left Antioch in April 378, mere months before he died in the disastrous battle of Adrianople. This means that at the time when Hypatius came to Epiphanius, the head of the Egyptian church was a Homoean, who according to the church historians violently persecuted Nicene church- and monastic leaders. Meanwhile the Nicene bishop Peter wrote a letter to other Egyptian bishops and priests in exile, in which he says the disciple of Apollinaris, Timothy of Beirut, attempted to have him wrongfully anathematize Epiphanius, whom he considered to be one of “the strongest champions of truth.”<sup>24</sup> This is the historical backdrop to Hypatius’s visit to Salamis, though one would not know it from reading the *Ancoratus*, where there is no reference to the hostile bishop of Alexandria or the exiled Peter. No doubt Epiphanius purposefully avoided mentioning the politically sensitive issue of the Homoean bishop, who had the Emperor’s support. Although the “Arian” heresy is criticized throughout, there is no mention of the Emperors having any affiliation with it. Perhaps encouraged by the success of the *Ancoratus*, or the increasing unpopularity of Lucius, Epiphanius did denounce Lucius and the violent persecutions enacted by him and his fellow “Ariomaniacs” in the *Panarion*.<sup>25</sup> Jerome makes a point of the fact that Epiphanius was not persecuted by Valens while he was bishop of Cyprus, claiming that the Emperor left him alone since he feared that persecuting such a venerated figure would lead to his own disgrace.<sup>26</sup> In fact, Epiphanius in the *Panarion* refers to Valens as “the pious and most devout Emperor, beloved by God,”<sup>27</sup> which hardly suggests he took a heroic stand, though he admits that wicked Arians had corrupted the Emperor’s ear and seduced him to undertake the current persecutions.

Epiphanius indicates that he is writing for an Egyptian audience in the *Ancoratus* when he turns from dealing with the trinity, in the first part of the treatise, to the resurrection of the flesh. This resurrection is denied, he says, “by certain ascetics in Egypt, both of the Thebaïd and other regions elsewhere, who think the same as the Hieracites and say that the resurrection of our flesh is not of *this*

23 E. g., Socrates Scholasticus, *Historia ecclesiastica* 21–22; 37 (GCS.NF 1, 248,8–249,9; 271,29–272,6 Hansen); Theodoret, *Historia ecclesiastica* 4,17–19 (GCS.NF 5, 12,18–13,4 Hansen).

24 Facundus of Hermiane, *Pro Defensione Trium Capitulorum* 4,2,15–16 (150,141 F.-B.): *propugnatores fortissimi ueritatis*. The characterization is not a direct quote from the letter of Peter, but added by Facundus, possibly paraphrasing sections of the letter he did not quote. On the persecution in Egypt, see Noel Lenski, *Failure of Empire: Valens and the Roman State in the Fourth Century a. d.* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 255–257.

25 Epiphanius, *Panarion* 68,11,5–7 (GCS 37, 151,25–152,8 Holl/Dummer).

26 Jerome, *Adversus Joannem Hierosolymitanum* 1,4 (PL 23:374).

27 Epiphanius, *Panarion* 69,13,1 (163,10–11 H./D.): Οὐάλεντος τοῦ θεοσεβῶς βασιλέως καὶ εὐλαβεστάτου καὶ θεοφιλοῦς.

flesh, but another one instead of it.”<sup>28</sup> This statement launches a lengthy section where Epiphanius tries to prove that it is in fact this earthly flesh that will be resurrected, not another spiritual one. Presumably these ascetics worried the Egyptian monks represented by Hypatius, and unlike bishop Lucius they could be attacked without fear of political reprisals. The Hieracites were followers of Hieracas of Leontopolis, an ascetic foe of Athanasius dead by the time the *Ancoratus* was written.<sup>29</sup> The legendary *Life of Epiphanius* narrates a dramatic encounter between Epiphanius and Hieracas when the former was a monk in Egypt in his youth, wherein the two debate the resurrection of the flesh and Hieracas finally repents of his wicked teachings.<sup>30</sup> Though this is surely a fanciful tale, it is likely based on the chapter on the Hieracites in *Panarion* 67,<sup>31</sup> in which the grudging approval of Hieracas’s ascetic discipline may imply that Epiphanius had first-hand knowledge of the teacher. If so, he must have met him as a young man in Egypt, perhaps in the 330s.<sup>32</sup> In the *Panarion*, Epiphanius expressly places Hieracas in the tradition of Origen and claims that he wrote treatises on scriptural sub-

**28** Epiphanius, *Ancoratus* 82,3 (102,31–103,4 H./B./C.): παρά τισι τῶν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ἀσκητῶν καὶ Θεβαΐδος καὶ ἄλλων ἄλλοθι κλιμάτων, τὰ ὅμοια τοῖς Ἱερακίταις φρονούντων καὶ λεγόντων ἀνάστασιν μὲν τῆς ἡμετέρας σαρκός, οὐ ταύτης δέ, ἀλλ’ ἄλλης τινὸς ἀντ’ αὐτῆς.

**29** Brakke, *Athanasius* (see note 22), 44–57; James E. Goehring, chapter “Hieracas of Leontopolis” in *Ascetics, Society and the Desert: Studies in Early Egyptian Monasticism* (Studies in Antiquity and Christianity; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1999), 110–133; Kim, *Epiphanius* (see note 1), 28–31. Epiphanius, *Panarion* 67,3,7–9 (136,8–18 H./D.) says he died in old age, past the age of ninety. Hieracas is denounced for his excessive zeal for virginity and against marriage by Athanasius in his first *Epistula ad virgines* 22–29 (CSCO 150, 83,13–87,31 Lefort), only preserved in Coptic, and in Pseudo-Athanasius, *Sermo contra omnes haereses* 9 (PG 28:516–517), which Wolfgang W. Klein, *Die Argumentation in den griechisch-christlichen Antimanichaica* (Studies in Oriental Religions 19; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1991), 33–34, dates to the 360s and places in Alexandria; see also Uta Heil, “Athanasius, Apollinarius und der pseudathanasianische *Sermo contra omnes haereses*,” in *Apollinarius und seine Folgen* (ed. Silke-Petra Bergjan, Benjamin Gleede, and Martin Heimgartner; STAC 93; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 143–166.

**30** *Vita Epiphani* 27 (PG 41:57B–60A). On this text see Claudia Rapp, “Epiphanius of Salamis: The Church Father as Saint,” in *“The Sweet Land of Cyprus”: Papers Given at the Twenty-Fifth Jubilee Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Birmingham, March 1991* (ed. Anthony A. M. Bryer and Georgios S. Georghallides; Nicosia: Cyprus Research Centre, 1993). A Coptic translation also exists, see Francesco Rossi, “Un nuovo codice copto del Museo Egizio di Torino,” *Atti Accademia dei Lincei* 5 (1893): 3–136. I am in the course of preparing a new edition of the Coptic text together with Alexandros Tsakos.

**31** Epiphanius, *Panarion* 67 (132,12–140,16 H./D.).

**32** Brakke, *Athanasius* (see note 22), 45, accepts the basic historicity of the encounter as described in the *Life* and places it in 335, though admitting parts must be fabrication. On Epiphanius’ youth in Egypt, see Dechow, *Dogma and Mysticism* (see note 1), 32–36; Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre* (see note 3), 20–29; Pourkier, *L’hérésiologie* (see note 2), 30–34; Kim, *Epiphanius* (see note 1), 17–43.



jects and psalms in both Greek and Coptic<sup>33</sup>—making him possibly the earliest named Coptic author<sup>34</sup>—and that he gained many ascetic adherents.<sup>35</sup> By 374, his influence and possibly his texts in Coptic and Greek had reached the Thebaïd, if we are to believe Epiphanius who accused ascetics there of being influenced by this foe of Athanasius.<sup>36</sup> A few years later, when Epiphanius wrote the *Panarion*, Egyptian Origenism was still on his mind:

the heresy that sprung from him [Origen] was at first in the country of the Egyptians, but is now present among even the most prominent, who think they have taken upon themselves the monastic way of life, among those who withdraw by natural inclination into the desert and have chosen poverty.<sup>37</sup>

That they only “think they” or “seem to” (δοκοῦσι) have undertaken the monastic life, shows that Epiphanius thinks they are pseudo-monks, but there is no reason to assume that they did not see themselves as inheritors of the monasticism of Antony or Pachomius, or that they constituted a sect instead of being part of regular churches or monasteries, even if they had ideas that did not square with orthodoxy as Epiphanius conceived of it.

---

**33** Epiphanius, *Panarion* 67,3,7 (136,8–12 H./D.).

**34** Tito Orlandi, “Coptic Literature,” in *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity* (ed. Birger Pearson and James E. Goehring; Studies in Antiquity and Christianity; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), (51–81) 60. If Antony’s letters are authentic, and originally written in Coptic, as argued by Samuel Rubenson, *The Letters of Antony: Monasticism and the Making of a Saint* (Studies in Antiquity and Christianity; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), he possibly predated Hieracas.

**35** Epiphanius, *Panarion* 67,1,6 (133,19–20 H./D.): αὐτίκα πολλοὶ τῶν ἀσκητῶν τῶν Αἰγυπτίων αὐτῷ συναπήχθησαν.

**36** On the monastic opponents of Origen called Anthropomorphites, a label also used against Epiphanius (Jerome, *Adversus Rufinum* 3,23 [274,10–276,1 L.]), see Dimitrij Bumazhnov, *Der Mensch als Gottes Bild im christlichen Ägypten: Studien zu Gen 1,26 in zwei koptischen Quellen des 4.–5. Jahrhunderts* (STAC 34; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006).

**37** Epiphanius, *Panarion* 64,4,1 (409,19–410,1 H./D.): Ἡ δὲ ἐξ αὐτοῦ φύσα αἴρεσις πρῶτον μὲν ἐν τῇ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων χώρα ὑπάρχουσα, τὰ νῦν δὲ παρ’ αὐτοῖς τοῖς ἐξοχωτάτοις καὶ δοκοῦσι τὸν μονήρη βίον ἀναδεδέχθαι <εὐρίσκεται>, παρὰ τοῖς φύσει κατὰ τὰς ἐρημίας ἀναχωροῦσι τε καὶ τὴν ἀκτιμοσύνην ἐλομένοις; Williams, *The Panarion* 2 (see note 2), 137, translates: “The sect which sprang from him was located in Egypt first, but < it is > now < to be found > among the very persons who are the most eminent and appear to have adopted the monastic life, among those who have really retired to the deserts and elected voluntary poverty.” Instead of emending εὐρίσκεται I assume an implicit ἔστι post αἴρεσις (my thanks to Alexandros Tsakos for help with this sentence). The prominent monks likely correspond to “intellectual” Origenist monks, such as the “perfect” among the Pachomians, who could have been the readers of the Nag Hammadi texts according to Jon F. Dechow, “The Nag Hammadi Milieu: An Assessment in the Light of the Origenist Controversies (with Appendix 2015),” in *The Nag Hammadi Codices and Late Antique Egypt* (ed. Hugo Lundhaug and Lance Jenott; STAC 110; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018), 11–52.

## 2 The Coptic Translation of the *Ancoratus*

With these considerations of the Egyptian situation in mind, we can now turn to the Coptic translation of the *Ancoratus* (CPC [= *Clavis Patrum Copticorum*] 0140), which will occupy the remainder of this article.<sup>38</sup> The Coptic text exists in two fragmentary exemplars today. The first and by far the most extensive is a circa 10th century parchment codex deriving from the White Monastery of Shenoute, near Sohag in Upper Egypt. The codex is part of the subgroup that was produced by the Touton scriptorium in the Fayum,<sup>39</sup> and it originally contained the full *Ancoratus* followed by Epiphanius's treatise *On the 12 Stones* on the breastplate of the Israelite high priest.<sup>40</sup> The codex was produced by two scribes, of whom one copied nearly all of the *Ancoratus*, while the second copied the end of the *Ancoratus* and all of *On the 12 Stones* (CPC [= *Clavis Patrum Copticorum*] 0142).<sup>41</sup> Like the

---

**38** I am currently in the process of preparing an edition of this text, of which parts have been published separately, so the following comments should be considered as prolegomena. See Johannes Leipoldt, "Epiphanius' von Salamis 'Ancoratus' in sahidischer Übersetzung," *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der königlich sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse* 54 (1902): 136–171; Alla I. Elanskaya, "A Fragment of 'Ancoratus' in Coptic (the Ms. I.1.b.668 of the Pushkin Museum of Fine Art)," *Bulletin de la Société d'Archéologie Copte* 28 (1986–1989): 5–10. Additional *folia* have been published without identification, for which see Enzo Lucchesi, "Un corpus épiphaniien en copte," *Analecta Bollandiana* 99 (1981): 95–100; Alberto Camplani, "Epifanio (Ancoratus) e Gregorio di Nazianzo in copto: identificazioni e status quaestionis," *Augusteum* 35 (1995): 327–347; Alin Suciu, "The Borgian Coptic Manuscripts in Naples: Supplementary Identifications to a Recently Published Catalogue," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 77 (2011): (299–325) 316–317. I am most thankful to Alin Suciu for additional identifications, and for providing me with photos of the *folia*, without which I could not have undertaken this work.

**39** See Chiè Nakano, "Indices d'une chronologie relative des manuscrits coptes copiés à Toutôn (Fayoum)," *Journal of Coptic Studies* 8 (2006): 147–159.

**40** On the latter text, see Robert P. Blake and Henri De Vis, *Epiphanius, De gemmis* (London: Christophers, 1934), which contains the full Georgian text and the partial Coptic. Recently the Armenian translation has been published by Felix Albrecht and Arthur Manukyan, *Epiphanius von Salamis, Über die zwölf Steine im hohepriesterlichen Brustschild (De duodecim gemmis rationalis): Nach dem Codex Vaticanus Borgianus Armenus 31* (Gorgias Eastern Christian Studies 37; Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2014). Note that the authors incorrectly state that our Coptic codex contained "the whole *Corpus Epiphaniianum*" [sic!] (xv [note 40]), referring to Lucchesi, "Un corpus épiphaniien" (see note 38), 98, who however only states that "Il semble donc avoir aussi existé en copte un véritable corpus épiphaniien."

**41** Lucchesi, "Un corpus épiphaniien" (see note 38), thinks we are dealing with two separate codices, with different scribes but the same contents, now labelled MONB.CE and MONB.HA in Tito Orlandi's *Corpus dei Manoscritti Copti Letterari* ([www.cmcl.it](http://www.cmcl.it); last access 27 August 2022). All of *De XII gemmis* are in MONB.CE, but only two *folia* of the *Ancoratus* paginated 241–242 and 245–246. These are the last two extant *folia* of the *Ancoratus* before the *De XII gemmis*, which

rest of the once extensive library of the White Monastery, our codex was divided and sold to several different collections, so that the part of the manuscript containing the *Ancoratus* is now located in Paris (12 *folia*), London (2), Naples (2), Oxford (1), Cambridge (1), St. Petersburg (1), New York (1), and Cairo (1).<sup>42</sup>

The second exemplar we have is far more fragmentary. It was written on papyrus, the scraps of which are today kept in Vienna.<sup>43</sup> Very little work has been done on this manuscript, and I have not myself yet seen it. It has been dated on paleographical grounds to the 9th century, though this appears somewhat late for a papyrus codex, seeing that the parchment codex had largely—but not completely—replaced papyrus by the 6th century.<sup>44</sup>

It should be mentioned that we also have an Arabic version based on the Coptic, and an Ethiopic based on the Arabic.<sup>45</sup> If these versions correspond closely to the Coptic they could tell us more about the Coptic translation, even the parts for which we do not have any Coptic manuscript evidence.

Preliminary research by Alberto Camplani indicates that both our Coptic copies derive from the same original translation from Greek,<sup>46</sup> which was written in standard Sahidic. This means that the archetype in principle may have been translated any time between the composition of the Greek original, in 374, and the 9th century. This complicates our ability to say anything about the context of our translation. However, there are multiple factors that make an early translation likely. First, there is the fact that after the council of Chalcedon in 451, the Coptic Non-Chalcedonian church gradually lost access to the Greek patrological tradition, and Tito Orlandi has observed that “the texts found in the later manuscripts

---

must have started on page 247 or 248, now lost. If there were two distinct manuscripts, we should have had some pages from MONB.CE before page 220 (the last page we have of MONB.HA), or from MONB.HA after 241. Since we do not, it is most likely that two scribes collaborated on one single codex, a common enough phenomenon. Elanskaya, “A Fragment” (see note 38), sees this possibility but still suggests there were two manuscripts.

**42** For fuller descriptions of the manuscript, see Leipoldt, “Epiphanius” (see note 38), 136–138, and Blake and De Vis, *Epiphanius* (see note 40), xxxiv–xxxvi. On the library, see Tito Orlandi, “The Library of the Monastery of Saint Shenute at Atripe,” in *Perspectives on Panopolis: An Egyptian Town from Alexander the Great to the Arab Conquest* (ed. Arno Egberts, Brian P. Muhs, and Joep van der Vliet; Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava 31; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 211–231.

**43** Iain Gardner, *Coptic Theological Papyri II: Edition, Commentary, Translation* (Vienna: Hollinek, 1988), 1–41; Camplani, “Epifanio” (see note 38).

**44** Christian Askeland, “The Coptic Versions of the New Testament,” in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis* (ed. Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes; 2d ed.; Leiden: Brill, 2012), (201–229) 210.

**45** Delio V. Proverbio, “Introduzione alle versioni orientali dell’*Ancoratus* di Epifanio: la recensione etiopica,” *Miscellanea Marciana* 12 (1997): 67–91.

**46** Camplani, “Epifanio” (see note 38), 341.

generally follow the 'normal' patristic production patterns. Thus, their translation was probably executed as part of this 'normal' production in the fourth and fifth centuries."<sup>47</sup> The Copts then instead started composing their own works with pseudepigraphic attributions to earlier fathers of the church.<sup>48</sup> Thus, for example, there is a rich literature by Pseudo-John Chrysostom.<sup>49</sup> It is in other words less likely that the *Ancoratus* would have been translated after the 5th century, especially since much of it is devoted to distinguishing the human and divine natures of Christ, parts of which might have been problematic for Miaphysite Copts after Chalcedon.<sup>50</sup>

A possible *terminus ante quem* for the Coptic translation might be furnished by the Coptic *Homily on the Virgin Mary* (CPC [= *Clavis Patrum Coptiorum*] 0119) by Pseudo-Cyril of Jerusalem, composed in the first half of the 6th century,<sup>51</sup> in which Cyril debates the heretic monk Annarikos, who follows the *Gospel of the Hebrews* in claiming that Mary was a divine power called Micha sent down to earth: "How many heresies came into being, which (ms G: Apa; ms C: the blessed) Epiphanius spoke about in his *Ancoratus* (ms G: πεφευαγγεροδος / ms C: πεφανκερατος / ms F: πεφελνγερατος), with a different error for each one of them,

---

47 Orlandi, "Coptic Literature" (see note 34), 58.

48 So Leipoldt, "Epiphanius" (see note 38), 164 (note 1), who makes 451 the *terminus ad quem*. See further Tito Orlandi, "Patristica copta e patristica greca," *Vetera Christianorum* 10 (1973): 327–341; idem, "La documentation patristique copte: bilan et prospectives," in *La documentation patristique: bilan et prospectives* (ed. Jean-Claude Fredouille and René-Michel Roberge; Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval, 1995), 127–148; idem, "Patristic Texts in Coptic," in *Patrology: The Eastern Fathers from the Council of Chalcedon (451) to John of Damascus († 750)* (ed. Angelo di Berardino, trans. Adrian Walford; Cambridge: James Clarke, 2006), (491–570) 546–554. It should be pointed out that the *Ancoratus* is somewhat anomalous also for genuine patristic translations, which mostly consists of shorter homilies rather than lengthy theological treatises. For more overviews on Coptic literature, see Orlandi, "Coptic Literature" (see note 34); idem, "Egyptian Monasticism and the Beginnings of Coptic Literature," in *Carl-Schmidt-Kolloquium an der Martin Luther Universität 1988* (ed. Peter Nagel; Wissenschaftliche Beiträge/Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg K9; Halle: Martin Luther Universität, 1990), 129–142; idem, "Literature, Coptic," *The Coptic Encyclopedia* (New York: Maxwell Macmillan, 1991): 1450b–1460a.

49 Orlandi, "Patristic Texts" (see note 48), 550–551.

50 See Dechow, *Dogma and Mysticism* (see note 1), 218–219, who points to *Ancoratus* 118,9–12 (146,22–23 H./B./C.) and 119,3–12 (148,4–149,11 H./B./C.) as problematic for Monophysite Copts. I am aware of the problems with the terms Monophysite and Miaphysite, and admittedly the text was still read by Non-Chalcedonians since the Coptic translation was after all being copied until the 10th century.

51 Roelof van den Broek, *Pseudo-Cyril of Jerusalem: On the Life and Passion of Christ: A Coptic Apocryphon* (VCS 118; Leiden: Brill, 2013), 93–97. I thank Alin Suciu for the reference to Pseudo-Cyril.

yet yours is worse than all of them.”<sup>52</sup> The reference to the *Ancoratus* clinches Cyril’s rebuttal of Annarikos, who duly repents of his errors, a scene demonstrating that by the time the homily was composed, the *Ancoratus* was established as a useful instrument against heresies in Upper Egypt. Epiphanius himself had pseudepigraphic homilies written in his name, such as a homily *On the Virgin Mary*, close in time to the homily of Pseudo-Cyril, which also combats the idea that the virgin Mary was a heavenly power, an idea attributed to schismatics.<sup>53</sup> Both homilies may take their inspiration from the *Ancoratus* chapter 51, in which Epiphanius refutes an anonymous heretic who seems to be of the opinion that the Virgin is uncreated, and thus a heavenly power like her son, since created beings cannot be worshipped.

The homilies demonstrate that the *Ancoratus* and Epiphanius were known in Coptophone literature as effective against heresies in the first half of the 6th century, but there are additional considerations which would make a very early translation likely. Shenoute of Atripe in his diatribe against Origenists, *I am Amazed*, refers to the bishop of Salamis simply as “the man of God”: “Truly the man of God scolded the stupidity of those who despise the body, saying: ‘The shadow of Peter healed multitudes.’”<sup>54</sup> Again Epiphanius is invoked against

---

52 Pseudo-Cyril, *In Mariam virginem* 31. The text is extant in five Coptic manuscripts, compared by Chiemi Nakano, “Fragments d’une homélie copte sur la vierge Marie attribuée à Cyrille de Jérusalem [CPG 3603] (Le Caire, IFAO Copte 159–160, 302–304),” *Journal of Coptic Studies* 14 (2012): 1–26. Two mss are fragmentary and lack the pages containing our passage. I follow ms F (MICH.BH; Pierpont Morgan Library M 597): ⲁⲟϥⲏⲣ ⲛⲉⲣⲉⲣⲉⲥ ⲩⲱⲡⲉ: ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲧⲁⲉⲡⲓⲫⲁⲛⲓⲟⲥ ⲩⲱⲗⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲟϥ ⲉⲛ ⲡⲉⲫⲁⲛⲉⲣⲁⲧⲟⲥ: ⲉⲟϥⲉⲧ ⲧⲉⲡⲓⲗⲁⲛⲏ ⲛⲧⲟϥⲉⲓ ⲧⲟϥⲉⲓ ⲛⲙⲟϥ ⲧⲟⲕ ⲗⲉ ⲉⲥⲣⲟⲟϥ ⲉⲣⲟⲟϥ ⲧⲏⲣⲟϥ. Coptic text in Stefan Bombeck, “Pseudo Kyrillos In Mariam Virginem: Text und Übersetzung von Pierpont Morgan M597 fols. 46–74,” *Orientalia* 70 (2001): (40–88) 53. Coptic text of G (MERC.AB; British Library Or 6784) in Ernest A. Wallis Budge, *Miscellaneous Coptic Texts in the Dialect of Upper Egypt* (London: Longmans, 1915), 61, fol. 13b: ⲁ[ⲓ] † [sic] ⲉⲁⲣ ⲛⲉⲣⲉⲣⲉⲥⲓ ⲩⲱⲡⲉ: ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲧⲁ ⲁⲡⲁ ⲉⲡⲓⲫⲁⲛⲓⲟⲥ ⲩⲱⲗⲉ ⲉⲁ ⲣⲟⲟϥ: ⲉⲛ ⲡⲉⲫⲉϥⲁⲗⲉⲣⲟⲗⲟⲥ: ⲟϥⲉⲧ ⲧⲉⲡⲓⲗⲁⲛⲏ ⲛⲧⲟϥⲉⲓ ⲧⲟϥⲉⲓ ⲛⲙⲟϥ ⲧⲟⲕ ⲣⲁⲣⲁ ⲧⲟⲟϥ ⲧⲏⲣⲟϥ. Coptic text of C (MICH.BP; Pierpont Morgan Library M 583) in Antonella Campagnano, *Ps. Cirillo di Gerusalemme: omelie copte sulla Passione, sulla Croce e sulla Vergine* (Testi e Documenti per lo Studio dell’Antichità 65; Milan: Cisalpino-Goliardica, 1980), 174,7–10: ⲁⲧⲁⲛⲟϥ [sic] ⲉⲁⲣ ⲛⲉⲣⲉⲣⲉⲥ ⲩⲱⲡⲉ, ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲧⲁ ⲡⲓⲁⲕⲁⲣⲓⲟⲥ ⲉⲡⲓⲫⲁⲛⲓⲟⲥ ⲩⲱⲗⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲟϥ ⲉⲛ ⲡⲉⲫⲁⲛⲉⲣⲁⲧⲟⲥ ⲉⲫⲧⲁϥⲟ ⲛⲧⲉⲡⲓⲗⲁⲛⲏ ⲛⲧⲟϥⲉⲓ ⲧⲟϥⲉⲓ ⲛⲙⲟϥ. ⲛⲧⲟⲕ ⲗⲉ ⲕⲣⲟⲟϥ ⲣⲁⲣⲁ ⲣⲟⲟϥ ⲧⲏⲣⲟϥ. *Pace* Budge (see above), the final part of the sentence is not a quote from the *Ancoratus*.

53 Budge, *Miscellaneous* (see note 52), 122, fol. 12a.2; van den Broek, *Pseudo-Cyril* (see note 51), 97.

54 Shenoute, *I am Amazed* (= HB 32.ii,24–33.i,3): ⲁⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲟⲛ ⲙⲡⲛⲟϥⲧⲉ ⲉⲛ ⲟϥⲛⲉ ⲫⲓⲡⲉ ⲧⲏⲛⲧⲁⲟⲛⲧ ⲛⲏⲉⲧⲱⲥⲟϥ ⲙⲡⲥⲱⲙⲁ ⲉϥϥⲱⲟ ⲛⲓⲙⲟⲥ ⲕⲉ ⲟⲗⲓⲱⲉⲥ ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲣⲟⲥ ⲁⲥⲧⲁⲗⲟⲉ ⲉⲛⲙⲏⲏⲟϥ: (ii refers to the right, i to the left column). Coptic text in Hans-Joachim Cristea, *Schenute von Atripe: Contra Origenistas: Edition des koptischen Textes mit annotierter Übersetzung und Indizes einschließlich einer Übersetzung des 16. Osterfestbriefs des Theophilus in der Fassung des Hieronymus (ep. 96)* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 155.

those who downplay the role of the body in the divine economy. As Janet Timbie has shown, this is a quote from the *Panarion* of Epiphanius in Coptic,<sup>55</sup> which indicates that this text was present in the White Monastery library in his time, in Coptic if Shenoute did not ad hoc translate the sentence. If the *Panarion* was present, it is likely that the *Ancoratus* was too, and indeed Dimitrij Bumazhnov argues that Shenoute's *Christological catechesis* is influenced by a passage on the Eucharist in the *Ancoratus*.<sup>56</sup> Shenoute headed the White Monastery for a record-breaking eighty years between 385 and 465, thus taking over only ten years after the composition of the *Ancoratus*. He might thus have read a very early ancestor of our 10th century White Monastery codex.<sup>57</sup>

### 3 Monastic Heterodoxy and Coptic Translations in Upper Egypt (4th–5th century)

There are historical circumstances to support the hypothesis that Shenoute knew the Coptic translation of the *Ancoratus*. As we have seen, the *Ancoratus* was partly elicited by a group of Egyptians, likely monks, who had grave concerns over certain ascetics in the Thebaïd with heterodox opinions about the resurrection. This in itself makes it likely that the text would have made its way to Upper Egypt soon after its composition. Copies of the Greek original would likely have been made on Cyprus, and sent at least to the presbyters and monks in Pamphylia and Egypt. Perhaps Hypatius, who had been sent from the Egyptians, brought the treatise back himself, where his brothers in Upper Egypt must have been eager to put it to use against the ascetic heretics.

The Pachomian federation would be likely recipients of the treatise, and much of the other literature preserved in the White Monastery has Pachomian roots, such as the Pachomian letters, the lives of Pachomius and his successors, and the Rules. Shenoute clearly saw Pachomius as a predecessor of his own

---

<sup>55</sup> Janet A. Timbie, "Non-Canonical Scriptural Citation in Shenoute," in *Actes du huitième congrès international d'études coptes: Paris, 28 juin – 3 juillet 2004* 2 (ed. Nathalie Bosson and Anne Boud'hors; Leuven: Peeters, 2007), (625–634) 627–628.

<sup>56</sup> Dimitrij Bumazhnov, "Einige Aspekte der Nachwirkung des *Ancoratus* und des *Panarion* des hl. Epiphanius von Salamis in der früheren monastischen Tradition," *Adamantius: Rivista del Gruppo Italiano di Ricerca su "Origene e la tradizione alessandrina"* 11 (2005): (158–178) 173 and note 38.

<sup>57</sup> On replacing old codices with new ones in the library of the White Monastery, see Orlandi, "The Library" (see note 42), 220.

Rules.<sup>58</sup> In this literature we learn that the federation included both Greeks with no Coptic and Copts with little Greek, and monastic activities included teaching brothers the requisite language skills, and copying and translating manuscripts, as well as simultaneous translating of catechesis.<sup>59</sup> So, our treatise could have been translated in a Pachomian monastery, though of course there are other options, like the White Monastery itself.

Yet in 374, the Pachomian federation would have been the dominant monastic institution in the Thebaïd, the area in which the heterodox ascetics attacked by Epiphanius dwelled. The head of the federation at this time was Horsiesius,<sup>60</sup> and even the hagiographic tradition recognizes that there were major disciplinary problems in several Pachomian monasteries after the death of Pachomius around 347, meaning that control of reading materials might have been lax.<sup>61</sup> So, Pachomian monks could have been among the heterodox ascetics targeted by Epipha-

---

**58** Bentley Layton, *The Canons of Our Fathers: Monastic Rules of Shenoute* (Oxford Early Christian Studies; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 39–41. Dechow, *Dogma and Mysticism* (see note 1), 219, suggests the translation “would not be inappropriate for use by ‘strictly orthodox Pachomians’ who ‘were existing in a situation of religious variety within orthodoxy until 400.’”

**59** See Malcolm Choat, “Monastic Letters on Papyrus from Late Antique Egypt,” in *Writing and Communication in Early Egyptian Monasticism* (ed. Malcolm Choat and Maria C. Giorda; Texts and Studies in Eastern Christianity 9; Leiden: Brill, 2017), (17–72) 59, arguing that those proficient in writing Coptic would likely also know Greek. See idem, “Language and Culture in Late Antique Egypt,” in *A Companion to Late Antiquity* (ed. Philip Rousseau; Malden: Blackwell, 2009), 342–356, on the use of Coptic, and p. 349 on language in Pachomian monasteries. Arietta Papaconstantinou, “Egyptians and ‘Hellenists’: Linguistic Diversity in the Early Pachomian Monasteries,” in *Le myrte et la rose: mélange offerts à Françoise Dunand par ses élèves, collègues et amis* (ed. Gaëlle Tallet and Christiane Zivie-Coche; Cahiers Égypte Nilotique et Méditerranéenne 9/1; Montpellier: Équipe Égypte Nilotique et Méditerranéenne, 2014), (15–21) 17, points out that though the Greeks seem to have had their own house in the monastery, they were expected to learn Coptic so they could follow the teaching.

**60** Horsiesius was abbot first from 346 to 351, then again from 368 until his death, likely during the episcopate of Theophilus. See William A. Graham, *Beyond the Written Word: Oral Aspects of Scripture in the History of Religion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 224.

**61** See *Pachomii Vita bohairica* 139 = S<sup>6</sup> 3 (CSCO 99/100, 268.i,5-ii,16 Lefort); *Vita prima Graeca* 127 (ed. François Halkin, *Sancti Pachomii Vitae Graecae* [Subsidia Hagiographica 19; Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1932], 80,34–81,9); and Theodore, *Instructio* 3,46 (CSCO 159, 60.ii,4–15 Lefort). See also Hugo Lundhaug and Lance Jenott, *The Monastic Origins of the Nag Hammadi Codices* (STAC 97; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 251–252, for further references. Dechow “The Nag Hammadi Milieu” (see note 37), 29–30, suggests that Pachomius in fact only controlled the reading of “the simple,” letting “perfect” or “spiritual” monks read what they wanted.

nus.<sup>62</sup> One could imagine in the Pachomian monasteries a tension between Origenist or mystically oriented monks and the simpler monks, similar to the rift that triggered the Origenist controversy among the monks of Nitria in Lower Egypt. If so, the *Ancoratus* would have been of use to the anti-Origenist monks against their brethren. A later letter of Cyril of Alexandria to the monks of Phua specifically warns them about following Origen in denying the resurrection of this flesh.<sup>63</sup> The name Phua, otherwise unknown, is most likely a corruption of the Pachomian Phow.<sup>64</sup> In fact, confirmation that the teaching against the resurrection of the flesh existed at Pachomian monasteries is found in the *Letter of Ammon* 26, where Theodore confronts the brother Patchelpius that he had been secretly teaching a younger brother that there is no resurrection of the flesh.<sup>65</sup> According to Theodore an angel had informed against Patchelpius, perhaps more likely an informant who overheard the heterodox teaching of his brother, and though Patchelpius duly repents, the story indicates doctrinal disputes within the federation in the years 352–355, around twenty years before the *Ancoratus* was authored. This is, of course, provided Ammon can be taken at face value: the letter is likely written to the archbishop Theophilus, and the Patchelpius-story might indicate a *terminus post quem* after Theophilus turned against Origenism in 399. So, the intervening fifty years or so, theological hindsight, and Ammon's time in the monastery at Nitria might have contaminated his memory of the events.<sup>66</sup> Yet the basic story sounds credible, apart from the angelic informant.

The presence in the area around Phow and Shenaset of the teaching against the resurrection of this earthly flesh is also attested by the Nag Hammadi codices, containing texts beyond the pale of Nicene orthodoxy and buried in the Pachomian heartland, which were owned and read by monks who with some likelihood

---

<sup>62</sup> Dechow, *Dogma and Mysticism* (see note 1), 190–206, lists some options for the identities of the Origenists, among which the Pachomians figure prominently. See also Dechow, “The Nag Hammadi Milieu” (see note 37).

<sup>63</sup> Cyril of Alexandria, *Epistula* 81 (ACO ser. III p. 201,20–202,17 Schwartz). The other fragment is against the Origenist teaching of the preexistence of souls.

<sup>64</sup> Hans-Bernd Krismanek, *Das Briefkorpus Kyrills von Alexandrien als Quelle des Antiken Mönchtums: Kirchenpolitik, Christologie und Pastoral* (Patrologia 24; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2010), 47–49; Ernst Honigmann, “The Monks of Fua, Addressees of a Letter from Cyril of Alexandria (412–444 A. D.),” in idem, *Patristic Studies* (Studi et Testi 173; Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1953), 52–53, who claims that there were no Origenists in Pachomian monasteries, nor in Upper Egypt at all.

<sup>65</sup> *Epistula Ammonis* 26 (PTS 27, 148,12–149,16 Goehring; trans. ibid., 175–176).

<sup>66</sup> See James E. Goehring, *The Letter of Ammon and Pachomian Monasticism* (PTS 27; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1986), 24–33, 103–122.



were Pachomians.<sup>67</sup> These monks would then have been able to read for example *A Treatise on the Resurrection*, which contains a teaching similar to that criticized by Epiphanius, namely that it is not this earthly flesh that is resurrected, but a new, spiritual flesh is received: “If you were not in flesh, you received flesh when you came into the world. Why will you not receive the flesh when you ascend to the aeon?”<sup>68</sup> Combined with the notion that the spiritual resurrection “swallows

---

**67** Dechow, *Dogma and Mysticism* (see note 1); idem, “The Nag Hammadi Milieu” (see note 37); Lundhaug and Jenott, *The Monastic Origins* (see note 61). Przemysław Piwowarczyk and Ewa Wipszycka, “A Monastic Origin of the Nag Hammadi Codices?,” review of Hugo Lundhaug and Lance Jenott, *The Monastic Origins of the Nag Hammadi Codices* (STAC 97; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), *Adamantius: Rivista del Gruppo Italiano di Ricerca su “Origene e la tradizione aleassandria”* 23 (2017): 432–458, misrepresents the book. Hugo Lundhaug, “The Dishna Papers and the Nag Hammadi Codices: The Remains of a Single Monastic Library?,” in *The Nag Hammadi Codices and Late Antique Egypt* (ed. Hugo Lundhaug and Lance Jenott; STAC 110; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018), 329–386, argues that the Nag Hammadi codices might have been part of the same library as the so-called Dishna or Bodmer papyri. According to James M. Robinson, *The Story of the Bodmer Papyri: From the First Monastery’s Library in Upper Egypt to Geneva and Dublin* (Eugene: Cascade, 2011), these papyri derive from a Pachomian monastery, though the hypothesis is controversial, as is the identification of which codices belong to the group, cf. the contributions of a conference organized by Gianfranco Agosti, Paola Buzi, and Alberto Camplani, and published in *Adamantius: Rivista del Gruppo Italiano di Ricerca su “Origene e la tradizione aleassandria”* 21 (2015): 6–172. I argue that one subgroup of the NHC was produced in the Pachomian monastery of Shenaset (Chenoboskion), whereas one or two others were produced in the Pachomian monastery in Panopolis, and only later united with the other codex in Shenaset before burial at Jabal al-Tarif, an hour or so walk north from Shenaset. See Christian H. Bull, “The Panopolis Connection: the Pachomian Federation as Context for the Nag Hammadi Codices,” in *Coptic Literature in Context (4th–13th cent.): Cultural Landscape, Literary Production, and Manuscript Archaeology* (ed. Paola Buzi; Percorsi Strumenti e Temi di Archeologia 5; Rome: Edizioni Quasar, 2020), 133–147.

**68** *Tractatus de resurrectione* (NHC I,4, 47,4–8): ⲉⲓⲱⲛⲓⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲕⲁⲟⲩⲟⲩⲉ ⲛ̅ⲉⲁⲣ ⲉⲛ ⲉ̅ⲛ̅ ⲥⲁⲣⲉ ⲁⲕⲕⲓ ⲥⲁⲣⲉ ⲛ̅ⲉⲁⲣⲉⲕⲉⲓ ⲁⲣⲟⲩⲛ ⲁⲛⲓⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲉⲧ̅ ⲛ̅ⲓⲕⲛⲁⲕⲓ ⲉⲛ ⲛ̅ⲉⲧⲥⲁⲣⲉ ⲉⲕⲱⲁⲛⲃⲁⲕ ⲁⲣⲣⲛⲓ ⲁⲣⲟⲩⲛ ⲁⲛⲁⲓⲱⲛ. Coptic text in Malcolm L. Peel, “The Treatise on the Resurrection,” in *Nag Hammadi Codex I (The Jung Codex)* (ed. Harold W. Attridge; NHS 23; Leiden: Brill, 1985), (123–157) 152. See Hugo Lundhaug, “‘Tell Me What Shall Arise’: Conflicting Notions of the Resurrection Body in Coptic Egypt,” in *Coming Back to Life: The Permeability of Past and Present, Mortality and Immortality, Death and Life in the Ancient Mediterranean* (ed. Frederick S. Tappenden and Carly Daniel-Hughes; Montreal: McGill University Library and Archives, 2017), (215–236) 220–225. *The Evangelium Philippi* (NHC II,3) also denies the resurrection of this flesh, see *ibid.*, 225–228; idem, *Images of Rebirth: Cognitive Poetics and Transformational Soteriology in the Gospel of Philip and the Exegesis on the Soul* (NHMS 73; Leiden: Brill, 2010); idem, “Begotten, Not Made, to Arise in This Flesh: The Post-Nicene Soteriology of the Gospel of Philip,” in *Beyond the Gnostic Gospels: Studies Building on the Work of Elaine Pagels* (ed. Eduard Iricinschi et al.; STAC 82; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 235–271.

up"<sup>69</sup> that of the soul and of the flesh, it seems that the text agrees with the Hieracite-inspired ascetics of the Thebaïd that this flesh is substituted with another one in the resurrection. If the Pachomian provenance of the Nag Hammadi Codices is accepted, this would further strengthen the idea that Pachomians were amongst the ascetic adversaries Epiphanius had in mind, though they were probably not the only ones. The monastic diversity in Upper Egypt included Origen-influenced monks like John of Lycopolis, who at least later was in touch with Nitrian Origenists like Evagrius Ponticus, though we do not know anything about his thoughts on the resurrection of the flesh.<sup>70</sup>

Theophilus of Alexandria, who recruited Epiphanius in his vendetta against John Chrysostom, like his nephew and successor Cyril condemned Origen and apocryphal texts in his sixteenth Festal letter of 401. It was translated into Coptic, with some likelihood by Shenoute himself, who quoted it nearly in its entirety in a *Catechesis*.<sup>71</sup> Both Cyril and Shenoute also attack Origenist monks elsewhere, and in particular the Origenist view of resurrection.<sup>72</sup> Likewise, the *Life of Pachomius* informs us that Athanasius's famous Easter letter of 367, which defined the canon and condemned the reading of apocrypha, was received by the Pachomians, and that Apa Theodore who was in charge of the federation at that time had it translated into Coptic and established as law.<sup>73</sup> Portions of a Coptic translation

**69** *Tractatus de resurrectione* (NHC I,4, 45,40–46,2): ταναστασις ἡπνευματικῆ ἐσωθῆκ ἡτῆρῃχικῆ ἰσομοιως ἡπ τκεσαρκικῆ.

**70** See Mark Sheridan, "John of Lycopolis," in *Christianity and Monasticism in Middle Egypt: Al-Minya and Asyut* (ed. Gawdat Gabra and Hany N. Takla; Cairo: The American University in Cairo Press, 2017), 123–132, for an overview.

**71** Tito Orlandi, "Theophilus of Alexandria in Coptic Literature," *Studia Patristica* 16 (1985): (100–104) 101–102; Stephen Emmel, "Theophilus's Festal Letter of 401 as Quoted by Shenoute," in *Divitiae Aegypti: Koptologische und verwandte Studien zu Ehren von Martin Krause* (ed. Cäcilia Fluck, Lucia Langener, and Siegfried Richter; Wiesbaden: L. Reichert, 1995), 93–98; Hugo Lundhaug, "Shenoute's Heresiological Polemics and Its Context(s)," in *Invention, Rewriting, Usurpation: Discursive Fights over Religious Traditions in Antiquity* (ed. Jörg Ulrich, Anders-Christian Jacobsen, and David Brakke; Early Christianity in the Context of Antiquity 11; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2012), 239–261; Cristea, *Shenoute* (see note 54), 107–108. On the monastic reception of Theophilus, see Krastu Banev, *Theophilus of Alexandria and the First Origenist Controversy: Rhetoric and Power* (Oxford Early Christian Studies; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 165–200.

**72** See Lundhaug and Jenott, *The Monastic Origins* (see note 61), 239–340; Lundhaug, "Tell me What Shall Arise" (see note 68), 218–220, 222–232.

**73** *Pachomii Vita bohairica* 189 (CSCO 89, 175,21–178,8 Lefort) = S<sup>6</sup> 7 (CSCO 99/100, 283.i,13–284.ii,32 Lefort). Dechow "The Nag Hammadi Milieu" (see note 37), 27. On Athanasius and the Pachomians, see Brakke, *Athanasius* (see note 22), 111–129, and 326–332 for a translation of the letter.

has survived, though this is not necessarily the same translation.<sup>74</sup> Since Theodore died in 368 the translation must have taken place shortly after the reception of the letter, only a few years before the composition of the *Ancoratus*, and this clearly indicates that the Pachomians considered the translation of theological texts into Coptic as an important way to enforce Nicene orthodoxy. This is yet again confirmed by Cyril's successor Dioscorus, who in the 440s wrote a letter targeting a heretical priest and probably monk called Elijah, allegedly a propagator of the texts and doctrines of Origen, which Dioscorus claims are widespread in a monastery and a former temple of Shmin (Panopolis).<sup>75</sup> The letter was addressed to three bishops of Upper Egypt, but it was contained within a cover letter to Shenoute, whom he asked to translate it: "May your reverence make haste that this entire memorandum is translated into the language of the Egyptians, so that it will be read in this way and that no one will be ignorant of the authority of what is written in it."<sup>76</sup> For all we know, a similar cover letter could have accompanied the copy of the *Ancoratus* sent back with Hypatius to the Egyptians.

So, the Pachomians were beset with a hostile Homoean bishop of Alexandria and heterodox ascetics in their immediate vicinity, perhaps in their very midst. If they or other Upper Egyptian monks were the ones who sent Hypatius to Cyprus to ask Epiphanius for written guidance, they would certainly also have translated the resulting treatise once it was returned to them, so that all the brothers in Upper Egypt would have access to it. The 5th-century church historian Sozomen states that Epiphanius became famous in Egypt and Palestine because of his monastic

<sup>74</sup> See Louis Th. Lefort, "Théodore de Tabennési et la lettre pascale de St-Athanase sur le canon de la Bible," *Le Muséon* 29 (1910): 205–216; David Brakke, "A New Fragment of Athanasius's Thirty-Ninth Festal Letter: Heresy, Apocrypha, and the Canon," *The Harvard Theological Review* 103 (2010): 47–66.

<sup>75</sup> Dioscorus of Alexandria, *Epistula ad Sinuthium* (MONB.XZ ⲟⲩ, lines 29–44): ⲉⲓⲉⲓⲏⲏ ⲁⲉ ⲁⲓⲙⲟⲩⲧⲏ ⲟⲩ ⲁⲉ ⲟⲩⲛⲓ ⲗⲉⲛⲁⲩⲟⲩⲙⲉ ⲁⲩⲱⲩ ⲗⲁⲗ ⲛⲥⲩⲛⲧⲁⲒⲙⲁ ⲛⲧⲉⲓⲡⲟⲓⲙⲟⲥ ⲁⲉ ⲗⲟⲣⲓⲒⲉⲛⲛⲥⲏⲧⲏ ⲗⲉⲛⲕⲉⲗⲓⲣⲉⲧⲓⲕⲟⲥ ⲉⲩⲗⲏ ⲟⲉⲛⲉⲧⲏ ⲉⲧⲏⲙⲁⲩ: ⲁⲩⲱⲩ ⲗⲏⲓ ⲛⲉⲣⲧⲉ ⲟⲩ ⲛⲓⲟⲣⲧⲏ ⲛⲓⲟⲩⲛⲓ: ⲁⲩⲱⲩ ⲗⲏⲓ ⲗⲉⲛⲕⲉⲛⲁ.—"Because I heard too that there are books and several treatises of the plague, Origenes, as well as other heretics, that are in that monastery and in the former temple of Shmin, and also in other places." Coptic text in Henri Munier, *Catalogue de la bibliothèque du Musée égyptien du Caire* (Le Caire: Imprimerie de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, 1928), (146–150) 148; the translation is mine. The letter is preserved in the White Monastery codex MONB.XZ, see Lundhaug, "Shenoute's Heresiological Polemics" (see note 71), (239–261) 249–252.

<sup>76</sup> Dioscorus of Alexandria, *Epistula ad Sinuthium* (MONB.XZ ⲗⲗ, lines 43–46): ⲙⲁⲣⲉⲧⲉⲕⲉⲩⲗⲁⲅⲓⲁ ⲥⲓⲡⲟⲩⲗⲁⲗⲉ ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲩⲣⲉⲣⲙⲏⲛⲉⲩⲉ ⲙⲡⲣⲩⲡⲟⲛⲛⲏⲙⲁ ⲧⲏⲣⲓⲥ ⲛⲧⲁⲥⲓⲡⲉ ⲛⲏⲣⲏⲧⲏⲕⲏⲙⲉ: ⲁⲉⲕⲁⲥ ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲟⲩⲩⲥ ⲛⲧⲉⲓⲗⲉ ⲛⲧⲉⲧⲏⲗⲁⲗⲁⲩ ⲣⲁⲧⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲧⲁⲩⲛⲁⲙⲓⲥ ⲛⲏⲉⲧⲥⲏⲗⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲥ: Coptic text in Herbert Thompson, "Dioscorus and Shenoute," in *Recueil d'études égyptologiques dédiées à la mémoire de Jean-François Champollion à l'occasion du centenaire de la lettre à M. Dacier, relative à l'alphabet des hiéroglyphes phonétiques* (Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études 234; Paris: Champion, 1922), (367–376) 371.

philosophy, and describes him as the most famous man under heaven.<sup>77</sup> Jerome himself, some years before translating Epiphanius's letter, included the bishop in his catalogue *On illustrious men*<sup>78</sup> and claimed that his writings were avidly read by the educated for their subject matter, and by regular people for their style. It has also been argued that passages from the *Ancoratus* and the *Panarion* have directly influenced Egyptian monasticism at least from the time of the First Origenist Controversy, including the early Coptic writings of Paul of Tamma, Shenoute and the *Life of Aphu of Pemje*.<sup>79</sup> These considerations militate in favor that the *Ancoratus* was translated into Coptic soon after its composition, once it reached Upper Egypt, just as the Festal letters of the Alexandrian patriarchs were.

This must admittedly remain hypothetical. Even though it is likely that the *Ancoratus* was translated into Coptic soon after its composition, another possible context is the so-called first Origenist controversy, around the turn of the 5th century, which played out as a power-struggle between Theophilus of Alexandria and John Chrysostom. Epiphanius was enlisted on the side of Theophilus, and would die from advanced age before the conflict was resolved. It is entirely possible that the treatise was translated at the prompting of Theophilus, who initiated a crack-down on monks suspected of Origenist sympathies and reading apocrypha. Theophilus himself had apparently flip-flopped after he was confronted by monks who marched on Alexandria. These monks were known as Anthropomorphites, and were considered to be more literal in their reading of the Bible, thinking of God as having human form, unlike the more Platonist allegorical readings in the tradition after Origen.<sup>80</sup>

## 4 The Quality of the Coptic Translation of the *Ancoratus*

The likely historical context of the translation must be taken into consideration: the monastic community in which the treatise was likely translated would have been part of a bitter struggle with fellow Christians, perhaps even with some of its own members, and this struggle could potentially lead to imprisonment, exile,

---

<sup>77</sup> Sozomen, *Historia ecclesiastica* 6,32,3–4 (420 F.). On the fame of Epiphanius, see Jacobs, *Epiphanius* (see note 1), 31–64.

<sup>78</sup> Jerome, *De viris illustribus* 114 (250 B.).

<sup>79</sup> Bumazhnov, "Einige Aspekte" (see note 56), 158–178.

<sup>80</sup> See Dechow, *Dogma and Mysticism* (see note 1); Clark, *The Origenist Controversy* (see note 4); Banev, *Theophilus* (see note 71); Bumazhnov, *Der Mensch als Gottes Bild* (see note 36).

or even death for the losing part. The Homoean Lucius actively persecuted Athanasian priests and monks between 374 and 378, and Origenist monks were exiled from Egypt at the turn of the century. The urgency for the translation was thus high, and apparently this led to haste, as we also saw was the case when Jerome translated Epiphanius' letter. Our translator likely did not work alone, but like Jerome probably dictated his translation to a scribe. This was common practice, and furthermore there are errors in the Coptic text that can be best explained under the hypothesis of dictation, for example a number of misspelled proper names. The translation is also very direct, often keeping a Greek sentence syntax that does not work in Coptic, like the use of  $\pi\epsilon\lambda\alpha\gamma$  within quotations in place of the Greek  $\varphi\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}(v)$ .

The mistakes also indicate something else, namely that our translator did not check the copy of his scribe, which again leads one to believe that the translation was produced in haste. Some mistakes surely also slipped into our text in subsequent copying, so it is not always possible to say if a mistake is due to the translator or a later copyist. There is however one highly interesting fact, which leads us to believe that many of the discrepancies with the Greek are due to the translator, and which is furthermore of some importance for our understanding of the Greek *textus receptus*: To a high degree, our most significant discrepancies occur in places where the Greek is corrupt, which indicates that the Greek exemplar in front of our Coptic translator was already corrupt. We shall consider some examples of this tendency presently. It is striking how few of Karl Holl's editorial emendations of the Greek are supported by the Coptic, a tendency I can only allude to now and will demonstrate in my forthcoming edition. Of course, if the Greek *Vorlage* was already faulty, that would complicate our argument that the Coptic translation occurred soon after the time of the original composition. However, the Greek text might have been faulty from the very beginning. Although this would square poorly with Jerome's assessment that Epiphanius was famous for his good language, we must remember, first, that it was in Jerome's best interest to speak well of his close ally, and second, that it was allegedly the uneducated people who enjoyed Epiphanius's language, whereas learned men appreciated the theological arguments. Photius, in the 9th century, took a harsher view on Epiphanius as an author than Jerome: "His style is poor, and of such a level as is proper of one who is unfamiliar with Attic education."<sup>81</sup> Frank Williams points out that the *Panarion* was dictated in haste and for a large part ad libbed, which seems also to

---

<sup>81</sup> Photius, *Bibliotheca* 122–124 (ed. René Henry, *Photius, Bibliothèque 2: Codices 84–185* [Collection Byzantine; Paris: Belles Lettres, 1960], 96 [94b,9–11]): Τὴν δὲ φράσιν ταπεινός τε καὶ οἷα εἰκὸς Ἀττικῆς παιδείας ἀμελέτητον τυγχάνειν.

be the case with the *Ancoratus*: “All this evidences oral composition and probably lack of time for revision—the busy bishop would have had little time for that.”<sup>82</sup>

These considerations suggest that not all the errors in the Greek of Epiphanius's texts—and the errors are plentiful—are due to corruptions in the manuscript tradition, but were there from the beginning, predictably worsened by the misguided emendations of later copyists. The complex stemma of the Greek text laid forth by Holl, in the early 20th century, must be revisited in light of the Coptic text.<sup>83</sup> This task surpasses the present contribution, though it should at least be pointed out that while our Coptic text is bound together with *On the 12 Stones*, it is in the Greek manuscript tradition transmitted in a collected edition of Epiphanius together with the *Panarion*, *On Measures and Weights*, and the pseudo-Epiphanian *Anakephalaiosis*, which is a summary of the *Panarion*. According to Holl, the *Gesamtausgabe* goes back to the time of Epiphanius or shortly thereafter, at which time the initial text was the *Ancoratus*, followed by the *Panarion* and then *On Measures and Weights*.<sup>84</sup> This order was changed by the 9th century, when our earliest manuscripts as well as Photius testify to a different order, starting with the *Panarion*. If the earliest *Gesamtausgabe* really goes back to the time of Epiphanius, then it is surely important that our Coptic translation is instead bound together with *On the 12 Stones*, which means that the Greek exemplar in the hands of our translator likely predates the *Gesamtausgabe*, such as would be the case if the text was sent to Egypt shortly after its composition.

<sup>82</sup> Williams, *The Panarion* 1 (see note 2), xxix. Similarly Kim, *St. Epiphanius* (see note 3), 6–7, on the *Ancoratus*: “Epiphanius's reply was neither carefully composed nor subsequently edited for publication.”

<sup>83</sup> Karl Holl, *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung des Epiphanius (Ancoratus und Panarion)* (Classics in the History of Early Christian Literature 53; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1910; reprint Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2010). Holl did take into account the parts of the Coptic text edited by Leipoldt, “Epiphanius” (see note 38). See Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre* (see note 3), 77–80, for an evaluation of Holl.

<sup>84</sup> Holl, *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung* (see note 83), 95. None of the mss preserve the full *Gesamtausgabe*. The older group of mss preserve *Panarion* 1–64, though Vindobonensis suppl. gr. 91 has extracts showing its source was the *Gesamtausgabe* (*Ancoratus* is missing, but Holl supposes that it too must have been present, *ibid.*, 60). The younger group preserves a *Gesamtausgabe* starting with *Panarion*, then *Ancoratus*, the *Anakephalaiosis*, and extracts from *De mensuris et ponderibus*. Only parts of the latter text is preserved in Greek, though it has a full Syriac and partial Georgian and Armenian translations: James E. Dean, *Epiphanius' Treatise on Weights and Measures; the Syriac Version* (Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 11; Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1935); Michel van Esbroeck, *Les versions géorgiennes d'Épiphane de Chypre, Traité des Poids et des Mesures* (2 vols.; CSCO 460/461; Leuven: Peeters, 1984); Michael E. Stone and Roberta R. Ervine, *The Armenian Texts of Epiphanius of Salamis De mensuris et ponderibus* (CSCO 583; Leuven: Peeters, 2000).

## 5 Discrepancies between the Greek Original and the Coptic Translation

It will be instructive to look at translation-mistakes for clues to the identity of the translator, his understanding of Greek, and his cultural and theological knowledge.<sup>85</sup> I will focus here on a section of the *Ancoratus* dealing with examples from pagan mythology, since it clearly showcases some of the misunderstandings due to the translator's lack of familiarity with the source material, and has already been edited by Johannes Leipoldt.<sup>86</sup> Some examples are chosen more to showcase the problems with the Greek *textus receptus*, and how the Coptic translation can illuminate some of these passages.

### 5.1 From Gladiators and the Satyr-Goat, to Monks who Fight the Dragon

A passage near the end of the work indicates that the translator was a monk. After the passage dealing with the reality of resurrection of *this* flesh,<sup>87</sup> Epiphanius goes on to exhort the orthodox churches to abhor idols,<sup>88</sup> which are in reality human passions given form: adulterers thought up Aphrodite, bloodthirsty men thought up Ares, and promiscuous men thought up Apollo and Zeus, for example. Egyptians are singled out negatively, since they even worship animals.<sup>89</sup> Epiphanius rehearses the fact that there are several versions of the pagan gods, for example one Zeus is born on Crete as the son of Kronos, while another is called Latiarius, and another one Tragōdos (“the tragedy-singer”):

ὁ δ' ἄλλος Λατιάριος λεγόμενος, ἐξ οὐπερ οἱ μονομάχοι γεγόνασιν, ἄλλος δὲ ὁ τραγωδός, ὁ καὶ τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ καύσας. τάχα δὲ θεὸς ὧν ἐπελάθετο ὅτι δάκνει τὸ πῦρ καὶ οὐκ εἶχε τὴν πρόγνωσιν τοῦ λέγοντος τράγω τῷ σατύρῳ, εὐρόντι πρότερον τὸ πῦρ καὶ προσελθόντι φιλησαι “μὴ ἄψῃ, τράγε ἀψάμενος γὰρ σοῦ ἐμπρήσεις τὰ γένηα.”

Another one is called Latiarios, from whom the gladiators have come into being, and another one Tragōdos, who burned his hand. Perhaps even though he is a god he forgot that fire stings, and he did not have the foreknowledge of the one who said to the satyr-goat, who

<sup>85</sup> I work under the assumption that our translator was a man, though she might have been a woman.

<sup>86</sup> Leipoldt, “Epiphanius” (see note 38).

<sup>87</sup> Epiphanius, *Ancoratus* 82–100 (102,22–121,25 H./B./C.).

<sup>88</sup> Epiphanius, *Ancoratus* 102,5–103,3 (123,5–27 H./B./C.).

<sup>89</sup> Epiphanius, *Ancoratus* 103,4–5 (123,27–124,7 H./B./C.).

had earlier discovered the fire and approached it to kiss it: “Do not touch, goat! For if you touch you will set your beard on fire.”<sup>90</sup>

ΠΚεΟΥΑ ΔΕ ΛΑΔΙΑΡΙΟΣ ΠΕ ΠΕΦΡΑΝ· ΠΑΙ ΝΤΑΜΜΟΝΟΧΟΣ ΤΣΑΒΟ ΕΜΙΩΞΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΙ ΤΟΥΤΟϣ·~  
 ΠΚεΟΥΑ ΔΕ ΟΝ ΧΕ ΤΡΑΚΩΝΤΟΣ ΠΕΝΤΑΦΡΕΚῆ ΤΕΦΟΙΧ ΖΗ ΠΚΩΖΤ· ΕΩΧΕ ΟΥΝΟΥΤΕ ΠΕ· ΕΙΘ ΕΤΒΕ ΟΥ ΑΑΓῆ  
 ΠΩΒΩ· ΧΕ ΦΑΡΕΠῆΩΖΤ ΡΑΚῆ· ΑΥΩ ΗΝΤΑϣ ΗΝΑΥ ΗΤΕΠΡΟΓΝΩΣΙΣ ΜΠΕΔΡΑΚΩΝΤΟΣ·~  
 ΣΑΤΥΡΟΣ ΠΑΙ ΝΤΑΦΟΜ ΠΚΩΖΤ ΝΦΟΡΠ ΕΧΩΩ ΗΜΟΣ· ΧΕ ΜΠῆΧΩΖ Ω ΠΟΙῆ· ΕΚΦΑΝΧΩΖ ΓΑΡ ΚΝΑῆ ΖΗΒΕ  
 ΗΤΕΚΜΟΡΤ·

Another one has the name Ladiarios, from whom the monks learn how to fight.

Another one also (is called) Trakōntos, he who burned his hand in the fire. If he is a god, then why did he forget that fire burns, and he does not have the foreknowledge of the Drakōntos? As for Satyros, he is the one who discovered the fire first, saying: “Do not touch, goat! For if you touch you will be sorry for your beard.”<sup>91</sup>

Having little to no knowledge about Jupiter Latiarius and the fact that he is celebrated with gladiatorial combat (ἐξ οὔτερ οἱ μονομάχοι γεγόνασιν),<sup>92</sup> our Copt instead writes that “Ladiarios” is the one “from whom the monks learn how to fight.”<sup>93</sup> The Copt either interpolates or misunderstands, and yet his translation yields perfect sense in a monastic milieu familiar with such texts as the *Life of Antony* and the *Life of Pachomius*, where fighting demons is the quintessential task of the monk.<sup>94</sup> Our ΜΟΝΟΧΟΣ is a widely attested variant of ΜΟΝΑΧΟΣ.<sup>95</sup> Epiphanius immediately goes on to say that another Zeus is called “the goat-singer” or “tragedian” (ὁ τραγωδός),<sup>96</sup> who burnt his hand,<sup>97</sup> a myth unknown

<sup>90</sup> Epiphanius, *Ancoratus* 106,2–4 (128,13–129,3 H./B./C.; my translation).

<sup>91</sup> Paris, BNF Copte 131<sup>3</sup>, fol. 56v (p. 214.i,32–ii,25); Leipoldt, “Epiphanius” (see note 38), 147–148. I use throughout my own edition of the Bibliothèque nationale de France folia, by pagination, column (left [i] and right [ii]), and line number, followed by a reference to Leipoldt’s edition.

<sup>92</sup> Epiphanius, *Ancoratus* 106,2 (128,14 H./B./C.).

<sup>93</sup> Paris, BNF Copte 131<sup>3</sup>, fol. 56v (p. 214.ii,1–4); Leipoldt, “Epiphanius” (see note 38), 147: ΠΑΙ ΝΤΑΜΜΟΝΟΧΟΣ ΤΣΑΒΟ ΕΜΙΩΞΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΙΤΟΥΤΟϣ.

<sup>94</sup> See David Brakke, *Demons and the Making of the Monk: Spiritual Combat in Early Christianity* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006).

<sup>95</sup> See Hugo Lundhaug, “An Illusion of Textual Stability: Textual Fluidity, New Philology, and the Nag Hammadi Codices,” in *Snapshots of Evolving Traditions: Jewish and Christian Manuscript Culture, Textual Fluidity, and New Philology* (ed. Liv I. Lied and Hugo Lundhaug; Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 175; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2017), (20–54) 38 (note 77).

<sup>96</sup> Epiphanius, *Ancoratus* 106,2 (128,14 H./B./C.).

<sup>97</sup> Epiphanius has taken this from Theophilus of Antioch, *Ad Autolycom* 3,8 (PTS 44, 108,6–10 Marcovich), who also mentions Zeus Latiarius and the Tragedian after each other. Everett Ferguson, *Personalities of the Early Church* (Studies in Early Christianity 1; New York: Garland, 1993), 186, suggests that Zeus the tragedian goes back to a statue erected by Augustus in Suetonius,



to us that probably has to do with Zeus burning his hand on his thunderbolt. The title “tragedian” is rendered in Coptic as  $\tau\rho\alpha\kappa\omega\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ ,<sup>98</sup> which could be explained as a listening mistake. Yet the Copt was possibly still in a demonological frame of mind, and was thinking of a demonic snake or dragon ( $\Delta\rho\alpha\kappa\omega\nu$ ), for later in the paragraph the error recurs: Epiphanius says sarcastically that perhaps this Zeus “did not have the foreknowledge of the one who said to the satyr-goat” ( $\omicron\upsilon\kappa \epsilon\acute{\iota}\chi\epsilon \tau\eta\nu \pi\rho\acute{o}\gamma\nu\omega\sigma\iota\nu \tau\omicron\upsilon \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma \tau\rho\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omega \tau\acute{\omega} \sigma\alpha\tau\upsilon\rho\omega$ )<sup>99</sup> that he should keep his beard out of the fire. The allusion is to a passage of Aeschylus’s lost *Prometheus the Fire-bearer*, which we only know through the testimony of Plutarch: When the Satyr first sees fire, he wants to embrace it but is warned by Prometheus that it will burn his beard.<sup>100</sup> The foreknowledge thus belongs to Prometheus, appropriately enough, who warns the satyr-goat. Instead the Coptic translates “he does not have the foreknowledge of the Drakōntos (the dragon?). Satyros is the one who first discovered fire.”<sup>101</sup> The Copt understandably misses the allusion to Prometheus and paradoxically says that Zeus Trakontos does not have the foreknowledge of “the Drakōntos” ( $\tau\rho\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omega > \pi\epsilon\Delta\rho\alpha\kappa\omega\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ ) and that it was one Satyros, not Prometheus, who spoke to the goat. Again, this is at least the work of someone unfamiliar with Aeschylus, who seems to have interpreted “goat” as “dragon,” though he clearly knew the Greek word, for he translates it correctly only a few lines down ( $\tau\rho\acute{\alpha}\gamma\epsilon > \pi\omicron\sigma\iota\epsilon$ ).<sup>102</sup>

## 5.2 Kanōbos, Isis, and the Wax Placed in Leaking Jars

Epiphanius then talks about deified humans and mentions an example from Egypt, in which the Egyptian name of the city Canopus, by the westernmost

---

*Divus Augustus* 57 (BSGRT, 81,5–6 Ihm), and that the burnt hand might have to do with Zeus’s thunderbolt. Epiphanius adds details not in Theophilus, for example the quote from Aeschylus, which he possibly got from Plutarch (see below).

**98** Paris, BNF Copte 131<sup>3</sup>, fol. 56v (p. 214.ii,6); Leipoldt, “Epiphanius” (see note 38), 148.

**99** Epiphanius, *Ancoratus* 106,3 (129,1 H./B./C.).

**100** Plutarch, *De capienda ex inimicis utilitate* 2,86E-F [= Aeschylus frg. 207 Nauck] (BSGRT, 173,13–16 Paton/Wegehaupt):  $\tau\omicron\upsilon \delta\acute{\epsilon} \sigma\alpha\tau\upsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon \tau\omicron \pi\upsilon\rho, \acute{\omega}\varsigma \pi\rho\acute{\omega}\tau\omicron\nu \acute{\alpha}\phi\theta\eta, \beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\upsilon \phi\iota\lambda\eta\sigma\alpha\iota \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota} \pi\epsilon\rho\iota\beta\alpha\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu \acute{\omicron} \Pi\rho\omicron\mu\eta\theta\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma \text{“}\tau\rho\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omicron\varsigma \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\iota\omicron\nu \acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha \pi\epsilon\nu\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma \sigma\acute{\upsilon} \gamma\epsilon\text{”}$ .  $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\epsilon\iota \tau\omicron\nu \acute{\alpha}\psi\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron$  (The point derived from the tale by Plutarch is that though fire is destructive, it can also be beneficial, just like enemies).

**101** Paris, BNF Copte 131<sup>3</sup>, fol. 56v (p. 214.ii,14–20); Leipoldt, “Epiphanius” (see note 38), 148:  $\mu\eta\acute{\iota}\tau\alpha\upsilon \mu\eta\alpha\gamma \eta\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\gamma\eta\nu\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma \eta\pi\epsilon\Delta\rho\alpha\kappa\omega\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma \text{“}\text{--} \text{“}\text{C}\acute{\alpha}\tau\upsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma \pi\alpha\acute{\iota} \eta\tau\alpha\upsilon\phi\omicron\mu \eta\kappa\omega\rho\tau \eta\sigma\omicron\rho\eta\acute{\iota}$ .

**102** Paris, BNF Copte 131<sup>3</sup>, fol. 56v (p. 214.ii,22); Leipoldt, “Epiphanius” (see note 38), 148.

*Canopic* mouth of the Nile, was explained with a myth about Menelaos burying his pilot there, on a landfall on his way home from Troy:

Κάνωβός τε ὁ Μενελάου κυβερνήτης καὶ ἡ τούτου γυνὴ Ἐυμενουθὶς ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ τεθαμμένοι τιμῶνται πρὸς τῇ ὄχθῃ τῆς θαλάσσης, ἀπὸ δεκαδύο σημείων διεστῶτες.

And Kanōbos, the pilot of Menelaos, and his wife *Eumenouthis*, having been buried in Alexandria, at a twelve-mile distance, are honored near the shore of the sea.<sup>103</sup>

ΚΑΝΩΒΟΣ ΔΕ ΠΝΕΒ ΝΗΛΛΟΣ· ΠΕΤΡ ΖῆΜΕ Μῆ ΤΕΦΖῆΜΕ ΝΕΓΕΪΣ· ΑΓΤΟΜΣΟΥ ΖΝ ΡΑΚΟΤΕ· ΣΕΤΑΙΟ  
ἸΜΟΟΥ ΖΑΤῆ ΘΑΛΛΑΣΑ· ΕΓΟΥΓΗ ἸΜΟΟΥ ΔΗῆΤῆΣΟΟΥΣ ΜΗΙΛΙΟΝ ΕΑΚΑ ΖῆΚΕΡΟΣ ΝΤΑΧ ἸΜΑΥ·:-

Kanōbos, the pilot of the peoples, the steersman, and his wife, *Neuaise* (?), have been buried in Rakote (Alexandria). They are honored close to the sea, being at a distance of twelve miles, where they have placed some of their *wax* (?).<sup>104</sup>

First, our Copt obviously did not know the myth connecting Kanōbos to Menelaos, and does not even recognize the name of the latter, which he misunderstands to be λαός, “people” (ὁ Μενελάου κυβερνήτης > ὁ μὲν λαοῦ κυβερνήτης > ΠΝΕΒ ΝΗΛΛΟΣ). This may also be a listening mistake.

More obscure still is the reference to his wife. Holl reads the name of Kanōbos’s wife as Ἐυμενουθὶς, whereas Dindorf and Leipoldt both read Εὐμενουθὶς.<sup>105</sup> No such names are otherwise attested, but the town Menouthis is right next to the town Canopus, practically its suburb, and both are located just twelve miles east of Alexandria.<sup>106</sup> In reality it is Sarapis or Osiris whose sanctuary was in Canopus,<sup>107</sup> and his wife is Isis, who had an oracular shrine in nearby Menouthis.<sup>108</sup> Two relevant inscriptions are found on a base for a statue of “Isis who is in Menouthis” (ἐν Μενούθ[ι]) and on a statue base meant for “the wooden idol of the

**103** Epiphanius, *Ancoratus* 106,9 (130,4–6 H./B./C.).

**104** Paris, BNF Copte 131<sup>3</sup>, fol. 57v (p. 216.i,18–29); Leipoldt, “Epiphanius” (see note 38), 151–152.

**105** Epiphanius, *Ancoratus* 106,9 (130,5 H./B./C.); Leipoldt, “Epiphanius” (see note 38), 151; Wilhelm Dindorf, *Epiphanii episcopi Constantiae opera* 1 (Leipzig: T. O. Weigel, 1859), 209,27.

**106** Dominic Montserrat, “Pilgrimage to the Shrine of SS Cyrus and John at Menouthis in Late Antiquity,” in *Pilgrimage & Holy Space in Late Antique Egypt* (ed. David Frankfurter; Leiden: Brill, 1998), (257–279) 257.

**107** E. g., *Sylloge inscriptionum religionis Isiacae et Sarapiacae* no. 406 (ed. Ladislav Vidman, *Sylloge inscriptionum religionis Isiacae et Sarapiacae* [Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011], 203,3–12): Σαράπιδι . . . τὸν ἐν Κανώβῳ.

**108** See André Bernand, *Le Delta égyptien d’après les textes grecs* 1,1 (Cairo: Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale du Caire, 1970), 164–257.

most holy god Sarapis, with Isis who is in Menouthis” ([ἐ]ν Μενούθι).<sup>109</sup> Likewise, in the famous Isis aretology from the Oxyrhynchus Papyri, the local epithets of Isis in different Egyptian cities are listed, calling her “the one raising muses in Canopus, truth in Menouthis” (ἐν Μεν[ο]ύθι).<sup>110</sup> It would thus be reasonable to emend the name Ἐμμενουθίς or Ἐνμενουθίς to “in Menouthis,” ἐν Μενούθι(ς). However, the Coptic text has no reference to Menouthis at all, and instead writes νεγείσε, which is hard to make immediate sense of. The word εἶσε is clear enough: It is the Coptic name of the goddess Isis, whereas νεγ- could be the third person plural possessive article, thus “their Isises,” similar to how the several versions of pagan gods were listed earlier. Another possibility is that -εγ- reflects the Greek manuscript reading Εὐ-μενουθίς, providing a hitherto unknown epithet of Isis in Menouthis, though the initial Coptic η- then remains unexplained. Although this is not fully satisfactory, and the νεγ- must remain somewhat cryptic, it seems our Copt knew that the goddess of Menouthis is Isis, a fact not spelled out by Epiphanius, and changed the text accordingly.

Finally, the Copt adds a circumstantial sentence that is hard to make head or tail of, stating that something is placed there, presumably at Canopus: εαγκα ρῆκερος ἡταγ ἡμαγ. Leipoldt suggests that κερος comes from γέρας, “gift of honour,” which the translator did not understand and just kept untranslated, so that γερας was later corrupted into κερος by copyists.<sup>111</sup> This would of course presuppose that the Greek exemplar in front of our translator included this sentence, subsequently lost in the Greek *textus receptus*. κερος is however much closer to κηρός, “wax,” since the interchange η > ε is unproblematic before a liquid consonant, and in fact the fluidity between epsilon and eta is typical in Egyptian.<sup>112</sup>

**109** *Sylloge inscriptionum religionis Isiacae et Sarapiacae* no. 403 (202,1–2 V.): Εἴσιδι Φαρ[ί]α Εἴσιν τῆν ἐν Μενούθ[ι]; no. 556a (258,1–5 V.): Τὸ ξόανον τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου θεοῦ Σαράπιδος [σ]ὺν τῆ Ἴσιδι [τῆ] ἐν Μενουθί. Holl (*apparatus* to *Ancoratus* 106,9 [130,5 H./B./C.]), emends Ἐνμενουθίς with reference to a publication of Vidman’s no. 403 by Wilhelm Weber, *Drei Untersuchungen zur ägyptisch-griechischen Religion* (Heidelberg: J. Hörning, 1911), 41, who reads Ἐισιν τῆν [...] ENMENOYΘ [...] (first lacuna not attested by Vidman).

**110** Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 1380, col. 4, lines 62–63 (ed. Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 11 [London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1915], 197): ἐ[ν] Κανώβω μουσαναγωγόν· ἐν Μεν[ο]ύθι ἀλήθια. Epiphanius himself refers to a temple in Menouthis in an appendix to the *Panarion*, *De fide* 12,1 (512,1–2 H./D.): ἐν Μενουθίτιδος, where there were female priestesses or worshippers whom he accuses of shameless behavior.

**111** Leipoldt, “Epiphanius” (see note 38), 152 (note 1).

**112** Francis T. Gignac, *Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods 1: Phonology* (Testi e Documenti per lo Studio dell’Antichità 55; Milan: Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino, 1976), 243; Sonja Dahlgren, *Outcome of Long-term Language Contact: Transfer of Egyptian Phonological Features onto Greek in Graeco-Roman Egypt* (Diss.; University of Helsinki, 2017), 108.

There is actually a good explanation why there should be an obscure reference to wax here. From the name Canopus we have our *canopic jars* which were used to contain the inner organs of mummified humans, smallish clay jars with lids formed as the heads of five gods known as the *Sons of Horus*. Rufinus of Aquileia gives us a fascinating tale about the use of similar jars in Canopus, which must have served as an etiology of the local statue of Sarapis: At one time there were Persian priests, here called Chaldeans instead of Magi, who travelled around and made their sacred fire fight against the divine statues of different regions. Since these were made of materials like wood and stone, the fire would always consume them and thus be victorious. When a priest of Canopus heard about this he made a plan: he took a water jar (ὕδρια) which had narrow holes used to purify dirty water, painted it, and used the head of an ancient statue of the steersman of Menelaus as a lid. He blocked the narrow holes with wax and filled the jar with water. When the Persians came and kindled their fire under the jar, the wax melted and water poured out and extinguished the fire, proving Canopus to be the superior god. When the archbishop Theophilus much later arrived, however, “no deceit concealed with wax” was of any avail, and the idols were thrown down.<sup>113</sup> The combination of Canopus, Menelaus, and the wax, makes it likely that this myth underlies our offhand sentence.

The question of the sources used by Rufinus has been under debate: he studied under Didymus the Blind in Egypt for eight years during the 370s (at the same time as Epiphanius composed the *Ancoratus*), and could have conducted research there. Or perhaps his source was Sophronius, who according to Jerome “recently composed a notable volume, *On the overthrow of Serapis*.”<sup>114</sup>

---

**113** Rufinus, *Historia ecclesiastica* 11,26 (GCS 9/2, 1033,11–12 Schwartz): *Nunc vero adventante sacerdote Dei Theophilo nullus profuit sudor, nec ceris fraus obtecta subvenit*. A Greek version of the myth can be found in Georgios Monachos, *Chronicon* 9,8 (BSGRT, 588,7 de Boor): πανουργία τις ἀπὸ κηροῦ κατασκευασθεῖσα. The Greek is also paraphrased by Cedrenus and repeated verbatim in Suda. According to Theodor Mommsen, “Einleitung zu Rufin,” in *Eusebius Werke* 2,3: *Die Kirchengeschichte, Die Lateinische Übersetzung des Rufinus bearbeitet von Theodor Mommsen* (ed. Eduard Schwartz; GCS 9,3; Leipzig, 1909), (ccli-cclxviii) cclvi-cclxi, the Latin of Rufinus was used by later Greek historians. See also Frank Trombley, *Hellenic Religion and Christianization c. 370–529* 1 (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 115; Leiden: Brill, 2014), 137–139; Christian H. Bull, “‘Only in Egypt Did these Great Signs Appear’: Egyptian and Hermetic Motifs in *On the Origin of the World* (NHC II,5),” in *Universum Hermeticum: Kosmogonie und Kosmologie in hermetischen Schriften* (ed. Niclas Förster and Uwe-Karsten Plisch; STAC 131; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2021), 243–272.

**114** Jerome, *De viris illustribus* 134,1 (260 B.): *nuper De subversione Serapis insignem librum composuit*. In fact, Sophronius was also credited with the Greek translation of the *De viris illustribus* which reads (PL 23:756B): ὑπόγυον δὲ περὶ τῆς καταλύσεως τοῦ Σεραπειοῦ ἐπισημον συνέθηκε λόγον.

Of course, Epiphanius wrote before the episcopate of Theophilus and knew nothing of his future overthrow of the idols in Canopus, though he might have known the myth of the water jars. However, Epiphanius would hardly have included such an obscure allusion, and it is more likely that the sentence was interpolated by the Coptic translator. Before the events that led to the destruction of the Serapeum of Alexandria and the temple in Canopus, the latter was still in operation, and in the 370s it served as base for the pagan Neoplatonist Antoninus.<sup>115</sup> If the Coptic sentence is an interpolation, it would fit better in the 370s—as an allusion to the waxen-deceit of the Egyptian priests at Canopus—than after the 390s, when one would have expected a reference to Theophilus throwing down the Canopic images in the interpolation.

### 5.3 The Intended Use of the Pagan Myths: Bad Examples or Sandals?

At the end of the passages concerning pagan mythology comes a passage that explains their purpose:

Ταῦτα οὖν πάντα ὅταν <έν> μέση τῆ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀκριβοῦτε, κακὸν ὑπόδειγμα θανασίμης ὁδοῦ τοὺς οὕτω προαχθέντας ὑπολύετε.

So, making inquiry about all these things when you are in the middle of the church, untie what has been brought forth like this as (?) a bad example of a deadly path.<sup>116</sup>

ⲛⲁⲓ ⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲉⲧⲏⲱⲁⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ρⲏ ⲧⲏⲏⲧⲉ ⲏⲧⲉⲕⲕⲗⲏⲥⲓⲁ. ⲃⲟⲗ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲏⲡⲧⲟⲟⲩ<ⲉ> ⲉⲃⲟⲟⲩ ⲏⲧⲉⲗⲓⲏ ⲏⲏⲣⲉⲑⲙⲟⲟⲩⲧ ⲉⲣⲏ ⲣⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲏⲏⲏⲧⲁⲅⲉⲛⲧⲟⲩ ⲉⲣⲣⲁⲓ ϣⲓⲏ ⲏⲱⲟⲣⲓ ⲏⲧⲉⲓⲗⲉ.

Now, as for all of these things, when you reveal them in the middle of the church, release the bad *sandal* from the way of the dead toward (?) those who have been brought up from the beginning in this way.<sup>117</sup>

Holl's emendation <έν> is supported by the Coptic version. Instead of ὑπόδειγμα the Coptic has ⲏⲧⲟⲟⲩ, which Leipoldt translates as “mountain.” An alternate meaning could be “monastery,” and it would be entirely possible for our Copt

<sup>115</sup> Eunapius, *Vitae sophistarum* 6,94–118 (CUFr Série grecque 508, 37,11–42,3 Goulet). See Christian H. Bull, “Prophesying the Demise of Egyptian Religion in Late Antiquity: The *Perfect Discourse* and Antoninus in Canopus,” *Numen* 68 (2021): 180–203.

<sup>116</sup> Epiphanius, *Ancoratus* 107,1 (130,9–11 H./B./C.). Holl obelizes † ὑπόδειγμα and places \* τοὺς \* between asterixes.

<sup>117</sup> Paris, BNF Copte 131<sup>3</sup>, fol. 57v (p. 216.ii,5–16); Leipoldt, “Epiphanius” (see note 38), 152.

to have interpolated a reference to bad monasteries. However, the solution is easier.  $\pi\tau\omicron\omicron\gamma$  should be emended to  $\pi\tau\omicron\omicron\epsilon$ , “sandal,” where the final epsilon was omitted due to haplography, likely by a later copyist. Thus, our translator read  $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\acute{o}\delta\eta\mu\alpha$  instead of  $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\acute{o}\delta\epsilon\iota\gamma\mu\alpha$  in his Greek *Vorlage*, which Oscar von Lemm realized already in 1909, from the Coptic text published by Leipoldt, though he did not elaborate on this point.<sup>118</sup> This must in fact have been the original reading of our Greek text. The sandals are images of mortal sins in chapter 102 of the *Ancoratus*, which we do not have in Coptic:

Christ shepherds his flock in the holy land . . . and gives the order to untie the sandal of the feet of the shepherds, as Moses first said, which is why those who have received the tradition also themselves lead those who are inducted into the holy knowledge safely by the hand, taking care to untie the sandals of each one. But each of us have different sandals, for each will untie them by his own action.<sup>119</sup>

Epiphanius then goes on to list different sins as examples of such “sandals” that the readers, as good teachers and shepherds, should take care to untie from the feet of their flock. The reference to Moses is from Exod 3:5, where he is commanded by God to loosen the sandals from his feet before entering the holy ground, and this passage is reprised in chapter 115 of the *Ancoratus*,<sup>120</sup> where it is explained as referring to purification before entering into the baptismal font. The holy ground of Exodus is thus interpreted as the holy church, and untying the sandals is the required purification to be made by catechumens before baptism.

The verb  $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\tau\epsilon$  in our problematic sentence—literally “to loosen underneath,” or simply “untie sandals”—makes it clear that the Greek original must have been  $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\acute{o}\delta\eta\mu\alpha$ , not  $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\acute{o}\delta\epsilon\iota\gamma\mu\alpha$ . Thus,  $\beta\omega\lambda \epsilon\beta\omicron\lambda \mu\pi\tau\omicron\omicron\gamma\langle\epsilon\rangle\epsilon \epsilon\theta\omicron\omicron\gamma \eta\tau\epsilon\gamma\iota\eta \{N\}$   $\eta\tau\epsilon\gamma\mu\omicron\omicron\gamma\tau$  reflects  $\kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{o}\nu \acute{\upsilon}\pi\acute{o}\delta\eta\mu\alpha \theta\alpha\nu\alpha\sigma\acute{\iota}\mu\eta\varsigma \acute{o}\delta\omicron\upsilon \dots \acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ . The other part of the sentence is trickier.  $\epsilon\zeta\eta \rho\alpha\tau\omicron\gamma$  must be emended to  $\epsilon\langle\tau\rangle\zeta\eta \rho\alpha\tau\omicron\gamma$ , “which

<sup>118</sup> Oscar von Lemm, “Koptische Miscellen: LXVI. LXVII,” *Bulletin de l’Académie Impériale des Sciences de St.-Petersbourg* 6 (1909): (393–404) 404. Lemm does not comment on the other problems of this passage, and thinks  $\epsilon\zeta\eta\rho\alpha\tau\omicron\gamma$  is fine without emendation. See also Karl Holl with Marc Bergemann and Christian-Friedrich Collatz, *Epiphanius 1: Ancoratus und Panarion haer. 1–33 2: Addenda & Corrigenda* (GCS.NF 10/1; 2d ed.; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013), 531. Kim, *St. Epiphanius* (see note 3), 207, is unaware of the emendation.

<sup>119</sup> Epiphanius, *Ancoratus* 102,1–3 (122,23–29 H./B./C.):  $\pi\omicron\iota\mu\alpha\iota\eta\iota \delta\epsilon \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\nu \acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\alpha \gamma\eta\tau\eta \pi\omicron\iota\mu\alpha\iota\eta\iota \kappa\alpha\iota \omicron\upsilon \mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\nu \pi\omicron\iota\mu\alpha\iota\eta\iota, \acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha} \kappa\alpha\iota \pi\omicron\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\iota \lambda\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\iota\nu \tau\acute{o} \acute{\upsilon}\pi\acute{o}\delta\eta\mu\alpha \tau\acute{\omega}\nu \pi\omicron\delta\acute{\omega}\nu \tau\acute{\omega}\nu \pi\omicron\iota\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega\nu, \acute{\omega}\varsigma \text{Μωυση} \pi\rho\acute{\omega}\tau\omicron\nu \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota \text{παρ' οὗ} \tau\eta\nu \pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\delta\omicron\sigma\iota\nu \pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\iota\lambda\eta\phi\acute{o}\tau\epsilon\varsigma \kappa\alpha\iota \acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma \tau\eta\nu \acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\alpha\nu \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\mu\eta\nu \acute{\epsilon}\iota\sigma\alpha\gamma\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\sigma\phi\alpha\lambda\acute{\omega}\varsigma \chi\epsilon\iota\rho\alpha\gamma\omega\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\iota\tau\epsilon \pi\rho\acute{\omega}\tau\omicron\nu, \tau\acute{\alpha} \acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\delta\eta\mu\alpha\tau\alpha \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\mu\epsilon\lambda\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota. \acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\delta\eta\mu\alpha\tau\alpha \delta\acute{\epsilon} \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon \acute{\eta}\mu\acute{\omega}\nu \acute{\epsilon}\chi\eta\iota \delta\iota\alpha\phi\omega\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu. \tau\eta\gamma\acute{\alpha\rho} \acute{\iota}\delta\iota\alpha \acute{\epsilon}\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon \pi\rho\acute{\alpha}\xi\epsilon\iota \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\alpha\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma \acute{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\delta\eta\acute{\iota}\sigma\alpha\tau\omicron.$

<sup>120</sup> Epiphanius, *Ancoratus* 115 (142,19–143,24 H./B./C.).

is on their feet,” based on the biblical antecedent, Exod 3:5:  $\beta\omega\lambda \epsilon\beta\omega\lambda \mu\eta\tau\tau\omicron\upsilon\gamma\epsilon \epsilon\tau\epsilon\lambda\eta \nu\epsilon\kappa\omicron\gamma\epsilon\rho\eta\tau\epsilon$  for  $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\lambda\upsilon\sigma\alpha\iota \tau\acute{\alpha} \acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\delta\acute{\eta}\mu\alpha\tau\alpha \acute{\epsilon}\kappa \tau\acute{\omega}\nu \pi\omicron\delta\acute{\omega}\nu \sigma\omicron\upsilon$ .<sup>121</sup> Furthermore,  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \omicron\acute{\upsilon}\tau\omega \pi\rho\omicron\alpha\chi\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma$  must originally have been in Genitive, as in the Coptic ( $\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}\bar{\nu}\bar{\tau}\bar{\alpha}\gamma\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\nu}\bar{\tau}\bar{\omicron}\gamma$ ), not in Accusative. Possibly  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa \tau\acute{\omega}\nu \pi\omicron\delta\acute{\omega}\nu$  was omitted due to the eye of a later Greek copyist jumping from  $\acute{\omicron}\delta\omicron\upsilon$  to  $\pi\omicron\delta\acute{\omega}\nu$ . Once  $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\delta\acute{\eta}\mu\alpha$  had been turned into  $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\delta\epsilon\iota\gamma\mu\alpha$  and  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa \tau\acute{\omega}\nu \pi\omicron\delta\acute{\omega}\nu$  was gone, someone corrected  $\tau\acute{\omega}\nu \pi\rho\omicron\alpha\chi\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\omega\upsilon$  to  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \pi\rho\omicron\alpha\chi\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma$  as the object of  $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\lambda\upsilon\tau\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ . The morpheme  $\pi\rho\omicron\omicron$ -, indicating “those who have been led *forward*,” was not fully understood by the Copt, who rendered it  $\chi\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta} \bar{\eta}\bar{\omega}\bar{\rho}\bar{\eta}$ , “from the beginning.”

The Coptic text thus indicates that its Greek *Vorlage* was the following (underlining represents the meaning-units corresponding to each other but placed in different parts of the sentence):

κακὸν ὑπόδημα θανασίμης ὁδοῦ <ἐκ τῶν ποδῶν> τ<ῶν> οὕτω προαχθέντ<ων> ὑπολύετε

$\beta\omega\lambda \epsilon\beta\omega\lambda \mu\eta\tau\tau\omicron\upsilon\gamma\epsilon\epsilon\tau\epsilon \epsilon\theta\omicron\omicron\gamma \bar{\eta}\bar{\tau}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\rho}\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta} \{ \bar{\eta} \} \bar{\eta}\bar{\rho}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\tau}\bar{\eta}\bar{\mu}\bar{\omicron}\bar{\sigma}\bar{\omicron}\bar{\tau} \epsilon\epsilon\tau\bar{\tau}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\rho}\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta} \bar{\rho}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\tau}\bar{\omicron}\bar{\gamma} \bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}\bar{\nu}\bar{\tau}\bar{\alpha}\gamma\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\nu}\bar{\tau}\bar{\omicron}\bar{\gamma} \epsilon\bar{\rho}\bar{\rho}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\iota} \chi\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta} \bar{\eta}\bar{\omega}\bar{\rho}\bar{\eta} \bar{\eta}\bar{\tau}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\rho}\bar{\eta}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\iota}$

“loosen a bad sandal of the deadly path from the feet of those who have been led forward in this way.”<sup>122</sup>

This makes perfect sense after the exhortation to reveal the passages from pagan mythology in church as bad “sandals” of a deadly path, which must be loosened and thrown away before entering church, just as Moses untied his sandals before approaching the holy ground.

## 5.4 The Unspiritual Interpretation of Soulful and Earthly Heretics

At the end of this ecclesiastical passage Epiphanius tells his readers that they should exhort their flock to emulate the zeal of monks, and that they should

<sup>121</sup> Sahidic Coptic text from Rodolphe Kasser, ed., *Papyrus Bodmer XVI: Exode I–XV, 21, en sahidique* (Cologne-Genève: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1961), 40,17–18; Septuaginta Greek from Alfred Rahlfs, ed., *Septuaginta* 1 (9th ed.; Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935), 89.

<sup>122</sup> Paris, BNF Copte 131<sup>3</sup>, fol. 57v (p. 216.ii,10–16); Leipoldt, “Epiphanius” (see note 38), 152. Epiphanius, *Ancoratus* 107,1 (130,10–11 H./B./C.). Carl Schmidt proposes a different Greek original in the *Nachträge* of Karl Holl, *Epiphanius (Ancoratus und Panarion) Erster Band* (Leipzig: J.C. Hincks’sche, 1915), x (not included in the 2013 revised edition):  $\kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{\omicron}\nu \acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\delta\acute{\eta}\mu\alpha \theta\alpha\nu\alpha\sigma\acute{\iota}\mu\eta\varsigma \acute{\omicron}\delta\omicron\upsilon \tau\acute{\omicron} \acute{\epsilon}\nu \pi\omicron\sigma\iota \tau\acute{\omega}\nu <\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\eta\varsigma> \omicron\acute{\upsilon}\tau\omega \pi\rho\omicron\alpha\chi\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\omega\upsilon$ .





as soulful,” identifying his heretical opponents with the first human of 1 Cor 2:14–15, at a pre-spiritual level of understanding. Epiphanius again alludes to Paul, who says that the *psychics* will be judged spiritually.<sup>127</sup> The Coptic has changed ἀνακρινόμενοι to εγδιᾶκρίνε ἡμοῦ, and we should likely associate ἡψυχικόν with this phrase rather than πκαρ as suggested earlier, so that we get “they are judged to be soulful,” similar to the proposed Greek original.

Interestingly, the rhetorical strategy of labeling one’s opponents as soulful (ψυχικοί), devoid of spirit, while portraying oneself as spiritual, in fact corresponds to the critique Epiphanius levels against the Valentinian heretics, also attested in Clement’s excerpts from Theodotus and elsewhere.<sup>128</sup>

## Conclusion

I have argued for a likely historical context for the Coptic translation of the *Ancoratus* soon after its composition, and sketched out some reasons why the text in Coptic would have been welcome to the Upper Egyptian anti-Origenists at the time. Yet it is hardly credible that a person able to read through the lengthy and (let us face it) dreary theological tract would not also have been able to read the Greek original, so why translate the treatise at all? In fact, the intended use of the *Ancoratus* is indicated in the conclusion of the anti-pagan portion of the work, already treated above (no. 3–4), which clearly also refers back to the anti-heretical parts of the work.<sup>129</sup> We already know that the treatise was addressed to presbyters and monks, who had requested an authoritative doctrinal work. The tirade against pagan mythology, Epiphanius suggests, should repeatedly be investigated whenever the congregation is gathered at church, in order to untie the *bad sandals* from the flock:

And whenever you impart all these things laboring through oral expression . . . engender the zeal of monks in the greatest number. By the firmest faith without dissimulation in you, who abhor heretics, who muzzle Manichaeans, Marcionites, and the rest similar to them, expel them from the fold of God, dismissing and bridling all of their pretexs.<sup>130</sup>

<sup>127</sup> 1 Cor 2:14–15: ψυχικός δὲ ἄνθρωπος . . . πνευματικῶς ἀνακρίνεται. ὁ δὲ πνευματικῶς ἀνακρίνει τὰ πάντα.

<sup>128</sup> Epiphanius, *Panarion* 31,6–11 (396,16–398,5 H./D.); Clement, *Excerpta ex Theodoto* 56,1–2 (ed. Robert P. Casey, *The Excerpta Ex Theodoto of Clement of Alexandria* [Studies and Documents 1; London: Christophers, 1934], 76,527–529).

<sup>129</sup> See Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre* (see note 3), 313.

<sup>130</sup> Epiphanius, *Ancoratus* 107,2–5 (130,16–131,13 H.; trans. Kim, *St. Epiphanius* [see note 3], 207–208): καὶ ὅταν πάντα ταῦτα διὰ στόματος καὶ δι’ ἔργων κάμνοντες παραδῶτε . . . μοναχῶν δὲ ζήλον

The *Ancoratus* is thus meant to serve as an *aide-mémoire* for oral refutations of heretics, which would have been performed by monastic or church leaders in Coptic in Upper Egypt. It is worth pointing out that Epiphanius in the above-quoted sentence clearly sees the heretics not as constituting separate sects, but spreading their false message within the fold of God. Orthodox leaders should thus use the *Ancoratus* as proof text against the heretics in churches and monasteries, in order to expose and expel their message, much like Theodore publicly refuted Patchelpius' rejection of the resurrection of the flesh in Phow, according to the *Letter of Ammon*.

This corresponds to the use of other Coptic translations of pre-Chalcedonian patristic sources: they are mostly homilies, meant to be performed in front of an audience, not doctrinal treatises. Seen in the light of its purpose for oral presentation, the *Ancoratus* seems to be less of an abnormality than its companion piece in the White Monastery codex, the treatise *On the 12 stones*, which explains the stones in the breastplate of the Israelite high priest allegorically. Our Coptic translation was not meant for the solitary consumption of a literate elite, who might as well have read it in the Greek original, but for use in public addresses in monasteries, as well as city and village churches, where there was a perceived danger that anti-Nicene and Origenist sympathizers might lead the flock astray.

**Article Note:** This paper derives in part from work undertaken under the aegis of NEWCONT (New Contexts for Old Texts: Unorthodox Texts and Monastic Manuscript Culture in Fourth- and Fifth-Century Egypt) at the University of Oslo, Faculty of Theology. The project was funded by the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Community's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007–2013)/ERC Grant Agreement no. 283741.

---

τοῖς πλείστοις ἐγγενῶτε· διὰ τῆς ἐν ὑμῖν στερρότητος καὶ ἀνυποκρίτου πίστεως αἰρεσιώτας στυγοῦντες, Μανιχαίους φμοῦντες Μαρκιωνιστάς <τε> καὶ λοιποὺς ὁμοίους αὐτῶν, τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ μάνδρας ἀπελαύνετε, πάσας αὐτῶν τὰς προφάσεις παραλύοντες καὶ ἐπιστομίζοντες.