

Shenoute of Atri on the Resurrection

Caroline T. Schroeder,* *Stanford University*

As Frederik Wisse gently reminded us over twenty-five years ago, scholars must not imagine nostalgically that early Egyptian monasticism always functioned as a “bulwark against heresy.”¹ Rather, heterodox monks, too, found themselves drawn to the ascetic movement. This “monastic diversity”² led more than one archbishop in Alexandria to attempt to cleanse the Egyptian monasteries of their “heretical” elements, often drawing like-minded counterparts in those monasteries to aid them in their efforts. One notable ascetic ally was the Egyptian archimandrite Shenoute of Atri.

Shenoute was deeply involved in the orthodox church’s repeated attempts to purge Egypt of Origenist books and monks. A key feature of that debate was the resurrection, and Shenoute came down squarely in support of an embodied resurrection.³ Shenoute’s adherence to the “orthodox” view of the resurrection body, however, stretched well beyond mere lip service to anti-Origenist doctrines promoted by the archbishops of Alexandria. In his more public sermons and treatises, known as the *Discourses*, Shenoute develops a theology of the resurrection in the context of a far-reaching anti-heretical and anti-pagan polemic, not limited to Origenists. First, Shenoute insists upon the truth of the full fleshly incarnation of Jesus Christ as the son of God from the moment of his conception to his bodily resurrection. Second, he contends that Jesus’s resurrection provides the foundation for Christians’ faith in their own bodily resurrection. Finally, the resurrection body will be the same body that God made at the moment of creation.

Although Shenoute treats the resurrection in some of his other writings, three texts form the basis of this study. The first sermon, known by its incipit, *The Lord Thundered*, criticizes both pagans and heretics for, among other things, not believing in the resurrection.⁴ The scribal preface reports that Shenoute preached the sermon in Antinoopolis when some Christians (possibly including Shenoute) were arrested for destroying a pagan temple.⁵ Interestingly, in this

sermon delivered in defense of anti-*pagan* activities, Shenoute also names and disputes Jews, philosophers, Manichaeans, and heretics.⁶

The second source is the so-called anti-Origenist treatise known by its incipit as *I Am Amazed*.⁷ Shenoute mentions Ephesus and Nestorius, who was condemned as a heretic at Ephesus in 431.⁸ It also seems that Shenoute quotes Theophilus's festal letter condemning Origenism in its entirety.⁹ Building on Tito Orlandi's characterization of *I Am Amazed* as an anti-Origenist treatise, Clark has identified the primary object of Shenoute's critique as Gnosticizing Origenists who held beliefs similar to those of Evagrius of Pontus.¹⁰ Some of the doctrines mentioned by Shenoute bear the hallmarks of a philosophical and theological tradition that has often been labelled "Gnostic."¹¹ However, Shenoute himself brands his adversaries with a variety of labels: generic heretics,¹² Melitians,¹³ Origen and his supporters,¹⁴ pagans (ΝΈΑΛΛΗΝ),¹⁵ and Nestorius.¹⁶

The third text is *Who Speaks Through the Prophet*.¹⁷ Shenoute presents words of "light" to counter "dark words of the pagans and every heretic."¹⁸ Almost all of the extant fragments are devoted to the resurrection of Jesus or the resurrection of the body.

Jesus Christ's embodiment from birth to resurrection figures prominently in Shenoute's understanding of the nature of the human body and the resurrection. Jesus Christ's life and resurrection prove the sanctity of human embodied existence and promise a bodily resurrection for all. Disavowing any aspect of Christ's embodiment denies that Christ was crucified and resurrected in the body and also denies the resurrection of humanity.

Shenoute addresses the relationship between the resurrection and this Christological claim about the incarnation in both *The Lord Thundered* and *I Am Amazed*, where he disputes people who disagree with him about the status of the virgin Mary as the woman who, in giving birth to Jesus, conceived and bore the second person of the trinity. Shenoute addresses this issue in two extended passages in *I Am Amazed*. He does not name his opponents in the first passage, but he quotes slogans from them and then uses the Gospel infancy narratives as prooftexts for his position—that Jesus Christ was in fact conceived as a human inside of Mary:

Others blaspheme that Mary did not conceive the Christ, and that if she did conceive then (they ask) did her belly not swell up or collapse? Let them hear about this from us. If she did not conceive

him then the prophet spoke a vain thing, saying, “Behold, the virgin will conceive and bear a son and his name will be called Emmanuel.” (Mt 1:23) And also, “The birth of Jesus Christ was like this.” And, “Behold, you will conceive and bear a son and will call his name Jesus.” (Lk 1:30-31)¹⁹

Shenoute emphasizes the human conception, birth, and thus embodiment of Jesus Christ in his discussion of Mary.

The end of the passage ties this Christological debate to the resurrection. According to Shenoute, his opponents’ claims about Mary represent more than a crude misinterpretation of the Gospels. They threaten to undermine the meaning of Christ’s resurrection. He presses that Christ’s *divinity* was present in Mary’s womb and then born out of Mary, for if it had not been, then Christ did not possess genuine humanity, and the resurrection was meaningless.

If she did not conceive him, then he was not born. If he was not born, then he did not become human. If he did not become human, then he was not crucified. And if he was not crucified, he did not rise on the third day, having gone to his holy dwelling in which he was before, when his Father had not yet sent him, so that he might exist from a woman who, for her part, is Mary, the holy virgin.²⁰

For Shenoute, Jesus Christ is the divinity incarnate from conception through the resurrection. Although Shenoute does not refer to Jesus Christ as the “Logos” here, he invokes the Gospel of John to assert that the figure who was born and crucified in fact existed “before” God the father sent him. The meaning of the crucifixion and the resurrection depends on a genuine embodiment of the divinity that began within Mary’s womb.

It seems likely that Shenoute has in mind Nestorius or his supporters. During this period, the most prominent debate about the status of Mary as the mother of God was the argument between Shenoute’s archbishop, Cyril of Alexandria, and Nestorius. Shenoute may have accompanied Cyril to Ephesus, where, according to his *vita*, he hit Nestorius in the chest.²¹ Nestorius was ultimately exiled to the Great Oasis in Egypt, just 170 kilometers southwest of Shenoute’s monastery.²² Nestorius argued against the title of Mary as the “Theotokos,” the bearer of God, because it implied that the divine nature of God “has need of a second birth from a woman,” and it attributed to the divine nature of God “the characteristics of the

flesh,” which Nestorius considered debasing and bordering on the heresies of Arianism or Apollinarianism.²³ Cyril and others accused Nestorius of claiming that only the humanity of Jesus Christ, and not the divinity, was conceived by Mary.²⁴ This seems to be the issue for Shenoute, as well, since he takes pains to follow Cyril’s argumentation and even quotes some of the same Biblical citations that Cyril used against Nestorius.²⁵

Cyril also charged Nestorius with making too great a distinction between Christ’s divinity and humanity by arguing for two distinct and unmixed natures in Christ.²⁶ Shenoute raises this point in the second passage about Mary in *I Am Amazed*. He takes from Cyril an emphasis on an incarnation in which the flesh and divinity are indistinguishable. He singles out Nestorius by name and accuses him of believing that Christ’s divine nature was not present at the crucifixion. Shenoute in contrast maintains that Jesus Christ himself made no distinction between his humanity and his divinity.²⁷ Shenoute quotes two of the most famous Christological claims attributed to Nestorius: that Jesus “is a man in whom God dwells,” and, “After being born from Mary, the Word went into him.”²⁸ He then addresses Nestorius’s supposed pronouncement that the second person of the trinity was not crucified, because the Bible never calls “the crucified one” God, and because Jesus himself professed that his resurrected body was not a human body. Shenoute replies, “Why did he (Nestorius) [not k]now this [...] that he (Jesus Christ) did [not s]ay, ‘See the [hands] and fe[e]t of a man,’ but simply he said, ‘My own feet and hands,’ since he did not separate the body from the divinity.”²⁹ In other words Jesus himself never claimed to be anything other than simultaneously and inseparably human and divine.

Shenoute dismisses any insinuation that the divine Christ did not experience a human death on the cross. He accuses Nestorius of stating that the divine Christ left the human body before Jesus died:

And he (Nestorius) said, “The divinity went to the heights; it left the flesh on the wood.” . . . (It is) not that the nature of the divinity died, but it was in the flesh that he died, as it is written, “Christ suffered in the flesh.” (1 Peter 4:1) For surely the divinity is not separated from the body while it is on the wood.³⁰

Shenoute is careful not to claim that God actually died. Nonetheless, he maintains, the man who died on the cross was the divine, embodied Christ:

When a person is killed, is it said, “A body was killed?” Is it not said, “We killed a whole person,” even though [the soul] does not die, but it is the body alone that dies? So it is with the Lord. He died in the flesh, even though he was immortal in his divinity. For just as he said, “He shared blood and flesh,” (Heb 2:14) so he said many times, “The Word became flesh” (Jn 1:14). Where did he become flesh except in the virgin? . . . the Son is not different from the Father. . . . He is God from God. And he is the Son from the Father who begot him.”³¹

Shenoute grounds the meaning of the crucifixion and resurrection for human salvation in the debate about Mary. God created the possibility for humanity’s redemption while embodied. Jesus Christ “tasted death for us,” Shenoute insists, by willingly dying on the cross, raising “the body on the third day,” and returning to heaven with that body.³² Furthermore, Christ will someday return again “in it (the body) to judge the living and the dead.”³³ Within Mary’s womb, the divine Christ assumed the human flesh in which he would be crucified and resurrected.³⁴ Shenoute therefore concludes, Mary is rightfully proclaimed “she who bore God”—ΤΕΝΤΑΧΣΠΕ-ΠΝΟΥΤΕ.³⁵ Thus, Shenoute’s defense of Jesus’s bodily resurrection is embedded within his anti-Nestorian polemic.

In his efforts to prove the bodily resurrection of Christ, Shenoute also defines his views on the nature of the human body. He adamantly defends the resurrection against pagans and Manichaeans, as well as Origenists. Jesus performed resurrections, was himself raised in the body, and thus guaranteed a future bodily resurrection for humanity.

In *I Am Amazed*, Shenoute takes issue with certain Christians who sound suspiciously like Origenists although Shenoute does not label them as such.³⁶ They deny that Christ raised Lazarus’s body from the dead, and they interpret his resurrection allegorically, holding that Lazarus represents the intellect (*nous*).³⁷ Shenoute, however, argues for a literal reading. Christ’s raising of the dead is the fundamental mystery that provides the foundation for all of God’s other miracles:

In brief, if, as they maintain, the Lord did not raise Lazarus and if he did not rise, then the others did not rise, and he did not raise them; nor did he cause the deaf to hear and the lame to walk; nor did he make water into wine. And he did not bless the five loaves and the seven that all those multitudes ate, and they were sated, and they took those other baskets of fragments. Nor did he walk upon the sea; he did not command the winds. He did not do the other great things, the other miracles and all the other signs.³⁸

Most significant for Shenoute's theology and anthropology is Jesus Christ's own resurrection. In *The Lord Thundered*, he claims that Jesus died and rose again precisely so that mortal people might also rise from the dead. "For it is our Lord Jesus who died for us so that we might rise not only bodily from death at the final day, but also so that we might rise now from the death of sin."³⁹ In *Who Speaks Through the Prophet*, he scoffs at people who find the whole concept of a corporeal resurrection ludicrous, in part because they doubt that Jesus himself was ever resurrected. He quotes these skeptics, who suggest that someone replaced Jesus's body in the tomb with the body of another, live person before the "resurrection": "For some on the one hand say, 'This body will not rise,' and, 'They put another person in his place.'"⁴⁰ Shenoute dismisses them and predicts that anyone who rejects the resurrection will be consumed by flames, and their blasphemous words will disintegrate, dispersing like dust in the wind.⁴¹

For Shenoute, the resurrection is resolutely corporeal. Both *The Lord Thundered* and *I Am Amazed* contain vivid descriptions of this moment, which he pieces together using a sequence of Biblical passages. The Lord's archangels will "sound the trumpet" to indicate the moment when the dead "will rise imperishable." These once dead bodies will have transformed into "the likeness of the body of his glory." (Phil 3:21) Then the dead shall "hear the voice of the Son of God and come forth. (John 5:25)"⁴² Mountains and earth break open, stones roll from the mouths of tombs, dead bodies exit their tombs, and trees rejoice.⁴³ Shenoute bombards his audience with detailed and palpable imagery, as if the overwhelming sensory experience will prove the truth of his claims.

In *The Lord Thundered*, he uses this rhetorical strategy to great effect in a rather graphic reading of Ezekiel 37. He describes how dried, dispersed bones and rotted, decaying bodies will ultimately reconsolidate and rejuvenate.

The bones that are scattered, the bones that are burned in a flame, the bodies that the beasts and the birds eat, the bodies that are rotted in the earth—they will hear the voice of the son of God, and they will gather together to each other, each one to the one to which it belongs, and sinews will come upon them, and flesh will come over them, and skin will spread over them, and a spirit will come into them, and they will live, and they will rise, and they will stand before the one who had commanded them, as Ezekiel the prophet said. . . .⁴⁴

Shenoute then quotes in its entirety the passage in which Ezekiel prophesies in a valley of dried bones; the Lord revivifies the bones and renews the “house of Israel.” Shenoute deploys this text in defense of the future resurrection of the body, writing, “See the command of God who will cause the dead to rise hurriedly.”⁴⁵ In Shenoute’s hermeneutic, this passage promises a literal resurrection of the body on judgment day, when the bones of each person will reunite only with each other—“searching” so that they do not “mix” with any other person’s bones.⁴⁶

He also defends the orthodox position against those who believe that the body will dissipate into the four elements.⁴⁷ According to Shenoute, a person’s material body is resurrected at the end of time because God himself created the body at the beginning from the stuff of the earth. “Listen, ‘From the earth,’ and not from elements. He molded him. He breathed into his face. The person became a living soul, this one whom he will also raise up, according to the scriptures (Gen 2:6-7).”⁴⁸ Here Shenoute gestures to an important tenet of his theology of the resurrection: the body is good because it is a product of God’s creation. At the final judgment, human life will come full circle. The body which God once created will rise up and return to its maker.

Shenoute develops this principle more explicitly in *Who Speaks Through the Prophet*. There he also links the resurrection of Jesus to humanity’s future resurrection by prefacing one section on the resurrection with a humble nod to the resurrected Jesus: “For this reason, not by the power of the one who speaks (Shenoute), but by the grace of the one who says, ‘Now I will rise,’ says the Lord.”⁴⁹ He lists a litany of challenges to the doctrine of the bodily resurrection. Some people believe the soul will enter a criminal or beasts. Others hold that it will become dispersed into the atmosphere. Still others believe that souls will join the celestial bodies in heaven.⁵⁰

Manichaeans face particular censure because they believe that matter, and hence, the body, does not have a divine origin:

But as for the Manichaeans, they say, “If a soul is killed, if it dies, it is changed to a husk of a body. . . .” Just as they also say, “This body is not something from God but something from matter.” And, “It is dark, and it is bound also to become dark.” But as for the sky as well as the earth, they say, “They are not things from God.”⁵¹

For Shenoute, the Manichaeans’ rejection of the resurrection reveals another equally (if not more) heretical principle: that the earthly matter that comprises the body is “dark” and was not created by God.⁵² Shenoute holds fast to his basic principle that the body’s goodness and potential for resurrection derive from its divine origins. The human and seemingly frail or flawed body will indeed rise because it is the same body that God created.

Despite acknowledging that the body might somehow “change” or transform in the resurrection, Shenoute insists unflinchingly that no new body will appear. He disputes people who have read 1 Cor 15:35–49 to mean that like the sowing of a seed, death will bring forth a new and different body after the old body is interred in the earth.⁵³ Shenoute argues that these people have misinterpreted Paul, and insists that “this” body will rise, “not weakly but strongly, not shamefully but gloriously.”⁵⁴ Again, “You err because you [re]ad the scriptures that the dead will rise, even though there are no readings that (say that) it is another body that will be released from the bodies of the dead.”⁵⁵ He mocks his opponents’ hermeneutics by offering an example of the kind of verse that would have to exist in order for them to extract their particular theology from the Bible:

When the prophets and the apostles spoke, they did not say in your manner that it is another body that will be released from the body of the dead, nor did they say, “This is the way that Adonai, the Lord, said, ‘Rise up from these scattered bones, since behold, I myself will bring another body to you.’”⁵⁶

Shenoute tries to depict his opponents’ views as outlandish and portray his own interpretations as the simple and “obvious” readings of scripture.

The backdrop to each of these conflicts over the resurrection is Shenoute's commitment to bodily sanctity. Whether Shenoute defends Christ's conception within Mary or his resurrection, whether he explains the divine origin of the human body or its final form at the end of time, Shenoute bases his argumentation on the premise that the body holds an intimate and even primal relationship with the sacred. These three texts reveal a theological agenda that stretches beyond the boundaries of the Origenist controversy. They give us a sense of the diverse interpretations of the resurrection among ascetics in Egypt.

Notes

* I would like to thank Elizabeth A. Clark, Lucas van Rompay, Orval Wintermute, and the audience at the 2003 Oxford International Patristics Conference for their comments on earlier versions of this work.

1. Frederik Wisse, "Gnosticism and Early Monasticism in Egypt," in *Gnosis: Festschrift für Hans Jonas*, ed. Barbara Aland (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978), 440.

2. In addition to Wisse's early remarks on this topic, see also James E. Goehring, "Monastic Diversity and Ideological Boundaries in Fourth-Century Christian Egypt," *JECS* 5 (1997): 61–84; repr. idem, *Ascetics, Society, and the Desert: Studies in Early Egyptian Monasticism* (SAC; Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press, 1999), 196–218.

3. Elizabeth A. Clark points to Shenoute's writings as proof of the extensive reach of both the Origenist ascetic practices modeled on the monasticism of Evagrius and the anti-Origenist fervor of "orthodox" clergy. Clark, *The Origenist Controversy: the Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992) 151–57.

4. I follow Stephen Emmel's codicological reconstruction of *The Lord Thundered* and the volume of Shenoute's writings that contains it, known as *Discourses 4*. For the reconstruction of manuscript witnesses to *Discourses 4* in codices GG, DU, YQ, and possibly GM, see Emmel, "Shenoute's Literary Corpus," (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1993), 323–42, 597–601, 612–14, 621–22, 698, and the synoptic table in 1122–24. I have examined all the witnesses to *The Lord Thundered* (apart from cases of textual parallels) reported by Emmel.

5. Shenoute, *The Lord Thundered, Discourses 4*, GG 1–2 in *Sinuthii Archimandritae Vita et Opera Omnia*, ed. Johannes Leipoldt with the assistance of W. E. Crum, 3 vols. (numbered 1, 3, 4), CSCO 41, 42, 73, *Scriptores Coptici* 1, 2, 5 (Paris: Reipublicae, 1906–1913), 3:84–85. Some scholars have

hypothesized that Shenoute himself was involved. E.g. Emmel, “Corpus,” 891; John W. B. Barns, “Shenute as a Historical Source,” in *Actes du X^e congrès international de papyrologues: Varsovie-Cracovie 3–9 septembre 1961*, ed. Jozef Wolski (Wrocław, Warsaw, and Krakow: Zakład Narodowy Imienia Ossolinskich Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 1964), 151–59. See also Wisse’s discussion in “The Naples Fragments of Shenoute’s ‘De certamine contra diabolum,’” *OrChr* 75 (1991): 124.

6. See also Emmel, “Corpus,” 891.

7. I follow Emmel’s codicological reconstruction of *I Am Amazed*. The text has many codicological difficulties because it appears to have been included in at least two volumes of the *Discourses*—volume seven and somewhere in the badly damaged volumes one, two, and/or three. For the reconstruction of manuscript witnesses DQ, HB, XN, YU, ZN, DS, XE, and DT to *I Am Amazed* see Emmel, “Corpus,” 366–673, 406–32, 589–91, 594–96, 633–34, 645–47, 670, 701, and the synoptic table in 1109–15. Tito Orlandi published the text and Italian translation of a portion of *I Am Amazed* in his *Shenute Contra Origenistas: Testo con introduzione e traduzione* (Roma: Centro Italiano Microfiches, 1985). As Emmel has noted, Orlandi’s version does not include fragments confirmed as portions of the text only after Orlandi’s publication, and it excludes the extant fragments of a Coptic translation of a festal letter from Theophilus of Alexandria that was included at the end of the text. (Emmel, “Corpus,” 943–46.) In addition, Janet Timbie has proposed some revisions to Orlandi’s transcriptions in a paper at the annual meeting of the North American Patristics Society in Chicago on May 24, 2001 (“Nestorius in Shenoute’s *I Am Amazed*: A Corrected Text Yields New Information”). I also extend my appreciation to Janet Timbie for sharing with me her copy of the microfilm of DS 190–204 in unpublished British Library manuscript 8800 ff. 7–13. I have examined all the witnesses to *I Am Amazed* (apart from textual parallels) reported by Emmel.

8. See also Emmel, “Corpus,” 939. Emmel suggests a date for *I Am Amazed* somewhat late in Shenoute’s life, probably sometime between 444 and 449. Emmel, “Theophilus’s Festal Letter of 401 as Quoted by Shenute,” in *Divitiae Aegypti: Koptologische und verwandte Studien zu Ehren von Martin Krause*, ed. Cäcilia Fluck et al. (Wiesbaden: Verlag, 1995), 97.

9. Fragments of *I Am Amazed* have been lost, and we no longer possess the full text of Theophilus’s letter in Coptic. Emmel, “Theophilus,” 94.

10. Clark, *Origenist Controversy*, 153, 157.

11. E.g., the existence of a “plurality of worlds.” Clark, *Origenist Controversy*, 153.

12. Shenoute, *I Am Amazed*, HB 22 and DQ 77 in Orlandi, *Shenute Contra Origenistas*, 24, 56.

13. Shenoute, *I Am Amazed*, HB 22 in Orlandi, *Shenute Contra Origenistas*, 24.
14. Shenoute, *I Am Amazed*, HB 33 in Orlandi, *Shenute Contra Origenistas*, 32 and DQ 113 in Carl Wessely, *Griechische und koptische Texte theologischen Inhalts*, 5 vols., Studien zur Palaeographie und Papyruskunde 9, 11, 12, 15, 18 (Leipzg: H. Haessel Hachfolger, 1909–1917; repr. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1966–1967), 1: 131.
15. Shenoute, *I Am Amazed*, HB 44, DS 116 in Orlandi, *Shenute Contra Origenistas*, 40, 46.
16. Shenoute, *I Am Amazed*, DQ 59 in Orlandi, *Shenute Contra Origenistas*, 50.
17. I follow Emmel's codicological reconstruction of *Who Speaks Through the Prophet*. For the reconstruction of manuscript witnesses ZM and DD to *Who Speaks Through the Prophet* see Emmel, "Corpus," 508–15, 523–34, 578–81, 717–18, 995–96, and the synoptic table in 1174. I have examined all the witnesses to *Who Speaks Through the Prophet* reported by Emmel.
18. Shenoute, *Who Speaks Through the Prophet*, ZM 42–43, unpublished (France, Bibliothèque Nationale ms. copte [hereafter FR-BN] 131⁴ ff. 157V–158R): πογοειν ΠΝΩΔΑΧΕ ΠΝΕΓΡΑΦΗ ΠΕ ψαψη ΠΜΔΥ ΠΝΩΔΑΧΕ ΠΚΔΚΕ ΝΝ2ΕΛΛΗΝ ΜΝ 2ΔΙΡΕΤΙΚΟC ΝΙΜ.
19. Shenoute, *I Am Amazed*, HB 29 in Orlandi, *Shenute Contra Origenistas*, 28, 30; Eng. trans. in Michael Eugene Foat, "I Myself Have Seen: the Representation of Humanity in the Writings of Apa Shenoute of Atri," (Ph.D. Diss., Brown University, 1996), 119, rev.; and Hans Quecke in Aloys Grillmeier in collaboration with Theresia Hainthaler, *Christ in the Christian Tradition, Volume 2: From the Council of Chalcedon (451) to Gregory the Great (590–604), Part 4: The Church of Alexandria with Nubia and Ethiopia after 451*, trans. O. C. Dean Jr. (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996), 194. My translation follows Quecke, slightly revised.
20. Shenoute, *I Am Amazed*, HB 29–30 in Orlandi, *Shenute Contra Origenistas*, 30; Eng. trans. in Foat, "I Myself Have Seen," 119, rev. Regarding the passage cited here and above in n. 19, cf. Cyril's first and twelfth anathemas of Nestorius: "If anyone does not confess Emmanuel to be God in truth and the holy Virgin on this ground to be Theotokos, since she brought forth after the flesh the Word of God who became flesh, be he anathema. . . . If anyone does not confess that the Word of God suffered in flesh and was crucified in flesh and 'tasted of death' in the flesh and became 'Firstborn from the dead,' inasmuch as he is life and life-giving, as God, be he anathema." Herbert Bindley, ed. and trans., *The Oecumenical Documents of the Faith*, 4th ed. (London: Methuen, 1950), 113–15; ET in idem, 218–19, rev.
21. Besa, *Vita Sinuthii*, 128–29 in Leipoldt, *Opera Omnia*, 1: 57–58; ET in David N. Bell, trans., *The Life of Shenoute by Besa* (CS 73; Kalamazoo:

Cistercian, 1983), 78. See also Grillmeier, *Christ in the Christian Tradition*, vol. 2, part 4: 212–13.

22. C. Wilfred Griggs, *Early Egyptian Christianity: from its Origins to 451 CE* (Leiden: Brill, 1991), 197; Emmel, “Corpus,” 8. A network of roads connected the oasis to the cities along the Nile. Roger S. Bagnall, *Egypt in Late Antiquity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), 146. Shenoute outlived Nestorius and reports of his death in *It Happened One Day, Discourses 8*, part of which was published in Lefort, “Catéchèse Christologique de Chenoute,” *ZÄS* 80 (1955): 40–45.

23. Nestorius’s second letter to Cyril; ET in Richard A. Norris, ed. and trans., *The Christological Controversy, Sources of Early Christian Thought* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980), 135–40, esp. 137–39. See also his first letter to Celestine, where he states that Mary cannot be the mother of “God the Logos” because parent and child must be “consubstantial” and “of the same essence.” ET in Edward Rochie Hardy, ed., in collaboration with Cyril C. Richardson, *Christology of the Later Fathers* (LCC 3; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1954), 348.

24. Or, as J. N. D. Kelly summarizes the position, that, “Mary bore a man, the vehicle of divinity but not God.” Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, 5th rev. ed. (New York: HarperCollins, 1978), 311. See esp. Cyril’s second letter to Nestorius, where he argues to Nestorius, “It is not the case that first of all an ordinary human being was born of the holy Virgin and that the Logos descended upon him subsequently.” In *The Oecumenical Documents of the Faith*, 4th ed., rev. and with introduction and notes by F. W. Green; T. Herbert Bindley, ed. and trans. (London: Methuen, 1950), 96; ET in Norris, *The Christological Controversy*, 133.

25. See Cyril’s letter to John of Antioch in Bindley, *Oecumenical Documents*, 142; ET also in Norris, *Christological Controversy*, 142–43.

26. Cyril argued that Jesus Christ did not possess *two* natures but *one* in which the divinity had actually become flesh and thus become human. See Grillmeier, *Christ in the Christian Tradition, Volume 1: From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon (451)*, 2nd rev. ed., trans. John Bowden (Atlanta: John Knox, 1975), 467–83; Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, 310–23.

27. Nestorius might have disputed the archimandrite’s characterization of his doctrines. Shenoute finds that Nestorius neglects the Son’s full humanity by separating off and favoring his divinity. Nestorius, however, insisted that Jesus Christ’s human body was in fact joined with the divinity “so that the nature of the deity associates itself with the things belonging to the body, and the body is acknowledged to be noble and worthy of the wonders related in the Gospels.” Nestorius’s Second Letter to Cyril; ET in Norris, *Christological Controversy*, 138.

28. Shenoute, *I Am Amazed*, DQ 59 in Orlando, *Shenute Contra Origenistas*, 50; ET in Foat, "I Myself Have Seen," 132, rev. As Grillmeier notes, Shenoute's representation of Nestorius is not always an accurate depiction of Nestorius's own claims. Shenoute accuses Nestorius of doctrines that he did not advocate, such as an "adoptionist" view of Christ. Nonetheless, this is a critique commonly levied against Nestorius, as in Cyril's second letter to Nestorius: "It is not the case that first of all an ordinary human being was born of the holy Virgin and that the Logos descended upon him subsequently." Bindley, *Oecumenical Documents*, 96; ET in Norris, *Christological Controversy*, 133.

29. Shenoute, *I Am Amazed*, DQ 60 in Orlando, *Shenute Contra Origenistas*, 52; ET in Foat, "I Myself Have Seen," 132, rev.

30. Shenoute, *I Am Amazed*, DQ 61 in Orlando, *Shenute Contra Origenistas*, 52, rev.; Eng. trans. in Foat, "I Myself Have Seen," 132, rev. My translation is based on a revision of Orlando's text after consulting a reproduction of DQ 61 (FR-BN 131⁶ f. 32R) provided by Timbie in "Nestorius in Shenute." Orlando's text with the new readings in brackets {} is as follows: $\Delta\gamma\omega\chi\epsilon\Delta\tau\mu\eta\tau\eta\omega\tau\epsilon\beta\omega\kappa\epsilon\pi\chi\epsilon\pi\mu\tau\epsilon\eta\mu\epsilon\tau\mu\omega\epsilon\{\alpha\kappa\alpha\tau\kappa\pi\tau\pi\mu\omega\epsilon\}.$. . .

31. Shenoute, *I Am Amazed*, DQ 62 in Orlando, *Shenute Contra Origenistas*, 52, 54; ET in Foat, 133, rev. Timbie in "Nestorius in Shenute" has suggested the following reading (provided in brackets {}) as a revision to Orlando's text: ". . . even though he was immortal in his whole soul {in his divinity} (ενοΔε natmoυ 2NTEψYXH T[HPC] {2NTEψMNTNOΥTε}); ". . . so he said many times, '[The Word became] flesh {The Word became flesh},' (κατα θε ηταψXOOC N2a2 χε Ncon χε [.] TCAPI. {απλογος P-CAPI}); "[S]ince the Son is not different from the father, nor is the father (different) {the father is a spirit} . . . (εβολ χε πωψε ψωψε ΑΝ επει ωψ ουλε ηπει ωψ {ουπιλ πε πιψτ}). . . ."

32. Shenoute, *I Am Amazed*, DQ 63 in Orlando, *Shenute Contra Origenistas*, 54; ET in Foat, "I Myself Have Seen," 134, rev. On Shenoute's views of Christ's soul, see Grillmeier, *Christ in the Christian Tradition*, vol. 2, part 4: 211–12.

33. Shenoute, *I Am Amazed*, DQ 63-64 in Orlando, *Shenute Contra Origenistas*, 54; ET in Foat, "I Myself Have Seen," 134, rev.

34. Shenoute makes an abbreviated version of this argument in *The Lord Thundered*. His opponents in this section are probably Nestorians, because Shenoute's brief defense of the virgin Mary emphasizes that Jesus Christ was indeed the embodiment of the second person of the Trinity. He maintains that the incarnate Son (the "father of the entirety") was born of Mary: "It is you who will blaspheme that he did not exist from the virgin Mary. But what I say is that the Lord the Christ Jesus, God of the Christians, chose for himself a holy virgin who had not known a man as it is written (Luke 1:17). He existed from her, and he who was father of the entirety called Joseph father." *The Lord*

Thundered, *Discourses 4*, DU 18 in Émile Amélineau, *Oeuvres de Schenoudi: Texte copte et traduction française*, 2 vols. (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1907–1914), 1:368.

35. Shenoute, *I Am Amazed*, DQ 64 in Orlandi, *Shenute Contra Origenistas*, 54. Note that Shenoute does not use the Greek term *theotokos* here, but a Coptic equivalent.

36. See also Clark, *The Origenist Controversy*, 155.

37. Shenoute, *I Am Amazed*, DS 114 in Orlandi, *Shenute Contra Origenistas*, 44; Eng. trans. in Foat, “I Myself Have Seen,” 128–29.

38. Shenoute, *I Am Amazed*, DS 114–15 in Orlandi, *Shenute Contra Origenistas*, 44; Eng. trans. in Foat, “I Myself Have Seen,” 129, rev.

39. Shenoute, *The Lord Thundered, Discourses 4*, DU 43 in Amélineau, *Oeuvres*, 1: 375–76.

40. Shenoute, *Who Speaks Through the Prophet*, ZM 43, unpublished (FR-BN 131⁴ f. 158R): ΖΩΙΝΕ ΜΕΝ ΓΑΡ ΕΥΧΩ ΜΜΟΣ ΧΕ ΠΙΣΩΜΑ ΝΑΤΩΟΥΝ ΑΝ ΑΓΩ ΧΕ ΑΥΤ ΝΙΚΕΟΥΔΑ ΕΠΕΨΜΑ.

41. Shenoute, *Who Speaks Through the Prophet*, ZM 43, unpublished (FR-BN 131⁴ f. 158R): ΕΤΒΕ ΠΑΙ 2ΡΔΙ 2ΝΤΣΟΜ ΑΝ ΜΠΕΤΨΔΧΕ ΆΛΛΑ 2ΡΔΙ 2ΝΤΕΧΑΡΙC ΜΠΕΤΨΧ ΜΜΟΣ ΧΕ ΤΕΝΟΥ ΤΝΑΤΩΟΥΝ ΠΕΧΕΠΧΟΕΙC ΤΕΝΟΥ ΤΝΑΧΙΕΟΟΥ ΤΕΝΟΥ ΤΝΑΧΙC ΤΕΝΟΥ ΤΕΤΝΑΝΑΥ ΤΕΝΟΥ ΤΕΤΝΑΧΙΨΠΕ ΤΣΟΜ ΜΠΕΤΝΠΝΑ ΝΑΨΩΠΕ ΕΨΦΟΥΕΙΤ ΠΚΩΣΤ ΝΑΟΥΕΜΤΗΥΤΝ ΝΕΤΨΔΧΕ ΝΤΟΒΤΒ 2ΙΨΒΩ ΕΤΕΤΝΧΩ ΜΜΟ[С] ΨΝΑΨΔΨΟΥ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΘΕ ΜΠΨΟΕΙΨ ΕΨΔΡΕΠΤΗΥ ΘΛΟΨ ΕΒΟΛ 2ΙΧΜ Π2Ο ΜΠΚΑ2.

42. Shenoute, *I Am Amazed*, HB 41 in Orlandi, *Shenute Contra Origenistas*, 38; Eng. trans. in Foat, “I Myself Have Seen,” 125, rev.

43. Shenoute, *I Am Amazed*, HB 42–43 in Orlandi, *Shenute Contra Origenistas*, 38, 40; Eng. trans. in Foat, “I Myself Have Seen,” 125–26, rev. Ps 95:12–13.

44. Shenoute, *The Lord Thundered, Discourses 4*, DU 35 in Amélineau, *Oeuvres*, 1: 368–69.

45. Shenoute, *The Lord Thundered, Discourses 4*, DU 37 in Amélineau, *Oeuvres*, 1: 371.

46. Shenoute, *The Lord Thundered, Discourses 4*, DU 38 in Amélineau, *Oeuvres*, 1: 371.

47. Cf. Clark, *The Origenist Controversy*, 155.

48. Shenoute, *I Am Amazed*, HB 45 in Orlandi, *Shenute Contra Origenistas*, 40; ET in Foat, “I Myself Have Seen,” 126, rev.

49. See n. 41 above.

50. Shenoute, *Who Speaks Through the Prophet*, ZM 43, unpublished (FR-BN 131⁴ f. 158R): ΖΕΝΚΟΟΥΨ ΔΕ ΧΕ ΕΡΨΔΛΠΡΨΜΕ ΜΟΥ ΕΨΔΡΕΤΕΨΨΧΗ ΒΨΚ Ε2ΟΥΝ ΕΟΥΖΑΡΠΔΖ ΖΕΝΚΟΟΥΨ ΔΕ ΧΕ ΕΨΔΣΒΨΚ Ε2ΟΥΝ ΕΝΤΒΝΟΟΥΨ. ΖΕΝΚΟΟΥΨ ΔΕ ΧΕ

ΕΨΑΣΨΩΨΕ ΕΣ2ΗΑ 2ΜΠΔΗΡ. 2ΟΙΝΕ ΔΕ ΕΥΧΩ ΜΜΟΣ ΧΕ ΕΨΑΡΕΝΕΨΥΧΗ ΝΝ2ΕΛΛΗΝ ΨΩΨΕ ΕΥΨΑ ΜΝ ΠΡΗ ΜΝ ΠΟΟ2 ΜΝ ΝCΙΟΥ 2ΝΜΠΗΥ6.

51. Shenoute, Who Speaks Through the Prophet, ZM 44, unpublished (FR-BN 131⁴ f. 158V): ΜΜΑΝΙΧΔΙΟC ΔΕ ΕΥΧΩ ΜΜΟS ΧΕ ΕΨΩΨΕ ΟΥΨΥΧΗ ΕΑΣ2ΩΤΒ ΤΕ ΕΨΑΛΜΟΥ ΨΑΥΠΟΟΝΕC ΕΥCΩΜΑ ΝΚΕΛΕΦΩC. ΕΥΟΨΩ2 ΔΕ ΟΝ ΕΧΝΤΕΥΜΗΤΔΤΝΟΥΤΕ ΨΑΥΧΟΟC ΧΕ ΠΔΗΡ ΤΕΨΥΧΗΠΕ ΝΝΖΩΨΟΝ ΜΝ ΝΡΨΜΕ ΜΝ Ν2ΔΛΔΤΕ ΜΝ ΝΤΒΤ ΜΝ ΝΧΔΤΨΕ ΜΝ ΝΚΑ ΝΙΜ ΕΤ2ΜΠΚΟCΜΟC ΝΘΕ ΟΝ ΕΤΟΨΧΩ ΜΜΟS ΧΕ ΠΕΙCΩΜΑ ΠΑΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΑΝ ΠΕ ΔΛΛΔ ΠΑΘΥΛΗ ΠΕ. ΔΥΨ ΧΕ ΟΥΚΑΚΕ ΠΕ Ε2ΔΠC ΟΝ ΕΤΡΕΨΡΚΔΚΕ. ΤΠΕ ΔΕ ΟΝ ΜΝ ΠΚΑ2 ΕΥΧΩ ΜΜΟS ΧΕ ΝΑΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΑΝ ΝΕ.

52. Shenoute buttresses his position by noting that Athanasius of Alexandria has already revealed the “wickedness” and “impieties” inherent in the Manichaean beliefs. Shenoute, Who Speaks Through the Prophet, ZM 44, unpublished (FR-BN 131⁴ f. 158V): ΠΑΓΓΕΛΟC ΕΤΟΥΔΔΒ ΜΠΧΟΕΙC Α[ΘΑΝ]ΑCΙΟC ΠΑΡΧΙΕΠΙCΚΟΠΟC ΝΘΕ ΟΝ ΝΤΑΝΕΙΜΕ ΕΤΕΠΛΔΗΝ Ν2Δ2 Ν2ΔΙΡΕΤΙΚΟC ΕΒΩΛ 2ΙΤΝΕΨΕΠΙCΤΩΗ.

53. “Thusly you also have said, ‘Another body comes on the day of the resurrection, so that this one in which we are now becomes earth and no longer exists.’” Shenoute, Who Speaks Through the Prophet, ZM 59–60 in Amélineau, *Oeuvres*, 2: 192.

54. Shenoute, Who Speaks Through the Prophet, ZM 65 in Wessely, *Texte*, 5: 127.

55. Shenoute, Who Speaks Through the Prophet, ZM 60 in Amélineau, *Oeuvres*, 2: 192–93; continued in DD 83, unpublished (FR-BN 131⁵ f. 79R): ΕΙ Ε ΤΗΠΛΔΝΑ ΧΕ ΤΝ[Ψ]Ω ΝΝΕΓΡΑΦΗ ΧΕ ΝΕΤΜΟΟΥΤ ΝΔΤΦΟΥΝ ΕΜΝΕΨΨ ΧΕ ΚΕCΩΜΑ ΠΕΤΝΑ[+]ΟΨ Ε2ΡΔΤ 2ΝΝCΩΜΑ ΝΝΕΤΜΟΟΥΤ.

56. Shenoute, Who Speaks Through the Prophet, DD 83, unpublished (FR-BN 131⁵ f. 79R): ΕΝΕΠΡΟΦΗΤΗC ΜΝ ΝΑΠΟCΤΟΛΟC ΧΕ ΜΠΟΥΧΟΟC ΝΤΕΚ2Ε ΧΕ ΚΕCΩΜΑ ΠΕΤΝΑΤΟΨ Ε2ΡΔΤ 2ΝΠCΩΜΑ ΝΝΕΤΜΟΟΟΥΤ Ή ΧΕ ΜΠΟΥΧΟΟC ΧΕ ΤΔΪ ΤΕ ΘΕ ΝΤΑΛΔΩΝΔΙ ΠΧΟΕΙC ΧΟΟC ΧΕ ΔΧΙC Ε2ΟΨ 2ΝΝΕΙΚΕΕC ΕΤΨΟΨωΟΥ ΧΕ ΕΙC 2ΗΗΤΕ ΑΝΟΚ ΤΗΔΕΙΝΕ ΝΚΕCΩΜΑ Ε2ΟΨ ΕΡΩΤΗ. Shenoute again cites Ezekiel 37:1–14 as proof that his vision of the resurrection is the correct one; the Lord did not mention “other” bodies that would be released from the bones of the dead.