Two Coptic Ostraca in the Brigham Young University Collection

In the late 1970s and early 1980s Brigham Young University (BYU) acquired a modest collection of Coptic papyri, parchments and ostraca from Aziz Atiya (†) of the University of Utah. The Coptic collection is comprised of about eight ostraca, three papyri, a few dozen parchment fragments and a parchment codex containing seven folios (1). While very little is known about the provenance of the BYU Coptic collection (2), the origin of two ostraca, edited here for the first time, can be determined since they share some distinct parallels with certain provenanced texts. The first is BYU inv. Coptic Ostracon 70 that must have come from Wadi Sarga because it shares a few significant details with a text from this monastery; the second is BYU inv. Coptic Ostracon 71 that must have originated from the monastery of Apa Apollo in Bawit due in part to its use of some unique phraseology (3). Exactly how Atiya acquired these two

(*) I would like to thank Alain Delattre and Anne Boud'hors for their help and direction as I edited these ostraca. I would also like to thank Russell C. Taylor, Supervisor of Reference Services at the L. Tom Perry Special Collections Library, for permission to edit and publish images of these pieces.

(1) Besides the present two ostraca, there are three letters as well as a collection of three ostraca that belong to a magical archive containing a *historiola* of Horus and Isis. The three Coptic papyri are extremely fragmentary and only contain a few lines of text that are barely legible. While the greater majority of the parchment fragments are unidentified, they include some eleven New Testament fragments, at least one Old Testament fragment, as well as a copy of the Nicene Creed; on the latter see W.F. Macomber, “The Nicene Creed in a Liturgical Fragment of the 5th or 6th Century from Upper Egypt,” *OrChr* 77 (1991), pp. 98–103. The parchment codex contains a homily and probably dates to the eleventh or twelfth century and potentially comes from the White Monastery.

(2) Unfortunately, neither the acquisition records, the library’s catalogue, nor any of Atiyah’s extant correspondence mentions anything about how he acquired the texts nor their provenance.

(3) There is no need to rehearse the material from Bawit, which can be readily accessed in a number of lucid studies. See S.J. Clackson, “Reconstructing the archives of the Monastery of Apollo at Bawit,” *PapCongr*. XXII (Florence, 1998), pp. 219–36; S.J. Clackson, *Coptic and Greek Texts Relating to the Hermopolite Monastery of Apa Apollo* (P.Mon. Apollo; Oxford, 2000); S.J. Clackson, *It is Our Father Who Writes: Orders from the*
ostraca is a matter of speculation, but since the site of Bawit was plundered in the early 1970s and a number of its artifacts went on the antiquities market in Cairo it seems probable that at least BYU inv. Coptic Ostracon 71 may have been obtained at this time (4).

1. Notification for the Sending of Some Sacks (FIG. 1)

BYU inv. Coptic Ostracon 70 12.5 × 13.0 cm Wadi Sarga, vii-viii cent.

This text consists of nine lines, fully intact, and concerns notification that some sacks have been collected from two individuals and sent. The text is written along the ribbing of the ostracon in a single hand with black ink and has a slight tilt to the right. For the most part the hand is regular and clear with few ligatures; while the text contains various abbreviations all of them are common and are otherwise well-attested. The text is bilingual with most of the document written in Coptic but the total number of sacks to be delivered and the date is written in Greek, which is written in a distinctly different style than the Coptic albeit in the same hand. Following the date the text closes with an addendum, which is somewhat unclear, where some instructions are given about some torn sacks. It is worth pointing out that this text only mentions sacks, σῶματα, but never specifies what product is actually being shipped, like wheat or barley, although it is typical to specify the commodity. In a few significant details this text shares some remarkable parallels with P.Sarga 189 (vii-viii) that would otherwise suggest that these two ostraca are related: both texts were written in Phamenoth during an Indiction year 13 and both contain references to a certain Isaiah and Nshenpareas.

Monastery of Apollo at Bawit (P.Bawit Clackson; Cincinnati, 2008); A. Boud'hors, Ostraca grecs et coptes des fouilles de Jean Maspero à Baouit (O.BawitIFAO; Cairo, 2004); A. Delattre, Papyrus coptes et grecs du monastère d’apa Apollô de Baouît conservés aux Musées royaux d’Art et d’Histoire de Bruxelles (P.Brux.Bawit; Brussels, 2007). See also: J. Clédat, Le monastère et la nécropole de Baouît (Tome I, MIFAO 12; Cairo, 1904); J. Clédat, Le monastère et la nécropole de Baouît (Tome II, 1er fascicule, MIFAO 39; Cairo, 1916); J. Clédat, Le monastère et la nécropole de Baouît, Notes mises en œuvre par D. Bénazeth et M.-H. Rutschowscaya. Avec des contributions de A. Boud’hrs, R.-G. Coquin (†), É. Gaillard (MIFAO 111; Cairo, 1999).

eic qto Ἁσογ-

ēe ἰτε πσηπαβωκ

mē 2me mē chte ἦ/te ἡ Ἔν-

παρεακ αἰτιογοσ’ γί(νονται) θαλλ(ία) μξ.

Ἐγρ(ἀφή) φαμ(ἐνώθ) ἢ ἰνδ(ικτίωνος) ἵγ. Ἡσαίας στοιχ(εῖ). ἡ ἱερωτερπ ἰεγςογ-

κε μον σουπεζ +

κοταγεσογ βολ. +

5 γι θαλλ, μξς 6 ἐγρ φαμ ἰνδ στοι

“There are four sacks of Pshenpabok and forty-two sacks of Nshenpareas. I have sent them. Total: 46 sacks. Written Phamenoth 8, Indiction year 13. Isaias confirms. And they should seize their sacks, for they are torn, and they should send them out.”

1 eic. The use of eic at the beginning of a text to specify that sacks have been sent is attested in P.Sarga 189.1 (VII-VIII); cf. P.Bawit Clackson 4.2 (VIII).

3 πσηπαβωκ. As with πψηπαρεακ (see n. 4–5) the exact meaning of this word is not entirely clear. If it is to be taken as an anthroponym then it represents an addendum onomastis; Pshenpabok is etymologically Egyptian and literally means “the son of Pabok.” The name πσωκ, and all its derivations (Piabôk, Pâbôkia, Pâbôkia, Pâbôkia), mean “he of the buchis bowl”: see NB Dem. 7.364. The name πσωκ/Πσωκ is attested in P.Kell. V 47.24 (A.D. IV) and P.Petaus 93.4,97 (ca. A.D. 182–87).

4-5 πψηπαρεακ. There is some uncertainty over the exact meaning of this reading. In P.Sarga 189.4–5 it reads: ἰτε πσαμοῦα πψηπαρες; the πψηπαρες of P.Sarga 189 is certainly the πψηπαρεακ of the present text. In the translation of P.Sarga 189 Crum seemingly took it as an anthroponym but in the notes he pointed out that the meaning could either be “of (the) sons of Pares” or perhaps even an unattested toponym. Outside of these two texts πψηπαρεκ/πψηπαρες is unattested; however, the name παρεακ/Παρέακ appears in P.Wash.Univ. I 27.4 (V) and P.Lond. IV 1471 descr. (VIII) Παρέακ; cf. Παρίακ in P.Lond. IV 1419.6277 (A.D. 716–17). Depending on how πψηπαρεακ is interpreted could have a bearing on the interpretation of πσηπαβωκ in l. 3.

6 Ἐγρ(ἀφή) φαμ(ἐνώθ) ἢ ἰνδ(ικτίωνος) ἵγ. In the eighth century this date corresponds with March 4 of the following years: 714, 729, 744, 760, 774, and 789.

6 Ἡσαίας στοιχ(εῖ). The name Ἡσαίας is a fairly common one; however, there is only one other occasion where an Ἡσαίας will στοιχεῖ a similar document, it is in P.Sarga 189.4 (VIII): Ἡσαίας στοιχ.

7-9 ἡ ἱερωτερπ πσαμοῦα μον σουπεζ + κοταγεσογ βολ +. The addendum, which is not entirely clear, seems to contain instructions
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Fig. 1. — BYU inv. Coptic Ostracon 70 (1:2).

Fig. 2. — BYU inv. Coptic Ostracon 71 (1:2).
that torn sacks should nevertheless be sent. It may be significant that no product is ever mentioned in the text since it is hard to imagine why instructions would be given to send a product like wheat or barley in torn or otherwise damaged sacks.

2. Order for the Delivery of Wine (Fig. 2)

BYU inv. Coptic Ostracon 71 14.0 × 12.0 cm Bawit, viii cent.

This document is comprised of six full lines that are written along the ribbing of an ostracon where the right half is covered with a chalk-like glaze that partially effaces the text. While it is written in a different hand than the previous ostracon, the writing shares some general affinities: the letters are clear and well-formed with few ligatures, the letters are written with a slight rightward slant, and the text is written with black ink. Like the previous ostracon the present text is bilingual: the total amount of wine, the date, and shipment number are given in Greek whereas everything else is written in Coptic. The ostracon begins with the formula ψῖνε Νξα, which otherwise indicates that this text is from Bawit, and structurally conforms to a number of orders from Bawit that begin with this formula, state the quantity of the merchandise being requested, the origin of the merchandise, the name of the transporter, the date, and conclude with the number of the φόρα (see O.Bawit pp. 247–48). In terms of format and structure this text is remarkably similar to O.Bawit 36 (A.D. viii) and shares a number of unique parallels with O.Mich.Copt. 17 (A.D. viii). In fact, the present text and O.Mich.Copt. 17 were written on the very same date, refer to the same rare toponym, and both contain a reference to an individual named Anoup who is identified as “the one of the camel stall.” In light of these distinct parallels one can conclude that these two ostraca were written by the same scribe, in the same month of the same year.

1 ος μη 2 l. πεντήκοντα, δέσαρι, l. τέσσερα. 4 πκαμελκ, καμηλών 5 εγρ ινδιν 6 φορ.
“Enquire after 54 measures of wine, that is fifty-four, pertaining to the estate, through Anoup, the one of the camel stall. Written Thoth 14, Indiction year 14, convoy 12.”


οι(νον) μ(ήρα). While this reading seems most likely and is attested in a number of Bawit ostraca, it could also be possible to read μ(εύζα). Both alternatives are attested: O.Bawit 36.1, 38.2; O.BawitIFAO 31.3, 42.2; P Brux.Bawit 5.2, 6.2, 7.2, 9.1, 10.3, 22.2. For the importance of the wine trade at Bawit see S. Bacot, “La circulation du vin dans les monastères d’Égypte à l’époque copte,” in eds. N. Grimal and B. Menu, Le commerce en Égypte ancienne (Le Caire, 1998), pp. 278–80; cf. P.Mon.Apoll, p. 27.


4 άνουπ πα πκαμελ(αη). For the reading πκαμελ(αη) see O.Mich. Copt. 23.3–4 (viii) where possibly the very same individual is attested: γιτην άνουπ πα πκαμελων; cf. O.Mich.Copt. 23.5 (viii): γιτην θεοδ( ) πα πκαμελων. The same individual may also be attested in O.Mich.Copt. 17.3–4 (viii): γιτην άνουπ πα πκ(αμελω). One additional reference to this individual might occur in O.Bawit. 38.1 where there is a reference to a πκαμ and the name that precedes begins with α[...] but is lost in a lacuna. It may be noted generally that the name άνουπ is one of the most well-attested names in the papyri and ostraca from Bawit with literally dozens of attestations. For καμελων referring to “camel stall” see LSJ s.v. καμ-ηλων.

5 Ἔγρ(άη) ὨΔΘ ιδ ιγδ(κτιώνος) ιδ. In the eighth century this date corresponds with September 11 of the following years: 700, 715, 730, 745, 760, 775, and 790. O.Mich.Copt. 17 carries the very same date and as noted above there is reason to think that it was written on the very same day as the present text.

6 ιβ φορ(ά). On the meaning of the abbreviation φορ, presumably φορά, in ostraca from Bawit see O.Bawit p. 250.
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