


Please cite the Published Version

Cromwell, Jennifer  and Penland, Elizabeth (2024) Settlement concerning a House and a courtyard, from Jeme. In: *Coptica Lipsiensia: Koptische Texte aus der Papyrus- und Ostrakasammlung der Universitätsbibliothek Leipzig* (P.Lips.Copt. 1). Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete – Beihefte (52). De Gruyter, pp. 179-188. ISBN 9783111423944 (hardcover); 9783111427607 (ebook)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111427607-011>

Publisher: De Gruyter

Version: Accepted Version

Downloaded from: <https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk/636846/>

Usage rights:  In Copyright

Additional Information: This is an accepted manuscript of a chapter which appeared in final form in *Coptica Lipsiensia: Koptische Texte aus der Papyrus- und Ostrakasammlung der Universitätsbibliothek Leipzig* (P.Lips.Copt. 1), published by De Gruyter

Enquiries:

If you have questions about this document, contact openresearch@mmu.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in e-space. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our Take Down policy (available from <https://www.mmu.ac.uk/library/using-the-library/policies-and-guidelines>)

8. Settlement concerning a house and a courtyard, from Jeme

Jennifer Cromwell & Elizabeth Penland*

Codex Tischendorfianus LI and LII
Vollers 1090E and F
Pl. LXII–LXIII

late 720s–730s
Jeme

The text comprises 15 large and 10 small fragments mounted across two plates. The plates were originally assigned two separate inventory numbers, perhaps due to perceived variations in letter forms and papyrus condition. The fragments in these two plates belong to one settlement document (διάλυσις) written in a single hand. The settlement concerns a house and a courtyard in the village of Jeme and is between *NN* (first party, whose name is lost) and Nohe son of Jeremiah (second party). Nohe is well attested in the Jeme legal corpus, as priest and hegemon of the Holy Church of Jeme (see commentary). His dates, in combination with further prosopographic information, allow the text to be dated within the first third of the eighth century CE, and more precisely to the late 720s or 730s.

The papyrus is of a medium brown color with several lighter vertical strips running through the surface. The quality of papyrus is good: it is on the thick side with a smooth surface. The document is written along the fibers. The ink is brown-black and in decent condition, showing little exposure to the elements. The fragments are broken mostly in a rectilinear fashion and the left and right text margins are preserved for many of the larger pieces. Damage to the document occurred mostly along the width of the papyrus, likely as a result of how it was rolled, but there is also vertical damage evident that resulted in several smaller fragments. The written line width varies greatly: the longest complete line width, 17.4 cm, occurs in fragment F8, the smallest, 13.4 cm, in fragment E6. Neither the top nor bottom margins survive—the Greek protocol that would have prefaced the settlement is missing and the list of witnesses is represented by one small fragment. The surviving text comes primarily from the body of the document. As not all papyri documents were cut from the beginning of the papy-

* We would like to thank Anne Boud'hors, Frederic Krueger, and Sebastian Richter for their discussions on different aspects of this text.

rus roll, it is not possible to determine whether a sheet bearing the Arabic *protokollon* was originally attached to this document or not.¹

The most substantial fragments, i.e., those preserving the left and right margins of the text, have a total length of 65.2 cm. Even though an unknown amount of text has been lost from the beginning and end of the document, estimating from the formulaic elements allows for a total document length of 4–5 sheets, ca. 120–150 cm. Three *kolleseis* are evident in sections B and E below (original fragment numbers E5 and F9, and F6 respectively). On the verso, there are ink traces, but these appear to be transfer from contact with another papyrus rather than remnants of an actual address.

The scribal hand is practiced: it is fluid and variable with several cursive formations and ligatures. The width and spacing of letters and lines varies greatly. Vowels are often pointed with dots, and diresis occurs over the ι in ροῖτε (l. B1, below) and ηῖ (l. E2, below). Supralinear strokes are evident over names (ΝΥΜΩ, l. A2; ΝΑΥΘΕΝΤΗΣ, l. E8), and there are abbreviation strokes as well (evident in μακ(αριος), l. E10). The Greek letters in particular are highly cursive. Vertical strokes at the end of the lines tend to be lengthened. Some of the final sigmas are non-lunate (e.g., in ἠεωΔορος, l. E15) and there are cursive and non-cursive forms of π.

Reconstructing the document

The 1906 catalog by Vollers lists the plates under two separate inventory numbers, 1090E and 1090F.² The content is identified as documentary and the text condition is listed as consisting of “einzelne Streifen.” The inventory number preceding these fragments (1090D) also refers to a fragmentary eighth-century CE documentary text from Jeme (here as *P.Lips.Copt.* I 7). While the fragments of this settlement were originally mounted separately, the fragments all belong to a single document and the original order in which they were mounted does not reflect the correct order of the two pieces. The text, as it is edited here, comprises seventeen of these fragments, with eight fragments being too small and bearing too little text to allow their position to be determined definitively in relation to the other pieces. In order to retain the archival information of the pieces, the following list provides the original mounted position of the numbers (E and F refer to the two inventory numbers, which are on separate plates):

(A): E1. Introductory formulae; provision of officials.

(B): F6. Summary of ownership.

¹ See, for example, CROMWELL, *Village Life*, p. 8.

² LEIPOLDT, “II. Christliche Literatur”, p. 426)

(C): E7. From introductory formulae.

(D): F4. From introductory formulae.

(E): E2, F10, E8, E4, E5, E12, F9, E5, F1, E6, F2. Description of the two properties.

(F): E3. Agreement of resolution.

(G): E14. Witness statement.

The following fragments have not been edited, and the relation to the above fragments cannot be determined: E9,10,11,13,15, F3,7,8.

(A)

[. . .] . . . ς . ςΥ[.]Ν . . . ΩΡ . . [. ΧΑΗΛ]
 ΠΩΗΡΕ ΝΨΜΩ ΔΑΥΤΗΝΟΥ ΖΕΝΝΟΣ ΝΡΩΜΕ
 ΜΝ ΠΕΚΩΤ ΟΥΔΙ [. . . .]
 ΜΜΩΝ ΜΝ ΝΕΝ [ca. 11–14]
 5 [. .] . [. .] . [ca. 14–19]

(B)

1 ΖΝ ΝΟΥΒ ΖΝ ΖΑΤ ΖΝ ΖΟΪΤΕ ΖΝ ΗΙ ΖΝ ΠΕΤΚΙΜ
 [ΖΝ ΠΕΤ] ΚΙΜ ΔΝ ΩΔ ΖΡΑΙ ΕΥΑΜΕΤΩΠ
 [.] . [.]

(C)

1 ΕΧΩΝ ΕΜΗΤΕ ΕΤΕΤΕΝΝΑΟΥΟΝΖΦ ΕΒΟΛ
 ΖΙ ΤΕΤΙΑΛΗCΙC ΝΤΟΚ ΔΕ ΝΩΖΕ ΠΖΗ-
 [ΚΟΥΜΕΝΟC]

(D)

1 [ca.10–12] . [. .] [. . . .]
 2 [ca.10–12] ΕΡΗΥ ΜΠΜΕΡ[οC .]

(E)

[ΝΤΟΚ ΝΩΖΕ ΠΖΗ-]
 ΚΟΥΜΕΝΟC ΑΚΤΑΖΟ ΠΗΪ ΕΤΕΦΜΟΥΤΕ [ΕΡΟ] Φ ΔΕ ΠΗΪ
 ΠΑΖΑΜ ΜΝ ΠΑΝΖ ΩΡΑΡΑΤΗΥ ΜΝ ΝΕΦΧΡΙCΤΕ-

5 ΡΙΩΝ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΕΤΑΝΥΓΙ ΕΡΟΟΥ ΠΗΙ ΔΕ ΕΦΖΙ
 ΒΟΛ ΜΠῚΩ ΝΙΩΝΟΦΡΙΟΣ ΝΚΟΥΖΗΥ
 ΝΤΑΩ ΔΕ ΜΠΗΙ ΕΤΗΜΑΥ ΝΕ ΝΑΙ
 ΕΠΕΦΤΟΥΤΡΑΚΩΝ ΕΓΚΩΤΕ ΠΖΗΤ ΠῚΩ
 ΝΔΥΘΕΝΤΗΣ ΑΥΩ ΠΖΙΡ ΕΖΡΑΪ ΕΠΖΑΓΙΟΣ ΔΗΝΑΝ[ΙΑΣ]
 ΠΕΜΝΤΕ ΔΑΥΕΙΔ ΣΟΥΟΙ ΠΡΗΣ
 10 ΝΩΗΡΕ ΜΠΜΑΚ(ΑΡΙΟΣ) ΙΩΔΑΝΝΗΣ ΚΑΛΗ
 ΠΕΙΒΤ ΤΖΙΡ ΖΟΜΕΟΣ ΕΡΗΣ ΔΧΝ ΤΕΡῚΩ
 ΕΙΣ ΝΑΙ ΝΕ ΝΤΑΩ ΜΠΗΙ ΝΤΑΩ ΔΕ ΜΠΑΝῚ
 ΩΜΕΟΣ ΕΠΕΦΤΟΥΣΑ ΝΑΙ ΝΕ ΠΖΗΤ
 ΔΑΥΕΙΔ ΚΟΣΤΑΝΤΙΝΟΣ ΜΗ ΝΕΦΚΛΗΡΟΝΟΜΟΣ
 15 ΠΡΗΣ ΦΕΛΟΘΙΟΣ ΝΘΕΩΔΟΡΟΣ ΠΕΙΒΤ
 ΤΖΙΡΖΙΡΕ ΕΖΟΥΝ ΝΤΕΠΡΟ ΝΔΥΘΕΝΤΕΣ ΟΥΟΝ
 ΕΡΟΣ ΠΕΜΝΤΕ ΠΗΪ ΝΝΩΖΕ ΠΕΝΕΙΩΤ
 ΕΙΣ ΝΑΙ ΖΩΜΙΩΣ ΝΕΝῚΤΑΩ ΜΠΑΝῚ
 ΕΠΕΦΤΟΥΣΑ ΤΑΡΕΚΡ ΠΕΦΧΟΕΙΣ
 20 ΝΤ[Ο]Κ ΝΩΖΕ ΠΩΗΡΕ [Ν]ΙΗΡΗΜΑΙΑΣ
 ΧΕ ΝΤΑΚΤΑΖΟΟΥ ΕΠΕΚΜΕΡΟΣ
 ΩΔ ΕΝΕΖ ΝΤΟΚ ΔΕ ΝΩΖΕ ΠΖΕΚΟΥΜΕ-
 [ΝΟΣ]

(F)

1 [. .] . [. .] [ca. 8–10]
 ΩΜΩΛΟΚΗ ΧΕ ΜῚΝΤΕΝΛΑΔΥ ΖΗ ΠΚΕΝΟΝ

(G)

1 [ca.?] ΔΥ ΔΝΟΚ ΦΕΛ[ΟΘΙΟΣ ΝΘΕΩΔΟΡΟΣ?]

B: 2 1. εγραμ ντωπ | **C: 2** διάλυσις, δέ **2-3** ἡγούμενος | **D: 2** μέρος | **E: 1** ἡγούμενος | **3-4** χρηστήριον | **4** ἀνήκειν, δέ | **6** δέ | **7** τετράγωνος | **8** ἀθέντης, **8** ἄγιος | **10** μακ, παρ. (μακάριος) | **11** ὁμοίως, 1. εχν | **13** ὁμοίως | **14** κληρονόμος | **16** ἀθέντης | **18** ὁμοίως | **21** μέρος | **22** δέ, ἡγούμενος | **F: 2** ὁμολογεῖν, κοινόν.

Translation

(A)

1¹ [... Chael] 2² the son of Psmo sent officials 3³ and the builder [...] 4⁴ us and our [...]

(B)

[...] ¹ in gold, silver, garments, houses, in movables ² and immovables, down to the smallest thing ³ [...]

(C)

[...] ¹ between us, which you will reveal ² in the settlement. You, Nohe, hegumen [...]

(D)

¹ [...] ... ² [...] of the part(y/ies) [...]

(E)

¹ [... you, Nohe, he-]²-gemon, you received the house that is called the house (of) ³ Paham and the courtyard, in their entirety, with every-⁴-thing that belongs to them.

The house is out-⁵-side of the door of Onophrios son of Kohêu. ⁶ These are the borders of that house, ⁷ to the four surrounding corners: north, the front ⁸ door and the road down to Saint Ananias; ⁹ west, David (son of) Swai; south, ¹⁰ the children of the late Johannes (son of) Kale; ¹¹ east, the road similarly southwards, towards the sheepfold. ¹² Note: these are the borders of the house.

These are the borders of the courtyard, ¹³ likewise to its four sides: north, ¹⁴ David son of Konstantinos and his heirs; ¹⁵ south, Philotheos son of Theodoros; east ¹⁶ the small street inside, onto which the front door opens; ¹⁷ west, the house of Nohe our father. ¹⁸ Note: likewise, these are the borders of the courtyard ¹⁹ to its four sides. You shall become its owner, ²⁰ you, Nohe (son of) Jeremiah, ²¹ because you have received your share forever, you, Nohe, hegum[en ...]

(F)

¹ [...] ... [...] ² agree that we hold nothing in common.

(G)

[...] I Phil[otheos son of Theodoros? ...]

Commentary

(A)

2 [Chael] son of Psmo: Based on parallels, [NN] son of Psmo must be a senior official, before whom the dispute was brought, who selected other officials to mediate the case; cf. similarly *P.KRU* 42.8–11, in which the parties bring their dispute first before the local Arab official Abd al-Rahman (ΑΒΔΕΡΖΟΜΑΡ; see LEGENDRE, “Perméabilité linguistique”, p. 402, for the transcription of the name), who delegates a local official to mediate, who in turn assigns local offi-

cials to the matter (see CROMWELL, “Western Thebes” pp. 138–139). The official in question in our document is most likely Chael son of Psemo, who served as *dioiketes* and *lashane* (i.e., magistrate and village headman respectively; see BERKES, *Dorfverwaltung* for these titles) of Jeme in the late 720s and 730s (see TILL, *Datierung und Prosopographie*, p. 68 for further details).

3 The builder in this context refers to an expert called upon to mediate in disputes concerning properties (CRUM, *Dict.*, 123a). He occurs together with the officials (the ‘great men’) in *P.KRU* 23.26–27, *P.KRU* 42.11–13, and *P.KRU* 45.22–23. The second of these documents is of particular note here, because Nohe, the second party to this document, occurs there amongst the officials ἀφτνοογ ννοσ νρωμε ετεναι νε νωρε πργτογμενος μν θωμα νβικτωρ μν ζαρων νανδρεαδ μν πιγνθιοσ νψγροσ πεκωτ ‘he sent the officials, namely Nohe, the hegemon, Thomas son of Victor, Aaron son of Andreas, and the builder Pesynthios son of Psyros’). Two sale documents, *P.KRU* 3.40–41 and 7.28–29, refer to examination (δοκιμασία) by the builder.

(B)

This fragment is placed here, as it is understood to be referring to the entire property about which the officials are reaching a decision. It may be the case that this is an inheritance dispute. While this phrase encapsulates the entirety of the estate, the real issue concerns the house and courtyard that Nohe receives. As an example, *P.KRU* 38 (dated 738) concerns the inheritance of the woman Elisabeth daughter of Epiphanius (for whom see WILFONG, *Women of Jeme*, p. 47–68) between her son and his stepfather and his half-siblings. Immediately after reference to the officials, the inheritance is described (ll. 21–25): ἀγει ετενημτε μν νενερηγ ζα τεκληρονομια τηρσ ζν ζωβ νιμ ζν νογβ ζν ζατ ζν βαρωτ ζν πενιπε ζν νετεβαεκ νεβσνητ ζν νηι εγκητ ζν εισρογβρωτ ζιν πετκιμ ωα πετκιμ αν ζιν ογκογι ωα ογνοσ ζν ζωβ νιμ ζα φωβ τηρσ ντεκληρονομια ‘They (i.e., the officials) came between us concerning the entire inheritance, in everything, in gold, silver, bronze, iron, smithing tools, built houses, vacant land, from moveables to immoveables, from small to great, in everything concerning the entire matter of the inheritance.’

2 ἀμετωπ: ‘A needle’ occurs as the epitome of a small object in a number of Jeme documents, e.g., *P.KRU* 36.26 (ζιν ογνοσ ωα ογκογ[ι] ωα ζραι εγελδοσ νβλζε νελαχιστον μν οζαμε ντωπ ‘from great to small, down to a humblest pot and a needle’); cf. similarly *P.KRU* 65.61 and 68.53.

(C)

1 εζων εμητε: There are no parallels in the Jeme corpus. It is understood here as referring to the decision that was made between the two parties, which

will be set down in the following clauses of the document. As such, this fragment follows the previous two, which introduce the officials and the property in question.

2 Nohe, as is made clear later, is the son of Jeremiah (l. E20), priest and hegemon of the Holy Church of Jeme. Nohe is well attested at Thebes: *P.KRU* 21.104 (witness; 725 CE); 42.11 (official) and 54 (witness; 725/6 CE); 45.70 (witness; 725 CE); 46.49 (witness; 725 CE); 12.59 (witness; 733 CE); 13.75 (witness; 733 CE); 106.226 (735 CE); 95.36 (amanuensis; mid-8th c.); *O.Vind.Copt.* 67.5 (scribe; 738 CE); all dates are from TILL, *Datierung und Prosopographie*, p. 147 (for possible alternative dates for some of these documents, see CROMWELL, *Village Life*, pp. 48; 58). This is the first document in which he occurs as one of the principal parties.

(D)

This small piece is difficult to place. μέρος in settlements from Jeme means either a “share” of the property to be divided, or one or the two ‘parties’ to be settled, as in the frequent formula προς θε ντασρ αναν μμηρος σναγ ‘as it pleased both parties of us’ If μμηρ[ος] refers to something happening to the two parties, it may refer to the disputes that took place between them, or their agreement to seek arbitration. If μμηρ[ος] refers to the share (μέρος) that Nohe received from the settlement, it is possible that the explication of the share immediately follows, hence its placement here before section E.

(E)

2–3 It is interesting to note that the house is not described as belonging to Paham, but is named as such. This is, to the best of our knowledge, the only example of a house that is described in this way. In fact, this expression is only otherwise used twice to refer to parts of the village: ‘the street that is called Trailakine’ (*P.KRU* 1.53: πριρ ετογμογτε εροφ χετπαϊλακινε) and ‘that land which is called the cabbage land’ (*P.KRU* 3.21: κκαρ ετμναγ εγμογτε εροογ χε κκαρ νγραμπε).

5 Onophrios son of Kohêu occurs in *P.KRU* 24.6,62 (763 CE) as a house owner. If the dates of these two documents are correct, and this is the same property, then Onophrios lived in the same house for circa 30 years. In support of this, Onophrios’ house in *P.KRU* 24 is also noted as being in the vicinity of Apa Ananias, for which see l. 7 below.

7 επεφτογτρακων: This is an example of a hybrid combination of the Coptic phrase πεφτοογ σα (εγκωτε εροφ) ‘its four sides (which surround it)’ and Greek-based formula, such as ντετρακονον, εκ τετραγωνον, εκ τετραγωνογ

(ἐκ τετράγωνου). A close parallel is *P.KRU* 9,46: ἐπερτογτρακενον εγκωτε εροϋ. For other attestations of τετράγωνος, the majority of which are Theban (and all are eighth century), see FÖRSTER, *Wörterbuch*, p. 804.

8 A church or sanctuary of Apa Ananias occurs in a number of Theban documents. Two properties within the village are referred to in connection with it: *P.KRU* 106.128 mentions a house situated in the street of Saint Apa Ananias (πριρ ηρηαγιος απα ανανιας), and in *P.KRU* 24.65–68 a courtyard is described as in the vicinity of Saint Apa Ananias, the bishop (ρηαγιος απα ανανιας πεπισκ(οπος)). A group of texts (collected in BEHLMER, “Christian Use”, pp. 167–168) refer to a church or sanctuary of Apa Ananias: *O.Crum* 118 (its affairs), 212 (its steward), 215 (its sacks(?)), and *SB Kopt.* II 1030 (theft of ritual implements). This is presumably connected to the bishop Apa Ananias who was once resident in western Thebes (in the area of Theban Tombs [TT] 85 and 87; see BEHLMER, “Christian Use”).

9 David son of Swai occurs once, as scribe of *O.Vind.Copt.* 107.

10 Johannes son of Kale is not otherwise attested. Kale here is certainly a patronymic, rather than a toponym. Literally ‘the lame’, καλε (σαλε) is the Coptic version of the Demotic word *gl* ‘paralyzed’, which is well-attested as Greek proper name: Καλῆς; it could potentially be a descriptor of Johannes, as occurs with other physical attributes, e.g., ‘blind Jacob’ (ιακωβ βλλε), *P.KRU* 27.27, 40.

11 This is the only known attestation of a sheepfold (or cattlefold) in the village; the term is not otherwise attested at Thebes. It occurs in a Hermopolite lease (*P.Ryl.Copt.* 302a) and two unpublished papyri in the British Library (Or. 6201 A22 and 1073), as noted in CRUM, *Dict.*, 302a. As the property is located between streets leading to a church and a sheepfold, it is likely that it is situated on the edge of the village, perhaps even outside the ancient mudbrick enclosure wall.

14 David son of Konstantinos is not otherwise attested. However, the property in *P.KRU* 24, with which the house described in this settlement is perhaps connected, was bordered by the property of an Abraham son of Konstantinos (for whom, see TILL *Datierung und Prosopographie*, p. 50). It is not outside the realm of possibility that Abraham and David are related.

15 The only known occurrence of a Philotheos son of Theodoros is *O.Medin.HabuCopt.* 101.1–2, in which he is stated as being from Terkôt (south of Jeme in the Hermonthite nome; see TIMM, *Das christlich-koptische Ägypten*, pp. 2590–2591). It is possible, but not certain, that the two refer to the same individual.

16 ΤΡΙΠΡΙΠΕ ΕΞΟΥΝ, literally ‘the small street inside’, is probably best understood as a sidestreet or alley.

17 Nohe clearly had vested interest in the courtyard under dispute, as we see here that he also owned property to the west of it.

(F)

This fragment, containing part of a single line, confirms that the two parties have no other business with each other, and so is placed after the description of the properties that Nohe received.

(G)

This small fragment is the only one that bears traces of the witness statements. We tentatively reconstruct the name Philotheos son of Theodoros, who appears elsewhere in this document (E15). However, as Philotheos is a common name, this witness may instead be a different individual not otherwise connected to the property.

Bibliography

- BEHLMER H., “Christian Use of Pharaonic Sacred Space in Western Thebes: The Case of TT 85 and 87” in P.F. Dorman & B.M. Bryan (Eds.), *Sacred Space and Sacred Function in Ancient Thebes. Occasional Proceedings of the Theban Workshop* (SAOC 61) Chicago 2007, pp. 165–177.
- BERKES L., *Dorfverwaltung und Dorfgemeinschaft in Ägypten von Diokletian zu den Abbasiden* (Philippika 104), Wiesbaden 2017.
- CROMWELL J.A., *Recording Village Life: A Coptic scribe in Early Islamic Egypt*, Ann Arbor 2017.
- CROMWELL J., “Western Thebes and the Arab Administration of Pre-Abbasid Egypt,” in L. Berkes (Ed.), *Christians and Muslims in Early Islamic Egypt (P.Christ.Musl.)* (ASP 56), Durham, NC 2022, pp. 135–147.
- LEGENDRE M., “Perméabilité linguistique et anthroponymique entre copte et arabe: l’exemple du comptes en caractères coptes du Fayoum Fatimide”, in A. Boud’hors, A. Delattre, C. Louis & T.S. Richter (Eds.), *Coptica Argentoratensia. Textes et documents de la troisième université d’été de papyrologie copte (Strasbourg, 18–25 juillet 2010)* (Cahiers de la bibliothèque copte 19), Paris 2014, pp. 325–440.
- LEIPOLDT J., “II. Christliche Literatur: 3. In koptischer Sprache”, in K. Vollers (Ed.), *Katalog der islamischen, christlich-orientalischen, jüdischen und samaritanischen Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek zu Leipzig* (Katalog der Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek zu Leipzig 2), Leipzig 1906, pp. 383–427.
- TILL W.C., *Datierung und Prosopographie der koptischen Urkunden aus Theben* (SÖAW 240, 1), Wien 1962.
- WILFONG T.G., *Women of Jeme. Lives in a Coptic Town in late Antique Egypt*, Ann Arbor 2002.