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JENNIFER CROMWELL

Identifying New Scribes in Old Documents:
P.KRU 34 and 55

(Tafel 7–9)

Thebes during the early Islamic period provides an excellent opportunity to study the work of Coptic scribes in the main village in the area, Djeme (Medinet Habu). Not only is there a vast amount of written material dating to the 7th and 8th centuries, many documents are signed, allowing the study of the dossiers of individual scribes. At the time of their original publication, some of these scribes were not identified. This includes the men who wrote *P.KRU* 34 and 55. Re-examination of these papyri corrects this situation, enabling the two men responsible – Paulos son of Kabiou and Shenoute son of Elias – to be added to the growing number of known scribes and writers from this region. This study includes new editions, commentaries, and the first published images of both documents.

Of the Coptic documents from Djeme¹ published as *P.KRU*, 36 are listed as anonymous – that is, they are unsigned and the editor could not attribute them to known scribes.² Re-examination of several of these documents changes this situation. Two documents in the collection of the Bodleian Library, Oxford, which were published as ‘anonymous’, do in fact preserve the name of the scribe responsible for them: *P.KRU* 34 and 55. The second of these was not available to the editor of the texts, Walter Ewing Crum, who instead incorporated the text based on an unpublished transcription, which will be discussed further below. This paper provides the opportunity for complete new editions of these texts, correcting various mistakes in the originals (including the non-identification of the scribes involved), accompanied by the first published images of these papyri.³ In so doing, it improves the current state of knowledge of scribes from 8th century Thebes.

¹ The village built in and around Medinet Habu, which was the site of a bustling Coptic community during the 7th and 8th centuries CE. For a general introduction to the site, see T.G. Wilfong, *Women of Jeme: Lives in a Coptic Town in Late Antique Egypt*, Ann Arbor, 2002, p. 1–22.
² See *P.KRU* Index V “Schreiber”. I use the term ‘scribe’ here in a general sense, neither as an indication of the writer’s proficiency nor as a professional title.
³ W.C. Till, *Datierung und Prosopographie der koptischen Urkunden*, Wien, 1962, p. 12 was the first to note that many of the early editions of Coptic documentary texts (which remain the sole publications of most of this material) contain mistakes and that while those by Crum (e.g. *P.KRU*) are the most dependable they are not error free. This was repeated by H. Förster, “Corrigenda zu *P.KRU*,” in: *GM* 179, 2000, p. 107, who does not, though, provide corrections for either *P.KRU* 34 or 55.

*Enchoria* 34, 2014/15
1. P.KRU 34

Paulos son of Kabiou

MS.Copt.e.8(P) 125 mm (w) × 105 mm (h)
15.01.713³ 18 mm (w) × 23 mm (h)

The text does not refer to this document as a deed of sale (промыш/πράσις), but simply as a papyrus-document (χαρτ/χάρτης). It records a transaction involving a silver item, the nature of which is unclear (see commentary to l. 3). This appears not to be a true sale but the confirmation of an earlier sale: there is no sale price and a lack of standard formulae, as found in longer documents, with the acknowledgement of payment followed by heavily abbreviated clauses.⁶

The document is written on a small rectangle of papyrus and the text fills the entire surface, from edge to edge, with only the bottom 15 mm left empty. There are three holes in the top centre, which have destroyed part of the text here, and smaller holes throughout the rest of the papyrus. The left edge is intact, but the fibres of the first five lines are frayed. The right margin is not preserved; a small rectangular fragment (18 mm wide) belongs to the end of lines 1–5, but this does not provide all the lost text. Based on the approximate amount missing, the papyrus’ width would have been at least 180 mm originally.

The same person, Paulos son of Kabiou (see below), wrote the entire document. The hand is a competent bilinear, which is somewhat untidy in places, with few ligatures. Lines are written closely together, possibly due to the small size of the papyrus. The scribe makes consistent use of diacritics (the superlinear stroke and diaeresis), which are omitted in the ed. princ.

---


⁵ For this date, see the commentary to l. 13.

Recto

1. [+] άνοκ ήρτυρία τουερ ειβικτοι τριξ[νυ νειεί]
2. [η]ψερναιας πανμε νιναυς πριξνυ ναμ[ος νουυτ αι]
3. τη [±3] κων τοκ ετο νιναχωνι νικαλη ηακ […]
4. [να]λι ντρπομος νιν εκναυωει εισειτε[…]
5. ραθω ιναχοφ ηατ ετινης εβε ανοκ [ειν νααυ νρον]
6. ενερε ιναπρακοουινοι ντεν κερη γνλαγη ηι[…]
7. [ε]ροι ντανε καλ νελοκο, ννρντινου νντα[ει εροην νταρν]
8. επιμαρτυς εναερ αινθτπεγραφου νορ [ρα … ρι–]
9. ηι νιν εκανθπανιε ιναο ιναλ ανχ[νοι αρνανοει]
10. γος προκο, ανοκ ναρτυρια τετάνπριρα[ιε [εις τοιεκε ανοκ]
11. παλοκ καθο νριξνι ανπαρκαλει [νινο αιεοι …]
12. ινουκ ιντοβε ιτρομπε ιτεκαθυς ινα, ιξ […]
13. αεκανιου ινπτρος ηι ιναρτυρος + αεκα[ειο …]

Verso

15. […] ενγραφου ιταναρτυρια εραν ιπερναιε γανε[νακ]
16. ηατ ιταμγαονον


Recto

“[+] I, Martyria the daughter of Victor, from Dj[eme am writing to] Jeremias the son of Moses, from Djeme, in the n[ome … I sold to you] my silver ρατο-item, as you have given its pric[e] to me […] item. You are its owner, and keep it […] (5) [and u]se it in any way that you want. If I [sue you] about that silver item, either me o[r anyone] acting as my representative, any time, in any […] me, and I give 2 holokottinoi as the fine and [enter into and comply with] this document. As a surety, I have drawn up this document. It is se[cure … in] (10) every place in which it may be produced. [I] was a[sked, I agreed], as laid out.
I, the abovementioned Martyria [sign.] She asked [me], Paulos (son of) Kabiou, from Djeme [and I wrote …] 20th Tobe, year 11, (i.e.) indiction 11. […]
(I), Athanasios (son) of Petros, am witness. + Athan[asios …”

Verso
“[…] the document that Martyria wrote for Jeremias concerning her silver [item] that he had purchased.”

1. This is the only attestation of Martyria daughter of Victor.\(^7\)

1\&2. τ-/π-ῥηχήσεως is rare in papyrus documents, as ῥηχή is mostly referred to in full as καστορνή (passim. P.KRU). Only P.KRU 59.2–3 otherwise uses this when introducing the two parties (λυκὸς σοϕερής ῥηχής, παράν προς τον ευήμερο ῥηχής παράμεσος ῥηχής “I, Souai son of the late Pacham from Tsê, write to Phanè son of Petros from Djeme). There are two further examples where this construction is used by witnesses: P.KRU 37.117–8 (… ῥηχής “from Djeme”) and 75.100 (… πρύμνητ παλ ετοιμή ἤνοι ῥηχής, “… from Ermont, now living in Djeme”). However, it is more common in ostraca, where reduced formulae are required due to the lack of available space. The small size of this papyrus would therefore account for the abridged writing.\(^8\)

1. [ὡςῷ] is reconstructed without hesitation in the ed. princ., immediately after ῥηχής. However, as the toponym following Jeremias’ name is expanded at the end of l. 2 with ἐπιστομὸς …, it is possible that the same expansion was required here, in which case the lacuna should also include ἐπιστομὸς ἐρμοιωτ, or variations thereof. Against this suggestion are the lengths of the suggested reconstructions in the lacunae of ll. 6, 8, 10 and 11, which, if correct, indicate that nothing else is in fact lost.

2. This is the only attestation of Jeremias son of Moses.\(^9\)

2. πι[ομός ηοὐωντ], “the same nome”, or πι[ομός ἐπιστομὸς ἐρμοιωτ], “of the city Ermont”, or both, are expected, but there only appears to be room for the former.

2–3. Only the adverb, ἐβολ, survives of the statement of sale. οἱτ ἦκ ἐβολ, “I sold to you”, is preferable to ἐτ ἦκ ἐβολ, “I sell / am selling to you”, in a document confirming

---

\(^7\) W.C. Till, Datierung und Prosopographie, p. 138.
\(^8\) My thanks to Richard Burchfield (Macquarie) for supplying me with his statistics concerning the distribution of this location designator in Theban texts, as taken from his recently completed PhD thesis (Macquarie University).
\(^9\) W.C. Till, Datierung und Prosopographie, p. 105.
a sale after the fact. The following use of the circumstantial I Perfect, ḫⲥⲧⲥ in l. 3, supports this. However, it must be borne in mind that in sale documents, while the declaration of sale is in the present tense, the money is always recorded as having already been handed over; cf. e.g. P.KRU 9: ḫⲥ ⲅⲟⲩ Ⲇⲭ ⲟⲩⲧ “I am selling to you” (l. 32–3), ⲏⲡⲣⲓⲉ ⲏ Ⲥⲧ ⲓⲡⲁ̀ⲧ Ⲇⲭ ⲡⲟⲩⲧ “as you have given me its price, from hand to hand” (l. 81–2). The situation is therefore not clear-cut.

3. In the original publication, the editor Walter Crum labelled this the sale of a silver “Gerät” while Till referred to it by the more generic “Gegenstand,” but left the term untranslated, as Schop, in his translation. Only Wilfong provides a slightly more precise definition, as “jewellery”. CD 576b translates ṣⲟⲩⲣ as “a metal object, mostly of silver, necklet, bracelet”. In P.KRU 66.39–41 and 76.42–44 it appears amongst a list of objects inherited by three brothers from their grandmother: ṣⲟⲩⲣ ⲉⲧ ⲡⲟⲩⲩ ⲡⲟⲟⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲟⲟⲩ ⲡⲟⲟ ⲡⲟⲟⲟⲟⲩ ⲡⲟⲟ, etc., “three silver chains, three silver schop, three candlesticks, etc.”, in P.KRU 76.42–3 it is modified by ⲑⲧⲧⲧ, “bridal”; here, Till qualifies “Schōp” as “Schmuckstück”. The main text of P.KRU 30 records the transfer of a bridial gift (specifically, a house), but in an addendum to the text, which appears amongst the witness statements at the end, there is reference to a silver schop: ⲛⲧⲧⲧⲧ ⲡⲟⲩ ⲡⲟⲟⲩ ⲡⲟⲟ ⲡⲟⲟ ⲡⲟⲟ ⲡⲟⲟ, etc., “concerning the small silver schop that your father gave to my [mother …] no-one is able to sue her …” (P.KRU 30.34–5). The transfers of the objects occur from a woman to a man (P.KRU 34, 66, 76) and from a man to a woman (P.KRU 30). This provides no gender distinction to aid in identifying the object, e.g. as an object only used by women.

It is named in O.Crum 183.7 and 477.7, lists of various objects, both of which are too damaged to enable an identification of the item. Silver ṣⲟⲟⲣ-objects (ⲉⲣⲓⲟⲩ ⲉⲣⲓⲧ)
appear in a list of pledged articles, mainly of metal, in O.CrumST 439.5. But this does not serve to elucidate the matter, either. P.Mon.Epiph. 545 (ostracon) is an extract from a will containing yet another list of articles. While the function of the *schop* here listed is not described, its value is stated as 2 holokottinoi – ὀφθαλμός ἀργυρὸν ἀθηρόκολον (οὐτήμος) – a pricey sum!16 This is the same as the penalty recorded in the current document and, as the penalty was set at a higher price than the item in question (in order to act as a true deterrent for violating the deed), the price of the ὀφθαλμός in *P.KRU* is certainly less than this. The list also includes clothing, a mat, knives, bowls, and a candlestick, which is the second most expensive item, but half the cost of the ὀφθαλμός at only 1 holokottinos.17 Till translates it in this instance as “Armband”, providing yet another translation of the term, this time more precise still. In his translations we see the following progression: Schop > Schmuckstück > Armband (i.e. untranslated > general category > specific item). There is nothing in the text that indicates this is correct.

ὁφθαλμός also appears in O.Medin.HabuCopt. 28, an account containing names of men and women followed by measurements. Three measurements are included: μῆτρα (CD 176a) and μακρύς (CD 213a) are both grain measures, and ὀφθαλμός. While it is possible that this is in error for ὀφθαλμός, a unit of measure of four fingers, i.e. a palm (CD 574b), it may instead be connected with the ὀφθαλμός heretofore discussed. P.Mon.Epiph. 293.4 refers to a ὀφθαλμοκέρας, a compound comprising ὀφθαλμός and λακ, ‘bowl, cup’ (from λακός, CD 138a–b) as a measure, but the ostracon is incomplete and further details are lost.18 Could our ὀφθαλμός also refer to a unit of measure? If so, ὀφθαλμός may be a vessel of some kind, of a specific size, derived from a unit of measure. This is speculative, and it is questionable whether something so seemingly mundane would have such a high value, unless ‘vessel’ is taken to mean a chalice of

---

15 This list also includes other metal objects, in bronze (.lineWidth='1.3') ἔκκλης ἀργυρίων; ὀψαρίς [Π]υροζώνιτι; ὕκων Πυροζώνιτι [αἱ] and copper (ὦλακάς χαράκτ). L.S.B. MacCoul, in her discussion of this text, “Further Notes on ST 439,” ZPE 96 (1993), p. 229–233, treats ὀφθαλμός as “receptacle”.

16 This is on a par with the value of real estate from the village, where divisions of a house sell for less than this; cf. e.g. in P.KRU 13, one-quarter of two buildings is sold for only 1 holokottinos.

17 P.Mon.Epiph. 545.5–16: ὀφθάλμος ἀργυρόν ἀθηρόκολον λοτεῖ ἄλλαγας κεφαλὴς ἰδικής ἵππος εἰσὶν προτέρῳ ἰδίκαις ὑπέροχοις νομίζωσαν ὑπερβαίνοντο[ι] ἴδιον μοιλον ἔχαι[...] ἰδίκαιος στρατικὸς [ΟΥΝΤΕΡΙΛ]ίς ὑπερβαίνοντος ἴδιον. Καὶ ίδιον ἐπάνω ὑπερβαίνοντος ἰδίας ἴδιον δοκεῖσθαι ἵππον. “a silver ὀφθαλμός worth (lit. ‘for’) 2 holokottinoi; (a) valuable blanket (λόδιξ); (an)other 9 λίκνα of money; 2 women’s dyed garments; a candlestick, worth 1 holokottinos; a jug, worth 1 tremis; 10 (?) loaves; a mat [worth 1 tremis]; 10 knives; 9 bowls; a lau-blanket, worth half a holokottinos”. Cf. W.C. Till, Erbrechtliche Untersuchungen, p. 96–7.

18 Only a description is provided of P.Mon.Epiph. 293, a letter involving women. In this, Crum notes the measure as on l. 5, but consultation of the original (available on the Metropolitan Museum of Art’s online catalogue, http://www.metmuseum.org/collections/) shows that ὀφθαλμοκέρας is at the end of l. 4.
some description. In this light, the translation most closely agrees with that suggested by MacCoull for O.CrumST 439, i.e. ‘receptacle’ (cf. n. 15).

I believe it most likely that in P.KRU 34 the term refers to a form of jewellery, but there do appear to be two different nouns, ϡⲱⲡ, in use at Thebes at this time, the second referring to a unit of measure or container of some kind. With this in mind, I have adopted a generic translation here.

3–4. MacCoull reconstructs the lost text as “[I am selling] you my silver object. You gave its price to me; [I have transferred] the object [to you]” (note: the use of square brackets is my own to indicate reconstructed text). This ignores the circumstantial prefix е- and therefore its subordinate relationship with either what precedes or what follows.

5. ефαντε[…: Till supplies “Wenn ich [gegen dich auftrete] in Angelegenheit jenes silbernen Schop”. The usual idiom found at Djeme is either е- е overwhelmingly е- е- е- е- е-. This is not the case here, as τ- is certain, unless τ- is read as a mistake. If, е- is a mistake for е-, this is the prenominal prefix, ефαντε-, for which a parallel exists in P.KRU 4.64: ефαντεάχανυ е- е- е- е- “If my siblings sue you”.

6. ραψ is the most common variant found before ер е- ер ер ер е- ер ер ер ер ер “through another acting as my representative” (P.KRU 28.41); еион еион еион еион “the one who will proceed, acting as his representative” (P.KRU 68.80); ραψ еион еион еион еион еион eион “anybody, at all, coming after me, acting as my representative” (P.KRU 74.78–9). The last of these, or anything akin to it, is too long.

7. The closest parallel (presuming that the lacuna at the end of l. 5 refers to legal action against the second party) is P.KRU 45.49–50: нот ер ер ер “Any time, the one who will dare, in any time, sue you”. However, the switch to the first party as object at the beginning of l. 8 – е- е- ер ер – means that this is not applicable here.

8. Compliance with the original terms of the contract is standard at the end of the penal clause, following the financial penalty, and is typically expressed with the Conjunctive, as here. The most common formula is reconstructed here. The use of 1st person singular pronouns is again unusual.

19 L.S.B. MacCoull, Coptic Legal Documents, p. 60.
9. χο[πογ....] for χο[ν πεοει] (ed. princ.). This is another set formula in legal documents, which states the validity of the document and which normally comprises two or more elements. ν πεοει is found in initial position only in P.KRU 55.23–4 (ἀκεπειγεγραφον(ν) επο ν πεοει) and O.CrumST 429.8 (τεσσαρελα σογ δοει τε). When ν πεοει appears in second place, it is as a variant of στοιχ, which appears more frequently, and the two appear together only twice, in P.KRU 66.64 (σορια στοιχοι κο ν ξιτ) and 105.22 (ιπορια επεβαλου λο νεοσοιν επι ν πεοει). It is therefore unlikely, even without other parallels by this scribe, that ν πεοει is first; χορι is more probable.

10. The ed. princ. reconstructs ἀτοικει, but ἀρομολογει is expected in this formula (see the commentary to l. 13). ἀτοικει is, instead, expected in the lacuna at the end of l. 11 (see below).

11. προκο for προκ (ed. princ.).

11. τενταχωρπισα[ι] for τενταχωρπισα[ι] (ed. princ.): Following the relative I Perfect prefix, the pronominal subject was written as στο (3rd fem. sing.), but this was immediately corrected to στο (1st sing.), identifiable by its descending vertical stroke. Thus, “the one whom I already mentioned”, not “the one whom she already mentioned”.

11. The ed. princ. fails to reconstruct the text here. In P.KRU 7.59, the first party’s subscription reads: ἀνοικ χορον πορει ἀνώμαλος πενταχωρπει τη τεκτει “I, the above-mentioned Joseph, agree”. A variant of this – with or without mistakes (πενταχωρπει τη > πενταχωρπει τητε) – is expected here.

12. Paulos son of Kabiou is otherwise attested in O.Crum 166.5, but only in passing. As is noted above, the document is written in a single hand and Till already recognised Paulos as the scribe of this text, labelling him as N., that is “Urkundenschreiber”, even though he is not listed as such in P.KRU Index V (Schreiber).20 The identification of Paulos as the scribe is based on the reconstructed text from l. 12.

12. The use of παρακαλει (παρακαλεω) is often found where the help of a writing assistant has been sought, e.g. P.KRU 68.110 ἀκεπειγεγραφον ἰδιοικει προς σε πενταπαρακαλει ημιο “I drew up this document in accordance with what he begged of me”. This includes witnesses who could not sign by their own hand, e.g. P.KRU 65.96–7. Parallels with what survives here are found in O.Medin.HabuCopt 50.7–9 (ἀνταρχα εμει νεοι αεραι ἵπαξ τεα μαρτυρ αεραι ῥηουχοντε παοει “I was begged and I wrote by my hand. I bear


Enchoria 34, 2014/15
New Scribes in Old Documents: P.KRU 34 and 55

witness. I wrote on the 20th Paone”); 56.8–9 (ⲧⲁⲧⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁ ⲡⲓ ⲉⲃⲧ) “He begged me and I set up (i.e. drew up) the ostracon by my hand”); 58.19–20 (ⲧⲁⲧⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁ ⲡⲓ ⲉⲃⲧ ⲕⲧⲣⲟ ⲧⲉⲃⲧⲉ ⲧⲉⲃⲧⲉ “He begged me and I wrote for him”); O.Crum 222.20–1 (ⲧⲡⲧⲧⲧⲧⲡⲧⲧⲧⲧ ⲡⲓ ⲉⲃⲧⲉ ⲧⲉⲃⲧⲉ “He begged me and I wrote this tablet (ⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧ”). parakaléo is largely synonymous with aithéo, for which many more examples can be found. Of particular note is O.Crum 40.13–6, where it is also preceded by the date: ⲧⲉⲃⲧⲉ ⲡⲓ ⲉⲃⲧ ⲡⲧⲣⲧⲧⲣⲧⲧⲣⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧ ⲧⲉⲃⲧⲉ ⲧⲉⲃⲧⲉ “He asked me and [I] wrote the ostracon on 23rd Mechir, the 3rd indiction, and I bear witness”. It cannot be determined whether ⲡⲧⲣⲧⲧⲣⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧ ⲧⲉⲃⲧⲉ or ⲡⲧⲣⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧⲧ ⲧⲉⲃⲧⲉ ⲧⲉⲃⲧⲉ was written in the lacuna here.

13. ⲡⲧⲣⲧⲧⲧⲧ ⲡⲧⲣⲧⲧⲧⲧ ⲧⲉⲃⲧⲉ for ⲡⲧⲣⲧⲧⲧⲧ ⲡⲧⲣⲧⲧⲧⲧ ⲧⲉⲃⲧⲉ ⲧⲉⲃⲧⲉ (ed. princ.). The document is dated 15.01.713. An absolute date is given, despite the lack of attestations for all those mentioned in the text, based on the use of the old form of the Stipulationsklausel: ⲧⲉⲃⲧⲉ ⲧⲉⲃⲧⲉ ⲧⲉⲃⲧⲉ ⲧⲉⲃⲧⲉ ⲧⲉⲃⲧⲉ. This is deemed more secure than the only prosopographic evidence: Paulos son of Kabiu appears in O.Crum 166, in which Stephanos son of Johannes also appears. The latter is mentioned in P.KRU 119, but this is dated simply mid-8th century.22

14. This is the only attestation of Athanasios son of Petros.23

2. P.KRU 55\textsuperscript{24}

Shenoute son of Elias

MS.Copt.b.12 (P) 165 mm (w) × 390 mm (h)
07.10.720 (or 735)

P.KRU 55 records a settlement between business partners in the village. Georgios son of Matthias, the first party, reaches a settlement with Petros son of Komes, the second party,

\textsuperscript{21} W.C. TILL, “Die koptische Stipulationsklausel,” Orientalia 19, 1950, p. 82.
\textsuperscript{22} W.C. TILL, Datierung und Prosopographie, p. 22 and 41 for P.KRU 34 and 119 respectively.
\textsuperscript{23} W.C. TILL, Datierung und Prosopographie, p. 65.
\textsuperscript{24} Translations of this text can be found in: W.C. TILL, Die koptischen Rechtsurkunden, p. 137–8, and L.S.B. MACCOULL, Coptic Legal Documents, p. 68–9. The document first appeared as P.Brit.Mus.Copt. I 437, which provides a description and partial translation.

\textit{Enchoria} 34, 2014/15
concerning mutual business and payment owed by Petros to Georgios.\textsuperscript{25} No particulars concerning the arrangement, i.e. the amount of money owed by Petros, are recorded.

The document was known to Crum only on the basis of Goodwin’s earlier transcription (as is also the case with P.KRU 38 above), amongst whose notes it was labelled as “Joad I”. Consultation of the original shows that Goodwin’s transcription can be improved in several respects. Chief amongst these is the reading of the final line of the text, in which the scribe wrote his signature. This is not an anonymous document, as it appears to be in the ed. princ.

The papyrus comprises three sheets, with joins at 15 and 185 mm from the top edge. The fibres of the top sheet, which bears no text, are horizontal, and so originally must have been the top sheet and borne the Arabic protocol (as is standard practice in Theban Coptic documents). The document is preserved in full but there are several areas of damage, especially in the top half. There are some patches of discoloration, notably at the bottom of the sheet, which predate the writing of the text.

In the ed. princ. no individual hands are identified. In addition to the scribe of the main text, the first party, Georgios, writes his own subscription, and one Sergios writes for Mena son of Paham. These statements are written more closely together than the body of the text, in order that they could fit in the remaining space at the bottom of the papyrus (it may also be for this reason that Shenoute writes Daniel’s statement directly after Georgios’, on the same line, rather than at the beginning of a new line, as is typical). The main scribe is Shenoute son of Elias, for whom this is the only attestation (see commentary to l. 31), who writes in a cursive hand, with a right slant, and few ligatures. There are some extravagant writings, particularly \( \alpha \) in the \( \alpha \tau \)-group and \( \beta \). Lines are consistently well spaced throughout. The superlinear stroke is used, often over entire lexemes, and can have a pronounced arch (this is especially the case in l. 2, where it looks like superlinear \( \tau \) above \( \nu \)). The diaeresis above \( \iota \) is common.

\textsuperscript{25} P.Brit.Mus.Copt. I 437: “George … recalls the division previously made of their common business and now undertakes not to make any subsequent claim as regards the fine which he had paid on Peter’s behalf?” \( \eta \rho \tau \alpha \nu \omega \chi \kappa \epsilon \chi \omicron \omicron \kappa \omicron \), since the latter had already repaid him” (although, see here the correction to l. 8). This is the only known attestation of Georgios; cf. W.C. Till, \textit{Datierung und Prosopographie}, p. 90. Conversely, the name Petros son of Komes is attested several times at Djeme, including a \textit{lashane} (698–719) and a \textit{dioiketes} (724–5), amongst others, for which see W.C. Till, \textit{Datierung und Prosopographie}, p. 171–2. It is not possible to certainly identify our Petros, from 720 or 735, with one of these.
vac.? + Δνοκ γεωρ[γ]ιος Νο[ηρ]ε . . . [...]
[γιοκακτ]ρον Νηχνε Πνοιος Νητ[ποιε]
[ερων]τ [ε]ιρζαί Μπρεος Ποηρε Νηνακ/
κομετεος γιοικακτρον Νουατ
[ε]επεδηλ γαρπαω ιπραγκατελ ατη-
[γ]ωβ ερος Ν[η]ενερ[η]υ αιμωκος εβολ [η]-
νεπερνυ ιπνερος σιαυ γιφωβ ηι
[. . . .]η ετβεπαω ιτζηνηη ιτζηνοχε
ειωκ πενταίταιη ηακ ικανολογιζε
ηνο[η] ιαι ουδε Δνοκ ουδε Ντο επαι
ουδε ιααυ ιρανε εισρε ιπαπροκαποι
ηνεκενεναιε ηαι ουδε ιητοκ ουδε
νεκωρη ουδε ιααυ ιρανε εποικπε εβολ
αεικανολογιζε ηαι ιπετερκαηταυροη ηιο
αιπωλος εβολ ινηνερνυ ρινουβ ρι-
[. . . .]ατ ιεζας [ης] ειπατεπραγκατεαινε ειηνιη
εγοβ ινεναςφαεια ινωνερνυ ιγιο
ιντεκτη ετηβολ ενωρε ιπνουτε
ιπαντοκρατωρ ιπνοιοχαι ινεναξιογε
εταρχει εικων ικινοπερεαρρε ιπνουτε
εταρεκερ ετοιοι ινεπιγραφο [ο] ινπιαρβα
ινοχ ιγιο πεταπιαρβα ινοχ ειναη
[. . . .]ουλιτρα ρινουβ εγωρρς [η] ιαι ιαεινιεγει-
γραφ[ε]ιε ειο ιεζοιε ειρ [ι] ιοφι ιεζι [ι]/ [ε] ιεταρ [Τ +
Hd 2 + Δνοκ γεωρυιος Νο[ηρ]ε ινακριος ιαειος
τετεχ Πενκαρφον ιεζοω ιην ειεμη
ροι ιπταοηη ηιο ηιοη [Η] [Η] [Η] ιρη ιηνακ/
ζακαρηα ηο ιηνιτρε + Δνοκ ρεηνοηη [ο] ιλας αιρζαί ιαροη +
Hd 3 + Δνοκ ιηνα ιρανε ιππραα [ιω] ιηνιτρε
[α] Δνοκ εριηος αιρζαί ιαροη
Hd 1 + ρεηνοηη [ο] ιλας αιηνηιη +

Enchoria 34, 2014/15
Concerning the business with which we are involved, we have reached a settlement [with] each other, both parties, in every matter. [And also], concerning the expenditure imposed upon you, what I gave to you, you have repaid to me.

Neither I nor (a) brother of mine, nor any man acting as my representative is able to sue you, neither you nor your children, nor any man of yours, because you have paid me what I am due. Moreover, we reached an agreement together, in gold, in silver, in everything belonging to our business, except the matter of our deed of agreement together, and the outstanding full payment.

We swear by God Almighty and the health of our lords who rule over us through the command of God to preserve the authority of this inviolable document. Moreover, the one who will transgress it will pay a pound of gold.

As a surety for you, I have drawn up this authoritative document.

Written 16th Paopi, 4th indiction.

+ I, Georgios the son of the late Matthias from the castrum Djeme, agree to the document and every matter written therein, by my hand.

+ I, Daniel the son of the late Zacharias, bear witness. + I, Shenoute (son of) Elias, wrote for him. +

+ I, Mena the son of Paham, bear witness. I, Sergios, wrote for him.

+ (I,) Shenoute (son of) Elias wrote it. +”

1. The beginning of the line is either blank, possibly because of previous damage to the papyrus, or a short opening was written, which is now lost. The only likely contender is γῦνα (σὺν θεῷ) “With God”, or a variant thereof, which is also found at the start of P.KRU 88.2 (γῦνα) and 110.1 (cn). In each instance it immediately precedes ἰνόκ, although in the
first example it is written after the Greek protocol. The phrase is also found at the begin-
ing of a number of smaller texts, including tax receipts (O.Crum 426–9, O.CrumST 67),
a tax notification (P.Bal. 130 Appendix A), and orders from a superior (O.Crum 500–8).

1. The patronymic ⲙⲡⲁⲕ/ⲙⲁⲑⲟⲥ (or a variant spelling), which is preserved on l. 25
where Georgios signs his consent, is expected at the end of the line, but it is difficult to
reconstruct the extant traces to support this.

2. [ⲙⲡⲕⲁⲥⲧⲣⲟⲛ] is omitted in the ed. princ., where the second line is indented without any
indication of a lacuna or traces. The reconstruction ⲙⲡ- rather than ⲡⲣⲡ- is made on the
basis of the parallel in l. 4, ⲙⲡⲉⲕⲁⲥⲧⲣⲟⲛ.

6. [ⲛ]ⲉⲛⲉⲣ[ⲏ]ⲩ for ⲛⲛⲉⲛⲉⲣⲏⲩ (ed. princ.). In the first lacuna there is only space for a
single letter; there has thus been a mistake by the scribe.

8. The ed. princ. reconstructs [ⲛⲟⲐ]ⲡ, but this is not certain and it is questionable whether
there is sufficient space for it in the lacuna. An alternative reconstruction is [ⲧⲥ ⲡ][ⲡ],
which is how I have decided to translate it.26

8. ⲡⲧⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ[ⲥ] for Ⲣⲧⲁⲓⲛⲟⲩ (ed. princ.). The writing here is faint, but following ⲧ there is
a small ⲧ, of which the left diagonal stroke is visible. The interpretation of the text remains
the same: Petros became in debt, as a result of unspecified expenditures (ζημία), and it
was Georgios who provided the financial aid for these. This document records the settling
of this situation.

10. ⲝⲟⲩⲓ for ⲝⲟⲩⲓⲡⲉ (ed. princ.). There is insufficient space for ⲝⲡ at the end of the line.
This is a careless omission by the scribe, who writes the same construction correctly in
l. 13.

16. ⲑⲃⲱⲓ is not noted as a superlinear addition in the ed. princ.

16. ⲑⲃⲱⲓ for ⲑⲃⲱⲓ (ed. princ.).

18. What ⲧⲡⲓⲧ(ⲕⲱ) (ⲧⲡⲓⲧε ϋς, η) refers to is unclear: this ‘full payment’ cannot refer to the
sum of money Georgios paid out on Petros’ behalf, as it is previously stated that this has
been repaid. Till was also uncertain, reading “(? ⲧⲡⲓⲧε ϋς?)”, and translating it as ‘Be-
gleichung’.27 ⲧⲡⲓⲧ(ⲕⲱ) (ⲧⲡⲓⲧ, η), ‘founding’ or ‘settling’ (‘setting-up’), is also possible,

26  I owe this point to the editor, Prof. Friedhelm Hoffmann.
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which would then refer to a payment made during the initial phases of the business. Both readings are possible, but the lack of specific details and background make the selection of one over the other difficult.

24. εγρινίοφι ις ινττεταρτγ for εγρινίοφι ις ινττεταρτγ (ed. princ.). There is no digraphic shift in Shenoute’s hand here. However, the area is damaged and none of the letters involved are those that would show clear variants between Coptic and Greek, such as β. If this is to be treated as Greek, it is to be read ἐγρινίοφι μηνός Φαῶφι ις ινδικτίωνος τέταρτος.

16th Paopi, 4th indiction = 7th October 720 or 735.

25–28. Hand 2: Georgios son of Matthias writes his own consent in an uneven bilinear hand with multiple stroke letter formations. Letters are often cramped and there is some difficulty in their formation.

27–28. This is the only known attestation of Daniel son of Zacharias.

29–30. Hand 3: Sergios’ hand is similar to Georgios’, that is, thick with some difficulties maintaining an even appearance. Overall, though, letters are more rounded and it is a slightly more accomplished style.

29. MacCoull, reads Abraham rather than Paham. A Mena son of Abraham is attested in P.KRU 51.12, but Mena son of Paham is well attested at Djeme.

31. Goodwin was not able to read this line – the scribe’s notation, and Till misread it as Samuel, without patronymic. The text is damaged and difficult to read, and this is exact-
eribated by poor writing in cramped conditions at the bottom of the page (the witnesses left barely enough room for him to sign), and interference from l. 30 above. Comparison with his writing of his name on l. 28 confirms that the same individual, σηνοῦς ἡλιακ (Shenoute son of Elias), wrote both. This is especially clear in the writing of γ, η, λ, and final ε, which are almost identical in each example. The only major differences are the writing of ε and superlinear θ. In l. 31, both letters are more extravagant: ε has an ascending stroke and the bisecting horizontal stroke of θ is much longer. This is possibly the result of Shenoute having to lift his pen from the papyrus to re-dip, as indicated by the discrepancy in colour between the horizontal stroke and the body of theta.

P.KRU 55.28

P.KRU 55.31

3. New Scribes in Old Documents

The Djeme documents have been published now for a century (P.KRU was published in 1912), but despite this, the scribes responsible for them have received scant attention. This is, in part, due to the lack of published images of the documents and also that the location of several were largely unknown.

Neither P.KRU 34 nor P.KRU 55 was previously attributed to certain scribes, instead being included in P.KRU Index V, ‘Schreiber’, as anonymous texts. Consultation of the original manuscripts corrects this. In the first case, only one person is responsible for the writing of the entire document, and the only person to assign his name to any part of it is

Paulos son of Kabiou. In the second document, Shenoute’s signature can be read. These are the only attestations of each as a scribe. Indeed, P.KRU 55 is the only attestation of Shenoute son of Elias in Till’s prosopographic study of Theban texts. This reference is, of course, restricted to his role as ‘Schreibhelfer’, i.e. ὑπογραφέως, referring to l. 28 in which he writes on behalf of Daniel son of Zacharias, who is unable to write his own witness statement. The reading of the final line of the papyrus makes it clear that Shenoute wrote the actual document as well.

While this brings the number of ‘anonymous’ P.KRU texts down to 34, the number is in fact lower, as has been noted – albeit not explicitly – in several studies since the 1960s. A number of documents lacking their scribal notation can be assigned to known scribes of other documents. Sebastian Richter, in his study of David son of Psate, attributes P.KRU 22 and 29 (two deeds of sale) to him. P.KRU 56, a settlement over money, can certainly be attributed to Shmentsnêy (also spelled Khmentsnêy) son of Shenoute, the scribe of P.KRU 12, 13, and 106. Till had already suggested this, based on the presence of his name in a broken segment towards the end of the document: χατσενην πούρη ρς . .. ρος [. . .]ηρε ιεσνοντ ης αγιοι αιρα� χαπεραςον άλω αιραβ ειτσξοι. “Shmentsnêy son of S[henoute? . . . the s]on of Shenoute, I was asked and I wrote for these people, and I wrote it (i.e. the document), by my hand” (ll. 27–31). This is confirmed through personal inspection of the papyri involved, all of which are written in the same hand. Till also recognized that Markos son of Athanasios was the scribe of P.KRU 20 and 111. Crum, who must have looked only at the last line of each edition when drawing up his scribes’ index, missed Markos’ notation in P.KRU 20.127–130, which is located between witness statements: ἀνοι ηαρκος πούρε ηπωκ / ἀλας η ἄιοι ηπας ταξιας προς ταγιας εσεβανος πούρε γεμνανος ἄλω τιο λντρε “I, Markos son of the late Anastasios, drew up this deed of sale by my hand, at the request of Stephanos son of Germanos, and I bear witness”. The same is also true of the donation deed P.KRU 111, where Markos’ statement is followed by that of a witness: ἀνοι ηαρκος πούρε ηπωκ, ἀλας η ἄιοι

---

38 W.C. TILL, Datierung und Prosopographie, p. 209.
39 T.S. RICHTER, “Zwei Urkunden des koptischen Notars David”.
40 W.C. TILL, Datierung und Prosopographie, p. 69.
41 This is based on my own personal examination of the papyri that are part of the British Library’s collection, i.e. P.KRU 12, 13, and 56. An example from the second of these texts is available in: J. CROMWELL, “Following in Father’s Footsteps: The Question of Father-Son Training in Eighth Century Thebes,” in: P. SCHUBERT (ed.), Actes du 26e Congrès international de papyrologie, Genèse, 16–21 août 2010, Genève, 2012: p. 151 (fig. 1). Indeed, P.KRU 56 was omitted from that study and should be entered into the dataset for the scribes in question.
42 W.C. TILL, Datierung und Prosopographie, p. 139.
I, Markos son of the late Anastastios, drew up this donation deed [by my] hand, at the request of Enoch” (ll. 31–33). The orthography and palaeography of both documents confirm they are written by the same man.43

Together, P.KRU 22, 29, 56 (which can be assigned to known scribes) and 20, 34, 54, and 111 (written by men not previously identified as scribes), reduce the number of anonymous P.KRU texts from 36 to 29. In so doing, they add three men to the body of known writers who drew up documents: Paulos son of Kabiou, Shenoute son of Elias, and Markos son of Athanasios. One additional note needs to be made here. It is not only the anonymous texts that need to be examined to see if they can be assigned to certain individuals. Crum’s index of scribes is not infallible in other respects either.

Crum lists the two copies of the testament of Susanna, daughter of Tsia, P.KRU 66 and 76, under different scribes, respectively Shenetom son of Mena and the priest Komes. Shenetom did not write P.KRU 66. Indeed, as stated explicitly in the document, he was not even able to write: ϣⲉⲛⲓⲧⲱⲙ ⲡϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲙⲡⲙⲁⲕ / ⲙⲏⲛⲟⲩ ⲙⲙⲧⲣⲉ ⲕⲟⲙⲉⲥ ⲡⲓⲇⲥⲧⲃⲫ/ ⲁⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟⲥ ϫⲉⲙⲉϥⲛⲟ[ⲓ ⲛⲥϩ]ⲁⲓ “Shenitom son of Mena, I bear witness. Komes, the most humble priest, have written for him because he cannot write” (l. 85). Again, Crum looked at the final line of the document and noted that name as the scribe. The correct attestation of P.KRU 66 was also noted by Till and a detailed comparison of the two copies demonstrates that Komes wrote both.44 Shenitom (of course, as an illiterate) is not attested as a scribe anywhere else. Therefore, while three scribes can be added to Crum’s list, Shenitom must be removed and P.KRU 66 assigned to Komes.

On balance, this increases the number of scribes in P.KRU Index V to 39 men and reduces the number of anonymous texts to 29 (out of 123). Many of these men are also known outside of P.KRU, amongst the vast number of non-literary texts that the village – let alone the entire Theban region – has produced. Examination of the original manuscripts of other P.KRU texts, especially in light of the amount of material that has been made available since their publication in 1912, might help to further reduce the number of ‘anonymous’ productions and identify more men who were able to – and did – draw up such documents.

43 This is again based on personal analysis of the papyri, both of which are in the British Library.
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