

Thomas Laver

**THE DEVELOPMENT AND USAGE  
OF THE GREEK AND COPTIC TERM *PAPA*  
IN ECCLESIASTICAL AND MONASTIC CONTEXTS\***

THROUGHOUT THE PAPYRI of Byzantine and early Islamic Egypt appear a variety of individuals identified by the title *papa*, each associated with a variety of roles and identifications. Very little work has sought to determine the function of this term, with Ewa Wipszycka and Tomasz Derda's study being the main relevant work (which has become the standard reference when encountering the term), but examining it very briefly and on the basis of only a small proportion of the total attestations of the term.<sup>1</sup> They concluded that it was a title 'applied exclusively to the members of the clergy'<sup>2</sup> and moved on to focus on the better-attested titles *abba* and *apa*. Hans Förster, too, defines the term *papa* as an ecclesiastical one in the entry for *papas* in his dictionary.<sup>3</sup> Other definitions have focused on the term's use for the patriarchs of Alexandria, known by the anglicised form of *papa* as 'pope', but the *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium* also argues for

\* My particular thanks to Phil Booth and Marek Jankowiak, under whose supervision an early form of this article was produced. My research is supported by the Wolfson Foundation.

<sup>1</sup> T. DERDA & E. WIPSYZKA, 'L'emploi des titres *abba*, *apa* et *papas* dans l'Égypte byzantine', *The Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 24 (1994), pp. 23–56.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 54.

<sup>3</sup> H. FÖRSTER, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Wörter in den koptischen dokumentarischen Texten* [= *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* 148], Berlin – New York 2002.

its use being more generally for bishops and presbyters as well.<sup>4</sup> However, these definitions are mainly based on third- or fourth-century Greek papyri, and generally fail to properly consider later attestations of the title in Coptic documents, often from monastic contexts. These later Coptic attestations of the term arguably represent an entirely distinct phase in the development of the term *papa*, in which it functions as an indicator of seniority within the monastic hierarchy and signifies a role in its economic administration, which stands in considerable contrast to these earlier Greek uses. As such, this article will attempt to first track the grammatical development of *papas* from its initial Greek usage – in which it developed a noun and honorific form, both initially meaning bishop<sup>5</sup> – to later Coptic adoption and adaptations of it, before then exploring the role of monastic *papas* within monastic financial administration. As such, this article seeks to better inform future editors of papyri who encounter this esoteric term in Greek or Coptic documents, and so to act as an updated reference point for discussions of this element of ecclesiastical and monastic titlature.

## 1. EARLY GRAMMATICAL DEVELOPMENT AND MORPHOLOGY

First, we will examine the development and grammatical morphology of the term *papa*. An initial difficulty with studying the development of the term is separating it from usage of *papas* in its literal sense as a Greek term for father, as in *P. Giss.* I 80, l. 3, or *P. Gron.* 18, l. 15, but this is fortunately quite uncommon, and it can generally be inferred from context in each document that the term is not being used in a manner which relates to the title under consideration here.

There also appears to be a village of Papa in the Herakleopolite nome (*SB* XIV 11615),<sup>6</sup> which has caused confusion for Walter Crum in his edi-

<sup>4</sup> A. PAPADAKIS, 'Papas', [in:] A. KAZHDAN (ed.) *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, Oxford 1991, pp. 1579–1580.

<sup>5</sup> Rather than priest, contrary to existing understanding of the term.

<sup>6</sup> As discussed by A. M. LUIJENDIJK, *Greetings in the Lord: Early Christians and the Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Cambridge 2008, p. 95.

tion of *P. Ryl. Copt.* 310, in which an archon is described as ϣμπαπα, causing Crum to render in translation ‘magistrate, a *papa*’, believing this individual to hold both roles, although with a note that he does not understand the use of ϣμ- in this case. However, given the existence of the village of Papa, it is best not to interpret this term as meaning ‘a man who is a *papa*’, but instead that he is a ‘man from the village of Papa’.

This study is also complicated by the fact that the name Papas – and similar names such as Ppapas and Papais<sup>7</sup> – were relatively prevalent in Byzantine Egypt, and so the editor of a text must take great care to identify when *papa* or *papas* was being used as an ecclesiastical or monastic term, rather than simply as a name or patronym. An excellent example of this difficulty is shown by the document *SB Kopt.* III 1267, where the writer is identified on the verso as παπας μαρκος, which at first appears to be the name ‘Papas son of Markos’. However, we can tell that this is the title *papa* rather than a name, as elsewhere in the text the letter is said to be from (ϩιτν) Markos, and the author makes clear his identity by saying ‘I, Markos’ (δνοκ μαρκος), demonstrating that Markos is a first name, not a patronym, and as such we have παπας used here as an honorific. The reverse is demonstrated by *SB Kopt.* III 1370, in which we seem to have ‘the *papas*’ (ππαπας) mentioned first as a brother, and then as *oikonomos* and deacon. However, such an identification of four roles mentioned consecutively without a name is extremely odd, and could not be a list of multiple people either as brother (con) is in the singular rather than plural. As such, while it appeared at first that someone had been identified as having the role of *papas* (which could then be said to potentially relate to being an *oikonomos* or deacon), in fact we have a name here: either a first attestation of the name Ppapas, a misspelling of the existing name Ppapais, or a dittography of the first *pi* on the name Papas, rather than an attestation of the title *papa*.

The first recorded instances of the ecclesiastical and monastic term *papa* in the papyrological record are from the third century AD in Greek, and seem to feature a use of *papa* as a title for a bishop, in keeping with

<sup>7</sup> See NB, s.vv. It should be noted that – while similar to *papas* – none of these names are derived from that word: they just appear to be similar.

some of the existing definitions of the term. This first attestation is from the papyrus *SB VI 9557*, which has the naming formulae *Μάξιμον τὸν πάπαν* and *Μαξίμῳ τῷ πάπα* (Maximus the *papa*) in lines 41 and 45. This comes soon after literary sources say that the term *papa* began to be applied to the bishops of Alexandria, starting with Heraclas, the thirteenth patriarch, who held the role from AD 232–248.<sup>8</sup> Of particular grammatical note – in both the literary and papyrological attestations from this time – is that the word ‘*papas*’ is being declined, which from other Greek papyri with similar uses of the term (see Appendix 2) can be inferred to have the pattern *πάπας*, *πάπαν*, *πάπα*, *πάπα* in the singular nominative, accusative, genitive, and dative cases respectively. We can also see that this *papa* follows the name rather than preceding it, and is used as a noun for the role the individual is fulfilling. In the aforementioned *SB VI 9557*, it can be inferred that *papa* means the patriarch (pope) of Alexandria, due to attestations of a Maximus as patriarch in the same period, as the fifteenth patriarch of Alexandria.<sup>9</sup> However, in *P. Oxy. XI 1357* the *papa* mentioned in the heading of this liturgical calendar from Oxyrhynchus (*Γνωσις συνάξεων μετὰ τὸ κατελθ(εῖν) ἐν Ἀλεξάνδρ(ειᾳ) τὸν πάπα οὕτως*) is instead more likely to be a regular bishop, due to the fact that this bishop is seemingly travelling to Alexandria after being based in Oxyrhynchus, rather than being the Pope of Alexandria returning to his see.<sup>10</sup>

However, in the fourth century we begin to see the emergence of the usage of *papa* in Greek as a title without declension, which precedes the name as an honorific, rather than being used as a noun. The first such attestation – *P. Oxy. XXXVI 2785*, l. 1 – has a *πάπα Σώτα*, with the original

<sup>8</sup> M. CHOAT, ‘Egypt’s role in the rise of Christianity, monasticism, and regional schisms’, [in:] K. VANDORPE (ed.), *Companion to Greco-Roman and Late Antique Egypt*, Chichester 2019, pp. 449–471.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 453.

<sup>10</sup> Following A. PAPA-CONSTANTINOU, ‘La liturgie stationnelle à Oxyrhynchus dans la première moitié du VI<sup>e</sup> siècle. Réédition et commentaire de *P. Oxy. XI 1357*’, *Revue des études byzantines* 54 (1996), pp. 135–159, versus the original interpretation of F. G. Kenyon in *P. Oxy. XI*.

editors of the text interpreting the line *πάπα Σώτα πρεσβ(ύτερ) Ἡρακλέους* as a vocative phrase meaning ‘father Sotas, priest of Heracleopolis’.<sup>11</sup> This development of an honorific form of *papa* (rather than just the noun form) is key to note, as it is this indeclinable honorific form which dominates later Coptic usage of the term, being in form very similar to the well-attested monastic honorifics *abba* and *apa*, which also preceded a name.

Both forms of the Greek *papa* (declinable noun and indeclinable honorific) appear to have been contemporaneous, with attestations of the declinable noun form persisting until the eighth/ninth century in Greek documents (*SB* I 5947), and the indeclinable honorific up to the eighth century (*CPR* XXII 49). However, with the exception of the much later *SB* I 5947, Greek instances of the declinable *papa* generally have strong contextual suggestions that they refer to an episcopal office,<sup>12</sup> while no instance is accompanied by concrete proof that they refer to something other than a bishop. Even *SB* I 5947 uses *presbuteros* and *papas* as separate terms, so *papa* is unlikely to be used here to mean priest, leaving it entirely possible that this attestation too means bishop.

However, it could be questioned whether Kaor, *papas* of Ἑρμοῦ πόλεως, from *P. Lond.* II 417, l. 3, is a bishop or a priest, due to the ambiguity over interpreting Ἑρμοῦ as either meaning the small village in the Fayum, or the city of Hermopolis Magna, with the former unlikely to have had a bishop attached to it. However, this argument is not sufficiently convincing to me to contradict the above evidence, in part as the letter is sent by this Kaor to the *praepositus* Abinnaeus regarding a soldier fleeing Abinnaeus’s forces,<sup>13</sup> and so it did not necessarily need to have been local to the Abinnaeus archive. After all, this soldier could have fled anywhere in Egypt. Therefore, the letter could well have been sent from the city of Hermopolis Magna (and from the bishop of that city) instead of a lesser

<sup>11</sup> R. A. COLES *et. alii* (eds.), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* XXXVI, London 1970, p. 84.

<sup>12</sup> E. WIPSZYCKA, ‘L’église dans la *chora* égyptienne et les artisans’, *Aegyptus* 48 (1968), pp. 130–138, convincingly argues, for instance, that *SB* XII 10767 relates to a bishop in this way.

<sup>13</sup> A. M. KAISER, ‘Die Fahndung nach Deserteuren im spätantiken Ägypten’, [in:] *Pap. Congr.* XXVI, pp. 381–390.

settlement. This would be much more in line with all other attestations of the noun form of *papas* highlighted above, as no other use appears to relate to being *papas* of only a small village.

As highlighted earlier, this noun form is distinct grammatically from the indeclinable honorific form of *papa*, and so the argument could be made that the indeclinable form had a different meaning from this declinable noun, particularly given the original editors' interpretation of *P. Oxy. XXXVI 2785* (see above), which would seem to provide proof that – while the noun form was used predominantly for bishops – this honorific form was applied as a title for priests in much the way both Förster, as well as Derda and Wipszycka, had originally thought. However, Anne-Marie Luijendijk has much more convincingly demonstrated that this Papa Sotas was a local Oxyrhynchite bishop who is attested in a number of other documents, with the phrase  $\pi\rho\epsilon\sigma\beta\lambda\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$  (*Ἡρακλέους*) best interpreted not as his identifier in the vocative case, but as a plural nominative which identifies the senders of the letter, the 'presbyters of Herakleopolis', following the very strict formulae that we can observe in similar letters from this archive and period.<sup>14</sup> Given the absence of any other indeclinable honorific uses of *papa* before the sixth century, this may therefore suggest that while grammatically distinct from the noun form, the honorific form of *papa* also generally indicated a holder of episcopal office in Greek papyri from the third to the fifth centuries (at least), rather than a presbyter.

While this interpretation of *papa* as an episcopal title therefore appears to be the strongest one for the third–fifth-century usage of the term in either form, caution should be applied in applying this conclusion to attestations of the honorific *papa* beyond this period, as the next attestations of the honorific form in the sixth century appear to have very different contexts (notably, monastic ones) to this Oxyrhynchite document, and have the *papas* performing notably different roles. As such, while it seems relatively secure to believe that they were semantically the same before this point, we should perhaps apply caution assuming that the honorific form of *papa* in its Greek usage continued to have the same meaning as its noun counterpart after the fifth century. Indeed, I will

<sup>14</sup> LUIJENDIJK, *Greetings in the Lord* (cit. n. 6), p. 93.

argue here that from the sixth century it developed a separate meaning to the noun form – particularly when used in monastic documents – the reason for which may well have been the adoption of the term by Coptic.

As just discussed, the indeclinable form of *papa* – preceding a name – is the form that seems to have generally (but not exclusively)<sup>15</sup> made the linguistic leap from Greek into Coptic, with Coptic documents from as early as the fourth and fifth centuries attesting to its use as an honorific for individuals with a wide variety of identifications,<sup>16</sup> but none of them bishops.<sup>17</sup> What is of particular interest for Coptic occurrences is that the majority of these attestations come from documents in monastic contexts, most notably at Bawit, Bala'izah, and Wadi Sarga, among others, demonstrating its use in monasteries across Egypt, although with a seeming relative dearth from the Upper Theban region.<sup>18</sup> In part this may be because an overweight proportion of surviving Coptic papyri from this period come from monasteries, but it is nonetheless interesting just how many *papas* appear in monastic contexts from the sixth to the ninth centuries, apparently with some sort of role within their administration. What roles these were will be discussed shortly, but it may suffice for now to highlight that these 174 attestations of the indeclinable *papa* – generally from Coptic monastic contexts – deserve an assessment of their meaning and use on their own merits, rather than basing definitions entirely on the thirteen attestations of *papa* in Greek papyri, of which only four are the indeclinable form that migrated into Coptic. These latter four shall nonetheless be included in the below discussion as – aside from *P. Oxy. XXXVI 2785* – they come from sixth- to eighth-century monastic contexts (seemingly from Bawit and Wadi Sarga) and so fit the same general pattern of provenance as the Coptic attestations. Therefore, it is likely they are a part of the same linguistic developments, with it entirely possible that

<sup>15</sup> See later arguments about the Pisentius archive, the main exception to this.

<sup>16</sup> For the fourth century, see *SB Kopt. III* 1311, for the fifth/sixth century, see *SB Kopt. IV* 1866, for the sixth century see *P. Athen. Xyla* 12 (among others).

<sup>17</sup> See Appendix 1 for all these attestations collected together, with how the persons are identified in each case.

<sup>18</sup> For discussion, see below, pp. 76–77.

these Coptic semantic developments then affected how the Greek honorific form was used from the sixth century onwards.

It should be briefly noted, before we move on, that the declinable noun form of *papa* did also make its way into Coptic, but is in no way near as prevalent as the indeclinable honorific form. This is most evident in the seventh-century Pisentius archive, where '*papas*' or 'the *papas*' is occasionally used as a term to refer to the bishop Pisentius without giving his name, although we can also see a similar usage of the term in the sixth-century documents *SB Kopt.* IV 1726 and 1727, where Jean-Luc Fournet not unconvincingly argues that these *papas* were also bishops.<sup>19</sup> However – barring *P. Lond. Copt.* I 544 and 1156, which arguably represent post-ninth-century developments entirely separate from the original Greek usages of the word – usage of *papas* as a noun meaning 'bishop' does not seem to have persisted in Coptic papyri beyond the seventh century, potentially as the honorific form came to dominate.

Returning to questions of grammar, in Coptic the honorific title *papa* was able to take the Coptic definite article, doing so in roughly two-fifths of attested cases.<sup>20</sup> The singular male definite article in Coptic is π- (or πϵ-), which we see affixed to the term *papa* in documents such as *CPR* XII 13, which names ππαπα μερκυρε, 'the *papa* Merkure'. However, a potential issue arises if we recall that the term *apa* was commonly used by Coptic monks, and attaching a definite article to this title would appear as παπα, possibly meaning that we have mistakenly rendered *papa* in documents such as *CPR* II 220 (which only has παπα γεωργι rather than ππαπα) instead of 'the *apa*'.<sup>21</sup> However, such mistakes are unlikely, as in a number of these instances where παπα is written, we see that 'the *apa*' would not

<sup>19</sup> J. L. FOURNET, 'Deux lettres inédites de la collection de Strasbourg', [in:] N. BOSSON & A. BOUD'HORS (eds.) *Actes du huitième Congrès international d'études coptes, Paris, 28 juin – 2 juillet 2004* [= *Orientalia Lovaniensia analecta* 163], Leuven 2007, vol. 2, pp. 691–692.

<sup>20</sup> Approximately 74 of the 182 total in Appendix 1

<sup>21</sup> Such a translation of παπα as 'the *apa*' is quite common in the literature: see, e.g., L. S. B. MACCOULL, 'The Apa Apollon Monastery of Pharou and its papyrus archive', *Le Muséon* 106 (1992), pp. 21–63, or S. RICHTER, 'Spätkoptische Rechtsurkunden neu bearbeitet (II): Die Rechtsurkunden des Teschlot-Archivs' *The Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 30 (2000), pp. 95–148.



make sense in context. For instance, in the Bala'izah corpus we have a number of instances of a *papa* mentioned among other brothers of the monastery in letters such as *P. Bal.* 188 (listing people whom the sender wishes to greet alongside the recipient), where it does not make sense for a definite article to be added to call one brother 'the *apa* Constantine' while the surrounding brothers are referred to simply as '*apa*' without definite articles attached.<sup>22</sup> Many other documents can similarly be dealt with based on context and sense in this way. We can add further strength to this argument by highlighting the general rarity of attestations in Greek where *apa* is prefigured by a definite article, with very few attestations of this in the context of the sizeable corpus of Greek monastic papyri, indicating a strong preference amongst scribes against adding a definite article to that title. This preference is shown clearly to have carried over into Coptic by *SB Kopt.* IV 1933, an epitaph from Saqqara which lists a number of monks with the title '*apa*', then *ⲡⲁⲡⲁ* (the *papa*) Apollo, before resuming listing '*apa*' monks. Here we have the definite article added to the term *papa*, but not to any of the attestations of *apa*, which is generally only explicable by assuming that *apa* simply did not take a definite article – even in contexts which would suggest that it should – while *papa* both could take an article, and did. Therefore, it would be unusual for Coptic usages not to follow the Greek preference against preceding *apa* with a definite article, giving us even greater security in concluding that instances in Coptic papyri which use *ⲡⲁⲡⲁ* (rather than *ⲡⲁⲡⲁⲛ*) can be securely rendered as the honorific *papa* rather than 'the *apa*'.

## 2. USAGE OF THE TERM BEFORE THE NINTH CENTURY

As mentioned earlier, Derda and Wipszycka's conclusion was that *papa* was a term used in Greek and Coptic to indicate priests, based almost entirely upon the fourth-century Greek document *P. Oxy.* XXXVI 2785, and the eighth-century Coptic document *CPR* IV 203, where individuals are referred to as '*papa* [name]' and then have the term *presbuteros* added

<sup>22</sup> *P. Bal.* 192 is much the same.

later in the document, identifying them as priests. While we have already mentioned how Luijendijk's reinterpretation of *P. Oxy.* XXXVI 2785 has undermined this argument for Greek attestations, we could highlight that the documents *P. Lond. Copt.* I 1130, *P. Mon. Apollo* 50, and *SB Kopt.* III 1430 would initially seem to strengthen Derda and Wipszycka's conclusions for usage of the term in Coptic, as in each of these the individuals identified in the Coptic portions of these texts are in the Greek portion then identified as presbyters, perhaps suggesting some equivalence between the two identifiers.

However, one key question must be asked of this definition in light of the wider corpus of documents: why would these few presbyters be identified as *papa*, but not others? We have many Greek and Coptic attestations of presbyters in similar monastic contexts having the title *apa* instead of *papa* – at Aphrodito,<sup>23</sup> Naqlun,<sup>24</sup> Bawit,<sup>25</sup> and elsewhere – demonstrating that *papa* was most certainly not a universal term for a presbyter, or even for a presbyter within a monastery. It is therefore likely that in the monastic contexts where the later (primarily Coptic) attestations of *papa* come from, the title did not derive from ecclesiastical orders, but was given to individuals within a monastery who had other specific roles or responsibilities within their communities. As such, the title will be approached there primarily as a monastic rather than ecclesiastical honorific, although it will be taken into account that a few of its holders were presbyters.

A dating limit of the ninth-century is being applied to this section's analysis, as I believe that after this point we see a further development of *papa* that is largely distinct from how we should interpret the term's usage in the monastic Coptic documents that come predominantly from this pre-ninth-century period, and which I will discuss later.

<sup>23</sup> *P. Aphrod. Reg.*: numerous persons, including *apa* Biktor, *apa* Enoch, and *apa* Iohannes.

<sup>24</sup> *P. Naqlun* 39 as in T. DERDA & J. WEGNER, 'Πατέρες τοῦ ἁγίου Νεκλονίου: Functionaries of the Naqlun monastery in the first two centuries of its existence', [in:] I. ZYCH, A. ŁAJTAR, & A. OBLUSKI (eds.), *Aegyptus et Nubia Christiana. The Włodzimierz Godlewski Jubilee Volume on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday*, Warsaw 2016, pp. 73–97.

<sup>25</sup> *P. Bawit Clackson* 37: *apa* Phoibammon.

The first point that helps to illuminate the potential role of an individual with the title *papa* within a monastery is the seeming rarity of multiple *papa* attestations in any one document. The vast majority of documents appear to have only one *papa* attested in each of them, even in long lists of people in the monastery (such as *P. Bal.* 291), while the very rare exceptions – see *P. Sarga* 185, *CPR* XII 24, *CPR* XII 31, *P. Bal.* 188, BL Ms. Or. 6204<sup>26</sup> – only ever attest to two distinct holders of the title in the same text. Therefore, unlike the frequent occurrences of multiple *apas* in monastic texts, this may suggest that there were very few *papas* in any monastery at a time, with a maximum of two entirely possible given the lack of any documents from this period with more than that.

The exceptions to this general rule before the ninth century seem to be epitaphs which list multiple *papas*, such as *O. Brit. Mus. Copt.* I App:16 (which has three separate *papas* being commemorated), or *SB Kopt.* I 793 and *SB Kopt.* IV 2003 (which each have two). While this may seem to present a problem to the above arguments, it is worth highlighting that these *papas* are generally deceased, and so are not necessarily operating in the monastery at the same time. What may in fact be occurring here is that one monk may have served as *papa*, and then died and been commemorated on the epitaph using the honorific, with his successor(s) then assuming both the role and honorific in his absence, before later dying and being commemorated on the same epitaph. As such, this does not contradict the theory that there could only be one or two *papas* in the same monastery at a time, even if it may cause us temporary pause.

The general rarity of *papas* is further suggested by how few additional identifiers are generally attached to them. Usually, individuals in legal documents had a series of identifiers to give very granular detail and distinction between the many different people who had any given name in an area,<sup>27</sup> which in monasteries were primarily profession and monastic

<sup>26</sup> L. S. B. MACCOULL, 'The Bawit contracts: Texts and translations', *The Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 31 (1994), no. 2.

<sup>27</sup> A. DELATTRE, 'Elements de l'identification en Égypte', [in:] M. DEPAUW & S. COUSSEMENT (eds.), *Identifiers and Identification Methods in the Ancient World* [= *Orientalia Lovaniensia analecta* 229], Leuven – Walpole, Ma. 2014, p. 153.

rank/religious title, while in secular contexts patronyms were exceedingly important.<sup>28</sup> However, this is not usually the case for *papa* titleholders: for example, in the case of *CPR* IV 185, a string of individuals are listed in a receipt of purchase, all identified with patronyms, but *papa* Alex is identified solely by name and his title, in stark contrast to the rest. This is probably as the designation *papa* was sufficiently rare for it to distinguish this Alex from any other in the locality, while others needed to be distinguished by additional identifiers. This seems to be a general pattern with individuals identified with a *papa* title before their names – Appendix 1 demonstrates the unusual paucity of any other identifications used aside from the title *papa* (or Christian niceties such as ‘my brother’ or ‘my father’, which would not be used for legal identification) – which may suggest that just a name and the unusual title was generally enough to distinguish any individual in both secular and monastic contexts, demonstrating again the rarity of the title and the few holders of it in any given area. Nonetheless, the few identifiers that are used will be of value later.

By examining the type of documents in which these *papa* titleholders feature, and their roles within these documents, we can also attempt to draw further conclusions about the nature of the title itself, aside from its relative rarity. Appendix 1 is helpful for showing that while there is some variety in the role of *papas* in each document, a significant number of them are performing administrative tasks of different kinds, often in a facilitating role acting for their monastery. A number of the *papa* titleholders in *P. Bawit Clackson* – most notably the frequently-attested *papa* Shenoute<sup>29</sup> – act in this way, in most cases travelling to pay out agricultural goods to various recipients, including cultivators of (presumably) monastic land in *P. Bawit Clackson* 20. Similarly, in *P. Ryl. Copt.* 365, *papa* Biktor also seems to have a role in distributing wood for various purposes, likely linked in some way to the instructions he gives for the management of groups of workers. We see similar roles being fulfilled at Bala’izah too, where in *P. Bal.* 291 *papa* Theodoros is noted in the accounts of the monastery to have paid a horse-doctor on the monastery’s behalf, while

<sup>28</sup> DELATTRE, ‘Elements de l’identification’ (cit. n. 27), pp. 156–159.

<sup>29</sup> Likely the same man in *P. Bawit Clackson* 18, 20, 28, and 46.

at Wadi Sarga the *papa* Isaac of *P. Sarga* 106 is said to be the one from whom dates and wine being distributed to the shepherds come, likely meaning that he is in charge of the storage of these comestibles. The *papa* Merkure of *CPR* XII 13 seemingly also has a role in charge of the administration and storage of a long list of objects including clothes, baskets, and storage containers, clearly demonstrating an internal administrative aspect of the role, alongside the above external facilitation.

These documents are just a small sample of similar ones, which together seemingly confirm some sort of role for a *papa* in the economic administration and organisation of sixth–ninth-century monasteries, helping to hold and distribute the monastery’s assets, and fulfil the institutions’ external obligations. While not the only facilitators in this way – for instance *papa* Theodoros is accompanied by a number of *apas* also paying for various things in *P. Bal.* 291 – the title nonetheless appears overwhelmingly performing these administrative roles, suggesting that regardless of the actions of the *apas* around them, that *papa* was an administrative title. Both the external distributions and internal administrative roles appear relatively equally attested among the papyri, potentially demonstrating responsibility for both in a role reminiscent of a monastic *oikonomos*.

However, we also see a large number of papyri where *papa* titleholders are attested as witnesses and scribes of legal documents. While witnessing a document does not tell us much about the role of *papa* specifically, the scribal function is a particularly interesting element of these attestations, which in documents such as *P. Mon. Apollo* 50 (a lease of monastic beehives) demonstrates not only literacy – a trait which may explain their importance and role in monastic administrative matters – but also that *papa* titleholders were integral members of a monastery’s economic administration, as the *papa* Helias in this document is responsible not only for drafting the contract, but also for signing on the behalf of the monastery. Similarly, in *P. Ryl. Copt.* 201 (in which the *topos* of Apa Th[....]<sup>30</sup> acknowledges a loan), an

<sup>30</sup> Likely the monastery of Apa Thomas, rather than any other name, or alternate meaning of *topos*: see R. DEKKER, ‘The Monastery of Apa Thomas at Wadi Sarga: Points of departure for a relative chronology’, [in:] G. GABRA & H. TAKLA (eds.), *Christianity and Monasticism in Middle Egypt*, Cairo 2015, p. 12.

unnamed *papa* both drafts the document – he is described as *πεγραφευε*, ‘the scribe’ – and also seems to act on the behalf of the *dikaion* (legal personality) of the *topos*, as is suggested by a fragment of his signature, which states *ἐπιτρεπε ναὶ γμ πρὰν ... αἰχῶναι*, among significant lacunae. This is a relatively standard Coptic legal formula which we generally see used where individuals who are illiterate entrust others to sign on their behalf, with the scribe usually saying that the responsibility of signing has been *ἐπιτρεπε ναὶ* (‘entrusted to me’), which is soon after followed by the phrase *αἰχῶναι* (‘and I wrote’), as in *CPR IV 23*, *CPR IV 161*, *P. KRU 75*, and *P. KRU 106*. However, the use of ‘in the name of’ between the two elements in this case is unusual and unattested elsewhere, which therefore suggests to me not that this signature is being written for an illiterate individual, but that the *papa* has had ‘entrusted to me’ the responsibility for signing ‘in the name of’ either the *dikaion* or *topos* (the complete phrase is lost to lacunae, but is unlikely to be ‘in the name of the father, son and holy spirit’ given the size of the lacuna), and so is the representative of the monastery in this financial matter. Both of these documents therefore suggest some significant seniority and power beyond just being an instrument of the monastic administration, as they had the authority to both draft and sign legal documents on the behalf of the institution, a right few ordinary monks enjoyed.

As such, we can clearly see a tendency for *papa* titleholders to be few in number, but relatively senior members of their monasteries, often being involved in their economic administrations in charge of material assets and goods, and at times able to act on the behalf of the institution in the management of property and money.

The infrequent additional identifiers attached to these *papas* generally confirm this image of seniority and involvement in administrative affairs, most helpfully in *P. Köln Ägypt. II 21*, where *papa* Anouph is identified as the *oikonomos* of the monastery at Bawit, a very senior official within a monastery with responsibility for its economic management.<sup>31</sup> *SBKopt. V 2166* also features a *papa* Mena identified as a monastic *oikonomos*. A sim-

<sup>31</sup> This role is well-known in monastic administrations. See, e.g., P. MAGDALINO & A.-M. TALBOT, ‘Oikonomos’, [in:] KAZHDAN (ed.), *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium* (cit. n. 4), p. 1517.

ilar attestation is made at Wadi Sarga in Greek, where the *papa* Apollo of *O. Sarga* 124 also seems to be indicated to be an *oikonomos* by the phrase  $\delta\mu\omicron\iota(\omega\varsigma)$ , ‘ditto’, applied as his identifier after the previous entry indicates another monk explicitly identified as serving in this role.<sup>32</sup> While ‘ditto’ could apply to other parts of the previous entry, this is not my reading of the document, and so *papa* Apollo being an *oikonomos* is the most likely interpretation of the force of  $\delta\mu\omicron\iota(\omega\varsigma)$ . As mentioned before, the role of *oikonomos* appears to be very similar to the functions performed by a number of *papa* titleholders – even those not explicitly identified as such are administering the assets, payments, and liabilities of the monastic institution – suggesting that the *oikonomos* role may be a uniting factor between monastic attestations of the title in this period.

However, designations other than *oikonomos* also reinforce the senior place of a *papa* more generally within monastic hierarchies. This can be particularly seen in *P. Bawit Clackson* 47 where *papa* Damianos is described as *sab*, a term at Bawit that denoted a senior monk,<sup>33</sup> but also in *CPR* IV 195, in which *papa* Gregorios is called ‘the *diadochos*’. This is a relatively unusual term, understood by Walter Till as the designated successor of the abbot,<sup>34</sup> which is self-evidently very senior. Taking this even further, at Aphrodito we seem to have at least two attestations of *papa* titleholders being explicitly identified as monastic heads: the *papa* Phoibammon is described as  $\pi\omega\tau\tau\ \eta\pi\tau\omicron\omicron\upsilon\ \eta\eta\alpha\pi\alpha\ \alpha\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\omega$ , ‘the father of the mount of Apa Apollo’, in Griffith Institute Crum MSS V 4.5r,<sup>35</sup> a term that identified him as the superior of the well-attested Aphroditan monastery of Apa Apollos, while in *SB Kopt.* III 1436 another *papa* Phoibammon is explicitly identified as ‘*proestos* of the *topos*’.<sup>36</sup> Similar attestations occur outside of

<sup>32</sup> Who interestingly does not have this title of *papa*, see later for discussion of this.

<sup>33</sup> S. CLACKSON (ed.), *Coptic and Greek Texts Relating to the Hermopolite Monastery of Apa Apollo*, Oxford 2000, p. 31.

<sup>34</sup> W. TILL (ed.), *Corpus Papyrorum Raineri* IV: *Die koptischen Rechtsurkunden der Papyrusammlung der Oesterreichischen Nationalbibliothek*, Vienna 1958, p. 177.

<sup>35</sup> MACCOULL, ‘The Apa Apollos Monastery’ (cit. n. 21), no. 12.

<sup>36</sup> Note that this latter attestation is much firmer than the former, as the former seems to have been entirely reconstructed from a lacuna by Crum without much explanation,

Aphrodito as well, with *O. Crum ST 244* having a *papa* Helias identified as ‘*proestos* of the *topos*’.<sup>37</sup> While it would be an over-reach to consider that all *papa* titleholders were therefore automatically the abbot or their designated successor – particularly in light of the documents in which multiple *papas* are mentioned – the generally senior position of the title in the monastic hierarchy nonetheless appears quite evident when examining both the roles they perform in the documentary papyri and the few attestations of other identifiers we can find.

This suggestion of the seniority of the *papa* honorific is reinforced by its simple meaning in Greek as ‘father’. Uses of the term ‘father’ in monastic contexts are frequent, be it in Greek (πατήρ) or Coptic (ⲉⲱⲧⲣ), with it usually denoting some element of authority, even if it is one that Philip Rousseau highlights – through analysis of the Pachomian literature – is tempered by an element of ‘mutual obligation’.<sup>38</sup> This meaning of *papa* therefore greatly complements the argument that the title denotes a senior individual within a monastery with significant administrative power, but also a responsibility for those under their material and spiritual care. In the highly bilingual (Greek and Coptic) environment of Egypt in this period, it is entirely convincing that most monks would have been aware of this simple Greek meaning of *papa*, and so its use was likely with this alternate meaning of ‘father’ in mind. Furthermore, it is from this basic meaning of seniority that we can perhaps infer in the aforementioned case of *O. Sarga 124* that the difference between the two *oikonomoi* could be that *papa* Apollo is the ‘senior’ *oikonomos*, perhaps on the basis of literacy,

but the latter should give us faith that Crum’s reconstruction is possible, and likely correct. For *SB Kopt.* III 1436 coming from Aphrodito, see M. HASITZKA & G. SCHMELZ, ‘Die Klosterbesitzverzeichnisse P. Lond. IV 1631. Eine Neuedition’, *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete* 49 (2003), pp. 79–112.

<sup>37</sup> While *SB Kopt.* IV 1895 may tempt us to also identify the *papa* Georgios in this document as *proestos*, which is the word immediately before his title and name, given that most identifiers of that sort follow rather than precede a name, it is in fact that individual mentioned before *papa* Georgios who is likely to be the *proestos*, rather than *papa* Georgios himself.

<sup>38</sup> P. ROUSSEAU, *Pachomius: The Making of a Community in Fourth-Century Egypt* [= *The Transformation of the Classical Heritage* 6], Berkeley – Los Angeles 1985, p. 109.



tenure, or other additional responsibilities, which would merit this additional title over a more junior colleague.

While initially presenting a difficulty to our comprehension, this seeming seniority of a *papa* within monastic contexts can also be reconciled to their being ordered around in some of the administrative documents discussed earlier. The ‘our father who writes to his son’ formula at Bawit particularly raises this issue for several *papa* attestations, as in these the *papa* is generally being given orders and referred to as a ‘son’ of a monastic father, suggesting a relatively lower position within the monastery. However, if we view this as a standard formula for these documents, and that the ‘father’ is only head of a department of the monastery rather than the monastic superior themselves (following Gesa Schenke’s interpretation of the term ΠΕΝΕΙΩΤ ΠΕΤΣΖΑΙ<sup>39</sup>) then such documents may only be using formulaic terms to address another monk of likely equal seniority, and do not necessarily imply that the sender has any real seniority over them. This interpretation is all the likelier given that a *papa* identified as *oikonomos* is featured in one of these texts, *P. Köln Ägypt.* II 21, as the ‘son’ being written to, demonstrating that a senior monk in the monastery (the *oikonomos*) could still be addressed in this way. Furthermore, this argument arguably works even better if it is indeed the superior of the monastery writing to the *papa* in these ‘it is our father who writes’ documents,<sup>40</sup> as the sender would indeed be senior to the *papa* recipient (and every other recipient), whatever the *papa*’s relative seniority to the rest of the monastery, and so being referred to as ‘son’ remains entirely congruous.

We could also link the performance of these relatively menial tasks to Rousseau’s argument about humility in Pachomian monasticism,<sup>41</sup> which

<sup>39</sup> G. SCHENKE, ‘Micro- and macro-management responsibilities of the head of the monastery of Apa Apollo at Bawit’, [in:] P. BUZI, A. CAMPLANI, & F. CONTARDI (eds.), *Coptic Society, Literature and Religion from Late Antiquity to Modern Times* [= *Orientalia Lovaniensia analecta* 247] Leuven 2016, p. 690.

<sup>40</sup> A. DELATTRE, ‘L’administration de Baouit au VIII<sup>e</sup> siècle. À propos des documents ΠΕΝΕΙΩΤ ΠΕΤΣΖΑΙ’, *Chronique d’Égypte* 85 (2010), pp. 391–395, argues for this interpretation of ΠΕΝΕΙΩΤ ΠΕΤΣΖΑΙ.

<sup>41</sup> Of course, humility is also a prominent motif in much other normative monastic literature, such as John Cassian’s *Conferences*, or the *Apophthegmata Patrum*.

highlights that all monks were subject to the commands of those in authority positions, with even Pachomius himself doing menial work, as instructed by monastic officials.<sup>42</sup> As such, just being a senior monk (as a *papa* likely was) would not necessarily exempt them from being ordered by a different administrative head to distribute goods or run errands, and in fact it would be almost necessary to reinforce monastic humility and prevent him becoming excessively proud of his position. A potentially relevant document in this respect is *SB Kopt.* IV 1964, a seventh-century epitaph commemorating *papa* Iohannes, who is described as παλ{α}ογ, ‘the servant’, which instead of designating a menial position in the monastery may be intended to greatly glorify him for his performance of such menial administrative duties for the monastery while being a *papa*. As such, the menial tasks that *papas* at times seemed to undertake do not contradict the idea of the *papa* as a senior member of the monastic administration or wider monastic community.

Other identifiers are also attached to various *papas*, with a few identified by geographical areas,<sup>43</sup> patronyms,<sup>44</sup> and professions,<sup>45</sup> and a few even appearing as fathers of secular individuals,<sup>46</sup> although these tell us relatively little about the title *papa* itself.

However, it is also important to consider the attestations in which the *papa* titleholder is identified as a priest, which has been the previous interpretation of the term in both Greek and Coptic, and which I have already demonstrated is largely incorrect in the Greek case. Interestingly, only five of the 174 attestations of the indeclinable honorific *papa* make explicit that the holder of a *papa* honorific is a presbyter,<sup>47</sup> one of which

<sup>42</sup> ROUSSEAU, *Pachomius*, (cit. n. 38), pp. 110–112.

<sup>43</sup> ‘Man of Hage’ in *O. Sarga* 55; ‘man from Saft’ in *SB Kopt.* IV 1963; etc.

<sup>44</sup> ‘Son of Nahrau’ in *CPR* IV 206; ‘son of Sergios’ in *SB Kopt.* III 1423; etc.

<sup>45</sup> ἐλαιουργός, ‘oil-dealer’, in *P. Barwit Clackson* 20; χαλωγ, ‘carpenter’, in BL Ms. Or. 6204 (MACCOULL, ‘The Bawit contracts’ [cit. n. 26], no. 2); etc. These could either have been their past professions, or the roles that they fulfilled in the monastery, or both, which could well have been how these *papa* titleholders began their paths up the ranks of monastic economic administration.

<sup>46</sup> Thirteen attestations in Appendix 1 – likely children conceived before taking holy orders.

<sup>47</sup> *CPR* IV 203; *P. Lond. Copt.* I 1130 (two attestations); *P. Mon. Apollo* 50; *SB Kopt.* III 1430. This excludes *P. Oxy.* XXXVI 2785 for reasons given earlier.

is the earlier-mentioned *P. Mon. Apollo* 50, in which the *papa* Helias who is responsible for the drawing up and signing of a contract on the behalf of the monastery is identified on the recto as a presbyter. This document indicates to us that while *papa* Helias was indeed a priest, he was also a member of the monastic community and intimately tied up in their administration, in much the same way as *papa* Ptolemai seems to be in *SB Kopt.* III 1430, a receipt for a wine delivery to the Bawit monastery. As these presbyter *papas* are generally attested performing the same roles as all other *papa* titleholders, and come from the same monastic contexts, the title *papa* is probably best seen not as deriving from their ecclesiastical orders, but from their administrative roles performed within the monastic community. When we recall again the great number of attestations of monk-priests identified as *apa* – crucially, even at communities where we have attestations of the title *papa*<sup>48</sup> – then this argument gains even greater strength, as surely if *papa* referred to a monastic priest, then these other individuals would not have the title *apa*. These ordained monks were likely given such administrative roles because both priests and monastic administrators generally needed to be literate, and so in a monastery which may have had a dearth of literate individuals, an ordained monk could be an obvious choice to appoint as an administrator, and so to claim the title of *papa*. As such, these five attestations should be seen only as *papa* titleholders who also happened to be presbyters, rather than as the basis for a more widespread equivalence of *papa* = presbyter, particularly as these are only five out of 174 attestations of the title: tiny number when faced by the massive volume of evidence for *papa* titleholders being monastic administrators.

What can we therefore conclude from the above? That the title is rare, that the holders of it were often involved in administrative matters, and that when an additional identifier was used, it generally highlighted the seniority of its holder. From this, it is therefore likely that the title was bestowed on individuals who were senior members of the administrative apparatus of a monastery, fulfilling functions similar to that of *oikonomoi*, even if they were not explicitly identified as such. However, a *papa* was

<sup>48</sup> Bawit and Aphrodito examples provided, see nn. 23 & 25.

not by necessity only an *oikonomos*, as other senior administrative roles existed within monasteries such as the ‘fathers of the *diakonia*’ at Bawit which had responsibility for different departments of the monastic administration,<sup>49</sup> and indeed we see *papa* Zeth in *P. Louvre Bawit* 9 as having a title which Delattre’s edition highlights could be read as ‘father of X’ where X could be ‘*diakonia*’, ‘gardens’, ‘cells’, or any other department he helped to administer.<sup>50</sup> The forms and compositions of similar internal ‘administrative institutions’<sup>51</sup> varied extensively across all Egyptian monasteries, but the holders of the *papa* title likely held specific roles on them which gave them the right to the honorific. The seniority that is suggested by the Greek meaning of ‘father’ suggests that they were likely the more senior members of these administrative units, in light of other ‘fathers of the *diakonia*’ and *oikonomoi* who are attested without the *papa* title. In relation to earlier discussions of a monastic superior or *diadochos* holding this title, the role of *oikonomos* was often given to the second most senior monk, and could also be held by the superiors of smaller monasteries, and so it is entirely congruous in both situations for the head of a monastery to also be the *oikonomos* or administrative head, with the title *papa* highlighting their role as heads of the financial administration, while their other identifiers demonstrate their roles in charge of (or as deputy in) more general and spiritual matters.

The above all demonstrates some relative imprecision in the concordance between the honorific *papa* and any given administrative role, but this is understandable given the greatly variable titlature and administrative structures that existed within different Egyptian monasteries,<sup>52</sup> with even common terms like *oikonomos* and *proestos* having varying levels of

<sup>49</sup> CLACKSON, *Coptic and Greek Texts*, (cit. n. 33), p. 29.

<sup>50</sup> Although he also presents the – in my eyes less likely – alternative explanation that πει... could be reconstructed as πει[ρεσβυτερος] instead of πει[ωτ η...], so we should apply a modicum of caution in dealing with this attestation.

<sup>51</sup> Phrase from J. WEGNER, *Monastic Communities in Context: Monasteries, Economy, and Society in Late Antique Egypt* [= *The Journal of Juristic Papyrology Supplement* 41], Leuven 2021, p. 243.

<sup>52</sup> See E. WIPSYCKA, *Moines et communautés monastiques en Égypte (IV<sup>e</sup>–VIII<sup>e</sup> siècles)* [= *The Journal of Juristic Papyrology Supplement* 11], Warsaw 2009, chapter 6.

seniority in different monastic hierarchies. As such, it is entirely understandable that the exact usage of *papa* also varied from monastery to monastery in a similar way.

For precedents to such a role as we seem to see for the *papa*, we could perhaps look to the administration of the Egyptian temples, which had the *lesonis*: a priest who was also financial administrator for the temple, whose responsibilities in the Ptolemaic period covered the entire temple, while in the Roman period were just for a specific department or chapel of the temple.<sup>53</sup> This role seems relatively comparable to the monks – already a member of the community, like the temple priest – who were put in charge of various administrative matters for the monastery, and derive some great seniority from this, on top of a new title (in this case *papa* rather than *lesonis*). In fact, the two phases of the *lesonis*'s development may provide excellent paradigms for understanding the variety of monastic *papas*: the Ptolemaic *lesoneis* would be comparable to a *papa* in a smaller monastery, such as those at Aphrodito, who seemingly was close to being in overall charge of the monastery (i.e. as *proestos*) in addition to his administrative duties. In contrast, the Roman *lesoneis* are instead more comparable to the *papa* title-holders at larger monasteries such as Bawit, who were in charge of much smaller portions of the monastery's financial management, and were no longer the only *papa* in the monastery as a result (in much the same way that the *lesoneis* multiplied in the temples of the Roman period).<sup>54</sup>

Therefore, there could have been no hard and fast rules to who received the honorific *papa* across all monastic communities, and this is most clearly demonstrated by the notable absence of any individuals holding the title of *papa* in certain lists of the senior monks of particular monasteries. This is most obvious in the Bala'izah case, where no such *papa* seems to occur within the lists of 'senior brethren' enumerated in the signatories of documents such as *P. Bal.* 102 and 104. How then can we

<sup>53</sup> M. SCHENTULEIT, 'Organization of the priesthood in Soknopaiou Nesos. Transition between the Ptolemaic and Roman periods', [in:] M. CAPASSO & P. DAVOLI (eds.), *Soknopaios. The Temple and Worship. Proceedings of the First Round Table of the Centro di Studi Papirologici di Università del Salento, Lecce – October 9th 2013*, Lecce 2015, pp. 168–185.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 182.

explain this? The first route we may consider is that the ‘senior brethren’ enumerated in various lists like these may – in certain monasteries – exclude those performing administrative duties, instead being less an ‘administrative institutions’ than a group of the spiritual leaders of the community. Indeed, at Naqlun it seems that while there was an *oikonomos*, he was not enumerated among the heads of the community in the document *P. Naqlun* 39,<sup>55</sup> so it is entirely possible that the *papa* titleholders at Bala’izah or elsewhere could also have been relatively senior and administrative figures, but were simply not enumerated among the ‘fathers’ of any community as they were not their spiritual leaders. Furthermore, where *oikonomoi* or other administrative heads are not identified as *papa* at other monasteries this may be either as they are simply not the most senior holder of that role – such as we argue for *O. Sarga* 124 – or as the exact usage of the terms *oikonomos* and *papa* was different within each monastery. For instance, while the senior administrative officials at Bawit may have held the title, at Bala’izah a *papa* may have been relatively more junior, perhaps serving as some other administrative functionary or more specialist role.

Alternatively, we could potentially find a distinction in varying scribal practice, as while some scribes may have used both the title *papa* and their job titles, others may have preferred to just call them the *oikonomos*, with *papa* then understood as one of their titles (either eschewing it in favour of no title, or the more generic *apa*). Other groups of scribes may just have written *papa* and instead let *oikonomos* or ‘administrator’ be implied by it. Indeed, the earlier mentioned *SB Kopt.* III 1267 is a good example of this, with the author identifying himself on the verso as *papas* Markos, but on the recto just as Markos, allowing his title to be omitted, but understood.

Regional variation in scribal practice may also help to explain why no attestation of the honorific *papa* has been securely linked to the Upper Theban region, as monasteries and scribes there may not have adopted the title at all, even if there were individuals fulfilling similar roles to the *papas* in the monastic administrations at Jeme. Indeed, as earlier highlighted the Upper Thebaid appears to have been the only place where the old noun form of *papas* made its way into Coptic usage instead of the hon-

<sup>55</sup> DERDA & WEGNER, ‘Functionaries of the Naqlun monastery’ (cit. n. 24).

orific one, which while not having much of a permanence beyond the seventh century, may still have led to the region preferring not to use the *papa* honorific in the same way that monasteries elsewhere in Egypt did, as it may have had different (episcopal) associations for them.

Such variation between monasteries in organisational, scribal, and title practices means that individuals with similar roles to *papa* titleholders without themselves bearing the title do not disprove the general trend of *papa* usage, but simply highlight that there were diverse practices regarding honorifics for administrative officials in monasteries, much in the same way that terms such as *proestos* and *archimandrites* varied in their application. As such, we can safely rebut any counterarguments that *papa* was not a senior administrative official by highlighting that the exact place of such an official in the monastic hierarchy varied considerably between monasteries, much as the structure of the monasteries themselves varied, as did the scribal practice that recorded them.

### 3. DEVELOPMENTS FROM THE NINTH CENTURY ONWARDS

Here, I shall attempt to present some brief remarks on what appears to me a third phase in the development of the Coptic form of *papa*, which is possibly evident in the Coptic papyri from the ninth century, and definitely from the tenth. The attestations from this period predominantly come from the volumes *P. Fay. Copt.* and *P. Lond. Copt.* I, and are largely dated by Walter Crum to the ninth century or later on palaeographic grounds. I will refrain from making any firm conclusions of this later phase of the title given my own shakier knowledge of the wider corpus of documents, as well as this relatively imprecise dating compared to the sixth–ninth century period, leaving it to another scholar to do the work its proper justice. Nonetheless, I provide here some brief observations that may guide future analysis.

The first of two major distinctions with earlier periods that emerges is the increasing use of the abbreviation  $\overline{\text{nn}}$  for *papa* in Coptic. This development is briefly summarised in the attestations I have collated into Appendix 3. Derda and Wipszycka discussed this abbreviation in the Greek context, particularly highlighting the fragility of reconstructing it

as  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha$  due to the variety of other roles (such as *praipositos*) which could be reconstructed from that abbreviation. The use of  $\pi\pi$  as an abbreviation to mean *papa* emerges in Coptic only from the tenth century onwards, and in a manner that appears more securely reconstructed given it has been better paralleled in literary texts: Crum highlights the numerous times that Henri Hyvernat securely reconstructs it in his translations of various Coptic saints' lives from this period.<sup>56</sup> The fact that this abbreviation for *papa* seemingly had not been previously used in Coptic may suggest that in Greek it was an abbreviation only for the noun form of *papa*, rather than the honorific one that was adopted by the Coptic language. This is if it was even an accepted abbreviation for *papa* in Greek at all, which would suggest (were that to be the case) that we should never reconstruct  $\pi( )\pi( )$  as  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha$  in papyri from any context before the tenth century.

The second of the two major developments is the increasing number of *papas* who could feature in a single document, with numerous documents from this period containing multiple *papas*. The earliest indication of this seems to be *P. Fay. Copt.* 13, which is palaeographically dated by Crum (using Hyvernat's *Album de paléographie copte*)<sup>57</sup> to the ninth or tenth centuries, and features no less than seven different *papas* being greeted or sending their greetings. Notable about this is that all these *papas* are alive at the same time, rather than being commemorated in an epitaph, which was the only type of record that had more than two *papa* titleholders before the ninth-century *P. Fay. Copt.* 22 similarly has three *papas* and *P. Lond. Copt.* I 594 has four, all either being greeted or listed as the recipient of the letter, with both documents likely to be roughly contemporaneous to *P. Fay. Copt.* 13, and so part of this general trend. Of course, not every document from this period has multiple *papas* – look for instance to *P. Lond. Copt.* I 529 or 549 – but the fact that we begin to see a multiplication of *papa* titleholders in Coptic documents is nonetheless worth remark, and may be indicative either of administrative changes within monasteries at this time, or further

<sup>56</sup> W. E. CRUM (ed.), *Coptic Manuscripts brought from the Fayyum by W.M. Flinders Petrie, Esq., D.C.L., Together with a Papyrus in the Bodleian Library*, London 1893, p. 30.

<sup>57</sup> H. HYVERNAT, *Album de paléographie copte, pour servir à l'introduction paléographique des Actes des martyrs de l'Égypte*, Paris 1888.



linguistic developments. The latter is not impossible, and may have occurred under the influence of Arabic (see later in this section), while for the former we can look once more to the development of the *lesoneis* in the temples of the Roman period for a potential parallel. The role of *lesoneis* went from being held by a single person in the Ptolemaic period, to being subdivided into a series of smaller roles by the Roman period because – as Maren Schentuleit argues – it was the best way to make the tasks more manageable for administrators of average competence, rather than requiring a single, over-qualified administrator.<sup>58</sup>

These two developments are both jointly made clear in *SB Kopt.* I 374 – from the thirteenth century – a document which has eight different *papas* listed (the first seven as members of the community, the last as a father of another member), and also has each attestation reconstructed from the  $\bar{n}\bar{n}$  abbreviation.

Crum also highlights the prevalence of the term *papa* in Coptic literary texts, meaning in one case the head of the monastery, and in another its founder.<sup>59</sup> This is of interest because such interpretations of these later attestations are much closer to the interpretation presented here of the term *papa* in fifth- to ninth-century Coptic documentary texts, than they are to the ecclesiastical meaning that has previously been argued for this term. Looking to literary texts from this later period may therefore reinforce the arguments presented for the period prior to the ninth century that a *papa* was a monk with a level of seniority within their monastery, rather than a priest. Similarly, *P. Lond. Copt.* I 529 and 549 (11th century) seem to reinforce these administrative responsibilities of a monastic *papa*, with the *papa* in both of these documents involved in managing monastic animals in much the same way as their earlier *papa* counterparts in *P. Mich. Copt.* 11 (7th cent.) or *SB Kopt.* III 1267 (7th/8th cent.). Therefore, while this period may have seen some significant changes in how the title *papa* was used, continuity with the pre-ninth-century period is still possible, which may even reinforce the earlier arguments.

<sup>58</sup> SCHENTULEIT, 'Organization of the priesthood', (cit. n. 53), p. 185.

<sup>59</sup> W. E. CRUM (ed.), *Catalogue of the Coptic Manuscripts in the British Museum*, London 1905, p. 266.

The increasing dominance of Arabic may be key to the development of the term from the ninth century onwards, at which point it would have been prevalent for long enough to influence the Coptic language. Cecilia Palombo has highlighted how the term *babā* came to be used in Arabic to transliterate the honorific *papa*, but that this would have been homograph to the Persian *babā*,<sup>60</sup> a different (and very popular) term for father. Is it potentially possible that because of this transliteration, the general meaning and usage of the Persian *babā* began to affect the usage of the Coptic honorific *papa*, and as a result *papa* became used more frequently and as a generic term of seniority, in much the same way that *babā* too was relatively generic? If *papa* lost its specific technical meaning and became just another term of affection, seniority, or familial ties, this may help to explain why so many individuals are identified as *papa* in these later documents in ways which appear so different from the analysis of the pre-ninth century documentary sources.

Similarly, we could potentially view documents such as *P. Lond. Copt.* I 1156 – in which a *papa* seems to be arrested for his involvement in the confiscation of goods, potentially on the behalf of the Arab pagarch – as the reverse of this process. Here, we possibly have an Arab who is referred to as a *babā*, with this then being transliterated in Coptic sources as *papa*, rather than it being a senior monk involved in a matter such as this. That this *papa* was a secular Arab rather than a monk is only likely (rather than certain) in my interpretation of this document, but as *papa* is used here as a noun rather than the honorific form that was most dominant in Coptic after the seventh century, it raises even more questions of what this term is meant to signify, and if it fits into the development of the ecclesiastical and monastic term *papa* in earlier centuries. One document which may provide strength to the interpretation of certain later uses of the term *papa* as a reverse transliteration of *babā* is *SB Kopt.* I 374, which identifies *papa* Abū'l-Ma'ani (ⲙⲁⲛⲓ ⲡⲟⲩ ⲕⲙⲁⲁⲛⲓ)<sup>61</sup> as the father of a member of the community (rather than a monk himself), demonstrating Arabs increasingly using the honorific *papa*.

<sup>60</sup> C. PALOMBO, *The Christian Clergy's Islamic Local Government in Late Marwanid and Abbasid Egypt*, PhD thesis, Princeton University 2020, p. 191.

I offer the questions to any scholar with knowledge of the Coptic and Arabic texts from the ninth century and beyond, and who will hopefully be able to sketch out the third (and potentially fourth) phases of the development of the term *papa* in greater detail and surety than I am currently qualified to provide.

#### 4. CONCLUSIONS

We can therefore provide important clarification to previous interpretations of the use of the Greek and Coptic title *papa*. While initially a term used in a declinable noun form in Greek to mean ‘bishop’, the title developed an indeclinable honorific form preceding a name that by the sixth century developed a non-episcopal – and specifically monastic – meaning, seemingly once it had made its way into usage in primarily Coptic monastic texts, with this new meaning of the honorific seemingly persisting until at least the ninth century, if not further. Due to the general Greek aversion to preceding the title *apa* with the definite article, we can also reasonably assume that Coptic scribes did the same – and we have good evidence for this – meaning that rendering the title *papa* is preferable to the alternative ‘the *apa*’ when presented with the word παπα in Coptic documentary texts.

Through examination of the monastic texts which attest to the use of *papa* as an indeclinable honorific before the ninth century, we can see that the role the titleholder had was generally a senior one with administrative responsibility and influence, implying that the term attached itself to *oikonomoi* and other senior monastic administrators, who occasionally could also hold other roles such as that of monastic superior or *diadochos*. While priests do seem to occasionally hold the title, it is likely by virtue

<sup>61</sup> It is worth noting that this use of *papa* is not related to the use of *apa* to mean Abū (see N. GONIS, “Abu” and “apa”. Arab onomastics in Egyptian context’, *The Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 31 [2001], pp. 47–49), as in this document ποϣ is used to transliterate Abū, so παπα is definitely not being used to mean Abū, as we may have thought were there to have been no ποϣ.

of a monastic administrative role that they do so rather than their ecclesiastical orders (which is a major deviation from the conclusions of Derda and Wipszycka), in part as we have so many more attestations from the sixth century onwards where monks identified as presbyters only had the title *apa*, rather than *papa*. While the exact meaning and accepted usage of the title could vary between monasteries, scribes, and regions, its holders were nonetheless evidently very senior and played significant roles in monastic economic administration. Hopefully, this reinterpretation can help to guide future work examining the shape of monastic financial administrations, as we have highlighted the presence of an honorific that in Coptic documents generally seems to have designated administrative functionaries of some seniority, which can help to provide some clarity in this otherwise difficult task.

The term *papa* appears to have developed further in the ninth to thirteenth centuries, where the final attestation of the term in Coptic papyri has so far been found, although the exact interpretation of the term in that period is a subject for another author better qualified to interpret those documents and their contexts.

Care should be taken of century and the precise language used, and the discovery of more attestations of the term in Greek or Coptic papyri may subtly alter our understanding of its meaning and development, but nonetheless this paradigm should – going forwards – become the standard way for editors to interpret the term in Greek and Coptic documents from the first millennium AD, particularly when these attestations come from ecclesiastical or monastic contexts.

A priestly title no more, the true episcopal and monastic meanings of *papa* should now hopefully be clear.

*Thomas Laver*

---

St John's College  
University of Cambridge  
St. John's Street  
Cambridge, CB2 1TP  
UNITED KINGDOM  
e-mail: [tpdl2@cam.ac.uk](mailto:tpdl2@cam.ac.uk)

## APPENDICES

These appendices are a preliminary attempt at a comprehensive list of all attestations of the title *papa* over the millennium of its use, which may serve as a reference for others to check the conclusions made here, as well as hopefully to go forward and develop them further. Other attestations of the term may be extant but missed, and future published work may also add to this corpus, but these appendices nonetheless attempt to be as comprehensive as possible at the time of their creation. This collection has been assembled entirely by myself, and so all errors are my own.

Document type and century are generally given as the original editors gave them, with only occasional substitutions of the papyri.info descriptions (or my own) in their place, usually where these are not given in the original edition.

The sorting in Appendix 1 is done alphabetically by siglum for easier referencing, rather than sorting by the name of the *papa*, the century, or any other criterion.

### *A brief note on dating*

The dating of all documents from Wadi Sarga follows the arguments of Renate Dekker.<sup>62</sup>

The *P. Fay. Copt.* documents are dated by Crum's references (where given) to the dated hands contained in Hyvernats's palaeographical album.<sup>63</sup> Where such reference is not to Hyvernats, or is otherwise unclear, I have marked them as 'unsure', but in general Crum argues that these are likely from the eighth to twelfth centuries given the form, provenance, and content of these documents, with a baseline assumption applied by myself for the purposes of my analysis that they are all most likely from the ninth century onwards.

<sup>62</sup> DEKKER, 'The Monastery of Apa Thomas' (cit. n. 30).

<sup>63</sup> HYVERNAT, *Album de paléographie copte* (cit. n. 57).

The *P. Lond. Copt.* I documents are similarly dated by the editors' reference to specific hands of Hyvernât, and where this is not given, labelled unsure. During my analysis, I have similarly applied the baseline assumption that these too came from any point from the ninth century onwards.

*A note on the collation of these three appendices*

The process of bringing these appendices together first started from performing my own search on papyri.info for attestations of the term *papa*, which were filtered for instances in which *papa* is used as a name or to mean 'father'. I then incorporated various relevant *papa* attestations in various other volumes of papyri, particularly those from monastic contexts, such as *P. Bal*, *P. Mon. Apollo*, *P. Barwit Clackson*, *P. Sarga*, and *P. Mon. Epiph.* This list was then checked against the documents mentioned by Derda and Wipszycka and by Förster to ensure that none were missing. I then verified using the indices the volumes of papyri referenced in those two works (e.g. *P. Ryl. Copt.* and *P. Lond. Copt.* I) that all relevant *papa* attestations in these volumes (and information about each attestation) had been gathered, including a few that the original studies had missed.

Finally, I went through the *Koptisches Sammelbuch* volumes I–V to find a number of additional attestations, which was a significantly easier task in the case of volumes III, IV, and V, as each has *πάπας* included in their Greek word index. Any *SB Kopt.* attestation has been rechecked (in part for contextual information) with the original publications that these editions came from.

Having collected all of this information, I believed a division of the attestations into these three appendices was appropriate to convey the information contained in each document as briefly and relevantly as possible.

APPENDIX 1

USES OF THE HONORIFIC, PRECEDING FORM OF PAPA

<i>Text</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Other identifiers</i>	<i>Document type</i>	<i>Role in document</i>	<i>Form and/or abbreviation</i>	<i>Century</i>
<i>CPR</i> II 26	Isak	N/A	deed of sale	father of those involved	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	8th
<i>CPR</i> II 68	Chael	N/A	bond / loan contract	writer of document	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	8th
<i>CPR</i> II 180	Timotheos	N/A	document regarding salaries	unclear	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	8th
<i>CPR</i> II 195	Kollouthe	N/A	document regarding oil	signatory?	ⲡⲡⲁⲡⲁ	7th
<i>CPR</i> II 220	Georgi	N/A	document	scribe (& signatory?)	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	8th
<i>CPR</i> II 236	Kalamon	N/A	document regarding money	father of those involved	ⲡⲡⲁⲡⲁ	8th
<i>CPR</i> II 237	Ioule	N/A	document regarding camels and money	father of those involved	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	8th
<i>CPR</i> IV 46	Shenoute	N/A	contract for delivery of lentils	signatory	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	8th
<i>CPR</i> IV 64	Hamais	N/A	loan contract	father of those involved	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	8th
<i>CPR</i> IV 66	unknown	N/A	loan contract	signatory	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	8th
<i>CPR</i> IV 120	Shenoute	N/A	lease agreement	scribe	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	8th
<i>CPR</i> IV 125	Peter	N/A	document relating to a lease	heir to land	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	8th
<i>CPR</i> IV 185	Alex	N/A	receipt of purchase	one of the sellers of land	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	8th
<i>CPR</i> IV 195	Gregorios	<i>diadochos</i>	document of indeterminate content	represents the monastery	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	7th/8th
<i>CPR</i> IV 203	Mena	(none in Coptic) Greek: presbyter	document of indeterminate content	unclear	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	8th

<i>Text</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Other identifiers</i>	<i>Document type</i>	<i>Role in document</i>	<i>Form and/or abbreviation</i>	<i>Century</i>
<i>CPR</i> IV 206	Shenoute	son of Nahrau	document of indeterminate content	signatory	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	8th
<i>CPR</i> XII 5	Shenoute	N/A	wine list	unclear	ⲡⲡⲁⲡⲁ	9th
<i>CPR</i> XII 13	Merkure	N/A	directory of objects	in charge of the things	ⲡⲡⲁⲡⲁ	7th/8th
<i>CPR</i> XII 24	Daniel	N/A	money list	giving money to / receiving from monastery	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	8th
<i>CPR</i> XII 24	Mena	N/A	money list	giving money to / receiving from monastery	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	8th
<i>CPR</i> XII 31	Johannes	N/A	names	receives 1 <i>nomisma</i>	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	7th/8th
<i>CPR</i> XII 31	Shenoute	N/A	names	receives 1 <i>nomisma</i>	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	7th/8th
<i>CPR</i> XXII 49	Neilou	N/A	document regarding workers	father of those involved	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	8th
MacCoull, ‘The Apa Apollos Monastery’ (cit. n. 21), no. 12	Phoibammon	father of the mount of Apa Apollo	donation of land to the monastery	monastic superior	[ⲡⲁⲡⲁ] <sup>64</sup>	6th
<i>Ibidem</i> , no. 16	Iohannes	N/A	letter	being greeted	ⲡⲡⲁⲡⲁ	6th
<i>Ibidem</i> , no. 25	Iohannes	N/A	letter	delivering letters <sup>65</sup>	ⲡⲡⲁⲡⲁ	6th/7th
MacCoull, ‘The Bawit contracts’ (cit. n. 26), no. 2	Hor	carpenter	contract regarding monastic cells	brother of a signatory	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	9th
<i>Ibidem</i> , no. 2	Ioseph	N/A	contract regarding monastic cells	owner of an adjoining cell	ⲡⲡⲁⲡⲁ	9th
<i>Ibidem</i> , no. 5 <sup>66</sup>	Hor	carpenter	contract regarding monastic cells	brother of a signatory	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	9th
<i>O. Brit. Mus. Copt.</i> I app:16	Apollo	my father	epitaph	being commemorated	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	unclear
<i>O. Brit. Mus. Copt.</i> I app:16	Ioseph	my father, the son of <i>apa</i> Ioseph	epitaph	being commemorated	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	unclear
<i>O. Brit. Mus. Copt.</i> I app:16	Phoibammon	my father	epitaph	being commemorated	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	unclear
<i>O. Brit. Mus. Copt.</i> I app:17	Pol(ydorus?)	N/A	epitaph	being commemorated	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	unclear



<i>O. Brit. Mus. Copt. I, pl. XLI</i>	Asa	son of Antseinou	epitaph	intercession requested for him and other monks	ⲡⲓⲁⲛⲁ	8th/9th
<i>O. Crum ST 186</i>	Makare	N/A	letter	mentioned in letter	ⲡⲓⲁⲛⲁ	6th–8th
<i>O. Crum ST 244</i>	Helias	<i>proestos</i> of the <i>topos</i>	letter regarding a <i>logos</i>	recipient of the letter and liable in a certain matter	ⲡⲓⲁⲛⲁ	6th–8th
<i>O. Crum ST 329</i>	Akoui	N/A	letter	author of the letter	ⲡⲓⲁⲛⲁ	6th–8th
<i>O. Sarga 35</i>	Victor	of Hage	prayer text	inscribing / dedicating the epitaph	ⲡⲓⲁⲛⲁ	7th/8th
<i>O. Sarga 35</i>	Victor	of Touho	prayer text	being commemorated	ⲡⲓⲁⲛⲁ	7th/8th
<i>O. Sarga 37</i>	Victor	the less	prayer text	inscribing / dedicating the epitaph	ⲡⲓⲁⲛⲁ	7th/8th
<i>O. Sarga 39</i>	Phoibammon	the ...	prayer text	being prayed for	ⲡⲓⲁⲛⲁ	7th/8th
<i>O. Sarga 42</i>	Victor	the less	prayer text	inscribing / dedicating the epitaph	ⲡⲓⲁⲛⲁ	7th/8th
<i>O. Sarga 44</i>	Victor	of Hage	epitaph	inscribing / dedicating the epitaph	ⲡⲓⲁⲛⲁ <sup>67</sup>	7th/8th
<i>O. Sarga 55</i>	Phoibammon	N/A	prayer text	being prayed for	[ⲡ]ⲓⲁⲛⲁ	7th/8th
<i>O. Sarga 55</i>	Wenofer	of Iom	prayer text	being prayed for	[ⲡ]ⲓⲁⲛⲁ	7th/8th

<sup>64</sup> Note that this is entirely in a restoration, without much note of how MacCoull has done it, but I trust MacCoull's restoration to be accurate, given that *SBKopt. III* 1436 (also from Aphrodito) similarly has the *papa* Phoibammon.

<sup>65</sup> The grammar of this particularly lacunose document makes parsing the actual role of *papa* Iohannes quite difficult – this is essentially a best guess.

<sup>66</sup> While this document is not actually edited in MacCOULL, 'The Bawit contracts' (cit. n. 26), she references the fact that it has the brother of *papa* Hor as a signatory in an identical way to document 2, and FÖRSTER, *Wörterbuch* (cit. n. 3), says that this document includes a *papa*, so it is almost certain that this document 5 has *papa* Hor, identified in the same way, still as the brother of a signatory.

<sup>67</sup> Crum restores this additional *pt* in both cases of *O. Sarga 55*, when it is not necessarily needed: the line is perfectly comprehensible as just 'With *papa* Phoibammon' rather than THE *papa* Phoibammon.

Text	Name	Other identifiers	Document type	Role in document	Form and/or abbreviation	Century
<i>O. Sarga</i> 79	Pater	the less	inscription	unclear	παπα	7th/8th
<i>O. Sarga</i> 86	George	N/A	letter	holding nets and being given corn	ππαπα	7th/8th
<i>O. Sarga</i> 88	Iohannes	unclear (φεβετροπε)	letter	receiving 4 sacks of onions	παπα	7th/8th
<i>O. Sarga</i> 90	Andreas	N/A	letter	given 'old wine'	παπα	7th/8th
<i>O. Sarga</i> 101	Pihew	N/A	internal requisition	holder/owner of net-cord	παπα	7th/8th
<i>O. Sarga</i> 106	Isaak	N/A	letter	sender of dates, wine, and <i>hotos</i> <sup>68</sup>	πα[πα] <sup>69</sup>	7th/8th
<i>O. Sarga</i> 124	Apollo	'the same' (i.e. <i>oikonomos</i> )	wine account	administering an account of wine	πάπα	7th/8th
<i>O. Sarga</i> 153	Psha	N/A	account	cell named after him	παπα	7th/8th
<i>O. Sarga</i> 181	Iohanes	N/A	letter	receiving oil and meat	παπα	7th/8th
<i>O. Sarga</i> 185	Kolthe	N/A	wine account	recipient of letter	παπα	7th/8th
<i>O. Sarga</i> 185	P...	N/A	wine account	has an account of wine	παπα	7th/8th
<i>P. Athen. Xyla</i> 12 <sup>70</sup>	Andreas	N/A	loan document	lending money	παπα	6th
<i>P. Bal.</i> 58	Papnoute	man of the (Great) Oasis	prayer text	being prayed for	παπα	7th/8th
<i>P. Bal.</i> 115	Helias	N/A	debt repayment	witness	ππαπα	7th/8th
<i>P. Bal.</i> 119	Pshoi	N/A	deed of sale	witness	ππαπα	7th/8th
<i>P. Bal.</i> 126	Ter	N/A	receipt	signatory?	ππαπα	7th/8th
<i>P. Bal.</i> 138	unknown	N/A	tax receipt	father of those involved?	παπα	7th/8th
<i>P. Bal.</i> 151	Abraham	N/A	tax receipt	second signatory	παπα	7th/8th
<i>P. Bal.</i> 151	Helias	N/A	tax receipt	first signatory	παπα	7th/8th
<i>P. Bal.</i> 188	Konstantinos	N/A	letter	being greeted	παπα	7th/8th
<i>P. Bal.</i> 188	Theodosios	N/A	letter	being greeted	ππα <sup>71</sup>	7th/8th

<i>P. Bal.</i> 192	Phoka	N/A	letter	being greeted	ⲡⲁⲣⲓ[Δ]	7th/8th
<i>P. Bal.</i> 197	Pishote	N/A	letter	unclear	ⲡⲡⲁⲡⲁ	7th/8th
<i>P. Bal.</i> 205	Iohannes	our son	letter or writing exercise	delivering	ⲡⲡⲁⲡⲁ	7th/8th
<i>P. Bal.</i> 247	Iohannes	N/A	letter	will receive something	ⲡⲡⲁⲡⲁ	7th/8th
<i>P. Bal.</i> 291	Theodoros	N/A	account	paying horse-doctor on behalf of monastery	ⲡⲡ <sup>72</sup>	7th/8th
<i>P. Bal.</i> 309	Kosma	N/A	food account	unclear	ⲡⲡⲁⲡⲁ	7th/8th
<i>P. Bal.</i> 411	Iohannes	N/A	fragment (likely writing exercise)	signatory?	ⲡⲡⲁ & ⲡⲡⲁⲡⲁ <sup>73</sup>	7th/8th
<i>P. Barwit Clackson</i> 18	Shenoute	N/A	order to supply wheat	distributing wheat	ⲡⲡⲁⲡⲁ	8th
<i>P. Barwit Clackson</i> 20	Shenoute	oil-dealer	order to supply aracus and barley	distributing aracus	ⲡⲡⲁⲡⲁ	8th

<sup>68</sup> See CRUM, *CD*, p. 727a for the meaning of *bots*.

<sup>69</sup> No justification is given as to why this restored, as ⲡⲁ[cont] is also possible.

<sup>70</sup> Mandilaras gives ‘*abba* Andreas’ rather than ‘*papa* Andreas’ in his translation, despite having written *papa* in his edition of the text, which he may have then rendered as *abba* due to a combination of the document’s monastic context and his own limited understanding of the term. Unhelpfully, Mandilaras does not comment on this shift in his commentary or apparatus. Nonetheless, this demonstrates the value of this present work in setting down the linguistic forms and common usages of the term *papa* in both Greek and Coptic to ensure that it is recognised for what it is – a distinct title which distinguishes its holder from other monks and ecclesiasts bearing the titles *abba* or *apa*, and as such should be rendered in future translations simply as *papa* rather than any other term.

<sup>71</sup> *P. Bal.*, p. 606, states that this is a common spelling for *papa* in Coptic inscriptions, but I would raise that it is unclear whether we are meant to restore ⲡ(Δ)ⲡⲁ or ⲡⲡⲁ(ⲡⲁ). Which of these it is has relevance for our discussion concerning the use of the definite article with the title *papa*.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 718, restores *papa* here for a *pi* with a supralinear stroke, noting that this was at the time unparalleled, and was premised upon similar tenth/eleventh century abbreviations where two *pis*, each with a supralinear stroke, meant *papa* (see Appendix 3 for examples). Therefore, we may wish to be cautious about this specific abbreviation, although the document could potentially be used as a parallel in future should similar abbreviations be found in other Coptic documentary papyri from these earlier centuries, with monastic contexts.

<sup>73</sup> The use of both of these in this document for the same *papa* titleholder may suggest that the accurate reconstruction other ⲡⲡⲁ abbreviations (as in *P. Bal.* 188) is as ⲡⲡⲁ(ⲡⲁ) rather than ⲡ(Δ)ⲡⲁ, although this is only speculation.

<i>Text</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Other identifiers</i>	<i>Document type</i>	<i>Role in document</i>	<i>Form and/or abbreviation</i>	<i>Century</i>
<i>P. Barwit Clackson</i> 25	Anoup	<i>shdiou</i>	poll-tax document	unclear	ⲙⲁⲛ[ⲁ]	8th
<i>P. Barwit Clackson</i> 28	Shenoute	N/A	order to supply aracus	distributing chickling	ⲙⲁⲛⲁ	8th
<i>P. Barwit Clackson</i> 45	Jacob	N/A	order for payment	distributing a jug	ⲙⲁⲛⲁ	8th
<i>P. Barwit Clackson</i> 46	Shenoute	N/A	order to supply commodity	distributing 24 artabas of a good	ⲙⲁⲛⲁ	8th
<i>P. Barwit Clackson</i> 47	Damianos	<i>ṣḥ</i> (scribe / senior monk)	order to supply wine	requesting wine	ⲡ[ⲁⲛⲁ] <sup>74</sup>	8th
<i>P. Barwit Clackson</i> 64	Palau	N/A	fragment (admin of a field)	recipient of order	ⲙⲁⲛⲁ	8th
<i>P. Barwit Clackson</i> 65	unknown	N/A	fragment	unclear	ⲙⲁⲛⲁ	8th
<i>P. Barwit Clackson</i> 84	Ptolemai	N/A	end of a contract	scribe	ⲙⲁⲛⲁ	8th
<i>P. Barwit Clackson</i> 85	unknown	N/A	list of payments	paying on behalf of monastery	ⲙⲁⲛⲁ	8th
<i>P. Brux. Barwit</i> 34	unknown	N/A	loan document	lender?	ⲙⲁⲛⲁ	7th/8th
<i>P. Fay. Copt.</i> 13	Athanasi	my father	letter	being greeted	ⲙⲁⲛⲁ	9th/10th
<i>P. Fay. Copt.</i> 13	Biktor	my father	letter	being greeted	[ⲛ]ⲁ[ⲛ]ⲁ	9th/10th
<i>P. Fay. Copt.</i> 13	Chael	my father	letter	sending greetings	ⲙⲁⲛⲁ	9th/10th
<i>P. Fay. Copt.</i> 13	Damian	my father	letter	being greeted	[ⲙⲁⲛⲁ]	9th/10th
<i>P. Fay. Copt.</i> 13	Iohannes	my father	letter	being greeted	ⲙⲁⲛⲁ	9th/10th
<i>P. Fay. Copt.</i> 13	Petros	my father	letter	being greeted	ⲙⲁⲛⲁ	9th/10th
<i>P. Fay. Copt.</i> 13	Poimen	my father	letter	being greeted	ⲙⲁⲛⲁ	9th/10th
<i>P. Fay. Copt.</i> 22	Philoth(eus)	my father	letter	being greeted	ⲙⲁⲛⲁ	unclear (see intro)
<i>P. Fay. Copt.</i> 22	Poimen	N/A	letter	being greeted	ⲙⲁⲛⲁ	unclear (see intro)

<i>P. Fay. Copt.</i> 22	Shenoute	N/A	letter	recipient of the letter	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	unclear (see intro)
<i>P. Fay. Copt.</i> 38	Sampale	my holy father	letter	recipient	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	unclear (see intro)
<i>P. Fay. Copt.</i> 45	Helias	son of Humej <sup>75</sup>	account	receiving goods/money	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	unclear (see intro)
<i>P. Fay. Copt.</i> 45	Petros	the gardener / vine-grower (νεσνιϥ)	account	receiving goods/money	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	unclear (see intro)
<i>P. Köln. Egypt.</i> II 21	Anouph	<i>oikonomos</i>	order to supply cured products	distributing cured products	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	8th
<i>P. Köln. Egypt.</i> II 24	Anouph	N/A	'our father who writes' document	sending a rider and dealing with affairs further north	ⲡⲡⲁⲡⲁ	7th/8th
<i>P. Lond. Copt.</i> I 529	Mena	my brother	letter	moving donkeys and managing items	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	11th
<i>P. Lond. Copt.</i> I 547	Asosi (Sosipater?)	N/A	letter	being greeted	ⲡⲡⲁⲡⲁ	unclear (see intro)
<i>P. Lond. Copt.</i> I 549	Simon	N/A	letter	owns donkeys to be sent to the author	ⲡⲡⲁⲡⲁ	11th
<i>P. Lond. Copt.</i> I 550	Iohannes	N/A	letter	requesting parchment from <i>papa</i> Ioule for his monks	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	unclear (see intro)
<i>P. Lond. Copt.</i> I 550	Ioule	your god-loving holy father	letter	has boxes of parchment requested from him	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	unclear (see intro)
<i>P. Lond. Copt.</i> I 553	Merkouri	N/A	letter	father of those involved	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	10th/11th
<i>P. Lond. Copt.</i> I 581	Thomas	N/A	letter	writing regarding his own taxes	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	unclear (see intro)

<sup>74</sup> Clackson is not clear why she restores *papa* here, as *pason* (my brother) is also potentially possible, but I defer to her edition.

<sup>75</sup> This appears to be a new attestation of this name, similar perhaps to ⲉⲛⲏⲁⲗ/ⲉⲛⲏⲁⲗ or ⲉⲛⲏⲁⲗ/ⲉⲛⲏⲁⲗ.

<i>Text</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Other identifiers</i>	<i>Document type</i>	<i>Role in document</i>	<i>Form and/or</i>	<i>Century</i>
<i>P. Lond. Copt.</i> I 582	Ioseph	my father	letter	being greeted	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	unclear (see intro)
<i>P. Lond. Copt.</i> I 592	Gabriel	N/A	letter	to have rope deposited with him	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	unclear (see intro)
<i>P. Lond. Copt.</i> I 592	Merkouri	N/A	letter	representative of the <i>topos</i> ?	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	unclear (see intro)
<i>P. Lond. Copt.</i> I 594	Abraham	son of <i>papa</i> Merkoure	letter dealing with sale of goods	being greeted	ⲡⲓⲡⲁⲡⲁ	unclear (see intro)
<i>P. Lond. Copt.</i> I 594	Assosse (Sosipater?)	N/A	letter dealing with sale of goods	being greeted	ⲡⲓⲡⲁⲡⲁ	unclear (see intro)
<i>P. Lond. Copt.</i> I 594	Kosma	son of <i>papa</i> Assose	letter dealing with sale of goods	being greeted	ⲡⲓⲡⲁⲡⲁ	unclear (see intro)
<i>P. Lond. Copt.</i> I 594	Merkoure	my brother	letter dealing with sale of goods	being greeted	ⲡⲓⲡⲁⲡⲁ	unclear (see intro)
<i>P. Lond. Copt.</i> I 625	Merkouri	N/A	letter	has authority over the writer and others	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	unclear (see intro)
<i>P. Lond. Copt.</i> I 627	Merkouri	N/A	letter	being written to	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	unclear (see intro)
<i>P. Lond. Copt.</i> I 629	Nahrau	N/A	letter regarding management of cattle	to be given items (possibly cattle)	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	unclear (see intro)
<i>P. Lond. Copt.</i> I 632	Marine	our father	letter	unclear	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	11 <sup>th</sup>
<i>P. Lond. Copt.</i> I 642	Amon	N/A	unclear	unclear	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	10 <sup>th</sup> /11 <sup>th</sup>
<i>P. Lond. Copt.</i> I 658	Isidorus	N/A	letter	author of the letter	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	unclear (see intro)
<i>P. Lond. Copt.</i> I 683	Abraham	N/A	account	given a sum of goods/money	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	unclear (see intro)
<i>P. Lond. Copt.</i> I 688	Iohannes	N/A	account	unclear	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	unclear (see intro)



<i>Text</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Other identifiers</i>	<i>Document type</i>	<i>Role in document</i>	<i>Form and/or abbreviation</i>	<i>Century</i>
<i>P. Ryl. Copt.</i> 201	unknown	N/A	loan repayment document	scribe, and signatory (‘in the name of...’ the <i>topos</i> <sup>78</sup> )	ⲡⲓⲁⲛⲁ	7th/8th
<i>P. Ryl. Copt.</i> 290	Saul	N/A	letter	being greeted	ⲡⲓⲁⲛⲁ	11th/12th
<i>P. Ryl. Copt.</i> 290	Theodore	my lord father	letter	being written to	ⲡⲓⲁⲛⲁ	11th/12th
<i>P. Ryl. Copt.</i> 365	Biktor	N/A	letter	distributing wood and managing workers	ⲡⲓⲁⲛⲁ	6th/7th
<i>P. Sarga</i> 106	Isaak	N/A	letter	sender of dates, wine, and <i>hots</i> <sup>77</sup>	ⲡⲁ[ⲡⲁ] <sup>78</sup>	7th/8th
<i>P. Sarga</i> 185	Kolthe	N/A	wine account	recipient of letter	ⲡⲁⲛⲁ	7th/8th
<i>P. Sarga</i> 185	P..	N/A	wine account	has an account of wine	ⲡⲁⲛⲁ	7th/8th
<i>P. Yale Copt</i> 12	Isaak	my brother	letter	possibly delivering items to the recipient of the letter	ⲡⲓⲁⲛⲁ	7th/8th
<i>SB XVI</i> 12662	Theodoros	N/A	writing exercise	father of those involved	ⲡⲁⲛⲁ	7th
<i>SB Kopt.</i> I 299	Basile	N/A	jug-label (donation)	donating myrrh	ⲡⲓⲁⲛⲁ	12th
<i>SB Kopt.</i> I 299	Ioseph	the man of Talmarge	jug-label (donation)	father of those involved	ⲡⲓⲁⲛⲁ	12th
<i>SB Kopt.</i> I 479	Anoup	the barber OR the leather-worker <sup>79</sup>	epitaph	being commemorated	ⲡⲓⲁⲛⲁ	8th/9th
<i>SB Kopt.</i> I 480	Biktor	N/A	epitaph	being commemorated	ⲡⲓⲁⲛⲁ	8th/9th <sup>80</sup>
<i>SB Kopt.</i> I 793	Apollo	his son	epitaph	son of the deceased	ⲡⲓⲁⲛⲁ	unclear
<i>SB Kopt.</i> I 793	Iohannes	unclear (ⲏⲉ) <sup>81</sup>	epitaph	being commemorated (?)	ⲡⲁⲛⲁ	unclear
<i>SB Kopt.</i> III 1267	Markos	your son	letter regarding a working camel	writing the letter and providing guarantees over the camel	ⲡⲁⲛⲁⲥ <sup>82</sup>	7th/8th



<i>SB Kopt.</i> III 1273	unknown	N/A	unclear	unclear	παπα	7th/8th
<i>SB Kopt.</i> III 1311	Tabecit	N/A	letter	being greeted	παπα	4th
<i>SB Kopt.</i> III 1358	unknown	N/A	unclear	unclear	παπα	unclear
<i>SB Kopt.</i> III 1408	Ioseph	son of Petros	contract	witness	{Δ}παπα <sup>83</sup>	11th
<i>SB Kopt.</i> III 1412	Ioseph	son of Petros	sale of land	witness	παπα	11th
<i>SB Kopt.</i> III 1413	(Pap)pnouti <sup>84</sup>	N/A	sale of land	witness	παπα	10th
<i>SB Kopt.</i> III 1413	Chael	N/A	sale of land	witness	παπα	10th
<i>SB Kopt.</i> III 1417	Seth	N/A	will	owns an adjoining property	παπαπα <sup>85</sup>	11th

<sup>78</sup> See p. 68 above for this argument.

<sup>79</sup> πκογτεγς has been read as either *κοιρευς* (cf. Cramer) or *σκυρευς* (cf. Hastizka).

<sup>80</sup> I have dated this document to the eighth/ninth century due to the text being almost identical to *SB Kopt.* I 479.

<sup>81</sup> One explanation offered by the original editor is that this could be π ε(Δ)ορρ), ‘Hathor 18’, the date of *papa* Iohannes’ death: R. ENGELBACH, ‘Coptic stela of Serne of Damshir’, *Bulletin de la Société d’archéologie copte* 3 (1937), pp 6–8.

<sup>82</sup> It appears very rare to have the ς at the end of this honorific (rather than noun) form of *papa*, but see p. 57 above for why we can be secure in seeing it as a title rather than a name.

<sup>83</sup> Alternatively, this could be Δ(ΝΟΚ) παπα given the context of the previous few lines, each of which opens with ΔΝΟΚ. RICHTER, ‘Spätkoptische Rechtsurkunden neu bearbeitet II’, (cit. n. 21), believes that it is only intended as ΔΝΑ, and then sees the additional ΝΑ as a dittography, but this is unconvincing to both me and Hastizka, particularly as the other documents Richter edits in this article also include the term *papa*.

<sup>84</sup> This attestation is potentially troublesome, and illustrates the issues that come with having to do word separation in the context of a potential scribal error. The line reads παπαπνοϣϣ, which T. S. RICHTER, ‘Spätkoptische Rechtsurkunden neu bearbeitet’, *The Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 29 (1999), pp. 85–92, believed included a haplography, and so should read παπα (πα)πνοϣϣ (although he still renders ‘*papa* Ppnouti’ in his translation), given that Pnouti is not an attested name, and just πα-παπνοϣϣ does not make sense in this context. However, it cannot be denied that it is possible that only an *alpha* has been omitted at the start, making (Δ)πα παπνοϣϣ also a possibility, even if it does appear less likely than ‘*papa* Ppnouti’.

<sup>85</sup> RICHTER, ‘Spätkoptische Rechtsurkunden neu bearbeitet II’ (cit. n. 21), p. 136, argues that the first *pi* was a dittography, and that we should read ‘the *apa*’ instead, but in the context of the arguments presented here, this is highly unlikely.

<i>Text</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Other identifiers</i>	<i>Document type</i>	<i>Role in document</i>	<i>Form and/or abbreviation</i>	<i>Century</i>
<i>SB Kopt.</i> III 1423	Severos	son of Sergios	tax receipt	paying taxes	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	8th
<i>SB Kopt.</i> III 1430	Ptolemai	(none in Coptic) Greek: presbyter	receipt for wine delivery	unclear	ⲡⲡⲁⲡⲁ	8th
<i>SB Kopt.</i> III 1436	Phoihammon	<i>proestos</i> of the <i>topos</i>	list of property	list deposited with him	ⲡⲡⲁⲡⲁ	7th/8th
<i>SB Kopt.</i> III 1493	Pater	my brother	inscription	brother of author	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	unclear
<i>SB Kopt.</i> III 1496	unknown	N/A	unclear	unclear	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	unclear
<i>SB Kopt.</i> III 1592	Mena	our brother, man of Besh	epitaph	being commemorated	ⲡⲡⲁⲡⲁ	8th/9th
<i>SB Kopt.</i> III 1320a	Serene	N/A	letter	being written to	ⲡⲡⲁⲡⲁ	6th/7th
<i>SB Kopt.</i> III 1320b	Serene	N/A	letter	instructing the distribution of expenses	ⲡⲡⲁⲡⲁ	6th/7th
<i>SB Kopt.</i> IV 1847	Michael	the blessed	epitaph	unclear	ⲡⲁⲡⲓ(ⲁ)	unclear
<i>SB Kopt.</i> IV 1866	Eisak	N/A	contract	father of those involved	ⲡⲡⲁⲡⲁ	5th/6th
<i>SB Kopt.</i> IV 1890	Apollo	N/A	inscription	intercession requested for him and his family	ⲡⲡⲁⲡⲁ	unclear
<i>SB Kopt.</i> IV 1895	George	N/A	list of names	listed among other monks	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	7th–9th
<i>SB Kopt.</i> IV 1923	Phib	N/A	graffito	unclear	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	7th–9th
<i>SB Kopt.</i> IV 1933	Apollo	N/A	list of names	unclear	ⲡⲡⲁⲡⲁ	unclear
<i>SB Kopt.</i> IV 1963	Phib	man from Saft	epitaph	being commemorated	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	7th
<i>SB Kopt.</i> IV 1964	Iohannes	‘the servant’ (ⲁⲗⲟⲩ)	epitaph	being commemorated	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	7th
<i>SB Kopt.</i> IV 1974	Iohannes	N/A	epitaph	deceased and father of other deceased	ⲡⲁⲡⲁ	7th–9th

<i>SB Kopt.</i> IV 1985	unknown	N/A	epitaph	unclear	ⲙⲏⲁ[ⲙⲁ] <sup>86</sup>	7th–9th
<i>SB Kopt.</i> IV 1998	Ieremias	my father	epitaph	being commemorated	ⲙⲏⲁⲛⲁ	8th
<i>SB Kopt.</i> IV 2003	Biktor	man of Touho	epitaph	being commemorated	ⲙⲏⲁⲛⲁ	unclear
<i>SB Kopt.</i> IV 2003	Biktor	man of Hage	epitaph	unclear	ⲙⲏⲁⲛⲁ	unclear
<i>SB Kopt.</i> IV 2081	Enoch	our brother	epitaph	being commemorated	ⲙⲏⲁⲛⲁ	7th/8th
<i>SB Kopt.</i> IV 2098	Phib	N/A	epitaph	being commemorated	ⲛⲁⲛⲁ	unclear
<i>SB Kopt.</i> IV 2161	unknown	N/A	unclear	unclear	ⲛⲁⲛⲁ	unclear
<i>SB Kopt.</i> V 2166	Mena	the <i>oikonomos</i>	letter regarding monastic obligations	responsible for the monastic oxen	ⲙⲏⲁⲛⲁ	8th
<i>SB Kopt.</i> V 2170	Paule	the most humble	letter	author of the letter	ⲙⲏⲁⲛⲁ	6th–8th
<i>SB Kopt.</i> V 2341	Pekyosh	N/A	inventory	unclear	[ⲏ]ⲛⲁ	8th
<i>SB Kopt.</i> V 2350	Iohannes	man of Psuneuros	epitaph	being commemorated	ⲙⲏⲁⲛⲁ	7th–9th

<sup>86</sup> Unlike *P. Bal* 188, in which ⲙⲏⲁ is an abbreviation for *papa*, here the final ⲛⲁ at the end of ⲙⲏⲁⲛⲁ is reconstructed by Hasitzka out of a lacuna, from comparison to the numerous other Saqqara inscriptions included here which have monks identified as ⲙⲏⲁⲛⲁ among lists of other monks identified as *apa*.

<sup>87</sup> Following C. KIM, ‘*Griiße in Gott, dem Herrn!*’ – *Studien zum Stil und zur Struktur der griechischen christlichen Privatbriefe aus Agypten*, PhD thesis, University of Trier 2011, p. 102.

## APPENDIX 2

USES OF THE DECLINABLE NOUN FORM OF *PAPAS*

All ‘current interpretations’ are generally as given by the original editor, unless they have not given any such interpretation, in which case I have referenced the existing interpretations from other literature. However, it is argued in this work that all such attestations of *papa* in this noun form (in both Greek and Coptic) should be viewed as bishops, up until the seventh century at least. However, this rule may not apply to either *SB* I 5947 or the *P. Lond. Copt.* I attestations noted here, given their unclear – but certainly post-seventh-century – dates. Appendix 2 is arranged chronologically by estimated century, given the arguments of this work.

<i>Text</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Current interpretation of role</i>	<i>Transcription of attestation</i>	<i>Century</i>
SB VI 9557	Maximus	patriarch	Μάξιμον τὸν πάπαν & Μαξιμίω τῷ πάπα	3rd
SB XVI 12304	Heraklites	priest <sup>87</sup>	Ἡρακλῆτης π(α)π(ᾱ)ς	3rd/4th
<i>P. Lond.</i> II 417	Kaor	bishop	Κάορ πάπας Ἐρμοῦ	4th
<i>P. Lond.</i> VI 1914	Heraiskon	bishop <sup>88</sup>	τὸν πάπαν Ἡραεῖσκον	4th
<i>P. Ross. Georg.</i> III 28	Aurelius Ammonios	unclear	Αὐρήλιος Ἀμμώνιος παπᾱς	4th
<i>P. Oxy.</i> XI 1357	‘the <i>papa</i> ’	patriarch	τον πάπα	6th
SB XII 10767	‘the <i>papa</i> ’	bishop <sup>89</sup>	τοῦ πάπα	6th
SB Kopt. IV 1726	‘the <i>papa</i> ’	bishop <sup>90</sup>	ππαπας πετςραι / ριτν ππαπας	6th
SB Kopt. IV 1727	‘the <i>papa</i> ’	bishop <sup>91</sup>	ππαπας πετςραι / ριτν ππαπας	6th
<i>P. Lond.</i> I 113 (10)	Cyrus	patriarch	Κύρου τοῦ ἁγιοτάτου καὶ θεοτιμήτου πάπα	6th/7th
<i>P. Ryl. Copt.</i> 153	Theodosius	clerical functions	ρδαπας ... λογος νπαπας ... +ανοκ θεοδοσι πιαλαχ/ νπρεσβγτ	6th/7th
<i>P. Pisentius</i> 9	none given	bishop	πεχε ... σε παπας κελεγε ερι μνωτν εβολ τηρτν	7th
<i>P. Pisentius</i> 19	none given	bishop	μπατχει επαπας	7th
<i>P. Pisentius</i> 32	none given	bishop	ακχοος να νπαπας	7th
<i>P. Pisentius</i> 61	‘the <i>papa</i> ’	bishop	απαπακαλει νπαιωτ ππαπα	7th
SB I 5947	Theodoros	unclear	Θεοδώρου πρεσβυτέρου τ παπας	8th/9th
<i>P. Lond. Copt.</i> I 544	none given	head of the monastery	ωινε εππαπας	unclear (see Appendix 1 intro)
<i>P. Lond. Copt.</i> I 1156	none given	presbyter	αππαπα ει	unclear (see Appendix 1 intro)

<sup>88</sup> Following P. VAN MINNEN, ‘*P. Harrauer* 48 and the problem of *papas* Heraiscus in *P. Lond.* VI 1914’, *Tyche* 16 (2001), pp. 103–105.

<sup>89</sup> Following WIPSZYCKA, ‘L’église dans la *chora*’ (cit. n. 12), pp. 130–138.

<sup>90</sup> Following FOURNET, ‘Deux lettres’ (cit. n. 19), p. 691–692.

<sup>91</sup> Following *ibidem*, loc. cit.

<sup>92</sup> DERDA & WIPSZYCKA, ‘L’emploi des titres’ (cit. n. 1), p. 55.

<sup>93</sup> CRUM, *Coptic Manuscripts* (cit. n. 56), p. 30.

## APPENDIX 3

ATTESTATIONS OF THE  $\overline{\pi}\overline{\pi}$  FORM OF *PAPA*  
IN COPTIC DOCUMENTS

Here I have attempted to centralise all instances in which editors of texts have restored *papa* from the abbreviation  $\overline{\pi}\overline{\pi}$  in Coptic documents, a practice which appears to primarily emerge in the tenth century. Derda and Wipszycka stress that care should be taken reconstructing  $\pi( )\pi( )$  as  $\pi(\alpha)\pi(\alpha s)$  in Greek contexts, as other titles such as *praipositos* were similarly abbreviated in this way.<sup>92</sup> They do not disqualify all uses of this abbreviation on these grounds, but note that only a few can reasonably be reconstructed in this way in Greek documentary texts, which may be a point that we wish to take under consideration with these Coptic texts as well (see p. 78 for further discussion of this). However, Crum convincingly argues that  $\overline{\pi}\overline{\pi}$  can be securely reconstructed as  $\pi(\Delta)\pi(\Delta)$  from the tenth century onwards, at least in Coptic contexts.<sup>93</sup>

<sup>94</sup> Interestingly, this attestation is the first and only one we have for an abbreviation being used for the name Papa, rather than the noun or honorific.

<i>Text</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Identifiers</i>	<i>Role in document</i>	<i>Transcription of attestation</i>	<i>Century</i>
<i>P. Fay. Copt.</i> 15	Merkouri	N/A	father of those involved	ⲓⲱ ⲡ ⲡⲓ ⲙⲁⲣⲕⲟⲩⲣⲓ	10th/11th
<i>P. Fay. Copt.</i> 15	Kail	N/A	writing the letter	+ ⲁⲛⲁⲕ ⲡⲓ ⲃⲁⲓⲕ ⲙⲏ...	10th/11th
<i>P. Lond. Copt.</i> I 465	Phoibammon	our son	establishing a <i>kanon</i>	ⲡⲓⲛⲱⲛⲣⲉ ⲡⲓⲡⲓ Ⲣⲟⲓⲃⲁⲙⲙⲱⲛ	11th
<i>P. Lond. Copt.</i> I 607	Petros	N/A	unclear	ⲛ ⲡⲓ ⲡⲉⲧⲣⲟⲥ	11th
<i>P. Lond. Copt.</i> I 607	Stratos	N/A	unclear	ⲡⲓ ⲥⲧⲁⲅⲣⲟⲥ	11th
<i>P. Lond. Copt.</i> I 688	(multiple individuals)	N/A	given 1 of something	ⲡ <sup>ⲁ</sup> ⲡ <sup>ⲁ</sup> + NAME	unclear (see Appendix I intro)
<i>P. Ryl. Copt.</i> 290	Stephen	my lord father, the <i>begoumenos</i>	being greeted	ⲡⲁⲭⲟⲓⲥ ⲛⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲡⲁⲡⲁ ⲙⲉⲱⲁⲟⲣ	11th/12th
<i>SB Kopt.</i> I 374	Petros	archi- <i>papa</i> ⲉⲃ 'of this church'	member of the community	ⲁⲣⲭⲏⲡⲓ ⲡⲉⲧⲣⲟⲥ ⲛⲧⲉ ⲧⲁⲓ ⲉⲕⲕⲗⲉⲛⲥⲓⲁ, ⲛⲉⲙ...	13th
<i>SB Kopt.</i> I 374	Michael	N/A	member of the community	ⲡⲓ ⲙⲓ[ⲭ]ⲁⲛⲗ, ⲛⲉⲙ...	13th
<i>SB Kopt.</i> I 374	[.]etakah	N/A	member of the community	ⲡⲓ [.]ⲏⲧⲁⲕⲁⲅ ⲛ[ⲉ]ⲙ...	13th
<i>SB Kopt.</i> I 374	Petros	N/A	member of the community	ⲡⲓ ⲡⲉⲧ[ⲣ]ⲟⲥ ⲛ[ⲉ]ⲙ...	13th
<i>SB Kopt.</i> I 374	Damoul	N/A	member of the community	ⲡⲓ ⲁⲁⲙⲟⲩⲗ ⲛⲉⲙ...	13th
<i>SB Kopt.</i> I 374	Markos	N/A	member of the community	ⲡⲓ ⲙⲁⲣⲕⲟⲥ ⲛⲉⲙ...	13th
<i>SB Kopt.</i> I 374	Markos	N/A	member of the community	ⲡⲓ ⲙⲁⲣⲕⲟⲥ ⲛⲉⲙ...	13th
<i>SB Kopt.</i> I 374	Abu 'I-Ma'ani	N/A	father of a member of the community	... ⲛⲱⲛⲣⲓ ⲙⲡⲓ ⲡⲟⲩ ⲗⲙⲁⲁⲛⲓ	13th
<i>SB Kopt.</i> III 1277	Markos	N/A	administering solidi	ⲉⲣⲉⲡⲓ ⲙⲁⲣⲕⲟⲥ ⲟⲩⲱⲱ ⲉⲃⲁⲡⲥ...	13th
<i>SB Kopt.</i> III 1286	Kafr(iel)	N/A	unclear	ⲡⲓ ⲕⲁⲕⲣ[ⲓⲛⲗ ...]	11th
<i>SB Kopt.</i> III 1377	Papa (= ⲡⲓ) <sup>94</sup>	archdeacon	listed as leaders of the monastery	ⲙⲏ ⲡⲁ <sup>ⲭ</sup> ⲣⲁⲓ ⲡⲓ ⲙⲏ...	10th/11th
<i>SB Kopt.</i> III 1377	Apimi	N/A	listed as leaders of the monastery	ⲙⲏ ⲡⲓ ⲁⲡⲓⲙⲓ ⲙⲏ...	10th/11th