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In Klio 41 (1963) 234-235 P.L. Photiades gave an erroneous transcription¹ and an extremely fanciful explanation² of this fragment. In fact inspection of the plate quickly makes matters clear. The fragment comes from a codex containing a Eucharistic anaphora (or more than one). The first petition is from the intercession for the emperor(s);³ the second is from that for the region.⁴ Hair and flesh sides are not signalled by the first editor and are not identifiable from the plate. The dialect is Sahidic Coptic. I re-transcribe:

(a)  

\[
[\text{πέχῃ τὸν ἄνας}]
\]

1  

\[\text{εἰσκό εὐτή εἰρήν ἕν ἕν ἕνεκ}
\]

\[\text{γιάρ τοῦ συνηπλασθή(ε)μι}
\]

\[\text{ἀντώγες κ(ω) ἡμῖν ἑκάστη}
\]

4  

\[\text{ἀντώγες: γιάρ τοῦ σωλάκ}
\]

\[\text{ἀντώγες παίτα [τά] ἐκ-}
\]

\[\text{ἀρωμ: κ (ω) πολεμισών}
\]

(b)  

\[\text{παραίτερα}
\]

1  

\[\text{τῷ ὁ τῷ εἰς πιστεῖ}
\]

\[\text{οἰκογνώστου εἰς ἄντωγες}
\]

\[\text{ἀλειφασία(δ)}
\]

4  

\[\text{εὐπρεπες τινος λιθος: Ἥπικες-}
\]

\[\text{πολίς τηροῦ· ἡπτήξεως}
\]

\[\text{ἡπτήξεις: ἡπτήξεως τηρεῖ}
\]

(a) 5-6 read αὐτῶν, ἐξορόν, πολέμουν  
(b) 2 read οἰκογνώτων

¹ Neither the transcriber nor the typeface appeared able to distinguish between a Coptic \textit{fai} (φ) and an \textit{upsilon} (υ).
² The interpretation involved the circumstances of the Arab conquest of Egypt, which is quite irrelevant.
³ Photiades p. 235 wrongly states that ὑπὲρ...πολέμιον "does not find any parallel in the liturgy".
⁴ Partly seen by Photiades, \textit{ibid}.
(a) "(O Lord, we call upon) Thee: hear us and (have mercy on us.) For (Thy) fighting alongside him/them and subduing under his [their', if collegial emperors] feet all foes in war, (we beseech Thee, O Lord.) ... (b) (For this land and every land,) and all who dwell in them in faith, we beseech Thee: For our city and all other cities, and our countryside (chora), and the villages, and all our faith (we beseech Thee, etc.)."

In the three anaphoras of Egypt as we have them (with Sahidic witnesses of course being earlier than Bohairic) there are not absolutely exact parallels to these passages in the parchment.

However, the bilingual Leiden MS. Inssinger 29 (ed. W. Pleyte, P.A.A. Boeser, Manuscrits coptes du Musée d'antiquités des Pays-Bas à Leide [Leiden 1897] 127-128) has (recto lines 7-16) ἔνδοξος ηῆος σωτήρ ἡῆ ἡῆ | ἔπες τῷ συμπολεμήσαι ἀγωγὸς καὶ καλοποτάξαι ἀγωγὸς ὑπὸ τοὺς πολλὰς τὰ εὐφράμ καὶ πολεμεῖν ἄγωγος σοῦ ἐπικογόνος | καὶ εἰκόνος | εἰς ἐμπολεμήσαι ξέκλας εἴς τρεῖς ἐμποτάξεις | τῷ ὑποτάξεσθαι ἡῆ ἔνδοξος ηῆος | σωτήρ ἡῆ ἡῆ ἡῆ. This MS text, from the White Monastery, is nearly identical in its Greek portion; it follows the intercession for the ἐβρίος ἡῆρος, the Christ-loving kings (plural). It has the same expansion of added ἀγωγὸς in the same places. Since its verso begins with ἔνδοξος ηῆος estamos, perhaps the intercession for "this city and every city" was at the mutilated bottom of the leaf, on the recto.

For (a) compare G. Cuming, The Liturgy of St Mark (= OCA 234; Rome 1990) p. 6 (cited in a parallel): ὑπὲρ τοῦ συμπολεμήσας καὶ ὑποτάξας ὑπὸ τῶν πολλῶν πάντα ἐξθέν καὶ πολεμέων, τοῦ κυρίου ἐδηθώμεν: very close. And for (b) compare, in Sahidic, E. Lanne, ed., Le Grand Euchologe du Monastère Blanc (PO 28; Paris 1958), 298-299: ἀρι pmeeue πιεισιε ντεεπολες τμ αν αποικ πυηηη πυηηη πυηηη | πυηηη πυηηη | πυηηη πυηηη | πυηηη πυηηη | πυηηη πυηηη | πυηηη πυηηη | πυηηη πυηηη | πυηηη πυηηη | πυηηη πυηηη | πυηηη πυηηη | πυηηη πυηηη: "Remember, O Lord, this city and every city, and every countryside (chora), and every village, and every orthodox monastery,5 and every faithful house." (Something like this last may underlie the last item in the list in the parchment text.)

In (a) 1 the hand in which the respond is written is clearly different from that of the text of the petition proper. The hand of the word ἄγωγος(α) in (b) 3 is similar: both have a characteristic flattened μυ, like those observable in B. Layton, Catalogue of Coptic Literary Manuscripts in the British Library acquired since the year 1906 (London 1987), nos. 70 (Plate 5.1) and 71 (Plate 1.5). Both of the latter were found in 1898 at the White Monastery. For the main hand, compare Layton Catalogue no. 176 (Plate 8.2), from the same find; and Crum, BM 489 (Plate 7), also from the White Monastery (dated Pharmouthi, Martyr’s year 828 = April A.D. 1113). These data, added to the close White Monastery parallel in the Leiden text, may reinforce the suggestion of a White Monastery origin for the Madrid fragment, stated by Photiades to have come from Ben Hason (sic).

I leave it to specialists in liturgy to sort out the exact parallels and dating. For the present, it is of interest that this fragment, now more correctly identified, is an Egyptian witness to a liturgical text early enough to still pray for the Byzantine emperor and his victory over his enemies.

Society for Coptic Archaeology (North America) L.S.B. MacCoull

---

5 Not paralleled in the parchment text.