

L. S. B. MACCOULL

FURTHER NOTES ON CAIRO COPTIC INSCRIPTIONS

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 112 (1996) 284–285

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

FURTHER NOTES ON CAIRO COPTIC INSCRIPTIONS

In a recent study "Zu einer neuen Edition einiger Kairener Inschriften",¹ 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'Égypte* (Cairo 1907) or (ii) I. Kamel, *Coptic Funerary Stelae* (Cairo 1987).² 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,³ line 1 is obviously a vocative, +ΔΓΙΕ + ΚΟΛΛΟΥΓΘΕ, rather than the ΔΓΙΕ printed by Br. The inscription, found at Antinoopolis, invokes the city's patron saint (cf. Timm, *Ägypten* I 115). Line 2 begins CΥΝΕΡΓΟΣ ΓΕΝΘ. For the rest,⁴ I propose ΤΩ Κ|ΤΙCΗ(Δ)Τ(Ι) (ΚΑΙ) ΤΩ ΚΤΙCΤΙ (read -Η) Κ[.] |ω τω ΔϞΑΩ CϞ ΠCΓΥΗO|ΤΙΚ(ΔΡΙΩ) ΔΡΧ(Η) ΘΩΘ ΠΛ(ΚΤΙΟΗC) Θ [ϞΘ. The final indiction 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 ΔΡΧ() was indeed an ΔΡΧΗ, 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 ΔΡΧΗ-dates, cf. *CSBE* 60 n. 45. He suggests that ΔΡΧ() may be an abbreviation for another titles, 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 cυνοδικάρτιοc 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 ΠΛ/(Ι)Κ(ΤΙΟΗC).

Br. #10: Line 3 on the plate p. 138 clearly shows that the *nomen sacrum* is Κ(ΥΡΙ)Ε, 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 ΤΟΙΥΡΟΤ is probably the feminine of ΠΟΥΡΟΤ, "joy" (W. Brunsch, "Index zu Heuser's 'Personennamen der Kopten' ", *Enchoria* 12 [1984] 140).

Br. #18: In line 1 read ΠΩΗΡΕ: 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 ωε in φΔΗ' ωε' are raised above the line. The order of the spaces filled is interesting: NW, NE, SE, SW. Although Br. states "o(hne) N(umme)r", 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 ΠΧΟΕΙC, 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 2Π ΗΕΒΕ "in Memphis", instead of Brunsch's ΠΗΗΕΡΙ 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 ΙΩCΗΦ. 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 ΗΕ2CΠΤΕ, "second", and in line 10 read CΗOY, "bless": a blundered lunar sigma can often look like an omicron. 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 Π(ΔΤ)ΡΟC (ΚΑΙ) ΤΟΥ ΥΙ(ΟΥ) (ΚΑΙ) ΤΟΥ etc. In fact they are quite clear on the plate (here p. 164), and Br.'s reading ΤΟΥ ΠΡΟΟΥΤΟΗ (*sic!* p. 163) and translation "des Ersten" (p. 164) are impossible. Here too in Π(ΔΤ)ΡΟC 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 Papyrusforschung* 38 (1992) 47-60.

³ Seen for that matter by S. de Ricci in the first publication by A. Gayet, "L'exploration des nécropoles de la montagne d'Antinoë", *Ann. Musée Guimet* 30.3 (Paris 1903) 142 and Pl. II no. 10. Compare S. Timm, *Das christlich-koptische Ägypten* I (Wiesbaden 1981) 127 n. 37 (s.v. "Ansina").

⁴ Lefebvre got cυ(ι)λη (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 κ/(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 $\text{C}\text{O}\gamma\text{H}$, "8th": Munier read his lines 5-6 better as $\text{H}\text{Z}\text{H}\text{T}\text{C}$, having pointed out that in the usual Aswan gravestone phraseology the resumptive $\text{H}\text{Z}\text{H}\text{T}\text{C}$ is used at this place in the formula (after $\text{H}\text{T}\text{O}\text{H}\ \text{H}\text{H}\text{O}\text{C}$). 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 $\text{C}\text{O}\gamma\text{E}\text{P}\text{A}\text{M}\text{H}\text{O}\text{O}\text{C}$, "7th", for the day numeral. However, Munier's $\text{H}\text{Z}\text{O}\text{L}\text{O}\gamma$ followed by $\text{E}\text{P}\text{P}\text{A}\text{F}\text{H}\ \text{H}\text{E}\text{H}\text{H}$ (his lines 16-17) is clearly better according to the plate. Munier's day numeral $\text{K}\Delta$, 21, is to be read rather than part of Br.'s $\text{K}\Delta\text{T}\Delta$. This should be followed by Munier's correct $\text{H}\Delta(\text{K})\text{T}(\text{I}\text{O}\text{H}\text{O}\text{C})\ \text{I}\Delta$, 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 $\text{H}\chi\Delta\text{H}\Delta$.

Br. #48: According to the plate (p. 185) it is really doubtful if the delta and iota for $\Delta\text{I}\text{O}\text{K}(\text{A}\text{H}\text{T}\text{I}\Delta\text{H}\text{O}\gamma)$ can be read in the last line.

Br. #53: Br.'s note on line 5 does not make sense: the $\text{E}\text{T}\text{O}\text{H}\ \xi$ 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 $\text{P}\text{I}\zeta$ (516).