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FURTHER NOTES ON CAIRO COPTIC INSCRIPTIONS

In a recent study "Zu einer neuen Edition einiger Kairener Inschriften", K.A. Worp of Amsterdam has listed the instance in which the inscriptions treated by W. Brunsch in _Aegyptus_ 73 (1993) 127-196 (hereafter "Br.") were already known from either (i) G. Lefebvre, _Recueil des inscriptions grecques-chrétiennes d'Egypte_ (Cairo 1907) or (ii) I. Kamel, _Coptic Funerary Stelae_ (Cairo 1987). At Worp's suggestion I present here further annotations and identifications.

Br. #1 (=Lef. 191; listed by Brunsch, _Archiv_ 38 [1992] 58): As was clearly seen by Lefebvre, line 1 is obviously a vocative, *khrns + koalwgrn*, rather than the *xyn* printed by Br. The inscription, found at Antinoopolis, invokes the city's patron saint (cf. Timm, _Ägypten_ I 115). Line 2 begins *sy.nptwgrn genv*n. For the rest, I propose τ(ω κρητικ(Δ)τ(ι) (κα) τω κτιστη) (read -ν(ι) λ[..]ω τω *xyn* πτ(ης)γ(ιο)τ(ης) *xyn*(υ) θυς θ(μοι) (κρητικοις) θ(μοι). The final indication numeral seems to be a theta. Translate: "O Saint Colluthus, be a helper (lit. fellow-worker) to the building and the builder, ... (and) to your servant the synodicarius. Beginning of Thoth, ind. 9, Amen." However, Worp informs me (per litt. d.d. 19.X.94) that he and Bagnall were doubtful enough whether this *xyn* ( ) was indeed an *xyn*, particularly in view of the uncertainty about Thoth coinciding with the indiction in the Antinoopolis region, that they deliberately did not include it in their list of *xyn*-dates, cf. _CSBE_ 60 n. 45. He suggests that *xyn* ( ) may be an abbreviation for another title, preceded by an understood και, e.g. "the synodicarius and archimandrite." I cannot resolve this problem. Antinoopolis had an extensive building program under Justinian and then suffered much destruction by the Persians (C. Uggeri in _Antinoë_ 1965-1968 [Rome 1974] 66) as well as a severe flood under Maurice (Timm, _Ägypten_, I 118). This inscription, from the necropolis (perhaps re-used), could have come from one of these building or rebuilding campaigns. Since the term *xynos* is attested for the seventh century, the ninth indiction might have corresponded to either A.D. 604/5 or 634/5.

Br. #9: Line 7, read ηλια(ί)κ(τις)θος.

Br. #10: Line 3 on the plate p. 138 clearly shows that the *nomen sacrum* is κ(γρις), with epsilon, not the numeral 29 with theta. Correct the translation to read "O Lord, give rest to the soul of your servant etc.

Br. #13: In line 3 the name τουργετ is probably the feminine of τουργετ, "joy" (W. Brunsch, "Index zu Heuser's 'Personennamen der Kopfen', _Enchoria_ 12 [1984] 140).

Br. #18: In line 1 read τημηρες, the tail on the shai can just be seen on the plate (p. 147).

Br. #26 (also Kamel # 111, pls. L and 33): This is C. Wietheger, _Das Jeremias-Kloster zu Saggara unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Inschriften, Arbeiten zum spätantiken und koptischen Ägypten_ 1 (Altenberg 1992) #5, p. 305 with literature.

The opening phraseology is typical of Apa Jeremias monastery commemorative stelae. In lines 13-14 it needs to be shown more clearly that the letters ως in ης ως ' are raised above the line. The order of the spaces filled is interesting: NW, NE, SE, SW. Although Br. states "(thee) Nummer", in fact it has the inv. no. 8021.

Br. #27 (= Kamel #190, pls. LXXXIX and 45): On Kamel's pl. 45 this has the Egyptian Museum inventory number 8617, while in Kamel's index p. 270 it confusingly has the number 8445.

Br. #28 (= Kamel #59): In line 1 read τηνακοινος, with omicron: there is no crossbar to make it a theta.

Br. #29: This is Quibell _Excav. Saqqara_ 1908/1910 (Cairo 1912), no. 205, p. 62, where the ed. pr. read Phaophi 2, not 8, and ζβ *hes* "in Memphis", instead of Brunsch's ψαψ (which Br. calls "nicht belegt"). Also Wietheger, _Jeremias-Kloster_, no. 193, p. 378 (cf. 266); she states that the location of the stone is "unbekannt". In line 10 read ιουχτηρ. This is dating information, since the only Patriarch of Alexandria named Joseph before the 20th century was Joseph I (reigned A.D. 830-849).

Br. #30: In line 9 read *hμεστης*, "second", and in line 10 read *hξως*, "bless": a blundered lunar sigma can often look like anomicron. In view of the reading in line 9 Br.'s translation "Jahre 3" (p. 164) is incorrect: substitute "2". As Worp has pointed out, this text is _ASAE_ 6 (1905) 108. There Mallon (p. 109) gave a correct translation for line 2 but made too much of not being able to see the actual letters του τη(ξη)τος (κα) του γυο(ι)ο (κα) του τοι etc. In fact they are quite clear on the plate (here p. 164), and Br.'s reading του προσωπο(ν) (sic! p. 163) and translation "des Ersten" (p. 164) are impossible. Here too in τη(ξη)τος the blundered lunar sigma looks like an omicron.

---

1 _ZPE_ 105 (1995) 160; I thank the author for sending me a pre-publication printout.

2 One was also treated by Brunsch himself earlier in his article in _Orientalia_ 60 (1991) 92-108; compare also his additional article listing inscriptions in _Archiv für Papyrologie_ 38 (1992) 47-60.


4 Lefebvre got ζ(μ)(ι)της (1. 3) from Millet, but not only is this foreign to epigraphic phraseology, but the restorations proposed are too long for the space missing; he gave up on ζ (1. 5).
Br. #31: This is Munier 112 (Aegyptus 11 [1930-31] 450; MacCoull-Worp, "The Era of the Martyrs," Misc. Pap. 2 [Florence 1990] 394); Hasitzka Koptisches Sammelbuch I 610. In several places Munier's readings seem more reliable than those of Br. and we have continued to accept those earlier ones. E.g. the day numeral read by Br. at the end of his line 4 (Munier's line 5) as σοῦνη, "8th": Munier read his lines 5-6 better as η²ητηγηλ, having pointed out that in the usual Aswan gravestone phraseology the resumptive η²ητηγηλ is used at this place in the formula (after ητοη δηεοητ). On the plate published by Br. (p. 166), clearly there is only one letter between the nu and the eta. Also in Br.'s lines 15-16 he reads σωροηυμηνοη, "7th", for the day numeral. However, Munier's ηπηγηογηο followed by εγγηφηηληηηη (his lines 16-17) is clearly better according to the plate. Munier's day numeral κα, 21, is to be read rather than part of Br.'s κατη. This should be followed by Munier's correct ηλη(μηητηητη) ηη, which is the correct indiction for Diocletian year 582 as also read by Munier (the third numeral in his line 19 is a cursive-type beta rather than an alpha.)

Br. #38: Line 3, print ηηηηηηηη.
Br. #48: According to the plate (p. 185) it is really doubtful if the delta and iota for δηεοη(δηηζηηοοη) can be read in the last line.
Br. #53: Br.'s note on line 5 does not make sense: the ητοη τη is the number of years of the deceased's lifetime.
Br. #55: as Worp points out, in line 10 the indiction number is eta, 8, as is clear on the plate (p. 194). This corresponds correctly with the Diocletian year. In line 11 print the Diocletian year numeral as φηζ (516).
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