



# BULLETIN DE L'INSTITUT FRANÇAIS D'ARCHÉOLOGIE ORIENTALE

en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne

BIFAO 121 (2021), p. 475-509

Lorenzo Uggetti

The Agents of Hathor in P.Tor.Botti and the Ptolemaic Temple of Deir el-Medina

#### *Conditions d'utilisation*

L'utilisation du contenu de ce site est limitée à un usage personnel et non commercial. Toute autre utilisation du site et de son contenu est soumise à une autorisation préalable de l'éditeur (contact AT ifao.egnet.net). Le copyright est conservé par l'éditeur (Ifao).

#### *Conditions of Use*

You may use content in this website only for your personal, noncommercial use. Any further use of this website and its content is forbidden, unless you have obtained prior permission from the publisher (contact AT ifao.egnet.net). The copyright is retained by the publisher (Ifao).

#### **Dernières publications**

9782724711714	<i>La pensée et la pratique pharmacologiques d'Avicenne</i>	Sylvie Ayari
9782724711899	<i>BCAI 40</i>	
9782724711288	<i>Karnak-Nord XI</i>	Colin Hope
9782724711622	<i>BIFAO 126</i>	
9782724711059	<i>Les Inscriptions de visiteurs dans les Tombes thébaines</i>	Chloé Ragazzoli
9782724711455	<i>Les émotions dans l'Égypte Ancienne</i>	Rania Y. Merzeban (éd.), Marie-Lys Arnette (éd.), Dimitri Laboury, Cédric Larcher
9782724711639	<i>AnIsl 60</i>	
9782724711448	<i>Athribis XI</i>	Marcus Müller (éd.)

# The Agents of Hathor in *P.Tor.Botti* and the Ptolemaic Temple of Deir el-Medina

LORENZO UGGETTI\*

## ABSTRACT

Found inside the jars containing the archive of Totoês, *P.Tor.Botti* 34 A, 34 B+C, 35 and 36 were wrapped together. Transliteration and translation are provided for the body of these texts, as well as for the related *P.Tor.Botti* 40. An explanation is given for why they were rolled together: these papyri attest to the agreements made in the year 100 BC between the elders of the priests of the sanctuary of Hathor at Deir el-Medina and the three sons of Chestephnachthis (B), who bore the title of “agents of Hathor”. They collected the income of the temple, paid the priests their due, managed both ordinary and extra charges and kept the account book of the sanctuary. The amount of 17 talents mentioned in *P.Tor.Botti* 34 A could even indicate that the family of Chestephnachthis (B) was responsible for building or decorating the “mammisi” or the temple portal at Deir el-Medina.

**Keywords:** *P.Tor.Botti*, Deir el-Medina, temple of Hathor, administration, Demotic, ancient archive.

\* UMR 8546 AOrOc. This paper is a considerably revised version of a talk given during the “12. Internationale Konferenz für demotische Studien”, held in Würzburg in 2014; STADLER et al. 2016/2017, pp. 29–30. I thank Ikuyo Kato, MA, for the discussions on the topic during and after the conference, and also before the publication of her intervention: KATO 2019. I thank Prof. Michel Chauveau, Dr. Sandra L. Lippert, Dr. Marie-Pierre Chaufray and Dr. Stéphanie Wackenier for their numerous valuable comments and Faye Wills, MA BA (Hons) PGCE, PhD candidate at LASAR Canterbury Christ Church University, for checking and correcting my English. Any shortcoming remains my responsibility. As far as possible, the papyrological documents are cited following the *Checklist of editions of Greek, Latin, Demotic, and Coptic papyri, ostraca, and tablets* on papyri.info. Photo samples of P. Turin Suppl. 6085, 6096, 6100, 6102 and 6109 (*P.Tor.Botti* 34 A, 34 B+C, 35, 36 and 40) courtesy of Museo Egizio, Turin. I thank Dr. Susanne Töpfer, Dr. Marco Rossani, Dr. Federico Poole and Dr. Sara Demichelis for having given me access to the originals in Turin and having provided the high resolution images.

## RÉSUMÉ

Trouvés dans les jarres qui contenaient les archives de Totoês, *P.Tor.Botti* 34 A, 34 B+C, 35 et 36 furent emballés ensemble. La translittération et la traduction des textes qu'ils contiennent sont proposées, avec celles du *P.Tor.Botti* 40 qui s'y rapporte, et une explication est proposée pour leur découverte groupée : ils attestent des accords pris en l'an 100 av. J.-C. entre les aînés des prêtres d'Hathor à Deir el-Médina et les trois fils de Chéstéphnachthis (B), qui portaient le titre d'« agents d'Hathor » ; ils percevaient les revenus du temple, payaient aux prêtres leur dû, géraient les frais ordinaires et supplémentaires, et tenaient le livre des comptes. Le montant de 17 talents mentionné dans *P.Tor.Botti* 34 A pourrait éventuellement suggérer l'engagement de la famille de Chéstéphnachthis (B) dans la construction ou la décoration du « mammisi » ou du portail du temple de Deir el-Médina.

**Mots-clés :** *P.Tor.Botti*, Deir el-Médina, temple d'Hathor, administration, démotique, archives anciennes.



ONLY a few documents dated to the Ptolemaic period were discovered during archaeological excavations in their original depository: inside jars or boxes, placed in a hidden spot of a building.<sup>1</sup> Among the known cases, one can mention the Graeco-Demotic papers of the *praktôr* Milôn:<sup>2</sup> currently kept in Berlin after being discovered by Otto Rubensohn in 1906 on the island of Elephantine, they were contained in a round-bellied jar, which was lying destroyed on the floor of a narrow cellar.<sup>3</sup> In 1911, Howard Carter and the Earl of Carnarvon found two Demotic papyri belonging to Paôs and Psenêsis, sons of Paneithês, in a vessel under a Ptolemaic mud-brick tomb in Dra Abou el-Naga.<sup>4</sup> On February 22nd, 1922, the University of Pennsylvania Museum's mission, led by Clarence S. Fisher, uncovered the Demotic archive of Psenminis son of Bellês and of his wife Tamounis<sup>5</sup> inside two jars on the same site, in the corner of a Ptolemaic house leaning against the pylon of a nineteenth dynasty tomb (TT 156).<sup>6</sup> A similar discovery in analogous circumstances was made in Tuna el-Gebel by Cairo University,<sup>7</sup> yielding the bilingual archive of Teôs son of Hôros.<sup>8</sup>

1 SEIDL 1962, p. 16; EL-AMIR 1974, pp. III–II2; PESTMAN 1989a, p. 8; VANDORPE 2009, pp. 219–220.

2 TM Arch 141.

3 RUBENSOHN 1907, p. 34; SPIEGELBERG 1908, p. 7; SEIDL 1962, pp. 45–46, n° 36; LÜDDECKENS 1986, p. 877, n° I; CLARYSSE 2003, pp. 17–18; VANDORPE 2009, p. 219.

4 CARNARVON 1912, p. 8; CARTER 1912, p. 43; SPIEGELBERG 1932, p. 116, n° 50164; EL-AMIR 1974, p. III; MUHS 2005, p. 128.

5 TM Arch 203.

6 FISHER 1924, p. 45; REICH 1938a, p. 12; REICH 1938b, pp. 7–8; GLANVILLE 1939, p. XX, n. 4; EL-AMIR 1959, vol. 1, pp. IX–X and vol. 2, p. 2; SEIDL 1962, pp. 17–19, n° 1; BOTTI 1967, vol. 1, p. 2; EL-AMIR 1974, p. 112; PESTMAN 1989b, p. 29; DEPAUW 1997, p. 156; DEPAUW 2000, pp. 3–4, n. 4; MUHS 2005, pp. 128 and 130.

7 EL-AMIR 1974, p. 112; LÜDDECKENS 1974, p. 235; LÜDDECKENS 1986, p. 881, n° VI A; FARID 2005, p. 324; FARID 2009, p. 261.

8 TM Arch 440.

Even under these circumstances, the way individual texts were packed together and arranged within their containers has rarely been noted by excavators. O. Rubensohn stated that *P.Eleph. Dem.* 7 + *P.Eleph.* 7 and *P.Eleph.* 8 on one hand, and on the other *P.Eleph. Dem.* 6 + *P.Eleph.* 6 and *P.Eleph. Dem.* 5 + *P.Eleph.* 26, all from Milôn's archive, were rolled one inside the other.<sup>9</sup> As for the papyri of Psenminis son of Bellês and of his wife Tamounis, Nathaniel J. Reich recorded their distribution between the two jars and the numbering given to them in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo, where they were unrolled.<sup>10</sup> The fact that different texts received the same inventory numbers (*P.Fam. Theb.* 7 and 14; *P.Fam. Theb.* 21 and 23; *P.Fam. Theb.* 1+31 and 22; *P.Fam. Theb.* 12, 19, 27, 28, 29 and 32) might be the only indication that they actually belong together. The importance of this kind of information can be proven by a fortunate case, provided by a small group of texts coming from the largest Ptolemaic bilingual archive found intact so far: the one belonging to Totoês son of Zmanrês and to his wife Tatehathyrîs.<sup>11</sup>

## 1. THE DISCOVERY AND THE UNROLLING OF THE PAPYRI

During the 1905 field season of the “Missione Archeologica Italiana” (MAI) in Deir el-Medina, two sealed vases were unearthed, probably on February 14th by Roberto Paribeni,<sup>12</sup> containing 61 texts from the 2nd century BC written in Demotic and Greek on papyri and linen strips. Ernesto Schiaparelli, at that time director of both the archaeological mission and the Museo Egizio, sent them to Turin, where the entire batch is now inventoried as P. Turin Suppl. 6068-6125. The documents were published separately: at first, the Greek papyri in 1929 by Girolamo Vitelli;<sup>13</sup> then, in 1967, the Demotic texts by Giuseppe Botti.<sup>14</sup> Both editors supplied only scant information on the matter, but thanks to the photographic documentation of the MAI, it has been possible to precisely locate the discovery: in the recess of a wall among the ruins of House H (or of a later structure built over it), to the south of the 19th Dynasty Chapel G, at the northernmost edge of the cluster of cult buildings north of the Ptolemaic enclosure wall of the temple of Hathor.<sup>15</sup>

Although G. Botti affirmed that both jars entered the Museo Egizio in Turin still sealed, two letters written by Schiaparelli reveal that at least one of them had already been opened in Egypt shortly after the discovery. Different sources state that all the papyri of the archive were wrapped in linen cloths or strips, forming only 33 or 34 scrolls on the whole: accordingly, some of them were rolled up together. A number was assigned to each roll: some of these numbers were written in pencil on photos sent by E. Schiaparelli to Francis L. Griffith for a preliminary study of the Demotic material. Later, Henry F.H. Thompson, Stephen R.K. Glanville and

<sup>9</sup> RUBENSOHN 1907, p. 66; CLARYSSE 2003, pp. 17–18, p. 24, n<sup>os</sup> 1–2 and 4, p. 26, n<sup>o</sup> 23.

<sup>10</sup> REICH 1936, pp. 14–29; REICH 1938a, pp. 13–18; REICH 1938b, pp. 8–14; REICH 1938c, pp. 8–12 and 16–18; GLANVILLE 1939, p. XX, n. 4; EL-AMIR 1959, vol. 2, p. 41, n. 1; SEIDL 1962, pp. 17–19, n<sup>o</sup> 1.

<sup>11</sup> TM Arch 248.

<sup>12</sup> UGGETTI 2021.

<sup>13</sup> VITELLI 1929, pp. 15–35.

<sup>14</sup> BOTTI 1967. On the publication history of the archive, see KATO 2019, pp. 136–137.

<sup>15</sup> DEL VESCO, POOLE 2018, pp. 110 and 114–118; UGGETTI 2021.

Mustafa M. el-Amir, who saw those images before G. Botti's *editio princeps*, provided some of the numbers in scattered publications. G. Botti himself recorded many of them in his drafts, but he came across several losses and discrepancies, which in the end induced him to omit this kind of data from his final work.<sup>16</sup>

The only exception concerns *P.Tor.Botti* 35:<sup>17</sup> Botti remarked that it enveloped a bundle of papyri and that *P.Tor.Botti* 34 B+C was one of them.<sup>18</sup> Later, without revealing his source, Pieter W. Pestman confirmed this statement and added to the list both *P.Tor.Botti* 34 A and 36: these four papyri together constituted the scroll number 11.<sup>19</sup> The fact of having been wrapped together stresses a strong, not otherwise obvious connection between these documents, which therefore deserve to be studied as a whole. For the sake of completeness, *P.Tor.Botti* 40 needs to be included in the analysis because it is relevant to *P.Tor.Botti* 36, even though it was not rolled up with the other papyri: although M.M. el-Amir ascribed also *P.Tor.Botti* 40 to the scroll number 11,<sup>20</sup> P.W. Pestman traced back its origin to scroll number 18.<sup>21</sup>

*P.Tor.Botti* 34 A<sup>22</sup> and *P.Tor.Botti* 36<sup>23</sup> are legal documents, while *P.Tor.Botti* 34 B+C<sup>24</sup> and *P.Tor.Botti* 40<sup>25</sup> are promissory temple oaths.<sup>26</sup> All these documents were stored in the archive of Totoês because he belonged to one of the parties involved: *n3 hl-ʿy.w n p3 rpy / n n3 wʿb.w n Hw.t-Hr*, “the *presbyteroi* (or elders) of the temple<sup>27</sup> / of the priests of Hathor”, usually six in number.<sup>28</sup> The list of their members is preceded by the titles they all shared: *wn-pr<sup>29</sup> n ʿImn n Dm3 hm-ntr n Hw.t-Hr hmw.t imnt*, “*pastophoros* of Amun of Djême, divine servant of Hathor, mistress of the West”.<sup>30</sup> Given that his name was mentioned either in first<sup>31</sup> or in second place,<sup>32</sup> Totoês was one of the most prominent members of this representative body in Deir el-Medina in the year 100 BC, when all these texts were written<sup>33</sup>.

16 UGGETTI 2021.

17 P. Turin Suppl. 6109 = TM 45107.

18 BOTTI 1967, vol. 1, p. 179.

19 PESTMAN 1985, p. 169, n. 8; DEN BRINKER, MUHS, VLEEMING 2005, vol. 1, pp. 396–398; KATO 2019, p. 138.

20 EL-AMIR 1960, p. 225, n° 40.

21 PESTMAN 1985, p. 181, n. \*. In his drafts, G. Botti first noted the number 11, then he rectified it with the number 18: BOTTI 1964-1966.

22 P. Turin Suppl. 6102 = TM 45106. The inventory number indicated in G. Botti's *editio princeps* is wrong and its plate XLIII is misleading, because P. Turin Suppl. 6100 is a separate papyrus indeed, while on that plate the two documents are superposed. See PESTMAN 1985, p. 168, n. 6; DEN BRINKER, MUHS, VLEEMING 2005, vol. 1, p. 396; KATO 2019, p. 137, n. 7.

23 P. Turin Suppl. 6085 = TM 45108.

24 P. Turin Suppl. 6100 = TM 47146.

25 P. Turin Suppl. 6096 = TM 45111.

26 “Promissorischer Eid”: see KAPLONY-HECKEL 1963, vol. 1, pp. 9 and 17; LIPPERT 2008 (ed. 2012), p. 105, § 4.1.3.2.1 and pp. 174–175, § 4.2.7.1.

27 On the existence of only one sanctuary devoted to Hathor in Western Thebes in the Graeco-Roman period, that is the one in Deir el-Medina, excluding any continuity of her cult in the chapel in the middle court of the funerary temple of Hatshepsut in Deir el-Bahari, see LANCIERS 2014, pp. 105–113.

28 *P.Tor.Botti* 34 A, l. 15; *P.Tor.Botti* 36, ll. 12–13. See PESTMAN 1985, pp. 168–170; ALLAM 2002, pp. 15–26; CLARYSSE 2010, p. 288; LANCIERS 2014, p. 113; COLIN 2016, p. 56; KATO 2019, pp. 135–136 and 138.

29 On the transliteration of this word, see CHAUVEAU 2020, pp. 4–10, *pace* HOFFMANN, QUACK 2014, pp. 127–147.

30 *P.Tor.Botti* 34 A, ll. 10–11; *P.Tor.Botti* 36, l. 10. See LANCIERS 2014, p. 113; KATO 2019, p. 138.

31 *P.Tor.Botti* 34 B+C, ll. 2–3; *P.Tor.Botti* 40, ll. 1–2.

32 *P.Tor.Botti* 34 A, ll. 12–13; *P.Tor.Botti* 36, l. 11.

33 LAJTAR 2006, p. 72.

The other party was composed of three brothers (in two instances, just of one of them): Harsiêsis (B), Amenôthês and Pikôs, sons of Chestephnachthis (B).<sup>34</sup> They are introduced by the following titles: *sh wn-pr n Īmn n Dmz hm-ntr n Hw.t-Hr hnw.t ĩmnt hm-ntr w' b wn-pr ĩw.t*.<sup>35</sup> *nb.t shn nb n sh-nsu.t Īmn-htp s Hp*, “scribe, *pastophoros* of Amun of Djême, divine servant of Hathor, mistress of the West, divine servant, priest, *pastophoros*, (in charge of) every permanent and every temporary function of the royal scribe Amenôthês son of Hapu”.<sup>36</sup> As in the case of the *presbyteroi*, their enumeration is followed by the designation of the board they represented, also used in other texts as a collective term to evoke them without mentioning them by name. The term used was transliterated by Ursula Kaplony-Heckel, G. Botti, P.W. Pestman, Willy Clarysse, Jan K. Winnicki and I. Kato as *rwd*, “agent”,<sup>37</sup> written with the bowstring sign (catalogued as T 12 in Gardiner’s hieroglyphic sign list), which has the same phonetic value.<sup>38</sup> However, in four over five papyri of this small lot, this qualification is determined by the seated man with hand to mouth:<sup>39</sup> this prompted M.M. el-Amir and Karl-Theodor Zauzich to suggest the correction *hs*, “singers”.<sup>40</sup> A closer look at the content of the texts sheds more light on the matter.

## 2. *P.TOR.BOTTI* 34 A:

### A DISCHARGE FROM PREVIOUS AGREEMENTS

[FIG. 1; PL. 1]

The first document in chronological order is *P.Tor.Botti* 34 A: it bears the date of Tybi I of the year 14 of Ptolemy X Alexander I, mentioned together with his wife Cleopatra Berenike III and his son Alexander (the future sovereign Ptolemy XI), which corresponds to January 15th, 100 BC.<sup>41</sup> Albeit not made explicit by the text, it is possible to determine that it is a copy,<sup>42</sup> because the formula that cuts short the protocol is attested in other Demotic documents that are clearly duplicates.<sup>43</sup>

<sup>34</sup> For the letters given to the members of this family, see UGGETTI 2020b, pp. 60–62.

<sup>35</sup> ZAUZICH 1973, p. 65; BOTTI 1967, vol. 1, pp. 174 and 181 transliterated *qnb.t*.

<sup>36</sup> *P.Tor.Botti* 34 A, ll. 5–8; *P.Tor.Botti* 36, ll. 6–8. See ŁAJTAR 2006, pp. 72 and 75; HOFFMANN, QUACK 2014, pp. 144–145; KATO 2019, p. 137.

<sup>37</sup> KAPLONY-HECKEL 1963, vol. 1, pp. 348–350; BOTTI 1967, vol. 1, pp. 174–175, 178–179, 181–182, 184, 194–195; PESTMAN 1985, p. 169; CLARYSSE, WINNICKI 1989, p. 46, n. 31; DEN BRINKER, MUHS, VLEEMING 2005, vol. 1, pp. 396–400; KATO 2019, p. 137.

<sup>38</sup> *Wb* II, p. 413.12–26; *DemGloss*, pp. 256–257.

<sup>39</sup> *P.Tor.Botti* 34 A, l. 10; *P.Tor.Botti* 35, l. 1; *P.Tor.Botti* 36, l. 8 and v<sup>o</sup>, l. 1; *P.Tor.Botti* 40, ll. 7 and 13.

<sup>40</sup> EL-AMIR 1960, p. 220, n<sup>o</sup> 25; EL-AMIR 1969, p. 116; ZAUZICH 1973, pp. 65–66 and 68. ŁAJTAR 2006, p. 72, presented both terms without taking sides.

<sup>41</sup> PESTMAN 1978, p. 195; HUSS 2001, p. 653, n. 95; DEN BRINKER, MUHS, VLEEMING 2005, vol. 1, p. 396; DEPAUW 2008, p. 140; KATO 2019, p. 137 and p. 146, n. 30.

<sup>42</sup> As already noted by ZAUZICH 1968, vol. 1, pp. 209–210, n<sup>o</sup> 38.

<sup>43</sup> *P.Tor.Botti* 34 A, l. 5: *m-s ĩ nhb.t n n Pr-Ĝ'w.s. w*, “after the titulary of the sovereigns”. The same can be found in *P.Berl.Dem.* II 3112, l. 3 (whose original is the sale on *P.Choach.Survey* 81 A, both published by VITTMANN 1987); *P.Tor.Botti* 4, l. 1; *P.Choach.Survey* 31 B, l. 2 (copy of *P.Brit.Mus.* IV 21); *P.Tor.Choach.* 2, l. 1 (duplicate of *P.Berl.Dem.* II 3101 A). Each of them specifies at the beginning that it is a *h(e.t)*, “copy”, of another legal document. Similarly, the trial record of Assiut itself, and also several documents cited in it as proofs: *P.Siut* 10591 r<sup>o</sup>, col. I, l. 1; col. VI, ll. 21–22; col. VII, ll. 5–6; v<sup>o</sup>, col. V, l. 1. On the matter, see THOMPSON 1934, vol. 1, p. 3, p. 12, nn. 1–2, p. 57, p. 59, n. 1; ERICHSEN 1955, p. 76; LÜDDECKENS 1960, p. 223, n. 693; BOTTI 1967, vol. 1, p. 43; ZAUZICH 1968, vol. 2, pp. 269–270, nn. 350 and 362, and pp. 275–276, n. 426; PESTMAN 1977, vol. 1, p. 151, n. nn; PESTMAN 1992, pp. 18–36; PESTMAN 1995, pp. 120–122, 157–160, 234–236 and 329–335; HOFFMANN 2000, pp. 91–92; ARLT 2009, p. 44, n. 74 and p. 46, n. 88.

The original, if not a reciprocal receipt issued by the *presbyteroi*,<sup>44</sup> was probably given to one of the three sons of Chestephnachthis (B) – Harsiêsis (B), Amenôthês or Pikôs – who formed the first contracting party in ll. 5–10, if it was not directly kept by Amenôthês, who was also the official scribe of the legal document according to ll. 29–30, undersigned by his two brothers in ll. 31–32.<sup>45</sup> The body of the text reads as follows.<sup>46</sup>




FIG. 1. P.Tor.Botti 34 A = P. Turin Suppl. 6102 r<sup>o</sup> = TM 45106. W. x H.: 20,5 x 28,5 cm (detail).

<sup>44</sup> A similar process can be found in Roman Soknopaiou Nêsos: *P.Dime* II 56–69. See LIPPERT, SCHENTULEIT 2006, p. 4.

<sup>45</sup> KATO 2019, p. 138; UGETTI 2020b, pp. 55, 61 and 64–65.

<sup>46</sup> KATO 2019, pp. 139–140 and 145–147.

[16] *twz n mh n p3y b3k r.irz tn*

[17] *n Hnsw-t3y=f-nht.t s3 Hr-s3-Is.t p3y=n it.t  
r p3y krkr*

[18] *17 hn<sup>c</sup> b3k nb sh nb r.irz tn hn<sup>c</sup> hy nb he*

[19] *nb i.irzf<sup>47</sup> n p3 rpy n Hw.t-Hr t3 h3.t r  
hn r*

[20] *hsb.t<sup>48</sup> 17 (i.)ir ir<sup>49</sup> hsb.t 14 ibd-4 3h.t sw  
r qy hn<sup>c</sup> n3.w-irz n h<sup>c</sup>=n r hn r*

[21] *hsb.t 17 (i.)ir ir hsb.t 14 ibd-4 3h.t sw r qy  
p3 ssw hrw nty hry<sup>c</sup> n*

[22] *mn md.t iwz n<sup>c</sup> s m-s3z tn n-imz s iwz tn  
mh n*

[23] *hd nwb prt hmt hbs nty nb nkt nb (i.)ir  
ir iw r-dr.t.tzf<sup>50</sup> n*

[24] *Hnsw-t3y=f-nht.t s3 Hr-s3-Is.t p3y=n it.t  
hn<sup>c</sup> n3 i.ir ir*

[25] *iw r-dr.t.tz n h<sup>c</sup>=n r hn r hsb.t 17 (i.)ir ir  
hsb.t 14 ibd-4 3h.t sw r qy*

[26] *p3 ssw hrw nty hry<sup>c</sup> n p3 rmt n-imz n nty  
iwz fr st3.t r tm ir r-*

[27] *-h(.t) md.t nb.t nty hry iwz fr di.t hd 30 000  
r krkr 100 r hd 30 000<sup>c</sup> n n db<sup>c</sup>.t*

[16] We are paid in full for this *b3k*-document which you drew up

[17] for Chestephnachthis son of Harsiêsis, our father, regarding these 17 talents,

[18] and (for) every *b3k*-document and every *sh*-document which you drew up, and (for) every maintenance expenditure and every expense

[19] which he previously made in the temple of Hathor, until

[20] regnal year 17 which corresponds to regnal year 14, Choiak, last day, and (for) those which we made ourselves until

[21] regnal year 17 which corresponds to regnal year 14, Choiak, last day, the date already mentioned above.

[22] There is nothing on account of which we have a claim on you, whereas you are paid in full for

[23] silver, gold, grain, copper, clothing, all and everything of which he took delivery, namely

[24] Chestephnachthis son of Harsiêsis, our father, and (for) that which we took

[25] delivery of ourselves until regnal year 17 which corresponds to regnal year 14, Choiak, last day,

[26] the date already mentioned above. The one of us who will refuse to act ac-

[27] cording to everything mentioned above, he will give 30 000 deben, that is 100 talents, that is again 30 000 deben, at (the rate of) 24 obols

<sup>47</sup> For this writing of the past tense relative form of the verb *i.ir* plus suffix pronoun, used when the subject of the relative differed from the antecedent, see SPIEGELBERG 1925, pp. 248–249, § 549; JOHNSON 1976, p. 118.

<sup>48</sup> On the transliteration of the term, see ZAUZICH 1987, pp. 83–84; RITNER 2002, p. 357; *CDD H*, pp. 268–273; VINSON 2006/2007, pp. 151–154; VANDORPE, QUACK 2018, p. 251, n. to l. 1.

<sup>49</sup> On this form of the imperfective periphrastic participle of the verb *ir*, with loss of the prothetic *yod*, and on other variants like *(i.)ir* in *P.Tor.Botti* 34 B, l. 15, often used in dates for the equivalence between the regnal years of Cleopatra III and Ptolemy X Alexander I, see FELBER 1991, pp. 29–30, n. 11; FELBER 1997, p. 28, n. to l. 1; DEPAUW 2002, pp. 104 and 114–115.

<sup>50</sup> This formula, in the variant *i.ir iy n-dr.tz k*, is found in discharge receipts from Soknopaiou Nêsos: *PDime* II 56–60, 63–65 and 67–68. See LIPPERT, SCHENTULEIT 2006, p. 3.

[28] 24 r qd.t 2 iw=w m-s3=f n<sup>51</sup> di.t ir=f r-h(.t)  
md.t nb.t nty hry 'n n htre.t

[28] to 2 kite, whereas one can still assert a claim against him in order to force him to act according to everything mentioned above of necessity,

[29] iw.ty mn iw.ty sh nb

[29] without delay and without any obstruction.

The purpose of this *sh*-document is to acknowledge that neither party is in arrears on its payments to the other for a time period ending on the previous day. For the three brothers, this discharge regarded three elements:

- The content of any kind of agreement, both *b3k* and *sh*, drawn up for their father Chestephnachthis (B) by the *presbyteroi*, especially a *b3k*-document concerning the amount of 17 talents (ll. 16–18);
- Any maintenance expenditure and any expense made by their father for the temple of Hathor (ll. 18–20);
- Any similar activity or investment they did themselves (ll. 20–21).<sup>52</sup>

The three sons of Chestephnachthis (B) stated that they owed the elders none of the items of which their father and they themselves had taken delivery on account of the temple (ll. 22–26).

It is evident from the text that until January 15th, 100 BC, the *presbyteroi* only drew up documents for Chestephnachthis (B): even if it is stated that his sons also performed some duties in the temple of Hathor, they acted without any legal recognition.

### 3. *P.Tor.Botti* 34 B+C:

#### A PROMISSORY TEMPLE OATH


[FIG. 2 AND PL. 2; FIG. 3]

The second papyrus to be analysed is *P.Tor.Botti* 34 B+C: an oath by Amun-of-the-Ogdoad.<sup>53</sup> Compared to the previous document, the order of the two parties is inverted: here, it is the *presbyteroi* who give their solemn pledge to Harsiêsis (B) son of Chestephnachthis (B) and “his brothers”, Amenôthês and Pikôs. Moreover, a third party drafted the oath: the private scribe Amenôthês son of Teôs. Even if he did not revise the dating formula in light of the contemporary political situation – still noting the equivalence between the regnal years of Cleopatra III and those of Ptolemy X Alexander I as if the former were still alive – in ll. 26–27 he indicated the day when the text of the oath was written: January 15th, 100 BC, the same as *P.Tor.Botti* 34 A. According to Botti’s publication, text B is the one on the recto.

<sup>51</sup> As in *P.Tor.Botti* 34 B, l. 21, the horizontal stroke could be read either as *n* or as an archaic *r*. The presence in the previous line of *r di.t* written the usual way, as well as parallels inside the same scribal family of this preposition in front of verbs, as *P.Tor.Botti* 10, l. 13 and *P.Tor.Botti* 27, ll. 12–13 by Amenôthês’ father Chestephnachthis (B), suggest to transliterate the sign as *n*.

<sup>52</sup> KATO 2019, p. 143.

<sup>53</sup> UGGETTI 2016, pp. 157–175.



© Museo Egizio, Turin

FIG. 2. P.Tor.Botti 34 B = P. Turin Suppl. 6100 r° = TM 47146.  
W. × H.: 8 × 28,5 cm (detail).

- [10] *ḥnb Ḳmn-nꜣyꜣw-*  
 [11] *-Ḳmn.w-Ḳw<sup>54</sup> nty ḥtp dy ḡrm nꜣr nb*  
 [12] *nty ḥtp dy ḡrm=f twꜣn <ḥn>*  
 [13] *pꜣyꜣtn Ḳ-sḥn nfr bn-Ḳwꜣn šm*  
 [14] *ḥn pꜣyꜣtn Ḳ-sḥn bīn*  
 [15] *n tꜣy (n) ḥsb.t 17 (i.)ḡr ḥsb.t 14 tpy pr.t*  
*(sw-)I r ḥry*  
 [16] *twꜣn ḥn pꜣ Ḳ-sḥn nfr n*  
 [17] *pꜣ rpy Ḳw.t-Ḳr twꜣn*  
 [18] *m-sꜣ=k ḡrm nꜣyꜣk sn.w n tꜣy rnp.t*
- [19] *ꜣ.t nty wꜣḥꜣn ḡr nꜣk ḥn r-rꜣw n tꜣy (n)*  
*ḥsb.t 17*  
 [20] *(i.)ḡr ḥsb.t 14 tpy pr(.t) (sw-)I r ḥry*  
*bn-Ḳwꜣn*  
 [21] *ḡ ḡr dꜣ.w<sup>56</sup> n dī.t ḡr pꜣ rpy*
- [22] *Ḳw.t-Ḳr ꜣyꜣ<sup>57</sup> bn-Ḳwꜣ*  
 [23] *ꜣn ḡr ry.<sup>58</sup> r-ḥrꜣtn n tꜣy rnp.t ꜣ.t*
- [24] *pꜣ rmt nty Ḳwꜣf (r) ḥpr ḥn pꜣ Ḳ-sḥn*  
 [25] *bīn n pꜣ rpy Ḳwꜣn (r) ḥpr ḥn*  
 [26] *pꜣyꜣw<sup>59</sup> Ḳ-sḥn bīn*
- [10] By Amun-of-the-  
 [11] -Ogdoad who dwells here and every god  
 [12] who dwells here with him! We act in  
 [13] your interest<sup>55</sup>. We will not go  
 [14] against your interest  
 [15] from regnal year 17 which corresponds to  
 regnal year 14, Tybi, day 1 onwards.  
 [16] We act in the interest of  
 [17] the temple of Hathor. We are  
 [18] entitled to assert a claim against you and  
 your brothers during these 5 years,  
 [19] with regard to which we have drawn up for  
 you a fiduciary agreement from regnal year 17  
 [20] which corresponds to regnal year 14, Tybi,  
 day 1 onwards. We will not  
 [21] commit any offence(?) to cause the  
 temple  
 [22] of Hathor to suffer loss. We will not  
 [23] take sides(?) against you during these  
 5 years.  
 [24] The one who will act against the interest  
 [25] of the temple, we will act against  
 [26] their (SIC!) interest.

54 For an explanation of the writing of this god's name, see UGETTI 2016, pp. 170–171, n. 74.

55 The translation proposed by G.R. Hughes in KAPLONY-HECKEL 1968, p. 148, seems to be the most suitable to the context. For a better rendering, the choice has been made to move the positive or negative connotation of the adjectives to the preceding prepositions: so, *ḥn pꜣ Ḳ-sḥn nfr* has been translated as “(act) in the interest”, while *ḥn pꜣ Ḳ-sḥn bīn* as “(act) against the interest”. For *Ḳ-sḥn bīn* in *P.Tor.Botti* 34 B, ll. 14 and 26, the element *ḥn* lacks to the expression, while at ll. 24–25 and on the verso (*P.Tor.Botti* 34 C, ll. 2 and 4), the writing of the same group is complete. *P.Tor.Botti* 40, ll. 14–15 shows *ḥn nfr* without the preceding *Ḳ*, but the context confirms that the meaning is the same as in *P.Tor.Botti* 34 B+C. The same can be remarked for *O. Tempeleide* 217, ll. 4–5 and *O. Berl. Dem.* P 12906, l. 4 in KAPLONY-HECKEL 1968, p. 161, n° 10. In *Short Texts* I 200, l. 6 there is reference to *nꜣyꜣf mwe.w ḥr pꜣ Ḳ-sḥn nfr n nꜣ nꜣr.w*, “his thoughts upon the best interest of the gods”.

56 The reading is doubtful. At any rate, it is worth noting the mention of *dꜣ(.t)* in contexts referring to gods in *P. Erbach*, ll. 10–12 and in an ostrakon in Brussels, both mentioned by SPIEGELBERG 1905, pp. 57–58, n. XVII.

57 The slight variations in the vertical strokes seem to imply a metathesis between *yod* and *ꜣ*, instead of the most frequently attested form *ꜣy*. For the meaning of the expression *ḡr ꜣy*, “to suffer loss”, see *DemGloss*, p. 10; *CDD* 3, pp. 81–82.

58 A search for this formulation on the website of the *Thesaurus Linguae Aegyptiae* (query 1) has brought up no attestations. However, the signification of this formulation could be similar to *tꜣy ry.t*, “take sides”, in *P. Brit. Mus.* EA 10508, col. IX, l. 3; see GLANVILLE 1955, p. 25; *CDD R*, p. 13.

59 Mistake of concordance of the plural suffix with the antecedent, that is the singular *rmt* in l. 1. The same on the verso: *P.Tor.Botti* 34 C, l. 5.

On the verso of the same papyrus (text C), Amenôthês son of Teôs made an addition.




FIG. 3. *P.Tor.Botti* 34 C = P. Turin Suppl. 6100 v<sup>o</sup> = TM 47146.  
W. × H.: 8 × 28,5 cm (detail).

[1] *p3 rmt nty iw=f hpr hn p3*  
 [2] *'s-shn bin n3 rwd.w*  
 [3] *irm p3 rpy (iw=)n (r) hpr*  
 [4] *hn 'p3y=f' 's-shn bin*  
 [5] *irm n3y=w iry.w*  
 [6] *sh*<sup>60</sup>

[1] The one who will act against the  
 [2] interest of the agents  
 [3] and of the temple, we will act  
 [4] against his interest  
 [5] and (that of) their (sic!) companions.  
 [6] Written.

Even if there had been prior arguments between the parties, the discharge contained in *P.Tor.Botti* 34 A, stating that each of them was satisfactorily paid without any further claim, cleared the way for a new agreement on the same day. By *P.Tor.Botti* 34 B+C, the elders bound themselves not to hinder the three brothers' activity, probably also not to act detrimentally to the temple of Hathor, but reserving the right to proceed against Chestephnachthis (B)'s sons or anyone else who might act against the sanctuary's interest. The verso expands upon the last sentence on the recto, in order to include the three brothers into the protection granted to the temple against third parties and to broaden its effectiveness, potentially prosecuting more people in case of a legal controversy. *P.Tor.Botti* 34 A, ll. 19–21 did not specify the previous time span taken into account, while *P.Tor.Botti* 34 B, ll. 18 and 23 stresses twice that the new concession provided a tenure of five years. The same term is found in two documents written three months later.

<sup>60</sup> The word is used as an abbreviated closing formula, especially in letters or in oracle questions: DEPAUW 1994, p. 89; ZAUZICH 1996, pp. 376–380; DEPAUW 2006, pp. 167–168; CDD S, p. 410.

#### 4. *P.Tor.BOTTI* 36: A FIDUCIARY AGREEMENT CONCERNING COLLECTION-BOXES

[FIG. 4; PL. 4]

The last papyrus enveloped in the scroll number 11 is *P.Tor.Botti* 36. Dated to Pharmuthi 3 of the year 14 of Ptolemy X Alexander I, that is April 17th, 100 BC,<sup>61</sup> this agreement “in front of Hathor” only concerns Amenôthês son of Chestephnachthis (B) and the elders of the goddess’ priests. As in *P.Tor.Botti* 34 A, the king is in co-regency with both Cleopatra Berenike III and his son Alexander, and the official scribe is Amenôthês himself, as shown by ll. 26–27.<sup>62</sup>




FIG. 4. *P.Tor.Botti* 36 = P. Turin Suppl. 6085 r<sup>o</sup> = TM 45108. W. × H.: 33,5 × 32,5 cm (detail).

[13] *shn=tn n=y t3 'ff.t<sup>63</sup> n hftb n p3 rpy n Hw.t-Hr*

[14] *hn<sup>c</sup> t3 'ff.t 2.t n p3 dmy hr n t3y n<sup>65</sup> hsb.t 17 (i.)ir ir hsb.t 14 tpy pr(.t) sw-I r hsb.t 22 (i.)ir ir hsb.t 19*

[13] You entrusted to me the collection-box of the forecourt<sup>64</sup> of the temple of Hathor [14] and the two collection-boxes of the village from regnal year 17 which corresponds to regnal year 14, Tybi, day 1 to regnal year 22 which corresponds to regnal year 19,

<sup>61</sup> HUSS 2001, p. 653, n. 95; DEPAUW 2008, p. 140.

<sup>62</sup> UGGETTI 2020b, pp. 55, 61 and 64.

<sup>63</sup> For this word and the debate about the extension of its meaning, see WÄNGSTEDT 1954, p. 149, n. to l. 2; NUR EL-DIN 1974, p. 21, n. to l. 2; VITTMANN 1983, pp. 328–329, n. f; VLEEMING 1987, pp. 147–154; VITTMANN 1998, p. 300; MUHS, DIELEMAN 2006, p. 59, n. d; MARTIN 1996 (ed. 2011), p. 374, n. 8; COLIN 2016, p. 55.

<sup>64</sup> On the translation of the term as “forecourt” in the specific architectural context of the temple of Deir el-Medina, that never had a frontal *dromos*, see UGGETTI 2016, pp. 169–170, n. 71.

<sup>65</sup> For the expression *hr n t3y n*, whose Coptic equivalent is 2Δ-ΧΙΝ (CRUM 1939, p. 773), see the note by Mark Smith in VLEEMING 2010, p. 29.

[15] *ibd-4 3h.t sw 'rqr r rnp.t 5.t r ibd 60 2/3  
1/6<sup>66</sup> r rnp.t 5.t 'n mtw=y<sup>67</sup> ir n3 šdy.w n p3  
dny*

[16] *r-h(.t) p3 snṯ hr rnp.t n n3 ssw.w nty hry  
mtw=y dī.t p3y=tn 1/4 n n3 hḏ.w n3 prt.w*

[17] *nty iw=w r ir iw r-dr.t.ṯy hr Hw.t-Hr n  
n3 ssw.w nty hry hr ibd mtw=y ir p3 ky 1/2 1/4*

[18] *n hy he hr.t mī-nn r-h(.t) p3 snṯ hr rnp.t  
irm n3 hḏ.w n3 nwb.w nty iw=w r dī.t st*

[19] *r hḏ=w<sup>71</sup> n nwb r t3 gw.t n Hw.t-Hr iw  
bn-iw=y ir hy he iw.ty šn=tn*

[20] *mtw=y in p3 ip n Hw.t-Hr i.ir-hr=tn n p3  
hrw nty i.ir=tn r šn.ṯy r-r=f*

[21] *n-im=f in-n3=w hsb.t 22 (i.)ir ir hsb.t 19  
ibd-4 3h.t sw 'rqr p3 mnq n t3 rnp.t 5.t nty  
hry hpr*

[22] *mtw=y h3<sup>c</sup> n3 'ft.t.w nty hry i.ir-hr=tn  
mtw=tn shn.ṯw n p3 rmt nty i.ir=tn r mr  
shn.ṯw*

[23] *n=f bn-iw=y rh dd shn p3y iw wdb=f rnp.t  
mtw=y ir n=tn r-h.t.ṯf n ssw nb*

[15] Choiak, last day, that is 5 years, that is 60 5/6 months, that is again 5 years. And I shall attend to the collection<sup>68</sup> of the village [16] according to the custom every year in the period mentioned above. And I shall give your quarter of the money and of the grain [17] of which I will take delivery on behalf of Hathor in the period mentioned above every month. And I shall use the other three quarters

[18] for maintenance expenditures, expenses and<sup>69</sup> provisions likewise<sup>70</sup> according to the custom every year, and the silver and the gold which will be given

[19] for covering with gold the shrine of Hathor, while I will not make maintenance expenditures or expenses without asking you. [20] And I shall bring the ledger of Hathor before you on the day on which you will demand it from me.

[21] When regnal year 22 which corresponds to regnal year 19, Choiak, last day, the completion of the five years mentioned above, comes, [22] I shall leave the collection-boxes mentioned above to you and you will entrust them to whom you will want to entrust them.

[23] I will not be able to say: "It is a fiduciary agreement that has been extended for a year." And I shall act towards you according to it at any date.

<sup>66</sup> For the reading of this group of fractions, see NIMS 1958, p. 241, n. g; CHAUCHEAU 1986, pp. 26–27, n. to l. 11,2; *CDD Numbers*, p. 300.

<sup>67</sup> For the independent conjunctive with the value of an injunctive future, see SPIEGELBERG 1925, pp. 73–74, § 152; NIMS 1938, pp. 77–78; JOHNSON 1976, pp. 188–189.

<sup>68</sup> On the term *šdy*, specifically used in Theban receipts from the reigns of Claudius and Nero for the "collection of the god", see SPIEGELBERG 1918, pp. 116–120; MATTHA 1945, p. 154; WÄNGSTEDT 1954, pp. 40 and 122–126; WÄNGSTEDT 1965, p. 21, n° 11, n. to l. 2; CLARYSSE, WINNICKI 1989, p. 46; KLOTZ 2009, p. 252; KLOTZ 2012, pp. 296–297; LANCIERS 2015, p. 380.

<sup>69</sup> Despite the arguments advanced by COLIN 2016, p. 55, n. 57 for his translation "en dépenses de nourriture", I opt for the alternative "en dépenses et en nourriture" he proposed in the same note: this includes other operating expenses than those for provisions and justifies the addition of *mī-nn* after *hr.t*, "and provisions likewise", especially if compared to the formula *hy nb he nb*, "every maintenance expenditure and every expense", used in a similar context in *P.Tor.Botti* 34 A, ll. 18–19.

<sup>70</sup> On the translation, see PESTMAN 1963, p. 14, n. b; JASNOW 1982, pp. 18–20, n. f; COLIN 2016, p. 55.

<sup>71</sup> For this verb, see *DemGloss*, p. 282; *Wb* III, p. 204.1–5; ZAUZICH 1976, p. 82, n. to l. 10; *CDD H*, p. 327; COLIN 2016, pp. 42–46, 50–52, 55–58 and 70; CHAUCHEAU 2018, pp. 10–11. As in O. Stras. Inv. D. 156 = *DDS* III 6 (COLIN 2016, p. 70), ll. 6 and 9, the gilded object is introduced by the preposition *r*.

[24] *p3 rmt n-im=n nty iw=fr st3.t r tm ir r-h(.t)*  
*md.t nb.t nty hry iw=fr di.t h3 3 000 r krkr*  
*10 r h3 3 000 'n*

[25] *m-b3h Hw.t-Hr iw=fr di.t ky h3 3 000 r*  
*n3 gll.w n n3 Pr-'3'.w.s.w iw=w m-s3=fn di.t*

[26] *ir=fr-h(.t) md.t nb.t nty hry 'n n htre.t*  
*iw.ty mn iw.ty sh nb*

[24] The one of us who will refuse to act according to everything mentioned above, he will give 3 000 deben, that is 10 talents, that is again 3 000 deben

[25] in front of Hathor and will give another 3 000 deben for the holocausts of the sovereigns<sup>l.s.h.</sup>, while one can still assert a claim against him in order to force

[26] him to act according to everything mentioned above of necessity, without delay and without any obstruction.

As made clear in l. 14, the beginning of Amenôthês' appointment was backdated: the deal is said to have entered into force on Tybi I of the same year, meaning it includes the three-month period during which he was already charged with the task together with his brothers Harsiêsis (B) and Pikôs. Several times, in ll. 14–15, 21 and also on the verso, it is recalled that the term was supposed to span five years.<sup>72</sup>

Amenôthês reported in detail his duties, which mainly consisted in the management of three collection-boxes that the elders entrusted to him (ll. 13–14):<sup>73</sup> one in the forecourt of the temple of Hathor and two others in the village, probably Djême (modern Medinet Habu). Another papyrus attesting the management of such collection-boxes, also for a temple of Hathor but in another town (Gebelein), is *P.Cair.* II 30699, l. 8.<sup>74</sup> It seems likely that the two collection-boxes in the village were reserved for the deposit of money and grain respectively, but the one in the forecourt of the sanctuary was probably a real box for money offerings by pilgrims going there, situated next to the main gate.<sup>75</sup> In any case, all these donations, made by the common folk, were destined for Hathor. Every month, Amenôthês had to cede to the *presbyteroi* one quarter of this income (ll. 16–17). Then, he was to use the other three quarters, on a yearly basis, for “maintenance expenditures, expenses and provisions likewise”, no doubt for the upkeep of the Ptolemaic temple of Deir el-Medina, but he was not allowed to undertake major interventions without the consent of the elders (ll. 17–19). There were also gifts of gold and silver, probably as raw metals or as small jewels to remelt, intended for gilding a shrine of the goddess (ll. 18–19).<sup>76</sup> Amenôthês acknowledged his financial functions in l. 20, where he affirmed he was keeping the accounts of the Hathor temple, which he would have to produce when requested by the *presbyteroi* (in a similar way, but on a far smaller scale, like what was demanded from the *praktôr* Milôn in *P.Eleph.* 10 and 11 for the great temple of Edfou).<sup>77</sup> The end of the text warned that breach of the terms of this agreement would be punished with a penalty of 10 talents for Hathor and another 10 talents for the burnt offerings to the pharaohs.

<sup>72</sup> COLIN 2016, p. 55.

<sup>73</sup> Ll. 13–19 were transliterated and translated also by COLIN 2016, pp. 55–56.

<sup>74</sup> NUR EL-DIN 1974, p. 21, n. to l. 2; VLEEMING 1987, p. 154, n. 32.

<sup>75</sup> BIRK 2020, p. 116 and p. 422, n. 589.

<sup>76</sup> COLIN 2016, pp. 43, 56 and 67.

<sup>77</sup> RUBENSOHN 1907, pp. 43–44; WILCKEN 1913, pp. 211–213; CLARYSSE 2003, pp. 17–18, 21 and p. 25, n° 18; MANNING 2003, p. 84.

5. *P.TOR.BOTTI* 40: THE PROMISSORY TEMPLE OATH RELEVANT TO *P.TOR.BOTTI* 36 [FIG. 5; PL. 3]

Left out of scroll number 11, *P.Tor.Botti* 40 is nonetheless the promissory oath connected to *P.Tor.Botti* 36. Like *P.Tor.Botti* 34 B+C, it was to be sworn in the name of Amun-of-the-Ogdoad and, as explicitly noted in the insert above l. 7, in the courtyard of the small temple of Medinet Habu.<sup>78</sup> The text is neither signed nor dated, but it was without doubt prepared on the same day as the legal document it correlates with.<sup>79</sup>




FIG. 5. *P.Tor.Botti* 40 = P. Turin Suppl. 6096 r<sup>o</sup> = TM 45111. W. x H.: 9 x 21 cm (detail).

<sup>78</sup> UGGETTI 2016, pp. 169–170, n. 71.

<sup>79</sup> PESTMAN 1985, p. 169.

[8] *ḥnh Ḳmn-nʒy-w-Ḥmn.w-ḳw nty ḥtp*  
 [9] *dy ḳrm ntr nb nty ḥtp dy ḳrm=f*

[10] *ḳw=n r ḥpr ḳrm=k<sup>80</sup> n ʒy rnp.t ʒ.t*  
 [11] *nty wʒḥ=k ḳr ḥn r-r=w n=n bn-ḳw=n*

[12] *[...] bn-ḳw=n ḳr*  
 [13] *gr rmt n rwd (r-)bnr=k n ʒy rnp.t ʒ.t*

[14] *tw=n ḥn pʒy=k ḥn nfr tw=n*  
 [15] *ḥn pʒ ḥn nfr n pʒ rpy*  
 [16] *n Ḥw.t-Ḥr pʒ dd qnb(.t)<sup>81</sup>*  
 [17] *nty ḳw=f r ḳr pʒ mʒ Ḥw.t-Ḥr*  
 [18] *ḳw=n r ḥpr ḳrm=k wʒ=f n*  
 [19] *gy nb*

[8] By Amun-of-the-Ogdoad who dwells  
 [9] here and every god who dwells here with  
 him!

[10] We will support you during these 5 years,  
 [11] with regard to which you have drawn up  
 a fiduciary agreement for us. We will not  
 [12] [...] We will not appoint  
 [13] anybody else but you as agent during  
 these 5 years.

[14] We act in your interest. We act  
 [15] in the interest of the temple  
 [16] of Hathor. The litigant  
 [17] who will come to the place of Hathor,  
 [18] we will support you against him in  
 [19] any way.

The commitments of the elders of Hathor towards Amenôthês are not that different from those in *P.Tor.Botti* 34 B+C: they pledge to defend him against any legal action, reassuring him that they would name nobody instead of him during his five years' appointment, the length of which is repeated in ll. 10 and 13. As in the other temple oath, from the priests' point of view, the interests of Amenôthês and of the sanctuary are considered as naturally convergent.

## 6. *P.TOR.BOTTI* 35: THE ARCHIVAL NOTE OF THE SCROLL NUMBER II

[FIG. 6]

As previously remarked, *P.Tor.Botti* 35 wrapped together *P.Tor.Botti* 34 A, 34 B+C and 36 in one scroll. The following line recorded its content<sup>82</sup>, showing a gap in the middle for the passage of the string that was tied around the bundle.



FIG. 6. *P.Tor.Botti* 35 = P. Turin Suppl. 6109 r<sup>o</sup> = TM 45107. W. × H.: 30,5 × 14,5 cm (detail).

<sup>80</sup> A parallel for this phrase, also repeated in l. 18, in case of lawsuits is found in *P.Cair.* II 30619, l. 7: CENIVAL 1972, vol. 1, pp. 95–96.

<sup>81</sup> So far, this seems to be the only attestation of this nominalised term where it might not designate a process or legal proceedings, but the person bringing a case to court: KAPLONY-HECKEL 1963, vol. 1, p. 349; *CDD D*, p. 6.

<sup>82</sup> KATO 2019, p. 138.

[1] *p3 shn n n3 rwd.w n Hw.t-Hr VACAT irm*  
*p3 wy irm p3 b3k n 'nh*

[1] The fiduciary agreement of the agents of Hathor, the discharge and the document of oath.

*P3 wy* refers to *P.Tor.Botti* 34 A, the discharge that settled once and for all the matter of the earlier agreements, which had taken the form of both *b3k*-documents and *sh*-documents, and are now lost, between Chestephnachthis (B) and the *presbyteroi* of the priests of Hathor. *P3 shn n n3 rwd.w n Hw.t-Hr* refers to the subsequent fiduciary agreement that entered into force the same day, but this time between the elders and the three sons of Chestephnachthis (B), without the involvement of their father. *P3 b3k n 'nh* is *P.Tor.Botti* 34 B+C, the promissory temple oath relevant to this second document. But this legal document is absent from the archive of Totoês: the bundle instead contained a third fiduciary agreement (*P.Tor.Botti* 36), stipulated a little over three months later, between Amenôthês alone and the *presbyteroi*, but retroactively taking effect from the same date as the second one. The plural *n3 rwd.w* cannot indicate *P.Tor.Botti* 36, given that from then on, there would have been only one agent of Hathor. This means that the archival note on *P.Tor.Botti* 35 was written on or soon after January 15th, 100 BC, when the discharge of the first agreements (*P.Tor.Botti* 34 A), the text of the (no longer existing) second one and its oath (*P.Tor.Botti* 34 B+C) were written, and that its papyrus support at first served to wrap these together. At any rate, it happened before April 17th, 100 BC, date of *P.Tor.Botti* 36: when one of the parties of the agreement changed three months later, the scroll was opened, the older agreement was thrown away and replaced by the new one (*P.Tor.Botti* 36), then just rolled up with the other two documents and, in the end, stored in one of Totoês' jars. Noticeably, the transition from three agents of Hathor to one did not urge the archivist to modify the wording of *P.Tor.Botti* 35, by correcting *rwd* from plural to singular, but the mention of just one oath on the wrapper might have been the reason why he left *P.Tor.Botti* 40, the one relevant to *P.Tor.Botti* 36, out of the package, so that it was found separately by the Italian archaeological mission in 1905.

## 7. THE TITLE OF CHESTEPHNACHTHIS (B)'S SONS

The tasks enumerated in *P.Tor.Botti* 36 involve collecting, if not all, then a big part of the sanctuary's income, managing it in order to carry out both current affairs and major works for the temple (also evoked in *P.Tor.Botti* 34 A, ll. 18–19 and 23), and finally recording the accounts of all supervised financial operations. These activities seem to go beyond the competences of a *hs*, “singer”, and are more suited to those of a *rwd*, “agent”. At least three ostraca (*O.Leid.Dem.* 18, l. 2; *O.Mattha* 164, ll. 1–2; *O.Wångstedt* 53, l. 2) provide evidence of *p3 rwd / n3 rwd.w n t3 'ft(.t) / n3 'ft.w*, “the agent(s) of the collection-box(es)”: it is possible that this denotes the same charge as in *P.Tor.Botti* 36. Still, the seated man with hand to mouth at the end of the word is unexpected.

However, two of the documents presenting the title at issue with this determinative were explicitly signed by Amenôthês son of Chestephnachthis (B): *P.Tor.Botti* 34 A, ll. 29–30 and *P.Tor.Botti* 36, ll. 26–27. Moreover, *P.Tor.Botti* 40 shows important graphic similarities with

these two documents. For example, in the onomastic catalogue for the Ptolemaic period, the spellings of the names Chestephnachthis (*Hnsu-tʿyʿf-nḥt.t*), written with the feminine ending after *nḥt* and the seated man as a determinative,<sup>83</sup> and of Snachomneus (*Ns-nʿyʿw-Hmn.w-ḥw*), with two divine standards (the one behind *Hmn.w*, the other at the end) and the final element *ḥw* drawn as two curved lines and a third, vertical stroke,<sup>84</sup> can be found only in texts in the handwriting of members of Amenôthês' family. As a consequence, I propose to assign *P.Tor.Botti* 40 to Amenôthês son of Chestephnachthis (B), too.<sup>85</sup> Accordingly, it is very likely that on the verso of *P.Tor.Botti* 36, signed by him, it was also he who recorded the archival note, displaying an identical orthography of the name Chestephnachthis (see Table 1). Finally, even if admitting that *P.Tor.Botti* 35 had not been composed by Amenôthês, at any rate its author would have used *P.Tor.Botti* 34 A and *P.Tor.Botti* 36 as reference points, since *P.Tor.Botti* 35 served as their archival note. Thus, the determinative of the seated man with hand to mouth in the spellings of the title giving account of the function of Amenôthês son of Chestephnachthis (B) and his brothers seems only to appear in documents drawn up or influenced by him.










	Chestephnachthis ( <i>Hnsu-tʿyʿf-nḥt.t</i> )	Snachomneus ( <i>Ns-nʿyʿw-Hmn.w-ḥw</i> )
<i>P.Tor.Botti</i> 34 A		
<i>P.Tor.Botti</i> 36 r°		
<i>P.Tor.Botti</i> 36 v°		
<i>P.Tor.Botti</i> 40		
<i>P.Tor.Botti</i> 34 B		

TABLE 1. The writings of the names “Chestephnachthis” and “Snachomneus”.

<sup>83</sup> LÜDDECKENS et al. 1981–2000, vol. I.12, pp. 880–881.

<sup>84</sup> LÜDDECKENS et al. 1981–2000, vol. I.9, pp. 680–682. For an explanation of the writing of this name, see UGGETTI 2016, pp. 170–171, n. 74.

<sup>85</sup> UGGETTI 2020b, pp. 55 and 64.

In the end, the only text surely not by Amenôthês son of Chestephnachthis (B) is the temple oath *P.Tor.Botti* 34 B+C, bearing the signature of the private scribe Amenôthês son of Teôs. In l. 2 of *P.Tor.Botti* 34 C, he employed the title detained in common by Harsiêsis (B) son of Chestephnachthis (B) and his brothers. Finally, not only the context – the *presbyteroi* stating that they would argue with whomever interfered with the interest of this office holder and of the temple of Hathor – but also the spelling with the bowstring sign call for the transliteration as *rwd*, “agent”. The comparison with the word *bin*, “bad”, clearly illustrates the identical results attained in Demotic by the graphic evolutions of both the bowstring sign and the bound enemy (Z 6 in Gardiner’s hieroglyphic sign list), the latter occurring with most of the words burdened with negative meanings.

So, the unusual writings of the term *rwd*, “agent”, with the determinative of the seated man with hand to mouth, could be explained as hypercorrections by Amenôthês son of Chestephnachthis (B). Probably unhappy that the title he was bearing himself had a determinative that could have been confused (or which he was the only one to confuse) with the one used for bad things, he might have preferred to replace it with the more neutral one of the seated man with hand to mouth. Furthermore, this is not the only instance in which Amenôthês took creative liberties with determinatives: on the verso of *P.Tor.Botti* 36, for the word *shn*, “fiduciary agreement; lease”, instead of the usual determinative, derived from the archaic form of the papyrus scroll with a stroke underneath<sup>86</sup>, he chose the cobra, used for the homophone *shn*, “crown” (see Table 2).<sup>87</sup>

	Agent ( <i>rwd</i> )	Fiduciary Agreement; Lease ( <i>shn</i> )
<i>P.Tor.Botti</i> 34 A		
<i>P.Tor.Botti</i> 36 r°		
<i>P.Tor.Botti</i> 40		
<i>P.Tor.Botti</i> 35		

<sup>86</sup> *DemGloss*, p. 448. For the origin of the determinative, see PESTMAN 1994, vol. 2, p. 47, n° Y 1 c.

<sup>87</sup> *DemGloss*, p. 446; BOTTI 1967, vol. 1, p. 184, n. 1; *CDD S*, p. 352.





	Agent ( <i>rwḏ</i> )	Fiduciary Agreement; Lease ( <i>šbn</i> )
<i>P.Tor.Botti</i> 36 v <sup>o</sup>		
<i>P.Tor.Botti</i> 34 B+C		

TABLE 2. The writings of the words “agent” and “fiduciary agreement; lease”.

It is not possible to know for certain why *P.Tor.Botti* 34 A was drafted on Tybi 1, but *P.Tor.Botti* 34 B+C implies that, from that same day onwards, Chestephnachthis (B) was no longer involved in the affairs of the temple of Hathor. This might have been due to his death. However, the discharge and the oath for a new agreement are both dated to the first day of the first month of the *pr.t*-season, which makes it look more like a planned transition. Furthermore, *P.Tor.Botti* 34 A, ll. 18–20 seems to imply that Chestephnachthis (B) coped with his responsibilities until the previous day, Choiak 30. *P.Dime* II 56, 59, 63, 64 and 65 are Roman discharge receipts from Soknopaiou Nêsos which cover periods that start and stop roughly at the beginning or at the end of a month, possibly in connection with audit dates.<sup>88</sup> Even if based on a different schedule, one might wonder whether a similar system was not also in effect in Ptolemaic Thebes. All these elements might suggest that Chestephnachthis (B) simply retired from his tasks, which his three sons took over. Given that he acted as witness in *P.Ackerpacht.*, pp. 29–32, l. 31, written by his son Harsiêsis (B),<sup>89</sup> Chestephnachthis (B) must still have been alive on November 16th, 101 BC, that is two months before *P.Tor.Botti* 34 A.

In any case, *P.Tor.Botti* 34 A, ll. 18–21 shows that not only Chestephnachthis (B), but also his three sons performed their duties until Choiak 30: this implies that they all collaborated and that the title of “agent of Hathor”, attributed there to Harsiêsis (B), Amenôthês and Pikôs, was previously borne also by their father. Such a constellation is also made plausible by the comparable organisation of their family activity as official scribes, their only additional occupation known from other documents: a collegial direction of Djême’s scribal office by Chestephnachthis (B) and Harsiêsis (B) between 114 and 104 BC, then a cooperation of three, including Amenôthês until the years 101 and 100 BC, when Chestephnachthis (B) relinquished that post as well.<sup>90</sup>

Soknopaiou Nêsos offers a similar general picture. In *P.Oxf.Griffith* 72 of March 23rd, 133 BC, the *lesônis* of Soknopaios and Isis Nefersês delivered a discharge receipt to “the agent of the priests” (*pꜣ rwḏ nꜣ wꜣb.w*) “for the (amounts of) money (which) you raised from the collection of year 37”<sup>91</sup>: this implies that collecting money and other items for the manage-

<sup>88</sup> *P.Dime* II 56: Thôth 1 – 28; *P.Dime* II 59: Thôth 1 – 5th epagomenal day; *P.Dime* II 63: Phaôphi ? – Pachôns 30(?); *P.Dime* II 64: Pachôns 30 – Thôth 2; *P.Dime* II 65: Thôth 30 – Thôth 30. See LIPPERT, SCHENTULEIT 2006, pp. 236–237.

<sup>89</sup> UGGETTI 2020b, pp. 48–49, 53–56, 60–61 and 64.

<sup>90</sup> UGGETTI 2020a, pp. 76–79; UGGETTI 2020b, pp. 60–65.

<sup>91</sup> *P.Oxf.Griffith* 72, l. 5: *hr nꜣ ḥḏ.w ꜣr.šde=k ḥn ꜣ wpy.t ḥsb.t 37* (Sandra L. Lippert, personal communication).

ment of the temple was one of the agent's main tasks. This is confirmed by *P.Oxf.Griffith* 61, dated to February 1st, 132 BC: a receipt that the priests and their agent gave in return to an individual for the supply of oil for lighting and of wine. In the Roman period, it seems that it was the "scribe of the priests" who acted as a trustee, taking delivery of and managing the incomes on behalf of the clergy, in addition to his duties as an accountant. Compared to the Theban region, the differences are that these charges were not hereditary and the length of the tenures was far shorter: one year, but with the possibility of serving several terms.<sup>92</sup>

## 8. CHESTEPHNACHTHIS (B)'S FAMILY AND THE PTOLEMAIC TEMPLE OF DEIR EL-MEDINA

Another element that deserves attention is the amount of money at the center of *P.Tor.Botti* 34 A, ll. 17–18: 17 talents. In order to contextualize this, it is useful to look at Greek payment receipts of the transfer tax ensuing from some sales, which provide approximate contemporary values for real estate in Djême. *P.Berl.Dem.* II 3104 of March 16th, 103 BC and *P.Berl.Dem.* II 3105 of April 1st, 103 BC give two talents and half a talent respectively as prices for a sixth of the same building, which gives a price for the whole house between 3 and 12 talents.

Even if penalties in Demotic legal documents were always too high to be paid and not strictly connected to the value of the goods concerned, the amount of 100 talents, equivalent to 30 000 deben, in *P.Tor.Botti* 34 A, ll. 26–28, is exceptionally large.<sup>93</sup> The one in *P.Tor.Botti* 36, ll. 24–25, dealing with similar matters and involving a comparable number of people, amounts to no more than 20 talents. Just considering the archive of Totoês, the second highest fine is 30 talents in *P.Tor.Botti* 32, ll. 8–9 and *Pap.Lugd.Bat.* XXIII, pp. 182–183, n° 3, ll. 11–14, both dealing with hereditary issues, while it was usually of 2 talents in leases.<sup>94</sup> This could point to the fact that it was particularly sensitive, not only the agreement itself attested by *P.Tor.Botti* 34 A, but also its object.

In *P.Tor.Botti* 34 A, ll. 18–21, as well as in *P.Tor.Botti* 36, ll. 17–19, the words *hy* and *he* are mentioned among the tasks already begun by Chestephnachthis (B) and his sons, and which were subsequently to be performed by Amenôthês in the temple of Hathor. George R. Hughes distinguished and explained these terms as follows: "construction, repair work" for *hy*, "expense" for *he*.<sup>95</sup> Recently, K.-T. Zauzich questioned the meaning proposed for *hy* in the edition of *P.Fam.Theb.* 30 and suggested equating *hy* and *he* and to translate both as "expenditure".<sup>96</sup> Even

<sup>92</sup> LIPPERT, SCHENTULEIT 2005, p. 78; LIPPERT, SCHENTULEIT 2006, pp. 2–3, 9, 18–19 and 236–237. The role of the "scribe of the priests" as temple accountant, as well as the relationship with the *presbyteroi* of a temple, is also detailed in P. Vindob. D 4852: BRESCIANI 1983, pp. 181–184. I thank Sandra L. Lippert for having drawn my attention to both *P.Oxf.Griffith* 61 and 72, for the reading of *P.Oxf.Griffith* 72 and for all the precisions concerning Soknopaiou Nêsos' temple staff in the Graeco-Roman Period.

<sup>93</sup> A search for this formula, combining the occurrences of the words *sk.t* and *tm*, on the website of the *Thesaurus Linguae Aegyptiae* (query 2) has given no higher amounts.

<sup>94</sup> As examples: *P.Tor.Botti* 17, ll. 24–25; *P.Tor.Botti* 21, l. 25; *P.Batav.* 1, l. 25; *P.Tor.Botti* 24, l. 16; *P.Tor.Botti* 25 A, l. 23 and B, ll. 24–25; *P.Ackerpacht.*, pp. 23–25, l. 24; *P.Ackerpacht.*, pp. 26–28, ll. 22–23; *P.Ackerpacht.*, pp. 29–32, ll. 26–27.

<sup>95</sup> HUGHES, NIMS 1940, pp. 247–248; HUGHES 1957, p. 60; *CDD H*, pp. 4–11.

<sup>96</sup> THISSEN<sup>†</sup>, ZAUZICH 2018, p. 151, n. to l. 1.

though he admitted that the best solution for *rmṯ.w hy* in col. I, l. 19 was still “workers”, he translated *hy* in col. I, l. 1 and col. II, l. 18 on one hand, and on the other *he* in col. II, l. 24 in exactly the same way, although they have different spellings and determinatives, just as in *P.Tor.Botti* 34 A, l. 18 and *P.Tor.Botti* 36, ll. 18–19. While K.-T. Zauzich cites the impossibility of classifying the necropolis tax (col. II, l. 25) under the category “work” as one of his arguments against G.H. Hughes’ suggested translation of *hy*, this entry is in reality listed under *he* (col. II, l. 24). The disagreement between these two scholars’ positions can be solved by translating *hy* as “construction (costs)” for repair works: that would include the bricks, the doors, the locks and the masons’ wages and provisions listed for a Theban tomb in *P.Fam.Theb.* 30.<sup>97</sup>

Thus, it is possible that the sum of 17 talents was spent, at least partially, for maintenance or repair of the Ptolemaic temple of Deir el-Medina. One possible project could have been the gilding of the shrine of Hathor mentioned in *P.Tor.Botti* 36, l. 19, the determinative of which indicates that it was made of wood.<sup>98</sup> However, one might also take other kinds of interventions into account, notably on the sandstone structure still standing *in situ*. Moreover, in the same area, Graffito Medinet Habu 44, ll. 1–3 provides a connection between agents of a god and the inauguration of new buildings: on September 17th, 48 BC, the *stratêgos* Plênis alias Pamônthês son of Monkorês inaugurated the portico in front of the pylon of the small temple of Medinet Habu;<sup>99</sup> besides him, there were the agents of Djême (to be understood here as the god Amun-of-the-Ogdoad, patron deity of the sanctuary),<sup>100</sup> who were probably responsible for the job.<sup>101</sup>

The reliefs of the three chapels at the rear of the Ptolemaic temple of Deir el-Medina, which form its original core, were executed partly under the reign of Ptolemy IV Philopatôr,<sup>102</sup> partly under Ptolemy VI Philomêtôr; it was also during the latter’s reign that their portals as well as the pronaos and the staircase were decorated.<sup>103</sup> Columns of hieroglyphs show interventions in the central chapel and in the pronaos at the time of Ptolemy VIII Euergetês II, Cleopatra II and Cleopatra III.<sup>104</sup> The cartouches on the entrance portal of the sanctuary were left empty,<sup>105</sup> while its enclosure gate was embellished during the reign of Ptolemy XII Neos Dionysos.<sup>106</sup> Finally, a small mud-brick contra-temple was built and decorated under Augustus.<sup>107</sup> A structure attached to the lateral wall of the main sanctuary’s southern chapel, composed of two

<sup>97</sup> THISSEN<sup>†</sup>, ZAUZICH 2018, pp. 149–151.

<sup>98</sup> It is always the case for this term, usually written as *gꜣ(.t)*: COLIN 2016, pp. 47, 52 and 56.

<sup>99</sup> THISSEN 1989, p. 22, n. to l. 2. For the date, see RICKETTS 1990, p. 51, n. 15; RICKETTS 1992, p. 279, n. 27; CHAUVEAU 1995, p. 253; DEN BRINKER, MUHS, VLEEMING 2005, vol. 2, p. 512; DEPAUW 2008, p. 156.

<sup>100</sup> UGGETTI 2016, pp. 157–175.

<sup>101</sup> One of these agents is called Pikôs sons of Chestephnachthis, but conclusive evidence for his identification with one of the three sons of Chestephnachthis (B) is lacking: see UGGETTI 2020b, p. 61, n. 91.

<sup>102</sup> BOURGUET<sup>†</sup> 2008, pp. 16, 22, 32, 54 and 76. For a summary of the different building phases of this temple, see MONTERRAT, MESKELL 1997, p. 182.

<sup>103</sup> BOURGUET<sup>†</sup> 2008, pp. 3, 28, 36, 40, 49, 56, 58, 60, 69, 78, 80, 82, 91, 92, 94, 98, 102, 107, III, II4, II6, 127, 136, 138, 148 and 150.

<sup>104</sup> BOURGUET<sup>†</sup> 2008, pp. 29–31, 36, 38, 91 and 96.

<sup>105</sup> BOURGUET<sup>†</sup> 2008, § 171–180.

<sup>106</sup> BOURGUET<sup>†</sup> 2008, p. 177.

<sup>107</sup> BOURGUET<sup>†</sup> 2008, p. 173.

vaulted rooms of mud-bricks, is commonly called “mammisi”.<sup>108</sup> On the right side of the second chamber, the outer stone masonry of the temple was used as support for the engraving of two scenes, which bear the cartouches of Cleopatra III and Ptolemy IX Sôtêr II:<sup>109</sup> the first representing Hathor holding on her knees a royal child with a sidelock of youth; the second, the same child with royal sceptres standing on a *smꜣ-tꜣ.wy*-representation.<sup>110</sup>

Given that Chestephnachthis (B) started his activity as official scribe in Djême in the last years of the joint reign of Cleopatra III and Ptolemy IX Sôtêr II<sup>111</sup> and that, during the same period, he might have been agent of Hathor as well, one might suppose that he was in charge of the construction and decoration of the so-called “mammisi” of Deir el-Medina, or that he and his sons were responsible for the building of the temple portal, the cartouches of which were not filled.

Even if that was the case, they need not necessarily have been the ones who conceived the decorative program, as Ahmes son of Smendes had done for the inscriptions on a portal of the temple of Khonsu at Karnak under the reign of Nectanebo II.<sup>112</sup> But it is likely that, in the Ptolemaic sanctuary of Deir el-Medina, Chestephnachthis (B) and his sons played a role similar to the one of Parthenios son of Paminis in Coptos, during the reigns of the Roman emperors Tiberius to Nero,<sup>113</sup> who was in charge of the building of the barque of Isis,<sup>114</sup> of enclosure walls for Isis, Geb and Harpokrates,<sup>115</sup> of gates for Geb<sup>116</sup>, of a ceiling in the temple of Coptos<sup>117</sup> and of monuments for different deities.<sup>118</sup> It is no accident that he held the title of *pꜣ rwd (n) Îs(.t) (Qbt)* in Demotic,<sup>119</sup> *προστάτης Ἰσιδος* in Greek:<sup>120</sup> “the agent of Isis (of Coptos)”.<sup>121</sup>

<sup>108</sup> DAUMAS 1958, pp. 43–44 considered the surviving inscriptions on this structure not specific enough to call the latter “mammisi”.

<sup>109</sup> BOURGUET† 2008, p. 167.

<sup>110</sup> Both are not surrounded by holes, which could have bolstered beams for a wooden structure, as it was the case for the Hathoric head over the gold-sign in the middle of the southern outer wall of the Ptolemaic temple of Dendara: DAUMAS 1969, p. 71. As a consequence, it is not possible that the wooden shrine mentioned in *P.Tor.Botti* 36, l. 19 could correspond to a structure which should have been built inside the mud-brick vaulted rooms enclosing them.

<sup>111</sup> UGGETTI 2020b, pp. 51, 54–55 and 59–63.

<sup>112</sup> Statue Cairo JE 37075 (Cachette de Karnak 170): COULON 2006, p. 16; MEKIS 2016, pp. 388–390; BIRK 2020, pp. 224–225, 410, 412 and 499.

<sup>113</sup> KLOTZ 2009, p. 254 and KLOTZ 2012, pp. 296–297 argued that a group of Greek and Demotic *λογεῖα*-receipts on ostraca from the years AD 47–68 showed devotees’ collection of money for the construction or renovation of the temple of Deir Shelwit under Claudius and Nero. Nevertheless, E. Lanciers (2015, pp. 379–390) confuted this theory and convincingly invited to consider these payments not as sums exacted from the local populace, but as annual taxes paid in regard to priestly offices. So, it cannot be drawn an exact parallel between the functions of Chestephnachthis (B) and his sons and those of Psenamounis son of Pekysis, who acted as collector of the abovementioned contributions and called himself in the Demotic ostraca *O.Zürich* II and *O.Mattha* 187 as *pꜣ rwd n pꜣ ntr*, while in the Greek texts *PSI* III 262, *O.Cair.* 76, *O.Wilck.* II 412, 414, 418, 420 and 421 as *προστάτης (τοῦ) θεοῦ*, both translatable as “the agent of the god”.

<sup>114</sup> *Short Texts* I 183.

<sup>115</sup> *Short Texts* I 184, 187, 189, 200 and the Stele Petrie Museum UC 71136: PASQUALI 2007, pp. 187–192.

<sup>116</sup> *Short Texts* I 186 and 199.

<sup>117</sup> *Short Texts* I 202.

<sup>118</sup> Sokar-Osiris in *Short Texts* I 185; Geb in *Short Texts* I 186, 196, 197 and 201; Harpokrates in *Short Texts* I 195; Min-Ra in *Short Texts* I 201.

<sup>119</sup> *Short Texts* I 179, 181, 183, 187–197, 199–202 and the Stele Petrie Museum UC 71136.

<sup>120</sup> *Short Texts* I 182, 185, 186 and 198.

<sup>121</sup> REINACH, WEILL 1912, pp. 19–24; FARID 1988, pp. 13 and 55–57; CLARYSSE, WINNICKI 1989, p. 46; TRAUNECKER 1992, pp. 23, 33–35, 257, 330 and 339; VLEEMING 2001, pp. 170–197, n<sup>os</sup> 179–202; VANDORPE, CLARYSSE 2019, p. 413.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALLAM 2002  
Allam, S., “Elders (Πρεσβύτεροι) – Notables – Great Men – *rmṯ.w ʿj.yw - ḥl-ʿj.yw*”, in K. Ryholt (ed.), *Acts of the Seventh International Conference of Demotic Studies: Copenhagen, 23-27 August 1999*, CNIP 27, Copenhagen, 2002, pp. 1–26.
- EL-AMIR 1959  
el-Amir, M.M., *A Family Archive from Thebes: Demotic Papyri in the Philadelphia and Cairo Museums from the Ptolemaic Period*, 2 vols., Cairo, 1959.
- EL-AMIR 1960  
el-Amir, M.M., “The Unpublished Demotic Papyri in the Turin Museum”, *AcOr* (C) 25, 1960, pp. 203–228.
- EL-AMIR 1969  
el-Amir, M.M., “Further Notes on the Demotic Papyri in the Turin Museum (Topographical, Sociological and Legal Studies)”, *BIFAO* 68, 1969, pp. 85–120.
- EL-AMIR 1974  
el-Amir, M.M., “Varia Demotica”, in E. Kießling, H.-A. Rupprecht (eds.), *Akten des XIII. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses: Marburg/Lahn, 2. bis 6. August 1971*, MBPF 66, Munich, 1974, pp. III–II6.
- ARLT 2009  
Arlt, C., “Die thebanischen Notare”, in G. Widmer, D. Devauchelle (eds.), *Actes du IX<sup>e</sup> Congrès International des Études Démotiques*, BiEtud 147, Cairo, 2009, pp. 29–49.
- BIRK 2020  
Birk, R., *Türöffner des Himmels. Prosopographische Studien zur thebanischen Hohepriesterschaft der Ptolemäerzeit*, ÄgAbh 76, Wiesbaden, 2020.
- BOTTI 1964–1966  
Botti, G., “Archivio da Deir-el-Medinet. Papiro: Suppl. 6096”, publication draft, 30 May 1964–19 May 1966, State Archive of Turin, Sections “Corte”, Collection “Botti”, folder 7, file 4.
- BOTTI 1967  
Botti, G., *L'archivio demotico da Deir El-Medineh*, 2 vols., CMT. Serie Prima – Monumenti e Testi I, Florence, 1967.
- BOURGUET<sup>†</sup> 2008  
Bourguet<sup>†</sup>, P. du, *Le temple de Deir al-Médina*, MIFAO 121, Cairo, 2008.
- BRESCIANI 1983  
Bresciani, E., “Un documento dell’anno 15° di Domiziano dall’archivio templare di Dime. (P. Vindob. D 4852): le condizioni previste per lo scriba e l’addetto alle spese dei sacerdoti”, in *Festschrift zum 100-jährigen Bestehen der Papyrussammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek. Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer (P. Rainer Cent.)*, Vienna, 1983, pp. 181–184 and pl. 6.
- CARNARVON 1912  
The Earl of Carnarvon, “Introduction”, in The Earl of Carnarvon, H. Carter (eds.), *Five Years’ Explorations at Thebes. A Record of Work Done 1907-1911*, London, New York, Toronto, Melbourne, 1912, pp. 1–11.
- CARTER 1912  
Carter, H., “Ptolemaic Vaulted Graves”, in The Earl of Carnarvon, H. Carter (eds.), *Five Years’ Explorations at Thebes. A Record of Work Done 1907-1911*, London, New York, Toronto, Melbourne, 1912, pp. 42–45.
- CENIVAL 1972  
Cenival, F. de, *Les associations religieuses en Égypte d’après les documents démotiques*, 2 vols., BiEtud 46, Cairo, 1972.
- CHAUVEAU 1986  
Chauveau, M., “Un compte en démotique archaïque : le Pap. Claude 1”, *Enchoria* 14, 1986, pp. 21–29 and pl. 13–14.
- CHAUVEAU 1995  
Chauveau, M., “review of H.J. Thissen, *Die demotischen Graffiti von Medinet Habu*”, *RdE* 46, 1995, pp. 250–255.

- CHAUVEAU 2018  
 Chauveau, M., “Démotique”, *AEPHE* 149 (2016-2017), 2018, pp. 7–11.
- CHAUVEAU 2020  
 Chauveau, M., “Démotique”, *AEPHE* 151 (2018-2019), 2020, pp. 4–10.
- CLARYSSE 2003  
 Clarysse, W., “The Archive of the Praktor Milon”, in K. Vandorpe, W. Clarysse (eds.), *Edfu, an Egyptian Provincial Capital in the Ptolemaic Period. Brussels, 3 September 2001*, Brussels, 2003, pp. 17–27.
- CLARYSSE 2010  
 Clarysse, W., “Egyptian Temples and Priests: Graeco-Roman”, in A.B. Lloyd (ed.), *A Companion to Ancient Egypt*, Malden, Chichester, Oxford, 2010, pp. 274–290.
- CLARYSSE, WINNICKI 1989  
 Clarysse, W., Winnicki, J.K., “Letter of Portis and the Youths”, in E. Van ’t Dack, W. Clarysse, G. Cohen, J. Quaegebeur, J.K. Winnicki, *The Judean-Syrian-Egyptian Conflict of 103-101 B.C. A Multilingual Dossier Concerning A “War of Sceptres”*, CollHell 1, Brussels, 1989, pp. 39–49.
- COLIN 2016  
 Colin, F., “Documents démotiques de Strasbourg, III 6 : la dorure de monuments sacrés dans l’Égypte hellénistique et romaine”, *ChronEg* 91/181, 2016, pp. 41–74.
- COULON 2006  
 Coulon, L., “Les sièges de prêtre d’époque tardive. À propos de trois documents thébains”, *RdE* 57, 2006, pp. 1–31 and pl. I-VII.
- CRUM 1939  
 Crum, W.E., *A Coptic Dictionary*, Oxford, 1939.
- DAUMAS 1958  
 Daumas, F., *Les mammisis des temples égyptiens*, Paris, 1958.
- DAUMAS 1969  
 Daumas, F., *Dendara et le temple d’Hathor. Notice sommaire*, RAPH 29, Cairo, 1969.
- DEL VESCO, POOLE 2018  
 Del Vesco, P., Poole, F., “Deir el-Medina in the Egyptian Museum of Turin. An Overview, and the Way Forward”, in A. Dorn, S. Polis (eds.), *Outside the Box: Selected Papers from the Conference “Deir el-Medina and the Theban Necropolis in Contact”, Liège, 27-29 October 2014*, AegLeod II, Liège, 2018, pp. 97–130.
- DEN BRINKER, MUHS, VLEEMING 2005  
 Den Brinker, A.A., Muhs, B.P., Vleeming, S.P., *A Berichtigungsliste of Demotic Documents*, 2 vols., StudDem 7, Leuven, Paris, Dudley, 2005.
- DEPAUW 1994  
 Depauw, M., “The Demotic Epistolary Formulae”, in E. Bresciani (ed.), *Acta Demotica. Acts of the Fifth International Conference for Demotists. Pisa, 4th–8th September 1993*, EVO 17, Pisa, 1994, pp. 87–94.
- DEPAUW 1997  
 Depauw, M., *A Companion to Demotic Studies*, PapBrux 28, Brussels, 1997.
- DEPAUW 2000  
 Depauw, M., *The Archive of Teos and Thabis from Early Ptolemaic Thebes: P. Brux. Dem. Inv. E. 8252-8256*, MRE 8, Turnhout, 2000.
- DEPAUW 2002  
 Depauw, M., “Two Notes on the Demotic Participle or how *i.îr* Became Theologically Relevant”, *LingAeg* 10, 2002, pp. 101–121.
- DEPAUW 2006  
 Depauw, M., *The Demotic Letter: A Study of Epistolographic Scribal Traditions Against Their Intra- and Intercultural Background*, DemStud 14, Sommerhausen, 2006.
- DEPAUW 2008  
 Depauw, M., *A Chronological Survey of Precisely Dated Demotic and Abnormal Hieratic Sources*, TOP 1, Cologne, Leuven, 2008.
- ERICHSEN 1955  
 Erichsen, W., “Einige demotische Urkundenvermerke”, in O. Firchow (ed.), *Ägyptologische Studien*, VIO 29, Berlin, 1955, pp. 76–80.
- FARID 1988  
 Farid, A., “Die Denkmäler des Parthenios, des Verwalters des Isis von Koptos”, *MDAIK* 44, 1988, pp. 13–65 and pl. 1–14.

- FARID 2005  
Farid, A., "Two Demotic Annuity Contracts", in K.A. Daoud, S. Bedier, S. AbdEl-Fattah (eds.), *Studies in Honor of Ali Radwan*, vol. 1, ASAE-Suppl. 34, Cairo, 2005, pp. 323–346 and pl. 1–5.
- FARID 2009  
Farid, A., "A Demotic Sale Contract of the Whole Property", in B.S. El-Sharkawy (ed.), *The Horizon: Studies in Egyptology in Honour of M.A. Nur el-Din (10-12 April 2007)*, vol. 3, Cairo, 2009, pp. 261–276.
- FELBER 1991  
Felber, H., "Augustus Ζευς ἐλευθέριος im Demotischen und die Etymologie von ϣⲙⲉ", *GöttMisZ* 123, 1991, pp. 27–36.
- FELBER 1997  
Felber, H., *Demotische Ackerpachtverträge der Ptolemäerzeit: Untersuchungen zu Aufbau, Entwicklung und inhaltlichen Aspekten einer Gruppe von demotischen Urkunden*, ÄgAbh 58, Wiesbaden, 1997.
- FISHER 1924  
Fisher, C.S., "A Group of Theban Tombs: Work of the Eckley B. Coxe Jr. Expedition to Egypt", *UPMJ* 15, 1924, pp. 28–49.
- GLANVILLE 1939  
Glanville, S.R.K., *Catalogue of Demotic Papyri in the British Museum*, vol. 1: *A Theban Archive of the Reign of Ptolemy I, Soter*, London, 1939.
- GLANVILLE 1955  
Glanville, S.R.K., *Catalogue of Demotic Papyri in the British Museum*, vol. 2: *The Instructions of 'Onchsheshonqy (British Museum Papyrus 10508)*, part I: *Introduction, Transliteration, Translation, Notes, and Plates*, London, 1955.
- HOFFMANN 2000  
Hoffmann, F., *Ägypten: Kultur und Lebenswelt in griechisch-römischer Zeit. Eine Darstellung nach den demotischen Quellen*, Berlin, 2000.
- HOFFMANN, QUACK 2014  
Hoffmann, F., Quack, J.F., "Pastophoros", in A.M. Dodson, J.J. Johnston, W. Monkhouse (eds.), *A Good Scribe and an Exceedingly Wise Man. Studies in Honour of W.J. Tait*, GHP Egyptology 21, London, 2014, pp. 127–155.
- HUGHES, NIMS 1940  
Hughes, G.R., Nims, C.F., "Some Observations on the British Museum Demotic Theban Archive", *AJSL* 57, 1940, pp. 244–261.
- HUGHES 1957  
Hughes, G.R., "review of W. Erichsen, *Demotisches Glossar*", *JNES* 16, 1957, pp. 55–63.
- HUSS 2001  
Huß, W., *Ägypten in hellenistischer Zeit, 332-30 v. Chr.*, Munich, 2001.
- JASNOW 1982  
Jasnow, R., "Two Demotic Papyri in the Oriental Institute", *Enchoria* 11, 1982, pp. 17–22 and pl. 5–6.
- JOHNSON 1976  
Johnson, J.H., *The Demotic Verbal System*, SAOC 38, Chicago, 1976.
- KAPLONY-HECKEL 1963  
Kaplony-Heckel, U., *Die demotischen Tempeleide*, 2 vols., ÄgAbh 6, Wiesbaden, 1963.
- KAPLONY-HECKEL 1968  
Kaplony-Heckel, U., "Die demotischen Tempeleide der Berliner Papyrussammlung", *ForschBer* 10, 1968, pp. 133–184 and pl. 26–27.
- KATO 2019  
Kato, I., "A Re-Examination of P. Tor. Botti 34 A. A Demotic Document Made by Agents of Hathor for Elders of the Temple of Hathor from the Archive of *Twtw* (2nd Century BC, Djeme)", in F. Naether (ed.), *New Approaches in Demotic Studies. Acts of the 13th International Conference of Demotic Studies*, ZÄS-B 10, Berlin, Boston, 2019, pp. 135–149.
- KLOTZ 2009  
Klotz, D., "Λογεία-Receipts and the Construction of Deir Shelwit", *ZPE* 168, 2009, pp. 252–256.
- KLOTZ 2012  
Klotz, D., *Caesar in the City of Amun. Egyptian Temple Construction and Theology in Roman Thebes*, MRE 15, 2012, Turnhout, 2012.

- ŁAJTAR 2006  
 Łajtar, A., *Deir el-Bahari in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods. A Study of an Egyptian Temple Based on Greek Sources*, JJP-Suppl. 4, Warsaw, 2006.
- LANCIERS 2014  
 Lanciers, E., “The Shrines of Hathor and Amenhotep in Western Thebes in the Ptolemaic Period”, *AncSoc* 44, 2014, pp. 105–125.
- LANCIERS 2015  
 Lanciers, E., “The Isis Cult in Western Thebes in the Graeco-Roman Period (Part II)”, *ChronEg* 90/180, 2015, pp. 379–405.
- LIPPERT 2008 (ed. 2012)  
 Lippert, S.L., *Einführung in die altägyptische Rechtsgeschichte* (2008), EQA 5, Münster, 2012 (2nd ed.).
- LIPPERT, SCHENTULEIT 2005  
 Lippert, S.L., Schentuleit, M., “Die Tempelökonomie nach den demotischen Texten aus Soknopaiu Nesos”, in S.L. Lippert, M. Schentuleit (eds.), *Tebtynis und Soknopaiu Nesos: Leben im römischen Fajum. Akten des Internationalen Symposiums vom 11. bis 13. Dezember 2003 in Sommerhausen bei Würzburg*, Wiesbaden, 2005, pp. 71–78.
- LIPPERT, SCHENTULEIT 2006  
 Lippert, S.L., Schentuleit, M., *Demotische Dokumente aus Dime II. Quittungen*, Wiesbaden, 2006.
- LÜDDECKENS 1960  
 Lüddeckens, E., *Ägyptische Eheverträge*, ÄgAbh 1, Wiesbaden, 1960.
- LÜDDECKENS 1974  
 Lüddeckens, E., “Ein demotischer Urkundenfund in Tuna el Gebel mit einer genealogischen Skizze”, in E. Kießling, H.-A. Rupprecht (eds.), *Akten des XIII. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses. Marburg/Lahn, 2. bis 6. August 1971*, MBPF 66, Munich, 1974, pp. 235–238.
- LÜDDECKENS 1986  
 Lüddeckens, E., *LÄ VI*, Wiesbaden, 1986, cols. 876–886, s.v. “Urkundenarchive”.
- LÜDDECKENS et al. 1981–2000  
 Lüddeckens, E., Thissen, H.J., Brunsch, W., Vittmann, G., Zauzich, K.-T., *Demotisches Namenbuch*, 18 vols., Wiesbaden, 1981–2000.
- MANNING 2003  
 Manning, J.G., *Land and Power in Ptolemaic Egypt. The Structure of Land Tenure*, Cambridge, 2003.
- MARTIN 1996 (ed. 2011)  
 Martin, C.J., “The Demotic Texts”, in B. Porten (ed.), *The Elephantine Papyri in English. Three Millennia of Cross-Cultural Continuity and Change* (1996), Atlanta, 2011, (2nd ed.), pp. 276–384 and pl. 4–5.
- MATTHA 1945  
 Mattha, G., *Demotic Ostraka from the Collections at Oxford, Paris, Berlin, Vienna and Cairo*, PSFP 6, Cairo, 1945.
- MEKIS 2016  
 Mekis, T., “Quelques données nouvelles sur les stèles Budapest MBA inv. n° 51.1928 et Prague MN P 1636, et sur la famille de Iáhmès fils de Smendès, propriétaire de la statue Caire JE 37075”, in L. Coulon (ed.), *La cachette de Karnak. Nouvelles perspectives sur les découvertes de Georges Legrain*, BiEtud 161, Cairo, 2016, pp. 383–395.
- MONTERRAT, MESKELL 1997  
 Montserrat, D., Meskell, L., “Mortuary Archaeology and Religious Landscape at Graeco-Roman Deir el-Medina”, *JEA* 83, 1997, pp. 179–197 and pl. 23.
- MUHS 2005  
 Muhs, B.P., *Tax Receipts, Taxpayers, and Taxes in Early Ptolemaic Thebes*, OIP 126, Chicago, 2005.
- MUHS, DIELEMAN 2006  
 Muhs, B.P., Dieleman, J., “A Bilingual Account from Late Ptolemaic Tebtunis. P. Leiden RMO Inv. No. F 1974/7.52”, *ZÄS* 133, 2006, pp. 56–65 and pl. XV–XVIII.
- NIMS 1938  
 Nims, C.F., “Notes on University of Michigan Demotic Papyri from Philadelphia”, *JEA* 24/1, 1938, pp. 73–82.

- NIMS 1958  
Nims, C.F., "A Demotic 'Document of Endowment' from the Time of Nectanebo I", *MDAIK* 16, 1958, pp. 237–246 and pl. 17–20.
- NUR EL-DIN 1974  
Nur El-Din, M.A., *The Demotic Ostraca in the National Museum of Antiquities at Leiden*, CNMAL 1, Leiden, 1974.
- PASQUALI 2007  
Pasquali, S., "Une nouvelle stèle de Parthénios fils de Paminis de Coptos", *RdE* 58, 2007, pp. 187–192.
- PESTMAN 1963  
Pestman, P.W., "Les documents juridiques des 'chanceliers du dieu' de Memphis à l'époque ptolémaïque", *OMRO* 44, 1963, pp. 8–23 and pl. VI–IX.
- PESTMAN 1977  
Pestman, P.W., *Recueil de textes démotiques et bilingues*, 3 vols., Leiden, 1977.
- PESTMAN 1978  
Pestman, P.W., "La terre 'la Pointe' dans le domaine Pestenenemôphis. Archives de Totoês, prêtre aux Memnoneia", in E. Boswinkel, P.W. Pestman (eds.), *Textes grecs, démotiques et bilingues*, P.L.Bat. 19, Leiden, 1978, pp. 193–205.
- PESTMAN 1985  
Pestman, P.W., "Lo scriba privato Amenôthes, figlio di Panas: tre documenti provenienti dall'archivio di Totoês", in P.W. Pestman (ed.), *Textes et études de papyrologie grecque, démotique et copte*, P.L.Bat. 23, Leiden, 1985, pp. 167–197.
- PESTMAN 1989a  
Pestman, P.W., "Familiearchieven in Egypte", in P.W. Pestman (ed.), *Familiearchieven uit het land van Pharao*, Zutphen, 1989, pp. 7–13.
- PESTMAN 1989b  
Pestman, P.W., "Was de Egyptische vrouw geëmancipeerd of niet? (een verstoorde droom)", in P.W. Pestman (ed.), *Familiearchieven uit het land van Pharao*, Zutphen, 1989, pp. 24–29 and 165.
- PESTMAN 1992  
Pestman, P.W., *Il processo di Hermias e altri documenti dell'archivio dei choachiti (P. Tor. Choachiti). Papiri greci e demotici conservati a Torino e in altre collezioni d'Italia*, CMT. Serie Prima – Monumenti e Testi 6, Turin, 1992.
- PESTMAN 1994  
Pestman, P.W., *Les papyrus démotiques de Tsenhor (P. Tsenhor). Les archives privées d'une femme égyptienne du temps de Darius I<sup>er</sup>*, 2 vols., StudDem 4, Leuven, 1994.
- PESTMAN 1995  
Pestman, P.W., *The Archive of the Theban Choachytes (Second Century B.C.). A Survey of the Demotic and Greek Papyri Contained in the Archive*, StudDem 2, Leuven, 1993.
- REICH 1936  
Reich, N.J., "The Legal Transactions of a Family: Preserved in the University Museum at Philadelphia (the Demotic Papyri from Draḥ Abu 'l-Negga Covering a Century of the Early Ptolemaic Period)", *Mizraim* 2, 1936, pp. 13–29.
- REICH 1938a  
Reich, N.J., "The Papyrus-Archive in the Philadelphia University Museum (the Papyri from Dirā' Abū 'l-Naga) I", *Mizraim* 7, 1938, pp. 11–19 and pl. 1–10.
- REICH 1938b  
Reich, N.J., "The Papyrus-Archive in the Philadelphia University Museum (the Papyri from Dirā' Abū 'l-Naga) II", *Mizraim* 8, 1938, pp. 7–14 and pl. 11–20.
- REICH 1938c  
Reich, N.J., "The Papyrus-Archive in the Philadelphia University Museum (the Papyri from Dirā' Abū 'l-Naga) III", *Mizraim* 9, 1938, pp. 7–18 and pl. 21–28.
- REINACH, WEILL 1912  
Reinach, A., Weill, R., "Parthénios fils de Paminis, *prostatès* d'Isis à Koptos", *ASAE* 12, 1912, pp. 1–24.
- RICKETTS 1990  
Ricketts, L.M., "A Dual Queenship in the Reign of Berenice IV", *BASP* 27, 1990, pp. 49–60.
- RICKETTS 1992  
Ricketts, L.M., "The Administration of Late Ptolemaic Egypt", in J.H. Johnson (ed.), *Life in a Multi-cultural Society: Egypt from Cambyses*

- to *Constantine and Beyond*, SAOC 51, Chicago, 1992, pp. 275–281.
- RITNER 2002
- Ritner, R.K., “Third Intermediate Period Antecedents of Demotic Legal Terminology”, in K. Ryholt (ed.), *Acts of the Seventh International Conference of Demotic Studies: Copenhagen, 23–27 August 1999*, CNIP 27, Copenhagen, 2002, pp. 343–359.
- RUBENSOHN 1907
- Rubensohn, O., *Elephantine-Papyri*, Berlin, 1907.
- SEIDL 1962
- Seidl, E., *Ptolemäische Rechtsgeschichte*, ÄgForsch 22, Glückstadt, Hambourg, New York, 1962.
- SPIEGELBERG 1905
- Spiegelberg, W., “Papyrus Erbach. Ein demotisches Brieffragment”, *ZÄS* 42, 1905, pp. 43–60 and pl. III–IV.
- SPIEGELBERG 1908
- Spiegelberg, W., *Demotische Papyrus von der Insel Elephantine I, 1–13*, Leipzig, 1908.
- SPIEGELBERG 1918
- Spiegelberg, W., “Demotische Kleinigkeiten: 3. Demotische Urkunden zu der λογεία Ἰσιδος”, *ZÄS* 54, 1918, pp. 116–120.
- SPIEGELBERG 1925
- Spiegelberg, W., *Demotische Grammatik*, Heidelberg, 1925.
- SPIEGELBERG 1932
- Spiegelberg, W., *Die demotischen Denkmäler. III, Demotische Inschriften und Papyri (Fortsetzung)*, CGC 50023–50165, Berlin, 1932.
- STADLER et al. 2016/2017
- Stadler, M.A., et al., “12. Internationale Konferenz für demotische Studien, Würzburg, 31. August bis 4. September 2014: Abstracts der Vorträge”, *Enchoria* 35, 2016/2017, pp. 17–32.
- Thesaurus Linguae Aegyptiae* (query 1)
- Thesaurus Linguae Aegyptiae*, online database, <<http://aaew.bbaw.de/tla/servlet/so?f=o&l=o&ff=2&db=1&w1=592&l1=o&ci=o&w2=3423&l2=o&c2=o&d2=10&di=1&d3=1&d4=10>> accessed 30 March 2020.
- Thesaurus Linguae Aegyptiae* (query 2)
- Thesaurus Linguae Aegyptiae*, online database, <<http://aaew.bbaw.de/tla/servlet/so?f=o&l=o&ff=2&db=1&w1=5720&l1=o&ci=o&w2=7271&l2=o&c2=o&d2=30&di=1&d3=1&d4=30>> accessed 30 March 2020 .
- THISSEN 1989
- Thissen, H.J., *Die demotischen Graffiti von Medinet Habu*, DemStud 10, Sommerhausen, 1989.
- THISSEN<sup>†</sup>, ZAUZICH 2018
- Thissen<sup>†</sup>, H.J., Zauzich, K.-T., “Ein thebanisches Grab und seine Restaurierung”, in K. Donker Van Heel, F.A.J. Hoogendijk, C.J. Martin, *Hieratic, Demotic and Greek Studies and Text Editions. Of Making Many Books There is no End: Festschrift in Honour of Sven P. Vleeming*, P.L.Bat. 34, Leiden, 2018, pp. 148–156 and pl. XXIX–XXXII.
- THOMPSON 1934
- Thompson, H., *A Family Archive from Siut from Papyri in the British Museum Including an Account of a Trial Before the Laocritae in the Year B.C. 170*, 2 vols., Oxford, 1934.
- TRAUNECKER 1992
- Traunecker, C., *Coptos. Hommes et dieux sur le parvis de Geb*, OLA 43, Leuven, 1992.
- UGGETTI 2016
- Uggetti, L., “The God Djeme”, *RdE* 67, 2016, pp. 157–175.
- UGGETTI 2020a
- Uggetti, L., “Attention aux scribes ! Variantes, différences et raccourcissements délibérés dans les protocoles des papyrus du II<sup>ème</sup>–début du I<sup>er</sup> siècle”, in G. Gorre, S. Wackenier (eds.), *Quand la fortune du royaume ne dépend pas de la vertu du prince: un renforcement de la monarchie lagide de Ptolémée VI à Ptolémée X?*, StudHell 59, Paris, 2020, pp. 71–94.
- UGGETTI 2020b
- Uggetti, L., “Scribes in Ptolemaic Djême: the Family of Harsiësis and Chestephnachthis”, *ChronEg* 95/189, 2020, pp. 42–67.


- UGGETTI 2021  
 Uggetti, L., “Deir el-Medina Ptolemaic Papyri: The Archive of Totoes”, in P. Del Vesco, C. Greco, F. Poole, S. Töpfer (eds.), *Deir el-Medina Through the Kaleidoscope. Proceedings of the Turin International Workshop*, Turin, 2021 (in press).
- VANDORPE 2009  
 Vandorpe, K., “Archives and Dossiers”, in R.S. Bagnall (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology*, Oxford, New York, 2009, pp. 216–255.
- VANDORPE, QUACK 2018  
 Vandorpe, K., Quack, J.F., “Drei demotische Papyri aus der Sammlung des Übersee-Museums Bremen”, in K. Donker Van Heel, F.A.J. Hoogendijk, C.J. Martin (eds.), *Hieratic, Demotic and Greek Studies and Text Editions. Of Making Many Books There is No End: Festschrift in Honour of Sven P. Vleeming*, P.L.Bat. 34, Leiden, 2018, pp. 249–256 and pl. XLI–XLIII.
- VANDORPE, CLARYSSE 2019  
 Vandorpe, K., Clarysse, W., “Cults, Creeds, and Clergy in a Multicultural Context”, in K. Vandorpe (ed.), *A Companion to Greco-Roman and Late Antique Egypt*, Hoboken, 2019, pp. 407–427.
- VINSON 2006/2007  
 Vinson, S., “The Demotic ‘Regnal Year’ Group as *hsb*, ‘Reckoning’”, *Enchoria* 30, 2006/2007, pp. 151–154.
- VITELLI 1929  
 Vitelli, G., “Nuovi documenti greci tolemaici del Museo di Torino”, in G. Vitelli, M. Norsa (eds.), *Papiri greci e latini. Volume nono, n.º 1001-1096*, Papiri greci e latini 9, Florence, 1929, pp. 15–35.
- VITTMANN 1983  
 Vittmann, G., “Eine genealogische Inschrift der Spätzeit im Tempel von Luxor”, *SAK* 10, 1983, pp. 325–332 and pl. XXa.
- VITTMANN 1987  
 Vittmann, G., “Drei thebanische Urkunden aus dem Jahre 175 v.Chr.”, *Enchoria* 15, 1987, pp. 97–146 and pl. 13–23.
- VITTMANN 1998  
 Vittmann, G., *Der demotische Papyrus Rylands 9. Teil II. Kommentare und Indizes*, ÄAT 38, Wiesbaden, 1998.
- VLEEMING 1987  
 Vleeming, S.P., “A Dromos Tax”, *Enchoria* 15, 1987, pp. 147–154 and pl. 24.
- VLEEMING 2001  
 Vleeming, S.P., *Some Coins of Artaxerxes and Other Short Texts in the Demotic Script Found on Various Objects and Gathered from Many Publications*, StudDem 5, Leuven, Paris, Sterling, 2001.
- VLEEMING 2010  
 Vleeming, S.P., *The Berichtigungsliste of Demotic Documents in A.D. 2007-9*, Brauneberg, 2010.
- WÄNGSTEDT 1954  
 Wängstedt, S.V., *Ausgewählte demotische Ostraka aus der Sammlung des Victoria-Museums zu Uppsala und der Staatlichen Papyrussammlung zu Berlin*, Uppsala, 1954.
- WÄNGSTEDT 1965  
 Wängstedt, S.V., *Die demotischen Ostraka der Universität zu Zürich*, BEURU 62, Uppsala, Wiesbaden, Haag, Geneva, 1965.
- WILCKEN 1913  
 Wilcken, U., “Referate. Papyrus-Urkunden. II/II. P. Eleph. und P. Eleph. dem.”, *APF* 5, 1913, pp. 200–217.
- ZAUZICH 1968  
 Zauzich, K.-T., *Die ägyptische Schreibertradition in Aufbau, Sprache und Schrift der demotischen Kaufverträge aus Ptolemäischer Zeit*, 2 vols., ÄgAbh 19, Wiesbaden, 1968.
- ZAUZICH 1973  
 Zauzich, K.-T., “Korrekturvorschläge zur Publikation des demotischen Archivs von Deir el-Medineh (Schluß) (Fortsetzung von Heft 2, 1972, 85-95)”, *Enchoria* 3, 1973, pp. 63–70.
- ZAUZICH 1976  
 Zauzich, K.-T., “Die schlimme Geschichte von dem Mann der Gottesmutter, der ein Gespenst war”, *Enchoria* 6, 1976, pp. 79–82.

## ZAUZICH 1987

Zauzich, K.-T., “Das topographische Onomastikon im P. Kairo 31169”, *GöttMisz* 99, 1987, pp. 83–91.


## ZAUZICH 1996

Zauzich, K.-T., “Anchsheschonqi – eine Lehre für den Schreiber?”, in M. Schade-Busch (ed.), *Wege öffnen. Festschrift für Rolf Gundlach zum 65. Geburtstag*, *ÄAT* 35, Wiesbaden, 1996, pp. 376–384.




© Museo Egizio, Turin

PL. 1. P.Tor.Botti 34 A = P. Turin Suppl. 6102 r<sup>o</sup> = TM 45106. W. x H.: 20,5 x 28,5 cm.




© Museo Egizio, Turin

Pl. 2. P.Tor.Botti 34 B = P.Turin Suppl. 6100 r°  
= TM 47146. W. x H.: 8 x 28,5 cm.



© Museo Egizio, Turin

Pl. 3. P.Tor.Botti 40 = P. Turin Suppl. 6096 r° = TM 45111.  
W. x H.: 9 x 21 cm.



© Museo Egizio, Turin

Pl. 4. P.Tor.Botti 36 = P. Turin Suppl. 6085 r<sup>o</sup> = TM 45108. W. × H.: 33,5 × 32,5 cm.

