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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 Totoès, *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.
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RÉSUMÉ


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

**O**nly 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. Among the known cases, one can mention the Graeco-Demotic papers of the praktôr Milôn: 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. 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. 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 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). A similar discovery in analogous circumstances was made in 1962 in Tuna el-Gebel by Cairo University, yielding the bilingual archive of Teôs son of Hôros.
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. 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. 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 Zmanrès and to his wife Tatehathyris.

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, 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; then, in 1967, the Demotic texts by Giuseppe Botti. 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.

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

10 Reich 1936, pp. 14-20; 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° 1.
11 TM Arch 248.
12 Uggetti 2021.
13 Vitelli 1929, pp. 15–35.
15 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. The only exception concerns P.Tor.Botti 35: Botti remarked that it enveloped a bundle of papyri and that P.Tor.Botti 34 B+C was one of them. 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. 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, P.W. Pestman traced back its origin to scroll number 18.

P.Tor.Botti 34 A and P.Tor.Botti 36 are legal documents, while P.Tor.Botti 34 B+C and P.Tor.Botti 40 are promissory temple oaths. All these documents were stored in the archive of Totoês because he belonged to one of the parties involved: nȝ ẖl-ʿy.w n pȝ rpy / n nȝ wʿb.w n Ḥw.t-Ḥr, “the presbyteroi (or elders) of the temple of the priests of Hathor”, usually six in number. The list of their members is preceded by the titles they all shared: wn-pr n Ḥm-nṯr n Ḥw.t ỉmnṱ, “pastophoros of Amun of Djême, divine servant of Hathor, mistress of the West”. Given that his name was mentioned either in first or in second place, 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.

16 Uggetti 2021.
17 P. Turin Suppl. 6109 = TM 45107.
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.
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 Hatsheshut in Deir el-Bahari, see Lanciers 2014, pp. 105–113.
29 On the transliteration of this word, see Chauveau 2020, pp. 4–10, pace Hoffmann, Quack 2014, pp. 127–147.
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 Łajtar 2006, p. 72.
The other party was composed of three brothers (in two instances, just one of them): Harsiësis (B), Amenôthês and Pikôs, sons of Chestephanachthis (B). They are introduced by the following titles: sh w-pr n ỉmn n Dm₂ bn-nfr n Hw.t-Hr bnw.t ỉmnḥ bn-nfr wɔ b wn-pr ḫw. 琇 nb.t shn nb n sh-nsw.t ỉmn-htp s Ḥp, “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”.

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 ỉȝw.t nb.t sḥn nb n sẖ-nsw.t.

A closer look at the content of the texts sheds more light on the matter.

2. \textit{P. Tor. Botti 34 A: A DISCHARGE FROM PREVIOUS AGREEMENTS} \[\text{FIG. I; PL. I}\]

The first document in chronological order is \textit{P. Tor. Botti 34 A}: it bears the date of Tybi 1 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.

Albeit not made explicit by the text, it is possible to determine that it is a copy, because the formula that cuts short the protocol is attested in other Demotic documents that are clearly duplicates.

\begin{enumerate}
\item For the letters given to the members of this family, see Uggetti 2020b, pp. 60–62.
\item Zauzich 1973, p. 65; Botti 1967, vol. 1, pp. 174 and 181 transliterated \textit{qub.t}.
\item \textit{P. Tor. Botti} 34 A, ll. 5–8; \textit{P. Tor. Botti} 36, ll. 6–8. See Łajtar 2006, pp. 72 and 75; Hoffmann, Quack 2014, pp. 144–145; Kato 2019, p. 137.
\item Wb II, p. 413.12–26; DemGloss, pp. 256–257.
\item \textit{P. Tor. Botti} 34 A, l. 10; \textit{P. Tor. Botti} 35, l. 1; \textit{P. Tor. Botti} 36, l. 8 and v, l. 1; \textit{P. Tor. Botti} 40, ll. 7 and 13.
\item As already noted by Zauzich 1968, vol. 1, pp. 209–210, n° 38.
\end{enumerate}
The original, if not a reciprocal receipt issued by the *presbyteroi*, was probably given to one of the three sons of Chestepnachthis (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. The body of the text reads as follows.

---

Figure 1. *P.Tor.Botti* 34 A = *P. Turin Suppl. 6102 r* = TM 45106. W. × H.: 20,5 × 28,5 cm (detail).

---

[44] A similar process can be found in Roman Soknopaiou Nësos: *P.Dime* II 56–69. See Lippert, Schentuleit 2006, p. 4.


We are paid in full for this bꜣk-document which you drew up for Chestephnachthis son of Harsiêsis, our father, regarding these 17 talents, and (for) every bꜣk-document and every sb-document which you drew up, and (for) every maintenance expenditure and every expense which he previously made in the temple of Hathor, until regnal year 17 which corresponds to regnal year 14, Choiak, last day, and (for) those which we made ourselves until regnal year 17 which corresponds to regnal year 14, Choiak, last day, the date already mentioned above. There is nothing on account of which we have a claim on you, whereas you are paid in full for silver, gold, grain, copper, clothing, all and everything of which he took delivery, namely Chestephnachthis son of Harsiêsis, our father, and (for) that which we took delivery of ourselves until regnal year 17 which corresponds to regnal year 14, Choiak, last day, at (the rate of) 24 obols

47 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.
49 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 . T OR . 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.
50 This formula, in the variant i.ir iy n-dr.t-k, is found in discharge receipts from Soknopaiou Nênos: P .DIME II 56–60, 63–65 and 67–68. See LIPPERT, SCHENTULEIT 2006, p. 3.
The purpose of this $\text{ṣf}$-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 $\text{ḥbk}$ and $\text{ṣḥ}$, drawn up for their father Chestephnachthis (B) by the presbyteroi, especially a $\text{ḥbk}$-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).\(^{52}\)

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. \textit{P.\text{Tor.}Botti} 34 B+C: A PROMISSORY TEMPLE OATH

The second papyrus to be analysed is \textit{P.\text{Tor.}Botti} 34 B+C: an oath by Amun-of-the-Ogdoad.\(^{53}\) 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 \textit{P.\text{Tor.}Botti} 34 A. According to Botti’s publication, text B is the one on the recto.

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

\(^{52}\) Kato 2019, p. 143.

Fig. 2. *P.Tor.Botti* 34 B = P. Turin Suppl. 6100 = TM 47146. W. x H.: 8 x 28.5 cm (detail).
By Amun-of-the-Øgdoad who dwells here and every god who dwells here with him! We act in your interest. We will not go against your interest from regnal year 17 which corresponds to regnal year 14, Tybi, day 1 onwards. We act in the interest of the temple of Hathor. We are entitled to assert a claim against you and your brothers during these 5 years, with regard to which we have drawn up for you a fiduciary agreement from regnal year 17 which corresponds to regnal year 14, Tybi, day 1 onwards. We will not commit any offence to cause the temple of Hathor to suffer loss. We will not take sides against you during these 5 years. The one who will act against the interest of the temple, we will act against their (sic!) interest.
On the verso of the same papyrus (text C), Amenôtês son of Têos made an addition.

\[ \text{[1] } pȝ \text{ rmṯ nty } īw⸗f hpr hn pȝ} \\
\text{[2] } ʿs-shn bin n ṣrw.d.w} \\
\text{[3] } īrm pȝ rpy īw⸗n (r) hpr} \\
\text{[4] } bn ʿpȝyṣf ʿs-shn bin} \\
\text{[5] } īrm nȝyṣw ʿry.w} \\
\text{[6] } śhṣō

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

Even if there had been prior arguments between the parties, the discharge contained in \text{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 \text{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. \text{P.Tor.Botti 34 A}, ll. 19–21 did not specify the previous time span taken into account, while \text{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.

4. **P.Tor.Botti 36: A Fiduciary Agreement Concerning Collection-Boxes**

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, 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. 26–27.62

![Fig. 4](https://www.ifao.egnet.net)

**Fig. 4.** *P.Tor.Botti* 36 = P. Turin Suppl. 6085 r° = TM 45108. W. × H.: 33.5 × 32.5 cm (detail).

---

[13] *shn-in nȝ y ḫt.t ẖn ḫfr n pȝ ḫy n ḫw.t-Hr*

[14] *ḥn ḫt. t ḫy n pȝ ḫmy hr n ḫy n ḫsbt 17 (i.)ṛ ṯ ḫsbt 14 ḫpy pr(.) sw-1 ḫ ḫsbt 22 (i.)ṛ ṯ ḫsbt 19*

[13] You entrusted to me the collection-box of the forecourt of the temple of Hathor 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.

---

62 Uggetti 2020b, pp. 55, 61 and 64.
64 On the translation of the term as “forecourt” in the specific architectonical context of the temple of Deir el-Medina, that never had a frontal *dromos*, see Uggetti 2016, pp. 169–170, n. 71.
65 For the expression *ḥr n ḫy n*, whose Coptic equivalent is ḫn-jn (CRUM 1939, p. 773), see the note by Mark Smith in Vleeming 2010, p. 29.
the agents of hathor in \textit{p.tor.botti} and the ptolemaic temple of deir el-medina

[15] \textit{ibd-4 šh.t sw 'rqy r rnp.t št r ibd 60 2/3 i/6} \textit{r rnp.t št n mtw=y}^{67} \textit{ir n ṣdy.w n p ḫm}

[16] \textit{r ḫ(t).t p₂ ṣnḥ hr rnp.t n n₂ ssuw nnty hr}

\textit{mtw=y dl.t p₂y=tn 1/4 n n₂ ḫd.w n₂ prtw}

[17] \textit{nty iws=w r ḫr r-dt.t₂ y hr Huw.t-Hr n n₂ ssuw nnty hr} \textit{ibd mtw=y ir p₂ ky 1/2 1/4}

[18] \textit{n ḫy he hr.t mi-nn r-h(t).t p₂ ṣnḥ hr rnp.t}

\textit{irm n₂ ḫd.w n₂ nbw.w nnty iws=w r dl.t st}

[19] \textit{r ḫd=ō² I n nbw r t₂ gsw.t n Huw.t-Hr iws}

\textit{bn-iws=y ir ḫy he iws.ty šn=tn}

[20] \textit{mtw=y in p₂ ḫp n Huw.t-Hr i, ir-hr=tn n p₂}

\textit{hrw nty i, i=tn r Šn.ṭ=y r-rf}

[21] \textit{n-imš I n-n² w ḫsb.t 22 (I.)ir ir ḫsb.t 19}

\textit{ibd-4 šh.t sw 'rqy p₂ mnq n t₂ rnp.t št nty}

\textit{hr y hr}

[22] \textit{mtw=y šṣ² n₂ 'ft.t.w nnty hr y hr-tn}

\textit{mtw=tn Šhn.ṭ=y w n p₂ ḫmṯ nty i, i=tn r mr}

\textit{ṣm.ṭ=w}

[23] \textit{n=š ḫn-iws=y ḫr dd Šhn p₂y iws ṣwb=s frnp.t}

\textit{mtw=y ir n=tn r-h.t,t²=f n ssbw nb}

[15] Choiak, last day, that is 5 years, that is 65/6 months, that is again 5 years. And I shall attend to the collection\textsuperscript{68} of the village\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{18} for maintenance expenditures, expenses and provisions likewise\textsuperscript{70} according to the custom every year, and the silver and the gold which will be given\textsuperscript{19} for covering with gold the shrine of Hathor, while I will not make maintenance expenditures or expenses without asking you.\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{21} 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.

\textsuperscript{66} For the reading of this group of fractions, see Nims 1938, p. 241, n. g; Chauveau 1986, pp. 26-27, n. to l. 11.2; CDD Numbers, p. 300.

\textsuperscript{67} 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.

\textsuperscript{68} On the term ṣdy, specifically used in Theban receipts from the reigns of Claudius and Nero for the “collection of the god”, see Spiegelberg 1918, pp. 116-120; Matthia 1945, p. 154; Wängstedt 1954, pp. 40 and 122-126; Wängstedt 1965, p. 21, n° ii, n. to l. 2; Clarysse, Winnicki 1989, p. 46; Klotz 2009, p. 252; Klotz 2012, pp. 296-297; Lanciers 2015, p. 380.

\textsuperscript{69} Despite the arguments advanced by Colin 2016, p. 55, n. 7 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 \textit{mi-nn} after \textit{ḥnt}, “and provisions likewise”, especially if compared to the formula \textit{ḥy nb ḫn nb}, “every maintenance expenditure and every expense”, used in a similar context in \textit{P.Tor.Botti} 34 A, ll. 18-19.

\textsuperscript{70} On the translation, see Pestman 1963, p. 14, n. 1; Jasnow 1982, pp. 18-20, n. f; Colin 2016, p. 55.

\textsuperscript{71} 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; Chauveau 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 \textit{r}.
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 in front of Hathor and will give another 3,000 deben for the holocausts of the sovereigns, while one can still assert a claim against him in order to force 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 1 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.72

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):73 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 PCair. II 30699, l. 8.74 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.75 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).76 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 prêktör Milôn in PEleph. 10 and 11 for the great temple of Edfou).77
5. *P.Tor.Botti* 40: THE PROMISSORY TEMPLE OATH RELEVANT TO *P.Tor.Botti* 36

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. The text is neither signed nor dated, but it was without doubt prepared on the same day as the legal document it correlates with.

---

**Fig. 5.** *P.Tor.Botti* 40 = P. Turin Suppl. 6096 r° = TM 45111.

W. × H.: 9 × 21 cm (detail).

---

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

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 82, showing a gap in the middle for the passage of the string that was tied around the bundle.

---

80 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.

81 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 Ḏ, p. 6.

82 KATO 2019, p. 138.
The fiduciary agreement of the agents of Hathor, the discharge and the document of oath.

\[1\] \(P\ \text{wy}\) 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 \(b\\&k\)-documents and \(sh\)-documents, and are now lost, between Chestephnachthis (B) and the presbyteroi of the priests of Hathor. \(P\ \text{shn}\ n\ nECT\ \text{rw}d.w\ \text{n Hv}w.t-Hr\) 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. \(P\ \text{bk} n\ \text{nh}\) 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 Totoës: 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 \(nECT\ \text{rw}d.w\) 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 Totoës’ 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 \(\text{rw}d\) 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 \(\text{rw}d\), “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 \(P\ \text{rw}d\ \text{nECT} \text{rw}d.w\ \text{nECT} \text{ft}(.t)\ \text{nECT} \text{ft}w.w\), “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 (Ḫnsw-tȝy⸗f-nḫṱ.t), written with the feminine ending after nḫṱ and the seated man as a determinative,⁸³ and of Snachomneus (Ns-nȝy⸗w-Ḥmn.w-ỉw), with two divine standards (the one behind Ḥmn.w, the other at the end) and the final element ỉw drawn as two curved lines and a third, vertical stroke,⁸⁴ can be found only in texts of 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.⁸⁵ 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chestephnachthis (Ḫnsw-tȝy⸗f-nḫṱ.t)</th>
<th>Snachomneus (Ns-nȝy⸗w-Ḥmn.w-ỉw)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P.Tor.Botti 34 A</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Tor.Botti 36 v⁴</td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Tor.Botti 36 r⁵</td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Tor.Botti 40</td>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Tor.Botti 34 B</td>
<td><img src="image9" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image10" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

⁸⁵ 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 Teós. In l. 2 of *P.Tor.Botti* 34 C, he employed the title detained in common by Haršiēsis (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 *rwḏ*, “agent”. The comparison with the word *bîn*, “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 *rwḏ*, “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 *sḥn*, “fiduciary agreement; lease”, instead of the usual determinative, derived from the archaic form of the papyrus scroll with a stroke underneath[^86^], he chose the cobra, used for the homophone *sḥn*, “crown” (see Table 2).[^87^]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>P.Tor.Botti</em> 34 A</th>
<th>Agent (<em>rwḏ</em>)</th>
<th>Fiduciary Agreement; Lease (<em>sḥn</em>)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Agent (rwḏ)" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Fiduciary Agreement; Lease (sḥn)" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>P.Tor.Botti</em> 36 v°</th>
<th>Agent (<em>rwḏ</em>)</th>
<th>Fiduciary Agreement; Lease (<em>sḥn</em>)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Agent (rwḏ)" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Fiduciary Agreement; Lease (sḥn)" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>P.Tor.Botti</em> 40</th>
<th>Agent (<em>rwḏ</em>)</th>
<th>Fiduciary Agreement; Lease (<em>sḥn</em>)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Agent (rwḏ)" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Fiduciary Agreement; Lease (sḥn)" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>P.Tor.Botti</em> 35</th>
<th>Agent (<em>rwḏ</em>)</th>
<th>Fiduciary Agreement; Lease (<em>sḥn</em>)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Agent (rwḏ)" /></td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Fiduciary Agreement; Lease (sḥn)" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


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 Nêos which cover periods that start and stop roughly at the beginning or at the end of a month, possibly in connection with audit dates.\(^{88}\) 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),\(^{89}\) 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.\(^{90}\)

Soknopaiou Nêos 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” (*p₂ ruḏ n₂ wˁ b.w*) “for the (amounts of) money (which) you raised from the collection of year 37”\(^{91}\): this implies that collecting money and other items for the manage-

---


\(^{89}\) Uggetti 2020b, pp. 48–49, 53–56, 60–61 and 64.

\(^{90}\) Uggetti 2020a, pp. 76–79; Uggetti 2020b, pp. 60–65.

\(^{91}\) *P.Oxf.Griffith* 72, l. 5: *ḥr n₂ bd.w *rwḏ̀ nb 12 wpy.t bḥt 37 (Sandra L. Lippert, personal communication).
ment of the temple was one of the agent’s main tasks. This is confirmed by *POxf.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.92

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 Djémé. *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.93 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 Totoès, 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.94 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 υπὸ and ἅπε 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 υπὸ, “expense” for ἅπε.95 Recently, K.-T. Zauzich questioned the meaning proposed for υπὸ in the edition of *P.Fam.Theb.* 30 and suggested equating υπὸ and ἅπε and to translate both as “expenditure”.96 Even

---

92 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 *POxf.Griffith* 61 and 72, for the reading of *POxf.Griffith* 72 and for all the precisions concerning Soknopaiou Néso’s temple staff in the Graeco-Roman Period.

93 A search for this formula, combining the occurrences of the words sṯȝ.ṱ and tm, on the website of the *Thesaurus Linguae Aegyptiae* (query 2) has given no higher amounts.

94 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.

95 Hughes, Nims 1940, pp. 247–248; Hughes 1957, p. 60; *CDD H*, pp. 4–11.

96 Thissen†, Zauzich 2018, p. 151, n. to l. 1.
though he admitted that the best solution for *rmt.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.* 30.97

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.98 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;99 besides him, there were the agents of Djême (to be understood here as the god Amun-of-the-Ogdoad, patron deity of the sanctuary),100 who were probably responsible for the job.101

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,102 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.103 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.104 The cartouches on the entrance portal of the sanctuary were left empty,105 while its enclosure gate was embellished during the reign of Ptolemy XII Neos Dionysos.106 Finally, a small mud-brick contra-temple was built and decorated under Augustus.107 A structure attached to the lateral wall of the main sanctuary’s southern chapel, composed of two

97 Thissen1, Zauzich 2018, pp. 149–151.
98 It is always the case for this term, usually written as *g(.t);* Colin 2016, pp. 47, 52 and 56.
100 Uggetti 2016, pp. 157–175.
101 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.
102 Bourguet1 2008, pp. 16, 22, 32, 54 and 76. For a summary of the different building phases of this temple, see Montserrat, Miskell 1997, p. 182.
104 Bourguet1 2008, pp. 29–31, 36, 38, 91 and 96.
106 Bourguet1 2008, p. 177.
vaulted rooms of mud-bricks, is commonly called “mammisi”. 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 Sōtēr II; 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 sm2-kw-representation.

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 Sōtēr II 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. 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, who was in charge of the building of the barque of Isis, of enclosure walls for Isis, Geb and Harpokrates, of gates for Geb, of a ceiling in the temple of Coptos and of monuments for different deities. It is no accident that he held the title of pȝ rwḏ (n) Ṭ((t) (Qbt) in Demotic, προστάτης Ἰσίδος in Greek: “the agent of Isis (of Coptos)”.

---

108 Daumas 1958, pp. 43–44 considered the surviving inscriptions on this structure not specific enough to call the latter “mammisi”.
110 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.
113 Klotz 2009, p. 254 and Klotz 2012, pp. 296–297 argued that a group of Greek and Demotic λογεία-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) confined 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 Pianamounis son of Pekysis, who acted as collector of the abovementioned contributions and called himself in the Demotic ostraca O.Zürich 11 and O.Mattha 187 as pȝ rwḏ n pȝ nṯr, while in the Greek texts PSI III 262, O.Cair. 76, O.Wilck. II 412, 414, 418, 420 and 421 as προστάτης (τοῦ) βασιλέως, both translatable as “the agent of the god”.
114 Short Texts I 183.
116 Short Texts I 186 and 199.
118 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.
120 Short Texts I 182, 185, 186 and 198.
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