The Old Coptic Schmidt Papyrus*

HELMUT SATZINGER

In *JE A* 28 (1942), 21, W. E. Crum mentions an unpublished Old Coptic papyrus which, as he said, was “acquired by Carl S(chmidt), 1937, who gave me a photograph.” In a footnote he adds, “Not among his MSS. bought by Michigan University (so Worrell); others he had sold to Louvain, 1936 (Muséon L, 5). Its present whereabouts I know not.” Professor Schmidt died in 1938.

It was not until 1954 that mention was again made of that document. P. E. Kahle says in his *Bala‘iza*, I, 254 n. 3, “I have been able to make use of a photo of this invaluable papyrus in the Griffith Institute, Oxford . . .” The present writer has tried to trace the Schmidt Papyrus for some years, but in vain. It cannot be excluded that it was either destroyed in the war or perhaps passed into a private collection, in which case its reappearance will depend on mere accident. Although the original text is not available, I feel that it is justifiable to publish the photograph anyway, due to the significance of both its content and its language. As one may judge from plate XIII, the photograph is very clear. Probably a study of the original would hardly be of any help in clarifying the text or in solving any of the problems that are left open.

The text is written on the horizontal fibres of a papyrus sheet. The size of the latter cannot be given with certainty, since it is not known whether or not the photograph is the same size as the original. Judging from the normal size of the letters, however, it is reasonable to assume that the original had approximately the same measurements, that is 13.2 by 10.2 cm.

The papyrus seems to consist of at least four fragments:

a. lines 1–10, left side.

b. lines 1–13, right side, fitting exactly to a,

c. lines 11–18, left side, fitting not as closely to a as it would seem from the photograph at first sight, and

d. lines 15–18, right side, fitting exactly to c only on the very lowest edge.

There exists a slight possibility that there is a gap of one or more lines between fragments a and c. If the papyrus were accessible this could probably be determined from the fibre structure. Apart from this possible (though not probable) gap there are lacunae of one to three letters in lines 11, 12, 16, 17, and 18. There are also larger ones in lines 13 and 15, and line 14 is almost entirely lost.

The Writing System

The writing was dated by Crum to approximately 100 A.D. As other Old Coptic texts, it does not make use of the letters Ζ, Ξ, Φ, Χ, or Ψ, which is mostly due to the complete lack of words of Greek origin. But even Θ, in its function as a bi-consonantal sign for ῥ, seems to be avoided, if the reading ἡθόηρ in line 15 is correct. On the other hand, Δ is once used instead of Τ, that is,
in \( \textit{AOGIM} \), line 8, and once again in the unintelligible group at the end of line II. \( \Gamma \Gamma \) (which I suggest to correct to \( \Pi \Pi \)) is possibly used for \( \kappa + \tau \) in \( \textit{NAXX} \), line 6. This use of \( \aleph \) and \( \tau \) is to be regarded as exceptional, since otherwise full use is made of \( \tau \) and \( \kappa \).

The fund of Greek signs is complemented by a set of signs of Demotic origin, which are shown in fig. 1.8

1. \( / \) for \( \delta \)
2. \( \mathcal{H} \) for \( f \): \( \mathcal{H} \) > Demotic \( \mathcal{H} \) > Coptic \( \mathfrak{q} \)
3. \( \mathcal{B} \) for \( h \): \( \square \) > Demotic \( \mathcal{B} \)
4. \( \mathcal{Z} \) for \( h \): \( \equiv \) > Demotic \( \mathcal{Z} \) > Coptic \( \mathfrak{z} \)
5. \( \aleph \) for \( i \) and \( \varphi \) (when they are \( \chi \), not \( \tau \), in Valley and Fayyûmic Coptic): \( \mathcal{I} \mathcal{I} \) > Demotic \( \mathcal{I} \mathcal{I} \) > Coptic \( \chi \)
6. \( \triangle \) for \( g \) (when it is \( \sigma \), not \( \kappa \), in Valley and Fayyûmic Coptic): maybe from \( \equiv \) > Demotic \( \equiv \), \( \mathcal{R} \)
7. \( \mathcal{H} \mathcal{H} \) for \( \delta \) (for which \( \omega \) is also used): \( \mathcal{H} \mathcal{H} \) (determinative of \( \# \) ‘back’) > Demotic \( \mathcal{H} \mathcal{H} \)
8. \( \mathfrak{p} \) for final \( r \) (?): \( \mathfrak{p} \) with diacritic marks?
9. \( \overline{\mathfrak{p}} \)

Fig. 1. Additional signs

Comments on fig. 1:

No. 1: This sign is otherwise unknown, since other Old Coptic texts use signs derived from \( \equiv \), like Coptic \( \mathfrak{q} \). Crum thinks it possible that it is derived from the oblique stroke (Gardiner, Sign List, Z 9), used mainly in Hieratic instead of determinatives which are difficult to draw. Note that the sign is used for both \( \equiv \) > \( \mathfrak{q} \) and \( \phi \) > \( \mathfrak{q} \) (in Akhmîmic \( \mathfrak{z} \)), which means that no etymological distinction is made, as is done between \( \equiv \) > 2 and \( \mathfrak{p} \) > 2: see comments 3 and 4.

No. 2: The oblique form of \( \mathfrak{q} \) is used in most other Old Coptic texts.

No. 3: The sign also occurs in the Demotic Magical Papyrus9 (3rd cent. A.D.) and in the Egyptian Oxyrhynchus Papyrus10 (ca. 100-150 A.D.). But in these texts it is also used for \( \mathfrak{p} \) > 2 in addition to the specific \( h \)-sign, whereas the equivalent of sign no. 4 is used several times for \( \equiv \) > 2 in the Oxyrhynchus Papyrus.11 This means that by then phonetic differences between the two sounds had ceased to exist. Although it is true that the Schmidt Papyrus has a very short text, in none of the other two texts mentioned can one find a passage of comparable length where the distinction of the two historical \( h \)-sounds is as strictly observed as here.12 This shows that the author was familiar with Egyptian scribal traditions.
No. 4 and 5: Similar forms are found in the other Old Coptic texts, some of them more closely resembling the Demotic prototype.

No. 6: This sign is only found in the Schmidt Papyrus. Crum wrongly puts it on the same line as the $\sigma > \phi$ of other Old Coptic texts, though he notes that it is the equivalent of Valley Coptic $\sigma$, which is usually represented by $K$ or the Demotic form of $\phi$ (prototype of $\sigma$) in the Old Coptic texts.

No. 7: This sign is known from the cryptographic system used in the Demotic Magical Papyrus. In the Schmidt Papyrus, $\Omega$ is only used once, namely in the place-name $2\lambda\theta\mu\rho\varphi$ (Ihsr(y)t). In five other words (7 instances) the Demotic sign is used. Other examples where the use of $\Omega$ for the transcription of Egyptian $\delta$ is avoided, are: 1) the use of Ypsilon in graecized names, e.g. $\alpha\sigma\upsilon\rho\varphi \sim 2\lambda\theta\mu\rho\varphi$, Τεντυρα $\sim \pi\eta\chi\eta\tau\iota\nu\mu\rho\varphi$, 2) the use of $\Omega$ for the o-sound only in half-stressed words (i.e., in the construct state), while $O$ is used for $\delta$ in fully stressed words, in the Egyptian Oxyrhynchus Papyrus, and 3) the use of $O$ for $\Omega$ in the Middle Egyptian dialect of Coptic and in the "Coptic documents in Greek script".

No. 8: Line 15 may offer a clue as to the value of this sign, since the last word should quite probably be read $2\lambda\theta\mu\rho\varphi$. Thus the sign in question seems to be used for expressing an r-sound of a special quality. It seems to occur only in the final position, $P$ being used otherwise. On the other hand, it is only in the personal name $2\theta\mu\rho\varphi$ that $P$ is used in the final position. Assuming this explanation to be correct (although admittedly by applying it elsewhere in the text no new words are understood), the sign is to be described as a $P$ with diacritic marks.

No explanation can be offered, however, for the strange signs 9 and 10 (lines 11 and 18, resp.) except that the fuzziness of sign 9 could suggest that it is a correction.

**Translation**

It is Esrmpe, the daughter of Kllaouc, who is complaining about Hör, the (son) of Tanesneou.

My lord Osiris, (Lord) of Ḥasrō! I complain to you, do justice to me! Hör, the (son) of Tanesneou, concerning what I have done to him and what he has done to me. Namely, he does not cohabit with me (?), having no power, I having no protector-son. I am unable to help (myself). I am childless (?). There is no one who could complain concerning me before you (lit. him) because of Hör.

........, I complain to [you ...] Osiris, listen to my calls! ... what he has done to me. Open the way for (lit. Give way to) your [messengers (?) ...] Osiris, (lord) of Abydos, Osiris [ ... ] Isis, Ophois (?), Hathor (?), nurse [of] Anubis the Osiride, the cowherd of ....... do justice to me!

**Commentary**

a. The Greek form of the name Esrmpe, Esrmph, Esrmph, found in the Ptolemaic and Roman periods (Presikke, Foraboschi), while it is generally used as a feminine personal name, it is once found as an epithet of the goddess Isis: ὑπάρχων ἐν κόμη Θεοδελφεία τοῦ Ἀρσινοι-τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἱσίδος Ἐσρέμπιος Ἑθας μεγάττης 'there being in Theadelphia of the Arsinoite nome a shrine of Isis Eserphnis, the very great goddess'. Ad hoc, W. Spiegelberg proposed the etymology '1st-iri-n-nfr, 'Isis who makes a good name', but this cannot be accepted on account of the variants displaying $\pi\upsilon$, $\pi\nu\epsilon$ instead of $\phi\iota\upsilon$. Furthermore, an etymology should
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Fig. 2. The Old Coptic Schmidt Papyrus
take into account such variant forms as Τεσσεραυς and Έσενεμφις (also Еσενεμφις; Foraboschi), which suggest a structure t(article)-es(e)-n(genitive)-rmpe. Accordingly, both es(e)- and rmpe should be nouns. W. Brunsh of Würzburg has proposed to me as an etymology wsr-rmpe ‘mighty of years’ Wörterbuch, I, 361, a fuller form being, according to him, 'Oσερέμφιας. For the vocalisation of rmpe, he refers to ṢΗ ΝΠΗΝΙΕ ΡΗΝΟΥ (i.e., ΝΠΗΝΟΥ), 'in the years named', in the Old Coptic Horoscope,23 ᴴ."

Whereas this explanation seems possible phonetically, there are contradictory arguments to be considered. Why, for example, is 'Εσενεμφις (and variants) used as a feminine name only? Furthermore, it is an epithet of kings rather than of a goddess like Isis. 'Οσερέμφιας, on the other hand, is used as a masculine name. It contains the divine name Osiris in construct state,24 as results from a comparison with Νφεμφις fem. (Preisigke; construct state of ΝΕΒΟΘO [Nephthys] plus -emp(h)is), and Τεςεμφις fem. (Preisigke; construct state of ΤΗΜΟΡΕ ‘the beautiful one’ plus -emp(h)is). However, 'Εσενεμφις cannot be explained on this basis (i.e., as containing the name of Isis plus -emp(h)is), because then there would remain an element -e(s)- unexplained.

Wsrt(τ)-rmpe, suggested by Brunsh, is not found as a personal name in Hieroglyphic. But compare ψιτ(τ)-rmpe ‘flourishing of years’ Wörterbuch, I, 366, found as a personal name25 both in its masculine and feminine form (its most prominent bearer was Queen Hatshepsowe).

As was said above, ΠΗΝΙΕ may be rmpe ‘years’. It may, as well, be the infinitive of τοιπ ‘to rejuvenate’. For the vocalisation pattern cf. the intransitives ΟΠΗΕ (from srht) ‘to be at leisure’, ΝΕΠΙΕ (from nhpl) ‘to mourn’, and Boh. 26ΜΟΙ (from hmsl) ‘to sit’, and verbs derived from causatives, like ΠΕΠΗΕ (more often CMΠΗΕ), Boh. 26ΜΟΙ (from smnl) ‘to establish’, ‘to be established’, and ΟΑΗΕ (from sddh) ‘to speak’. In this case, ICΠΗΕ could either be τσ-r-rmpe ‘she shall rejuvenate’, or 'Ιστ-κτ-ρυπ ‘Isis rejuvenates’. However, the variant form Τεςεμφις, which obviously contains the feminine definite article, contradicts these etymologies. In consequence, it is not possible to suggest an explanation that would reconcile all the contradictory evidence for the personal name ICΠΗΕ. It is an Egyptian name, found elsewhere from the Ptolemaic period onward, but only in Greek context (Εσενεμφις, etc.).

b. From the New Kingdom on, filiation is expressed by the patterns Α srs B, ‘A, the son of B’, and A ψι (n) B, ‘A, the one from B’; cf. Harsîsis and Harpaessis.26 The latter pattern is also used for mentioning the place of origin: ‘A, the one from B’.27 In Coptic documents, filiation is usually expressed by Α ΠΝΗ-Π-Β, ‘A, the son of B’, while Α ΠΛ-Β, ‘A, the one from B’, is reserved for mentioning the place of origin (also Α ΠΡΙ-Β, ‘A the man of B’). The Α ΠΛ-Β pattern expressing filiation of the present text may, therefore, be regarded as a pre-Coptic feature of our text.

c. The Greek form of this name is Κέλλαυης, Κολλαυης (in the a/e-vocalisation:28 -ευης),29 which is, it seems, the feminine form of Κολλαυης, Κολλαυης, and variants, the hieroglyphic prototype being Orê, Oρδ30; cf. also Oρδ-σμι,31 'Kelidi junior', and Κολλαυης.32 For the vocalisation of the feminine form, as compared to Κλαυης, cf. 'Αμαυν33 as compared to Amăn. Instead of the expected Κλαυης we find in Coptic Κολλαυης, Κελλαυης, fem. Κολλαυης, and variants34 on the one hand, and Κολλαυης and variants on the other. While the first group continues the Egyptian form, but is influenced by the Greek (note especially that the feminine form is secondarily derived from the masculine form, as already the Greek feminine form Κολλαυης as compared to Κολλαυης of the genuine Egyptian feminine pattern), the second, Κολλαυης, is clearly derived from the Greek form and has not direct connection with the Egyptian prototype.

d. For the construction used, see H. J. Polotsky, "Nominalsatz und Cleft Sentence im Koptischen," Orientalia 31 (1962), 413–30.

e. Κολλαυης,35 as already smi from the new Kingdom on, means ‘to accuse’, ‘to appeal’. The prepositions used are, in the main, n, n-, for the person to whom application is made, and r, e-,
for the accused. See further, notes i, u, v, and w. Thus, Esrmpe is asking for a lawsuit against Ḥor, the god Osiris being the judge.37

f. Ḥor is used as a personal name from the Old Kingdom onward until Christian times.38

g. Ṣanvešu, fem. Ṣa[nvešu, and variants, is often found in the Roman period.39 The etymology is Pt-(n)-ns-nw, 'The one belonging to the (divine) brothers', cf. Pt-n-sn-Hr 'The one belonging to Horus' brother'.40

h. OYSPE renders Wsr nb Ḥsr; cf. below, line 13, OYSPE NABOT. On Ḥṣrō see Gardiner, Ancient Egyptian Onomastica, II, 8r*. It is perhaps Tūn I-Jebel near Hermopolis. From the mention of this otherwise hardly known place, Crum41 deduces that the papyrus was written somewhere nearby.

i. Following Ch. Nims, "The Term ḫp, 'law, right' in Demotic," JNES i (1948), 243–60, esp. 260 sub E./. The 'doing of the ḫp' is what a complainant demands, cf. P. Lille 39, 23 (translated by Nims, op. cit., 247): pỉ-rm ... nt ṭwrf smy e rm ... ṭr-hr na pỉ-y, mtw-w ir ṭf pỉ-ḥp [e tr-m] ḏ tt-rs ... ' (As for) the man ... who complains against (another) man ... before those of the (chapter) house and they do for him the ḫp of the matter named ... ' Note smy 'complain' (Coptic THME) construed with e 'against' and, as below, line 9, ṭr-hr (Coptic trp-) 'before' an authority or court. Compare further ir n-w ṭ-Ḥp 'to do right to him' with Coptic API n622API 'do his right'. In other cases ṭr ṭ-hp n may be paraphrased 'to punish'.42 In older days the latter expression runs ṭr ḫp r, cf. the Haremheb Decree,43 line 17, ṭr-tw ḫp r, smw fnā'f 'It is by cutting his nose that he shall be punished'; sim. ṭbd., ṭasim, and in the Nauri Decree of Seti I,44 line 46 and passim. In the Coptic period, API n622API 'do justice to me', occurs in connection with THME 'to complain', in the magical texts AŽ 34 (1896), 85ff. and BKU III,45 389. Father A. Kropp46 translated it in a more concrete sense: 'Conduct my case!' (führe meinen Prozess).

j. Taking NM-(Saʿidic ṢN-) in its function of continuing pronouns. Cf. Crum, Coptic Dictionary, t69 b NOYN ṢMMAX 'ours and his' (BIFA2O 23, 63).

NM-, recalling Bohairic and Fayyumic NGM-, is the main non-Saʿidic feature of our text. It must be remembered, however, that the metathesis of the Valley form ṢN- is an innovation as compared to the Late Egyptian and Demotic prototypes.47 It may be assumed that it was not as wide-spread in the first century A. D. as it was in later times.

k. In Coptic proper, 'concerning' is expressed in another way, e. g. by NTBE-. The use of ṢN-, found also in Demotic,48 is one of the pre-Coptic features of the text.

l. Judging from Crum's and Kahle's remarks in JEA 28 (1942), 23, and Balāʿīza, I, 256, n. 3, respectively, neither of the two scholars recognized the true nature of ḫP- (and therefore as a testimony of Fayyumic influence on the language of the text). Actually ḫP- is the Late Egyptian and Demotic relative form ṭr-f 'which he did'. Thus our fund of survivals of that form49 is enlarged for one item, see fig. 3.50

Note that the text does not say ḫP- ḫP 'what he has done against me'.

m. In accordance with the established rule,51 the preposition ṢN- is not repeated after ṢN-.

n. The elements of this passage are to be separated like this: XC 4 NMAG ṢN 6 MMDT1 etc. Thus, 'He does not ......, I not having ......' There is no verb NMAG, ṢNKK, ṢNMT, or the like. Therefore an emendation to NMAG (for ṢNKT) is suggested, which I think is the pronominal state of a verb *NKE plus the pronoun 1st pers. sing., having zero value after Ṣ.52 Although it is true that there is no NKE in Coptic, it can be easily explained as the descendant of Egyptian nk 'to copulate'. The form given in the Wörterbuch is nk. If our assumption is right, however, we have to read nk instead.
### Fig. 3. Coptic and Old Coptic residues of the Late Egyptian relative forms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i-†df</th>
<th>which he said</th>
<th>Π-ἐξε-(S.B.F.M)</th>
<th>Π-ἀκε-(A.A³)</th>
<th>Π-ἐξαζ-(S.B)</th>
<th>Π-ἐξεαζ-(P Bodm VI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i-‥f</td>
<td>which he did</td>
<td>Π-ἀρε-(DMF)</td>
<td>Π-ἐραζ-(PSch)</td>
<td>Π-ἀχνεζ-(DMP)</td>
<td>Π-ἀχναζ-(PMP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-‥f</td>
<td>which he brought</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-‥r</td>
<td>which he likes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-‥s</td>
<td>'to whom...gave birth'</td>
<td>ΕΜΕΚΙΕ-(PMP)</td>
<td>ΑΜΕΚΙΕ-(DMF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The meaning proposed may, however, be questioned on grammatical grounds. According to Jernstedt's Rule there should not be a direct object in a sentence displaying a durative tense. Negligence of this rule cannot be explained as a pre-Coptic feature. As was shown by R. Parker, the very same rule already applied to VIth century Demotic (P. Rylands IX). Anyhow, exceptions do occur in Coptic, and most probably in Demotic, too.

o. The reading 607, as well as ΑΦΗ in the next line, was already recognized by Crum.


q. (M)ΜΙ- 'I have not', plus infinitive, means 'I cannot ...' Before the infinitive, (O)- 'able' is inserted tautologically. Thus, lit., 'I cannot be able to ...'

r. For ἙΡ-ΑΟΓΙΜ read Ρ-ΤΟΓΙΜ, cf. ΤΑΙΜΕ (A2), ΤΑΣΙΜ (M), ΤΑ(Ε)ΙΜ(Ε) (F) 'to help', 'to strengthen'; see W. Westendorf, *Handwörterbuch*, 225; ΕΛ-ΤΑΙΜΕ (F) 'to help' (intransitive!), see Crum, *Dictionary*, 412b; extremely rare in Coptic proper.

s. ΑΦΗ 'barren female', according to Crum, *Dictionary*, 26b. Here, however, the context does not suggest physical inability to conceive but rather, more generally, childlessness.

t. Read ΜΗ ΠΤΕΓΙΕ, i.e., (M)ΜΙ- 'there is not' plus a relative clause of the Third Future substantivised by means of the definite article. In Coptic, as well as in Demotic and in Late Egyptian, a substantivised relative clause is not necessarily defined, despite the use of the article. The construction used here appears somewhat archaic, that is to say, pre-Coptic, ΜΗ ΛΛΑΥ 696- ΚΜΕ being expected. See, however, W. Spiegelberg, *Demotische Grammatik*, §441, note, for Coptic (and Demotic) parallels. The Third Future seems to have here, not 'volitive', but rather irreals meaning.

u. Haplography of Ε. Crum, *Dictionary*, 336b, quotes Bohairic parallels for ΚΜΕ 6ΕΛ- 'to complain concerning'.

v. To be read ΕΠΑ. R. Haardt, in his *Versuch einer altkoptischen Grammatik*, quotes for the omission of the h-sign before p, magical names like ΚΑΡΠΗ (Demotic g'rhre) and ΠΠΑΤ (for...
\[\text{περατ} 'the child', \text{Demotic ϕε-θαρ} \] in the Demotic Magical Papyrus.\textsuperscript{64} For Coptic proper cf. \text{ΔΑΡΔΑ} for \text{ΔΑΡΔΑ} (Crum, Dictionary, 631b).

No Coptic parallels are found for \text{ἡμμη ϕε-πη}. In Demotic, \text{σν ύρ-θρ} means 'to complain before' an authority, cf. the passage of P. Lille 39 quoted above, note i. Therefore the pronoun must refer to Osiris as the entity invoked.

w. \text{κετειο} \text{κεμμη ...} \text{κωδ} cannot mean here 'who would complain ... to Ηόρ', as one might expect from \text{Tικμεν ιακ} in line 3. Therefore \text{κω-} will mean here 'concerning', 'because of', as above in line 5 (see note k).

x. Considering \text{κτμ κνοος} 'listen to my calls!' in the next line, one may expect an imperative sentence here too. I thought of a construct imperative \text{εζημ- 'learn!'} from \text{ειμι} 'to know' (of a vocalisation pattern different from \text{Απι-, Απι-}), but the second letter is rather a \text{C} than an \text{E}. \text{Πα-} may be the masculine possessive pronoun of the 1st person sing. The following element, \text{Tιπτερ}, recurs perhaps in line 17, possibly preceded by the plural possessive pronoun of the 1st person plur. Cf. below, note af.

y. \text{κτμ-} is the construct form of \text{κωτμ}. One would expect \text{κωτμ-}, but cf. \text{κτμ πιντ} 'who have heard my name' in the Egyptian Oxyrhynchus Papyrus,\textsuperscript{65} col. I, 12 (sim. line 37). In Coptic proper, this verb is construed with an indirect object (the preposition \text{ε-} being used), except in a few instances.\textsuperscript{66} Once again the text displays a pre-Coptic feature.

z. Suggestions can be made neither for the enigmatic group at the end of line 11 (an emendation?) nor for the traces of signs at the beginning of line 12. After the gap in line 12, traces would suggest on first reading \text{πανον ιπατον} 'numerous is what he has done ...', although this is quite difficult to reconcile with the context.\textsuperscript{67}

aa. One is reminded of the letter written by Osiris to the gods' assembly in the Late Egyptian Story of Horus and Seth, 15, 4–5,\textsuperscript{68} \text{ιε-θε κτοι κτοι ιμ-φ}, \text{σω σσοιοι ιπωττειοι ιακω-θρ} \text{ιω ιο ιο (θρ)} \text{ιω μιοι ιοι}. As to the land in which I am, it is full of grim-faced messengers who fear neither god nor goddess. I will send them forth ...'

ab. L.e., \text{ωστ ιοι ιο].} Cf. above, note h.

ac. The traces could suggest a reading \text{ουτεροπεριποιο [ο]υποποιο [ο]υποποιο} 'Osiris-Ophois' (for the construct form of \text{ουχιποκεφ} cf. the Old Coptic Paris Magical Papyrus, line 128: \text{ουτεροπεριποιο [ο]υποποιο [ο]υποποιο} 'Osiris-Onophris'). However, there is no evidence that these two gods were ever equated, Wepwaue being generally regarded as a son of Osiris.

ad. Several goddesses claim to have borne Anubis, e.g. Baste and the \text{κσιτ} cow of Ατφι.\textsuperscript{70} Here, allusion is made to the myth related by Plutarch (\text{De Iside}, chap. 14)\textsuperscript{71} of Osiris begetting the god\textsuperscript{72} with Nephthys. In consequence of this adultery, the goddess abandons her child right after his birth out of fear of her husband Seth. And it was Isis, Osiris' wife, who, though knowing his parentage, searched for him and brought him up. In our text, Hathor is substituted for Isis, which offers no problem, since both goddesses are often equated in the last stages of Egyptian religion.\textsuperscript{73} Maybe it is the milk-giving role of a nurse that suggested the introduction of a cow-goddess (cf. also the \text{κσιτ} cow mentioned above). But regarding the nature of the text — a love charm — one is more tempted to see the reason for this substitution in the aspect of Hathor as a protectress of love and fertility.\textsuperscript{74}

ae. For \text{ελονευρ} see W. Westendorf, \text{Handwörterbuch}, 34. Cf. the following note.

af. The mention of Anubis as a cowherd recalls the Tale of the Two Brothers of the d'Orbin's Papyrus.\textsuperscript{75} Anūp's younger brother, Bata (identified by Gardiner with the local bull-god of Saka-Kasa in the seventeenth Upper Egyptian nome) is herding cows. Later he becomes a bull himself, his elder brother accompanying him. But already before this metamorphosis the gods address him, "Ho, Bata, Bull of the Ennead!" (9, 4 = \text{LES} 19,3). This background suggests that we see here an
epithet of Anubis alluding to his role of a companion of the divine bull, such as \textit{\text{\textepsilon\text{\textalpha\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textnu\textomicron\textnu\textomicron\textomicron}\text{\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron}}
\text{\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicr
be seriously doubted if they contained a sharp glottal stop, as is generally assumed, since this sound is otherwise alien to Coptic. The difference between double and simple vowels in pronunciation was probably a rather slight one, as it is often enough neglected in writing. By the time the Schmidt Papyrus was written, perhaps the device of doubling vowels in writing had not yet been invented. **MOONG** may thus render exactly the same pronunciation as the **MOONE** of classical Sa'edic.

Whenever the Valley dialects would display doubled (i.e., lengthened) consonants, the Schmidt Papyrus does also: **ΚΑΛΧΟΥΧ** (liquida both closing pre-stress syllable, and opening stressed syllable, as in Sa'edic **ΜΜΑΚ**); **CMME** (liquida both closing stressed syllable, and opening post-stress syllable, as in Sa'edic **CMME**). This “Valley” feature is not a superficial one that was easy to observe by a writer whose mother tongue did not have this peculiarity. We therefore have another reason not to assume that the writer’s own dialect was some kind of Bohairic.

Thus, the language of the Schmidt Papyrus is Sa'edic, though of a rather archaic appearance. In comparison to Coptic proper, a number of archaic features have been noted above:

1) use of **ΠΑ-** and **ΤΑ-** for expressing parentage,
2) the preposition **Η**- (**ΝΑ**) meaning ‘concerning’,
3) the relative form **ΕΠΑς** of **ΕΠΕ** ‘to do’ still in use,
4) use of the verb **ΝΙΚΕ** ‘to copulate with’ instead of **Π-ΝΟΕΙΚ**,
5) use of **Ρ-ΤΟΘΜ** ‘to help’ instead of **Ρ-(ΙΙ)ΤΟΟΤ**,
6) use of **ΜΝ**- ‘there is not’ + relative clause, which is rare in Coptic proper,
7) **CMME ΕΠΗ**- ‘to complain before’ an authority, not found anymore in Coptic proper,
8) the use of **ΕΩΕΝ** with direct object, which is seldom found in Coptic proper, and, as in the Old Coptic texts in general,
9) avoidance of Greek loan words.

Another pre-Coptic feature, characteristic of the Old Coptic texts, may be seen in the redundancy of the graphic system, apparent in even so short a text:
for **t** both **Τ** and **Α**,
for **k** both **Κ** and **Γ**,
for **o** both **#** and **Ω**,
for **h** two different signs, distinguished etymologically, but not phonologically.

The graphic system, with respect to the syllabic consonants, is inconsistent. The signal for the syllabic quality of a consonant may be:

1) **Ε**: **ΕΠ**- (line 8), **ΛΗΕΚ**- (ibid.), **ΤΙΡΕΠ’** (? - lines 10, 17),
2) two dots: **Η**- (line 9), and
3) no signal: **CMME, Ν-, ΝΜ-, (Μ)ΜΝ**- (lines 6–9), **CTM-** (line 11).

**CONCLUSION**

The Schmidt Papyrus has the function of a love charm, but in format it differs from the other known samples of this kind. The text has the form of a complaint, of an appeal to a court. This reminds one of the close connection that existed, at least from the New Kingdom onward, between jurisdiction and oracular practices. The text is not necessarily to be termed magical, in reference to the contents. It is simply a prayer, asking the god for help in a personal affair. In respect to the sobriety of its speech it stands in marked contrast to other love-spells. But the mere fact that it is written in the “Old Coptic” script shows that magical ideas are involved, since this writing system was generally chosen in order to establish the exact pronunciation of a text that had to be recited aloud.
Thus, the text must be regarded as an important source for the study of Egyptian magic, due to its unique character. Unfortunately, parts of the invocations of the second half are either lost or incomprehensible. Still, they are welcome as evidence for the last stages of Egyptian religion. The allusion to Anubis being the son of Osiris and Nephthys is a further testimony for this myth. Furthermore, the allusion to Anubis as a cowherd seems to be connected with the interesting god Bata and his myth.
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Postscriptum

A few additions occurred during the printing.

Commentary, n. t: Although the construction $\text{there is not}$ plus relative clause is not as often found as $\text{there is not}$ plus clause of circumstance (cf., in the New Testament, Mc 4.22 (bis); Ro 3.12; Heb 6.13, versus Mt 10.26; Mc 7.15; 9.39; 10.29; Lc 8.17 (bis); 18.29), it cannot be called a pre-Coptic feature. However, the use of the Third Future in a relative clause, or in a clause of circumstance, is to be regarded as archaic. In Coptic proper, the First Future has generally replaced the Third Future in these and other cases (cf. Polotsky, Orientalia 29, 1960, 400: § 18, n. c), while in Demotic the latter still prevails (cf. Spiegelberg, Demotische Grammatik, §§ 139. 542. 544). In Late Egyptian there is only the Third Future (apart from a $\text{sgm.f}$ form with future meaning, which is most probably a residue of Middle Egyptian, cf. Théodorides, Chronique d'Égypte 44, 1969, 272).

Commentary, n. ag: B. H. Stricker discusses a strikingly similar Demotic sign in OMRO 42, 37. None of its various meanings seems, however, to conform with our context.

N. 71: For Anubis being the son of Osiris, V. Wessetzyk refers me to Vandier, Le papyrus Jumilhac, 155. 122. 126 (III,25; XII,2; XV,7), where Osiris is mentioned as the father of Anubis, to Griffiths, op. cit., 141. 318, and to $\text{Inpw ss Wsir}$, inscription of a wall scene of a Ptolemaic (?) chapel at Tiina I-Jebel (see Sami Gabra, ASAE 39, 1939, 487). Also cf. Diodorus I 18 (see Vandier, op. cit., 84, n. 1).

N. 74: In the Dendera temple inscriptions, the Hathor of the 18th Upper Egyptian nome is said to have given life "to Anubis with her milk", see Kees, MIO 6, 174.

N. 75: Also cf. the legend of Seth-Bata and Anubis, in the Jumilhac Papyrus, see Vandier, op. cit., 105 (communicated by Wessetzky).

* Dedicated to G. T., on the occasion of her 70th birthday (December 29, 1975).
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The Old Coptic Schmidt Papyrus. (Courtesy: The Griffith Institute).